

Approximating the Nash Social Welfare with Budget-Additive Valuations

Jugal Garg*

Martin Hoefer†

Kurt Mehlhorn‡

Abstract

We present the first constant-factor approximation algorithm for maximizing the Nash social welfare when allocating indivisible items to agents with budget-additive valuation functions. Budget-additive valuations represent an important class of submodular functions. They have attracted a lot of research interest in recent years due to many interesting applications. For every $\varepsilon > 0$, our algorithm obtains a $(2.404 + \varepsilon)$ -approximation in time polynomial in the input size and $1/\varepsilon$.

Our algorithm relies on rounding an approximate equilibrium in a linear Fisher market where sellers have *earning limits* (upper bounds on the amount of money they want to earn) and buyers have *utility limits* (upper bounds on the amount of utility they want to achieve). In contrast to markets with *either earning or utility limits*, these markets have not been studied before. They turn out to have fundamentally different properties.

Although the existence of equilibria is not guaranteed, we show that the market instances arising from the Nash social welfare problem always have an equilibrium. Further, we show that the set of equilibria is not convex, answering a question of [17]. We design an FPTAS to compute an approximate equilibrium, a result that may be of independent interest.

1 Introduction

One of the most fundamental problems in markets is to allocate a heterogeneous set of indivisible items to a set of agents, where each agent has a valuation for the received items. Over the last decades, variants of this problem have attracted an enormous amount of research interest in economics, computer science, and operations research. The problem captures basic assignment tasks that arise in many applications, e.g., when assigning goods to customers in online markets or resources to users in computer networks. The predominant approach in algorithmic research concerns optimization of *social welfare*: Allocate items to maximize the *sum of valuations*. Over the last two decades, a rich understanding of algorithms for optimizing and approximating social welfare has been derived (e.g., [10, 22, 23, 26, 31, 35, 46] and many more).

Social welfare follows a utilitarian approach to aggregate the valuations of agents, and it has several drawbacks. Most prominently, social welfare tends to assign items only to the agents with high numerical values, and as such can determine a highly unfair allocation. Towards this end, several works have started to consider an egalitarian approach by optimization of *max-min fairness*: Allocate items to maximize the *minimum of valuations*. For a restricted variant of additive valuations (termed the *Santa Claus problem*) there has been significant progress in terms of improved approximation algorithms (e.g., [4, 5, 7, 14, 29] and more).

Social welfare and max-min fairness represent two extremes on a spectrum of aggregation methods. While social welfare tends to focus only on highest-valued agents, max-min fairness tends to focus only on the smallest-valued agent. An interesting trade-off between these extremal objectives is the *Nash social welfare*: Allocate items to maximize the *geometric mean of valuations*. It has been proposed

*University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, USA. jugal@illinois.edu

†Goethe University, Frankfurt am Main, Germany. mhoefer@cs.uni-frankfurt.de

‡MPI für Informatik, Germany. mehlhorn@mpi-inf.mpg.de

in the classic game theory literature by Nash [37] when solving the bargaining problem. It is closely related to the notion of proportional fairness studied in networking [30] – in contrast to both social welfare and max-min fairness it is invariant to individual scaling of each agent valuation with a possibly different constant factor. Moreover, for divisible items the optimal Nash social welfare is achieved via the classic fairness notion of *competitive equilibrium with equal incomes* [36].

The algorithmic problem of allocating indivisible items to maximize the Nash social welfare is far from being well-understood. Only recently, it has started to attract significant research interest in the literature on approximation algorithms. The problem is known to be NP- [38] and APX-hard [32], even for additive valuations. As a remarkable result, Cole and Gkatzelis [18] gave the first constant-factor approximation algorithm for additive valuations, where the constant was recently improved to 2 [17]. Constant-factor approximation algorithms for additive valuations can also be obtained using methods from the domain of stable polynomials [1]. Moreover, these algorithms have been extended to provide a 2-approximation in multi-unit markets with agent valuations, which remain additive-separable over items [9], but might be concave in the number of copies received for each item [2].

In this paper, we provide the first constant-factor approximation algorithm for the maximum Nash social welfare in markets with *a class of non-separable submodular* valuation functions. In particular, we show how to obtain in polynomial time a $(2e^{1/(2e)} + \varepsilon)$ -approximation for budget-additive valuation functions, for any constant $\varepsilon > 0$. These valuations are given by non-negative numbers $v_{ij} \geq 0$ for every agent i and item j , as well as a *utility cap* $c_i > 0$ for every agent i . The valuation of agent i for any subset S of items is $v_i(S) = \min(c_i, \sum_{j \in S} v_{ij})$.

The analysis of budget-additive valuations significantly advances our understanding beyond additive-separable and towards submodular ones. The handling of non-separability requires several new insights and techniques that we explain in detail below. Moreover, budget-additive valuations are of interest in a variety of applications, most prominently in online advertising [33, 34]. They have been studied frequently in the literature, e.g., for offline social welfare maximization [3, 6, 15, 43], online algorithms [11, 20], mechanism design [12], Walrasian equilibrium [27, 41], and market equilibrium [8, 17].

Contribution and Techniques Our main contribution is the first constant-factor approximation algorithm for maximizing the Nash social welfare with budget-additive valuations. We obtain an approximation factor of $(2e^{1/(2e)} + \varepsilon)$ in polynomial time, for any constant $\varepsilon > 0$. We also show a lower bound of $\sqrt{8/7} > 1.069$ for approximating the Nash social welfare with budget-additive valuations, unless $P=NP$. The best previous result was a lower bound of 1.00008 derived for additive valuations [32].

In contrast to the approaches based on stable polynomials [1, 2], our algorithm relies on relaxing the problem to a class of Fisher markets and then rounding an equilibrium allocation to an integral assignment. Conceptually, this appears similar to the algorithm by Cole and Gkatzelis [18], but there are many challenges that need to be overcome for non-separable valuations.

First, to guarantee a bounded approximation factor in the final rounding step, we introduce earning limits into the resulting Fisher market. For additive valuations, this creates a market with a convex set of equilibria. For budget-additive valuations, where we have earning and utility limits, we show that the set of market equilibria can be *non-convex*. Hence, in contrast to the additive case, the toolbox for solving convex programs (e.g., ellipsoid [17] or scaling algorithms [8, 18]) is not directly applicable for computing an equilibrium. Instead, we design a new algorithm to compute an approximate equilibrium. Based on a constant $\varepsilon > 0$, it perturbs the valuations and rounds the parameters v_{ij} up to the next power of $(1 + \varepsilon)$. Then it computes an exact equilibrium of the perturbed market in polynomial time, which represents an approximate equilibrium in the original market. This yields a novel FPTAS for markets with earning and utility limits, which might be of independent interest.

To compute an exact equilibrium in the perturbed market, we first obtain an equilibrium (prices \mathbf{p} , allocation \mathbf{x}) of a market that results from ignoring all utility caps [9, 17]. This is not an equilibrium of the market with both caps, because some buyers may be overspending. Let the *surplus of a buyer* be the money spent minus the money needed to earn the optimal utility, and similarly let the *surplus of a good* be the target earning minus the actual earning. Let S be the set of buyers who have positive

surplus at prices \mathbf{p} . Our idea is to pick a buyer, say k , in S and decrease the prices of goods in a coordinated fashion. The goal is to make k 's surplus zero while maintaining the surpluses of all goods and all buyers not in S to be zero. We show that after a polynomial number of iterations of price decrease, either the surplus of buyer k becomes zero or we discover a good with price 0 in equilibrium. Picking a particular buyer is crucial in the analysis, because we rely on this buyer to show that a certain parameter strictly decreases. This implies substantial price decrease of goods and polynomial running time.

Given such an exact equilibrium wrt. perturbed valuations, we provide a new rounding algorithm that turns the fractional equilibrium allocation into an integral one. While the algorithm exploits a tree structure of the equilibrium allocation as in [18], the rounding must be much more careful to correctly treat agents that reach their utility caps in the equilibrium. In particular, we first conduct several initial assignment steps to arrive at a solution where we have a set of rooted trees on agents and items, and each item j has exactly one child agent i who gets at least half of its fractional valuation from j . In the main step of the rounding algorithm, we need to ensure that the root agent r receives one of its child items. Here we pick a child item j that generates the most value for r . A problem arises at the child agent i of j , since r receiving j could decrease i 's valuation by a lot more than a factor of 2. Recursively, we again need to enforce an allocation for the root agent, thereby “stealing” fractional value from one of its grandchildren agents. This approach may seem hopeless to yield any reasonable approximation guarantee, but we show that overall the agents only suffer by a small constant factor.

Our analysis of this rounding procedure provides a new lower bound on the Nash social welfare obtained by the algorithm, which is complemented with a novel upper bound on the optimum solution. Both bounds crucially exploit the properties of agents (goods) that reach the utility (earning) caps in the market equilibrium. These bounds imply an approximation factor of $2e^{1/(2e)} < 2.404$. Since the equilibrium conditions apply wrt. perturbed valuations, we obtain a $(2e^{1/(2e)} + \varepsilon)$ -approximation in polynomial time, for any constant $\varepsilon > 0$.

Related Work The Nash social welfare is a classic objective for allocation of goods to agents. It was proposed by Nash [37] for the bargaining problem as the unique objective that satisfies a collection of natural axioms. Since then it has received significant attention in the literature on social choice and fair division (see, e.g. [13, 19, 28, 40] for a subset of notable recent work, and the references therein).

For indivisible items and general non-negative valuations, the problem of maximizing the Nash social welfare is hard to approximate within any finite factor [38]. For additive valuations, the problem is APX-hard [32], and efficient 2-approximation algorithms based on market equilibrium [17, 18] and stable polynomials [1, 2] exist. These algorithms have been extended to give a 2-approximation also in markets with multiple copies per item [9] and separable concave valuations [2].

For divisible items, the problem of maximizing the Nash social welfare is solved by competitive equilibria with equal incomes (CEEI) [36]. These equilibria often can be computed by solving convex programs due to Eisenberg and Gale [25] or Shmyrev [42]. For additive valuations, there are combinatorial [21] and even strongly polynomial-time algorithms [39, 45] for computing such an equilibrium.

Unfortunately, even for additive valuations CEEI can be exponentially more valuable than optimal solutions for indivisible items. To obtain an improved bound on the indivisible optimum, Cole and Gkatzelis [18] introduced and rounded *spending-restricted equilibria* with earning caps for every good. More generally, equilibria in *markets with earning limits* are described by a *convex program* [17]. They can be computed and rounded efficiently to obtain a 2-approximation for additive valuations and any number of indivisible items [9].

Budget-additive valuations are a popular class of submodular valuation functions, especially due to applications in online advertising [33]. They are additive valuations with a global limit, which makes the valuation non-separable. These *utility limits* have been recently proposed and studied in Fisher markets, and the equilibria are described by a *convex program* [8, 17]. An equilibrium in these markets can be computed using algorithms for concave generalized flows [44], the set of equilibria forms a lattice, and equilibria with maximum or minimum prices can also be obtained efficiently [8].

2 Preliminaries

Nash Social Welfare There is a set B of n agents and a set G of m indivisible items, where we assume $m \geq n$. We allocate the items to the agents, and we represent an allocation $S = (S_1, \dots, S_n)$ using a characteristic vector \mathbf{x}^S with $x_{ij}^S = 1$ iff $j \in S_i$ and 0 otherwise. Agent $i \in B$ has a value $v_{ij} \geq 0$ for item j and a global utility cap $c_i > 0$. The budget-additive valuation of agent i for an allocation S of items is $v_i(\mathbf{x}_i^S) = \min\left(c_i, \sum_{j \in G} v_{ij} x_{ij}^S\right)$. The goal is to find an allocation that approximates the optimal Nash social welfare, i.e., the optimal geometric mean of valuations

$$\max_S \left(\prod_{i \in B} v_i(\mathbf{x}_i^S) \right)^{1/n}.$$

Our approximation algorithm in Section 3 relies on rounding an approximate equilibrium for a linear Fisher market with earning and utility limits.

