

Symmetric Splendor: Unraveling Universally Closest Refinements and Fisher Market Equilibrium through Density-Friendly Decomposition

T-H. Hubert Chan*

Quan Xue*

Abstract

We investigate the closest distribution refinements problem, which involves a vertex-weighted bipartite graph as input, where the vertex weights on each side sum to 1 and represent a probability distribution. A refinement of one side's distribution is an edge distribution that corresponds to distributing the weight of each vertex from that side to its incident edges. The objective is to identify a pair of distribution refinements for both sides of the bipartite graph such that the two edge distributions are as close as possible with respect to a specific divergence notion. This problem is a generalization of transportation, in which the special case occurs when the two closest distributions are identical. The problem has recently emerged in the context of composing differentially oblivious mechanisms.

Our main result demonstrates that a universal refinement pair exists, which is simultaneously closest under all divergence notions that satisfy the data processing inequality. Since differential obliviousness can be examined using various divergence notions, such a universally closest refinement pair offers a powerful tool in relation to such applications.

We discover that this pair can be achieved via locally verifiable optimality conditions. Specifically, we observe that it is equivalent to the following problems, which have been traditionally studied in distinct research communities: (1) hypergraph density decomposition, and (2) symmetric Fisher Market equilibrium.

We adopt a symmetric perspective of hypergraph density decomposition, in which hyperedges and nodes play equivalent roles. This symmetric decomposition serves as a tool for deriving precise characterizations of optimal solutions for other problems and enables the application of algorithms from one problem to another. This connection allows existing algorithms for computing or approximating the Fisher market equilibrium to be adapted for all the aforementioned problems. For example, this approach allows the well-known iterative proportional response process to provide approximations for the corresponding problems with multiplicative error in distributed settings, whereas previously, only absolute error had been achieved in these contexts. Our study contributes to the understanding of various problems within a unified framework, which may serve as a foundation for connecting other problems in the future.

*Department of Computer Science, the University of Hong Kong.

1 Introduction

In this work, we explore several existing and new problems under the same unifying framework. By unraveling previously unknown connections between these seemingly unrelated problems, we offer deeper insights into them. Moreover, existing solutions for one problem can readily offer improvements to other problems. Input instances for these problems all have the following form.

Input Instance. An instance is a vertex-weighted bipartite graph with vertex bipartition $\mathcal{I} = \mathcal{I}^{(0)} \cup \mathcal{I}^{(1)}$, edge set \mathcal{F} and positive¹ vertex weights $w : \mathcal{I} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{>0}$. For some problems, it is convenient to normalize the vertex weights into distributions, i.e., the vertex weights on each side sum to 1; in this case, we call this a *distribution* instance. We use $\mathbb{B} := \{0, 1\}$ to index the two sides. Given a side $\iota \in \mathbb{B}$, we use $\bar{\iota} := \iota \oplus 1$ to denote the other side.

Solution Concept. We shall see that in each problem, *refinement* is the underlying solution concept. Given a side $\iota \in \mathbb{B}$, a refinement² $\alpha^{(\iota)}$ on vertex weights on side ι indicates how each vertex $i \in \mathcal{I}^{(\iota)}$ distributes its weight $w(i)$ among its incident edges in \mathcal{F} . In other words, $\alpha^{(\iota)}$ is a vector of edge weights in \mathcal{F} such that for each $i \in \mathcal{I}^{(\iota)}$, the sum of weights of edges incident on i equals $w(i)$. While some problems may require refinements of vertex weights from one side only, it will still be insightful to consider a *refinement pair* $\vec{\alpha} = (\alpha^{(0)}, \alpha^{(1)})$ of vertex weights on both sides.

The main problem we focus on is the closest distribution refinement problem, which we show is intricately related to other problems. In probability theory, a *divergence* notion quantifies how close two distributions are to each other, where a smaller quantity indicates that they are closer. Common examples of divergences include total variation distance and KL-divergence. Observe that a divergence notion D needs not be symmetric, i.e. for two distributions P and Q on the same sample space, it is possible that $D(P\|Q) \neq D(Q\|P)$.

Definition 1.1 (Closest Distribution Refinement Problem). Given a distribution instance $(\mathcal{I}^{(0)}, \mathcal{I}^{(1)}; \mathcal{F}; w)$ and a divergence notion D , the goal is to find a distribution refinement pair $\vec{\alpha} = (\alpha^{(0)}, \alpha^{(1)})$ such that the distributions $\alpha^{(0)}$ and $\alpha^{(1)}$ on the edges \mathcal{F} are as close to each other as possible under D , i.e., $D(\alpha^{(0)}\|\alpha^{(1)})$ is minimized.

Universally Closest Refinement Pair. It is not clear *a priori* if a refinement pair achieving the minimum for one divergence notion would also achieve the minimum for another divergence notion. For a non-symmetric divergence D , a pair $\vec{\alpha} = (\alpha^{(0)}, \alpha^{(1)})$ minimizing $D(\alpha^{(0)}\|\alpha^{(1)})$ may not necessarily achieve the minimum $D(\alpha^{(1)}\|\alpha^{(0)})$. The special case when $\vec{\alpha}$ consists of a pair of identical refinements is also known as *w-transportation* or *perfect fractional matching* [Bru06, Kor, S⁺03, Beh13], in which case $\vec{\alpha}$ is obviously the minimizer for all divergences.

In general, it would seem ambitious to request a *universally closest* refinement pair that simultaneously minimizes all “reasonable” divergence notions. In the literature, all commonly used divergence notions satisfy the *data processing inequality*, which intuitively says that the divergence of two distributions cannot increase after post-processing. Formally, for any deterministic function $\varphi : \Omega \rightarrow \hat{\Omega}$, the induced distribution $\varphi(P)$ and $\varphi(Q)$ on $\hat{\Omega}$ satisfy the inequality: $D(\varphi(P)\|\varphi(Q)) \leq D(P\|Q)$. Surprisingly, we show that such a universally closest pair exists.

Theorem 1.2 (Universally Closest Refinement Pair). *Given a distribution instance $(\mathcal{I}^{(0)}, \mathcal{I}^{(1)}; \mathcal{F}; w)$, there exists a distribution refinement pair $\vec{\alpha} = (\alpha^{(0)}, \alpha^{(1)})$ that minimizes $D(\alpha^{(0)}\|\alpha^{(1)})$ simultaneously for all divergence notions D that satisfy the data processing inequality.*

Moreover, this pair can be returned using the near-linear time algorithm of Chen et al. [CKL⁺22] for the minimum quadratic-cost flow problem.

¹Vertices with zero weights are removed and identified with the empty set \emptyset .

²Since vertex weights on one side can be interpreted as a probability distribution, allocating the weight of each vertex to its incident edges can be viewed as a refinement of the original distribution.

Since Definition 1.1 gives a clean mathematical problem, we first describe the technical contributions and approaches of this work, and we describe its motivation and application in Section 1.2.

While the technical proofs are given in Sections 4 and 5, we give some motivation for why the problem is studied in the first place and sketch the key ideas for our proofs.

1.1 Our Technical Contributions and Approaches

In addition to the problem in Definition 1.1, we shall see that the following solution properties are also the key to solving other problems as well.

Desirable Solution Properties. Two desirable solution properties are *local maximin* and *proportional response*.

- **Local Maximin.** A refinement $\alpha^{(\iota)}$ on vertex weights on side ι can also be interpreted as how each vertex in $\mathcal{I}^{(\iota)}$ allocates its weight to its neighbors on the other side $\mathcal{I}^{(\bar{\iota})}$ via the edges in \mathcal{F} . Specifically, for $i \in \mathcal{I}^{(\iota)}$ and $j \in \mathcal{I}^{(\bar{\iota})}$, $\alpha^{(\iota)}(ij)$ is the *payload* received by j from i , where we rely on the superscript in $\alpha^{(\iota)}$ to indicate that the payload is sent from side ι to side $\bar{\iota}$ along an edge in \mathcal{F} . Consequently, $\alpha^{(\iota)}$ induces a payload vector $p \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{I}^{(\bar{\iota})}}$, where $p(j) = \sum_i \alpha^{(\iota)}(ij)$ is the total payload received by j in the allocation $\alpha^{(\iota)}$. Recalling that vertex j also has a weight, the payload density (resulting from $\alpha^{(\iota)}$) of j is $\rho(j) := \frac{p(j)}{w(j)}$.

The refinement $\alpha^{(\iota)}$ is *locally maximin* if for each $i \in \mathcal{I}^{(\iota)}$, vertex i distributes a non-zero payload $\alpha^{(\iota)}(ij) > 0$ to vertex j only if j is among the neighbors of i with minimum payload densities (resulting from $\alpha^{(\iota)}$).

The intuition of the term “maximin” is that vertex i tries to maximize the minimum payload density among its neighbors by giving its weight to only neighbors that achieve the minimum payload density.

- **Proportional Response.** Given a refinement $\alpha^{(\iota)}$ on vertex weights on side ι , its proportional response $\alpha^{(\bar{\iota})}$ is a refinement on vertex weights from the other side $\bar{\iota}$. Specifically, vertex $j \in \mathcal{I}^{(\bar{\iota})}$ distributes its weight $w(j)$ proportionately according to its received payloads: $\alpha^{(\bar{\iota})}(ij) = \frac{\alpha^{(\iota)}(ij)}{p(j)} \cdot w(j)$.

Several problems in the literature studied in different contexts can be expressed with the same goal.

Goal 1.3 (High-Level Goal). Given an instance $(\mathcal{I}^{(0)}, \mathcal{I}^{(1)}; \mathcal{F}; w)$, find a refinement pair $\vec{\alpha} = (\alpha^{(0)}, \alpha^{(1)})$ such that both refinements are locally maximin and proportional response to each other.

This abstract problem have been studied extensively in the literature under different contexts, and various algorithms to exactly achieve or *approximate* (whose meaning we will explain) Goal 1.3 have been designed. One contribution of this work is to unify all these problems under our abstract framework. Consequently, we readily offer new approximation results for some problems that are unknown before this connection is discovered.

We next describe how our abstract framework is related to each considered problem and what new insights or results are achieved, which also provide the tools to solve or approximate the problem in Definition 1.1.

1.1.1 Hypergraph Density Decomposition

An instance $(\mathcal{I}^{(0)}, \mathcal{I}^{(1)}; \mathcal{F}; w)$ is interpreted as a *hypergraph* H . Each element in $i \in \mathcal{I}^{(0)}$ is a hyperedge and each element in $j \in \mathcal{I}^{(1)}$ is a node, where $\{i, j\} \in \mathcal{F}$ means that node j is contained in hyperedge i . Observe that in this hypergraph, both the hyperedges and the nodes are weighted.

Densest Subset Problem. Given a subset $S \subseteq \mathcal{I}^{(1)}$ of nodes in a (weighted) hypergraph, its density is $\rho(S) := \frac{w(H[S])}{w(S)}$, where $H[S]$ is the collection of hyperedges containing only nodes inside S . The densest subset problem requests a subset S with the maximum density.

Density Decomposition. The decomposition can be described by an iterative process that generates a density vector $\rho_* \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{I}^{(1)}}$ for the nodes in the hypergraph by repeated peeling off densest subsets. First, the (unique) maximal densest subset S_1 is obtained, and each $j \in S_1$ will be assigned the density $\rho_*(j) = \frac{w(H[S_1])}{w(S_1)}$ of S_1 . Then, the hyperedges $H[S_1]$ and the subset S_1 are removed from the instance; note that any hyperedge containing a node outside S_1 will remain. The process is applied to the remaining instance until eventually every node in $\mathcal{I}^{(1)}$ is removed and assigned its density. The collection of subsets found in the iterative process forms the density decomposition $\mathcal{I}^{(1)} = \cup_{k \geq 1} S_k$.

As mentioned in [HQC22], the earliest variant of this decomposition was introduced by Fujishige [Fuj80] in the context of polymatroids. We describe the related work in more detail in Section 1.3.

Connection with the Local Maximin Condition. Charikar [Cha00] gave an LP (that can be easily generalized to weighted hypergraphs) which solves the densest subset problem exactly, and a refinement $\alpha^{(0)}$ on the weights of hyperedges $\mathcal{I}^{(0)}$ corresponds exactly to a feasible solution of the dual LP. Replacing the linear function in this dual LP with a quadratic function while keeping the same feasible variable $\alpha^{(0)}$, Danisch et al. [DCS17] considered a quadratic program (that has also appeared in [Fuj80]). They showed that a refinement corresponds to an optimal solution to the quadratic program *iff* it is locally maximin³. Moreover, a locally maximin refinement also induces the aforementioned density vector ρ_* .

As observed in [HQC22], the quadratic program can be expressed as a minimum quadratic-cost flow problem, which can be solved optimally using the nearly-linear time algorithm of Chen et al. [CKL⁺22]. As we shall show that our considered problems are all equivalent to Goal 1.3, this implies the algorithmic result in Theorem 1.2.

Symmetry of Density Decomposition. We observe that the density decomposition is symmetric between the hyperedges and the nodes. Recall that in iteration k of the density decomposition, a subset S_k is produced, together with its corresponding collection \widehat{S}_k of hyperedges that determines the density $\frac{w(\widehat{S}_k)}{w(S_k)}$. Therefore, in addition to a partition of nodes, there is a corresponding decomposition of the hyperedges $\mathcal{I}^{(0)} = \cup_{k \geq 1} \widehat{S}_k$.

Given an abstract instance $(\mathcal{I}^{(0)}, \mathcal{I}^{(1)}; \mathcal{F}; w)$, one could have interpreted it differently with $\mathcal{I}^{(0)}$ as nodes and $\mathcal{I}^{(1)}$ as hyperedges. When the density decomposition is constructed with the roles reversed, the exact sequence $\{(\widehat{S}_k, S_k)\}_k$ of pairs is obtained, but in reversed order. Intuitively, (\widehat{S}_1, S_1) is the densest from the perspective of $S_1 \subseteq \mathcal{I}^{(1)}$, but it is the least dense from the perspective of $\widehat{S}_1 \subseteq \mathcal{I}^{(0)}$.

The symmetric nature of the density decomposition has been mentioned recently by Harb et al. [HQC23, Theorem 13], but we shall explain later this fact may be inferred when different earlier works are viewed together. Hence, this observation may be considered as part of the folklore. Since we need some crucial properties of the symmetric density decomposition to prove Theorem 1.2, for the sake of completeness, the connection of Goal 1.3 and this folklore result is described in Section 3.

Approximation Notions. Even though the exact density decomposition can be achieved via LP or maximum flow, it can be computationally expensive in practice. In the literature, efficient approximation algorithms have been considered. While there are different attempts to define approximation notions for density decompositions, it is less clear what they mean when they are applied to different problems.

Observe that a refinement pair $\vec{\alpha} = (\alpha^{(0)}, \alpha^{(1)})$ achieving Goal 1.3 may not be unique, but

³Instead of using the term “maximin”, the same concept is called “stability” in [DCS17].

the induced payload vectors $(p_*^{(0)}, p_*^{(1)})$ and density vectors $(\rho_*^{(0)}, \rho_*^{(1)})$ are unique. When we say *approximating* Goal 1.3, we mean finding a refinement pair such that the induced payload and density vectors have some approximation guarantees. We shall see that approximation guarantees⁴ on these vectors can be translated readily to approximation notions for various problems.

1.1.2 Unraveling Universally Closest Distribution Refinements via Symmetric Density Decomposition

Restricted Class of Divergence. As a first step towards proving Theorem 1.2, we consider a restricted class of divergences known as *hockey-stick* divergence. For each $\gamma \geq 0$,

$$D_\gamma(P\|Q) := \sup_{S \subseteq \Omega} Q(S) - \gamma \cdot P(S).$$

The hockey-stick divergence is related to the well-known (ϵ, δ) -differential privacy inequality. Specifically, $D_{e^\epsilon}(P\|Q) \leq \delta$ iff for all subsets $S \subseteq \Omega$,

$$Q(S) \leq e^\epsilon \cdot P(S) + \delta.$$

We first consider the universal closest distribution refinements with respect to the class of hockey-stick divergences $\mathcal{D}_{\text{HS}} := \{D_\gamma : \gamma \geq 0\}$. In Lemma 5.6, we show that the restricted variant of Theorem 1.2 to the class \mathcal{D}_{HS} is equivalent to the following problem.

Universal Refinement Matching Problem. Given an instance $G = (\mathcal{I}^{(0)}, \mathcal{I}^{(1)}; \mathcal{F}; w)$ and two non-negative weights $\vec{c} = (c^{(0)}, c^{(1)}) \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{B}}$, we use $G^{(\vec{c})}$ to denote the instance of (fractional) maximum matching on the bipartite graph $(\mathcal{I}^{(0)}, \mathcal{I}^{(1)}; \mathcal{F})$ with vertex capacity constraints. For side ι and $i \in \mathcal{I}^{(\iota)}$, the capacity constraint at vertex i is $c^{(\iota)} \cdot w(i)$. A fractional solution consists of assigning non-negative weights to the edges in \mathcal{F} such that the weighted degree of every vertex does not exceed its capacity constraint. Observe that for any refinement pair $\vec{\alpha} = (\alpha^{(0)}, \alpha^{(1)})$, the fractional matching $\vec{c} \bullet \vec{\alpha}$ defined below is a feasible solution to $G^{(\vec{c})}$:

$$\vec{c} \bullet \vec{\alpha}(ij) := \min\{c^{(0)} \cdot \alpha^{(0)}(ij), c^{(1)} \cdot \alpha^{(1)}(ij)\} \text{ for all } \{i, j\} \in \mathcal{F}.$$

The goal is to find a refinement pair $\vec{\alpha} = (\alpha^{(0)}, \alpha^{(1)})$ such that for any weight pair \vec{c} , the edge weights $\vec{c} \bullet \vec{\alpha}$ form an optimal (fractional) solution to the maximum matching instance $G^{(\vec{c})}$.

The structure of the symmetric density decomposition described in Section 1.1.1 makes it convenient to apply a primal-dual analysis to achieve the following in Section 4.

Theorem 1.4 (Universal Maximum Refinement Matching). *Given an instance $(\mathcal{I}^{(0)}, \mathcal{I}^{(1)}; \mathcal{F}; w)$, suppose a distribution refinement pair $\vec{\alpha} = (\alpha^{(0)}, \alpha^{(1)})$ satisfies Goal 1.3. Then, for any $\vec{c} = (c^{(0)}, c^{(1)})$, the (fractional) solution $\vec{c} \bullet \vec{\alpha}$ is optimal for the maximum matching instance $G^{(\vec{c})}$.*

Extension to General Case. To extend Theorem 1.2 beyond the restricted divergence class \mathcal{D}_{HS} , we consider the closest distribution refinement problem under a more general probability distance notion.

Capturing All Data Processing Divergences via Power Functions. As opposed to using a single number by a divergence notion to measure the closeness of two distributions, the *power function* $\text{Pow}(P\|Q) : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ between distributions P and Q captures enough information to recover all divergence notions that satisfy the data processing inequality. We will give a formal explanation in Section 5. A main result is given in Theorem 5.12, which states that any distribution refinement pair satisfying Goal 1.3 achieves the minimal power function, from which Theorem 1.2 follows immediately.

⁴See Definition 2.7 for approximation notions of *multiplicative* vs *absolute* errors on vectors.

Approximation Results. As mentioned in Section 1.1.1, we also show that a refinement that induces a payload with multiplicative error can lead to approximation guarantees for other problems. For the universal refinement matching problem, a natural approximation notion is based on the standard approximation ratio for the maximum matching problem.

On the other hand, achieving a meaningful approximation notion for the universally closest distribution refinement problem in terms of divergence values is more difficult. The reason is that any strictly increasing function on a data processing divergence still satisfies the data processing inequality. Therefore, any non-zero deviation from the correct answer may be magnified arbitrarily. Instead of giving approximation guarantees directly on the divergence values, we consider a technical notion of power function stretching, and the approximation quality of a refinement pair is quantified by how much the optimal power function is stretched. The formal statement is given in Theorem 5.21.

1.1.3 Achieving Multiplicative Error via Proportional Response in Fisher Markets

We next interpret an instance $(\mathcal{I}^{(0)}, \mathcal{I}^{(1)}; \mathcal{F}; w)$ as a special symmetric case of linear Fisher markets [Fis92], which is itself a special case of the more general Arrow-Debreu markets [AD54]. This allows us to transfer any algorithmic results for Fisher/Arrow-Debreu market equilibrium to counterparts for Goal 1.3. Specifically, we can use a quick iterative procedure *proportional response* [WZ07, Zha09] to approximate the densities of vertices in the density decomposition in Section 1.1.1 with multiplicative error, where only absolute error has been achieved before [DCS17, HQC22]. In addition to being interesting in its own right, multiplicative error is also used to achieve the approximation results in Section 1.1.2.

Market Interpretation. Even though in an instance, the roles of the two sides are symmetric, it will be intuitive to think of $\mathcal{I}^{(0)}$ as buyers and $\mathcal{I}^{(1)}$ as sellers. For buyer $i \in \mathcal{I}^{(0)}$, the weight $w(i)$ is its *budget*. In the symmetric variant, the utilities of buyers have a special form. Each seller $j \in \mathcal{I}^{(1)}$ has one divisible unit of good j for which a buyer i has a positive utility exactly when $\{i, j\} \in \mathcal{F}$, in which case the utility per unit of good j is $w(j)$ (that is common for all buyers that have a positive utility for j). For a general Fisher market, a buyer i can have an arbitrary utility $w_i(j)$ for one unit of good j .

Market Allocation and Equilibrium. For the symmetric variant, an allocation can be represented by a refinement pair $\vec{\alpha} = (\alpha^{(0)}, \alpha^{(1)})$, in which $\alpha^{(1)}$ must be a proportional response to $\alpha^{(0)}$. For the refinement $\alpha^{(0)}$ on the buyers' budgets, the induced payload vector $p^{(1)}$ on the sellers corresponds to the *price* vector on goods. For the refinement $\alpha^{(1)}$ on the sellers' weights, the induced payload vector $p^{(0)}$ on the buyers corresponds to the utilities received by the buyers. It is well-known (explained in Fact 6.7) that a market equilibrium is characterized by a locally maximin refinement $\alpha^{(0)}$ of buyers' budgets together with its proportional response $\alpha^{(1)}$. From our theory of symmetric density decomposition in Section 1.1.1, this is equivalent to Goal 1.3.

Alternative Characterization. The fact that the local maximin condition on the buyers' budget allocation is equivalent to Fisher market equilibrium readily allows us to borrow any algorithmic results for market equilibrium to solve or approximate Goal 1.3. However, our framework allows us to make the following observations.

- In linear Fisher markets (not necessarily symmetric), we show in Theorem 6.10 that the local maximin condition on sellers' goods allocation to buyers can be used to characterize a market equilibrium. This is an alternative characterization of linear Fisher market equilibrium that involves only goods allocation and buyers' utilities, but not involving good prices.
- On the other hand, we show in Theorem 6.11 that there exists an Arrow-Debreu market such that there is a goods allocation satisfying the local maximin condition, but it is not an equilibrium.

