

# NONPARAMETRIC TREATMENT EFFECT IDENTIFICATION IN SCHOOL CHOICE

JIAFENG CHEN

**ABSTRACT.** We study identification and estimation of treatment effects in common school choice settings, under unrestricted heterogeneity in individual potential outcomes. We propose two notions of identification, corresponding to design- and sampling-based uncertainty, respectively. We characterize the set of causal estimands that are identified for a large variety of school choice mechanisms, including ones that feature both random and non-random tie-breaking; we discuss their policy implications. We also study the asymptotic behavior of nonparametric estimators for these causal estimands. Lastly, we connect our approach to the propensity score approach proposed in [Abdulkadiroğlu, Angrist, Narita and Pathak \(2017a, forthcoming\)](#), and derive the implicit estimands of the latter approach, under fully heterogeneous treatment effects.

*Keywords:* School choice, nonparametric identification, regression discontinuity, heterogeneous treatment effects

*JEL codes:* C1, D47, J01

---

*Date:* December 7, 2021.

Chen: Department of Economics, Harvard University and Harvard Business School, [jiafengchen@g.harvard.edu](mailto:jiafengchen@g.harvard.edu). I am especially indebted to David C. Parkes, Scott Duke Kominers, Isaiah Andrews, and Elie Tamer for their valuable guidance. I thank Xavier D'Haultfoeuille, Bryan Graham, Jeff Gortmaker, Peter Hull, Ashesh Rambachan, David Ritzwoller, Brad Ross, Jonathan Roth, Neil Shephard, Winnie van Dijk, Christopher Walker, as well as participants of the Harvard Econometrics Workshop and SOLE 2021. This paper subsumes my undergraduate thesis ([Chen, 2019](#)), as well as SSRN submissions 3510897, 3510899, and 3510903 in January, 2020. All errors are my own.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

There is a rapidly growing empirical literature studying centralized school assignment (inter alia, [Kapor, Neilson and Zimmerman, 2020](#); [Abdulkadiroğlu et al., 2017a, forthcoming](#); [Agarwal and Somaini, 2018](#); [Fack, Grenet and He, 2019](#); [Calsamiglia, Fu and Güell, 2020](#); [Abdulkadiroğlu, Pathak, Schellenberg and Walters, 2020](#); [Abdulkadiroğlu, Angrist, Narita, Pathak and Zarate, 2017b](#); [Abdulkadiroğlu, Agarwal and Pathak, 2017c](#); [Angrist, Hull, Pathak and Walters, 2020](#); [Beuermann, Jackson, Navarro-Sola and Pardo, 2018](#)). In particular, recent work by [Abdulkadiroğlu et al. \(2017a, forthcoming, 2020, 2017b\)](#) proposes using features of centralized school assignment for program evaluation of schools. [Abdulkadiroğlu et al. \(2017a\)](#) observe that certain centralized school assignment algorithms have inherent randomness, where ties between students are broken via lotteries. The randomness generates exogenous variation in school assignments that may be used to identify school effects. In subsequent work, [Abdulkadiroğlu et al. \(forthcoming\)](#) observe that a wide class of school assignment mechanisms—based on deferred acceptance ([Gale and Shapley, 1962](#))—have a particular cutoff structure where school assignments change discontinuously around a cutoff.<sup>1</sup> They propose using variation around the cutoffs to estimate regression-discontinuity-type treatment effects.

In this work, we highlight certain intricacies of the school choice setting<sup>2</sup> that depart from the usual cross-sectional nonparametric potential outcomes (Neyman–Rubin) model, in which students are units of analysis and schools are treatment arms. First, in complex school choice mechanisms, treatment assignment is determined *jointly* via the algorithm, and thus two students’ treatments are generally not independent. The non-independence complicates the analysis of identification, as well as the asymptotics of estimators for causal effects. Second, conventional overlap conditions fail for a large portion of student-school pairs. For instance, a particular school might not appear on some students’ preference rankings, or students may qualify (with certainty) for schools they like better; in these cases, the potential outcomes of these students at the particular school are never observed. When combined with heterogeneity in potential outcomes and many treatment arms, overlap failure for specific student-school pairs makes interpreting causal effects complex.

These difficulties call for formal analyses of nonparametric identification and estimation, which we pursue in this paper. We shed light on the following questions: In a nonparametric potential outcomes model, to what extent is data informative about causal effects of interest?

---

<sup>1</sup>For instance, they include variants of the student-proposing deferred acceptance algorithm and the immediate acceptance (Boston) mechanism.

<sup>2</sup>Despite motivating all of our results in a school choice setting, our formal results extend easily to market design settings where agents are matched to objects or positions, especially if the assignment mechanism is deferred acceptance ([Gale and Shapley, 1962](#)), and the object of inference is the treatment effect of the agents’ assignments.

Which causal effects are identified, and what policy counterfactuals do they inform? Are natural nonparametric estimators asymptotically normal and unbiased? What causal effects do popular regression estimators recover?

To address these questions, we first propose two definitions of identification in this setting. They correspond to identification notions for sample and superpopulation quantities, respectively. The first notion, which we call *identification by design*, leads to a finite-population, design-based analysis (Neyman, 1923; Fisher, 1936; Abadie, Athey, Imbens and Wooldridge, 2020) of school assignment algorithms that have built-in randomness. The second definition, which we call *identification by sampling*, formalizes the notion of large-market approximation in the literature (Abdulkadiroğlu et al., 2017a, forthcoming). This notion sidesteps conceptual issues due to the non-independence of treatment assignment.

Second, we characterize the set of sample average treatment effects and conditional average treatment effects that are identified *solely with* continuity assumptions on conditional expectations of potential outcomes.<sup>3</sup> Under design-based analysis, the identified linear contrasts of potential outcomes are exactly those that put zero weight on treatment-individual pairs that are never observed. On the other hand, causal effects are more complex under a sampling-based analysis, particularly when the assignment mechanism features both test scores and lottery numbers. In these *mixed mechanisms*, there are two types of identified conditional average treatment effects, induced respectively by lottery numbers and by regression-discontinuity-type variation<sup>4</sup> in test scores. We find that both types of treatment effects are sufficient for “local” counterfactuals that correspond to certain small changes of the institutional setting, but insufficient for more global ones.

Third, for mixed mechanisms, we analyze the asymptotic properties of locally linear regression estimators (Hahn, Todd and Van der Klaauw, 2001) for the regression-discontinuity-type treatment contrasts. Our analysis fully takes into account the fact that the observed cutoffs are random sample quantities. We show that the estimators are first-order equivalent to an oracle estimator where the population cutoff is observed. Hence, we formally justify using locally linear regression for estimation and inference in such settings. This continuity-based analysis supplements the propensity-score based analysis of Abdulkadiroğlu et al. (forthcoming); it also clarifies the asymptotic influence of the rates of convergence of the sample cutoffs, and opens the door for analyses of data-driven bandwidth choices (Imbens and Kalyanaraman, 2012; Calonico, Cattaneo and Titiunik, 2014) or bias-aware inference (Armstrong and Kolesár, 2020).

Finally, we analyze estimation approaches similar to those used in the literature. We find that in the design-based setting, regression estimators of *mean potential outcomes* recover

---

<sup>3</sup>In particular, unlike Abdulkadiroğlu et al. (forthcoming), we do not assume constant effects.

<sup>4</sup>This is similar to the types of general regression discontinuity variation described in Narita and Yata (2021), though we define them from a continuity perspective, rather than a randomization one.

quantities that approximate certain Horvitz–Thompson estimators. The Horvitz–Thompson estimators are in turn unbiased for assignment-probability-weighted mean potential outcomes. However, regression adjustment for *causal contrasts* is not identified due to collinearity when overlap fails, and automatic covariate dropping induces implicit causal estimands that are not invariant to the choice of the baseline covariate level.

Interestingly, in mixed mechanisms, we find that propensity-score based approaches (Abdulkadiroğlu et al., forthcoming) pool lottery and regression-discontinuity variation together, with *asymptotically vanishing weights* on the latter. While, under constant treatment effects, the pooling does not affect the asymptotic limit of the estimator, it does mean that the regression-discontinuity variation has vanishing influence on the estimator asymptotically. The reason is that the regression-discontinuity treatment effects are defined on measure-zero sets (*irregularly identified*, in the language of Khan and Tamer, 2010), and are hence necessarily estimated with a slower rate of convergence than their lottery-based counterparts. As a result, lottery-based variation dominates in a pooled estimator.

Our work contributes to a recent methodological literature on causal inference in market design and school choice settings (Narita, 2021; Abdulkadiroğlu et al., forthcoming, 2017a; Diamond and Agarwal, 2017; Agarwal, Hodgson and Somaini, 2020).<sup>5</sup> It is also related to natural experiment perspectives where treatments are assigned algorithmically (e.g. Narita and Yata, 2021), as well as causal inference in settings with equilibrium quantities (Munro, Wager and Xu, 2021). Moreover, the multiplicity of regression-discontinuity-type treatment effects in the mixed mechanism setting is related to extrapolation approaches in the regression discontinuity literature (Cattaneo, Keele, Titiunik and Vazquez-Bare, 2020; Angrist and Rokkanen, 2015; Dong and Lewbel, 2015; Bertanha and Imbens, 2020). To the best of our knowledge, the asymptotics of regression discontinuity estimators with a non-ignorable random cutoff appears novel in the regression discontinuity literature as well (for an analysis assuming ignorability, see Cattaneo, Titiunik, Vazquez-Bare and Keele, 2016).

Despite benefiting heavily from intuitions developed by Abdulkadiroğlu et al. (2017a, forthcoming), our work is distinct and novel in the following aspects. Compared to Abdulkadiroğlu et al. (2017b), our results for stochastic mechanisms are design-based and show that identification in such a setting needs not rely on large-market approximations. We also analyze the implications of overlap failure for identifiable treatment effect estimands. Compared to Abdulkadiroğlu et al. (forthcoming), this paper does not assume constant treatment effects and allows for arbitrarily heterogeneous treatment effects—investigations of the

---

<sup>5</sup>In parallel, there is a literature using tools from empirical industrial organization and econometrics of games in such settings; see Agarwal and Budish (2021); Agarwal and Somaini (2020) for recent reviews.

identifiable treatment effects yield further insights;<sup>6</sup> we also provide a formal treatment of asymptotic properties of nonparametric estimators, taking into account the rates of convergence of the sample cutoffs. Complementing [Abdulkadiroğlu et al. \(forthcoming\)](#), we use a continuity-based perspective in developing our identification and estimation results.

This paper proceeds as follows. [Section 2](#) introduces basic notation, models, school choice mechanisms, and data-generating processes, as well as proposes notions of identification. [Section 3](#) analyzes identification and estimation in a design-based framework for stochastic mechanisms. [Section 4](#) analyzes identification and estimation in a sampling-based framework semi-deterministic mechanisms, with the mixed mechanism as a leading special case. [Section 5](#) analyzes regression-based and propensity-score based estimators in both stochastic and mixed mechanisms. [Section 6](#) concludes the paper.

## 2. MODEL, DATA-GENERATING PROCESSES, AND NOTIONS OF IDENTIFICATION

In this section, we introduce our model ([Section 2.1](#)) and define the notions of identification. Since the school assignments are determined jointly, the data is not precisely approximated via i.i.d. sampling. As a result, identification is not as straightforward as in a cross-sectional setting ([Lewbel, 2019](#)).<sup>7</sup> We propose notions of identification in [Section 2.2](#) that make precise intuitive notions of observational equivalence, while ensuring that identified quantities can be estimated. [Section 2.3](#) introduces a large family of mechanisms, which we refer to as *mechanisms with deferred acceptance priority scores*. It also introduces a special case that is general enough for most applied settings ([Example 3](#)), which we refer to as *mixed mechanisms*. Mechanisms of this form use the deferred acceptance algorithm ([Gale and Shapley, 1962](#)) for assignment of students to schools, and have asymptotic properties ([Azevedo and Leshno, 2016](#); [Abdulkadiroğlu, Che and Yasuda, 2015](#)) which render our large-market identification notion useful.

**2.1. Model.** Consider a finite set of students  $I = \{1, \dots, N\}$  and a finite set of schools  $S = \{0, 1, \dots, M\}$ . The schools have *capacity*  $q_1, \dots, q_M \in \mathbb{N}$ . Assume the school 0 represents an outside option and has infinite capacity. Each student  $i \in I$  has observed (by the analyst) characteristics  $W_i = (X_i, Z_i)$  and unobserved potential outcomes  $A_i = [Y_i(0), \dots, Y_i(M)]'$ , where  $X_i$  is a vector of characteristics that are relevant for the assignment mechanism, and  $Z_i$  collects other observed characteristics that the analyst may use. Implicitly, the notation  $Y_i(s)$  defines the school a student matches to as a treatment. This rules out peer effects or

<sup>6</sup>In fact, [Abdulkadiroğlu et al. \(forthcoming\)](#) “look forward to a more detailed investigation of the consequences of heterogeneous treatment effects for identification strategies of the sort considered here,” which is precisely the theme of this paper.

<sup>7</sup>A straightforward definition of identification based on observational equivalence ([Koopmans and Reiersol, 1950](#); [Hurwicz, 1950](#)) would result in certain quantities being identified but not consistently estimable, which we discuss in [Appendix A.1](#).

other violations of the stable unit treatment value assumption (SUTVA, see, e.g. [Imbens and Rubin, 2015](#)), since the assignment statuses of other individuals  $j \neq i$  do not matter for the observed outcome for individual  $i$ .<sup>8</sup> The analyst additionally observes that each student  $i$  has been assigned to one of the  $M + 1$  schools, which we may represent as a one-hot encoded binary vector  $D_i$  with a 1 at the entry corresponding to the school that  $i$  is assigned to.

An *assignment mechanism*  $\Pi_N$  determines the school assignments.  $\Pi_N$  takes the observable characteristics  $X_i$  as input and returns as output  $\Pi_N(X_1, \dots, X_N)$ , a distribution over the set of possible assignments  $\Omega_N$  that respect the capacity constraints at each school:  $\Omega_N = \{(d_1, \dots, d_N) \mid \forall i : d_i \in \{0, 1\}^{M+1}, \|d_i\|_0 = 1; \forall k \in S : \sum_{i \in I} d_{ik} \leq q_k\}$ . That is, the observed vector of assignments  $(D_1, \dots, D_N)$  is a draw from  $\Pi_N(X_1, \dots, X_N)$ . If the distribution  $\Pi_N(X_1, \dots, X_N)$  is non-degenerate for some input values, we call the mechanism *stochastic*; otherwise, we refer to the mechanism as *deterministic*, and write  $(D_1, \dots, D_N) = \Pi_N(X_1, \dots, X_N)$ , without ambiguity. Moreover, we assume that  $\Pi_N(X_1, \dots, X_N)$  is known, so that we may freely draw from  $\Pi_N$  if we wish. The distribution  $\Pi_N$  induces a joint distribution  $\Upsilon_N$  of the observed outcomes and treatments  $(D_1, Y_1), \dots, (D_N, Y_N)$ , where the observed outcome of student  $i$  is  $Y_i \equiv \sum_{s \in S} D_{is} Y_i(s)$ .

**Remark 1** (Imperfect compliance). Implicitly, defining the observed outcome in this manner means that we are considering a setting with almost perfect treatment compliance—students matched to school  $s$  attend school  $s$ . In the absence of perfect compliance, we may consider these causal effects as intent-to-treat effects. Moreover, to consider causal effects under imperfect compliance in this setting is very challenging nonparametrically. If we view the school someone *attends* as the treatment and the school someone is *matched to* as an instrument, then this setting features a large number of both treatments and instruments. The compliance pattern generated is thus combinatorially complex (See, among others, [Mogstad, Torgovitsky and Walters, 2020](#); [Mogstad and Torgovitsky, 2018](#); [Mogstad, Santos and Torgovitsky, 2018](#), for examples of such settings), resulting in a large family of local average treatment effects (LATE)-like estimands. We leave characterizations of causal effects in these settings to future work. ■

**2.2. Notions of identification.** Under *design-based inference* ([Neyman, 1923](#); [Fisher, 1936](#)), we proceed by thinking of the objects  $(I, \{W_i : i \in I\}, \{A_i : i \in I\})$  as non-random. We think of functions of the finite population  $(I, \{W_i : i \in I\}, \{A_i : i \in I\})$  as objectives for inference, in contrast to making inferences on features of a superpopulation from which the data is assumed to be sampled. The only source of randomness under the design-based framework is the distribution  $\Pi_N(X_1, \dots, X_N)$ . We say a quantity  $\tau = \tau(I, \{W_i : i \in I\}, \{A_i : i \in I\}, \Upsilon_N)$

<sup>8</sup>To account for potential peer effects, we note that for a known exposure mapping ([Aronow and Samii, 2017](#)), the design-based analyses extend in a natural manner.

is *identified by design* if it can be written as a map  $\phi$  of the observable information:

$$\tau(I, \{W_i : i \in I\}, \{A_i : i \in I\}, \Upsilon_N) = \phi(I, \{W_i : i \in I\}, \Upsilon_N).$$

Naturally, if, for some  $\tilde{A}_i$ , we have two different values for  $\tau$  under the same observable information:

$$\tau(I, \{W_i : i \in I\}, \{A_i : i \in I\}, \Upsilon_N) \neq \tau(I, \{W_i : i \in I\}, \{\tilde{A}_i : i \in I\}, \Upsilon_N),$$

then these two values are observationally equivalent, and hence  $\tau$  would not be identified.

On the other hand, to consider *sampling-based inference*—which is necessary if  $\Pi_N$  is non-stochastic, or if we are interested in quantities beyond our sample—we need to specify a data-generating process under which the quantities  $W_i, A_i$  are random variables. A natural model is that the characteristics are identically distributed and independently drawn from some joint distribution, which we may think of as a superpopulation:

$$(W_i, A_i) \stackrel{\text{i.i.d.}}{\sim} P_{W,A}.$$

Naturally, we also consider each school capacity as a sequence  $q_{s,N} = \lfloor Nq_s \rfloor$ , so that capacities, as proportions of  $N$ , are held fixed.<sup>9</sup> This data-generating process then induces a joint distribution of the observable information

$$((W_1, D_1, Y_1), \dots, (W_N, D_N, Y_N)) \sim P_{W,Y,D,N,\Pi_N},$$

where, importantly, the vectors  $(W_i, D_i, Y_i)$  may not be independent, since the assignments  $(D_i)_{i \in I}$  are made jointly.

To define identification in this setting, we leverage a particular structure of the assignment mechanisms that are commonly used (described in the next section, [Section 2.3](#)). The distribution of the assignments

$$\Pi_N(X_1, \dots, X_N) = \Pi(X_1, \dots, X_N; C_N)$$

is determined through a real-valued vector  $C_N$  that depends on the realized values  $X_1, \dots, X_N$ . Under mild conditions, the vector  $C_N \xrightarrow{p} c$ ,<sup>10</sup> as  $N \rightarrow \infty$ . Moreover, for a fixed  $c$ , under the treatment distribution

$$D^*(c) \sim \Pi(X_1, \dots, X_N; c), \tag{1}$$

the data  $(D_i^*, W_i, A_i)_{i \in I}$  are i.i.d. with joint distribution  $P_{W,Y,D,N,c}^{\otimes N}$ . We say that a quantity  $\tau = \tau(P_{W,A})$  is *identified by sampling* if it can be written as a known function of the limiting observable distribution  $P_{W,Y,D,N,c}$ .<sup>11</sup>

<sup>9</sup>Proposition 3 in [Azevedo and Leshno \(2016\)](#) is under this sampling sequence.

<sup>10</sup>We use  $\xrightarrow{p}$  to denote convergence in probability and  $\xrightarrow{d}$  to denote convergence in distribution.

<sup>11</sup>A more straightforward notion of identification is to define that  $\tau$  is identified if it can be written as a known function of the distribution of observed data  $P_{W,Y,D,N,\Pi_N}$ . However, certain events would have positive probabilities under  $P_{W,Y,D,N,\Pi_N}$ , but their probabilities vanish as  $N \rightarrow \infty$ . Identification of certain

The notion of identification by sampling formalizes the idea of a *large-market approximation* in Abdulkadiroğlu et al. (2017a, forthcoming). Indeed, Abdulkadiroğlu et al. (2017a, forthcoming) treat the observed cutoffs  $C_N$  as fixed and compute the corresponding assignment probabilities, and argue that these estimated probabilities converge to the large-market quantity as  $C_N \rightarrow c$ . By treating  $C_N$  as fixed, the assignment probabilities do not depend on characteristics of other students in the market, and we can interpret the probabilities as a *propensity score* (Rosenbaum and Rubin, 1984) and discuss identification using familiar cross-sectional language. Again, we emphasize that such an argument implicitly defines identification vis-à-vis the large market, so as to evade conceptual difficulties in the finite market where assignments are determined jointly as the output of a complex school choice algorithm.

**2.3. Mechanisms with deferred acceptance priority scores.** As we have discussed, identification by sampling requires specific properties of the mechanism. We now turn to a class of mechanisms where such properties are satisfied. Of course, in the design-based framework, the exact form of the mechanism does not matter for our analysis, since its output is a known and non-degenerate distribution over assignments. Nevertheless, it may be helpful to describe a class of mechanisms in detail,<sup>12</sup> both for concreteness and for introducing additional notation that we use later in the paper.

We consider a class of mechanisms that may be computed as deferred acceptance mechanisms (Gale and Shapley, 1962; Roth and Sotomayor, 1992). Commonly, the assignment-relevant observable information  $X_i$  contains the student’s preferences  $\succ_i$  and *eligibility information*  $\mathbf{R}_i$  related to the student’s priority order at schools:  $X_i = (\succ_i, \mathbf{R}_i)$ . The mechanism  $\Pi_N$  then assigns each student a priority score at each school  $s$ <sup>13</sup>

$$V_{is} = g_s(\succ_i, \mathbf{R}_i, U_{is}) \in [0, 1] \quad (2)$$

where  $U_{is}$  is a random tie-breaker drawn by the mechanism, which we may view as sources of randomness in stochastic mechanisms. Assume that for two different individuals  $i, j$ ,  $V_{is} \neq V_{js}$  almost surely. Then the priority scores induce an ordering  $\triangleright_s$  at each school, where  $i \triangleright_s j$  if and only if  $V_{is} > V_{js}$ . The orderings  $\{\succ_i : i \in I\}$  and  $\{\triangleright_s : s \in S\}$  are then inputs to the *deferred acceptance algorithm* (Gale and Shapley, 1962):

- (1) Initially, all students are unmatched, and they have not been rejected from any school.
- (2) At the beginning of stage  $t$ , every unmatched student proposes to her favorite school, according to  $\succ_i$ , from which she has not been rejected.

---

parameters may rely on these vanishing events. Since we need large  $N$  to estimate features of  $P_{W,Y,D,N,\Pi_N}$  in the data, this straightforward notion of identification would render these parameters identified but not estimable. We give an example in Appendix A.1 to illustrate the conceptual difficulties.

<sup>12</sup>We largely follow examples in (Abdulkadiroğlu et al., 2017a, forthcoming).

<sup>13</sup>The restriction of  $V_{is}$  to  $[0, 1]$  is without loss of generality, and the functions  $g_s$  are known to the analyst.



(3) Each school  $s$  considers the set of students tentatively matched to  $s$  after stage  $t - 1$ , as well as those who propose to  $s$  at stage  $t$ , and *tentatively* accepts the most preferable students, up to capacity  $q_s$ , ranked according to  $\triangleright_s$ , while rejecting the rest.

(4) Stage  $t$  concludes. If there is an unmatched student who have not been rejected from every school on her list, then stage  $t + 1$  begins and we return to step (2); otherwise, the algorithm terminates, and outputs the tentative matches at the conclusion of stage  $t$ .

Mechanisms in this class have outputs that may be rationalized by a vector of cutoffs  $C_N$ . Consider  $C_N = (C_{1,N}, \dots, C_{M,N})$  where each cutoff  $C_{s,N}$  is the priority of the student matched to the school who has *the least priority*:

$$C_{s,N} = \begin{cases} \min \{V_{is} : i \text{ is matched to } s\} & s \text{ is oversubscribed, i.e. it is matched to } q_s \text{ students} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

We may rationalize the school assignment made by the algorithm as though each student  $i$  is assigned to her favorite school among those schools  $s$  such that  $V_{is} \geq C_{s,N}$ . In other words, schools whose cutoffs are lower than student  $i$ 's priority scores constitute  $i$ 's choice set, and  $i$  is simply matched to her favorite school in her choice set.

Proposition 3 of [Azevedo and Leshno \(2016\)](#) states that if  $\{(\succ_{is}, V_{is}) : s \in S\}$  are independently and identically distributed across students  $i$ , then under mild conditions,<sup>14</sup> the cutoffs  $C_N$  concentrate to some population counterpart  $c$  at the parametric rate:

$$\|C_N - c\|_\infty = O_P(N^{-1/2}).$$

These features of deferred acceptance provide the theoretical basis for defining identification by sampling in the manner, as we have done in [Section 2.2](#).

A range of mechanisms used in real-life school matches fall in this class by picking specific functions  $g_s(\succ_i, \mathbf{R}_i, U)$  and specific information that  $\mathbf{R}_i$  and  $U$  represent. In the remainder of this section, we describe three examples, which further builds familiarity and introduces notation that we subsequently use.<sup>15</sup> Most of our subsequent analysis in [Section 4](#) is about [Example 3](#), which is the most general out of the three examples.

**Example 1** (Lottery mechanism). Assume  $\mathbf{R}_i = [Q_{i1}, \dots, Q_{iM}]$ , where  $Q_{is} \in \{0, 1, \dots, J\}$  indicates certain *discrete priorities* that a student may have that presents a compelling

<sup>14</sup>Precisely speaking, [Azevedo and Leshno \(2016\)](#) define a notion of deferred acceptance matching acting on the *continuum economy*—which is the distribution of  $\{(\succ_{is}, V_{is}) : s \in S\}$ . The additional regularity condition is that this continuum version of deferred acceptance matching admits a unique stable matching. In other words, it is a very mild regularity condition on the distribution of  $\{(\succ_{is}, V_{is}) : s \in S\}$ .

<sup>15</sup>In all of these examples, the priority score assignment  $g_s$  does not depend on student preferences, and they are in fact variants of deferred acceptance mechanism. Some mechanisms that are not isomorphic to deferred acceptance, such as the immediate acceptance (Boston) mechanism, can nonetheless be computed by deferred acceptance via making  $g_s$  depend on the preference ordering  $\succ_i$ , a point made by [Abdulkadiroğlu et al. \(forthcoming\)](#).

interest for a school to accept the student. For instance,  $Q_{is}$  may represent walk zone or sibling status:

$$Q_{is} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{Either } i \text{ has a sibling at school } s \text{ or } i \text{ lives in the walk zone of } s. \\ 2 & i \text{ has a sibling at school } s \text{ and } i \text{ lives in the walk zone of } s. \\ 0 & \text{Otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

School districts often choose  $g_s$  such that  $g_s(q, v)$  represents a lexicographic ordering in  $(q, v)$

$$g_s(\succ_i, \mathbf{R}_i, U_{is}) = g_s(Q_{is}, U_{is}) > g_s(Q_{js}, U_{js}) = g_s(\succ_i, \mathbf{R}_j, U_{js})$$

if  $Q_{is} > Q_{js}$  or if  $Q_{is} = Q_{js}$  and  $U_{is} > U_{js}$ . The lottery numbers  $\{U_{is} : i \in I, s \in S\}$  have a known distribution: Typically, either  $U_{is} \stackrel{\text{i.i.d.}}{\sim} \text{Unif}[0, 1]$  across  $i, s$ , or  $U_{is} = U_i \stackrel{\text{i.i.d.}}{\sim} \text{Unif}[0, 1]$  across  $i$ . Of course, such lottery mechanisms are particularly suited to a design-based analysis. ■

**Example 2** (Test-score mechanism). Assume  $\mathbf{R}_i = [R_{i1}, \dots, R_{iT}]$  is a vector of entrance test scores over  $T$  assessments. Each school  $s$  ranks students via one of the assessments, specified by  $t_s$ : i.e.  $g_s(\succ_i, \mathbf{R}_i, U_{is}) = R_{it_s}$ . Such a mechanism is deterministic, as  $g_s$  do not depend on  $U_{is}$ . ■

Next, we discuss a class of mechanisms that shares features with both lottery and test-score mechanisms. The analysis of this mixed mechanism is the bulk of [Section 4](#).

