

A General Incentives-Based Framework for Fairness in Multi-agent Resource Allocation

Ashwin Kumar

Washington University in St Louis
St Louis, MO, USA
ashwinkumar@wustl.edu

ABSTRACT

We introduce the General Incentives-based Framework for Fairness (GIFF), a novel approach for fair multi-agent resource allocation that infers fair decision-making from standard value functions. In resource-constrained settings, agents optimizing for efficiency often create inequitable outcomes. Our approach leverages the action-value (Q -)function to balance efficiency and fairness without requiring additional training. Specifically, our method computes a local fairness gain for each action and introduces a counterfactual advantage correction term to discourage over-allocation to already well-off agents. This approach is formalized within a centralized control setting, where an arbitrator uses the GIFF-modified Q -values to solve an allocation problem.

Empirical evaluations across diverse domains—including dynamic ridesharing, homelessness prevention, and a complex job allocation task—demonstrate that our framework consistently outperforms strong baselines and can discover far-sighted, equitable policies. The framework’s effectiveness is supported by a theoretical foundation; we prove its fairness surrogate is a principled lower bound on the true fairness improvement and that its trade-off parameter offers monotonic tuning. Our findings establish GIFF as a robust and principled framework for leveraging standard reinforcement learning components to achieve more equitable outcomes in complex multi-agent systems.

KEYWORDS

Fairness, Resource Allocation, Multiagent Systems, Multiagent Planning

1 INTRODUCTION

In many real-world applications, ranging from ridesharing [2, 19] to allocating homelessness resources [8], multiple agents vie for limited resources, often leading to significant disparities in outcomes. Traditional RL-based allocation methods focus on maximizing individual or aggregate utility, but they typically overlook fairness, resulting in inequitable resource distributions that can undermine both system-wide performance and societal acceptance. In this work, we address this gap by proposing a novel framework for fair multi-agent resource allocation that leverages the existing action-value functions to *infer* fairness improvements, without any additional learning.

Existing approaches to fair RL generally incorporate fairness directly into the reward structure or modify the learning process to produce value functions that reflect fairness considerations. However, these strategies can introduce complexities such as non-stationarity and may require extensive retraining, which is impractical in many dynamic and high-stakes environments. Moreover,

William Yeoh

Washington University in St Louis
St Louis, MO, USA
wyeh@wustl.edu

such methods typically assume that agents are intrinsically motivated to be fair, that is, they are willing to sacrifice their own utility for collective equity. In many real-world scenarios, agents may have competing objectives or operate independently without centralized coordination, making it unreasonable to expect them to adopt fairness as an inherent goal. Our work takes a different path: Rather than embedding fairness into the value function, we infer fair decisions by analyzing the long-term Q -values computed by agents. This allows us to extract information about the potential fairness gains associated with different actions and adjust the allocation process accordingly.

The core idea of our approach, named General Incentives-based Framework for Fairness (GIFF), is to combine the standard utility-driven Q -values with additional fairness-related signals. Specifically, we decompose the fairness gain into a component that captures the marginal improvement in fairness resulting from an action, and we introduce an advantage correction term that incentivizes better-off agents to moderate their resource consumption in favor of those who are disadvantaged. This decomposition not only translates to a diverse set of fairness metrics but also offers a transparent mechanism to balance efficiency and fairness during the resource allocation process.

We formalize our framework within a centralized control setting, where a central arbitrator uses the GIFF-modified Q -values to solve an optimization problem subject to resource constraints, and wishes to incorporate fairness into the decision-making. Through extensive experiments in domains such as ridesharing, homelessness, and job allocation, we demonstrate that our framework achieves competitive fairness-utility trade-offs compared to state-of-the-art methods. Our evaluations also highlight the critical role of the advantage correction term, particularly in environments where independent evaluations of fairness improvement fail to capture the benefits of inter-agent cooperation.

In summary, our contributions are as follows:

- (1) We develop a **General Incentives-based Framework for Fairness (GIFF)** that can be used to improve diverse fairness metrics in multi-agent resource allocation problems without the need for additional learning. This framework infers fairness from standard Q -values without altering the underlying RL models.
- (2) We propose a principled mechanism—comprising fairness gain estimation and counterfactual advantage correction—to adjust allocation decisions in favor of fairer outcomes, with only two hyperparameters.
- (3) We derive instantiations of GIFF for various fairness measures like variance, α -fairness and Generalized Gini Functions (GGF).

- (4) We provide theoretical bounds on the actual fairness improvement in relation to the locally estimated fairness gain when using GIFF, for multiple fairness functions. We also provide a Pareto-improvement property over the total local fairness.
- (5) We provide experimental evidence across multiple domains and fairness metrics to illustrate the effectiveness of our approach.

By rethinking how fairness can be integrated into multi-agent systems, our work opens up promising new directions for achieving equitable resource distribution in complex, dynamic environments—a crucial step toward deploying RL in socially sensitive applications.

2 RELATED WORK

Many domains employ multi-agent resource allocation with centralized decision-makers, like ridesharing [2, 19], homelessness prevention [8, 9], satellite allocation [14] and wireless networks [22]. In our work, we focus on fair decision making in multi-agent systems that have a similar structure. There has been recent work on developing methods to learn fair policies in multi-agent RL [7, 20, 23], using policy optimization [17] with modified rewards or hierarchical policies to elicit fair behavior. Almdari et al. [1] look at fair resource allocation at different time horizons, learning to be fair by constructing counterfactual experiences. In our approach, we instead try to develop a learning-free method to improve fairness, by post-processing the Q-values associated with resource allocations. Simple Incentives [11] is a related approach looking at fairness in ridesharing systems, employing domain and metric specific fairness post-processing. Our approach is much more general and adaptable to different domains and fairness metrics, as we show in our experimental results.

Beyond reinforcement learning and resource allocation, the machine learning community has broadly investigated bias and fairness. Surveys such as [12] provide comprehensive overviews of fairness metrics and mitigation strategies, while foundational works [5, 6] have laid the groundwork for understanding fairness in supervised settings. In parallel, economic and social welfare research has long provided robust formulations of equity, giving rise to measures like α -fairness and the Generalized Gini Function—which are rooted in social welfare theory [3, 13, 16, 18]. By drawing on these diverse strands of literature, our work bridges multi-agent reinforcement learning, dynamic resource allocation, and fairness, contributing a novel framework that infers fairness directly from long-term Q-value estimates.

3 PRELIMINARIES

We now formally describe the resource allocation problem that tackled in this paper as well as describe several key fairness concepts that motivates our work and used later in empirical evaluations.

3.1 Resource Allocation

A typical resource allocation problem consists of n agents $i \in \alpha$ with diverse preferences over K types of resources, with a total set of resources \mathcal{R} being available. Each time-step, agents attempt to take resources they want, following which new resources appear and the global state changes according to some transition dynamics.

In the centralized control setting, an arbitrator aggregates agent preferences and allocates actions while ensuring no two agents try to take the same resource. This constrained Multi-agent MDP model [4] is described by the tuple \mathcal{M} with the following components:

$$\mathcal{M} = \langle \alpha, S, O, \{A_i\}_{i \in \alpha}, T, R, \gamma, c \rangle \quad (1)$$

- α is the set of agents indexed by i (n agents).
- S is the global state space.
- $O : S \rightarrow O_1 \times O_2 \times \dots \times O_n$ is the observation function that maps the true state to agent observations.
- A_i is the action space for agent i , where an action a includes allocation of a set of resources.
- $T : S \times A_1 \times A_2 \times \dots \times A_n \times S \rightarrow [0, 1]$ represents the joint transition probabilities.
- $R : S \times A_1 \times A_2 \times \dots \times A_n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ denotes the (utility) reward function, which returns a vector of rewards, one for each agent.
- γ is the discount factor for future rewards.
- $c : A_1 \cup A_2 \cup \dots \cup A_n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^K$ maps each action to its resource consumption for K types of resources.

Each agent can then learn an action-value function $Q(o_i, a)$, which estimates the expected long-term return from taking action a given the local observation o_i , without knowledge of other agents' current actions. Formally, this is defined as:

$$Q(o_i, a) = \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t r_i^{(t)} \mid o_i^{(0)} = o_i, a_i^{(0)} = a \right], \quad (2)$$

where $r_i^{(t)}$ is the reward received by agent i at time-step t , and $\gamma \in [0, 1]$ is the discount factor. The expectation is taken over the trajectories induced by the environment dynamics and policies of all agents, conditioned only on agent i 's observation and action. In any state s , agents compute the Q-values for all of their available actions and communicate them to the central arbitrator, who can then use them to compute a utilitarian allocation.

Let \mathcal{A} denote the allocation of actions decided by the central allocator such that \mathcal{A}_i is the action assigned to agent i . Let $x_i(a) \in \{0, 1\}$ be a binary decision variable that indicates whether agent i is assigned action $a \in A_i$. Let $\mathcal{R} \in \mathbb{R}^K$ denote the vector of available resources, with \mathcal{R}_k representing the quantity of resource type $k \in \{1, 2, \dots, K\}$. Let $c(a) \in \mathbb{R}^K$ denote the resource consumption vector for action a , where $c(a)_k$ is the amount of resource k consumed by action a . This gives us the following optimization:

$$\max_{x_i(a) \in \{0, 1\}} \sum_{i \in \alpha} \sum_{a \in A_i} x_i(a) \cdot Q(o_i, a) \quad (3)$$

$$\text{subject to } \sum_{a \in A_i} x_i(a) = 1, \quad \forall i \in \alpha \quad (4)$$

$$\sum_{i \in \alpha} \sum_{a \in A_i} x_i(a) \cdot c(a)_k \leq \mathcal{R}_k, \quad \forall k \in \{1, \dots, K\} \quad (5)$$

These constraints ensure that each agent is assigned exactly one action and that total resource usage does not exceed available supplies. This is a general formulation, and many real-world problems follow this approach [2, 8, 14, 19, 22]. This problem can be formulated as an integer linear program (ILP), but more efficient algorithms and distributed approaches exist for allocation problems

with stricter constraints. For instance, if the constraints boil down to a bipartite matching between agents and resources, the Hungarian algorithm [10] can solve the allocation problem in polynomial time.

Alternatively, some systems assume agents act independently without a central arbitrator or consensus-based decision making. In this case, methods like first-come-first-served or random tie breaks are used to decide who gets contested resources. This approach is much more commonly seen in multi-agent RL [7, 21, 23]. When using a policy optimization based approach, agents express preferences over actions which maximize their chances of getting good resources in the form of a policy π rather than expressing valuations over bundles of resources.

In this paper, we restrict ourselves to using Q-functions. Further, we select the centralized control setting, where the decision-maker has the ability to enforce fairness constraints by providing incentives to agents. Thus, in this work, we assume agents bid for actions by communicating their Q-values to the central decision maker, and each action is associated with the allocation of some resources and the corresponding gain in utility is the reward. The Q-function then captures the long-term expected utility for each agent.

