

Allocating Indivisible Resources under Price Rigidities in Polynomial Time

Wei Huang¹, Jian Lou¹, and Zhonghua Wen²

1. School of Computer Science and Technology, USTC, Hefei, China

huangbodao@gmail.com, loujian@mail.ustc.edu.cn

2. College of Information Engineering, Xiangtan University, Xiangtan, China

zhonghua@xtu.edu.cn

Abstract

In many realistic problems of allocating resources, economy efficiency must be taken into consideration together with social equality, and price rigidities are often made according to some economic and social needs. We study the computational issues of dynamic mechanisms for selling multiple indivisible items under price rigidities. We propose a polynomial algorithm that can be used to find over-demanded sets of items, and then introduce a dynamic mechanism with rationing to discover constrained Walrasian equilibria under price rigidities in polynomial time. We also address the computation of sellers' expected profits and items' expected prices, and discuss strategic issues in the sense of expected profits.

1 Introduction

Problem of allocating resources among selfish agents has been a well-established research theme in economics and recently becomes an emerging research topic in AI because AI methodologies can provide computational techniques [Rothkopf *et al.*, 1998; Sandholm, 2002; Zhang *et al.*, 2010] to the balancing of computation tractability and economic (or societal) needs in these problems.

Dynamic mechanisms for resource allocation are trading mechanisms for discovering market-clearing prices and equilibrium allocations based on price adjustment processes [Ausubel, 2006; Gul and Stacchetti, 2000; Zhang *et al.*, 2010]. Assume a seller wishes to sell a set of indivisible items to a number of buyers. The seller announces the current prices of the items and the buyers respond by reporting the set of items they wish to buy at the given prices. The seller then calculates the over-demanded set of items and increases the prices of over-demanded items. This iterative process continues until all the selling items can be sold at the prices at which each buyer is assigned with items that maximize her personal net benefit.

Different from one-shot combinatorial auctions [Cramton *et al.*, 2006], the main issue of a dynamic mechanism is whether the procedure can lead to an equilibrium state (Walrasian equilibrium) at which all the

selling items are effectively allocated to the buyers (equilibrium allocation) and the price of items gives the buyers their best values [Gul and Stacchetti, 1999; Kelso *et al.*, 1982; Lehmann *et al.*, 2006; Sun and Yang, 2009].

Most of the discussions on the issues of dynamic mechanisms are based on market models in which there does not exist price rigidities. In fact, "good" allocations must look after both sides economy efficiency and social equality, and price rigidities may play a key role in some of these problems. For instance, in an estate bubble period, housing cost is unbearable for most of the members of society. The government may need to allocate some housing resources (whose prices are not completely flexible but restricted under some price rigidities) to middle-income earners. On one hand, the lower bound prices can be made according to some basic economic requirements (e.g., construction costs); on the other hand, the upper bound prices¹ should be made according to some realistic social foundation (e.g., average income level or pay ability). It is well-known that a Walrasian equilibrium exists in the economy when there are no price rigidities. In the case of price restrictions, a Walrasian equilibrium may not exist since the equilibrium price vector may not be admissible.

Talman and Yang studied the equilibrium allocation of heterogeneous indivisible items under price rigidities, and proposed the concept of constrained Walrasian equilibria [Talman and Yang, 2008]. A constrained Walrasian equilibrium consists of a price vector \mathbf{p} , a rationing system R , and a (constrained) equilibrium allocation π [Lehmann *et al.*, 2006] s.t. \mathbf{p} obeys the price rigidities, and π assigns each buyer an item (permitted by R) that maximizes her personal net benefit at \mathbf{p} . They also proposed two dynamic auction procedures that produce constrained Walrasian equilibria. However, the computational issues of these procedures have not been touched.

In this paper, we present a polynomial algorithm that can be used to find over-demanded sets of items, and then introduce a dynamic mechanism (called MAPR) with rationing to discover constrained Walrasian equilibria under price rigidities in polynomial time. In MAPR, buyers compete with each other (with the help of the seller) on prices of items for mul-

¹Note that since upper bound prices are often set for the sake of equality between social members (who have some but limited pay ability), they generally accompany a limit to the number of resources one member can get.

multiple rounds. In each round, the seller announces the current price vector (initially, the lower bound price vector) of the items that remain, then the buyers respond by reporting the set of resources they wish to buy, then the seller computes a minimal over-demanded set X_{min} of the items. If $X_{min} = \emptyset$ then the final allocation is computed by the RM subroutine and MAPR stops. Otherwise if all the prices of the items in X_{min} are less than their upper bounds then the seller increases them; else an item $a \in X_{min}$ (whose price is on its upper bound) is picked and the buyers who only demand some items (including a) in X_{min} draw lots for the right to buy a . Since MAPR's execution process is nondeterministic, we define the concepts of buyers' expected profits and items' expected prices, and consider strategical issues (in the sense of expected profit) in MAPR.

Here are main contributions of our work:

- We address the computational problems of dynamic auction proposed by [Talman and Yang, 2008], where these problems have not been touched.
- [Talman and Yang, 2008] has not finished the proof about the existence of constrained Walrasian equilibrium. We propose an algorithm to get the final allocation and several lemmas to prove the criteria required in constrained Walrasian equilibrium.
- We defined the "expected profits" and "expected prices" and discuss strategical issues.

This paper is structured as follows. First, we review some basic notions that are relevant to our work (see [Talman and Yang, 2008] for further details and examples). Second, we represent demand situations with bipartite graphs. Third, we address the computation of minimal over-demanded sets of items. Fourth, we present MAPR, and prove formally that it yields a constrained Walrasian equilibrium in polynomial time. Fifth, we consider strategical issues in MAPR. Finally, we draw some conclusions.

2 Preliminaries

Consider a market situation where a seller wishes to sell a finite set X of indivisible items to a finite number of buyers $N = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$. The item $o \in X$ is a dummy item which can be assigned to more than one buyer. Items (eg., houses or apartments) in $X \setminus \{o\}$ may be heterogeneous.

A price vector $\mathbf{p} \in \mathbb{Z}_+^X$ assigns a non-negative integer to each $a \in X$ and \mathbf{p}_a is the price of a under \mathbf{p} . It is required that \mathbf{p}_a is not completely flexible and restricted to an interval $[\underline{\mathbf{p}}_a, \overline{\mathbf{p}}_a]$ s.t. $\underline{\mathbf{p}}_a, \overline{\mathbf{p}}_a \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, $\underline{\mathbf{p}}_a \leq \overline{\mathbf{p}}_a$, and $0 = \underline{\mathbf{p}}_o = \overline{\mathbf{p}}_o$. We say $\underline{\mathbf{p}}$ and $\overline{\mathbf{p}}$ as the lower and upper bound price vectors. $P = \{\mathbf{p} \in \mathbb{Z}_+^X | (\forall a \in X) \underline{\mathbf{p}}_a \leq \mathbf{p}_a \leq \overline{\mathbf{p}}_a\}$ is called the set of *admissible* price vectors. Each $i \in N$ has an integer value function, i.e., $u_i : X \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_+$. $u_i(a)$ is i 's valuation to item a . We assume u_i is i 's private information, $u_i(o) = 0$, and i can pay $\max_{a \in X} \overline{\mathbf{p}}_a$ units of money. We say $E = \langle N, X, \{u_i\}_{i \in N} \rangle$ is an *economy*.

