

# College admissions markets with combinatorial preferences, constrained applications, and uncertainty

Max Kapur

February 19, 2022

# Contents

|          |                                                                  |           |
|----------|------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|
| <b>1</b> | <b>Introduction</b>                                              | <b>3</b>  |
| <b>2</b> | <b>Equilibrium model</b>                                         | <b>3</b>  |
| <b>3</b> | <b>The optimal college application strategy</b>                  | <b>4</b>  |
| 3.1      | Problem formulation . . . . .                                    | 5         |
| 3.2      | Naïve solution . . . . .                                         | 7         |
| 3.3      | Solution . . . . .                                               | 7         |
| 3.4      | Additional theoretical results . . . . .                         | 10        |
| <b>4</b> | <b>Two-school model</b>                                          | <b>11</b> |
| 4.1      | Market participants . . . . .                                    | 12        |
| 4.2      | The competitive admissions process . . . . .                     | 12        |
| 4.3      | Student preferences . . . . .                                    | 13        |
| 4.4      | Notion of equilibrium . . . . .                                  | 13        |
| 4.5      | Size of equilibrium . . . . .                                    | 14        |
| 4.6      | Measures of efficiency . . . . .                                 | 15        |
| 4.6.1    | Fairness . . . . .                                               | 15        |
| 4.6.2    | School utility . . . . .                                         | 16        |
| 4.6.3    | Student welfare . . . . .                                        | 16        |
| 4.6.4    | Summary . . . . .                                                | 16        |
| <b>5</b> | <b>Computational results</b>                                     | <b>17</b> |
| 5.1      | Additive school utility with homogeneous risk aversion . . . . . | 17        |
| 5.1.1    | Existence of sorted equilibrium . . . . .                        | 17        |
| 5.1.2    | Bounds on the efficiency measures . . . . .                      | 17        |
| 5.1.3    | Sorted equilibrium algorithm . . . . .                           | 17        |
| 5.1.4    | Computational experiments . . . . .                              | 17        |
| 5.2      | Combinatorial admissions with uncertainty from QP . . . . .      | 17        |
| 5.2.1    | Model . . . . .                                                  | 18        |
| 5.2.2    | Equilibrium computation . . . . .                                | 19        |
| 5.2.3    | Computational experiments . . . . .                              | 20        |
| <b>6</b> | <b>References</b>                                                | <b>22</b> |

# 1 Introduction

## 2 Equilibrium model

This study considers the efficiency of a college admissions market in which the following three features coincide:

1. Colleges have *combinatorial* preferences over the composition of their entering class.
2. There is *uncertainty* in colleges' preferences; that is, students have only probabilistic information about their admissions prospects at the time of application.
3. Students are *constrained* in the number of schools to which they can apply.

The model contains finite sets  $\mathcal{S} = \{1 \dots n\}$  of students and  $\mathcal{C} = \{1 \dots m\}$  of colleges. The name of student  $i$  is  $s_i$ , and the name of college  $j$  is  $c_j$ .

Feature 1 says that each school has a preference order  $\succsim_j$  over the set of admitted-student cohorts. Note that  $\succsim_j$  orders sets of *admitted* students, with the understanding that only a subset of admits will actually enroll at the college. The college-specific optimization problem that produces  $\succsim_j$  is considered exogenous to our model. This assumption is reasonable because in this model, students' preferences are deterministic.

Feature 2 arises in real admissions markets because there is asymmetry in the information that students have about themselves and the information that colleges collect about students in the application process. For example, students may have a rough idea of the quality of their personal essay, but the college's evaluation of the same will depend on the biases and mood of the reader. We model this asymmetry by regarding each  $\succsim_j$  as a random variable whose space is  $2^{\mathcal{S}!}$ . Specific realizations of  $\succsim_j$  are denoted  $\tilde{\succsim}_j$ . Notice that this definition alone does not impose any constraint on whether it is students who possess complete information about their qualifications and colleges who add measurement noise, or vice-versa. However, the following assumption (which greatly simplifies the subsequent analysis of student utility) implies that the noise is added by the colleges:

**Assumption 1.** For two colleges  $c_j$  and  $c_{j'}$ ,  $\succsim_j$  is statistically independent of  $\succsim_{j'}$ .

Now we can specify the admissions procedure. First, students submit applications to a subset of colleges. Let  $\mathcal{X}_i$  denote the set of schools to which  $s_i$  applies. Next, each school draws a realization of its preference order  $\tilde{\succsim}_j$  and applies it to the set of applicants to determine which students to admit. Thus, when student  $i$  applies to  $c_j$ , her admissions outcome is determined entirely by two variables: first, the set of applicants with whom she must compete; and second, the realization  $\tilde{\succsim}_j$  of  $c_j$ 's preference order. In our model, the distribution of  $\tilde{\succsim}$  is exogenized. Therefore, student  $i$ 's *admissions probability* can be expressed as a function of her peers' application decisions.

**Assumption 2** (Existence of  $f(\cdot)$ ). Let  $\mathcal{X}_{\setminus i}$  denote the application decisions of students other than  $s_i$ . Then

$$f_{ij}(\mathcal{X}_{\setminus i}) = \Pr \left[ \begin{array}{l} s_i \text{ admitted to } c_j \mid \\ s_i \text{ applies to } c_j \text{ and others' application decisions are } \mathcal{X}_{\setminus i} \end{array} \right] \in [0, 1] \quad (1)$$

Going forward, we interact with the distributions of the random variables  $\succsim_j$  primarily via the function  $f(\cdot)$ . However, it is worth bearing in mind that  $f_{\cdot j}$  is a low-dimension projection of  $c_j$ 's true preference distribution. For example, suppose that  $n = 4$ ,  $q = 2$ , and when all four students apply to  $c_j$ ,  $f_{\cdot j} = (\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2})$ . This could mean that  $c_j$  prefers all admitted-student cohorts with equal probability, or it could mean that  $c_j$ 's preferred cohort is  $\{s_1, s_2\}$  with probability  $1/2$  and  $\{s_3, s_4\}$  with probability  $1/2$ .

We model feature 3 by allowing each student to apply to only  $h$  colleges. Let  $t_{ij}$  denote the utility that  $s_i$  receives from attending  $c_j$ . Assume that students receive zero utility if they do not attend college. Then we regard the expected utility associated with the application portfolio  $\mathcal{X}_i$  as the value it provides the student.

**Definition 1** (Portfolio valuation function).

$$v_i(\mathcal{X}_i) = \mathbb{E} \left[ \max_{j \in \mathcal{X}_i} \{t_{ij} \mid s_i \text{ admitted to } c_j\} \right] \quad (2)$$

The optimal application portfolio for  $s_i$  is a set of  $h$  schools that maximizes  $v_i(\mathcal{X}_i)$ . A polynomial-time algorithm for this combinatorial optimization problem is provided in §3.

If there are multiple optimal portfolios, then  $s_i$  may elect to choose randomly among them. In fact,  $s_i$  may find it strategically advantageous to do so. Thus, in the broadest conception,  $s_i$ 's decision variable is a probability vector  $x_i$  over the  $\binom{m}{h}$  possible portfolios. We will refer to  $x_i$  as  $s_i$ 's *application probability vector*, and regard each student's expected portfolio valuation as her utility function.

**Definition 2** (Student utility function). The function

$$u_i(x_i) = \sum_{l=1}^{\binom{m}{h}} v_i(\mathcal{X}_l) x_{il} \quad (3)$$

is called student  $s_i$ 's *utility function*, where  $l$  is an index of the possible  $h$ -school application portfolios and  $x_{il}$  is the probability that  $s_i$  applies to the schools in  $\mathcal{X}_l$ ,

Now we are ready to define the market equilibrium.

