

HOW (NOT) TO REFORM INDIA'S AFFIRMATIVE ACTION POLICIES FOR ITS ECONOMICALLY WEAKER SEGMENTS

TAYFUN SÖNMEZ AND M. UTKU ÜNVER

ABSTRACT. In India, various groups are protected with a vertical reservation (VR) policy, which sets aside a fraction of government positions and public school seats for each protected group. By law, the protected positions are processed after those open to all applicants, thus assuring that they are awarded to individuals who otherwise cannot receive open positions. Historically, the VR-protected groups have been various Socially and Educationally Backward Classes (SEBCs), whose members suffered marginalization due to their caste identities. This structure also means that no individual can belong to multiple VR-protected groups; thereby, deeming the processing sequence of VR-protected groups immaterial. A 2019 amendment to the constitution granted economically weaker sections (EWS) with vertical reservations, but limited its eligibility to members of forward castes who are ineligible for SEBC positions. As such, individuals still cannot belong to multiple VR-protected groups under the amendment. The Amendment was immediately brought to court, and its exclusion of SEBCs was challenged. In September 2022, a compromise that is discussed at the Supreme Court involves maintaining the amendment, but expanding its scope to include SEBCs. If adopted in the country, individuals can belong to multiple VR-protected groups. Therefore, if the Supreme Court mandates the compromise without specifying how EWS positions are to be processed, a major loophole in the system will emerge. If EWS positions are processed after SEBC positions, then the result is a true compromise which provides the benefits of the EWS positions to all individuals with financial disabilities. If, however, EWS positions are processed prior to SEBC positions, then the result is virtually equivalent to the elimination of EWS reservation.

Keywords: Market design, matching, affirmative action, reserve system, EWS quota

JEL codes: C78, D47

Date: October 16th, 2022.

Both Sönmez and Ünver are affiliated with the Department of Economics, Boston College, 140 Commonwealth Ave, Chestnut Hill, MA, 02467. Emails: sonmezt@bc.edu, unver@bc.edu. We thank Manshu Khanna for his detailed comments.

1. Introduction

Affirmative action is embedded into the 1950 Constitution of India through two types of protective policies, a primary provision called *vertical reservations (VR policy)* and a secondary provision called *horizontal reservations (HR policy)*. On the surface the two policies are similar in that, under both schemes certain percentages of government positions and seats at institutions of higher education are reserved for members of various protected groups. What makes the VR policy a higher-level positive discrimination policy is that, by law VR-protected positions are awarded to members of the protected group who do not merit an unprotected *open-category* position. That is, the reserved positions are not awarded to individuals who are in no need of affirmative action. The HR policy, in contrast, only provides a minimum guarantee to members of the protected group, which means its benefits kick in only if this guaranteed level cannot be reached.

Prior to the 103rd Constitutional Amendment, passed in January 2019, the scope of the VR policy was restricted to members of the Socially and Educationally Backward Classes (SEBCs) who faced various degrees of social marginalization on the basis of their caste identity. In India, SEBCs consist of the three broad groups Scheduled Castes (SCs), Scheduled Tribes (STs), and Other Backward Classes (OBCs).¹ With a highly controversial amendment to the Constitution, VR protections for up to 10% of government positions and seats at institutions of higher education is now provided for members of a new category called Economically Weaker Sections (EWS). Eligibility for EWS was provided to individuals in financial incapacity, but controversially it was restricted to those who do not qualify for earlier caste-based VR protections provided to SEBCs. As soon as the 103rd Constitutional Amendment Act was enacted in January 2019, it was challenged by several groups, in a high profile case that was eventually elevated in August 2020 to a five-judge Constitution Bench of the Supreme Court.

On September 8th, 2022, the Constitution Bench announced the following three main issues for examining whether the 103rd Constitutional Amendment violates the basic structure of the Constitution:²

- (1) Can reservations be granted solely on the basis of economic criteria?

¹Scheduled Castes (SC) is the official term for Dalits or “untouchables,” who endured millenniums-long oppression and discrimination due to their lowest status under the caste system. Scheduled Tribes (ST) is the official term for the indigenous ethnic groups of India, whose faced oppression due to their isolation and exclusion from mainstream society. Other Backward Classes (OBC) is the official term that describes lower-level castes who were engaged in various marginal occupation assigned to them by the society to serve castes higher to them in the caste hierarchy.

²See the coverage of the case in the *Supreme Court Observer*, last retrieved on 10/01/2022.

- (2) Can states provide reservations in private educational institutions which do not receive government aid?
- (3) Are EWS reservations constitutionally invalid for excluding SEBCs, i.e., SCs, STs, and OBCs, from its scope?

In relation to the last issue, advocates for the petitioners repeatedly argued throughout the hearings that the amendment violates the country's *Equality Code* by excluding SCs, STs, OBCs from its scope.³ Our paper is directly related to this very issue.

On the last day of hearings, as a compromise between the two sides, Dr. Mohan Gopal suggested an alternative way forward that did not involve striking down the 103rd Amendment. Under this proposal, members of SCBCs who are covered by existing VR protections can also receive the benefits of EWS reservations.⁴ Indeed, a few days earlier, the state cabinet in Maharashtra—the second most populous state in India—already adopted this compromise policy for allocation of positions at state public jobs and educational institutions.⁵ After hearing both sides' arguments for six and a half days, the Constitution Bench reserved a verdict on these questions on September 27th, 2022.⁶ A final decision is expected from the Supreme Court over the next few months.

In this paper, our main objective is exploring how this “compromise” policy—aimed at aligning the contested amendment with India's *Equality Code*—affects the country's reservation system. Through a series of results, we show that a technical aspect of this compromise policy

- (1) fundamentally alters a key feature of the procedures that implement India's reservation policies, and
- (2) unless it is addressed, it can result in large-scale unintended consequences.

In our formal analysis of the Constitutional amendment, presented in Section 3, we also formulate the tools that are needed to avoid these unintended consequences.

1.1. Implementation of VR Policy. India's reservation system allocates government positions and seats at public educational institutions to candidates based on their merit

³In India, the *Equality Code* refers to articles 14-18 of the Constitution which formulate the fundamental rights to equality.

⁴See, the document on EWS Reservation Day #8: Responses to Governments Arguments on Last Day of Hearing by the *Supreme Court Observer*, last retrieved on 10/01/2022.

⁵With this new resolution members of Maratha community are eligible for both VR protections reserving 16% positions at state public jobs and state educational institutions for the SEBC community, as well as for VR protections reserving 10% of the positions for the EWS community. See <https://www.thehindu.com/news/states/marathas-to-get-ews-benefits/article32672887.ece>, last retrieved 10/01/2022.

⁶According to Wikipedia, a *reserved* decision is a legal term which judges employ in delaying final judgement for a while.

scores and their eligibility for VR/HR protections. The ongoing crisis in India is about the VR policy, i.e., the primary affirmative action policy in the country.⁷

Any time a public institution allocates a number of positions, it has to reserve a legislatively determined percentage for each VR-protected group. The remaining positions are referred to as open category. The term *vertical reservations* was coined in the landmark Supreme Court judgment *Indra Sawhney vs Union Of India* (1992),⁸ which formulated the defining characteristics of this primary protective policy as follows:

- A member of a VR-protected group who deserves an open-category position based on her merit score must be awarded an open-category position, and not deplete the VR-protected positions. VR-protected positions too must be allocated based on merit scores, but they must be saved for those who do not merit an open-category position based on their scores.
- VR-protected positions are *hard reserves* and they are exclusive to members of the protected group.

When no individual is eligible for multiple VR-protected groups, as it has been until now, these two characteristics together imply that the positions should be allocated with the following *over-and-above choice rule*: First, open-category positions are awarded to individuals with highest merit scores, and next, for each VR-protected category, the protected positions are awarded to remaining members of the category with highest merit scores. Critically, because,

- (1) there is no overlap between members of any two VR-protected categories, and
- (2) VR-protected positions are exclusively reserved for the members of their respective categories,

it does not matter in what sequence (or other form) the positions reserved for VR-protected categories are allocated under this procedure. That because, provided that both conditions hold, no individual competes for positions at multiple VR-protected categories, thus rendering the competitions at VR-protected categories completely independent from each other. Barring some rare exceptions, both conditions currently hold in

⁷While any recruitment or admission system implemented in the country has to accommodate the secondary HR policy as well, so far the discussions in the country abstract away from them. In contrast, we consider the HR policy as well in our formal analysis. However, the HR policy has no bearing on any of the main points we make in this paper. It merely makes the technical analysis of the problem more complex. As such, just as the discussions in the country, we abstract away from the HR policy for our discussions in the Introduction only.

⁸Widely known as known as the *Mandal Commission Case*, this judgment is considered the main reference for legislation on reservation system. The judgment is available in <https://indiankanoon.org/doc/1363234/>, last retrieved on 03/10/2022.

field applications in India.⁹ Once either condition is relaxed, however, this conclusion no longer holds. In that case allocation of reserved positions at VR-protected categories interfere with each other, thus potentially affecting the distribution of positions. This is why the compromise policy proposed by Dr. Mohan Gopal (and already adopted by the state cabinet of Maharashtra) fundamentally alters a key aspect of the reservation system. Without specification of an additional (and admittedly subtle) parameter of the system (i.e. when EWS positions are to be allocated in relation to positions at other VR-protected categories), a mere expansion of the scope of the EWS reservation to cover all individuals with financial disability no longer results in a well-defined system under the current legislation.

1.2. Consequences of Overlapping VR Protections. So how important is this new parameter-processing order of the EWS positions in relation to other VR-protected categories—in practice? The short answer to this question is, it is very important! To explain why that is the case, let us consider the following two extreme policies:

- (1) *EWS-first VR policy*: EWS positions are processed prior to all other VR-protected positions.
- (2) *EWS-last VR policy*: EWS positions are processed after all other VR-protected positions.

Recall that, by legislation open-category positions are allocated prior to all VR-protected positions.

To assess the effect of a potential expansion of the scope of EWS-category eligibility under the *EWS-first VR policy*, the following observation is useful: Apart from the exclusion of SEBCs, the eligibility conditions for the EWS category is set fairly laxed. According to the Deshpande and Ramachandran (2019), 98% of the Indian population earns below the annual income limit Rs 8 lakh to be eligible for the EWS reservation. Hence, it is fairly informative to consider the case where everyone is eligible for the EWS reservation. Well, under this assumption the *EWS-first VR policy* is equivalent to completely striking down the EWS reservation! The actual impact will not be exactly identical to this scenario, because in reality not everyone is eligible for the EWS reservation, but the difference will likely be nominal. Thus, the compromise policy has a version that pretty much accounts to eliminating the EWS reservation.¹⁰

⁹Recent reform in Maharashtra, where the state cabinet already relaxed the first condition for allocation of positions at state public jobs and educational institutions, is one of these exceptions. See Section 4 for a field application where the second condition is relaxed.

¹⁰It may be illustrative to emphasize that, in order that avoid a possible revocation of the EWS reservation, the Central government announced right before the last day of the Supreme Court hearings that, a total of 214,766 additional seats were approved to be created in the central educational institutions, and

What about the effect of a potential expansion of the scope of EWS-category eligibility under the *EWS-last VR policy*? Remember that, one of the main issues that is to be decided by the Constitution Bench is whether the Right to Equality for SEBCs are violated under the amendment. Assuming that the Bench confirms that the Equality Code is breached in this way, it is formally possible to identify the specific SEBC members who are directly affected by this violation by losing a position they would have received otherwise (Lemma 4). As our main theoretical result, in Theorem 1 we show that under the *EWS-last VR policy*,

- this very group of the “compromised” members of SEBCs replace those from forward castes who each receive a position with lower scores at their expense,
- but otherwise, the rest of the positions are allocated exactly to the same individuals as the current policy.

Thus, the *EWS-last VR policy* is literally the smallest possible deviation from the current policy that avoids a violation of the Equality Code. In particular, if no member of SEBCs loses a position due to their exclusion from the scope of EWS reservation under the current policy, then the outcome of the *EWS-last VR policy* is identical to that of the current policy (Corollary 1). Essentially the *EWS-last VR policy* continues to provide its first order benefits to those who are ineligible for other VR-protected categories, but does so in a way that avoids a violation of the Equality Code.

Given the big difference between the two seemingly similar policies, we believe it is in the Indian population’s best interests to understand their distinction.¹¹

1.3. Alternative VR Policies. While uncovering the implications of the overlapping VR protections is our main motivation, our model and analysis are considerably more general. Recall that non-overlapping structure of the VR protections is one of the two reasons why the processing order of VR-protected categories has been immaterial in India. As we discussed in Section 1.1, the second reason is implementation of VR protections as hard reserves in the country. Even though this is the regular implementation mode of VR policy, there is need for analysis of a broader class of VR policies due to a judgment of Supreme Court in *Ashoka Kumar Thakur v. Union of India* (2008).¹² For the case of seat allocation at elite educational institutions, this judgment provided a directive that corresponds to

a total fund of Rs 4,315.15 crores (an equivalent of more than 500 million US dollars) was approved. See *The Print* story for the details.

¹¹Our exercise here is in the spirit of maintaining *informed neutrality* between reasonable but competing ethical principles (Li, 2017), and minimizing the *normative gap* between intended and implemented normative objectives (Hitzig, 2020).

¹²The judgment is available in <https://indiankanoon.org/doc/63489929/>, last retrieved on 10/04/2022.

giving a 10 points of advantage to beneficiaries of the OBC category for allocation of VR-protected positions for this category, rather than exclusively reserving these positions for them. Motivated with this directive, we present a general model of reservation allows both for overlapping VR protections, and also for non-regular VR policies. Moreover, in relation to the directive of *Ashoka Kumar Thakur (2008)*, in Theorem 2 we show that the best policy for maintaining standards of excellence can be achieved by processing OBC-category positions after all other VR-protected categories.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows: In the next subsection we discuss related literature. In Section 2, we present and analyze a generalized model of reservation which allows both for overlapping VR protections, and also for more flexible VR policies. In Section 3, we present our main application on the contested 103rd Amendment of the Constitution, and propose a resolution that brings the amendment in line with the country's Equality Code. Our main application utilizes the generality of our model that allows for overlapping VR protections. In Section 4, we present a second application that utilizes the generality of our model that allows for non-regular VR policies. We conclude in Section 5, and relegate all proofs to the Appendix.

1.4. Related Literature. Starting with Hafalir et al. (2013), there is a growing literature on reserve systems. The role of processing order of different types of positions in this framework was first studied by Kominers and Sönmez (2016) in a theoretical framework, and subsequently by Dur et al. (2018) in the context of school choice. Other papers on reserve systems include Ehlers et al. (2014), Echenique and Yenmez (2015), Dur et al. (2020), Pathak et al. (2020a,b), Abdulkadiroğlu and Grigoryan (2021), Aygün and Bó (2021), Celebi and Flynn (2021, 2022), Celebi (2022), and Sönmez and Yenmez (2022a,b).

