

Probabilistic Serial Mechanism for Multi-Type Resource Allocation

Xiaoxi Guo¹ · Sujoy Sikdar² · Haibin Wang¹ ·
Lirong Xia³ · Yongzhi Cao^{1,*} · Hanpin Wang¹

Received: date / Accepted: date

Abstract In *multi-type resource allocation (MTRA) problems*, there are $p \geq 2$ types of items, and n agents, who each demand one unit of items of each type, and have *strict linear preferences over bundles* consisting of one item of each type.

For MTRAs with indivisible items, our first result is an impossibility theorem that is in direct contrast to the single type ($p = 1$) setting: No mechanism, the output of which is always *decomposable* into a probability distribution over discrete assignments (where no item is split between agents), can satisfy both sd-efficiency and sd-envy-freeness. To circumvent this impossibility result, we consider the natural assumption of lexicographic preference, and provide an extension of the *probabilistic serial (PS)*, called *lexicographic probabilistic serial (LexiPS)*. We prove that LexiPS satisfies sd-efficiency and sd-envy-freeness, retaining the desirable properties of PS. Moreover, LexiPS satisfies sd-weak-strategyproofness when agents are not allowed to misreport their importance orders.

Xiaoxi Guo
E-mail: guoxiaoxi@pku.edu.cn

Sujoy Sikdar
E-mail: sujoy@wustl.edu

Haibin Wang
E-mail: beach@pku.edu.cn

Lirong Xia
E-mail: xialirong@gmail.com

✉Yongzhi Cao
E-mail: caoyz@pku.edu.cn

Hanpin Wang
E-mail: whpxhy@pku.edu.cn

¹ Key Laboratory of High Confidence Software Technologies (MOE), Department of Computer Science and Technology, Peking University, China.

² Computer Science & Engineering, Washington University in St. Louis.

³ Department of Computer Science, Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute.

For MTRAs with divisible items, we show that the existing *multi-type probabilistic serial (MPS)* mechanism satisfies the stronger efficiency notion of lexi-efficiency, and is sd-envy-free under strict linear preferences, and sd-weak-strategyproof under lexicographic preferences. We also prove that MPS can be characterized both by leximin-optimality and by item-wise ordinal fairness, and the family of eating algorithms which MPS belongs to can be characterized by no-generalized-cycle condition.

Keywords Multi-type resource allocation · Probabilistic serial · LexiPS · MPS · Fractional assignment · sd-efficiency · sd-envy-freeness

1 Introduction

In this paper, we focus on extensions of the celebrated *probabilistic serial (PS)* mechanism [8] for the classical resource allocation problem [2, 8, 13, 31], to the *multi-type resource allocation problem (MTRA)* [30]. An MTRA involves n agents, $p \geq 2$ types of items which are not interchangeable, one unit each of n items of each type. Each agent demands a *bundle* consisting of one item of each type, and has *strict preferences* over all bundles. MTRAs may involve *divisible* items, like land and water resources [38], or computational resources such as CPU, memory, and storage in cloud computing [18–20]. Items may also be *indivisible*, where each item must be assigned fully to a single agent, like houses and cars [40, 41], or research papers and time slots in a seminar class [30].

Efficient and fair resource allocation for a single type of items ($p = 1$) is well studied [1, 2, 8, 13, 26, 31, 32, 39, 47]. Our work follows the line of research initiated by Bogomolnaia and Moulin [8], who proposed the probabilistic serial (PS) mechanism. The PS mechanism outputs a fractional assignment in multiple rounds, by having all agents simultaneously eat shares of their favorite remaining items at a uniform and equal rate, until one of the items is exhausted, in each round.

PS is a popular prototype for mechanism designers due to the following reasons: (i) *decomposability*: PS can be applied to allocate both divisible and indivisible items, since fractional assignments are always *decomposable* when $p = 1$, as guaranteed by the Birkhoff-von Neumann theorem [5, 33]. In other words, a fractional assignment can be represented as a probability distribution over “discrete” assignments, where no item is split among agents. (ii) *efficiency and fairness*: PS satisfies sd-efficiency and sd-envy-freeness, which are desirable efficiency and fairness properties respectively based on the notion of *stochastic dominance*: Given a strict preference over the items, an allocation p *stochastically dominates* q , if at every item o , the total share of o and items strictly preferred to o in p , is at least the total share of the same items in q .

Unfortunately, designing efficient and fair mechanisms for MTRA with $p \geq 2$ types is more challenging, especially because direct applications of PS to MTRA fail to satisfy the two desirable properties discussed above.

First, decomposability (property (i)) above relies on the decomposability of fractional assignments, which not always holds for MTRA as in the following simple example.

Example 1 Consider the MTRA with two agents, 1 and 2, two types of items, food (F) and beverages (B), and two items of each type $\{1_F, 2_F\}$, and $\{1_B, 2_B\}$ respectively. We demonstrate how the fractional assignment P below, where agent 1 gets 0.5 share of $1_F 1_B$ and 0.5 share of $2_F 2_B$ is not decomposable.

Agent	P				Agent	P'			
	$1_F 1_B$	$1_F 2_B$	$2_F 1_B$	$2_F 2_B$		$1_F 1_B$	$1_F 2_B$	$2_F 1_B$	$2_F 2_B$
1	0.5	0	0	0.5	1	0	0	0	
2	0	0.5	0.5	0	0	0	0	1	

Obviously, the assignment P' as above is the only assignment where $1_F 1_B$ is allocated fully to agent 1. Since agent 1 acquires $1_F 1_B$ with 0.5 shares in P , the probability for P' ought to be 0.5, and therefore $2_F 2_B$ should be allocated to agent 2 with 0.5 shares in P accordingly. However, agent 2 is not allocated $2_F 2_B$ in P actually. Thus P is not decomposable.

A natural idea is to decompose MTRA into p single-type instances, one for each type of items, and then apply PS or other mechanisms separately to each of them. Unfortunately, this does not work because first it is unclear how to decompose agents' combinatorial preferences over bundles into separable preferences over items of the same type, and more importantly, even when there is a natural way to do so, e.g. when agents' preferences are *separable*, and *lexicographic*, meaning that the agent has an importance order over types to compare bundles. The following example shows that the fairness and efficiency properties (ii) above do not hold anymore.

Example 2 We continue to use the MTRA above and assume that agents' preferences over $\{1_F, 2_F\} \times \{1_B, 2_B\}$ are as below.

Agent	Preferences
1	$1_F 1_B \succ_1 1_F 2_B \succ_1 2_F 1_B \succ_1 2_F 2_B$
2	$1_F 1_B \succ_2 2_F 1_B \succ_2 1_F 2_B \succ_2 2_F 2_B$

We note that both agents prefer 1_F to 2_F , and 1_B to 2_B (separable preferences). Agent 1 considers F to be more important than B , while agent 2 considers B to be more important. In this way we can decompose this MTRA into two single type resource allocation problems for F and B respectively. It is easy to see that for each single type the only sd-efficient and sd-envy-free assignment is to give both agents 0.5 shares of each item, yielding the decomposable fractional assignment Q by the mutual independence of each type. However, Q is inefficient, as Q' stochastically dominates Q from both agents' perspectives:

Agent	Q				Agent	Q'			
	$1_F 1_B$	$1_F 2_B$	$2_F 1_B$	$2_F 2_B$		$1_F 1_B$	$1_F 2_B$	$2_F 1_B$	$2_F 2_B$
1	0.25	0.25	0.25	0.25	1	0.25	0.5	0	0.25
2	0.25	0.25	0.25	0.25	2	0.25	0	0.5	0.25

As we have observed, the two desirable properties of PS for single type resource allocation no longer obviously hold for MTRAs. Recently, Wang et al. [43] proposed *multi-type probabilistic serial (MPS)* mechanism as an extension of PS for MTRAs with *divisible* items, and proved that MPS is sd-efficient for general partial preference, sd-envy-free for CP-net preferences [11], and sd-weak-strategyproof for CP-net preferences with the shared dependency graph. However, it is unclear whether MPS can be applied to the allocation of indivisible items because the outcome may not be decomposable. This leaves the following natural open question:

*How to design efficient and fair mechanisms for MTRAs with indivisible and divisible items?*¹

¹ Note that for indivisible items, the (fractional) output of a mechanism must be decomposable.

Our Contributions. For MTRAs with indivisible items, unfortunately, our impossibility theorem (**Theorem 1**) shows that no mechanism which satisfies sd-efficiency and sd-envy-freeness is guaranteed to always output decomposable assignments, if agents' preferences are allowed to be any linear orders over bundles. Fortunately, when agents' preferences are *lexicographic*, the impossibility theorem can be circumvented. To this end, we propose *lexicographic probabilistic serial mechanism (LexiPS)* and prove that it satisfies many desirable properties of PS: it is guaranteed to output a decomposable assignment, satisfy sd-efficiency and sd-envy-freeness (**Theorem 2**), and satisfies sd-weak-strategyproofness, when agents do not lie about their importance orders over types (**Theorem 3**).

For MTRAs with divisible items, we show that when agents' preferences are linear orders over all bundles of items, the MPS mechanism proposed by Wang et al. [43] satisfies lexi-efficiency (**Theorem 4**) which is a stronger notion of efficiency than sd-efficiency. Indeed, we show that lexi-efficiency implies the *no-generalized-cycle* condition, which is a sufficient condition for sd-efficiency (similarly to Wang et al. [43]), but not a necessary one (**Proposition 1**). We also prove that *every* assignment satisfying no-generalized-cycle can be computed by some algorithm in the family of *eating* algorithms (**Theorem 5**), of which MPS is a member. Importantly, MPS retains sd-envy-freeness (**Proposition 2**), and when agents' preferences are further assumed to be lexicographic, MPS satisfies sd-weak-strategyproofness (**Theorem 6**). Finally, we characterize MPS by leximin-optimality and item-wise ordinal fairness, respectively (**Theorem 7**). However, the output of MPS is not always decomposable (Remark 4) even under lexicographic preference, making it unsuitable for MTRAs with indivisible items.

Related Work and Discussions. Our paper provides the first results on designing efficient and fair mechanisms for MTRAs *with indivisible items*, to the best of our knowledge. Despite our impossibility theorem (**Theorem 1**), our LexiPS mechanism and its properties deliver the following positive message: *it is possible to design efficient and fair mechanism for indivisible items under the natural domain restriction of lexicographic preferences*.

Our results on properties of MPS are complementary, and not directly comparable, to the results by Wang et al. [43] because we assume that agents' preferences are linear orders over bundles of items, whereas Wang et al. [43] assumed partial orders. In particular, we prove that MPS satisfies lexi-efficiency which is a stronger notion than sd-efficiency for the unrestricted domain of linear orders, and we prove that MPS satisfies sd-weak-strategyproofness when agents' preferences are lexicographic (w.r.t. possibly different importance orders). In contrast, Wang et al. [43] prove that MPS satisfies sd-efficiency for the unrestricted domain of partial orders, and satisfies sd-weak-strategyproofness when agents' preferences are CP-nets with a common dependency structure.

MTRAs was first introduced and discussed by Moulin [31], and was recently explicitly formulated in the form presented in this paper by Mackin and Xia [30], who provided a characterization of serial dictatorships satisfying strategyproofness, neutrality, and non-bossiness for MTRAs. In a similar vein, Sikdar et al. [40, 41] considered multi-type housing markets [31]. A related problem setting is one where agents may demand multiple units of items. Hatfield [23] considered that agents have multi-unit demands, but their setting has a different combinatorial structure to ours'. Fujita et al. [16] considered the exchange economy with multi-unit consumption. However, in each of these works, items are never shared, and agents must be assigned a whole bundle. The work by Ghodsi et al. [18] is an exception, as they consider the problem of allocating multiple types of divisible resources by shares, but is not comparable to ours because resources of the same type are indistinguishable in their

setting. MTRAs with divisible items may also be viewed as a version of the cake-cutting problem [12, 14, 15, 34, 35, 42], with p cakes, and agents having ordinal preferences over combinations of pieces from each cake.

The lexicographic preference is a natural restriction on preference domain in resource allocation [16, 40, 41], and combinatorial voting [10, 29, 44]. Saban and Sethuraman [37] showed that PS is efficient, envy-free, and strategy-proof under lexicographic preference on allocations. Fujita et al. [16] considered the allocation problem which allows agents to receive multiple items and agents rank the groups of items lexicographically. Our work follows in this research agenda of natural domain restrictions on agents' preferences to circumvent impossibility results in guaranteeing efficiency and fairness.

MTRAs belongs to a more general line of research on mechanism design known as multi-agent resource allocation (see Chevaleyre et al. [13] for a survey), where literature focuses on the problem where items are of a single type. Early research focused mainly on developing "discrete" mechanisms for indivisible items, where each item is assigned fully to a single agent [2, 17, 28, 36, 39]. However, discrete mechanisms often fail to simultaneously satisfy efficiency and fairness.

Fractional mechanisms simultaneously provide stronger efficiency and fairness guarantees. For example, the random priority (RP) mechanism [1] outputs fractional assignments, and satisfies ex-post-efficiency, sd-weak-envy-freeness, and sd-strategyproofness. Such fractional mechanisms can be applied to both divisible and indivisible items in the single type setting ($p = 1$), due to the Birkhoff-Von Neumann theorem which implies that every fractional assignment is decomposable.

Bogomolnaia and Moulin [8] proposed the PS mechanism, a fractional mechanism satisfying sd-efficiency, sd-envy-freeness, and sd-weak-strategyproofness. PS uniquely possesses the important properties of sd-efficiency and sd-envy-freeness with the restriction of *bounded invariance* [6, 7], and is the only mechanism satisfying ordinal fairness and non-wastefulness [22]. Besides, Bogomolnaia [6] characterized PS with leximin maximizing the vector describing cumulative shares at each item [4, 9], which reflects that PS is egalitarian in attempting to equalize agents shares of their top ranked choices. The remarkable properties of PS has encouraged several extensions: to the full preference domain, allowing indifferences [25, 27], to multi-unit demands [24], and to housing markets [3, 45]. In the settings above, PS usually only retains some of its original properties and loses strategyproofness [3, 24, 27, 46].

Structure of the paper. The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we define the MTRA problem, and provide definitions of desirable efficiency and fairness properties. Section 3 is the impossibility result for MTRAs with indivisible items. In Section 4, we propose LexiPS for MTRAs with indivisible items under lexicographic preferences, which satisfies sd-efficiency and sd-envy-freeness, and it is sd-weak-strategyproof when agents do not lie about importance orders. In Section 5, we show the properties of MPS for MTRAs with divisible items under linear preferences, and provide two characterizations for MPS. In Section 6, we summarize the contributions of our paper, and discuss directions for future work.

2 Preliminaries

Let $N = \{1, \dots, n\}$ be the set of agents, and $M = D_1 \cup \dots \cup D_p$ be the set of items. For each $i \leq p$, D_i is a set of n items of type i , and for all $\hat{i} \neq i$, we have $D_i \cap D_{\hat{i}} = \emptyset$. There is one unit

of *supply* of each item in M . We use $\mathcal{D} = D_1 \times \cdots \times D_p$ to denote the set of *bundles*. Each bundle $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{D}$ is a p -vector and each component refers to an item of each type. We use $o \in \mathbf{x}$ to indicate that bundle \mathbf{x} contains item o . In an MTRA, each agent demands, and is allocated one unit of item of each type.

A *preference profile* is denoted by $R = (\succ_j)_{j \leq n}$, where \succ_j represents agent j 's preference as a *strict linear preference*, i.e. the strict linear order over \mathcal{D} . Let \mathcal{R} be the set of all possible preference profiles.

A *fractional allocation* is a $|\mathcal{D}|$ -vector, describing the fractional share of each bundle allocated to an agent. Let Π be the set of all the possible fractional allocations. For any $p \in \Pi$, $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{D}$, we use $p_{\mathbf{x}}$ to denote the share of \mathbf{x} assigned by p . A *fractional assignment* is a $n \times |\mathcal{D}|$ -matrix $P = [p_{j,\mathbf{x}}]_{j \leq n, \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{D}}$, where (i) for each $j \leq n$, $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{D}$, $p_{j,\mathbf{x}} \in [0, 1]$ is the fractional share of \mathbf{x} allocated to agent j , (ii) for every $j \leq n$, $\sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{D}} p_{j,\mathbf{x}} = 1$, fulfilling the demand of each agent, (iii) for every $o \in M$, $S_o = \{\mathbf{x} : \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{D} \text{ and } o \in \mathbf{x}\}$, $\sum_{j \leq n, \mathbf{x} \in S_o} p_{j,\mathbf{x}} = 1$, respecting the unit supply of each item. For each $j \leq n$, row j of P , denoted by P_j represents agent j 's fractional allocation under P . We use \mathcal{P} to denote the set of all possible fractional assignments. A *discrete assignment* A , is an assignment where each agent is assigned a unit share of a bundle, and each item is fully allocated to some agent². It follows that a discrete assignment is represented by a matrix where each element is either 0 or 1. We use \mathcal{A} to denote the set of all discrete assignment matrices.

A *mechanism* f is a mapping from preference profiles to fractional assignments. For any profile $R \in \mathcal{R}$, we use $f(R)$ to refer to the fractional assignment output by f , and for any agent $j \leq n$ and any bundle $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{D}$, $f(R)_{j,\mathbf{x}}$ refers to the value of the element of the matrix indexed by j and \mathbf{x} .

2.1 Desirable Properties

We use the notion of stochastic dominance to compare fractional assignments, and define desired notions of efficiency and fairness in the MTRA setting from Wang et al. [43].

Definition 1 (stochastic dominance [43]) Given a preference \succ over \mathcal{D} , the *stochastic dominance* relation associated with \succ , denoted \succ^{sd} , is a partial ordering over Π such that for any pair of fractional allocations $p, q \in \Pi$, p *weakly stochastically dominates* q , denoted $p \succ^{sd} q$, if and only if for every $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{D}$, $\sum_{\hat{\mathbf{x}} \in U(\succ, \mathbf{x})} p_{\hat{\mathbf{x}}} \geq \sum_{\hat{\mathbf{x}} \in U(\succ, \mathbf{x})} q_{\hat{\mathbf{x}}}$, where $U(\succ, \mathbf{x}) = \{\hat{\mathbf{x}} : \hat{\mathbf{x}} \succ \mathbf{x}\} \cup \{\mathbf{x}\}$.

The stochastic dominance order can also be extended to fractional assignments. For $P, Q \in \mathcal{P}$, $j \leq n$, we assume that agent j only cares about her own allocations P_j, Q_j . If $P_j \succ_j^{sd} Q_j$, it will weakly prefer P to Q , i.e. $P \succ_j^{sd} Q$. Therefore we say that P weakly stochastically dominates Q , denoted $P \succ^{sd} Q$, if $P \succ_j^{sd} Q$ for any $j \leq n$. It is easy to prove that $P \succ_j^{sd} Q, Q \succ_j^{sd} P$ if and only if $P_j = Q_j$.

