

Dynamic Pricing Provides Robust Equilibria in Stochastic Ride-Sharing Networks

J. Massey Cashore*

Peter I. Frazier†

Éva Tardos‡

Cornell University
May 20, 2022

Abstract

Ridesharing markets are complex: drivers are strategic, rider demand and driver availability are stochastic, and complex city-scale phenomena like weather induce large scale correlation across space and time. At the same time, past work has focused on a subset of these challenges. We propose a model of ridesharing networks with strategic drivers, spatiotemporal dynamics, and stochasticity. Supporting both computational tractability and better modeling flexibility than classical fluid limits, we use a two-level stochastic model that allows correlated shocks caused by weather or large public events.

Using this model, we propose a novel pricing mechanism: stochastic spatiotemporal pricing (SSP). We show that the SSP mechanism is asymptotically incentive-compatible and that all (approximate) equilibria of the resulting game are asymptotically welfare-maximizing when the market is large enough. The SSP mechanism iteratively recomputes prices based on realized demand and supply, and in this sense prices dynamically. We show that this is critical: while a static variant of the SSP mechanism (whose prices vary with the market-level stochastic scenario but not individual rider and driver decisions) has a sequence of asymptotically welfare-optimal approximate equilibria, we demonstrate that it also has other equilibria producing extremely low social welfare. Thus, we argue that dynamic pricing is important for ensuring robustness in stochastic ride-sharing networks.

1 Introduction

Ridesharing markets are complex. Drivers are strategic (Cradeur, 2018; Lu et al., 2018), rider and driver decisions are stochastic, stochastic city-scale phenomenon like weather create correlation across space and time (Chou, 2002; Kanga et al., 2013), and factors including irrationality (Camerer, 1997; Sheldon, 2016), learning (Cook et al., 2018), and model error require robust off-equilibrium performance.

At the same time, pricing methods for ridesharing published in the academic literature are developed and analyzed considering only a portion of this complexity. Work studying stochastic demand focuses on non-strategic drivers (Alonso-Mora et al., 2017; Ashlagi et al., 2018; Banerjee et al., 2017; Besbes et al., 2019; Braverman et al., 2019; Özkan and Ward, 2020; Yan et al., 2020) and/or ignores spatial aspects of ridesharing (Castillo et al., 2017; Chen et al., 2019a; Garg and Nazerzadeh, 2020). Work focusing on strategic drivers in more realistic spatial settings assume deterministic

*Supported by an NSERC PGS D Fellowship

†Supported by AFOSR grant FA9550-19-1-0283

‡Supported by AFOSR grant FA9550-19-1-0183 and NSF grants CCF-1408673 and CCF-1563714

demand (Ma et al., 2018), take a fluid limit in which demand becomes deterministic (Afeche et al., 2018; Besbes et al., 2018; Bimpikis et al., 2016), or are descriptive rather than normative (Lu et al., 2018).

Our paper studies strategic driver behaviour in a model unifying many of the real-world complexities that were previously studied in isolation: stochastic rider demand, stochastic driver availability, strategic driver decisions, and network structure with spatial and temporal components. In a novel stochastic large-market limit more appropriate for ridesharing applications than past deterministic fluid limits (Afeche et al., 2018), we develop a computationally tractable pricing and matching mechanism under which all approximate equilibria are asymptotically welfare-optimal. We additionally show that ensuring *all* approximate equilibria are good is non-trivial: we demonstrate that persistent stochasticity in the large-market limit creates the need for a “re-solving” step when defining our mechanism. Without this, we show that a different mechanism that does not resolve and that is more closely linked to deterministic past work (Ma et al., 2018) has approximate equilibria that lose substantial welfare even in the large-market limit.

We model stochastic supply and demand with a two-level hierarchical distribution reminiscent of stochastic programming (Prékopa, 2013) that simultaneously provides computational tractability and modeling flexibility. The top level corresponds to city-level variation in demand and supply patterns caused by weather, large public events, public transit outages and other random phenomenon that affect many riders and drivers simultaneously. These phenomena create random shocks that are correlated across many riders and drivers. The lower level corresponds to fine-grained idiosyncratic randomness that affects individual riders and drivers independently.

Idiosyncratic randomness is tackled with a key analytical tool: a large-market setting in which the number of riders and drivers scale proportionally. This is especially relevant for the key ridesharing markets, those in large cities, where the number of riders and drivers is large. Through this approach, some randomness vanishes (conditionally independent rider and driver variation), supporting efficient computation of mechanisms based on this large-market limit. At the same time, randomness encoded by the stochastic scenario tree modeling city-level phenomena remains. This fact is an important difference between the large-market limit that we study and other deterministic large-market limits previously studied in ridesharing (Afeche et al., 2018), and allows us to model important correlated city-wide shocks that pure fluid limits do not.

Building on the power of this novel modeling approach, we develop a novel pricing and matching algorithm for ridesharing markets, called the stochastic spatiotemporal pricing (SSP) mechanism. This recomputes pricing and matching decisions at each time period based on the observed scenario and driver distribution by solving a multistage stochastic program arising in the large-market limit. This can be solved as a convex program that remains tractable for up to several thousand scenarios. Since the SSP responds to the stochastic scenario and real-time driver locations, it is a form of dynamic pricing.

The SSP mechanism is incentive compatible and all equilibria are welfare-maximizing when idiosyncratic randomness is absent. Further, all approximate equilibria are approximately welfare-maximizing when demand *is* idiosyncratically random and the market is large, in the sense that incentive compatibility violations and welfare-suboptimality of any equilibria vanish in this limit.

Indeed, this is critical in practice because such perturbations are inevitable. We show that the repeated computations are essential for achieving robust market performance in the presence of such perturbations. This insight is derived from comparing the SSP mechanism to a static analog that uses static prices derived from only a single computation, depending only on the scenario. While this static mechanism has at least one approximate equilibrium that is asymptotically welfare-optimal, namely, resulting from following the platform’s suggestions, we observe, using a simple example, that its performance is not robust: approximate equilibria of the static mechanism can

have extremely low social welfare while those of the SSP mechanism cannot.

The key distinction between the SSP and the static mechanism is that the first responds to real-time conditions, while the second is only able to respond to variation in the top-level stochastic scenario. Indeed, in the example in §5, there is only one scenario and so the static mechanism (which can depend on the scenario in general) corresponds to a fully deterministic pricing strategy of the kind studied by (Ma et al., 2018). Thus, the fact that SSP (which uses re-solving and thus changes prices dynamically based on market conditions) is guaranteed to result in equilibria with high social welfare while the static mechanism does not, argues that dynamic pricing is better able to provide robust equilibria and adapt to market fluctuations. This is the first analysis, of which we are aware, to argue that dynamic pricing is needed for this purpose, and contributes to the larger literature on the purpose and value of dynamic pricing in ridesharing (Banerjee et al., 2016; Cachon et al., 2017; Castillo et al., 2017; Chen and Sheldon, 2016; Hall et al., 2015; Lu et al., 2018).

In summary, the primary contributions of this paper are:

- In §2 we provide a novel two-level stochastic model of ride-sharing, that allows us to study a large-market limit retaining the persistent uncertainty of the macroscopic stochasticity of our model. We refer to a model created by taking this limit as the *stochastic fluid* model and to the original model as the *two-level model*.
- In §3 we show that the optimal driver allocation in the stochastic fluid model can be computed by a tractable convex program. We will then use the dual variables of this convex program for the suggested pricing method for rideshare pricing, resulting in a practical dynamic pricing mechanism, SSP, defined in §4.
- In §4, we study SSP’s properties. First, in the stochastic fluid model, we show (Theorem 2) that all equilibria resulting from the SSP mechanism are welfare optimal and all approximate equilibria are approximately welfare optimal.
- Then, in the two-level model, we show (Theorem 3) that in this detailed and realistic model, every approximate equilibrium resulting from the SSP mechanism achieves approximately optimal welfare when the market is large enough.
- Finally, in §5 we show that dynamic pricing enabled by re-solving is a key component in enabling our robustness result Theorem 3. We consider a variant of the SSP that does not re-solve, ignoring current driver locations. We demonstrate in a simple example how a risk premium leads to an equilibrium with significantly suboptimal welfare in large finite markets, despite existence of another equilibrium with optimal welfare in the stochastic fluid model. This suggests that being fully dynamic (depending both on observed supply/demand and city-level stochastic scenarios) may be important for achieving good practical performance in rideshare pricing.

1.1 Related Work

The literature on ridesharing has recently considered drivers’ strategic choice of location in (Afeche et al., 2018; Besbes et al., 2018; Bimpikis et al., 2016; Lu et al., 2018; Ma et al., 2018).

Papers (Afeche et al., 2018; Besbes et al., 2018; Bimpikis et al., 2016) all consider spatially heterogeneous driver-side pricing to incentivize driver relocation, but unlike the current paper consider a deterministic continuum approximation of the number of drivers in each node (or at

points in a spatial continuum in (Besbes et al., 2018)) and the flow of demand between nodes. In contrast, we focus on atomic drivers and study the effects of demand uncertainty.

(Lu et al., 2018) provides empirical evidence using data from Uber that surge pricing causes drivers to relocate toward locations with higher surge. It argues that the causal effect of surge has three components: a direct effect on earnings per trip; a real-time signal that demand is higher than expected at the surging location; and a slower signal about average location-specific demand. In the current paper we focus on the first aspect. The second and third aspects are absent from our model due to assumptions that the demand distribution, other drivers’ strategies, and the platform’s mechanism are all known.

The work within this ridesharing literature most closely related to the current paper is (Ma et al., 2018). This paper studies driver-side pricing in a multi-location multi-period model of a ridesharing market, and considers how to set prices over space (and time) to ensure that strategic drivers make welfare-optimal empty relocation decisions and accept all dispatches. Like the current paper, these prices are based on solving an LP relaxation of the optimal planning problem to integrality. Critically, and unlike the current paper, (Ma et al., 2018) assumes that the platform (and drivers) have complete information about future demand from riders. This assumption causes the welfare-optimal actions to be incentivizable. We show that this result extends to the fluid limit variant of our problem, despite the high-level uncertainty in the model. However, stochasticity not encoded in a top-level scenario (including the idiosyncratic low-level stochasticity in our model), can cause the equilibria of such a mechanism without dynamic pricing to have extremely low social welfare. Including a perfect representation of all stochasticity into a scenario tree is practically impossible from a modeling perspective and would lead to computational intractability. Thus, we see the model in (Ma et al., 2018) as focusing on fully deterministic ridesharing markets, without providing a robust way to generalize to realistic settings. In contrast, we see our approach as a step toward the computational tractability, modeling flexibility and robustness required in practice.

Within the sharing economy more broadly, (Chung et al., 2018) considers the problem of designing incentives in the context of bike sharing rebalancing, in which strategic agents trade off the cost (in terms of time and effort) of moving a bike between stations against the location-specific platform-controlled reward. The work in (Chung et al., 2018) pays special attention to practical considerations, and they demonstrate that the intelligent design of centrally controlled incentives can have meaningful real-world impact.

There is also work that considers drivers’ strategic behavior regarding which trips to accept (Castro et al., 2020; Chen and Hu, 2020; Chen et al., 2019b; Garg and Nazerzadeh, 2020) without considering the spatial aspects of ridesharing.

2 Model Description

Stochastic Network Structure. Drivers move across a set of locations $\mathcal{L} \neq \emptyset$ in discrete time over T periods.

Macroscopic randomness is modeled by a Markov chain $(A_t : t)$ with discrete random variables A_t that will make the behavior of riders and drivers random, even in the large-market limit. We refer to $\omega_t = A_{1:t}$ as the *scenario* at time t (including the history), where $\omega_0 = \emptyset$. Ω_t denotes the set of possible values for ω_t . We write $\omega_t \sim \mathbb{P}(\cdot \mid \omega_{t-1})$ to indicate the conditional distribution of ω_t . We use $\Omega_t(\omega_s) = \{\omega_t \in \Omega_t : \omega_t^{1:s} = \omega_s\}$ to denote the set of scenarios possible at time t given ω_s at time s , where $\omega_t^{1:s}$ truncates ω_t to its first s elements. We refer to the set of all scenarios as the *scenario tree*. Each scenario ω_t is a node in this tree, linked to all scenarios $\Omega_{t+1}(\omega_t)$.

We assume there is a fixed cost $c_{(\ell,d,\omega_t)}$ to drive from a location ℓ to a destination d at time t under the scenario ω_t .

Driver and Rider Entry. We consider a large-market limit where the volume of drivers and riders scale with a *population-size parameter* $k \in \mathbb{N}$. The number of drivers entering the market at location ℓ , time t , and scenario ω_t under population size k is a random variable $M_{(\ell,\omega_t)}^{(k)}$. The number of riders interested in traveling from location ℓ to location d is a random variable $D_{(\ell,d,\omega_t)}^{(k)}$. We sometimes omit the superscript k and write $M_{(\ell,\omega_t)}$ or $D_{(\ell,d,\omega_t)}$. A subset of the possible riders in $D_{(\ell,d,\omega_t)}^{(k)}$ will request a ride, depending on the price set by the platform. We assume that these random variables satisfy good concentration properties as k grows large and have expected values that scale linearly in k , as stated in Assumption 1.

Assumption 1. Let $(X^{(k)})_{k=1}^\infty$ be the sequence of driver- or rider-entry random variables $(M_{(\ell,\omega_t)}^{(k)})_{k=1}^\infty$ or $(D_{(\ell,d,\omega_t)}^{(k)})_{k=1}^\infty$, for any location ℓ, d, ω_t . We assume:

1. The expected value of $X^{(k)}$ grows linearly in k , i.e. $\mathbb{E}[X^{(k)}] = k\mathbb{E}[X^{(1)}]$ for all $k \geq 1$.
2. There exists a sequence of error terms $(\epsilon_k : k \geq 1)$ and probability terms $(q_k : k \geq 1)$, both converging to 0 as $k \rightarrow \infty$, such that:

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\frac{1}{k}|X^{(k)} - \mathbb{E}[X^{(k)}]| \geq \epsilon_k\right) \leq q_k. \quad (1)$$

For example, if each $X^{(k)}$ follows a $\text{Poisson}(\lambda k)$ distribution, then property 1 is immediate and property 2 follows from concentration inequalities.

For simplicity we assume that drivers do not exit the market. We also assume that it takes a single time period to driver from any origin location to destination location. Both assumptions are without loss of generality: we can add locations that model being on-trip or leaving the market.

Market State. Let \mathcal{M}_t be the set of drivers who have entered the marketplace by time t and let $\ell_i \in \mathcal{L}$ be the current location of driver i (momentarily suppressing the dependence on t in the notation). Let S_ℓ denote $1/k$ times the number of drivers at position ℓ , that is the volume of active drivers who are positioned at ℓ , normalized by k .

Then, $\mathbf{S}_t = (S_\ell : \ell \in \mathcal{L})$ represents the supply volume across all locations. We refer to \mathbf{S}_t as the supply-location vector. We define our state variable at the beginning of each time period t to be the tuple (ω_t, \mathbf{S}_t) , meaning that the platform pricing and matching decisions, as well as strategic driver decisions about where to drive, depend only on the realized scenario ω_t and the spatial distribution of drivers specified by \mathbf{S}_t . Section shows that this is (essentially) without loss of generality, assuming that drivers are expected utility maximizers.

The notation $\mathcal{S} = \mathbb{R}_+^{\mathcal{L}}$ indicates the set of vectors indexed by locations \mathcal{L} with nonnegative components. We think of $\Omega_t \times \mathcal{S}$ as the state space at time t .

Pricing Policy and Rider Dispatch Requests. The platform sets prices at time t using function P_t . We write $P_{(\ell,d,\omega_t)}(\mathbf{S}_t)$ to mean the price for trips from ℓ to d when (ω_t, \mathbf{S}_t) is the market state. More simply, we write $P_{(\ell,d)}$ when the pricing function and associated market state is clear.

Prices filter demand for a trip. For each pair of locations $(\ell, d) \in \mathcal{L}^2$ and each scenario ω_t , every rider who is interested in a trip from ℓ to d holds a private value V for the trip. We assume the private values V_j for all $j = 1, 2, \dots, D_{(\ell,d,\omega_t)}$ riders are independent, identically distributed random variables. Let $F_{(\ell,d,\omega_t)}$ be the associated cumulative distribution function. We assume $F_{(\ell,d,\omega_t)}$ satisfies Assumption 2.

Assumption 2. *We assume:*

1. *There exists an upper bound V_{max} on the valuation V such that $F(V_{max}) = 1$.*
2. *$F : [0, V_{max}] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ is continuous and invertible, and the inverse is Lipschitz continuous.*
3. *The inverse function at 0 satisfies $F^{-1}(0) = 0$.*

We assume that riders only request a dispatch if their value V_j exceeds the price $P_{(\ell,d)}$. Let $R_{(\ell,d,\omega_t)}$ be a random variable counting the number of riders who request a trip from ℓ to d under the price $P_{(\ell,d)}$. $R_{(\ell,d,\omega_t)}$ follows a Binomial distribution with $D_{(\ell,d,\omega_t)}$ trials and $1 - F_{(\ell,d,\omega_t)}(P_{(\ell,d)})$ success probability. We write $R_{(\ell,d)}$ for the number of dispatch requests when the scenario ω_t is clear.

Matching Process, Driver Strategies and Add-Passenger Disutility. After prices filter demand and dispatch requests are realized for each route, the platform operates a matching process that allocates dispatch requests to available drivers. When allocated a dispatch, a driver may accept or decline. If the driver accepts, they drive the passenger to the dispatch's destination and collect the associated payment. If the driver declines, they do not collect a payment and may optionally drive to any destination they choose.

Drivers incur an idiosyncratic *add-passenger disutility*, which models the cost of adding a passenger to their car. In each period, every driver samples their add-passenger disutility independently from a Uniform(0, C) distribution for some constant $C > 0$. A driver's decision about whether to accept or reject a dispatch depends also on their add-passenger disutility.

We model driver decisions by assuming every driver at a location ℓ specifies a threshold $x_{(\ell,d)} \in [0, C]$ for each possible dispatch destination $d \in \mathcal{L}$. These threshold may depend on the driver, though we suppress this in the notation. When a driver is allocated a dispatch towards location d , we assume they only accept the dispatch if their add-passenger disutility value X is smaller than $x_{(\ell,d)}$. Each driver's strategy also specifies a destination $e \in \mathcal{L}$, to which they will drive empty if they do not accept a dispatch.

For each location ℓ and time t , let $\mathcal{M}_{\ell,t}$ be the set of drivers at ℓ at time t . For each driver $i \in \mathcal{M}_{\ell,t}$, we write $\mathbf{x}_i = (x_{(\ell,d)}^i : d \in \mathcal{L})$ to mean the vector of disutility-acceptance thresholds selected by driver i , and $e_i \in \mathcal{L}$ is the relocation destination selected by driver i .

We assume that dispatches can only be served by drivers positioned at the dispatch's origin. We also assume that each driver can be allocated at most one dispatch, that is, drivers who decline a dispatch will not get allocated an alternate dispatch in the same period.

We formalize the matching process as a function MP taking these arguments:

- A location $\ell \in \mathcal{L}$, and the market state (ω_t, \mathbf{S}_t) .
- For each driver $i \in \mathcal{M}_{\ell,t}$, the disutility thresholds \mathbf{x}_i and the relocation destination e_i .
- For each driver $i \in \mathcal{M}_{\ell,t}$, the add-passenger disutility value X_i .
- For each destination d , the number of dispatch requests $R_{(\ell,d)}$.
- An external source of randomness U sampled independently and uniformly from $[0, 1]$.

The matching process produces a set of tuples $\{(i, b_i) : i \in \mathcal{M}_{\ell,t}\}$. Here, $b_i \in \mathcal{L} \cup \{\emptyset\}$ is the destination of the dispatch allocated to driver i (where $b_i = \emptyset$ if driver i was not allocated a dispatch).

For each driver $i \in \mathcal{M}_{\ell,t}$, we use $a_i^t = (\ell, d_i, \delta_i)$ to indicate their action at time t . The driver's starting location is ℓ . The destination location d_i depends on the output of the matching process and the driver's strategy (\mathbf{x}_i, e_i) . If the add-passenger disutility X_i is smaller than the threshold $x_{(\ell, b_i)}$, then the driver accepts the dispatch and $d_i = b_i$ and $\delta_i = 1$. If not, then the driver declines the dispatch and instead drives towards $d_i = e_i$ with $\delta_i = 0$.

We thus think of this entire matching process as taking the inputs to the function MP specified above and producing the drivers' actions $(a_i^t : i \in \mathcal{M}_{\ell,t})$:

$$(a_i^t : i \in \mathcal{M}_{\ell,t}) \sim \text{MP}(\ell, \{(\mathbf{x}_i, e_i) : i \in \mathcal{M}_{\ell,t}\}, \{R_{(\ell,d)} : d \in \mathcal{L}\}).$$

We assume the platform randomizes its selection of drivers (in particular, preferential dispatch is not an available lever to align incentives). We also assume the actions produced by the matching process are always feasible with respect to demand, i.e. the number of drivers serving a dispatch from ℓ to d never exceeds the number of dispatch requests $R_{(\ell,d)}$.

Strategy Profiles and Approximate Equilibria. We now define a strategy profile. Let \mathcal{M} be the set of indices for all drivers who could potentially join the market. For each driver $i \in \mathcal{M}$, a strategy is a sequence of functions $\pi_i = (\pi_i^1, \pi_i^2, \dots, \pi_i^T)$ where each π_i^t determines the driver's action at time t . This function $\pi_i^t : \mathcal{L} \times \mathcal{S}_t \rightarrow \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{L}$ takes as input a location ℓ and a time t state $(\omega_t, \mathbf{S}_t) \in \mathcal{S}_t$, and produces a disutility threshold vector $\mathbf{x}_i \in \mathcal{X}$ and a relocation destination $e_i \in \mathcal{L}$.

We define a strategy profile as $\Pi = (\pi_i : i \in \mathcal{M})$. We model strategic driver behaviour by assuming that drivers select strategies resulting in an approximate equilibrium strategy profile Π , as defined below. Fixing the strategy profile, (and also the pricing and matching policies), the market dynamics are simply a stochastic process. Whether a strategy profile Π is an approximate equilibrium (with respect to a pricing and matching policy) depends on this stochastic process.

Fix a strategy profile Π and assume that pricing and matching policies are fixed. Let $(a_i^t : t \in [T])$ be the sequence of actions taken by each driver $i \in \mathcal{M}$. Set $a_i^t = \emptyset$ for any driver i who hasn't entered the market by time period t ; otherwise a_i^t is selected based on the matching process for time period t .

Let R_i^t be the reward collected by driver i in time period t . R_i^t is determined from the action a_i^t based on the following relationship:

$$R_i^t = \begin{cases} P_{(\ell,d)}^t - X_i^t - c_{(\ell,d)} & \text{if } a_i^t = (\ell, d, 1), \\ -c_{(\ell,d)} & \text{if } a_i^t = (\ell, d, 0), \\ 0 & \text{if } a_i^t = \emptyset, \end{cases} \quad (2)$$

where $P_{(\ell,d)}^t$ is the price set by the SSP mechanism for a dispatch from ℓ to d in time period t , and X_i^t is driver i 's add-passenger disutility from time period t . The utility-to-go U_i^t for driver i at time period t is the sum of rewards they collect over all future time periods,

$$U_i^t = \sum_{\tau=t}^T R_i^\tau. \quad (3)$$

R_i^t and U_i^t are both random variables.

Our definition of incentive compatibility for Π will use of a driver's expected utility to go, conditioned on their dispatch destination and their add-passenger disutility. Define $\mathcal{U}_i^t(\ell, b, X, (\omega_t, \mathbf{S}_t); \Pi)$ to mean the expected utility-to-go collected by driver i , conditioned on being located at ℓ , on being

allocated a dispatch towards $b \in \mathcal{L} \cup \{\emptyset\}$, on seeing add-passenger disutility $X \in [0, C]$, on the market state (ω_t, \mathbf{S}_t) , and the strategy profile Π :

$$\mathcal{U}_i^t(\ell, b, X, (\omega_t, \mathbf{S}_t); \Pi) = \mathbb{E}^\Pi [U_i^t \mid \ell_i^t = \ell, b_i^t = b, X_i^t = X, (\omega_t, \mathbf{S}_t)].$$

When the location and the state do not need to be emphasized, we write $\mathcal{U}_i^t(b, X; \Pi)$ for clarity.

Informally, a strategy profile Π is an approximate equilibrium if (almost) every driver has small incentive to deviate, regardless of the destination they are dispatched towards (if any). We use the notation $\Pi - \pi_i + \pi'_i$ to represent that driver i deviates from a strategy π_i to an alternate strategy π'_i . The incentive-to-deviate for a driver, given a particular time period and market state, is defined as the maximum utility gain the driver can achieve by switching to an alternate strategy. Recall we use the set \mathcal{M}_t to index the active drivers in the marketplace at time t . We use the notation $\mathcal{M}_t(\epsilon; (\omega_t, \mathbf{S}_t))$ to mean the set of active drivers whose conditional incentive-to-deviate is at most ϵ , given the market state (ω_t, \mathbf{S}_t) :

$$\mathcal{M}_t(\epsilon; (\omega_t, \mathbf{S}_t)) = \left\{ i \in \mathcal{M}_t : \sup_{b \in \mathcal{L} \cup \{\emptyset\}} \sup_{X \in [0, C]} \sup_{\pi'_i} \mathcal{U}_i^t(b, X; \Pi - \pi_i + \pi'_i) - \mathcal{U}_i^t(b, X; \Pi) \leq \epsilon \right\}. \quad (4)$$

$\mathcal{M}_t(\epsilon)$ implicitly depends on the market state (ω_t, \mathbf{S}_t) , but we omit this dependence in the notation for clarity. The formal definition Π must meet to be considered an approximate equilibrium is stated below.

Definition 1. *Consider the two-level model with population size k . Hold the platform and matching policies fixed and let Π be a strategy-profile. For a constant $\epsilon > 0$, we say that Π is an (ϵ, δ) -approximate equilibrium if the number of drivers who have at least ϵ -conditional incentive to deviate from any market state is smaller than δk , i.e., if*

$$|\mathcal{M}_t \setminus \mathcal{M}_t(\epsilon; \omega_t, \mathbf{S}_t)| \leq \delta k$$

for every t and every market state $(\omega_t, \mathbf{S}_t) \in \Omega_t \times \mathcal{S}_t(\gamma_t)$.

In the above definition, we use the notation $\mathcal{S}_t(\gamma_t)$ to mean the set of supply-location vectors $\mathbf{S} = (S_\ell \geq 0 : \ell \in \mathcal{L})$ such that the total volume of drivers in the network is smaller than γ_t , i.e. $\sum_\ell S_\ell \leq \gamma_t$. We pick γ_t to be a large constant so that $\mathbf{S}_t \in \mathcal{S}_t(\gamma_t)$ occurs with high-probability. Note that the choice of γ_t need only depend on the distributions governing the number of drivers who enter the marketplace, which satisfy the concentration assumptions described in Assumption 1. In particular, the total volume of drivers in the marketplace at time t is invariant to the strategy that the drivers use (since we assume without loss of generality that drivers never exit the marketplace).

The Stochastic Fluid Model The fluid model is our tractable approximation to the main model we have been describing so far. We can think of the sources of randomness in our main model as falling under two buckets: the stochastic scenario tree governs *macroscopic* randomness, and the remaining sources of randomness (driver entry, rider entry and dispatch requests) form *microscopic* randomness. With this designation in mind, we refer to our main model as the stochastic two-level model. The stochastic two-level model retains the top-level macroscopic randomness, but it approximates the microscopic randomness with deterministic dynamics.

The volume of riders and drivers who enter the market is deterministic in the stochastic fluid model, conditional on the realized scenario. For a time period t and scenario ω_t , let

$$\bar{M}_{(\ell, \omega_t)} = \mathbb{E}[M_{(\ell, \omega_t)}^{(1)}] \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{D}_{(\ell, d, \omega_t)} = \mathbb{E}[D_{(\ell, d, \omega_t)}^{(1)}]$$

be the volume of drivers who join the market at location ℓ , and the volume of riders who enter the market interested in a dispatch from ℓ to d , respectively. While these definitions are stated in terms of the expected number of drivers and riders who join the market under a population-size parameter k equal to 1, this is equivalent to taking the expected number of drivers and riders who join under any population-size k and dividing that by k , under the first condition stated in Assumption 1. Also define

$$\bar{r}_{(\ell,d,\omega_t)}(P) = \bar{D}_{(\ell,d,\omega_t)} (1 - F_{(\ell,d,\omega_t)}(P))$$

to be the fluid volume of riders who request a trip, as a function of the trip price P .

Our formalization of a pricing policy is the same in the stochastic fluid model as it was in the two-level model: a pricing policy is a sequence of functions (P_1, P_2, \dots, P_T) where each P_t is a function that sees the market state (ω_t, \mathbf{S}_t) and produces a vector of trip prices for each route $(P_{(\ell,d)} \geq 0 : (\ell, d) \in \mathcal{L}^2)$.

We model strategy profiles in the fluid model as a sequence of functions $\Sigma = (\Sigma_1, \dots, \Sigma_T)$. In the stochastic fluid model we assume all drivers at the same location use the same disutility threshold for accepting or rejecting a dispatch decision. We also assume that driver relocation decisions are determined by a collective relocation distribution for all drivers at the same location. Each function Σ_t takes as input a time t state (ω_t, \mathbf{S}_t) and produces a disutility threshold vector $\mathbf{x}_\ell \in \mathcal{X}$ and a relocation distribution $\mathbf{e}_\ell \in \Delta(\mathcal{L})$, for each location ℓ .

In the stochastic fluid model, the matching process is defined as a function $\bar{\text{MP}}$ that takes as input a location ℓ , a market state (ω_t, \mathbf{S}_t) , and a disutility threshold vector \mathbf{x}_ℓ , and produces a dispatch vector $\mathbf{g}_\ell = (g_{(\ell,d)} : d \in \mathcal{L})$ specifying the volume of drivers $g_{(\ell,d)}$ who serve a dispatch from ℓ to d . If the drivers at ℓ use a disutility acceptance threshold $x = x_{(\ell,d)}$ for destination d , and the matching process specifies $g = g_{(\ell,d)}$ dispatches towards d , we assume the fluid matching process has to allocated dispatches towards d to a pool of drivers with volume

$$Z(g, x) = \begin{cases} g \frac{C}{x} & \text{if } x > 0, \\ 0 & \text{else.} \end{cases} \quad (5)$$

For the dispatch volumes to be feasible, each $g_{(\ell,d)}$ cannot exceed the dispatch request volume $\bar{r}_{(\ell,d)}(P_{(\ell,d)})$, and the implied pool sizes cannot exceed the available driver supply: at each location ℓ ,

$$\sum_{d \in \mathcal{L}} Z(g_{(\ell,d)}, x_{(\ell,d)}) \leq S_\ell. \quad (6)$$

The volume of relocation trips along each route is then determined by the relocation distribution \mathbf{e}_ℓ and the remaining volume of undispatched drivers at ℓ . The volume of drivers who serve a relocation trip from ℓ to d is defined as

$$h_{(\ell,d)} = e_{(\ell,d)} \left(S_\ell - \sum_{d \in \mathcal{L}} g_{(\ell,d)} \right).$$

Because the relocation volumes are deterministic functions of the dispatch volumes, we can think of the matching process as a deterministic function that takes as input the market state (ω_t, \mathbf{S}_t) , the disutility thresholds $\mathbf{x}_\ell \in \mathcal{X}^{\mathcal{L}}$ and the relocation distributions $\mathbf{e}_\ell \in \Delta(\mathcal{L})$ used at each location ℓ , and producing trip volumes $(\mathbf{h}, \mathbf{g}) = \bar{\text{MP}}(\omega_t, \mathbf{S}_t, (\mathbf{x}_\ell, \mathbf{e}_\ell : \ell \in \mathcal{L}))$, where $\mathbf{h} = (h_{(\ell,d)} : (\ell, d) \in \mathcal{L}^2)$ specifies the volume of relocation trips along each route, and $\mathbf{g} = (g_{(\ell,d)} : (\ell, d) \in \mathcal{L}^2)$ specifies the volume of dispatch trips along each route.

We will frequently use the parameterization $\mathbf{f} = \mathbf{h} + \mathbf{g}$ to mean the vector of total trip volumes across each route. In the stochastic fluid model, note that the supply location vector for the next time period is a deterministic function of the scenario in the next time period and the total trip volumes in the current time period. If the time t scenario is ω_t and the time t total trip volumes are given by \mathbf{f} , if the time $t + 1$ scenario is ω_{t+1} then let $\bar{\mathbf{S}}_{\omega_{t+1}}(\mathbf{f})$ specify the the time $t + 1$ supply location vector, where

$$(\bar{\mathbf{S}}_{\omega_{t+1}}(\mathbf{f}))_\ell = \bar{M}_{(\ell, \omega_{t+1})} + \sum_{o \in \mathcal{L}} f_{(o, \ell)}. \quad (7)$$

Equilibrium Strategies in the Stochastic Fluid Model. In order to define what it means for a fluid strategy profile $\Sigma = (\Sigma_1, \dots, \Sigma_T)$ to be an equilibrium strategy profile, we associated with Σ a value function for each location and a Q-value for each trip type. The value function specifies the expected utility-to-go for a driver given their location, and the Q-value specifies the expected utility-to-go for a driver given their action.

Assume the pricing and matching policies are fixed. We define the Q-values and the value function associated with Σ recursively. For the base case, let $\mathcal{V}_{T+1}(\cdot)$ always equal 0. Let $a = (\ell, d, \delta) \in \mathcal{L}^2 \times \{0, 1\}$ denote any action, let $X \in [0, C]$ be any add-passenger disutility value, let $t \in [T]$ be any time period, and let $(\omega_t, \mathbf{S}_t) \in \Omega_t \times \mathcal{S}$ be any market state. Assume the value function for the next time period $\mathcal{V}_{t+1} : \mathcal{L} \times \Omega_t \times \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ has already been defined. Let \mathbf{h}, \mathbf{g} be the relocation-trip and dispatch-trip volumes produced by the matching process and the time t strategy Σ_t , and let $\mathbf{f} = \mathbf{h} + \mathbf{g}$ be the total-trip volumes.

Define the Q-value for time t as:

$$\mathcal{Q}_t(a, X, \omega_t, \mathbf{S}_t) = \delta(P_{(\ell, d)} - X) - c_{(\ell, d)} + \mathbb{E} [\mathcal{V}_{t+1}(d, \omega_{t+1}, \bar{\mathbf{S}}_{\omega_{t+1}}(\mathbf{f}))],$$

and define the value of location ℓ at time t as:

$$\mathcal{V}_t(\ell, \omega_t, \mathbf{S}_t) = \frac{1}{S_\ell} \sum_{d \in \mathcal{L}} \left[h_{(\ell, d)} \mathcal{Q}_t(\ell, d, 0) + g_{(\ell, d)} \mathcal{Q}_t\left(\ell, d, 1, \frac{x_{(\ell, d)}}{2}\right) \right].$$

In the above, we write

$$\mathcal{Q}_t(\ell, d, 0) = \mathcal{Q}_t((\ell, d, 0), X, \omega_t, \mathbf{S}_t)$$

to mean the expected utility-to-go of drivers who take a relocation trip from ℓ to d , and we write

$$\mathcal{Q}_t\left(\ell, d, 1, \frac{x_{(\ell, d)}}{2}\right) = \mathcal{Q}_t\left((\ell, d, 0), \frac{x_{(\ell, d)}}{2}, \omega_t, \mathbf{S}_t\right)$$

to mean the expected utility-to-go of drivers who serve a dispatch from ℓ to d . Note that $\frac{x_{(\ell, d)}}{2}$ is the average pickup disutility incurred by drivers who serve a dispatch from ℓ to d . In this definition of \mathcal{V}_t , we are implicitly relying on the equality

$$\mathcal{Q}_t\left(\ell, d, 1, \frac{x_{(\ell, d)}}{2}\right) = \frac{1}{x_{(\ell, d)}} \int_0^{x_{(\ell, d)}} \bar{\mathcal{Q}}_t(\ell, d, 1, x) dx.$$

In order for a fluid strategy Σ to be an equilibrium with respect to a fixed pricing policy and matching process, we require that no driver can have a profitable deviation from their specified action, from any market state. The property that no driver can have a profitable deviation can be broken down further into the following subproperties:

- A driver who takes a relocation trip cannot have the ability to take a relocation trip toward a different destination yielding higher utility.

- A driver who accepts a dispatch cannot have the ability to take a relocation trip yielding higher utility.
- A driver who declines a dispatch cannot have been able to achieve higher utility by accepting the dispatch.