**Example 3** (Mixed mechanism). Assume  $\mathbf{R}_i = ([Q_{i1}, \dots, Q_{iM}], [R_{i1}, \dots, R_{iT}])$ , where the  $R_{it}$ 's are test scores and the  $Q_{is}$ 's are discrete priorities. The test scores  $R_i$  take value in  $[0, 1]^T$  and the discrete qualifiers  $Q_{is}$  take value in  $\{0, \dots, \bar{q}_s\}$ .

Suppose there are *lottery schools* and *test-score schools*. A lottery school  $s$  uses a lottery indexed by  $\ell_s \in \{1, \dots, L\}$ . A test-score school  $s$  uses a test score indexed by  $t_s \in \{1, \dots, T\}$ . The priority scores are determined via

$$g_s(\succ_i, \mathbf{R}_i, U_{is}) = \begin{cases} g_s(Q_{is}, R_{it_s}) & s \text{ is a test-score school} \\ g_s(Q_{is}, U_{i\ell_s}) & s \text{ is a lottery school, } U_{i\ell_s} \in [0, 1] \end{cases}$$

where the maps

$$g_s(q, v) = \frac{q + v}{\bar{q}_s + 1}.$$

$g_s$  represents a lexicographic ordering in  $(q, v)$ .<sup>16</sup> The restriction of  $g_s(q, v)$  to an affine function is without loss of generality.

As this mechanism is a realistic description of many school choice mechanisms, much of the analysis in [Section 4](#) focuses on analyzing treatment effects in this case. Whenever we refer to mixed mechanisms, we also maintain the following assumption, [Assumption 2.1](#), on

<sup>16</sup>This is a construction in [Abdulkadiroğlu et al. \(2017a\)](#)

the sampling process, which is a support and continuity condition for the test scores  $R$ , as well as a normalization on  $g_s$ . [Assumption 2.1](#) may be weakened,<sup>17</sup> but is maintained for simplicity.<sup>18</sup> ■

**Assumption 2.1** (Mixed mechanism). (1) *The distribution of the test scores  $(R_1, \dots, R_T)$ , conditional on discrete qualifiers  $Q$ , preferences  $\succ$ , potential outcomes  $A$ , and other observable characteristics  $Z$ , is absolutely continuous with respect to the Lebesgue measure on  $[0, 1]^T$  and has positive density.*

(2) *For lottery schools  $s$ , the distribution of the lottery numbers  $U_{i\ell}$ ,  $\ell \in \{1, \dots, L\}$  is also absolutely continuous with respect to the Lebesgue measure on  $[0, 1]^L$ , and independent of the student characteristics  $(Q, A, \succ, Z)$ , though the lottery numbers may be non-independent across  $\ell$  for the same student.*

(3) *For all  $s$ , the  $[0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$  function  $r \mapsto g_s(q, r)$  is affine and increasing.*

### 3. STOCHASTIC MECHANISM

In this section, we describe design-based identification and inference for stochastic mechanisms.<sup>19</sup> In general, a stochastic mechanism under design-based inference is simply a known joint distribution of the  $N$  treatment variables  $(D_1, \dots, D_N)$ , and fits into the setting of [Mukerjee, Dasgupta and Rubin \(2018\)](#). A highly general class of treatment effect parameters is the following set of (linear) treatment contrasts, indexed by the fixed and known coefficients  $\lambda_{i,s}$ :

$$\tau = \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{s=1}^M \lambda_{i,s} y_i(s), \quad (3)$$

where we use lower-case  $y_i(s)$  to denote potential outcomes, so as to emphasize that they are non-random. For instance, the sample average treatment effect between schools 1 and 2 is constructed by taking  $\lambda_{i1} = 1/N$  and  $\lambda_{i2} = -1/N$ , whereas all other  $\lambda_{i,s}$ 's are zero. As another example, the sample average outcome of school 1 among those with observable information  $Z_i = z$  is constructed by setting  $\lambda_{i,1} = \frac{1}{N_z}$ , where  $N_z = \#\{i : Z_i = z\}$ .

Perhaps unsurprisingly, linear contrasts of this form are identified if and only if they depend only on potential outcomes that may be observed with positive probability.

**Proposition 3.1.** *Let  $\tau = \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{s=1}^M \lambda_{i,s} Y_i(s)$  be the parameter of interest.  $\tau$  is identified by design if and only if, for all  $i \in I$ ,  $s \in S$ ,  $\lambda_{i,s} = 0$  whenever student  $i$  has no chance of being matched to school  $s$ :  $\pi_{is} \equiv \mathbb{E}_{\Pi_N(X_1, \dots, X_N)}[D_{is}] = 0$ .*

<sup>17</sup>For instance, we do not require any restrictions on behavior of  $R$  far in the tails for identification and estimation

<sup>18</sup>Assumption 1(ii) in [Abdulkadiroğlu et al. \(forthcoming\)](#) is similar.

<sup>19</sup>This setting strikes some similarity with [Borusyak and Hull \(2020\)](#).

We relegate the proof to [Appendix A.2](#). While straightforward, [Proposition 3.1](#) does have implications for interpretation of estimated causal effects from lottery-based variation in school choice mechanisms. For instance, the average treatment effect between two schools is in general not point identified, due to the presence of students for whom it is impossible that they are assigned to at least one of the schools. These students select into only one or neither of the two schools, and this selection may have policy implications. For instance, students with certain qualifiers—e.g. those who live near a particular school—are often prioritized by the school, making it more likely that they are assigned to the neighborhood school with probability one. Their counterfactual outcomes under certain changes to the neighborhood policy<sup>20</sup> may not be nonparametrically identified as a result.

**3.1. Estimation.** We now turn to estimation of  $\tau$ , where  $\tau = \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{s=1}^M \lambda_{is} y_i(s)$  is a linear contrast identified by design. A natural estimator for  $\tau$  is the Horvitz–Thompson estimator:

$$\hat{\tau}_{\text{HT}} \equiv \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{s=1}^M \lambda_{is} \frac{D_{is} y_i}{\pi_{is}} \quad \pi_{is} \equiv \mathbb{E}_{\Pi_N(X_1, \dots, X_N)}[D_{is}].$$

In practice, the probabilities  $\pi_{is}$  may be estimated to arbitrary precision via Monte Carlo, or approximated via the argument put forth in [Abdulkadiroğlu et al. \(2017a\)](#). The Horvitz–Thompson estimator is exactly unbiased,<sup>21</sup> and hold certain finite-sample optimality properties.<sup>22</sup> The variance of  $\hat{\tau}_{\text{HT}}$  depends on products of potential outcomes, and is in general infeasible to estimate. Conservative variance estimation is possible, and the results of [Aronow and Middleton \(2013\)](#) apply to this setting.<sup>23</sup> As a practical matter, due to the poor mean-squared error properties of Horvitz–Thompson estimators, it may also be preferable to use a self-normalizing Hájek estimator (or other adaptively weighted estimators; see [Khan and Ugander, 2021](#), for a recent treatment).

In the next section, we turn to sampling-based inference, where students are assumed to be sampled independently from a superpopulation. Under sampling-based inference, causal quantities of interest are population, rather than finite-sample, quantities, and uncertainty in their estimation stems from random sampling. Moreover, under a sampling-based framework,

<sup>20</sup>For instance, in 2013, Boston switched to a home-based system where students’ menus of school options depend on their residential address ([Shi, 2015](#)), where students only have access to the nearest schools. As a result, with the data from the home-based system alone, we cannot identify the effect of assigning students to schools that are farther from their addresses.

<sup>21</sup>Of course, it is only unbiased when the probabilities  $\pi_{is}$  are known, and so would not be unbiased if we plug in approximate versions via large-market approximations.

<sup>22</sup>For instance, [Horvitz and Thompson \(1952\)](#) show that the estimator is the unique unbiased estimator among the class of homogeneous linear (in  $D_{is} y_i$ ) estimators, whose weights do not depend on the realized assignment. [Godambe and Joshi \(1965\)](#) show that the estimation problem does not admit an UMVUE, but the Horvitz–Thompson estimator is admissible.

<sup>23</sup>For distributional inference here, we would need a finite-population central limit theorem, similar to [Li and Ding \(2017\)](#). To the best of our knowledge, such a characterization is not available for complex market design settings, and we leave an exploration for future work.

we can leverage continuity assumptions on conditional means of potential outcomes and identify causal effects even for non-stochastic mechanisms.

#### 4. SEMI-DETERMINISTIC MECHANISMS

This section considers identification and estimation by sampling for semi-deterministic mechanisms. These are mechanisms with a mixture of stochastic and deterministic components. Note that if the mechanism is not fully deterministic—i.e. the assignment remains stochastic holding the student information  $X_1, \dots, X_N$  fixed—we can treat the mechanism as a stochastic mechanism and apply identification results from [Section 3](#). However, certain types of estimands are additionally identified by sampling, assuming continuity of the conditional expectation function of potential outcomes.<sup>24</sup>

We discuss identification in generality in [Section 4.1](#), but focus our discussion mostly on the mixed mechanism described in [Example 3](#), whose identification results are collected in [Section 4.2](#). In both mechanisms, a conditional average potential outcome for school  $s$  (conditional on observable characteristics) is identified if and only if the student’s test scores fall in a certain set, which we call the student’s *s-eligibility set*. Causal effect contrasts are identified on intersections of (closures of) *s-eligibility sets*. In [Section 4.3](#), we explicitly characterize these sets, as well as their closures’ intersections, for mixed mechanisms, thereby resulting in a characterization of the identifiable treatment effects between pairs of schools. Lastly, in [Section 4.4](#), we state asymptotic properties of locally linear regression estimators, which are proved in [Appendix B](#). Additionally, [Appendix A.5](#) connects our exposition to the locally deferred acceptance (DA) propensity scores of [Abdulkadiroğlu et al. \(forthcoming\)](#). Throughout the discussion, it is perhaps useful to refer to the running example, [Example 4](#), described in [Section 4.2](#), for concreteness.

**4.1. Identification of conditional means of potential outcomes.** We consider the general mechanism described in [Section 2.3](#). Recall that each school uses a priority score (2),

$$V_{is} = g_s(\succ_i, \mathbf{R}_i, U_{is}) \in [0, 1]$$

where  $U_{is}$  is a random tie-breaker drawn by the mechanism and  $\mathbf{R}_i$  is a vector of information that relates to student  $i$ ’s eligibility at each of the schools.<sup>25</sup> The mechanism then runs the student-proposing deferred acceptance algorithm to assign students to schools, where student preferences are  $\succ_i$  and school priorities are generated by ordering the scalars  $V_{is}$ .

We focus on the identification of conditional averages of the potential outcomes  $Y(s)$ . By the law of iterated expectations, it suffices to consider the finest conditioning for the conditional means. Furthermore, since extending our results to conditioning on observable

<sup>24</sup>Of course, sampling-based inference is necessary if we wish to consider superpopulation quantities instead of finite-sample quantities.

<sup>25</sup>For instance, in mixed mechanisms,  $\mathbf{R}_i$  includes both discrete priorities  $Q_{is}$  and test scores  $R_{is}$ .

but non-mechanism-relevant covariates  $Z$  is straightforward,<sup>26</sup> we do not consider such covariates  $Z$ . We assume that the following conditional expectations of potential outcomes is continuous in  $\mathbf{R}$ .<sup>27</sup>

**Assumption 4.1.** *The map*

$$\mathbf{R} \mapsto \mathbb{E}[Y(s) \mid (\succ, \mathbf{R})] \equiv \mu_s(\succ, \mathbf{R}) \quad (4)$$

*is continuous for every  $s \in S$  and every  $\succ$ .*

Since we consider identification by sampling, we may consider the school cutoffs as fixed  $\{c_s : s \in S\}$ , maintaining the following assumption that ensures the conclusion of [Azevedo and Leshno \(2016\)](#) holds.

**Assumption 4.2.** *The population of students is such that the cutoffs on priority scores  $V_{is}$ ,  $\{C_{s,N}\}$ , satisfy  $\max_{s \in S} |C_{s,N} - c_s| = O_p(N^{-1/2})$  for some fixed  $c = (c_s : s \in S)$ .*

Under these assumptions, we show that  $\mu_s(\succ, \mathbf{R})$  is identified if and only if  $\mathbf{R}$  falls in a set  $\bar{E}_s(\succ, c)$ , which is the closure of what we term the *s-eligibility set* for  $\succ$ .

**Proposition 4.3.** *Consider a mechanism with deferred acceptance priority scores, described in [Section 2.3](#). Let the cutoffs of test schools be  $c$ . Fix a preference order  $\succ$  that occurs with positive probability. Under [Assumptions 4.1](#) and [4.2](#), the conditional expectation of potential outcomes  $\mu_s(\succ, \mathbf{r})$  is identified (by sampling) if and only if  $\mathbf{r} \in \bar{E}_s(\succ, c)$ , where:*

(1)  $E_s(\succ, c) \equiv \{\mathbf{r} : \Pr[D_s^*(c) = 1 \mid \succ, \mathbf{R} = \mathbf{r}] > 0\}$  is the *s-eligibility set* for preference  $\succ$ , where  $D^*(c)$  follows the treatment distribution induced by the fixed  $c$ , as in (1).

(2)  $\bar{E}_s$  is the closure of  $E_s$  with respect to the metric on the values  $\mathbf{R}$ .

The intuition for [Proposition 4.3](#) is simple. The potential randomness in the mechanism (driven by lottery numbers  $U_{is}$ ) induces a distribution (1) over treatment values  $D^*(c) = [D_1^*, \dots, D_M^*]'$ .<sup>28</sup> These treatments are ignorable by virtue of the lottery:

$$D^*(c) \perp (\{Y(s) : s \in S\}, Z) \mid (\succ, \mathbf{R}).$$

Since the treatment values are with respect to a fixed set of cutoffs  $c = \{c_s\}$ , these treatment values are independently drawn for each student. The *s-eligibility set*  $E_s(\succ, c)$  is then defined as the set of  $\mathbf{R}$  values where a student with preference  $\succ$  has positive probability of being assigned school  $s$ , at the cutoff values  $c$ . Naturally, since  $D^*(c)$  is ignorable, the mean potential outcome for  $s$ ,  $\mu_s(\succ, \mathbf{R})$ , is identified whenever the overlap condition holds for  $s$ , i.e. when  $\mathbf{R} \in E_s(\succ, c)$ : Explicitly, for instance, we may consider the inverse propensity

<sup>26</sup>We may simply understand the analysis as conditioning on some fixed value  $Z = z$ .

<sup>27</sup>The notion of continuity is, of course, with respect to the metric on the domain that we are not making explicit at the moment, due to the generality of the setting.

<sup>28</sup>As a reminder, we use the notation  $D^*$  to distinguish from the fact that these treatment values are contingent on a fixed cutoff. In particular,  $D_s^* = 1$  if the student is matched to school  $s$  when the cutoff is  $c$ , which is a deterministic function of the student's observable characteristics as well as her lottery numbers.

weighting:

$$\mu_s(\succ, \mathbf{R}) = \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{D_s^* Y}{\Pr[D_s^*(c) \mid \succ, \mathbf{R}]} \mid \succ, \mathbf{R} \right]. \quad (5)$$

Since  $\mu_s$  is assumed to be continuous in  $\mathbf{R}$  ( [Assumption 4.1](#)), we may extend the identification to the closure  $\overline{E}_s(\succ, c)$ . This argument shows the “if” direction, and we leave the “only if” direction to [Appendix A.3](#).

**4.2. Identification in mixed mechanisms.** It is now useful to specialize [Proposition 4.3](#) to the mixed mechanism described in [Example 3](#), maintaining [Assumption 2.1](#). As a reminder, in such a mechanism, the students’ eligibility information takes the form  $\mathbf{R}_i = ([Q_{i1}, \dots, Q_{iM}], [R_{i1}, \dots, R_{iT}])$ . The  $R_{it}$ ’s are test scores and the  $Q_{is}$ ’s are discrete priorities. The schools are divided into lottery schools and test-score schools, such that school priorities are determined by the priority score

$$V_{is} \equiv g_s(\succ_i, \mathbf{R}_i, U_{is}) = \begin{cases} g_s(Q_{is}, R_{it_s}) & s \text{ is a test-score school that uses test } t_s \\ g_s(Q_{is}, U_{i\ell_s}) & s \text{ is a lottery school} \end{cases}$$

and the maps  $g_s(q, v)$  are known, affine, and monotone ( [Assumption 2.1](#)), representing a lexicographic ordering in  $(q, v)$ .

Working with  $\mathbf{R} = (Q, R)$  is inelegant since  $Q$  is discrete, and it would be convenient to also hold  $Q$  fixed and assume that the conditional mean<sup>29</sup>

$$r \mapsto \mathbb{E}[Y(s) \mid (\succ, Q, r)] \equiv \mu_s(\succ, Q, r) \text{ is continuous for every } s, \succ, Q. \quad (6)$$

(6) is a special case of [Assumption 4.1](#) in the mixed mechanism setting. Similarly, redefine the  $s$ -eligibility sets

$$E_s(\succ, Q, c) \equiv \{r : \Pr[D_s^*(c) = 1 \mid (\succ, Q, r)] > 0\}.$$

[Proposition 4.3](#) then implies the following corollary.

**Corollary 4.4.** *In the mixed mechanism of [Example 3](#), under (6) and [Assumption 4.2](#), for  $(\succ, Q)$  values that occur with positive probability, the conditional average of potential outcomes  $\mu_s(\succ, Q, r)$  is identified if and only if  $r \in \overline{E}_s(\succ, Q, c)$ .*

**Example 4.** As a running example, let us consider a simplified setting. For this setting, in order to build intuition, we fully compute and characterize the  $s$ -eligibility sets  $E_s$ , as well as intersections of the form  $\overline{E}_{s_i} \cap \overline{E}_{s_j}$ , which are regions of test scores that allow for meaningful causal comparisons between  $s_i$  and  $s_j$ . The next section, [Section 4.3](#), formalizes and generalizes the calculation in this example.

<sup>29</sup>Precisely speaking, to connect with [Assumption 4.1](#), we set the topology over the space of  $\mathbf{R}$ ’s to be the product resulting from equipping the space of  $Q$ ’s with the discrete topology and the space of  $R$ ’s with the usual metric topology.

Let  $M = \#S = 4$ , where the schools are  $s_0, s_1, s_2, s_3$ . Suppose there are three types of students, denoted by (A, B, C), with the following preferences and the same discrete priorities  $Q$ :

	Preferences	Discrete qualifiers $Q$
A	$s_2 \succ s_3 \succ s_1 \succ s_0$	0
B	$s_2 \succ s_1 \succ s_3 \succ s_0$	0
C	$s_3 \succ s_2 \succ s_1 \succ s_0$	0

We have the following additional setup:

- (1) The schools  $s_1, s_2$  are test-score schools using the same test score  $R \in [0, 1]$ .
- (2)  $s_3$  is a lottery school, and  $s_0$  is an undersubscribed (lottery) school with sufficient capacity.
- (3) Since every student has the same discrete qualifier, it is without loss to assume the priority score is simply the test score  $g_s(\succ, Q, R) = R$ .
- (4) Assume the number of students is sufficiently large so that the cutoffs  $c_1, c_2$  are fixed.
- (5) Since everyone prefers  $s_2 \succ s_1$ , school 2 has a more stringent cutoff:  $c_2 > c_1$ .
- (6) Since the distribution of  $R$  is unspecified, assume  $c_2 = \frac{2}{3}, c_1 = \frac{1}{3}$ .
- (7) Assume that  $s_3$  is oversubscribed—the probability of qualifying for  $s_3$  for any student is not zero or one.<sup>30</sup>

Then, we may compute the  $s_j$ -eligibility sets for each type of student. Since there is a single test score  $R$ , these sets  $E_{s_j}$  take the form of one-dimensional intervals:

Preference type	$E_{s_0}$	$E_{s_1}$	$E_{s_2}$	$E_{s_3}$
A	$[0, \frac{1}{3})$	$[\frac{1}{3}, \frac{2}{3})$	$[\frac{2}{3}, 1]$	$[0, \frac{2}{3})$
B	$[0, \frac{1}{3})$	$[\frac{1}{3}, \frac{2}{3})$	$[\frac{2}{3}, 1]$	$[0, \frac{1}{3})$
C	$[0, \frac{1}{3})$	$[\frac{1}{3}, \frac{2}{3})$	$[\frac{2}{3}, 1]$	$[0, 1]$

As an exercise, let us calculate  $E_{s_1}$  for students of type A:

- These students qualify for  $s_1$  when  $R \geq \frac{1}{3}$ . Hence they would not be matched to  $s_1$  when  $R < \frac{1}{3}$ .
- However, when  $R \geq \frac{2}{3}$ , these students qualify for school  $s_2 \succ_A s_1$ , which means that they would not be matched to  $s_1$ .
- When  $R \in [\frac{1}{3}, \frac{2}{3})$ , students of type A are matched to  $s_1$  if they do not qualify for  $s_3$  by lottery.

<sup>30</sup>Note that if certain students do have discrete priority over others, then it may be the case that they qualify for  $s_3$  with probability one, even if  $s_3$  is oversubscribed.



Hence the  $s_1$ -eligibility set  $E_{s_1}$  for students of type A is  $[\frac{1}{3}, \frac{2}{3})$ . Eligibility sets for other school-student pairs are computed similarly.

Under continuity, the conditional mean  $\mathbb{E}[Y(s_j) \mid R = r, T]$  is identified when the test score is in type T's eligibility set,  $r \in \overline{E}_{s_j}(T)$ . Making causal comparisons between two schools, absent further assumptions, requires conditioning on  $R$  falling in the intersection of  $\overline{E}_{s_i}$ 's. From the table of  $E_{s_j}$  above, it is straightforward to compute  $\overline{E}_{s_i} \cap \overline{E}_{s_j}$  for each pair of schools  $(s_i, s_j)$ :

Preference type	$(s_0, s_1)$	$(s_0, s_2)$	$(s_0, s_3)$	$(s_1, s_2)$	$(s_1, s_3)$	$(s_2, s_3)$
A	$\{\frac{1}{3}\}$	$\emptyset$	$[0, \frac{1}{3})$	$\{\frac{2}{3}\}$	$[\frac{1}{3}, \frac{2}{3})$	$\{\frac{2}{3}\}$
B	$\{\frac{1}{3}\}$	$\emptyset$	$[0, \frac{1}{3})$	$\{\frac{2}{3}\}$	$\{\frac{1}{3}\}$	$\emptyset$
C	$\{\frac{1}{3}\}$	$\emptyset$	$[0, \frac{1}{3})$	$\{\frac{2}{3}\}$	$[\frac{1}{3}, \frac{2}{3})$	$[\frac{2}{3}, 1]$

We see that there is important heterogeneity, in at least two senses. First, different pairs of schools  $(s_i, s_j)$  are comparable on different regions of the test score  $R$ . Second, regions of  $R$  that admit comparisons for a given pair of schools differ substantially across student types—this is true in this example for comparisons with between  $(s_2, s_3)$ :

- Students of type A admits valid comparisons between  $s_2, s_3$  at a single point  $\{\frac{2}{3}\}$ , which has zero measure.
- There is no variation for students of type B between  $s_2, s_3$ .
- Students of type C have variation between  $(s_2, s_3)$  for the set  $[\frac{2}{3}, 1]$ , which has positive measure.

We should expect the heterogeneity in both senses to be even more complex in general, as, for this example, we only include 3 out of the 24 possible preferences and only a single type of test score. ■

In light of the heterogeneity, estimates of treatment effects that pool over multiple schools, multiple student preference types, and multiple test score values may not be transparent with respect to the implicit weighting assigned to the pairwise comparisons, conditional on student preferences and test score values. To understand these estimates, we characterize the eligibility sets  $E_s$  as well as pairwise treatment contrasts formally below.

**4.3.  $s$ -eligibility sets and identification of pairwise treatment contrasts.** With the identification result [Corollary 4.4](#) in hand, we are now ready to ask: In mixed mechanisms, which pairs of schools  $s_1, s_2$  have treatment effect contrasts that are identified, and what these causal effect contrasts look like? [Corollary 4.4](#) shows that these causal effects take the form of aggregations of conditional average treatment effects:

$$\tau_{s_1, s_0}^{\text{fine}}(\succ, Q, r) \equiv \mathbb{E}[Y(s_1) - Y(s_0) \mid (\succ, Q), R = r] \text{ where } r \in \overline{E}_{s_1}(\succ, Q, c) \cap \overline{E}_{s_0}(\succ, Q, c) \quad (7)$$

Thus it is convenient to characterize  $E_s(\succ, Q, c)$  as well as intersections  $\overline{E}_{s_1}(\succ, Q, c) \cap \overline{E}_{s_0}(\succ, Q, c)$ .

We turn to such a characterization in this subsection. The calculation below formalizes and generalizes the ad hoc computation in the simple setting in [Example 4](#); we note that the statement is notationally cumbersome due to its generality, but it does not require substantial conceptual leaps relative to the calculations in [Example 4](#). We first state the results, collected in [Theorem 4.5](#), proved in [Appendix A.4](#). We illustrate the results to the running example in [Example 5](#). Then, we walk through each claim subsequently. Our characterization bears some similarity to the *local deferred acceptance (DA) propensity scores* of [Abdulkadiroğlu et al. \(forthcoming\)](#), which we connect in detail in [Appendix A.5](#).

**Theorem 4.5.** *Consider mixed mechanisms ([Example 3](#)) under (6) and [Assumption 4.2](#). Let  $(\succ, Q, R)$  be in the support of the distribution of student observable characteristics, and let  $c$  be the limiting cutoff under [Assumption 4.2](#). Then we have the following properties regarding variation induced by lottery:*

(1) Define the support  $\text{supp}(\succ, Q, R) = \{s : R \in E_s(\succ, Q, c)\}$  as the set of schools that have positive probability of being assigned at characteristics  $(\succ, Q, R)$ . Then  $\text{supp}(\succ, Q, R)$  contains at most one test-score school, and if it does, then the test score school is the least preferred element in  $\text{supp}(\succ, Q, R)$  according to  $\succ$ .

(2) If  $s_1, s_2$  are two test-score schools, then  $E_{s_1}(\succ, Q, c) \cap E_{s_2}(\succ, Q, c) = \emptyset$ .

