

# Classification of Priorities Such That Deferred Acceptance is Obviously Strategyproof

CLAYTON THOMAS, Princeton University, U.S.A.

We study the strategic simplicity of stable matching mechanisms where one side has fixed preferences, termed priorities. Specifically, we ask which priorities are such that the strategyproofness of deferred acceptance (DA) can be recognized by agents unable to perform contingency reasoning, that is, *when is DA obviously strategyproof* (Li, 2017 [Li17])?

We answer this question by completely characterizing those priorities which make DA obviously strategyproof (OSP). This solves an open problem of Ashlagi and Gonczarowski, 2018 [AG18]. We find that when DA is OSP, priorities are either acyclic (Ergin, 2002 [Erg02]), a restrictive condition which allows priorities to only differ on only two agents at a time, or contain an extremely limited cyclic pattern where all priority lists are identical except for exactly two. We conclude that, for stable matching mechanisms, the tension between understandability (in the sense of OSP) and expressiveness of priorities is very high.

## 1 INTRODUCTION

The central task of mechanism design is achieving desirable outcomes in the presence of strategic behaviour. Traditionally, this is achieved through strategyproof mechanisms, in which truth telling is a dominant strategy. Suppose, however, that agents are not perfectly rational, and are not always able to identify their dominant strategies. To ensure good outcomes in such an environment, the mechanism must be strategically simple, that is, truth telling should be *easily recognized* as a dominant strategy.

The notion of *obvious* strategyproofness (OSP) has emerged in recent years as a fundamental criterion of strategic simplicity [Li17]. Briefly, OSP mechanisms are those which can be recognized as strategyproof by an agent who does not fully understand the mechanism they are participating in, but only understands how the possible results of the game depend on their own actions (and thus, this agent cannot perform the contingency reasoning required to prove that certain strategies are dominant). By eliminating the need to perform contingency reasoning, the dominant strategies in OSP mechanisms are easier to recognize, and the game becomes simpler for limited-sophistication agents to play [Li17, ZL17].

Matching environments are a crucially important environment for limited-sophistication agents. In the real world, centralized mechanisms are used to match workers to firms in labor markets, doctors to hospitals in residency matchings, and students to schools in school choice environments. In many of these markets, stability is a primary objective, and is often necessary to prevent market unraveling [Rot02]. Formally, stability means that no pair of unmatched agents would wish to break their match with their assigned partner, and pair with each other instead. The celebrated deferred acceptance (DA) algorithm of [GS62] efficiently determines a stable matching, and is strategyproof for one side of the market [DF81]. These attractive theoretical properties lead many real world matching markets to implement DA. Unfortunately, the agents participating in these mechanisms often do not have the cognitive resources to precisely identify and understand how they should participate in the mechanism, and in practice often make costly strategic mistakes even though the mechanism is strategyproof [HMRS17, RJ18]. This begs the question: why does deferred acceptance appear to be strategically complex, despite being strategyproof?

To get a lens on the strategic complexity of matching markets, we study obvious strategyproofness in stable matching mechanisms with one strategic side. In such an environment, a set of  $n$  strategic *applicants* (e.g., the students being matched to schools) is assigned in a one-to-one matching to a set of  $n$  *positions* (e.g., the schools). The applicants have *preferences* over the positions, represented as a ranked list from favorite to least favorite, which they may misreport if they believe it will benefit them. On the other hand, the preferences of the positions over the applicants are fixed and non-strategic, and thus termed *priorities* over the applicants<sup>1</sup>. We focus on applicant-proposing deferred acceptance<sup>2</sup> (DA), the canonical stable matching mechanism for strategic applicants.

Due to the crucial importance of the stable matching problem, a refined and precise understanding of the strategic complexity of deferred acceptance is vital. Moreover, obvious strategyproofness has been identified as the fundamental theoretical criterion of strategic simplicity for agents who are unable to perform contingency reasoning. The central question of this paper is thus: *for which priorities is deferred acceptance obviously strategyproof?*

<sup>1</sup>No stable matching mechanism can be strategyproof for both sides of the market [Rot82]. Since all obviously strategyproof mechanisms are strategyproof, limiting our attention to one strategic side is necessary.

<sup>2</sup>DA is the unique stable matching mechanism which is strategyproof for one side [GS85, CEPY16]. Thus, for the problem of finding obviously strategyproof stable matching mechanisms, restricting attention to DA proposes is without loss of generality.

This paper is a follow-up to [AG18], which was the first paper to study OSP implementations of stable matching mechanisms. [AG18] provides a condition on priorities which is sufficient for OSP implementability. This condition is *acyclicity*, as introduced in [Erg02]. Acyclicity is a strong condition on priorities, which intuitively says that priorities may only disagree on adjacent sets of two agents. More formally, a set of priorities is acyclic if the applicants can be partitioned into  $S_1, \dots, S_k$ , with  $|S_i| \leq 2$  for each  $i$ , such that each position gives higher priority to applicants in  $S_i$  than applicants in  $S_j$  for any pair  $i, j$  with  $j > i$  (see Proposition 2.8). [AG18] proves that DA is OSP implementable whenever priorities are acyclic. However, [AG18] shows that acyclicity is not necessary for priorities to be OSP implementable. That is, they give an example of cyclic yet OSP implementable priorities.

Unfortunately, [AG18] also proves that there exist fixed priority sets such that DA cannot be implemented with an OSP mechanism. However, they do not prove precisely which priorities are OSP implementable, and thus leave open the possibility that there are OSP implementable priorities which are “diverse” in some useful sense (that is, there may be priorities which allow for enough variation between the positions to capture practically useful constraints in some matching environment).

We show that for stable matching mechanisms, the gap between OSP implementable priorities and acyclic priorities is very small. That is, by classifying which priorities are OSP implementable, we show that very little is possible with cyclic but OSP implementable priorities.

We now give one example of cyclic but OSP priorities for 6 applicants and 6 positions. We write priorities as a list, starting from the top priority and proceeding downwards. In this example, positions 1, 2, 3, 4 have the same priority over all applicants, but 5 and 6 have slightly different priorities (we highlight the pairs of applicants at which 5 and 6 differ from 1, 2, 3, 4 using parentheses):

$$\begin{aligned}
 1, 2, 3, 4 : a &> b > c > d > e > f \\
 5 : a &> (c > b) > (e > d) > f \\
 6 : (b &> a) > (d > c) > (f > e)
 \end{aligned}
 \tag{*}$$

It turns out that all cyclic but OSP priorities can be constructed from acyclic priorities, and priorities that are exactly like this example (generalized to any number of applicants). In particular, when priorities are cyclic on some set of applicants, every position except for precisely two must have the same priority list (and moreover, the remaining two must differ in a precise pattern which flips only adjacent applicants). We term such priorities *limited cyclic* (Definition 3.1).

When priorities are acyclic, [AG18] shows that an OSP mechanism for DA constructed from simple combinations of a mechanism which we call 2Tr. Their mechanism proceeds in a way somewhat similar to a serial dictatorship (in which applicants arrive in some fixed order and are permanently matched to their favorite remaining position) but where two applicants may arrive simultaneously. These two agents are assigned to the remaining positions via the mechanism 2Tr. When priorities are limited cyclic, it turns out that an OSP mechanism can be constructed from a combination<sup>3</sup> of 2Tr and a fairly simple mechanism we term 3Lu, which interacts with three applicants at a time. Interestingly, this implies that in some sense there are only two “irreducible” obviously strategyproof stable matching mechanisms, 2Tr and 3Lu.

The crux of our characterization revolves around proving that when priorities are not limited cyclic, DA is not OSP implementable. We sketch how this proof proceeds below. Interestingly, the

<sup>3</sup>In the combined mechanism, no agent ever participates in two distinct “sub-mechanisms” 2Tr or 3Lu. This gives a strong sense in which ever OSP stable matching mechanism can be built out of 2Tr and 3Lu.

1		a	b	c
2		b	c	a
3		c	a	b

(a) Non-OSP by  
[AG18, Section 4]

1		a	b	c
2		a	b	c
3		c	a	b

(b) Non-OSP by [AG18, Appendix B] and Section B.2.1

1		a	b	c
2		a	b	c
3		c	b	a

1		a	b	c
2		a	b	c
3		b	c	a

1		a	b	c
2		a	c	b
3		c	b	a

(c) Non-OSP by  
Section B.2.2

1		a	b	c
2		b	a	c
3		c	b	a

(d) Non-OSP by  
Section B.2.3

1		a	b	c	d
2		a	b	d	c
3		a	c	b	d
4		b	a	c	d

(e) Non-OSP by  
Section B.4

Fig. 1. Each set of priorities displayed here is not OSP implementable. Moreover, any set of priorities which is not OSP implementable contains one of these sets of priorities as a sub-pattern (up to relabeling).

structure of the proof admits another characterization of OSP implementable priorities. Specifically, a set of priorities is OSP implementable if and only if no restriction of the priorities (i.e. restricting attention to some subset of positions and applicants) is equal to one of the priority sets listed in Figure 1. Thus, our characterization not only implies that there are essentially only two OSP stable matching mechanisms, but that there is in some sense a finite list of “irreducible” non-OSP priority sets.

All told, our characterizations can be concisely states as follows. We prove our main theorem in Section 4 as a simple combination of Theorem 3.2, Theorem 4.1, and Theorem 4.2.

**THEOREM (MAIN THEOREM).** *For any set of priorities  $q$ , the following are equivalent:*

- (1) *Deferred acceptance with priorities  $q$  is OSP implementable.*
- (2)  *$q$  is limited cyclic.*
- (3) *An OSP mechanism for deferred acceptance with priorities  $q$  can be constructed from compositions of 2Tr and 3Lu.*
- (4) *No restriction of  $q$  is equal, up to relabeling, to any of the priority sets exhibited in Figure 1.*

### 1.1 Intuition and layout of the proof

We now give informal intuition as to why one might expect obvious strategyproofness to place such severe restriction on priority sets. Obvious strategyproofness requires that every time an agent acts the mechanism, the worst thing that can happen if they play truthfully (for the remainder of the mechanism) is no worse than the best thing that can happen if they lie. When priorities are acyclic, there are at most two applicants who are ranked first by some set of position. As shown in [AG18], these applicants can be assigned to positions in an OSP manner via the mechanism 2Tr, which we recall in Figure 2. The mechanism 2Tr communicates with only these top two applicants and queries these applicants at most twice, that is, only those two applicants are “active”<sup>4</sup>, and each applicant “moves” at most twice. In order for *cyclic* priorities to be OSP, one of two things must happen in the mechanism: some applicant must move more than twice, or more than two applicants must be active at some point.

<sup>4</sup>Formally, at some state  $h$  of the mechanism, an applicant  $a$  is *active* if either  $a$  moves at  $h$ , or if  $a$  has moved in the past, but their match is not yet completely determined.




Fig. 2. An example of acyclic priorities, and the mechanism 2Tr which matches the “top two” applicants  $a, b$  (who have top priority at the set of positions  $U$  and  $V$ , respectively). “Clinching” a position  $x$  allows an applicant to exit the mechanism and be permanently matched to that position. At the top right node where applicant  $b$  acts, applicant  $a$  has moved, but their match is not yet determined, so two applicants are active. This mechanism is OSP because at the second node where  $a$  acts (i.e. the bottom right node),  $a$  can either clinch their favorite position in  $V$ , or (if  $b$  already clinched that position) they can clinch anything in  $U$  (the set they were offered to clinch at the first node where they acted).

Intuitively, no applicant can make more than two non-trivial moves in an OSP implementation of deferred acceptance because *it is hard for an applicant to ever guarantee themselves a position where they do not have top priority*. This is because when some applicant  $a$  proposes to such a position  $x$ , there is almost always a risk that an applicant with higher priority proposes to that position later. If an OSP mechanism learns from applicant  $a$  that their favorite position is  $x$ , but  $a$  is later rejected from  $x$ , they must be able to guarantee themselves every position which was possible at the first time they acted. Thus, the mechanism cannot again ask applicant  $a$  further questions which result in uncertainty for  $a$ , i.e. the second question asked to  $a$  should determine  $a$ ’s final match.

It is possible for three applicants to be active at some point in an OSP implementation of deferred acceptance. Indeed, this is the case in 3Lu. However, this can happen only in a very specific way. Let  $a$  be the first of those three applicants to move. It turns out that in order for this instance of DA to be OSP, the mechanism must deduce from the first question asked to  $a$  that one of the other applicants (call them  $c$ ) cannot possibly achieve some position. Due to the definition of DA, this means the mechanism must know  $a$ ’s favorite position, and  $c$  must have a lower priority than  $a$  at this position. But for a matching mechanism to be OSP, the only way it can deduce that  $a$ ’s favorite position is  $x$  is to offer  $a$  to “clinched” every position other than  $x$ <sup>5</sup>, that is,  $a$  must be able to guarantee themselves every position other than  $x$  if they choose. Thus,  $a$  must have top priority at every position other than  $x$ . For  $a$  to remain active after they move, there must be an applicant  $b$  such that  $x$  has priority  $b > a > c$ . Moreover, for  $b$  and  $c$  to be active at the same time, there must also be a position  $y$  for which  $c > b$ .