We summarize these properties with the following equations:

$$\begin{aligned}
h_{(\ell,d)} > 0 &\implies \mathcal{Q}_t(\ell, d, 0) = \max_{d' \in \mathcal{L}} \mathcal{Q}_t(\ell, d', 0), \\
g_{(\ell,d)} > 0 &\implies \mathcal{Q}_t(\ell, d, 1, X) \geq \max_{d' \in \mathcal{L}} \mathcal{Q}_t(\ell, d', 0) \quad \forall X \in [0, x_{(\ell,d)}], \\
\bar{r}_{(\ell,d)} > 0, \quad x_{(\ell,d)} < C &\implies \mathcal{Q}_t(\ell, d, 1, X) \leq \max_{d' \in \mathcal{L}} \mathcal{Q}_t(\ell, d', 0) \quad \forall X \in (x_{(\ell,d)}, C].
\end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

We also provide approximate incentive compatibility conditions, which depend on an error term $\epsilon > 0$:

$$\begin{aligned}
h_{(\ell,d)} > \epsilon &\implies \mathcal{Q}_t(\ell, d, 0) \geq \max_{d' \in \mathcal{L}} \mathcal{Q}_t(\ell, d', 0) - \epsilon, \\
g_{(\ell,d)} > \epsilon &\implies \mathcal{Q}_t(\ell, d, 1, X) \geq \max_{d' \in \mathcal{L}} \mathcal{Q}_t(\ell, d', 0) - \epsilon \quad \forall X \in [0, x_{(\ell,d)}], \\
\bar{r}_{(\ell,d)} > \epsilon, \quad x_{(\ell,d)} < C - \epsilon &\implies \mathcal{Q}_t(\ell, d, 1, X) \leq \max_{d' \in \mathcal{L}} \mathcal{Q}_t(\ell, d', 0) + \epsilon \quad \forall X \in (x_{(\ell,d)}, C].
\end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

Definition 2. We say a fluid strategy profile Σ is an exact equilibrium, with respect to a fixed pricing and matching policy, if the incentive compatibility conditions (8) are satisfied from every market state. Σ is an ϵ -approximate equilibrium if the approximate incentive compatibility conditions (9) are satisfied from any market state.

3 Optimal Centralized Solution for the Stochastic Fluid Model

In this section we construct an optimization problem to obtain the welfare-optimal movement of drivers for the stochastic fluid model, ignoring strategic aspects of the problem and assuming that all drivers can be routed by a centralized planner. We refer to this problem as the *fluid optimization problem*.

The fluid optimization problem resembles a maximum-value flow problem over a “stochastic flow network” in which drivers move across locations and scenarios $\omega_1, \omega_2, \dots, \omega_T$ unfold as time progresses.

The fluid optimization problem solves for the welfare-optimal trip specification from any market state (ω_t, \mathbf{S}_t) . Let $\Phi_{\omega_t} : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a function such that $\Phi_{\omega_t}(\mathbf{S}_t)$ gives the optimal expected welfare that can be achieved in the fluid model starting from the market state (ω_t, \mathbf{S}_t) at time t .

We define Φ_{ω_t} via backwards induction. For the base case, let $\Phi_{\omega_{T+1}}(\cdot) = 0$. Fix any time period t and assume that $\Phi_{\omega_{t+1}}$ has already been defined for all time $t+1$ scenarios ω_{t+1} . We define

$\Phi_{\omega_t}(\mathbf{S}_t)$ to be the value of the optimization problem stated below in (10):

$$\Phi_{\omega_t}(\mathbf{S}) \equiv \sup_{\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{g}} \mathcal{W}_{\omega_t}(\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{g}) \quad (10)$$

subject to

$$f_{(\ell, d)} \geq 0 \quad \forall (\ell, d) \in \mathcal{L}^2 \quad (11)$$

$$g_{(\ell, d)} \geq 0 \quad \forall (\ell, d) \in \mathcal{L}^2 \quad (12)$$

$$f_{(\ell, d)} \geq g_{(\ell, d)} \quad \forall (\ell, d) \in \mathcal{L}^2 \quad (13)$$

$$\sum_{d \in \mathcal{L}} f_{(\ell, d)} = S_\ell \quad \forall \ell \in \mathcal{L}. \quad (14)$$

The decision variables in (10) are the pair of vectors (\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{g}) , where $\mathbf{f} = (f_{(\ell, d)} : (\ell, d) \in \mathcal{L}^2)$ encodes the total trip volumes along each route and $\mathbf{g} = (g_{(\ell, d)} : (\ell, d) \in \mathcal{L}^2)$ encodes the dispatch trip volumes along each route. We use the notation

$$F_{\omega_t}^*(\mathbf{S}) = \{(\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{g}) \text{ satisfying (11 - 14), } \mathcal{W}_{\omega_t}(\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{g}) = \Phi_{\omega_t}(\mathbf{S})\}$$

to mean the set of optimal solutions with respect to (ω_t, \mathbf{S}_t) .

The objective function has two components:

$$\mathcal{W}_{\omega_t}(\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{g}) = \mathcal{U}_{\omega_t}(\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{g}) + \mathcal{U}_{\omega_t}^{>t}(\mathbf{f}).$$

The second component $\mathcal{U}_{\omega_t}^{>t}(\mathbf{f})$ gives the expected total welfare achievable over all future time periods starting from time $t+1$, as a function of the total trip volumes \mathbf{f} taken in the current time period. It is defined via

$$\mathcal{U}_{\omega_t}^{>t}(\mathbf{f}) = \mathbb{E} [\Phi_{\omega_{t+1}}(\bar{\mathbf{S}}_{\omega_{t+1}}(\mathbf{f})) \mid \omega_t]. \quad (15)$$

The expectation is taken over the scenario ω_{t+1} given the time t scenario ω_t . Recall that $\bar{\mathbf{S}}_{\omega_{t+1}}(\mathbf{f})$ is a deterministic function, specified in equation (7), that gives the time $t+1$ supply location vector as a function of the total trip volumes \mathbf{f} .

The first component of the objective function, $\mathcal{U}_{\omega_t}(\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{g})$, gives the total welfare generated by the trips (\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{g}) in time period t . $\mathcal{U}_{\omega_t}(\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{g})$ is defined by the following equation:

$$\mathcal{U}_{\omega_t}(\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{g}) = \sum_{(\ell, d) \in \mathcal{L}^2} U_{(\ell, d, \omega_t)}(g_{(\ell, d)}) - \sum_{(\ell, d) \in \mathcal{L}^2} c_{(\ell, d, \omega_t)} f_{(\ell, d)} - \sum_{\ell} A(\mathbf{g}^T \mathbf{1}_\ell, \mathbf{f}^T \mathbf{1}_\ell), \quad (16)$$

where $U_{(\ell, d, \omega_t)}(g_{(\ell, d)})$ is the maximum utility generated by serving $g_{(\ell, d)}$ dispatch trips, $-c_{(\ell, d, \omega_t)} f_{(\ell, d)}$ is the constant cost incurred by all drivers who drive from ℓ to d , and $A(\mathbf{g}^T \mathbf{1}_\ell, \mathbf{f}^T \mathbf{1}_\ell)$ is the add-passenger disutility incurred by all drivers from ℓ who serve a dispatch.

In writing the add-passenger disutility cost function, we adopt the convention that $\mathbf{1}_\ell$ is a vector indexed by routes $(\ell, d) \in \mathcal{L}^2$ that takes the value 1 on components where the origin location is ℓ and 0 otherwise. With this convention, $\mathbf{g}^T \mathbf{1}_\ell$ specifies the total volume of drivers at ℓ who serve a dispatch, and $\mathbf{f}^T \mathbf{1}_\ell$ specifies the total volume of drivers at ℓ in total.

The minimum disutility we can incur by serving $\mathbf{g}^T \mathbf{1}_\ell$ dispatches is to select drivers positioned at ℓ whose add-passenger disutility falls in the bottom $\frac{\mathbf{g}^T \mathbf{1}_\ell}{\mathbf{f}^T \mathbf{1}_\ell}$ quantile of the disutility distribution. Recall that the add-passenger disutility follows a Uniform(0, C) distribution in each time period. So the best quantile results when drivers use the cutoff $x_{(\ell, d)} = (1 - \frac{\mathbf{g}^T \mathbf{1}_\ell}{\mathbf{f}^T \mathbf{1}_\ell})C$, resulting in an idiosyncratic disutility cost function which is 0 when $\mathbf{f}^T \mathbf{1}_\ell = 0$, and otherwise can be expressed as:

$$A(\mathbf{g}^T \mathbf{1}_\ell, \mathbf{f}^T \mathbf{1}_\ell) = \mathbf{g}^T \mathbf{1}_\ell \left(\frac{C \mathbf{g}^T \mathbf{1}_\ell}{2 \mathbf{f}^T \mathbf{1}_\ell} \right) = \frac{C (\mathbf{g}^T \mathbf{1}_\ell)^2}{2 \mathbf{f}^T \mathbf{1}_\ell}. \quad (17)$$

To define the function $U_{(\ell,d,\omega_t)}(g)$, which specifies the total rider welfare generated as a function of the dispatch volume g , we first derive the rider-side price maximizing welfare along that route. Recall that $\bar{D}_{(\ell,d,\omega_t)}$ riders arrive for a trip from ℓ to d under the scenario ω_t . For the sake of notational simplicity we don't explicitly include a constraint that the dispatch-volume $g_{(\ell,d)}$ cannot exceed rider demand $\bar{D}_{(\ell,d,\omega_t)}$. Instead, we incorporate rider demand volume into the objective function. If the dispatch volume is smaller than the total volume of riders, then the maximum utility is generated when the price selects for the upper $\frac{g_{(\ell,d,\omega_t)}}{\bar{D}_{(\ell,d,\omega_t)}}$ quantile of potential riders to request a dispatch. If the dispatch volume is larger than the volume of riders then the price should select for all available riders. Thus, the welfare-optimal price as a function of the dispatch-volume g can be written as follows:

$$P_{(\ell,d,\omega_t)}(g) = \begin{cases} F_{(\ell,d,\omega_t)}^{-1} \left(1 - \frac{g}{\bar{D}_{(\ell,d,\omega_t)}} \right) & \text{if } g \leq \bar{D}_{(\ell,d,\omega_t)}, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad (18)$$

where $F_{(o,d,\omega_t)}$ is the distribution function for the rider value distribution of riders from ℓ to d under ω_t . We are now ready to specify the reward function $U_{(\ell,d,\omega_t)}(g)$:

$$U_{(\ell,d,\omega_t)}(g) = \begin{cases} \min(g, \bar{D}_{(\ell,d,\omega_t)}) \mathbb{E}[V \mid V \geq P_{(\ell,d,\omega_t)}(g)] & \text{if } g \geq 0, \\ V_{max} g & \text{if } g < 0, \end{cases} \quad (19)$$

where V is a rider willingness-to-pay random variable with distribution function $F_{(\ell,d,\omega_t)}$, and where V_{max} is the smallest value for which $F_{(\ell,d,\omega_t)}(V_{max}) = 1$. The following Lemma characterizes the derivative of each utility function $U_{(o,d,\omega_t)}(\cdot, \cdot)$:

Lemma 1. *Consider the reward function $U_{(\ell,d,\omega_t)}$ associated with any route $(\ell, d) \in \mathcal{L}^2$ and any scenario ω_t . Assume the rider-value distribution $F_{(\ell,d,\omega_t)}$ satisfies Assumption 2. Then $U_{(\ell,d,\omega_t)}(g)$ is concave in g , is differentiable at every $g \in \mathbb{R}$, and the derivative at each $g \in \mathbb{R}$ satisfies:*

$$\frac{d}{dg} U_{(\ell,d,\omega_t)}(g) = \begin{cases} P_{(\ell,d,\omega_t)}(g) & \text{if } g \geq 0, \\ V_{max} & \text{if } g < 0. \end{cases}$$

Moreover, the fluid optimization problem (10) has a concave objective function for any market state.

We defer the proof of Lemma 1 to Appendix D.1. Next, we state a Lemma characterizing the optimality conditions for the optimization problem (10). We defer the proof of Lemma 2 to Appendix D.3.

Lemma 2. *Let (ω_t, \mathbf{S}_t) be any market state and let $\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{g} \in \mathbb{R}_+^{\mathcal{L}^2}$ be any feasible solution to the fluid optimization problem (10) with respect to (ω_t, \mathbf{S}_t) . Then (\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{g}) is an optimal solution if and only if there exist dual variables $\alpha_{(\ell,d)}, \beta_{(\ell,d)}, \gamma_{(\ell,d)} \geq 0$ for all $(\ell, d) \in \mathcal{L}^2$, and $\eta_\ell \in \mathbb{R}$ for all $\ell \in \mathcal{L}$, for which the following conditions are satisfied:*

1. *Complementary Slackness:*

$$\forall (\ell, d) \in \mathcal{L}^2, \quad f_{(\ell,d)} \alpha_{(\ell,d)} = 0, \quad g_{(\ell,d)} \beta_{(\ell,d)} = 0, \quad (g_{(\ell,d)} - f_{(\ell,d)}) \gamma_{(\ell,d)} = 0.$$

2. *Stationarity.* For all $(\ell, d) \in \mathcal{L}^2$, if the volume of drivers S_ℓ at ℓ is larger than 0 then the following equations hold:

$$P_{(\ell,d)}(g_{(\ell,d)}) - C \frac{\mathbf{g}^T \mathbf{1}_\ell}{\mathbf{f}^T \mathbf{1}_\ell} = \gamma_{(\ell,d)} - \beta_{(\ell,d)}. \quad (20)$$

$$-c_{(\ell,d)} + \frac{C}{2} \left(\frac{\mathbf{g}^T \mathbf{1}_\ell}{\mathbf{f}^T \mathbf{1}_\ell} \right)^2 = \eta_\ell - \frac{\partial}{\partial f_{(\ell,d)}} \mathcal{U}_{\omega_t}^{>t}(\mathbf{f}) - \alpha_{(\ell,d)} - \gamma_{(\ell,d)}. \quad (21)$$

In equation (21) above, $\frac{\partial}{\partial f_{(\ell,d)}} \mathcal{U}_{\omega_t}^{>t}(\mathbf{f})$ is the partial derivative of the future welfare function $\mathcal{U}_{\omega_t}^{>t}(\mathbf{f})$ (see equation 15) with respect to the total trip volume along route (ℓ, d) . From the definition of the future welfare function, we have the following equality:

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial f_{(\ell,d)}} \mathcal{U}_{\omega_t}^{>t}(\mathbf{f}) = \mathbb{E}_{\omega_{t+1}} \left[\frac{\partial}{\partial f_{(\ell,d)}} \Phi_{\omega_{t+1}}(\bar{\mathbf{S}}_{\omega_{t+1}}(\mathbf{f})) \mid \omega_t \right],$$

where $\Phi_{\omega_{t+1}}(\cdot)$ is the optimal welfare achievable from scenario ω_{t+1} as a function of the supply locations $\bar{\mathbf{S}}_{\omega_{t+1}}(\mathbf{f})$.

The following Lemma characterizes the partial derivatives of $\Phi_{\omega_t}(\mathbf{S})$ in terms of dual variables.

Lemma 3. *Fix a time-scenario ω_t and let $\mathbf{S} = (S_\ell \geq 0 : \ell \in \mathcal{L})$ be any supply-location vector. Pick any location ℓ for which the volume of supply at ℓ is nonzero under \mathbf{S} , i.e. $S_\ell > 0$.*

1. *For the state-dependent optimization problem with respect to \mathbf{S} the value of any optimal dual variable associated with the flow conservation constraint for location ℓ is unique. That is there exists a number η_ℓ^* such that $\eta_\ell = \eta_\ell^*$, where η_ℓ is the ℓ th component of $\boldsymbol{\eta}$ for any optimal dual variables $(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\gamma}, \boldsymbol{\eta}) \in D^*(\mathbf{S})$.*
2. *The state dependent optimization function $\Phi_{\omega_t}(\cdot)$ is differentiable with respect to S_ℓ at the supply location vector \mathbf{S} . Moreover, the partial derivative is equal to the value of the optimal dual variable for the flow conservation constraint at location ℓ :*

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial S_\ell} \Phi_{\omega_t}(\mathbf{S}) = \eta_\ell^*.$$

3. *The partial derivative $\frac{\partial}{\partial S_\ell} \Phi_{\omega_t}(\mathbf{S})$ is continuous at \mathbf{S} .*

Lemma 3 concerns partial derivatives of the state-dependent optimization function assuming the volume of drivers S_ℓ at location ℓ is larger than 0. Notice that, if the supply volume S_ℓ is strictly smaller than 0, then the feasible region for the state-dependent optimization problem is empty and the optimal value is $-\infty$. Therefore, the state-dependent optimization function $\Phi_{\omega_t}(\cdot)$ is only finite for supply-location vectors which are nonnegative in every component.

It will be useful for us to extend our understanding of the partial derivative $\frac{\partial}{\partial S_\ell} \Phi_{\omega_t}(\mathbf{S})$ to supply-location vectors which lie on the boundary of the domain, i.e. where $S_\ell = 0$. For supply-location vectors \mathbf{S} where S_ℓ is 0 we will take $\frac{\partial}{\partial S_\ell} \Phi_{\omega_t}(\mathbf{S})$ to mean the sequence of derivatives of $\mathbf{S} + h\mathbf{1}_\ell$ as h goes to 0 from above:

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial S_\ell} \Phi_{\omega_t}(\mathbf{S}^+) = \lim_{h \downarrow 0} \frac{\partial}{\partial S_\ell} \Phi_{\omega_t}(\mathbf{S} + h\mathbf{1}_\ell),$$

where $\mathbf{1}_\ell$ represents a vector indexed by locations \mathcal{L} with a 1 in the ℓ component and 0 everywhere else. In a slight abuse of notation we will write

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial S_\ell} \Phi_{\omega_t}(\mathbf{S}) = \begin{cases} \frac{\partial}{\partial S_\ell} \Phi_{\omega_t}(\mathbf{S}) & \text{if } S_\ell > 0, \\ \frac{\partial}{\partial S_\ell} \Phi_{\omega_t}(\mathbf{S}^+) & \text{if } S_\ell = 0, \end{cases} \quad (22)$$

for any supply-location vector \mathbf{S} with nonnegative components. The following Lemma states that the right derivative $\frac{\partial}{\partial S_\ell} \Phi_{\omega_t}(\mathbf{S}^+)$ is well-defined for points on the boundary, and also that the partial derivative is continuous over all supply-location vectors with nonnegative components.

Lemma 4. *Let \mathbf{S} be a supply-location vector with nonnegative components and assume $S_\ell = 0$ for some location ℓ . Then the right-derivative $\frac{\partial}{\partial S_\ell} \Phi_{\omega_t}(\mathbf{S}^+)$ is well-defined at \mathbf{S} . Moreover, the partial derivative function $\frac{\partial}{\partial S_\ell} \Phi_{\omega_t}(\mathbf{S})$, defined in (22), is continuous over the set $\{\mathbf{S} \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{L}} : S_\ell \geq 0 \forall \ell \in \mathcal{L}\}$.*

We defer the proof of Lemma 3 and Lemma 4 to Appendix D.

4 The Stochastic Spatiotemporal Pricing Mechanism

In this section we describe our main algorithmic contribution, which we refer to as the stochastic spatiotemporal pricing (SSP) mechanism. The SSP mechanism re-solves the fluid optimization problem based on the observed market state in each time period and derives its prices and matching decisions from the computed optimum.

The SSP pricing policy is the same algorithm in both the fluid model and the two level model. It is formally defined below, in Definition 3.

Definition 3. *At each time period t , the SSP pricing policy observes the market state $(\omega_t, \mathbf{S}_t) \in \mathcal{S}_t$ and computes the price along each route (ℓ, d) to be*

$$P_{(\ell,d)} = P_{(\ell,d,\omega_t)}(g_{(\ell,d)}^*) = F_{(\ell,d,\omega_t)}^{-1} \left(1 - \frac{g_{(\ell,d)}^*}{D_{(\ell,d,\omega_t)}} \right),$$

where $(\mathbf{f}^*, \mathbf{g}^*) \in F_{\omega_t}^*(\mathbf{S}_t)$ is an optimal solution for the associated fluid optimization problem.

For brevity, we defer the exact definition of the SSP matching process to Appendix E.1. For the arguments below, it is important to note only that the matching process satisfies two properties: 1) it attempts to serve all dispatches, and only fails to do so if too many drivers decline dispatches, and 2) the only problem instances where the matching process results in dispatch volume $g_{(\ell,d)}$ strictly smaller than the optimal dispatch volume $g_{(\ell,d)}^*$ are those where drivers use a threshold $x_{(\ell,d)}$ strictly smaller than the acceptance threshold implied by the optimal solution.

4.1 Incentive Compatibility of the Fluid Optimal Solution

Our first result in this section shows that, under the SSP pricing mechanism, the optimal trips and acceptance thresholds obtained from an optimal solution to the fluid optimization problem form an equilibrium.

Let $\Sigma^* = (\Sigma_1^*, \dots, \Sigma_T^*)$ be the fluid strategy profile that maps market states (ω_t, \mathbf{S}_t) to thresholds \mathbf{x} and relocation distributions which correspond to the same optimal solution $(\mathbf{f}^*, \mathbf{g}^*)$ that the SSP mechanism uses to set prices. That is, when $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{e}) = \Sigma_t^*(\omega_t, \mathbf{S}_t)$, then, for every route $(\ell, d) \in \mathcal{L}^2$, we mean

$$x_{(\ell,d)} = \frac{\mathbf{g}^{*T} \mathbf{1}_\ell}{S_\ell} C$$

and

$$e_{(\ell,d)} = \frac{f_{(\ell,d)} - g_{(\ell,d)}}{S_\ell - \mathbf{g}^{*T} \mathbf{1}_\ell}.$$

We also define a variant of this strategy profile which follows the fluid optimal solutions for the stochastic two-level model with population size k . Let $\Pi^{(k)}$ be the strategy profile where drivers select their thresholds and relocation destinations using the fluid optimal strategy Σ^* . Specifically, at time t with market state (ω_t, \mathbf{S}_t) , a driver i positioned at location ℓ selects their action by first computing $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{e}) = \Sigma_t^*(\omega_t, \mathbf{S}_t)$. The driver uses acceptance thresholds $\mathbf{x}_i = \mathbf{x}_\ell = (x_{(\ell,d)} : d \in \mathcal{L})$ as their threshold vector. The drivers at each location ℓ collectively choose their relocation destination so that the fraction of drivers choosing each relocation destination is as close as possible to the fraction prescribed by the fluid relocation distribution $\mathbf{e}_\ell = (e_{(\ell,d)} : d \in \mathcal{L})$.

We start by proving a Lemma which characterizes the value function of the strategy Σ^* .

Lemma 5. Let $\mathcal{V}_t(\ell, \omega_t, \mathbf{S}_t)$ be the value function associated with the strategy profile Σ^* , for a location ℓ and market state (ω_t, \mathbf{S}_t) . When the SSP mechanism is used to set prices in the stochastic fluid model, the value function satisfies

$$\mathcal{V}_t(\ell, \omega_t, \mathbf{S}_t) = \frac{\partial}{\partial S_\ell} \Phi_{\omega_t}(\mathbf{S}_t), \quad (23)$$

where $\Phi_{\omega_t}(\mathbf{S}_t)$ is the state-dependent optimal welfare function.

Proof. We prove (23) via backwards induction. Fix a time period t and assume that the value function at the next time period $t + 1$ satisfies equation (23) for any time $t + 1$ market state.

Let (ω_t, \mathbf{S}_t) be any time t market state, and let $(\mathbf{f}^*, \mathbf{g}^*) \in F_{\omega_t}^*(\mathbf{S}_t)$ be the optimal fluid solution that the SSP mechanism uses to set prices, and that the strategy profile Σ^* uses to determine its actions.

Let $(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\gamma}, \boldsymbol{\eta})$ be dual variables certifying the optimality of $(\mathbf{f}^*, \mathbf{g}^*)$. In Lemma 3, we show that the dual variables $\boldsymbol{\eta}$, which are associated with the flow-conservation constraint for each location ℓ , are equal to the partial derivative of the state-dependent optimization function, i.e. $\eta_\ell = \frac{\partial}{\partial S_\ell} \Phi_{\omega_t}(\mathbf{S}_t)$. Therefore, to finish the proof of equation (23), it suffices to show that $\eta_\ell = \mathcal{V}_t(\ell, \omega_t, \mathbf{S}_t)$. We proceed with the following equations, which start from the definition of the value function:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{V}_t(\ell, \omega_t, \mathbf{S}_t) &= \frac{1}{S_\ell} \left[\sum_{d \in \mathcal{L}} (f_{(\ell,d)}^* - g_{(\ell,d)}^*) \mathcal{Q}_t(\ell, d, 0) + g_{(\ell,d)}^* \mathcal{Q}_t(\ell, d, 1, \frac{x_{(\ell,d)}}{2}) \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{S_\ell} \left[\sum_{d \in \mathcal{L}} f_{(\ell,d)}^* \mathcal{Q}_t(\ell, d, 0) + g_{(\ell,d)}^* \left(P_{(\ell,d)} - \frac{x_{(\ell,d)}}{2} \right) \right], \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathcal{Q}_t(\ell, d, 0)$ is the Q value associated with a relocation trip from ℓ to d , $\mathcal{Q}_t(\ell, d, 1, \frac{x_{(\ell,d)}}{2})$ is the Q value associated with a dispatch trip from ℓ to d , with respect to the average pickup disutility $\frac{x_{(\ell,d)}}{2}$. Recall that the disutility threshold $x_{(\ell,d)}$ used by the strategy profile Σ^* is equal to $x_{(\ell,d)} = C \frac{\mathbf{g}^{*T} \mathbf{1}_\ell}{\mathbf{f}^{*T} \mathbf{1}_\ell}$. Therefore the following equation holds, continuing from our earlier algebra:

$$\mathcal{V}_t(\ell, \omega_t, \mathbf{S}_t) = \frac{1}{S_\ell} \left[\sum_{d \in \mathcal{L}} f_{(\ell,d)}^* \mathcal{Q}_t(\ell, d, 0) + g_{(\ell,d)}^* \frac{C}{2} \frac{\mathbf{g}^{*T} \mathbf{1}_\ell}{\mathbf{f}^{*T} \mathbf{1}_\ell} + g_{(\ell,d)}^* \left(P_{(\ell,d)} - C \frac{\mathbf{g}^{*T} \mathbf{1}_\ell}{\mathbf{f}^{*T} \mathbf{1}_\ell} \right) \right].$$

The stationarity optimality condition (20) states $P_{(\ell,d)} - C \frac{\mathbf{g}^{*T} \mathbf{1}_\ell}{\mathbf{f}^{*T} \mathbf{1}_\ell} = \gamma_{(\ell,d)} - \beta_{(\ell,d)}$. The complementary slackness conditions also state $g_{(\ell,d)}^* (\gamma_{(\ell,d)} - \beta_{(\ell,d)}) = f_{(\ell,d)}^* \gamma_{(\ell,d)}$, as well as $f_{(\ell,d)}^* \alpha_{(\ell,d)} = 0$.

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{V}_t(\ell, \omega_t, \mathbf{S}_t) &= \frac{1}{S_\ell} \left[\sum_{d \in \mathcal{L}} f_{(\ell, d)}^* \mathcal{Q}_t(\ell, d, 0) + g_{(\ell, d)}^* \frac{C}{2} \frac{\mathbf{g}^{*T} \mathbf{1}_\ell}{\mathbf{f}^{*T} \mathbf{1}_\ell} + g_{(\ell, d)}^* (\gamma_{(\ell, d)} - \beta_{(\ell, d)}) \right] \\
&= \frac{1}{S_\ell} \left[\sum_{d \in \mathcal{L}} f_{(\ell, d)}^* (\mathcal{Q}_t(\ell, d, 0) + \gamma_{(\ell, d)} + \alpha_{(\ell, d)}) + g_{(\ell, d)}^* \frac{C}{2} \frac{\mathbf{g}^{*T} \mathbf{1}_\ell}{\mathbf{f}^{*T} \mathbf{1}_\ell} \right] \\
&= \frac{1}{S_\ell} \left[\sum_{d \in \mathcal{L}} f_{(\ell, d)}^* (\mathcal{Q}_t(\ell, d, 0) + \gamma_{(\ell, d)} + \alpha_{(\ell, d)}) \right] + \left(\frac{\mathbf{g}^{*T} \mathbf{1}_\ell}{S_\ell} \right) \frac{C}{2} \frac{\mathbf{g}^{*T} \mathbf{1}_\ell}{\mathbf{f}^{*T} \mathbf{1}_\ell} \\
&= \frac{1}{S_\ell} \left[\sum_{d \in \mathcal{L}} f_{(\ell, d)}^* (\mathcal{Q}_t(\ell, d, 0) + \gamma_{(\ell, d)} + \alpha_{(\ell, d)}) \right] + \frac{C}{2} \left(\frac{\mathbf{g}^{*T} \mathbf{1}_\ell}{\mathbf{f}^{*T} \mathbf{1}_\ell} \right)^2 \\
&= \frac{1}{S_\ell} \left[\sum_{d \in \mathcal{L}} f_{(\ell, d)}^* \left(\mathcal{Q}_t(\ell, d, 0) + \gamma_{(\ell, d)} + \alpha_{(\ell, d)} + \frac{C}{2} \left(\frac{\mathbf{g}^{*T} \mathbf{1}_\ell}{\mathbf{f}^{*T} \mathbf{1}_\ell} \right)^2 \right) \right] \tag{24}
\end{aligned}$$

The stationarity condition (21) states that, for any destination d

$$-c_{(\ell, d)} + \frac{C}{2} \left(\frac{\mathbf{g}^T \mathbf{1}_\ell}{\mathbf{f}^T \mathbf{1}_\ell} \right)^2 + \frac{\partial}{\partial f_{(\ell, d)}} \mathcal{U}_{\omega_t}^{>t}(\mathbf{f}^*) + \alpha_{(\ell, d)} + \gamma_{(\ell, d)} = \eta_\ell.$$

Lemma 3 and our backwards induction assumption characterizes the partial derivative as

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\partial}{\partial f_{(\ell, d)}} \mathcal{U}_{\omega_t}^{>t}(\mathbf{f}^*) &= \mathbb{E}_{\omega_{t+1}} \left[\frac{\partial}{\partial f_{(\ell, d)}} \Phi_{\omega_{t+1}}(\bar{\mathbf{S}}_{\omega_{t+1}}(\mathbf{f}^*)) \mid \omega_t \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E}_{\omega_{t+1}} [\mathcal{V}_{t+1}(d, \omega_{t+1}, \bar{\mathbf{S}}_{\omega_{t+1}}(\mathbf{f}^*)) \mid \omega_t].
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, the dual variable η_ℓ can be written as

$$\eta_\ell = \mathcal{Q}_t(\ell, d, 0) + \frac{C}{2} \left(\frac{\mathbf{g}^T \mathbf{1}_\ell}{\mathbf{f}^T \mathbf{1}_\ell} \right)^2 + \alpha_{(\ell, d)} + \gamma_{(\ell, d)}.$$

Plugging the above in to the expression (24), we obtain

$$\mathcal{V}_t(\ell, \omega_t, \mathbf{S}_t) = \frac{1}{S_\ell} \sum_{d \in \mathcal{L}} f_{(\ell, d)}^* \eta_\ell = \eta_\ell,$$

establishing our backwards induction hypothesis and finishing the proof of equation (23). \square

Lemma 6. *Let \mathcal{Q}_t be the Q values associated with the strategy profile Σ^* . Let t be any time period and (ω_t, \mathbf{S}_t) be any market state. Let $(\mathbf{f}^*, \mathbf{g}^*) \in F_{\omega_t}^*(\mathbf{S}_t)$ be the optimal fluid solution that the SSP mechanism uses to set prices, and that the strategy profile Σ^* uses to determine its actions. Let $(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\gamma}, \boldsymbol{\eta})$ be dual variables certifying the optimality of $(\mathbf{f}^*, \mathbf{g}^*)$. Let $\ell \in \mathcal{L}$ be any location. When the SSP mechanism is used to set prices, we have the following upper bound on the Q value of any relocation trip originating from ℓ :*

$$\eta_\ell - \frac{C}{2} \left(\frac{\mathbf{g}^{*T} \mathbf{1}_\ell}{\mathbf{f}^{*T} \mathbf{1}_\ell} \right)^2 \geq \max_d \mathcal{Q}_t(\ell, d, 0). \tag{25}$$

Moreover, if any drivers at ℓ take a relocation trip towards d , i.e. if $f_{(\ell,d)}^* > g_{(\ell,d)}^*$, then

$$\eta_\ell - \frac{C}{2} \left(\frac{\mathbf{g}^{*T} \mathbf{1}_\ell}{\mathbf{f}^{*T} \mathbf{1}_\ell} \right)^2 = \mathcal{Q}_t(\ell, d, 0). \quad (26)$$

Finally, if there are any drivers at ℓ who take a relocation trip, i.e. if $\mathbf{g}^{*T} \mathbf{1}_\ell < \mathbf{f}^{*T} \mathbf{1}_\ell$, then for all destinations d where $g_{(\ell,d)}^* > 0$ we have

$$\mathcal{Q}_t(\ell, d, 1, x_{(\ell,d)}) = \max_{d'} \mathcal{Q}_t(\ell, d', 0) = \eta_\ell - \frac{C}{2} \left(\frac{\mathbf{g}^{*T} \mathbf{1}_\ell}{\mathbf{f}^{*T} \mathbf{1}_\ell} \right)^2. \quad (27)$$

Proof. For any destination d , the stationarity condition (21) states that

$$\eta_\ell = \mathcal{Q}_t(\ell, d, 0) + \frac{C}{2} \left(\frac{\mathbf{g}^{*T} \mathbf{1}_\ell}{\mathbf{f}^{*T} \mathbf{1}_\ell} \right)^2 + \alpha_{(\ell,d)} + \gamma_{(\ell,d)}.$$

Rearranging,

$$\eta_\ell - \frac{C}{2} \left(\frac{\mathbf{g}^{*T} \mathbf{1}_\ell}{\mathbf{f}^{*T} \mathbf{1}_\ell} \right)^2 = \mathcal{Q}_t(\ell, d, 0) + \alpha_{(\ell,d)} + \gamma_{(\ell,d)}.$$

The upper bound (25) follows from the fact that $\alpha_{(\ell,d)}$ and $\gamma_{(\ell,d)}$ are nonnegative.

To establish (26), consider any destination $d \in \mathcal{L}$ where $f_{(\ell,d)}^* > g_{(\ell,d)}^*$. Then by the complementary slackness conditions $f_{(\ell,d)}^* \alpha_{(\ell,d)} = 0$ we know that $\alpha_{(\ell,d)} = 0$ must be satisfied, and by $(g_{(\ell,d)}^* - f_{(\ell,d)}^*) \gamma_{(\ell,d)} = 0$ we know $\gamma_{(\ell,d)} = 0$ must be satisfied.

To establish (27), first observe the condition $\mathbf{g}^{*T} \mathbf{1}_\ell < \mathbf{f}^{*T} \mathbf{1}_\ell$ guarantees the existence of at least one destination d where $g_{(\ell,d)}^* < f_{(\ell,d)}^*$, so equation (26) guarantees $\max_{d'} \mathcal{Q}_t(\ell, d', 0) = \eta_\ell - \frac{C}{2} \left(\frac{\mathbf{g}^{*T} \mathbf{1}_\ell}{\mathbf{f}^{*T} \mathbf{1}_\ell} \right)^2$. Next, consider any destination d where $g_{(\ell,d)}^* > 0$. The stationarity condition (20) states

$$P_{(\ell,d)} - x_{(\ell,d)} + \beta_{(\ell,d)} = \gamma_{(\ell,d)},$$

and since $g_{(\ell,d)}^* > 0$, complementary slackness provides us $\beta_{(\ell,d)} = 0$. Therefore, starting from the stationarity condition (21), we obtain

$$\eta_\ell = \mathcal{Q}_t(\ell, d, 0) + \frac{C}{2} \left(\frac{\mathbf{g}^{*T} \mathbf{1}_\ell}{\mathbf{f}^{*T} \mathbf{1}_\ell} \right)^2 + P_{(\ell,d)} - x_{(\ell,d)}.$$

Observing that $\mathcal{Q}_t(\ell, d, 0) + P_{(\ell,d)} - x_{(\ell,d)} = \mathcal{Q}_t(\ell, d, 1, x_{(\ell,d)})$ establishes (27). □

We are now ready to state and prove our main theorem, which states that the fluid optimal strategy profile Σ^* is an equilibrium under the SSP prices.

Theorem 1. *The following statements are true:*

1. *When the SSP mechanism is used to set prices in the stochastic fluid model, the strategy profile Σ^* is an exact equilibrium.*
2. *There exist nonnegative sequences $(\epsilon_k : k \geq 1)$ and $(\delta_k : k \geq 1)$, both converging to 0 as $k \rightarrow \infty$, such that when the SSP mechanism is used to set prices in the stochastic two-level model with population-size k , then $\Pi^{(k)}$ is an (ϵ_k, δ_k) equilibrium.*

Proof. We present the proof of Theorem 1 part 1 below, and defer the proof of part 2 to Appendix A. Let (ω_t, \mathbf{S}_t) be any time t market state, and let $(\mathbf{f}^*, \mathbf{g}^*) \in F_{\omega_t}^*(\mathbf{S}_t)$ be the optimal fluid solution that the SSP mechanism uses to set prices, and that the strategy profile Σ^* uses to determine its actions. Let $(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\gamma}, \boldsymbol{\eta})$ be dual variables certifying the optimality of $(\mathbf{f}^*, \mathbf{g}^*)$.

To show that Σ^* is an equilibrium we have to show that no drivers have an incentive to deviate.

First, we show that no driver has incentive to deviate from a relocation trip to another relocation trip. Indeed, if there exists a destination d where drivers are taking a relocation trip, i.e. where $f_{(\ell,d)}^* > g_{(\ell,d)}^*$, then Lemma 6 shows $\mathcal{Q}_t(\ell, d, 0) = \max_{d'} \mathcal{Q}_t(\ell, d', 0)$.

