

Regulating Matching Markets with Constraints: Data-driven Taxation

Akira Matsushita,¹ Kei Ikegami,² Kyohei Okumura,³ Yoji Tomita,⁴ Atsushi Iwasaki⁵

¹ University of Tokyo

² New York University

³ Northwestern University

⁴ CyberAgent, Inc.

⁵ University of Electro-Communications

matsushita@ants-tears.com, ki2047@nyu.edu, kyohei.okumura@gmail.com,

tomita-yoji@cyberagent.co.jp, atsushi.iwasaki@uec.ac.jp

Abstract

This paper develops a framework to conduct a counterfactual analysis to regulate matching markets with regional constraints that impose lower and upper bounds on the number of matches in each region. Our work is motivated by the Japan Residency Matching Program, in which the policymaker wants to guarantee the least number of doctors working in rural regions to achieve the minimum standard of service. Among the multiple possible policies that satisfy such constraints, a policymaker wants to choose the best. To this end, we develop a discrete choice model approach that estimates the utility functions of agents from observed data and predicts agents' behavior under different counterfactual policies. Our framework also allows the policymaker to design the welfare-maximizing tax scheme, which outperforms the policy currently used in practice. Furthermore, a numerical experiment illustrates how our method works.

1 Introduction

Matching with constraints, initiated by Kamada and Kojima (2015), has been recently paid considerable attention across economics, computer science, and AI (Abdulkadiroğlu and Sönmez 2003; Biró et al. 2010; Ehlers et al. 2014; Fragiadakis et al. 2016; Kojima 2012; Hafalir, Yenmez, and Yildirim 2013; Goto et al. 2016; Kurata et al. 2017; Kawase and Iwasaki 2017, 2018; Aziz, Biró, and Yokoo 2022). For example, *diversity constraints* matter in the context of school choice: each school is required to balance its composition of students, typically in terms of socioeconomic status. The central contribution of recent advances is to design an algorithm for finding desirable matching outcomes under constraints and analyze the associated complexity problems, e.g., (Aziz et al. 2019; Aziz, Baychkov, and Biró 2020; Kawase and Iwasaki 2020). However, no empirical or econometric framework has been considered.

Our paper is the first work that develops an empirical, i.e., data-driven, framework to design a policy that regulates matching markets with regional constraints. Regional constraints impose lower and upper bounds on the number of matches in each region (Goto et al. 2016). The policymaker (hereafter, PM) needs to satisfy such constraints due to societal or ethical reasons. For example, the government may

need to guarantee the minimum number of doctors working in each rural region to maintain standard service. In general, since there are many policies to satisfy the constraints, it is often unclear which policy is better. We provide PM with a way to examine different policies in a counterfactual sense.

A seminal work by Choo and Siow (2006) initiated the estimation method for the two-sided matching model. The utility of each agent is assumed to be transferable (Shapley and Shubik 1971; Becker 1973; Kelso and Crawford 1982), where agents can transfer their utility to their partner via monetary transfer. Galichon and Salanié (2021) show that, under some assumptions, a stable matching coincides with the market clearing allocation in which the agents solve the discrete choice problems, choosing an agent from the other side that maximizes his utility. They also propose a method to estimate the utility functions that are consistent with the observed matching patterns under the *unobserved heterogeneity*, which captures the different behaviors of agents that have the same covariates and look the same to PM.

Given the utility functions estimated by the method of Galichon and Salanié (2021), our framework allows PM to predict matching patterns under different counterfactual tax schemes. In principle, PM can use taxes and subsidies to incentivize agents to satisfy regional constraints. Our approach provides a way of computing the tax scheme that maximizes social surplus. We define *efficient aggregate equilibrium (EAE)*, which is the welfare maximizing equilibrium under the constraints achievable by taxes and subsidies. We characterize EAE as a solution to a convex optimization problem and show that the solution always exists and is unique. This result enables us to design the welfare-maximizing tax scheme for any arbitrary regional constraints.

Finally, we conduct a numerical experiment to illustrate how our approach works. We imitate the problem that the Japan Residency Matching Program (JRMP) deals with: its policy goal is to mitigate the popularity gap among urban and rural hospitals (Kamada and Kojima 2015). To this end, JRMP restricts the maximum number of residents matched within each prefecture and proportionally decreases the capacity of hospitals in each prefecture to meet the bound (We will refer to this policy as *cap-reduced AE (CR-AE)* in Section 6). The simulation demonstrates that our method outperforms such a policy used in practice in terms of social welfare. In addition, we show that even when the PM cannot

We assume that all agents know the joint surpluses and how they are divided, i.e., $(\Phi_{ij}, u_{ij}, v_{ij})_{i,j}$, and tax scheme $(w_z)_z$ for all regions.

We now define an *individual equilibrium* or *stable matching* (Shapley and Shubik 1971). Below u_i and v_j are interpreted as i 's and j 's payoffs in the equilibrium, respectively.

Definition 1 (Individual Equilibrium (IE)). A profile $(d, (u, v), w)$ of matching d , equilibrium payoffs $(u, v) \in \mathbb{R}^{|I|} \times \mathbb{R}^{|J|}$, and taxes $w \in \mathbb{R}^L$ forms *individual equilibrium*, or is *stable* if d satisfies the population constraint, and

1. Individual rationality: For all $i \in I$, $u_i \geq \tilde{\Phi}_{ij_0} = 0$, with equality if i is unmatched in d ; for all $j \in J$, $v_j \geq \tilde{\Phi}_{i_0j} = 0$, with equality if j is unmatched in d .
2. No blocking pairs: For all i and j , $u_i + v_j \geq \tilde{\Phi}_{ij}$, with equality if i and j are matched in d .

Throughout the paper, we assume that IE is realized in the economy.² It depends on tax w whether the regional constraint is satisfied in IE or not. To set the appropriate taxes w under which the regional constraint is satisfied and hence the matching is feasible, the PM needs to know the agents' preferences. However, in practice, the PM does not know the exact individual preferences, so she cannot set taxes w using (Φ_{ij}) . Instead, she often has access to information such as population characteristics. In the subsequent sections, we introduce a concept of *aggregate equilibrium*, based on IE, to handle such a situation and develop a method that enables PM to compute the optimal tax scheme.

3 Aggregate Equilibrium with Unobserved Heterogeneity

In this section, we show that, under proper assumptions, IE can be seen as a result of each agent's solving a discrete choice problem. This enables us to utilize the estimation techniques of discrete choice literature to estimate agents' preferences and evaluate counterfactual policies.

3.1 Unobserved Heterogeneity and Separability

Let $X := \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_N\}$ be the finite set of observable worker types. Each worker $i \in I$ has a type $x(i) \in X$. Similarly, let $Y := \{y_1, y_2, \dots, y_M\}$ be the finite set of observable job slot types. Each slot $j \in J$ has a type $y(j) \in Y$. With a slight abuse of notation, $x(i) = x$ (resp. $y(j) = y$) is denoted by $i \in x$ (resp. $j \in y$). We define x_0 and y_0 as "null types" that are the types of outside options i_0 and j_0 . Finally, let $X_0 := X \cup \{x_0\}$ and $Y_0 := Y \cup \{y_0\}$ be the sets of all worker and slot types including the null types, and define $T := X_0 \times Y_0 \setminus \{(x_0, y_0)\}$ as the set of all type pairs.

PM can observe these types only; they cannot distinguish the same type agents or slots. There is *unobserved heterogeneity* in the sense that even when two agents i and i' have the same type x , their preferences can be different.

²There are two well-known scenarios of agents' reaching IE: via frictionless decentralized job markets and via centralized mechanisms with descending salary-adjustment mechanism. See Appendix B for more details.

Type $y \in Y$ and region $z \in Z$ can be interpreted in various manners. One may think of a type as a firm/hospital and region z as a unit of districts. It is also possible that a type is a minor subcategory of occupation (e.g., registered/licensed practical nurse, physician assistant, medical doctor) and a region is a larger category of occupation (e.g., medical jobs). Throughout this paper, we interpret a type as a firm, and a region as a unit of districts for simplicity.

Assumption 1 (Regional Constraint). Each type $y \in Y$ can belong to only one region³. Denote the region that type y belongs to by $z(y) \in Z$.

Let us define $n_x := \#\{i: x(i) = x\}$ the number of type x agents and $m_y := \#\{j: y(j) = y\}$ the number of type y slots. Hereafter we make the large market approximation:

Assumption 2 (Large Market Approximation). Each type x has n_x mass of continuum of agents. Similarly, we assume there is the m_y mass of type y job slots.