Payoff-vector (Z): We are interested in resource allocation problems that have a temporal aspect to them, i.e., after each allocation, new resources may arrive in the system, and resources and agents may enter or exit the allocation pool. We consider two cases: 1) A fixed number of agents, and 2) An arbitrary number of agents that belong to a fixed number of groups. In both cases, we consider a total of n groups or agents. Given this, we can construct a vector of payoffs $Z = [z_1, z_2, \dots, z_n]$ that captures the accumulated value of all resources allocated to each agent/group over time.

Unless specified otherwise, we use z_i to denote the cumulative payoff for agent or group i at the current time-step. When referring to a specific time, we will write $z_i^{(t)}$ to indicate the value at time-step t . The cumulative reward is given by:

$$z_i = \sum_{\tau=0}^t r_i^{(\tau)}, \quad (6)$$

where $r_i^{(\tau)}$ is the reward received by agent i at time-step τ . In some settings, an average payoff is used instead:

$$\bar{z}_i = \frac{1}{t+1} \sum_{\tau=0}^t r_i^{(\tau)}. \quad (7)$$

This payoff vector serves as a temporal record of how resources have been distributed across agents and provides a foundation for incorporating fairness criteria into future allocation decisions.

3.2 Fairness Concepts

To capture fairness, we consider a fairness function $F : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, which maps any payoff vector $Z = [z_1, \dots, z_n]$ to a numerical value such that larger values correspond to fairer distributions. In other words, for any two payoff vectors Z_1 and Z_2 , we say that Z_1 is fairer than Z_2 if and only if $F(Z_1) > F(Z_2)$.

In the literature on fair multi-agent resource allocation, two main schools of thought emerge:

- **Social Welfare Function Approaches.** In these methods, fairness is directly embedded into a social welfare function that aggregates individual utilities [20, 23]. Such functions may be designed to satisfy three desirable properties: They exhibit **impartiality**, remaining invariant under any permutation of agents to ensure equal treatment; they promote **equity** by rewarding reallocations that transfer resources from better-off agents to those worse-off, consistent with the Pigou-Dalton principle; and they ensure **efficiency** by assigning a higher value to allocations in which every agent receives higher or equal utility compared to alternative allocations.

These metrics usually take the form of a summation over transformations of agent utilities, for example:

- **α -Fairness:** For a given payoff vector $Z = [z_1, \dots, z_n]$, define the per-agent α -fair utility as:

$$U_\alpha(z) = \begin{cases} \frac{z^{1-\alpha}}{1-\alpha} & \text{if } \alpha \neq 1, \\ \log(z) & \text{if } \alpha = 1, \end{cases} \quad (8)$$

and the overall fairness measure as: $F_\alpha(Z) = \sum_{i=1}^n U_\alpha(z_i)$.

- **Generalized Gini Function (GGF):** Order the components of Z as $z_{(1)} \leq z_{(2)} \leq \dots \leq z_{(n)}$. Then, the GGF function is defined as

$$F_{GGF}(Z) = \sum_{i=1}^n w_i z_{(i)}, \quad (9)$$

with weights satisfying $w_1 \geq w_2 \geq \dots \geq w_n$ and $\sum_{i=1}^n w_i = 1$. By varying α or w_i , these metrics can transition between utilitarian and egalitarian fairness. Specifically, α -fairness with $\alpha = 1$ is equivalent to the popular log Nash Welfare metric.

- **Distributional Approaches.** Alternatively, fairness may be measured separately via distributional metrics—such as variance, the Gini index, or Jain’s fairness index—and then combined with total utility [11, 15]. These metrics can capture non-linear relationships among agents’ utilities and provide a distinct measure of fairness that is later interpolated with the overall efficiency.

Having outlined these approaches, our work aims to balance efficiency and fairness via a joint objective. Specifically, for a given time horizon T with payoff vector Z_T , we seek an allocation policy that maximizes:

$$\max \quad (1 - \beta)U_T + \beta F(Z_T), \quad (10)$$

$$U_T = \sum_{i=1}^n z_i, \quad (11)$$

Here, $\beta \in [0, 1]$ is a trade-off parameter that controls the relative importance of efficiency (total utility) versus fairness.

In our evaluations, we show results using both kinds of fairness metrics. In particular, for the social welfare function approaches, we incorporate a specialized term that enables agents to locally assess the benefits of their actions for others. Notably, our incentives-based framework operates entirely online with zero additional training.

4 GIFF

The key insight in our work is that the Q-function, which captures the long-term utilitarian effects of actions, can also be used to guide the decision maker towards a fair allocation. Previous work has considered directly learning to optimize for fairness [7, 23] or

using knowledge of the true reward function to myopically improve variance using domain-specific post-processing [11]. Instead, we provide a General Incentives-based Framework for Fairness (GIFF) that improves fairness without the need for additional learning for a variety of domains and fairness functions.

To achieve this, we develop an approach that takes advantage of the instantaneous pre-decision payoffs \mathbf{Z}_t at the current time t to guide the present decision towards a fairer outcome by improving the perceived value of fairer allocations. We do this by computing the estimated improvement to fairness, the *fairness gain* of actions, and augmenting the pre-trained Q-values to reflect our objective (Eq. 10).

First, we assume an idealized scenario. Let $\mathcal{A} = [a_i]_{i \in \alpha}$ denote an allocation that contains one action for each agent. We overload the notation for the reward function to let $R(\mathcal{A}_i)$ be a shorthand for the true reward received by agent i under allocation \mathcal{A} . The updated payoff vector $\mathbf{Z}_{t+1}|\mathcal{A}$ can be computed using \mathbf{Z}_t and \mathcal{A} , by updating the payoffs using the true rewards. Then, the fairness gain for any allocation can be defined as:

$$\Delta F(\mathcal{A}) = F(\mathbf{Z}_{t+1}) - F(\mathbf{Z}_t) \quad (12)$$

$$z_i^{t+1} = z_i^t + R(\mathcal{A}_i) \quad \forall i \quad (13)$$

$$\mathcal{A}_f^* = \operatorname{argmax}_{\mathcal{A}} \Delta F(\mathcal{A}) \quad (14)$$

Here, \mathcal{A}_f^* is the allocation that improves fairness the most in the current step. We can also conceive of a similar search which maximizes over an entire sequence of allocations to maximize long-term fairness. However, even for the one-step allocation, the search space is combinatorial in the number of agents and their respective action spaces, as we have to consider all possible joint actions. This makes the global optimization intractable, necessitating alternate methods for computing a fair allocation.

4.1 Using Q-values to Estimate Fairness

We observe that it is much easier to reason about fair actions if we can decompose the fairness gain across agents. To achieve this, we reason only over the locally conditioned updated payoff vector $\mathbf{Z}_t^{a^i}$, updating all accumulated utilities based only on a single agent's action a^i , keeping everything else unaffected.

$$z_j^{t+1} = z_j^t + \mathbb{I}\{j = i\} R(a^i) \quad \forall j \quad (15)$$

In many real problems, having access to the true reward function $R(a)$ is unlikely. Further, in dynamic environments, agents may take a critical action earlier, which leads to a payoff after multiple steps; however, a critical decision towards getting to it may happen much earlier. If the agent is a Q-learner, we can leverage the fact that the Q-values encode the long-term value of taking certain actions, and the difference in Q-values will be small in states where all routes lead to similar payoffs. Thus, if we use the Q-value as a proxy for the reward function, we can account for long-term returns without knowing the reward function or the environment dynamics.

$$\Delta F(a^i) = F(\mathbf{Z}_{t+1}^{a^i}) - F(\mathbf{Z}_t) \quad (16)$$

$$z_j^{t+1} = z_j^t + \mathbb{I}\{j = i\} Q(o_i, a^i) \quad \forall j \quad (17)$$

This quantity $\Delta F(a^i)$, termed the *fairness gain* measures the marginal (local) impact of agent i 's action on the overall fairness of

the allocation given the current distribution of resources \mathbf{Z}_t . Note that computing this for all agent actions is linear in the size of the action space for each agent. This has two benefits. First, we do not need to have access to the true reward function (which is not available in many cases) and, second, we capture more than just the immediate return, allowing us to capture long-term effects of certain allocations. However, this has the drawback that it does not capture inter-agent interactions very well. Thus, we introduce an additional mechanism that can provide this information.

4.2 Advantage Correction: Incorporating Counterfactual Fairness Gains

Fairness concerns in dynamic resource allocation may also require that agents who are already well-off (i.e., have a high accumulated utility) are discouraged from taking resources that can help worse-off agents improve their return, thus allowing disadvantaged agents to catch up. This is also a desirable property of social welfare functions, termed **equity**, used to capture the notion of accumulated wealth: Moving resources from better-off agents to worse-off agents should improve the fairness function's value. This is also known as the Pigou-Dalton principle [23] and has been discussed in previous works in fair multi-agent RL.

However, in practice, the local fairness gain $\Delta F(a^i)$ —which reflects only the immediate change in an agent's own utility—does not capture the broader altruistic impact of reallocating resources. In many fairness metrics, this counterfactual update considers solely the acting agent's payoff, thereby ignoring the significant improvement in fairness that would occur if the resource were allocated to a disadvantaged agent. Consequently, even when an agent's decision to forgo an action yields $\Delta F = 0$, it may still lead to substantial overall fairness gains if the resource were reallocated. This limitation motivates the inclusion of a method to more accurately account for these counterfactual benefits.

To this end, we introduce an *advantage correction* term that incentivizes better-off agents to give up their top preferences to benefit other disadvantaged agents. Recall that in our setting, when agent i takes action a , its local fairness gain $\Delta F(a)$ is computed by updating the agent's payoff z_i with $Q(o_i, a)$ (Eqs. 16 and 17). To measure the counterfactual benefit of this action, we consider allocating this resource to any other agent that can take this action $j \neq i, a \in A_j$, and compute the counterfactual benefit $\Delta F^{(j)}$, using $Q(o_j, a)$ to update agent j 's payoff:

$$\Delta F^{(j)} = F(\mathbf{Z}_{t+1}^{(j)}) - F(\mathbf{Z}_t), \quad (18)$$

$$z_j^{t+1} = z_j^t + Q(o_j, a) \quad (19)$$

Let us define the set of these candidate counterfactual agents as $\alpha_c(a) = \{j \in \alpha : j \neq i, a \in A_j\}$. We can then compute the average counterfactual fairness improvement:

$$\Delta F_{\text{avg}}(a) = \frac{1}{|\alpha_c(a)|} \sum_{j \in \alpha_c(a)} \Delta F^{(j)} \quad (20)$$

To capture the benefit of allocating this resource to agent i , we can calculate the advantage function:

$$F_{\text{adv}}(a) = \Delta F(a) - \Delta F_{\text{avg}}(a) \quad (21)$$

A negative F_{adv} suggests that another agent would benefit more from the resource allocation, whereas a positive F_{adv} indicates that the current agent can better improve fairness. If the fairness metric follows the principle of equity, then we expect agents with higher fairness gain to be the disadvantaged agents. Instead of ΔF_{avg} , alternate baselines like the maximum fairness improvement may also be considered.

