

# Almost Envy-freeness, Envy-rank, and Nash Social Welfare Matchings

Alireza Farhadi<sup>1</sup>, MohammadTaghi Hajiaghayi<sup>1</sup>, Mohamad Latifian<sup>2</sup>, Masoud Seddighin<sup>3</sup>,  
and Hadi Yami<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>University of Maryland, College Park

<sup>2</sup>Sharif University of Technology

<sup>3</sup>Institute for Research in Fundamental Sciences (IPM)

July 15, 2020

## Abstract

Envy-free up to one good (EF1) and envy-free up to any good (EFX) are two well-known extensions of envy-freeness for the case of indivisible items. It is shown that EF1 can always be guaranteed for agents with subadditive valuations [26]. In sharp contrast, it is unknown whether or not an EFX allocation always exists, even for four agents and additive valuations. In addition, the best approximation guarantee for EFX is  $(\phi - 1) \simeq 0.61$  by Amanitidis et al. [2].

In order to find a middle ground to bridge this gap, in this paper we suggest another fairness criterion, namely *envy-freeness up to a random good* or EFR, which is weaker than EFX, yet stronger than EF1. For this notion, we provide a polynomial-time 0.73-approximation allocation algorithm. For our algorithm we introduce Nash Social Welfare Matching which makes a connection between Nash Social Welfare and envy freeness. We believe Nash Social Welfare Matching will find its applications in future work.

## 1 Introduction

Fair division is a fundamental and interdisciplinary problem that has been extensively studied in economics, mathematics, political science, and computer science [21, 30, 24, 20, 4, 25, 28, 26, 27, 5, 18, 2, 14]. Generally, the goal is to find an allocation of a resource to  $n$  agents, which is agreeable to all the agents according to their preferences. The first formal treatment of this problem was in 1948 by Steinhaus [31]. Following his work, a vast literature has been developed and several notions for measuring fairness have been suggested [31, 22, 12, 26, 14]. One of the most prominent and well-established fairness notions, introduced by Foley [22], is envy-freeness, which requires that each agent prefers his share over that of any other agent.

Traditionally, envy-freeness has been studied for both divisible and indivisible resources. When the resource is a single heterogeneous divisible item (i.e, can be fractionally allocated), envy-freeness admits strong theoretical guarantees. For example, it is shown that allocations exist that allocate the entire resource, and are both envy-free and Pareto efficient<sup>1</sup> and allocate each agent a contiguous piece of the resource [32]. Apart from mere existence, there are algorithms that find an envy-free allocation for arbitrary number of agents [3, 10, 19]. However, beyond divisibility, when dealing with a set of indivisible goods, envy-freeness is too strong to be attained; for example, for two agents and a single indivisible good, the agent that receives no good envies another party. Therefore, several relaxations of envy-freeness are introduced for the case of indivisible items [26, 12, 14]. One of these relaxations, suggested by Budish [12], is *envy-freeness up to one good* (EF1)<sup>2</sup>. An allocation of indivisible goods is EF1 if any possible envy of an agent for the share of

<sup>1</sup> An allocation is Pareto efficient if it is not possible to reallocate the resources such that at least one agent is better off without making any other person worse off.

<sup>2</sup> It is worth to mention that before the work of Budish [12] EF1 was implicitly addressed by Lipton et. al [26].

another agent can be resolved by removing some good from the envied share. In contrast to envy-freeness, EF1 allocation always exists. Indeed, a simple round-robin algorithm always guarantees EF1 for additive valuations, and a standard envy-graph based allocation guarantees EF1 for more general (sub-additive) valuations. Besides, it is shown that any Nash welfare maximizing allocation (allocation that maximizes the product of the agents' utilities) is both Pareto efficient and EF1.

Recently, Caragiannis *et al.* [14] suggested another intriguing relaxation of envy-freeness, namely *envy-free up to any good* (EFX), which attracted a lot of attention. An allocation is said to be EFX, if no agent envies another agent after the removal of any item from the other agent's bundle. Theoretically, this notion is strictly stronger than EF1 and is strictly weaker than EF. In contrast to EF1, questions related to EFX notion is relatively unexplored. As an example, despite significant effort [14], the existence of such allocations is still unknown. The most impressive breakthrough in this area is the recent work of Chaudhury, Garg, and Mehlhorn [16], which shows that for the case of 3 agents with additive valuations EFX allocation always exists. Furthermore, unlike EF1, Nash social welfare maximizing allocations are not necessarily EFX [14].

Given this impenetrability of EFX, a growing strand of research started considering its relaxations. For example, Plaut and Roughgarden [28], consider an approximate version of EFX<sup>3</sup> and provide a 1/2 approximation solution for agents with sub-additive valuation functions. For additive valuations, this factor is recently improved to 0.618 by Amanatidis *et al.* [2]. Another interesting relaxation is *EFX-with-charity*. Such allocations donate a bundle of items to charity and guarantee EFX for the rest of the items. The less valuable the donated items are, the more desirable the allocation is. Caragiannis *et al.*[13] show that there always exists an EFX-with-charity allocation where every agent receives half the value of his bundle in the optimal Nash social welfare allocation. Recently, Chaudhury *et al.* [18] have proposed an EFX-with-charity allocation such that no agent values the donated items more than his bundle and the number of donated items is less than the number of agents.

Considering the huge discrepancy between EFX and EF1, in this paper we wish to find a middle ground to bridge this gap. We therefore suggest another fairness criterion, namely *envy-freeness up to a random item* or EFR, which is weaker than EFX, yet stronger than EF1. For this notion, we provide a polynomial time 0.73-approximation algorithm, i.e., an algorithm that constructs 0.73-EFR allocations in polynomial time. Our allocation method is based on a special type of matching, namely Nash Social Welfare Matching. In Section 1.1, we briefly discuss our techniques to obtain these results.

## 1.1 Our Results and Techniques

**Envy-freeness up to a random item.** We suggest a new fairness notion, namely *envy-free up to a random good* (EFR). Roughly speaking, in an EFR allocation, no agent  $i$  envies another agent  $j$  (in expectation), if we remove a random good from the bundle of agent  $j$ . In other words, the expected value of agent  $i$  for the bundle allocated to agent  $j$ , after removing a random item from it is at most as much as the value of his own bundle. Obviously, EFR is a weaker notion than EFX, yet stronger than EF1.

The intuition behind EFR is to use randomness to reduce the *severe impact of small items*. To see what we mean by this term, consider the following scenario: suppose that the value of agent  $i$  for his share is 1000. In addition, assume that the bundle allocated to an agent  $j$  contains two items, each with value 600 to agent  $i$ . Even though the allocation is currently EFX with respect to agent  $i$ , allocating even a very small item (say, with value close to 0 to agent  $i$ ) to agent  $j$  violates EFX condition for agent  $i$ . This is counter-intuitive in the sense that the last item allocated to agent  $j$  was totally worthless to agent  $i$ . On the other hand, allocating any item with value less than 300 to agent  $j$  preserves EFR condition for agent  $i$ . This property makes EFR more flexible, especially when the number of items is not too much. On the other hand, as the number of items allocated to an agent grows larger, we expect EFX and EFR to be more and more aligned.

Similar to EFX, we provide a counter example which shows that a Nash Social Welfare allocation is not necessarily EFR (see Example 4). This separates EFR from EF1 given the fact that a Nash Social welfare allocation is always EF1[14]. It is worth mentioning that Caragiannis *et al.* [14] presented an example to

---

<sup>3</sup> An allocation is  $\alpha$ -approximate EFX, if for every pair of agents  $i$  and  $j$ , agent  $i$  believes that the share allocated to him is worth at least  $\alpha$  fraction of the share allocated to agent  $j$ , after removal of agent  $j$ 's least valued item (according to agent  $i$ 's preference).

show that Nash Social welfare allocation is not necessarily EFX. However, their example is still EFR. The difference between these two examples can be seen as an evidence for the distinction between EFR and EFX.

As noted, the best approximation guarantee for EFX is 0.61 by Amanatidis *et al.* [2]. Since every EFX allocation is also EFR, this result also provides a 0.61-approximation algorithm for EFR. In this paper, we improve this ratio to 0.73.

**Theorem 1.** There exists an algorithm that finds a 0.73-EFR allocation. In addition, such an allocation can be found in polynomial time.

In order to prove Theorem 1, we propose a three-step algorithm that finds a 0.73-EFR allocation in polynomial time. Roughly speaking, in the first two steps, we allocate valuable (i.e., large) items while preserving the 0.73-EFR property. Next, we use an envy-cycle based procedure to allocate the rest of the items. Figure 1 shows a flowchart of our method.




Figure 1: Flowchart of the 0.73-EFR allocation algorithm

The first challenge to address is the method by which we must allocate large items in the first step. Interestingly, we introduce a special type of matching allocation with intriguing properties which makes it ideal for our algorithm. We call such an allocation a *Nash Social Welfare Matching*.

