

A proof of the Nisan-Ronen conjecture

George Christodoulou* Elias Koutsoupias[†] Annamária Kovács[‡]

Abstract

Noam Nisan and Amir Ronen conjectured that the best approximation ratio of deterministic truthful mechanisms for makespan-minimization for n unrelated machines is n . This work validates the conjecture.

1 Introduction

This work resolves the oldest open problem in *algorithmic mechanism design*, the Nisan-Ronen conjecture. The seminal work of Nisan and Ronen [28] set the foundations of the field of *algorithmic mechanism design* by probing the computational and information-theoretic aspects of *mechanism design*. Mechanism design, a celebrated branch of game theory and microeconomics, studies the design of algorithms (called mechanisms) in environments where the input is privately held and provided by selfish participants. A mechanism for an optimization problem, on top of the traditional algorithmic goal (that assumes knowledge of the input), bears the extra burden of providing incentives to the participants to report their true input.

One of the main thrusts in this research area is to demarcate the limitations imposed by truthfulness on algorithms. To what extent are mechanisms less powerful than traditional algorithms? This question was crystallized by the widely influential Nisan-Ronen conjecture for the scheduling problem, which asserts that no deterministic mechanism for n machines can have approximation ratio better than n .

The objective of the scheduling problem is to minimize the makespan of allocating m tasks to n unrelated machines, where each machine i needs t_{ij} units of time to process task j . The problem combines various interesting properties. First, it belongs to the most challenging and unexplored area of *multi-dimensional* mechanism design, as the private information (the t_{ij} 's) is multi-dimensional. In contrast, *related* machines scheduling belongs to *single-dimensional* mechanism design, which is well-understood, and for which the power of truthful mechanisms does not substantially differ from the best non-truthful algorithms: not only truthful mechanisms can compute exact optimal solutions (if one disregards computational issues [1]), but a truthful PTAS exists [13]. Second, the objective of the scheduling problem has a min-max objective, which from the mechanism design point of view is much more challenging, as opposed to the min-sum objective achievable by the famous VCG [30, 14, 22] mechanism. VCG is truthful and can be applied to the scheduling problem, but it achieves a very poor approximation ratio, equal to the number of machines n [28].

Is there a better mechanism for scheduling than VCG? Nisan and Ronen [28] conjectured that the answer should be negative, but for the past two decades, the question has remained open. In this work we validate the Nisan-Ronen conjecture.

*School of Informatics, Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, Greece. Email: gichristo@csd.auth.gr

[†]Department of Computer Science, University of Oxford, UK. Email: elias@cs.ox.ac.uk

[‡]Department of Informatics, Goethe University, Frankfurt M., Germany. Email: panni@cs.uni-frankfurt.de

Theorem 1. *There is no deterministic truthful mechanism with approximation ratio better than n for the problem of scheduling n unrelated machines.*

This result resolves the Nisan-Ronen conjecture. Over the years, various research attempts with limited success have been made to improve the original lower bound of 2 by Nisan and Ronen. For example, the bound was improved to 2.41 in [12], and later to 2.61 in [23], which held as the best bound for over a decade. More recently, the lower bound was improved to 2.75 by Giannakopoulos, Hamerl, and Poças [19], and then to 3 by Dobzinski and Shaulker [17]. These improved bounds represented progress in the field, but they left a huge gap between the lower and upper bounds. The first non-constant lower bound for the truthful scheduling problem was given in [9], which showed a lower bound of $\Omega(\sqrt{n})$.

1.1 Further Related work

A line of research studies randomized mechanisms with slightly improved approximation guarantees. Note that there are two notions of truthfulness for randomized mechanisms; a mechanism is *universally truthful* if it is defined as a probability distribution over deterministic truthful mechanisms, and it is *truthful-in-expectation*, if in expectation no player can benefit by lying. In [28], a universally truthful mechanism was proposed for the case of two machines, and was later extended to the case of n machines by Mu’alem and Schapira [27] with an approximation guarantee of $0.875n$, which was later improved to $0.837n$ by [25]. Lu and Yu [26] showed a truthful-in-expectation mechanism with an approximation guarantee of $(n + 5)/2$. Mu’alem and Schapira [27], showed a lower bound of $2 - 1/n$, for both types of randomized truthful mechanisms. In [7], the lower bound was extended to fractional mechanisms, where each task can be fractionally allocated to multiple machines. They also showed a fractional mechanism with a guarantee of $(n + 1)/2$. Even for the special case of two machines the upper and lower bounds are not tight [26, 6].

In the Bayesian setting, Daskalakis and Weinberg [16] showed a mechanism that is at most a factor of 2 from the *optimal truthful mechanism*, but not with respect to optimal makespan. The work of [5] provided bounds of prior-independent mechanisms (where the input comes from a probability distribution unknown to the mechanism). Giannakopoulos and Kyropoulou [20] showed that the VCG mechanism achieves an approximation ratio of $O(\log n / \log \log n)$ under some distributional and symmetry assumptions. Finally, in a recent work, [10] showed positive results for *graph* settings where each task can only be allocated to at most two machines. The construction of the lower bound of this work uses multi-cliques and multi-stars.

There is also work on variants of the scheduling problem and also of special cases, for which significant results have been obtained. Ashlagi, Dobzinski, and Lavi [2], resolved a restricted version of the Nisan-Ronen conjecture, for the special but natural class of *anonymous* mechanisms. Lavi and Swamy [24] studied a restricted input domain which however retains the multi-dimensional flavour of the setting. They considered inputs with only two possible values “low” and “high” and they showed an elegant deterministic mechanism with an approximation factor of 2. They also showed that even for this setting achieving the optimal makespan is not possible under truthfulness, and provided a lower bound of $11/10$. Yu [32] extended the results for a range of values, and [3] studied multi-dimensional domains where the private information of the machines is a single bit.

2 Preliminaries

In the unrelated machines scheduling problem, a set M of m tasks needs to be scheduled on a set N of n machines. The processing time or value that each machine i needs to process task j is t_{ij} , and

the completion time of machine i for a subset S of tasks is equal to the sum of the individual task values $t_i(S) = \sum_{j \in S} t_{ij}$. The objective is to find an allocation of tasks to machines that minimize the *makespan*, that is, the maximum completion time.

2.1 Mechanism design setting

We assume that each machine $i \in N$ is controlled by a selfish agent (player) that is unwilling to process tasks and the values t_{ij} is private information known only to them (also called the *type* of agent i). The set \mathcal{T}_i of possible types of agent i consists of all vectors $b_i = (b_{i1}, \dots, b_{im}) \in \mathbb{R}_+^m$. Let also $\mathcal{T} = \times_{i \in N} \mathcal{T}_i$ denote the space of type profiles.

A mechanism defines for each player i a set \mathcal{B}_i of available strategies the player can choose from. We consider *direct revelation* mechanisms, i.e., $\mathcal{B}_i = \mathcal{T}_i$ for all i , meaning that the players strategies are to simply report their types to the mechanism. Each player i provides a *bid* $b_i \in \mathcal{T}_i$, which not necessarily matches the true type t_i , if this serves their interests. A mechanism (A, \mathcal{P}) consists of two parts:

An allocation algorithm: The allocation algorithm A allocates the tasks to machines based on the players' inputs (bid vector) $b = (b_1, \dots, b_n)$. Let \mathcal{A} be the set of all possible partitions of m tasks to n machines. The allocation function $A : \mathcal{T} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ partitions the tasks into the n machines; we denote by $A_i(b)$ the subset of tasks assigned to machine i for bid vector $b = (b_1, \dots, b_n)$.

A payment scheme: The payment scheme $\mathcal{P} = (\mathcal{P}_1, \dots, \mathcal{P}_n)$ determines the payments, which also depends on the bid vector b . The functions $\mathcal{P}_1, \dots, \mathcal{P}_n$ stand for the payments that the mechanism hands to each agent, i.e., $\mathcal{P}_i : \mathcal{T} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$.

The *utility* u_i of a player i is the payment that they get minus the *actual* time that they need to process the set of tasks assigned to them, $u_i(b) = \mathcal{P}_i(b) - t_i(A_i(b))$, where $t_i(A_i(b)) = \sum_{j \in A_i(b)} t_{i,j}$. We are interested in *truthful* mechanisms. A mechanism is truthful, if for every player, reporting his true type is a *dominant strategy*. Formally,

$$u_i(t_i, b_{-i}) \geq u_i(t'_i, b_{-i}), \quad \forall i \in [n], \quad t_i, t'_i \in \mathcal{T}_i, \quad b_{-i} \in \mathcal{T}_{-i},$$

where notation \mathcal{T}_{-i} denotes all parts of \mathcal{T} except its i -th part.

The quality of a mechanism for a given type t is measured by the makespan $\text{MECH}(t)$ achieved by its allocation algorithm A , $\text{MECH}(t) = \max_{i \in N} t_i(A_i(t))$, which is compared to the optimal makespan $\text{OPT}(t) = \min_{A \in \mathcal{A}} \max_{i \in N} t_i(A_i)$.

It is well known that only a subset of algorithms can be allocation algorithms of truthful mechanisms. In particular, no mechanism's allocation algorithm is optimal for every t , so it is natural to focus on the approximation ratio of the mechanism's allocation algorithm. A mechanism is *c-approximate*, if its allocation algorithm is c -approximate, that is, if $c \geq \frac{\text{MECH}(t)}{\text{OPT}(t)}$ for all possible inputs t .

In this work, we do not place any requirements on the time to compute the mechanism's allocation A and payments \mathcal{P} . In other words, the lower bound is information-theoretic and does not make use of any computational assumptions.

2.2 Weak monotonicity

A mechanism consists of two algorithms, the allocation algorithm and the payment algorithm. However, we are only interested in the performance of the allocation algorithm. Therefore it is

natural to ask whether it is possible to characterize the class of allocation algorithms that are part of a truthful mechanism with no reference to the payment algorithm. Indeed the following definition provides such a characterization.

Definition 2. An allocation algorithm A is called weakly monotone (WMON) if it satisfies the following property: for every $i \in N$ and two inputs $t = (t_i, t_{-i})$ and $t' = (t'_i, t_{-i})$, the associated allocations A and A' satisfy

$$t_i(A_i) - t_i(A'_i) \leq t'_i(A_i) - t'_i(A'_i).$$

An equivalent condition, using indicator variables $a_{ij}(t) \in \{0, 1\}$ of whether task j is allocated to player i , is

$$\sum_{j \in M} (a_{ij}(t') - a_{ij}(t))(t'_{ij} - t_{ij}) \leq 0.$$

It is well known that the allocation function of every truthful mechanism is weakly monotone [4]. Although it is not needed in establishing a lower bound on the approximation ratio, it turns out that this is also a sufficient condition for truthfulness in convex domains [29] (which is the case for the scheduling domain).

A useful tool in our proof relies on the following immediate consequence of weak monotonicity (see [8] for a simple proof). Intuitively, it states that when you fix the values of all players for a subset of tasks, then the *restriction* of the allocation to the rest of the tasks is still weakly monotone.

Lemma 3. Let A be a weakly monotone allocation, and let (S, T) a partition of M . When we fix the values of the tasks of T , the restriction of the allocation A on S is also weakly monotone.

The following implication of weak monotonicity, that was first used in [28], is a standard tool for showing lower bounds for truthful mechanisms (see for example [28, 12, 27, 2, 19, 17]).

Lemma 4. Consider a truthful mechanism (A, \mathcal{P}) and its allocation for a bid vector t . Let S be a subset of the tasks allocated to player i and let S' be a subset of the tasks allocated to the other players. Consider any bid profile $t' = (t'_i, t_{-i})$ that is obtained from t by decreasing the values of player i in S , i.e., $t'_{ij} < t_{ij}, j \in S$, and increasing the values of player i in S' , i.e., $t'_{ij} > t_{ij}, j \in S'$. Then the allocation of player i for t and t' agree for all tasks in $S \cup S'$.

Notice that this lemma guarantees that only the set S of tasks allocated to player i remains the same. This does not preclude changing the allocation of the other players for the tasks in S' , unless there are only two players. This is a major obstacle in multi-player settings, that we avoid in this work by focusing on *graph settings* with only two players for each task.

3 The main argument

We consider multi-graph instances, where edges correspond to tasks and nodes to machines [10]. For an edge e , we use the notation $e = \{i, j\}$ to denote its vertices i and j , although they do not determine e uniquely. An edge $e = \{i, j\}$ corresponds to a task that has extremely high values for nodes other than i and j , which guarantees that any algorithm with approximation ratio at most n must allocate it to either machine i or machine j (see Figure 1 for an illustration).

The argument deals with multi-cliques with very high *multiplicity*¹, in which *every edge has an endpoint with value 0* (see Figure 3 for an example). The goal is to carefully select a subgraph

¹The multiplicity of a multi-graph is defined to be the minimum multiplicity among its edges.

of this multi-clique and change the values of some of its edges to obtain a lower bound on the approximation ratio. The fact that one of the two values of every edge is 0 is very convenient: a lower bound on the approximation ratio of the subgraph is a lower bound on the approximation ratio of the whole multi-clique as well, since the other edges do not affect the cost of the optimal allocation.




Figure 1: A multi-star instance with three players and four tasks in matrix form (left) and in graph form (right). The symbol ∞ denotes values that are extremely high compared to the other values. This instance is a multi-star, in which player 1 is the root and players 2 and 3 are the leaves.

In this and the next section, which deal with multi-graphs, for an instance v , we use the notation v_i^e to denote the value of node i for an edge $e = \{i, j\}$. Section 5 deals only with multi-stars and we use a different, more convenient, notation. In most of the argument, we fix the values of the multi-clique and we focus on the boundary functions.

Definition 5 (Boundary function). *Fix a mechanism and consider a multi-clique with values v . For an edge $e = \{i, j\}$, the boundary function or critical value function $\psi_{i,j}^e(z)$ is the threshold value for the allocation of e to node i . More precisely, if we keep all the other values fixed and change the value of e for node j to z , then e is allocated to i if $v_i^e < \psi_{i,j}^e(z)$ and to j if $v_i^e > \psi_{i,j}^e(z)$.*

Note that a boundary function $\psi_{i,j}^e(\cdot)$ may depend on the other values of v . A more precise notation would be $\psi_{i,j}^e[v](z)$ or $\psi_{i,j}^e[v_{-e}](z)$, but in this and in the next section we are dealing with a fixed v , so we drop it from the notation.

Boundary functions are real functions that are monotone but not necessarily continuous. An annoying, albeit minor, issue is that boundary functions are difficult to handle at points of discontinuity, so we want to avoid such points. The high level idea for achieving this is obvious: since the functions are monotone, they have only countably many points of discontinuity by Froda's theorem; by taking random instances in a continuous range, we have no points of discontinuity almost surely. This is formalized in Lemma 17. The following definition makes the requirement precise.

Definition 6 (Continuity requirement). *Fix a mechanism and consider an instance v . We say that v has a discontinuity if there exists some edge $e = \{i, j\}$ so that $v_j^e \neq 0$ and $\psi_{i,j}^e(\cdot)$ is discontinuous at v_j^e . We say that an instance satisfies the continuity requirement if no rational translation of v has a discontinuity.*

The instances of the argument will be selected randomly so that they satisfy the continuity requirement almost surely.

The aim of the proof of Theorem 1 is to show — by the probabilistic method — that there exists a multi-clique of sufficiently high multiplicity that contains a star with approximation ratio at least n , when we keep the values of all other edges fixed. Actually the argument aims to show that the bound on the approximation ratio for the star is arbitrarily close to $n - 1$. The extra $+1$ in the approximation ratio comes, almost for free, by adding a loop to the root of the star, or equivalently an additional edge between the root and another node j with very high value for j .

To show that there exists a star S with approximation ratio $n - 1$, we *roughly* aim to show that there exists a star with some root i , with the following properties:

1. every edge $e = (i, j)$ of S has value 0 for i and *the same* value z for the leaves, for some $z > 0$.
2. the sum of the values of the boundary functions over all edges $\sum_{e \in S} \psi_{i,j}^e(z)$ is at least $(n - 1)z$.
3. the mechanism allocates all edges to the root, when we change its values to $\psi_{i,j}^e(z)$ for all $j \neq i$.

It follows immediately that such a star has approximation ratio $n - 1$: the mechanism allocates all tasks to the root with makespan $\sum_{e \in S} \psi_{i,j}^e(z) \geq (n - 1)z$, while a better allocation is to allocate all tasks to the leaves with makespan z .

A star that satisfies the second property will be called *nice* and the third property *box*. Actually, for technical reasons we need to work with approximate notions of niceness and box-ness.

Definition 7 (Nice star and multi-star). *For a given $\varepsilon > 0$ and an instance v , a star S with root i and leaves all the remaining $(n - 1)$ nodes is called ε -nice, or simply nice, if there exists $z > 0$ such that, first, every edge $e = \{i, j\}$ of S has value $v_i^e = 0$ for root i and $v_j^e \in (z, (1 + \varepsilon)z)$ for leaf j , and second,*

$$\sum_{e \in S} \psi_{i,j}^e(v_j^e) \geq (1 - 3\varepsilon)(n - 1)z. \quad (1)$$

A multi-star is called nice if all of its stars with $n - 1$ leaves are nice, with the same z .

By letting ε tend to 0, $1 - 3\varepsilon$ can be arbitrarily close to 1 and v_j^e can be arbitrarily close to z . The factor 3 in the expression $1 - 3\varepsilon$ is for convenience when such a property is established in Section 4.

Definition 8 (Box). *For a given $\delta > 0$ and instance v , a star S with root i is called δ -box, or simply box, if every edge e of S has value 0 for i and the mechanism allocates all edges to the root, when we change the root values to $\psi_{i,j}^e(v_j^e) - \delta$ for every leaf j of S .*

See Figure 2 for an illustration. Note that while nice stars have $n - 1$ leaves, box stars may have fewer leaves. This will be useful to facilitate induction in Section 5, where this property is established.

Now that we have the definitions of nice multi-stars and box stars, we can state the two main propositions that almost immediately establish the main result.

First, the following theorem, proved in Section 4, says that there exist nice multi-stars of arbitrarily high multiplicity (see Figure 3).

Theorem 9 (Nice Multi-Star). *For every mechanism with bounded approximation ratio and every q , there exists a multi-clique that satisfies the continuity requirement and contains a nice multi-star with multiplicity q .*

Second, the following theorem says that nice multi-stars with sufficiently high multiplicity — guaranteed to exist by the above theorem — contain a spanning box i.e., a box star of $n - 1$ leaves (see Figure 4).

Theorem 10 (Box). *Fix $\delta, \varepsilon > 0$ and a mechanism with approximation ratio at most n . Consider an instance that satisfies the continuity requirement and contains a multi-star, of sufficiently high multiplicity, in which all values of the root i are 0 and all values of the leaves are in $(z, (1 + \varepsilon)z)$. Then the multi-star contains a star with $n - 1$ leaves, which is a δ -box.*




Figure 2: (Box). Allocation partitions of the root values for a star of 2 leaves (a)-(c) and 3 leaves (d)-(e); in the latter case, only part of the allocation partition is shown. This figure is about a star with root i and leaves $j \in \{1, 2, 3\}$. If we denote the edges of the star by e_j , the figure uses the shorthand: $t_j = v_i^{e_j}$ for the values of the root, and $\psi_j^* = \psi_{i,j}^{e_j}(v_j^{e_j})$ for the boundary values. Note that monotonicity restricts the shapes and boundaries of the allocation areas, as discussed in detail in Sections 5.1.1 and 5.1.2. The dotted red lines correspond to values $\psi_j^* - \delta$ of the box definition. Cases (a), (b), and (d) are boxes, as the corner o is inside the region where the root gets all the tasks. On the other hand, cases (c) and (e) are not boxes, since the corner point o lies outside this region.

The proof of the Box Theorem is given in Section 5. To keep the notation as clean as possible, in the proof we assume without loss of generality that the root of the multi-star is node 0, the leaves are nodes 1 to $n - 1$, and we adapt the notation accordingly.

The proof of the main result (Theorem 1) follows immediately from the above two theorems. We consider multi-cliques that contain loops with value 0 for every node and observe that the addition of loops does not affect the proofs of the above theorems. Use Theorem 9 to find a multi-clique that satisfies the continuity requirements and contains a nice multi-star with sufficiently high multiplicity. Use Theorem 10 to find a nice box inside it.