This informal argument begins to explain why the priority set of Figure 3 might be the only cyclic but OSP priority set for three applicants and three positions. This is indeed the case. Moreover, removing applicant  $a$  from consideration and applying the argument recursively, we’d expect that  $b$  should be the top applicant (other than  $a$ ) at every position except for one. Indeed, limited cyclic priority sets such as Equation (\*) satisfy a recursive property like this, in which removing

<sup>5</sup>For the reader familiar with [BG16], this is precisely the condition under which applicant  $u$  may become a “lurker” for position  $x$ .

their top applicants yields another limited cyclic priority set of the same pattern. This gives intuition for the structure of the proof as well – the highly demanding constraints which OSP imposes apply recursively, and generalizations of Figure 3 such as Equation (\*) are the only examples of cyclic but OSP priority sets.

More technically, our proof proceeds by first enumerating all cyclic priorities for three applicants and three positions. It turns out that up to relabeling there is only one such case which is OSP (namely, that of Figure 3), and all the others (namely, (a)-(d) of Figure 1) are non-OSP. As pointed out in [AG18], a set of priorities can be OSP only if every restriction of those priorities (to some subset of applicants and positions) is also OSP (we recall this in Lemma 2.6). Thus, the fact that only one cyclic case for three applicants and positions is OSP gives a very controlled form which cyclic and OSP priorities of four applicants and positions could possibly take. The only such nontrivial cases are limited cyclic cases, which are OSP, and (e) from Figure 1, which is not OSP. This again gives a very controlled form which cyclic and OSP priorities of more than four applicants and positions can take, and indeed suffices to show that all OSP priorities must be limited cyclic for any number of agents.

1	a	b	c
2	a	c	b
3	b	a	c

Fig. 3. OSP but cyclic case

## 1.2 Discussion

While our result allows for a general class of cyclic but OSP priorities, priorities like Equation (\*) are arguably *less* “diverse” than acyclic preferences. In acyclic preferences, half of all positions may give some applicant *a* in their top priority, but the other half may give some applicant *b* top priority. But our characterization shows that when priorities over some applicants are cyclic, the priorities of all positions must be identical except for exactly two of them. Thus, the expressiveness of OSP priorities is very limited – priorities may either differ on only two applicants at a time, or may differ at only two positions (in a very controlled way).

It is instructive to compare our characterization of OSP deferred acceptance mechanisms to the OSP implementations of *top trading cycles* presented in [Tro19]. OSP implementations of top trading cycles are also fairly restrictive, but may, for example, gradually endow an applicant with a larger and larger set of positions they might “clinch”, querying them many times. If the applicant’s favorite position is not in this “endowed” set, the applicant will not clinch any position, and based on the actions of other applicants, they may be gradually endowed with more positions and be called to act in the mechanism many times.

In contrast, in the mechanisms 2Tr and 3Lu, and thus in all OSP implementations of deferred acceptance, applicants are called to act at most two times. This may indicate that deferred acceptance is fundamentally more “strategically complex” than top trading cycles, because the obvious strategyproofness constraint seems more demanding for deferred acceptance than for top trading cycles. That is, the “more complex” deferred acceptance mechanism should have a smaller OSP subset, and its possible OSP interactions with the applicants should be more limited<sup>6</sup>. On the other hand, it is possible for three agents to be active at a time in OSP implementations of deferred acceptance (during the mechanism 3Lu), which can never happen in top trading cycles, so the comparison is nuanced.

<sup>6</sup>This conforms to our intuition for why OSP implementation of DA cannot ask agents to move more than twice. In DA, it is hard to guarantee an applicant any position where they do not have top priority. On the other hand, in the middle of the execution of top trading cycles, an applicant is guaranteed to receive a position (at least as good as) any position which currently points to them (directly or indirectly). OSP implementations of top trading cycles harness exactly this fact in order to (potentially) interact with agents many times.

Limited cyclic priorities, and thus all cyclic but OSP implementable priorities, are a generalization of the example used by [AG18] to demonstrate that acyclicity is not necessary for OSP implementability (and thus our mechanism 3Lu generalizes the mechanism which they constructed). This came as quite a surprise to us. Indeed, our first goal in pursuing this question was to identify interesting new cases of deferred acceptance with fixed priorities (for example, ones where more than 3 applicant are active at a time, or where an applicant moves more than twice). In the end, we proved that there are no such cases. We believe that this result is a further demonstration of the opinion that, while obvious strategyproofness is a fundamental notion of simplicity in mechanism design, new definitions are needed to allow for practical mechanisms which are still strategically simple or easy to explain. Studying the “irreducible” non-OSP priorities of Figure 1 may be a small stepping stone to formulating such a definition.

### 1.3 Additional related work

There is a rapidly growing body of work on obvious strategyproofness and various related notions of strategic simplicity. [Li17] introduced OSP, used this notion to study ascending price auctions, and proved that serial dictatorship is OSP implementable but top trading cycles with initial endowments is not OSP implementable. [AG18], the most related work to the present paper, was the first released follow-up work to [Li17]. [Tro19] and [MR20] study top trading cycles without initial endowments, and classify those priorities which make top trading cycles OSP implementable. Our classification completes the line of study initiated by [AG18], answering their main open questions. The present paper is significantly more involved than prior works on OSP matching mechanisms on the basis of priorities, and to complete our classification we must carefully reason about sub-patterns of priority sets as well as prove that several specific matching mechanisms induced by certain priority sets are not OSP implementable.

[BG16] studies a range of social-choice settings, and investigates the possibility of OSP and Pareto optimal social choice functions. Deferred acceptance with cyclic preferences is not Pareto optimal [Erg02], and thus falls outside this paradigm. [PT19] provides various simplification results for a broad class of domains which they call “rich”. [Bad19] constructs an interesting OSP mechanism for the house-matching problem with initial endowments in which agents have single-peaked preferences. [Mac20] studies OSP mechanisms in great generality, proving several equivalences and simplifications. [ZL17] provides a decision-theoretic framework justifying obvious dominance. [GL21] provides a general condition over any environment which is equivalent to OSP implementability, and provides an algorithm for checking this condition in time which is polynomial in the size of a table for computing the social choice function (i.e. a table listing the result for each possible tuple of agent’s types).

Refinements and generalizations of the notion of OSP have been made. [PT19] introduce the notions of strongly obviously strategyproof and one-step foresight obviously strategyproof mechanisms, which are a subset of OSP mechanisms which are even “simpler” to recognize as strategyproof. [TM20] introduces the notion of non-obviously manipulable mechanisms, which generalize *strategyproof* mechanisms to allow for some strategic manipulations (but not “obvious” ones). [LD20] goes in another distinct direction, and designs revenue-maximizing mechanisms for strategically simple agents (who may, for example, play dominated strategies but will not play obviously dominated strategies).

*Acknowledgements.* We thank Yannai Gonczarowski for invaluable guidance in the presentation of this manuscript. We thank Itai Ashlagi, Linda Cai, and Matt Weinberg for helpful discussions.

## 2 PRELIMINARIES AND PRIOR RESULTS

### 2.1 Mechanisms and Obvious Strategyproofness

An (ordinal) environment  $E = (Y, (\mathcal{T}_i)_{i \in \mathcal{N}})$  consists of a set of outcomes  $Y$ , a set of agents (also known as players)  $\mathcal{N} = [n]$ , and types  $\mathcal{T}_i$  for each agent  $i \in \mathcal{N}$ . Each type  $t_i \in \mathcal{T}_i$  corresponds to a weak order  $\succeq_i^{t_i}$  over outcomes in  $Y$ <sup>7</sup>, which represents how agent  $i$  ranks each outcome in  $Y$  when their type is  $t_i$ . A social choice function over  $E$  is a mapping  $f : \mathcal{T}_1 \times \dots \times \mathcal{T}_n \rightarrow Y$  from types of each agent to outcomes. The most commonly studied notion in mechanism design is that of a strategyproof social choice function:

DEFINITION 2.1. *Social choice function  $f$  is strategyproof if, for any  $i \in \mathcal{N}$ ,  $t_1 \in \mathcal{T}_1, \dots, t_n \in \mathcal{T}_n$ , and  $t'_i \in \mathcal{T}_i$ , we have*

$$f(t_i, t_{-i}) \succeq_i^{t_i} f(t'_i, t_{-i}).$$

To study cognitively limited agents (who may not fully understand the game they are playing), one needs to also know how the social choice function is implemented, i.e. how the social planner interacts with the strategic agents to compute  $f$ . This is done via a mechanism. A mechanism<sup>8</sup> over  $E$  is a tuple  $\mathcal{G} = (H, E, \text{Pl}, (\mathcal{T}_i(\cdot))_{i \in \mathcal{N}}, g)$  such that:

- $H$  is a set of states (also called nodes), and  $E$  is a set of directed edges between the states, such that  $(H, E)$  forms a finite directed tree (where every edge points away from the root). Let the set of leaves be denoted  $Z$ , and let the root be denoted  $h_0$ . For any  $h \in H$ , let  $\text{succ}(h) \subseteq H$  be the set of nodes which are immediate successors of  $h$  in the game tree.
- $\text{Pl} : H \setminus Z \rightarrow \mathcal{N}$  is the player choice function, which labels each non-leaf node in  $H \setminus Z$  with the agent who acts at that node.
- For each  $i \in \mathcal{N}$  and  $h \in H$ , we have  $\mathcal{T}_i(h) \subseteq \mathcal{T}_i$  the type-set of agent  $i$  at  $h$ . These must satisfy
  - For any  $h$  with  $\text{Pl}(h) = i$ , the sets  $\{\mathcal{T}_i(h')\}_{h' \in \text{succ}(h)}$  form a partition of  $\mathcal{T}_i(h)$ .
  - If  $\text{Pl}(h) \neq i$ , then for all  $h' \in \text{succ}(h)$ , we have  $\mathcal{T}_i(h') = \mathcal{T}_i(h)$ .
- $g : Z \rightarrow Y$  labels each leaf node with an outcome in  $Y$ .

For types  $t_1 \in \mathcal{T}_1, \dots, t_n \in \mathcal{T}_n$ , we let  $\mathcal{G}(t_1, \dots, t_n)$  denote  $g(\ell)$ , where  $\ell$  is the unique leaf node of  $H$  with  $(t_1, \dots, t_n) \in \mathcal{T}_1(\ell) \times \dots \times \mathcal{T}_n(\ell)$ . We say  $\mathcal{G}$  implements social choice function  $f$  when  $\mathcal{G}(t_1, \dots, t_n) = f(t_1, \dots, t_n)$ . Note that the collection of nodes  $h$  where  $(t_1, \dots, t_n) \in \mathcal{T}_1(h) \times \dots \times \mathcal{T}_n(h)$  always forms a path from the root to the leaf  $\ell$ . Intuitively, this path is the “execution path” of  $\mathcal{G}(t_1, \dots, t_n)$ . A node  $h$  where  $\text{Pl}(h) = i$  represents the mechanism asking player  $i$  the question “which of the sets  $\{\mathcal{T}_i(h')\}_{h' \in \text{succ}(h)}$  does your type lie in?”. If agent  $i$  with type  $t_i$  plays truthfully, the mechanism only reaches node  $h$  if  $t_i \in \mathcal{T}_i(h)$ , and the agent will “play the action” leading to the unique  $h'$  with  $t_i \in \mathcal{T}_i(h')$ .

Obvious strategyproofness (OSP) can then be defined as follows:

DEFINITION 2.2 (OSP, [L17, AG18]). *Mechanism  $\mathcal{G}$  over  $E$  is OSP at node  $h \in H$  if the following holds: If  $\text{Pl}(h) = i$ , for every  $t_i \in \mathcal{T}_i(h)$ , let  $h' \in \text{succ}(h)$  be the unique successor node of  $h$  such that  $t_i \in \mathcal{T}_i(h')$ . Then for every leaf  $\ell$  which is a descendant of  $h$  such that  $t_i \in \mathcal{T}_i(\ell)$ , and every leaf  $\ell'$  which is a descendant of  $h$  but not  $h'$ , we have  $g(\ell) \succeq_i^{t_i} g(\ell')$ .*

*Mechanism  $\mathcal{G}$  is OSP if it is OSP at every node  $h \in H$ .*

*Social choice function  $f$  over  $E$  is OSP implementable (simply called OSP for short) if there exists an OSP mechanism which implements  $f$ .*

<sup>7</sup>A weak order over  $Y$  is a reflexive and transitive binary relation on  $Y$  such that, for all  $x, y \in Y$ , we have one of  $x \succeq y$  or  $y \succeq x$ . We write  $a > b$  when we have  $a \succeq b$  but we do not have  $b \succeq a$ .