A rationing system is a function $R : N \times X \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ s.t. $R(i, o) = 1$ for every $i \in N$. $R(i, a) = 1$ means that buyer i is allowed to demand item a , while $R(i, a) = 0$ means that i is not allowed to demand a . At $\mathbf{p} \in P$ and

Table 1: Values, Indirect Utilities, and Constrained Demand

buyer i	$u_i(o)$	$u_i(a)$	$u_i(b)$	$u_i(c)$	$u_i(d)$	$V_i(\mathbf{p}, R)$	$D_i(\mathbf{p}, R)$
1	0	4	3	5	7	0	$\{o, d\}$
2	0	7	6	8	3	4	$\{c\}$
3	0	5	5	8	7	1	$\{b\}$
4	0	9	4	3	2	4	$\{a\}$
5	0	6	2	4	10	3	$\{d\}$

rationing system R , the indirect utility $V_i(\mathbf{p}, R)$ and constrained demand $D_i(\mathbf{p}, R)$ of buyer i is given by: $V_i(\mathbf{p}, R) = \max\{u_i(a) - \mathbf{p}_a | a \in X \text{ and } R(i, a) = 1\}$, and $D_i(\mathbf{p}, R) = \{a \in X | R(i, a) = 1 \text{ and } u_i(a) - \mathbf{p}_a = V_i(\mathbf{p}, R)\}$. An *allocation* of X is a function $\pi : N \rightarrow X$ s.t. $\pi(i) \neq \pi(j)$ if $j \neq i$ and $\pi(i) \in X \setminus \{o\}$. π is an *equilibrium allocation* if $\pi(i) \in D_i(\mathbf{p}, R)$ for all $i \in N$.

$\langle \mathbf{p}, R, \pi \rangle$ is a *constrained Walrasian equilibrium* if **(1)** $\mathbf{p} \in P$, R is a rationing system, **(2)** π is an equilibrium allocation, **(3)** $\mathbf{p}_a = \underline{\mathbf{p}}_a$ if $\pi(i) \neq a$ for all $i \in N$, **(4)** $\mathbf{p}_a = \overline{\mathbf{p}}_a$ and $\pi(i) = a$ for some $i \in N$ if $R(j, a) = 0$ for some $j \in N$, and **(5)** $a \in D_i(\mathbf{p}, R')$ if $R(i, a) = 0$, where $R'(j, b) = R(j, b)$ for all $\langle j, b \rangle \in N \times X$ except $R'(i, a) = 1$.

Conditions **(1)** and **(2)** need no explanation. Condition **(3)** says that if the price of a item is greater than its lower bound then it must be assigned to some buyer. **(4)** states that if an buyer is not allowed to demand some items then the item must be assigned to another buyer at its upper bound price. Condition **(5)** says that if an buyer is allowed to demand a item which she was not allowed to demand, then she will demand the item. To sum up, *constrained Walrasian equilibrium* is a equilibrium state under price rigidities. All the five conditions make a balance between efficiency and equality.

The following example is modified from the one given in [Talman and Yang, 2008]. It illustrates the notions introduced in this section and will be used throughout the paper.

Example 1 Let $E = \langle N, X, \{u_i\}_{i \in N} \rangle$ be an economy such that $N = \{1, 2, 3, 4, 5\}$, $X = \{o, a, b, c, d\}$, and buyers' values are given in Table 1; price vector $\mathbf{p} = (0, 5, 4, 4, 7)$; and π be an allocation of X such that $\pi(1) = o$, $\pi(2) = c$, $\pi(3) = b$, $\pi(4) = a$, and $\pi(5) = d$. Suppose the lower and upper bound price vectors are $\underline{\mathbf{p}} = (0, 5, 4, 1, 5)$, and $\overline{\mathbf{p}} = (0, 6, 6, 4, 7)$, respectively. So \mathbf{p} is an admissible price vector. Let R be a rationing system such that $R(i, x) = 1$ for all $\langle i, x \rangle \in N \times X$ except that $R(3, c) = R(1, c) = 0$. For each buyer $i \in N$, $V_i(\mathbf{p}, R)$ and $D_i(\mathbf{p}, R)$ are also shown in Table 1. Obviously, $\langle \mathbf{p}, R, \pi \rangle$ is a constrained Walrasian equilibrium.

3 Demand Situation and Maximum Consistent Allocation

Given an economy $E = \langle N, X, \{u_i\}_{i \in N} \rangle$, we call $\mathcal{D} = (D_i)_{i \in N}$ a *demand situation* of E if there is a price vector \mathbf{p} and a rationing system R such that $D_i = D_i(\mathbf{p}, R)$ for all $i \in N$. An allocation π is *consistent* with \mathcal{D} if $\pi(i) \in D_i \cup \{o\}$ for all $i \in N$. π is *maximum* if $|\{i \in N | o \notin D_i \text{ and } \pi(i) \neq o\}| \geq |\{i \in N | o \notin D_i \text{ and } \pi'(i) \neq o\}|$ for every allocation π' consistent with \mathcal{D} .

\mathcal{D} can be represented as a bipartite graph $BG(\mathcal{D}) = \langle N' \cup X', \mathcal{E} \rangle$ where $N' = \{i \in N \mid o \notin D_i\}$, $X' = \bigcup_{i \in N'} D_i$, and $\mathcal{E} = \{\{i, a\} \mid i \in N', a \in D_i\}$. A *matching* in $BG(\mathcal{D})$ is a subset M of \mathcal{E} s.t. $e \cap e' = \emptyset$ for all $e, e' \in M$ with $e \neq e'$. M is maximum if $|M'| \leq |M|$ for each matching M' .

It is not hard to see that a matching M in $BG(\mathcal{D})$ determines an allocation consistent with \mathcal{D} . π^M denotes the allocation determined by M , that is, $\pi^M(i) = a$ if $\exists \{i, a\} \in M$, and $\pi^M(i) = o$ otherwise. Suppose M is maximum, then π^M is maximum and it is easy to find that: there exists an equilibrium allocation $\Leftrightarrow |M| = |\{i \in N \mid o \notin D_i\}| \Leftrightarrow \pi^M$ is an equilibrium allocation.