1.2 Motivation and Application for Universally Closest Distribution Refinements

The problem in Definition 5.1 arises in the study of the composition of differentially oblivious mechanisms [ZSCM23, ZZCS24], which is a generalization of the more well-known concept of differential privacy (DP) [Dwo06].

A Quick Introduction to Differential Privacy/Obliviousness. Consider a (randomized) mechanism \mathcal{M} that takes an input from space \mathcal{X} and returns an output from space \mathcal{Y} that will be passed to a second mechanism. During the computation of \mathcal{M} , an adversary can observe some *view* from space \mathcal{V} that might not necessarily include the output in general. Suppose at first we just consider the privacy/obliviousness of \mathcal{M} on its own, which measures how much information the adversary can learn about the input from its view. Intuitively, it should be difficult for the adversary to distinguish between two similar inputs from their corresponding views produced by the mechanism. Formally, similar inputs in \mathcal{X} are captured by a *neighboring* symmetric relation, and the privacy/obliviousness of the mechanism \mathcal{M} requires that the two distributions of views produced by neighboring inputs are “close”, where closeness can be quantified by some notion of divergence. As mentioned in Section 1.1.2, the popular notion of (ϵ, δ) -DP is captured using hockey-stick divergences.

Composition of Differentially Oblivious Mechanisms. Suppose the output of mechanism \mathcal{M} from space \mathcal{Y} is passed as an input to a second mechanism \mathcal{M}' , which is differentially oblivious with respect to some neighboring relation on \mathcal{Y} . Hence, given input x to \mathcal{M} , one should consider the joint distribution $\mathcal{M}(x)$ on the space $\mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{Y}$ of views and outputs.

The notion of neighbor-preserving differential obliviousness (NPDO) has been introduced [ZSCM23, ZZCS24] to give sufficient conditions on \mathcal{M} that allows composition with such a mechanism \mathcal{M}' so that the overall composition preserves differential obliviousness.

Specifically, given neighboring inputs $x_0 \sim x_1$, conditions are specified on the two distributions $\mathcal{M}(x_0)$ and $\mathcal{M}(x_1)$. Unlike the case for differential privacy/obliviousness, it is not appropriate to just require that the two distributions are close. This is because the adversary can only observe the view component of $\mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{Y}$. Moreover, one also needs to incorporate the neighboring relation on the output space \mathcal{Y} , which is needed for the privacy guarantee for the second mechanism \mathcal{M}' .

The definition of NPDO is more conveniently described via the terminology offered by our abstract instance $(\mathcal{I}^{(0)}, \mathcal{I}^{(1)}; \mathcal{F}; w)$. Here, the sets $\mathcal{I}^{(0)}$ and $\mathcal{I}^{(1)}$ are two copies of $\mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{Y}$. For each $\iota \in \mathbb{B}$, the weights w on $\mathcal{I}^{(\iota)}$ corresponds to the distribution $\mathcal{M}(x_\iota)$. Finally, $(v_0, y_0) \in \mathcal{I}^{(0)}$ and $(v_1, y_1) \in \mathcal{I}^{(1)}$ are neighbors in \mathcal{F} iff $v_0 = v_1$ and $y_0 \sim y_1$ are neighboring in \mathcal{Y} .

In the original definition [ZZCS24], the mechanism \mathcal{M} is said to be d -NPDO with respect to divergence D if for the constructed instance $(\mathcal{I}^{(0)}, \mathcal{I}^{(1)}; \mathcal{F}; w)$, there exists a distribution refinement pair $\vec{\alpha} = (\alpha^{(0)}, \alpha^{(1)})$, which may depend on the divergence D , such that $\mathsf{D}(\alpha^{(0)} \parallel \alpha^{(1)}) \leq d$. Examples of considered divergences include the standard hockey-stick divergence and Rényi divergence [Mir17].

Since it only makes sense to consider divergences satisfying the data processing inequality in the privacy context, the universally closest refinement pair guaranteed in Theorem 1.2 makes the notion of NPDO conceptually simpler, because the closest refinement pair does not need to specifically depend on the considered divergence.

We believe that this simplification will be a very useful tool. In fact, to achieve advanced composition in [ZZCS24], a very complicated argument has been used to prove the following fact, which is just an easy corollary of Theorem 1.2.

Fact 1.5 (Lemma B.1 in [ZZCS24]). *Given a distribution instance $(\mathcal{I}^{(0)}, \mathcal{I}^{(1)}; \mathcal{F}; w)$, suppose there*

exist two refinement pairs $\vec{\alpha}_s = (\alpha_s^{(0)}, \alpha_s^{(1)})$ and $\vec{\alpha}_t = (\alpha_t^{(0)}, \alpha_t^{(1)})$ such that the hockey-stick divergences $D_\gamma(\alpha_s^{(0)} \parallel \alpha_s^{(1)})$ and $D_\gamma(\alpha_t^{(1)} \parallel \alpha_t^{(0)})$ are both at most δ .

Then, there exists a single refinement pair $\vec{\alpha} = (\alpha^{(0)}, \alpha^{(1)})$ such that both $D_\gamma(\alpha^{(0)} \parallel \alpha^{(1)})$ and $D_\gamma(\alpha^{(1)} \parallel \alpha^{(0)})$ are at most δ .

1.3 Related Work

The densest subset problem is a classical problem in combinatorial optimization with numerous real-world applications in data mining, network analysis, and machine learning [Gol84, Cha00, KS09, MFC⁺20, ASKS12, SERF16, LLL⁺20], and it is the basic subroutine in defining the density decomposition.

Density Decomposition. As mentioned in Section 1.1.1, the earliest reference to the density decomposition and its associated quadratic program were introduced by Fujishige [Fuj80]. Even though this decomposition was defined for the more general submodular or supermodular case, the procedure has been rediscovered independently many times in the literature for the special bipartite graph case (or equivalently its hypergraph interpretation).

Earlier we described the decomposition procedure by repeatedly peeling off maximal densest subsets in a hypergraph. This was the approach by Tatti and Gionis [TG15, Tat19] and Danisch et al. [DCS17]. Moreover, the same procedure has been used to define hypergraph Laplacians in the context of the spectral properties of hypergraphs [CLTZ18].

In the literature, there is another line of research that defines the decomposition by repeatedly peeling off least densest subsets instead. However, given a subset $S \subseteq V$ of nodes in a weighted hypergraph $H = (V, E)$, a different notion of density is considered: $\tau(S) := \frac{w(E(S))}{w(S)}$, where $E(S)$ is the collection of hyperedges that have non-empty intersection with S . The difference is that before we consider $E[S]$ that is the collection of hyperedges totally contained inside S . Then, an alternative procedure can be defined by peeling off a maximal least densest subset under τ and performing recursion on the remaining graph.

This was the approach used by Goel et al. [GKK12] to consider the communication and streaming complexity of maximum bipartite matching. The same procedure has been used by Bernstein et al. [BHR19] to analyze the replacement cost of online maximum bipartite matching maintenance. Lee and Singla [LS20] also used this decomposition to investigate the the batch arrival model of online bipartite matching. Bansal and Cohen [BC21] have independently discovered this decomposition procedure to consider maximin allocation of hyperedge weights to incident nodes.

Symmetric Nature of Density Decomposition. At this point, the reader may ask how we know that the two procedures will give the same decomposition (but in reversed order). The answer is that exactly the same quadratic program has been used in [DCS17] and [BHR19] to analyze the corresponding approaches. This observation has also been made recently by Harb et al. [HQC23, Theorem 13]. It is not too difficult to see that the least densest subset using the modified density τ is equivalent to the densest subset with the roles of vertices and hyperedges reversed. Therefore, Theorem 3.10 can also be obtained indirectly through these observations.

Connection between Density Decomposition and Fisher Market Equilibrium. Even before this work in which we highlight the local maximin condition, density decomposition has already surreptitiously appeared in algorithms computing Fisher market equilibrium. Jain and Vazirani [JV10] considered submodular utility allocation (SUA) markets, which generalize linear Fisher markets. Their procedure [JV10, Algorithm 9] for computing an SUA market equilibrium can be viewed as a masqueraded variant of the density decomposition by Fujishige [Fuj80]. Buchbinder et al. [BGH⁺24] used a variant of SUA market equilibrium to analyze online maintenance of matroid intersections, where equilibrium prices are also obtained by the density decomposition procedure.

In this work, we observe conversely that algorithms for approximating market equilibrium can also be directly used for approximating density decompositions. For the simple special case in which the input graph contains a perfect fractional matching, Motwani et al. [MPX06] showed that several randomized balls-into-bins procedures attempting to maintain the locally maximin condition can achieve $(1 + \epsilon)$ -approximation.

Distributed Iterative Approximation Algorithms. Even though efficient exact algorithms are known to achieve Goal 1.3, distributed iterative approximation algorithms have been considered for practical scenarios.

Density Decomposition. By applying the first-order iterative approach of Frank-Wolfe to the quadratic program, Danisch et al. [DCS17] showed that T iterations, each of which takes $O(|\mathcal{F}|)$ work and may be parallelized, can achieve an absolute error of $O(\frac{1}{\sqrt{T}})$ on the density vector ρ_* . Harb et al. [HQC23] showed that the method GREEDY++ can be viewed as a noisy variant of Frank-Wolfe and hence has a similar convergence result.

By using a first-order method augmented with Nesterov momentum [Nes83] such as accelerated FISTA [BT09], Elfarouk et al. [HQC22] readily concluded that T iterations can achieve an absolute error of $O(\frac{1}{T})$. However, observe that if there is a vertex i such that $\rho_*(i) \leq \epsilon$, an absolute error of ϵ may produce an estimate $\rho(i)$ that is arbitrarily small.

Inspired by estimates of ρ_* , several notions of approximate density decompositions have been considered in previous works [TG15, DCS17, HQC22]. However, it is not clear if there is any meaningful interpretations of these approximate decompositions in the context of closest distribution refinements or market equilibrium.

Fisher Market Equilibrium. Market dynamics have been considered to investigate how agents' mutual interaction can lead to convergence to a market equilibrium. The proportional response (PR, *aka* tit-for-tat) protocol has been used by Wu and Zhang [WZ07] to analyze bandwidth trading in a peer-to-peer network $G = (V, E)$ with vertex weights w . This can be seen as a special case of our instance $(\mathcal{I}^{(0)}, \mathcal{I}^{(1)}; \mathcal{F}; w)$, where $\mathcal{I}^{(0)}$ and $\mathcal{I}^{(1)}$ are two copies of V , and $i \in \mathcal{I}^{(0)}$ and $j \in \mathcal{I}^{(1)}$ are neighbors in \mathcal{F} *iff* the corresponding pair $\{i, j\} \in E$ are neighbors in G . Interestingly, they consider a *bottleneck* decomposition of the graph G which can be recovered from our symmetric density decomposition. They showed that the PR protocol converges to some equilibrium under this special model.

Subsequently, Zhang [Zha09] showed that the PR protocol can be applied in Fisher markets between buyers and sellers, and analyzed the convergence rate to the market equilibrium in terms of multiplicative error. Birnbaum et al. [BDX11] later improved the analysis of the PR protocol by demonstrating that it can be viewed as a generalized gradient descent algorithm.

For completeness, in Section 7, we summarize the analysis of how the PR protocol can estimate payloads from Goal 1.3 with multiplicative error.

1.4 Potential Impacts and Paper Organization

This work unifies diverse problems under a single framework, revealing connections and providing new approximation results. Future research directions are abundant. Examining the implications of various market models or equilibrium concepts on the densest subset problem and density decomposition opens the door for further exploration of the relationships between economic markets and combinatorial optimization problems. This line of inquiry could also lead to new insights into economics, particularly regarding market participants' behavior and the efficiency of different market mechanisms.

Paper Organization. In Section 2, we introduce the precise notation that will be used throughout the paper. In Section 3, we summarize the structural results regarding the symmetric density decomposition, which is used as a technical tool to analyze other problems. As mentioned in the in-

roduction, Section 4 investigates the universal refinement matching problem which is the precursor for tackling the more challenging universally closest distribution refinements problem in Section 5. In Section 5.1, we first consider the special case of hockey-stick divergences; by considering power functions, we prove Theorem 1.2 in Section 5.2; in Section 5.3, we present approximation results for the universal closest refinements problem by defining a stretching operation on power functions. In Section 6, we recap the connection between the symmetric density decomposition and the symmetric Fisher market equilibrium; moreover, we give an alternative characterization of the Fisher market equilibrium in terms of the local maximin condition on sellers' goods allocation to buyers. In Section 7, we give details on the convergence rates of how the iterative proportional response protocol can achieve an approximation with multiplicative error for Goal 1.3. For completeness, in Section 8, we give a review of how absolute error for Goal 1.3 is achieved using techniques in previous works.

2 Preliminaries

We shall consider several problems, whose inputs are in the form of vertex-weighted bipartite graphs.

Definition 2.1 (Input Instance). An instance $(\mathcal{I}^{(0)}, \mathcal{I}^{(1)}; \mathcal{F}; w)$ of the input consists of the following:

- Two disjoint vertex sets $\mathcal{I}^{(0)}$ and $\mathcal{I}^{(1)}$.
For the side $\iota \in \mathbb{B} := \{0, 1\}$, we use $\bar{\iota} := \iota \oplus 1$ to indicate the other side different from ι .
- A collection \mathcal{F} of unordered pairs of vertices that is interpreted as a bipartite graph between vertex sets $\mathcal{I}^{(0)}$ and $\mathcal{I}^{(1)}$; in other words, if $f = \{i, j\} \in \mathcal{F}$, then exactly one element of f is in $\mathcal{I}^{(0)}$ and the other is in $\mathcal{I}^{(1)}$. In this case, we also denote $i \sim_{\mathcal{F}} j$ or just $i \sim j$.
A vertex is isolated if it has no neighbor.
- Positive⁵ vertex weights $w : \mathcal{I}^{(0)} \cup \mathcal{I}^{(1)} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{>0}$; for a vertex i , we use w_i or $w(i)$ to denote its weight.
For $\iota \in \mathbb{B}$, we also use $w^{(\iota)} \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{I}^{(\iota)}}$ to denote the weight vector for each side.
This notation highlights the symmetry between the two sets $\mathcal{I}^{(0)}$ and $\mathcal{I}^{(1)}$.

Remark 2.2. In this work, we focus on the case that $\mathcal{I}^{(0)}$ and $\mathcal{I}^{(1)}$ are finite. Even though it is possible to extend the results to continuous and uncountable sets (which are relevant when those sets are interpreted as continuous probability spaces), the mathematical notations and tools involved are outside the scope of the typical computer science community.

Definition 2.3 (Allocation Refinement and Payload). Given an input instance as in Definition 2.1, for side $\iota \in \mathbb{B}$, an allocation refinement (or simply refinement) $\alpha^{(\iota)} \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{\mathcal{F}}$ of $w^{(\iota)} \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{I}^{(\iota)}}$ can be interpreted as edge weights on \mathcal{F} such that for each non-isolated vertex $i \in \mathcal{I}^{(\iota)}$,

$$w^{(\iota)}(i) = \sum_{f \in \mathcal{F}: i \in f} \alpha^{(\iota)}(f).$$

In other words, if a vertex i has at least one neighbor, it distributes its weight w_i among its neighboring edges $\{i, j\}$ such that $i \sim j$. These edge weights due to the refinement $\alpha^{(\iota)}$ can be interpreted as received by vertices on the other side $\mathcal{I}^{(\bar{\iota})}$; this induces a payload vector $p^{(\bar{\iota})} \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{I}^{(\bar{\iota})}}$ defined by:

$$\forall j \in \mathcal{I}^{(\bar{\iota})}, p^{(\bar{\iota})}(j) := \sum_{f: j \in f} \alpha^{(\iota)}(f).$$

⁵Vertices with zero weight do not play any role and may be excluded.

With respect to the weights of vertices in $\mathcal{I}^{(\bar{\tau})}$, the (payload) density $\rho^{(\bar{\tau})} \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{I}^{(\bar{\tau})}}$ is defined by:

$$\rho^{(\bar{\tau})}(j) := \frac{p^{(\bar{\tau})}(j)}{w(j)}.$$

When there is no risk of ambiguity, the superscripts (ι) and $(\bar{\tau})$ may be omitted.

Definition 2.4 (Proportional Response). Suppose for side $\iota \in \mathbb{B}$, $\alpha^{(\iota)}$ is a refinement of the vertex weights on $\mathcal{I}^{(\iota)}$. Then, a proportional response to $\alpha^{(\iota)}$ is a refinement $\alpha^{(\bar{\tau})}$ of the vertex weights on the other side $\mathcal{I}^{(\bar{\tau})}$ satisfying the following:

- If $j \in \mathcal{I}^{(\bar{\tau})}$ receives a positive payload $p^{(\bar{\tau})}(j) > 0$ from $\alpha^{(\iota)}$, then for each $i \sim j$,

$$\alpha^{(\bar{\tau})}(ij) = \frac{\alpha^{(\iota)}(ij)}{p^{(\bar{\tau})}(j)} \cdot w(j) = \frac{\alpha^{(\iota)}(ij)}{\rho^{(\bar{\tau})}(j)}.$$
- If a non-isolated vertex $j \in \mathcal{I}^{(\bar{\tau})}$ receives zero payload from $\alpha^{(\iota)}$, then in $\alpha^{(\bar{\tau})}$, vertex j may distribute its weight $w(j)$ arbitrarily among its incident edges in \mathcal{F} .

Definition 2.5 (Local Maximin Condition). Given an input instance as in Definition 2.1, for $\iota \in \mathbb{B}$, suppose a refinement $\alpha^{(\iota)} \in \mathbb{R}_+^{\mathcal{F}}$ of $w^{(\iota)} \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{I}^{(\iota)}}$ induces a payload density vector $\rho^{(\bar{\tau})} \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{I}^{(\bar{\tau})}}$ as in Definition 2.3. Then, $\alpha^{(\iota)}$ is locally maximin if,

$$\forall i \in \mathcal{I}^{(\iota)}, \quad \alpha^{(\iota)}(ij) > 0 \implies j \in \arg \min_{\ell \in \mathcal{I}^{(\bar{\tau})}: \ell \sim i} \rho^{(\bar{\tau})}(\ell).$$

In other words, the local maximin condition states that each vertex $i \in \mathcal{I}^{(\iota)}$ attempts to send a positive weight to a neighbor $j \sim i$ only if j achieves the minimum $\rho^{(\bar{\tau})}(\ell)$ among the neighbors ℓ of i .

Remark 2.6. Observe that if $\alpha^{(\iota)}$ satisfies the local maximin condition, then every non-isolated vertex in $\mathcal{I}^{(\bar{\tau})}$ must receive a positive payload. This means that its proportional response $\alpha^{(\bar{\tau})}$ is uniquely determined.

Definition 2.7 (Notions of Error). Given a vector ρ , we consider two notions of error for an approximation vector $\hat{\rho}$.

- *Absolute error ϵ with respect to norm $\|\cdot\|$.* We have: $\|\rho - \hat{\rho}\| \leq \epsilon$.
A common example is the standard ℓ_2 -norm.
- *Multiplicative error ϵ .* For all coordinates i , $|\rho(i) - \hat{\rho}(i)| \leq \epsilon \cdot |\rho(i)|$.

3 Folklore: Symmetric Density Decomposition

Given an instance $(\mathcal{I}^{(0)}, \mathcal{I}^{(1)}; \mathcal{F}; w)$ as in Definition 2.1, instead of interpreting it as a bipartite graph between $\mathcal{I}^{(0)}$ and $\mathcal{I}^{(1)}$, one can interpret it as a hypergraph H . In this case, we have the vertex set $V = \mathcal{I}^{(1)}$ and the hyperedge set $E = \mathcal{I}^{(0)}$, where $v \in V$ and $e \in E$ are neighbors in \mathcal{F} iff the hyperedge e contains the vertex v . Moreover, w assigns weights to both V and E in the hypergraph.

Under the hypergraph interpretation, the density of a subset $S \subseteq V$ of vertices is $\rho(S) := \frac{w(H[S])}{w(S)}$, where $H[S]$ is the subset of edges that are totally contained in S . Inspired by the densest subset problem, density decomposition (which is applicable to hypergraphs) has been studied.

With the hypergraph interpretation, one can readily define the density decomposition for an instance $(\mathcal{I}^{(0)}, \mathcal{I}^{(1)}; \mathcal{F}; w)$. However, under this approach, the roles of $\mathcal{I}^{(0)}$ and $\mathcal{I}^{(1)}$ are not symmetric: one of $\mathcal{I}^{(0)}$ and $\mathcal{I}^{(1)}$ plays the role of vertices and the other plays the role of hyperedges. We show that it is possible to reinterpret the density decomposition such that the two sets $\mathcal{I}^{(0)}$ and

$\mathcal{I}^{(1)}$ play symmetric roles. This symmetric interpretation will be a useful tool when we study the universally closest distribution refinements problem in Section 5.

Notation: Ground and Auxiliary Sets. For side $\iota \in \mathbb{B}$, the *open neighborhood* of a non-empty subset $S \subseteq \mathcal{I}^{(\iota)}$ consists of vertices on the other side that have at least one neighbor in S , i.e., $\mathcal{F}(S) := \{j \in \mathcal{I}^{(\bar{\iota})} : \exists i \in S, i \sim j\}$. Its *closed neighborhood* is $\mathcal{F}[S] := \{j \in \mathcal{F}(S) : \mathcal{F}(\{j\}) \subseteq S\}$, i.e., a vertex j is in $\mathcal{F}[S]$ iff it has at least one neighbor and all its neighbors are contained in S . Its density is defined as $\rho^{(\iota)}(S) := \frac{w(\mathcal{F}[S])}{w(S)}$, where the superscript ι may be omitted when the context is clear. When we consider the densities of subsets in $\mathcal{I}^{(\iota)}$, the set $\mathcal{I}^{(\iota)}$ plays the role of the *ground set* and the set $\mathcal{I}^{(\bar{\iota})}$ plays the role of the *auxiliary set*. Observe that this definition is consistent with the hypergraph (V, H) interpretation when $\iota = 1$ plays the role of the vertex set V .

Extension to Empty Set. In some of our applications, it makes sense to have isolated vertices in the input instance. For $\emptyset \subseteq \mathcal{I}^{(\iota)}$, we extend $\mathcal{F}(\emptyset) = \mathcal{F}[\emptyset] := \{j \in \mathcal{I}^{(\bar{\iota})} : \forall i \in \mathcal{I}^{(\iota)}, j \not\sim i\}$. For the purpose of defining $\rho(\emptyset)$, we use the convention that $\frac{0}{0} = 0$ and $\frac{x}{0} = +\infty$ for $x > 0$.

Definition 3.1 (Densest Subset). When $\mathcal{I}^{(\iota)}$ plays the role of the ground set, a subset $S \subseteq \mathcal{I}^{(\iota)}$ is a densest subset, if it attains $\max_{S \subseteq \mathcal{I}^{(\iota)}} \rho^{(\iota)}(S)$.

The following well-known fact characterizes a property of maximal densest subset (see [BBC⁺15, Lemma 4.1] for a proof).