Of these papers, three that are especially related to our study are Sönmez and Yenmez (2022a), Dur et al. (2018), and Pathak et al. (2020a).

Our model builds on Sönmez and Yenmez (2022a), which formulates the Indian reservation system with both VR and HR protections, and shows that there is a unique mechanism which satisfies the mandates of the Supreme Court judgments *Indra Sawhney (1992)* and *Saurav Yadav vs The State Of Uttar Pradesh (2020)*.¹³ This mechanism, namely the *two-step minimum guarantee* choice rule, is endorsed by the Supreme Court in their judgment *Saurav Yadav (2020)*,¹⁴ and it is further mandated in the state of Gujarat by its high court

¹³The judgment *Saurav Yadav (2020)* is available in <https://indiankanoon.org/doc/27820739/>, last retrieved on 10/06/2022.

¹⁴While this mechanism itself is merely endorsed by the Supreme Court, it is de facto mandated due to the uniqueness result by Sönmez and Yenmez (2022a).

in *Tamannaben Ashokbhai Desai vs Shital Amrutlal Nishar* (2020).¹⁵ Our model extends the model of Sönmez and Yenmez (2022a) by extending the scope of the VR policy by (1) allowing for overlaps between VR-protected groups and (2) by allowing for wider class of VR protection policies. As we emphasized in Sections 1.2 and 1.3, both generalizations are important in the field. Critically, the uniqueness result by Sönmez and Yenmez (2022a) no longer holds under our generalization. And as we have thoroughly discussed in Section 1.2, this observation has major policy implications in relation to the current debates in the country in relation to the contested EWS reservation. In particular, if accepted without additional specifications, the compromise policy which extends the scope of EWS reservation to SEBCs will result in a major legislative ambiguity in the country. By processing EWS positions prior to other VR-protected positions an authority will virtually be able to eliminate the effect of this policy, whereas by processing them after all other VR-protected positions they will be able to direct its main benefits to members of forward castes. This potential ambiguity can result both in an erroneous implementation of an unintended policy in the country, and also to its utilization by politically motivated authorities. Interestingly, both types of possibilities transpired in real-life applications of reserve systems.

This type of phenomenon was first presented in Dur et al. (2018) for allocation of seats at Boston Public Schools (BPS) between years 1999-2013. As a compromise between a faction which demanded neighborhood assignment and another which demanded more comprehensive school choice, in 1999 leadership at BPS announced that neighborhood students will receive preferential treatment in half of the seats at each public school. This policy was referred to as *walk-zone priority*. However, processing the walk-zone seats prior to remaining ones effectively negated this policy until 2013. An analog of this policy oversight in India would be, unintentionally negating the effects of the EWS reservation due to processing EWS positions prior to all other VR-protected positions. After discovering that their policy was superfluous and misleading, the walk zone policy was abandoned at BPS altogether.¹⁶

¹⁵The judgment *Tamannaben Ashokbhai Desai* (2020) is available in <https://indiankanoon.org/doc/101656671/>, last retrieved on 10/06/2022.

¹⁶As reported in Appendix D of Dur et al. (2018), during a March 2013 speech to Boston School Committee, Superintendent Carol Johnson justified this decision as follows:

Leaving the walk zone priority to continue as it currently operates is not a good option. We know from research that it does not make a significant difference the way it is applied today: although people may have thought that it did, the walk zone priority does not in fact actually help students attend schools closer to home. The External Advisory Committee suggested taking this important issue up in two years, but I believe we are ready to take this step now. We must ensure the Home-Based system works in an honest and transparent way from the very beginning.

A related phenomenon for allocation of H1-B visas in the US is presented in Pathak et al. (2020a). With the *H-1B Visa Reform Act of 2004*, the US Congress reduced the number of annual H1-B visas from 195,000 to 65,000, but granted an exemption of 20,000 units for holders of advanced degrees. Reflecting a number of purely logistical constraints, the procedure that is used to implement this act was changed a few times over the years, although each time with significant (but likely unrealized) distributional implications. In response to the former President Trump's *Buy American and Hire American Executive Order in 2017*, however, the procedure was reformed by the U.S. Department of Homeland Security with an explicit objective of increasing the number of awards to recipients with advanced degrees. The latest reform, which led to an adoption of a new visa allocation rule for US Fiscal Year 2020, simply involved a reversal of processing sequence of advanced degree visas and general category visas.

More broadly than the literature on reserve systems, there is a large and growing literature on analysis and design of mechanisms which are deployed in settings in which issues of social, racial and distributive justice are particularly important. Our paper contributes to this broader literature, which includes Abdulkadiroğlu and Sönmez (2003), Abdulkadiroğlu (2005), Erdil and Ergin (2008), Kesten (2010), Kojima (2012), Pycia (2012), Andersson and Svensson (2014), Kamada and Kojima (2015), Doğan (2016), Delacrétaz et al. (2016), Chen and Kesten (2017), Fragiadakis and Troyan (2017), Andersson (2019), Erdil and Kumano (2019), Andersson and Ehlers (2020), Ehlers and Morrill (2020), Root and Ahn (2020), and Reny (2022).

2. Model and Analysis

Our model builds on Sönmez and Yenmez (2022a), and it generalizes their model by

- (1) allowing overlaps between VR-protected groups, and
- (2) considering a range of VR policies (rather than the regular VR-policy only).

There is a finite set $\mathcal{I}$ of individuals who are competing for $q^\Sigma \in \mathbb{N}$ identical positions. Each individual $i \in \mathcal{I}$ is in need of a single position, and has a distinct merit score $\sigma_i \in \mathbb{R}_+$. Let $\sigma = (\sigma_i)_{i \in \mathcal{I}}$ denote the vector of merit scores. In the absence of a positive discrimination policy, individuals with higher merit scores have higher claims for a position.

There are two types of affirmative action provisions, VR policy and HR policy, presented in Sections 2.1 and 2.2 respectively.

Our message for our main application is similar to that of Superintendent Johnson, albeit for an application with a much larger scope and scale. If India extends the benefits of the EWS reservation to SEBCs, it is important to ensure that the new policy is implemented in a transparent way.

2.1. Vertical Reservation Policies. There is a set $\mathcal{R}$ of **VR-protected categories**, each of which provides its members easier access to receive a position. An individual $i \in \mathcal{I}$ is a member of, each of a (possibly empty) set $\rho_i \in 2^{\mathcal{R}}$ of VR-protected categories. Let $\rho = (\rho_i)_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \in (2^{\mathcal{R}})^{|\mathcal{I}|}$ denote the profile of **(individual) category memberships**. For any VR-protected category $c \in \mathcal{R}$, let $\mathcal{I}^c(\rho) = \{i \in \mathcal{I} : c \in \rho_i\}$ denote the set of members of category c , who are also referred to as the **beneficiaries** of VR protections at category c . Individuals who do not belong to any VR-protected category are all members of a **general category** $g \notin \mathcal{R}$. Let $\mathcal{I}^g(\rho) = \{i \in \mathcal{I} : \rho_i = \emptyset\} = \mathcal{I} \setminus \bigcup_{c \in \mathcal{R}} \mathcal{I}^c(\rho)$ denote the set of individuals in the general category.

It is important to emphasize that, while a member of the general category cannot be a member of any VR-protected category, different than in Sönmez and Yenmez (2022a), an individual can be a member of multiple VR-protected categories. We refer to VR-protected categories as **overlapping** if at least some of the individuals can be members of multiple VR-protected categories, and as **non-overlapping** if each individual can be a member of at most one VR-protected category.

For any VR-protected category $c \in \mathcal{R}$, beneficiaries of category c are provided with some form of a positive discrimination for $q^c \in \mathbb{N}$ of the positions. These positions are referred to as **VR-protected positions at category c** . The total number of all VR-protected positions, naturally, is no more than the number of all positions. That is,

$$\sum_{c \in \mathcal{R}} q^c \leq q.$$

The remaining

$$q^0 = q^\Sigma - \sum_{c \in \mathcal{R}} q^c$$

positions are referred to as **open-category** (or **category-o**) positions. Let $\mathcal{V} = \mathcal{R} \cup \{o\}$ denote the set of **vertical categories for positions**.

While all individuals are eligible for open-category positions, those who have higher merit scores have higher claims over them. That is, the priority order of individuals over open-category positions is given by a linear order π^0 on $\mathcal{I} \cup \{\emptyset\}$, where for any two distinct individuals $i, j \in \mathcal{I}$,

$$i \pi^0 j \pi^0 \emptyset \iff \sigma_i > \sigma_j.$$

We sometimes refer to the linear order π^0 as the **baseline priority order**. Throughout the paper, we fix a vector of merit scores $\sigma = (\sigma_i)_{i \in \mathcal{I}}$ and the induced baseline priority order π^0 .

Let $\mathcal{E}^0$ denote the set of individuals who are **eligible for open-category positions**. By assumption, $\mathcal{E}^0 = \mathcal{I}$.

2.1.1. VR Protection Policies. For any VR-protected category, the extent of the positive discrimination provided by the reservation system is determined, in part, by the relation we formulate next.

Definition 1. Fix a profile of category memberships $\rho \in (2^{\mathcal{R}})^{|\mathcal{I}|}$ and a VR-protected category $c \in \mathcal{R}$. The **VR protection policy for category c** is a linear order π^c on $\mathcal{I} \cup \{\emptyset\}$, and it satisfies the following three properties:¹⁷

- (1) For any pair of distinct individuals $i, j \in \mathcal{I}^c(\rho)$,

$$i \pi^c j \pi^c \emptyset \iff \sigma_i > \sigma_j.$$

- (2) For any pair of distinct individuals $i, j \in \mathcal{I} \setminus \mathcal{I}^c(\rho)$,

$$i \pi^c j \iff \sigma_i > \sigma_j.$$

- (3) For any pair of individuals $i \in \mathcal{I}^c(\rho)$ and $j \in \mathcal{I} \setminus \mathcal{I}^c$,

$$\sigma_i > \sigma_j \implies i \pi^c j.$$

The first property of the VR protection policy indicates that the relative priority between any pair of beneficiaries remains the same as in their baseline priority order, but otherwise they both remain eligible for their VR-protected positions. The second property indicates that the relative priority between any two non-beneficiaries remains the same as in their baseline priority order. The third property indicates that a beneficiary never loses priority over a non-beneficiary.

Given a profile of category memberships $\rho \in (2^{\mathcal{R}})^{|\mathcal{I}|}$ and a VR-protected category $c \in \mathcal{R}$, let $\Pi^c(\rho)$ denote the set of all VR protection policies for category c under ρ . Given a VR-protected category $c \in \mathcal{R}$ and a VR protection policy $\pi^c \in \Pi^c(\rho)$, let

$$\mathcal{E}^c(\pi^c) = \{i \in \mathcal{I} : i \pi^c \emptyset\}$$

denote the set of individuals who are **eligible for the VR-protected positions at category c** . Importantly, and different than in Sönmez and Yenmez (2022a), the set $\mathcal{E}^c(\pi^c)$ can differ from the set $\mathcal{I}^c$. By the first property of a VR protection policy, however, each member of category c is eligible for its VR-protected positions. Therefore, for any profile of category memberships $\rho \in (2^{\mathcal{R}})^{|\mathcal{I}|}$, VR-protected category $c \in \mathcal{R}$, and VR protection policy $\pi^c \in \Pi^c(\rho)$, we have

$$\mathcal{I}^c(\rho) \subseteq \mathcal{E}^c(\pi^c).$$

¹⁷Since the vector of merit scores $\sigma = (\sigma_i)_{i \in \mathcal{I}}$ is fixed throughout the paper, we suppress the argument of the VR protection policy, and simply denote it as π^c (rather than $\pi^c(\sigma)$). On the other hand, our formal analysis includes exercises which involve changes in category memberships. Thus, throughout the paper, we maintain the profile of category memberships ρ as an argument of the sets $\mathcal{I}^c(\cdot)$ and $\mathcal{I}^g(\cdot)$.

Fix a profile of category memberships $\rho \in (2^{\mathcal{R}})^{|\mathcal{I}|}$ and a VR-protected category $c \in \mathcal{R}$. The following three VR protection policies play prominent roles in our formal analysis.

(a) **The regular VR protection policy $\overline{\pi}^c$:**

Our first VR protection policy is uniquely defined by the relation $\mathcal{E}(\overline{\pi}^c) = \mathcal{I}^c(\rho)$. That is, the VR-protected positions are exclusively set aside for the beneficiaries of category c under the regular VR protection policy, and they cannot be awarded to any other individual.¹⁸ We refer this policy as *regular*, because it is the standard form of the VR protection policy in India. The use of any other VR protection policy is rare in the field, and typically happens due to application-specific policy objectives.

(b) **The soft VR protection policy $\ddot{\pi}^c$:**

Our second VR protection policy is uniquely defined by the following refinements of the second and third properties of a VR protection policy:

(2) For any pair of distinct individuals $i, j \in \mathcal{I} \setminus \mathcal{I}^c(\rho)$,

$$i \ddot{\pi}^c j \ddot{\pi}^c \emptyset \iff \sigma_i > \sigma_j.$$

(3) For any pair of individuals $i \in \mathcal{I}^c(\rho)$ and $j \in \mathcal{I} \setminus \mathcal{I}^c(\rho)$,

$$i \ddot{\pi}^c j.$$

Under the soft VR protection policy for category c , all individuals are eligible for the VR-protected positions (refined property 2); i.e. $\mathcal{E}(\ddot{\pi}^c) = \mathcal{I}$, but beneficiaries of category c gain absolute priority for these positions over individuals who are not members of category c (refined property 3).

(c) **The score-elevated VR protection policy $\widehat{\pi}^c$:**

Given a positive number $k \in \mathbb{R}_+$ (that is interpreted as the amount of a boost for merit scores of the members of category c), our third VR protection policy is uniquely defined by the following refinements of the second and third properties of a VR protection policy:

(2) For any pair of distinct individuals $i, j \in \mathcal{I} \setminus \mathcal{I}^c(\rho)$,

$$i \widehat{\pi}^c j \widehat{\pi}^c \emptyset \iff \sigma_i > \sigma_j.$$

(3) For any pair of individuals $i \in \mathcal{I}^c(\rho)$ and $j \in \mathcal{I} \setminus \mathcal{I}^c(\rho)$,

$$i \widehat{\pi}^c j \iff \sigma_i + k \geq \sigma_j.$$

¹⁸Reservations of this form are sometimes referred to a *hard reserves* in the literature.

Under the score-elevated VR protection policy for category c , all individuals become eligible for the VR-protected positions (refined property 2); i.e. $\mathcal{E}(\hat{\pi}^c) = \mathcal{I}$, but beneficiaries of category c gain a merit score boost of k points for these positions over individuals who are not members of category c (refined property 3).¹⁹

The score-elevated VR protection policy plays an important role in our application presented in Section 4.