In fact, to find a maximum matching in a bipartite graph is a pure combinatorial optimization problem, which can be addressed in polynomial time. [Schrijver, 2004] presents the matching augmenting algorithm MA, which takes a bipartite graph $\mathcal{G} = \langle \mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E} \rangle$ and a matching M in \mathcal{G} as input, and outputs a matching $MA(\mathcal{G}, M) = M'$ s.t. $|M'| \geq |M|$ and $\bigcup_{e \in M'} e \supseteq \bigcup_{e \in M} e$ in time $O(|\mathcal{E}|)$. So a maximum matching can be found in time $O(|\mathcal{V}||\mathcal{E}|)$ (as we do at most $|\mathcal{V}|$ iterations), i.e., $O(|N||X| \min(|N|, |X|))$. In the following discussion, $\hat{M}_{\mathcal{D}}$ denotes the maximum matching of $BG(\mathcal{D})$ found by this way.

Example 2 See the economy given in Example 1. Let price vector $\mathbf{p} = (0, 5, 4, 3, 5)$ and R be the rationing system such that $R(i, a) = 1$ for all $\langle i, a \rangle \in N \times X$. Then buyers' constrained demands at \mathbf{p} and R are: $D_1(\mathbf{p}, R) = \{c, d\}$, $D_2(\mathbf{p}, R) = D_3(\mathbf{p}, R) = \{c\}$, $D_4(\mathbf{p}, R) = \{a\}$, $D_5(\mathbf{p}, R) = \{d\}$. Let $\mathcal{D} = (D_i(\mathbf{p}, R))_{i \in N}$. Then $\hat{M}_{\mathcal{D}} = \{\{1, c\}, \{4, a\}, \{5, d\}\}$.

4 Over-demanded Set of Items

What can lead to non-existence of equilibrium allocations? This is a key issue that we need to consider.

Given a demand situation $\mathcal{D} = (D_i)_{i \in N}$, a set of real items $X' \subseteq X \setminus \{o\}$ is *over-demanded* in \mathcal{D} , if the number of buyers who demand only items in X' is strictly greater than the number of items in X' , i.e., $|\{i \in N \mid D_i \subseteq X'\}| > |X'|$; X' is *not under-demanded*, if the number of buyers who demand some items in X' is not less than the number of items in X' , i.e., $|\{i \in N \mid D_i \cap X' \neq \emptyset\}| \geq |X'|$. An over-demanded set X' is *minimal* if no strict subset of X' is over-demanded. We can get Lemma 1 directly based on these definitions.

Lemma 1 Let $X' \subseteq X \setminus \{o\}$ is over-demanded. Then for each $a \in X'$, either there exists a minimal over-demanded set $X'' \subseteq X'$ s.t. $a \notin X''$, or $a \in X''$ for every minimal over-demanded set $X'' \subseteq X'$.

Theorem 1 answers the question proposed in the beginning of this section.

Theorem 1 There exists an over-demanded set of items in $\mathcal{D} = (D_i)_{i \in N}$ if and only if there does not exist an equilibrium allocation.

PROOF. Sufficiency is obvious. Let us prove necessity. Suppose there does not exist an equilibrium allocation. Let $M = \hat{M}_{\mathcal{D}}$ and $N' = \{i \in N \mid o \notin D_i\}$. Then $|M| = |N \cap \bigcup_{e \in M} e| < |N'|$. Pick a buyer i from $N' \setminus N \cap \bigcup_{e \in M} e$. We construct a sequence $\langle X_0, N_0 \rangle, \langle X_1, N_1 \rangle, \dots$ as follow:

```

1. algorithm MODS( $\mathcal{D} = (D_i)_{i \in N}, M = \hat{M}_{\mathcal{D}}$ )
2.   pick  $i$  from  $\{i \in N \mid o \notin D_i\} \setminus \bigcup_{e \in M} e$ ;
3.    $X'' := D_i, X' := \emptyset$ ;
4.   while( $X'' \neq \emptyset$ )
5.      $N' := \{j \in N \mid (\exists a \in X'')\{j, a\} \in M\}$ ;
6.      $X' := X' \cup X'', X'' := \bigcup_{j \in N'} D_j \setminus X'$ ;
7.    $X_{min} := \emptyset, X'' := X'$ ;
8.   for all  $a \in X'$ 
9.      $X'' := X'' \setminus \{a\}$ ;
10.   $N' := \{i \in N \mid D_i \subseteq X_{min} \cup X''\}$ ;
11.   $\mathcal{D}' := (D_i)_{i \in N'}, k := |\hat{M}_{\mathcal{D}'}|$ ;
12.  if  $k = |N'|$ 
13.     $X_{min} := X_{min} \cup \{a\}$ ;
14.  return  $X_{min}$ ;

```

Figure 1: MODS algorithm.

- $X_0 = D_i, N_0 = \{j \in N \mid (\exists a \in X_0)\{j, a\} \in M\}$;
- $X_{k+1} = \bigcup_{j \in N_k} D_j$; and $N_{k+1} = \{j \in N \mid (\exists a \in X_{k+1})\{j, a\} \in M\}$.

Pick any $k \geq 0$ and $a \in X_k$. Suppose there does not exist $j \in N$ such that $\{j, a\} \in M$. Then there is an M -augmenting path [Schrijver, 2004] from a to i , i.e., M is not maximum, contradicting the fact that M is maximum. So for all $k \geq 0$ and $a \in X_k$, there exists $j \in N$ such that $\{j, a\} \in M$. Consequently,

1. $X_k \subseteq X_{k+1} \subseteq X, N_k \subseteq N_{k+1} \subseteq N$ for all $k \geq 0$;
2. if $X_{k+1} = X_k$ then $X_{k+l} = X_k$ and $N_{k+l} = N_k$ for all $k, l \geq 0$.

So there must exist $K \geq 0$ s.t. $X_0 \subset \dots \subset X_K = X_{K+1} = \dots$. For each $b \in X_K, b$ is assigned to only one buyer in N_K at π^M . And for each $j \in N_K, D_j \subseteq X_K$ and j is assigned with only one item in X_K at π^M . So $|X_K| = |N_K|$. Consequently, $|\{i \in N \mid D_i \subseteq X_K\}| \geq |N_K \cup \{i\}| = |N_K| + 1 = |X_K| + 1 > |X_K|$. So X_K is an over-demanded set of items in \mathcal{D} . \square

To find a minimal over-demanded set of items, we develop the MODS algorithm shown in Figure 1. Given a demand situation \mathcal{D} , and $\hat{M}_{\mathcal{D}}$ s.t. $|\hat{M}_{\mathcal{D}}| < |\{i \in N \mid o \notin D_i\}|$, MODS returns a minimal over-demanded set of items X_{min} . The basic idea of MODS is to generate an over-demanded set X' firstly (see lines 2-6 in Figure 1), and then (according to Lemma 1) to find a minimal over-demanded set $X_{min} \subseteq X'$ (see lines 7-14 in Figure 1).

