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Abstract

Decision makers often aim to learn a treatment assignment policy under a capacity constraint on the number of agents that they can treat. When agents can respond strategically to such policies, competition arises, complicating the estimation of the effect of the policy. In this paper, we study capacity-constrained treatment assignment in the presence of such interference. We consider a dynamic model where heterogeneous agents myopically best respond to the previous treatment assignment policy. When the number of agents is large but finite, we show that the threshold for receiving treatment under a given policy converges to the policy’s mean-field equilibrium threshold. Based on this result, we develop a consistent estimator for the policy effect and demonstrate in simulations that it can be used for learning optimal capacity-constrained policies in the presence of strategic behavior.

1 Introduction

In policy learning, a decision maker aims to map observed individual characteristics to treatment assignments [Bhattacharya and Dupas, 2012, Kitagawa and Tetenov, 2018, Manski, 2004]. For example, a school must decide which applicants to admit and an employer must decide which candidates should be extended offers. The observed data is typically assumed to be exogenous to the treatment assignment policy. However, when human agents being considered for the treatment have knowledge of the assignment policy, the observed data is not exogenous because agents may change their behavior in response to the policy.

A growing body of work focuses on policy learning in the presence of strategic human behavior [Björkegren et al., 2020, Frankel and Kartik, 2019a, Munro, 2020]. In these works, an agent’s treatment assignment only depends on their own strategic behavior and is unaffected by the behavior of others in the population. This setup implicitly assumes that the decision maker does not have a capacity constraint on the number of agents they can treat.

However, in applications such as college admissions and job hiring, strategic behavior arises while the decision maker also has a capacity constraint on the number of agents they can treat. For example, students may enroll in test preparation services and take advanced courses to improve their chances of getting accepted to college [Bound et al., 2009], while a college can only accept a small fraction of the applicant pool. Similarly, job candidates may join intensive bootcamps to improve their career prospects [Thayer and Ko, 2017], while an employer has a fixed number of positions to fill. To enforce the capacity constraint, a decision maker uses a selection criteria, such as a machine learning model, to score agents and assigns treatments to agents who score above a threshold, given by a quantile of the
score distribution [Bhattacharya and Dupas, 2012]. Competition arises because an agent’s treatment assignment depends on how their score ranks relative to that of other agents.

In this work, we study the problem of capacity-constrained treatment assignment in the presence of strategic behavior. We frame the problem in a dynamic setting. At each time step $t$, agents report their covariates to the decision maker and the decision maker assigns treatments. Suppose a decision maker deploys a fixed selection criteria for all time. At time step $t + 1$, agents react to the policy from time step $t$, which depends on the fixed selection criteria and the threshold for receiving treatment at time step $t$. To enforce the capacity constraint, the decision maker sets the threshold for receiving treatment at time step $t + 1$ to the appropriate quantile of the score distribution observed at time step $t + 1$. So, the threshold for receiving treatment depends on agents’ strategic behavior. At an equilibrium induced by a fixed selection criteria, the threshold for receiving treatment is fixed over time.

The goal of the decision maker, and the main goal of this work, is to find a selection criteria that obtains low equilibrium policy loss, which is the policy loss obtained at the equilibrium induced by the selection criteria.

The goal of learning a policy that minimizes the equilibrium policy loss is motivated by prior works that estimate policy effects or treatment effects at equilibrium [Heckman et al., 1998, Munro et al., 2021, Wager and Xu, 2021]. Heckman et al. [1998] estimates the effect of a tuition subsidy program on college enrollment by accounting for the program’s impact on the equilibrium college skill price. Munro et al. [2021] estimates the effect of a binary intervention in a marketplace setting by accounting for the impact of the intervention on the resulting supply-demand equilibrium. Wager and Xu [2021] estimates the effect of supply-side payments on a platform’s utility in equilibrium.

We outline a dynamic model for capacity-constrained treatment assignment in the presence of generic strategic behavior and specify the form of strategic behavior we consider in Section 2. Key elements of our model include that agents are myopic, so the covariates they report to the decision maker at time step $t + 1$ depend only on the state of the system in time step $t$. Also, drawing on the aggregative games literature [Acemoglu and Jensen, 2010, 2015, Corchón, 1994], we assume that agents respond to an aggregate of other agents’ actions. In particular, at time step $t + 1$, agents will react to the threshold for receiving treatment from time step $t$, which is an aggregate of agents’ strategic behavior from time step $t$. Finally, based on Frankel and Kartik [2019a,b], we assume that agents are heterogenous in their raw covariates (covariates prior to modification) and in their ability to deviate from their raw covariates in their reported covariates.

Minimizing the equilibrium policy loss is a well-defined goal only when a unique equilibrium exists under each of the considered policies. In Section 3, we give conditions on our model that guarantee existence and uniqueness of equilibria in the mean-field regime, the limiting regime where at each time step, an infinite number of agents are considered for the treatment. Furthermore, we show that under additional conditions, the mean-field equilibrium arises via fixed-point iteration. In Section 4, we translate these results to the finite regime, where a finite number of agents, sampled i.i.d. at each time step, are considered for treatment. We show that as the number of agents grows large, the behavior of the system converges to the equilibrium of the mean-field model in a stochastic version of fixed-point iteration.

In Section 5, we propose a method for learning the selection criteria that minimizes the equilibrium policy loss. Based on Wager and Xu [2021], we take the approach of optimizing selection criteria via gradient descent. To this end, we develop a consistent estimator for the policy effect, the gradient of the equilibrium policy loss. To estimate the policy effect
without disturbing the equilibrium, we follow the approach of Munro et al. [2021], Wager and Xu [2021]. We recover components of the policy effect by applying symmetric, mean-zero perturbations to the selection criteria and the threshold for receiving treatment for each unit and running regressions from the perturbations to outcomes of interest. In Section 6, through simulations, we validate that our policy effect estimator can be used to learn optimal capacity-constrained policies in the presence of strategic behavior.

1.1 Related Work

The problem of learning optimal treatment assignment policies has received attention in econometrics, statistics, and computer science [Athey et al., 2018, Bhattacharya and Dupas, 2012, Kallus and Zhou, 2021, Kitagawa and Tetenov, 2018, Manski, 2004]. Treatments can be discrete-valued (typically, binary) or continuous-valued, and the policy may be subject to budget or capacity constraints. Most related to our work, Bhattacharya and Dupas [2012] study the problem of optimal capacity-constrained treatment assignment, where the decision maker can only allocate treatments to $1 - q$ proportion of the population, where $q \in (0, 1)$. They show that the welfare-maximizing assignment policy is a threshold rule on the agents' scores, where agents who score above $q$-th quantile of the score distribution are allocated treatment. Our work differs from Bhattacharya and Dupas [2012] because we do not assume that the distribution of potential outcomes is exogenous to the treatment assignment policy.

Björkegren et al. [2020], Frankel and Kartik [2019a], Munro [2020] study policy learning in the presence of strategic behavior. Björkegren et al. [2020] proposes a structural model for manipulation, estimates the parameters of this model with data from a field experiment, and computes the optimal policy under the estimated model. Frankel and Kartik [2019a] demonstrates that optimal policies that account for strategic behavior will underweight manipulable data. Munro [2020] studies the optimal unconstrained assignment of binary-valued treatments in the presence of strategic behavior, without parametric assumptions on agent behavior. The main difference between our work and these previous works is that we account for the equilibrium effects of strategic behavior that arise via competition.

The area of strategic classification in computer science is also related to our work [Brückner et al., 2012, Dalvi et al., 2004, Dong et al., 2018, Hardt et al., 2016, Jagadeesan et al., 2021, Levanon and Rosenfeld, 2022]. These works propose models for the interaction between the classifier and the strategic agent and methods for training classifiers that are robust to gaming. In addition, other works in this area investigate how decision makers can design classifiers that incentivize agents to invest effort in improving, instead of gaming [Ahmadi et al., 2022, Kleinberg and Raghavan, 2020]. Nevertheless, the setting of strategic classification implicitly assumes that an agent's classification does not depend on the behavior of others in the population, limiting the applicability of these methods to our setting of policy learning with capacity constraints.

To the best of our knowledge, Liu et al. [2021] is the only existing work that studies capacity-constrained allocation in the presence of strategic behavior. Liu et al. [2021] introduces the problem of strategic ranking, where agents’ rewards depend on their ranks after investing effort in modifying their covariates. They consider a setting where agents are heterogenous in their raw covariates but homogenous in their ability to modify their covariates. Under these assumptions, the authors find that agents’ post-effort ranking preserves their original ranking by raw covariates and analyze the implications this has on decision maker, agent, and societal utility. Our work differs from Liu et al. [2021] because following Frankel and Kartik [2019a,b], we assume agents are heterogenous in both their raw covariates and
ability to modify their reported covariates. When agents can be heterogenous across both
dimensions, ranks are not necessarily preserved after the agents have modified their covari-
ates. In our model, the selection criteria modulates how the equilibrium post-effort ranks
change from the pre-effort ranks; in other words, strategic behavior changes who receives
treatment, and thus fundamentally alters the nature of the resulting policy learning problem.

The problem of estimating the effect of an intervention in a marketplace setting is also
relevant to our work. Marketplace interventions can impact the resulting supply-demand
equilibrium, introducing interference and complicating estimation of the intervention’s effect
[Blake and Coey, 2014, Heckman et al., 1998]. We find that our setting yields analogous
challenges to estimating the effect of a marketplace intervention because when agents are
strategic and the decision maker is capacity-constrained, the selection criteria impacts the
equilibrium threshold for receiving treatment. To estimate an intervention’s effect without
disturbing the market equilibrium, Munro et al. [2021], Wager and Xu [2021] propose a
local experimentation scheme, motivated by mean-field modeling. Methodologically, we
adapt their mean-field modeling and estimation strategies to estimate the effect of a policy
in our setting.

Finally, we note that our dynamic model draws on game theory concepts, such as the
myopic best response and dynamic aggregative games. Our assumption that agents are
myopic, or will take decisions based on information from short time horizons, is a standard
heuristic used in many previous works [Cournot, 1982, Kandori et al., 1993, Monderer and
Shapley, 1996]. In addition, our assumption that agents account for the behavior of other
agents through an aggregate quantity of their actions is a paradigm borrowed from aggrega-
tive games [Acemoglu and Jensen, 2010, 2015, Corchón, 1994]. Most related to our work,
Acemoglu and Jensen [2015] considers a dynamic setting where the market aggregate at
time step \( t \) is an aggregate function of all the agents’ best responses from time step \( t \), and
an agent’s best response at time step \( t + 1 \) is selected from a constraint set determined by
the market aggregate from time step \( t \). Analogously, in our work, the “market aggregate” is
the threshold for receiving treatment. The threshold for receiving treatment is a particular
quantile of the agents’ scores, so we can view it as a function of agents’ reported covariates
(agents’ best responses). Furthermore, the covariates that agents report in time step \( t + 1 \)
depend on the value of the market aggregate, or the threshold for receiving treatment, in
time step \( t \).

2 Model
In this section, we first define a dynamic model for capacity-constrained treatment assign-
ment in the presence of strategic behavior, and define the decision maker’s equilibrium policy
loss in terms of this model. We then propose a model for agent behavior in terms of my-
opic utility maximization, and provide conditions under which the resulting best response
functions vary smoothly in problem parameters.

2.1 Dynamic Model
Our dynamic model is similar to the dynamic aggregative game model presented in Acemoglu
and Jensen [2015] in that an aggregate quantity, the threshold for receiving treatment,
depends on agents’ actions, and the value of the aggregate quantity from a previous time
step informs agent behavior in the subsequent time step.
Let $q \in (0,1)$. At each time step $t \in \{1,2,3\ldots\}$, the decision maker assigns treatments to $1 - q$ proportion of a target population based on observed covariates. The decision maker’s selection criteria is a linear model $\beta \in \mathcal{B}$, where $\mathcal{B} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ is a convex, compact set. The selection criteria is applied to observed covariates $x \in \mathcal{X}$, where $\mathcal{X} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ is a convex, compact set. An agent’s score is subjected to noise $\epsilon \sim G$, where $G$ is a mean-zero distribution. The decision maker fixes the linear model $\beta$ for all $t$, but they adjust the threshold for receiving treatment at each time step to ensure that the capacity constraint is satisfied. The decision maker’s policy has the form of a threshold rule

$$\pi(x, c; \beta, s) = I(\beta^T x + \epsilon \geq s), \quad (2.1)$$

where $\beta \in \mathcal{B}$ and $s \in \mathcal{S}$, where $\mathcal{S} \subset \mathbb{R}$. Suppose that each agent has a private type $\nu \sim F$. Let the policy at time step $t$ be $\pi(x, c; \beta, s')$. At time step $t+1$, an agent with type $\nu$ will report covariates $x(\beta, s', \nu)$ to the decision maker, reacting strategically to the policy deployed in time step $t$; see Section 2.3 for a detailed specification for $x(\beta, s, \nu)$. Following Bhattacharya and Dupas [2012], we have that $s'^{t+1}$, the threshold for receiving treatment at time step $t+1$, is equal to the $q$-th quantile of the marginal distribution of $\beta^T x(\beta, s', \nu) + \epsilon$.

Remark 1. In Equation 2.1, we model agents’ scores as being subject to mean-zero noise. We do so for two reasons. First, on a practical level, having noise in the system helps us avoid unstable agent behavior; see Section 2.4 for details. Second, on a more conceptual level, we note that in most realistic cases, noise will arise in this system from a variety of sources, such as imperfection in agent best responses [Jagadeesan et al., 2021], unconscious preferences of the evaluators of the agents’ covariates [Kleinberg et al., 2018], and differential privacy [Dwork et al., 2014]. Incorporating all these various sources of noise is beyond the scope of our model; however, we still want to have some noise source in our model, and so we do so via the simple and transparent approach in Equation 2.1 where the noise is part of the treatment assignment. Previous works in strategic classification also consider the role of noise. Braverman and Garg [2020] investigates the benefits of randomization in the decision rule in strategic classification. Jagadeesan et al. [2021] proposes the noisy response model, where the agents are assumed to have a noisy understanding of the classifier.

2.2 Population Equilibria and Policy Loss

The decision maker observes a loss $\ell(\pi, \nu)$ if they assign a treatment $\pi \in \{0,1\}$ to an agent with type $\nu$. Note that an agent’s type may not be directly observable, but the decision maker can still measure $\ell(\pi, \nu)$ for each agent. As an example, in college admissions, the decision maker may aim to admit students with high academic ability. Assuming that first-year GPA is a reasonable proxy for academic ability, the decision maker can set $\ell(1, \nu)$ to be the negation of an admitted agent’s first-year GPA. Since the decision maker cannot assess the academic ability of students they did not admit, the decision maker incurs a loss $\ell(0, \nu) = 0$ on these students.

Given some specification of $\ell(\pi, \nu)$ that the decision maker can observe, we can define the population policy loss in the presence of strategic behavior and a capacity constraint. Let $s$ denote the previous threshold for receiving treatment, which is the threshold that agents respond to, and let $r$ denote the realized threshold for receiving treatment, which is the threshold that enforces the capacity constraint. The decision maker’s population policy loss is given by

$$L(\beta, s, r) = \mathbb{E}_{\nu \sim F, \epsilon \sim G}\left[\ell(\pi(x(\beta, s, \nu), c; \beta, r), \nu)\right]. \quad (2.2)$$
To enforce the capacity constraint, \( r \) must be set to the \( q \)-th quantile of the marginal distribution over \( \beta^T x(\beta, s, \nu) + \epsilon \). In our dynamic model, at time step \( t + 1 \), the decision maker’s population policy loss is given by \( L(\beta, s_t, s_{t+1}) \).

At an equilibrium induced by a fixed selection criteria \( \beta \), the threshold for receiving treatment is fixed over time. In other words, the previous and realized thresholds for receiving treatment are equal. Let \( s(\beta) \) be the equilibrium threshold induced by the fixed selection criteria \( \beta \). If \( s^t = s(\beta) \), then we have that \( s^{t+1}, s^{t+2} \ldots \) is a constant sequence where each term is \( s(\beta) \). In the following definition, we express the decision maker’s policy loss at equilibrium.

**Definition 1** (Equilibrium Policy Loss). Given a fixed selection criteria \( \beta \in \mathcal{B} \). Let \( s(\beta) \) be an equilibrium threshold, i.e., \( s(\beta) \) is equal to the \( q \)-th quantile of the marginal distribution over \( \beta^T x(\beta, s(\beta), \nu) + \epsilon \). The decision maker’s population policy loss at equilibrium is given by

\[
L_{eq}(\beta) = L(\beta, s(\beta), s(\beta)) = \mathbb{E}_{\nu \sim F, \epsilon \sim G} [\ell(\pi(x(\beta, s(\beta), \nu), \epsilon; \beta, s(\beta), \nu)]
\]

Under conditions where the equilibrium is guaranteed to exist and is unique, the decision maker aims to find \( \beta \) such that \( L_{eq}(\beta) \) is minimized. Such an objective is motivated by the observation that it may not be feasible for the decision maker to change their selection criteria at each time step. Instead, the decision maker aims to select \( \beta \) that performs well with respect to the equilibrium behavior of the system.

### 2.3 Agent Behavior

Next, we specify a flexible model for agent behavior and establish when agent behavior exhibits useful properties, such as continuity and contraction. In our model, agents are heterogeneous in their raw covariates and ability to modify the covariates they report to the decision maker, and they myopically choose their reported covariates based on a previous policy. Following Frankel and Kartik [2019a,b], we suppose that each agent has a private type \( \nu = (\eta, \gamma) \) sampled from a joint distribution \( F \). An agent’s raw covariates, or covariates prior to modification, are denoted by \( \eta \in \mathcal{X} \). The agent’s ability to change their raw covariates is given by \( \gamma \in \mathcal{G} \), where \( \mathcal{G} \) is bounded. The support of \( F \) is contained in \( \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{G} \). Note that \( F \) has bounded support.

An agent, with knowledge of the selection criteria \( \beta \in \mathcal{B} \), the previous threshold for receiving treatment \( s \in \mathcal{S} \), and the noise distribution \( G \), will deviate from their raw covariates in hopes of getting the treatment. Let the function \( c_{\nu}(y) : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R} \) capture the cost of an agent with type \( \nu \) deviating \( y \) from their raw covariates \( \eta \). Using the policy defined in Equation 2.1, we suppose that the agent’s utility function takes the following form

\[
u(x; \beta, s, \nu) = -c_{\nu}(x - \eta; \gamma) + \pi(x, \epsilon; \beta, s).
\]

The left term is the cost to the agent of deviating from their raw covariates. The right term is the reward from receiving the treatment. Taking the expectation over the noise yields the following expected utility function.

\[
\mathbb{E}_{\epsilon \sim G} [\nu(x; \beta, s, \nu)] = -c_{\nu}(x - \eta; \gamma) + 1 - G(s - \beta^T x).
\]

We show an example expected utility function.
**Example 2** (Expected Utility Function with Quadratic Cost). This expected utility function has a quadratic cost of deviating from the raw covariates. Let $\gamma \in \mathcal{G} \subset (\mathbb{R}^+)^d$.

$$E_{\epsilon \sim \mathcal{G}}[u(x; \beta, s, \nu)] = -(x - \eta)^T \text{Diag}(\gamma)(x - \eta) + 1 - G(s - \beta^T x).$$

We note that the cost function $c_\nu(x - \eta; \gamma) = (x - \eta)^T \text{Diag}(\gamma)(x - \eta)$ is $2 \cdot \lambda_{\min}(\text{Diag}(\gamma))$-strongly convex.

The best response mapping for an agent is obtained by finding the covariates $x \in X$ that maximize the expected utility function, as follows

$$x(\beta, s, \nu) = \arg\max_{x \in X} E_{\epsilon \sim \mathcal{G}}[u(x; \beta, s, \nu)].$$

The covariates that an agent reports to the decision maker is the agent’s best response.

### 2.4 Properties of Agent Best Response

Using the following two assumptions, we establish a condition on the noise distribution which guarantees that the agent best response is a well-defined function and is continuously differentiable in $\beta, s$. We also establish a related condition on the noise distribution which guarantees that the score of the agent best response is a contraction mapping.

**Assumption 1.** The cost function $c_\nu(x) : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}$ is twice continuously differentiable. In addition, $c_\nu$ is also $\alpha_\nu$-strongly convex function for $\alpha_\nu > 0$ and $c_\nu(0)$ is its minimum.

Assumption 1 provides structure to the agent’s cost of covariate modification by requiring that it is an $\alpha_\nu$-strongly convex function. The cost is minimized when the agent does not deviate from their raw covariates $\eta$.

**Assumption 2.** The noise distribution $G$ is twice continuously differentiable and has bounded second derivative $|G''(\epsilon)| \leq M$ where $M > 0$.

In the following lemma, we give a condition on the noise distribution under which the agent best response exists and is unique. This is essential so that we can treat the best response mapping as a well-defined function of $\beta$ and $s$. Let

$$B = \sup_{\beta \in B} ||\beta||^2_2,$$

and $M$ and $\alpha_\nu$ are defined in Assumptions 1 and 2.

**Lemma 1.** Consider an agent with type $\nu \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{G}$. Under Assumption 1 and 2, the best response $x(\beta, s, \nu)$ exists. Furthermore, if $M < \frac{\alpha_\nu}{B}$, then the best response $x(\beta, s, \nu)$ is uniquely defined. Proof in Appendix C.1.

Furthermore, using the Implicit Function Theorem, we can show that under the same conditions, the best response mapping is continuously differentiable in $\beta, s$.

**Lemma 2.** Consider an agent with type $\nu \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{G}$. Under Assumption 1 and 2, if $M < \frac{\alpha_\nu}{B}$ and a best response $x(\beta, s, \nu) \in \text{Int}(X)$, then the best response is continuously differentiable in $\beta$ and $s$. Proof in Appendix C.2.
We give an interpretation of the condition $M < \alpha_\nu/B$ by considering the example of a mean-zero Gaussian distribution with variance $\sigma^2$. Note that for a mean-zero Gaussian distribution, we have that

$$\sup_{\epsilon} |G''(\epsilon)| \leq \frac{1}{\sigma^2 \sqrt{2\pi}\epsilon}.$$ 

So, we have that $M = 1/(\sigma^2 \sqrt{2\pi}\epsilon)$. The condition that $M < \alpha_\nu/B$ is equivalent to the condition that $\sigma^2 > B/(\alpha_\nu \cdot \sqrt{2\pi}\epsilon)$. When $G$ is a mean-zero Gaussian distribution, the condition that $M < \alpha_\nu/B$ is equivalent to requiring $G$ to have sufficiently high variance. We can loosely interpret Lemma 1 as follows: if $G$ has sufficiently high variance, then the best response mapping exists and is unique.

Given a slightly stronger bound on $M$, we can strengthen our result and verify that the score of the agent’s best response mapping is a contraction in $s$, i.e., there is $\kappa \in (0, 1)$ such that, for any fixed $\beta \in B$ and $\nu \in X \times G$,

$$|\beta^T x(\beta, s, \nu) - \beta^T x(\beta, s', \nu)| \leq \kappa |s - s'| \quad \forall s, s' \in S.$$ 

The contraction property is useful because fixed-point iteration is known to converge for functions that are contractions (see Theorem 24).

**Lemma 3.** Consider an agent with type $\nu \in X \times G$. Under Assumption 1 and 2, if $M < \frac{\alpha_\nu}{2\pi}$ and a best response $x(\beta, s, \nu) \in \text{Int}(X)$, then for fixed $\beta \in B$, the score of an agent’s best response $\beta^T x(\beta, s, \nu)$ is a contraction mapping in $s$. **Proof in Appendix C.3.**

When $G$ is a mean-zero Gaussian distribution with variance $\sigma^2$, the condition that $M < \alpha_\nu/(2B)$ is equivalent to $\sigma^2 > 2B/(\alpha_\nu \cdot \sqrt{2\pi}\epsilon)$. We can loosely interpret Lemma 3 as follows: if $G$ has sufficiently high variance (twice as high as that required for continuity of the best response), then the score of the best response mapping is a contraction.

We end this section by numerically investigating the role of noise on the agents’ best response functions, and verify that in the absence of sufficient noise unstable behaviors may occur. Qualitatively, the reason why instability may arise is that, in a zero-noise setting, there are two modes of agent behavior. In one mode, the agent does not deviate from their raw covariates at all, so $\beta^T x(\beta, s, \nu) = \beta^T \eta$. This is either because the threshold is low
enough that the agent expects to receive the treatment without deviating from their raw covariates or because the threshold is so high that the benefit of receiving the treatment does not outweigh the cost of modifying their covariates. In the other mode, the threshold takes on intermediate values, so the agent will invest the minimum effort to ensure that they receive the treatment under the previous policy, meaning that \( \beta^T x(\beta, s, \nu) = s \). A discontinuity in the best response arises when an agent no longer finds modifying their covariates beneficial. Introducing noise increases the agent’s uncertainty in whether they will receive the treatment, which causes agents to be less reactive to the previous policy and smooths the agent best response.

Under different noise settings, we analyze the score of an agent’s best response with a fixed selection criteria \( \beta \) while the threshold \( s \) varies. We consider an agent with type \( \nu = (\eta, \gamma) \) where \( \eta = [3.,0.]^T \) and \( \gamma = [0.1,1.]^T \). We suppose the decision maker’s model is \( \beta = [1.,0.]^T \) and suppose \( B = \{ \beta \in \mathbb{R}^2 \mid ||\beta||_2 \leq 1 \} \), so \( B = 1 \). We suppose the noise distribution \( G \) is mean-zero Gaussian with variance \( \sigma^2 \). Let the agent have an expected utility function with quadratic cost of covariate modification, as given in Equation 2.5.

We visualize the score of the agent best response, \( \beta^T x(\beta, s, \nu) \), as a function of \( s \), the previous threshold for receiving treatment. We plot \( \beta^T x(\beta, s, \nu) \) vs. \( s \) at four different noise levels \( \sigma \). In the left plot of Figure 1, the noise distribution satisfies \( M < \alpha_\nu/2 \), so Lemma 3 is applicable, and we observe that the score of the best response is a contraction in \( s \). In the middle left plot, the noise distribution satisfies \( M < \alpha_\nu \), so Lemma 2 is applicable, and the score of the best response is continuous. In the plots on the right of Figure 1, the noise distributions satisfy \( M \geq \alpha_\nu \). In such cases, the best response mapping may be discontinuous and may not necessarily have a fixed point.

The lack of a fixed point in the score of an agent best response in in low-noise regimes (rightmost plot, Figure 1) implies that there are distributions \( F \) over agent types for which there is no equilibrium in our dynamic model in low-noise regimes. As a result, when the noise condition for continuity of the agent best response does not hold, an equilibrium of our dynamic model may not exist. In Section 3, when we establish uniqueness and existence of equilibria of our dynamic model, we assume a noise condition that guarantees continuity properties of the agents’ best response mappings.