Throughout their analysis, Sönmez and Yenmez (2022a) assume that (i) no individual belongs to multiple categories (i.e., VR protections are non-overlapping), and (ii) the VR protection policy is regular at each VR-protected category $c \in \mathcal{R}$.²⁰ One of our main objectives is exploring how potential overlaps among the VR-protected groups along with a broader set of VR protection policies can be utilized to attain various policy objectives in India.

2.2. Horizontal Reservation Policies. By legislation, the primary VR protections have an important property that makes them also the “higher level” affirmative action policy in India. Positions that are earned by the members VR-protected categories without invoking the VR protections do not count against the VR-protected positions. In this sense, VR protections are to be implemented on an “over-and-above” basis.

In addition to the VR-protected categories in $\mathcal{R}$ that are associated with the primary VR protections, there is a finite set $\mathcal{T}$ of (horizontal) **traits** associated with the secondary HR protections. Each individual $i \in \mathcal{I}$ has a (possibly empty) set of traits, denoted by $\tau_i \in 2^{\mathcal{T}}$. Let $\tau = (\tau_i)_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \in (2^{\mathcal{T}})^{|\mathcal{I}|}$ denote the profile of individual traits. Traits represent various forms of societal disadvantages unrelated to caste-based historical discrimination, and individuals with these trait are provided with easier access to positions through a second type of affirmative action policy.

HR protections are provided within each vertical category of positions (including the open category).²¹ For any trait $t \in \mathcal{T}$ and subject to availability of individuals with trait t , a minimum of $q_t^o \in \mathbb{N}$ open-category positions are to be assigned to individuals with trait t . These are referred to as **open-category HR-protected positions for trait t** . Similarly, for any $\rho \in (2^{\mathcal{R}})^{|\mathcal{I}|}$, $c \in \mathcal{R}$, $\pi^c \in \Pi^c(\rho)$, and $t \in \mathcal{T}$, subject to the availability of individuals in

¹⁹Since individuals have distinct merit scores by assumption, there cannot be any ties between any two individuals under the original scores. A boost to a member of category c , however, can result in a tie with a non-member of the category. In that case the tie is broken in favor of the member of category c under the score-elevated VR protection policy.

²⁰As we later present in Section 2.4.1, these assumptions play a key role in their main characterization result and its policy implications in India.

²¹Because of this feature, HR protections are sometimes referred to as *interlocking reservations*.

$\mathcal{E}(\pi^c)$ with trait t , a minimum of $q_t^c \in \mathbb{N}$ category- c positions are to be assigned to individuals in $\mathcal{E}(\pi^c)$ with trait t . These are referred to as **category- c HR-protected positions for trait t** . In contrast to VR protections which are provided on an “over-and-above” basis, HR protections are provided within each vertical category on a “minimum guarantee” basis. This means that positions obtained without invoking any HR protection still accommodate the HR protections.

Let $q = (q^\Sigma, (q^c)_{c \in \mathcal{R}}, (q_t^v)_{(v,t) \in \mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{T}})$ denote the vector that specifies (i) the number of all positions, (ii) the number of all VR-protected positions at each VR-protected category, and (iii) the number of HR-protected positions for each trait and category of positions. We refer to vector q as the **reservation vector**.

Throughout the paper, we fix the profile of individual traits τ and the reservation vector q .

2.2.1. The HR Compliance Function. The following technical construction is useful to formulate a measure of compliance with the HR policy.

Fix a profile of category memberships $\rho \in (2^{\mathcal{R}})^{|\mathcal{I}|}$ and a category $v \in \mathcal{V}$. If $v = o$, then, by assumption $\mathcal{E}^v = \mathcal{I}$. Otherwise, if $v \in \mathcal{R}$, then fix a VR protection policy $\pi^v \in \Pi^v(\rho)$ and let $\mathcal{E}^v = \mathcal{E}^v(\pi^v)$. In either case $\mathcal{E}^v$ is the set of individuals eligible for positions in category v .

Next, define the **category- v HR compliance function** $n^v : 2^{\mathcal{I}} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ as a function that gives the total number of category- v HR-protected positions that are honored across all traits for any subset of individuals $I \subseteq \mathcal{I}$.²² If each individual has at most one trait, the case referred to as **non-overlapping HR protections** in Sönmez and Yenmez (2022a), this function is simply given as follows: For any $I \subseteq \mathcal{I}$,

$$n^v(I) = \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}} \min \left\{ |\{i \in I \cap \mathcal{E}^v : t \in \tau_i\}|, q_t^v \right\}.$$

Observe that, for each trait $t \in \mathcal{T}$, the function $\min \left\{ |\{i \in I \cap \mathcal{E}^v : t \in \tau_i\}|, q_t^v \right\}$ gives the total number category- v and trait- t HR-protected positions that are honored by the set of individuals I , and therefore, when aggregated across all traits the formula gives the total number of HR-protected positions that are honored by I .

If an individual can have multiple traits, the case referred to as **overlapping HR protections** in Sönmez and Yenmez (2022a), then the formulation of HR compliance function depends on a key assumption. If an individual accommodates the minimum guarantees for each of her traits, then the same formulation given above also works for the case of overlapping HR protections, and therefore no adjustment is necessary. Sönmez and Yenmez

²²This function is referred to as the *HR-maximality function* in Sönmez and Yenmez (2022a).

(2022a) refers to this form of “accounting” for HR protections as **one-to-all HR matching**. However, in most field applications in India, the number of positions are announced for each vertical category-horizontal trait pair (including the “nil” trait which indicates the lack of a trait), and therefore an individual can account for the minimum guarantee for at most one horizontal trait. Sönmez and Yenmez (2022a) refers to this form of “accounting” for HR protections as **one-to-one HR matching**. The HR compliance function is slightly more involved for this more prominent accounting norm of HR protections, and it involves a *maximal assignment of individuals to traits*. However, it is straightforward to calculate the maximum number of HR-protected positions that can be accommodated by any set of individuals $I \subseteq \mathcal{I}$ for any category $v \in \mathcal{V}$ through various computationally efficient maximum cardinality matching algorithms in bipartite graphs, thus generalizing the HR compliance function for this version of the problem. This generalization is formally defined in Appendix A. Following Sönmez and Yenmez (2022a) and based on the prominence of this latter form of accounting for HR protections in India, we assume that each individual accommodates the minimum guarantees for at most one of her traits.²³

2.3. Solution Concepts and Primary Axioms. We next present the solution concepts used in our paper, and the primary axioms imposed on them. Throughout this section, fix a profile of category memberships $\rho \in (2^{\mathcal{R}})^{|\mathcal{I}|}$ along with a VR protection policy $\pi^c \in \Pi^c(\rho)$ for each VR-protected category $c \in \mathcal{R}$, and let $\mathcal{E}^c = \mathcal{E}^c(\pi^c)$.

Definition 2. Given a category $v \in \mathcal{V}$, a **single-category choice rule** is a function $C^v(\rho; \cdot) : 2^{\mathcal{I}} \rightarrow 2^{\mathcal{I}}$, such that, for any set of individuals $I \subseteq \mathcal{I}$,

$$C^v(\rho; I) \subseteq I \cap \mathcal{E}^v \quad \text{and} \quad |C^v(\rho; I)| \leq q^v.$$

That is, for any set of individuals, a single-category choice rule selects a subset from those eligible, and up to capacity.

Definition 3. A **choice rule** is a multidimensional function $C(\rho; \cdot) = (C^v(\rho; \cdot))_{v \in \mathcal{V}} : 2^{\mathcal{I}} \rightarrow (2^{\mathcal{I}})^{|\mathcal{V}|}$ such that, for any set of individuals $I \subseteq \mathcal{I}$,

(1) for any category $v \in \mathcal{V}$,

$$C^v(\rho; I) \subseteq I \cap \mathcal{E}^v \quad \text{and} \quad |C^v(\rho; I)| \leq q^v,$$

(2) for any two distinct categories $v, v' \in \mathcal{V}$,

$$C^v(\rho; I) \cap C^{v'}(\rho; I) = \emptyset.$$

²³Indeed, we are unable to find any field application in India where the alternative *one-to-all HR matching* convention is used.

That is, a choice rule is a list of interconnected single-category choice rules for each category of positions, where no individual is selected by more than a single category.

Definition 4. For any choice rule $C(\rho; \cdot) = (C^v(\rho; \cdot))_{v \in \mathcal{V}}$, the resulting **aggregate choice rule** $\hat{C}(\rho; \cdot) : 2^{\mathcal{I}} \rightarrow 2^{\mathcal{I}}$ is given as, for any $I \subseteq \mathcal{I}$,

$$\hat{C}(\rho; I) = \bigcup_{v \in \mathcal{V}} C^v(\rho; I).$$

For any reservation vector, profile of category memberships, and set of individuals, the aggregate choice rule yields the set of chosen individuals across all categories.

As it is discussed in depth in Sönmez and Yenmez (2022a), each of the following four axioms are mandated throughout India with the Supreme Court judgment *Saurav Yadav* (2020).²⁴ Throughout the paper we focus on choice rules that satisfy all four axioms.

Definition 5. A choice rule $C(\rho; \cdot) = (C^v(\rho; \cdot))_{v \in \mathcal{V}}$ satisfies **non-wastefulness** if, for any $I \subseteq \mathcal{I}$, $v \in \mathcal{V}$, and $j \in I$,

$$j \notin \hat{C}(\rho; I) \text{ and } |C^v(\rho; I)| < q^v \implies j \notin \mathcal{E}^v.$$

The first axiom requires no position to remain idle for as long as there is an eligible individual.

Definition 6. A choice rule $C(\rho; \cdot) = (C^v(\rho; \cdot))_{v \in \mathcal{V}}$ satisfies **maximal accommodation of HR protections**, if for any $I \subseteq \mathcal{I}$, $v \in \mathcal{V}$, and $j \in (I \cap \mathcal{E}^v) \setminus \hat{C}(\rho; I)$,

$$n^v(C^v(\rho; I)) = n^v(C^v(\rho; I) \cup \{j\}).$$

The second axiom requires as many HR-protected positions to be honored as possible at each vertical category of positions. When HR-protected groups are non-overlapping, this simply means not ignoring HR protections. When HR protections are overlapping, it also implies a maximal assignment of individuals to HR-protected positions.

Definition 7. A choice rule $C(\rho; \cdot) = (C^v(\rho; \cdot))_{v \in \mathcal{V}}$ satisfies **no justified envy** if, for any $I \subseteq \mathcal{I}$, $v \in \mathcal{V}$, $i \in C^v(\rho; I)$, and $j \in (I \cap \mathcal{E}^v) \setminus \hat{C}(\rho; I)$,

$$i \pi^v j \text{ or } n^v(C^v(\rho; I)) > n^v((C^v(\rho; I) \setminus \{i\}) \cup \{j\}).$$

²⁴Indeed, as it is thoroughly discussed in Sönmez and Yenmez (2022a), the failure of the *no justified envy* axiom under a choice rule that had been mandated in the country between years 1995-2020 resulted countless litigations in the country, and resulted enforcement of this axiom with *Saurav Yadav* (2020). That is, formulation and enforcement of the *no justified envy* axiom is the primary purpose of this important judgment. The judgment, however, also clarified what it means “to deserve an open-category position on the basis of merit” in the presence of HR protections, and also enforced the axiom *compliance with VR protections*.

The third axiom requires no individual to receive a position at any category $v \in \mathcal{V}$ at the expense of another individual who is also eligible for the position, unless she either has higher priority for the position at category v or awarding position to her increases the number of HR-protected positions that are honored at category v .

Definition 8. A choice rule $C(\rho; \cdot) = (C^v(\rho; \cdot))_{v \in \mathcal{V}}$ satisfies **compliance with VR protections** if, for any $I \subseteq \mathcal{I}$, $c \in \mathcal{R}$, and $i \in C^c(\rho; I)$, we have

$$(1) |C^o(\rho; I)| = q^o,$$

$$(2) \text{ for every } j \in C^o(\rho; I),$$

$$j \pi^o i \quad \text{or} \quad n^o(C^o(\rho; I)) > n^o((C^o(\rho; I) \setminus \{j\}) \cup \{i\}), \text{ and}$$

$$(3) n^o(C^o(\rho; I) \cup \{i\}) \not\geq n^o(C^o(\rho; I)).$$

The last axiom requires that, an individual who is “deserving” of an open-category position

- either because she has a sufficiently high merit score, or
- because she helps honor a higher number of open-category HR-protected positions,

should be awarded an open-category position and not a position that is VR-protected.

2.4. Sequential Meritorious Horizontal Choice Rules. In this section we introduce a class of choice rules that plays a key role in our analysis. The core “engine” of this class is the *meritorious horizontal* choice rule, a single-category choice rule originally introduced in Sönmez and Yenmez (2022a).

Throughout this section, we fix a profile $\rho \in (2^{\mathcal{R}})^{|\mathcal{I}|}$ of category memberships. Define

$$\Pi^o = \{\pi^o\} \quad \text{and} \quad \Pi(\rho) = \left(\bigtimes_{c \in \mathcal{R}} \Pi^c(\rho) \right) \times \Pi^o.$$

We also fix a list $\pi = (\pi^v)_{v \in \mathcal{V}} \in \Pi(\rho)$ of priority orders. Here, the priority order π^v is equal to the baseline priority order π^o when $v = o$, and it corresponds to a VR protection policy for category c when $c \in \mathcal{R}$. For each VR-protected category $c \in \mathcal{R}$, let $\mathcal{E}^c = \mathcal{E}(\pi^c)$.

The following auxiliary definition simplifies the formulation of the meritorious horizontal choice rule.

Definition 9. Given a category $v \in \mathcal{V}$ and a set of individuals $I \subseteq \mathcal{E}^v$, an individual $i \in \mathcal{E}^v \setminus I$ **increases the (category- v) HR utilization of I** if

$$n^v(I \cup \{i\}) = n^v(I) + 1.$$

Meritorious horizontal choice rule is defined for a given category $v \in \mathcal{V}$, along with the priority order π^v of individuals for category v .

Given a set of individuals $I \subseteq \mathcal{I}$, the outcome of the meritorious horizontal choice rule $C_{\mathbb{M}}^v(\pi^v, \rho; \cdot)$ is obtained with the following procedure.

(Category- v) Meritorious Horizontal Choice Rule $C_{\mathbb{M}}^v(\pi^v, \rho; \cdot)$

Step 1.0 (Initiation): Let $I_0 = \emptyset$.

Step 1.k ($k \in \{1, \dots, \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}} q_t^v\}$): Assuming such an individual exists, choose the highest π^v -priority individual in $(I \cap \mathcal{E}^v) \setminus I_{k-1}$ who increases the HR utilization of I_{k-1} . Denote this individual by i_k and let $I_k = I_{k-1} \cup \{i_k\}$. If no such individual exists, proceed to Step 2.

Step 2: For unfilled positions, choose highest π^v -priority unassigned individuals in $(I \cap \mathcal{E}^v)$ until either all positions are filled or all eligible individuals are selected.