Next, we show that no driver declines a dispatch that they would have preferred to take. Let ℓ be the origin location and let d be the destination that the driver declines to take. If a driver declines a dispatch then that means they are taking a relocation trip, so $\mathbf{g}^{*T} \mathbf{1}_\ell < \mathbf{f}^{*T} \mathbf{1}_\ell$. Therefore, Lemma 6 states $\mathcal{Q}_t(\ell, d, 1, x_{(\ell,d)}) = \max_{d'} \mathcal{Q}_t(\ell, d', 0)$. Any driver who declines a dispatch towards d has add-passenger disutility X larger than the threshold $x_{(\ell,d)}$, so the Q value $\mathcal{Q}_t(\ell, d, 1, X)$ is smaller than the optimal relocation-trip utility that they do collect.

Finally, we show that no driver who accepts a dispatch would prefer to take a relocation trip. This also follows from Lemma 6, which shows $\mathcal{Q}_t(\ell, d, 1, x_{(\ell,d)}) \geq \max_{d'} \mathcal{Q}_t(\ell, d', 0)$ always holds. Any driver who accepts a dispatch trip from ℓ to d has add-passenger disutility X smaller than the threshold $x_{(\ell,d)}$. Therefore, the utility they collect $\mathcal{Q}_t(\ell, d, 1, X)$ is larger than the optimal relocation-trip utility that they could collect. \square

4.2 Robustness of Equilibria Under the SSP Mechanism

Theorem 2, below, states our welfare-robustness theorem for the SSP mechanism in the stochastic fluid model. Theorem 2's proof is given in §4.3 with additional details in Appendix B.

Theorem 2 (Welfare-robustness in the stochastic fluid model). *When the SSP mechanism is used to set prices in the stochastic fluid model, every equilibrium strategy profile achieves optimal welfare, and every ϵ -equilibrium strategy achieves ϵ' -optimal welfare, where ϵ' goes to 0 as ϵ goes to 0.*

Our welfare robustness theorem for the stochastic two-level model considers approximate equilibria whose approximation error vanishes as the population size grows large. We also restrict our attention to a subset of the state space in which the total (normalized) volume of drivers in the network does not exceed a constant. Let $\gamma > 0$ be a constant, and for each time period $t \in [T]$ define $\mathcal{S}_t(\gamma) = \{(\omega_t, \mathbf{S}_t) \in \Omega_t \times \mathcal{S} : \sum_\ell S_\ell \leq \gamma\}$. We assume that γ is large enough so that the probability of the market state belonging to $\mathcal{S}_t(\gamma)$ converges to 1 as the population size grows large, regardless of the strategy profile. This is possible because there are only finitely many points at which drivers can enter the network, and all the driver-entry random variables concentrate around their mean as the population size grows, and these means grow linearly in k (see Assumption 1). Therefore, we can pick any γ larger than the maximum fluid driver volume over all scenarios.

Let $\alpha_k \geq 0$ be a sequence of error terms converging to 0 as $k \rightarrow \infty$, and for each $k \geq 1$ let \mathcal{P}^k be the set of α_k -equilibrium strategy profiles for the two-level model with population size k , over the state space $\mathcal{S}_t(\gamma)$.

For any strategy profile Π , let $W_{\omega_t}(\mathbf{S}_t; \Pi, k)$ denote the normalized expected welfare achieved by Π from the market state (ω_t, \mathbf{S}_t) under the population size parameter k . A formal definition of $W_{\omega_t}(\mathbf{S}_t; \Pi, k)$ is given in Appendix C.1.

Theorem 3, below, states our welfare-robustness theorem for the SSP mechanism in the stochastic two-level model. We defer the proof of Theorem 3 to Appendix C.

Theorem 3 (Approximate welfare-robustness in the stochastic two-level model). *When the SSP mechanism is used to set prices in the stochastic two-level model, every approximate equilibrium achieves approximately optimal welfare.*

Specifically, there exists a sequence of error terms $\epsilon_k \geq 0$ converging to 0 as $k \rightarrow \infty$ such that the following is true: for every $k \geq 1$, every α_k -approximate equilibrium $\Pi \in \mathcal{P}^k$, and every market state $(\omega_t, \mathbf{S}_t) \in \mathcal{S}(\gamma)$, we have

$$\Phi_{\omega_t}(\mathbf{S}_t) - W_{\omega_t}(\mathbf{S}_t; \Pi, k) \leq \epsilon_k.$$

4.3 Proof of Theorem 2

We begin by proving the first part of Theorem 2, stating that equilibrium fluid strategies achieve optimal welfare. Let Σ be an equilibrium strategy profile for the fluid model, meaning that the incentive compatibility conditions (8) hold. Recall a fluid strategy profile is a sequence of functions $\Sigma = (\Sigma_1, \dots, \Sigma_T)$ such that each Σ_t maps market states (ω_t, \mathbf{S}_t) to a vector of disutility thresholds and relocation distributions: $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{e}) = \Sigma_t(\omega_t, \mathbf{S}_t)$. The matching process takes as input the driver strategy (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{e}) , the dispatch volumes and the market state, and produces trip specifications (\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{g}) .

For each t , let \mathcal{V}_t and \mathcal{Q}_t be the value function and the Q-value function associated with Σ at t .

We prove Theorem 2 by backward induction on t . Fix a period $t \leq T$ and assume:

1. Σ achieves optimal welfare from every market state at time $t + 1$.
2. For any time $t + 1$ state $(\omega_{t+1}, \mathbf{S}_{t+1}) \in \mathcal{S}_{t+1}$, the value function for any location ℓ satisfies:

$$\mathcal{V}_{t+1}(\ell, \omega_{t+1}, \mathbf{S}_{t+1}) = \frac{\partial}{\partial S_\ell} \Phi_{\omega_{t+1}}(\mathbf{S}_{t+1}). \quad (28)$$

For the rest of this section we will write $(\mathbf{g}', \mathbf{f}', \mathbf{x}')$ to mean the trips and the disutility thresholds used by the drivers in our arbitrary equilibrium, and we will use $(\mathbf{g}^*, \mathbf{f}^*, \mathbf{x}^*)$ to mean the optimal solution to the fluid optimization problem and its associated disutility thresholds.

Where do the non-dispatched drivers go? We first show that the non-dispatched drivers are incentivized to accept welfare-optimal trips, given any set of dispatch trips. To show this we consider the optimization problem (29), which depends on the vector \mathbf{g}' encoding the dispatch trips occurring under our equilibrium and solves for the corresponding welfare-optimal trips \mathbf{f} .

$$\sup_{\mathbf{f}} \sum_{(\ell, d) \in \mathcal{L}^2} -c_{(\ell, d)} f_{(\ell, d)} + \mathcal{U}_{\omega_t}^{>t}(\mathbf{f}) \quad (29)$$

subject to

$$f_{(\ell, d)} \geq g'_{(\ell, d)} \quad \forall (\ell, d) \in \mathcal{L}^2 \quad (30)$$

$$\sum_{d \in \mathcal{L}} f_{(\ell, d)} = S_\ell \quad \forall \ell \in \mathcal{L}. \quad (31)$$

where $\mathcal{U}_{\omega_t}^{>t}(\mathbf{f})$ is the future welfare function (15). The following Lemma shows \mathbf{f}' is an optimal solution for (29).

Lemma 7. *The total trip volumes \mathbf{f}' from our equilibrium is an optimal solution for the relocation problem (29) with respect to the dispatch trips \mathbf{g}' . Moreover, dual variables certifying the optimality of \mathbf{f}' are given by*

$$\lambda_{(\ell, d)} = \max_{d'} \mathcal{Q}_t(\ell, d', 0) - \mathcal{Q}_t(\ell, d, 0), \quad (32)$$

associated with the inequality constraint (30) for each (ℓ, d) , and

$$\eta_\ell = \max_{d'} \mathcal{Q}_t(\ell, d', 0) \quad (33)$$

associated with the equality constraint (31) for each ℓ .

Proof. First, the complementary slackness conditions follow immediately from incentive-compatibility properties. In particular, if a nonzero volume of drivers take a relocation trip along (ℓ, d) , i.e. if $f'_{(\ell,d)} - g'_{(\ell,d)} > 0$, then the incentive compatibility conditions (8) state we must have

$$\mathcal{Q}_t(\ell, d, 0) = \max_{d'} \mathcal{Q}_t(\ell, d', 0),$$

hence $(f'_{(\ell,d)} - g'_{(\ell,d)})\lambda_{(\ell,d)} = 0$ is satisfied for every route (ℓ, d) .

It remains to check stationarity. We take the negative objective function to convert (29) into a convex minimization problem, for compatibility with standard definitions of the Lagrangian and associated optimality conditions. The Lagrangian for this convex minimization problem is:

$$L(\mathbf{f}; \boldsymbol{\lambda}, \boldsymbol{\eta}) = c_{(\ell,d)}f_{(\ell,d)} - \mathcal{U}_{\omega_t}^{>t}(\mathbf{f}) + \boldsymbol{\lambda}^T(\mathbf{g}' - \mathbf{f}) + \sum_{\ell} \eta_{\ell} \left(\sum_d f_{(\ell,d)} - S_{\ell} \right).$$

The stationarity condition we must verify is that 0 is the (sub-)gradient of $L(\mathbf{f}'; \boldsymbol{\lambda}, \boldsymbol{\eta})$. Our induction hypothesis (28) yields

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial f'_{(\ell,d)}} \mathcal{U}_{\omega_t}^{>t}(\mathbf{f}') = \frac{\partial}{\partial f'_{(\ell,d)}} \mathbb{E} [\Phi_{\omega_{t+1}}(\bar{\mathbf{S}}_{\omega_{t+1}}(\mathbf{f}')) \mid \omega_t] = \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\partial}{\partial f'_{(\ell,d)}} \Phi_{\omega_{t+1}}(\bar{\mathbf{S}}_{\omega_{t+1}}(\mathbf{f}')) \mid \omega_t \right].$$

The derivative $\frac{\partial}{\partial f'_{(\ell,d)}} \Phi_{\omega_{t+1}}(\bar{\mathbf{S}}_{\omega_{t+1}}(\mathbf{f}'))$ is the directional derivative of $\Phi_{\omega_{t+1}}$ evaluated at $\bar{\mathbf{S}}_{\omega_{t+1}}(\mathbf{f}')$ as we increase the supply at location d (this is the effect on $\bar{\mathbf{S}}_{\omega_{t+1}}(\mathbf{f}')$ of increasing the driver flow $f'_{(\ell,d)}$ from ℓ into d). By the induction hypothesis, this directional derivative is $\mathcal{V}_{t+1}(d; \omega_{t+1}, \bar{\mathbf{S}}_{\omega_{t+1}}(\mathbf{f}'))$.

Thus,

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial f'_{(\ell,d)}} \mathcal{U}_{\omega_t}^{>t}(\mathbf{f}') = \mathbb{E} [\mathcal{V}_{t+1}(d; \omega_{t+1}, \bar{\mathbf{S}}_{\omega_{t+1}}(\mathbf{f}')) \mid \omega_t] = \mathcal{Q}_t(\ell, d, 0) + c_{(\ell,d)}.$$

We evaluate the partial derivative of $L(\mathbf{f}'; \boldsymbol{\lambda}, \boldsymbol{\eta})$ at each coordinate $f'_{(\ell,d)}$:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial}{\partial f'_{(\ell,d)}} L(\mathbf{f}'; \boldsymbol{\lambda}, \boldsymbol{\eta}) &= c_{(\ell,d)} - \frac{\partial}{\partial f'_{(\ell,d)}} \mathcal{U}_{\omega_t}^{>t}(\mathbf{f}') - \lambda_{(\ell,d)} + \eta_{\ell} \\ &= -\mathcal{Q}_t(\ell, d, 0) - \lambda_{(\ell,d)} + \max_{d'} \mathcal{Q}_t(\ell, d, 0) \\ &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore \mathbf{f}' is an optimal solution for the problem (29). \square

All equilibria serve all available dispatch demand. We proceed with the second step of our proof, which is to show that all equilibria that arise under the SSP prices must serve all available dispatch demand. Consider the optimum solution $(\mathbf{g}^*, \mathbf{f}^*, \mathbf{x}^*)$ and an arbitrary equilibrium $(\mathbf{g}', \mathbf{f}', \mathbf{x}')$ serves strictly fewer dispatch trips than the corresponding optimum at some route. Recall that $\mathbf{g}' \leq \mathbf{g}^*$ on all routes, and that $g'_{(\ell,d)} < g^*_{(\ell,d)}$ on any route implies that $x'_{(\ell,d)} < x^*_{(\ell,d)}$. Based on our matching process of drivers to passengers, it is no loss of generality to assume that drivers

that in the optimum should have accepted the passenger for a route (ℓ, d) were offered this drive. To prove Theorem 2 we will use Lemma 7 on an auxiliary networks that we construct next.

For all drivers that serve dispatches in the equilibrium, assume they start in the next period at the destination of their current dispatch. For a location ℓ where some route (ℓ, d) serves strictly fewer dispatch trips in \mathbf{g}' than in \mathbf{g}^* , if ℓ has k routes (ℓ, d) that had passengers to dispatch, we create k copies of ℓ , each associated with one the the routes (ℓ, d) , denoted by ℓ^d . We distribute the drivers from the equilibrium who started at location ℓ among the copies such that drivers who were offered dispatch (ℓ, d) will start at location ℓ^d . Note if there are unserved dispatches at location ℓ than all drivers at ℓ were offered a dispatch. Each copy ℓ^d is connected to the same set of nodes for the next period as ℓ with the same cost, but each has one additional possible route: (ℓ^d, d') going to the same destination as the drive d , but with a different cost. Suppose the price offered to the drivers was $p_{\ell, d}$ and cutoff expected by our optimization is $x_{(\ell, d)}^*$, and the cost of the drive is $c_{(\ell, d)}$ then this additional route will have cost $c_{(\ell, d)} - p_{(\ell, d)} - x_{(\ell, d)}^*$.

First we construct the optimal solution $(\mathbf{g}^{**}, \mathbf{f}^{**}, \mathbf{x}^{**})$ in this network, which is the same as $(\mathbf{g}^*, \mathbf{f}^*, \mathbf{x}^*)$ except drivers serving dispatches in the equilibrium start only in the next period at the destination of their dispatch, there are no dispatches available in period 1, so $\mathbf{g}_{(\ell, d)}^{**} = 0$ for the first period and \mathbf{f}^{**} includes all additional dispatches that \mathbf{f}^* would serve along the routes with the new cost $c_{(\ell, d)} - p_{(\ell, d)} - x_{(\ell, d)}^*$, and \mathbf{x}^{**} is only for later periods of the problem. We call this the linearized problem (where the first period values are linear). We first lemma this is an optimal solution to the linearized program, with the same dual variables as the original optimization problem.

Lemma 8. *The flow $(\mathbf{g}^{**}, \mathbf{f}^{**}, \mathbf{x}^{**})$ is an optimal solution to our modified convex program, with optimal value OPT^{**} .*

Second, for any route (ℓ, d) where not all dispatches are served, we can replace $x_{(\ell, d)}^*$ with its equilibrium cutoff $x'_{(\ell, d)}$, this makes the cost lower, and hence the value of the solution $(\mathbf{g}'', \mathbf{f}'', \mathbf{x}'')$ is now strictly larger than OPT'' .

Lemma 9. *The optimal solution to our modified convex program, using x' in places of x^* is strictly larger by at least $\sum_{(\ell, d)} (g_{(\ell, d)}^* - g'_{(\ell, d)}) (x_{(\ell, d)}^* - x'_{(\ell, d)})$ unless all dispatches are served.*

Next consider the equilibrium solution $(\mathbf{g}', \mathbf{f}', \mathbf{x}')$ on the modified network. To be precise, drivers who accepted dispatches again are starting in the next period at the destination of the dispatch. All other drives either were not offered dispatches or rejected their offer and choose an alternate drive instead. We will call this $(\mathbf{g}'', \mathbf{f}'', \mathbf{x}'')$. The resulting solution is an equilibrium of this network, and actually this is true both with x^* and with x' in our problem.

Lemma 10. *The flow $(\mathbf{g}'', \mathbf{f}'', \mathbf{x}'')$ is an equilibrium on our modified network either with cost $c_{(\ell, d)} - p_{(\ell, d)} - x_{(\ell, d)}^*$ or with costs $c_{(\ell, d)} - p_{(\ell, d)} - x'_{(\ell, d)}$ of the drives with modified costs.*

Now by Lemma 7 this equilibrium solution is optimal with both version of the problem. Using x^* to define cost we get the the equilibrium solution has value OPT^{**} . However, using x' does not change the value of the equilibrium, while the optimum increases by Lemma 9 unless all dispatches are served.

All equilibria are welfare optimal. We now finish the backwards induction proof. First, we claim that the thresholds \mathbf{x}' from our arbitrary equilibrium have to equal the optimal thresholds \mathbf{x}^* associated with the optimal solution $(\mathbf{f}^*, \mathbf{g}^*)$. This follows from the fact we just established, that $\mathbf{g}' = \mathbf{g}^*$. Consider the case that all drivers at a location ℓ serve a dispatch. Then no drivers can reject a dispatch, so it must be the case that $x_{(\ell, d)} = x_{\ell}^* = C$ for all destinations d . Otherwise,

consider the case that some nonzero volume of drivers serve a relocation trip originating from ℓ . Then from Lemma 7, \mathbf{f}' and \mathbf{f}^* are both optimal solutions for the problem (29). Let $\boldsymbol{\lambda}^*$ and $\boldsymbol{\eta}^*$ be the dual variables (32) and (33) associated with the flow \mathbf{f}^* . Let d' be the destination where $f'_{(\ell,d')} > g'_{(\ell,d')}$. From the equality $0 = \frac{\partial}{\partial f_{(\ell,d)}} L(\mathbf{f}'; \boldsymbol{\lambda}^*, \boldsymbol{\eta}^*)$ we conclude

$$\max_d \mathcal{Q}_t(\ell, d, 0) = \mathcal{Q}_t(\ell, d', 0) = \mathcal{Q}_t^*(\ell, d', 0) \leq \max_d \mathcal{Q}_t^*(\ell, d, 0).$$

Analogously, we can obtain the bound

$$\max_d \mathcal{Q}_t^*(\ell, d, 0) = \mathcal{Q}_t(\ell, d^*, 0) = \mathcal{Q}_t(\ell, d^*, 0) \leq \max_d \mathcal{Q}_t(\ell, d, 0).$$

Therefore the relocation utilities are the same under our arbitrary equilibrium and the optimal solution. The incentive compatibility conditions (8) give $P_{(\ell,d)} - x_{(\ell,d)} = \max_{d'} \mathcal{Q}_t(\ell, d', 0)$, and we also have $P_{(\ell,d)} - x_{\ell}^* = \max_{d'} \mathcal{Q}_t^*(\ell, d', 0)$, therefore $x_{(\ell,d)} = x_{\ell}^*$ follows.

Therefore, the Q-values $\mathcal{Q}_t(\ell, d, 0)$ and $\mathcal{Q}_t(\ell, d, 1, X)$ associated with our arbitrary equilibrium take the same value as the Q-values $\mathcal{Q}_t^*(\ell, d, 0)$ and $\mathcal{Q}_t^*(\ell, d, 1, X)$ associated with our optimal solution, which implies the value function $\mathcal{V}_t(\ell; \omega_t, \mathbf{S}_t)$ is equal to the optimal value function $\mathcal{V}_t^*(\ell; \omega_t, \mathbf{S}_t)$. But we know the optimal value function is equal to $\frac{\partial}{\partial S_{\ell}} \Phi_{\omega_t}(\mathbf{S}_t)$, establishing the second and final part of our backwards induction assumption.

We defer the proof of approximate welfare robustness in the fluid model to Appendix B.

5 The Value of Re-Solving

The SSP mechanism changes prices based on drivers' locations: in each period t , the fluid optimization problem (10) used to set prices is re-solved using drivers' locations \mathbf{S}_t . Here we show that re-solving is necessary, in the sense that Theorem 3's robustness property vanishes without it.

To show this, we consider a variant of the SSP mechanism, called the *static mechanism*. This mechanism solves the optimization problem (10) once, for the initial market state, and re-uses this solution to compute prices following the same approach as the SSP mechanism. To define the static mechanism formally, we first observe that solving (10) for the initial market state defines an optimal anticipated sequence of supply location vectors $\mathbf{S}_{\omega_t}^*$ and flows $\mathbf{f}_{\omega_t}^*, \mathbf{g}_{\omega_t}^*$ indexed by time t and scenario ω_t . These satisfy the forward recursion: $\mathbf{f}_{\omega_0}^* = 0$; $\mathbf{S}_{\omega_{t+1}}^* = \bar{\mathbf{S}}_{\omega_{t+1}}(\mathbf{f}_{\omega_t}^*)$ via (7) where $(\mathbf{f}_{\omega_t}^*, \mathbf{g}_{\omega_t}^*) \in F_{\omega_t}^*(\mathbf{S}_{\omega_t}^*)$ is an optimal solution to the fluid optimization problem. Then, the price set by the static mechanism in scenario ω_t on route ℓ, d is $P_{(\ell,d,\omega_t)}(g_{(\omega_t,\ell,d)}^*)$ as defined in Definition 3, i.e., the price needed to have a flow $\mathbf{g}_{\omega_t}^*$ of riders requesting trips in the stochastic fluid model.

One can show that this static mechanism has a welfare-optimal equilibrium under the stochastic fluid model: this is the strategy profile implied by the solution to (10). Moreover, there exists a sequence of approximate equilibria in the two-level model indexed by the population size k that are asymptotically welfare-optimal: those corresponding to this same strategy profile.

Unfortunately, however, the static mechanism is not robust, in the sense that poor equilibria (both exact and approximate) can exist, in contrast with the SSP's Theorem 3. Essentially, the issue is that prices do not react to deviations between the actual supply location vector and the one anticipated by solving (10).

We demonstrate this with a simple two-time-period one-location one-scenario example. In the first period there are k drivers who join the market in the one location. Each driver can exit the market and collect utility E , or stay for the second period and hope to serve a dispatch. In the second period there are no new drivers who join, and the number of riders interested in taking a trip (from the one location to itself) is $D \sim \text{Binomial}(k, \frac{1}{2})$. The distribution of the rider value for

taking a trip is $V \sim \text{Uniform}(0, 1)$, there is $c = 0$ cost to a driver for serving a dispatch, and no add-passenger disutility ($C = 0$).

In the fluid model for this example, the welfare of having S_2 drivers available to serve dispatches at the beginning of the second period ($t = 2$) is

$$\Phi_2(S_2) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{4}k & \text{if } S_2 > k/2, \\ S_2 - \frac{S_2^2}{k} & \text{if } S_2 \leq k/2. \end{cases}$$

We can find the welfare-optimal S_2 by solving $\frac{d}{dS_2}\Phi_2(S_2) = E$. Setting $E = \frac{1}{2}$, welfare optimality is obtained at $S_2 = \frac{k}{4}$, so $\frac{3k}{4}$ drivers should exit the market in the first period. The trip-price set by the platform in this case is $P = \frac{1}{2}$, which correctly selects the 50% of the $\frac{k}{2}$ price-inquiring riders with the highest value V . In the fluid setting, all drivers collect utility $\frac{1}{2}$ by following the welfare-optimal solution, and no driver has incentive to deviate under the static price $P = \frac{1}{2}$.

However, incentives break down if the static price $P = \frac{1}{2}$ is used in the two-level model. From the perspective of a driver in the first period, and relative to the fluid model, the utility of exiting at period 1 remains $\frac{1}{2}$, but the utility of staying is lower because receiving a dispatch is not guaranteed. While the probability of dispatch goes to 1 as k goes to ∞ , and hence staying for the second period is approximately incentive compatible for the $k/4$ drivers, the decision to exit the market will always dominate the decision to stay in the market, for all drivers and for all finite values of k , assuming the static price $P = \frac{1}{2}$ is used. If many drivers leave that results in significant welfare loss.

SSP's approach (using dynamic prices based on recomputing an optimal solution in the second period) solves this problem. Adapting the price to the observed amount of driver volume S_2 and computing the optimal solution with respect to the expected rider volume interested in taking a trip produces a trip-price $P = \frac{d}{dS_2}\Phi_2(S_2)$, where S_2 is now the observed volume of drivers that remain at the start of the second period. If S_2 is lower than the value of $\frac{k}{2}$ anticipated in the fluid solution, then P will be larger than the anticipated price of $\frac{1}{2}$. From the perspective of a driver in the first period, the utility of staying in the market in the first period is $\frac{d}{dS_2}\Phi_2(S_2)\mathbb{P}^k(\text{dispatch} \mid S_2)$, where $\mathbb{P}^k(\text{dispatch} \mid S_2)$ is the probability of receiving a dispatch in the second period and also increases as S_2 falls. Since a driver's utility $\frac{d}{dS_2}\Phi_2(S_2)$ is increasing as S_2 decreases, it is no longer a dominant strategy, or even an equilibrium of the game for all drivers to exit the market in the first period.

References

- Philipp Afeche, Zhe Liu, and Costis Maglaras. 2018. *Ride-hailing networks with strategic drivers: The impact of platform control capabilities on performance*. Technical Report. Columbia Business School. Available at SSRN 3120544.
- Javier Alonso-Mora, Samitha Samaranyake, Alex Wallar, Emilio Frazzoli, and Daniela Rus. 2017. On-demand high-capacity ride-sharing via dynamic trip-vehicle assignment. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 114, 3 (2017), 462–467.
- Itai Ashlagi, Maximilien Burq, Chinmoy Dutta, Patrick Jaillet, Amin Saberi, and Chris Sholley. 2018. Maximum weight online matching with deadlines. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1808.03526* (2018).
- Siddhartha Banerjee, Daniel Freund, and Thodoris Lykouris. 2017. Pricing and Optimization in Shared Vehicle Systems: An Approximation Framework. In *Proceedings of the 2017 ACM Conference on Economics and Computation* (Cambridge, Massachusetts, USA) (*EC '17*). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 517. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3033274.3085099>

- Siddhartha Banerjee, Ramesh Johari, and Carlos Riquelme. 2016. Dynamic pricing in ridesharing platforms. *ACM SIGecom Exchanges* 15, 1 (2016), 65–70.
- Omar Besbes, Francisco Castro, and Ilan Lobel. 2018. *Surge Pricing and Its Spatial Supply Response*. Technical Report. Columbia Business School Research Paper No. 18-25. Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=3124571>.
- Omar Besbes, Francisco Castro, and Ilan Lobel. 2019. Spatial Capacity Planning. In *Proceedings of the 2019 ACM Conference on Economics and Computation*. 585–585.
- Kostas Bimpikis, Ozan Candogan, and Daniela Saban. 2016. *Spatial pricing in ride-sharing networks*. Technical Report. Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=2868080> or <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2868080>.
- Anton Braverman, J. G. Dai, Xin Liu, and Lei Ying. 2019. Empty-Car Routing in Ridesharing Systems. *Operations Research* 67 (2019). Issue 5. <https://doi.org/10.1287/opre.2018.1822>
- Gerard P Cachon, Kaitlin M Daniels, and Ruben Lobel. 2017. The role of surge pricing on a service platform with self-scheduling capacity. *Manufacturing & Service Operations Management* 19, 3 (2017), 368–384.
- Colin F Camerer. 1997. Taxi drivers and beauty contests. *Engineering and science* 60, 1 (1997), 10–19.
- Juan Camilo Castillo, Dan Knoepfle, and Glen Weyl. 2017. Surge pricing solves the wild goose chase. In *Proceedings of the 2017 ACM Conference on Economics and Computation*. ACM, 241–242.
- Francisco Castro, Peter Frazier, Hongyao Ma, Hamid Nazerzadeh, and Chiwei Yan. 2020. Matching Queues, Flexibility and Incentives. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2006.08863* (2020).
- M Keith Chen and Michael Sheldon. 2016. Dynamic Pricing in a Labor Market: Surge Pricing and Flexible Work on the Uber Platform. *Ec* 455, 10.1145 (2016), 2940716–2940798.
- Yiwei Chen and Ming Hu. 2020. Pricing and matching with forward-looking buyers and sellers. *Manufacturing & Service Operations Management* 22, 4 (2020), 717–734.
- Yiwei Chen, Ming Hu, and Yun Zhou. 2019a. *Pricing and Matching in the Sharing Economy*. Chapter 8, 137–164.
- Yiwei Chen, Ming Hu, and Yun Zhou. 2019b. Pricing and Matching in the Sharing Economy. In *Sharing Economy*. Springer, 137–164.
- Yuan K Chou. 2002. Testing alternative models of labour supply: Evidence from taxi drivers in Singapore. *The Singapore Economic Review* 47, 01 (2002), 17–47.
- Hangil Chung, Daniel Freund, and David B. Shmoys. 2018. Bike Angels: An Analysis of Citi Bike’s Incentive Program. In *Proceedings of the 1st ACM SIGCAS Conference on Computing and Sustainable Societies* (Menlo Park and San Jose, CA, USA) (*COMPASS '18*). ACM, New York, NY, USA, Article 5, 9 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3209811.3209866>
- Cody Cook, Rebecca Diamond, Jonathan Hall, John A List, and Paul Oyer. 2018. *The gender earnings gap in the gig economy: Evidence from over a million rideshare drivers*. Technical Report. National Bureau of Economic Research.

- Jay Cradeur. 2018. Rideshare Guy. <https://therideshareguy.com/how-i-make-1900-per-week-driving-for>
- Nikhil Garg and Hamid Nazerzadeh. 2020. Driver Surge Pricing. In *Proceedings of the 21st ACM Conference on Economics and Computation*. 501–501.
- Jonathan Hall, Cory Kendrick, and Chris Nosko. 2015. The effects of Uber’s surge pricing: A case study. *The University of Chicago Booth School of Business* (2015).
- Camille Kamga, M Anil Yazici, and Abhishek Singhal. 2013. Hailing in the rain: Temporal and weather-related variations in taxi ridership and taxi demand-supply equilibrium. In *Transportation Research Board 92nd Annual Meeting*.
- Jonathan Borwein Adrian Lewis. 2006. *Convex Analysis and Nonlinear Optimization*. Springer.
- Alice Lu, Peter I Frazier, and Oren Kislev. 2018. Surge Pricing Moves Uber’s Driver-Partners. In *Proceedings of the 2018 ACM Conference on Economics and Computation*. 3–3.
- Hangyaou Ma, Fei Fang, and David C. Parkes. 2018. Spatio-Temporal Pricing for Ridesharing Systems. (2018). arXiv:1801.04015 [cs-gt]
- Erhun Özkan and Amy R Ward. 2020. Dynamic matching for real-time ride sharing. *Stochastic Systems* 10, 1 (2020), 29–70.
- András Prékopa. 2013. *Stochastic programming*. Vol. 324. Springer Science & Business Media.
- Michael Sheldon. 2016. Income targeting and the ridesharing market. *Unpublished manuscript*. Available at: <https://static1.squarespace.com/static/56500157e4b0cb706005352d/56/1457131797556>.
- Chiwei Yan, Helin Zhu, Nikita Korolko, and Dawn Woodard. 2020. Dynamic pricing and matching in ride-hailing platforms. *Naval Research Logistics (NRL)* 67, 8 (2020), 705–724.

A Approximate Incentive-Compatibility of the Fluid Optimal Solution in the Two-Level Model

In this section we prove part 2 of Theorem 1. We start by proving the following Lemma, which shows that expected driver utilities in the two-level model are approximately equal to driver utilities in the fluid model.

Lemma 11. *There exist nonnegative sequences $(\epsilon_k : k \geq 1)$ and $(\beta_k : k \geq 1)$, both converging to 0 as $k \rightarrow \infty$, such that when the SSP mechanism is used to set prices in the stochastic two-level model with population-size k , then for any market state $(\omega_t, \mathbf{S}_t) \in \Omega_t \times \mathcal{S}_t$, and any location ℓ with driver-volume larger than β_k , i.e. $S_\ell \geq \beta_k$, we have the expected utility of drivers at ℓ is at most ϵ_k away from the fluid utility for drivers at ℓ , i.e.*

$$\left| \mathbb{E}[U_i^t \mid \ell_i^t = \ell] - \frac{\partial}{\partial S_\ell} \Phi_{\omega_t}(\mathbf{S}_t) \right| \leq \epsilon_k.$$

Proof. Fix a time period t and we assume via backwards induction that, at future time periods $t + 1$, drivers who are positioned at a location ℓ collect expected utility that is approximately the same as the fluid counterpart. That is, assume there exist sequences $(\epsilon_k^{t+1}), (\beta_k^{t+1})$ converging to

0 as $k \rightarrow \infty$, such that for any time $t + 1$ state $(\omega_{t+1}, \mathbf{S}_{t+1}) \in \Omega_{t+1} \times \mathcal{S}_{t+1}(\gamma_{t+1})$ we have that the location-specific value function for the two-level model under $\Pi^{(k)}$ is within ϵ_k^{t+1} of the value function for the corresponding two-level model, for any location ℓ where $S_\ell \geq \beta_k^{t+1}$. That is,

$$|\mathbb{E}[U_i^{t+1} \mid \ell_i^t = \ell] - \frac{\partial}{\partial S_\ell} \Phi_{\omega_{t+1}}(\mathbf{S}_{t+1})| \leq \epsilon_k^{t+1} \quad (34)$$

holds for every location ℓ where $S_\ell \geq \beta_k^{t+1}$, where i is a driver positioned at location ℓ , and U_i^{t+1} is a random variable specifying the utility collected by the driver starting from time period $t + 1$ onwards under the strategy profile $\Pi^{(k)}$.

Fix any state (ω_t, \mathbf{S}_t) and let $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{e}) = \Sigma_t^*(\omega_t, \mathbf{S}_t)$ be the disutility acceptance thresholds $\mathbf{x} = (\mathbf{x}_\ell : \ell \in \mathcal{L})$ and relocation destination distributions $\mathbf{e} = (\mathbf{e}_\ell : \ell \in \mathcal{L})$ selected by the fluid optimal strategy Σ^* . Let $(\mathbf{f}^*, \mathbf{g}^*) \in F_{\omega_t}^*(\mathbf{S}_t)$ be the optimal solution that the SSP mechanism uses to set prices. Let $(\bar{\mathbf{f}}_k, \bar{\mathbf{g}}_k)$ be the fluid outcomes associated with the market state (ω_t, \mathbf{S}_t) and strategy-profile $\Pi^{(k)}$ (7). Recall that, by definition, under the strategy profile $\Pi^{(k)}$, every driver positioned at ℓ uses \mathbf{x}_ℓ as their threshold vector, and the distribution of relocation destinations selected by drivers at ℓ is equal to a rounded version of \mathbf{e}_ℓ . The fluid outcomes are deterministic functions of the common disutility threshold vector \mathbf{x}_ℓ and the relocation distribution used by drivers at ℓ (see equations (89-90), and Definition 5). Since the relocation distribution used by drivers at ℓ under $\Pi^{(k)}$ is a rounded version of \mathbf{e}_ℓ , and the rounding error is on the order of $\frac{1}{k}$ for where k is the population-size parameter, it follows that $(\bar{\mathbf{f}}_k, \bar{\mathbf{g}}_k)$ converges uniformly to $(\mathbf{f}^*, \mathbf{g}^*)$ over all states $(\omega_t, \mathbf{S}_t) \in \Omega_t \times \mathcal{S}_t(\gamma_t)$, i.e.

$$\sup_{(\omega_t, \mathbf{S}_t) \in \Omega_t \times \mathcal{S}_t(\gamma_t)} \|\bar{\mathbf{f}}_k - \mathbf{f}^*\| + \|\bar{\mathbf{g}}_k - \mathbf{g}^*\| \rightarrow 0, \text{ as } k \rightarrow \infty.$$

Next, concentration properties for the matching process tell us that the stochastic actions which occur under $\Pi^{(k)}$ converge to their deterministic fluid counterparts. Specifically, let $(\mathbf{f}_k, \mathbf{g}_k)$ be (stochastic) vectors which encode the actions taken under $\Pi^{(k)}$ with respect to a market state $(\omega_t, \mathbf{S}_t) \in \Omega_t \times \mathcal{S}_t(\gamma_t)$. Lemma 28 states there exist nonnegative sequences α_k and q_k , both converging to 0 as $k \rightarrow \infty$, such that

$$\sup_{(\omega_t, \mathbf{S}_t) \in \Omega_t \times \mathcal{S}_t(\gamma_t)} \mathbb{P}(\|\bar{\mathbf{f}}_k - \mathbf{f}_k\| + \|\bar{\mathbf{g}}_k - \mathbf{g}_k\| \leq \alpha_k) \geq 1 - q_k. \quad (35)$$

holds for all k .

Define the sequence $(\beta_k)_{k=1}^\infty$ by setting $\beta_k = \sqrt{\alpha_k}$ for every $k \geq 1$. Since we know that $\alpha_k \rightarrow 0$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$, it follows that $\beta_k \rightarrow 0$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$, as required by our theorem statement.