Moreover, for a school  $s$  and a test  $t$ , and define the following objects:

- Suppose  $t_s = t$ . Let the most disfavored test score that clears the cutoff  $c_s$  at school  $s$  be<sup>31</sup>

$$\underline{r}_t(s, Q_s, c_s) = g_s^{-1}(Q_s, c_s) \equiv \inf \{r \in [0, 1] : g_s(Q_s, r) \geq c_s\}.$$

- Let the most lenient test score  $t$  among those schools preferred to  $s$  be<sup>32</sup>

$$\underline{R}_t(s, \succ, Q; c) = \min_{\substack{s_1 \succ s \\ t_{s_1} = t}} \underline{r}_t(s_1, Q_{s_1}, c_{s_1})$$

- Let  $L(Q, c)$  be the set of lottery schools at which a student with discrete priority  $Q$  qualifies for sure, regardless of lottery outcomes.

<sup>31</sup>Effectively,  $\underline{r}_t$  transports the cutoff  $c_s$  from the space of priority scores  $V_s$  to the space of test scores  $R_t$ . Depending on the value of  $Q_s$ ,  $\underline{r}_t$  takes one of three forms: (a) some value  $r_{t,s}(c) \in (0, 1)$ , which does not depend on  $Q_s$ , (b) 0, indicating that  $Q_s$  is sufficiently compelling to qualify the student at  $s$  regardless of her test scores, or (c) 1, indicating that  $Q_s$  is sufficiently low that the student cannot be seated at  $s$  regardless of her test scores.

<sup>32</sup> $\underline{R}_t(s)$  is, loosely speaking, what [Abdulkadiroğlu et al. \(forthcoming\)](#) refer to as the *most informative disqualification*. Echoing [Abdulkadiroğlu et al. \(forthcoming\)](#), the test score distribution of students matched to  $s$  are truncated by  $\underline{R}_t$  on the right, since any test score  $R_t$  higher than  $\underline{R}_t$  qualifies the student to a school she prefers to  $s$ . The definition differs from most informative disqualification in [Abdulkadiroğlu et al. \(forthcoming\)](#) slightly and immaterially, as we operate in the space of the test scores  $R_t$ , while [Abdulkadiroğlu et al. \(forthcoming\)](#) operate in the space of the priority scores  $V_s$ .

Then, we have the following characterization of eligibility sets for test-score schools and the intersections of their closures, suppressing the dependence on  $\succ, Q, c$ :

(3) For a test-score school  $s_0$ , the  $s_0$ -eligibility set takes the following form:

$$E_{s_0}(\succ, Q, c) = \begin{cases} [r_{t_0}(s_0), \underline{R}_{t_0}(s_0)) \times \left( \times_{t \neq t_0} [0, \underline{R}_t(s_0)) \right), & \text{if } s_0 \succ L(Q, c) \\ \emptyset & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad (8)$$

and its closure takes the following form

$$\overline{E}_{s_0}(\succ, Q, c) = \begin{cases} [r_{t_0}(s_0), \underline{R}_{t_0}(s_0)] \times \left( \times_{t \neq t_0} [0, \underline{R}_t(s_0)] \right), & \text{if } E_{s_0} \neq \emptyset \\ \emptyset & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (9)$$

These are either hyperrectangles of dimension  $T = \dim R$  or empty sets.

(4) For two test-score schools  $s_0, s_1$ , where  $s_1 \succ s_0$ , the intersection  $\overline{E}_{s_0} \cap \overline{E}_{s_1}$  takes the following form

$$\overline{E}_{s_0} \cap \overline{E}_{s_1} = \begin{cases} \overline{E}_{s_0} \cap (\{r_{t_1}(s_1)\} \times [0, 1]^{T-1}) & \text{if } \underline{R}_{t_1}(s_0) = r_{t_1}(s_1) \text{ and } E_{s_0}, E_{s_1} \neq \emptyset \\ \emptyset & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad (10)$$

which is either a hyperrectangle of dimension  $T - 1$  or an empty set.

**Example 5** (Specializing [Theorem 4.5](#) to [Example 4](#)). We illustrate the results of [Theorem 4.5](#) in the context of the running example [Example 4](#). We enumerate some instances of the first two claims of [Theorem 4.5](#):

(1) For students of type A ( $s_2 \succ s_3 \succ s_1 \succ s_0$ ), as an example, the test score  $R = \frac{1}{2}$  falls inside the eligibility set for both  $s_1$  and  $s_3$ , indicating that  $\text{supp}(\succ_A, Q_A, \frac{1}{2}) = \{s_1, s_3\}$ . It indeed contains only one test score school ( $s_1$ ), which is less preferred by A to  $s_3$ .

(2) There are only two test-score schools,  $s_1$  and  $s_2$ . For every student, it is easy to check that  $E_{s_1} \cap E_{s_2} = \emptyset$ .

To illustrate the next two claims, let us consider students of type B ( $s_2 \succ s_1 \succ s_3 \succ s_0$ ) with schools  $s_1, s_2$ :

(3) The third claim of [Theorem 4.5](#) states that

$$E_{s_1}(\succ_B, Q_B, c) = [r(s_1), \underline{R}(s_1)),$$

if  $s_1 \succ_B L(Q_B, c)$ , where we omit the  $t$  subscript as there is a single test score. The set  $L(Q_B, c)$  is empty in this case, as there are no discrete priority differences, and hence students of type B do not qualify for any lottery schools for sure. Moreover, no lottery school is preferred to  $s_1$  by students of type B. The quantity  $r(s_1)$  is simply  $s_1$ 's cutoff in test-score space, which is  $\frac{1}{3}$ . The quantity  $\underline{R}(s_1)$  is the most lenient test score cutoff for test schools

preferred to  $s_1$ —in this case  $\{s_2\}$ . Hence  $\underline{R}(s_1) = \underline{r}(s_2) = \frac{2}{3}$ . We conclude that  $E_{s_1}$  for students of type B is equal to  $[\frac{1}{3}, \frac{2}{3})$ , as claimed in [Example 4](#).

(4) The fourth claim of [Theorem 4.5](#) states that

$$\overline{E}_{s_2}(\succ_B, Q_B, c) \cap \overline{E}_{s_1}(\succ_B, Q_B, c) = [\underline{r}(s_1), \underline{R}(s_1)] \cap \{\underline{r}(s_2)\} = \left[\frac{1}{3}, \frac{2}{3}\right] \cap \left\{\frac{2}{3}\right\} = \left\{\frac{2}{3}\right\},$$

which agrees with the claim in [Example 4](#). ■

The first two claims of [Theorem 4.5](#) concern the identification induced by the randomized lottery number. The first claim observes that the support  $\text{supp}(\succ, Q, R)$  contains at most one test-score school. This is because the random lottery number  $U$  cannot induce randomized assignment between two schools that do not use lottery numbers for assignment. Moreover, if the support does contain a test-score school  $s$ , then  $s$  must be the  $\succ$ -least preferred school in  $\text{supp}(\succ, Q, R)$ . To see this, note that the student with characteristics  $\mathbf{R} = (Q, R)$  can attend  $s$  if she so desires; thus having positive probability of attending  $s'$  implies that  $s' \succ s$ . Therefore, the first claim implies that most lottery-driven comparisons between schools are comparisons between lottery schools. Lottery-driven comparisons between a lottery school and a test-score school are also possible, but always imply that the lottery school is preferred to the test-score school.

The second claim of [Theorem 4.5](#) observes that the eligibility sets of two test-score schools are disjoint, because lottery comparisons between two test-score schools are impossible. As a result, causal comparisons between two test-score schools necessarily rely on the possibly non-disjoint closures of the eligibility sets. Continuity of the potential outcome conditional means (4) is therefore critical for identification. Since the intersection of the closures is typically a measure-zero set, the resulting causal estimands are irregularly identified, in the sense of [Khan and Tamer \(2010\)](#), and hence are estimated at a slower rate than  $N^{-1/2}$ .

The third and fourth claims characterize regions of observable characteristics on which causal comparisons between two test-score schools are possible. The third claim characterizes  $s_0$ -eligibility sets for a school  $s_0$ . The form (8) of the  $s_0$ -eligibility set for a test-score school comes from three simple facts. First, if any school in  $L(Q, c)$  is preferable to  $s_0$ , then  $s_0$  cannot possibly be assigned with positive probability under any test score configurations, and hence the  $s_0$ -eligibility set is empty. Second, in order for the student to be eligible at  $s_0$ , she must have test scores that clear the cutoff  $\underline{r}_{t_0}$ , explaining the lower bound in the  $t_0^{\text{th}}$  coordinate. Third, for every test  $t$ , if the score  $R_t$  exceeds  $\underline{R}_t$ , then there is some other school  $s \succ s_0$  that the student qualifies for, leaving it impossible for the student to be matched to  $s_0$ ; hence,  $R_t < \underline{R}_t$  for  $R \in E_{s_0}$ , explaining the upper bound in the  $t^{\text{th}}$  coordinate. The result for a lottery school  $s_0$  follows analogously.

The fourth claim characterizes the (measure-zero) region of observables on which the causal contrast between  $s_1, s_0$ —two test-score schools where  $s_1 \succ s_0$ —is identified. Combined with

**Corollary 4.4**, the fourth claim makes explicit the identified causal effects between  $s_0$  and  $s_1$ , which are aggregations of (7). When (10) is nonempty, it is simply the slice of  $\bar{E}_{s_0}$  where the  $t_1^{\text{th}}$  coordinate equals the threshold  $r_{t_1}$ .

**Remark 2.** We now discuss the policy relevance of the identified treatment effects. Aggregations of (7) cover both variations induced by lottery- and regression-discontinuity-type variation.<sup>33</sup> For simplicity, let us consider the identified treatment effect between two schools  $s_0, s_1$ . **Corollary 4.4** implies that the only (conditional average) treatment contrasts that are identified are aggregations of (7). One natural policy interpretation of effects like the above is the following. Expanding school  $s_1$  by a small amount generates direct treatment effects that are exactly aggregations of  $\tau_{s_1, s_0}^{\text{fine}}$  over choices of  $s_0$  and  $\succ$  such that  $s_1 \succ s_0$ , representing the effect of students who prefer  $s_1$  sorting into  $s_1$ . Of course, such an expansion of capacities would also create indirect effects due to sorting into schools which are newly vacant due to expanding capacity at  $s_1$ . Despite the complexity, these indirect effects are also aggregations of effects of the form (7).

However, treatment effects (7) do not inform counterfactual outcomes that involve global interventions, without further smoothness or homogeneity assumptions. This represents inherent limitations of school choice data. For instance, treatment effects (7) are not in general sufficient of large increases or reductions in the school capacity, closure of schools, or substantial changes to the school’s admission policy, as such interventions can easily involve comparisons on students with observables  $(\succ, Q, R)$  between schools where  $R \notin \bar{E}_{s_1} \cap \bar{E}_{s_0}$ . Nevertheless, in the presence of stronger identifying assumptions such as smoothness of the potential outcome function  $r \mapsto \mu_s(\succ, Q, Z, r)$ , homogeneity of treatment effects, or parametric structural models, the nonparametrically identified treatment effects (7) may serve as moments for estimation or for validation. ■

**4.4. Estimation and inference.** Having characterized the identified causal effects, we now turn to formally deriving asymptotic properties of a locally linear regression estimator (Hahn et al., 2001) for a family of estimands whose identification depends on regression-discontinuity-type variation. Our asymptotic arguments explicitly take into account the fact that  $C_N \rightarrow c$  in probability, and show that when  $C_N = c + O_p(1/\sqrt{N})$ , the randomness in  $C_N$  does not affect the estimator to first order. As a result, the estimator is asymptotically normal and unbiased, under the usual undersmoothing bandwidths. This analysis is novel, and formally justifies inference procedures in the literature.

Consider a mixed mechanism (Example 3 and maintaining Assumption 2.1). Let  $s_1, s_0$  be two test-score schools with tests  $t_0, t_1$ , respectively. We are interested in the  $s_1$ -minus- $s_0$

<sup>33</sup>In this sense, they are more general than the pure lottery-driven causal effects in Proposition 3.1. Of course, Proposition 3.1 concerns sample average treatment effects where (7) are population average treatment effects, and so they are not strictly comparable.

treatment effect contrast of students near school  $s_1$ 's cutoff, for those students with  $s_1 \succ s_0$  and whose effects are identified. Indeed, students for which such a treatment effect is identified have observable characteristics such that, all else equal, they are matched to school  $s_1$  if  $R_{t_1}$  is slightly higher, and they are matched to school  $s_0$  if  $R_{t_1}$  is slightly lower.

Formally speaking, we consider the estimand

$$\begin{aligned}\tau_{s_0, s_1} &= \mathbb{E} [Y(s_1) - Y(s_0) \mid s_1 \succ s_0, R \in \overline{E}_{s_0}(\succ, Q; c) \cap \overline{E}_{s_1}(\succ, Q; c)], \\ &\equiv \mathbb{E}[Y(s_1) - Y(s_0) \mid J_i(c) = 1, R_{t_1} = \rho(c)],\end{aligned}$$

where we may write the conditioning as sample selection indicator  $J_i(c) = 1$  and the conditioning that  $R_{t_1}$  is at some cutoff  $R_{t_1} = \rho(c)$  that we define shortly.<sup>34</sup>

$\tau_{s_0, s_1}$  is the coarsest conditional treatment effect between schools  $s_0$  and  $s_1$  driven by variation near  $s_1$ 's cutoff.<sup>35</sup> In finite samples, the coarsest effect has the most data with which to estimate, and thus the asymptotic analysis of estimation for such effects is likely to be practically relevant. Moreover, estimation of treatment effects identified from randomization, as opposed to regression discontinuity, may be analyzed with simple inverse propensity weighting arguments or even in a design-based framework as in [Section 3](#). Thus, estimation of the coarsest regression-discontinuity effects is both practically relevant and non-obvious, and so we focus on it here. Nonetheless, finer conditional average treatment effects are identified, and analogous estimators may be proposed by modifying the indicator  $J_i(c)$ . Their asymptotic analyses are analogous to our analysis of the coarsest level of effect.

In particular, we consider a locally linear regression estimator for  $\tau_{s_0, s_1}$  with uniform kernel. The estimator takes the form of a difference

$$\hat{\tau}(h_N) = \hat{\beta}_{+,0}(h_N) - \hat{\beta}_{-,0}(h_N)$$

indexed by some bandwidth  $h_N$ . The estimator for the right-limit,  $\hat{\beta}_{+,0}(h_N)$ , is the intercept in a linear regression of some *reweighted outcome measure*  $Y_i^{(1)}(C_N)$  on the centered running variable  $(R_{it_1} - \rho(C_N))$ , among those observations with  $R_{it_1} \in [\rho(C_N), \rho(C_N) + h_N]$  and  $J_i(C_N) = 1$ :

$$\hat{\beta}_+(h_N) = \arg \min_{b_0, b_1} \sum_{i=1}^N J_i(C_N) \mathbb{1}(R_{it_1} \in [\rho(C_N), \rho(C_N) + h_N]) \left( Y_i^{(1)}(C_N) - b_0 - (R_{it_1} - \rho(C_N))b_1 \right)^2.$$

We define  $\hat{\beta}_-(h_N)$  analogously.

To complete the description of the estimator, it remains to define the cutoff  $\rho(c)$  and the reweighted outcome  $Y_i^{(1)}(c)$ . For a school  $s$  that uses the  $w^{\text{th}}$  test or lottery number, we define  $r_{w,s}(c)$  as the corresponding cutoff in the space of test scores or lottery numbers under

<sup>34</sup>The precise definition of  $J_i(c)$  is notationally cumbersome, which we lay out explicitly in (B.17) in [Appendix B](#).

<sup>35</sup>In fact,  $\tau_{s_0, s_1}$  and  $-\tau_{s_1, s_0}$  form the maximal aggregation of the conditional average treatment effects (7).

cutoffs  $c$ , and we define  $\rho(c) = r_{t_1, s_1}(c)$ :

$$r_{w,s}(c) = \max \{g_s^{-1}(q, c_s) : g_s^{-1}(q, c_s) < 1, q = 1, \dots, \bar{q}_s\} \in [0, 1); \quad \rho(c) \equiv r_{t_1, s_1}(c).$$

The object  $r_{w,s}(c)$  is more intuitive than its definition seems. Excluding knife-edge cases (ruled out shortly in [Assumption 4.6](#)), for cutoffs  $c$  in the space of priority scores  $V_{is}$ , there is a single level of the discrete qualifier  $q$  where some students with  $Q_{is} = q$  qualify for school  $s$  and others do not. Those who qualify have test score or lottery numbers above some cutoff, and those who do not qualify have those running variables below the cutoff. That cutoff is precisely  $r_{w,s}(c)$ .

On the other hand, the reweighted outcome measure  $Y_i^{(1)}(c)$  is defined as the inverse-propensity weighting  $Y_i^{(1)}(c) = \frac{D_i^{\dagger(1)}(c)Y_i}{\pi_i^{(1)}(c)}$ , where: (i)  $0/0$  is interpreted as zero; (ii)  $D_i^{\dagger(1)}(c)$  is an indicator for the student failing to qualify for all lottery schools that she prefers to school  $s_1$  under cutoffs  $c$ :  $D_i^{\dagger(1)}(c) = \prod_{s: \ell_s \neq \emptyset, s > s_1} \mathbb{1}(U_{i\ell_s} < g_s^{-1}(Q_i, c_s))$ . The object  $D^\dagger$  is essentially equal to  $D_{is}^*$  appearing in (5) (and  $\pi_i$  with  $\mathbb{E}[D_{is}^* | \succ_i, Q_i]$ ), which is formalized in [Lemma B.1](#); and (iii)  $\pi_i^{(1)}(c) = \mathbb{E}[D_i^{\dagger(1)}(c) | (\succ_i, Q_i)]$ . Since the only other random variable in the expectation,  $U_i$ , is independent of  $(\succ_i, Q_i)$ , this amounts to integrating over the known lottery distribution.

Having introduced the estimator, we turn to assumptions. The first assumption is a substantive restriction on school capacities and the population distribution of student characteristics, such that the large-market cutoffs are not in certain knife-edge configurations.

**Assumption 4.6** (Population cutoffs are interior). *The distribution of student observables satisfies [Assumption 4.2](#), where the population cutoffs  $c$  satisfy:*

- (1) *School  $s_1$  is not undersubscribed:  $\rho(c) > 0$ .*
- (2) *For each school  $s$ , either (i) there is a unique  $q_s^*(c)$  under which the tie-breaker cutoff is in the open interval  $(0, 1)$ ,  $0 < r_{t_s, s}(c) \equiv g_s^{-1}(q_s^*(c), c_s) < 1$ , or (ii)  $c_s = 0$  and for all  $q$ ,  $r_{t_s, s}(c) = g_s^{-1}(q, c_s) = 0$ ; in this case,  $q_s^*(c) = -\infty$ .*
- (3) *If  $c_s = 0$ , then  $s$  is eventually undersubscribed:  $\Pr(C_{s, N} = 0) \rightarrow 1$ .*
- (4) *If two schools  $s_3, s_4$  uses the same test  $t$ , then their test score cutoffs are different, unless both are undersubscribed:  $r_{t, s_3}(c) = r_{t, s_4}(c) \implies r_{t, s_3}(c) = r_{t, s_4}(c) = 0$ .*

[Assumption 4.6](#) rules out populations where the large-market cutoffs from [Azevedo and Leshno \(2016\)](#) are on the boundary of certain sets. The first assumption simply says that the school  $s_1$  is not undersubscribed so that the treatment effect  $\tau_{s_0, s_1}$  is identified. The second assumption says that the cutoff for each school  $s$  does not lie exactly on the boundary between some  $Q = q$  and  $Q = q + 1$ . It rules out a scenario where everyone with  $Q = q$  do not qualify for  $s$  regardless of their tie-breakers and everyone with  $Q = q + 1$  qualify for  $s$  regardless of their tie-breakers. The third assumption says that undersubscribed schools are

eventually undersubscribed, and so the population capacity of a school is not *exactly* at the threshold making the school undersubscribed.<sup>36</sup> Lastly, the fourth assumption assumes that the population cutoffs are not exactly the same for two schools that uses the same test.<sup>37</sup>

Additionally, we maintain a few technical assumptions, [Assumptions B.2 to B.5](#), stated in [Appendix B](#), on the distribution of test scores and lotteries, as well as the conditional means and higher moments of the potential outcomes. Under these technical assumptions, the estimator  $\hat{\tau}_{s_0, s_1}$  is equivalent in first order to an oracle estimator  $\check{\tau}_{s_0, s_1} = \check{\beta}_{+,0} - \check{\beta}_{-,0}$ , where

$$\check{\beta}_+(h_N) \equiv \begin{bmatrix} \beta_0 \\ \beta_1 \end{bmatrix} = \arg \min_{b_0, b_1} \sum_{i=1}^N J_i(c) \mathbb{1}(R_{t_1} \in [\rho(c), \rho(c) + h_N]) \left( Y_i^{(1)}(c) - b_0 - (R_{it_1} - \rho(c))b_1 \right)^2$$

and similarly for  $\check{\beta}_-$ . The oracle estimator  $\check{\tau}_{s_0, s_1}$  is a standard regression discontinuity estimator on observations with  $J_i(c) = 1$ , whose asymptotic properties are well-known (inter alia, [Imbens and Lemieux, 2008](#); [Hahn et al., 2001](#)). Thus,  $\hat{\tau}_{s_0, s_1}$  is asymptotically normal with estimable asymptotic variance.

**Theorem 4.7.** *Under [Assumptions 4.2, 4.6, and B.2 to B.5](#), assuming  $N^{-1/2} = o(h_N)$  and  $h_N = o(1)$ ,*

$$\sqrt{Nh_N}(\hat{\tau}_{s_0, s_1} - \check{\tau}_{s_0, s_1}) = o_p(1).$$

*In particular, if  $h_N = O(N^{-d})$  with  $1/4 < d < 1/5$ , the discrepancy is smaller than the bias of the oracle estimator:  $\sqrt{Nh_N}(\hat{\tau}_{s_0, s_1} - \check{\tau}_{s_0, s_1}) = o_p(\sqrt{Nh_N} \cdot h_N^2) = o_p(1)$ . Moreover, under undersmoothing, i.e.  $h_N = o(N^{-1/5})$ ,  $\hat{\tau}_{s_0, s_1}$  is asymptotically normal:*

$$\hat{\sigma}_{s_0, s_1}^{-1}(\hat{\tau}_{s_0, s_1} - \tau_{s_0, s_1}) \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(0, 1).$$

*The variance estimate  $\hat{\sigma}_{s_0, s_1}^2$  is the sum  $\hat{\sigma}_{s_0, s_1} = \hat{\sigma}_{+,N}^2 + \hat{\sigma}_{-,N}^2$ , where (i)  $\hat{\sigma}_{+,N}^2$  is defined as*

$$\hat{\sigma}_{+,N}^2 = \frac{4Nh_N}{N_+} \left( \frac{1}{N_+} \sum_{i=1}^N W_i(C_N, h_N) Y_i^{(1)}(C_N)^2 - \hat{\beta}_{+,0}^2 \right);$$

*(ii) the sample size is*

$$N_+ \equiv \sum_{i=1}^N W_i(C_N, h_N) \quad W_i(C_N, h_N) \equiv J_i(C_N) \mathbb{1}(R_{t_1} \in [\rho(C_N), \rho(C_N) + h_N])$$

<sup>36</sup>This assumption is stronger than the  $O_p(N^{-1/2})$  convergence of the cutoffs that we assume. However, the assumption holds generically for sufficiently large population school capacities. Precisely speaking, suppose some school  $s$  with population capacity  $q_s$  is undersubscribed in the population, but the probability that it is undersubscribed in samples of size  $N$  does not tend to one (and so violates the third assumption). Then we may add a little slack to the school capacity—for any  $\epsilon > 0$ , making the capacity  $q_s + \epsilon$  instead—to guarantee that the third assumption holds. Intuitively, adding  $\epsilon$  to the capacity adds  $O(\epsilon N)$  seats to the school in finite samples, but the random fluctuation of the market generates variation in student assignments of size  $O(\sqrt{N})$ .

<sup>37</sup>This is Assumption 2 in [Abdulkadiroğlu et al. \(forthcoming\)](#).



and (iii)  $\hat{\sigma}_{-,N}^2$  is defined analogously.

The proof of [Theorem 4.7](#) is relegated to [Appendix B](#) ([Theorem B.6](#) for the first-order equivalence and [Theorem B.9](#) for the variance estimation). We give a brief sketch here. Within the bandwidth  $h_N$ , there are roughly  $O(Nh_N)$  students. On running variables other than  $t_1$ , the discrepancy  $\|C_N - c\|_\infty = O_p(N^{-1/2})$  leads to discrepancies  $J_i(C_N) \neq J_i(c)$  in about  $O(Nh_N \cdot N^{-1/2}) = O(\sqrt{N}h_N)$  students. Thus the asymptotic bias incurred due to discrepancies in  $J_i$  is of order  $O(\sqrt{N}h_N/\sqrt{N}h_N) = O(\sqrt{h_N})$ . On the other hand, for the running variable  $R_{t_1}$ , the discrepancy in  $C_{s,N} - c_s$  incurs a discrepancy in  $O(\sqrt{N})$  students, all of whom are contained in the bandwidth. Thankfully, the accrued error in these students is of order  $O((\sqrt{N})^{1/2}) = O(N^{1/4})$ , via an application of Kolmogorov’s maximal inequality, a key step in our argument. The total asymptotic discrepancy, due to  $c \neq C_N$ , is then  $O((N^{1/4} + N^{1/2}h_N)/\sqrt{N}h_N)$ , leading to the rates in the result. The maximal inequality argument, in the context of non-ignorable random cutoffs<sup>38</sup> in regression discontinuity, appears to be novel.

[Theorem 4.7](#) provides a basis for Wald inference with locally linear regression estimators, through standard undersmoothing arguments. This supplies theoretical justification for confidence intervals reported in empirical work ([Abdulkadiroğlu et al., forthcoming](#)). Moreover, the asymptotic representation also allows for testing joint hypotheses of different combinations of these treatment effects, leading naturally to a test of treatment effect heterogeneity. Likewise, the joint normality naturally allows for selective inference approaches, such as inference on the value of the largest pairwise treatment effect ([Andrews, Kitagawa and McCloskey, 2019](#)).

Moreover, [Theorem 4.7](#) also sheds light on the construction of MSE-optimal bandwidth selection procedures ([Imbens and Kalyanaraman, 2012](#)), as well as bias-corrected estimators ([Calonico et al., 2014](#)). In particular, since the fact that the cutoff is random ( $C_N = c + O_p(1/\sqrt{N})$ ) does not affect first order behavior of the estimator (and incurs an error that is lower stochastic order than the bias under certain bandwidth sequences), the population optimal bandwidths or bias correction should not require any modification. However, nuisance parameters in these procedures typically themselves require estimation, which is complicated by the fact that  $C_N \neq c$ , and we leave investigations of these aspects, as well as uniform-in-bias approaches ([Armstrong and Kolesár, 2020](#); [Imbens and Wager, 2019](#); [Kwon and Kwon, 2020](#)) to future work.