The correctness of algorithm MODS is directly from Lemma 1 and the proof of Theorem 1. Let $BG(\mathcal{D}) = \langle \mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E} \rangle$. Observe MODS and we can find the following facts.

1. In order to generate an over-demanded set X' (lines 4-6 in Figure 1), MODS only visits edges in \mathcal{E} . For each $e \in \mathcal{E}, e$ can be visited once at most.
2. $|X'| \leq |\hat{M}_{\mathcal{D}}| \leq \min(|N|, |X|)$, and $BG(\mathcal{D}') \subseteq BG(\mathcal{D})$ (see line 11).

According to $|\mathcal{E}| \leq |N||X|$, and that the complexity of $\hat{M}_{\mathcal{D}}$ is in $O(|N||X| \min(|N|, |X|))$, the overall complexity of MODS($\mathcal{D}, \hat{M}_{\mathcal{D}}$) is in $O(|N||X|(\min(|N|, |X|))^2)$.

Example 3 See \mathcal{D} and $\hat{M}_{\mathcal{D}}$ described in Example 2. It is easy to find that $|\hat{M}_{\mathcal{D}}| < |\{i \in N \mid o \notin D_i\}|$. We apply MODS algorithm

-
1. **algorithm** RM($((D_i)_{i \in N}, M, \mathbf{p}, \underline{\mathbf{p}})$)
 2. $X' := \{a \in X \mid \bigcup_{e \in M} e | \mathbf{p}_a > \underline{\mathbf{p}}_a\}$;
 3. $N' := \{i \in N \mid \bigcup_{e \in M} e | D_i \cap X' \neq \emptyset\}$;
 4. $\mathcal{D}' := (D_i \cap X')_{i \in N'}$, $M' := \hat{M}_{\mathcal{D}'}$;
 5. $N^* := N \setminus \bigcup_{e \in M} e$, $(\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E}) := BG((D_i)_{i \in N^*})$;
 6. $M'' := M' \cap \mathcal{E}$;
 7. **while**(MA($(\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E}), M''$) $\neq M''$)
 8. $M'' := \text{MA}((\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E}), M'')$;
 9. **return** $M'' \cup \{e \in M' \mid e \cap \bigcup_{e' \in M''} e' = \emptyset\}$;
-

Figure 2: RM algorithm.

to $(\mathcal{D}, \hat{M}_{\mathcal{D}})$. Firstly, an over-demanded set $X' = \{c, d\}$ is found. And then a minimal over-demanded set $X_{min} = \{c\}$ is found.

5 Mechanism for Resource Allocation under Price Rigidities

In this section, we present a polynomial mechanism for resource allocation under price rigidities (MAPR). Its basic idea is to eliminate over-demanded sets of items by increasing the prices of over-demanded items or rationing an over-demanded item whose price has reached its upper bound.

MAPR

- (1) The seller φ announces the set X of items to allocate, and sets $\mathbf{p}^0 := \underline{\mathbf{p}}$, $M^0 := \emptyset$, $N' := N$. Each buyer $i \in N$ sets $R_i[a] := 1$ for all $a \in X$. Let $t := 0$.
- (2) φ sends \mathbf{p}^t and ‘‘Report your demand.’’ to each $i \in N'$.
- (3) Each $i \in N'$ computes and sends D_i^2 to φ .
- (4) φ computes $N'' = \{i \in N' \mid D_i \cap \bigcup_{e \in M^t} e \neq \emptyset\}$. If $N'' = \emptyset$ then go to step (6). φ sends ‘‘Sorry, items in $D'_i = D_i \cap \bigcup_{e \in M^t} e$ have been sold. Please report your new demand.’’ to each $i \in N''$, and sets $N' := N''$.
- (5) Each $i \in N'$ sets $R_i[a] := 0$ for all $a \in D'_i$. Go to (3).
- (6) Let $N^* = N \setminus \bigcup_{e \in M^t} e$ and $\mathcal{D}^* = (D_i)_{i \in N^*}$. φ computes $\hat{M}_{\mathcal{D}^*}$. If $|\hat{M}_{\mathcal{D}^*}| = |\{i \in N^* \mid o \notin D_i\}|$ then go to step (9). φ computes $X_{min} = \text{MODS}(\mathcal{D}^*, \hat{M}_{\mathcal{D}^*})$.
- (7) φ computes $\bar{X} = \{a \in X_{min} \mid \mathbf{p}_a^t = \bar{\mathbf{p}}_a\}$. If $\bar{X} = \emptyset$ then: φ sets $N' := N^*$, $M^{t+1} := M^t$, $\mathbf{p}_a^{t+1} := \mathbf{p}_a^t + 1$ for all $a \in X_{min}$, and $\mathbf{p}_a^{t+1} := \mathbf{p}_a^t$ for all $a \in X \setminus X_{min}$. Let $t := t+1$. Go to (2).
- (8) φ picks an item a from \bar{X} and asks the buyers in $\{i \in N^* \mid a \in D_i \subseteq X_{min}\}$ to draw lots for the right to buy a . Let i be the winning buyer. φ sets $M^{t+1} := M^t \cup \{i, a\}$, $N' := N^* \setminus \{i\}$ and $\mathbf{p}^{t+1} := \mathbf{p}^t$. Let $t := t+1$. Go to (2).
- (9) φ computes $M^* := M^t \cup \text{RM}((D_i)_{i \in N}, M^t, \mathbf{p}^t, \underline{\mathbf{p}})$ and then announces \mathbf{p}^t and π^{M^*} are the final price vector and allocation. MAPR stops.

² $D_i = \{a \in X \mid R_i[a] = 1 \text{ and } u_i(a) - \mathbf{p}_a^t = \max\{u_i(b) - \mathbf{p}_b^t \mid R_i[b] = 1\}\}$

[Talman and Yang, 2008] provides two dynamic procedures that produce constrained Walrasian equilibrium. But it does not address the computation issues, and the third condition of constrained Walrasian equilibrium cannot be guaranteed either. In order to make sure that all the items whose prices exceed their lower bound prices will be sold (the third criterion of constrained Walrasian equilibrium), the RM subroutine shown in Figure 2 is called in step 9. Given a demand situation $\mathcal{D} = (D_i)_{i \in N}$, a partial matching M consistent with \mathcal{D} , the current price vector \mathbf{p} , and the lower bound price vector $\underline{\mathbf{p}}$, RM returns a matching M' such that (1) $\pi^{M \cup M'}$ is an equilibrium allocation, (2) $M \cap M' = \emptyset$, and (3) $\{a \in X \setminus \bigcup_{e \in M} e \mid \mathbf{p}_a > \underline{\mathbf{p}}_a\} \subseteq \bigcup_{e \in M'} e$.

