

# Monte Paper Notes

Dylan Baker

October 2024

## Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Terms</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>The Model</b>	<b>5</b>
2.1	Preferences and Endowments . . . . .	5
2.1.1	Preferences . . . . .	5
2.1.2	Good Consumption Index . . . . .	5
2.1.3	Land and Local Consumption . . . . .	5
2.2	Production . . . . .	6
2.2.1	Labor Requirement for Production . . . . .	6
2.2.2	Price: Constant Markup over Marginal Cost . . . . .	7
2.2.3	Equilibrium Output of $j$ in $i$ . . . . .	7
2.2.4	Measure of Produced Varieties . . . . .	7
2.3	Goods Trade . . . . .	7
2.3.1	Share of $n$ 's Expenditure on $i$ 's Goods . . . . .	7
2.3.2	Workplace Income . . . . .	8
2.3.3	Price Index Re-Expression . . . . .	8
2.4	Labor Mobility and Commuting . . . . .	8
2.4.1	Indirect Utility . . . . .	8
2.4.1.1	Indirect Utility and the Fréchet distribution . . . . .	9
2.4.2	The Probability of Living in $n$ and Working in $i$ . . . . .	9

2.4.2.1	The Probability of Living in $n$ . . . . .	9
2.4.2.2	The Probability of Working in $i$ . . . . .	10
2.4.3	Worker Income . . . . .	10
2.4.3.1	Probability that a Worker Living in $n$ Commutes to $i$ . . . . .	10
2.4.3.2	Labor Market Clearing . . . . .	11
2.4.3.3	Expected Worker Income . . . . .	11
2.4.4	Expected Utility . . . . .	11
2.5	General Equilibrium . . . . .	12
2.6	Counterfactuals . . . . .	13
<b>3</b>	<b>Data and Measurement</b>	<b>13</b>
3.1	Goods Trade . . . . .	13
<b>4</b>	<b>Derivations</b>	<b>13</b>
4.1	Derivation of $c_{ni}(j)$ Expression . . . . .	13
4.1.1	Write the Problem . . . . .	13
4.1.2	Lagrangian and FOCs . . . . .	14
4.1.3	Solve for $\lambda$ . . . . .	14
4.1.4	Plug in $\lambda$ . . . . .	15
4.2	Derivation of $p_{ni}(j)$ Expression . . . . .	15
4.2.1	Marginal Cost . . . . .	15
4.2.2	Marginal Revenue . . . . .	16
4.2.3	Equating MR and MC . . . . .	17
4.3	Derivation of $x_i(j)$ Expression . . . . .	17
4.4	Derivation of $M_i$ Expression . . . . .	18
4.5	Derivation of $\pi_{ni}$ Expression . . . . .	18
4.6	Derivation of $w_i L_i$ Expression . . . . .	20
4.7	Derivation of $P_n$ Re-Expression . . . . .	20
4.8	Derivation of Indirect Utility . . . . .	21

4.9	Derivation of Fréchet Distribution for Indirect Utility . . . . .	22
4.10	Derivation of $\lambda_{ni}$ Expression . . . . .	23
4.11	Derivation of $\bar{U}$ Expression . . . . .	25

## 1 Terms

- $\omega$ : Worker
- $n$ : Location where the worker lives and consumes
- $i$ : Location where the worker works
- $C_{n\omega}$ : Final good consumption

$$C_n = \left[ \sum_{i \in N} \int_0^{M_i} c_{ni}(j)^\rho dj \right]^{\frac{1}{\rho}}, \quad \sigma = \frac{1}{1-\rho} > 1 \quad (1)$$

- $\sigma$ : The elasticity of substitution between different varieties of goods
- $c_{ni}(j)$ : Consumption in location  $n$  of each variety,  $j$ , sourced from location  $i$
- $H_{n\omega}$ : Residential land use
- $b_{ni\omega}$ : Idiosyncratic amenities shock
  - This term “captures the idea that individual workers can have idiosyncratic reasons for living and working in different locations.”
  - Drawn from an independent Fréchet distribution

$$G_{ni}(b) = e^{-B_{ni}b^{-\epsilon}}, \quad B_{ni} > 0, \epsilon > 1$$

- \*  $B_{ni}$ : This is the “scale parameter,” which “determines the average amenities from living in location  $n$  and working in location  $i$ .”
- \*  $\epsilon$ : This is the “shape parameter,” which “controls the dispersion of amenities.”
- $\kappa_{ni}$ : Iceberg commuting cost
  - $\kappa_{ni} \in [1, \infty)$
- $U_{ni\omega}$ : Utility

$$U_{ni\omega} = \frac{b_{ni\omega}}{\kappa_{ni}} \left( \frac{C_{n\omega}}{\alpha} \right)^\alpha \left( \frac{H_{n\omega}}{1-\alpha} \right)^{1-\alpha}$$

- $\alpha$ : The share of income spent on goods consumption
- $(1-\alpha)$ : The share of income spent on housing
- $X_n$ : Aggregate expenditure in location  $n$
- $P_n$ : The price index dual to (1)

- $p_{ni}(j)$ : The “cost inclusive of freight” price of a variety  $j$  produced in location  $i$  and consumed in location  $n$
- $\bar{v}_n$ : The average income of residents of  $n$  (some of whom may work outside of  $n$ )
- $R_n$ : The measure of residents in location  $n$
- $Q_n$ : Land price in location  $n$
- $H_n$ : The supply of land in location  $n$
- $x_i(j)$ : The number of variety  $j$  produced in location  $i$
- $F$ : The fixed cost of producing a variety  $j$
- $l_i(j)$ : The labor input required to produce an amount of variety  $j$ ,  $x_i(j)$ , in location  $i$
- $d_{ni}$ : The trade cost of shipping from location  $i$  to location  $n$
- $M_i$ : The measure of varieties produced in location  $i$
- $L_i$ : The measure of workers in location  $i$
- $G_{ni}(U)$ : The CDF of the indirect utility of living in location  $n$  and working in location  $i$

$$G_{ni}(U) = e^{-\Psi_{ni}U^{-\epsilon}}$$

where

$$\Psi_{ni} = B_{ni} (\kappa_{ni} P_n^\alpha Q_n^{1-\alpha})^{-\epsilon} w_i^\epsilon$$

- $\lambda_{ni}$ : The probability that a worker lives in location  $n$  and works in location  $i$

$$\lambda_{ni} = \frac{B_{ni} (\kappa_{ni} P_n^\alpha Q_n^{1-\alpha})^{-\epsilon} w_i^\epsilon}{\sum_{r \in N} \sum_{s \in N} B_{rs} (\kappa_{rs} P_r^\alpha Q_r^{1-\alpha})^{-\epsilon} w_s^\epsilon} \equiv \frac{\Phi_{ni}}{\Phi}$$