---

<sup>38</sup>That is, a cutoff  $C$  where  $C \not\perp Y(\cdot) \mid X$  for observable information  $X$ . [Cattaneo et al. \(2016\)](#) give an analysis under the cutoff ignorability assumption

## 5. REGRESSION AND PROPENSITY SCORE ESTIMATORS

In this section, we analyze regression-based estimators combined with estimates of propensity scores, motivated by the fact that such specifications are popular in applied work. In [Section 5.1](#), we analyze regression adjustment estimators in the context of stochastic mechanisms. We find that the linear specification for treatment arm means, with discretized propensity score as controls, recovers a Horvitz–Thompson-like estimator with a plug-in estimate of the assignment probability. Interestingly, specifications for causal contrasts are in general not identified via regression due to collinearity, and automatic covariate removal—common default options in statistical software—may result in estimands that do not have reasonable properties.

In [Section 5.2](#), we analyze the causal estimand—which is the aggregation of difference-in-means conditioned on estimated local DA propensity scores ([Abdulkadiroğlu et al., forthcoming](#))—in the mixed mechanism running example, [Example 4](#). We find that such an estimand pools over variation induced both by test-scores and lottery numbers. However, for such an estimand to be free of selection bias, the weight put on variation from test-scores must vanish, reflecting the fact that the causal effects identified by regression discontinuity are irregularly identified. Moreover, the lottery variation and the regression-discontinuity variation may be very different ([Theorem 4.5](#)), and so ignoring the latter may have empirical consequences—which we speculate on in [Remark 4](#)

**5.1. Regression estimators under stochastic mechanisms.** For stochastic mechanisms, [Abdulkadiroğlu et al. \(2017a\)](#) (expression (7)) consider using bins of estimated propensity scores as covariates in a regression estimator. The estimator considered do not feature interaction between the treatment variable and the propensity score controls, which, in the typical binary-treatment, cross-sectional setting, estimates a weighted average of conditional average treatment effects ([Angrist, 1998](#)). However, [Goldsmith-Pinkham, Hull and Kolesár \(2021\)](#) show that with multiple treatments, the regression estimator without interactions estimates a non-convex weighting of the treatment effects.

Therefore, we analyze in [Lemma 5.1](#) a regression estimator that does interact with the propensity score bins,<sup>39</sup> and show that it is similar to a Horvitz–Thompson estimator for an estimand of the form (3), and derive the implicit unit-level weights  $\lambda_{is}$ . Such regressions estimate the maximal identifiable potential outcome average for treatment arm; however, since such averages involve different individuals for two different treatment arms, differences in the regression coefficients are not valid causal comparisons in general.

Before introducing [Lemma 5.1](#), we define some notation. It is typical that certain sets of schools are grouped into a treatment arm. Therefore, we coarsen treatments into the levels

---

<sup>39</sup>[Appendix A.6](#) shows that versions of the regression estimator without interactions are approximately unbiased under constant treatment effects.

$L_{i0}, \dots, L_{iK}$ , where the indicator for assignment to category  $k$  is defined as  $L_{ik} \equiv \sum_{s \in S_k} D_{is}$ , summing over some partition of the set of schools:  $\bigcup_{k=1}^K S_k = S$ . Correspondingly, let the assignment probability to each category of schools be  $e_{ik} = \sum_{s \in S_k} \pi_{is}$ , where  $\pi_{is} = \Pr_{\Pi(X_1, \dots, X_N)}(D_{is} = 1)$ . We consider discretizing  $e_{ik}$  into bins  $\{B_{k0}, \dots, B_{kJ_k} : k = 1, \dots, K\}$ , where  $B_{ikj_k} = 1$  denotes that student  $i$ 's assignment probability to the  $k^{\text{th}}$  category of schools,  $e_{ik}$ , falls in the  $j_s^{\text{th}}$  bin, where (i) the bins contain similar values of the assignment probabilities; (ii) the bins are ordered such that assignment probabilities in the  $j_s^{\text{th}}$  bin are lower than those in the  $(j_s + 1)^{\text{th}}$  bin; (iii), the  $0^{\text{th}}$  bin contains only  $e_{ik} = 0$ ; and, (iv) any value of the assignment probability falls into some bin. Note that the partition over the assignment probabilities may differ by school.<sup>40</sup>

**Lemma 5.1.** *The regression coefficients*

$$\hat{\mu}_0, \dots, \hat{\mu}_K = \arg \min_{\mu_k} \min_{\mu_{k,j_k}} \sum_{i=1}^N \left( Y_i - \sum_{k=0}^K \mu_k L_{ik} - \sum_{k=0}^K \sum_{j_k=2}^{J_k} \mu_{k,j_k} L_{ik} (B_{i,k,j_k} - \bar{B}_{k,j_k}) \right)^2 \quad (11)$$

are explicitly written as

$$\hat{\mu}_k = \frac{1}{N_k} \sum_{i=1}^N (1 - B_{i,k,0}) \frac{L_{ik} Y_i}{\hat{e}_{ik}},$$

where  $N_k = \sum_{i=1}^N (1 - B_{i,k,0})$ ,  $\hat{e}_{ik} = \sum_{j_k=1}^{J_k} \frac{B_{i,k,j_k} n_{k,j_k}}{n_{j_k}}$ ,  $n_{j_k} = \sum_{i=1}^N B_{i,k,j_k}$ , and  $n_{k,j_k} = \sum_{\ell=1}^N L_{\ell k} B_{\ell,k,j_k}$ .

We find that  $\hat{\mu}_k$  is the propensity-weighted mean of those assigned to treatment type  $k$ , among those with positive probability of doing so; in particular,  $\hat{\mu}_k$  plugs in a frequency estimator  $\hat{e}_{ik}$  for the assignment probability. We may write  $\hat{\mu}_k$  as an approximate Horvitz–Thompson estimator

$$\hat{\mu}_k = \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{s=0}^M \frac{\mathbb{1}(s \in S_k) \pi_{is} D_{is} Y_i}{N_k \hat{e}_{ik} \pi_{is}} \equiv \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{s=0}^M \hat{\lambda}_{is}^{(k)} \frac{D_{is} Y_i}{\pi_{is}}.$$

Let  $\lambda_{is}^{(k)} = \frac{\mathbb{1}(s \in S_k) \pi_{is}}{N_k e_{ik}}$  be a nonrandom analogue of  $\hat{\lambda}_{is}^{(k)}$ . The corresponding estimand is

$$\mu_k = \mathbb{E}_{\Pi(X_1, \dots, X_N)} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{s=0}^M \lambda_{is}^{(k)} \frac{D_{is} Y_i}{\pi_{is}} \right] = \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{s=0}^M \frac{\mathbb{1}(s \in S_k) \pi_{is}}{N_k e_{ik}} y_i(s),$$

which is the average potential outcome of treatment type  $k$ , viewing the potential outcome of arm  $k$  as the assignment-probability-weighted average  $\bar{y}_i(k) \equiv \sum_{s \in S_k} \frac{\pi_{is}}{e_{ik}} y_i(s)$ . The regression estimator (11) plugs in a frequency estimate  $\hat{e}_{ik}$  for  $e_{ik}$ , which may have finite-sample benefits over the Horvitz–Thompson estimator in terms of mean-squared error, at the cost of exact unbiasedness.

<sup>40</sup>Of course, this notation nests the case where the estimated propensity scores take discrete values, as in [Abdulkadiroğlu et al. \(2017a\)](#).

The weights  $\lambda_{is}^{(k)}$  are reasonable weights for causal means, in the sense that (i)  $\lambda_{is}^{(k)} \geq 0$ , (ii)  $\sum_s \lambda_{is}^{(k)} \in \{0, 1/N_k\}$ , and (iii)  $\sum_{is} \lambda_{is}^{(k)} = 1$ . However, in general, for  $k \neq \ell$ , the difference  $\lambda_{is}^{(k)} - \lambda_{is}^{(\ell)}$  are not reasonable weights for causal contrasts, since  $\sum_s (\lambda_{is}^{(k)} - \lambda_{is}^{(\ell)}) \neq 0$ , as the set of students with positive assignment probability to treatment type  $k$  may not be the set of students with positive assignment probability to treatment type  $\ell$ .

Somewhat unexpectedly, canonical regression estimators for causal contrasts may not estimate valid causal contrasts when the overlap condition fails. Overlap failure is very common in the school choice setting. We illustrate this point with a general result, [Lemma 5.2](#), about average treatment effect estimation under unconfoundedness with overlap failure.

**Lemma 5.2.** *Consider real-valued random variables  $(Y(0), Y(1), D, X) \sim P$ , where the distribution  $P$  has finite second moments. Suppose  $D \in \{0, 1\}$ ,  $X \in \{0, \dots, J\}$ . Let the observed outcome be  $Y = Y(D)$ . Assume that treatment is unconfounded:  $Y(0), Y(1) \perp\!\!\!\perp D \mid X$ . Let  $X_j = \mathbb{1}(X = j)$ ,  $\nu_j = \mathbb{E}[X_j]$ ,  $\tilde{X}_j = X_j - \nu_j$ , and  $\pi_j = \Pr(D = 1 \mid X_j = 1)$ . Suppose the baseline level  $X = 0$  has overlap:  $0 < \pi_0 < 1$ . Then:*

(1) *If, for all  $j$ ,  $0 < \pi_j < 1$ , then the regression coefficient in the following population regression recovers the average treatment effect*

$$\beta_0 = \arg \min_{\beta} \min_{\alpha, \gamma, \delta} \mathbb{E} \left[ \left( Y - \alpha - D\beta - \sum_{j=1}^J \tilde{X}_j \gamma_j - \sum_{j=1}^J \delta_j D \tilde{X}_j \right)^2 \right] = \mathbb{E}[Y(1) - Y(0)].$$

(2) *If, for any  $j$ ,  $\pi_j \in \{0, 1\}$ , then the population projection coefficient  $\beta$  is not identified: i.e.  $D$  is a linear combination of 1 and  $\{\tilde{X}_j, D\tilde{X}_j\}_{j=1}^J$ .*

(3) *Let  $G = \{j : \pi_j \in \{0, 1\}\}$ . The regression dropping interactions for indices in  $G$  estimates a particular aggregation of the conditional average treatment effects:*

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\beta}_0 &= \arg \min_{\beta} \min_{\alpha, \gamma, \delta} \mathbb{E} \left[ \left( Y - \alpha - D\beta - \sum_{j=1}^J \tilde{X}_j \gamma_j - \sum_{j=1, j \notin G}^J \delta_j D \tilde{X}_j \right)^2 \right] \\ &= \left( \nu_0 + \sum_{j \in G} \nu_j \right) \mathbb{E}[Y(1) - Y(0) \mid X = 0] + \sum_{j=1, j \notin G}^J \nu_j \mathbb{E}[Y(1) - Y(0) \mid X = j]. \end{aligned}$$

*In particular,  $\tilde{\beta}_0$  is not invariant to the choice of the baseline covariate level  $X = 0$ .*

(4) *Let  $\check{X}_j = X_j - \frac{\nu_j}{1 - \sum_{k \in G} \nu_k}$ . The regression in (3) with  $\check{X}_j$  instead of  $\tilde{X}_j$  recovers the maximal identifiable average treatment effect  $\mathbb{E}[Y(1) - Y(0) \mid X \notin G]$ .*

The first claim of [Lemma 5.2](#) restates the well-known result (e.g. [Imbens and Wooldridge, 2009](#)) that the interacted regression with properly demeaned covariates recovers the average treatment effect. The second and third claim show that, when the overlap condition fails, the interacted regression is non-identified due to collinearity; in this case, automatic covariate dropping in typical statistical softwares recovers convex-weighted average treatment

effects that are *not* invariant to the choice of the baseline covariate level. The fourth claim states that modifying the covariate-demeaning—which amounts to dropping problematic observations—recovers the maximal identifiable causal contrast. [Lemma 5.2](#) offers a warning that regression estimators may have unreasonable estimands when overlap fails, unless care is taken to manually purge observations that do not select into the relevant treatment arms with positive probability. It is perhaps more transparent and simpler using the appropriate Horvitz–Thompson or Hájek estimators for these causal contrasts instead, as we propose in [Section 3](#).

**5.2. Regression estimation in mixed mechanisms with local deferred acceptance propensity scores.** In mixed mechanisms, [Abdulkadiroğlu et al. \(forthcoming\)](#) propose *local deferred acceptance propensity scores* and estimators that condition on estimated values of these propensity scores. Here, in the context of [Example 4](#), we calculate the local DA propensity scores, and note the similarities between the propensity scores and the eligibility regions calculated. We also characterize the implicit estimand of a condition-on-propensity-score estimator of the causal effect between two groups of schools; through this exercise, we can gain a few insights. First, we characterize the levels of heterogeneous treatment effects that the propensity score estimator aggregates over. Second, we show that in the limit, as the bandwidth parameter  $\delta$  tends to zero, the estimand aggregates over valid causal effects with nonnegative weights. However, importantly, in the presence of variation driven by lotteries, all causal effects whose identification relies on regression-discontinuity-type variation contribute a vanishing amount to the estimand as the bandwidth  $\delta \rightarrow 0$ . Indeed, for sufficiently small  $\delta$  (where  $\delta \rightarrow 0$  is needed to eliminate selection bias), the estimand effectively only aggregates over treatment variation driven by lotteries, rather than driven by discontinuities in the treatment assignment process. This may have empirical consequences that we comment on in [Remark 4](#).

Let us continue with the simplified setting of [Example 4](#), imposing a few further assumptions. Recall that we have three types of students,  $\{A, B, C\}$ , differing only in preferences, with the same discrete priority  $Q \equiv 0$ . There are four schools  $s_0, \dots, s_3$ , such that  $s_1, s_2$  are test-score schools using a single test score  $R$ , and  $s_0, s_3$  are lottery schools. School  $s_0$  is undersubscribed. School  $s_1$  has cutoff  $c_1 = 1/3$  and school  $s_2$  has cutoff  $c_2 = 2/3$ .

Here, we additionally assume that the probability of qualifying for  $s_3$  for any student is approximately equal to  $1/2$ , in order to compute the local DA propensity scores. Moreover, for ease of analysis, we binarize the treatment. Let  $Y(s_0) = Y(s_1) = Y_C$  and  $Y(s_2) = Y(s_3) = Y_T$ , where the potential outcomes  $Y_C, Y_T$  may vary freely across students. Correspondingly, let  $D = D_2 + D_3$  be the indicator for whether the student is assigned to a treatment school ( $s_2, s_3$ ).

We partition the space of test scores into five regions, with a bandwidth parameter  $\delta > 0$ . Regions II and IV are small bands around the cutoffs  $c_1, c_2$ , and regions I, III, V are large regions in between the cutoffs:

I	II	III	IV	V
$(0, \frac{1}{3} - \delta)$	$(\frac{1}{3} - \delta, \frac{1}{3} + \delta)$	$(\frac{1}{3} + \delta, \frac{2}{3} - \delta)$	$(\frac{2}{3} - \delta, \frac{2}{3} + \delta)$	$(\frac{2}{3} + \delta, 1)$

The local deferred acceptance propensity scores,<sup>41</sup> as a function of the region that the test score  $R$  falls into, are as follows:

	I	II	III	IV	V
A	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.75	1
B	0.5	0.25	0	0.5	1
C	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.75	1

We walk through the computation (Abdulkadiroğlu et al., forthcoming) for, say, students of type B ( $s_2 \succ s_1 \succ s_3 \succ s_0$ ) with test scores in region II. We do so heuristically here; a more precise exposition of the computation is in Appendix A.5. Loosely speaking, the probability that a student is assigned to a school  $s$  is the product of (i) the probability that the student fails to clear the cutoff of any test score schools that she likes better, (ii) the probability that the student fails to qualify for any lottery school that she likes better, and (iii) the (conditional) probability that she qualifies for  $s$ . The key here is that when the test score falls in regions II and IV, we act as if there is a probability of 1/2 that the test score falls on the left-side of the cutoff. Then, for a student of type B with test scores in II:

- She fails to qualify for  $s_2$  when her test score is in II with probability one.
- She qualifies for  $s_1$  with probability 0.5 since her test score is in II.
- $s_1$  is the only control school preferred to  $s_3$
- She qualifies for  $s_3$  (via lottery) with probability 0.5.
- Thus her probability of being treated is  $\psi = 0 + (1 - 0.5) \cdot 0.5 = 0.25$ .

In contrast, we may also consider the pair-of-school comparisons between treatment and control schools. Recall that we computed  $\bar{E}_{s_i} \cap \bar{E}_{s_j}$  for different types of students in Example 4:

<sup>41</sup>Since we coarsen the treatment level, the propensity score is equal to the sum of the propensity scores for  $s_2$  and  $s_3$

Preference type	$(s_0, s_3)$	$(s_1, s_2)$	$(s_1, s_3)$
A	$[0, \frac{1}{3})$	$\{\frac{2}{3}\}$	$[\frac{1}{3}, \frac{2}{3})$
B	$[0, \frac{1}{3})$	$\{\frac{2}{3}\}$	$\{\frac{1}{3}\}$
C	$[0, \frac{1}{3})$	$\{\frac{2}{3}\}$	$[\frac{1}{3}, \frac{2}{3})$

We see that the regions allowing for comparisons roughly correspond to regions where the local DA propensity score is not equal to  $\{0, 1\}$ , indicating that our perspective is connected to the propensity scores of [Abdulkadiroğlu et al. \(forthcoming\)](#).

We now turn to analyzing the natural estimand following the propensity score approach. The treatment effect estimand via conditioning on the computed propensity scores  $\psi$  is

$$\tau(\delta) \equiv \sum_{x \in \{0.25, 0.5, 0.75\}} (\mathbb{E}[Y \mid D = 1, \psi = x] - \mathbb{E}[Y \mid D = 0, \psi = x]) \Pr(\psi = x),$$

where we compute whether  $\tau(\delta)$  is an expectation of potential outcome contrasts.

We collect our computations in the following remark. In summary, for  $\tau(\delta)$  to be approximately a causal contrast, we must have  $\delta \approx 0$ . However, this means that the variation driven by regression discontinuity (in II, IV) becomes negligible.

**Remark 3.** (1) Let  $C \in \{A, B, C\} \times \{I, \dots, V\}$  denote a student preference-by-test score region pair. We may write, by law of total probability,

$$\tau(\delta) = \sum_C \Pr(C) \cdot \left\{ \frac{\mathbb{E}[Y_T \mid D = 1, C] \Pr(D = 1 \mid C)}{\Pr(D = 1 \mid \psi = \psi(C))} - \frac{\mathbb{E}[Y_C \mid D = 0, C] \Pr(D = 1 \mid C)}{\Pr(D = 1 \mid \psi = \psi(C))} \right\}. \quad (12)$$

$$\equiv \sum_C \Pr(C) \{w_1(C, \delta) \mathbb{E}[Y_T \mid D = 1, C] - w_0(C, \delta) \mathbb{E}[Y_C \mid D = 0, C]\}$$

(2) One source of bias is that  $w_0(C, \delta) \neq w_1(C, \delta)$ . The weights associated with  $D = d$ ,

$$w_d(C, \delta) = \frac{\Pr(D = d \mid C)}{\Pr(D = d \mid \psi = \psi(C))} = \frac{\Pr(D = d \mid C)}{\sum_{C'} \Pr(D = d \mid C') \Pr(C' \mid \psi = \psi(C))},$$

are equal to one if the true assignment probability is exactly equal to  $\psi(C)$  for all  $C$ . However, it is unlikely that the threshold-crossing probabilities are exactly  $1/2$  in regions II, IV for  $\delta > 0$ , which causes the estimand  $\tau(\delta)$  to not equal a causal contrast. Of course, under a continuity-of-density assumption (Assumption 1(ii) of [Abdulkadiroğlu et al., forthcoming](#)), the imbalances in the weights disappear as  $\delta \rightarrow 0$ , and they converge to 1 on regions I, III, V, where regions II, IV have measures tending to zero.

(3) Another source of bias may come from the fact that

$$\mathbb{E}[Y_T \mid D = 1, C] - \mathbb{E}[Y_C \mid D = 0, C] \neq \mathbb{E}[Y_T - Y_C \mid C].$$

As an illustration, let us only consider students of type B with test scores in region II, whose contribution to  $\tau(\delta)$  is

$$\Pr(\text{B, II})\tau(\delta, \text{B, II}) \equiv \Pr(\text{B, II}) \cdot (\mathbb{E}[Y_T | D = 1, \text{B, II}] - \mathbb{E}[Y_C | D = 0, \text{B, II}]).$$

An analysis of the conditions for treating students of type (B, II) finds that

$$\begin{aligned} \tau(\delta, \text{B, II}) &= \mathbb{E}[Y_T - Y_C | \text{B}, 1/3 - \delta < R < 1/3] \\ &\quad + (1 - w_L(\delta)) \underbrace{(\mathbb{E}[Y_C | \text{B}, 1/3 - \delta < R < 1/3] - \mathbb{E}[Y_C | \text{B}, 1/3 \leq R < 1/3 + \delta])}_{\text{Selection bias due to } \delta > 0}, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$w_L(\delta) = \frac{\frac{1}{2} \Pr(1/3 - \delta < R < 1/3 | \text{B, II})}{\frac{1}{2} \Pr(1/3 - \delta < R < 1/3 | \text{B, II}) + \Pr(1/3 \leq R < 1/3 + \delta | \text{B, II})}$$

is the conditional probability of failing to qualify for both schools  $s_1$  and  $s_3$  (thereby assigned to school  $s_0$ ), conditional on the student being untreated. This form comes from the fact that (i) students of this type are only treated when  $1/3 - \delta < R < 1/3$  and (ii) they are untreated either when  $R > 1/3$ , or when  $1/3 - \delta < R < 1/3$  but they fail to qualify via lottery at  $s_3$ . The selection bias term may be small when  $\delta$  is small, under suitable continuity conditions on  $r \mapsto \mathbb{E}[Y_C | R = r, \text{B}]$ . ■

Translated to finite samples, the observation in [Remark 3](#) implies that the asymptotic unbiasedness of propensity-score estimators requires  $\delta = \delta_N \rightarrow 0$  at appropriate rates, yet the part of the estimator driven by variation from regression discontinuity becomes asymptotically negligible as  $\delta \rightarrow 0$ , so long as there is variation driven by lotteries. In light of our characterization of the causal comparisons ([Theorem 4.5](#)), this finding is not surprising, as all comparisons between test-score schools rely on sets of zero measure, and are thus necessarily estimated at rates that are slower than the parametric  $\sqrt{N}$  rate ([Khan and Tamer, 2010](#)). Indeed, the observation is confirmed by our estimation results in [Section 4.4](#), where the locally linear regression estimator for regression-discontinuity-type variation converges at the rates no faster than  $N^{-2/5} \gg N^{-1/2}$ .

Of course, whether the variation driven by regression discontinuity matters independently depends on what policy questions the causal effects are meant to inform. If they matter independently, then empirical researchers should isolate variation from these regions (II and IV) in this example, either by ex post reweighting or by presenting separate estimates. We note, however, the statistical uncertainty in estimates of the discontinuity-based causal effects is likely to be orders of magnitudes larger than their lottery-driven counterparts.

Finally, there is perhaps good reason to believe that the regression-discontinuity-based treatment contrasts *are* different from the lottery-based treatment effects, where we offer some speculation in the following remark to conclude the section.



**Remark 4.** Suppose we are in an empirical setting where high-performing schools also tend to be selective test-score schools, and we are concerned with treatment effects of these high-performing schools (similar to the empirical illustration in [Abdulkadiroğlu et al., forthcoming](#)). Since the only lottery variation available to a test-score school is driven by the student losing the lottery at a school she desires more (Claim (1) in [Theorem 4.5](#)), the corresponding treatment contrast always pits the test-score school against a lottery school that the student prefers. Such a conditional average treatment effect is likely to be less favorable to the test-score school than other average treatment effects, if students tends to prefer schools at which their potential outcomes are high (i.e. positive sorting). If the pooled effect estimate is dominated by the variation in these lottery effects, then we may *underestimate* the value of selective schools relative to its typical treatment effect—since our estimates are for treatment effects of a subpopulation for whom the value may be low. Of course, whether this hypothesized channel explains some of [Abdulkadiroğlu et al. \(forthcoming\)](#)’s empirical results—e.g., (i) low empirical treatment effect of Grade A (high-performing) schools in New York City and (ii) surprisingly similar estimated treatment effects of test-score Grade A schools and lottery Grade A schools compared to non-Grade A schools—remains to be seen in the data. ■

## 6. CONCLUSION

Detailed administrative data from school choice settings provide an exciting frontier for causal inference in observational data. Remarkably, school choice markets are engineered ([Roth, 2002](#)) to have desirable properties for market participants, and yet it may yield natural-experiment variation that inform program evaluation and policy objectives. Credibility of empirical studies using such variation demands an understanding of the limits of the data—an understanding of what counterfactual queries the data can and cannot answer (absent further assumptions). Our analyses here provide a step towards that understanding.

As a review, we provide a detailed analysis of treatment effect identification in school choice settings. We propose two notions of identification, corresponding to design- and sampling-based notions of uncertainty. We then characterize which treatment effects are identified in design-based and sampling-based settings, focusing the latter on a class of deferred acceptance assignment mechanisms (mixed mechanisms). We provide corresponding estimators and derive the asymptotic properties of a locally linear regression estimator in the case of mixed mechanisms. Moreover, we relate our approach to the propensity score approaches of [Abdulkadiroğlu et al. \(2017b, forthcoming\)](#). We find that pooling over lottery and regression-discontinuity-type variations leads the former to dominate the latter asymptotically.

There are many questions for future research, both theoretical and empirical, of which we enumerate a few that are not mentioned elsewhere in the paper. In light of the dazzling heterogeneity in the treatment effects in mixed mechanisms, how do we efficiently aggregate them into a policy relevant treatment effect (Heckman and Vytlacil, 2001)? Each treatment effect is likely poorly estimated with finite data, especially in light of the irregular identification—how do we pool similar estimates to improve efficiency without having the lottery effects dominate? Under heterogeneous treatment effects, these effects are only partially informative for school value-added; nevertheless, these effects may validate school value-added estimates. It also remains an empirical question how large the heterogeneity is and what it implies about choice behavior. Finally, we leave a similar characterization of treatment effects in top-trading cycles to future work, since the latter also admits a cutoff structure (Leshno and Lo, 2021).

## Appendix to “Nonparametric Treatment Effect Identification in School Choice”

Jiafeng Chen  
Harvard University  
[jiafengchen@g.harvard.edu](mailto:jiafengchen@g.harvard.edu)

### APPENDIX A. MISCELLANEOUS DISCUSSIONS

**A.1. An example illustrating that identification notions are not straightforward.** As an example, consider  $X_1, \dots, X_N \stackrel{\text{i.i.d.}}{\sim} \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$  and a treatment where everyone above median is treated:

$$D_i = \mathbb{1}(X_i \geq \text{Med}(X_1, \dots, X_N)).$$

Note that for any finite  $N$ , the conditional ATE

$$\tau(x) = \mathbb{E}[Y(1) - Y(0) \mid X = x]$$

is identified, since the observed conditional expectations are equal to conditional expectations of the potential outcomes

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[Y_i \mid D_i = d, X_i = x] &= \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[Y_i(d) \mid X_1, \dots, X_N, X_i = x, D_i = d] \mid D_i = d, X_i = x] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[Y_i(d) \mid X_1, \dots, X_N, X_i = x] \mid D_i = d, X_i = x] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[Y_i(d) \mid X_i = x] \mid D_i = d, X_i = x] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[Y_i(d) \mid X_i = x], \end{aligned}$$

and since  $\Pr(D_i = d \mid X_i = x) > 0$  for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}$ . However, there is a sense in which the only *morally* identified parameter is  $\tau(0)$  since  $\text{Med}(X_1, \dots, X_N) \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} 0$ . For any  $c < 0$ , it becomes vanishingly unlikely that a unit with  $X_i = c$  is treated, and similarly for  $c > 0$ . However, we would need  $N \rightarrow \infty$  for the conditional expectations to be estimated, and hence  $\tau(x)$  cannot be estimated if  $x \neq 0$ .