In this setting, the matching is defined as the measure of matches for each pair of type (x, y) ; let $\mu = (\mu_{xy})_{x,y} \in \mathbb{R}_+^{|T|}$. And its feasibility is defined as follows;

Definition 2 (Feasible matching). $\mu = (\mu_{xy})_{x,y} \in \mathbb{R}_+^{|T|}$ is a *feasible matching* if it satisfies

1. Population constraint: Each worker type $x \in X$ satisfies $\sum_{y \in Y_0} \mu_{xy} = n_x$; each slot type $y \in Y$ satisfies $\sum_{x \in X_0} \mu_{xy} = m_y$, and
2. Regional constraint: Each region $z \in Z$ satisfies $\sum_{x \in X} \sum_{y \in z} \mu_{xy} \in [\underline{q}_z, \bar{q}_z]$.

To conduct an estimation using only the data on the matching patterns, we make the following assumptions.⁴ Regarding the joint surplus $\tilde{\Phi}_{ij}$, we impose two structures on it. First, for some i.i.d. random variable ξ_{ij} , $\tilde{\Phi}_{ij} - \xi_{ij}$ does not depend on the pair of individuals (i, j) , but only depends on their types $x(i)$ and $y(j)$. Second, for each i and j such that $x(i) = x$ and $y(j) = y$, ξ_{ij} can be represented as a sum of two i.i.d. random variables ϵ_{iy} and η_{xj} . We call these properties of the joint surplus *additive separability*. We summarize these as follows:

Assumption 3 (Independence). For each x and $i \in x$, error term ϵ_{iy} is drawn from the distribution P_x . Similarly, for each y and $j \in y$, error term η_{xj} is drawn from distribution Q_y . The error terms are independent across all i 's and j 's.

Assumption 4 (Additive Separability). For each x and y , $\tilde{\Phi}_{ij} - \epsilon_{iy} - \eta_{xj}$ is constant over the individuals $i \in x$ and $j \in y$, and is denoted by Φ_{xy} .

We also impose the following technical assumption on the error terms ϵ_{iy} 's and η_{xj} 's:

Assumption 5 (Smooth Distribution with Full-Support). For each x, y , CDF's P_x and Q_y are continuously differentiable. Moreover, $\text{supp}(P_x) = \mathbb{R}^{N+1}$ and $\text{supp}(Q_y) = \mathbb{R}^{M+1}$.

³If type y slots belong to regions z_1 and z_2 , we redefine the type of slots in z_1 as $y^{(1)}$ and z_2 as $y^{(2)}$.

⁴Here, PM uses the data only about matching patterns and has no access to other data such as agents' preference lists submitted to a centralized mechanism (Agarwal and Somaini 2018).

Although the discrete choice literature usually uses Assumptions 2-5, we will discuss the necessity in Appendix B.

Example 1. Consider a matching market between two types of workers and three types of jobs divided into two regions (z_1, z_2) . I.e., $|X| = 2, |Y| = 3, |Z| = 2$. Let Φ_{xy} be

$$\Phi = \begin{bmatrix} \Phi_{x_1y_1} & \Phi_{x_1y_2} & \Phi_{x_1y_3} \\ \Phi_{x_2y_1} & \Phi_{x_2y_2} & \Phi_{x_2y_3} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 2 & 1.5 & 1 \\ 1.5 & 2 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$$

and generate $\Phi_{ij} = \Phi_{xy} + \epsilon_{iy} + \eta_{xj}$ where ϵ_{iy} and η_{xj} follow Gumbel distribution whose location parameter is 0 and the scale parameter is 1. An example for the other variables are; $n = (n_{x_1}, n_{x_2}) = (0.5, 0.5)$, $m = (m_{y_1}, m_{y_2}, m_{y_3}) = (0.3, 0.3, 0.4)$, $z(y_1) = z(y_2) = z_1, z(y_3) = z_2$, $\bar{o}_{z_1} = 0.5$, $\bar{o}_{z_2} = 0.4$, $\underline{o}_{z_1} = 0.1$, $\underline{o}_{z_2} = 0.05$.

3.2 Discrete Choice Representation and Aggregate Equilibrium

Under Assumptions 3-5, PM can relate the observed matching data to the error distribution. We first introduce the concept of *systematic utilities* U_{xy} and V_{xy} , defined as

$$U_{xy} := \min_{i: x(i)=x} \{u_i - \epsilon_{iy}\}, \quad V_{xy} := \min_{j: y(j)=y} \{v_j - \eta_{jx}\}$$

and $U_{xy_0} = V_{x_0y} = 0$ for each $x \in X$ and $y \in Y$.

For each $i \in x$ and $j \in y$, Assumption 4 assumes that $\tilde{\Phi}_{ij} - \epsilon_{iy} - \eta_{xj} \equiv \Phi_{xy}$ does only depend on x and y . In addition, we assume that the error distributions satisfy the following: for each $i \in x$ and $j \in y$, we have $\tilde{\Phi}_{ij} - \epsilon_{iy} - \eta_{xj} = U_{xy} + V_{xy}$.

The following Lemma 1 states that the matching observed in IE is observationally equivalent to the result of agents' discrete choice.

Lemma 1. For any worker $i \in I$ and any slot $j \in J$, we can rewrite u_i and v_j as

$$u_i = \max_{y \in Y_0} U_{x(i),y} + \epsilon_{iy}, \quad \text{and} \quad v_j = \max_{x \in X_0} V_{x,y(j)} + \eta_{xj}.$$

Lemma 1 also implies that U_{xy} 's and V_{xy} 's can be interpreted as the part of utilities that depend merely on the type pairs. When we write $U = (U_{xy})_{x \in X, y \in Y}, V = (V_{xy})_{x \in X, y \in Y}$, the welfare of side X, Y is defined as follows:

$$G(U) = \sum_{x \in X} n_x \mathbb{E}_{\epsilon_i \sim P_x} \left[\max_{y \in Y_0} U_{xy} + \epsilon_{iy} \right]$$

$$H(V) = \sum_{y \in Y} m_y \mathbb{E}_{\eta_j \sim Q_y} \left[\max_{x \in X_0} V_{xy} + \eta_{xj} \right]$$

By Daly-Zachary-Williams theorem (McFadden 1980), we have

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial U_{xy}} \mathbb{E}_{\epsilon_i \sim P_x} \left[\max_{y \in Y_0} U_{xy} + \epsilon_{iy} \right] = \Pr(i \text{ with } x \text{ chooses } y).$$

Under the large market approximation, this value coincides with the fraction of type x agents choosing type y . Thus, $(\partial G(U))/(\partial U_{xy})$ is the demand of x for y ; similarly,

$(\partial H(V))/(\partial V_{xy})$ is the demand of y for x . In equilibrium, these two should be equal and coincide with the number of matches between x and y . Since G and H are determined by the error distributions, the fact that the realized matching pattern coincides with the partial derivatives of G and H relates the observed matching data to the errors.

We define *aggregate equilibrium with regional constraints*. The observed part of the joint surplus (Φ_{xy}) is usually parameterized by the researcher and estimated from the data. Galichon and Salanié (2021) provide a method to estimate (Φ_{xy}) using the matching pattern data (μ_{xy}) , which we review in Section 5. Suppose for the moment that (μ_{xy}) is available and (Φ_{xy}) is given (already estimated).

Definition 3. Given $(\Phi_{xy})_{x,y}$, profile $(\mu, (U, V, w))$ is an *aggregate equilibrium with regional constraints*, if it satisfies the following four conditions:

1. Population constraint: For any $x \in X$, $\sum_{y \in Y_0} \mu_{xy} = n_x$; for any $y \in Y$, $\sum_{x \in X_0} \mu_{xy} = m_y$.
2. No-blocking pairs: For any $(x, y) \in T$,

$$U_{xy} + V_{xy} \geq \Phi_{xy} - w_{z(y)}.$$

3. Market clearing: For any $(x, y) \in T$,

$$\mu_{xy} = \nabla_{xy} G(U) = \nabla_{xy} H(V).$$

4. Regional constraint: For any $z \in Z$,

$$\sum_{y \in z} \sum_{x \in X} \mu_{xy} \in [\underline{o}_z, \bar{o}_z].$$

Note that the additive separability and Lemma 1 together imply that condition 2 is equivalent to $u_i + v_j \geq \tilde{\Phi}_{ij}$, which corresponds to the no-blocking pairs condition in the individual equilibrium. Thus the aggregate equilibrium with regional constraints does coincide with a feasible individual equilibrium in the market with unobserved heterogeneity.

4 Efficient Aggregate Equilibrium

The aggregate equilibria need not be unique because the multiple combinations of taxes can adjust the number of matches (see Example 1 below). Hence, we define *efficient aggregate equilibrium*, hereafter EAE, as a refinement. EAE is an aggregate equilibrium that does not impose any tax or subsidy on the regions whose constraints are not binding (complementary slackness).

