

Bounding the Menu-Size of Approximately Optimal Auctions via Optimal-Transport Duality

Yannai A. Gonczarowski*

July 11, 2018

Abstract

The question of the minimum menu-size for approximate (i.e., up-to- ε) Bayesian revenue maximization when selling two goods to an additive risk-neutral quasilinear buyer was introduced by Hart and Nisan (2013), who give an upper bound of $O(1/\varepsilon^4)$ for this problem. Using the optimal-transport duality framework of Daskalakis et al. (2013, 2015), we derive the first lower bound for this problem — of $\Omega(1/\sqrt[4]{\varepsilon})$, even when the values for the two goods are drawn i.i.d. from “nice” distributions, establishing how to reason about approximately optimal mechanisms via this duality framework. This bound implies, for any fixed number of goods, a tight bound of $\Theta(\log 1/\varepsilon)$ on the minimum deterministic communication complexity guaranteed to suffice for running some approximately revenue-maximizing mechanism, thereby completely resolving this problem. As a secondary result, we show that under standard economic assumptions on distributions, the above upper bound of Hart and Nisan (2013) can be strengthened to $O(1/\varepsilon^2)$.

1 Introduction

One of the high-level goals of the field of Algorithmic Mechanism Design is to understand the tradeoff between the economic efficiency and the simplicity of mechanisms, with a central example being auction mechanisms. One of the most fundamental scenarios studied in this context is that of revenue-maximization by a single seller who is offering for sale two or more goods to a single buyer. Indeed, while classic economic analysis (Myerson, 1981) shows that for a single good, the revenue-maximizing mechanism is extremely simple to describe, it is known that the optimal auction for even two goods may be surprisingly complex and unintuitive (McAfee and McMillan, 1988; Thanassoulis, 2004; Manelli and Vincent, 2006; Hart and Reny, 2015; Daskalakis et al., 2013, 2015; Giannakopoulos and Koutsoupias, 2014, 2015), eluding a general description to date.

In this paper we study, for a fixed number of goods, the tradeoff between the complexity of an auction and the extent to which it can approximate the optimal revenue. While one may choose various measures of auction complexity (Hart and Nisan, 2013; Dughmi et al., 2014; Morgenstern and Roughgarden, 2015), we join several recent papers by focusing on the

*Einstein Institute of Mathematics, Rachel & Selim Benin School of Computer Science & Engineering, and Federmann Center for the Study of Rationality, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, Israel; and Microsoft Research. *E-mail*: yannai@gonch.name.

simplest measure, the *menu-size* suggested by Hart and Nisan (2013). While previous lower bounds on the menu-size as a function of the desired approximation to the revenue all assume a coupling between the number of goods and the desired approximation (so that the former tends to infinity simultaneously with the latter tending to optimal; e.g., setting $\varepsilon \triangleq 1/n$), in this paper we focus on the behavior of the menu-size as a function only of the desired approximation to the revenue, keeping the number of goods fixed and uncoupled from it. In particular, we obtain the first lower-bound on the menu-size that is not asymptotic in the number of goods, thereby quantifying the degree to which the menu-size of an auction really is a bottleneck to extracting high revenue even for a fixed number of goods.

Revenue Maximization We consider the following classic setting. A risk-neutral seller has two goods for sale. A risk-neutral quasilinear buyer has a valuation (maximum willingness to pay) $v_i \in [0, 1]$ for each of these goods i ,¹ and has an additive valuation (i.e., values the bundle of both goods by the sum of the valuations for each good). The seller has no access to the valuations v_i , but only to a joint distribution F from which they are drawn. The seller wishes to devise a (truthful) auction mechanism for selling these goods, which will maximize her revenue among all such mechanisms, in expectation over the distribution F . (The seller has no use for any unsold good.) We denote the maximum obtainable expected revenue by $\text{OPT}(F)$.

Menu-Size Hart and Nisan (2013) have introduced the *menu-size* of a mechanism as a measure of its complexity: this measure counts the number of possible outcomes of the mechanism (where an outcome is a specification of an allocation probability for each good, coupled with a price).² Daskalakis et al. (2013) have shown that even in the case of independently distributed valuations for the two goods, precise revenue maximization may require an infinite menu-size; Daskalakis et al. (2015) have shown this even when the valuations for the two goods are drawn i.i.d. from “nice” distributions. In light of these results, relaxations of this problem, allowing for mechanisms that maximize revenue up-to- ε , were considered.

Approximate Revenue Maximization Hart and Nisan (2013) have shown that a menu-size of $O(1/\varepsilon^4)$ suffices for maximizing revenue up to an additive ε :

Theorem 1 (Hart and Nisan, 2013). *There exists $C(\varepsilon) = O(1/\varepsilon^4)$ such that for every $\varepsilon > 0$ and for every distribution $F \in \Delta([0, 1]^2)$, there exists a mechanism M with menu-size at most $C(\varepsilon)$ such that $\text{Rev}_F(M) > \text{OPT}(F) - \varepsilon$. ($\text{Rev}_F(M)$ is the expected revenue of M from F .)*

While the above-described results of Daskalakis et al. imply that the menu-size required for up-to- ε revenue maximization tends to infinity as ε tends to 0, no lower bound whatsoever was known on the speed at which it tends to infinity. (I.e., all that was known was that the menu-size is $\omega(1)$ as a function of ε .) Our main result, which we prove in Section 2, is the first lower bound on the required menu-size for this problem,³ showing that a polynomial dependence on ε is not only sufficient, but also required, hence establishing that the menu-size really is a nontrivial bottleneck to extracting high revenue, even for two goods and even when the valuations for the goods are drawn i.i.d. from “nice” distributions:

¹Having 1 rather than any other upper bound is without loss of generality, as the units are arbitrary.

²By the Taxation Principle, any mechanism is essentially described by the menu of its possible outcomes, as the mechanism amounts to the buyer choosing from this menu an outcome that maximizes her utility.

³In fact, we do not know of any previous menu-size bound, for any problem, that lower-bounds the menu-size as a function of ε without having the number of goods n also tend to infinity (e.g., by setting $\varepsilon \triangleq 1/n$).

Theorem 2 (Menu-Size: Lower Bound). *There exist $C(\varepsilon) = \Omega(1/\sqrt[4]{\varepsilon})$ and a distribution $F \in \Delta([0, 1])$, such that for every $\varepsilon > 0$ it is the case that $\text{Rev}_{F^2}(M) < \text{OPT}(F^2) - \varepsilon$ for every mechanism M with menu-size at most $C(\varepsilon)$.*

Our proof of Theorem 2 uses the optimal-transport duality framework of Daskalakis et al. (2013, 2015). To the best of our knowledge, this is the first use of this framework to reason about approximately optimal mechanisms, thereby establishing how to leverage this framework to do so.