Fact 3.2. *With respect to set inclusion, the maximal densest subset in $\mathcal{I}^{(\iota)}$ is unique and contains all densest subsets.*

Definition 3.3 (Sub-Instance). Given an instance $(\mathcal{I}^{(0)}, \mathcal{I}^{(1)}; \mathcal{F}; w)$, the subsets $S^{(0)} \subseteq \mathcal{I}^{(0)}$ and $S^{(1)} \subseteq \mathcal{I}^{(1)}$ naturally induces a sub-instance $(S^{(0)}, S^{(1)}; \mathcal{F}'; w')$, where \mathcal{F}' and w' are restrictions of \mathcal{F} and w , respectively, to $S^{(0)} \cup S^{(1)}$.

The following definition is essentially the same as the density decomposition of a hypergraph.

Definition 3.4 (Density Decomposition with Ground Set). Given an instance $(\mathcal{I}^{(0)}, \mathcal{I}^{(1)}; \mathcal{F}; w)$, suppose for $\iota \in \mathbb{B}$, we consider $\mathcal{I}^{(\iota)}$ as the ground set. The density decomposition with $\mathcal{I}^{(\iota)}$ as the ground set is a sequence of pairs $\{(S_\ell^{(0)}, S_\ell^{(1)})\}_{\ell \geq 1}$, together with a density vector $\rho_*^{(\iota)} : \mathcal{I}^{(\iota)} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$, defined by the following iterative process.

Initially, we set $G_0 := (\mathcal{I}^{(0)}, \mathcal{I}^{(1)}; \mathcal{F}; w)$ to be the original given instance, and initialize $\ell = 1$.

1. If $G_{\ell-1}$ is an instance where the vertex sets on both sides are empty, the process stops.
2. Otherwise, let $S_\ell^{(\iota)}$ be the maximal densest subset in $G_{\ell-1}$ with side ι being the ground set, where ρ_ℓ is the corresponding density; let $S_\ell^{(\bar{\iota})} := \mathcal{F}[S_\ell^{(\iota)}]$ be its closed neighborhood in $G_{\ell-1}$.

For each $u \in S_\ell^{(\iota)}$, define $\rho_*^{(\iota)}(u) := \rho_\ell = \frac{w(S_\ell^{(\bar{\iota})})}{w(S_\ell^{(\iota)})}$.

3. Let G_ℓ be the sub-instance induced by removing $S_\ell^{(\iota)}$ and $S_\ell^{(\bar{\iota})}$ from $G_{\ell-1}$; note that edges in \mathcal{F} incident to removed vertices are also removed.

Increment ℓ and go to the next iteration.

Remark 3.5 (Isolated Vertices). Observe that if each side ι has isolated vertices $U^{(\iota)}$ that have no neighbors, then they will also appear at the beginning and the end of the decomposition sequence as $(U^{(0)}, \emptyset)$ and $(\emptyset, U^{(1)})$.

When $\mathcal{I}^{(\iota)}$ is the ground set, the density $\rho^{(\iota)}$ of vertices in $U^{(\iota)}$ is zero. In the rest of this section, we may assume that isolated vertices are removed from the instance.

Symmetry in Density Decomposition. In Definition 3.4, one side $\iota \in \mathbb{B}$ plays the role of the ground set. One of our major discoveries is that if we switch the ground set to the other side $\bar{\iota}$, the same sequence $\{(S_\ell^{(0)}, S_\ell^{(1)})\}_{\ell \geq 1}$ will be produced in the density decomposition, but in the reversed order. To show this, we need a result that relates the local maximin condition in Definition 2.5 with the density decomposition in Definition 3.4. This is already known in a previous work [DCS17], but we include the details in Section 3.1.

3.1 Local Maximin Condition Implies Density Decomposition

The following fact has been proved in [DCS17] when the vertices in the ground set have uniform weights. For completeness, we are going to extend the approach where both sides have general positive weights.

Fact 3.6 (Local Maximin Condition Gives Density Decomposition). *Given an instance $(\mathcal{I}^{(0)}, \mathcal{I}^{(1)}; \mathcal{F}; w)$, consider side $\iota \in \mathbb{B}$ as the ground set. Suppose $\alpha^{(\bar{\iota})} \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{F}}$ is a refinement of the vertex weights $w^{(\bar{\iota})}$ on side $\bar{\iota}$, which induces the payload density vector $\rho^{(\iota)}$ on side ι as in Definition 2.3.*

Suppose further that $\alpha^{(\bar{\iota})}$ satisfies the local maximin condition in Definition 2.5. Then, $\rho^{(\iota)}$ coincides exactly with the density vector $\rho_\star^{(\iota)}$ achieved by the density decomposition in Definition 3.4 with side ι being the ground set.

Moreover, if $(S_\ell^{(\bar{\iota})}, S_\ell^{(\iota)})$ is a pair in the density decomposition, then $S_\ell^{(\bar{\iota})}$ is exactly the collection of vertices that send positive payload to $S_\ell^{(\iota)}$ in $\alpha^{(\bar{\iota})}$.

LP Relaxation of Densest Subset. For ease of illustration, we will consider $\iota = 1$ as the ground set. In terms of the hypergraph interpretation, the reader can treat side $\bar{\iota} = 0$ as the hyperedges and side ι as vertices. To simplify the notation, we will omit some superscripts and denote $\alpha = \alpha^{(0)}$ as the refinement of $w^{(0)}$ and $\rho = \rho^{(1)}$ as the density vector for $\mathcal{I}^{(1)}$. An LP relaxation for the densest subset problem has been considered [Cha00] and we rephrase it with $\mathcal{I}^{(1)}$ being the ground set in an instance $G = (\mathcal{I}^{(0)}, \mathcal{I}^{(1)}; \mathcal{F}; w)$ as follows. It is known that the optimal objective value of $\text{LP}(G)$ is exactly the maximum density of a subset.

$$\begin{aligned} \text{LP}(G) : \quad & \max \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}^{(0)}} w(i) \cdot x_i \\ & \text{s.t. } x_i \leq y_j, & \forall i \in \mathcal{I}^{(0)} \sim j \in \mathcal{I}^{(1)} \\ & \sum_{j \in \mathcal{I}^{(1)}} w(j) \cdot y_j = 1 \\ & x_i, y_j \geq 0, & \forall i \in \mathcal{I}^{(0)}, j \in \mathcal{I}^{(1)} \end{aligned}$$

The corresponding dual DP can be expressed as follows, where the dual variables α naturally corresponds to a refinement of $w^{(0)} \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{I}^{(0)}}$. Because DP is a minimization LP, in an optimal solution, equality should hold for the first constraint.

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{DP}(G) : \quad & \min \quad r \\
\text{s.t.} \quad & \sum_{j \in \mathcal{I}^{(1)}: i \sim j} \alpha(ij) \geq w(i), & \forall i \in \mathcal{I}^{(0)} \\
& w(j) \cdot r \geq p(j) := \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}^{(0)}: i \sim j} \alpha(ij), & \forall j \in \mathcal{I}^{(1)} \\
& \alpha(ij) \geq 0, & \forall i \in \mathcal{I}^{(0)} \sim j \in \mathcal{I}^{(1)} \\
& r \in \mathbb{R}
\end{aligned}$$

Lemma 3.7 (Maximin Condition Recovers Maximal Densest Subset). *Suppose $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{F}}$ is a refinement of vertex weights $w^{(0)}$ in $\mathcal{I}^{(0)}$, which induces a payload density vector ρ on the vertices $\mathcal{I}^{(1)}$. Suppose $S := \arg \max_{j \in \mathcal{I}^{(1)}} \rho(j)$ are the vertices with the maximum payload density.*

In addition, if α satisfies the local maximin condition in Definition 2.5, then S is the maximal densest subset in $\mathcal{I}^{(1)}$, whose density equals to the payload density $\rho(j)$ for $j \in S$.

Proof. We first show that S is a densest subset. Note that the refinement α of $w^{(0)}$ is a feasible dual solution to $\text{DP}(G)$. Because α satisfies the local maximin condition in Definition 2.5, it follows that any vertex $j \in S = \arg \max_{j \in \mathcal{I}^{(1)}} \rho(j)$ can receive positive payload $\alpha(ij) > 0$ only from i in the closed neighborhood $\mathcal{F}[S]$. Hence, it follows that for all $j \in S$, $\rho(j) = \rho_G(S) := \frac{w(\mathcal{F}[S])}{w(S)}$.

Moreover, since S are the vertices in $\mathcal{I}^{(1)}$ with the maximum payload density, it follows that we can set the objective value $r = \rho_G(S)$ for the dual feasible solution α . On the other hand, $\rho_G(S)$ is the density of the subset $S \subseteq \mathcal{I}^{(1)}$, which induces a feasible primal solution. Since we have exhibited a primal-dual pair with the same objective value, it follows that both solutions are optimal, i.e., S is a densest subset.

We next show that S is the maximal densest subset. For the sake of contradiction, assume that there exists a non-empty $B \subseteq \mathcal{I}^{(1)}$ disjoint from S such that the density of $S \cup B$ in G is also $\rho_G(S)$, i.e, we have

$$\rho_G(S \cup B) = \frac{w(\mathcal{F}[S]) + w(\mathcal{F}[S \cup B] \setminus \mathcal{F}[S])}{w(S) + w(B)} = \rho_G(S), \text{ which implies that } \frac{w(\mathcal{F}[S \cup B] \setminus \mathcal{F}[S])}{w(B)} = \rho_G(S).$$

Consider the sub-instance \widehat{G} obtained by removing S and $\mathcal{F}[S]$ from G . Then, we can conclude that the objective value of $\text{LP}(\widehat{G})$ is at least $\rho_G(S)$, because we have $\rho_{\widehat{G}}(B) = \rho_G(S)$.

Next, consider the dual $\text{DP}(\widehat{G})$. Because α satisfies the local maximin condition, this means that for any $i \notin \mathcal{F}[S]$ and $j \in S$, $\alpha(ij) = 0$. Therefore, the natural restriction $\widehat{\alpha}$ of α to \widehat{G} is a feasible dual solution to $\text{LP}(\widehat{G})$. However, observe that since all vertices S with the maximum payload density has been removed, the corresponding objective value of the dual solution $\widehat{\alpha}$ will drop strictly below $\rho_G(S)$. This violates the weak duality between $\text{LP}(\widehat{G})$ and $\text{DP}(\widehat{G})$.

Hence, we conclude that S is the maximal densest subset in G . \square

Proof of Fact 3.6. We can prove the result by induction on the number of distinct values appearing in the payload density vector ρ on $\mathcal{I}^{(1)}$ induced by the refinement α of the vertex weights $w^{(0)}$ on $\mathcal{I}^{(0)}$. For the base case when all vertices $j \in \mathcal{I}^{(1)}$ have the same payload density $\rho(j)$, Lemma 3.7 implies that the decomposition consists of only one pair $(\mathcal{I}^{(0)}, \mathcal{I}^{(1)})$.

For the inductive case, suppose $S = \arg \max_{j \in \mathcal{I}^{(1)}} \rho(j)$ as defined in Lemma 3.7. Then, the first pair in the decomposition is $(\mathcal{F}[S], S)$. As argued in the proof of Lemma 3.7, the result follows from the induction hypothesis on the sub-instance \widehat{G} by removing $(\mathcal{F}[S], S)$ from the original instance. The reason this works is because α satisfies the local maximin condition, for $i \notin \mathcal{F}[S] \sim j \in S$,

$\alpha(ij) = 0$. Hence, the restriction $\hat{\alpha}$ of α to the sub-instance \hat{G} is also a refinement of the vertex weights on side 0 that satisfies the local maximin condition. \square

Fact 3.6 states the desirable properties achieved by a locally maximin refinement. It is easy to show that a locally maximin refinement exists.

Fact 3.8 (Existence of Locally Maximin Refinement). *There exists a refinement $\alpha^{(0)}$ of the vertex weights in $\mathcal{I}^{(0)}$ that is locally maximin.*

Proof. We prove by induction on the number ℓ of pairs in the density decomposition of the instance G .

Consider an optimal dual solution α^* to the dual $\text{DP}(G)$. By strong LP duality, we know that the objective value of the dual equals to the density $\frac{w(\mathcal{F}[S])}{w(S)}$ of the maximal densest subset $S \subseteq \mathcal{I}^{(1)}$.

Hence, when we consider the restriction of α^* to the edges between $\mathcal{F}[S] \subseteq \mathcal{I}^{(0)}$ and $S \subseteq \mathcal{I}^{(1)}$, it must be the case that the payload density of every vertex in S is the same; otherwise, some vertex in S will have payload density strictly larger than $\frac{w(\mathcal{F}[S])}{w(S)}$, which makes the dual objective value also strictly larger than $\frac{w(\mathcal{F}[S])}{w(S)}$. Therefore, we can use this restriction to define a refinement α' for the vertex weights in $\mathcal{F}[S]$.

For the case $\ell = 1$ where $\mathcal{F}[S] = \mathcal{I}^{(0)}$ and $S = \mathcal{I}^{(1)}$, the base case is completed.

For $\ell \geq 2$, we consider the sub-instance \hat{G} by removing $\mathcal{F}[S]$ and S from the original instance G , and apply the induction hypothesis to \hat{G} and obtain a locally maximin refinement $\hat{\alpha}$ of vertex weights in $\mathcal{I}^{(0)} \setminus \mathcal{F}[S]$.

Observe that we can combine α' and $\hat{\alpha}$ to get a refinement $\alpha^{(0)}$ for the vertex weights in $\mathcal{I}^{(0)}$. We check that $\alpha^{(0)}$ is locally maximin, because the payload density of every vertex in S is strictly larger than that of every vertex in $\mathcal{I}^{(1)} \setminus S$, by the property of density decomposition. \square

3.2 Density Decomposition Is Symmetric

Since we have shown in Lemma 3.7 that a refinement that satisfies the local maximin condition is related to the density decomposition in Definition 3.4, we will illustrate the symmetry of the density decomposition by considering the proportional response to a locally maximin refinement.

Lemma 3.9 (Proportional Response to Locally Maximin Refinement). *Let $\alpha^{(0)}$ be a refinement of vertex weights in $\mathcal{I}^{(0)}$ that satisfies the local maximin condition. By Remark 2.6, suppose the refinement $\alpha^{(1)}$ on vertex weights in $\mathcal{I}^{(1)}$ is the unique proportional response to $\alpha^{(0)}$. Moreover, for each side $\iota \in \mathbb{B}$, the refinement $\alpha^{(\iota)}$ induces the payload density vector $\rho^{(\bar{\iota})}$ on vertices on the other side $\bar{\iota}$. Then, the following holds:*

- For any $i \in \mathcal{I}^{(0)}$ and $j \in \mathcal{I}^{(1)}$ such that $i \sim j$ and $\alpha^{(0)}(ij) > 0$, their received payload densities due to the refinements satisfy $\rho^{(0)}(i) = \frac{1}{\rho^{(1)}(j)}$.
- The refinement $\alpha^{(1)}$ also satisfies the local maximin condition.
- We get back $\alpha^{(0)}$ as the proportional response to $\alpha^{(1)}$.

Proof. By the definition of proportional response, for any $i \in \mathcal{I}^{(0)}$ and $j \in \mathcal{I}^{(1)}$, $\alpha^{(0)}(ij) > 0$ iff $\alpha^{(1)}(ij) > 0$.

We prove the first statement. For $i \in \mathcal{I}^{(0)}$, denote $F_i := \{j \in \mathcal{I}^{(1)} : \alpha^{(0)}(ij) > 0\}$. Since $\alpha^{(0)}$ satisfies the local maximin condition, all $j \in F_i$ has the same payload density $\rho^{(1)}(j)$. Now, consider the payload received by i due to the proportional response $\alpha^{(1)}$:

$$p^{(0)}(i) := \sum_{j \in F_i} \alpha^{(1)}(ij) = \sum_{j \in F_i} \alpha^{(0)}(ij) \cdot \frac{w(j)}{p^{(1)}(j)} = \frac{w(i)}{\rho^{(1)}(j)},$$

where in the last equality, we use that all $j \in F_i$ have the same payload density $\rho^{(1)}(j)$, and $w(i) = \sum_{j \in F_i} \alpha^{(0)}(ij)$. This implies that for any $j \in F_i$,

$$\rho^{(0)}(i) := \frac{p^{(0)}(i)}{w(i)} = \frac{1}{\rho^{(1)}(j)}.$$

We next prove the second statement. Fix some $j \in \mathcal{I}^{(1)}$ and suppose $\alpha^{(1)}(ij) > 0$, which is equivalent to $\alpha^{(0)}(ij) > 0$ and $j \in F_i$. If some vertex $i' \in \mathcal{I}^{(0)}$ has payload density $\rho^{(0)}(i') > \rho^{(0)}(i)$, then our first statement implies that $\rho^{(0)}(i') \cdot \rho^{(1)}(j) > \rho^{(0)}(i) \cdot \rho^{(1)}(j) = 1$, which means that both $\alpha^{(0)}(i'j) = \alpha^{(1)}(i'j) = 0$.

Hence, it suffices to show that if a vertex $\hat{i} \in \mathcal{I}^{(0)}$ has payload density $\rho^{(0)}(\hat{i}) < \rho^{(0)}(i)$, then \hat{i} and j are not neighbors in \mathcal{F} .

Consider some $\hat{j} \in F_{\hat{i}}$ that receives positive payload from \hat{i} in the refinement $\alpha^{(0)}$. By our first statement, we have the payload density $\rho^{(1)}(\hat{j}) = \frac{1}{\rho^{(0)}(\hat{i})} > \frac{1}{\rho^{(0)}(i)} = \rho^{(1)}(j)$. Since $\alpha^{(0)}$ satisfies the local maximin condition, it follows that \hat{i} and j cannot be neighbors in \mathcal{F} .

Hence, $\alpha^{(1)}$ also satisfies the local maximin condition.

Finally, for $i \in \mathcal{I}^{(0)}$ and $j \in \mathcal{I}^{(1)}$, the proportional response to $\alpha^{(1)}$ is $\hat{\alpha}(ij) = \frac{\alpha^{(1)}(ij)}{\rho^{(0)}(i)} = \frac{\alpha^{(0)}(ij)}{\rho^{(1)}(j) \cdot \rho^{(0)}(i)} = \alpha^{(0)}(ij)$. \square

Now, we are ready to prove that density decomposition is symmetric.

Theorem 3.10 (Folklore: Symmetry of Density Decomposition). *Given an instance $(\mathcal{I}^{(0)}, \mathcal{I}^{(1)}; \mathcal{F}; w)$, suppose the sequence $\{(S_\ell^{(0)}, S_\ell^{(1)})\}_{\ell \geq 1}$ of pairs is the density decomposition using $\mathcal{I}^{(1)}$ as the ground set.*

Then, the density decomposition using $\mathcal{I}^{(0)}$ as the ground set produces the same sequence of pairs in reversed order.

Proof. By Facts 3.6 and 3.8, the density decomposition $\{(S_\ell^{(0)}, S_\ell^{(1)})\}_{\ell \geq 1}$ using $\mathcal{I}^{(1)}$ as the ground set is associated with a locally maximin refinement $\alpha^{(0)}$ of the vertex weights in $\mathcal{I}^{(0)}$.

We next apply Lemma 3.9 to the proportional response $\alpha^{(1)}$ to $\alpha^{(0)}$, and conclude that the refinement $\alpha^{(1)}$ of vertices weights in $\mathcal{I}^{(1)}$ is also locally maximin. By Fact 3.6, the payload density vector $\rho^{(0)} \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{I}^{(0)}}$ induced by $\alpha^{(1)}$ coincides with the density vector in the density decomposition $\{(\hat{S}_k^{(0)}, \hat{S}_k^{(1)})\}_{k \geq 1}$ with $\mathcal{I}^{(0)}$ as the ground set.

By Lemma 3.9, for all ℓ , for all $i \in S_\ell^{(0)}$ and for all $j \in S_\ell^{(1)}$, $\rho^{(0)}(i) \cdot \rho^{(1)}(j) = 1$.

Because $\{(S_\ell^{(0)}, S_\ell^{(1)})\}_{\ell \geq 1}$ is the density decomposition with $\mathcal{I}^{(1)}$ being the ground set, this means that the densities $\rho^{(0)}$ are the same for vertices within the same $S_\ell^{(0)}$ and different for $\ell \neq \ell'$. Moreover, since the density $\rho^{(1)}$ of vertices in $S_\ell^{(1)}$ decreases as ℓ increases, this implies that the sequence $\{\hat{S}_k^{(0)}\}_{k \geq 1}$ is the reverse of $\{S_\ell^{(0)}\}_{\ell \geq 1}$.

Finally, observe that proportional response has the property that $\alpha^{(0)}(ij) > 0$ iff $\alpha^{(1)}(ij) > 0$. From Fact 3.6, $\hat{S}_k^{(1)}$ is exactly the collection of vertices that send positive payload to $\hat{S}_k^{(0)}$ in $\alpha^{(1)}$. Therefore, $S_\ell^{(0)} = \hat{S}_k^{(0)}$ iff $S_\ell^{(1)} = \hat{S}_k^{(1)}$. This finishes the proof. \square

4 Universal Refinement Matching Problem

As mentioned in Section 1, an instance in Definition 2.1 can be interpreted as inputs in various problems. As a precursor to the universally closest distribution refinements problem studied in Section 5, we consider a matching problem. Here, an instance is interpreted as the input of the vertex-constrained fractional matching problem, where the vertex constraints on each side is scaled by the same multiplicative factor.

Definition 4.1 (Vertex-Constrained Matching Instance). Given an instance $G = (\mathcal{I}^{(0)}, \mathcal{I}^{(1)}; \mathcal{F}; w)$ as in Definition 2.1 and two non-negative weights $\vec{c} = (c^{(0)}, c^{(1)}) \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{B}}$, we use $G^{(\vec{c})}$ to denote

the instance of (fractional) matching on the bipartite graph $(\mathcal{I}^{(0)}, \mathcal{I}^{(1)}; \mathcal{F})$ with vertex capacity constraints. For side ι and $i \in \mathcal{I}^{(\iota)}$, the capacity constraint at vertex i is $c^{(\iota)} \cdot w(i)$.