Definition 4 (Efficient Aggregate Equilibrium). $(\mu, (U, V, w))$ is an *efficient aggregate equilibrium*, if it is an aggregate equilibrium and satisfies the following additional condition:

5. Complementary slackness; for any $z \in Z$,

$$[w_z > 0 \implies \sum_{y \in z} \sum_{x \in X} \mu_{xy} = \bar{o}_z] \text{ and}$$

$$[w_z < 0 \implies \sum_{y \in z} \sum_{x \in X} \mu_{xy} = \underline{o}_z].$$

Our main result is that EAE always uniquely exists and is *efficient* in the sense that it maximizes social welfare among aggregate equilibria. This result is derived as the corollary of Theorem 1, which characterizes EAE as a solution to a convex optimization problem. Furthermore, this enables us to compute EAE by solving the optimization problem. Proofs are deferred to the appendix.

Theorem 1. Fix any $\Phi \in \mathbb{R}^{(N+1) \times (M+1)}$. If $(\mu, (U, V, w))$ is an EAE, then $(U, V, \bar{w}, \underline{w})$ is a solution to the optimization problem (D) and μ satisfies the market clearing condition, where $\bar{w}_z := \max\{0, w_z\}$, $\underline{w}_z := -\min\{0, w_z\}$. Conversely, if $(U, V, \bar{w}, \underline{w})$ is a solution to the optimization problem (D) and μ satisfies the market clearing condition, then $(\mu, (U, V, w))$ is an EAE.

$$(D) \quad \begin{cases} \min_{U, V, \bar{w}_z, \underline{w}_z} G(U) + H(V) + \sum_{z \in Z} \bar{o}_z \bar{w}_z - \sum_{z \in Z} \underline{o}_z \underline{w}_z \\ \text{s.t. } \forall (x, y) \in T, \\ U_{xy} + V_{xy} \geq \Phi_{xy} - \bar{w}_{z(y)} + \underline{w}_{z(y)}, \\ \forall z \in Z, \bar{w}_z \geq 0, \underline{w}_z \geq 0. \end{cases}$$

Corollary 1. EAE always exists and is unique.

We can show that the dual problem (P) of (D) corresponds to the social welfare maximization problem under the population constraints and the regional constraints. (See Appendix A.4 for more details.) The optimal value of (P) coincides with that of (D) by the strong duality. Thus, the tax scheme $(w_z)_z$ obtained as a solution to these optimization problems maximizes social welfare. It is also worth mentioning that, while (P) potentially allows taxes to differ among different type pairs, all the pairs in the same region z incurs the same amount of tax w_z under the welfare-maximizing tax scheme. The following corollary summarizes these observations.

Corollary 2. EAE maximizes social welfare under regional constraints, whose tax scheme is not conditioned on the types of pairs but is dependent only on the region.

We give one possible scenario in which Theorem 1 and related results are useful to obtain the optimal tax scheme. Suppose that the data on the existing matching in the market without regional constraints is available. As mentioned in Section 3, then we can estimate Φ_{xy} 's, assuming specific error term distributions, such as Gumbel distribution as in Example 1. The distributional assumption also determines the form of G and H . Given Φ , G , and H , we solve (D) to obtain tax scheme w , which is backed up from \bar{w} and \underline{w} .

Example 1 (Continued). Figure 1 has the yellow area, which represents the set of aggregate equilibria: for each (w'_1, w'_2) therein, there exists an AE $(\mu, (U, V, w))$ in which $w = (w'_1, w'_2)$. We draw the contours of social welfare in Panel (a), and the PM surplus (or deficit if negative and dotted lines) in Panel (b). As we see in Corollary 2, the red point in Panel (a), $(w_1, w_2) = (0.583, 0)$, that tangents to the contour is the unique EAE. In Section 5, we will discuss budget balanced AE located in the orange area in Panel (b).

5 Estimation of the Joint Surplus

So far we see how to compute the welfare-maximizing matching μ_{xy} given the known joint surplus Φ_{xy} . This section, on the contrary, briefly explains how to estimate the joint surplus Φ_{xy} given matching patterns $\tilde{\mu}_{xy}$. We take the set of agent types X and Y , their population (n_x) and (m_y) , and regions $z(y)$ as given. Now suppose we have the data of

1. observed matching patterns $\tilde{\mu} = (\tilde{\mu}_{xy})_{x,y}$,
2. current tax levels $(w_z)_z$, and
3. type-pair specific covariates $c = (c_{xy})_{x,y}$ (here $c_{xy} \in \mathbb{R}^S$ for some S).

The candidates of c_{xy} are, for example, physical distances between the living area of type x doctors and the office area of type y hospitals, compatibility between doctors' skills and job description, or characteristics that depend only on type x or y (such as doctor's age or the average wage level around its office). It can simply be the vector of indicator functions of type pairs.

To estimate Φ_{xy} , we first choose a parametric function F_β that maps covariates c_{xy} to joint surplus Φ_{xy} , e.g. $F_\beta(c_{xy}) = \beta^\top c_{xy}$ (linear regression). Then, we estimate β by solving the nested optimization problem: we initialize $\beta = \beta^0$ and update β in step k as

1. Compute $\Phi_{xy}^k = F_{\beta^k}(c_{xy})$ for given β^k
2. Solve (D') and obtain the simulated matching μ^k using $\nabla_{xy} G = \nabla_{xy} H = \mu_{xy}^k$
3. Compute the error (distance) between the simulated matching μ^k and the observed matching $\tilde{\mu}$, $d(\mu^k, \tilde{\mu})$
4. If $d(\mu^k, \tilde{\mu})$ is small enough, finish the estimation. Then, the current $\Phi_{xy}^k = F_{\beta^k}(c_{xy})$ is the point estimate. Otherwise, update $\beta^k \rightarrow \beta^{k+1}$ so that d becomes smaller and go back to Step 1.

$$(D') \quad \begin{cases} \min_{U, V} G(U) + H(V) \\ \text{s.t. } \forall x \in X, y \in Y, U_{xy} + V_{xy} \geq \Phi_{xy} - w_{z(y)}. \end{cases}$$

Note that (D') is a convex programming problem and the existence and the uniqueness of the solution are guaranteed like Corollary 1. Both the inner optimization problem (w.r.t. μ^k) and the outer optimization problem (w.r.t. β^k) are solved by the standard optimization algorithm, e.g., Newton method.

The choice of the function F_β and the distance d is arbitrary. See (Galichon and Salanié 2021) for the details. Here, we explain the maximum likelihood estimation (MLE). Let us adopt the Kullback-Leibler divergence of the multinomial distribution over the type pairs as d ,

$$d(\tilde{\mu}, \mu) \equiv \sum_{(x,y) \in T} (\tilde{\mu}_{xy} / |\tilde{\mu}|) \log \frac{(\tilde{\mu}_{xy} / |\tilde{\mu}|)}{(\mu_{xy} / |\mu|)},$$

where $|\mu| \equiv \sum_{(x,y) \in T} \mu_{xy}$. Given the matching data $\tilde{\mu}$, minimizing the KL-divergence is equivalent to maximizing the log-likelihood function

$$\log L(\beta) \propto \sum_{(x,y) \in T} \tilde{\mu}_{xy} \log \frac{\mu_{xy}}{|\mu|}.$$




Figure 1: Panel (a) illustrates social welfare and (b) PM surplus in the AE given (w_1, w_2) . The vertical (horizontal) axis indicates the tax (or subsidy if negative) on region z_1 (z_2). The yellow + orange regions are the set of AE. The red point is the unique EAE. In (b), the orange region indicates BB-AE (AE in which the PM surplus is nonnegative) defined in Section 6.

Note that β affects μ_{xy} through $\Phi_{xy} = F_\beta(c_{xy})$ and (D’). By minimizing d for the parameter β , we get the estimate of Φ_{xy} using the MLE.

6 Illustrative Experiment

This section compares EAE with other equilibrium concepts. To get intuition, we simulate a small tractable matching market of residencies with one urban region (z_1) and two rural regions (z_2, z_3) in which all doctors prefer urban hospitals to rural hospitals on average. The policy challenge is to satisfy the minimum standards in the rural regions. We also conduct simulations with a larger number of types and regions in Appendix B that describes the details of this section.

We assume there are 10 types of doctors and 6 types of hospitals, $|X| = 10$ and $|Y| = 6$. The population of each type is identical, $n_x = 0.1$ for all $x \in X$ and $m_y = 0.25$ for all $y \in Y$. There are three regions $z_1 = z(y_1) = z(y_2)$, $z_2 = z(y_3) = z(y_4)$, and $z_3 = z(y_5) = z(y_6)$. Region z_1 is attractive for doctors (an urban area) while z_2 and z_3 are not (rural areas). All doctors are identical for each hospital on average. Specifically we set

$$\Phi_{xy} := \begin{cases} 2.0 + \xi_{xy} & (x \in X, y \in z_1) \\ 0.5 + \xi_{xy} & (x \in X, y \in \{z_2, z_3\}) \end{cases},$$

where ξ_{xy} are independent noise drawn from $N(0, 1)$.

We assume there are lower bounds on rural areas, and no other constraints are imposed. We take the same lower bound \underline{q}_z for the rural areas z_2 and z_3 ($\{\underline{q}_z \in \mathbb{R} \mid 0.1 \leq \underline{q}_z \leq 0.4\}$) and set no lower bound on the urban area $\underline{q}_{z_1} = 0$. We take an average of 30 simulations in Figure 2.