### 3 Mean-Field Results

Thus far, we have presented a dynamic model for capacity-constrained treatment assignment in the presence of generic strategic behavior and specified the type of strategic behavior we consider in this work. Recall that the decision maker’s objective, as outlined in Section 2, is to find a selection criteria \( \beta \) that minimizes the equilibrium policy loss \( L_{eq}(\beta) \). This is a sensible goal in settings where an equilibrium exists and is unique for each selection criteria \( \beta \) in consideration. In this section, we give conditions for existence and uniqueness of an equilibrium in the mean-field regime, where there are an infinite number of agents. We describe a plausible mechanism through which the equilibrium will arise in the mean-field regime. Finally, we show that the mean-field equilibrium threshold is differentiable with respect to \( \beta \), which is crucial for defining the policy effect in Section 5.

We instantiate the dynamic model from Section 2 in the mean-field regime. An infinite population of agents with types sampled from \( F \) is considered for the treatment at each time step \( t \). Let \( \beta \) be the decision maker’s fixed selection criteria. At time step \( t + 1 \), suppose all agents best respond with knowledge of the same selection criteria \( \beta \) and previous threshold...
for receiving treatment $s^t$, and noise distribution $G$. Let $P_{\beta,s^t}$ be the marginal distribution over scores of the form $\beta^T x(\beta, s^t, \nu) + \epsilon$. Let $q(P_{\beta,s^t})$ denote the $q$-th quantile of $P_{\beta,s^t}$. Then, agents who score above $s^{t+1} = q(P_{\beta,s^t})$ will receive the treatment. Iterating this procedure gives a fixed-point iteration process

$$s^{t+1} = q(P_{\beta,s^t}) \quad t = 0, 1, 2, \ldots$$

(3.1)

As described in Section 2, the system is at the selection criteria $\beta$'s equilibrium if the threshold for receiving treatment is fixed over time. The equilibrium induced by $\beta$ is characterized by an equilibrium threshold $s^*$ for which $s^* = q(P_{\beta,s^*})$. In the iterative process in Equation 3.1 if $s^0 = s^*$, then $s^t = s^*$ for all $t$.

To give conditions under which the equilibrium is unique, we use the following three assumptions.

**Assumption 3.** There are finitely many distinct types $\nu$ that occur with positive probability in $F$.

Assumption 3 is made for convenience. In combination with Assumption 1 for all agent types $\nu \sim F$, Assumption 3 guarantees that $\alpha_*(F)$, as defined below, is positive.

$$\alpha_*(F) = \inf_{\nu \in \text{supp}(F)} \alpha_\nu.$$  

(3.2)

We will omit the dependence of $\alpha_*(F)$ on $F$ when it is clear that there is only one type distribution of interest.

**Assumption 4.** For any agent type $\nu$ in the support of $F$ and any choice of $\beta \in B$ and $s \in S$, we assume that $x(\beta, s, \nu) \in \text{Int}(X)$. In other words, we require that agent best responses fall in the interior of the set $X$.

We require Assumption 4 to ensure that the best response mapping for each agent type $\nu \sim F$ is uniquely defined, so that $P_{\beta,s}$ is a valid distribution function.

**Assumption 5.** The noise distribution $G$ has strictly increasing CDF.

The above assumption is made so that we can ensure that $P_{\beta,s}$ has a strictly increasing CDF, which is a useful for ensuring that $q(P_{\beta,s})$ is uniquely defined. These assumptions, along with a noise condition that $M < \frac{\alpha_\beta}{B}$, guarantee uniqueness of the equilibrium. Note that the condition that $M < \frac{\alpha_\beta}{B}$, where $\alpha_*$ is as defined in Equation 3.2, ensures that for all agent types in $F$, their best response mappings are well-defined (Lemma 1) and continuously differentiable in $\beta, s$ (Lemma 2).

**Theorem 4.** Fix $\beta \in B$. Under Assumption 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5, if $M < \frac{\alpha_\beta}{B}$ and $q(P_{\beta,s})$ has a fixed point ($s = q(P_{\beta,s})$ has a solution), then the fixed point must be unique. Proof in Appendix D.1.

The proof of uniqueness relies on exhibiting useful properties of the distribution function $P_{\beta,s}(r)$, namely that it is continuously differentiable in its arguments and has a well-defined inverse function. When this holds, we have that a fixed point of $q(P_{\beta,s})$ is given by a value of $s$ that solves the equation $P_{\beta,s}(s) = q$. Finally, we observe that $P_{\beta,s}(s)$ is a monotonically increasing function, so it can intersect the horizontal line $y = q$ in at most one point, yielding uniqueness.

Under the same assumptions, we can also show that the $q(P_{\beta,s})$ is continuously differentiable in $\beta$ and $s$. This result is follows from the Implicit Function Theorem.
Lemma 5. Under Assumption 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5, if $M < \frac{\alpha}{\beta}$, then $q(P_{\beta,s})$ is continuously differentiable in $\beta$ and $s$. **Proof in Appendix D.2.**

With the result that $q(P_{\beta,s})$ is continuous, we can establish the existence of the equilibrium in the mean-field model through an application of Brouwer’s Fixed Point Theorem (Theorem 22). Applying Brouwer’s Fixed Point Theorem requires an additional assumption.

**Assumption 6.** The noise distribution $G$ has bounded support, and $S$ is a compact, convex set with $[\bar{s}, \tilde{s}] \subset S$, where

$$
\bar{s} = \inf_{\beta \in \mathcal{B}, x \in \mathcal{X}} \beta^T x + \inf_{\epsilon \in \text{supp}(G)} \epsilon,
$$

$$
\tilde{s} = \sup_{\beta \in \mathcal{B}, x \in \mathcal{X}} \beta^T x + \sup_{\epsilon \in \text{supp}(G)} \epsilon.
$$

Since the domain and range of the function in Brouwer’s Fixed-Point Theorem must be convex and compact, we require that $q(P_{\beta,s})$ (where $\beta$ fixed) has domain and range restricted to a convex, compact set $S$. Since we already have that $\mathcal{B}$ is convex and compact, then we must require that the noise distribution $G$ has bounded support to ensure the compactness of the domain and range of $q(P_{\beta,s})$. If the noise distribution has bounded support as in Assumption 6, $q(P_{\beta,s})$ can only take values in $[\bar{s}, \tilde{s}]$. By Assumption 6, we have that $[\bar{s}, \tilde{s}] \subset S$, a convex, compact set. Thus, $q(P_{\beta,s}) : S \to S$, where $S$ is convex and compact.

**Theorem 6.** Fix $\beta \in \mathcal{B}$. Under Assumption 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6, if $M < \frac{\alpha}{\beta}$, then there exists a threshold $s$ such that $q(P_{\beta,s}) = s$. In other words, $q(P_{\beta,s})$ has at least one fixed point. **Proof in Appendix D.3.**

The next two results give conditions under which the equilibrium arises via fixed-point iteration (Equation 3.1). Theorem 7 is a direct application of standard results on contraction mappings under fixed-point iteration.

**Theorem 7.** Fix $\beta \in \mathcal{B}$. Under Assumptions 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6, if $M < \frac{\alpha}{\beta}$ and $q(P_{\beta,s})$ is a contraction mapping with constant $\kappa \in (0, 1]$ where $s^*$ is the unique fixed point of $q(P_{\beta,s})$, then fixed-point iteration (Equation 3.1) converges to $s^*$. **Proof in Appendix D.4.**

In Corollary 8, we give a sufficient condition for ensuring that $q(P_{\beta,s})$ is a contraction. The sufficient condition is equivalent to ensuring that for all agent types $\nu$ in the support of $F$, we have that the best response mapping is a contraction in $s$. In the proof of this corollary, we use the fact that the derivative of $q(P_{\beta,s})$ with respect to $s$ is a convex combination of the derivatives of the agents’ best response mappings with respect to $s$. We note that a function is a contraction if and only if its derivative is bounded between $-1$ and 1 (Lemma 23). So, ensuring that each agent’s best response mapping is a contraction guarantees that $q(P_{\beta,s})$ is a contraction. We note that this condition is sufficient but not necessary for $q(P_{\beta,s})$ to be a contraction.

**Corollary 8.** Fix $\beta \in \mathcal{B}$. Under Assumptions 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6, if $M < \frac{\alpha}{\beta}$, then $q(P_{\beta,s})$ is a contraction in $s$ and fixed-point iteration (Equation 3.1) converges to $s^*$, the unique fixed point of $q(P_{\beta,s})$. **Proof in Appendix D.5.**

Thus far, we have demonstrated that under sufficient regularity conditions, for a fixed selection criteria $\beta$, an equilibrium exists and is unique in the mean-field limit, and fixed-point iteration is a mechanism through which this equilibrium arises. Crucially, the existence
and uniqueness of equilibria induced by fixed selection criteria allows us to define a function \( s(\beta) : B \rightarrow S \) that maps selection criteria \( \beta \in B \) to the equilibrium threshold \( s(\beta) \in S \) that characterizes the criteria’s mean-field equilibrium. The following theorem establishes the differentiability of \( s \).

**Theorem 9.** Under Assumption 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6, if \( M < \frac{\alpha}{B} \), then we can define a function \( s : B \rightarrow S \) that maps model parameters \( \beta \in B \) to the unique fixed point \( s^* \in S \) that satisfies \( q(P_{\beta,s^*}) = s^* \). The function \( s \) is continuously differentiable in \( \beta \). Proof in Appendix D.6.

We conclude this section by observing that a selection criteria impacts the level of competition that agents experience through its impact on the equilibrium threshold for receiving the treatment. Although different selection criteria will induce different equilibrium thresholds in the mean-field limit, under regularity conditions the equilibrium thresholds will vary smoothly with the selection criteria. These results make it possible to define and estimate policy effects in Section 5.

4 Finite Sample Approximation

Understanding equilibrium behavior of our dynamic model in the finite regime is of interest because our ultimate goal is to learn optimal equilibrium policies in finite samples. In this section, we instantiate the dynamic model from Section 2 in the regime where a finite number of agents are considered for the treatment at each time step. A difficulty of the finite regime is that deterministic equilibria do not exist. Instead, we give conditions under which stochastic equilibria arise and show that, in large samples, these stochastic equilibria sharply approximate the mean-field limit derived above.

Let \( \beta \) be the decision maker’s fixed selection criteria. At each time step, \( n \) new agents with types sampled i.i.d., from \( F \) are considered for the treatment. For example, in the application of college admissions, the sampled agents at each time step represent a class of students applying for admission each year. At time step \( t+1 \), the \( n \) agents who are being considered for the treatment best respond with knowledge of the same selection criteria \( \beta \), previous threshold for receiving treatment \( \hat{s}_t \), and noise distribution \( G \). In the finite model, the decision maker observes an empirical score distribution \( P_{n,\beta,\hat{s}_t} \). Let \( q(P_{n,\beta,\hat{s}_t}) \) denote the \( q \)-th quantile of \( P_{n,\beta,\hat{s}_t} \). Then, agents who score above \( \hat{s}_{t+1} = q(P_{n,\beta,\hat{s}_t}) \) will receive the treatment. Iterating this procedure gives a stochastic version of fixed-point iteration

\[
\hat{s}_{t+1} = q(P_{n,\beta,\hat{s}_t}), \quad t = 0, 1, 2, \ldots
\]

Since new agents are sampled at each time step, \( q(P_{n,\beta,\hat{s}_t}) \) is a random operator. Iterating the random operator \( q(P_{n,\beta,\hat{s}_t}) \) given some initial threshold \( \hat{s}_0 \) yields a stochastic process \( \{\hat{s}_t\}_{t \geq 0} \). We note that for any fixed \( \beta \), the random operator \( q(P_{n,\beta}) \) approximates the deterministic function \( q(P_{\beta}) \).

In Section 3, we showed that there are conditions under which fixed-point iteration of the mean-field model’s deterministic operator \( q(P_{\beta}) \) converges to \( s^* \), the mean-field equilibrium threshold. In the finite model, if \( q(P_{n,\beta}) \) closely approximates \( q(P_{\beta}) \), we may expect that there are conditions under which the stochastic process \( \{\hat{s}_t\}_{t \geq 0} \) will eventually oscillate in a small neighborhood about \( s^* \). This is illustrated in Figure 2.

Theorem 10 formalizes this intuition. We show that under the same conditions that enable fixed-point iteration in the mean-field model to converge to the mean-field equilibrium
Figure 2: Given a fixed distribution $F$ over agent types, we consider the finite model for various $n$ and the mean-field model. In this example, the conditions of Theorem 7 are satisfied, so fixed-point iteration in the mean-field model (Equation 3.1) converges to its unique fixed point. Fixed-point iteration in the finite models (Equation 4.1) oscillates about the fixed point of the mean-field model. For large $n$, we observe that the iterates $\{\hat{s}_n^t\}$ are more concentrated about the fixed point of the mean-field model.

Theorem 10. Fix $\beta \in B$. Suppose the conditions of Theorem 7 hold. Let $\epsilon \in (0, 1), \delta \in (0, 1)$, and $s^*$ is the mean-field equilibrium threshold induced by selection criteria $\beta$ (the unique fixed point of $q(P_{\beta, s^*})$). Let $D > 0$ be the lower bound of the density function of $P_{\beta, s^*}$. Let $k = \lceil \log(\frac{\epsilon}{2\delta}) \rceil$. For $t$ such that $t \geq k$ and $n$ such that

$$n \geq \frac{2}{\epsilon^2(1 - \kappa)^2 D^2 \log(\frac{2k}{\delta})},$$

we have that

$$P(\left| s_n^t - s^* \right| \geq \epsilon) \leq \delta.$$

Proof in Appendix E.1.

The main idea of the proof of this result is at each time step the quantity $\left| s_n^t - s^* \right|$ can be decomposed into two terms,

$$\left| s_n^t - s^* \right| \leq |q(P^n_{\beta, \hat{s}_n^t}) - q(P_{\beta, \hat{s}_n^t - 1})| + |q(P_{\beta, \hat{s}_n^t - 1}) - s^*|.$$

The first term on the right side is a noise term that arises due to the difference between an empirical quantile and a population quantile. The second term on the right side can be upper bounded by $\kappa |\hat{s}_n^{t-1} - s^*|$ because $q(P_{\beta, \cdot})$ is assumed to be a contraction. Recursively applying this decomposition $k$ times leaves a vanishing series of dependent noise terms and a term that depends on the distance of the $t - k$-th iterate from $s^*$. Analyzing the series of noise terms is difficult due to the dependence between the noise terms. We sidestep this challenge by introducing a sequence of independent random variables each of which
stochastically dominates the corresponding noise terms in our series of interest. Analysis of
the series of consisting of independent random variables yields our theorem.

Also, we can obtain a useful corollary that will be a building block for our consistency
results in Section 5.

**Corollary 11.** Fix \( \beta \in \mathcal{B} \). Let \( \{ t_n \} \) be a sequence such that \( t_n \uparrow \infty \) as \( n \to \infty \). Under the
conditions of Theorem 10, \( s_{t_n}^n \xrightarrow{p} s^* \), where \( s^* \) is the unique fixed point of \( q(P_{\beta, s}) \). *Proof in
Appendix E.2.*

## 5 Learning Policies via Gradient Descent

In this section, we apply the equilibrium concepts developed in Sections 3 and 4 to define
and estimate the policy effect, the gradient of the equilibrium policy loss with respect to
the selection criteria. To enable learning of the optimal policy, we rely on estimation of
the derivative of the policy loss, a method that is motivated by prior works [Chetty, 2009,
Wager and Xu, 2021].

First, we give conditions under which the loss function is continuously differentiable as
a function of \( \beta \) and define the policy effect in terms of the mean-field equilibrium threshold.
Next, using results from Section 4, we give methods for estimating these effects in finite
samples in a unit-level randomized experiment as in Munro et al. [2021], Wager and Xu
[2021]. Finally, we propose a method for learning the optimal policy by using the policy
effect estimator.

### 5.1 Policy Effect

Recall the equilibrium policy loss defined in Section 2.

**Lemma 12.** Under the conditions of Theorem 9, \( L_{eq}(\beta) \) is continuously differentiable in \( \beta \).

*Proof in Appendix F.1.*

From the definition of \( L_{eq}(\beta) \) in Definition 1, we have that the total derivative of \( L_{eq}(\beta) \)
can be written as

\[
d\frac{dL_{eq}(\beta)}{d\beta} = \frac{\partial L}{\partial \beta}(\beta, s(\beta), s(\beta)) + \left( \frac{\partial L}{\partial s}(\beta, s(\beta), s(\beta)) + \frac{\partial L}{\partial r}(\beta, s(\beta), s(\beta)) \right) \cdot \frac{\partial s}{\partial \beta}(\beta). \tag{5.1}
\]

We decompose the total derivative of \( L_{eq}(\beta) \), or the policy effect, into two parts. The first
term corresponds to the model effect and the second term corresponds to the equilibrium
effect.

**Definition 3 (Model Effect).** Let \( \tau_{ME} \) denote the model effect of deploying selection criteria
\( \beta \) on the equilibrium policy loss the decision maker incurs.

\[ \tau_{ME}(\beta) = \frac{\partial L}{\partial \beta}(\beta, s(\beta), s(\beta)). \]

The selection criteria \( \beta \) impacts the decision maker’s loss because agents modify their
covariates in response to the criteria and the criteria is also used to score the agents. Both of
these influence the treatments that the agents receive and thus the loss the decision maker
incurs.
In the absence of capacity constraints, the model effect is sufficient for capturing the policy effect. However, due to the decision maker’s capacity constraint, the equilibrium threshold for receiving treatment also depends on the selection criteria. So, we must also account for how the decision maker’s loss changes with respect to the equilibrium threshold and how the equilibrium threshold changes with respect to the selection criteria. Following notation from (2.2), we write $\partial L/\partial s$ and $\partial L/\partial r$ for the partial derivatives of $L$ in its second and third arguments respectively.

**Definition 4 (Equilibrium Effect).** Let $\tau_{EE}$ denote the equilibrium effect of deploying selection criteria $\beta$ on the equilibrium policy loss the decision maker incurs.

$$
\tau_{EE}(\beta) = \left( \frac{\partial L}{\partial s}(\beta, s(\beta)) + \frac{\partial L}{\partial r}(\beta, s(\beta)) \right) \cdot \frac{\partial s}{\partial \beta}(\beta).
$$

The previous threshold for receiving treatment $s$ impacts the decision maker’s loss because agents modify their covariates in response to $s$. This influences the treatments that agents receive and thus the loss the decision maker incurs. The realized threshold for receiving treatment $r$ impacts the decision maker’s loss because it determines agents’ treatment assignments, which influences the loss the decision maker incurs. At equilibrium, we have that $s = r = s(\beta)$, so we can account for both of these effects simultaneously.

**Definition 5 (Policy Effect).** Let $\tau_{PE}$ denote the policy effect of deploying selection criteria $\beta$ on the equilibrium policy loss the decision maker incurs.

$$
\tau_{PE}(\beta) = \tau_{ME}(\beta) + \tau_{EE}(\beta).
$$

The policy captures both the model effect and equilibrium effect.

### 5.2 Estimation of Policy Effect

We derive estimators for the model, equilibrium, policy effects through a unit-level randomized experiment in a finite samples. In a system consisting of $n$ agents, we apply symmetric, mean-zero perturbations to the parameters of the policy that each agent responds to. Let $R$ represent the distribution of Rademacher random variables and let $R^d$ represent a distribution over $d$-dimensional Rademacher random variables. For agent $i$, we perturb the policy parameters as follows

$$
\beta_i = \beta + b_n \zeta_i, \quad \zeta_i \sim R^d,
$$

$$
s_i = s + b_n \zeta_i, \quad \zeta_i \sim R.
$$

In practice, these perturbations can be applied by telling agent $i$ that they will be scored according to $\beta_i$, instead of $\beta$ and a small shock of size $-b_n \zeta_i$ will be applied to their score. Instead of reporting covariates in response to the previous policy $\pi(x, \epsilon; \beta, s)$, we presume that with information about the perturbations, agent $i$ will report covariates in response to a policy $\pi(x, \epsilon; \beta_i, s_i)$ as follows:

$$
x(\beta_i, s_i, \nu_i) = \arg\max_{x \in X} \mathbb{E}_{\nu \sim G}[u(x; \beta_i, s_i, \nu)].
$$

Let $P_{\beta, s, b_n}$ denote the distribution over scores when each agent $i$ responds to $(\beta_i, s_i)$ and the prescribed perturbation is applied to the agent’s score. For clarity, we contrast the
form of a score sampled from $P_{\beta,s}$ to that of the form of a score sampled from $P_{\beta,s,b_n}$. An agent with type $\nu_i$ who best responds to $\beta,s$ will obtain a score $\beta^T X(\beta,s,\nu_i) + \epsilon_i$ in the unperturbed setting. An agent with type $\nu_i$ who best responds to a perturbed version of $\beta,s$ will obtain a score $\beta^T X(\beta_i,s_i,\nu_i) - b_n \zeta_i + \epsilon_i$.

The purpose of applying these perturbations is so that we can recover the relevant gradient terms by running a linear regression from the perturbations to outcomes of interest, which include the decision maker’s loss and the proportion of agents whose score exceeds a threshold $r$. To construct the estimators of the model and equilibrium effects, we rely on gradient estimates of the loss function $L(\beta,s,r)$ and gradient estimates of the complementary CDF of the score distribution $\Pi(\beta,s,r)$, which is defined as

$$\Pi(\beta,s;r) = 1 - P_{\beta,s}(r). \tag{5.3}$$

In this experiment, we suppose that thresholds evolve by the stochastic fixed-point iteration process below. Note that it differs slightly from the process given in Section 4 because it includes perturbations of size $b_n$ to the selection criteria and threshold

$$s_n^{t+1} = q(P^n_{\beta,s,b_n}) \quad t = 0, 1, 2, \ldots \tag{5.4}$$

Analyzing the stochastic process $\{s_n^t\}_{t \geq 0}$ generated by the iteration above presents a technical challenge because the results from Section 3 and Section 4 only hold for the setting where all agents best respond to the same policy $\pi(x,c;\beta,s)$. Nevertheless, under the following assumption, we can show that for sufficiently small $b_n$, analogous results hold under unit-level perturbations, where an agent $i$ best responds to the policy $\pi(x,c;\beta_i,s_i)$.

**Assumption 7.** For all types $\nu = (\eta, \gamma)$ that have positive probability in $F$, we have that $\eta \in \text{Int}(\mathcal{X})$.

We can show that the results from Section 4 transfer to the setting with unit-level perturbations. The main idea is that we can define a new distribution over agent types $\tilde{F}$ and new cost functions. When agents with types sampled from $\tilde{F}$ and best respond to $\beta,s$ according to the new cost function, the score distribution that results equals $P_{\beta,s,b_n}$. Now, we can define the model effect estimator.

**Definition 6 (Model Effect Estimator).** We consider an experiment where $n$ agents are considered for the treatment. Let each row of $Z \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$ correspond to $b_n \zeta_i^T$, the perturbation applied to the selection criteria observed by the $i$-th agent. Since the $n$ agents will best respond to these perturbations as in Equation 5.2, we observe an empirical distribution over scores $P^n_{\beta,s,b_n}$. Let each entry of $\ell(\beta,s,r) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ correspond to the loss the decision maker incurs on the $i$-th agent as follows

$$\ell_i(\beta,s,r) = \ell(\pi(x(\beta_i,s_i,\nu_i), \epsilon_i - b_n \zeta_i; \beta_i, r), \nu_i). \tag{5.5}$$

Let $\hat{\Gamma}^n_{\ell,\beta}(\beta,s)$ be the regression coefficient that is obtained by running OLS of $\ell$ on $Z$. In particular,

$$\hat{\Gamma}^n_{\ell,\beta}(\beta,s,r) = b_n^{-1} \left( \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \zeta_i \zeta_i^T \right)^{-1} \left( \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \zeta_i \ell_i(\beta,s,r) \right).$$

The model effect estimator with sample size $n$ and iteration $t$ as

$$\tilde{x}_{\text{ME},s}^t(\beta) = \hat{\Gamma}_{\ell,\beta}(\beta, s, \hat{s}^t_n, q(P^n_{\beta,s,b_n})). \tag{5.6}$$
where \( \hat{s}_{i,t} \) is given by Equation 5.4.

To prove consistency of this estimator, we require additional conditions on the loss function \( \ell \).

**Assumption 8.** The functions \( \ell(0, \nu) \) and \( \ell(1, \nu) \) are continuous on \( \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{G} \). In addition, \( \ell(\pi, \nu) \) is bounded on \( \{0, 1\} \times \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{G} \).

**Theorem 13.** Let \( \{t_n\} \) be a sequence such that \( t_n \uparrow \infty \) as \( n \to \infty \). We consider the sequence of model effect estimators given by \( \hat{\beta}_{\text{ME},n}(\beta) \). Under Assumptions 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8, if \( M < \frac{n}{2\theta_{\epsilon_{\beta}}} \), then there exists a sequence \( \{b_n\} \) such that \( b_n \to 0 \) so that \( \hat{\beta}_{\text{ME},n}(\beta) \xrightarrow{p} \tau_{\text{ME}}(\beta) \).

**Proof in Appendix F.2.**

Second, we define the equilibrium effect estimator. Although the same approach applies, estimating the equilibrium effect is more complicated than estimating the model effect. We estimate the equilibrium effect by estimating the two components of the equilibrium effect, \( \frac{\partial L}{\partial s} + \frac{\partial L}{\partial \tau} \) and \( \frac{\partial s}{\partial \beta} \).

**Definition 7 (Equilibrium Effect Estimator).** We consider an experiment where \( n \) agents are considered for the treatment. Let each row of \( Z_\beta \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d} \) and of \( Z_s \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d} \) correspond to the perturbation applied to the linear model and baseline score, respectively for the \( i \)-th agent. Since the \( n \) agents will best respond to these perturbations as in Equation 5.2, we observe an empirical distribution over scores \( \hat{p}_{\beta,s,b_n} \). Let each entry of \( \ell, \pi \in \mathbb{R}^n \) correspond to the following outcomes for the \( i \)-th agent

\[
\ell_i(\beta, s, r) = \ell(\pi(x_i, s_i, \nu_i), \epsilon_i - b_n \zeta_i; \beta_i, r_i), \\
\pi_i(\beta, s, r) = \pi(x_i, s_i, \nu_i; \beta_i, r).
\]

Let \( \hat{\Gamma}_{\ell,s,t,r}(\beta, s, r), \hat{\Gamma}_{\pi,s}(\beta, s, r), \) and \( \hat{\Gamma}_{\pi,s}(\beta, s, r) \) correspond to the regression coefficients from running OLS of \( \ell \) on \( Z_s, \pi \) on \( Z_\beta \), and \( \pi \) on \( Z_s \), respectively. In particular,

\[
\hat{\Gamma}_{\ell,s,t,r}(\beta, s, r) = b_n^{-1} \left( \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \zeta_i \zeta_i^T \right)^{-1} \left( \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \zeta_i \ell_i(\beta, s, r) \right), \\
\hat{\Gamma}_{\pi,s}(\beta, s, r) = b_n^{-1} \left( \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \zeta_i \zeta_i^T \right)^{-1} \left( \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \zeta_i \pi_i(\beta, s, r) \right), \\
\hat{\Gamma}_{\pi,s}(\beta, s, r) = b_n^{-1} \left( \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \zeta_i \zeta_i^T \right)^{-1} \left( \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \zeta_i \pi_i(\beta, s, r) \right).
\]

Let \( \{h_n\} \) be a sequence such that \( h_n \to 0 \) and \( nh_n \to \infty \). Let \( p_{\beta,s,b_n}(r) \) denote a kernel density estimate of \( p_{\beta,s,b_n}(r) \) with kernel function \( k(z) = \frac{1}{2} \chi_{[-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]}(z) \) and bandwidth \( h_n \).