**Definition 3** (Nash equilibrium). The matrix of application probability vectors  $x$ , where  $x_{il}$  represents the probability that  $s_i$  applies to the  $h$ -school subset indicated by  $l$ , is said to be a (mixed-strategy) *Nash equilibrium* if

$$x_i \in \arg \max_{x_i} \left\{ u_i(x_i) : x_{il} \in [0, 1], \sum_{l=1}^{\binom{m}{h}} x_{il} = 1 \right\}, \quad \forall i \in \mathcal{S} \quad (4)$$

If, furthermore,  $x_{il} \in \{0, 1\}$  for all  $i$  and  $l$ , then  $x$  is called a *pure-strategy* (Nash) equilibrium.

### 3 The optimal college application strategy

In this section, we consider the optimal college application strategy for a single student. As Chao (2014) remarked, this represents a somewhat subtle portfolio optimization problem. The traditional Markowitz model trades off the expected value across all assets with a risk term,

obtaining a concave maximization problem with linear constraints. But college applicants maximize the observed value of their *best* asset: If a student is admitted to her  $j$ th choice, then she is indifferent to whether or not she gets into her  $(j + 1)$ th choice. As a result, the valuation function that students maximize is *convex* in the expected utility associated with individual applications. Risk management is implicit in the college application problem because, in a typical admissions market, college preferability is negatively correlated with competitiveness. Thus, students must negotiate a tradeoff between highly attractive, selective “reach schools” and less preferable “safety schools” where admission is a safer bet. Finally, the combinatorial nature of the college application problem makes it difficult to solve using the gradient-based techniques used in continuous portfolio optimization.

Chao estimated her model (which considers application as a *cost* rather than a constraint) by clustering the schools so that  $m = 8$ , a scale at which enumeration is possible. However, subject to certain assumptions on the quality of the data available to students in their decision-making process, an optimal application portfolio for a single student can be computed in time polynomial in  $h$  and  $m$ , as we show presently.

As this section considers a single student’s optimization problem, we drop subscripts where appropriate.

### 3.1 Problem formulation

Consider a college admissions market with  $m$  schools,  $\mathcal{C} = \{1 \dots m\}$ . The  $j$ th school is named  $c_j$ . By government regulation, students are allowed to apply to no more than  $h$  schools. (In the Korean case,  $m = 202$  and  $h = 3$ .) We consider the optimal application strategy for a single student, whom we will call Alma.

For  $j = 1 \dots m$ , let  $t_j > 0$  denote the utility that Alma receives from attending  $c_j$ , and let  $f_j$  denote the probability that she is admitted if she applies. Let the random variable  $Z_j$  equal one if Alma gets into  $c_j$  and zero otherwise. We assume that Alma’s admissions outcome at each school is independent of her outcome at the other schools.<sup>1</sup> Thus  $Z$  is a vector of independent Bernoulli variables with probabilities given by  $f$ . Let  $c_0$  denote Alma’s outcome if she does not get into any college, with utility  $t_0$  and  $f_0 = 1$ . Sort the schools so that  $t_{j-1} \leq t_j$  for  $j = 1 \dots m$ .

Let  $\mathcal{X}$  denote the set of schools to which Alma applies, called her *application portfolio*, and let  $x$  denote the same encoded as a binary vector, where  $x_j = \mathbf{1}[j \in \mathcal{X}]$  for  $j = 1 \dots m$ . The expected utility Alma receives from  $\mathcal{X}$  is called the portfolio’s *valuation*.

**Definition 4** (Portfolio valuation function).  $v(\mathcal{X}) = \mathbb{E}[\max\{t_j Z_j : j \in \mathcal{X}\}]$ .

Let  $p_j(\mathcal{X})$  denote the probability that Alma attends  $c_j$ . Alma attends  $c_j$  if and only if she *applies* to  $c_j$ , is *admitted* to  $c_j$ , and is *rejected* from any school she prefers to  $c_j$ ; that is, any

<sup>1</sup>This assumption is appropriate when  $f$  gives the admissions probabilities *specifically* for Alma. Recall that in the equilibrium model, the entries of  $f = f_i(\mathcal{X}_i)$  depend on Alma’s index  $i$  and the application decisions of students other than Alma. Once these factors are accounted for, the independence of the  $Z_j$  is a direct consequence of Assumption 1.

school with higher index. Hence, for  $j = 0 \dots m$ ,

$$p_j(\mathcal{X}) = \begin{cases} f_j \prod_{\substack{j' \in \mathcal{X}: \\ j' > j}} (1 - f_{j'}), & j \in \{0\} \cup \mathcal{X} \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (5)$$

$$\iff p_j(x) = x_j f_j \prod_{j'=j+1}^m (1 - f_{j'} x_{j'}) \quad (6)$$

with the understanding that  $x_0 = 1$  and the empty product equals one. The following proposition follows immediately.

**Proposition 1** (Closed form of portfolio valuation function).

$$v(\mathcal{X}) = \sum_{j \in \{0\} \cup \mathcal{X}} t_j f_j \prod_{\substack{j' \in \mathcal{X}: \\ j' > j}} (1 - f_{j'}), \quad \text{or equivalently,} \quad (7)$$

$$v(x) = t_0 \prod_{j=1}^m (1 - f_j) + \sum_{j=1}^m x_j t_j f_j \prod_{j'=j+1}^m (1 - f_{j'} x_{j'}) \quad (8)$$

Next, we show that without loss of generality, we may assume that  $t_0 = 0$  (or any constant).

**Theorem 1.** *Let  $\bar{t}_j = t_j - \gamma$  for  $j = 0 \dots m$ . Then  $v(\mathcal{X}; \bar{t}_j) = v(\mathcal{X}; t_j) - \gamma$  regardless of  $\mathcal{X}$ .*

*Proof.* By definition,  $\sum_{j=0}^m p_j(\mathcal{X}) = \sum_{j \in \{0\} \cup \mathcal{X}} p_j(\mathcal{X}) = 1$ . Letting  $\bar{t}_j = t_j - t_0$  for  $j = 0 \dots m$ , we obtain  $\bar{t}_0 = 0$  and

$$v(\mathcal{X}; \bar{t}_j) = \sum_{j \in \{0\} \cup \mathcal{X}} \bar{t}_j p_j(\mathcal{X}) \quad (9)$$

$$= \sum_{j \in \{0\} \cup \mathcal{X}} (t_j - \gamma) p_j(\mathcal{X}) \quad (10)$$

$$= \sum_{j \in \{0\} \cup \mathcal{X}} t_j p_j(\mathcal{X}) - \gamma \quad (11)$$

$$= v(\mathcal{X}; t_j) - \gamma \quad (12)$$

which completes the proof.  $\square$

Let us express the optimal college application problem as an INLP.

**Definition 5** (Alma's problem). Alma's optimal college application portfolio is given by the solution to the following integer nonlinear program:

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{maximize} && v(x) = \sum_{j=1}^m x_j t_j f_j \prod_{j'=j+1}^m (1 - f_{j'} x_{j'}) \\ & \text{subject to} && \sum_{j=1}^m x_j \leq h \\ & && x_j \in \{0, 1\}, \quad j = 1 \dots m \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

### 3.2 Naïve solution

Notice that for a given school  $c_j$ , the expected utility associated with applying to  $c_j$  is simply  $E[t_j Z_j] = t_j f_j$ . It is therefore tempting to adopt the following greedy strategy, which turns out to be inoptimal.