To integrate this counterfactual fairness measure with the action's inherent quality, we weigh the fairness advantage by the relative Q-value gap:

$$\Delta Q(a) = Q(o_i, a) - \min_{a' \in A_i} Q(o_i, a'), \quad (22)$$

which reflects how much better action a is compared to the worst option for agent i . This is helpful in preventing disproportional changes because of Q-value overestimation.

Finally, we define the counterfactual advantage correction term as:

$$\Delta Q_{\text{adv}}(a) = F_{\text{adv}}(a) \Delta Q(a). \quad (23)$$

This formulation has the following intuitive implications:

- If the fairness gain $\Delta F(a)$ is lower than the mean counterfactual gain $\Delta F_{\text{avg}}(a)$, then $F_{\text{adv}}(a)$ is negative, leading to a negative $\Delta Q_{\text{adv}}(a)$. This reduces the attractiveness of action a , discouraging further accumulation by already advantaged agents.
- Conversely, if $\Delta F(a)$ exceeds $\Delta F_{\text{avg}}(a)$, then $F_{\text{adv}}(a)$ is positive, and $\Delta Q_{\text{adv}}(a)$ is positive. This boosts the value of actions that help a disadvantaged agent catch up.

4.3 GIFF-modified Q-values

We combine the original Q-value estimate with the fairness gain and the counterfactual advantage correction to obtain the GIFF-modified Q-value, which we can use in the optimization in Equation 3 to compute allocations:

$$Q_f(a) = \Delta F(a) + \delta \Delta Q_{\text{adv}}(a)$$

$$Q^{\text{GIFF}}(o_i, a, \beta, \delta) = (1 - \beta) Q(o_i, a) + \beta Q_f(a) \quad (24)$$

- $\beta \in [0, 1]$ controls the trade-off between efficiency (standard Q-values) and fairness, with $\beta = 1$ leading to allocations based purely off the fairness gain.
- $\delta \geq 0$ controls the degree of advantage correction. Empirically, we observed that small positive values (< 0.5) lead to good results, but this is dependent on the environment and fairness function being used.

In practice, by adjusting β and δ , the central optimizer can be nudged toward actions that balance both overall system utility and fairness, as measured by $F(\mathbf{Z})$.

Approximation for Distributed Computation: Computing the counterfactual fairness gains requires access to the Q-values of all agents. However, in many practical settings, collecting the true Q-values from every agent at each time-step may be infeasible due to communication constraints or scalability concerns.

To reduce this overhead, we adopt an approximation where each agent assumes that all other agents evaluate actions similarly to

themselves. That is, agent i approximates the Q-values of other agents $j \in \alpha_c$ as:

$$Q(o_i, a) \simeq Q(o_j, a) \quad \forall j \in \alpha_c, \quad (25)$$

where $\alpha_c \subseteq \alpha$ is the subset of agents competing for a .

This assumption enables each agent to use their own Q-value estimates as stand-ins for those of others when computing fairness-aware updates. As a result, the modified Q-values can be computed using only the current utility vector \mathbf{Z}_t and the agent's local Q-values, avoiding the need for global Q-value communication.

5 THEORETICAL RESULTS

In this section, we provide theoretical guarantees for the core mechanism of GIFF. The algorithm's fairness-aware Q-value, Q^{GIFF} , relies on a tractable surrogate for the true, combinatorial fairness improvement of a joint allocation. Specifically, GIFF approximates the true joint gain by summing the individual, local fairness gains of each agent's action (or Q-value), a quantity we formally define as the surrogate, S . We now prove three key properties of this design: (1) This surrogate S is a principled lower bound on the true fairness improvement for several canonical fairness functions; (2) Maximizing this surrogate is guaranteed to improve as the fairness weight β increases; and (3) How these guarantees on our surrogate translate to guarantees on the realized, real-world fairness.

Throughout, let $\mathbf{Z} = (z_1, \dots, z_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ be the current payoff vector and $y = (y_1, \dots, y_n) \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n$ be the vector of utility increments from a feasible allocation. For a fairness function $F : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, we define the *realized fairness improvement* as $\Delta_{\text{joint}} := F(\mathbf{Z} + y) - F(\mathbf{Z})$ and the *local fairness gain* for agent i as $\Delta_i^{\text{local}} := F(\mathbf{Z} + y_i e_i) - F(\mathbf{Z})$, where e_i is the i -th unit vector. GIFF's objective uses the sum of local gains, $S := \sum_{i=1}^n \Delta_i^{\text{local}}$, as a surrogate for the true joint improvement.

Our proofs rely on the following assumptions:

Assumption 1 (Nonnegative increments). *Any agent's change in utility from an allocation is nonnegative: $y_i \geq 0$ for all i .*

Assumption 2 (Q-value correctness). *Q-values are perfectly accurate predictors of utility increments.*

5.1 Local-Gain Lower Bound

Our first result establishes that the surrogate S is a conservative lower bound on the realized fairness improvement Δ_{joint} for four canonical fairness metrics.

Theorem 1 (Local-Gain Lower Bound). *Let $\mathbf{Z} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ be a payoff vector and $y \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n$ be a nonnegative increment vector. For each fairness function $F \in \{F_\alpha, F_{GGF}, F_{var}, F_{min}\}$, the realized joint gain dominates the sum of local gains:*

$$\Delta_{\text{joint}} \geq S = \sum_{i=1}^n \Delta_i^{\text{local}},$$

PROOF SKETCH. The result for α -fairness follows from the separability of the function, which yields exact equality. For negative variance, the inequality arises from the non-negative cross-term $\frac{2}{n^2} \sum_{i < j} y_i y_j$ in the expression for $\Delta_{\text{joint}} - S$. The proofs for GGF and maximin rely on the properties of order statistics and case analysis on the minimum-achieving agents, respectively. Full proofs are provided in the appendix. \square

5.2 Monotonicity of Surrogate Fairness in β

Next, we show that GIFF's surrogate objective is guaranteed to be nondecreasing as the fairness weight β increases. This provides a reliable mechanism for tuning the fairness-utility trade-off.

Theorem 2 (Monotone Surrogate Fairness). *Fix a decision round and let \mathcal{A} be the finite set of feasible joint allocations. Let $U(A)$ be the total utility and $S(A)$ be the sum of local fairness gains for an allocation $A \in \mathcal{A}$. Let $A^*(\beta)$ be the allocation chosen by GIFF for a given fairness weight $\beta \in [0, 1]$. For any $0 \leq \beta_1 < \beta_2 < 1$, the corresponding surrogate fairness values are ordered:*

$$S(A^*(\beta_2)) \geq S(A^*(\beta_1)).$$

PROOF SKETCH. Let $\theta = \beta/(1 - \beta)$. The GIFF objective is to maximize $G_\theta(A) = U(A) + \theta S(A)$. By optimality, we have $G_{\theta_1}(A_1) \geq G_{\theta_2}(A_2)$ and $G_{\theta_2}(A_2) \geq G_{\theta_2}(A_1)$. Subtracting these two inequalities yields $(\theta_2 - \theta_1)(S(A_2) - S(A_1)) \geq 0$. Since $\theta_2 > \theta_1$, we must have $S(A_2) \geq S(A_1)$. \square

Corollary 1 (Strict Increase at a Switch). *If the maximizer of the GIFF objective is unique at β_1 and β_2 , and $A^*(\beta_1) \neq A^*(\beta_2)$, then $S(A^*(\beta_2)) > S(A^*(\beta_1))$.*

5.3 From Surrogate to Realized Fairness Guarantees

Finally, we connect the surrogate guarantees to realized fairness by bounding the *slack*, defined as $\text{slack} := \Delta_{\text{joint}} - S$. By Theorem 1, the slack is always non-negative for the metrics considered. We can derive exact expressions or tight bounds for it:

- **α -fairness:** The surrogate is exact, so slack = 0.
- **Negative Variance:** The slack is a precisely computable quadratic term, slack = $\frac{2}{n^2} \sum_{i < j} y_i y_j$.
- **GGF & Maximin:** The slack depends on whether utility increments cause agents to change ranks (for GGF) or on the uniqueness of the minimum-payoff agent (for maximin).

These bounds allow us to translate the monotonicity of the surrogate into a guarantee on realized fairness. When an increase in β triggers a switch to a new allocation, if the surrogate S increases by more than the maximum possible slack of the previous allocation, the realized fairness Δ_{joint} is guaranteed to strictly increase. For α -fairness, any switch to a different allocation with a higher surrogate value implies a strict increase in realized fairness.

In summary, our theoretical results provide a firm foundation for GIFF. We have shown that its core mechanism of using a sum-of-local-gains surrogate is principled (Theorem 1), predictable (Theorem 2), and directly translatable into guarantees on realized fairness (Section 5.3). This analysis confirms that GIFF is not just a heuristic but a structured framework for improving fairness in complex allocation problems.

6 EMPIRICAL RESULTS

We show results from two experiments. First, we compare GIFF to an existing domain-specific method for ridesharing, optimizing variance (a distributional metric). Then, we extend this to a new domain of homelessness, minimizing the Gini index. Finally, we look at SWF-based metrics in a domain highlighting the need for the counterfactual advantage correction.




Figure 1: Comparison of fairness versus system utility. Each line is plotted in order of increasing fairness tradeoff weight β , starting from the red X ($\beta = 0$). Top: Passenger fairness (measured as $-\text{var}(Z_p)$) versus overall service rate. Bottom: Driver fairness (measured as $-\text{var}(Z_d)$) versus overall service rate. The red X indicates the baseline performance (raw Q-values without fairness adjustments).

6.1 Baseline Comparisons in Real-World Domains: Ridesharing

We test our approach in the complicated ridesharing domain [11, 19], where passengers are allocated to drivers in a dynamic matching environment. Part of the complexity also arises from the fact that more than one passenger can be allocated to the same driver, sharing the trip, leading to a huge combinatorial search space that is difficult to directly optimize. Each vehicle estimates the Q-values based on groups of passengers, and the central allocation maximizes this Q-value for all drivers, subject to passenger constraints.

We compare our results to SI [11], a recent approach for myopic fairness designed for the ridesharing application. SI's fairness objective is to reduce variance in groups of passengers (measured in terms of service rate) and in drivers (measured as differences in trips assigned). Their approach operates in a centrally constrained resource allocation environment by augmenting the base model with an additive fairness term. In our experiments, we compare both the original SI and its heuristic variant SI(+), which clips negative fairness incentives to focus solely on improvements. We also implement a corresponding heuristic in our method, denoted GIFF(+).

Both GIFF and SI start from the same base model that predicts raw Q-values (indicated by the red X's in Figure 1, which represents the baseline with no fairness adjustments). Our goal is to demonstrate that GIFF not only improves fairness over SI, but also avoids the drawbacks of SI(+) at high fairness weights. For passengers, fairness is measured as the variance in service rate for groups traveling between source and destination neighborhoods (Z_p). For drivers, the objective is to minimize variance in driver income, measured by the number of trips per driver (Z_d). In our simulation, 1000 vehicles are deployed on the island of Manhattan, using a real-world dataset from New York City, capturing passenger requests between 8am and 12pm during the busy morning hours.