Fisher Markets with Earning and Utility Limits In such a market there is a set B of n buyers and a set G of m divisible goods. Each good is owned by a separate seller and comes in unit supply. Each buyer $i \in B$ has a value $u_{ij} \geq 0$ for a unit of good $j \in G$ and an endowment $m_i \geq 0$ of money. Suppose buyer i receives a bundle of goods $\mathbf{x}_i = (x_{ij})_{j \in G}$ with $x_{ij} \in [0, 1]$, then the utility function is $u_i(\mathbf{x}_i) = \min\left(c_i, \sum_j u_{ij} x_{ij}\right)$, where $c_i > 0$ is the utility cap.

The vector $\mathbf{x} = (\mathbf{x}_i)_{i \in B}$ with $\sum_{i \in B} x_{ij} = 1$ for every $j \in G$ denotes a (fractional) allocation of goods to buyers. For an allocation, we call i a capped buyer if $u_i(\mathbf{x}_i) = c_i$. We also maintain a vector $\mathbf{p} = (p_1, \dots, p_m)$ of prices for the goods. Given such prices \mathbf{p} , a demand bundle \mathbf{x}_i^* of buyer i is a bundle of goods that maximizes the utility of buyer i for its budget, i.e., $\mathbf{x}_i^* \in \arg \max \left\{ u_i(\mathbf{x}_i) \mid \sum_j p_j x_{ij} \leq m_i \right\}$. For price vector \mathbf{p} and buyer i , we use $\lambda_i = \min_j p_j / u_{ij}$ and denote by $\alpha_i = 1/\lambda_i$ the maximum bang-per-buck (MBB) ratio (where we assume $0/0 = 0$). Given prices \mathbf{p} and allocation \mathbf{x} , the money flow f_{ij} from buyer i to seller j is given by $f_{ij} = p_j x_{ij}$. If price $p_j > 0$, then x_{ij} uniquely determines f_{ij} and vice versa.

For the sellers, let $x_j = \sum_i x_{ij}$, then the seller utility is $u_j(x_j, p_j) = \min(d_j, p_j x_j) = \min(d_j, \sum_i f_{ij})$, where $d_j > 0$ is the earning or income cap. We call seller j a capped seller if $u_j(x_j, p_j) = d_j$. An optimal supply e_j^* allows seller j to obtain the highest utility, i.e., $e_j^* \in \arg \max \{u_j(e_j, p_j) \mid e_j \leq 1\}$.

We consider three natural properties for allocation and supply vectors:

1. An allocation \mathbf{x}_i for buyer i is called *modest* if $\sum_j u_{ij} x_{ij} \leq c_i$. By definition, for uncapped buyers every demand bundle is modest. For capped buyers, a modest bundle of goods \mathbf{x}_i is such that $c_i = \sum_j u_{ij} x_{ij}$.
2. A demand bundle \mathbf{x}_i is called *thrifty* or *MBB* if it consists only of MBB goods: $x_{ij} > 0$ only if $u_{ij}/p_j = \alpha_i$. For uncapped buyers every demand bundle is MBB.
3. A supply e_j for seller j is called *modest* if $e_j = \min(1, d_j/p_j)$.

Given a set of prices, a thrifty and modest demand bundle for buyer i minimizes the amount of money required to obtain optimal utility. A modest supply for seller j minimizes the amount of supply required to obtain optimal utility in equilibrium. Our interest lies in market equilibria that have thrifty and modest demands and modest supply. Note that they also emerge when earning and utility caps are not satiation points but *limits in the form of hard constraints* on the utility in equilibrium (c.f. [17]).

Definition 2.1 (Thrifty and Modest Equilibrium). A thrifty and modest (market) equilibrium is a pair (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{p}) , where \mathbf{x} is an allocation and \mathbf{p} a vector of prices such that the following conditions hold: (1) $\mathbf{p} \geq 0$ (prices are nonnegative), (2) e_j is a modest supply for every $j \in G$, (3) $x_j \leq e_j$ for every

$j \in G$ (no overallocation), (4) \mathbf{x}_i is a thrifty and modest demand bundle for every $i \in B$, and (5) Walras' law holds: $p_j(e_j - x_j) = 0$ for every $j \in G$.

Note that in equilibrium, if $x_j < e_j$, then $p_j = 0$. Moreover, we assume that all parameters of the market u_{ij} , c_i , d_j and m_i for all $i \in B$ and $j \in G$ are non-negative integers. Let $U = \max_{i \in B, j \in G} \{u_{ij}, m_i, c_i, d_j\}$ be the largest integer in the representation of the market.

Consider the following condition termed *money clearing*: For each subset of buyers and the goods these buyers are interested in, there must be a feasible allocation of the buyer money that does not violate the earning caps. More formally, let $\hat{B} \subseteq B$ be a set of buyers, and $N(\hat{B}) = \{j \in G \mid u_{ij} > 0 \text{ for some } i \in \hat{B}\}$ be the set of goods such that there is at least one buyer in \hat{B} with positive utility for the good.

Definition 2.2 (Money Clearing). *A market is money clearing if*

$$\forall \hat{B} \subseteq B, \sum_{i \in \hat{B}} m_i \leq \sum_{j \in N(\hat{B})} d_j . \quad (1)$$

When there are only earning limits, money clearing is a precise characterization of markets that have thrifty and modest equilibria [9]. For markets with both limits, it is sufficient for existence (see Section 4.1).

Perturbed Markets Our FPTAS in Section 4.2 computes a thrifty and modest equilibrium in a *perturbed market* $\tilde{\mathcal{M}}$.

Definition 2.3 (Perturbed Utility, Perturbed Market). *For a market \mathcal{M} and a parameter $\varepsilon > 0$, the perturbed utility of buyer i is given by $\tilde{u}_i(\mathbf{x}_i) = \sum_j \tilde{u}_{ij} x_{ij}$, where $\tilde{u}_{ij} = (1 + \varepsilon)^{k_{ij}}$ for an integer $k_{ij} > 0$, such that*

$$\tilde{u}_{ij}/(1 + \varepsilon) < u_{ij} \leq \tilde{u}_{ij}, \quad \forall i \in B, j \in G. \quad (2)$$

The perturbed market $\tilde{\mathcal{M}}$ is exactly the market \mathcal{M} where every buyer $i \in B$ has perturbed utilities \tilde{u}_i .

In Section 4.2 we observe that an exact equilibrium in $\tilde{\mathcal{M}}$ represents an ε -approximate equilibrium for the unperturbed market \mathcal{M} . Moreover, given an exact equilibrium of $\tilde{\mathcal{M}}$, rounding this equilibrium to an integral assignment deteriorates the approximation factor of our algorithm for the Nash social welfare only by a small constant (see Section 3.3).

3 Approximating the Nash Social Welfare

In this section, we present a $(2e^{1/(2e)} + \varepsilon)$ -approximation algorithm for the problem of maximizing the Nash social welfare with budget-additive valuations, for every constant $\varepsilon > 0$.

If $v_{ij} \geq c_i$, we can equivalently assume that $v_{ij} = c_i$ since the valuation can be at most c_i . More formally, let $v'_{ij} = \min(v_{ij}, c_i)$ and $v'_i(\mathbf{x}_i^S) = \min\left(c_i, \sum_{j \in G} v'_{ij} x_{ij}^S\right)$. The following lemma is straightforward and its proof is omitted.

Lemma 3.1. *For every integral allocation \mathbf{x} we have $v'_i(\mathbf{x}) = v_i(\mathbf{x})$.*

Henceforth, we will assume that $v_{ij} \leq c_i$, for all $i \in B, j \in G$. We relate our problem to a Fisher market \mathcal{M} with earning and utility limits in a direct way – in \mathcal{M} , we have a buyer i for each agent i and a divisible good j for each item j . For each buyer i the budget $m_i = 1$, $u_{ij} = v_{ij}$, and c_i is the utility cap. Further, we assume that each good j comes in unit supply, and its earning cap is $d_j = 1$.

Lemma 3.2. *If the market \mathcal{M} is not money clearing, then the maximum Nash social welfare for indivisible items is 0.*

Proof. Obviously, if market \mathcal{M} is not money clearing, then there exists a subset B' of buyers such that the sum of earning caps of goods in $\Gamma(B') = \{j \mid v_{ij} > 0, i \in B'\}$ is less than the sum of budgets of buyers in B' . This implies that $|\Gamma(B')| < |B'|$. Hence, there is no allocation where each agent in B' gets at least one item of positive valuation. Thus, the Nash social welfare must always be 0. \square

When the market is not money clearing, every allocation has the optimal Nash social welfare. It is easy to check condition (1) by a max-flow computation. We therefore assume that our instance satisfies it. We show in Section 4.1 that a money-clearing market \mathcal{M} always has a thrifty and modest equilibrium.

Suppose we are given such an equilibrium (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{p}) . Our subsequent analysis in Sections 3.1 and 3.2 shows how to obtain a $2e^{1/(2e)}$ -approximation for the Nash social welfare based on any such equilibrium. In Section 3.3 we provide a guarantee for rounding an equilibrium of the perturbed market, which can be computed in polynomial time (see Section 4.2).

The Nash social welfare objective allows scaling the valuation function of every agent i by any factor $\gamma_i > 0$. This does neither change the optimum solution nor the approximation factor. Our first aim is to *normalize* the valuation function for agent i based on the MBB ratio α_i of buyer i in the market equilibrium (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{p}) .

In equilibrium, there can be a set of goods $G_0 = \{j \mid p_j = 0\}$. All buyers $B_0 = \{i \mid j \in G_0, u_{ij} > 0\}$ interested in any good $j \in G_0$ have infinite MBB ratio. Due to our equilibrium conditions, every $i \in B_0$ must be capped and receive allocation only from G_0 , i.e., $u_i(\mathbf{x}) = c_i$ and $x_{ij} > 0$ only if $j \in G_0$ and $u_{ij} > 0$. Moreover, since no buyer $i \in B \setminus B_0$ has positive utility for any of the goods G_0 , these goods are allocated only to B_0 . Therefore, we can treat items G_0 and agents B_0 separately in the analysis.

For all $i \in B \setminus B_0$, we normalize $v'_{ij} = v_{ij}/\alpha_i$ and $c'_i = c_i/\alpha_i$. This does not change the demand bundle for buyer i , and thus (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{p}) remains an equilibrium. In the resulting instance, every such buyer has MBB of 1 in (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{p}) . Consequently, $v'_{ij} \leq p_j$ for all $i \in B \setminus B_0, j \in G$, where equality holds if and only if j is an MBB good of buyer i . For simplicity we assume that v and c fulfill these conditions directly, i.e., $v_{ij} = v'_{ij}$ and $c_i = c'_i$. Together with the fact that $v_{ij} \leq c_i, \forall (i, j)$ this implies

$$v_{ij} \leq \min(p_j, c_i), \quad \text{for all } i \in B \setminus B_0, j \in G. \quad (3)$$

Moreover, the following lemma is a helpful insight on the structure of equilibria.