**Definition 6** (Naïve algorithm for Alma's problem). Apply to the  $h$  schools having the highest expected utility  $t_j f_j$ .

The basic error of this algorithm is that it maximizes  $E[\sum t_j Z_j]$  instead of  $E[\max\{t_j Z_j\}]$ . The latter is what Alma is truly concerned with, since in the end she can attend only one school.

**Theorem 2.** *The greedy algorithm can produce a suboptimal solution.*

*Proof.* Suppose  $m = 3$ ,  $q = 2$ , and

$$\begin{aligned} t &= (70, 80, 90) \\ f &= (0.4, 0.4, 0.3) \\ \implies t * f &= (28, 32, 27) \end{aligned}$$

The greedy algorithm picks  $\tilde{x} = (1, 1, 0)$  with

$$v(\tilde{x}) = 70(0.4)(1 - 0.4) + 80(0.4) = 48.8$$

But  $x = (0, 1, 1)$  with

$$v(x) = 80(0.4)(1 - 0.3) + 90(0.3) = 49.4$$

is the optimal solution. □

Hope is not lost. We can still find the optimal solution in time polynomial in  $h$  and  $m$ , as we will now show.

### 3.3 Solution

It turns out that the solution to Alma's problem possesses a special structure: An optimal portfolio of size  $h + 1$  includes an optimal portfolio of size  $h$  as a subset.

**Theorem 3** (Nestedness of optimal application portfolios). *Let  $\mathcal{X}_h$  denote Alma's optimal application portfolio when the application limit is  $h$ . If each  $\mathcal{X}_h$  is unique, then*

$$\mathcal{X}_1 \subset \mathcal{X}_2 \subset \cdots \subset \mathcal{X}_m \tag{14}$$

*If the optimal portfolios are not unique, then there is a sequence of optimal portfolios satisfying the above.*

*Proof.* By induction on  $h$ . Applying Theorem 1, we assume that  $t_0 = 0$ .

(Base case.) First, we will show that  $\mathcal{X}_1 \subset \mathcal{X}_2$ . To get a contradiction, suppose that the optima are  $\mathcal{X}_1 = \{j\}$  and  $\mathcal{X}_2 = \{k, l\}$ , where we may assume that  $t_k \leq t_l$ . Optimality requires that

$$v(\mathcal{X}_1) = f_j t_j > v(\{k\}) = f_k t_k \quad (15)$$

and

$$v(\mathcal{X}_2) = f_k(1 - f_l)t_k + f_l t_l > v(\{j, l\}) \quad (16)$$

$$= f_j(1 - f_l)t_j + (1 - f_j)f_l t_l + f_j f_l \max\{t_j, t_l\} \quad (17)$$

$$\geq f_j(1 - f_l)t_j + (1 - f_j)f_l t_l + f_j f_l t_l \quad (18)$$

$$= f_j(1 - f_l)t_j + f_l t_l \quad (19)$$

$$> f_k(1 - f_l)t_k + f_l t_l = v(\mathcal{X}_2) \quad (20)$$

which is a contradiction.

(Inductive step.) Assume that  $\mathcal{X}_1 \subset \dots \subset \mathcal{X}_h$ , and we will show  $\mathcal{X}_h \subset \mathcal{X}_{h+1}$ . Let  $k = \arg \max\{t_k : k \in \mathcal{X}_{h+1}\}$  and write  $\mathcal{X}_{h+1} = \mathcal{Y}_h \cup \{k\}$ .

Suppose  $k \notin \mathcal{X}_h$ . To get a contradiction, assume that  $v(\mathcal{Y}_h) < v(\mathcal{X}_h)$ . Then

$$v(\mathcal{X}_{h+1}) = v(\mathcal{Y}_h \cup \{k\}) \quad (21)$$

$$= (1 - f_k)v(\mathcal{Y}_h) + f_k t_k \quad (22)$$

$$< (1 - f_k)v(\mathcal{X}_h) + f_k \mathbb{E}[\max\{t_k, \max\{t_j Z_j : j \in \mathcal{X}_h\}\}] \quad (23)$$

$$= v(\mathcal{X}_h \cup \{k\}) \quad (24)$$

contradicts the optimality of  $\mathcal{X}_{h+1}$ .

Now suppose that  $k \in \mathcal{X}_h$ . We can write  $\mathcal{X}_h = \mathcal{Y}_{h-1} \cup \{k\}$ , where  $\mathcal{Y}_{h-1}$  is some portfolio of size  $h - 1$ . It suffices to show that  $\mathcal{Y}_{h-1} \subset \mathcal{Y}_h$ . By definition,  $\mathcal{Y}_{h-1}$  (respectively,  $\mathcal{Y}_h$ ) maximizes the function  $v(\mathcal{Y} \cup \{k\})$  over portfolios of size  $h - 1$  (respectively,  $h$ ) that do not include  $k$ . That is,  $\mathcal{Y}_{h-1}$  and  $\mathcal{Y}_h$  must be the optimal *complements* to the singleton portfolio  $\{k\}$ .

We will use the function  $w(\mathcal{Y})$  to grade portfolios  $\mathcal{Y} \subseteq \mathcal{C} \setminus \{k\}$  according to how well they complement  $\{k\}$ . To construct  $w(\mathcal{Y})$ , let  $\tilde{t}_j$  denote the expected utility Alma receives from school  $c_j$  given that she has been admitted to  $c_j$  and applied to  $c_k$ . For  $j < k$ , including  $j = 0$ , this is  $\tilde{t}_j = t_j(1 - f_k) + t_k f_k$ ; for  $j > k$ , this is  $\tilde{t}_j = t_j$ . This means that

$$v(\mathcal{Y} \cup \{k\}) = \sum_{j \in \{0\} \cup \mathcal{Y}} \tilde{t}_j p_j(\mathcal{Y}) \quad (25)$$

The transformation to  $\tilde{t}$  does not change the order of the  $t_j$ -values. Therefore, the expression on the right is itself a portfolio valuation function. In the corresponding market,  $t$  is replaced by  $\tilde{t}$  and  $\mathcal{C}$  is replaced by  $\mathcal{C} \setminus \{k\}$ . Now, we obtain  $w(\mathcal{Y})$  through one more transformation: Define  $\bar{t}_j = \tilde{t}_j - \tilde{t}_0$  so that  $\bar{t}_0 = 0$  and let

$$w(\mathcal{Y}) = \sum_{j \in \{0\} \cup \mathcal{Y}} \bar{t}_j p_j(\mathcal{Y}) = \sum_{j \in \{0\} \cup \mathcal{Y}} \tilde{t}_j p_j(\mathcal{Y}) - \tilde{t}_0 = v(\mathcal{Y} \cup \{k\}) - \tilde{t}_0 \quad (26)$$

where the second equality follows from Theorem 1. This identity says that the optimal comple-



ments to  $\{k\}$ , given by  $\mathcal{Y}_{h-1}$  and  $\mathcal{Y}_h$ , are themselves optimal portfolios of size  $h - 1$  and  $h$  for the market whose objective function is  $w(\mathcal{Y})$ . Since  $\bar{t}_0 = 0$  in the latter market, the inductive hypothesis implies that  $\mathcal{Y}_{h-1} \subset \mathcal{Y}_h$ , which completes the proof.<sup>2</sup>  $\square$

Applying the result above yields an efficient algorithm for the optimal portfolio: Start with the empty set and add schools one at a time, maximizing  $v(\mathcal{X} \cup \{k\})$  at each addition. Sorting  $t$  is  $O(m \log m)$ . At each of the  $h$  iterations, there are  $O(m)$  candidates for  $k$ , and computing  $v(\mathcal{X} \cup \{k\})$  is  $O(h)$  using (7); therefore, the time complexity of this algorithm is  $O(h^2m + m \log m)$ .