**A.2. Identification in stochastic mechanisms (details).** We prove [Proposition 3.1](#), reproduced here.

**Proposition 3.1.** *Let  $\tau = \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{s=1}^M \lambda_{i,s} Y_i(s)$  be the parameter of interest.  $\tau$  is identified by design if and only if, for all  $i \in I, s \in S, \lambda_{i,s} = 0$  whenever student  $i$  has no chance of being matched to school  $s$ :  $\pi_{is} \equiv \mathbb{E}_{\Pi_N(X_1, \dots, X_N)}[D_{is}] = 0$ .*

*Proof.* (“If” part) Note that the random variable  $\frac{D_{is} Y_i}{\pi_{is}}$  has expectation (over  $D \sim \Pi_N$ )  $y_i(s)$ , so long as  $\pi_{is} \neq 0$ . Therefore, the set of numbers  $y_i(s)$  where  $\pi_{is} \neq 0$  is identified. Hence, if  $\tau$  does not depend on those  $y_i(s)$  for which  $\pi_{is} = 0$ ,  $\tau$  would be identified.

(“Only if” part) We prove the contrapositive. Suppose  $\lambda_{i,s} \neq 0$  where  $\pi_{is} = 0$ . Note that  $y_i(s)$  is never observed. Hence, changes in the value of  $y_i(s)$  are not reflected in the distribution of the observed data. However, such changes are reflected in  $\tau$ , resulting in observationally equivalent  $\tau$  values. Hence  $\tau$  is not identified.  $\square$

**A.3. Identification in semi-deterministic mechanisms (details).** We prove [Proposition 4.3](#), reproduced here.

**Proposition 4.3.** *Consider a mechanism with deferred acceptance priority scores, described in [Section 2.3](#). Let the cutoffs of test schools be  $c$ . Fix a preference order  $\succ$  that occurs with positive probability. Under [Assumptions 4.1](#) and [4.2](#), the conditional expectation of potential outcomes  $\mu_s(\succ, \mathbf{r})$  is identified (by sampling) if and only if  $\mathbf{r} \in \overline{E}_s(\succ, c)$ , where:*

- (1)  $E_s(\succ, c) \equiv \{\mathbf{r} : \Pr[D_s^*(c) = 1 \mid \succ, \mathbf{R} = \mathbf{r}] > 0\}$  is the  $s$ -eligibility set for preference  $\succ$ , where  $D^*(c)$  follows the treatment distribution induced by the fixed  $c$ , as in (1).
- (2)  $\overline{E}_s$  is the closure of  $E_s$  with respect to the metric on the values  $\mathbf{R}$ .

*Proof.* (If) This is proved in [Section 4.1](#).

(Only if) Fix cutoffs at  $c$ . Consider  $\succ$  with positive measure and suppose  $\mathbf{r} \notin \overline{E}_s(\succ, c)$ . Since the complement of a closed set is open, there is a neighborhood  $U$  of  $\mathbf{r}$  such that  $U \cap \overline{E}_s(\succ, c) = \emptyset$ . Consider two continuous  $\mu_s(\succ, \cdot, Z)$  and  $\lambda_s(\succ, \cdot, Z)$  which differ solely on  $U$  and in particular they disagree at  $\mathbf{r}$

$$\mu_s(\succ, \mathbf{r}, Z) \neq \lambda_s(\succ, \mathbf{r}, Z).$$

They exist since  $U$  is open. Note that under the cutoff  $c$  and corresponding treatment  $D^*(c)$  has that  $\Pr(D_s^*(c) \mid \succ, \mathbf{r}', Z) = 0$  for all  $\mathbf{r}' \in U$ , as a result, the observed outcome is never  $Y_i(s)$  when  $\mathbf{r}' \in U$ . Naturally,  $\mu_s, \lambda_s$  are observationally equivalent. Hence  $\mu_s(\succ, \mathbf{r}, Z)$  is not identified.  $\square$

#### A.4. Proof of [Theorem 4.5](#).

**Theorem 4.5.** *Consider mixed mechanisms ([Example 3](#)) under (6) and [Assumption 4.2](#). Let  $(\succ, Q, R)$  be in the support of the distribution of student observable characteristics, and let  $c$  be the limiting cutoff under [Assumption 4.2](#). Then we have the following properties regarding variation induced by lottery:*

(1) Define the support  $\text{supp}(\succ, Q, R) = \{s : R \in E_s(\succ, Q, c)\}$  as the set of schools that have positive probability of being assigned at characteristics  $(\succ, Q, R)$ . Then  $\text{supp}(\succ, Q, R)$  contains at most one test-score school, and if it does, then the test score school is the least preferred element in  $\text{supp}(\succ, Q, R)$  according to  $\succ$ .

(2) If  $s_1, s_2$  are two test-score schools, then  $E_{s_1}(\succ, Q, c) \cap E_{s_2}(\succ, Q, c) = \emptyset$ .

Moreover, for a school  $s$  and a test  $t$ , and define the following objects:

- Suppose  $t_s = t$ . Let the most disfavored test score that clears the cutoff  $c_s$  at school  $s$  be<sup>42</sup>

$$r_t(s, Q_s, c_s) = g_s^{-1}(Q_s, c_s) \equiv \inf \{r \in [0, 1] : g_s(Q_s, r) \geq c_s\}.$$

<sup>42</sup>Effectively,  $r_t$  transports the cutoff  $c_s$  from the space of priority scores  $V_s$  to the space of test scores  $R_t$ . Depending on the value of  $Q_s$ ,  $r_t$  takes one of three forms: (a) some value  $r_{t,s}(c) \in (0, 1)$ , which does not depend on  $Q_s$ , (b) 0, indicating that  $Q_s$  is sufficiently compelling to qualify the student at  $s$  regardless of her test scores, or (c) 1, indicating that  $Q_s$  is sufficiently low that the student cannot be seated at  $s$  regardless of her test scores.

- Let the most lenient test score  $t$  among those schools preferred to  $s$  be<sup>43</sup>

$$\underline{R}_t(s, \succ, Q; c) = \min_{\substack{s_1 \succ s \\ t_{s_1} = t}} r_t(s_1, Q_{s_1}, c_{s_1})$$

- Let  $L(Q, c)$  be the set of lottery schools at which a student with discrete priority  $Q$  qualifies for sure, regardless of lottery outcomes.

Then, we have the following characterization of eligibility sets for test-score schools and the intersections of their closures, suppressing the dependence on  $\succ, Q, c$ :

- (3) For a test-score school  $s_0$ , the  $s_0$ -eligibility set takes the following form:

$$E_{s_0}(\succ, Q, c) = \begin{cases} [r_{t_0}(s_0), \underline{R}_{t_0}(s_0)) \times \left( \times_{t \neq t_0} [0, \underline{R}_t(s_0)) \right), & \text{if } s_0 \succ L(Q, c) \\ \emptyset & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad (8)$$

and its closure takes the following form

$$\overline{E}_{s_0}(\succ, Q, c) = \begin{cases} [r_{t_0}(s_0), \underline{R}_{t_0}(s_0)] \times \left( \times_{t \neq t_0} [0, \underline{R}_t(s_0)] \right), & \text{if } E_{s_0} \neq \emptyset \\ \emptyset & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (9)$$

These are either hyperrectangles of dimension  $T = \dim R$  or empty sets.

- (4) For two test-score schools  $s_0, s_1$ , where  $s_1 \succ s_0$ , the intersection  $\overline{E}_{s_0} \cap \overline{E}_{s_1}$  takes the following form

$$\overline{E}_{s_0} \cap \overline{E}_{s_1} = \begin{cases} \overline{E}_{s_0} \cap (\{r_{t_1}(s_1)\} \times [0, 1]^{T-1}) & \text{if } \underline{R}_{t_1}(s_0) = r_{t_1}(s_1) \text{ and } E_{s_0}, E_{s_1} \neq \emptyset \\ \emptyset & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad (10)$$

which is either a hyperrectangle of dimension  $T - 1$  or an empty set.

*Proof.* (1) At any  $(\succ, Q, R)$  value, the treatment  $D^*$  must only put weight on at most a single test-score school, since there cannot be lottery variation between two test-score schools. Hence the support contains at most one test-score school. Suppose  $D^*$  does put weight on a test-score school  $s$ . Then at  $(\succ, Q, R)$ , the student qualifies for  $s$ . Suppose  $s \succ s'$  for some lottery school  $s'$ . Then  $D^*$  cannot put weight on  $s'$ , since the student qualifies for  $s$  and must be assigned at a school no worse than  $s$ .

(2) This is a consequence of the fact that only 1 test-score school is in the support.

(3) Fix  $(\succ, Q)$  in the support and test-score school  $s_0$ . If  $s_0$  does not dominate every school in  $L(Q, c)$ , then the student can pick any school in  $L(Q, c)$  and must not be assigned to  $s_0$  regardless of  $R$  values. Hence  $s_0 \succ L(Q, c)$  is a necessary condition for  $E_{s_0}$  being non-empty.

The student qualifies at  $s_0$  iff  $r_{t_0}(s_0) \leq R_{t_0}$ . The student fails to qualify for any test-score school that she prefers iff  $R_t < \underline{R}_t(s_0)$  for all  $t$ . Hence, when  $E_{s_0}$  is as stated (8),  $R \in E_{s_0}$  implies that  $s_0$

<sup>43</sup> $\underline{R}_t(s)$  is, loosely speaking, what Abdulkadiroğlu et al. (forthcoming) refer to as the *most informative disqualification*. Echoing Abdulkadiroğlu et al. (forthcoming), the test score distribution of students matched to  $s$  are truncated by  $\underline{R}_t$  on the right, since any test score  $R_t$  higher than  $\underline{R}_t$  qualifies the student to a school she prefers to  $s$ . The definition differs from most informative disqualification in Abdulkadiroğlu et al. (forthcoming) slightly and immaterially, as we operate in the space of the test scores  $R_t$ , while Abdulkadiroğlu et al. (forthcoming) operate in the space of the priority scores  $V_s$ .

is the student's favorite test score school among those in her choice set, and she does not qualify for sure at any lottery school preferred to  $s_0$ . This is exactly the condition needed for the probability of being assigned to  $s_0$  under  $D^*$  to be positive.

(4) Assume  $E_{s_0}, E_{s_1} \neq \emptyset$ . Note that  $\underline{R}_t(s_0) \leq \underline{R}_t(s_1)$  since  $s_1 \succ s_0$ . Thus the intersection only depends on  $E_{s_1}$  on the  $t_1^{\text{th}}$  coordinate. Note that  $\underline{r}_{t_1}(s_1) \geq \underline{R}_{t_1}(s_0)$ . Hence the intersection is only nonempty if the  $\geq$  is an equality. In that case, the intersection is simply  $\bar{E}_{s_0}$ , but with  $\{\underline{r}_{t_1}(s_1)\}$  on the  $t_1^{\text{th}}$  coordinate. □

**A.5. Connection to local deferred acceptance propensity scores.** Here, we connect our results in Section 4.3 to Abdulkadiroğlu et al. (forthcoming)'s *local deferred acceptance propensity score* (defined in Theorem 1 in Abdulkadiroğlu et al. (forthcoming)). The propensity score for assignment at test-score school  $s_0$  is computed as follows. Consider a student with discrete qualifiers  $Q$ , preferences  $\succ$ , and test scores  $R = [R_1, \dots, R_T]$ . Consider a slightly augmented version of the eligibility set (9)

$$\tilde{E}_{s_0}(\succ, Q, c; \delta) = \begin{cases} [\underline{r}_{t_0}(s_0) - \delta, \underline{R}_{t_0}(s_0) + \delta) \times \left( \times_{t \neq t_0} [0, \underline{R}_t(s_0) + \delta) \right), & \text{if } s_0 \succ L(Q, c) \\ \emptyset & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

where all the boundaries are expanded by some bandwidth  $\delta$ .<sup>44</sup> The student's propensity score is zero if  $R \notin \tilde{E}_{s_0}$ .

Suppose  $R \in \tilde{E}_{s_0}$ . Consider the following probability

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\sigma}_{s_0}(\succ, Q, R; \delta) &\equiv \widehat{\Pr}(\text{Failing to qualify for any test-score school } s \succ s_0) \\ &\equiv \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{m_{s_0}(\succ, Q, R; \delta)}, \end{aligned} \tag{A.13}$$

where  $m_{s_0}(\succ, Q, R) \equiv \sum_{s \succ s_0: t_s \neq \emptyset} \mathbb{1}[R_{t_s} > \underline{r}_{t_s}(s) - \delta]$  is the number of test-score schools preferred to  $s_0$ , for which the student's corresponding test score falls in the bandwidth. From a randomization perspective,  $m_{s_0}$  is roughly the number of test-score schools for which the student's scores are close enough to the cutoffs to treat assignment as random. Indeed, the quantity  $\hat{\sigma}$  approximates qualification at  $s \succ s_0$  as outcomes of independent coin flips, if  $R_{t_s}$  is within  $\delta$  of the cutoff.<sup>45</sup> Such an approximation is valid in the limit, as Abdulkadiroğlu et al. (forthcoming) assume continuous densities of the running variable. The probability

$$\hat{\lambda}_{s_0}(\succ, Q, R; \delta) \equiv \widehat{\Pr}(\text{Failing to qualify for lottery schools } s \succ s_0)$$

is readily computed via redrawing the lottery numbers in simulation, or via a large-market approximation with fixed  $c_s$ , as Abdulkadiroğlu et al. (forthcoming) do. Putting it together, the local

<sup>44</sup>Assume  $\delta$  is sufficiently small so that adding or subtracting  $\delta$  doesn't collide with the boundary of  $[0, 1]$ .

<sup>45</sup>The upper bound condition  $R_{t_s} < \underline{r}_{t_s}(s) + \delta$  is satisfied because  $R \in \tilde{E}_{s_0}$

propensity score for being assigned to the test-score school  $s_0$  is thus

$$\hat{\psi}_s(\succ, Q, R; \delta) \equiv \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2} \hat{\sigma}_{s_0}(\succ, Q, R; \delta) \cdot \hat{\lambda}_{s_0}(\succ, Q, R; \delta) & R_{t_0} < \underline{r}_{t_0}(s_0) + \delta \text{ and } \tilde{E}_{s_0} \neq \emptyset \\ \hat{\sigma}_{s_0}(\succ, Q, R; \delta) \cdot \hat{\lambda}_{s_0}(\succ, Q, R; \delta) & R_{t_0} \geq \underline{r}_{t_0}(s_0) + \delta \text{ and } \tilde{E}_{s_0} \neq \emptyset \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (\text{A.14})$$

$\hat{\psi}_s$  is a product of  $\hat{\sigma}$  and  $\hat{\lambda}$ , since due to the exogeneity of lottery numbers, failing to qualify for lottery schools and failing to qualify for test-score schools are independent events.

Similarly, for a lottery school  $s_0$ , if  $\tilde{E}_{s_0} \neq \emptyset$ , the propensity score may be approximated via

$$\hat{\sigma}_{s_0}(\succ, Q, R; \delta) \cdot \hat{\lambda}_{s_0}(\succ, Q, R; \delta) \cdot \hat{\pi}_{s_0}(\succ, Q, R; \delta), \quad (\text{A.15})$$

where the third term  $\hat{\pi}_{s_0}(\succ, Q, R; \delta)$  approximates the conditional probability

$$\Pr(\text{Qualifies for } s_0 \mid \text{Failing to qualify for lottery schools } s \succ s_0),$$

via, again, simulation or analytic approximation.

**A.6. More on regression estimators in stochastic mechanisms.** In this section, we expand on [Lemma 5.1](#) by analyzing a non-interacted regression estimator. In contrast to the specification (11), a much more common specification does not interact the controls with the treatment:

$$Y_i = \alpha + \sum_{k=1}^K \beta_k L_{ik} + \gamma' B_i + v_i \quad (\text{A.16})$$

where  $B_i$  is a vector of covariates, which may be the full collection of assignment probability bins  $[B_{ikj_k} : k = 0, \dots, K, j_k = 1, \dots, J_k]$ . From a superpopulation perspective, when there is a single unconfounded treatment—i.e.  $K = 1$ —the estimand  $\beta_k = \beta_1$  is a weighted average treatment effect. However, as [Goldsmith-Pinkham, Hull and Kolesár \(2021\)](#) point out, with multiple treatments  $\beta_k$  is no longer a convex-weighted average treatment effect. This issue of the specification (A.16) exists outside of our setting, and thus we do not explore it and instead assume constant treatment effects for our analysis. Of course, if the treatment categories  $L_k$  contains multiple schools, constant treatment effect is an even stronger assumption than usual.

Nevertheless, suppose the unit-level potential outcomes are of the form

$$y_i(s) = y_i(0) + \tau_k \text{ for } s \in S_k$$

where  $\tau_k$  does not depend on  $i$ . As a result, all the heterogeneity is contained in variation of the baseline potential outcomes. We may compute via the Frisch–Waugh–Lovell theorem that

$$\hat{\beta} = \begin{bmatrix} \tau_1 \\ \vdots \\ \tau_K \end{bmatrix} + \left[ \sum_{i=1}^N \tilde{L}_i \tilde{L}_i' \right]^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \tilde{L}_i y_i(0) \equiv \tau + \epsilon_N$$

where  $\tilde{L}_i$  is the projection residual from a regression of  $L_i \equiv [L_{i1}, \dots, L_{iK}]'$  on a constant and the covariates  $B_i$ . The OLS estimator  $\hat{\beta}$  can be decomposed into the target parameter  $\tau$  plus a noise

term  $\epsilon_N$ , where if  $N$  is sufficiently large, the noise term has mean:

$$\mathbb{E}[\epsilon_N] \approx \left( \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \tilde{L}_i \tilde{L}_i' \right)^{-1} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{E}[L_i - B_i \hat{\Pi}] y_i(0),$$

where  $B_i \hat{\Pi}$  is the fitted value from the  $L$ -on- $X$  regression.  $\mathbb{E}[\epsilon_N]$  is close to zero if the best prediction from  $X_i$  is close to the assignment probability:  $B_i \hat{\Pi} \approx [e_{i1}, \dots, e_{iK}]'$ , suggesting that  $B_i$  may take the form of the propensity score bins, or even directly the propensity scores  $B_i = [e_{i1}, \dots, e_{iK}]'$ .<sup>46</sup>

**A.7. Regression estimation proofs.** We prove [Lemma 5.1](#), restated below, here

**Lemma 5.1.** *The regression coefficients*

$$\hat{\mu}_0, \dots, \hat{\mu}_K = \arg \min_{\mu_k} \min_{\mu_{k,j_k}} \sum_{i=1}^N \left( Y_i - \sum_{k=0}^K \mu_k L_{ik} - \sum_{k=0}^K \sum_{j_k=2}^{J_k} \mu_{k,j_k} L_{ik} (B_{i,k,j_k} - \bar{B}_{k,j_k}) \right)^2 \quad (11)$$

are explicitly written as

$$\hat{\mu}_k = \frac{1}{N_k} \sum_{i=1}^N (1 - B_{i,k,0}) \frac{L_{ik} Y_i}{\hat{e}_{ik}},$$

where  $N_k = \sum_{i=1}^N (1 - B_{i,k,0})$ ,  $\hat{e}_{ik} = \sum_{j_k=1}^{J_k} \frac{B_{i,k,j_k} n_{k,j_k}}{n_{j_k}}$ ,  $n_{j_k} = \sum_{i=1}^N B_{i,k,j_k}$ , and  $n_{k,j_k} = \sum_{\ell=1}^N L_{\ell k} B_{\ell,k,j_k}$ .

*Proof.* We may reparametrize the regression (11) into

$$\min \sum_i \left( Y_i - \sum_{k=0}^K \sum_{j_k=1}^{J_k} \nu_{k,j_k} L_{ik} B_{ik,j_k} \right)^2$$

to find that

$$\hat{\mu}_k = \sum_{j_k=1}^{J_k} \frac{n_{j_k}}{N_k} \hat{\nu}_{k,j_k},$$

where  $\hat{\nu}_{k,j_k}$  is the within-cell mean, among those who have  $L_{ik} = 1$  and  $B_{i,k,j_k} = 1$ :

$$\hat{\nu}_{k,j_k} = \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{B_{ik,j_k} L_{ik} Y_i}{n_{k,j_k}}.$$

The claim then follows from explicitly computing  $\hat{\mu}_k$ . □

We prove [Lemma 5.2](#), restated below, here

**Lemma 5.2.** *Consider real-valued random variables  $(Y(0), Y(1), D, X) \sim P$ , where the distribution  $P$  has finite second moments. Suppose  $D \in \{0, 1\}$ ,  $X \in \{0, \dots, J\}$ . Let the observed outcome be  $Y = Y(D)$ . Assume that treatment is unconfounded:  $Y(0), Y(1) \perp\!\!\!\perp D \mid X$ . Let  $X_j = \mathbb{1}(X = j)$ ,  $\nu_j = \mathbb{E}[X_j]$ ,  $\tilde{X}_j = X_j - \nu_j$ , and  $\pi_j = \Pr(D = 1 \mid X_j = 1)$ . Suppose the baseline level  $X = 0$  has overlap:  $0 < \pi_0 < 1$ . Then:*

<sup>46</sup>These two estimators are not numerically equivalent in sample, but they should be close when  $N$  is large.



(1) If, for all  $j$ ,  $0 < \pi_j < 1$ , then the regression coefficient in the following population regression recovers the average treatment effect

$$\beta_0 = \arg \min_{\beta} \min_{\alpha, \gamma, \delta} \mathbb{E} \left[ \left( Y - \alpha - D\beta - \sum_{j=1}^J \tilde{X}_j \gamma_j - \sum_{j=1}^J \delta_j D \tilde{X}_j \right)^2 \right] = \mathbb{E}[Y(1) - Y(0)].$$

(2) If, for any  $j$ ,  $\pi_j \in \{0, 1\}$ , then the population projection coefficient  $\beta$  is not identified: i.e.  $D$  is a linear combination of 1 and  $\{\tilde{X}_j, D\tilde{X}_j\}_{j=1}^J$ .

(3) Let  $G = \{j : \pi_j \in \{0, 1\}\}$ . The regression dropping interactions for indices in  $G$  estimates a particular aggregation of the conditional average treatment effects:

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\beta}_0 &= \arg \min_{\beta} \min_{\alpha, \gamma, \delta} \mathbb{E} \left[ \left( Y - \alpha - D\beta - \sum_{j=1}^J \tilde{X}_j \gamma_j - \sum_{j=1, j \notin G}^J \delta_j D \tilde{X}_j \right)^2 \right] \\ &= \left( \nu_0 + \sum_{j \in G} \nu_j \right) \mathbb{E}[Y(1) - Y(0) \mid X = 0] + \sum_{j=1, j \notin G}^J \nu_j \mathbb{E}[Y(1) - Y(0) \mid X = j]. \end{aligned}$$

In particular,  $\tilde{\beta}_0$  is not invariant to the choice of the baseline covariate level  $X = 0$ .

(4) Let  $\tilde{X}_j = X_j - \frac{\nu_j}{1 - \sum_{k \in G} \nu_k}$ . The regression in (3) with  $\tilde{X}_j$  instead of  $\tilde{X}_j$  recovers the maximal identifiable average treatment effect  $\mathbb{E}[Y(1) - Y(0) \mid X \notin G]$ .

*Proof.* (1) The claim is well-known. See, e.g., expression (21.35) in [Wooldridge \(2010\)](#).

(2) Suppose  $\pi_j = 1$ . Then  $D\tilde{X}_j = D(X_j - \nu_j) = X_j - \nu_j D$ . Since

$$D = -\nu_j^{-1} (D\tilde{X}_j - \tilde{X}_j - \nu_j)$$

is a linear combination of 1,  $D\tilde{X}_j$ ,  $\tilde{X}_j$ , the coefficient on  $D$  is not identified.

Suppose  $\nu_j = 0$ , then  $D\tilde{X}_j = -\nu_j D$ , and is therefore collinear with  $D$ .

(3) Let  $\mu_{dk} = \mathbb{E}[Y \mid D = d, X_k = 1] = \mathbb{E}[Y(d) \mid X_k = 1]$ . (Certain  $\mu_{dk}$ 's are not defined since the conditioning is probability zero.) For  $k \notin G$ , the regression predicts

$$m_{dk} = \alpha - \sum_{k=1}^J \gamma_k \nu_k + \left( \beta + \delta_k - \sum_{k=1, k \notin G}^J \delta_k \nu_k \right) d + \gamma_k \equiv \tilde{\alpha} + (\tilde{\beta} + \delta_k) d + \gamma_k$$

If  $k \in G$  and  $\pi_k = 0$ , then

$$m_{0k} = \tilde{\alpha} + \gamma_k$$

If  $k \in G$  and  $\pi_k = 1$ , then

$$m_{1k} = \tilde{\alpha} + \tilde{\beta} + \gamma_k.$$

Finally, for  $k = 0$ , we have

$$\mu_{d0} = \tilde{\alpha} + \tilde{\beta} d$$

Now, it is well-known that the regression problem is equivalent to projecting  $\mu_{DX}$  onto  $m_{DX}$ , where the latter is a function of the parameters:

$$\mathbb{E}[(\mu_{DX} - m_{DX})^2] = \sum_{k=0}^J \nu_k \pi_k (\mu_{1k} - m_{1k})^2 + \nu_k (1 - \pi_k) (\mu_{1k} - m_{1k})^2.$$

The minimum value of zero in the above is achieved by setting

$$\tilde{\alpha} = \mu_{00}, \quad \tilde{\beta} = \mu_{10} - \mu_{00}, \quad \gamma_k = \begin{cases} \mu_{0k} - \mu_{00} & \pi_k < 1 \\ \mu_{1k} - \mu_{10} & \pi_k = 1 \end{cases}, \text{ and } \delta_k = (\mu_{1k} - \mu_{0k}) - (\mu_{10} - \mu_{00}),$$

and thus they correspond to the population OLS coefficients. Note that there are  $2(J+1) - |G|$   $\mu_{dk}$ 's and  $2 + J + J - |G| = 2(J+1) - |G|$  coefficients. Hence the solution of the coefficients is unique.

The coefficient  $\beta$  is

$$\begin{aligned} \beta &= \tilde{\beta} + \sum_{k=1, k \notin G}^J \delta_k \nu_k \mu_{10} - \mu_{00} + \sum_{k=1, k \notin G}^J \nu_k (\mu_{1k} - \mu_{0k}) - \sum_{k=1, k \notin G}^J \nu_k (\mu_{10} - \mu_{00}) \\ &= \left(1 + \sum_{k \in G} \nu_k\right) (\mu_{10} - \mu_{00}) + \sum_{k=1, k \neq G}^J \nu_k (\mu_{1k} - \mu_{0k}), \end{aligned}$$

as claimed.

