

Posted Prices, Smoothness, and Combinatorial Prophet Inequalities

Paul Dütting* Michal Feldman† Thomas Kesselheim‡ Brendan Lucier§

December 12, 2016

Abstract

We present a general framework for proving combinatorial prophet inequalities and constructing posted-price mechanisms. Our framework applies to stochastic welfare optimization problems, in which buyers arrive sequentially and make utility-maximizing purchases. Our analysis takes the form of an extension theorem: we derive sufficient conditions for achieving welfare bounds in the special case of deterministic valuations, then prove that these bounds extend directly to stochastic settings. Furthermore, our welfare bounds compose in the sense that the welfare guarantees are preserved when buyers participate in many optimization problems simultaneously. Our sufficient conditions have a natural economic interpretation, and our approach is closely connected to the smoothness framework for bounding the price of anarchy of mechanisms. We show that many smooth mechanisms can be recast as posted price mechanisms with comparable performance guarantees. We illustrate the power of our framework in a range of applications, including combinatorial auctions, matroids, and sparse packing programs, where we unify and improve many of the previously known results.

*Department of Mathematics, London School of Economics, Houghton Street, London WC2A 2AE, UK, Email: p.d.duetting@lse.ac.uk.

†Blavatnic School of Computer Science, Tel Aviv University, P.O.B. 39040, Ramat Aviv, Tel Aviv, Israel. Email: mfeldman@tau.ac.il

‡Max Planck Institute for Informatics and Saarland University, Saarland Informatics Campus, Campus E1 4, 66123 Saarbrücken, Germany. Email: thomas.kesselheim@mpi-inf.mpg.de. Supported in part by the DFG through Cluster of Excellence MMCI. Part of this work was done while the author was visiting Simons Institute for the Theory of Computing.

§Microsoft Research, 1 Memorial Drive #1, Cambridge, MA 02142, USA. Email: brlucier@microsoft.com

1 Introduction

A concert is being held in a local theatre, and potential audience members begin calling to reserve seats. The organizer doesn't know individuals' values for seats in advance, but has distributional knowledge about their preferences. Some need only a single seat, others require a block of seats. Some think seats are very valuable, others are only willing to attend if tickets are very cheap. Some prefer front-row seats, some prefer to sit a few rows back, and some prefer the balcony. The organizer needs to decide which seats, if any, to allocate to each individual as they call. The goal is to maximize the total value of the seating arrangement.

Such stochastic online optimization problems have been studied for decades, initially in the context of optimal stopping theory. A natural goal is to attain “prophet inequalities” that compare the performance of an online algorithm to that of an omniscient offline planner. A classic result in stopping theory is that if the goal is to choose exactly one element (i.e., there is only a single seat to allocate), then a simple threshold strategy—choosing the first value higher than a certain pre-computed threshold—yields at least half of the expected maximum value [37, 38, 47]. Threshold algorithms are especially appealing from an economic perspective: thresholds naturally correspond to posted prices, since a self-interested individual would buy the seat if and only if their value exceeds the posted price.¹ A natural question, then, is whether more complex allocation problems (like the concert example above) can be approximated by posting prices and allowing buyers to select their preferred outcomes in sequence.

Driven in part by this connection to posted prices, prophet inequalities have seen a resurgence in theoretical computer science. Recent work has established new prophet inequalities for a variety of allocation problems, including matroids [14, 36], unit demand bidders [14, 2], and combinatorial auctions [28]. In this paper we develop a new framework for proving prophet inequalities and constructing posted-price mechanisms. Our framework, which is based on insights from economic theory, unifies and extends many existing results.

1.1 Paper Overview

This paper makes the following contributions, which are described in more detail below.

- We develop a general framework for constructing posted-price mechanisms for welfare maximization. Our results apply to arbitrary valuation structures and feasibility constraints, and can be used to derive prophet inequalities in multi-dimensional settings.
- We establish *extension* and *composition* theorems for posted prices, which allow the analyst to derive results for complex settings from simpler scenarios. We first define *balanced prices*, which directly imply welfare guarantees for a particular choice of values known in advance. Our extension theorem shows that these welfare guarantees extend automatically to stochastic problems of incomplete information, and our composition theorems show how prices for separate allocation problems can be used to construct balanced prices for a combined problem.
- We establish a connection between balanced prices and the *smoothness* framework for bounding the price of anarchy of non-truthful auctions [45, 48]. We show that many smooth mechanisms have natural analogs as posted-price mechanisms with similar welfare guarantees.

¹In the language of mechanism design, posted-price mechanisms are incentive compatible in dominant strategies.

- We demonstrate the power of our framework via applications to prominent optimization problems from the literature (such as combinatorial auctions, matroid constraints, and sparse packing integer programs). In addition to unifying many results in the literature, we use our framework to establish new bounds on the power of posted prices and to develop new approaches for constructing such prices in polynomial time.

1.2 Contribution and Techniques

Balanced Prices There is a natural tension when setting prices for an allocation problem. If prices are too low then low-value agents might purchase and prevent subsequent, higher-valued agents from being served. If prices are too high then resources might go unsold, leaving value on the table. The starting point of our analysis is the definition of (α, β) -balanced prices, which avoids both pitfalls and can be used to construct a posted-price mechanism with approximation factor $(\alpha\beta + 1)$ for the full-information setting (where all buyer preferences are known in advance).² Balancedness first requires that the total price of an allocation is at least $\frac{1}{\alpha}$ times the difference between optimal welfare in the original problem and in the residual problem. Second, the total price of any allocation in any residual problem should be at most β times the optimal achievable welfare in the residual problem.

Extension and Composition An advantage of balanced prices is that it is not necessary to analyze the stochastic setting directly. We prove that the full-information welfare bounds implied by balancedness extend directly to stochastic settings.³ This extension theorem is constructive: to generate prices for a certain valuation distribution \mathcal{D} , it suffices to generate (α, β) -balanced prices for each deterministic valuation profile in the support, reduce these prices by a certain constant factor, then take the expectation of these prices over valuations drawn from the distribution. Our composition theorems show that if two allocation problems admit balanced prices, then these prices remain balanced in a combined problem. In particular, balancedness is preserved under XOS composition (as in Syrgkanis and Tardos [48]), enabling the derivation of posted-price mechanisms for complex settings by analyzing simpler base markets.

Connection to Price of Anarchy Our analysis of balanced prices is based on insights from auction theory. We bound separately the portion of the welfare covered by the thresholds themselves (which corresponds to revenue), and any additional value in excess of the thresholds (which corresponds to buyer utility). Interpreting the latter as utility is convenient for our analysis: a buyer’s utility is always at least the utility obtainable from any outcome available for purchase, and this fact implies lower bounds on welfare.

A similar analysis is central to the smoothness framework [45, 48], which establishes price of anarchy guarantees by analyzing the utility of “deviation” strategies for agents in an auction. Indeed, we find that many smooth mechanisms have natural analogs as posted-price mechanisms with similar welfare guarantees. This provides a natural tradeoff: smooth mechanisms tend to be prior-independent but not incentive compatible, so that the onus is on the agents to determine their rational play given their beliefs about the other participants. On the other hand, posted-price

²Our notion of balanced prices is closely related to a similar notion due to Kleinberg and Weinberg [36], which was defined for stochastic settings directly.

³The definition of balancedness allows prices to be adaptive and/or buyer-specific, but if the full-information prices are anonymous, static, or order-oblivious, these properties are preserved by the extension result as well.

mechanisms must be tuned to the market, but are dominant strategy incentive compatible (and in fact satisfy the even stronger notion of obvious strategyproofness [41]).

For single-parameter problems, we show that if a greedy or welfare-maximizing mechanism is smooth, then it implies the existence of balanced prices. The driving force behind this result is the notion of *permeability*, which characterizes smoothness in binary, single-parameter settings [21]. More generally, we show that (not necessarily single-parameter) smooth welfare-maximizing mechanisms can be used to construct balanced posted prices under some mild technical conditions; this last result requires a modified outcome-based interpretation of smoothness, as we describe in Section 5.3.⁴ Typical smoothness proofs satisfy this stronger requirement, and we show by means of a counter-example that some such strengthening is necessary.

Computation Our extension theorem reduces price computation in a stochastic setting to the problem of finding (α, β) -balanced prices for deterministic valuations. The approximation guarantee in our extension theorem degrades gracefully if the prices are perturbed, so one can use sampling to estimate the appropriate prices rather than computing expected prices directly.

When computing balanced prices, it is sometimes useful to extend the definition of balancedness to be with respect to an arbitrary allocation rule **ALG**, rather than the optimal allocation. Prices that are (α, β) -balanced with respect to **ALG** yield an $(\alpha\beta + 1)$ approximation to the welfare of **ALG**. This is computationally convenient when using allocations to derive prices, as we do in many of our applications. This black-box approach leads to an additional loss in welfare: the original loss due to balancedness, and another loss due to the approximation algorithm. In some of our applications, it is possible to further improve the computational bounds by “skipping” the second loss. This is enabled by applying our balancedness analysis directly to a fractional relaxation of the allocation problem, and then observing that the welfare bounds carry over to posted-price mechanisms for the integral problem as well.

1.3 Applications

We illustrate the power and flexibility of our framework for a wide range of applications, unifying and improving many of the previously best-known pricing algorithms and prophet inequalities from the literature. Our results appear below and also in Table 1. Notably, our framework is flexible enough so that many of our results can be derived in multiple ways.

Combinatorial Auctions We show how to re-derive the existence of a 2-approximate posted-price mechanism for XOS preferences⁵ shown in [28] in three different ways. It can be derived by establishing $(1, 1)$ -balanced prices (essentially recovering the result in [28]), or by reducing balancedness to outcome smoothness of a first-price auction. The easiest way, however, to obtain this result is by establishing $(1, 1)$ -balanced prices for the simple (full-information) single-item setting, then applying the composition and extension theorems. We also show how to compute

⁴Similar but different outcome-based smoothness notions were considered in [44, 16], where they were used to establish learning results for auction mechanisms.

⁵XOS preferences, also known as fractionally subadditive valuations, are a generalization of submodular valuations. They can be represented via a collection of additive functions. The value for any given set of items is the maximum over these additive functions.

Feasibility Constraint	Valuation Class	Pricing Model	Upper Bound	Query Model
Combinatorial Auction	XOS	Static, anonymous item prices	$\frac{2e}{e-1}$ [28] 2 [this work]	XOS, Demand
Combinatorial Auction	MPH- k	Static, anonymous item prices	$O(k^2)$ [28] $4k - 2$ [this work]	MPH, Demand
Matroid	Submodular	Dynamic prices	2 (existential) 4 (computational)	Value
Knapsack	Additive	Static, anonymous prices	3	Explicit
d -Sparse PIPs	Additive	Static, anonymous prices	$8d$	Explicit

Table 1: Applications to allocation problems. All results are order-oblivious. Results are computational unless otherwise stated. The query model refers to the valuation access needed for the computational upper bounds, where “explicit” indicates that valuations can be described explicitly.

$(1, 1)$ -balanced prices in polynomially many demand and XOS queries⁶ to the valuations, improving upon the previous best-known $\frac{2e}{e-1}$ -approximation [28]. This improved computational result applies the flexibility of our framework: we compute balanced prices for fractional allocations, and prove that the resulting welfare bounds apply also to the integral allocation problem.

We also consider general combinatorial auctions with bounded set size k . For this problem we show how to compute balanced prices that yield a $(4k - 2)$ approximation using polynomially many demand queries. This improves upon the best-known $O(k^2)$ -approximation [28], and matches (up to constant factors) the best-known offline algorithmic solutions. In fact, this computational result applies to the more general class of MPH- k preferences [26], which corresponds to XOS preferences when $k = 1$ and capture more and more pronounced complementarities as k grows larger.⁷ Here too, we improve the best-known bounds.

Matroids We observe that the existence of a (computational) 2-approximate posted-price mechanism for matroids [36] follows directly from outcome-smoothness of the first-price greedy mechanism. We also show that the prices defined in [36] for matroids (and the intersection of k matroids) yield balanced prices that guarantee a 2 (resp. $4k - 2$) approximation.

Going beyond the known results, we first generalize the arguments in [36] so that they establish $(1, 1)$ -balanced prices for settings where players may receive more than one element of the ground set and have additive preferences. We then use our composition result to extend this to XOS preferences. We also show how to make these results computational by basing the prices on the greedy algorithm, rather than the algorithm that maximizes welfare. Putting this all together, we show how to compute prices that yield a factor 4 approximation for submodular preferences. This significantly extends prior prophet inequality results for matroids, in which values are single-dimensional and each agent can either be served (or not) at each step.

⁶Given a set of items, an XOS query returns the *supporting additive valuation*; i.e., the additive function that assigns the highest value to this set of items.

⁷The computational result requires an appropriate MPH- k query oracle, which generalizes the XOS query oracle introduced above; see Appendix I for details.

Sparse PIPs Finally, to demonstrate the ease with which our framework leads to new results, we consider sparse packing integer programs. In a d -sparse packing integer program, agent allocations are subject to a collection of linear packing constraints. The sparseness condition is that each allocation appears non-trivially in at most d constraints. We use our framework to design balanced prices for d -sparse PIPs, resulting in an $O(d)$ welfare approximation. For the special case of allocation subject to a knapsack constraint, where the value and weight of each agent are drawn from a joint distribution and no single agent demands more than half of the total capacity, we show how to construct (1,2)-balanced prices, implying a factor 3 approximation. To the best of our knowledge, these are novel scenarios in which threshold-based prophet inequalities were not previously known.

1.4 Related Work

Prophet inequalities and their applicability as posted-price mechanisms were (re-)discovered in theoretical computer science by [31]. Subsequently, threshold-based prophet inequalities and posted-price mechanisms were developed for matroids and matroid intersection [14, 36, 6], polymatroids [22], unit-demand bidders [14, 2], and combinatorial auctions [2, 28].

Not all prophet inequalities in the literature are based on explicit thresholds. Examples include prophet inequalities for the generalized assignment problem [3, 4], matroids and matroid intersection [30], and for general binary feasibility constraints [46]. Since these results are not established using threshold algorithms, they are not directly interpretable as posted-price mechanisms.

On the other hand, many posted-price mechanisms from the literature are constructed either without explicit reference to prophet inequalities or via different techniques. Chawla et al. [13] developed posted-price mechanisms for unit-demand buyers. Posted-price mechanisms have subsequently been developed for a variety of other auction settings [19, 7, 12, 5].

Another related literature is the study of simple versus optimal mechanisms in algorithmic game theory. Originally, this line of work focused on strategyproof mechanisms, trying to quantify how well an optimal strategyproof mechanism can be approximated by a simple strategyproof mechanism, e.g., for revenue maximization [32, 18]. Since then, the study of simple mechanisms has been extended beyond strategyproof mechanisms and revenue maximization. Simple mechanisms have been proposed for welfare maximization and analyzed in equilibrium. Prominent examples include the simultaneous item auctions [15, 8, 34, 27, 23], the generalized second price (GSP) auction for selling online ads [25, 49, 40, 11], and the single bid auction [17, 9]. These auctions tend to have simple rules, but their equilibria can be significantly more complicated. For example, it has been shown that the strategic behavior induced by simultaneous item auctions can be quite complex [10, 20, 16].

The notion of smooth games was introduced by Roughgarden [45] as a tool for bounding the price of anarchy, which measures the inefficiency that can be incurred in equilibrium. This notion has been extended to mechanisms by Syrgkanis and Tardos [48], who also showed that simultaneous composition of smooth mechanisms preserves the smoothness property. The notion of permeability has been introduced by Duetting and Kesselheim [21], who showed that in some settings, permeability essentially captures smoothness; similar notions have been used in [42, 48, 33] as sufficient conditions. Price of anarchy bounds that apply to a broad class of algorithms have been given for greedy algorithms [42, 43] and for algorithms based on the relax-and-round paradigm [24]. The resulting welfare bounds can improve as market instances grow large [29].

2 Model and Notation

Problem Formulation We assume there is a set N of n agents. We typically index agents so that $N = [n] = \{1, \dots, n\}$. For each agent $i \in N$ there is an outcome space X_i . We assume that X_i contains a null outcome \emptyset . We write $X = X_1 \times \dots \times X_n$ for the joint outcome space, and refer to an element $\mathbf{x} \in X$ as an outcome (or allocation) profile. Given outcome profile \mathbf{x} and a subset of agents $S \subseteq N$, we will write \mathbf{x}_S for the outcome in which each $i \in S$ receives x_i and each $i \notin S$ receives \emptyset . There is a subset $\mathcal{F} \subseteq X$ of *feasible* outcomes. We will assume that \mathcal{F} is downward-closed, so that if $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{F}$ then also $\mathbf{x}_S \in \mathcal{F}$ for all $S \subseteq N$.

These definitions capture a broad range of problems, and it is instructive to have a concrete running example in mind. One example is a combinatorial auction, where there is a set of goods M . An outcome for agent i is a subset of the goods, i.e., $X_i = 2^M$, and an outcome is feasible if it assigns each good to at most one agent, i.e., $\mathcal{F} = \{\mathbf{x} \mid x_i \cap x_j = \emptyset \forall i \neq j\}$. The null outcome \emptyset is simply the empty set. As a second example consider a binary feasibility problem subject to a matroid constraint $\mathcal{M} = (N, \mathcal{I})$, with independent sets $\mathcal{I} \subseteq 2^N$. This type of problem is modelled by letting $X_i = \{0, 1\}$ with 0 taking the role of the null outcome \emptyset , and by taking \mathcal{F} to be the set of characteristic vectors of the independent sets \mathcal{I} .

A *valuation function* for agent i is a function $v_i: X_i \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$. We will assume values are bounded, and without loss of generality scaled to lie in $[0, 1]$. We consider a Bayesian setting of incomplete information: each agent i has a private valuation v_i , drawn independently from a publicly known distribution \mathcal{D}_i over a set V_i of permitted valuations. We write $\mathcal{D} = \mathcal{D}_1 \times \dots \times \mathcal{D}_n$ for the product distribution over the set $V = V_1 \times \dots \times V_n$ of valuation profiles. When it is clear from the context that we are referring to \mathcal{D} , we will suppress \mathcal{D} from our notation when taking expectations or probabilities over valuation profiles. Note that the full-information setting is the special case in which each \mathcal{D}_i is a point-mass distribution. Agent utilities are quasilinear: if agent i receives outcome x_i and makes a payment π_i , his utility is $u_i = v_i(x_i) - \pi_i$.

Given valuation profile $\mathbf{v} = (v_1, \dots, v_n)$, the *welfare* of outcome \mathbf{x} is $\mathbf{v}(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_i v_i(x_i)$. An outcome rule ALG maps each valuation profile to a feasible outcome. $\text{ALG}_i(\mathbf{v})$ denotes the outcome of agent i on input \mathbf{v} . We will write $\text{OPT}(\mathbf{v}, \mathcal{F}) = \arg \max_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{F}} \{\mathbf{v}(\mathbf{x})\}$ for the welfare-maximizing outcome rule for \mathcal{F} , omitting the dependence on \mathcal{F} when it is clear from context.

Pricing Rules and Mechanisms A *pricing rule* is a profile of functions $\mathbf{p} = (p_1, \dots, p_n)$ that assign prices to outcomes. We write $p_i(x_i \mid \mathbf{y})$ for the (non-negative) price assigned to outcome $x_i \in X_i$, offered to agent i , given partial allocation $\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{F}$. Define $p_i(x_i) = p_i(x_i \mid \emptyset)$ for convenience. We require that $p_i(x_i \mid \mathbf{y}) = \infty$ for any x_i such that $(x_i, \mathbf{y}_{-i}) \notin \mathcal{F}$. A pricing rule is said to be *monotone non-decreasing* if $p_i(x_i \mid \mathbf{y}) \geq p_i(x_i \mid \mathbf{y}_S)$ for all i , $x_i \in X_i$, $\mathbf{y} \in X$, $(x_i, \mathbf{y}_{-i}) \in \mathcal{F}$, and $S \subseteq N$. In general, we allow prices to be dynamic and discriminatory. We refer to prices that do not depend on the partial allocation (apart from feasibility) as *static* and to prices that do not depend on the identity of the agent as *anonymous*.

A *posted-price mechanism* is defined by a pricing rule \mathbf{p} and an ordering over the agents. The agents are approached sequentially. Each agent i is presented the menu of prices determined by p_i , given all previous allocations, and selects a utility-maximizing outcome. Such a mechanism is listed as Algorithm 1. A posted-price mechanism is *order-oblivious* if it does not require the agents to be processed in a specific order. In all of the applications we consider, the mechanisms we construct are order-oblivious.

Algorithm 1: POSTED-PRICE MECHANISM (fixed order), parameterized by pricing rule \mathbf{p}

Input: N (with fixed indexing), \mathbf{v}

Output: $\mathbf{x}(\mathbf{v}) \in \mathcal{F}$, $\pi \in \mathbb{R}^n$

$\hat{\mathbf{x}} = (\emptyset, \emptyset, \dots, \emptyset)$ // after iteration i , \hat{x}_i is an allocation to agents 1 through i

for $i \leftarrow 1$ **to** n **do**

// Post prices conditional on $\hat{\mathbf{x}}$, and let player i choose a utility-maximizing outcome
 Choose $x_i \in \arg \max_{x_i} (v_i(x_i) - p_i(x_i | \hat{\mathbf{x}}))$
 $\pi_i \leftarrow p_i(x_i | \hat{\mathbf{x}})$, $\hat{x}_i \leftarrow x_i$

return $\mathbf{x}(\mathbf{v}) = \hat{\mathbf{x}}$, charge payments (π_1, \dots, π_n)

3 Balanced Prices and an Extension Theorem

In this section we introduce the formal definition of an (α, β) -balanced pricing rule. We prove that such pricing rules can be used to construct near-optimal posted-price mechanisms in Bayesian settings. This is an *extension theorem* in the sense that the balancedness property is with respect to a particular valuation profile. We will address the question of how to find balanced pricing rules in later sections.

It will be useful to define a notion of feasibility given a partial allocation. Given outcome profile $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{F}$, we say that the set of outcome profiles $\mathcal{H} \subseteq X$ is *exchange compatible* with \mathbf{x} if for all $\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{H}$ and all $i \in N$, we have $(y_i, \mathbf{x}_{-i}) \in \mathcal{F}$. For example, in a combinatorial auction, the set of outcomes that allocate only items that are not allocated in \mathbf{x} — i.e., $\mathcal{H} = \{\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{F} : (\bigcup_i y_i) \cap (\bigcup_i x_i) = \emptyset\}$ — is exchange compatible with \mathbf{x} . For a binary feasibility problem subject to matroid constraints, the set of characteristic vectors of independent sets after contracting \mathbf{x} is exchange compatible with \mathbf{x} . We call a family of sets $(\mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{x}})_{\mathbf{x} \in X}$ exchange compatible if $\mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{x}}$ is exchange compatible with \mathbf{x} for all $\mathbf{x} \in X$.

We are now ready to proceed with the definition of balancedness. Recall that we write $\mathbf{x}_{[i-1]}$ for allocation \mathbf{x} with the outcomes of agents i, \dots, n set to \emptyset .

Definition 3.1. Let $\alpha > 0$, $\beta \geq 0$. Given a set of feasible outcomes \mathcal{F} and a valuation profile \mathbf{v} , a pricing rule \mathbf{p} is (α, β) -balanced with respect to an allocation rule ALG , an exchange-compatible family of sets $(\mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{x}})_{\mathbf{x} \in X}$, and an indexing of the players $i = 1, \dots, n$ if for all $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{F}$

- (a) $\sum_{i \in N} p_i(x_i | \mathbf{x}_{[i-1]}) \geq \frac{1}{\alpha} \cdot (\mathbf{v}(\text{ALG}(\mathbf{v})) - \mathbf{v}(\text{OPT}(\mathbf{v}, \mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{x}})))$, and
- (b) for all $\mathbf{x}' \in \mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{x}}$: $\sum_{i \in N} p_i(x'_i | \mathbf{x}_{[i-1]}) \leq \beta \cdot \mathbf{v}(\text{OPT}(\mathbf{v}, \mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{x}}))$.

It will often be convenient to think of a pricing rule as a mapping from a valuation profile to a choice of prices. In this case, we will sometimes omit the dependency on the exchange-compatible family of sets and say that a collection of pricing rules $(p^{\mathbf{v}})_{\mathbf{v} \in V}$ is (α, β) -balanced if there exists a choice of exchange-compatible sets $(\mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{x}})_{\mathbf{x} \in X}$ such that, for each \mathbf{v} , the pricing rule $p^{\mathbf{v}}$ is balanced with respect to $(\mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{x}})_{\mathbf{x} \in X}$.

We think of $\mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{x}}$ as the residual allocation problem that remains after the allocation \mathbf{x} has been made. We note that the definition provides flexibility in the precise choice of $\mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{x}}$. As $\mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{x}}$ becomes more permissive, both inequalities become easier to satisfy since $\mathbf{v}(\text{OPT}(\mathbf{v}, \mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{x}}))$ increases. On the other hand, a larger set $\mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{x}}$ means that the second condition must be satisfied for more outcomes $\mathbf{x}' \in \mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{x}}$.

When $\text{ALG} = \text{OPT}$, the two conditions have a particularly natural interpretation. The first condition is a lower bound on the total price for an outcome \mathbf{x} , in terms of the loss in total welfare suffered by committing to this outcome. The second condition provides an upper bound on the prices for alternative outcomes \mathbf{x}' in terms of the optimal social welfare that is achievable after committing to \mathbf{x} .

Example 3.1 (Single-item auction). Consider the case that a single item can be allocated to one of the agents. This corresponds to the original prophet-inequality setting, to a trivial combinatorial auction, and also to a 1-uniform matroid. In this case, $X_i = \{0, 1\}$ for all i , $\mathcal{F} = \{\mathbf{x} \mid \sum_i x_i \leq 1\}$. We now set $p_i(1 \mid \mathbf{x}) = \max_\ell v_\ell$ if \mathbf{x} does not allocate the item, ∞ otherwise; $p_i(0 \mid \mathbf{x}) = 0$ for all \mathbf{x} . This corresponds to a fixed posted price of $\max_\ell v_\ell$ on the item.

We claim that these prices are $(1, 1)$ -balanced with respect to the optimal allocation (i.e., $\text{ALG} = \text{OPT}$) and to the canonical residual market $\mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{x}}$ (defined by $\mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{x}} = \mathcal{F}$ if \mathbf{x} does not allocate the item and $\mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{x}} = \emptyset$ otherwise). To observe this, let \mathbf{x} be an arbitrary allocation profile. If \mathbf{x} allocates the item, then $\mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{x}} = \emptyset$ and thus Condition (b) is trivially fulfilled. For Condition (a), we observe that $\mathbf{v}(\text{OPT}(\mathbf{v}, \mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{x}})) = 0$ and that $\mathbf{v}(\text{OPT}(\mathbf{v})) = \max_\ell v_\ell = \sum_i p_i(x_i \mid \mathbf{x}_{[i-1]})$, because exactly one buyer pays $\max_\ell v_\ell$. If \mathbf{x} does not allocate the item, then $\mathbf{v}(\text{OPT}(\mathbf{v}, \mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{x}})) = \mathbf{v}(\text{OPT}(\mathbf{v}))$, making Condition (a) trivial. For Condition (b), we use that in \mathbf{x}' at most one buyer is allocated the item. Therefore, $\sum_i p_i(x'_i \mid \mathbf{x}_{[i-1]}) \leq \max_\ell v_\ell = \mathbf{v}(\text{OPT}(\mathbf{v})) = \mathbf{v}(\text{OPT}(\mathbf{v}, \mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{x}}))$.