We define the model effect estimator with sample size \( n \) and iteration \( t \) as

\[
\hat{\beta}_{\text{ME},n}(\beta) = \hat{\Gamma}_{\ell,s,t,r}(\beta, s_{t}^{\beta}, q(P_{\beta,s,b_n}^{\beta})) \cdot \left( \frac{1}{p_{\beta,s,b_n}(s_{t}^{\beta})} - \hat{\Gamma}_{\pi,s}(\beta, s_{t}^{\beta}) \right) \cdot \hat{\pi}_{\beta,s,b_n}(s_{t}^{\beta}, s_{t}^{s}).
\]

In Theorem 14, we show that these three linear approximations and the density estimate of the score distribution enable us to estimate the equilibrium effect.
Theorem 14. Let \( \{t_n\} \) be a sequence such that \( t_n \uparrow \infty \) as \( n \to \infty \). We consider the sequence of equilibrium effect estimators given by \( \hat{\tau}_{EE,n}^{t_n}(\beta) \). Under the conditions of Theorem 13, if \( M < \frac{\alpha^*}{2\beta} \), then there exists a sequence \( \{b_n\} \) such that \( b_n \to 0 \) so that \( \hat{\tau}_{EE,n}^{t_n}(\beta) \overset{P}{\to} \tau_{EE}(\beta) \). Proof in Appendix F.3.

Finally, we can sum the estimators of the model and equilibrium effects to estimate the policy effect.

Corollary 15. Let \( \{t_n\} \) be a sequence such that \( t_n \uparrow \infty \) as \( n \to \infty \). We consider the sequence of approximate policy effects given by
\[
\hat{\tau}_{PE,n}^{t_n}(\beta) = \hat{\tau}_{ME,n}^{t_n}(\beta) + \hat{\tau}_{EE,n}^{t_n}(\beta).
\]
Under the conditions of Theorem 13, if \( M < \frac{\alpha^*}{2\beta} \), then there exists a sequence \( \{b_n\} \) such that \( b_n \to 0 \) so that \( \hat{\tau}_{PE,n}^{t_n}(\beta) \overset{P}{\to} \tau_{PE}(\beta) \). Proof in Appendix F.4.

Algorithm 1: Gradient Descent with \( \hat{\tau}_{PE} \)

while \( j \leq J \) do
  Decision maker deploys \( \beta^j \);
  Stochastic fixed-point iteration for sufficiently many iterations with unit-level perturbations (see Equation 5.4) until \( s^j \) is reached;
  for \( i \in \{1 \ldots n\} \) do
    Sample random perturbation \( \zeta_i \sim R^d \) and \( \zeta_i \sim R \);
    \( \beta_i^j \leftarrow \beta^j + b_n \zeta_i \);
    \( s_i^j \leftarrow s^j + b_n \zeta_i \);
    Agent \( i \) best responds to \( \beta_i^j, s_i^j \);
    Decision maker observes best response \( x_i^j \);
  end
  Given the scores \( \{\beta_i^j x_i^j + \epsilon_i^j - b_n \zeta_i^j\}^n_{i=1} \), the decision maker computes the \( q \)-th quantile of the scores \( q^j \) and density of scores at \( q^j \), yields \( \rho^j \);
  for \( i \in \{1 \ldots n\} \) do
    Decision incurs loss \( \ell_i^j \) and measures
    \( \pi_i^j \leftarrow I((\beta_i^j)^T x_i^j + \epsilon_i^j > s_i^j) \);
  end
  \( Z_\beta^j \leftarrow b_n \zeta^j \) is the \( n \times d \) matrix of perturbations \( \zeta_i \);
  \( Z_\pi^j \leftarrow b_n \pi^j \) is the \( n \times 1 \) matrix of perturbations \( \zeta_i \);
  \( \ell^j \) is the \( n \)-length vector of losses \( \ell_i \);
  \( \pi^j \) is the \( n \)-length vector of indicators \( \pi_i \);
  Construct gradient estimate \( \Gamma^j \) from \( Z_\beta^j, Z_\pi^j, \ell^j, \pi^j, \rho^j \) (See Algorithm 2);
  Take a projected gradient descent step
  \( \beta^{j+1} \leftarrow \text{Proj}[\beta^j - a \cdot \Gamma^j] \);
end
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5.3 Learning the Optimal Policy

We now describe an algorithm (see Algorithm 1) for learning the optimal policy. Following Wager and Xu [2021], the algorithm entails first learning equilibrium-adjusted gradients of the policy loss as discussed above and then updating the selection criteria via gradient descent. In this paper, we will only investigate empirical properties of this approach, and refer to Wager and Xu [2021] for formal results for this type of gradient-based learning.

The decision maker runs the algorithm for $J$ epochs. In Section 2, we describe that it may be infeasible for the decision maker to update the selection criteria at each time step. This algorithm requires the decision maker to deploy an updated selection criteria at each epoch $j$. In other words, updates to the selection criteria are necessary but infrequent. We emphasize that deploying different selection criteria is only necessary for the learning procedure, and ultimately, we aim to learn a fixed selection criteria that minimizes the equilibrium policy loss.

In epoch $j$, the decision maker deploys a policy $\beta_j$. Through the stochastic fixed-point iteration process with perturbations (Equation 5.4), a stochastic equilibrium induced by $\beta_j$ emerges, yielding the threshold for receiving treatment $s_j$. Each agent best responds to their perturbed policy and the decision maker observes their reported covariates. Following the procedure from Section 5.2, the decision maker can then use the outcomes and the perturbations to estimate the policy effect of $\beta_j$ on the equilibrium policy loss (Algorithm 2). The decision maker can set $\beta_{j+1}$ by taking a gradient descent step from $\beta_j$ using the policy effect estimator as the gradient. Any first-order variant of stochastic gradient descent can be used. In our experiments, we use vanilla stochastic gradient descent and projected stochastic gradient descent.

6 Numerical Experiments

In this section, we demonstrate that the policy effect estimator defined Section 5 can be used to learn a capacity-constrained policy that achieves lower equilibrium policy loss compared to approaches that do not account for strategic behavior or only account for the model effect. First, we give a one-dimensional toy example, where we suppose that $F$ contains cross-types, which are pairs of agent types where one agent has higher ability to modify their covariates and the other has more favorable raw covariates. In the toy example, we demonstrate that using the policy effect estimator $\hat{\tau}_{PE}$ enables a decision maker to learn the optimal solution. Second, in a high-dimensional ($d = 10$) simulation with a generic distribution $F$ over agent types, we also demonstrate that learning with the policy effect estimator $\hat{\tau}_{PE}$ yields solutions with lower equilibrium policy loss than just the model effect estimator $\hat{\tau}_{ME}$.
Figure 3: **Left:** We plot the (expected) equilibrium policy loss across $\theta = \arctan(\beta_1/\beta_0)$. Deploying $\beta = \hat{\beta}$ (equivalently, $\theta = 0$) does not yield an optimal loss. We note that the equilibrium policy loss has a global minimum $\beta^* = [0.345, 0.938]^T$ (equivalently, $\theta^* = 1.22$). **Middle:** When $\beta = \hat{\beta}$, the naturals make up only 34% of agents who score above the threshold. **Right:** When $\beta = \beta^*$, the naturals make up 69% of agents who score above the threshold.

### 6.1 Toy Example

For a one-dimensional example, we consider policies with the following parametrization

$$\beta = [\cos \theta, \sin \theta]^T, \text{ where } \theta \in S^1.$$  

We suppose that the capacity constraint limits the decision maker to accept only 30% of the agent population. To define the decision maker’s loss, suppose $\ell$ is specified as follows

$$\ell(\pi, \nu) = \begin{cases} -\eta_1 & \pi = 1 \\ 0 & \pi = 0 \end{cases}.$$ 

The decision maker’s equilibrium policy loss $L_{eq}(\beta)$ is given by Definition 1.

We consider an agent distribution where agents are heterogeneous in their raw covariates and ability to modify their observed covariates. We suppose that $\eta_1, \eta_2 \sim \text{Uniform}[5, 7]$, $\gamma_1, \gamma_2 \sim \text{Uniform}[0.01, 0.02]$, $x \sim \text{Uniform}[0, 10]^2$, and $G$ is the CDF of a Gaussian with mean 0 and variance $\sigma^2$. The variance $\sigma^2$ is set to ensure the continuous differentiability property of the quantile mapping of the score distribution; we set $\sigma = 3.3$. Agents optimize the quadratic utility function in Equation 2.5. So, the entry $\gamma_i$ quantifies the cost of gaming $\eta_i$.

Motivated by Frankel and Kartik [2019b], we consider an agent distribution with two groups of agent types in the population of equal proportion, the *naturals* and the *gamers*. The naturals have

$$\eta_1, \eta_2 \sim \text{Uniform}[5, 7], \quad \gamma_1, \gamma_2 \sim \text{Uniform}[0, 20].$$

In contrast, the gamers have

$$\eta_1, \eta_2 \sim \text{Uniform}[3, 5], \quad \gamma_1 \sim \text{Uniform}[0.01, 0.02], \quad \gamma_2 \sim \text{Uniform}[10, 20].$$

In this simulation, there are 10 agent types, 5 naturals and 5 gamers. The naturals and gamers are cross types as in Frankel and Kartik [2019b] because the naturals have higher
coordinate representations of the solutions and the learned solution. In addition, we report the absolute difference between the polar representation of $\beta$ and $\hat{\beta}$.

We report the absolute difference between the equilibrium policy loss of the optimal solution and as expected it places considerable weight on $x$. Selection criteria that places some weight on naturals.

Arctan($\beta$) which corresponds to $\beta$ in (Figure 3, left plot). As expected, we observe that deploying the naive policy $\beta = \tilde{\theta}$ achieves the optimal equilibrium policy loss, and as expected it places considerable weight on naturals.

We plot the equilibrium policy loss of decision maker as a function of $\theta = \arctan(\beta_1/\beta_0)$ in (Figure 3, left plot). As expected, we observe that deploying the naive policy $\beta = \tilde{\theta}$, which corresponds to $\theta = 0$, is suboptimal for minimizing the equilibrium policy loss. When $\beta = \tilde{\theta}$, we observe that only 35% of agents who score above $s(\beta)$ are naturals (Figure 3, middle plot).

The policy $\beta^* = [0.345, 0.938]^T$ achieves the optimal equilibrium policy loss, and as expected it places considerable weight on $x_2$. When $\beta = \beta^*$, we observe that 69% of agents who score above $s(\beta)$ are naturals (Figure 3, right plot).

We compare the solutions obtained by running stochastic gradient descent with $\hat{\tau}_{\text{ME}}$ and $\hat{\tau}_{\text{PE}}$. We optimize $\beta$ via vanilla stochastic gradient descent on $\theta$, the polar-coordinate representation of $\beta$. We initialize gradient descent with $\beta^* (\theta=0)$. We report the equilibrium policy loss obtained by the learned parameters $\hat{\beta}$ after 100 iterations of gradient descent.

We assume that $n = 1000000$ agents are observed by the decision maker at each iteration. We report the absolute difference between the equilibrium policy loss of the optimal solution and the learned solution. In addition, we report the absolute difference between the polar coordinate representations of the solutions $|\hat{\theta} - \theta^*|$, where $\hat{\theta} = \arctan(\beta_1/\beta_0)$ and $\theta^* = \arctan(\beta_1/\beta_3)$.

Across 10 random trials (where the randomness is over the sampled agent types and sampled agents), we observe that gradient descent using the policy effect $\hat{\tau}_{\text{PE}}$ from Corollary 15 converges to $\theta^*$ (Table 1). Meanwhile, gradient descent with the model effect $\hat{\tau}_{\text{ME}}$ from Theorem 13 converges to a policy that attains suboptimal equilibrium policy loss (Table 1). This demonstrates the value of accounting for the equilibrium effect. Nevertheless, we note that $\hat{\tau}_{\text{ME}}$ is a relatively strong baseline because it accounts for agents’ strategic behavior with knowledge of the selection criteria $\beta$’s impact on the decision maker’s loss. In absence of capacity constraints, gradient descent with $\hat{\tau}_{\text{ME}}$ will enable learning of the optimal solution.

| Method                  | $|L_{eq}(\hat{\beta}) - L_{eq}(\beta^*)|$ | $|\hat{\theta} - \theta^*|$ |
|------------------------|----------------------------------------|---------------------------|
| None (Set $\beta = \beta$) | 0.19 ± 0.04                           | 1.24 ± 0.08               |
| GD with $\hat{\tau}_{\text{ME}}$ | 0.08 ± 0.02                           | 0.68 ± 0.13               |
| GD with $\hat{\tau}_{\text{PE}}$ | 0.00 ± 0.00                           | 0.03 ± 0.02               |

Table 1: Over 10 random trials, we observe that gradient descent with the policy effect converges to the optimal $\theta^*$ (or in Cartesian coordinates, $\beta^*$). However, gradient descent with the model effect does not converge to $\theta^*$.
Figure 4: We plot the equilibrium policy loss obtained from iterates of gradient descent with \( \hat{\tau}_{\text{ME}} \) and \( \hat{\tau}_{\text{PE}} \) in our high-dimensional simulation \((d = 10)\) and find that gradient descent with \( \hat{\tau}_{\text{PE}} \) converges to a solution that obtains lower equilibrium policy loss.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Equilibrium Policy Loss ( L_{eq}(\hat{\beta}) )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GD with ( \hat{\tau}_{\text{ME}} )</td>
<td>-1.81 ± 0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GD with ( \hat{\tau}_{\text{PE}} )</td>
<td>-2.04 ± 0.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Across 10 random trials, we find that GD with \( \hat{\tau}_{\text{PE}} \) attains lower equilibrium policy loss than GD with \( \hat{\tau}_{\text{ME}} \) in our high-dimensional simulation \((d = 10)\). A one-sided paired t-test, where we compare the final loss incurred of the policy learned via GD with \( \hat{\tau}_{\text{PE}} \) and GD with \( \hat{\tau}_{\text{ME}} \) with the same random seed, yields a \( p \)-value of 1e-5.

### 6.2 High-Dimensional Simulation

For \( d = 10 \), in this simulation we consider \( d \)-dimensional linear policies

\[
\beta \in \mathcal{B}, \text{ where } \mathcal{B} = \{ y \in \mathbb{R}^d \mid ||y||_2 \leq 1 \}.
\]

We suppose the capacity constraint only allows the decision maker to accept 30% of the agent population. To define the decision maker’s loss, suppose that \( \ell \) is specified as follows

\[
\ell(\pi, \nu) = \begin{cases} 
-\eta_i & \pi = 1 \\
0 & \pi = 0
\end{cases}.
\]

The decision maker’s equilibrium policy loss \( L_{eq}(\beta) \) is given by Definition 1.

We suppose that

\[
\eta \in [0, 10]^d, \quad \gamma \in [0.05, 5]^d, \quad x \in [0, 10]^d,
\]

and \( G \) is the CDF of a Gaussian with mean 0 and variance \( \sigma^2 \). The variance \( \sigma^2 \) is set to ensure the continuous differentiability property of the quantile mapping of the score distribution; we set \( \sigma = 1.10 \). Agents optimize the quadratic utility function in Equation 2.5, and the entry \( \gamma_i \) quantifies the cost of gaming \( \eta_i \). We consider a population with 10 agent types. For each agent type \((\eta, \gamma)\), we have that

\[
\eta_i \sim \text{Uniform}[3, 8], \quad \gamma_i \sim \text{Uniform}[0.05, 5], \quad i \in \{1, \ldots, d\}.
\]
We optimize $\beta$ via projected stochastic gradient descent, initialized with $\hat{\beta} = 0$. We compare the equilibrium policy loss of the gradient descent iterates obtained by using $\hat{\tau}_{\text{ME}}$ as the gradient to those obtained by using $\hat{\tau}_{\text{PE}}$ as the gradient (Figure 4). We assume that $n = 1000000$ agents are observed by the decision maker at each iteration. Across 10 random trials (where the randomness is over the sampled agent types and the sampled agents), we observe that gradient descent with $\hat{\tau}_{\text{PE}}$ finds a solution with lower equilibrium policy loss than gradient descent with $\hat{\tau}_{\text{ME}}$ (Table 2). Again, we note that GD with $\hat{\tau}_{\text{ME}}$ is a relatively strong baseline because it captures how the decision maker’s loss changes with respect to the selection criteria in a way that accounts for agents’ strategic behavior.
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A Experiment Details

A.1 Toy Experiment

We use a learning rate of $a = 1$ in GD with $\hat{r}_{PE}$. We use a learning rate of $a = 0.25$ in GD with $\hat{r}_{ME}$. We use a perturbation size $b = 0.025$ for $\beta$ and $b = 0.2$ for $s$.
A.2 High-Dimensional Experiment

We use a learning rate of $a = 1$ in GD with $\tilde{\tau}_{ME}$ and in GD with $\tilde{\tau}_{TE}$. We use a perturbation size $b = 0.025$ for $\beta$ and $b = 0.2$ for $s$.

B Standard Results

Definition 8 (Positive Definite). A symmetric matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ is positive definite if $z^T A z > 0$ for all $z \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$.

Lemma 16 (Strong Convexity of Twice Differentiable Functions.). A twice-differentiable function $f : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}$ is $\alpha-$strongly convex for $\alpha \geq 0$, iff $z^T \nabla^2 f(x) z \geq \alpha ||z||^2_2$ for all $x, z \in \mathbb{R}^d$.

Lemma 17. Let $X \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ is a convex set. Let $f : X \to \mathbb{R}$ be a strictly concave function. If $f$ has a global maximizer, then the maximizer is unique (Boyd et al. [2004]).

Lemma 18. Let $f : X \to \mathbb{R}$, where $X \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ is a convex set, be a twice-differentiable function. If $f$ is a strictly concave function and $x^*$ is in the interior of $X$, then $x^*$ is the unique global maximizer of $f$ on $X$ if and only if $\nabla f(x^*) = 0$ (Boyd et al. [2004]).

Theorem 19 (Implicit Function Theorem). Suppose $f : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^m \to \mathbb{R}^m$ is continuously differentiable in an open set containing $(x_0, y_0)$ and $f(x_0, y_0) = 0$. Let $M$ be the $m \times m$ matrix

$$D_{n+m} f(x, y) 1 \leq i, j \leq m.$$

If $\det(M) \neq 0$, then there is an open set $X \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ containing $x_0$ and an open set $Y \subset \mathbb{R}^m$ containing $y_0$, with the following property: for each $x \in X$ there is a unique $g(x) \in Y$ such that $f(x, g(x)) = 0$. The function $g$ is continuously differentiable.

Theorem 20 (Sherman-Morrison Formula). Suppose $A \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ is an invertible square matrix, $u, v \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Then $A + uv^T$ is invertible iff $1 + v^T A^{-1} u \neq 0$. In this case,

$$(A + uv^T)^{-1} = A^{-1} - \frac{A^{-1}uv^TA^{-1}}{1 + v^TA^{-1}u}.$$

Lemma 21. Suppose $A, B \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ are positive definite matrices. If $A - B$ is positive semidefinite, then $B^{-1} - A^{-1}$ is positive semidefinite (Dhrymes [1978]).

Theorem 22 (Brouwer’s Fixed-Point Theorem). For any continuous function $f$ mapping a compact convex set to itself there is a point $x^*$ such that $f(x^*) = x^*$.

Lemma 23. Let $f : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ be a differentiable real function. The function $f$ is a contraction with modulus $\kappa \in (0, 1)$ if and only if $|f'(x)| \leq \kappa$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$ (Ortega [1990]).

Theorem 24. Let $g \in C[a, b]$ be such that $g(x) \in [a, b]$, for all $x$ in $[a, b]$. Suppose, in addition, that $g$ exists on $(a, b)$ and that a constant $0 < \kappa < 1$ exists with $|g'(x)| \leq \kappa$, for all $x \in (a, b)$. Then for any number $p_0$ in $[a, b]$, the sequence defined by $p_n = g(p_{n-1}), n \geq 1$, converges to the unique fixed point $p$ in $[a, b]$ (Burden et al. [2015]).
Theorem 25 (Dvoretzky–Kiefer–Wolfowitz Inequality). Let $F$ be a distribution function and $F_n$ be an empirical distribution function over $n$ i.i.d. samples from $F$. For any $\epsilon > 0$ and $n > 0$,

$$P \left( \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} |F_n(x) - F(x)| < \epsilon \right) \leq 1 - 2e^{-2n\epsilon^2}.$$

Theorem 26 (Bernoulli’s Inequality). For every $r \geq 0$ and $x \geq -1$, $(1 + x)^r \geq 1 + rx$.

Lemma 27. If the $w_i$ i.i.d., $\Theta$ is compact, $a(\cdot, \theta)$ is continuous at each $\theta \in \Theta$ with probability one, and there is $d(w)$ with $||a(w, \theta)|| \leq d(w)$ for all $\theta \in \Theta$ and $\mathbb{E}[d(w)] < \infty$, then $\mathbb{E}[a(w, \theta)]$ is continuous and

$$\sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} a(w_i, \theta) - \mathbb{E}[a(w, \theta)] \xrightarrow{P} 0$$

(Lemma 2.4, Newey and McFadden [1994]).

Lemma 28. Suppose $\Theta$ is compact and $f(\theta)$ is continuous. Then $\sup_{\theta \in \Theta} |\hat{f}_n(\theta) - f(\theta)| \to 0$ if and only if $\hat{f}_n(\theta) \xrightarrow{P} f(\theta)$ for all $\theta \in \Theta$ and $\{\hat{f}_n(\theta)\}$ is stochastically equicontinuous (Lemma 2.8, Newey and McFadden [1994]).

Lemma 29. Suppose $\{Z_n(t)\}$ is a collection of stochastic processes indexed by $t \in \mathcal{T}$. Suppose $\{Z_n(t)\}$ is stochastically equicontinuous at $t_0 \in \mathcal{T}$. Let $\tau_n$ be a sequence of random elements of $\mathcal{T}$ known to satisfy $\tau_n \xrightarrow{P} t_0$. It follows that $Z_n(\tau_n) - Z_n(t_0) \xrightarrow{P} 0$, (Pollard [2012]).

Lemma 30. Let $f_n : \mathcal{X} \to \mathbb{R}$ where $\mathcal{X} \subset \mathbb{R}$ is a compact set. Let $\{f_n\}$ be a sequence of monotonic functions that converge pointwise to a continuous function $f$. Then $f_n \to f$ uniformly (Buchanan and Hildebrandt [1908]).

Lemma 31. Let $f_n : [a, b] \to \mathbb{R}$. Let $\{f_n\}$ be a sequence of continuous functions that converge uniformly to $f$. Suppose each $f_n$ has exactly one root $x_n \in [a, b]$ and $f$ has exactly one root $x^* \in [a, b]$. Then $x_n \to x^*$. Proof in Appendix G.1.

Theorem 32. Let us assume the following:

1. $K$ vanishes at infinity, and $\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} K^2(x)dx < \infty$,
2. $h_n \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$,
3. $nh_n \to \infty$ as $n \to \infty$.

Let $f^\tau(x)$ be a kernel density estimate of the density function $f$ with $n$ samples, kernel $K$, and bandwidth $h_n$. Then $f^\tau(x) \xrightarrow{L^2} f(x)$, as $n \to \infty$ (Parzen [1962]).

C Proofs of Agent Results

Lemma 33. Under Assumptions 1 and 2, the expected utility (Equation 2.4) is twice continuously differentiable in $x, \beta, s$. Proof in Appendix G.2.

Lemma 34. Under Assumptions 1 and 2, if $M < \frac{a}{\beta}$, then $\nabla_x^2 \mathbb{E}_{\nu \sim G} [u(x; \beta, s, \nu)]$ is negative definite. Proof in Appendix G.3.
Lemma 35. Under Assumptions 1 and 2, if \( M < \frac{\alpha}{\beta} \) and \( x \in \text{Int}(\mathcal{X}) \), then \( x = \omega(\beta, s, \nu) \) if and only if \( \nabla_x E_{\varepsilon \sim G} [u(x; \beta, s, \nu)] = 0 \). Proof in Appendix G.4.

Lemma 36. Under Assumptions 1 and 2, if \( M < \frac{\alpha}{\beta} \) and \( x(\beta, s, \nu) \in \text{Int}(\mathcal{X}) \), then

\[
\beta^T \nabla_x x = G''(s - \beta^T x(s))\beta^T H^{-1} \beta - \left( \frac{G''(s - \beta^T x(s))\beta^T H^{-1} \beta}{1 + G''(s - \beta^T x(s))\beta^T H^{-1} \beta} \right),
\]

(C.1)

where \( \nu = (\eta, \gamma) \), \( x(s) := x(\beta, s, \nu) \), and \( H := \nabla^2 c_\nu(x(s) - \eta; \gamma) \). Proof in Appendix G.5.

Lemma 37. Let \( H = \nabla^2 c_\nu(y) \) for some \( y \in \mathcal{X} \). Under Assumption 1, we have that \( H \) is positive definite, \( H^{-1} \) is positive definite, and

\[
\sup_{z \in B} z^T H^{-1} z \leq \frac{B}{\alpha}.
\]

(C.2)

Proof in Appendix G.6.

Lemma 38. Under Assumptions 1 and 2, if \( M < \frac{\alpha}{\beta} \) and \( x(\beta, s, \nu) \in \text{Int}(\mathcal{X}) \), then the function \( h(s; \beta, \nu) = s - \beta^T x(\beta, s, \nu) \) is strictly increasing in \( s \). Proof in Appendix G.7.

C.1 Proof of Lemma 1

We can apply Lemma 33 to show that the expected utility (Equation 2.4) is twice continuously differentiable in \( x \), and thus continuous in \( x \). Since \( \mathcal{X} \) is compact, the expected utility attains a maximum value on \( \mathcal{X} \) because a continuous function attains a maximum value on a compact set. Thus, there exists \( x \in \mathcal{X} \) that maximizes the expected utility.

From Lemma 34, \( \nabla^2_x E_{\varepsilon \sim G} [u(x; \beta, s, \nu)] \) is negative definite everywhere. This implies that the expected utility is strictly concave. Since \( \mathcal{X} \) is a convex set and the expected utility is strictly concave, we can apply Lemma 17 to conclude that the best response is the unique maximizer of the expected utility on \( \mathcal{X} \).

C.2 Proof of Lemma 2

We use the following abbreviations for the expected utility and best response

\[
E_{\varepsilon \sim G} [u(x; s)] := E_{\varepsilon \sim G} [u(x; \beta, s, \nu)]
\]

\[
x(s) := x(\beta, s, \nu),
\]

where \( \beta, \nu \) are fixed. We aim to show that if a best response \( x(s) \in \text{Int}(\mathcal{X}) \), then \( x \) is continuously differentiable in \( s \). By Lemma 35, if a best response \( x(s) \in \text{Int}(\mathcal{X}) \), then it satisfies \( \nabla_x E_{\varepsilon \sim G} [u(x; s)] = 0 \). Our goal is to apply the Implicit Function Theorem (Theorem 19) to show that \( x \) that satisfies \( \nabla_x E_{\varepsilon \sim G} [u(x; s)] = 0 \) can be written as a continuously differentiable function of \( s \).