Definition 2 (sd-efficiency [43]) Given an MTRA (N, M, R) , a fractional assignment P is *sd-efficient* if there is no other fractional assignment $Q \neq P$ such that $Q \succ_j^{sd} P$ for every $j \leq n$. Correspondingly, if for every $R \in \mathcal{R}$, $f(R)$ is *sd-efficient*, then mechanism f satisfies *sd-efficiency*.

² For for indivisible items, discrete assignments refer to deterministic assignments in the papers about randomization.

Definition 3 (sd-envy-freeness [43]) Given an MTRA (N, M, R) , a fractional assignment P is sd-envy-free if for every pair of agents $j, \hat{j} \leq n$, $P_j \succ_j^{sd} P_{\hat{j}}$. Correspondingly, if for every $R \in \mathcal{R}$, $f(R)$ is sd-envy-free, then mechanism f satisfies sd-envy-freeness.

Definition 4 (sd-weak-strategyproofness [43]) Given an MTRA (N, M, R) , a mechanism f satisfies sd-weak-strategyproofness if for every profile $R \in \mathcal{R}$, every agent $j \leq n$, every $R' \in \mathcal{R}$ such that $R' = (\succ'_j, \succ_{-j})$, where \succ_{-j} is the preferences of agents in the set $N \setminus \{j\}$, it holds that:

$$f(R') \succ_j^{sd} f(R) \implies f(R')_j = f(R)_j.$$

Besides stochastic dominance, we introduce the *lexicographic dominance* relation to compare pairs of fractional allocations, by comparing the components of their respective vector representations one by one according to the agent's preference.

Definition 5 (lexicographic dominance) Given a preference \succ , and a pair of allocations p and q , p lexicographically dominates q , denoted $p \succ^{lexi} q$, if and only if there exist a bundle \mathbf{x} such that $p_{\mathbf{x}} > q_{\mathbf{x}}$, and for each $\hat{\mathbf{x}} \succ \mathbf{x}$, $p_{\hat{\mathbf{x}}} \geq q_{\hat{\mathbf{x}}}$.

Just like stochastic dominance, given assignments P and Q , we say $Q \succ^{lexi} P$ if $Q_j \succ_j^{lexi} P_j$ ($Q \succ_j^{lexi} P$ for short) for every agent j . Note that stochastic dominance implies lexicographic dominance, but lexicographic dominance does not imply stochastic dominance.

Definition 6 (lexi-efficiency) Given a preference profile R , the fractional assignment P is lexi-efficient if there is no $Q \in \mathcal{P}$ s.t. $Q \succ^{lexi} P$. A fractional assignment algorithm f satisfies lexi-efficiency if $f(R)$ is lexi-efficient for every $R \in \mathcal{R}$.

Leximin-optimality requires that the output of a mechanism leximin maximizes the vector describing cumulative shares at each item [4, 9], which reflects the egalitarian nature of the mechanism in attempting to equalize agents shares of their top ranked choices.

Definition 7 (leximin-optimality) For any vector \mathbf{u} of length k , let $\mathbf{u}^* = (u_1^*, u_2^*, \dots, u_k^*)$, be its transformation into the k -vector of \mathbf{u} 's components sorted in ascending order. Let L be the *leximin relation*, where for any two vectors \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} , we say $(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) \in L$, if $\mathbf{u}^* \succ^{lexi} \mathbf{v}^*$. For any fractional assignment P , let $\mathbf{u}^P = (u_{j,\mathbf{x}}^P)_{j \leq n, \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{D}}$, where for each agent $j \leq n$, and bundle $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{D}$, $u_{j,\mathbf{x}}^P = \sum_{\hat{\mathbf{x}} \in U(\succ_j, \mathbf{x})} p_{j,\hat{\mathbf{x}}}$. A fractional assignment P is *leximin-optimal*, if for every other assignment Q , $(\mathbf{u}^P, \mathbf{u}^Q) \in L$.

Item-wise ordinal fairness involves the comparison of the cumulative share. In contrast to sd-envy-freeness, the upper contour sets in item-wise ordinal fairness depend on the different preferences, and the bundles to determine the sets only need to share a certain item.

Definition 8 (item-wise ordinal fairness) The fractional assignment P which is item-wise ordinal fair satisfies that: For any \mathbf{x} with positive shares for agent j s.t. $p_{j,\mathbf{x}} > 0$, there exists $o \in \mathbf{x}$ such that for any $\hat{\mathbf{x}}$ containing o and an arbitrary agent k , if $p_{k,\hat{\mathbf{x}}} > 0$, then $\sum_{\mathbf{x}' \in U(\succ_k, \hat{\mathbf{x}})} p_{k,\mathbf{x}'} \leq \sum_{\mathbf{x}' \in U(\succ_j, \mathbf{x})} p_{j,\mathbf{x}'}$. A fractional assignment algorithm f satisfies item-wise ordinal fairness if $f(R)$ is item-wise ordinal fair for every $R \in \mathcal{R}$.

3 Efficiency and Fairness for MTRAs with Indivisible Items

In this section, we show an impossibility result in Theorem 1 that no mechanism satisfying sd-envy-freeness and sd-efficiency is guaranteed to output decomposable assignments. This is unlike the case of resource allocation problems with a single type of items, where by the Birkhoff-von Neumann theorem, every fractional assignment is decomposable, i.e. every fractional assignment can be decomposed like

$$P = \sum_{A_k \in \mathcal{A}} \alpha_k \times A_k.$$

Here each A_k is a discrete assignment that assigns every item wholly to some agent. Observe that $\sum \alpha_k = 1$. It follows that such a decomposable assignment can be applied to allocating indivisible items, by issuing a lottery for A_k , and α_k is its probability being selected among all the discrete assignments. It is not necessarily so in MTRAs, which leads to the impossibility result.

Theorem 1 *For any MTRAs with $p \geq 2$, where agents are allowed to submit any linear order over bundles, no mechanism that satisfies sd-efficiency and sd-envy-freeness always outputs decomposable assignments.*

Proof Suppose for the sake of contradiction that there exists a mechanism f satisfying sd-efficiency and sd-envy-freeness and $f(R)$ is always decomposable for any $R \in \mathcal{R}$. Let R be the following preference and $Q = f(R)$.

Agent	Preferences
1	$1_F 1_B \succ_1 1_F 2_B \succ_1 2_F 2_B \succ_1 2_F 1_B$
2	$1_F 2_B \succ_2 2_F 1_B \succ_2 1_F 1_B \succ_2 2_F 2_B$

We show that if Q is sd-envy-free and decomposable, it fails to satisfy sd-efficiency. There are only four discrete assignments which assign $1_F 1_B, 1_F 2_B, 2_F 1_B, 2_F 2_B$ to agent 1 respectively. Since Q is decomposable, it can be represented as the following assignment. We also provide an assignment P which is not decomposable since it does not satisfy the constraints for Q .

Agent	P				Agent	Q			
	$1_F 1_B$	$1_F 2_B$	$2_F 1_B$	$2_F 2_B$		$1_F 1_B$	$1_F 2_B$	$2_F 1_B$	$2_F 2_B$
1	0.5	0	0	0.5	1	v	w	y	z
2	0	0.5	0.5	0	2	z	y	w	v

Here v, w, y, z are probabilities of these four discrete assignments and there exists $v + w + y + z = 1$. Due to sd-envy-freeness, we have following inequalities in terms of agent 1: It is easy to see that $\sum_{x \in U(\succ_{1, 2_F 1_B})} q_{1,x} = 1 = \sum_{x \in U(\succ_{1, 2_F 1_B})} q_{2,x}$. In addition,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{x \in U(\succ_{1, 1_F 1_B})} q_{1,x} = v &\geq z = \sum_{x \in U(\succ_{1, 1_F 1_B})} q_{2,x} \\ \sum_{x \in U(\succ_{1, 1_F 2_B})} q_{1,x} = v + w &\geq z + y = \sum_{x \in U(\succ_{1, 1_F 2_B})} q_{2,x} \\ \sum_{x \in U(\succ_{1, 2_F 2_B})} q_{1,x} = v + w + z &\geq z + y + v = \sum_{x \in U(\succ_{1, 2_F 2_B})} q_{2,x} \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, for agent 2, there exists $y \geq w, y + w + z \geq w + y + v$. Thus $w = y, v = z, v + w = y + z = 0.5$. Because Q is sd-efficient, $P \not\prec_1^{sd} Q$. Suppose that $P \not\prec_1^{sd} Q$. Therefore at least one of the following inequalities is true:

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{\mathbf{x} \in U(\succ_{-1,1F1B})} q_{1,\mathbf{x}} = v &> 0.5 = \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in U(\succ_{-1,1F1B})} p_{1,\mathbf{x}} \\
\sum_{\mathbf{x} \in U(\succ_{-1,1F2B})} q_{1,\mathbf{x}} = v + w &> 0.5 = \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in U(\succ_{-1,1F2B})} p_{1,\mathbf{x}} \\
\sum_{\mathbf{x} \in U(\succ_{-1,2F2B})} q_{1,\mathbf{x}} = v + w + z &> 1 = \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in U(\succ_{-1,2F2B})} p_{1,\mathbf{x}} \\
\sum_{\mathbf{x} \in U(\succ_{-1,2F1B})} q_{1,\mathbf{x}} = v + w + z + y &> 1 = \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in U(\succ_{-1,2F1B})} p_{1,\mathbf{x}}
\end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

Since $v = z \leq v + w = y + z = 0.5$, all inequalities in (1) do not hold. Thus we have $P \succ_1^{sd} Q$. With a similar analysis, we can also obtain that $P \succ_2^{sd} Q$. Therefore we have that $P \succ^{sd} Q$ and $P \neq Q$, which is contradictory to the assumption. \square

Remark 1 Theorem 1 can be tightened under LP-tree preferences [10, 41] contained in the strict linear preferences, with sd-weak-efficiency [7, 21] implied by sd-efficiency, and sd-weak-envy-freeness [8] implied by sd-envy-freeness.

An LP-tree preference profile is that each agent's preference can be represented as a rooted directed tree with each node labeled by type and a conditional preference table. In each path from root to a leaf, every type occurs only once. For a node labeled by type t , its conditional preference table is a strict linear order over items in D_t , and each edge from it is labeled by each of these items. The sd-weak-efficiency only concerns that any two agents cannot improve their allocations by exchanging shares between them. The sd-weak-envy-freeness requires that for any agent, the other agents' allocations are not better than hers. Here we give the brief definition of these two properties, and the proof of the tighter result is in Appendix A.1.

sd-weak-efficiency: The mechanism f satisfies sd-weak-efficiency if for any $R \in \mathcal{R}$, there is no fractional assignment $P \neq f(R)$ such that $P \succ_j^{sd} f(R)$ for every $j \leq n$ and $|\{j \in N : P_j \neq f(R)_j\}| \leq 2$.

sd-weak-envy-freeness: The mechanism f satisfies sd-weak-envy-freeness if for every pair of agents $j, \hat{j} \leq n, P_{\hat{j}} \succ_j^{sd} P_j \Rightarrow P_{\hat{j}} = P_j$.

We give the proof in Appendix A.1.

4 MTRAs with Indivisible Items and Lexicographic Preferences

In this section, we first introduce the lexicographic preference, and then develop LexiPS as a specialized mechanism for MTRAs where the items are indivisible and agents' preferences are restricted to the lexicographic preference domain, and show that it retains the good properties of PS.

Faced with the impossibility result of Theorem 1 we wonder if it is possible to circumvent it by adding some reasonable restriction. We finally choose lexicographic preferences as a restriction on the preference domain in our setting according to the result in Remark 1. An agent with a lexicographic preference compares two bundles by comparing the items of each type in the two bundles one by one according to the importance order on types. In short, the agent takes the importance of types into consideration while ranking bundles. We

say that a certain MTRA is under the restriction of lexicographic preferences if it satisfies that for every agent $j \leq n$, \succ_j is a lexicographic preference. We give its formal definition in the following with the notation $D_i(\mathbf{x})$: Given any bundle $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{D}$ and any type $i \leq p$, $D_i(\mathbf{x})$ refers to the item of type i in \mathbf{x} .

Definition 9 (lexicographic preference) Given an MTRA, the preference relation \succ_j of agent $j \leq n$ is lexicographic if there exists (i) importance order i.e. a strict linear order \triangleright_j over p types, (ii) for each type $i \leq p$, a strict linear order \succ_j^i over D_i , such that for every pair $\mathbf{x}, \hat{\mathbf{x}} \in \mathcal{D}$, $\mathbf{x} \succ_j \hat{\mathbf{x}}$ if and only if there exists a type i s.t. $D_i(\mathbf{x}) \succ_j^i D_i(\hat{\mathbf{x}})$, and for all $\hat{i} \triangleright_j i$, $D_{\hat{i}}(\mathbf{x}) = D_{\hat{i}}(\hat{\mathbf{x}})$.

For example, the preference $1_F 2_B \succ 1_F 1_B \succ 2_F 2_B \succ 2_F 1_B$ is a lexicographic preference represented as importance order $F \triangleright B$, and strict linear orders $1_F \succ^F 2_F$ and $2_B \succ^B 1_B$ for two types. We also note that although lexicographic preference and lexicographic dominance looks similar, lexicographic preference is used in ranking bundles in agents' preferences, while lexicographic dominance is used to compare allocations or assignments consisting of shares of bundles.

4.1 Algorithm for LexiPS

Before going any further with LexiPS, we introduce some notations for ease of exposition. We use P^i to denote the fractional assignment of items of type i at P . P^i is a $|N| \times |D_i|$ matrix and for any $i \leq p$, any $o \in D_i$, $p_{j,o}^i = \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{D}} p_{i,\mathbf{x}} P_{j,\mathbf{x}}$ represents the total share of bundles containing o consumed by agent j . To distinguish from single type fractional assignments, we call the ones for MTRAs as multi-type fractional assignments. Besides, for $o \in D_i$, we use the notation of the upper contour set $U(\succ^i, o)$ to refer to items of type i that better or equal to o regarding \succ^i .

Algorithm 1 LexiPS

```

1: Input: An MTRA  $(N, M)$ , a lexicographic preference profile  $R$ .
2: For every  $o \in M$ ,  $supply(o) \leftarrow 1$ . For every  $i \leq n$ ,  $P^i \leftarrow 0^{n \times n}$ ,  $P \leftarrow 0^{n \times |\mathcal{D}|}$ .
3: loop  $p$  times
4:   Identify top type  $i_j$  for every agent  $j \leq n$ .
      //For the  $k$ th loop,  $i_j$  is the  $k$ th type regarding  $\triangleright_j$ .
5:   for  $i \leq p$  do
6:      $t \leftarrow 0$ .
7:      $N^i = \{j \leq n | i_j = i\}$ .
8:     while  $t < 1$  do
9:       Identify top item  $top^i(j)$  in type  $i$  for every agent  $j \in N^i$ .
10:      Consume.
10.1: For each  $o \in D_i$ ,  $consumers(o) \leftarrow |\{j \in N^i : top^i(j) = o\}|$ .
10.2:  $\rho \leftarrow \min_{o \in D_i} \frac{supply(o)}{consumers(o)}$ .
10.3: For each  $j \in N^0$ ,  $p_{j, top^i(j)}^i \leftarrow p_{j, top^i(j)}^i + \rho$ .
10.4: For each  $o \in D_i$ ,  $supply(o) \leftarrow supply(o) - \rho \times consumers(o)$ .
10.5:  $t \leftarrow t + \rho$ .
11: For every  $j \leq n$ ,  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{D}$ ,  $p_{j,\mathbf{x}} = \prod_{o=D_i(\mathbf{x}), i \leq p} P_{j,o}^i$ .
12: return  $P$ 

```

In the LexiPS mechanism, agent j always consumes her favorite item o_j available in the current most important type. Agent j would not stop consuming o_j unless one of the following occurs:

- (i) o_j is exhausted, and then agent j will consume her next favorite and available item according to \succ_j^i ;
- (ii) $\sum_{o \in D_i} p_{j,o}^i = 1, o_j \in D_i$, and then agent j will turn to her next most important type \hat{i} according to \triangleright_j and consume her favorite item available in that type.

After consumption, we obtain P^i for every type $i \leq p$. With the assumption that allocations among different types are independent, we construct P by

$$p_{j,x} = \prod_{o \in D_i(x), i \leq p} p_{j,o}^i. \quad (2)$$

We divide the execution of LexiPS into p phase where each agent only consume items in her current most important type i_j , and the time t for each phase is up to one unit. In the beginning of each phase, we set the timer $t = 0$. During the consumption, agent j first decides her most preferred *unexhausted* item $top^i(j)$ in her current most importance type i regarding \succ_j^i . Here we say an item o is exhausted if the supply $supply(o) = 0$. Each agent consumes the item at a uniform rate of one unit per unit of time. The consumption pauses whenever one of the items being consumed becomes exhausted. That means agent j 's share on $top^i(j)$ is increased by ρ , the duration since last pause, and the supply $supply(o)$ is computed by subtracting ρ for $consumers(o)$ times, the number of agent j which satisfies $top^i(j) = o$. In Algorithm 1, ρ is computed by $\min_{o \in M} \frac{supply(o)}{consumers(o)}$. After that we increase the timer t by ρ , identify $top^i(j)$ for each agent, and continue the consumption. The current phase ends when the timer t reaches 1, and the algorithm starts the next phase. We show that LexiPS is able to deal with indivisible items while retaining the good properties in Theorem 2.




Fig. 1 Execution of LexiPS in Example 3.

Example 3 Consider an MTRA where $N = \{1, 2, 3\}$, $M = D_F \times D_B$, $D_F = \{1_F, 2_F, 3_F\}$, $D_B = \{1_B, 2_B, 3_B\}$, and the profile $R = \{\succ_1, \succ_2, \succ_3\}$. The preferences $\succ_1, \succ_2, \succ_3$ are as follows:

Agent	Preferences
1	$F \triangleright_1 B, 1_F \succ_1^F 2_F \succ_1^F 3_F, 1_B \succ_1^B 2_B \succ_1^B 3_B$
2	$F \triangleright_2 B, 1_F \succ_2^F 2_F \succ_2^F 3_F, 1_B \succ_2^B 3_B \succ_2^B 2_B$
3	$B \triangleright_3 F, 1_F \succ_3^F 2_F \succ_3^F 3_F, 2_B \succ_3^B 3_B \succ_3^B 1_B$

The execution of LexiPS is shown in Fig. 1. In loop 1, agent 1 and 2 consume items in D_F , while agent 3 consumes alone in D_B . Therefore agent 3 gets her favorite items 2_B in D_B

fully, and 1_B and 3_B are left. Since agent 1 and 2 have the same preference for D_F , they each obtain 0.5 units of 1_F and 0.5 units of 2_F , and 3_F is left. Similarly in loop 2, agent 1 and 2 prefers type B while agent 3 prefers F . Then agent 3 gets the remaining item 3_F , and agent 1 and 2 divide 1_B and 3_B uniformly according to their preferences.

Agent	P				
	$1_F 1_B$	$1_F 3_B$	$2_F 1_B$	$2_F 3_B$	$3_F 2_B$
1	0.25	0.25	0.25	0.25	0
2	0.25	0.25	0.25	0.25	0
3	0	0	0	0	1

The consumption above results in the final assignment P , and it is easy to check that P is decomposable.

