

Kesten, Onur; Kurino, Morimitsu

**Working Paper**

## On the (im)possibility of improving upon the student-proposing deferred acceptance mechanism

WZB Discussion Paper, No. SP II 2012-202

**Provided in Cooperation with:**

WZB Berlin Social Science Center

*Suggested Citation:* Kesten, Onur; Kurino, Morimitsu (2012) : On the (im)possibility of improving upon the student-proposing deferred acceptance mechanism, WZB Discussion Paper, No. SP II 2012-202, Wissenschaftszentrum Berlin für Sozialforschung (WZB), Berlin

This Version is available at:

<https://hdl.handle.net/10419/60234>

**Standard-Nutzungsbedingungen:**

Die Dokumente auf EconStor dürfen zu eigenen wissenschaftlichen Zwecken und zum Privatgebrauch gespeichert und kopiert werden.

Sie dürfen die Dokumente nicht für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, öffentlich zugänglich machen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Sofern die Verfasser die Dokumente unter Open-Content-Lizenzen (insbesondere CC-Lizenzen) zur Verfügung gestellt haben sollten, gelten abweichend von diesen Nutzungsbedingungen die in der dort genannten Lizenz gewährten Nutzungsrechte.

**Terms of use:**

*Documents in EconStor may be saved and copied for your personal and scholarly purposes.*

*You are not to copy documents for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the documents publicly, to make them publicly available on the internet, or to distribute or otherwise use the documents in public.*

*If the documents have been made available under an Open Content Licence (especially Creative Commons Licences), you may exercise further usage rights as specified in the indicated licence.*

# WZB

Wissenschaftszentrum Berlin  
für Sozialforschung



Onur Kesten  
Morimitsu Kurino

## **On the (im)possibility of improving upon the student-proposing deferred acceptance mechanism**

**Discussion Paper**

SP II 2012–202

June 2012

**Social Science Research Center Berlin (WZB)**

Research Area  
**Markets and Politics**

Research Unit  
**Market Behavior**

Wissenschaftszentrum Berlin für Sozialforschung gGmbH  
Reichpietschufer 50  
10785 Berlin  
Germany  
www.wzb.eu

Onur Kesten, Morimitsu Kurino  
**On the (im)possibility of improving upon the student-proposing deferred  
acceptance mechanism**  
Discussion Paper SP II 2012–202  
Wissenschaftszentrum Berlin für Sozialforschung (2012)

Copyright remains with the author(s).

ISSN No. 0722 – 6748

Affiliation of the authors other than WZB:

**Onur Kesten**  
Carnegie Mellon University

**Morimitsu Kurino**  
Maastricht University

Discussion papers of the WZB serve to disseminate the research results of work in progress prior to publication to encourage the exchange of ideas and academic debate. Inclusion of a paper in the discussion paper series does not constitute publication and should not limit publication in any other venue. The discussion papers published by the WZB represent the views of the respective author(s) and not of the institute as a whole.

Abstract

## **On the (im)possibility of improving upon the student-proposing deferred acceptance mechanism**

by Onur Kesten and Morimitsu Kurino\*

This paper studies a general school choice problem with or without outside options. The Gale-Shapley student-proposing deferred acceptance mechanism (DA) has played a central role not only in theory but also in important practical applications. We show that in problems where some students cannot credibly submit a single school as the only acceptable option, it is possible to improve upon DA without sacrificing strategy-proofness. On the other hand, in unrestricted problems where no outside options necessarily exist, it is not possible to improve upon DA via a strategy-proof mechanism.

*Keywords: Student-proposing deferred acceptance mechanism, strategy-proofness, Pareto dominance, outside options*

*JEL classification: C78, D78, I21*

### Zusammenfassung

Es wird ein allgemeines school-choice-Problem untersucht mit und ohne „outside options“. Der „Gale-Shapley student-proposing deferred acceptance“-Mechanismus (DA) spielt eine zentrale Rolle nicht nur in der Theorie sondern auch in wichtigen praktischen Anwendungen. Wir zeigen, dass in Situationen, in denen einige Schüler nicht glaubwürdig nur eine einzige Schule als akzeptable Option angeben können, der DA verbessert werden kann, ohne dass die Nichtmanipulierbarkeit („strategy proofness“) des Mechanismus dafür geopfert werden muss. Auf der anderen Seite gilt für Situationen, in denen nicht notwendigerweise "outside options" existieren, dass der DA nicht verbessert werden kann mit Hilfe eines nichtmanipulierbaren Mechanismus.

---

\* E-mail: okesten@andrew.cmu.edu / morimitsu.kurino@wzb.eu

# 1 Introduction

The Gale-Shapley student-proposing deferred acceptance mechanism (DA) has been a prominent allocation method both in theory and in practice for school choice. Thanks to economists’ and officials’ collaborative efforts, the New York City Department of Education as well as the Boston Public School system transitioned to new designs implementing DA for student assignment beginning in 2004 and 2006, respectively. Because of its theoretical appeal, DA has remained at the center of the recent debate concerning the trade-off among efficiency, stability, and strategy-proofness.

In a model where schools have strict priorities, Kesten (2010) showed that no efficient and strategy-proof mechanism dominates DA. In a two-sided matching model allowing for weak priorities, Abdulkadiroğlu, Pathak, and Roth (2009) (henceforth APR) showed that no strategy-proof mechanism dominates DA. APR claimed that the latter result is tighter than the former. We note that Kesten’s model cannot be embedded into the APR framework. Nor is the proof technique offered by APR applicable in this setting. Critically, contrary to Kesten, APR assume that students are equipped with the strategy to rank-list an option of remaining “unassigned” and are able to submit preference lists that declare only a single school as acceptable. Nevertheless, singleton preference lists are risky and are generally used only by a small fraction of students (see Figure 1). Moreover, most if not all households typically do not have the means to afford outside options such as private education.

We study two natural departures from the APR framework to investigate the strategic role of outside options. First, we consider problems where some students cannot credibly submit singleton preference lists. Specifically, these are problems that involve at least two students who draw their reported top-choices from a set  $T$  of schools where  $|T| \geq 2$  and  $T$  does not contain any outside options. A simple problem of this kind arises when there are at least two students who always report remaining unassigned as the last choice. We show that in such cases strategy-proof mechanisms dominating DA may exist (Theorem 1).<sup>1</sup>

Second, we consider unrestricted problems where no outside options necessarily exist. We show that in these cases DA cannot be dominated by a strategy-proof mechanism (Theorem 2). This result strengthens the impossibilities of Kesten (2010) and APR, and relies on a new proof that involves the identification of “overdemanded” schools that may be endogenously determined at a problem.

Our analysis suggests that manipulating a Pareto-superior mechanism to DA may be sensitive to a student’s actual strategy set, and even in cases when profitable manipulation is possible, this

---

<sup>1</sup>For an assignment model that also assumes outside options, Erdil (2011) shows that no strategy-proof mechanism dominating a non-wasteful and strategy-proof mechanism exists. We note, however, that that result also no longer holds once outside options are ruled out. Consider, for example, a simple assignment setting with  $n$  agents and  $n$  objects. Clearly, any constant assignment mechanism is strategy-proof. However, such a mechanism is dominated by the corresponding core mechanism, which is also strategy-proof.




Figure 1: Percentage of students who listed only one school in Boston (left) and New York City (right). *Data:* The above plotted statistics for the Boston Public Schools and NYC are reported in Abdulkadiroğlu, Pathak, Roth, and Sönmez (2006) and Abdulkadiroğlu, Pathak, and Roth (2009) respectively.

may require students to devise rather sophisticated strategies despite holding complete information about the environment.