- $\lambda_n^R$ : The probability that a worker lives in location  $n$  and works in location  $i$

$$\lambda_n^R = \frac{R_n}{L} = \sum_{i \in N} \lambda_{ni} = \sum_{i \in N} \frac{\Phi_{ni}}{\Phi}$$

- $\lambda_i^L$ : The probability that a worker works in location  $i$

$$\lambda_i^L = \frac{L_n}{L} = \sum_{n \in N} \lambda_{ni} = \sum_{n \in N} \frac{\Phi_{ni}}{\Phi}$$

- $\lambda_{ni|n}^R$ : The probability that a worker living in  $n$  commutes to  $i$ .

$$\lambda_{ni|n}^R \equiv \frac{\lambda_{ni}}{\lambda_n^R} = \frac{B_{ni} (w_i / \kappa_{ni})^\epsilon}{\sum_{s \in N} B_{ns} (w_s / \kappa_{ns})^\epsilon}$$

## 2 The Model

### 2.1 Preferences and Endowments

#### 2.1.1 Preferences

The preferences of a worker who lives in location  $n$  and works in location  $i$  is given by the following utility function of the Cobb-Douglas form:

$$U_{ni\omega} = \frac{b_{ni\omega}}{\kappa_{ni}} \left( \frac{C_{n\omega}}{\alpha} \right)^\alpha \left( \frac{H_{n\omega}}{1-\alpha} \right)^{1-\alpha} \quad (2)$$

Idiosyncratic amenities are drawn from an independent Fréchet distribution:

$$G_{ni}(b) = e^{-B_{ni}b^{-\epsilon}}, \quad B_{ni} > 0, \epsilon > 1$$

#### 2.1.2 Good Consumption Index

The good consumption index is given the form:

$$C_n = \left[ \sum_{i \in N} \int_0^{M_i} c_{ni}(j)^\rho dj \right]^{\frac{1}{\rho}}, \quad \sigma = \frac{1}{1-\rho} > 1$$

“The goods consumption index in location  $n$  is a constant elasticity of substitution (CES) function of consumption of a continuum of tradable varieties sourced from each location  $i$ .”

Utility maximization will give that “the equilibrium consumption in location  $n$  of each variety sourced from location  $i$  is given by”:

$$c_{ni}(j) = \alpha X_n P_n^{\sigma-1} p_{ni}(j)^{-\sigma} \quad (3)$$

See subsection 4.1 for derivation.

#### 2.1.3 Land and Local Consumption

“We assume that this land is owned by immobile landlords, who receive worker expenditure on residential land as income, and consume only goods where they live.”

From there, we get the expression

$$P_n C_n = \alpha \bar{v}_n R_n + (1-\alpha) \bar{v}_n R_n = \bar{v}_n R_n$$

which says that the total expenditure on goods in location  $n$ ,  $P_n C_n$  is equal to the total labor income of residents in location  $n$ ,  $\bar{v}_n R_n$ .

### Questions

Should I be saying “total labor income” or just “total income” for  $\bar{v}_n R_n$ ?

The middle term can be read as residents’ total spending on goods in  $n$ ,  $\alpha \bar{v}_n R_n$ , plus residents’ total spending on land in  $n$ ,  $(1 - \alpha) \bar{v}_n R_n$ .

We can also get the following expression:

$$Q_n = (1 - \alpha) \frac{\bar{v}_n R_n}{H_n} \quad (4)$$

which says that the land price in location  $n$ ,  $Q_n$ , is equal to the total spending on land in  $n$  divided by the supply of land in  $n$ .

This follows from the land market clearing condition:

$$\underbrace{Q_n \times H_n}_{\text{price} \times \text{quantity of land}} = \underbrace{(1 - \alpha) \bar{v}_n R_n}_{\text{total rent paid by residents}}$$

and is useful, because it allows us to express rent as a function of the supply of land.

### Questions

Why do we only say that it’s a function of the supply of land? It seems to be a function of several things, no?

## 2.2 Production

### 2.2.1 Labor Requirement for Production

Firms produce tradable varieties under monopolistic competition and increasing returns to scale using labor as the lone input.

To produce a variety, firms incur a fixed cost,  $F$ , as well as a variable cost that is determined by the inverse of local productivity,  $A_i$ :  $x_i(j)/A_i$ .

Thus, the total amount of labor,  $l_i(j)$ , required to produce  $x_i(j)$  units of variety  $j$  in location  $i$  is given by:

$$l_i(j) = F + \frac{x_i(j)}{A_i} \quad (5)$$

### 2.2.2 Price: Constant Markup over Marginal Cost

Profit maximization gives us that the equilibrium prices are a constant markup over marginal cost:

$$p_{ni}(j) = \left( \frac{\sigma}{\sigma - 1} \right) \frac{d_{ni}w_i}{A_i} \quad (6)$$

The derivation is given in subsection 4.2.

Notice also that  $p_{ni}(j)$  is the same for all varieties produced in location  $i$  and consumed in location  $n$ , i.e., there is no  $j$  on the RHS.

### 2.2.3 Equilibrium Output of $j$ in $i$

If we then additionally note zero profits, we get an expression for equilibrium output of each variety in each location:

$$x_i(j) = A_i F(\sigma - 1) \quad (7)$$

The derivation is given in subsection 4.3.

### 2.2.4 Measure of Produced Varieties

(7) combined with labor market clearing gives us that the total measure of produced varieties in region  $i$ ,  $M_i$ , is proportional to the measure of employed workers,  $L_i$ :

$$M_i = \frac{L_i}{\sigma F} \quad (8)$$

The derivation is given in subsection 4.4.

## 2.3 Goods Trade

### 2.3.1 Share of $n$ 's Expenditure on $i$ 's Goods

“The model implies a gravity equation for bilateral trade between locations.”

“Using the CES expenditure function, the equilibrium pricing rule, and the measure of firms, the share of location  $n$ 's expenditure on good's produced in location  $i$  is:”

$$\pi_{ni} = \frac{M_i p_{ni}^{1-\sigma}}{\sum_{k \in N} M_k p_{nk}^{1-\sigma}} = \frac{L_i (d_{ni}w_i/A_i)^{1-\sigma}}{\sum_{k \in N} L_k (d_{nk}w_k/A_k)^{1-\sigma}} \quad (9)$$

The derivation is given in subsection 4.5.

Notice that trade between locations  $n$  and  $i$  depends on both their own trade costs,  $d_{ni}$ , as well as the trade costs between  $n$  and all other locations.

### 2.3.2 Workplace Income

“Equating revenue and expenditure, and using zero profits, workplace income in each location equals total expenditure on goods produced in that location, namely,”

$$w_i L_i = \sum_{n \in N} \pi_{ni} \bar{v}_n R_n \quad (10)$$

The derivation is given in subsection 4.6.