**Nash Social Welfare Matching.** In the first step of the algorithm, we allocate one item to each agent such that the product of the utilities of the agents is maximized. The interesting fact about this allocation is that, not only does this allocation allocates large items, but it also provides very useful information about the value of the rest of the items. In Section 2 we broadly discuss such allocations and their properties. However, to shed light on their usefulness, assume that after a Nash Social Welfare Matching, agent  $i$  envies agent  $j$  with a ratio  $\alpha > 1$ , meaning that he thinks the value of the good allocated to agent  $j$  is  $\alpha$  times more than the value of his item. In that case, we can immediately conclude that the item allocated to agent  $j$  is  $\alpha$  times more valuable to him (agent  $j$ ) than any remaining item; otherwise, we could improve the utility product by allocating the most valuable remaining item to agent  $j$  and giving his former item to agent  $i$  (and of course, freeing agent  $i$ 's former item). In addition, we can express the same proposition for the value of the item allocated to agent  $i$  for agent  $j$ : the value of this item for agent  $j$  is at most  $1/\alpha$  of the item allocated to agent  $j$ . The above statement can be generalized to the arguments that include more than two agents. With this aim, we introduce several new concepts, including *envy-ratio graph* (a complete weighted graph that represents the envy-ratios between agents), *improving cycles*, and *envy-rank*.

It is worth mentioning that the main challenge in many fair allocation problems for different fairness criteria (e.g., MMS, EFX) is allocating valuable items. The structure of such matchings makes them ideal for allocating these items. We strongly believe that using Nash Social Welfare matching is not only useful for our algorithm, but can also be seen as a strong tool in the way of finding fair allocations related to the other fairness notions, especially maximin-share. In Section 4 we show how to use NSW matching to obtain a simple algorithm with the approximation ratio of  $(\phi - 1) \simeq 0.61$  for EFX. The approximation ratio of our algorithm matches the state-of-the-art  $(\phi - 1)$  approximation result by Amanatidis *et al.* [1].

## 1.2 Related work

Fair allocation of a divisible resource (known as *cake cutting*) was first introduced by Steinhaus[31] in 1948, and since then has been the subject of intensive studies. We refer the reader to [11] and [29] for an overview of different fairness notions and their related results. Proportionality and Envy-freeness are among the most

well-established notions for cake cutting. As mentioned, the literature of cake cutting admits strong positive results for these two notions (see [31] for details).

Since neither EF nor proportionality or any approximation of these notions can be guaranteed for indivisible goods, several relaxations are introduced for these two notions in the past decade. These relaxations include EF1 and EFX for envy-freeness and maximin-share [12] for proportionality. Nash Social Welfare (NSW) is also another important notion in allocation of indivisible goods which is somewhat a trade off between fairness and optimality.

Apart from the results mentioned in the introduction for EFX and EF1, there are other studies related to these notions [8, 7, 9, 13, 14, 15]. In particular, Barman *et al.* [8] propose a pseudo-polynomial time algorithm that finds an EF1 and pareto efficient allocation. They also show that any EF1 and pareto efficient allocation approximates Nash Social Welfare with a factor of 1.45. In contrast to EF1, our knowledge of EFX and NSW beyond additive valuations is limited. For EFX, the only positive results for general valuations is the work of Plaut and Roughgarden [28] which provides a 1/2-EFX allocation. For NSW, Grag *et al.* [23] prove an  $O(n \log n)$  approximation guarantee for submodular valuations. Recently this factor is improved to  $O(n)$  [17].

Maximin-share is one of the most well-studied notions in the recent years. In a pioneering study, Kurokawa *et al.* [25] provide an approximation algorithm with the factor of 2/3 for maximin-share, which is improved to 3/4 by Ghodsi *et al.* [24]. Beyond additivity, Barman *et al.* [5] show that a simple round robin algorithm can guarantee 1/10-MMS for submodular valuations, and Ghodsi *et al.* provide approximation guarantees for submodular (1/3), XOS (1/5) and subadditive ( $1/\log n$ ) valuations. In addition, several notions are ramified from maximin-share, including weighted maximin-share (WMMS) [21], pairwise maximin-share (PMMS) [14], and groupwise maximin-share (GMMS) [6]. Several studies consider the relation between these notions and seek to find an allocation that guarantees a subset of them simultaneously. For example, Amanatidis *et al.* [1] investigate the connections between EF1, EFX, maximin share, and pairwise maximin share. They show that any EF1 allocation is also a 1/n-MMS and a 1/2-PMMS allocation. They also prove that any EFX allocation is a 4/7-MMS and a 2/3-PMMS allocation.

## 2 Preliminaries and Basic Observations

**Fair allocation problem.** An instance of fair allocation problem consists of a set of  $n$  agents, a set  $\mathcal{M}$  of  $m$  goods, and a valuation profile  $V = \{v_1, v_2, \dots, v_n\}$ . Each  $v_i$  is a function of the form  $2^{\mathcal{M}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$  which specifies the preferences of agent  $i \in [n]$  over the goods. Throughout the paper, we assume that a valuation function  $v_i$  satisfies the following conditions.

- **Normalization:**  $v_i(\emptyset) = 0$ .
- **Monotonicity:**  $v_i(S) \leq v_i(T)$  whenever  $S \subseteq T$ .
- **Additivity:**  $v_i(S) = \sum_{b \in S} v_i(\{b\})$ .

An allocation of a set  $S$  of goods is an  $n$ -partition  $\mathcal{A} = \langle \mathcal{A}_1, \mathcal{A}_2, \dots, \mathcal{A}_n \rangle$  of  $S$ , where  $\mathcal{A}_i$  is the bundle allocated to agent  $i$ . Allocation is complete, if  $S = \mathcal{M}$  and is partial otherwise. Since we are interested in the allocations that allocate the whole set of items, the final allocation must be complete.

**Fairness criteria.** Given an instance of fair division problem and an allocation  $\mathcal{A}$ , an agent  $i$  envies another agent  $j$ , if he strictly prefers  $\mathcal{A}_j$  over his bundle  $\mathcal{A}_i$ . An allocation is then said to be *envy-free* (EF), if no agent envies another, i.e., for every pair  $i, j \in [n]$  of agents we have  $v_i(\mathcal{A}_i) \geq v_i(\mathcal{A}_j)$ . As mentioned, envy-freeness is too strong to be guaranteed in an allocation of indivisible items. Therefore, two relaxations of this notion are introduced, namely *envy-free up to one good* (EF1) and *envy-free up to any good* (EFX).

**Definition 2.** An allocation  $\mathcal{A}$  is called

- *envy-free up to one good* (EF1) if for all  $i, j$  we have  $v_i(\mathcal{A}_i) \geq \min_{b \in \mathcal{A}_j} v_i(\mathcal{A}_j \setminus \{b\})$ ,

- envy-free up to any good (EFX) if for all  $i, j$  we have  $v_i(\mathcal{A}_i) \geq \max_{b \in \mathcal{A}_j} v_i(\mathcal{A}_j \setminus \{b\})$ .

Even though these two notions seem to be somewhat related, there is a huge discrepancy between the current results obtained for them. It is shown that even for instances with general valuations, an EF1 allocation always exists, and can be computed in polynomial time [26]. In contrast, whether or not an EFX allocation always exists is still open, even for additive valuations.

In this paper, we introduce another relaxation of envy-freeness, namely *envy-free up to a random good*. Let  $D_j$  be a uniform distribution over the items of  $\mathcal{A}_j$  that selects each item with probability  $1/|\mathcal{A}_j|$ .

**Definition 3.** Allocation  $\mathcal{A}$  is envy-free up to a random good (EFR) if for all  $i, j$  we have

$$v_i(\mathcal{A}_i) \geq \mathbb{E}_{b \sim D_j} \left[ v_i(\mathcal{A}_j \setminus \{b\}) \right].$$

Clearly, EFR lies in between EFX and EF1: EFX is a stronger notion of fairness than EFR, and EFR is stronger than EF1. In Example 4, we show one structural difference between EF1 and EFR: in contrast to EF1, EFR is not implied by an allocation that maximizes Nash social welfare.

	1	2	3	4	5
$v_1$	3	3	1	1	1
$v_2$	5	5	1	4	3

Figure 2: Agents' valuations over items

**Example 4.** Consider an instance of the fair allocation problem with 5 items, and 2 agents with the valuations represented in Figure 2. The unique allocation that maximizes the NSW allocates the first 3 items to the first agent, and the other 2 items to the second agent. Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be this allocation. Since there are 3 items in the first agent's bundle, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{b \sim D_1} \left[ v_2(\mathcal{A}_1 \setminus \{b\}) \right] &= \frac{1}{3} \cdot (v_2(\mathcal{A}_1 \setminus \{1\}) + v_2(\mathcal{A}_1 \setminus \{2\}) + v_2(\mathcal{A}_1 \setminus \{3\})) \\ &= \frac{22}{3} \geq v_2(\mathcal{A}_2) = 7. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, this allocation is not EFR.

Finally, approximate versions of EFX and EFR are defined as follows.

**Definition 5.** For a constant  $c \leq 1$ , an allocation  $\mathcal{A}$  is called

- $c$ -approximate envy-free up to any good ( $c$ -EFX), if for all  $i, j$  we have

$$v_i(\mathcal{A}_i) \geq c \cdot \max_{b \in \mathcal{A}_j} v_i(\mathcal{A}_j \setminus \{b\}),$$

- $c$ -approximate envy-free up to a random good ( $c$ -EFR) if for all  $i, j$  we have

$$v_i(\mathcal{A}_i) \geq c \cdot \mathbb{E}_{b \sim D_j} \left[ v_i(\mathcal{A}_j \setminus \{b\}) \right].$$

Note that Example 4 also shows that the maximum NSW allocation does not guarantee better than  $\frac{21}{22}$  approximation of EFR.