Now consider a supply-location vector $(\omega_t, \mathbf{S}_t) \in \Omega_t \times \mathcal{S}_t(\gamma_t)$, and consider a location ℓ with $S_\ell \geq \beta_k$. Consider the expected utility collected by a driver i positioned at ℓ :

$$\mathbb{E}[U_i^t \mid \ell_i^t = \ell] = \sum_{d \in \mathcal{L} \cup \{\emptyset\}, \delta \in \{0,1\}} \mathbb{E}[U_i^t \mid a_i^t = (\ell, d, \delta)] \mathbb{P}(a_i^t = (\ell, d, \delta) \mid \ell_i^t = \ell),$$

where $a_i^t = (\ell, d, \delta, X)$ denote the action they take, where $\delta \in \{0, 1\}$ is an indicator specifying whether or not it is a dispatch trip, and $X \in [0, C]$ is their sampled add-passenger disutility. Under

the backwards induction assumption (34), the driver i has expected utility at time t given by

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[U_i^t \mid a_i^t = (\ell, d, \delta)] &= \delta(P_{(\ell,d)} - c_{(\ell,d)} - X) + \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{\partial}{\partial S_d}\Phi_{\omega_{t+1}}(\mathbf{S}_{t+1}) \mid a_i^t\right] + \epsilon_k^{t+1} \\ &= \delta(P_{(\ell,d)} - c_{(\ell,d)} - X) + \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{\partial}{\partial S_d}\Phi_{\omega_{t+1}}(\mathbf{S}_{t+1})\right] + \gamma_k + \epsilon_k^{t+1} \\ &= \delta(P_{(\ell,d)} - c_{(\ell,d)} - X) + \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{\partial}{\partial S_d}\Phi_{\omega_{t+1}}(\bar{\mathbf{S}}_{\omega_{t+1}}(\mathbf{f}^*))\right] + \psi_k + \gamma_k + \epsilon_k^{t+1}\end{aligned}$$

where ϵ_k^{t+1} is the error term bounding the difference between the time $t + 1$ expected utility of agent i and the partial derivative of the state-dependent optimization function, which exists by our backwards induction assumption (34), assuming, for now, the destination d has sufficiently many drivers for the backwards induction assumption to hold. The backwards induction assumption only holds if $S_d \geq \beta_k^{t+1}$, but β_k^{t+1} is vanishingly small as $k \rightarrow \infty$, so the proportion of drivers who drive towards destinations satisfying this condition goes to one as $k \rightarrow \infty$.

γ_k is the error we pay for going from the distribution of the time $t + 1$ supply-locations \mathbf{S}_{t+1} conditional on a_i^t to the unconditional distribution on \mathbf{S}_{t+1} . By Assumption 4 we know that there exists a constant γ_k that bounds the difference between the conditional and unconditional distribution of \mathbf{S}_{t+1} for all initial states (ω_t, \mathbf{S}_t) and all strategy profiles, and that $\gamma_k \rightarrow 0$ as the population size k tends to ∞ .

ψ_k is an error term that bounds the difference between the expected partial derivative of the state-dependent optimization function with respect to the stochastic time $t + 1$ supply-location vector \mathbf{S}_{t+1} , and the fluid time $t + 1$ supply-location vector $\bar{\mathbf{S}}_{\omega_{t+1}}(\mathbf{f}^*)$, which is a deterministic function of the time $t + 1$ scenario ω_{t+1} and the fluid optimal trips \mathbf{f}^* . We know there exists a constant ψ_k that bounds this difference, such that $\psi_k \rightarrow 0$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$, because of the uniform convergence described in equation (35), as well as the fact that the partial derivative function $\frac{\partial}{\partial S_d}\Phi_{\omega_{t+1}}(\cdot)$ is bounded and continuous over a compact domain.

Lemma 6 gives us the following expression for Q-values in the fluid model:

$$\mathcal{Q}_t(\ell, d, 1, x_{(\ell,d)}) = \frac{\partial}{\partial S_\ell}\Phi_{\omega_t}(\mathbf{S}_t) - \frac{C}{2} \left(\frac{\mathbf{g}^{*T}\mathbf{1}_\ell}{\mathbf{f}^{*T}\mathbf{1}_\ell} \right)^2 = \max_{d'} \mathcal{Q}_t(\ell, d', 0),$$

so therefore we have

$$\mathbb{E}[U_i^t \mid a_i^t = (\ell, d, \delta)] = \frac{\partial}{\partial S_\ell}\Phi_{\omega_t}(\mathbf{S}_t) - \frac{C}{2} \left(\frac{\mathbf{g}^{*T}\mathbf{1}_\ell}{\mathbf{f}^{*T}\mathbf{1}_\ell} \right)^2 + \delta(x_{(\ell,d)} - X) + \epsilon_k,$$

where $\epsilon'_k = \psi_k + \gamma_k + \epsilon_k^{t+1}$ is the sum of all the errors accrued by approximating the stochastic utility-to-go with the fluid utility-to-go, and $\delta(x_{(\ell,d)} - X)$ is the extra utility the driver collects when the trip is a dispatch trip ($\delta = 1$) and their add-passenger disutility X is smaller than the threshold $x_{(\ell,d)}$. Therefore, averaging over all trips we have

$$\left| \mathbb{E}[U_i^t] - \frac{\partial}{\partial S_\ell}\Phi_{\omega_t}(\mathbf{S}_t) \right| = \mathbb{P}(\delta = 1)\mathbb{E}[x_{(\ell,d)} - X \mid \delta = 1] - \frac{C}{2} \left(\frac{\mathbf{g}^{*T}\mathbf{1}_\ell}{\mathbf{f}^{*T}\mathbf{1}_\ell} \right)^2 + \epsilon'_k.$$

We turn to analyzing the $\mathbb{P}(\delta = 1)\mathbb{E}[x_{(\ell,d)} - X \mid \delta = 1]$ term. Recall that the threshold $x_{(\ell,d)}$ is the same for every destination d under the policy $\Pi^{(k)}$, and this value is $C \frac{\mathbf{g}^{*T}\mathbf{1}_\ell}{\mathbf{f}^{*T}\mathbf{1}_\ell}$. Also,

conditioned on driver i being allocated a dispatch trip, we know that their add-passenger disutility X is uniformly distributed between 0 and $x_{(\ell,d)}$. Therefore we have

$$\mathbb{E}[x_{(\ell,d)} - X \mid \delta = 1] = \frac{C \mathbf{g}^{*T} \mathbf{1}_\ell}{2 \mathbf{f}^{*T} \mathbf{1}_\ell}.$$

Also, the probability of a dispatch trip $\mathbb{P}(\delta = 1)$ can be expressed in terms of the total number of dispatch trips:

$$\mathbb{P}(\delta = 1) = \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\mathbf{g}^T \mathbf{1}_\ell}{S_\ell} \right] = \frac{\mathbf{g}^{*T} \mathbf{1}_\ell}{S_\ell} + \frac{\alpha_k}{S_\ell},$$

where α_k is the error term bounding the convergence of \mathbf{g} to \mathbf{g}^* . Now we use the fact that $S_\ell \geq \beta_k = \sqrt{k}$ to conclude that $\frac{\alpha_k}{S_\ell} \leq \sqrt{\alpha_k} \rightarrow 0$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$. So, we have

$$\left| \mathbb{P}(\delta = 1) \mathbb{E}[x_{(\ell,d)} - X \mid \delta = 1] - \frac{C}{2} \left(\frac{\mathbf{g}^{*T} \mathbf{1}_\ell}{\mathbf{f}^{*T} \mathbf{1}_\ell} \right)^2 \right| \leq \sqrt{\alpha_k}.$$

Defining $\epsilon_k = \epsilon'_k + \sqrt{\alpha_k}$, which we know converges to 0 as $k \rightarrow \infty$, we have shown

$$\left| \mathbb{E}[U_i^t \mid \ell_i^t = \ell] - \frac{\partial}{\partial S_\ell} \Phi_{\omega_t}(\mathbf{S}_t) \right| \leq \epsilon_k,$$

finishing the proof. \square

We restate part 2 of Theorem 1 below.

Theorem. *There exist nonnegative sequences $(\epsilon_k : k \geq 1)$ and $(\delta_k : k \geq 1)$, both converging to 0 as $k \rightarrow \infty$, such that when the SSP mechanism is used to set prices in the stochastic two-level model with population-size k , then $\Pi^{(k)}$ is an (ϵ_k, δ_k) equilibrium.*

Proof. To show that $\Pi^{(k)}$ is an (ϵ_k, δ_k) -approximate equilibrium, we have to show that from any market state $(\omega_t, \mathbf{S}_t) \in \Omega_t \times \mathcal{S}_t(\gamma_t)$, the number of drivers who have at least ϵ_k -conditional incentive to deviate from any market state is smaller than $\delta_k k$. That is, if \mathcal{M}_t is the index set of drivers corresponding to the supply-location vector \mathbf{S}_t , and $\mathcal{M}_t(\epsilon_k; \omega_t, \mathbf{S}_t)$ is the set of drivers whose conditional incentive to deviate from $\Pi^{(k)}$ is no larger than ϵ_k , we have to show

$$|\mathcal{M}_t \setminus \mathcal{M}_t(\epsilon_k; \omega_t, \mathbf{S}_t)| \leq \delta_k k. \quad (36)$$

Define $\delta_k = |\mathcal{L}| \beta_k$, where $(\beta_k)_{k=1}^\infty$ is the sequence from Lemma 11. Define ϵ_k to be the maximum incentive to deviate, over all market states (ω_t, \mathbf{S}_t) , for a driver positioned at a location ℓ which satisfies the minimum driver volume condition described in Lemma 11, i.e. $S_\ell \geq \beta_k$.

Note the inequalities

$$|\mathcal{M}_t \setminus \mathcal{M}_t(\epsilon_k; \omega_t, \mathbf{S}_t)| \leq k \sum_{\ell \in \mathcal{L}: S_\ell < \beta_k} S_\ell \leq k \delta_k,$$

so the equilibrium condition (36) is satisfied, and we already know $\delta_k \rightarrow 0$ holds.

That the incentive to deviate term ϵ_k converges to 0 follows from the fact that there is no incentive to deviate in the fluid model, and as $k \rightarrow \infty$ we have that the stochastic utility converges to the fluid utility, for drivers at locations ℓ which satisfy the minimum driver volume condition $S_\ell \geq \beta_k$. \square

B Approximate Welfare-Robustness Proof in the Fluid Model

In this Appendix we prove the second part of the statement in Theorem 2, stating that every ϵ -equilibrium in the fluid model achieves approximately optimal welfare.

Let Σ be an ϵ -equilibrium for the fluid model under the SSP pricing and matching policy. Let \mathcal{V}_t and \mathcal{Q}_t be the value function and Q-values associated with Σ . We proceed via backwards induction on the time t , and make the following assumption about the future time period $t + 1$: There exists an error term ϵ_{t+1} (which converges to 0 as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$) such that the following are true:

1. The welfare achieved by Σ from any time $t + 1$ market state is within ϵ_{t+1} from the optimum.
2. The value function for a location ℓ at any time $t + 1$ state is within ϵ_{t+1} of the partial derivative of the fluid optimization function: i.e. for any ℓ and $(\omega_{t+1}, \mathbf{S}_{t+1}) \in \mathcal{S}_{t+1}$ we have

$$\left| \mathcal{V}_{t+1}(\ell, \omega_{t+1}, \mathbf{S}_{t+1}) - \frac{\partial}{\partial S_\ell} \Phi_{\omega_{t+1}}(\mathbf{S}_{t+1}) \right| \leq \epsilon_{t+1}. \quad (37)$$

Fix a time period t and let $(\omega_t, \mathbf{S}_t) \in \mathcal{S}_t$ be any market state from time t . Let \mathbf{x}' be the disutility thresholds used by the drivers under Σ at (ω_t, \mathbf{S}_t) and let $(\mathbf{g}', \mathbf{f}')$ be the vector of dispatch trips and total trips that result under Σ and the SSP prices and matching process at (ω_t, \mathbf{S}_t) . Additionally, let $(\mathbf{g}^*, \mathbf{f}^*)$ denote the optimal solution for the fluid optimization problem with respect to (ω_t, \mathbf{S}_t) used by the SSP mechanism to set prices and allocate matches.

Recall an ϵ -equilibrium strategy profile for the fluid model is characterized by the approximate incentive compatibility conditions (9), which we restate here for clarity.

$$\begin{aligned} f'_{(\ell,d)} - g'_{(\ell,d)} > \epsilon &\implies \mathcal{Q}_t(\ell, d, 0) \geq \max_{d' \in \mathcal{L}} \mathcal{Q}_t(\ell, d', 0) - \epsilon, \\ g'_{(\ell,d)} > \epsilon &\implies \mathcal{Q}_t(\ell, d, 1, x'_{(\ell,d)}) \geq \max_{d' \in \mathcal{L}} \mathcal{Q}_t(\ell, d', 0) - \epsilon, \end{aligned} \quad (38)$$

$$g'_{(\ell,d)} > \epsilon, S_\ell - \sum_{d'} g'_{(\ell,d')} > \epsilon \implies \mathcal{Q}_t(\ell, d, 1, x'_{(\ell,d)}) \leq \max_{d' \in \mathcal{L}} \mathcal{Q}_t(\ell, d', 0) + \epsilon. \quad (39)$$

Our proof mirrors the steps in Section 4.3.

Where do the non-dispatched drivers go? First, we show that the non-dispatched drivers, whose trips are specified by $\mathbf{f}' - \mathbf{g}'$, take approximately optimal trips given the dispatch trips \mathbf{g}' . Recall the optimization problem (29), which depends on the vector \mathbf{g}' , which we restate below:

$$\sup_{\mathbf{f}} \sum_{(\ell,d) \in \mathcal{L}^2} -c_{(\ell,d)} f_{(\ell,d)} + \mathcal{U}_{\omega_t}^{>t}(\mathbf{f}) \quad (40)$$

subject to

$$f_{(\ell,d)} \geq g'_{(\ell,d)} \quad \forall (\ell, d) \in \mathcal{L}^2 \quad (41)$$

$$\sum_{d \in \mathcal{L}} f_{(\ell,d)} = S_\ell \quad \forall \ell \in \mathcal{L}. \quad (42)$$

Lemma 12. *Let $\epsilon' = \max(\epsilon, \epsilon_{t+1})$, where ϵ is the error term in our definition of approximate equilibrium, and ϵ_{t+1} is the error bound from our backwards induction assumption (37).*

Then there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that the total trip volumes \mathbf{f}' from our equilibrium is a $C\epsilon'$ -optimal solution for the relocation problem (40) with respect to the dispatch trips \mathbf{g}' . Moreover,

the following dual variables form an ϵ' -approximate Lagrange multiplier vector for \mathbf{f}' (in the sense of Definition 8):

$$\lambda'_{(\ell,d)} = \max_{d'} \mathcal{Q}_t(\ell, d', 0) - \mathcal{Q}_t(\ell, d, 0), \quad (43)$$

associated with the inequality constraint (30) for each (ℓ, d) , and

$$\eta'_\ell = \max_{d'} \mathcal{Q}_t(\ell, d', 0) \quad (44)$$

associated with the equality constraint (31) for each ℓ .

Proof. We show that $(\boldsymbol{\lambda}', \boldsymbol{\eta}')$ is an ϵ' -approximate Lagrange multiplier vector for \mathbf{f}' , in the sense of Definition 8, where $\epsilon' = \max(\epsilon, \epsilon_{t+1})$.

First, observe that approximate complementary slackness conditions follow from the approximate incentive compatibility properties. Indeed, if $f'_{(\ell,d)} - g'_{(\ell,d)} > \epsilon$ then (38) states $\lambda_{(\ell,d)} < \epsilon$.

Next, we check approximate stationarity. We work in terms of a convex cost function instead of a concave utility function. Define

$$\mathcal{C}_{\omega_t}(\mathbf{f}) = \sum_{(\ell,d) \in \mathcal{L}^2} c_{(\ell,d)} f_{(\ell,d)} - \mathcal{U}_{\omega_t}^{>t}(\mathbf{f}) \quad (45)$$

to be the cost function of the relocation trip variables \mathbf{f} , i.e. the negative of the objective function in the relocation problem (40).

First, observe our backwards induction assumption (37) yields the following equalities:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial}{\partial f_{(\ell,d)}} \mathcal{C}_{\omega_t}(\mathbf{f}') &= c_{(\ell,d)} - \frac{\partial}{\partial f_{(\ell,d)}} \mathbb{E} [\Phi_{\omega_{t+1}}(\bar{\mathbf{S}}_{\omega_{t+1}}(\mathbf{f}')) \mid \omega_t] \\ &= c_{(\ell,d)} - \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\partial}{\partial S_d} \Phi_{\omega_{t+1}}(\bar{\mathbf{S}}_{\omega_{t+1}}(\mathbf{f}')) \mid \omega_t \right] \\ &= c_{(\ell,d)} - \mathbb{E} [\mathcal{V}_{t+1}(d; \omega_{t+1}, \bar{\mathbf{S}}_{\omega_{t+1}}(\mathbf{f}'))] + \delta \\ &= -\mathcal{Q}_t(\ell, d, 0) + \delta, \end{aligned} \quad (46)$$

where δ is a constant satisfying $|\delta| \leq \epsilon_{t+1}$.

The Lagrangian for (40) is the following:

$$L(\mathbf{f}; \boldsymbol{\lambda}, \boldsymbol{\eta}) = \mathcal{C}_{\omega_t}(\mathbf{f}) + \boldsymbol{\lambda}^T (\mathbf{g}' - \mathbf{f}) + \sum_{\ell} \eta_{\ell} \left(\sum_d f_{(\ell,d)} - S_{\ell} \right).$$

Evaluate the partial derivative of $L(\mathbf{f}'; \boldsymbol{\lambda}', \boldsymbol{\eta}')$ at each coordinate $f'_{(\ell,d)}$:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial}{\partial f_{(\ell,d)}} L(\mathbf{f}'; \boldsymbol{\lambda}', \boldsymbol{\eta}') &= c_{(\ell,d)} - \frac{\partial}{\partial f_{(\ell,d)}} \mathcal{U}_{\omega_t}^{>t}(\mathbf{f}') - \lambda_{(\ell,d)} + \eta_{\ell} \\ &= -\mathcal{Q}(\ell, d, 0) - \lambda_{(\ell,d)} + \max_{d'} \mathcal{Q}(\ell, d, 0) + \delta, \end{aligned}$$

so $|\frac{\partial}{\partial f_{(\ell,d)}} L(\mathbf{f}'; \boldsymbol{\lambda}', \boldsymbol{\eta}')| \leq \epsilon_{t+1}$.

Therefore, $(\boldsymbol{\lambda}', \boldsymbol{\eta}')$ is an ϵ' -approximate Lagrange multiplier vector for \mathbf{f}' , in the sense of Definition 8. By Lemma 35, it follows that \mathbf{f}' is an ϵ'' -optimal solution for (40), where $\epsilon'' = C\epsilon'$ for some problem-independent constant C . □

Approximate equilibria serve approximately all available dispatch demand. The proof of this fact follows the outline along the same line as in Section 4 using Lemma 12 in place of the exact version used there. We define an alternate network as was done there. By Lemma 8 the flow $(\mathbf{g}^{**}, \mathbf{f}^{**}, \mathbf{x}^{**})$ is an optimal solution to our modified convex program, with optimal value OPT^{**} and using costs $c_{(\ell,d)} - p_{(\ell,d)} - x_{(\ell,d)}^*$ on the special edges.

Now consider the approximate equilibrium solution $(\mathbf{g}', \mathbf{f}', \mathbf{x}')$. Different drivers may use different cutoffs for their dis-utility. We define $x'_{(\ell,d)}$ as lowest pick-up dis-utility by a driver who rejected a dispatch. This means that all drivers with $x_{(\ell,d)} < x'_{(\ell,d)}$ offered a dispatch (ℓ, d) accepted it, and by the equilibrium property, all drivers with $x_{(\ell,d)} \geq x'_{(\ell,d)} + \epsilon$ rejected the dispatch if offered.

Now consider the same network using the alternate cost $c_{(\ell,d)} - p_{(\ell,d)} - x'_{(\ell,d)}$.

By Lemma 9 (using $(\mathbf{g}^{**}, \mathbf{f}^{**}, \mathbf{x}^{**})$ as a feasible solution), the optimum value with this new cost is now at least $\sum_{(\ell,d)} (g_{(\ell,d)}^* - g'_{(\ell,d)}) (x_{(\ell,d)}^* - x'_{(\ell,d)} - \epsilon)$ larger.

Next consider the solution $(\mathbf{g}'', \mathbf{f}'', \mathbf{x}'')$ constructed from the approximate equilibrium as was done in Section 4. We claim that this solution is an approximate equilibrium for the modified problem.

Lemma 13. *The flow $(\mathbf{g}'', \mathbf{f}'', \mathbf{x}'')$ is an equilibrium on our modified network either with cost $c_{(\ell,d)} - p_{(\ell,d)} - x_{(\ell,d)}^*$ or with costs $c_{(\ell,d)} - p_{(\ell,d)} - x'_{(\ell,d)}$ of the drivers with modified costs.*

Now by Lemma 12 this equilibrium solution is approximately optimal with both version of the problem.

Using x^* to define cost we get that the equilibrium solution has value close to OPT^{**} . Using x' does not change the value of the equilibrium, while the optimum increases by Lemma 9 by at least

$$\sum_{(\ell,d)} (g_{(\ell,d)}^* - g'_{(\ell,d)}) (x_{(\ell,d)}^* - x'_{(\ell,d)}).$$

Since the shared equilibrium solution is approximately optimal for both problems, this gives an upper bound on this difference in terms of the optimality of the solution.

For the product $\sum_d (g_{(\ell,d)}^* - g'_{(\ell,d)}) (x_{(\ell,d)}^* - x'_{(\ell,d)})$ to be small for a location ℓ , we must have that for each destination, either $g_{(\ell,d)}^* - g'_{(\ell,d)}$ must be small or $x_{(\ell,d)}^* - x'_{(\ell,d)}$ is small. To be able to bound the difference between $g_{(\ell,d)}^*$ and $g'_{(\ell,d)}$, we need to show that $x_{(\ell,d)}^* \approx x'_{(\ell,d)}$ implies that $g_{(\ell,d)}^* \approx g'_{(\ell,d)}$. To see this, consider the subset of destinations that have $x_{(\ell,d)}^* - x'_{(\ell,d)} \leq \epsilon C$, and let S_ℓ^ϵ denote the driver volume that is used to offer dispatches to one of these destinations from location ℓ .

Lemma 14. *If an approximate equilibrium satisfies $x'_{(\ell,d)} \geq x_{(\ell,d)}^* - \epsilon C$ for a subset of destinations at a location ℓ , and let S_ℓ^ϵ be the set of drivers who would be offered rides to one of these locations in the optimum solution, then at most ϵS_ℓ^ϵ riders requesting rides do not receive a ride to this subset of destinations.*

Proof. The price is set so that we have $g_{(\ell,d)}^*$ riders that will accept the price offered. Our mechanism offers the dispatch (ℓ, d) to at least $\frac{C}{x_{(\ell,d)}^*} g_{(\ell,d)}^*$ drivers. With the lower disutility cutoff $x'_{(\ell,d)}$, out of these dispatch offers, a fraction of $\frac{x_{(\ell,d)}^* - x'_{(\ell,d)}}{C}$ will reject the dispatch that would be accepted in the optimum. This is an upper bound on the riders remaining unserved at location ℓ with possible extra drivers, or other destinations where riders are already served, the mechanism may offer the rides to additional drivers. Summing these over the different routes starting at ℓ , we see that at most ϵS_ℓ^ϵ riders do not get a ride. \square

Approximate equilibria are approximately welfare optimal. We can now finish the backwards induction proof analogously to the proof for the exact case in Section 4. We start by showing that the thresholds $x'_{(\ell,d)}$ are approximately equal to the thresholds $x^*_{(\ell,d)}$.

Lemma 15. *For any location ℓ where the total driver volume S_ℓ is larger than $\sqrt{\epsilon}$, and for any route (ℓ, d) where the dispatch volume $g^*_{(\ell,d)}$ is larger than ϵ , then the difference between the optimal threshold $x^*_{(\ell,d)}$ and the threshold used by the drivers in an approximate equilibrium $x'_{(\ell,d)}$ is bounded by an error term ϵ'' , such that ϵ'' goes to 0 as $\max(\epsilon, \epsilon_{t+1})$ goes to 0.*

Proof. Consider the following modification of the optimization problem (40), where the pre-specified dispatch trips correspond to the fluid optimal dispatch trips \mathbf{g}^* rather than \mathbf{g}' :

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{\mathbf{f}} \sum_{(\ell,d) \in \mathcal{L}^2} -c_{(\ell,d)} f_{(\ell,d)} + U_{\omega_t}^{>t}(\mathbf{f}) \\ & \text{subject to} \\ & f_{(\ell,d)} \geq g^*_{(\ell,d)} \quad \forall (\ell, d) \in \mathcal{L}^2 \\ & \sum_{d \in \mathcal{L}} f_{(\ell,d)} = S_\ell \quad \forall \ell \in \mathcal{L}. \end{aligned}$$

We have established that $\mathbf{g}' \approx \mathbf{g}^*$. Therefore, by Lemma 12, \mathbf{f}' is approximately optimal for the above optimization problem, and \mathbf{f}^* is an exact optimum. Let $(\boldsymbol{\lambda}^*, \boldsymbol{\eta}^*)$ be the optimal dual variables associated with \mathbf{f}^* . By Lemma 36, it follows that $(\boldsymbol{\lambda}^*, \boldsymbol{\eta}^*)$ is an ϵ' -approximate Lagrange multiplier vector for \mathbf{f}' , in the sense of Definition 8, where ϵ' goes to 0 as the suboptimality of \mathbf{f}' goes to 0. In particular, this means that the norm of the gradient of the mixed-solution Lagrangian is small: $\|\nabla_{\mathbf{f}} L(\mathbf{f}'; \boldsymbol{\lambda}^*, \boldsymbol{\eta}^*)\|_2 \leq \epsilon'$, where the Lagrangian is

$$L(\mathbf{f}; \boldsymbol{\lambda}, \boldsymbol{\eta}) = C_{\omega_t}(\mathbf{f}) + \boldsymbol{\lambda}^T (\mathbf{g}^* - \mathbf{f}) + \sum_{\ell \in \mathcal{L}} \eta_\ell \left(\sum_{d \in \mathcal{L}} f_{(\ell,d)} - S_\ell \right).$$

In particular, for any pair of origin and destination locations (ℓ, d) we have the bound

$$\left| \frac{\partial}{\partial f_{(\ell,d)}} L(\mathbf{f}'; \boldsymbol{\lambda}^*, \boldsymbol{\eta}^*) \right| \leq \epsilon'.$$

Evaluating the partial derivative, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial}{\partial f_{(\ell,d)}} L(\mathbf{f}'; \boldsymbol{\lambda}^*, \boldsymbol{\eta}^*) &= \frac{\partial}{\partial f_{(\ell,d)}} C_{\omega_t}(\mathbf{f}') - \lambda^*_{(\ell,d)} + \eta_\ell^* \\ &\approx -\mathcal{Q}'(\ell, d, 0) - \lambda^*_{(\ell,d)} + \eta_\ell^* \\ &= -\mathcal{Q}'(\ell, d, 0) - \left(\max_{d'} \mathcal{Q}^*(\ell, d', 0) - \mathcal{Q}^*(\ell, d, 0) \right) + \max_{d'} \mathcal{Q}^*(\ell, d', 0) \\ &= \mathcal{Q}^*(\ell, d, 0) - \mathcal{Q}'(\ell, d, 0). \end{aligned}$$

The first line uses the approximate equality established in equation (46), which shows that, under our backwards induction assumption that the continuation utilities at a location are approximately equal to the partial derivative of the optimal welfare function with respect to driver supply at that location, the partial derivative of the cost function with respect to driver volume along a route is approximately equal to the negative utility of taking a relocation trip along that route. Therefore,

$$|\mathcal{Q}'(\ell, d, 0) - \mathcal{Q}^*(\ell, d, 0)| \leq \epsilon' + \epsilon_{t+1},$$

where $\mathcal{Q}'(\ell, d, 0)$ is the utility generated by a relocation trip from ℓ to d under the approximate equilibrium $(\mathbf{f}', \mathbf{g}', \mathbf{x}')$, and $\mathcal{Q}^*(\ell, d, 0)$ is the utility generated by the same relocation trip under the exact equilibrium $(\mathbf{f}^*, \mathbf{g}^*, \mathbf{x}^*)$.

Now recall that, since the actions $(\mathbf{f}', \mathbf{g}', \mathbf{x}')$ come from an approximate equilibrium, we know the following properties are satisfied:

$$g'_{(\ell, d)} > \epsilon \implies \mathcal{Q}'(\ell, d, 1, x'_{(\ell, d)}) \geq \max_{d'} \mathcal{Q}'(\ell, d', 0) - \epsilon \quad (47)$$

$$S_\ell - \sum_{d'} g'_{(\ell, d')} > \epsilon, g'_{(\ell, d)} > \epsilon \implies \mathcal{Q}'(\ell, d, 1, x'_{(\ell, d)}) \leq \max_{d'} \mathcal{Q}'(\ell, d', 0) + \epsilon. \quad (48)$$

The above properties formalize what we mean when we say that a driver, whose add-passenger disutility is exactly the threshold value $x'_{(\ell, d)}$, is approximately indifferent between serving a dispatch trip from ℓ to d and serving a relocation trip to any destination. The first line (47) says that, for a route (ℓ, d) where a non-negligible volume of drivers serve a dispatch trip, then the utility collected by a driver who serves a dispatch trip along (ℓ, d) , and whose add-passenger disutility is exactly equal to the threshold $x'_{(\ell, d)}$, is (approximately) at least as large as the maximum relocation-trip utility achievable from the same origin location. The second line (48) says that, for a route (ℓ, d) where a non-negligible volume of drivers serve a dispatch trip, and where a non-negligible volume of drivers also serve a relocation trip, then the utility collected by a driver whose add-passenger disutility is exactly $x'_{(\ell, d)}$ who serves a dispatch-trip from ℓ to d is (approximately) no larger than the maximum relocation-trip utility achievable from the same origin location.

We proceed by analyzing two cases. In the first case, suppose that the volume of drivers at ℓ who serve a relocation trip is no larger than ϵ , i.e. $S_\ell - \sum_{d'} g'_{(\ell, d')} < \epsilon$.

In this case, since the realized dispatch trip volumes $g'_{(\ell, d)}$ cannot be larger than the optimal dispatch trip volumes $g^*_{(\ell, d)}$, we also have $S_\ell - \sum_{d'} g^*_{(\ell, d)} < \epsilon$. Recall that under the fluid optimal solution $(\mathbf{f}^*, \mathbf{g}^*, \mathbf{x}^*)$, the thresholds along each route (ℓ, d) depend only on the origin location ℓ , i.e. there is a threshold x^*_ℓ such that $x^*_{(\ell, d)} = x^*_\ell$, and the following equation holds:

$$\sum_d g^*_{(\ell, d)} = S_\ell \frac{x^*_\ell}{C},$$

where $\frac{x^*_\ell}{C}$ is the probability any driver from ℓ accepts a dispatch. Therefore,

$$\epsilon \geq S_\ell - \sum_d g^*_{(\ell, d)} \geq S_\ell - S_\ell \frac{x^*_\ell}{C}.$$

So,

$$x^*_\ell \geq C - \epsilon \frac{C}{S_\ell} \geq C - \sqrt{\epsilon} C,$$

where the final inequality follows from our assumption that $S_\ell \geq \sqrt{\epsilon}$.

Now we want to compare the optimal threshold to the chosen driver thresholds $x'_{(\ell, d)}$. Observe the total dispatch demand volume is larger than if every destination used the minimum threshold $\min_d x'_{(\ell, d)}$:

$$\sum_d g'_{(\ell, d)} \geq S_\ell \frac{\min_d x'_{(\ell, d)}}{C}.$$

By the same logic as above, we have

$$\min_d x'_{(\ell, d)} \geq C - \sqrt{\epsilon} C.$$

Therefore we have $|x'_{(\ell,d)} - x^*_{\ell}| \leq \sqrt{\epsilon}C$ for any route (ℓ, d) where $g^*_{(\ell,d)} > \epsilon$. Taking $\epsilon'' = \sqrt{\epsilon}C$ establishes the claimed result in the case where approximately every driver serves a dispatch trip.

In the next case, we consider the thresholds when a non-negligible fraction of drivers serve a relocation trip, i.e. where $S_{\ell} - \sum_d g'_{(\ell,d)} > \epsilon$. In this case, for any route (ℓ, d) where $g'_{(\ell,d)} > \epsilon$, the approximate incentive compatibility conditions (47) and (48) establish the following equality:

$$P_{(\ell,d)} - x'_{(\ell,d)} + \mathcal{Q}'(\ell, d, 0) + \delta' = \max_{d'} \mathcal{Q}'(\ell, d', 0),$$

where δ' is an error term smaller than ϵ . Now, the exact incentive compatibility conditions on $(\mathbf{f}^*, \mathbf{g}^*, \mathbf{x}^*)$ state the relationship

$$P_{(\ell,d)} - x^*_{(\ell,d)} + \mathcal{Q}^*(\ell, d, 0) = \max_{d'} \mathcal{Q}^*(\ell, d', 0)$$

holds. Combining the two equations, we have the difference between $x^*_{(\ell,d)}$ and $x'_{(\ell,d)}$ is bounded as follows:

$$|x^*_{(\ell,d)} - x'_{(\ell,d)}| \leq \delta' + |\mathcal{Q}'(\ell, d, 0) - \mathcal{Q}^*(\ell, d, 0)| + \left| \max_{d'} \mathcal{Q}'(\ell, d', 0) - \max_{d'} \mathcal{Q}^*(\ell, d, 0) \right| \leq \epsilon + 2(\epsilon' + \epsilon_{t+1}).$$

Taking $\epsilon'' = \epsilon + 2(\epsilon' + \epsilon_{t+1})$ shows the bound $|x^*_{(\ell,d)} - x'_{(\ell,d)}| \leq \epsilon''$, finishing the proof of Lemma 15. \square

We now finish the proof, by showing that both our backwards induction assumptions hold at time period t . First, we show that the ϵ -equilibrium strategy profile produces actions which have total welfare at most ϵ_t away from the optimal expected welfare, where ϵ_t goes to 0 as ϵ goes to 0.

We have already established that \mathbf{f}' are approximately optimal relocation trips with respect to the fluid dispatch trips \mathbf{g}^* . Lemma 15 shows that $(\mathbf{f}', \mathbf{g}', \mathbf{x}')$ is an approximately optimal fluid solution, when we additionally include the welfare from dispatch trips in the objective function. Indeed, the welfare from dispatch trips is a function of the dispatch trip volumes and the add-passenger disutility thresholds. We know that $\mathbf{g}' \approx \mathbf{g}^*$, and Lemma 15 establishes $\mathbf{x}' \approx \mathbf{x}^*$, so the welfare generated by dispatch trips at time t under $(\mathbf{f}', \mathbf{g}', \mathbf{x}')$ is approximately equal to the welfare generated by dispatch trips at time t under $(\mathbf{f}^*, \mathbf{g}^*, \mathbf{x}^*)$. From the backwards induction assumption, we know that from any time $t+1$ state, the drivers will achieve welfare that is at most ϵ_{t+1} away from the optimal welfare from that state. Therefore, it follows that the ϵ -equilibrium strategy which produces actions $(\mathbf{f}', \mathbf{g}', \mathbf{x}')$ achieves approximately optimal social welfare at time t .

It remains to establish our second backwards induction assumption, i.e. we need to establish that the expected utility of a driver positioned at a location ℓ , under the approximate equilibrium $(\mathbf{f}', \mathbf{g}', \mathbf{x}')$, is approximately equal to the partial derivative of the state-dependent welfare function. Recall $\mathcal{V}_t(\ell, \omega_t, \mathbf{S}_t)$ denotes the expected value for a driver of being positioned at ℓ , under scenario

ω_t , and supply-location vector \mathbf{S}_t . We characterize the value of being positioned at ℓ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{V}_t(\ell, \omega_t, \mathbf{S}_t) &= \sum_{d \in \mathcal{L}} \frac{g'_{(\ell, d)}}{S_\ell} \left(P_{(\ell, d)} - \frac{x'_{(\ell, d)}}{2} + \mathcal{Q}'(\ell, d, 0) \right) + \sum_{d \in \mathcal{L}} \frac{f'_{(\ell, d)} - g'_{(\ell, d)}}{S_\ell} \mathcal{Q}'(\ell, d, 0) \\
&\approx \sum_{d \in \mathcal{L}} \frac{g'_{(\ell, d)}}{S_\ell} \left(P_{(\ell, d)} - \frac{x'_{(\ell, d)}}{2} + \mathcal{Q}'(\ell, d, 0) \right) + \frac{S_\ell - \sum_d g'_{(\ell, d)}}{S_\ell} \left(\max_d \mathcal{Q}'(\ell, d, 0) \right) \\
&\approx \sum_{d \in \mathcal{L}} \frac{g^*_{(\ell, d)}}{S_\ell} \left(P_{(\ell, d)} - \frac{x^*_{(\ell, d)}}{2} + \mathcal{Q}^*(\ell, d, 0) \right) + \frac{S_\ell - \sum_d g^*_{(\ell, d)}}{S_\ell} \left(\max_d \mathcal{Q}^*(\ell, d, 0) \right) \\
&= \eta_\ell^* \\
&= \frac{\partial}{\partial S_\ell} \Phi_{\omega_t}(\mathbf{S}_t).
\end{aligned}$$

The first line is the definition of the expected utility for a driver positioned at ℓ , the second line follows because all but a negligible fraction of drivers who serve a relocation trip will serve an optimal relocation trip, the third line follows because we have established that the thresholds \mathbf{x}' , the dispatch trips \mathbf{g}' , and the relocation utilities \mathcal{Q}' , are all approximately equal to their exact-equilibrium counterparts, and the fourth and fifth lines follow from our earlier characterizations of the dual variables for the state dependent optimization problem (Lemma 3).