Now, we verify the conditions of the Implicit Function Theorem. The conditions include \( \nabla_x E_{\varepsilon \sim G} [u(x; s)] \) is continuously differentiable in its arguments and that at the point \((x_0, s_0)\) where the theorem is applied, we have \( \det(\nabla^2_x E_{\varepsilon \sim G} [u(x_0; s_0)]) \neq 0 \). The first condition follows from Lemma 33, which in fact states that \( E_{\varepsilon \sim G} [u(x; s)] \) is twice continuously differentiable in its arguments. For the second condition, we note that \( \nabla^2_x E_{\varepsilon \sim G} [u(x; s)] \) is always negative definite everywhere from Lemma 34.
As a result, the conditions of the Implicit Function Theorem are satisfied. Let \((x_0, s_0)\) be any point that satisfies \(\nabla_x E_{\tau \sim \mathcal{G}} [u(x; s)] = 0\). In an open neighborhood \(V \times W \subset \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}\) of \((x_0, s_0)\), for each \(s \in W\) there is a unique \(g(s) \in V\) such that \(\nabla_x E_{\tau \sim \mathcal{G}} [u(g(s); s)] = 0\) and \(g\) is a continuously differentiable function of \(s\). If \(g(s) \in \text{Int}(\mathcal{X})\), then \(g(s)\) coincides with the unique best response \(x(s)\) by Lemma 35. This implies that for \(x(s) \in \text{Int}(\mathcal{X})\), then \(x\) is continuously differentiable in \(s\).

An analogous proof can be used to show that the best response \(x\) is continuously differentiable in \(\beta\).

### C.3 Proof of Lemma 3

Without loss of generality, we fix \(\beta, \nu\). We abbreviate
\[
x(s) := x(\beta, s, \nu).
\]
To show that \(\beta^T x(s)\) is a contraction, it is sufficient to show that \(|\beta^T \nabla_s x| < 1\) (Lemma 23). We show this result in two steps. First, we use Lemma 38 to show that \(\beta^T \nabla_s x < 1\). Second, we can use our assumption that \(M < \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}\) to show \(\beta^T \nabla_s x < 1\).

We first show that \(\beta^T \nabla_s x < 1\). Since we assume that \(M < \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}\), we certainly have that \(M < \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}\), so we can apply Lemma 38. This gives us that \(h(s; \beta, \nu) = s - \beta^T x(\beta, s, \nu)\) is strictly increasing. We can apply Lemma 2 to establish the differentiability of the best response, which consequently gives the differentiability of \(h\). Since \(h\) is also strictly increasing, we have that
\[
\frac{dh}{ds} = 1 - \beta^T \nabla_s x(s) > 0.
\]
This gives us that \(\beta^T \nabla_s x(s) < 1\).

Now, we establish that \(\beta^T \nabla_s x > -1\). We use Lemma 36 to get an expression (Equation C.1) for the \(\beta^T \nabla_s x\).

We can simplify Equation C.1 as follows,
\[
\beta^T \nabla_s x = G''(s - \beta^T x(s))\beta^T H^{-1} \beta - \left( \frac{G''(s - \beta^T x(s))\beta^T H^{-1} \beta}{1 + G''(s - \beta^T x(s))\beta^T H^{-1} \beta} \right) \tag{C.3}
\]
\[
= \frac{G''(s - \beta^T x(s))\beta^T H^{-1} \beta}{1 + G''(s - \beta^T x(s))\beta^T H^{-1} \beta} \tag{C.4}
\]
We study the numerator of the term on the right side of Equation C.4.
\[
G''(s - \beta^T x(s))\beta^T H^{-1} \beta \geq \inf_y G''(y) \sup_{z \in B} z^T H^{-1} z \tag{C.5}
\]
\[
\geq (-M) \cdot \frac{B}{\alpha_y} \tag{C.6}
\]
\[
> -\frac{\alpha_y}{2B} \cdot \frac{B}{\alpha_y} \tag{C.7}
\]
\[
= -\frac{1}{2} \tag{C.8}
\]

Equation C.5 follows from the observation that \(G''(y)\) may take negative values (recall Assumption 2, which gives that \(|G''(y)| \leq M\) while \(H^{-1}\) is positive definite (Lemma 37). Equation C.6 is an application of Lemma 37. In Equation C.7, we use our assumption that \(M < \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}\).
Finally, we have that
\[
G''(s - \beta^T x(s))\beta^T H^{-1}\beta > -\frac{1}{2} \tag{C.9}
\]
\[
2G''(s - \beta^T x(s))\beta^T H^{-1}\beta > -1 \tag{C.10}
\]
\[
G''(s - \beta^T x(s))\beta^T H^{-1}\beta > -1 - G''(s - \beta^T x(s))\beta^T H^{-1}\beta. \tag{C.11}
\]

Since
\[
1 + G''(s - \beta^T x(s))\beta^T H^{-1}\beta > \frac{1}{2} > 0,
\]
we can divide both sides of Equation C.11 by \(1 + G''(s - \beta^T x(s))\beta^T H^{-1}\beta\) to see that
\[
\frac{G''(s - \beta^T x(s))\beta^T H^{-1}\beta}{1 + G''(s - \beta^T x(s))\beta^T H^{-1}\beta} > -1. \tag{C.12}
\]

We realize that the term on the left side of Equation C.12 matches our expression for the gradient of the score of the best response from Equation C.4, so we conclude that
\[
\beta^T \nabla_s x > -1.
\]

Thus, we have that \(|\beta^T \nabla_s x| < 1\), so \(\beta^T \nabla_s x\) is a contraction in \(s\).

**D Proofs of Mean-Field Results**

We state technical lemmas that will be used in many of our results. The proofs of these lemmas can be found in Appendix G.

**Lemma 39.** The distribution \(P_{\beta,s}\) is given by
\[
P_{\beta,s}(r) = \int_{X \times G} G(r - \beta^T x(\beta, s, \nu))dF. \tag{D.1}
\]

Under Assumptions 1, 2, 3, 5, and 4, if \(M < \frac{\alpha^*_B}{B}\), then \(P_{\beta,s}(r)\) is a well-defined function. Furthermore, it is strictly increasing in \(r\), continuously differentiable in \(\beta, s, r\), and has a unique inverse distribution function. Proof in Appendix G.8.

**Lemma 40.** Fix \(\beta \in B\). Suppose Assumptions 1, 2, 3, 5 and 4 hold. If \(M < \frac{\alpha^*_B}{2B}\), then \(\frac{\partial q(P_{\beta,s})}{\partial s} < 1\). If \(M < \frac{\alpha^*_B}{2B}\), then \(\left|\frac{\partial q(P_{\beta,s})}{\partial s}\right| < 1\). Proof in Appendix G.9.

**D.1 Proof of Theorem 4**

Our main goal is show that \(P_{\beta,s}(s)\) is a continuous and strictly increasing function of \(s\). A continuous and strictly increasing function can intersect a horizontal line (e.g. \(y = q\)) in at most one point, so if a fixed point of \(q(P_{\beta,s})\) exists, then it must be unique.

From Lemma 39, \(P_{\beta,s}\) has a unique inverse. So, if there is a fixed point \(s\), which means that \(s = q(P_{\beta,s})\), then the fixed point satisfies \(P_{\beta,s}(s) = q\).

Applying Equation D.1 from Lemma 39, we have
\[
P_{\beta,s}(s) = \int_{X \times G} G(s - \beta^T x(\beta, s, \nu))dF = \int_{X \times G} G(b(s; \beta, \nu))dF,
\]
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where \( h(s; \beta, \nu) = s - \beta^T x(\beta, s, \nu) \).

The continuity of \( P_{\beta,s}(s) \) in \( s \) follows from the continuity of \( P_{\beta,s}(r) \) in \( (s, r) \) (Lemma 39).

We show that \( P_{\beta,s}(s) \) is strictly increasing in \( s \). From Lemma 38, we have that \( h(s; \beta, \nu) \) is strictly increasing in \( s \) for any agent type \( (\nu) \). From Assumption 5, we have that \( G \) is a strictly increasing CDF, so we have that \( G(h(s; \beta, \nu)) \) is also strictly increasing. Finally, the sum of strictly increasing functions is strictly increasing, which gives that the integral is also a strictly increasing function of \( s \).

Since \( P_{\beta,s}(s) \) is continuous and strictly increasing in \( s \), there is at most one point where it can equal \( q \). Thus, if a fixed point of \( q(P_{\beta,s}) \) exists, then it is unique.

### D.2 Proof of Lemma 5

To show that \( q(P_{\beta,s}) \) is continuously differentiable in \( s \), we first show that \( q(P_{\beta,s}) \) can be expressed implicitly as a solution to

\[
h(s, r) = P_{\beta,s}(r) - q = 0, \quad \text{where } r = q(P_{\beta,s}). \tag{D.2}
\]

Second, we verify that the Implicit Function Theorem (Theorem 19) can be applied to \( h(s, r) = 0 \), so that \( r \) can be expressed as a continuously differentiable function of \( s \). Since \( r = q(P_{\beta,s}) \), we can conclude that \( q(P_{\beta,s}) \) is continuously differentiable in \( s \).

For the first step, we aim to show that \( q(P_{\beta,s}) \) can be expressed by Equation D.2. By Lemma 39, we have that \( P_{\beta,s} \) has a unique inverse distribution function. So, there exists a unique \( r \) such that \( r = q(P_{\beta,s}) \). Equivalently, \( P_{\beta,s}(r) = q \) for \( r = q(P_{\beta,s}) \), which yields Equation D.2.

In the second step, we aim to apply Implicit Function Theorem to \( h(s, r) = 0 \) at any point \((s_0, r_0)\) that satisfies \( h(s, r) = 0 \) to show that \( r \) can be expressed as a continuously differentiable function of \( s \). Since \( r = q(P_{\beta,s}) \), this is sufficient for showing that \( q(P_{\beta,s}) \) is continuously differentiable function of \( s \).

The conditions of the Implicit Function Theorem include that \( h(s, r) \) is continuously differentiable in its arguments and that \( \frac{\partial h}{\partial r}(s_0, r_0) \neq 0 \). We verify that these conditions hold as follows. Both of these conditions follow from Lemma 39, which gives that \( P_{\beta,s}(r) \) is continuously differentiable in \((s, r)\) and strictly increasing in \( r \). We have that

\[
\frac{\partial h}{\partial r} = \frac{\partial P_{\beta,s}(r)}{\partial r},
\]

and \( \frac{\partial P_{\beta,s}(r)}{\partial r} > 0 \). So, for any \((s_0, r_0)\), we have that \( \frac{\partial h}{\partial r}(s_0, r_0) \neq 0 \).

As a result, the conditions of the Implicit Function Theorem are satisfied. Let \((s_0, r_0)\) be any point that satisfies \( h(s, r) = 0 \). In an open neighborhood \( V \times W \subset \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} \) of \((s_0, r_0)\), for each \( s \in V \) there is a unique \( g(s) \in W \) such that \( h(s, g(s)) = 0 \) and \( g \) is a continuously differentiable function of \( s \). Since \( r = q(P_{\beta,s}) \) satisfies \( h(s, r) = 0 \), we must have that \( q(P_{\beta,s}) \) is a continuously differentiable function of \( s \).

An analogous proof can be used to show that \( q(P_{\beta,s}) \) is continuously differentiable in \( \beta \).

### D.3 Proof of Theorem 6

The proof follows by an application of Brouwer’s Fixed-Point Theorem (Theorem 22). We verify the conditions of the theorem—namely, that \( q(P_{\beta,s}) \) is a continuous function of \( s \) and \( q(P_{\beta,s}) : S \to S \) where \( S \) is a convex, compact set.
The first condition follows from Lemma 5, which gives that $q(P_{\beta,s})$ is continuously differentiable in $s$, and thus continuous in $s$.

To show the second condition, note that the domain of $q(P_{\beta,s})$ is $S$, a convex, compact set. It remains to show that the range of $q(P_{\beta,s})$ is a subset of $S$. From Assumption 6, we have that $G$ has bounded support. As a result, any agent’s score $\beta^T x(\beta, s, \nu) + \epsilon$ must lie in a bounded interval $[s, \bar{s}]$:

$$s = \inf_{\beta \in B, x \in X} \beta^T x \quad \inf_{\epsilon \in \text{supp}(G)} \epsilon \leq \inf_{x \in X, \epsilon \in \text{supp}(G)} \beta^T x + \epsilon \leq \beta^T x(\beta, s, \nu) + \epsilon \leq \sup_{x \in X, \epsilon \in \text{supp}(G)} \beta^T x + \epsilon \leq \sup_{\beta \in B, x \in X} \beta^T x + \sup_{\epsilon \in \text{supp}(G)} \epsilon = \bar{s}.$$

Since the agents’ scores must lie in $[s, \bar{s}]$, then $q(P_{\beta,s})$, which is the $q$-th quantile of the scores, must also lie in $[s, \bar{s}]$. By Assumption 6, we have that $S$ is convex and compact with $[s, \bar{s}] \subset S$, so $q(P_{\beta,s})$ is a function mapping $S \rightarrow S$. Thus, Theorem 22 gives that there must exist some $s \in S$ such that $q(P_{\beta,s}) = s$.

D.4 Proof of Theorem 7

First, we can apply Lemma 5 to establish that $q(P_{\beta,s})$ is differentiable in $s$ for any fixed $\beta \in B$. Second, since we assumed that $q(P_{\beta,s})$ is a contraction in $s$, by Lemma 23, we have that $|\frac{\partial q(P_{\beta,s})}{\partial s}| \leq \kappa < 1$. Finally, we note that under Assumption 6, $q(P_{\beta,s}) : S \rightarrow S$ where $S$ is a convex compact subset of $\mathbb{R}$. So, for any fixed $\beta \in B$, $q(P_{\beta,s})$ satisfies the assumptions of Theorem 24. Thus, we conclude that the process in Equation 3.1 converges to $s^*$, the unique fixed point of $q(P_{\beta,s})$.

D.5 Proof of Corollary 8

If $M < \frac{\alpha^*}{\sqrt{2}}$, we can apply the second part of Lemma 40 to conclude that $|\frac{\partial q(P_{\beta,s})}{\partial s}| < 1$. By Lemma 23, $q(P_{\beta,s})$ is a contraction in $s$. As a consequence of Theorem 7, we can conclude that fixed point iteration (Equation 3.1) converges to $s^*$, the unique fixed point of $q(P_{\beta,s})$.

D.6 Proof of Theorem 9

First, we show that we can define a function that maps a linear model $\beta$ to the equilibrium threshold $s^*$ induced by $\beta$. Second, we give an equation that implicitly expresses this function. We verify that this equation satisfies the conditions of the Implicit Function Theorem at any point $(\beta, s^*)$, where $\beta$ is a linear model and $s^*$ is equilibrium threshold induced by $\beta$, and apply the Implicit Function Theorem to arrive at the desired result. To prove one of the conditions of the Implicit Function Theorem, we will use the first part of Lemma 40.

Recall that for every $\beta \in B$, there exists a fixed point $s^*$ that satisfies $q(P_{\beta,s^*}) = s^*$ (Theorem 6), and it is unique (Theorem 4). As a result, we can define a function $s : B \rightarrow S$ that maps $\beta$ to the fixed point induced by $\beta$. 
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Note that we can implicitly represent \( s(\beta) \) by \( s \) in the following equation

\[
h(\beta, s) = s - q(P_{\beta,s}) = 0.
\]

We aim to apply the Implicit Function Theorem to \( h(\beta, s) \) at any point \((\beta_0, s_0)\) where \( h(\beta_0, s_0) = 0 \). We verify that the conditions of the Implicit Function Theorem are satisfied—\( h(\beta, s) \) must be continuously differentiable in its arguments and \( \frac{\partial h(\beta, s)}{\partial s}(\beta_0, s_0) \neq 0 \).

For the first condition, Lemma 5 gives us that \( q(P_{\beta,s}) \) is continuously differentiable in its arguments. As a result, \( h(\beta, s) \) is also continuously differentiable in \( \beta, s \).

For the second condition, we note that

\[
\frac{\partial h(\beta, s)}{\partial s} = 1 - \frac{\partial q(P_{\beta,s})}{\partial s}.
\]

From Lemma 40, we have that \( \frac{\partial q(P_{\beta,s})}{\partial s} < 1 \), so \( \frac{\partial h(\beta, s)}{\partial s} > 0 \). Thus, the conditions of the Implicit Function Theorem are satisfied.

Let \((\beta_0, s_0)\) be a point that yields \( h(\beta_0, s_0) = 0 \). In an open neighborhood \( V \times W \subset \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R} \) of \((\beta_0, s_0)\), for every \( \beta \in V \), there is a unique \( g(\beta) \in W \) such that \( h(\beta, g(\beta)) = 0 \) and \( g \) is a continuously differentiable function of \( \beta \). We note that such \( g(\beta) \) must correspond to the unique equilibrium threshold induced by \( \beta \), so \( s(\beta) = g(\beta) \). Thus, \( s(\beta) \) is a continuously differentiable function of \( \beta \).

### E Proofs of Finite Approximation Results

We state a technical lemma that will be used in our subsequent results.

**Lemma 41.** Let \( P, \tilde{P} \) be a distribution functions with the same support \( X \). Suppose \( P \) is strictly increasing and differentiable. Let \( D > 0 \) be a lower bound on the derivative of \( P \). Then,

\[
|q(P) - q(\tilde{P})| \leq \frac{1}{D} \sup_{x \in X} |P(x) - \tilde{P}(x)|.
\]

(E.1)

*Proof in Appendix G.10.*

#### E.1 Proof of Theorem 10

First, we state two lemmas that will be used in the proof of our main theorem.

**Lemma 42.** Let \( P \) be a strictly increasing and differentiable distribution function and let \( P^n \) be its corresponding empirical distribution. For \( \epsilon > 0 \) and \( n > 0 \)

\[
P(|q(P) - q(P^n)| < \epsilon) \geq 1 - 2e^{-2nD^2\epsilon^2},
\]

where \( D > 0 \) is a lower bound on the derivative of \( P \). *Proof in Appendix G.11.*

**Lemma 43.** Suppose the conditions of Theorem 10 hold. Let \( \{\hat{s}_t\}_{t \geq 0} \) be a stochastic process generated via Equation 4.1. Let \( S < \infty \) be the range of \( S \). Let \( \{z^t\}_{t \geq 1} \) be a sequence of random variables where

\[
z^t = \begin{cases} S & \text{w.p. } 1 - p_n(\epsilon_g) \\ \epsilon_g & \text{w.p. } p_n(\epsilon_g) \end{cases},
\]
where \( p_n(\epsilon_g) \) is the bound from Lemma 42. Then, \( \sum_{i=0}^{k} z^{t-i} \kappa^i + \kappa^k |\hat{s}_n^{t-k} - s^*| \) stochastically dominates \( |\hat{s}_n^t - s^*| \). \textbf{Proof in Appendix G.12.}

Under Assumption 6, the range of \( q(P_{B,s}) \) is the convex, compact set \( \mathcal{S} \subset \mathbb{R} \). Let \( \mathcal{S} < \infty \) be the range of \( \mathcal{S} \).

Let \( \{z^i\}_{t \geq 1} \) be a sequence of random variables where

\[
z^i = \begin{cases} S & \text{w.p. } 1 - p_n(\epsilon_g) \\ \epsilon_g & \text{w.p. } p_n(\epsilon_g) \end{cases},
\]

\( \epsilon_g = \frac{\epsilon(1 - \kappa)}{2} \) and \( p_n(\epsilon_g) \) is the bound from Lemma 42. We have that

\[
|\hat{s}_n^t - s^*| \leq_{\text{SD}} \sum_{i=0}^{k} z^{t-i} \kappa^i + \kappa^k |\hat{s}_n^{t-k} - s^*| \quad (E.2)
\]

\[
\leq_{\text{SD}} \sum_{i=0}^{k} z^{t-i} \kappa^i + \kappa^k \mathcal{S} \quad (E.3)
\]

Equation E.2 follows from Lemma 43. Equation E.3 holds because \( \mathcal{S} \) is the maximum value that \( |\hat{s}_n^t - s^*| \) may take.

We note that

\[
\sum_{i=0}^{k} \epsilon_g \kappa^i < \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \epsilon_g \kappa^i = \frac{\epsilon_g}{1 - \kappa} = \frac{\epsilon(1 - \kappa)}{2} \cdot \frac{1}{1 - \kappa} = \frac{\epsilon}{2}.
\]

In addition, let \( k = \lceil \frac{\log(\frac{\epsilon}{S})}{\log \kappa} \rceil \). For such \( k \), we have that

\[
k \geq \frac{\log(\frac{\epsilon}{S})}{\log \kappa}.
\]

Rearranging the above inequality gives

\[
\kappa^k \mathcal{S} \leq \frac{\epsilon}{2}.
\]

As a result, we have that

\[
\sum_{i=0}^{k} \epsilon_g \kappa^i + \kappa^k \mathcal{S} < \frac{\epsilon}{2} + \frac{\epsilon}{2} = \epsilon.
\]

By Equation E.3 and the definition of stochastic dominance, we have that

\[
P(|\hat{s}_n^t - s^*| \leq \epsilon) \geq P(\sum_{i=0}^{k} z^{t-i} \kappa^i + \kappa^k \mathcal{S} \leq \epsilon)
\]

\[
\geq P(z^{t-i} = \epsilon_g \text{ for } i = 0 \ldots k)
\]

\[
\geq (p_n(\epsilon_g))^k
\]
If we have that
\[ n \geq \frac{2}{\epsilon^2(1-\kappa)^2D^2} \log(\frac{2k}{\delta}) \] (E.4)
then we can show that \( p_n(\epsilon_g) \geq 1 - \frac{\delta}{k} \). We replace \( \epsilon(1-\kappa) \) in Equation E.4.

\[ n \geq \frac{2}{\epsilon^2(1-\kappa)^2D^2} \log(\frac{2k}{\delta}) \]
\[ \geq \frac{4}{\epsilon^2(1-\kappa)^2} \cdot \frac{1}{2D^2} \log(\frac{2k}{\delta}) \]
\[ \geq \frac{1}{\epsilon_g^2} \cdot \frac{1}{2D^2} \log(\frac{2k}{\delta}). \]

After that, we can rearrange the above equation to find that
\[ e^{-2n\epsilon_g^2D^2} \leq \frac{\delta}{2k}. \]
Rearranging again,
\[ 1 - 2e^{-2n\epsilon_g^2D^2} \geq 1 - \frac{\delta}{k}. \]
Since \( p_n(\epsilon_g) \geq 1 - 2e^{-2n\epsilon_g^2D^2} \), we have that
\[ p_n(\epsilon_g) \geq 1 - \frac{\delta}{k}. \]

So, \( (p_n(\epsilon_g))^k \geq (1 - \frac{\delta}{k})^k \). Applying Theorem 26 gives that \( (p_n(\epsilon_g))^k \geq 1 - \delta \). Therefore, we conclude that if \( t \geq k \) and \( n \geq \frac{2}{\epsilon(1-\kappa)^2D^2} \log(\frac{2k}{\delta}) \), then
\[ P(|\hat{s}_n^t - s^*| \leq \epsilon) \geq 1 - \delta, \]
as desired.

**E.2 Proof of Corollary 11**

To show that \( \hat{s}_n^t \overset{p}{\to} s^* \), we must show that
\[ \lim_{n \to \infty} P(|\hat{s}_n^t - s^*| > \epsilon) = 0. \]
It is sufficient to show that for any \( \delta > 0 \), there exists \( N \) such that for \( n \geq N \),
\[ P(|\hat{s}_n^t - s^*| > \epsilon) \leq \delta. \]

As in the statement of Theorem 10, let \( S \) be the range of \( S \). Let \( N_1 \) be the smallest value of \( n \) such that \( t_n \geq k \), where \( k = \lceil \frac{\log(n+1)}{\log \kappa} \rceil \) and \( N_2 \) be the smallest value of \( n \) such that \( n \geq \frac{2}{\epsilon(1-\kappa)^2D^2} \log(\frac{2k}{\delta}) \). We can take \( N = \max\{N_1, N_2\} \). By Theorem 10, we have that for \( n \geq N \), \( P(|\hat{s}_n^t - s^*| > \epsilon) \leq \delta \). Thus, we have that \( \hat{s}_n^t \overset{p}{\to} s^* \).
F Proofs of Learning Results

We state technical lemmas that will be used in many of our learning results.

Lemma 44. Let $\hat{\pi}$ and $\hat{\ell}$ be functions $X \times G \times \text{supp}(G) \times B \times S \times S \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$.

$$
\hat{\pi}(\nu, \epsilon, \beta, s, r) = \pi(x(\beta, s, \nu), c, \beta, r).
$$

$$
\hat{\ell}(\nu, \epsilon, \beta, s, r) = \ell(\pi(x(\beta, s, \nu), c, \beta, r), \nu).
$$

$$
\hat{k}(\nu, \epsilon, \beta, s, r) = \mathbb{I}\left(\frac{r - \beta^T x(\beta, s, \nu) - \epsilon}{\frac{1}{2}} \in \left[-1, \frac{1}{2}\right]\right)
$$

Let $(\nu, \epsilon)$ represent the data $w$ and $(\beta, s, r)$ represent parameters $\theta$. Suppose the conditions of Theorem 13 hold. With $(\nu, \epsilon)$ i.i.d., $\hat{\pi}$, and $\hat{k}$ satisfy the requirements on the function $a(w; \theta)$ from Lemma 27. Proof in Appendix G.13.

Lemma 45. Suppose Assumption 2 holds. Let $\beta \in B, s \in S, \zeta \in \{-1,1\}^d, \zeta \in \{-1, 1\}$, and $b > 0$. Define $T : (\nu, c_\nu, b, \zeta, \zeta) \rightarrow (\nu', c', \zeta, \zeta)$, where $\nu = (\eta, \gamma) \in X \times G$ and cost function $c_\nu$ satisfies Assumption 1. Let

$$(\nu', c', \zeta, \zeta) = \left((\nu, c_\nu, b, \zeta, \zeta), \gamma\right).$$

Let $\nu'_{\beta, \zeta, \zeta} = (\eta'_{\beta, \zeta, \zeta}, \gamma)$ and cost function $c'_{\gamma}$ defined as follows.

$$
\eta'_{\beta, \zeta, \zeta} := \eta + \frac{\beta}{\|eta\|} \cdot b \cdot (\gamma^T x_1 - \zeta) \quad (\text{F.1})
$$

$$
c'_{\gamma}(y) := c'_{\gamma}(y) - G(s - r) \beta^T y. \quad (\text{F.2})
$$

If $\eta, x_1 \in \text{Int}(X)$ and $b$ sufficiently small, then $\nu'_{\beta, \zeta, \zeta} \in X \times G$, $c'_{\gamma}$ is $\alpha_{\gamma}$-strongly convex,

$$(\beta, s, \nu'_{\beta, \zeta, \zeta}) = x_1 + b \frac{\beta}{\|eta\|} (\gamma^T x_1 - \zeta),$$

$$(\beta, s, \nu'_{\beta, \zeta, \zeta}) \in \text{Int}(X), \text{ and } \beta^T x(\beta, s, \nu'_{\beta, \zeta, \zeta}) = r.$$ In other words, when the agent with type and cost function $T(\nu, c_\nu)$ best responds to the unperturbed model $\beta$ and threshold $s$, they obtain the same raw score (without noise) as the agent with type and cost function $(\nu', c')$ who responds to a perturbed model $\beta + b\zeta$ and threshold $s + b\zeta$. Proof in Appendix G.14.