**Envy-ratio Graph.** Envy-ratio graph is in fact a generalization of envy-graph introduced by Lipton et al. [26]. Suppose that at some stage of our algorithm we have a partial allocation  $\mathcal{A}$ . We define a graph called *envy-ratio graph* to be a complete weighted digraph with the following construction: each vertex corresponds to an agent, and for each ordered pair  $(i, j)$ , there is a directed edge from vertex  $i$  to vertex  $j$  with the weight  $w_{i,j} = v_i(\mathcal{A}_j)/v_i(\mathcal{A}_i)$ .

Assuming each agent has a non-zero value for each good, for every  $i, j$  we have  $w_{i,j} \in [0, \infty)$ . Note that  $w_{i,j} \leq 1$  implies that agent  $i$  does not envy agent  $j$ , whereas  $w_{i,j} > 1$  indicates agent  $i$  envies agent  $j$ . The higher the value of  $w_{i,j}$  is, the more envious agent  $i$  is to the bundle of agent  $j$ . Indeed, the well-known envy-graph is a subgraph of envy-ratio graph containing only the edges with  $w_{i,j} > 1$ .

**Nash Social Welfare (NSW) Matching.** Nash social welfare, originally proposed by Nash [27], is defined to be the geometric mean of agents' valuations. Allocation that maximizes Nash social welfare is known to have desirable properties. For example, such allocations are proved to be EF1 and pareto optimal. Roughly, Nash social welfare maximizing allocations can be seen as a trade-off between social welfare and fairness.

In the first step of the algorithm, we allocate one item to each agent such that the Nash social welfare of the agents is maximized. More formally, define Nash Social Welfare matching of  $[m]$  to be a partial allocation  $\mathcal{A} = \langle \mathcal{A}_1, \mathcal{A}_2, \dots, \mathcal{A}_n \rangle$ , such that  $\prod_i v_i(\mathcal{A}_i)$  is maximized and for every  $i$  we have  $|\mathcal{A}_i| = 1$ .

Similar to Nash social welfare allocations, Nash social welfare matchings exhibit beautiful properties which greatly help us in designing our algorithm. One simple property of such allocations is shown in Observation 7. Before we state Observation 7, we need to define concepts of *improving* and *strictly improving* cycles.

**Definition 6.** Let  $c = i_1 \rightarrow i_2 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow i_k \rightarrow i_1$  be a cycle in the envy-ratio graph. Then,  $c$  is an improving cycle, if

$$w_{i_1, i_2} \times w_{i_2, i_3} \times \dots \times w_{i_{k-1}, i_k} \times w_{i_k, i_1} > 1.$$

Furthermore, we say a cycle  $c$  is strictly improving cycle, if  $c$  is an improving cycle and for every  $(i \rightarrow j) \in c$ ,  $w_{i,j} > 1$  holds.

We note that strictly improving cycle is an essential concept in all envy-cycle elimination methods [26, 5, 18, 2]. These methods typically rotate the shares over strictly improving cycles to enhance social welfare. However, to the best of our knowledge, no previous work made use of improving cycles.

**Observation 7.** Suppose that we allocate one item to each agent using Nash social welfare matching. Then, the envy-ratio graph admits no improving cycle.

The proof of the mentioned observation is available in Appendix A. A particularly useful case of Observation 7 is for the cycles of length 2, which we state in Corollary 8.

**Corollary 8** (of Observation 7). Suppose that for two agents  $i, j$  we have  $v_i(\mathcal{A}_j) \geq r \cdot v_i(\mathcal{A}_i)$ , where  $r \geq 1$ . Then, we have  $v_j(\mathcal{A}_i) \leq v_j(\mathcal{A}_j)/r$ .

**Definition 9.** Suppose that we allocate one item to each agent using Nash social welfare matching. We define the envy-rank of an agent  $i$ , denoted by  $r_i$  as


$$r_i = \max_{j_0, j_1, \dots, j_k} \prod_{z=1}^k w_{j_z, j_{z-1}},$$

where  $j_0 = i$ . Roughly speaking, let  $p$  be a path leading to vertex  $i$  in the envy-ratio graph such that the product of the weights of the edges in  $p$  is maximum. Then, the envy-rank of agent  $i$  equals to the product of the weights of the edges in  $p$ . Note that by Observation 7 we can assume w.l.o.g that  $p$  is a simple path (i.e.,  $p$  includes no duplicate vertices).


**Observation 10.**  $p$  is a simple path.

	1	2	3	4
$v_1$	8	2	4	3
$v_2$	4	2	0	2
$v_3$	0	3	2	2
$v_4$	1	6	3	9


(a) Agents' valuations over items



(b) Envy-ratio graph



(c) Envy graph



(d) Envy-ratio graph after eliminating a cycle.

Figure 3: An example to illustrate envy-ratio graph.

*Proof.* Assume  $p$  is not simple and let  $c$  be a cycle in  $p$ . By Observation 7 we know that  $c$  can not be improving. Therefore, the product of the weight of the edges of  $p \setminus c$  is at least as large as  $p$ .  $\square$

To get a better understanding of these definitions take a look at Example 11.

**Example 11.** Consider an instance of the fair allocation problem with 4 items, 4 agents, and a valuation profile  $V = \{v_1, v_2, v_3, v_4\}$  represented in Figure 3a. Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be the allocation that allocates item  $i$  to agent  $i$ . The envy-ratio graph and the envy graph of  $\mathcal{A}$  are shown in Figure 3b and Figure 3c respectively. This allocation is not envy-free, however, it is both EFX and EFR since each agent receives only one item.

As we mentioned before, the envy-rank of an agent can be seen as the product of the weights of the edges in a path leading to that agent. For instance, consider the agent 1. The envy-rank of this agent is 3 which is the product of the weights of the edges in the path  $3 \rightarrow 2 \rightarrow 1$ . Also consider the cycle  $1 \rightarrow 3 \rightarrow 2 \rightarrow 1$ . This cycle is an improving cycle. Therefore, allocation  $\mathcal{A}$  is not a NSW matching. The allocation can be improved by moving the items alongside this cycle which leads to a new allocation  $\mathcal{A}' = \{\{3\}, \{1\}, \{2\}, \{4\}\}$ . The envy-ratio graph of  $\mathcal{A}'$  can be seen in Figure 3d.

We finish our discussion in this section by mentioning some properties of envy-rank values. The proofs of flowing observations are available in Appendix A.

**Observation 12.** Suppose that allocation  $\mathcal{A}$  allocates one item to each agent using a Nash social welfare matching. Then for every pair of agents  $i$  and  $j$ , we have

$$\frac{v_i(\mathcal{A}_j)}{v_i(\mathcal{A}_i)} \leq \min \left\{ r_j, \frac{r_j}{r_i} \right\}.$$

In addition to Observation 7, Nash social welfare matchings admit another important and elegant property, which we state in Observation 13. This observation provides upper bounds on the value of remaining goods and can be of independent interest for various fair allocation problems.

**Observation 13.** Suppose that we allocate one item to each agent using a Nash social welfare matching. Then, for each agent  $i$  and any unallocated item  $b$  we have

$$v_i(b) \leq \min \left\{ v_i(\mathcal{A}_i), \frac{v_i(\mathcal{A}_i)}{r_i} \right\}.$$

### 3 An approximate EFR Allocation

In this section, we present our algorithm for finding a 0.73-EFR allocation. Our algorithm is divided into 3 steps, namely NSW matching, allocation refinement, and envy-graph based allocation. In the first step, we allocate each agent one item using a Nash social welfare matching and accordingly divide the agents into three groups based on their envy-rank. Next, in the second step we allocate a set of goods to the agents in each group, and finally in the third step we allocate the rest of the items using the classic envy-cycle elimination method. The outline of our algorithm is represented in Algorithm 1.

---

**ALGORITHM 1:** The outline of the 0.73-EFR algorithm.

---

**Parameters :**  $\varphi = \sqrt{3} + 1$ .

// Step 1

Allocate NSW matching;

Let  $r_i$  be envy-rank of an agent  $i$ . Divide the agents into groups  $G_1, G_2, G_3$  as follows. Agent  $i$  belongs to  $G_1$  if  $r_i > \varphi$ , belongs to  $G_2$  if  $2 < r_i \leq \varphi$ , and belongs to  $G_3$  if  $r_i \leq 2$ ;

// Step 2

Let  $\mathcal{O}$  be a topological ordering of the agents with respect to the envy-graph;

**foreach**  $i \in G_3$  *ordered by*  $\mathcal{O}$  **do**

    | Ask agent  $i$  to pick his most valuable remaining item;

**end**

**foreach**  $i \in G_2$  *ordered by*  $\mathcal{O}$  **do**

    | Ask agent  $i$  to pick his most valuable remaining item;

**end**

**foreach**  $i \in G_1$  *ordered by*  $\mathcal{O}$  **do**

    | Ask agent  $i$  to pick his most valuable remaining item;

**end**

// Step 3

**while** *the allocation is not complete* **do**

    | Eliminate all directed cycles in the envy-graph;

    | Let  $s$  be an arbitrary source in the envy-graph;

    | Ask agent  $s$  to pick his most valuable remaining item;

**end**

**return** the allocation;

---

#### 3.1 Step 1.

In the first step, we allocate one item to each agent using a NSW matching. We first show that this allocation can be found in polynomial time. The proof is available in Appendix A.