Observe MAPR and RM subroutine. We can find that:

- computation of each step is polynomial in $|N|$ and $|X|$;
- for each $t \geq 0$, the number of the loops consisting of steps 3-5 is not more than $|X|$; and
- the number of the loops consisting of steps 2-8 is not more than $\sum_{a \in X} (\bar{\mathbf{p}}_a - \underline{\mathbf{p}}_a)$.

Consequently, MAPR always terminates and is polynomial in $|N|$, $|X|$, and $\sum_{a \in X} (\bar{\mathbf{p}}_a - \underline{\mathbf{p}}_a)$.

In order to prove the correctness of MAPR and RM, we will first give some definitions and provide three lemmas, then we will prove that MAPR can lead to a constrained Walrasian equilibrium with the help of these three lemmas. In the following discussion, we suppose that MAPR terminates at some time $T \geq 0$; \mathbf{p}^t , M^t , R^t ($R^t(i, a) = R_i[a]$ for all $\langle i, a \rangle \in N \times X$, where R_i is the vector kept by buyer i at time t), and $(D_i^t)_{i \in N}$ denote the price vector, partial matching that has been made so far, rationing system, and demand situation at time $0 \leq t \leq T$, respectively. Let $X^t = \{a \in X \setminus \bigcup_{e \in M^t} e \mid \mathbf{p}_a^t > \underline{\mathbf{p}}_a\}$ and $N^t = \{i \in N \setminus \bigcup_{e \in M^t} e \mid D_i^t \cap X^t \neq \emptyset\}$.

Now we introduce three auxiliary lemmas (in which $\mathcal{D} = (D_i)_{i \in N}$ denotes a demand situation). These three lemmas are closely connected. The proof of Lemma 4 is based on Lemma 2 and Lemma 3, and the proof of Theorem 2 is based on these three lemmas. Lemma 2 states that, each nonempty subset of a minimal over-demanded set of items is not under-demanded.

Lemma 2 *Let X' be a minimal over-demanded set of items. Then for each $\emptyset \subset X'' \subseteq X'$, $|\{i \in N \mid D_i \cap X'' \neq \emptyset \text{ and } D_i \subseteq X'\}| > |X''|$.*

The proof of Lemma 2 is not very hard, and comes from using the reduction to absurdity.

Lemma 3 states that, the cardinality of a maximum matching is not less than the cardinality of a set of real items if each subset of the set is not under-demanded.

Lemma 3 *Let $X' \subseteq X \setminus \{o\}$ and $|\{i \in N \mid D_i \cap X'' \neq \emptyset\}| \geq |X''|$ for each $X'' \subseteq X'$. If M is a maximum matching of $BG((D_i \setminus \{o\})_{i \in N})$, then $|M| \geq |X'|$.*

The proof of Lemma 3 is similar to that of Theorem 1. Due to lack of space, it is omitted.

Lemma 4 states that, all the items in X^t can be sold. The proof of Lemma 4 is based on Lemma 2 and Lemma 3.

Lemma 4 Let $\mathcal{D}^t = (D_i^t \cap X^t)_{i \in N^t}$. Then $|\hat{M}_{\mathcal{D}^t}| = |X^t|$ for each $0 \leq t \leq T$.

PROOF. We first prove that $|\{i \in N^t | D_i^t \cap X' \neq \emptyset\}| \geq |X'|$ for each $\emptyset \subset X' \subseteq X^t$ and $0 \leq t \leq T$:

1. It holds at $t = 0$ because $X^0 = \emptyset$.
2. Suppose MAPR does not stop at $\hat{t} \geq 0$ and $|\{i \in N^t | D_i^t \cap X' \neq \emptyset\}| \geq |X'|$ for each $\emptyset \subset X' \subseteq X^t$ and $0 \leq t \leq \hat{t}$.
3. Then $X_{min} \neq \emptyset$ and \bar{X} are computed at time \hat{t} and steps 6-7 of MAPR. Pick any $\emptyset \subset X' \subseteq X^{\hat{t}+1}$. Let $N_1 = \{i \in N^{\hat{t}} | D_i^{\hat{t}} \subseteq X_{min} \text{ and } D_i^{\hat{t}} \cap X' \neq \emptyset\}$ and $N_2 = \{i \in N^{\hat{t}} | D_i^{\hat{t}} \cap (X' \setminus X_{min}) \neq \emptyset\}$. There are two possibilities:

Case I : $\bar{X} = \emptyset$. So $X^{\hat{t}+1} = X^{\hat{t}} \cup X_{min}$. According to Lemma 2 and item 2, we have $|N_1| > |X' \cap X_{min}|$ and $|N_2| \geq |X' \setminus X_{min}|$. It is easy to find that $D_i^{\hat{t}+1} \cap X' \neq \emptyset$ for each $i \in N_1 \cup N_2 \subseteq N^{\hat{t}+1}$ and $N_1 \cap N_2 = \emptyset$. So $|\{i \in N^{\hat{t}+1} | D_i^{\hat{t}+1} \cap X' \neq \emptyset\}| \geq |N_1 \cup N_2| = |N_1| + |N_2| > |X' \cap X_{min}| + |X' \setminus X_{min}| = |X'|$.

Case II : $\bar{X} \neq \emptyset$ and some $a \in \bar{X}$ is assigned to some buyer j such that $a \in D_j^{\hat{t}} \subseteq X_{min}$. So $X^{\hat{t}+1} = X^{\hat{t}} \setminus \{a\}$. According to Lemma 2 and item 2, we have $|N_1| > |X' \cap X_{min}|$ and $|N_2| \geq |X' \setminus X_{min}|$. It is easy to find that $D_i^{\hat{t}+1} \cap X' \neq \emptyset$ for each $i \in (N_1 \setminus \{j\}) \cup N_2 \subseteq N^{\hat{t}+1}$ and $N_1 \cap N_2 = \emptyset$. Consequently, $|\{i \in N^{\hat{t}+1} | D_i^{\hat{t}+1} \cap X' \neq \emptyset\}| \geq |(N_1 \setminus \{j\}) \cup N_2| \geq |N_1| - 1 + |N_2| \geq |X' \cap X_{min}| + |X' \setminus X_{min}| = |X'|$.

Consequently, $|\{i \in N^{\hat{t}+1} | D_i^{\hat{t}+1} \cap X' \neq \emptyset\}| \geq |X'|$.