Lemma 11. *A δ -nice box with a loop in the root, in which all values of the root are 0 and all values of the leaves are in $(z, (1 + \varepsilon)z)$, has approximation ratio n , as δ and ε tend to 0.*

Proof. Take a nice box and consider the instance when we change the values of the root i to $\psi_{i,j}^e(v_j^e) - \delta$ for all $j \neq i$. By the box-ness property all the edges are allocated to the root. Change now the value of the loop to z and decrease the values of the root to $\psi_{i,j}^e(v_j^e) - 2\delta$. By using the fact that the task that corresponds to the loop must still be allocated to root, even when we increase its value to z , and by also applying monotonicity (Lemma 4), the allocation of the edges remains the same. The makespan of the mechanism is

$$z + \sum_{j \neq i} (\psi_{i,j}^e(v_j^e) - 2\delta) \geq z + (1 - 3\varepsilon)(n - 1)z - 2(n - 1)\delta,$$




Figure 3: This is an illustration of the components that appear in the statement of Theorem 9. In (a), a multi-clique with four nodes and multiplicity 2 is depicted. For simplification, we use z to denote non-zero values, which are not necessarily the same for all edges. It should be noted that the actual multiplicity needed is much higher. In (b), a multi-star which is a subgraph of the multi-clique is depicted. Again the actual multiplicity needed is very high. If this is a *nice* multi-star, the value z is approximately the same for all leaves.

while the optimal makespan is at most $(1 + \varepsilon)z$, (when the root gets the loop and the leaves get all the remaining edges). The ratio tends to n as δ and ε tend to 0. \square

The lemma, together with the Nice-Multi-Star and the Box theorems, establishes the main result. Actually it establishes something stronger. The approximation ratio of truthful scheduling is n even when the domain is the set of multi-graphs.

Corollary 12. *The approximation ratio of truthful scheduling of multi-graphs is n .*

4 Proof of the Nice Multi-Star theorem (Theorem 9)

The aim of this section is to prove Theorem 9. To keep the argument clean, we first collect and prove some useful statements. These include an immediate application of Young's inequality on boundary functions of one-dimensional mechanisms, and two easy properties of mechanisms with two players and one or two tasks.

4.1 Boundary functions and integrals

For an edge $e = \{i, j\}$, we fix the values of every other edge and consider the boundary functions $\psi_{i,j}^e(\cdot)$ and $\psi_{j,i}^e(\cdot)$. By the definition of the boundary functions (Definition 5), if the values of an edge e are v_i^e and v_j^e , e is allocated to node i when $v_i^e < \psi_{i,j}^e(v_j^e)$ and to node j when $v_j^e < \psi_{j,i}^e(v_i^e)$, where v_i^e and v_j^e are the values of nodes i and j on edge e , respectively. Note that the boundary functions do not determine the allocation when we have equality.

These functions are nondecreasing and, roughly speaking, inverse of each other. More precisely, $\psi_{j,i}^e$ is a pseudo-inverse of $\psi_{i,j}^e$, that is,

$$\sup\{x \geq 0: \psi_{i,j}^e(x) < y\} \leq \psi_{j,i}^e(y) \leq \inf\{x \geq 0: \psi_{i,j}^e(x) > y\}. \quad (2)$$

By convention the supremum on the left is 0 when $y = 0$.




Figure 4: The figure depicts a multi-star with high multiplicity (a) and the final spanning star (b) selected by Theorem 10. If the multi-star satisfies the niceness property, then the final star also satisfies the niceness property (hence roughly $\psi_1 + \psi_2 + \psi_3 \geq 3z$) and also the box-ness property (see Figure 2(d)) which guarantees that these edges must be allocated to the root. Note that this final star is a subgraph of the original multi-clique, the contribution of the remaining edges (which do not appear in the figure) to the optimal makespan is 0.

The following proposition is a special case of Young's Inequality². The original proof required continuous and strictly increasing functions, but subsequent proofs relaxed these conditions to nondecreasing pseudo-inverse functions [15].

Proposition 13 (Young's inequality). *If $\psi_{i,j}^e$ and $\psi_{j,i}^e$ are the boundary functions of an edge, then for every $a \geq 0$:*

$$\int_0^a \psi_{i,j}^e(x) dx + \int_0^a \psi_{j,i}^e(x) dx \geq a^2. \quad (3)$$

4.2 Independence of boundary functions of parallel edges

Proposition 14. *For every mechanism with bounded approximation ratio and every multi-graph in which one value of every edge is 0, the boundary function $\psi_{i,j}^e(\cdot)$ of an edge $e = \{i, j\}$ is independent of the values of the other edges between i and j , except perhaps at its points of discontinuity.*

Proof. Let $e' \neq e$ be an edge between i and j . It suffices to show that $\psi_{i,j}^e(\cdot)$ is independent of the values of e' when we fix the values of the remaining edges. It is known [18] and it also follows directly from Theorem 37 that a 2×2 mechanism has unbounded approximation ratio unless it is a (relaxed) task-independent mechanism. This proves the proposition, since the contribution of the remaining edges to the optimal makespan is 0. \square

Proposition 15. *For every mechanism with approximation ratio less than n and every multi-graph in which one value of every edge is 0, the boundary function $\psi_{i,j}^e(\cdot)$ of an edge $e = \{i, j\}$ satisfies $\psi_{i,j}^e(x) < nx$.*

Proof. If for some x , $\psi_{i,j}^e(x) \geq nx$, by setting the values of e for nodes j and i to x and $\psi_{i,j}^e(x) - \epsilon x$, respectively, for some $\epsilon > 0$, the approximation ratio is at least $n - \epsilon$. The proposition follows by letting $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$. \square

²The original Young's Inequality states that if f is nonnegative, continuous, and strictly increasing, then $\int_0^a f(x) dx + \int_0^b f^{-1}(x) dx \geq ab$.

4.3 The construction

Fix some ε so that $1/\varepsilon$ is a positive integer and let $\varepsilon\mathbb{Z}_{>0} = \{k\varepsilon: k \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}\}$ denote the integer multiples of ε . We will also use the notation $\lfloor x \rfloor_\varepsilon = \varepsilon \lfloor x/\varepsilon \rfloor$ and $\lceil x \rceil_\varepsilon = \varepsilon \lceil x/\varepsilon \rceil$.

Let D_ε denote the subset $\varepsilon\mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ with values in $(0, 1]$, i.e., $D_\varepsilon = \{\varepsilon, 2\varepsilon, \dots, 1 - \varepsilon, 1\}$, and define $W_\varepsilon = \{(0, z): z \in D_\varepsilon\} \cup \{(z, 0): z \in D_\varepsilon\}$.

In this section, we will say that a multi-graph has *multiplicity* k when *every* edge of the multi-graph has multiplicity k . The instances of the argument are selected as follows:

Definition 16 (Random multi-clique). *Take a multi-clique of sufficiently large multiplicity q' . For each edge e of this multi-clique, select its values in two steps: in the first step, uniformly and independently select a value $(0, z)$ or $(z, 0)$ from W_ε and, in the second step, change z to a random value uniformly distributed in $(z, (1 + \varepsilon)z)$. We will refer to the result as a random multi-clique.*

Once we select the values, *we fix them once and for all in this section*. Since every edge of a random multi-clique has a value equal to 0, the optimal makespan for these multi-graphs is 0.

The only reason of having the second step in selecting the values of a random multi-clique is to satisfy the continuity requirements, which is established in the next lemma. This second step plays no other role in this section and it can be mostly ignored, in the sense that the argument would be more straightforward if the values of an edge e were simply in W_ε .

Lemma 17. *A random multi-clique satisfies the continuity requirement almost surely.*

Proof. For a fixed instance v , Froda's theorem applied to the monotone boundary function $\psi_{i,j}^e(\cdot)$ guarantees that its set of discontinuity points is countable. Since the set of edges is finite, and the rational translations of v are countable, the set of discontinuity points for v and its rational translations is also countable. The lemma follows because, every value of a random multi-clique is selected uniformly in $(z, (1 + \varepsilon)z)$, for some $z, \varepsilon > 0$, which is an uncountable set. \square

The *objective in this section* is to show that for every truthful mechanism with bounded approximation ratio and for any given positive integer q , if the multiplicity q' of the random multi-clique is sufficiently high, it contains a nice multi-star of multiplicity q . To do this, we work with a *finite set of functions* with domain D_ε that approximate the boundary functions with multiples of ε :

$$\underline{\psi}_{i,j}^e(z) = \lfloor \psi_{i,j}^e(z) \rfloor_\varepsilon, \quad (4)$$

for every $z \in D_\varepsilon$.

The important property is that the set of *approximate boundary functions* is finite. Their domain D_ε consists of $1/\varepsilon$ values and their range consists of n/ε values $\{0, \varepsilon, 2\varepsilon, \dots, n - \varepsilon\}$, which follows from the fact that a mechanism with approximation ratio strictly less than n must satisfy $\psi_{i,j}^e(z) < nz$ (Proposition 15). We will use this fact to show that a large random multi-clique contains many edges with identical approximate boundary functions. Actually, we will need something stronger, because the edges of nice multi-stars must also agree on their values. To achieve this, we consider sets of edges with identical approximate boundary functions that cover the whole spectrum of values. The precise requirements are captured by the following definition.

Definition 18. *A set A of $2/\varepsilon$ edges between nodes i and j is called a *full-range-dipole* or *simply dipole* if*

- *for every value z in D_ε , there is a pair of edges $e, e' \in A$ with values such that $\lfloor v_i^e \rfloor_\varepsilon = z, v_j^e = 0, v_i^{e'} = 0$, and $\lfloor v_j^{e'} \rfloor_\varepsilon = z$, and*

- all edges $e \in A$ have the same $\underline{\psi}_{i,j}^e(\cdot)$, which we simply denote by $\underline{\psi}_{i,j}(\cdot)$. Similarly all edges have the same $\underline{\psi}_{j,i}^e(\cdot)$.

Dipoles are useful because any clique of them — that is, a multi-graph with a dipole between every pair of nodes — contains a nice star as the following lemma shows. Actually the lemma shows the *stronger statement* that bound (1) in the definition of nice stars (Definition 7) holds when we replace $\psi_{i,j}^e(v_j^e)$ by its lower bound $\underline{\psi}_{i,j}^e(z)$. It is this stronger statement that will be useful to establish the main result of the section.

Lemma 19. *In every clique of dipoles there exist $i \in [n]$ and $z \in D_\varepsilon$ such that the following holds for the star S that has root i , leaves the remaining $n - 1$ nodes, and edges with value 0 for i and in $(z, (1 + \varepsilon)z)$ for every $j \neq i$:*

$$\sum_{j \neq i} \underline{\psi}_{i,j}(z) \geq (1 - 3\varepsilon)(n - 1)z. \quad (5)$$

Proof. First, for every edge e between i and j , since $\psi_{i,j}^e(x)$ and $\psi_{j,i}^e(x)$ are pseudo-inverse functions, Young's inequality (Proposition 13) gives

$$\int_0^1 \psi_{i,j}^e(x) + \psi_{j,i}^e(x) dx \geq 1.$$

Second, by the monotonicity property of the function $\psi_{i,j}^e(\cdot)$ and the definition of the approximate boundary functions, we get

$$\int_0^1 \psi_{i,j}^e(x) dx \leq \int_0^1 \psi_{i,j}^e(\lceil x \rceil_\varepsilon) dx \leq \int_0^1 \underline{\psi}_{i,j}(\lceil x \rceil_\varepsilon) + \varepsilon dx = \varepsilon + \sum_{z \in D_\varepsilon} \varepsilon \underline{\psi}_{i,j}(z).$$

Putting both facts together, we get that for every edge e between i and j :

$$\sum_{z \in D_\varepsilon} (\underline{\psi}_{i,j}(z) + \underline{\psi}_{j,i}(z)) \geq \frac{1}{\varepsilon} - 2.$$

By summing for all pairs $\{i, j\}$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{z \in D_\varepsilon} \sum_{\{i,j\}} (\underline{\psi}_{i,j}(z) + \underline{\psi}_{j,i}(z)) &\geq \binom{n}{2} \left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon} - 2 \right), \\ \sum_{z \in D_\varepsilon} \sum_i \sum_{j \neq i} \underline{\psi}_{i,j}(z) &\geq \binom{n}{2} \left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon} - 2 \right). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, by a variant of the mean value theorem, there exists $z \in D_\varepsilon$ and $i \in [n]$ such that (5) holds. To see this, assume that there is no such z and i and therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{z \in D_\varepsilon} \sum_i \sum_{j \neq i} \underline{\psi}_{i,j}(z) &< \sum_{z \in D_\varepsilon} \sum_i (n - 1)(1 - 3\varepsilon)z \\ &= n(n - 1)(1 - 3\varepsilon)(\varepsilon + 2\varepsilon + \dots + 1) \\ &= n(n - 1)(1 - 3\varepsilon) \frac{1 + \varepsilon}{2\varepsilon} \\ &\leq \binom{n}{2} \left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon} - 2 \right), \end{aligned}$$

a contradiction.

The edges that have value 0 for i and z for every $j \neq i$ form a star that satisfies the properties of the lemma. \square




Figure 5: A dipole. All pairs $(\underline{\psi}_{i,j}^e(\cdot), \underline{\psi}_{j,i}^e(\cdot))$ are identical and the set of values $\{[v_i^e]_\varepsilon, [v_j^e]_\varepsilon\}$ is equal to $W_\varepsilon = \{(0, z) : z \in D_\varepsilon\} \cup \{(z, 0) : z \in D_\varepsilon\}$. The figure shows $[v_i^e]_\varepsilon$ instead of v_i^e .

By definition $\underline{\psi}_{i,j}(z)$ is a lower bound of $\psi_{i,j}^e(z)$. Furthermore, if $z = [v_j^e]_\varepsilon$, we have $\underline{\psi}_{i,j}(z) \leq \psi_{i,j}^e(z) \leq \psi_{i,j}^e(v_j^e)$. Therefore the star guaranteed by the above lemma is a nice star. However, we need a nice multi-star with appropriately high multiplicity. There is a straightforward strategy to achieve it: take a random multi-clique with sufficiently high multiplicity; between every pair of nodes, it will contain many dipoles with the same approximate boundary functions with nonzero probability, due to the fact that the number of values and the number of approximate boundary functions are bounded; by the above lemma every multi-clique formed from these dipoles will have a nice star with the same i and z .

Lemma 20. *Define a multi-clique of dipoles of multiplicity q to be a multi-graph that contains q disjoint dipoles between every pair of nodes $\{i, j\}$ with the same approximate boundary functions $\underline{\psi}_{i,j}(\cdot)$ and $\underline{\psi}_{j,i}(\cdot)$. For any given q , there is q' such that a random multi-clique of multiplicity q' contains a multi-clique of dipoles of multiplicity q with strictly positive probability.*

Proof. Consider a random multi-clique and focus on the edges between two nodes i and j . We argue that for sufficiently high q' , the probability that there are q dipoles between i and j is close to 1. Actually it suffices this probability to be more than $1 - 1/\binom{n}{2}$ to get the lemma by the union bound.

Each one of the q' edges between i and j is associated with a pair of values in W_ε and a pair of approximate boundary functions. There are two crucial properties here. First, since the domain and the range of the approximate boundary functions take $2/\varepsilon$ and $(n/\varepsilon)^2$ values, respectively, there are at most $K = (n/\varepsilon)^{4/\varepsilon}$ possible pairs of approximate boundary functions. Second, the boundary functions — and therefore the approximate boundary functions — are independent of the values of the edges between i and j (Proposition 14).

It follows from the first property that there exists a set of at least q'/K edges with identical approximate boundary functions. Fix such a set, partition it into subsets of $2/\varepsilon$ edges, and for each part consider the event that it forms an dipole. The probability for each such event is equal to the probability that all the values in a part are distinct, which is $p = (2/\varepsilon)!(\varepsilon/2)^{2/\varepsilon}$. To see this, note that the probability that the $2/\varepsilon$ edges have values $(0, \varepsilon), (\varepsilon, 0), \dots, (0, 1), (1, 0)$ is $(\varepsilon/2)^{2/\varepsilon}$ and that there are $(2/\varepsilon)!$ permutations of these pairs of values. Taking into account that the values on the edges are selected independently, the events for each part are independent. It follows immediately that if q'/K is sufficiently high, there are q dipoles with probability more than $1 - 1/\binom{n}{2}$.

Although it is not needed in the proof, we give a bound of q' in relation to q . The situation

is captured by a random experiment in which there are $(q'/K)/(2/\varepsilon)$ independent Bernoulli trials, each with probability p of success, and the question is to determine the probability that there are at least q successes. It follows³ from Cantelli's inequality that a binomially distributed random variable $X \sim B((2k + \lambda^2)/p, p)$ satisfies $P[X > k] \geq 1 - 1/(1 + \lambda^2)$. In our case, $k = q$, $\lambda^2 = \binom{n}{2}$, and $p = (2/\varepsilon)!(\varepsilon/2)^{2/\varepsilon}$. Actually, in the rest of the proof, we will need q to be much larger than $\binom{n}{2}$, so we can simplify $2k + \lambda^2$ to $3k$ to obtain the bound $(q'/K)/(2/\varepsilon) \geq 3q/p$. We conclude that $q' \geq 6Kq/(p\varepsilon)$ suffices for the statement of the lemma. \square

The proof of Theorem 9 follows directly from Lemma 19 and Lemma 20.

Proof of Theorem 9. Lemma 20 guarantees the existence of a multi-clique of dipoles of multiplicity q . By Lemma 19, there exist i and z such that every clique formed by its dipoles satisfy (5). Since parallel dipoles have the same approximate boundary functions⁴, the same i and z work for every clique of dipoles.

Therefore there exists a multi-star of multiplicity q such that all its stars satisfy (5). Since $\psi_{i,j}^e(v_j^e) \geq \psi_{i,j}^e(\lfloor v_j^e \rfloor_\varepsilon) \geq \underline{\psi}_{i,j}^e(\lfloor v_j^e \rfloor_\varepsilon)$, this is a nice multi-star. \square

5 Proof of the Box Theorem (Theorem 10)

In this section we prove the Box Theorem 10, which states that all multi-stars with sufficiently high multiplicity contain a box. Roughly, a box is a star S for which when we fix the values of its leaves, and we set the values of the root to all other tasks to 0, the allocation region R_S of the root for obtaining all the tasks in S is rectangular (see Figure 2 for an illustration, Definition 8 for the precise definition, and Section 5.1.1 for a precise definition and properties of the allocation region R_S).

Actually the proof establishes that the probability that a random star is a box tends to 1, as the multiplicity tends to infinity.

The Nice Multi-Star theorem of the previous section (Section 4) shows that there exist nice multi-stars of any desired multiplicity and values in $(z, (1 + \varepsilon)z)$, for some $z \in [\varepsilon, 1]$, for a given small parameter $\varepsilon > 0$. To keep the notation simple, the main theorem of this section is about multi-stars with values in $(\xi, 1)$, where ξ can be any strictly positive value. Naturally the argument applies to any interval of values not only to $(\xi, 1)$, and in particular to the interval $(z, (1 + \varepsilon)z)$, so the two theorems can be combined to obtain the main result of this work.

The proof of the Box Theorem is by induction on the number of leaves k . The case of one leaf is trivial — all stars are boxes. However, we don't use this as the base case of the induction, because proving the theorem for $k = 2$ requires different handling than the general case, and it is harder than the inductive step, in many aspects. The difference between the case of two leaves and more than two leaves is due to simple geometric facts that will become clear when we discuss the idea of the inductive step.

Roughly speaking the inductive step goes as follows: suppose that we have established that most stars of multi-stars with $k - 1$ leaves are boxes. Then we can find a star S of k leaves — actually many such stars — in which all its sub-stars of $k - 1$ leaves are boxes. Now S may be a box

³Proof: For $X \in B(m, p)$, we have $\sigma_X^2 = mp(1 - p) \leq E[X] = mp$, so substituting them to Cantelli's inequality $P[X > E[X] - \lambda\sigma_X] \geq 1 - 1/(1 + \lambda^2)$, we get $P[X > mp - \lambda\sqrt{mp}] > 1 - 1/(1 + \lambda^2)$. When $m = (2k + \lambda^2)/p$, it can be easily verified that $mp - \lambda\sqrt{mp} \geq k$, so we get the result.