(4) The result follows readily from the argument in (3) by replacing  $\nu_k$  with  $\nu_k / (1 - \sum_{j \in G} \nu_j)$ .  $\square$

APPENDIX B. ESTIMATION AND INFERENCE IN SEMI-DETERMINISTIC MECHANISMS

This section contains details for estimation and inference for mixed mechanisms (Section 4.4). Various lemmas that bound various terms are relegated to the subsections, and the section contains the main flow of the argument. Recall that we consider test-scores schools  $s_0, s_1$  with tests  $t_0, t_1$ . We have the the following treatment effect

$$\tau = \tau_{s_0, s_1} = \mathbb{E} [Y(s_1) - Y(s_0) \mid s_1 \succ s_0, R \in \overline{E}_{s_0}(\succ, Q; c) \cap \overline{E}_{s_1}(\succ, Q; c)].$$

Recall that  $r_{t,s}(c)$  is the interior  $(0, 1)$  value of  $\underline{r}_t(s; Q)$  that does not depend on  $Q$ . For convenience on the test-score cutoff of school  $s_1$ , let  $\rho(c) = r_{t_1, s_1}(c)$ .

Let us first decompose the conditioning event into restrictions on  $t_1$  and restrictions not on  $t_1$ . Recall that the intersection

$$\overline{E}_{s_0}(\succ, Q; c) \cap \overline{E}_{s_1}(\succ, Q; c) \quad \text{where } s_1 \succ s_0$$

takes the form of (10), which is a Cartesian product of intervals corresponding to the following conditions on the vector of test scores  $R = [R_1, \dots, R_T]'$ :

$$\begin{aligned} R_{t_1} &= \underline{r}_{t_1}(s_1; Q, \succ, c) \\ R_{t_1} &\leq \underline{R}_{t_1}(s_0; Q, \succ, c) \\ R_{t_0} &\in [\underline{r}_{t_0}(s_0; Q, \succ, c), \underline{R}_{t_0}(s_0; Q, \succ, c)] \\ R_t &\leq \underline{R}_t(s_0; Q, \succ, c), t \neq t_1, t_0 \end{aligned}$$

as well as the condition that  $s_0 \succ L(Q, c)$ . If  $t_1 = t_0$ , then the  $R_{t_0}$  condition should be replaced with the following condition

$$\underline{R}_{t_1}(s_0; Q, \succ, c) = \underline{r}_{t_1}(s_0; Q, \succ, c).$$

Define the following indicator random variables (functions of  $R, \succ, Q$ ) that correspond to the above restrictions, with the restrictions on  $t_1$  relaxed with the bandwidth parameter  $h$ :

- $I_1^+(c, h) = \mathbb{1}(R_{t_1} \in [\rho(c), \rho(c) + h])$
- $I_1(c, h) = \mathbb{1}(\rho(c) + h < \underline{R}_{t_1}(s_1; Q, \succ, c))$
- $I_{10}(c) = \mathbb{1}(\rho(c) \leq \underline{R}_{t_1}(s_0; Q, \succ, c))$
- If  $t_1 \neq t_0$ , then

$$I_0(c) = \mathbb{1}(R_{t_0} \in [\underline{r}_{t_0}(s_0; Q, \succ, c), \underline{R}_{t_0}(s_0; Q, \succ, c)]).$$

Otherwise  $I_0(c) = 1$ .

- For  $t \neq t_0, t_1$ , define  $I_t(c) = \mathbb{1}(0 < R_t \leq \underline{R}_t(s_0; Q, \succ, c))$
- $I(c) = \mathbb{1}(s_0 \succ L(Q, c), s_1 \succ s_0)$
- Let the sample selection indicator be defined as

$$J(c, h) = I(c)I_{10}(c) \cdot I_1(c)I_0(c) \cdot \prod_{t \neq t_0, t_1} I_t(c), \tag{B.17}$$

such that, for fixed  $(R, Q, \succ)$ ,

$$s_1 \succ s_0 \text{ and } R \in \overline{E}_{s_0}(\succ, Q; c) \cap \overline{E}_{s_1}(\succ, Q; c) \iff \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} J(c, h)I_1^+(c, h) = 1.$$

We only consider the asymptotic behavior of the estimator for the right-limit. The result for that of the left-limit is exactly analogous. A natural estimator of the right-limit,

$$\lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \mathbb{E} [Y \mid J(c, h) = 1, I_1^+(c, h) = 1] = \mathbb{E}[Y(s_1) \mid s_1 \succ s_0, R \in \overline{E}_{s_0}(\succ, Q; c) \cap \overline{E}_{s_1}(\succ, Q; c)],$$

is a locally linear estimator with uniform kernel and bandwidth  $h_N$ :

$$\hat{\beta}(h_N) = [\hat{\beta}_0, \hat{\beta}_1]' = \arg \min_{\beta_0, \beta_1} \sum_{i=1}^N W_i(C_N, h_N) [Y_i(C_N) - \beta_0 - \beta_1(R_{it_1} - \rho(C_N))],$$

where, recall, that the outcome and weighting are defined as:

- $Y_i(C_N) = \frac{D_i^\dagger(C_N)Y_i(s_1)}{\pi_i(C_N)}$ , where, for a fixed  $c$ ,  $D_i^\dagger(c)$  is the indicator for failing to qualify for lottery schools that  $\succ_i$  prefers:

$$D_i^\dagger(c) = \prod_{s: \ell_s \neq \emptyset, s \succ s_1} \mathbb{1}(U_{i\ell_s} < g_s^{-1}(Q_i, c_s))$$

and  $\pi_i(c)$  is the corresponding probability, integrating solely over the lottery numbers  $U_i$ :

$$\pi_i(c) = \Pr [\forall s : \ell_s \neq \emptyset, s \succ_i s_1, U_{i\ell_s} < g_s^{-1}(Q_i, c_s) \mid Q_i, \succ_i].$$

Note that  $\pi_i(c) = 0$  implies that  $D_i^\dagger(c) = 0$ , and we define  $0/0 = 0$  in this case.

As a quick digression, we immediately have the following fact about  $Y_i(c)$ , indicating that it can be replaced with the inverse propensity weighting  $\frac{D_{is_1}^* Y_i(s_1)}{\mathbb{E}[D_{is_1}^*(c) \mid \succ_i, Q_i, R_i]}$ .

**Lemma B.1.** *For a fixed  $c$ , suppose  $W_i(c, h_N) = 1$ . (This implies  $\rho(c) < \underline{R}_{t_1}(s_1; \succ_i, Q_i, c)$ .) Moreover, suppose  $h_N$  is sufficiently small such that  $\rho(c) + h_N < \underline{R}_{t_1}(s_1; \succ_i, Q_i, c)$ . Then  $D_i^\dagger(c) = D_{is}^*(c)$  and*

$$\pi_i(c) = \mathbb{E} [D_{is_1}^*(c) \mid \succ_i, Q_i, R_i] \quad \text{for all } R_i, \succ_i, Q_i \text{ such that } W_i(c, h_N) = 1.$$

*Proof.* Under the assumptions and fixed cutoff  $c$ , the treatment is  $s_1$  if and only if the student fails to obtain admission to any lottery school that she prefers, since  $W_i = 1$  indicates that she qualifies for  $s_1$  and fails to qualify for any test-score school that she prefers to  $s_1$ . Hence  $D_i^\dagger = D_{is}^*$  and the corresponding probability agree.  $\square$

- $W_i(C_N, h_N) = J_i(C_N, h_N)I_{1i}^+(C_N, h_N)$ .

Let  $x_i(C_N) = [1, R_{it_1} - \rho(C_N)]'$  collect the right-hand side variable in the weighted least-squares regression. Then the locally linear regression estimator is

$$\hat{\beta}_0(h_N) = e_1' \left( \sum_{i=1}^N W_i(C_N, h_N) x_i(C_N) x_i(C_N)' \right)^{-1} \left( \sum_{i=1}^N W_i(C_N, h_N) x_i(C_N) Y_i(C_N) \right)$$

There is a natural oracle estimator

$$\check{\beta}_0(h_N) = e_1' \left( \sum_{i=1}^N W_i(c, h_N) x_i(c) x_i(c)' \right)^{-1} \left( \sum_{i=1}^N W_i(c, h_N) x_i(c) Y_i(c) \right)$$

whose asymptotic properties are well-understood.<sup>47</sup> Our goal is to show that the difference between the two estimators is small:

$$\sqrt{nh_N} \left( \hat{\beta}_0(h_N) - \check{\beta}_0(h_N) \right) = o_p(1).$$

First, let us recall the following assumption to avoid certain knife-edge populations.

**Assumption 4.6** (Population cutoffs are interior). *The distribution of student observables satisfies Assumption 4.2, where the population cutoffs  $c$  satisfy:*

- (1) School  $s_1$  is not undersubscribed:  $\rho(c) > 0$ .
- (2) For each school  $s$ , either (i) there is a unique  $q_s^*(c)$  under which the tie-breaker cutoff is in the open interval  $(0, 1)$ ,  $0 < r_{t,s}(c) \equiv g_s^{-1}(q_s^*(c), c_s) < 1$ , or (ii)  $c_s = 0$  and for all  $q$ ,  $r_{t,s}(c) = g_s^{-1}(q, c_s) = 0$ ; in this case,  $q_s^*(c) = -\infty$ .
- (3) If  $c_s = 0$ , then  $s$  is eventually undersubscribed:  $\Pr(C_{s,N} = 0) \rightarrow 1$ .
- (4) If two schools  $s_3, s_4$  uses the same test  $t$ , then their test score cutoffs are different, unless both are undersubscribed:  $r_{t,s_3}(c) = r_{t,s_4}(c) \implies r_{t,s_3}(c) = r_{t,s_4}(c) = 0$ .

Let us also state the following technical conditions

**Assumption B.2** (Bounded densities). *For some constant  $0 < B < \infty$ ,*

- (1) *The density of  $(R_i \mid \succ_i, Q_i, A_i)$  with respect to the Lebesgue measure is positive and bounded by  $B$ , uniformly over the conditioning variables.*
- (2) *The density of  $U_i = [U_{i\ell_s} : \ell_s \neq \emptyset]$  with respect to the Lebesgue measure is positive and bounded by  $B$ .*

**Assumption B.3** (Moment bounds). (1) *Let  $\epsilon_i^{(1)} = Y_i(s_1) - \mu_+(r)$ . For some  $\varepsilon > 0$ , the  $(2+\varepsilon)^{th}$  moment exists and is bounded uniformly:*

$$\mathbb{E}[(\epsilon_i^{(1)})^{2+\varepsilon} \mid J_i(c) = 1, R_{it_1} = r] < B_V(\varepsilon) < \infty.$$

*Similarly, the same moment bounds hold for  $Y_i(s_0)$ . Note that this implies that the second moment is bounded uniformly by some  $B_V = B_V(0)$ .*

(2) *The conditional variance  $\text{Var}(\epsilon_i \mid J_i(c) = 1, R_{it_1} = r)$  is right-continuous at  $\rho(c)$  with right-limit  $\sigma_+^2 > 0$ . Similarly, the conditional variance for  $Y_i(s_0)$  is also continuous with left-limit  $\sigma_-^2 > 0$ .*

(3) *The conditional first moment is bounded uniformly:  $\mathbb{E}[|Y_i(s_k)| \mid R_i, \succ_i, Q_i] < B_M < \infty$  for  $k = 0, 1$ .*

**Assumption B.4** (Smoothness of mean). *The maps  $\mu_+(r), \mu_-(r)$  are thrice continuously differentiable with bounded third derivative  $\|\mu_+'''(r)\|_\infty, \|\mu_-'''(r)\|_\infty < B_D < \infty$ .*

**Assumption B.5** (Continuously differentiable density). *The density  $f(r) = p(R_{it_1} = r \mid J_i(c) = 1)$  is continuously differentiable at  $\rho(c)$  and strictly positive.*

We introduce the main theorem.

---

<sup>47</sup> $e_1 = [1, 0]'$ .

**Theorem B.6.** Under *Assumptions 4.2, 4.6, and B.2 to B.5*, assuming  $N^{-1/2} = o(h_N)$  and  $h_N = o(1)$ , then the feasible estimator and the oracle estimator are equivalent in the first order

$$\sqrt{Nh_N}(\hat{\beta} - \check{\beta}) = O_p\left(h_N^{1/2} + N^{-1/4}h_N^{-1/2} + N^{-1/2}h_N^{-1}\right) = o_p(1).$$

**Corollary B.7.** Under *Theorem B.6*, we immediately have that the discrepancy is  $o_p(\sqrt{Nh_N}h_N^2)$  if  $h_N = O(N^{-d})$  with  $d \in [0.2, 0.25]$ .

Let  $\check{\beta} = \check{A}_{1N}^{-1}\check{A}_{2N}$  and let  $\hat{\beta} = \hat{A}_{1N}^{-1}\hat{A}_{2N}$  for matrices  $\check{A}_{kN}, \hat{A}_{kN}$ . The theorem follows from the following proposition.

**Proposition B.8.** Under *Assumptions 4.2, 4.6, and B.2 to B.5*, assuming  $N^{-1/2} = o(h_N)$  and  $h_N = o(1)$ , then

(1) The matrix

$$\check{A}_{1N} = \begin{bmatrix} O_p(1) & O_p(h_N) \\ O_p(h_N) & O_p(h_N^2) \end{bmatrix}$$

and, as a result,

$$(\check{A}_{1N} + b_N)^{-1} = \check{A}_{1N}^{-1} + \begin{bmatrix} O_p(b_N) & O_p(b_N/h_N^2) \\ O_p(b_N/h_N^2) & O_p(b_N/h_N^4) \end{bmatrix}.$$

Similarly,

$$\check{A}_{2N} = \begin{bmatrix} O_p(1) \\ O_p(h_N) \end{bmatrix}.$$

(2) Let

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\beta} &\equiv \left( \frac{1}{Nh_N} \sum_{i=1}^N J_i(c) I_{1i}^+(C_N, h_N) x_i(C_N) x_i(C_N)' \right)^{-1} \left( \frac{1}{Nh_N} \sum_{i=1}^N J_i(c) I_{1i}^+(C_N, h_N) x_i(C_N) Y_i(c) \right) \\ &\equiv \tilde{A}_{1N}^{-1} \tilde{A}_{2N}. \end{aligned}$$

Then

$$\tilde{A}_{1N} = \check{A}_{1N} + \begin{bmatrix} O_p(N^{-1/2}/h_N) & O_p(N^{-1/2}) \\ O_p(N^{-1/2}) & O_p(N^{-1/2}h_N) \end{bmatrix}$$

and

$$\tilde{A}_{2N} = \check{A}_{2N} + \begin{bmatrix} N^{-1/2}/h_N \\ N^{-1/2} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} O_p(1) \\ O_p(h_N) \end{bmatrix}.$$

(3) Moreover,  $\sqrt{Nh_N}(\hat{\beta}_0 - \tilde{\beta}_0) = O_p(\sqrt{h_N})$ .

(4) We may write the discrepancy as

$$\tilde{A}_{1N}^{-1} \sqrt{Nh_N} \tilde{A}_{2N} - \check{A}_{1N}^{-1} \sqrt{Nh_N} \check{A}_{2N} = \tilde{A}_{1N}^{-1} \tilde{B}_{2N} - \check{A}_{1N}^{-1} \check{B}_{2N}$$

for some  $\tilde{B}_{2N}, \check{B}_{2N}$  where (a)  $\check{B}_{2N} = [O_p(1), O_p(h_N)]'$  and (b)

$$\tilde{B}_{2N} = \check{B}_{2N} + \begin{bmatrix} O_p(h_N^{3/2} + N^{-1/4}h_N^{-1/2}) \\ O_p(h_N^{5/2} + N^{-1/4}h_N^{1/2}) \end{bmatrix}.$$

**Remark 5.** We write  $J_i(c)$  instead of  $J_i(c, h_N)$  since it does not depend on  $h_N$  for sufficiently small  $h_N$ —see [Corollary B.12](#). ■

*Proof.* [Proof of [Theorem B.6](#) assuming [Proposition B.8](#)]

We multiply out, by parts (2) and (4):

$$\tilde{A}_{1N}\tilde{B}_{2N} = \left( \check{A}_{1N} + \begin{bmatrix} O_p(N^{-1/2}/h_N) & O_p(N^{-1/2}) \\ O_p(N^{-1/2}) & O_p(N^{-1/2}h_N) \end{bmatrix} \right)^{-1} \left( \check{B}_{2N} + \begin{bmatrix} O_p(h_N^{3/2} + N^{-1/4}h_N^{-1/2}) \\ O_p(h_N^{5/2} + N^{-1/4}h_N^{1/2}) \end{bmatrix} \right)$$

The first term is

$$\check{A}_{1N}^{-1} + \begin{bmatrix} O_p(N^{-1/2}/h_N) & O_p(N^{-1/2}/h_N^2) \\ O_p(N^{-1/2}/h_N^2) & O_p(N^{-1/2}/h_N^3) \end{bmatrix}.$$

Multiplying out, we have that the RHS is

$$\check{A}_{1N}^{-1}\check{B}_{2N} + \begin{bmatrix} O_p\left(N^{-1/2}/h_N + h_N^{3/2} + N^{-1/4}h_N^{-1/2}\right) \\ O_p\left(h_N^{-1} \cdot \left(N^{-1/2}/h_N + h_N^{3/2} + N^{-1/4}h_N^{-1/2}\right)\right) \end{bmatrix}$$

The total discrepancy between  $\hat{\beta}$  and  $\check{\beta}$ , in the first entry, by (3), is then

$$O_p\left(N^{-1/2}/h_N + h_N^{3/2} + N^{-1/4}h_N^{-1/2} + \sqrt{h_N}\right) = O_p\left(N^{-1/2}/h_N + h_N^{1/2} + N^{-1/4}h_N^{-1/2}\right).$$

□

**Proof of Proposition B.8.** We prove [Proposition B.8](#) in the remainder of this section. The first part is a direct application of Lemma A.2 in [Imbens and Kalyanaraman \(2012\)](#), which is a routine approximation of the sum  $\tilde{A}_{1N}$  with its integral counterpart.

*Proof.* [Proof of [Proposition B.8\(1\)](#)] The claim follows directly from [Lemma B.20](#), which is a re-statement of Lemma A.2 in [Imbens and Kalyanaraman \(2012\)](#). The inversion part follows from  $1/(a+b) = 1/a + O(b/a^2)$ . □

Next, the proof of part (2) follows from bounds of the discrepancy between  $\tilde{A}_{1N}$  and  $\check{A}_{1N}$ , detailed in [Lemma B.16](#).

*Proof.* [Proof of [Proposition B.8\(2\)](#)] [Lemma B.16](#) directly shows that

$$\tilde{A}_{1N} = \check{A}_{1N} + O_p(N^{-1/2}) \begin{bmatrix} 1/h_N & 1 \\ 1 & h_N \end{bmatrix}$$

when we expand

$$A_{1N} = \begin{bmatrix} S_{0N} & S_{1N} \\ S_{1N} & S_{2N} \end{bmatrix}$$

in the notation of [Lemma B.16](#). The part about  $\tilde{A}_{2N}$  follows similarly from [Corollary B.17](#). □

Next, the proof of part (3) follows from bounds of the discrepancy between  $\hat{A}_{kN}$  and  $\check{A}_{kN}$ , detailed in [Lemmas B.14](#) and [B.15](#).

*Proof.* [Proof of [Proposition B.8\(3\)](#)] Note that (1) and (2) implies that

$$\tilde{A}_{1N} = \begin{bmatrix} O_p(1) & O_p(h_N) \\ O_p(h_N) & O_p(h_N^2) \end{bmatrix}.$$

[Lemma B.14](#) shows that

$$\hat{A}_{1N} = \tilde{A}_{1N} + O_p(N^{-1/2}) \begin{bmatrix} 1 & h_N \\ h_N & h_N^2 \end{bmatrix}.$$

and [Lemma B.15](#) shows that

$$\hat{A}_{2N} = \tilde{A}_{2N} + O_p(N^{-1/2}) \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ h_N \end{bmatrix}.$$

The inverse is then

$$\hat{A}_{1N}^{-1} = \tilde{A}_{1N}^{-1} + O_p(N^{-1/2}) \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1/h_N \\ 1/h_N & 1/h_N^2 \end{bmatrix}$$

Multiplying the terms out, we have that

$$\hat{A}_{1N}^{-1} \hat{A}_{2N} = \tilde{A}_{1N}^{-1} \tilde{A}_{2N} + \begin{bmatrix} N^{-1/2} \\ N^{-1/2}/h_N \end{bmatrix}$$

Scaling by  $\sqrt{Nh_N}$  yields the bound  $\sqrt{h_N}$  in (3).  $\square$

Lastly, we consider the fourth claim. To that end, we recall that

$$\mathbb{E}[Y_i(c) \mid J_i(c) = 1, R_{it_s} = r] = \mathbb{E}[Y_i(s_1) \mid J_i(c) = 1, R_{it_s} = r] \equiv \mu_+(r).$$

Let  $\epsilon_i = Y_i(c) - \mu_+(R_{it_s})$ . Now, observe that  $\mathbb{E}[\epsilon_i \mid R_{it_s}, J_i(c) = 1] = 0$ . We first do a Taylor expansion of  $\mu_+$ . [Assumption B.4](#) implies that

$$\mu_+(r) = \mu_+(\rho(c)) + \mu'_+(\rho(c))(r - \rho) + \frac{1}{2}\mu''_+(\rho(c))(r - \rho)^2 = \nu(r; c, \rho),$$

where  $|\nu(r; c, \rho)| < B_D(r - \rho(c))^3 + B_\mu(c)(|r - \rho(c)| + |\rho(c) - \rho|)|\rho(c) - \rho|$  for some constant  $B_\mu(c)$ .

*Proof.* [Proof of [Proposition B.8\(4\)](#)] In the notation of [Lemmas B.16](#) and [B.18](#), we can write  $\tilde{A}_{2N} = \frac{1}{Nh_N} \sum_{i=1}^N J_i(c) I_{1i}^+(C_N, h_N) x_i(C_N) Y_i(c)$  as

$$\begin{bmatrix} \mu_+(c)S_{0N} + \mu'_+(c)S_{1N} + \frac{\mu''_+(c)}{2}S_{2N} \\ \mu_+(c)S_{1N} + \mu'_+(c)S_{2N} + \frac{\mu''_+(c)}{2}S_{3N} \end{bmatrix} + \bar{\nu}_N + \begin{bmatrix} T_{0N} \\ T_{1N} \end{bmatrix},$$

where the argument  $\rho = \rho(C_N)$  for  $S_{kN}$ . Let

$$\tilde{B}_{2N} = \sqrt{Nh_N} \left( \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\mu''_+(c)}{2}S_{2N} \\ \frac{\mu''_+(c)}{2}S_{3N} \end{bmatrix} + \bar{\nu}_N + \begin{bmatrix} T_{0N} \\ T_{1N} \end{bmatrix} \right).$$

Let  $\check{B}_{2N}$  be similarly defined. Note that

$$\tilde{A}_{1N}^{-1} \tilde{A}_{2N} = \begin{bmatrix} \mu_+(c) \\ \mu'_+(c) \end{bmatrix} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{Nh_N}} \tilde{A}_{1N}^{-1} \tilde{B}_{2N}$$

and similarly

$$\check{A}_{1N}^{-1} \check{A}_{2N} = \begin{bmatrix} \mu_+(c) \\ \mu'_+(c) \end{bmatrix} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{Nh_N}} \check{A}_{1N}^{-1} \check{B}_{2N}$$



Thus it remains to show that

$$\tilde{B}_{2N} = \check{B}_{2N} + \begin{bmatrix} O_p(h_N^{3/2} + N^{-1/4}h_N^{-1/2}) \\ O_p(h_N^{5/2} + N^{-1/4}h_N^{1/2}) \end{bmatrix}.$$

The above claim follows immediately from the bounds in [Lemmas B.16, B.18, and B.19](#).  $\square$

**Central limit theorem and variance estimation.** Under the Taylor expansion ([Assumption B.4](#)) of  $\mu_+(r)$ , we have that, so long as  $h_N = o(N^{-1/5})$ ,

$$\sqrt{Nh_N}(\tilde{\beta}_0 - \mu_+(c)) = \underbrace{\frac{1}{\sqrt{Nh_N}} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{\nu_2 - \nu_1 \frac{R_{it_1} - \rho(c)}{h_N}}{(\nu_0 \nu_2 - \nu_1^2) f(\rho(c)) \Pr(J_i(c) = 1)}}_{Z_N} \cdot W_i(c, h_N) \cdot (Y_i(c) - \mu_+(R_{it_1})) + o_p(1)$$

via a standard argument. See, for instance, [Imbens and Lemieux \(2008\)](#); [Hahn et al. \(2001\)](#); [Imbens and Kalyanaraman \(2012\)](#).

**Theorem B.9.** When  $h_N = o(N^{-1/5})$ , under [Assumptions B.3 to B.5](#), we have the following central limit theorem:

$$\hat{\sigma}_N^{-1}(\tilde{\beta}_0 - \mu_+(c)) \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$$

where the variance estimate is

$$\hat{\sigma}_N^2 = \frac{4Nh_N}{N_+} \left( \frac{1}{N_+} \sum_{i=1}^N W_i(C_N, h_N) Y_i(C_N)^2 - \hat{\beta}_0^2 \right) \quad N_+ = \sum_{i=1}^N W_i(C_N, h_N).$$

*Proof.* The central limit theorem follows from [Lemma B.22](#), which shows normality of  $Z_N$  under Lyapunov conditions, and [Lemma B.24](#), which shows consistency of  $\hat{\sigma}_N^2$ .  $\square$

**Guide to the lemmas.** We conclude the main text of this appendix section with a guide to the lemmas that are appended in the rest of the section ([Appendices B.1 to B.5](#)). The key to the bounds is placing ourselves in an event that is well-behaved, in the sense that the ordering of the sample cutoffs  $C_N$  agrees with its population counterpart. This is dealt with in [Appendix B.1](#). Under such an event, all but  $\sqrt{N}$  of students' qualification statuses in sample disagree with those in population, yielding bounds related to  $J_i$  ([Appendix B.2](#)) and  $J_i Y_i(C_N)$  ([Appendix B.3](#)). Having dealt with  $J_i(C_N, h_N) \neq J_i(c)$ , we can bound the discrepancy due to  $\rho(C_N) \neq \rho(c)$ , and those are in [Corollary B.17](#) and [Lemma B.18](#) in [Appendix B.4](#). Lastly, [Appendix B.5](#) contains lemmas that are useful for the CLT and variance estimation parts of the argument.

### B.1. Placing ourselves on well-behaved events.

**Lemma B.10.** Let  $0 \leq M_N \rightarrow \infty$  diverge. Let  $A_N = A_N(M_N, h_N)$  be the following event:

- (1) ( $c$  and  $C_N$  agree on all  $q_s^*$ ) For any school  $s$  and any  $q \in \{0, \dots, \bar{q}_s\}$ ,  $g_s^{-1}(q, C_N) \in (0, 1)$  if and only if  $g_s^{-1}(q, c) \in (0, 1)$ . If  $g_s^{-1}(q, C_N) \notin (0, 1)$ , then  $g_s^{-1}(q, C_N) = g_s^{-1}(q, c)$ .
- (2) The cutoffs converge for every  $s, q$ :

$$\max_s \max_q |g_s^{-1}(q, c_s) - g_s^{-1}(q, C_{s,N})| \leq M_N N^{-1/2}$$

(3) ( $c$  and  $C_N$  agree on all the ordering of  $r_{t,s}$ ) For any schools  $s_1, s_2$  which uses the same test  $t$ ,  $r_{t,s_1}(C_N)$  and  $r_{t,s_2}(C_N)$  are exactly ordered as  $r_{t,s_1}(c)$  and  $r_{t,s_2}(c)$ .