Communication Complexity As Babaioff et al. (2017) show, the logarithm (base 2, rounded up) of the menu-size of a mechanism is precisely the deterministic communication complexity (between the seller and the buyer) of running this mechanism, when the description of the mechanism itself is common knowledge. Therefore, by Theorems 1 and 2, we obtain a tight bound on the minimum deterministic communication complexity guaranteed to suffice for running some up-to- ε revenue-maximizing mechanism, thereby completely resolving this problem:

Corollary 3 (Communication Complexity: Tight Bound). *There exists $D(\varepsilon) = \Theta(\log 1/\varepsilon)$ such that for every $\varepsilon > 0$ it is the case that $D(\varepsilon)$ is the minimum communication complexity that satisfies the following: for every distribution $F \in \Delta([0, 1]^2)$ there exists a mechanism M such that the deterministic communication complexity of running M is $D(\varepsilon)$ and such that $\text{Rev}_F(M) > \text{OPT}(F) - \varepsilon$. This continues to hold even if F is guaranteed to be a product of two independent identical distributions.*

In Section 4, we extend this tight communication-complexity bound to any fixed number of goods, as well as derive analogues of our results for multiplicative up-to- ε approximation.

While our lower bound completely resolves the open question of whether a polynomial menu-size is necessary (and not merely sufficient), and while it tightly characterizes the related communication complexity, it does not yet fully characterize the precise polynomial dependence of the menu-size on ε . While the proof of our lower bound (Theorem 2) makes delicate use of a considerable amount of information regarding the optimal mechanism via the optimal-transport duality framework of Daskalakis et al. (2013, 2015), the proof of the upper bound of Hart and Nisan (2013) (Theorem 1) makes use of very little information regarding the optimal mechanism. (As noted above, indeed very little is known regarding the structure of general optimal mechanisms.) Our secondary result, which we prove in Section 3, shows that under standard economic assumptions on valuation distributions, the upper bound of Hart and Nisan (2013) can be tightened by two orders of magnitude. This suggests that it may well be possible to use more information regarding the structure of optimal mechanisms, as such will be discovered, to unconditionally improve the upper bound of Hart and Nisan (2013).

Theorem 4 (Menu-Size: Conditional Upper Bound). *There exists $C(\varepsilon) = O(1/\varepsilon^2)$ such that for every $\varepsilon > 0$ and for every distribution $F \in \Delta([0, 1]^2)$ satisfying the McAfee-McMillan hazard condition (see Definition 1 in Section 3), there exists a mechanism M with menu-size at most $C(\varepsilon)$ such that $\text{Rev}_F(M) > \text{OPT}(F) - \varepsilon$.*

The question of a precise tight bound on the menu-size required for up-to- ε revenue maximization remains open, for correlated as well as product (even i.i.d.) distributions. We further discuss our results and their connection to other results and open problems in the literature in Section 5.

2 Lower Bound

We prove our lower bound (i.e., Theorem 2) by considering the setting in which Daskalakis et al. (2015) show that precise revenue maximization requires infinite menu-size, that is, the case of two items with i.i.d. valuations each drawn from the Beta distribution $F \triangleq B(1, 2)$, i.e., the distribution over $[0, 1]$ with density $f(x) \triangleq 2(1 - x)$. We first present, in Section 2.1, a very high-level overview of the main proof idea in a way that does not go into any technical details regarding the duality framework of Daskalakis et al. (2013, 2015). We then present, in Section 2.2, only the minimal amount of detail from the extensive analysis of Daskalakis et al. (2015) that is required to follow our proof. Finally, in Section 2.3 we prove Theorem 2.

2.1 Proof Idea Overview

We start by presenting a very high-level overview of the main idea of the proof of Theorem 2 in a way that does not go into any technical details regarding the duality framework of Daskalakis et al. (2013, 2015).

Fix a concrete distribution from which the values of the goods are drawn. Let us denote the set of all truthful mechanisms by S_p and for each $s_p \in S_p$, let us denote its expected revenue by $o_p(s_p)$.⁴ The revenue maximization problem is to find a *solution* $s_p \in S_p$ for which the value of the *objective function* o_p is maximal. Daskalakis et al. (2013, 2015) identify a *dual problem* to the revenue maximization problem: this is a minimization problem, i.e., a problem where the goal is to find a solution s_d from a specific set of feasible solutions S_d that they identify, that minimizes the value $o_d(s_d)$ of a specific objective function o_d that they identify. This problem is an instance of a class of problems called *optimal-transport problems*, and it is a dual problem to the revenue maximization problem in the sense that for every pair of solutions (s_p, s_d) for the primal (revenue maximization) problem and dual (optimal-transport) problem respectively, it holds that the value of the primal objective function for the primal solution is upper-bounded by the value of the dual objective function for the dual solution, that is,

$$\forall s_p \in S_p, s_d \in S_d : \quad o_p(s_p) \leq o_d(s_d). \quad (1)$$

(See Equation (5) below for the full details.) This property is called *weak duality*. Daskalakis et al. (2015) also show that this duality is *strong* in the sense that there always exists a pair of solutions (\hat{s}_p, \hat{s}_d) for the primal and dual problems respectively such that

$$o_p(\hat{s}_p) = o_d(\hat{s}_d). \quad (2)$$

A standard observation in duality frameworks is that such \hat{s}_d *certifies* that \hat{s}_p is an optimal solution for the primal problem, since by Equation (1) the value of *any* primal solution is bounded by $o_d(\hat{s}_d) = o_p(\hat{s}_p)$. Indeed, Daskalakis et al. (2015) use their framework to identify and certify optimal primal solutions (revenue-maximizing mechanisms) by identifying such pairs (\hat{s}_p, \hat{s}_d) . To facilitate finding such pairs of solutions, they identify *complementary slackness* conditions, that is, conditions on s_p and s_d that are necessary and sufficient for the inequality in Equation (1) to in fact be an equality as in Equation (2). In particular, for the revenue maximization problem where the two items are sampled i.i.d. from the Beta

⁴As will become clear momentarily, S and s stand for “solution,” p stands for “primal,” and o stands for “objective.”

distribution $F = B(1, 2)$, they identify such a pair of solutions (\hat{s}_p, \hat{s}_d) . They in fact show that complementary slackness conditions (for this distribution) uniquely define the optimal primal solution and that this solution has an infinite menu-size.