According to items 1-3, $|\{i \in N^t | D_i^t \cap X' \neq \emptyset\}| \geq |X'|$ for each $X' \subseteq X^t$ and $0 \leq t \leq T$. It is easy to find that $|\hat{M}_{\mathcal{D}^t}| \leq |X^t|$ for each $0 \leq t \leq T$. According to Lemma 3, we have $|\hat{M}_{\mathcal{D}^t}| \geq |X^t|$ for each $0 \leq t \leq T$. So $|\hat{M}_{\mathcal{D}^t}| = |X^t|$ for each $0 \leq t \leq T$. \square

Now we are ready to establish the following correctness theorem for MAPR (and RM subroutine).

Theorem 2 $\langle \mathbf{p}^T, R^T, \pi^{M^T} \rangle$ found by MAPR, is a constrained Walrasian equilibrium.

PROOF. (Sketch) $\langle \mathbf{p}^T, R^T, \pi^{M^T} \rangle$ is a constrained Walrasian equilibrium iff it satisfies the five conditions shown in page 2.

1. It is easy to find that conditions (1), (4), and (5) are satisfied by $\langle \mathbf{p}^T, R^T, \pi^{M^T} \rangle$.
2. For each buyer i and the item assigned to her $a = \pi^{M^T}(i)$, there are two possibilities: Case I (step (8)), i is the winner of a lottery on item a at some time $T' \leq T$, and Case II (step (6) and (9)), a is assigned to i at time T .
 - (a) In case I, $a \in D_i(\mathbf{p}^{T'}, R^{T'})$. So $u_i(a) - \mathbf{p}_a^{T'} \geq u_i(b) - \mathbf{p}_b^{T'}$ for all $b \in \{b \in X | R^{T'}(i, b) = 1\}$. Because $R^{T'}(i, a) = R^T(i, a) = 1$, $\mathbf{p}_a^{T'} = \mathbf{p}_a^T$, $R^{T'}(i, b) \geq R^T(i, b)$ and $\mathbf{p}_b^{T'} \leq \mathbf{p}_b^T$ for all $b \in X$, $u_i(a) - \mathbf{p}_a^T \geq u_i(b) - \mathbf{p}_b^T$ for all $b \in \{b \in X | R^T(i, b) = 1\}$. So $a \in D_i(\mathbf{p}^T, R^T)$.
 - (b) In case II, according to the definition of π^{M^T} (see RM subroutine and steps (6)-(9)), we have $a \in D_i(\mathbf{p}^T, R^T)$.

Consequently, π^{M^T} is an equilibrium allocation.

3. According to Lemma 4, all the items in X^T are sold. Consequently, $\mathbf{p}_a^T = \underline{\mathbf{p}}_a$ for each $a \in \{b \in X | (\forall i \in N) \pi^{M^T}(i) \neq b\}$. The correctness of RM subroutine can derive from item 2 and item 3 directly.

So $\langle \mathbf{p}^T, R^T, \pi^{M^T} \rangle$ is a constrained Walrasian equilibrium. \square

Example 4 See Example 1. Apply MAPR to $\langle E, \mathbf{p}, \bar{\mathbf{p}} \rangle$. The demands, price vectors, rationing system and other relevant data generated by MAPR are illustrated in Table 2, where U_i , D_i , X' , N' , and X_{min} denote $\{a \in X | R^t(i, a) = 0\}$, $D_i(\mathbf{p}^t, R^t)$, $X \cap \bigcup_{e \in M^t} e$, $N \cap \bigcup_{e \in M^t} e$, and the value of X_{min} computed by the seller at step (6) and time t .

At $t = 3$, the price of c has reached its upper bound 4. The seller assigns randomly c to buyer 2 or buyer 3. So there are two different possible histories of resource allocation from $t = 3$. Along the history of $t = 4.1; 5.1; 6.1$, MAPR finds $\langle \mathbf{p}^{6.1}, R^{6.1}, \pi^{M^{6.1}} \rangle$, where $\pi^{M^{6.1}}(1) = o$, $\pi^{M^{6.1}}(2) = c$, $\pi^{M^{6.1}}(3) = b$, $\pi^{M^{6.1}}(4) = a$, and $\pi^{M^{6.1}}(5) = d$. Along the history of $t = 4.2; 5.2; 6.2$, MAPR finds $\langle \mathbf{p}^{6.2}, R^{6.2}, \pi^{M^{6.2}} \rangle$, where $\pi^{M^{6.2}}(1) = o$, $\pi^{M^{6.2}}(2) = b$, $\pi^{M^{6.2}}(3) = c$, $\pi^{M^{6.2}}(4) = a$, and $\pi^{M^{6.2}}(5) = d$.

6 Expected profits, Expected Prices, and Strategic Issues

Since the history of MAPR is nondeterministic, we need to introduce concepts of buyers' *expected profits* and items' *expected prices*. Let R_*^t be a rationing system s.t. $R_*^t(i, a) = 1$ if $\{i, a\} \in M^t$ or $a \notin \bigcup_{e \in M^t} e$, and 0 otherwise. Because we can induce M^t from R_*^t . So M^t can be written as $M^{R_*^t}$. We say $\langle \mathbf{p}^t, R_*^t \rangle$ is an allocation situation. Assume that the computation of MODS algorithm and the selection of items in step (8) are deterministic, all the lots happening in MAPR are fair³. Then buyer i 's expected profit and item a 's expected price on $\langle \mathbf{p}, R \rangle$ (i.e., $u_i^*(\mathbf{p}, R)$ and $\mathbf{p}_a^*(\mathbf{p}, R)$) are:

$$u_i^*(\mathbf{p}, R) = \begin{cases} V_i(\mathbf{p}, R) & \text{if } X_{min} = \emptyset \\ u_i^*(\mathbf{p}', R) & \text{if } \bar{X} = \emptyset \\ \frac{\sum_{i' \in N'} u_{i'}^*(\mathbf{p}, R_{i'})}{|N'|} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

$$\mathbf{p}_a^*(\mathbf{p}, R) = \begin{cases} \mathbf{p}_a & \text{if } X_{min} = \emptyset \\ \mathbf{p}_a^*(\mathbf{p}', R) & \text{if } \bar{X} = \emptyset \\ \frac{\sum_{i' \in N'} \mathbf{p}_a^*(\mathbf{p}, R_{i'})}{|N'|} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

where (let $\mathcal{D} = (D_i(\mathbf{p}, R))_{i \in N}$):

- $X_{min} = \emptyset$ if $|\hat{M}_{\mathcal{D}}| = |\{i \in N | o \notin D_i(\mathbf{p}, R)\}|$, and MODS($\mathcal{D}, \hat{M}_{\mathcal{D}}$) otherwise; $\bar{X} = \{a \in X_{min} | \mathbf{p}_a = \bar{\mathbf{p}}_a\}$;
- $\mathbf{p}'_a = \mathbf{p}_a$ for all $a \notin X_{min}$ and $\mathbf{p}'_a = \mathbf{p}_a + 1$ for all $a \in X_{min}$;
- $b \in \bar{X}$ is the item selected by the seller in step (8);
- $N' = \{i \in N | b \in D_i(\mathbf{p}, R) \subseteq X_{min}\}$;
- for all $\langle i, a \rangle \in N \times X$: $R_{i'}(i, a) = R(i, a)$ if $a \neq b$; $R_{i'}(i, b) = 0$ if $i \neq i'$; and $R_{i'}(i', b) = 1$.