We are ready to formulate the class of *sequential meritorious horizontal (SMH)* choice rules. Each element of the class has two main parameters. The first parameter is the list $\pi = (\pi^v)_{v \in \mathcal{V}}$ of priority orders, earlier fixed in this section. The second parameter is a linear order $\triangleright$ on the set of categories for positions $\mathcal{V}$ that we refer to as an **order of precedence**.

Let Δ be the set of all orders of precedence, and

- Δ^o be the set of all orders of precedence where the open-category has the highest order of precedence.

For any VR-protected category $c \in \mathcal{R}$, let

- Δ_c^o be the set of all orders of precedence where the open-category has the highest order of precedence and category c has the lowest order of precedence, and
- $\Delta^{o,c}$ be the set of all orders of precedence where the open-category has the highest order of precedence and category c has the second highest order of precedence.

Fix an order of precedence $\triangleright \in \Delta$. Given a set of individuals $I \subseteq \mathcal{I}$, the outcome of the sequential meritorious horizontal choice rule $C_{\mathbb{M}}(\pi, \triangleright, \rho; \cdot)$ is obtained with the following procedure.

SMH Choice Rule $C_{\mathbb{M}}(\pi, \triangleright, \rho; \cdot) = (C_{\mathbb{M}}^v(\pi, \triangleright, \rho; \cdot))_{v \in \mathcal{V}}$

Step 0 (Initiation): Let $I_0 = \emptyset$.

Step k ($k \in \{1, \dots, |\mathcal{V}|\}$): Let v_k be the category which has the k^{th} highest order of precedence under $\triangleright$.

$$C_{\mathbb{M}}^{v_k}(\pi, \triangleright, \rho; I) = C_{\mathbb{M}}^{v_k}(\pi^{v_k}, \rho; (I \setminus I_{k-1}) \cap \mathcal{E}^{v_k})$$

Let $I_k = I_{k-1} \cup C_{\mathbb{M}}^{v_k}(\pi, \triangleright, \rho; I)$.

Under this procedure the meritorious horizontal choice rule is applied sequentially for each vertical category, following their order of precedence under $\triangleright$, and using the priority order π^v for each category $v \in \mathcal{V}$.

2.4.1. Preliminary Results on SMH Choice Rules. The class of SMH choice rules generalizes the *Two-Step Meritorious Horizontal (2SMH)* choice rule $C_{\mathbb{M}}^{2s}(\rho; \cdot) = (C_{\mathbb{M}}^{2s, \nu}(\rho; \cdot))_{\nu \in \mathcal{V}}$ which was introduced in (Sönmez and Yenmez, 2022a) for environments with non-overlapping VR protections. In addition to this restriction on the structure of category memberships, the two parameters $\pi = (\pi^v)_{v \in \mathcal{V}} \in \Pi(\rho)$ and $\triangleright \in \Delta$ are also restricted under the 2SMH choice rule as follows:

- (1) $\pi^c = \bar{\pi}^c$ for each $c \in \mathcal{R}$, and
- (2) $\triangleright \in \Delta^o$ (i.e., the open-category has the highest order of precedence under $\triangleright$).

That is, under the choice rule 2SMH the regular VR protection policy is adopted at each VR-protected category, and the open-category is processed prior to any VR-protected category. Since $\mathcal{E}(\bar{\pi}^c) \cap \mathcal{E}(\bar{\pi}^{c'}) = \emptyset$ for any two distinct VR-protected categories $c, c' \in \mathcal{R}$ when the regular VR protection policy is adopted at each of a non-overlapping set of VR-protected categories, the relative processing sequence of the VR-protected categories becomes immaterial once the open-category is processed first.²⁵

The following characterization is the starting point of our analysis.

Theorem 0 (Sönmez and Yenmez (2022a)). *Fix a profile of category memberships $\rho = (\rho_i)_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \in (2^{\mathcal{R}})^{|\mathcal{I}|}$ such that VR-protected categories are non-overlapping, and suppose that the VR protection policy is regular at each VR-protected category $c \in \mathcal{R}$. Then a choice rule $C(\rho; \cdot)$ satisfies non-wastefulness, maximal accommodation of HR protections, no justified envy, and compliance with VR protections if, and only if $C(\rho; \cdot) = C_{\mathbb{M}}^{2s}(\rho; \cdot)$.*

Since VR-protected categories are currently non-overlapping in India, the legislation in India has airtight implications by Theorem 0 when the VR protection policy is regular at each VR-protected category. Indeed, focusing on a simpler version of problem with non-overlapping HR protections, the 2SMH choice rule was recently endorsed in the country by the Supreme Court judgment *Saurav Yadav (2020)*, and enforced in the state of Gujarat by the high court judgment *Tamannaben Ashokbhai Desai (2020)*.²⁶

²⁵Since (i) the parameter π is uniquely determined by the vector of merit scores σ along with the profile of category memberships ρ , and (ii) the outcome of the 2SMH choice rule is independent of the choice of an order of precedence in Δ^o , the two parameters π and $\triangleright$ are suppressed in $C_{\mathbb{M}}^{2s}(\rho; \cdot)$.

²⁶When HR protections are non-overlapping, Sönmez and Yenmez (2022a) refers to the resulting simpler version of the 2SMH choice rule as the *two-step minimum guarantee (2SMG) choice rule*.

As we thoroughly discussed in the Introduction, however, the current non-overlapping structure of the VR-protected groups may potentially be lost in the country in the near future if the Supreme Court extends eligibility for the EWS reservation to include members of SEBCs.²⁷ Indeed, this has already happened at the state of Maharashtra for allocation of positions at state public offices and educational institutions. Moreover, there are also applications in the country where some non-regular VR protection policies are considered to accommodate various application-specific policy objectives.²⁸ These observations render other elements of the class of SMH choice rules of potential interest.

Our first two preliminary results show that each SMS choice rule satisfies the first three axioms mandated by the Supreme Court, and for as long as open-category has higher order of precedence than any other VR-protected category, it also satisfies the fourth axiom.

Lemma 1. *For any $\rho \in (2^{\mathcal{R}})^{|\mathcal{I}|}$, $\pi \in \Pi(\rho)$, and $\triangleright \in \Delta$, the SMH choice rule $C_{\textcircled{M}}(\pi, \triangleright, \rho; \cdot)$ satisfies non-wastefulness, maximal accommodation of HR protections, and no justified envy.*

Lemma 2. *For any $\rho \in (2^{\mathcal{R}})^{|\mathcal{I}|}$, $\pi \in \Pi(\rho)$, and $\triangleright \in \Delta^o$, the SMH choice rule $C_{\textcircled{M}}(\pi, \triangleright, \rho; \cdot)$ satisfies compliance with VR protections.*

The next preliminary result further shows that, even if non-regular VR policies are adopted at some (or all) of potentially overlapping VR-protected categories, any choice rule that satisfies the Supreme Court's axioms still has to allocate the open-category positions to the same individuals who would have received them under the 2SMH choice rule. Thus, any deviation from the outcome of the 2SMH is due to the assignment of VR-protected positions.²⁹

Lemma 3. *Fix a profile $\rho \in (2^{\mathcal{R}})^{|\mathcal{I}|}$ of category memberships. Let $\pi \in \Pi(\rho)$ and $C(\rho; \cdot) = (C^v(\rho; \cdot))_{v \in \mathcal{V}}$ be any choice rule that satisfies non-wastefulness, maximal accommodation of HR protections, no justified envy, and compliance with VR protections. Then, for any profile of category memberships $\rho' \in (2^{\mathcal{R}})^{|\mathcal{I}|}$ and set of individuals $I \subseteq \mathcal{I}$,*

$$C^o(\rho; I) = C_{\textcircled{M}}^{2s,o}(\rho'; I).$$

In the next two sections, we focus on two special cases of our model. Section 3 is motivated by the ongoing constitutional crisis on EWS reservations, and it is our main application. Section 4 is motivated by an earlier debate on OBC reservations.

²⁷See Section 3 for details.

²⁸See Section 4 for a concrete application.

²⁹While this result is a slightly stronger version of Lemma 10 in Sönmez and Yenmez (2022a) (due to overlapping VR-protected categories and different profiles of category memberships used under the two choice rules), the changes are superfluous and the two proofs are analogous. Hence, we omit the proof of Lemma 3.

3. Main Application: Formulating a Resolution for the Crisis on EWS Reservation

Throughout this section, we maintain the regularity of the VR protection policies, and relax the traditional non-overlapping structure of the VR-protected categories. As already discussed in the Introduction, this version of the model is directly motivated by the recommendation of Dr. Mohan Gopal in the last day of hearings for the ongoing Supreme Court case on the 103rd Amendment.³⁰ While we also support the expansion of the scope of the EWS reservation to SEBCs to help find a resolution for the ongoing crisis on the 103rd Amendment of the Constitution, our recommendation is more nuanced to avoid any potential unintended consequences of this proposed reform.

3.1. History of the VR Protections for the EWS Category. Until recently, VR protections had been exclusive to certain groups that have been subject to marginalization in India due to their caste identities. This norm has changed with the 103rd Amendment of the Constitution of India, which came into effect in the country in January 2019. Under the Constitutional Amendment, the *Economically Weaker Sections* (EWS) of the society are awarded with VR protections for up to 10 percent of the positions in government jobs and seats in higher education on the basis of their financial incapacity. Importantly, the non-overlapping structure of the VR protections is maintained with the Constitutional Amendment, and classes who are eligible for the existing VR protections, i.e. SCs, STs, and OBSs, are excluded from the new provisions. Accordingly, the new VR-protected group is officially identified as “Economically Weaker Section (EWS) in the General category.”

In January 2019, Youth For Equality, an NGO that opposes caste-based policies, challenged the Constitutional Amendment at the Supreme Court of India. Among their objections is the exclusion of members of SCs, STs, and OBCs from the new EWS category, as it violates the fundamental right to equality. Consequently, the present non-overlapping structure of the VR-protected groups in the country is also under dispute with the challenge of the amendment, which has advanced to a five-judge Constitution Bench of the Supreme Court in August 2020. On September 8th, 2022, the Bench announced the following issue as one of the three that will be decided:³¹ “If EWS reservations are invalid for excluding SCs, STs, OBSs, SEBCs from its scope?” Hence, the Bench will decide whether the Constitutional *Right for Equality* is violated for members of SEBCs. Following seven

³⁰See footnote 4 for Dr. Mohan’s compromise proposal, and footnote 5 for the adoption of this policy at the state of Maharashtra.

³¹The other two issues, which can be seen in the Introduction, has no relevance for our analysis.

days of hearings, the arguments from both sides concluded on September 27th, and the Constitution Bench reserved its judgment.³²

3.2. A Proposed Reform: Extended EWS Membership and EWS-last VR Policy. Our analysis and policy recommendation in this section is based on the premise that, exclusion of SEBSs from the scope of EWS reservation indeed results in a violation for the Right to Equality. Starting with this premise, in this section we argue that, a natural resolution for the contested amendment involves a modification of the current choice rule 2SMH by,

- (1) first including all financially disabled members of categories SC, ST and OBC to the set of beneficiaries for the new category EWS, and
- (2) then adopting an SMH choice rule where open-category positions are processed first and the VR-protected positions in the “scope-enlarged” EWS category is processed last.

The first part of our proposed reform directly addresses the (potential) violation of the Right to Equity for SEBCs, and it is the same as Dr. Gopal’s proposal in the last day of the hearings of the ongoing case on EWS reservation. Therefore, through the second part of our proposed reform, we refine Dr. Gopal’s proposal. In order to justify this proposal, we need the following additional analysis.

Let $\hat{\rho} = (\hat{\rho}_i)_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \in (2^{\mathcal{R}})^{|\mathcal{I}|}$ denote the original (i.e. existing) profile of category memberships. Since no individual currently belongs to multiple VR-protected categories currently, $|\hat{\rho}_i| \leq 1$ for each $i \in \mathcal{I}$. Fix a VR-protected category $\tilde{c} \in \mathcal{R}$ (that corresponds to EWS), and a set of individuals $\mathcal{J} \subseteq \bigcup_{c \in \mathcal{R} \setminus \{\tilde{c}\}} \mathcal{I}^c(\hat{\rho}) \subset \mathcal{I}$ whose Right to Equality is violated due to exclusion from the scope of EWS reservation. So, who among individuals in $\mathcal{J}$ can argue that, she is directly affected by this violation, because she lost a position due to her exclusion from category $\tilde{c}$ under the existing profile of category memberships $\hat{\rho}$? An individual $i \in \mathcal{J}$ can make this argument, if she remains unmatched under the membership profile $\hat{\rho}$, although she would have received a position under an alternative scenario where she is granted with a membership of the new category $\tilde{c}$ instead of a membership of her existing category in $\mathcal{R} \setminus \{\tilde{c}\}$. This observation motivates the following two definitions.

Given an individual $j \in \mathcal{J}$, let $\tilde{\rho}_j = \{\tilde{c}\}$.

Definition 10. Given a profile of category memberships $\rho \in (2^{\mathcal{R}})^{|\mathcal{I}|}$, a choice rule $C(\rho; \cdot)$, and a set of individuals $I \subseteq \mathcal{I}$, an individual $j \in \mathcal{J} \cap I$ **suffers from a violation of the**

³²The current status of the case can be found in the following link <https://www.scobserver.in/cases/youth-for-equality-union-of-india-ews-reservation-case-background/>.

Equality Code under $C(\rho; \cdot)$ for I , if

$$j \notin \widehat{C}(\rho; I) \quad \text{and} \quad j \in \widehat{C}((\rho_{-j}, \tilde{\rho}_j); I).$$

Given a profile of category memberships $\rho \in (2^{\mathcal{R}})^{|\mathcal{I}|}$, a choice rule $C(\rho; \cdot)$, and a set of individuals $I \subseteq \mathcal{I}$, a set of individuals $J \subseteq \mathcal{J} \cap I$ **suffer from a violation of the Equality Code** under $C(\rho; \cdot)$ for I , if, for each $j \in J$,

$$j \notin \widehat{C}(\rho; I) \quad \text{and} \quad j \in \widehat{C}((\rho_{-J}, \tilde{\rho}_J); I).$$

Definition 11. Given a profile of category memberships $\rho \in (2^{\mathcal{R}})^{|\mathcal{I}|}$, a choice rule $C(\rho; \cdot)$, and a set of individuals $I \subseteq \mathcal{I}$, the choice rule $C(\rho; \cdot)$ **abides by the Equality Code** for I , if there exists no set of individuals $J \subseteq (\mathcal{J} \cap I)$ who suffer from a violation of the Equality Code under $C(\rho, \cdot)$ for I .

By definition, for any set of individuals $J \subseteq \mathcal{J} \cap I$ who suffer from a violation of the Equality Code under the choice rule $C(\rho; \cdot)$ for I , we have $J \cap \widehat{C}(\rho; I) = \emptyset$.

Observe that, a set of individuals may suffer from a violation of the Equality Code based on Definition 10, and yet some of its members may still not be deserving of a position, because there may be other individuals who also suffer from a violation of the Equality Code despite being even more meritorious. This observation motivates our next definition.