⁴but not necessarily the same boundary functions; this is the reason for using the stronger statement with approximate boundary functions in (5).




Figure 6: The figure is a high-level illustration of the main argument of the proof of Lemma 53 for $k = 3$. The left figure corresponds to a strictly chopped off box, while the other three figures illustrate the shift of the boundaries when s_3 is decreased, which leads to a contradiction, as the last figure is not a box for tasks 1, 2.

itself, in which case there is nothing to prove, or a box with a single corner cut off by a diagonal cut (see Figures 2 and 6). Let’s call this shape “chopped off box”.

The heart of the argument, which is based on the characterization of 2×2 (2 players, 2 tasks) mechanisms, is to establish that either the chopped off box is actually a box, or we can obtain a box when one of the tasks in S is replaced by a sibling task (i.e., a task of the same leaf). To show this, we take a task p of the star S and some sibling p' of p and consider the (p, p') -slice mechanism, that is, the mechanism for these two tasks when we fix the values of every other task. By the characterization of 2×2 mechanisms, the slice mechanism is either a (relaxed) affine minimizer or a (relaxed) task independent mechanism.

If the slice mechanism is task independent the proof is relatively straightforward. The fact that tasks p and p' are independent implies by geometry of the allocation region that if we replace task p by p' , we obtain a *box* that includes p' and the remaining $k - 1$ tasks. The only real complication for this case would arise at discontinuity points, but we have excluded them by the continuity requirement.

The other case is when the (p, p') -slice mechanism is an affine minimizer and the allocation boundaries are linear functions. The key idea is to exploit this linearity. We keep only the linearity property for p and completely ignore task p' and focus on the original box. Linearity is used to show that the allocation boundaries move rectilinearly, when we change the leaf value of task p . In other words, the whole upper envelope of the chopped off box moves rectilinearly. But then if it is moved sufficiently close to the side, the chopped off piece will reach the boundary and create a chopped off box on it (see the 3-dimensional case in Figure 6). This would contradict the inductive hypothesis that the sub-stars are boxes or equivalently that the sides are lower dimensional boxes, except for the fact that we have changed the leaf value of task p . To actually reach a contradiction, we use a stronger inductive hypothesis in which the side (sub-star) is a box for many values of the leaf (see the definition of chopped off box, below).

Notice however that the above argument fails for $k = 2$, because a chopped off 1-dimensional interval is still an interval, that is, a box. Thus the case of $k = 2$ needs to be handled differently. For this, we consider a star with two leaves and two edges per leaf and show that at least one of its four stars is a box. This is done by an argument similar to the argument for the inductive step, only that linearity is exploited for moving boundaries in two distinct directions. The fact that a multi-star with two leaves and two edges per leaf contains a box, can be combined by a known extremal graph theory result — related to the Zarankiewicz problem — to show that almost all stars are boxes.

The rest of this section makes the above outline precise. In particular, in Subsection 5.1 we

set up the notation and provide definitions, a formal statement of the main result of this section (Thm 24), and useful facts and lemmas. In Section 5.2 we present the main argument. In Section 5.3 we provide the proof of the base case, in Section 5.4 the proof of the induction step, and finally in Section 5.5 we wrap up to show existence of a box.

5.1 Notation, definitions and preliminaries

Most of the following definitions depend on the mechanism at hand, therefore it will be convenient to *fix an arbitrary truthful mechanism throughout this section*. Since we are dealing with multi-stars and not general multi-graphs, it will be convenient to change the notation.

We consider multi-stars with n nodes: the root is node 0 and the leaves are nodes $1, \dots, n-1$. We name the edges $1, 2, \dots, m$, where $m = \ell(n-1)$. Edges correspond to tasks; two parallel edges are called *siblings*. The set of tasks for leaf i is denoted by C_i , and we use the term leaf for both i and C_i . The multiplicity of every edge is ℓ , i.e., $|C_i| = \ell$, for every $i \in [n-1]$.

The values of an edge $j \in [m]$ between node 0 and leaf i has two nonnegative values $(v_{0,i}^j, v_i^j)$, which represent the processing time for the two players; for simplicity we denote them by (t_j, s_j) . All the instances in this section satisfy $s_j \in [0, B)$ for some arbitrarily high value B , although in most of the argument s_j takes values in $[0, 1]$. The set of values for all edges $T = (t, s) = (t_j, s_j)_{j \in [m]}$ is called an instance.

For a given instance $T = (t, s)$, we denote the boundary function $\psi_{0,i}^j(v_i^j)$ of the root for edge $j \in [m]$ by $\psi_j(s_j)$. Recall that the interpretation is that, having fixed the values of all other edges, *edge j is given to the root if $t_j < \psi_j(s_j)$, and it is given to the leaf when $t_j > \psi_j(s_j)$* . Since the argument sometimes considers more than one instance, it will be useful to extend the notation to $\psi_j(t_{-j}, s_{-j}, s_j)$ to explicitly indicate the values of the other edges. We also write it as $\psi_j[t_{-j}, s_{-j}](s_j)$ when we want to treat it as a function of s_j only. Since the values of most other edges can be inferred from the context, we only indicate the values that have changed inside the optional part (the part inside the square brackets). For example, for an instance $T = (t, s)$, which can be inferred from the context, if we change t_1 from its current value to x , the new boundary function of edge 2 is written as $\psi_2[t_1 = x](s_2)$ or simply $\psi_2[x](s_2)$.

In this section, we use instances that satisfy the *continuity requirement* (Definition 6), although their values do not have to be rational. We use the following fixed parameters.

Definition 21 (Parameters). *The values of these parameters are assumed to be rational numbers.*

- $\xi \in (0, 1)$;
- $\nu \in (0, \frac{\xi}{n^2 \cdot 4^n})$, a very small fixed strictly positive value;
- $\nu' = \nu/4$.

The aim is to prove that a multi-star (t, s) with $t_j = 0$ and $s_j \in (\xi, 1)$, for all $j \in [m]$ has a box with parameter $\delta = 4^n \nu$. Obviously the range of values $(\xi, 1)$ can be replaced by any other interval, so the theorem can be used for the nice multi-stars of the main argument, where the values are in the range $(z, (1 + \varepsilon)z)$, where ε is fixed small parameter.

To apply induction, we need the definition of box for smaller stars, so we repeat the definition of box (Definition 8) using the notation of this section and for the specific parameter δ that we are going to use. Note that δ depends on the size of the star.

Definition 22 (Box). *For a fixed ν , a star S with k leaves, is called a δ -box or simply box, if the mechanism allocates all edges to the root, when we set $t_j = \psi_j(s_j) - \delta$ for every leaf j of S , where $\delta = 4^k \nu$.*

The following derived instances are used many times in what follows.

Definition 23 (Instance $T_\nu(S)$). *For a given instance $T = (t, s)$, let $T_\nu(S) = (t^\nu, s)$ be the instance that agrees with T everywhere, except for tasks in a star S with k leaves for which $t_j = \psi_j(s_j) - 4^k \nu$.*

We can now restate the main theorem of this section, a restatement of Theorem 10.

Theorem 24 (Box). *For every ν and ξ that satisfy the requirements of Definition 21, a multi-star instance $T = (t, \bar{s})$ with values $t_j = 0$, $\bar{s}_j \in [\xi, 1]$ and multiplicity $\ell > \left(\frac{5n}{\nu}\right)^{2n}$, that satisfies the continuity requirement contains a δ -box with $n - 1$ leaves, where $\delta = 4^{n-1} \nu$.*

Usually we fix the values of most tasks and consider the allocation of the mechanism on the remaining tasks. In particular, we do this when we employ the characterization of 2×2 mechanisms. The next definition formalizes this.

Definition 25 (Slice and slice mechanism). *Fix an instance T and two tasks p and p' . The set of instances that agree with T on all tasks except for the tasks p and p' is called a (p, p') slice. The allocation function of these two tasks by the mechanism is called the (p, p') slice mechanism for the given values of the other tasks, or simply the (p, p') slice mechanism, when the other values can be inferred by the context. Similarly, we define slice mechanisms for larger sets of tasks.*

Definition 26 (Trivial leaf). *A leaf i with set of edges C_i is called trivial for a given instance T if $t_j = 0$ and $s_j < 1$ for every task $j \in C_i$.*

We now provide the definition of the main type of instances that we consider throughout.

Definition 27 (Standard instance). *For a given truthful mechanism, an instance $T = (t, \bar{s})$ is a standard instance for a set of leaves \mathcal{C} if the following conditions hold*

- $t_j = 0$, for every $j \in [m]$
- $\bar{s}_j \in (\xi, 1)$, for every task j of these leaves, i.e., $j \in \cup_{i \in \mathcal{C}} C_i$,
- T satisfies the continuity requirement.

The leaves in \mathcal{C} are then called standard leaves for the instance T .

Henceforth the notation \bar{s} will denote some fixed standard instance (clear from the context). We reserve the notation s for the variable, which can take any value. Note that instance $T = (t, \bar{s})$ in the statement of Theorem 24 is standard for the set of all leaves.

The central part of the argument is an induction on the number of leaves k . In the induction step from $(k - 1)$ to k , the remaining leaves are trivial with fixed values, and therefore play no role; in particular they do not affect the approximation ratio.

Definition 28 (critical values α_j for singletons). *For standard instances $T = (t, \bar{s})$, we will use the shorthand α_j for $\psi_j(\bar{s}_j)$.*

The following observation about the boundary functions $\psi_j(s_j)$ is a straightforward generalization of Proposition 15. The proof of the lower bound is almost identical to the proof of the upper bound given in Proposition 15.

Lemma 29. *Let $T = (t, s)$ be an instance so that all leaves are trivial. Assuming that the approximation factor is less than n , for every task $j \in [m]$ it holds that*

- (i) $s_j/n < \psi_j(s_j) < ns_j$;
- (ii) $\lim_{s_j \rightarrow 0} \psi_j(s_j) = \psi_j(0) = 0$;

5.1.1 Region R_P

The next definition of region R_P of a given mechanism and instance T , concerns a k -dimensional slice defined by a task set P . The other tasks $[m] \setminus P$ have fixed values and for simplicity they are not treated in the definition. In most cases when R_P is considered, P will be a star, or a pair of siblings, and the tasks $[m] \setminus P$ will be trivial.

Definition 30 (region R_P and $R_{\emptyset|P}$). *Let $T = (t, s)$ be a given instance and $P = \{p_1, \dots, p_k\}$ be a set of tasks. The allocation region $R_P^T \subset \mathbb{R}_{0,+}^k$ consists of all vectors t'_P such that for input $T' = ((t'_P, t_{-P}), s)$, all tasks of P are allocated to the root. Similarly, $R_{\emptyset|P}^T$ consists of all the t'_P so that for $((t'_P, t_{-P}), s)$, all tasks of P are allocated to the leaves. T is omitted from the notation when it is clear from the context.*

It follows directly by the Weak Monotonicity property that R_P is a (possibly degenerate) k -dimensional polyhedron defined by linear constraints of the form $\sum_{i \in I} t_{p_i} \leq c_I$, for some $I \subset [k]$, and some $c_I \in \mathbb{R}_+$. In particular, for $k = 2$, R_P is either a rectangle or a rectangle from which we cut off a piece by a -45° cut. For higher dimensions, it is a hyperrectangle (orthotope) with pieces cut off by specific hypercuts. See Figure 2 for examples of R_P for $k = 2$ and $k = 3$ and see also [31] for a geometric interpretation of truthfulness. Note that $R_P \subseteq \times_{i=1}^k [0, \alpha_{p_i}]$, where $\alpha_{p_i} = \psi_{p_i}(s_{p_i})$.

Two particular shapes of R_P play significant role in the argument, boxes (complete orthotopes), and chopped off boxes, which are boxes with a single corner removed by a diagonal cut of the form $\sum_{i \in [k]} t_{p_i} = c_{[k]}$. Strictly speaking, in the definition of box and chopped off box, we allow thin pieces of width at most δ to be missing from its faces.

More generally, when the facet $\sum_{i \in [k]} t_{p_i} = c_{[k]}$ of R_P exists, we call it *bundling facet*. When the bundling boundary facet exists, it separates the regions R_P and $R_{\emptyset|P}$.

The following obvious lemma will be useful later.

Lemma 31. *Let $T = (t, s)$ be an instance with $t_j = 0$ for all j , and assume that for some set of tasks $P = \{p_1, p_2, \dots, p_k\}$ the region R_P has a full dimensional bundling facet, i.e., it contains a point with strictly positive coordinates. Then $\psi_{p_j}(s_{p_j}) > 0$ and $s_{p_j} > 0$ for every task $p_j \in P$.*

Proof. Let \hat{t}_P be a point on the bundling facet with strictly positive coordinates. For some sufficiently small $\epsilon > 0$, consider the point $(t_{p_j} = \hat{t}_{p_j} - \epsilon, (t_{p_i} = 0)_{i \in [k] \setminus j})$. By weak monotonicity, this input point is in R_P , so all tasks in P are given to the root. It follows that $\psi_{p_j}(s_{p_j}) \geq \hat{t}_{p_j} - \epsilon > 0$. The fact that s_{p_j} is also strictly positive follows from Lemma 29, since $s_{p_j} > \psi_{p_j}(s_{p_j})/n$. \square

The following is a useful proposition from [9].

Proposition 32 ([9] Lemma 21. Claim (i)). *For every truthful mechanism, and arbitrary $T = (t, s)$, the boundary function $\psi_r(t_{-r}, s)$ is 1-Lipschitz in t_{-r} , i.e., $|\psi_r(t_{-r}, s) - \psi_r(t'_{-r}, s)| \leq |t_{-r} - t'_{-r}|_1$.*

5.1.2 Facts about two tasks.

In this section we summarize known concepts and results for two tasks, i.e., two edges that can belong to the same leaf (sibling tasks) or to two different leaves (star of two tasks) (see for example [9]). Here we assume that all other tasks are fixed, and omit them from the notation. So let simply $t = (t_1, t_2)$ and $s = (s_1, s_2)$. First we consider allocation regions for the root depending on his own bids (t_1, t_2) for fixed values $s = (s_1, s_2)$. Here the s_1 and s_2 do not necessarily belong to the same leaf. It is known that in the case of two tasks, for a fixed s the four possible allocation regions of the root in a weakly monotone allocation subdivide $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^2$ basically in three possible ways summarized in the following definition (see Figure 7 for an illustration).

Definition 33. For given (s_1, s_2) we call the allocation for the root

- quasi-bundling, if there are at least two points $t \neq t'$ on the boundary of $R_{\{1,2\}}$ and $R_{\emptyset\{1,2\}}$;
- quasi-flipping, if $R_{\{1,2\}}$ and R_{\emptyset} have no common boundary point;
- crossing, otherwise, if there is a unique common boundary point.

We sometimes refer collectively to both quasi-bundling and quasi-flipping allocations as non-crossing.




Figure 7: The possible allocation to the root depending on their own bid vector (t_1, t_2) for fixed values $s = (s_1, s_2)$ of the other player: (a) quasi-bundling allocation; (b) quasi-flipping allocation; (c) crossing allocation. The boundary $\psi_1[t_2](s_1)$ for task 1 is shown by a dashed line. Part (d) depicts a half-bundling allocation at task 1, a degenerate case of quasi-bundling allocation.

In case the allocation is quasi-bundling, the boundary between $R_{\{1,2\}}$ and $R_{\emptyset\{1,2\}}$ is a bundling boundary. In general the facets defining $R_{\{1,2\}}$ in $\mathbb{R}_{0,+}^2$ are of the possible forms $t_1 = c_1$, $t_2 = c_2$, and $t_1 + t_2 = c$. A nontrivial facet $t_1 + t_2 = c$ exists if and only if the allocation is quasi-bundling.

We need to distinguish and treat separately a special sort of quasi-bundling allocation, because in this case the boundary function ψ_1 can become nonlinear function of s_1 , even in affine minimizers (more precisely, in their generalizations called *relaxed* affine minimizers, see Theorem 35 and [8]). If the facet $t_1 + t_2 = c$ exists but the facet $t_1 = c_1$ is missing (i.e., $c_1 > c$), then we will call the allocation of the tasks half-bundling, as defined next (see Figure 7 (d)).

Definition 34. The allocation of two tasks $(1, 2)$ (siblings or not) is called half-bundling at task 1, if the region $R_{\{1,2\}}$ is nonempty and is defined by at most two facets $t_2 = c_2$ and $t_1 + t_2 = c$, but no nontrivial facet $t_1 = c_1$ exists i.e., $c_1 > c$. The allocation will be called fully bundling, if it is half-bundling at both task 1 and task 2 i.e. both $c_1, c_2 > c$.

Finally, we include here the characterization result for 2 machines and 2 tasks (2×2 case).⁵ That is, from here on we consider two sibling tasks: the input (t_1, t_2) is of the root, and (s_1, s_2) belong to the same leaf. The characterization assumes that for fixed values s and sufficiently high values of the root, both tasks will be allocated to the leaf; otherwise the approximation ratio is unbounded (even when there exist other players and tasks with fixed values). Recall that in our instances $T = (t, s)$ the values for the root can be arbitrarily high, but for the s players they belong in $[0, B)$. The theorem from [8] that we use, characterizes mechanisms with values exactly in this domain.

Theorem 35 (Characterization of 2×2 mechanisms [8]). *For every $B \in \mathbb{R}_{>0} \cup \{\infty\}$, every weakly monotone allocation for two tasks and two players with values $t \in [0, \infty) \times [0, \infty)$ and $s \in [0, B) \times [0, B)$ – such that for every s there exists t for which both tasks are allocated to the second player – belongs to the following classes: (1) relaxed affine minimizers (including the special case of affine minimizers), (2) relaxed task independent mechanisms (including the special case of task independent mechanisms), (3) 1-dimensional mechanisms, (4) constant mechanisms.*

Remark. Two important remarks are due.

(a) Strictly speaking, the allocation of the root in an affine minimizer adheres to the definition over the open region $s \in (0, B) \times (0, B)$. If $s_1 = 0$ or $s_2 = 0$ the ψ boundaries of (even) an affine minimizer can have jump discontinuities (and vice versa for the leaf, see [8]). However, this will not affect our proof because (i) no jump in $s_p = 0$ in a 2×2 mechanism can occur if every task other than the siblings (p, p') is trivial and the approximation is finite (by Lemma 29, $\lim_{s_p \rightarrow 0} \psi_p(s_p) = \psi_p(0) = 0$); (ii) whenever the other tasks are non trivial, and the characterization for (p, p') is used, we never consider an instance with $s_p = 0$.

(b) 1-dimensional bundling mechanisms (where the 2 tasks are always bundled) are special relaxed affine minimizers with some additive constants that are ∞ . 1-dimensional task independent mechanisms (where one of the tasks is always given to the same player) are special relaxed task independent mechanisms. Constant mechanisms (these are independent of (s_1, s_2)) are special affine minimizers with a multiplicative constant 0. In this sense, the only possible 2×2 mechanisms are *relaxed affine minimizers* and *relaxed task independent mechanisms*.

Some mechanisms can be of two types; for example the VCG mechanism is both an affine minimizer and task independent, and there exist other task independent affine minimizers. These will be treated as task independent mechanisms.

We summarize the most relevant properties of these mechanisms in terms of the possible allocation figures (see [8, 9]). Roughly speaking, when there exists a bundling (or flipping) boundary and three or four allocation regions, the boundary functions are affine.

Observation 36. *The following properties hold for a 2×2 truthful mechanism.*

- (i) *the allocation of a relaxed task independent mechanism is crossing for every (s_1, s_2) , except for countably many points (s'_1, s'_2) , where both $\psi_1(s_1)$ has jump discontinuity in s'_1 , and $\psi_2(s_2)$ has jump discontinuity in s'_2 ;*
- (ii) *the allocation of a (non task independent) relaxed affine minimizer is non crossing for every (s_1, s_2) ,⁶ either it is always quasi-bundling, or always quasi-flipping, with the same length of slanted boundary for every high enough s — as s_1 and/or s_2 gets smaller, part of the slanted boundary may disappear, thus it may get shorter (moreover, in degenerate relaxed affine minimizers, the possible length of the slanted boundary may be unbounded);*

⁵For a description of these mechanisms see [8, 9]. For related characterization results see [11, 18].