Our results, shown in Figure 1, demonstrate that GIFF consistently achieves a better fairness-utility tradeoff than SI for both passengers and drivers. For passengers, GIFF outperforms the base SI method. While the heuristic variant SI(+) provides a marginal improvement, applying the same heuristic to our method (GIFF(+)) matches its performance. This shows that GIFF's core formulation is




Figure 2: Variance vs. Fairness Weight. Top row: GIFF results using $\log\left(1 + \frac{\beta}{1-\beta}\right)$. Bottom row: SI results using $\log(1 + \beta)$.

strong and can be enhanced with simple heuristics when long-term values are unavailable.

The superiority of GIFF is most pronounced for drivers. As the fairness weight β increases, GIFF maintains a stable and favorable tradeoff. In contrast, SI(+) becomes counterproductive, eventually degrading fairness to a level **worse than the baseline** with no fairness adjustments (indicated by the red X). This instability at high fairness weights highlights a critical drawback of the SI(+) heuristic, whereas our method, GIFF, remains robust and effective across the full range of fairness weights.

Fairness with changing β : In SI, the objective is additive ($U + \beta F$), as opposed to GIFF’s weighted combination (Eq. 10). To compare the effect of this tradeoff weight on fairness, we transform the weights for GIFF as $\frac{\beta}{1+\beta}$, and plot the change in fairness for both SI and GIFF with this hyperparameter on a logarithmic scale. Figure 2 shows the tradeoff between fairness weight and the variance in utilities Z_p and Z_d .

For passengers, both GIFF and SI keep improving fairness as β is increased, as shown in the left panels. In the top right panel, GIFF continues to lower the variance for drivers as the fairness weight increases. However, SI(+) (bottom right) eventually worsens fairness, even falling below the baseline performance. This demonstrates that GIFF achieves a more stable fairness–utility tradeoff.

6.2 Generalization to Homelessness Prevention

To demonstrate the versatility of our approach beyond dynamic, Q-value-based environments, we test GIFF in the domain of homelessness prevention using a real-world dataset [8]. Here, the task is to assign households to one of four interventions to minimize the total probability of re-entry into homelessness. The “cost” of assigning household h to intervention a is given by a pre-computed counterfactual probability, $\Pr(h, a)$.

Our framework is adapted to this new context by treating it as a cost-minimization problem. We use the negative of the re-entry probabilities as utility values, so that $Q^{\text{GIFF}}(h, a, \beta, \delta) = (1 - \beta)(-\Pr(h, a)) + \beta Q_f(a)$. To further highlight GIFF’s flexibility, we move beyond variance reduction and adopt the **Gini coefficient** as the fairness metric, $F_{\text{gini}} = -\frac{\sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n |z_i - z_j|}{2n \sum_{k=1}^n z_k}$, where $z_i \in [0, 1]$ is the average re-entry probability for a given demographic group.




Figure 3: Results for the homelessness dataset. Top: Comparison of the benefit of fairness (BoF) distribution as the price of fairness (PoF) threshold is increased. Bottom: The BoF gap compared to the best method, excluding BoF=0. Each vertical slice corresponds to the distribution over all 38 features.

The dataset includes 38 household features (e.g., race, gender, family size), and we run 38 independent experiments, each defining fairness groups based on one feature. This allows us to assess the robustness of each method across a wide variety of fairness definitions. Since the original SI method is not applicable directly, we developed a competitive baseline, Simple Incentives - Extended (SI-X). Further details about the dataset, implementation and SI-X formulation are included in the supplement.

To evaluate performance across these 38 experiments, we introduce two metrics:

- **Price of Fairness (PoF):** The ratio of the total re-entry probability with fairness adjustments to the baseline (fairness-unaware) total probability. A PoF of 1.05 means a 5% increase in the overall re-entry rate.
- **Benefit of Fairness (BoF):** The percentage reduction in the Gini coefficient compared to the baseline, calculated as $1 - \frac{\text{Gini(new)}}{\text{Gini(base)}}$.

Figure 3 summarizes the results by plotting the distribution of BoF achieved for a given PoF threshold. Each vertical slice represents the BoF distribution over all 38 feature-based groupings. The top panel shows that GIFF is a more effective and reliable method. On 90% of the features, GIFF is able to get 60% improvement in F_{gini} compared to the baseline. GIFF consistently yields a higher **mean** BoF. More importantly, GIFF demonstrates superior worst-case performance; its 90th percentile is substantially higher than that of SI-X, indicating that GIFF avoids the severe fairness failures that SI-X is prone to on certain groups. The bottom panel reinforces this conclusion by analyzing the **BoF Gap**, which measures how much a method underperforms *only on the tasks where it was not the best*. The gap for GIFF is minimal and concentrated near zero, showing that even when it is not the top performer, it is a close second. In contrast, SI-X exhibits a wide gap distribution, with its 90th percentile exceeding 0.4. This means that when SI-X fails, it




Figure 4: Fairness and utility for the Job Allocation environment as functions of β and δ .

fails badly, achieving fairness outcomes that are dramatically worse than what is possible with GIFF.

Overall, these results in a distinct problem domain with a non-linear fairness metric confirm that GIFF is a robust and broadly applicable framework for integrating fairness into resource allocation systems.

6.3 Job Allocation and Advantage Correction

We evaluate our method in a challenging Job Allocation environment where 4 agents compete for a single job over 100 time steps. An agent occupying the job earns reward but must forfeit it (earning no reward for that step) to allow another agent to take over. This setup creates a tension between a greedy strategy (one agent gets 100 utility), a simple turn-taking strategy (50 total utility, fairly split), and a hard-to-compute **oracle solution** that achieves 96 total utility (24 per agent). Our goal is to show that our method can discover this oracle solution via a simple hyperparameter search over β and δ , without needing to plan over the full time horizon.

Our approach relies on the advantage correction term, ΔQ_{adv} . We test two **Efficient** fairness metrics (α -fair and GGF), where the fairness gain ΔF is always positive. Consequently, without the correction term, an agent would never forfeit the job, and even a fully fairness-focused policy ($\beta = 1$) would produce the same unfair outcome as a purely utilitarian one ($\beta = 0$). The advantage correction solves this by reducing the value of actions that offer below-average fairness gains to agents that are already better off, thereby encouraging equitable turn-taking.

Our results, shown in Figure 4, confirm that this mechanism successfully balances utility and fairness:

- With the α -fair metric (Figure 4a), the policy achieves near-optimal performance with a moderate $\delta \approx 0.1$. As δ increases, fair behavior emerges at lower β values.
- With the GGF metric (Figure 4b), the impact of advantage correction becomes noticeable around $\delta \approx 0.3$. This metric reveals a distinct band of high-utility, high-fairness solutions before the policy converges to a simple turn-taking strategy when both β and δ are high. This difference occurs because the logarithmic nature of α -fairness is less sensitive to utility changes once all agents are doing reasonably well.

In both experiments, we observe that as δ increases, the transition from utilitarian to fair behavior happens at a smaller β . Crucially, our method identifies the optimal long-term strategy through a simple evaluation-only grid search, without any information about the time horizon. This demonstrates that the advantage correction term is a powerful and essential mechanism for achieving complex, far-sighted fairness without explicit planning.

7 DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

In this work, we introduced GIFF, a general and lightweight framework that integrates fairness into multi-agent resource allocation systems. By modifying pre-trained Q-values with a local fairness gain and a crucial counterfactual advantage correction, our method adjusts allocations to be more equitable without requiring any additional training. Our empirical evaluation showcased GIFF’s power and versatility across diverse and challenging domains. In ride-sharing, it consistently outperformed a strong, domain-specific baseline and demonstrated superior stability. In homelessness prevention, it proved its generality, adapting seamlessly with a Gini coefficient fairness metric. Finally, in the job allocation environment, the advantage correction mechanism was essential in discovering a near-oracle, long-horizon solution, demonstrating GIFF’s power.

The practical strengths of GIFF are underpinned by a solid theoretical foundation. Its design is simple, with minimal computational overhead and just two interpretable hyperparameters (β, δ) that allow for easy tuning of the fairness-utility trade-off at deployment. We formally proved that this is not merely a heuristic approach; GIFF’s fairness surrogate is a principled lower bound on the true, realized fairness improvement for several canonical metrics. Furthermore, we showed that the fairness weight β provides a monotonic guarantee, ensuring that increasing the emphasis on fairness predictably improves the surrogate objective.

In conclusion, GIFF provides a practical, powerful, and principled bridge between the efficiency of reinforcement learning and the critical societal need for equity, representing a significant step toward creating multi-agent systems that are not only optimal but also just.

REFERENCES

- [1] Parand Alizadeh Alamdari, Toryn Q. Klassen, Elliot Creager, and Sheila A. McIlraith. 2024. Remembering to be fair: On non-Markovian fairness in sequential decision making. In *Proceedings of the 2024 International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*.
- [2] Javier Alonso-Mora, Samitha Samaranayake, Alex Wallar, Emilio Frazzoli, and Daniela Rus. 2017. On-demand High-capacity Ride-sharing via Dynamic Trip-vehicle Assignment. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 114 (2017), 462–467.
- [3] Ioannis Caragiannis, David Kurokawa, Hervé Moulin, Ariel D Procaccia, Nisarg Shah, and Junxing Wang. 2019. The unreasonable fairness of maximum Nash