4.2 Properties

Theorem 2 shows that, as an extension of PS, LexiPS inherits efficiency and envyfreeness based on stochastic dominance in solving MTRAs with lexicographic preferences, and it is able to deal with indivisible items for its decomposable outputs.

Theorem 2 *For MTRAs with lexicographic preferences, LexiPS satisfies sd-efficiency and sd-envy-freeness. Especially, LexiPS outputs decomposable assignments.*

Proof Given a MTRA (N, M) , and profile R of lexicographic preferences, let $P = \text{LexiPS}(R)$. In the following proof, we use o_i to refer to an arbitrary item of type i , and (o_i^*) to refer to any bundle containing o_i .

(1) (**sd-efficiency**) By contradiction, we suppose in another assignment Q there exists agent j who get a better allocation than in P when others are also better or not affected, which means $Q \succ^{sd} P$. W.l.o.g, label the type according to \triangleright_j as $1 \triangleright_j 2 \triangleright_j \dots \triangleright_j p$. We show that $Q_j = P_j$ by proving the following equation with mathematical induction: for any $i \leq p$ and any o_1, \dots, o_i ,

$$\sum_{\mathbf{x}=(o_1, \dots, o_i^*)} p_{j,\mathbf{x}} = \sum_{\mathbf{x}=(o_1, \dots, o_i^*)} q_{j,\mathbf{x}}. \quad (3)$$

First, we prove (3) when $i = 1$ i.e. $Q_j^1 = P_j^1$. If $Q_j^1 \succ_j^{sd} P_j^1$ is false, we have that there exists \hat{o}_1 and the least preferred bundle $\hat{\mathbf{x}}$ containing \hat{o}_1 regarding \succ_j such that

$$\sum_{\mathbf{x} \in U(\succ_j, \hat{\mathbf{x}})} p_{j,\mathbf{x}} = \sum_{o \in U(\succ_j, \hat{o}_1)} p_{j,o} > \sum_{o \in U(\succ_j, \hat{o}_1)} q_{j,o} = \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in U(\succ_j, \hat{\mathbf{x}})} q_{j,\mathbf{x}}.$$

That is a contradiction to the assumption $Q \succ_j^{sd} P$. Therefore we suppose $Q_j^1 \succ_j^{sd} P_j^1$ and $Q_j^1 \neq P_j^1$. In some way, we say P_j^1 can be improved to Q_j^1 by shares transferring of bundles. Let N_1 denote the set of agents who consume items of type 1 in Phase 1. Let \hat{o}_1 be the least preferred item agent j gets in P_j^1 according to \succ_j . From Algorithm 1, we learn that agents in N_1 obey the rule of PS in Phase 1, and therefore the partial assignment for them $P_{N_1}^1 = (P_j^1)_{j \in N_1}$ is sd-efficient. Besides, agents not in N_1 only gets bundles \mathbf{x} with $D_1(\mathbf{x})$ not better than \hat{o}_1 . By assumption there exists o_1 such that $p_{j,o_1}^1 < q_{j,o_1}^1$ and $\sum_{o \succ_j^1 o_1} p_{j,o}^1 = \sum_{o \succ_j^1 o_1} q_{j,o}^1$, and therefore we have that the share transferring:

- (i) only involves agents in N_1 , which is a contradiction of sd-efficiency of $P_{N_1}^1$;

(ii) involves agents not in N_1 and the best items of type 1 w.r.t. \succ_j^1 they may have is \hat{o}_1 . If $o_1 \neq \hat{o}_1$, the extra share of q_{j,o_1}^1 comes from agents in N_1 , which is a contradiction of sd-efficiency as in Case (i). Therefore $o_1 = \hat{o}_1$ and we have $\sum_{o \in D_1} q_{j,o}^1 = \sum_{o \in U(\succ_j^1, o_1)} q_{j,o}^1 > \sum_{o \in U(\succ_j^1, o_1)} p_{j,o}^1 = \sum_{o \in D_1} p_{j,o}^1 = 1$, which is a contradiction.

Therefore we have $Q_j^1 = P_j^1$.

Then we prove (3) for type $i > 1$ while for any o_1, \dots, o_{i-1} ,

$$\sum_{\mathbf{x}=(o_1, \dots, o_{i-1}^*)} p_{j,\mathbf{x}} = \sum_{\mathbf{x}=(o_1, \dots, o_{i-1}^*)} q_{j,\mathbf{x}}. \quad (4)$$

It is easy to see that here (3) is equivalent to $Q^i = P^i$. We first show that like in type 1 it is necessary that $Q^i \succ_j^{sd} P^i$. For any $\hat{o}_1, \dots, \hat{o}_i$, let $\hat{\mathbf{x}}$ be the least preferred bundle containing them regarding \succ_j . Let

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{D}_i &= \{(\hat{o}_1, \dots, \hat{o}_{i-1}, o_i^*) \mid o_i \in U(\succ_j^i, \hat{o}_i)\}, \\ \mathcal{D}'_i &= \{(o_1, \dots, o_{i-1}^*) \mid o_1 \in U(\succ_j^1, \hat{o}_1), \dots, o_{i-2} \in U(\succ_j^{i-2}, \hat{o}_{i-2}), o_{i-1} \succ_j^{i-1} \hat{o}_{i-1}\}. \end{aligned}$$

By assumption $Q \succ_j^{sd} P$ we have that

$$\sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{D}_i} p_{j,\mathbf{x}} + \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{D}'_i} p_{j,\mathbf{x}} = \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in U(\succ_j, \hat{\mathbf{x}})} p_{j,\mathbf{x}} \leq \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in U(\succ_j, \hat{\mathbf{x}})} q_{j,\mathbf{x}} = \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{D}_i} q_{j,\mathbf{x}} + \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{D}'_i} q_{j,\mathbf{x}} \quad (5)$$

With (4) we have $\sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{D}'_i} p_{j,\mathbf{x}} = \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{D}'_i} q_{j,\mathbf{x}}$, and induce from (5) that $\sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{D}_i} p_{j,\mathbf{x}} \leq \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{D}_i} q_{j,\mathbf{x}}$. By summing up each side by $\hat{o}_1, \dots, \hat{o}_{i-1}$, we have that:

$$\sum_{\hat{o}_1} \dots \sum_{\hat{o}_{i-1}} \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{D}_i} p_{j,\mathbf{x}} \leq \sum_{\hat{o}_1} \dots \sum_{\hat{o}_{i-1}} \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{D}_i} q_{j,\mathbf{x}}.$$

According to the definition of lexicographic preference, it is equal to:

$$\sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \{(o_i^*) \mid o_i \in U(\succ_j^i, \hat{o}_i)\}} p_{j,\mathbf{x}} \leq \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \{(o_i^*) \mid o_i \in U(\succ_j^i, \hat{o}_i)\}} q_{j,\mathbf{x}}.$$

It can also be written as:

$$\sum_{o_i \in U(\succ_j^i, \hat{o}_i)} p_{j,o_i}^i \leq \sum_{o_i \in U(\succ_j^i, \hat{o}_i)} q_{j,o_i}^i$$

That means $Q^i \succ_j^{sd} P^i$.

With $Q^i \succ_j^{sd} P^i$, next we prove $Q^i \neq P^i$ is false by contradiction as for type i . Let N_i denote the set of agents who consume items of type i in Phase i and N'_i denote agents consume items of type i after Phase i . Notice that agents which have obtained items of type i before Phase i are not considered because they can never benefit by trading shares with agents in $N_i \cup N'_i$. Let \hat{o}_i be the least preferred item agent j gets in P^i according to \succ_j^i . As we have shown in the proof for type 1, $P_{N_i}^i = (P_j^i)_{j \in N_i}$, the partial assignment for agents in N_i , is sd-efficient regarding the available items of type i in Phase i , and agents in N'_i only gets bundles \mathbf{x} with $D_i(\mathbf{x})$ not better than \hat{o}_i . By assumption there exists o_i such that $p_{j,o_i}^i < q_{j,o_i}^i$ and $\sum_{o \succ_j^i o_i} p_{j,o}^i = \sum_{o \succ_j^i o_i} q_{j,o}^i$, and therefore we have that the share transferring:

(i') only involves agents in N_i , which is a contradiction of sd-efficiency of $P_{N_i}^i$;

(ii') involves agents in N'_i , and the best items of type i w.r.t. \succ_j^i they may have is \hat{o}_i . If $o_i \neq \hat{o}_i$, the extra share of q_{j,o_i}^i comes from agents in N_i , which is a contradiction of sd-efficiency as in Case (i'). Therefore $o_i = \hat{o}_i$ and we have $\sum_{o \in D_i} q_{j,o}^i = \sum_{o \in U(\succ_j^i, o_i)} p_{j,o}^i > \sum_{o \in U(\succ_j^i, o_i)} q_{j,o}^i = \sum_{o \in D_i} q_{j,o}^i = 1$, which is a contradiction.

Therefore we have the result.

By mathematical induction, we have that $p_{j,\mathbf{x}} = q_{j,\mathbf{x}}$, which is a contradiction to $Q_j \neq P_j$.

(2) (**sd-envy-freeness**) As agents spend one unit of time for each type, we divide the execution of LexiPS into p phases by type, and the following proof develops by phases.

We first declare that agent j does not envy other agents who have the same importance order. For convenience, we label the types according to \triangleright_j . Let N_i be the set of agents who consume items of types i in Phase i . Phase i can be viewed as the execution of PS for the single type allocation problem with agents in N_i and available items left in D_i at Phase i . By [8], we know that PS satisfies sd-envy-freeness. Therefore we have that for any $k \in N_i$, $\sum_{o' \in U(\succ_j^i, o)} p_{j,o'}^i \geq \sum_{o' \in U(\succ_j^i, o)} p_{k,o'}^i$ for any $o \in D_i$, which also means $\sum_{\mathbf{x}' \in U(\succ_j, \mathbf{x})} p_{j,\mathbf{x}'} \geq \sum_{\mathbf{x}' \in U(\succ_j, \mathbf{x})} p_{k,\mathbf{x}'}$ for any $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{D}$.

We next declare that agent j does not envy agents who have different important orders. Assume by contradiction that k is such an agent and there exists $\hat{\mathbf{x}} \in \mathcal{D}$ which satisfies

$$\sum_{\mathbf{x} \in U(\succ_j, \hat{\mathbf{x}})} p_{j,\mathbf{x}} < \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in U(\succ_j, \hat{\mathbf{x}})} p_{k,\mathbf{x}}. \quad (6)$$

We prove the declaration by mathematical induction. First we prove agent k 's most important type is 1. If not, then agent k would consume $o \in D_1$ in the later phase. However, the items left in D_1 at phase $i \neq 1$ are not more preferable than those consumed by agent j . Thus for any \hat{o}_1, o_1 satisfying $p_{j,\hat{o}_1}^1 > 0, p_{k,o_1}^1 > 0$, we have $\hat{o}_1 \succ_j^1 o_1$ or $\hat{o}_1 = o_1$. We discuss them respectively.

Case (i): If $\hat{o}_1 \succ_j^1 o_1$ for any \hat{o}_1, o_1 satisfying $p_{j,\hat{o}_1}^1 > 0, p_{k,o_1}^1 > 0$. then we obtain that for any $\hat{\mathbf{x}}, \mathbf{x}, p_{j,\hat{\mathbf{x}}} > 0, p_{k,\mathbf{x}} > 0$, we have $\hat{\mathbf{x}} \succ_j \mathbf{x}$ since $D_1(\hat{\mathbf{x}}) \succ_j^1 D_1(\mathbf{x})$. Let $\hat{\mathbf{x}}$ be least preferable bundle according to \succ_j and $p_{j,\hat{\mathbf{x}}} > 0$, and we have that for any $\mathbf{x}' \in U(\succ_j, \hat{\mathbf{x}})$,

$$\sum_{\mathbf{x}' \in U(\succ_j, \mathbf{x}')} p_{j,\mathbf{x}'} \geq \sum_{\mathbf{x}' \in U(\succ_j, \mathbf{x}')} p_{k,\mathbf{x}'} = 0 \quad (7)$$

For any \mathbf{x}' which satisfies $\hat{\mathbf{x}} \succ_j \mathbf{x}'$,

$$\sum_{\mathbf{x}' \in U(\succ_j, \mathbf{x}')} p_{j,\mathbf{x}'} = 1 \geq \sum_{\mathbf{x}' \in U(\succ_j, \mathbf{x}')} p_{k,\mathbf{x}'} \quad (8)$$

Combining (7) and (8), we obtain that $\sum_{\mathbf{x}' \in U(\succ_j, \mathbf{x}')} p_{j,\mathbf{x}'} \geq \sum_{\mathbf{x}' \in U(\succ_j, \mathbf{x}')} p_{k,\mathbf{x}'}$ for any \mathbf{x}' , a contradiction to (6).

Case (ii): If there exists \hat{o}_1 satisfying $p_{j,\hat{o}_1}^1 > 0, p_{k,\hat{o}_1}^1 > 0$, then \hat{o}_1 will be the least preferable item consumed by agent j , and the most preferable one consumed by agent k both regarding \succ_j^1 . We obtain that

$$\sum_{o \succ_j^1 \hat{o}_1} p_{j,o}^1 = 1 - p_{j,\hat{o}_1}^1 \geq p_{k,\hat{o}_1}^1 = \sum_{o \in U(\succ_j^1, \hat{o}_1)} p_{k,o}^1. \quad (9)$$

It means that for every $\hat{\mathbf{x}} = (\hat{o}_1^*)$,

$$\sum_{\mathbf{x} \in U(\succ_j, \hat{\mathbf{x}})} p_{j,\mathbf{x}} \geq \sum_{o \succ_j^1 \hat{o}_1} p_{j,o}^1 \geq \sum_{o \in U(\succ_j^1, \hat{o}_1)} p_{k,o}^1 \geq \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in U(\succ_j, \hat{\mathbf{x}})} p_{k,\mathbf{x}}$$

When $\hat{\mathbf{x}} \neq (\hat{o}_1^*)$, we have (7) for $D_1(\hat{\mathbf{x}}) \succ_j^1 o_1$ and (8) for $o_1 \succ_j^i D_1(\hat{\mathbf{x}})$, which cover the remaining cases. Therefore agent k 's first important type is 1.

Then we prove the agent k 's i th important type is i when her i 'th type is \hat{i} for $i' < i$, i.e. $p_{j,o_{i'}}^i = p_{k,o_{i'}}^i$ for $i' < i$. Suppose it is false and we discuss by cases above as for type 1. Because agent k consumes items in type i later that agent j , we note that for any o_i, \hat{o}_i satisfying $p_{j,o_i}^i > 0, p_{k,\hat{o}_i}^i > 0$, we have $o_i \succ_j^i \hat{o}_i$ or $o_i = \hat{o}_i$.

Case (i'): Suppose for any o_i, \hat{o}_i satisfying $p_{j,o_i}^i > 0, p_{k,\hat{o}_i}^i > 0$ and $o_i \neq \hat{o}_i$, we have $o_i \succ_j^i \hat{o}_i$. That means for $\mathbf{x} = (o_1, \dots, o_{i-1}, o_i^*)$, $\hat{\mathbf{x}} = (o_1, \dots, o_{i-1}, \hat{o}_i^*)$ satisfying $p_{j,\mathbf{x}} > 0, p_{k,\hat{\mathbf{x}}} > 0$, we have that $\mathbf{x} \succ_j \hat{\mathbf{x}}$. For any o'_1, \dots, o'_i , let $\mathbf{x}' = (o'_1, \dots, o'_i^*)$. Then we can obtain the result similar to (7) and (8) in Case (i) regarding (2), the computation way of bundle shares in LexiPS:

$$\sum_{\mathbf{x}=(o'_1, \dots, o'_{i-1}^*), \mathbf{x} \in U(\succ_j, \mathbf{x}')} p_{j,\mathbf{x}} \geq \sum_{\mathbf{x}=(o'_1, \dots, o'_{i-1}^*), \mathbf{x} \in U(\succ_j, \mathbf{x}')} p_{k,\mathbf{x}} \quad (10)$$

In addition, we can take the cumulative shares of upper contour set apart as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in U(\succ_j, \mathbf{x}')} p_{j,\mathbf{x}} &= \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \{(o_1^*) | o_1 \succ_j^1 o'_1\}} p_{j,\mathbf{x}} + \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \{(o_1^*, o_2^*) | o_2 \succ_j^2 o'_2\}} p_{j,\mathbf{x}} \\ &+ \dots + \sum_{\mathbf{x}=(o'_1, \dots, o'_{i-1}^*), \mathbf{x} \in U(\succ_j, \mathbf{x}')} p_{j,\mathbf{x}} \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

By the computation of shares for bundles (2) and for any $\hat{i} < i$, $p_{j,o_{\hat{i}}}^i = p_{k,o_{\hat{i}}}^i$, we have that

$$\sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \{(o'_1, \dots, o'_i) | o_i \succ_j^i o'_i\}} p_{j,\mathbf{x}} = \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \{(o'_1, \dots, o'_i) | o_i \succ_j^i o'_i\}} p_{k,\mathbf{x}} \quad (12)$$

Therefore with (10), (11) and (12) we have $\sum_{\mathbf{x} \in U(\succ_j, \mathbf{x}')} p_{j,\mathbf{x}} \geq \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in U(\succ_j, \mathbf{x}')} p_{k,\mathbf{x}}$ for any \mathbf{x}' , a contradiction to (6).

Case (ii'): Suppose there exists \hat{o}_i satisfying $p_{j,\hat{o}_i}^i > 0, p_{k,\hat{o}_i}^i > 0$. Therefore \hat{o}_i will be the least preferable item consumed by agent j , and the most preferable one consumed by agent k both regarding \succ_j^i . Let $\mathbf{x}' = (o'_1, \dots, o'_{i-1}, o_i^*)$. We first consider $o'_i = \hat{o}_i$. Similar to (9), we have that

$$\sum_{o \succ_j^i \hat{o}_i} p_{j,o}^i = 1 - p_{j,\hat{o}_i}^i \geq p_{k,\hat{o}_i}^i = \sum_{o \in U(\succ_j^i, \hat{o}_i)} p_{k,o}^i \quad (13)$$

With computation way of bundle shares (2), we induce that for $\alpha = \prod_{i'=1}^{i-1} p_{j,o_{i'}}^i = \prod_{i'=1}^{i-1} p_{k,o_{i'}}^i$,

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{\mathbf{x}=(o'_1, \dots, o'_{i-1}^*), \mathbf{x} \in U(\succ_j, \mathbf{x}')} p_{j,\mathbf{x}} \\ &\geq \alpha \times \sum_{o \succ_j^i \hat{o}_i} p_{j,o}^i \geq \alpha \times \sum_{o \in U(\succ_j^i, \hat{o}_i)} p_{k,o}^i \\ &\geq \sum_{\mathbf{x}=(o'_1, \dots, o'_{i-1}^*), \mathbf{x} \in U(\succ_j, \mathbf{x}')} p_{k,\mathbf{x}} \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

With (11) and (12), (14) means $\sum_{\mathbf{x} \in U(\succ_j, \mathbf{x}')} p_{j,\mathbf{x}} \geq \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in U(\succ_j, \mathbf{x}')} p_{k,\mathbf{x}}$. When $o'_i \neq \hat{o}_i$, we have (10) for \mathbf{x}' , and we can obtain the same results as in Case (i'). Therefore agent k 's first important type is i .