### 2.3.3 Price Index Re-Expression

Then, using the equilibrium pricing rule and labor market clearing, we can re-express the price index dual to the consumption index as:

$$\begin{aligned} P_n &= \frac{\sigma}{\sigma - 1} \left( \frac{1}{\sigma F} \right)^{\frac{1}{1-\sigma}} \left[ \sum_{i \in N} L_i (d_{ni} w_i / A_i)^{1-\sigma} \right]^{\frac{1}{1-\sigma}} \\ &= \frac{\sigma}{\sigma - 1} \left( \frac{L_n}{\sigma F \pi_{nn}} \right)^{\frac{1}{1-\sigma}} \frac{d_{nn} w_n}{A_n} \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

The derivation is given in subsection 4.7.

## 2.4 Labor Mobility and Commuting

### 2.4.1 Indirect Utility

Workers are geographically mobile and select both the location of their residence and the location of their workplace (possibly different) to maximize their utility.

Building from our baseline utility function, (2), we can then get the indirect utility expression:

$$U_{ni\omega} = \frac{b_{ni\omega} w_i}{\kappa_{ni} P_n^\alpha Q_n^{1-\alpha}} \quad (12)$$

which is the utility of a worker who lives in location  $n$ , works in location  $i$ , has idiosyncratic amenities  $b_{ni\omega}$ , and has made the consumption and housing choices that maximize their utility.

The derivation is given in subsection 4.8.



#### 2.4.1.1 Indirect Utility and the Fréchet distribution

Notice that indirect utility expression follows a Fréchet distribution, since  $b_{ni\omega}$  is drawn from an independent Fréchet distribution and the other terms are constant in  $\omega$ :

$$U_{ni\omega} = \underbrace{\frac{w_i}{\kappa_{ni} P_n^\alpha Q_n^{1-\alpha}}}_{\text{constant w.r.t. } \omega} \times b_{ni\omega}$$

That is, the indirect utility expression is a monotonic transformation of  $b_{ni\omega}$  with  $\frac{w_i}{\kappa_{ni} P_n^\alpha Q_n^{1-\alpha}} > 0$  and also follows a Fréchet distribution.

The CDF of  $U$  is given by:

$$G_{ni}(U) = e^{-\Psi_{ni} U^{-\epsilon}} \quad (13)$$

where

$$\Psi_{ni} = B_{ni} (\kappa_{ni} P_n^\alpha Q_n^{1-\alpha})^{-\epsilon} w_i^\epsilon$$

The derivation is given in subsection 4.9.

“Each worker selects the bilateral commute that offers her the maximum utility, where the maximum of Fréchet distributed random variables is itself Fréchet distributed.”

#### 2.4.2 The Probability of Living in $n$ and Working in $i$

Based on the above-established distribution of utility, the probability of a worker choosing to live in  $n$  and work in  $i$  is then given by:

$$\lambda_{ni} = \frac{B_{ni} (\kappa_{ni} P_n^\alpha Q_n^{1-\alpha})^{-\epsilon} w_i^\epsilon}{\sum_{r \in N} \sum_{s \in N} B_{rs} (\kappa_{rs} P_r^\alpha Q_r^{1-\alpha})^{-\epsilon} w_s^\epsilon} \equiv \frac{\Phi_{ni}}{\Phi} \quad (14)$$

The derivation is given in subsection 4.10.

Thus, the idiosyncratic shocks imply that workers will select different bilateral commutes even when faced with the same set of prices,  $(P_n, Q_n, w_i)$ , commuting costs,  $\kappa_{ni}$ , and location characteristics,  $B_{ni}$ . However, it also implies that, all else equal, workers are more likely to live in location  $n$  and work in location  $i$  when the consumption goods price index ( $P_n$ ) is lower, the land prices ( $Q_n$ ) are lower, wages ( $w_i$ ) are higher, the amenities ( $B_n$ ) are nicer, and the commuting costs ( $\kappa_{ni}$ ) are lower.

##### 2.4.2.1 The Probability of Living in $n$

Summing over  $i$ , we get the probability of living in  $n$ :

$$\lambda_n^R = \frac{R_n}{L} = \sum_{i \in N} \lambda_{ni} = \sum_{i \in N} \frac{\Phi_{ni}}{\Phi} \quad (15)$$

where national labor market clearing corresponds to  $\sum_n \lambda_n^R = \sum_i \lambda_i^L = 1$ .

#### 2.4.2.2 The Probability of Working in $i$

Summing over  $n$ , we get the probability of working in  $i$ :

$$\lambda_i^L = \frac{L_i}{L} = \sum_{n \in N} \lambda_{ni} = \sum_{n \in N} \frac{\Phi_{ni}}{\Phi} \quad (16)$$

where national labor market clearing corresponds to  $\sum_n \lambda_n^R = \sum_i \lambda_i^L = 1$ .

### 2.4.3 Worker Income

#### 2.4.3.1 Probability that a Worker Living in $n$ Commutes to $i$

The probability that a worker living in  $n$  commutes to  $i$  is given by:

$$\lambda_{ni|n}^R \equiv \frac{\lambda_{ni}}{\lambda_n^R} = \frac{B_{ni} (w_i / \kappa_{ni})^\epsilon}{\sum_{s \in N} B_{ns} (w_s / \kappa_{ns})^\epsilon} \quad (17)$$

(17) implies a “commuting gravity equation,” where the elasticity of commuting flows with respect to commuting costs is  $-\epsilon$ , since

$$\frac{d \ln \lambda_{ni|n}^R}{d \ln \kappa_{ni}} = -\epsilon$$

since

$$\begin{aligned} \ln (\lambda_{ni|n}^R) &= \ln \left( \frac{B_{ni} (w_i / \kappa_{ni})^\epsilon}{\sum_{s \in N} B_{ns} (w_s / \kappa_{ns})^\epsilon} \right) \\ &= \ln(B_{ni}) + \epsilon \ln(w_i) - \epsilon \ln(\kappa_{ni}) - \ln \left( \sum_{s \in N} B_{ns} (w_s / \kappa_{ns})^\epsilon \right) \end{aligned}$$

## Questions

Not totally sure why we're allowed to neglect the term in the denominator.

### 2.4.3.2 Labor Market Clearing

We then re-write the labor market clearing condition using the  $\lambda_{ni|n}^R$  term:

$$L_i = \sum_{n \in N} \lambda_{ni|n}^R R_n$$

which says that the labor supply in  $i$  must equal the sum across locations  $n$  of the share of people living in  $n$  and working in  $i$  multiplied by the measure of residents in  $n$ .