<sup>8</sup>In technical terms, we consider a mechanism to be a deterministic perfect information extensive form game with consequences in  $Y$ . As in [AG18], restricting attention to these mechanisms is without loss of generality.

In words, a mechanism is OSP if, for every node  $h$  where an agent  $i$  is called to act, the *worst* thing that can happen if  $i$  continues to play truthfully for the rest of the game is no worse for  $i$  than the *best* thing that could possibly happen if  $i$  deviates at node  $h$ . In particular, this implies that the mechanism (and the social choice function it implements) is strategyproof.

**2.1.1 Monotonicity of OSP implementability.** A subdomain of an environment  $E = (Y, (\mathcal{T}_i)_{i \in N})$  is simply another environment  $E' = (Y', (\mathcal{T}'_i)_{i \in N})$ , in which  $Y' \subseteq Y$  and  $\mathcal{T}'_i \subseteq \mathcal{T}_i$  for each  $i \in N = [n]$ . A restriction of a social choice function  $f$  to  $E'$  is the social choice function  $f|_{E'}$  such that  $f|_{E'}(t_1, \dots, t_n) = f(t_1, \dots, t_n)$  for each  $(t_1, \dots, t_n) \in \mathcal{T}'_1 \times \dots \times \mathcal{T}'_n$ , provided that  $f(t_1, \dots, t_n) \in Y'$  for each  $(t_1, \dots, t_n) \in \mathcal{T}'_1 \times \dots \times \mathcal{T}'_n$ .

The following lemma is essentially the “pruning” technique pioneered by [Li17] and used in almost all known works on OSP mechanisms.

**LEMMA 2.3.** *If a social choice function  $f$  over  $E$  is OSP, then every restriction  $f|_{E'}$  of  $f$  to a subdomain  $E'$  is also OSP.*

**PROOF.** Consider any OSP implementation  $\mathcal{G}$  of  $f$  over  $E$ . Construct a mechanism  $\mathcal{G}'$  over  $E' = (Y', (\mathcal{T}'_i)_{i \in N})$  with the same set of states, the same player function  $\text{Pl}$ , and the same outcome function  $g$ . Define type sets  $\mathcal{T}'_i(h) = \mathcal{T}_i(h) \cap \mathcal{T}'_i$  for each node  $h$  of  $\mathcal{G}'$ . It is clear that  $\mathcal{G}'$  implements  $f|_{E'}$ . Moreover, it follows directly from the definitions that if  $\mathcal{G}'$  failed to be OSP, then  $\mathcal{G}$  would fail to be OSP, a contradiction.  $\square$

## 2.2 Matching mechanisms

Our primary interest is the *one sided stable matching environment* with  $n$  applicants and  $n$  positions. The outcomes  $Y$  of this environment consist of the set of assignments of all applicants to some (distinct) position. That is,  $Y$  is the set of all bijections  $\mu$  between applicants and positions. We typically denote applicants with letters  $a_i$  or  $\{a, b, c, \dots\}$ , and we denote positions as  $p_i$  or with integers  $x \in \{1, 2, 3, \dots\}$ . We let  $\mu(a_i)$  denote the position  $a_i$  is assigned to, and let  $\mu(p_i)$  denote the applicant assigned to position  $p_i$ .

For each applicant  $a_i$ , the set of types  $\mathcal{T}_{a_i}$  consists of all total orderings over the  $n$  positions. Each applicant is indifferent between matchings which assign the applicant to the same position. Formally, for  $t_i \in \mathcal{T}_{a_i}$ , we have  $\mu \succ_i^{t_i} \mu'$  if and only if  $\mu(a_i) \prec_i \mu'(a_i)$ . We refer to types of applicants as *preferences* over the positions, and denote them  $\succ_{i \in \mathcal{T}_{a_i}}$ . We typically suppress the notation  $\mu \succ_i^{t_i} \mu'$  in favor of simply  $\mu(a_i) \succ_i \mu'(a_i)$ .

Consider a set  $q = \{\succ_i\}_{i \in [n]}$  of preferences over the *applicants*, one for each position. We refer to these as *priorities*, as they are fixed and not considered strategic. A matching  $\mu$  is *stable* if, for every pair  $a, p$  of applicants and positions for which  $\mu(a) \neq p$ , we either have  $\mu(a) \succ_a p$ , or  $\mu(p) \succ_p a$ . That is, no pair of one applicant and one position would rather match with each other than with their assignment under  $\mu$ . Note that we restrict attention to complete preference lists (where every applicant ranks every position and vice-versa) and environments with the same number of applicants and positions (and thus, stable matchings must have every applicant and position matched).

The celebrated results of [GS62] are that there always exists a unique applicant-optimal stable matching (that is, one in which each applicant is assigned to their favorite position among the set of positions they are assigned to in any stable matching). Moreover, this matching can be found in the polynomial time algorithm of *applicant-proposing deferred acceptance*. We thus define the social choice function<sup>9</sup>  $\text{DA}^q$  as follows:

<sup>9</sup>This is a slight abuse of notion, because the proper deferred acceptance algorithm constitutes a mechanism, but we use  $\text{DA}^q$  to refer to a social choice function.

DEFINITION 2.4. For a fixed set of priorities  $q = \{>_i\}_i$ , we let  $DA^q$  denote the social choice function which, for any set of applicant's preferences  $\{>_a\}_a$ , outputs the applicant-optimal stable matching.

This social choice function is strategyproof [DF81], and the main question this paper addresses is when  $DA^q$  is furthermore *obviously* strategyproof.

DEFINITION 2.5 (OSP PRIORITIES). We say that a set of priorities  $q = \{>_i\}$  of  $n$  positions over  $n$  applicants is OSP implementable (or simply OSP for short) if  $DA^q$  is OSP implementable.

2.2.1 *Monotonicity of OSP priorities.* Section 2.1.1 describes a general monotonicity condition of OSP mechanisms: restricting attention to a subset of each agent's types preserves the OSP property. In the context of matching environments with fixed priorities, we need to reason about a second kind of monotonicity as well<sup>10</sup>.

LEMMA 2.6. Consider a set of priorities  $q = \{>_i\}_i$  of  $n$  positions over  $n$  applicants. If  $q$  is OSP, then for any  $m \leq n$  and any subset  $S$  of  $m$  applicants and  $T$  of  $m$  positions, the restriction of  $q' = \{>_i\}_{i \in T}$  is OSP as well.

PROOF. Let  $\mathcal{G}$  be an OSP implementation of  $DA^q$ . Consider any subdomain  $E'$  in which applicants in  $S$  rank all positions in  $T$  before all positions not in  $T$ , and all applicants not in  $S$  have a fixed preference ranking which puts distinct positions not in  $S$  as their top preference. In a run of deferred acceptance with preferences in  $E'$ , all applicants outside of  $S$  will immediately propose to their top choice, and never be rejected. Moreover, agents outside of  $S$  will have no effect on the run of DA for agents in  $S$  and preferences in  $E'$ . Thus, consider  $\mathcal{G}'$  restricted to  $E'$ . Restricting  $\mathcal{G}'$  to agents in  $S$  give an OSP implementation of  $DA^{q'}$ .  $\square$

2.2.2 *Cyclic priorities.* Cyclic priorities were introduced to the context of studying  $DA^q$  by [Erg02], which categorizes acyclic priorities as precisely those for which  $DA^q$  always results in a matching which is Pareto optimal for the applicants.

DEFINITION 2.7 ([Erg02]). A priority set  $\{>_i\}_i$  over  $\mathcal{N}$  is cyclic if there exists applicants  $a, b, c$  and positions  $i, j$  such that  $a >_i b >_j c$  and  $c >_j a$ .

Priorities are called acyclic otherwise.

The acyclicity condition is very strong, that is, acyclicity does not allow for a wide diversity in the priorities. We typically use the following characterization to describe acyclic priorities:

PROPOSITION 2.8. Priorities are acyclic if and only if there exists an ordered partition  $S_1, \dots, S_k$  of applicants such that  $1 \leq |S_i| \leq 2$ , and for all  $a \in S_i$  and  $b \in S_{i+1} \cup \dots \cup S_k$ , every position  $x$  has  $a >_x b$ .

PROOF. If such a partition exists and there is a position  $x$  with  $a >_x b >_x c$ , then  $a, c$  cannot be in the same element of the partition. Thus, for each position  $y$ , we have  $a >_y c$ , and priorities are acyclic.

On the other hand, if priorities are acyclic, observe that there can be at most two applicants which have the top priority at any position. If there is only one such applicant  $a$ , let  $S_1 = \{a\}$ . If there are two such applicants  $a, b$ , observe that the top two priorities of each position must be  $a$  and  $b$  (if the top two priorities of some position  $x$  were  $a >_x c$ , then we'd have  $a >_x c >_x b$  and  $b >_y a$  for some other position  $y$ ). So let  $S_1 = \{a, b\}$ . Observe that removing  $\{a, b\}$  from each priority list results in another set of acyclic priorities, so repeating this process until all applicants are in some  $S_i$  constructs the desired partition.  $\square$




Fig. 4. An OSP implementation of DA for priorities 1 :  $a > b > c$ , 2 :  $b > a > c$ , and 3 :  $a > c > b$  as in [Theorem 2.9, Item 2](#) (originally in [\[AG18, Section 3\]](#)). Actions labeled with  $C(i)$  indicate an action which “clinches” position  $i$  for the applicant acting at that node (that is, when an applicant takes action  $C(i)$ , they will be irrevocably matched to position  $i$ ). Square nodes represent subtrees in which the priorities of unmatched positions, restricted to unmatched applicants, become acyclic (and thus OSP implementable). Circular nodes are leaf nodes in which the match is determined. Some nodes are labeled above with the set of remaining “possible” positions the applicant may be matched to in all descendant leafs. These sets can be calculated using the properties of the classic applicant-proposing deferred acceptance algorithm. (For example, at the  $(c)$  node in the figure, we know that  $a$ ’s favorite position is 3, so  $a$  will propose to 3 in deferred acceptance. But  $a$  has higher priority at 3 than  $c$ , so  $c$  will never be matched to 3. Similar logic implies that at the second  $(b)$  node,  $b$  cannot get 2, because  $c$  has proposed to 2). To verify that this mechanism is OSP, it suffices to check that at the second node where any agent acts, they can clinch any position they were able to clinch in the first node where they acted.

**2.2.3 Prior results on OSP implementations of DA .** We concisely sum up the results of [\[AG18\]](#) as follows:

**THEOREM 2.9** ([\[AG18\]](#)). *Consider a set of priorities  $q$  over applicants.*

- (1) *If  $q$  is acyclic, then  $DA^q$  is OSP<sup>11</sup>.*
- (2) *There exists a  $q$  which is cyclic, yet  $DA^q$  is OSP. Specifically, one such set of priorities (which is OSP implemented by the mechanism described in [Figure 4](#)) is:*

$$1 : a > b > c$$

$$2 : a > c > b$$

$$3 : b > a > c$$

- (3)  *$DA^q$  is not OSP in general. Specifically, neither of the following preference sets are OSP implementable:*

$$1 : a > b > c$$

$$2 : b > c > a$$

$$3 : c > a > b$$

$$1 : a > b > c$$

$$2 : a > b > c$$

$$3 : c > a > b$$

The main result of this paper is to close the gap between the construction and impossibility result of [\[AG18\]](#).

### 3 PROOF THAT LIMITED CYCLIC PRIORITIES ARE OSP

The cyclic yet OSP example of [Theorem 2.9, Item 2](#) can be extended in the following way to include arbitrarily many applicants:

<sup>10</sup>As demonstrated by [\[MR20\]](#), this sort of monotonicity is somewhat subtle, and does not hold for priorities used in the top trading cycles mechanism. However, for deferred acceptance in our environment, this type of monotonicity holds.

<sup>11</sup>See [Figure 5](#) for the basic idea of how an OSP mechanism is constructed. This is a special case of [Theorem 3.2](#).

DEFINITION 3.1. For any  $\ell, k \geq 3$ , a set of priorities of  $\ell$  positions over applicants  $\{a_1, a_2, \dots, a_k\}$  is two-adjacent-alternating if, up to relabeling, each priority list is of the form  $x = a_1 > a_2 > a_3 > a_4 > \dots$  except for two, one of which is of the form  $u$  (where  $u$  flips every adjacent pair of applicants starting from  $a_2, a_3$  onward), and the other is of the form  $v$  (where  $v$  flips every adjacent pair of applicants starting from  $a_1, a_2$  onward). That is, up to relabeling we have

$$\begin{aligned} x : a_1 &> a_2 > a_3 > a_4 > a_5 > a_6 > a_7 \dots \\ u : a_1 &> a_3 > a_2 > a_5 > a_4 > a_7 > a_6 \dots \\ v : a_2 &> a_1 > a_4 > a_3 > a_6 > a_5 > \dots \end{aligned}$$

where  $x$  is repeated  $\ell - 2$  times, and  $u$  and  $v$  each appear exactly once.