Let us compare EAE with three different aggregate equilibria (plus AE with no regional constraints (Unconstrained AE, U-AE) as a baseline). First, **Upper-Bounded EAE**

(**UB-EAE**), instead of directly putting the lower bounds on rural regions, imposes the “loosest” upper bound on the urban ones so that a sufficient proportion of doctors moves to the urban regions under EAE. For example, if PM would like to fulfill the lower bounds $\underline{q}_{z_1} = \underline{q}_{z_2} = 0.4$, UB-EAE instead sets an upper-bound with the smallest \bar{q}_{z_1} satisfying $\sum_x \sum_{y \in z_2} \mu_{xy}^{\text{UB-EAE}} \geq 0.4$ and $\sum_x \sum_{y \in z_3} \mu_{xy}^{\text{UB-EAE}} \geq 0.4$. This technique is frequently used in non-transferable utility settings since feasible matchings need not exist with lower bounds (Fragiadakis et al. 2016; Kamada and Kojima 2015). It is also illustrated by the second example in Section 1.1

Second, the **Cap-Reduced AE (CR-AE)** limits the maximum number of doctors matched in the urban area, instead of directly imposing the lower bounds on the rural areas, like UB-EAE. The difference is that PM artificially reduces the capacities of **each hospital type** in the urban area, instead of imposing an upper bound on the urban region. For example, instead of imposing the regional upper-bound $\bar{q}_{z_1} = 0.4$ in UB-EAE, PM sets the artificial capacities $m_{y_1} = m_{y_2} = 0.2$ of the urban hospital slots and computes AE without tax and subsidy. Although this policy inevitably causes inefficient matchings, it is easy to implement and a similar policy is frequently practiced, e.g., JRMP (Kamada and Kojima 2015).

Finally, **Budget-Balanced AE (BB-AE)** requires PM to attain the budget-balanced, i.e., $\sum_{x,y} \mu_{xy} w_z(y) \geq 0$. BB-AE may not be unique as in Panel (b) of Figure 1. We concentrate on BB-AE which maximizes social welfare.

Interestingly, these equilibrium concepts are in an order w.r.t. social welfare for any problem instance.

Proposition 1. For any instance, the levels of social welfare are in the following order:

$$\text{EAE} \geq \text{BB-AE} \geq \text{UB-EAE} \geq \text{CR-AE}.$$

The first inequality comes from the fact that EAE is welfare-maximizing as Corollary 2 states, the second one

holds because UB-EAE imposes only taxes on urban areas so PM always makes a positive surplus, and the third one again follows from the same reason as the first one (under the alternative upper-bound constraints).

Figure 2 summarizes how each equilibrium concept performs. Panel (a) illustrates how much social welfare each equilibrium achieves at each lower bound level to confirm Proposition 1. Panels (b) and (c) represent the agents' (the doctors' and the job slots') welfare and the PM's surplus, which reveals that in EAE, the social efficiency is achieved by relocating the surplus from the PM to the agents. Panels (d) and (e) show the number of doctors matched in the urban and the rural areas. We can see that EAE successfully keeps the number of doctors in z_1 as much as possible while tightly satisfying the rural lower bounds. Finally, Panel (f) depicts the locus of the tax and the average subsidy levels when \underline{q}_z changes. It shows that EAE and UB-EAE are the complete opposites; EAE uses subsidies on the rural regions only while UB-EAE uses a tax on the urban regions only. Here BB-AE, balances a tax and subsidies so that it maximizes the social welfare in the range that the PM surplus remains nonnegative. When PM cannot make a deficit, the BB-AE is the second-best choice that is more desirable than UB-EAE or CR-EAE.

7 Summary and Discussion

This paper develops a framework to conduct a counterfactual analysis to regulate matching markets with constraints. Extending the framework of (Galichon and Salanié 2021), we propose a method to (1) estimate the utility functions of agents from currently available data about matching patterns, (2) predict outcomes under counterfactual policies, and (3) design the welfare-maximizing tax scheme. Our results suggest that there is a better way to implement regional constraints than the policy currently used in practice.

Our framework should be useful for PMs who want to figure out how costly it is to implement the regional constraints. Although constraints are exogenously given in most papers in the literature on matching with constraints, PM often needs to set them balancing the tradeoff between their tightness and the welfare loss. Our method allows her to estimate how much she should pay to meet the different levels of regional quotas, and helps her decision making.

Let us discuss a few possible future directions. First, our framework relies on the large market approximation, assuming that each type has sufficiently many agents. However, when PM has detailed individual data, she may use it to design a better policy. It is worth considering how we can utilize such fine-grained data. Second, although our framework assumes transferable utilities, there is another thick strand of research on matching that assumes non-transferable utilities. Galichon, Kominers, and Weber (2019) establish a general framework that includes both transferable and non-transferable utility matching as special cases. An extension of our framework to their setting is also promising. Lastly, it is worth evaluating the cost of the large market assumption comparing its performance with exact methods.

References

- Abdulkadiroğlu, A.; and Sönmez, T. 2003. School Choice: A Mechanism Design Approach. *American Economic Review*, 93(3): 729–747.
- Agarwal, N.; and Somaini, P. 2018. Demand analysis using strategic reports: An application to a school choice mechanism. *Econometrica*, 86(2): 391–444.
- Aguirregabiria, V.; and Mira, P. 2010. Dynamic discrete choice structural models: A survey. *Journal of Econometrics*, 156(1): 38–67. Structural Models of Optimization Behavior in Labor, Aging, and Health.
- Azevedo, E. M.; and Budish, E. 2019. Strategy-proofness in the large. *The Review of Economic Studies*, 86(1): 81–116.
- Azevedo, E. M.; and Leshno, J. D. 2016. A Supply and Demand Framework for Two-Sided Matching Markets. *Journal of Political Economy*, 124(5): 1235–1268.
- Aziz, H.; Baychkov, A.; and Biró, P. 2020. Summer Internship Matching with Funding Constraints. In *Proceedings of the 19th International Conference on Autonomous Agents and MultiAgent Systems*, 97–104.
- Aziz, H.; Biró, P.; and Yokoo, M. 2022. Matching Market Design with Constraints. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 12308–12316.
- Aziz, H.; Gaspers, S.; Sun, Z.; and Walsh, T. 2019. From Matching with Diversity Constraints to Matching with Regional Quotas. In *Proceedings of the 18th International Conference on Autonomous Agents and MultiAgent Systems*, 377–385.
- Becker, G. S. 1973. A Theory of Marriage: Part I. *Journal of Political Economy*, 81(4): 813–846.
- Biró, P.; Fleiner, T.; Irving, R.; and Manlove, D. 2010. The College Admissions problem with lower and common quotas. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 411(34-36): 3136–3153.
- Bonhomme, S. 2020. *Econometric analysis of bipartite networks*, 83–121. Academic Press. ISBN 9780128117712.
- Choo, E.; and Siow, A. 2006. Estimating a marriage matching model with spillover effects. *Demography*, 43(3): 463–490.
- Demange, G. 1982. *Strategyproofness in the assignment market game*. Laboratoire d'économétrie de l'École polytechnique.
- Ehlers, L.; Hafalir, I. E.; Yenmez, M. B.; and Yildirim, M. A. 2014. School Choice with Controlled Choice Constraints: Hard Bounds versus Soft Bounds. *Journal of Economic Theory*, 153: 648–683.
- Fragiadakis, D.; Iwasaki, A.; Troyan, P.; Ueda, S.; and Yokoo, M. 2016. Strategyproof Matching with Minimum Quotas. *ACM Transactions on Economics and Computation*, 4. (an extended abstract appeared in AAMAS, pages 1327–1328, 2012).
- Gale, D.; and Shapley, L. S. 1962. College Admissions and the Stability of Marriage. *The American Mathematical Monthly*, 69(1): 9–15.
- Galichon, A.; Kominers, S. D.; and Weber, S. 2019. Costly Concessions: An Empirical Framework for Matching with




Figure 2: Panel (a)-(e): the horizontal axis is the lower bound constraints of rural regions ($\underline{q}_{z_2} = \underline{q}_{z_3}$), and the vertical axes indicate (a) the levels of the social welfare, (b) the agent welfare (the doctor welfare + the hospital welfare), (c) the PM surplus, (d) the number of matched doctors in the urban region z_1 , and (e) in the rural regions z_2, z_3 of each algorithm. The gray line in Panel (e) indicates the sum of the lower bounds of z_2, z_3 . Panel (f): the locus of the equilibrium tax and average subsidy of each method when \underline{q}_{z_2} and \underline{q}_{z_3} change. Note that U-AE and CR-EAE use neither tax nor subsidy, the blue, and the green lines stick to the origin.

Imperfectly Transferable Utility. *Journal of Political Economy*, 127(6): 2875–2925.