### 2.4.3.3 Expected Worker Income

Expected worker income conditional on living in location  $n$  can then be written as a weighted average of all possible workplace regions, where the weight is given by the conditional probability of working in the region:

$$\bar{v}_n = \sum_{i \in N} \lambda_{ni|n}^R w_i \quad (18)$$

Notice that since  $\lambda_{ni|n}^R$  increases as commuting costs to  $i$  decrease, expected wage is higher in regions with low commuting costs to areas with high wages.

### 2.4.4 Expected Utility

Population mobility implies that expected utility is the same across all work-home location pairs, which is, naturally, the same as the expected utility for the economy as a whole:

$$\bar{U} = \mathbb{E}[U_{ni\omega}] = \Gamma\left(\frac{\epsilon-1}{\epsilon}\right) \left[ \sum_{r \in N} \sum_{s \in N} B_{rs} (\kappa_{rs} P_r^\alpha Q_r^{1-\alpha})^{-\epsilon} w_s^\epsilon \right]^{\frac{1}{\epsilon}} \quad \text{all } n, i \in N \quad (19)$$

The derivation is given in subsection 4.11.

Note that even though expected utility is constant across locations, other details of the locations vary. Wages, for example, must vary to accommodate preference heterogeneity over location.

“Workplaces and residences face upward-sloping supply functions for workers and residents, respectively.” In order to attract more workers, workplaces must pay higher wages to raise commuters’ real income and induce additional workers with lower idiosyncratic amenities for that workplace to

commute there. Similarly, residences must offer lower land prices to raise residents' real income and induce additional workers to live there who have lower idiosyncratic amenities for that residence.

Bilateral commutes with attractive characteristics, e.g., high workplace wage and low residence cost of living, “attract additional commuters with lower idiosyncratic amenities, until expected utility (taking into account idiosyncratic amenities) is the same across all bilateral commutes.”

## 2.5 General Equilibrium

“The general equilibrium of the model can be referenced by the following vector of six variables:

$$\{w_n, \bar{v}_n, Q_n, L_n, R_n, P_n\}_n$$

and the scalar

$$\bar{U}.$$

Given this equilibrium vector and scalar, all other endogenous variables of the model can be determined. ”

“This equilibrium vector solves the following 6 sets of equations:”

$w_i L_i = \sum_{n \in N} \pi_{ni} \bar{v}_n R_n$	income equals expenditure, (10) above
$\bar{v}_n = \sum_{i \in N} \lambda_{ni}^R w_i$	average residential income, (18) above
$Q_n = (1 - \alpha) \frac{\bar{v}_n R_n}{H_n}$	land market clearing, (4) above
$\lambda_i^L = \frac{L_n}{\bar{L}} = \sum_{n \in N} \lambda_{ni} = \sum_{n \in N} \frac{\Phi_{ni}}{\Phi}$	workplace choice probabilities, (16) above
$\lambda_n^R = \frac{R_n}{\bar{L}} = \sum_{i \in N} \lambda_{ni} = \sum_{i \in N} \frac{\Phi_{ni}}{\Phi}$	residence choice probabilities, (15) above
$P_n = \frac{\sigma}{\sigma - 1} \left( \frac{L_n}{\sigma F \pi_{nn}} \right)^{\frac{1}{1-\sigma}} \frac{d_{nn} w_n}{A_n}$	price index, (11) above

The final condition “needed to determine the scalar  $\bar{U}$  is the labor market clearing condition”:

$$\bar{L} = \sum_{n \in N} R_n = \sum_{n \in N} L_n$$

## 2.6 Counterfactuals

# 3 Data and Measurement

Data used:

- Commodity Flow Survey (CFS)
  - “[D]ata on bilateral trade and distances shipped for 123 CFS regions”
- American Community Survey (ACS) 2006-2010 & US Census 1960–2000
  - “[D]ata on bilateral commuting between counties”
- Bureau of Economic Analysis (BEA)
  - “[D]ata on employment and wages by workplace”

Data on employment and commuting is used to calculate the “implied number of residents and their average income by county.” [More to say here but come back to it.]

## 3.1 Goods Trade

“In the Commodity Flow Survey (CFS) data, we observe bilateral trade flows and distances shipped between 123 CFS regions and trade deficits for each these CFS regions”

We don’t have a more granular level of data from the CFS. Thus, to consider the model at the county level, “we allocate the deficit for each CFS region across the counties within that region according to their shares of CFS residential income (as measured by  $\bar{v}_i R_i$ ).”

# 4 Derivations

## 4.1 Derivation of $c_{ni}(j)$ Expression

### 4.1.1 Write the Problem

This is the derivation of (3).

When making consumption decisions surrounding  $c_{ni}(j)$ , an individual is solving the following problem:

$$\begin{aligned} & \max_{\{c_{ni}(j)\}} C_n \\ \text{s.t. } & \sum_i \int_0^{M_i} p_{ni}(j) c_{ni}(j) dj = \alpha X_n \end{aligned}$$

or expanded out:

$$\begin{aligned} & \max_{\{c_{ni}(j)\}} \left[ \sum_{i \in N} \int_0^{M_i} c_{ni}(j)^\rho dj \right]^{\frac{1}{\rho}} \\ \text{s.t. } & \sum_i \int_0^{M_i} p_{ni}(j) c_{ni}(j) dj = \alpha X_n \end{aligned}$$

where the  $\alpha X_n$  term comes from the fact that people spend  $\alpha$  of their total expenditures,  $X_n$ , on goods.

#### 4.1.2 Lagrangian and FOCs

The Lagrangian for this problem is then:

$$\mathcal{L} = \left[ \sum_{i \in N} \int_0^{M_i} c_{ni}(j)^\rho dj \right]^{\frac{1}{\rho}} + \lambda \left( \alpha X_n - \sum_i \int_0^{M_i} p_{ni}(j) c_{ni}(j) dj \right)$$

which gives the relevant FOC:

$$\begin{aligned} \{c_{ni}(j)\} \quad & \frac{\partial}{\partial c_{ni}(j)} \left[ \left( \sum_{i \in N} \int_0^{M_i} c_{ni}(j)^\rho dj \right)^{\frac{1}{\rho}} \right] - \lambda p_{ni}(j) = 0 \\ \Leftrightarrow & \frac{1}{\rho} \left[ \sum_{i \in N} \int_0^{M_i} \rho c_{ni}(j)^{\rho-1} dj \right]^{\frac{1}{\rho}-1} c_{ni}(j)^{\rho-1} - \lambda p_{ni}(j) = 0 \\ \Leftrightarrow & C_n^{1-\rho} c_{ni}(j)^{\rho-1} = \lambda p_{ni}(j) \\ \Leftrightarrow & c_{ni}(j) = \lambda^{\frac{1}{\rho-1}} p_{ni}(j)^{\frac{1}{\rho-1}} C_n \\ \Leftrightarrow & c_{ni}(j) = \lambda^{-\sigma} p_{ni}(j)^{-\sigma} C_n \end{aligned} \quad \text{since } \sigma = \frac{1}{1-\rho} \quad (20)$$