Therefore agent k 's important order is the same as agent j 's, which is a contradiction. With the results above, we prove that agent j envies nobody.

(3) (**decomposable outputs**) By the classical Birkhoff-Von Neumann theorem, all the single type fractional assignments are decomposable. For $i \leq p$, let \mathcal{A}^i be the set of all the single type deterministic assignments for type i , A^i be an arbitrary assignment in \mathcal{A}^i , and we use α^i to denote the possibility of A^i . Therefore $P^i = \sum (\alpha_k^i \times A_k^i)$ for every $i \leq p$.

We first give a obvious claim that single type deterministic assignments of p types decide an unique multi-type deterministic assignments, and vice versa. Specifically, for any multi-type deterministic assignment $A \in \mathcal{A}$ and A^1, \dots, A^p comprising A , we have that for every $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{D}$ and $o_i = D_i(\mathbf{x})$,

$$A_{j,\mathbf{x}} = \prod_{i=1}^p A_{j,o_i}^i. \quad (15)$$

That means agent j is assigned bundle \mathbf{x} if she is assigned all the items in \mathbf{x} . We show an example of types $\{F, B\}$ for agent $\{1, 2\}$ as follows:

Agent	P^F		P^B	
	1_F	2_F	1_B	2_B
1	1	0	0	1
2	0	1	1	0

Agent	P			
	$1_F 1_B$	$1_F 2_B$	$2_F 1_B$	$2_F 2_B$
1	0	1	0	0
2	0	0	1	0

Then by definition of LexiPS we obtain that for any $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{D}$ and any $o_i = D_i(\mathbf{x})$,

$$p_{j,\mathbf{x}} = \prod_{i \leq p} P_{j,o_i}^i = \prod_{i \leq p} \sum_{A_k^i \in \mathcal{A}^i} (\alpha_k^i \times (A_k^i)_{j,o_i}) \quad (16)$$

The result of (16) is a product of p polynomials, and we can write it as one polynomial and induce as below:

$$\begin{aligned} (16) &= \sum_{A_{k_1}^1 \in \mathcal{A}^1, A_{k_2}^2 \in \mathcal{A}^2, \dots, A_{k_p}^p \in \mathcal{A}^p} \prod_{i \leq p} (\alpha_{k_i}^i \times (A_{k_i}^i)_{j,o_i}) \\ &= \sum_{A_{k_1}^1 \in \mathcal{A}^1, A_{k_2}^2 \in \mathcal{A}^2, \dots, A_{k_p}^p \in \mathcal{A}^p} \left(\prod_{i \leq p} \alpha_{k_i}^i \times \prod_{i \leq p} (A_{k_i}^i)_{j,o_i} \right) \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

Given $A_{k_1}^1, A_{k_2}^2, \dots, A_{k_p}^p$, let A_k be the corresponding multi-type assignment consisting of them and $\alpha_k = \prod_{i \leq p} \alpha_{k_i}^i$ is the probability of A_k where $\alpha_{k_i}^i$ is the probability of $A_{k_i}^i$ for P^i . With (15) we have:

$$(16) = \sum_{A_k \in \mathcal{A}} (\alpha_k \times (A_k)_{j,\mathbf{x}})$$

Therefore P is decomposable. \square

Remark 2 LexiPS does not satisfy lexi-efficiency. In Example 3, agent 1's allocation in P , denoted p here, is lexicographically dominated by the following allocation q :

Agent	$1_F 1_B$	$1_F 3_B$	$2_F 1_B$	$2_F 3_B$	$3_F 2_B$
1	0.5	0	0	0.5	0

We note that q can be obtained by reallocating the shares of items in p .

However, in resistance against manipulation, LexiPS does not perform as well as PS just like most extensions. Theorem 3 shows that LexiPS is sd-weak-strategyproof if the importance orders reported by agents are ensured to be truthful. We also show in Remark 3 how an agent cheats by misreporting her importance order.

Theorem 3 For MTRAs with lexicographic preferences, LexiPS satisfies sd-weak-strategy proofness when agents report importance orders truthfully.

Proof In the following proof, we use o_i to refer to an arbitrary item of type i , and (o_i^*) to refer to any bundle containing o_i . We also use (o_i^*) as a shorthand to refer to an arbitrary bundle containing o_i .

Suppose agent j misreports its preference as \succ'_j for some types and acquire a better allocation. Label the type according to \triangleright_j and let i be the most important type for which j misreports. Let $P = \text{LexiPS}(R)$, $R' = (\succ'_j, \succ_{-j})$ and $Q = \text{LexiPS}(R')$. Then by assumption we have that $Q \succ_j^{sd} P$, $Q \neq P$ and $p_{j,o}^{\hat{i}} = q_{j,o}^{\hat{i}}$ for every $\hat{i} < i$. The phase when agent j consumes items in D_i can be viewed as executing PS of type i . By [8], PS satisfies sd-weak-strategyproofness, which means $Q^i \succ_j^{sd} P^i$ is false. Thus there exists \hat{o}_i which satisfies

$$\sum_{o \in U(\succ_j^i, \hat{o}_i)} p_{j,o}^i > \sum_{o \in U(\succ_j^i, \hat{o}_i)} q_{j,o}^i \quad (18)$$

With (11) and (12) in Theorem 2, we can simplify (18) and obtain that for $\hat{\mathbf{x}} = (\hat{o}_1, \dots, \hat{o}_i^*)$,

$$\sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \{(\hat{o}_1, \dots, \hat{o}_{i-1}, o_i^*) | o_i \in U(\succ_j^i, \hat{o}_i)\}} p_{j,\mathbf{x}} > \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \{(\hat{o}_1, \dots, \hat{o}_{i-1}, o_i^*) | o_i \in U(\succ_j^i, \hat{o}_i)\}} q_{j,\mathbf{x}}$$

It is equal to $\sum_{\mathbf{x} \in U(\succ_j, \hat{\mathbf{x}})} p_{j,\mathbf{x}} > \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in U(\succ_j, \hat{\mathbf{x}})} q_{j,\mathbf{x}}$, which means agent j does not obtain a better allocation in Q , a contradiction. \square

Remark 3 When applying LexiPS to MTRAs with lexicographic preferences, an agent may get a better allocation by misreporting her importance order.

Proof Consider a MTRA with lexicographic preferences where there are agents 1, 2 and types F, B, T . Agents both prefer 1_i to 2_i for $i \in \{F, B, T\}$, but their preferences over bundle are different due to their importance orders as follow:

Agent	Importance Order
1	$F \triangleright_1 B \triangleright_1 T$
2	$T \triangleright_2 F \triangleright_2 B$

LexiPS gives the fractional assignment denoted P . If agent 2 misreports her importance order as $\triangleright_2: F \triangleright_2 T \triangleright_2 B$, LexiPS gives another fractional assignment denoted P' . Both P and P' are shown as follows (To save space, we omit the columns which only contain 0, similarly hereinafter.):

Agent	P		Agent	P'			
	$1_F 1_B 2_T$	$2_F 2_B 1_T$		$1_F 1_B 2_T$	$1_F 2_B 1_T$	$2_F 1_B 2_T$	$2_F 2_B 1_T$
1	1	0	1	0.5	0	0.5	0
2	0	1	2	0	0.5	0	0.5

We observe that compared with P , agent 2 loses 0.5 shares of $2_F 2_B 1_T$, but acquires 0.5 shares of $1_F 2_B 1_T$ in P' . Since $1_F 2_B 1_T \succ_2 2_F 2_B 1_T$, we obtain that $P' \succ_2^{sd} P$, but $P \succ_2^{sd} P'$ is false, which means LexiPS does not satisfy sd-weak-strategyproofness when an agent can misreport her importance order. \square

5 MPS for MTRAs with divisible items

In this section we only consider MTRA with divisible items, which is not affected by Theorem 1. We present a simplified version of MPS [43] in **Algorithm 2**, since we no longer need to deal with partial preferences. At a high level, in MPS agents consume bundles consisting of items in contrast with PS where agents consume items directly. Under strict linear preferences, we prove that MPS satisfies lexi-efficiency, which implies sd-efficiency, and provide two characterizations involving leximin-optimality and item-wise ordinal fairness respectively.

5.1 Algorithm for MPS

Given an MTRA, MPS proceeds in multiple rounds as follows: In the beginning of each round, M' contains all items that are unexhausted. Agent j first decides her most preferred *available* bundle $top(j)$ according to \succ_j . A bundle \mathbf{x} is available so long as every item $o \in \mathbf{x}$ is unexhausted. Then, each agent consumes the bundle by consuming all of the items in it at a uniform rate of one unit per unit of time. The round ends whenever one of the bundles being consumed becomes unavailable because an item being consumed has been exhausted. The algorithm terminates when all the items are exhausted.

Algorithm 2 MPS for MTRAs under strict linear preference.

- 1: **Input:** An MTRA (N, M) and a preference profile R .
 - 2: For every $o \in M$, $supply(o) \leftarrow 1$. $M' \leftarrow M$. $P \leftarrow 0^{n \times |M|}$.
 - 3: **while** $M' \neq \emptyset$ **do**
 - 4: **Identify top bundle** $top(j)$ for every agent $j \leq n$.
 - 5: **Consume.**
 - 5.1: For any $o \in M'$, $consumers(o) \leftarrow \{j \in N : o \in top(j)\}$.
 - 5.2: $\rho \leftarrow \min_{o \in M'} \frac{supply(o)}{consumers(o)}$.
 - 5.3: For each $j \leq n$, $p_{j,top(j)} \leftarrow p_{j,top(j)} + \rho$.
 - 5.4: For each $o \in M'$, $supply(o) \leftarrow supply(o) - \rho \times consumers(o)$.
 - 6: $B \leftarrow \arg \min_{o \in M'} \frac{supply(o)}{consumers(o)}$, $M' \leftarrow M' \setminus B$
 - 7: **return** P
-

Example 4 The execution of MPS for the following instance of MTRA is shown in **Fig. 2**.

Agent	Preferences	P			
		$1_F 1_B$	$1_F 2_B$	$2_F 1_B$	$2_F 2_B$
1	$1_F 1_B \succ_1 1_F 2_B \succ_1 2_F 2_B \succ_1 2_F 1_B$	0.5	0	0	0.5
2	$1_F 2_B \succ_2 2_F 1_B \succ_2 1_F 1_B \succ_2 2_F 2_B$	0	0.5	0.5	0

At round 1, agent 1's top bundle is $1_F 1_B$, and agent 2's top bundle is $1_F 2_B$. Notice that both agents wish to consume 1_F . Therefore, round 1 ends as 1_F gets exhausted with both agents getting a share of 0.5 units of 1_F . Agents 1 and 2 also consume 1_B and 2_B respectively at the same rate during round 1. At the end of round 1, agents 1 and 2 are assigned with a 0.5 share of $1_F 1_B$ and $1_F 2_B$ respectively.

At the start of round 2, there is a supply of 1 unit of 2_F and 0.5 units each of 1_B and 2_B . Agent 1's top available bundle is $2_F 2_B$ since $1_F 2_B$ is unavailable for the exhausted item

1_F , and agent 2's top available bundle is $2_F 1_B$ accordingly. The agents consume the items of each type from their top bundles at a uniform rate and at the end of the round, all items are exhausted, and agents 1 and 2 have consumed 0.5 units each of $2_F 2_B$ and $2_F 1_B$ respectively, which results in the final assignment as shown in **Fig. 2**, which is the undecomposable assignment P in Example 1.

Further, we show in Remark 4 that even under lexicographic preferences, the output of MPS is not always decomposable. This means that MPS is only applicable to MTRAs with divisible items.




Fig. 2 An example of the execution of MPS.

Remark 4 The output of MPS is not always a decomposable assignment under the restriction of lexicographic preferences.

Proof For the MTRA in Example 3, MPS outputs the following fractional assignment, denoted P :

Agent	P						
	$1_F 1_B$	$1_F 2_B$	$2_F 1_B$	$2_F 2_B$	$2_F 3_B$	$3_F 2_B$	$3_F 3_B$
1	1/3	0	1/6	1/6	0	1/12	1/4
2	1/3	0	1/6	0	1/6	0	1/3
3	0	1/3	0	1/3	0	1/12	1/4

When items are indivisible, if agent 2 get $2_F 3_B$, agent 1 will get $1_F 1_B$ and agent 3 will get $3_F 2_B$ as P indicates. However, $p_{1,1_F 1_B} = 1/3$, $p_{2,2_F 3_B} = 1/6$, $p_{3,3_F 2_B} = 1/12$ are not equal, which is a contradiction. \square

5.2 Efficiency and Generalized Cycles

Under the unrestricted domain of strict linear preferences, Theorem 2 in [43] implies that MPS satisfies sd-efficiency. We prove in Theorem 4 below that MPS satisfies lexi-efficiency, which is a stronger notion of efficiency than sd-efficiency, as we will prove in Proposition 1 later.

Theorem 4 *MPS satisfies lexi-efficiency.*

Proof Given MTRA(M,N) and preference profile R , let $P = \text{MPS}(R)$, and suppose another assignment Q satisfies $Q \succ^{\text{lexi}} P$. Let \hat{N} be the set of agents which have different allocations in Q , and by assumption we have that for any $j \in \hat{N}$, there exists a bundle \mathbf{x} satisfies $q_{j,\mathbf{x}} > p_{j,\mathbf{x}}$ and $q_{j,\hat{\mathbf{x}}} = p_{j,\hat{\mathbf{x}}}$ for any $\hat{\mathbf{x}} \succ_j \mathbf{x}$. W.l.o.g. let j be the agent with smallest $\sum_{\hat{\mathbf{x}} \succ_j \mathbf{x}} p_{j,\hat{\mathbf{x}}}$, and let t denote the value. However, when MPS executes till time t , \mathbf{x} is unavailable, which means that at least one item in \mathbf{x} is exhausted and $p_{j,\mathbf{x}}$ cannot be increased anymore. Therefore if agent j gains more shares of \mathbf{x} in Q , there is another agent who lose shares before t , which is a contradiction. \square

We establish the relationship between lexi-efficiency and sd-efficiency in Proposition 1 through the *no-generalized-cycle* condition (Definition 11), by showing that sd-efficiency is implied by the no-generalized-cycle condition, which is implied by lexi-efficiency. We begin by borrowing the tool named generalized cycle from Wang et al. [43], which is based on the relation τ and the notion of *improvable tuples* defined as follows:

Definition 10 (improvable tuples [43]) Given a fractional assignment P , and a profile $R = (\succ_j)_{j \leq n}$,

- for pair of bundles $\mathbf{x}, \hat{\mathbf{x}} \in \mathcal{D}$, $\mathbf{x} \tau \hat{\mathbf{x}} \iff$ there exists an agent $j \leq n$, such that $\mathbf{x} \succ_j \hat{\mathbf{x}}$ and $p_{j,\hat{\mathbf{x}}} > 0$.
- for any pair of bundles $\mathbf{x}, \hat{\mathbf{x}} \in \mathcal{D}$, $(\mathbf{x}, \hat{\mathbf{x}})$ is an *improvable tuple* if and only if $\mathbf{x} \tau \hat{\mathbf{x}}$, and
- $\text{Imp}(P, R)$ is the set of all improvable tuples admitted by assignment P w.r.t. the preference profile R .

For ease of exposition, we use $\text{Imp}(P)$ to refer to the set of all improvable tuples admitted by the fractional assignment P when the profile is clear from the context. We are now ready to formally define the no-generalized-cycle condition.

Definition 11 (no-generalized-cycle [43]) Given an MTRA (N, M, R) and a fractional assignment P , a set $C \subseteq \text{Imp}(P, R)$ is a *generalized cycle* if it holds for every $o \in M$ that: if an improvable tuple $(\mathbf{x}_1, \hat{\mathbf{x}}_1) \in C$ satisfies that $o \in \mathbf{x}_1$, then there exists a tuple $(\mathbf{x}_2, \hat{\mathbf{x}}_2) \in C$ such that $o \in \hat{\mathbf{x}}_2$. An assignment P satisfies *no-generalized-cycle*, if it admits no generalized cycles.

When $p = 1$, Bogomolnaia and Moulin [8] proved that an assignment is sd-efficient if and only if the relation τ on it is acyclic, i.e. there does not exist $\mathbf{x}_1 \tau \mathbf{x}_2 \tau \dots \tau \mathbf{x}_1$. However, this condition fails for MTRAs. Example 5 shows that an assignment which does not satisfy sd-efficiency satisfies the acyclicity of τ , but admits a generalized cycle, which means the generalized cycle is more reliable in identifying sd-efficient assignments.

Example 5 We illustrate generalized cycles, with the following assignment Q for the MTRA in Example 4. Note that Q is not sd-efficient because the assignment P in Example 4 stochastically dominates Q .

Agent	Q				Agent	Improvable Tuples
	$1_F 1_B$	$1_F 2_B$	$2_F 1_B$	$2_F 2_B$		
1	0.4	0	0	0.6	1	$(1_F 1_B, 2_F 2_B), (1_F 2_B, 2_F 2_B), (2_F 1_B, 2_F 2_B)$
2	0.2	0.4	0.4	0	2	$(1_F 2_B, 2_F 1_B), (1_F 2_B, 1_F 1_B), (2_F 1_B, 1_F 1_B)$

It is easy to see that τ is acyclic on Q . However, it is easy to verify that there is a generalized cycle on Q : $\{(1_F 1_B, 2_F 2_B), (1_F 2_B, 2_F 1_B), (2_F 1_B, 1_F 1_B)\}$. Consider for example

the items in type B : 1_B is present in both components of $(2_F 1_B, 1_F 1_B)$, and 2_B is present in the left component of $(1_F 2_B, 2_F 1_B)$ and the right component of $(1_F 1_B, 2_F 2_B)$. A similar analysis can be performed for the items of type F .

Proposition 1 reveals the relationship between lexi-efficiency and sd-efficiency vis-à-vis the no-generalized-cycle condition. Unlike Bogomolnaia [6] who point out that lexi-efficiency and sd-efficiency are equivalent in their setting where $p = 1$, because both of them are equivalent to acyclicity condition on the relation τ , we show that this is no longer true for MTRAs.

Proposition 1 *Given a preference profile R and a fractional assignment P ,*

- (1) P is sd-efficient regarding R if P admits no generalized cycle.
- (2) P is lexi-efficient regarding R only if P admits no generalized cycle.

Proof (1) The proof is similar to the proof of Theorem 5, Claim (1) in Wang et al. [43]. A full proof is provided in Appendix A.2 for completeness.