(4) For all  $\succ, Q$ ,  $\rho(C_N) + h_N < \underline{R}_{t_1}(s_1; \succ, Q, C_N)$  if and only if  $\rho(c) < \underline{R}_{t_1}(s_1; \succ, Q, c)$ .

Under [Assumptions 4.2](#) and [4.6](#) and  $h_N \rightarrow 0$ ,  $A_N$  occurs almost surely eventually:

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \Pr(A_N) = 1.$$

*Proof.* Since intersections of eventually almost sure events are eventually almost sure, it suffices to show that the following types events individually occur with probability tending to one:

(1) For any fixed  $s$  and any  $q \in \{0, \dots, \bar{q}_s\}$ ,  $g_s^{-1}(q, C_{s,N}) \in (0, 1)$  if and only if  $g_s^{-1}(q, c_s) \in (0, 1)$ .

If  $g_s^{-1}(q, C_{s,N}) \notin (0, 1)$ , then  $g_s^{-1}(q, C_{s,N}) = g_s^{-1}(q, c_s)$ .

- Suppose  $q_s^*(c)$  in (1) in [Assumption 4.6](#) is not  $-\infty$ . Then for  $q = q_s^*(c)$ ,  $g_s^{-1}(q, c_s) \in (0, 1)$ . By the linearity (and hence continuity) of  $r \mapsto g_s(q, r)$ , there exists some  $\epsilon > 0$  such that  $g_s^{-1}(q, c') \in (0, 1)$  for  $c' \in [c_s - \epsilon, c_s + \epsilon]$ .

Note that the event  $C_{N,s} \in [c_s - \epsilon, c_s + \epsilon]$  implies that (a)  $g_s^{-1}(q, C_{s,N}) \in (0, 1)$ , (b)  $g_s^{-1}(q', C_{s,N}) = 0$  for  $q' > q^*$ , and (c)  $g_s^{-1}(q', C_{s,N}) = 1$  for  $q' < q^*$ . These agree with  $g_s^{-1}(q, c_s)$ . The event happens eventually almost surely since

$$\Pr(C_{N,s} \in [c_s - \epsilon, c_s + \epsilon]) \rightarrow 1$$

by [Assumption 4.2](#).

- On the other hand, suppose  $q_s^*(c_s) = -\infty$  and  $s$  is undersubscribed. [Assumption 4.6](#) (2) implies that  $C_{s,N} = 0$  eventually almost surely, meaning that  $g_s^{-1}(q, C_{s,N}) = g_s^{-1}(q, c_s)$  for every  $q$  with probability tending to 1.

(2) For fixed  $s, q$ ,  $|g_s^{-1}(q, c_s) - g_s^{-1}(q, C_{s,N})| \leq M_N N^{-1/2}$

- If  $q \neq q_s^*$ , with probability tending to 1  $|g_s^{-1}(q, c_s) - g_s^{-1}(q, C_{s,N})| = 0$ .
- If  $q = q_s^*$ , then since  $\max_s |c_s - C_{s,N}| = O_p(N^{-1/2})$  and  $g_s(q, \cdot)$  is affine, the preimage is also  $O_p(N^{-1/2})$  (uniformly over  $s$ ).

(3) For fixed schools  $s_1, s_2$  which uses the same test  $t$ ,  $r_{t,s_1}(C_N)$  and  $r_{t,s_2}(C_N)$  are exactly ordered as  $r_{t,s_1}(c)$  and  $r_{t,s_2}(c)$ .

- Suppose  $r_{t,s_1}(c) > r_{t,s_2}(c)$ . Note that for any  $\epsilon > 0$ ,  $\Pr[r_{t,s_1}(C_N) > r_{t,s_1}(c) - \epsilon] \rightarrow 1$  by [Assumption 4.2](#). Similarly,  $\Pr[r_{t,s_2}(C_N) < r_{t,s_2}(c) + \epsilon] \rightarrow 1$ . Therefore, we may take  $\epsilon = \frac{r_{t,s_1}(c) - r_{t,s_2}(c)}{2}$ .
- Suppose  $r_{t,s_1}(c) = r_{t,s_2}(c)$ . Then by (3) in [Assumption 4.6](#), both schools are undersubscribed. In that case, (2) in [Assumption 4.6](#) implies that  $r_{t,s_1}(C_N) = r_{t,s_2}(C_N)$  eventually almost surely.

(4) For a fixed  $\succ, Q$  and  $h_N \rightarrow 0$ ,  $\rho(C_N) + h_N < \underline{R}_{t_1}(s_1; \succ, Q, C_N)$  if and only if  $\rho(c) < \underline{R}_{t_1}(s_1; \succ, Q, c)$ .

- By [Assumption 4.6](#),  $\rho(c) \in (0, 1)$ , and hence  $\rho(c) \neq \underline{R}_{t_1}(s_1; \succ, Q, c)$  for any  $\succ, Q$ . The event in (2) implies

$$|\rho(C_N) - \rho(c)| < M_N N^{-1/2}$$

and  $|\underline{R}_{t_1}(s_1; \succ, Q, C_N) - \underline{R}_{t_1}(s_1; \succ, Q, c)| < M_N N^{-1/2}$ . Under this event, since  $h_N \rightarrow 0$ , we have  $\rho(C_N) + h_N < \underline{R}_{t_1}(s_1; \succ, Q, C_N)$  for all sufficiently large  $N$ . Hence if (2) occurs almost surely eventually, then (4) must also.  $\square$

**Remark 6.** We work with nonstochastic sequences of the bandwidth parameter  $h_N$ . If the bandwidth parameter is a stochastic  $H_N$ , then we can modify by appending to  $A_N$  the event  $H_N < M_N h_N$  for some nonstochastic sequence  $h_N$ . If  $H_N = O_p(h_N)$ , then  $\Pr(H_N < M_N h_N) \rightarrow 1$ ; as a result, our subsequent conclusions are not affected.  $\blacksquare$

**B.2. Bounding discrepancy in  $J_i$ .** By studying the implications of the event  $A_N$ —all score cutoffs are induced by  $C_N$  agrees with that induced by  $c$  and all almost-sure-qualification statuses also agree—we immediately have the following result, which, roughly speaking, implies that the event  $J_i(C_N) \neq J_i(c)$  is a subset of an event where  $R_i$  belongs to a set of Lebesgue measure at most  $M_N N^{-1/2}$ .

**Lemma B.11.** *On the event  $A_N$ ,*

- (1) For all  $i$ ,  $I_i(c) = I_i(C_N)$ .
- (2) For all  $i$ ,  $I_{1i}(c, h) = I_{1i}(C_N, h_N)$ .
- (3) For all  $i$ ,  $I_{10i}(c) = I_{10i}(C_N)$ .
- (4) For  $t \neq t_0, t_1$ ,  $I_{ti}(c) \neq I_{ti}(C_N)$  implies that (a)  $\underline{R}_t(s_0; Q_i, \succ_i, C_N) \in (0, 1)$ , (b)

$$|\underline{R}_t(s_0; Q_i, \succ_i, C_N) - \underline{R}_t(s_0; Q_i, \succ_i, c)| \leq M_N N^{-1/2},$$

and (c)  $R_{it}$  is between  $\underline{R}_t(s_0; Q_i, \succ_i, C_N)$  and  $\underline{R}_t(s_0; Q_i, \succ_i, c)$ .

- (5) If  $t_1 = t_0$ , then  $I_{0i}(C_N) = I_{0i}(c)$ .
- (6) For  $t_1 \neq t_0$ ,  $I_{0i}(c) \neq I_{0i}(C_N)$  implies that (a)  $\underline{R}_{t_0}(s_0; Q_i, \succ_i, C_N) \in (0, 1)$ , (b)

$$|\underline{R}_{t_0}(s_0; Q_i, \succ_i, C_N) - \underline{R}_{t_0}(s_0; Q_i, \succ_i, c)| \leq M_N N^{-1/2},$$

(c)

$$|\underline{r}_{t_0}(s_0; Q_i, \succ_i, C_N) - \underline{r}_{t_0}(s_0; Q_i, \succ_i, c)| \leq M_N N^{-1/2},$$

and (d) either  $R_{it_0}$  is between  $\underline{R}_{t_0}(s_0; Q_i, \succ_i, C_N)$  and  $\underline{R}_{t_0}(s_0; Q_i, \succ_i, c)$ , or  $R_{it_0}$  is between  $\underline{r}_{t_0}(s_0; Q_i, \succ_i, C_N)$  and  $\underline{r}_{t_0}(s_0; Q_i, \succ_i, c)$ .

- (7) Under [Assumption B.2](#), for all  $i$ ,  $\pi_i(c) = 0$  if and only if  $\pi_i(C_N) = 0$ . Moreover, if  $\pi_i(c) > 0$ , then

$$|\pi_i(C_N) - \pi_i(c)| \leq LBM_N N^{-1/2}.$$

*Proof.* Every claim is immediate given the definition of  $A_N$  in [Lemma B.10](#).  $\square$

**Corollary B.12.** *On the event  $A_N$ , the disagreement  $J_i(C_N, h_N) \neq J_i(c, h_N)$  implies that  $(R_{it} : t \neq t_1) \in K(\succ_i, Q_i; c)$ , where  $\mu_{\mathbb{R}^{T-1}}(K(\succ_i, Q_i; c)) \leq TM_N N^{-1/2}$ . Moreover, under [Assumption 4.6](#), for all sufficiently small  $h_N$ ,  $J_i(c, h_N) = J_i(c)$  does not depend on  $h_N$ .*

*Proof.*  $J_i(C_N, h_N) \neq J_i(c, h_N)$  implies that at least one of  $I_i, I_{t_i}, I_{0i}$  have a disagreement over  $c$  and  $C_N$ . On  $A_N$ , disagreements of  $I_{t_i}$  imply that  $R_{t_i}$  is contained in a region of measure at most  $M_N N^{-1/2}$ . If  $t_1 = t_0$ , then the union of disagreements over  $I_{t_i}$  is a region of size at most  $(T - 1)M_N N^{-1/2}$ , and  $I_i, I_{0i}$  has no disagreement. If  $t_1 \neq t_0$ , disagreements of  $I_{0i}$  imply that  $R_{it_0}$  is contained in a region of measure at most  $2M_N N^{-1/2}$ , and hence the union of disagreements is a region of size at most  $TM_N N^{-1/2}$ . Neither case implies anything about  $R_{it_1}$ .

The only part of  $J_i$  that depends on  $h_N$  is  $I_1(c, h_N)$ , which does not depend on  $h_N$  when  $h_N$  is sufficiently small due to [Assumption 4.6](#).  $\square$

**Corollary B.13.** *Suppose  $M_N = o(N^{1/2})$ . On the event  $A_N$ , there exists some  $\eta > 0$ , independently of  $M_N$ , such that for all sufficiently large  $N$ , if  $\pi_i(C_N) > 0$  then  $\pi_i(C_N) \geq \eta$ . Equivalently,  $1/\pi_i(C_N) < 1/\eta$  whenever defined.*

*Proof.* Let  $\eta = \min\{v = \pi_i(c) : v > 0\}/2 > 0$ . Under  $A_N$ ,  $\pi_i(c) = 0$  if and only if  $\pi_i(C_N) = 0$  and  $\pi_i(C_N)$  is uniformly  $o(1)$  away from  $\pi_i(c)$ . Hence for sufficiently large  $N$ , the discrepancy between  $\pi_i(c)$  and  $\pi_i(C_N)$  is bounded above by  $\eta$ , thereby  $\pi_i(C_N) > \eta$  as long as  $\pi_i(C_N) > 0$ .  $\square$

**Lemma B.14.** *Let  $\Gamma_i \geq 0$  be some random variable at the student level where  $\mathbb{E}[\Gamma_i \mid R_i, \succ_i, Q_i, Z_i] < B_M < \infty$  almost surely. Under [Assumptions 4.2, 4.6](#), and [B.2](#), assuming  $N^{-1/2} = o(h_N)$ , the discrepancy of the sample selection is of the following stochastic order:*

$$F_N \equiv \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}h_N} \sum_{i=1}^N |J_i(C_N, h_N) - J_i(c, h_N)| I_{1i}^+(C_N, h_N) \Gamma_i = O_p(1).$$

*Proof.* On the event  $A_N$ ,  $|\rho(c) - \rho(C_N)| \leq M_N N^{-1/2}$ . Then, on  $A_N$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \sqrt{N}h_N F_N &= \sum_{i=1}^N |J_i(C_N) - J_i(c)| I_{1i}^+(C_N, h_N) \Gamma_i \\ &\leq \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{1}[(R_{it} : t \neq t_1) \in K(\succ_i, Q_i; c)] \mathbb{1}(R_{it_1} \in [\rho(c) - M_N N^{-1/2}, \rho(c) + M_N N^{-1/2} + h_N]) \Gamma_i \\ &\equiv \sqrt{N}h_N G_N(M_N). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, under [Lemma B.10](#), for any sequence  $M_N \rightarrow \infty$ , since the corresponding  $\Pr(A_N) \rightarrow 1$ ,

$$F_N = F_N A_N + o_p(1) \leq G_N(M_N) A_N + o_p(1) \leq G_N(M_N) + o_p(1).$$

Since  $G_N \geq 0$  almost surely, by Markov's inequality, [Assumption B.2](#), and  $N^{-1/2} = o(h_N)$ ,

$$G_N = O_p(\mathbb{E}[G_N]) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}h_N} \cdot O_p\left(N \cdot (TM_N N^{-1/2}) \cdot (2M_N N^{-1/2} + h_N) \cdot B\right) \leq M_N^2 O_p(1).$$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[G_N] &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}h_N} N \mathbb{E}\left[R_i \in \tilde{K}(\succ_i, Q_i; c)\right] \mathbb{E}[\Gamma_i \mid R_i \in \tilde{K}(\succ_i, Q_i; c)] \\ &\leq \frac{\sqrt{N}}{h_N} B \cdot (TM_N N^{-1/2}) \cdot (2M_N N^{-1/2} + h_N) \cdot B_M \end{aligned}$$

$$= O(M_N^2)$$

Therefore, for any  $M_N \rightarrow \infty$ , no matter how slowly,  $F_N = O_p(M_N^2)$ . This implies that  $F_N = O_p(1)$ .  $\square$

### B.3. Bounding discrepancy in terms involving $Y_i(C_N)$ .

**Lemma B.15.** Fix  $M_N \rightarrow \infty$ . Suppose that  $\mathbb{E}[|Y_i(s_1)| \mid R_i, \succ_i, Q_i, Z_i] < B_M < \infty$  almost surely. Then the difference

$$\left| \sum_{i=1}^N J_i(C_N, h_N) I_1^+(C_N, h_N) Y_i(C_N) - \sum_{i=1}^N J_i(C_N, h_N) I_1^+(C_N, h_N) Y_i(C_N) \right| \leq \Delta_{1N} + \Delta_{2N} + \Delta_{3N}$$

where

$$\Delta_{1N} = \sum_i I_i^+(C_N, h_N) J_i(c, h_N) \left| \frac{D_i^\dagger(C_N)}{\pi_i(C_N)} - \frac{D_i^\dagger(c)}{\pi_i(c)} \right| Y_i(s_1)$$

$$\Delta_{2N} = \sum_i I_i^+(C_N, h_N) \frac{D_i^\dagger(c)}{\pi_i(c)} |J_i(C_N, h_N) - J_i(c, h_N)| Y_i(s_1)$$

$$\Delta_{3N} = \sum_i I_i^+(C_N, h_N) |J_i(C_N, h_N) - J_i(c, h_N)| \left| \frac{D_i^\dagger(C_N)}{\pi_i(C_N)} - \frac{D_i^\dagger(c)}{\pi_i(c)} \right| Y_i(s_1).$$

Moreover, under [Assumptions 4.2, 4.6, and B.2](#), for  $j = 1, 2, 3$ ,  $\frac{\Delta_{jN}}{\sqrt{N}h_N} = O_p(1)$ . As a result,

$$\left| \sum_{i=1}^N J_i(C_N, h_N) I_1^+(C_N, h_N) Y_i(C_N) - \sum_{i=1}^N J_i(C_N, h_N) I_1^+(C_N, h_N) Y_i(C_N) \right| = O_p\left(N^{1/2}h_N\right).$$

*Proof.* The part before “moreover” follows from adding and subtracting and triangle inequality. To prove the claim after “moreover,” first, note that by [Corollary B.13](#), for all sufficiently large  $N$ , the inverse propensity weight  $1/\pi_i < 1/\eta$ . Immediately, then,  $\Delta_{2N}, \Delta_{3N}$  are bounded above by

$$\sum_i I_i^+(C_N, h_N) |J_i(C_N, h_N) - J_i(c, h_N)| \cdot Y_i(s_1) = O_p(\sqrt{N}h_N)$$

via [Lemma B.14](#).

By the same argument where we bound  $1/\pi_i$ ,

$$\Delta_{1N} = \sum_{i=1}^N I_i^+(C_N, h_N) J_i(c, h_N) \left| \frac{1}{\pi_i(C_N)} - \frac{1}{\pi_i(c)} \right| D_i^\dagger(c) Y_i(s_1) + O_p(\sqrt{N}h_N).$$

By [Lemma B.11](#),

$$\left| \frac{1}{\pi_i(C_N)} - \frac{1}{\pi_i(c)} \right| < M_N N^{-1/2}.$$

On  $A_N$ , since

$$\sum_i I_i^+(C_N, h_N) J_i(c, h_N) D_i^\dagger(c) Y_i(s_1) \leq \sum_i \mathbb{1}(R_i \in \tilde{K}(\succ_i, Q_i; c)) Y_i(s_1)$$

where  $\sup_{\succ_i, Q_i} \mu(K(\succ_i, Q_i; c)) = O(h_N)$ . We have again by Markov's inequality and the bound on the conditional first moment of  $Y_i(s_1)$ ,

$$\sum_i I_i^+(C_N, h_N) J_i(c, h_N) D_i^\dagger(c) Y_i(s_1) = O_p(Nh_N).$$

Hence  $\Delta_{1N} = O_p(\sqrt{N}h_N)$ . □

#### B.4. Bounding terms involving $x_i$ and $I_{1i}^+$ .

**Lemma B.16.** *Suppose  $N^{-1/2} = o(h_N)$ . Consider*

$$S_{k,N}(\rho) \equiv \frac{1}{Nh_N} \sum_{i=1}^N J_i(c) (R_{it_1} - \rho)^k \mathbb{1}(R_{it_1} \in [\rho, \rho + h_N]).$$

Then, under [Assumptions 4.2, 4.6, and B.2](#),

$$|S_{k,N}(\rho(C_N)) - S_{k,N}(\rho(c))| = O_p\left(h_N^{k-1} N^{-1/2}\right) = o_p(h_N^k).$$

*Proof.* Suppose  $N$  is sufficiently large such that  $M_N N^{-1/2} < h_N$ . On the event  $A_N$ ,

$$|S_{k,N}(\rho(C_N)) - S_{k,N}(\rho(c))| \leq \sup \left\{ |S_{k,N}(\rho) - S_{k,N}(\rho(c))| : \rho \in [\rho(c) - M_N N^{-1/2}, \rho(c) + M_N N^{-1/2}] \right\}.$$

For a fixed  $\rho \in [\rho(c) - M_N N^{-1/2}, \rho(c) + M_N N^{-1/2}]$ , the difference

$$\begin{aligned} |S_{k,N}(\rho(C_N)) - S_{k,N}(\rho(c))| &\leq \frac{1}{Nh_N} \sum_{i=1}^N J_i(c) \mathbb{1}(R_{it_1} \in [\rho(c), \rho(c) + h_N]) \Delta_{1ik} \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{Nh_N} \sum_{i=1}^N J_i(c) \mathbb{1}(R_{it_1} \in \Delta_2) (R_{it_1} - \rho)^k \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{Nh_N} \sum_{i=1}^N J_i(c) \mathbb{1}(R_{it_1} \in \Delta_2) \Delta_{1ik} \end{aligned}$$

where  $\Delta_{1ik} = |(R_{it_1} - \rho)^k - (R_{it_1} - \rho(c))^k|$  and  $\Delta_2 = [\rho, \rho(c)] \cup [\rho + h_N, \rho(c) + h_N]$  if  $\rho < \rho(c)$  and  $[\rho(c), \rho] \cup [\rho(c) + h_N, \rho + h_N]$  otherwise.

Note that  $\Delta_{1ik} = 0$  if  $k = 0$ . If  $k > 0$  then

$$\Delta_{ik} < |\rho - \rho(c)| k (2M_N N^{-1/2} + h_N)^{k-1} < B_k M_N N^{-1/2} h_N^{k-1}$$

for some constants  $B_k$ , by the difference of two  $k^{\text{th}}$  powers formula. Let  $B_0 = 0$ , then the first term is bounded by

$$B_k M_N N^{-1/2} h_N^{k-1} \cdot \frac{1}{Nh_N} \sum_{i=1}^N J_i(c) \mathbb{1}(R_{it_1} \in [\rho(c), \rho(c) + h_N]).$$

The second term is bounded by

$$B'_k h_N^k \frac{1}{Nh_N} \sum_{i=1}^N J_i(c) \mathbb{1}(R_{it_1} \in \Delta_2)$$

for some constants  $B'_k$  where  $B'_0 = 1$ . The third term is bounded by

$$B_k M_N N^{-1/2} h_N^{k-1} \frac{1}{N h_N} \sum_{i=1}^N J_i(c) \mathbb{1}(R_{it_1} \in \Delta_2)$$

These bounds hold regardless of  $\rho$ , and hence taking the supremum over  $\rho$  yields that, for any  $M_N \rightarrow \infty$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} |S_{k,N}(\rho(C_N)) - S_{k,N}(\rho(c))| &= O_p \left( B_k M_N N^{-1/2} h_N^{k-1} + h_N^{k-1} M_N N^{-1/2} + B_k M_N N^{-1} h_N^{k-2} \right) \\ &= O_p(M_N h_N^{k-1} N^{-1/2}). \end{aligned}$$

Hence  $|S_{k,N}(\rho(C_N)) - S_{k,N}(\rho(c))| = O_p(h_N^{k-1} N^{-1/2})$ .  $\square$

**Corollary B.17.** *The conclusion of Lemma B.16 continues to hold if each term of  $S_{k,N}(\rho)$  is multiplied with some independent  $\Gamma_i$  where  $\mathbb{E}[|\Gamma_i| \mid R_i, \succ_i, Q_i, Z_i] < B_M < \infty$  almost surely.*

*Proof.* The bounds continue to hold where the right-hand side involves terms like

$$\frac{1}{N h_N} \sum_{i=1}^N J_i(c) \mathbb{1}(R_{it_1} \in \Delta_2) |\Gamma_i|.$$

The last step of the proof to Lemma B.16 uses Markov's inequality, which incurs a constant of  $B_M$  since terms like

$$\mathbb{E}[|\Gamma_i| \mid J_i(c) \mathbb{1}(R_{it_1} \in \Delta_2) = 1] \leq B_M.$$

$\square$

**Lemma B.18.** *Suppose  $N^{-1/2} = o(h_N)$ . Suppose  $\epsilon_i$  are independent over  $i$  with  $\mathbb{E}[\epsilon_i \mid J_i(c), R_{it_1}] = 0$  and  $\text{Var}[\epsilon_i \mid J_i(c), R_{it_1}] < B_V < \infty$  almost surely. Consider*

$$T_{k,N}(\rho) \equiv \frac{1}{N h_N} \sum_{i=1}^N J_i(c, h_N) (R_{it_1} - \rho)^k \mathbb{1}(R_{it_1} \in [\rho, \rho + h_N]) \epsilon_i.$$

Then, under Assumptions 4.2, 4.6, and B.2, for  $k = 0, 1$ ,

$$|T_{k,N}(\rho(C_N)) - T_{k,N}(\rho(c))| = O_p \left( N^{-1/4} \cdot N^{-1/2} \cdot h_N^{k-1} \right).$$

*Proof.* Suppose  $N$  is sufficiently large such that  $M_N N^{-1/2} < h_N$ . On the event  $A_N$ ,

$$|T_{k,N}(\rho(C_N)) - T_{k,N}(\rho(c))| \leq \sup \left\{ |T_{k,N}(\rho) - T_{k,N}(\rho(c))| : \rho \in [\rho(c) - M_N N^{-1/2}, \rho(c) + M_N N^{-1/2}] \right\}.$$

For a fixed  $\rho \in [\rho(c) - M_N N^{-1/2}, \rho(c) + M_N N^{-1/2}]$ , the difference

$$\begin{aligned} |T_{k,N}(\rho(C_N)) - T_{k,N}(\rho(c))| &\leq \frac{1}{N h_N} \left| \sum_{i=1}^N J_i(c) \mathbb{1}(R_{it_1} \in [\rho(c), \rho(c) + h_N]) \Delta_{1ik} \epsilon_i \right| \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{N h_N} \left| \sum_{i=1}^N J_i(c) \mathbb{1}(R_{it_1} \in \Delta_2) (R_{it_1} - \rho)^k \epsilon_i \right| \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{N h_N} \left| \sum_{i=1}^N J_i(c) \mathbb{1}(R_{it_1} \in \Delta_2) \Delta_{1ik} \epsilon_i \right| \end{aligned}$$

where  $\Delta_{1ik} = |(R_{it_1} - \rho)^k - (R_{it_1} - \rho(c))^k|$  and  $\Delta_2 = [\rho, \rho(c)] \cup [\rho + h_N, \rho(c) + h_N]$  if  $\rho < \rho(c)$  and  $[\rho(c), \rho] \cup [\rho(c) + h_N, \rho + h_N]$  otherwise. Note that  $\Delta_{1ik} = 0$  if  $k = 0$  and  $\Delta_{1ik} = |\rho - \rho(c)| < M_N N^{-1/2}$  if  $k = 1$ .