#### 4.1.3 Solve for $\lambda$

From there, we can define the dual price index

$$P_n \equiv \left( \sum_{i \in N} \int_0^{M_i} p_{ni}(j)^{1-\sigma} dj \right)^{\frac{1}{1-\sigma}} \quad (21)$$

and revisit to our budget constraint:

$$\begin{aligned}
\alpha X_n &= \sum_i \int_0^{M_i} p_{ni}(j) c_{ni}(j) dj \\
&= \sum_i \int_0^{M_i} p_{ni}(j) \lambda^{-\sigma} p_{ni}(j)^{-\sigma} C_n dj \quad \text{by (20)} \\
&= \lambda^{-\sigma} C_n \sum_i \int_0^{M_i} p_{ni}(j)^{1-\sigma} dj \\
&= \lambda^{-\sigma} C_n P_n^{1-\sigma} \\
\Rightarrow \lambda^{-\sigma} &= \frac{\alpha X_n}{C_n} P_n^{\sigma-1}
\end{aligned}$$

#### 4.1.4 Plug in $\lambda$

Then, returning to (20), we can plug in our expression for  $\lambda^{-\sigma}$ :

$$\begin{aligned}
c_{ni}(j) &= \lambda^{-\sigma} p_{ni}(j)^{-\sigma} C_n \\
&= \left( \frac{\alpha X_n}{C_n} P_n^{\sigma-1} \right) p_{ni}(j)^{-\sigma} C_n \\
&= \alpha X_n P_n^{\sigma-1} p_{ni}(j)^{-\sigma}
\end{aligned}$$

which is what we wanted.

## 4.2 Derivation of $p_{ni}(j)$ Expression

This is the derivation of (6).

### 4.2.1 Marginal Cost

We will get the expression for  $p_{ni}(j)$  by equating marginal cost and marginal revenue.

First, notice that since

$$l_i(j) = F + \frac{x_i(j)}{A_i}$$

cost is given by:

$$\underbrace{\text{Cost}(x_i(j))}_{\text{total monetary cost}} = \underbrace{w_i}_{\text{wage}} \left[ F + \frac{x_i(j)}{A_i} \right] \tag{22}$$

However, to account for trade costs, we must consider the variable cost of delivering  $q_{ni}(j)$  units of variety  $j$  to location  $n$  from location  $i$ :

$$\underbrace{\text{Var Cost}(q_{ni}(j))}_{\text{variable monetary cost}} = \underbrace{w_i}_{\text{wage}} \underbrace{d_{ni}}_{\text{trade costs}} \left[ \frac{q_{ni}(j)}{A_i} \right] \quad (23)$$

This is fine for marginal cost, since the fixed cost will disappear when we take the derivative.

Also, notice that we've defined  $q_{ni}(j)$  such that:

$$x_i(j) = \sum_{n \in N} d_{ni} q_{ni}(j) \quad (24)$$

where  $d_{ni}$  is the multiplier reflecting how many more units of variety  $j$  must be made to deliver  $q_{ni}(j)$  units of variety  $j$  to location  $n$  from location  $i$ .

Then, marginal cost is given by:

$$\text{MC} = \frac{d}{dq_{ni}(j)} \text{Var Cost}(q_{ni}(j)) = \frac{w_i d_{ni}}{A_i}$$

#### 4.2.2 Marginal Revenue

Under isoelastic (CES) demand, we can write the quantity demanded as

$$q_{ni}(j) = A_i p_{ni}(j)^{-\sigma}$$

Then, revenue is given by:

$$\text{Rev}(p_{ni}(j)) = p_{ni}(j) q_{ni}(j) = A_i p_{ni}(j)^{1-\sigma}$$

Then marginal revenue is given by:

$$\text{MR}_{ni}(j) = \frac{d\text{Rev}(p_{ni}(j))}{dp_{ni}(j)} \frac{dp_{ni}(j)}{dq_{ni}(j)} \quad (25)$$

by the chain rule.

Then notice that

$$\frac{d\text{Rev}(p_{ni}(j))}{dp_{ni}(j)} = A_i (1 - \sigma) p_{ni}(j)^{-\sigma} \quad (26)$$



and

$$\frac{dq_{ni}(j)}{dp_{ni}(j)} = -\sigma A_i p_{ni}(j)^{-\sigma-1}$$

Since  $q$  and  $p$  are inversely related, we can write:

$$\frac{dp_{ni}(j)}{dq_{ni}(j)} = \left( \frac{dq_{ni}(j)}{dp_{ni}(j)} \right)^{-1} = -\frac{1}{\sigma A_i p_{ni}(j)^{\sigma+1}} \quad (27)$$

Then, plugging (26) and (27) into (25), we get:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{MR}_{ni}(j) &= \frac{d\text{Rev}(p_{ni}(j))}{dp_{ni}(j)} \frac{dp_{ni}(j)}{dq_{ni}(j)} \\ &= A_i (1 - \sigma) p_{ni}(j)^{-\sigma} \left( -\frac{1}{\sigma A_i p_{ni}(j)^{\sigma+1}} \right) \\ &= \left( \frac{\sigma - 1}{\sigma} \right) p_{ni}(j) \end{aligned}$$

#### 4.2.3 Equating MR and MC

Then, equating marginal revenue and marginal cost, we get the desired expression:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{MR}_{ni}(j) &= \text{MC} \\ \Rightarrow \left( \frac{\sigma - 1}{\sigma} \right) p_{ni}(j) &= \frac{d_{ni} w_i}{A_i} \\ \Rightarrow p_{ni}(j) &= \left( \frac{\sigma}{\sigma - 1} \right) \frac{d_{ni} w_i}{A_i} \end{aligned}$$

### 4.3 Derivation of $x_i(j)$ Expression

This is the derivation of (7).