Therefore, there is an error term ϵ_t such that ϵ_t is an upper bound on the difference $|\mathcal{V}_t(\ell, \omega_t, \mathbf{S}_t) - \frac{\partial}{\partial S_\ell} \Phi_{\omega_t}(\mathbf{S}_t)|$, and such that ϵ_t goes to 0 as $\max(\epsilon, \epsilon_{t+1})$ goes to 0. This establishes our backwards induction assumption, and therefore finishes the proof of approximate welfare robustness in the fluid model.

C Approximate Welfare-Robustness Proof in the Two Level Model

C.1 Expected Welfare of a Strategy Profile in the Two Level Model

Let W_i^t denote the welfare generated in the action driver by i at time t . The welfare W_i^t differs from the driver reward R_i^t when driver i fulfils a dispatch in time t ; in this case, the rider collects utility equal to the difference between their value for the trip and the trip price. Let V_i^t be the value held by the rider whose dispatch driver i fulfils in time t , if any such rider exists. The welfare term W_i^t is defined as follows:

$$W_i^t = \begin{cases} R_i^t + (V_i^t - P_{(\ell, d)}^t) & \text{if } a_i^t = (\ell, d, 1), \\ R_i^t & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (49)$$

The total welfare generated by the marketplace is then the sum over welfare terms W_i^t for all drivers i and time periods t . In the context of the two-level model, where the number of riders and drivers scales with the population-size parameter k , we normalize the expected welfare by dividing by k , so that expected welfare terms are comparable across different population sizes.

Let $W_{\omega_t}(\mathbf{S}_t; \Pi)$ be the expected welfare-to-go given a strategy profile Π , a population size k , as a function of the market state (ω_t, \mathbf{S}_t) :

$$W_{\omega_t}(\mathbf{S}_t; \Pi, k) = \frac{1}{k} \mathbb{E}^\Pi \left[\sum_{i \in \mathcal{M}} \sum_{\tau=t}^T W_i^\tau \mid (\omega_t, \mathbf{S}_t) \right]. \quad (50)$$

Notice the expected welfare term $\Phi_{\omega_t}(\mathbf{S}_t; \Pi)$ implicitly depends on the population size parameter k , but we omit this dependence from the notation for convenience.

Recall that $\Phi_{\omega_t}(\mathbf{S}_t)$ denotes the optimal value of the state-dependent optimization problem given the state (ω_t, \mathbf{S}_t) , which corresponds to the optimal welfare achievable given the state (ω_t, \mathbf{S}_t) in the stochastic fluid model. The following Lemma states that the optimal fluid welfare is always an upper bound on the expected welfare in the two-level model.

Lemma 16. *Let Π be any strategy profile and consider any time t with state (ω_t, \mathbf{S}_t) . The optimal welfare from the state (ω_t, \mathbf{S}_t) in the fluid model is always larger than the expected welfare generated by Π in the two-level model, i.e.*

$$\Phi_{\omega_t}(\mathbf{S}_t) \geq W_{\omega_t}(\mathbf{S}_t; \Pi) \quad (51)$$

always holds.

C.2 Proof of Theorem 3

In this section we summarize the key steps we take to prove Theorem 3. We prove Theorem 3 by backwards induction on the time period. Fix a time period $t \in [T]$. For each $k \geq 1$ assume there exists an error term $\epsilon_{t+1}(k)$, converging to 0 as $k \rightarrow \infty$, such that the the following properties hold:

- For every market state $(\omega_{t+1}, \mathbf{S}_{t+1}) \in \mathcal{S}_{t+1}(\gamma)$, and any approximate equilibrium $\Pi \in \mathcal{P}^k$,

$$\Phi_{\omega_{t+1}}(\mathbf{S}_{t+1}) - W_{\omega_{t+1}}(\mathbf{S}_{t+1}; \Pi, k) \leq \epsilon_{t+1}(k).$$

- For any approximate equilibrium $\Pi \in \mathcal{P}^k$, at time $t+1$, every driver has expected utility-to-go that is close to the partial derivative of the fluid optimization function. Specifically, for any market state $(\omega_{t+1}, \mathbf{S}_{t+1})$ and any driver $i \in \mathcal{M}_{t+1}$ whose location is $\ell_i^{t+1} = \ell$, the following bound holds:

$$\left| \mathbb{E}^{\Pi}[U_i^{t+1} \mid \ell_i^{t+1} = \ell, (\omega_{t+1}, \mathbf{S}_{t+1})] - \frac{\partial}{\partial S_{\ell}} \Phi_{\omega_{t+1}}(\mathbf{S}_{t+1}) \right| \leq \epsilon_{t+1}(k). \quad (52)$$

Our proof technique is to convert the stochastic actions taken by a strategy profile Π to an approximate equilibrium fluid strategy. We proceed via a series of lemmas. The first Lemma shows that in an approximate equilibrium, drivers at the same location use approximately the same disutility acceptance thresholds. We provide the proof of Lemma 17 in Appendix C.3

Lemma 17. *There exists an error function $\delta(k) \geq 0$, converging to 0 as $k \rightarrow \infty$, such that the following is true: For any $k \geq 1$, any approximate equilibrium $\Pi \in \mathcal{P}^k$, and any market state $(\omega_t, \mathbf{S}_t) \in \mathcal{S}_t(\gamma)$, let $\mathbf{x}_i = (x_i^d : d \in \mathcal{L})$ be the disutility acceptance threshold used by each active driver $i \in \mathcal{M}_t$. Then for each location ℓ there exists a disutility threshold vector $\mathbf{x}_{\ell} = (x_{\ell,d} : d \in \mathcal{L})$ such that the disutility threshold vector used by every driver positioned at ℓ is at most $\delta(k)$ away from \mathbf{x}_{ℓ} , i.e.*

$$\max_{d \in \mathcal{L}} |x_i^d - x_{\ell,d}| \leq \delta(k), \quad \forall i \in \mathcal{M}_{t,\ell}. \quad (53)$$

Our next Lemma shows that the stochastic actions taken under equilibrium strategy profile Π concentrate towards the fluid actions which arise under the common disutility threshold established by Lemma 17.

For any $k \geq 1$, $\Pi \in \mathcal{P}^k$ and $(\omega_t, \mathbf{S}_t) \in \mathcal{S}_t(\gamma)$, let (\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{g}) encode the stochastic trip volumes that occur on each route. Recall that a_i^t is a random variable which corresponds to the action that each active driver $i \in \mathcal{M}_t$ takes in time period t . Define $g_{(\ell, d)}$ by

$$g_{(\ell, d)} = \frac{1}{k} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{M}_t} \mathbf{1}\{a_i^t = (\ell, d, 1)\}, \quad \forall (\ell, d) \in \mathcal{L}^2 \quad (54)$$

and $f_{(\ell, d)}$ by

$$f_{(\ell, d)} = g_{(\ell, d)} + \frac{1}{k} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{M}_t} \mathbf{1}\{a_i^t = (\ell, d, 0)\}. \quad \forall (\ell, d) \in \mathcal{L}^2 \quad (55)$$

Note that (\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{g}) are random variables that depend on stochastic dispatch demand, stochastic add-passenger disutilities, as well as the randomness inherent to the matching process.

We want to compare (\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{g}) to trips that arise in a fluid version of the strategy Π . Define a fluid strategy profile that produces a disutility threshold vector \mathbf{x} , where \mathbf{x} is the common disutility threshold vector whose existence is established by Lemma 17, and define the relocation distribution \mathbf{e} using the relocation destinations selected by all drivers in the population: For each destination d define

$$e_{(\ell, d)} = 1/|\mathcal{M}_{t, \ell}| \sum_{i \in \mathcal{M}_{t, \ell}} \mathbf{1}\{r_i = d\}$$

where r_i is the relocation destination selected by each driver i . Let $\bar{\mathbf{f}}, \bar{\mathbf{g}}$ be the fluid trip volumes that occur under the market state (ω_t, \mathbf{S}_t) and the fluid strategy (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{e}) .

Recall that $\mathbf{S}_{\omega_{t+1}}(\mathbf{f})$ is the stochastic time $t+1$ supply location vector, given the time t trips \mathbf{f} and a time $t+1$ scenario ω_{t+1} , and $\bar{\mathbf{S}}_{\omega_{t+1}}(\bar{\mathbf{f}})$ is the deterministic time $t+1$ supply location vector arising in the fluid model. The following Lemma states that $\mathbf{S}_{\omega_{t+1}}(\mathbf{f})$ is close to $\bar{\mathbf{S}}_{\omega_{t+1}}(\bar{\mathbf{f}})$ with high probability for large k . We provide the proof of Lemma 18 in Appendix C.4.

Lemma 18. *There exists an error function $\kappa(k) \geq 0$, and another function $q(k) \geq 0$, both converging to 0 as $k \rightarrow \infty$, such that the following is true: For any $k \geq 1$, any approximate equilibrium $\Pi \in \mathcal{P}^k$, and any market state $(\omega_t, \mathbf{S}_t) \in \mathcal{S}_t(\gamma)$, let (\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{g}) be the stochastic trip volumes and $(\bar{\mathbf{f}}, \bar{\mathbf{g}})$ be the fluid trip volumes as defined above. Then following inequalities holds:*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\|\mathbf{g} - \bar{\mathbf{g}}\|_1 \geq \kappa(k)) &\leq q(k), \\ \mathbb{P}(\|\mathbf{f} - \bar{\mathbf{f}}\|_1 \geq \kappa(k)) &\leq q(k), \\ \mathbb{P}(\|\mathbf{S}_{\omega_{t+1}}(\mathbf{f}) - \bar{\mathbf{S}}_{\omega_{t+1}}(\bar{\mathbf{f}})\|_1 \geq \kappa(k)) &\leq q(k). \end{aligned}$$

Our final lemma shows that $(\bar{\mathbf{f}}, \bar{\mathbf{g}}, \mathbf{x})$ corresponds to an approximate equilibrium in the fluid model. We defer the proof of Lemma 19 to Appendix C.5.

Lemma 19. *There exists an error function $\iota(k) \geq 0$, converging to 0 as $k \rightarrow \infty$, such that the following is true: For any $k \geq 1$, any approximate equilibrium $\Pi \in \mathcal{P}^k$, and any market state $(\omega_t, \mathbf{S}_t) \in \mathcal{S}_t(\gamma)$, let $(\bar{\mathbf{f}}, \bar{\mathbf{g}})$ be the fluid trip volumes associated with Π under the market state (ω_t, \mathbf{S}_t) , and let \mathbf{x} be the common disutility threshold that drivers use under Π , established in Lemma 17. Then $(\bar{\mathbf{f}}, \bar{\mathbf{g}}, \mathbf{x})$ corresponds to an $\iota(k)$ -approximate equilibrium for the fluid model.*

Lemma 18 and 19 are sufficient to conclude the proof of Theorem 3.

From the second part of Theorem 2 we know that there is an error function $\epsilon(k) \geq 0$ which converges to 0 as $k \rightarrow \infty$, such that the welfare achieved by $(\bar{\mathbf{f}}, \bar{\mathbf{g}}, \mathbf{x})$ in the fluid model is at most $\epsilon(k)$ off from the optimal welfare.

Next, observe a consequence of Lemma 18 is the expected welfare under Π converges to the welfare of the associated fluid strategy, and the expected utility of drivers at ℓ under Π converges to the expected utility of drivers at ℓ in the associated fluid strategy. That is, there exists an error function $\theta(k) \geq 0$ converging to 0 as $k \rightarrow \infty$ such that

$$|W_{\omega_t}(\mathbf{S}_t; \Pi, k) - \mathcal{W}_{\omega_t}(\bar{\mathbf{f}}, \bar{\mathbf{g}}, \mathbf{x})| \leq \theta(k),$$

and

$$\left| \mathbb{E}^\Pi[U_i^t \mid \ell_i^t = \ell, (\omega_t, \mathbf{S}_t)] - \frac{\partial}{\partial S_\ell} \Phi_{\omega_t}(\mathbf{S}_t) \right| \leq \theta(k)$$

holds for every $k \geq 1$, $\Pi \in \mathcal{P}^k$, $(\omega_t, \mathbf{S}_t) \in \mathcal{S}_t(\gamma)$.

The above inequality establishes the second part of our backwards induction assumption. The first part our backwards induction assumption also follows:

$$W_{\omega_t}(\mathbf{S}_t; \Pi, k) \geq \mathcal{W}_{\omega_t}(\bar{\mathbf{f}}, \bar{\mathbf{g}}, \mathbf{x}) - \theta(k) \geq \Phi_{\omega_t}(\mathbf{S}_t) - \epsilon(k) - \theta(k).$$

C.3 Proof of Lemma 17

Below is a restatement of Lemma 17.

Lemma. *There exists an error function $\delta(k) \geq 0$, converging to 0 as $k \rightarrow \infty$, such that the following is true: For any $k \geq 1$, any approximate equilibrium $\Pi \in \mathcal{P}^k$, and any market state $(\omega_t, \mathbf{S}_t) \in \mathcal{S}_t(\gamma)$, let $\mathbf{x}_i = (x_i^d : d \in \mathcal{L})$ be the disutility acceptance threshold used by each active driver $i \in \mathcal{M}_t$. Then for each location ℓ there exists a disutility threshold vector $\mathbf{x}_\ell = (x_{(\ell,d)} : d \in \mathcal{L})$ such that the disutility threshold vector used by every driver positioned at ℓ is at most $\delta(k)$ away from \mathbf{x}_ℓ , i.e.*

$$\max_{d \in \mathcal{L}} |x_i^d - x_{(\ell,d)}| \leq \delta(k), \quad \forall i \in \mathcal{M}_{t,\ell}.$$

Proof. Fix $k \geq 1$, let $\Pi \in \mathcal{P}^k$ be an α_k -equilibrium, and let $(\omega_t, \mathbf{S}_t) \in \mathcal{S}_t(\gamma)$ be any market state with less than γ total driver volume.

Consider any two drivers i and j positioned at the same location ℓ , and suppose there is some destination d for which driver i uses a lower acceptance threshold than driver j , i.e. $x_i^d < x_j^d$. Let $x \in (x_i^d, x_j^d)$ be a number in between the two thresholds and consider the following events:

1. Driver i is allocated a dispatch towards d and samples $X_i = x$ as their add-passenger disutility.
2. Driver j is allocated a dispatch towards d and samples $X_j = x$ as their add-passenger disutility.

In event 1, driver i rejects the dispatch towards d and drives empty towards their relocation destination r_i . The utility-to-go that driver i collects conditioned on event 1 is thus equal to

$$\mathbb{E}[U_i^t \mid d_i = d, X_i = x] = -c_{(\ell,r_i)} + \mathbb{E}[U_i^{t+1} \mid \ell_i^{t+1} = r_i]. \quad (56)$$

From the definition of Π being an approximate equilibrium, we know that conditioned on event 1 the alternate action of accepting the dispatch towards d can only increase driver i 's utility to go by at most α_k . This implies the inequality

$$-c_{(\ell,r_i)} + \mathbb{E}[U_i^{t+1} \mid \ell_i^{t+1} = r_i] + \alpha_k \geq P_{(\ell,d)} - x - c_{(\ell,d)} + \mathbb{E}[U_i^{t+1} \mid \ell_i^{t+1} = d]. \quad (57)$$

Let $Z = -c_{(\ell,d)} + \alpha_k - P_{(\ell,d)} + x + c_{(\ell,d)}$ be a temporary variable to track the non-utility to go terms from the above expression, so we have

$$Z + \mathbb{E}[U_i^{t+1} \mid \ell_i^{t+1} = r_i] \geq \mathbb{E}[U_i^{t+1} \mid \ell_i^{t+1} = d]. \quad (58)$$

From the backwards induction assumption (52), the time $t+1$ utilities are approximately functions of the locations and market state:

$$Z + \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\partial}{\partial S_{r_i}} \Phi_{\omega_{t+1}}(\mathbf{S}_{t+1}) + \epsilon_{t+1}(k) \mid \ell_i^{t+1} = r_i \right] \quad (59)$$

$$\geq Z + \mathbb{E} [U_i^{t+1} \mid \ell_i^{t+1} = r_i] \quad (60)$$

$$\geq \mathbb{E} [U_i^{t+1} \mid \ell_i^{t+1} = d] \quad (61)$$

$$\geq \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\partial}{\partial S_d} \Phi_{\omega_{t+1}}(\mathbf{S}_{t+1}) - \epsilon_{t+1}(k) \mid \ell_i^{t+1} = d \right]. \quad (62)$$

In the above, \mathbf{S}_{t+1} is the (stochastic) supply-location vector the time $t+1$, and $\epsilon(\omega_{t+1}, \mathbf{S}_{t+1})$ is the error term provided in the backwards induction assumption Assumption 3.

Next, Assumption 4 states that we can move from a conditional expectation to an unconditional expectation, at the cost of an error term β_k which converges to 0 as $k \rightarrow \infty$:

$$Z + \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\partial}{\partial S_{r_i}} \Phi_{\omega_{t+1}}(\mathbf{S}_{t+1}) - \frac{\partial}{\partial S_d} \Phi_{\omega_{t+1}}(\mathbf{S}_{t+1}) \right] + 2\epsilon_{t+1}(k) + \beta_k \geq 0. \quad (63)$$

In the second event, driver j accepts the dispatch and drives a passenger towards d . The utility to go that driver j collects conditioned on event 2 is equal to

$$\mathbb{E}[U_j^t \mid d_j = d, X_j = x] = P_{(\ell, d)} - x - c_{(\ell, d)} + \mathbb{E} [U_j^{t+1} \mid \ell_j^{t+1} = d].$$

From Π being an approximate equilibrium, we know that the utility of accepting the dispatch towards d is at most α_k short of the utility from any other action, in particular it is at most α_k short from the utility of taking a relocation trip towards driver i 's destination r_i . This implies the inequality

$$P_{(\ell, d)} - x - c_{(\ell, d)} + \mathbb{E} [U_j^{t+1} \mid \ell_j^{t+1} = d] + \alpha_k \geq -c_{(\ell, r_i)} + \mathbb{E} [U_j^{t+1} \mid \ell_j^{t+1} = r_i].$$

Following the same steps as before, we deduce the bound

$$Z' + \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\partial}{\partial S_d} \Phi_{\omega_{t+1}}(\mathbf{S}_{t+1}) - \frac{\partial}{\partial S_{r_i}} \Phi_{\omega_{t+1}}(\mathbf{S}_{t+1}) \right] + 2\epsilon_{t+1}(k) + \beta_k \geq 0, \quad (64)$$

where $Z' = -Z + 2\alpha_k$.

Now, recall the terms Z in equation (63) and Z' in equation (64) include an arbitrary disutility threshold x in between x_i^d and x_j^d . Let us now write $Z(x)$ and $Z'(x)$ to explicitly denote the dependence on x . Next, consider what happens when we add the equations (63) using the threshold $x = x_i^d$ and (64) using the threshold $x = x_j^d$. The partial derivative terms cancel, and we are left with

$$Z(x_i^d) + Z'(x_j^d) + 4\epsilon_{t+1}(k) + 2\beta_k \geq 0.$$

Observe that $Z(x_i^d) + Z'(x_j^d) = x_i^d - x_j^d + 2\alpha_k$. Therefore, we have

$$x_j^d - x_i^d \leq 2\alpha_k + 4\epsilon_{t+1}(k) + \beta_k.$$

Therefore, the Lemma holds by setting δ_k equal to the right hand side of the above equation and taking \mathbf{x}_ℓ to be the threshold vector \mathbf{x}_i used by any driver located at ℓ . \square

C.4 Proof of Lemma 18

Below is a restatement of Lemma 18.

Lemma. *There exists an error function $\kappa(k) \geq 0$, and another function $q(k) \geq 0$, both converging to 0 as $k \rightarrow \infty$, such that the following is true: For any $k \geq 1$, any approximate equilibrium $\Pi \in \mathcal{P}^k$, and any market state $(\omega_t, \mathbf{S}_t) \in \mathcal{S}_t(\gamma)$, let (\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{g}) be the stochastic trip volumes and $(\bar{\mathbf{f}}, \bar{\mathbf{g}})$ be the fluid trip volumes as defined above. Then following inequalities holds:*

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}(\|\mathbf{g} - \bar{\mathbf{g}}\|_1 \geq \kappa(k)) &\leq q(k), \\ \mathbb{P}(\|\mathbf{f} - \bar{\mathbf{f}}\|_1 \geq \kappa(k)) &\leq q(k), \\ \mathbb{P}(\|\mathbf{S}_{\omega_{t+1}}(\mathbf{f}) - \bar{\mathbf{S}}_{\omega_{t+1}}(\bar{\mathbf{f}})\|_1 \geq \kappa(k)) &\leq q(k).\end{aligned}$$

Proof. These bounds follow from the matching process concentration results discussed in Appendix E.

From Lemma ?? we have concentration functions $\epsilon_1(k)$, $q_1(k)$, with $\epsilon_1(k)/k \rightarrow 0$ and $q_1(k) \rightarrow 0$ as $k \rightarrow 0$, such that

$$\mathbb{P}(|G_{(\ell,d)} - \bar{G}_{(\ell,d)}| \geq \epsilon_1(k)) \leq q_1(k),$$

where $G_{(\ell,d)}$ and $\bar{G}_{(\ell,d)}$ are the unscaled number of dispatches and fluid dispatches along the route (ℓ, d) . Take $\kappa_1(k) = \epsilon_1(k)|\mathcal{L}|^2/k$, $p_1(k) = |\mathcal{L}|^2 q_1(k)$ and observe:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}(\|\mathbf{g} - \bar{\mathbf{g}}\|_1 \geq \kappa_1(k)) &\leq \sum_{(\ell,d)} \mathbb{P}(|g_{(\ell,d)} - \bar{g}_{(\ell,d)}| \geq \kappa_1(k)/|\mathcal{L}|^2) \\ &= \sum_{(\ell,d)} \mathbb{P}(|G_{(\ell,d)} - \bar{G}_{(\ell,d)}| \geq \epsilon_1(k)) \\ &\leq |\mathcal{L}|^2 q_1(k) = p_1(k)\end{aligned}$$

From Lemma 28 we have concentration functions $\epsilon_2(k)$, $q_2(k)$, with $\epsilon_2(k)/k \rightarrow 0$ and $q_2(k) \rightarrow 0$ as $k \rightarrow 0$, such that

$$\mathbb{P}(|H_{(\ell,d)} - \bar{H}_{(\ell,d)}| \geq \epsilon_2(k)) \leq q_2(k),$$

where $H_{(\ell,d)}$ is the number of relocation trips along (ℓ, d) . Take $\kappa_2(k) = \epsilon_2(k)|\mathcal{L}|^2/k$ and $p_2(k) = p_1(k) + |\mathcal{L}|^2 q_2(k)$ and observe:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}(\|\mathbf{f} - \bar{\mathbf{f}}\|_1 \geq \kappa_2(k)) &\leq \mathbb{P}(\|\mathbf{f} - \bar{\mathbf{f}}\|_1 \geq \kappa_2(k) \mid \|\mathbf{g} - \bar{\mathbf{g}}\|_1 \leq \kappa_1(k)) + \mathbb{P}(\|\mathbf{g} - \bar{\mathbf{g}}\|_1 \geq \kappa_1(k)) \\ &\leq \sum_{(\ell,d)} \mathbb{P}(|H_{(\ell,d)} - \bar{H}_{(\ell,d)}| \geq \epsilon_2(k)) + p_1(k) \\ &\leq |\mathcal{L}|^2 q_2(k) + p_1(k) = p_2(k).\end{aligned}$$

Finally, we observe that

$$\|\mathbf{S}_{\omega_{t+1}}(\mathbf{f}) - \bar{\mathbf{S}}_{\omega_{t+1}}(\bar{\mathbf{f}})\|_1 \leq \|\mathbf{f} - \bar{\mathbf{f}}\|_1 + \|\mathbf{M}_{\omega_{t+1}} - \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{\omega_{t+1}}\|_1$$

where $\mathbf{M}_{\omega_{t+1}}$ is the vector counting driver-entry at time $t+1$ under scenario ω_{t+1} . By Assumption 1 we have concentration functions $\epsilon_3(k)$ and $q_3(k)$ which bound the convergence of $\mathbf{M}_{\omega_{t+1}}$ to $\bar{\mathbf{M}}_{\omega_{t+1}}$. We define $\kappa_3(k) = \kappa_2(k) + \epsilon_3(k)|\mathcal{L}|^2/k$ and $p_3(k) = p_2(k) + |\mathcal{L}|q_3(k)$. □

C.5 Proof of Lemma 19

Below is a restatement of Lemma 19.

Lemma. *There exists an error function $\iota(k) \geq 0$, converging to 0 as $k \rightarrow \infty$, such that the following is true: For any $k \geq 1$, any approximate equilibrium $\Pi \in \mathcal{P}^k$, and any market state $(\omega_t, \mathbf{S}_t) \in \mathcal{S}_t(\gamma)$, let $(\bar{\mathbf{f}}, \bar{\mathbf{g}})$ be the fluid trip volumes associated with Π under the market state (ω_t, \mathbf{S}_t) , and let \mathbf{x} be the common disutility threshold that drivers use under Π , established in Lemma 17. Then $(\bar{\mathbf{f}}, \bar{\mathbf{g}}, \mathbf{x})$ corresponds to an $\iota(k)$ -approximate equilibrium for the fluid model.*

Proof. We outline the proof for Lemma 19. For any $k \geq 1$ and α_k -equilibrium Π , let Σ be the fluid strategy we associate with Π , which maps market states (ω_t, \mathbf{S}_t) to a disutility threshold vector \mathbf{x} that is approximately common to all drivers (see Lemma 17), and a relocation distribution \mathbf{e} which is derived from the population distribution of relocation destinations.

To show that Σ is an approximate equilibrium under the fluid model, it is sufficient to show that the continuation utility under the two-level model with strategy Π (which is approximately incentive compatible) is close to the continuation utility in the fluid model with strategy Σ . This can be accomplished by providing a bound

$$\left| \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\partial}{\partial S_\ell} \Phi_{\omega_{t+1}}(\mathbf{S}_{t+1}(\mathbf{f})) - \frac{\partial}{\partial S_\ell} \Phi_{\omega_{t+1}}(\bar{\mathbf{S}}_{t+1}(\bar{\mathbf{f}})) \right] \right| \leq \epsilon_k,$$

that holds uniformly in the market state and location ℓ , where the constant ϵ_k goes to 0 as $k \rightarrow \infty$. Approximate incentive compatibility conditions on Σ then follow from approximate incentive compatibility conditions on Π .

To provide this bound, recall that Lemma 3 establishes that the partial derivative $\frac{\partial}{\partial S_\ell} \Phi_{\omega_{t+1}}(\cdot)$ exists and is continuous. The space of supply-location vectors \mathbf{S} satisfying $\sum_\ell S_\ell \leq \gamma$ is compact, and a continuous function over a compact set is bounded. Let U be the maximum value.

Moreover, a continuous function over a compact set is uniformly continuous. Therefore, for every $\epsilon > 0$ there exists a $\delta(\epsilon) > 0$ such that, for any $\mathbf{S}_1, \mathbf{S}_2$ in $\mathcal{S}(\gamma)$ satisfying $\|\mathbf{S}_1 - \mathbf{S}_2\| \leq \delta$, we have $\left\| \frac{\partial}{\partial S_\ell} \Phi_{\omega_{t+1}}(\mathbf{S}_1) - \frac{\partial}{\partial S_\ell} \Phi_{\omega_{t+1}}(\mathbf{S}_2) \right\| \leq \epsilon$.

For any $\delta > 0$, define

$$\epsilon(\delta) = \max \left(\left\| \frac{\partial}{\partial S_\ell} \Phi_{\omega_{t+1}}(\mathbf{S}_1) - \frac{\partial}{\partial S_\ell} \Phi_{\omega_{t+1}}(\mathbf{S}_2) \right\| : \mathbf{S}_1, \mathbf{S}_2 \in \mathcal{S}(\gamma), \|\mathbf{S}_1 - \mathbf{S}_2\| \leq \delta \right).$$

Because the partial derivative $\frac{\partial}{\partial S_\ell} \Phi_{\omega_{t+1}}(\cdot)$ is uniformly continuous, the error term $\epsilon(\delta)$ goes to 0 as δ goes to 0.

Next, we use the fact from Lemma 18 that $\mathbf{S}_{\omega_{t+1}}(\mathbf{f})$ concentrates towards $\bar{\mathbf{S}}_{\omega_{t+1}}(\bar{\mathbf{f}})$. Let $\kappa(k)$, $q(k)$ be functions such that

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\|\mathbf{S}_{\omega_{t+1}}(\mathbf{f}) - \bar{\mathbf{S}}_{\omega_{t+1}}(\bar{\mathbf{f}})\|_1 \geq \kappa(k) \right) \leq q(k).$$

For simplicity, write $\mathbf{S} = \mathbf{S}_{\omega_{t+1}}(\mathbf{f})$, $\bar{\mathbf{S}} = \bar{\mathbf{S}}_{\omega_{t+1}}(\bar{\mathbf{f}})$, and $F(\mathbf{S}) = \frac{\partial}{\partial S_\ell} \Phi_{\omega_{t+1}}(\mathbf{S})$. We have:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[F(\mathbf{S}) - F(\bar{\mathbf{S}})] &\leq \mathbb{E}[F(\mathbf{S}) - F(\bar{\mathbf{S}}) \mid \|\mathbf{S} - \bar{\mathbf{S}}\| \leq \kappa_k] + Uq_k \\ &\leq \epsilon(\kappa_k) + U(1 - q_k). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore the term we needed to bound is uniformly bounded by a term $\epsilon(\kappa_k) + Uq_k$ which converges to 0 as $k \rightarrow \infty$, so incentive compatibility conditions on Σ follow from incentive compatibility conditions on Π . \square

D Partial Derivatives of the State-Dependent Optimization Problem

In this section we prove a number of results about the fluid optimization problem.

D.1 Proof of Lemma 1

Lemma. Consider the reward function $U_{(\ell,d,\omega_t)}$ associated with any route $(\ell,d) \in \mathcal{L}^2$ and any scenario ω_t . Assume the rider-value distribution $F_{(\ell,d,\omega_t)}$ satisfies Assumption 2. Then $U_{(\ell,d,\omega_t)}(g)$ is concave in g , is differentiable at every $g > 0$, and the derivative at each $g > 0$ satisfies:

$$\frac{d}{dg}U_{(\ell,d,\omega_t)}(g) = P_{(\ell,d,\omega_t)}(g).$$

Moreover, the fluid optimization problem (10) has a concave objective function for any market state.

Proof. Let us write the utility function as $U(f) = U_{(\ell,d,\omega_t)}(f)$. First, observe that the utility function can be equivalently written as the following equation

$$U(g) = \bar{D} \mathbb{E} \left[V \mathbf{1}_{\{V \geq F^{-1}\left(1 - \frac{g \wedge \bar{D}}{\bar{D}}\right)\}} \right], \quad (65)$$

where we write \bar{D} in place of $\bar{D}_{(\ell,d,\omega_t)}$, F to mean $F_{(\ell,d,\omega_t)}$, and $f \wedge \bar{D}$ to mean $\min(f, \bar{D})$. This characterization is justified by the following series of equalities:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[V \mathbf{1}_{\{V \geq F^{-1}\left(1 - \frac{g \wedge \bar{D}}{\bar{D}}\right)\}} \right] &= \mathbb{E} \left[V \mid V \geq F^{-1}\left(1 - \frac{g \wedge \bar{D}}{\bar{D}}\right) \right] \mathbb{P} \left(V \geq F^{-1}\left(1 - \frac{g \wedge \bar{D}}{\bar{D}}\right) \right) \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[V \mid V \geq F^{-1}\left(1 - \frac{g \wedge \bar{D}}{\bar{D}}\right) \right] \left(1 - F \left(F^{-1}\left(1 - \frac{g \wedge \bar{D}}{\bar{D}}\right) \right) \right) \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[V \mid V \geq F^{-1}\left(1 - \frac{g \wedge \bar{D}}{\bar{D}}\right) \right] \frac{g \wedge \bar{D}}{\bar{D}}. \end{aligned}$$

Next, recall that if X is a uniform $[0, 1]$ random variable then $F^{-1}(X)$ is a random variable with distribution function F . Using the fact that if X is uniform $[0, 1]$ then so too is $1 - X$, from the characterization (65) we have the following equalities:

$$\begin{aligned} U(g) &= \bar{D} \int_0^1 F^{-1}(u) \mathbf{1}_{\{F^{-1}(u) \geq F^{-1}\left(1 - \frac{g \wedge \bar{D}}{\bar{D}}\right)\}} du \\ &= \bar{D} \int_0^1 F^{-1}(1 - u) \mathbf{1}_{\{F^{-1}(1 - u) \geq F^{-1}\left(1 - \frac{g \wedge \bar{D}}{\bar{D}}\right)\}} du \\ &= \bar{D} \int_0^1 F^{-1}(1 - u) \mathbf{1}_{\{\frac{g \wedge \bar{D}}{\bar{D}} \geq u\}} du \\ &= \bar{D} \int_0^{\frac{g \wedge \bar{D}}{\bar{D}}} F^{-1}(1 - u) du. \end{aligned}$$

Now, fix any $0 < g < \bar{D}$ and consider the above expression. The assumption $g < \bar{D}$ means that the integral upper bound $\frac{g \wedge \bar{D}}{\bar{D}}$ is simply $\frac{g}{\bar{D}}$, and from the assumption that F^{-1} satisfies Assumption 2

we know that $F^{-1}(\cdot)$ is continuous. Hence, by the fundamental theorem of calculus the function $U(g)$ is differentiable at $0 < g < \bar{D}$, and using the chain rule we compute the derivative to be:

$$\frac{d}{dg}U(g) = \bar{D}F^{-1}\left(1 - \frac{g}{\bar{D}}\right) \frac{1}{\bar{D}} = F^{-1}\left(1 - \frac{g}{\bar{D}}\right).$$

Further, note that $U(g)$ is constant for $g \geq \bar{D}$, from which we conclude that $\frac{d}{dg}U(g) = 0$ for $g > \bar{D}$. Finally, we must establish existence of the derivative at the point $g = \bar{D}$. To this end, it suffices to show that limit of the partial derivatives from below $g = \bar{D}$ and from above $g = \bar{D}$ are equal. This fact follows from the second assertion in Assumption 2 which states that $F^{-1}(0) = 0$:

$$\lim_{g \uparrow \bar{D}} \frac{d}{dg}U(g) = \lim_{g \uparrow \bar{D}} F^{-1}\left(1 - \frac{g}{\bar{D}}\right) = 0 = \lim_{g \downarrow \bar{D}} \frac{d}{dg}U(g).$$

Thus, we have established the derivative $\frac{d}{dg}U(g)$ exists for all $g > 0$ and is equal to $P_{(\ell, d, \omega_t)}(g)$. Concavity of $U(\cdot)$ follows from the observation that this derivative is non-increasing in g .

To show that (10) we has a concave objective we have to show that the remaining terms in $\mathcal{W}_{\omega_t}(\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{g})$ are also concave. Well, clearly the linear costs are concave. And finally, the add-passenger disutility cost function $-A(\mathbf{g}^T \mathbf{1}_\ell, \mathbf{f}^T \mathbf{1}_\ell)$ is convex, from the equation (17) and Lemma 20. \square

Lemma 20. *Define*

$$f(x, y) = \begin{cases} \frac{y^2}{x} & \text{if } x > 0, \\ 0 & \text{if } x = 0. \end{cases}$$

Then f is convex over the domain $x, y \geq 0, y \leq x$.

Proof. Let (x_1, y_1) and (x_2, y_2) be two points in the domain of f , and let $\lambda \in [0, 1]$. We need to check

$$f(\lambda(x_1, y_1) + (1 - \lambda)(x_2, y_2)) \leq \lambda f(x_1, y_1) + (1 - \lambda)f(x_2, y_2).$$

Let's start with the case where x_1 and x_2 are both nonzero. In this case, the inequality we have to check is given by

$$\frac{(\lambda y_1 + (1 - \lambda)y_2)^2}{\lambda x_1 + (1 - \lambda)x_2} \leq \lambda \frac{y_1^2}{x_1} + (1 - \lambda) \frac{y_2^2}{x_2}.$$

We will verify this inequality by applying the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality. Define the following values:

$$u_1 = \frac{\lambda y_1}{\sqrt{\lambda x_1}} \quad u_2 = \frac{(1 - \lambda)y_2}{\sqrt{(1 - \lambda)x_2}} \quad v_1 = \sqrt{\lambda x_1} \quad v_2 = \sqrt{(1 - \lambda)x_2}.$$

The Cauchy-Schwarz inequality says $u^T v \leq \|u\| \|v\|$. Observe the following equalities:

$$\begin{aligned} (u^T v)^2 &= (\lambda y_1 + (1 - \lambda)y_2)^2, \\ \|v\|^2 &= \lambda x_1 + (1 - \lambda)x_2, \\ \|u\|^2 &= \lambda \frac{y_1^2}{x_1} + (1 - \lambda) \frac{y_2^2}{x_2}. \end{aligned}$$

Rearranging C-S we have

$$\frac{(u^T v)^2}{\|v\|^2} \leq \|u\|^2,$$

which implies the desired inequality holds, and hence f is convex whenever x_1 and x_2 are both nonzero.