The main idea of our proof is, with the optimal dual \hat{s}_d that Daskalakis et al. (2015) identify in hand, to carefully show that for every primal solution s_p *that is a mechanism with small menu-size*, these complementary slackness conditions not only fail to hold for (s_p, \hat{s}_d) (as follows from the result of Daskalakis et al., 2015), but in fact are sufficiently violated to yield the required separation, that is,

$$o_p(s_p) < o_d(\hat{s}_d) - \varepsilon = o_p(\hat{s}_p) - \varepsilon, \quad (3)$$

where \hat{s}_p is the optimal primal solution and the equality is by Equation (2). (See Equation (7) below for the full details.)

In slightly more detail, Daskalakis et al. (2015) show that for two items sampled i.i.d. from $F = B(1, 2)$, the complementary slackness conditions dictate that in a certain part of the value space, the set of values of buyers to which Good 2 (say) is allocated with probability 1 by the optimal mechanism and the set of values of buyers to which it is allocated with probability 0 in that mechanism are separated by a strictly concave curve (the curve S in Figure 1 below) and that this implies that the optimal mechanism has an infinite menu-size. Another way to state this conclusion is to observe that it follows from known properties that in a mechanism with a finite menu-size such a curve must be piecewise-linear rather than strictly concave, and so to conclude that the optimal mechanism cannot have a finite menu-size. Roughly speaking, we relate the loss in revenue (compared to the optimal mechanism) of a given mechanism to a certain metric (see below) of the region between the separating curve S of the optimal mechanism and an analogue of this curve (see below for the precise definition) in the given mechanism. We then observe that this analogue of S is a piecewise-linear curve with number of pieces at most the menu-size of the given mechanism, and use this to appropriately lower-bound this metric (see Proposition 5 below) for mechanisms with small menu-size. A lower bound on the loss in revenue for mechanisms with such a menu-size follows.

To present our analysis in further detail, we must now first dive into some of the details of the optimal-transport duality framework of Daskalakis et al. (2015).

2.2 Minimal Needed Essentials of the Optimal-Transport Duality Framework of Daskalakis et al. (2015), and Commentary

We now present only the minimal amount of detail from the extensive analysis of Daskalakis et al. (2015) that is required to follow our proof; the interested reader is referred to their paper or to the excellent survey of Daskalakis (2015), whose notation we follow, for the full details that lie beyond the scope of this paper. (See also Giannakopoulos and Koutsoupias (2014) for a slightly different duality approach, and Kash and Frongillo (2016) for an extension.)

In their analysis, Daskalakis et al. (2015) identify a signed Radon measure⁵ μ on $[0, 1]^2$

⁵To understand our proof there is no need to be familiar with the general definition of a signed Radon measure. It suffices to know that signed Radon measures generalize distributions that are defined by a combination of atoms and a density function, and allow in particular for a) densities (and atoms) that can also be negative (hence the term *signed*), and b) the overall measure not necessarily summing up to 1.

with $\mu([0, 1]^2) = 0$,⁶ such that for a mechanism with utility function⁷ u , the expected revenue of this mechanism from F^2 is equal to⁸

$$\int_{[0,1]^2} u d\mu. \quad (4)$$

They show that (the utility function of) the revenue-maximizing mechanism is obtained by maximizing Equation (4) subject to $u(0, 0) = 0$, to u being convex, and to $\forall x, y \in [0, 1]^2 : u(x) - u(y) \leq |(x - y)_+|_1$, where $|(x - y)_+|_1 = \sum_i \max(0, x_i - y_i)$. (Rochet (1987) has shown that the utility function of any truthful mechanism satisfies the latter two properties as well as $u(0, 0) \geq 0$. An equality as in the first property may be assumed without losing revenue or changing the menu-size.)

We comment that while one could have directly attempted prove Theorem 2 by analyzing how much revenue is lost in Equation (4) due to restricting attention only to u that corresponds to a mechanism with a certain (small) menu-size (in particular, the graph of such u is a maximum of C planes, where C is the menu-size), such an analysis, even if successful, would have been hard and involved, and immensely tailored to the specifics of the distribution F^2 , due to the complex definition of μ . For this reason we base our analysis on the duality-based framework of Daskalakis et al. (2013, 2015), which they have developed to help find and certify the optimal u , and we show, for the first time to the best of our knowledge, how to use this framework to quantitatively reason about the revenue loss from suboptimal mechanisms. The resulting approach is principled, general, and robust.⁹

Daskalakis et al. (2015) show that for every utility function u of a (truthful) mechanism for valuations in $[0, 1]^2$ and for every coupling¹⁰ γ of μ'_+ and μ'_- , where $\mu' = \mu'_+ - \mu'_-$ is any measure that convex-dominates¹¹ μ , it is the case that¹²

$$\int_{[0,1]^2} u d\mu \leq \int_{[0,1]^2 \times [0,1]^2} |(x - y)_+|_1 d\gamma(x, y). \quad (5)$$

⁶That is, the overall measure sums up to 0.

⁷The utility function of a mechanism maps each buyer type (i.e., pair of valuations) to the utility that a buyer of this type obtains from participating in the mechanism.

⁸This *Lebesgue integral* is the measure-theoretic analogue of the expectation (or average) of u with respect to a given distribution (but as μ is not a distribution, when “averaging,” some values are taken with negative weights, and weights do not sum up to 1).

⁹For example, readers familiar with the definition of *exclusion set* mechanisms (Daskalakis et al., 2015) may notice that our analysis of F^2 below can be readily applied with virtually no changes also to other distributions for which the optimal mechanism is derived from an exclusion set that is nonpolygonal (as \mathcal{Z} is in the analysis below).

¹⁰Informally (and sufficient to understand our proof), a coupling γ of two unsigned Radon measures μ_1 and μ_2 both having the same overall measure is a recipe for rearranging the mass of μ_1 into the mass of μ_2 by specifying where each piece of (positive) mass is transported. Formally, a coupling γ of two unsigned Radon measures μ_1 and μ_2 on $[0, 1]^2$ with $\mu_1([0, 1]^2) = \mu_2([0, 1]^2)$ is an unsigned Radon measure on $[0, 1]^2 \times [0, 1]^2$ whose marginals are μ_1 and μ_2 , i.e., for every measurable set $A \subseteq [0, 1]^2$, it holds that $\gamma(A \times [0, 1]^2) = \mu_1(A)$ and $\gamma([0, 1]^2 \times A) = \mu_2(A)$.