We reduce the computation time to  $O(hm + m \log m)$  by taking advantage of the transformation from the inductive step in the proof of Theorem 3. Once school  $k$  is added to  $\mathcal{X}$ , we remove it from the set  $\mathcal{C} \setminus \mathcal{X}$  of candidates, and update the  $t_j$ -values of the remaining schools according to the following transformation:

$$\bar{t}_j = \begin{cases} t_j(1 - f_k), & j < k \\ t_j - t_k f_k, & j > k \end{cases} \quad (27)$$

It is easy to verify that this is the composition of the two transformations (from  $t$  to  $\tilde{t}$ , and from  $\tilde{t}$  to  $\bar{t}$ ) given in the proof. Now, the *next* school added must be the optimal singleton portfolio in the modified market. But the optimal singleton portfolio consists simply of the school with the highest value of  $f_j \bar{t}_j$ . Therefore, by storing the set of candidate schools in a heap ordered by  $f_j \bar{t}_j$  and updating these values at each iteration, we eliminate the need to compute  $v(\mathcal{X})$  entirely.

The algorithm below requires a data structure `MaxFibHeap()`, a Fibonacci heap whose entries are tuples  $D = (D.j, D.f, D.t)$  of information about each college. The heap is ordered according to the criterion  $D \geq E \iff D.f \cdot D.t \geq E.f \cdot E.t$ . The algorithm outputs a list  $X$  of the  $h$  schools to which Alma should apply. The schools appear in the order of entry such that when the algorithm is run with  $h = m$ , the optimal portfolio of size  $h$  is given by  $\mathcal{X}_h = \{X[1], \dots, X[h]\}$ .

---

<sup>2</sup>We thank Yim Seho for discovering this critical transformation.

The entries of the list  $V$  give the valuation thereof.

---

**Algorithm 1:** Optimal portfolio algorithm for Alma's problem.

---

**Data:** Utility values  $t \in [0, \infty)^m$ , admissions probabilities  $f \in [0, 1]^m$ , application limit  $h \leq m$ .  
Index schools in ascending order by  $t$ ;  
 $X, V \leftarrow$  empty lists;  
 $H \leftarrow \text{MaxFibHeap}()$ , an empty heap of named tuples  $C$  ordered by  $C.f \cdot C.t$ ;  
**for**  $j = 1 \dots m$  **do**  $\text{push!}(H, (j, f_j, t_j))$ ;  
**for**  $i = 1 \dots h$  **do**  
     $D \leftarrow \text{pop!}(H)$ ;  
     $\text{append!}(X, D.j)$ ;  
    **if**  $i = 1$  **then**  $\text{append!}(V, D.f \cdot D.t)$  **else**  $\text{append!}(V, V[i - 1] + D.f \cdot D.t)$ ;  
    **for**  $E \in H$  **do**  
        **if**  $E.j < D.j$  **then**  $E.t \leftarrow E.t \cdot (1 - D.f)$  **else**  $E.t \leftarrow E.t - D.f \cdot D.t$ ;  
    **end**  
**end**  
**return**  $X, V$

---

**Theorem 4** (Validity of Algorithm 1). *Algorithm 1 produces an optimal application portfolio in  $O(hm + m \log m)$  time.*

*Proof.* Optimality follows from the proof of Theorem 3. The initialization steps are equivalent to sorting the schools by  $t_j$  and  $f_j t_j$ , and therefore their computation time is  $O(m \log m)$ . At each of the  $h$  iterations of the main loop, extracting the top school costs  $O(\log m)$ . There are  $O(m)$  schools whose  $t_j$ -values are updated, and these updates cost  $O(1)$  (amortized) on a Fibonacci heap (Fredman and Tarjan 1987). Therefore, the overall time complexity is  $O(hm + m \log m)$ .  $\square$

In fact, the time complexity remains  $O(hm + m \log m)$  if a list is used instead of a heap. Rather than a list or Fibonacci heap, we found a simple binary heap to be the most effective data structure in our numerical experiments due to its low overhead cost. Although using a binary heap nominally increases the cost of updating to the  $t_j$ -values from  $O(1)$  to  $O(\log m)$ , typical problem instances do not achieve this upper bound because the order of the  $f_j t_j$ -values changes only slightly between iterations.

### 3.4 Additional theoretical results

The nestedness property implies that Alma's expected utility is a concave function of  $h$ .

**Theorem 5** (Optimal portfolio valuation concave in  $h$ ). *For  $h = 2 \dots (m - 1)$ ,*

$$v(\mathcal{X}_h) - v(\mathcal{X}_{h-1}) \geq v(\mathcal{X}_{h+1}) - v(\mathcal{X}_h) \quad (28)$$

*Proof.* We will prove the equivalent expression  $2v(\mathcal{X}_h) \geq v(\mathcal{X}_{h+1}) + v(\mathcal{X}_{h-1})$ . Applying Theorem 3, we write  $\mathcal{X}_h = \mathcal{X}_{h-1} \cup \{j\}$  and  $\mathcal{X}_{h+1} = \mathcal{X}_{h-1} \cup \{j, k\}$ . Define the random variables  $X_i$

as above. If  $t_k \leq t_j$ , then

$$2v(\mathcal{X}_h) = v(\mathcal{X}_{h-1} \cup \{j\}) + v(\mathcal{X}_{h-1} \cup \{j\}) \quad (29)$$

$$\geq v(\mathcal{X}_{h-1} \cup \{k\}) + v(\mathcal{X}_{h-1} \cup \{j\}) \quad (30)$$

$$= v(\mathcal{X}_{h-1} \cup \{k\}) + (1 - f_j)v(\mathcal{X}_{h-1}) + f_j E[\max\{t_j, X_{h-1}\}] \quad (31)$$

$$= v(\mathcal{X}_{h-1} \cup \{k\}) - f_j v(\mathcal{X}_{h-1}) + f_j E[\max\{t_j, X_{h-1}\}] + v(\mathcal{X}_{h-1}) \quad (32)$$

$$\geq v(\mathcal{X}_{h-1} \cup \{k\}) - f_j v(\mathcal{X}_{h-1} \cup \{k\}) + f_j E[\max\{t_j, X_{h-1}\}] + v(\mathcal{X}_{h-1}) \quad (33)$$

$$= (1 - f_j)v(\mathcal{X}_{h-1} \cup \{k\}) + f_j E[\max\{t_j, X_{h-1}\}] + v(\mathcal{X}_{h-1}) \quad (34)$$

$$= v(\mathcal{X}_{h-1} \cup \{j, k\}) + v(\mathcal{X}_{h-1}) \quad (35)$$

$$= v(\mathcal{X}_{h+1}) + v(\mathcal{X}_{h-1}) \quad (36)$$

The first inequality follows from the optimality of  $\mathcal{X}_h$ , while the second follows from the fact that adding  $k$  to  $\mathcal{X}_{h-1}$  can only increase its valuation.