**Observation 14.** NSW matching can be found in polynomial time.

Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be NSW matching and fix a parameter  $\varphi = \sqrt{3} + 1$ . Based on the envy-rank of the agents, we divide them into 3 groups  $G_1, G_2$ , and  $G_3$  as follows.

- Agent  $i$  belongs to  $G_1$  if  $r_i > \varphi$ .



- Agent  $i$  belongs to  $G_2$  if  $2 < r_i \leq \varphi$ .
- Agent  $i$  belongs to  $G_3$  if  $r_i \leq 2$ .

Note that by Observation 13, we know that for every remaining item  $b$  the following properties hold.

- (Property 1): For every agent  $i \in G_1$  we have  $v_i(b) < v_i(\mathcal{A}_i)/\varphi$ .
- (Property 2): For every agent  $i \in G_2$  we have  $v_i(b) < v_i(\mathcal{A}_i)/2$ .

Intuitively, if each remaining item is worth less than  $v_i(\mathcal{A}_i)/\varphi$  to every agent  $i$ , then we can guarantee the approximation factor of  $1/(1+1/\varphi)$  in the third step. This property holds for the agents in  $G_1$ ; however, this is not the case for agents in  $G_2$  and  $G_3$ . In the second step, we seek to allocate a set of items to the agents in  $G_2$  and  $G_3$  so that the same property holds for these agents. Note that alongside this property, the final partial allocation after the second step must be fair (i.e., 0.73-EFR).

### 3.2 Step 2.

In the second step, we allocate one item to each agent in  $G_2$  and two items to each agent in  $G_3$ . Algorithm 1 shows the method by which we allocate these items to the agents in  $G_2$  and  $G_3$ . Let  $\mathcal{O}$  be a topological ordering of the agents with respect to the envy-graph. We order the agents in  $G_3$  according to  $\mathcal{O}$  and ask them one by one to pick their most valuable remaining good. We then again ask agents in  $G_3$  to pick one more item according to the same topological ordering  $\mathcal{O}$ . Afterwards, we order the agents in  $G_2$  according to  $\mathcal{O}$  and ask them one by one to add the most desirable remaining item to their bundles.

We now show that at the end of Step 2 the following conditions hold. The proof can be found in Appendix B.

**Claim 15.** At the end of Step 2 the following conditions hold.

- The allocation is EFR with respect to the agents in  $G_1$ .
- The allocation is  $(3/4)$ -EFR with respect to the agents in  $G_2$ .
- The allocation is  $(2/\varphi)$ -EFR with respect to the agents in  $G_3$ .

Since  $2/\varphi < 3/4$ , the allocation by the end of Step 2 is  $(2/\varphi)$ -EFR.

### 3.3 Step 3.

In the third step, we use the envy-graph to allocate the remaining unallocated items. We repeat the following steps until all the goods are allocated.

- Find and eliminate all the directed cycles from the envy-graph. In order to eliminate all cycles in the envy-graph, we repeatedly find a directed cycle in the envy-graph. Let  $i_1 \rightarrow i_2 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow i_k \rightarrow i_1$  be a cycle in envy-graph. By definition, each agent  $i_j$  envies agent  $i_{(j \bmod k)+1}$ , i.e.,

$$v_{i_j}(\mathcal{A}_{i_j}) < v_{i_j}(\mathcal{A}_{i_{(j \bmod k)+1}}),$$

where  $\mathcal{A}$  is the current allocation. We then exchange the allocations of the agents that are in the cycle such that each agent  $i_j$  receives  $\mathcal{A}_{i_{(j \bmod k)+1}}$ . Note that this exchanging does not change bundles. Furthermore, the utility of each agent does not decrease. Hence, if the allocation is  $\alpha$ -EFR before the exchange, it remains  $\alpha$ -EFR after it (*Lemma 6.1* in [28]). Also, exchanging these allocations decreases the number of edges in the envy-graph. Thus, we eventually find an allocation such that its corresponding envy-graph is acyclic.

- Give an item to an agent that no-one envies. In the previous step we showed that we can always find an allocation such that its corresponding envy-graph is acyclic. Therefore, there should be a vertex in the envy-graph with no incoming edges. Let  $i$  be the agent corresponding to this vertex. Since  $i$  has no incoming edges in the envy-graph, no other agent envies  $i$ . At this step, we ask agent  $i$  to pick his best item among all remaining goods.

The following Lemma shows the approximation guarantee of our algorithm. The proof can be found in Appendix A.

**Lemma 16.** Suppose that we are given a partial  $\alpha$ -EFR allocation  $\mathcal{A}$  such that for every agent  $i$  and every remaining item  $b$ , we have  $v_i(b) \leq \alpha' \cdot v_i(\mathcal{A}_i)$  for some constant  $\alpha' \leq 1$ . Then, the resulting allocation after performing the method mentioned above is  $\min\{\alpha, \frac{1}{1+\alpha'}\}$ -EFR.

We now show that at the beginning of Step 3, the valuation of every remaining item is small for all agents. The proof is available in Appendix A.

**Observation 17.** Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be the allocation after Step 2. Then for an agent  $i$  and every remaining item  $b$  we have

- If  $i \in G_1$ ,  $v_i(b) \leq v_i(\mathcal{A}_i)/\varphi$ .
- If  $i \in G_2$ ,  $v_i(b) \leq v_i(\mathcal{A}_i)/3$ .
- If  $i \in G_3$ ,  $v_i(b) \leq v_i(\mathcal{A}_i)/3$ .

It follows from the observation above that for every agent  $i$  the valuation of every remaining item is at most  $v_i(\mathcal{A}_i)/\varphi$  after the second step of our algorithm. Recall that our allocation by the end of Step 2 is  $(2/\varphi)$ -EFR. Therefore, using Lemma 16, the allocation at the end of Step 3 is  $\min\{\frac{2}{\varphi}, \frac{1}{1+1/\varphi}\}$ -EFR. Since  $\varphi = \sqrt{3} + 1$ , we have

$$\frac{2}{\varphi} = \frac{1}{1+1/\varphi} = \sqrt{3} - 1.$$

Therefore our final allocation is  $\sqrt{3} - 1 \approx 0.73$ -EFR. This, coupled with the fact that all the steps can be implemented in polynomial time follows Theorem 1.

**Theorem 1.** There exists an algorithm that finds a 0.73-EFR allocation. In addition, such an allocation can be found in polynomial time.

## 4 Simple $(\phi - 1)$ -EFX Allocation

In this section, we show that our idea to use NSW matching as the first step of the allocation can easily give a  $(\phi - 1)$ -EFX allocation where  $\phi = \frac{1+\sqrt{5}}{2}$  is the golden ratio. The approximation ratio of our algorithm matches the state-of-the-art  $(\phi - 1)$  approximation result by Amanitidis et al. [1]. Likewise our algorithm for EFR allocation, our  $(\phi - 1)$ -EFX algorithm consists of 3 steps, namely NSW matching, allocation refinement, and envy-graph based allocation. The first and the third steps of our algorithm are almost the same as our previous algorithm. For the sake of completeness, we will briefly restate these steps in the rest of the section. The outline of our algorithm is represented in Algorithm 2.

### 4.1 Step 1.

In the first step, we allocate one item to each agent using NSW matching. Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be the resulting allocation, and let  $\phi = \frac{1+\sqrt{5}}{2}$  be the golden ratio. Based on the envy-rank of the agents, we divide them into 2 groups  $G_1$  and  $G_2$ , as follows:

- Agent  $i$  belongs to  $G_1$  if  $r_i > \phi$ .
- Agent  $i$  belongs to  $G_2$  if  $r_i \leq \phi$ .

---

**ALGORITHM 2:** The outline of the  $(\phi - 1)$ -EFX algorithm.

---

// Step 1

Allocate NSW matching;

Let  $r_i$  be envy-rank of an agent  $i$ . Divide the agents into groups  $G_1$  and  $G_2$  as follows. Agent  $i$  belongs to  $G_1$  if  $r_i > \phi$  and belongs to  $G_2$  otherwise;

// Step 2

Let  $\mathcal{O}$  be a topological ordering of the agents with respect to the envy-graph;

**foreach**  $i \in G_2$  *ordered by*  $\mathcal{O}$  **do**

  | Ask agent  $i$  to pick his most valuable remaining item;

**end**

// Step 3

**while** *the allocation is not complete* **do**

  | Eliminate all directed cycles in the envy-graph;

  | Let  $s$  be an arbitrary source in the envy-graph;

  | Ask agent  $s$  to pick his most valuable remaining item;

**end**

**return** the allocation;

---

## 4.2 Step 2.

In the second step, we allocate one item to each agent in  $G_2$  via the following process. Let  $\mathcal{O}$  be a topological ordering of the agents with respect to the envy-graph. We order the agents in  $G_2$  according to  $\mathcal{O}$  and ask them one by one to pick their most valuable remaining good.

After this step, the bundle of every agent in  $G_2$  contains two items. For an agent  $i \in G_2$  we use  $\{b_i, b'_i\}$  to denote the items allocated to this agent where  $b'_i$  is the item allocated in Step 2. We also use  $\{b_i\}$  to denote the only item received by an agent  $i \in G_1$ . We show that at the end of Step 2 the following claim holds.