Zero profit implies that revenue minus variable cost equals fixed cost, which leads to the desired equation:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \text{Revenue} - \text{Variable Cost} = \text{Fixed Cost} \\
\Rightarrow \sum_n \left[ p_{ni}(j)q_{ni}(j) - w_i d_{ni} \left( \frac{q_{ni}(j)}{A_i} \right) \right] &= w_i F && \text{By (22) and (23)} \\
\Rightarrow \sum_n \left[ \frac{\sigma}{\sigma-1} \frac{d_{ni} w_i}{A_i} q_{ni}(j) - w_i d_{ni} \left( \frac{q_{ni}(j)}{A_i} \right) \right] &= w_i F && \text{By (6)} \\
\Rightarrow \sum_n \left[ \frac{1}{\sigma-1} \frac{d_{ni}}{A_i} q_{ni}(j) \right] &= F \\
\Rightarrow \sum_n d_{ni} q_{ni}(j) &= A_i F (\sigma-1) \\
\Rightarrow x_i(j) &= A_i F (\sigma-1) && \text{By (24)}
\end{aligned}$$

#### 4.4 Derivation of $M_i$ Expression

This is a derivation of (8).

$$\begin{aligned}
L_i &= \int_0^{M_i} l_i(j) dj && \text{Labor market clearing} \\
&= \int_0^{M_i} \left[ F + \frac{x_i(j)}{A_i} \right] dj && \text{By (5)} \\
&= \int_0^{M_i} F + \frac{A_i F (\sigma-1)}{A_i} dj && \text{By (7)} \\
&= \int_0^{M_i} \sigma F dj \\
&= \sigma F M_i
\end{aligned}$$

By re-arranging, we get the desired expression:

$$M_i = \frac{L_i}{\sigma F}$$

#### 4.5 Derivation of $\pi_{ni}$ Expression

This is a derivation of (9).

First, because it will be useful momentarily, note:

$$\begin{aligned}
P_n &= \left[ \sum_{k \in N} \int_0^{M_k} p_{nk}(j)^{1-\sigma} dj \right]^{\frac{1}{1-\sigma}} \\
\Rightarrow P_n^{1-\sigma} &= \sum_{k \in N} \int_0^{M_k} p_{nk}(j)^{1-\sigma} dj \\
\Rightarrow P_n^{1-\sigma} &= \sum_{k \in N} \int_0^{M_k} p_{nk}^{1-\sigma} dj && \text{By (6)} \\
\Rightarrow P_n^{1-\sigma} &= \sum_{k \in N} M_k p_{nk}^{1-\sigma} && (28)
\end{aligned}$$

Now, begin with the baseline expression for share of expenditure:

$$\begin{aligned}
\pi_{ni} &= \frac{\int_0^{M_i} p_{ni}(j) c_{ni}(j) dj}{\sum_{k \in N} \int_0^{M_k} p_{nk}(j) c_{nk}(j) dj} \\
&= \frac{\int_0^{M_i} p_{ni}(j) \alpha X_n P_n^{\sigma-1} p_{ni}(j)^{-\sigma} dj}{\sum_{k \in N} \int_0^{M_k} p_{nk}(j) \alpha X_n P_n^{\sigma-1} p_{nk}(j)^{-\sigma} dj} && \text{By (3)} \\
&= \frac{\int_0^{M_i} p_{ni}(j)^{1-\sigma} dj}{\sum_{k \in N} \int_0^{M_k} p_{nk}(j)^{1-\sigma} dj} && \text{Cancel terms} \\
&= \frac{\int_0^{M_i} p_{ni}(j)^{1-\sigma} dj}{P_n^{1-\sigma}} && \text{By (21)} \\
&= \frac{\int_0^{M_i} p_{ni}^{1-\sigma} dj}{\sum_{k \in N} M_k p_{nk}^{1-\sigma}} && \text{By (6) \& (28)} \\
&= \frac{M_i p_{ni}^{1-\sigma}}{\sum_{k \in N} M_k p_{nk}^{1-\sigma}}
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, we now have the first desired equality:

$$\pi_{ni} = \frac{M_i p_{ni}^{1-\sigma}}{\sum_{k \in N} M_k p_{nk}^{1-\sigma}} \quad (29)$$

Now, notice that:

$$M_i p_{ni}^{1-\sigma} = \left( \frac{L_i}{\sigma F} \right) \left( \frac{\sigma}{\sigma - 1} \right)^{1-\sigma} \frac{d_{ni} w_i^{1-\sigma}}{A_i} \quad \text{By (6) and (8)}$$

Thus, we can re-write (29) to be:

$$\begin{aligned}
\pi_{ni} &= \frac{M_i p_{ni}^{1-\sigma}}{\sum_{k \in N} M_k p_{nk}^{1-\sigma}} \\
&= \frac{\left(\frac{L_i}{\sigma F}\right) \left(\frac{\sigma}{\sigma-1}\right)^{1-\sigma} \frac{d_{ni} w_i}{A_i}^{1-\sigma}}{\sum_{k \in N} \left(\frac{L_k}{\sigma F}\right) \left(\frac{\sigma}{\sigma-1}\right)^{1-\sigma} \frac{d_{nk} w_k}{A_k}^{1-\sigma}} \\
&= \frac{L_i \left(\frac{d_{ni} w_i}{A_i}\right)^{1-\sigma}}{\sum_{k \in N} L_k \left(\frac{d_{nk} w_k}{A_k}\right)^{1-\sigma}}
\end{aligned}$$

which is what we wanted.

#### 4.6 Derivation of $w_i L_i$ Expression

This is a derivation of (10).

There's not really much of a derivation here.

First, note that total labor income is expressed as:

$$w_i L_i$$

Total revenue from goods produced in location  $i$  is given by:

$$\sum_{n \in N} \pi_{ni} \bar{v}_n R_n$$

There are no net profits, so total revenue minus total cost must be zero:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{n \in N} \pi_{ni} \bar{v}_n R_n - w_i L_i = 0 \\
\Rightarrow &\sum_{n \in N} \pi_{ni} \bar{v}_n R_n = w_i L_i
\end{aligned}$$

Also, note, since I briefly forgot, that the fixed costs of production and the costs associated with trade are already accounted for in the  $L_i$  term.

#### 4.7 Derivation of $P_n$ Re-Expression

This is a derivation of (11).

$$\begin{aligned}
P_n &= \left[ \sum_{i \in N} \int_0^{M_i} p_{ni}(j)^{1-\sigma} dj \right]^{\frac{1}{1-\sigma}} && \text{By (21)} \\
&= \left[ \sum_{i \in N} \int_0^{M_i} p_{ni}^{1-\sigma} dj \right]^{\frac{1}{1-\sigma}} && \text{By (6)} \\
&= \left[ \sum_{i \in N} M_i p_{ni}^{1-\sigma} \right]^{\frac{1}{1-\sigma}} \\
&= \left[ \sum_{i \in N} \frac{L_i}{\sigma F} \left( \frac{\sigma}{\sigma-1} \right)^{1-\sigma} \frac{d_{ni} w_i^{1-\sigma}}{A_i} \right]^{\frac{1}{1-\sigma}} && \text{By (8) and (6)} \\
&= \left( \frac{\sigma}{\sigma-1} \right) \left( \frac{1}{\sigma F} \right)^{\frac{1}{1-\sigma}} \left[ \sum_{i \in N} L_i \left( \frac{d_{ni} w_i}{A_i} \right)^{1-\sigma} \right]^{\frac{1}{1-\sigma}}
\end{aligned}$$

which is the first desired equality.