We first show that

$$\left| \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{1}(R_{it_1} \in \Delta_2) \eta_i \right| = O_p(N^{1/4}) \quad \eta_i \equiv J_i(c, h_N) \epsilon_i$$

Note that the event

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{1}(R_{it_1} \text{ is between } \rho(c) \text{ and } \rho, \text{ for some } \rho \in [\rho(c) - M_N N^{-1/2}, \rho(c) + M_N N^{-1/2}]) \\ < 2M_N \cdot BM_N N^{-1/2} = 2BM_N^2 N^{-1/2} \equiv K_N \end{aligned}$$

occurs with probability tending to 1, and so does the event

$$\sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{1}(R_{it_1} \text{ is between } \rho(c) + h_N \text{ and } \rho + h_N, \text{ for some } \rho \in [\rho(c) - M_N N^{-1/2}, \rho(c) + M_N N^{-1/2}]) < K_N.$$

On both events, the sum

$$\left| \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{1}(R_{it_1} \in \Delta_2) \eta_i \right| \leq \sup_{U_1 < K_N} \left| \sum_{1 \leq u_1 \leq U_1} \eta_1(u_1) \right| + \sup_{U_2 < K_N} \left| \sum_{1 \leq u_2 \leq U_2} \eta_2(u_2) \right|$$

where we label the observation such that  $\eta_1(u)$  is the  $u^{\text{th}}$   $\eta_i$  with  $R_{it_1}$  closest to  $\rho(c)$  and  $\eta_2(u)$  is the  $u^{\text{th}}$   $\eta_i$  with  $R_{it_1}$  closest to  $\rho(c) + h_N$ . Observe that  $Z_{1U} \equiv \sum_{1 \leq u \leq U} \eta_1(u)$  is a martingale adapted to the filtration  $\mathcal{F}_U = \sigma \{ (R_{it_1})_{i=1}^N, \eta_1(u) : u \leq U \}$ . By Kolmogorov's maximal inequality,

$$\Pr \left( \sup_{U \leq K_N} |Z_{1U}| \geq t \right) \leq \frac{\mathbb{E}[Z_{1K_N}^2]}{t^2} \leq \frac{K_N B_V}{t^2}.$$

Similarly, we obtain the same bound for the terms involving  $\epsilon_2(u)$ . Hence

$$\sup_{U_1 < K_N} \left| \sum_{1 \leq u_1 \leq U_1} \eta_1(u_1) \right| + \sup_{U_2 < K_N} \left| \sum_{1 \leq u_2 \leq U_2} \eta_2(u_2) \right| = O_p(\sqrt{K_N}) = M_N O_p(N^{1/4}).$$

Therefore, since for any arbitrarily slowly diverging  $M_N$ , the three events that we place ourselves on occurs with probability tending to 1,  $|\sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{1}(R_{it_1} \in \Delta_2) \eta_i| = O_p(N^{1/4})$ .

Now, we bound the three terms on the RHS. The second term is bounded above by

$$\frac{h_N^{k-1}}{N} \left| \sum_{i=1}^N J_i(c, h_N) \mathbb{1}(R_{it_1} \in \Delta_2) \eta_i \right| = O_p(h_N^{k-1} N^{-3/4}).$$

The third term is also  $O_p(h_N^{k-1} N^{-3/4})$  since  $\Delta_{1ik} < M_N N^{-1/2} = O(1)$  uniformly over  $i$ . The first term is zero if  $k = 0$ . If  $k = 1$ , the first term is bounded above by

$$M_N N^{-1/2-1} h_N^{-1} \sum_i \mathbb{1}(R_{it_1} \in [\rho(c), \rho(c) + h_N]) \eta_i.$$

Chebyshev's inequality suggests that

$$\sum_i \mathbb{1}(R_{it_1} \in [\rho(c), \rho(c) + h_N]) \eta_i = O_p \left( \sqrt{N} \sqrt{\text{Var}(\mathbb{1}(R_{it_1} \in [\rho(c), \rho(c) + h_N]) \eta_i)} \right) = O_p(\sqrt{N h_N}),$$



thus bounding the first term with  $O_p\left(N^{-1}h_N^{-1/2}\right) = o_p(h_N^{k-1}N^{-3/4})$ . Hence, since the above bounds are uniform over  $\rho \in [\rho(c) - M_N N^{-1/2}, \rho(c) + M_N N^{-1/2}]$ , the bound is  $O_p(N^{-3/4}h_N^{k-1})$  on the difference  $|T_{k,N}(\rho(C_N)) - T_{k,N}(\rho(c))|$ .  $\square$

**Lemma B.19.** *Suppose  $\nu(r; c, \rho)$  is such that*

$$|\nu(r; c, \rho)| < B_D(r - \rho(c))^3 + B_\mu(c)(|r - \rho(c)| + |\rho(c) - \rho|)|\rho(c) - \rho|.$$

*Then the difference*

$$\begin{aligned} & \bar{\nu}_N(C_N) - \bar{\nu}_N(c) \\ & \equiv \frac{1}{Nh_N} \sum_{i=1}^N J_i(c) I_{1i}^+(C_N, h_N) x_i(C_N) \nu(R_{it_1}; c, \rho(C_N)) - \frac{1}{Nh_N} \sum_{i=1}^N J_i(c) I_{1i}^+(c, h_N) x_i(c) \nu(R_{it_1}; c, \rho(c)) \\ & = o_p(h_N N^{-1/2}), \end{aligned}$$

assuming  $N^{-1/2} = o(h_N)$ .

*Proof.* On  $A_N$ , when  $I_{1i}^+ = 1$ , the  $\nu$  terms are uniformly bounded by

$$B_D(h_N + 2M_N N^{-1/2})^3 + 10B_\mu(c)(h_N + M_N N^{-1/2})M_N N^{-1/2} = O(h_N N^{-1/2} + h_N^3).$$

Thus, by [Lemma B.16](#), the difference is bounded by

$$O_p(h_N N^{-1/2} + h_N^3) \left[ \frac{N^{-1/2}/h_N}{N^{-1/2}} \right] = o_p(h_N N^{-1/2}).$$

$\square$

**Lemma B.20** (A modified version of [Lemma A.2](#) in [Imbens and Kalyanaraman \(2012\)](#)). *Consider  $S_{k,N} = S_{k,N}(c)$  in [Lemma B.16](#). Then, under [Assumption B.5](#),*

$$S_{k,N} = \Pr(J_i(c) = 1) \cdot f(\rho(c)) h_N^k \int_0^{1/2} t^j dt + o_p(h_N^k),$$

and, as a result,

$$\begin{bmatrix} S_{0,N} & S_{1,N} \\ S_{1,N} & S_{2,N} \end{bmatrix}^{-1} = \begin{bmatrix} a_2 & -a_1/h_N \\ -a_1/h_N & a_2/h_N^2 \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} o_p(1) & o_p(1/h_N) \\ o_p(1/h_N) & o_p(1/h_N^2) \end{bmatrix}$$

where the constants are<sup>48</sup>

$$a_k = \frac{\nu_k}{\Pr(J_i(c) = 1) f(\rho(c)) (\nu_0 \nu_2 - \nu_1^2)} = \frac{12/(k+1)}{\Pr(J_i(c) = 1) f(\rho(c))} \quad \nu_k = \int_0^1 t^k dt = \frac{1}{k+1}$$

and  $f(\rho(c)) = p(R_{it_1} = \rho(c) \mid J_i(c) = 1)$  is the conditional density of the running variable at the cutoff point.

<sup>48</sup>The constants  $\nu_k$  depends on the kernel choice, which we fix to be the uniform kernel  $K(x) = \mathbb{1}(x < 1/2)$ .

*Proof.* The presence of  $J_i(c)$  adds  $\Pr(J_i(c) = 1)$  to the final result, via conditioning on  $J_i(c) = 1$ . The rest of the result follows directly from Lemma A.2 in [Imbens and Kalyanaraman \(2012\)](#) when working with the joint distribution conditioned on  $J_i(c) = 1$ .  $\square$

### B.5. Central limit theorem and variance estimation.

**Lemma B.21.** *Let*

$$Z_N = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}h_N} \sum_{i=1}^N W_i(c, h_N) \frac{4 - 6 \frac{R_{it_1} - \rho(c)}{h_N}}{\Pr(J_i(c) = 1)f(\rho(c))} \epsilon_i$$

Then, under [Assumptions B.3 and B.5](#),

$$\text{Var}(Z_N) \rightarrow \frac{4}{\Pr(J_i(c) = 1)f(\rho(c))} \sigma_+^2$$

as  $N \rightarrow \infty$ .

*Proof.* It suffices to compute the limit

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{\mathbb{1}(R_{it_1} \in [\rho(c), \rho(c) + h_N])}{h_N} \left( 2 - 3 \frac{R_{it_1} - \rho(c)}{h_N} \right)^2 \epsilon_i^2 \mid J_i(c) = 1 \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{\mathbb{1}(R_{it_1} \in [\rho(c), \rho(c) + h_N])}{h_N} \left( 2 - 3 \frac{R_{it_1} - \rho(c)}{h_N} \right)^2 \mathbb{E}[\epsilon_i^2 \mid J_i(c) = 1, R_{it_1}] \mid J_i(c) = 1 \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{h_N} \int_{\rho(c)}^{\rho(c) + h_N} \left( 2 - 3 \frac{r - \rho(c)}{h_N} \right)^2 \sigma_+^2(r) f(r) dr \quad (\text{Denote the conditional variance with } \sigma_+^2) \\ &= \int_0^1 (2 - 3v)^2 \sigma_+^2(\rho(c) + h_N v) f(\rho(c) + h_N v) dv \\ &\rightarrow \sigma_+^2 f(\rho(c)) \cdot \int_0^1 (2 - 3v)^2 dv \quad (\text{Dominated convergence and continuity}) \\ &= \sigma_+^2 f(\rho(c)). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, the limiting variance is

$$\frac{1}{Nh_N} \cdot N \cdot \Pr(J_i(c) = 1) \cdot \frac{4h_N}{\Pr(J_i(c) = 1)^2 f(\rho(c))^2} (\sigma_+^2 f(\rho(c)) + o(1)) \rightarrow \frac{4}{\Pr(J_i(c) = 1)f(\rho(c))}.$$

$\square$

**Lemma B.22** (Lyapunov). *Let*

$$Z_N = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}h_N} \sum_{i=1}^N W_i(c, h_N) \frac{4 - 6 \frac{R_{it_1} - \rho(c)}{h_N}}{\Pr(J_i(c) = 1)f(\rho(c))} \epsilon_i \equiv \sum_{i=1}^N Z_{N,i}.$$

Then, under [Assumptions B.3 and B.5](#)  $N\mathbb{E}|Z_{N,i}|^{2+\varepsilon} \rightarrow 0$  where  $\varepsilon$  is given in [Assumption B.3](#). Hence

$$Z_N \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N} \left( 0, \frac{4}{\Pr(J_i(c) = 1)f(\rho(c))} \sigma_+^2 \right).$$

*Proof.* The part after “hence” follows directly from the Lyapunov CLT for triangular arrays.

Now,

$$\mathbb{E}|Z_{N,i}|^{2+\varepsilon} = \frac{\Pr(J_i(c) = 1)}{Nh_N(Nh_N)^{\varepsilon/2}} \cdot \mathbb{E} \left[ \mathbb{1}(R_{it_1} \in [\rho(c), \rho(c) + h_N]) \cdot \left( 2 - 3 \frac{R_{it_1} - \rho(c)}{h_N} \right)^{2+\varepsilon} \epsilon_i^{2+\varepsilon} \mid J_i(c) = 1 \right]$$

Since the  $2 + \varepsilon$  moment of  $\epsilon_i$  is uniformly bounded, and  $R_{it_1} - \rho(c) < h_N$  whenever  $\mathbb{1}(R_{it_1} \in [\rho(c), \rho(c) + h_N]) = 1$ , the above is bounded above by

$$B_{CLT} \frac{1}{N(Nh_N)^{\varepsilon/2}} = o(N)$$

for some constant  $B_{CLT}$ . □

**Lemma B.23** (WLLN for triangular arrays, [Durrett \(2019\)](#) Theorem 2.2.11). *For each  $n$  let  $X_{n,k}$  be independent for  $1 \leq k \leq n$ . Let  $b_n > 0$  with  $b_n \rightarrow \infty$ . Let  $\bar{X}_{n,k} = X_{n,k} \mathbb{1}(|X_{n,k}| \leq b_n)$ . Suppose that as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ ,*

- (1)  $\sum_k \Pr\{|X_{n,k}| > b_n\} \rightarrow 0$
- (2)  $b_n^{-2} \sum_{k=1}^n \mathbb{E}[\bar{X}_{n,k}^2] \rightarrow 0$ .

Let  $S_n = \sum_k X_{n,k}$  and let  $\mu_n = \mathbb{E}[\bar{X}_{n,k}]$ , then

$$\frac{1}{b_n} (S_n - \mu_n) \xrightarrow{p} 0.$$

**Lemma B.24** (Variance estimation). *Let  $N_+$  be the number of observations with  $J_i(C_N) = 1$  and  $R_{it_1} \in [\rho(C_N), \rho(C_N) + h_N]$ . Then, under [Assumptions B.3](#) and [B.5](#), and that  $\hat{\beta}_0 = \mu_+(\rho(c)) + o_p(1)$ ,*

$$\frac{Nh_N}{N_+} \left( \frac{1}{N_+} \sum_{i=1}^N W_i(C_N, h_N) Y_i(C_N)^2 - \hat{\beta}_0^2 \right) \xrightarrow{p} \frac{\sigma_+^2}{\Pr(J_i(c) = 1) f(\rho(c))}.$$

*Proof.* Note that

$$\frac{1}{Nh_N} N_+ = \frac{1}{Nh_N} \sum_i W_i(C_N, h_N) = \frac{1}{Nh_N} \sum_i W_i(c, h_N) + o_p(1) = \Pr(J_i(c) = 1) f(\rho(c)) + o_p(1)$$

([Lemmas B.14](#) and [B.16](#))

By [Lemma B.15](#) and [Corollary B.17](#), we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{Nh_N} \sum_{i=1}^N W_i(C_N, h_N) Y_i^2(C_N) &= \frac{1}{Nh_N} \sum_{i=1}^N W_i(c, h_N) Y_i^2(c) + o_p(1) \\ &= \Pr(J_i(c) = 1) \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{\mathbb{1}(R_{it_1} \in [\rho(c), \rho(c) + h_N])}{h_N} Y_i(c)^2 \mid J_i(c) = 1 \right] + o_p(1) \\ &\rightarrow \Pr(J_i(c) = 1) \mathbb{E}[Y_i(c)^2 \mid J_i(c) = 1, R_{it_1} = \rho(c)] f(\rho(c)). \end{aligned}$$

The second equality follows from [Lemma B.23](#), which requires some justification. Barring that, the claim follows via Slutsky’s theorem, noting that  $\hat{\beta}_0 = \mu_+(\rho(c)) + o_p(1)$ .

To show the second equality above, let  $X_{k,N} = W_k(c, h_N) Y_i^2(c)$  and let  $b_N = Nh_N$ . Note that by Markov’s inequality and [Assumption B.3](#),

$$\Pr(X_{k,N} > b_N) = \Pr\left(W_k(c, h_N) Y_i(c)^{2+\varepsilon} > b_N^{1+\varepsilon/2}\right) \lesssim \frac{\mathbb{E}[W_k(c, h_N)]}{b_N^{1+\varepsilon/2}} \lesssim \frac{h_N}{b_N^{1+\varepsilon/2}}.$$

Thus the first condition of [Lemma B.23](#) is satisfied:

$$\sum_k \Pr[X_{k,N} > b_N] \lesssim b_N/b_N^{1+\varepsilon/2} \rightarrow 0.$$

Note that  $\mathbb{E}[\bar{X}_{k,N}] \lesssim h_N$  since  $\mathbb{E}[X_{k,N} \mid X_{k,N} \neq 0] < \infty$ . Note that ([Lemma 2.2.13 Durrett, 2019](#))

$$\mathbb{E}[\bar{X}_{k,N}^2] = \int_0^{b_N} 2y \Pr(X_{k,N} > y) dy \lesssim \int_0^{b_N} 2y \frac{h_N}{y^{1+\varepsilon/2}} dy$$

via the same Markov's inequality argument. Calculating the integral shows that

$$b_N^{-2} \sum_k \mathbb{E}[\bar{X}_{k,N}^2] \rightarrow 0$$

and thus the second condition follows. The implication of [Lemma B.23](#) is that

$$\frac{1}{Nh_N} \sum_{i=1}^N W_i(c, h_N) Y_i^2(c) = \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{1}{Nh_N} \sum_{i=1}^N W_i(c, h_N) Y_i^2(c) \mathbb{1}(Y_i^2(c) < Nh_N) \right] + o_p(1).$$

Since  $\mathbb{E}[Y_i^2(c) \mid J_i(c) = 1, R_{it_1} = r] < B_V < \infty$ ,

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{1}{Nh_N} \sum_{i=1}^N W_i(c, h_N) Y_i^2(c) \mathbb{1}(Y_i^2(c) < Nh_N) \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{1}{Nh_N} \sum_{i=1}^N W_i(c, h_N) Y_i^2(c) \right] + o(1),$$

concluding the proof. □

## REFERENCES

- Abadie, Alberto, Susan Athey, Guido W Imbens, and Jeffrey M Wooldridge**, “Sampling-Based versus Design-Based Uncertainty in Regression Analysis,” *Econometrica*, 2020, *88* (1), 265–296.
- Abdulkadiroğlu, Atila, Joshua D. Angrist, Yusuke Narita, and Parag A. Pathak**, “Research Design Meets Market Design: Using Centralized Assignment for Impact Evaluation,” *Econometrica*, 2017, *85* (5), 1373–1432.
- , ———, ———, and ———, “Breaking ties: regression discontinuity design meets market design,” *Econometrica*, forthcoming.
- , **Joshua D Angrist, Yusuke Narita, Parag A Pathak, and Roman A Zarate**, “Regression Discontinuity in Serial Dictatorship: Achievement Effects at Chicago’s Exam Schools,” *American Economic Review*, 2017, *107* (5), 240–45.
- , **Nikhil Agarwal, and Parag A Pathak**, “The welfare effects of coordinated assignment: Evidence from the New York City high school match,” *American Economic Review*, 2017, *107* (12), 3635–89.
- , **Parag A Pathak, Jonathan Schellenberg, and Christopher R Walters**, “Do parents value school effectiveness?,” *American Economic Review*, 2020, *110* (5), 1502–39.
- , **Yeon-Koo Che, and Yosuke Yasuda**, “Expanding” choice” in school choice,” *American Economic Journal: Microeconomics*, 2015, *7* (1), 1–42.
- Agarwal, Nikhil and Eric Budish**, “Market Design,” Technical Report, National Bureau of Economic Research 2021.
- and **Paulo Somaini**, “Demand analysis using strategic reports: An application to a school choice mechanism,” *Econometrica*, 2018, *86* (2), 391–444.
- and ———, “Revealed preference analysis of school choice models,” *Annual Review of Economics*, 2020, *12*, 471–501.
- , **Charles Hodgson, and Paulo Somaini**, “Choices and outcomes in assignment mechanisms: The allocation of deceased donor kidneys,” Technical Report, National Bureau of Economic Research 2020.
- Andrews, Isaiah, Toru Kitagawa, and Adam McCloskey**, “Inference on winners,” Technical Report, National Bureau of Economic Research 2019.
- Angrist, Joshua D.**, “Estimating the Labor Market Impact of Voluntary Military Service Using Social Security Data on Military Applicants,” *Econometrica*, 1998, *66* (2), 249–288.
- and **Miikka Rokkanen**, “Wanna get away? Regression discontinuity estimation of exam school effects away from the cutoff,” *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 2015, *110* (512), 1331–1344.
- , **Peter Hull, Parag A Pathak, and Christopher R Walters**, “Simple and Credible Value-Added Estimation Using Centralized School Assignment,” Technical Report, National Bureau of Economic Research 2020.
- Armstrong, Timothy B and Michal Kolesár**, “Simple and honest confidence intervals in nonparametric regression,” *Quantitative Economics*, 2020, *11* (1), 1–39.

- Aronow, Peter M and Cyrus Samii**, “Estimating average causal effects under general interference, with application to a social network experiment,” *The Annals of Applied Statistics*, 2017, *11* (4), 1912–1947.
- and **Joel A Middleton**, “A class of unbiased estimators of the average treatment effect in randomized experiments,” *Journal of Causal Inference*, 2013, *1* (1), 135–154.
- Azevedo, Eduardo M and Jacob D Leshno**, “A supply and demand framework for two-sided matching markets,” *Journal of Political Economy*, 2016, *124* (5), 1235–1268.
- Bertanha, Marinho and Guido W Imbens**, “External validity in fuzzy regression discontinuity designs,” *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics*, 2020, *38* (3), 593–612.
- Beuermann, Diether, C Kirabo Jackson, Laia Navarro-Sola, and Francisco Pardo**, “What is a good school, and can parents tell? Evidence on the multidimensionality of school output,” Technical Report, National Bureau of Economic Research 2018.
- Borusyak, Kirill and Peter Hull**, “Non-random exposure to exogenous shocks: Theory and applications,” Technical Report, National Bureau of Economic Research 2020.
- Calonico, Sebastian, Matias D Cattaneo, and Rocio Titiunik**, “Robust nonparametric confidence intervals for regression-discontinuity designs,” *Econometrica*, 2014, *82* (6), 2295–2326.
- Calsamiglia, Caterina, Chao Fu, and Maia Güell**, “Structural estimation of a model of school choices: The boston mechanism versus its alternatives,” *Journal of Political Economy*, 2020, *128* (2), 642–680.
- Cattaneo, Matias D, Luke Keele, Rocío Titiunik, and Gonzalo Vazquez-Bare**, “Extrapolating treatment effects in multi-cutoff regression discontinuity designs,” *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 2020, pp. 1–12.
- , **Rocío Titiunik, Gonzalo Vazquez-Bare, and Luke Keele**, “Interpreting regression discontinuity designs with multiple cutoffs,” *The Journal of Politics*, 2016, *78* (4), 1229–1248.
- Chen, Jiafeng**, “Causal Inference in Matching Markets,” 2019.
- Diamond, William and Nikhil Agarwal**, “Latent indices in assortative matching models,” *Quantitative Economics*, 2017, *8* (3), 685–728.
- Dong, Yingying and Arthur Lewbel**, “Identifying the effect of changing the policy threshold in regression discontinuity models,” *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 2015, *97* (5), 1081–1092.
- Durrett, Rick**, *Probability: theory and examples*, Vol. 49, Cambridge university press, 2019.
- Fack, Gabrielle, Julien Grenet, and Yinghua He**, “Beyond truth-telling: Preference estimation with centralized school choice and college admissions,” *American Economic Review*, 2019, *109* (4), 1486–1529.
- Fisher, Ronald Aylmer**, “Design of experiments,” *Br Med J*, 1936, *1* (3923), 554–554.
- Gale, David and Lloyd S Shapley**, “College admissions and the stability of marriage,” *The American Mathematical Monthly*, 1962, *69* (1), 9–15.
- Godambe, VP and VM Joshi**, “Admissibility and Bayes estimation in sampling finite populations. I,” *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, 1965, *36* (6), 1707–1722.
- Goldsmith-Pinkham, Paul, Peter Hull, and Michal Kolesár**, “On Estimating Multiple Treatment Effects with Regression,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2106.05024*, 2021.

- Hahn, Jinyong, Petra Todd, and Wilbert Van der Klaauw**, “Identification and estimation of treatment effects with a regression-discontinuity design,” *Econometrica*, 2001, 69 (1), 201–209.
- Heckman, James J and Edward Vytlacil**, “Policy-relevant treatment effects,” *American Economic Review*, 2001, 91 (2), 107–111.
- Horvitz, Daniel G and Donovan J Thompson**, “A generalization of sampling without replacement from a finite universe,” *Journal of the American statistical Association*, 1952, 47 (260), 663–685.
- Hurwicz, Leonid**, “Generalization of the concept of identification,” *Statistical inference in dynamic economic models*, 1950, 10, 245–57.
- Imbens, Guido and Donald B Rubin**, *Causal inference in statistics, social, and biomedical sciences*, Cambridge University Press, 2015.
- and **Karthik Kalyanaraman**, “Optimal bandwidth choice for the regression discontinuity estimator,” *The Review of economic studies*, 2012, 79 (3), 933–959.
- and **Stefan Wager**, “Optimized regression discontinuity designs,” *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 2019, 101 (2), 264–278.
- and **Thomas Lemieux**, “Regression discontinuity designs: A guide to practice,” *Journal of econometrics*, 2008, 142 (2), 615–635.
- Imbens, Guido W and Jeffrey M Wooldridge**, “Recent developments in the econometrics of program evaluation,” *Journal of economic literature*, 2009, 47 (1), 5–86.
- Kapor, Adam J, Christopher A Neilson, and Seth D Zimmerman**, “Heterogeneous beliefs and school choice mechanisms,” *American Economic Review*, 2020, 110 (5), 1274–1315.
- Khan, Samir and Johan Ugander**, “Adaptive normalization for IPW estimation,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2106.07695*, 2021.
- Khan, Shakeeb and Elie Tamer**, “Irregular identification, support conditions, and inverse weight estimation,” *Econometrica*, 2010, 78 (6), 2021–2042.
- Koopmans, Tjalling C and Olav Reiersol**, “The identification of structural characteristics,” *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, 1950, 21 (2), 165–181.
- Kwon, Koo Hyun and Soonwoo Kwon**, “Inference in regression discontinuity designs under monotonicity,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2011.14216*, 2020.
- Leshno, Jacob D and Irene Lo**, “The cutoff structure of top trading cycles in school choice,” *The Review of Economic Studies*, 2021, 88 (4), 1582–1623.
- Lewbel, Arthur**, “The identification zoo: Meanings of identification in econometrics,” *Journal of Economic Literature*, 2019, 57 (4), 835–903.
- Li, Xinran and Peng Ding**, “General forms of finite population central limit theorems with applications to causal inference,” *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 2017, 112 (520), 1759–1769.
- Mogstad, Magne, Alexander Torgovitsky, and Christopher R Walters**, “Policy evaluation with multiple instrumental variables,” Technical Report, National Bureau of Economic Research 2020.

- \_\_\_\_\_ and \_\_\_\_\_, “Identification and extrapolation of causal effects with instrumental variables,” *Annual Review of Economics*, 2018, *10*, 577–613.
- \_\_\_\_\_, **Andres Santos**, and **Alexander Torgovitsky**, “Using instrumental variables for inference about policy relevant treatment parameters,” *Econometrica*, 2018, *86* (5), 1589–1619.
- Mukerjee, Rahul, Tirthankar Dasgupta, and Donald B Rubin**, “Using standard tools from finite population sampling to improve causal inference for complex experiments,” *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 2018, *113* (522), 868–881.
- Munro, Evan, Stefan Wager, and Kuang Xu**, “Treatment Effects in Market Equilibrium,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2109.11647*, 2021.
- Narita, Yusuke**, “A Theory of Quasi-Experimental Evaluation of School Quality,” *Management Science*, 2021.
- \_\_\_\_\_ and **Kohei Yata**, “Algorithm is Experiment: Machine Learning, Market Design, and Policy Eligibility Rules,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2104.12909*, 2021.
- Neyman, Jerzy S**, “On the application of probability theory to agricultural experiments. essay on principles. section 9.(translated and edited by dm dabrowska and tp speed, statistical science (1990), 5, 465-480),” *Annals of Agricultural Sciences*, 1923, *10*, 1–51.
- Rosenbaum, Paul R and Donald B Rubin**, “Reducing bias in observational studies using subclassification on the propensity score,” *Journal of the American statistical Association*, 1984, *79* (387), 516–524.
- Roth, Alvin E**, “The economist as engineer: Game theory, experimentation, and computation as tools for design economics,” *Econometrica*, 2002, *70* (4), 1341–1378.
- \_\_\_\_\_ and **Marilda Sotomayor**, “Two-sided matching,” *Handbook of game theory with economic applications*, 1992, *1*, 485–541.
- Shi, Peng**, “Guiding school-choice reform through novel applications of operations research,” *Interfaces*, 2015, *45* (2), 117–132.
- Wooldridge, Jeffrey M**, *Econometric analysis of cross section and panel data*, MIT press, 2010.