## 2 The Model

We consider a general school choice model with or without the option of being unassigned. For convenience, we mostly follow the same notation as in APR. A school choice problem is a five-tuple  $(I, S, (q_s)_{s \in S}, (P_i)_{i \in I}, (R_s)_{s \in S})$ .  $I$  is a finite set of students and  $S$  is a finite set of schools. Each school  $s \in S$  has  $q_s$  available seats, or **capacity**. We assume throughout the paper that the total number of seats is no less than the number of students, i.e.,  $|I| \leq \sum_{s \in S} q_s$ . If  $q_s$  is large enough, say  $q_s = |I|$ , then the school  $s$  may represent the option of remaining unassigned (or, an outside option such as a private school). We call such a school the **null school**, denoted by  $\emptyset$ . We do not necessarily assume the existence of the null school. Notice that when the null school is allowed, this model contains that of APR. Each student  $i \in I$  has a strict preference relation  $P_i$  on  $S$ . Let  $R_i$  denote the at-least-as-good-as relation associated with  $P_i$ . We assume that each school  $s$  has a weak priority  $R_s$  on  $I$  that is a complete and transitive binary relation on  $I$ . We say that a priority  $R_s$  is strict if it is an antisymmetric weak priority. Let  $P_s$  represent the asymmetric part of  $R_s$ . For any  $I' \subseteq I$ , let  $P_{I'} = (P_i)_{i \in I'}$  and  $P_{-i} = (P_j)_{j \in I \setminus \{i\}}$ . We define  $R_{S'}$  and  $R_{-s}$  similarly. We fix  $I, S, (q_s)_{s \in S}$  throughout the paper.

A **matching** is a correspondence  $\mu : I \cup S \rightarrow S \cup I$  such that each student is assigned only one school and each school is assigned students up to its capacity, i.e., for all  $i \in I$  and  $s \in S$ ,  $\mu(i) \in S$ ,  $\mu(s) \in I$ ,  $|\mu(i)| = 1$ ,  $|\mu(s)| \leq q_s$ , and  $i \in \mu(s) \Leftrightarrow s \in \mu(i)$ . Since  $\mu(i)$  is a singleton, we denote  $\mu(i) = s$  instead of  $\mu(i) = \{s\}$ . A matching is **non-wasteful** at  $P_I$  if for all  $i \in I$  and

all  $s \in S$ ,  $s P_i \mu(i)$  implies  $|\mu(s)| = q_s$ . A matching  $\mu$  **dominates** matching  $\nu$  at  $P_I$  if for all  $i \in I$ ,  $\mu(i) R_i \nu(i)$ , and for some  $i \in I$ ,  $\mu(i) P_i \nu(i)$ . A matching is **Pareto efficient** at  $P_I$  if it is not dominated by any other matching at  $P_I$ . A pair  $(i, s) \in I \times S$  **blocks** a matching  $\mu$  at  $(P_I, R_S)$  if  $s P_i \mu(i)$  and [either  $|\mu(s)| < q_s$  or for some  $j \in \mu(s)$ ,  $i P_s j$ ]. A matching is **stable** at  $(P_I, R_S)$  if it is not blocked by any pair at  $(P_I, R_S)$ . A stable matching is a **student-optimal stable matching** at  $(P_I, R_S)$  if it is not dominated at  $P_I$  by any other matching that is stable at  $(P_I, R_S)$ .

A (direct) **mechanism**  $\varphi$  is a function that maps every  $(P_I, R_S)$  to a matching. Denote by  $\varphi_i(P_I, R_S)$  the school that is matched to  $i$  by  $\varphi$ . Similarly, denote by  $\varphi_s(P_I, R_S)$  the set of students that are matched to  $s$  by  $\varphi$ . A mechanism  $\varphi$  is **strategy-proof** if for all  $(P_I, R_S)$ ,  $i \in I$ , and  $P'_I$ ,  $\varphi_i(P_I, R_S) R_i \varphi_i(P'_I, P_{-i}, R_S)$ . A mechanism  $\varphi$  **dominates**  $\psi$  if (i) for all  $P_I, R_S$ , and  $i \in I$ ,  $\varphi_i(P_I, R_S) R_i \psi_i(P_I, R_S)$ , and (ii) for some  $P_I, R_S$ , and  $i \in I$ ,  $\varphi_i(P_I, R_S) P_i \psi_i(P_I, R_S)$ . A mechanism  $\varphi$  is **Pareto efficient (non-wasteful)** if for all  $P_I$  and  $R_S$ , matching  $\varphi(P_I, R_S)$  is Pareto efficient (non-wasteful) at  $P_I$ .

Abdulkadiroğlu and Sönmez (2003) advocated the use of Gale and Shapley's (1962) **student-proposing deferred acceptance (DA) algorithm** as a plausible assignment method in school choice. For a *strict* priority profile  $R_S$ , the algorithm works as follows:

**Step 1:** Each student applies to her favorite school. Each school  $s$  tentatively assigns its seats to its applicants following the priority order  $R_s$ . Any unassigned student is rejected.

In general,

**Step  $k$ :** Each student who was rejected at the previous step applies to her next favorite school. Each school  $s$  considers the students it has been holding together with its new applicants and tentatively assigns its seats following the priority order  $R_s$ . Any unassigned student is rejected.

The algorithm terminates when no student remains unassigned. At this point all current assignments are final.

A **tie-breaker** for school  $s$  is an injective function  $\tau_s : I \rightarrow \mathbf{N}$  by associating  $R_s$  with a strict priority  $R_s^\tau$  as follows:  $i P_s^\tau j \Leftrightarrow [(i R_s j) \text{ or } (i I_s j \text{ and } \tau_s(i) < \tau_s(j))]$ . A **tie-breaking rule** is a profile  $\tau := (\tau_s)_{s \in S}$  of all schools' tie-breakers.

The **student-proposing deferred acceptance mechanism with a tie-breaking rule**  $\tau$ , which is denoted by  $DA^\tau$ , is the mechanism obtained by the student-proposing deferred acceptance algorithm acting on  $(P_I, R_S^\tau)$ , where  $R_S^\tau$  is obtained from  $R_S$  by breaking ties using  $\tau_s$ .

It is well known that if  $R_S$  is not strict, there might be multiple student-optimal stable matchings (Erdil and Ergin, 2008). But if it is strict, such a matching is unique and dominates any other stable matching (Gale and Shapley, 1962; Balinski and Sönmez, 1999). More precisely, when  $R_S$  is not strict and  $\tau$  is a tie-breaking rule,  $DA^\tau(P_I, R_S)$  is the unique student-optimal stable matching

at  $(P_I, R_S^\tau)$  and dominates at  $P_I$  any other matching that is stable at  $(P_I, R_S^\tau)$ . Furthermore,  $DA^\tau$  is strategy-proof<sup>2</sup> (Dubins and Freedman, 1981; Roth, 1982) and non-wasteful.

### 3 The Main Results

We investigate whether or not there is a strategy-proof mechanism that dominates the student-proposing deferred acceptance mechanism with any tie-breaking rule. To this end, we introduce a key notion: A school  $s$  is **overdemanded at**  $(P_I, R_S; \tau)$  if there is a student  $i \in I$  such that  $s P_i DA_i^\tau(P_I, R_S)$ . A school  $s$  is **underdemanded at**  $(P_I, R_S; \tau)$  if it is not overdemanded at  $(P_I, R_S; \tau)$ , i.e., for each student  $i \in I$ ,  $DA_i^\tau(P_I, R_S) R_i s$ . Under DA an overdemanded school rejects at least one student, whereas an underdemanded school accepts all its applicants. Note that the null school is always underdemanded if it is allowed in the model.<sup>3</sup> Importantly, whether a school is overdemanded or not depends on the specific problem and the DA algorithm.

**Lemma 1.** *For all  $(P_I, R_S; \tau)$ , there is an underdemanded school at  $(P_I, R_S; \tau)$ .*

The proofs of all lemmas in this section are in the Appendix.

In our first departure from APR’s specification of a school choice problem, we introduce a new type of students whose most preferred choices belong to a set  $T$  of “competitive” schools. We require that the size of  $T$  is at least two and these students never rank-list an option outside  $T$  as one of their top- $|T|$  choices. The former requirement implies that this student type cannot submit singleton preference lists, whereas the latter means that their strategic choices are limited to only those schools in the set  $T$  that cannot include the null school.<sup>4</sup> Our first result makes this description more precise, and shows that in these situations improving upon DA has no incentive cost.