If  $t_k \geq t_j$ , then the steps are analogous:

$$2v(\mathcal{X}_h) = v(\mathcal{X}_{h-1} \cup \{j\}) + v(\mathcal{X}_{h-1} \cup \{j\}) \quad (37)$$

$$\geq v(\mathcal{X}_{h-1} \cup \{k\}) + v(\mathcal{X}_{h-1} \cup \{j\}) \quad (38)$$

$$= (1 - f_k)v(\mathcal{X}_{h-1}) + f_k E[\max\{t_k, X_{h-1}\}] + v(\mathcal{X}_{h-1} \cup \{j\}) \quad (39)$$

$$= v(\mathcal{X}_{h-1}) - f_k v(\mathcal{X}_{h-1}) + f_k E[\max\{t_k, X_{h-1}\}] + v(\mathcal{X}_{h-1} \cup \{j\}) \quad (40)$$

$$\geq v(\mathcal{X}_{h-1}) - f_k v(\mathcal{X}_{h-1} \cup \{j\}) + f_k E[\max\{t_k, X_{h-1}\}] + v(\mathcal{X}_{h-1} \cup \{j\}) \quad (41)$$

$$= v(\mathcal{X}_{h-1}) + (1 - f_k)v(\mathcal{X}_{h-1} \cup \{j\}) + f_k E[\max\{t_k, X_{h-1}\}] \quad (42)$$

$$= v(\mathcal{X}_{h-1}) + v(\mathcal{X}_{h-1} \cup \{j, k\}) \quad (43)$$

$$= v(\mathcal{X}_{h-1}) + v(\mathcal{X}_{h+1}) \quad \square$$

To wrap up, we show that the nestedness property depends on the assumption of independent admissions by providing a simple counterexample.

**Theorem 6.** *If the entries of  $Z$  are dependent, then the optimal solution may violate the nestedness property of Theorem 3.*

*Proof.* Let  $t = (3, 3, 4)$ ,  $Z_1 \sim \text{Bernoulli}(0.5)$ ,  $Z_2 = 1 - Z_1$ , and  $Z_3 \sim \text{Bernoulli}(0.5)$ . Then it is easy to verify that the unique optimal portfolios are  $\mathcal{X}_1 = \{3\}$  and  $\mathcal{X}_2 = \{1, 2\}$ .  $\square$

## 4 Two-school model

The market described above is intractably complex. However, we argue that we can maintain its most important features while restricting our attention to a tractable, stylized market with  $m = 2$  and  $h = 1$ .

The coexistence of an application limit and uncertainty in college preferences requires students to strategize in selecting the set of schools to which they apply. We can think of the student's application decision of consisting of two parts: First, she must rank the colleges by preferability and identify her admissions probability at each. Second, she must allocate her limited applications across the set of schools in the market.

For a typical student, college preferability and admissions probability are negatively correlated. Thus, the second stage of the application decision boils down to trading off schools that are desirable but hard to get into (reach schools) with schools that are less desirable but easy to get into (safety schools). The optimal allocation between reach schools and safety schools depends on the individual student's tolerance for risk.

## 4.1 Market participants

To highlight the essential nature of the tradeoff between reach schools and safety schools, we consider a stylized admissions market with two schools,  $c_1$  and  $c_2$ .  $c_1$  is a competitive university, whereas  $c_2$  represents the safety school, which admits any applicant. Students are allowed to apply to only one school. Every student prefers attending  $c_1$  to  $c_2$ , and  $c_2$  to nonattendance, but students differ in the strength of these preferences as well as in their admissions probabilities at  $c_1$ , as detailed below.

Let  $\mathcal{S} = \{1 \dots n\}$  denote the set of *students*, and let the natural number  $q < n$  denote  $c_1$ 's *capacity*.  $c_1$  has an ordinal preference order over the set of possible entering classes comprised of  $q$  students. This preference order is a random variable  $\succsim$  whose space is  $\{\mathcal{T} \subseteq \mathcal{S} : |\mathcal{T}| = q\}$ !. Specific realizations of  $\succsim$  are denoted  $\succsim$ . The safety school,  $c_2$ , admits every applicant.

## 4.2 The competitive admissions process

Let  $x \in [0, 1]^n$  denote the *application probability vector*, where  $x_i$  is the probability that student  $i$  applies to  $c_1$  and  $1 - x_i$  is the probability that  $i$  applies to  $c_2$ . If  $x \in \{0, 1\}^n$ , then it is called a (deterministic) *application vector*.

If more than  $q$  students apply to  $c_1$ , then  $c_1$  draws a realization of its preference order  $\succsim$  and applies it to  $x$  to determine the entering class. If  $q$  or fewer students apply to  $c_1$ , all are admitted. Thus, when student  $i$  applies to  $c_1$ , her admissions outcome is determined entirely by two parameters: first, the set of applicants with whom she must compete; and second, the realization  $\succsim$  of  $c_1$ 's preference order. In our model, the distribution of  $\succsim$  is regarded as an exogenous variable. Therefore, student  $i$ 's *admissions probability* can be expressed as a function of her peers' application decisions.

**Assumption 3** (Existence of  $f(\cdot)$ ). Let  $x_{\setminus i}$  denote the application decisions of students other than  $i$ . Then

$$f_i(x_{\setminus i}) = \Pr \left[ \begin{array}{l} i \text{ admitted to } c_1 \mid \\ i \text{ applies to } c_1 \text{ and others' application probabilities are } x_{\setminus i} \end{array} \right] \in [0, 1] \quad (44)$$

We will use the vector  $f(x)$  to denote the concatenation of these probabilities, with the understanding that the  $i$ th entry of  $f(x)$  does not depend on  $x_i$ .

**Assumption 4** ( $c_1$  fills capacity).  $x \in \{0, 1\}^n$  and  $\sum_{j \neq i} x_j < q \implies f_i(x_{\setminus i}) = 1$ .

This assumption need not hold for mixed strategies: If each student applies with near-zero probability, say  $\epsilon$ , then there is an  $\epsilon^n$  chance that *every* student applies, and some rejections must occur.

It is convenient to define the random variable  $Y$  as the admissions vector that arises when every student applies to  $c_1$ ; that is,  $c_1$ 's "global optimum." A given realization  $\succsim$  of  $c_1$ 's preference order induces a realization  $y$  of  $Y$ .

**Definition 7** (Expected ideal entering class). Let

$$\mathcal{Y} = \arg \max_{\mathcal{T} \subseteq \mathcal{S}} \{\succsim: |\mathcal{T}| = q\} \quad (45)$$

denote the set of students  $c_1$  admits when all students apply, and let  $Y_i = \mathbf{1}[i \in \mathcal{Y}]$  denote the same encoded as a binary vector. Then the expectation of  $Y$  is denoted

$$\bar{y} = f(\mathbf{1}) \quad (46)$$

and called the *expected ideal entering class*.

Going forward, we will interact with  $\succsim$  primarily via the function  $f(\cdot)$  and the statistic  $\bar{y}$ . The following fact is helpful.

**Theorem 7.**  $x \in \{0, 1\}^n$  and  $\sum x_i \geq q \implies x \cdot f(x) = q$ .

*Proof.* When  $x$  is fixed, the quantity  $x_i f_i(x_{\setminus i})$  represents the probability that student  $i$  will attend  $c_1$ . Thus, summing over  $i$  yields the expected size of  $c_1$ 's entering class. By assumption, this is always  $q$ .  $\square$

As above, this result may not hold for mixed strategies.

**Corollary 1.**  $\sum \bar{y}_i = q$ .

### 4.3 Student preferences

Each student receives one unit of utility if she attends  $c_1$ ,  $t_i \in (0, 1)$  units of utility if she attends  $c_2$ , and zero units of utility if she is unable to enroll in college this season (that is, if she applies to  $c_1$  and is rejected). We regard student  $i$ 's expected utility

$$u_i(x) = x_i(f_i(x_{\setminus i})) + (1 - x_i)t_i \quad (47)$$

as her utility function.  $t_i$  is called student  $i$ 's *risk aversion parameter*, as explained below.