A set of priorities  $\{>_x\}_x$  is limited cyclic if there exists an ordered partition  $S_1, S_2, \dots, S_L$  of applicants, such that for any  $a \in S_i$  and  $b \in S_{i+1}, \dots, S_L$ , we have  $a >_x b$  for all positions  $x$ , and moreover, for any  $i$  with  $|S_i| \geq 3$ , the restriction of  $\{>_x\}_x$  to  $S_i$  is two-adjacent-alternating.

For two examples of two-adjacent alternating priorities, consider

$$\begin{array}{l|llllll} 1,2,3,4 & a & b & c & d & e & f \\ 5 & a & (c & b) & (e & d) & f \\ 6 & (b & a) & (d & c) & (f & e) \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{l|llllll} 1,2,3,4,5 & a & b & c & d & e & f & g \\ 6 & a & (c & b) & (e & d) & (g & f) \\ 7 & (b & a) & (d & c) & (f & e) & g \end{array}$$

(where we write each priority list as an ordered list, and add parentheses to highlight where applicants are flipped from their “normal ordering”).

Observe that by Proposition 2.8, acyclic priorities are a special case of limited cyclic priorities, in which each  $|S_i| \leq 2$ . Moreover, the preference list of Theorem 2.9, Item 2 is limited cyclic. It turns out that limited cyclic priorities are the *only* priorities that are cyclic and OSP implementable. In this section, we prove that limited cyclic priorities are OSP implementable. In the next section, we prove that *only* limited cyclic priorities are OSP implementable.

THEOREM 3.2. For any set of priorities  $q$  which is limited cyclic,  $DA^q$  is OSP implementable.

PROOF. Suppose  $q$  is limited cyclic, and let  $S_1, S_2, \dots, S_L$  be the partition of applicants as in Definition 3.1. We use induction on  $L$  to construct a mechanism  $\mathcal{G}$  which is OSP and implements  $DA^q$ .

The proof will procede as in [AG18] in the case that  $|S_1| \in \{1, 2\}$ . Moreover, when  $|S_1| = k \geq 3$ , the mechanism of Figure 4 can be used “in sequence”  $k - 2$  times to assign applicants in  $S_1$ . The key observation is that in Definition 3.1, removing  $a_1$  from a two-adjacent-alternating set of priorities results in a two-adjacent-alternating set of priorities with one fewer applicant. For completeness, we now provide the full details.

Suppose  $|S_1| = 1$ , say  $S_1 = \{a\}$ . In this case,  $\mathcal{G}$  can simply have  $a$  choose to be matched to any position, remove  $a$  and their match from consideration, and run a mechanism OSP implementing  $DA^q$  restricted to  $S_2, \dots, S_L$ . This is clearly OSP for  $a$ , and implements  $DA^q$ .

Suppose  $|S_1| = 2$ , say  $S_1 = \{a, b\}$ . Let  $U$  be the set of positions which rank  $a$  first, and let  $V$  be those which rank  $b$  first. Observe that in  $DA^q$ , if  $a$ ’s favorite position is any  $u \in U$ , then they will be matched, and if  $b$ ’s favorite position is any  $v \in V$ , then they will be matched. If neither of the above happen, then  $a$ ’s favorite lies in  $V$  and  $b$ ’s favorite lies in  $U$ , so both applicants  $a$  and  $b$  are matched to their favorite position. Consider the mechanisms  $2Tr_{a,b}^{U,V}$  in Figure 5. By the above logic, this mechanism correctly computes the match of  $a$  and  $b$ . Moreover, this mechanism is OSP for both  $a$  (because if  $a$  passes at the root node, then  $a$  will either be offered all of  $U$  or all of  $V$ ) and  $b$  (because  $b$  acts only once in any execution of the mechanism). After running  $2Tr_{a,b}^{U,V}$ , remove  $a, b$  from the matching and run an OSP mechanism to match  $S_2, \dots, S_L$  by induction. This is OSP and implements  $DA^q$ .




Fig. 5. The mechanism  $2\text{Tr}_{a,b}^{U;V}$ , in which all positions give top priority to either  $a$  or  $b$ , and positions in  $U$  rank  $a$  first, and positions in  $V$  rank  $b$  first. The name  $2\text{Tr}$  refers to the idea that  $a$  and  $b$  can trade their priority at  $U$  and  $V$  if they wish. An agent should choose to “clinch” a position (that is, become permanently matched to that position) when that position is their favorite among the set of positions which are still possible for them to match to. This mechanism was used by [AG18] to show that all acyclic priorities are OSP implementable.




Fig. 6. The mechanism  $3\text{Lu}_{a_1, \dots, a_k}^{X,u,v}$  for two-adjacent-alternating priorities over  $a_1, a_2, \dots, a_k$  (labeled as in Definition 3.1, with  $X$  denoting the set of positions with priority list  $x$ ). The name  $3\text{Lu}$  refers to the idea that applicant  $a_1$  becomes a “lurker” for position  $v$  (following the terminology of [BG16]), while the mechanism must query  $a_2$  and  $a_3$  to know if  $a_1$  matches to  $v$ . If  $a_1$  clinches some  $x \in X$ , then the remaining priorities on  $a_2, \dots, a_k$  are also two-adjacent-alternating, and we can recursively construct an OSP mechanism. In all other branches, one of  $u$  or  $v$  is matched, and the remaining priorities are acyclic.

All nodes are OSP, by similar logic to that of Figure 4. Specifically, at the second node where any agent acts, they are able to clinch everything they were offered to clinch at their first node. In particular, when  $a_1$  acts in the square node (i), they can clinch any position in  $X \cup \{u\}$ . When  $a_3$  acts in the square node (ii), two things are possible:  $a_1$  may have clinched  $u$  (in which case  $a_3$  can clinch any  $x \in X$ ), or not (in which case  $a_3$  will match with  $u$ , their favorite attainable position).

Suppose  $|S_1| = k \geq 3$ , say  $S_1 = \{a_1, a_2, a_3, \dots, a_k\}$ , where we label  $(a_i)_{i \in [k]}$ ,  $x$ ,  $u$ , and  $v$  as in the definition of two-adjacent-alternating priorities (Definition 3.1). Let  $X$  denote the set of positions with preference  $x$ . By the same logic of Figure 4 (which describes a mechanism from [AG18]), we can see that  $3\text{Lu}_{a_1, \dots, a_k}^{X,u,v}$  in Figure 6 correctly computes the match of  $a_1, a_2$ , and  $a_3$ . Moreover, if the top choice of  $a_1$  is some position  $x \in X$ , then  $a_1$  can be matched to  $x$  and the remaining priorities

over  $a_2, \dots, a_k$  are still two-adjacent-alternating. So a mechanism can be recursively constructed in this case.

The resulting mechanism is OSP for the same reason as in [AG18]. For completeness, we check the OSP constraints here. If  $a_1$  “passes” in the first round (i.e. if they choose not to clinch any position), the only way  $a_1$  moves again is if  $a_2$  clinches  $v$  at some point. But the next action of  $a_1$  always allows  $a_1$  to clinch  $X \cup \{u\}$ , which is everything  $a_1$  could clinch in their first node. If  $a_2$  “passes” in their first node displayed in Figure 6, then at their second node they can still clinch all of  $X \cup \{v\}$ , which is everything  $a_2$  could clinch in their first node. If  $a_3$  passes, then they only move again if  $a_2$  clinches  $v$  and then  $a_1$  clinches  $u$ . But in this case,  $a_3$  can clinch any position in  $X$ , which is everything  $a_2$  could clinch in their first node. Thus, the mechanism is OSP.

After running  $3Lu_{a_1, \dots, a_k}^{X, u, v}$ , remove  $S_1$  from the matching and run an OSP mechanism to match  $S_2, \dots, S_L$  by induction. This is OSP and implements  $DA^q$ .

Thus, all limited cyclic priorities are OSP implementable.  $\square$

#### 4 PROOF OF MAIN THEOREM

The crux of our characterization is proving that priorities which are not limited cyclic are not OSP. Formally, this breaks down into two results as follows:

**THEOREM 4.1.** *None of the priority sets shown in Figure 1 are OSP implementable.*

**PROOF.** For each of Subfigures (a) through (e) of Figure 1 respectively, this is shown in [AG18, Section 4], Section B.2.1, Section B.2.2, Section B.2.3, and Section B.4.  $\square$

**THEOREM 4.2.** *Consider any priority set  $q$ . If no restriction of  $q$  is equal to any of the priority sets of Figure 1, then  $q$  is limited cyclic.*

We prove both these theorems in full in Appendix B. The proof is organized as outlined in Section 1.1 to naturally reveal how this characterization (and in particular, the list of priority sets of Figure 1) was originally attained. With these results in hand, the proof of our main characterization is easy:

**THEOREM (MAIN THEOREM).** *For any set of priorities  $q$ , the following are equivalent:*

- (1) *Deferred acceptance with priorities  $q$  is OSP implementable.*
- (2)  *$q$  is limited cyclic.*
- (3) *An OSP mechanism for deferred acceptance with priorities  $q$  can be constructed from compositions of  $2Tr$  and  $3Lu$ .*
- (4) *No restriction of  $q$  is equal, up to relabeling, to any of the priority sets exhibited in Figure 1.*

**PROOF.** Theorem 3.2 shows that (2) implies (1) and (3). (3) implies (1) by definition. By Theorem 4.1 and Lemma 2.6, (1) implies (4). By Theorem 4.2, (4) implies (2). This proves the theorem.  $\square$

#### REFERENCES

- [AG18] Itai Ashlagi and Yannai A Gonczarowski. Stable matching mechanisms are not obviously strategy-proof. *Journal of Economic Theory*, 177:405–425, 2018. Originally appeared in 2015.
- [Bad19] Sophie Bade. Matching with single-peaked preferences. *Journal of Economic Theory*, 180:81–99, 2019.
- [BG16] Sophie Bade and Yannai A Gonczarowski. Gibbard-satterthwaite success stories and obvious strategyproofness. In *EC*, 2016.
- [CEPY16] Peter Chen, Michael Egedal, Marek Pycia, and M Bumin Yenmez. Manipulability of stable mechanisms. *American Economic Journal: Microeconomics*, 8(2):202–14, 2016.
- [DF81] E. L. Dubins and A. D. Freedman. Machiavelli and the gale-shapley algorithm. *The American Mathematical Monthly*, 88:485–494, 08 1981.
- [Erg02] Haluk I. Ergin. Efficient resource allocation on the basis of priorities. *Econometrica*, 70(6):2489–2497, 2002.

- [GL21] Louis Golowich and Shengwu Li. On the computational properties of obviously strategy-proof mechanisms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2101.05149*, 2021.
- [GS62] D. Gale and Lloyd S. Shapley. College admissions and the stability of marriage. *American Mathematical Monthly*, 69:9–14, 1962.
- [GS85] David Gale and Marilda Sotomayor. Some remarks on the stable matching problem. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 11(3):223–232, 1985.
- [HMRS17] Avinatan Hassidim, Déborah Marciano, Assaf Romm, and Ran I Shorrer. The mechanism is truthful, why aren’t you? *American Economic Review*, 107(5):220–24, 2017.
- [LD20] Jiangtao Li and Piotr Dworczak. Are simple mechanisms optimal when agents are unsophisticated? *Available at SSRN 3632971*, 2020.
- [Li17] Shengwu Li. Obviously strategy-proof mechanisms. *Mathematische Annalen*, 107(11):3257–3287, 2017. Originally appeared in 2015.
- [Mac20] Andrew Mackenzie. A revelation principle for obviously strategy-proof implementation. *Games and Economic Behavior*, 2020.
- [MR20] Pinaki Mandal and Souvik Roy. Obviously strategy-proof implementation of assignment rules: A new characterization. *Preprint*, 2020.
- [PT19] Marek Pycia and Peter Troyan. A theory of simplicity in games and mechanism design. *CEPR Discussion Paper No. DP14043*, 2019.
- [RJ18] Alex Rees-Jones. Suboptimal behavior in strategy-proof mechanisms: Evidence from the residency match. *Games and Economic Behavior*, 108(C):317–330, 2018.
- [Rot82] Alvin E. Roth. The economics of matching: stability and incentives. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 7(4):617–628, 1982.
- [Rot02] Alvin E Roth. The economist as engineer: Game theory, experimentation, and computation as tools for design economics. *Econometrica*, 70(4):1341–1378, 2002.
- [TM20] Peter Troyan and Thayer Morrill. Obvious manipulations. *Journal of Economic Theory*, 185:104970, 2020.
- [Tro19] Peter Troyan. Obviously strategy-proof implementation of top trading cycles. *International Economic Review*, 60(3):1249–1261, 2019.
- [ZL17] Luyao Zhang and Dan Levin. Bounded rationality and robust mechanism design: An axiomatic approach. *American Economic Review*, 107(5):235–39, 2017.