LP Interpretation. The maximum (fractional) matching problem instance $G^{(\vec{c})}$ is captured by the following linear program.

$$\begin{aligned} \text{LP}(G^{(\vec{c})}) \quad & \max \quad \sum_{i \sim j} x_{ij} \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \sum_{j': i \sim j'} x_{ij'} \leq c^{(0)} \cdot w(i), \quad \forall i \in \mathcal{I}^{(0)} \\ & \sum_{i': i' \sim j} x_{i'j} \leq c^{(1)} \cdot w(j), \quad \forall j \in \mathcal{I}^{(1)} \\ & x_{ij} \geq 0, \quad \forall i \in \mathcal{I}^{(0)} \sim j \in \mathcal{I}^{(1)} \end{aligned}$$

We will also consider the dual in our analysis:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{DP}(G^{(\vec{c})}) \quad & \min \quad c^{(0)} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}^{(0)}} w(i) \cdot \lambda_i + c^{(1)} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{I}^{(1)}} w(j) \cdot \lambda_j \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \lambda_i + \lambda_j \geq 1, \quad \forall i \in \mathcal{I}^{(0)} \sim j \in \mathcal{I}^{(1)} \\ & \lambda_i \geq 0, \quad \forall i \in \mathcal{I}^{(0)} \cup \mathcal{I}^{(1)} \end{aligned}$$

Definition 4.2 (Fractional Matching Induced by Refinement Pair). Given an instance $G = (\mathcal{I}^{(0)}, \mathcal{I}^{(1)}; \mathcal{F}; w)$ and a non-negative weight pair $\vec{c} = (c^{(0)}, c^{(1)})$, a refinement pair $\vec{\alpha} = (\alpha^{(0)}, \alpha^{(1)})$, where $\alpha^{(\iota)}$ is a refinement on vertex weights in $\mathcal{I}^{(\iota)}$, induces a feasible fractional matching for $G^{(\vec{c})}$ that is denoted as follows:

$$\vec{c} \bullet \vec{\alpha}(ij) := \min\{c^{(0)} \cdot \alpha^{(0)}(ij), c^{(1)} \cdot \alpha^{(1)}(ij)\}, \text{ for all } i \sim j.$$

Remark 4.3. The feasibility of the fractional matching $\vec{c} \bullet \vec{\alpha}$ to the instance $G^{(\vec{c})}$ follows directly because each $\alpha^{(\iota)}$ is a refinement of the vertex weights in $\mathcal{I}^{(\iota)}$.

Definition 4.4 (Universal Refinement Pair for Matching). Given an instance $G = (\mathcal{I}^{(0)}, \mathcal{I}^{(1)}; \mathcal{F}; w)$ and $\tau \in [0, 1]$, a refinement pair $\vec{\alpha}$ is $(1 - \tau)$ -universal for matching in G , if for any non-negative weight pair \vec{c} , the solution $\vec{c} \bullet \vec{\alpha}$ achieves $(1 - \tau)$ -approximation for the maximum matching problem on $G^{(\vec{c})}$.

For $\tau = 0$, we simply say $\vec{\alpha}$ is universal (for matching in G).

Intuition for Universal Refinement Pair. Besides being a technical tool for later sections, the notion of a universal refinement pair is interesting in terms of understanding the structure of vertex-constrained bipartite matching. Suppose it is known that the vertex weights on each side are correlated and may vary but follow some fixed relative ratios among themselves. The idea of a universal refinement pair is that some pre-computation can be performed such that when the vertex weights on each side change proportionally, the matching can be updated quickly to get a (nearly) optimal solution without computing from scratch.

Observe that the density decomposition in Definition 3.4 does not change if the vertex weights on one side are multiplied by the same scalar. Informally, the decomposition identifies different levels of “congestion” when a matching is performed between vertices on the two sides. The following result formalizes the connection between the density decomposition and universal refinement pairs.

Lemma 4.5 (Local Maximin Achieves Universal for Matching). *Suppose in an instance G , for side $\iota \in \mathbb{B}$, the refinement $\alpha^{(\iota)}$ on vertex weights in $\mathcal{I}^{(\iota)}$ is locally maximin, and the refinement $\alpha^{(\bar{\iota})}$ is the (unique) proportional response to $\alpha^{(\iota)}$. Then, the refinement pair $(\alpha^{(\iota)}, \alpha^{(\bar{\iota})})$ is universal for matching in G .*

Moreover, suppose in the density decomposition, for side ι , $\rho_*^{(\iota)}$ is the payload density vector and $p_*^{(\iota)}$ is the payload vector. Then, for any $c = (c^{(\iota)}, c^{(\bar{\iota})})$, the weight of the maximum matching in $G^{(\bar{c})}$ is:

$$\sum_{j \in \mathcal{I}^{(\iota)}} \min\left\{\frac{c^{(\iota)}(j)}{\rho_*^{(\iota)}(j)}, c^{(\bar{\iota})}(j)\right\} \cdot p_*^{(\iota)}(j).$$

Proof. By Lemma 3.9, $\alpha^{(\iota)}$ and $\alpha^{(\bar{\iota})}$ are proportional responses to each other and both are locally maximin. Fix some $\bar{c} = (c^{(0)}, c^{(1)})$ and we show that $\bar{c} \bullet \bar{\alpha}$ is an optimal solution to $G^{(\bar{c})}$.

Let $\{(S_\ell^{(0)}, S_\ell^{(1)})\}_{\ell \geq 1}$ be the density decomposition with $\mathcal{I}^{(1)}$ being the ground set. (Recall that the density decomposition is symmetric between $\mathcal{I}^{(0)}$ and $\mathcal{I}^{(1)}$, where the forward or backward order of the sequence depends on which side is the ground set.)

From Fact 3.6, recall that $\alpha^{(0)}(ij)$ and $\alpha^{(1)}(ij)$ are non-zero only if there exists some ℓ such that $(i, j) \in \mathcal{F}_\ell := \mathcal{F} \cap (S_\ell^{(0)} \times S_\ell^{(1)})$.

Let $L^{(1)} := \{\ell : c^{(1)} \cdot w(S_\ell^{(1)}) \leq c^{(0)} \cdot w(S_\ell^{(0)})\}$ and $L^{(0)} := \{\ell : c^{(1)} \cdot w(S_\ell^{(1)}) > c^{(0)} \cdot w(S_\ell^{(0)})\}$.

Observe that for $i \in S_\ell^{(1)}$, $\rho_*^{(1)}(i) = \frac{w(S_\ell^{(0)})}{w(S_\ell^{(1)})}$. Therefore, for all $\ell \in L^{(1)}$ and $\ell' \in L^{(0)}$, $\ell < \ell'$.

Moreover, for all $\ell < \ell'$, for all $i \in S_\ell^{(0)}$ and $j \in S_{\ell'}^{(1)}$, i and j are not neighbors in \mathcal{F} , from the definition of the density decomposition.

Hence, we can construct a feasible dual solution λ to $\text{DP}(G^{(\bar{c})})$ as follows.

- For $\ell \in L^{(1)}$: for $i \in S_\ell^{(0)}$, $\lambda_i = 0$; for $j \in S_\ell^{(1)}$, $\lambda_j = 1$.
- For $\ell \in L^{(0)}$: for $i \in S_\ell^{(0)}$, $\lambda_i = 1$; for $j \in S_\ell^{(1)}$, $\lambda_j = 0$.

The dual feasibility of λ holds because if $i \in \mathcal{I}^{(0)}$ and $j \in \mathcal{I}^{(1)}$ such that $\lambda_i = \lambda_j = 0$, then it must be the case that i and j are not neighbors in \mathcal{F} .

Next, we check that the dual solution λ has the same objective value as the primal solution $\bar{c} \bullet \bar{\alpha}$ to $\text{LP}(G^{(\bar{c})})$.

Observe that for $\ell \in L^{(1)}$, for $i \in S_\ell^{(0)} \sim j \in S_\ell^{(1)}$, we have

$$c^{(1)} \cdot \alpha^{(1)}(ij) = c^{(1)} \cdot \alpha^{(0)}(ij) \cdot \frac{w(S_\ell^{(1)})}{w(S_\ell^{(0)})} \leq c^{(0)} \cdot \alpha^{(0)}(ij).$$

Hence, $c^{(1)} \sum_{j \in S_\ell^{(1)}} w(j) \cdot \lambda_j = c^{(1)} \sum_{(i,j) \in \mathcal{F}_\ell} \alpha^{(1)}(ij) = \sum_{(i,j) \in \mathcal{F}_\ell} \bar{c} \bullet \bar{\alpha}(ij)$, where the first equality holds because $\alpha^{(1)}$ restricted to \mathcal{F}_ℓ is a refinement of vertex weights in $S_\ell^{(1)}$.

Similarly, for $\ell \in L^{(0)}$, we have $c^{(0)} \sum_{i \in S_\ell^{(0)}} w(i) \cdot \lambda_i = \sum_{(i,j) \in \mathcal{F}_\ell} \bar{c} \bullet \bar{\alpha}(ij)$.

Therefore, the feasible primal solution $\bar{c} \bullet \bar{\alpha}$ and the feasible dual solution λ have the same objective value, which implies that both are optimal.

Finally, we compute the weight of the maximum matching in $G^{(\bar{c})}$. For simpler notation, it is understood that in each sum below, we include only pairs (i, j) such that both $\alpha^{(0)}(ij)$ and $\alpha^{(1)}(ij)$ are non-zero.

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{(i,j) \in (\mathcal{I}^{(\bar{\tau})} \times \mathcal{I}^{(\iota)}) \cap \mathcal{F}: \alpha(ij) > 0} \min\{c^{(\bar{\tau})} \cdot \alpha^{(\bar{\tau})}(ij), c^{(\iota)} \cdot \alpha^{(\iota)}(ij)\} \\
&= \sum_{(i,j)} \min\{c^{(\bar{\tau})}, c^{(\iota)} \cdot \frac{\alpha^{(\iota)}(ij)}{\alpha^{(\bar{\tau})}(ij)}\} \cdot \alpha^{(\bar{\tau})}(ij) \\
&= \sum_{(i,j)} \min\{c^{(\bar{\tau})}, c^{(\iota)} \cdot \frac{1}{\rho_*^{(\iota)}(j)}\} \cdot \alpha^{(\bar{\tau})}(ij) \\
&= \sum_{j \in \mathcal{I}^{(\iota)}} \min\{c^{(\bar{\tau})}, \frac{c^{(\iota)}}{\rho_*^{(\iota)}(j)}\} \sum_{i: i \sim j} \alpha^{(\bar{\tau})}(ij) \\
&= \sum_{j \in \mathcal{I}^{(\iota)}} \min\{\frac{c^{(\iota)}}{\rho_*^{(\iota)}(j)}, c^{(\bar{\tau})}\} \cdot p_*^{(\iota)}(j).
\end{aligned}$$

□

4.1 Approximate Universal Matching

Although locally maximin refinements (on one side ι) may not be unique, Fact 3.6 states that all such refinements correspond to the same payload density vector (on the other side $\bar{\tau}$). Hence, it is natural to define the notion of approximation for refinements based on the induced payload density vector.

Definition 4.6 (τ -Approximate Refinement). For $\tau \geq 0$, a refinement $\alpha^{(\iota)}$ on vertex weights in $\mathcal{I}^{(\iota)}$ achieves τ -multiplicative error if the induced payload density vector $\rho^{(\bar{\tau})}$ achieves τ -multiplicative error with respect to the density vector $\rho_*^{(\bar{\tau})}$ in the density decomposition.

In other words, for each $i \in \mathcal{I}^{(\bar{\tau})}$, we have $|\rho^{(\bar{\tau})}(i) - \rho_*^{(\bar{\tau})}(i)| \leq \tau \cdot \rho_*^{(\bar{\tau})}(i)$.

We now demonstrate how to translate the density vector approximation into approximations for the universal refinement matching problem.

Theorem 4.7 (Approximate Refinements Give Approximate Universal Matching). *Suppose given an instance G , for $0 \leq \tau < 1$, for side $\bar{\tau} \in \mathbb{B}$, $\alpha^{(\bar{\tau})}$ is a refinement on vertex weights in $\mathcal{I}^{(\bar{\tau})}$ that achieves τ -multiplicative error, and $\alpha^{(\iota)}$ is the proportional response to $\alpha^{(\bar{\tau})}$. Then, the pair $\vec{\alpha} = (\alpha^{(\bar{\tau})}, \alpha^{(\iota)})$ is $\frac{1-\tau}{1+\tau}$ -universal for matching in G .*

Proof. Without loss of generality, we prove the result for $\bar{\tau} = 0$. Fix positive weights $\vec{c} = (c^{(0)}, c^{(1)})$, and we will show that $\vec{c} \bullet \vec{\alpha}$ achieves $\frac{1-\tau}{1+\tau}$ -approximation for the maximum fractional matching instance $G^{(\vec{c})}$.

Since $\alpha^{(0)}$ achieves τ -multiplicative error, the induced payload density $\rho^{(1)}$ satisfies, for all $j \in \mathcal{I}^{(1)}$,

$$(1 - \tau) \cdot \rho_*^{(1)}(j) \leq \rho^{(1)}(j) \leq (1 + \tau) \cdot \rho_*^{(1)}(j). \quad (1)$$

Equivalently, the induced payload $p^{(1)}(j) = w(j) \cdot \rho^{(1)}(j)$ also satisfies:

$$(1 - \tau) \cdot p_*^{(1)}(j) \leq p^{(1)}(j) \leq (1 + \tau) \cdot p_*^{(1)}(j). \quad (2)$$

Moreover, because $\tau < 1$, the proportional response $\alpha^{(1)}$ to $\alpha^{(0)}$ is unique, and we have for $i \in \mathcal{I}^{(0)}$, $\alpha^{(1)}(ij) = \frac{\alpha^{(0)}(ij)}{\rho^{(1)}(j)}$. By considering only pairs such that $\alpha^{(0)}(ij) > 0$, the weight of the solution $\vec{c} \bullet \vec{\alpha}$ is:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{(i,j) \in (\mathcal{I}^{(0)} \times \mathcal{I}^{(1)}) \cap \mathcal{F}: \alpha^{(0)}(ij) > 0} \min\{c^{(0)} \cdot \alpha^{(0)}(ij), c^{(1)} \cdot \alpha^{(1)}(ij)\} \\
&= \sum_{(i,j)} \min\{c^{(0)}, c^{(1)} \cdot \frac{\alpha^{(1)}(ij)}{\alpha^{(0)}(ij)}\} \cdot \alpha^{(0)}(ij) \\
&= \sum_{(i,j)} \min\{c^{(0)}, c^{(1)} \cdot \frac{1}{\rho^{(1)}(j)}\} \cdot \alpha^{(0)}(ij) \\
&\geq \sum_{j \in \mathcal{I}^{(1)}} \min\{c^{(0)}, \frac{c^{(1)}}{(1+\tau) \cdot \rho_*^{(1)}(j)}\} \cdot \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}^{(0)}: i \sim j} \alpha^{(0)}(ij) && \text{(upper bound in (1))} \\
&\geq \frac{1}{1+\tau} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{I}^{(1)}} \min\{\frac{c^{(1)}}{\rho_*^{(1)}(j)}, c^{(0)}\} \cdot p^{(1)}(j) \\
&\geq \frac{1-\tau}{1+\tau} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{I}^{(1)}} \min\{\frac{c^{(1)}}{\rho_*^{(1)}(j)}, c^{(0)}\} \cdot p_*^{(1)}(j) && \text{(lower bound in (2))} \\
&= \frac{1-\tau}{1+\tau} \cdot \text{LP}(G(\vec{c})),
\end{aligned}$$

where the last equality comes from Lemma 4.5. □

4.2 Negative Result: Approximation Non-Transferable to Proportional Response

Contrary to Lemma 4.7, we show that given a refinement $\alpha^{(\bar{\tau})}$ to vertex weights on side $\bar{\tau}$ that achieves a certain multiplicative error, there is not necessarily any guarantee on its proportional response.

Lemma 4.8 (Approximation Guarantees Non-Transferable to Proportional Response). *For any $\tau \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$, there exists an instance G such that there exists a refinement $\alpha^{(0)}$ for vertex weights on $\mathcal{I}^{(0)}$ achieving τ -multiplicative error, but its proportional response $\alpha^{(1)}$ has a multiplicative error of at least $1 - \tau$.*

Proof. Our counterexample is given in Figure 1. Observe that there are 3 vertices on each side. Moreover, the only dependence on τ are the weights of $i_2 \in \mathcal{I}^{(0)}$ and $j_3 \in \mathcal{I}^{(1)}$.

The density decomposition is: $(\{i_1\}, \{j_1, j_2\})$ and $(\{i_2, i_3\}, \{j_3\})$. Moreover, for vertices in $\mathcal{I}^{(1)}$, the correct payload densities are $\rho_*^{(1)}(j_1) = \rho_*^{(1)}(j_2) = 1$ and $\rho_*^{(1)}(j_3) = \tau(1 + \tau)$.




Figure 1: Counterexample

Now, let us consider the following refinement $\alpha^{(0)}$ on vertex weights in $\mathcal{I}^{(0)}$:

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha^{(0)}(i_1 j_1) &= \alpha^{(0)}(i_1 j_2) = 1; \\ \alpha^{(0)}(i_2 j_2) &= \tau \text{ and } \alpha^{(0)}(i_2 j_3) = 0; \\ \alpha^{(0)}(i_3 j_3) &= 1. \end{aligned}$$

The intuition is that the mistake is made by vertex i_2 . Instead of sending its weight to j_3 , its weight is sent to j_2 .

However, the resulting payload density on $\mathcal{I}^{(1)}$ is only affected slightly:

$\rho^{(1)}(j_1) = 1$, $\rho^{(1)}(j_2) = 1 + \tau$ and $\rho^{(1)}(j_3) = \tau$. Hence, the density vector $\rho^{(1)}$ achieves τ -multiplicative error with respect to $\rho_*^{(1)}$.

Consider the payload density for i_2 due to the proportional response $\alpha^{(1)}$ to $\alpha^{(0)}$. The payload received by i_2 is: $1 \cdot \frac{\tau}{1+\tau} = \frac{\tau}{1+\tau}$. Hence, the payload density from the proportional response is: $\rho^{(0)}(i_2) = \frac{1}{1+\tau}$.

However, in the density decomposition, the correct payload density should be $\rho_*^{(0)}(i_2) = \frac{1}{\tau(1+\tau)}$.

Therefore, the multiplicative error is at least: $1 - \frac{\rho^{(0)}(i_2)}{\rho_*^{(0)}(i_2)} = 1 - \tau$.

□

5 Universally Closest Distribution Refinements Problem

In this section, we show that when an instance is interpreted as two distributions on two sample spaces imposed with a neighboring relation, a refinement pair satisfying Goal 1.3 is an optimal solution to the *universally closest distribution refinements problem*.

Distribution Instance. In Definition 2.1, an input is a *distribution instance*, if, in addition, we require that for each side $\iota \in \mathbb{B}$, the vertex weights satisfies $\sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}^{(\iota)}} w^{(\iota)}(i) = 1$, i.e., $w^{(\iota)}$ is a probability distribution on $\mathcal{I}^{(\iota)}$.

Observe that given a distribution instance $G = (\mathcal{I}^{(0)}, \mathcal{I}^{(1)}; \mathcal{F}; w)$, for each side $\iota \in \mathbb{B}$, a refinement $\alpha^{(\iota)}$ of the vertex weights $w^{(\iota)}$ is a probability distribution on \mathcal{F} . A high-level problem is to find a refinement pair $\vec{\alpha} = (\alpha^{(0)}, \alpha^{(1)})$ such that the distributions $\alpha^{(0)}$ and $\alpha^{(1)}$ on \mathcal{F} are as “close” to each other as possible.

Divergence Notion. Given two distributions P and Q on the same sample space Ω , a notion of *divergence* $D(P\|Q)$ measures how close two distributions are, where a smaller value typically means that the two distributions are closer. An example is the total variation distance $D_{\text{TV}}(P\|Q) := \sup_{E \subseteq \Omega} |P(E) - Q(E)|$. However, note that in general, a divergence needs not be symmetric,

i.e., it is possible that $D(P\|Q) \neq D(Q\|P)$. An example of a non-symmetric divergence notion is $D_{\text{KL}}(P\|Q) = \sum_{\omega \in \Omega} p_{\omega} \ln \frac{p_{\omega}}{q_{\omega}}$.

Definition 5.1 (Closest Refinement Pair). Given a distribution instance $G = (\mathcal{I}^{(0)}, \mathcal{I}^{(1)}; \mathcal{F}; w)$ and a divergence notion D , a refinement pair $\vec{\alpha} = (\alpha^{(0)}, \alpha^{(1)})$ (as in Definition 2.3) is closest (with respect to D) if, the pair attains the minimum $D(\alpha^{(0)}\|\alpha^{(1)})$ among all refinement pairs, whose value we denote as $D^*(G)$.

Remark 5.2. Since a divergence is typically continuous and the collection of refinement pairs forms a compact set, the minimum is attainable in such a case.

However, note that since D is not necessarily symmetric, from Definition 5.1 alone, it is not clear if a pair minimizing $D(\alpha^{(0)}\|\alpha^{(1)})$ would also minimize $D(\alpha^{(1)}\|\alpha^{(0)})$.

Definition 5.3 (Universally Closest Refinement Pair). Given a distribution instance $G = (\mathcal{I}^{(0)}, \mathcal{I}^{(1)}; \mathcal{F}; w)$ and a collection \mathcal{D} of divergence notions, a refinement pair $\vec{\alpha} = (\alpha^{(0)}, \alpha^{(1)})$ is universally closest (with respect to \mathcal{D}) if, for all $D \in \mathcal{D}$, $D(\alpha^{(0)}\|\alpha^{(1)}) = D^*(G)$.

5.1 Class of Hockey-Stick Divergences

We first consider the class of hockey-stick divergences.

Definition 5.4 (Hockey-Stick Divergence). Given distributions P and Q on the same sample space Ω and $\gamma \geq 0$, the (reversed⁶) hockey-stick divergence is defined as

$$D_{\gamma}(P\|Q) := \sup_{S \subseteq \Omega} Q(S) - \gamma \cdot P(S).$$

Remark 5.5. The hockey-stick divergence is related to the well-known (ϵ, δ) -differential privacy inequality. Specifically, $D_{e^{\epsilon}}(P\|Q) \leq \delta$ iff for all subsets $S \subseteq \Omega$,

$$Q(S) \leq e^{\epsilon} \cdot P(S) + \delta.$$

To express the other direction of the inequality, i.e., $D_{e^{\epsilon}}(Q\|P) \leq \delta$, we could consider another parameter $\hat{\gamma} \geq 0$ and keep the order of arguments in $D_{\hat{\gamma}}(P\|Q)$. Specifically, by considering the complement of events S in the above inequality, we can deduce that: $D_{e^{\epsilon}}(Q\|P) \leq \delta$ iff $D_{e^{-\epsilon}}(P\|Q) \leq 1 - e^{-\epsilon}(1 - \delta)$.

We consider universal closest distribution refinements with respect to the class of hockey-stick divergences $\mathcal{D}_{\text{HS}} := \{D_{\gamma} : \gamma \geq 0\}$.

The following lemma shows that the hockey-stick divergence is closely related to the matching instance defined in Definition 4.1.

Lemma 5.6 (Hockey-Stick Divergence and Matching). *Suppose $G = (\mathcal{I}^{(0)}, \mathcal{I}^{(1)}; \mathcal{F}; w)$ is a distribution instance and $\vec{\alpha} = (\alpha^{(0)}, \alpha^{(1)})$ is a refinement pair. For $\gamma \geq 0$, consider the pair of weights $\vec{c} := (c^{(0)} = \gamma, c^{(1)} = 1)$.*

Then, the weight of the fractional matching $\vec{c} \bullet \vec{\alpha}$ in the matching instance $G^{(\vec{c})}$ is exactly $1 - D_{\gamma}(\alpha^{(0)}\|\alpha^{(1)})$.