From there, we can note

$$\pi_{nn} = \frac{L_n \left( \frac{d_{nn} w_n}{A_n} \right)^{1-\sigma}}{\sum_{i \in N} L_i \left( \frac{d_{ni} w_i}{A_i} \right)^{1-\sigma}} \quad \text{By (9)} \quad (30)$$

which let's us pick back up to write:

$$\begin{aligned}
P_n &= \left( \frac{\sigma}{\sigma-1} \right) \left( \frac{1}{\sigma F} \right)^{\frac{1}{1-\sigma}} \left[ \sum_{i \in N} L_i \left( \frac{d_{ni} w_i}{A_i} \right)^{1-\sigma} \right]^{\frac{1}{1-\sigma}} \\
&= \left( \frac{\sigma}{\sigma-1} \right) \left( \frac{1}{\sigma F} \right)^{\frac{1}{1-\sigma}} \left[ \frac{L_n \left( \frac{d_{nn} w_n}{A_n} \right)^{1-\sigma}}{\pi_{nn}} \right]^{\frac{1}{1-\sigma}} && \text{By (30)} \\
&= \left( \frac{\sigma}{\sigma-1} \right) \left( \frac{L_n}{\sigma F \pi_{nn}} \right)^{\frac{1}{1-\sigma}} \frac{d_{nn} w_n}{A_n}
\end{aligned}$$

which is the second desired expression.

## 4.8 Derivation of Indirect Utility

This is a derivation of (12).

Beginning with our utility function:

$$U_{ni\omega} = \frac{b_{ni\omega}}{\kappa_{ni}} \left( \frac{C_{n\omega}}{\alpha} \right)^\alpha \left( \frac{H_{n\omega}}{1-\alpha} \right)^{1-\alpha}$$

Optimization gives us that workers (living in region  $n$  and working in region  $i$ ) spend  $\alpha$  of their income,  $w_i$ , on consumption and  $(1 - \alpha)$  on housing. The price of  $C_n$  is  $P_n$  and the price of  $H_n$  is  $Q_n$ . Thus we have the expressions:

$$P_n C_n = \alpha w_i \tag{31}$$

$$Q_n H_n = (1 - \alpha) w_i \tag{32}$$

Then we can re-write:

$$\begin{aligned} U_{ni\omega} &= \frac{b_{ni\omega}}{\kappa_{ni}} \left( \frac{C_{n\omega}}{\alpha} \right)^\alpha \left( \frac{H_{n\omega}}{1-\alpha} \right)^{1-\alpha} && \text{by (2)} \\ &= \frac{b_{ni\omega}}{\kappa_{ni}} \left( \frac{\alpha w_i}{\alpha P_n} \right)^\alpha \left( \frac{(1-\alpha) w_i}{(1-\alpha) Q_n} \right)^{1-\alpha} && \text{by (31) and (32)} \\ &= \frac{b_{ni\omega}}{\kappa_{ni}} \left( \frac{w_i}{P_n} \right)^\alpha \left( \frac{w_i}{Q_n} \right)^{1-\alpha} \\ &= \frac{b_{ni\omega} w_i}{\kappa_{ni} P_n^\alpha Q_n^{1-\alpha}} \end{aligned}$$

which is the desired expression.

## 4.9 Derivation of Fréchet Distribution for Indirect Utility

This is a derivation of (13).

Consider the following property of the Fréchet distribution:

### Fréchet Distribution Property

If  $X \sim \text{Fréchet}(B, \epsilon)$ , then  $F_X(x) = \exp[-Bx^{-\epsilon}]$  for  $x > 0$ .

Then for a constant  $c > 0$ ,  $cX \sim \text{Fréchet}(c^{-\epsilon}B, \epsilon)$ .

In other words,

$$F_{cX}(u) = \Pr\{cX \leq u\} = \Pr\{X \leq u/c\} = \exp[-B(u/c)^{-\epsilon}] = \exp[-(c^\epsilon B) u^{-\epsilon}]$$

Recall that

$$b \sim \text{Fréchet}(B, \epsilon)$$

and hence

$$G_{ni\omega}^b(b) = \exp [-B_{ni}b^{-\epsilon}]$$

Moreover, recall that

$$U_{ni\omega} = \underbrace{\frac{w_i}{\kappa_{ni}P_n^\alpha Q_n^{1-\alpha}}}_{\text{constant w.r.t. } \omega} \times b_{ni\omega}$$

Thus, employing out property of the Fréchet distribution, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} G_{ni}(U) &= \exp \left[ - \left( \frac{w_i}{\kappa_{ni}P_n^\alpha Q_n^{1-\alpha}} \right)^\epsilon B_{ni}U^{-\epsilon} \right] && \text{by the property above} \\ &= \exp \left[ -B_{ni}(\kappa_{ni}P_n^\alpha Q_n^{1-\alpha})^{-\epsilon} w_i^\epsilon U^{-\epsilon} \right] \\ &= \exp \left[ -\Psi_{ni}U^{-\epsilon} \right] \end{aligned}$$

if we define

$$\Psi_{ni} = B_{ni} (\kappa_{ni}P_n^\alpha Q_n^{1-\alpha})^{-\epsilon} w_i^\epsilon$$

which is the desired expression.

Also, notice that this is saying that

$$U_{ni\omega} \sim \text{Fréchet}(\Psi_{ni}, \epsilon) \tag{33}$$

#### 4.10 Derivation of $\lambda_{ni}$ Expression

This is a derivation of (14).

First, note that the pdf of  $U_{ni\omega}$  is given by:

$$f_{ni}(u) = \frac{d}{du} G_{ni}(u) = \frac{d}{du} [\exp (-\Psi_{ni}u^{-\epsilon})] = \epsilon \Psi_{ni} u^{-\epsilon-1} \exp [-\Psi_{ni}u^{-\epsilon}] \tag{34}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\lambda_{ni} &= \Pr \left( \operatorname{argmax}_{(mh)} U_{mh\omega} = (ni) \right) \\
&= \Pr (U_{ni\omega} > U_{mh\omega} \text{ for all } (mh) \neq (ni)) \\
&= \int_0^\infty \underbrace{f_{ni}(u)}_{\text{pdf of } U_{ni\omega}} \Pr (U_{mh\omega} < u, \forall (m, h) \neq (n, i) \mid U_{ni\omega} = u) du \\
&= \int_0^\infty f_{ni}(u) \Pr (U_{mh\omega} < u, \forall (m, h) \neq (n, i)) du && \text{by independence} \\
&= \int_0^\infty f_{ni}(u) \prod_{(m, h) \neq (n, i)} \Pr (U_{mh, \omega} < u) du && \text{by independence} \\
&= \int_0^\infty f_{ni}(u) \prod_{(m, h) \neq (n, i)} G_{mh}(u) du && \text{by definition of CDF} \\
&= \int_0^\infty \epsilon \Psi_{ni} u^{-\epsilon-1} \exp [-\Psi_{ni} u^{-\epsilon}] \prod_{(m, h) \neq (n, i)} G_{mh}(u) du && \text{by (34)} \\
&= \int_0^\infty \epsilon \Psi_{ni} u^{-\epsilon-1} \exp [-\Psi_{ni} u^{-\epsilon}] \prod_{(m, h) \neq (n, i)} \exp [-\Psi_{mh} u^{-\epsilon}] du && \text{by (13)} \\
&= \int_0^\infty \epsilon \Psi_{ni} u^{-\epsilon-1} \exp \left[ - \underbrace{\left( \Psi_{ni} + \sum_{(m, h) \neq (n, i)} \Psi_{mh} \right)}_{\sum_{r, s} \Psi_{rs}} u^{-\epsilon} \right] du \\
&= \int_0^\infty \epsilon \Psi_{ni} u^{-\epsilon-1} \exp \left[ - \left( \sum_{r, s} \Psi_{rs} \right) u^{-\epsilon} \right] du \\
&= \Psi_{ni} \int_0^\infty \epsilon u^{-\epsilon-1} \exp \left[ - \left( \sum_{r, s} \Psi_{rs} \right) u^{-\epsilon} \right] du
\end{aligned}$$