Definition 12. Given a profile of category memberships $\rho \in (2^{\mathcal{R}})^{|\mathcal{I}|}$, a choice rule $C(\rho; \cdot)$, and a set of individuals $I \subseteq \mathcal{I}$, the set of individuals $J \subseteq (\mathcal{J} \cap I) \setminus \widehat{C}(\rho; I)$ is a **maximal set of individuals who suffer from a violation of the Equality Code** under $C(\rho; \cdot)$ for I , if,

- (1) the set of individuals J suffer from a violation of the Equality Code under $C(\rho; \cdot)$ for I , and
- (2) for any set of individuals $J' \subseteq (\mathcal{J} \cap I) \setminus \widehat{C}(\rho; I)$ with $J \subsetneq J'$,
 - (a) J' does not suffer from a violation of the Equality Code under $C(\rho; \cdot)$ for I , and
 - (b) $J \subseteq \widehat{C}((\rho_{-J'}, \tilde{\rho}_{J'}); I)$.

Lemma 4. Fix the profile of category memberships as $\hat{\rho}$. For any set of individuals $I \subseteq \mathcal{I}$, the maximal set of individuals who suffer from a violation of the Equality Code under the choice rule $C_{\text{MS}}^{2s}(\hat{\rho}; \cdot)$ for I is uniquely defined.

Lemma 4 says that, the uniquely defined maximal set of individuals who suffer from a violation of the Equality Code under 2SMH for I are exactly the same set of individuals who can all argue that they lost a position because the government's EWS reform has denied them eligibility for the new category.

We are ready to formulate an SMH choice rule that not only abides by the Equality Code, but it is also a minimal deviation from the existing system in a certain sense.

Let $\rho^* = (\rho_i^*)_{i \in \mathcal{I}}$ be such that,

- (1) $\rho_i^* = \rho_i \cup \{\tilde{c}\}$ for any $i \in \mathcal{J}$, and
- (2) $\rho_i^* = \rho_i$ for any $i \in \mathcal{I} \setminus \mathcal{J}$.

Compared to the profile of category memberships ρ , our proposed profile of category memberships ρ^* grants each member of set $\mathcal{J}$ an extra membership of category $\tilde{c}$. Since each of these individuals are already member of a caste-based VR-protected category, the structure of category memberships in our proposal results in overlapping VR protections. Moreover, it also means that, the choice rule 2SMH is no longer well defined. Therefore, instead, we propose an SMH choice rule where the VR protection policies are still regular, and the order of precedence is such that the open-category is processed first and the “scope-extended” VR-protected category $\tilde{c}$ the last.

Note that, the first part of our proposal that involves an increase in the scope of EWS category is parallel to the proposal of Dr. Mohan Gopal that was brought to the Constitution Bench during the last day of hearings for the pending case. We refine this proposal by also advocating for processing the scope-extended EWS category after all other categories. We refer to this second (and more subtle) aspect of our proposed reform as **EWS-last VR policy**.

We next present, why our proposal captures a plausible “compromise” for the contested amendment.

Let $\bar{\pi} = (\pi^0, (\bar{\pi}^c)_{c \in \mathcal{R}}) \in \Pi(\rho^*)$ denote the regular VR protection policy for the amended profile of category memberships ρ^* , and let $\succeq \in \Delta_{\tilde{c}}^0$, i.e., the order of precedence $\succeq$ orders the open category first and category $\tilde{c}$ last. As an alternative choice rule that abides by the Equality Code through a “minimal interference” with the existing system, we propose an SMH that is induced by the amended category membership profile ρ^* along with the parameters $(\bar{\pi}, \succeq)$.³³ Note that, under our proposed reform, we maintain the regularity of the VR protection policies, but amend the profile of category memberships as ρ^* and pick an order of precedence in $\Delta_{\tilde{c}}^0$.

Our proposed rule not only satisfies the mandates of the Supreme Court in *Saurav Yadav (2020)*, but it also abides by the Equality Code.

Proposition 1. *Fix the profile of category memberships as ρ^* , the profile of VR protection policies to be regular as $\bar{\pi}$, and the order of precedence as $\succeq \in \Delta_{\tilde{c}}^0$. Then, for any set of individuals*

³³Here, the outcome of our proposed choice rule is independent of which order of precedence is picked from $\Delta_{\tilde{c}}^0$, and therefore our proposal corresponds to a unique choice rule.

$I \subseteq \mathcal{I}$, the choice rule $C_{\mathbb{M}}(\bar{\pi}, \succeq, \rho^*; \cdot)$ abides by the Equality Code for I , and it satisfies non-wastefulness, maximal accommodation of HR protections, no justified envy, and compliance with VR protections.

We are ready to present the main result of this section.

Theorem 1. *Consider any set of individuals $I \subseteq \mathcal{I}$. Then, the set of individuals*

$$\widehat{C}_{\mathbb{M}}(\bar{\pi}, \succeq, \rho^*; I) \setminus \widehat{C}_{\mathbb{M}}^{2s}(\hat{\rho}; I)$$

is equal to the maximal set of individuals who suffer from a violation of the Equality Code under the choice rule $C_{\mathbb{M}}^{2s}(\hat{\rho}; \cdot)$ for I .

Corollary 1. *Consider any set of individuals $I \subseteq \mathcal{I}$. Then, we have*

$$C_{\mathbb{M}}(\bar{\pi}, \succeq, \rho^*; I) = C_{\mathbb{M}}^{2s}(\hat{\rho}; I)$$

if and only if the choice rule $C_{\mathbb{M}}^{2s}(\hat{\rho}; \cdot)$ abides by the Equality Code for I .

Theorem 1 shows that the outcome of our proposed SMH choice rule $C_{\mathbb{M}}(\bar{\pi}, \succeq, \rho^*; \cdot)$ differs from the outcome of the existing rule $C_{\mathbb{M}}^{2s}(\hat{\rho}; \cdot)$ only if the latter involves a violation of the Equality Code, and when its outcome differs from the existing rule, it does so by merely replacing the beneficiaries of this oversight with those who suffer from the violation of the Equality Code. In that sense our proposed reform can be considered one that “minimally interferes” with the existing system.

3.2.1. Conditional Membership for the New Members Under the EWS-last VR Policy. It is worthwhile to highlight the important role the specific order of precedence $\succeq \in \Delta_{\tilde{c}}^o$ plays in our proposed reform. Under this order of precedence,

- (1) positions in the open-category are allocated prior to positions in any other category (as it is mandated under under *Saurav Yadav (2020)*),
- (2) but more critically, the positions in category $\tilde{c}$ are processed after the positions in all other categories.

This selection has a key implication on the scope of benefits the extra category- $\tilde{c}$ membership given to members of the set $\mathcal{J} \subseteq \bigcup_{c \in \mathcal{R} \setminus \{\tilde{c}\}} \mathcal{I}^c(\hat{\rho})$ under our proposed profile of category memberships ρ^* . More specifically, the potential benefits of this new membership becomes largely diminished for individuals in $\mathcal{J}$ under the order of precedence $\succeq$, and the benefits kick in only if there would be a violation of the Equality Code in the absence of their category- $\tilde{c}$ membership.³⁴ That is because, since positions at all other categories are already allocated prior to allocation of positions in category $\tilde{c}$ under the order

³⁴In contrast, the potential benefits would always fully kick in under an alternative order of precedence $\triangleright \in \Delta^{o, \tilde{c}}$, where category $\tilde{c}$ positions are allocated immediately after the open-category positions.

of precedence $\succeq$, relatively the lower merit-score members of other VR-protected categories remain in competition for allocation of category- $\tilde{c}$ positions. And if there wouldn't be any violation of the Equality Code in the absence of the extra memberships provided under ρ^* , then all these positions are awarded to existing members of category $\tilde{c}$ under $\tilde{\rho}$. Therefore, the extra membership provided to members of set $\mathcal{J}$ under our proposed reform can be interpreted as a “conditional membership” which only kicks in when it is absolutely necessary to avoid a violation of the Equity Code. This important observation is also the main driving force behind Theorem 1.

3.2.2. Legislative Loophole under a Reform Which Only Extends the Scope of EWS Category. So what happens if justices resolve the ongoing crisis by merely increasing the scope of EWS reservation to include SEBCs, but without interfering with the processing sequence of the EWS positions in relation to other VR-protected positions? We view this possibility as a likely but undesirable scenario, for it will introduce a major loophole in the system. On the one hand, through the EWS-last VR policy, the scope-extended EWS reservation could be implemented as a protective policy that essentially provides its benefits to financially disabled individuals who are unable to receive a position due to merit or other caste-based VR protections. On the other hand, through the EWS-first policy, the scope-extended EWS reservation could be implemented in a way that extends the “over-and-above” implementation aspect of the caste-based VR protections from open category only to both open category and EWS category. As we discussed in Section 1.2, the latter version largely correspond to a de facto elimination EWS reservation altogether, when it is implemented with the current lax income criteria for EWS eligibility. Thus, unless such a major “flexibility” in implementation of EWS reservation is deemed desirable by the Constitution Bench, the potential for unintended consequences is significant with a mere expansion of the scope of EWS category.

4. Application: Supreme Court Directive on Maintaining Standards of Excellence at Educational Institutions

In Section 3, we maintained the regularity of the VR protection policies, and relaxed the traditional non-overlapping structure of the VR-protected categories. Throughout this section, in contrast, we maintain the traditional non-overlapping structure of the VR-protected categories, and instead relax the regularity of the VR protection policy for one of the VR-protected categories.

Members of OBC in India have been granted with VR protections in two phases, first for government positions with the Supreme Court judgment *Indra Sawhney* (1992), and subsequently for seats at institutes of higher education with another judgment of the same

court in *Ashoka Kumar Thakur (2008)*. While the VR protection policy for OBC was explicitly formulated as regular in the first phase, the justices outlined a completely different VR protection policy for OBC for allocation of seats at institutes of higher education in the second phase, making this case a perfect application of our analysis.

The justices ruled the following directive in the conclusion of *Ashoka Kumar Thakur (2008)*:

11. Would it be reasonable to balance OBC reservation with societal interests by instituting OBC cut-off marks that are slightly lower than that of the general category?

It is reasonable to balance reservation with other societal interests. To maintain standards of excellence, cut off marks for OBCs should be set not more than 10 marks out of 100 below that of the general category.

Together with the below more detailed description given in paragraphs 277 and 278 of the judgment, we interpret the intended VR protection policy for OBC as one that merely gives an advantage of 10 points to members of OBC, but otherwise keeps everyone eligible for the VR-protected positions for this category.

277. Balaji thus serves as an example in which this Court sought to ensure that reservation would remain reasonable. We heed this example. There should be no case in which the gap of cut off marks between OBC and general category students is too large. To preclude such a situation, cut off marks for OBCs should be set no lower than 10 marks below the general category.

278. To this end, the Government shall set up a committee to look into the question of setting the OBC cut off at not more than 10 marks below that of the general category. Under such a scheme, whenever the non-creamy layer OBCs fail to fill the 27% reservation, the remaining seats would revert to general category students.

Finally, the same judgment further ruled that the VR protection policy for the original target groups, i.e. for SC and ST, has to remain regular.

Limitations of the regular VR protection policy for category OBC for certain field applications was first brought to light in Aygün and Turhan (2022) in the context of allocation of seats at elite engineering colleges in India, where the authors presented the judgment *Ashoka Kumar Thakur (2008)* as supporting evidence. The authors propose to accommodate the above-given directives of the Supreme Court by (i) adopting a soft VR protection policy (introduced in Section 2.1.1) for OBC, and (ii) processing the OBC category prior to all other VR-protected categories. Since replacing the regular VR protection policy with

the soft VR protection policy for OBC affects the outcome only when there isn't a sufficient number of applicants (regardless of the merit scores of existing OBC applicants), the choice rule proposed by Aygün and Turhan (2022) fails to accommodate the above-given directive of the Supreme Court. Moreover, as we present in Theorem 2, the order of precedence for the OBC proposed by Aygün and Turhan (2022) also does not serve the stated objective of the Supreme Court in maintaining standards of excellence. As a result, we advocate for a completely different choice rule. In order to compare and contrast our proposed choice rule with the one proposed in Aygün and Turhan (2022), we follow this paper and assume away the secondary HR protections in the rest of this section.

Fortunately it is straightforward to accommodate the above-given directive of *Ashoka Kumar Thakur* (2008) by maintaining the regular VR protection policy for SC and ST, and adopting the score-elevated VR protection policy—formulated in Section 2.1.1—for OBC.³⁵ Also, recall that, for any $\rho \in (2^{\mathcal{R}})^{|\mathcal{I}|}$, $\pi \in \Pi(\rho)$, and $\triangleright^o \in \Delta^o$, the SMH choice rule $C_{\otimes}(\pi, \triangleright^o, \rho; \cdot)$ satisfies all four axioms mandated by *Saurav Yadav* (2020) by Lemmata 1 and 2. Therefore, any SMH choice rule $C_{\otimes}(\pi^*, \triangleright^o, \rho; \cdot)$ where

- (1) $\pi^{*OBC} = \hat{\pi}^{OBC}$,
- (2) $\pi^{*c} = \bar{\pi}^c$ for any VR-protected category c other than OBC, and
- (3) $\triangleright^o \in \Delta^o$

satisfies all four axioms mandated by *Saurav Yadav* (2020), as well as the additional directive by *Ashoka Kumar Thakur* (2008).

While this class is already fairly narrow, our next result along with the court's stated policy objective of maintaining standards of excellence further narrow down the list of viable choice rules to a single element of the class of SMH choice rules. We need the following terminology to present our next result.

Definition 13 (Gale (1968)). Let members of two sets of individuals $I = \{i_1, \dots, i_{|I|}\}$, $J = \{j_1, \dots, j_{|J|}\} \subseteq \mathcal{I}$ be each enumerated such that the higher the merit score of an individual

³⁵Our interpretation here relies on an important technical detail. In India the term “general category” is often used synonymously with the term “open category.” This terminology is somewhat misleading, because, unlike the VR-protected positions which are exclusive to its members, the open-category positions are not exclusive to the members of the general category. That is why in our paper we introduce the set $\mathcal{V} = \mathcal{R} \cup \{o\}$ to indicate categories for positions. Since a cutoff mark is a concept that pertains to categories of positions (rather than individuals), we interpret the Supreme Court's directive as one where an upper cap of 10 points is imposed for the difference between the cutoffs for open-category positions and category-OBC positions, and in the event a VR-protected position cannot be awarded to a beneficiary of the group without exceeding the 10 points cap, the position is to be awarded to the highest merit-score unmatched individual *regardless of her category*, thus following the same principle for the open-category positions. Clearly making these positions exclusive to members of the general category is not only inconsistent with the philosophy of affirmative action, but also with the intended directive of maintaining the standards of excellence in educational institutions.

is the lower index number she has. Then, the set of individuals I **Gale dominates** the set of individuals J if,

$$(1) |I| \geq |J|, \text{ and}$$

$$(2) \text{ for each } \ell \in \{1, \dots, |J|\},$$

$$\sigma_{i_\ell} \geq \sigma_{j_\ell}.$$

Assuming there are no HR protections, we are ready to present our final result.