- welfare. *ACM Transactions on Economics and Computation* 7, 3 (2019), 1–32.
- [4] Frits De Nijs, Erwin Walraven, Mathijs De Weerdt, and Matthijs Spaan. 2021. Constrained Multiagent Markov Decision Processes: A Taxonomy of Problems and Algorithms. *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research* 70 (2021), 955–1001.
 - [5] Cynthia Dwork, Moritz Hardt, Toniann Pitassi, Omer Reingold, and Richard Zemel. 2012. Fairness through awareness. In *Proceedings of the Conference on Innovations in Theoretical Computer Science*. 214–226.
 - [6] Moritz Hardt, Eric Price, and Nati Srebro. 2016. Equality of opportunity in supervised learning. In *Proceedings of the Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*. 3323–3331.
 - [7] Jiechuan Jiang and Zongqing Lu. 2019. Learning fairness in multi-agent systems. In *Proceedings of the Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*. 13854–13865.
 - [8] Amanda R. Kube, Sanmay Das, and Patrick J. Fowler. 2019. Allocating interventions based on predicted outcomes: A case study on homelessness services. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*. 622–629.
 - [9] Amanda R. Kube, Sanmay Das, and Patrick J. Fowler. 2023. Community-and data-driven homelessness prevention and service delivery: optimizing for equity. *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association* 30, 6 (2023), 1032–1041.
 - [10] Harold W Kuhn. 1955. The Hungarian method for the assignment problem. *Naval research logistics quarterly* 2, 1-2 (1955), 83–97.
 - [11] Ashwin Kumar, Yevgeniy Vorobeychik, and William Yeoh. 2023. Using simple incentives to improve two-sided fairness in ridesharing systems. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Automated Planning and Scheduling*. 227–235.
 - [12] Ninareh Mehrabi, Fred Morstatter, Nripsuta Saxena, Kristina Lerman, and Aram Galstyan. 2021. A survey on bias and fairness in machine learning. *Comput. Surveys* 54, 6 (2021), 1–35.
 - [13] John F Nash et al. 1950. The bargaining problem. *Econometrica* 18, 2 (1950), 155–162.
 - [14] Ali Nauman, Haya Mesfer Alshahrani, Nadhem Nemri, Kamal M Othman, Nojood O Aljehane, Mashael Maashi, Ashit Kumar Dutta, Mohammed Assiri, and Wali Ullah Khan. 2024. Dynamic resource management in integrated NOMA terrestrial–satellite networks using multi-agent reinforcement learning. *Journal of Network and Computer Applications* 221 (2024), 103770.
 - [15] Naveen Raman, Sanket Shah, and John Dickerson. 2021. Data-driven methods for balancing fairness and efficiency in ride-pooling. In *International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence*. 363–369.
 - [16] John Rawls. 1971. Atheory of justice. *Cambridge (Mass.)* (1971).
 - [17] John Schulman, Filip Wolski, Prafulla Dhariwal, Alec Radford, and Oleg Klimov. 2017. Proximal Policy Optimization Algorithms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1707.06347* (2017).
 - [18] Amartya Sen. 2017. *Collective Choice and Social Welfare: Expanded Edition*. Penguin UK.
 - [19] Sanket Shah, Meghna Lowalekar, and Pradeep Varakantham. 2020. Neural approximate dynamic programming for on-demand ride-pooling. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*. 507–515.
 - [20] Umer Siddique, Paul Weng, and Matthieu Zimmer. 2020. Learning fair policies in multi-objective (deep) reinforcement learning with average and discounted rewards. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Machine Learning*. 8905–8915.
 - [21] Peter Sunehag, Guy Lever, Audrunas Gruslys, Wojciech Marian Czarnecki, Vincius Zambaldi, Max Jaderberg, Marc Lanctot, Nicolas Sonnerat, Joel Z. Leibo, Karl Tuyls, and Thore Graepel. 2018. Value-Decomposition Networks For Cooperative Multi-Agent Learning Based On Team Reward. In *Proceedings of the Conference on Autonomous Agents and Multiagent Systems*. 2085–2087.
 - [22] Yuan Xue, Baochun Li, and Klara Nahrstedt. 2003. Price-based resource allocation in wireless ad hoc networks. In *International Workshop on Quality of Service*. Springer, 79–96.
 - [23] Matthieu Zimmer, Claire Glanois, Umer Siddique, and Paul Weng. 2021. Learning fair policies in decentralized cooperative multi-agent reinforcement learning. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Machine Learning*. 12967–12978.

Here we present the supplementary material complementing the main paper, including full proofs for the theoretical results and extended discussion.

A THEORETICAL RESULTS

In this section, we present the full proofs for the core theoretical properties of GIFF. Throughout this section, let $\mathbf{Z} = (z_1, \dots, z_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ denote the current payoff vector, and let $y = (y_1, \dots, y_n) \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n$ denote the increments from a feasible allocation in the current round. For a fairness function $F : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ we define:

$$\Delta_{\text{joint}} := F(\mathbf{Z} + y) - F(\mathbf{Z}), \quad (26)$$

$$\Delta_i^{\text{local}} := F(\mathbf{Z} + y_i e_i) - F(\mathbf{Z}) \quad (27)$$

$$S := \sum_{i=1}^n \Delta_i^{\text{local}} \quad (28)$$

where e_i is the i -th unit vector. We call Δ_{joint} the *realized fairness improvement*, Δ_i^{local} the *local fairness gain* for agent i , and S the *sum of local gains*, which we term as GIFF's **surrogate**.

Our proofs rely on the following assumption:

Assumption 3 (Nonnegative increments). *Any coordinate's change in utility is nonnegative for any allocation: $y_i \geq 0$ for all i .*

Assumption 4 (Q-value correctness). *For every agent i and action a , the estimated Q-value equals the true utility increment:*

$$Q(o_i, a) = \Delta z_i(a),$$

where $\Delta z_i(a)$ denotes the change in payoff z_i that results from assigning action a to agent i . In other words, Q-values are perfectly accurate predictors of payoff increments.

Our results fall into three families:

- (1) A *Local-Gain Lower Bound*, showing that the surrogate never overstates realized fairness improvements.
- (2) A *Monotonicity in β* , showing that surrogate fairness is non-decreasing as the fairness weight β increases.
- (3) *Slack bounds*, quantifying the gap between surrogate and realized fairness to turn surrogate guarantees into realized guarantees.

A.1 Local-Gain Lower Bound

Our first main result establishes that GIFF's per-agent local gains form a certified lower bound on the realized joint fairness change. The result covers four canonical metrics: α -fairness, negative variance, generalized Gini (GGF), and maximin.

Theorem 3 (Local-Gain Lower Bound). *Let $\mathbf{Z} = (z_1, \dots, z_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ be a payoff vector and let $y = (y_1, \dots, y_n) \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n$ be a nonnegative increment vector. For each fairness function F below, the realized joint gain dominates the sum of local gains:*

$$\Delta_{\text{joint}} := F(\mathbf{Z} + y) - F(\mathbf{Z}) \geq \sum_{i=1}^n \Delta_i^{\text{local}} \quad (29)$$

$$\Delta_i^{\text{local}} := F(\mathbf{Z} + y_i e_i) - F(\mathbf{Z}) \quad (30)$$

under the stated assumptions:

- (1) $F = F_\alpha$ (α -fairness): $\alpha \geq 0$ and $z_i, z_i + y_i$ lie in the domain of U_α (so $z_i > 0$ and $z_i + y_i > 0$ when $\alpha = 1$).

- (2) $F = F_{\text{var}}$ (negative variance): no further assumptions (beyond $y \geq 0$).

- (3) $F = F_{\text{GGF}}$ (generalized Gini) with nonincreasing weights $w_1 \geq \dots \geq w_n$.

- (4) $F = F_{\min}$ (maximin): no further assumptions (beyond $y \geq 0$).

Moreover, equality holds in (1); in (2) equality holds iff at most one $y_i > 0$; and in (4) equality conditions are given in Lemma 4.

Lemma 1 (α -fairness: exact additivity). *Let $F_\alpha(\mathbf{Z}) = \sum_{i=1}^n U_\alpha(z_i)$ with $U_\alpha(t) = \frac{t^{1-\alpha}}{1-\alpha}$ for $\alpha \neq 1$ (domain $t \geq 0$) and $U_1(t) = \log t$ (domain $t > 0$). If z_i and $z_i + y_i$ are in the domain for all i , then*

$$F_\alpha(\mathbf{Z} + y) - F_\alpha(\mathbf{Z}) = \sum_{i=1}^n [F_\alpha(\mathbf{Z} + y_i e_i) - F_\alpha(\mathbf{Z})].$$

PROOF. By separability, $F_\alpha(\mathbf{Z} + y) - F_\alpha(\mathbf{Z}) = \sum_i [U_\alpha(z_i + y_i) - U_\alpha(z_i)]$, and for a single-coordinate update $F_\alpha(\mathbf{Z} + y_i e_i) - F_\alpha(\mathbf{Z}) = U_\alpha(z_i + y_i) - U_\alpha(z_i)$. Summing over i yields the identity. \square

Lemma 2 (Negative variance: nonnegative synergy). *Let $F_{\text{var}}(\mathbf{Z}) = -\text{Var}(\mathbf{Z})$ with $\text{Var}(\mathbf{Z}) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (z_i - \mu)^2$ and $\mu = \frac{1}{n} \sum_i z_i$. If $y \geq 0$, then*

$$F_{\text{var}}(\mathbf{Z} + y) - F_{\text{var}}(\mathbf{Z}) \geq \sum_{i=1}^n [F_{\text{var}}(\mathbf{Z} + y_i e_i) - F_{\text{var}}(\mathbf{Z})],$$

with equality iff at most one $y_i > 0$.

PROOF. Use $F_{\text{var}}(\mathbf{Z}) = \mu^2 - \frac{1}{n} \sum_i z_i^2$. Let $S = \sum_i z_i$ and $Y = \sum_i y_i$. Then

$$F_{\text{var}}(\mathbf{Z} + y) - F_{\text{var}}(\mathbf{Z}) = \frac{2SY + Y^2}{n^2} - \frac{2}{n} \sum_i z_i y_i - \frac{1}{n} \sum_i y_i^2.$$

For a single update y_i , $F_{\text{var}}(\mathbf{Z} + y_i e_i) - F_{\text{var}}(\mathbf{Z}) = \frac{2Sy_i + y_i^2}{n^2} - \frac{2}{n} z_i y_i - \frac{1}{n} y_i^2$. Summing over i gives

$$\sum_i \Delta_i^{\text{local}} = \frac{2SY}{n^2} - \frac{2}{n} \sum_i z_i y_i + \left(\frac{1}{n^2} - \frac{1}{n} \right) \sum_i y_i^2.$$

Subtracting yields $\Delta_{\text{joint}} - \sum_i \Delta_i^{\text{local}} = \frac{Y^2 - \sum_i y_i^2}{n^2} = \frac{2}{n^2} \sum_{i < j} y_i y_j \geq 0$, with equality iff at most one $y_i > 0$. \square

Lemma 3 (GGF: joint gain dominates locals). *Let $F_{\text{GGF}}(\mathbf{Z}) = \sum_{k=1}^n w_k z_{(k)}$ with nonincreasing weights $w_1 \geq \dots \geq w_n$ (and $w_{n+1} := 0$), where $z_{(1)} \leq \dots \leq z_{(n)}$ are the sorted entries of \mathbf{Z} . If $y \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n$, then*

$$F_{\text{GGF}}(\mathbf{Z} + y) - F_{\text{GGF}}(\mathbf{Z}) \geq \sum_{i=1}^n [F_{\text{GGF}}(\mathbf{Z} + y_i e_i) - F_{\text{GGF}}(\mathbf{Z})].$$

PROOF. Use the equivalent form $F_{\text{GGF}}(\mathbf{Z}) = \sum_{k=1}^n v_k S_k(\mathbf{Z})$ with $v_k := w_k - w_{k+1} \geq 0$ and $S_k(\mathbf{Z}) = \sum_{j=1}^k z_{(j)}$. Since $v_k \geq 0$, it is enough to prove the claim for each S_k and sum with weights v_k .

Fix k and let τ be the k -th smallest value in \mathbf{Z} . Set $L = \{i : z_i < \tau\}$, $T = \{i : z_i = \tau\}$, $c = k - |L|$. Any k -subset achieving $S_k(\mathbf{Z})$ must include all of L and exactly c indices from T .