⁶unless, because of small s , the allocation has at most two regions

(iii) the boundary function $\psi_1[t_2, s_2](s_1)$ of a relaxed affine minimizer is a truncated linear function for every (t_2, s_1, s_2) , unless the allocation is fully bundling.⁷

$$\psi_1[t_2, s_2](s_1) = \max(0, \lambda(t_2, s_2) s_1 - \gamma(t_2, s_2)).$$

Symmetric statements hold for ψ_2 .

The fact that relaxed task independent mechanisms have discontinuities could create complications, but we avoid them by considering instances that satisfy the continuity requirement.

5.2 Proof of the main Box Theorem 24

The proof of the Box Theorem has some similarities to the main lemma in [9], but both the general structure and the details of the proof must be handled differently.

Proof of Theorem 24. Fix some standard instance of $n - 1$ leaves and sufficiently high multiplicity ℓ . We show by induction on k that in every subset of $k \in [n - 1]$ leaves, a random star selected uniformly and independently is a box with a certain positive probability.

More precisely, let $1 - b_k$ be (a lower bound on) the probability that a random star of k leaves is a box. We establish a recurrence on b_k that shows that $b_{n-1} < 1$, which proves the existence of at least one box of $n - 1$ leaves.

Specifically, Theorem 45 establishes the base case of the induction ($k = 2$), which shows that $b_2 \leq 2/\sqrt{\ell}$. Lemma 58 based on the proof of the inductive hypothesis establishes the recurrence

$$b_k \leq \left(\frac{5n}{\nu} - 1 \right) b_{k-1} + \frac{2n^3}{\xi\sqrt{\ell}},$$

for $k \geq 3$. It follows that for sufficiently large ℓ , b_{n-1} can be arbitrarily small (see Corollary 59 for a more precise bound on b_k). \square

5.2.1 Preliminary observations

The following theorem, essentially a restatement of Proposition 14, says that if the mechanism has bounded approximation ratio, the allocation of the slice mechanism of two siblings must be crossing. It also excludes the degenerate case of constant mechanisms.

Theorem 37. *Let $T = (t, \bar{s})$ be a standard instance. If the mechanism has approximation ratio at most n , the boundary function $\psi_p[t_{-p}, \bar{s}_{-p}](s_p)$ of a task p is independent of the values of its siblings. Furthermore, for an arbitrary sibling p' the (p, p') -slice mechanism cannot be constant, even when we change t to non-zero values.*

Proof. The theorem is a direct consequence of the following two lemmas. The first lemma excludes the degenerate case of constant mechanisms. The next one states that slice mechanism of two sibling tasks cannot have a quasi-bundling or quasi-flipping boundary, when the approximation ratio is bounded. By the characterization, the slice mechanism must be a relaxed task independent mechanism. By the continuity requirement, there are no discontinuities, so $\psi_p[t_{-p}, \bar{s}_{-p}](s_p)$ of a task p is independent of the values of its siblings. \square

⁷Therefore, if the allocation is half-bundling at task 1, then for reduced s_1 the $\psi_1(s_1)$ can become non-linear when the figure becomes fully bundling.




Figure 8: High-level illustration of the proof of Lemma 39

Lemma 38. *Assume that the mechanism has approximation ratio at most n . Let $T = (t, \bar{s})$ be a standard instance and Q any leaf, with sibling tasks $p, p' \in Q$. Furthermore, for some $k \leq n - 1$ let $P = \{p_1, p_2, \dots, p_k\}$ be an arbitrary set of k other tasks. If in T we increase each t_{p_i} ($p_i \in P$) to some arbitrary value $\hat{t}_{p_i} \geq 0$, then in the obtained instance \hat{T} the slice mechanism (p, p') is not a constant mechanism, unless the approximation ratio of the whole mechanism is at least n .*

Proof. Consider the (p, p') slice mechanism, and let $(t, t') = (t_p, t_{p'})$ and $(s, s') = (s_p, s_{p'})$ denote an input for these two tasks in general. A 2×2 constant mechanism is by definition independent of the values of (at least) the root or the leaf. Looking at the allocation of the root (for any fixed s), w.l.o.g. the region $R_{\emptyset|\{p,p'\}}$ is nonempty (otherwise we could increase to $(t, t') = (\infty, \infty)$, so that the root still gets a task, showing unbounded approximation ratio). So, if the mechanism were independent of the root, then for *every* (s, s') the allocation would consist only of $R_{\emptyset|\{p,p'\}}$ – the root would never get any task, also independently of s . Thus, *in any case the allocation must be independent of s* . The contribution to OPT of every task other than p, p' , is at most $\sum_{p_i \in P} \bar{s}_{p_i} \leq (n - 1) \cdot 1$, since T is a standard instance.

Now, set $(t, t') = (n^2, n^2)$. If the root receives no task from $\{p, p'\}$, then increase $(s, s') = (2n^3, 0)$. Then $MECH \geq 2n^3$, and $OPT < n + n^2 < 2n^2$, proving high approximation. If the root receives at least one of the tasks, then $MECH \geq n^2$. Setting $(s, s') = (0, 0)$, we have $OPT < n$, so again, we have high approximation ratio. \square

Lemma 39. *Let $T = (t, \bar{s})$ be a standard instance, and Q be any leaf. Assume that two sibling tasks $p, p' \in Q$ exist so that the allocation in the (p, p') -slice mechanism is quasi-bundling or quasi-flipping. Then the mechanism has infinite approximation ratio.*

Proof. By the characterization result (Theorem 35 and Observation 36), the (p, p') -slice mechanism is a (non task independent) relaxed affine minimizer.

Consider first the case that the affine minimizer is quasi-flipping (Fig. 8 (a)), with height $\alpha_{p,p'}$ of the flipping boundary (i.e., the height of the 45° boundary). Lemma 29 implies $\psi_p(s_p) \rightarrow 0$ when




Figure 9: The base case instance

$s_p \rightarrow 0$, and $\psi_{p'}(s_{p'}) \rightarrow 0$ when $s_{p'} \rightarrow 0$, hence for $(s_p, s_{p'}) = (\epsilon, \epsilon)$ the allocation is still quasi-flipping. In particular, because $0 < \psi_p(\epsilon) \leq n\epsilon$, and $0 < \psi_{p'}(\epsilon) \leq n\epsilon$, and the flipping boundary has height $\alpha_{p,p'}$, exactly one of the tasks is given to the root for values $(t_p, t_{p'}) = (\alpha_{p,p'}/2, \alpha_{p,p'}/2)$ (Fig. 8 (b)). The approximation ratio is $\text{MECH}/\text{OPT} > (\alpha_{p,p'}/2)/2\epsilon \rightarrow \infty$ when $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$. Finally, in the quasi-flipping case $\alpha_{pp'} = \infty$ can be excluded by Lemma 29 (i) (to put it simply, both $R_{\{p,p'\}}$ and $R_{\emptyset|\{p,p'\}}$ must be nonempty).

Now consider the case that the relaxed affine minimizer is quasi-bundling with height of the bundling boundary equal to $\alpha_{p,p'}$ (Fig. 8 (c)). The 2×2 characterization implies that $\alpha_{p,p'}$ is constant (i.e., independent of the (s, t) values when s large enough, see Observation 36). Set s_p so that $\psi_p(s_p) = \alpha_{p,p'} + \epsilon/2$ (Fig. 8 (d)). Now for some large $s_{p'}$, the allocation is almost half-bundling at p' , and by the definition of relaxed affine minimizers, the allocation remains quasi-bundling when we decrease $s_{p'}$. If we set $s_{p'} = \epsilon/(2n)$ and $t = (\epsilon, \epsilon)$, taking into account that $\psi_{p'}(s_{p'}) < n s_{p'} = \epsilon/2$, the existence of the bundling boundary guarantees that both tasks are given to the leaf (Fig. 8 (e)). In turn this gives unbounded approximation ratio because $\text{MECH} \geq s_p > \psi_p(s_p)/n > \alpha_{p,p'}/n$, while $\text{OPT} \leq 2\epsilon$.

If in the quasi-bundling case $\alpha_{pp'} = \infty$ (e.g., for one-dimensional bundling mechanisms) the argument is analogous. For $s_p = 1$, $s_{p'} = \epsilon/2n$ and $t = (\epsilon, \epsilon)$, both tasks are allocated to the leaves and we obtain unbounded ratio. \square

Corollary 40. *Let $T = (t, \bar{s})$ be a standard instance, p, p' be sibling tasks and q be an arbitrary third task. If the region $R_{\{p,p',q\}}$ has a bundling facet of equation $t_p + t_{p'} + t_q = D$ for some $D < \alpha_p + \alpha_{p'}$, then $R_{\{p,p'\}}$ is quasi-bundling, so by Lemma 39 the mechanism has unbounded ratio.*

Proof. By definition, in the (p, p') slice the points $(\alpha_p, 0)$ and $(0, \alpha_{p'})$ are on the boundary of $R_{\{p,p'\}}$. On the other hand, in $R_{\{p,p',q\}}$ the point $(\alpha_p, \alpha_{p'}, 0)$ strictly violates $t_p + t_{p'} + t_q \leq D$. Therefore, the point $(\alpha_p, \alpha_{p'})$ does not belong in $R_{\{p,p'\}}$ so this allocation region can only be quasi-bundling (See also Figure 10). \square

5.3 Base case

In this section we prove the special case of the Box Theorem (Theorem 24) for two leaves. In this particular case, multiplicity 2 is sufficient.

Theorem 41. *For a mechanism with approximation ratio at most n , every standard instance with 2 leaves and 2 tasks per leaf contain a box of 2 leaves.*

The proof of the theorem is given in this section. We consider a multi-star with two leaves and two tasks per leaf, as shown in Figure 9. We rename the two tasks of leaf 1 as 1,1' and the two tasks of leaf 2 as 2,2'.

The next claim follows directly from the definition of a box. The factor $32 = 2 \cdot 4^2$ comes from the definition of the box and simple geometric considerations.

Lemma 42. *If the pair of tasks $\{1, 2\}$, is not a box, then the $R_{\{1,2\}}$ region of the slice-mechanism for these two tasks has a bundling boundary. In particular, there exists $\alpha_{12} \geq 32\nu$ such that the bundling boundary is defined by the equation $t_1 + t_2 = \alpha_1 + \alpha_2 - \alpha_{12}$. Similarly for the other pairs $\{1, 2'\}$, $\{1', 2\}$, and $\{1', 2'\}$.*

We continue with two technical lemmas. We provide some intuition of the base case after the lemmas. Notice that the first lemma, which is a consequence of Corollary 40, breaks the symmetry between tasks, i.e., the conclusion does not apply if we exchange the role of the two leaves.

Lemma 43. *Assume that $\alpha_{2'} = \max\{\alpha_1, \alpha_{1'}, \alpha_2, \alpha_{2'}\}$. If there exists some $\bar{t}_1 \in (\alpha_1 - \alpha_{12}, \alpha_1)$ such that the allocation in the slice $(2, 2')$ is half-bundling at task 2, then the mechanism has unbounded approximation ratio. Analogously, if there exists some $\bar{t}_{1'} \in (\alpha_{1'} - \alpha_{1'2}, \alpha_{1'})$ such that the allocation in the slice $(2, 2')$ is half-bundling at task 2, then the mechanism has unbounded approximation ratio.*

Proof. See Figure 10 for an illustration of the proof. Assume that for $\bar{t}_1 \in (\alpha_1 - \alpha_{12}, \alpha_1)$ the allocation in the slice $(2, 2')$ is half-bundling at task 2. Let the endpoint of the half-bundling boundary be $\bar{t} = (\bar{t}_1, \bar{t}_2, t_{2'} = 0)$. Since this is the boundary point for task 2 (i.e., \bar{t}_2 is a critical value), it also lies on the bundling boundary of $R_{\{1,2\}}$, and obviously $\bar{t}_1 < \alpha_1$ and $\bar{t}_2 < \alpha_2$ hold.

We will show that the region $R_{\{1,2,2'\}}$ must have a bundling facet of equation $t_1 + t_2 + t_{2'} = D$, for $D < \alpha_1 + \alpha_2 \leq \alpha_{2'} + \alpha_2$. By Corollary 40 this will imply that the mechanism has infinite approximation.

By the geometry of the half-bundling boundary, for an input point $\bar{t}' = (\bar{t}_1, \bar{t}_2 - \epsilon, t_{2'} = 2\epsilon)$ the tasks 2 and 2' are not allocated to the root player. So \bar{t}' is outside the region $R_{\{1,2,2'\}}$, and violates at least one linear constraint defining $R_{\{1,2,2'\}}$.

What can these constraints be? We will eliminate all other possibilities, by choosing ϵ to be sufficiently small, concluding that there must exist a bundling facet of equation $t_1 + t_2 + t_{2'} = D$. Firstly, $R_{\{1,2,2'\}}$ may have facets of equations $t_1 = \alpha_1$, $t_2 = \alpha_2$, $t_{2'} = \alpha_{2'}$, but \bar{t}' does not violate any of these. Further, there might be a facet of the form $t_1 + t_2 = d$. But since \bar{t} satisfies this constraint, $d \geq \bar{t}_1 + \bar{t}_2 > \bar{t}_1 + \bar{t}_2 - \epsilon$, so this constraint cannot be violated for \bar{t}' either. Similarly a facet of equation $t_2 + t_{2'} = e$ is not violated since $e \geq \alpha_2 > \bar{t}_2 + \epsilon$, and finally a facet of equation $t_1 + t_{2'} = f$ cannot be violated since $f \geq \alpha_1 > \bar{t}_1 + 2\epsilon$, for small enough ϵ . The only remaining possibility is a facet $t_1 + t_2 + t_{2'} = D$, so that $D \leq \bar{t}_1 + (\bar{t}_2 - \epsilon) + 2\epsilon = \bar{t}_1 + \bar{t}_2 + \epsilon < \alpha_1 + \alpha_2$, which concludes the proof. The proof of the second statement is analogous with task 1' instead of task 1. \square

The claim of the next lemma holds under quite general conditions. We will apply it to different triples of the four tasks, and even different instances.

Lemma 44. *If both $R_{\{1,2\}}$ and $R_{\{1,2'\}}$ are quasi-bundling, then the allocation of the slice mechanism $(2, 2')$ is non-crossing when we set t_1 to any value in $(\alpha_1 - \min\{\alpha_{12}, \alpha_{12'}\}, \alpha_1)$, with the possible exception of a single value in this interval. The same holds for task 1' instead of task 1.*

Proof. Towards a contradiction, assume that there are two values \bar{t}_1 and \bar{t}'_1 with $\bar{t}_1 < \bar{t}'_1$ in this interval, for both of which the allocation in the slice $(2, 2')$ is crossing. This means that for $t_1 \in \{\bar{t}_1, \bar{t}'_1\}$ the slice mechanism for tasks 2 and 2' is task-independent, i.e., the boundary of task 2 is unaffected by changing the value of task 2'.

The fact that these two values of t_1 are in $(\alpha_1 - \min\{\alpha_{12}, \alpha_{12'}\}, \alpha_1) \subseteq (\alpha_1 - \alpha_{12}, \alpha_1)$ means that they fall in the bundling boundary between 1 and 2 (Figure 11). In the interval $[\bar{t}_1, \bar{t}'_1]$ the bundling boundary is common between tasks 1 and 2. Since the boundary of task 2 is unaffected




Figure 10: Illustration of the proof of Lemma 43. The half-bundling boundary in the slice $(t_2, t_{2'})$ for $t_1 = \bar{t}_1$ is drawn by the dashed lines. It can exist only if $R_{\{1,2,2'\}}$ has a bundling facet on the plane $t_1 + t_2 + t_{2'} = D$ (where $D = \bar{t}_1 + \bar{t}_2$). Given that $D < \alpha_2 + \alpha_{2'}$, the allocation of $R_{\{2,2'\}}$ (for $t_1 = 0$) cannot be crossing, even if arbitrary other defining facets for $R_{\{1,2,2'\}}$ exist.

by changing the value of task 2', the boundary of t_1 in $[\bar{t}_1, \bar{t}'_1]$ also remains unaffected by changing the value of task 2'. In particular, this means that for instances $(t_1 = \bar{t}_1, t_2 = 0, t_{2'} = x)$, the mechanism allocates both task 1 and 2 to the root, for all x .

But for large x , say $x \geq \alpha_{2'}$, the above points are in the region $R_{\emptyset|\{1,2'\}}$, because $\bar{t}_1 > \alpha_1 - \alpha_{12'}$ and the point $(t_1 = \bar{t}_1, t_2 = 0, t_{2'} = x)$ is above the bundling boundary of 1 and 2'. This contradicts the fact that 1 is allocated to the root. \square

Now we are ready to state the main lemma of the base case. We will show that if none of the four stars from $\{1, 1', 2, 2'\}$ is a box, then the mechanism has high approximation ratio.

Intuitively, we will argue as follows: By reducing s_2 to some *positive* value s_2^* , we shift the 2-dimensional bundling boundary facets of both $R_{\{1,2\}}$ and of $R_{\{1',2'\}}$ parallel to themselves until both of them reach the $t_2 = 0$ plane (i.e., bundling boundaries reach the t_1 -axis, and the $t_{1'}$ -axis, respectively, but they do not disappear). Hereby we will use that by the previous lemma, the $(2, 2')$ slices are not task-independent, and therefore the boundary positions ψ_2 are linear functions of s_2 .

Subsequently, — applying the lemma in another, orthogonal, direction — we reduce s_1 , in order to shift one of the bundling boundaries (say, of $R_{\{1,2\}}$) in the other direction to reach the t_2 -axis and further, until the bundling boundary 'disappears'. This will imply high approximation ratio in the end, because s_2^* remains positive and bounded from below, but the $(t_1, t_2) \approx (0, 0)$ input will be allocated to the leaves.

We remark that such a parallel shift of the boundary by linear function of s_i is trivial for an affine minimizer, but far from obvious for tasks 1 and 2 that *are not siblings*, since the 2×2 characterization does apply to the $(1, 2)$ -slice mechanism.

We are now ready to prove the base case (Theorem 41).

Proof of Theorem 41. Consider a standard instance $T = (t, \bar{s})$, and assume w.l.o.g. that $\alpha_{2'} = \max\{\alpha_1, \alpha_{1'}, \alpha_2, \alpha_{2'}\}$. First, we apply Lemma 44 to the triple $\{1, 2, 2'\}$. According to the lemma, for all but at most one $t_1 \in (\alpha_1 - C, \alpha_1)$ the corresponding slice mechanism $(2, 2')$ has a non-crossing allocation, where $C = \min\{\alpha_{12}, \alpha_{12'}\} \geq 32\nu$.

By the continuity requirement, the $(2, 2')$ -slice mechanism cannot be task independent (for t_1 rational) because it has a non-crossing allocation. Also, Theorem 37 establishes that it cannot be




Figure 11: High-level argument of the proof of Lemma 44. The blue part depicts the values of tasks 1 and 2 and the green part depicts the values of task 1 and 2'. The blue continuous line shows the boundaries for tasks 1 and 2 when $t_{2'} = 0$. Similarly, the green continuous line shows the boundaries for tasks 1 and 2' when $t_2 = 0$. $t_1 = \bar{t}_1$ and $t_1 = \bar{t}'_1$ are two values on the bundling boundary (i.e., the part with slope -45°) between tasks 1 and 2. The lemma shows that the $(2, 2')$ slice mechanism cannot be task independent at both of these values of t_1 . Indeed if tasks 2 and 2' are independent at $t_1 \in \{\bar{t}_1, \bar{t}'_1\}$, changing $t_{2'}$ does not change the blue line at these values, and therefore the boundary between 1 and 2 remains bundling in the interval $[\bar{t}_1, \bar{t}'_1]$. This leads to a contradiction, when we consider the allocation of an instance $(t_1 = \bar{t}_1, t_2 = 0, t_{2'} = x)$, for $x \geq \alpha_{2'}$. This instance, depicted as a blue dot at $(t_1 = \bar{t}_1, t_2 = 0)$ and as a green dot at $(t_1 = \bar{t}_1, t_{2'} = x)$, is to the west of the blue line (which is the boundary between 1 and 2) and east of the green line (which is the boundary between 1 and 2'); the first says that task 1 is given to the root and the latter that it is not given to the root.

a constant mechanism, if the approximation ratio is at most n . Thus the $(2, 2')$ -slice mechanism can only be a relaxed affine minimizer. Lemma 43 excludes the possibility that it is half-bundling at task 2, for $t_1 \in (\alpha_1 - C, \alpha_1)$. We conclude that for (all but one) rational $t_1 \in (\alpha_1 - C, \alpha_1)$ the $(2, 2')$ slice mechanism is in the linear part of a relaxed affine minimizer, that is, by Observation 36 (iii) it has critical values for t_2 that are truncated linear functions of s_2 :

$$\psi_2[t_1](s_2) = \max(0, \lambda(t_1) s_2 - \gamma(t_1)).$$

Recall that this notation omits the parameters that have their original values \bar{s} and $t = 0$. In particular, both $\lambda(t_1)$ and $\gamma(t_1)$ may depend on values in s_{-2} , but this dependency will not play any role in the argument.