¹¹A distribution μ' convex-dominates a distribution μ if μ' is obtained from μ by shifting mass to coordinate-wise larger points and by performing mean-preserving spreads of positive mass. To follow our paper only a single property of convex dominance is needed — see below. As Daskalakis et al. (2015) show (but not required for our proof), of interest in this context are in fact only cases where μ' is obtained from μ by mean-preserving spreads of positive mass.

¹²Once again, the Lebesgue integral on the right-hand side is the measure-theoretic analogue of the average of the values $|(x - y)_+|_1$, where, informally, each pair (x, y) is taken with weight equal to the amount of (positive) mass transported by γ from x to y .

(This is precisely Equation (1) in full detail.) They identify the optimal mechanism \hat{M} for the distribution F^2 by finding a measure¹³ $\hat{\mu}'$ and a coupling $\hat{\gamma}$ of $\hat{\mu}'_+$ and $\hat{\mu}'_-$, such that Equation (5) holds with an equality for $u = \hat{u}$ (the utility function of \hat{M}) and $\gamma = \hat{\gamma}$ (this is precisely Equation (2) in full detail).¹⁴ To find \hat{u} and $\hat{\gamma}$, they make use of *complementary slackness conditions* that they identify, and make sure they are all completely satisfied. In our proof below, we will claim that for any utility function u that corresponds to a mechanism with small menu-size, the complementary slackness conditions with respect to u and $\hat{\gamma}$ will be sufficiently violated so as to give sufficient separation between the left-hand side of Equation (5) for u (that is, the revenue of the mechanism with small menu-size) and the right-hand side of Equation (5) for $\hat{\gamma}$ (that is, the optimal revenue).

To better understand the complementary slackness conditions identified by Daskalakis et al. (2015), let us review their proof for Equation (5):

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{[0,1]^2} u d\mu &\leq \int_{[0,1]^2} u d\mu' = \int_{[0,1]^2} u d(\mu'_+ - \mu'_-) = \int_{[0,1]^2 \times [0,1]^2} (u(x) - u(y)) d\gamma(x, y) \leq \\ &\leq \int_{[0,1]^2 \times [0,1]^2} |(x - y)_+|_1 d\gamma(x, y), \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

where the first inequality is since u is convex (this inequality is the only property of convex dominance that is needed to follow our paper), the second equality is by the definition of a coupling, and the second inequality is due to the third property of u as defined above following Equation (4). Daskalakis et al. (2015) note that if it would not be the case that γ -almost everywhere¹⁵ we would have $u(x) - u(y) = |(x - y)_+|_1$, then the second inequality in Equation (6) would be strict, and so the same proof would give a strict inequality in Equation (5); they use this insight to guide their search for the optimal \hat{u} and its tight dual $\hat{\gamma}$. (They also perform a similar analysis with respect to the first inequality in Equation (6), which we skip as we do not require it.) In our proof below we will show that for the coupling $\hat{\gamma}$ that they identify, and for any u that corresponds to a mechanism with small menu-size, this constraint (i.e., that γ -almost everywhere $u(x) - u(y) = |(x - y)_+|_1$) will be significantly violated, in a precise sense. To do so, we first describe the measure $\hat{\mu}'$ and the coupling $\hat{\gamma}$ that they identify.

Examine Figure 1. For our proof below it suffices to describe the measure $\hat{\mu}'$ and the coupling $\hat{\gamma}$, both restricted to a region $R \triangleq [0, x'] \times [0, 1]$ for an appropriate $x' > 0$.¹⁶ The measure $\hat{\mu}'$ has a point mass of measure 1 in $(0, 0)$, and otherwise in every $(x_1, x_2) \in R \setminus \{(0, 0)\}$ has density

$$f(x_1)f(x_2) \left(\frac{1}{1 - x_1} + \frac{1}{1 - x_2} - 5 \right).$$

In the region \mathcal{A} , the coupling $\hat{\gamma}$ sends positive mass downward, from positive-density points to negative-density points. In the region \mathcal{Z} , the coupling $\hat{\gamma}$ sends positive mass from $(0, 0)$

¹³For this specific distribution F^2 , the measure $\hat{\mu}'$ that they identify in fact equals μ .

¹⁴In fact, Daskalakis et al. (2015) prove a beautiful theorem that states that this (i.e., finding suitable μ' and γ such that Equation (5) holds with an equality for the optimal u) can be done for any underlying distribution, i.e., that this duality is *strong*.

¹⁵Informally (and sufficient to understand our proof), for a condition to hold *γ -almost everywhere* means for that condition to hold for every x and y such that the coupling γ transports (positive) mass from x to y .

¹⁶We choose x' as the horizontal-axis coordinate of the right boundary of the region denoted by \mathcal{A} in Daskalakis et al. (2015).




Figure 1: The optimal coupling $\hat{\gamma}$ identified by Daskalakis et al. (2015) for F^2 , illustrated in the region $R = [0, x'] \times [0, 1]$. Figure adapted from Daskalakis et al. (2015) with permission.

upward and rightward to all points (the density is indeed negative throughout $\mathcal{Z} \setminus \{(0, 0)\}$). No other positive mass is transported inside R or into R . (Some additional positive mass from $(0, 0)$ is transported out of R .)

The optimal mechanism that Daskalakis et al. (2015) identify does not award any good (nor does it charge any price) in the region \mathcal{Z} , while awarding Good 2 with probability 1 and Good 1 with varying probabilities (and charging varying prices) in the region \mathcal{A} .

As Daskalakis et al. (2015) note, indeed $\hat{\gamma}$ -almost everywhere the complementary slackness condition $\hat{u}(x) - \hat{u}(y) = |(x - y)_+|_1$ holds for this mechanism: in the region \mathcal{A} , coupled points x, y have $x_1 = y_1$ and $x_2 > y_2$, and in this region, $\hat{u}'_2 = 1$; in the region \mathcal{Z} , coupled points have $x_i = 0 \leq y_i$ and $\hat{u}(x) = \hat{u}(y)$. In fact, this reasoning shows that given the optimal coupling $\hat{\gamma}$, the utility function \hat{u} is uniquely defined by the complementary slackness conditions, and so is the unique revenue-maximizing utility function. Since it is well known that wherever a utility function $u(x_1, x_2)$ of a truthful mechanism is differentiable, its derivative in the direction of x_i is the allocation probability of Good i (indeed, by examining Good $i = 2$ one can verify using this property that the mechanism corresponding to \hat{u} indeed awards Good 2 with probability 1 in the region \mathcal{A} and with probability 0 in the region \mathcal{Z}), then by examining Good $i = 1$, since the curve S (see Figure 1) that separates the regions \mathcal{Z} and \mathcal{A} is strictly concave, Daskalakis et al. (2015) conclude that there is a continuum of allocation probabilities of Good 1 in the mechanism corresponding to \hat{u} (which is the unique revenue-maximizing mechanism), thus concluding that the unique revenue-maximizing mechanism for the distribution F^2 has an infinite menu-size.