**Claim 18.** By the end of Step 2, the allocation is EFX with respect to the agents in  $G_1$ .

*Proof.* Let  $i$  be an agent in  $G_1$ , we show that for every other agent  $j$  we have

$$v_i(\mathcal{A}_i) \geq \max_{b \in \mathcal{A}_j} v_i(\mathcal{A}_j \setminus \{b\}),$$

so the allocation is EFX from the agent  $i$ 's perspective. If  $j \in G_1$ , then we have  $|\mathcal{A}_j| = 1$ . Therefore,

$$\max_{b \in \mathcal{A}_j} v_i(\mathcal{A}_j \setminus \{b\}) = 0,$$

and the claim clearly holds.

Consider an agent  $j \in G_2$ . At the end of Step 2, agent  $j$  has two allocated items. By Observation 13, the valuation of the item  $b'_j$  for agent  $i$  is bounded by  $v_i(\mathcal{A}_i)/r_i = v_i(b_i)/r_i$ . Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{b \in \mathcal{A}_j} v_i(\mathcal{A}_j \setminus \{b\}) &= \max \{v_i(b_j), v_i(b'_j)\} \\ &\leq \max \{v_i(b_j), v_i(b_i)/r_i\} && \text{Observation 13.} \\ &\leq \max \{v_i(b_i), v_i(b_i)/r_i\} && \text{Observation 12.} \\ &= v_i(b_i) = v_i(\mathcal{A}_i). && r_i > 1. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore the allocation is EFX. □

**Claim 19.** By the end of Step 2, the allocation is  $(\phi - 1)$ -EFX with respect to the agents in  $G_2$ .

*Proof.* Let  $i$  be an agent in  $\mathbf{G}_2$ , we show that for every other agent  $j$  we have

$$v_i(\mathcal{A}_i) \geq (\phi - 1) \cdot \max_{b \in \mathcal{A}_j} v_i(\mathcal{A}_j \setminus \{b\}),$$

so the allocation is  $(\phi - 1)$ -EFX from agent  $i$ 's perspective. If  $j \in \mathbf{G}_1$ , then we have  $|\mathcal{A}_j| = 1$ , and the claim clearly holds.

Consider an agent  $j$  in  $\mathbf{G}_2$ . We first consider the case that  $v_i(b_i) < v_i(b_j)$ . In this case, the position of agent  $i$  in  $\mathcal{O}$  is before agent  $j$ . Therefore, agent  $i$  receives his second good before agent  $j$ , and we have

$$v_i(b'_i) \geq v_i(b'_j). \quad (1)$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{b \in \mathcal{A}_j} v_i(\mathcal{A}_j \setminus \{b\}) &= \max \{v_i(b_j), v_i(b'_j)\} \\ &\leq \max \{v_i(b_j), v_i(b'_i)\} && \text{By (1).} \\ &\leq \max \{r_j \cdot v_i(b_i), v_i(b'_i)\} && \text{Observation 12.} \\ &\leq \max \{\phi \cdot v_i(b_i), v_i(b'_i)\} && r_j \leq \phi. \\ &\leq \phi \cdot (v_i(b_i) + v_i(b'_i)) \\ &= \phi \cdot v_i(\mathcal{A}_i). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$v_i(\mathcal{A}_i) \geq \frac{1}{\phi} \cdot \max_{b \in \mathcal{A}_j} v_i(\mathcal{A}_j \setminus \{b\}).$$

Since  $\frac{1}{\phi} = \phi - 1$ , it follows that our allocation is  $(\phi - 1)$ -EFX. The other case is when  $v_i(b_i) \geq v_i(b_j)$ . In this case, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{b \in \mathcal{A}_j} v_i(\mathcal{A}_j \setminus \{b\}) &= \max \{v_i(b_j), v_i(b'_j)\} \\ &\leq \max \{v_i(b_i), v_i(b'_j)\} && v_i(b_i) \geq v_i(b_j). \\ &\leq \max \{v_i(b_i), v_i(b_i)\} && \text{Observation 13.} \\ &= v_i(b_i) \leq v_i(\mathcal{A}_i). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, in this case the allocation is EFX which completes the proof of the claim.  $\square$

### 4.3 Step 3.

In the third step, we use the envy-graph to allocate the rest of the items. We show that at the beginning of Step 3, the valuation of every remaining item is small for all the agents.

**Observation 20.** Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be the allocation after Step 2. Then, for an agent  $i$  and every remaining item  $b$  we have

- If  $i \in \mathbf{G}_1$ ,  $v_i(b) \leq v_i(\mathcal{A}_i)/\phi$ .
- If  $i \in \mathbf{G}_2$ ,  $v_i(b) \leq v_i(\mathcal{A}_i)/2$ .

*Proof.* Consider an agent  $i \in \mathbf{G}_1$ , then by Observation 13 we have

$$v_i(b) \leq v_i(\mathcal{A}_i)/r_i \leq v_i(\mathcal{A}_i)/\phi.$$

Next, consider an agent  $i \in \mathbf{G}_2$ . This agent has two allocated items which are larger than every remaining item. Therefore,  $v_i(b) \leq v(\mathcal{A}_i)/2$ .  $\square$

Therefore, for every agent  $i$ , the valuation of every remaining item is at most  $v_i(\mathcal{A}_i)/\phi$ . In order to complete the allocation we repeat the following steps until all the goods are allocated.

- Find and eliminate all the directed cycles from the envy-graph.
- Allocate an item to an agent that no-one envies to him.

**Lemma 21** ([28]). Suppose that we are given a partial  $\alpha$ -EFX allocation  $\mathcal{A}$  such that for every agent  $i$  and every remaining item  $b$ , we have  $v_i(b) \leq \alpha' \cdot (\mathcal{A}_i)$  for some constant  $\alpha' \leq 1$ . Then, the resulting allocation after performing the method mentioned above is  $\min\{\alpha, \frac{1}{1+\alpha'}\}$ -EFX.

Recall that our allocation by the end of Step 2 is  $(\phi - 1)$ -EFX. Therefore, by lemma above the approximation ratio of our approach is  $\min\{\phi - 1, \frac{1}{1+1/\phi}\}$ . Since  $\frac{1}{1+1/\phi} = \phi - 1$ , it follows that our final allocation is  $(\phi - 1) \approx 0.61$ -EFX.

## References

- [1] G. Amanatidis, G. Birmpas, and E. Markakis. Comparing approximate relaxations of envy-freeness. In *Proceedings of the 27th International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, pages 42–48, 2018.
- [2] G. Amanatidis, E. Markakis, and A. Ntokos. Multiple birds with one stone: Beating  $1/2$  for efx and gmms via envy cycle elimination. In *AAAI*, pages 1790–1797, 2020.
- [3] H. Aziz and S. Mackenzie. A discrete and bounded envy-free cake cutting protocol for any number of agents. In *Proceedings of the 57th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*, pages 416–427. IEEE, 2016.
- [4] H. Aziz, I. Caragiannis, A. Igarashi, and T. Walsh. Fair allocation of indivisible goods and chores. In *Proceedings of the 28th International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, pages 53–59, 2019.
- [5] S. Barman and S. K. Krishna Murthy. Approximation algorithms for maximin fair division. In *Proceedings of the 2017 ACM Conference on Economics and Computation*, pages 647–664, 2017.
- [6] S. Barman, A. Biswas, S. K. Krishnamurthy, and Y. Narahari. Groupwise maximin fair allocation of indivisible goods. In *Thirty-Second AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 2018.
- [7] S. Barman, S. K. KrishnaMurthy, and R. Vaish. Finding fair and efficient allocations. In *Proceedings of the 19th ACM Conference on Economics and Computation (ACM-EC)*, pages 557–574. ACM Press, 2018.
- [8] S. Barman, S. K. Krishnamurthy, and R. Vaish. Finding fair and efficient allocations. In *Proceedings of the 2018 ACM Conference on Economics and Computation*, pages 557–574, 2018.
- [9] S. Barman, S. K. Krishnamurthy, and R. Vaish. Greedy algorithms for maximizing nash social welfare. In *Proceedings of the 17th International Conference on Autonomous Agents and MultiAgent Systems*, pages 7–13, 2018.
- [10] S. J. Brams and A. D. Taylor. An envy-free cake division protocol. *American Mathematical Monthly*, pages 9–18, 1995.
- [11] S. J. Brams and A. D. Taylor. *Fair Division: From cake-cutting to dispute resolution*. Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- [12] E. Budish. The combinatorial assignment problem: Approximate competitive equilibrium from equal incomes. *Journal of Political Economy*, 119(6):1061–1103, 2011.