Lemma 3.3. *Consider a capped buyer i . Let j be an MBB good of buyer i . Then $p_j \leq 1$.*

Proof. Suppose i is a capped buyer with MBB good j and $p_j > 1$. Then our scaling implies that the MBB ratio is 1, and thus $1 = v_{ij}/p_j < v_{ij} \leq c_i$. Since the budget of i is 1, its maximum utility is $1 < c_i$, which is a contradiction. \square

3.1 Upper Bound

In this section, we obtain an upper bound on the optimal Nash social welfare when valuations are normalized based on an equilibrium (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{p}) . The bound relates to prices and utility caps of the capped buyers in (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{p}) . We denote by B_c and B_u the set of capped and uncapped buyers in (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{p}) , respectively. Recall that since (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{p}) is a thrifty and modest equilibrium, buyers may not spend their entire budget and sellers may not sell their entire supply. We denote by $m_i^a = \min(m_i, c_i/\alpha_i)$ the active budget of buyer i where α_i is the MBB ratio of buyer i at prices \mathbf{p} , and by $p_j^a = \min(p_j, d_j)$ the active price of good j . The following result is a generalization of a similar bound shown in [18]. The main difference is to carefully account for the contribution of capped buyers.

Theorem 3.1. *For valuations v and caps c normalized according to equilibrium prices \mathbf{p} , we have*

$$\left(\prod_{i \in B} v_i(\mathbf{x}^*) \right)^{1/n} \leq \left(\prod_{i \in B_c} c_i \prod_{j: p_j > 1} p_j \right)^{1/n},$$

where x^* is an integral allocation that maximizes the Nash social welfare.

Proof. Consider the equilibrium (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{p}) . For the agents $i \in B_0 \subseteq B_c$, a simple upper bound is $\prod_{i \in B_0} v_i(\mathbf{x}^*) \leq \prod_{i \in B_0} c_i$. For the rest of the proof, we consider the remaining agents $B \setminus B_0$. Due to our scaling to MBB of 1, every capped $i \in B_c \setminus B_0$ has $c_i = v_i(\mathbf{x}) = m_i^a \leq 1$, whereas every uncapped $i \in B_u$ has $c_i > v_i(\mathbf{x}) = m_i^a = 1$. Market clearing implies

$$\sum_{i \in B_c \setminus B_0} c_i + \sum_{i \in B_u} 1 = \sum_{i \in B \setminus B_0} m_i^a = \sum_{j \in G} p_j^a = \sum_{j: p_j > 1} 1 + \sum_{j: p_j \leq 1} p_j ,$$

which yields

$$\sum_j p_j = \sum_{j: p_j > 1} p_j + \sum_{j: p_j \leq 1} p_j = \sum_{j: p_j > 1} p_j + \sum_{i \in B_c \setminus B_0} c_i + |B_u| - \sum_{j: p_j > 1} 1 . \quad (4)$$

Now consider an integral allocation \mathbf{x}^* that maximizes the Nash social welfare. To obtain an upper bound on $\prod_{i \in B \setminus B_0} v_i(\mathbf{x}^*)$, we can assume for the rest of this proof that all inequalities (3) are tight, i.e., $v_{ij} = \min(c_i, p_j)$ for all (i, j) . This implies that $\sum_{i \in B \setminus B_0} v_i(\mathbf{x}^*) \leq \sum_{j \in G} p_j$. We denote by G_c be the set of goods allocated to agents in $B_c \setminus B_0$ in \mathbf{x}^* . Again, due to (3), we have $\sum_{i \in B_c \setminus B_0} v_i(\mathbf{x}^*) \leq \sum_{j \in G_c} p_j$ and $\sum_{i \in B_u} v_i(\mathbf{x}^*) \leq \sum_{j \in G \setminus G_c} p_j$. Using (4), we get

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i \in B_u} v_i(\mathbf{x}^*) &\leq \sum_{j \in G \setminus G_c} p_j = \sum_j p_j - \sum_{j \in G_c} p_j \\ &= \sum_{j: j \notin G_c; p_j > 1} p_j + \sum_{i \in B_c \setminus B_0} c_i + |B_u| - \sum_{j: p_j > 1} 1 - \sum_{j: j \in G_c; p_j \leq 1} p_j . \end{aligned}$$

Let $G_u^1 = \{j \in G \mid p_j > 1; x_{ij}^* = 1, i \in B_u\}$ be the set of items with price more than 1 that are assigned in \mathbf{x}^* to buyers in B_u . Let $B_u^1 = \{i \in B_u \mid x_{ij}^* = 1, j \in G_u^1\}$ be the set of buyers from B_u that receive an item of G_u^1 in \mathbf{x}^* . Note that $|B_u^1| \leq |G_u^1|$. Again, using (3) we see that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i \in B_u \setminus B_u^1} v_i(\mathbf{x}^*) &\leq \sum_{G \setminus (G_c \cup G_u^1)} p_j = \sum_j p_j - \sum_{j \in G_c} p_j - \sum_{j \in G_u^1} p_j \\ &= \sum_{i \in B_c \setminus B_0} c_i + |B_u| - \sum_{j: p_j > 1} 1 - \sum_{j: j \in G_c; p_j \leq 1} p_j \\ &= |B_u| - |G_u^1| + \sum_{i \in B_c \setminus B_0} c_i - \sum_{j \in G_c} p_j^a . \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

To obtain an upper bound on $\prod_{i \in B \setminus B_0} v_i(\mathbf{x}^*)$, we now take a fractional improvement step and relax the integrality condition on \mathbf{x}^* for buyers in $B \setminus (B_u^1 \cup B_0)$. We take goods assigned to B_u^1 in \mathbf{x}^* and fractionally allocate them to buyers in $B \setminus (B_u^1 \cup B_0)$. Moreover, we take the goods assigned to $B \setminus (B_u^1 \cup B_0)$ and redistribute them fractionally among these buyers. However, we require that the fractional solution respects the upper bound (5). We denote by $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}$ the best solution obtained in this improvement step. Note that the Nash social welfare can only increase.

Recall that $c_i \leq 1$ for every capped buyer $i \in B_c \setminus B_0$, so $v_i(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}) \leq c_i \leq 1$. Further, since no good $j \in G_c$ can give value more than 1 to any buyer in $B_c \setminus B_0$, we have

$$\sum_{i \in B_c \setminus B_0} v_i(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}) \leq \sum_{j \in G_c} p_j^a . \quad (6)$$

$\tilde{\mathbf{x}}$ satisfies (5), so we obtain $\sum_{i \in B_u \setminus B_u^1} v_i(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}) \leq |B_u| - |G_u^1| + \sum_{i \in B_c \setminus B_0} c_i - \sum_{i \in B_c \setminus B_0} v_i(\tilde{\mathbf{x}})$. Now in order to maximize $\prod_{i \in B \setminus B_0} v_i(\tilde{\mathbf{x}})$, we assume that each buyer in $B_u \setminus B_u^1$ gets equal value. This implies

$$v_i(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}) \leq \frac{|B_u| - |G_u^1| + \sum_{i \in B_c \setminus B_0} c_i - \sum_{i \in B_c \setminus B_0} v_i(\tilde{\mathbf{x}})}{|B_u \setminus B_u^1|}, \quad \forall i \in B_u \setminus B_u^1. \quad (7)$$

Further, recall that each buyer in $i \in B_u^1$ gets at least one good j with price $p_j > 1$ in \mathbf{x}^* . Since $v_{ij} = \min(c_i, p_j) > 1$, we have $v_i(\mathbf{x}^*) > 1$ for all $i \in B_u^1$.

Next we observe that the maximum value for $\prod_{i \in B \setminus B_0} v_i(\tilde{\mathbf{x}})$ is obtained when each buyer $i \in B_c \setminus B_0$ gets value c_i , each buyer $i \in B_u^1$ gets exactly one good of G_u^1 , i.e., $|B_u^1| = |G_u^1|$, and each buyer $i \in B_u \setminus B_u^1$ gets value 1. This will prove the claim.

Suppose at $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}$, some (hence, by assumption, each) buyer in $B_u \setminus B_u^1$ receives value more than 1, then (7) implies that at least one buyer $i \in B_c \setminus B_0$ gets value strictly less than $c_i < 1$. Since $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}$ is allowed to be fractional for buyers in $B_c \setminus B_0$ and $B_u \setminus B_u^1$, we can reallocate some amount of good from a $i' \in B_u \setminus B_u^1$ to i . This increases the Nash social welfare, which is a contradiction.

Further suppose at $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}$ we have $|B_u^1| < |G_u^1|$, i.e., a buyer $i' \in B_u^1$ gets at least two goods of G_u^1 . Then (7) implies that either buyers in $B_u \setminus B_u^1$ get value strictly less than 1 or there is a buyer $i \in B_c \setminus B_0$ who gets value strictly less than c_i , or both. In all cases, we can increase the Nash social welfare by taking one entire good of G_u^1 from i' , reallocate it (fractionally) to buyers in $B_u \setminus B_u^1$, and then reallocate some amount of goods from buyers in $B_u \setminus B_u^1$ to buyer $i \in B_c \setminus B_0$ with value less than c_i (if any). This increases the Nash social welfare, which is a contradiction. \square

3.2 Rounding Equilibria

In this section, we give an algorithm to round a fractional allocation of a thrifty and modest equilibrium (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{p}) to an integral one. W.l.o.g., we may assume that the allocation graph $(B \cup G, E)$ with $E = \{\{i, j\} \in B \times G \mid x_{ij} > 0\}$ is a forest [24, 39]. In the following, we only discuss how to round the trees in $(B \setminus B_0) \times (G \setminus G_0)$. For trees in $B_0 \times G_0$, the rounding and the analysis are very similar, but independent of prices and slightly simpler (see Appendix A). Consider the following procedure:

Preprocessing: For each tree component of the allocation graph, assign some agent to be a root node. For each good that has no child-agent, assign it to its parent agent. For each good j , if it has two or more child agents, then keep only one child agent who buys the largest amount of j . For every other child agent i , delete the edge (i, j) and make i the root node of the newly created tree. For each good j , if its price is at most half of the active budget of its child-agent i , i.e., $p_j \leq m_i^a/2$, then assign j to its parent agent and make the child agent i the root node of a newly created tree.

Rounding: For each tree component, do the following recursively: Assign the root agent a child-good j that gives him the maximum value (among all children goods) in the fractional solution. Except in the subtree rooted at j , assign each good to its child-agent in the remaining tree. Make the child-agent of good j the root node of the newly created tree.

Lemma 3.4. *After preprocessing, each tree component T has $k_T + 1$ agents and k_T goods, for some $k_T > 1$. The valuation of the root agent r is at least $v_r(\mathbf{x})/2$. For all other agents i the valuation is at least $v_i(\mathbf{x})$.*

Proof. The first part is straightforward since after preprocessing, every remaining good has exactly one parent agent and one child agent. For the second part, whenever an agent loses allocation, a new tree component is being created, and we make this agent its root node. Since $v_{ij} \leq c_i, \forall (i, j)$, each capped agent needs to buy in total at least one unit of goods and each uncapped agent spends his entire budget. If a child agent i is cut off from a good j , then either $x_{ij} \leq 1/2$ or $p_j \leq m_i^a/2$. In the latter case, the maximum utility of good j for agent i is at most half of its active budget. In the former case, if i is capped, $x_{ij}v_{ij} \leq 1/2 \cdot c_i \leq c_i/2 = v_i(\mathbf{x})/2$, and if i is uncapped, $x_{ij}p_j \leq p_j^a/2 \leq 1/2 = v_i(\mathbf{x})/2$. \square

Lemma 3.5. *After rounding, each agent i that is assigned its parent good obtains a valuation of at least $v_i(\mathbf{x})/2$.*

Proof. Consider any good j in the tree in the rounding step. Since j was not assigned to its parent agent during preprocessing, we know its price is at least half of the active budget of its child agent. Hence, from this good the child agent obtains a valuation of at least half of the valuation in the equilibrium. \square

Consider a tree T at the beginning of the rounding step with $k_T + 1$ agents and k_T goods. Let $a_1, g_1, a_2, g_2, \dots, a_l, g_l, a_{l+1}$ be the *recursion path* in T starting from the root agent a_1 and ending at the leaf agent a_{l+1} such that a_1, \dots, a_{l+1} became root agents of the trees formed recursively during the rounding step, and good g_i is assigned to a_i in this process, for $1 \leq i \leq l$. We denote by k_i the number of children for agent a_i , for $1 \leq i \leq l$.