Theorem 2. Fix a profile of non-overlapping VR-protected category memberships $\rho \in (2^{\mathcal{R}})^{|\mathcal{I}|}$, and a VR-protected category $c^* \in \mathcal{R}$. Consider any choice rule $C(\rho; \cdot)$ that satisfies non-wastefulness, no justified envy, and compliance with VR protections. Next, consider the SMH choice rule $C(\pi^*, \succeq, \rho; I)$, where

$$(1) \succeq \in \Delta_{c^*}^0, \text{ and}$$

$$(2) \pi^* \in \Pi(\rho) \text{ is such that}$$

$$(a) \pi^{*c^*} \in \Pi^{c^*}(\rho) \text{ is any VR protection policy for category } c^*, \text{ and}$$

$$(b) \pi^{*c} = \overline{\pi}^c \text{ is the regular VR protection category for any other VR-protected category } c \in \mathcal{R} \setminus \{c^*\}.$$

Then, for any set of individuals $I \subseteq \mathcal{I}$, $\widehat{C}_{\mathbb{M}}(\pi^*, \succeq, \rho; I)$ Gale dominates $\widehat{C}(\rho; I)$.

Theorem 2 has important policy implications in relation to Supreme Court's rulings in *Saurav Yadav (2020)* and *Ashoka Kumar Thakur (2008)*. Regardless of the VR protection policy chosen for OBC and assuming that there are no HR-protected positions,³⁶ for as long as the adopted VR protection policy is regular for any other VR-protected category, of all choice rules that satisfy the Supreme Court's mandates in *Saurav Yadav 2020*, SMH choice rules where

- the open-category is processed first, and
- the OBC category is processed last

always admit the most competitive set of students.³⁷ Note that, this conclusion holds even if the soft VR protection policy advocated for OBC in Aygün and Turhan (2022) is adopted for this category. Thus, together with our earlier observation that the court's directive in *Ashoka Kumar Thakur (2008)* is in line with the adoption of the score-elevated VR protection policy $\widehat{\pi}^{OBC}$ for OBC, Theorem 2 narrow down the set of viable choice rules to essentially a single one (in the sense that the outcomes of all these choice rules are identical); namely the SMH choice rule $C_{\mathbb{M}}(\pi^*, \succeq; \cdot)$ where

³⁶The judgment *Ashoka Kumar Thakur (2008)* assumes away HR protections altogether, and focuses on the higher level VR protections.

³⁷Theorem 2 immediately implies that the outcomes of any two such SMH choice rules are identical.

- (1) $\pi^{*OBC} = \hat{\pi}^{OBC}$,
- (2) $\pi^{*c} = \bar{\pi}^c$ for any VR-protected category c other than OBC, and
- (3) $\succeq \in \Delta_{OBC}^o$.

Therefore, parallel to the formal analysis that supports our policy advice for our main application in Section 3, Theorem 2 corroborates the potentially important role the second parameter of SMH choice rules—the order of precedence—can play to help achieve various policy objectives.

5. Conclusion

India has a constitutionally-protected affirmative action system that involves a very complex set of normative goals and requirements. While Supreme Court and state high court justices in the country have historically done an exemplary job of rigorously formulating these normative principles and providing guidance on their implementation, due to the sheer complexity of the problem, in some cases they failed to identify the collective implications of these principles or how changes in various aspects of the the applications may interfere with them Sönmez and Yenmez (2022a,b). These challenges in turn resulted in inconsistencies between judgments, loopholes in the system, and various unintended consequences. As emphasized in Li (2017),

In addition to studying cause and effect in markets, economists also have a comparative advantage in stating precisely the normatively-relevant properties of complex systems [...]

The primary aim of this paper is taking advantage of this comparative advantage by presenting how an intuitive compromise policy brought recently to the hearings of a major Supreme Court case on a potential repeal of the 103rd Amendment of the Constitution can both

- result in a major loophole in the system if adopted by the court without any additional structure,
- but at the same time can be further refined to a policy that corresponds to a “true compromise.”

Since the compromise policy is adopted at the state of Maharashtra, our findings already have direct and large scale policy implications in India.

References

- Abdulkadiroğlu, Atila**, “College admissions with affirmative action,” *International Journal of Game Theory*, 2005, 33 (4), 535–549.
- Abdulkadiroğlu, Atila and Aram Grigoryan**, “Priority-Based Assignment with Reserves and Quotas,” 2021. Working Paper.
- Abdulkadiroğlu, Atila and Tayfun Sönmez**, “School choice: A mechanism design approach,” *American Economic Review*, June 2003, 93 (3), 729–747.
- Andersson, Tommy**, “Refugee Matching as a Market Design Application,” in Jean-Francois Laslier, Hervé Moulin, M. Remzi Sanver, and William S. Zwicker, eds., *The Future of Economic Design: The Continuing Development of a Field as Envisioned by Its Researchers*, Springer International Publishing Cham 2019, pp. 445–450.
- and **Lars Ehlers**, “Assigning Refugees to Landlords in Sweden: Efficient, Stable, and Maximum Matchings,” *The Scandinavian Journal of Economics*, 2020, 122 (3), 937–965.
- and **Lars-Gunnar Svensson**, “Non-Manipulable House Allocation with Rent Control,” *Econometrica*, 2014, 82 (2), 507–539.
- Aygün, Orhan and Bertan Turhan**, “How to De-Reserve Reserves: Admissions to Technical Colleges in India,” 2022. ArXiv working paper, <https://arxiv.org/abs/2103.05899v5>. Forthcoming in *Management Science*.
- Aygün, Orhan and Inácio Bó**, “College admission with multidimensional privileges: The Brazilian affirmative action case,” *American Economic Journal: Microeconomics*, 2021, 13 (3), 1–28.
- Celebi, Oğuzhan and Joel P. Flynn**, “Priority Design in Centralized Matching Markets,” *The Review of Economic Studies*, 2021, 89 (3), 1245–1277.
- and ———, “Adaptive Priority Mechanisms,” 2022. MIT Working paper.
- Celebi, Oğuzhan**, “Diversity Preferences, Affirmative Action and Choice Rules,” 2022. MIT Working paper.
- Chen, Yan and Onur Kesten**, “Chinese College Admissions and School Choice Reforms: A Theoretical Analysis,” *Journal of Political Economy*, 2017, 125 (1), 99–139.
- Delacrétaz, David, Scott D. Kominers, and Alexander Teytelboym**, “Refugee Resettlement,” 2016. Working Paper.
- Deshpande, Ashwini and Rajesh Ramachandran**, “The 10% Quota Is Caste Still an Indicator of Backwardness?,” *Economic and Political Weekly*, 2019, 54 (13), 27–31.
- Doğan, Battal**, “Responsive affirmative action in school choice,” *Journal of Economic Theory*, 2016, 165, 69–105.
- Dur, Umut, Parag A. Pathak, and Tayfun Sönmez**, “Explicit vs. statistical targeting in

- affirmative action: Theory and evidence from Chicago's exam schools," *Journal of Economic Theory*, 2020, 187, 104996.
- , **Scott D. Kominers**, **Parag A. Pathak**, and **Tayfun Sönmez**, "Reserve Design: Unintended Consequences and the Demise of Boston's Walk Zones," *Journal of Political Economy*, 2018, 126 (6), 2457–2479.
- Echenique, Federico** and **M. Bumin Yenmez**, "How to Control Controlled School Choice," *American Economic Review*, August 2015, 105 (8), 2679–2694.
- Ehlers, Lars** and **Thayer Morrill**, "(Il)legal Assignments in School Choice," *Review of Economic Studies*, 2020, 87 (4), 1837–1875.
- , **Isa E. Hafalir**, **M. Bumin Yenmez**, and **Muhammed A. Yildirim**, "School choice with controlled choice constraints: Hard bounds versus soft bounds," *Journal of Economic Theory*, 2014, 153, 648–683.
- Erdil, Aytek** and **Haluk Ergin**, "What's the Matter with Tie-Breaking? Improving Efficiency in School Choice," *American Economic Review*, June 2008, 98 (3), 669–89.
- and **Toru Kumano**, "Efficiency and stability under substitutable priorities with ties," *Journal of Economic Theory*, 2019, 184, 104950.
- Fragiadakis, Daniel** and **Peter Troyan**, "Improving matching under hard distributional constraints," *Theoretical Economics*, 2017, 12 (2), 863–908.
- Gale, David**, "Optimal assignments in an ordered set: An application of matroid theory," *Journal of Combinatorial Theory*, 1968, 4 (2), 176–180.
- Hafalir, Isa E.**, **M. Bumin Yenmez**, and **Muhammed A. Yildirim**, "Effective affirmative action in school choice," *Theoretical Economics*, May 2013, 8 (2), 325–363.
- Hitzig, Zoë**, "The normative gap: mechanism design and ideal theories of justice," *Economics and Philosophy*, 2020, 36 (3), 407–434.
- Kamada, Yuichiro** and **Fuhito Kojima**, "Efficient Matching under Distributional Constraints: Theory and Applications," *American Economic Review*, 2015, 105 (1), 67–99.
- Kesten, Onur**, "School Choice with Consent*," *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 2010, 125 (3), 1297–1348.
- Kojima, Fuhito**, "School choice: Impossibilities for affirmative action," *Games and Economic Behavior*, 2012, 75 (2), 685–693.
- Kominers, Scott D.** and **Tayfun Sönmez**, "Matching with slot-specific priorities: Theory," *Theoretical Economics*, 2016, 11 (2), 683–710.
- Li, Shengwu**, "Ethics and market design," *Oxford Review of Economic Policy*, 2017, 33 (4), 705–720.

- Pathak, Parag, Alex Rees-Jones, and Tayfun Sönmez**, “Immigration Lottery Design: Engineered and Coincidental Consequences of H-1B Reforms,” 2020. NBER Working Paper 26767. Forthcoming in *Review of Economics and Statistics*.
- , **Tayfun Sönmez, M. Utku Ünver, and M. Bumin Yenmez**, “Fair Allocation of Vaccines, Ventilators and Antiviral Treatments: Leaving No Ethical Value Behind in Health Care Rationing,” 2020. ArXiv working paper, <https://arxiv.org/abs/2008.00374>.
- Pycia, Marek**, “Stability and Preference Alignment in Matching and Coalition Formation,” *Econometrica*, 2012, 80 (1), 323–362.
- Reny, Philip J.**, “Efficient Matching in the School Choice Problem,” *American Economic Review*, June 2022, 112 (6), 2025–43.
- Root, Joseph and David Ahn**, “Incentives and Efficiency in Constrained Allocation Mechanisms,” 2020. Working Paper.
- Sönmez, Tayfun and M. Bumin Yenmez**, “Affirmative Action in India via Vertical, Horizontal, and Overlapping Reservations,” *Econometrica*, 2022, 90 (3), 1143–1176.
- and ———, “Constitutional Implementation of Affirmative Action Policies in India,” 2022. ArXiv working paper, <https://arxiv.org/abs/2203.01483>.

Appendices

Appendix A. Preliminaries

A.1. Matchings and Accommodation of HR Protections. When traits are overlapping, for a category $v \in \mathcal{V}$ we did not formally define in the main text the maximum number of HR-protected positions that can be accommodated. We formalize this concept here and introduce a graph theoretical tool that we use in proving our results.

Fix a profile of category memberships $\rho \in (2^{\mathcal{R}})^{|\mathcal{I}|}$, a list of priority orders $\pi \in \Pi(\rho)$, and a set of agents $I \subseteq \mathcal{I}$ in this subsection. Let $\mathcal{E}^c = \mathcal{E}^c(\pi^c)$ for each VR-protected category $c \in \mathcal{R}$. Define for each $v \in \mathcal{V}$,

$$q_{t_\emptyset}^v = q^v - \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}} q_t^v$$

where $t_\emptyset$ refers to **nil trait**, which we use to denote a position of any category v that is not protected by horizontal reservations.

Definition A.1. A **matching** is a mapping $\mu : I \rightarrow (\mathcal{V} \times (\mathcal{T} \cup \{t_\emptyset\})) \cup \{\emptyset\}$ such that

- for each $i \in I$, $\mu(i) = \emptyset$ or $\mu(i) = (v, t)$ with $i \in \mathcal{E}^v$ and $t \in \tau_i \cup \{t_\emptyset\}$,
- for each $v \in \mathcal{V}$ and $t \in \mathcal{T} \cup \{t_\emptyset\}$, $|\mu^{-1}(v, t)| \leq q_t^v$.

For an individual, $\emptyset$ refers to remaining **unmatched**. Let $\mathcal{M}(I)$ be the set of matchings for I .

Definition A.2. For each $v \in \mathcal{V}$, the maximum number of HR-protected positions that can be accommodated for I is defined as

$$n^v(I) = \max_{\mu \in \mathcal{M}(I)} \left| \{i \in I : \mu(i) \in \{v\} \times \mathcal{T}\} \right|.$$

A.2. Some Properties of the SMH Choice Rule. First, we introduce a property of the choice rules that we will use in our proofs.

Definition A.3. For any $\rho \in (2^{\mathcal{R}})^{|\mathcal{I}|}$, a choice rule $C(\rho; \cdot)$ satisfies **irrelevance of rejected individuals** if, for any $I \subseteq \mathcal{I}$ and $i \in I \setminus \widehat{C}(\rho; I)$,

$$\widehat{C}(\rho; I \setminus \{i\}) = \widehat{C}(\rho; I).$$

Lemma A.1 (Sönmez and Yenmez (2022b)). *For any $\rho \in (2^{\mathcal{R}})^{|\mathcal{I}|}$ and $v \in \mathcal{V}$, the category- v meritorious horizontal choice rule $C_{\oplus}^v(\pi^v, \rho; \cdot)$ satisfies irrelevance of rejected individuals.*

We also explicitly state an implication of Theorem 0 for single-category choice rules that we use in our proofs.

Lemma A.2 (Sönmez and Yenmez (2022a)). *For any $\rho \in (2^{\mathcal{R}})^{|\mathcal{I}|}$, $\pi \in \Pi(\rho)$, and $v \in \mathcal{V}$, a single-category choice rule $C^v(\rho; \cdot)$ maximally accommodates HR protections, satisfies no justified envy, and is non-wasteful if, and only if, $C^v(\rho; \cdot) = C_{\oplus}^v(\pi^v, \rho; \cdot)$.*

Appendix B. Proofs

B.1. Proofs of Preliminary Results in Section 2.4.1.

Proof of Lemma 1. Fix $\rho \in (2^{\mathcal{R}})^{|\mathcal{I}|}$, $\pi = (\pi^v)_{v \in \mathcal{V}} \in \Pi(\rho)$, and $\triangleright \in \Delta$. Let $\mathcal{E}^c = \mathcal{E}^c(\pi^c)$ for each $c \in \mathcal{R}$. Fix also $I \subseteq \mathcal{I}$.