The definition of (α, β) -balancedness captures sufficient conditions for a posted-price mechanism to guarantee high welfare when agents have valuation profile \mathbf{v} . Our interest in (α, β) -balanced pricing rules comes from the fact that this result extends to Bayesian settings. We first prove this result for a given valuation profile \mathbf{v} as a warm-up (Theorem 3.1), and then provide the extension to Bayesian settings (Theorem 3.2).

Theorem 3.1. *Suppose that the pricing rule \mathbf{p} for feasible outcomes \mathcal{F} and valuation profile \mathbf{v} is (α, β) -balanced with respect to allocation rule ALG , exchange-compatible family of sets $(\mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{x}})_{\mathbf{x} \in X}$, and indexing of the players $i = 1, \dots, n$. Then for $\delta = \frac{\alpha}{1+\alpha\beta}$, the posted price mechanism with price rule $\delta\mathbf{p}$ generates welfare at least $\frac{1}{1+\alpha\beta} \cdot \mathbf{v}(\text{ALG}(\mathbf{v}))$ when approaching players with valuation profile \mathbf{v} , in the order they are indexed.*

Proof. Let $\delta \in (0, 1)$ be a constant to be fixed later. Write \mathbf{x} for the allocation returned by the posted-price mechanism with prices $\delta\mathbf{p}$ on input \mathbf{v} . Let $\mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{x}}$ be the exchange-compatible set associated with \mathbf{x} , and let $\mathbf{x}' = \text{OPT}(\mathbf{v}, \mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{x}})$.

We will proceed in two steps. We will use Property (b) of balancedness to show a lower bound on the utilities of the players, and Property (a) to show a lower bound on the revenue of the posted-price mechanism. We will then add these together to obtain a bound on the social welfare.

Utility bound: The first step is to provide a lower bound on the sum of the players' utilities. Since players pick their favorite outcome, we can lower bound the sum of the utilities by letting some of the players purchase a potentially suboptimal outcome. Since agent i could choose x'_i when selecting an outcome to purchase (since $\mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{x}}$ is exchange compatible with \mathbf{x} , and hence with $\mathbf{x}_{[i-1]}$), his utility from the posted-price mechanism is at least

$$u_i \geq v_i(x'_i) - \delta \cdot p_i(x'_i \mid \mathbf{x}_{[i-1]}).$$

Summing the previous inequality over all agents and applying Property (b) we get

$$\sum_i u_i \geq \sum_i v_i(x'_i) - \sum_i \delta \cdot p_i(x'_i \mid \mathbf{x}_{[i-1]}) \geq \mathbf{v}(\text{OPT}(\mathbf{v}, \mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{x}})) - \delta\beta \cdot \mathbf{v}(\text{OPT}(\mathbf{v}, \mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{x}})).$$

Revenue bound: Using Property (a) and the fact that the posted-price mechanism generates outcome profile \mathbf{x} with pricing rule $\delta \mathbf{p}$, we have that its revenue is at least

$$\sum_i \delta \cdot p_i(x_i \mid \mathbf{x}_{[i-1]}) \geq \frac{\delta}{\alpha} \cdot [\mathbf{v}(\text{ALG}(\mathbf{v})) - \mathbf{v}(\text{OPT}(\mathbf{v}, \mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{x}}))].$$

Combination: By quasi-linearity we can rewrite the social welfare of the posted-price mechanism as the sum of the agent utilities plus the revenue. Using $\delta = \alpha/(1 + \alpha\beta)$ yields

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{v}(\mathbf{x}) &\geq \sum_{i \in N} u_i + \sum_{i \in N} \delta \cdot p_i(x_i \mid \mathbf{x}_{[i-1]}) \\ &\geq (1 - \delta\beta) \cdot \mathbf{v}(\text{OPT}(\mathbf{v}, \mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{x}})) + \frac{\delta}{\alpha} \cdot [\mathbf{v}(\text{ALG}(\mathbf{v})) - \mathbf{v}(\text{OPT}(\mathbf{v}, \mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{x}}))] \\ &= \frac{1}{1 + \alpha\beta} \cdot \mathbf{v}(\text{ALG}(\mathbf{v})) . \end{aligned} \quad \square$$

Theorem 3.1 extends to Bayesian settings by taking an expectation over the prices suggested by Theorem 3.1. This is cast in the following extension theorem, which we prove in Appendix A.

Theorem 3.2. *Suppose that the collection of pricing rules $(\mathbf{p}^{\mathbf{v}})_{\mathbf{v} \in V}$ for feasible outcomes \mathcal{F} and valuation profiles $\mathbf{v} \in V$ is (α, β) -balanced with respect to allocation rule ALG and indexing of the players $i = 1, \dots, n$. Then for $\delta = \frac{\alpha}{1 + \alpha\beta}$ the posted-price mechanism with pricing rule $\delta \mathbf{p}$, where $p_i(x_i \mid \mathbf{y}) = \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\mathbf{v}}}[p_i^{\tilde{\mathbf{v}}}(x_i \mid \mathbf{y})]$, generates welfare at least $\frac{1}{1 + \alpha\beta} \cdot \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{v}}[\mathbf{v}(\text{ALG}(\mathbf{v}))]$ when approaching players in the order they are indexed.*

The general proof technique is to follow the steps of the proof of Theorem 3.1 and to take expectations over the respective quantities. However, prices are defined based on independently sampled valuations $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}$. To ensure that terms cancel out as in the proof of Theorem 3.1, we define \mathbf{x}' suitably based on another independently resampled valuation profile \mathbf{v}' . This additional randomness ensures independence between what the buyers choose to buy and what is available for them to purchase.

We note that if the pricing rule is (α, β) -balanced with respect to *any* indexing of the players, then the previous result implies the existence of a posted-price mechanism that approaches the players in any order. Moreover, our construction used to prove the previous result is such that if the pricing rule is fixed and/or anonymous for every \mathbf{v} , then the posted-price mechanism inherits that property as well.

Remark 3.1 (Perturbed prices and computability). We note that if the price rule \mathbf{p} in Theorem 3.2 is perturbed to some $\hat{\mathbf{p}}$ with $\|\mathbf{p} - \hat{\mathbf{p}}\|_{\infty} < \epsilon$, then the welfare guarantee degrades by at most an additive $O(n\epsilon)$ term. This implies that appropriate prices can therefore be computed for bounded values using standard sampling techniques and concentration bounds, as has been observed for various posted price settings [13, 28]. In other words, assuming one can efficiently compute prices for a fixed valuation profile, then one can also compute prices for the Bayesian setting by repeatedly sampling a valuation profile \mathbf{v} , computing prices $\mathbf{p}^{\mathbf{v}}$, and using the average prices.

In what follows, we provide an alternative definition of balancedness, in which Property (b) is refined. This definition will be useful for some applications, as exemplified in Section 6.

Definition 3.2. Let $\alpha > 0, \beta_1, \beta_2 \geq 0$. Given a set of feasible outcomes \mathcal{F} and a valuation profile \mathbf{v} , a pricing rule \mathbf{p} is *weakly* $(\alpha, \beta_1, \beta_2)$ -balanced with respect to allocation rule **ALG**, an exchange-compatible family of sets $(\mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{x}})_{\mathbf{x} \in X}$, and an indexing of the players $i = 1, \dots, n$ if, for all $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{F}$,

- (a) $\sum_{i \in N} p_i(x_i | \mathbf{x}_{[i-1]}) \geq \frac{1}{\alpha} \cdot (\mathbf{v}(\mathbf{ALG}(\mathbf{v})) - \mathbf{v}(\mathbf{OPT}(\mathbf{v}, \mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{x}})))$, and
- (b) for all $\mathbf{x}' \in \mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{x}}$: $\sum_{i \in N} p_i(x'_i | \mathbf{x}_{[i-1]}) \leq \beta_1 \cdot \mathbf{v}(\mathbf{OPT}(\mathbf{v}, \mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{x}})) + \beta_2 \cdot \mathbf{v}(\mathbf{ALG}(\mathbf{v}))$.

The following theorem specifies the refined bound on the welfare that is obtained by weakly $(\alpha, \beta_1, \beta_2)$ -balanced pricing rules. Its proof appears in Appendix A.

Theorem 3.3. *Suppose that the collection of pricing rules $(\mathbf{p}^{\mathbf{v}})_{\mathbf{v} \in V}$ for feasible outcomes \mathcal{F} and valuation profiles $\mathbf{v} \in V$ is weakly $(\alpha, \beta_1, \beta_2)$ -balanced with respect to allocation **ALG** and indexing of the players $i = 1, \dots, n$ with $\beta_1 + \beta_2 \geq \frac{1}{\alpha}$. Then for $\delta = \frac{1}{\beta_1 + \max\{2\beta_2, 1/\alpha\}}$ the posted-price mechanism with pricing rule $\delta \mathbf{p}$, where $p_i(x_i | \mathbf{y}) = \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\mathbf{v}}} [p_i^{\tilde{\mathbf{v}}}(x_i | \mathbf{y})]$, generates welfare at least $\frac{1}{\alpha(2\beta_1 + 4\beta_2)} \cdot \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{v}}[\mathbf{v}(\mathbf{ALG}(\mathbf{v}))]$ when approaching players in the order they are indexed.*

4 Composition

In this section we show that balanced prices are *composable*, in the sense that balanced prices for separate markets remain balanced when the markets are combined. We consider two forms of composition. The first is a composition of preferences: it shows how to extend from a class of valuations V to any maximum over valuations from V . The second shows how to compose allocations across different markets, where agents have additive preferences across markets. Together these two composition results capture XOS composition, in the sense of [48].

Closure under Maximum Given an arbitrary valuation space V_i for player i , we consider its extension V_i^{\max} , which contains all functions $v_i^{\max}: X_i \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ for which there is a finite set $\{v_i^1, \dots, v_i^m\} \in V_i$ such that $v_i^{\max}(x_i) = \max_{\ell} v_i^{\ell}(x_i)$ for all $x_i \in X_i$. We say that a valuation profile $\tilde{\mathbf{v}} \in V$ is a *supporting* valuation profile for allocation \mathbf{x} and valuation profile $\mathbf{v} \in V^{\max}$ if $\tilde{v}_i \leq v_i$ and $\tilde{v}_i(x_i) = v_i(x_i)$ for all i . The following composition theorem infers the existence of an (α, β) -balanced pricing rule for **OPT** on V^{\max} from the existence of an (α, β) -balanced pricing rule for **OPT** on V .

Theorem 4.1. *Suppose that for each $\mathbf{v} \in V$ there exists a pricing rule $\mathbf{p}^{\mathbf{v}}$ that is (α, β) -balanced with respect to \mathbf{v} , the optimal allocation rule **OPT**, and the exchange-compatible family of sets $(\mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{x}})_{\mathbf{x} \in X}$. For each $\mathbf{v} \in V^{\max}$ let $\tilde{\mathbf{v}} \in V$ be a supporting valuation profile for **OPT**(\mathbf{v}). Then the pricing rule $\mathbf{p}^{\tilde{\mathbf{v}}}$ is (α, β) -balanced with respect to \mathbf{v} , **OPT**, and $(\mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{x}})_{\mathbf{x} \in X}$.*

Closure under Addition Suppose there are m separate allocation problems, each with feasibility constraint \mathcal{F}^{ℓ} over allocation space $X^{\ell} = X_1^{\ell} \times \dots \times X_n^{\ell}$. The joint problem is then defined over the product allocation space $X = X^1 \times \dots \times X^m$, with feasibility constraint $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}^1 \times \dots \times \mathcal{F}^m$. We say that a valuation $v_i: X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is *additive* if it is defined by a (not necessarily additive) valuation function v_i^{ℓ} for each outcome $x_i^{\ell} \in X_i^{\ell}$, and for an outcome $x_i = (x_i^1, \dots, x_i^m) \in X_i$, the value of x_i is given by $v_i(x_i) = \sum_{\ell=1}^m v_i^{\ell}(x_i^{\ell})$. The following composition theorem infers the existence of an (α, β) -balanced pricing rule for **OPT** on \mathcal{F} from the existence of (α, β) -balanced pricing rules for **OPT** ^{ℓ} on each allocation problem \mathcal{F}^{ℓ} .

Theorem 4.2. *Suppose that \mathbf{v} is additive over a set of allocation problems, and for each individual allocation problem there exists a pricing rule $\mathbf{p}^{\mathbf{v}^\ell}$ that is (α, β) -balanced with respect to \mathbf{v}^ℓ , the optimal allocation rule OPT^ℓ on \mathcal{F}^ℓ , and the exchange-compatible family of sets $(\mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{x}^\ell}^\ell)_{\mathbf{x}^\ell \in X^\ell}$. Then the pricing rule $\mathbf{p} = \sum_{\ell=1}^m \mathbf{p}^{\mathbf{v}^\ell}$ is (α, β) -balanced with respect to \mathbf{v} , OPT on \mathcal{F} , and $(\prod_{i=1}^m \mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{x}^\ell}^\ell)_{\mathbf{x} \in X}$.*

Both of our composition theorems apply more generally to pricing rules that are balanced with respect to suitable allocation rules ALG . We give the exact requirements of suitability in Appendix B and show that the optimal allocation rule satisfies them. We then establish the assertions of Theorems 4.1 and 4.2. We note that both Theorem 4.1 and Theorem 4.2 (and their generalizations in the appendix) also apply to weakly balanced pricing rules.

5 Connection to Smoothness

In this section we explore the connection between balanced prices and mechanism smoothness. We will see that balancedness is generally a stronger requirement, but at the same time we will argue that typical smoothness proofs translate into posted price guarantees and present pretty general reductions from smooth mechanisms to balanced prices.

We first recall the definition of a smooth mechanism. A (possibly indirect) mechanism \mathcal{M}_π for an allocation problem π is defined by a bid space $B = B_1 \times \dots \times B_n$, an allocation rule $f : B \rightarrow \mathcal{F}$, and a payment rule $P : B \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n$. Typically, mechanisms are defined for a collection of problems Π , in which case we will simply refer to the mechanism as \mathcal{M} .

Definition 5.1 (Syrgkanis and Tardos [48]). Mechanism \mathcal{M}_π is (λ, μ) -smooth for $\lambda, \mu \geq 0$ if for any valuation profile $\mathbf{v} \in V$ and any bid profile $\mathbf{b} \in B$ there exists a bid $b'_i(\mathbf{v}, b_i) \in B_i$ for each player $i \in N$ such that

$$\sum_{i \in N} u_i(b'_i, \mathbf{b}_{-i}) \geq \lambda \cdot \mathbf{v}(\text{OPT}(\mathbf{v})) - \mu \cdot \sum_{i \in N} P_i(\mathbf{b}).$$

A mechanism \mathcal{M} that is (λ, μ) -smooth has a Price of Anarchy (with respect to correlated and Bayes-Nash equilibria) of at most $\max\{\mu, 1\}/\lambda$ [48].

The following formal notion of a residual market will be useful for our further analysis. For any $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{F}$ we define the *contraction* of \mathcal{F} by \mathbf{x} , \mathcal{F}/\mathbf{x} , as follows. Let $N^+(\mathbf{x}) = \{i \in N \mid x_i \neq \emptyset\}$. Then $\mathcal{F}/\mathbf{x} = \{\mathbf{z} = (z_j)_{j \in N \setminus N^+(\mathbf{x})} \mid (\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{x}_{N^+(\mathbf{x})}) \in \mathcal{F}\}$. That is, \mathcal{F}/\mathbf{x} contains allocations to players who were allocated nothing in \mathbf{x} , that remain feasible when combined with the allocations in \mathbf{x} . We think of the contraction by \mathbf{x} as a *subinstance* on players $N \setminus N^+(\mathbf{x})$ with feasibility constraint \mathcal{F}/\mathbf{x} , and refer to it as the subinstance induced by \mathbf{x} . We say that a collection of problems Π is *subinstance closed* if for every $\pi \in \Pi$ with feasible allocations \mathcal{F} and every $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{F}$ the subinstance induced by \mathbf{x} is contained in Π . The contraction by \mathbf{x} also naturally leads to an exchange feasible set $\mathcal{F}_\mathbf{x}$ by padding the allocations $\mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{F}/\mathbf{x}$ with null outcomes. We refer to this $\mathcal{F}_\mathbf{x}$ as the *canonical exchange-feasible set*.

In Appendix C we show that if a problem admits (α, β) -balanced prices with respect to the optimal allocation rule and the canonical exchange feasible sets, then a mechanism that maximizes declared welfare and charges first-price payments is $(\frac{1}{2}, \alpha\beta + 1)$ -smooth. In other words, a problem that admits balanced prices yielding a given welfare guarantee will also admit a smooth mechanism with an asymptotically identical price of anarchy. In Appendix D we show that the reverse implication does not hold in general.

5.1 Warm-up: Binary, Single-Parameter Problems with Monotone Prices

We begin with a simple result that serves to illustrate the connection between balancedness and smoothness. We will show that if a binary, single-parameter problem has the property that the welfare-maximizing mechanism is (λ, μ) -smooth and its critical prices $\tau_i(\cdot \mid \mathbf{y})$ are non-decreasing in \mathbf{y} ,⁸ then there exists a pricing rule that is (α, β) -balanced, where $\alpha\beta = O(\max\{\mu, 1\}/\lambda)$. In particular, this implies that the welfare guarantee due to Theorem 3.2 is within a constant factor of the price of anarchy of the mechanism implied by smoothness. We note that this result imposes strong requirements on both the allocation problem and the mechanism; in Section 5.2 we show how to relax the assumption of monotone critical prices, and in Section 5.3 we show how to extend the result beyond single-parameter problems.

Theorem 5.1. *Consider a subinstance-closed collection of binary, single-parameter problems such that the first-price mechanism based on the welfare maximizing allocation rule OPT is (λ, μ) -smooth. If the critical prices $\tau_i(\cdot \mid \mathbf{y})$ are non-decreasing in \mathbf{y} then setting $p_i(1 \mid \mathbf{y}) = \max\{v_i, \tau_i(\mathbf{v}_{-i} \mid \mathbf{y})\}$ and $p_i(0 \mid \mathbf{y}) = 0$ is $(1, \frac{\mu+1+\lambda}{\lambda})$ -balanced with respect to OPT and the canonical exchange-feasible sets $(\mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{x}})_{\mathbf{x} \in X}$.*

Proof. Fix any \mathbf{y} and $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{y}}$. Observe that by definition of the prices, it holds that

$$p_i(x_i \mid \mathbf{y}) \geq \mathbf{v}(\text{OPT}(\mathbf{v}, \mathcal{F}_{(\emptyset, \mathbf{y}_{-i})})) - \mathbf{v}(\text{OPT}(\mathbf{v}, \mathcal{F}_{(x_i, \mathbf{y}_{-i})})).$$

To see this, first note that both sides of the inequality are equal to 0 if $x_i = 0$. If $x_i = 1$ and $v_i \geq \tau_i(\mathbf{v}_{-i} \mid \mathbf{y})$, then agent i is allocated in $\text{OPT}(\mathbf{v}, \mathcal{F}_{(\emptyset, \mathbf{y}_{-i})})$ and hence both sides of the inequality are equal to v_i . If $x_i = 1$ and $v_i < \tau_i(\mathbf{v}_{-i} \mid \mathbf{y})$, then agent i is not allocated in $\text{OPT}(\mathbf{v}, \mathcal{F}_{(\emptyset, \mathbf{y}_{-i})})$, and hence the right-hand side of the inequality is at most the externality imposed by forcing an allocation to agent i , which is at most $\tau_i(\mathbf{v}_{-i} \mid \mathbf{y}) = p_i(x_i \mid \mathbf{y})$.

We are now ready to prove balancedness. To verify Condition (a), choose $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{F}$ and note that

$$\sum_{i=1}^n p_i(x_i \mid \mathbf{x}_{[i-1]}) \geq \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\mathbf{v}(\text{OPT}(\mathbf{v}, \mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{x}_{[i-1]}})) - \mathbf{v}(\text{OPT}(\mathbf{v}, \mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{x}_{[i]}})) \right) = \mathbf{v}(\text{OPT}(\mathbf{v})) - \mathbf{v}(\text{OPT}(\mathbf{v}, \mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{x}}))$$

as required. For Condition (b), we observe that monotonicity of critical prices, followed by a known implication of smoothness [21] (see Appendix E.1) implies

$$\sum_{i \in \mathbf{x}'} \tau_i(\mathbf{v}_{-i} \mid \mathbf{x}_{[i-1]}) \leq \sum_{i \in \mathbf{x}'} \tau_i(\mathbf{v}_{-i} \mid \mathbf{x}) \leq \frac{\mu+1}{\lambda} \mathbf{v}(\text{OPT}(\mathbf{v}, \mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{x}})).$$

Therefore, for any $\mathbf{x}' \in \mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{x}}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_i p_i(x'_i \mid \mathbf{x}_{[i-1]}) &\leq \sum_{i \in \mathbf{x}'} v_i + \sum_{i \in \mathbf{x}'} \tau_i(\mathbf{v}_{-i} \mid \mathbf{x}_{[i-1]}) \\ &\leq \mathbf{v}(\mathbf{x}') + \frac{\mu+1}{\lambda} \mathbf{v}(\text{OPT}(\mathbf{v}, \mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{x}})) \\ &\leq \frac{\mu+1+\lambda}{\lambda} \mathbf{v}(\text{OPT}(\mathbf{v}, \mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{x}})) \end{aligned}$$

as required. □

⁸The critical price $\tau_i(\mathbf{v}_{-i} \mid \mathbf{y})$ is the infimum of values v_i such that the mechanism allocates 1 to agent i on input (v_i, \mathbf{v}_{-i}) , in the problem subinstance induced by \mathbf{y} .

5.2 Binary, Single-Parameter Problems

We next show a general reduction from smoothness to balanced prices that applies in binary, single-parameter settings, where players can either win or lose. For any such problem, we prove that if the pay-your-bid mechanism with either a greedy or welfare-maximizing allocation rule is smooth, then one can use that mechanism to define balanced prices.

Theorem 5.2. *Let ALG be any allocation rule. Suppose that the first-price mechanism based on the greedy allocation rule GRD is (λ, μ) -smooth for a subinstance-closed collection of binary, single-parameter feasibility problems Π . Then for every $\mathbf{v} \in V$ there exists a pricing rule that is weakly $((\mu + 1)/\lambda, 0, (\mu + 1)/\lambda)$ -balanced with respect to ALG and the canonical exchange-feasible sets $(\mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{x}})_{\mathbf{x} \in X}$.*

Theorem 5.3. *Let ALG be any allocation rule. Suppose that the first-price mechanism based on the welfare-maximizing allocation rule OPT is (λ, μ) -smooth for a subinstance-closed collection of binary, single-parameter feasibility problems Π . Then for every $\mathbf{v} \in V$ there exists a pricing rule that is weakly $(1, 0, ((\mu + 1)/\lambda)^2)$ -balanced with respect to ALG and the canonical exchange-feasible sets $(\mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{x}})_{\mathbf{x} \in X}$.*

These results show that if an appropriate mechanism has a certain price of anarchy κ due to smoothness, then there exist balanced prices yielding welfare guarantee $O(\kappa^2)$. Our construction of the prices (in Appendices E.2 and E.3) is the same for both mechanisms. The idea is to first use ALG to compute a reference allocation and valuations. The reference allocation and valuations are adjusted over time, depending on the purchase decisions of the players. A player's price is then his own valuation, if he is part of the reference allocation, or his critical value against the players in the reference allocation, if he is not.

Our proofs of Theorems 5.2 and 5.3 (in Appendix E) establish balancedness with respect to the canonical exchange-feasible sets and use smoothness as follows. Condition (a) follows directly from a close connection between smoothness and the mechanism's approximation guarantee. For Condition (b), we note that smoothness implies an upper bound on the sum of critical values, as shown in [21] and Appendix E.1. Since our prices are defined based on critical values, this immediately implies that for all \mathbf{x} and all $\mathbf{x}' \in \mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{x}}$ we have $\sum_{i \in N} p_i(x'_i | \mathbf{x}) \leq \frac{\mu+1}{\lambda} \cdot \mathbf{v}(\text{OPT}(\mathbf{v}, \mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{x}}))$. Note that the left-hand side of the inequality involves $p_i(x'_i | \mathbf{x})$, and not $p_i(x'_i | \mathbf{x}_{[i-1]})$ as required for balancedness; as a result, this bound directly implies balancedness only if prices are non-decreasing. Pricing based on critical values, however, is generally not monotone (see Appendix E.4); this necessitates a more careful analysis that makes up the bulk of the proof.

5.3 General Problems and Outcome Smoothness

We proceed to show an implication from smoothness to prices that works in more general settings. It is based on the observation that many smoothness proofs proceed by arguing that agent i could place a bid b'_i that targets the outcome x_i^* that he receives in the welfare-maximizing allocation (or some other sensible target outcome). The smoothness proof then establishes a charging scheme that either the agent is indeed assigned this outcome against \mathbf{b}_{-i} or the payments are high.

Outcome Smoothness We begin by formalizing smoothness proofs that proceed in this manner. Related but different definitions were considered in [16, 44]. In order to capture mechanisms where

players may not be able to get any outcome they like we assume that each outcome space X_i is endowed with a partial order \preceq such that $v_i(x_i) \leq v_i(y_i)$ whenever $x_i \preceq y_i$.

Definition 5.2. A mechanism is (λ, μ) -outcome smooth for $\lambda, \mu \geq 0$ if for all valuation profiles $\mathbf{v} \in V$ there exists an outcome $\mathbf{x}'(\mathbf{v}) \in \mathcal{F}$ such that for all bid profiles $\mathbf{b} \in B$,

$$\sum_{i \in N} \left(v_i(x'_i) - \inf_{b'_i: f_i(b'_i, \mathbf{b}_{-i}) \succeq x'_i} P_i(b'_i, \mathbf{b}_{-i}) \right) \geq \lambda \cdot \mathbf{v}(\text{OPT}(\mathbf{v})) - \mu \cdot \sum_{i \in N} P_i(\mathbf{b}).$$

Just like mechanism smoothness, this smoothness notion requires the existence of an object that does not depend on the bids, but this object is an allocation \mathbf{x}' rather than a bid vector \mathbf{b}' . The i -th term on the left-hand side then corresponds to the maximum utility agent i can have when getting an outcome at least as good as x'_i , similar to the term $u_i(b'_i, \mathbf{b}_{-i})$ in usual smoothness. In both cases, this term depends on the bids \mathbf{b}_{-i} , although x'_i or b'_i respectively does not.

We think of outcome smoothness as a stronger condition than mechanism smoothness. In Appendix F, we substantiate this claim by showing that for declared welfare maximizers with pay-your-bid payments, outcome smoothness implies smoothness but not vice versa.

Designing the Prices We show that if a declared welfare maximizer is (λ, μ) -outcome smooth and has non-decreasing critical payments, then the critical payments for that mechanism (from the definition of outcome smoothness) can be used as posted prices that yield an $O(\lambda/\mu)$ approximation to the optimal welfare. This result has a mild technical caveat: we require that the mechanism continues to be smooth in a modified problem with multiple copies of each bidders. An allocation is feasible in the modified feasibility space \mathcal{F}' if it corresponds to a feasible allocation $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{F}$, with each x_i being partitioned between the copies of agent i .

Theorem 5.4. *Fix valuation space V and feasibility space \mathcal{F} , and suppose \mathcal{F}' is an extension of \mathcal{F} as defined above. Suppose that the declared welfare maximizer for valuation space V and feasibility space \mathcal{F}' has non-decreasing critical payments, and is (λ, μ) -outcome smooth for every \mathcal{F}'/\mathbf{z} . Then there is a collection of exchange-feasible sets $(\mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{x}})_{\mathbf{x} \in X}$, and an allocation rule **ALG** that returns the welfare-maximization allocation with probability λ , such that for every $\mathbf{v} \in V$ there exists a pricing rule that is $(\lambda, \mu/\lambda)$ -balanced with respect to **ALG** and $(\mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{x}})_{\mathbf{x} \in X}$.*

In particular, Theorem 5.4 implies that posting (an appropriately scaled version of) the critical payments from the outcome smooth mechanism yields a welfare approximation of $O(\lambda/\mu)$, matching the price of anarchy guarantee of the original mechanism. The proof of Theorem 5.4 appears in Appendix G.

