

What is "social choice"?

- algorithms / mechanisms for groups of people to make decisions, collectively.

Example: voting,
 (and committees, how to allocate budgets, selecting students, etc)
 seat allocation, in colleges & courses,
 more generally, allocating scarce resources
 eg. food kits, vaccines,
 allocating goods / resources / loads fairly:
 eg. budget among various projects,
 inheritance among relatives,
 fishing in intl. waters,
 chores between a couple living together, etc.

- usually money cannot be exchanged (so different from auctions)
 (nevertheless, will show money is still impl.)

What is "computational social choice"?

- associated with computation
- but more generally, more concerned with quantitative aspects.
- so less work on new models, empirical work.

Logistics:

Course will roughly be in 3-5 parts:

- ① Fair division
- ② Voting
- ③ Matchings
- ③-5 Some new stuff (fairness in ML / projects / paper presentations)

In between may take some basics, eg. equilibria, linear /

convex programming, etc.

If there are topics you'd like me to cover, please let me know.

Grading:

- ① 3-4 HWs + quizzes ~ 30%.
- ② 2 in-class exams ~ 30%.
- ③ Project / paper ~ 40%.

Pacing: will be erratic, will take extra classes

PART 1: FAIR DIVISION

How should we divide items among a set of interested agents?

Example 1: 2 siblings

inherit bank deposit, stocks, gold jewellery, a house, a car

Example 2: 3 housemates

share a house w/ 3 unequal rooms, 40,000 £/yr. rent p.m.

Example 3: A couple

chores: cleaning, cooking, groceries, watering plants

More examples: vaccines, production quotas, fishing rights, ...

Real-world applications:

- Spliddit,
- Kajihutan,
- Course match (Wharton),
- Fair Outcomes Inc.

(on slides)

CAKE - CUTTING

The cake $C = [0,1]$, n agents, each agent $i \in N$ has a valuation fn. v_i defined over subsets of C , so that v_i :

- ① $v_i(S) \geq 0 \quad \forall S \subseteq C$ ("cake")
- ② For disjoint S, T , $v_i(S \cup T) = v_i(S) + v_i(T)$ (additivity)
- ③ For any point x , $v_i(x) = 0$ (non-atomicity)
- ④ $v_i(C) = 1$ (normalization)

(v_i is thus a non-atomic probability measure on $[0,1]$)

cake = time, land, bandwidth, etc.

Note that this is not wlog.

Claim: $v_i([x,y])$ is continuous (w/o proof)

How do n agents "fairly" decide this cake?

(do some examples?)

An allocation $A = (A_1, A_2, \dots, A_n)$ is a partition of the cake,

so that: ① $\forall i \neq j, A_i \cap A_j = \emptyset$ *

$$\textcircled{2} \bigcup_{i \in N} A_i = [0,1]$$

Fairness Concepts:

1. Proportionality (PROP): $\forall i, v_i(A_i) \geq \frac{1}{n} v_i(C)$

basic, easy. each agent gets an average amount of cake.

2. Envy-freeness (EF): $\forall i, j, v_i(A_i) \geq v_i(A_j)$

each agent is happy with their allocation.

Lemma: If Allocation $A = (A_1, \dots, A_n)$ is EF, then it is PROP also.

Proof: Fix $i \in N$. Then $v_i(A_i) \geq v_i(A_j) \quad \forall j \in N$

$$\Rightarrow n v_i(A_i) \geq \sum_{j \in N} v_i(A_j) = v_i(C) = 1$$

(since A is a partition, & using additivity).

$$\Rightarrow v_i(A_i) \geq \frac{1}{n}$$

For cake-cutting, will use the following "Robertson-Webb" (RW)

query model:

1. $\text{Eval}_i(x,y)$: returns $v_i([x,y])$

2. $\text{Cut}_i(x,\alpha)$: returns $\inf \{y \geq x : v_i([x,y]) = \alpha\}$, if it exists

Claim: Both above fns. are continuous in both arguments

Q. Does PROP $\Rightarrow$ EF?

Theorem: There always exists a PROP allocation.

Algo: (PROP allocation for n agents)

Let $x_0 = 0$, $N' = N$

for $k = 1 \dots n-1$

$\forall i \in N'$, let $y_i = \text{Cut}_i(x_{k-1}, \frac{1}{n})$

Let $i^* = \arg \min_{i \in N'} y_i$

$$A_{i^*} = [x_{k-1}, y_{i^*}]$$

$$N' \leftarrow N' \setminus \{i^*\}, x_k \leftarrow y_{i^*}$$

Let i^* be the last remaining agent in N' , then $A_{i^*} = [x_{n-1}, 1]$

(note that this gives a "connected" allocation, i.e., each agent gets an interval)

Proof: Will show that at the end of the k^{th} iteration,

for every agent i remaining in N' , $v_i([x_k, 1]) \geq (n-k)/n$.

Note that this is true after the 0^{th} iteration, i.e., at the beginning of the first iteration.

Now fix an iteration k , and an agent $i \in N'$ at the end. Then note that, in each previous iteration $j \leq k$, $v_i([x_{j-1}, x_j]) \leq \frac{1}{n}$. This is

because if $v_i([x_{j-1}, x_j]) > \frac{1}{n}$, then in the j^{th} iteration, a smaller piece would have been cut.

Hence $v_i([0, x_k]) \leq \frac{k}{n}$, & hence $v_i([x_k, 1]) \geq \frac{n-k}{n}$ $\square$

An EF allocation for 2 agents.

(The cut-and-choose protocol).

Algo:

Let $x = \text{Cut}_1([0, \frac{1}{2}])$ (then $v_1([0,x]) = \frac{1}{2} = v_1([x,1])$)

If $v_2([0,x]) \geq v_2([x,1])$ (agent 1 cuts, agent 2 chooses)

$$A_1 = [x, 1], A_2 = [0, x]$$

Else

$$A_1 = [0, x], A_2 = [x, 1]$$

But we can do more:

Defn: Allocation $A = (A_1, \dots, A_n)$ is a perfect partition if

$$\forall i \in N, j \in [n], v_i(A_j) = \frac{1}{n}$$

Theorem: There exists a perfect partition for $n=2$.

Proof: Define $f_1(x) = \text{Cut}_1(y, \frac{1}{2})$

$$\text{Define } w_2(x) = v_2([0,x]) + v_2([f_1(x), 1])$$

Since f_1 is a continuous fn., so is w_2 .

Now consider the cut $[0, f_1(0)]$.

Then $v_1([0, f_1(0)]) = \frac{1}{2} = v_1([f_1(0), 1])$

If $v_2([f_1(0), 1]) = \frac{1}{2}$, we are done.

So suppose $v_2([f_1(0), 1]) > \frac{1}{2}$

Now $w_2(0) = v_2([f_1(0), 1]) > \frac{1}{2}$

$$\& w_2(f_1(0)) = v_2([0, f_1(0)]) + v_2([f_1(f_1(0)), 1])$$

$$= v_2([0, f_1(0)]) < \frac{1}{2}$$

Thus, $\exists x^*$ s.t. $w_2(x^*) = \frac{1}{2}$

Then consider the cut $A_1 = [x^*, f_1(x^*)]$

$$A_2 = [0, x^*] \cup [f_1(x^*), 1]$$

This is a perfect partition. $\square$

Q. Is a connected perfect partition for 2 agents?