- [13] I. Caragiannis, N. Gravin, and X. Huang. Envy-freeness up to any item with high nash welfare: The virtue of donating items. In *Proceedings of the 2019 ACM Conference on Economics and Computation*, pages 527–545, 2019.
- [14] I. Caragiannis, D. Kurokawa, H. Moulin, A. D. Procaccia, N. Shah, and J. Wang. The unreasonable fairness of maximum nash welfare. *ACM Transactions on Economics and Computation*, 7(3):12, 2019.
- [15] B. R. Chaudhury, Y. K. Cheung, J. Garg, N. Garg, M. Hoefer, and K. Mehlhorn. On fair division for indivisible items. In *38th IARCS Annual Conference on Foundations of Software Technology and Theoretical Computer Science, FSTTCS 2018, December 11-13, 2018, Ahmedabad, India*, pages 25:1–25:17. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2018.
- [16] B. R. Chaudhury, J. Garg, and K. Mehlhorn. Efx exists for three agents. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2002.05119*, 2020.
- [17] B. R. Chaudhury, J. Garg, and R. Mehta. Fair and efficient allocations under subadditive valuations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2005.06511*, 2020.
- [18] B. R. Chaudhury, T. Kavitha, K. Mehlhorn, and A. Sgouritsa. A little charity guarantees almost envy-freeness. In *Proceedings of the 31st Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms*, pages 2658–2672, 2020.
- [19] S. Dehghani, A. Farhadi, M. HajiAghayi, and H. Yami. Envy-free chore division for an arbitrary number of agents. In *Proceedings of the 29th Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms*, pages 2564–2583, 2018.
- [20] J. P. Dickerson, J. Goldman, J. Karp, A. D. Procaccia, and T. Sandholm. The computational rise and fall of fairness. In *Proceedings of the 28th Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 2014.
- [21] A. Farhadi, M. Ghodsi, M. T. Hajiaghayi, S. Lahaie, D. Pennock, M. Seddighin, S. Seddighin, and H. Yami. Fair allocation of indivisible goods to asymmetric agents. *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research*, 64:1–20, 2019.
- [22] D. K. Foley. Resource allocation and the public sector. *Yale Econ Essays*, 7(1):45–98, 1967.
- [23] J. Garg, P. Kulkarni, and R. Kulkarni. Approximating nash social welfare under submodular valuations through (un) matchings. In *Proceedings of the fourteenth annual ACM-SIAM symposium on discrete algorithms*, pages 2673–2687. SIAM, 2020.
- [24] M. Ghodsi, M. HajiAghayi, M. Seddighin, S. Seddighin, and H. Yami. Fair allocation of indivisible goods: Improvements and generalizations. In *Proceedings of the 2018 ACM Conference on Economics and Computation*, pages 539–556, 2018.
- [25] D. Kurokawa, A. D. Procaccia, and J. Wang. Fair enough: Guaranteeing approximate maximin shares. *Journal of the ACM*, 65(2):8, 2018.
- [26] R. J. Lipton, E. Markakis, E. Mossel, and A. Saberi. On approximately fair allocations of indivisible goods. In *Proceedings of the 5th ACM Conference on Electronic Commerce*, pages 125–131, 2004.
- [27] J. F. Nash Jr. The bargaining problem. *Econometrica: Journal of the Econometric Society*, pages 155–162, 1950.
- [28] B. Plaut and T. Rougigarden. Almost envy-freeness with general valuations. In *Proceedings of the 29th Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms*, pages 2584–2603. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, 2018.
- [29] J. Robertson and W. Webb. *Cake-cutting algorithms: Be fair if you can*. AK Peters/CRC Press, 1998.

- [30] M. Seddighin, H. Saleh, and M. Ghodsi. Externalities and fairness. In *Proceedings of the 2019 World Wide Web Conference*, pages 538–548, 2019.
- [31] H. Steinhaus. The problem of fair division. *Econometrica*, 16(1), 1948.
- [32] H. R. Varian. Equity, envy, and efficiency. 1973.

## A Missing proofs

### A.1 Missing proofs of Section 2

**Observation 7.** Suppose that we allocate one item to each agent using Nash social welfare matching. Then, the envy-ratio graph admits no improving cycle.

*Proof.* Assume  $c = i_1 \rightarrow i_2 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow i_k \rightarrow i_1$  is an improving cycle. Then, it is easy to see that rotating the goods over this cycle (i.e., reallocating  $\mathcal{A}_{i_j}$  to agent  $i_{j-1}$  for every  $1 < j \leq k$ , and reallocating  $\mathcal{A}_{i_1}$  to agent  $i_k$ ) yields a matching with a higher Nash social welfare.  $\square$

**Observation 12.** Suppose that allocation  $\mathcal{A}$  allocates one item to each agent using a Nash social welfare matching. Then for every pair of agents  $i$  and  $j$ , we have

$$\frac{v_i(\mathcal{A}_j)}{v_i(\mathcal{A}_i)} \leq \min \left\{ r_j, \frac{r_j}{r_i} \right\}.$$

*Proof.* In the envy-ratio graph, the weight of the directed edge from  $i$  to  $j$  is  $w_{i,j} = \frac{v_i(\mathcal{A}_j)}{v_i(\mathcal{A}_i)}$ . Recall that  $r_j$  is the maximum product of the weights of the edges in a path leading to  $j$ . Since the edge from  $i$  to  $j$  is also a path leading to vertex  $j$ , we have  $w_{i,j} \leq r_j$ . Therefore,  $\frac{v_i(\mathcal{A}_j)}{v_i(\mathcal{A}_i)} \leq r_j$ . Now consider a path  $p$  leading to  $i$  with the maximum product of the weights of the edges. Based on the definition of envy-rank, the product of the weights of the edges in  $p$  is  $r_i$ . We can use the edge from  $i$  to  $j$  to extend this path. This new path leads to  $j$ , and its product of the weights of the edges is  $r_i \cdot w_{i,j}$ . Therefore, we can say  $r_j \geq r_i \cdot w_{i,j}$ . Hence,

$$\frac{v_i(\mathcal{A}_j)}{v_i(\mathcal{A}_i)} = w_{i,j} \leq \frac{r_j}{r_i}.$$

$\square$

**Observation 13.** Suppose that we allocate one item to each agent using a Nash social welfare matching. Then, for each agent  $i$  and any unallocated item  $b$  we have

$$v_i(b) \leq \min \left\{ v_i(\mathcal{A}_i), \frac{v_i(\mathcal{A}_i)}{r_i} \right\}.$$

*Proof.* First, for any agent  $i$  and any remaining good  $b$ , we have  $v_i(b) \leq v_i(\mathcal{A}_i)$ , if not NSW can be increased by giving  $b$  to  $i$  instead of  $\mathcal{A}_i$ . Moreover, consider a path  $p = i_1 \rightarrow i_2 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow i_k \rightarrow i$  in the envy-ratio graph leading to  $i$  with the maximum product of the weights of the edges. By the definition of the envy-rank the product of the weights of this path is  $r_i$ . By moving items along this path (giving  $\mathcal{A}_i$  to  $i_k$ ,  $\mathcal{A}_{i_k}$  to  $i_{k-1}$ , etc.) and giving  $b$  to agent  $i$ , the NSW will be multiplied by a factor of  $r_i \cdot \frac{v_i(b)}{v_i(\mathcal{A}_i)}$ . Since  $\mathcal{A}$  is the allocation that maximizes NSW, we have  $r_i \cdot \frac{v_i(b)}{v_i(\mathcal{A}_i)} \leq 1$ , and hence  $v_i(b) \leq \frac{v_i(\mathcal{A}_i)}{r_i}$ .  $\square$

### A.2 Missing proofs of Section 3

**Observation 14.** NSW matching can be found in polynomial time.

*Proof.* Let  $G = (U_1, U_2)$  be a bipartite graph that has a vertex for each agent in  $U_1$  and has a vertex for every item in  $U_2$ . For every agent  $i$  and every item  $b$  we add an undirected edge with the weight of  $\log v_i(\{b\})$  between their corresponding vertices. By finding a maximum weighted matching in this graph, we get an allocation  $\mathcal{A}$  such that every agent has at most one allocated item. Also, this allocation maximizes  $\sum_{i=1}^n \log v_i(\mathcal{A}_i)$ . Therefore, this allocation also maximizes  $\prod_{i=1}^n v_i(\mathcal{A}_i)$ . Hence,  $\mathcal{A}$  allocates at most one item to every agent and maximizes Nash social welfare.  $\square$

**Lemma 16.** Suppose that we are given a partial  $\alpha$ -EFR allocation  $\mathcal{A}$  such that for every agent  $i$  and every remaining item  $b$ , we have  $v_i(b) \leq \alpha' \cdot v_i(\mathcal{A}_i)$  for some constant  $\alpha' \leq 1$ . Then, the resulting allocation after performing the method mentioned above is  $\min\{\alpha, \frac{1}{1+\alpha'}\}$ -EFR.



*Proof.* The algorithm repeats the following steps until it allocates all items.

- Find and eliminate all the directed cycles from the envy-graph.
- Give an item to an agent that no-one envies.

Consider the step in which the algorithm eliminates cycles. As we discussed earlier, this step does not change the approximation factor of the algorithm. Hence, if the allocation is  $\alpha$ -EFR before this step, it remains  $\alpha$ -EFR after it (See *Lemma 6.1* in [28] for more detail).