Galichon, A.; and Salanié, B. 2021. Cupid’s Invisible Hand: Social Surplus and Identification in Matching Models. *Review of Economic Studies*, forthcoming.

Goto, M.; Iwasaki, A.; Kawasaki, Y.; Kurata, R.; Yasuda, Y.; and Yokoo, M. 2016. Strategyproof matching with regional minimum and maximum quotas. *Artificial Intelligence*, 235: 40–57.

Greinecker, M.; and Kah, C. 2021. Pairwise Stable Matching in Large Economies. *Econometrica*, 89(6): 2929–2974.

Hafalir, I. E.; Yenmez, M. B.; and Yildirim, M. A. 2013. Effective affirmative action in school choice. *Theoretical Economics*, 8(2): 325–363.

Jagadeesan, R.; Kominers, S. D.; and Rheingans-Yoo, R. 2018. Strategy-proofness of worker-optimal matching with continuously transferable utility. *Games and Economic Behavior*, 108: 287–294.

Kamada, Y.; and Kojima, F. 2015. Efficient Matching under Distributional Constraints: Theory and Applications. *American Economic Review*, 105(1): 67–99.

Kawase, Y.; and Iwasaki, A. 2017. Near-Feasible Stable Matchings with Budget Constraints. In *Proceedings of the 26th International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 242–248.

Kawase, Y.; and Iwasaki, A. 2018. Approximately Stable Matchings with Budget Constraints. In *Proceedings of the*

Thirty-Second AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence, 1113–1120.

Kawase, Y.; and Iwasaki, A. 2020. Approximately Stable Matchings with General Constraints. In *Proceedings of the 19th International Conference on Autonomous Agents and MultiAgent Systems*, 602–610.

Kelso, A.; and Crawford, V. 1982. Job Matching, Coalition Formation, and Gross Substitutes. *Econometrica*, 50(6): 1483–1504.

Kojima, F. 2012. School choice: Impossibilities for affirmative action. *Games and Economic Behavior*, 75(2): 685–693.

Kurata, R.; Hamada, N.; Iwasaki, A.; and Yokoo, M. 2017. Controlled School Choice with Soft Bounds and Overlapping Types. *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research*, 58: 153–184.

McFadden, D. 1980. Econometric Models for Probabilistic Choice Among Products. *The Journal of Business*, 53(3): S13–S29.

Nöldeke, G.; and Samuelson, L. 2018. The Implementation Duality. *Econometrica*, 86(4): 1283–1324.

Shapley, L. S.; and Shubik, M. 1971. The assignment game I: The core. *International Journal of game theory*, 1(1): 111–130.

A Omitted proofs

A.1 Proof of Lemma 1

Proof. For any type x doctor $i \in I$, by definition of U , we have

$$\begin{aligned} U_{xy} &\leq u_i - \epsilon_{iy}, \quad \forall y \in Y_0 \\ \iff u_i &\geq U_{xy} + \epsilon_{iy}, \quad \forall y \in Y_0 \\ \iff u_i &\geq \max_{y \in Y_0} U_{xy} + \epsilon_{iy}. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, for any type y doctor $j \in J$, we have $v_j \geq \max_{x \in X_0} V_{xy} + \eta_{xj}$.

Suppose to the contrary that there exists type x doctor $i \in I$ that satisfies

$$u_i > \max_{y \in Y_0} U_{xy} + \epsilon_{iy}.$$

If i is matched with hospital $j \in J$, then

$$\begin{aligned} u_i + v_j &= \Phi_{ij} - w_{z(y)} \\ &> \left(\max_{y' \in Y_0} U_{xy'} + \epsilon_{iy'} \right) + \left(\max_{x' \in X_0} V_{x'y} + \eta_{x'j} \right) \\ &\geq U_{xy(j)} + \epsilon_{iy(j)} + V_{xy(j)} + \eta_{xj} \\ &\geq \Phi_{xy} - w_{z(y)} + \epsilon_{iy(j)} + \eta_{jx} \\ &= \Phi_{ij} - w_{z(y)}, \end{aligned}$$

which includes a contradiction. Similarly we see a contradiction when we assume $v_j > \max_{x \in X_0} V_{xy} + \eta_{xj}$. \square

A.2 Theorem 1

First, we show two lemmas used in the proof.

Lemma 2. G and H are strictly increasing and strictly convex.

Proof. G is strictly increasing. Take any $U^1, U^2 \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times M}$ such that $U^1 \geq U^2$ and $U^1 \neq U^2$. Then $G(U^1) \geq G(U^2)$ by definition. In addition, note that $U_{xy}^1 > U_{xy}^2$ holds for some $x \in X$ and $y \in Y$. Since P_x has full support, we have

$$\Pr_{\epsilon_i}(u_i = U_{xy}^1 + \epsilon_{iy}) \geq \Pr_{\epsilon_i}(u_i = U_{xy}^2 + \epsilon_{iy}) > 0.$$

Because $\mathbb{E}_{\epsilon_i}[u_i \mid u_i = U_{xy} + \epsilon_{iy}]$ is strictly increasing in U_{xy} , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{\epsilon_i}[u_i \mid u_i = U_{xy}^1 + \epsilon_{iy}] \cdot \Pr_{\epsilon_i}(u_i = U_{xy}^1 + \epsilon_{iy}) \\ > \mathbb{E}_{\epsilon_i}[u_i \mid u_i = U_{xy}^2 + \epsilon_{iy}] \cdot \Pr_{\eta_j}(u_i = U_{xy}^2 + \epsilon_{iy}), \end{aligned}$$

and thus $G(U^1) > G(U^2)$ holds.

G is strictly convex. Take any $U^1, U^2 \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times M}$ and $s \in [0, 1]$. Since

$$\begin{aligned} sG(U^1) + (1-s)G(U^2) &= \sum_x n_x \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\max_y s(U_{xy}^1 + \epsilon_{iy}) \right) + \left(\max_y (1-s)(U_{xy}^2 + \epsilon_{iy}) \right) \right] \\ &\geq \sum_x n_x \mathbb{E} \left[\max_y sU_{xy}^1 + (1-s)U_{xy}^2 + \epsilon_{iy} \right] \\ &= G(sU^1 + (1-s)U^2) \end{aligned}$$

holds, G is a convex function.

Now suppose $U^1 \neq U^2$. Then $U_{xy}^1 \neq U_{xy}^2$ holds for some $x \in X$, $y \in Y$. Without loss of generality, assume $U_{xy}^1 > U_{xy}^2$. Since P_x is full support,

$$\Pr \left(\left\{ \epsilon_i \mid U_{xy}^1 + \epsilon_{iy} > \max_{y' \neq y} U_{xy'}^1 + \epsilon_{iy'} \quad \wedge \quad \max_{y' \neq y} U_{xy'}^2 + \epsilon_{iy'} > U_{xy}^2 + \epsilon_{iy} \right\} \right) > 0$$

holds. Therefore for any $s \in (0, 1)$, we have

$$sG(U^1) + (1-s)G(U^2) > G(sU^1 + (1-s)U^2),$$

which implies G is strictly convex. Similarly, we can show H is also strictly increasing and strictly convex. \square

Lemma 3. For each x and y , if $\mu_{xy} > 0$, then $U_{xy} + V_{xy} = \Phi_{xy} - w_{z(y)}$.

Proof. Fix any x and y . Suppose that $\mu_{xy} > 0$. Then there exists i and j such that $x(i) = x$, $y(j) = y$, and $d_{ij} = 1$. Suppose toward contradiction that $U_{xy} + V_{xy} > \Phi_{xy} - w_{z(y)}$. By the definition of U_{xy} and V_{xy} , we have

$$u_i - \epsilon_{iy} + v_j - \eta_{xj} > \Phi_{xy} - w_{z(y)},$$

which implies that $u_i + v_j > \tilde{\Phi}_{ij} - w_{ij}$. A contradiction. \square

Proof of Theorem 1.