Lemma 3.6. *The product of the valuations of agents in T in the rounded solution is at least*

$$\left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{k_T - l + 1} \cdot \frac{1}{k_1 \cdots k_l} \cdot \prod_{i \in T \cap B_c} c_i \prod_{j \in T: p_j > 1} p_j .$$

Proof. First assume that all prices are at most 1, which implies that all goods are fully sold. Let $\bar{c}_i = \min\{1, c_i\}, \forall i \in B$. Let $q_i = x_{a_i, g_i}$ be the amount of good g_i bought by agent a_i in the equilibrium, for $1 \leq i \leq l$. Clearly, $\sum_{j=1}^l k_j \leq k$. Using Lemma 3.4 and the fact that the rounding assigns a child good that gives the maximum value in the fractional solution to the root agent, the value obtained by a_1 in the rounded solution is at least $\frac{\bar{c}_1}{2q_1 k_1}$; note that the child contributes at least $\bar{c}_1/(2k_1)$ to the utility of the root and assigning the good completely will multiply this by $1/q_1$. Since $v_{ij} \leq \min\{c_i, p_j\}, \forall (i, j)$ and $p_j \leq 1$, we note that $\frac{\bar{c}_1}{2q_1 k_1} \leq \bar{c}_1$, so this is indeed a feasible lower bound on the valuation achieved by the root agent.

Due to the assignment of g_1 to a_1 , a_2 loses at most $\bar{c}_2(1 - q_1)$ value, but he still gets at least $\bar{c}_2 q_1$ value from other goods. Hence, similarly, assigning g_2 to a_2 in the rounded solution, a_2 gets value at least $\frac{\bar{c}_2 q_1}{q_2 k_2}$. Again, this represents a number less than \bar{c}_2 and hence a feasible lower bound on the valuation of a_2 . Continuing in this way, we obtain that in the rounded solution, a_i gets value at least $\frac{\bar{c}_i q_{i-1}}{q_i k_i}$ for $2 \leq i \leq l$, and a_{l+1} gets value at least $\bar{c}_{l+1} q_l$.

Using Lemma 3.5, each of the remaining $k - l$ agents in T get a value at least $v_i(\mathbf{x})/2$. This implies that the product of valuations of agents in T in the rounded solution is at least

$$\left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{k-l+1} \left(\frac{1}{k_1 \cdots k_l}\right) \prod_{i \in T} \bar{c}_i .$$

Next we remove the assumption that all prices are at most 1. Consider a good j such that $p_j > 1$. Using Lemma 3.3, it can be only assigned to an uncapped agent i during the rounding. Further since $p_j = v_{ij} \leq c_i$, the value of agent i with this allocation is at least p_j . Finally, since at most one good is assigned to each agent during the rounding step, each capped good is assigned to a separate agent, and hence the product of the valuations of agents in T in the rounded solution is at least

$$\left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{k-l+1} \left(\frac{1}{k_1 \cdots k_l}\right) \prod_{i \in T \cap B_c} c_i \prod_{j \in T: p_j > 1} p_j . \quad \square$$

Theorem 3.2. *The rounding procedure gives a $2e^{1/2e}$ -approximation for the optimal Nash social welfare with budget-additive valuations, where $2e^{1/2e} < 2.404$.*

Proof. Suppose there are trees T^1, T^2, \dots, T^a at the beginning of the rounding. Let $k^i + 1$ and k^i be the number of agents and goods in tree T^i , respectively. Let $l^i + 1$ be the number of agents on the

path in T^i traced during the rounding step, and let $k_1^i, \dots, k_{l_i}^i$ be the degrees of the number of children goods for agents along that path.

The bound in Lemma 3.6 for trees $T \subseteq (B \setminus B_0) \times (G \setminus G_0)$ can also be obtained for our rounding of trees $T \subseteq B_0 \times G_0$ (Lemma A.3 in the Appendix). Thus, the Nash social welfare of the rounded solution is at least

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(\left(\frac{1}{2} \right)^{\sum_{i=1}^a (k^i - l^i + 1)} \left(\frac{1}{k_1^1 \dots k_{l_1}^1 k_1^2 \dots k_{l_2}^2 \dots k_1^a \dots k_{l_a}^a} \right) \prod_{i \in B_c} c_i \prod_{j: p_j > 1} p_j \right)^{1/n} \\ & \geq \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{2 \sum_i l^i}{\sum_i \sum_j k_j^i} \right)^{\sum_i l^i / n} \left(\prod_{i \in B_c} c_i \prod_{j: p_j > 1} p_j \right)^{1/n} \geq \frac{1}{2e^{1/2e}} \left(\prod_{i \in B_c} c_i \prod_{j: p_j > 1} p_j \right)^{1/n}, \end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality follows from $\sum_i (k^i + 1) \leq n$ and $\prod_i \prod_j k_j^i \leq (\sum_i \sum_j k_j^i / \sum_i l^i)^{\sum_i l^i}$, and the second inequality uses $\sum_{i=1}^a \sum_{j=1}^{l_i} k_j^i \leq n$ and the fact that $(2x)^x$ is minimum at $x = 1/2e$. \square

3.3 Rounding Equilibria of Perturbed Markets

Given a parameter $\varepsilon' > 0$, our FPTAS in Section 4.2 computes an exact equilibrium for a perturbed market, which results when agents have perturbed valuations $\tilde{v}_i(\mathbf{x}) = \min(c_i, \sum_j \tilde{v}_{ij} x_{ij})$ with the same caps c_i and $\tilde{v}_{ij} \geq v_{ij} \geq \tilde{v}_{ij}/(1 + \varepsilon')$. Suppose we apply our rounding algorithm to the exact equilibrium for \tilde{v} . It obtains an allocation S such that

$$\prod_i v_i(\mathbf{x}_i^S) \geq \frac{1}{(1 + \varepsilon')^n} \prod_i \tilde{v}_i(\mathbf{x}_i^S) \geq \frac{1}{(1 + \varepsilon')^n} \cdot \frac{1}{2e^{1/2e}} \prod_i \tilde{v}_i(\mathbf{x}^*) \geq \frac{1}{(1 + \varepsilon')^n 2e^{1/2e}} \cdot \prod_i v_i(\mathbf{x}^*).$$

Given a constant $\varepsilon'' > 0$, we apply the FPTAS with $\varepsilon' = \varepsilon''/n$. This yields an approximation ratio of at most $2e^{1/2e} e^{\varepsilon''} = 2e^{1/2e} + \varepsilon$, for some constant $\varepsilon > 0$. We summarize our main result:

Corollary 3.1. *For every $\varepsilon > 0$ there is an algorithm with running time polynomial in n , m , $\log \max_{i,j} \{v_{ij}, c_i\}$, and $1/\varepsilon$ that computes an allocation which represents a $(2e^{1/2e} + \varepsilon)$ -approximation for the optimal Nash social welfare.*

4 Computing Equilibria

4.1 Existence and Structure of Equilibria

Thrifty and modest equilibria in markets with utility and earning limits have interesting and non-trivial structure. For markets with utility limits, such an equilibrium always exists [8]. For markets with earning limits, such an equilibrium may not exist, because uncapped buyers always spend all their money. In these markets, the money-clearing condition is necessary and sufficient for the existence of a thrifty and modest equilibrium [9] (see also [17] for the case that $u_{ij} > 0$ for all $i \in B, j \in G$).

We observe that in a market \mathcal{M} with both limits, money clearing is sufficient but not necessary for the existence of a thrifty and modest equilibrium. Our FPTAS below gives an ε -approximate equilibrium in money-clearing markets, for arbitrarily small ε . Since market parameters are finite integers, for sufficiently small ε this implies existence of an exact equilibrium.

This is interesting since the structure of equilibria in such markets can be quite complex. For example, in money-clearing markets \mathcal{M} there can be no convex program describing thrifty and modest equilibria. This holds even if we restrict to the ones that are Pareto-optimal with respect to the set of all thrifty and modest equilibria. Equilibria for the corresponding markets *without* caps, or with *either* earning *or* utility caps might not remain equilibria in the market with *both* sets of caps. Hence,

existence of a thrifty and modest equilibrium in money-clearing markets \mathcal{M} follows neither from a convex program nor by a direct application of existing algorithms for markets with only one set of either utility or earning caps. The following proposition summarizes our observations.

Proposition 4.1. *There are markets \mathcal{M} with utility and earning limits such that the following holds:*

1. \mathcal{M} is not money-clearing and has a thrifty and modest equilibrium.
2. \mathcal{M} is money-clearing, and the set of thrifty and modest equilibria is not convex. Among these equilibria, there are multiple Pareto-optimal equilibria, and their set is also not convex.
3. For a money-clearing market \mathcal{M} and the three related markets – (1) with only utility caps, (2) with only earning caps, (3) without any caps – the sets of equilibria are mutually disjoint.

Proof. We provide an example market for each of the three properties.

Property 1: Consider a linear market with one buyer and one good. The buyer has $m_1 = 2$, utility $u_{11} = 2$, and utility cap $c_1 = 1$. The good has earning cap $d_1 = 1$. The unique thrifty and modest equilibrium has price $p_1 = 2$ and allocation $x_{11} = 1/2$. Both seller and buyer exactly reach their cap. The active budget $m_i^a = 1$ equals the earning cap. Conversely, due to price 2, the supply is 1, for which the achieved utility equals the utility cap. Note that condition (1) is violated.

Property 2: Consider the following example. There are two buyers and two goods. The buyer budgets are $m_1 = 1$ and $m_2 = 10$. The utility caps are $c_1 = \infty$, $c_2 = 1$, the earning caps are $d_1 = 5$, $d_2 = 6$. The linear utilities are given by the parameters $u_{11} = u_{22} = 1$, $u_{12} = 3$, and $u_{21} = 1/10$.

If we ignore all caps, the unique equilibrium has prices $(1, 10)$ and buyer utilities $(1, 1)$. If we ignore the utility caps and consider only earning caps, the equilibrium prices are $(5y, 50y)$ and buyer utilities are $(1/5y, 1/5y)$, for $y \geq 1$. If we ignore the earning caps and consider only utility caps, the equilibrium prices are $(1, x)$ and buyer utilities are $(1, 1)$, for $x \in [3, 10]$.

With all caps, the equilibria form two disjoint convex sets: either prices $(1, x)$ and buyer utilities $(1, 1)$, for $x \in [3, 6]$; or prices $(5y, 50y)$ and buyer utilities $(1/5y, 1/5y)$, for $y \geq 1$. Note that $(1, x)$ for $x \in (6, 10]$ are not equilibrium prices, since this would violate the earning cap of seller 2.

Observe that there are exactly two Pareto-optimal equilibria: prices $(1, 6)$ (which also represents income for the sellers) and buyer utilities $(1, 1)$; and prices $(5, 50)$ (with income $(3, 6)$ for the sellers) and buyer utilities $(1/5, 1/5)$. The first equilibrium is strictly better for both buyers, the second one strictly better for seller 1.