## A KEY TECHNICAL LEMMA

Papers on obvious strategyproofness typically use [Lemma 2.3](#) to find a more tractable subdomain in which to prove a social choice function is not OSP. Intuitively, the goal is to find a subdomain in which a mechanism can *never* ask an agent a nontrivial question about their type in an OSP manner<sup>12</sup>. When we prove a fixed priority list is non-OSP, we always use the following lemma:

LEMMA A.1. *Consider a social choice function  $f$  over an environment  $E = (Y, \mathcal{T}_1, \dots, \mathcal{T}_n)$ . Suppose there is a subdomain  $E' = (Y, \mathcal{T}'_1, \dots, \mathcal{T}'_n)$  of  $E$ , where  $|\mathcal{T}'_i| \in \{1, 2, 3\}$  for each  $i$ , and there is some  $i$  for which  $|\mathcal{T}'_i| > 1$ . Suppose further that we have:*

- (1) *For each  $i$  where  $|\mathcal{T}'_i| = 2$ : there exists  $\succ_i, \succ'_i \in \mathcal{T}'_i$ , where  $\succ_i \neq \succ'_i$ , and  $\succ_{-i}, \succ'_{-i} \in \mathcal{T}'_{-i}$  such that  $f(\succ'_i, \succ'_{-i}) \succ_i f(\succ_i, \succ_{-i})$ .*
- (2) *For each  $i$  where  $|\mathcal{T}'_i| = 3$ : for every  $\succ_i \in \mathcal{T}'_i$ , there exists  $\succ'_i \in \mathcal{T}'_i$  with  $\succ'_i \neq \succ_i$ , and  $\succ_{-i}, \succ'_{-i} \in \mathcal{T}'_{-i}$  such that  $f(\succ'_i, \succ'_{-i}) \succ_i f(\succ_i, \succ_{-i})$ .*

Then  $f$  is not OSP.

PROOF. Suppose we have a mechanism  $\mathcal{G}$  implementing  $f|_{E'}$  over the subdomain  $E'$ . Recall that for any node  $h$  of  $\mathcal{G}$ , we let  $\text{succ}(h)$  denote the set of immediate successor nodes of  $h$ . For this proof, let  $\text{desc}(h)$  denote the set of descendants of  $h$  in the game tree. Consider the (unique) earliest node  $h_0$  in  $\mathcal{G}$  with at least two distinct successors  $h_1, h_2 \in \text{succ}(h_0)$  such that  $\mathcal{T}_i(h_1), \mathcal{T}_i(h_2) \neq \emptyset$ . Let  $i = \text{Pl}(h_0)$ , and observe that for every  $j \neq i$ , we have  $\mathcal{T}_j(h_0) = \mathcal{T}'_j$ .

Suppose that  $|\mathcal{T}'_i| = 2$ , and let  $\mathcal{T}'_i = \{\succ_i, \succ'_i\}$ , and  $\succ_{-i}, \succ'_{-i} \in \mathcal{T}'_{-i}$  be as in [Item 1](#). The only possible nontrivial partition of  $\mathcal{T}'_i$  is  $\{\{\succ_i\}, \{\succ'_i\}\}$ , and thus we must have  $\text{succ}(h_0) = \{h_1, h_2\}$ , where  $\mathcal{T}'_i(h_1) = \{\succ_i\}$ ,  $\mathcal{T}'_i(h_2) = \{\succ'_i\}$ . In order for  $\mathcal{G}$  to correctly compute  $f$ , there must be some leaf  $\ell \in \text{desc}(h_1)$  with  $g(\ell) = f(\succ_i, \succ_{-i})$ , and some  $\ell' \in \text{desc}(h_2)$  with  $g(\ell') = f(\succ'_i, \succ'_{-i})$ . But then we have  $g(\ell') \succ_i g(\ell)$ , so  $\mathcal{G}$  is not OSP.

Suppose that  $|\mathcal{T}'_i| = 3$ . Any nontrivial partition of  $(\mathcal{T}'_i(h))_{h \in \text{succ}(h_0)}$  must put some type  $\succ_i$  in its own set of the partition. Thus,  $\mathcal{T}'_i(h_1) = \{\succ_i\}$  for some  $h_1 \in \text{succ}(h_0)$ . For this  $\succ_i$ , let  $\succ'_i \in \mathcal{T}'_i$  and  $\succ_{-i}, \succ'_{-i} \in \mathcal{T}'_{-i}$  be as in [Item 2](#). Let  $h_2 \in \text{succ}(h_0)$  have  $\succ'_i \in \mathcal{T}'_i(h_2)$ . In order for  $\mathcal{G}$  to correctly compute  $f$ , there must be some leaf  $\ell \in \text{desc}(h_1)$  with  $g(\ell) = f(\succ_i, \succ_{-i})$ , and some  $\ell' \in \text{desc}(h_2)$  with  $g(\ell') = f(\succ'_i, \succ'_{-i})$ . But then we have  $g(\ell') \succ_i g(\ell)$ , so  $\mathcal{G}$  is not OSP.

Thus, in either case  $\mathcal{G}$  is not OSP<sup>13</sup>, and no mechanism implementing  $f|_{E'}$  can be OSP. But by [Lemma 2.3](#), this means that no mechanism implementing  $f$  can be OSP either.  $\square$

## B PROOF OF THEOREMS 4.1 AND 4.2

In this appendix, we complete the proof of our main theorem by showing that all priorities which are not limited cyclic are non-OSP. The proof proceeded through a series of case analysis and proving that  $\text{DA}^q$  is non-OSP (using [Lemma A.1](#)) for specific instances of  $q$  identified by the case analysis.

*Notation:* For brevity, we typically write sets of priorities of the positions lists like

1	a	b	c		1 : a > b > c
2	b	c	a	instead of the more cluttered	2 : b > c > a .
3	c	a	b		3 : c > a > b

<sup>12</sup>This is equivalent to the “pruning principle” in [\[Li17\]](#).

<sup>13</sup>This lemma can readily be extended to 4 or more types per agent, but the resulting case analysis becomes more involved. At worst, one needs to look at all possible partitions of  $\mathcal{T}'_i$ , and find two types  $\succ_i, \succ'_i$  in different elements of the partition such that  $f(\succ'_i, \succ'_{-i}) \succ_i f(\succ_i, \succ_{-i})$  for some  $\succ_{-i}, \succ'_{-i}$ . It is interesting to note that all concrete proofs of non-OSP implementability that we are aware of use at most 3 types per agent.

We typically write the preference lists of applicants like  $p_a^i = 1, 2, 3$ , which indicates that applicant  $a$  with type  $p_a^i$  has top preference for position 1, followed by 2 and then 3.

We often transcribe the run of applicant-proposing deferred acceptance, both to see what the outcome is and track what facts about priorities are important for the argument. We write this like

$$\begin{array}{c|c|c|c|c} 1 & b & c & & a \\ 2 & & & & \\ 3 & a & & c & \end{array} \quad b ,$$

where the positions are 1,2,3, their row shows the applicants proposing to them, and the vertical bars separate proposals that happen in different “time steps”. When we apply [Lemma A.1](#), we construct a subdomain of preferences of applicants, and show that each required case (where some applicant acts at the root node of the mechanism) is satisfied. For clarity, we show which cases are the “truth getting a bad result” (which computes  $DA^q(>_i, >_{-i})$  as in [Lemma A.1](#)) and which are a “lie getting a good result” (which computes  $DA^q(>'_i, >_{-i})$ ).

### B.1 Enumeration for three applicants and positions

We start by enumerating all possible priorities of 3 positions  $\{1, 2, 3\}$  over 3 applicants  $\{a, b, c\}$ , up to relabeling. In [Section B.2](#), we classify all those cases not already handled by [\[AG18\]](#) as either OSP or non-OSP.

First, fix the first position’s priority as  $a > b > c$  and consider the other two positions. There are 6 cases where the second position also has priority list  $a > b > c$  (items 1 and 2, which each contain 3 distinct cases). There are  $10 = \binom{5}{2}$  priority sets where all positions’ priority lists are distinct, but it turns out that there are only four cases up to relabeling (items 3 to 6, which each contain one case up to relabeling).

- (1) Acyclic cases. These are OSP, as shown in [\[AG18, Section 3\]](#) (this is a special case of [Theorem 3.2](#)).

These are:

$$\begin{array}{c|c|c} 1 & a & b & c \\ 2 & a & b & c \\ 3 & a & b & c \end{array} \quad \text{and} \quad \begin{array}{c|c|c} 1 & a & b & c \\ 2 & a & b & c \\ 3 & b & a & c \end{array} \quad \text{and} \quad \begin{array}{c|c|c} 1 & a & b & c \\ 2 & a & b & c \\ 3 & a & c & b \end{array} .$$

- (2) Cyclic cases where positions 1 and 2 have identical priorities. By adapting a proof from [\[AG18, Appendix B\]](#), we show these are not OSP in [Section B.2.1](#). These are:

$$\begin{array}{c|c|c} 1 & a & b & c \\ 2 & a & b & c \\ 3 & c & a & b \end{array} \quad \text{and} \quad \begin{array}{c|c|c} 1 & a & b & c \\ 2 & a & b & c \\ 3 & c & b & a \end{array} \quad \text{and} \quad \begin{array}{c|c|c} 1 & a & b & c \\ 2 & a & b & c \\ 3 & b & c & a \end{array} .$$

- (3) The “fully cyclic” case. This is shown to not be OSP in [\[AG18, Section 4\]](#). This is:

$$\begin{array}{c|c|c} 1 & a & b & c \\ 2 & b & c & a \\ 3 & c & a & b \end{array} .$$

- (4) The cyclic but OSP case. These are all equivalent up to relabeling. An OSP mechanism for these is constructed in [\[AG18, Section 3\]](#) (this is a special case of [Theorem 3.2](#)). These are:

$$\begin{array}{c|c|c} 1 & a & b & c \\ 2 & b & a & c \\ 3 & a & c & b \end{array} \quad \text{and} \quad \begin{array}{c|c|c} 1 & a & b & c \\ 2 & b & a & c \\ 3 & b & c & a \end{array} \quad \text{and} \quad \begin{array}{c|c|c} 1 & a & b & c \\ 2 & a & c & b \\ 3 & c & a & b \end{array} .$$

- (5) The case in which two positions have the same top priority applicant (but distinct priority lists). These are all equivalent up to relabeling. We show these are not OSP in [Section B.2.2](#).

These are:

$$\begin{array}{c|c|c} 1 & a & b & c \\ 2 & a & c & b \\ 3 & c & b & a \end{array} \quad \text{and} \quad \begin{array}{c|c|c} 1 & a & b & c \\ 2 & a & c & b \\ 3 & b & c & a \end{array} \quad \text{and} \quad \begin{array}{c|c|c} 1 & a & b & c \\ 2 & c & b & a \\ 3 & c & a & b \end{array} .$$

1	a	b	c	1	a	b	c	1	a	b	c	1	a	b	c
2	a	b	c	2	a	b	c	2	a	b	c	2	a	c	b
3	a	b	c	3	b	a	c	3	a	c	b	3	b	a	c

(a) OSP by acyclicity

(b) OSP but cyclic case

Fig. 7. OSP cases for three positions and three applicants.

1	a	b	c	1	a	b	c	1	a	b	c
2	b	c	a	2	a	b	c	2	a	b	c
3	c	a	b	3	c	a	b	3	c	b	a

(a) Non-OSP by [AG18, Section 4]

(b) Non-OSP by [AG18, Appendix B] and Section B.2.1

1	a	b	c	1	a	b	c
2	a	c	b	2	b	a	c
3	c	b	a	3	c	b	a

(c) Non-OSP by Section B.2.2

(d) Non-OSP by Section B.2.3

Fig. 8. Non-OSP cases for three positions and three applicants.

- (6) The case in which all positions have distinct top priority applicants (other than the “fully cyclic” case). These are all equivalent up to relabeling. We prove below that this is not OSP in Section B.2.3. These are:

1	a	b	c	1	a	b	c	1	a	b	c
2	b	a	c	2	b	a	c	2	c	b	a
3	c	a	b	3	c	b	a	3	b	c	a

The following lemmas immediately follow from inspection of the above cases. In Section B.3, we use the conditions of this proposition to identify which cases for four applicants and positions contain no restriction which is non-OSP.