In fact, $u_i^*(\mathbf{p}, R)$ and $\mathbf{p}_a^*(\mathbf{p}, R)$ can be computed by developing a search tree: each node is an allocation situation, and is expanded (if $X_{min} \neq \emptyset$) into (i) one single branch if $\bar{X} = \emptyset$,

³Suppose there are k buyers drawing lots for the right to buy item a . Then the lot is fair if each one of these buyers has $1/k$ chance of winning the lot.

Table 2: Data Generated by MAPR

t	\mathbf{p}_o^t	\mathbf{p}_a^t	\mathbf{p}_b^t	\mathbf{p}_c^t	\mathbf{p}_d^t	X_{min}	U_1	U_2	U_3	U_4	U_5	N'	D_1	D_2	D_3	D_4	D_5	X'
0	0	5	4	1	5	{c}	\emptyset	\emptyset	\emptyset	\emptyset	\emptyset	\emptyset	{c}	{c}	{c}	{a}	{d}	\emptyset
1	0	5	4	2	5	{c}	\emptyset	\emptyset	\emptyset	\emptyset	\emptyset	\emptyset	{c}	{c}	{c}	{a}	{d}	\emptyset
2	0	5	4	3	5	{c}	\emptyset	\emptyset	\emptyset	\emptyset	\emptyset	\emptyset	{c, d}	{c}	{c}	{a}	{d}	\emptyset
3	0	5	4	4	5	{c}	\emptyset	\emptyset	\emptyset	\emptyset	\emptyset	\emptyset	{d}	{c}	{c}	{a}	{d}	\emptyset
4.1	0	5	4	4	5	{d}	\emptyset	\emptyset	{c}	\emptyset	\emptyset	{2}	{d}		{d}	{a}	{d}	{c}
5.1	0	5	4	4	6	{d}	{c}	\emptyset	{c}	\emptyset	\emptyset	{2}	{d}		{d}	{a}	{d}	{c}
6.1	0	5	4	4	7	\emptyset	{c}	\emptyset	{c}	\emptyset	\emptyset	{2}	{o, d}		{b, d}	{a}	{d}	{c}
4.2	0	5	4	4	5	{d}	\emptyset	{c}	\emptyset	\emptyset	\emptyset	{3}	{d}	{a, b}		{a}	{d}	{c}
5.2	0	5	4	4	6	{d}	{c}	{c}	\emptyset	\emptyset	\emptyset	{3}	{d}	{a, b}		{a}	{d}	{c}
6.2	0	5	4	4	7	\emptyset	{c}	{c}	\emptyset	\emptyset	\emptyset	{3}	{o, d}	{a, b}		{a}	{d}	{c}

and (ii) $|N'|$ branches otherwise. See Table 1 and Table 2. We can find that $u_1^*(\mathbf{p}^0, R_*^0) = 0.5 * u_1^*(\mathbf{p}^{6.1}, R_*^{6.1}) + 0.5 * u_1^*(\mathbf{p}^{6.2}, R_*^{6.2}) = 0$, $u_3^*(\mathbf{p}^0, R_*^0) = 0.5 * u_3^*(\mathbf{p}^{6.1}, R_*^{6.1}) + 0.5 * u_3^*(\mathbf{p}^{6.2}, R_*^{6.2}) = 2.5$, $\mathbf{p}_a^*(\mathbf{p}^0, R_*^0) = 0.5 * \mathbf{p}_a^*(\mathbf{p}^{6.1}, R_*^{6.1}) + 0.5 * \mathbf{p}_a^*(\mathbf{p}^{6.2}, R_*^{6.2}) = 5$.

As most collective decision mechanisms, MAPR is generally not *strategyproof* (in the sense of expected profit). For instance, see Example 4. If buyer 1 reports her demands sincerely, then her expected profit is 0. However, if 1 knows other buyers' valuations and reports strategically, then she reports {c} from $t = 0$ to $t = 3$ (i.e., as if her valuation to item c is not less than 7), then reports sincerely, then her expected profit changes to 1/3, which makes her better off.

Now we are interested in two questions: (1) is MAPR strategyproof for some restricted domains? (2) when it is not, how hard is it for an buyer who knows the valuations of the others to compute an optimal strategy?

First we define reporting strategies and manipulation problems formally. Without loss of generality, let 1 be the manipulator. Note that not every sequence of 1's demands is reasonable. For instance, see Example 4 and Table 2. The seller can detect 1's manipulation if 1 reports {c}, {c}, {c, d}, and {c} at $t = 0, 1, 2,$ and $3,$ respectively, because there is no value function u s.t. $u(c) - \mathbf{p}_c^2 = u(c) - 3 = u(d) - 5 = u(d) - \mathbf{p}_d^2 = u(d) - \mathbf{p}_d^3 < u(c) - \mathbf{p}_c^3 = u(c) - 4$. A strategy for buyer 1 is a value function $u : X \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_+$ with $u(o) = 0$. So 1 can safely manipulate the process of MAPR when she reports her demands according to u completely (as if u is her true value function). A manipulation problem M (for buyer 1) is a 5-tuple $\langle N, X, \{u_i\}_{i \in N}, \underline{\mathbf{p}}, \bar{\mathbf{p}} \rangle$ where $\langle N, X, \{u_i\}_{i \in N} \rangle$ is an economy, $\underline{\mathbf{p}}$ and $\bar{\mathbf{p}}$ are the lower and upper bound price vectors on X , respectively. A strategy for M is *optimal* if 1 can not strictly increase her expected profit by reporting her demands according to any other strategy.

Now, back to question (1): we show that the answer is positive when there are two buyers.

Theorem 3 *Let $M = \langle N, X, \{u_i\}_{i \in N}, \underline{\mathbf{p}}, \bar{\mathbf{p}} \rangle$ be a manipulation problem s.t. $N = \{1, 2\}$. Then u_1 is optimal for M .*

PROOF. Suppose that if 1 reports sincerely, then her expected profit is Δ . Let D_1 and D_2 be 1 and 2's true demands at $\underline{\mathbf{p}}$ and R respectively, where $R(i, a) = 1$ for each $i \in N$ and $a \in X$.