Non-wastefulness: Suppose $v \in \mathcal{V}$ be such that $|C_{\oplus}^v(\pi, \triangleright, \rho; I)| < q^v$, and there exists some $j \in I \setminus \widehat{C}_{\oplus}(\pi, \triangleright, \rho; I)$. Then, just before v is processed in the sequence $\triangleright$, j is still available. Moreover, she does not receive a category- v position. Thus, even though in Step 2 of the procedure of $C_{\oplus}^v(\pi^v, \rho; \cdot)$ leaves some vacant jobs in category v , j does not receive a position. Thus, $j \notin \mathcal{E}^v$. Since by definition

$$C_{\oplus}^v(\pi, \triangleright, \rho; I) = C_{\oplus}^v(\pi^v, \rho; I \setminus \bigcup_{v \in \mathcal{V}: v \triangleleft \triangleright} C_{\oplus}^v(\pi, \triangleright, \rho; I)) \quad (1)$$

and the argument in previous sentence is true for each category v , the SMH choice rule is non-wasteful.

Maximal accommodation of HR protections: Suppose $v \in \mathcal{V}$ and $j \in (I \cap \mathcal{E}^v) \setminus \hat{C}_{\mathbb{M}}(\pi, \triangleright, \rho; I)$. In processing the sequence $\triangleright$ in executing the SMH choice rule for I , j was available before category v was processed and remains available after it was processed although $j \in \mathcal{E}^v$. Thus, as $C_{\mathbb{M}}^v(\pi^v, \rho; \cdot)$ is maximal for accommodation of HR protections for category v by Lemma A.2 and Eq. (1) holds by definition, we have $n^v(C_{\mathbb{M}}^v(\pi, \triangleright, \rho; I)) = n^v(C_{\mathbb{M}}^v(\pi, \triangleright, \rho; I) \cup \{j\})$. Thus, the SMH choice rule maximally accommodates HR protections.

No justified envy: Suppose $v \in \mathcal{V}$ and $i \in C_{\mathbb{M}}^v(\pi, \triangleright, \rho; I)$ and $j \in (I \cap \mathcal{E}^v) \setminus \hat{C}_{\mathbb{M}}(\pi, \triangleright, \rho; I)$ such that $j \pi^v i$. By Lemma A.2, as $C_{\mathbb{M}}^v(\pi^v, \cdot)$ satisfies no justified envy we have

$$n^v(C_{\mathbb{M}}^v(\pi^v, \rho; J)) > n^v((C_{\mathbb{M}}^v(\pi^v, \rho; J) \setminus \{i\}) \cup \{j\})$$

where $J = I \setminus \bigcup_{v \in \mathcal{V}: v \triangleleft v} C_{\mathbb{M}}^v(\pi, \triangleright, \rho; I)$. Since $C_{\mathbb{M}}^v(\pi, \triangleright, \rho; I) = C_{\mathbb{M}}^v(\pi^v, \rho; J)$ (see Eq. (1)), the SMH choice rule satisfies no justified envy. ■

Proof of Lemma 2. Fix $\rho \in (2^{\mathcal{R}})^{|\mathcal{I}|}$, $\pi = (\pi^v)_{v \in \mathcal{V}} \in \Pi(\rho)$, and $\triangleright \in \Delta^o$. Suppose $I \subseteq \mathcal{I}$, $c \in \mathcal{R}$, and $i \in C_{\mathbb{M}}^c(\pi, \triangleright, \rho; I)$. In executing the procedure of the SMH choice rule according to $\triangleright$, the open category is processed first and individual i is still available when the VR-protected category c is about to be processed. Thus, it should be the case that $|C_{\mathbb{M}}^o(\pi, \triangleright, \rho; I)| = q^o$, as otherwise i would have received a category- o position instead of a category- c position. Moreover, $C(\rho; \cdot)$ satisfies justified no envy by Lemma 1, implying that for every $j \in C_{\mathbb{M}}^o(\pi, \triangleright, \rho; I)$, $j \pi^o i$ or $n^o(C_{\mathbb{M}}^o(\pi, \triangleright, \rho; I)) > n^o((C_{\mathbb{M}}^o(\pi, \triangleright, \rho; I) \setminus \{j\}) \cup \{i\})$. Since $C_{\mathbb{M}}^o(\pi, \triangleright, \rho; I) = C_{\mathbb{M}}^o(\pi^o, \rho; I)$ by definition, $C_{\mathbb{M}}^o(\pi^o, \rho; \cdot)$ maximally accommodates HR protections for the open category by Lemma A.2, and $i \notin C^o(\rho; I)$, we have

$$n^o(C_{\mathbb{M}}^o(\pi, \triangleright, \rho; I) \cup \{i\}) \not> n^o(C_{\mathbb{M}}^o(\pi, \triangleright, \rho; I)).$$

These show that the SMH choice rule satisfies compliance with VR protections. ■

B.2. Proofs of Results in Section 3.

Consider the category of memberships $\hat{\rho} = (\hat{\rho}_i)_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \in (2^{\mathcal{R}})^{|\mathcal{I}|}$ with $|\hat{\rho}_i| \leq 1$ for each $i \in \mathcal{I}$ so that the VR-protected categories are non-overlapping. Recall that $\mathcal{J} \subseteq \bigcup_{c \in \mathcal{R} \setminus \{\tilde{c}\}} \mathcal{I}^c(\hat{\rho})$ and $\tilde{\rho}_i = \{\tilde{c}\}$ for each $i \in \mathcal{J}$.

We state and prove a more detailed version of Lemma 4 as we use this new lemma also in the proof of Theorem 1.

Lemma B.3. Fix $I \subseteq \mathcal{I}$. Define $\bar{J}$ as

$$\bar{J} = (\mathcal{J} \cap I) \setminus \widehat{C}_{\mathbb{M}}^{2s}(\rho; I). \quad (2)$$

and J as

$$J = \widehat{C}_{\mathbb{M}}^{2s}((\rho_{-\bar{J}}, \tilde{\rho}_{\bar{J}}); I) \setminus \widehat{C}_{\mathbb{M}}^{2s}(\rho; I). \quad (3)$$

Then, J is the unique maximal set of individuals who suffer from a violation of the Equality Code under the choice rule $C_{\mathbb{M}}^{2s}(\rho; \cdot)$ for I .

Proof of Lemma B.3. First observe that Lemma 3 implies for any $K \subseteq \mathcal{J}$,

$$C_{\mathbb{M}}^{2s,o}((\rho_{-K}, \tilde{\rho}_K), I) = C_{\mathbb{M}}^{2s,o}(\rho; I). \quad (4)$$

Then, by the definition of the procedure of the 2SMH choice rule and non-overlapping nature of VR-protected categories at ρ and $(\rho_{-K}, \tilde{\rho}_K)$ that only differ in the memberships of individuals in K for any fixed $K \subseteq (\mathcal{J} \cap I) \setminus \widehat{C}_{\mathbb{M}}^{2s}(\rho; I)$, we have

$$C_{\mathbb{M}}^{2s,c}((\rho_{-K}, \tilde{\rho}_K), I) = C_{\mathbb{M}}^{2s,c}(\rho; I) \quad \text{for each } c \in \mathcal{R} \setminus \{\tilde{c}\}. \quad (5)$$

As (i) single-category meritorious horizontal rule used in the definition of the 2SMH choice rule satisfies irrelevance of rejected individuals by Lemma A.1 and (ii) category $\tilde{c}$ is processed after the open category

$$\begin{aligned} C_{\mathbb{M}}^{2s,\tilde{c}}((\rho_{-K}, \tilde{\rho}_K), I) &= C_{\mathbb{M}}^{\tilde{c}}(\bar{\pi}^{\tilde{c}}, (\rho_{-K}, \tilde{\rho}_K); I \setminus C_{\mathbb{M}}^{2s,o}(\rho; I)) \\ &= C_{\mathbb{M}}^{\tilde{c}}(\bar{\pi}^{\tilde{c}}, (\rho_{-K}, \tilde{\rho}_K); K \cup \tilde{J}) \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

where we define

$$\tilde{J} = \mathcal{I}^{\tilde{c}}(\rho) \cap (I \setminus C_{\mathbb{M}}^{2s,o}(\rho; I)).$$

Here, $\tilde{J}$ is the set of original members of the VR-protected category $\tilde{c}$ in I who do not receive an open category position (i.e., not matched under 2SMH choice rule in Step 1 of its procedure). Thus, Eq. (6) holds as members of sets K and $\tilde{J}$ are the only individuals who are eligible to be chosen under category $\tilde{c}$ in Step 2 of the procedure of the 2SMH choice rule just before $\tilde{c}$ is processed. Eqs. (4), (5), and (6) imply

$$\widehat{C}_{\mathbb{M}}^{2s}((\rho_{-K}, \tilde{\rho}_K); I) \setminus \widehat{C}_{\mathbb{M}}^{2s}(\rho; I) = C_{\mathbb{M}}^{\tilde{c}}(\bar{\pi}^{\tilde{c}}, (\rho_{-K}, \tilde{\rho}_K); K \cup \tilde{J}) \setminus C_{\mathbb{M}}^{\tilde{c}}(\bar{\pi}^{\tilde{c}}, (\rho_{-K}, \tilde{\rho}_K); \tilde{J}). \quad (7)$$

Therefore, by definition of J in Eq. (3) and by Eq. (7) by setting $K = \bar{J}$, we obtain J is also equal to

$$J = C_{\mathbb{M}}^{\tilde{c}}(\bar{\pi}^{\tilde{c}}, (\rho_{-\bar{J}}, \tilde{\rho}_{\bar{J}}); \bar{J} \cup \tilde{J}) \setminus C_{\mathbb{M}}^{\tilde{c}}(\bar{\pi}^{\tilde{c}}, \rho; \tilde{J}). \quad (8)$$

Since the single-category meritorious horizontal choice rule satisfies irrelevance of rejected individuals by Lemma A.1 and $\bar{J} \setminus J$ is a subset of individuals who do not receive any position at membership profile $(\hat{\rho}_{-\bar{J}}, \tilde{\rho}_{\bar{J}})$ (by definitions in Eqs. (2) and (3)), making these individuals ineligible for category $\tilde{c}$ will not change the choice for this category, i.e., $C_{\mathbb{M}}^{\tilde{c}}(\bar{\pi}^{\tilde{c}}, (\hat{\rho}_{-J}, \tilde{\rho}_J); J \cup \bar{J}) = C_{\mathbb{M}}^{\tilde{c}}(\bar{\pi}^{\tilde{c}}, (\hat{\rho}_{-\bar{J}}, \tilde{\rho}_{\bar{J}}); \bar{J} \cup \bar{J})$. Hence, Eq. (8) implies that

$$\begin{aligned} J &= C_{\mathbb{M}}^{\tilde{c}}(\bar{\pi}^{\tilde{c}}, (\hat{\rho}_{-J}, \tilde{\rho}_J); J \cup \bar{J}) \setminus C_{\mathbb{M}}^{\tilde{c}}(\bar{\pi}^{\tilde{c}}, \hat{\rho}; \bar{J}) \\ &= \widehat{C}_{\mathbb{M}}^{2s}((\hat{\rho}_{-J}, \tilde{\rho}_J); I) \setminus \widehat{C}_{\mathbb{M}}^{2s}(\hat{\rho}; I), \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality follows from Eq. (7). Thus, J is a set of individuals that suffer from a violation of the Equality Code. Moreover, irrelevance of rejected individuals also implies that for any $J' \subseteq (\mathcal{J} \cap I) \setminus \widehat{C}_{\mathbb{M}}^{2s}(\hat{\rho}; I)$ such that $J \subsetneq J'$, by Eqs. (7) and (8) we similarly have

$$J = \widehat{C}_{\mathbb{M}}^{2s}((\hat{\rho}_{-J'}, \tilde{\rho}_{J'}); I) \setminus \widehat{C}_{\mathbb{M}}^{2s}(\hat{\rho}; I) \subsetneq J';$$

thus, there exists some $i \in J'$ such that $i \notin \widehat{C}_{\mathbb{M}}^{2s}((\hat{\rho}_{-J'}, \tilde{\rho}_{J'}); I)$, so J' is not a set of individuals that suffer from a violation of the Equality Code, and moreover, $J \subseteq \widehat{C}_{\mathbb{M}}^{2s}((\hat{\rho}_{-J'}, \tilde{\rho}_{J'}); I)$. These two establish that J is a maximal set of individuals who suffer from a violation of the Equality Code.

Finally, we prove its uniqueness. Since $\bar{J}$ is a superset of any $J'' \neq J$ such that $J'' \subseteq \mathcal{J} \cap I$ is a set of individuals who suffer from a violation of the Equality Code, Eq. (3) implies that J'' cannot be maximal, as there exists some $i \in J''$ such that $i \notin \widehat{C}_{\mathbb{M}}^{2s}((\hat{\rho}_{-\bar{J}}, \tilde{\rho}_{\bar{J}}); I)$. Therefore, this establishes that J is the unique maximal set of individuals who suffer from a violation of the Equality Code under $C_{\mathbb{M}}^{2s}(\hat{\rho}; \cdot)$ for I . ■

Proof of Lemma 4. It directly follows from Lemma B.3. ■

Recall that $\rho_i^* = \hat{\rho}_i \cup \{\tilde{c}\}$ for each $i \in \mathcal{J}$ and $\rho_i^* = \hat{\rho}_i$ for each $i \in \mathcal{I} \setminus \mathcal{J}$. Consider the order of precedence $\succeq$ that orders category o first and category $\tilde{c}$ last. Also consider the regular VR protection policy $\bar{\pi} = (\pi^o, (\bar{\pi}^c)_{c \in \mathcal{R}})$ for ρ^* .

Proof of Proposition 1. Fix a set of individuals $I \subseteq \mathcal{I}$. Lemma 1 implies that $C_{\mathbb{M}}(\bar{\pi}, \succeq, \rho^*; \cdot)$ satisfies non-wastefulness, no justified envy, and maximal accommodation of HR protections. Lemma 2 implies that $C_{\mathbb{M}}(\bar{\pi}, \succeq, \rho^*; \cdot)$ satisfies compliance with VR protections.

Fix $J \subseteq \mathcal{J} \cap I$. We show that J is not a set of individuals that suffer from a violation of the Equality Code under $C_{\mathbb{M}}(\bar{\pi}, \succeq, \rho^*; \cdot)$. If there exists some $i \in J \cap \widehat{C}_{\mathbb{M}}(\bar{\pi}, \succeq, \rho^*; I)$ then

we are done. So assume that $J \cap \widehat{C}_{\mathbb{M}}(\bar{\pi}, \underline{\triangleright}, \rho^*; I) = \emptyset$. We use induction in our proof to show that $\widehat{C}_{\mathbb{M}}(\bar{\pi}, \underline{\triangleright}, (\rho_{-J}^*, \tilde{\rho}_J); I) = \widehat{C}_{\mathbb{M}}(\bar{\pi}, \underline{\triangleright}, \rho^*; I)$.