2.3 Proof of Theorem 2

An alternative way to state the conclusion of the argument of Daskalakis et al. (2015) that any revenue-maximizing mechanism for F^2 has an infinite menu-size is as follows: let u be

the utility function of a mechanism M with a finite menu-size. It is well known that the graph of u is the maximum of a finite number of planes (each corresponding to one entry in the menu of M). Therefore, since S is strictly concave, it is impossible for u to have derivative 0 beneath the curve S and derivative 1 above the curve S , and so the complementary slackness conditions must be violated, and hence M is not optimal. In our proof we will quantify the degree of violation of the complementary slackness conditions as a function of the finite menu-size of such u . We would like to reason as follows: for such u with a finite menu-size, define the corresponding curve T that is the analogue for u of the curve S , and then show that since T must be piecewise-linear, quantifiable revenue is lost due to the complementary slackness conditions not holding in the region between S and T . It is not immediately clear how to define T , though.

Intuitively we would have liked to define T to be the curve on $[0, x']$ above which u awards Good 2 with probability 1 and below which u awards Good 2 with probability 0, but what if u also awards Good 2 with fractional probability? How should we define T in such cases? (Remember that all that we know about u is that it has small menu-size.) As we will see below, to show that we indeed have quantifiably sufficient revenue loss from any deviation of T from S , we will define T as the curve above which u awards Good 2 with probability more than one half, and below which u awards Good 2 with probability less than or equal to one half. As will become clear from our calculations, the constant one half could have been replaced here with any fixed fraction,¹⁷ but crucially it could not have been replaced with 0 (i.e., defining T as the curve above which u awards Good 2 with positive probability and below which u does not award Good 2) or with 1 (i.e., defining T as the curve above which u awards Good 2 with probability 1 and below which u awards Good 2 with probability strictly less than 1).

We are now finally ready to prove Theorem 2, with the help of the following proposition, which may be of separate interest. (We prove Proposition 5 following the proof of Theorem 2.)

Proposition 5. *Let $S : [0, x'] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a concave function with radius of curvature at most r everywhere, for some $r < \infty$. For small enough δ , the following holds. For any piecewise-linear function $T : [0, x'] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ composed of at most $\frac{x'}{8\sqrt{r\delta}}$ linear segments, the Lebesgue measure of the set of coordinates x_1 with $|S(x_1) - T(x_1)| > \delta$ is at least $x'/2$.*

Proof of Theorem 2. The curve S (see Figure 1) that separates the regions \mathcal{Z} and \mathcal{A} is given by $x_2 = \frac{2-3x_1}{4-5x_1}$ (where $x_1 \in [0, x']$) (Daskalakis et al., 2015). Therefore, it is strictly concave, having radius of curvature at most r everywhere, for some fixed $r < \infty$. We note also that there exists a constant $d > 0$ and a neighborhood N of the curve S in R in which the density of $\hat{\mu}'$ is (negative and) smaller than $-d$.

Let $\varepsilon > 0$ and set $\delta \triangleq \sqrt{\frac{8\varepsilon}{x'.d}}$. Assume without loss of generality that ε is sufficiently small so that both i) the δ -neighborhood of S in R is contained in the neighborhood N of S , and ii) Proposition 5 holds with respect to δ . Let $C \triangleq \frac{x'}{8\sqrt{r\delta}} = \Omega(1/\sqrt[4]{\varepsilon})$.

Let u be the utility function of a mechanism M with menu-size at most C , and let $T : [0, x'] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ be defined as follows:

$$T(x_1) \triangleq \inf\{x_2 \in [0, 1] \mid u'_2(x_1, x_2) > 1/2\} = \sup\{x_2 \in [0, 1] \mid u'_2(x_1, x_2) \leq 1/2\}.$$

¹⁷Similarly, the direction of tie breaking with respect to the region where Good 2 is awarded with probability precisely one half could have been flipped.

It is well known that the graph of u is the maximum of C planes. Therefore, T is a piecewise-linear function composed of at most C linear segments.

Let $y_1 \in [0, x']$ with $T(y_1) - S(y_1) > \delta$. Let $y_2 \in (S(y_1), S(y_1) + \delta/2)$ and let x_2 be such that $\hat{\gamma}$ transfers positive mass from $x \triangleq (y_1, x_2)$ to $y \triangleq (y_1, y_2)$. (All mass transferred to y by $\hat{\gamma}$ is from points of this form.) We note that by definition of T ,

$$u(x) - u(y) \leq x_2 - y_2 - \delta/4 = |(x - y)_+|_1 - \delta/4.$$

Similarly, let $y_1 \in [0, x']$ with $S(y_1) - T(y_1) > \delta$. Let $y_2 \in (S(y_1) - \delta/2, S(y_1))$. Note that $\hat{\gamma}$ transfers positive mass from $x \triangleq (0, 0)$ to $y \triangleq (y_1, y_2)$. (All mass transferred to y by $\hat{\gamma}$ is from the point x .) We note that by definition of T ,

$$u(x) - u(y) \leq -\delta/4 = |(x - y)_+|_1 - \delta/4.$$

By Proposition 5, the Lebesgue measure of the set of coordinates y_1 with $|S(y_1) - T(y_1)| > \delta$ is at least $x'/2$. Similarly to Equation (6), we therefore obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Rev}_{F^2}(M) &= \\ &= \int_{[0,1]^2} u d\mu \leq \int_{[0,1]^2} u d\hat{\mu}' = \int_{[0,1]^2} u d(\hat{\mu}'_+ - \hat{\mu}'_-) = \int_{[0,1]^2 \times [0,1]^2} (u(x) - u(y)) d\hat{\gamma}(x, y) \leq \\ &\leq \int_{[0,1]^2 \times [0,1]^2} |(x - y)_+|_1 d\hat{\gamma}(x, y) - \delta/4 \cdot \delta/2 \cdot x'/2 \cdot d = \int_{[0,1]^2} \hat{u} d\mu - \delta/4 \cdot \delta/2 \cdot x'/2 \cdot d = \\ &= \text{OPT}(F^2) - \delta/4 \cdot \delta/2 \cdot x'/2 \cdot d = \text{OPT}(F^2) - \varepsilon/2 < \text{OPT}(F^2) - \varepsilon, \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

as required (this is precisely Equation (3) in full detail). \square

Proof of Proposition 5. We will show that from each linear segment of T , at most a Lebesgue measure $4\sqrt{r\delta}$ of coordinates x_1 satisfy

$$|S(x_1) - T(x_1)| \leq \delta. \quad (8)$$

This implies the proposition since this means that from all linear segments of T together, at most a Lebesgue measure $\frac{x'}{8\sqrt{r\delta}} \cdot 4\sqrt{r\delta} = \frac{x'}{2}$ of coordinates x_1 satisfy Equation (8), and hence at least a Lebesgue measure $\frac{x'}{2}$ of coordinates x_1 satisfy $|S(x_1) - T(x_1)| > \delta$, as required.