6 Applications

We now show how to apply the techniques and results developed in the previous sections to various canonical optimization problems. In Section 6.1 we establish the existence of balanced prices (and hence posted price mechanisms) for combinatorial auctions. These results are for general valuations, parametrized by their level of complementarity, and contain XOS valuations as a special case. In Section 6.2, we consider matroid feasibility constraints. Finally, in Section 6.3, we apply our techniques to knapsack problems or, more generally, multi-unit auctions and packing (integer) linear programs. In all of these applications, we illustrate the advantages of our framework and the

ease with which existing and novel results can be derived. The applications further emphasize the close connection to mechanism smoothness, and we use them to point out possible extensions of our framework.

6.1 Combinatorial Auctions

In a combinatorial auction, there is a set M of m indivisible items, and each X_i consists of all subsets of M . An allocation \mathbf{x} is feasible if $x_i \cap x_j = \emptyset$ for all agents i and j . A valuation v_i is XOS (a.k.a. fractionally subadditive) if there exists a collection of additive valuation functions a^1, \dots, a^ℓ such that $v_i(S) = \max_{j=1, \dots, \ell} a^j(S)$ for every $S \subseteq M$.

It is shown in [28] that there are (static, anonymous) prices that give at least a half of the optimal expected welfare for combinatorial auctions with XOS bidders. This result can be derived in several ways. First, it can be derived by directly establishing (1,1)-balanced prices for XOS bidders (essentially the proof in [28]). It also follows from our general reduction from outcome smoothness to balanced prices in Section 5.3. But our framework enables an even easier proof for this result. Specifically, it can be directly derived by the existence of balanced prices for a single-item auction (Example 3.1) via our extension and composition theorems, as shown below.

Theorem 6.1. *For XOS combinatorial auctions there exist (1,1)-balanced item prices with respect to OPT that are static, anonymous, and order oblivious.*

Proof. Example 3.1 establishes the existence of (1,1)-balanced prices with respect to OPT for a single-item auction. For XOS we construct item prices by running OPT on the given valuation profile \mathbf{v} , finding a supporting additive valuation profile $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}$, and using the (1,1)-balanced pricing rule (for a single-item auction) for each item separately. The claim then follows from our composition theorems (Theorem 4.1 and Theorem 4.2). \square

Theorem 6.1 extends naturally to arbitrary allocation rules. Applying the construction to the best-known polynomial-time approximation algorithm, instead of OPT, yields a polynomial-time $2e/(e-1)$ -approximation (as shown in [28]). We improve this factor to 2 by exploiting the generality of our framework and basing prices on solving a fractional relaxation of the allocation problem. Recall that an XOS query takes as input an XOS valuation and a set of items, and returns a supporting additive valuation for the given set.

Theorem 6.2. *There exists a 2-approximate posted-price mechanism for XOS combinatorial auctions. The prices are static, anonymous, and order-oblivious item prices, and can be computed in $\text{POLY}(n, m, 1/\epsilon)$ demand and XOS queries, where ϵ is an additive error due to sampling.*

We will prove Theorem 6.2 in Section 6.1.1 below. But we first note that this result is actually a special case of the more general Theorem 6.3, proved in Appendix I. Theorem 6.3 applies to MPH- k valuations and an associated class of MPH queries (defined in [26] and Appendix I), where $k \geq 1$ bounds the degree of complementarity in the valuations. MPH-1 is precisely the class of XOS valuations, and MPH queries correspond to XOS queries when $k = 1$.

Theorem 6.3. *For MPH- k combinatorial auctions there exist weakly (1,1, $k-1$)-balanced item prices that are static, anonymous, and order oblivious. Moreover, a $(4k-2)$ -approximate posted-price mechanism can be computed in $\text{POLY}(n, m, 1/\epsilon)$ demand and MPH queries, where ϵ is an additive error due to sampling.*

This bound yields a $(4k - 2)$ -approximation in polynomial time. It improves the previously best-known computational result of $O(k^2)$ and it also slightly improves the best known existential result of $4k$ (both due to [28]). As an immediate corollary we obtain a $(4d - 2)$ -approximation for combinatorial auctions with arbitrary valuations over sets of size at most d :

Corollary 6.1. *For combinatorial auctions where every agent can get at most d items, there exist weakly $(1, 1, d-1)$ -balanced item prices that are static, anonymous, and order oblivious. Moreover, a $(4d-2)$ -approximate posted-price mechanism can be computed in $\text{POLY}(n, m, 1/\epsilon)$ demand queries, where ϵ is an additive error due to sampling.*

6.1.1 Proof of Theorem 6.2

We show here that for XOS combinatorial auctions, it is possible to construct static, anonymous, and order-oblivious item prices that are $(1, 1)$ -balanced with respect to OPT , and these prices can be computed in polynomial time given access to demand and XOS query oracles. Our approach is to first construct $(1, 1)$ -balanced prices for a relaxed fractional allocation problem, then show how to apply these prices to the original integral problem.

The following linear problem, known as the *configuration LP* for combinatorial auctions, computes a fractional allocation that maximizes the social welfare among all fractional allocations.

$$\begin{aligned}
\max \quad & \sum_{i,S} v_i(S) \cdot x_{i,S} \\
\text{s.t.} \quad & \sum_S x_{i,S} \leq 1 \text{ for every } i \in N \\
& \sum_{i,S:j \in S} x_{i,S} \leq 1 \text{ for every } j \in M \\
& x_{i,S} \in [0, 1] \text{ for every } i \in N, S \subseteq M
\end{aligned}$$

We extend the definition of \mathcal{F} to include all fractional allocations that fulfill the above LP; $\mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{x}}$ is extended to all fractional allocations \mathbf{y} such that $\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{F}$.

Given a fixed valuation profile \mathbf{v} , we will define a pricing rule based on the optimal LP solution \mathbf{x}^* . For each set of goods S , let \tilde{v}_i^S be an additive valuation profile that supports v_i on input S . Then for each item j , we will set a static item price of $p_j = \sum_{i,S \ni j} x_{i,S}^* \tilde{v}_i^S(j)$. In other words, the price of each item is the weighted sum of supporting prices for that item, over all allocations in the support of \mathbf{x}^* . The pricing rule p is additive over these item prices. Note that the pricing rule is static and anonymous. Moreover, an optimal solution to the LP can be found in polynomially many demand queries resulting in a solution with polynomial-sized support, from which the price of each item can be computed in polynomially many queries to an XOS oracle.

We claim that these prices are $(1, 1)$ -balanced with respect to the optimal allocation rule. Fix some \mathbf{v} and, as before, let $\mathbf{x}^* = \text{OPT}(\mathbf{v})$ be the fractional optimum. Without loss of generality we can assume that \mathbf{x}^* fully allocates each item. Choose some $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{F}$. Write $x^{(j)} = \sum_{i,S \ni j} x_{i,S}$, the total amount of item j allocated in \mathbf{x} .

Claim 6.1. $\mathbf{v}(\text{OPT}(\mathbf{v}, \mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{x}})) \geq \sum_j (1 - x^{(j)}) p_j$.

Before proving Claim 6.1, let us show how it implies balancedness. Property (a) of balancedness holds since

$$\sum_i p_i(x_i) = \sum_j x^{(j)} p_j = \sum_j p_j - \sum_j (1 - x^{(j)}) p_j \leq \mathbf{v}(\text{OPT}(\mathbf{v})) - \mathbf{v}(\text{OPT}(\mathbf{v}, \mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{x}}))$$

where the inequality is precisely Claim 6.1 combined with the definition of the item prices p_j . Claim 6.1 further implies property (b) of balancedness, since for any $\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{x}}$ we have

$$\sum_i p_i(y_i) \leq \sum_j (1 - x^{(j)}) p_j \leq \mathbf{v}(\text{OPT}(\mathbf{v}, \mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{x}})).$$

We will now prove Claim 6.1. Consider the following allocation \mathbf{y} : $y_{i,S} = \sum_{T \supseteq S} x_{i,T}^* (\prod_{j \in S} (1 - x^{(j)}) \prod_{j \in T-S} x^{(j)})$. We can think of \mathbf{y} as the allocation constructed by starting with \mathbf{x}^* , then removing each item j from each set in the support of \mathbf{x}^* independently with probability $x^{(j)}$. Note that $\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{x}}$, and hence $\mathbf{v}(\text{OPT}(\mathbf{v}, \mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{x}})) \geq \mathbf{v}(\mathbf{y})$. Moreover, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{v}(\mathbf{y}) &= \sum_i \sum_S y_{i,S} v_i(S) \\ &= \sum_i \sum_S \left(\sum_{T \supseteq S} x_{i,T}^* \prod_{j \in S} (1 - x^{(j)}) \prod_{j \in T-S} x^{(j)} \right) v_i(S) \\ &\geq \sum_i \sum_S \left(\sum_{T \supseteq S} x_{i,T}^* \prod_{j \in S} (1 - x^{(j)}) \prod_{j \in T-S} x^{(j)} \right) \sum_{j \in S} \tilde{v}_i^T(j) \\ &= \sum_j \sum_i \sum_{T \ni j} x_{i,T}^* \tilde{v}_i^T(j) \cdot \left(\sum_{S \subseteq T, S \ni j} \prod_{k \in S} (1 - x^{(k)}) \prod_{k \in T-S} x^{(k)} \right) \\ &= \sum_j \sum_i \sum_{T \ni j} x_{i,T}^* \tilde{v}_i^S(j) \cdot (1 - x^{(j)}) \\ &= \sum_j (1 - x^{(j)}) p_j \end{aligned}$$

where the first two equalities are definitions, the inequality on the third line follows from the definition of XOS valuations, the equality on the fourth line is a change of the order of summation, the equality on the fifth line follows because the quantity in parentheses is simply the total probability that item j remains in T after each item k is omitted independently with probability $(1 - x^{(k)})$, and the final equality is the definition of item prices p_j . This completes the proof of Claim 6.1.

To complete the proof of Theorem 6.2, we observe the following: for every agent i , if all previous agents have selected integral outcomes from the posted price mechanism, then agent i has a utility-maximizing outcome in their demand correspondence that is integral. This is because any fractional allocation of an integral set of items to a single agent can be interpreted as a convex combination of integral allocations to that agent. Since our approximation guarantee holds regardless of the demanded set chosen by each agent, it will hold even if we restrict agents to only select integral outcomes in the posted price mechanism. In other words, Theorem 3.2 applies even if the posted-price mechanism prohibits non-integral allocations from being purchased. We conclude

that the expectation of the prices computed using the configuration LP, as described above, will also generate a 2 approximation for the (non-fractional) XOS combinatorial auction problem. As noted in Remark 3.1, these prices can be estimated by sampling, leading to an additional additive loss of ϵ using $\text{POLY}(n, 1/\epsilon)$ samples per item.

6.2 Matroids

We next consider matroid feasibility constraints. Kleinberg and Weinberg [36] gave a 2-approximation for the binary problem, in which each agent corresponds to one element of a matroid ground set. One has to select a subset of these agents that is independent in the matroid. In our notation, we write $X_i = \{0, 1\}$ for each agent $i \in N$ and we identify outcome profiles $\mathbf{x} \in X$ with sets. An outcome profile is feasible if and only if $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{I}$, where \mathcal{I} is the set of independent sets of a given, fixed matroid. Furthermore, define $\mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{x}} = \{\mathbf{y} \mid \mathbf{x} \cap \mathbf{y} = \emptyset, \mathbf{x} \cup \mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{I}\}$. Note that $\mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{x}}$ corresponds to contracting the matroid by \mathbf{x} . In particular, if $x_i = 1$ then $y_i = 0$.

The pricing scheme used by Kleinberg and Weinberg can be stated as follows: $p_i(1 \mid \mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{v}(\text{OPT}(\mathbf{v}, \mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{x}})) - \mathbf{v}(\text{OPT}(\mathbf{v}, \mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{x} \cup \{i\}}))$ if $\mathbf{x} \cup \{i\} \in \mathcal{F}$ and ∞ otherwise; and $p_i(0 \mid \mathbf{x}) = 0$. Their result can be interpreted as showing that this pricing scheme is $(1, 1)$ -balanced. This can also be observed by using the connection to smoothness from Section 5.3, as follows.

Theorem 6.4. *For matroids, the prices described above are $(1, 1)$ -balanced with respect to OPT.*

Proof. It is known that the direct mechanism that maximizes declared welfare and charges players their bids is $(1, 1)$ -outcome smooth on matroids (see, e.g., [42]). Observe that the price definition is equivalent to the prices defined in Section 5.3 when using this particular mechanism. Furthermore, we have $p_i(y_i \mid \mathbf{x}_S) \leq p_i(y_i \mid \mathbf{x})$ for all y_i, \mathbf{x} , and $S \subseteq N$. This follows from submodularity of the function $f(U) = \mathbf{v}(\text{OPT}(\mathbf{v}, \mathcal{F}_U))$ (cf. [35, Lemma 3]). Therefore, Theorem 5.4 implies $(1, 1)$ -balancedness with respect to OPT. \square

For matroids, OPT can be computed in polynomial time by a greedy algorithm. Theorem 6.4 therefore implies a polynomial-time order-oblivious 2-approximate posted price mechanism.

Our definition of balancedness also allows to capture the pricing rule suggested by [36] for matroid intersection. In Appendix H.1 we show that these prices are weakly $(1, 1, k - 1)$ -balanced, implying an order-oblivious $(4k - 2)$ -approximation.

We can also consider a multi-dimensional matroid setting, where each agent can own more than one element of the ground set. The valuation functions v_i of agent i can be additive, submodular, or XOS over the set of items that agent i owns.⁹

Theorem 6.5. *There exist prices for multi-dimensional matroid settings in which players have additive, submodular, or XOS valuations that are $(1, 1)$ -balanced with respect to OPT.*

Our proof of this theorem in Appendix H.2 first uses the Rota exchange theorem [39, Lemma 2.7] to generalize the arguments of [36] from settings where players each want a single element of the ground set to settings where they have additive preferences over sets of elements. The existential result for submodular and XOS valuations then follows via composition, resulting in a 2-approximation. It can be made computational by basing the prices on the greedy algorithm and

⁹Kleinberg and Weinberg [36] also provide bounds for a multi-dimensional matroid setting. Their result, which has implications for revenue and welfare, applies when buyers have unit-demand preferences with independent values across elements. Our approach is different, and provides a welfare bound for a broader class of valuations.

observing that greedy satisfies the conditions of our composition theorems. This way we obtain an order-oblivious 4-approximation for submodular valuations.

6.3 Sparse PIPs

Our framework also applies to knapsack problems or, more generally, multi-unit auctions and packing (integer) linear programs. Consider the following problem for an illustration. Suppose, we have a knapsack of size 1; each agent has value $v_i \geq 0$ for getting at least capacity $s_i \leq 1/2$. That is, $X_i = [0, \frac{1}{2}]$, $\mathcal{F} = \{\mathbf{x} \mid \sum_i x_i \leq 1\}$, $v_i(x_i) = v_i$ if $x_i \geq s_i$ and 0 otherwise. Based on an arbitrary allocation algorithm ALG , we design anonymous, static prices by setting $p_i(x_i \mid \mathbf{y}) = x_i \mathbf{v}(\text{ALG}(\mathbf{v}))$ if x_i can feasibly be added and ∞ otherwise.

Theorem 6.6. *For the knapsack allocation problem in which no single agent can request more than half of the total capacity, the described pricing scheme is (1, 2)-balanced with respect to ALG .*

Theorem 6.6 implies a computational 3-approximation with respect to the social welfare attained by ALG . Note that it is not necessary for request sizes to be known in advance: each agent’s value and size can be drawn from a joint distribution. By using Theorem 4.1 and its generalization Theorem B.1, we can extend this result to arbitrary functions v_i that attain only finitely many values. This extension corresponds to the standard setting of multi-unit auctions with no assumptions on the valuations except for the fact that no player demands more than half of the items.

This approach can be extended to sparse packing linear programs, both without and with integrality constraints. That is, the possible outcomes for agent i are either $[0, 1]$ (fractional solutions) or $\{0, 1\}$ (integral solutions). We assume that valuations are linear, i.e., $v_i(x_i) = v_i \cdot x_i$. In both cases, the feasibility constraints \mathcal{F} are given by a constraint matrix $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{m \times n}$ such that $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{F}$ if and only if $\mathbf{A} \cdot \mathbf{x} \leq \mathbf{c}$. Without loss of generality, let $c_j = 1$ for all $j \in [m]$.

We assume that $a_{i,j} \leq \frac{1}{2}$ for all i and j and that the column sparsity is bounded by d , meaning that for each i there are at most d choices of j such that $a_{i,j} \geq 0$.

Theorem 6.7. *For sparse PIPs, there exist weakly (1, 0, d)- and (2, 0, d)-balanced prices, for fractional and integral solutions, respectively, with respect to arbitrary allocation algorithms ALG .*

We thus obtain $O(d)$ approximations via posted prices. To the best of our knowledge these are the first posted-price mechanisms in these settings. These results complement prior work showing the existence of *online* approximation algorithms for the generalized assignment problem [3, 4].

7 Conclusions and Open Problems

We introduced a general framework for establishing prophet inequalities and posted price mechanisms for multi-dimensional settings, using extension and composition results that build up from simpler, deterministic problems. This work leaves many questions open.

A general class of questions is to determine the best approximation guarantee that a prophet inequality can achieve for a particular setting. For example, even for the intersection of two matroids there is a gap between the trivial lower bound 2 and the upper bound of $4k - 2 = 6$. Similarly, in subadditive combinatorial auctions, the best-known upper bound is logarithmic in the number of items m [28], but again the best-known lower bound is 2, inherited from the case of a single item. Notably, the price of anarchy for simultaneous single-item auctions is known to be constant

for subadditive valuations [27], but the proof does not use the smoothness framework and hence our results relating posted prices to smooth mechanisms do not directly apply.

A related question is whether there exist prophet inequalities that cannot be implemented using posted prices. Interestingly, we are not aware of any separation between the two so far. More generally, one could ask about the power of anonymous versus personalized prices, item versus bundle prices, static versus dynamic prices, and so on. For example, to what extent can *static* prices approximate the welfare under a matroid constraint, an intersection of matroids, or an arbitrary downward-closed feasibility constraint?

Regarding the pricing framework itself, it would be interesting to extend the notion of (α, β) -balancedness to allow randomization in a dynamic pricing rule, and to understand the additional power of randomization. One could also generalize beyond feasibility constraints to more general seller-side costs for allocations. For the connection between smoothness and balancedness, we leave open the question of removing the price-monotonicity condition from Theorem 5.4, or whether the approximation factors can be improved for our single-parameter reductions (Theorems 5.2 and 5.3). Finally, recent work has shown that smoothness guarantees often improve as markets grow large [29]; is there a corresponding result for balancedness?

References

- [1] I. Abraham, M. Babaioff, S. Dughmi, and T. Roughgarden. Combinatorial auctions with restricted complements. In *Proceedings of the 13th ACM Conference on Electronic Commerce*, pages 3–16, 2012.
- [2] S. Alaei. Bayesian combinatorial auctions: Expanding single buyer mechanisms to many buyers. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 43(2):930–972, 2014.
- [3] S. Alaei, M. Hajiaghayi, and V. Liaghat. Online prophet-inequality matching with applications to ad allocation. In *Proceedings of the 13th ACM Conference on Electronic Commerce*, pages 18–35, 2012.
- [4] S. Alaei, M. Hajiaghayi, and V. Liaghat. The online stochastic generalized assignment problem. In *Proceedings of the 16th International Workshop on Approximation, Randomization, and Combinatorial Optimization Problems*, pages 11–25, 2013.
- [5] S. Alaei, J. D. Hartline, R. Niazadeh, E. Pountourakis, and Y. Yuan. Optimal auctions vs. anonymous pricing. In *Proceedings of 56th IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*, pages 1446–1463, 2015.
- [6] P. D. Azar, R. Kleinberg, and S. M. Weinberg. Prophet inequalities with limited information. In *Proceedings of the 25th ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms*, pages 1358–1377, 2014.
- [7] M. Balcan, A. Blum, and Y. Mansour. Item pricing for revenue maximization. In *Proceedings 9th ACM Conference on Electronic Commerce*, pages 50–59, 2008.
- [8] K. Bhawalkar and T. Roughgarden. Welfare guarantees for combinatorial auctions with item bidding. In *Proceedings of the 22nd ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms*, pages 700–709, 2011.

- [9] M. Braverman, J. Mao, and S. M. Weinberg. Interpolating between truthful and non-truthful mechanisms for combinatorial auctions. In *Proceedings of the 27th ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms*, pages 1444–1457, 2016.
- [10] Y. Cai and C. H. Papadimitriou. Simultaneous bayesian auctions and computational complexity. In *Proceedings of the 15th ACM Conference on Economics and Computation*, pages 895–910, 2014.
- [11] I. Caragiannis, C. Kaklamanis, P. Kanellopoulos, M. Kyropoulou, B. Lucier, R. P. Leme, and É. Tardos. Bounding the inefficiency of outcomes in generalized second price auctions. *Journal of Economic Theory*, 156:343–388, 2015.
- [12] T. Chakraborty, Z. Huang, and S. Khanna. Dynamic and non-uniform pricing strategies for revenue maximization. In *50th Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*, pages 495–504, 2009.
- [13] S. Chawla, J. D. Hartline, and R. D. Kleinberg. Algorithmic pricing via virtual valuations. In *Proceedings of the 8th ACM Conference on Electronic Commerce*, pages 243–251, 2007.
- [14] S. Chawla, J. D. Hartline, D. L. Malec, and B. Sivan. Multi-parameter mechanism design and sequential posted pricing. In *Proceedings of the 42nd ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*, pages 311–320, 2010.
- [15] G. Christodoulou, A. Kovács, and M. Schapira. Bayesian combinatorial auctions. *Journal of the ACM*, 63(2):11, 2016.
- [16] C. Daskalakis and V. Syrgkanis. Learning in auctions: Regret is hard, envy is easy. In *Proceedings of the 57th IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*, pages 219–228, 2016.
- [17] N. R. Devanur, J. Morgenstern, V. Syrgkanis, and S. M. Weinberg. Simple auctions with simple strategies. In *Proceedings of the 16th ACM Conference on Economics and Computation*, pages 305–322, 2015.
- [18] P. Dhangwatnotai, T. Roughgarden, and Q. Yan. Revenue maximization with a single sample. In *Proceedings of the 11th ACM Conference on Economics and Computation*, pages 129–138, 2010.
- [19] S. Dobzinski, N. Nisan, and M. Schapira. Truthful randomized mechanisms for combinatorial auctions. In *Proceedings of the 38th Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*, pages 644–652, 2006.
- [20] S. Dobzinski, H. Fu, and R. D. Kleinberg. On the complexity of computing an equilibrium in combinatorial auctions. In *Proceedings of the 26th Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms*, pages 110–122, 2015.
- [21] P. Dütting and T. Kesselheim. Algorithms against anarchy: Understanding non-truthful mechanisms. In *Proceedings of the 16th ACM Conference on Economics and Computation*, pages 239–255, 2015.

- [22] P. Dütting and R. Kleinberg. Polymatroid prophet inequalities. In *Proceedings of the 23rd European Symposium on Algorithms*, pages 437–449, 2015.
- [23] P. Dütting, M. Henzinger, and M. Starnberger. Valuation compressions in vcg-based combinatorial auctions. In *Proceedings of the 9th Conference on Web and Internet Economics*, pages 146–159, 2013.
- [24] P. Dütting, T. Kesselheim, and É. Tardos. Algorithms as mechanisms: The price of anarchy of relax-and-round. In *Proceedings of the 16th ACM Conference on Economics and Computation*, pages 187–201, 2015.
- [25] B. Edelman, M. Ostrovsky, and M. Schwarz. Internet advertising and the generalized second price auction: Selling billions of dollars worth of keywords. *American Economic Review*, pages 242–259, 2007.
- [26] U. Feige, M. Feldman, N. Immorlica, R. Izsak, B. Lucier, and V. Syrgkanis. A unifying hierarchy of valuations with complements and substitutes. In *Proceedings of the 29th AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, pages 872–878, 2015.
- [27] M. Feldman, H. Fu, N. Gravin, and B. Lucier. Simultaneous auctions are (almost) efficient. In *Proceedings of the 45th ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*, pages 201–210, 2013.
- [28] M. Feldman, N. Gravin, and B. Lucier. Combinatorial auctions via posted prices. In *Proceedings of the 26th ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms*, pages 123–135, 2015.
- [29] M. Feldman, N. Immorlica, B. Lucier, T. Roughgarden, and V. Syrgkanis. The price of anarchy in large games. In *Proceedings of the 48th ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*, pages 963–976, 2016.
- [30] M. Feldman, O. Svensson, and R. Zenklusen. Online contention resolution schemes. In *Proceedings of the 27th ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms*, pages 1014–1033, 2016.
- [31] M. Hajiaghayi, R. Kleinberg, and T. W. Sandholm. Automated mechanism design and prophet inequalities. In *Proceedings of the 22nd AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, pages 58–65, 2007.
- [32] J. D. Hartline and T. Roughgarden. Simple versus optimal mechanisms. In *Proceedings of the 10th ACM Conference on Electronic Commerce*, pages 225–234, 2009.
- [33] J. D. Hartline, D. Hoy, and S. Taggart. Price of anarchy for auction revenue. In *Proceedings of the 15th ACM Conference on Economics and Computation*, pages 693–710, 2014.
- [34] A. Hassidim, H. Kaplan, Y. Mansour, and N. Nisan. Non-price equilibria in markets of discrete goods. In *Proceedings of the 12th ACM Conference on Electronic Commerce*, pages 295–296, 2011.
- [35] R. Kleinberg and S. M. Weinberg. Matroid prophet inequalities. In *Proceedings of the 44th ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing Conference*, pages 123–136, 2012.
- [36] R. Kleinberg and S. M. Weinberg. Matroid prophet inequalities. In *Proceedings of the 44th ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*, pages 123–136, 2012.

- [37] U. Krengel and L. Sucheston. Semiamarts and finite values. *Bulletin of the American Mathematical Society*, 83:745–747, 1977.
- [38] U. Krengel and L. Sucheston. On semiamarts, amarts, and processes with finite value. *Advances in Probability and Related Topics*, 4:197–266, 1978.
- [39] J. Lee, M. Sviridenko, and J. Vondrak. Submodular maximization over multiple matroids via generalized exchange properties. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 35(4):795–806, 2010.
- [40] R. P. Leme and É. Tardos. Pure and bayes-nash price of anarchy for generalized second price auction. In *Proceedings of the 51th IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*, pages 735–744, 2010.
- [41] S. Li. Obviously strategy-proof mechanisms. Working paper, 2015.
- [42] B. Lucier and A. Borodin. Price of anarchy for greedy auctions. In *Proceedings of the 21st ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms*, pages 537–553, 2010.
- [43] B. Lucier and V. Syrgkanis. Greedy algorithms make efficient mechanisms. In *Proceedings of the 16th ACM Conference on Economics and Computation*, pages 221–238, 2015.
- [44] T. Lykouris, V. Syrgkanis, and É. Tardos. Learning and efficiency in games with dynamic population. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Seventh Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms*, pages 120–129, 2016.
- [45] T. Roughgarden. Intrinsic robustness of the price of anarchy. *Journal of the ACM*, 62(5):32, 2015.
- [46] A. Rubinstein. Beyond matroids: Secretary problem and prophet inequality with general constraints. In *Proceedings of the 48th ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*, 2016. 324–332.
- [47] E. Samuel-Cahn. Comparison of threshold stop rules and maximum for independent nonnegative random variables. *Annals of Probability*, 12:1213–1216, 1984.
- [48] V. Syrgkanis and É. Tardos. Composable and efficient mechanisms. In *Proceedings of the 45th ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*, pages 211–220, 2013.
- [49] H. R. Varian. Position auctions. *International Journal of Industrial Organization*, 25(6):1163–1178, 2007.