**Theorem 1. (Possibility)** *Suppose that there exist a set  $J$  of at least two students and a set  $T$  of at least two schools such that the top- $|T|$  reported choices of each student in  $J$  belong to  $T$  and  $\sum_{t \in T} q_t < |I|$ .<sup>5</sup> Then, there is a strategy-proof mechanism that dominates the student-proposing deferred acceptance mechanism with any tie-breaking rule.*

---

<sup>2</sup>We note, however, that irrespective of the assumption on the existence of the null school, strategy-proofness of DA is lost when a quota is imposed on the length of students’ preference lists. Therefore, consistent with the model of APR, we also assume that students face no such restrictions. See Haeringer and Klijn (2009) for an equilibrium analysis of DA when students’ choices are constrained in this manner.

<sup>3</sup>Put differently, in our general model an underdemanded school is the analogue of the null school (or, the option of being unassigned) in the APR model. Therefore, here too a student need not rank-list any schools below an underdemanded school, as she would not need to rank-list any schools below the null school in the APR model.

<sup>4</sup>The set  $T$  can be interpreted as a group of schools that this type of students are seriously targeting such that they are not willing to take the risk of ranking a school from set  $T$  below a school they actually deem to be inferior.

<sup>5</sup>Put another way, the first part of the assumption suggests a sense of “correlation” among the preferences of students in  $J$  and the second part of the assumption (i.e., the inequality  $\sum_{t \in T} q_t < |I|$ ) suggests a sense of “scarcity” for the collection of schools in  $T$ .



*Proof.* Let  $\tau$  be a tie-breaking rule and  $T := \{t_1, \dots, t_m\}$  such that  $m \geq 2$  and  $\sum_{t \in T} q_t < |I|$ . Let two distinct students  $i_1 \in J$  and  $i_2 \in J$  report preferences that always list a school in  $T$  above any school not in  $T$ . Also, let  $I_1, \dots, I_{m+1}$  be a partition of  $I$  such that  $|I_1| = q_{t_1}, \dots, |I_m| = q_{t_m}$ ,  $i_1 \in I_1$ , and  $i_2 \in I_2$ . Note that since  $\sum_{t \in T} q_t < |I|$ ,  $I_{m+1}$  is nonempty. Let  $\bar{R}_S$  be a priority profile such that the post-tie-breaking priority profile  $\bar{R}_S^\tau$  is given by the following table on the right, where vertical dots represent arbitrary students. For example, the first column means that students in  $I_1$  have higher priority for  $t_1$  than those in  $I_{m+1}$ , who have higher priority than those in  $I_2$ , and the priorities of all remaining students are arbitrary. Similarly, for each school  $t_j \in \{t_3, \dots, t_m\}$ , students in  $I_j$  have the highest priority for it.

$P_{i \in I_1}^{**}$	$P_{i \in I_2}^*$	$P_{i \in I_3}^3$	$\dots$	$P_{i \in I_m}^m$	$P_{i \in I_{m+1}}^*$	$\bar{R}_{t_1}^\tau$	$\bar{R}_{t_2}^\tau$	$\bar{R}_{t_3}^\tau$	$\bar{R}_{t_4}^\tau$	$\dots$	$\bar{R}_{t_m}^\tau$	$\bar{R}_{s \in S \setminus T}$
$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$t_3$	$\dots$	$t_m$	$\vdots$	$I_1$	$I_2$	$I_3$	$I_4$	$\dots$	$I_m$	$\vdots$
$t_2$	$t_1$	$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$t_1$	$I_{m+1}$	$I_1$	$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$\vdots$
$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$I_2$	$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$\vdots$
$t_1$	$t_2$	$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$t_2$	$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$\vdots$
$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$\vdots$

We consider the following sets of preferences (see the table above on the left): Let  $\mathcal{P}^*$  be the set of preferences on  $S$  such that  $t_1$  is preferred to  $t_2$  and any school in  $T$  is preferred to each school not in  $T$ ; let  $\mathcal{P}^{**}$  be the set of preferences on  $S$  such that  $t_2$  is preferred to  $t_1$  and any school in  $T$  is preferred to each school not in  $T$ ; for each  $j = 3, \dots, m$ , let  $\mathcal{P}^j$  be the set of preferences on  $S$  such that  $t_j$  is the top choice; finally, let  $\mathcal{P}$  be the set of all preferences on  $S$ . Note that for each student  $i \in \{i_1, i_2\}$  and each  $P_i$ , because  $i \in J$ , we have  $P_i \in \mathcal{P}^*$  or  $P_i \in \mathcal{P}^{**}$ . For each  $I' \subseteq I$  and each set of preferences  $\mathcal{P}'$ , we denote by  $\mathcal{P}'_{I'}$  the product set of  $\mathcal{P}'$  over  $I'$ .

Then, it is straightforward to calculate that, for all  $P_I \in (P_{I_1}^{**}, \mathcal{P}_{I_2}^*, \mathcal{P}_{I_3}^3, \dots, \mathcal{P}_{I_m}^m, \mathcal{P}_{I_{m+1}}^*)$ ,

$$DA^\tau(P_I, \bar{R}_S) = \begin{pmatrix} I_1 & I_2 & \dots & I_m & I_{m+1} \\ t_1 & t_2 & \dots & t_m & S \setminus T \end{pmatrix}, \quad (1)$$

where all schools in  $T$  are overdemanded, and thus students  $i_1$  and  $i_2$  do not list any underdemanded schools above their DA assignments. We define a mechanism  $\varphi$  as follows: for all  $P_I$  and  $R_S$ , if  $R_S \neq \bar{R}_S$ , let  $\varphi(P_I, R_S) = DA^\tau(P_I, R_S)$ . If  $R_S = \bar{R}_S$ ,  $\varphi(P_I, R_S)|_{-\{i_1, i_2\}} = DA^\tau(P_I, R_S)|_{-\{i_1, i_2\}}$ , and

$$\varphi(P_I, R_S)|_{\{i_1, i_2\}} = \begin{cases} \begin{pmatrix} i_1 & i_2 \\ t_2 & t_1 \end{pmatrix} & \text{if } P_I \in (P_{I_1}^{**}, \mathcal{P}_{I_2}^*, \mathcal{P}_{I_3}^3, \dots, \mathcal{P}_{I_m}^m, \mathcal{P}_{I_{m+1}}^*), \\ DA^\tau(P_I, R_S)|_{\{i_1, i_2\}} & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Clearly,  $\varphi$  dominates  $DA^\tau$ .<sup>6</sup> We show in the Online Appendix that  $\varphi$  is strategy-proof.  $\square$

Theorem 1 entails that once the ability of using the null school as a strategic option is limited for some students, the tension posed by strategy-proofness may be relaxed. As a realistic scenario, it is also plausible to imagine student types who cannot credibly use the null school as part of their strategies. The following corollary pertains to such cases where a school choice problem involves students who always report the null school as the least preferred outcome.<sup>7</sup> Then, we have the following corollary:

**Corollary 1.** *Suppose that there is the null school  $\emptyset$ ,  $|S \setminus \{\emptyset\}| \geq 2$ , and  $\sum_{s \in S \setminus \{\emptyset\}} q_s < |I|$ . If the null school is the last reported choice of at least two students, there is a strategy-proof mechanism that dominates the student-proposing deferred acceptance mechanism with any tie-breaking rule.*

Now we turn to a more general model possibly without the null school, where a student can list any underdemanded school at any position of her preference list. In this case, one cannot improve upon DA without harming students' incentives.