Lemma 46. Suppose Assumptions 1, 2, 3, 4, and 7 hold. Fix $\beta \in B, s \in S$. For sufficiently small $b$, there exists a distribution over agent types, $\tilde{F}_b$ and corresponding cost functions $c'_{\gamma}$ for each type $\nu' \sim \tilde{F}_b$ such that when agents with types $\nu' \sim \tilde{F}_b$ and cost functions $c'_{\gamma}$ best respond to the unperturbed model $\beta$ and threshold $s$ the induced score distribution is equal to $P_{\beta, s, b}$. Furthermore, the support of $\tilde{F}_b$ is contained in $X \times G$, each $c'_{\gamma}$ satisfies Assumption 1, $\tilde{F}_b$ has a finite number of agent types, $\alpha_*(\tilde{F}_b) = \alpha_*(F)$, and for any agent type $\nu' \sim \tilde{F}_b$, we have $x(\beta, s, \nu') \in \text{Int}(X)$. Proof in Appendix G.15.

Lemma 47. Fix $\beta \in B$. Under Assumptions 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7, if $M < \frac{\alpha_7}{\alpha_7}$ and $b$ is sufficiently small, then $q(P_{B, s, b})$ has a unique fixed point $s(\beta, b)$. As $b \rightarrow 0$, $s(\beta, b) \rightarrow s(\beta)$, where $s(\beta)$ is the unique fixed point of $q(P_{B, s})$. Proof in Appendix G.16.
Lemma 48. Fix $\beta \in B$. Let $\{t_n\}$ be a sequence such that $t_n \uparrow \infty$ as $n \to \infty$. Under Assumptions 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, if $M < \frac{1}{\sigma_\beta^2}$ and $b$ sufficiently small,
\[
\tilde{s}_{n, n}^{t_n} \overset{p}{\to} s(\beta, b), \quad q(P_{\beta, s_{n, n}^{t_n}}) \overset{p}{\to} s(\beta, b)
\]
where $s(\beta, b)$ is the unique fixed point of $q(P_{\beta, s, b})$. Proof in Appendix G.17.

F.1 Proof of Lemma 12
Let $\Delta \ell(\nu) = \ell(1, \nu) - \ell(0, \nu)$. We have that
\[
L_{eq}(\beta) = L(\beta, s(\beta), s(\beta)) = \mathbb{E}_{r \sim G, \nu \sim F}[\ell(\pi(x(\beta, s(\beta), \nu), \epsilon; \beta, s(\beta)), \nu)]
\]
\[
= \mathbb{E}_{r \sim G, \nu \sim F}[\ell(\beta^T x(\beta, s(\beta), \nu) + \epsilon \geq s(\beta), \nu)]
\]
\[
= \mathbb{E}_{s \sim F}[\mathbb{E}_{r \sim G|s}[\ell(1, \nu)(1 - G(s(\beta) - \beta^T x(\beta, s(\beta), \nu))] + \mathbb{E}_{s \sim F}[\mathbb{E}_{r \sim G|s}[\ell(0, \nu)G(s(\beta) - \beta^T x(\beta, s(\beta), \nu))] = \mathbb{E}_{s \sim F}[\ell(1, \nu) - \Delta \ell(\nu)G(s(\beta) - \beta^T x(\beta, s(\beta), \nu)]
\]
Under the assumed conditions, we have that $x$ is continuously differentiable in its first and second arguments by Lemma 2. We also have that $s$ is continuously differentiable $\beta$ by Theorem 9. Thus, $L_{eq}(\beta)$ continuously differentiable in $\beta$.

F.2 Proof of Theorem 13
Let $s(\beta)$ be the unique fixed point of $q(P_{\beta, s})$. We introduce the following quantities.
\[
\tilde{\ell}_i(\beta, s, r) := \ell(\pi(x(\beta, s, \nu), \epsilon_i; \beta, r), \nu_i)
\]
\[
\tilde{\ell}_n(\beta, s, r) := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \tilde{\ell}_i(\beta, s, r).
\]
\[
\tilde{L}(\beta, s, r) := \mathbb{E}_{s \sim F, \epsilon_i \sim G}[\tilde{\ell}_i(\beta, s, r)]
\]
We note that
\[
\ell_i(\beta, s, r) = \tilde{\ell}_i(\beta + b_n \zeta_i, s + b_n \zeta_i, r + b_n \zeta_i),
\]
where $\zeta_i$ and $\zeta_i$ are the perturbations applied to agent $i$. When $s = r = s(\beta)$, $\tilde{L}(\beta, s, r) = L_{eq}(\beta)$. Through an identical argument as in the proof of Lemma 12, we can see that $\tilde{L}(\beta, s, r)$ is continuously differentiable in $s$ and $r$.

The model effect estimator $\tilde{\tau}_{ME,n}^{t_n}(\beta)$ is the regression coefficient obtained by running OLS of $\ell(\beta, s_n^{t_n}, q(P_{\beta, s_n^{t_n}, b_n}))$ on $Z$. The regression coefficient must have the following form.
\[
\hat{\tau}_{ME,n}^{t_n}(\beta) = (S_z)^{-1}s_{zy}, \quad \text{where} \quad S_z := \frac{1}{b_n^2 n}Z^T Z, \quad s_{zy} := \frac{1}{b_n^2 n}Z^T \ell(\beta, s_n^{t_n}, q(P_{\beta, s_n^{t_n}, b_n})). \tag{F.3}
\]
In this proof, we establish convergence in probability of the two terms above separately. The bulk of the proof is the first step, which entails showing that

$$ s_{zy}^n \xrightarrow{p} \frac{\partial L}{\partial \beta} (\beta, s(\beta), s(\beta)). $$

Due to $\ell$’s dependence on the stochastic processes \{\hat{s}^n_i\} and \{q(P^n_{\hat{s},s_n,b_n})\}, the main workhorse of this result is Lemma 29. To apply this lemma, we must establish stochastic equicontinuity for the collection of stochastic processes \{\hat{\ell}_n(\beta, s, r)\}. Second, through a straightforward application of the Weak Law of Large Numbers, we show that

$$ S_{zz} \xrightarrow{p} I_d. $$

Finally, we use Slutsky’s Theorem to establish the convergence of the model effect estimator.

We proceed with the first step of establishing convergence of $s_{zy}^n$. We have that

$$ s_{zy}^n = \frac{1}{b^n} Z^n T \ell(\beta, \hat{s}^n, q(P^n_{\hat{s},s_n,b_n})) $$

$$ = \frac{1}{b^n} \sum_{i=1}^n b_n \xi_i \ell_i(\beta, \hat{s}^n, q(P^n_{\hat{s},s_n,b_n})) $$

$$ = \frac{1}{b_n} \left( \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \xi_i \ell_i(\beta, \hat{s}^n, q(P^n_{\hat{s},s_n,b_n})) \right). $$

We fix $j$ and $b_n = b$ where $b > 0$ and is small enough to satisfy the hypothesis of Lemma 48. For each $\zeta \in \{-1, 1\}^d$ and $\zeta \in \{-1, 1\}$, let

$$ n \zeta_\zeta = \sum_{i=1}^n \zeta_\zeta(i = \zeta, \zeta = \zeta). $$

Let $z(\zeta)$ map a perturbation $\zeta \in \{-1, 1\}^d$ to the identical vector $\zeta$, except with $j$-th entry set to 0. So, if the $j$-th entry of $\zeta$ is 1, then $\zeta = e_j + z(\zeta)$. If the $j$-th entry of $\zeta$ is -1, then $\zeta = -e_j + z(\zeta)$. So, we have that

$$ \ell_i(\beta, \hat{s}^n, q(P^n_{\hat{s},s_n,b_n})) = \ell_i(\beta + b \xi_i, \hat{s}^n + b \xi_i, q(P^n_{\hat{s},s_n,b_n}) + b \xi_i) $$

$$ = \ell_i(\beta + b \xi_i e_j + b \cdot z(\zeta), \hat{s}^n + b \xi_i, q(P^n_{\hat{s},s_n,b_n}) + b \xi_i). $$

As a result, we have that

$$ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \xi_i \ell_i(\beta, \hat{s}^n, q(P^n_{\hat{s},s_n,b_n})) $$

$$ = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \xi_i \ell_i(\beta + b \xi_i e_j + b \cdot z(\zeta), \hat{s}^n + b \xi_i, q(P^n_{\hat{s},s_n,b_n}) + b \xi_i) $$

$$ = \sum_{\zeta \in \{-1, 1\}^d \text{ s.t. } \xi = 1} \frac{n \zeta_\zeta}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \xi_i \ell_i(\beta + b \xi_i e_j + b \cdot z(\zeta), \hat{s}^n + b \xi_i, q(P^n_{\hat{s},s_n,b_n}) + b \xi_i) $$

$$ - \sum_{\zeta \in \{-1, 1\}^d \text{ s.t. } \xi = -1} \frac{n \zeta_\zeta}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \xi_i \ell_i(\beta - b \xi_i e_j + b \cdot z(\zeta), \hat{s}^n + b \xi_i, q(P^n_{\hat{s},s_n,b_n}) + b \xi_i). $$
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To establish convergence properties of each term in the double sum in Equations F.6 and F.7, we must establish stochastic equicontinuity of the collection of stochastic processes \( \{ \hat{\ell}_n(\beta, s, r) \} \) indexed by \((s, r) \in S \times S\). Because \( S \times S \) compact and \( \hat{L}(\beta, s, r) \) is continuous in \( s \) and \( r \), we can show that \( \{ \hat{\ell}_n(\beta, s, r) \} \) is stochastically equicontinuous by establishing that \( \hat{\ell}_n(\beta, s, r) \) converges uniformly in probability (with respect to \((s, r)\)) to \( \hat{L}(\beta, s, r) \) (Lemma 28). We will show that \( \hat{\ell}_n(\beta, s, r) \) converges uniformly (with respect to \((s, r)\)) in probability to \( \hat{L}(\beta, s, r) \) via Lemma 27.

By Lemma 44, we have that \( \hat{\ell} \) satisfies the conditions of Lemma 27. Thus, we can apply Lemma 27 to establish uniform convergence in probability of \( \hat{\ell}_n(\beta, s, r) \) with respect to \((s, r)\). As a consequence, the collection of stochastic processes \( \{ \hat{\ell}_n(\beta, s, r) \} \) is stochastically equicontinuous. In particular, \( \hat{\ell}_n(\beta, s, r) \) is stochastically equicontinuous at \((s(\beta, b), s(\beta, b))\), where \( s(\beta, b) \) is the unique fixed point of \( q(P_{\beta,s,b}) \) (see Lemma 47). By Lemma 48, we have that

\[
\hat{s}_n^{t_n} \xrightarrow{p} s(\beta, b) \quad q(P_{\beta,s,b}^{t_n}) \xrightarrow{p} s(\beta, b).
\]

Now, we can apply Lemma 29 to establish convergence in probability for each term in the double sum of Equations F.6, F.7. As an example, for a perturbation \( \zeta \in \{-1, 1\}^d \) with \( j \)-th entry equal to 1 and arbitrary \( \zeta \in \{-1, 1\} \), Lemma 29 gives that

\[
\hat{\ell}_{n\zeta,j}(\beta + be_j + b \cdot z(\zeta), s_{n}^{t_n} + b\zeta, q(P_{\beta,s,b}^{t_n}) + b\zeta) \xrightarrow{p} \hat{\ell}_{n\zeta,j}(\beta + be_j + b \cdot z(\zeta), s(\beta, b) + b\zeta, s(\beta, b) + b\zeta),
\]

and by the Weak Law of Large Numbers, we have that

\[
\hat{\ell}_{n\zeta,j}(\beta + be_j + b \cdot z(\zeta), s(\beta, b) + b\zeta, s(\beta, b) + b\zeta) \xrightarrow{p} \hat{L}(\beta + be_j + b \cdot z(\zeta), s(\beta, b) + b\zeta, s(\beta, b) + b\zeta).
\]

Analogous statements hold for the remaining terms in Equations F.6 and F.7. Also,

\[
\frac{n \zeta \cdot \zeta}{n} \xrightarrow{p} \frac{1}{2d+1}, \quad \zeta \in \{-1, 1\}^d, \zeta \in \{-1, 1\}.
\]

By Slutsky’s Theorem, when any \( j \) and \( b \) fixed, we have

\[
s_{n^2,j} \xrightarrow{p} \sum_{\zeta \in \{-1,1\}^d s.t. \ z(\zeta) = 0} \frac{\hat{L}(\beta + be_j + b \cdot z(\zeta), s(\beta, b) + b\zeta, s(\beta, b) + b\zeta)}{2d+1 \cdot b} \quad (F.8)
\]

\[
- \sum_{\zeta \in \{-1,1\}^d s.t. \ z(\zeta) = 0} \frac{\hat{L}(\beta - be_j + b \cdot z(\zeta), s(\beta, b) + b\zeta, s(\beta, b) + b\zeta)}{2d+1 \cdot b} \quad (F.9)
\]

Let \( R_b \) denote the expression on the right side of the above equation. If there is a sequence \( \{ b_n \} \) such that \( b_n \rightarrow 0 \), then by Lemma 47, \( s(\beta, b_n) \rightarrow s(\beta) \), where \( s(\beta) \) is the unique fixed point of \( q(P_{\beta,s}) \). Furthermore, by the continuity of \( L \), we have that

\[
R_{b_n} \rightarrow \frac{\partial L}{\partial \beta_j}(\beta, s(\beta), s(\beta)).
\]
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Using the definition of convergence in probability, we show that there exists such a sequence \( \{b_n\} \). From Equations F.8 and F.9, we have that for each \( \epsilon, \delta > 0 \) and \( b > 0 \) and sufficiently small, there exists \( n(\epsilon, \delta, b) \) such that for \( n \geq n(\epsilon, \delta, b) \)

\[
P(|s_{zy,j}^n - R_{zy,j}| \leq \epsilon) \geq 1 - \delta.
\]

So, we can fix \( \delta > 0 \). For \( k = 1, 2, \ldots \), let \( N(k) = n(\epsilon, \delta, b_k) \). Then, we can define a sequence such that \( b_n = \epsilon_n = \frac{1}{k} \) for all \( N(k) \leq n \leq N(k + 1) \). So, we have that \( \epsilon_n \to 0 \) and \( b_n \to 0 \).

Finally, this gives that \( s_{zy,j}^n \to \partial L / \partial \beta \beta \beta (\beta, s(\beta), s(\beta)) \).

Considering all indices \( j \),

\[
s_{zy}^n \to \partial L / \partial \beta \beta \beta (\beta, s(\beta), s(\beta)).
\]

It remains to establish convergence in probability for \( S_{zy}^n \). We have that

\[
Z^n = \frac{1}{b_n^2} Z^T Z = \frac{1}{b_n^2} \sum_{i=1}^{n} (b_n \zeta_i)^T (b_n \zeta_i).
\]

We note that

\[
E_{\zeta_i \sim R^d} [\zeta_i, j, \zeta_i, k] = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } j = k \\ 0 & \text{if } j \neq k \end{cases}
\]

because \( \zeta_i \) is a vector of independent Rademacher random variables. So, \( E[\zeta_i^T \zeta_i] = I_d \). By the Weak Law of Large Numbers, we have that

\[
S_{zy}^n \to I_d.
\]

Finally, we can use Slutsky’s Theorem to show that

\[
\hat{\tau}_{ME,n} (\beta) = (S_{zy}^n)^{-1} s_{zy}^n \to (I_d)^{-1} \frac{\partial L}{\partial \beta} (\beta, s(\beta), s(\beta)) + \frac{\partial L}{\partial s} (\beta, s(\beta), s(\beta)) = \tau_{ME}(\beta).
\]

F.3 Proof of Theorem 14

Let \( s^* = s(\beta) \). Let \( \hat{\Gamma}_{\ell,s}, \hat{\Gamma}_{\pi,s}, \hat{\Gamma}_{\pi,\beta} \) be the regression coefficients defined in Definition 7. Let \( p^{n, b_n}_{\beta,s} (s) \) be the density estimate defined in Definition 7. In this proof, we rely on the results on the following convergence results for these estimators.

**Corollary 49.** Let \( \{t_n\} \) be a sequence such that \( t_n \uparrow \infty \) as \( n \to \infty \). Let \( Z_s, \ell, \hat{\Gamma}^n_{\ell,s} (\beta, s, r) \) be as defined in Definition 7. Under the conditions of Theorem 13, there exists a sequence \( \{b_n\} \) such that \( b_n \to 0 \) so that

\[
\hat{\Gamma}^n_{\ell,s,r} (\beta, s_t, q(P^n_{\beta,s,b_n})), \quad \frac{\partial L}{\partial \beta} (\beta, s(\beta), s(\beta)) + \frac{\partial L}{\partial s} (\beta, s(\beta), s(\beta)). \quad (F.10)
\]

*Proof in Appendix G.18.*
Lemma 50. Let \( \{ t_n \} \) be a sequence such that \( t_n \uparrow \infty \) as \( n \to \infty \). Let \( Z_{\beta, \pi}, \hat{\Gamma}_{n, \beta}(\beta, s, r) \) be as defined in Definition 7. Under the conditions of Theorem 13, there exists a sequence \( \{ b_n \} \) such that \( b_n \to 0 \) so that

\[
\hat{\Gamma}_{n, \beta}(\beta, \hat{s}_{t_n}^n, \hat{s}_{t_n}^n) \xrightarrow{p} \frac{\partial \Pi}{\partial \beta} (\beta; s(\beta)), \tag{F.11}
\]

Proof in Appendix G.19.

Corollary 51. Let \( \{ t_n \} \) be a sequence such that \( t_n \uparrow \infty \) as \( n \to \infty \). Let \( Z_{s, \pi}, \hat{\Gamma}_{n, \beta}(\beta, s, r) \) be as defined in Definition 7. Under the conditions of Theorem 13, there exists a sequence \( \{ b_n \} \) such that \( b_n \to 0 \) so that

\[
\hat{\Gamma}_{n, \beta}(\beta, \hat{s}_{t_n}^n, \hat{s}_{t_n}^n) \xrightarrow{p} \frac{\partial \Pi}{\partial \beta} (\beta; s(\beta)). \tag{F.12}
\]

Proof in Appendix G.20.

Lemma 52. Fix \( \beta \in \mathcal{B} \). Let \( \{ b_n \} \) be a sequence such that \( h_n \to 0 \) and \( nh_n \to \infty \). Let \( p_{\beta, s, b}(r) \) denote a kernel density estimate of \( p_{\beta, s, b}(r) \) with kernel function \( k(z) = \mathbb{I}(z \in [-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]) \) and bandwidth \( h_n \). Let \( \{ t_n \} \) be a sequence such that \( t_n \uparrow \infty \) as \( n \to \infty \). Under the conditions of Theorem 13, there exists a sequence \( \{ b_n \} \) such that \( b_n \to 0 \) so that

\[
p_{\beta, s, b_n}(\hat{s}_{t_n}^n) \xrightarrow{p} p_{\beta, s^*}(s^*), \tag{F.13}
\]

where \( s^* \) is the unique fixed point of \( q(P_{\beta, s}) \). Proof in Appendix G.21.

Finally, we use the following lemma to show that we recover the equilibrium effect.

Lemma 53. Let \( \Pi(\beta, s; r) \) be defined as in Equation 5.3. Under Assumptions 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6, if \( M < \frac{\alpha}{\beta} \), then

\[
\frac{\partial s}{\partial \beta} = \frac{1}{p_{\beta, s^*}(s^*) - \frac{\partial \Pi}{\partial s}(\beta, s^*; s^*)} \cdot \frac{\partial \Pi}{\partial \beta} (\beta, s^*; s^*), \tag{F.14}
\]

where \( s^* = s(\beta) \), the unique fixed point induced by the model \( \beta \). Proof in Appendix G.22.

We proceed with the main proof. The equilibrium effect estimator in Equation 5.7 consists of two terms. We see that the convergence of the first term is immediately given by Equation F.10 above. It remains to show that the second term converges in probability to \( \frac{\partial s}{\partial \beta}(\beta) \). We have that

\[
\frac{\hat{\Gamma}_{n, \beta}(\beta, \hat{s}_{t_n}^n, \hat{s}_{t_n}^n)}{p_{\beta, s, b_n}(\hat{s}_{t_n}^n) - \hat{\Gamma}_{n, \beta}(\beta, \hat{s}_{t_n}^n, \hat{s}_{t_n}^n)} \xrightarrow{p} \frac{1}{p_{\beta, s^*}(s^*) - \frac{\partial \Pi}{\partial s}(\beta, s^*; s^*)} \cdot \frac{\partial \Pi}{\partial \beta} (\beta, s^*; s^*) \quad \tag{F.15}
\]

\[
= \frac{\frac{\partial s}{\partial \beta}(\beta)}{\partial \beta}(\beta). \quad \tag{F.16}
\]

Equation F.15 follows by Slutsky’s Theorem given Equations F.12, F.11, and F.13. Equation F.16 follows from Lemma 53. Combining Equation F.10 and Equation F.16 using Slutsky’s Theorem, yields
\[ t_{EE,n}(\beta) = \Gamma_{t,s,t,r}(\beta, s^n, q(P^n_{\beta, s^n, b_n})) \cdot \Gamma_{x, s}(\beta, s^n ; s^n) \]

\[ = \tau_{EE}(\beta). \]

### F.4 Proof of Corollary 15
This result follows from applying Slutsky’s Theorem to the results of Theorem 13 and Theorem 14.

### G Proofs of Technical Results

#### G.1 Proof of Lemma 31
Since \( f_n \to f \) uniformly and \( f_n \)'s are defined on a compact domain, then \( f \) must be continuous. By assumption, \( f \) has only one zero \( x^* \) in \([a, b]\). We can choose

\[ \epsilon = \inf\{|f(x)| \mid |x - x^*| > \delta\}. \]

By uniform convergence, there exists \( N \) such that for \( n \geq N \), \( \sup_{x \in X} |f_n(x) - f(x)| < \frac{\epsilon}{2} \).

By the triangle inequality we have that

\[ |f(x)| = |f(x) - f_n(x) + f_n(x)| \leq |f(x) - f_n(x)| + |f_n(x)| \]

\[ |f_n(x)| \geq |f(x)| - |f(x) - f_n(x)|. \]

For \( n \geq N \) and \( x \) such that \( |x - x^*| > \delta \), we realize that \( |f_n(x)| > \frac{\epsilon}{2} \). So \( x \) cannot be a fixed point of \( f_n \). Thus, if \( x \) is a fixed point of \( f_n \), then we have that \( |x_n - x^*| < \delta \). This implies that \( x_n \to x^* \).

#### G.2 Proof of Lemma 33
From Assumption 1, we have that \( c_\nu \) is twice continuously differentiable. From Assumption 2, we have that \( G \) is twice continuously differentiable. Since the composition and sum of twice continuously differentiable functions is also twice continuously differentiable, we have that \( E_{\epsilon \sim G}[u(x; \beta, s, \nu)] \) is twice continuously differentiable in \( x, \beta, s \).

#### G.3 Proof of Lemma 34
We abbreviate

\[ E_{\epsilon \sim G}[u(x)] := E_{\epsilon \sim G}[u(x; \beta, s, \nu)]. \]
From Lemma 33, we have that $\mathbb{E}_{\epsilon \sim G} [u(x)]$ is twice continuously differentiable in $x$, so

$$
\nabla_x \mathbb{E}_{\epsilon \sim G} [u(x)] = -\nabla c_v(x - \eta; \gamma) + G'(s - \beta^T x)\beta^T,
$$

$$
\nabla_x^2 \mathbb{E}_{\epsilon \sim G} [u(x)] = -\nabla^2 c_v(x - \eta; \gamma) - \beta G''(s - \beta^T x)\beta^T.
$$

To show that $\nabla_x^2 \mathbb{E}_{\epsilon \sim G} [u(x)]$ is negative definite at any point $(x, s)$, we can show that $-\nabla_x^2 \mathbb{E}_{\epsilon \sim G} [u(x)]$ is positive definite at any point $(x, s)$ via Definition 8. Let $z \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1},$

$$
z^T (-\nabla_x^2 \mathbb{E}_{\epsilon \sim G} [u(x)]) z = z^T \nabla^2 c_v(x - \eta; \gamma) + \beta G''(s - \beta^T x)\beta^T z
$$

$$
= z^T \nabla^2 c_v(x - \eta; \gamma) z + G''(s - \beta^T x) \cdot z^T \beta^T z
$$

$$
\geq \inf_y z^T \nabla^2 c_v(y) z + \inf_y G''(y) \cdot z^T \beta^T z
$$

$$
\geq \alpha_v + (-M) \cdot B
$$

$$
> 0
$$

We check the above inequality as follows. By Assumption 1, $c_v$ is $\alpha_v$-strongly convex and twice differentiable. So, we can apply Lemma 16 to lower bound the first term in G.2. Equation G.4 holds because by Assumption 2, we have that $|G''(y)| \leq M$, and $z^T \beta^T z = (\beta^T z)^2$. Let $v$ be a unit vector in the direction of $\beta$. Then, $(\beta^T z)^2 \leq B(v^T z)^2$, where $v$ and $z$ are both unit vectors. The dot product of two unit vectors lies between $-1$ and $1$, so $0 \leq z^T \beta^T z \leq B$. The assumption that $M < \frac{2}{2\beta^T}$ yields Equation G.5. Thus, Definition 8 gives that $-\nabla_x^2 \mathbb{E}_{\epsilon \sim G} [u(x)]$ is positive definite.

### G.4 Proof of Lemma 35

Without loss of generality, we fix $\beta, s, \nu$. So, we abbreviate

$$
\mathbb{E}_{\epsilon \sim G} [u(x)] := \mathbb{E}_{\epsilon \sim G} [u(x; \beta, s, \nu)].
$$

We apply Lemma 18 to $\mathbb{E}_{\epsilon \sim G} [u(x)]$ to establish the claim. The conditions of Lemma 18 include twice-differentiability in $x$ and strict concavity in $x$ of $\mathbb{E}_{\epsilon \sim G} [u(x)]$. Twice-differentiability follows from Lemma 33 and strict concavity follows from Lemma 34, which establishes that $\nabla^2 \mathbb{E}_{\epsilon \sim G} [u(x)]$ is negative definite everywhere. Since $\mathbb{E}_{\epsilon \sim G} [u(x)]$ satisfies the conditions of Lemma 18, we have that if $x \in \text{Int}(X)$, then $x$ is the unique global maximizer of $\mathbb{E}_{\epsilon \sim G} [u(x)]$ on $X$ if and only if $\nabla_x \mathbb{E}_{\epsilon \sim G} [u(x)] = 0$. Under these conditions, if $x \in \text{Int}(X)$, then $x = x(\beta, s, \nu)$ if and only if $\nabla_x \mathbb{E}_{\epsilon \sim G} [u(x)] = 0$, as desired.