LEMMA B.1. *If there is a set of priorities of 3 positions over 3 applicant, where each applicant has top priority at some position, then the priorities are in Figure 8 (and thus are not OSP).*

LEMMA B.2. *If there is a set of priorities of 3 positions over 3 applicants which is cyclic, and in which two priority lists are identical, then the priorities are in Figure 8 (and thus are not OSP).*

LEMMA B.3. *If there is a set of priorities of 3 positions over 3 applicants for which two positions have exactly reversed priority lists, then the priority set is in Figure 8 (and thus are not OSP).*

LEMMA B.4. *If a set of priorities of 3 positions of 3 positions over 3 applicants not in Figure 8 (i.e. if the priorities are OSP), then there is a pair of applicants  $a, c$  such that  $a$  has higher priority than  $c$  at every position.*

## B.2 Cases with three applicants and positions

In this subsection, we prove that Subfigures (b) through (d) of Figure 8 are non-OSP. This completes the classification of which priorities are OSP for three applicants and three positions.

B.2.1 *The cases where two priorities are identical.* Appendix B of [AG18] shows that priorities

1	a	b	c
2	a	b	c
3	c	a	b

are non-OSP. We re-prove this, and point out that the proof as given (with the same applicants' preferences) does not require anything about positions 3's priority over applicant  $b$ .

CLAIM B.5. *Any priorities such that*

$$1 : a > b > c$$

$$2 : a > b > c$$

$$3 : c > a$$

*are not OSP.*

PROOF. We apply Lemma A.1 to the the subdomain in which applicants may have the following preferences:

$$p_a^1 = 3, 1, 2$$

$$p_b^1 = 1, 2, 3$$

$$p_c^1 = 1, 2, 3$$

$$p_a^2 = 3, 2, 1$$

$$p_b^2 = 2, 1, 3$$

$$p_c^2 = 1, 3, 2$$

$$p_c^3 = 2, 3, 1$$

- $a$  acts at the root node.

$$\text{"truth getting a bad result": } p_a^2, p_b^1, p_c^2: \begin{array}{c|c|c} 1 & b & c \\ 2 & & \\ 3 & a & c \end{array} \left| \begin{array}{c} a \end{array} \right.$$

This works any time  $b >_1 c$  and  $c >_3 a$ .

$$\text{"lie getting a good result": } p_a^1, p_b^2, p_c^2: \begin{array}{c|c} 1 & c \\ 2 & b \\ 3 & a \end{array}.$$

This works regardless of the priorities.

- $b$  acts at the root node.

$$\text{"truth getting a bad result": } p_a^1, p_b^1, p_c^2: \begin{array}{c|c|c|c} 1 & b & c & \\ 2 & & & a \\ 3 & a & c & \end{array} \left| \begin{array}{c} b \end{array} \right.$$

This works any time  $b >_1 c$ ,  $c >_3 a$ ,  $a >_1 b$ .

$$\text{"lie getting a good result": } p_a^2, p_b^2, p_c^3: \begin{array}{c|c|c|c} 1 & & & b \\ 2 & b & c & \\ 3 & a & c & a \end{array}.$$

This works any time  $b >_2 c$ ,  $c >_3 a$ ,  $a >_2 b$ .

- $c$  acts at the root node. There are three subcases, depending on which preference of  $c$  is "singled out".

–  $p_c^1$  singled out.

$$\text{"truth getting a bad result": } p_a^2, p_b^1, p_c^1: \begin{array}{c|c|c} 1 & b & c \\ 2 & & \\ 3 & a & \end{array} \left| \begin{array}{c} c \end{array} \right.$$

This needs  $b >_1 c$ .

$$\text{"lie getting a good result": } p_a^2, p_b^2, p_c^2: \begin{array}{c|c} 1 & c \\ 2 & b \\ 3 & a \end{array}.$$

This works regardless.

- $p_c^2$  singled out. This is essentially the same as the previous case, and again we only need  $b >_1 c$  for the case to work.
- $p_c^3$  singled out.

$$\text{“truth getting a bad result”}: p_a^1, p_b^2, p_c^3 \quad \begin{array}{c|c|c} 1 & & \\ 2 & b & c \\ 3 & a & c \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c} \\ \\ a \end{array}.$$

This needs  $b >_2 c$ .

$$\text{“lie getting a good result”}: p_a^1, p_b^1, p_c^1: \quad \begin{array}{c|c|c} 1 & b & c \\ 2 & & \\ 3 & a & \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c} \\ \\ c \end{array}.$$

This needs  $b >_1 c$ .

Note that nowhere in the above case analysis did we require anything about 3’s preference over  $b$  (indeed, in the runs of DA in the argument,  $b$  never proposes to 3).

□

**B.2.2 The case where two priorities have the same top applicant.** Consider the argument in [Section B.2.1](#), which details the facts about the position’s priorities are necessary for the argument to go through. Note that 2’s priority over  $b$  and  $c$  doesn’t effect the argument too much – only the “lie” case of “ $b$  acts at the root” and the “truth” case of “ $p_c^3$  singled out” required that  $b >_2 c$ . We’d like to use this observation to additionally prove that priorities

$$\begin{array}{c|c|c|c} 1 & a & b & c \\ 2 & a & c & b \\ 3 & c & b & a \end{array}$$

are not OSP-implementable. As it turns out, we will need one additional preference for  $b$  (namely  $p_b^3$ ).

CLAIM B.6. *Priorities*

$$\begin{aligned} 1 &: a > b > c \\ 2 &: a > c > b \\ 3 &: c > b > a \end{aligned}$$

are not OSP.

We apply [Lemma A.1](#) to the the subdomain in which applicants may have the following preferences:

$$\begin{array}{lll} p_a^1 = 3, 1, 2 & p_b^1 = 1, 2, 3 & p_c^1 = 1, 2, 3 \\ p_a^2 = 3, 2, 1 & p_b^2 = 2, 1, 3 & p_c^2 = 1, 3, 2 \\ & p_b^3 = 2, 3, 1 & p_c^3 = 2, 3, 1 \end{array}$$

Note that all preferences from [Section B.2.1](#) are still in the subdomain – we merely add  $p_b^3$ . We describe how the argument from [Section B.2.1](#) must change.

- $a$  acts at the root node. This argument works as before:  $a$ ’s preferences are the same, and 2’s priority list was irrelevant for this case. For this to work requires only that  $b >_1 c$  and  $c >_3 a$ .
- $b$  acts at the root node. This argument now has three subcases.
  - $p_b^1$  singled out. This is close to the original case of  $b$  being at the root, but needs modification (it actually gets a bit easier to satisfy).

“truth getting a bad result”: (as before)  $p_a^1, p_b^1, p_c^2$ :  $\begin{array}{c|c|c|c} 1 & b & c & \\ 2 & & & a \\ 3 & a & & c \end{array} \left| \begin{array}{c} b \end{array} \right.$ .

This works any time  $b \succ_1 c$ ,  $c \succ_3 a$ ,  $a \succ_1 b$ .

“lie getting a good result”:  $p_a^1, p_b^2, p_c^3$ :  $\begin{array}{c|c|c|c} 1 & & & b \\ 2 & b & c & \\ 3 & & a & \end{array} \left| \begin{array}{c} b \end{array} \right.$ .

This requires  $c \succ_2 b$  (as is indeed now the case).

–  $p_b^2$  singled out.

“truth getting a bad result”:  $p_a^1, p_b^2, p_c^3$ :  $\begin{array}{c|c|c|c} 1 & & & b \\ 2 & b & c & \\ 3 & & a & \end{array} \left| \begin{array}{c} b \end{array} \right.$ .

This requires  $c \succ_2 b$ .

“lie getting a good result”:  $p_a^1, p_b^3, p_c^2$ :  $\begin{array}{c|c|c} 1 & c & \\ 2 & b & \\ 3 & a & \end{array} \left| \begin{array}{c} b \end{array} \right.$ .

This works regardless of priorities.

–  $p_b^3$  singled out.

“truth getting a bad result”:  $p_a^1, p_b^3, p_c^3$ :  $\begin{array}{c|c|c|c} 1 & & & a \\ 2 & b & c & \\ 3 & & a & b \end{array} \left| \begin{array}{c} a \end{array} \right.$ .

This requires that  $c \succ_2 b$ .

“lie getting a good result”: (as the previous subcase):  $p_a^1, p_b^2, p_c^2$ :  $\begin{array}{c|c} 1 & c \\ 2 & b \\ 3 & a \end{array} \left| \begin{array}{c} b \end{array} \right.$ .

This works regardless of priorities.

•  $c$  acts at the root node. One of the subcases changes.

–  $p_c^1$  singled out. This case still holds as before. This requires  $b \succ_1 c$ .

–  $p_c^2$  singled out. This case still holds as before. This requires  $b \succ_1 c$ .

–  $p_c^3$  singled out. This subcase needs different logic because the original argument depended on  $b \succ_2 c$  (indeed, fixing this subcase was the reason we need to add the preference  $p_b^3$  to the analysis).

“truth getting a bad result”:  $p_a^2, p_b^3, p_c^3$ :  $\begin{array}{c|c|c|c|c} 1 & & & & b \\ 2 & b & c & & \\ 3 & & a & b & c \end{array} \left| \begin{array}{c} b \end{array} \right.$ .

This needs  $c \succ_2 b$ ,  $b \succ_3 a$ ,  $a \succ_2 c$ .

“lie getting a good result”: (as before)  $p_a^1, p_b^1, p_c^1$ :  $\begin{array}{c|c|c} 1 & b & c \\ 2 & & \\ 3 & a & \end{array} \left| \begin{array}{c} c \end{array} \right.$ .

This needs  $b \succ_1 c$ .

**B.2.3 The case where all priorities have distinct top applicants.** We now consider the final case with three positions and three applicants, namely

$\begin{array}{c|c|c} 1 & a & b & c \\ 2 & b & a & c \\ 3 & c & a & b \end{array}$ .

This has a bit different flavor because every applicant has first priority at some position.

CLAIM B.7. *Priorities*

- $$\begin{aligned}
1 : a > b > c \\
2 : b > a > c \\
3 : c > a > b
\end{aligned}$$

are not OSP.

PROOF. We apply [Lemma A.1](#) to the the subdomain in which applicants may have the following preferences:

$$\begin{array}{lll}
p_a^1 = 2, 1, 3 & p_b^1 = 3, 2, 1 & p_c^1 = 2, 3, 1 \\
p_a^2 = 3, 1, 2 & p_b^2 = 1, 3, 2 & p_c^2 = 1, 2, 3 \\
p_a^3 = 3, 2, 1 & & p_c^3 = 1, 3, 2
\end{array}$$

- $a$  acts at the root node.

- $p_a^1$  singled out.

$$\text{“truth getting a bad result”}: p_a^1, p_b^1, p_c^1: \begin{array}{c|c|c|c} 1 & & & \\ 2 & a & c & \\ 3 & b & & c \end{array} \begin{array}{c|c} & b \\ & \end{array} \begin{array}{c} a \\ . \end{array}$$

$$\text{“lie getting a good result”}: p_a^3, p_b^2, p_c^3: \begin{array}{c|c|c} 1 & b & c \\ 2 & & \\ 3 & a & c \end{array} \begin{array}{c} a \\ . \end{array}$$

- $p_a^2$  singled out.

$$\text{“truth getting a bad result”}: p_a^2, p_b^2, p_c^3: \begin{array}{c|c|c|c} 1 & b & c & \\ 2 & & & a \\ 3 & a & c & \end{array} \begin{array}{c|c} & b \\ & \end{array} \begin{array}{c} a \\ b \\ . \end{array}$$

$$\text{“lie getting a good result”}: p_a^3, p_b^2, p_c^1: \begin{array}{c|c} 1 & b \\ 2 & c \\ 3 & a \end{array} \begin{array}{c} . \\ . \end{array}$$

- $p_a^3$  singled out.

This is essentially the same as the previous case. In the “truth getting a bad result”  $a$  gets kicked out of 3, but in the “lie getting a good result”  $b$  and  $c$  leave  $a$  alone.

- $b$  acts at the root node.

$$\text{“truth getting a bad result”}: p_a^2, p_b^2, p_c^3: \begin{array}{c|c|c|c} 1 & b & c & \\ 2 & & & a \\ 3 & a & c & \end{array} \begin{array}{c|c} & b \\ & \end{array} \begin{array}{c} a \\ b \\ . \end{array}$$

$$\text{“lie getting a good result”}: p_a^1, p_b^1, p_c^3: \begin{array}{c|c} 1 & c \\ 2 & a \\ 3 & b \end{array} \begin{array}{c} . \\ . \end{array}$$

- $c$  at the root.

- $p_c^1$  singled out.

$$\text{“truth getting a bad result”}: p_a^1, p_b^2, p_c^1: \begin{array}{c|c|c} 1 & b & \\ 2 & c & a \\ 3 & & c \end{array} \begin{array}{c} . \\ . \end{array}$$

$$\text{“lie getting a good result”}: p_a^2, p_b^2, p_c^2: \begin{array}{c|c|c} 1 & b & c \\ 2 & & \\ 3 & a & \end{array} \begin{array}{c} c \\ . \end{array}$$

–  $p_c^2$  singled out.