**Theorem 2. (Impossibility)** *No strategy-proof mechanism dominates the student-proposing deferred acceptance mechanism with any tie-breaking rule.*

**Corollary 2** (Kesten, 2010). *When priorities are strict and the null school need not exist, no strategy-proof and efficient mechanism dominates the student-proposing deferred acceptance mechanism.*

**Corollary 3** (Abdulkadiroğlu, Pathak, and Roth, 2009). *When the null school exists, no strategy-proof mechanism dominates the student-proposing deferred acceptance mechanism with any tie-breaking rule.*

*Remark 1.* Note that Corollary 2 does not follow from Corollary 3 since APR's proof of Corollary 3 crucially depends on the existence of the null school.<sup>8</sup>

The following lemma says that if a matching under DA is dominated by another matching and some student  $i$  is assigned to different schools at the two matchings, then the assignment of student  $i$  under DA is overdemanding.

**Lemma 2.** *Suppose that a matching  $\nu$  dominates  $DA^\tau(P_I, R_S)$  at  $P_I$  for a given tie-breaking rule  $\tau$ . If  $\nu(i) \neq DA_i^\tau(P_I, R_S)$  for some  $i \in I$ , then school  $DA_i^\tau(P_I, R_S)$  is overdemanding at  $(P_I, R_S; \tau)$ .*

---

<sup>6</sup>As shown in this construction, the DA outcome can be inefficient. Ergin (2002) identifies restrictions on priority structures to ensure the efficiency of DA.

<sup>7</sup>Indeed, in all years of Boston and NYC student assignments for which data exist, thousands of students chose to rank-list as many schools as they were allowed to.

<sup>8</sup>To illustrate the difference between the two setups through a realistic scenario, consider, for example, a poor neighborhood where the total capacity is sufficient to serve the student body within the neighborhood ( $\sum_{s \in S \setminus \{\emptyset\}} q_s > |I|$ ) but students have no outside options. Notice that Corollary 3 is not applicable in this case. Moreover, Theorem 2 implies that the efficiency requirement in Corollary 2 can also be dropped.

We shall focus on a specific preference manipulation. To this end, we define some useful notions: Let  $U(P_i, s) := \{s' \in S \mid s' R_i s\}$  be the **upper contour set of  $i$  at  $s$** . Also, for any  $S' \subseteq S$ , define a strict preference relation  $P_i|_{S'}$  on  $S'$  if for all  $s, s' \in S'$ ,  $s' P_i|_{S'} s \Leftrightarrow s' P_i s$ . Given preference  $P_i$  of student  $i$  and schools  $s^*, s^u$  with  $s^* P_i s^u$ , **preference  $P'_i$  upgrades  $s^u$  above  $s^*$  in  $P_i$**  if  $P'_i$  ranks  $s^u$  right above  $s^*$  and the relative ranking of the other schools stays the same, i.e., (i)  $s^* P_i s^u$  and  $s^u P'_i s^*$ , (ii) there is no  $s \in S$  with  $s^u P'_i s P'_i s^*$ , and (iii)  $P_i|_{S \setminus \{s^u, s^*\}} = P'_i|_{S \setminus \{s^u, s^*\}}$ .

**Lemma 3.** *Suppose that student  $i$  is assigned school  $s^*$  that is overdemanded at  $(P_I, R_S; \tau)$ . Then, there is an underdemanded school  $s^u$  at  $(P_I, R_S; \tau)$  such that  $DA_i^\tau(P''_i, P_{-i}, R_S) = s^u$  and  $s^u$  is underdemanded at  $(P''_i, P_{-i}, R_S; \tau)$ , where preference  $P''_i$  upgrades  $s^u$  above  $s^*$  in  $P_i$ .*

We are now ready to prove Theorem 2.

**Proof of Theorem 2.** Fix a tie-breaking rule  $\tau$ . Suppose that a strategy-proof mechanism  $\varphi$  dominates  $DA^\tau$ . Then, there exist  $P_I, R_S$ , and  $i \in I$  such that  $\varphi_i(P_I, R_S) P_i DA_i^\tau(P_I, R_S)$ . Let  $s^* := DA_i^\tau(P_I, R_S)$ . Since  $\varphi_i(P_I, R_S) \neq s^*$ , Lemma 2 implies that  $s^*$  is overdemanded at  $(P_I, R_S; \tau)$ . Thus, by Lemma 3, there is an underdemanded school  $s^u$  at  $(P_I, R_S; \tau)$  such that school  $DA_i^\tau(P''_i, P_{-i}, R_S) = s^u$  is underdemanded at  $(P''_i, P_{-i}, R_S; \tau)$ , where preference  $P''_i$  upgrades  $s^u$  above  $s^*$  in  $P_i$ . For simplicity, let  $P'' := (P''_i, P_{-i})$ .

We first show that  $\varphi_i(P_I, R_S) = \varphi_i(P''_i, R_S)$ . Note that  $U(P_i, \varphi_i(P_I, R_S)) = U(P''_i, \varphi_i(P_I, R_S))$  and  $P_i|_{U(P_i, \varphi_i(P_I, R_S))} = P''_i|_{U(P''_i, \varphi_i(P_I, R_S))}$ , as  $P''_i$  upgrades  $s^u$  above  $s^*$  in  $P_i$  and  $\varphi_i(P_I, R_S) \neq s^u, s^*$ . By *strategy-proofness* of  $\varphi$ ,  $\varphi_i(P_I, R_S) R_i \varphi_i(P''_i, R_S)$ . Also,  $\varphi_i(P''_i, R_S) R''_i \varphi_i(P_I, R_S)$  and thus  $\varphi_i(P''_i, R_S) R_i \varphi_i(P_I, R_S)$  as  $P_i|_{U(P_i, \varphi_i(P_I, R_S))} = P''_i|_{U(P''_i, \varphi_i(P_I, R_S))}$ . Thus,  $\varphi_i(P_I, R_S) = \varphi_i(P''_i, R_S)$ .

Now, we have  $\varphi_i(P''_i, R_S) \neq DA_i^\tau(P''_i, R_S)$ , for otherwise, since  $\varphi_i(P_I, R_S) P_i DA_i^\tau(P_I, R_S)$  and  $\varphi_i(P_I, R_S) = \varphi_i(P''_i, R_S)$ ,  $DA_i^\tau(P''_i, R_S) P_i DA_i^\tau(P_I, R_S)$ , which violates *strategy-proofness* of  $DA^\tau$ .

Since  $\varphi$  dominates  $DA^\tau$ ,  $\varphi(P''_i, R_S)$  dominates  $DA^\tau(P''_i, R_S)$  at  $P''_i$  and  $\varphi_i(P''_i, R_S) \neq DA_i^\tau(P''_i, R_S)$ . Then, at  $(P''_i, R_S, \tau)$ ,  $DA_i^\tau(P''_i, R_S) \equiv s^u$ , which is overdemanded by Lemma 2, whereas it is not by Lemma 3. A contradiction.  $\square$

## 4 Concluding Remarks

The Gale-Shapley deferred acceptance (DA) mechanism has been a focal assignment tool not only for theory but also for practical market design. Recent research has shown a surge of interest in exploring mechanisms that go beyond DA in terms of welfare (either ex ante or ex post). We have shown that whether such attempts come at the cost of strategy-proofness may be sensitive to the specifics of the environment. In circumstances when students cannot credibly use outside options as strategic choices or when it may be difficult to identify underdemanded schools, the scope of manipulation under alternative mechanisms may be diminished.

More broadly, our approach puts the three-way tension among efficiency, stability, and strategy-proofness into a new perspective by highlighting the importance of the strategic role outside options

may play. It remains an interesting future issue to search for new assignment mechanisms in light of this optimistic perspective.