(2) Suppose by contradiction there is a lexi-efficient assignment P which admits a generalized cycle C . For any agent j , let $(\mathbf{x}, \hat{\mathbf{x}}) \in C$ be the one of tuple she involves, and let \mathbf{x} be top ranked among bundles in all the tuples involved j . For every $o_k \in \mathbf{x}$, we can find a tuple $(\mathbf{x}_k, \hat{\mathbf{x}}_k) \in C$ which satisfies that $o_k \in \hat{\mathbf{x}}_k$ and $p_{j, \hat{\mathbf{x}}_k} > 0$ for some \hat{j} by definition. Then we extract shares of each $\hat{\mathbf{x}}_k$ by a small enough value ε , and we can have ε shares of \mathbf{x} with the shares of each o_k from $\hat{\mathbf{x}}_k$. And to keep the supply of bundle not beyond her demand, she should give out the same shares of $\hat{\mathbf{x}}$. It is trivial that the shares of items in $\hat{\mathbf{x}}$ and rest items in each $\hat{\mathbf{x}}_k$ can be combined as bundles with no share left for single items, and we just assign them arbitrarily to agents who donate $\hat{\mathbf{x}}_k$ to meet their demands. We note that ε is chosen to be small enough so that the shares of bundles above are not used up, and therefore they can be used for other agents. Let Q be the new assignment after we do the step above for all the agents. In this way, for any agent j with the chosen tuple $(\mathbf{x}, \hat{\mathbf{x}})$, it gains shares of \mathbf{x} and maybe other bundles, with loss of shares of $\hat{\mathbf{x}}$ and other bundles ranked behind \mathbf{x} . It follows that $Q_{j, \mathbf{x}} \geq P_{j, \mathbf{x}} + \varepsilon > P_{j, \mathbf{x}}$ and for any $\mathbf{x}' \succ_j \mathbf{x}$, $Q_{j, \mathbf{x}'} \geq P_{j, \mathbf{x}'}$ because agent j gains but not loses the shares of these bundles, which means $Q \succ^{lexi} P$, a contradiction. \square

Remark 5 The no-generalized-cycle condition is not a necessary condition of sd-efficiency. Consider an MTRA with two agents where \succ_1, \succ_2 are the same as $1_F 1_B \succ_1 1_F 2_B \succ_1 2_F 1_B \succ_1 2_F 2_B$. We find that the assignment P in Example 4 is sd-efficient for this MTRA but admits a generalized cycle (not unique): $\{(1_F 1_B, 1_F 2_B), (1_F 2_B, 2_F 1_B), (2_F 1_B, 2_F 2_B)\}$. The no-generalized-cycle condition is also not a sufficient condition of lexi-efficiency. With the \succ_1, \succ_2 above, the following assignment admits no generalized cycle, but is not lexi-efficient:

Agent	$1_F 1_B$	$1_F 2_B$	$2_F 1_B$	$2_F 2_B$
1,2	0	0.5	0.5	0

In Theorem 5, we characterize the entire set of assignments that do not admit generalized cycles by the family of *eating* algorithms for MTRAs (Algorithm 3), which is a natural extension of the family of eating algorithms introduced in Bogomolnaia and Moulin [8] for the single type setting. Each eating algorithm is specified by a collection of exogenous *eating speed functions* $\omega = (\omega_j)_{j \leq n}$. An eating speed function ω_j specifies the instantaneous rate at which agent j consumes bundles, consisting of an item of each type, at each instant $t \in [0, 1]$, such that the integral $\int_{t=0}^1 \omega_j(t)$ is 1. In an eating algorithm, in each round, each agent

j consumes her most preferred available bundle at the rate specified by her eating speed function ω_j , until the supply of one of the items in one of the bundles being consumed is exhausted. Note that MPS is a special case of the family of eating algorithms, with $\omega_j(t) = 1$ for all $t \in [0, 1]$, and all $j \leq n$.

Algorithm 3 Eating Algorithms

- 1: **Input:** An MTRA (N, M) and a preference profile R .
 - 2: **Parameters:** Eating speed functions $\omega = (\omega_j)_{j \leq n}$.
 - 3: For every $o \in M$, $\text{supply}(o) \leftarrow 1$. $M' \leftarrow M$. $P \leftarrow \mathbf{0}^{n \times |\mathcal{D}|}$. $t \leftarrow 0$.
 - 4: **while** $M' \neq \emptyset$ and $t < 1$ **do**
 - 5: **Identify top bundle** $\text{top}(j)$ for every agent $j \leq n$.
 - 6: **Consume.**
 - 5.1: For any $o \in M'$, $\text{consumers}(o) \leftarrow |\{j \in N : o \in \text{top}(j)\}|$.
 - 5.2: $\rho \leftarrow \min\{\rho \mid \sum_{j \in \text{consumers}(o)} \int_t^{t+\rho} \omega_j = \text{supply}(o), o \in M'\}$.
 - 5.3: For each $j \leq n$, $p_{j, \text{top}(j)} \leftarrow p_{j, \text{top}(j)} + \int_t^{t+\rho} \omega_j$.
 - 5.4: For each $o \in M'$, $\text{supply}(o) \leftarrow \text{supply}(o) - \sum_{j \in \text{consumers}(o)} \int_t^{t+\rho} \omega_j$.
 - 7: $M' \leftarrow M' \setminus \{o \in M' \mid \text{supply}(o) = 0\}$. $t \leftarrow t + \rho$.
 - 8: **return** P
-

Theorem 5 *An assignment satisfies no-generalized-cycle if and only if the assignment is the output of an eating algorithm (Algorithm 3).*

Proof (\Leftarrow) The proof that an assignment P , which is an output of an eating algorithm satisfies no-generalized-cycle is similar to the proof of Proposition 1, Claim (1).

(\Rightarrow) Let R be an arbitrary preference profile, and let P be an arbitrary assignment satisfying no-generalized-cycle w.r.t. R . For convenience, we define some quantities to represent the state during the execution of a member of the family of eating algorithms at each round s . For ease of exposition, we use $s = 0$ to represent the initial state before the start of execution. Let $M^0 = M$, $\mathcal{D}^0 = \mathcal{D}$. Let $B^s = \{o \in M^{s-1} : \text{there are no } \mathbf{x}, \hat{\mathbf{x}} \in \mathcal{D}^{s-1} \text{ s.t. } o \in \hat{\mathbf{x}} \text{ and } (\mathbf{x}, \hat{\mathbf{x}}) \in \text{Imp}(P)\}$, $M^s = M^{s-1} - B^s$ and $\mathcal{D}^s = \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{D} : \text{for every } o \in \mathbf{x}, o \in M^s\}$ be the available bundles in M^s . Let $S = \min\{s : M^s = \emptyset\}$. Let $\omega_j(t)$ be the eating rate of agent j at time t , $N(\mathbf{x}, \mathcal{D}^s)$ be the set of agents who prefer \mathbf{x} best in the available bundles \mathcal{D}^s for any $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{D}^s$. The following eating speed functions ω_j define the algorithm:

$$\forall s \leq S, \frac{s-1}{S} \leq t \leq \frac{s}{S}, \omega_j(t) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \begin{cases} S \times p_{j, \mathbf{x}}, & \exists o \in \mathbf{x}, o \in B^s \text{ and } j \in N(\mathbf{x}, \mathcal{D}^{s-1}) \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

From the design of algorithm, we know that items in B^s decide which bundles in \mathcal{D}^{s-1} are consumed in round s , and these items are not consumed after the round s . We claim that the algorithm specified by the eating speed functions $\omega = (\omega_j)_{j \leq n}$ above, outputs P for the MTRA with preference profile R . Let Q be the output of the eating algorithm and we prove $P = Q$ by proving with induction that for any $s \in [1, S]$, $o \in B^s$, $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{D}^{s-1}$ s.t. $o \in \mathbf{x}$, we prove for each $j \in N$, $p_{j, \mathbf{x}} = q_{j, \mathbf{x}}$. The base case where $s = 1$ is omitted here, and we provide a proof sketch for the inductive step in the following. The full proof is in Appendix A.4.

Inductive step. With the assumption that $p_{j, \mathbf{x}} = q_{j, \mathbf{x}}$ for any $o \in \bigcup_{k=1}^s B^k$, $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{D}$ s.t. $o \in \mathbf{x}$ and any $j \in N$, we prove that: for any $o \in B^{s+1}$, $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{D}$ s.t. $o \in \mathbf{x}$ and any $j \in N$, $p_{j, \mathbf{x}} = q_{j, \mathbf{x}}$. If \mathbf{x} is not in \mathcal{D}^s , then there is an item $\hat{o} \in \bigcup_{k=1}^s B^k$ s.t. $\hat{o} \in \mathbf{x}$ and we have $p_{j, \mathbf{x}} = q_{j, \mathbf{x}}$ by the assumption. For $o \in B^{s+1}$ and $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{D}^s$ s.t. $o \in \mathbf{x}$, if \mathbf{x} is not most preferred in \mathcal{D}^s by some

agent j , then $p_{j,\mathbf{x}} = 0$, because if $p_{j,\mathbf{x}} > 0$, then let $\hat{\mathbf{x}}$ be the most preferred bundle by j in \mathcal{D}^s and we have $(\hat{\mathbf{x}}, \mathbf{x}) \in \text{Imp}(P)$ where $o \in \mathbf{x}$, a contradiction to the construction of B^{s+1} . Therefore we have the following equation by construction

$$\sum_{o \in \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{D}^s} \sum_{j \in N(\mathbf{x}, \mathcal{D}^s)} p_{j,\mathbf{x}} + \sum_{o \in \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{D} \setminus \mathcal{D}^s} \sum_{j \in N} p_{j,\mathbf{x}} = \sum_{o \in \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{D}} \sum_{j \in N} p_{j,\mathbf{x}} = 1.$$

That implies for any $o \in B^{s+1}$, $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{D}^s$ s.t. $o \in \mathbf{x}$, if j is not in $N(\mathbf{x}, \mathcal{D}^s)$, then $p_{j,\mathbf{x}} = 0$.

For any $o \in B^{s+1}$, $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{D}^s$ s.t. $o \in \mathbf{x}$ and $j \in N(\mathbf{x}, \mathcal{D}^s)$, we prove that agent j consumes exactly $p_{j,\mathbf{x}}$ units of bundle \mathbf{x} . By the assumption, o remains available in $\frac{s}{S} \leq t \leq \frac{s+1}{S}$ and agent j consumes \mathbf{x} in $\frac{s}{S} \leq t \leq \frac{s+1}{S}$. We know that $q_{j,\mathbf{x}} = 0$ by time $\frac{s}{S}$, and by time $\frac{s+1}{S}$, $q_{j,\mathbf{x}} = \frac{1}{S} \times S \times p_{j,\mathbf{x}} = p_{j,\mathbf{x}}$. That means

$$\sum_{o \in \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{D}^s} \sum_{j \in N(\mathbf{x}, \mathcal{D}^s)} q_{j,\mathbf{x}} + \sum_{o \in \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{D} \setminus \mathcal{D}^s} \sum_{j \in N} q_{j,\mathbf{x}} = \sum_{o \in \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{D}^s} \sum_{j \in N(\mathbf{x}, \mathcal{D}^s)} p_{j,\mathbf{x}} + \sum_{o \in \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{D} \setminus \mathcal{D}^s} \sum_{j \in N} p_{j,\mathbf{x}} = 1$$

That implies for any $o \in B^{s+1}$, $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{D}^s$ s.t. $o \in \mathbf{x}$, (i) if $j \in N(\mathbf{x}, \mathcal{D}^s)$, then $q_{j,\mathbf{x}} = p_{j,\mathbf{x}}$; (ii) if j is not in $N(\mathbf{x}, \mathcal{D}^s)$, then $q_{j,\mathbf{x}} = 0 = p_{j,\mathbf{x}}$. Therefore, for any $o \in B^{s+1}$, $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{D}^s$ s.t. $o \in \mathbf{x}$ and any $j \in N$, $p_{j,\mathbf{x}} = q_{j,\mathbf{x}}$. \square

5.3 Fairness and Characterization

For CP-net preferences, Theorem 5 in Wang et al. [43] showed that MPS satisfies sd-envy-freeness for CP-net preferences. Here CP-net determines the dependence among preferences of types, which also reflects the importance of each type. Since the domain of CP-net preferences and strict linear preferences are not totally overlapping, we provide Proposition 2 as complement and the proof is in Appendix A.3.

Proposition 2 *MPS satisfies sd-envy-freeness for MTRAs.*

By [43], MPS is sd-weak-strategyproof if all the agents share the same CP-net, which means their importance orders are identical. We prove that under lexicographic preferences, MPS satisfies sd-weak-strategyproofness, and in particular, the importance orders of agents can be different.

Theorem 6 *MPS satisfies sd-weak-strategyproofness for MTRAs with lexicographic preferences.*

Proof Consider an arbitrary MTRA (N, M) and an arbitrary lexicographic preference profile R . Suppose for the sake of contradiction that an agent j can obtain a better allocation by misreporting her preference as another lexicographic preference \succ'_j . Throughout, we use $P = \text{MPS}(R)$ and $Q = \text{MPS}(R')$, where $R' = (\succ'_j, \succ_{-j})$. By assumption of beneficial misreporting, we have $Q \succ_j^{sd} P$. We will show that $Q_j = P_j$.

We claim that $Q_j^i = P_j^i$ for every type $i \leq p$, where P_j^i is agent j 's single type allocations of type i at P and Q_j^i the same at Q . W.l.o.g. let the types be labeled such that $1 \triangleright_j \cdots \triangleright_j p$. For convenience, for any type $i \leq p$, we define o_i to be an item o of type i , and (o_i^*) to be an arbitrary bundle containing o_i .

Claim 1 Under lexicographic preferences, $(\text{MPS}(R))^i = PS(R^i)$, where $R^i = (\succ_j^i)_{j \leq n}$.

The claim is obtained by comparing the execution of MPS with PS in each type. The full proof of the claim is in Appendix A.5. Since PS satisfies sd-weak-strategyproofness [8], we deduce from **Claim 1** that for each type $i \leq p$, $Q^i \succ_j^{sd} P^i \Rightarrow Q_j^i = P_j^i$. Therefore we can prove $Q_j^i = P_j^i$ by showing $Q^i \succ_j^{sd} P^i$ instead, by induction.

First we assume $Q^1 \not\succeq_j^{sd} P^1$. That means there exists \hat{o}_1 such that $\sum_{o \in U(\succ_j^1, \hat{o}_1)} P_{j,o}^1 > \sum_{o \in U(\succ_j^1, \hat{o}_1)} q_{j,o}^1$. Let $\hat{\mathbf{x}}$ be the least preferred bundle containing \hat{o}_1 . It follows that

$$\sum_{o \in U(\succ_j^1, \hat{o}_1)} P_{j,o}^1 = \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in U(\succ_j, \hat{\mathbf{x}})} P_{j,\mathbf{x}} > \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in U(\succ_j, \hat{\mathbf{x}})} q_{j,\mathbf{x}} = \sum_{o \in U(\succ_j^1, \hat{o}_1)} q_{j,o}^1,$$

which is a contradiction to our assumption. Thus $Q_j^1 = P_j^1$.

Next we prove that for any type $i \leq p$ when $Q_j^{\hat{i}} = P_j^{\hat{i}}$ for every $\hat{i} < i$. For arbitrary $\hat{o}_1, \hat{o}_2, \dots, \hat{o}_i$, let $\hat{\mathbf{x}} = (\hat{o}_1, \dots, \hat{o}_i^*)$ be the least preferred bundle containing them. Because $Q \succ_j^{sd} P$, we have $\sum_{\mathbf{x} \in U(\succ_j, \hat{\mathbf{x}})} P_{j,\mathbf{x}} \leq \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in U(\succ_j, \hat{\mathbf{x}})} q_{j,\mathbf{x}}$, and we take apart the sum like:

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \{(o_1^*) | o_1 \succ_j^1 \hat{o}_1\}} P_{j,\mathbf{x}} + \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \{(\hat{o}_1, o_2^*) | o_2 \succ_j^2 \hat{o}_2\}} P_{j,\mathbf{x}} \\ & + \dots + \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \{(\hat{o}_1, \hat{o}_2, \dots, o_{i-1}^*) | o_{i-1} \succ_j^{i-1} \hat{o}_{i-1}\}} P_{j,\mathbf{x}} + \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in S_i} P_{j,\mathbf{x}} \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

Here we use S_i to refer to the set $\{(\hat{o}_1, \dots, \hat{o}_{i-1}, o_i^*) | o_i \in U(\succ_j^i, \hat{o}_i)\}$. **Claim 2** follows from the observation that agents consume bundles until unavailable. The full proof of the claim is in Appendix A.6.

Claim 2 For $P = \text{MPS}(R)$, given a fixed i' and $Q_j^{\hat{i}} = P_j^{\hat{i}}$ for any $\hat{i} \leq i'$, if $Q \succ_j^{sd} P$, then for $S_i = \{(\hat{o}_1, \dots, \hat{o}_{i-1}, o_i^*) | o_i \in U(\succ_j^i, \hat{o}_i)\}$, $\sum_{\mathbf{x} \in S_i} P_{j,\mathbf{x}} = \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in S_i} q_{j,\mathbf{x}}$.

With (19) and **Claim 2** we obtain $\sum_{\mathbf{x} \in S_i} P_{j,\mathbf{x}} \leq \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in S_i} q_{j,\mathbf{x}}$. We can sum up the inequality by $\hat{o}_1, \hat{o}_2, \dots, \hat{o}_{i-1}$ like

$$\sum_{\hat{o}_1} \sum_{\hat{o}_2} \dots \sum_{\hat{o}_{i-1}} \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in S_i} P_{j,\mathbf{x}} \leq \sum_{\hat{o}_1} \sum_{\hat{o}_2} \dots \sum_{\hat{o}_{i-1}} \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in S_i} q_{j,\mathbf{x}}.$$

Then we have

$$\sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \{(o_i^*) | o_i \in U(\succ_j^i, \hat{o}_i)\}} P_{j,\mathbf{x}} \leq \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \{(o_i^*) | o_i \in U(\succ_j^i, \hat{o}_i)\}} q_{j,\mathbf{x}}$$

It is equal to $\sum_{o_i \in U(\succ_j^i, \hat{o}_i)} P_{j,o_i}^i \leq \sum_{o_i \in U(\succ_j^i, \hat{o}_i)} q_{j,o_i}^i$, which means $Q^i \succ_j^{sd} P^i$.

We have proved that $Q_j^i = P_j^i$ for every $i \leq p$. By **Claim 2**, agent j has the same share over each upper contour set and therefore $Q_j = P_j$. \square

In Theorem 7 we provide two characterizations for MPS. The leximin-optimality reflects the egalitarian nature of the PS mechanism, which means that the mechanism always tries to balance the shares over top ranked items/bundles among all the agents. MPS retains this nature for MTRAs with strict linear preferences. The item-wise ordinal fairness is extended from [22]. We note that item-wise ordinal fairness involves the cumulative shares regarding items, different from the version in [43] which only involves the share of each bundle.