Analogously, we can apply Proposition 44 to the triple $\{1', 2, 2'\}$, obtaining that with $C' = \min\{\alpha_{1'2}, \alpha_{1'2'}\}$ for all but at most one, rational $t_{1'} \in (\alpha_{1'} - C', \alpha_{1'})$ the $\psi_2[t_{1'}](s_2)$ are truncated linear functions of s_2 .

The following claim is a variant of ([8], Lemma 4); we show that for different points on the same bundling boundary, due to linearity, the multiplicative constant of $\psi_2(\cdot)$ must be the same.

Claim (i). *In the interval $t_1 \in (\alpha_1 - C, \alpha_1)$, $\lambda(t_1)$ is fixed, i.e., independent of t_1 . Similarly $\lambda(t_{1'})$ is independent of $t_{1'} \in (\alpha_{1'} - C', \alpha_{1'})$.*

Proof. Fix two values $t_1, \hat{t}_1 \in (\alpha_1 - C, \alpha_1) \subset (\alpha_1 - \alpha_{12}, \alpha_1)$ with $t_1 < \hat{t}_1$. The critical value points for t_2 are on a bundling boundary of $R_{\{1,2\}}$, so

$$\psi_2[t_1](\bar{s}_2) - \psi_2[\hat{t}_1](\bar{s}_2) = \hat{t}_1 - t_1.$$




Figure 12: High-level argument of the proof of Theorem 41. Figure (a) shows the $(1, 2)$ slice. Figure (b) shows how the area of the $R_{1,2}$ changes when we reduce the values of s_2 to $s_2^* > 0$ and Figure (c) when we reduce s_1 to s_1^* . In Figure (c) none of the tasks is allocated to the root, even for small values of $t_1 = t_2 = \epsilon$ which implies an unbounded ratio (see Lemma 39). Note that this shift of the bundling boundary would be straightforward for an affine-minimizer, because of linearity of the boundaries. But here we need to establish this carefully, by using the sibling tasks $1', 2'$. By applying Lemma 44 first to the triple $\{1, 2, 2'\}$ and then to the triple $\{1', 2, 2'\}$, we establish linearity of the boundary $\psi_2(s_2)$ for an interval of t_1 values. Figure (b) illustrates that this allows to shift the bundling boundary by reducing s_2 to $s_2^* > 0$ reaching a half-bundling position (Claims (i), (ii), (iii)). Then Claim (iv) establishes linearity of $\psi_1(s_1)$, which allows us to reduce s_1 to $s_1^* > 0$ and obtain an unbounded approximation ratio.

Assume for contradiction that $\lambda(t_1) > \lambda(\hat{t}_1)$. Then we slightly increase s_2 to $\bar{s}_2 + \epsilon$, and obtain $\psi_2[t_1](\bar{s}_2 + \epsilon) - \psi_2[\hat{t}_1](\bar{s}_2 + \epsilon) = \hat{t}_1 - t_1 + \epsilon(\lambda(t_1) - \lambda(\hat{t}_1)) > \hat{t}_1 - t_1$, which contradicts the Lipschitz property (Proposition 32).

For the other direction, $\lambda(t_1) < \lambda(\hat{t}_1)$, we slightly decrease the value to $s_2 - \epsilon$, and again violate the Lipschitz property analogously. \square

From Claim (i) it follows that $\psi_2[t_1](s_2) - \psi_2[t'_1](s_2) = t'_1 - t_1$ for every s_2 for which these ψ_2 values are positive. Thus for every s_2 the following set of boundary points of $R_{\{1,2\}}$,

$$\{(t_1, \psi_2[t_1](s_2)) : t_1 \in (\alpha_1 - C, \alpha_1) \wedge \psi_2[t_1](s_2) > 0\},$$

remain part of a bundling boundary. An analogous statement holds for the boundary of $R_{\{1',2\}}$ for $t_{1'} \in (\alpha_1 - C', \alpha_1]$. Next we give simple bounds for λ and γ .

Claim (ii). Let $t_1 \in (\alpha_1 - C, \alpha_1]$, and

$$\psi_2[t_1](s_2) = \max(0, \lambda(t_1) \cdot s_2 - \gamma(t_1));$$

Then $0 < \gamma(t_1) < \lambda(t_1) < 2n$ or the approximation ratio is at least n . Similarly for every $t'_1 \in (\alpha_1 - C', \alpha_1]$.

Proof. Fix a $t_1 \in (\alpha_1 - C, \alpha_1]$, and let $\lambda = \lambda(t_1)$ and $\gamma = \gamma(t_1)$.

First we prove $0 < \gamma$. For every s_2 , for which $R_{\{1,2\}}$ (or $R_{\{1',2\}}$) has a bundling boundary, it obviously holds that $\psi_2(s_2) > 0$ (Lemma 31). On the other hand, by Lemma 29, $\psi_2(s_2) \rightarrow 0$ as $s_2 \rightarrow 0$. Therefore, for $s_2 = 0$, no piece of bundling boundary can remain for $R_{\{1,2\}}$. Thus for t_1 it holds that $\psi_2[t_1](0) = 0$, and therefore $\lambda \cdot 0 - \gamma \leq 0$, which implies $0 \leq \gamma$. Finally, since by the same argument $\gamma(t_1 - \epsilon) \geq 0$, and due to the bundling boundary $\gamma(t_1) - \epsilon = \gamma(t_1 - \epsilon) \geq 0$, we even obtain strict inequality $\gamma(t_1) > 0$ for every $t_1 \in (\alpha_1 - C, \alpha_1]$.

Second, we prove $\gamma < \lambda$. By $R_{\{1,2\}}$ being quasi-bundling, and by the position of t_1 , we obviously have $\psi_2[t_1](\bar{s}_2) > 0$. Since $\bar{s}_2 \leq 1$, we get $\gamma < \lambda$. Then, $\lambda < 2n$ follows from the fact that $\psi_2[t_1](s_2) < ns_2$, for all values of s_2 (Lemma 29). \square

Let $\hat{s}_2 = \gamma(\alpha_1)/\lambda(\alpha_1) > 0$. Note that \hat{s}_2 is the largest s_2 value such that $\psi_2[t_1 = \alpha_1](s_2) = 0$ (that is, for \hat{s}_2 the bundling boundary of $R_{\{1,2\}}$ touches the t_1 axis). Analogously, define $\hat{s}'_2 > 0$ to be the largest s_2 value such that $\psi_2[t_1' = \alpha_{1'}](s_2) = 0$. Assume w.l.o.g that $\hat{s}_2 \leq \hat{s}'_2$, that is

$$\psi_2[t_1 = \alpha_1](\hat{s}_2) = 0 \quad \Rightarrow \quad \psi_2[t_1' = \alpha_{1'}](\hat{s}_2) = 0.$$

We would like to reduce $s_2 = \bar{s}_2$ to some appropriate $s_2 = s_2^* > 0$, where $\psi_2[t_1 = \alpha_1](s_2^*) = 0$ and $\psi_2[t_1' = \alpha_{1'}](s_2^*) = 0$, but for $(t_1, t_1') = (0, 0)$ it still holds that $\psi_2[t_1 = 0, t_1' = 0](s_2^*) > 0$. The next claim provides such an s_2^* :

Claim (iii). *There exists $q^* \in \{0, 1, \dots, 4n/\nu\}$ such that for $s_2^* := \bar{s}_2 - q^*\nu/(4n)$ the following hold:*

- (a) $\psi_2[t_1 = \alpha_1](s_2^*) = \psi_2[t_1' = \alpha_{1'}](s_2^*) = 0$;
- (b) $\psi_2[t_1 = 0, t_1' = 0](s_2^*) > 30\nu$
- (c) $s_2^* > 30\nu/n$.

Proof. For any $t_1 \in [\alpha_1 - C, \alpha_1]$, consider the sequence of values $\psi_2[t_1](\bar{s}_2 - q\frac{\nu}{4n})$, for $q = 0, 1, 2, \dots$. By Claim (ii), $\lambda(t_1) \leq 2n$, so successive values in this sequence differ by at most $\lambda(\nu/4n) \leq 2n\nu/4n = \nu/2$.

As above, let \hat{s}_2 be the largest value such that $\psi_2[t_1 = \alpha_1](\hat{s}_2) = 0$. Then for this \hat{s}_2 , over the whole interval $t_1 \in [\alpha_1 - C, \alpha_1]$ there is still a bundling boundary of $R_{\{1,2\}}$. It follows that

$$\psi_2[t_1 = \alpha_1 - C](\hat{s}_2) - 0 = \psi_2[t_1 = \alpha_1 - C](\hat{s}_2) - \psi_2[t_1 = \alpha_1](\hat{s}_2) = \alpha_1 - (\alpha_1 - C) = C \geq 32\nu.$$

Now we further reduce \hat{s}_2 to the next possible value of the form $\bar{s}_2 - q\nu/(4n)$, and define this to be s_2^* . We have $\psi_2[t_1 = 0, t_1' = 0](s_2^*) \geq \psi_2[t_1 = \alpha_1 - C, t_1' = 0](s_2^*) \geq 32\nu - \nu/2 > 30\nu$, so (b) holds. Also, (a) holds by the assumption that $\psi_2[t_1 = \alpha_1](s_2) = 0 \Rightarrow \psi_2[t_1' = \alpha_{1'}](s_2) = 0$. Finally, (c) holds, since by Observation 29 $s_2^* \cdot n > \psi_2(s_2^*) = \psi_2[t_1 = 0, t_1' = 0](s_2^*) > 30\nu$. \square

Let T^* denote the instance that we get by changing \bar{s}_2 to s_2^* in $T = (t, \bar{s})$. We claim that in T^* the region $R_{\{1,2\}}^{T^*}$ is half-bundling at 1, and the region $R_{\{1',2\}}^{T^*}$ is half-bundling at 1'. This follows immediately from Claim (iii) (a) and (b). Indeed, if $\psi_2[t_1 = 0](s_2^*) > \psi_2[t_1 = t'_1](s_2^*) = 0$ for some $t'_1 > 0$, then geometry implies that $R_{\{1,2\}}$ can only be half-bundling (and similarly for $R_{\{1',2\}}$).

Observe, that T^* is a standard instance for leaf set $\{1\}$. We apply Lemma 39 to $(1, 1')$, and obtain that $R_{\{1,1'\}}$ (for $t_2 = 0$) must be crossing, otherwise the approximation ratio is ∞ .

Let $c = \psi_2[t_1 = 0, t_1' = 0](s_2^*) > 30\nu$ (see also Figure 13). For the critical value of t_1 , we will use the notation $\alpha_1^* = \psi_1[T^*](\bar{s}_1)$. Analogously, let $\alpha_{1'}^* = \psi_{1'}[T^*](\bar{s}_{1'})$. By $R_{\{1',2\}}$ being half-bundling at 1', we have $\alpha_1^* \geq c$ and $\alpha_{1'}^* \geq c$.

Consider now the $(1, 1')$ slice allocation for T^* for different positive rational values of $t_2 \in (0, c)$. What kind of allocations can these be? By Proposition 44 applied to $\{2, 1, 1'\}$, for almost all (in fact, for all) $t_2 \in (0, c)$, it cannot be a crossing allocation. The next claim excludes that it is half-bundling for any $t_2 \in (0, c)$. The only remaining possibility is, that for every rational $t_2 \in (0, c)$, it is (the linear part of) a relaxed affine minimizer. This will imply that for such a t_2 , the critical value function $\psi_1[t_2](s_1)$ is truncated linear in the variable s_1 .

Claim (iv). *If the allocation of the slice $(1, 1')$ is half bundling for some $t_2 \in (0, c)$, then the approximation ratio of the mechanism is unbounded.*




Figure 13: Illustration to the proof of Claim iv. The dashed line is a half-bundling boundary in the slice $(t_1, t_{1'})$. It implies the existence of a bundling facet of $R_{\{1,1',2\}}$. Such a facet excludes that $R_{\{1,1'\}}$ (for $t_2 = 0$) is crossing, even if other facets of $R_{\{1,1',2\}}$ exist.

Proof. The proof is similar to that of Lemma 43. Assume that for some $\hat{t}_2 \in (0, c)$ the $(1, 1')$ allocation is half-bundling at task 1. Let $(\hat{t}_1, t_{1'} = 0, \hat{t}_2)$ denote the endpoint of the half-bundling boundary (see Figure 13). By definition, this point is on the half-bundling boundary of the slice $(1, 1')$ (for $t_2 = \hat{t}_2$ fixed). On the other hand, (since the critical value \hat{t}_1 for task 1 is unique) it is also on the half-bundling boundary of the slice $(1, 2)$ (for $t_{1'} = 0$ fixed), because $R_{\{1,2\}}$ is half-bundling at task 1 and $\hat{t}_2 < c$. From the latter it follows that $\hat{t}_1 + \hat{t}_2 = \alpha_1^*$.

We show that the region $R_{\{1,1',2\}}$ has a bundling facet of equation $t_1 + t_{1'} + t_2 = \alpha_1^* < \alpha_1^* + \alpha_{1'}^*$. By Corollary 40 this will imply that the mechanism has unbounded approximation ratio.

For some small enough $\epsilon > 0$, the point $(\hat{t}_1 - \epsilon, t_{1'} = 2\epsilon, \hat{t}_2)$ is not in $R_{\{1,1',2\}}$, since (at least) the tasks 1 and $1'$ are not allocated to the root by the definition of the half-bundling boundary of the slice $(1, 1')$. So this point violates at least one linear constraint defining $R_{\{1,1',2\}}$.

$R_{\{1,1',2\}}$ may have facets of equations $t_1 = \alpha_1^*$, $t_{1'} = \alpha_{1'}^*$, and $t_2 = c$, respectively. The point $(\hat{t}_1 - \epsilon, t_{1'} = 2\epsilon, \hat{t}_2)$ is within these boundaries for $2\epsilon < \alpha_{1'}^*$. Further, there might be boundaries of equations $t_1 + t_2 = d$ (for some $d \geq \alpha_1^*$), or $t_1 + t_{1'} = e$ (for $e \geq \alpha_1^*$), or $t_{1'} + t_2 = f$ (for $f \geq c$). However, for small ϵ these would not exclude the point $(\hat{t}_1 - \epsilon, t_{1'} = 2\epsilon, \hat{t}_2)$ from $R_{\{1,1',2\}}$ (as follows from $\hat{t}_1 + \hat{t}_2 = \alpha_1^* \leq d$, and $\hat{t}_1 < \alpha_1^* \leq e$, and $\hat{t}_2 < c \leq f$, respectively).

The only remaining possibility is a facet $t_1 + t_{1'} + t_2 = D$ such that $\hat{t}_1 + \epsilon + \hat{t}_2 \geq D \geq \alpha_1^* = \hat{t}_1 + \hat{t}_2$. Taking $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$, we obtain $D = \alpha_1^*$, which concludes the proof. \square

We therefore conclude that for every (rational) $t_2 \in (0, c)$ the $(1, 1')$ slice is (in the linear part of) an affine minimizer and so the critical value function (at $t_{1'} = 0$) for t_1 is linear in s_1 , that is $\psi_1[t_2](s_1) = \max(0, \lambda(t_2) \cdot s_1 - \gamma(t_2))$. With role change between tasks 1 and 2, with precisely the same argument as in Claim (i), we obtain that $\lambda(t_2)$ is equal for all rational $t_2 \in (0, c)$, and therefore, for all $t_2 \in (0, c)$.

We concentrate only on the $(1, 2)$ allocation now, while every other t -value is 0. Let $\psi_1(s_1) = \psi_1[t_2 = 0](s_1)$. We reduce s_1 so that $s_1 \rightarrow 0$. By Observation 29 (ii) applied to T^* , we have $\psi_1(s_1) \rightarrow 0$ (that is, $\gamma(t_2 = 0) = 0$). Because of linearity of ψ_1 with unique λ for every $t_2 \in (0, c)$, the $R_{\{1,2\}}$ has a half-bundling boundary, as long as $\psi_1(s_1) > 0$, that is, as long as $s_1 > 0$. This implies that for every $s_1 > 0$, the point $(t_1, t_2) = (\psi_1(s_1), \psi_1(s_1))$ is in the region $R_{\emptyset|\{1,2\}}$, i.e., tasks 1 and 2 are allocated to the leaves. As s_1 tends to 0, the point $(\psi_1(s_1), \psi_1(s_1))$ tends to $(0, 0)$. Clearly, $\text{OPT} \rightarrow 0$, and $\text{MECH} \geq s_2^* > 30\nu$. Taking $s_1 \rightarrow 0$, we obtain unbounded approximation ratio. \square

Theorem 41 established that every pair of leaves with two tasks per leaf contains a box of size

two. This immediately suggests that there are many boxes of size two. The following statement makes it precise.

Theorem 45. *Let T be a standard instance. If the approximation ratio is at most n , a random star of two leaves is not a box with probability at most $2/\sqrt{\ell}$.*

Proof. The proof is an immediate consequence of the following extremal graph theory result [21]: Every $\ell \times \ell$ bipartite graph with at least $2\ell\sqrt{\ell}$ edges, contains a cycle C_4 .

Take an $\ell \times \ell$ bipartite graph with edges indicating that the associated star is not a box. Theorem 41 guarantees that there exists no C_4 , which implies that there are at most $2\ell\sqrt{\ell}$ stars that are not boxes. \square

5.4 Induction step

For the induction step, we consider a star of $k \geq 3$ tasks, which we call *chopped off box*, such that all its subsets of $k - 1$ tasks are boxes. The precise structure of a chopped off box is detailed in the following definition.

Definition 46 (Chopped off box). *Fix a mechanism. A star $P = \{p_1, \dots, p_k\}$ from a set of leaves \mathcal{C} , for $|\mathcal{C}| = k \geq 3$ is called a chopped off box for an instance $T = (t, \bar{s})$ if $T = (t, \bar{s})$ is standard for P and the following conditions hold*

- for every $i \in [k]$, $P_{-i} = P \setminus \{p_i\}$ is a box for T ;
- for every $q = 1, \dots, 4n/\nu$, such that $\bar{s}_{p_k} > q\nu/(4n)$, the instance that results from T when we replace the values of task p_k with $[t_{p_k} = 0, \bar{s}_{p_k} - q\nu/(4n)]$, the P_{-k} is a box.

If a chopped off box is not a box itself, it will be called strictly chopped off box.

The definition of a box is about the allocation area R_P , in which all tasks are allocated to the root. Recall that a box is a set of tasks for which R_P is (almost) an orthotope (a hyperrectangle). On the other hand, the first condition in the definition of a chopped off box essentially says that it is a box from which a simplex was cut off by a diagonal cut (i.e., by a hyperplane of the form $\sum_{i \in [k]} t_{p_i} = c_{[k]}$). While the definition allows the removed simplex to be empty (in which case it is simply a box), when we want to emphasize that it is not empty, we call it a strictly chopped off box (see Figure 2 (c) and (e)).

In the rest of this section we establish that the probability that a chopped off box is not a box, is small. We consider a standard instance $T = (t, s)$ and a star $P = \{p_1, \dots, p_k\}$ from a set of leaves $\mathcal{C} = (Q_1, \dots, Q_k)$, and we assume that P is a strictly chopped off box. Let p'_k be a random sibling of p_k , i.e., another task of leaf Q_k . The main result of this section establishes that *almost all other sets (P_{-k}, p'_k) are boxes*. In particular, we will show via a probabilistic argument that (P_{-k}, p'_k) is a box with probability at least $1 - 2n^3/\ell\xi$ (Lemma 55). In order to show this result, we consider the (p_k, p'_k) -slice mechanism which is a mechanism between two players and two tasks, utilizing the 2×2 characterization (Theorem 35 and Observation 36).