## A Appendix

### A.1 Proof of Lemma 1

Let  $(P_I, R_S; \tau)$  be given. Suppose on the contrary that all schools are overdemanded at  $(P_I, R_S; \tau)$ . Then, for each school  $s \in S$ , there is  $j \in I$  such that  $s P_j DA_j^\tau(P_I, R_S)$ . Thus, by *non-wastefulness* of DA,  $|DA_s^\tau(P_I, R_S)| = q_s$  for all  $s \in S$ . Note first that DA ends in at least two steps. Consider the last step  $r \geq 2$  of DA at  $(P_I, R_S; \tau)$  where some student  $k$  rejected at step  $r - 1$  and applies to some school  $t$  at step  $r$ . Since  $t$  is overdemanded, there is some student  $k' \neq k$  such that  $t P_{k'} DA_{k'}^\tau(P_I, R_S)$ . Thus,  $k'$  must have applied to and been rejected by  $t$  at an earlier step than  $r$ . Thus, school  $t$  has kept  $q_t$  applicants at step  $r - 1$ . Hence, school  $t$  has at least  $|q_t| + 1$  applications at step  $r$ , and thus rejects one of them. But this contradicts the assumption that  $r$  is the last step of DA. ■

### A.2 Proof of Lemma 2

Suppose that matching  $\nu$  dominates a non-wasteful matching  $\mu$  at  $P_I$ . Let  $J$  be the set of students who prefer  $\nu$  to  $\mu$ , i.e.,  $J = \{i \in I \mid \nu(i) P_i \mu(i)\} = \{i \in I \mid \nu(i) \neq \mu(i)\}$ . Define an **improvement cycle from  $\mu$  to  $\nu$  (at  $P_I$ )** as a finite list  $(i^1, i^2, \dots, i^n)$  of students, where  $i^{n+1} \equiv i^1$  and  $n \geq 2$ , such that for each  $k \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ ,  $\nu(i^k) = \mu(i^{k+1})$  and  $\nu(i^k) P_{i^k} \mu(i^k)$ .

*Claim 1.* Suppose that matching  $\nu$  dominates a non-wasteful matching  $\mu'$  at  $P_I$ . Then there is an improvement cycle from  $\mu'$  to  $\nu$  at  $P_I$ .

*Proof.* We define a list of students  $(i^1, \dots, i^n)$  to be **temporary list of size  $n \geq 2$**  if for all  $k \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ ,  $\nu(i^k) P_{i^k} \mu'(i^k)$  and for all  $k \in \{1, \dots, n - 1\}$ ,  $\nu(i^k) = \mu'(i^{k+1})$ .

We first construct a temporary list of size 2. Since  $\nu$  dominates  $\mu'$  at  $P_I$ , there is  $i^1 \in I$  such that  $\nu(i^1) P_{i^1} \mu'(i^1)$ . Let  $s^2 := \nu(i^1)$  and  $s^1 := \mu'(i^1)$ . Note that  $s^1 \neq s^2$ . By *non-wastefulness* of  $\mu'$ , as  $s^2 P_{i^1} \mu'(i^1)$ , we have  $|\mu'(s^2)| = q_{s^2}$ . Then, there is  $i^2 \in \mu'(s^2)$  such that  $\nu(i^2) \neq \mu'(i^2)$  (otherwise, as  $|\mu'(s^2)| = q_{s^2}$ , we have  $\mu'(s^2) = \nu(s^2)$  and thus  $i^1 \in \nu(s^2) = \mu'(s^2)$ . Thus,  $\mu'(i^1) = s^2$  but  $\mu'(i^1) \equiv s^1$ , which contradicts  $s^1 \neq s^2$ ). Thus, as  $\nu$  dominates  $\mu'$  at  $P_I$ ,  $\nu(i^2) P_{i^2} \mu'(i^2)$ . Also, as  $i^2 \in \mu'(s^2)$ ,  $\nu(i^1) \equiv s^2 = \mu'(i^2)$ . Thus,  $(i^1, i^2)$  is a temporary list of size 2. If  $\nu(i^2) = \mu(i^1)$ , the temporary list is an improvement cycle from  $\mu'$  to  $\nu$ . If not, we continue as follows.

Suppose that  $(i^1, \dots, i^{n-1})$  is a temporary list of size  $n - 1$  where  $n \geq 3$ . We construct a temporary list of size  $n$ . Let  $s^k := \mu'(i^k)$  for each  $k \in \{1, \dots, n - 1\}$ . Since  $(i^1, \dots, i^{n-1})$  is a temporary list,  $\nu(i^{n-1}) P_{i^{n-1}} \mu'(i^{n-1})$ . Let  $s^n := \nu(i^{n-1})$ . Note that  $s^{n-1} \neq s^n$ . By *non-wastefulness* of  $\mu'$ , as  $s^n P_{i^{n-1}} \mu'(i^{n-1})$ , we have  $|\mu'(s^n)| = q_{s^n}$ . Then, there is  $i^n \in \mu'(s^n)$  such that

$\nu(i^n) \neq \mu'(i^n)$  (Otherwise, as  $|\mu'(s^n)| = q_{s^n}$ , we have  $\mu'(s^n) = \nu(s^n)$  and thus  $i^{n-1} \in \nu(s^n) = \mu'(s^n)$ . Thus,  $\mu'(i^{n-1}) = s^n$  but  $\mu'(i^{n-1}) \equiv s^{n-1}$ , which contradicts  $s^{n-1} \neq s^n$ ). Thus, as  $\nu$  dominates  $\mu'$  at  $P_I$ ,  $\nu(i^n) P_{i^n} \mu'(i^n)$ . Also, as  $i^n \in \mu'(s^n)$ ,  $\nu(i^{n-1}) \equiv s^n = \mu'(i^n)$ . Thus,  $(i^1, \dots, i^n)$  is a temporary list of size  $n$ . If  $\nu(i^n) = \mu'(i^k)$  for some  $k \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}$ , then the list  $(i^k, \dots, i^n)$  is an improvement cycle from  $\mu'$  to  $\nu$ . As the set of students is finite, we eventually obtain an improvement cycle from  $\mu'$  to  $\nu$ .  $\square$

Given an improvement cycle  $(i^1, \dots, i^n)$  from  $\mu'$  to  $\nu$  at  $P_I$ , matching  $\mu''$  is said to be **induced by an improvement cycle** if  $\mu''(i) = \nu(i^k) \equiv \mu'(i^{k+1})$  when  $i = i^k$  for some  $k \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ , and  $\mu''(i) = \mu'(i)$  otherwise.

*Claim 2.* Suppose that  $\nu$  dominates a non-wasteful matching  $\mu'$  at  $P_I$  and  $\mu''$  is a matching induced by an improvement cycle from  $\mu'$  to  $\nu$ . Then, (i) either  $\nu = \mu''$  or  $\nu$  dominates  $\mu''$  at  $P_I$ , and (ii)  $\mu''$  is non-wasteful at  $P_I$ .

*Proof.* The proof of Part (i) is straightforward and thus omitted. We prove Part (ii). Let the improvement cycle be  $(i^1, \dots, i^n)$ . Let  $i \in I$  and  $s \in S$  be such that  $s P_i \mu''(i)$ . We need to show  $|\mu''(s)| = q_s$ . We consider two cases:

Case 1: for all  $k \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ ,  $i \neq i^k$ . Then  $\mu''(i) = \mu'(i)$ . Thus, as  $s P_i \mu''(i)$ , we have  $s P_i \mu'(i)$ . By *non-wastefulness* of  $\mu'$ ,  $|\mu'(s)| = q_s$ . Since by construction  $|\mu'(s)| = |\mu''(s)|$ , we have  $|\mu''(s)| = q_s$ .  
Case 2: for some  $k \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ ,  $i = i^k$ . Then  $\nu(i^k) P_{i^k} \mu'(i^k)$  and  $\nu(i^k) = \mu''(i^k)$ . Thus, as  $s P_i \mu''(i)$ ,  $s P_i \nu(i) P_i \mu'(i)$ . Then, by *non-wastefulness* of  $\mu'$ ,  $|\mu'(s)| = q_s$ . Since by construction  $|\mu'(s)| = |\mu''(s)|$ , we have  $|\mu''(s)| = q_s$ .  $\square$

We say that **matching  $\nu$  can be achieved from matching  $\mu$  by improvement cycles at  $P_I$**  if there is a partition  $\{J^r\}_{r=1}^R$  of  $J$  such that each subset in the partition forms an improvement cycle from  $\mu$  to  $\nu$  at  $P_I$ .