Theorem 7 *MPS is the unique mechanism which (I) satisfies leximin-optimality, and (II) satisfies item-wise ordinal fairness.*

Proof (I) leximin-optimality: Let R be any profile of strict linear preferences. Let $P = \text{MPS}(R)$, $\mathbf{u} = (u_{j,\mathbf{x}})_{j \leq n, \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{D}}$. For $j \leq n$, and bundle $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{D}$, let $u_{j,\mathbf{x}} = \sum_{\hat{\mathbf{x}} \in U(\succ_j, \mathbf{x})} p_{j,\hat{\mathbf{x}}}$. Suppose for the sake of contradiction that P is not leximin-optimal. Then, there exists a fractional assignment Q , such that for $\mathbf{v} = (v_{j,\mathbf{x}})_{j \leq n, \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{D}}$, where $v_{j,\mathbf{x}} = \sum_{\hat{\mathbf{x}} \in U(\succ_j, \mathbf{x})} q_{j,\hat{\mathbf{x}}}$, it holds that $(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{u}) \in L$, where L is the leximin relation (Definition 7). Let \mathbf{u}^* constructed by sorting the components of \mathbf{u} in ascending order, and \mathbf{v}^* be defined on \mathbf{v} similarly.

We prove by induction that $\mathbf{v}^* = \mathbf{u}^*$, i.e. $v_k^* = u_k^*$ for all k , and the corresponding assignments P and Q are identical.

Base case. As the basis of induction, we prove that $u_1^* = v_1^*$. Suppose for the sake of contradiction that $u_1^* < v_1^*$. We use the tuple (j, \mathbf{x}) as the index of the component $u_{j,\mathbf{x}}$, for every agent $j \leq n$, and bundle $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{D}$. Let S_1 be the set of indices, such that for each $(j, \mathbf{x}) \in S_1$, $u_{j,\mathbf{x}} = u_1^*$.

We consider the corresponding elements in \mathbf{v} indicated by the set S_1 . We note that for each $(j, \mathbf{x}) \in S_1$, there are two possible cases:

Case 1. \mathbf{x} is the most preferred bundle w.r.t. \succ_j . Then, $p_{j,\mathbf{x}} = \sum_{\mathbf{x}' \in U(j, \mathbf{x})} p_{j,\mathbf{x}'} = u_1^*$, and $u_1^* < v_1^*$, implies that $p_{j,\mathbf{x}} = u_1^* < v_1^* \leq \sum_{\mathbf{x}' \in U(j, \mathbf{x})} q_{j,\mathbf{x}'} = q_{j,\mathbf{x}}$.

Case 2. \mathbf{x} is not the most preferred bundle w.r.t. \succ_j . Then, for the most preferred bundle $\hat{\mathbf{x}}$ w.r.t. \succ_j , there must exist $p_{j,\hat{\mathbf{x}}} = u_1^*$ as in *Case 1*, since $u_1^* \leq \sum_{\mathbf{x}' \in U(j, \hat{\mathbf{x}})} p_{j,\mathbf{x}'} \leq \sum_{\mathbf{x}' \in U(j, \mathbf{x})} p_{j,\mathbf{x}'} = u_1^*$. This implies that $p_{j,\mathbf{x}} = 0 \leq q_{j,\mathbf{x}}$.

From the execution of MPS, \mathbf{x} must be unavailable at time u_1^* because some items in it are exhausted at that time. Let B_1 denote the set of the items exhausted at time u_1^* . For any $o \in B_1$, we have that $\sum_{(j', \mathbf{x}') \in S_1, o \in \mathbf{x}'} p_{j', \mathbf{x}'} = 1$. With the inequality in *Case 1* and *Case 2* we have $\sum_{(j', \mathbf{x}') \in S_1, o \in \mathbf{x}'} q_{j', \mathbf{x}'} > \sum_{(j', \mathbf{x}') \in S_1, o \in \mathbf{x}'} p_{j', \mathbf{x}'} = 1$ for some $o \in B_1$, which is a contradiction.

Having shown that $u_1^* = v_1^*$, we claim that the shares indicated by S_1 are equal in P and Q , i.e. for any $(j, \mathbf{x}) \in S_1$, $p_{j,\mathbf{x}} = q_{j,\mathbf{x}}$. Suppose for the sake of contradiction, there exists a tuple $(j, \mathbf{x}) \in S_1$ such that $p_{j,\mathbf{x}} < q_{j,\mathbf{x}}$, then for any $o \in \mathbf{x}$ such that $o \in B_1$, there must exist $(\hat{j}, \hat{\mathbf{x}}) \in S_1$ such that $\hat{\mathbf{x}}$ contains o and $p_{\hat{j}, \hat{\mathbf{x}}} > q_{\hat{j}, \hat{\mathbf{x}}} \geq 0$, because for any $o \in B_1$ $\sum_{(j', \mathbf{x}') \in S_1, o \in \mathbf{x}'} p_{j', \mathbf{x}'} = 1$. By *Case 1* we know that $\hat{\mathbf{x}}$ is most preferred by agent \hat{j} , and therefore $u_1^* = \sum_{\mathbf{x}' \in U(\succ_{\hat{j}}, \hat{\mathbf{x}})} p_{\hat{j}, \mathbf{x}'} > \sum_{\mathbf{x}' \in U(\succ_{\hat{j}}, \hat{\mathbf{x}})} q_{\hat{j}, \mathbf{x}'}$ which means $(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) \in L$, a contradiction to the assumption. The claim also means that for all $k \leq |S_1|$, $u_k^* = u_1^* = v_k^*$.

Inductive step. Next, we prove by induction that for any $k > 1$, $u_k^* = v_k^*$ given $u_k^* > u_{k-1}^*$, and $u_l^* = v_l^*$ for $l < k$, and $p_{j,\mathbf{x}} = q_{j,\mathbf{x}}$ for any $(j, \mathbf{x}) \in S_l, l < k$. Suppose for the sake of contradiction that $u_k^* < v_k^*$. Let S_k be the set of indices, such that for each (j, \mathbf{x}) in S_k , $u_{j,\mathbf{x}} = u_k^*$. Let S_k be the set of tuples which correspond to u_k^* . For $(j, \mathbf{x}) \in S_k$, let $\hat{\mathbf{x}}$ be the least preferred bundle in $\{\mathbf{x}' | \mathbf{x}' \succ_j \mathbf{x}\}$ w.r.t. \succ_j , and its corresponding index is $(j, \hat{\mathbf{x}})$. Then, we have $p_{j,\mathbf{x}} = u_k^* - u_{j,\hat{\mathbf{x}}}$. Let $u_l^* = u_{j,\hat{\mathbf{x}}}$. By our initial assumption that $(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{u}) \in L$, we claim that for all $(j, \mathbf{x}) \in S_k$, $p_{j,\mathbf{x}} \leq q_{j,\mathbf{x}}$ and strict for some indices, because

Case 1'. if $(j, \hat{\mathbf{x}}) \notin S_k$, then we have that $l < k$ and $u_k^* > u_l^* = v_l^*$, and therefore $p_{j,\mathbf{x}} = u_k^* - u_l^* < v_k^* - v_l^* = q_{j,\mathbf{x}}$,

Case 2'. if $(j, \hat{\mathbf{x}}) \in S_k$, then $u_l^* = u_k^*$ and $p_{j,\mathbf{x}} = 0 \leq q_{j,\mathbf{x}}$.

W.l.o.g let \mathbf{x} satisfy $p_{j,\mathbf{x}} < q_{j,\mathbf{x}}$. We know \mathbf{x} is unavailable at time u_k^* in the execution of MPS because of exhausted items in it. Let B_k be the set of items exhausted at time u_k^* . For any

$o \in B_k$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{(j', \mathbf{x}') \in \cup_{l < k} S_l, o \in \mathbf{x}'} p_{j', \mathbf{x}'} &= \sum_{(j', \mathbf{x}') \in \cup_{l < k} S_l, o \in \mathbf{x}'} q_{j', \mathbf{x}'} \\ \sum_{(j', \mathbf{x}') \in \cup_{l < k} S_l, o \in \mathbf{x}'} p_{j', \mathbf{x}'} + \sum_{(j', \mathbf{x}') \in S_k, o \in \mathbf{x}'} p_{j', \mathbf{x}'} &= 1. \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

Thus we have $\sum_{(j', \mathbf{x}') \in \cup_{l \leq k} S_l, o \in \mathbf{x}} q_{j', \mathbf{x}'} > \sum_{(j', \mathbf{x}') \in \cup_{l \leq k} S_l, o \in \mathbf{x}} p_{j', \mathbf{x}'} = 1$ for some $o \in B_k$, which is a contradiction.

Then we show if the shares indicated by S_k in P and Q are equal. With $u_k^* = v_k^*$, we claim that

$$\text{for any } (j, \mathbf{x}) \in S_k, p_{j, \mathbf{x}} = q_{j, \mathbf{x}}. \quad (21)$$

If a tuple $(j, \mathbf{x}) \in S_k$ satisfies $p_{j, \mathbf{x}} < q_{j, \mathbf{x}}$, there must exist some $(\hat{j}, \hat{\mathbf{x}}) \in S_k$ such that $p_{\hat{j}, \hat{\mathbf{x}}} > q_{\hat{j}, \hat{\mathbf{x}}} \geq 0$ by (20) since $p_{j', \mathbf{x}'} = q_{j', \mathbf{x}'}$ for $(j', \mathbf{x}') \in S_l, l < k$. Because $p_{\hat{j}, \hat{\mathbf{x}}} > 0$, by *Case 1'* we know that $u_k^* = u_{\hat{j}, \hat{\mathbf{x}}}^* > v_{\hat{j}, \hat{\mathbf{x}}}^*$ which means $(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) \in L$, a contradiction to the assumption. By the claim we also know that for all $k \leq l < k + |S_k|$, $u_l^* = v_l^*$.

By induction, we have $u_k^* = v_k^*$ for all $k \leq n|\mathcal{D}|$ and therefore $\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{v}$. Besides, since $\cup_{k < = |\mathbf{u}|} S_k = N \times \mathcal{D}$, from (21) we have that $p_{j, \mathbf{x}} = q_{j, \mathbf{x}}$ for any $j \in N, \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{D}$.

(II) item-wise ordinal fairness: We use the relation of time and consumption to make the proof and show the uniqueness. Given any MTRA(M,N) and preference profile R , let $P = \text{MPS}(R)$ in the following proof.

Satisfaction: For an arbitrary agent j and any bundle \mathbf{x} , let $t = \sum_{\mathbf{x}' \in U(\succ_j, \mathbf{x})} p_{j, \mathbf{x}'}$. We assume by contradiction that there exists an agent k who gets shares of bundle $\hat{\mathbf{x}}$ containing o i.e. $p_{k, \hat{\mathbf{x}}} > 0$, and $\hat{t} = \sum_{\mathbf{x}' \in U(\succ_k, \hat{\mathbf{x}})} p_{k, \mathbf{x}'} > t$. From the relation of time and consumption, we know that at time t , \mathbf{x} is unavailable and therefore the supply of some item $o \in \mathbf{x}$ is exhausted. We note that t is not necessary to be the exact time when \mathbf{x} become unavailable. We also know that at time \hat{t} , $\hat{\mathbf{x}}$ become unavailable, and therefore for $t < t' < \hat{t}$, $\hat{\mathbf{x}}$ is still available, which also means $o \in \hat{\mathbf{x}}$ is not exhausted, which is a contradiction.

Uniqueness: Suppose Q is another item-wise ordinal fair assignment by contradiction. For some agent j , we can find by comparing P and Q that a bundle \mathbf{x} which satisfies $p_{j, \mathbf{x}} \neq q_{j, \mathbf{x}}$ and $p_{j, \hat{\mathbf{x}}} = q_{j, \hat{\mathbf{x}}}$ for $\hat{\mathbf{x}} \succ_j \mathbf{x}$. W.l.o.g. let agent j and \mathbf{x} just mentioned satisfy that $t = \min(\sum_{\mathbf{x}' \in U(\succ_j, \mathbf{x})} p_{j, \mathbf{x}'}, \sum_{\mathbf{x}' \in U(\succ_j, \mathbf{x})} q_{j, \mathbf{x}'})$ is the smallest among all the agents and bundles. By the selection of j and \mathbf{x} , we have $p_{k, \hat{\mathbf{x}}} = q_{k, \hat{\mathbf{x}}}$ for $(k, \hat{\mathbf{x}}) \in S = \{(k, \hat{\mathbf{x}}) | \sum_{\mathbf{x}' \in U(\succ_k, \hat{\mathbf{x}})} q_{j, \mathbf{x}'} \leq t\}$.

We first claim that $p_{j, \mathbf{x}} > q_{j, \mathbf{x}}$, i.e. $t = \sum_{\mathbf{x}' \in U(\succ_j, \mathbf{x})} q_{j, \mathbf{x}'}$. Otherwise, if $p_{j, \mathbf{x}} < q_{j, \mathbf{x}}$, then agent j get more shares of \mathbf{x} in Q and therefore demands more supply of item contained in \mathbf{x} . Since the assumption also means $t = \sum_{\mathbf{x}' \in U(\succ_j, \mathbf{x})} p_{j, \mathbf{x}'}$, we know that in P there exists an item $o \in \mathbf{x}$ exhausted at t which makes \mathbf{x} unavailable, and the supply of o is also used up in Q for agents and bundles in S . Therefore the extra demand of o for agent j on bundle \mathbf{x} comes from agent k on bundle $\hat{\mathbf{x}}$ containing o such that $(k, \hat{\mathbf{x}}) \in S$, which means $q_{k, \hat{\mathbf{x}}} < p_{k, \hat{\mathbf{x}}}$, a contradiction.

Since $p_{j, \mathbf{x}} > q_{j, \mathbf{x}}$ i.e. $t = \sum_{\mathbf{x}' \in U(\succ_j, \mathbf{x})} q_{j, \mathbf{x}'}$ now, which means agent j gives up some shares of \mathbf{x} in Q , and thus for every $o \in \mathbf{x}$ we can find out some agent k and $\hat{\mathbf{x}}$ containing o such that k gains more shares of $\hat{\mathbf{x}}$ in Q , i.e. $q_{k, \hat{\mathbf{x}}} > p_{k, \hat{\mathbf{x}}} \geq 0$. By the definition of t , we have $\sum_{\mathbf{x}' \in U(\succ_k, \hat{\mathbf{x}})} q_{j, \mathbf{x}'} > t = \sum_{\mathbf{x}' \in U(\succ_j, \mathbf{x})} q_{j, \mathbf{x}'}$. Therefore every $o \in \mathbf{x}$ does not meet the condition of item-wise ordinal fairness, which is contradictory to the assumption that $Q \neq P$ is item-wise ordinal fair. \square

Remark 6 MPS does not satisfy sd-weak-strategyproofness.

Proof Consider an MTRA with two agents where \succ_1, \succ_2 are as below:

Agent	Preferences
1	$1_F 2_B \succ_1 1_F 1_B \succ_1 2_F 1_B \succ_1 2_F 2_B$
2	$1_F 1_B \succ_2 2_F 1_B \succ_2 2_F 2_B \succ_2 1_F 2_B$

MPS outputs P for this preference profile. If agent 1 misreports \succ_1 as $\succ'_1: 2_F 1_B \succ_1 1_F 1_B \succ_1 1_F 2_B \succ_1 2_F 2_B$, then MPS outputs P' . Both P and P' are shown as below:

Agent	P				Agent	P'			
	$1_F 1_B$	$1_F 2_B$	$2_F 1_B$	$2_F 2_B$		$1_F 1_B$	$1_F 2_B$	$2_F 1_B$	$2_F 2_B$
1	0	0.5	0.25	0.25	1	0	0.5	0.5	0
2	0.5	0	0.25	0.25	2	0.5	0	0	0.5

We have that $P' \succ_1^{sd} P$ and $P' \neq P$ by shifting agent 1's share from $2_F 2_B$ to $2_F 1_B$, which violates the requirement of sd-weak-strategyproofness i.e. $P'_1 = P_1$ if $P' \succ_1^{sd} P$. \square

6 Conclusion and Future Work

In the paper, we first point out that it is impossible to design sd-efficient and sd-envy-free mechanisms for MTRAs with indivisible items. However, under the natural assumption that agents' preferences are lexicographic, we propose LexiPS as a mechanism which can deal with indivisible items while satisfying the desired efficiency and fairness properties of sd-efficiency and sd-envy-freeness.

For divisible items, we show that MPS satisfies the stronger efficiency notion of lexi-efficiency in addition to sd-envy-freeness under the unrestricted domain of linear preferences, and is sd-weak-strategyproof under lexicographic preferences, which complement the results in [43]. We also provide two separate characterizations for MPS by leximin-optimality and item-wise ordinal fairness. We also show that every assignment that satisfies no-generalized-cycle, a sufficient condition for sd-efficiency, can be computed by an eating algorithm.


Characterizing the domain of preferences under which it is possible to design mechanisms for MTRAs with indivisible items that are simultaneously fair, efficient, and strategyproof is an exciting topic for future research. For divisible items, characterizations of mechanisms for MTRAs satisfying sd-efficiency and sd-envy-freeness, in addition to other combinations of desirable properties, is an interesting topic for future work. In addition, developing efficient and fair mechanisms for natural extensions of the MTRA problem such as settings where there are demands for multiple units of each type, or initial endowments is also an exciting new avenue for future research.

A Appendix

A.1 Proof of Remark 1

We use the MTRA with the following LP-tree preference profile R as a tool to prove the tighter result. We also show \succ_1 by a LP-tree.

Agent	Preferences
1	$1_F 1_B \succ_1 1_F 2_B \succ_1 2_F 2_B \succ_1 2_F 1_B$
2	$1_F 2_B \succ_2 1_F 1_B \succ_2 2_F 1_B \succ_2 2_F 2_B$



Suppose that f satisfies sd-weak-efficiency and sd-weak-envy-freeness, and let $Q = f(R)$. As in the proof of Theorem 1, we show that such a decomposable assignment Q in the following does not exist.

Agent	Q			
	$1_F 1_B$	$1_F 2_B$	$2_F 1_B$	$2_F 2_B$
1	v	w	y	z
2	z	y	w	v

From agent 1's preference, we observe that she does not get shares of $1_F 2_B$ and $2_F 1_B$ simultaneously, because that means she can mix up the items in them to get $1_F 1_B$ that better than $1_F 2_B$ and $2_F 2_B$ that better than $2_F 1_B$. With the similar reason, agent 2 does not get shares of $1_F 1_B$ and $2_F 2_B$ simultaneously. This means that in the assignment Q , there are at least two variants are 0: either v or z is 0, and either y or w is 0.

We first exclude the case that v, w, y, z are all 0 for $v + w + y + z = 1$, and consider the cases that there are three variants are 0, which means Q is a discrete assignment. The assignments that assign any agent with her least preferable bundle, i.e. $2_F 1_B$ to agent 1 or $2_F 2_B$ to agent 2, are excluded because it violates sd-weak-envy-freeness. The other possible cases are: If Q assigns $1_F 2_B$ to agent 1 and $2_F 1_B$ to agent 2, then agent 2 envies agent 1 due to $1_F 2_B \succ_2 2_F 1_B$; If Q assigns $2_F 2_B$ to agent 1 and $1_F 1_B$ to agent 2, then agent 1 envies agent 2 due to $1_F 1_B \succ_1 2_F 2_B$. Both cases violate sd-weak-envy-freeness.