In order words, finding a closest refinement pair for the divergence D_{γ} is equivalent to finding a maximum matching in $G^{(\vec{c})}$.

Proof. Let $S := \{f \in \mathcal{F} : \alpha^{(1)}(f) \geq \gamma \cdot \alpha^{(0)}(f)\}$.

Observe that $D_{\gamma}(\alpha^{(0)}\|\alpha^{(1)}) = \sum_{f \in S} (\alpha^{(1)}(f) - \gamma \cdot \alpha^{(0)}(f))$.

Finally, the weight of the matching $\vec{c} \bullet \vec{\alpha}$ is:

⁶In the literature, the hockey-stick divergence \tilde{D}_{γ} is defined with the roles of P and Q interchanged: $\tilde{D}_{\gamma}(P\|Q) = D_{\gamma}(Q\|P)$. We change the convention to make the notation consistent when we consider power functions later.

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \min\{\gamma \cdot \alpha^{(0)}(f), \alpha^{(1)}(f)\} = \sum_{f \in S} \gamma \cdot \alpha^{(0)}(f) + \sum_{f \in \mathcal{F} \setminus S} \alpha^{(1)}(f) \\
& = 1 - \sum_{f \in S} (\alpha^{(1)}(f) - \gamma \cdot \alpha^{(0)}(f)) = 1 - D_\gamma(\alpha^{(0)} \parallel \alpha^{(1)}),
\end{aligned}$$

as required. \square

Theorem 5.7 (Locally Maximin Pair is Closest for \mathcal{D}_{HS}). *Suppose in a distribution instance G , $\vec{\alpha} = (\alpha^{(0)}, \alpha^{(1)})$ is a distribution refinement pair. Then, we have the following.*

- *Suppose the pair $\vec{\alpha}$ is locally maximin and and proportional response to each other. Then, $\vec{\alpha}$ is universally closest with respect to the class \mathcal{D}_{HS} of hockey-stick divergences.*
- *Suppose for some $\iota \in \mathbb{B}$ and $0 \leq \tau < 1$, $\alpha^{(\iota)}$ achieves τ -multiplicative error and $\alpha^{(\bar{\iota})}$ is the proportional response to $\alpha^{(\iota)}$.*

Then, for any $D \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{HS}}$, $D(\alpha^{(0)} \parallel \alpha^{(1)}) \leq \frac{1-\tau}{1+\tau} \cdot D^(G) + \frac{2\tau}{1+\tau}$.*

Proof. The first statement is a direct consequence of Lemmas 4.5 and 5.6. The second statement follows from Lemma 4.7; specifically, we have $(1 - D) \geq (\frac{1-\tau}{1+\tau}) \cdot (1 - D^*)$, which is equivalent to the required result after rearranging. \square

5.2 Class of Data Processing Divergences

Extending Theorem 5.7, we show that a locally maximin pair is actually the closest with respect to a wide class of divergences. In fact, for any reasonable usage of divergence, it is intuitive that taking a partial view of a pair of objects should not increase the divergence between them. This is formally captured by the *data processing inequality*.

Definition 5.8 (Data Processing Inequality). A divergence notion D satisfies the data processing inequality if given any two distributions P and Q on the sample space Ω and any function $\varphi : \Omega \rightarrow \widehat{\Omega}$, the induced distributions $\varphi(P)$ and $\varphi(Q)$ on $\widehat{\Omega}$ satisfy the monotone property:

$$D(\varphi(P) \parallel \varphi(Q)) \leq D(P \parallel Q).$$

We use \mathcal{D}_{DPI} to denote the class of divergences satisfying the data processing inequality.

It is known that all divergences in \mathcal{D}_{DPI} between two distributions P and Q can be recovered from the power function between them. Recall that in this work, we focus on finite sample spaces; see Figure 2 for an example. It is known that power functions have a fractional knapsack interpretation [Kad68].

Definition 5.9 (Power Function). Suppose P and Q are distributions on the same sample space Ω .

- For a discrete sample space Ω , the power function $\text{Pow}(P \parallel Q) : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ can be defined in terms of the *fractional knapsack problem*.

Given a collection Ω of items, suppose $\omega \in \Omega$ has weight $P(\omega)$ and value $Q(\omega)$. Then, given $x \in [0, 1]$, $\text{Pow}(P \parallel Q)(x)$ is the maximum value attained with weight capacity constraint x , where items may be taken fractionally.

- For a continuous sample space Ω , given $x \in [0, 1]$, $\text{Pow}(P \parallel Q)(x)$ is the supremum of $Q(S)$ over measurable subsets $S \subseteq \Omega$ satisfying $P(S) = x$.




Figure 2: Consider a sample space Ω with 6 elements indicated with different rainbow colors. Two distributions on Ω are given by the arrays: $P = [0, 0.1, 0.14, 0.11, 0.41, 0.24]$ and $Q = [0.15, 0.3, 0.2, 0.1, 0.25, 0]$, where the elements $\omega \in \Omega$ are sorted in increasing order of the ratio $\frac{Q(\omega)}{P(\omega)}$. The left figure shows the power curve $g = \text{Pow}(P||Q)$, and the right figure shows $\hat{g} = \text{Pow}(Q||P)$ which is the reflection of g about the line $y = 1 - x$.

In the literature (see [DRS22] for instance), the tradeoff function $\mathbb{T}(P||Q) := 1 - \text{Pow}(P||Q)$, which has essentially equivalent mathematical properties, has also been considered. However, power functions have the same notation interpretation as divergences in the sense that “smaller” means “closer” distributions. In fact, Vadhan and Zhang [VZ23] defined an abstract concept of *generalized probability distance* (with the tradeoff function as the main example) such that the notation agrees with this interpretation. We recap some well-known properties of power functions.

Fact 5.10 (Valid power functions [DRS22, Proposition 2.2]). *Suppose $g : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ is a function. Then, there exist distributions X and Y such that $\text{Pow}(X||Y) = g$ iff g is continuous, concave and $g(x) \geq x$ for all $x \in [0, 1]$.*

Partial Order on Power Functions. We consider a partial order on power functions. Given such functions g_1 and g_2 , we denote $g_1 \preceq g_2$ iff for all $x \in [0, 1]$, $g_1(x) \leq g_2(x)$.

We next state formally how a divergence satisfying Definition 5.8 can be recovered from the power function.

Fact 5.11 (Recovering Divergence From Power Function [DRS22, Proposition B.1]). *For any divergence $D \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{DPI}}$, there exists a functional $\ell_D : [0, 1]^{[0, 1]} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that for any distributions P and Q on the same sample space, $D(P||Q) = \ell_D(\text{Pow}(P||Q))$.*

Moreover, if $g_1 \preceq g_2$, then $\ell_D(g_1) \leq \ell_D(g_2)$.

The following is the main result of this section, which states that a locally maximin pair essentially solves the closest distribution refinement problem optimally in the most general sense.

Theorem 5.12 (Locally Maximin Pair Gives Minimal Power Function). *Suppose in a distribution instance G , $\vec{\alpha} = (\alpha^{(0)}, \alpha^{(1)})$ is a distribution refinement pair that is locally maximin and proportional response to each other. Then, the power function g_{\dagger} between any other distribution refinement pair of G satisfies $\text{Pow}(\alpha^{(0)}||\alpha^{(1)}) \preceq g_{\dagger}$. Consequently, any such locally maximin pair gives rise to the same power function, and we denote $\text{Pow}^*(G) = \text{Pow}(\alpha^{(0)}||\alpha^{(1)})$.*

From Fact 5.11, this implies that $\vec{\alpha}$ is a universally closest refinement pair with respect to \mathcal{D}_{DPI} .

Remark 5.13. Observe that given any $D \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{DPI}}$ and any strictly increasing function $\phi : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, we still have $\phi(D(\cdot|\cdot)) \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{DPI}}$. Since any deviation from the correct answer can be arbitrarily magnified by ϕ , it is difficult to give any meaningful approximation guarantee on the value of a general divergence in \mathcal{D}_{DPI} .

We prove Theorem 5.12 by analyzing the relationship between hockey-stick divergence and power function, and extend the result from Theorem 5.7. Similar to convex functions, we also consider the notion of subgradient for power functions.

Definition 5.14 (Subgradient). Suppose $g : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ is a power function and $x \in [0, 1]$. Then, the subgradient of g at x is defined as the collection $\partial g(x)$ of real numbers satisfying:

$$\gamma \in \partial g(x) \text{ iff for all } y \in [0, 1], g(x) + \gamma \cdot (y - x) \geq g(y).$$

In other words, the line segment with slope γ touching the curve g at x never goes below the curve.

The following is a special case of Fact 5.11, and describes explicitly how a hockey-stick divergence is recovered from a power function. See Figure 3 for an illustration.

Fact 5.15 (Recovering Hockey-Stick Divergence From Power Function). *Suppose P and Q are distributions on the same sample space Ω , where $g = \text{Pow}(P||Q)$ is the power function between them. Then, for any $\gamma \geq 0$, there exists $x \in [0, 1]$ such that $\gamma \in \partial g(x)$ and $D_\gamma(P||Q) = g(x) - \gamma x$.*

In other words, one can find a line segment with slope γ touching the curve g and the y -intercept of the line will give $D_\gamma(P||Q)$.

Proof. The result should be standard, but we include a short proof for completeness. One can imagine a line segment with slope γ starting high above and gradually being lowered until touching the curve g at some $x \in [0, 1]$. Observe that the line segment may touch the curve at more than 1 point, in which case we take x to be the infimum.

We partition the sample space Ω into $S_1 := \{\omega \in \Omega : Q(\omega) > \gamma \cdot P(\omega)\}$ and $S_2 := \Omega \setminus S_1$. Observe that $P(S_1) = x$ and $g(x) = Q(S_1)$.

Then, it follows that $D_\gamma(P||Q) = Q(S_1) - \gamma \cdot P(S_1) = g(x) - \gamma x$, as required. \square




Figure 3: Using the same example in Figure 2, consider a line segment with slope $\gamma = 1.2$ touching the curve g at x . In this case, the red, orange, and yellow elements ω to the left of point x satisfy $\frac{Q(\omega)}{P(\omega)} > 1.2$.

Proof of Theorem 5.12. Suppose $g = \text{Pow}(\alpha^{(0)} \parallel \alpha^{(1)})$ is the power function between the given locally maximin pair $\vec{\alpha}$. For the sake of contradiction, suppose some other refinement pair $\vec{\alpha}_\dagger$ produces the power function g_\dagger such that for some $x \in [0, 1]$, $g(x) > g_\dagger(x)$.

Fix some $\gamma \in \partial g_\dagger(x)$ and consider the line segment ℓ_\dagger with slope γ touching curve g_\dagger at x . By Fact 5.15, the hockey-stick divergence $D_\gamma(\vec{\alpha}_\dagger)$ is the y -intercept of ℓ_\dagger .

However, since $g(x) > g_\dagger(x)$, to find a line segment with slope γ touching curve g , we must move ℓ_\dagger strictly upwards. This implies that $D_\gamma(\vec{\alpha}) > D_\gamma(\vec{\alpha}_\dagger)$, contradicting Theorem 5.7 which states that $\vec{\alpha}$ is universally closest with respect to \mathcal{D}_{HS} . \square

5.3 Approximation to Minimal Power Function

Even though in Remark 5.13, we mention that an approximate refinement does not necessarily give any guarantee to the value of a general divergence notion, we show that it is possible to give some guarantee for the resulting power function.

Notation. In order to describe an approximation notion for power functions, we introduce some precise notation that facilitates the description of power function transformation.

Power Curve. When we plot a power function g in the xy -plane, if $g(0) > 0$, we assume that there is a vertical line segment from $(0, 0)$ to $(0, g(0))$. We also use g to denote the power curve.

Reflection. We use $\mathfrak{R}(u, v) := (1 - v, 1 - u)$ to denote the reflection transformation of the line $y = 1 - x$. Observe that for any two distributions P and Q , $\text{Pow}(Q \parallel P) = \mathfrak{R}(\text{Pow}(P \parallel Q))$; see Figure 2b. Moreover, $g_1 \preceq g_2$ iff $\mathfrak{R}(g_1) \preceq \mathfrak{R}(g_2)$.

Convention. Observe that a power function $g : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ is almost injective except that multiple inputs might map to 1. We use the convention that $g^{-1}(y) = \inf\{x \in [0, 1] : g(x) = y\}$, where the infimum is needed only for the case $y = 1$. Then, a reflected power function can be expressed as $\mathfrak{R}(g)(x) = 1 - g^{-1}(1 - x)$.

Approximation to Power Functions. Given a power function g and $\gamma \geq 1$, our goal is to define a notion of γ -approximation to g that corresponds to a *stretching* transformation \mathfrak{S}_γ , where $\gamma = 1$ is the identity transformation, and $\gamma_1 < \gamma_2$ implies that for all power functions g , $\mathfrak{S}_{\gamma_1}(g) \preceq \mathfrak{S}_{\gamma_2}(g)$.

Since we have shown that the optimal power function for the closest distribution refinement problem can be achieved by the symmetric density decomposition, ideally, the stretching transformation should also be symmetric, i.e., $\mathfrak{R} \circ \mathfrak{S}_\gamma = \mathfrak{S}_\gamma \circ \mathfrak{R}$.

Orientation of Power Curves. As aforementioned, a power curve starts at $(0, 0)$ and ends at $(1, 1)$. Given $\iota \in \{0, 1\}$, we use ι to denote the orientation of the curve starting at (ι, ι) . For $\iota = 0$, the motion is clockwise; for $\iota = 1$, the motion is anti-clockwise. In either case, the curve is like an arc moving around the center $(1, 0)$. Since we need to describe stretching with respect to the two curve orientations, instead of using the terms vertical vs horizontal (which would be exchanged after reflection), we will use the terms *radial* vs *tangential* in the sense as follows.

- *Radial Axis.* For the curve orientation $\iota = 0$ that starts at $(0, 0)$, the radial direction refers to the x -axis in the increasing direction. For the curve orientation $\iota = 1$ that starts at $(1, 1)$, the radial direction refers to the y -axis in the decreasing direction.
- *Tangential Axis.* For the curve orientation $\iota = 0$, the tangential direction refers to the y -axis in the increasing direction. For the curve orientation $\iota = 1$, the tangential direction refers to the x -axis in the decreasing direction.

We define radial and tangential stretching as follows; see Figure 4.

Definition 5.16 (Power Curve Stretching). Given $\gamma \geq 1$, orientation $\iota \in \{0, 1\}$ and direction $\mathbf{d} \in \{\text{tan}, \text{rad}\}$, we define a stretching transformation $\mathfrak{S}_\gamma^{(\iota, \mathbf{d})}$. We describe the case $\iota = 0$ and use symmetry $\mathfrak{S}_\gamma^{(1, \mathbf{d})} := \mathfrak{R} \circ \mathfrak{S}_\gamma^{(0, \mathbf{d})} \circ \mathfrak{R}$ to define the case $\iota = 1$. Two directions of stretching can be defined for an oriented power curve g as follows.

- *Radial Stretching.* For $x \in [0, 1]$, $\mathfrak{S}_\gamma^{(0,\text{rad})}(g)(x) := g(\min\{\gamma x, 1\})$; see Figure 4a.

In the orientation $\iota = 0$, we can view this as pushing the curve horizontally towards the line $x = 0$.

- *Tangential Stretching.* For $x \in [0, 1]$, $\mathfrak{S}_\gamma^{(0,\text{tan})}(g)(x) := \min\{\gamma \cdot (g(x) - g(0)) + g(0), 1\}$; see Figure 4b.

In the orientation $\iota = 0$, we can view this as pushing the curve vertically towards the line $y = 1$.

From Fact 5.10, it is easy to check that the result of stretching a power function is still a power function.

Using the geometric interpretation, one can verify the expressions of the stretching transformations for the orientation $\iota = 1$.

Fact 5.17 (Stretching Transformations for Orientation $\iota = 1$). *For any power function g and $x \in [0, 1]$, we have the following expressions.*

- $\mathfrak{S}_\gamma^{(1,\text{rad})}(g)(x) = \frac{1}{\gamma} \cdot g(x) + 1 - \frac{1}{\gamma}$; see Figure 4c.
- $\mathfrak{S}_\gamma^{(1,\text{tan})}(g)(x) = g(\frac{1}{\gamma} \cdot x + (1 - \frac{1}{\gamma}) \cdot g^{-1}(1))$; see Figure 4d.

Relating Power Curve Stretching to Density Perturbation in Fractional Knapsack

Instance. Recall that the power function $g = \text{Pow}(P||Q)$ between distributions P and Q on sample space has a fractional knapsack interpretation as in Definition 5.9, where each item $\omega \in \Omega$ has weight $P(\omega)$ and value $Q(\omega)$.

In the curve orientation $\iota = 0$ where we start from $(0, 0)$, given $x \in [0, 1]$, recall that $g(x)$ is the maximum achievable value by (fractionally) including items with total weight at most x .

On the other hand, the curve orientation $\iota = 1$ (starting at $(1, 1)$) can be interpreted as the *reversed* knapsack problem. Given $z \in [0, 1]$, the quantity $1 - g(1 - z)$ can be interpreted as the minimum achievable value by (fractionally) including items with total weight at least z .

Density Perturbation and Power Curve Stretching. Suppose for the items in Ω , the weights P stay the same, but the values Q are perturbed to some new \widehat{Q} (which is still a distribution) within a multiplicative factor of $\gamma \geq 1$.⁷ Intuitively, for the fractional knapsack problem, the optimal value can increase by a factor of at most γ , while the optimal value for the reversed knapsack problem can decrease by a factor of at most γ . When this is interpreted by the power curve, note that even though stretching happens in the values (y -direction) in both cases, because of reflection, tangential stretching happens for the orientation $\iota = 0$ (original knapsack), while radial stretching happens for orientation $\iota = 1$ (reversed knapsack). This intuition is formalized in the following lemma.

Lemma 5.18. *Suppose P and Q are distributions on sample space Ω with the power function $g := \text{Pow}(P||Q)$. Moreover, \widehat{Q} is a perturbed distribution of Q for which there exist $\gamma_1, \gamma_2 \geq 1$ such that for all $\omega \in \Omega$ satisfying $P(\omega) > 0$, $\frac{1}{\gamma_2} \cdot Q(\omega) \leq \widehat{Q}(\omega) \leq \gamma_1 \cdot Q(\omega)$; if $P(\omega) = 0$, then $\widehat{Q}(\omega) = Q(\omega)$.*

Then, the power function between P and \widehat{Q} satisfies:

$$\widehat{g} := \text{Pow}(P||\widehat{Q}) \preceq \min\{\mathfrak{S}_{\gamma_1}^{(0,\text{tan})}(g), \mathfrak{S}_{\gamma_2}^{(1,\text{rad})}(g)\}.$$

⁷Because of the application to the closest distribution refinements problem, we include the extra condition that if $P(\omega) = 0$, then the weight $\widehat{Q}(\omega) = Q(\omega)$ stays the same.




Figure 4: We use the same example in Figure 2 with the power curves g and $\hat{g} = \mathfrak{R}(g)$, with stretching factor $\gamma = 1.25$. In each subfigure, the location of the black arrow denotes the orientation, where an arrow next to the point (ι, ι) indicates orientation $\iota \in \{0, 1\}$. The direction of the arrow indicates the direction of the stretching. The solid curve indicates the original power function, and the dotted curve indicates the stretched power function. Observe that (a) and (c) are reflections of each other, and (b) and (d) are reflections of each other.

Proof. Without loss of generality, items ω with $P(\omega) = Q(\omega) = 0$ may first be removed. We consider how the new power function $\hat{g} = \text{Pow}(P||\hat{Q})$ compared with the original g . Since we want to bound the worst case when P and \hat{Q} become even further apart, intuitively this happens if the items ω with higher densities $\frac{Q(\omega)}{P(\omega)}$ have their values $\hat{Q}(\omega)$ increased further, while the opposite holds for items with lower densities.

Using the interpretation of the power function via the fractional knapsack problem as in Definition 5.9, observe that the fractional knapsack problem can be solved optimally by using the

densities of items as the greedy heuristic. Hence, in the orientation $\iota = 0$ starting at $(0, 0)$, we show that the maximum value achievable in the knapsack problem increases by a factor of at most γ_1 ; this corresponds to the stretching transformation $\mathfrak{S}_{\gamma_1}^{(0,\text{tan})}$. On the other hand, when we consider the other orientation $\iota = 1$ starting at $(1, 1)$, this can be interpreted as the reversed knapsack problem, in which we show that the minimum value achievable decreases by a factor of at most γ_2 ; this corresponds to the stretching transformation $\mathfrak{S}_{\gamma_2}^{(1,\text{rad})}$.

(1) We prove the result formally for the orientation $\iota = 0$. Since $\widehat{Q}(\omega) = Q(\omega)$ stays the same if $P(\omega) = 0$, $\widehat{g}(0) = g(0) = \sum_{\omega: P(\omega)=0} Q(\omega)$.

Suppose for the sake of contradiction, there exists $0 < x \leq 1$ such that

$$\widehat{g}(x) > \mathfrak{S}_{\gamma_1}^{(0,\text{tan})}(g)(x) = \min\{g(0) + \gamma_1 \cdot (g(x) - g(0)), 1\}.$$

If $\mathfrak{S}_{\gamma_1}^{(0,\text{tan})}(g)(x) = 1$, we immediately get a contradiction, because a power function cannot take values strictly greater than 1. Hence, we may assume $\mathfrak{S}_{\gamma_1}^{(0,\text{tan})}(g)(x) = g(0) + \gamma_1 \cdot (g(x) - g(0))$ from now on.

Recall that $\widehat{g}(x)$ is the optimal value achieved in the fractional knapsack problem (with item weights P and values \widehat{Q}) where the total weight constraint at most $x > 0$. Observe that in the knapsack solution, one can always include items ω with zero weight $P(\omega) = 0$ (whose aggregate value is $g(0)$). Suppose S is the corresponding collection of (fractional) items with non-zero weights whose aggregate value (with respect to \widehat{Q}) attains $\widehat{g}(x) - g(0)$.

Next, observe that if $P(\omega) > 0$, then $Q(\omega) \geq \frac{1}{\gamma_1} \cdot \widehat{Q}(\omega)$. Hence, in the original instance of the knapsack problem with values Q , the solution S together with zero-weighted items gives an aggregate value of at least $g(0) + \frac{1}{\gamma_1} \cdot (\widehat{g}(x) - g(0)) > g(x)$, which gives the required contradiction.

(2) We next consider the other curve orientation $\iota = 1$ starting at $(1, 1)$. Recall that with respect to the original values Q in the reversed knapsack problem, for $z \in [0, 1]$, $1 - g(1 - z)$ is the minimum value achieved by fractionally selecting items with aggregate weight at least z .

Let $N := \{\omega \in \Omega : Q(\omega) = 0\}$. Observe that $Q(\omega) = 0$ iff $\widehat{Q}(\omega) = 0$. Hence, it follows that for $0 \leq z \leq z_0 := P(N)$, $g(1 - z) = \widehat{g}(1 - z) = 1$, because in the reversed knapsack problem, when the required aggregate weight is less than $P(N)$, it is possible to fractionally select items in N to achieve zero value.