### 4.4 Notion of equilibrium

Each student seeks to maximize her utility. The market reaches equilibrium when no student, acting alone, can increase her expected payoff by changing her application strategy.

**Definition 8** (Nash equilibrium). The application probability vector  $x$ , where  $x_i \in [0, 1]$  represents the probability that student  $i$  applies to  $c_1$  instead of  $c_2$ , is said to be a (mixed-strategy) *Nash equilibrium* if

$$x_i \in \arg \max_{x_i} \{u_i(x) : x_i \in [0, 1]\}, \quad i = 1 \dots n \quad (48)$$

If, furthermore,  $x_i \in \{0, 1\}$  for all  $i$ , then  $x$  is called a *pure-strategy* (Nash) equilibrium.

Behavioral economics research tells us that humans often make decisions in terms of risk-mitigating heuristics rather than explicit payoff functions. The notion of equilibrium defined above admits an alternative interpretation in which  $t_i$  is a parameter that represents student  $i$ 's risk aversion. In particular, suppose that each student resolves to apply to  $c_1$  only if her probability of admission is at least  $t_i$ . Then we can define an equilibrium as an admissions vector in which students' stated risk preferences accord with their actual application decisions.

**Definition 9** (Risk equilibrium). The application vector  $x$  is said to be a *risk equilibrium* if and only if  $x_i \in \{0, 1\}$  and

$$x_i = 1 \iff f_i(x_{\setminus i}) \geq t_i, \quad i = 1 \dots n \quad (49)$$

Risk equilibria and Nash equilibria are related by the following theorem.

**Theorem 8** (Risk equilibria and Nash equilibria). Let  $\mathcal{X}_r$ ,  $\mathcal{X}_p$ , and  $\mathcal{X}_n$  denote the sets of risk, pure-strategy, and Nash equilibria for a given market. Then  $\mathcal{X}_r \subseteq \mathcal{X}_p \subseteq \mathcal{X}_n$ .

*Proof.* The result follows immediately from the fact that  $u_i(x)$  is linear in  $x_i$ .  $\square$

**Corollary 2.** If  $x$  is a Nash equilibrium and  $f_i(x_{\setminus i}) \neq t_i$  for all  $i$ , then  $x \in \{0, 1\}^n$ , and  $x$  is also a pure-strategy equilibrium and a risk equilibrium.

This study will concern itself primarily with risk equilibria. In a mixed-strategy equilibrium, there is a chance that zero students apply to  $c_1$ , which makes some of our efficiency measures undefined.

## 4.5 Size of equilibrium

**Definition 10** (Size of  $x$ ). The number of applicants  $k(x) = \sum x_i$  is referred to as the *size* of the application vector  $x$ .

We will write simply  $k$  when the value of  $x$  is clear from context.

**Theorem 9** (Bounds on equilibrium size). The size of any pure-strategy equilibrium  $x$  is bound by

$$q \leq k(x) \leq \frac{q}{\min(t_i)} \quad (50)$$

*Proof.* The lower bound is from Assumption 4. For the upper bound, fix  $x$  and notice that among the set of applicants, the *average* admissions probability is  $q/k$ . If this value is less than  $\min(t_i)$ , then there must be at least applicant whose admissions probability is below  $t_i$ ; thus  $x$  is not an equilibrium.  $\square$

Neither bound is necessary for mixed-strategy equilibria. Consider a market in which the  $\tilde{\omega}$  is distributed uniformly on its support; that is,  $c_1$  picks a random subset of applicants with uniform probability. For all  $i$ , let  $x_i = \chi \in (0, 1)$ ; then  $f_i(x_{\setminus i})$  is some common constant  $\varphi \in (0, 1)$ , and picking  $t_i = \phi$  makes  $x$  an equilibrium.  $\chi$ , and therefore  $k(x)$ , can be made arbitrarily small. To violate the upper bound,

## 4.6 Measures of efficiency

In our model, the level of utility experienced by the students is incommensurate with the utility experienced by the schools. Thus, there is no single index akin to market surplus that can capture the overall efficiency of the admissions process. Instead, we propose separate measures which serve as indices of fairness, school utility, and student welfare. We will first define these measures under the assumption that  $x$  is a binary vector, then discuss the extension to mixed strategies in §4.6.4.

### 4.6.1 Fairness

We consider two notions of fairness, both derived from the dot product  $x \cdot \bar{y}$ .

**Definition 11** (Stability index). The statistic

$$\bar{S}(x) = \frac{x \cdot \bar{y}}{k(x)} \quad (51)$$

is called the *stability index* of the application vector  $x$ .

For any equilibrium, since  $x \in [0, 1]^n$ ,  $\sum \bar{y}_i = q$ , and  $k \geq q$ , we have  $\bar{S}(x) \in [0, 1]$ .

We interpret the stability index as follows: The uncertain nature of the admissions process means that even in equilibrium, there are some market realizations in which the students who attend  $c_2$  are more qualified than those who attend  $c_1$ . The stability index captures the equilibrium's robustness to the envy that arises from these mismatches.

To see this, consider a realization  $\succsim$  of  $c_1$ 's preference order, and let  $y$  denote the associated realization of  $Y$ . Let  $\mathcal{B} = \{i : x_i = 0 \wedge y_i = 1\}$  denote the set of students who applied to  $c_2$  but appear in  $y$ . These students form a blocking coalition for the outcome induced by  $x$  and  $\succsim$ . That is, if the students in  $\mathcal{B}$  collectively decide to apply to  $c_1$  alongside the students already in  $x$ , they will surely be admitted.<sup>3</sup>

Let  $\mathcal{A}_+ = \{i : x_i = 1 \wedge y_i = 1\}$  and  $\mathcal{A}_- = \{i : x_i = 1 \wedge y_i = 0\}$ . When the coalition  $\mathcal{B}$  mobilizes, any student in  $\mathcal{A}_+$  receives a weakly better outcome: Either she goes from being rejected from  $c_1$  to being admitted, or she is admitted in both cases. On the other hand, any student in  $\mathcal{A}_-$  receives a weakly worse outcome. The quantity

$$S(x) = \frac{|\mathcal{A}_+|}{|\mathcal{A}_-| + |\mathcal{A}_+|} = \frac{x \cdot y}{k} \quad (52)$$

represents the proportion of applicants who are “safe” from disruption by  $\mathcal{B}$ , and  $\bar{S}(x)$  represents the expectation thereof.

The second measure of fairness is as follows.

**Definition 12** (Alignment index). The statistic

$$\bar{T}(x) = \frac{x \cdot \bar{y}}{q} \quad (53)$$

---

<sup>3</sup>Note that for the students in  $\mathcal{B}$ , coordination is not a significant challenge. Once the students in  $\mathcal{B}$  have agreed to mobilize, any single student who fails to comply does so at her own expense. One may nonetheless regard the expected number of students in  $\mathcal{B}$  as a meaningful efficiency property. This quantity is  $(\mathbf{1} - x) \cdot \bar{y} = q - x \cdot \bar{y}$ , which is perfectly inversely correlated with the alignment index  $\bar{T}(x)$  defined below.

is called the *alignment index* of the application vector  $x$ .

By Corollary 1 and the fact that  $x \in [0, 1]^n$ , we have  $\bar{T}(x) \in [0, 1]$ .

The alignment index captures the intuitive notion that “the best students go to the best school.” The dot product  $x \cdot \bar{y}$  represents, in expectation, the degree of overlap between  $c_1$ ’s set of applicants  $x$  and its ideal entering class  $\bar{y}$ . Since the entries of  $\bar{y}$  are nonnegative and  $x \in [0, 1]^n$ , this quantity is maximized when  $x = \mathbf{1}$ , yielding  $\mathbf{1} \cdot \bar{y} = q$ . Thus,  $\bar{T}(x)$  represents the extent to which  $c_1$  is able to approximate its ideal entering class using only the students in  $x$ .