### G.5 Proof of Lemma 36

Without loss of generality, we fix $\beta, \nu$. We use the following abbreviations

$$
\mathbb{E}_{\epsilon \sim G} [u(x; s)] := \mathbb{E}_{\epsilon \sim G} [u(x; \beta, s, \nu)]
$$

$$
x(s) := x(\beta, s, \nu)
$$

$$
h(s) := h(s; \beta, \nu).
$$

We state an additional lemma that will be used in the proof of Lemma 36.
**Lemma 54.** Let \( x \in \mathcal{X} \) and \( \nu \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{G} \), and \( s \in \mathcal{S} \). Let \( \mathbf{H} = \nabla^2 c_\nu(x - \eta; \gamma) \). Under Assumption 1, we have that

\[
(\mathbf{H} + G''(s - \beta^T x)\beta \beta^T)^{-1} = \mathbf{H}^{-1} - \frac{G''(s - \beta^T x)\beta \beta^T \mathbf{H}^{-1}}{1 + G''(s - \beta^T x)\beta \beta^T \mathbf{H}^{-1} \beta}.
\]

**Proof in Appendix G.23.**

Now, we proceed with the main proof. We compute \( \nabla_s x \) by using the implicit expression for \( x(s) \) given by the first-order condition in Lemma 35. From Lemma 35, we note that \( x(s) \) must satisfy \( \nabla x \mathbb{E}_{\omega \sim G} [u(x; s)] = 0 \). We have that

\[
\nabla_x \mathbb{E}_{\omega \sim G} [u(x; s)] = -\nabla c_\nu(x - \eta; \gamma) + G'(s - \beta^T x)\beta^T.
\]

So, the best response \( x(s) \) satisfies

\[-\nabla c_\nu(x(s) - \eta; \gamma) + G'(s - \beta^T x(s))\beta^T = 0.\]

From Lemma 2, we have that the best response \( x(s) \) is continuously differentiable in \( s \), so we can differentiate the above equation with respect to \( s \). This yields the following equation

\[
(\nabla^2 c_\nu(x(s) - \eta) + G''(s - \beta^T x(s))\beta \beta^T) \nabla_s x = G''(s - \beta^T x(s))\beta.
\]

Let \( \mathbf{H} = \nabla^2 c_\nu(x(s) - \eta) \). The above equation can be rewritten as

\[
(\mathbf{H} + G''(s - \beta^T x(s))\beta \beta^T) \nabla_s x = G''(s - \beta^T x(s))\beta.
\]

From Lemma 54, we realize that the matrix term on the left side of the equation is invertible. We multiply both sides of the equation by the inverse of the matrix to compute \( \nabla_s x \).

\[
\nabla_s x = (\mathbf{H} + G''(s - \beta^T x(s))\beta \beta^T)^{-1} G''(s - \beta^T x(s))\beta.
\]

We can substitute the expression for \( (\mathbf{H} + G''(s - \beta^T x(s))\beta \beta^T)^{-1} \) from Lemma 54 into the above equation.

\[
\nabla_s x = \left( \mathbf{H}^{-1} - \frac{G''(s - \beta^T x(s))\beta \beta^T \mathbf{H}^{-1} \beta}{1 + G''(s - \beta^T x(s))\beta \beta^T \mathbf{H}^{-1} \beta} \right) G''(s - \beta^T x(s))\beta.
\]

This gives us that

\[
\beta^T \nabla_s x = \beta^T \left( \mathbf{H}^{-1} - \frac{G''(s - \beta^T x(s))\beta \beta^T \mathbf{H}^{-1} \beta}{1 + G''(s - \beta^T x(s))\beta \beta^T \mathbf{H}^{-1} \beta} \right) G''(s - \beta^T x(s))\beta \tag{G.6}
\]

\[
= G''(s - \beta^T x(s)) \beta \mathbf{H}^{-1} \beta - \frac{(G''(s - \beta^T x(s)) \beta \mathbf{H}^{-1} \beta)^2}{1 + G''(s - \beta^T x(s))\beta \mathbf{H}^{-1} \beta}, \tag{G.7}
\]

as desired.
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G.6 Proof of Lemma 37

Since $c_\nu$ is $\alpha_\nu$-strongly convex (with $\alpha_\nu > 0$) and twice differentiable, we can apply Lemma 16, to see that for $z \in \mathbb{R}^d$,\[ z^T \nabla^2 c_\nu(y) z \geq \alpha_\nu |z|^2 > 0 \]

So, by Definition 8, $H = \nabla^2 c_\nu(y)$ is positive definite. Since $H$ is positive definite, it is invertible and its inverse $H^{-1}$ is also positive definite. Assumption 1 and Lemma 16 give\[ H \succeq \alpha_\nu I. \]

Since $H$ and $\alpha_\nu I$ are positive definite and $H - \alpha_\nu I$ is positive semidefinite, Lemma 21 gives us that $(\alpha_\nu I)^{-1} - H^{-1}$ is positive semidefinite. As a result,\[ \frac{1}{\alpha_\nu} I \succeq H^{-1}. \]

We conclude that Equation C.2 holds because\[ \sup_{z \in B} z^T H^{-1} z \leq \sup_{z \in B} \frac{1}{\alpha_\nu} z^T z \leq \frac{B}{\alpha_\nu}. \]

G.7 Proof of Lemma 38

Without loss of generality, we fix $\beta, \nu$. We use the following abbreviations\[ x(s) := x(\beta, s, \nu) \]
[\[ h(s) := h(s; \beta, \nu). \]

First, we establish that $h$ is differentiable and compute $\frac{dh}{ds}$ as follows\[ \frac{dh}{ds} = 1 - \beta^T \nabla_s x. \] (G.8)

Second, we use the expression for $\beta^T \nabla_s x$ from Lemma 36 to show that under our conditions, $\beta^T \nabla_s x < 1$. Finally, using this fact along with Equation G.8, we conclude that $h$ has a positive derivative, so it must be strictly increasing.

Now, we proceed with the main proof. First, we observe that $h$ is differentiable in $s$ because Lemma 2 gives that $x(s)$ is continuously differentiable in $s$. Differentiating with respect to $s$ yields Equation G.8.

Next, we use Equation C.1 to upper bound $\beta^T \nabla_s x$. We show that the second term on the right side of Equation C.1 is nonnegative. Let $N$ and $D$ be the numerator and denominator of the term, respectively. In particular,\[ N := (G''(s - \beta^T x(s)) \beta^T H^{-1} \beta)^2 \]
[\[ D := 1 + G''(s - \beta^T x(s)) \beta^T H^{-1} \beta \]

Clearly, we must have $N \geq 0$ because it consists of a squared term. We show that $D > 0$, as well.
\[ D = 1 + G''(s - \beta^T x(s))\beta^T H^{-1}\beta \]  
\[ \geq 1 + \inf_y G''(y) \sup_{z \in B} z^T H^{-1} z \]  
\[ \geq 1 + (-M) \cdot \frac{B}{\alpha_\nu} \tag{G.11} \]  
\[ > 1 + (-\frac{\alpha_\nu}{B}) \tag{G.12} \]  
\[ > 0 \tag{G.13} \]

Equation G.10 follows from the observation that \( H^{-1} \) is positive definite (Lemma 37), so \( \beta^T H^{-1} \beta > 0 \) (Definition 8), while \( G''(y) \) may take negative values (recall Assumption 2, which gives that \(|G''(y)| \leq M\). In Equation G.11, we apply Lemma 37. In Equation G.12, we use the condition that \( M < \frac{\alpha_\nu}{B} \).

Since \( D > 0 \) and \( N \geq 0 \), we have that the second term on the right side of Equation C.1 is nonnegative. As a result, we can upper bound \( \beta^T \nabla_s x \) as follows

\[ \beta^T \nabla_s x = G''(s - \beta^T x(s))\beta^T H^{-1}\beta - \frac{(G''(s - \beta^T x(s))\beta^T H^{-1}\beta)^2}{1 + G''(s - \beta^T x(s))\beta^T H^{-1}\beta} \leq G''(s - \beta^T x(s))\beta^T H^{-1}\beta \leq \sup_{z \in B} z^T H^{-1} z \cdot \sup_y G''(y) \leq \sup_{z \in B} z^T H^{-1} z \cdot M \leq \frac{B}{\alpha_\nu} \cdot \frac{\alpha_\nu}{B} \leq 1. \]

We can apply \( \beta^T \nabla_s x < 1 \) to Equation G.8 to find that

\[ \frac{dh}{ds} = 1 - \beta \nabla_s x > 0. \]

Thus, \( h \) has a positive derivative, so it must be strictly increasing.

\section*{G.8 Proof of Lemma 39}

Recall that \( P_{\beta,s} \) denotes the distribution over the noisy scores, and the noisy score for an agent with type \( \nu \) is denoted by \( \beta^T x(\beta, s, \nu) + \epsilon \), where \( \epsilon, \nu \) are random variables. In addition, recall that the noise the decision maker adds to the score is independent from the agents’
type (and as a result, best response). We have that
\[ P_{\beta,s}(r) = P(\beta^T x(\beta, s, \nu) + \epsilon \leq r) \]
where \( \nu, \epsilon \) are random variables
\[ = \int_{X \times \mathcal{G}} P(\epsilon \leq r - \beta^T x(\beta, s, \nu)) dF \]
\[ = \int_{X \times \mathcal{G}} G(r - \beta^T x(\beta, s, \nu)) dF. \]

Thus, \( P_{\beta,s}(r) \) has the form given in Equation D.1. Under our conditions, the best response for each agent type exists and is unique via Lemma 1, so \( P_{\beta,s}(r) \) is a well-defined function.

First, we establish that \( P_{\beta,s} \) is strictly increasing because from Assumption 5, we know that \( G \) is strictly increasing, and the sum of strictly increasing functions is also strictly increasing.

Second, we establish that \( P_{\beta,s} \) is continuously differentiable in \( r \) because from Assumption 2, we have that \( G \) is continuously differentiable. \( P_{\beta,s} \) is continuously differentiable in \( \beta, s \) because \( G \) is continuously differentiable and the best response mappings \( x(\beta, s, \nu) \) are continuously differentiable (Lemma 2).

The combination of the above two properties is sufficient for showing that \( P_{\beta,s} \) has an inverse distribution function.

### G.9 Proof of Lemma 40

First, we compute \( \frac{\partial q(Q_{\beta,s})}{\partial s} \) via implicit differentiation. We note that our expression for \( \frac{\partial q(Q_{\beta,s})}{\partial s} \) consists of a convex combination of terms of the form \( \beta^T \nabla_s x(\beta, s, \nu) \). Finally, we can bound each term in the convex combination and bound \( \frac{\partial q(Q_{\beta,s})}{\partial s} \).

From Lemma 39, we have that \( P_{\beta,s} \) has an inverse distribution function, so \( q(P_{\beta,s}) \) is uniquely defined. Thus, \( P_{\beta,s}(q(P_{\beta,s})) = q \) implicitly defines \( q(P_{\beta,s}) \). Using the expression for \( P_{\beta,s}(r) \) from Equation D.1, we have
\[ \int_{X \times \mathcal{G}} G(q(P_{\beta,s}) - \beta^T x(\beta, s, \nu)) dF = q \quad (G.14) \]

From Lemma 5, we have that \( q(P_{\beta,s}) \) is differentiable in \( s \). So, we can differentiate both sides of Equation G.14 with respect to \( s \).

\[ \frac{\partial}{\partial s} \int_{X \times \mathcal{G}} G(q(P_{\beta,s}) - \beta^T x(\beta, s, \nu)) dF \]
\[ = \int_{X \times \mathcal{G}} \frac{\partial}{\partial s} \left( G(q(P_{\beta,s}) - \beta^T x(\beta, s, \nu)) \right) dF \]
\[ = \int_{X \times \mathcal{G}} G'(q(P_{\beta,s}) - \beta^T x(\beta, s, \nu)) \cdot \left( \frac{\partial q(P_{\beta,s})}{\partial s} - \beta^T \nabla_s x(\beta, s, \nu) \right) dF \]
\[ = 0. \]
Rearranging the last two lines to solve for $\frac{\partial q(P_{\beta,s})}{\partial s}$ yields

$$\frac{\partial q(P_{\beta,s})}{\partial s} = \int_{X \times G} \beta^T \nabla_s x(\beta, s, \nu) \cdot \frac{G'(q(P_{\beta,s}) - \beta^T x(\beta, s, \nu))}{\int_{X \times G} G'(q(P_{\beta,s}) - \beta^T x(\beta, s, \nu)) dF} dF.$$  

By Assumption 5, we have that $G$ has a strictly increasing CDF, so $G' > 0$. As a result, we can define

$$w(\beta, s, \nu) = \frac{G'(q(P_{\beta,s}) - \beta^T x(\beta, s, \nu))}{\int_{X \times G} G'(q(P_{\beta,s}) - \beta^T x(\beta, s, \nu)) dF}$$

where $0 \leq w(\beta, s, \nu) \leq 1$ and $\int w(\beta, s, \nu) dF = 1$. As a result, $\frac{\partial q(P_{\beta,s})}{\partial s}$ is a convex combination of $\beta^T \nabla_s x(\beta, s, \nu)$ terms:

$$\frac{\partial q(P_{\beta,s})}{\partial s} = \int_{X \times G} \beta^T \nabla_s x(\beta, s, \nu) \cdot w(\beta, s, \nu) dF.$$  

We can upper bound each term $\beta^T \nabla_s x(\beta, s, \nu)$. When $M < \frac{\alpha}{2\beta}$, Lemma 38 gives us that for any agent type $\nu \in \text{supp}(F)$, the function $h(s; \beta, \nu) = s - \beta^T x(\beta, s, \nu)$ is strictly increasing. Since $h(s; \beta, \nu)$ is strictly increasing and differentiable, we have that

$$\frac{dh}{ds} = 1 - \beta^T \nabla_s x(\beta, s, \nu) > 0.$$  

As a result, each term satisfies $\beta^T x(\beta, s, \nu) < 1$. Since $\frac{\partial q(P_{\beta,s})}{\partial s}$ is a convex combination of such terms, we also have that $\frac{\partial q(P_{\beta,s})}{\partial s} < 1$.

When $M < \frac{\alpha}{2\beta}$, Lemma 3 gives us that for any agent type $\nu \in \text{supp}(F)$, the function $\beta^T x(\beta, s, \nu)$ is a contraction in $s$, so $|\beta^T \nabla_s x| < 1$. As a result, since $\frac{\partial q(P_{\beta,s})}{\partial s}$ is a convex combination of such terms $\beta^T \nabla_s x$, then $\left| \frac{\partial q(P_{\beta,s})}{\partial s} \right| < 1$.

**G.10 Proof of Lemma 41**

We define the events $A = \{ \sup_{x \in X} |P(x) - \tilde{P}(x)| < D\epsilon \}$ and $B = \{ |q(P) - q(\tilde{P})| < \epsilon \}$. Our goal is to obtain a lower bound on the probability of event $B$. We show that if event $A$ occurs then event $B$ occurs.

Since $P$ and $\tilde{P}$ are both surjective functions, there exist $r_1, r_2$ in $X$ such that $P(r_1) = q$ and $\tilde{P}(r_2) = q$. In other words, $r_1 = q(P)$ and $r_2 = q(\tilde{P})$. WLOG, suppose $r_1 < r_2$, then we have that

$$|P(r_2) - \tilde{P}(r_2)| = |P(r_2) - P(r_1)|
\quad = |p(r)(r_2 - r_1)|$$
\quad = |p(r)||r_2 - r_1|$$
\quad \geq D|r_2 - r_1|.$$  

The first line follows from $q = P(r_1) = \tilde{P}(r_2)$. The second line follows from the Mean Value Theorem. The third line follows because $p(r) > 0$. The fourth line follows because $D$ is a
lower bound on \( p(r) \). As a result, we have that
\[
|q(P) - q(\bar{P})| \leq \frac{1}{D} |P(r_2) - \bar{P}(r_2)|
\]
\[
\leq \frac{1}{D} \sup_{x \in \mathcal{X}} |P(x) - \bar{P}(x)|.
\]

\textbf{G.11 Proof of Lemma 42}

From Lemma 41, we have that
\[
|q(P) - q(P^n)| \leq \frac{1}{D} \cdot \sup_{r \in \mathbb{R}} |P(r) - P^n(r)|.
\]
We observe that if \( \sup_{r \in \mathbb{R}} |P(r) - P^n(r)| \leq D\epsilon \), then \( |q(P) - q(P^n)| \leq \epsilon \). Thus, by Theorem 25, we have that
\[
P(|q(P) - q(P^n)| \leq \epsilon) \geq P(\sup_{r \in \mathbb{R}} |P(r) - P^n(r)| \leq D\epsilon)
\]
\[
\geq 1 - 2e^{-2nD^2\epsilon^2}.
\]

\textbf{G.12 Proof of Lemma 43}

We use the following lemma in this proof.

\textbf{Lemma 55.} Suppose Assumption 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6 hold. Let \( S < \infty \) be the range of \( S \). Let \( \{z^t\} \) be a sequence of random variables where
\[
z^t = \begin{cases}
S & \text{w.p. } 1 - p_n(\epsilon_g) \\
\epsilon_g & \text{w.p. } p_n(\epsilon_g)
\end{cases},
\]
where \( p_n(\epsilon_g) \) is the bound from Lemma 42. Then, for any \( s \in S \), \( z^t \) stochastically dominates \( |q(P_{\beta,s}^n) - q(P_{\beta,s})| \). \textit{Proof in Appendix G.24.}

We observe that
\[
|\hat{s}_n^t - s^*| = |\hat{s}_n^t - q(P_{\beta,\hat{s}_n^{t-1}}) + q(P_{\beta,\hat{s}_n^{t-1}}) - s^*| \quad \text{(G.15)}
\]
\[
= |q(P_{\beta,\hat{s}_n^{t-1}}) - q(P_{\beta,\hat{s}_n^{t-1}}) + q(P_{\beta,\hat{s}_n^{t-1}}) - s^*| \quad \text{(G.16)}
\]
\[
\leq |q(P_{\beta,\hat{s}_n^{t-1}}) - q(P_{\beta,\hat{s}_n^{t-1}})| + |q(P_{\beta,\hat{s}_n^{t-1}}) - s^*| \quad \text{(G.17)}
\]
\[
\leq |q(P_{\beta,\hat{s}_n^{t-1}}) - q(P_{\beta,\hat{s}_n^{t-1}})| + \kappa|\hat{s}_n^{t-1} - s^*| \quad \text{(G.18)}
\]
\[
\leq_{\text{SD}} z^t + \kappa|\hat{s}_n^{t-1} - s^*|. \quad \text{(G.19)}
\]
We have Equation G.16 because \( \hat{s}_n^t \) is generated via Equation 4.1. Equation G.18 holds because \( q(P_{\beta,s}) \) is a contraction mapping in \( s \) and \( s^* \) is the unique fixed point of \( q(P_{\beta,s}) \). Equation G.19 follows from Lemma 55.

Using recursion, we find that
\[
|\hat{s}_n^t - s^*| \leq_{\text{SD}} \sum_{i=0}^{k} z^{t-i} \kappa^i + \kappa^k|\hat{s}_n^{t-k} - s^*|.
\]
G.13 Proof of Lemma 44

Let $H$ be the joint distribution of $\nu$ and $\epsilon$. We can use the following abbreviations

$$w := (\nu, \epsilon)$$
$$\theta := (\beta, s, r)$$
$$\tilde{\pi}(w, \theta) := \tilde{\pi}(\nu, \epsilon, \beta, s, r)$$
$$\tilde{\ell}(w, \theta) := \tilde{\ell}(\nu, \epsilon, \beta, s, r)$$
$$\tilde{k}(w, \theta) := \tilde{k}(\nu, \epsilon, \beta, s, r).$$

The conditions on $a(w; \theta)$ in Lemma 27 include that

1. $\theta \in \Theta$, where $\Theta$ is compact.
2. $a(w; \theta)$ is continuous with probability 1 for each $\theta \in \Theta$.
3. $|a(w; \theta)| \leq d(w)$ and $E_{w \sim H} [d(w)]$.

First, for all of $\tilde{\ell}, \tilde{\pi}, \tilde{k}$, we have that the parameter space $\mathcal{B} \times \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{S}$ is compact.

Second, we can verify that for fixed parameters, $\tilde{\ell}, \tilde{\pi}, \tilde{k}$ are continuous with probability 1. By Assumption 8, we have that each for $\pi \in \{0, 1\}$, $\ell(\pi, \nu)$ is continuous, so the only discontinuity of $\ell$ occurs at the threshold when $\pi$ flips from 0 to 1. Similarly, $\tilde{\pi}$ is an indicator function, so its only discontinuity occurs at threshold. Thus, $\tilde{\ell}(\cdot, \theta)$ and $\tilde{\pi}(\cdot, \theta)$ are discontinuous on the set

$$A = \{(\nu, \epsilon) : \beta^T x(\beta, s, \nu) + \epsilon = r\}$$

but are otherwise continuous. The probability that $(\nu, \epsilon) \sim H$ satisfies the condition of set $A$ is equal to the probability that a score $z \sim P_{\beta,s}$ takes value exactly $r$. We note that a singleton subset $\{r\}$ will have measure 0, so the probability that a score takes value $r$ is 0. Thus, $A$ must also have measure 0. Since $\tilde{\ell}$ and $\tilde{\pi}$ are continuous except on a set of measure 0, $\tilde{\ell}$ and $\tilde{\pi}$ are continuous with probability 1. We realize that $\tilde{k}$ is continuous except for on the following set

$$A' = \{(\nu, \epsilon) : \beta^T x(\beta, s, \nu) = r + \frac{h}{2}\} \cup \{(\nu, \epsilon) : \beta^T x(\beta, s, \nu) = r - \frac{h}{2}\}.$$

The probability that $(\nu, \epsilon) \sim H$ satisfies the condition of set $A'$ is equal to the probability that a score $z \sim P_{\beta,s}$ takes value exactly $r + \frac{h}{2}$ or value $r - \frac{h}{2}$. Since the sets $\{r + \frac{h}{2}\}$ and $\{r - \frac{h}{2}\}$ have measure zero and a countable union of measure zero sets has measure zero, then $A'$ has measure zero. Thus, $\tilde{k}$ is continuous with probability 1.

Third, we note that $\tilde{\ell}, \tilde{\pi}$, and $\tilde{k}$ are dominated. For $\tilde{\ell}$, Assumption 8 gives us that $\ell(\pi, \nu)$ is bounded, so any constant function $d(\nu) = c$ for $c \geq \sup_{\nu \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{G}, \pi \in \{0, 1\}} \ell(\nu, \pi)$ dominates $\tilde{\ell}$. Since $\tilde{\pi}$ and $\tilde{k}$ are indicators, they only takes values $\{0, 1\}$, so any constant function $d(\nu) = c$ where $c > 1$ satisfies the required condition. Thus, $\tilde{\ell}, \tilde{k}$, and $\tilde{\pi}$ satisfy the conditions of Lemma 27.

G.14 Proof of Lemma 45

In this proof, we first verify that the agent with type $\nu'_{b,\xi,\zeta}$ has $\nu'_{b,\xi,\zeta} \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{G}$ and has a strongly-convex cost function $c_{\nu'}$. Second, we verify the value of the best response for this
agent and show that it lies in \( \text{Int}(X) \). Lastly, we show that this agent’s raw score (without noise) matches that of the agent with type \( \nu \) under the perturbed model.

By the following lemma, we realize that with \( \nu'_{b,\zeta} \) as defined in Equation F.1, \( \nu'_{b,\zeta} = (\eta'_{b,\zeta}, \gamma) \in X \times G \) is a valid type as long as the perturbation magnitude \( b \) is sufficiently small.

**Lemma 56.** Let \( \zeta \in \{-1, 1\}^d \) and \( \zeta \in \{-1, 1\} \) denote perturbations. Let \( b \) be the magnitude of the perturbations. Let \( \beta \in B \) and \( \beta \neq 0 \). If \( y \in \text{Interior}(X) \) and \( x \in X \), then for any \( b \) sufficiently small and

\[
y' = y + \frac{\beta}{||\beta||} \cdot b \cdot (\zeta^T x - \zeta),
\]

we have that \( y' \in \text{Int}(X) \). *Proof in Appendix G.25.*

With the above lemma, we define \( b_l \) so that \( \eta'_{b_l,\zeta} \in X \) for \( b < b_l \).

We verify that \( c_{\nu'} \) satisfies Assumption 1. We note that \( c_{\nu'} \) is twice continuously differentiable because it is the sum of twice continuously differentiable functions. Second, we show that \( c_{\nu'} \) is strongly convex. Since \( c_{\nu} \) satisfies Assumption 1, then \( c_{\nu'} = \alpha_{\nu'} \)-strongly convex for \( \alpha_{\nu'} > 0 \) and twice continuously differentiable. In addition, \( G'(s - r)\beta^T y \) is differentiable and convex in \( y \). By the strong convexity of \( c_{\nu'} \) and the convexity of \( G'(s - r)\beta^T y \), we have that

\[
c_{\nu'}(y) = c_{\nu}(y) + G'(s - r)\beta^T y \\
\geq (c_{\nu}(y_0) + \nabla c_{\nu}(y_0)^T (y - y_0) + \frac{\alpha_{\nu}}{2} ||y - y_0||^2) \\
+ (G'(s - r)\beta^T (y_0) + G'(s - r)\beta^T (y - y_0)) \\
= (c_{\nu}(y_0) + G'(s - r)\beta^T (y_0)) + (\nabla c_{\nu}(y_0)^T + G'(s - r)\beta^T (y - y_0)) + \frac{\alpha_{\nu}}{2} ||y - y_0||^2 \\
= c_{\nu'}(y_0) + \nabla c_{\nu'}(y_0)^T (y - y_0) + \frac{\alpha_{\nu}}{2} ||y - y_0||^2.
\]

So, \( c_{\nu'} \) is \( \alpha_{\nu'} \)-strongly convex where \( \alpha_{\nu'} = \alpha_{\nu} \), satisfying Assumption 1.