Next, we consider the stretched curve $\mathfrak{S}_{\gamma_2}^{(1,\text{rad})}(g)$. For $x \in [0, 1]$, from Fact 5.17, we have $\mathfrak{S}_{\gamma_2}^{(1,\text{rad})}(g)(x) = \frac{1}{\gamma_2} \cdot g(x) + 1 - \frac{1}{\gamma_2}$.

Observe that for $x \in [1 - z_0, 1]$, $\mathfrak{S}_{\gamma_2}^{(1,\text{rad})}(g)(x) = \widehat{g}(x) = 1$. For the sake of contradiction, suppose that there exists some $x \in [0, 1 - z_0]$ such that $\widehat{g}(x) > \frac{1}{\gamma_2} \cdot g(x) + 1 - \frac{1}{\gamma_2}$. This implies that in the reversed knapsack problem with values \widehat{Q} and weight requirement $z = 1 - x \geq z_0$, there is a fractional collection S of items with aggregate value $1 - \widehat{g}(x) < \frac{1}{\gamma_2} \cdot (1 - g(x))$.

Since in the reversed knapsack problem, one would never need to pick any item ω with $P(\omega) = 0$, it follows that any selected item ω must satisfy $Q(\omega) \leq \gamma_2 \cdot \widehat{Q}(\omega)$. Therefore, it follows that in the reversed knapsack problem with original values Q and weight requirement z , the collection S is a feasible solution with aggregate value at most $\gamma_2 \cdot (1 - \widehat{g}(x)) < 1 - g(x) = 1 - g(1 - z)$, thereby reaching a contradiction.

Combining both parts, we have the required result. \square

Lemma 5.18 suggests an approximation notion for power curves that involves both radial and tangential stretching transformations. Hence, it would not readily give a symmetric approximation notion. The next lemma shows that radial and tangential stretching transformations are comparable, which means we can pick one of them to define an approximation notion on power curves.

Lemma 5.19 (Comparing Radial and Tangential Stretchings). *For each orientation $\iota \in \{0, 1\}$, $\gamma \geq 1$ and any power function g ,*

$$\mathfrak{S}_\gamma^{(\iota, \text{rad})}(g) \preceq \mathfrak{S}_\gamma^{(\iota, \text{tan})}(g).$$

Proof. To simplify the notation, we extend the domain of a power function to $g : [0, +\infty) \rightarrow [0, 1]$, where $g(x) = 1$ for $x \geq 1$. Observe that g is still concave.

We show that result for $\iota = 0$, and use the expressions in Definition 5.16. It suffices to show that for all $x \in [0, 1]$,

$$g(\gamma x) \leq \gamma \cdot (g(x) - g(0)) + g(0). \quad (3)$$

This is because we still have $g(x) \leq 1$ for all $x \geq 0$. Hence, when the right-hand side of (3) is larger than 1, the left-hand side is still at most 1.

Rearranging (3) is equivalent to:

$$\frac{1}{\gamma} \cdot g(\gamma x) + \left(1 - \frac{1}{\gamma}\right) \cdot g(0) \leq g\left(\frac{1}{\gamma} \cdot \gamma x + \left(1 - \frac{1}{\gamma}\right) \cdot 0\right),$$

which holds because g is concave.

The result for the orientation $\iota = 1$ follows immediately by symmetry. \square

From Lemma 5.19, it follows that using tangential stretching will lead to a more convenient notion of power curve approximation; see Figure 5.

Definition 5.20 (γ -Approximation for Power Function). Given $\gamma \geq 1$ and a power function g , the γ -approximation of g is defined as:

$$\mathfrak{S}_\gamma(g) := \min\{\mathfrak{S}_\gamma^{(0, \text{tan})}(g), \mathfrak{S}_\gamma^{(1, \text{tan})}(g)\}.$$

From Fact 5.10, it is easy to check that applying the operator \mathfrak{S}_γ to a power function g will return a power function $\mathfrak{S}_\gamma(g)$, because the minimum of two concave functions is still concave.




Figure 5: We consider the same $g = \text{Pow}(P||Q)$ from Figure 2. The dotted curve in left figure shows $\mathfrak{S}_\gamma^{(1, \text{tan})}(g)$. Taking the minimum with $\mathfrak{S}_\gamma^{(0, \text{tan})}$ from Figure 4b, the dotted curve on the right figure shows $\mathfrak{S}_\gamma(g)$.

Now we have all the technical tools to describe the approximation result for power function.

Theorem 5.21 (Approximation to Minimal Power Function). *Suppose in a distribution instance G , for $0 \leq \tau \leq \frac{1}{2}$, $\vec{\alpha} = (\alpha^{(0)}, \alpha^{(1)})$ is a distribution refinement pair such that $\alpha^{(1)}$ achieves τ -multiplicative error, and $\alpha^{(0)}$ is the proportional response to $\alpha^{(1)}$. Then, the corresponding power function satisfies*

$$\text{Pow}(\alpha^{(0)} \parallel \alpha^{(1)}) \preceq \mathfrak{S}_{1+2\tau}(\text{Pow}^*(G)).$$

Proof. Consider the density decomposition as in Definition 3.4 with $\mathcal{I}^{(0)}$ as the ground set, in which element $i \in \mathcal{I}^{(0)}$ has density $\rho_*(i)$.

In view of Fact 3.6 that relates the density decomposition to locally maximin refinements and the interpretation of power functions in Definition 5.9 as the fractional knapsack problem, the power function $g^* := \text{Pow}^*(G)$ is related to the following instance of the fractional knapsack problem.

Given some locally maximin refinement pair $(\alpha_*^{(0)}, \alpha_*^{(1)})$ that are proportional responses to each other, the items in the knapsack problem are pairs in \mathcal{F} such that $(i, j) \in \mathcal{F}$ has weight $\alpha_*^{(0)}(ij)$ and value $\alpha_*^{(1)}(ij)$. However, if we fix some $i \in \mathcal{I}^{(0)}$, then any $(i, j) \in \mathcal{F}$ with $\alpha_*^{(0)}(ij) > 0$ must have value-to-weight density $\rho_*(i) = \frac{\alpha_*^{(1)}(ij)}{\alpha_*^{(0)}(ij)}$. Since we may select items fractionally, it is equivalent to consolidate all items with the same density as a single item (with the corresponding aggregated weight).

Therefore, we can interpret $\text{Pow}^*(G)$ via an alternative instance of the fractional knapsack problem in which $\mathcal{I}^{(0)}$ is the collection of items, where each $i \in \mathcal{I}^{(0)}$ has weight $w(i)$ and value-to-weight density $\rho_*(i)$. Recall that for $x \in [0, 1]$, $\text{Pow}^*(G)(x)$ is the maximum achieved value by fractionally picking items whose aggregate weight is at most x .

Next, we consider a perturbation of the item values (but keeping the same item weights). If $\alpha^{(1)}$ is a refinement on vertex weights on $\mathcal{I}^{(1)}$ and has τ -multiplicative error, this means that this refinement will induce a density vector ρ for $\mathcal{I}^{(0)}$ such that for each $i \in \mathcal{I}^{(0)}$, $(1 - \tau)\rho_*(i) \leq \rho(i) \leq (1 + \tau)\rho_*(i)$.

Moreover, if $\alpha^{(0)}$ is the proportional response to $\alpha^{(1)}$, then the power function $g := \text{Pow}(\alpha^{(0)} \parallel \alpha^{(1)})$ corresponds to an instance of the fractional knapsack problem such that each item $i \in \mathcal{I}^{(0)}$ still has weight $w(i)$, but its value is $\rho(i) \cdot w(i)$.

Hence, we can apply Lemma 5.18 with $\gamma_1 = 1 + \tau$ and $\gamma_2 = \frac{1}{1-\tau} \leq 1 + 2\tau$ for $\tau \in [0, \frac{1}{2}]$. Then, we have $g \preceq \min\{\mathfrak{S}_{\gamma_1}^{(0, \text{tan})}(g^*), \mathfrak{S}_{\gamma_2}^{(1, \text{rad})}(g^*)\}$.

Finally, applying Lemma 5.19 to compare tangential and radial stretching and using Definition 5.20 for power curve approximation gives the required result. \square

6 Characterizing Market Equilibrium via Local Maximin Condition

In this section, we show how an instance in Definition 2.1 can be interpreted as a special symmetric case of a linear Fisher market, which is itself a special case of a linear Arrow-Debreu market. We show that in Fisher markets, a market equilibrium can be equivalently characterized by a simpler local maximin condition. Therefore, existing algorithms for finding approximate market equilibria may be used to find approximate refinements as in Definition 4.6.

6.1 Linear Arrow-Debreu and Fisher Markets

Definition 6.1 (Linear Arrow-Debreu Market). There is a collection \mathcal{I} of agents, where each $i \in \mathcal{I}$ has one unit of divisible good of type i . From agent i 's perspective, per unit of another good j has value $w_i(j)$.

An allocation \vec{x} specifies how each good is *completely* allocated to the agents. Specifically, $x_{j \rightarrow i} \geq 0$ is the fraction of good j assigned to agent i , i.e., for each j , $\sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} x_{j \rightarrow i} = 1$.

Under allocation \vec{x} , the utility of agent i is $u_i(\vec{x}) := \sum_{j \in \mathcal{I}} w_i(j) \cdot x_{j \rightarrow i}$.

Special Bipartite Case. A market is *bipartite* if the agents can be partitioned into two sides such that $w_i(j) > 0$ implies that i and j are from different sides. Moreover, an allocation \vec{x} is bipartite (with respect to the same bipartition) if $x_{i \rightarrow j} > 0$ implies that i and j are from different sides.

Equilibrium for Arrow-Debreu markets is defined by introducing the notion of good *prices*, which gives an evaluation for each good. An intuitive view is that there is some platform that buys the good from each agent at this price, after which each agent can use this earned money to buy other goods from the platform at their corresponding prices.

Definition 6.2 (Arrow-Debreu Market Equilibrium). Given an instance of a market in Definition 6.1, an allocation \vec{x} is an equilibrium if there exist positive good prices $\vec{p} \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{I}}$ such that the following holds.

- Agent i 's good is considered to be worth money p_i per unit, and agent i must use all this amount to buy goods to realize the allocation \vec{x} , i.e., for each i , we have $p_i = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{I}} x_{j \rightarrow i} \cdot p_j$.
- Agent i is going to spend money on goods that have the best value-to-price ratio, i.e., $x_{j \rightarrow i} > 0$ only if $j \in \arg \max_{k \in \mathcal{I}} \frac{w_i(k)}{p_k}$.

With the introduction of money, observe that an agent i receiving good j in an equilibrium allocation \vec{x} does not mean that agent j will receive good i . In other words, it is possible that $x_{j \rightarrow i} > 0$, but $x_{i \rightarrow j} = 0$.

Non-Uniqueness for Equilibrium Prices. Note that equilibrium prices are not unique, because any positive scalar multiple of an equilibrium price vector is still an equilibrium. However, equilibrium prices are not unique even after normalization with some scalar. An extreme example is when there are two independent ecosystems, where equilibrium prices in each system may be scaled arbitrarily. This example can be modified to an irreducible market, where an agent from one system has non-zero, but minimal, valuations for goods from the other system. On the other hand, the utilities of agents are unique at equilibrium. Therefore, an equilibrium characterization based on a local maximin condition in terms of utilities is more direct without going through the notion of prices.

A Fisher market can be viewed as a special case of bipartite Arrow-Debreu markets, where the view of one side is *objective* in the sense defined as follows.

Definition 6.3 (Fisher Market). A Fisher market can be viewed as a special case of Definition 6.1 in which the agents are partitioned into buyers \mathcal{B} and sellers \mathcal{S} such that the valuations of agents satisfy the following.

- Each buyer has non-zero valuations only for sellers' goods. The valuation of buyer i on per unit of seller j 's goods can be any $w_i(j) \geq 0$. In this case, we say that the view of the buyers may be *subjective*.
- Each seller has non-zero valuations only for buyers' goods. Moreover, for each buyer $i \in \mathcal{B}$, there exists B_i (*aka* budget) such that if buyer i has a positive valuation $w_i(j) > 0$ on seller j 's good, then seller j derives value $w_j(i) = B_i$ from per unit of buyer i 's good.

As we shall see, if a buyer i has zero $w_i(j) = 0$ interest on good j , then in an equilibrium, buyer i will never receive any positive fraction of good j . Hence, the value $w_j(i)$ of buyer i 's good from the perspective of seller j is irrelevant. The convention is that we assume either $w_j(i) = B_i$ (in which case the view of the sellers is *objective*), or $w_j(i) = 0$ (i.e., sellers' view is partially objective).

As before, an allocation \vec{x} specifies how each agent distributes its good completely to other agents. For buyer i and seller j , the notation $b_{i \rightarrow j} := B_i \cdot x_{i \rightarrow j}$ is also used.

Remark 6.4 (Fisher Market Equilibrium). Because the Fisher market has a special structure, the prices \vec{p} for an equilibrium allocation \vec{x} in Definition 6.2 are chosen to have the following special form in the literature.

- As aforementioned, equilibrium prices are not unique in an Arrow-Debreu equilibrium. However, it is possible to choose, for each buyer i , $p_i = B_i$.

This means that the good for each buyer i becomes a form of currency from the perspective of sellers. Hence, sellers view that every buyer's good has the same value-to-price ratio.

Observe that when viewed as an Arrow-Debreu market, the equilibrium prices for buyers' goods need not be proportional to the budgets.

- For each seller j , the price of its good is naturally induced by the amount it receives from the buyers: $p_j = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{B}} b_{i \rightarrow j}$, where $b_{i \rightarrow j} = B_i \cdot x_{i \rightarrow j}$. Since we can view that seller j has utility B_i for buyer i 's total budget, sometimes it is more convenient to view p_j as the utility of seller j .

In the literature, for Fisher markets, \vec{b} typically refers to the actual amount $b_{i \rightarrow j}$ sent from a buyer i to a seller j , and \vec{x} refers to the fraction $x_{j \rightarrow i}$ of good j allocated to buyer i . However, we will continue to use the notation $x_{i \rightarrow j} = \frac{b_{i \rightarrow j}}{B_i}$.

Even though equilibrium allocations may not be unique, it is known that the equilibrium utilities are unique. After we fix $p_i = B_i$ for all buyers i as aforementioned, for each seller j , p_j represents both the corresponding price and utility, which is therefore unique under equilibrium.

- In the literature, an equilibrium allocation in a Fisher market also satisfies a proportional response condition. Specifically, the allocation of sellers' goods is a proportional response to the allocation of the buyers' budgets. This is captured by the equation that for each buyer i and seller j :

$$B_i \cdot x_{i \rightarrow j} = b_{i \rightarrow j} = x_{j \rightarrow i} \cdot p_j.$$

Contrary to the more general Arrow-Debreu equilibrium, it must hold that $x_{i \rightarrow j} > 0$ iff $x_{j \rightarrow i} > 0$.

The above discussion implies that it is straightforward to check whether a budget allocation \vec{b} from buyers to sellers is an equilibrium. The price p_j of seller j 's good is simply the total amount of money received by j . Then, it suffices to check that for every buyer i , $b_{i \rightarrow j} > 0$ only if j attains the minimum price to value ratio $\frac{p_j}{w_i(j)}$. The formal argument is given in Fact 6.7.

On the other hand, given an allocation \vec{x} of sellers' goods to buyers, it is possible to check whether it is an equilibrium by first deriving a budget allocation $b_{i \rightarrow j} := \frac{w_i(j) \cdot x_{j \rightarrow i}}{u_i(\vec{x})} \cdot B_i$ by proportional response, and then check whether the resulting \vec{b} is an equilibrium. (It is known that if the derived \vec{b} is an equilibrium, then the proportional response to \vec{b} will return the original \vec{x} .)

One of our discoveries is that it is possible to directly check whether \vec{x} is an equilibrium by considering a similar local maximin condition at every seller.

We next describe how an input instance in Definition 2.1 can be interpreted as a symmetric instance of Fisher markets, in which both buyers and sellers have (partially) objective views. Hence, there is no distinction between buyers and sellers, as both groups of agents have exactly the same role.

Definition 6.5 (Symmetric Fisher Market). Given an instance $(\mathcal{I}^{(0)}, \mathcal{I}^{(1)}; \mathcal{F}; w)$, for side $\iota \in \mathbb{B}$, an agent $i \in \mathcal{I}^{(\iota)}$ has a non-zero valuation on some good $j \in \mathcal{I}^{(\bar{\iota})}$ only if $\{i, j\} \in \mathcal{F}$, in which case agent i 's valuation on per unit of good j is $w^{(\bar{\iota})}(j)$.

Equilibrium Characterization for Symmetric Markets. Observe that as mentioned in Remark 6.4, the description of the Fisher equilibrium is not symmetric between the two sides, because the vertex weights on one side act as budgets of buyers. We will instead give an alternative equilibrium characterization based on the local maximin condition that is symmetric for agents from both sides.

6.2 Characterizing Fisher Equilibrium via Local Maximin Conditions

As seen in Sections 3, 4 and 5, the local maximin condition is a key concept in the various scenarios. Hence, we explore if a similar notion is relevant in markets. However, since the value of a good may be subjective among agents, instead of considering refinements (that specify how the objective weight of an item is distributed), we adapt the local maximin condition to allocations (that specify how an item is fractionally distributed).

Definition 6.6 (Local Maximin Condition in Arrow-Debreu Markets). In an Arrow-Debreu market as in Definition 6.1, an allocation \vec{x} achieves the local maximin condition at $i \in \mathcal{I}$ if, $x_{i \rightarrow j} > 0$ implies that

$$j \in \arg \min_{k \in \mathcal{I}} \frac{u_k(\vec{x})}{w_k(i) \cdot w_i(k)},$$

where we use the convention that for any $x \in \mathbb{R}$, $\frac{x}{0} = +\infty$.

Since $u_k(\vec{x})$ is the utility of agent k , the quantity $\frac{u_k(\vec{x})}{w_k(i)}$ measures the utility of k in terms of the number of units of good i . Finally, from agent i 's perspective, the value of good k is $w_i(k)$; hence, the quantity $\frac{u_k(\vec{x})}{w_k(i) \cdot w_i(k)}$ measures the ‘‘utility density’’ of agent k from i 's perspective. The local maximin condition means that agent i will allocate non-zero fraction of its good only to agents j that achieve minimum utility density from its perspective.

If an allocation \vec{x} achieves the local maximin condition at every $i \in \mathcal{I}$, we simply say that \vec{x} is locally maximin.

Special Bipartite Case. In a bipartite market with bipartition $\mathcal{I} = \mathcal{I}^{(0)} \cup \mathcal{I}^{(1)}$ of agents, for side $\iota \in \mathbb{B}$, we use $\vec{x}^{(\iota)} = x_{\mathcal{I}^{(\iota)} \rightarrow \mathcal{I}^{(\bar{\iota})}}$ to denote the complete (fractional) allocation of items from $\mathcal{I}^{(\iota)}$ to $\mathcal{I}^{(\bar{\iota})}$. In this case, $\vec{x}^{(\iota)}$ is locally maximin if it is locally maximin at every agent in $\mathcal{I}^{(\iota)}$.

Observe that the Fisher market is a special case of bipartite Arrow-Debreu markets. Moreover, as in Remark 6.4, the local maximin condition on buyer budget allocation is equivalent to the market equilibrium condition.

Fact 6.7 (Fisher Equilibrium Equivalent to Locally Maximin Buyers). *In a Fisher market, a buyer budget allocation \vec{b} is locally maximin iff it corresponds to a market equilibrium.*

Proof. Observe that given a buyer budget allocation \vec{b} , the utility of a seller j is exactly the price $p_j = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{B}} b_{i \rightarrow j}$. (Moreover, the good allocation \vec{x} is naturally induced by proportional response $x_{j \rightarrow i} := \frac{b_{i \rightarrow j}}{p_j}$.)

For the local maximin condition at buyer i , $b_{i \rightarrow j} > 0$ implies that seller j achieves the minimum utility density $\frac{p_j}{B_i \cdot w_i(j)}$ among all sellers.

However, since B_i is the same for all sellers, this is equivalent to j achieving the maximum $\frac{w_i(j)}{p_j}$, which is the value-to-price ratio of good j from buyer i 's perspective, as specified in the market equilibrium condition. \square

We will show that the local maximin condition on the allocation of the goods is also equivalent to a market equilibrium, which has not been investigated before. We have briefly mentioned the concept of proportional response in Remark 6.4, which we now formally describe in a bipartite market.

Definition 6.8 (Proportional Response in Bipartite Markets). Suppose in a bipartite Arrow-Debreu market with bipartition $\mathcal{I} = \mathcal{I}^{(0)} \cup \mathcal{I}^{(1)}$ of agents, for side $\iota \in \mathbb{B}$, $\bar{x}^{(\iota)}$ is an allocation on items from $\mathcal{I}^{(\iota)}$ to $\mathcal{I}^{(\bar{\iota})}$. Then, a proportional response to $\bar{x}^{(\iota)}$ is an allocation $\bar{x}^{(\bar{\iota})}$ of items from $\mathcal{I}^{(\bar{\iota})}$ to $\mathcal{I}^{(\iota)}$ satisfying the following:

- If $j \in \mathcal{I}^{(\bar{\iota})}$ receives a positive utility $u_j(\bar{x}^{(\iota)}) = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}^{(\iota)}} w_j(i) \cdot x_{i \rightarrow j} > 0$ from $\bar{x}^{(\iota)}$, then for each $i \in \mathcal{I}^{(\iota)}$,

$$x_{j \rightarrow i}^{(\bar{\iota})} = \frac{w_j(i) \cdot x_{i \rightarrow j}^{(\iota)}}{u_j(\bar{x}^{(\iota)})}.$$

- If $j \in \mathcal{I}^{(\bar{\iota})}$ receives zero utility from $\bar{x}^{(\iota)}$, then in $x^{(\bar{\iota})}$, j may distribute its item arbitrarily among $\mathcal{I}^{(\iota)}$, i.e., we just need $\sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}^{(\iota)}} x_{j \rightarrow i}^{(\bar{\iota})} = 1$.

The following lemma is a generalization of Lemma 3.9. To avoid degenerate cases, we assume that every agent i has another *mutually interested* agent j , i.e., $w_i(j) \cdot w_j(i) > 0$.

Lemma 6.9 (Proportional Response to Locally Maximin Allocation). *Consider a bipartite Arrow-Debreu market with bipartition $\mathcal{I} = \mathcal{I}^{(0)} \cup \mathcal{I}^{(1)}$ such that every agent has at least one mutually interested agent on the other side.*

For side $\iota \in \mathbb{B}$, let $\bar{x}^{(\iota)}$ be an allocation of items from $\mathcal{I}^{(\iota)}$ to $\mathcal{I}^{(\bar{\iota})}$ that satisfies the local maximin condition. Suppose the allocation $\bar{x}^{(\bar{\iota})}$ on items in $\mathcal{I}^{(\bar{\iota})}$ is the (unique) proportional response to $\bar{x}^{(\iota)}$. Then, the following holds:

- The allocation $\bar{x}^{(\bar{\iota})}$ also satisfies the local maximin condition at every agent in $\mathcal{I}^{(\bar{\iota})}$.
- We get back $\bar{x}^{(\iota)}$ as the proportional response to $\bar{x}^{(\bar{\iota})}$.