For a Lebesgue measure m of coordinates from a single linear segment of T to satisfy Equation (8), we note that a necessary condition is that m be at most the length of a chord of sagitta at most 2δ in a circle of radius at most r . (See Figure 2.) We claim that this implies that $m \leq \sqrt{16r\delta - 16\delta^2} \leq 4\sqrt{r\delta}$, as required. Indeed, in the extreme case where m is the length of a chord of sagitta precisely 2δ in a circle of radius precisely r , we have by a standard use of the Intersecting Chords Theorem¹⁸ that $(\frac{m}{2})^2 = (2r - 2\delta) \cdot 2\delta$. Solving for m , we have that (in the extreme case) $m = \sqrt{16r\delta - 16\delta^2}$, as claimed. \square

¹⁸The Intersecting Chords Theorem states that when two chords of the same circle intersect, the product of the lengths of the two segments (that are delineated by the intersection point) of one chord equals the product of the lengths of the two segments of the other.

The main idea of the “nudge and round” argument of Hart and Nisan (2013) is that while the rounding (which is performed to reduce the menu-size — see below), by itself (without the discounting, which is the “nudge” part), could have hypothetically constituted the “last straw” that causes some buyer type to switch from preferring a very expensive outcome to preferring a very cheap one (thus significantly hurting the revenue), since more expensive outcomes are more heavily discounted, then this compensates for any such “last straw” effects. More concretely, while the rounding, before the ε -discounting, can cause a buyer’s utility from any outcome to shift by at most ε^2 (which could be the “last straw”), and since for any outcome whose price is cheaper by more than an ε compared to the buyer’s original outcome of choice the given discount is smaller by at least ε^2 , this smaller discount more than eliminates any potential utility gain due to rounding, so such an outcome would not become the most-preferred one. We will now formally show this.

Fix a type $x = (x_1, x_2) \in [0, 1]^2$ for the buyer. Let e be the outcome according to M when the buyer has type x . It is enough to show that the buyer pays at least $(1-\varepsilon)t_e - \varepsilon$ according to M' when she has type x . (We denote the price of, e.g., e by t_e .) Let f' be a possible outcome of M' , and let f be the outcome of M that corresponds to it. We will show that if $(1-\varepsilon)\lfloor t_{f'} \rfloor_\delta < (1-\varepsilon)(\lfloor t_e \rfloor_\delta - \varepsilon)$, then a buyer of type x strictly prefers the outcome e' of M' that corresponds to e over f' (and so does not choose f' in M'). Indeed, since in this case $\lfloor t_{f'} \rfloor_\delta < \lfloor t_e \rfloor_\delta - \varepsilon$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} u_x(e') &\geq u_x(e) + \varepsilon \cdot \lfloor t_e \rfloor_\delta \geq u_x(f) + \varepsilon \cdot \lfloor t_e \rfloor_\delta > u_x(f') - \delta - \varepsilon \cdot \lfloor t_{f'} \rfloor_\delta + \varepsilon \cdot \lfloor t_e \rfloor_\delta = \\ &= u_x(f') - \delta + \varepsilon \cdot (\lfloor t_e \rfloor_\delta - \lfloor t_{f'} \rfloor_\delta) > u_x(f') - \delta + \varepsilon \cdot \varepsilon = u_x(f'), \end{aligned}$$

so in M' , a buyer of type x pays at least

$$(1-\varepsilon)(\lfloor t_e \rfloor_\delta - \varepsilon) > (1-\varepsilon)(t_e - \delta - \varepsilon) = (1-\varepsilon)(t_e - \varepsilon^2 - \varepsilon) > (1-\varepsilon)t_e - \varepsilon.$$

How many menu entries does M' really have (i.e., how many menu entries ever get chosen by the buyer)? The number of menu entries $(p_1, p_2; t)$ with $p_1 = 1$ is at most $O(1/\varepsilon^2)$, since for every price t (there are $O(1/\varepsilon^2)$ such options) we can assume without loss of generality that only the menu entry $(p_1, p_2; t)$ with highest p_2 will ever be chosen.¹⁹ A similar argument for the cases $p_1 = 0$, $p_2 = 0$, and $p_2 = 1$ (by Theorem 6, no more cases exist beyond these four) shows that in total there really are at most $O(1/\varepsilon^2)$ menu entries in M' , as required. \square

We note that both Pavlov (2011) and Kash and Frongillo (2016) conjecture that the conclusion of Theorem 6 holds under more general conditions than the McAfee-McMillan hazard condition. An affirmation of (either of) these conjectures would, by the above proof, immediately imply that the conclusion of Theorem 4 holds under the same generalized assumptions.

Hart and Nisan (2013) also analyze the scenario of a two-good distribution supported on $[1, H]^2$ for any given H , and give an upper bound of $O(\log^2 H/\varepsilon^5)$ on the menu-size that suffices for revenue maximization up to a *multiplicative* ε . Using the above techniques, their argument could be similarly modified to give an improved upper bound of $O(\log H/\varepsilon^2)$ in that setting for distributions $F \in \Delta([1, H]^2)$ satisfying the McAfee-McMillan hazard condition (or any generalized condition under which the conclusion of Theorem 6 holds).

¹⁹If a maximum such p_2 is not attained, then we can add a suitable menu entry with the supremum of such p_2 ; see Babaioff et al. (2017) for a full argument.