The case where x_1 and x_2 are both zero is immediate. It remains to check the case where x_1 is nonzero and x_2 is 0. In this case, y_2 must also be zero, because of the constraint $y \leq x$. Therefore we have to verify

$$f(\lambda(x_1, y_1)) \leq \lambda f(x_1, y_1).$$

By inspection we see that $f(\lambda(x, y)) = \lambda f(x, y)$ is always satisfied, so f is convex in this case as well. \square

D.2 State-Dependent Optimization Problem

For clarity we restate the state-dependent optimization problem below. Fix a time period t and a scenario ω_t . The state-dependent optimization problem depends on a supply-location vector $\mathbf{S} = (S_\ell : \ell \in \mathcal{L})$ where each component $S_\ell \geq 0$ specifies the volume of active drivers at location ℓ . Active drivers at a location ℓ consist of drivers who took a trip destined towards ℓ at the previous time period $t - 1$, as well as new drivers who enter the market at location ℓ in the current time period t . The state-dependent optimization problem solves for the welfare-optimal trips in the current time period in the stochastic fluid model, given the market state specified by the scenario ω_t and the supply-location vector \mathbf{S} . We write $\Phi_{\omega_t}(\mathbf{S})$ to denote the value of the state-dependent optimization problem under the scenario ω_t as a function of the supply-location vector \mathbf{S} . The function $\Phi_{\omega_t}(\mathbf{S})$ is formally defined as the value of the following optimization problem:

$$\Phi_{\omega_t}(\mathbf{S}) \equiv \sup_{\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{g}} \mathcal{U}_{\omega_t}(\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{g}) + \mathbb{E}_{\omega_t} [\Phi_{\omega_{t+1}}(\mathbf{S}_{\omega_{t+1}}(\mathbf{f}))] \quad (66)$$

subject to

$$f_{(\ell, d)} \geq 0 \quad \forall (\ell, d) \in \mathcal{L}^2 \quad (67)$$

$$g_{(\ell, d)} \geq 0 \quad \forall (\ell, d) \in \mathcal{L}^2 \quad (68)$$

$$f_{(\ell, d)} \geq g_{(\ell, d)} \quad \forall (\ell, d) \in \mathcal{L}^2 \quad (69)$$

$$\sum_{d \in \mathcal{L}} f_{(\ell, d)} = S_\ell \quad \forall \ell \in \mathcal{L} \quad (70)$$

The decision variable $\mathbf{f} = (f_{(\ell, d)} : (\ell, d) \in \mathcal{L}^2)$ has components $f_{(\ell, d)}$ which specify the total trip volume along each route (ℓ, d) . By total trip volume we mean $f_{(\ell, d)}$ specifies the sum of the relocation-trip volume and the dispatch trip-volume. The decision variable $\mathbf{g} = (g_{(\ell, d)} : (\ell, d) \in \mathcal{L}^2)$ has components $g_{(\ell, d)}$ which specify the dispatch trip volume along each route (ℓ, d) .

The objective function is the sum of two functions: $\mathcal{U}_{\omega_t}(\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{g})$ specifies the welfare collected in the current time period t , and $\mathbb{E}_{\omega_t} [\Phi_{\omega_{t+1}}(\mathbf{S}_{\omega_{t+1}}(\mathbf{f}))]$ specifies the welfare to be collected in future time periods.

When $t = T$ is the final time period we just take $\mathbb{E}_{\omega_t} [\Phi_{\omega_{t+1}}(\mathbf{S}_{\omega_{t+1}}(\mathbf{f}))]$ to be 0. When $t < T$, we define $\mathbf{S}_{\omega_{t+1}}(\mathbf{f})$ to be the supply-location vector arising at time $t + 1$ under the trip volumes specified by \mathbf{f} and the future scenario ω_{t+1} . The expectation $\mathbb{E}_{\omega_t} [\cdot]$ is taken over all time $t + 1$ scenarios given the time t scenario ω_t . The function $\mathbf{S}_{\omega_{t+1}}(\mathbf{f})$ follows the convention that supply-location vectors include new drivers who enter the market in the relevant time period. Let us write $S_{\omega_{t+1}, \ell}(\mathbf{f})$ for the component of the supply-location vector $\mathbf{S}_{\omega_{t+1}}(\mathbf{f})$ corresponding to location ℓ .

$S_{\omega_{t+1},\ell}(\mathbf{f})$ is defined formally by the following equation

$$S_{\omega_{t+1},\ell}(\mathbf{f}) = \frac{1}{k} M_{\omega_{t+1},\ell} + \sum_{o \in \mathcal{L}} f_{(o,\ell)}, \quad (71)$$

where $M_{\omega_{t+1},\ell}$ is the volume of new drivers who enter the market at location ℓ under the scenario ω_{t+1} and the sum is over all routes whose destination location is ℓ .

The utility collected in the current time period is the difference between the rider value we generate by serving dispatches and the disutility that drivers incur. Since we assume the price is a transfer from riders to drivers the price does not appear explicitly in the objective function. The function $\mathcal{U}_{\omega_t}(\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{g})$ is formally defined by the following equation:

$$\mathcal{U}_{\omega_t}(\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{g}) = \sum_{(\ell,d) \in \mathcal{L}^2} U_{(\ell,d,\omega_t)}(g_{(\ell,d)}) - \left(\sum_{(\ell,d) \in \mathcal{L}^2} c_{(\ell,d)} f_{(\ell,d)} + \sum_{\ell} A(\mathbf{g}^T \mathbf{1}_{\ell}, \mathbf{f}^T \mathbf{1}_{\ell}) \right). \quad (72)$$

The function $U_{(\ell,d,\omega_t)}(g_{(\ell,d)})$ specifies the total rider value generated as a function of dispatch-trip volume along the route (ℓ, d) , the function $A(\mathbf{g}^T \mathbf{1}_{\ell}, \mathbf{f}^T \mathbf{1}_{\ell})$ specifies the total add-passenger disutility incurred by drivers located at ℓ , as a function of the volume of dispatch trips originating from ℓ , $\mathbf{g}^T \mathbf{1}_{\ell}$, and the total volume of available drivers located at ℓ , $\mathbf{f}^T \mathbf{1}_{\ell}$.

We take $\mathbf{1}_{\ell}$ to be an indicator vector indexed by pairs of locations, where the value corresponding to each $(\ell', d) \in \mathcal{L}^2$ is 1 if $\ell' = \ell$ and 0 otherwise. With this convention, the quantities $\mathbf{g}^T \mathbf{1}_{\ell}$ and $\mathbf{f}^T \mathbf{1}_{\ell}$ specify the volume of dispatch trips originating from ℓ and the total volume of trips originating from ℓ , respectively:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{g}^T \mathbf{1}_{\ell} &= \sum_{d \in \mathcal{L}} g_{(\ell,d)}, \\ \mathbf{f}^T \mathbf{1}_{\ell} &= \sum_{d \in \mathcal{L}} f_{(\ell,d)}. \end{aligned}$$

Assuming \mathbf{f} satisfies the flow-conservation constraint (70), the total trip volume originating from ℓ is equal to the total volume of supply positioned at ℓ :

$$\mathbf{f}^T \mathbf{1}_{\ell} = S_{\ell}.$$

D.3 Optimality Conditions

We now derive the Lagrangian optimality conditions for the state-dependent optimization problem (66). For succinctness, we use the following notation for the objective function:

$$\mathcal{W}_{\omega_t}(\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{g}) = \mathcal{U}_{\omega_t}(\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{g}) + \mathbb{E}_{\omega_t} [\Phi_{\omega_{t+1}}(\mathbf{S}_{\omega_{t+1}}(\mathbf{f}))]. \quad (73)$$

We begin by converting the optimization problem to a convex minimization problem where all inequality constraints have an upper bound of 0:

$$-\Phi_{\omega_t}(\mathbf{S}) \equiv \inf_{\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{g}} -\mathcal{W}_{\omega_t}(\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{g}) \quad (74)$$

subject to

$$-f_{(\ell,d)} \leq 0 \quad \forall (\ell, d) \in \mathcal{L}^2 \quad (75)$$

$$-g_{(\ell,d)} \leq 0 \quad \forall (\ell, d) \in \mathcal{L}^2 \quad (76)$$

$$g_{(\ell,d)} - f_{(\ell,d)} \leq 0 \quad \forall (\ell, d) \in \mathcal{L}^2 \quad (77)$$

$$\sum_{d \in \mathcal{L}} f_{(\ell,d)} - S_{\ell} = 0 \quad \forall \ell \in \mathcal{L} \quad (78)$$

We associate dual variables $\alpha_{(\ell,d)}$, $\beta_{(\ell,d)}$, $\gamma_{(\ell,d)}$ and η_ℓ with each of the constraints (75), (76), (77), (78), respectively. We will write $\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\gamma}, \boldsymbol{\eta}$ to indicate the vector of dual variables.

Since all we have done is changed the sign and direction of the objective function and algebraically rearranged the inequality constraint functions, the optimization problems (74) and (66) have the same set of optimal solutions.

We now obtain the Lagrangian function for the optimization problem (74):

$$\begin{aligned} L(\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{g}; \boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\gamma}, \boldsymbol{\eta}) = & -\mathcal{W}_{\omega_t}(\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{g}) + \sum_{(\ell,d)} [\gamma_{(\ell,d)}(g_{(\ell,d)} - f_{(\ell,d)}) - \alpha_{(\ell,d)}f_{(\ell,d)} - \beta_{(\ell,d)}g_{(\ell,d)}] \\ & + \sum_{\ell} \eta_{\ell} \left(\sum_d f_{(\ell,d)} - S_{\ell} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Because all of the constraints for the problem (74) are linear, and the primal problem (66) has a finite optimal solution, we know strong duality holds Lewis (2006). Therefore, a feasible solution (\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{g}) is optimal if and only if there exist feasible dual variables $\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\gamma}, \boldsymbol{\eta}$ for which the stationarity conditions and the complementary slackness conditions hold. For dual feasibility to hold the variables associated with inequality constraints must be nonnegative, that is the following inequalities must hold pointwise:

$$\boldsymbol{\alpha} \geq 0, \boldsymbol{\beta} \geq 0, \boldsymbol{\gamma} \geq 0.$$

The complementary slackness conditions are satisfied when the following equations hold for all origin-destination pairs $(\ell, d) \in \mathcal{L}^2$:

$$\alpha_{(\ell,d)}f_{(\ell,d)} = 0, \beta_{(\ell,d)}g_{(\ell,d)} = 0, \gamma_{(\ell,d)}(g_{(\ell,d)} - f_{(\ell,d)}) = 0,$$

that is the dual variables associated with inequality constraints must be 0 unless the corresponding inequality constraint is tight at the primal solution.

Finally, the stationarity conditions are satisfied when the primal solution (\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{g}) are a stationary point of the Lagrangian function when the dual variables are held fixed. Notice that when we hold the dual variables fixed the Lagrangian is a convex function of the primal solution, so a primal solution (\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{g}) is a stationary point if and only if 0 is a subgradient of the Lagrangian at (\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{g}) . We use the notation $\partial L(\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{g}; \boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\gamma}, \boldsymbol{\eta})$ to refer to the subgradient of the Lagrangian where the dual variables $\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\gamma}, \boldsymbol{\eta}$ are held fixed. The subgradient condition for a primal solution (\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{g}) to be a stationary point can thus be expressed as follows

$$0 \in \partial L(\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{g}; \boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\gamma}, \boldsymbol{\eta}).$$

We work in terms of the subgradient because the objective function $\mathcal{W}_{\omega_t}(\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{g})$ is not differentiable at coordinates where $f_{(\ell,d)} = 0$ or $g_{(\ell,d)} = 0$. However, we can use the following property (see Theorem 3.1.8 in Lewis (2006)) about general convex functions to obtain a stationarity condition in terms of the partial derivatives for the nonzero coordinates of \mathbf{f} and \mathbf{g} :

Lemma. *Let $h : \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ be a convex function and consider any point $x \in \mathbb{R}^m$ in its domain. Let $\partial h(x_0)$ be the subdifferential of h at x and assume the partial derivative $\frac{\partial}{\partial x_j} h(x)$ exists for some coordinate j . Then the j th component of every subgradient in the subdifferential of h at x is equal to the partial derivative of h at x . That is, for every $\phi \in \partial h(x)$ the equality $\phi_j = \frac{\partial}{\partial x_j} h(x)$ holds.*

Therefore, for any pair of locations (ℓ, d) where the objective function is differentiable with respect to $f_{(\ell,d)}$, the stationarity conditions require the following equality hold:

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial f_{(\ell,d)}} \mathcal{W}_{\omega_t}(\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{g}) = \eta_{\ell} - \alpha_{(\ell,d)} - \gamma_{(\ell,d)}. \quad (79)$$

And, for any pair of locations (ℓ, d) where the objective function is differentiable with respect to $g_{(\ell,d)}$, the stationarity conditions require the following equality hold:

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial g_{(\ell,d)}} \mathcal{W}_{\omega_t}(\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{g}) = \gamma_{(\ell,d)} - \beta_{(\ell,d)}. \quad (80)$$

D.4 Statement of Lemma 3

For the rest of this document we will focus on properties of the state-dependent optimization function (66). Recall the function $\Phi_{\omega_t}(\mathbf{S})$ gives the optimal value of the state-dependent optimization problem with respect to the time-scenario ω_t as a function of a supply-location vector \mathbf{S} . In this section we will show that the partial derivative $\frac{\partial}{\partial S_\ell} \Phi_{\omega_t}(\mathbf{S})$ exists for every location ℓ with a nonzero volume of drivers under \mathbf{S} .

First, let us introduce notation to refer to optimal primal and dual solutions of the state-dependent optimization problem. Let

$$F^*(\mathbf{S}) = \{(\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{g}) : \mathcal{W}_{\omega_t}(\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{g}) = \Phi_{\omega_t}(\mathbf{S}), (\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{g}) \text{ is feasible for (66) with respect to } \mathbf{S}\}$$

denote the set of primal optimal solutions as a function of the supply-location vector \mathbf{S} . Let

$$D^*(\mathbf{S}) = \{(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\gamma}, \boldsymbol{\eta}) : \exists(\mathbf{f}^*, \mathbf{g}^*) \in F^*(\mathbf{S}) \text{ such that } 0 \in \partial L(\mathbf{f}^*, \mathbf{g}^*; \boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\gamma}, \boldsymbol{\eta}), \boldsymbol{\alpha} \geq 0, \boldsymbol{\beta} \geq 0, \boldsymbol{\gamma} \geq 0\}$$

denote the set of dual optimal solutions as a function of the supply-location vector \mathbf{S} .

Our main result in this section is the following Lemma, which characterizes important properties about partial derivatives of the state-dependent optimization function. Below is a restatement of Lemma 3.

Lemma. *Fix a time-scenario ω_t and let $\mathbf{S} = (S_\ell \geq 0 : \ell \in \mathcal{L})$ be any supply-location vector. Pick any location ℓ for which the volume of supply at ℓ is nonzero under \mathbf{S} , i.e. $S_\ell > 0$.*

1. *For the state-dependent optimization problem (66) with respect to \mathbf{S} the value of any optimal dual variable associated with the flow conservation constraint (70) for location ℓ is unique. That is there exists a number η_ℓ^* such that $\eta_\ell = \eta_\ell^*$, where η_ℓ is the ℓ th component of $\boldsymbol{\eta}$ for any optimal dual variables $(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\gamma}, \boldsymbol{\eta}) \in D^*(\mathbf{S})$.*
2. *The state dependent optimization function $\Phi_{\omega_t}(\cdot)$ is differentiable with respect to S_ℓ at the supply location vector \mathbf{S} . Moreover, the partial derivative is equal to the value of the optimal dual variable for the flow conservation constraint at location ℓ :*

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial S_\ell} \Phi_{\omega_t}(\mathbf{S}) = \eta_\ell^*.$$

3. *The partial derivative $\frac{\partial}{\partial S_\ell} \Phi_{\omega_t}(\mathbf{S})$ is continuous at \mathbf{S} .*

Below, in Section D.5 we prove Lemma 3.

D.5 Proof of Lemma 3

We prove Lemma 3 by backwards induction on the time t . For the rest of this section we hold fixed a time-scenario ω_t , a supply-location vector $\mathbf{S} = (S_\ell : \ell \in \mathcal{L})$, and we fix a location $\ell \in \mathcal{L}$ for which the volume of supply at ℓ under \mathbf{S} is nonzero, i.e. $S_\ell > 0$.

Our backwards induction hypothesis states that the conclusion of Lemma 3 holds for all supply-location vectors at all time $t + 1$ scenarios. For clarity we formally state our backwards induction hypothesis in Assumption 3.

Assumption 3. When $t = T$ is the final time period then we make no assumption. When $t < T$, let ω_{t+1} be any time $t + 1$ scenario, let \mathbf{S}' be any supply location vector, and let ℓ' be any location for which the volume of supply at ℓ' under \mathbf{S}' is nonzero. Then Lemma 3 parts 1, 2, and 3 are true, with respect to ω_{t+1} , \mathbf{S}' and ℓ' .

In the following subsections we prove parts 1, 2, and 3 of Lemma 3 assuming the backwards induction hypothesis.

D.5.1 Proof of Part 1

Lemma 3 Part 1 claims that the optimal dual variable associated with the flow-conservation constraint for location ℓ is unique. We prove this claim by invoking Lemma 21 which states that the Lagrangian optimality conditions for the state-dependent optimization problem hold between any pair of primal and dual optima.

Specifically, let $(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\gamma}, \boldsymbol{\eta}), (\boldsymbol{\alpha}', \boldsymbol{\beta}', \boldsymbol{\gamma}', \boldsymbol{\eta}') \in D^*(\mathbf{S})$ be any pair of dual optima and let $(\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{g}) \in F^*(\mathbf{S})$ be any primal optimum. Lemma 21 states that the stationarity conditions and complementary slackness conditions hold between the primal optimum (\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{g}) and both dual optima $(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\gamma}, \boldsymbol{\eta}), (\boldsymbol{\alpha}', \boldsymbol{\beta}', \boldsymbol{\gamma}', \boldsymbol{\eta}')$.

We first consider the stationarity optimality conditions. From the assumption that location ℓ has nonzero supply-volume under \mathbf{S} , there must be a destination $d \in \mathcal{L}$ for which a nonzero volume of drivers traverse from ℓ to d under any feasible solution. In particular, consider a location d for which the $f_{(\ell,d)}$ component of the optimal solution (\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{g}) is nonzero.

Observe that under the backwards induction hypothesis, the objective function $\mathcal{W}_{\omega_t}(\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{g})$ is differentiable with respect to $f_{(\ell,d)}$ at the primal optimum (\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{g}) . Recall the objective function $\mathcal{W}_{\omega_t}(\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{g})$ is the sum of the current reward $\mathcal{U}_{\omega_t}(\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{g})$ and the future reward $\mathbb{E}_{\omega_t} [\Phi_{\omega_{t+1}}(\mathbf{S}_{\omega_{t+1}}(\mathbf{f}))]$. That the current reward $\mathcal{U}_{\omega_t}(\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{g})$ is differentiable with respect to any nonzero component of \mathbf{f} follows from Lemma 1. That the future reward is differentiable with respect to $f_{(\ell,d)}$ follows from the backward induction hypothesis. Specifically, for any time $t + 1$ scenario ω_{t+1} , there will be nonzero supply-volume at location d under the resulting time $t + 1$ supply-location vector, since there is a nonzero volume of drivers driving from ℓ to d . Therefore the state-dependent optimization function $\Phi_{\omega_{t+1}}(\mathbf{S}_{\omega_{t+1}}(\mathbf{f}))$ is differentiable with respect to the volume of supply at location d . Therefore, it follows from the chain rule that the partial derivative of the future reward exists and can be written as follows:

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial f_{(\ell,d)}} \mathbb{E}_{\omega_t} [\Phi_{\omega_{t+1}}(\mathbf{S}_{\omega_{t+1}}(\mathbf{f}))] = \mathbb{E}_{\omega_t} \left[\frac{\partial}{\partial S_d} \Phi_{\omega_{t+1}}(\mathbf{S}_{\omega_{t+1}}(\mathbf{f})) \right].$$

Having established differentiability of the objective function with respect to the $f_{(\ell,d)}$ variable, let's return to the stationarity optimality conditions. It follows from equation (79) that the stationarity conditions imply the following equality:

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial f_{(\ell,d)}} \mathcal{W}_{\omega_t}(\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{g}) = \eta_\ell - \alpha_{(\ell,d)} - \gamma_{(\ell,d)}.$$

The above equation gives us a useful characterization of the dual variable η_ℓ , whenever the supply-

volume S_ℓ is greater than 0:

$$\begin{aligned}
\eta_\ell &= \frac{1}{S_\ell} \sum_{d \in \mathcal{L}} f_{(\ell,d)} \left[\frac{\partial}{\partial f_{(\ell,d)}} \mathcal{W}_{\omega_t}(\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{g}) + \alpha_{(\ell,d)} + \gamma_{(\ell,d)} \right] \\
&= \frac{1}{S_\ell} \sum_{d \in \mathcal{L}} \left[f_{(\ell,d)} \frac{\partial}{\partial f_{(\ell,d)}} \mathcal{W}_{\omega_t}(\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{g}) + g_{(\ell,d)} \gamma_{(\ell,d)} \right] \\
&= \frac{1}{S_\ell} \sum_{d \in \mathcal{L}} \left[f_{(\ell,d)} \frac{\partial}{\partial f_{(\ell,d)}} \mathcal{W}_{\omega_t}(\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{g}) + g_{(\ell,d)} \frac{\partial}{\partial g_{(\ell,d)}} \mathcal{W}_{\omega_t}(\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{g}) \right] \tag{81}
\end{aligned}$$

For the remainder of this proof we consider two cases: in one case a nonzero volume of drivers traversing (ℓ, d) have no passenger, i.e. $g_{(\ell,d)} < f_{(\ell,d)}$; in the other case, we have all drivers traversing (ℓ, d) are carrying a passenger, i.e. $g_{(\ell,d)} = f_{(\ell,d)}$. In the first case, since the constraint $g_{(\ell,d)} \leq f_{(\ell,d)}$ is strict it follows from the complementary slackness conditions that dual variable associated with the constraint, $\gamma_{(\ell,d)}$, is 0. Similarly, since $f_{(\ell,d)}$ is nonzero, the dual variable associated with the nonnegativity constraint on $f_{(\ell,d)}$, that is $\alpha_{(\ell,d)}$, is 0. Therefore, the stationarity condition simplifies to the following:

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial f_{(\ell,d)}} \mathcal{W}_{\omega_t}(\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{g}) = \eta_\ell.$$

Since Lemma 21 states the optimality conditions hold between any pair of primal and dual optima, we can apply the same line of reasoning to our other dual solution and conclude

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial f_{(\ell,d)}} \mathcal{W}_{\omega_t}(\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{g}) = \eta'_\ell,$$

from which $\eta_\ell = \eta'_\ell$ follows.

In the second case where all drivers along (ℓ, d) have a passenger the dual variable $\gamma_{(\ell,d)}$ need not be 0, but equation (80) gives us the following characterization:

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial g_{(\ell,d)}} \mathcal{W}_{\omega_t}(\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{g}) = \gamma_{(\ell,d)} - \beta_{(\ell,d)}.$$

Note that the objective function only depends on \mathbf{g} for the current reward $\mathcal{U}_{\omega_t}(\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{g})$, and this is differentiable with respect to any nonzero component $g_{(\ell,d)}$. Further, $\beta_{(\ell,d)}$ is the dual variable associated with the nonnegativity constraint on $g_{(\ell,d)}$, and from the assumption that $g_{(\ell,d)} = f_{(\ell,d)}$ and $f_{(\ell,d)} > 0$ the complementary slackness conditions imply that $\beta_{(\ell,d)}$ is 0. Therefore we obtain the equality

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial f_{(\ell,d)}} \mathcal{W}_{\omega_t}(\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{g}) + \frac{\partial}{\partial g_{(\ell,d)}} \mathcal{W}_{\omega_t}(\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{g}) = \eta_\ell$$

and

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial f_{(\ell,d)}} \mathcal{W}_{\omega_t}(\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{g}) + \frac{\partial}{\partial g_{(\ell,d)}} \mathcal{W}_{\omega_t}(\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{g}) = \eta'_\ell$$

from which $\eta'_\ell = \eta_\ell$ follows.

D.5.2 Proof of Part 2

We give a high-level outline of the proof for part 2. We start by using Lemma 22, which considers the *value function* associated with an optimization problem, which gives the optimal value of an optimization problem as a function of the constraint vector. Lemma 22 shows that the set of

optimal dual variables for the optimization problem at a particular constraint vector is the same as the set of negative subgradients for the value function at that constraint vector.

The negative state-dependent optimization function $-\Phi_{\omega_t}(\mathbf{S})$ is similar to the value function considered by Lemma 22, except the state-dependent optimization problem has a mix of equality constraints and inequality constraints whereas the optimization problem considered in Lemma 22 only explicitly includes inequality constraints, and the supply-location vector \mathbf{S} that $-\Phi_{\omega_t}(\mathbf{S})$ takes as an argument only varies the bounds for the equality constraints.

To use the result of Lemma 22 in the context of our state-dependent optimization function we first rewrite the state-depnt optimization problem solely in terms of inequality constraints, where each equality constraint is replaced by two inequality constraints pointing in opposite directions. When the state-dependent optimization problem is written in this way it has the same structure as the optimization problem considered in Lemma 22, so we can associate a “value function” with the problem in the same manner as Lemma 22, and then the state-dependent optimization problem $-\Phi_{\omega_t}(\mathbf{S})$ is equivalent to this value function applied to a linear transformation of the supply-location vector \mathbf{S} .

Finally we invoke Lemma 23 which gives a version of the chain-rule that applies to subgradients. Invoking Lemma 23 tells us that a vector ϕ is a subgradient of $(-\Phi_{\omega_t})(\mathbf{S})$ if and only iff $\phi = -\boldsymbol{\eta}$, where $\boldsymbol{\eta}$ is the restriction of any optimal dual variable $(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\gamma}, \boldsymbol{\eta}) \in D^*(\mathbf{S})$ to the components associated with the flow-conservation equality constraints.

The conclusion of part 2 follows from the results of part 1, which states that there is a unique optimal dual variable for the flow-conservation constraint associated with location ℓ . It follows that there is a unique value for the ℓ th component of any subgradient for the negative state-dependent optimization function evaluated at \mathbf{S} . We know that a function is differentiable at a point when the subderivative of that function at that point is unique. Therefore, the partial derivative of the negative state-dependent value function with respect to the ℓ th component of the input vector exists and is equal to the negative dual variable associated with the ℓ th flow-conservation constraint. Taking negatives on both sides of the equality, we conclude $\frac{\partial}{\partial S_\ell} \Phi_{\omega_t}(\mathbf{S})$ exists and is equal to η_ℓ^* , as claimed.

D.5.3 Proof of Part 3

The final result left to establish for Lemma 3 is that the state-dependent optimization function has continuous partial derivatives at any location where the supply-location vector is nonzero. We prove this result by showing that, for any sequence of supply-location vectors converging to \mathbf{S} , the corresponding sequence of partial derivatives with respect to location ℓ converges to the partial derivative evaluated at \mathbf{S} .

Formally, let $(\mathbf{S}_k : k = 1, 2, \dots)$ be a sequence of supply-location vectors converging to \mathbf{S} , and assume without loss of generality that the ℓ th component of each iterate \mathbf{S}_k is nonzero. Having already established parts 1 and 2 of Lemma 3, we know the following:

- For the state-dependent optimization problem with respect to each supply-location vector \mathbf{S}_k there is a unique optimal dual variable associated with the flow-conservation constraint for location ℓ .
- The state-dependent optimization function evaluated at \mathbf{S}_k is partially differentiable in the direction ℓ , and the value of the partial derivative is equal to the optimal dual variable for the location ℓ flow-conservation constraint.

Let $\eta_\ell^*(\mathbf{S}_k)$ denote the optimal dual variable for the location ℓ flow-conservation constraint with respect to \mathbf{S}_k and let $\eta_\ell^*(\mathbf{S})$ denote the same optimal dual variable with respect to \mathbf{S} . We will

show that the partial derivative of the state-dependent optimization function is continuous at \mathbf{S} by showing that the sequence of optimal dual variables $(\eta_\ell^*(\mathbf{S}_k) : k = 1, 2, \dots)$ converges to $\eta_\ell^*(\mathbf{S})$, i.e.

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \eta_\ell^*(\mathbf{S}_k) = \eta_\ell^*(\mathbf{S}). \quad (82)$$

Our approach for establishing the equality in equation (82) is to use the Lagrangian optimality conditions to obtain an equivalent expression in terms of primal solutions. To obtain this equivalent expression that works in the space of primal solutions, we construct a function that takes as input a primal optimal solution and produces the value of the optimal dual variable for location ℓ as the output. Define $\mathcal{S} = \{\mathbf{S}_k : k = 1, 2, \dots\} \cup \{\mathbf{S}\}$ to be the set of all supply-location vectors in our sequence and the limiting supply-location vector to which they converge, and define

$$\mathcal{F} = \bigcup_{\mathbf{S}' \in \mathcal{S}} F^*(\mathbf{S}')$$

to be the set of all primal solutions that are optimal for some supply-location vector in \mathcal{S} .

We write $E_\ell : \mathcal{F} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ to denote our function that recovers the optimal dual variable associated with location ℓ from a primal optimal solution. For a primal optimal solution $(\mathbf{f}^*, \mathbf{g}^*) \in \mathcal{F}$, the exact definition of $E_\ell(\mathbf{f}^*, \mathbf{g}^*)$ will reflect the optimality conditions associated with a particular route (ℓ, d) . The choice of the destination location d will depend on which components of \mathbf{f}^* are nonzero. Specifically, order the locations in \mathcal{L} as d_1, d_2, \dots, d_n where $n = |\mathcal{L}|$, and let $i(\mathbf{f}^*) = i$ be the smallest index in $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ such that $f_{(\ell, d_i)}^*$ is nonzero. Note that by construction every supply-location vector in \mathcal{S} has nonzero volume on location ℓ , so every primal optimal solution $(\mathbf{f}^*, \mathbf{g}^*) \in \mathcal{F}$ always has at least one destination d for which $f_{(\ell, d)}^*$ is nonzero; in particular, the index $i(\mathbf{f}^*)$ is always well-defined.

Now, consider any sequence of optimal solutions $(\mathbf{f}_k^*, \mathbf{g}_k^*) \in F^*(\mathbf{S}_k)$ for $k \geq 1$, and observe the sequence $(\mathbf{f}_k^*, \mathbf{g}_k^*)$ is bounded, in particular there is a convergent subsequence $((\mathbf{f}_{k(i)}^*, \mathbf{g}_{k(i)}^*) : i \geq 1)$. Let $\mathbf{f}^*, \mathbf{g}^*$ be the limit point of this subsequence, and observe that $(\mathbf{f}^*, \mathbf{g}^*) \in F^*(\mathbf{S})$. Define the function $E_\ell(\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{g})$ as

$$E_\ell(\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{g}) = \frac{1}{S_\ell} \sum_{d \in \mathcal{L}} \left[f_{(\ell, d)} \frac{\partial}{\partial f_{(\ell, d)}} \mathcal{W}_{\omega_t}(\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{g}) + g_{(\ell, d)} \frac{\partial}{\partial g_{(\ell, d)}} \mathcal{W}_{\omega_t}(\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{g}) \right]$$

From the equation (81), we know that $\eta_\ell^*(\mathbf{S}')$ is equal to $E_\ell(\mathbf{f}^*, \mathbf{g}^*)$, if $(\mathbf{f}^*, \mathbf{g}^*) \in F^*(\mathbf{S}')$ for any $\mathbf{S}' \in \mathcal{F}$.

Observe that for i large enough, the convergent subsequence $((\mathbf{f}_{k(i)}^*, \mathbf{g}_{k(i)}^*) : i \geq 1)$ will be nonzero on the same components as $(\mathbf{f}^*, \mathbf{g}^*)$. Therefore

$$\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \eta_\ell^*(\mathbf{S}_{k(i)}) = \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} E_\ell(\mathbf{f}_{k(i)}^*, \mathbf{g}_{k(i)}^*) = E_\ell(\mathbf{f}^*, \mathbf{g}^*) = \eta_\ell^*(\mathbf{S}).$$

Also observe that the sequence of dual variables $(\eta_\ell^*(\mathbf{S}_k) : k \geq 1)$ is the same sequence as $(E_\ell(\mathbf{f}_k^*, \mathbf{g}_k^*) : k \geq 1)$. From the above equation it follows that every limit point is equal to $\eta_\ell^*(\mathbf{S})$. Since the sequence $(\eta_\ell^*(\mathbf{S}_k) : k \geq 1)$ is bounded and since there is a single limit point, it follows the sequence converges: $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \eta_\ell^*(\mathbf{S}_k) = \eta_\ell^*(\mathbf{S})$, finishing the proof.

D.5.4 Additional Lemma for Proof of Lemma 3

Lemma 21. *For any convex optimization problem the stationarity and complementary slackness conditions hold between any pair of primal and dual optima. In particular, for the state-dependent*

optimization problem (66) with respect to any scenario ω_t and supply location vector \mathbf{S} , if $(\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{g}) \in F^*(\mathbf{S})$ is any primal optimum and $(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\gamma}, \boldsymbol{\eta}) \in D^*(\mathbf{S})$ is any dual optimum then the stationarity conditions hold, i.e.

$$0 \in \partial L(\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{g}; \boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\gamma}, \boldsymbol{\eta}),$$

and the complementary slackness conditions hold, i.e.

$$\alpha_{(\ell,d)} f_{(\ell,d)} = 0, \quad \beta_{(\ell,d)} g_{(\ell,d)} = 0, \quad \gamma_{(\ell,d)} (g_{(\ell,d)} - f_{(\ell,d)}) = 0.$$

For the following lemma, consider the optimization problem

$$\inf_{x \in \mathbb{R}^m} \{f(x) \mid g(x) \leq 0\}, \quad (83)$$

where $f : \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is our objective function and $g : \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ is our constraint function. We assume that f and g_1, \dots, g_n are convex functions, where $g_j(x)$ is the j th component function of the multivariate constraint function g . The Lagrangian function $L : \mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R}_+^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is defined by

$$L(x, \lambda) = f(x) + \lambda^T g(x).$$

The dual function $\Gamma : \mathbb{R}_+^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is defined by

$$\Gamma(\lambda) = \inf_{x \in \mathbb{R}^m} L(x; \lambda).$$

The *value function* associated with the mathematical program (83) describes how the optimal value changes as we perturb the constraint vector away from 0. Formally, it is a function $v : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defined by the equation

$$v(b) = \inf_{x \in \mathbb{R}^m} \{f(x) \mid g(x) \leq b\}. \quad (84)$$

The problem (83) is said to have zero duality gap when strong duality holds, i.e. when the primal optimum is equal to the dual optimum, as described by the following equation:

$$\inf_{x \in \mathbb{R}^m} \{f(x) \mid g(x) \leq 0\} = \sup_{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_+^n} \Gamma(\lambda).$$

Any $\lambda^* \in \mathbb{R}_+^n$ which achieves the optimum on the right side of the above equation is said to be an optimal dual solution. The following lemma appears as Corollary 4.3.6 in Lewis (2006).

Lemma 22. *The mathematical program (83) has zero duality gap if and only if the value function v is lower semicontinuous at 0. In this case the set of dual optimal solutions is $-\partial v(0)$.*

In order to apply the result of Lemma 22 we also make use of the following result from Lewis (2006), which provides a chain rule for subdifferentials of convex functions composed with linear functions.

Lemma 23. *Let $f : \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a convex function and let $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ be a matrix. Then the following equality is satisfied for $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$:*

$$\partial(f \circ A)(x) = A^T \partial f(Ax).$$

D.6 Proof of Lemma 4

We re-state Lemma 4 below.

Lemma. *Let \mathbf{S} be a supply-location vector with nonnegative components and assume $S_\ell = 0$ for some location ℓ . Then the right-derivative $\frac{\partial}{\partial S_\ell} \Phi_{\omega_t}(\mathbf{S}^+)$ is well-defined at \mathbf{S} . Moreover, the partial derivative function $\frac{\partial}{\partial S_\ell} \Phi_{\omega_t}(\mathbf{S})$, defined in (22), is continuous over the set $\{\mathbf{S} \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{L}} : S_\ell \geq 0 \forall \ell \in \mathcal{L}\}$.*

Also, in the case where $S_\ell = 0$, there exists an optimal dual solution such that the dual variable η_ℓ associated with the ℓ th flow-conservation constraint is equal to the right derivative $\frac{\partial}{\partial S_\ell} \Phi_{\omega_t}(\mathbf{S}^+)$.

We prove Lemma 4 by characterizing optimal primal solutions to the state-dependent optimization problem, in the regime where there is an infinitesimal volume of drivers at ℓ .

We start by defining the continuation utilities associated with a primal solution. Let ω_t be any scenario, and let $\mathbf{f} = (f_{(\ell,d)} \geq 0 : (\ell,d) \in \mathcal{L}^2)$ be any flow vector. For a destination $d \in \mathcal{L}$ define the continuation utility associated with d and \mathbf{f} to be

$$U_d(\mathbf{f}) = \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\partial}{\partial S_d} \Phi_{\omega_{t+1}}(\bar{\mathbf{S}}_{\omega_{t+1}}(\mathbf{f})) \mid \omega_t \right]. \quad (85)$$

The following lemma states that the continuation utilities associated with optimal solutions to the state-dependent optimization problem all take the same value.

Lemma 24. *Let ω_t be any scenario and let \mathbf{S} be any feasible supply-location vector. Let $(\mathbf{f}_i, \mathbf{g}_i) \in F_{\omega_t}^*(\mathbf{S})$, for $i = 1, 2$, be any optimal solutions to the state-dependent optimization problem with respect to (ω_t, \mathbf{S}_t) . Then the continuation utilities under \mathbf{f}_1 and \mathbf{f}_2 are the same, i.e. $U_d(\mathbf{f}_1) = U_d(\mathbf{f}_2)$ for any choice of destination d .*

Lemma 24 follows from the optimality conditions, and the fact that complementary slackness holds between any pair of primal and dual optima.