Proof. Since $\bar{x}^{(\iota)}$ is locally maximin and every agent has a mutually interested agent on the other side, it follows that under $\bar{x}^{(\iota)}$, every agent in $\mathcal{I}^{(\bar{\iota})}$ has positive utility. Therefore, the proportional response $\bar{x}^{(\bar{\iota})}$ to $\bar{x}^{(\iota)}$ is unique. When there is no risk of ambiguity, we omit the superscript and just write \bar{x} . When k and l are agents from different sides, we denote $\phi_l(k) := \frac{u_k(\bar{x})}{w_k(l) \cdot w_l(k)}$.

Define $\phi_i(k) = \frac{u_k(\bar{x})}{w_k(i) \cdot w_i(k)}$, which is the “utility density” score of k from agent i ’s perspective.

For $i \in \mathcal{I}^{(\iota)}$, since $\bar{x}^{(\iota)}$ is locally maximin at i and agent i has a mutually interested agent in $\mathcal{I}^{(\bar{\iota})}$, it follows that $\lambda_i := \min_{k \in \mathcal{I}^{(\bar{\iota})}} \phi_i(k)$ is positive and finite. Moreover, for $i \in \mathcal{I}^{(\iota)}$ and $j \in \mathcal{I}^{(\bar{\iota})}$, proportional response means that $x_{j \rightarrow i}^{(\bar{\iota})} > 0$ iff $x_{i \rightarrow j}^{(\iota)} > 0$, in which case we must have $w_i(j) \cdot w_j(i) > 0$ and

$$x_{j \rightarrow i}^{(\bar{\iota})} = \frac{w_j(i) \cdot x_{i \rightarrow j}^{(\iota)}}{u_j(\bar{x})} = \frac{x_{i \rightarrow j}^{(\iota)}}{\phi_i(j) \cdot w_i(j)} = \frac{x_{i \rightarrow j}^{(\iota)}}{\lambda_i \cdot w_i(j)}.$$

For any agent k , let $\Gamma(k)$ denote the collection of agents l on the other side such that both $x_{k \rightarrow l}$ and $x_{l \rightarrow k}$ are positive.

For $i \in \mathcal{I}^{(\iota)}$, its utility from $x^{(\bar{\iota})}$ is:

$$u_i(\bar{x}) = \sum_{l \in \Gamma(i)} w_i(l) \cdot x_{l \rightarrow i} = \sum_{l \in \Gamma(i)} w_i(l) \cdot \frac{x_{i \rightarrow l}}{\lambda_i \cdot w_i(l)} = \frac{1}{\lambda_i}.$$

Therefore, $x_{i \rightarrow j} > 0$ and $x_{j \rightarrow i} > 0$ implies that $u_i(\bar{x}) \cdot u_j(\bar{x}) = w_i(j) \cdot w_j(i)$.

(1) We prove the first statement. For $j \in \mathcal{I}^{(\bar{\iota})}$ and $k \in \mathcal{I}^{(\iota)}$, we have

$$\phi_j(k) = \frac{u_k(\vec{x})}{w_k(j) \cdot w_j(k)} = \frac{1}{\lambda_k \cdot w_k(j) \cdot w_j(k)}.$$

Hence, $x_{j \rightarrow i}^{(\vec{v})} > 0$ implies that $\phi_j(i) = \frac{1}{u_j(\vec{x})}$. It suffices to show that $x_{j \rightarrow i}^{(\vec{v})} = 0$ implies that $\phi_j(i) \geq \frac{1}{u_j(\vec{x})}$.

Since $x_{j \rightarrow i} = 0$, we have $x_{i \rightarrow j} = 0$. Then, because $\vec{x}^{(\iota)}$ is locally maximin at i , we have $\frac{u_j(\vec{x})}{w_i(j) \cdot w_j(i)} = \phi_i(j) \geq \lambda_i = \frac{1}{u_i(\vec{x})}$, i.e., $u_i(\vec{x}) \cdot u_j(\vec{x}) \geq w_i(j) \cdot w_j(i)$. Therefore, $\phi_j(i) = \frac{u_i(\vec{x})}{w_i(j) \cdot w_j(i)} \geq \frac{1}{u_j(\vec{x})}$, as required.

(2) We prove the second statement. Suppose $\vec{z}^{(\iota)}$ is the proportional response to $\vec{x}^{(\vec{v})}$. From Definition 6.8 of proportional response, we have:

$$z_{i \rightarrow j} = \frac{w_i(j) \cdot x_{j \rightarrow i}}{u_i(\vec{x})}.$$

If $x_{i \rightarrow j} = 0$, then $x_{j \rightarrow i} = 0$, then $z_{i \rightarrow j} = 0$.

If $x_{i \rightarrow j} > 0$, then $x_{j \rightarrow i} > 0$ and $u_i(\vec{x}) \cdot u_j(\vec{x}) = w_i(j) \cdot w_j(i)$. Recalling that $x_{j \rightarrow i} = \frac{w_j(i) \cdot x_{i \rightarrow j}}{u_j(\vec{x})}$, we have:

$$z_{i \rightarrow j} = \frac{w_i(j)}{u_i(\vec{x})} \cdot \frac{w_j(i)}{u_j(\vec{x})} \cdot x_{i \rightarrow j} = x_{i \rightarrow j},$$

as required.

This completes the proof. \square

With Lemma 6.9, we can get an alternative characterization of an equilibrium goods allocation in terms of the local maximin condition, without the need to consider good prices.

Theorem 6.10 (Fisher Equilibrium Equivalent to Locally Maximin Sellers). *In a Fisher market in which every buyer has a non-zero utility from at least one good, an allocation \vec{x} of goods to buyers corresponds to a market equilibrium iff \vec{x} is locally maximin (with respect to sellers), i.e., for each seller $j \in \mathcal{S}$ and buyer $i \in \mathcal{B}$, $x_{j \rightarrow i} > 0$ only if*

$$i \in \arg \min_{k \in \mathcal{B}} \frac{u_k(\vec{x})}{w_j(k) \cdot w_k(j)}.$$

Proof. We apply Lemma 6.9 and start from the locally maximin goods allocation \vec{x} to buyers. Then, the proportional response \vec{b} to \vec{x} is the buyers' budget allocation to the sellers that is locally maximin. Moreover, \vec{b} and \vec{x} are proportional response to each other. From Fact 6.7, the budget allocation \vec{b} corresponds to an equilibrium, and hence, \vec{x} is also an equilibrium.

Conversely, suppose a goods allocation \vec{x} is an equilibrium. This means that there exists an equilibrium budget allocation \vec{b} such that \vec{x} is the proportional response to \vec{b} . Fact 6.7 implies that \vec{b} is locally maximin, and applying Lemma 6.9 again, we conclude that \vec{x} is also locally maximin. \square

Counter Example for General Arrow-Debreu Markets. Contrary to the Fisher market, we show that the local maximin condition is not a sufficient condition for market equilibrium in general Arrow-Debreu markets. Our counterexample is a bipartite market, but the views of both sides are subjective.

Theorem 6.11 (Local Maximin Allocation Does Not Imply Equilibrium in Bipartite Arrow-Debreu Markets). *There exists a bipartite Arrow-Debreu market with bipartition $\mathcal{I} = \mathcal{I}^{(0)} \cup \mathcal{I}^{(1)}$ and an allocation \vec{x} of agents' items such that the following holds.*

- The allocation \vec{x} consists of a pair $(\vec{x}^{(0)}, \vec{x}^{(1)})$ that are proportional responses to each other by agents from both sides, and both are locally maximin.
- The allocation \vec{x} is not a market equilibrium.

Proof. There are 4 agents in total, where $\mathcal{I}^{(0)} := \{0, 2\}$ and $\mathcal{I}^{(1)} := \{1, 3\}$. When we perform addition or subtraction on the agent indices, we use mod 4.

The valuations of the agents on goods are defined as follows. For each agent i , $w_i(i+1) = 2$ and $w_i(i-1) = 1$. All other valuations are zero. It can be checked that these valuations correspond to a bipartite market, and every agent has a non-zero utility on the goods of both agents on the other side. Also, the views of both sides are subjective, and so this is not a Fisher market.

By symmetry, the equilibrium allocation \vec{x}^* is unique, and each agent i should receive 1 unit of good $i+1$, i.e., $x_{i+1 \rightarrow i}^* = 1$, and all goods have some common positive price. Moreover, every agent has utility 2 in the equilibrium.

We next construct a locally maximin \vec{x} that is not an equilibrium. It corresponds to agents 0 and 1 exchanging their goods, and agents 2 and 3 exchanging their goods. This clearly satisfies proportional response. Moreover, each agent in $\mathcal{I}^{(0)}$ has utility 2, while each agent in $\mathcal{I}^{(1)}$ has utility 1. Hence, \vec{x} is not an equilibrium.

However, observe that if i and j are from different sides, then it must be the case that $w_i(j) \cdot w_j(i) = 2$. Then, from the perspective of agent i , it follows that both agents j on the other side will have the same utility density $\frac{u_j(\vec{x})}{w_i(j) \cdot w_j(i)} = \frac{u_j(\vec{x})}{2}$. Hence, \vec{x} is locally maximin and we have our counterexample. \square

7 Achieving Approximate Refinements with Multiplicative Error in Distributed Settings

In this section, we show how approximate refinements with multiplicative error as in Definition 4.6 can be computed via the iterative proportional response process [WZ07, Zha11, BDX11] that has been proposed for approximating market equilibrium in distributed settings.

In Section 3, we establish the connection between symmetric density decompositions and locally maximin refinements, while in Section 6, we show that the local maximin condition is equivalent to the market equilibrium condition. Therefore, existing algorithms to compute approximate market equilibrium with multiplicative error and their analysis [Zha11, BDX11] can be readily applied to achieve the same approximation notion for refinements. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first approach that achieves multiplicative error to approximate the densities of vertices in the density decomposition.

Iterative Proportional Response Process. This process has been extensively analyzed in the context of computing an approximate equilibrium for Fisher markets [Zha11, BDX11] through interaction between agents in distributed settings. Since we will only consider refinements $\alpha^{(\ell)}$ in which every (non-isolated) node on the receiving side \bar{t} has a non-zero payload, we use $\text{PR}(\alpha^{(\ell)})$ to denote the unique proportional response to $\alpha^{(\ell)}$ as defined in Definition 2.4. In a distributed setting, each node in $\mathcal{I}^{(\ell)}$ is responsible for maintaining $\alpha^{(\ell)}(f)$ for edges $f \in \mathcal{F}$ incident on i ; it is clear that $\text{PR}(\cdot)$ takes one round of communication and a node needs to communicate only with its neighbors in \mathcal{F} .

Following the convention in [Zha11, BDX11], we also assume that the input is a distribution instance, i.e., the vertex weights on each side sum to 1. We paraphrase the iterative process for our input instance as follows.

Definition 7.1 (Iterative Proportional Response Process). Given an instance $(\mathcal{I}^{(0)}, \mathcal{I}^{(1)}; \mathcal{F}; w)$, suppose for side $\iota \in \mathbb{B}$, $\alpha_0^{(\iota)}$ is a refinement on vertex weights in $\mathcal{I}^{(\iota)}$ such the every non-isolated vertex in $\mathcal{I}^{(\bar{\iota})}$ receives non-zero payload from $\alpha_0^{(\iota)}$.

Starting from $\alpha_0^{(\iota)}$, a sequence of refinements is produced as follows. For $t \geq 1$, assuming that $\alpha_{t-1}^{(\iota)}$ is already computed, the following refinements are computed in the t -th iteration:

- $\alpha_{t-1}^{(\bar{\iota})} \leftarrow \text{PR}(\alpha_{t-1}^{(\iota)});$
- $\alpha_t^{(\iota)} \leftarrow \text{PR}(\alpha_{t-1}^{(\bar{\iota})}).$

Remark 7.2 (Comparison of Terminology in Fisher Markets). Even though our instance can be interpreted as a symmetric Fisher market where both sides play equal roles, the iterative process in Definition 7.1 is not symmetric between the two sides, because the process is initiated at some refinement on vertex weights on one side ι .

For Fisher market, the initiating side ι corresponds to the buyers, while side $\bar{\iota}$ corresponds to the sellers. After iteration t , the refinement $\alpha_t^{(\iota)}$ on vertex weights on side ι corresponds to the budget allocation from buyers to sellers, and the resulting payloads $p_t^{(\bar{\iota})}$ received by the other side $\bar{\iota}$ correspond to the prices of sellers' goods in the Fisher market, but in a symmetric market, it is more convenient to interpret the payloads as utilities.

After getting the proportional response $\alpha_t^{(\bar{\iota})} \leftarrow \text{PR}(\alpha_t^{(\iota)})$, the payloads received by vertices on side ι from $\alpha_t^{(\bar{\iota})}$ correspond to the buyers' utilities.

For the rest of the description, we will interpret the problem instance in terms of density decomposition and locally maximin refinements. Hence, we will phrase the results in terms of payloads, instead of prices and utilities. Observe that the multiplicative error in Definition 4.6 is stated for the density $\rho(i) = \frac{p(i)}{w(i)}$, for which it is equivalent to consider payload $p(i)$ as far as multiplicative error is concerned.

Notation Recap. Given a distribution instance $(\mathcal{I}^{(0)}, \mathcal{I}^{(1)}; \mathcal{F}; w)$, suppose we fix some pair $\vec{\alpha}_* = (\alpha_*^{(0)}, \alpha_*^{(1)})$ of locally maximin refinements that are proportional response to each other. Observe that even though $\vec{\alpha}_*$ may not be unique, by Fact 3.6, the induced payload vectors $(p_*^{(0)}, p_*^{(1)})$ are unique. Given some side $\iota \in \mathbb{B}$, we denote $n := |\mathcal{I}^{(\iota)}|$ and $\bar{n} := |\mathcal{I}^{(\bar{\iota})}|$.

The following fact is paraphrased from Section 5.1 in [BDX11]. We denote $w_{\min} := \min_{i \in \mathcal{I}^{(\iota)}} w^{(\iota)}(i)$ and $\bar{w}_{\min} := \min_{j \in \mathcal{I}^{(\bar{\iota})}} w^{(\bar{\iota})}(j)$. Their result considers a parameter $\bar{u}_{\min} := \min_{i \in \mathcal{I}^{(\iota)} \sim j \in \mathcal{I}^{(\bar{\iota})}} \frac{w^{(\bar{\iota})}(j)}{\sum_{k: i \sim k} w^{(\bar{\iota})}(k)} \geq \bar{w}_{\min}$.

Fact 7.3 (Convergence Rate for Payloads [BDX11]). *Suppose the iterative process in Definition 7.1 is initiated on side ι with refinement $\alpha_0^{(\iota)}$. Suppose after iteration t , the refinement $\alpha_t^{(\iota)}$ on vertex weights on side ι induces the payload vector $p_t^{(\bar{\iota})}$ on side $\bar{\iota}$, and denote $\bar{\eta}_t := \max_{j \in \mathcal{I}^{(\bar{\iota})}} \frac{|p_*^{(\bar{\iota})}(j) - p_t^{(\bar{\iota})}(j)|}{p_*^{(\bar{\iota})}(j)}$. Then, we have:*

$$\bar{\eta}_t^2 \leq \frac{16n}{\bar{u}_{\min}} \cdot \frac{\text{D}_{\text{KL}}(\alpha_*^{(\iota)} \parallel \alpha_0^{(\iota)})}{t}.$$

Initial Refinement. As stated in Fact 7.3, the convergence rate depends on the choice of the initial refinement $\alpha_0^{(\iota)}$ on the vertex weights from side ι . Observe that if $\alpha_0^{(\iota)}(ij) = 0$ for some $i \sim j$, then for all $t \geq 1$, $\alpha_t^{(\iota)}(ij)$ stays zero. Moreover, if $\alpha_*^{(\iota)}(ij) > 0$, then $\text{D}_{\text{KL}}(\alpha_*^{(\iota)} \parallel \alpha_0^{(\iota)}) = +\infty$, and the convergence result becomes degenerate. In the literature [Zha11, BDX11], a conservative choice is to distribute that weight $w^{(\iota)}(i)$ evenly among among all j 's on the other side. Specifically, for all $i \in \mathcal{I}^{(\iota)} \sim j \in \mathcal{I}^{(\bar{\iota})}$, we have:

$$\alpha_0^{(\iota)}(ij) \leftarrow \frac{w^{(\iota)}(i)}{\bar{n}}. \quad (4)$$

Technical Remark. Observe that in (4), we did not specify $\alpha_0^{(\iota)}(ij)$ when i and j are not neighbors in \mathcal{F} . In order for $\alpha_0^{(\iota)}$ to be a distribution, we could define $\alpha_0^{(\iota)}(ij) = \frac{w^{(\iota)}(i)}{\bar{n}}$ for such cases. Hence, we refer to $\alpha_0^{(\iota)}$ as a super-refinement, because the support of $\alpha_0^{(\iota)}$ may be a proper superset of \mathcal{F} .

However, note that in Definition 2.4 of proportional response to $\alpha_0^{(\iota)}$, any weights on pairs outside \mathcal{F} will be ignored. Hence, for $t \geq 1$, $\alpha_t^{(\iota)}$ will have support contained in \mathcal{F} .

Note that in $\alpha_0^{(\iota)}(ij)$, we could have distributed the weight $w(i)$ evenly only among neighbors of i . However, this would lead to a weaker result in the later Lemma 7.5.

The following fact is proved in [BDX11, Lemma 13].

Fact 7.4 (Divergence between Initial and Optimal Refinements). *Using the initial (super-)refinement $\alpha_0^{(\iota)}$ in (4), for any refinement α (not necessarily locally maximin) on vertex weights on side ι , the divergence between the two refinements has the following bound:*

$$D_{KL}(\alpha \parallel \alpha_0^{(\iota)}) \leq \ln(n \cdot \bar{n}).$$

Achieving Multiplicative Error for Payloads on Both Sides. Observe that Facts 7.3 and 7.4 together can give a bound on the multiplicative error for the payloads on side $\bar{\iota}$, when the process is initiated on the other side ι . Observe that multiplicative error on one side's payloads is sufficient for the applications to universal maximum matching in Theorem 4.7 and universal closest refinements in Theorem 5.21.

However, it is interesting to see if the iterative process can achieve multiplicative error for both sides' payloads simultaneously. A careful study of the proofs in [Zha11, BDX11] reveals that it is also possible to derive an upper bound for the multiplicative error for payloads on side ι . However, since our instance is symmetric on both sides, a better and simpler bound can be achieved by deriving a variant of Fact 7.4 for the proportional response $\alpha_0^{(\bar{\iota})}$ to $\alpha_0^{(\iota)}$. Then, it suffices to consider initiating the process on side $\bar{\iota}$ with the refinement $\alpha_0^{(\bar{\iota})}$.

Lemma 7.5 (Divergence for the Other Side). *Suppose the (super-)refinement $\alpha_0^{(\iota)}$ on vertex weights on side ι is defined as in (4), and $\alpha_0^{(\bar{\iota})} = \text{PR}(\alpha_0^{(\iota)})$ is its proportional response. Then, for any refinement $\bar{\alpha}$ of vertex weights on side $\bar{\iota}$, we have:*

$$D_{KL}(\bar{\alpha} \parallel \alpha_0^{(\bar{\iota})}) \leq \ln \frac{\bar{n}}{u_{\min}},$$

$$\text{where } u_{\min} := \min_{i \in \mathcal{I}^{(\iota)} \sim j \in \mathcal{I}^{(\bar{\iota})}} \frac{w^{(\iota)}(i)}{\sum_{k: k \sim j} w^{(\iota)}(k)}.$$

Proof. By definition of proportional response, for $i \in \mathcal{I}^{(\iota)} \sim j \in \mathcal{I}^{(\bar{\iota})}$,

$$\alpha_0^{(\bar{\iota})}(ij) = \frac{\alpha_0^{(\iota)}(ij)}{\sum_{k: k \sim j} \alpha_0^{(\iota)}(kj)} \cdot w^{(\bar{\iota})}(j) = \frac{w^{(\iota)}(i)/\bar{n}}{\sum_{k: k \sim j} w^{(\iota)}(k)/\bar{n}} \cdot w^{(\bar{\iota})}(j) \geq u_{\min} \cdot w^{(\bar{\iota})}(j).$$

Next, we give a bound on the divergence. The first inequality below follows because entropy of a distribution is non-negative.

$$\begin{aligned}
D_{\text{KL}}(\bar{\alpha} \parallel \alpha_0^{(\bar{\tau})}) &= \sum_{i \sim j} \bar{\alpha}(ij) \ln \frac{\bar{\alpha}(ij)}{\alpha_0^{(\bar{\tau})}(ij)} \leq \sum_{i \sim j} \bar{\alpha}(ij) \ln \frac{1}{\alpha_0^{(\bar{\tau})}(ij)} \\
&\leq \sum_{i \sim j} \bar{\alpha}(ij) \ln \frac{1}{u_{\min} \cdot w^{(\bar{\tau})}(j)} = \sum_{i \sim j} \bar{\alpha}(ij) \ln \frac{1}{u_{\min}} + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{I}^{(\bar{\tau})}} w^{(\bar{\tau})}(j) \ln \frac{1}{w^{(\bar{\tau})}(j)} \\
&\leq \ln \frac{1}{u_{\min}} + \ln \bar{n},
\end{aligned}$$

as required. \square

Facts 7.3, 7.4 and Lemma 7.5 readily give the main conclusion of this section.