4 Extensions

4.1 More than Two Goods

Recall that Corollary 3 concludes, from our menu-size lower bound (Theorem 2) and the menu-size upper bound of Hart and Nisan (2013) (Theorem 1), a tight bound on the minimum deterministic communication complexity guaranteed to suffice for running some up-to- ε revenue-maximizing mechanism for selling two goods, thereby completely resolving this problem. In fact, since Hart and Nisan (2013) prove an upper bound of $(n/\varepsilon)^{O(n)}$ (later strengthened to $(\log n/\varepsilon)^{O(n)}$ by Dughmi et al., 2014) on the menu-size required for revenue maximization up to an additive ε when selling any number of goods n , we obtain our tight communication-complexity bound not only for two goods, but for any fixed number of goods $n \geq 2$:

Corollary 7 (Communication Complexity: Tight Bound for Any Number of Goods). *Fix $n \geq 2$. There exists $D_n(\varepsilon) = \Theta(\log 1/\varepsilon)$ such that for every $\varepsilon > 0$ it is the case that $D_n(\varepsilon)$ is the minimum communication complexity that satisfies the following: for every distribution $F \in \Delta([0, 1]^n)$ there exists a mechanism M for selling n goods such that the deterministic communication complexity of running M is $D_n(\varepsilon)$ and such that $\text{Rev}_F(M) > \text{OPT}(F) - \varepsilon$. This continues to hold even if F is guaranteed to be a product distribution.*

For the case of one good, the seminal result of Myerson (1981) shows that there exists a (precisely) revenue-maximizing mechanism with only two possible outcomes (and hence deterministic communication complexity of 1), which simply offers the good for a suitably chosen take-it-or-leave-it price. Corollary 7 therefore shows a precise dichotomy in the asymptotic communication complexity of up-to- ε revenue maximization, between the case of one good (Myerson’s result; 1 bit of communication) on the one hand, and the case of any other fixed number of goods ($\Theta(\log 1/\varepsilon)$ bits of communication) on the other hand.

4.2 Multiplicative Approximation

In a scenario where the valuations may be unbounded, i.e., $v_i \in [0, \infty)$ for all i , Hart and Nisan (2013) have shown that no finite menu-size suffices for maximizing revenue up to a multiplicative²⁰ ε , and consequently Hart and Nisan (2014) asked²¹ whether this impossibility may be overcome for the case of independently distributed valuations for the goods. Babaioff, Gonczarowski, and Nisan (2017) gave a positive answer, showing that for every n and ε , a finite menu-size suffices, and moreover gave an upper bound of $(\log n/\varepsilon)^{O(n)}$ on the sufficient menu-size. Since for valuations in $[0, 1]$, revenue maximization up to a multiplicative ε is a stricter requirement than revenue maximization up to an additive ε , our lower bound from Theorem 2 immediately provides a lower bound for this scenario as well.

Corollary 8 (Menu-Size for Multiplicative Approximation: Lower Bound). *There exist $C(\varepsilon) = \Omega(1/\sqrt[4]{\varepsilon})$ and a distribution $F \in \Delta([0, 1]) \subseteq \Delta([0, \infty))$, such that for every $\varepsilon > 0$ it is the case that $\text{Rev}_{F^2}(M) < (1 - \varepsilon) \cdot \text{OPT}(F^2)$ for every mechanism M with menu-size at most $C(\varepsilon)$.*

²⁰For unbounded valuations, it makes no sense to consider additive guarantees, as the problem is invariant under scaling of the currency.

²¹Hart and Nisan (2014) is a manuscript combining Hart and Nisan (2013) with an earlier paper.

By an argument similar to that yielding Corollary 7, using the above upper bound of Babaioff et al. (2017) in lieu of that of Hart and Nisan (2013) / Dughmi et al. (2014), we therefore obtain an analogue of Corollary 7 for this setting as well.

Corollary 9 (Communication Complexity of Multiplicative Approximation: Tight Bound). *Fix $n \geq 2$. There exists $D_n(\varepsilon) = \Theta(\log 1/\varepsilon)$ such that for every $\varepsilon > 0$ it is the case that $D_n(\varepsilon)$ is the minimum communication complexity that satisfies the following: for every product distribution $F \in \Delta([0, \infty))^n$ there exists a mechanism M for selling n goods such that the deterministic communication complexity of running M is $D_n(\varepsilon)$ and such that $\text{Rev}_F(M) > (1 - \varepsilon) \cdot \text{OPT}(F)$. This continues to hold even if each of the distributions whose product is F is guaranteed to be supported in $[0, 1]$.*

Corollary 9 shows that the dichotomy between one good and any other fixed number of goods that is shown by Corollary 7 also holds for multiplicative up-to- ε revenue maximization.

5 Discussion

In a very recent paper, Saxena et al. (2018) analyze the menu-size required for approximate revenue maximization in what is known as the FedEx problem (Fiat et al., 2016). Interestingly, they also use piecewise-linear approximation of concave functions to derive their bounds. Nonetheless, there are considerably many differences between their analysis and ours, e.g.: the effects of bad piecewise-linear approximation on the revenue,²² the approximated/approximating object,²³ the mathematical features of the approximated object,²⁴ the geometric/analytic proof of the bound on the number of linear segments, and finally, the argument that uses the piecewise-linear approximation and whether or not it couples the desired approximation with another parameter of the problem.²⁵ It therefore seems to be unlikely that both analyses are special cases of some general analysis, and so it would be interesting to see whether piecewise-linear approximations of concave (or other) functions “pop up” in the future in any additional contexts in connection with bounds on the menu-size of mechanisms.²⁶

As mentioned in Section 4, Babaioff et al. (2017) prove an upper bound on the menu-size required for multiplicative up-to- ε approximate revenue maximization when selling n goods to an additive buyer with independently distributed valuations. For any fixed n , this bound is polynomial in $1/\varepsilon$, and the lower bound that we establish in Corollary 8 shows in particular that a polynomial dependence cannot be avoided here (e.g., it cannot be reduced to a logarithmic or lower dependence) even for bounded distributions, yielding a tight communication-complexity bound (see Corollary 9 in Section 4). Alternatively to fixing n and analyzing the

²²There: even a single point having large distance can cause quantifiable revenue loss; Here: at least a certain measure of points having large distance causes quantifiable revenue loss.

²³There: revenue curves, with vertices corresponding to menu entries; Here: contour lines of the allocation function, with edges corresponding to menu entries.

²⁴There: piecewise-linear; Here: strictly concave.

²⁵There: lower bound achieved by coupling the desired approximation with the number of possible deadlines n (setting $\varepsilon \triangleq 1/n^2$); Here: desired approximation uncoupled from the number of goods n .