A Proofs Omitted From Section 3

In this appendix we give the proofs of Theorem 3.2 and Theorem 3.3, which show that balanced prices imply posted-price mechanisms that achieve near-optimal welfare. In both proofs we will denote the exchange-compatible family of sets with respect to which the collection of pricing rules $(\mathbf{p}^{\mathbf{v}})_{\mathbf{v} \in V}$ is balanced by $(\mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{x}})_{\mathbf{x} \in X}$.

A.1 Proof of Theorem 3.2

We will first use Property (b) to show a lower bound on the utilities of the players, and Property (a) to show a lower bound on the revenue of the posted-price mechanism. We will then add these together to obtain a bound on the social welfare.

We will write $\mathbf{x}(\mathbf{v})$ for the allocation returned by the posted-price mechanism on input valuation profile \mathbf{v} and $\mathbf{x}'(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{v}') = \text{OPT}(\mathbf{v}', \mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{x}(\mathbf{v})})$ for the welfare-maximizing allocation with respect to valuation profile \mathbf{v}' under feasibility constraint $\mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{x}(\mathbf{v})}$.

Utility bound: We obtain a lower bound on the expected utility of a player as follows. We sample valuations $\mathbf{v}' \sim \mathcal{D}$. Player i now considers buying $\text{OPT}_i((v_i, \mathbf{v}'_{-i}), \mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{x}(v'_i, \mathbf{v}'_{-i})})$ at price $\delta \cdot p_i(\text{OPT}_i((v_i, \mathbf{v}'_{-i}), \mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{x}(v'_i, \mathbf{v}'_{-i})}) \mid \mathbf{x}_{[i-1]}(\mathbf{v}))$. Taking expectations and exploiting that $\mathbf{x}_{[i-1]}(\mathbf{v})$ does not depend on v_i we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{v}}[u_i(\mathbf{v})] &\geq \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{v}'} \left[v_i \left(\text{OPT}_i((v_i, \mathbf{v}'_{-i}), \mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{x}(v'_i, \mathbf{v}'_{-i})}) \right) - \delta \cdot p_i \left(\text{OPT}_i((v_i, \mathbf{v}'_{-i}), \mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{x}(v'_i, \mathbf{v}'_{-i})}) \mid \mathbf{x}_{[i-1]}(\mathbf{v}) \right) \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{v}'} \left[v'_i \left(x'_i(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{v}') \right) - \delta \cdot p_i \left(x'_i(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{v}') \mid \mathbf{x}_{[i-1]}(\mathbf{v}) \right) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Summing the previous inequality over all agents we get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{v}} \left[\sum_{i \in N} u_i(\mathbf{v}) \right] &\geq \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{v}'} \left[\sum_{i \in N} v'_i \left(x'_i(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{v}') \right) \right] - \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{v}'} \left[\sum_{i \in N} \delta \cdot p_i \left(x'_i(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{v}') \mid \mathbf{x}_{[i-1]}(\mathbf{v}) \right) \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{v}'} \left[\mathbf{v}' \left(\text{OPT}(\mathbf{v}', \mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{x}(\mathbf{v})}) \right) \right] - \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{v}'} \left[\sum_{i \in N} \delta \cdot p_i \left(x'_i(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{v}') \mid \mathbf{x}_{[i-1]}(\mathbf{v}) \right) \right]. \quad (1) \end{aligned}$$

We can upper bound the last term in the previous inequality by using Property (b). This gives pointwise for any \mathbf{v} and \mathbf{v}'

$$\sum_{i \in N} \delta \cdot p_i \left(x'_i(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{v}') \mid \mathbf{x}_{[i-1]}(\mathbf{v}) \right) \leq \delta \beta \cdot \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\mathbf{v}}} \left[\tilde{\mathbf{v}} \left(\text{OPT}(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}, \mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{x}(\mathbf{v})}) \right) \right],$$

and therefore also

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{v}'} \left[\sum_{i \in N} \delta \cdot p_i \left(x'_i(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{v}') \mid \mathbf{x}_{[i-1]}(\mathbf{v}) \right) \right] \leq \delta \beta \cdot \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{v}, \tilde{\mathbf{v}}} \left[\tilde{\mathbf{v}} \left(\text{OPT}(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}, \mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{x}(\mathbf{v})}) \right) \right]. \quad (2)$$

Replacing \mathbf{v}' with $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}$ in Inequality (1) and combining it with Inequality (2) we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{v}} \left[\sum_{i \in N} u_i(\mathbf{v}) \right] \geq (1 - \delta \beta) \cdot \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{v}, \tilde{\mathbf{v}}} \left[\tilde{\mathbf{v}} \left(\text{OPT}(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}, \mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{x}(\mathbf{v})}) \right) \right]. \quad (3)$$

Revenue bound: The second step is a lower bound on the revenue achieved by the posted-price mechanism. Applying Property (a) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i \in N} \delta \cdot p_i(x_i(\mathbf{v}) \mid \mathbf{x}_{[i-1]}(\mathbf{v})) &= \delta \cdot \sum_{i \in N} \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\mathbf{v}}} \left[p_i^{\tilde{\mathbf{v}}}(x_i(\mathbf{v}) \mid \mathbf{x}_{[i-1]}(\mathbf{v})) \right] \\ &\geq \frac{\delta}{\alpha} \cdot \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\mathbf{v}}} \left[\tilde{\mathbf{v}}(\text{ALG}(\tilde{\mathbf{v}})) - \tilde{\mathbf{v}}(\text{OPT}(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}, \mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{x}(\mathbf{v})})) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Taking expectation over \mathbf{v} this shows

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{v}} \left[\sum_{i \in N} \delta \cdot p_i(x_i(\mathbf{v}) \mid \mathbf{x}_{[i-1]}(\mathbf{v})) \right] \geq \frac{\delta}{\alpha} \cdot \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\mathbf{v}}} [\tilde{\mathbf{v}}(\text{ALG}(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}))] - \frac{\delta}{\alpha} \cdot \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\mathbf{v}}, \mathbf{v}} [\tilde{\mathbf{v}}(\text{OPT}(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}, \mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{x}(\mathbf{v})}))]. \quad (4)$$

Combination: It remains to show how the two bounds can be combined so that they imply the approximation guarantee. By quasi-linearity we can rewrite the expected social welfare that is achieved by the posted-price mechanism as the sum of the expected utilities plus the expected revenue. Using $\delta = \alpha/(1 + \alpha\beta)$ and Inequalities (3) and (4), this gives

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{v}} \left[\sum_{i \in N} v_i(x_i(\mathbf{v})) \right] &\geq \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{v}} \left[\sum_{i \in N} u_i(\mathbf{v}) \right] + \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{v}} \left[\sum_{i \in N} \delta \cdot p_i(x_i(\mathbf{v}) \mid \mathbf{x}_{[i-1]}(\mathbf{v})) \right] \\ &\geq (1 - 2\delta\beta) \cdot \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{v}, \tilde{\mathbf{v}}} [\tilde{\mathbf{v}}(\text{OPT}(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}, \mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{x}(\mathbf{v})}))] + \frac{\delta}{\alpha} \cdot \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\mathbf{v}}} [\tilde{\mathbf{v}}(\text{ALG}(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}))] - \frac{\delta}{\alpha} \cdot \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\mathbf{v}}, \mathbf{v}} [\tilde{\mathbf{v}}(\text{OPT}(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}, \mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{x}(\mathbf{v})}))] \\ &= \frac{1}{1 + \alpha\beta} \cdot \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\mathbf{v}}} [\tilde{\mathbf{v}}(\text{ALG}(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}))]. \end{aligned}$$

A.2 Proof of Theorem 3.3

Our proof will follow the same steps as the one for Theorem 3.2. Again, let $\mathbf{x}(\mathbf{v})$ be the allocation returned by the posted-price mechanism on input valuation profile \mathbf{v} and $\mathbf{x}'(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{v}') = \text{OPT}(\mathbf{v}', \mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{x}(\mathbf{v})})$ be the allocation that maximizes welfare with respect to valuation profile \mathbf{v}' over feasibility constraint $\mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{x}(\mathbf{v})}$.

Utility bound: Again sample valuations $\mathbf{v}' \sim \mathcal{D}$. By the same reasoning as in the proof of Theorem 3.2, we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{v}} \left[\sum_{i \in N} u_i(\mathbf{v}) \right] = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{v}'} [\mathbf{v}'(\mathbf{x}'(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{v}'))] - \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{v}'} \left[\sum_{i \in N} \delta \cdot p_i(x'_i(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{v}') \mid \mathbf{x}_{[i-1]}(\mathbf{v})) \right]. \quad (5)$$

We upper bound the last term in the previous inequality by using Property (b). This gives pointwise for any \mathbf{v} and \mathbf{v}'

$$\sum_{i \in N} \delta \cdot p_i(x'_i(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{v}') \mid \mathbf{x}_{[i-1]}(\mathbf{v})) \leq \delta\beta_1 \cdot \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\mathbf{v}}} [\tilde{\mathbf{v}}(\text{OPT}(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}, \mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{x}(\mathbf{v})}))] + \delta\beta_2 \cdot \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\mathbf{v}}} [\tilde{\mathbf{v}}(\text{ALG}(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}))],$$

and therefore also

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{v}'} \left[\sum_{i \in N} \delta \cdot p_i(x'_i(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{v}') \mid \mathbf{x}_{[i-1]}(\mathbf{v})) \right] \leq \delta\beta_1 \cdot \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\mathbf{v}}} [\tilde{\mathbf{v}}(\text{OPT}(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}, \mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{x}(\mathbf{v})}))] + \delta\beta_2 \cdot \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\mathbf{v}}} [\tilde{\mathbf{v}}(\text{ALG}(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}))]. \quad (6)$$

Replacing \mathbf{v}' with $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}$ in Inequality (5) and combining it with Inequality (6) we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{v}} \left[\sum_{i \in N} u_i(\mathbf{v}) \right] \geq (1 - \delta\beta_1) \cdot \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{v}, \tilde{\mathbf{v}}} [\tilde{\mathbf{v}}(\text{OPT}(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}, \mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{x}(\mathbf{v})}))] - \delta\beta_2 \cdot \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{v}, \tilde{\mathbf{v}}} [\tilde{\mathbf{v}}(\text{ALG}(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}))]. \quad (7)$$

Revenue bound: Again, applying Property (a) we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{v}} \left[\sum_{i \in N} \delta \cdot p_i(x_i(\mathbf{v}) \mid \mathbf{x}_{[i-1]}(\mathbf{v})) \right] \geq \frac{\delta}{\alpha} \cdot \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\mathbf{v}}} [\tilde{\mathbf{v}}(\text{ALG}(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}))] - \frac{\delta}{\alpha} \cdot \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\mathbf{v}}, \mathbf{v}} [\tilde{\mathbf{v}}(\text{OPT}(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}, \mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{x}(\mathbf{v})}))]. \quad (8)$$

Combination: To combine our bounds, we distinguish whether $\beta_2 \geq \frac{1}{2\alpha}$.

Case 1: $\beta_2 \geq \frac{1}{2\alpha}$ We use that point-wise for every $i \in N$ we have $u_i(\mathbf{v}) \geq 0$. Therefore, $u_i(\mathbf{v}) \geq \rho u_i(\mathbf{v})$ for all $0 \leq \rho \leq 1$. Using $\delta = \frac{1}{\beta_1 + 2\beta_2}$, $\rho = \frac{1}{2\alpha\beta_2}$, and Inequalities (7) and (8), we get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{v}} \left[\sum_{i \in N} v_i(x_i(\mathbf{v})) \right] &\geq \rho \cdot \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{v}} \left[\sum_{i \in N} u_i(\mathbf{v}) \right] + \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{v}} \left[\sum_{i \in N} \delta \cdot p_i(x_i(\mathbf{v}) \mid \mathbf{x}_{[i-1]}(\mathbf{v})) \right] \\ &\geq \rho(1 - \delta\beta_1) \cdot \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{v}, \tilde{\mathbf{v}}} [\tilde{\mathbf{v}}(\text{OPT}(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}, \mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{x}(\mathbf{v})}))] - \rho\delta\beta_2 \cdot \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{v}, \tilde{\mathbf{v}}} [\tilde{\mathbf{v}}(\text{ALG}(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}))] \\ &\quad + \frac{\delta}{\alpha} \cdot \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\mathbf{v}}} [\tilde{\mathbf{v}}(\text{ALG}(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}))] - \frac{\delta}{\alpha} \cdot \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\mathbf{v}}, \mathbf{v}} [\tilde{\mathbf{v}}(\text{OPT}(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}, \mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{x}(\mathbf{v})}))] \\ &= \frac{1}{\alpha(2\beta_1 + 4\beta_2)} \cdot \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\mathbf{v}}} [\tilde{\mathbf{v}}(\text{ALG}(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}))]. \end{aligned}$$

Case 2: $\beta_2 < \frac{1}{2\alpha}$ Now, we use $\delta = \frac{1}{\beta_1 + 1/\alpha}$. Inequalities (7) and (8) yield

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{v}} \left[\sum_{i \in N} v_i(x_i(\mathbf{v})) \right] &\geq \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{v}} \left[\sum_{i \in N} u_i(\mathbf{v}) \right] + \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{v}} \left[\sum_{i \in N} \delta \cdot p_i(x_i(\mathbf{v}) \mid \mathbf{x}_{[i-1]}(\mathbf{v})) \right] \\ &\geq (1 - \delta\beta_1) \cdot \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{v}, \tilde{\mathbf{v}}} [\tilde{\mathbf{v}}(\text{OPT}(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}, \mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{x}(\mathbf{v})}))] - \delta\beta_2 \cdot \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{v}, \tilde{\mathbf{v}}} [\tilde{\mathbf{v}}(\text{ALG}(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}))] \\ &\quad + \frac{\delta}{\alpha} \cdot \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\mathbf{v}}} [\tilde{\mathbf{v}}(\text{ALG}(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}))] - \frac{\delta}{\alpha} \cdot \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\mathbf{v}}, \mathbf{v}} [\tilde{\mathbf{v}}(\text{OPT}(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}, \mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{x}(\mathbf{v})}))] \\ &= \frac{1 - \alpha\beta_2}{1 + \alpha\beta_1} \cdot \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\mathbf{v}}} [\tilde{\mathbf{v}}(\text{ALG}(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}))] \\ &\geq \frac{1}{\alpha(2\beta_1 + 4\beta_2)} \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\mathbf{v}}} [\tilde{\mathbf{v}}(\text{ALG}(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}))], \end{aligned}$$

where the last step uses that $\beta_1 + \beta_2 \geq \frac{1}{\alpha}$ and $\beta_2 < \frac{1}{2\alpha}$.

B Generalization of Results in Section 4

In this appendix we prove more general versions of our composition theorems in Section 4 (Theorems B.1 and B.2) that also apply to non-optimal allocation rules ALG under suitable assumptions.

Closure under Maximum Our first composition theorem (Theorem 4.1) applies more generally to pricing rules that are (α, β) -balanced with respect to a non-optimal allocation rule ALG , as long as ALG is *consistent* in the following sense.

Definition B.1. Allocation rule ALG is *consistent* if for every $\mathbf{v} \in V^{\max}$ and corresponding supporting valuation profile $\tilde{\mathbf{v}} \in V$ for $\text{ALG}(\mathbf{v})$, we have $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}(\text{ALG}(\tilde{\mathbf{v}})) \geq \tilde{\mathbf{v}}(\text{ALG}(\mathbf{v}))$.

This condition is an “invariance” condition, requiring that if we plug the supporting valuations $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}$ back into ALG this does not lead to a worse outcome. A sufficient condition is $\text{ALG}(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}) = \text{ALG}(\mathbf{v})$.

Lemma B.1. *The optimal allocation rule OPT is consistent.*

Proof. Since $\text{OPT}(\mathbf{v})$ is a feasible outcome under $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}$, it holds that $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}(\text{OPT}(\tilde{\mathbf{v}})) \geq \tilde{\mathbf{v}}(\text{OPT}(\mathbf{v}))$ by optimality. \square

Theorem B.1. *Suppose that for each $\mathbf{v} \in V$ there exists a pricing rule $\mathbf{p}^{\mathbf{v}}$ that is (α, β) -balanced with respect to \mathbf{v} , consistent allocation rule ALG , and exchange-compatible family of sets $(\mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{x}})_{\mathbf{x} \in X}$. For each $\mathbf{v} \in V^{\max}$ let $\tilde{\mathbf{v}} \in V$ be a supporting valuation profile for $\text{ALG}(\mathbf{v})$. Then the pricing rule $\mathbf{p}^{\tilde{\mathbf{v}}}$ is (α, β) -balanced with respect to \mathbf{v} , ALG , and $(\mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{x}})_{\mathbf{x} \in X}$.*

Proof. We first establish Property (a). We use Property (a) of the original pricing rules, plus the definition of a supporting valuation profile to conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i \in N} p_i^{\tilde{\mathbf{v}}}(x_i \mid \mathbf{x}_{[i-1]}) &\geq \frac{1}{\alpha} \cdot (\tilde{\mathbf{v}}(\text{ALG}(\tilde{\mathbf{v}})) - \tilde{\mathbf{v}}(\text{OPT}(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}, \mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{x}}))) \\ &\geq \frac{1}{\alpha} \cdot (\tilde{\mathbf{v}}(\text{ALG}(\mathbf{v})) - \mathbf{v}(\text{OPT}(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}, \mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{x}}))) \\ &\geq \frac{1}{\alpha} \cdot (\mathbf{v}(\text{ALG}(\mathbf{v})) - \mathbf{v}(\text{OPT}(\mathbf{v}, \mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{x}}))). \end{aligned}$$

Next we establish Property (b). By Property (b) of the original pricing rule and the definition of a supporting valuation profile,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i \in N} p_i^{\tilde{\mathbf{v}}}(x'_i \mid \mathbf{x}_{[i-1]}) &\leq \beta \cdot \tilde{\mathbf{v}}(\text{OPT}(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}, \mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{x}})) \\ &\leq \beta \cdot \mathbf{v}(\text{OPT}(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}, \mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{x}})) \\ &\leq \beta \cdot \mathbf{v}(\text{OPT}(\mathbf{v}, \mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{x}})). \end{aligned} \quad \square$$

Closure under Addition Our second composition theorem (Theorem 4.2) applies to general allocation rules ALG without additional assumptions.

Theorem B.2. *Suppose that \mathbf{v} is additive over a set of allocation problems, and for each individual allocation problem there exists a pricing rule $\mathbf{p}^{\mathbf{v}^\ell}$ that is (α, β) -balanced with respect to \mathbf{v}^ℓ , allocation rule ALG^ℓ on \mathcal{F}^ℓ , and exchange-compatible family of sets $(\mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{x}^\ell}^\ell)_{\mathbf{x}^\ell \in X^\ell}$. Then the pricing rule $\mathbf{p} = \sum_{\ell=1}^m \mathbf{p}^{\mathbf{v}^\ell}$ is (α, β) -balanced with respect to \mathbf{v} , ALG on \mathcal{F} defined as $\text{ALG}(\mathbf{v}) = (\text{ALG}^1(\mathbf{v}^1), \dots, \text{ALG}^m(\mathbf{v}^m))$, and $(\prod_{i=1}^m \mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{x}^\ell}^\ell)_{\mathbf{x} \in X}$.*

Proof. We first verify Condition (a). We use the definition of the joint pricing rule, Condition (a) of the component pricing rules together with additivity across subproblems to conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i \in N} p_i(x_i \mid \mathbf{x}_{[i-1]}) &= \sum_{i \in N} \sum_{\ell=1}^m p_i^{\mathbf{v}^\ell}(x_i^\ell \mid \mathbf{x}_{[i-1]}^\ell) \\ &\geq \sum_{\ell=1}^m \frac{1}{\alpha} \cdot \left(\mathbf{v}^\ell(\text{ALG}^\ell(\mathbf{v}^\ell)) - \mathbf{v}^\ell(\text{OPT}(\mathbf{v}^\ell, \mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{x}^\ell})) \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{\alpha} \cdot (\mathbf{v}(\text{ALG}(\mathbf{v})) - \mathbf{v}(\text{OPT}(\mathbf{v}, \mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{x}}))). \end{aligned}$$

Next we verify Condition (b). We use the definition of the joint pricing rule, Condition (b) of the component pricing rules together with additivity across subproblems to conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i \in N} p_i(x'_i \mid \mathbf{x}_{[i-1]}) &= \sum_{\ell=1}^m \sum_{i \in N} p_i^{\mathbf{v}^\ell}((x'_i)^\ell \mid \mathbf{x}_{[i-1]}^\ell) \\ &\leq \sum_{\ell=1}^m \beta \cdot \mathbf{v}^\ell(\text{OPT}(\mathbf{v}^\ell, \mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{x}^\ell})) \\ &= \beta \cdot \mathbf{v}(\text{OPT}(\mathbf{v}, \mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{x}})). \end{aligned} \quad \square$$

C Smoothness from Balanced Prices

In this appendix we show that if a problem admits (α, β) -balanced prices with respect to the optimal allocation rule and the canonical exchange-feasible sets, then a mechanism that maximizes declared welfare and charges first-price payments is $(\frac{1}{2}, \alpha\beta + 1)$ -smooth. Consequently, we view balancedness as a stronger property than smoothness.

Theorem C.1. *Suppose that for each valuation profile $\mathbf{v} \in V$ there exists a pricing rule $\mathbf{p}^{\mathbf{v}}$ which is (α, β) -balanced with respect to allocation rule OPT and the canonical exchange-feasible sets. Then the mechanism that admits bids from V , uses allocation rule OPT , and charges first-price payments is $(\frac{1}{2}, \alpha\beta + 1)$ -smooth.*

Proof. Fix valuation profile \mathbf{v} , and suppose \mathbf{x}^* is the welfare-optimal allocation for \mathbf{v} . Fix a bid profile \mathbf{b} . For each agent i , consider a deviation to bid $b'_i = \frac{1}{2}v_i$. Let $x'_i = \text{OPT}_i(b'_i, \mathbf{b}_{-i})$ be the allocation made to agent i when declaring b'_i . Because the mechanism uses allocation rule OPT , the welfare obtained under (b'_i, \mathbf{b}_{-i}) when assigning x'_i to agent i must be as least as high as when assigning x_i^* . That is,

$$\frac{1}{2}v_i(x'_i) + \mathbf{b}(\text{OPT}(\mathbf{b})) \geq \frac{1}{2}v_i(x'_i) + \max_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{F}: y_i = x'_i} \sum_{j \neq i} b_j(y_j) \geq \frac{1}{2}v_i(x_i^*) + \max_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{F}: y_i = x_i^*} \sum_{j \neq i} b_j(y_j)$$

and hence, because the mechanism is pay-your-bid,

$$u_i(b'_i, \mathbf{b}_{-i}) = \frac{1}{2}v_i(x'_i) \geq \frac{1}{2}v_i(x_i^*) - \left(\mathbf{b}(\text{OPT}(\mathbf{b})) - \max_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{F}: y_i = x_i^*} \sum_{j \neq i} b_j(y_j) \right). \quad (9)$$

Now by the definition of $\mathcal{F}_{x_i^*}$, the final term in the preceding inequality is exactly the declared welfare of all agents for allocation $\text{OPT}(\mathbf{b}, \mathcal{F}_{x_i^*})$ if $x_i^* \neq \emptyset$ and at least the declared welfare of all agents except i for allocation $\text{OPT}(\mathbf{b}, \mathcal{F}_{x_i^*})$ if $x_i^* = \emptyset$. Since $b_i(\text{OPT}_i(\mathbf{b}, \mathcal{F}_{x_i^*})) = b_i(\text{OPT}_i(\mathbf{b}))$ if $x_i^* = \emptyset$ and generally $b_i(\text{OPT}_i(\mathbf{b})) \geq 0$, we thus have

$$\max_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{F}: y_i = x_i^*} \sum_{j \neq i} b_j(y_j) \geq \mathbf{b}(\text{OPT}(\mathbf{b}, \mathcal{F}_{x_i^*})) - b_i(\text{OPT}_i(\mathbf{b})). \quad (10)$$

Combining (10) with (9), we have

$$u_i(b'_i, \mathbf{b}_{-i}) \geq \frac{1}{2}v_i(x_i^*) - \left(\mathbf{b}(\text{OPT}(\mathbf{b})) - \mathbf{b}(\text{OPT}(\mathbf{b}, \mathcal{F}_{x_i^*})) \right) - b_i(\text{OPT}_i(\mathbf{b})).$$

Summing over all agents yields

$$\sum_i u_i(b'_i, \mathbf{b}_{-i}) \geq \frac{1}{2}\mathbf{v}(\text{OPT}(\mathbf{v})) - \sum_i \left(\mathbf{b}(\text{OPT}(\mathbf{b})) - \mathbf{b}(\text{OPT}(\mathbf{b}, \mathcal{F}_{x_i^*})) \right) - \mathbf{b}(\text{OPT}(\mathbf{b})). \quad (11)$$

Since there exists an (α, β) -balanced pricing rule $\mathbf{p}^{\mathbf{b}}$ for valuation profile \mathbf{b} , we have

$$\sum_i \left(\mathbf{b}(\text{OPT}(\mathbf{b})) - \mathbf{b}(\text{OPT}(\mathbf{b}, \mathcal{F}_{x_i^*})) \right) \leq \sum_i \alpha \cdot p_i^{\mathbf{b}}(x_i^*) \leq \alpha\beta \cdot \mathbf{b}(\text{OPT}(\mathbf{b})),$$

where the first inequality uses property (a) of (α, β) -balancedness separately for each agent i (with \mathbf{x} from the statement of (α, β) -balancedness set so that $x_i = x_i^*$ and $x_j = \emptyset$ for all $j \neq i$) and the second inequality uses property (b) of (α, β) -balancedness (with \mathbf{x} set to the empty allocation and \mathbf{x}' set to \mathbf{x}^*). Plugging these inequalities into (11), we have

$$\sum_i u_i(b'_i, \mathbf{b}_{-i}) \geq \frac{1}{2}\mathbf{v}(\text{OPT}(\mathbf{v})) - \alpha\beta \cdot \mathbf{b}(\text{OPT}(\mathbf{b})) - \mathbf{b}(\text{OPT}(\mathbf{b})).$$

Since the revenue of the mechanism on input \mathbf{b} is precisely $\mathbf{b}(\text{OPT}(\mathbf{b}))$, we conclude the mechanism is $(\frac{1}{2}, 1 + \alpha\beta)$ -smooth as required. \square

D A Smooth Mechanism Without Good Posted Prices

Theorem C.1 establishes that the existence of balanced prices implies smoothness of a welfare-maximizing mechanism. One might also hope that for every smooth mechanism there is a corresponding posted-price mechanism with similar welfare guarantees. In this appendix we show that this is not the case: there are allocation problems that admit constant-factor smooth mechanisms, but for which no posted-price mechanism can guarantee more than a linear fraction of the optimal social welfare.