Proof. Let's consider the necessary and sufficient conditions of the solution to (D). Let $(\lambda_{xy})_{x \in X, y \in Y}$, $(\bar{\lambda}_z, \underline{\lambda}_z)_{z \in Z}$ be lagrange multipliers, then the Lagrangean denoted by \mathcal{L} is computed as follows;

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L} = & G(U) + H(V) + \sum_{z \in Z} \bar{o}_z \bar{w}_z - \sum_{z \in Z} \underline{o}_z \underline{w}_z \\ & + \sum_{x \in X, y \in Y} \lambda_{xy} \left(U_{xy} + V_{xy} - \Phi_{xy} + \bar{w}_{z(y)} - \underline{w}_{z(y)} \right) + \sum_{z \in Z} \bar{\lambda}_z \bar{w}_z + \sum_{z \in Z} \underline{\lambda}_z \underline{w}_z. \end{aligned}$$

The KKT conditions are,

$$\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial U_{xy}} = \nabla_{xy} G(U) + \lambda_{xy} = 0 \quad \forall x \in X, y \in Y, \quad (1)$$

$$\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial V_{xy}} = \nabla_{xy} H(V) + \lambda_{xy} = 0 \quad \forall x \in X, y \in Y, \quad (2)$$

$$\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial \bar{w}_z} = \bar{o}_z + \sum_{y \in z} \sum_{x \in X} \lambda_{xy} + \bar{\lambda}_z = 0 \quad \forall z \in Z, \quad (3)$$

$$\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial \underline{w}_z} = -\underline{o}_z - \sum_{y \in z} \sum_{x \in X} \lambda_{xy} + \underline{\lambda}_z = 0 \quad \forall z \in Z, \quad (4)$$

$$U_{xy} + V_{xy} - \Phi_{xy} + \bar{w}_{z(y)} - \underline{w}_{z(y)} \geq 0 \quad \forall x \in X, y \in Y \quad (5)$$

$$\lambda_{xy} \leq 0, \quad \lambda_{xy} \left(U_{xy} + V_{xy} - \Phi_{xy} + \bar{w}_{z(y)} - \underline{w}_{z(y)} \right) = 0 \quad \forall x \in X, y \in Y \quad (6)$$

$$\bar{w}_z \geq 0, \quad \bar{\lambda}_z \leq 0, \quad \bar{\lambda}_z \bar{w}_z = 0 \quad \forall z \in Z \quad (7)$$

$$\underline{w}_z \geq 0, \quad \underline{\lambda}_z \leq 0, \quad \underline{\lambda}_z \underline{w}_z = 0 \quad \forall z \in Z. \quad (8)$$

This satisfies the linearly independent constraint qualification, which implies these are the necessary conditions for the optimality.

From Lemma 2, the objective function of (D) is convex with respect to $(U, V, \bar{w}, \underline{w})$. Because the constraints are linear in the parameters, KKT conditions are also sufficient conditions for the optimality.

EAE \implies solution of (D): Take any EAE $(\mu, (U, V, w))$ and define $\bar{w}_z = \max\{0, w_z\}$ and $\underline{w}_z = -\min\{0, w_z\}$ for all $z \in Z$.

Define $\lambda_{xy} = -\mu_{xy}$ for all $x \in X, y \in Y$. Then from condition 3 of EAE, the following holds;

$$-\lambda_{xy} = \mu_{xy} = \nabla_{xy} G(U) = \nabla_{xy} H(V), \quad \forall x \in X, y \in Y.$$

This implies that (1) and (2) are satisfied. Now $\mu_{xy} \geq 0$ implies $\lambda_{xy} \leq 0$. From condition 2 of EAE,

$$U_{xy} + V_{xy} - \Phi_{xy} + \bar{w}_{z(y)} - \underline{w}_{z(y)} = 0.$$

This implies that (5) and (6) are satisfied.

Next, when we define

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\lambda}_z &= \sum_{y \in z} \sum_{x \in X} \mu_{xy} - \bar{o}_z \\ \underline{\lambda}_z &= \sum_{y \in z} \sum_{x \in X} -\mu_{xy} + \underline{o}_z, \end{aligned}$$

(3) and (4) are directly implied. Furthermore, by definition, $\bar{w}_z, \underline{w}_z \geq 0$ for every $z \in Z$. And condition 4 of EAE implies that $\bar{\lambda}_z \leq 0, \underline{\lambda}_z \leq 0$. From condition 5 of EAE gives;

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{w}_z > 0 &\implies w_z > 0 \implies \sum_{y \in z} \sum_{x \in X} \mu_{xy} = \bar{o}_z \\ \underline{w}_z > 0 &\implies w_z < 0 \implies \sum_{y \in z} \sum_{x \in X} \mu_{xy} = \underline{o}_z,\end{aligned}$$

which implies that (7) and (8). So we are done with this part.

A solution of (D) \implies EAE: Take any $(U, V, \bar{w}, \underline{w}, \lambda)$ satisfying KKT conditions and define $\mu_{xy} = -\lambda_{xy}$ then (1) and (2) implies that $\mu_{xy} = \nabla_{xy} G(U) = \nabla_{xy} H(V)$ and so condition 3 is satisfied.

(3) and (7) implies;

$$\bar{\lambda}_z = -\sum_{y \in z} \sum_{x \in X} \lambda_{xy} - \bar{o}_z \leq 0 \iff \sum_{y \in z} \sum_{x \in X} \mu_{xy} \leq \bar{o}_z.$$

Similarly, (4) and (8) implies;

$$\underline{\lambda}_z = \sum_{y \in z} \sum_{x \in X} \lambda_{xy} + \underline{o}_z \leq 0 \iff \sum_{y \in z} \sum_{x \in X} \mu_{xy} \geq \underline{o}_z.$$

These says that condition 4 is satisfied.

Define $w_z = \bar{w}_z - \underline{w}_z$, then from (7) we get

$$w_z > 0 \implies \bar{w}_z > 0 \implies \bar{\lambda}_z = \sum_{y \in z} \sum_{x \in X} \mu_{xy} - \bar{o}_z = 0.$$

Now from (8),

$$w_z < 0 \implies \underline{w}_z > 0 \implies \underline{\lambda}_z = -\sum_{y \in z} \sum_{x \in X} \mu_{xy} + \underline{o}_z = 0.$$

Thus, we obtain condition 5 of EAE.

Next, from $\mu_{xy} = \nabla_{xy} G(U) = \nabla_{xy} H(V)$, we get

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{y \in Y_0} \mu_{xy} &= \sum_{y \in Y_0} \nabla_{xy} G(U) = n_x \sum_{y \in Y_0} \Pr\left(\{\epsilon_{iy} \mid u_i = U_{xy} + \epsilon_{iy}\}\right) = n_x, \quad \forall x \in X \\ \sum_{x \in X_0} \mu_{xy} &= \sum_{x \in X_0} \nabla_{xy} H(V) = m_y \sum_{x \in X_0} \Pr\left(\{\eta_{xj} \mid v_j = V_{xy} + \eta_{xj}\}\right) = m_y, \quad \forall y \in Y.\end{aligned}$$

This is equivalent to condition 1 of EAE.

Lastly, Assumption 5 assures us the following; for any $x \in X, y \in Y$,

$$\begin{aligned}-\lambda_{xy} &= \nabla_{xy} G(U) = \Pr\left(\{\epsilon_{iy} \mid u_i = U_{xy} + \epsilon_{iy}\}\right) > 0 \\ -\lambda_{xy} &= \nabla_{xy} H(V) = \Pr\left(\{\eta_{xj} \mid v_j = V_{xy} + \eta_{xj}\}\right) > 0.\end{aligned}$$

(6) implies

$$U_{xy} + V_{xy} = \Phi_{xy} - w_z(y), \quad \forall x \in X, y \in Y.$$

Hence, condition 2 of EAE is satisfied.

Therefore we are done with this part. □

A.3 Proof of Corollary 1

Proof.

Existence: First, observe that the feasible set of (D) is nonempty and convex. Then by the theorem of convex duality, (D) has a solution.

Uniqueness: Fix any EAEs $(\mu, (U, V, w))$ and $(\mu', (U', V', w'))$. We want to show that $(\mu, (U, V, w)) = (\mu', (U', V', w'))$.

Let $I(w) := \sum_{z \in Z} \bar{o}_z \max\{0, w_z\} - \sum_{z \in Z} \underline{o}_z (-\min\{0, w_z\})$. Then, the objective function of (D) can be rewritten as

$$g(U, V, w) := G(U) + H(V) + I(w).$$

Note that I is convex, and hence g is also convex.

Consider

$$(\mu'', (U'', V'', w'')) := \frac{1}{2}(\mu, (U, V, w)) + \frac{1}{2}(\mu', (U', V', w')).$$

Note that $(\mu'', (U'', V'', w''))$ is feasible in (D). Since G and H are strictly convex and any EAE should be a solution to (D), we have $U = U' = U''$ and $V = V' = V''$; otherwise $g(U'', V'', w'') < g(U, V, w)$ and this contradicts the optimality of (U, V, w) .

Suppose toward contradiction that $w \neq w'$, or there exists z_0 such that $w_{z_0} \neq w'_{z_0}$. First, note that since $U = U'$ and $V = V'$, we have $\mu = \mu'$ by the market clearing condition.

Case (i): $\sum_{y \in z_0} \sum_x \mu_{xy} \in (\bar{o}_{z_0}, \underline{o}_{z_0})$. By the complementary slackness condition, we have $w_{z_0} = w'_{z_0}$. A contradiction.

Case (ii): $\sum_{y \in z_0} \sum_x \mu_{xy} = \bar{o}_{z_0} (> 0)$. By the complementary slackness condition, we have $w_{z_0} \geq 0$ and $w'_{z_0} \geq 0$. Since $w_{z_0} \neq w'_{z_0}$, assume without loss of generality that $w_{z_0} > w'_{z_0} \geq 0$. Let $\tilde{w} := (w''_{z_0}, w_{-z_0})$. Observe that (U, V, \tilde{w}) is feasible in (D).