Therefore the only possibility is that two variants are 0, and we list all the possible combination of variants as following and explain in brief why they fail to meet the requirements:

($v \neq 0, y \neq 0$): There exists a generalized cycle $(2_F 2_B, 2_F 1_B), (2_F 1_B, 2_F 2_B)$;

($v \neq 0, w \neq 0$): $Q_1 \neq Q_2$ and $Q_1 \succ_2^{sd} Q_2$;

($y \neq 0, z \neq 0$): $Q_2 \neq Q_1$ and $Q_2 \succ_1^{sd} Q_1$;

($w \neq 0, z \neq 0$): There exists a generalized cycle $(1_F 1_B, 1_F 2_B), (1_F 2_B, 1_F 1_B)$.

By (1) in Proposition 1, the existence of generalized cycle means violating sd-efficiency, i.e. sd-weak-efficiency in this problem since there are only two agents. Therefore we can conclude that such a mechanism f does not exist. \square

A.2 Proof of (1) in Proposition 1

Proof The proof involves showing that every fractional assignment which is not sd-efficient admits a generalized cycle. Let P be such as fractional assignment for a given MTRA. Then, there exists another fractional assignment $Q \neq P$ such that $Q \succ^{sd} P$. We show that the set of tuples which shows the difference between P and Q is a generalized cycle on P .

Let $\hat{N} = \{j \leq n : P_j \neq Q_j\} \subseteq N$. By definition of sd-efficiency, for every $j \in \hat{N}$, $Q_j \succ_j^{sd} P_j$. Let C be the set of all tuples $(\mathbf{x}, \hat{\mathbf{x}})$ such that $\mathbf{x} \succ_j \hat{\mathbf{x}}$ and $q_{j,\mathbf{x}} > p_{j,\mathbf{x}}, q_{j,\hat{\mathbf{x}}} < p_{j,\hat{\mathbf{x}}}$ for some $j \in \hat{N}$. Therefore at a high level, from C we can learn all the difference of shares for bundles in allocations of agents in P and Q . First we prove the following claim:

Claim 3 For any agent $j \in \hat{N}$, there exists a bundle with a greater share in Q_j than in P_j , and this bundle is ranked above all bundles with a smaller share.

In fact, we can prove the claim by supposing for the sake of contradiction that there is a bundle $\hat{\mathbf{x}}$ with a smaller share in Q which is ranked above all bundles with a greater share, i.e. for every $\mathbf{x} \succ_j \hat{\mathbf{x}}$, $p_{j,\hat{\mathbf{x}}} > q_{j,\hat{\mathbf{x}}}$ and $p_{j,\mathbf{x}} \geq q_{j,\mathbf{x}}$. This implies that $\sum_{\mathbf{x} \in U(\succ_j, \hat{\mathbf{x}})} p_{j,\mathbf{x}} > \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in U(\succ_j, \hat{\mathbf{x}})} q_{j,\mathbf{x}}$, which is a contradiction to our assumption that $Q \succ^{sd} P$.

Then We show that C is not empty. If $q_{j,\mathbf{x}} \geq p_{j,\mathbf{x}}, j \in \hat{N}$ for every $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{D}$, then $P_j = Q_j$, a contradiction to our initial assumption. Thus there exists $\hat{\mathbf{x}}$ which satisfies $q_{j,\hat{\mathbf{x}}} < p_{j,\hat{\mathbf{x}}}$, which means there is a tuple $(\mathbf{x}, \hat{\mathbf{x}}) \in C$ according to **Claim 3**. Therefore, $C \neq \emptyset$ since $P \neq Q$. Since $p_{j,\hat{\mathbf{x}}} > q_{j,\hat{\mathbf{x}}} \geq 0$, we have that $(\mathbf{x}, \hat{\mathbf{x}}) \in \text{Imp}(P)$, which implies that $C \subseteq \text{Imp}(P)$.

Suppose for sake of contradiction that C is not a generalized cycle. W.l.o.g. let o be an item such that for any bundle \mathbf{x} containing o , \mathbf{x} is always the left component of any improvable tuple involving \mathbf{x} in C . If so, we have that:

- (i) for $j \notin \hat{N}$, $q_{j,\mathbf{x}} = p_{j,\mathbf{x}}$ trivially by the assumption,
- (ii) for $j \in \hat{N}$, $q_{j,\mathbf{x}} \geq p_{j,\mathbf{x}}$. Because if $q_{j,\mathbf{x}_0} < p_{j,\mathbf{x}_0}$ for some \mathbf{x}_0 containing o , then by **Claim 3** there will be a tuple $(\hat{\mathbf{x}}_0, \mathbf{x}_0) \in \text{Imp}(P)$ where \mathbf{x}_0 is the right component and $\hat{\mathbf{x}}_0$ contains o , which is a contradiction. Specifically, for $(\mathbf{x}, \hat{\mathbf{x}}) \in C$ where $o \in \mathbf{x}$, $q_{j,\mathbf{x}} > p_{j,\mathbf{x}}$ exists for some $j \in \hat{N}$ because otherwise $q_{j,\mathbf{x}} = p_{j,\mathbf{x}}$ and therefore \mathbf{x} is not in any tuple in C .

Therefore we have $\sum_{j \leq n, o \in \mathbf{x}} q_{j,\mathbf{x}} > \sum_{j \leq n, o \in \mathbf{x}} p_{j,\mathbf{x}} = 1$, a contradiction to our assumption that Q is a fractional assignment. That means C satisfies one of the requirements of generalized cycle: If an tuple $(\mathbf{x}_1, \hat{\mathbf{x}}_1) \in C$ satisfies that $o \in \mathbf{x}_1$, then there exists a tuple $(\mathbf{x}_2, \hat{\mathbf{x}}_2) \in C$ such that $o \in \hat{\mathbf{x}}_2$. Thus C is a generalized cycle on P . \square

A.3 Proof of Proposition 2

Proof We begin our proof with any MTRA(N, M) with an arbitrary preference R . Throughout, we use P to refer to MPS(R). We first give a few observations about MPS which are helpful for understanding the following proof. We know that MPS executes multiple rounds which end when some items are exhausted and we label all the rounds by time. Let j be an arbitrary agent. Here we consider the round $r_{k_m} \in \{r_{k_1}, r_{k_2}, \dots\}$ where agent j stop consuming a bundle. We note that these rounds are not necessarily continuous because agent j may not change her current most preferred bundles for every round. Without loss of generality, let $r_{k_m} < r_{k_{\hat{m}}}$ if $m < \hat{m}$.

Let \mathbf{x}_{k_m} denote the bundle consumed by j at round r_{k_m} of MPS. Let $t_{k_0} = 0$, and for any round r_{k_m} , let t_{k_m} be the units of time elapsed from the start of the mechanism till the end of round r_{k_m} . Then, by construction of MPS, we have that for any round r_{k_m} , $m > 1$, $p_{j,\mathbf{x}_{k_m}} = t_{k_m} - t_{k_{m-1}}$. Specially, when $m = 1$, $p_{j,\mathbf{x}_{k_1}} = t_{k_1} - t_{k_0}$ trivially. This implies that

$$t_{k_m} = t_{k_m} - t_{k_0} = \sum_{\hat{m}=1}^m (t_{k_{\hat{m}}} - t_{k_{\hat{m}-1}}) = \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in U(\succ_j, \mathbf{x}_{k_m})} p_{j,\mathbf{x}}. \quad (22)$$

For any round r_{k_m} , and any $\hat{\mathbf{x}}$ such that $\mathbf{x}_{k_m} \succ_j \hat{\mathbf{x}} \succ_j \mathbf{x}_{k_{m+1}}$, $\hat{\mathbf{x}}$ is not consumed by j i.e. $p_{j,\hat{\mathbf{x}}} = 0$. Therefore it must hold that $\hat{\mathbf{x}}$ is unavailable by the end of round r_{k_m} . Let \hat{t} denote the time at which $\hat{\mathbf{x}}$ becomes unavailable. Then,

$$\hat{t} \leq t_{k_m} = \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in U(\succ_j, \mathbf{x}_{k_m})} p_{j,\mathbf{x}} = \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in U(\succ_j, \hat{\mathbf{x}})} p_{j,\mathbf{x}}. \quad (23)$$

Suppose for the sake of contradiction that there is a pair of agents j, \hat{j} such that j envies \hat{j} at P . Then, $P_j \not\preceq_j^{sd} P_{\hat{j}}$ and there exists a bundle $\hat{\mathbf{x}}$ which satisfies $\sum_{\mathbf{x} \in U(\succ_j, \hat{\mathbf{x}})} p_{j,\mathbf{x}} > \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in U(\succ_{\hat{j}}, \hat{\mathbf{x}})} p_{\hat{j},\mathbf{x}}$.

Let $t = \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in U(\succ_j, \hat{\mathbf{x}})} p_{j,\mathbf{x}}$ and $\hat{t} = \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in U(\succ_{\hat{j}}, \hat{\mathbf{x}})} p_{\hat{j},\mathbf{x}}$. It is easy to see that it must hold that $t < \hat{t}$. The rest of the proof involves showing that due to the construction of MPS, $\hat{t} \leq t$, contradicting our assumption.

Now, let \mathbf{x}' be the bundle least preferred by \hat{j} while satisfying $\mathbf{x}' \in U(\succ_j, \hat{\mathbf{x}})$ and $p_{\hat{j},\mathbf{x}'} > 0$. Such a \mathbf{x}' must exist. Otherwise, $p_{\hat{j},\mathbf{x}} = 0$ for every $\mathbf{x} \in U(\succ_j, \hat{\mathbf{x}})$ which implies that $\hat{t} = 0 \leq t$, a contradiction.

Let t' be the time at which \mathbf{x}' becomes unavailable. Due to $U(\succ_j, \mathbf{x}') \subseteq U(\succ_j, \hat{\mathbf{x}})$, we can deduce that $t' \leq \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in U(\succ_j, \mathbf{x}')} p_{j,\mathbf{x}} \leq \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in U(\succ_j, \hat{\mathbf{x}})} p_{j,\mathbf{x}} = t$ by (23). Also, we have $t' = \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in U(\succ_{\hat{j}}, \mathbf{x}')} p_{\hat{j},\mathbf{x}}$ by (22). By the selection of \mathbf{x}' , we have the following set relation: $U(\succ_j, \hat{\mathbf{x}}) \setminus \{\mathbf{x} : p_{\hat{j},\mathbf{x}} = 0\} \subseteq U(\succ_{\hat{j}}, \mathbf{x}')$. Therefore we can deduce that

$$\hat{t} = \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in U(\succ_j, \hat{\mathbf{x}}) \setminus \{\mathbf{x} : p_{\hat{j},\mathbf{x}} = 0\}} p_{\hat{j},\mathbf{x}} \leq \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in U(\succ_{\hat{j}}, \mathbf{x}')} p_{\hat{j},\mathbf{x}} = t'.$$

This implies $\hat{t} \leq t' \leq t$, a contradiction. \square

A.4 Full Proof of (\Rightarrow) part in Theorem 5

Proof (\Rightarrow) Let R be an arbitrary preference profile, and let P be an arbitrary assignment satisfying no-generalized-cycle w.r.t. R . For convenience, we define some quantities to represent the state during the execution of a member of the family of eating algorithms at each round s . For ease of exposition, we use $s = 0$ to represent the initial state before the start of execution. Let $M^0 = M$, $\mathcal{D}^0 = \mathcal{D}$. Let $B^s = \{o \in M^{s-1} : \text{there are no } \mathbf{x}, \hat{\mathbf{x}} \in \mathcal{D}^{s-1} \text{ s.t. } o \in \hat{\mathbf{x}} \text{ and } (\mathbf{x}, \hat{\mathbf{x}}) \in \text{Imp}(P)\}$, $M^s = M^{s-1} - B^s$ and $\mathcal{D}^s = \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{D} : \text{for every } o \in \mathbf{x}, o \in M^s\}$ be the available bundles in M^s . We note that for any $M^{s-1} \neq \emptyset$, $B^s \neq \emptyset$. Otherwise, for any $o \in M^{s-1}$, there exists

$\mathbf{x}, \hat{\mathbf{x}} \in \mathcal{D}^{s-1}$ s.t. $o \in \hat{\mathbf{x}}$ and $(\mathbf{x}, \hat{\mathbf{x}}) \in \text{Imp}(P)$ which implies $\text{Imp}(P)$ admits a generalized cycle, a contradiction. Hence, $M^s = \emptyset$ for some $s \leq np$. Let $S = \min\{s : M^s = \emptyset\}$. Let $\omega_j(t)$ be the eating rate of agent j at time t , $N(\mathbf{x}, \mathcal{D}^s)$ be the set of agents who prefer \mathbf{x} best in the available bundles \mathcal{D}^s for any $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{D}^s$. The following eating speed functions ω_j define the algorithm:

$$\forall s \leq S, \frac{s-1}{S} \leq t \leq \frac{s}{S}, \omega_j(t) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \begin{cases} S \times p_{j,\mathbf{x}}, & \exists o \in \mathbf{x}, o \in B^s \text{ and } j \in N(\mathbf{x}, \mathcal{D}^{s-1}) \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

From the design of algorithm, we know that items in B^s decide which bundles in \mathcal{D}^{s-1} are consumed in round s , and these items are not consumed after the round s . Note that $j \in N(\mathbf{x}, \mathcal{D}^{s-1})$ implies $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{D}^{s-1}$. We claim that the algorithm specified by the eating speed functions $\omega = (\omega_j)_{j \in N}$ above, outputs P for the MTRA with preference profile R . Let Q be the output of the eating algorithm. We prove $P = Q$ with induction.

Base case. For any $o \in B^1$, $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{D}$ s.t. $o \in \mathbf{x}$, we prove $\forall j \in N, p_{j,\mathbf{x}} = q_{j,\mathbf{x}}$. For any $o \in B^1$, suppose

$$\sum_{o \in \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{D}^0} \sum_{j \in N(\mathbf{x}, \mathcal{D}^0)} p_{j,\mathbf{x}} < \sum_{o \in \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{D}^0} \sum_{j \in N} p_{j,\mathbf{x}} = 1.$$

Then, there exists $\mathbf{x}, \hat{\mathbf{x}} \in \mathcal{D}^0$ and $\hat{j} \in N(\mathbf{x}, \mathcal{D}^0)$ such that $\mathbf{x} \succ_{\hat{j}} \hat{\mathbf{x}}$, $o \in \hat{\mathbf{x}}$ and $p_{\hat{j},\hat{\mathbf{x}}} > 0$, which implies that o is not in B^1 , a contradiction. Hence, we have

$$\sum_{o \in \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{D}^0} \sum_{j \in N(\mathbf{x}, \mathcal{D}^0)} p_{j,\mathbf{x}} = \sum_{o \in \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{D}^0} \sum_{j \in N} p_{j,\mathbf{x}} = 1.$$

That implies for any $o \in B^1$, $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{D}^0$ s.t. $o \in \mathbf{x}$, if j is not in $N(\mathbf{x}, \mathcal{D}^0)$, then $p_{j,\mathbf{x}} = 0$.

Then for any $o \in B^1$, $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{D}^0$ s.t. $o \in \mathbf{x}$ and $j \in N(\mathbf{x}, \mathcal{D}^0)$, we prove that agent j consumes exactly $p_{j,\mathbf{x}}$ units of bundle \mathbf{x} . We know that \mathbf{x} is available in $0 \leq t \leq \frac{1}{S}$ and agent j consumes \mathbf{x} in $0 \leq t \leq \frac{1}{S}$. Therefore, $q_{j,\mathbf{x}} \geq \frac{1}{S} \times S \times p_{j,\mathbf{x}} = p_{j,\mathbf{x}}$. Hence,

$$\sum_{o \in \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{D}^0} \sum_{j \in N(\mathbf{x}, \mathcal{D}^0)} q_{j,\mathbf{x}} \geq \sum_{o \in \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{D}^0} \sum_{j \in N(\mathbf{x}, \mathcal{D}^0)} p_{j,\mathbf{x}} = 1.$$

Since,

$$\sum_{o \in \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{D}^0} \sum_{j \in N(\mathbf{x}, \mathcal{D}^0)} q_{j,\mathbf{x}} \leq \sum_{o \in \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{D}^0} \sum_{j \in N} q_{j,\mathbf{x}} = 1,$$

we have

$$\sum_{o \in \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{D}^0} \sum_{j \in N(\mathbf{x}, \mathcal{D}^0)} q_{j,\mathbf{x}} = \sum_{o \in \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{D}^0} \sum_{j \in N(\mathbf{x}, \mathcal{D}^0)} p_{j,\mathbf{x}} = 1.$$

That implies for any $o \in B^1$, $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{D}^0$ s.t. $o \in \mathbf{x}$, (i) if $j \in N(\mathbf{x}, \mathcal{D}^0)$, $p_{j,\mathbf{x}} = q_{j,\mathbf{x}}$; (ii) if j is not in $N(\mathbf{x}, \mathcal{D}^0)$, $q_{j,\mathbf{x}} = 0$. Therefore, for any $o \in B^1$, $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{D}$ s.t. $o \in \mathbf{x}$ and any $j \in N$, $p_{j,\mathbf{x}} = q_{j,\mathbf{x}}$.

Inductive step. Assume for any $o \in \bigcup_{k=1}^s B^k$, $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{D}$ s.t. $o \in \mathbf{x}$ and any $j \in N$,

$$p_{j,\mathbf{x}} = q_{j,\mathbf{x}}. \quad (24)$$

We prove for any $o \in B^{s+1}$, $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{D}$ s.t. $o \in \mathbf{x}$ and any $j \in N$, $p_{j,\mathbf{x}} = q_{j,\mathbf{x}}$. If \mathbf{x} is not in \mathcal{D}^s , there is $\hat{o} \in \bigcup_{k=1}^s B^k$ such that $\hat{o} \in \mathbf{x}$ and we have $p_{j,\mathbf{x}} = q_{j,\mathbf{x}}$ by assumption (24). For any $o \in B^{s+1}$, suppose

$$\sum_{o \in \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{D}^s} \sum_{j \in N(\mathbf{x}, \mathcal{D}^s)} p_{j,\mathbf{x}} + \sum_{o \in \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x} \text{ not in } \mathcal{D}^s} \sum_{j \in N} p_{j,\mathbf{x}} < \sum_{o \in \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{D}^s} \sum_{j \in N} p_{j,\mathbf{x}} = 1.$$

Then, there exists $\mathbf{x}, \hat{\mathbf{x}} \in \mathcal{D}^s$ and $\hat{j} \in N(\mathbf{x}, \mathcal{D}^s)$ such that $\mathbf{x} \succ_{\hat{j}} \hat{\mathbf{x}}$, $o \in \hat{\mathbf{x}}$ and $p_{\hat{j},\hat{\mathbf{x}}} > 0$, which implies that o is not in B^{s+1} , a contradiction. Hence, we have

$$\sum_{o \in \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{D}^s} \sum_{j \in N(\mathbf{x}, \mathcal{D}^s)} p_{j,\mathbf{x}} + \sum_{o \in \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x} \text{ not in } \mathcal{D}^s} \sum_{j \in N} p_{j,\mathbf{x}} = \sum_{o \in \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{D}^s} \sum_{j \in N} p_{j,\mathbf{x}} = 1.$$

That implies for any $o \in B^{s+1}$, $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{D}^s$ s.t. $o \in \mathbf{x}$, if j is not in $N(\mathbf{x}, \mathcal{D}^s)$, then $p_{j,\mathbf{x}} = 0$.