Proposition D.1. *There exists a downward-closed welfare maximization problem that admits a $(1, 0)$ -smooth mechanism, but for which any posted price mechanism has approximation factor $\Omega(n)$.*

Proof. Let k be a positive integer to be fixed later. In the allocation problem we consider, $X_i = [k]^n \cup \{\emptyset\}$ for each $i \in [n]$. That is, each agent is allocated either \emptyset or a sequence of n integers between 1 and k . For $x_i \in X_i \setminus \{\emptyset\}$, write $x_i = (x_{i1}, \dots, x_{in})$, where each $x_{ij} \in [k]$. The set of feasible allocations is $\mathcal{F} = \{\mathbf{x}: (x_i \neq x_j) \implies ((x_i = \emptyset) \vee (x_j = \emptyset))\}$. That is, all agents who receive a non-empty allocation must receive the same allocation.

Agents have the following valuations. Each agent i has some desired value $z_i \in [k]$. The value of an allocation is $v_i(x_i) = 1$ if $x_{ii} = z_i$, and $v_i(x_i) = 0$ otherwise. Let \mathcal{D}_i be the distribution over such valuations in which z_i is chosen uniformly from $[k]$.

For this feasibility constraint and space of valuations, consider the mechanism that returns the welfare-optimal allocation and charges payments of 0. This mechanism simultaneously satisfies all desires by allocating (z_1, \dots, z_n) to every agent, where z_i is the desired value reported by agent i . This mechanism is $(1, 0)$ -smooth, with truth-telling being the required deviation.

On the other hand, consider any posted-price mechanism. Whichever is the first agent to obtain a non- \emptyset outcome, say agent i purchasing allocation x_i , each subsequent agent j can obtain positive value only if $z_j = x_{ij}$, which occurs with probability $1/k$. We therefore have that the expected welfare of any posted price mechanism is at most $1 + \frac{n-1}{k}$. Taking $k = n$ and noting that the optimal welfare is n , we conclude that no posted price mechanism can obtain more than an $\Omega(n)$ approximation to the optimal welfare. \square

E Proofs of Theorem 5.2 and Theorem 5.3

In this appendix we describe how to obtain balanced prices from smooth mechanisms in binary, single-parameter settings. In these settings players can either “win” or “lose”, and have a value $v_i \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ for winning. Feasible solutions $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{F} \subseteq \{0, 1\}^n$ are subsets of players that can win simultaneously. For ease of notation we identify the vectors $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{F}$ with the subset of players $i \in N$ for which $x_i = 1$. This lets us write $i \in \mathbf{x}$ if $x_i = 1$ and $i \notin \mathbf{x}$ otherwise.

E.1 Permeable Allocation Rules

We begin by defining the *permeability* of an allocation rule f , and by showing that (λ, μ) -smoothness implies a bound on permeability.

An algorithm f for a binary, single-parameter problem is *monotone* if for every player $i \in N$, any two bids $b'_i \geq b_i$, and any bid vector \mathbf{b}_{-i} ,

$$f_i(b_i, \mathbf{b}_{-i}) = 1 \quad \implies \quad f_i(b'_i, \mathbf{b}_{-i}) = 1.$$

For monotone allocation rules the *critical value* for player i is the smallest bid that ensures that player i wins against bids \mathbf{b}_{-i} . That is, $\tau_i^f(\mathbf{b}_{-i}) = \inf\{b_i \mid f_i(b_i, \mathbf{b}_{-i}) = 1\}$.

Definition E.1 (Dütting and Kesselheim [21], see also [42, 48, 33]). A monotone allocation algorithm f for a binary, single parameter problem \mathcal{F} is γ -permeable if $\gamma \geq 1$ is the smallest multiplier such that for all bid vectors \mathbf{b} and all feasible allocations $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{F}$ it holds that

$$\sum_{i \in N: x_i=1} \tau_i^f(\mathbf{b}_{-i}) \leq \gamma \cdot \mathbf{b}(f(\mathbf{b})). \tag{12}$$

Theorem E.1 (Dütting and Kesselheim [21]). *Suppose that the pay-your-bid mechanism \mathcal{M} based on allocation f is (λ, μ) -smooth, then f is γ -permeable with $\gamma \leq (\mu + 1)/\lambda$.*

Proof. Given a bid vector \mathbf{b} , we have to show that $\sum_{i: x_i=1} \tau_i^f(\mathbf{b}_{-i}) \leq \frac{\mu+1}{\lambda} \cdot \mathbf{b}(f(\mathbf{b}))$. To this end, consider fixed $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{F}$ and \mathbf{b} . Let $\epsilon > 0$ and let \mathbf{v} be defined by $v_i = \max\{b_i, \tau_i^f(\mathbf{b}_{-i})\}$. By smoothness of \mathcal{M} , there are b'_i such that

$$\sum_{i \in N} u_i(b'_i, \mathbf{b}_{-i}) \geq \lambda \cdot \mathbf{v}(\text{OPT}(\mathbf{v})) - \mu \cdot \sum_{i \in N} P_i(\mathbf{b}).$$

Observe that if $i \notin f(\mathbf{b})$, then $u_i(b'_i, \mathbf{b}_{-i}) \leq 0$ because $\tau_i^f(\mathbf{b}_{-i}) > b_i$ and this means that $i \notin f(b'_i, \mathbf{b}_{-i})$ unless $b'_i > v_i$. None of these choices results in positive utility. Furthermore, for $i \in f(\mathbf{b})$, we have $u_i(b'_i, \mathbf{b}_{-i}) \leq v_i = b_i$. Therefore $\sum_{i \in N} u_i(b'_i, \mathbf{b}_{-i}) \leq \mathbf{b}(f(\mathbf{b}))$.

Next, we can lower-bound $\mathbf{v}(\text{OPT}(\mathbf{v}))$ by the value of the feasible solution \mathbf{x} , which gives us $\mathbf{v}(\text{OPT}(\mathbf{v})) \geq \sum_{i: x_i=1} v_i \geq \sum_{i: x_i=1} (\tau_i^f(\mathbf{b}_{-i}) - \epsilon) \geq \sum_{i: x_i=1} \tau_i^f(\mathbf{b}_{-i}) - n\epsilon$.

Finally, as \mathcal{M} is pay-your-bid, we also have $\sum_{i \in N} P_i(\mathbf{b}) = \mathbf{b}(f(\mathbf{b}))$.

In combination this yields

$$\mathbf{b}(f(\mathbf{b})) \geq \lambda \cdot \left(\sum_{i: x_i=1} \tau_i^f(\mathbf{b}_{-i}) - n\epsilon \right) - \mu \cdot \mathbf{b}(f(\mathbf{b})),$$

which implies

$$\sum_{i: x_i=1} \tau_i^f(\mathbf{b}_{-i}) \leq \frac{\mu+1}{\lambda} \cdot \mathbf{b}(f(\mathbf{b})) + n\epsilon.$$

As this holds for all $\epsilon > 0$, this shows the claim. \square

Applying Theorem E.1 to each problem in a collection of problems Π , we see that if a mechanism \mathcal{M} is (λ, μ) -smooth for Π then it is $(\mu+1)/\lambda$ -permeable for Π .

Remark E.1. While the definition of permeability requires γ to be the smallest multiplier for which inequality (12) is satisfied, all our results can be derived from any upper bound on this multiplier at the cost of slightly worse guarantees.

E.2 Proof of Theorem 5.2

In this subsection we prove Theorem 5.2, which shows that (λ, μ) -smoothness of the greedy allocation rule for a subinstance-closed closed collection of binary, single-parameter problems Π implies the existence of a weakly $((\mu+1)/\lambda, 0, (\mu+1)/\lambda)$ -balanced pricing rule. By Theorem E.1, in order to show this result, it suffices to show the following theorem.

Theorem E.2. *Let ALG be any allocation rule. Suppose that the greedy allocation rule GRD is γ -permeable for a subinstance-closed collection of binary, single-parameter feasibility problems Π . Then for every $\mathbf{v} \in V$ there exists a pricing rule that is weakly $(\gamma, 0, \gamma)$ -balanced with respect to ALG and the canonical exchange-feasible sets $(\mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{x}})_{\mathbf{x} \in X}$.*

We first describe the pricing rule that achieves this result. Afterwards, we show that this pricing rule has the desirable properties.

E.2.1 Construction of the Prices

We set the price $p_i(z_i | \mathbf{x})$ for player $i \in N$ and outcome $z_i \in \{0, 1\}$ for arbitrary but fixed valuations \mathbf{v} and allocation $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{F}$ through Algorithm 2. For this let $\text{GRD}(\mathbf{v} | \mathbf{x}) \in \mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{x}}$ denote the allocation that results if we go through the players in order of non-increasing value but only add a player if he is not in \mathbf{x} and feasible together with \mathbf{x} and the previously accepted players.

We generally set $p_i(0 | \mathbf{x}) = 0$. That is, the price for losing is always zero. To determine the price $p_i(1 | \mathbf{x})$ for winning we first compute a sequence of reference allocations $\mathbf{r}^{(0)} \geq \dots \geq \mathbf{r}^{(n)}$ and a sequence of reference valuations $\mathbf{v}^{(0)} \geq \dots \geq \mathbf{v}^{(n)}$. We then set $p_i(1 | \mathbf{x}) = v_i$ if $i \in \mathbf{r}^{(n)}$, i.e., the price of player i is that player's valuation if he is part of the final reference allocation. Otherwise, we set $p_i(1 | \mathbf{x}) = \inf\{v'_i : i \in \text{GRD}(v'_i, \mathbf{v}_{-i}^{(n)} | \mathbf{x})\}$, i.e., we set the price to the player's critical value against the players in the final reference allocation.

While we need to define prices $p_i(z_i | \mathbf{x})$ for any possible allocation $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{F}$, the prices that player i will actually see are the ones where \mathbf{x} is set to the purchase decisions of the players $j = 1, \dots, i-1$ that precede player i in the ordering. Note that in this case $x_i = x_{i+1} = \dots = x_n = 0$ and therefore $\mathbf{r}^{(n)} = \dots = \mathbf{r}^{(i-1)}$ and $\mathbf{v}^{(n)} = \dots = \mathbf{v}^{(i-1)}$. We use the shorthand $\tau_i^{\text{GRD}}(\mathbf{v}_{-i}^{(i-1)} | \mathbf{x}_{[i-1]}) := \inf\{v'_i : i \in \text{GRD}(v'_i, \mathbf{v}_{-i}^{(i-1)} | \mathbf{x}_{[i-1]})\}$.

Algorithm 2: PRICING RULE DERIVED FROM GRD (Parametrized by ALG)

Input: $z_i \in \{0, 1\}, \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{F}$

Output: $p_i(z_i | \mathbf{x})$

if $z_i = 0$ **then**

 // In this case the price is simply zero
 $p_i(z_i | \mathbf{x}) = 0$

else

 // First determine reference allocation and valuations
 $\mathbf{r}^{(0)} \leftarrow \text{ALG}(\mathbf{v}), v_k^{(0)} \leftarrow v_k$ if $k \in \mathbf{r}^{(0)}$ and $v_k^{(0)} \leftarrow 0$ otherwise
 for $j \leftarrow 1$ **to** n **do**
 $\mathbf{r}^{(j)} \leftarrow \text{GRD}(\mathbf{v}^{(j-1)} | \mathbf{x}_{[j]}), v_k^{(j)} \leftarrow v_k^{(j-1)} = v_k$ if $k \in \mathbf{r}^{(j)}$ and $v_k^{(j)} \leftarrow 0$ else
 // Now determine the price
 if $i \in \mathbf{r}^{(n)}$ **then**
 // If player i is part of the reference allocation he pays his valuation
 $p_i(z_i | \mathbf{x}) \leftarrow v_i$
 else
 // Otherwise he pays the critical value against the players in the reference allocation
 $p_i(z_i | \mathbf{x}) \leftarrow \inf\{v'_i : i \in \text{GRD}(v'_i, \mathbf{v}_{-i}^{(n)} | \mathbf{x})\}$

return $p_i(z_i | \mathbf{x})$

E.2.2 Proof of Theorem E.2

We prove the theorem in two steps. We first use permeability of the greedy allocation rule to establish Condition (a) (in Lemma E.1). We then show Condition (b). For this we first prove a

novel combinatorial implication of permeability of the greedy allocation rule (in Lemma E.2) by considering valuations that are either zero or one. We then use this property in a careful layering argument to establish Condition (b) (in Lemma E.3).

Lemma E.1. *Let ALG be any allocation rule. Suppose that the greedy allocation rule GRD is γ -permeable for a subinstance-closed collection of binary, single-parameter problems Π . Then the pricing rule described in Algorithm 2 fulfills Condition (a) of Definition 3.2 with $\alpha = \gamma$ with respect to allocation rule ALG and the canonical exchange-feasible sets $(\mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{x}})_{\mathbf{x} \in X}$.*

Proof. Let $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{F}$. We will show that $p_i(x_i \mid \mathbf{x}_{[i-1]}) \geq \frac{1}{\gamma} \cdot (\mathbf{v}(\mathbf{r}^{(i-1)}) - \mathbf{v}(\mathbf{r}^{(i)}))$. By a telescoping-sum argument, this then implies

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i \in N} p_i(x_i \mid \mathbf{x}_{[i-1]}) &\geq \sum_{i \in N} \frac{1}{\gamma} \cdot \left(\mathbf{v}(\mathbf{r}^{(i-1)}) - \mathbf{v}(\mathbf{r}^{(i)}) \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{\gamma} \cdot \left(\mathbf{v}(\mathbf{r}^{(0)}) - \mathbf{v}(\mathbf{r}^{(n)}) \right) \geq \frac{1}{\gamma} \cdot \left(\mathbf{v}(\text{ALG}(\mathbf{v})) - \mathbf{v}(\text{OPT}(\mathbf{v}, \mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{x}})) \right), \end{aligned}$$

where the last step follows from the fact that $\mathbf{r}^{(0)} = \text{ALG}(\mathbf{v})$ and $\mathbf{r}^{(n)} \in \mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{x}}$.

So, it only remains to show $p_i(x_i \mid \mathbf{x}_{[i-1]}) \geq \frac{1}{\gamma} \cdot (\mathbf{v}(\mathbf{r}^{(i-1)}) - \mathbf{v}(\mathbf{r}^{(i)}))$. Observe that if $x_i = 0$, we have $\mathbf{r}^{(i-1)} = \mathbf{r}^{(i)}$ and this claim follows trivially. So, consider an arbitrary player i for which $x_i = 1$. If $i \in \mathbf{r}^{(i-1)}$ then $\mathbf{r}^{(i-1)} \setminus \mathbf{r}^{(i)} = \{i\}$. So $p_i(1 \mid \mathbf{x}_{[i-1]}) = v_i$, while $\mathbf{v}(\mathbf{r}^{(i-1)}) - \mathbf{v}(\mathbf{r}^{(i)}) = v_i$ and the claim is true.

Otherwise, $i \notin \mathbf{r}^{(i-1)}$, and we will first use smoothness with respect to subinstances to bound the size of the set $\mathbf{r}^{(i-1)} \setminus \mathbf{r}^{(i)}$. For a fixed $\epsilon > 0$, define \mathbf{v}' by setting $v'_i = \tau_i^{\text{GRD}}(\mathbf{v}_{-i}^{(i-1)} \mid \mathbf{x}_{[i-1]}) + \epsilon$, $v'_j = v_j$ for $j \in \mathbf{r}^{(i-1)} \setminus \mathbf{r}^{(i)}$, and $v'_j = 0$ for all other j .

Now player $i \in \text{GRD}(\mathbf{v}' \mid \mathbf{x}_{[i-1]} \cup \mathbf{r}^{(i)})$ by definition of \mathbf{v}' and v'_i in particular, while for each player $j \in \mathbf{r}^{(i-1)} \setminus \mathbf{r}^{(i)}$ we have $j \notin \text{GRD}(\mathbf{v}' \mid \mathbf{x}_{[i-1]} \cup \mathbf{r}^{(i)})$ because it cannot be added to $\mathbf{x}_{[i-1]} \cup \mathbf{r}^{(i)} \cup \{i\} = \mathbf{x}_{[i]} \cup \mathbf{r}^{(i)}$ by definition of $\mathbf{r}^{(i)}$. Hence, the greedy critical values of each player $j \in \mathbf{r}^{(i-1)} \setminus \mathbf{r}^{(i)}$ must be at least $\tau_j^{\text{GRD}}(\mathbf{v}' \mid \mathbf{x}_{[i-1]} \cup \mathbf{r}^{(i)}) \geq v'_i$.

Since both player i and the set of players $\mathbf{r}^{(i-1)} \setminus \mathbf{r}^{(i)}$ are feasible extensions to $\mathbf{x}_{[i-1]} \cup \mathbf{r}^{(i)}$, we can use γ -permeability of the greedy allocation rule in the subinstance in which we hold $\mathbf{x}_{[i-1]} \cup \mathbf{r}^{(i)}$ fixed to obtain,

$$|\mathbf{r}^{(i-1)} \setminus \mathbf{r}^{(i)}| \cdot v'_i \leq \sum_{j \in \mathbf{r}^{(i-1)} \setminus \mathbf{r}^{(i)}} \tau_j^{\text{GRD}}(\mathbf{v}' \mid \mathbf{x}_{[i-1]} \cup \mathbf{r}^{(i)}) \leq \gamma \cdot \mathbf{v}' \left(\text{GRD}(\mathbf{v}' \mid \mathbf{x}_{[i-1]} \cup \mathbf{r}^{(i)}) \right) = \gamma \cdot v'_i.$$

Cancelling v'_i shows that $|\mathbf{r}^{(i-1)} \setminus \mathbf{r}^{(i)}| \leq \gamma$.

To show the claim it now suffices to observe that the greedy critical value of player i in the subinstance where we hold $\mathbf{x}_{[i-1]}$ fixed under the original valuations is the highest value of a player $j \in \mathbf{r}^{(i-1)} \setminus \mathbf{r}^{(i)}$. Namely,

$$p_i(1 \mid \mathbf{x}_{[i-1]}) = \max_{j \in \mathbf{r}^{(i-1)} \setminus \mathbf{r}^{(i)}} v_j \geq \frac{1}{\gamma} \cdot \sum_{j \in \mathbf{r}^{(i-1)} \setminus \mathbf{r}^{(i)}} v_j = \mathbf{v}(\mathbf{r}^{(i-1)}) - \mathbf{v}(\mathbf{r}^{(i)}),$$

which concludes the proof. \square

Lemma E.2. *Suppose that the greedy allocation rule GRD is γ -permeable for a subinstance-closed collection of problems of binary, single-parameter problems Π . Consider any problem $\pi \in \Pi$ with feasibility structure \mathcal{F} . Furthermore, let $B_0 \supseteq B_1 \supseteq \dots \supseteq B_n$ and $A_0 \subseteq A_1 \subseteq \dots \subseteq A_n$ with $B_t \cup A_t \in \mathcal{F}$ for all t . Consider a set C that fulfills $C \cup A_n \in \mathcal{F}$ and for every $i \in C$ there is a $t \in \{0, 1, \dots, n\}$ with $i \in B_t$ or $\{i\} \cup B_t \cup A_t \notin \mathcal{F}$. Then we have $|C| \leq \gamma \cdot |B_0|$.*

Proof. Set $B_{n+1} = \emptyset$ and define $C_{n+1} = C$. Furthermore, define C_t for $0 \leq t \leq n$ recursively as a maximal subset of the players in $C_{t+1} \setminus B_t$ such that $C_t \cup A_t \cup B_t \in \mathcal{F}$.

We will show that for all $t \in \{0, 1, \dots, n\}$,

$$|C_{t+1} \setminus C_t| \leq \gamma \cdot |B_t \setminus B_{t+1}|.$$

Consider some fixed t and define $D := B_t \cap C_{t+1}$.

Now a crucial observation is that the set $C_{t+1} \setminus (C_t \cup D)$ is feasible holding $E := B_{t+1} \cup A_t \cup C_t \cup D$ fixed. This is because

$$(C_{t+1} \setminus (C_t \cup D)) \cup B_{t+1} \cup A_t \cup C_t \cup D = B_{t+1} \cup A_t \cup C_{t+1} \subseteq B_{t+1} \cup A_{t+1} \cup C_{t+1} \in \mathcal{F}.$$

Further note that by the way we have chosen C_t we know that $B_t \setminus (B_{t+1} \cup D)$ is another feasible extension to E because

$$(B_t \setminus (B_{t+1} \cup D)) \cup B_{t+1} \cup A_t \cup C_t \cup D = B_t \cup A_t \cup C_t \in \mathcal{F}.$$

To apply γ -permeability in the subinstance where we hold E fixed, define a valuation profile $\bar{\mathbf{v}}$ by setting $\bar{v}_i = 1$ for $i \in B_t \setminus (B_{t+1} \cup D)$ and 0 otherwise. Now, for every $i \in C_{t+1} \setminus (C_t \cup D)$, we have

$$\tau_i^{\text{GRD}}(\bar{\mathbf{v}} \mid E) = 1.$$

This is due to the maximality of C_t : If for some $i \in C_{t+1} \setminus (C_t \cup D)$ this value is 0, then also $\{i\} \cup (B_t \setminus (B_{t+1} \cup D)) \cup B_{t+1} \cup A_t \cup C_t \cup D \in \mathcal{F}$.

So by permeability,

$$|C_{t+1} \setminus (C_t \cup D)| = \sum_{i \in C_{t+1} \setminus (C_t \cup D)} \tau_i^{\text{GRD}}(\bar{\mathbf{v}} \mid E) \leq \gamma \cdot \bar{\mathbf{v}}(\text{GRD}(\bar{\mathbf{v}} \mid E)) = \gamma \cdot |B_t \setminus (B_{t+1} \cup D)|,$$

and therefore

$$|C_{t+1} \setminus C_t| = |D| + |C_{t+1} \setminus (C_t \cup D)| \leq |D| + \gamma \cdot |B_t \setminus (B_{t+1} \cup D)| \leq \gamma \cdot |B_t \setminus B_{t+1}|.$$

We now obtain the desired bound on the size of the set C by summing the previous inequality over all t and using that it becomes a telescoping sum

$$|C| + |C_0| = |C_{n+1}| + |C_0| = \sum_{t=0}^n |C_{t+1} \setminus C_t| \leq \gamma \cdot \sum_{t=0}^n |B_t \setminus B_{t+1}| = \gamma \cdot (|B_0| - |B_{n+1}|) = \gamma \cdot |B_0|.$$

It remains to show that all players in C will be covered (i.e., that $C_0 = \emptyset$). This follows from the fact that for each player $i \in C$ by the definition of C there exists a t such that $i \in B_t$ or i does not fit into $B_t \cup A_t$ and, thus, in either case $i \notin C_t$. \square




Figure 1: Our proof that the pricing rule derived from the greedy allocation rule satisfies Condition (b), relies on the fact that we can chop the valuation and price space into discrete layers, which reduces the problem to 0/1-valuations.

Lemma E.3. *Let ALG be any allocation rule. Suppose that the greedy allocation rule GRD is γ -permeable for a subinstance-closed collection of binary, single-parameter problems Π . Then the pricing rule described in Algorithm 2 fulfills Condition (b) of Definition 3.2 with $\beta_1 = 0$ and $\beta_2 = \gamma$ with respect to allocation rule ALG and the canonical exchange-feasible sets $(\mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{x}})_{\mathbf{x} \in X}$.*

Proof. Consider an arbitrary feasible $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{F}$ and an arbitrary feasible extension $\mathbf{x}' \in \mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{x}}$. We want to show that

$$\sum_{i \in N} p_i(x'_i \mid \mathbf{x}_{[i-1]}) \leq \gamma \cdot \mathbf{v}(ALG(\mathbf{v})).$$

We will prove this claim through a layering argument; as depicted in Figure 1. To this end, let $v_{(j)}$ be the j -th highest value of v_1, \dots, v_n ; furthermore $v_{(n+1)} = 0$. For each $j \in [n]$, let S^j denote the set of players with value at least $v_{(j)}$ and let T^j denote the set of players with $x'_i = 1$ that see a price $p_i(1 \mid \mathbf{x}_{[i-1]})$ of at least $v_{(j)}$.

We now apply Lemma E.2 for each $j \in [n]$ by setting $A_t = \mathbf{x}_{[t]}$, $B_t = \mathbf{r}^{(t)} \cap S^j$, $C = T^j$. Note that $C \cup A_n \in \mathcal{F}$ and for every $i \in C$ there is a $t \in \{0, 1, \dots, n\}$ such that $i \in B_t$ or $\{i\} \cup B_t \cup A_t \notin \mathcal{F}$. We obtain $|T^j| \leq \gamma \cdot |\mathbf{r}^{(0)} \cap S^j|$.

We conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i \in N} p_i(x'_i \mid \mathbf{x}_{[i-1]}) &= \sum_{i \in N} \sum_{j=1}^n \mathbb{1}_{i \in T^j} \cdot (v_{(j)} - v_{(j+1)}) \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^n |T^j| \cdot (v_{(j)} - v_{(j+1)}) \\ &\leq \sum_{j=1}^n \gamma \cdot |\mathbf{r}^{(0)} \cap S^j| \cdot (v_{(j)} - v_{(j+1)}) \\ &= \gamma \cdot \mathbf{v}(ALG(\mathbf{v})), \end{aligned}$$

where the first equality holds by definition of the sets T^j , the second equality is basic calculus, the inequality follows from Lemma E.2 as argued above, and the final equality holds by definition of $\mathbf{r}^{(0)} = ALG(\mathbf{v})$ and the sets S^j . \square

E.3 Proof of Theorem 5.3

In this subsection we prove Theorem 5.3, which claims that (λ, μ) -smoothness of the pay-your-bid mechanism based on the welfare-maximizing allocation rule for subinstance-closed collection of binary, single-parameter problems Π implies the existence of a weakly $(1, (\mu + 1)/\lambda)$ -balanced pricing rule. By Theorem E.1 it suffices to show the following theorem.

Theorem E.3. *Let ALG be any allocation rule. Suppose that the welfare-maximizing allocation rule OPT is γ -permeable for a subinstance-closed collection of binary, single-parameter feasibility problems Π . Then there exists a pricing rule that is weakly $(1, 0, \gamma^2)$ -balanced with respect to ALG and the canonical exchange-feasible sets $(\mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{x}})_{\mathbf{x} \in X}$.*

As in the case of greedy we first describe the construction of the prices, and then we show that these prices are balanced.

E.3.1 Construction of the Prices

We define the price $p_i(z_i \mid \mathbf{x})$ for player $i \in N$ and outcome $z_i \in \{0, 1\}$ and arbitrary but fixed valuation profile \mathbf{v} and allocation $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{F}$ through Algorithm 3. For this section, define $\text{OPT}(\mathbf{v} \mid \mathbf{x})$ as the allocation that results by padding the welfare-maximizing allocation for valuation profile \mathbf{v} over \mathcal{F}/\mathbf{x} with empty allocations.

As in the the case of the greedy allocation rule, we again set $p_i(0 \mid \mathbf{x}) = 0$ and we compute $p_i(1 \mid \mathbf{x})$ via reference allocations and reference valuations. We again define the initial reference allocation as $\mathbf{r}^{(0)} = \text{ALG}(\mathbf{v})$ and the initial reference valuations by setting $v_j^{(0)} = v_j$ for $j \in \mathbf{r}^{(0)}$ and $v_j^{(0)} = 0$ otherwise. The subsequent reference allocations and valuations are defined recursively as $\mathbf{r}^{(i)} = \text{OPT}(v^{(i-1)} \mid \mathbf{x}_{[i]})$ and $v_j^{(i)} = v_j^{(i-1)} = v_j$ for $j \in \mathbf{r}^{(0)}$ and $v_j^{(i)} = 0$ otherwise. We then set $p_i(1 \mid \mathbf{x}) = v_i$ if $i \in \mathbf{r}^{(n)}$ and $p_i(1 \mid \mathbf{x}) = \inf\{v'_i \mid i \in \text{OPT}(v'_i, \mathbf{v}_{-i}^{(n)} \mid \mathbf{x})\}$ otherwise. Note that this definition immediately implies that $p_i(x_i \mid \mathbf{x}_{[i-1]}) = \mathbf{v}(\mathbf{r}^{(i-1)}) - \mathbf{v}(\mathbf{r}^{(i)})$.