Our next Lemma characterizes optimal solutions for the state-dependent optimization problem in the regime where there is an infinitesimal volume of drivers at ℓ .

Lemma 25. *Let ω_t be any scenario and let \mathbf{S} be any feasible supply-location vector. Assume $S_\ell = 0$ for some location ℓ . Let $(\mathbf{S}_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ be a sequence of feasible supply-location vectors converging to \mathbf{S} , such that each element of the sequence has a nonzero volume of drivers at ℓ , i.e. $S_\ell^n > 0$ for all n . Let $(\mathbf{f}_n^*, \mathbf{g}_n^*) \in F_{\omega_t}^*(\mathbf{S}_n)$ be an optimal primal solution for each n , and define*

$$\mathbf{f}_\ell^n = \frac{1}{S_\ell^n} \left(f_{n,(\ell,d)}^* : d \in \mathcal{L} \right) \quad \mathbf{g}_\ell^n = \frac{1}{S_\ell^n} \left(g_{n,(\ell,d)}^* : d \in \mathcal{L} \right)$$

to be the restriction of $(\mathbf{f}_n^, \mathbf{g}_n^*)$ to components that correspond to trips originating from ℓ , divided by the volume of drivers at ℓ under the n th iterate in the sequence. Then every limit point of the sequence $(\mathbf{f}_{\ell,n}, \mathbf{g}_{\ell,n})_{n=1}^\infty$ is an optimal solution to the following optimization problem:*

$$\sup \sum_{d \in \mathcal{L}} V_d g_d + \sum_{d \in \mathcal{L}} (U_d - c_{(\ell,d)}) f_d - A \left(\sum_{d \in \mathcal{L}} g_d, \sum_{d \in \mathcal{L}} f_d \right) \quad (86)$$

$$\text{such that } 0 \leq g_d \leq f_d \quad \forall d \in \mathcal{L}, \quad (87)$$

$$\sum_{d \in \mathcal{L}} f_d = 1. \quad (88)$$

In the above, V_d is to the maximum rider value held by riders requesting a trip from ℓ to d under ω_t , U_d is the continuation utility associated with each destination $d \in \mathcal{L}$ under an optimal solution for the limiting supply-location vector \mathbf{S} , and $A(\cdot, \cdot)$ is the add-passenger disutility cost function $A(g, f) = \frac{C}{2} \frac{g^2}{f}$.

Moreover, the optimization problem (86) has a unique optimal dual variable η_ℓ associated with the constraint (88), and the value of this dual variable is equal to the right-derivative limit $\frac{\partial}{\partial S_\ell} \Phi_{\omega_t}(\mathbf{S}^+)$.

Proof. We give a high-level outline for the proof of Lemma 25. First, a backwards induction argument lets us assume that the objective function of the original state-dependent optimization problem $\mathcal{W}_{\omega_t}(\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{g})$ has continuous right derivatives on the boundary of the feasible region (the backwards induction assumption applies to the future-period reward function $\Phi_{\omega_{t+1}}(\mathbf{S}_{\omega_{t+1}}(\mathbf{f}))$ which appears as a summand in the objective $\mathcal{W}_{\omega_t}(\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{g})$).

Next, by considering convergent subsequences, we can assume without loss of generality that the sequence of optimal solutions $(\mathbf{f}_n^*, \mathbf{g}_n^*)$, $n = 1, 2, \dots$, converges to some limit $(\mathbf{f}^*, \mathbf{g}^*)$, and by continuity of the objective function it follows that the limit point is optimal with respect to the limiting supply-location vector $(\mathbf{f}^*, \mathbf{g}^*) \in F_{\omega_t}^*(\mathbf{S})$.

Also by considering convergent subsequences, we can assume without loss of generality that the scaled sequence of points

$$\mathbf{f}_\ell^n = \frac{1}{S_\ell^n} \left(f_{n,(\ell,d)}^* : d \in \mathcal{L} \right) \quad \mathbf{g}_\ell^n = \frac{1}{S_\ell^n} \left(g_{n,(\ell,d)}^* : d \in \mathcal{L} \right)$$

converges to some limit $(\bar{\mathbf{f}}_\ell, \bar{\mathbf{g}}_\ell)$, and by virtue of the scaling it follows that this limit is a feasible solution for the linearized optimization problem (86).

Next, we consider the optimality conditions associated with each iterate in our sequence of supply-location vectors. Let η_ℓ^n be the dual variable associated with the ℓ th flow-conservation constraint, for the n th supply-location vector in our sequence. Since every iterate in our sequence has nonzero volume of drivers at ℓ , the dual variable η_ℓ^n is unique. Further, the characterization (81) of this dual variable yields the following expression:

$$\eta_\ell^n = \frac{1}{S_\ell^n} \sum_{d \in \mathcal{L}} \left[f_{(\ell,d)}^n \frac{\partial}{\partial f_{(\ell,d)}} \mathcal{W}_{\omega_t}(\mathbf{f}_n^*, \mathbf{g}_n^*) + g_{(\ell,d)}^n \frac{\partial}{\partial g_{(\ell,d)}} \mathcal{W}_{\omega_t}(\mathbf{f}_n^*, \mathbf{g}_n^*) \right].$$

Notice that the partial derivatives of the objective function have the following expressions:

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial f_{(\ell,d)}} \mathcal{W}_{\omega_t}(\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{g}) = -c_{(\ell,d)} + \frac{\partial}{\partial f_{(\ell,d)}} \mathcal{U}_{\omega_t}^{>t}(\mathbf{f}) - \frac{\partial}{\partial f_{(\ell,d)}} A(\mathbf{g}^T \mathbf{1}_\ell, \mathbf{f}^T \mathbf{1}_\ell),$$

and

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial g_{(\ell,d)}} \mathcal{W}_{\omega_t}(\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{g}) = \frac{d}{dg} U_{(\ell,d,\omega_t)}(g_{(\ell,d)}) - \frac{\partial}{\partial g_{(\ell,d)}} A(\mathbf{g}^T \mathbf{1}_\ell, \mathbf{f}^T \mathbf{1}_\ell).$$

Also, notice that the partial derivatives of the add-passenger disutility function have the following expressions:

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial f_{(\ell,d)}} A(\mathbf{g}^T \mathbf{1}_\ell, \mathbf{f}^T \mathbf{1}_\ell) = -\frac{C}{2} \left(\frac{\mathbf{g}^T \mathbf{1}_\ell}{\mathbf{f}^T \mathbf{1}_\ell} \right)^2 \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\partial}{\partial g_{(\ell,d)}} A(\mathbf{g}^T \mathbf{1}_\ell, \mathbf{f}^T \mathbf{1}_\ell) = C \frac{\mathbf{g}^T \mathbf{1}_\ell}{\mathbf{f}^T \mathbf{1}_\ell}.$$

Therefore, the partial derivatives of $A(\cdot, \cdot)$ are invariant to both of its arguments being scaled by the same multiple. In particular, we have the equality

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial f_{(\ell,d)}} A(\mathbf{g}_n^{*T} \mathbf{1}_\ell, \mathbf{f}_n^{*T} \mathbf{1}_\ell) = \frac{\partial}{\partial f_{(\ell,d)}} A\left(\frac{\mathbf{g}_n^{*T} \mathbf{1}_\ell}{S_\ell^n}, \frac{\mathbf{f}_n^{*T} \mathbf{1}_\ell}{S_\ell^n}\right) \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\partial}{\partial g_{(\ell,d)}} A(\mathbf{g}_n^{*T} \mathbf{1}_\ell, \mathbf{f}_n^{*T} \mathbf{1}_\ell) = \frac{\partial}{\partial g_{(\ell,d)}} A\left(\frac{\mathbf{g}_n^{*T} \mathbf{1}_\ell}{S_\ell^n}, \frac{\mathbf{f}_n^{*T} \mathbf{1}_\ell}{S_\ell^n}\right).$$

We can rewrite our expression for the optimal dual variable η_ℓ^n as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}\eta_\ell^n &= \sum_{d \in \mathcal{L}} \frac{f_{(\ell,d)}^n}{S_\ell^n} \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial f_{(\ell,d)}} \mathcal{U}_{\omega_t}^{>t}(\mathbf{f}_n^*) - c_{(\ell,d)} - \frac{\partial}{\partial f_{(\ell,d)}} A\left(\frac{\mathbf{g}_n^{*T} \mathbf{1}_\ell}{S_\ell^n}, \frac{\mathbf{f}_n^{*T} \mathbf{1}_\ell}{S_\ell^n}\right) \right) \\ &\quad + \sum_{d \in \mathcal{L}} \frac{f_{(\ell,d)}^n}{S_\ell^n} \left(\frac{d}{dg} U_{(\ell,d,\omega_t)}(g_{(\ell,d)}^n) - \frac{\partial}{\partial g_{(\ell,d)}} A\left(\frac{\mathbf{g}_n^{*T} \mathbf{1}_\ell}{S_\ell^n}, \frac{\mathbf{f}_n^{*T} \mathbf{1}_\ell}{S_\ell^n}\right) \right)\end{aligned}$$

We know that $(\mathbf{f}_n^*, \mathbf{g}_n^*)$ converges as $n \rightarrow \infty$, as does $\frac{f_{(\ell,d)}^n}{S_\ell^n}$ and $\frac{g_{(\ell,d)}^n}{S_\ell^n}$. Therefore the sequence of optimal dual variables converges to the following limit.

$$\begin{aligned}\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \eta_\ell^n &= \sum_{d \in \mathcal{L}} \bar{f}_{(\ell,d)} \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial f_{(\ell,d)}} \mathcal{U}_{\omega_t}^{>t}(\mathbf{f}^*) - c_{(\ell,d)} - \frac{\partial}{\partial f_{(\ell,d)}} A(\bar{\mathbf{g}}^T \mathbf{1}_\ell, \bar{\mathbf{f}}^T \mathbf{1}_\ell) \right) \\ &\quad + \sum_{d \in \mathcal{L}} \bar{g}_{(\ell,d)} \left(\frac{d}{dg} U_{(\ell,d,\omega_t)}(g_{(\ell,d)}^*) - \frac{\partial}{\partial g_{(\ell,d)}} A(\bar{\mathbf{g}}^T \mathbf{1}_\ell, \bar{\mathbf{f}}^T \mathbf{1}_\ell) \right).\end{aligned}$$

However, since \mathbf{g}^* is feasible for the limiting supply-location vector \mathbf{S} , we know

$$\frac{d}{dg} U_{(\ell,d,\omega_t)}(g_{(\ell,d)}^*) = \frac{d}{dg} U_{(\ell,d,\omega_t)}(0) = V_d,$$

where V_d is the maximum rider value for riders requesting from ℓ to d under ω_t . Also, since $(\mathbf{f}^*, \mathbf{g}^*)$ is an optimal solution with respect to \mathbf{S} , we have the partial derivative $\frac{\partial}{\partial f_{(\ell,d)}} \mathcal{U}_{\omega_t}^{>t}(\mathbf{f}^*)$ is equal to the optimal continuation utility U_d associated with d . Therefore, the limit of the sequence of dual variables, $\eta_\ell = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \eta_\ell^n$, is equal to

$$\begin{aligned}\eta_\ell &= \sum_{d \in \mathcal{L}} \bar{f}_{(\ell,d)} \left(U_d - c_{(\ell,d)} - \frac{\partial}{\partial f_{(\ell,d)}} A(\bar{\mathbf{g}}^T \mathbf{1}_\ell, \bar{\mathbf{f}}^T \mathbf{1}_\ell) \right) \\ &\quad + \sum_{d \in \mathcal{L}} \bar{g}_{(\ell,d)} \left(V_d - \frac{\partial}{\partial g_{(\ell,d)}} A(\bar{\mathbf{g}}^T \mathbf{1}_\ell, \bar{\mathbf{f}}^T \mathbf{1}_\ell) \right).\end{aligned}$$

Optimality of $(\bar{\mathbf{f}}, \bar{\mathbf{g}})$ and η_ℓ follow by using the above characterization of η_ℓ to show that $(\bar{\mathbf{f}}, \bar{\mathbf{g}})$ satisfies optimality conditions for the optimization problem (86). Finally, uniqueness of the dual variable η_ℓ follows from the same argument we used in Part one (appendix D.5.1) of the proof for Lemma 3. \square

Lemma 25 shows that the right-hand derivative limit $\frac{\partial}{\partial S_\ell} \Phi_{\omega_t}(\mathbf{S}^+)$ is well-defined when $S_\ell = 0$, and that every sequence of partial derivatives $\frac{\partial}{\partial S_\ell} \Phi_{\omega_t}(\mathbf{S}_n)$ with $S_\ell^n > 0$ converges to the same limit. To finish showing that the partial derivative function To finish proving Lemma 4 it suffices to show that sequences of right-hand derivatives $\frac{\partial}{\partial S_\ell} \Phi_{\omega_t}(\mathbf{S}_n^+)$ converge, for supply-location vectors \mathbf{S}_n^+ on the boundary of the feasible space, i.e. with $S_\ell^n = 0$.

Lemma 26 follows from analyzing the optimization problem (86) using the same logic as part three of our proof of Lemma 3.

Lemma 26. *Let $(\mathbf{S}_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ be a sequence of supply location vectors which converge to \mathbf{S} , all of which have 0 driver volume at ℓ , i.e. $S_\ell^n = 0$ for all n . Then $\frac{\partial}{\partial S_\ell} \Phi_{\omega_t}(\mathbf{S}_n^+)$ converges to $\frac{\partial}{\partial S_\ell} \Phi_{\omega_t}(\mathbf{S})$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.*

E Matching Process Details

We view the matching process as a generic procedure for allocating trips to available drivers. In general, we assume there is a stochastic matching process for the two-level model as well as a deterministic matching process for the fluid model. Our analysis holds for any matching process that satisfies three properties, stated informally below:

Assumption 4. 1. *The random trip-volumes produced by the stochastic two-level model matching process converge to their corresponding deterministic fluid trip-volumes as the population size parameter grows to infinity.*

2. *In the deterministic fluid matching process, the only way for the trip volume produced by the matching process along a route to be smaller than the optimal trip volume along that route is if the drivers are using an acceptance threshold smaller than the optimal acceptance threshold.*

3. *In the stochastic two-level model matching process, conditioning on the action taken by a single driver has negligible effect on the overall distribution of aggregate trip counts in the limit as the population size grows to infinity. Specifically, we assume there exists a sequence $(\beta_k)_{k=1}^{\infty}$ converging to 0 as $k \rightarrow \infty$ such that the conditional distribution $\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{S}_{t+1} \mid a_i^t)$ is at most β_k different from the unconditional distribution $\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{S}_{t+1})$, i.e. $|\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{S}_{t+1} \mid a_i^t) - \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{S}_{t+1})| \leq \beta_k$. We assume the sequence $(\beta_k)_{k=1}^{\infty}$ works for all initial states (ω_t, \mathbf{S}_t) and all driver strategy profiles.*

For completeness, we define one example of a matching process that the platform can use, and show that it satisfies properties 1 and 2 listed above. We conjecture that this process also satisfies 3, but have not yet verified this.

E.1 Example Matching Process Definition

The SSP matching process definition differs slightly between the fluid model and the two-level model, because granular rider and driver decisions which affect the dynamics of the matching process are stochastic in the two level model but deterministic in the fluid model.

In both cases the SSP matching process makes use of a subroutine which takes a collection of drivers and a collection of riders all heading towards the same destination, and allocates dispatches towards that destination until either no drivers or riders remain.

Definition 4. *The single destination dispatch subroutine in the fluid model is a procedure that takes as input a rider volume \bar{R} , driver volume \bar{M} , and a single disutility threshold x . The output is a number $\bar{G}(\bar{R}, \bar{M}, x)$ specifying the volume of dispatches that were accepted, and a number $\bar{U}(\bar{R}, \bar{M}, x)$ specifying the volume of drivers who were not allocated a dispatch in the process. The function definitions are stated below.*

$$\bar{G}(\bar{R}, \bar{M}, x) = \min(Z(\bar{R}, x), \bar{M}) \frac{x}{C}, \quad (89)$$

$$\bar{U}(\bar{R}, \bar{M}, x) = \bar{M} - \min(Z(\bar{R}, x), \bar{M}). \quad (90)$$

(Recall $Z(\bar{R}, x)$ is the volume of drivers (5) who need to be allocated a dispatch in order to see \bar{R} accepted dispatches given a disutility threshold x).

In the two level model it is a procedure that takes as input a number of riders R , a number of drivers M , and a choice of disutility thresholds x_1, \dots, x_M for each driver. The procedure allocates dispatches to riders until all rides have been served or no drivers remain. The output is a number of drivers G who accepted a dispatch, and a set $U \subseteq [M]$ of driver labels who were not allocated a dispatch in the process. The stochastic dynamics governing G and U are stated in Algorithm 1.

Algorithm 1: The Single Destination Dispatch Subroutine in the Two Level Model

1. Input: A number of dispatch requests R , a number of drivers M , a choice of disutility threshold x_i for each $i = 1, 2, \dots, M$.
 2. Randomly permute the driver labels: select a permutation $\pi : [M] \rightarrow [M]$ uniformly at random and define new labels $j = \pi(i)$.
 3. Initialize $G \leftarrow 0$, $U \leftarrow \{1, 2, \dots, M\}$.
 4. For $j = 1, 2, \dots, M$:
 - Allocate a dispatch to driver j .
 - Sample the accept/reject decision $\delta_j \sim \text{Ber}(x_j/C)$.
 - Record the decision: $R \leftarrow R - \delta_j$, $G \leftarrow G + \delta_j$.
 - Remove j from U : $U \leftarrow U \setminus \{j\}$.
 - If $R = 0$: go to step 5.
 5. Return G, U .
-

The SSP matching process, in both the fluid model and the two level model, uses the single destination dispatch subroutine in two separate stages. In the first stage, drivers are subdivided into groups, where there is one group for each destination, and group sizes are determined by the dispatch volumes and the disutility threshold from the optimal solution. The single destination subroutine is then used to allocate dispatches for each destination to drivers in the group associated with that destination. This is the first stage of the matching process. If any drivers remain undispached after the first stage, the second stage goes through the dispatch destinations one by one and it uses the single destination dispatch subroutine to allocate all remaining demand for that destination to all remaining drivers.

Notice that the disutility threshold associated with the optimal solution $(\mathbf{f}^*, \mathbf{g}^*)$ is the same for every destination d :

$$x_\ell^* = C \frac{\mathbf{g}^{*T} \mathbf{1}_\ell}{\mathbf{f}^{*T} \mathbf{1}_\ell}. \quad (91)$$

Let

$$Z_{(\ell,d)} = Z(g_{(\ell,d)}^*, x_\ell^*) = g_{(\ell,d)}^* \frac{x_\ell^*}{C} \quad (92)$$

be the volume of drivers we need to allocate a dispatch toward d in order to see $g_{(\ell,d)}^*$ accepted dispatches under the threshold x_ℓ^* . Observe

$$\sum_{d \in \mathcal{L}} Z_{(\ell,d)} = \sum_{d \in \mathcal{L}} Z(g_{(\ell,d)}^*, x_\ell^*) = \sum_{d \in \mathcal{L}} g_{(\ell,d)}^* \frac{C}{x_\ell^*} = \mathbf{f}^{*T} \mathbf{1}_\ell = S_\ell,$$

so the fractions $Z_{(\ell,d)}/S_\ell$ sum to 1 over all d . These fractions are used to determine the partition sizes in the first stage of the matching process.

Definition 5. *The matching process in the fluid model takes as input a market state (ω_t, \mathbf{S}_t) , a volume of requests \bar{R}_d for each destination d , a location ℓ , a volume of drivers \bar{M}_ℓ , and a disutility threshold vector $\mathbf{x}_\ell = (x_{(\ell,d)} : d \in \mathcal{L})$. It proceeds in two stages:*

Algorithm 2: The Matching Process in the Two Level Model

1. Input: A location ℓ , a number of dispatch requests $R_{(\ell,d)}$ for each destination d , a number of drivers M_ℓ , an add-passenger threshold vector $\mathbf{x}_i = (x_{(\ell,d)}^i : d \in \mathcal{L})$ for each driver $i = 1, 2, \dots, M_\ell$, the fluid optimal actions $(\mathbf{f}^*, \mathbf{g}^*, \mathbf{x}^*)$.
 2. Stage one:
 - (a) Compute partition sizes $Z_{(\ell,d)}^*$ for each destination d , using equation (92) with the fluid optimal trip volume $g_{(\ell,d)}^*$ and threshold x_ℓ^* .
 - (b) Partition the M_ℓ drivers into groups of size $M_{(\ell,d)}$, where each $M_{(\ell,d)}$ is rounded up or down from $Z_{(\ell,d)}^*$.
 - (c) Use the single-destination dispatch subroutine to allocate the $R_{(\ell,d)}$ dispatch requests to the $M_{(\ell,d)}$ drivers, for each destination d .
 - (d) Record the output from the single-destination dispatch subroutine: Let $G_{(\ell,d)}^{(1)}$ be the number of dispatch trips accepted and $U_{(\ell,d)}^{(1)}$ the number of drivers who were not allocated a trip.
 3. Stage two:
 - (a) Let $R_{(\ell,d)}^{(2)} = R_{(\ell,d)} - G_{(\ell,d)}^{(1)}$ be the number of riders who have not been matched to a driver at the end of the first stage.
 - (b) Let $M_\ell^{(2)} = \sum_d U_{(\ell,d)}^{(1)}$ be the number of drivers who were not allocated a dispatch at the end of the first stage.
 - (c) Pick an ordering of the destinations $d_1, d_2, \dots, d_{|\mathcal{L}|}$. For each destination $d = d_1, d_2, \dots, d_{|\mathcal{L}|}$:
 - Use the single-destination dispatch subroutine to allocate the $R_{(\ell,d)}^{(2)}$ dispatch requests to the $M_\ell^{(2)}$ remaining drivers.
 - Record the output from the single-destination dispatch subroutine: let $G_{(\ell,d)}^{(2)}$ be the number of dispatch trips accepted, and $U_{(\ell,d)}^{(2)}$ be the number of drivers who remain undispached.
 - Update the number of remaining drivers: set $M_\ell^{(2)} = U_{(\ell,d)}^{(2)}$.
-

1. In the first stage, it partitions the M_ℓ drivers into groups of size $\bar{M}_{(\ell,d)} = \frac{Z_{(\ell,d)}}{S_\ell} \bar{M}_\ell$ for each d . It uses the single destination dispatch subroutine for each d to allocate the \bar{R}_d dispatches to the $\bar{M}_{(\ell,d)}$ drivers. The first stage produces $\bar{G}_d^{(1)} = \bar{G}(\bar{R}_d, \bar{M}_{(\ell,d)}, x_{(\ell,d)})$ accepted dispatches towards each destination d , and $\bar{U}_d = \bar{U}(\bar{R}_d, \bar{M}_{(\ell,d)}, x_{(\ell,d)})$ drivers remain unallocated from each group d .
2. In the second stage the initial volume of drivers who were not allocated in the first stage is equal to $\bar{U}^{(0)} = \sum_{d \in \mathcal{L}} \bar{U}_d$. The matching process orders the locations d_1, \dots, d_L and it goes through the destinations and uses the single destination dispatch subroutine to allocate all remaining dispatches to the pool of unallocated drivers, until either all demand has been served or all drivers have been allocated. Specifically, for each destination $i = 1, 2, \dots, L$, it runs the single destination dispatch subroutine on $\bar{R}_d - \bar{G}_d^{(1)}$, $\bar{U}^{(i-1)}$, $x_{(\ell,d_i)}$, and it records $\bar{G}^{(2)} = \bar{G}(\bar{R}_d - \bar{G}_d^{(1)}, \bar{U}^{(i-1)}, x_{(\ell,d_i)})$ accepted dispatches and $\bar{U}^{(i)} = \bar{U}(\bar{R}_d - \bar{G}_d^{(1)}, \bar{U}^{(i-1)}, x_{(\ell,d_i)})$ remaining unallocated drivers.

The matching process in the two level model takes as input a market state (ω_t, \mathbf{S}_t) , a number of requests R_d for each destination d , a location ℓ , a number of drivers M_ℓ , and a disutility threshold vector $\mathbf{x}_i = (x_d^i : d \in \mathcal{L})$ for each driver $i = 1, 2, \dots, M_\ell$. It proceeds in two stages:

1. In the first stage, it partitions the M_ℓ drivers into groups of size $M_{(\ell,d)}$, which are either rounded up or down from $\frac{Z_{(\ell,d)}}{S_\ell} M_\ell$, for each d . The allocation of drivers to groups happens uniformly at random. It uses the single destination dispatch subroutine for each d to allocate the R_d dispatches to the $M_{(\ell,d)}$ drivers. The first stage produces $G_d^{(1)}$ accepted dispatches towards each destination d , and U_d is the set of driver indices which remain unallocated from each group d .
2. In the second stage the initial volume of drivers who were not allocated in the first stage is equal to $U^{(0)} = \cup_{d \in \mathcal{L}} U_d$. The matching process orders the locations d_1, \dots, d_L and it goes through the destinations and uses the single destination dispatch subroutine to allocates all remaining dispatches to the pool of unallocated drivers, until either all demand has been served or all drivers have been allocated. Specifically, for each destination $i = 1, 2, \dots, L$, it runs the single destination dispatch subroutine on $R_d - G_d^{(1)}$, $U^{(i-1)}$, and the thresholds x_d^i for $i \in U^{(i-1)}$. The output is $G^{(2)}$ accepted dispatches and $U^{(i)}$ is the index set of unallocated drivers.

Lemma 27. Let (ω_t, \mathbf{S}_t) be any market state, let $(\mathbf{f}^*, \mathbf{g}^*) \in F_{\omega_t}^*(\mathbf{S}_t)$ be a solution to the fluid optimization problem. Consider the fluid matching process which allocates all dispatch demand $(g_{(\ell,d)}^* : d \in \mathcal{L})$ originating from ℓ to all S_ℓ drivers positioned at ℓ . Let $\mathbf{x} = (x_{(\ell,d)} : d \in \mathcal{L})$ be any disutility threshold vector used by drivers at ℓ and let $\mathbf{g}_\ell = (g_{(\ell,d)} : d \in \mathcal{L})$ be the output of the matching process. Then $g_{(\ell,d)} < g_{(\ell,d)}^*$ implies $x_{(\ell,d)} < x_\ell^*$.

E.2 Matching Process Concentration Properties

In this section of the appendix we establish that the matching process satisfies good concentration properties as the population size goes to infinity. For ease of use in the analysis of our main algorithm, we establish concentration inequalities that hold uniformly across all relevant market states. Informally, the relevant market states are those in which approximately every agent uses approximately the same add-passenger disutilities. In addition, we require that the total number of drivers is no larger than a multiple of the population-size parameter.

To describe the relevant market states to which our concentration inequalities apply, fix a time period t and scenario ω_t . Let \mathcal{M} be an index set of all active drivers in the marketplace, and let \mathcal{M}_ℓ be the subset of drivers who are positioned at each location ℓ . For a driver $i \in \mathcal{M}_\ell$, we use $\mathbf{x}_i = (x_{(\ell,d)}^i : d \in \mathcal{L})$ to denote the add-passenger disutility threshold vector selected by driver i , and we use $r_i \in \mathcal{L}$ to denote the relocation destination selected by driver i , which is the destination towards which driver i will drive empty if they do not accept a dispatch trip. We use the term *driver-state* to mean the specification of add-passenger disutility threshold vector \mathbf{x}_i and relocation destination r_i for each driver $i \in \mathcal{M}_\ell$ for each location ℓ . At a location ℓ , we will use $\mathbf{r}_\ell = (r_{(\ell,d)} : d \in \mathcal{L})$ to mean the distribution of relocation destinations used by drivers positioned at ℓ . Each component $r_{(\ell,d)}$ is the probability a randomly selected driver from ℓ would have selected d as their relocation destination:

$$r_{(\ell,d)} = \frac{\sum_{i \in \mathcal{M}_\ell} \mathbf{1}\{r_i = d\}}{|\mathcal{M}_\ell|}.$$

To simplify notation we will use \mathcal{M} to refer to the set of driver indices, as well as their choice of disutility threshold and relocation destinations.

For each location ℓ let $\mathbf{x}_\ell = (x_{(\ell,d)} : d \in \mathcal{L})$ denote a common add-passenger threshold vector, potentially used by drivers at ℓ . For an error term $\epsilon > 0$, define

$$\mathcal{M}_\ell(\epsilon, \mathbf{x}_\ell) = \{i \in \mathcal{M}_\ell : \|\mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{x}_\ell\|_\infty < \epsilon\}$$

to be the subset of drivers positioned at ℓ whose threshold vector is no more than ϵ away from \mathbf{x}_ℓ in any component. Let $\mathbf{x} = (\mathbf{x}_\ell : \ell \in \mathcal{L})$ denote a common threshold vector for each location. For $\epsilon > 0$, define

$$\mathcal{M}(\epsilon, \mathbf{x}) = \bigcup_{\ell \in \mathcal{L}} \mathcal{M}_\ell(\epsilon, \mathbf{x}_\ell).$$

Definition 6. Let γ be any constant, and let $(\epsilon_k : k \geq 1)$ and $(\delta_k : k \geq 1)$ be nonnegative sequences which converge to 0 as $k \rightarrow \infty$. For any population-size $k \geq 1$ and any driver state \mathcal{M} , we say \mathcal{M} is permissible with respect to $\gamma, \epsilon_k, \delta_k$ if the following conditions are satisfied:

1. The total number of drivers is no larger than γk , i.e. $|\mathcal{M}| \leq \gamma k$.
2. There exists a common disutility threshold vector $\mathbf{x} = (\mathbf{x}_\ell : \ell \in \mathcal{L})$ such that the number of drivers who use a disutility threshold vector that is further than ϵ_k from \mathbf{x} is vanishingly small, relative to k :

$$\frac{|\mathcal{M} \setminus \mathcal{M}(\epsilon_k, \mathbf{x})|}{k} \leq \delta_k.$$

The concentration inequalities we provide in this section show that, when the matching process is applied to a driver state that is permissible with respect to $\gamma, \epsilon_k, \delta_k$, then with high probability, the difference between the stochastic output of the matching process and the corresponding fluid output is small.

We now describe what we mean by the fluid outcome associated with a particular driver state. Given population-size parameter $k \geq 1$, a driver state \mathcal{M} determines the supply-location vector \mathbf{S}_t by, in each component ℓ , taking the ratio between the total number of drivers at ℓ and k :

$$S_\ell = \frac{|\mathcal{M}_\ell|}{k}.$$

The market state (ω_t, \mathbf{S}_t) then determines the prices, $P_{(\ell, d)}$ for $(\ell, d) \in \mathcal{L}^2$, set by the SSP mechanism. The prices then determine the expected number of riders who request a dispatch:

$$\bar{R}_{(\ell, d)} = \mathbb{E}[D_{(\ell, d)}^k](1 - F_{(\ell, d)}(P_{(\ell, d)})),$$

where $D_{(\ell, d)}^k$ is the (stochastic) number of riders who are potentially interested in a dispatch from ℓ to d .

Definition 7. Fix a population-size parameter k and let \mathcal{M} be a driver-state that is permissible with respect to parameters $(\gamma, \epsilon_k, \delta_k)$. Let \mathbf{x} be the common disutility threshold vector used by approximately all drivers in \mathcal{M} (which exists from the second condition in the definition of permissible driver state, Definition 6). Let $\mathbf{r} = (\mathbf{r}_\ell : \ell \in \mathcal{L})$ denote the relocation distributions used by the population of drivers across each location.

The fluid outcome associated with \mathcal{M} , k , are, for each route (ℓ, d) , the dispatch trip volumes $\bar{G}_{(\ell, d)}$ and total trip volumes $\bar{F}_{(\ell, d)}$, which result from using the fluid matching process to allocate the dispatch demand volumes $\bar{R}_{(\ell, d)}$, along each route (ℓ, d) , assuming $|\mathcal{M}_\ell|$ drivers are positioned at each location ℓ , and the drivers at ℓ use disutility threshold vector \mathbf{x}_ℓ and relocation-trip distribution \mathbf{r}_ℓ .

We also define $\bar{f}_{(\ell, d)} = \frac{\bar{F}_{(\ell, d)}}{k}$ and $\bar{g}_{(\ell, d)} = \frac{\bar{G}_{(\ell, d)}}{k}$ to be the fluid outcome, normalized by the population size k .

To summarize, a permissible driver state \mathcal{M} and a population-size parameter k induce both a deterministic fluid trip specification, denoted by dispatch trip volumes $\bar{G}_{(\ell, d)}$ and total trip volumes $\bar{F}_{(\ell, d)}$, for each route (ℓ, d) , and stochastic trip specifications, denoted by dispatch trip volumes $G_{(\ell, d)}$ and total trip volumes $F_{(\ell, d)}$, for each (ℓ, d) . The stochastic procedure governing $G_{(\ell, d)}$ and $F_{(\ell, d)}$ is described in Algorithm 2, and the deterministic procedure governing $\bar{G}_{(\ell, d)}$ and $\bar{F}_{(\ell, d)}$ is described in Definition 5. We will use \mathbf{F} , \mathbf{G} , $\bar{\mathbf{F}}$, $\bar{\mathbf{G}}$, to mean the corresponding vectors of trip counts (the vectors are indexed by routes $(\ell, d) \in \mathcal{L}^2$).

Also, define $H_{(\ell, d)} = F_{(\ell, d)} - G_{(\ell, d)}$ to mean the (stochastic) total number of relocation trips along (ℓ, d) , and define $\bar{H}_{(\ell, d)} = \bar{F}_{(\ell, d)} - \bar{G}_{(\ell, d)}$ to mean the deterministic fluid number of relocation trips along (ℓ, d) . Let \mathbf{H} be the vector with components $H_{(\ell, d)}$ for each $(\ell, d) \in \mathcal{L}^2$ and let $\bar{\mathbf{H}}$ be the vector with components $\bar{H}_{(\ell, d)}$ for each $(\ell, d) \in \mathcal{L}^2$.

For each $k \geq 1$, let \mathcal{D}_k be the set of driver states \mathcal{M} that are permissible with respect to $(\gamma, \epsilon_k, \delta_k)$ when the population-size parameter is k . The main concentration lemma that we prove in this section is stated below:

Lemma 28. *There exist nonnegative sequences $(\alpha_k : k \geq 1)$ and $(q_k : k \geq 1)$, both converging to 0 as $k \rightarrow \infty$, such that the following equation is true for every k :*

$$\sup_{\mathcal{M} \in \mathcal{D}_k} \mathbb{P} \left(\frac{1}{k} (\|\mathbf{H} - \bar{\mathbf{H}}\|_1 + \|\mathbf{G} - \bar{\mathbf{G}}\|_1) \leq \alpha_k \right) \geq 1 - q_k. \quad (93)$$

In the above equation, it is understood that the trip specifications \mathbf{H} , \mathbf{G} , $\bar{\mathbf{H}}$, $\bar{\mathbf{G}}$ are those which arise from the driver state \mathcal{M} and the population-size parameter k .

Proof. We give a brief summary of the proof of Lemma 28, the details of which are contained in the Lemmas below.

Observe that the outcome of the matching process, i.e. the vector \mathbf{G} , is the sum of two vectors $\mathbf{G} = \mathbf{G}_1 + \mathbf{G}_2$ where \mathbf{G}_1 encodes the output from the first stage of the matching process and \mathbf{G}_2 encodes the output from the second stage. We analyze the convergence of \mathbf{G}_1 and \mathbf{G}_2 separately.

Lemma 31 provides an asymptotic concentration result for the output of the single-destination dispatch procedure with deterministic inputs, which we use to deduce that \mathbf{G}_1 converges asymptotically to $\bar{\mathbf{G}}_1$. Next, Lemma 32 provides asymptotic concentration for the single-destination dispatch procedure with inputs that have small stochastic perturbations. These small stochastic perturbations correspond to the second stage of the matching process, and are used to show that \mathbf{G}_2 converges to $\bar{\mathbf{G}}_2$.

Finally, Lemma 33 shows that the remaining undispached drivers, i.e. the trips encoded by \mathbf{H} , converge to the deterministic fluid approximation $\bar{\mathbf{H}}$. \square

Before proving Lemma 28, we provide a number of Lemmas that help us analyze the different components of the matching process. The following Lemma follows from standard concentration inequalities for sub-Gaussian random variables.

Lemma 29. *Let \mathcal{I} be an arbitrary index set and let $\gamma > 0$ be a constant. For each $k \geq 1$ and $i \in \mathcal{I}$, let $X_{k,i}$ be a Binomial random variable and let $R_{k,i}$ be a constant no larger than γk . Let $Z_{k,i} = \min(R_{k,i}, X_{k,i})$ and let $\bar{Z}_{k,i} = \min(R_{k,i}, \mathbb{E}[X_{k,i}])$. Then there exists concentration functions $\epsilon(k)$, $q(k)$ such that*

$$\sup_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \mathbb{P}(|Z_{k,i} - \bar{Z}_{k,i}| \geq \epsilon(k)) \leq q(k). \quad (94)$$

Lemma 30. *Moreover, for each k and i let $Y_{k,i}$ have a negative binomial distribution, let $M_{k,i}$ be a constant no larger than γk . Define $Z_{k,i} = \min(Y_{k,i}, M_{k,i})$ and $\bar{Z}_{k,i} = \min(\mathbb{E}[Y_{k,i}], M_{k,i})$. Then there exist concentration functions $\epsilon(k)$, $q(k)$ such that*

$$\sup_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \mathbb{P}(|Z_{k,i} - \bar{Z}_{k,i}| \geq \epsilon(k)) \leq q(k). \quad (95)$$

Next, we analyze asymptotic convergence of the single destination dispatch subroutine.