For any $o \in B^{s+1}$, $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{D}^s$ s.t. $o \in \mathbf{x}$ and $j \in N(\mathbf{x}, \mathcal{D}^s)$, we prove that agent j consumes exactly $p_{j,\mathbf{x}}$ units of bundle \mathbf{x} . By the assumption (24), for any $\hat{o} \in M^s$, \hat{o} remains $\sum_{\hat{o} \in \hat{\mathbf{x}}, \hat{\mathbf{x}} \in \mathcal{D}^s} \sum_{j \in N(\hat{\mathbf{x}}, \mathcal{D}^s)} p_{j,\hat{\mathbf{x}}}$ at least at time $t = \frac{s}{S}$.

Hence, \mathbf{x} is available in $\frac{\varepsilon}{S} \leq t \leq \frac{\varepsilon+1}{S}$ and agent j consumes \mathbf{x} in $\frac{\varepsilon}{S} \leq t \leq \frac{\varepsilon+1}{S}$. Therefore, $q_{j,\mathbf{x}} \geq \frac{1}{S} \times S \times p_{j,\mathbf{x}} = p_{j,\mathbf{x}}$. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{o \in \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{D}^s} \sum_{j \in N(\mathbf{x}, \mathcal{D}^s)} q_{j,\mathbf{x}} + \sum_{o \in \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x} \text{ not in } \mathcal{D}^s} \sum_{j \in N} q_{j,\mathbf{x}} &\geq \\ \sum_{o \in \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{D}^s} \sum_{j \in N(\mathbf{x}, \mathcal{D}^s)} p_{j,\mathbf{x}} + \sum_{o \in \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x} \text{ not in } \mathcal{D}^s} \sum_{j \in N} p_{j,\mathbf{x}} &= 1. \end{aligned}$$

Since,

$$\sum_{o \in \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{D}^s} \sum_{j \in N(\mathbf{x}, \mathcal{D}^s)} q_{j,\mathbf{x}} + \sum_{o \in \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x} \text{ not in } \mathcal{D}^s} \sum_{j \in N} q_{j,\mathbf{x}} \leq \sum_{o \in \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{D}^s} \sum_{j \in N} q_{j,\mathbf{x}} = 1,$$

we have

$$\sum_{o \in \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{D}^s} \sum_{j \in N(\mathbf{x}, \mathcal{D}^s)} q_{j,\mathbf{x}} + \sum_{o \in \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x} \text{ not in } \mathcal{D}^s} \sum_{j \in N} q_{j,\mathbf{x}} = 1,$$

That implies for any $o \in B^{s+1}$, $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{D}^s$ s.t. $o \in \mathbf{x}$, (i) if $j \in N(\mathbf{x}, \mathcal{D}^s)$, $p_{j,\mathbf{x}} = q_{j,\mathbf{x}}$; (ii) if j is not in $N(\mathbf{x}, \mathcal{D}^s)$, $q_{j,\mathbf{x}} = 0$. Therefore, for any $o \in B^{s+1}$, $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{D}^s$ s.t. $o \in \mathbf{x}$ and any $j \in N$, $p_{j,\mathbf{x}} = q_{j,\mathbf{x}}$.

By induction, we have for any $o \in \bigcup_{k=1}^s B^k$, $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{D}$ s.t. $o \in \mathbf{x}$ and any $j \in N$, $p_{j,\mathbf{x}} = q_{j,\mathbf{x}}$. That is to say, for any $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{D}$ and $j \in N$, $p_{j,\mathbf{x}} = q_{j,\mathbf{x}}$. \square

A.5 Proof of Claim 1 in Theorem 6

Proof We know that each agent does the following things repeatedly in PS: consuming her most preferred and unexhausted item till it is exhausted. To prove the claim, we show that agents in MPS executes the same in each type as they does in PS, i.e. for any $i \leq p$, $j \leq n$, agent j still consumes her most preferred and unexhausted item in type i while consuming her most preferred and available bundle. In the following discussion, we use $(\hat{o}, \mathbf{x} \setminus o)$ to denote the bundle replacing o with \hat{o} in \mathbf{x} .

W.l.o.g. we discuss the behavior of agent j in MPS for type i . At the beginning of MPS, the bundle consumed by agent j , denoted by \mathbf{x}_1 , is her most preferred bundle regarding \succ_j . By Definition 9, the most preferred bundle contains agent j 's most preferred item in type i regarding \succ_j^i . That means when agent j consumes \mathbf{x}_1 , she also consumes her most preferred item $o_1 = D_i(\mathbf{x}_1)$. When the consumption of \mathbf{x}_1 pauses, agent j turns to the bundle consumed after \mathbf{x}_1 , denoted by \mathbf{x}_2 . We note that \mathbf{x}_2 does not need to be the second preferred regarding \succ_j . There are two kinds of cases before consuming \mathbf{x}_2 : (i) $D_{i_0}(\mathbf{x}_1)$ is exhausted, $i_0 \neq i$, (ii) o_1 is exhausted.

We claim that $D_i(\mathbf{x}_2)$ is the most preferred and unexhausted item in type i just after \mathbf{x}_1 is unavailable. For Case (i), the agent j 's most preferred item in type i is still o_1 . We claim that $o_1 \in \mathbf{x}_2$. Otherwise, suppose that $o_2 = D_i(\mathbf{x}_2) \neq o_1$. Then $o_1 \succ_j^i o_2$. Because $D_{i_0}((o_1, \mathbf{x}_2 \setminus o_2)) = D_{i_0}(\mathbf{x}_2)$ for $i_0 \triangleright_j i$ and $o_1 = D_i((o_1, \mathbf{x} \setminus o_2)) \succ_j^i D_i(\mathbf{x}_2) = o_2$, it follows that $(o_1, \mathbf{x}_2 \setminus o_2) \succ_j \mathbf{x}_2$, which is a contradiction to the fact that \mathbf{x}_2 is the next preferred bundle for agent j . For Case (ii), let M_1 be the set of unexhausted items just after \mathbf{x}_1 is unavailable in MPS, and $o_2 \in M_1 \cap D_i$ be agent j 's most preferred and unexhausted item in D_i regarding \succ_j^i . We also note that o_2 does not need to be the second preferred item regarding \succ_j^i . By Algorithm 2, we know that $o_2 = D_i(\mathbf{x}_2)$, and we can obtain that $\mathbf{x}_2 \succ_j (o_2', \mathbf{x}_2 \setminus o_2)$ if $o_2' \in M_1 \cap D_i$ and $o_2' \neq o_2$.

The claim in the previous paragraph can be applied to the general case when \mathbf{x}_k is unavailable and turns to \mathbf{x}_{k+1} , and we have that $D_i(\mathbf{x}_{k+1})$ is always the most preferred and unexhausted item in type i just after \mathbf{x}_k is unavailable. We note again that \mathbf{x}_k does not need to be the k th preferred regarding \succ_j , and \mathbf{x}_{k+1} only refers to the bundle consumed after \mathbf{x}_k . From the result of proof, we can observe that agent j consumes the bundle containing the most preferred and unexhausted item in type i . That is exactly what agent j does in PS of type i . This result can be extended to any agent and any type. Thus each single type fractional assignment of P is the same as the one produced by PS of that type.

A.6 Proof of Claim 2 in Theorem 6

Proof When $\hat{i} \leq i' = 1$ i.e. $P_j^1 = Q_j^1$, the claim means for $S_1 = \{(o_1^*) | o_1 \in U(\succ_j^1, \hat{o}_1)\}$,

$$\sum_{\mathbf{x} \in S_1} p_{j,\mathbf{x}} = \sum_{o \in U(\succ_j^1, \hat{o}_1)} p_{j,o}^1 = \sum_{o \in U(\succ_j^1, \hat{o}_1)} q_{j,o}^1 = \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in S_1} q_{j,\mathbf{x}},$$

which is trivially true.

Given $P^i = Q^i$ for $\hat{i} \leq i'$ and the claim is true for $\hat{i} \leq i' - 1$, which also means

$$\sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \{(\hat{o}_1, \dots, \hat{o}_{i-1}, o_i^*) | o_i \succ_j^i \hat{o}_i\}} p_{j,\mathbf{x}} = \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \{(\hat{o}_1, \dots, \hat{o}_{i-1}, o_i^*) | o_i \succ_j^i \hat{o}_i\}} q_{j,\mathbf{x}}, \quad (25)$$

we prove that it is also true for i' . Let $\hat{\mathbf{x}}$ denote the least preferred bundle containing $\hat{o}_1, \dots, \hat{o}_{i'}$. Since $P_j^{\hat{i}} = Q_j^{\hat{i}}$ for $\hat{i} \leq i'$, we have that $\sum_{\mathbf{x} \in U(\succ_j, \hat{\mathbf{x}})} p_{j,\mathbf{x}} \geq \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in U(\succ_j, \hat{\mathbf{x}})} q_{j,\mathbf{x}} \cdot \min_{\hat{o}_i \in \mathbf{x}, i \leq i'} \sum_{o \in U(\succ_j, \hat{o}_i)} P_o^{\hat{i}}$. That is because agent j consumes bundles in the set $U(\succ_j, \hat{\mathbf{x}})$ until they are unavailable in P , and therefore she is unable to get more on this set given the same shares of items. Because $Q \succ_j^{sd} P$, we have $\sum_{\mathbf{x} \in U(\succ_j, \hat{\mathbf{x}})} p_{j,\mathbf{x}} = \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in U(\succ_j, \hat{\mathbf{x}})} q_{j,\mathbf{x}}$. We also have that $\sum_{\mathbf{x} \in U(\succ_j, \hat{\mathbf{x}})} p_{j,\mathbf{x}} = \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in U(\succ_j, \hat{\mathbf{x}})} q_{j,\mathbf{x}}$, which is equal to

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \{(o_1^*) | o_1 \succ_j^1 \hat{o}_1\}} p_{j,\mathbf{x}} + \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \{(\hat{o}_1, o_2^*) | o_2 \succ_j^2 \hat{o}_2\}} p_{j,\mathbf{x}} + \dots + \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \{(\hat{o}_1, \hat{o}_2, o_{i-1}^*) | o_{i-1} \succ_j^{i-1} \hat{o}_{i-1}\}} q_{j,\mathbf{x}} + \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in S_{i'}} p_{j,\mathbf{x}} \\ = & \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \{(o_1^*) | o_1 \succ_j^1 \hat{o}_1\}} q_{j,\mathbf{x}} + \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \{(\hat{o}_1, o_2^*) | o_2 \succ_j^2 \hat{o}_2\}} q_{j,\mathbf{x}} + \dots + \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \{(\hat{o}_1, \hat{o}_2, o_{i-1}^*) | o_{i-1} \succ_j^{i-1} \hat{o}_{i-1}\}} q_{j,\mathbf{x}} + \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in S_{i'}} q_{j,\mathbf{x}}. \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

Here $S_{i'} = \{(\hat{o}_1, \dots, \hat{o}_{i'-1}, o_{i'}^*) | o_{i'} \in U(\succ_j^i, \hat{o}_{i'})\}$. Therefore by subtracting (25) for all $\hat{i} < i'$ from (26) we have that $\sum_{\mathbf{x} \in S_{i'}} p_{j,\mathbf{x}} = \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in S_{i'}} q_{j,\mathbf{x}}$. \square

References

1. Abdulkadiroğlu A, Sönmez T (1998) Random serial dictatorship and the core from random endowments in house allocation problems. *Econometrica* 66(3):689–702
2. Abdulkadiroğlu A, Sönmez T (1999) House allocation with existing tenants. *Journal of Economic Theory* 88:233–260
3. Athanassoglou S, Sethuraman J (2011) House allocation with fractional endowments. *International Journal of Game Theory* 40(3):481–513
4. Aziz H, Stursberg P (2014) A generalization of probabilistic serial to randomized social choice. In: *Proceedings of the Twenty-Eighth AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, AAAI Press, AAAI14, pp 559–565
5. Birkhoff G (1946) Three observations on linear algebra. *Universidad Nacional de Tucuman, Revista, Serie A* 5:147–151
6. Bogomolnaia A (2015) Random assignment: redefining the serial rule. *Journal of Economic Theory* 158:308–318
7. Bogomolnaia A, Heo EJ (2012) Probabilistic assignment of objects: characterizing the serial rule. *Journal of Economic Theory* 147(5):2072–2082
8. Bogomolnaia A, Moulin H (2001) A new solution to the random assignment problem. *Journal of Economic Theory* 100(2):295–328
9. Bogomolnaia A, Moulin H, Stong R (2005) Collective choice under dichotomous preferences. *Journal of Economic Theory* 122(2):165–184
10. Booth R, Chevaleyre Y, Lang J, Mengin J, Sombattheera C (2010) Learning conditionally lexicographic preference relations. In: *Proceedings of the 2010 Conference on ECAI 2010: 19th European Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, IOS Press, NLD, p 269274
11. Boutilier C, Brafman R, Domshlak C, Hoos H, Poole D (2004) CP-nets: A tool for representing and reasoning with conditional ceteris paribus statements. *Journal of artificial intelligence research* 21:135–191
12. Brams SJ, Taylor AD (1996) *Fair fivision: from cake-cutting to dispute resolution*. Cambridge University Press
13. Chevaleyre Y, Dunne PE, Endriss U, Lang J, Lemaitre M, Maudet N, Padget J, Phelps S, Rodríguez-Aguilar JA, Sousa P (2006) Issues in multiagent resource allocation. *Informatica* 30:3–31
14. Edmonds J, Pruhs K (2006) Cake cutting really is not a piece of cake. In: *Proceedings of the seventeenth annual ACM-SIAM symposium on Discrete algorithm*, Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, pp 271–278
15. Even S, Paz A (1984) A note on cake cutting. *Discrete Applied Mathematics* 7(3):285–296

16. Fujita E, Lesca J, Sonoda A, Todo T, Yokoo M (2015) A complexity approach for core-selecting exchange with multiple indivisible goods under lexicographic preferences. In: Proceedings of the Twenty-Ninth AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence, AAAI Press, AAAI15, p 907913
17. Gale D, Shapley LS (1962) College admissions and the stability of marriage. *The American Mathematical Monthly* 69(1):9–15
18. Ghodsi A, Zaharia M, Hindman B, Konwinski A, Shenker S, Stoica I (2011) Dominant resource fairness: fair allocation of multiple resource types. In: Proceedings of the 8th USENIX Conference on Networked Systems Design and Implementation, Boston, MA, USA, pp 323–336
19. Ghodsi A, Sekar V, Zaharia M, Stoica I (2012) Multi-resource fair queueing for packet processing. In: Proceedings of the ACM SIGCOMM 2012 Conference on Applications, Technologies, Architectures, and Protocols for Computer Communication, Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, SIGCOMM 12, p 112
20. Grandl R, Ananthanarayanan G, Kandula S, Rao S, Akella A (2015) Multi-resource packing for cluster schedulers. *ACM SIGCOMM Computer Communication Review* 44(4):455–466
21. Hashimoto T, Hirata D (2011) Characterizations of the probabilistic serial mechanism. Available at SSRN DOI <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.1601178>
22. Hashimoto T, Hirata D, Kesten O, Kurino M, Ünver MU (2014) Two axiomatic approaches to the probabilistic serial mechanism. *Theoretical Economics* 9(1):253–277
23. Hatfield JW (2009) Strategy-proof, efficient, and nonbossy quota allocations. *Social Choice and Welfare* 33(3):505–515
24. Heo EJ (2014) Probabilistic assignment problem with multi-unit demands: A generalization of the serial rule and its characterization. *Journal of Mathematical Economics* 54:40–47
25. Heo EJ, Yılmaz Ö (2015) A characterization of the extended serial correspondence. *Journal of Mathematical Economics* 59:102–110
26. Hylland A, Zeckhauser R (1979) The Efficient Allocation of Individuals to Positions. *Journal of Political Economy* 87(2):293–314
27. Katta AK, Sethuraman J (2006) A solution to the random assignment problem on the full preference domain. *Journal of Economic theory* 131(1):231–250
28. Kojima F, Manea M (2010) Axioms for deferred acceptance. *Econometrica* 78(2):633–653
29. Lang J, Mengin J, Xia L (2012) Aggregating conditionally lexicographic preferences on multi-issue domains. In: Proceedings of the 18th International Conference on Principles and Practice of Constraint Programming (CP), pp 973–987
30. Mackin E, Xia L (2016) Allocating indivisible items in categorized domains. In: Proceedings of the Twenty-Fifth International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence (IJCAI-16), pp 359–365
31. Moulin H (1995) Cooperative microeconomics: a game-theoretic introduction. Prentice Hall
32. Moulin H (2018) Fair division in the age of internet. *Annual Review of Economics*
33. von Neumann J (1953) A certain zero-sum two-person game equivalent to an optimal assignment problem. *Annals of Mathematics Studies* 2(28):5–12
34. Procaccia AD (2015) Cake cutting algorithms. In: *Handbook of Computational Social Choice*, chapter 13, Cambridge University Press
35. Robertson J, Webb W (1998) *Cake-cutting algorithms: be fair if you can*. CRC Press
36. Roth AE, Postlewaite A (1977) Weak versus strong domination in a market with indivisible goods. *Journal of Mathematical Economics* 4:131–137
37. Saban D, Sethuraman J (2014) A note on object allocation under lexicographic preferences. *Journal of Mathematical Economics* 50:283–289
38. Segal-Halevi E (2017) Fair division of land. PhD thesis, Bar Ilan University, Computer Science Department
39. Shapley L, Scarf H (1974) On cores and indivisibility. *Journal of Mathematical Economics* 1(1):23–37
40. Sikdar S, Adalundefined S, Xia L (2017) Mechanism design for multi-type housing markets. In: Proceedings of the Thirty-First AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence, AAAI Press, AAAI17, p 684690
41. Sikdar S, Adali S, Xia L (2019) Mechanism design for multi-type housing markets with acceptable bundles. In: Proceedings of the Thirty-Third AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence, AAAI Press, AAAI19, pp 2165–2172
42. Steinhaus H (1948) The problem of fair division. *Econometrica* 16:101–104
43. Wang H, Sikdar S, Guo X, Xia L, Cao Y, Wang H (2020) Multi-type resource allocation with partial preferences. In: Proceedings of the Thirty-Fourth AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence, AAAI Press, AAAI20
44. Xia L, Conitzer V (2010) Strategy-proof voting rules over multi-issue domains with restricted preferences. In: Proceedings of the 6th International Conference on Internet and Network Economics, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, Heidelberg, WINE10, p 402414

-
45. Yılmaz Ö (2009) Random assignment under weak preferences. *Games and Economic Behavior* 66(1):546–558
 46. Yılmaz Ö (2010) The probabilistic serial mechanism with private endowments. *Games and Economic Behavior* 69(2):475–491
 47. Zhou L (1990) On a conjecture by gale about one-sided matching problems. *Journal of Economic Theory* 52(1):123–135