*Claim 3.* Given that matching  $\nu$  dominates the non-wasteful matching  $\mu$  at  $P_I$ ,  $\nu$  can be achieved from  $\mu$  by improvement cycles at  $P_I$ .

*Proof.* We shall reach  $\nu$  from  $\mu$  iteratively via the following **improvement cycles algorithm**. Let  $\mu^0 = \mu$ . Let  $r \geq 1$ .

Step  $r$ : From the previous step,  $\mu^{r-1} \neq \nu$  is non-wasteful and  $\nu$  dominates  $\mu^{r-1}$  at  $P_I$ . Thus, by Claim 1, there is an improvement cycle from  $\mu^{r-1}$  to  $\nu$ . Choose one such cycle. Let  $\mu^r$  be the matching induced by the improvement cycle. By Claim 2-Part (i), either  $\mu^r = \nu$  or  $\nu$  dominates  $\mu^r$  at  $P$ . If the former happens, the algorithm stops. Otherwise, go to the next step. Note that by Claim 2-Part (ii),  $\mu^r$  is non-wasteful at  $P_I$  and  $\nu$  dominates  $\mu^r$  at  $P_I$ .

Let  $M^r := \{i \in I \mid \nu(i) \neq \mu^r(i)\}$  and  $J^r$  be the set of students involved in the improvement cycle in step  $r$ . Note that  $J^r \neq \emptyset$ . Then,  $M^r = M^{r-1} \setminus J^r = M^0 \setminus (\cup_{t=1}^r J^t)$ . Thus, as the set of students is finite, the algorithm stops in a finite step.

Now we are ready to prove Claim 3. Note that in each step of the algorithm, an improvement cycle from  $\mu^{r-1}$  to  $\nu$  is also an improvement cycle from  $\mu$  to  $\nu$ . Clearly,  $\{J^r\}_{r=1}^R$  is a partition of  $J$ , where  $R$  is the last step of the algorithm.  $\square$

## Proof of Lemma 2

Suppose that  $\nu(i) \neq DA_i^\tau(P_I, R_S)$ . Since  $DA^\tau$  is non-wasteful, it follows from Claim 3 that student  $i$  is in some subset  $J'$  in the partition of  $J$  and we can order elements of  $J'$  to form an improvement cycle from  $DA^\tau(P_I, R_S)$  to  $\nu$ . Let  $(i^1, \dots, i^n)$  be that cycle. Without loss of generality, let  $i^1 = i$ . Then, by the definition of an improvement cycle,  $\nu(i^n) = DA_{i^{n+1}}^\tau(P_I, R_S) \equiv DA_{i^1}^\tau(P_I, R_S)$  and  $\nu(i^n) P_{i^n} DA_{i^n}^\tau(P_I, R_S)$ . Thus,  $DA_{i^1}^\tau(P_I, R_S) P_{i^n} DA_{i^n}^\tau(P_I, R_S)$ . Hence,  $DA_{i^1}^\tau(P_I, R_S) \equiv DA_i^\tau(P_I, R_S)$ , which is overdemand.  $\blacksquare$

## A.3 Proof of Lemma 3

We start with the following useful claim whose straightforward proof is omitted.

*Claim 4.* Let  $T$  be the set of all schools that are underdemanded at  $(P_I, R_S; \tau)$ . For all  $R'_T$ , (i)  $DA^\tau(P_I, R_S) = DA^\tau(P_I, R'_T, R_{-T})$ , and (ii) if  $s$  is underdemanded at  $(P_I, R_S; \tau)$ , then  $s$  is also underdemanded at  $(P_I, R'_T, R_{-T}; \tau)$ .

Suppose that under DA student  $i$  is assigned school  $s^*$  that is overdemand at  $(P_I, R_S; \tau)$ . Let  $S^u$  be the set of all schools that are underdemanded at  $(P_I, R_S; \tau)$ . Note that  $S^u \neq \emptyset$  by Lemma 1, and any underdemanded school  $s \in S^u$  is strictly worse than  $s^*$  in  $P_i$  as  $s^*$  is overdemand. We consider two cases:

$P_i$	$P'_i$	$P''_i$
$P_i _{U(P_i, s^*) \setminus \{s^*\}}$	$P_i _{U(P_i, s^*) \setminus \{s^*\}}$	$P_i _{U(P_i, s^*) \setminus \{s^*\}}$
$s^*$	all underdemanded schools at $(P_I, R_S; \tau)$	$s^u$
$\vdots$	$s^*$	$s^*$
	$\vdots$	$\vdots$

**Case 1:** for some  $s \in S^u$ ,  $|DA_s^\tau(P_I, R_S)| < q_s$ . Let  $s^u \in S^u$  be one such school, i.e.,  $|DA_{s^u}^\tau(P_I, R_S; \tau)| < q_{s^u}$ . Consider the preference  $P''_i$  that upgrades  $s^u$  above  $s^*$  as described in the above table. Let  $P''_I := (P''_i, P_{-i})$ . Let  $\mu''$  be a matching such that  $\mu''(i) = s^u$  and for all  $j \neq i$ ,  $\mu''(j) = DA_j^\tau(P_I, R_S)$ . Then,  $\mu''$  is stable at  $(P''_I, R_S^\tau)$ . For problem  $(P''_I, R_S, \tau)$  DA works in exactly the same way as it does for  $(P_I, R_S, \tau)$  until right before the step  $i$  applies to  $s^u$ . Hence,  $DA_i^\tau(P''_I, R_S) \notin U(P_i, s^*) \setminus \{s^*\}$ . Note that matching  $DA^\tau(P''_I, R_S)$  dominates at  $P''_i$  any matching that is stable at  $(P''_I, R_S^\tau)$ ;  $\mu''$  is stable at  $(P''_I, R_S^\tau)$ ; and  $\mu''(i) = s^u$ . Thus,  $DA_i^\tau(P''_I, R_S) = s^u$ . Also, for each student  $j \neq i$ ,  $DA_j^\tau(P''_I, R_S) R_j \mu''(j)$ . Thus, for all  $j \neq i$ , as  $s^u \in S^u$  and  $\mu''(j) = DA_j^\tau(P_I, R_S)$ , we have  $DA_j^\tau(P''_I, R_S) R_j DA_j^\tau(P_I, R_S) R_j s^u$ . This implies that  $s^u$  is underdemanded at  $(P''_I, R_S; \tau)$ .

**Case 2:** for all  $s \in S^u$ ,  $|DA_s^\tau(P_I, R_S)| = q_s$ . As  $s^*$  is overdemanded at  $(P_I, R_S; \tau)$ , all schools in  $U(P_i, s^*)$  are overdemanded at  $(P_I, R_S; \tau)$ . Thus, since  $S^u \neq \emptyset$  by Lemma 1, all schools in  $S^u$  are less desirable than  $s^*$  to student  $i$  in  $P_i$ . We consider the preference  $P'_i$  that upgrades all underdemanded schools in  $S^u$  above  $s^*$  as described in the above table. Moreover, for all  $s \in S^u$ , let  $R'_s$  be the priority such that  $i$  has the lowest priority for  $s$ , and the relative rankings of all other students is the same as in  $R_s$ . Let  $P'_I := (P'_i, P_{-i})$  and  $R'_S := (R'_{S^u}, R_{-S^u})$ .

We first show that  $DA_i^\tau(P'_I, R'_S) \in S^u$ . Suppose not. Then, under DA all schools in  $S^u$  reject  $i$  at  $(P'_I, R'_S; \tau)$ . Since  $i$  has the lowest priority at all schools in  $S^u$  and  $DA^\tau(P_I, R_S)$  is stable at  $(P_I, R_S)$ ,  $DA^\tau(P_I, R_S)$  is also stable at  $(P'_I, R'_S)$ . Then, as the DA matching is student-optimal stable,  $DA^\tau(P'_I, R'_S) = DA^\tau(P_I, R_S)$ . Thus, all overdemanded schools at  $(P_I, R_S; \tau)$  are still overdemanded at  $(P'_I, R'_S; \tau)$ , and all underdemanded schools at  $(P_I, R_S; \tau)$  become overdemanded at  $(P'_I, R'_S; \tau)$ . Then, all schools are overdemanded at  $(P'_I, R'_S; \tau)$ , which contradicts Lemma 1.