We will focus on input points that lie on a specific area around the allocation region R_P , for which we can establish useful properties when we use the 2×2 characterization. In what follows, two important input points are $T_\nu(P)$ and $T_{\nu'}(P)$. Recall that by Definition 23, $T_\nu(P)$ is an instance (t^ν, s) that agrees with T everywhere, except for tasks in P , where $t^\nu_{p_i} = \alpha_{p_i} - 4^k\nu$. We define $T_{\nu'}(P) = (t^{\nu'}, s)$ similarly, but for $\nu' = \nu/4$. Then $t^{\nu'}$ is a point between t^ν_P and $(\alpha_{p_i})_{p_i \in P}$. Moreover, $T_\nu(P_{-k})$ is the projection in direction of the p_k -axis of $T_\nu(P)$, i.e., all tasks p_i in $P \setminus p_k$ have t -values equal to $\alpha_{p_i} - 4^{k-1}\nu$. We will use the short notation $T_\nu = T_\nu(P)$ and $T_{\nu'} = T_{\nu'}(P)$.

We proceed with some useful properties of chopped off boxes (Section 5.4.1), and then we examine the different possibilities for a (p_k, p'_k) -slice mechanism (Section 5.4.2). Then we conclude with the main result of this section, that shows that the probability that a chopped off box is not a box, is small (Section 5.4.3).

5.4.1 General observations.

We will need a few simple observations about weakly monotone mechanisms. First of all, the following proposition and its corollaries provide some intuition about chopped off box sets.

Proposition 47. *Suppose that $P = \{p_1, p_2, \dots, p_k\}$ is a strictly chopped off box for $T = (t, \bar{s})$. Consider an arbitrary instance $T' = [(t'_P, t_{[m] \setminus P}), \bar{s}]$ such that $t'_P < t_P < t'_P$ coordinate-wise – and so, $T_\nu \leq T' \leq T_{\nu'}$. Then the point t'_P obeys every linear constraint defining the region R_P^T , except for a single violated non-redundant constraint $\sum_{i=1}^k t_{p_i} = c$ for some $c \leq \sum_{i=1}^k \alpha_{p_i} - k \cdot 4^k \cdot \nu$, which defines a bundling boundary facet of R_P .*

Proof. For input t'_P at least one task $p_i \in P$ is not allocated to the root, otherwise P would be a box. In other words, $(\alpha_{p_i} - 4^k \nu)_{i=1}^k = t'_P \notin R_P$, and therefore a linear constraint of the form $\sum_{i \in I} t_{p_i} \leq c_I$ for R_P is either violated or satisfied with equality by t'_P . Clearly, then all points $t'_P > t'_P$ violate this constraint as well.

We need to show that $I = [k]$. Assume for contradiction that $I \neq [k]$, and let $j \in [k] \setminus I$. Then in the $(k-1)$ -dimensional space of the tasks P_{-j} , the point $(t'_{p_i})_{i \in [k] \setminus \{j\}}$ violates (at least) the same constraint $\sum_{i \in I} t_{p_i} \leq c_I$. But then the higher point $(t'_{p_i})_{i \in [k] \setminus \{j\}} = (\alpha_{p_i} - 4^{(k-1)} \nu)_{i \in [k] \setminus \{j\}}$ strictly violates the same constraint contradicting the fact, that P_{-j} is a box. By the same argument, no point $t'_P \leq t'_P$ can violate any other linear constraint of R_P , but this single constraint with $I = [k]$.

Remark. We used the fact that a restriction of a constraint for R_P to the (hyper-)plane $t_{p_j} = 0$ is a constraint for $R_{P \setminus \{p_j\}}$ for the same instance T . One short explanation for this is that the constant terms in the linear constraints for allocation regions correspond to (differences of) payments which are unique for a given mechanism and given \bar{s} .

□

Corollary 48. *Let the conditions be like in Proposition 47. Then*

- (i) *the region R_P has a non-redundant bundling facet of equation $\sum_{i=1}^k t_{p_i} = c$ for some c ;*
- (ii) *for T' every task $p_i \in P$ is allocated to the leaf;*
- (iii) *for each $j \in [k]$, if in T' we change the t -value of only task p_j to 0, then all tasks $i \in P$ are allocated to the root.*
- (iv) *in T' for the task p_k and its critical value $\psi_{p_k} = \psi_{p_k}(t'_{-p_k}, \bar{s})$, it holds that $\psi_{p_k} > 0$, and the point $(t'_{P \setminus \{p_k\}}, \psi_{p_k}) \in \mathbb{R}^k$ is a point of the bundling boundary facet of R_P .*

Proof. (i) follows trivially by Proposition 47.

(ii) For $T_\nu(P) = (t^\nu, \bar{s})$ it holds that $t'_P \notin R_P$, since P is not a box. Therefore, by Proposition 47, it must be either a point on the bundling facet between R_P and $R_{\emptyset|P}$, or a point in $R_{\emptyset|P}$, since it cannot violate any other type of linear constraint (i.e., with $I \neq [k]$) for R_P . By weak monotonicity, $t'_P > t'_P$ implies that $t'_P \in R_{\emptyset|P}$ for T' .

(iii) By definition, since P is a strictly chopped off box, P_{-j} must be a box, and therefore for input $(t_{p_j} = 0, t'_{-p_j})$ all tasks $i \in P \setminus \{p_j\}$ are allocated to the root. Further, by weak monotonicity the same holds for every $t'_P \leq t'_P$.

Next we argue that task p_j is also allocated to the root, when we change t'_{p_j} to 0. The only constraint that t'_{p_j} violates, is defined by the bundling facet between R_P and $R_{\emptyset|P}$. Thus, t'_{p_j} obeys, and t'_P strictly obeys every other constraint defining R_P . Obviously, this holds also after the change to $t'_{p_j} = 0$. Since, by Proposition 47, no other type of constraint is violated (i.e., with $I \neq [k]$), after this change to $t'_{p_j} = 0$, the point can be either in R_P , or in $R_{\emptyset|P}$. However, the fact that the tasks in $P \setminus \{p_j\}$ are allocated to the root, implies that the point cannot be in $R_{\emptyset|P}$, and therefore it must be in R_P .

(iv) $\psi_{p_k} > 0$ follows by (iii). The boundary point $(t'_{P \setminus \{p_k\}}, \psi_{p_k}) \in \mathbb{R}^k$ lies on at least one facet defined by a linear constraint for a set I of tasks such that $p_k \in I$. By Proposition 47, this can only be the constraint with $I = [k]$. \square

The next propositions are about points on the bundling boundary facet of R_P . We consider inputs $T_1 = [(t_P^1, t_{[m] \setminus P}), \bar{s}]$ and $T_2 = [(t_P^2, t_{[m] \setminus P}), \bar{s}]$ that differ from $T_{\nu'}$ and T_{ν} only in their coordinates t_{p_i} for tasks $p_i \in P$, such that $t_{p_i}^{\nu'} \leq t_{p_i}^1 < t_{p_i}^2 \leq t_{p_i}^{\nu'}$. All other t -coordinates $j \in [m] \setminus P$ stay the same, i.e., $t_j^{\nu'} = t_j^1 = t_j^2 = t_j^{\nu'}$, as well as the s -coordinates.

Due to the relative position of T_1 and T_2 , and since the critical value points for task p_k are on a bundling boundary of R_P , (Corollary 48 (iv)), it is intuitively clear that the Lipschitz property (Proposition 32) for any two such points is fulfilled with equality.

Proposition 49 ([9] Lemma 21. Claim (ii)). *Let $T_{\nu} \leq T_1 \leq T_2 \leq T_{\nu'}$ coordinate-wise, and $t_{p_i}^1 < t_{p_i}^2$ hold with strict inequality for every $p_i \in P$. Then*

$$\psi_{p_k}(t_{-p_k}^1, \bar{s}) - \psi_{p_k}(t_{-p_k}^2, \bar{s}) = |t_{-p_k}^1 - t_{-p_k}^2|_1 = \sum_{i \in [k-1]} (t_{p_i}^2 - t_{p_i}^1).$$

Proof. Fix \bar{s} . We know by Corollary 48 (ii) that in the allocation of instance T_1 all tasks in P are given to the leaves. We create another instance $\hat{T}_1 = [(\hat{t}_P^1, t_{[m] \setminus P}), \bar{s}]$ which is close to T_1 that has the same allocation for the tasks in P : we set $\hat{t}_{p_i}^1 = t_{p_i}^1 + \epsilon/n$, for $i \in [k-1]$ and we set $\hat{t}_{p_k}^1 = \psi_{p_k}(t_{-p_k}^1) + \epsilon$, for some small $\epsilon > 0$. The allocation of P remains the same, because (1) the boundary $\psi_{p_k}(t_{-p_k}^1)$ changes by less than $(n-1)\epsilon/n < \epsilon$ (due to the Lipschitz property), so the new t -value of p_k , $\hat{t}_{p_k}^1$ is still above the boundary, and (2) by weak monotonicity, the allocation of the other tasks remains the same.

Similarly, we create an instance \hat{T}_2 that is very close to T_2 : we set $\hat{t}_{p_i}^2 = t_{p_i}^2 - \epsilon/n$, for $i \in [k-1]$ and $\hat{t}_{p_k}^2 = \psi_{p_k}(t_{-p_k}^2) - \epsilon$. We claim that in \hat{T}_2 all tasks are allocated to the root. To see this, observe that for $(t_{-p_k}^2, t_{p_k} = 0)$ all tasks are allocated to the root (by Corollary 48), and by the Lipschitz property $\psi_{p_k}(t_{-p_k}^2)$ can decrease by less than ϵ , so p_k will be again allocated to the root. Again the allocation will not change.

By weak monotonicity we get

$$0 \geq \sum_{i \in [k]} (1-0)(\hat{t}_{p_i}^2 - \hat{t}_{p_i}^1) \geq \sum_{i \in [k-1]} (t_{p_i}^2 - t_{p_i}^1) + \psi_{p_k}(t_{-p_k}^2) - \psi_{p_k}(t_{-p_k}^1) - \left(2 + \frac{k-1}{n}\right) \epsilon.$$

On the other hand, the Lipschitz property implies

$$\psi_{p_k}(t_{-p_k}^2) - \psi_{p_k}(t_{-p_k}^1) \leq \sum_{i \in [k-1]} (t_{p_i}^2 - t_{p_i}^1),$$

since $T_2 \geq T_1$, hence all terms inside the sum on the right hand side are nonnegative. By letting ϵ tend to 0 we get the equality of the claim. \square

The (proof of the) previous proposition shows that $\psi_{p_k}(t^1) - \psi_{p_k}(t^2) = |t^1 - t^2|_1$, essentially uses the fact that for $i = 1, 2$ the points $(t_{-p_k}^i, \psi_{p_k}(t^i)) \in \mathbb{R}^k$ are on the bundling boundary of R_P and $R_{\emptyset|P}$. The next proposition and its corollary show that the reverse also holds: If $\psi_{p_k}(t_{-p_k}^1) - \psi_{p_k}(t_{-p_k}^2) = |t_{-p_k}^2 - t_{-p_k}^1|_1$, then for all points t' with $t^1 \leq t' \leq t^2$ their critical inputs for task p_k are on a bundling boundary of R_P .

Proposition 50. *Let s be fixed, let $t_{p_i}^1 < t_{p_i}^2$ for every $p_i \in P$, and $t_j^1 = t_j^2$ for $j \in [m] \setminus P$. If $\psi_{p_k}(t_{-p_k}^1) - \psi_{p_k}(t_{-p_k}^2) = \sum_{i \in [k-1]} (t_{p_i}^2 - t_{p_i}^1)$, then*

- (i) for $(t_{-p_k}^1, \psi_{p_k}(t^1) - \epsilon)$ all tasks $p_i \in P$ are given to the root for $0 < \epsilon < \psi_{p_k}(t^1)$, and
- (ii) for $(t_{-p_k}^2, \psi_{p_k}(t^2) + \epsilon)$ all tasks $p_i \in P$ are given to the leaves for $\epsilon > 0$.

Proof. The proof is almost the same as of Proposition 32. We can ignore the coordinates $j \in [m] \setminus P$, since here the values of these tasks stay fixed.

Consider the instances $(t_{-p_k}^1, \psi_{p_k}(t_{-p_k}^1) - \epsilon)$ and $(t_{-p_k}^2, \psi_{p_k}(t_{-p_k}^2) + \epsilon)$. By definition of ψ_{p_k} , task p_k is allocated to the root in the first instance, but not in the second one. Let a^1 and a^2 denote the allocation for these two instances. By weak monotonicity, we have

$$\sum_{i \neq k} (a_{p_i}^1 - a_{p_i}^2)(t_{p_i}^1 - t_{p_i}^2) + (1 - 0)((\psi_{p_k}(t^1) - \epsilon) - (\psi_{p_k}(t^2) + \epsilon)) \leq 0$$

$$\psi_{p_k}(t^1) - \psi_{p_k}(t^2) \leq \sum_{i \neq k} (a_{p_i}^1 - a_{p_i}^2)(t_{p_i}^2 - t_{p_i}^1) + 2\epsilon.$$

Since $\psi_{p_k}(t_{-p_k}^1) - \psi_{p_k}(t_{-p_k}^2) = \sum_{i \in [k-1]} (t_{p_i}^2 - t_{p_i}^1)$, by letting ϵ tend to 0, we get $a_{p_i}^1 = 1$ and $a_{p_i}^2 = 0$ for all $i \in [k-1]$ as well. \square

Corollary 51. *Assume that $t_{p_i}^1 < t_{p_i}^2$ for every $p_i \in P$, and $t_j^1 = t_j^2$ for $j \in [m] \setminus P$, and $\psi_{p_k}(t_{-p_k}^1) - \psi_{p_k}(t_{-p_k}^2) = \sum_{i \in [k-1]} (t_{p_i}^2 - t_{p_i}^1)$. Let $t^1 \leq t' \leq t^2$ be so that $t_{p_i}^1 < t'_{p_i} < t_{p_i}^2$ ($i \in [k]$). Then*

- (i) for $(t'_{-p_k}, \psi_{p_k}(t') - \epsilon)$ all tasks $p_i \in P$ are given to the root, and
- (ii) for $(t'_{-p_k}, \psi_{p_k}(t') + \epsilon)$ all tasks $p_i \in P$ are given to the leaves.

Proof. Let $\psi^1 = \psi_{p_k}(t^1)$, $\psi^2 = \psi_{p_k}(t^2)$, and $\psi' = \psi_{p_k}(t')$. Clearly,

$$\psi^1 - \psi^2 = (\psi^1 - \psi') + (\psi' - \psi^2) \leq \sum_{i \neq k} (t'_{p_i} - t_{p_i}^1) + \sum_{i \neq k} (t_{p_i}^2 - t'_{p_i}) = \sum_{i \neq k} (t_{p_i}^2 - t_{p_i}^1) = \psi^1 - \psi^2.$$

The inequality follows from the Lipschitz property, and the last equality by the assumption. We conclude that equality must hold everywhere, in particular $\psi^1 - \psi' = \sum_{i \neq k} (t'_{p_i} - t_{p_i}^1)$ and $(\psi' - \psi^2) = \sum_{i \neq k} (t_{p_i}^2 - t'_{p_i})$. So, t' can play the role of t^1 in Proposition 50, implying (i). Symmetrically, t' can take the role of t^2 , that implies (ii). \square

5.4.2 The p_k - p'_k slice

We now consider a strictly chopped off box $P = \{p_1, \dots, p_k\}$ and choose a random sibling p'_k of p_k . We will consider all different possibilities for the (p_k, p'_k) -slice mechanism based on the 2×2 characterization. First, we consider the case that the mechanism is task-independent, establishing that then (P_{-k}, p'_k) must be a box (Lemma 52). Then we treat the non task-independent case, excluding almost surely affine minimizers (Lemma 53) and bounding from above the number of p'_k siblings for which the mechanism can be relaxed-affine minimizer (Lemma 54).

The case of task-independent (crossing) allocations. In this paragraph we treat the case when in at least two points $T_1 < T_2$ between T_ν and $T_{\nu'}$ the allocation of the (p_k, p'_k) -slice is crossing. We prove that in this case the set (P_{-k}, p'_k) is a box.

Lemma 52. *Suppose that $P = \{p_1, p_2, \dots, p_k\}$ is a strictly chopped off box for $T = (t, \bar{s})$. Fix a sibling p'_k of p_k . Assume that there exist two distinct instances T_1, T_2 , such that*

- $T_\nu \leq T_1 \leq T_2 \leq T_{\nu'}$ coordinate-wise, and $t_{p_i}^\nu < t_{p_i}^1 < t_{p_i}^2 < t_{p_i}^{\nu'}$ holds with strict inequality for every $p_i \in P$;
- for both T_1 and T_2 , in the (p_k, p'_k) slice mechanism the allocation of the root is crossing.

Assuming that the approximation ratio is less than n , then (P_{-k}, p'_k) is a box for T .

Proof. The proof is analogous to the proof of ([9] Lemma 27), and a generalization of Proposition 44. We use the notation $t^1 = t_P^1$ and $t^2 = t_P^2$ for the respective k -dimensional t -vectors over the task set P . All other t values, as well as \bar{s} are fixed for all considered inputs, except for $t_{p'_k}$, that we will change and treat explicitly. We also use the notation $\alpha' = \alpha_{p'_k}$.

In both T_1 and T_2 let us now increase the value of task p'_k from $t_{p'_k} = 0$ to $\bar{t}_{p'_k} = \alpha' - \epsilon$ for some small $\epsilon < 4^k \nu$, to obtain the new instances \bar{T}_1 and \bar{T}_2 , respectively. Since by assumption of the lemma, in both T_1 and T_2 the (p_k, p'_k) mechanism has crossing (task independent) allocation, this change of the t -values does not affect the respective critical values for task p_k , i.e., $\psi_{p_k}(\bar{T}_1) = \psi_{p_k}(T_1)$ and $\psi_{p_k}(\bar{T}_2) = \psi_{p_k}(T_2)$.

By Corollary 48 (iv) for T_1 and T_2 the points $(t_{-p_k}^1, \psi_{p_k}(t^1))$ and $(t_{-p_k}^2, \psi_{p_k}(t^2))$ are on a bundling boundary facet of R_P ; moreover by Proposition 49 $(\psi_{p_k}(T_1) - \psi_{p_k}(T_2)) = |t_{-p_k}^2 - t_{-p_k}^1|_1$ holds. Since for \bar{T}_1 and \bar{T}_2 the critical values do not change, $(\psi_{p_k}(\bar{T}_1) - \psi_{p_k}(\bar{T}_2)) = |t_{-p_k}^2 - t_{-p_k}^1|_1$ remains true for $\bar{t}_{p'_k} = \alpha' - \epsilon$.

We apply now Proposition 50 (i) for $\bar{T}_1 \leq \bar{T}_2$ (for the region $R_P^{\bar{T}_1}$). Define the instance \hat{T} by reducing t_{p_k} to zero in \bar{T}_1 , i.e., let $\hat{t} := (t_{-p_k}^1, t_{p_k} = 0)$ and $\hat{t}_{p'_k} = \alpha' - \epsilon$. By Proposition 50 (i), we obtain that for input \hat{T} all tasks in P are given to the root.

We show that also p'_k is given to the root for \hat{T} . Assume for contradiction that this is not the case. Then we increase $\hat{t}_{p'_k}$ to $t_{p'_k}^* = \alpha' - \epsilon/2$, and decrease all other values from \hat{t}_{p_i} to $t_{p_i}^* = 0$ and obtain t^* . Omitting the coordinate t_{p_k} (which is 0), by weak monotonicity we get

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\geq \sum_{i \in [k-1]} (\hat{a}_{p_i} - a_{p_i}^*)(\hat{t}_{p_i} - t_{p_i}^*) + (\hat{a}_{p'_k} - a_{p'_k}^*)(\hat{t}_{p'_k} - t_{p'_k}^*) \\ &= \sum_{i \in [k-1]} (1 - a_{p_i}^*)(\hat{t}_{p_i}) + (0 - 1)(-\epsilon/2). \end{aligned}$$

Here the t -values follow from the definition of t^* ; $\hat{a}_{p_i} = 1$ by the previous paragraph; $\hat{a}_{p'_k} = 0$ by the indirect assumption, and $a_{p'_k}^* = 1$ by the definition of $\alpha' = \alpha_{p'_k}$, since $\hat{t}_{p'_k} < \alpha'$ and the other t -values are 0 in t^* . Since $\hat{t}_{p_i} > 0$ this is a contradiction. All in all, this proves that for input \hat{T} all tasks in $P_{-k} \cup \{p'_k\}$ are allocated to the root.