Let

\[
x_2 = x_1 + b \cdot \frac{\beta}{||\beta||} (\zeta^T x_1 - \zeta).
\]

Note that by Lemma 56, for sufficiently small \( b \), we have that \( x_2 \in \text{Int}(X) \). Suppose that \( x_2 \in \text{Int}(X) \) for \( b < b_2 \). We will show two useful facts about \( x_2 \) that will enable us to show that the best response of the agent with type \( \nu'_{b,\zeta} \) to the model \( \beta \) and threshold \( s \) is given by \( x_2 \). For the first fact, we see that \( x_2 - \eta'_{b,\zeta} = x_1 - \eta \).

\[
x_2 - \eta'_{b,\zeta} = \frac{\beta}{||\beta||} (b \zeta^T x_1 - b \zeta) + x_1 - \eta'_{b,\zeta} \\
= \frac{\beta}{||\beta||} (b \zeta^T x_1 - b \zeta) + x_1 - \eta - \frac{\beta}{||\beta||} \cdot b \cdot (\zeta^T x_1 - \zeta) \\
= x_1 - \eta.
\]
For the second fact, we have that \( \beta^T x_2 = r \).

\[
\beta^T x_2 = \beta^T \left( \frac{\beta}{|\beta|} (\kappa^T x_1 - b_\zeta) + x_1 \right) 
= \frac{\beta^T \beta}{|\beta|} (\kappa^T x_1 - b_\zeta) + \beta^T x_1 
= (\beta + \kappa)^T x_1 - b_\zeta 
= r. 
\] (G.20)

Now, we show that \( x_2 = x(\beta, s, \nu'_b, \zeta, \zeta') \). Since Assumptions 1 and 2 hold, by Lemma 35 it is sufficient to check \( \nabla_x E_{\gamma \sim G} [u(x_2; \beta, s, \nu'_b)] = 0 \) to verify that \( x_2 \) is the best response:

\[
\nabla_x E_{\gamma \sim G} [u(x_2; \beta, s, \nu'_b)] = -\nabla c_{\nu'}(x_2 - \eta'_b, \zeta, \zeta) + G(s - \beta^T x_2)\beta^T 
= -\nabla c_{\nu'}(x_1 - \eta) + G(s - r)\beta^T 
= -\nabla c_{\nu'}(x_1 - \eta) + G(s - r)(\beta + \kappa)^T 
= 0. 
\] (G.24)

To further simplify the above equation, we have that \( x_1 = x(\beta + \kappa, s + b_\zeta, \nu) \) and \( x_1 \in \text{Int}(\mathcal{X}) \). By Lemma 35, this implies that \( \nabla_x E_{\gamma \sim G} [u(x_1; \beta + \kappa, s + b_\zeta, \nu)] = 0 \). This gives that

\[
\nabla c_{\nu'}(x_1 - \eta) = G(s - r)(\beta + \kappa)^T. 
\]

Substituting this result into Equation G.26 yields

\[
\nabla_x E_{\gamma \sim G} [u(x_2; \beta, s, \nu'_b)] = -\nabla c_{\nu'}(x_1 - \eta) + G(s - r)b_\zeta^T + G(s - r)\beta^T 
= -G(s - r)(\beta + \kappa)^T + G(s - r)b_\zeta^T + G(s - r)\beta^T 
= 0. 
\]

We note that if \( b < \min(b_1, b_2) \), then we have that \( \eta'_b, \zeta, \zeta' \in \text{Int}(\mathcal{X}) \). Under such conditions, we conclude that \( x_2 = x(\beta, s, \nu'_b, \zeta, \zeta') \). The score obtained by the agent with type \( \nu'_b, \zeta, \zeta' \) and cost function \( c_{\nu'} \) under the model \( \beta \) and threshold \( s \) is \( \beta^T x_2 \). As we showed earlier in Equation G.23, this quantity is equal to \( r \). Thus, for sufficiently small perturbations, the agent with type \( \nu \) under perturbations obtains the same raw score as the agent with type \( \nu'_b, \zeta, \zeta' \) in the unperturbed setting.

G.15 Proof of Lemma 46

Note that by Assumption 3, \( F \) has finitely many types with positive probability. Let \( f \) be the probability mass function of \( F \), so \( f(\nu) \) gives the probability of that an agent has type \( \nu \).

We construct the probability mass function \( \tilde{F}_b \) of the distribution \( \tilde{F}_b \). Let \( \nu \sim F \) and \( c_\nu \) be its cost function. Under Assumptions 4 and 7, we can compute \( T(\nu, c_\nu; b, \zeta, \zeta) \), as defined in Lemma 45, for each perturbation \( \zeta \sim \{-1, 1\} \) and \( \zeta \sim \{-1, 1\} \) and type \( \nu \sim F \). Let

\[
T(\nu, c_\nu; b, \zeta, \zeta) = (\nu'_b, \zeta, \zeta', c_{\nu'}). 
\]
Lastly, for \( \nu \) function of the positive probability in \( F \) and finitely many perturbations \( (2^{d+1} \text{ possible perturbations}) \), there exists \( b > 0 \) such that this transformation is possible simultaneously for all types in the support of \( F \) and all perturbations. Note that this is a valid probability mass function because \( \sum_{\nu \sim \text{supp}(F)} f(\nu) = 1 \), so

\[
\sum_{\nu \sim \text{supp}(F)} \tilde{f}_b(\nu'_{b,\xi,\zeta}) = \sum_{\nu \sim \text{supp}(F)} \sum_{\xi \in \{-1,1\}^d} \frac{1}{2^{d+1}} f(\nu) = 1.
\]

In addition, note that the transformation yields

\[
\beta^T x(\beta, s, \nu'_{b,\xi,\zeta}) = (\beta + b\zeta)^T x(\beta + b\zeta, s + b\zeta, \nu) - b\zeta.
\]

The transformation given in Lemma 45 also provides other desirable properties. For instance, \( \nu'_{b,\xi,\zeta} \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{G} \), which means that the support of \( \tilde{F}_b \) is contained in \( \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{G} \). The cost function of the \( c_{\nu'} \) satisfies Assumption 1 with \( \alpha_{\nu'} \alpha_{\nu} \), which means that \( \alpha_{\nu}(\tilde{F}_b) = \alpha_{\nu}(F) \). Lastly, for \( \nu'_{b,\xi,\zeta} \sim \tilde{F}_b \), the best responses of the agents lie in \( \text{Int}(\mathcal{X}) \).

Additionally, we have that

\[
P_{\beta,b}(r) = \frac{1}{2^{d+1}} \sum_{\nu,\xi,s} \int G\left( r - (\beta + b\zeta)^T x(\beta + b\zeta, s + b\zeta, \nu) - b\zeta \right) dF
\]

\[
= \frac{1}{2^{d+1}} \sum_{\nu,\xi,s} \sum_{\zeta \in \{-1,1\}^d} G\left( r - (\beta + b\zeta)^T x(\beta + b\zeta, s + b\zeta, \nu) - b\zeta \right) f(\nu)
\]

\[
= \sum_{\nu,\xi,s} \sum_{\zeta \in \{-1,1\}^d} G\left( r - (\beta + b\zeta)^T x(\beta + b\zeta, s + b\zeta, \nu) - b\zeta \right) \tilde{f}_b(\nu'_{b,\xi,\zeta})
\]

\[
= \sum_{\nu'_{b,\xi,\zeta}} G\left( r - \beta^T x(\beta, s, \nu'_{b,\xi,\zeta}) \right) \tilde{f}_b(\nu'_{b,\xi,\zeta})
\]

\[
= \int G(r - \beta^T x(\beta, s, \nu)) d\tilde{F}_b.
\]

The final line matches the form of the score distribution’s CDF given in Lemma 39 assuming that the agent types are distributed according to \( \tilde{F}_b \).

**G.16 Proof of Lemma 47**

We define the sequence of functions \( \{h_b(s)\} \) where \( h_b : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathcal{S} \). Let \( h_b(s) := s - q(P_{\beta,s,b}) \) and \( h(s) := s - q(P_{\beta,s}) \).

We aim to apply Lemma 31 to this sequence of functions. We realize that the requirements on \( h(s) \) are given by our results from Section 3. Theorem 4 and Theorem 6 give us
that $h(s)$ has a unique root, which is the unique fixed point of $q(P_{\beta,s})$ called $s(\beta)$. Also, we note that $h_0(s)$ and $h(s)$ are defined on the compact set $S$. It remains to check that

1. Each $h_0(s)$ is continuous,

2. Each $h_0(s)$ has a unique root, which is the fixed point of $q(P_{\beta,s,b})$ called $s(\beta,b)$,

3. As $b \to 0$, $h_b(s) \to h(s)$ is uniformly.

To verify the first two properties from the above list, we apply the transformation provided in Lemma 46 to $P_{\beta,s,b}$. This transformation enables us to apply the results from Section 3 directly to expressions involving $P_{\beta,s,b}$.

Since the transformation maintains all of our assumptions and $M < \frac{\alpha_1(F)}{B} = \frac{\alpha_1(F_b)}{B}$, we can apply Lemma 5 to see that $q(P_{\beta,s,b})$ is continuous in $s$. This gives the continuity of $h_b(s)$. In addition, we can apply Theorem 4 and Theorem 6 to find that $q(P_{\beta,s,b})$ has a unique fixed point in $S$. We can call the fixed point $s(\beta,b)$, and $s(\beta,b)$ is also the unique root of $h_b(s)$.

Finally, we must check the third point, which is uniform convergence of $h_b(s)$ to $h(s)$. We aim to apply Lemma 30. First, we note that the continuity of $h(s)$ is given by Lemma 5. Second, we check that each $h_b(s)$ is monotonically increasing. Under the transformation from Lemma 46, we can apply Lemma 40 to observe that under our conditions, $\frac{\partial q(P_{\beta,s,b})}{\partial s} < 1$, so $h_b(s)$ is strictly increasing. Third, we show that $h_b(s)$ converges pointwise to $h(s)$ as follows.

To show $h_b(s) \to h(s)$ pointwise, we show $q(P_{\beta,s,b}) \to q(P_{\beta,s})$ pointwise. Note that by Lemma 39, $P_{\beta,s}$ is strictly increasing, so we can let a lower bound on its density be $D$. We can apply Equation E.1 from Lemma 41 with $P = P_{\beta,s}$ and $\tilde{P} = P_{\beta,s,b}$ to see that

$$\sup_{r \in S} |q(P_{\beta,s,b}) - q(P_{\beta,s})| \leq \frac{1}{D} \cdot \sup_{r \in S} |P_{\beta,s,b}(r) - P_{\beta,s}(r)|.$$  

The following lemma gives us the required uniform convergence in $r$

**Lemma 57.** Under Assumptions 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 7, if $M < \frac{\alpha_1(F)}{B}$, then $P_{\beta,s,b}(r) \to P_{\beta,s}(r)$ uniformly in $r$ as $b \to 0$. Proof in Appendix G.26.

So, we have that $q(P_{\beta,s,b}) \to q(P_{\beta,s})$ pointwise in $s$. This implies $h_b(s) \to h(s)$ pointwise. Thus, we have that $h_b(s)$ and $h(s)$ satisfy the conditions of Lemma 30, which implies that $h_b(s) \to h(s)$ uniformly.

Thus, the conditions of Lemma 31 are satisfied, so we have that $s(\beta,b) \to s(\beta)$ as $b \to 0$.

### G.17 Proof of Lemma 48

For sufficiently small $b$, we can apply Lemma 46 to show that $P_{\beta,s,b}$ is equal to the score distribution generated when agents with type $\nu_{\beta,b,\zeta} \sim \tilde{F}_b$ and cost functions $c_{\nu,b}$ best respond to a model $\beta$ and threshold $s$. The conditions assumed when types are distributed $\nu \sim F$ and cost functions are $c_{\nu}$ also hold when types are distributed $\nu_{\beta,b,\zeta} \sim \tilde{F}_b$ and cost functions are $c_{\nu,b}$. In particular, $\alpha_1(\tilde{F}_b) = \alpha_1(F)$, so we have that $M < \frac{\alpha_1(F_b)}{2B}$.

As a result, the results from Section 3 and Section 4 can be used to study $q(P_{\beta,s,b})$ and the stochastic fixed point iteration process given by

$$\tilde{s}_n^t = q(P_{\beta,s_{n-t-1}}).$$
First, we have that 
\[ M < \frac{\alpha(\tilde{F}_b)}{2B}, \] so we have that \( q(P_{\beta,s,b}) \) is a contraction in \( s \) by Corollary 8. Furthermore the conditions of Corollary 11 are satisfied by the assumed conditions, the results of Lemma 46, and the fact that \( q(P_{\beta,s,b}) \) is a contraction. So, we have that

\[ \hat{s}_n \overset{P}{\to} s(\beta,b), \]

where \( s(\beta,b) \) is the unique fixed point of \( q(P_{\beta,s,b}) \). In addition, we realize that \( q(P_{\beta,\hat{s}_n^{\beta,b}}) = \hat{s}_n^{\beta,b} + 1 \). Since \( \{t_n\} \) is an increasing sequence, we certainly have that \( \{t_n + 1\} \) is an increasing sequence, so again by Corollary 11, we have that

\[ q(P_{\beta,\hat{s}_n^{\beta,b}}) = \hat{s}_n^{\beta,b} + 1 \overset{P}{\to} s(\beta,b). \]

### G.18 Proof of Corollary 49

The proof of this result is analogous to Theorem 13.

### G.19 Proof of Lemma 50

To simplify notation, we use the following abbreviations. Let \( s(\beta) \) be the unique fixed point of \( q(P_{\beta,s}) \).

\[
\bar{\pi}_i(\beta, s, r) := \pi(\mathbf{x}(\beta, s, \nu_i), \epsilon_i; \beta, r) \\
\bar{\pi}_n(\beta, s, r) := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \bar{\pi}_i(\beta, s, r). \\
\bar{\Pi}(\beta, s, r) := \mathbb{E}_{\nu_i \sim F, \epsilon_i \sim G} [\bar{\pi}_i(\beta, s, r)].
\]

We note that \( \bar{\Pi}(\beta, s; r) = \Pi(\beta, s; r) \).

The regression coefficient obtained by running OLS of \( \pi(\mathbf{x}, \hat{s}_n^{\beta,b}, \hat{s}_n^{\beta,b}) \) on \( Z \) is denoted by \( \Gamma_n^{\pi,\beta}(\beta, \hat{s}_n^{\beta,b}, \hat{s}_n^{\beta,b}) \). The regression coefficient must have the following form.

\[
\Gamma_n^{\pi,\beta}(\beta, \hat{s}_n^{\beta,b}, \hat{s}_n^{\beta,b}) = (S_{\hat{s}_n^{\beta,b}})^{-1} s_{\hat{s}_n^{\beta,b}}, \text{ where } S_{\hat{s}_n^{\beta,b}} := \frac{1}{b_n^2} Z_{\hat{s}_n^{\beta,b}}^T \mathbf{Z}_{\hat{s}_n^{\beta,b}}, \quad s_{\hat{s}_n^{\beta,b}} := \frac{1}{b_n^2} Z_{\hat{s}_n^{\beta,b}}^T \pi. \quad (G.27)
\]

In this proof, we establish convergence in probability of the two terms above separately. The bulk of the proof is the first step, which entails showing that

\[ s_{\hat{s}_n^{\beta,b}} \overset{P}{\to} \frac{\partial \Pi}{\partial \beta}(\beta, s(\beta); s(\beta)). \]

Due to \( \hat{\pi}_i \)'s dependence on the stochastic process \( \{\hat{s}_n^{\beta,b}\} \), the main workhorse of this result is Lemma 29. To apply this lemma, we must establish stochastic equicontinuity for the collection of stochastic processes \( \{\bar{\pi}_n(\beta, s, r)\} \). Second, through a straightforward application of the Weak Law of Large Numbers, we show that

\[ S_{\hat{s}_n^{\beta,b}} \overset{P}{\to} \mathbf{I}_d. \]

Finally, we use Slutsky’s Theorem to establish the convergence the regression coefficient.
We proceed with the first step of establishing convergence of \( s_{zy} \). We have that
\[
  s_{zy}^n = \frac{1}{b_n^2} \pi^T \pi(\beta, \hat{\zeta}_n, \hat{\theta}_n) \\
  = \frac{1}{b_n^2} \sum_{i=1}^n b_i \zeta_i \pi(\beta, \hat{\theta}_n, \hat{\zeta}_n) \\
  = \frac{1}{b_n} \cdot \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \zeta_i \pi(\beta, \hat{\xi}_n, \hat{\zeta}_n)
\]

We fix \( j \) and \( b_n = b \) where \( b > 0 \) and is small enough to satisfy the hypothesis of Lemma 48. For each \( \zeta \in \{-1, 1\}^d \) and \( \zeta \in \{-1, 1\} \), let
\[
n_{\zeta, \zeta} = \sum_{i=1}^n \xi_i = \zeta, \hat{\xi}_i = \zeta.
\]

Let \( z(\zeta) \) map a perturbation \( \zeta \in \{-1, 1\}^d \) to the identical vector \( \zeta \), except with \( j \)-th entry set to 0. So, if the \( j \)-th entry of \( \zeta \) is 1, then \( \zeta = e_j + z(\zeta) \). If the \( j \)-th entry of \( \zeta \) is -1, then \( \zeta = -e_j + z(\zeta) \). So, we have that
\[
\pi_i(\beta, \hat{\xi}_n, \hat{\zeta}_n) = \pi_i(\beta + b \zeta_i, \hat{\xi}_n + b \zeta_i, \hat{\zeta}_n) \\
= \pi_i(\beta + b \zeta_i \cdot e_j + b \cdot z(\zeta_i), \hat{\xi}_n + b \zeta_i, \hat{\zeta}_n).
\]

As a result, we have that
\[
\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \zeta_{i,j} \pi_i(\beta, \hat{\xi}_n, \hat{\zeta}_n) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \zeta_{i,j} \cdot \pi_i(\beta + b \zeta_i \cdot e_j + b \cdot z(\zeta_i), \hat{\xi}_n + b \zeta_i, \hat{\zeta}_n) \tag{G.28}
\]
\[
= \sum_{\zeta \in \{-1, 1\}^d \text{ s.t. } \zeta_{i,j} = 1} \frac{n_{\zeta, \zeta}}{n} \pi_i(\beta + b e_j + b \cdot z(\zeta), \hat{\xi}_n + b \zeta, \hat{\zeta}_n) + \sum_{\zeta \in \{-1, 1\}^d \text{ s.t. } \zeta_{i,j} = -1} \frac{n_{\zeta, \zeta}}{n} \pi_i(\beta - b e_j + b \cdot z(\zeta), \hat{\xi}_n + b \zeta, \hat{\zeta}_n) \tag{G.29}
\]

To establish convergence properties of terms in the double sums in Equations G.30 and G.31, we must establish stochastic equicontinuity of the collection of stochastic processes \( \{ \hat{\pi}_n(\beta, \xi, \zeta) \} \) indexed by \((s, r) \in S \times S \). Because \( S \times S \) is compact and \( \tilde{\Pi}(\beta, \xi, \zeta) \) is continuous in \( (s, r) \), then we can show that \( \{ \hat{\pi}_n(\beta, \xi, \zeta) \} \) by showing that \( \hat{\pi}_n(\beta, \xi, \zeta) \) converges uniformly in probability to \( \tilde{\Pi}(\beta, \xi, \zeta) \) (Lemma 28). We can use Lemma 27 to show the necessary uniform convergence result.

By Lemma 44, we have that \( \pi \) satisfies the conditions of Lemma 27. Thus, we can apply Lemma 27 to establish uniform convergence in probability of \( \hat{\pi}_n(\beta, \xi, \zeta) \) with respect to
\( (s, r) \). As a consequence, the collection of stochastic processes \( \{ \tilde{\pi}_n(\beta, s, r) \} \) is stochastically equicontinuous. In particular, \( \tilde{\pi}_n(\beta, s, r) \) is stochastically equicontinuous at \( (s(\beta, b), s(\beta, b)) \), where \( s(\beta, b) \) is the unique fixed point of \( q(P_{\beta, s, b}) \) (see Lemma 47). By Lemma 48, we have that

\[
\tilde{s}^n = \frac{P_n}{s_n} \rightarrow s(\beta, b).
\]

Now, we can apply Lemma 29 to establish convergence in probability for the terms in Equation G.30 and G.31. As an example, for a perturbation \( \zeta \in \{-1, 1\}^d \) with \( j \)-th entry equal to 1 and arbitrary \( \xi \in \{-1, 1\}^d \), Lemma 29 gives that

\[
\tilde{\pi}_{n, \xi, \zeta}(\beta + b \xi, s_n + b \zeta, \tilde{s}^n) \rightarrow \tilde{\pi}_{n, \xi, \zeta}(\beta + b \xi, s(\beta, b) + b \zeta, s(\beta, b)),
\]

and by the Weak Law of Large Numbers, we have that

\[
\tilde{\pi}_{n, \xi, \zeta}(\beta + b \xi, s(\beta, b) + b \zeta, s(\beta, b)) \rightarrow \tilde{\Pi}(\beta + b \xi, s(\beta, b) + b \zeta, s(\beta, b)).
\]

Analogous results for the remaining terms in Equations G.32 and G.33. Also,

\[
\frac{n \xi \zeta}{n} \rightarrow \frac{1}{2^{d+1}}, \quad \xi \in \{-1, 1\}^d, \zeta \in \{-1, 1\}.
\]

By Slutsky’s Theorem, when any \( j \) and \( b \) fixed, we have

\[
s^n_{zy,j} \rightarrow \sum_{\xi \in \{-1, 1\}^d} \sum_{\xi \in \{-1, 1\}} \tilde{\Pi}(\beta + b \xi, s(\beta, b) + b \zeta, s(\beta, b)) \cdot \frac{1}{2^{d+1} \cdot b} \quad \text{G.32}
\]

\[
- \sum_{\xi \in \{-1, 1\}^d} \sum_{\xi \in \{-1, 1\}} \tilde{\Pi}(\beta - b \xi, s(\beta, b) + b \zeta, s(\beta, b)) \cdot \frac{1}{2^{d+1} \cdot b} \quad \text{G.33}
\]

Let \( R_b \) denote the expression on the right side of the above equation. If there is a sequence \( \{ b_n \} \) such that \( b_n \rightarrow 0 \), then by Lemma 47, \( s(\beta, b_n) \rightarrow s(\beta) \), where \( s(\beta) \) is the unique fixed point of \( q(P_{\beta, s, b}) \). Since \( \tilde{\Pi} = \Pi \) and by continuity of \( \Pi \)

\[
R_{b_n} \rightarrow \frac{\partial \Pi}{\partial \beta_j}(\beta, s(\beta); s(\beta)).
\]

Using the definition of convergence in probability, we show that there exists such a sequence \( \{ b_n \} \). From Equations G.32 and G.33, we have that for each \( \epsilon, \delta > 0 \) and \( b > 0 \) and sufficiently small, there exists \( n(\epsilon, \delta, b) \) such that for \( n \geq n(\epsilon, \delta, b) \)

\[
P(|s^n_{zy,j} - R_b| \leq \epsilon) \geq 1 - \delta.
\]

So, we can fix \( \delta > 0 \). For \( k = 1, 2, \ldots \), let \( N(k) = n(\frac{1}{k}, \delta, \frac{1}{k}) \). Then, we can define a sequence such that \( b_n = \epsilon_n = \frac{1}{k} \) for all \( N(k) \leq n \leq N(k+1) \). So, we have that \( \epsilon_n \rightarrow 0 \) and \( b_n \rightarrow 0 \). Thus, we have that

\[
s^n_{zy,j} \rightarrow \frac{\partial \Pi}{\partial \beta_j}(\beta, s(\beta); s(\beta)).
\]
Considering all indices \( j \),
\[
S^n_{zy} \overset{p}{\to} \frac{\partial \Pi}{\partial \beta}(\beta, s(\beta); s(\beta)).
\]

It remains to establish convergence in probability for \( S_{zz} \). We have that
\[
S^n_{zz} = \frac{1}{\sigma^2_n} Z^T Z = \frac{1}{\sigma^2_n} \sum_{i=1}^n (b_n \xi_i)^T (b_n \xi_i) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \xi_i\xi_i^T.
\]

We note that
\[
E_{\xi_i \sim R^d} \left[ \xi_i, \xi_k \right] = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } j = k \\ 0 & \text{if } j \neq k \end{cases}
\]
because \( \xi_i \) is a vector of independent Rademacher random variables. So, \( E[\xi_i^T \xi_i] = I_d \).

By the Weak Law of Large Numbers, we have that
\[
S^n_{zz} \overset{p}{\to} I_d.
\]

Finally, we can use Slutsky’s Theorem to show that
\[
\hat{\Gamma}_{\beta,\hat{s}_{tn},b_n}(\hat{s}_{tn}) = (S^n_{zz})^{-1} S^n_{zy} \overset{p}{\to} (I_d)^{-1} \frac{\partial \Pi}{\partial \beta}(\beta, s(\beta); s(\beta)) = \frac{\partial \Pi}{\partial \beta}(\beta, s(\beta); s(\beta)).
\]

G.20 Proof of Corollary 51
The proof of this result is analogous to Lemma 50.

G.21 Proof of Lemma 52
We study the convergence of the kernel density estimate \( p^n_{\beta,\hat{s}_{tn},s,b_n}(\hat{s}_{tn}) \). Let \( p^n_{\beta,s,b}(r) \) is a kernel density estimate of density of \( P_{\beta,s,b} \) at a point \( r \). Let \( \hat{\beta}_i = \beta + b\xi_i, \hat{s}_i = s + b\xi_i \), where \( \xi \sim R^d \) and \( \zeta \sim R \). We can write the explicit form of \( p^n_{\beta,s,b}(r) \) as follows
\[
p^n_{\beta,s,b}(r) = \frac{1}{h_n} \sum_{i=1}^n k \left( \frac{r - \beta_i^T x(\beta_i, s_i, \nu_i) - \epsilon_i + b\xi_i}{h_n} \right).
\]

For sufficiently small \( b \), we can apply Lemma 46 to map the types \( \nu \sim F \) and cost functions \( c_{\nu} \) to types \( \nu'_{b,\xi,\zeta} \sim \tilde{F}_b \) and cost functions \( c_{\nu'} \), so that when the agent with type \( \nu'_{b,\xi,\zeta} \) best responds to the unperturbed model and threshold, they obtain the same raw score (without noise) as the agent with type \( \nu \) who responds to a perturbed model and threshold. So, we can write
\[
p^n_{\beta,s,b}(r) = \frac{1}{h_n} \sum_{i=1}^n k \left( \frac{r - \beta_i^T x(\beta, s, \nu') - \epsilon_i}{h_n} \right).
\]
Let $H$ denote the joint distribution of $\nu_{b, \xi, \xi} \sim \tilde{F}_b$ and $\epsilon \sim G$.

$$w_b := (\nu_{b, \xi, \xi}, \epsilon)$$

$$\hat{k}(w_b, \beta, s, r; h) := k \left( \frac{r - \beta^T x(\beta, s, \nu_{b, \xi, \xi}) - \epsilon}{h} \right)$$

$$\bar{k}_n(\beta, s, r; h) := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \hat{k}(w_b, \beta, s, r; h)$$

$$K(\beta, s, r; h) := E_{w \sim H} \left[ \hat{k}(w_b; \beta, s, r; h) \right].$$

We can write

$$p_{\beta, s_{\beta}^h, b}(s_{\beta}^h) = \frac{1}{h_n} \bar{k}_n(\beta, s_{\beta}^h, s_{\beta}^h; h_n).$$

Due to the density estimate’s dependence on the stochastic process $s_{\beta}^h$, we must first establish the stochastic equicontinuity of the collection of stochastic processes $\{ k_n(\beta, s, r) \}$ indexed by $(s, r) \in S \times S$. We show stochastic equicontinuity via uniform convergence in probability (Lemma 27). The remainder of the proof follows by the Weak Law of Large Numbers and taking standard limits.