For a population-size parameter value k , consider the single destination dispatch subroutine with R riders and M drivers, both of which are smaller than γk . Assume that, except for a subset of size at most $k\delta_k$ drivers, each driver has probability of accepting a dispatch no more than ϵ_k away from some constant p .

Let G and U be random variables counting the number of accepted dispatches, and the number of undispached drivers, respectively. Let \bar{G} and \bar{U} be the volume of accepted dispatches and undispached drivers from the fluid matching process, with R riders, M drivers, and acceptance probability p .

Lemma 31. *There exists sequences of nonnegative numbers, $(\alpha_k : k \geq 1)$ and $(q_k : k \geq 1)$, both of which converge to 0 as $k \rightarrow \infty$, such that the following statement is true for every k :*

$$\sup_{M \leq \gamma k, R \leq \gamma k, p \in [0,1]} \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{1}{k}|G - \bar{G}| \leq \alpha_k\right) \geq 1 - q_k \quad (96)$$

$$\sup_{M \leq \gamma k, R \leq \gamma k, p \in [0,1]} \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{1}{k}|U - \bar{U}| \leq \alpha_k\right) \geq 1 - q_k. \quad (97)$$

In the above equations, it is understood that G and \bar{G} are the stochastic and fluid number of accepted dispatches from the single-destination dispatch subroutine with M drivers, R riders, and, except for a subset of size at most $k\delta_k$ drivers, drivers use an acceptance probability within ϵ_k of p . Similarly, it is understood that U and \bar{U} are the stochastic and fluid number of remaining undispached drivers.

We defer the proof of Lemma 31 to Appendix E.3.

Our next Lemma proves asymptotic convergence when the single-destination dispatch subroutine is called twice, where the number of riders and drivers remaining unmatched in the first call are used as input for the second call to the procedure. We consider a situation where the input parameters for the single-destination dispatch subroutine are stochastically perturbed by a random variable which satisfies asymptotic concentration properties. We show the conclusion of Lemma 31 still hold despite this stochastic perturbation.

Specifically, for each $k \geq 1$, let \mathcal{I}_k be a set of tuples of random variables $(X, Y) \in \mathcal{I}_k$, with deterministic fluid approximations (\bar{X}, \bar{Y}) , such that the following concentration property is satisfied:

$$\sup_{(X, Y) \in \mathcal{I}_k} \mathbb{P} \left(\frac{1}{k} (|X - \bar{X}| + |Y - \bar{Y}|) \leq \alpha_k \right) \geq 1 - q_k, \quad (98)$$

$$(99)$$

where $(\alpha_k : k \geq 1)$ and $(q_k : k \geq 1)$ are nonnegative sequences which converge to 0 as $k \rightarrow \infty$.

Our next Lemma analyzes convergence of the single-destination dispatch subroutine when the initial number of drivers and riders are perturbed by subtracting X and Y . Let G and U be the stochastic output from when the single-destination dispatch subroutine when $M - X$ is the initial number of drivers and $R - Y$ is the initial number of drivers. Let \bar{G} and \bar{U} be the fluid number of drivers when the initial driver volume is $M - \bar{X}$ and the initial rider volume is $R - \bar{Y}$. We show that G and U converge asymptotically to \bar{G} and \bar{U} , assuming that X and Y satisfy the concentration property (98).

Lemma 32. *For each $k \geq 1$, let \mathcal{I}_k be a set of tuples of nonnegative random variables $(X, Y) \in \mathcal{I}_k$, with deterministic fluid approximations (\bar{X}, \bar{Y}) , which satisfy the asymptotic concentration property (98). Let (M, R, p) be any constants satisfying $M \leq \gamma k$, $R \leq \gamma k$, and $p \in [0, 1]$. Let G be the number of dispatches and U the number of remaining drivers, when the single-destination dispatch subroutine (1) is used to allocate $R - Y$ dispatch requests to $M - X$ drivers, assuming that, except for a subset of size at most $k\delta_k$ drivers, drivers use an acceptance probability within ϵ_k of p . Let \bar{G} and \bar{U} be the output of the fluid subroutine when $R - \bar{Y}$ riders are allocated to $M - \bar{X}$ drivers. Then G converges asymptotically to \bar{G} and U converges asymptotically to \bar{U} , in the sense that the following equation holds for all $k \geq 1$:*

$$\sup_{M \leq \gamma k, R \leq \gamma k, p \in [0, 1], (X, Y) \in \mathcal{I}_k} \mathbb{P} \left(\frac{1}{k} |G - \bar{G}| \leq \beta_k \right) \geq 1 - p_k \quad (100)$$

$$\sup_{M \leq \gamma k, R \leq \gamma k, p \in [0, 1], (X, Y) \in \mathcal{I}_k} \mathbb{P} \left(\frac{1}{k} |U - \bar{U}| \leq \beta_k \right) \geq 1 - p_k, \quad (101)$$

where $(\beta_k : k \geq 1)$ and $(p_k : k \geq 1)$ are nonnegative sequences which converge to 0 as $k \rightarrow \infty$.

Our final intermediate Lemma analyzes the asymptotic convergence of the relocation trips taken by the drivers. Recall that, in the fluid matching process, the volume of relocation trips towards each location is proportional to the volume of drivers who selected that destination as their relocation destination. Specifically, the fluid volume of relocation trips from ℓ to d is determined by the following equation:

$$\bar{H}_{(\ell, d)} = \left(M_\ell - \sum_{d'} \bar{G}_{(\ell, d')} \right) \left(\frac{\sum_{i \in \mathcal{M}_\ell} \mathbf{1}\{r_i = d\}}{|\mathcal{M}_\ell|} \right).$$

The factor on the left, i.e. $M_\ell - \sum_{d'} \bar{G}_{(\ell, d')}$, counts the volume of supply that does not serve a dispatch in the fluid model (recall $M_\ell = |\mathcal{M}_\ell|$ is the unnormalized volume of drivers at ℓ), and the

factor on the right, $\frac{\sum_{i \in \mathcal{M}_\ell} \mathbf{1}\{r_i=d\}}{|\mathcal{M}_\ell|}$, counts the proportion of drivers positioned at ℓ who choose d as their relocation destination.

The stochastic number of relocation trips along each route (ℓ, d) is defined as the total number of undispatched drivers positioned at ℓ who chose d as their relocation destination. For a driver state \mathcal{M} , let $\mathcal{M}_\ell^R \subseteq \mathcal{M}_\ell$ be the (stochastic) subset of drivers who take a relocation trip. The number of relocation trips $H_{(\ell,d)}$ is defined by

$$H_{(\ell,d)} = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{M}_\ell^R} \mathbf{1}\{r_i = d\}.$$

Let us also use the notation \bar{H}_ℓ to mean the total volume of fluid relocation trips, and H_ℓ to mean the stochastic total number of relocation trips in the two level model:

$$\bar{H}_\ell = \sum_d \bar{H}_{(\ell,d)} \quad \text{and} \quad H_\ell = \sum_d H_{(\ell,d)}.$$

The following Lemma shows that the distribution of relocation trips converges asymptotically to the fluid distribution of relocation trips.

Lemma 33. *Suppose that the total number of relocation trips converges to the fluid volume of relocation trips, as $k \rightarrow \infty$, for all admissible driver states. That is, assume there exists sequences $(\alpha_k : k \geq 1)$ and $(q_k : k \geq 1)$ such that $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \alpha_k = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} q_k = 0$, for which the following inequality holds for every k and every ℓ*

$$\sup_{\mathcal{M} \in \mathcal{D}_k} \mathbb{P} \left(\frac{1}{k} |H_\ell - \bar{H}_\ell| \leq \alpha_k \right) \geq 1 - q_k.$$

Then the relocation trip volumes along each individual route converge to their fluid approximations, i.e. there exist sequences $(\beta_k : k \geq 1)$ and $(p_k : k \geq 1)$ such that $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \beta_k = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} p_k = 0$, for which the following inequality holds for every k :

$$\sup_{\mathcal{M} \in \mathcal{D}_k} \mathbb{P} \left(\frac{1}{k} \|\mathbf{H} - \bar{\mathbf{H}}\|_1 \leq \beta_k \right) \geq 1 - p_k.$$

Note that in the above equation, \mathbf{H} and $\bar{\mathbf{H}}$ are vectors with components corresponding to $H_{(\ell,d)}$ and $\bar{H}_{(\ell,d)}$ for each route (ℓ, d) . Therefore, the difference inside the probability is equal to the following:

$$\|\mathbf{H} - \bar{\mathbf{H}}\|_1 = \sum_{(\ell,d) \in \mathcal{L}^2} |H_{(\ell,d)} - \bar{H}_{(\ell,d)}|.$$

We defer the proof of Lemma 33 to Appendix E.5

E.3 Proof of Lemma 31

We restate Lemma 31 below.

Lemma. *There exists sequences of nonnegative numbers, $(\alpha_k : k \geq 1)$ and $(q_k : k \geq 1)$, both of which converge to 0 as $k \rightarrow \infty$, such that the following statement is true for every k :*

$$\sup_{M \leq \gamma k, R \leq \gamma k, p \in [0,1]} \mathbb{P} \left(\frac{1}{k} |G - \bar{G}| \leq \alpha_k \right) \geq 1 - q_k \quad (102)$$

$$\sup_{M \leq \gamma k, R \leq \gamma k, p \in [0,1]} \mathbb{P} \left(\frac{1}{k} |U - \bar{U}| \leq \alpha_k \right) \geq 1 - q_k. \quad (103)$$

In the above equations, it is understood that G and \bar{G} are the stochastic and fluid number of accepted dispatches from the single-destination dispatch subroutine with M drivers, R riders, and, except for a subset of size at most $k\delta_k$ drivers, drivers use an acceptance probability within ϵ_k of p . Similarly, it is understood that U and \bar{U} are the stochastic and fluid number of remaining undispached drivers.

Proof. We start with a proof of equation (102), which states that G converges to \bar{G} as $k \rightarrow \infty$.

Fix $k \geq 1$ and any $M \leq \gamma k$, $R \leq \gamma k$, $p \in [0, 1]$. Write the number of drivers M as $M = M' + M''$, such that M' is the number of drivers whose acceptance probability is within ϵ_k of p , and M'' is the number of drivers whose acceptance probability is further from p than ϵ_k . By assumption we have $M'' \leq \delta_k k$.

Consider the following modification of the single-destination dispatch subroutine parameters, which is designed to slightly underestimate the total number of dispatches produced the matching process. Assume that the dispatches are only allocated to the M' drivers whose acceptance probability is within ϵ_k of p , and assume that all M' drivers exactly use acceptance threshold $p - \epsilon_k$. Let the number of riders stay R . Let G_L be the number of accepted dispatches from this version of the single-destination dispatch subroutine. Also, define

$$\bar{G}_L = \min(M'(p - \epsilon_k), R)$$

to be the fluid output from this version of the single-destination dispatch subroutine.

Also consider the following modification, which is designed to slightly overestimate the total number of dispatches. Assume that all the M'' drivers agree to serve a dispatch before the single-destination dispatch subroutine is called, so that the remaining number of riders is $R' = R - \min(R, M'')$ and the remaining number of drivers is M' . Also assume that all M' drivers exactly use threshold value $p + \epsilon_k$. Let G_U be the number of accepted dispatches from this process, i.e. G_U is equal to $\min(R, M'')$ plus the stochastic number of dispatches that occur when R' riders are matched to M' drivers using the single-destination dispatch subroutine, assuming all M' drivers have acceptance probability exactly equal to $p + \epsilon_k$. Define

$$\bar{G}_U = \min(R, M'') + \min(R', M'(p + \epsilon_k))$$

to be the fluid output from this version of the dispatch subroutine.

Notice that when all drivers use the same acceptance probability, the resulting number of dispatch trips is equal in distribution to the minimum of the number of drivers and a Binomial distribution parameterized by the number of drivers and the common acceptance probability. Therefore, by Lemma 29, we have the following bounds:

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{M \leq \gamma k, R \leq \gamma k, p \in [0, 1]} \mathbb{P} \left(\frac{1}{k} |G_U - \bar{G}_U| \leq \alpha'_k \right) &\geq 1 - q'_k \\ \sup_{M \leq \gamma k, R \leq \gamma k, p \in [0, 1]} \mathbb{P} \left(\frac{1}{k} |G_L - \bar{G}_L| \leq \alpha'_k \right) &\geq 1 - q'_k, \end{aligned}$$

where $(\alpha'_k : k \geq 1)$ and $(q'_k : k \geq 1)$ are sequences that converge to 0 as $k \rightarrow \infty$. Also, Notice that for any parameter values $M \leq \gamma k$, $R \leq \gamma k$, $p \in [0, 1]$, we have the upper bound

$$\bar{G}_U - \bar{G}_L \leq M'' + M' 2\epsilon_k \leq k(\delta_k + 2\gamma\epsilon_k). \quad (104)$$

By construction, we have that G stochastically dominates G_L , and G_U stochastically dominates G . That is, for any $g \geq 0$, we have the following:

$$\mathbb{P}(G \leq g) \leq \mathbb{P}(G_L \leq g),$$

and

$$\mathbb{P}(G_U \leq g) \leq \mathbb{P}(G \leq g).$$

Therefore we obtain the following bounds, for any $\epsilon > 0$:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(|G - \bar{G}| \geq \epsilon) &\leq \mathbb{P}(G - \bar{G} \geq \epsilon) + \mathbb{P}(\bar{G} - G \geq \epsilon) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}(G_U - \bar{G} \geq \epsilon) + \mathbb{P}(\bar{G} - G_L \geq \epsilon) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}(|G_U - \bar{G}_U| \geq \epsilon + \bar{G} - \bar{G}_U) \\ &\quad + \mathbb{P}(|\bar{G}_L - G_L| \geq \epsilon + \bar{G}_L - \bar{G}). \end{aligned} \tag{105}$$

Finally, define

$$\alpha_k = \alpha'_k + (\delta_k + 2\gamma\epsilon_k).$$

By equation (105) we have the bound

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{1}{k}|G - \bar{G}| \geq \alpha_k\right) &\leq \mathbb{P}(|G_U - \bar{G}_U| \geq k\alpha_k + \bar{G} - \bar{G}_U) \\ &\quad + \mathbb{P}(|\bar{G}_L - G_L| \geq k\alpha_k + \bar{G}_L - \bar{G}). \end{aligned} \tag{106}$$

Now, from equation (104), we have

$$k\alpha_k + \bar{G} - \bar{G}_U \geq k\alpha'_k,$$

and similarly

$$k\alpha_k + \bar{G}_L - \bar{G} \geq k\alpha'_k.$$

Therefore, continuing from (106), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{1}{k}|G - \bar{G}| \geq \alpha_k\right) &\leq \mathbb{P}(|G_U - \bar{G}_U| \geq k\alpha'_k) + \mathbb{P}(|\bar{G}_L - G_L| \geq k\alpha'_k) \\ &\leq q'_k + q'_k. \end{aligned} \tag{107}$$

Taking $q_k = 2q'_k$ finishes the proof.

The proof of U converging to \bar{U} is analogous to the above argument. We first define U_L and U_U to mean the random number of undispatched drivers assuming all drivers use the acceptance probability $p - \epsilon_k$ and $p + \epsilon_k$, respectively, and we observe show that U_U stochastically dominates U which in turn stochastically dominates U_L . Stochastic dominance lets us bound the convergence of U in terms of the convergence of U_U and U_L . We then observe that each U_L and U_U is equal in distribution to the minimum of a constant and a negative binomial distribution, so Lemma 30 gives us large-population convergence. □

E.4 Proof of Lemma 32

To prove Lemma 32 we first state and prove the following Lemma.

Lemma 34. *For each $k \geq 1$, let \mathcal{Z}_k be a set of random variables $Z \in \mathcal{Z}_k$ with deterministic fluid approximations \bar{Z} . Assume that Z converges asymptotically to \bar{Z} , in the sense that there exists sequences $(\alpha_k : k \geq 1)$ and $(q_k : k \geq 1)$, both converging to 0 as $k \rightarrow \infty$, such that the following holds for every $k \geq 1$:*

$$\sup_{Z \in \mathcal{Z}_k} \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{1}{k}|Z - \bar{Z}| \leq \alpha_k\right) \geq 1 - q_k.$$

Let f be a Lipschitz continuous function with Lipschitz constant L . Then $f(Z)$ converges asymptotically to $f(\bar{Z})$, in the sense that the following equation holds:

$$\sup_{Z \in \mathcal{Z}_k} \mathbb{P} \left(\frac{1}{k} |f(Z) - f(\bar{Z})| \leq L\alpha_k \right) \geq 1 - q_k.$$

Proof. Observe that, if $\frac{1}{k}|Z - \bar{Z}| \leq \alpha_k$ is true, then we have

$$\frac{1}{k} |f(Z) - f(\bar{Z})| \leq \frac{1}{k} L |Z - \bar{Z}| \leq L\alpha_k.$$

Therefore we have

$$\sup_{Z \in \mathcal{Z}_k} \mathbb{P} \left(\frac{1}{k} |f(Z) - f(\bar{Z})| \leq L\alpha_k \right) \geq \sup_{Z \in \mathcal{Z}_k} \mathbb{P} \left(\frac{1}{k} |Z - \bar{Z}| \leq \alpha_k \right) \geq 1 - q_k,$$

as claimed. □

We restate Lemma 32 below.

Lemma. For each $k \geq 1$, let \mathcal{I}_k be a set of tuples of nonnegative random variables $(X, Y) \in \mathcal{I}_k$, with deterministic fluid approximations (\bar{X}, \bar{Y}) , which satisfy the asymptotic concentration property (98). Let (M, R, p) be any constants satisfying $M \leq \gamma k$, $R \leq \gamma k$, and $p \in [0, 1]$. Let G be the number of dispatches and U the number of remaining drivers, when the single-destination dispatch subroutine (1) is used to allocate $R - Y$ dispatch requests to $M - X$ drivers, assuming that, except for a subset of size at most $k\delta_k$ drivers, drivers use an acceptance probability within ϵ_k of p . Let \bar{G} and \bar{U} be the output of the fluid subroutine when $R - \bar{Y}$ riders are allocated to $M - \bar{X}$ drivers. Then G converges asymptotically to \bar{G} and U converges asymptotically to \bar{U} , in the sense that the following equation holds for all $k \geq 1$:

$$\sup_{M \leq \gamma k, R \leq \gamma k, p \in [0, 1], (X, Y) \in \mathcal{I}_k} \mathbb{P} \left(\frac{1}{k} |G - \bar{G}| \leq \beta_k \right) \geq 1 - p_k \quad (108)$$

$$\sup_{M \leq \gamma k, R \leq \gamma k, p \in [0, 1], (X, Y) \in \mathcal{I}_k} \mathbb{P} \left(\frac{1}{k} |U - \bar{U}| \leq \beta_k \right) \geq 1 - p_k, \quad (109)$$

where $(\beta_k : k \geq 1)$ and $(p_k : k \geq 1)$ are nonnegative sequences which converge to 0 as $k \rightarrow \infty$.

Proof. Consider the single-destination dispatch subroutine when the population-size parameter is $k \geq 1$, with $M \leq \gamma k$ drivers, $R \leq \gamma k$ riders, $p \in [0, 1]$ common acceptance probability, and let $(X, Y) \in \mathcal{I}_k$. Let G' and U' be the output of the fluid matching process with $R - Y$ riders and $M - X$ drivers. By Lemma 31 we have that G and U converge asymptotically to G' and U' , in the sense that there exists $(\alpha'_k : k \geq 1)$, $(q'_k : k \geq 1)$, both converging to 0 as $k \rightarrow \infty$, such that the following holds for every k :

$$\sup_{M \leq \gamma k, R \leq \gamma k, p \in [0, 1], (X, Y) \in \mathcal{I}_k} \mathbb{P} \left(\frac{1}{k} |G - G'| \leq \alpha'_k \right) \geq 1 - q'_k$$

$$\sup_{M \leq \gamma k, R \leq \gamma k, p \in [0, 1], (X, Y) \in \mathcal{I}_k} \mathbb{P} \left(\frac{1}{k} |U - U'| \leq \alpha'_k \right) \geq 1 - q'_k.$$

We now claim that G' and U' converge asymptotically to \bar{G} and \bar{U} . Recall the output of the fluid single-destination dispatch subroutine is defined (Definition 4) in terms of deterministic functions $\bar{G}(\cdot)$ and $\bar{U}(\cdot)$, so we have

$$\begin{aligned} G' &= \bar{G}(R - Y, M - X, p) & \bar{G} &= \bar{G}(R - \bar{Y}, M - \bar{X}, p) \\ U' &= \bar{U}(R - Y, M - X, p) & \bar{U} &= \bar{U}(R - \bar{Y}, M - \bar{X}, p). \end{aligned}$$

Observe that the functions $\bar{G}(\cdot)$ and $\bar{U}(\cdot)$ are both Lipschitz continuous, so by Lemma 34 we have G' converges asymptotically to \bar{G} , i.e. the following equation holds for every $k \geq 1$

$$\sup_{M \leq \gamma k, R \leq \gamma k, p \in [0,1], (X,Y) \in \mathcal{I}_k} \mathbb{P} \left(\frac{1}{k} |G' - \bar{G}| \leq L\alpha_k \right) \geq 1 - q_k,$$

where α_k and q_k are the error term and probability term from the convergence of (X, Y) to (\bar{X}, \bar{Y}) (see equation (98)), and L is the Lipschitz constant for the function $\bar{G}(\cdot)$. Taking $\beta_k = \alpha'_k + L\alpha_k$ and $p_k = q'_k + q_k$ finishes the proof. \square

E.5 Proof of Lemma 33

We restate Lemma 33 below.

Lemma. *Suppose that the total number of relocation trips converges to the fluid volume of relocation trips, as $k \rightarrow \infty$, for all admissible driver states. That is, assume there exists sequences $(\alpha_k : k \geq 1)$ and $(q_k : k \geq 1)$ such that $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \alpha_k = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} q_k = 0$, for which the following inequality holds for every k and every ℓ*

$$\sup_{\mathcal{M} \in \mathcal{D}_k} \mathbb{P} \left(\frac{1}{k} |H_\ell - \bar{H}_\ell| \leq \alpha_k \right) \geq 1 - q_k.$$

Then the relocation trip volumes along each individual route converge to their fluid approximations, i.e. there exist sequences $(\beta_k : k \geq 1)$ and $(p_k : k \geq 1)$ such that $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \beta_k = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} p_k = 0$, for which the following inequality holds for every k :

$$\sup_{\mathcal{M} \in \mathcal{D}_k} \mathbb{P} \left(\frac{1}{k} \|\mathbf{H} - \bar{\mathbf{H}}\|_1 \leq \beta_k \right) \geq 1 - p_k.$$

Proof. It suffices to prove the following is true for each route (ℓ, d) :

$$\sup_{\mathcal{M} \in \mathcal{D}_k} \mathbb{P} \left(\frac{1}{k} \|H_{(\ell,d)} - \bar{H}_{(\ell,d)}\|_1 \leq \beta_k \right) \geq 1 - p_k.$$

If the above inequality holds for each route (ℓ, d) , then the claimed inequality follows from a union bound over all locations.

Fix $k \geq 1$, an admissible driver state $\mathcal{M} \in \mathcal{D}_k$, and a location ℓ . Let $\mathcal{M}_\ell^R \subseteq \mathcal{M}$ be the stochastic subset of drivers who serve a relocation trip. By definition, we have $|\mathcal{M}_\ell^R|$ is the random variable H_ℓ , and by assumption we have that H_ℓ converges to a deterministic fluid approximation \bar{H}_ℓ .

The probability any individual driver falls in this subset depends on the exact threshold vector that the driver has selected, as well as their realized add-passenger disutility. In particular, if two drivers use the exact same threshold vector, they have the same probability of going non-dispatched. If two drivers use approximately the same threshold, and we condition on the event that their sampled add-passenger disutilities are bounded away from the region where the different

thresholds would lead to different decisions, then drivers still have the same probability of going non-dispatched.

Let \mathbf{x}_ℓ be the common disutility threshold vector which is approximately used by approximately all drivers at ℓ . Define

$$\mathcal{X}(\epsilon_k, \mathbf{x}_\ell) = [0, C] \setminus \left(\bigcup_{d \in \mathcal{L}} [x_{(\ell,d)} - \epsilon_k, x_{(\ell,d)} + \epsilon_k] \right)$$

to be the subset of feasible disutility thresholds $[0, C]$ where a small band $[x_{(\ell,d)} - \epsilon_k, x_{(\ell,d)} + \epsilon_k]$ centered at each threshold $x_{(\ell,d)}$ is removed.

Define

$$\mathcal{M}'_\ell = \mathcal{M}_\ell(\epsilon_k, \mathbf{x}_\ell) \cap \{i \in \mathcal{M}_\ell : X_i \in \mathcal{X}(\epsilon_k, \mathbf{x}_\ell)\}$$

to be the subset of drivers who approximately use the threshold \mathbf{x}_ℓ and whose sampled disutilities lie in $\mathcal{X}(\epsilon_k, \mathbf{x}_\ell)$. Notice that the cardinality $|\mathcal{M}'_\ell|$ has Binomial distribution with parameters $|\mathcal{M}_\ell(\epsilon_k, \mathbf{x}_\ell)|$ and $1 - 2|\mathcal{L}|\epsilon_k$, so $|\mathcal{M}'_\ell|$ converges to $|\mathcal{M}_\ell|$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$.

Define

$$H'_{(\ell,d)} = |\{i \in \mathcal{M}_\ell : r_i = d\} \cap \mathcal{M}'_\ell \cap \mathcal{M}_\ell^R|.$$

Notice that the number of trips from ℓ to d is bounded by

$$|\mathcal{M}_\ell \setminus \mathcal{M}'_\ell| + H'_{(\ell,d)} \geq H_{(\ell,d)} \geq H'_{(\ell,d)}.$$

Finally, notice that the distribution of $H'_{(\ell,d)}$ is equivalent to sampling $|\mathcal{M}_\ell^R|$ balls, without replacement, from a bag with $|\mathcal{M}'_\ell|$ balls, where each ball is associated with a destination, and counting how many balls are associated with the destination d . Concentration inequalities for sampling without replacement show that $H'_{(\ell,d)}$ converges asymptotically to $\bar{H}_{(\ell,d)}$, and this is sufficient to prove that $H_{(\ell,d)}$ converges to $\bar{H}_{(\ell,d)}$ asymptotically, because the difference between $H'_{(\ell,d)}$ and $H_{(\ell,d)}$ vanishes asymptotically. □

F General Convex Analysis Properties

In this section we obtain useful convex analysis properties. We change notation from the rest of the paper, and consider the following generic convex optimization problem

$$\inf (f(x) \mid g_i(x) \leq 0, i = 1, 2, \dots, m, x \in \mathbb{R}^n), \quad (110)$$

where f, g_1, \dots, g_m are convex functions from \mathbb{R}^n to \mathbb{R} . We assume our convex program (110) satisfies the conditions described in Assumption 5.

Assumption 5. *Assume the following conditions hold:*

1. f, g_1, \dots, g_m are continuously differentiable at every point $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$.
2. The feasible region $\{x \mid g_i(x) \leq 0, i = 1, 2, \dots, m, x \in \mathbb{R}^n\}$ is a bounded compact set. In particular, there is a constant γ such that the feasible region lies in $\bar{B}(0, \gamma)$, i.e. the closed ball centered at 0 with radius γ .
3. The gradients $\nabla f(x), \nabla g_1(x), \dots, \nabla g_m(x)$ have norm smaller than some constant C for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$.

The Lagrangian associated with the optimization problem (110) is the function $L : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}_+^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$ defined by

$$L(x; \lambda) = f(x) + \lambda^T g(x), \quad (111)$$

where $g(x)$ is the vector in \mathbb{R}^m with $g_i(x)$ as its i th component. Note the min-max theorem states the following relads :

$$\inf_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n} \sup_{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_+^m} L(x; \lambda) = \sup_{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_+^m} \inf_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n} L(x; \lambda). \quad (112)$$

Definition 8. Let $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$. A nonnegative vector $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_+^m$ is said to be a Lagrange multiplier vector for x if it satisfies the following conditions:

- *Complementary slackness:* $\lambda_i g_i(x) = 0$ holds for every $i = 1, 2, \dots, m$.
- *Stationarity:* $\nabla_x L(x; \lambda) = 0$. In other words, x is a global minimizer of $L(\cdot; \lambda)$.

We say λ is an ϵ -approximate Lagrange multiplier vector for x if it satisfies the following conditions:

- *Approximate complementary slackness:* $|\lambda_i g_i(x)| \leq \epsilon$ holds for every $i = 1, 2, \dots, m$.
- *Approximate stationarity:* $\|\nabla_x L(x; \lambda)\|_2 \leq \epsilon$.

For the next Lemma, we consider an optimal solution x^* and a Lagrange multiplier vector λ^* for x^* . Part of our proof is concerned with the function mapping $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ to the gradient of the Lagrangian $\nabla_x L(x; \lambda^*)$. In particular, we care about how large the gradient can vary when evaluated at two points that are close to one another. To reason about this maximum perturbation effect, for $\delta > 0$ define

$$\kappa(\delta) = \max (\|\nabla_x L(x; \lambda^*) - \nabla_x L(y; \lambda^*)\|_2 \mid x, y \in \bar{B}(0, \gamma), \|x - y\|_2 \leq \delta) \quad (113)$$

which gives the maximum norm of the difference between the gradients of any two points in $\bar{B}(0, \gamma)$ whose distance from each other is at most δ . From Assumption 5 we know the gradient $\nabla_x L(x; \lambda^*)$ is continuous in x , and we know that every continuous function over a compact set is uniformly continuous, so it follows that the gradient function, restricted to the closed ball $\bar{B}(0, \gamma)$, is uniformly continuous. Therefore, the maximum perturbation $\kappa(\delta)$ goes to 0 as $\delta \rightarrow 0$.

Lemma 35. Let \bar{x} be a feasible solution for (110) and let $\bar{\lambda} \in \mathbb{R}_+^m$. If $\bar{\lambda}$ is a Lagrange multiplier vector for \bar{x} then \bar{x} is an optimal solution for (110). If $\bar{\lambda}$ is an ϵ -approximate Lagrange multiplier vector for \bar{x} then \bar{x} is an ϵ' -optimal solution for (110), where $\epsilon' = \epsilon(n + 2\gamma)$.

Proof. We focus on the case where $\bar{\lambda}$ is an ϵ -approximate Lagrange multiplier vector for \bar{x} . Let x^* and λ^* be optimal primal and dual variables. Observe the following chain of inequalities:

$$f(x^*) = L(x^*; \lambda^*) \geq L(x^*; \bar{\lambda}) \geq L(\bar{x}; \bar{\lambda}) + \nabla_x L(\bar{x}; \bar{\lambda})^T (x^* - \bar{x}),$$

where the first bound follows from optimality of λ^* and the second line follows by convexity of $L(\cdot; \bar{\lambda})$. Therefore we have the upper bound

$$f(\bar{x}) \leq f(x^*) + \|\nabla_x L(\bar{x}; \bar{\lambda})\|_2 \|x^* - \bar{x}\|_2 + |\bar{\lambda}^T g(\bar{x})|.$$

By approximate complementary slackness we have $|\bar{\lambda}^T g(\bar{x})| \leq n\epsilon$, by approximate stationarity we have $\|\nabla_x L(\bar{x}; \bar{\lambda})\|_2 \leq \epsilon$, and by feasibility of x^* and \bar{x} we have $\|x^* - \bar{x}\|_2 \leq 2\gamma$. Therefore we obtain the bound

$$f(\bar{x}) \leq f(x^*) + \epsilon(n + 2\gamma) = f(x^*) + \epsilon'$$

as claimed. \square

Lemma 36. *Let x^* be an optimal solution for (110) and let λ^* be a Lagrange multiplier vector for x^* . Let \bar{x} be a feasible solution for (110). If \bar{x} is an optimal solution then λ^* is a Lagrange multiplier vector for \bar{x} . If \bar{x} is an ϵ -optimal solution, then λ^* is an ϵ' -approximate Lagrange multiplier vector, where $\epsilon' = \sqrt{\sqrt{\epsilon} + C\kappa(C\sqrt{\epsilon})}$.*

Proof. Observe the following chain of inequalities:

$$\begin{aligned} f(x^*) &= L(x^*; \lambda^*) \\ &= \min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n} L(x; \lambda^*) \\ &\leq L(\bar{x}; \lambda^*) \end{aligned} \tag{114}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &= f(\bar{x}) + \lambda^{*T} g(\bar{x}) \\ &\leq f(\bar{x}) \end{aligned} \tag{115}$$

The first two lines follow from the complementary slackness and stationarity conditions which hold between x^* and λ^* . Line (115) follows from feasibility of \bar{x} and nonnegativity of λ^* .

We first consider the case where \bar{x} is an optimal solution. In this case, we have $f(\bar{x}) = f(x^*)$ so every line in the above chain of inequalities holds with equality. In particular, line (114) holding with equality shows that \bar{x} is a global minimizer of $L(\cdot; \lambda^*)$, so the stationarity condition $\nabla_x L(\bar{x}; \lambda^*)$ holds, and line (115) holding with equality shows that complementary slackness holds between \bar{x} and λ^* . Therefore λ^* is a Lagrange multiplier vector for \bar{x} .

Next, we consider the case where \bar{x} is an ϵ -optimal solution. In this case, we have $f(\bar{x}) \leq f(x^*) + \epsilon$, so ϵ is an upper bound on the difference between any two consecutive terms in the above chain of inequalities. Applying this upper bound to line (115) we conclude that $|\lambda^{*T} g(\bar{x})| \leq \epsilon$. Since every term $\lambda_i^* g_i(\bar{x})$ is nonpositive, it follows that $|\lambda_i^* g_i(\bar{x})| \leq |\lambda^{*T} g(\bar{x})| \leq \epsilon \leq \epsilon'$, so approximate complementary slackness holds between λ^* and \bar{x} .

We show in Lemma 37 that \bar{x} satisfies approximate stationarity with respect to λ^* . We use the result in Lemma 37 by taking $h(x)$ to mean $L(x; \lambda^*)$. The result of Lemma 37 then provides the bound

$$\|\nabla_x L(\bar{x}; \lambda^*)\|_2^2 \leq \sqrt{\epsilon} + C\kappa(C\sqrt{\epsilon}).$$

Therefore, $\|\nabla_x L(\bar{x}; \lambda^*)\|_2 \leq \epsilon'$, establishing that λ^* is an ϵ' -approximate Lagrange multiplier vector for \bar{x} . \square

Lemma 37. *Let $h : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a continuously differentiable convex function. Let x^* be a global minimizer of h , let \bar{x} satisfy $h(\bar{x}) < h(x^*) + \epsilon$, and assume that \bar{x} and x^* both lie in $\bar{B}(0, \gamma)$, i.e. the closed ball centered at 0 with radius γ . For $\delta > 0$, define*

$$\kappa(\delta) = \max (\|\nabla h(x) - \nabla h(y)\|_2 \mid x, y \in \bar{B}(0, \gamma), \|x - y\|_2 \leq \delta)$$

to be the maximum norm of the difference between the gradients of any two points in $\bar{B}(0, \gamma)$ whose distance from each other is at most δ . Assume C is a constant upper bound on $\|\nabla h(x)\|_2$. Then

$$\|\nabla h(\bar{x})\|_2^2 \leq \sqrt{\epsilon} + C\kappa(C\sqrt{\epsilon}). \tag{116}$$

Proof. Define

$$x' = \bar{x} - t\nabla h(\bar{x}).$$

for some $t > 0$. From convexity of h we have

$$h(x') + \langle \nabla h(x'), \bar{x} - x' \rangle \leq h(\bar{x}).$$

Rearrange the above, and using the definition of x' ,

$$t\langle \nabla h(x'), \nabla h(\bar{x}) \rangle \leq h(\bar{x}) - h(x') \leq \epsilon.$$

Now consider the following chain of inequalities:

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla h(\bar{x})\|_2^2 &= \langle \nabla h(\bar{x}), \nabla h(\bar{x}) \rangle \\ &= \langle \nabla h(x'), \nabla h(\bar{x}) \rangle + \langle \nabla h(\bar{x}) - \nabla h(x'), \nabla h(\bar{x}) \rangle \\ &\leq \frac{\epsilon}{t} + \langle \nabla h(\bar{x}) - \nabla h(x'), \nabla h(\bar{x}) \rangle \\ &\leq \frac{\epsilon}{t} + \|\nabla h(\bar{x}) - \nabla h(x')\|_2 \|\nabla h(\bar{x})\|_2 \\ &\leq \frac{\epsilon}{t} + \|\nabla h(\bar{x}) - \nabla h(x')\|_2 C \\ &\leq \frac{\epsilon}{t} + C\kappa(\|\bar{x} - x'\|_2) \\ &\leq \frac{\epsilon}{t} + C\kappa(\|t\nabla h(\bar{x})\|_2) \\ &\leq \frac{\epsilon}{t} + C\kappa(Ct). \end{aligned}$$

Setting $t = \sqrt{\epsilon}$, we obtain the claimed bound (116). □