Property 3: Consider the following market with 2 buyers and 2 goods. The buyer budgets are $m_1 = 100$ and $m_2 = 11$. The utility caps are $c_1 = 0.9$, $c_2 = \infty$. The earning caps are $d_1 = 9$, $d_2 = \infty$. The utilities are $u_{11} = u_{22} = u_{12} = u_{21} = 1$.

If we ignore all caps, the unique equilibrium prices are $(55.5, 55.5)$. If we ignore the buyer caps and consider only seller caps, the unique equilibrium prices are $(102, 102)$. If we ignore the seller caps and consider only buyer caps, the unique equilibrium prices are $(10, 10)$. For both buyer and seller caps, the unique equilibrium prices are $(20, 20)$. \square

4.2 Computing Equilibria in Perturbed Markets

In this section, we analyze Algorithm 1 for computing an approximate equilibrium in money-clearing markets \mathcal{M} . Recall that the input is $u_{ij}, m_i, c_i, d_j, \forall i \in B, j \in G$, where u_{ij} is the utility derived by buyer i for a unit amount of good j , m_i is the budget of buyer i , c_i is the utility cap of buyer i , and d_j is the earning cap of seller j . For any $\varepsilon > 0$, Algorithm 1 computes an exact equilibrium in a perturbed market $\tilde{\mathcal{M}}$, where we increase every non-zero parameter u_{ij} to the next-larger power of $(1 + \varepsilon)$.

Algorithm 1. FPTAS for \mathcal{M} with Earning and Utility Caps

Input : Market \mathcal{M} given by budgets m_i , utility caps c_i , earning caps d_j , utilities $u_{ij}, \forall i \in B, j \in G$, approximation parameter ε ;

Output: Equilibrium (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{p}) of the perturbed market $\tilde{\mathcal{M}}$

```
1 Construct  $\tilde{\mathcal{M}}$ , set  $\tilde{U} \leftarrow \max_{ij} \tilde{u}_{ij}$ , and run the rest of the algorithm on this perturbed market
2  $(\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{p}) \leftarrow$  equilibrium of  $\tilde{\mathcal{M}}$  when ignoring all utility caps
3  $Z \leftarrow \{i \in B \mid s(i) = 0\}$  // set of zero surplus buyers
4 while  $Z \neq B$  do
5    $k \leftarrow$  a buyer in  $B \setminus Z$  //  $s(k) > 0$ 
6   while  $(s(k) > 0)$  and  $(\min_{j \in G: p_j > 0} p_j > 1/n\tilde{U}^n)$  do
7      $\hat{B} \leftarrow \{k\} \cup \{i \in B \mid i \text{ can reach } k \text{ in the MBB residual graph}\}$ 
8      $\hat{G} \leftarrow \{j \in G \mid j \text{ can reach } k \text{ in the MBB residual graph}\}$ 
9      $\mathbf{p}' \leftarrow \mathbf{p}$ 
10     $x \leftarrow 1$ ; Define  $p_j \leftarrow xp_j, \forall j \in \hat{G}$  // also active budgets & prices change
11    Decrease  $x$  continuously down from 1 until one of the following events occurs
12    Event 1: A new MBB edge appears
13    Event 2:  $x = \text{MinFactor}(\mathbf{p}', \mathbf{f}, \hat{B}, \hat{G}, Z)$  // Algorithm 2
14     $\mathbf{f} \leftarrow \text{FeasibleFlow}(\mathbf{p}, Z)$  // Algorithm 3
15  if  $\min_{j: p_j > 0} p_j \leq 1/n\tilde{U}^n$  then
16    Choose any good  $\ell \in \arg \min\{p_j \mid p_j > 0\}$ 
17     $\hat{G} \leftarrow \{\ell\} \cup \{j \in G \mid j \text{ is connected to } \ell \text{ in the MBB graph}\}$ 
18     $\hat{B} \leftarrow \{i \in B \mid \tilde{u}_{ij} > 0, j \in \hat{G}\}$ 
19    Assign  $(\mathbf{x}_i)_{i \in \hat{B}}$  according to  $\mathbf{f}$ 
20     $s(i) \leftarrow 0, \forall i \in \hat{B}$  and  $p_j \leftarrow 0, \forall j \in \hat{G}$ 
21   $Z \leftarrow Z \cup \{i \in B \mid s(i) = 0\}$ 
22 Assign  $\mathbf{x}_i$  according to  $\mathbf{f}$  for all buyers  $i \in B$  that have not been assigned yet.
23 return  $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{p})$ 
```

Additional Concepts Our algorithm steers prices and flow towards equilibrium by monitoring the surplus of buyers and sellers. Note that a buyer i is capped if $m_i \alpha_i \geq c_i$.

Definition 4.1 (Active Budget, Active Price, Surplus). *Given prices \mathbf{p} and money flow \mathbf{f} , the active budget of buyer i is $m_i^a = \min(m_i, c_i/\alpha_i)$, the active supply of seller j is $e_j^a = \min(1, d_j/p_j)$, and the active price is $p_j^a = p_j e_j^a = \min(p_j, d_j)$. The surplus of buyer i is $s(i) = \sum_{j \in G} f_{ij} - m_i^a$, and the surplus of good j is $s(j) = p_j^a - \sum_{i \in B} f_{ij}$.*

Several graphs connected to the MBB ratio are useful here. As argued in [24, 39], we can assume w.l.o.g. that the MBB graph is *non-degenerate*, i.e., it is a forest.

Definition 4.2 (MBB edge, MBB graph, MBB residual graph). *Given prices \mathbf{p} , an undirected pair $\{i, j\}$ is an MBB edge if $i \in B, j \in G$, and $u_{ij}/p_j = \alpha_i$. The MBB graph $\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{p}) = (B \cup G, E)$ is an undirected graph that contains exactly the MBB edges. Given prices \mathbf{p} and money flow \mathbf{f} , the MBB residual graph $\mathcal{G}_r(\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{p}) = (B \cup G, A)$ is a directed graph with the following arcs: If $\{i, j\}$ is MBB, then (i, j) is an arc in A ; if $\{i, j\}$ is MBB and $f_{ij} > 0$, then (j, i) is an arc in A .*

Let us also define a *reverse flow network* $N^-(\mathbf{p}, Z)$ by adding a sink t to the the MBB graph. The network has nodes $G \cup B \cup \{t\}$, edges (i, t) for $i \in B \setminus Z$, and the reverse MBB edges (j, i) if (i, j) is an MBB edge. All edges have infinite capacity. The supply at node $j \in G$ is p_j^a , demand at node $i \in B$ is m_i^a , and demand at node t is $\sum_j p_j^a - \sum_i m_i^a$. The flow in the network corresponds to money. Given

Algorithm 2. MinFactor

Input : Prices \mathbf{p} , flow \mathbf{f} , set of buyers \hat{B} , set of goods \hat{G} , set of zero-surplus buyers Z

Output: Minimum price decrease consistent with the input configuration

- 1 $E \leftarrow$ Set of MBB edges at prices \mathbf{p} between \hat{B} and \hat{G}
- 2 $G_c \leftarrow$ Set of goods from \hat{G} that are capped at (\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{p})
- 3 $B_c \leftarrow$ Set of buyers from \hat{B} that are capped at (\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{p})
- 4 $\lambda_i \leftarrow \min_{k \in G} p_k / u_{ik}, \forall i \in \hat{B}$
- 5 Set up the following LP in flow variables \mathbf{g} and x :

$\min x$	
$\sum_{i \in \hat{B}} g_{ij} = d_j,$	$\forall j \in G_c$
$\sum_{i \in \hat{B}} g_{ij} = xp_j,$	$\forall j \in \hat{G} \setminus G_c$
$\sum_{j \in \hat{G}} g_{ij} = xc_i \lambda_i,$	$\forall i \in B_c \cap Z$
$\sum_{j \in \hat{G}} g_{ij} \geq xc_i \lambda_i,$	$\forall i \in B_c \setminus Z$
$\sum_{j \in \hat{G}} g_{ij} = m_i,$	$\forall i \in (\hat{B} \setminus B_c) \cap Z$
$\sum_{j \in \hat{G}} g_{ij} \geq m_i,$	$\forall i \in (\hat{B} \setminus B_c) \setminus Z$
$g_{ij} = 0,$	$\forall (i, j) \notin E$
$g_{ij} \geq 0,$	$\forall i \in \hat{B}, j \in \hat{G}$

- 6 **return** *Optimal solution x of above LP*
-

a money flow \mathbf{f} in the network $N^-(\mathbf{p}, Z)$, the surplus of buyer $i \in B \setminus Z$ corresponds to flow on (i, t)

$$s(i) = \sum_{j \in G} f_{ij} - m_i^a = f_{it} .$$

Buyers in Z do not have edges to the sink. Hence, their surplus is fixed to 0 at every feasible flow.

Algorithm and Analysis Algorithm 1 computes an exact equilibrium of $\tilde{\mathcal{M}}$. For convenience, it maintains a money flow \mathbf{f} . For goods with non-zero price, \mathbf{f} is equivalent to an allocation \mathbf{x} . When the algorithm encounters a set of goods with price 0, the buyers interested in these goods must be capped, and the algorithm determines a suitable allocation for them by solving a system of linear equations.

The algorithm first calls a subroutine to compute a market equilibrium ignoring the utility caps of the buyers. Such an equilibrium exists because the market is money-clearing, can be computed in polynomial time [9, 17], and consists of a pair (\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{p}) of flow and prices such that the outflow of every good j is p_j^a and the inflow of every buyer i is m_i . Given this equilibrium, the algorithm then initializes Z to the set of buyers with surplus is zero in (\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{p}) .

The following **Invariants** are maintained during the run of Algorithm 1:

- no price ever increases.
- if $s(i) = 0$ for a buyer i , it remains 0. Z is monotonically increasing.
- $N^-(\mathbf{p}, Z)$ allows a feasible flow, i.e., $s(i) \geq 0$ for every buyer $i \in B$ and $s(j) = 0$ for every good $j \in G$.

More formally, the algorithm uses a descending-price approach. There is always a flow in $N^-(\mathbf{p}, Z)$ with outflow of a good $j \in G$ equal to p_j^a , in-flow into buyer $i \in B \cap Z$ equal to m_i^a , and in-flow into buyer $i \in B \setminus Z$ at least m_i^a . Descending prices imply that if a good (buyer) becomes uncapped (capped), it remains uncapped (capped).