Then, we have

$$\begin{aligned} g(U, V, \tilde{w}) - g(U, V, w) &= \bar{o}_{z_0}(w''_{z_0} - w_{z_0}) \\ &< 0 \quad (\because w''_{z_0} < w_{z_0}), \end{aligned}$$

which contradicts the optimality of (U, V, w) .

Case (iii): $\sum_{y \in z_0} \sum_x \mu_{xy} = \underline{o}_{z_0}$. If $\underline{o}_{z_0} > 0$, we can show $w_{z_0} = w'_{z_0}$ in a similar manner to case (ii).

Suppose that $\underline{o}_{z_0} = 0$. Assume without loss of generality that $w_{z_0} > w'_{z_0} \geq 0$. Let $\tilde{w} := (0, w_{-z_0})$, and $\tilde{U} := (U_{xy} - w_{z_0}, U_{-(xy)})$. Observe that $(\tilde{U}, V, \tilde{w})$ is feasible in (D). Since function G is strictly increasing in U_{xy} by Lemma 2, we have

$$g(\tilde{U}, V, \tilde{w}) < g(U, V, w),$$

which contradicts the optimality of (U, V, w) . □

A.4 Proof of Corollary 2

The dual expression of (D) is

$$(P) \quad \begin{array}{l} \text{maximize}_{\mu_{xy} \geq 0} \quad \sum_{(x,y) \in T} \mu_{xy} \Phi_{xy} + \mathcal{E}(\mu) \\ \text{subject to} \quad \sum_{y \in Y_0} \mu_{xy} = n_x, \forall x \in X \\ \quad \quad \quad \sum_{x \in X_0} \mu_{xy} = m_y, \forall y \in Y \\ \quad \quad \quad \underline{o}_z \leq \sum_{y \in z} \sum_{x \in X} \mu_{xy} \leq \bar{o}_z, \forall z \in Z \end{array}$$

where $\mathcal{E}(\mu) := -G^*(\mu) - H^*(\mu)$, and G^*, H^* are the Legendre-Fenchel transform of G, H :

$$G^*(\mu) := \sup_U \left\{ \sum_{x \in X} \sum_{y \in Y_0} \mu_{xy} U_{xy} - G(U) \right\} \quad (9)$$

$$H^*(\mu) := \sup_V \left\{ \sum_{y \in Y} \sum_{x \in X_0} \mu_{xy} V_{xy} - H(V) \right\}. \quad (10)$$

We are now to show that for any matching μ that satisfies the market clearing condition, the objective function of (P) represents the social welfare. First, we will show the following lemma:

Lemma 4. For each i and j , let

$$Y_i^*(U) \in \arg \max_{y \in Y_0} \{U_{x(i),y} + \epsilon_{iy}\}, \quad X_j^*(V) \in \arg \max_{x \in X_0} \{V_{x,y(j)} + \eta_{xj}\}.$$

Given any feasible matching μ that satisfies the market clearing condition, the systematic utilities U and V are uniquely determined by

$$\mu_{xy} = \nabla_{xy}G(U) = \nabla_{xy}H(V), \quad \forall (x, y) \in T \quad (11)$$

since G and H are strictly convex. Let us denote them by $U(\mu)$ and $V(\mu)$. Then, we have

$$\mathcal{E}(\mu) = \sum_{x \in X} n_x \mathbb{E}_{\epsilon_i \sim P_x} [\epsilon_{i, Y_i^*(U(\mu))}] + \sum_{y \in Y} m_y \mathbb{E}_{\eta_j \sim Q_y} [\eta_{X_j^*(V(\mu)), j}].$$

That is, $\mathcal{E}(\mu)$ is equal to the agents' welfare that comes from the unobserved error terms.

Proof of Lemma 4. First, we note that $U(\mu)$ and $V(\mu)$ attain the supremum on the RHS of (9) and (10) because (11) gives the first order conditions.

Let $\bar{\mu}_{xy} := \mu_{xy}/n_x$, which is the proportion of type- x agents matched with type- y agents. For any $x \in X$ and any $U_x := (U_{xy})_{y \in Y_0}$, define

$$\begin{aligned} G_x(U_x) &:= \mathbb{E}_{\epsilon_i \sim P_x} \left[\max_{y \in Y_0} \{U_{xy} + \epsilon_{iy}\} \right] \\ &= \sum_{y \in Y_0} U_{xy} \cdot \underbrace{\Pr \left(y \in \arg \max_{y' \in Y_0} \{U_{x, y'} + \epsilon_{iy'}\} \right)}_{\text{choice probability of } y} + \mathbb{E}_{\epsilon_i \sim P_x} [\epsilon_{i, Y_i^*(U)}] \\ &= \sum_{y \in Y} \bar{\mu}_{xy} U_{xy} + \mathbb{E}_{\epsilon_i \sim P_x} [\epsilon_{i, Y_i^*(U)}]. \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

Note that $U_{xy_0} = 0$. By definition, we have $G(U) = \sum_{x \in X} n_x G_x(U_x)$.

Let us consider the Legendre-Fenchel transform of G_x . That is

$$G_x^*(\bar{\mu}_x) := \begin{cases} \sup_{U_x} \left\{ \sum_{y \in Y_0} \bar{\mu}_{xy} U_{xy} - G_x(U_x) \right\} & \left(\sum_{y \in Y} \bar{\mu}_{xy} \leq 1 \right), \\ +\infty & \text{(otherwise)} \end{cases} \quad (13)$$

and it follows that $G^*(\mu) = \sum_{x \in X} n_x G_x^*(\bar{\mu}_x)$.

Then, we have

$$\begin{aligned} -G^*(\mu) &= \sum_{x \in X} n_x (-G_x^*(\bar{\mu}_x)) \\ &= \sum_{x \in X} n_x \left[G_x(U_x(\mu)) - \sum_y \bar{\mu}_{xy} U_{xy}(\mu) \right] \\ &= \sum_{x \in X} n_x \mathbb{E}_{\epsilon_i \sim P_x} [\epsilon_{i, Y_i^*(U(\mu))}]. \end{aligned}$$

The second equality follows from (13) and the definition of $U(\mu)$. The last equality follows from (12).

By a similar argument, we can show that

$$-H^*(\mu) = \sum_{y \in Y} m_y \mathbb{E}_{\eta_j \sim Q_y} [\eta_{X_j^*(V(\mu)), j}].$$

□

Lemma 4 states that $\mathcal{E}(\mu)$ captures the social surplus unobserved by the policy maker, which is the summation of the error terms that contribute to the social surplus. Hence, the objective function of (P) indeed represents the social welfare in this economy. Because the objective function is concave and the constraints are linear, the optimal value of (P) coincides with that of (D). Therefore the EAE maximizes the social welfare under the regional constraints. Furthermore, the optimal tax scheme is obtained as the lagrange multipliers for the regional constraints, they only depend on the binding region z . □

B Omitted Explanations

B.1 Validity of Individual Equilibrium

First, we recall the definition of the individual equilibrium. Below u_i and v_j are interpreted as i 's and j 's payoffs in the equilibrium, respectively.

Definition 5 (Individual Equilibrium). A profile $(d, (u, v), w)$ of matching d , equilibrium payoffs of agents $(u, v) \in \mathbb{R}^{|I|} \times \mathbb{R}^{|J|}$, and taxes $w \in \mathbb{R}^L$ is *stable* if d satisfies the population constraint, and

- (Individual rationality) For all i , $u_i \geq \tilde{\Phi}_{i j_0} := 0$, with equality if i is unmatched in d ; for all j , $v_j \geq \tilde{\Phi}_{i_0 j} := 0$, with equality if j is unmatched in d .
- (No blocking pairs) For all i and j , $u_i + v_j \geq \tilde{\Phi}_{ij}$, with equality if i and j are matched in d .

We can expect that $(d, (u, v), w)$ satisfies the stability condition in the frictionless decentralized job market by the following reason. First, if i and j match, their payoff should satisfy $u_i + v_j = \tilde{\Phi}_{ij}$. Here we only assume that they divide the joint surplus without any waste. Suppose, to the contrary, that $u_i + v_j < \tilde{\Phi}_{ij}$ holds for some i and j in a matching. These i and j are not matched with each other under the equilibrium matching d . If they deviate from the current match and form a pair (i, j) , they will produce the net joint surplus $\tilde{\Phi}_{ij}$. Then they can divide the net joint surplus so that both of them can be strictly better off. (We implicitly assume that they can reach such an agreement.) Therefore, $u_i + v_j < \tilde{\Phi}_{ij}$ cannot occur in the equilibrium.