The stability and alignment indices differ only slightly in form, but they capture distinct notions of fairness. As our computational results will show, the two measures are sometimes in tension.

#### 4.6.2 School utility

The discussion above implies that the alignment index is a heuristic indicator of  $c_1$ ’s utility. In the computational experiments, we will construct more precise indicators by using a utility function to induce the distribution of  $\succsim$ .

As for  $c_2$ , the assumption that  $c_2$  admits every applicant implies that  $c_2$ ’s utility is increasing in the number of students in its entering class, namely  $n - k$ .

#### 4.6.3 Student welfare

The following definition of student welfare is simply the sum of student utility after applying Theorem 7.

**Definition 13** (Aggregate student welfare). The sum of students’ utility functions

$$\bar{U}(x) = \sum_{i=1}^n u_i(x) = q + (\mathbf{1} - x) \cdot t \quad (54)$$

is called the *aggregate student welfare* of the application vector  $x$ .

If we choose to interpret  $t_i$  as a risk parameter rather than a utility valuation, then the measure above is inappropriate. An alternative measure of student disutility is the number of students who fail to enroll in either school, that is,  $k - q$ , which depends only on the size of the equilibrium. In a given market, if students have equal risk aversion  $t_i$ , then (54) depends only on the size of the equilibrium as well. Thus, both  $\bar{U}(x)$  and the size criterion order the market’s equilibria in the same way.

#### 4.6.4 Summary

Given a market and one of its equilibria  $x$ , we regard the stability index  $\bar{S}(x)$ , the alignment index  $\bar{T}(x)$ , the aggregate student welfare  $\bar{U}(x)$ , and the size of the equilibrium  $k$  as relevant economic indicators.

If  $x$  is a binary vector—that is, a pure-strategy equilibrium—then these are deterministic measures. On the other hand, if  $x$  is a vector of mixed strategies, then each student’s application



decision is the random Bernoulli variable  $X_i$  which equals 1 with probability  $x_i$ . We may assume that the entries of  $X_i$  are independent of one another and of  $\tilde{\succsim}$  (and therefore of  $Y$ ). It follows from the linearity of expectations that  $E[\bar{T}(X)] = \bar{T}(x)$ ,  $E[\bar{U}(X)] = \bar{U}(x)$ , and  $E[k(X)] = k(x)$ .  $\bar{S}(x)$  is the exception: When students play mixed strategies, there is a small chance that  $k(X) = 0$ , rendering the expectation of  $\bar{S}(X)$  undefined. One option is to redefine  $\bar{S}(x)$  to equal zero in the case that  $k < q$ , with the understanding that an application vector smaller than  $q$  is maximally vulnerable to the blocking coalition, then compute the expectation. Another is to simply report  $\bar{S}(x)$  according to the function's definition. To avoid imposing this interpretive choice, in the computational results that follow, we consider only pure strategies.

## 5 Computational results

Even in the two-school model, in which only  $c_1$  has a nontrivial preference order, the high dimension of  $\tilde{\succsim}$  and the associated probability space presents a challenging modeling problem. In this chapter, we explore two parameterizations of  $\tilde{\succsim}$  that are tractable enough to enable the computation of equilibria and the associated efficiency measures but also conformable to realistic recruitment goals such as aggregate student talent and diversity.

### 5.1 Additive school utility with homogeneous risk aversion

#### 5.1.1 Existence of sorted equilibrium

#### 5.1.2 Bounds on the efficiency measures

#### 5.1.3 Sorted equilibrium algorithm

#### 5.1.4 Computational experiments

### 5.2 Combinatorial admissions with uncertainty from QP

Previous research in college course enrollment has used a quadratic objective function to model complementarities in students' preferences over combinations of courses. In the course allocation problem, the decision variable is a set of deterministic course schedules, and it is possible to obtain an equilibrium course schedule with several desirable fairness properties by having students bid on courses using an artificial currency and computing course prices using a tâtonnement-like step rule (Othman et al. 2010; Budish 2011).

Our environment adds the new element of uncertainty, as well as being a sequential game.

In this section, we use a quadratic objective function with two terms to model combinatorial school preferences. We simulate the randomness in school preferences by solving the continuous relaxation of the quadratic program (QP) associated with  $c_1$ 's optimal entering class.

### 5.2.1 Model

Let  $z \in \{0, 1\}^n$  denote the vector of students who attend  $c_1$ . We suppose that  $c_1$ 's preference order is given by the concave objective function

$$w(z) = (1 - \gamma)a \cdot z - \gamma \|b - z\|_2^2 \quad (55)$$

where  $a, b \in \{c : \sum c_i = n, c \geq 0\}$  and  $\gamma \in [0, 1]$ .  $c_1$  then may determine its entering class by solving the following optimization problem.

$$\text{maximize } w(z) \quad \text{subject to } \sum z_i \leq q, \quad z \in \{0, 1\}^n \quad (56)$$

The first modification we make to this basic template is to model uncertainty in the preference order by allowing  $z$  to vary continuously zero and one. This yields the following convex QP:

$$\text{maximize } w(z) \quad \text{subject to } \sum z_i \leq q, \quad 0 \leq z \leq 1 \quad (57)$$

Then the expected ideal entering class is  $\bar{y} = z^*$ , where  $z^*$  is the solution to (57).

We interpret  $w(z)$  as follows. The first term,  $a \cdot z$ , is called the *substitution term*, as it treats students  $i$  and  $j$  as interchangeable in the ratio between the corresponding coefficients. For example, if  $\gamma = 0$  and  $c_1$  has a choice between two students  $s_i$  and  $s_j$  for whom  $w_i > w_j$ , it will always choose  $s_i$ . On the other hand, the quadratic term of  $w(z)$  is called the *complementarity term* and measures the Euclidean distance between  $z$  and the point  $b$ . The effect of this term is to pull the admitted student vector toward the interior of the positive orthant. Thus, as  $\gamma$  increases,  $c_1$  favors admitting  $s_i$  and  $s_j$  each to some extent in the continuous relaxation of the problem. Requiring the elements of  $b$  to sum to  $n$  ensures that the attracting point is on the outside of the constraint  $\sum z_i \leq q$  so that this equation always holds with equality at the optimum.

Now, we need to construct the admissions probability function  $f(x)$ . We begin by modifying (57) to read  $0 \leq z \leq x$ . If  $x$  is binary, then this constraint simply says that  $c_1$  can only admit students who apply. If  $s_i$  employs a mixed strategy, say  $x_i = 0.5$ , then this constraint says that  $c_1$  can only admit her “to the extent” of  $z = 0.5$ . Next, recall that  $f_i(x_{\setminus i})$  is a conditional probability, namely, the probability that  $s_i$  is admitted to  $c_1$  if she applies with certainty. Therefore, its entries are determined by solving the counterfactual QP in which  $x_i = 1$  and  $x_{\setminus i}$  is unchanged. With these observations, we are ready to define  $f(x)$  for the quadratic preference environment.

**Definition 14** (Admissions probability function from QP). Given an application vector  $x$ , the admissions probability function  $f(x)$  is defined as follows: For  $i = 1 \dots n$ ,  $f_i(x_i) = z^*(i)_i$ , where  $z^*(i)$  is the solution to the following QP.