The algorithm ends when $Z = B$, i.e., all buyers have surplus zero, and hence (\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{p}) is an equilibrium of $\tilde{\mathcal{M}}$. In the body of the outer while-loop, we first pick a buyer k whose surplus is positive. The inner while loop ends when either the surplus of k becomes zero or the minimum positive price of a

Algorithm 3. FeasibleFlow

Input : Perturbed market $\tilde{\mathcal{M}}$, prices \mathbf{p} , and set of zero-surplus buyers Z

Output: Feasible flow consistent with the input configuration

- 1 $E \leftarrow$ Set of MBB edges at prices \mathbf{p}
- 2 $\lambda_i \leftarrow \min_{k \in G} p_k / u_{ik}, \forall i \in B$
- 3 $B_c \leftarrow$ Set of capped buyers at \mathbf{p}
- 4 $G_c \leftarrow$ Set of capped goods at \mathbf{p}
- 5 Set up the following feasibility LP in flow variables \mathbf{f} :

$\sum_{i \in \hat{B}} f_{ij} = d_j, \quad \forall j \in G_c$
$\sum_{i \in \hat{B}} f_{ij} = p_j, \quad \forall j \in G \setminus G_c$
$\sum_{j \in \hat{G}} f_{ij} = c_i \lambda_i, \quad \forall i \in B_c \cap Z$
$\sum_{j \in \hat{G}} f_{ij} \geq c_i \lambda_i, \quad \forall i \in B_c \setminus Z$
$\sum_{j \in \hat{G}} f_{ij} = m_i, \quad \forall i \in (B \setminus B_c) \cap Z$
$\sum_{j \in \hat{G}} f_{ij} \geq m_i, \quad \forall i \in (B \setminus B_c) \setminus Z$
$f_{ij} = 0, \quad \forall (i, j) \notin E$
$f_{ij} \geq 0, \quad \forall i \in B, j \in G$

- 6 **return** Optimal solution f of above LP
-

good, say ℓ , is at most $1/n\tilde{U}^n$, where \tilde{U} is the maximum parameter value of the perturbed utilities. In the former case, the size of Z increases (in line 21). In the latter case, we obtain a set \hat{G} of goods connected to ℓ through MBB edges and a set \hat{B} of buyers who have non-zero utility for some good in \hat{G} . Since the price of each good in \hat{G} is so low and their surplus is zero, each buyer in \hat{B} must be capped. Hence we fix the allocation of buyers in \hat{B} according to the current money flow \mathbf{f} , and set the prices of all goods in \hat{G} and surplus of all buyers in \hat{B} to zero. Since the algorithm maintains goods with price 0 and buyers with surplus 0, the inner-while loop is executed at most $m + n$ times.

In the body of inner while-loop, we construct the set \hat{B} of buyers and \hat{G} of goods that can reach buyer k in the MBB residual graph (see Definition 4.2). We then continuously decrease the prices of all goods in \hat{G} by a common factor x , starting from $x = 1$. This may destroy MBB edges connecting buyers in \hat{B} with goods in $G \setminus \hat{G}$. However, by definition of \hat{G} there is no flow on such edges. For uncapped goods in \hat{G} (capped buyers in \hat{B}), this decreases the active price (budget) by a factor of x . We stop if one of the two events happens: (1) a new MBB edge appears, and (2) x is equal to the minimum factor possible that allows a feasible flow with the current MBB edges, i.e., in-flow into a good $j \in \hat{G}$ is equal to p_j^a , out-flow of a buyer in $\hat{B} \cap Z$ is equal to m_i^a , and out-flow of a buyer in $\hat{B} \setminus Z$ is at least m_i^a . While the value of x for event (1) results from ratios of \tilde{u}_{ij} , the value of x for event (2) is found by Algorithm 2 based on a linear program (LP). Observe that the flow \mathbf{f} and $x = 1$ are a feasible initial solution for the LP.

After the event happened, we update to a new feasible flow \mathbf{f} using Algorithm 3. For prices \mathbf{p} and the set Z of zero-surplus buyers, the in-flow into a good $j \in G$ must be equal to p_j^a , out-flow of a buyer in Z must be equal to m_i^a , and out-flow of a buyer in $B \setminus Z$ must be at least m_i^a . Algorithm 3 sets up a feasibility LP to find such a feasible flow. Observe that this feasibility set is non-empty due to Event 2.

The following lemma is straightforward, we omit the proof.

Lemma 4.1. *The Invariants hold during the run of Algorithm 1.*

Next we bound the running time of Algorithm 1. Event 1 provides a new MBB edge between a buyer in $B \setminus \hat{B}$ and a good in \hat{G} . Event 2 restricts the price decrease in x such that the Invariants are maintained. The event happens only if (1) at the value of x there is a subset of buyers $S \subseteq \hat{B}$ such that $\sum_{i \in S} m_i^a = \sum_{j \in \Gamma(S)} p_j^a$, where $\Gamma(S)$ is the set of goods to which buyers in S have MBB edges,

and (2) further decrease of prices would make the total active budget of buyers in S more than the total active prices of $\Gamma(S)$. This condition would violate the invariant that $N^-(\mathbf{p}, Z)$ has a feasible flow where the surplus of each good is zero.

If the subset S is equal to \hat{B} or S contains buyer k , then the surplus of k in every feasible flow is zero at such a minimum x , and hence the inner-while loop ends. Otherwise, the MBB edges between buyers in $B \setminus S$ and goods in $\Gamma(S)$ will become non-MBB in the next iteration. So in each event of the inner-while loop, either a new MBB edge evolves or an existing MBB edge vanishes. Next, we show that for a given buyer k , the total number of iterations of the inner-while loop is polynomially bounded. For this, we first show that price of a good strictly decreases during each iteration of inner-while loop.

Lemma 4.2. *In each iteration of inner-while loop, the MBB ratio of buyer k strictly increases.*

Proof. Each iteration of the inner while-loop ends with one of the two events. Clearly, Event 1 can occur only when the prices of goods in \hat{G} strictly decrease, and this implies that the MBB of buyer k strictly increases. In case of Event 2, as argued above, there is a subset $S \subseteq \hat{B}$ of buyers such that $\sum_{i \in S} m_i^a = \sum_{j \in \Gamma(S)} p_j^a$, where $\Gamma(S)$ is the set of goods to which S have MBB edges.

If $k \in S$, then $s(k) = 0$ in this iteration. This implies that $\sum_{i \in S} m_i^a < \sum_{j \in \Gamma(S)} p_j^a$ at the beginning of this iteration, and since equality emerges, prices must have strictly decreased and the MBB of k strictly increased.

If $k \notin S$, then $S \neq \hat{B}$ and flow on all MBB edges from $\hat{B} \setminus S$ to $\Gamma(S)$ has become zero. Note that there is at least one such edge due to the construction of \hat{B} and \hat{G} . Using the fact that there was a non-zero flow on these edges and $\sum_{i \in S} m_i^a < \sum_{j \in \Gamma(S)} p_j^a$ at the beginning of this iteration, we conclude that prices of goods must have strictly decreased and the MBB of k strictly increased. \square

Next we show that the price of a good substantially decreases after a certain number of iterations. For this, we partition the iterations into *phases*, where every phase has n^2 iterations of the inner while-loop.

Lemma 4.3. *Let \mathbf{p} and \mathbf{p}' be the prices at the beginning and end of a phase, respectively. Then $p'_j \leq p_j, \forall j \in G$, and there exists a good ℓ such that $p'_\ell \leq p_\ell / (1 + \varepsilon)$.*

Proof. Due to Lemma 4.1, we have $p'_j \leq p_j, \forall j \in G$. For the second part, note that \hat{B} always contains buyer k during an entire run of inner while-loop. Since prices monotonically decrease, the MBB α_k of buyer k monotonically increases. Further, if there is a MBB path from buyer k to a good j , then we have, for some $(i_1, j_1), \dots, (i_a, j_a), (i'_1, j'_1), \dots, (i'_b, j'_b)$ and an integer c

$$\alpha_k p_j = \frac{\prod \tilde{u}_{i_1 j_1} \dots \tilde{u}_{i_a j_a}}{\prod \tilde{u}_{i'_1 j'_1} \dots \tilde{u}_{i'_b j'_b}} = (1 + \varepsilon)^c .$$

In each iteration, either a new MBB edge evolves or an existing MBB edge vanishes. When a new MBB edge evolves, a new MBB path from buyer k to a good j gets established. When an existing MBB edge vanishes, then an old MBB path from k to a good j gets destroyed. Further, if there is an MBB path from a good j to buyer k , then price of good j monotonically decreases. If there is no MBB path from a good j to buyer k , then price of good j does not decrease. After n^2 events, there has to be a good j such that initially there is an MBB path from k to j , then no MBB path between them for some iterations, then again an MBB path between them. Let p_j be the price of good j at the time when there is no path between k and j , and let α_k and α'_k be the MBB for buyer k at the time the MBB path between j and k was broken and when it was later again established, respectively. Since p_j does not change unless there is a path between k and j , we have

$$\alpha_k p_j = (1 + \varepsilon)^{c_1} \text{ and } \alpha'_k p_j = (1 + \varepsilon)^{c_2}, \text{ for some integers } c_1 \text{ and } c_2.$$

Since $\alpha'_k > \alpha_k$ due to Lemma 4.2, we have $\alpha'_k \geq \alpha_k(1 + \varepsilon)$. Let good l give the MBB to buyer k at α'_k , and let p_l and p'_l be the prices of good l when the MBB path between j and k was broken and when it was later established. This implies

$$u_{il}/p'_l = \alpha'_k \geq \alpha_k(1 + \varepsilon) \geq (1 + \varepsilon)u_{il}/p_l,$$

and $p'_l \leq p_l/(1 + \varepsilon)$. □

Lemma 4.4. *The number of iterations of the inner while-loop is in $O(n^3 \log_{1+\varepsilon}(n\tilde{U}^n \sum_i m_i))$.*

Proof. From Lemma 4.3, in each phase the price of a good decreases by a factor of $(1 + \varepsilon)$. The number of iterations in a phase is $O(n^2)$. The starting price is at most $\sum_i m_i$. If a price becomes at most $1/n\tilde{U}^n$, the inner while-loop ends for a particular buyer k . Hence, the number of phases is at most $n \log_{1+\varepsilon} n\tilde{U}^n \sum_i m_i$, and the number of iterations of the inner while-loop is at most $O(n^3 \log_{1+\varepsilon} n\tilde{U}^n \sum_i m_i)$. □

Theorem 4.1. *For every $\varepsilon > 0$, Algorithm 1 computes a thrifty and modest equilibrium in the perturbed market $\tilde{\mathcal{M}}$ in time polynomial in n, U and $1/\varepsilon$.*

Proof. From Lemma 4.1, all invariants are maintained throughout the algorithm. Hence, the surplus of each good is 0, the surplus of each buyer is non-negative, and prices decrease monotonically. The algorithm ends when surplus of all buyers is zero. During the algorithm, when the price of a good, say ℓ , becomes at most $1/n\tilde{U}^n$, where \tilde{U} is the largest perturbed utility parameter, then the price of all the goods connected to ℓ by MBB edges is at most $1/n$. Since the minimum budget of a buyer is at least 1, all buyers buying these goods have to be capped. That implies that there is an equilibrium where prices of these goods are zero.

Lemma 4.4 shows that there are at most $O(n^3 \log_{1+\varepsilon} n\tilde{U}^n \sum_i m_i)$ iterations, which can be upper bounded by $O(n^{4/\varepsilon} \log(nU))$. Each iteration can be implemented in polynomial time. □

Approximate Equilibrium Our algorithm computes an exact equilibrium in $\tilde{\mathcal{M}}$ in polynomial time. We show that such an exact equilibrium of $\tilde{\mathcal{M}}$ represents an ε -approximate equilibrium of \mathcal{M} , thereby obtaining an FPTAS for the problem. Based on ε , let us define the precise notion of ε -approximate market equilibrium, which is based on a notion of ε -approximate demand bundle.

Definition 4.3 (Approximate Demand). *For a vector \mathbf{p} of prices, consider a demand bundle \mathbf{x}_i^* for buyer i . An allocation \mathbf{x}_i for buyer i is called an ε -approximate (thrifty and modest) demand bundle if (1) $\sum_j u_{ij}x_{ij} \leq c_i$, (2) $\sum_j x_{ij}p_j \leq m_i^a$, and (3) $u_i(\mathbf{x}_i) \geq (1 - \varepsilon)u_i(\mathbf{x}_i^*)$.*

An ε -approximate (thrifty and modest) equilibrium differs from an exact equilibrium only by a relaxation of condition (4) to ε -approximate demand (c.f. Definition 2.1)

Definition 4.4 (Approximate Equilibrium). *An ε -approximate (thrifty and modest) equilibrium is a pair (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{p}) , where \mathbf{x} is an allocation and \mathbf{p} a vector of prices such that conditions (1)-(3), (5) from Definition 2.1 hold, and (4) \mathbf{x}_i is an ε -approximate demand bundle for every $i \in B$.*

Note that our definition is rather demanding, since there are many further relaxations (e.g., we require exact market clearing, modest supplies, exact earning and utility caps, etc), some of which are found in other notions of approximate equilibrium in the literature.