By substituting all occurrences of n with $i - 1$ we obtain the formula for the price $p_i(1 \mid \mathbf{x}_{[i-1]})$. We use the shorthand $\tau^{\text{OPT}}(\mathbf{v}_{-i}^{(i-1)} \mid \mathbf{x}_{[i-1]}) := \inf\{v'_i \mid i \in \text{OPT}(v'_i, \mathbf{v}_{-i}^{(i-1)} \mid \mathbf{x}_{[i-1]})\}$.

E.3.2 Proof of Theorem E.3

We again proceed in two steps. We first show Condition (a) (in Lemma E.4 below). Afterwards we show that the permeability of OPT provides an upper bound on the permeability of GRD and that the critical prices with respect to OPT are not much higher than those with respect to GRD (in Lemmas E.5 and E.6). This allows us to bound Condition (b) using the same machinery that we used in the previous section (in Lemma E.7)

Lemma E.4. *Let ALG be any allocation rule. Suppose that the welfare-maximizing allocation rule OPT is γ -permeable for a subinstance-closed collection of problems of binary, single-parameter problems Π . Then the pricing rule described in Algorithm 3 fulfills Condition (a) of Definition 3.2 with $\alpha = 1$ with respect to allocation rule ALG and the canonical exchange-feasible sets $(\mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{x}})_{\mathbf{x} \in X}$.*

Proof. Consider $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{F}$. We defined prices exactly so that $p_i(x_i \mid \mathbf{x}_{[i-1]}) = \mathbf{v}(\mathbf{r}^{(i-1)}) - \mathbf{v}(\mathbf{r}^{(i)})$. Therefore, using a telescoping-sum argument, we get

$$\sum_{i \in N} p_i(x_i \mid \mathbf{x}_{[i-1]}) = \mathbf{v}(\mathbf{r}^{(0)}) - \mathbf{v}(\mathbf{r}^{(n)}).$$

Algorithm 3: PRICING RULE DERIVED FROM OPT (Parametrized by ALG)

Input: $z_i \in \{0, 1\}$, \mathbf{v} , $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{F}$
Output: $p_i(z_i | \mathbf{x})$
if $z_i = 0$ **then**
 // In this case the price is simply zero
 $p_i(z_i | \mathbf{x}) = 0$
else
 // First determine reference allocation and valuations
 $\mathbf{r}^{(0)} \leftarrow \text{ALG}(\mathbf{v})$, $v_k^{(0)} \leftarrow v_k$ if $k \in \mathbf{r}^{(0)}$ and $v_k^{(0)} \leftarrow 0$ otherwise
 for $j \leftarrow 1$ **to** n **do**
 $\mathbf{r}^{(j)} \leftarrow \text{OPT}(\mathbf{v}^{(j-1)} | \mathbf{x}_{[j]})$, $v_k^{(j)} \leftarrow v_k^{(j-1)} = v_k$ if $k \in \mathbf{r}^{(j)}$ and $v_k^{(j)} \leftarrow 0$ else
 // Now determine the price
 if $i \in \mathbf{r}^{(n)}$ **then**
 // If player i is part of the reference allocation he pays his valuation
 $p_i(z_i | \mathbf{x}) \leftarrow v_i$
 else
 // Otherwise he pays the critical value against the players in the reference allocation
 $p_i(z_i | \mathbf{x}) \leftarrow \inf\{v'_i : i \in \text{OPT}(v'_i, \mathbf{v}_{-i}^{(n)} | \mathbf{x})\}$
return $p_i(z_i | \mathbf{x})$

The claim now follows from the fact that $\mathbf{r}^{(0)} = \text{ALG}(\mathbf{v})$ and $\mathbf{r}^{(n)} \in \mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{x}}$. □

Lemma E.5. *If the greedy allocation rule GRD is γ^{GRD} -permeable and the welfare-maximizing allocation rule OPT is γ^{OPT} -permeable for a subinstance-closed collection of binary, single-parameter problems Π , then $\gamma^{\text{OPT}} \geq \gamma^{\text{GRD}}$.*

Proof. We only have to show that for all $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{F}$, $\mathbf{x}' \in \mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{x}}$ and all \mathbf{v} , we have

$$\sum_{i \in \mathbf{x}'} \tau_i^{\text{GRD}}(\mathbf{v}_{-i} | \mathbf{x}) \leq \gamma^{\text{OPT}} \cdot \mathbf{v}(\text{GRD}(\mathbf{v} | \mathbf{x})).$$

Let $\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{x}' \cap \text{GRD}(\mathbf{v} | \mathbf{x})$. Observe that because $\mathbf{y} \subseteq \text{GRD}(\mathbf{v} | \mathbf{x})$, we have $\text{GRD}(\mathbf{v} | \mathbf{x} \cup \mathbf{y}) = \text{GRD}(\mathbf{v} | \mathbf{x})$. Define a valuation profile \mathbf{v}' by setting $v'_i = v_i$ for all $i \in \mathbf{x}' \setminus \mathbf{y}$ and $v'_i = 0$ otherwise. By loser independence of greedy, $\text{GRD}(\mathbf{v} | \mathbf{x} \cup \mathbf{y}) = \text{GRD}(\mathbf{v}' | \mathbf{x} \cup \mathbf{y})$. Furthermore, $\text{OPT}(\mathbf{v}' | \mathbf{x} \cup \mathbf{y}) = \text{GRD}(\mathbf{v}' | \mathbf{x} \cup \mathbf{y})$.

We claim that for $i \in \mathbf{x}' \setminus \mathbf{y}$ we have

$$\tau_i^{\text{GRD}}(\mathbf{v}_{-i} | \mathbf{x}) \leq \tau_i^{\text{GRD}}(\mathbf{v}'_{-i} | \mathbf{x} \cup \mathbf{y}) \leq \tau_i^{\text{OPT}}(\mathbf{v}'_{-i} | \mathbf{x} \cup \mathbf{y}).$$

For the first inequality we use that $\tau_i^{\text{GRD}}(\mathbf{v}_{-i} | \mathbf{x})$ is the value v_j of some j that has to be outbid by player i . By fixing another set \mathbf{y} , this value can only go up because the options are limited further. Also, when fixing $\mathbf{x} \cup \mathbf{y}$, replacing the valuations by \mathbf{v}' has no influence because the set of players that are selected remains unchanged.

The second inequality holds because under \mathbf{v}' player i in order to win when we hold $\mathbf{x} \cup \mathbf{y}$ fixed has to force some subset $\mathbf{z} \subseteq \text{GRD}(\mathbf{v}'_{-i} \mid \mathbf{x} \cup \mathbf{y}) = \text{OPT}(\mathbf{v}'_{-i} \mid \mathbf{x} \cup \mathbf{y})$ out of the solution. Under OPT his payment is the sum of the respective players' valuations, under GRD it is just the highest valuation of any such player.

On the other hand, for players $i \in \mathbf{y}$, because $\mathbf{y} \subseteq \text{GRD}(\mathbf{v} \mid \mathbf{x})$, the greedy critical value $\tau_i^{\text{GRD}}(\mathbf{v}_{-i} \mid \mathbf{x})$ is at most v_i .

Using these two bounds on $\tau_i^{\text{GRD}}(\mathbf{v}_{-i} \mid \mathbf{x})$ we obtain,

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{i \in \mathbf{x}'} \tau_i^{\text{GRD}}(\mathbf{v}_{-i} \mid \mathbf{x}) &\leq \sum_{i \in \mathbf{y}} v_i + \sum_{i \in \mathbf{x}' \setminus \mathbf{y}} \tau_i^{\text{GRD}}(\mathbf{v}_{-i} \mid \mathbf{x}) \\
&\leq \sum_{i \in \mathbf{y}} v_i + \sum_{i \in \mathbf{x}' \setminus \mathbf{y}} \tau_i^{\text{OPT}}(\mathbf{v}'_{-i} \mid \mathbf{x} \cup \mathbf{y}) \\
&\leq \sum_{i \in \mathbf{y}} v_i + \gamma^{\text{OPT}} \cdot \mathbf{v}'(\text{OPT}(\mathbf{v}' \mid \mathbf{x} \cup \mathbf{y})) \\
&= \sum_{i \in \mathbf{y}} v_i + \gamma^{\text{OPT}} \cdot \mathbf{v}'(\text{GRD}(\mathbf{v}' \mid \mathbf{x} \cup \mathbf{y})) \\
&\leq \gamma^{\text{OPT}} \cdot \sum_{i \in \mathbf{y}} v_i + \gamma^{\text{OPT}} \cdot \mathbf{v}'(\text{GRD}(\mathbf{v}' \mid \mathbf{x} \cup \mathbf{y})) \\
&= \gamma^{\text{OPT}} \cdot \mathbf{v}(\text{OPT}(\mathbf{v} \mid \mathbf{x})) ,
\end{aligned}$$

where the third inequality use γ^{OPT} -permeability of the welfare-maximizing allocation rule OPT in the subinstance in which we hold $\mathbf{x} \cup \mathbf{y}$ fixed, the subsequent equality holds by the definition of \mathbf{v}' , the fourth inequality uses that $\gamma^{\text{OPT}} \geq 1$, and the final equality holds by the definition of \mathbf{y} and \mathbf{v}' . \square

Lemma E.6. *If the greedy allocation rule GRD is γ^{GRD} -permeable for a subinstance-closed collection of binary, single-parameter problems Π , then*

$$\tau_i^{\text{OPT}}(\mathbf{v}^{(i-1)} \mid \mathbf{x}_{[i-1]}) \leq \gamma^{\text{GRD}} \cdot \tau_i^{\text{GRD}}(\mathbf{v}^{(i-1)} \mid \mathbf{x}_{[i-1]})$$

Proof. Note that for valuations $\mathbf{v}^{(i-1)}$ both GRD and OPT over \mathcal{F}/\mathbf{x} return the same set of players. The same is true if we drop any player j from $\mathbf{v}^{(i-1)}$. Dropping player i we can define $\mathbf{y} = \text{GRD}(\mathbf{v}_{-i}^{(i-1)} \mid \mathbf{x}_{[i-1]}) = \text{OPT}(\mathbf{v}_{-i}^{(i-1)} \mid \mathbf{x}_{[i-1]})$.

Now consider player i bidding $b'_i = \tau_i^{\text{GRD}}(\mathbf{v}_{-i}^{(i-1)} \mid \mathbf{x}_{[i-1]}) + \epsilon$. Then $i \in \text{GRD}(b'_i, \mathbf{v}_{-i}^{(i-1)} \mid \mathbf{x}_{[i-1]})$. The addition of player i causes the removal of a (possibly empty) subset of players $\mathbf{z} \subseteq \mathbf{y}$. That is, $\text{GRD}(b'_i, \mathbf{v}_{-i}^{(i-1)} \mid \mathbf{x}_{[i-1]}) = (\mathbf{y} \setminus \mathbf{z}) \cup \{i\}$.

Define valuations \mathbf{v}' by setting $v'_i = b'_i$, $v'_j = v_j^{(i-1)}$ for $j \in \mathbf{z}$, and $v'_j = 0$ for every other player j . Consider the subinstance in which we hold $\mathbf{y} \setminus \mathbf{z}$ fixed. Since both player i and the set of players \mathbf{z} are feasible extensions we can apply γ^{GRD} -permeability of the greedy allocation rule to obtain

$$|\mathbf{z}| \cdot b'_i = \sum_{j \in \mathbf{z}} \tau_j^{\text{GRD}}(\mathbf{v}' \mid \mathbf{y} \setminus \mathbf{z}) \leq \gamma^{\text{GRD}} \cdot \mathbf{v}'(\text{GRD}(\mathbf{v}' \mid \mathbf{y} \setminus \mathbf{z})) = \gamma^{\text{GRD}} \cdot b'_i,$$

and therefore $|\mathbf{z}| \leq \gamma^{\text{GRD}}$.

The final step is now to observe that the critical value $\tau_i^{\text{OPT}}(\mathbf{v}^{(i-1)} \mid \mathbf{x}_{[i-1]})$ of player i under the welfare-maximizing allocation rule is at most $|T|$ times the critical value $p_i^{\text{GRD}}(\mathbf{v}^{(i-1)} \mid \mathbf{x}_{[i-1]})$ of player i under the greedy allocation rule. To see this let $\mathbf{z}' \subseteq \mathbf{y}$ be the set with the smallest value such that $(\mathbf{y} \setminus \mathbf{z}') \cup \{i\} \in \mathcal{F}$. Then,

$$\tau_i^{\text{OPT}}(\mathbf{v}^{(i-1)} \mid \mathbf{x}_{[i-1]}) = \sum_{j \in \mathbf{z}'} v_j \leq \sum_{j \in \mathbf{z}} v_j \leq |T| \cdot \max_{j \in \mathbf{z}} v_j = |\mathbf{z}| \cdot \tau_i^{\text{GRD}}(\mathbf{v}^{(i-1)} \mid \mathbf{x}_{[i-1]}),$$

where we used that \mathbf{z} is some subset of \mathbf{y} such that $(\mathbf{y} \setminus \mathbf{z}) \cup \{i\} \in \mathcal{F}$ and so its combined value can only be larger than that of \mathbf{z}' . \square

Lemma E.7. *Let ALG be any allocation rule. Suppose that the welfare-maximizing allocation rule OPT is γ -permeable for a subinstance-closed collection of binary, single-parameter problems Π . Then the pricing rule described in Algorithm 3 fulfills Condition (b) of Definition 3.2 with $\beta_1 = 0$ and $\beta_2 = \gamma^2$ with respect to allocation rule ALG and the canonical exchange-feasible sets $(\mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{x}})_{\mathbf{x} \in X}$.*

Proof. Consider an arbitrary allocation $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{F}$ and feasible extension $\mathbf{x}' \in \mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{x}}$. We want to show that

$$\sum_{i \in N} p_i(x'_i \mid \mathbf{x}_{[i-1]}) \leq (\gamma^{\text{OPT}})^2 \cdot \mathbf{v}(\text{ALG}(\mathbf{v})).$$

We will again show this claim through layering. This time, however, we need the layering to arbitrarily fine-grained. We will specify the granularity by $\epsilon > 0$. For each $j \in \mathbb{N}$, let S^j denote the set of players with value at least $j \cdot \epsilon$. Let T^j denote the set of players with $x'_i = 1$ that see a price $p_i^{\text{OPT}}(x'_i \mid \mathbf{x}_{[i-1]})$ of at least $\gamma^{\text{GRD}} \cdot j \cdot \epsilon$.

For any fixed $j \in \mathbb{N}$ we now bound $|T^j|$ using Lemma E.2. We set $A_t = x_{[t]}$, $B_t = \mathbf{r}^{(t)} \cap S^j$, $C = T^j$. Note that $C \cup A_n \in \mathcal{F}$. We claim that for every $i \in C$ we have $i \in B_t$ or $\{i\} \cup B_t \cup A_t \notin \mathcal{F}$ for $t = i-1$. To see this, consider the two options how $p_i^{\text{OPT}}(x'_i \mid \mathbf{x}_{[i-1]})$ can be set. If $i \in \mathbf{r}^{(i-1)}$, then $p_i^{\text{OPT}}(x'_i \mid \mathbf{x}_{[i-1]}) = v_i$. As by definition $p_i^{\text{OPT}}(x'_i \mid \mathbf{x}_{[i-1]}) \geq \gamma^{\text{GRD}} \cdot j \cdot \epsilon \geq j \cdot \epsilon$, this implies $v_i \geq j \cdot \epsilon$ and so $i \in B_{i-1} = \mathbf{r}^{(i-1)} \cap S^j$. Otherwise, if $i \notin \mathbf{r}^{(i-1)}$, then $p_i^{\text{OPT}}(x'_i \mid \mathbf{x}_{[i-1]}) = \tau_i^{\text{OPT}}(\mathbf{v}_{-i}^{(i-1)} \mid \mathbf{x}_{[i-1]})$. In this case, we can apply Lemma E.6 to get

$$p_i^{\text{OPT}}(x'_i \mid \mathbf{x}_{[i-1]}) = \tau_i^{\text{OPT}}(\mathbf{v}_{-i}^{(i-1)} \mid \mathbf{x}_{[i-1]}) \leq \gamma^{\text{GRD}} \cdot \tau_i^{\text{GRD}}(\mathbf{v}_{-i}^{(i-1)} \mid \mathbf{x}_{[i-1]}).$$

So, we know that $\tau_i^{\text{GRD}}(\mathbf{v}_{-i}^{(i-1)} \mid \mathbf{x}_{[i-1]}) \geq j \cdot \epsilon$ and therefore $\{i\} \cup \mathbf{x}_{[i-1]} \cup (\mathbf{r}^{(i-1)} \cap Y^j) \notin \mathcal{F}$.

So, by Lemma E.2, we get $|T^j| \leq \gamma^{\text{GRD}} \cdot |\mathbf{r}^{(0)} \cap Y^j|$.

We conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i \in \mathbf{x}'} p_i^{\text{OPT}}(x'_i \mid \mathbf{x}_{[i-1]}) &\leq n\epsilon + \sum_{i \in \mathbf{x}'} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{1}_{i \in T^j} \cdot \gamma^{\text{GRD}} \cdot \epsilon \\ &= n\epsilon + \gamma^{\text{GRD}} \cdot \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} |T^j| \cdot \epsilon \\ &\leq n\epsilon + \gamma^{\text{GRD}} \cdot \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \gamma^{\text{GRD}} \cdot |\mathbf{r}^{(0)} \cap Y^j| \cdot \epsilon \\ &\leq (\gamma^{\text{GRD}})^2 \cdot \mathbf{v}(\text{ALG}(\mathbf{v})) + 2n\epsilon. \end{aligned}$$

As this argument holds for any $\epsilon > 0$, we also have $\sum_{i \in \mathbf{x}'} p_i^{\text{OPT}}(x_i' | \mathbf{x}_{[i-1]}) \leq (\gamma^{\text{GRD}})^2 \cdot \mathbf{v}(\text{ALG}(\mathbf{v}))$. By Lemma E.5, $\gamma^{\text{GRD}} \leq \gamma^{\text{OPT}}$ and the claim follows. \square

Remark E.2. When the prices defined by Algorithm 3 are non-decreasing then γ -permeability of OPT immediately implies that $\tau_i^{\text{GRD}}(\mathbf{v}_{-i}^{(i-1)} | \mathbf{x}_{[i-1]}) \leq \tau_i^{\text{GRD}}(\mathbf{v}_{-i}^{(i-1)} | \mathbf{x}) \leq \gamma \cdot \mathbf{v}(\text{OPT}(\mathbf{v}, \mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{x}}))$ implying that the pricing rule is (α, β) -balanced with $\beta = \gamma$. In this case Theorem E.3 can be strengthened to show the existence of a $(1, \gamma)$ -balanced pricing rule.

E.4 Example with Non-Monotone Prices

We conclude this appendix with an example that shows that the pricing rules based on the critical values of the greedy and welfare-maximizing allocation rule (defined in the previous two subsections) may lead to non-monotone prices.




Figure 2: Binary, single-parameter problem with non-monotone prices

The example is visualized in Figure 2. Each column corresponds to an item, and the numbers below the columns indicate how many copies of that item are available. Players are interested in purchasing a specific bundle of items. Their demands are indicated by boxes, which are connected by a line if they belong to the same player.

Name the players in dark gray P_1, P_2, \dots , the players in gray by Q_1, Q_2, \dots , and the players in white by R_1, R_2, \dots . Consider a valuation profile \mathbf{v} in which only the gray players have a valuation of 1 and all other players have a value of 0. Suppose that $\text{ALG}(\mathbf{v})$ picks precisely the gray players, and consider the prices of the white players say under the greedy allocation rule, when committing to longer and longer prefixes of P_1, P_2, \dots .

Initially, the price of the first white player R_1 for winning $p_1(\mathbf{v} | \emptyset) = 0$, after the arrival of the first dark gray player P_1 it increases to $p_1(1 | P_1) = 1$, and after the arrival of the second dark gray player P_2 the price $p_1(1 | P_1, P_2)$ drops to and remains zero. More generally, the i -th white player sees a price of 0 until the i -th dark gray player P_i arrives. When this payer arrives the price increases to 1. The arrival of the $(i + 1)$ -st dark gray player P_{i+1} causes the price to drop (and stay) at zero.

F Smoothness and Outcome Smoothness

In this appendix we examine the connection between smoothness and outcome smoothness. We show that the former implies the latter, but not vice versa.

Theorem F.1. *Consider a scalable valuation class V . Suppose that the direct mechanism that uses the welfare-maximizing allocation rule OPT and the pay-your-bid payment rule P is (λ, μ) -outcome smooth. Then this mechanism is $(\frac{\lambda}{2}, \mu)$ -smooth.*

Proof. Let $\mathbf{x}'(\mathbf{v}/2)$ be the outcome whose existence is guaranteed by the outcome-smoothness definition for valuations $\mathbf{v}/2$. Consider an arbitrary bid profile \mathbf{b} , an arbitrary player i , and a deviation of that player to $b_i'' = v_i/2$. Denote the outcome that player i gets under bid profile (b_i'', \mathbf{b}_{-i}) by x_i'' . Then,

$$\begin{aligned} u_i^{v_i}(b_i'', \mathbf{b}_{-i}) &= \frac{1}{2}v_i(x_i'') \geq \frac{1}{2}v_i(x_i'') - P_i^{VCG}(x_i'', \mathbf{b}_{-i}) \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2}v_i(x_i') - P_i^{VCG}(x_i', \mathbf{b}_{-i}) \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2}v_i(x_i') - \inf_{b_i': \text{OPT}_i(b_i', \mathbf{b}_{-i}) \succeq x_i'} P_i(b_i', \mathbf{b}_{-i}), \end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality uses that the VCG payments are non-negative, the second inequality uses that the VCG mechanism is envy free, and the final inequality uses that pay-your-bid payments are only higher than the VCG payments.

Summing the above inequality over all players and invoking the outcome-smoothness inequality for valuations $\mathbf{v}/2$ we find that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i \in N} u_i^{v_i}(b_i'', \mathbf{b}_{-i}) &\geq \sum_{i \in N} \left(\frac{1}{2}v_i(x_i') - \inf_{b_i': \text{OPT}_i(b_i', \mathbf{b}_{-i}) \succeq x_i'} P_i(b_i', \mathbf{b}_{-i}) \right) \\ &\geq \frac{\lambda}{2} \cdot \mathbf{v}(\text{OPT}(\mathbf{v}/2)) - \mu_1 \cdot \sum_{i \in N} P_i(\mathbf{b}) - \mu_2 \cdot \mathbf{b}(f(\mathbf{b})), \end{aligned}$$

which shows the claim because $\text{OPT}(\mathbf{v}/2) = \text{OPT}(\mathbf{v})$. \square

Let us demonstrate the difference between regular smoothness and outcome smoothness and the important role that the representation of the outcome space plays for outcome smoothness by means of an example.

Theorem F.2. *There is a $(\frac{1}{2}, 0)$ -smooth pay-your-bid mechanism (implying a constant price of anarchy) for which the price of anarchy provable via outcome smoothness cannot be constant.*

Proof. The example is illustrated in Figure 3. There are $k + 1$ players $\{0, 1, \dots, k\}$ and $2k$ items $\{1, \dots, 2k\}$. Player 0 has a value of 1 either for items $\{1, \dots, k\}$ (with probability $1/2$) or for items $\{k + 1, \dots, 2k\}$ (otherwise). Players $1, \dots, k$ are unit demand and are indifferent between which item they get. They have a value of $1/\sqrt{k}$.

Consider the mechanism that chooses an outcome so as to maximize declared welfare and charges agents their bid. Note that in this example it is always possible to satisfy the demands of all players. In particular, it is possible to show a constant price of anarchy via smoothness by considering for each agent $i \in N$ a deviation to $v_i/2$.

On the other hand for the natural representation of the outcome space in which we encode the fact that player i for $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ receives item j by $x_i = j$, the price of anarchy provable via outcome smoothness cannot be constant. Consider valuations \mathbf{v} such that player 0 has a valuation of 1 for items $\{1, \dots, 2k\}$ and player $i \geq k$ has a valuation of $1/\sqrt{k}$ for any item. Note




Figure 3: Smoothness vs. Outcome Smoothness.

that $\mathbf{v}(\text{OPT}(\mathbf{v})) = 1 + \sqrt{k} = \Theta(\sqrt{k})$. Consider the possible choices for $\mathbf{x}'(\mathbf{v})$. First suppose $\sum_{i \in N} v_i(x'_i) = \Omega(\sqrt{k})$. This means that either $\Omega(k)$ many small players are granted an item in $\{1, \dots, k\}$ or $\Omega(k)$ many small players are granted an item in $\{k+1, \dots, 2k\}$. Choosing the bid of player 0 for the respective set to be 1 ensures that $\inf_{b'_i: f(b'_i, \mathbf{b}_{-i}) \succeq x'_i} P_i(b'_i, \mathbf{b}_{-i}) = \Omega(k)$ and $\sum_{i \in N} p_i(\mathbf{b}) = \mathbf{b}(f(\mathbf{b})) = 1$ so $\mu_1 + \mu_2$ must be $O(k)$. On the other hand if $\sum_{i \in N} v_i(x'_i) = o(\sqrt{k})$ we can set the bids to zero and λ must be $o(1)$.

Intuitively, what stands in the way of outcome smoothness here is that what agent i gets under the smoothness deviation b'_i is highly dependent on the bids b_{-i} of the agents other than i . So while there is a safe bid, there is not a safe outcome. \square

G Proof of Theorem 5.4

To prove Theorem 5.4, we will first introduce the notion of weak outcome smoothness, then show how to construct the prices, and finally establish the two conditions necessary for (α, β) -balancedness separately.

G.1 Weak Outcome Smoothness and Its Properties

We begin by defining a more general notion of outcome smoothness, corresponding to the notion of weak smoothness.

Definition G.1. A mechanism is weakly (λ, μ_1, μ_2) -outcome smooth for $\lambda, \mu_1, \mu_2 \geq 0$ if for all valuation profiles $\mathbf{v} \in V$ there exists an outcome $\mathbf{x}'(\mathbf{v}) \in \mathcal{F}$ such that for all bid profiles $\mathbf{b} \in B$,

$$\sum_{i \in N} \left(v_i(x'_i) - \inf_{b'_i: f(b'_i, \mathbf{b}_{-i}) \succeq x'_i} P_i(b'_i, \mathbf{b}_{-i}) \right) \geq \lambda \cdot \mathbf{v}(\text{OPT}(\mathbf{v})) - \mu_1 \cdot \sum_{i \in N} P_i(\mathbf{b}) - \mu_2 \cdot \mathbf{b}(f(\mathbf{b})).$$

The following observation will facilitate our discussion in what follows. Under a mild scale invariance assumption, we can without loss of generality consider $(\lambda, 0, \mu)$ -outcome smooth mechanisms.