Suppose that as the inductive assumption, for any $J' \subsetneq J$ with $|J'| \leq k$ for a fixed k with $|J| > k \geq 0$ we have $\widehat{C}_{\mathbb{M}}(\bar{\pi}, \underline{\triangleright}, (\rho_{-J'}^*, \tilde{\rho}_{J'}); I) = \widehat{C}_{\mathbb{M}}(\bar{\pi}, \underline{\triangleright}, \rho^*; I)$. (For $k = 0$, we have $J' = \emptyset$ in the initial step, and the inductive assumption is vacuously proven for this step.) We prove this statement for $k + 1$.

Let $J' \subsetneq J$ be such that $|J'| = k$ and let $i \in J \setminus J'$. We prove the statement holds for $J' \cup \{i\}$. When it is turn of category $\tilde{c}$ to be processed in Step 2 of the procedure of the SMH choice rule at both $(\rho_{-J' \cup \{i\}}^*, \tilde{\rho}_{J' \cup \{i\}})$ and $(\rho_{-J'}^*, \tilde{\rho}_{J'})$, as i is not selected yet, the same set of individuals are selected until that point at both cases, as only i 's category membership is different at both profiles. Moreover, as i is not selected at $(\rho_{-J'}^*, \tilde{\rho}_{J'})$ by the inductive assumption, she will not receive a position at $(\rho_{-J' \cup \{i\}}^*, \tilde{\rho}_{J' \cup \{i\}})$, either, as $\tilde{\rho}_i \subseteq \rho_i^*$. Thus, $i \notin \widehat{C}_{\mathbb{M}}(\bar{\pi}, \underline{\triangleright}, (\rho_{-J' \cup \{i\}}^*, \tilde{\rho}_{J' \cup \{i\}}); I)$, and moreover, $\widehat{C}_{\mathbb{M}}(\bar{\pi}, \underline{\triangleright}, (\rho_{-J'}^*, \tilde{\rho}_{J'}); I) = \widehat{C}_{\mathbb{M}}(\bar{\pi}, \underline{\triangleright}, (\rho_{-J' \cup \{i\}}^*, \tilde{\rho}_{J' \cup \{i\}}); I)$ completing the inductive step's proof.

We showed that $\widehat{C}_{\mathbb{M}}(\bar{\pi}, \underline{\triangleright}, (\rho_J^*, \tilde{\rho}_J); I) = \widehat{C}_{\mathbb{M}}(\bar{\pi}, \underline{\triangleright}, \rho^*; I)$ proving that $J \not\subseteq \widehat{C}_{\mathbb{M}}(\bar{\pi}, \underline{\triangleright}, (\rho_J^*, \tilde{\rho}_J); I)$, and hence, J is not a set of individuals who suffer from a violation of the Equality Code. This proves that $C_{\mathbb{M}}(\bar{\pi}, \underline{\triangleright}, \rho^*; \cdot)$ abides by the Equality Code for I . ■

Proof of Theorem 1. Fix a set of individuals $I \subseteq \mathcal{I}$. Define

$$J = \widehat{C}_{\mathbb{M}}(\bar{\pi}, \underline{\triangleright}, \rho^*; I) \setminus \widehat{C}_{\mathbb{M}}^{2s}(\hat{\rho}; I).$$

We prove below in Claim B.1

$$\widehat{C}_{\mathbb{M}}(\bar{\pi}, \underline{\triangleright}, \rho^*; I) = \widehat{C}_{\mathbb{M}}^{2s}((\hat{\rho}_{-\bar{J}}, \tilde{\rho}_{\bar{J}}); I),$$

where

$$\bar{J} = (\mathcal{J} \cap I) \setminus \widehat{C}_{\mathbb{M}}^{2s}(\hat{\rho}; I),$$

so that the rest of the proof follows from Lemma B.3.

Claim B.1. $\widehat{C}_{\mathbb{M}}(\bar{\pi}, \underline{\triangleright}, \rho^*; I) = \widehat{C}_{\mathbb{M}}^{2s}((\hat{\rho}_{-\bar{J}}, \tilde{\rho}_{\bar{J}}); I)$.

Proof of Claim B.1. Let

$$\rho' = (\hat{\rho}_{-\bar{J}}, \tilde{\rho}_{\bar{J}}).$$

Observe that for individuals in I , we have

- (1) for each $i \in \mathcal{J} \cap \widehat{C}_{\mathbb{M}}^{2s}(\hat{\rho}; I)$, $\rho_i^* = \hat{\rho}_i \cup \{\tilde{c}\}$ & $\rho'_i = \hat{\rho}_i$,
- (2) for each $i \in (\mathcal{J} \cap I) \setminus \widehat{C}_{\mathbb{M}}^{2s}(\hat{\rho}; I)$, $\rho_i^* = \hat{\rho}_i \cup \{\tilde{c}\}$ & $\rho'_i = \{\tilde{c}\}$,

$$(3) \text{ for each } i \in I \setminus \mathcal{J}, \quad \rho_i^* = \dot{\rho}_i \quad \& \quad \rho'_i = \dot{\rho}_i.$$

Since both choice rules rely on the regular VR protection policies for their respective profiles of category memberships, Lemma 3 implies that

$$C_{\mathbb{M}}^o(\bar{\pi}, \underline{\triangleright}, \rho^*; I) = C_{\mathbb{M}}^{2s,o}(\rho'; I) = C_{\mathbb{M}}^{2s,o}(\dot{\rho}; I). \quad (9)$$

Since VR-protected categories other than $\tilde{c}$ do not overlap with each other at ρ^* and VR-protected categories do not overlap at all at ρ' and $\dot{\rho}$, their order of precedence does not matter for $C_{\mathbb{M}}^{2s}$ under ρ' and $\dot{\rho}$ and as long as $\tilde{c}$ is processed last as it is done for choice rule $C_{\mathbb{M}}(\bar{\pi}, \underline{\triangleright}, \rho^*; \cdot)$ under $\underline{\triangleright}$. Therefore, for each $c \in \mathcal{R} \setminus \{\tilde{c}\}$,

$$C_{\mathbb{M}}^c(\bar{\pi}, \underline{\triangleright}, \rho^*; I) = C_{\mathbb{M}}^{2s,c}(\rho'; I) = C_{\mathbb{M}}^{2s,c}(\dot{\rho}; I). \quad (10)$$

Thus, only the set of individuals who receive category- $\tilde{c}$ positions could possibly differ under both choice rules $C_{\mathbb{M}}^{2s,\tilde{c}}(\rho'; \cdot)$ and $C_{\mathbb{M}}^{\tilde{c}}(\bar{\pi}, \underline{\triangleright}, \rho^*; \cdot)$. By Eqs. (9) and (10), in the procedures of $C_{\mathbb{M}}^{2s}(\rho'; \cdot)$ and $C_{\mathbb{M}}(\bar{\pi}, \underline{\triangleright}, \rho^*; \cdot)$ just before category $\tilde{c}$ is processed, we have exactly the same set of eligible individuals available for category $\tilde{c}$ by definitions of $\bar{J}$ and ρ' . Since each choice rule uses the single-category meritorious choice rule for category $\tilde{c}$ under the regular VR protection policies of their respective profiles of category memberships

$$C_{\mathbb{M}}^{\tilde{c}}(\bar{\pi}, \underline{\triangleright}, \rho^*; I) = C_{\mathbb{M}}^{2s,\tilde{c}}(\rho'; I). \quad (11)$$

Eqs. (9), (10), and (11) imply

$$\hat{C}_{\mathbb{M}}(\bar{\pi}, \underline{\triangleright}, \rho^*; I) = \hat{C}_{\mathbb{M}}^{2s}(\rho'; I).$$

□

■

B.3. Proof of the Result in Section 4.

Proof of Theorem 2. Recall that the reservation vector q is such that $q_t^v = 0$ for each $v \in \mathcal{V}$ and $t \in \mathcal{T}$. Fix a profile of non-overlapping VR-protected category memberships ρ , i.e., $\rho \in (2^{\mathcal{R}})^{|\mathcal{I}|}$ such that $|\rho_i| \leq 1$ for each $i \in \mathcal{I}$. Fix a VR-protected category $c^* \in \mathcal{R}$. Let $\underline{\triangleright} \in \Delta_{c^*}^o$. Suppose $C(\rho; \cdot)$ is any choice rule that satisfies non-wastefulness, no justified envy, and compliance with VR protections.

Let $\pi^* \in \Pi(\rho)$ be such that (i) $\pi^{*c^*} \in \Pi^{c^*}(\rho)$ is an arbitrary VR protection policy for category c^* , and (ii) $\pi^{*c} = \bar{\pi}^c$ is the regular VR protection policy for any other VR-protected category $c \in \mathcal{R} \setminus \{c^*\}$ under ρ .

By Lemma 3, we have

$$C^o(\rho, I) = C_{\mathbb{M}}^{2s}(\rho; I) \quad \& \quad C_{\mathbb{M}}^o(\pi^*, \triangleright, \rho; I) = C_{\mathbb{M}}^{2s,o}(\rho; I),$$

where the second equality follows as the SMH choice rule satisfies non-wastefulness, no justified envy, and compliance with VR protections by Lemmata 1 and 2. Thus,

$$C^o(\rho, I) = C_{\mathbb{M}}^o(\pi^*, \triangleright, \rho; I), \quad (12)$$

and we refer to this set as

$$J = C^o(\rho, I)$$

in the rest of the proof.

We prove the theorem using two claims and Eq. (12).

Claim B.2. *For each $c \in \mathcal{R} \setminus \{c^*\}$, $C_{\mathbb{M}}^c(\pi^*, \triangleright, \rho; I)$ Gale dominates $C^c(\rho; I)$.*

Proof of Claim B.2. Take $c \in \mathcal{R} \setminus \{c^*\}$. Let $J^c = (I \setminus (J \cup C^{c^*}(\rho; I))) \cap \mathcal{I}^c(\rho)$. Since (i) $C(\rho; \cdot)$ satisfies no justified envy, (ii) all VR-protected categories are non-overlapping and all but c^* use the regular VR protection policy, (iii) $q_t^c = 0$ for each $c \in \mathcal{R}$ and $t \in \mathcal{T}$, and (iv) $\mathcal{E}^c(\bar{\pi}^c) = \mathcal{I}^c(\rho)$ for each $c \in \mathcal{R} \setminus \{c^*\}$, we have that $C^c(\rho; \cdot)$ matches the highest priority $\max\{q^c, |J^c|\}$ eligible individuals in J^c with respect to $\bar{\pi}^c$. On the other hand, as c is processed before c^* under $\triangleright$, $C_{\mathbb{M}}^c(\pi^*, \triangleright, \rho; \cdot)$ matches the highest priority $\max\{q^c, |(I \setminus J) \cap \mathcal{I}^c(\rho)|\}$ eligible individuals in $(I \setminus J) \cap \mathcal{I}^c(\rho)$ with respect to $\bar{\pi}^c$. Since $(I \setminus J) \cap \mathcal{I}^c(\rho) \supseteq J^c$, $C_{\mathbb{M}}^c(\pi^*, \triangleright, \rho; I)$ Gale dominates $C^c(\rho; I)$. $\square$

Claim B.3. $C^{c^*}(\rho; I) \subseteq \widehat{C}_{\mathbb{M}}(\pi^*, \triangleright, \rho; I)$.

Proof of Claim B.3. Suppose to the contrary of the claim there exists some

$$j \in C^{c^*}(\rho; I) \setminus \widehat{C}_{\mathbb{M}}(\pi^*, \triangleright, \rho; I). \quad (13)$$

Then j is eligible for category c^* . By non-wastefulness property of the SMH choice rule, we have

$$|C_{\mathbb{M}}^{c^*}(\pi^*, \triangleright, \rho; I)| = q^{c^*} \geq |C^{c^*}(\rho; I)|. \quad (14)$$

By Claim B.2,

$$|C_{\mathbb{M}}^c(\pi^*, \triangleright, \rho; I)| \geq |C^c(\rho; I)| \quad \forall c \in \mathcal{R} \setminus \{c^*\}. \quad (15)$$

By no justified envy property of the SMH choice rule,

$$i \pi^{c^*} j \quad \forall i \in C_{\mathbb{M}}^{c^*}(\pi^*, \triangleright, \rho; I). \quad (16)$$

Recall that by the definition of VR protection policies, for any $c \in \mathcal{R} \setminus \{c^*\}$ and $i', i'' \in \mathcal{I}^c(\rho)$,

$$i' \pi^{*c^*} i'' \iff i' \bar{\pi}^c i''. \quad (17)$$

Let

$$\mathcal{R}^* = \left(\bigcup_{i \in C_{\mathbb{M}}^{c^*}(\pi^*, \underline{\triangleright}, \rho; I)} \rho_i \right) \setminus \{c^*\}.$$

Since $j \in C^{c^*}(\rho; I)$, by no-justified envy property of $C(\rho; \cdot)$ and Eqs. (16) and (17),

$$C_{\mathbb{M}}^{c^*}(\pi^*, \underline{\triangleright}, \rho; I) \subseteq C^{c^*}(\rho; I) \cup \left(\bigcup_{c \in \mathcal{R}^*} C^c(\rho; I) \right). \quad (18)$$

As category c^* is processed last under $\underline{\triangleright}$, we have for any $c \in \mathcal{R}^*$ and $i \in C_{\mathbb{M}}^{c^*}(\pi^*, \underline{\triangleright}, \rho; I) \cap \mathcal{I}^c(\rho)$, all individuals in $C_{\mathbb{M}}^c(\pi^*, \underline{\triangleright}, \rho; I)$ have higher priority than i with respect to $\bar{\pi}^c$, and therefore, with respect to π^{*c^*} by Eq. (17). By no justified envy property of $C(\rho; \cdot)$,

$$C_{\mathbb{M}}^c(\pi^*, \underline{\triangleright}, \rho; I) \subseteq C^{c^*}(\rho; I) \cup C^c(\rho; I) \quad \forall c \in \mathcal{R}^*. \quad (19)$$

Eqs. (18) and (19) imply

$$C_{\mathbb{M}}^{c^*}(\pi^*, \underline{\triangleright}, \rho; I) \cup \left(\bigcup_{c \in \mathcal{R}^*} C_{\mathbb{M}}^c(\pi^*, \underline{\triangleright}, \rho; I) \right) \subseteq C^{c^*}(\rho; I) \cup \left(\bigcup_{c \in \mathcal{R}^*} C^c(\rho; I) \right),$$

which contradicts Eqs. (13), (14), and (15). Thus, $C^{c^*}(\rho; I) \setminus \hat{C}_{\mathbb{M}}(\pi^*, \underline{\triangleright}, \rho; I) = \emptyset$. □

Eq. (12) and Claims B.2 and B.3 complete the proof of the theorem. ■