Theorem 7.6 (Multiplicative Error for Both Sides' Payloads). *Suppose the iterative process in Definition 7.1 is initiated on side ι with (super-)refinement $\alpha_0^{(\iota)}$ as in (4). Suppose after iteration t , the refinement $\alpha_t^{(\iota)}$ on vertex weights on side ι induces the payload vector $p_t^{(\bar{\tau})}$ on side $\bar{\tau}$ and the refinement $\alpha_t^{(\bar{\tau})} \leftarrow \text{PR}(\alpha_t^{(\iota)})$ on side $\bar{\tau}$ induces the payload vector $p_t^{(\iota)}$ on side ι .*

Denote $\eta_t := \max_{i \in \mathcal{I}^{(\iota)}} \frac{|p_*^{(\iota)}(i) - p_t^{(\iota)}(i)|}{p_*^{(\iota)}(i)}$ and $\bar{\eta}_t := \max_{j \in \mathcal{I}^{(\bar{\tau})}} \frac{|p_*^{(\bar{\tau})}(j) - p_t^{(\bar{\tau})}(j)|}{p_*^{(\bar{\tau})}(j)}$. Then, we have:

$$\eta_t^2 \leq \frac{1}{t} \cdot \frac{16\bar{n}}{u_{\min}} \cdot \ln \frac{\bar{n}}{u_{\min}};$$

$$\bar{\eta}_t^2 \leq \frac{1}{t} \cdot \frac{16n}{\bar{u}_{\min}} \cdot \ln(n \cdot \bar{n}).$$

In other words, for $0 < \tau \leq \frac{1}{2}$, to achieve τ -multiplicative error, we have the following:

- $T \geq \frac{1}{\tau^2} \cdot \frac{16\bar{n}}{u_{\min}} \cdot \ln \frac{\bar{n}}{u_{\min}} \implies \eta_T \leq \tau;$
- $T \geq \frac{1}{\tau^2} \cdot \frac{16n}{\bar{u}_{\min}} \cdot \ln(n \cdot \bar{n}) \implies \bar{\eta}_T \leq \tau.$

Remark 7.7. As aforementioned, using the proofs in [Zha11,BDX11], to achieve $\eta_T \leq \tau$, we would need $T \geq \Omega(\frac{1}{\tau^2} \cdot \frac{n}{\bar{u}_{\min} \cdot w_{\min}^2} \cdot \log(n \cdot \bar{n})) \geq \Omega(\frac{1}{\tau^2} \cdot \frac{n^3}{\bar{u}_{\min}} \cdot \log(n \cdot \bar{n})).$

8 Review: Achieving Absolute Error for Density Vectors in Previous Works

For completeness, we review how absolute error can be achieved in previous works [DCS17,HQC22]. In these approaches, the hypergraph interpretation of the instances is used, and the two sides do not play the same role. In previous presentations, the hyperedges can have arbitrarily positive weights, but the nodes have uniform weights. We show that these approaches can easily be adapted such that nodes can have arbitrary positive weights as well.

Simplified Notation. Since the hypergraph interpretation is used, we will denote hypergraph $H = (V, E)$, where edges $E = \mathcal{I}^{(0)}$ and nodes $V = \mathcal{I}^{(1)}$ may both have arbitrary positive weights $w : V \cup E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{>0}$. Recall that for $e \in E$ and $i \in V$, $\{e, i\} \in \mathcal{F}$ represents a pair neighbors in the instance iff $i \in e$ holds in the hypergraph H . Moreover, we use $\alpha : \mathcal{F} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ to denote a refinement of edge weights, where $\alpha_{e \rightarrow i}$ is the payload node i received from edge e . Consequently, for each node $i \in V$, we denote its totally received payload $p_i = \sum_{e \in E: i \in e} \alpha_{e \rightarrow i}$ and its density $\rho_i = \frac{p_i}{w_i}$.

Quadratic Program. Both works [DCS17,HQC22] considered the same convex program which can be readily extended to hypergraphs with general edge and node weights as follows. The feasible

set $\mathcal{K}(H) := \left\{ \alpha \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{|\mathcal{F}|} \mid \forall e \in E, \sum_{i \in V: i \in e} \alpha_{e \rightarrow i} = w_e \right\}$ consists of refinements of hyperedge weights. The objective function Q is given in the following quadratic program.

$$\begin{aligned} \text{CP}(H) : \quad \min \quad & Q(\alpha) = \sum_{i \in V} \frac{p_i^2}{w_i} = \sum_{i \in V} w_i \cdot \rho_i^2 \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & p_i = \sum_{e \in E: i \in e} \alpha_{e \rightarrow i} = w_i \cdot \rho_i, \quad \forall i \in V \\ & \alpha \in \mathcal{K}(H) \end{aligned}$$

A variant of the following fact was given as early as in [Fuj80], and a proof for uniform node weights is given in [DCS17, Corollary 4.4], which is easily extended to general weights.

Fact 8.1. *Every optimal solution α_* to $\text{CP}(H)$ induces the density vector ρ_* on nodes in the density decomposition in Definition 3.4.*

As mentioned in Definition 2.7, absolute error is defined with respect to a norm. We consider the following norm for density vectors on nodes in V .

Definition 8.2 (Norm $\|\cdot\|_w$). We define a norm $\|\cdot\|_w$ on the space of density vectors in V as follows. For $\rho \in \mathbb{R}^V$, $\|\rho\|_w^2 = \sum_{i \in V} w_i \cdot \rho_i^2$.

Remark 8.3. Comparing with the standard Euclidean norm, we have: $w_{\min} \cdot \|\rho\|_2^2 \leq \|\rho\|_w^2 \leq w_{\max} \cdot \|\rho\|_2^2$. Hence, ϵ -absolute error with respect to norm $\|\cdot\|_w$ implies $\frac{\epsilon}{\sqrt{w_{\min}}}$ -absolute error with respect to the Euclidean norm.

Furthermore, observe that given density vector ρ and the corresponding payload vector p , we have $\|\rho\|_w^2 = \sum_{i \in V} \frac{p_i^2}{w_i}$. Therefore, we would need to define another norm if we wish to express our results in terms of the payload vector. For the rest of the section, we will focus on approximating the density vector ρ_* .

The following lemma is generalized from [DCS17]. It shows that to get an absolute error for ρ , it suffices to consider an additive error for the objective function in $\text{CP}(H)$.

Lemma 8.4 (Additive Error for Quadratic Program). *Suppose an edge refinement $\alpha \in \mathcal{K}(H)$ induces the density vector $\rho \in \mathbb{R}^V$. Then, comparing with the optimal ρ_* induced by an optimal α_* , we have:*

$$\|\rho - \rho_*\|_w^2 \leq Q(\alpha) - Q(\alpha_*).$$

Proof. Denote $\epsilon := \|\rho - \rho_*\|_w$. Since $\mathcal{K}(H)$ is convex, we denote $\alpha(\theta) := \alpha_* + \theta(\alpha - \alpha_*) \in \mathcal{K}(H)$. We define a function $\gamma : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by $\gamma(\theta) := Q(\alpha(\theta)) = \sum_{i \in V} w_i \cdot (\rho_*(i) + \theta(\rho_i - \rho_*(i)))^2$, where the last equality follows because the density vector is a linear function of the hyperedge refinement.

Observe that since α_* is an optimal solution, we have $\gamma'(0) \geq 0$. Moreover, $\gamma(\theta)$ is a second-degree polynomial in θ , it can be easily verified that $\gamma''(\theta) = 2\epsilon^2$ for $\theta \in [0, 1]$.

Integrating this twice over $\theta \in [0, 1]$, we have $\gamma(1) - \gamma(0) = Q(\alpha) - Q(\alpha_*) = \epsilon^2 + \gamma'(0) \geq \epsilon^2$, as required. \square

First-Order Iterative Methods to Solve Convex Program. Both approaches [DCS17, HQC22] consider iterative gradient methods to tackle $\text{CP}(H)$. The difference is that the standard Frank-Wolfe method [Jag13] is used in [DCS17], while the projected gradient descent with

Nesterov momentum [Nes83] method (such as accelerated FISTA [BT09]) is used in [HQC22]. For completeness, we recap both methods. In first-order methods, the convergence rate depends on a smoothness parameter $L_Q := \sup_{x \neq y \in \mathcal{K}(H)} \frac{\|\nabla Q(x) - \nabla Q(y)\|_2}{\|x - y\|_2}$. If Q is twice differentiable, this is equivalent to the supremum of the spectral norm $\|\nabla^2 Q(\alpha)\|$ of the Hessian over $\alpha \in \mathcal{K}(H)$.

Algorithm 1: Frank-Wolfe Algorithm

Input: Objective function Q , feasible set $\mathcal{K}(H)$, number T of iterations.

Output: α_T

- 1 Set initial $\alpha_0 \in \mathcal{K}(H)$ arbitrarily;
 - 2 **for** $t = 1$ *to* T **do**
 - 3 $\gamma_t \leftarrow \frac{2}{t+2}$;
 - 4 $\hat{\alpha} \leftarrow \arg \min_{\alpha \in \mathcal{K}(H)} \langle \alpha, \nabla Q(\alpha_{t-1}) \rangle$;
 - 5 $\alpha_t \leftarrow (1 - \gamma_t) \cdot \alpha_{t-1} + \gamma_t \cdot \hat{\alpha}$;
 - 6 **end**
 - 7 **return** α_T ;
-

Algorithm 2: Accelerated FISTA

Input: Objective function Q , feasible set $\mathcal{K}(H)$, number T of iterations.

- 1 Set learning rate $\gamma \leftarrow \frac{1}{L_Q}$;
- 2 Set initial $\alpha_0 = \beta_0 \in \mathcal{K}(H)$ arbitrarily;
- 3 **for** $t = 1$ *to* T **do**
- 4 //Projection operator $\Pi_{\mathcal{K}(H)}$ to feasible set
- 5 $\alpha_t = \Pi_{\mathcal{K}(H)}(\beta_{t-1} - \gamma \cdot \nabla Q(\beta_{t-1}))$;
- 6 $\beta_t = \alpha_t + \frac{t-1}{t+2} \cdot (\alpha_t - \alpha_{t-1})$;

Output: α_T

Fact 8.5 (Running Time). *When applied to $\text{CP}(H)$, each iteration of Algorithm 1 takes $O(|\mathcal{F}|)$ time and each iteration of Algorithm 2 takes $O(|\mathcal{F}| \log r_H)$ time, where $|\mathcal{F}| := \sum_{e \in E} |e|$ and $r_H := \max_{e \in E} |e|$ is the maximum number of nodes contained in a hyperedge.*

Proof. Observe that for $i \in e$, $\nabla Q(\alpha)_{e \rightarrow i} = \frac{2p_i}{w_i}$. Hence, each iteration of Algorithm 1 takes $O(|\mathcal{F}|)$ time.

We next analyze the running time for each iteration of Algorithm 2, which is dominated by the projection step. Observe that given a vector $y \in \mathbb{R}_+^{|\mathcal{F}|}$, we can project it on $\mathcal{K}(H)$ by finding α that minimizes $\|\alpha - y\|_2^2$ subject to $\alpha \in \mathcal{K}(H)$. This is known as the simplex projection and it has a simple closed form solution; see [WCP13] for the basic algorithm, and [IC18] for a recent distributed variant of the algorithm. In any case, the projection will take $O(|e| \log |e|)$ time for each $e \in E$ to do the projection. Summing over $e \in E$, and hence overall the projection step takes time $O(|\mathcal{F}| \log r_H)$. \square

Fact 8.6 (Convergence Rates of First-Order Methods). *Suppose α_* is an optimal solution to $\text{CP}(H)$. Then, after $T \geq 1$ iterations for each of the following algorithms, we have the corresponding upper bound on the additive error $Q(\alpha_T) - Q(\alpha_*)$:*

- Frank-Wolfe (Algorithm 1) [Jag13]:

$$\frac{1}{T+2} \cdot \text{Diam}(\mathcal{K}(H))^2 \cdot L_Q.$$

- Accelerated FISTA (Algorithm 2) [BT09]:

$$\frac{2}{T^2} \cdot \text{Diam}(\mathcal{K}(H))^2 \cdot L_Q.$$

We next give upper bounds on $\text{Diam}(\mathcal{K}(H))$ and L_Q .

Fact 8.7 (Upper Bound on Diameter). *We have $\text{Diam}(\mathcal{K}(H))^2 \leq 2 \sum_{e \in E} w_e^2$.*

Proof. For any $\alpha, \beta \in \mathcal{K}(H)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\alpha - \beta\|^2 &= \sum_{e \in E} \sum_{i \in V} (\alpha_{e \rightarrow i} - \beta_{e \rightarrow i})^2 \leq \sum_{e \in E} \sum_{i \in V} (\alpha_{e \rightarrow i}^2 + \beta_{e \rightarrow i}^2) \\ &\leq \sum_{e \in E} \{(\sum_{i \in V} \alpha_{e \rightarrow i})^2 + (\sum_{i \in V} \beta_{e \rightarrow i})^2\} = 2 \sum_{e \in E} w_e^2. \end{aligned} \quad \square$$

Fact 8.8 (Upper Bound on L_Q). *We have $L_Q \leq 2\Delta_w(H)$, where $\Delta_w(H) := \max_{i \in V} \frac{d_i}{w_i}$ and $d_i := |\{e \in E : i \in e\}|$ is the number of hyperedges containing i .*

Proof. For any $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{R}_+^{|F|}$, for $i \in e$, denote $\nabla Q(\alpha)_{e \rightarrow i} = \frac{2p_i}{w_i}$ and $\nabla Q(\beta)_{e \rightarrow i} = \frac{2q_i}{w_i}$. Then, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla Q(\alpha) - \nabla Q(\beta)\|^2 &= \sum_{i \in V} \sum_{e \in E: i \in e} \left(\frac{2p_i}{w_i} - \frac{2q_i}{w_i} \right)^2 = \sum_{i \in V} \frac{4d_i}{w_i^2} \cdot (p_i - q_i)^2 \\ &= \sum_{i \in V} \frac{4d_i}{w_i^2} \left(\sum_{e \in E: i \in e} (\alpha_{e \rightarrow i} - \beta_{e \rightarrow i}) \right)^2 \\ &\leq \sum_{i \in V} \frac{4d_i^2}{w_i^2} \sum_{e \in E: i \in e} (\alpha_{e \rightarrow i} - \beta_{e \rightarrow i})^2 \\ &\leq (2\Delta_w(H))^2 \sum_{i \in V} \sum_{e \in E} (\alpha_{e \rightarrow i} - \beta_{e \rightarrow i})^2 \\ &= (2\Delta_w(H))^2 \cdot \|\alpha - \beta\|^2, \end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality follows from Cauchy-Schwarz inequality. □

From Lemma 8.4, Facts 8.6, 8.7 and 8.8, we have the following bounds on the absolute error.

Corollary 8.9 (Absolute Error on Density Vector). *Suppose ρ_* is density vector induced by an optimal solution to $\text{CP}(H)$. Then, after $T \geq 1$ iterations for each of the following algorithms, we have the corresponding upper bound on the absolute error $\|\rho_T - \rho_*\|_w$ on the density vector:*

- Frank-Wolfe (Algorithm 1):

$$2\sqrt{\frac{\Delta_w(H) \sum_{e \in E} w_e^2}{T+2}}.$$

- Accelerated FISTA (Algorithm 2):

$$\frac{\sqrt{8\Delta_w(H) \sum_{e \in E} w_e^2}}{T}.$$

References

- [AD54] Kenneth J Arrow and Gerard Debreu. Existence of an equilibrium for a competitive economy. *Econometrica: Journal of the Econometric Society*, pages 265–290, 1954.
- [ASKS12] Albert Angel, Nikos Sarkas, Nick Koudas, and Divesh Srivastava. Dense subgraph maintenance under streaming edge weight updates for real-time story identification. *Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment*, 5(6):574–585, 2012.
- [BBC⁺15] Oana Denisa Balalau, Francesco Bonchi, T.-H. Hubert Chan, Francesco Gullo, and Mauro Sozio. Finding subgraphs with maximum total density and limited overlap. In *WSDM*, pages 379–388. ACM, 2015.
- [BC21] Nikhil Bansal and Ilan Reuven Cohen. Contention resolution, matrix scaling and fair allocation. In *WAOA*, volume 12982 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 252–274. Springer, 2021.
- [BDX11] Benjamin Birnbaum, Nikhil R Devanur, and Lin Xiao. Distributed algorithms via gradient descent for fisher markets. In *Proceedings of the 12th ACM conference on Electronic commerce*, pages 127–136, 2011.
- [Beh13] Roger E Behrend. Fractional perfect b-matching polytopes i: General theory. *Linear Algebra and its Applications*, 439(12):3822–3858, 2013.
- [BGH⁺24] Niv Buchbinder, Anupam Gupta, Daniel Hathcock, Anna R. Karlin, and Sherry Sarkar. Maintaining matroid intersections online. In *SODA*, pages 4283–4304. SIAM, 2024.
- [BHR19] Aaron Bernstein, Jacob Holm, and Eva Rotenberg. Online bipartite matching with amortized $O(\log^2 n)$ replacements. *J. ACM*, 66(5):37:1–37:23, 2019.
- [Bru06] Richard A Brualdi. *Combinatorial matrix classes*, volume 13. Cambridge University Press, 2006.
- [BT09] Amir Beck and Marc Teboulle. A fast iterative shrinkage-thresholding algorithm for linear inverse problems. *SIAM journal on imaging sciences*, 2(1):183–202, 2009.
- [Cha00] Moses Charikar. Greedy approximation algorithms for finding dense components in a graph. In Klaus Jansen and Samir Khuller, editors, *Approximation Algorithms for Combinatorial Optimization*, pages 84–95, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2000. Springer Berlin Heidelberg.
- [CKL⁺22] Li Chen, Rasmus Kyng, Yang P. Liu, Richard Peng, Maximilian Probst Gutenberg, and Sushant Sachdeva. Maximum flow and minimum-cost flow in almost-linear time. In *FOCS*, pages 612–623. IEEE, 2022.
- [CLTZ18] T.-H. Hubert Chan, Anand Louis, Zhihao Gavin Tang, and Chenzi Zhang. Spectral properties of hypergraph laplacian and approximation algorithms. *J. ACM*, 65(3):15:1–15:48, 2018.
- [DCS17] Maximilien Danisch, T.-H. Hubert Chan, and Mauro Sozio. Large scale density-friendly graph decomposition via convex programming. In *WWW*, pages 233–242. ACM, 2017.
- [DRS22] Jinshuo Dong, Aaron Roth, and Weijie J Su. Gaussian differential privacy. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B: Statistical Methodology*, 84(1):3–37, 2022.

- [Dwo06] Cynthia Dwork. Differential privacy. In *ICALP (2)*, volume 4052 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 1–12. Springer, 2006.
- [Fis92] Irving Fisher. *Mathematical investigations in the theory of value and prices*. 1892.
- [Fuj80] Satoru Fujishige. Lexicographically optimal base of a polymatroid with respect to a weight vector. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 5(2):186–196, 1980.
- [GKK12] Ashish Goel, Michael Kapralov, and Sanjeev Khanna. On the communication and streaming complexity of maximum bipartite matching. In *SODA*, pages 468–485. SIAM, 2012.
- [Gol84] Andrew V Goldberg. *Finding a maximum density subgraph*. 1984.
- [HQC22] Elfarouk Harb, Kent Quanrud, and Chandra Chekuri. Faster and scalable algorithms for densest subgraph and decomposition. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:26966–26979, 2022.
- [HQC23] Elfarouk Harb, Kent Quanrud, and Chandra Chekuri. Convergence to lexicographically optimal base in a (contra)polymatroid and applications to densest subgraph and tree packing. In *ESA*, volume 274 of *LIPICs*, pages 56:1–56:17. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2023.
- [IC18] Franck Iutzeler and Laurent Condat. Distributed projection on the simplex and ℓ_1 ball via admm and gossip. *IEEE Signal Processing Letters*, 25(11):1650–1654, 2018.
- [Jag13] Martin Jaggi. Revisiting frank-wolfe: Projection-free sparse convex optimization. In *ICML (1)*, volume 28 of *JMLR Workshop and Conference Proceedings*, pages 427–435. JMLR.org, 2013.
- [JV10] Kamal Jain and Vijay V. Vazirani. Eisenberg-gale markets: Algorithms and game-theoretic properties. *Games Econ. Behav.*, 70(1):84–106, 2010.
- [Kad68] Joseph B Kadane. Discrete search and the neyman-pearson lemma. *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications*, 22(1):156–171, 1968.
- [Kor] BH 1938-(Bernhard H.) Korte. *Combinatorial optimization: theory and algorithms*. Springer.
- [KS09] Samir Khuller and Barna Saha. On finding dense subgraphs. In *International colloquium on automata, languages, and programming*, pages 597–608. Springer, 2009.
- [LLL⁺20] Xiangfeng Li, Shenghua Liu, Zifeng Li, Xiaotian Han, Chuan Shi, Bryan Hooi, He Huang, and Xueqi Cheng. Flowscope: Spotting money laundering based on graphs. In *Proceedings of the AAAI conference on artificial intelligence*, volume 34, pages 4731–4738, 2020.
- [LS20] Euiwoong Lee and Sahil Singla. Maximum matching in the online batch-arrival model. *ACM Trans. Algorithms*, 16(4):49:1–49:31, 2020.
- [MFC⁺20] Chenhao Ma, Yixiang Fang, Reynold Cheng, Laks VS Lakshmanan, Wenjie Zhang, and Xuemin Lin. Efficient algorithms for densest subgraph discovery on large directed graphs. In *Proceedings of the 2020 ACM SIGMOD International Conference on Management of Data*, pages 1051–1066, 2020.

- [Mir17] Ilya Mironov. Rényi differential privacy. In *CSF*, pages 263–275. IEEE Computer Society, 2017.
- [MPX06] Rajeev Motwani, Rina Panigrahy, and Ying Xu. Fractional matching via balls-and-bins. In *APPROX-RANDOM*, volume 4110 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 487–498. Springer, 2006.
- [Nes83] Yurii Nesterov. A method for solving the convex programming problem with convergence rate $o(1/k^2)$. *Proceedings of the USSR Academy of Sciences*, 269:543–547, 1983.
- [S⁺03] Alexander Schrijver et al. *Combinatorial optimization: polyhedra and efficiency*, volume 24. Springer, 2003.
- [SERF16] Kijung Shin, Tina Eliassi-Rad, and Christos Faloutsos. Corescope: Graph mining using k-core analysis—patterns, anomalies and algorithms. In *2016 IEEE 16th international conference on data mining (ICDM)*, pages 469–478. IEEE, 2016.
- [Tat19] Nikolaj Tatti. Density-friendly graph decomposition. *ACM Transactions on Knowledge Discovery from Data (TKDD)*, 13(5):1–29, 2019.
- [TG15] Nikolaj Tatti and Aristides Gionis. Density-friendly graph decomposition. In *Proceedings of the 24th International Conference on World Wide Web*, pages 1089–1099, 2015.
- [VZ23] Salil P. Vadhan and Wanrong Zhang. Concurrent composition theorems for differential privacy. In *STOC*, pages 507–519. ACM, 2023.
- [WCP13] Weiran Wang and Miguel A Carreira-Perpinán. Projection onto the probability simplex: An efficient algorithm with a simple proof, and an application. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1309.1541*, 2013.
- [WZ07] Fang Wu and Li Zhang. Proportional response dynamics leads to market equilibrium. In *Proceedings of the thirty-ninth annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing*, pages 354–363, 2007.
- [Zha09] Li Zhang. Proportional response dynamics in the fisher market. In *ICALP (2)*, volume 5556 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 583–594. Springer, 2009.
- [Zha11] Li Zhang. Proportional response dynamics in the fisher market. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 412(24):2691–2698, 2011.
- [ZSCM23] Mingxun Zhou, Elaine Shi, T.-H. Hubert Chan, and Shir Maimon. A theory of composition for differential obliviousness. In *EUROCRYPT (3)*, volume 14006 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 3–34. Springer, 2023.
- [ZZCS24] Mingxun Zhou, Mengshi Zhao, T.-H. Hubert Chan, and Elaine Shi. Advanced composition theorems for differential obliviousness. In *ITCS*, volume 287 of *LIPICs*, pages 103:1–103:24. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2024.