Proposition G.1. Consider a (λ, μ_1, μ_2) -outcome smooth mechanism with allocation rule f and payment rule P such that for every $\delta > 0$, we have $\mathbf{x}'(\mathbf{v}/\delta) = \mathbf{x}'(\mathbf{v})$. For every player $i \in N$ and all bid profiles $\mathbf{b} \in B$ define

$$\tilde{P}_i(\mathbf{b}) = \min \left\{ \frac{\mathbf{b}(f(\mathbf{b}))}{\sum_{i \in N} P_i(\mathbf{b})}, 1 \right\} \cdot P_i(\mathbf{b}).$$

Then the mechanism with allocation rule f and payment rule \tilde{P} is $(\lambda, 0, \mu_1 + \mu_2)$ -outcome smooth.

Proof. Given a valuation profile \mathbf{v} , we claim that the re-defined mechanism is $(\lambda, 0, \mu_1 + \mu_2)$ -outcome smooth with respect to the same outcome $\mathbf{x}'(\mathbf{v})$.

Fix a bid profile $\mathbf{b} \in B$ and let $\delta = \min \left\{ \frac{\mathbf{b}(f(\mathbf{b}))}{\sum_{i \in N} P_i(\mathbf{b})}, 1 \right\}$. Note that $\delta \leq 1$. Using outcome smoothness of the original mechanism for valuation profile \mathbf{v}/δ and corresponding outcome $\mathbf{x}'(\mathbf{v}/\delta) = \mathbf{x}'(\mathbf{v})$ we obtain

$$\sum_{i \in N} \left(\frac{1}{\delta} \cdot v_i(x'_i) - \inf_{b'_i: f(b'_i, \mathbf{b}_{-i}) \succeq x'_i} P_i(b'_i, \mathbf{b}_{-i}) \right) \geq \lambda \cdot \frac{1}{\delta} \cdot \mathbf{v}(\text{OPT}(\mathbf{v})) - \mu_1 \cdot \sum_{i \in N} P_i(\mathbf{b}) - \mu_2 \cdot \mathbf{b}(f(\mathbf{b})).$$

Multiplying by δ , we have

$$\sum_{i \in N} \left(v_i(x'_i) - \delta \cdot \inf_{b'_i: f(b'_i, \mathbf{b}_{-i}) \succeq x'_i} P_i(b'_i, \mathbf{b}_{-i}) \right) \geq \lambda \cdot \mathbf{v}(\text{OPT}(\mathbf{v})) - \mu_1 \cdot \delta \cdot \sum_{i \in N} P_i(\mathbf{b}) - \mu_2 \cdot \delta \cdot \mathbf{b}(f(\mathbf{b})).$$

From the definition of \tilde{P} and δ we know that $\delta \cdot P_i(b'_i, \mathbf{b}_{-i}) = \tilde{P}_i(b'_i, \mathbf{b}_{-i})$, $\delta \cdot \sum_{i \in N} P_i(\mathbf{b}) \leq \mathbf{b}(f(\mathbf{b}))$, and $\delta \cdot \mathbf{b}(f(\mathbf{b})) \leq \mathbf{b}(f(\mathbf{b}))$. This yields

$$\sum_{i \in N} \left(v_i(x'_i) - \inf_{b'_i: f(b'_i, \mathbf{b}_{-i}) \succeq x'_i} \tilde{P}_i(b'_i, \mathbf{b}_{-i}) \right) \geq \lambda \cdot \mathbf{v}(\text{OPT}(\mathbf{v})) - (\mu_1 + \mu_2) \cdot \mathbf{b}(f(\mathbf{b})). \quad \square$$

Another observation is that the function \mathbf{x}' of a weakly (λ, μ_1, μ_2) -outcome smooth mechanism is indeed a λ -approximation of social welfare, which also implies that its range λ -approximates the space of all outcome profiles.

Lemma G.1. *Suppose Y is the range of \mathbf{x}' . Then*

$$\max_{\mathbf{y} \in Y} \sum_{i \in N} v_i(y_i) \geq \sum_{i \in N} v_i(\mathbf{x}'(\mathbf{v})) \geq \lambda \cdot \mathbf{v}(\text{OPT}(\mathbf{v})).$$

Proof. We use outcome smoothness setting the valuation profile to \mathbf{v} and the bid profile to 0. Then for $\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{x}'(\mathbf{v})$,

$$\sum_{i \in N} \left(v_i(y_i) - \inf_{b'_i: f(b'_i, 0) \succeq y_i} P_i(b'_i, 0) \right) \geq \lambda \cdot \mathbf{v}(\text{OPT}(\mathbf{v})) .$$

As we assume that payments are never negative, this implies

$$\sum_{i \in N} v_i(y_i) \geq \lambda \cdot \mathbf{v}(\text{OPT}(\mathbf{v})) . \quad \square$$

G.2 Constructing the Prices

We first have to define $p_i(x_i | \mathbf{z})$ for all $i \in N$, $\mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{F}$, $x_i \in X_i$. To this end, we create two additional copies of each agent, implying that we have $3n$ agents overall. The different incarnations of agent i , denoted by i , $i + n$, and $i + 2n$ correspond to different roles when setting the prices. They particularly ensure that agent i competes against itself.

In more detail, for $i \in [n]$, the roles will be as follows in defining $p_i(x_i | \mathbf{z})$. Agent i is used to represent v_i , agent $i + n$ is used to represent z_i and agent $i + 2n$ tries to buy outcome x_i in the outcome-smooth mechanism. We will frequently map outcome profiles $\mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{F}$ from the original

space of n agents to the agents $n + 1, \dots, 2n$. This operation we denote by $\bar{\mathbf{z}}$. That is $\bar{z}_i = z_{i-n}$ for $i \in \{n + 1, \dots, 2n\}$ and $\bar{z}_i = \emptyset$ otherwise.

We will adopt the more general notion of weak outcome smoothness, from Appendix G.1. We assume that outcome smoothness holds in every subinstance \mathcal{F}'/\mathbf{z} of the extended outcome space \mathcal{F}' . To avoid any possible confusion of the numbering of the agents, we denote by $\mathcal{G}_{\mathbf{z}}$, the outcome space \mathcal{F}'/\mathbf{z} padded with \emptyset wherever $z_i \neq \emptyset$. That is, $\mathcal{G}_{\mathbf{z}}$ is isomorphic to \mathcal{F}'/\mathbf{z} but uses the exact same indices as \mathcal{F}' . We will denote the allocation rule of the outcome smooth mechanism in this space by $f(\cdot | \mathbf{z})$ and its payment rule by $P(\cdot | \mathbf{z})$.

Outcome smoothness now ensures that for all $\mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{F}'$ and valuation profiles $\mathbf{v} \in V$ there exists an outcome $\mathbf{x}'(\mathbf{v} | \mathbf{z}) \in \mathcal{G}_{\mathbf{z}}$ such that for all bid profiles $\mathbf{b} \in B$,

$$\sum_{i=1}^{3n} \left(v_i(x'_i) - \inf_{b'_i: f_i((b'_i, \mathbf{b}_{-i}) | \mathbf{z}) \succeq x'_i} P_i((b'_i, \mathbf{b}_{-i}) | \mathbf{z}) \right) \geq \lambda \cdot \mathbf{v}(\text{OPT}(\mathbf{v}, \mathcal{G}_{\mathbf{z}})) - \mu \cdot \mathbf{b}(f(\mathbf{b} | \mathbf{z})).$$

Given these definitions, we define prices based on the payments in the outcome-smooth mechanism by

$$p_i^{\mathbf{v}}(x_i | \mathbf{z}) = \inf_{b'_{i+2n}: f_i((b'_{i+2n}, \mathbf{v}_{-(i+2n)}) | \bar{\mathbf{z}}) \succeq x_i} P_i((b'_{i+2n}, \mathbf{v}_{-(i+2n)}) | \bar{\mathbf{z}}) .$$

The meaning is as follows: Agents $n + 1, \dots, 2n$ incorporate the allocation \mathbf{z} and agents $1, \dots, n$ represent the part of $\mathbf{v}(\text{OPT}(\mathbf{v}))$ that is not yet taken away by \mathbf{z} . Now, another copy of agent i is added to the system and competes with agents $1, \dots, n$ for the outcome.

G.3 Showing Balancedness

Let ALG denote the algorithm that returns $\text{OPT}(\mathbf{v})$ with probability λ . We will show that the constructed prices are $(\lambda, \mu/\lambda)$ -balanced with respect to ALG if they are monotone. To this end, we define $\mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{x}}$ as the range of $\mathbf{x}'(\cdot | \mathbf{z})$ on agents $2n + 1, \dots, 3n$. Formally,

$$\mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{x}} = \{\mathbf{y} \in X_1 \times \dots \times X_n \mid \exists \mathbf{v} : \mathbf{x}'(\mathbf{v} | \bar{\mathbf{x}}) = \bar{\mathbf{y}}\},$$

where $\bar{\mathbf{y}}$ is the outcome profile on $3n$ agents that sets $\bar{y}_{2n+i} = y_i$ for $i \in [n]$ and $\bar{y}_i = \emptyset$ for $i \leq 2n$.

Lemma G.2. *Suppose $(f(\cdot | \mathbf{z}), P(\cdot | \mathbf{z}))$ is $(\lambda, 0, \mu)$ -outcome smooth on every $\mathcal{G}_{\mathbf{z}}$ such that $\mathbf{x}'(\mathbf{v} | \mathbf{z}) = \mathbf{x}'(\epsilon \cdot \mathbf{v} | \mathbf{z})$ for every $\epsilon > 0$, $p_i^{\mathbf{v}}$ is monotonically increasing, then $p_i^{\mathbf{v}}$ satisfies Condition (b) of (α, β) -balancedness with $\beta = \mu/\lambda$, for the choice of $(\mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{x}})_{\mathbf{x} \in X}$ described above.*

Proof. Consider \mathbf{x} and $\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{x}}$. By definition of $\mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{x}}$, we can find some \mathbf{v}' such that $\mathbf{x}'(\mathbf{v}') = \bar{\mathbf{y}}$. Recall that, in allocation $\bar{\mathbf{y}}$, agents 1 through $2n$ obtain the empty allocation, and agents $2n + 1$ through $3n$ receive allocation profile \mathbf{y} .

By assumption for all $\epsilon > 0$ we have $\mathbf{x}'(\epsilon \cdot \mathbf{v}') = \bar{\mathbf{y}}$. Outcome smoothness for problem subinstances, with valuation profile $\epsilon \cdot \mathbf{v}'$ and bid profile \mathbf{v} implies

$$\sum_{i=1}^{3n} \left(\epsilon \cdot v'_i(\bar{y}_i) - \inf_{b'_i: f_i((b'_i, \mathbf{v}_{-i}) | \mathbf{x}) \succeq \bar{y}_i} P_i((b'_i, \mathbf{v}_{-i}) | \mathbf{x}) \right) \geq \lambda \cdot \epsilon \cdot \mathbf{v}'(\text{OPT}(\epsilon \cdot \mathbf{v}', \mathcal{G}_{\mathbf{x}})) - \mu \cdot \mathbf{v}(f(\mathbf{v} | \mathbf{x})) .$$

As payments P_i are never negative, this implies

$$\sum_{i=2n+1}^{3n} \left(- \inf_{b'_i: f_i((b'_i, \mathbf{v}_{-i}) | \mathbf{x}) \succeq \bar{y}_i} P_i((b'_i, \mathbf{v}_{-i}) | \mathbf{x}) \right) \geq \lambda \cdot \epsilon \cdot \mathbf{v}'(\text{OPT}(\epsilon \cdot \mathbf{v}', \mathcal{G}_{\mathbf{x}})) - \mu \cdot \mathbf{v}(f(\mathbf{v} | \mathbf{x})) - \sum_{i=1}^{3n} \epsilon \cdot v'_i(\bar{y}_i) .$$

This implies

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^n p_i^{\mathbf{v}}(y_i | \mathbf{x}) &= \sum_{i=2n+1}^{3n} \inf_{b'_i: f_i((b'_i, \mathbf{v}_{-i}) | \mathbf{x}) \succeq \bar{y}_i} P_i((b'_i, \mathbf{v}_{-i}) | \mathbf{x}) \\ &\leq \mu \cdot \mathbf{v}(f(\mathbf{v} | \mathbf{x})) - \epsilon \left(\sum_{i=1}^{3n} v'_i(\bar{y}_i) - \lambda \cdot \mathbf{v}'(\text{OPT}(\epsilon \cdot \mathbf{v}', \mathcal{G}_{\mathbf{x}})) \right). \end{aligned}$$

As this holds for all $\epsilon > 0$, we also have

$$\sum_{i=1}^n p_i^{\mathbf{v}}(y_i | \mathbf{x}) \leq \mu \cdot \mathbf{v}(f(\mathbf{v} | \mathbf{x})) \leq \mu \cdot \mathbf{v}(\text{OPT}((v_1, \dots, v_n, 0, \dots, 0), \mathcal{G}_{\mathbf{x}})) \leq \frac{\mu}{\lambda} \mathbf{v}(\text{OPT}(\mathbf{v}, \mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{x}})) ,$$

where the last step uses Lemma G.1. \square

Lemma G.3. *Suppose $(f(\cdot | \mathbf{z}), P(\cdot | \mathbf{z}))$ is $(\lambda, 0, \mu)$ -outcome smooth on every $\mathcal{G}_{\mathbf{z}}$ such that $\mathbf{x}'(\mathbf{v} | \mathbf{z}) = \mathbf{x}'(\epsilon \cdot \mathbf{v} | \mathbf{z})$ for every $\epsilon > 0$, f is the declared welfare maximizer, and P is the pay-your-bid rule. Then $p_i^{\mathbf{v}}$ satisfies Condition (a) of (α, β) -balancedness with $\alpha = \lambda$, for the choice of ALG and $(\mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{x}})_{\mathbf{x} \in X}$ described above.*

Proof. Consider an arbitrary player i and arbitrary outcomes $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{F}$. To bound $p_i(x_i | \mathbf{x}_{[i-1]})$, we consider player $2n + i$ in the outcome-smooth mechanism. Let b_{2n+i} be a bid such that $f_{2n+i}(b_{2n+i}, \mathbf{v}_{-(2n+i)} | \bar{\mathbf{x}}_{[n+i-1]}) \succeq x_i$. We show that for any such b_{2n+i} , we have

$$P_i(b_{2n+i}, \mathbf{v}_{-(2n+i)} | \bar{\mathbf{x}}_{[n+i-1]}) \geq \mathbf{v}(\text{OPT}(\mathbf{v}, \mathcal{G}_{\bar{\mathbf{x}}_{[n+i-1]}})) - \mathbf{v}(\text{OPT}(\mathbf{v}, \mathcal{G}_{\bar{\mathbf{x}}_{[n+i]}})) .$$

As this holds for all b_{2n+i} , this gives also a lower bound on the infimum.

In the following, we keep the allocation $\bar{\mathbf{x}}_{[n+i-1]} = (\emptyset, \dots, \emptyset, x_1, \dots, x_{i-1}, \emptyset, \dots, \emptyset)$ fixed and compare the two possible feasible solutions $\mathbf{a} := f(b_{2n+i}, \mathbf{v}_{-(2n+i)}^{(i-1)} | \bar{\mathbf{x}}_{[n+i-1]})$ and $\mathbf{q} := \text{OPT}(\mathbf{v}, \mathcal{G}_{\bar{\mathbf{x}}_{[n+i-1]}})$.

As \mathbf{a} maximizes $(b_{2n+i}, v_{-(2n+i)})$ when keeping $\bar{\mathbf{x}}_{[n+i-1]}$ fixed, we have

$$b_{2n+i}(a_{2n+i}) + \sum_{\substack{j=1 \\ j \neq 2n+i}}^{3n} v_j(a_j) \geq b_{2n+i}(q_{2n+i}) + \sum_{\substack{j=1 \\ j \neq n+i}}^{3n} v_j(q_j) .$$

As $v_j = 0$ for all $j > n$, this is equivalent to

$$b_{2n+i}(a_{2n+i}) \geq b_{2n+i}(q_{2n+i}) + \sum_{j=1}^n v_j(q_j) - \sum_{j=1}^n v_j(a_j) .$$

Now, observe that if we replace a_{2n+i} by x_i in allocation \mathbf{a} , then the modified vector \mathbf{a}' is still feasible in the space that keeps $\bar{\mathbf{x}}_{[n+i-1]}$ fixed. By symmetry of players $2n + i$ and $n + i$, this also means that $(a_1, \dots, a_n, \emptyset, \dots, \emptyset) \in \mathcal{G}_{\bar{\mathbf{x}}_{[n+i]}}$. This implies $\sum_{j=1}^n v_j(a_j) \leq \mathbf{v}(\text{OPT}(\mathbf{v}, \mathcal{G}_{\bar{\mathbf{x}}_{[n+i]}}))$.

Overall, we get

$$p_i^{\mathbf{v}}(x_i | \mathbf{x}_{[i-1]}) \geq \mathbf{v}(\text{OPT}(\mathbf{v}, \mathcal{G}_{\bar{\mathbf{x}}_{[n+i-1]}})) - \mathbf{v}(\text{OPT}(\mathbf{v}, \mathcal{G}_{\bar{\mathbf{x}}_{[n+i]}})) .$$

Summing up the prices for all players i and using a telescoping sum, this implies a lower bound of

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^n p_i^{\mathbf{v}}(x_i \mid \mathbf{x}_{[i-1]}) &\geq \mathbf{v}(\text{OPT}(\mathbf{v}, \mathcal{G}_{\bar{\mathbf{x}}_0})) - \mathbf{v}(\text{OPT}(\mathbf{v}, \mathcal{G}_{\bar{\mathbf{x}}_{[n]}})) \\ &= \mathbf{v}(\text{OPT}(\mathbf{v})) - \mathbf{v}(\text{OPT}(\mathbf{v}, \mathcal{G}_{\bar{\mathbf{x}}})) . \end{aligned}$$

Finally, we have $\mathbf{v}(\text{OPT}(\mathbf{v})) = \frac{1}{\lambda} \mathbf{v}(\text{ALG}(\mathbf{v}))$ and $\mathbf{v}(\text{OPT}(\mathbf{v}, \mathcal{G}_{\bar{\mathbf{x}}})) \leq \frac{1}{\lambda} \mathbf{v}(\text{OPT}(\mathbf{v}, \mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{x}}))$ by Lemma G.1. So, in combination

$$\sum_{i=1}^n p_i^{\mathbf{v}}(x_i \mid \mathbf{x}_{[i-1]}) \geq \frac{1}{\lambda} (\mathbf{v}(\text{ALG}(\mathbf{v})) - \mathbf{v}(\text{OPT}(\mathbf{v}, \mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{x}}))) . \quad \square$$

H Matroids

In this appendix we show that the pricing rule defined by [36] for matroid intersection is weakly balanced. We also show how to obtain balanced prices for settings in which agents can own multiple elements of the ground set.

H.1 Matroid Intersection

In this setting, we consider the intersection of k matroids. Let \mathcal{F}^j be the independent sets in the j th matroid and let $\mathcal{F} = \bigcap_j \mathcal{F}^j$ be the sets that are independent in every matroid and thus feasible to our problem.

To set prices for a valuation profile \mathbf{v} , we first compute a solution $S = \text{OPT}(\mathbf{v})$ with respect to these prices. Then, we pretend the valuation is actually \mathbf{v}_S and use the pricing rules $p_i^{j, \mathbf{v}_S}(\cdot \mid \cdot)$ for the individual matroids. We set $p_i(x_i \mid \mathbf{y}) = \sum_j p_i^{j, \mathbf{v}_S}(x_i \mid \mathbf{y})$.

Theorem H.1. *The pricing rule defined above is weakly $(1, 1, k-1)$ -balanced with respect to OPT.*

Proof. We let $\mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{x}}$ be the set of all sets \mathbf{y} such that $\mathbf{x} \cap \mathbf{y} = \emptyset$ and $\mathbf{x} \cup \mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{F}$. $\mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{x}}^j$ is defined as all \mathbf{y} for which $\mathbf{x} \cap \mathbf{y} = \emptyset$ and $\mathbf{x} \cup \mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{F}^j$. We will first show that these definitions imply

$$\sum_j \mathbf{v}_S(\text{OPT}(\mathbf{v}_S, \mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{x}}^j)) \leq \mathbf{v}(\text{OPT}(\mathbf{v}, \mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{x}})) + (k-1) \mathbf{v}(\text{OPT}(\mathbf{v}, \mathcal{F})) . \quad (13)$$

To prove this equality, let $T^j = \text{OPT}(\mathbf{v}_S, \mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{x}}^j) \cap S$. By this definition $\mathbf{v}_S(\text{OPT}(\mathbf{v}_S, \mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{x}}^j)) = \sum_{i \in T^j} v_i$. Furthermore, let $U = \bigcap_j T^j$. Observe that $\mathbf{v}(\text{OPT}(\mathbf{v}, \mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{x}})) \geq \mathbf{v}(U)$. Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_j \mathbf{v}_S(\text{OPT}(\mathbf{v}_S, \mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{x}}^j)) &= \sum_j \sum_{i \in T^j} v_i \\ &\leq k \sum_{i \in U} v_i + (k-1) \sum_{i \in S \setminus U} v_j \\ &= \sum_{i \in U} v_i + (k-1) \sum_{i \in S} v_j \\ &\leq \mathbf{v}(\text{OPT}(\mathbf{v}, \mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{x}})) + (k-1) \mathbf{v}(\text{OPT}(\mathbf{v}, \mathcal{F})) . \end{aligned}$$

To show Conditions (a) and (b), we can use the fact that the respective pricing schemes for single matroids are (1, 1)-balanced with respect to $\mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{x}}$. In both cases, we will add up the respective inequalities and use that always $\mathcal{F} \cup \mathcal{F}^j$, $\mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{x}} \cup \mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{x}}^j$. Regarding Condition (a), we get that for all $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{F}$

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_i p_i(x_i \mid \mathbf{x}_{[i-1]}) &= \sum_j \sum_i p_i^{j, \mathbf{v}_S}(x_i \mid \mathbf{x}_{[i-1]}) \\
&\geq \sum_j (\mathbf{v}_S(\text{OPT}(\mathbf{v}_S, \mathcal{F}^j)) - \mathbf{v}_S(\text{OPT}(\mathbf{v}_S, \mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{x}}^j))) \\
&= k\mathbf{v}(\text{OPT}(\mathbf{v}, \mathcal{F})) - \sum_j \mathbf{v}_S(\text{OPT}(\mathbf{v}_S, \mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{x}}^j)) \\
&\geq \mathbf{v}(\text{OPT}(\mathbf{v}, \mathcal{F})) - \mathbf{v}(\text{OPT}(\mathbf{v}, \mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{x}})) ,
\end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality comes from the respective balancedness conditions and the second inequality comes for Equation (13).

Regarding Condition (b), we get that for all $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{F}$ and all $\mathbf{x}' \in \mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{x}}$

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_i p_i(x'_i \mid \mathbf{x}_{[i-1]}) &= \sum_i \sum_j p_i^{j, \mathbf{v}_S}(x'_i \mid \mathbf{x}_{[i-1]}) \\
&\leq \sum_j \mathbf{v}_S(\text{OPT}(\mathbf{v}_S, \mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{x}}^j)) \\
&\leq \mathbf{v}(\text{OPT}(\mathbf{v}, \mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{x}})) + (k-1)\mathbf{v}(\text{OPT}(\mathbf{v}, \mathcal{F})) . \quad \square
\end{aligned}$$

H.2 Extension to Multi-Dimensional Valuations (Proof of Theorem 6.5)

We next consider a matroid feasibility constraint, where each ground set element is owned by an agent (and possibly more than one per agent). Consider matroid $\mathcal{M} = (E, \mathcal{I})$, where E is a ground set of elements and $\mathcal{I} \subseteq 2^E$ is a family of feasible subsets. Set E is partitioned into subsets corresponding to agents, E_1, \dots, E_n . We think of E_i as the elements owned by agent i . The outcome space X_i contains all subsets of E_i . An allocation \mathbf{x} is feasible if and only if $\bigcup_i x_i \in \mathcal{I}$; that is, if the chosen elements form an independent set.

Given a valuation profile \mathbf{v} , let $\text{OPT}(\mathbf{v}) \in \mathcal{I}$ denote a social-welfare maximizing allocation. Furthermore, given $S \in \mathcal{I}$, let $\text{OPT}(\mathbf{v} \mid S)$ denote the set $T \in \mathcal{I}$ maximizing $\mathbf{v}(T)$ such that $S \cap T = \emptyset$ and $S \cup T \in \mathcal{I}$.

H.2.1 Additive Valuations

We will first turn to the case that all valuation functions v_i are additive. That is, there are non-negative numbers $v_{i,j}$ such that $v_i(x_i) = \sum_{j \in x_i} v_{i,j}$. Given $S \in \mathcal{I}$, $i \in N$, and a valuation profile \mathbf{v} , define

$$p_i^{\mathbf{v}}(x_i \mid \mathbf{y}) = \begin{cases} \mathbf{v}(\text{OPT}(\mathbf{v} \mid \bigcup_j y_j)) - \mathbf{v}(\text{OPT}(\mathbf{v} \mid (\bigcup_j y_j \cup x_i))) & \text{if } (\bigcup_j y_j \cup x_i) \in \mathcal{I}, \text{ and} \\ \infty & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (14)$$

We first show that these prices are monotonically increasing.

Lemma H.1. Consider the pricing rule $p^{\mathbf{v}}$. For an arbitrary profile \mathbf{v} , feasible outcome profiles $\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{y}' \in \mathcal{F}$ such that $y_i \subseteq y'_i$, agent i and allocation x_i ,

$$p_i^{\mathbf{y}}(x_i | \mathbf{y}) \leq p_i^{\mathbf{y}'}(x_i | \mathbf{y}').$$

Proof. Let $S = \bigcup_j y_j, T = \bigcup_j y'_j$. If $S \cup x_i \notin \mathcal{I}$, then $T \cup x_i \notin \mathcal{I}$, and so $p_i^{\mathbf{y}}(x_i | \mathbf{y}) = p_i^{\mathbf{y}'}(x_i | \mathbf{y}') = \infty$. Otherwise,

$$\begin{aligned} p_i^{\mathbf{y}}(x_i | \mathbf{y}) &= \mathbf{v}(\text{OPT}(\mathbf{v} | S)) - \mathbf{v}(\text{OPT}(\mathbf{v} | (S \cup x_i))) \\ &\leq \mathbf{v}(\text{OPT}(\mathbf{v} | T)) - \mathbf{v}(\text{OPT}(\mathbf{v} | (T \cup x_i))) \\ &\leq p_i^{\mathbf{y}'}(x_i | \mathbf{y}'), \end{aligned}$$

where the equation follows by the definition of $p_i^{\mathbf{y}}(x_i | \mathbf{y})$, and the inequality follows from the submodularity of the function $f(U) = \mathbf{v}(\text{OPT}(\mathbf{v} | U))$ (cf. [35, Lemma 3]). \square

Theorem H.2. The pricing rule defined in Equation 14, is (1,1)-balanced with respect to the optimal allocation rule OPT .

Proof. We define $\mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{x}}$ as the set of all outcome profiles $\mathbf{y} \in E_1 \times \dots \times E_n$ such that $(\bigcup_i y_i) \cap (\bigcup_i x_i) = \emptyset$ and $(\bigcup_i y_i) \cup (\bigcup_i x_i) \in \mathcal{I}$. In other words, we consider the matroid contracted by the set $\bigcup_i x_i$.