We fix $h_n = h$. Since $\hat{k}$ satisfies the conditions of Lemma 27, we can apply Lemma 27 to realize that $\bar{k}_n(\beta, s, r; h)$ converges uniformly in probability to $K(\beta, s, r; h)$ with respect to $(s, r) \in S \times S$. As a result, the collection of stochastic processes $\{ k_n(\beta, s, r; h) \}$ indexed by $(s, r) \in S \times S$ are stochastically equicontinuous. In particular, $\{ k_n(\beta, s, r; h) \}$ is stochastically equicontinuous at $(s(\beta, b), s(\beta, b))$. By Lemma 48, we have that

$$s_{\beta}^h \overset{p}{\to} s(\beta, b),$$

where $s(\beta, b)$ is the unique fixed point of $q(P_{\beta, s, b})$. We can apply Lemma 29 to see that

$$k_n(\beta, s_{\beta}^h, s_{\beta}^h; h) - k_n(\beta, s(\beta, b), s(\beta, b); h) \overset{p}{\to} 0.$$ 

Furthermore, by the Weak Law of Large Numbers, we have that

$$k_n(\beta, s(\beta, b), s(\beta, b); h) \overset{p}{\to} K(\beta, s(\beta, b), s(\beta, b); h).$$

Given our definition of the kernel function $k$ and for fixed $h$, we have that

$$p_{\beta, s_{\beta}^h, b}(s_{\beta}^h) \overset{p}{\to} \frac{K(\beta, s(\beta, b), s(\beta, b); h)}{h} = \frac{P_{\beta, s(\beta, b), b}(s(\beta, b) + \frac{h}{2}) - P_{\beta, s(\beta, b), b}(s(\beta, b) - \frac{h}{2})}{h}.$$ 

Given that our sequence $h_n \to 0$ and $nh_n \to \infty$ and $k$ satisfies the assumptions of Theorem 32, we can apply Theorem 32 to see that for each fixed $b$, we obtain a consistent density estimate.

$$p_{\beta, s_{\beta}^h, b}(s_{\beta}^h) \overset{p}{\to} \lim_{h_n \to 0} \frac{P_{\beta, s(\beta, b), b}(s(\beta, b) + \frac{h}{2}) - P_{\beta, s(\beta, b), b}(s(\beta, b) - \frac{h}{2})}{h_n}$$

$$= p_{\beta, s(\beta, b), b}(s(\beta, b)).$$

(G.34)

(G.35)
Let $R_b$ denote the right side of the above equation. Suppose there exists a sequence such that $b_n \to 0$. By Lemma 47, this gives us that $s(\beta, b_n) \to s^*$, where $s^*$ is the unique fixed point of $q(P_{\beta,s})$. We can show that $R_{b_n} \to p_{\beta,s^*}(s^*)$ as follows.

$$|R_{b_n} - p_{\beta,s^*}(s^*)| \leq |p_{\beta,s(\beta,b_n)}(s(\beta,b_n)) - p_{\beta,s(\beta,b_n)}(s(\beta,b_n))| + |p_{\beta,s(\beta,b_n)}(s(\beta,b_n)) - p_{\beta,s^*}(s^*)|$$

$$\leq \sup_{s, r \in S} |p_{\beta,s}(r) - p_{\beta,s}(r)| + |p_{\beta,s(\beta,b_n)}(s(\beta,b_n)) - p_{\beta,s^*}(s^*)|.$$  

Since $p_{\beta,s}(r)$ is continuous in $s$ and $r$ (Lemma 39), there exists $N$ such that for $n \geq N$, the second term is less than $\epsilon$. To bound the first term, we require the following lemma.

**Lemma 58.** Under Assumptions 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7, if $M < \frac{\alpha(F)}{2}$, then $p_{\beta,s,\beta}(r) \to p_{\beta,s}(r)$ uniformly in $s$ and in $r$ as $b \to 0$. *Proof in Appendix G.27.*

Due to the uniform convergence result, we have that if there exists a sequence $\{b_n\}$ such that $b_n \to 0$, then

$$R_{b_n} \to p_{\beta,s^*}(s^*).$$

It remains to show that there exists such a sequence $\{b_n\}$ where $b_n \to 0$. Using the definition of convergence in probability, we show that there exists such a sequence $\{b_n\}$. From Equation G.35, we have that for each $\epsilon, \delta > 0$ and $b > 0$ and sufficiently small, there exists $n(\epsilon, \delta, b)$ such that for $n \geq n(\epsilon, \delta, b)$

$$P(|p_n^{\beta,s_n,b_n}(s_n^{t_n}) - R_b| \leq \epsilon) \geq 1 - \delta.$$  

So, we can fix $\delta > 0$. For $k = 1, 2, \ldots$, let $N(k) = n(\frac{1}{k}, \delta, \frac{1}{k})$. Then, we can define a sequence such that $b_n = \epsilon_n = \frac{1}{k}$ for all $N(k) \leq n \leq N(k+1)$. So, we have that $\epsilon_n \to 0$ and $b_n \to 0$. Finally, this gives that

$$p_n^{\beta,s_n,b_n}(s_n^{t_n}) \overset{p}{\to} p_{\beta,s^*}(s^*).$$

**G.22 Proof of Lemma 53**

First, we note that $s(\beta)$ is continuously differentiable in $\beta$ by Theorem 9, so we can use implicit differentiation to compute the following expression for $\frac{\partial s}{\partial \beta}$

$$\frac{\partial s}{\partial \beta} = \frac{1}{1 - \frac{\partial q(P_{\beta,s}(\beta))}{\partial s}} \cdot \frac{\partial q(P_{\beta,s}(\beta))}{\partial \beta}. \quad (G.36)$$

After that, we apply the lemma below to express the partial derivatives of the quantile mapping $q(P_{\beta,s})$ in terms of partial derivatives of the complementary CDF $\Pi(\beta, s; r)$.

**Lemma 59.** Let $\beta \in \mathcal{B}$, $s \in S$. Under Assumption 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5, if $M < \frac{\alpha(F)}{2}$, then for $\beta', s'$ sufficiently close to $\beta, s$, the derivative of $q(P_{\beta,s})$ with respect to a one-dimensional parameter $\theta$ is given by

$$\frac{\partial q(P_{\beta,s})}{\partial \theta} = \frac{1}{p_{\beta',s'}(r')} \cdot \frac{\partial \Pi(\beta, s; r')}{\partial \theta},$$

where $r' = q(P_{\beta', s'})$. *Proof in Appendix G.28.*
Since \( s(\beta) \) is the fixed point induced by \( \beta \), we have that
\[
s(\beta) - q(P_{\beta,s(\beta)}) = 0.
\]
From Theorem 9, we have that \( s(\beta) \) is continuously differentiable in \( \beta \). Differentiating both sides of the above equation with respect to \( \beta \) yields
\[
\frac{\partial s}{\partial \beta} - \left( \frac{\partial q(P_{\beta,s(\beta)})}{\partial \beta} + \frac{\partial q(P_{\beta,s(\beta)})}{\partial s} \cdot \frac{\partial s}{\partial \beta} \right) = 0.
\]
Rearranging the above equation yields Equation F.14, which shows that \( \frac{\partial s}{\partial \beta} \) in terms of \( \frac{\partial q(P_{\beta,s})}{\partial s} \) and \( \frac{\partial q(P_{\beta,s})}{\partial \beta} \).

From Lemma 59, we have that for \( \beta^t, s^t \) sufficiently close to \( \beta, s \), we have that
\[
\frac{\partial q(P_{\beta,s})}{\partial s} = \frac{1}{p_{\beta,s^t}(r^t)} \cdot \frac{\partial \Pi}{\partial s}(\beta, s^t; r^t),
\]
where \( r^t = q(P_{\beta^t,s^t}) \). Let \( s^* = s(\beta) \). Suppose that we aim to estimate the derivative when the model parameters are \( \beta \) and the threshold is \( s^* \). If we consider \( \beta^t = \beta, s^t = s^* \), then \( r^t = s^* \). So, we have that
\[
\frac{\partial q(P_{\beta,s^t})}{\partial s} = -\frac{1}{p_{\beta,s^t}(s^t)} \cdot \frac{\partial \Pi}{\partial s}(\beta, s^t; s^*), \tag{G.37}
\]
\[
\frac{\partial q(P_{\beta,s^t})}{\partial \beta} = \frac{1}{p_{\beta,s^t}(s^t)} \cdot \frac{\partial \Pi}{\partial \beta}(\beta, s^t; s^*). \tag{G.38}
\]
Substituting Equations G.37 and G.38 into Equation G.36 yields
\[
\frac{\partial s}{\partial \beta} = \frac{1}{p_{\beta,s^t}(s^t)} \cdot \frac{\partial \Pi}{\partial s}(\beta, s^t; s^*) \cdot \frac{\partial s}{\partial \beta}(\beta, s^t; s^*).
\]

**G.23 Proof of Lemma 54**

By Lemma 37, \( H \) is positive definite and invertible. As a result, we can apply the Sherman-Morrison Formula (Theorem 20) to
\[
(H + G''(s - \beta^T x)\beta \beta^T)^{-1}: \text{let } A = H, u = G''(s - \beta^T x)\beta, \text{ and } v = \beta.
\]
\[
(H + G''(s - \beta^T x)\beta \beta^T)^{-1} = H^{-1} - \frac{H^{-1}(G''(s - \beta^T x)\beta)\beta^T H^{-1}}{1 + \beta^T H^{-1}(G''(s - \beta^T x)\beta)}
\]
\[
= H^{-1} - \frac{G''(s - \beta^T x)H^{-1}\beta \beta^T H^{-1}}{1 + G''(s - \beta^T x)\beta \beta^T H^{-1}}.
\]
G.24 Proof of Lemma 55

For \( b \in \mathbb{R} \), we show that
\[
P(|q(P_{\beta,s}^n) - q(P_{\beta,s})| \geq b) \leq P(z' \geq b),
\]
which is equivalent to the condition that \( z' \) stochastically dominates \( |q(P_{\beta,s}^n) - q(P_{\beta,s})| \).

By Lemma 39, \( P_{\beta,s} \) is a strictly increasing function and is differentiable in \( r \). This means that the density function \( p_{\beta,s} \) can be lower bounded by \( D > 0 \). So, from Lemma 42 we realize that for \( b \in [0, S] \),
\[
P(|q(P_{\beta,s}^n) - q(P_{\beta,s})| \geq b) \leq 1 - p_n(b),
\]
and under Assumption 6, the range of \( q(P_{\beta,s}) \) is the compact set \( \mathcal{S} \), so we have that for \( b > S \),
\[
P(|q(P_{\beta,s}^n) - q(P_{\beta,s})| \geq b) = 0.
\]
In addition, we have that
\[
P(z' \geq b) = \begin{cases} 
1 & \text{if } b \leq \epsilon_g \\
1 - p_n(\epsilon_g) & \text{if } \epsilon_g < b \leq S \\
0 & \text{if } b > S.
\end{cases}
\]

We show that Equation G.39 holds for the three cases 1) \( b \leq \epsilon_g \), 2) \( \epsilon_g < b \leq S \), and 3) \( b > S \). When \( b \leq \epsilon_g \), we have that
\[
P(|q(P_{\beta,s}^n) - q(P_{\beta,s})| \geq b) \leq 1 - p_n(b) \leq 1 = P(z' \geq b).
\]
When \( \epsilon_g < b \leq S \), we have that \( p_n(b) \geq p_n(\epsilon_g) \) because \( p_n(y) \) is increasing in \( y \). So, we note that \( 1 - p_n(b) \leq 1 - p_n(\epsilon_g) \). This yields
\[
P(|q(P_{\beta,s}^n) - q(P_{\beta,s})| \geq b) \leq 1 - p_n(b) \leq 1 - p_n(\epsilon_g) = P(z' \geq b).
\]
Finally, when \( b > S \), then we have that
\[
P(|q(P_{\beta,s}^n) - q(P_{\beta,s})| \geq b) = 0 \leq P(z' \geq b).
\]
Thus, we conclude that Equation G.39 holds, yielding the desired result.

G.25 Proof of Lemma 56

First, we note that if \( \beta = 0 \), then \( y' = y \). Since \( y \in \text{Int}(\mathcal{X}) \), we have that for any \( b > 0 \), \( y' \in \text{Int}(\mathcal{X}') \). Second, we suppose \( \beta \neq 0 \). Since \( y \) is in the interior of \( \mathcal{X} \), then there exists some \( \epsilon > 0 \) such that the open ball of radius \( \epsilon \) about \( y \) is a subset of \( \mathcal{X} \). We note that
\[
|y' - y| = \left| \frac{\beta}{\|\beta\|} \cdot (b\varsigma^T x - b\varsigma) \right|
\leq \left| \frac{\beta}{\|\beta\|} \right| \cdot |b\varsigma^T x - b\varsigma|
\leq |b\varsigma^T x - b\varsigma|
\leq b|\varsigma^T x - \varsigma|
\leq b(|\varsigma||x| + |\varsigma|)
\leq b(\sqrt{d} \cdot \sup_{x \in \mathcal{X}} |x| + 1)
\]
Since $\mathcal{X}$ is compact, we can say that the supremum in the above equation is achieved on $\mathcal{X}$ and we can call its value $m$. So, if $b < \frac{\epsilon}{(m\sqrt{d+1})}$, then $y' \in \text{Int}(\mathcal{X})$.

**G.26 Proof of Lemma 57**

We first show that $P_{\beta,s,b}(r) \rightarrow P_{\beta,s}(r)$ uniformly in $r$ as $b \rightarrow 0$. We aim to apply Lemma 30. First, note that the continuity of $P_{\beta,s}$ in $r$ is given by Lemma 39. We recall that

$$P_{\beta,s,b}(r) = \frac{1}{2^{d+1}} \sum_{\zeta \in \{-1,1\}^d} \int G\left(r - (\beta + b\zeta)^T x(\beta + b\zeta, s + b\zeta, \nu) + b\zeta\right) dF.$$  \hspace{1cm} (G.40)

By Assumption 5, $G$ is strictly increasing, so $P_{\beta,s,b}(r)$ is strictly increasing because the sum of strictly increasing functions is also strictly increasing. By continuity of $x$ in $\beta$ and $s$ (Lemma 2), we have that $P_{\beta,s,b}(r) \rightarrow P_{\beta,s}(r)$ pointwise in $r$. By Lemma 30, as $b \rightarrow 0$, we have that

$$\sup_{r \in S} |P_{\beta,s,b}(r) - P_{\beta,s}(r)| \rightarrow 0.$$

**G.27 Proof of Lemma 58**

We show that $p_{\beta,s,b}(r) \rightarrow p_{\beta,s}(r)$ uniformly in $s$ and $r$ as $b \rightarrow 0$. We prove the claim in two steps. First, we rewrite $p_{\beta,s}(r)$ and $p_{\beta,s,b}(r)$ as a finite sum of terms that align by type and perturbation. Second, we can show uniform convergence for pairs of terms in the sums, which gives that the aggregate quantity $p_{\beta,s,b}(r) \rightarrow p_{\beta,s}(r)$ uniformly.

First, we rewrite $p_{\beta,s}$ as follows

$$p_{\beta,s}(r) = \int_{\mathcal{X} \times G} G'(r - \beta^T x(\beta, s, \nu)) dF$$  \hspace{1cm} (G.40)

$$= \sum_{\nu \in \text{supp}(F)} \sum_{\zeta \in \{-1,1\}^d} G'(r - \beta^T x(\beta, s, \nu)) \frac{f(\nu)}{2^{d+1}}. \hspace{1cm} (G.41)$$

To rewrite $p_{\beta,s,b}$, recall that for sufficiently small $b$, we can use Lemma 46 to express $P_{\beta,s,b}$ as the score distribution induced by agents with types $\nu'_{b,\zeta,\zeta} \sim \tilde{F}_b$ and cost functions $c_{\nu'}$ who best respond to a model $\beta$ and threshold $s$. The type and cost function is given by transformation $T$ from Lemma 56. Recall that $T : (\nu, c, \zeta, s, b) \rightarrow (\nu'_{b,\zeta,\zeta}, c_{\nu'})$. Let $T_1$ be defined as

$$T_1 : (\nu, c, b, \zeta, s) \rightarrow \nu'_{b,\zeta,\zeta}.$$  

Since our assumed conditions also transfer to $\tilde{F}_b$, we have that $P_{\beta,s,b}(r)$ is continuously
differentiable in $r$ with density $p_{\beta,s,b}$ (Lemma 39). Using the function $T_1$, we have that

$$p_{\beta,s,b}(r) = \int_{X \times G} G'(r - \beta^T x(\beta, s, \nu)) d\tilde{F}_b$$

(G.42)

$$= \sum_{\nu', \xi, \zeta \in \text{supp}(\tilde{F}_b)} G'(r - \beta^T x(\beta, s, \nu', \xi, \zeta)) \cdot \tilde{f}_b(\nu', \xi, \zeta)$$

(G.43)

$$= \sum_{\nu \sim \text{supp}(F)} \sum_{\xi \in \{-1,1\}} \sum_{\zeta \in \{-1,1\}} G'(r - \beta^T x(\beta, s, T_1(\nu, c_{\nu}; b, \xi, \zeta))) \cdot \tilde{f}_b(T_1(\nu, c_{\nu}; \xi, \zeta, b))$$

(G.44)

$$= \sum_{\nu \sim \text{supp}(F)} \sum_{\xi \in \{-1,1\}} \sum_{\zeta \in \{-1,1\}} G'(r - \beta^T x(\beta, s, T_1(\nu, c_{\nu}; b, \xi, \zeta))) \cdot \frac{f(\nu)}{2^{d+1}}.$$  

(G.45)

The last line follows from Lemma 46, where we have that

$$\tilde{f}_b(T_1(\nu, c_{\nu}; b, \xi, \zeta)) = \frac{f(\nu)}{2^{d+1}} \quad \nu \sim F.$$

Therefore, the terms of $p_{\beta,s}$ in Equation G.41 align with the terms of $p_{\beta,s,b}$ in Equation G.45 by type and perturbation. We have that

$$|p_{\beta,s,b}(r) - p_{\beta,s}(r)|$$

$$= \left| \sum_{\nu \sim \text{supp}(F)} \sum_{\xi \in \{-1,1\}} \sum_{\zeta \in \{-1,1\}} (G'(r - \beta^T x(\beta, s, T_1(\nu, c_{\nu}; b, \xi, \zeta))) - G'(r - \beta^T x(\beta, s, \nu))) \cdot \frac{f(\nu)}{2^{d+1}} \right|$$

$$\leq \sum_{\nu \sim \text{supp}(F)} \sum_{\xi \in \{-1,1\}} \sum_{\zeta \in \{-1,1\}} \left| G'(r - \beta^T x(\beta, s, T_1(\nu, c_{\nu}; b, \xi, \zeta))) - G'(r - \beta^T x(\beta, s, \nu)) \right| \cdot \frac{f(\nu)}{2^{d+1}}.$$

Since the sum in the above inequality is finite, we can show $p_{\beta,s,b}(r) \to p_{\beta,s}(r)$ uniformly in $s, r$ if we can show that for every type $\nu$ and perturbation $(\xi, \zeta)$, we have that

$$\sup_{(s, r) \in S \times S} |G'(r - \beta^T x(\beta, s, T_1(\nu, c_{\nu}; b, \xi, \zeta))) - G'(r - \beta^T x(\beta, s, \nu))| \to 0.$$

Now, we can use the following lemma to show uniform convergence (in $s$ and $r$) of the arguments to $G'$ in the above expression.

**Lemma 60.** Suppose Assumption 1, 2, 6, 7 hold. Let $\nu \sim F$ and $c_{\nu}$ be a cost function. Let $\nu'_{b,\xi,\zeta} = T(\nu, c_{\nu}; b, \xi, \zeta)$, where $T$ is as defined in Lemma 45 for any $\xi \in \{-1,1\}, \zeta \in \{-1,1\},$ and $b > 0$ and sufficiently small. As $b \to 0$, $\beta^T x(\beta, s, \nu'_{b,\xi,\zeta}) \to \beta^T x(\beta, s, \nu)$ uniformly in $s$. Proof in Appendix G.29.
We observe that
\[
\sup_{(s,r) \in S \times S} |(r - \beta^T \mathbf{x}(\beta, s, T_1(\nu, c_r; b, \xi, \zeta))) - (r - \beta^T \mathbf{x}(\beta, s, \nu))| \\
= \sup_{(s,r) \in S \times S} |\beta^T \mathbf{x}(\beta, s, T_1(\nu, c_r; b, \xi, \zeta)) - \beta^T \mathbf{x}(\beta, s, \nu)| \\
= \sup_{s \in S} |\beta^T \mathbf{x}(\beta, s, T_1(\nu, c_r; b, \xi, \zeta)) - \beta^T \mathbf{x}(\beta, s, \nu)| \to 0,
\]
where the uniform convergence in the last line follows from Lemma 60. Since the argument to \(G'\) in Equation G.45 converges uniformly in \(s\) and \(r\), the argument to \(G'\) is uniformly bounded. So, we can restrict the domain of \(G'\) to an closed interval on which it is uniformly continuous. As a result, we also have that
\[
\sup_{(s,r) \in S \times S} |G'(r - \beta^T \mathbf{x}(\beta, s, T_1(\nu, c_r; b, \xi, \zeta))) - G'(r - \beta^T \mathbf{x}(\beta, s, \nu))| \to 0,
\]
which concludes the proof.

**G.28 Proof of Lemma 59**

For simplicity, we can write
\[
r^t = q(P_{\beta^t,s^t}) = P_{\beta^t,s^t}^{-1}(q), \quad r = q(P_{\beta,s}) = P_{\beta,s}^{-1}(q).
\]
From Lemma 5, we have the \(q(P_{\beta,s})\) is continuous in \(\beta, s\). In addition, we note that the density of the scores \(p_{\beta,s}(y)\) is continuous with respect to \(\beta, s, y\) (Lemma 39). By the continuity of the density of the scores and the quantile mapping, we can choose \(\beta^t, s^t\) sufficiently close to \(\beta, s\) such that \(|r - r^t| < \epsilon\) and \(|p_{\beta,s}(r^t) - p_{\beta^t,s^t}(r^t)| < \epsilon\).

From Lemma 39, we have that \(P_{\beta,s}\) and \(P_{\beta^t,s^t}\) have unique inverses. So, the quantile mapping is uniquely defined, which means
\[
P_{\beta^t,s^t}(r^t) = q, \quad P_{\beta,s}(r) = q.
\]

As a result, we have that \(P_{\beta^t,s^t}(r^t) = P_{\beta,s}(r)\). Without loss of generality, suppose that \(r > r^t\),
\[
P_{\beta^t,s^t}(r^t) - P_{\beta,s}(r^t) = P_{\beta,s}(r) - P_{\beta,s}(r) \\
= \int_{-\infty}^r p_{\beta,s}(y)dy - \int_{-\infty}^r p_{\beta,s}(y)dy \\
= \int_{r^t}^r p_{\beta,s}(y)dy \\
= (r - r^t)p_{\beta,s}(r^t) + o(|r^t - r|) \\
= (r - r^t)p_{\beta^t,s^t}(r^t) + o((r - r^t)p_{\beta,s}(r^t) - p_{\beta^t,s^t}(r^t)) + o(|r - r^t|) \\
= (r - r^t)p_{\beta^t,s^t}(r^t) + o(|r - r^t| \cdot |p_{\beta,s}(r^t) - p_{\beta^t,s^t}(r^t)|) + o(|r - r^t|) \\
= (r - r^t)p_{\beta^t,s^t}(r^t) + o(\epsilon^2) + o(\epsilon) \\
= (q(P_{\beta,s}) - q(P_{\beta^t,s^t}))p_{\beta^t,s^t}(r^t) + o(\epsilon^2) + o(\epsilon)
\]
We can differentiate both sides of the above equation with respect to a one-dimensional parameter $\theta$.

\[-\frac{\partial P_{\beta,s}(r^t)}{\partial \theta} = \frac{\partial q(P_{\beta,s})}{\partial \theta} \cdot p_{\beta,s}(r^t).\]

From the Definition of $\Pi(\beta, s; r)$ in Equation 5.3, we observe that

\[\frac{\partial P_{\beta,s}(r)}{\partial \theta} = -\frac{\partial \Pi}{\partial \theta}(\beta, s; r).\]

Solving for $\frac{\partial q(P_{\beta,s})}{\partial \theta}$, we find that

\[\frac{\partial q(P_{\beta,s})}{\partial \theta} = \frac{1}{p_{\beta,s}(r^t)} \cdot \frac{\partial \Pi}{\partial \theta}(\beta, s; r^t).\]

### G.29 Proof of Lemma 60

Consider $b$ sufficiently small so that the transformation in Lemma 45 is possible. Let $\eta_{b,\zeta,\zeta}$ be as defined in Equation F.1. Let $h_b : S \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, where $h_b(s) := s - \beta^T x(\beta, s, \nu_{b,\zeta,\zeta})$ and $h(s) := s - \beta^T x(\beta, s, \nu)$. It is sufficient to show that $h_b(s) \to h(s)$ uniformly in $s$ because

\[
\sup_{s \in S} |\beta^T x(\beta, s, \nu_{b,\zeta,\zeta}) - \beta^T x(\beta, s, \nu)| = \sup_{s \in S} |s - \beta^T x(\beta, s, \nu_{b,\zeta,\zeta}) - s + \beta^T x(\beta, s, \nu)|
\]

\[
= \sup_{s \in S} |h_b(s) - h(s)|.
\]

We aim to apply Lemma 30 to show $h_b \to h$ uniformly. We have that $S$ compact by Assumption 6. By Lemma 2, we have that $h(s)$ is continuous. By Lemma 38, we have that each $h_b$ strictly increasing in $s$. In addition, we have the following pointwise convergence

\[
\lim_{b \to 0} h_b(s) = \lim_{b \to 0} s - \beta^T x(\beta, s, \nu_{b,\zeta,\zeta}) \tag{G.46}
\]

\[
= \lim_{b \to 0} s - \beta^T \left(x(\beta + b\zeta, s + b\zeta, \nu) + b \cdot \frac{\beta}{||\beta||} (\zeta^T x(\beta + b\zeta, s + b\zeta, \nu) - \zeta)\right) \tag{G.47}
\]

\[
= \lim_{b \to 0} s - \beta^T x(\beta + b\zeta, s + b\zeta, \nu) - b \cdot (\zeta^T x(\beta + b\zeta, s + b\zeta, \nu) - \zeta) \tag{G.48}
\]

\[
= s - \beta^T x(\beta, s, \nu) \tag{G.49}
\]

\[
= h(s). \tag{G.50}
\]

Equation G.47 follows from Lemma 45, which gives an explicit expression for $x(\beta, s, \nu_{b,\zeta,\zeta})$. Equation G.49 follows from continuity of the best response mapping in $\beta, s$ (Lemma 2). Thus, $h_b \to h$ uniformly, so we have that $\beta^T x(\beta, s, \nu_{b,\zeta,\zeta}) \to \beta^T x(\beta, s, \nu)$ uniformly in $s$. 
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