Lemma 4.5. *An exact equilibrium (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{p}) of $\tilde{\mathcal{M}}$ is an ε -approximate equilibrium of \mathcal{M} .*

Proof. Let α_i and $\tilde{\alpha}_i$ be the MBB of buyer i at prices \mathbf{p} w.r.t. utility u_i and perturbed utility \tilde{u}_i , respectively. Formally, $\alpha_i = \max_{k \in G} u_{ik}/p_k$ and $\tilde{\alpha}_i = \max_{k \in G} \tilde{u}_{ik}/p_k$. At prices \mathbf{p} , let u_i^* and \tilde{u}_i^* be the maximum utility buyer i can obtain in \mathcal{M} and $\tilde{\mathcal{M}}$, respectively. Clearly $u_i^* = \min\{c_i, m_i\alpha_i\}$, and $\tilde{u}_i^* = \min\{c_i, m_i\tilde{\alpha}_i\}$.

Since (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{p}) is an exact equilibrium of $\tilde{\mathcal{M}}$, the MBB condition implies that $x_{ij} > 0$ only if $\tilde{u}_{ij}/p_j = \max_{k \in G} \tilde{u}_{ik}/p_k$. Further, using (2) we get $\tilde{\alpha}_i(1+\varepsilon) > \alpha_i, \forall i$. This implies that $\tilde{u}_i^* > u_i^*/(1+\varepsilon) \geq u_i^*(1-\varepsilon)$. Further, since $\tilde{u}_{ij} \geq u_{ij}$, we have $\sum_j x_{ij} p_j = m_i^a, \forall i$. In addition, since (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{p}) is an exact equilibrium for $\tilde{\mathcal{M}}$, we obtain $\sum_i x_{ij} = \min\{1, p_j^a/p_j\}, \forall \{j \in G \mid p_j > 0\}$ and $\sum_i x_{ij} \leq 1, \forall \{j \in G \mid p_j = 0\}$. This proves the claim. \square

Corollary 4.1. *Algorithm 1 is an FPTAS for computing an ε -approximate equilibrium for money-clearing markets with earning and utility limits.*

5 Hardness of Approximation

In this section, we provide a result on the hardness of approximation of the maximum Nash social welfare with budget-additive valuations. The best previous bound was a factor of 1.00008 for the special case of additive valuations [32]. Our improved lower bound of $\sqrt{8/7} > 1.069$ follows by adapting a construction in [15] for (sum) social welfare,

Theorem 5.1. *There is no $\sqrt{8/7}$ -approximation algorithm for Nash social welfare with budget-additive valuations unless $\text{P}=\text{NP}$.*

Proof. Chakrabarty and Goel [15] show hardness for (sum) social welfare by reducing from MAX-E3-LIN-2. An instance of this problem consists of n variables and m linear equations over $\text{GF}(2)$. Each equation consists of 3 distinct variables. For the Nash social welfare objective, we require slightly more control over the behavior of the optimal assignments. Therefore, we consider the stronger problem variant Ek-OCC-MAX-E3-LIN-2, in which each variable occurs exactly k times in the equations.

Theorem 5.2 ([16]). *For every constant $\varepsilon \in (0, \frac{1}{4})$ there is a constant $k(\varepsilon)$ and a class of instances of Ek-OCC-MAX-E3-LIN-2 with $k \geq k(\varepsilon)$, for which we cannot decide if the optimal variable assignment fulfills more than $(1-\varepsilon)m$ equations or less than $(1/2+\varepsilon)m$ equations, unless $\text{P}=\text{NP}$.*

Our reduction follows the construction in [15]. We only sketch the main properties here. For more details see [15, Section 4].

For each variable x_i we introduce two agents $\langle x_i : 0 \rangle$ and $\langle x_i : 1 \rangle$. Each of these agents has a cap of $c_i = 4k$, where k is the number of occurrences of x_i in the equations. Since in E3-OCC-MAX-E3-LIN-2 every variable occurs exactly k times, we have $c_i = 4k$ for all agents. Moreover, for each variable x_i there is a *switch item*. The switch item has value $4k$ for agents $\langle x_i : 0 \rangle$ and $\langle x_i : 1 \rangle$, and value 0 for every other agent. It serves to capture the assignment of the variable – if x_i is set to $x_i = 1$, the switch item is given to $\langle x_i : 0 \rangle$ (for $x_i = 0$, the switch item goes to $\langle x_i : 1 \rangle$). When given a switch item, an agent cannot generate value for any additional equation items defined as follows.

For each equation $x_i + x_j + x_k = \alpha$ with $\alpha \in \{0, 1\}$, we introduce 4 classes of equation items – one class for each satisfying assignment. In particular, we get class $\langle x_i : \alpha; x_j : \alpha; x_k : \alpha \rangle$ as well as classes $\langle x_i : \bar{\alpha}, x_j : \bar{\alpha}, x_k : \alpha \rangle$, $\langle x_i : \bar{\alpha}, x_j : \alpha, x_k : \bar{\alpha} \rangle$ and $\langle x_i : \alpha, x_j : \bar{\alpha}, x_k : \bar{\alpha} \rangle$. For each of these classes, we introduce three items. Hence, for each equation we introduce 12 items in total. An item $\langle x_i : \alpha_i, x_j : \alpha_j, x_k : \alpha_k \rangle$ has a value of 1 for the three agents $\langle x_i : \alpha_i \rangle$, $\langle x_j : \alpha_j \rangle$, and $\langle x_k : \alpha_k \rangle$, and value 0 for every other agent.

It is easy to see that w.l.o.g. every optimal assignment of items to agents assigns all switch items. Hence, every optimal assignment yields some variable assignment for the underlying instance of Ek-OCC-MAX-E3-LIN-2.

Consider an equation $x_i + x_j + x_k = \alpha$ that becomes satisfied by setting the variables $(x_i, x_j, x_k) = (\alpha_i, \alpha_j, \alpha_k)$. Then none of the agents $\langle x_i : \alpha_i \rangle$, $\langle x_j : \alpha_j \rangle$, and $\langle x_k : \alpha_k \rangle$ gets a switch item, and we can assign exactly 4 equation items to each of these agents (for details see [15]). Hence, all 12 equation items generate additional value. In particular, it follows that if x_i is involved in a satisfied equation, one of its agent gets a switch item, and the other one can receive at least 3 equation items.

Consider an equation $x_i + x_j + x_k = \alpha$ that becomes unsatisfied by setting the variables $(x_i, x_j, x_k) = (\alpha_i, \alpha_j, \alpha_k)$. Then for one class of equation items, all agents that value these items have already received switch items (for details see [15]). This class of items cannot generate additional value. Hence, at most 9 equation items generate additional value. They can be assigned to the agents that did not receive switch items such that each agent receives 3 items. In particular, it follows that if x_i is involved in an unsatisfied equation, one of its agents gets a switch item, and the other one can receive at least 3 equation items. Hence, we can ensure that in every optimal solution the overall Nash social welfare is never 0.

We now derive a lower bound on the optimal Nash social welfare when $(1 - \varepsilon)m$ equations can be satisfied. In this case, we obtain value $4k$ for n agents that receive the switch items. Moreover, we get an additional total value of $12m(1 - \varepsilon) + 9m\varepsilon$ generated by the equation items. Note that $m = kn/3$. We strive to lower bound the Nash social welfare of such an assignment. For this, it suffices to consider the assignment indicated above – for each satisfied equation, all incident agents without switch items get 4 equation items. For each unsatisfied equation, all incident agents without switch items get 3 equation items. To obtain a lower bound on the Nash social welfare, we assume a value of $4k$ for a maximum of $n(1 - \varepsilon)$ agents, while the others get a value of $3k$. Therefore, when an assignment of items to agents generates Nash social welfare of more than

$$\left((4k)^n \cdot (4k)^{n(1-\varepsilon)} \cdot 3k^{n\varepsilon} \right)^{-2n} = k \cdot 4^{\frac{1}{2}} \cdot 4^{\frac{1}{2}} \cdot (3/4)^{\frac{\varepsilon}{2}} ,$$

we take this as an indicator that at least $m(1 - \varepsilon)$ equations can be fulfilled.

In contrast, now suppose only $(1/2 + \varepsilon)m$ equations can be fulfilled. In this case, we obtain value $4k$ for n agents that receive the switch items. Moreover, we get an additional total value of at most $12m(1/2 + \varepsilon) + 9m(1/2 - \varepsilon) = 10.5m + 3\varepsilon m$ generated by the equation items. We strive to upper bound the Nash social welfare of such an assignment. For this, we assume that all agents that do not receive a switch item get an equal share of the value generated by equation items, i.e., a share of $3.5k + k\varepsilon$. Therefore, when an assignment of items to agents generates Nash social welfare of less than

$$\left((4k)^n \cdot (k(3.5 + \varepsilon))^n \right)^{-2n} = k \cdot 4^{\frac{1}{2}} \cdot (3.5 + \varepsilon)^{\frac{1}{2}} ,$$

we take this as an indicator that at most $m(1/2 + \varepsilon)$ equations can be fulfilled.

Hence, if we can approximate the optimal Nash social welfare by at most a factor of

$$\frac{4^{\frac{1}{2}} \cdot (3/4)^{\frac{\varepsilon}{2}}}{(3.5 + \varepsilon)^{\frac{1}{2}}} = \left(\frac{4 \cdot (3/4)^\varepsilon}{3.5 + \varepsilon} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} ,$$

we can decide whether the instance of Ek-OCC-MAX-E3-LIN-2 has an optimal assignment with at least $m(1 - \varepsilon)$ or at most $m(1/2 + \varepsilon)$ satisfied equations. This shows that we cannot approximate Nash social welfare with a factor of $\sqrt{8/7} > 1.069$ unless P=NP. \square

References

- [1] Nima Anari, Shayan Oveis Gharan, Amin Saberi, and Mohit Singh. Nash social welfare, matrix permanent, and stable polynomials. In *Proc. 8th Symp. Innovations in Theoret. Computer Science (ITCS)*, 2017.
- [2] Nima Anari, Tung Mai, Shayan Oveis Gharan, and Vijay Vazirani. Nash social welfare for indivisible items under separable, piecewise-linear concave utilities, 2016. CoRR abs/1612.05191.
- [3] Nir Andelman and Yishay Mansour. Auctions with budget constraints. In *Proc. 9th Scandinavian Workshop Algorithm Theory (SWAT)*, pages 26–38, 2004.