We first show that Condition (a) holds for $\alpha = 1$. For every agent $i \in N$ and every $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{F}$ by a telescoping-sum argument,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_i p_i^{\mathbf{y}}(x_i | \mathbf{x}_{[i-1]}) &= \sum_i \left[\mathbf{v}(\text{OPT}(\mathbf{v} | \bigcup_{j=1}^{i-1} x_j)) - \mathbf{v}(\text{OPT}(\mathbf{v} | \bigcup_{j=1}^i x_j)) \right] \\ &= \mathbf{v}(\text{OPT}(\mathbf{v})) - \mathbf{v}(\text{OPT}(\mathbf{v} | \bigcup_j x_j)) \\ &= \mathbf{v}(\text{OPT}(\mathbf{v})) - \mathbf{v}(\text{OPT}(\mathbf{v}, \mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{x}})). \end{aligned}$$

We next show that the second condition holds for $\beta = 1$. Consider some arbitrary $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{F}$, $\mathbf{x}' \in \mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{x}}$. Let $S = \bigcup_i x_i$. Note that $\text{OPT}(\mathbf{v} | S)$ is precisely a maximum-weight basis of the matroid contracted with S . By the generalized Rota exchange theorem [39, Lemma 2.7], for each i there exists some set $R_i \subseteq \text{OPT}(\mathbf{v} | S)$ (which may not be contained in E_i) such that each element of $\text{OPT}(\mathbf{v} | S)$ appears in exactly one R_i , and $(\text{OPT}(\mathbf{v} | S) \setminus R_i) \cup x'_i$ is an independent set in the matroid after contracting S . We therefore have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i \in N} p_i^{\mathbf{y}}(x'_i | \mathbf{x}_{[i-1]}) &\leq \sum_{i \in N} p_i^{\mathbf{y}}(x'_i | \mathbf{x}) \\ &= \sum_{i \in N} \left[\mathbf{v}(\text{OPT}(\mathbf{v} | S)) - \mathbf{v}(\text{OPT}(\mathbf{v} | S \cup x'_i)) \right] \\ &\leq \sum_{i \in N} \left[\mathbf{v}(\text{OPT}(\mathbf{v} | S)) - \mathbf{v}(\text{OPT}(\mathbf{v} | S) \setminus R_i) \right] \\ &= \sum_{i \in N} \mathbf{v}(R_i) \\ &= \mathbf{v}(\text{OPT}(\mathbf{v} | \mathbf{x})), \end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality is by monotonicity of the prices, and the second inequality follows by observing that $(\text{OPT}(\mathbf{v}) \setminus R_i) \cup x'_i$ is feasible in the contracted matroid (see the Rota exchange argument above), and thus $\mathbf{v}(\text{OPT}(\mathbf{v}) \setminus R_i) \leq \mathbf{v}(\text{OPT}(\mathbf{v} \mid S \cup x'_i))$. The final equality follows by additivity. We conclude that the suggested prices are $(1, 1)$ -balanced. \square

H.2.2 Submodular and XOS Valuations

By Theorem 4.1, closure under maximum, we can immediately extend Theorem H.2 to XOS valuations. That is, there exist prices that yield a 2-approximation to the optimal welfare, when agent valuations are fractionally subadditive over their selected ground set elements.

Unlike the case of additive valuations, this existence result does not immediately imply that such prices can be computed in polynomial time. This is because determining the optimal allocation, OPT , is NP-hard for fractionally subadditive valuations. However, we claim that for submodular valuations, the greedy algorithm can be used to compute 4-approximate prices in polynomial time. The idea is that the greedy algorithm is *consistent* in the sense of Section 4 (and Appendix B), and hence one can use Theorem 4.1 to construct prices for fractionally subadditive valuations.

Let GRD be the algorithm that allocates items greedily by value, always choosing the item that locally increases $\mathbf{v}(\mathbf{x})$ the most subject to the matroid constraint.

Lemma H.2. *The algorithm GRD is consistent for XOS valuations over matroid feasibility constraints.*

Proof. Fix an XOS valuation profile \mathbf{v} , and let $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}$ be a supporting valuation profile for the allocation $\text{GRD}(\mathbf{v})$. Note that as the supporting valuation profile is additive, GRD returns the optimal solution. As $\text{GRD}(\mathbf{v})$ is another feasible solution, we have $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}(\text{GRD}(\tilde{\mathbf{v}})) \geq \tilde{\mathbf{v}}(\text{GRD}(\mathbf{v}))$. \square

Since GRD is identical to OPT for additive valuations, Theorem B.1 now implies that for an XOS valuation, the prices described by (14) for an additive valuation supporting $\text{GRD}(\mathbf{v})$ are $(1, 1)$ -balanced with respect to the greedy allocation. For submodular valuations, one can compute these prices in polynomial time by simulating GRD and then determining the supporting additive valuation.

I Combinatorial Auctions (Proofs of Theorems 6.2 and 6.3)

Our most general result for combinatorial auctions concerns the *maximum over positive hypergraphs* (MPH) hierarchy of valuations [26]. This is an inclusive hierarchy (i.e., it is expressive enough to include all valuations), which subsumes many interesting classes of valuations as special cases.

To formalize this valuation class, we first need a few preliminaries. A hypergraph representation w of valuation function $v: 2^M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ is a set function that satisfies $v(S) = \sum_{T \subseteq S} w(T)$. Any valuation function v admits a unique hypergraph representation and vice versa. A set S such that $w(S) \neq 0$ is said to be a *hyperedge* of w . Pictorially, the hypergraph representation can be thought as a weighted hypergraph, where every vertex is associated with an item in M , and the weight of each hyperedge $e \subseteq M$ is $w(e)$. Then the value of the function for any set $S \subseteq M$, is the total value of all hyperedges that are contained in S .

The *rank* of a hypergraph representation w is the cardinality k of the largest hyperedge. The rank of v is the rank of its corresponding w and we refer to a valuation function v with rank k as a

hypergraph- k valuation. If the hypergraph representation of v is non-negative, i.e. for any $S \subseteq M$, $w(S) \geq 0$, then we refer to function v as a *positive hypergraph- k* function (PH- k) [1].

We are now ready to present the definition of the class MPH- k , which was introduced by [26].

Definition I.1 (Maximum Over Positive Hypergraph- k (MPH- k) class [26]). A monotone valuation function $v : 2^M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ is *Maximum over Positive Hypergraph- k* (MPH- k) if it can be expressed as a maximum over a set of PH- k functions. That is, there exist PH- k functions $\{v_\ell\}_{\ell \in \mathcal{L}}$ such that for every set $S \subseteq M$,

$$v(S) = \max_{\ell \in \mathcal{L}} v_\ell(S), \quad (15)$$

where \mathcal{L} is an arbitrary index set.

It was shown in [28] that MPH- k CAs admit posted prices that guarantee a $\frac{1}{4k}$ fraction of the optimal expected welfare. Using our framework, one can show that these prices are weakly $(k, \frac{1}{k}, \frac{k-1}{k})$ balanced with respect to the allocation algorithm ALG used to compute them. This way, within our framework, one can show a slightly better guarantee of $\frac{1}{4k-2}$.

We will use slightly different prices because they will be easier to compute later on. To this end, given an arbitrary allocation algorithm ALG and valuation profile \mathbf{v} , write $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}$ for the supporting Hypergraph- k valuations for allocation ALG(\mathbf{v}). Write w_i for the hypergraph representation of \tilde{v}_i , so that $\tilde{v}_i(\text{ALG}(\mathbf{v})) = \sum_{T \subseteq \text{ALG}_i(\mathbf{v})} w_i(T)$.

Then, for each item j , we define

$$p^{\mathbf{v}}(\{j\}) = \sum_{\substack{T \ni j \\ T \subseteq \text{ALG}_i(\mathbf{v})}} w_i(T). \quad (16)$$

That is, item prices are determined by adding up the weights of each supporting hyperedges an item is contained in. These prices then extend linearly: For each set of goods x , set $p^{\mathbf{v}}(x) = \sum_{j \in x} p^{\mathbf{v}}(\{j\})$. Finally, for each agent i and allocation x_i , we will have $p_i^{\mathbf{v}}(x_i | \mathbf{z}) = p^{\mathbf{v}}(x_i)$ whenever x_i is disjoint from the sets in \mathbf{z} and ∞ otherwise.

Theorem I.1. *The pricing rule defined in Equation 16, extended linearly to sets of items, is weakly $(1, 1, k-1)$ -balanced with respect to an arbitrary allocation rule ALG and MPH- k valuation profile \mathbf{v} .*

Proof. We will show balancedness with respect to $\mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{x}} = \{\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{F} : (\bigcup_i y_i) \cap (\bigcup_i x_i) = \emptyset\}$. Observe that we can lower-bound the value of $\text{OPT}(\mathbf{v}, \mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{x}})$ by removing all items that are allocated by \mathbf{x} from the allocation ALG(\mathbf{v}). This gives us

$$\mathbf{v}(\text{OPT}(\mathbf{v}, \mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{x}})) \geq \sum_{\ell \in N} v_\ell(\text{ALG}_\ell(\mathbf{v}) \setminus (\bigcup_i x_i)) \geq \sum_{\ell} \sum_{\substack{T \subseteq \text{ALG}_\ell(\mathbf{v}) \\ \forall i: T \cap x_i = \emptyset}} w_\ell(T). \quad (17)$$

Furthermore, note first that $p^{\mathbf{v}}$ is a fixed pricing scheme, meaning that the price of an outcome

does not change unless it becomes infeasible. Therefore, for every allocation $\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{x}}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_i p_i(y_i \mid \mathbf{x}_{[i-1]}) &= \sum_i p_i(y_i \mid \mathbf{x}) \\
&= \sum_i \sum_{j \in y_i} p^{\mathbf{v}}(\{j\}) \\
&= \sum_i \sum_{\ell} \sum_{j \in \text{ALG}_{\ell}(\mathbf{v}) \cap y_i} p^{\mathbf{v}}(\{j\}) \\
&= \sum_{\ell} \sum_i \sum_{j \in \text{ALG}_{\ell}(\mathbf{v}) \cap y_i} \sum_{\substack{T \ni j \\ T \subseteq \text{ALG}_{\ell}(\mathbf{v})}} w_{\ell}(T). \tag{18}
\end{aligned}$$

For condition (a), by Equation (18),

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_i p_i^{\mathbf{v}}(x_i \mid \mathbf{x}_{[i-1]}) &\geq \sum_{\ell} \sum_{\substack{T \subseteq \text{ALG}_{\ell}(\mathbf{v}) \\ \exists i: T \cap x_i \neq \emptyset}} w_{\ell}(T) \\
&= \left(\sum_{\ell} \sum_{T \subseteq \text{ALG}_{\ell}(\mathbf{v})} w_{\ell}(T) - \sum_{\ell} \sum_{\substack{T \subseteq \text{ALG}_{\ell}(\mathbf{v}) \\ \forall i: T \cap x_i = \emptyset}} w_{\ell}(T) \right) \\
&\geq (\mathbf{v}(\text{ALG}(\mathbf{v})) - \mathbf{v}(\text{OPT}(\mathbf{v}, \mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{x}}))),
\end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality follows by changing the order of summation over j and T , and the second inequality is given in Equation 17.

For condition (b), note that for all \mathbf{x} and all $\mathbf{x}' \in \mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{x}}$, by Equation (18), after splitting the sum depending on whether the respective set T intersects with any of the bundles in \mathbf{x} or not

$$\sum_i p_i(x'_i \mid \mathbf{x}_{[i-1]}) = \sum_{\ell} \sum_i \sum_{j \in \text{ALG}_{\ell}(\mathbf{v}) \cap x'_i} \sum_{\substack{T \ni j \\ T \subseteq \text{ALG}_{\ell}(\mathbf{v}) \\ T \cap (\cup_{i'} x_{i'}) = \emptyset}} w_{\ell}(T) + \sum_{\ell} \sum_i \sum_{j \in \text{ALG}_{\ell}(\mathbf{v}) \cap x'_i} \sum_{\substack{T \ni j \\ T \subseteq \text{ALG}_{\ell}(\mathbf{v}) \\ T \cap (\cup_{i'} x_{i'}) \neq \emptyset}} w_{\ell}(T).$$

Observe that in the first sum for a fixed set T , the term $w_{\ell}(T)$ occurs at most $|T|$ times. In the second sum, it can even occur only $|T| - 1$ times because the intersection of \mathbf{x} and \mathbf{x}' is empty but \mathbf{x} intersects with T . By applying that $|T| \leq k$ whenever $w_{\ell}(T) > 0$, this gives us

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_i p_i(x'_i \mid \mathbf{x}_{[i-1]}) &\leq \sum_{\ell} \sum_{\substack{T \subseteq \text{ALG}_{\ell}(\mathbf{v}) \\ T \cap (\cup_{i'} x_{i'}) = \emptyset}} |T| w_{\ell}(T) + \sum_{\ell} \sum_{\substack{T \subseteq \text{ALG}_{\ell}(\mathbf{v}) \\ T \cap (\cup_{i'} x_{i'}) \neq \emptyset}} (|T| - 1) w_{\ell}(T) \\
&\leq k \sum_{\ell} \sum_{\substack{T \subseteq \text{ALG}_{\ell}(\mathbf{v}) \\ T \cap (\cup_{i'} x_{i'}) = \emptyset}} w_{\ell}(T) + (k - 1) \sum_{\ell} \sum_{\substack{T \subseteq \text{ALG}_{\ell}(\mathbf{v}) \\ T \cap (\cup_{i'} x_{i'}) \neq \emptyset}} w_{\ell}(T) \\
&= \sum_{\ell} \sum_{\substack{T \subseteq \text{ALG}_{\ell}(\mathbf{v}) \\ T \cap (\cup_{i'} x_{i'}) = \emptyset}} w_{\ell}(T) + (k - 1) \sum_{\ell} \sum_{T \subseteq \text{ALG}_{\ell}(\mathbf{v})} w_{\ell}(T) \\
&\geq \mathbf{v}(\text{OPT}(\mathbf{v}, \mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{x}})) + (k - 1) \mathbf{v}(\text{ALG}(\mathbf{v})).
\end{aligned}$$

□

As a corollary, taking $\text{ALG} = \text{OPT}$ shows that there exist static, anonymous item prices that generate expected welfare at least $\frac{1}{4k-2}$ of the expected optimal welfare.

I.1 Computational Considerations

The analysis above establishes the existence of prices that guarantee a $(4k-2)$ approximation, but does not provide guidance for calculating them. In this section, we show: (i) a direct argument that implies a poly-time pricing mechanism that gives $O(k^2)$ approximation, and (ii) a more subtle argument that improves this bound to $4k-2 = O(k)$ approximation.

We will assume that we have access to the following kind of MPH- k oracle. Suppose that valuation function v is MPH- k , with supporting PH- k functions $\{v_\ell\}_{\ell \in L}$. The for v takes as input a set of items S , and returns a value oracle to access to the PH- k function v_ℓ for which $v(S) = v_\ell(S)$. That is, for every $T \subseteq M$, we can query the value of $v_\ell(T)$ in a second step.

A direct argument for $O(k^2)$ approximation Given access to an oracle as described above for the valuations and an $O(k)$ approximation algorithm, one could come up with the constructive version of our result to find prices that give an $O(k^2)$ approximation. An $O(k)$ approximation algorithm for MPH- k valuations is given in [26]. The prices as defined in (16) can now be computed using the oracle because $p^{\mathbf{v}}(\{j\}) = \sum_{T \ni j} w_i(T) = w_i(\text{ALG}_i(\mathbf{v})) - w_i(\text{ALG}_i(\mathbf{v}) \setminus \{j\})$. As a direct corollary, we get a $O(k^2)$ approximation posted price mechanism for MPH- k valuations.

$(4k-2)$ -approximation via the configuration LP We show here that it is possible to construct prices in polynomial time that give an $4k-2$ approximation. The following linear problem, known as the *configuration LP* for combinatorial auctions, computes a fractional allocation that maximizes the social welfare among all fractional allocations.

$$\begin{aligned}
\max \quad & \sum_{i,S} v_i(S) \cdot x_{i,S} \\
\text{s.t.} \quad & \sum_S x_{i,S} \leq 1 \text{ for every } i \in N \\
& \sum_{i,S:j \in S} x_{i,S} \leq 1 \text{ for every } j \in M \\
& x_{i,S} \in [0, 1] \text{ for every } i \in N, S \subseteq M
\end{aligned}$$

We extend the definition of \mathcal{F} to include all fractional allocations that fulfill the above LP; $\mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{x}}$ is extended to all fractional allocations that use at most a fractional equivalent of $1 - \sum_{i,S:j \in S} x_{i,S}$ of every item $j \in M$. Our first observation will be that Theorem I.1 holds even for the fractional version of the MPH- k combinatorial auction problem. That is, if the set of feasible outcomes is extended to include all fractional allocations, then an appropriate extension of the prices described above remain weakly $(1, 1, k-1)$ -balanced. In particular, given a fixed valuation profile \mathbf{v} , we define prices based on the optimal LP solution \mathbf{x}^* . For every agent i and every bundle S , let $w_{i,S}$ be the PH- k representation in the support that maximizes agent i 's valuation of S , which is $v_i(S) = \sum_{T \subseteq S} w_{i,S}(T)$. Then, price item j as follows: $p(\{j\}) = \sum_i \sum_S x_{i,S}^* \sum_{T:j \in T, T \subseteq S} w_{i,S}(T) = \sum_i \sum_S x_{i,S}^* (w_{i,S}(S) - w_{i,S}(S \setminus \{j\}))$. This sum can be computed in polynomial time given oracle

access as described above because $x_{i,S}^* \neq 0$ only for polynomially many S . Then, extend this pricing linearly to prices over sets of items, and to prices over fractional allocations by simple scaling, i.e., for every $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{F}$ and $\mathbf{x}' \in \mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{x}}$, we let $p(x'_i | \mathbf{x}) = \sum_S x'_{i,S} \sum_{j \in S} p(\{j\})$.

It is well known that an optimal fractional solution to the configuration LP can be computed in polynomial time given access to demand queries (using demand queries to implement a separation oracle, as is standard). Therefore, for the space of fractional allocations, prices that are weakly $(1, 1, k-1)$ -balanced with respect to the optimal fractional solution can be computed in polynomial time, given access to demand and MPH- k oracles.

We can therefore compute prices that give a $(4k-2)$ -approximation to the optimal fractional allocation, in a posted price mechanism, where agents are free to purchase any fractional allocation at the posted prices. This, however, seems unsatisfactory. After all, we do not wish to allow agents to purchase infeasible sets, and the analysis only applies if every agent can purchase a set in her demand correspondence. The following observation comes to our help: for every agent i , if all previous agents have selected integral outcomes from the posted price mechanism, then agent i has a utility-maximizing outcome in their demand correspondence that is integral. This is because any fractional allocation can be interpreted as a convex combination of integral allocations. Since our approximation guarantee holds regardless of the demanded set chosen by each agent, it will hold even if we restrict agents to only select integral outcomes in the posted price mechanism. This means that we only need to price integral allocations and the analysis follows. We conclude that the prices computed using the configuration LP, as described above, actually generate a $(4k-2)$ approximation for the (non-fractional) MPH- k combinatorial auction problem. This is cast in the following theorem.

Theorem I.2. *There exists a posted price mechanism that gives $(4k-2)$ -approximation for MPH- k valuations. The appropriate prices can be computed in time polynomial in n and m , given access to demand queries and MPH- k queries.*

J Sparse PIPs

In this appendix we prove our results regarding the existence of (weakly) balanced prices for sparse PIPs and knapsacks.

J.1 Proof of Theorem 6.6

We define $\mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{x}}$ as follows. Let $\mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{x}} = \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{F} \mid x_i \leq \frac{1}{2} \text{ for all } i \in N\}$ if $\sum_i x_i < \frac{1}{2}$ and \emptyset otherwise. Note that this set is exchange compatible with \mathbf{x} as $x_j + \sum_i x_i \leq 1$ unless $\mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{x}} = \emptyset$.

It now only remains to verify Conditions (a) and (b). To this end, we distinguish whether $\sum_i x_i < \frac{1}{2}$.

If $\sum_i x_i < \frac{1}{2}$, then Condition (a) is trivially fulfilled because $\mathbf{v}(\text{ALG}(\mathbf{v})) - \mathbf{v}(\text{OPT}(\mathbf{v}, \mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{x}})) \leq \mathbf{v}(\text{OPT}(\mathbf{v})) - \mathbf{v}(\text{OPT}(\mathbf{v}, \mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{x}})) = 0$. For Condition (b), let $\mathbf{x}' \in \mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{x}}$. We now have $\sum_i p_i(x'_i | \mathbf{x}_{[i-1]}) = \sum_i x'_i \mathbf{v}(\text{ALG}(\mathbf{v})) \leq \mathbf{v}(\text{ALG}(\mathbf{v})) \leq \mathbf{v}(\text{OPT}(\mathbf{v})) = \mathbf{v}(\text{OPT}(\mathbf{v}, \mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{x}}))$.

If $\sum_i s_i x_i \geq \frac{1}{2}$, then Condition (b) is trivially fulfilled because it quantifies over $\mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{x}} = \emptyset$. For Condition (a), we have $\sum_i p_i(x_i | \mathbf{x}_{[i-1]}) = \sum_i s_i x_i \mathbf{v}(\text{ALG}(\mathbf{v})) \geq \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{v}(\text{ALG}(\mathbf{v})) = \frac{1}{2} (\mathbf{v}(\text{ALG}(\mathbf{v})) - \mathbf{v}(\text{OPT}(\mathbf{v}, \mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{x}})))$.

J.2 Proof of Theorem 6.7

We will define static prices $p_i(x_i | \mathbf{y})$ as follows. Let $\mathbf{x}^* = \text{ALG}(v)$ be a solution to the LP $\max \mathbf{v}^T \mathbf{x}$ subject to $\mathbf{A} \cdot \mathbf{x} \leq \mathbf{1}$, $0 \leq x_i \leq 1$ for all i . For each constraint j , we define a per-unit price ρ_j by setting $\rho_j = \sum_{i \in N: a_{j,i} > 0} v_i x_i^*$. Now, we define $p_i(x_i | \mathbf{y}) = \sum_j a_{j,i} x_i \rho_j$ for every quantity x_i that can feasibly be added to \mathbf{y} . The claim will now follow by the two lemmas below.

Lemma J.1. *For \mathcal{F} being all fractional solutions, the devised pricing scheme is weakly $(1, 0, d)$ -balanced.*

Proof. Let $\mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{x}} = \{\mathbf{z} \mid \mathbf{A}(\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{z}) \leq \mathbf{1}\}$. To verify Condition (a), we derive a lower bound on $\mathbf{v}(\text{OPT}(\mathbf{v}, \mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{x}}))$ as follows. Given \mathbf{x} , let \mathbf{z} be defined by setting $z_i = x_i^*(1 - \max_{j: a_{j,i} > 0} \sum_{i'} a_{j,i'} x_{i'})$. We have $\mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{x}}$ because for every constraint j we have $\sum_i a_{j,i} x_i + \sum_i a_{j,i} z_i \leq \sum_i a_{j,i} x_i + \sum_i a_{j,i} x_i^*(1 - \sum_{i'} a_{j,i'} x_{i'}) \leq 1$. Note that furthermore, by this definition, $x_{i'}^*(\sum_i a_{j,i} x_i) \geq x_{i'}^* - z_{i'}$ for all i' and all j .

Now, it follows that $\sum_i p_i(x_i | x_{[i-1]}) = \sum_i \sum_j a_{j,i} x_i \rho_j = \sum_i \sum_j a_{j,i} x_i \sum_{i': a_{j,i'} > 0} v_{i'} x_{i'}^* = \sum_j \sum_{i': a_{j,i'} > 0} v_{i'} x_{i'}^* (\sum_i a_{j,i} x_i) \geq \sum_j \sum_{i': a_{j,i'} > 0} v_{i'} (x_{i'}^* - z_{i'}) \geq \sum_{i'} v_{i'} (x_{i'}^* - z_{i'}) \geq \mathbf{v}(\text{OPT}(\mathbf{v})) - \mathbf{v}(\text{OPT}(\mathbf{v}, \mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{x}}))$.

For Condition (b), we simply observe that $\sum_i p_i(x_i' | x_{[i-1]}) = \sum_i \sum_j a_{j,i} x_i' \rho_j = \sum_j \rho_j \sum_j a_{j,i} x_i' \leq \sum_j \rho_j = \sum_j \sum_{i \in N: a_{j,i} > 0} v_i x_i^* = \sum_i \sum_{j: a_{j,i} > 0} v_i x_i^* \leq d \sum_i v_i x_i^* = d \mathbf{v}(\text{OPT}(\mathbf{v}))$. \square

Lemma J.2. *For \mathcal{F} being all integral solutions, the devised pricing scheme is weakly $(2, 0, d)$ -balanced.*

Proof. To define $\mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{x}}$, let $\mathbf{c}_{\mathbf{x}}$ be the vector such that $c_j = 1$ if $\sum_i a_{j,i} x_i \leq \frac{1}{2}$ and $c_j = 0$ otherwise. That is, $c_j = 1$ if and only if constraint j still has capacity at least $\frac{1}{2}$ after adding \mathbf{x} . Let $\mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{x}}$ be the set of integral solutions \mathbf{y} that fulfill $\mathbf{A}\mathbf{y} \leq \mathbf{c}$.

Let \mathbf{z} be defined such that $z_i = x_i^*$ if $\sum_{i'} a_{j,i'} x_{i'} \leq \frac{1}{2}$ for all j with $a_{j,i} > 0$ and let $z_i = 0$ otherwise. By this definition, we have $z_i \geq x_i^*(1 - 2 \max_{j: a_{j,i} > 0} \sum_{i'} a_{j,i'} x_{i'})$. For this reason, $x_{i'}^*(\sum_i a_{j,i} x_i) \geq \frac{1}{2}(x_{i'}^* - z_{i'})$ for all i' and all j .

From here on, we can follow the exact same calculations as above. For Condition (a), we have $\sum_i p_i(x_i | x_{[i-1]}) = \sum_i \sum_j a_{j,i} x_i \rho_j = \sum_i \sum_j a_{j,i} x_i \sum_{i': a_{j,i'} > 0} v_{i'} x_{i'}^* = \sum_j \sum_{i': a_{j,i'} > 0} v_{i'} x_{i'}^* (\sum_i a_{j,i} x_i) \geq \sum_j \sum_{i': a_{j,i'} > 0} v_{i'} \frac{1}{2}(x_{i'}^* - z_{i'}) \geq \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i'} v_{i'} (x_{i'}^* - z_{i'}) \geq \frac{1}{2}(\mathbf{v}(\text{OPT}(\mathbf{v})) - \mathbf{v}(\text{OPT}(\mathbf{v}, \mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{x}})))$.

For Condition (b), we observe that again $\sum_i p_i(x_i' | x_{[i-1]}) = \sum_i \sum_j a_{j,i} x_i' \rho_j = \sum_j \rho_j \sum_j a_{j,i} x_i' \leq \sum_j \rho_j = \sum_j \sum_{i \in N: a_{j,i} > 0} v_i x_i^* = \sum_i \sum_{j: a_{j,i} > 0} v_i x_i^* \leq d \sum_i v_i x_i^* = d \mathbf{v}(\text{OPT}(\mathbf{v}))$. \square

J.3 Remark: Pricing Integral Problems based on Fractional Solutions

The way we described the pricing schemes above was to use an offline allocation algorithm ALG for the respective problem. This algorithm has to solve an NP-hard problem and as we show any approximation guarantee is preserved in the process. However, it is also possible to use the respective optimal fractional solution instead of ALG. The pricing schemes defined this way then achieve the described approximation guarantees with respect to the fractional optimum. To show this result, we have to slightly extend our framework and allow $\mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{x}}$ to contain distributions over outcome profiles that are exchange compatible.

In the proof of Theorem 6.6, we would then define $\mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{x}}$ as the set of distributions such that the expected consumption is at most 1 in the case $\sum_i x_i < \frac{1}{2}$. The expected value achieved by the best

distribution corresponds exactly to the value of the best fractional solution, making the proof go through. A similar adaptation also works for the integral part of Theorem 6.7.