Local updates. For a single-coordinate increase $y_i \geq 0$,

$$S_k(\mathbf{Z} + y_i e_i) - S_k(\mathbf{Z}) = \begin{cases} y_i, & i \in L, \\ y_i, & i \in T \text{ and } c = |T|, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Therefore

$$\sum_{i=1}^n [S_k(\mathbf{Z} + y_i e_i) - S_k(\mathbf{Z})] = \sum_{i \in L} y_i + \mathbf{1}_{\{c=|T|\}} \sum_{i \in T} y_i. \quad (*)$$

Joint update. For the full increment $y \geq 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} S_k(\mathbf{Z} + y) &= \min_{|J|=k} \sum_{j \in J} (z_j + y_j) \geq \min_{\substack{C \subseteq T \\ |C|=c}} \left[\sum_{j \in L} (z_j + y_j) + \sum_{j \in C} (z_j + y_j) \right] \\ &= S_k(\mathbf{Z}) + \sum_{j \in L} y_j + \min_{\substack{C \subseteq T \\ |C|=c}} \sum_{j \in C} y_j. \end{aligned}$$

If $c = |T|$, the minimum over C equals $\sum_{j \in T} y_j$; otherwise it is ≥ 0 . Thus

$$S_k(\mathbf{Z} + y) - S_k(\mathbf{Z}) \geq \sum_{j \in L} y_j + \mathbf{1}_{\{c=|T|\}} \sum_{j \in T} y_j, \quad (**)$$

which matches or exceeds the sum in (*). This proves the claim for S_k . Multiplying by $v_k \geq 0$ and summing over k yields the inequality for F_{GGF} . \square

Lemma 4 (Maximin: joint never underestimates locals). *Let $F_{\min}(\mathbf{Z}) = \min_i z_i$, let $m = \min_i z_i$, and let $S = \{i : z_i = m\}$ be the set of minimizers. Let σ be the second-smallest baseline value (or $+\infty$ if none), and let*

$$\sigma' := \min_{j \neq i^*} (z_j + y_j)$$

be the post-update second-smallest value when $|S| = 1$ with $S = \{i^\}$. If $y \geq 0$, then*

$$F_{\min}(\mathbf{Z} + y) - F_{\min}(\mathbf{Z}) \geq \sum_{i=1}^n [F_{\min}(\mathbf{Z} + y_i e_i) - F_{\min}(\mathbf{Z})].$$

Equality conditions.

- If $|S| \geq 2$ (multiple minima), equality holds iff $\min_{i \in S} y_i = 0$. Otherwise the inequality is strict.
- If $|S| = 1$ with $S = \{i^*\}$ (unique minimum), write

$$\text{local sum} = \min\{y_{i^*}, \sigma - m\}, \quad \text{joint} = \min\{y_{i^*}, \sigma' - m\}.$$

Equality holds iff either

- (1) $y_{i^*} \leq \sigma - m$ (then both sides equal y_{i^*}), or
 - (2) $\sigma' = \sigma$ (then both sides equal $\min\{y_{i^*}, \sigma - m\}$).
- If $y_{i^*} > \sigma - m$ and $\sigma' > \sigma$, the inequality is strict.*

PROOF. *Local updates.* If $i \notin S$, the minimum stays m , so the local change is 0. If $|S| \geq 2$ and $i \in S$, raising a single tied minimum still leaves some index at m , so the local change is 0. If $|S| = 1$ with $S = \{i^*\}$, then

$$F_{\min}(\mathbf{Z} + y_{i^*} e_{i^*}) - F_{\min}(\mathbf{Z}) = \min\{m + y_{i^*}, \sigma\} - m = \min\{y_{i^*}, \sigma - m\}.$$

Summing over i gives the stated “local sum.”

Joint update. If $|S| \geq 2$,

$$F_{\min}(\mathbf{Z} + y) - F_{\min}(\mathbf{Z}) = \min\{\min_{i \in S} y_i, \sigma - m\} \geq 0,$$

so the inequality holds; equality iff $\min_{i \in S} y_i = 0$. If $|S| = 1$ with $S = \{i^*\}$,

$$F_{\min}(\mathbf{Z} + y) - F_{\min}(\mathbf{Z}) = \min\{y_{i^*}, \sigma' - m\}.$$

Since $\sigma' \geq \sigma$ (because $y \geq 0$ on non-min entries), we have $\min\{y_{i^*}, \sigma' - m\} \geq \min\{y_{i^*}, \sigma - m\}$ with equality exactly under (1) or (2) above. \square

Now we are ready to prove the main result.

PROOF OF THEOREM 3. Each case follows from the corresponding lemma, which establishes $\Delta_{\text{joint}} \geq \sum_i \Delta_i^{\text{local}}$ under the stated assumptions, and provides the equality conditions. \square

This theorem implies that GIFF’s surrogate never *over-promises*: the realized fairness gain is guaranteed to be at least as large as the surrogate, and is exact for α -fairness. Equality conditions for variance and maximin are given in Lemmas 2 and 4. See Subsection A.5 for a detailed discussion of implications.

A.2 Monotone Surrogate Fairness under β

Next, we show that as the fairness weight β increases, the allocation’s sum of local fairness gains is nondecreasing. This gives a monotonic control knob: tuning β cannot reduce surrogate fairness, and under uniqueness, any allocation switch yields a strict increase.

Theorem 4 (Monotone increase of the sum of local fairness gains). *Fix a decision round with baseline payoff vector $\mathbf{Z} \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Let \mathcal{A} be the (finite) set of feasible joint allocations $A = (a_1, \dots, a_n)$. For each $A \in \mathcal{A}$, define*

$$U(A) := \sum_{i=1}^n Q(o_i, a_i) \quad (31)$$

$$S(A) := \sum_{i=1}^n \Delta F_i(a_i) \quad (32)$$

$$\Delta F_i(a_i) := F(\mathbf{Z} + y_i(a_i) e_i) - F(\mathbf{Z}) \quad (33)$$

where $y_i(a_i) \geq 0$ is the accounted increment added to z_i if agent i takes a_i , and e_i is the i -th unit vector. (All $\Delta F_i(\cdot)$ use the same baseline \mathbf{Z} .)

For $\beta \in [0, 1]$, write $\theta = \beta/(1 - \beta)$ and consider

$$G_\theta(A) = U(A) + \theta S(A).$$

Let $A^*(\theta) \in \arg \max_{A \in \mathcal{A}} G_\theta(A)$ be any maximizer. Then for any $0 \leq \theta_1 < \theta_2 < \infty$ and any choices $A_1 \in \arg \max G_{\theta_1}$, $A_2 \in \arg \max G_{\theta_2}$,

$$S(A_2) \geq S(A_1).$$

Equivalently, as β increases, the chosen allocation’s sum of local fairness gains is nondecreasing.

PROOF. By optimality of A_1 at θ_1 and A_2 at θ_2 ,

$$U(A_1) + \theta_1 S(A_1) \geq U(A_2) + \theta_1 S(A_2), \quad (1)$$

$$U(A_2) + \theta_2 S(A_2) \geq U(A_1) + \theta_2 S(A_1). \quad (2)$$

Subtract (1) from (2) to cancel the U terms:

$$(\theta_2 - \theta_1)(S(A_2) - S(A_1)) \geq 0.$$

Since $\theta_2 > \theta_1$, we conclude $S(A_2) \geq S(A_1)$. \square

Corollary 2 (Strict increase at a true switch under uniqueness). *If the maximizer is unique at θ_1 and at θ_2 , let $A_1 = A^*(\theta_1)$ and $A_2 = A^*(\theta_2)$. If $A_1 \neq A_2$, then*

$$S(A_2) > S(A_1).$$

PROOF. From Theorem 4, $S(A_2) \geq S(A_1)$. If equality held, then (1) and (2) above would force $U(A_1) = U(A_2)$ as well, so both A_1 and A_2 would maximize G_{θ_1} and G_{θ_2} —contradicting uniqueness. \square

Scope, tie-breaking, and the $\beta \rightarrow 1$ endpoint. Theorem 4 requires only that (i) the feasible set \mathcal{A} for the round is finite, and (ii) all $\Delta F_i(\cdot)$ are computed against the same baseline \mathbf{Z} for that round. Changing the feasible set (e.g., constraints) or the baseline mid-sweep can break monotonicity; otherwise the result is agnostic to the choice of F and to how Q is obtained, provided $S(A)$ is well defined. Deterministic tie-breaking is not required for nondecreasing $S(A^*(\theta))$, but if you want strict improvement at switches without assuming uniqueness, adopt a consistent rule such as: among G_θ -maximizers, first maximize $S(A)$, then $U(A)$. With this rule, any change in the selected allocation across $\theta_1 < \theta_2$ implies $S(A_2) > S(A_1)$. Finally, interpreting $\beta \rightarrow 1^-$ as $\theta = \beta/(1-\beta) \rightarrow \infty$, the maximizers converge to $\arg \max_{A \in \mathcal{A}} S(A)$, so the monotonicity statement extends continuously to the endpoint $\beta = 1$. This monotonicity applies to the surrogate $S(A)$, not necessarily the realized fairness $F(\mathbf{Z})$. To connect the two, we require slack bounds.

A.3 Slack Bounds Between Surrogate and Realized Fairness

Define the *slack* of an allocation as

$$\text{slack} := \Delta_{\text{joint}} - S \geq 0.$$

By Theorem 3, $\text{slack} \geq 0$ for the given fairness metrics. Here we provide per-metric exact formulas or bounds, so that we can certify not just lower bounds but also two-sided guarantees.