Now, letting  $s^u := DA_i^\tau(P'_I, R'_S) \in S^u$ , consider the preference  $P''_i$  that upgrades  $s^u$  above  $s^*$  in  $P_i$  as described in the above table. Let  $P''_I := (P''_i, P_{-i})$ . We will show that  $DA_i^\tau(P''_I, R'_S) = s^u$ . For  $(P''_I, R'_S; \tau)$  DA works in the same way as for  $(P_I, R_S; \tau)$  until student  $i$  applies to  $s^u$ . Thus,  $DA_i^\tau(P''_I, R'_S) \notin U(P''_i, s^u) \setminus \{s^u\}$ . Then, by *strategy-proofness* of  $DA^\tau$ ,  $DA_i^\tau(P''_I, R'_S) R''_i DA_i^\tau(P'_I, R'_S)$ , i.e.,  $DA_i^\tau(P''_I, R'_S) R''_i s^u$ . Thus,  $DA_i^\tau(P''_I, R'_S) = s^u$ .

It remains to show that  $DA_i^\tau(P''_I, R_S) = s^u$  and  $s^u$  is underdemanded at  $(P''_I, R_S; \tau)$ . Note that  $DA^\tau(P_I, R_S)$  is stable at  $(P''_I, R'_S)$ , since  $DA^\tau(P_I, R_S)$  is stable at  $(P_I, R'_S)$  and  $i$  has the lowest priority for  $s^u$  with  $|DA_{s^u}^\tau(P_I, R_S)| = q_{s^u}$ . Since matching  $DA^\tau(P''_I, R'_S)$  is student-optimal stable, we have for all  $j \neq i$  and all  $s \in S^u$ ,  $DA_j^\tau(P''_I, R'_S) R''_j DA_j^\tau(P_I, R_S) R_j s$  and  $DA_i^\tau(P''_I, R'_S) R''_i s^u R''_i s$ . Since  $P''_{-i} = P_{-i}$ , for all  $j \in I$  and all  $s \in S^u$ ,  $DA_j^\tau(P''_I, R'_S) R''_j s$ . That is, all schools in  $S^u$ , including  $s^u$ , are underdemanded at  $(P''_I, R'_S; \tau)$ . Hence, by Claim 4,  $DA_i^\tau(P''_I, R_S) = DA_i^\tau(P''_I, R'_S) = s^u$ , which is underdemanded at  $(P''_I, R_S; \tau)$ . ■

## References

- ABDULKADIROĞLU, A., P. A. PATHAK, AND A. E. ROTH (2009): “Strategy-proofness versus Efficiency in Matching with Indifferences: Redesigning the NYC High School Match,” *American Economic Review*, 99, 1954–1978.
- ABDULKADIROĞLU, A., P. A. PATHAK, A. E. ROTH, AND T. SÖNMEZ (2006): “Changing the Boston School Choice Mechanism: Strategy-proofness as Equal Access,” Working paper.
- ABDULKADIROĞLU, A., AND T. SÖNMEZ (2003): “School Choice: A Mechanism Design Approach,” *American Economic Review*, 93, 729–747.
- BALINSKI, M., AND T. SÖNMEZ (1999): “A Tale of Two Mechanisms: Student Placement,” *Journal of Economic Theory*, 84, 73–94.

- DUBINS, L. E., AND D. A. FREEDMAN (1981): “Machiavelli and the Gale-Shapley algorithm,” *American Mathematical Monthly*, 88, 485–494.
- ERDIL, A. (2011): “Strategy-proof Stochastic Assignment,” Working paper.
- ERDIL, A., AND H. ERGIN (2008): “What’s the Matter with Tie-breaking? Improving Efficiency in School Choice,” *American Economic Review*, 98, 669–689.
- ERGIN, H. (2002): “Efficient Resource Allocation on the Basis of Priorities,” *Econometrica*, 70, 2489–2498.
- GALE, D., AND L. S. SHAPLEY (1962): “College Admissions and the Stability of Marriage,” *American Mathematical Monthly*, 69, 9–15.
- HAERINGER, G., AND F. KLIJN (2009): “Constrained School Choice,” *Journal of Economic Theory*, 144, 1921–1947.
- KESTEN, O. (2010): “School Choice with Consent,” *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 125(3), 1297–1348.
- ROTH, A. E. (1982): “The Economics of Matching: Stability and Incentives,” *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 7, 617–628.

## B For Online Publication

### Proof of strategy-proofness of the mechanism $\varphi$ in Theorem 1

We show that for all  $P_I, R_S, i \in I$ , and  $P'_i$ , student  $i$  cannot manipulate  $\varphi$  via  $P'_i$  at  $P_I$ , i.e.,  $\varphi_i(P_I, R_S) R_i \varphi_i(P'_i, P_{-i}, R_S)$ . Fix  $P_I, R_S, i \in I$ , and  $P'_i$ . If  $R_S \neq \bar{R}_S$  or  $[R_S = \bar{R}_S$  and  $i \in I \setminus \{i_1, i_2\}]$ , then for all  $P''_I$ ,  $\varphi_i(P''_I, R_S) = DA^\tau_i(P''_I, R_S)$  and  $DA^\tau$  is strategy-proof. Thus, student  $i$  cannot manipulate  $\varphi$  via any  $P'_i$  at  $(P_I, R_S)$ .

Suppose that  $R_S = \bar{R}_S$  and  $i = i_1$ .

Case 1-i:  $P_{I \setminus \{i_1\}} \notin (\mathcal{P}_{I_1 \setminus \{i_1\}}^{**}, \mathcal{P}_{I_2}^*, \mathcal{P}_{I_3}^3, \dots, \mathcal{P}_{I_m}^m, \mathcal{P}_{I_{m+1}}^*)$ . Then, for all  $P''_{i_1}$ ,  $\varphi(P''_{i_1}, P_{-i_1}, R_S) = DA^\tau(P''_{i_1}, P_{-i_1}, R_S)$  and  $DA^\tau$  is strategy-proof. Thus, student  $i_1$  cannot manipulate  $\varphi$  via  $P'_{i_1}$  at  $(P_I, R_S)$ .

Case 1-ii:  $P_{I \setminus \{i_1\}} \in (\mathcal{P}_{I_1 \setminus \{i_1\}}^{**}, \mathcal{P}_{I_2}^*, \mathcal{P}_{I_3}^3, \dots, \mathcal{P}_{I_m}^m, \mathcal{P}_{I_{m+1}}^*)$ . We first show that

$$\text{for all } P''_{i_1}, DA^\tau_{i_1}(P''_{i_1}, P_{-i_1}, R_S) = t_1. \quad (2)$$

If  $P''_{i_1} \in \mathcal{P}^{**}$ , then by (1)  $DA^\tau_{i_1}(P''_{i_1}, P_{-i_1}, R_S) = t_1$ . Suppose  $P''_{i_1} \in \mathcal{P}^*$ . Then, since  $|\sum_{t \in T} q_t| < |I|$ , by the preference profile and non-wastefulness of  $DA^\tau$ , each school  $t \in T$  is fully assigned  $|q_t|$



students under DA. Moreover, schools  $t_3, \dots, t_m$  are filled by students in  $I_3, \dots, I_m$  under DA at  $(P''_{i_1}, P_{-i_1}, R_S)$ . Thus,  $i_1$  is assigned  $t_1, t_2$ , or some  $s \in S \setminus T$ . Suppose on the contrary that  $i_1$  is assigned  $t_2$  or  $s \in S \setminus T$ . Then,  $s_1$  is assigned to some student in  $I_2 \cup I_{m+1}$ . However,  $(i_1, t_1)$  blocks the DA matching, which contradicts the stability of  $DA^\tau$ . Thus,  $DA^\tau_{i_1}(P''_{i_1}, P_{-i_1}, R_S) = t_1$ . This completes the proof of (2).