Consider the following change of variables:

$$\begin{aligned}
t &= u^{-\epsilon} \\
dt &= -\epsilon u^{-\epsilon-1} du \\
\Rightarrow \epsilon u^{-\epsilon-1} du &= -dt
\end{aligned}$$

Notice that as  $u$  goes from 0 to  $\infty$ ,  $t$  goes from  $\infty$  to 0.

Thus, we can re-write:



$$\begin{aligned}
\lambda_{ni} &= \Psi_{ni} \int_0^\infty \epsilon u^{-\epsilon-1} \exp \left[ - \left( \sum_{r,s} \Psi_{rs} \right) u^{-\epsilon} \right] du \\
&= \Psi_{ni} \int_{t=\infty}^{t=0} \exp \left[ - \left( \sum_{r,s} \Psi_{rs} \right) t \right] (-dt) \\
&= \Psi_{ni} \int_0^\infty \exp \left[ - \left( \sum_{r,s} \Psi_{rs} \right) t \right] dt && \text{integral property} \\
&= \frac{\Psi_{ni}}{(-\sum_{r,s} \Psi_{rs})} \int_0^\infty \left( -\sum_{r,s} \Psi_{rs} \right) \left[ - \left( \sum_{r,s} \Psi_{rs} \right) t \right] dt && \text{to make the inside of the} \\
&&& \text{integral equal } \frac{d}{dx}[e^{cx}] \\
&= \frac{\Psi_{ni}}{\sum_{r,s} \Psi_{rs}} \left[ \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \exp \left( - \left( \sum_{r,s} \Psi_{rs} \right) t \right) - \exp(0) \right] && \text{by the fundamental} \\
&&& \text{theorem of calculus} \\
&= \frac{\Psi_{ni}}{-(\sum_{r,s} \Psi_{rs})} [0 - 1] \\
&= \frac{\Psi_{ni}}{\sum_{r,s} \Psi_{rs}}
\end{aligned}$$

which is what we wanted.

## 4.11 Derivation of $\bar{U}$ Expression

This is a derivation of (19).

We are going to rely on the following properties of the Fréchet distribution:

### Fréchet Distribution Max Stability Property

If<sup>a</sup>  $b$

$$X_i \sim \text{Fréchet}(B_i, \epsilon)$$

and

$$Y = \max\{X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n\}$$

Then

$$Y \sim \text{Fréchet} \left( \sum_{i=1}^n B_i, \epsilon \right)$$

---

<sup>a</sup>Note that this is under the parameterization where  $X \sim \text{Fréchet}(B, \epsilon)$  corresponds to  $F_X(x) = \exp[-Bx^{-\epsilon}]$ . Sometimes, you will see people parameterize the Fréchet distribution as  $X \sim \text{Fréchet}(B, \epsilon)$  corresponds to  $F_X(x) = \exp\left[-\left(\frac{x}{B}\right)^{-\epsilon}\right]$ .

<sup>b</sup>Find a citation for this.

### Fréchet Distribution Property

If<sup>a</sup>  $X \sim \text{Fréchet}(B, \epsilon)$  and  $\epsilon > 1$ , then

$$\mathbb{E}[X] = B^{\frac{1}{\epsilon}} \Gamma\left(1 - \frac{1}{\epsilon}\right)$$

---

<sup>a</sup>Note that this is under the parameterization where  $X \sim \text{Fréchet}(B, \epsilon)$  corresponds to  $F_X(x) = \exp[-Bx^{-\epsilon}]$ . Sometimes, you will see people parameterize the Fréchet distribution as  $X \sim \text{Fréchet}(B, \epsilon)$  corresponds to  $F_X(x) = \exp\left[-\left(\frac{x}{B}\right)^{-\epsilon}\right]$ .

Recall from (33) that:

$$U_{ni\omega} \sim \text{Fréchet}(\Psi_{ni}, \epsilon)$$

If workers are choosing the location that maximizes utility, then their selected utility follows:

$$\max_{n,i} U_{ni\omega} \sim \text{Fréchet}\left(\sum_{n,i} \Psi_{ni}, \epsilon\right)$$

by the D.2 property.

From which, as long as  $\epsilon > 1$ , we get

$$\mathbb{E}[\max_{n,i} U_{ni\omega}] = \left(\sum_{n,i} \Psi_{ni}\right)^{\frac{1}{\epsilon}} \Gamma\left(1 - \frac{1}{\epsilon}\right)$$

by the D.3 property.

Additionally, it must be that

$$U_{ni\omega} = \mathbb{E}[\max_{n,i} U_{ni\omega}]$$

since if any home-work pair gave strictly higher utility, workers would move to that pair until it's utility was no longer strictly higher.

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}
\bar{U} &= U_{ni\omega} \\
&= \left( \sum_{r,s} \Psi_{rs} \right)^{\frac{1}{\epsilon}} \Gamma \left( 1 - \frac{1}{\epsilon} \right) \\
&= \Gamma \left( \frac{\epsilon - 1}{\epsilon} \right) \left[ \sum_{r \in N} \sum_{s \in N} B_{rs} (\kappa_{rs} P_r^\alpha Q_r^{1-\alpha})^{-\epsilon} w_s^\epsilon \right]^{\frac{1}{\epsilon}} \quad \text{by definition of } \Psi_{rs}
\end{aligned}$$

which is the desired expression.

### Questions

I'm not 100% sure if my argument here is correct, particularly the part trying to justify

$$U_{ni\omega} = \mathbb{E} \left[ \max_{n,i} U_{ni\omega} \right]$$