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{maximize} && (1 - \gamma)a \cdot z - \gamma \|b - z\|_2^2 \\ &\text{subject to} && \sum z_i \leq q \\ &&& 0 \leq z_{i'} \leq x_{i'}, \quad i' \neq i \\ &&& 0 \leq z_i \leq 1 \end{aligned} \quad (58)$$

The expected ideal entering class is defined as  $\bar{y} = f(1)$ .

Nominally, computing  $f(x)$  requires solving  $n$  QPs. The computation time can be reduced by first solving

$$\text{maximize } w(z) \quad \text{subject to } \sum z_i \leq q, \quad 0 \leq z \leq x \quad (59)$$

and inspecting the dual variables  $\lambda$  associated the constraint  $z \leq x$ . If  $\lambda_i = 0$ , then relaxing this constraint yields no improvement in the optimal value of  $w(z)$ , and the optimal  $z$ -vectors for (58) and (59) are identical.

### 5.2.2 Equilibrium computation

To compute mixed-strategy equilibria in the quadratic preference environment, we start with an arbitrary strategy vector  $x$  and adjust it according to a decreasing step rule reminiscent of projected gradient descent.

Let  $\text{Clamp}(x)$  denote the projection of the vector  $x$  to the 1-hypercube:

$$\text{Clamp}(x)_i = \max\{0, \min\{1, x_i\}\}, \quad (60)$$

Observe that a mixed strategy can be optimal for  $s_i$  only if  $f_i = t_i$ . If  $f_i - t_i \geq 0$ , then  $s_i$  can improve her utility by choosing  $x_i = \frac{1}{0}$ . Therefore, it is not difficult to see that  $x$  is an equilibrium if and only if

$$x = \text{Clamp}[x + f(x) - t] \quad (61)$$

Thus, we use the following intuitive notion of approximate equilibrium as our convergence criterion.

**Definition 15** ( $\varepsilon$ -approximate equilibrium). For a given market,  $x$  is called an  $\varepsilon$ -approximate equilibrium if and only if

$$\|x - \text{Clamp}[x + f(x) - t]\|_2 \leq \epsilon$$

We search for equilibria by generating an arbitrary mixed-strategy vector  $x$  and generate three kinds of neighbors, in a manner similar to that employed by Othman et al. (2010). updating in the direction of  $f(x) - t$ , as described in the following algorithm. The choice of step size ensures that, given infinite iterations, the algorithm can explore the entirety of the feasible space while refraining from cycling. Rather than iterating continuously from a single initial point, in our experiments, it proved more effective to terminate the search and choose a new seed point

when the algorithm fails to converge within several iterations.

---

**Algorithm 2:** Equilibrium algorithm for quadratic school preferences.

---

**Data:** Market parameters  $t \in [0, 1]^n$ ,  $a, b \in [0, \infty)^n$ ,  $q \leq n$ ; step parameters

$\alpha > 0, \beta \in (0, 1]$ ; tolerance  $\epsilon > 0$ .

**for**  $j = 1 \dots J$  **do**

$x^{(0)} \leftarrow$  an arbitrary vector in  $[0, 1]^n$ ;

**for**  $k = 1 \dots K$  **do**

$x^{(k)} \leftarrow \text{Box}\left[x^{(k-1)} + \frac{\alpha}{k^\beta} (f(x^{(k-1)}) - t)\right]$ ;

**if**  $|x_i^{(k)} - x_i^{(k-1)}| \leq \epsilon, i = 1 \dots n$  **then return**  $x^{(k)}$ ;

**end**

**end**

---

We were able to obtain a  $10^{-5}$ -approximate equilibrium in 90 percent of our synthetic instances using the parameters  $\alpha = 10$ ,  $\beta = 0.01$ ,  $J = 3$ , and  $K = 30$ .

### 5.2.3 Computational experiments

We consider two experiments. In the heterogeneity experiment, we fix the value of  $\gamma$  to 0.5 and the *expected value* of  $t_i$  to 0.5. We vary the *variance* of  $t_i$  by drawing  $t_i$  independently from the  $\text{Beta}(B, B)$  distribution, where  $1/B$  itself is drawn randomly from  $\text{Uniform}(0, 1)$ .

In the complementarity experiment, we fix the distribution of  $t_i$  to  $\text{Beta}(10, 10)$  and vary  $\gamma$  by drawing it randomly from  $\text{Uniform}(0, 1)$ .

In all cases,  $a, b, q$ , and  $n$  are ... and we create 500 instances.

Because the data used in these experiments is artificial, we elect to analyze the results graphically. T-tests show that convergence failures do not depend statistically on the experimental variables.




Figure 1: (Heterogeneity experiment.) Effect of heterogeneity in students' risk preferences on the stability index  $\bar{S}(x)$ , a measure of the equilibrium's robustness to envy. Risk parameters  $t_i$  were drawn from a  $\text{Beta}(B, B)$  distribution for 500 markets. 108 markets failed to converge to an equilibrium.




Figure 2: (Heterogeneity experiment.) Effect of heterogeneity in students' risk preferences on the alignment index  $\bar{T}(x)$ , a measure of the selective school's ability to approximate its ideal entering class using the subset of students who apply.




Figure 3: (Heterogeneity experiment.) Effect of heterogeneity in students' risk preferences on the aggregate student welfare  $\bar{U}(x)$ .




Figure 4: (Heterogeneity experiment.) Effect of heterogeneity in students' risk preferences on the size of the equilibrium  $\bar{k}(x)$ .

## 6 References

Budish, Eric. 2011. "The Combinatorial Assignment Problem: Approximate Competitive Equi-




Figure 5: (Complementarity experiment.) Effect of nonlinearity in the selective school's objective function on the stability index  $S(x)$ , a measure of the equilibrium's robustness to envy. 500 random markets with  $\gamma \sim \text{Uniform}(0, 1)$  were simulated. 142 markets failed to converge to an equilibrium.




Figure 6: (Complementarity experiment.) Effect of nonlinearity in the school's objective function on the alignment index  $\bar{T}(x)$ , a measure of the selective school's ability to approximate its ideal entering class using the subset of students who apply.




Figure 7: (Complementarity experiment.) Effect of nonlinearity in the school's objective function on the aggregate student welfare  $\bar{U}(x)$ .




Figure 8: (Complementarity experiment.) Effect of nonlinearity in the school's objective function on the size of the equilibrium  $\bar{k}(x)$ .

librium from Equal Incomes.” *Journal of Political Economy* 119(6): 1061–1103. <https://doi.org/10.1086/664613>.

Fisher, Marshall, George Nemhauser, and Laurence Wolsey. 1978. “An analysis of approxi-



- mations for maximizing submodular set functions—I.” *Mathematical Programming* 14: 265–94.
- Fredman, Michael Lawrence and Robert Tarjan. 1987. “Fibonacci heaps and their uses in improved network optimization algorithms.” *Journal of the Association for Computing Machinery* 34 (3): 596–615.
- Fu, Chao. 2014. “Equilibrium Tuition, Applications, Admissions, and Enrollment in the College Market.” *Journal of Political Economy* 122(2): 225–81. <https://doi.org/10.1086/675503>.
- Othman, Abraham, Eric Budish, and Tuomas Sandholm. 2010. “Finding Approximate Competitive Equilibria: Efficient and Fair Course Allocation.” In *Proceedings of 9th International Conference on Autonomous Agents and Multiagent Systems*. New York: ACM. <https://dl.acm.org/doi/abs/10.5555/1838206.1838323>.
- Rozanov, Mark and Arie Tamir. 2020. “The nestedness property of the convex ordered median location problem on a tree.” *Discrete Optimization* 36: 100581. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.disopt.2020.100581>.