Finally, observe that by definition $\hat{t}_{p_i} = t_{p_i}^1 > \alpha_{p_i} - 4^k \nu$, ($i \in [k-1]$), and $\hat{t}_{p'_k} = \alpha_{p'_k} - \epsilon > \alpha_{p'_k} - 4^k \nu$. This implies by weak monotonicity that also for $T_\nu(P_{-k} \cup \{p'_k\})$ the task set $P_{-k} \cup \{p'_k\}$ is given to the root, and therefore (P_{-k}, p'_k) is a box for T . \square

The case of non-crossing allocations. In the remaining part, we need to exclude the case that between T_ν and $T_{\nu'}$ there are ‘many’ points where the allocation of the slice mechanism (p_k, p'_k) is non-crossing. Allocations of 2×2 -mechanisms that are non-crossing for the root, occur (1) in the linear part (linear as function of s_{p_k}) of relaxed affine minimizers⁸, or (2) they must be half-bundling at p_k (including completely bundling)⁹.

The following paragraphs deal with both of these cases; for any given point T , case (1) – linear boundary functions – will be excluded to occur in k different points, positioned appropriately, hence linear functions are excluded almost surely; case (2) is excluded with high probability over the choice of p'_k .

Case 1: Linear boundary functions. Here we exclude the case that in k carefully selected points T_0, T_1, \dots, T_{k-1} the (p_k, p'_k) -slice mechanism is a (relaxed) affine minimizer, and so that in each of these points the critical value function $\psi_k(s_{p_k})$ is truncated linear. This implies that linear boundary functions are excluded almost surely. The next lemma is a variant of Lemma 21 in [9].

Lemma 53. *Assume that the approximation ratio is at most n . Suppose that $P = (p_1, \dots, p_k)$ is a strictly chopped off box for standard instance $T = (t, \bar{s})$. Fix a sibling p'_k of p_k . Finally let $h = (5/8) \cdot 4^k \nu$, and let $0 < \eta < \nu/4n$ be some small number. There exist no distinct instances $T_0 = (t^0, \bar{s}), T_1 = (t^1, \bar{s}), \dots, T_{k-1} = (t^{k-1}, \bar{s})$ such that*

- $T_\nu \leq T_j \leq T_{\nu'}$ for every $j = 0, \dots, k-1$;
- $t_{p_j}^0 + h < t_{p_j}^j < t_{p_j}^0 + h + \eta$ for all $j \in [k-1]$;
- $t_{p_i}^0 + \eta/2 < t_{p_i}^j < t_{p_i}^0 + \eta$ for all $j \in [k-1]$, and all $i \neq j$;
- the boundary function ψ_{p_k} is truncated linear in s_{p_k} , that is,

$$\psi_{p_k}(t_{-p_k}^j, \bar{s}) = \max(0, \lambda(t_{-p_k}^j, \bar{s}_{-p_k})s_{p_k} - \gamma(t_{-p_k}^j, \bar{s}_{-p_k})),$$

for each of the instances T_j , $j = 0, 1, \dots, k-1$.

Proof. Towards a contradiction, suppose that such instances T_0, T_1, \dots, T_{k-1} exist. For simplicity of notation, throughout the proof we write $\psi_k^j(s_{p_k})$ for the critical value function $\psi[T_j]_{p_k}(s_{p_k})$, defined for the fixed values $t_{-p_k}^j$ and \bar{s}_{-p_k} .

The high-level idea is the following. Let us ignore all other dimensions, except for those k coordinates of tasks P . Due to Corollary 48((ii),(iii)and (iv) respectively), we know that in the allocation of T_j , $j = 0, 1, \dots, k-1$, all tasks are given to the leaf, when we change the t_{p_k} -value to 0, all tasks $p_i \in P$ are given to the root, and the respective boundary points $(t_{-p_k}^j, \psi_k^j(\bar{s}_{p_k})) \in \mathbb{R}^k$ are on a bundling boundary facet of R_P . Now, as we reduce s_{p_k} , due to the linearity of each boundary function $\psi_k^j(s_{p_k})$, these k boundary points move by the same speed λ towards the coordinate-plane $t_{p_k} = 0$, so that all the time they remain on a bundling boundary. For some positive $s_{p_k}^*$ this bundling boundary facet will reach the plane $t_{p_k} = 0$,¹⁰ and there it will ‘form’ a bundling boundary of dimension $k-1$ for the task-set P_{-k} . But this will prove that for this $s_{p_k}^*$ the set P_k cannot be a box, contradicting the fact that P is chopped off box.

⁸Constant mechanisms are special affine minimizers; or we can exclude them immediately using Lemma 38

⁹The case of being at some singular point $(s_{p_k}, s_{p'_k})$ of a relaxed task independent mechanism is excluded since the inputs T that we consider satisfy the continuity requirement almost surely.

¹⁰Since we discretize (in order to have finitely many reduction steps for s_{p_k}), we have to ‘stop’ the considered boundary points slightly above the plane $t_{p_k} = 0$.

We start with some observations about the critical values $\psi_k^j(\bar{s}_{p_k})$, and the respective boundary points of R_P when $s_{p_k} = \bar{s}_{p_k}$. Note that for every $j \in [k-1]$ by definition $t_{p_i}^0 < t_{p_i}^j$ holds for all $p_i \in P$. Therefore, by Proposition 49

$$\psi_k^0(\bar{s}_{p_k}) - \psi_k^j(\bar{s}_{p_k}) = |t_{-p_k}^0 - t_{-p_k}^j|_1 = \sum_{i \in [k-1]} (t_{p_i}^j - t_{p_i}^0).$$

Moreover, for every $j \in [k-1]$ this difference roughly equals h , in particular

$$h < \sum_{i \in [k-1]} (t_{p_i}^j - t_{p_i}^0) < h + n \cdot \eta.$$

Therefore, all these critical values are almost the same, that is, for any pair of indices $j, j' \in [k-1]$ it holds

$$|\psi_k^j(\bar{s}_{p_k}) - \psi_k^{j'}(\bar{s}_{p_k})| < n \cdot \eta.$$

Next we show that these relative positions remain the same *for every* s_{p_k} . The following is a generalization of Claim (i) in the proof of Theorem 41.

Claim (i). *The boundary functions for t^j , $j = 0, 1, \dots, k-1$,*

$$\psi_k^j(s_{p_k}) = \lambda(t_{-p_k}^j)s_{p_k} - \gamma(t_{-p_k}^j)$$

have the same linear coefficient, i.e., $\lambda(t_{-p_k}^0) = \lambda(t_{-p_k}^1) = \dots = \lambda(t_{-p_k}^{k-1}) = \lambda$.

Proof. We prove that all linear coefficients are equal to $\lambda(t_{-p_k}^0)$. Suppose not, and assume that $\lambda(t_{-p_k}^0) > \lambda(t_{-p_k}^j)$ for some $j \in [k-1]$. For $s_{p_k} = \bar{s}_{p_k} + \epsilon$, for some $\epsilon > 0$, we get

$$\psi_k^0(\bar{s}_{p_k} + \epsilon) - \psi_k^j(\bar{s}_{p_k} + \epsilon) = \psi_k^0(\bar{s}_{p_k}) - \psi_k^j(\bar{s}_{p_k}) + (\lambda(t_{-p_k}^0) - \lambda(t_{-p_k}^j))\epsilon > |t_{-p_k}^0 - t_{-p_k}^j|_1,$$

which violates the Lipschitz property (Proposition 32). The case of $\lambda(t_{-p_k}^0) < \lambda(t_{-p_k}^j)$ is similar, only that we now consider $s_{p_k} = \bar{s}_{p_k} - \epsilon$. \square

As a corollary we obtain that the difference between (positive) critical values ψ_k^0 and ψ_k^j remains the same *for every* s_{p_k} .

Claim (ii). *Let $j \in [k-1]$. For every s_{p_k} , for which $\psi_k^j(s_{p_k}) > 0$, the following hold:*

(a) $\psi_k^0(s_{p_k}) - \psi_k^j(s_{p_k}) = |t_{-p_k}^0 - t_{-p_k}^j|_1;$

(b) $|\psi_k^j(s_{p_k}) - \psi_k^{j'}(s_{p_k})| \leq n \cdot \eta$ for every $j' \in [k-1];$

(c) *the point $(t_{-p_k}^j, \psi_k^j(s_{p_k})) \in \mathbb{R}^k$ is on a bundling boundary, in particular on a boundary of $R_P^{T'}$, where T' is obtained from T by replacing \bar{s}_{p_k} by s_{p_k} , for $j = 0, 1, \dots, k-1$;*

Proof. (a) and (b) follow from Claim (i); (c) follows from (a) and from Proposition 50 and Corollary 51. \square

Let $\psi_k^1(s_{p_k}) = \max(0, \lambda s_{p_k} - \gamma)$. Next we prove lower and upper bounds for γ and λ .

Claim (iii). *Let $\psi_k^1(s_{p_k}) = \max(0, \lambda s_{p_k} - \gamma)$ for some λ and γ that do not depend on t_{p_k} and s_{p_k} . Suppose further that the approximation ratio is less than n , then*

(a) $0 \leq \gamma < \lambda;$

(b) $\frac{1}{2n} < \lambda < 2n$.

Proof. (a) By Corollary 48 (iv) holds that $\psi_k^1(\bar{s}_{p_k}) > 0$. Now notice that $\lambda \cdot 1 - \gamma = \psi_k^1(1) \geq \psi_k^1(\bar{s}_{p_k}) > 0$. This implies $\gamma < \lambda$.

Next we show $\gamma \geq 0$. We claim that $\psi_k^1(s_{p_k} = 0) = 0$. Assume the contrary, that $\psi_k^1(s_{p_k} = 0) > 0$. Then, by Claim (ii) (c), the $(t_{-p_k}^1, \psi_k^1(0))$ is a point with positive coordinates on a bundling boundary of $R_P^{T'}$ where T' is obtained from T by setting $s_{p_k} = 0$. On the other hand, then by Observation 31 $s_{p_k} > 0$ must hold, contradiction. So we have $\psi_k^1(s_{p_k} = 0) = 0$. Consequently, $\lambda \cdot 0 - \gamma \leq 0$, so $0 \leq \gamma$.

(b) We prove $\lambda < 2n$ first. Assume that $\lambda \geq 2n$. We set $s_{p_k} = n + 1$, $t_{-p_k} = t_{-p_k}^1$ and $t_{p_k} = \psi_k^1(s_{p_k}) - \epsilon = \lambda s_{p_k} - \gamma - \epsilon$. Then task p_k is allocated to the root, and the makespan is $\text{MECH} \geq \lambda s_{p_k} - \gamma - \epsilon \geq \lambda s_{p_k} - \lambda - \epsilon \geq \lambda(s_{p_k} - 1) - \epsilon \geq 2n \cdot n - \epsilon$.

The contribution of the tasks $[m] \setminus P$ to the optimal makespan is 0, since the other leaves are trivial. We have $\text{OPT} \leq s_{p_k} + \sum_{i \neq k} \bar{s}_{p_i} \leq n + 1 + n - 1 = 2n$. We obtain $\text{MECH}/\text{OPT} \rightarrow n$ when $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$, which concludes the proof of the upper bound.

In order to show the lower bound for λ , we assume for contradiction $\lambda \leq 1/2n$, and set $s_{p_k} = 2n^2$, and $t_{p_k} = \lambda s_{p_k} - \gamma + \epsilon$, so that the leaf gets task p_k .

Then $\text{MECH} \geq 2n^2$, and because the contribution of the other tasks is at most $n - 1$, using $\gamma \geq 0$, we obtain $\text{OPT} \leq t_{p_k} + n - 1 \leq (1/2n) \cdot 2n^2 - \gamma + \epsilon + n - 1 \leq 2n$. The approximation factor is at least n , a contradiction. \square

Claim (iv). *There exists $q^* \in \{0, 1, \dots, 4n/\nu\}$ such that $\bar{s}_{p_k} \geq q^* \nu / (4n)$, and $\psi_k^j(\bar{s}_{p_k} - q^* \nu / (4n))$ is in the interval $(0, \nu)$, for every $j \in [k - 1]$.*

Proof. By Corollary 48 (iv) it holds for every $j \in [k]$ that $\psi_k^j(\bar{s}_{p_k}) > 0$. If also $\psi_k^j(\bar{s}_{p_k}) < \nu$ holds for every $j \in [k - 1]$, then the claim holds trivially with $q^* = 0$.

Otherwise let $\bar{q} \leq 4n/\nu$ be the largest integer such that $\bar{s}_{p_k} \geq \bar{q} \nu / (4n)$ (recall that $\bar{s}_{p_k} \leq 1$). Consider the sequence of values $\psi_k^1(\bar{s}_{p_k} - q \frac{\nu}{4n})$, for $q = 0, 1, \dots, \bar{q}$. By Claim (iii), $\lambda < 2n$, so successive values in this sequence differ by at most $\lambda(\nu/4n) \leq 2n\nu/4n = \nu/2$. Moreover, because $\gamma \geq 0$, we have $\psi_k^1(0) = 0$. Therefore for some $0 \leq q^* \leq \bar{q}$, the $\psi_k^1(\bar{s}_{p_k} - q^* \cdot \frac{\nu}{4n})$ falls between $\nu/4$ and $3\nu/4$. Finally, by Claim (ii) (b) it follows that $\psi_k^j(\bar{s}_{p_k} - q^* \cdot \frac{\nu}{4n}) \in (0, \nu)$ for every $j \in [k - 1]$, given that $n\eta < \nu/4$. \square

Let $s_{p_k}^* := \bar{s}_{p_k} - q^* \nu / (4n)$ be the value from the previous claim for which $\psi_k^j(s_{p_k}^*) \in (0, \nu)$, for every $j \in [n - 1]$. For the rest of the proof we fix $(s_{p_k}^*, \bar{s}_{-p_k})$. We know from Claim (ii) (c) that for every $j \in [k - 1]$, in an arbitrarily small neighborhood of the point $(t_{-p_k}^j, \psi_k^j(s_{p_k}^*)) \in \mathbb{R}^k$ there are points t_P so that all tasks $p_i \in P$ are allocated to the root, and also there are points so that none of the tasks $p_i \in P$ is allocated to the root.

Recall that $t_{p_i} = 0$ for every $p_i \in P$ in the instance $T = (t, \bar{s})$. Let $T^* = (t, (s_{p_k}^*, \bar{s}_{-p_k}))$ denote the instance that we obtain from T by replacing \bar{s}_{p_k} by $s_{p_k}^*$. Notice that T^* is standard instance for the star $P_{-k} = P \setminus p_k$. We need to be careful, because all we know about the allocation of instance T^* are the k shifted points $(t_{-p_k}^j, \psi_k^j(s_{p_k}^*))$ of a bundling boundary (in particular, the α_{p_j} values may have changed).

Here is how we finish the proof. For every $j \in [k - 1]$ we will define two nearby instances to $(t_{-p_k}^j, \psi_k^j(s_{p_k}^*))$, called \underline{T}_j and \overline{T}_j so that for each of them the t_{p_k} entry is zero, the s_{p_k} entry equals $s_{p_k}^*$, and for \underline{T}_j all tasks $p_i \in P_{-k}$ are given to the root, and for \overline{T}_j all tasks $p_i \in P_{-k}$ are given to the leaves. This will prove in the end, that for $t_{p_k} = 0$ and $s_{p_k} = s_{p_k}^*$ the task set P_{-k} is not a box, and thus contradict the assumption that P is a chopped off box (the second bullet of Definition 46).

We will use the notation $\alpha_{p_j}^*$ for the (new) α values of the tasks in the instance T^* (see Definition 28). In the next claim we define and use the \underline{T}_j instances to lower bound the $\alpha_{p_j}^*$ values for tasks in P_{-k} and for the instance T^* .

Claim (v). $\alpha_{p_j}^* > t_{p_j}^0 + h$ for every $j \in [k-1]$.

Proof. Fix an arbitrary $j \in [k-1]$. For simplicity, we ignore the coordinates $[m] \setminus P$. Define $\underline{T}_j = (\underline{t}^j, (s_{p_k}^*, \bar{s}_{-p_k}))$, so that $\underline{t}_{p_k}^j = 0$, and $\underline{t}_{p_i}^j = t_{p_i}^j - \epsilon$, for some small ϵ for every $p_i \in P_{-p_k}$. Since $\underline{t}_{p_i}^j < t_{p_i}^j$ for each $p_i \in P_{-k}$, and $\underline{t}_{p_k}^j = 0 < \psi_k^j(s_{p_k}^*)$, every $p_i \in P$ must be allocated to the root for \underline{T}_j , (by Claim (ii) (c), and weak monotonicity). This implies $\underline{t}_{-p_k}^j \in R_{P_{-k}}^{T^*}$, and thus $\alpha_{p_j}^* \geq \underline{t}_{p_j}^j$. Given that for ϵ small enough $\underline{t}_{p_j}^j = t_{p_j}^j - \epsilon > t_{p_j}^0 + h$, we obtain $\alpha_{p_j}^* \geq \underline{t}_{p_j}^j = t_{p_j}^j - \epsilon > t_{p_j}^0 + h$. \square

In the last claim we define the \overline{T}_j instances and use them to prove that for $T_\nu^*(P_{-k})$ the jobs of P_{-k} are all allocated to the leaves (see Definition 23 for T_ν^*). This contradicts the assumption that for $s_{p_k}^*$ the set P_{-k} is a box, and thus also that P is a chopped off box, which will conclude the proof.

Claim (vi). For the instance $T_\nu^*(P_{-k})$ none of the tasks in P_{-k} is allocated to the root.

Proof. We ignore the coordinates $[m] \setminus P$, and $(s_{p_k}^*, \bar{s}_{-p_k})$ is fixed. Take first an arbitrary $j \in [k-1]$. Let $t' = (t'_{-p_k}, \psi_k^j(s_{p_k}^*))_P$, denote the point on the bundling boundary (by Claim (ii) (c)) and a' the respective allocation for t' . Assume w.l.o.g. that a' assigns all tasks in P to the leaves (otherwise we slightly increase all t -values in P by an infinitesimally small amount).

We define $\overline{T}_j = (\bar{t}^j, (s_{p_k}^*, \bar{s}_{-p_k}))$ as follows: let $\bar{t}_{p_k}^j = 0 > \psi_k^j(s_{p_k}^*) - \nu$, and $\bar{t}_{p_i}^j = t_{p_i}^j + \nu$, for each $p_i \in P_{-p_k}$. We show first that for \bar{t}^j every $p_i \in P_{-k}$ is allocated to the leaves, i.e., $\bar{t}^j \in R_{\emptyset|P_{-k}}^{T^*}$. Let $\bar{t} = \bar{t}_P^j$ and \bar{a} be the allocation for \overline{T}_j . Then by weak monotonicity for the root

$$0 \geq \sum_{i \in [k]} (\bar{a}_i - a'_i)(\bar{t}_i - t'_i) = \sum_{i \in [k]} (\bar{a}_i - 0)(\bar{t}_i - t'_i) = \sum_{i \in [k-1]} \bar{a}_i \cdot \nu + \bar{a}_k(0 - t'_k).$$

The first equality holds because $a'_i = 0$ by assumption that all tasks go to the leaves in t' ; the second equality holds by the definition of $\bar{t}_i = \bar{t}_{p_i}^j$, and $t'_i = t_{p_i}^j$.

Since $t'_k = \psi_k^j(s_{p_k}^*) < \nu$ it must hold

$$\sum_{i \in [k-1]} \bar{a}_i \cdot \nu < \bar{a}_k \cdot \nu.$$

But since $\bar{a}_i \in \{0, 1\}$, the above implies $\bar{a}_i = 0$ for every $i \in [k-1]$, concluding that $\bar{t}^j \in R_{\emptyset|P_{-k}}^{T^*}$.