“truth getting a bad result”:  $p_a^2, p_b^2, p_c^2$ :  $\begin{array}{c|cc} 1 & b & c \\ 2 & & \\ 3 & a & \end{array} \quad c$ .

“lie getting a good result”:  $p_a^1, p_b^1, p_c^3$ :  $\begin{array}{c|cc} 1 & c & \\ 2 & a & \\ 3 & b & \end{array}$ .

–  $p_c^3$  singled out.

This is essentially the same as the previous case. In the “truth getting a bad result”  $c$  gets kicked out of 1, but in the “lie getting a good result”  $b$  and  $c$  leave  $a$  alone.

□

### B.3 Enumeration for four applicants and positions

We now describe and enumerate all cyclic priority sets for four applicants and four positions for which no restriction to three applicants and three positions is non-OSP. Due to the fact that (up to relabeling) exactly one set of cyclic priorities over three applicants is OSP, the collection of priority sets we need to consider is fairly small. Our enumeration proceeds through a series of lemmas.

LEMMA B.8. *Consider a set of priorities of  $n \geq 3$  positions over 3 applicants. Suppose the priorities are cyclic, yet no set of 3 positions have priorities over the three applicants which are equal (up to relabeling) to any of the priority sets in Figure 8 (i.e. no restriction to 3 positions is non-OSP). The, up to relabeling, every position’s priority list is of the form  $x$  except for two, which are of the form  $u$  and  $v$ , where we have*

$$\begin{array}{c|ccc} x & a & b & c \\ u & a & c & b \\ v & b & a & c \end{array}$$

*That is, priorities  $q$  are two-adjacent-alternating.*

PROOF. Such a priority set must, in particular, have an OSP and cyclic set of priorities of 3 positions contained in it. By Section B.1, up to relabeling, the only 3 applicant and 3 position priority set which is OSP is

$$\begin{array}{c|ccc} x & a & b & c \\ u & a & c & b \\ v & b & a & c \end{array}.$$

Thus, by relabeling, we can assume that three position’s priority lists are  $x, u, v$ . We now consider what the priority lists of the other positions could possibly be.

By Lemma B.1, other positions cannot have  $c$  as their top priority. Thus, the only possible preference other than those of  $x, u, v$  is  $w : b > c > a$ . But then positions  $u, v, w$  together form a pattern equivalent to that of Section B.2.2, and are not OSP.

Thus, all other positions must have priority lists which are equal to one of  $x, u$ , or  $v$ . If the priority list  $u$  or  $v$  is repeated, say at position  $y$ , then Lemma B.2 implies that  $u, v$ , and  $y$  together form a preference list in Figure 8. Thus, the only possibility is repeating the priority list of  $x$ .

□

LEMMA B.9. *Suppose  $q$  is a set of priorities of 4 positions over 4 applicants. Suppose  $q$  is cyclic, yet no restriction of  $q$  is equal (up to relabeling) to any priority set of Figure 8. Then, up to relabeling,  $q$*

must equal one of the following priority sets:

1	<b>d</b>	a	b	c	1	a	<b>d</b>	b	c	1	<b>d</b>	a	b	c
2	<b>d</b>	a	b	c	2	<b>d</b>	a	b	c	2	<b>d</b>	a	b	c
3	<b>d</b>	a	c	b	3	<b>d</b>	a	c	b	3	a	<b>d</b>	c	b
4	<b>d</b>	b	a	c	4	<b>d</b>	b	a	c	4	<b>d</b>	b	a	c

1	a	b	c	<b>d</b>	1	a	b	c	<b>d</b>	1	a	b	c	<b>d</b>
2	a	b	c	<b>d</b>	2	a	b	<b>d</b>	c	2	a	b	c	<b>d</b>
3	a	c	b	<b>d</b>	3	a	c	b	<b>d</b>	3	a	c	b	<b>d</b>
4	b	a	<b>d</b>	c	4	b	a	c	<b>d</b>	4	b	a	c	<b>d</b>

PROOF. Suppose the priorities are cyclic over applicants  $a, b, c$ . By [Lemma B.8](#), we can assume without loss of generality that the priorities, restricted to applicants  $a, b, c$ , are

1	a	b	c
2	a	b	c
3	a	c	b
4	b	a	c

Thus, we need only consider where applicant  $d$  is inserted on the priority list of each position. We divide into cases based on the position of applicant  $d$  on position 4's list. Throughout the proof, we make heavy use of [Lemmas B.1](#) through [B.4](#). To make the proof more readable, we mark this assumption on 4's list by (d), and when we consider a slot in a priority list where  $d$  might be located, we write "d?".

- $4 \mid (d) b a c$ .

By [Lemma B.3](#),  $d$  cannot be after  $b$  in any priority list of  $i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$  (as then we would have  $d >_4 b >_4 a$  and  $a >_i b >_i d$  for some  $i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ ). Thus  $d$  can be in the following places:

1	d?	a	d?	b	c	
2	d?	a	d?	b	c	
3	d?	a	d?	c	d?	b
4	(d)	b	a	c		

By [Lemma B.2](#), at most one position  $i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$  can have  $a >_i d >_i b$  (as we have  $b >_4 a$ ). Moreover, if  $i = 1$  and 2 both have  $d >_i a >_i c$ , then we cannot have  $c >_3 d$  (by [Lemma B.2](#) applied to  $d, a, c$ ). Thus, up to relabeling 1 and 2, the cases are

1	<b>d</b>	a	b	c	1	a	<b>d</b>	b	c	1	<b>d</b>	a	b	c
2	<b>d</b>	a	b	c	2	<b>d</b>	a	b	c	2	<b>d</b>	a	b	c
3	<b>d</b>	a	c	b	3	<b>d</b>	a	c	b	3	a	<b>d</b>	c	b
4	(d)	b	a	c	4	(d)	b	a	c	4	(d)	b	a	c

- $4 \mid b (d) a c$ .

By [Lemma B.1](#), either all  $i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$  have  $d >_i a$ , or none of them do. Moreover, by [Lemma B.3](#), we never have  $a >_i d >_i b$  (as  $b >_4 d >_4 a$ ). Thus, the places  $d$  could be are either

1	d?	a	b	c	1	a	b	d?	c	d?
2	d?	a	b	c	2	a	b	d?	c	d?
3	d?	a	c	b	3	a	c	b	d	
4	b	(d)	a	c	4	b	(d)	a	c	

or

For both cases, we can use [Lemma B.2](#) (applied to positions 1, 2, 4 and applicants  $d, a, b$ ) to see that all of these cases contain a priority set of [Figure 8](#). Thus, there are **no** possible cases with  $4 \mid b (d) a c$ .

- $4 \mid b a (d) c$ .

By [Lemma B.3](#), we never have  $d \succ_i a \succ_i b$  for  $i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$  (as we have  $b \succ_4 a \succ_4 d$ ). Moreover, we can't have  $c \succ_3 d \succ_3 b$  (as we have  $b \succ_4 d \succ_4 c$ ). If we have  $d \succ_3 c \succ_3 b$ , then by [Lemma B.3](#) we cannot have  $b \succ_i c \succ_i d$  for  $i \in \{1, 2\}$ . Thus the possible cases are:

1	a	d?	b	d?	c	1	a	d?	b	d?	c	d?
2	a	d?	b	d?	c	2	a	d?	b	d?	c	d?
3	a	d?	c	b		3	a	c	b	d?		
4	b	a	(d)	c		4	b	a	(d)	c		

Let's examine the first subcase. If either  $i \in \{1, 2\}$  has  $a \succ_i d \succ_i b$ , then the priorities are not OSP (by [Lemma B.2](#) applied to applicants  $a, d, b$  and positions  $i, 3$  and  $4$ ). But if both  $i \in \{1, 2\}$  have  $b \succ_i d \succ_i c$ , then the preference is also not OSP by [Lemma B.2](#) (applied to positions  $1, 2, 3$  and applicants  $b, d, c$ ). So **none** of the preferences in this subcase can be OSP.

Now let's consider the second subcase. By [Lemma B.3](#), we cannot have  $d \succ_i b \succ_i c$  for either of  $i \in \{1, 2\}$  (as we have  $c \succ_3 b \succ_3 d$ ). Moreover, we also cannot have  $b \succ_i d \succ_i c$  for either  $i \in \{1, 2\}$  by [Lemma B.2](#), (applied to position  $i, 3, 4$  and applicants  $b, d, c$ ). Thus, the only possible case remaining is

1	a	b	c	<b>d</b>
2	a	b	c	<b>d</b>
3	a	c	b	<b>d</b>
4	b	a	(d)	c

- $4 \mid b a c (d)$ .

By [Lemma B.3](#), we never have  $d \succ_i a \succ_i b$  for any  $i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$  (as we have  $b \succ_4 a \succ_4 d$ ), and moreover we can't have  $d \succ_3 c \succ_3 b$  (as we have  $b \succ_4 c \succ_4 d$ ). Thus, the possible locations for  $d$  are

1	a	d?	b	d?	c	d?
2	a	d?	b	d?	c	d?
3	a	c	d?	b	d?	
4	b	a	c	(d)		

By [Lemma B.3](#), if we have  $c \succ_3 d \succ_3 b$ , then we cannot have  $b \succ_i d \succ_i c$  for either of  $i \in \{1, 2\}$ , and if  $c \succ_3 b \succ_3 d$ , then we cannot have  $d \succ_i b \succ_i c$  for either of  $i \in \{1, 2\}$ . Thus, the cases which can be OSP are:

1	a	d?	b	c	d?	1	a	b	d?	c	d?
2	a	d?	b	c	d?	2	a	b	d?	c	d?
3	a	c	d	b		3	a	c	b	d	
4	b	a	c	(d)		4	b	a	c	(d)	

Consider the first subcase above. By [Lemma B.2](#) (applied to positions  $1, 2, 3$  and applicants  $b, d, c$ ), in the first subcase above we cannot have  $d \succ_i b \succ_i c$  for both  $i \in \{1, 2\}$ . But if  $b \succ_i c \succ_i d$  for some  $i \in \{1, 2\}$ , then the preference is not OSP, again by [Lemma B.2](#) (applied to positions  $i, 3, 4$  and applicants  $b, c, d$ ). So **none** of the priorities in this subcase are OSP.

Consider now the second subcase above. Again by [Lemma B.2](#) (applied to positions  $1, 2, 3$  and applicants  $b, d, c$ ), in the second subcase we cannot have  $b \succ_i d \succ_i c$  for both  $i \in \{1, 2\}$ . Thus, up to relabeling positions  $1, 2$ , the possible OSP cases are

1	a	b	<b>d</b>	c	1	a	b	c	<b>d</b>
2	a	b	c	<b>d</b>	2	a	b	c	<b>d</b>
3	a	c	b	<b>d</b>	3	a	c	b	<b>d</b>
4	b	a	c	(d)	4	b	a	c	(d)

□

Out of the six priority sets in the above lemma, four are limited cyclic (and thus OSP). The other two, namely

$$\begin{array}{c|cccc} 1 & a & \mathbf{d} & b & c \\ 2 & \mathbf{d} & a & b & c \\ 3 & \mathbf{d} & a & c & b \\ 4 & \mathbf{d} & b & a & c \end{array} \quad \text{and} \quad q = \begin{array}{c|cccc} 1 & a & b & c & \mathbf{d} \\ 2 & a & b & \mathbf{d} & c \\ 3 & a & c & b & \mathbf{d} \\ 4 & b & a & c & \mathbf{d} \end{array}$$

are equivalent up to relabeling (to see this, relabel the applicants in the first case as follows:  $a \mapsto b, b \mapsto c, c \mapsto d, d \mapsto a$ ). We show that this priority set is not OSP in [Section B.4](#).

Recall that [Figure 1](#) consists exactly of those priority sets from [Figure 8](#), along with  $q$  as above.

**COROLLARY B.10.** *The only set of priorities of 4 positions over 4 applicants which are cyclic, yet do not contain any of the priority lists in [Figure 1](#), are equal to one of the following (up to relabeling):*

$$\begin{array}{c|cccc} 1 & \mathbf{d} & a & b & c \\ 2 & \mathbf{d} & a & b & c \\ 3 & \mathbf{d} & a & c & b \\ 4 & \mathbf{d} & b & a & c \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c|cccc} 1 & a & b & c & \mathbf{d} \\ 2 & a & b & c & \mathbf{d} \\ 3 & a & c & b & \mathbf{d} \\ 4 & b & a & \mathbf{d} & c \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c|cccc} 1 & a & b & c & \mathbf{d} \\ 2 & a & b & c & \mathbf{d} \\ 3 & a & c & b & \mathbf{d} \\ 4 & b & a & c & \mathbf{d} \end{array}.$$

**PROOF.** By [Lemma B.9](#) and the fact that  $q$  (as defined above) is in [Figure 1](#), there are only 4 possible cases. Three of these are given, and the final is

$$\begin{array}{c|cccc} 1 & d & a & b & c \\ 2 & d & a & b & c \\ 3 & a & d & c & b \\ 4 & d & b & a & c \end{array}$$

which is equivalent up to relabeling to the middle priority set in the statement of the corollary.  $\square$

#### B.4 The case with four applicants and positions

We now provide the single needed direct proof that a set of priorities with 4 applicants and 4 positions is not OSP. This will complete the proof that all priority sets displayed in [Figure 1](#) are non-OSP.