Obviously, if $D_1 \cup D_2 = \{o\}$ or $|D_1 \cup D_2| \geq 2$ (i.e., $X_{min} = \emptyset$ at $t = 0$) then $\Delta = \max_{a \in X} (u_1(a) - \underline{\mathbf{p}}_a)$, which is the best possible outcome for 1. So u_1 is optimal in these cases.

Now, suppose $D_1 = D_2 = \{a\}$ s.t. $a \neq o$. Pick any strategy u' . Let $k = \bar{\mathbf{p}}_a - \underline{\mathbf{p}}_a$, $k_i = u_i(a) - \underline{\mathbf{p}}_a - \max_{b \in X \setminus \{a\}} (u_i(b) - \underline{\mathbf{p}}_b)$, $b_i \in X \setminus \{a\}$ s.t. $u_i(b_i) - \underline{\mathbf{p}}_{b_i} = u_i(a) - \underline{\mathbf{p}}_a - k_i$, and $\hat{k} = \min(k, k_1 - 1, k_2 - 1)$. Then if 1 applies strategy u_1 , then she will report D_1 from $t = 0$ to $t = \hat{k}$ and:

1. if $\hat{k} = k$, then $\Delta = 0.5 * (u_1(a) - \underline{\mathbf{p}}_a - k) + 0.5 * (u_1(b_1) - \underline{\mathbf{p}}_{b_1}) = u_1(b_1) - \underline{\mathbf{p}}_{b_1} + 0.5 * (k_1 - k) > u_1(b_1) - \underline{\mathbf{p}}_{b_1}$. If 1 applies u' instead, then her expected profit will not be better than $u_1(b_1) - \underline{\mathbf{p}}_{b_1} < \Delta$ if $u'(a) - \underline{\mathbf{p}}_a - \max_{b \in X \setminus \{a\}} (u'(b) - \underline{\mathbf{p}}_b) \leq k$, and will not be better than Δ otherwise.
2. if $k > \hat{k} = k_1 - 1$, then $\Delta = u_1(b_1) - \underline{\mathbf{p}}_{b_1}$. Because 2 can insist on $\{a\}$ to $t = \min(k, k_2 - 1) \geq k_1 - 1$, 1's expected profit can not be better than Δ .
3. if $k > \hat{k} = k_2 - 1$, then $\Delta = u_1(a) - \underline{\mathbf{p}}_a - k_2 \geq u_1(a) - \underline{\mathbf{p}}_a - k_1 = u_1(b_1) - \underline{\mathbf{p}}_{b_1}$. Because 2 can insist on $\{a\}$ to $t = k_2 - 1$, 1's expected profit can not be better than Δ .

To sum up, in all cases, 1 can not strictly increase her expected profit by applying strategy u' . So u_1 is optimal for M . \square

For the cases where there are more than two buyers, we conjecture that the manipulation problem is NP-hard, but we could not find a proof.

7 Conclusion

We have presented a decentralized protocol for allocating indivisible resources under price rigidities, and proved formally that it can discover constrained Walrasian equilibria in polynomial time. We also have studied the protocol from the points of computation of buyers' expected profits and items' expected prices, and discussed the manipulation (by one buyer) problem in the sense of buyer's expected profit. There are several directions for future work. One direction would be to prove the conjecture about the complexity of manipulation (in the sense of expected profits) by one buyer. Another direction would be to study manipulation (in the sense of expected prices) by one or more buyers (whose manipulation motivation is not to buy some resources but to put up the prices of some resources). Furthermore, we plan to study the problems of allocating divisible resources [Brams *et al.*, 2012] and sharable resources [Airiau and Endriss, 2010] under prices rigidities.

Acknowledgments

This work is supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China under grant No.61070232, No.61105039, No.61272295, and the Fundamental Research Funds for the Central Universities (Issue Number WK0110000026).

References

- [Airiau and Endriss, 2010] Stéphane Airiau and Ulle Endriss. Multiagent resource allocation with sharable items: simple protocols and nash equilibria. In *Proceedings of the 9th International Conference on Autonomous Agents and Multiagent Systems, AAMAS '10*, pages 167–174, Richland, SC, 2010. International Foundation for Autonomous Agents and Multiagent Systems.
- [Ausubel, 2006] L.M. Ausubel. An efficient dynamic auction for heterogeneous commodities. *American Economic Review*, 96(3):602–629, 2006.
- [Brams *et al.*, 2012] Steven J. Brams, Michal Feldman, John K. Lai, Jamie Morgenstern, and Ariel D. Procaccia. On maxsum fair cake divisions. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Sixth AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*. AAAI Press, 2012.
- [Cramton *et al.*, 2006] P. Cramton, Y. Shoham, and R. Steinberg. *Combinatorial Auctions*. MIT Press, 2006.
- [Gul and Stacchetti, 1999] F. Gul and E. Stacchetti. Walrasian equilibrium with gross substitutes. *Journal of Economic Theory*, 87(1):95–124, 1999.
- [Gul and Stacchetti, 2000] F. Gul and E. Stacchetti. The english auction with differentiated commodities. *Journal of Economic Theory*, 92(1):66–95, 2000.
- [Kelso *et al.*, 1982] J. Kelso, Alexander S, and V. P. Crawford. Job matching, coalition formation, and gross substitutes. *Econometrica*, 50(6):1483–1504, 1982.
- [Lehmann *et al.*, 2006] B. Lehmann, D. Lehmann, and N. Nisan. Combinatorial auctions with decreasing marginal utilities. *Games and Economic Behavior*, 55(2):270–296, 2006.
- [Rothkopf *et al.*, 1998] M. H. Rothkopf, A. Pekec, and R. M. Harstad. Computationally manageable combinatorial auctions. *Management Science*, 44(8):1131–1147, 1998.
- [Sandholm, 2002] T. Sandholm. Algorithm for optimal winner determination in combinatorial auctions. *Artificial Intelligence*, 135:1–54, 2002.
- [Schrijver, 2004] A. Schrijver. *Combinatorial Optimization: Polyhedra and Efficiency*. Springer, 2004.
- [Sun and Yang, 2009] N. Sun and Z. Yang. A double-track adjustment process for discrete markets with substitutes and complements. *Econometrica*, 77(3):933–952, 2009.
- [Talman and Yang, 2008] D. Talman and Z. Yang. A dynamic auction for differentiated items under price rigidities. *Economics Letters*, 99:278–281, 2008.
- [Zhang *et al.*, 2010] D. Zhang, W. Huang, and L. Perrussel. Dynamic auction: A tractable auction procedure. In *Proceedings of the 24th National Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, Atlanta, Georgia, USA, 2010. AAAI Press.