Now let t^c be the mean of the points $\{\bar{t}^1, \bar{t}^2, \dots, \bar{t}^{(k-1)}\}$. That is,

$$t_{p_i}^c = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^{k-1} \bar{t}_{p_i}^j}{k-1} \quad \forall p_i \in P.$$

Then $t_{p_k}^c = 0$, and for all $p_i \in P_{-k}$

$$t_{p_i}^c < t_{p_i}^0 + h/(k-1) + \eta + \nu < t_{p_i}^0 + h/2 + 2\nu. \quad (6)$$




Figure 14: The figure is a high-level illustration of the main argument of the proof of Lemma 53 for $k = 3$. The left figure corresponds to a strictly chopped off box, for \bar{s} while the right figure illustrates the shift of the boundaries when s_3 is decreased to s_3^* , which leads to a contradiction, as the last figure is not a box for tasks 1, 2.

Moreover, since $\bar{t}^j \in R_{\emptyset|P_{-k}}^{T^*}$ for every j , the same holds for their convex combination t^c . We use the notation $T_\nu^*(P_{-k}) = (t^{*\nu}, (s_{p_k}^*, \bar{s}_{-p_k}))$; by Definition 23 $t_{p_i}^{*\nu} = \alpha_{p_i}^* - 4^{k-1}\nu$ for $p_i \in P_{-k}$.

We conclude the proof by showing that $t_{p_i}^c < t_{p_i}^{*\nu}$ for every $p_i \in P_{-k}$. This will prove (by weak monotonicity) that also $t^{*\nu} \in R_{\emptyset|P_{-k}}^{T^*}$, and therefore P_{-k} is not a box for T^* , a contradiction. We have

$$t_{p_i}^{*\nu} = \alpha_{p_i}^* - 4^{k-1}\nu > t_{p_i}^0 + h - 4^{k-1}\nu > t_{p_i}^0 + h/2 + 2\nu > t_{p_i}^c.$$

The first inequality holds by Claim (v); the second inequality holds if $h = (5/8)4^k\nu$ and $k \geq 3$; the last inequality holds by inequality 6. This concludes the proof. \square

\square

Case 2: Half-bundling boundary functions. We consider the case that for some $T_\nu(P) \leq \hat{T} \leq T_{\nu'}(P)$, the slice mechanism (p_k, p'_k) is non-crossing, and so that it has a boundary half-bundling at p_k (or even fully bundling at both p_k and p'_k). Recall that this includes one-dimensional bundling mechanisms as well as relaxed affine minimizers that might become nonlinear for small s_{p_k} . Using a more technically involved argument, it is possible to show that even in this case, the boundary function $\psi_k(s_{p_k})$ must be linear, or else the (whole) mechanism has high approximation factor.¹¹ However, for the sake of simpler presentation, instead we argue the same way as in [9]: For arbitrary fixed $T_\nu(P) \leq \hat{T} \leq T_{\nu'}(P)$, we exclude that the slice mechanism (p_k, p'_k) is half-bundling at p_k , for many different siblings $p'_k \in Q_k$. The next lemma is a variant of ([9] Lemma 23).

Lemma 54. *Suppose that $P = \{p_1, p_2, \dots, p_k\}$ is a strictly chopped off box for standard instance $T = (t, \bar{s})$, and corresponding leaf set $\mathcal{C} = \{Q_1, Q_2, \dots, Q_k\}$, and the approximation ratio is less than n . Let $T_\nu(P) \leq \hat{T} \leq T_{\nu'}(P)$, be an arbitrary input. Then fewer than n^2/ξ siblings $p'_k \in Q_k$ of p_k have a 2×2 slice mechanism (p_k, p'_k) in \hat{T} that is half-bundling at p_k .*

¹¹Exploiting the fact that $R_{\{p_k, p'_k\}}$ must be crossing, and T is in general position, one can argue similarly as in Lemma 43.




Figure 15: Proof of Lemma 54: The slice (p_k, p'_k) in \hat{T} is half-bundling at p_k . For input (t^+, \bar{s}) neither p_k nor p'_k is allocated to the root.

Proof. Let $\hat{T} = ((\hat{t}_P, t_{-P}), \bar{s})$, (since by definition $t_{-P} = \hat{t}_{-P}$). We fix and omit \bar{s} from the notation in the rest of the proof. Let $\psi_{p_k} = \psi_{p_k}[\hat{T}]$ be the critical value of t_{p_k} in \hat{T} .

Let p'_k be an arbitrary sibling of p_k , such that the slice (p_k, p'_k) in \hat{T} is half-bundling at p_k (see Figure 15). Then, for the input point slightly above the boundary $t^+ = (\hat{t}_{P-k}, t_{p_k} = \psi_{p_k} + \epsilon, t_{-P})$ neither of the tasks p_k or p'_k is allocated to the root. This follows from the definition of ψ_{p_k} , the fact that $t_{p'_k} = 0$ (because T is standard instance for P), and that the boundary for p_k in the slice (p_k, p'_k) is locally bundling at $t_{p'_k} = 0$ by the definition of half-bundling allocations (Definition 34).

Assuming by contradiction that p_k has at least n^2/ξ different siblings p'_k with which it is half-bundling, for input t^+ we obtain that all these p'_k tasks are allocated to the same leaf player, incurring a cost of at least ξ for each of them (because Q_k is standard leaf, hence $\bar{s}_{p'_k} > \xi$). Therefore the makespan achieved by the mechanism is at least $(n^2/\xi) \cdot \xi \geq n^2$. On the other hand, since tasks in $[m] \setminus P$ are trivial, we have that the makespan of the optimal allocation is at most $\max_{p_i \in P} \bar{s}_{p_i} \leq 1$. This would imply approximation ratio higher than n , contradiction. \square

5.4.3 The main inductive lemma.

The results of Section 5.4.2 culminate in the following lemma.

Lemma 55. *Suppose that $P = (p_1, \dots, p_k)$ is a strictly chopped off box for T . Then either P is a box for T or the number of different siblings p'_k of p_k for which (P_{-k}, p'_k) is a box for T , is at least $\ell - 2n^3/\xi$.*

Proof. Suppose that P is not a box, and take a random sibling p'_k of p_k . For $j = 0, 1, \dots, k-1$, we fix instances T_j, T_j^* such that

- (i) $T_\nu \leq T_j \leq T_j^* \leq T_{\nu'}$ and all t -coordinates of T_j, T_j^* are rational;
- (ii) $t_{p_i}^{j*} = t_{p_i}^j + \epsilon$ for some small ϵ for every $i \in [k]$;
- (iii) the relative position of T_0, T_1, \dots, T_{k-1} is as defined in the statement of Lemma 53, moreover this property holds even if we replace any subset of the T_j by the respective T_j^* instances.

Observe first that such instances exist: in Lemma 53 $h = (5/8) \cdot 4^k \nu$, and η is arbitrarily small; on the other hand, $t_{p_i}^{\nu'} - t_{p_i}^\nu = (4^k - 4^{k-1})\nu = (3/4)4^k \nu > (5/8)4^k \nu$. So there is enough space for instances in the prescribed relative position.

By Lemma 54 and using the union bound, the number of siblings $p'_k \in Q_k \setminus \{p_k\}$ for which the (p_k, p'_k) slice mechanism is half-bundling in at least one of these $2k$ instances, is less than $2kn^2/\xi \leq 2n^3/\xi - 1$. Therefore, most of the siblings p'_k (at least $\ell - 1 - (2n^3/\xi - 1) = \ell - 2n^3/\xi$ of them) do not have a half-bundling boundary with p_k in any of the $2k$ fixed instances. We focus now on such a sibling p'_k . By Lemma 53, there must exist at least one $j \in \{0, 1, 2, \dots, k-1\}$ such that in both T_j and T_j^* the $\psi[T_j]_{p_k}(s_{p_k})$ and $\psi[T_j^*]_{p_k}(s_{p_k})$ functions are not truncated linear. Altogether, this excludes (non-task independent) relaxed affine minimizer mechanisms, constant, and one-dimensional bundling mechanisms as well as discontinuities in these two points. The remaining possibility is that the allocation of the slice (p_k, p'_k) is crossing for both T_j and T_j^* . Then, by Lemma 52 the star (P_{-k}, p'_k) is a box for T . \square

5.5 Existence of a box of size $n - 1$.

We are now ready to show the main result of this section (Corollary 59) that proves existence of a box of size $n - 1$. The proof is by induction on the size of the box, and the next definition is handy to define ‘bad’ events on k leaves.

Definition 56 (Probability b_k). *Fix a mechanism, and let $1 \leq k \leq n - 1$. Suppose that T is a standard instance for a set \mathcal{C} of k leaves. We denote by $b(T, \mathcal{C})$ the probability that a random star P of k tasks from \mathcal{C} is not a box. Let b_k denote the supremum of all possible $b(T, \mathcal{C})$ for all choices of T and \mathcal{C} with $|\mathcal{C}| = k$ for the given mechanism.*

Next we upper bound the probability that a random star P of k tasks is not a chopped off box, in terms of b_{k-1} .

Lemma 57. *Fix any instance T which is standard for a set \mathcal{C} of $k \geq 3$ leaves, and let P be a random star of k tasks from \mathcal{C} . The probability that P is not a chopped off box for T is at most $(5n/\nu - 1)b_{k-1}$.*

Proof. Take a random star $P = \{p_1, p_2, \dots, p_k\}$ of k tasks from \mathcal{C} . For each $i \in [k]$ the probability that P_{-i} is not a box for T is at most b_{k-1} . Also the probability that P_{-k} is not a box when we set task p_k to $(t_{p_k} = 0, s_{p_k} = \bar{s}_{p_k} - q\nu/(4n))$, is at most b_{k-1} for (at most) each of $q = 1, \dots, 4n/\nu$. By the union bound, the probability that some of these bad events happens is at most $(k + 4n/\nu)b_{k-1} < (n + 4n/\nu)b_{k-1} < (5n/\nu - 1)b_{k-1}$. \square

Finally, the next lemma combines the obtained probabilities.

Lemma 58. *Fix a mechanism with approximation ratio less than n , then for $3 \leq k \leq n - 1$*

$$b_k \leq \left(\frac{5n}{\nu} - 1\right) b_{k-1} + \frac{2n^3}{\xi\sqrt{\ell}}.$$

Proof. Let T be a standard instance for some set of leaves $\mathcal{C} = \{Q_1, \dots, Q_k\}$, and let $\mathcal{C}_{-k} = \{Q_1, \dots, Q_{k-1}\}$. Consider a star $P^* = \{p_1, \dots, p_{k-1}\}$ from \mathcal{C}_{-k} . Let's call the sets $P^* \cup \{p_k\}$, $p_k \in Q_k$, extensions of P^* .

Let $0 \leq y \leq \ell$ be the number of the extensions of P^* that are chopped off boxes. How many of these extensions are boxes? Either all y extensions are boxes, in which case the number of box extensions is at least y or some extension is not a box and $\ell - 2n^3/\xi$ other extensions are boxes (Lemma 55). Therefore the number of extensions that are boxes is at least $\min\{y, \ell - 2n^3/\xi\} \geq y(\ell - 2n^3/\xi)/\ell = y(1 - 2n^3/\ell\xi)$. Since this holds for every star P^* , the probability that a random

star of size k is a box is at least $1 - 2n^3/\xi\ell$ times the probability that a random star of size k is a chopped off box.

For a rigorous proof, let \mathcal{R} be the set of different stars of $k - 1$ tasks from \mathcal{C}_{-k} . We select a random star P of k tasks from \mathcal{C} , and define the events: Y : " P is a chopped off box"; X : " P is a box"; E_{P^*} : " $P_{-k} = P^*$ ". Note that in general $X \not\subset Y$. By the above argument $\mathbb{P}(X|E_{P^*}) \geq (1 - 2n^3/\xi\ell) \cdot \mathbb{P}(Y|E_{P^*})$. Therefore we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(X) &= \sum_{P^* \in \mathcal{R}} \mathbb{P}(X|E_{P^*})\mathbb{P}(E_{P^*}) \\ &\geq (1 - 2n^3/\xi\ell) \sum_{P^* \in \mathcal{R}} \mathbb{P}(Y|E_{P^*})\mathbb{P}(E_{P^*}) \\ &= (1 - 2n^3/\xi\ell) \cdot \mathbb{P}(Y). \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 57, the probability that a random star of size k is a chopped off box is at least $1 - (5n/\nu - 1)b_{k-1}$; so we get

$$\mathbb{P}(X) \geq \left(1 - \frac{2n^3}{\xi\ell}\right) \left[1 - \left(\frac{5n}{\nu} - 1\right)b_{k-1}\right] > 1 - \frac{2n^3}{\xi\ell} - \left(\frac{5n}{\nu} - 1\right)b_{k-1}.$$

This further yields

$$b_k = 1 - \mathbb{P}(X) < \left(\frac{5n}{\nu} - 1\right)b_{k-1} + \frac{2n^3}{\xi\ell} < \left(\frac{5n}{\nu} - 1\right)b_{k-1} + \frac{2n^3}{\xi\sqrt{\ell}}.$$

□

Corollary 59. *Fix a mechanism with approximation ratio less than n , then for $2 \leq k \leq n - 1$*

$$b_k \leq \left(\frac{5n}{\nu}\right)^{k-2} \cdot \frac{2n^3}{\xi\sqrt{\ell}}.$$

Proof. For $k = 2$, using Theorem 45 $b_2 \leq 3/\sqrt{\ell} < 2n^3/(\xi\sqrt{\ell})$, so the base case holds. Now for $k \geq 3$ by induction we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} b_k &\leq \left(\frac{5n}{\nu} - 1\right)b_{k-1} + \frac{2n^3}{\xi\sqrt{\ell}} \\ &\leq \left(\frac{5n}{\nu} - 1\right) \left(\frac{5n}{\nu}\right)^{k-3} \cdot \frac{2n^3}{\xi\sqrt{\ell}} + \frac{2n^3}{\xi\sqrt{\ell}} \\ &= \left(\left(\frac{5n}{\nu}\right)^{k-2} - \left(\frac{5n}{\nu}\right)^{k-3} + 1\right) \cdot \frac{2n^3}{\xi\sqrt{\ell}} \\ &\leq \left(\frac{5n}{\nu}\right)^{k-2} \cdot \frac{2n^3}{\xi\sqrt{\ell}}. \end{aligned}$$

□

Setting $k = n - 1$, and using $\nu < \xi$, we obtain the following rough lower bound for ℓ .

Corollary 60. *If $\ell > \left(\frac{5n}{\nu}\right)^{2n}$, we get $b_{n-1} < 1$, and there exists at least one box of size $n - 1$ for every instance $T = (t, \bar{s})$ standard for $\{C_i\}_{i \in [n-1]}$.*

References

- [1] Aaron Archer and Éva Tardos. Truthful mechanisms for one-parameter agents. In *Proc. of the 42nd IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*, pages 482–491, 2001. 1
- [2] Itai Ashlagi, Shahar Dobzinski, and Ron Lavi. Optimal lower bounds for anonymous scheduling mechanisms. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 37(2):244–258, 2012. 2, 4
- [3] Vincenzo Auletta, George Christodoulou, and Paolo Penna. Mechanisms for scheduling with single-bit private values. *Theory Comput. Syst.*, 57(3):523–548, 2015. 2
- [4] Sushil Bikhchandani, Shurojit Chatterji, Ron Lavi, Ahuva Mu’alem, Noam Nisan, and Arunava Sen. Weak monotonicity characterizes deterministic dominant strategy implementation. *Econometrica*, 74(4):1109–1132, 2006. 4
- [5] Shuchi Chawla, Jason D. Hartline, David L. Malec, and Balasubramanian Sivan. Prior-independent mechanisms for scheduling. In *STOC*, pages 51–60. ACM, 2013. 2
- [6] Xujin Chen, Donglei Du, and Luis Fernando Zuluaga. Copula-based randomized mechanisms for truthful scheduling on two unrelated machines. *Theory Comput. Syst.*, 57(3):753–781, 2015. 2
- [7] George Christodoulou, Elias Koutsoupias, and Annamária Kovács. Mechanism design for fractional scheduling on unrelated machines. *ACM Transactions on Algorithms*, 6(2), 2010. 2
- [8] George Christodoulou, Elias Koutsoupias, and Annamária Kovács. On the Nisan-Ronen conjecture for submodular valuations. In *STOC*, pages 1086–1096. ACM, 2020. (Full version arXiv:1907.12733). 4, 18, 19, 25
- [9] George Christodoulou, Elias Koutsoupias, and Annamária Kovács. On the Nisan-Ronen conjecture. In *FOCS*, pages 839–850. IEEE, 2021. 2, 17, 19, 20, 31, 33, 34, 38
- [10] George Christodoulou, Elias Koutsoupias, and Annamária Kovács. Truthful allocation in graphs and hypergraphs. In *ICALP*, volume 198 of *LIPICs*, pages 56:1–56:20. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2021. 2, 4
- [11] George Christodoulou, Elias Koutsoupias, and Angelina Vidali. A characterization of 2-player mechanisms for scheduling. In *ESA*, volume 5193 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 297–307. Springer, 2008. 19
- [12] George Christodoulou, Elias Koutsoupias, and Angelina Vidali. A lower bound for scheduling mechanisms. *Algorithmica*, 55(4):729–740, 2009. 2, 4
- [13] George Christodoulou and Annamária Kovács. A deterministic truthful ptas for scheduling related machines. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 42(4):1572–1595, 2013. 1
- [14] Edward H. Clarke. Multipart pricing of public goods. *Public Choice*, 8, 1971. 1
- [15] F. Cunningham and Nathaniel Grossman. On Young’s Inequality. *The American Mathematical Monthly*, 78(7):781–783, August 1971. Publisher: Taylor & Francis. 9
- [16] Constantinos Daskalakis and S. Matthew Weinberg. Bayesian truthful mechanisms for job scheduling from bi-criterion approximation algorithms. In *SODA*, pages 1934–1952. SIAM, 2015. 2

- [17] Shahar Dobzinski and Ariel Shaulker. Improved Lower Bounds for Truthful Scheduling, 2020. 2, 4
- [18] Shahar Dobzinski and Mukund Sundararajan. On characterizations of truthful mechanisms for combinatorial auctions and scheduling. In *EC*, pages 38–47. ACM, 2008. 9, 19
- [19] Yiannis Giannakopoulos, Alexander Hammerl, and Diogo Poças. A new lower bound for deterministic truthful scheduling. In *SAGT*, volume 12283 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 226–240. Springer, 2020. 2, 4
- [20] Yiannis Giannakopoulos and Maria Kyropoulou. The VCG mechanism for Bayesian scheduling. *ACM Trans. Economics and Comput.*, 5(4):19:1–19:16, 2017. 2
- [21] Ronald L. Graham, Bruce L. Rothschild, and Joel H. Spencer. *Ramsey Theory, 2nd Edition*. Wiley Series in Discrete Mathematics and Optimization, 1990. 29
- [22] Theodore Groves. Incentives in teams. *Econometrica*, 41(4):617–631, 1973. 1
- [23] Elias Koutsoupias and Angelina Vidali. A lower bound of $1+\phi$ for truthful scheduling mechanisms. *Algorithmica*, pages 1–13, 2012. 2
- [24] Ron Lavi and Chaitanya Swamy. Truthful mechanism design for multidimensional scheduling via cycle monotonicity. *Games and Economic Behavior*, 67(1):99–124, 2009. 2
- [25] Pinyan Lu and Changyuan Yu. An improved randomized truthful mechanism for scheduling unrelated machines. In *STACS*, volume 1, pages 527–538, 2008. 2
- [26] Pinyan Lu and Changyuan Yu. Randomized truthful mechanisms for scheduling unrelated machines. In *WINE*, volume 5385 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 402–413. Springer, 2008. 2
- [27] Ahuva Mu’alem and Michael Schapira. Setting lower bounds on truthfulness. *Games and Economic Behavior*, 110:174–193, 2018. 2, 4
- [28] Noam Nisan and Amir Ronen. Algorithmic mechanism design. *Games and Economic Behavior*, 35:166–196, 2001. 1, 2, 4
- [29] Michael E. Saks and Lan Yu. Weak monotonicity suffices for truthfulness on convex domains. In *EC*, pages 286–293. ACM, 2005. 4
- [30] William Vickrey. Counterspeculations, auctions and competitive sealed tenders. *Journal of Finance*, 16:8–37, 1961. 1
- [31] Angelina Vidali. The geometry of truthfulness. In *WINE*, volume 5929 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 340–350. Springer, 2009. 17
- [32] Changyuan Yu. Truthful mechanisms for two-range-values variant of unrelated scheduling. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 410(21-23):2196–2206, 2009. 2