²⁶Incidentally, other known derivations of menu-size bounds, such as those in Hart and Nisan (2013), Dughmi et al. (2014), and Babaioff et al. (2017), do not use (even implicitly, to the best of our understanding) piecewise-linear approximations.

menu-size and communication complexity as functions of ε as we do, one may fix ε and analyze these quantities as functions of n . For any fixed $\varepsilon > 0$, the upper bound of Babaioff et al. (2017) is exponential in n ; therefore, another question left open by that paper is whether this exponential dependence may be avoided. (In terms of communication complexity, this question asks whether for every fixed ε , the communication complexity can be logarithmic or even polylogarithmic in n .) Some progress on this question has been made already by Babaioff et al. (2017), who show that on the one hand, a polynomial dependence on n suffices for some values of ε (namely, $\varepsilon \geq 5/6$), and that on the other hand, an exponential dependence on n is required when coupling ε with the number of goods n by setting $\varepsilon \triangleq 1/n$;²⁷ however, as noted above, they leave the general case of arbitrary fixed $\varepsilon > 0$ (uncoupled from n , e.g., $\varepsilon = 1\%$) as their main remaining open question. While the current state-of-the-art literature seems to be a long way from identifying very-high-dimensional optimal mechanisms, and especially from identifying their duals (indeed, it took quite some impressive effort for Giannakopoulos and Koutsoupias (2014) to identify the optimal mechanism for 6 goods whose valuations are i.i.d. uniform in $[0, 1]$), one may hope that with time, it may be possible to do so. It seems plausible that if one could generate high-dimensional optimal mechanisms (and corresponding duals) for which the high-dimensional analogue of the curve that we denote by S in Section 2 has large-enough measure (while maintaining a small-enough radius of curvature, etc.), then an argument similar to the one that we give in the proof of Theorem 2 may be used to show that an exponential dependence on n in the above bound is indeed required for sufficiently small, yet fixed, ε , and thereby resolve the above open question. Whether one can generate such mechanisms with large-enough high-dimensional analogues of S , however, remains to be seen.

Acknowledgments

Yannai Gonczarowski is supported by the Adams Fellowship Program of the Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities. His work is supported by ISF grant 1435/14 administered by the Israeli Academy of Sciences and by Israel-USA Bi-national Science Foundation (BSF) grant number 2014389. This project has received funding from the European Research Council (ERC) under the European Union’s Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme (grant agreement No 740282). I thank Costis Daskalakis, Kira Goldner, Sergiu Hart, Ian Kash, Noam Nisan, Christos Tzamos, and an anonymous referee for helpful feedback. I thank Costis Daskalakis, Alan Deckelbaum, and Christos Tzamos for permission to base Figure 1 on a figure from their paper.

References

M. Babaioff, Y. A. Gonczarowski, and N. Nisan. The menu-size complexity of revenue approximation. In *Proceedings of the 49th Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing (STOC)*, pages 869–877, 2017.

²⁷This result also shows that the exponential dependence on n in the upper bounds of Hart and Nisan (2013) and Dughmi et al. (2014) for *additive* up-to- ε approximation (see Section 4) is required even for bounded product distributions. However, one may claim that the “more interesting” question when keeping ε fixed and letting n vary is that of a multiplicative approximation, as asking for at most an ε additive loss while increasing the total value in the market (by adding more and more items) is quite a harsh requirement.

- C. Daskalakis. Multi-item auctions defying intuition? *ACM SIGecom Exchanges*, 14(1): 41–75, 2015.
- C. Daskalakis, A. Deckelbaum, and C. Tzamos. Mechanism design via optimal transport. In *Proceedings of the 14th ACM Conference on Electronic Commerce (EC)*, pages 269–286, 2013.
- C. Daskalakis, A. Deckelbaum, and C. Tzamos. Strong duality for a multiple-good monopolist. In *Proceedings of the 16th ACM Conference on Economics and Computation (EC)*, pages 449–450, 2015.
- S. Dughmi, L. Han, and N. Nisan. Sampling and representation complexity of revenue maximization. In *Proceedings of the 10th Conference on Web and Internet Economics (WINE)*, pages 277–291, 2014.
- A. Fiat, K. Goldner, A. R. Karlin, and E. Koutsoupias. The FedEx problem. In *Proceedings of the 17th ACM Conference on Economics and Computation (EC)*, pages 21–22, 2016.
- Y. Giannakopoulos and E. Koutsoupias. Duality and optimality of auctions for uniform distributions. In *Proceedings of the 15th ACM Conference on Economics and Computation (EC)*, pages 259–276, 2014.
- Y. Giannakopoulos and E. Koutsoupias. Selling two goods optimally. In *Proceedings of the 42nd International Colloquium on Automata, Languages, and Programming (ICALP)*, pages 650–662, 2015.
- S. Hart and N. Nisan. The menu-size complexity of auctions. In *Proceedings of the 14th ACM Conference on Electronic Commerce (EC)*, page 565, 2013.
- S. Hart and N. Nisan. How good are simple mechanisms for selling multiple goods? Discussion Paper 666, Center for the Study of Rationality, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 2014.
- S. Hart and P. J. Reny. Maximal revenue with multiple goods: Nonmonotonicity and other observations. *Theoretical Economics*, 10(3):893–922, 2015.
- I. A. Kash and R. M. Frongillo. Optimal auctions with restricted allocations. In *Proceedings of the 17th ACM Conference on Economics and Computation (EC)*, pages 215–232, 2016.
- A. M. Manelli and D. R. Vincent. Bundling as an optimal selling mechanism for a multiple-good monopolist. *Journal of Economic Theory*, 127(1):1–35, 2006.
- R. P. McAfee and J. McMillan. Multidimensional incentive compatibility and mechanism design. *Journal of Economic Theory*, 46(2):335–354, 1988.
- J. Morgenstern and T. Roughgarden. On the pseudo-dimension of nearly optimal auctions. In *Proceedings of Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 28 (NIPS)*, pages 136–144, 2015.
- R. Myerson. Optimal auction design. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 6(1):58–73, 1981.

- G. Pavlov. A property of solutions to linear monopoly problems. *The BE Journal of Theoretical Economics*, 11(1):#4, 2011.
- J.-C. Rochet. A necessary and sufficient condition for rationalizability in a quasi-linear context. *Journal of Mathematical Economics*, 16(2):191–200, 1987.
- R. R. Saxena, A. Schwartzman, and S. M. Weinberg. The menu complexity of “one-and-a-half-dimensional” mechanism design. In *Proceedings of the 29th Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA)*, pages 2026–2035, 2018.
- J. Thanassoulis. Haggling over substitutes. *Journal of Economic Theory*, 117(2):217–245, 2004.