**CLAIM B.11.** *Priorities*

$$\begin{aligned} 1 &: a > b > c > d \\ 2 &: a > b > d > c \\ 3 &: a > c > b > d \\ 4 &: b > a > c > d \end{aligned}$$

are not OSP.

**PROOF.** We apply [Lemma A.1](#) to the the subdomain in which applicants may have the following preferences:

$$\begin{array}{cccc} p_a^1 = 4, 2 & p_b^1 = 3, 1 & p_c^1 = 2, 3 & p_d^1 = 1, 2 \\ p_a^2 = 4, 3 & p_b^2 = 3, 4 & p_c^2 = 3, 1 & p_d^2 = 2, 1 \end{array}$$

For simplicity, we do not specify the full preference lists here, only those positions which are relevant to the argument (filling in the remaining positions in any way will leave the argument unchanged).

- $a$  acts at the root node.

“truth getting a bad result”:  $p_a^1, p_b^2, p_c^2, p_d^1$ :

1	d		
2			a
3	b c		
4	a	b	

“lie getting a good result”:  $p_a^2, p_b^2, p_c^1, p_d^1$ :

1	d		
2	c		
3	b		
4	a		

- $b$  acts at the root node.

“truth getting a bad result”:  $p_a^1, p_b^1, p_c^2, p_d^2$ :

1			b
2	d		
3	b c		
4	a		

“lie getting a good result”:  $p_a^1, p_b^2, p_c^1, p_d^2$ :

1			d
2	d c		
3	b		
4	a		

- $c$  acts at the root node.

“truth getting a bad result”:  $p_a^2, p_b^2, p_c^2, p_d^2$ :

1				c
2	d			
3	b c		a	
4	a	b		

“lie getting a good result”:  $p_a^2, p_b^1, p_c^1, p_d^2$ :

1				b
2	d c			
3	b	c		
4	a			

- $d$  acts at the root node.

“truth getting a bad result”:  $p_a^1, p_b^1, p_c^2, p_d^1$ :

1	d	b		
2				d
3	b c			
4	a			

“lie getting a good result”:  $p_a^1, p_b^2, p_c^2, p_d^2$ :

1				d
2	d		a	
3	b c			
4	a	b		

□

## B.5 Proof of main result

We are now ready to complete our proof. Recall that Figure 1 contains exactly those preference sets of Figure 8 along with that of Section B.4. Intuitively, the proof starts from Lemma B.8, then uses the fact that the priority set of Section B.4 is the *only* nontrivial way to add *one* more applicants to a cyclic and OSP priority list. The new applicant must be placed in such a particular way that the priority list of Section B.4 is also the *only* way to add *more* applicants. The crux of the formal proof is to show that the two positions  $u$  and  $v$  at which the priority list “deviates from the norm” must be consistent with each further applicant added.

**THEOREM (4.2).** *Consider any priority set  $q$ . If no restriction of  $q$  is equal to any of the priority sets of Figure 1, then  $q$  is limited cyclic.*

PROOF. Let  $q$  satisfy the hypothesis of the theorem. Fix any position  $i^*$  and construct an ordered partition  $S_1, S_2, \dots, S_L$  of applicants as follows: take the priority list  $>_{i^*}$  and iteratively group together any applicants  $a, b$  with  $a >_{i^*} b$  such that there exists a position  $j$  where  $b >_j a$ . That is,  $\{S_1, \dots, S_L\}$  is the finest possible partition of applicants such that, 1) for all  $a \in S_k, b \in S_\ell$  with  $k < \ell$ , we have  $a >_{i^*} b$ , and 2) if  $a >_{i^*} b$  and  $b >_j a$  for some  $j \neq i^*$ , then  $a, b$  are in the same set  $S_i$ . Observe that for any  $a \in S_k, b \in S_\ell$  with  $k < \ell$ , we have  $a >_j b$  for all positions  $j$  (this follows because  $a >_{i^*} b$  by the way we construct the partition, so if we ever had  $b >_j a$  for some other position  $j$ , then  $a, b$  should be in the same set  $S_i$ ). Thus, to prove our theorem, we just need to show that for each  $S_i$  with  $|S_i| \geq 3$ , the priorities restricted to  $S_i$  are two-adjacent-alternating as in Definition 3.1.

To prove this, fix some  $i$  and let  $|S_i| = K \geq 3$ . We use induction on  $K$ . Let  $q'$  be  $q$ , with each priority list restricted to applicants in  $S_i$ . By Proposition 2.8,  $q'$  is cyclic. Thus, if  $K = 3$ , then Lemma B.8 proves the base case.

Otherwise, let  $|S_i| = K \geq 4$ . Assume by induction that for any such<sup>14</sup>  $S'_i$  with  $|S'_i| \leq K - 1$ , the priorities restricted to  $S'_i$  are two-adjacent-alternating. Let  $q'$  be  $q$ , with each priority list restricted to applicants in  $S_i$ . By Lemma B.1, there can be at most two applicants  $a_1, a_2$  such that some positions gives  $a_1, a_2$  top priority in  $q'$ . Moreover, there must exist some  $a_3$  such that  $q'$  restricted to applicants  $\{a_1, a_2, a_3\}$  is cyclic (by Proposition 2.8, if this were not the case,  $S_i$  would equal  $\{a_1, a_2\}$ ). By Lemma B.8, each priority list in  $q'$ , when restricted to  $\{a_1, a_2, a_3\}$ , must be equal to  $x_0, u_0, v_0$ , where  $u_0$  and  $v_0$  each appear exactly once (at positions  $u$  and  $v$ , respectively), and we have

$$\begin{array}{l|lll} x_0 & a_1 & a_2 & a_3 \\ u_0 & a_1 & a_3 & a_2 \\ v_0 & a_2 & a_1 & a_3 \end{array}$$

As  $|S_i| \geq 4$ , there must exist another applicant  $a_4$  such that  $a_4$  appears before one of  $a_1, a_2$ , or  $a_3$  on some position's priority list. Let  $y$  be any position which ranks  $a_4$  above at least one of  $a_1, a_2$ , or  $a_3$ . Consider any restriction  $q''$  of  $q'$  to any four positions including  $y, u, v$ . This forms a cyclic, OSP priority set of four positions for four applicants, and thus Corollary B.10 applies. The only case from Corollary B.10 in which  $d$  is sometimes (but not always) ranked above one of  $a, b, c$  is the middle case. That is, if we let

$$\begin{array}{l|llll} x_1 & a_1 & a_2 & a_3 & a_4 \\ u_1 & a_1 & a_3 & a_2 & a_4 \\ v_1 & a_2 & a_1 & a_4 & a_3 \end{array},$$

then  $q''$  restricted to  $\{a_1, a_2, a_3, a_4\}$  must contain  $x_1$  repeated twice, and each of  $u_1, v_1$  exactly once. In particular, we must have  $y = v$ , and  $u$  must have priority list  $u_1$  in  $q''$  and  $v$  must have  $v_1$ . This argument applies when we consider any positions  $i, i'$  together with  $u, v$ , and thus we can see that all positions other than  $u$  and  $v$  must have priority list  $x_1$  when restricted to  $\{a_1, a_2, a_3, a_4\}$ . This argument also applies to any applicant  $a_4$  who is ever ranked above any of  $a_1, a_2$ , or  $a_3$ , so in particular note that  $a_1$  has higher priority at every position applicant in  $q'$  other than  $a_2$  (at position  $v$ ).

Now, consider removing  $a_1$  from each position's priority list. What remains is still a cyclic set of priority lists with at least three applicants. Because  $a_1$  was only ever ranked below  $a_2$ , and no other applicants, the applicants in  $S_i \setminus \{a_1\}$  cannot be partitioned further and still satisfying the assumptions on the partition  $(S_i)_i$ . Thus, by induction, priorities are two-adjacent-alternating when restricted to  $S_i \setminus \{a_1\}$ . We already know that, restricted to  $\{a_2, a_3, a_4\}$ , priorities  $q'$  are of the

<sup>14</sup>Formally, the inductive hypothesis is that if  $q'$  is any priority set over  $K$  applicants such that 1) no restriction of  $q'$  is equal to any of the priority sets in Figure 1, and 2) the partition constructed on  $q'$  as in the first paragraph of this theorem contains only a single set, then  $q'$  is two-adjacent-alternating.

form

$$\begin{array}{l|lll} x_2 & a_2 & a_3 & a_4 \\ u_2 & a_3 & a_2 & a_4 \\ v_2 & a_2 & a_4 & a_3 \end{array},$$

where  $u_2$  is the priority list of  $u$  and  $v_2$  is the priority list of  $v$  (and all other positions have priority lists  $x_2$ ). Thus, the only way for priorities to be two-adjacent-alternating when restricted to  $S_i \setminus \{a_1\}$  is if we have

$$\begin{array}{l|llllll} x_3 & a_2 & a_3 & a_4 & a_5 & a_6 & a_7 \dots \\ u_3 & a_3 & a_2 & a_5 & a_4 & a_7 & a_6 \dots \\ v_3 & a_2 & a_4 & a_3 & a_6 & a_5 & \dots \end{array}$$

Moreover, it must be the case that  $u$  has priority  $u_3$ ,  $v$  has priority  $v_3$ , and all others have priority  $x_3$ . Thus, with  $a_1$  considered as well, priority lists must be of the form

$$\begin{array}{l|lllllll} x_4 & a_1 & a_2 & a_3 & a_4 & a_5 & a_6 & a_7 \dots \\ u_4 & a_1 & a_3 & a_2 & a_5 & a_4 & a_7 & a_6 \dots \\ v_4 & a_2 & a_1 & a_4 & a_3 & a_6 & a_5 & \dots \end{array}$$

That is,  $q'$  is two-adjacent-alternating.

By induction, this proves that  $q'$  is two-adjacent alternating, and thus that  $q$  is limited cyclic.  $\square$

## C EXTENSION TO UNBALANCED MATCHING MARKETS

In this appendix, we briefly discuss the possibility of extending our classification to a matching environment with a different number of applicants and positions, i.e. “unbalanced” environments. We consider the environment with “outside options”, i.e. in which applicants may mark positions as unacceptable (and chose to go unmatched instead of being matched to unacceptable positions)<sup>15</sup>.

It is possible for non-limited cyclic priorities to be OSP in this environment. Specifically, consider the following priorities, for which Figure 9 describes an OSP mechanism:

$$q = \begin{array}{l|lll} 1 & a & b & (d \ c) \\ 2 & a & (c \ b) & d \\ 3 & (b \ a) & c & d \end{array}$$

Interestingly, in this OSP mechanism four agents can be active at a time (in the rightmost node of the first row, where  $c$  acts). However, the mechanism still interacts with each agent at most twice.

This counterexample can be extended only in very limited ways – all counterexamples must have exactly three positions. To see this, first observe that Lemma 2.6 can be adapted to unbalanced environments with outside options (by having applicants outside the restriction submit empty preference lists). Whenever there are four or more positions and three or more applicants, Lemma B.8 and/or the proof of Theorem 4.2 apply and show that OSP priorities must be limited cyclic.

<sup>15</sup>It is possible to consider an environment with imbalance, yet no outside option. In this environment, applicants will always rank every position to try and avoid being unmatched. Such an environment leads to somewhat pathological matching rules. For example, consider two positions 1, 2 and three applicants  $a, b, c$ , with priorities  $1 : a > c > b$  and  $2 : b > c > a$ . In the environment with no outside options, there is a unique stable matching  $\{(1, a), (2, b)\}$  with these priorities *regardless of the preferences of the three applicants*. On a more technical side, our crucial Lemma 2.6 does not hold in unbalanced environments without outside options. Moreover, it is our view that if the mechanism designer intends to leave certain agents unmatched, they should model the possibility that the agent actually wishes to go unmatched.




Fig. 9. An OSP set of priorities which is not limited cyclic (in an unbalanced matching environment). In the square subnodes, remaining priorities are acyclic; in the triangular subnodes, the remaining priorities are limited cyclic; and in the circular subnodes, the match is fully determined. At node (i), applicant  $d$  drops out, and the mechanism proceeds in the same way as in the balanced case in Figure 4. The mechanism below node (ii) is continued in the lower part of the figure.