Suppose  $P_{i_1} \in \mathcal{P}^*$ . Then it follows from (2) and the construction of  $\varphi$  that  $\varphi_{i_1}(P_I, R_S) = DA^\tau_{i_1}(P_I, R_S) = t_1$ ,  $\varphi_{i_1}(P'_{i_1}, P_{-i_1}, R_S) = t_1$  if  $P'_{i_1} \in \mathcal{P}^*$ , and  $\varphi_{i_1}(P'_{i_1}, P_{-i_1}, R_S) = t_2$  if  $P'_{i_1} \in \mathcal{P}^{**}$ . In any case, as  $P_{i_1} \in \mathcal{P}^*$ ,  $\varphi_{i_1}(P_I, R_S) R_{i_1} \varphi_{i_1}(P'_{i_1}, P_{-i_1}, R_S)$ . On the other hand, suppose  $P_{i_1} \in \mathcal{P}^{**}$ . Then it follows from (2) and the construction of  $\varphi$  that  $\varphi_{i_1}(P_I, R_S) = t_2$ ,  $\varphi_{i_1}(P'_{i_1}, P_{-i_1}, R_S) = DA^\tau_{i_1}(P'_{i_1}, P_{-i_1}, R_S) = t_1$  if  $P'_{i_1} \in \mathcal{P}^*$ , and  $\varphi_{i_1}(P'_{i_1}, P_{-i_1}, R_S) = t_2$  if  $P'_{i_1} \in \mathcal{P}^{**}$ . Thus, in any case, as  $P_{i_1} \in \mathcal{P}^{**}$ ,  $\varphi_{i_1}(P_I, R_S) R_{i_1} \varphi_{i_1}(P'_{i_1}, P_{-i_1}, R_S)$ . Therefore,  $i_1$  cannot manipulate  $\varphi$  via  $P'_{i_1}$  at  $(P_I, R_S)$ .

We finally consider the case where  $R_S = \bar{R}_S$  and  $i = i_2$ .

Case 2-i:  $P_{I \setminus \{i_2\}} \notin (\mathcal{P}_{I_1}^{**}, \mathcal{P}_{I_2 \setminus \{i_2\}}^*, \mathcal{P}_{I_3}^3, \dots, \mathcal{P}_{I_m}^m, \mathcal{P}_{I_{m+1}}^*)$ . Then, for all  $P''_{i_2}$ ,  $\varphi(P''_{i_2}, P_{-i_2}, R_S) = DA^\tau(P''_{i_2}, P_{-i_2}, R_S)$  and  $DA^\tau$  is strategy-proof. Thus, student  $i_2$  cannot manipulate  $\varphi$  via  $P'_{i_2}$  at  $(P_I, R_S)$ .

Case 2-ii:  $P_{I \setminus \{i_2\}} \in (\mathcal{P}_{I_1}^{**}, \mathcal{P}_{I_2 \setminus \{i_2\}}^*, \mathcal{P}_{I_3}^3, \dots, \mathcal{P}_{I_m}^m, \mathcal{P}_{I_{m+1}}^*)$ . We show that

$$\text{for all } P''_{i_2}, DA^\tau_{i_2}(P''_{i_2}, P_{-i_2}, R_S) = t_2. \quad (3)$$

If  $P''_{i_2} \in \mathcal{P}^*$ , then by (1)  $DA^\tau_{i_2}(P''_{i_2}, P_{-i_2}, R_S) = t_2$ . Suppose  $P''_{i_2} \in \mathcal{P}^{**}$ . Then, since  $|\sum_{t \in T} q_t| < |I|$ , by the preference profile and non-wastefulness of  $DA^\tau$ , each school  $t \in T$  are fully assigned  $|q_t|$  students under DA. Moreover, schools  $t_3, \dots, t_m$  are filled by students in  $I_3, \dots, I_m$  under DA at  $(P''_{i_2}, P_{-i_2}, R_S)$ . Thus,  $i_1$  is assigned  $t_1, t_2$ , or some  $s \in S \setminus T$  under DA. Suppose on the contrary that  $i_2$  is assigned  $t_1$  or  $s \in S \setminus T$ . Then,  $t_2$  is assigned to some student in  $I_1 \cup I_{m+1}$ . However,  $(i_2, t_2)$  blocks the DA matching, which contradicts the stability of  $DA^\tau$ . Thus,  $DA^\tau_{i_2}(P''_{i_2}, P_{-i_2}, R_S) = t_2$ . This completes the proof of (3).

Suppose  $P_{i_2} \in \mathcal{P}^*$ . Then it follows from (3) and the construction of  $\varphi$  that  $\varphi_{i_2}(P_I, R_S) = t_1$ ,  $\varphi_{i_2}(P'_{i_2}, P_{-i_2}, R_S) = t_1$  if  $P'_{i_2} \in \mathcal{P}^*$ , and  $\varphi_{i_2}(P'_{i_2}, P_{-i_2}, R_S) = DA^\tau_{i_2}(P'_{i_2}, P_{-i_2}, R_S) = t_2$  if  $P'_{i_2} \in \mathcal{P}^{**}$ . In any case, since  $P_{i_2} \in \mathcal{P}^*$ ,  $\varphi_{i_2}(P_I, R_S) R_{i_2} \varphi_{i_2}(P'_{i_2}, P_{-i_2}, R_S)$ . On the other hand, suppose  $P_{i_2} \in \mathcal{P}^{**}$ . Then it follows from (3) and the construction of  $\varphi$  that  $\varphi_{i_2}(P_I, R_S) = DA^\tau_{i_2}(P_I, R_S) = t_2$ ,  $\varphi_{i_2}(P'_{i_2}, P_{-i_2}, R_S) = t_1$  if  $P'_{i_2} \in \mathcal{P}^*$ , and  $\varphi_{i_2}(P'_{i_2}, P_{-i_2}, R_S) = DA^\tau_{i_2}(P'_{i_2}, P_{-i_2}, R_S) = t_2$  if  $P'_{i_2} \in \mathcal{P}^{**}$ . Thus, in any case, since  $P_{i_2} \in \mathcal{P}^{**}$ ,  $\varphi_{i_2}(P_I, R_S) R_{i_2} \varphi_{i_2}(P'_{i_2}, P_{-i_2}, R_S)$ . Therefore,  $i_2$  cannot manipulate  $\varphi$  at  $(P_I, R_S)$ .  $\blacksquare$

## Discussion Paper of the Research Area Markets and Politics 2012

### Research Professorship & Project: **The Future of Fiscal Federalism**

- Benny Geys** SP II 2012-101  
Association Membership and Generalised Trust:  
Are Connections Between Associations Losing their Value?
- Benny Geys** SP II 2012-102  
Success and Failure in Electoral Competition:  
Selective Issue Emphasis under Incomplete Issue Ownership
- Tim Lohse, Julio R. Robledo** SP II 2012-103  
Public Self-Insurance and the Samaritan's Dilemma in a Federation
- Changxia Ke, Kai A. Konrad, Florian Morath** SP II 2012-104  
Alliances in the Shadow of Conflict
- Benny Geys, Karsten Mause** SP II 2012-105  
Delegation, Accountability & Legislator Moonlighting:  
Agency Problems in Germany
- Zuzana Murdoch, Jarle Trondal** SP II 2012-106  
Contracted Government:  
Unveiling the European Commission's Contracted Staff
- Research Unit: **Market Behavior**
- Sebastian Braun, Nadja Dwenger, Dorothea Kübler, Alexander Westkamp** SP II 2012-201  
Implementing Quotas in University Admissions:  
An Experimental Analysis
- Onur Kesten, Morimitsu Kurino** SP II 2012-202  
On the (im)possibility of improving upon the student-proposing deferred acceptance mechanism