- [4] Chidambaram Annamalai, Christos Kalaitzis, and Ola Svensson. Combinatorial algorithm for restricted max-min fair allocation. In *Proc. 26th Symp. Discrete Algorithms (SODA)*, pages 1357–1372, 2015.
- [5] Arash Asadpour and Amin Saberi. An approximation algorithm for max-min fair allocation of indivisible goods. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 39(7):2970–2989, 2010.
- [6] Yossi Azar, Benjamin Birnbaum, Anna Karlin, Claire Mathieu, and C. Thach Nguyen. Improved approximation algorithms for budgeted allocations. In *Proc. 35th Intl. Coll. Automata, Languages and Programming (ICALP)*, volume 1, pages 186–197, 2008.
- [7] Nikhil Bansal and Maxim Sviridenko. The Santa Claus problem. In *Proc. 38th Symp. Theory of Computing (STOC)*, pages 31–40, 2006.
- [8] Xiaohui Bei, Jugal Garg, Martin Hoefer, and Kurt Mehlhorn. Computing equilibria in markets with budget-additive utilities. In *Proc. 24th European Symp. Algorithms (ESA)*, pages 8:1–8:14, 2016.
- [9] Xiaohui Bei, Jugal Garg, Martin Hoefer, and Kurt Mehlhorn. Earning limits in Fisher markets with spending-constraint utilities. In *Proc. 10th Symp. Algorithmic Game Theory (SAGT)*, 2017. To appear.
- [10] Liad Blumrosen and Noam Nisan. Combinatorial auctions. In Noam Nisan, Éva Tardos, Tim Roughgarden, and Vijay Vazirani, editors, *Algorithmic Game Theory*, chapter 11. Cambridge University Press, 2007.
- [11] Niv Buchbinder, Kamal Jain, and Joseph Naor. Online primal-dual algorithms for maximizing ad-auctions revenue. In *Proc. 15th European Symp. Algorithms (ESA)*, pages 253–264, 2007.
- [12] Dave Buchfuhrer, Shaddin Dughmi, Hu Fu, Robert Kleinberg, Elchanan Mossel, Christos Papadimitriou, Michael Schapira, Yaron Singer, and Chris Umans. Inapproximability for VCG-based combinatorial auctions. In *Proc. 21st Symp. Discrete Algorithms (SODA)*, pages 518–536, 2010.
- [13] Ioannis Caragiannis, David Kurokawa, Hervé Moulin, Ariel Procaccia, Nisarg Shah, and Junxing Wang. The unreasonable fairness of maximum Nash welfare. In *Proc. 17th Conf. Economics and Computation (EC)*, pages 305–322, 2016.
- [14] Deeparnab Chakrabarty, Julia Chuzhoy, and Sanjeev Khanna. On allocating goods to maximize fairness. In *Proc. 50th Symp. Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*, pages 107–116, 2009.
- [15] Deeparnab Chakrabarty and Gagan Goel. On the approximability of budgeted allocations and improved lower bounds for submodular welfare maximization and GAP. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 39(6):2189–2211, 2010.
- [16] Miroslav Chlebík and Janka Chlebíková. Approximation hardness for small occurrence instances of NP-hard problems. In *Proc. 5th Intl. Conf. Algorithms and Complexity (CIAC)*, pages 152–164, 2003. Full version ECCO-TR02-073, 2002.
- [17] Richard Cole, Nikhil Devanur, Vasilis Gkatzelis, Kamal Jain, Tung Mai, Vijay Vazirani, and Sadra Yazdanbod. Convex program duality, Fisher markets, and Nash social welfare. In *Proc. 18th Conf. Economics and Computation (EC)*, 2017. To appear.
- [18] Richard Cole and Vasilis Gkatzelis. Approximating the Nash social welfare with indivisible items. In *Proc. 47th Symp. Theory of Computing (STOC)*, pages 371–380, 2015.
- [19] Andreas Darmann and Joachim Schauer. Maximizing nash product social welfare in allocating indivisible goods. *Europ. J. Oper. Res.*, 247(2):548–559, 2015.

- [20] Nikhil Devanur, Kamal Jain, Balasubramanian Sivan, and Christopher Wilkens. Near optimal online algorithms and fast approximation algorithms for resource allocation problems. In *Proc. 12th Conf. Electronic Commerce (EC)*, pages 29–38, 2011.
- [21] Nikhil Devanur, Christos Papadimitriou, Amin Saberi, and Vijay Vazirani. Market equilibrium via a primal–dual algorithm for a convex program. *J. ACM*, 55(5), 2008.
- [22] Shahar Dobzinski, Noam Nisan, and Michael Schapira. Truthful randomized mechanisms for combinatorial auctions. *J. Comput. Syst. Sci.*, 78(1):15–25, 2012.
- [23] Shahar Dobzinski and Jan Vondrák. Impossibility results for truthful combinatorial auctions with submodular valuations. *J. ACM*, 63(1):5, 2016.
- [24] Ran Duan and Kurt Mehlhorn. A combinatorial polynomial algorithm for the linear Arrow-Debreu market. *Inf. Comput.*, 243:112–132, 2015.
- [25] Edmund Eisenberg and David Gale. Consensus of subjective probabilities: The Pari-Mutuel method. *Ann. Math. Stat.*, 30(1):165–168, 1959.
- [26] Uriel Feige. On maximizing welfare when utility functions are subadditive. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 39(1):122–142, 2009.
- [27] Michal Feldman, Nick Gravin, and Brendan Lucier. Combinatorial Walrasian equilibrium. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 45(1):29–48, 2016.
- [28] Rupert Freeman, Seyed Zahedi, and Vincent Conitzer. Fair and efficient social choice in dynamic settings. In *Proc. 26th Intl. Joint Conf. Artif. Intell. (IJCAI)*, 2017. To appear.
- [29] Michel Goemans, Nicholas Harvey, Satoru Iwata, and Vahab Mirrokni. Approximating submodular functions everywhere. In *Proc. 20th Symp. Discrete Algorithms (SODA)*, pages 535–544, 2009.
- [30] Frank Kelly. Charging and rate control for elastic traffic. *European Transactions on Telecommunications*, 8:33–37, 1997.
- [31] Ron Lavi and Chaitanya Swamy. Truthful and near-optimal mechanism design via linear programming. *J. ACM*, 58(6):25, 2011.
- [32] Euiwoong Lee. APX-hardness of maximizing Nash social welfare with indivisible items. *Inf. Process. Lett.*, 122:17–20, 2017.
- [33] Aranyak Mehta. Online matching and ad allocation. *Foundations and Trends in Theoretical Computer Science*, 8(4):265–368, 2012.
- [34] Aranyak Mehta, Amin Saberi, Umesh Vazirani, and Vijay Vazirani. Adwords and generalized online matching. *J. ACM*, 54(5), 2007.
- [35] Vahab Mirrokni, Michael Schapira, and Jan Vondrák. Tight information-theoretic lower bounds for welfare maximization in combinatorial auctions. In *Proc. 9th Conf. Electronic Commerce (EC)*, pages 70–77, 2008.
- [36] Herve Moulin. *Fair Division and Collective Welfare*. MIT Press, 2003.
- [37] John Nash. The bargaining problem. *Econometrica*, 18(2):155–162, 1950.
- [38] Nhan-Tam Nguyen, Trung Thanh Nguyen, Magnus Roos, and Jörg Rothe. Computational complexity and approximability of social welfare optimization in multiagent resource allocation. *Autonom. Agents & Multi-Agent Syst.*, 28(2):256–289, 2014.

- [39] James Orlin. Improved algorithms for computing Fisher’s market clearing prices. In *Proc. 42nd Symp. Theory of Computing (STOC)*, pages 291–300, 2010.
- [40] Sara Ramezani and Ulle Endriss. Nash social welfare in multiagent resource allocation. In *Agent-Mediated Electronic Commerce. Designing Trading Strategies and Mechanisms for Electronic Markets*, pages 117–131. Springer Verlag, 2010.
- [41] Tim Roughgarden and Inbal Talgam-Cohen. Why prices need algorithms. In *Proc. 16th Conf. Economics and Computation (EC)*, pages 19–36, 2015.
- [42] Vadim Shmyrev. An algorithm for finding equilibrium in the linear exchange model with fixed budgets. *J. Appl. Indust. Math.*, 3(4):505–518, 2009.
- [43] Aravind Srinivasan. Budgeted allocations in the full-information setting. In *Proc. 11th Workshop Approximation Algorithms for Combinatorial Optimization Problems (APPROX)*, pages 247–253, 2008.
- [44] László Végh. Concave generalized flows with applications to market equilibria. *Math. Oper. Res.*, 39(2):573–596, 2014.
- [45] László Végh. Strongly polynomial algorithm for a class of minimum-cost flow problems with separable convex objectives. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 45(5):1729–1761, 2016.
- [46] Jan Vondrák. Optimal approximation for the submodular welfare problem in the value oracle model. In *Proc. 40th Symp. Theory of Computing (STOC)*, pages 67–74, 2008.

Appendix

A Rounding Trees with Zero Price Goods

In this section, we give an algorithm to round trees $T_0 \subseteq B_0 \times G_0$ of the equilibrium (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{p}) to an integral allocation. Recall that in such trees, all goods have price $p_j = 0$ and all buyers reach their cap c_i . Consider the following procedure which is similar to the procedure in Section 3.2. It uses only the allocation \mathbf{x} and does not rely on prices. In particular, the only price-based assignment rule is in the preprocessing step, and it can be replaced here with an equivalent, more direct criterion:

Preprocessing: For each zero-price tree component, assign some agent to be a root node. For each good that has no child-agent, assign it to its parent agent. For each good j , if it has two or more child agents, then keep only one child agent who buys the largest amount of j . For every other child agent i , delete the edge (i, j) and make i the root node of the newly created tree. For each good j , if its child-agent i gets at most half of its total utility from j , i.e., if $u_{ij}x_{ij} \leq c_i/2$, then assign j to its parent agent and make the child agent i the root node of a newly created tree.

Rounding: For each zero-price tree component, do the following recursively: Assign the root agent a child-good j that gives him the maximum value (among all children goods) in the fractional solution. Except the subtree rooted at j , assign each good to its child-agent in the remaining tree. Make the child-agent of good j the root node of the newly created tree.

Prices p_j play a role in exactly two places in Section 3.2.

First, when we assign a good j to the parent and drop the child agent i with $p_j \leq m_i^a/2$, this ensures that the valuation of agent i in the newly created tree is at least half of the original valuation. We use this fact to prove Lemmas 3.4 and 3.5. In case of zero price goods, our choice of assigning a good j to the parent and dropping the child agent i if $u_{ij}x_{ij} \leq c_i/2$ is an equivalent notion in terms of allocation.

Second, in the proof of Lemma 3.6 we argue that a good with price more than 1 is only assigned to an uncapped agent i which gives agent i at least p_j amount of value. Since each agent of B_0 is capped, we do not need this property in Lemma A.3.

As a result, the proofs of the following lemmas are almost completely identical to the proofs of Lemmas 3.4, 3.5 and 3.6, respectively, and hence are omitted.

Lemma A.1. *After preprocessing, each tree component T has $k_T + 1$ agents and k_T goods, for some $k_T > 1$. The valuation of the root agent r is at least $c_r/2$. For all other agents i the valuation is at least c_i .*

Lemma A.2. *After rounding, each agent i that is assigned its parent good obtains a valuation of at least $c_i/2$.*

Consider a zero-price tree T at the beginning of the rounding step with $k_T + 1$ agents and k_T goods. Let $a_1, g_1, a_2, g_2, \dots, a_l, g_l, a_{l+1}$ be the *recursion path* in T starting from the root agent a_1 and ending at the leaf agent a_{l+1} such that a_1, \dots, a_{l+1} became root agents of the trees formed recursively during the rounding step, and good g_i is assigned to a_i in this process, for $1 \leq i \leq l$. We denote by k_i the number of children for agent a_i , for $1 \leq i \leq l$.

Lemma A.3. *The product of the valuations of agents in T in the rounded solution is at least*

$$\left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{k_T - l + 1} \cdot \frac{1}{k_1 \cdots k_l} \cdot \prod_{i \in T} c_i \cdot$$