Consider the second step of the algorithm. In this step, the algorithm finds an agent such that no-one envies this agent, and it allocates an item to this agent. Suppose our algorithm allocates item  $b$  to agent  $i$ . Since no-one envies agent  $i$  before this step, for every other agent  $j$ , we have  $v_j(\mathcal{A}_i) \leq v_j(\mathcal{A}_j)$  where  $\mathcal{A}$  is the allocation of items before this step. In addition we have  $v_j(b) \leq \alpha' \cdot v_j(\mathcal{A}_j)$  since item  $b$  was among unallocated items at the beginning of this step. Thus, we have

$$v_j(\mathcal{A}_i) + v_j(b) \leq (1 + \alpha') \cdot v_j(\mathcal{A}_j).$$

This means that after allocation  $b$ , no agent  $j$  thinks the value of the bundle of agent  $i$  is  $(1 + \alpha')$  times more than the valuation his bundle. Therefore, the allocation remains  $\frac{1}{1+\alpha'}$ -EFR. Hence, the final allocation is  $\min\{\alpha, \frac{1}{1+\alpha'}\}$ -EFR.  $\square$

**Observation 17.** Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be the allocation after Step 2. Then for an agent  $i$  and every remaining item  $b$  we have

- If  $i \in \mathbf{G}_1$ ,  $v_i(b) \leq v_i(\mathcal{A}_i)/\varphi$ .
- If  $i \in \mathbf{G}_2$ ,  $v_i(b) \leq v_i(\mathcal{A}_i)/3$ .
- If  $i \in \mathbf{G}_3$ ,  $v_i(b) \leq v_i(\mathcal{A}_i)/3$ .

*Proof.* Consider an agent  $i \in \mathbf{G}_1$ , then by Observation 13 we have

$$v_i(b) \leq v_i(\mathcal{A}_i)/r_i \leq v_i(\mathcal{A}_i)/\varphi.$$

Next consider an agent  $i \in \mathbf{G}_2$ . This agent has two allocated items. Let  $\mathcal{A}_i = \{b_i, b'_i\}$  be these items where  $b_i$  is the item allocated using NSW matching. Since agent  $i$  picks his best remaining item at Step 2 of our algorithm, we have

$$v_i(b) \leq v_i(b'_i). \tag{2}$$

Since  $b_i$  is allocated by NSW matching, by Observation 13 we have

$$\begin{aligned} v_i(b) &\leq v_i(b_i)/r_i \\ &\leq v_i(b_i)/2. \end{aligned} \quad \text{Since } r_i > 2. \tag{3}$$

It follows from (2) and (3) that

$$v_i(b) \leq (v_i(b_i) + v_i(b'_i))/3 = v_i(\mathcal{A}_i)/3.$$

The last case is when  $i \in \mathbf{G}_3$ . In this case agent  $i$  has three allocated items which are all larger than every remaining item. Therefore  $v_i(b) \leq v(\mathcal{A}_i)/3$ .  $\square$

## B Proof of Claim 15

After the Step 2 of the algorithm, the bundle of every agent in  $\mathbf{G}_3$  contains three items. For an agent  $i \in \mathbf{G}_3$  we use  $\{b_i, b'_i, b''_i\}$  to denote the items allocated to this agent where  $b'_i$  and  $b''_i$  are the items allocated in Step 2 and  $b_i$  has been allocated before  $b''_i$ . Also, the bundle of every agent in  $\mathbf{G}_2$  contains two items. Similarly, for an agent  $i \in \mathbf{G}_2$  we use  $\{b_i, b'_i\}$  to denote the allocated items of this agent where  $b'_i$  is the item received in Step 2. We also use  $\{b_i\}$  to denote the only item received by an agent  $i \in \mathbf{G}_1$ .

We begin our analysis by showing the following claim.

**Claim 22.** For an allocation  $\mathcal{A}$  and agents  $i$  and  $j$ , we have

$$\mathbb{E}_{b \sim D_j} [v_i(\mathcal{A}_j \setminus \{b\})] = \frac{|\mathcal{A}_j| - 1}{|\mathcal{A}_j|} \cdot v_i(\mathcal{A}_j).$$

*Proof.* Distribution  $D_j$  selects each item in  $\mathcal{A}_j$  with the probability of  $1/|\mathcal{A}_j|$ . Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{b \sim D_j} [v_i(\mathcal{A}_j \setminus \{b\})] &= \frac{1}{|\mathcal{A}_j|} \cdot \sum_{b \in \mathcal{A}_j} v_i(\mathcal{A}_j \setminus \{b\}) \\ &= \frac{1}{|\mathcal{A}_j|} \cdot \sum_{b \in \mathcal{A}_j} \sum_{b' \in \mathcal{A}_j \setminus \{b\}} v_i(\{b'\}). \end{aligned} \quad \text{By Additivity assumption.}$$

Each item in  $\mathcal{A}_j$  appears  $|\mathcal{A}_j| - 1$  times in the above summation. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{b \sim D_j} [v_i(\mathcal{A}_j \setminus \{b\})] &= \frac{1}{|\mathcal{A}_j|} \cdot \sum_{b \in \mathcal{A}_j} \sum_{b' \in \mathcal{A}_j \setminus \{b\}} v_i(\{b'\}) \\ &= \frac{|\mathcal{A}_j| - 1}{|\mathcal{A}_j|} \cdot \sum_{b \in \mathcal{A}_j} v_i(\{b\}) = \frac{|\mathcal{A}_j| - 1}{|\mathcal{A}_j|} \cdot v_i(\mathcal{A}_j). \end{aligned}$$

□

First we show that at the end of Step 2, the allocation is EFR for the agents in  $\mathbf{G}_1$ .

**Claim 23.** By the end of Step 2, the allocation is EFR with respect to the agents in  $\mathbf{G}_1$ .

*Proof.* Let  $i$  be an agent in  $\mathbf{G}_1$ , we show that for every other agent  $j$  we have

$$\mathbb{E}_{b \sim D_j} [v_i(\mathcal{A}_j \setminus \{b\})] \leq v_i(\mathcal{A}_i),$$

so the allocation is EFR from the agent  $i$ 's perspective.

- If  $j \in \mathbf{G}_1$ , then we have  $|\mathcal{A}_j| = 1$  and the claim clearly holds.
- If  $j \in \mathbf{G}_2$ , then at the end of Step 2, agent  $j$  has two allocated items. By Observation 13 the valuation of the item  $b'_j$  for agent  $i$  is bounded by  $v_i(\mathcal{A}_i)/r_i = v_i(b_i)/r_i$ . Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{b \sim D_j} [v_i(\mathcal{A}_j \setminus \{b\})] &= \frac{v_i(b_j) + v_i(b'_j)}{2} && \text{Claim 22.} \\ &\leq \frac{v_i(b_j) + v_i(b_i)/r_i}{2} && \text{Observation 13.} \\ &\leq \frac{v_i(b_i) + v_i(b_i)/r_i}{2} && \text{Observation 12.} \\ &= \frac{1 + 1/r_i}{2} \cdot v_i(b_i). \end{aligned}$$

Since agent  $i$  is in  $G_1$ , we have  $r_i \geq \varphi$ . It follows that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}_{b \sim D_j} [v_i(\mathcal{A}_j \setminus \{b\})] &\leq \frac{1 + 1/r_i}{2} \cdot v_i(b_i) \\ &\leq \frac{1 + 1/\varphi}{2} \cdot v_i(b_i) \\ &= \frac{\varphi + 1}{2\varphi} \cdot v_i(b_i).\end{aligned}$$

Since  $\varphi = \sqrt{3} + 1$ , we have  $\frac{\varphi+1}{2\varphi} < 1$ . Therefore,

$$\mathbb{E}_{b \sim D_j} [v_i(\mathcal{A}_j \setminus \{b\})] \leq \frac{\varphi + 1}{2\varphi} \cdot v_i(b_i) < v_i(b_i) = v_i(\mathcal{A}_i).$$

Therefore, in this case the allocation is EFR.

- The only remaining case is when agent  $j$  is in  $G_3$ . By Observation 13, valuation of  $b'_j$  and  $b''_j$  for agent  $i$  is at most  $v_i(b_i)/r_i$ . Also, by Observation 12, valuation of  $b_j$  for agent  $i$  is at most  $r_j \cdot v_i(b_i)/r_i$ . Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}_{b \sim D_j} [v_i(\mathcal{A}_j \setminus \{b\})] &= \frac{2}{3} \cdot (v_i(b_j) + v_i(b'_j) + v_i(b''_j)) && \text{Claim 22.} \\ &\leq \frac{2}{3} \cdot (v_i(b_j) + 2v_i(b_i)/r_i) && \text{Observation 13.} \\ &\leq \frac{2}{3} \cdot (r_j \cdot v_i(b_i)/r_i + 2v_i(b_i)/r_i) && \text{Observation 12.} \\ &= \frac{2r_j/r_i + 4/r_i}{3} \cdot v_i(b_i).\end{aligned}$$

Recall that agents  $i$  and  $j$  are in  $G_1$  and  $G_3$  respectively. Therefore,  $r_i \geq \varphi$  and  $r_j \leq 2$ . We then have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}_{b \sim D_j} [v_i(\mathcal{A}_j \setminus \{b\})] &\leq \frac{2r_j/r_i + 4/r_i}{3} \cdot v_i(b_i) \\ &\leq \frac{8/\varphi}{3} \cdot v_i(b_i)\end{aligned}$$

Since  $\varphi = \sqrt{3} + 1$ , we have  $\frac{8/\varphi}{3} < 1$ . Therefore,

$$\mathbb{E}_{b \sim D_j} [v_i(\mathcal{A}_j \setminus \{b\})] \leq \frac{8/\varphi}{3} \cdot v_i(b_i) < v_i(b_i) = v_i(\mathcal{A}_i).$$

Therefore the allocation is EFR. □

Now we show that at the end of Step 2, the allocation is (3/4)-EFR with respect to the agents in  $G_2$ .