Lemma 5 (Slack for α -fairness). *Let $F_\alpha(\mathbf{Z}) = \sum_i U_\alpha(z_i)$ with $U_\alpha(t) = \frac{t^{1-\alpha}}{1-\alpha}$ for $\alpha \neq 1$ (domain $t \geq 0$) and $U_1(t) = \log t$ (domain $t > 0$). Assume all arguments lie in the domain. Then*

$$\Delta_{\text{joint}} = S \quad \text{and} \quad \text{slack} = 0.$$

Interpretation. *The surrogate is exact for any nonnegative increment profile.*

PROOF. By separability, $F_\alpha(\mathbf{Z} + \mathbf{y}) - F_\alpha(\mathbf{Z}) = \sum_i [U_\alpha(z_i + y_i) - U_\alpha(z_i)]$, while for a single-coordinate update $F_\alpha(\mathbf{Z} + y_i e_i) - F_\alpha(\mathbf{Z}) = U_\alpha(z_i + y_i) - U_\alpha(z_i)$. Summing over i gives $\Delta_{\text{joint}} = S$. \square

Lemma 6 (Slack for negative variance). *Let $F_{\text{var}}(\mathbf{Z}) = -\text{Var}(\mathbf{Z})$, and set $Y := \sum_i y_i$. Then*

$$\text{slack} = \frac{Y^2 - \sum_i y_i^2}{n^2} = \frac{2}{n^2} \sum_{i < j} y_i y_j \in \left[0, \frac{Y^2}{n^2} \left(1 - \frac{1}{m} \right) \right],$$

where $m := |\{i : y_i > 0\}|$. Interpretation. *The gap is a pure “synergy” term that grows when gains are spread across more agents; it vanishes when at most one coordinate increases.*

PROOF. Using $F_{\text{var}}(\mathbf{Z}) = \mu^2 - \frac{1}{n} \sum_i z_i^2$ with $\mu = \frac{1}{n} \sum_i z_i$, the calculation in Lemma 2 gives

$$\Delta_{\text{joint}} - \sum_i \Delta_i^{\text{local}} = \frac{Y^2 - \sum_i y_i^2}{n^2} = \frac{2}{n^2} \sum_{i < j} y_i y_j \geq 0.$$

For the upper bound, by Cauchy-Schwarz, with m positive entries, $\sum_i y_i^2 \geq Y^2/m$, hence $Y^2 - \sum_i y_i^2 \leq Y^2(1 - 1/m)$. \square

Lemma 7 (Slack for GGF (nonincreasing weights)). *Let $F_{\text{GGF}}(\mathbf{Z}) = \sum_{k=1}^n w_k z_{(k)}$ with nonincreasing weights $w_1 \geq \dots \geq w_n$ and $w_{n+1} := 0$, and let the increments \mathbf{y} be nonnegative. Set $Y := \sum_i y_i$, $m := |\{i : y_i > 0\}|$, and $y_{\max} := \max_i y_i$. Define*

$$q := \min(m, \lfloor Y/y_{\max} \rfloor), \quad r := Y - q y_{\max} \in [0, y_{\max}).$$

Then

$$\Delta_{\text{joint}} \leq y_{\max} \sum_{k=1}^q w_k + r w_{q+1}$$

and hence,

$$\text{slack} \leq \left(y_{\max} \sum_{k=1}^q w_k + r w_{q+1} \right) - S.$$

If the baseline order of \mathbf{Z} is strict and preserved after the update, writing $y_{(1)} \leq \dots \leq y_{(n)}$ aligned with that order,

$$\Delta_{\text{joint}} = \sum_{k=1}^n w_k y_{(k)} = S, \quad \text{so slack} = 0.$$

Interpretation. *The y_{\max} -cap is a simple data-dependent envelope (depending only on m , Y , y_{\max} and the weights); it is typically tight when mass is spread.*

PROOF. Let $y_{[1]} \geq \dots \geq y_{[n]}$ be the increments sorted descending. By rearrangement,

$$\Delta_{\text{joint}} \leq \sum_{k=1}^n w_k y_{[k]}.$$

Maximizing the right-hand side under $0 \leq y_{[k]} \leq y_{\max}$, $\sum_k y_{[k]} = Y$, and at most m positives fills the top q slots with y_{\max} and places the remainder r in slot $q+1$, yielding $y_{\max} \sum_{k=1}^q w_k + r w_{q+1}$. Since $\text{slack} = \Delta_{\text{joint}} - S$, the stated slack bound follows. In the no-rank-crossing regime, each baseline rank- k index remains at rank k , so the joint change equals $\sum_k w_k y_{(k)} = S$. \square

Lemma 8 (Slack for maximin). *Let $F_{\min}(\mathbf{Z}) = \min_i z_i$. Denote $m^* := \min_i z_i$ and $S := \{i : z_i = m^*\}$. Let $\sigma := \min_{j \notin S} z_j$ (or $+\infty$ if $S = \{1, \dots, n\}$), and define $y_{\max} := \max_i y_i$.*

(1) If $|S| \geq 2$,

$$\text{slack} = \min \left\{ \min_{i \in S} y_i, \sigma - m^* \right\} \in [0, y_{\max}],$$

with $\text{slack} = 0$ iff $\min_{i \in S} y_i = 0$.

(2) If $|S| = 1$ with $S = \{i^*\}$, let $\sigma' := \min_{j \neq i^*} (z_j + y_j) \geq \sigma$. Then

$$\text{slack} = \min \left\{ y_{i^*}, \sigma' - m^* \right\} - \min \left\{ y_{i^*}, \sigma - m^* \right\} \\ \in [0, \min \{ y_{i^*}, \sigma' - \sigma \}].$$

In particular, $\text{slack} = 0$ if either $y_{i^*} \leq \sigma - m^*$ or $\sigma' = \sigma$.

PROOF. Let $\Delta_{\text{joint}} = F_{\min}(\mathbf{Z} + \mathbf{y}) - F_{\min}(\mathbf{Z})$ and $\Delta_i^{\text{local}} = F_{\min}(\mathbf{Z} + y_i e_i) - F_{\min}(\mathbf{Z})$.

(1) If $|S| \geq 2$, every single-coordinate update leaves some entry at m^* , so $\Delta_i^{\text{local}} = 0$ for all i and $S = 0$. The new minimum after the joint update is $\min \{ m^* + \min_{i \in S} y_i, \sigma \}$, hence $\Delta_{\text{joint}} = \min \{ \min_{i \in S} y_i, \sigma - m^* \}$ and the stated bounds follow.

(2) If $|S| = 1$ with $S = \{i^*\}$, then $\Delta_{i^*}^{\text{local}} = \min \{ y_{i^*}, \sigma - m^* \}$ and $\Delta_i^{\text{local}} = 0$ for $i \neq i^*$, so $S = \min \{ y_{i^*}, \sigma - m^* \}$. After the joint update, the second-smallest value becomes $\sigma' = \min_{j \neq i^*} (z_j + y_j) \geq \sigma$,

hence $\Delta_{\text{joint}} = \min\{y_{i*}, \sigma' - m^*\}$. Subtracting gives the claim and bounds. \square

These results allow us to strengthen the monotonicity guarantee: if S increases by more than an upper bound on slack, then realized fairness must also strictly increase. For α -fairness, this is immediate because slack = 0.

A.4 Corollary: Strict Realized Fairness at β -Driven Switches

Combining Theorem 4 with the slack bounds above yields a useful corollary: when reallocations occur as β increases, and the increase in surrogate fairness exceeds the slack bound of the previous allocation, realized fairness must strictly improve.

This gives a precise, testable condition:

- For α -fairness, every true switch increases realized fairness.
- For variance, a computable quadratic bound applies (Lemma 6).
- For GGF, a y_{\max} -cap yields a data-dependent bound, with slack vanishing when no rank crossings occur (Lemma 7).
- For maximin, the gap depends on whether the minimum is unique (Lemma 8).

In practice, this means β can be tuned with confidence that surrogate monotonicity is preserved, and—in many metrics—realized fairness improves as well.

A.5 Practical Implications of the Theoretical Results

The preceding theorems are not only of theoretical interest but also provide practical tools for deploying GIFF in real systems:

Certified lower bounds. The Local–Gain Lower Bound guarantees that GIFF’s surrogate never overstates realized fairness improvement. This turns the surrogate into a safe proxy: if an allocation is predicted to achieve at least ε fairness gain, the realized gain is provably $\geq \varepsilon$. For α -fairness, the surrogate is exact.

Safe tuning of β . The monotonicity theorem ensures that increasing the fairness weight β cannot reduce surrogate fairness. Practitioners can therefore adjust β to explore efficiency–fairness trade-offs without fear of hidden regressions.

Two-sided certificates. Slack bounds provide upper bounds on how much realized fairness can exceed the surrogate. Together with the lower bound, this yields a sandwich:

$$S \leq \Delta_{\text{joint}} \leq S + \text{slack}_{\max}.$$

This makes GIFF auditable: both the minimum guaranteed improvement and the potential gap are known at each round.

Fairness floors as constraints. Because S is conservative, one can impose hard constraints of the form $S \geq \varepsilon$ in the allocation ILP, guaranteeing that realized fairness improvement is at least ε each round.

Telescoping guarantees. Summing the Local–Gain Lower Bound over time gives a cumulative guarantee:

$$F(\mathbf{Z}_T) - F(\mathbf{Z}_0) \geq \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} S^{(t)}.$$

This yields an auditable trajectory of fairness progress over a deployment horizon.

Monitoring and debugging. The bounds enable runtime checks. If the observed joint change Δ_{joint} ever falls below the computed S , then assumptions (such as nonnegative increments) have been violated, or an implementation error is present.

In short, the theorems make GIFF *deployable*: the system’s fairness behavior becomes predictable, auditable, and tunable in ways that are both theoretically grounded and operationally meaningful.

B SIMPLE INCENTIVES - EXTENDED (SI-X) BASELINE

To provide a strong point of comparison for our homelessness prevention experiments, we developed a competitive baseline by directly adapting the **Simple Incentives (SI)** framework [11]. The original method was designed to mitigate fairness issues in ridesharing by moving allocations closer to statistical parity. We apply its core variance-minimization logic to the homelessness domain, leading to the variant we term SI-X.

The central idea of the original SI framework is to treat the variance of outcomes across all groups, $\text{var}(\mathbf{Z})$, as a proxy for unfairness. At each step, the goal is to make an allocation that takes a gradient step toward minimizing this variance. The original paper derives a modified score function, s' , by subtracting the gradient of the variance from the original utility score, $s(i, a)$:

$$s'(i, a) = s(i, a) - \lambda \frac{\partial}{\partial \mathcal{A}} \text{var}(\mathbf{Z}) = s(i, a) + \frac{2}{|\mathbf{Z}|} \lambda \sum_{z_j \in \mathbf{Z}} (\bar{z} - z_j) \frac{\partial z_j}{\partial \mathcal{A}} \quad (34)$$

where λ is a hyperparameter, z_j is the historical average outcome for group j , and \bar{z} is the average across all groups. The second term is the fairness *incentive*: for each group, its disparity from the mean, $(\bar{z} - z_j)$, is weighted by the impact of the allocation on its outcome, $\frac{\partial z_j}{\partial \mathcal{A}}$.

To apply this framework to the homelessness domain, we make two simplifying assumptions in line with the assumptions made by the original work:

- (1) **Simplification:** For an action a involving a single household h , the sum over all groups collapses to just the term for that household’s group, $G(h)$, since no other group’s metric is affected.
- (2) **Approximation:** The complex partial derivative, $\frac{\partial z_{G(h)}}{\partial a}$, is approximated with a simple, intuitive heuristic: the difference between the action’s re-entry probability and the group’s historical average, $\Pr(h, a) - z_{G(h)}$.

These steps yield the final form for the fairness incentive, $F(a)$, used in our experiments. The modified utility for an action, $s'(a)$, becomes:

$$s'(a) = Q(a) + \beta F(a) \quad (35)$$

Table 1: The effect of the SI-X fairness incentive $F(a)$ for $\beta > 0$.