Moreover, it is known that the stable matching can also be achieved by centralized mechanisms with descending salary-adjustment mechanism and the mechanism is strategy-proof for one side (Jagadeesan, Kominers, and Rheingans-Yoo (2018); Demange (1982).) Although we did not show this, the results of Azevedo and Budish (2019) suggest that the mechanism may also be strategy-proof in the large (see Azevedo and Budish (2019) for the definition).

B.2 Additional Explanation for Assumptions

To derive Theorem 1, we made five assumptions in total. We restate them below.

Assumption 1 (Regional Constraint). Each type $y \in Y$ can belong to only one region. Denote the region that type y belongs to by $z(y) \in Z$.

Assumption 2 (Large Market Approximation). Each type x has n_x mass of continuum of agents rather than distinct n_x agents. Similarly we assume there are m_y mass of type y job slots.

Assumption 3 (Independence). For each x and $i \in x$, error term ϵ_{iy} is drawn from the distribution P_x . Similarly, for each y and $j \in y$, error term η_{xj} is drawn from the distribution Q_y . The error terms are independent across all i 's and j 's.

Assumption 4 (Additive Separability). For each x and y , $\tilde{\Phi}_{ij} - \epsilon_{iy} - \eta_{xj}$ is constant over the individuals $i \in x$ and $j \in y$, and denoted by Φ_{xy} .

Assumption 5 (Smooth Distribution with Full-Support). For each x and y , the cdf's P_x and Q_y are continuously differentiable. Moreover, $\text{supp}(P_x) = \mathbb{R}^{N+1}$ and $\text{supp}(Q_y) = \mathbb{R}^{M+1}$.

Assumption 1 suggests that, without loss of generality, if type y slots belong to region z_1 and z_2 , we redefine the type of slots in z_1 as $y_{(1)}$ and z_2 as $y_{(2)}$.

Assumption 2 implies that this is not a *finite agent model* as in (Gale and Shapley 1962; Shapley and Shubik 1971), but *large economy model* as in (Azevedo and Leshno 2016; Galichon, Kominers, and Weber 2019; Nöldeke and Samuelson 2018). As mentioned in (Greinecker and Kah 2021), the large economy model usually eliminates the existence of individuals and considers the matching outcomes defined as the pair of observable types as in the current paper. This is originally to diminish the influence of the individual to compute the stable matching under some externality. Galichon and Salanié (2021); Galichon, Kominers, and Weber (2019) recently take the advantage of this model to identify the matching model, i.e., to express the parameter of interest as a function of the distribution of the observed data. We follow this strategy to obtain the identification result from an econometric point of view.

Assumption 3 may be relaxed, but, as mentioned in (Aguirregabiria and Mira 2010), it is rare to drop the independence assumption in the discrete choice literature because the model becomes highly noncontractable.

Assumption 4 allows us to characterize stable matchings as market equilibria of discrete choice problems from both the doctor and the hospital side over the observable types of the other side. Additivity and separability are common assumptions in the econometrics literature (Aguirregabiria and Mira 2010; Bonhomme 2020).

Assumption 5 ensures that we observe at least one match between any two observable types. This is an essential assumption for our identification result. Imagine we do not observe any match between a pair of (x, y) . There are two possible cases for this to happen: (1) $\Phi_{xy} = -\infty$, or (2) just a realization error. Full support assumption eliminates the second case, and thus we can assume that a type pair suffers from infinite loss when we do not observe any matching between the pair. We focus the finite surplus setting and Assumption 5 excludes the above situation.

B.3 Simulate EAE in a Larger Market

Although EAE is relatively easy to compute by the convex programming (D), we measured how long it takes to compute. We use CVXPY solver⁵ on our M1 Max Macbook Pro (32GB memory, 2021 model). We simulate the markets with $|X| = 10, 20$ doctor types and $|Z| = 5, 10, \dots, 100$ regions. We assume each region has 10 types of hospitals.

The actual JRMP problem has 47 regions (all prefectures in Japan) and approximately 10000 residents in total each year. Here the market with 10 doctor types and 50 regions (500 hospital types) has 5000 doctor-hospital type pairs (two residents for each pair on average), which is enough large to imitate the actual market.

For each $|X|$, $|Y|$, and $|Z|$, we define the populations as $n_x = 1.0/|X|$ for $x \in X$ and $m_y = 1.5/|Y|$ for $y \in Y$. We set the lower bounds for all regions; $\underline{o}_z = 0.3/|Z|$. We do not impose upper bounds on the regions. We set

$$\Phi_{xy} := 2.0 + \xi_{xy}$$

for all $x \in X, y \in Y$, where ξ_{xy} are independent noise drawn from $N(0, 1)$. We measure the time to compute EAE 10 times for each $|X|$ and $|Z|$, and take the average of them. The result is illustrated in Figure 3. It is clear that EAE is fast enough to be used for estimation and counterfactual simulation.




Figure 3: Average computation time (seconds) to compute EAE (an average of 10 trials). The number of doctor types are $|X| = 10, 20$ and the number of regions are $|Z| = 5, 10, 15, \dots, 100$. Each region has 10 hospital types.

B.4 How to Compute Alternative Equilibria

Upper-bounded EAE (UB-EAE) Given a lower bound for $\underline{o}_z = \underline{o}_{z_2} = \underline{o}_{z_3}$, we compute UB-EAE as follows; we set the 41 candidates of the upper bound for z_1 as $B = \{0.10, 0.11, 0.12, \dots, 0.50\}$, and

1. We take an upper bound for z_1 , \bar{o}_{z_1} , from B from the smallest.
2. Compute EAE under the regional constraint \bar{o}_{z_1} (we do not impose other constraints; we set $\bar{o}_{z_2} = \bar{o}_{z_3} = \infty$ and $\underline{o}_z = 0$ for all z). Let the EAE matching be μ .
3. Check if the lower bounds for z_2 and z_3 are satisfied in EAE; check whether both $\sum_{x \in X} \sum_{y \in z_2} \mu_{xy} \geq \underline{o}_z$ and $\sum_{x \in X} \sum_{y \in z_3} \mu_{xy} \geq \underline{o}_z$ are satisfied.
 - If they are satisfied, then the current EAE is UB-EAE.
 - Otherwise, we take another candidate of the upper bound for z_1 from B which is one step larger.
4. Repeat the above process until we find an UB-EAE.

In the current setting, we successfully find an UB-EAE for every lower bound.

⁵<https://www.cvxpy.org/>

Cap-reduced AE (CR-AE) Given a lower bound for $\underline{q}_z = \underline{q}_{z_2} = \underline{q}_{z_3}$, we compute the unconstrained AE (U-AE) as follows; we set the 41 candidates of the artificial capacities of the urban hospitals y_1, y_2 as $\hat{m} = \hat{m}_{y_1} = \hat{m}_{y_2} \in B = \{0.050, 0.055, 0.060, \dots, 0.25\}$, and

1. We take an artificial capacity \hat{m} from B from the smallest.
2. Compute U-AE under the artificial capacities $\hat{m}_{y_1} = \hat{m}_{y_2} = \hat{m}$ by (D') setting $w_z = 0$ for all $z \in Z$ (note that we do not impose any regional constraints). Let the AE matching be μ .
3. Check if the lower bounds for z_2 and z_3 are satisfied in AE; check whether both $\sum_{x \in X} \sum_{y \in z_2} \mu_{xy} \geq \underline{q}_z$ and $\sum_{x \in X} \sum_{y \in z_3} \mu_{xy} \geq \underline{q}_z$ are satisfied.
 - If they are satisfied, then the current AE is CR-AE.
 - Otherwise, we take another candidate of \hat{m} from B which is one step larger.
4. Repeat the above process until we find CR-AE.

In the current setting, we successfully find CR-AE for every lower bound.

Budget-balanced AE (BB-AE) To compute BB-AE, we run the grid search; we set the candidates (grids) of taxes as

$$W = \left\{ (w_1, w_2, w_3) \in \mathbb{R}^3 \mid w_1 \in \{0, 0.5, 1.0, \dots, 10.0\} \text{ and } w_2, w_3 \in \{-0.2, -0.19, -0.18, \dots, 0.00\} \right\}.$$

For each $(w_{z_1}, w_{z_2}, w_{z_3}) \in W$, we compute U-AE by (D') setting $(w_{z_1}, w_{z_2}, w_{z_3})$. Then for each lower bound for $\underline{q}_z = \underline{q}_{z_2} = \underline{q}_{z_3}$, we select the equilibrium that maximizes the social welfare among all BB-AE; it is computed as the solution to

$$\max_{\mu \in \hat{M}} \sum_{x \in X} \sum_{y \in Y} \mu_{xy} (\Phi_{xy} - w_{z(y)})$$

where \hat{M} is the set of all μ (U-AE for some $w \in W$) that satisfies

$$\sum_{x \in X} \sum_{y \in Y} \mu_{xy} w_{z(y)} \geq 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{x \in X} \sum_{y \in z} \mu_{xy} \geq \underline{q}_z \text{ for each } z = z_2, z_3.$$