**Claim 24.** By the end of Step 2, the allocation is (3/4)-EFR with respect to the agents in  $G_2$ .

*Proof.* Let  $i$  be an agent in  $G_2$ , we show that for every other agent  $j$ , we have

$$\mathbb{E}_{b \sim D_j} [v_i(\mathcal{A}_j \setminus \{b\})] \leq 4/3 \cdot v_i(\mathcal{A}_i),$$

therefore the allocation is (3/4)-EFR.

- For an agent  $j$  in  $G_1$ , only one item is allocated to this agent and the claim clearly holds.
- Consider an agent  $j$  in  $G_2$ . Recall that  $\mathcal{A}_j = \{b_j, b'_j\}$  is the bundle of this agent. We first consider the case that  $v_i(b_i) < v_i(b_j)$ . In this case the position of agent  $i$  in the topological order  $\mathcal{O}$  is before agent  $j$ . Therefore, agent  $i$  receives his second good before agent  $j$ , and we have

$$v_i(b'_i) \geq v_i(b'_j). \quad (4)$$

Moreover, by Observation 12 we have

$$\frac{v_i(b_j)}{v_i(b_i)} \leq \frac{r_j}{r_i} < \frac{\varphi}{2}. \quad (5)$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{b \sim D_j} [v_i(\mathcal{A}_j \setminus \{b\})] &= \frac{v_i(b_j) + v_i(b'_j)}{2} && \text{Claim 22.} \\ &\leq \frac{v_i(b_j) + v_i(b'_i)}{2} && \text{By (4).} \\ &< \frac{\varphi/2 \cdot v_i(b_i) + v_i(b'_i)}{2} && \text{By (5).} \\ &\leq \frac{\varphi}{4} \cdot (v_i(b_i) + v_i(b'_i)) && \text{Since } \varphi/2 > 1. \end{aligned}$$

Since  $\varphi = \sqrt{3} + 1$ , we have  $\frac{\varphi}{4} < 1$ . Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{b \sim D_j} [v_i(\mathcal{A}_j \setminus \{b\})] &\leq \frac{\varphi}{4} \cdot (v_i(b_i) + v_i(b'_i)) \\ &< v_i(b_i) + v_i(b'_i) = v_i(\mathcal{A}_i). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, if  $v_i(b_i) < v_i(b_j)$ , the allocation is EFR. The other case is when  $v_i(b_i) \geq v_i(b_j)$ . In that case we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{b \sim D_j} [v_i(\mathcal{A}_j \setminus \{b\})] &= \frac{v_i(b_j) + v_i(b'_j)}{2} && \text{Claim 22.} \\ &\leq \frac{v_i(b_j) + v_i(b_i)/r_i}{2} && \text{Observation 13.} \\ &\leq \frac{v_i(b_i) + v_i(b_i)/r_i}{2} && v_i(b_i) \geq v_i(b_j). \\ &= \frac{1 + 1/r_i}{2} \cdot v_i(b_i) \\ &< \frac{3}{4} \cdot v_i(b_i) \leq \frac{3}{4} \cdot v_i(\mathcal{A}_i), && r_i > 2. \end{aligned}$$

therefore the allocation in this case is EFR.

- The only remaining case is when agent  $j$  is in  $G_3$ . By Observation 13, valuation of  $b'_j$  and  $b''_j$  for agent  $i$

is at most  $v_i(b_i)/r_i$ . Also, by Observation 12, valuation of  $b_j$  for agent  $i$  is at most  $r_j \cdot v_i(b_i)/r_i$ . Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}_{b \sim D_j} [v_i(\mathcal{A}_j \setminus \{b\})] &= \frac{2}{3} \cdot (v_i(b_j) + v_i(b'_j) + v_i(b''_j)) && \text{Claim 22.} \\
&\leq \frac{2}{3} \cdot (v_i(b_j) + 2v_i(b_i)/r_i) && \text{Observation 13.} \\
&\leq \frac{2}{3} \cdot (r_j \cdot v_i(b_i)/r_i + 2v_i(b_i)/r_i) && \text{Observation 12.} \\
&\leq \frac{2}{3} \cdot (v_i(b_i) + 2v_i(b_i)/r_i) && r_j < r_i. \\
&= \frac{2 + 4/r_i}{3} \cdot v_i(b_i) \\
&< \frac{4}{3} \cdot v_i(b_i) \leq \frac{4}{3} \cdot v_i(\mathcal{A}_i). && r_i > 2.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore the allocation is (3/4)-EFR.

□

Now we show that by the end of Step 2, the allocation is  $(2/\varphi)$ -EFR with respect to the agents in  $G_3$ .

**Claim 25.** By the end of Step 2, the allocation is  $(2/\varphi)$ -EFR with respect to the agents in  $G_3$ .

*Proof.* Let  $i$  be an agent in  $G_3$ , we show that for every other agent  $j$ , we have

$$\mathbb{E}_{b \sim D_j} [v_i(\mathcal{A}_j \setminus \{b\})] \leq \varphi/2 \cdot v_i(\mathcal{A}_i),$$

therefore the allocation is  $(2/\varphi)$ -EFR.

- For an agent  $j$  in  $G_1$ , the claim clearly holds since this agent has only one allocated item.
- Consider an agent  $j \in G_2$ . Agent  $i$  receives his second item before agent  $j$  in Step 2 of our algorithm. Thus, we have

$$v_i(b'_i) \geq v_i(b'_j). \tag{6}$$

Also, by Observation 12, valuation of  $b_j$  for agent  $i$  is at most  $r_j \cdot v_i(b_i)$ . Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}_{b \sim D_j} [v_i(\mathcal{A}_j \setminus \{b\})] &= \frac{v_i(b_j) + v_i(b'_j)}{2} && \text{Claim 22.} \\
&\leq \frac{v_i(b_j) + v_i(b'_i)}{2} && \text{By (6).} \\
&\leq \frac{r_j v_i(b_i) + v_i(b'_i)}{2} && \text{Observation 12.} \\
&\leq \frac{\varphi v_i(b_i) + v_i(b'_i)}{2} && r_j \leq \varphi. \\
&\leq \frac{\varphi}{2} \cdot (v_i(b_i) + v_i(b'_i)) && \text{Since } \varphi > 1. \\
&\leq \frac{\varphi}{2} \cdot v_i(\mathcal{A}_i).
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore the allocation is  $(2/\varphi)$ -EFR.

- The remaining case is when agent  $j$  is in  $\mathbf{G}_3$ . Consider the case that  $v_i(b_i) < v_i(b_j)$ . In this case the position of agent  $i$  in the topological order  $\mathcal{O}$  is before agent  $j$ . Therefore, in Step 2 of our algorithm, agent  $i$  receives his second and third items before agent  $j$ , and we have the followings.

$$v_i(b'_i) \geq v_i(b'_j), \quad (7)$$

and

$$v_i(b''_i) \geq v_i(b''_j). \quad (8)$$

Also, by Observation 12, valuation of  $b_j$  for agent  $i$  is at most  $r_j \cdot v_i(b_i)$ . Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{b \sim \mathbf{D}_j} [v_i(\mathcal{A}_j \setminus \{b\})] &= \frac{2}{3} \cdot (v_i(b_j) + v_i(b'_j) + v_i(b''_j)) && \text{Claim 22.} \\ &\leq \frac{2}{3} \cdot (v_i(b_j) + v_i(b'_i) + v_i(b''_i)) && \text{By (7) and (8).} \\ &\leq \frac{2}{3} \cdot (r_j v_i(b_i) + v_i(b'_i) + v_i(b''_i)) && \text{Observation 12.} \\ &\leq \frac{2}{3} \cdot (2v_i(b_i) + v_i(b'_i) + v_i(b''_i)) && r_j \leq 2. \\ &\leq \frac{4}{3} \cdot (v_i(b_i) + v_i(b'_i) + v_i(b''_i)) \\ &= \frac{4}{3} \cdot v_i(\mathcal{A}_i). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, the allocation is  $(3/4)$ -EFR. Since  $2/\varphi < 3/4$ , the allocation is also  $(2/\varphi)$ -EFR.

The other case is when  $v_i(b_i) \geq v_i(b_j)$ . In this case agent  $i$  receives  $b'_i$  prior to when agent  $j$  receives  $b''_j$ , and we have

$$v_i(b'_i) \geq v_i(b''_j) \quad (9)$$

Also, by Observation 13, valuation of  $b'_j$  for agent  $i$  is at most  $v_i(b_i)$ . Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{b \sim \mathbf{D}_j} [v_i(\mathcal{A}_j \setminus \{b\})] &= \frac{2}{3} \cdot (v_i(b_j) + v_i(b'_j) + v_i(b''_j)) && \text{Claim 22.} \\ &\leq \frac{2}{3} \cdot (v_i(b_i) + v_i(b'_j) + v_i(b''_j)) && v_i(b_i) \geq v_i(b_j). \\ &\leq \frac{2}{3} \cdot (v_i(b_i) + v_i(b'_j) + v_i(b'_i)) && \text{By (9).} \\ &\leq \frac{2}{3} \cdot (v_i(b_i) + v_i(b_i) + v_i(b'_i)) && \text{Observation 13.} \\ &\leq \frac{4}{3} \cdot (v_i(b_i) + v_i(b'_i)) \\ &\leq \frac{4}{3} \cdot v_i(\mathcal{A}_i), \end{aligned}$$

and the allocation is  $(3/4)$ -EFR as well as  $(2/\varphi)$ -EFR.

□