	Better-off group $(\bar{z} - z_{G(h)} > 0)$	Worse-off group $(\bar{z} - z_{G(h)} < 0)$
Bad action $(\Pr(h, a) - z_{G(h)} > 0)$	Discourage (Negative incentive)	Heavily discourage (Positive incentive, but bad action)
Good action $(\Pr(h, a) - z_{G(h)} < 0)$	Lightly encourage (Negative incentive)	Heavily encourage (Positive incentive)

$$\text{where } F(a) = \underbrace{(\bar{z} - z_{G(h)})}_{\text{group advantage}} \times \underbrace{(\Pr(h, a) - z_{G(h)})}_{\text{action advantage}} \quad (36)$$

and $Q(a) = -\Pr(h, a)$. The two components of this incentive have a clear intuition:

- **Group Advantage:** The term $(\bar{z} - z_{G(h)})$ is positive for better-off groups (where $z_{G(h)} < \bar{z}$) and negative for worse-off groups.
- **Action Advantage:** The term $(\Pr(h, a) - z_{G(h)})$ is negative for "good" actions (lower re-entry risk than the group average) and positive for "bad" actions.

The product of these two terms, summarized in Table 1, creates a targeted incentive structure that directly reflects the original framework's goal of reducing variance by penalizing actions that increase disparity and rewarding those that reduce it.

C GIFF ALGORITHM

Here we provide general algorithms for GIFF. These can be specialized for specific use cases and improved with practical modifications, like vectorization or short-circuiting when β or δ is zero. The main algorithm is provided in Algorithm 1, with the advantage correction process outlined in Algorithm 2.

Algorithm 1 General Incentives-based Framework for Fairness (GIFF)

Require: Set of agents α , Current payoff vector Z , Q-values $Q(i, a)$, Fairness function F , Hyperparameters β, δ

```

1: Initialize modified utility matrix  $Q_{GIFF}$ 
2: for each agent  $i \in \alpha$  do
3:   for each available action  $a \in A_i$  do
4:     // 1. Compute Local Fairness Gain
5:      $\Delta F(a) \leftarrow \text{ComputeFairnessGain}(i, a, Q(i, a), Z, F)$ 
6:
7:     // 2. Compute Advantage Correction (see Algorithm 2)
8:      $\Delta Q_{\text{adv}}(a) \leftarrow \text{AdvantageCorrection}(i, a, \{Q\}, Z, F)$ 
9:
10:    // 3. Combine into GIFF-modified Utility
11:     $Q_f(a) \leftarrow \Delta F(a) + \delta \cdot \Delta Q_{\text{adv}}(a)$ 
12:     $Q_{GIFF}(i, a) \leftarrow (1 - \beta) \cdot Q(i, a) + \beta \cdot Q_f(a)$ 
13:  end for
14: end for
15: // 4. Solve for Final Allocation
16:  $\mathcal{A}^* \leftarrow \text{SOLVE\_ALLOCATION}(Q_{GIFF})$ 
17: return The fair allocation  $\mathcal{A}^*$ 

```

Algorithm 2 Counterfactual Advantage Correction

Require: Agent i , Action a , Q-values $\{Q(j, a)\}$, Current payoff vector Z , Fairness function F

```

1: function ADVANTAGECORRECTION( $i, a, \{Q\}, Z, F$ )
2:   // 1. Compute agent  $i$ 's local fairness gain
3:    $\Delta F(a) \leftarrow \text{ComputeFairnessGain}(i, a, Q(i, a), Z, F)$ 
4:
5:   // 2. Compute average counterfactual fairness gain
6:   Initialize list  $\mathcal{F}_{\text{cf}}$ 
7:   for each agent  $j \neq i$  that can take action  $a$  do
8:      $\Delta F^{(j)} \leftarrow \text{ComputeFairnessGain}(j, a, Q(j, a), Z, F)$ 
9:     Append  $\Delta F^{(j)}$  to  $\mathcal{F}_{\text{cf}}$ 
10:  end for
11:   $\Delta F_{\text{avg}}(a) \leftarrow \text{mean}(\mathcal{F}_{\text{cf}})$ 
12:
13:  // 3. Compute final correction term
14:   $F_{\text{adv}}(a) \leftarrow \Delta F(a) - \Delta F_{\text{avg}}(a)$ 
15:   $\Delta Q(a) \leftarrow Q(i, a) - \min_{a' \in A_i} Q(i, a')$ 
16:   $\Delta Q_{\text{adv}}(a) \leftarrow F_{\text{adv}}(a) \cdot \Delta Q(a)$ 
17:  return  $\Delta Q_{\text{adv}}(a)$ 
18: end function

```

D IMPLEMENTATION DETAILS FOR THE RIDESHARING EXPERIMENT

We used the code provided by the authors of SI [11] directly, modifying the parts where the score is modified by SI, instead using GIFF's approach. The ridesharing experiments were conducted in a simulation environment based on prior work [11, 19].

- **Environment:** The simulation models a fleet of 1,000 vehicles in Manhattan using a real-world NYC dataset. The experiments focus on the morning rush hour from 8 am to 12 pm.
- **Q-Values:** We use the same pre-trained Q-value models from the baseline work to ensure a direct and fair comparison. A central allocator uses these Q-values to assign passengers to drivers.
- **Fairness Metrics:** We evaluate fairness for both passengers and drivers, using the same definitions as the baseline method.
 - **Passenger Fairness:** Passengers are grouped by their origin-destination neighborhood pair. The payoff vector, Z_p , consists of the service rate for each group. Fairness is measured as the negative variance, $-\text{var}(Z_p)$.
 - **Driver Fairness:** Each driver is their own group. The payoff vector, Z_d , is the cumulative number of trips assigned to each driver. Fairness is measured as $-\text{var}(Z_d)$.

E IMPLEMENTATION DETAILS FOR THE HOMELESSNESS EXPERIMENT

This section provides additional details on the experimental setup for the homelessness prevention domain, complementing the description in the main text.

E.1 Data and Preprocessing

The experiment utilizes two primary datasets, based on the work of Kube et al. [8]. The first contains counterfactual re-entry probabilities for 13,940 households. These probabilities were generated using Bayesian Additive Regression Trees (BART) and estimate the likelihood of a household re-entering the homelessness system if assigned to one of four interventions: **Emergency Shelter (ES)**, **Transitional Housing (TH)**, **Rapid Re-housing (RRH)**, and **Homelessness Prevention (Prev)**. The second dataset, contains demographic and background features for each household. These two datasets were merged using the household identifier.

To define the fairness groups for our analysis, we automatically selected relevant features from the household data. We filtered for categorical features with at least two and at most twenty unique values. To ensure statistical stability, we further required that each unique value (i.e., each subgroup) within a feature be associated with at least 50 households in the dataset. This process yielded **38 distinct features** (e.g., race, family size, disability status) that were used to define demographic groups in 38 independent experimental runs.

E.2 Temporal Simulation Setup

To simulate a realistic, dynamic allocation process, we structured the experiment into discrete time windows. Using the `EntryDate` for each household, we divided the dataset into sequential, non-overlapping windows of **30 days**. All households entering the system within a given 30-day period were considered for allocation simultaneously at the end of that window.

E.3 Resource Allocation and Constraints

The experiment was conducted in a **constrained allocation setting**, where the total number of available slots for each intervention was fixed over the entire simulation. These totals were derived from the historical assignments in the original dataset:

- **Prevention (Prev)**: 6202 slots
- **Emergency Shelter (ES)**: 4441 slots
- **Transitional Housing (TH)**: 2451 slots
- **Rapid Re-housing (RRH)**: 846 slots

The total available slots were not divided evenly across time. Instead, for each 30-day window, a number of slots for each intervention was made available proportionally. The number of slots in a given window was scaled based on the number of households arriving in that window relative to the total number of households. This ensures that resource availability realistically matches demand over time. Within each time window, an ILP solver was used to find the optimal assignment of households to the available intervention slots, based on the (potentially fairness-modified) utility scores.

E.4 Fairness Metric and Evaluation Protocol

The fairness objective in this experiment was to minimize the disparity in average re-entry probabilities across demographic groups. We used the **Gini index** as our measure of inequality. Since our framework is formulated as a maximization problem, the specific fairness function provided to the methods was the **negative Gini index** (`fairness_function = lambda x: -gini(x)`).

The full experiment consisted of a loop over the 38 selected demographic features. For each feature, we ran the entire temporal simulation for both the GIFF and SI-X methods. For each method, we performed a sweep across a range of the fairness hyperparameter (β) to trace the trade-off between overall efficiency (total re-entry probability) and fairness (Gini index). The results from all 38 runs were then aggregated to produce the final distributions shown in the main paper.

F PRACTICAL NOTES

F.1 A Note on Computational Overhead:

Assuming that evaluating the fairness function on a payoff vector takes constant time, computing the GIFF-modified Q-value for one agent involves two main steps for each available action. First, the fairness gain for an action is computed in constant time. Without advantage correction, this is the same computational complexity as it takes to enumerate all Q-values. Second, the advantage correction term requires evaluating the counterfactual fairness gain for up to n candidate agents, resulting in $O(n)$ time per action. With an average of m actions available per agent, the overall computational overhead for calculating the modified Q-values for one agent is $O(m \cdot n)$. The total time for all agents, then, is $O(m \cdot n^2)$, which is much smaller than evaluating fairness over the total combinatorial search space of $O(m^n)$ joint actions.

F.2 Clarification of the Q-value Assumption in Theoretical Analysis

Our theoretical results in Appendix A, particularly the local-gain lower bound (Theorem 3) and the monotonicity guarantee (Theorem 4), are derived under the idealizing assumption of Q-value correctness (Assumption 4). Specifically, we assume that the Q-value for an agent’s action, $Q(o_i, a)$, represents the exact, single-step utility increment, y_i , that the agent will realize from that allocation in the current timestep.

We acknowledge that this is a simplification. In practice, Q-values are learned estimates of the long-term, discounted sum of future rewards and are subject to approximation errors, especially when function approximators like deep neural networks are used. They are not equivalent to the true, immediate utility gain. However, if the Q-values are accurate representations of long-term value attained by the agent, the fairness improvement will still be correct, even though it will not be realized within the single time step.

Additionally, this kind of assumption is standard for the theoretical analysis of mechanisms built on top of reinforcement learning. Its purpose is to isolate and analyze the properties of the GIFF framework itself, disentangled from the separate and complex issue of Q-value estimation error. By assuming perfect Q-values as inputs, we can prove that the GIFF mechanism for translating utility

into fairness is principled—that its surrogate is a valid lower bound and that its tuning parameter β behaves predictably. The strong performance of GIFF in our diverse empirical evaluations, which use Q-values learned in complex and stochastic environments (or which appear from black-box sources), suggests that these desirable theoretical properties are robust enough to hold in practice even when this assumption is relaxed.

G BROADER IMPACT STATEMENT

Methods to approach fairness often come at a cost to some participants' utility. Resource allocation using GIFF has the potential to affect real-world stakeholders. However, users should exercise caution, as reliance on inaccurate learned Q-values or poor fairness metrics may propagate existing biases in the data , and misapplication in high-stakes environments could lead to unforeseen inequitable outcomes.