

# On Welfare Analysis under Limited Attention\*

Mikhail Freer<sup>†</sup>

Hassan Nosratabadi<sup>‡</sup>

December 13, 2022

## Abstract

An observer wants to understand a decision maker’s welfare from her choices. She believes that decisions are made under limited attention – i.e., not all alternatives are considered. Given the experimental evidence, we argue that existing models of limited attention are not helpful in achieving this observer’s goal. We propose a “minimal” adjustment to the baseline model of choice under limited attention by assuming that the decision process involves *at least one comparison*. Using experimental data, we illustrate that this adjustment significantly enriches the welfare relevance of the model with negligible costs in its explanatory power.

## 1 Introduction

An observer wants to retrieve reliable information about the preferences of a decision maker (henceforth, DM) from her choice. If the DM is rational, i.e. maximizes a complete and transitive preference relation – then this task is straightforward. A chosen alternative is preferred to all alternatives that are available but not chosen. However, this conclusion is only valid if the DM pays attention to all alternatives, which is hardly satisfied in reality. This behooves the observer to drop the assumption of full attention in practice.

Masatlioglu et al. (2012) proposes a parsimonious model of choice under limited attention. In this model, the DM is endowed with a rational preference relation, but only considers a subset of a given budget set. She chooses the best alternative from those that she considers. How are these consideration sets formed? The observer may not know much about their formation. Perhaps a fundamental property of an inattentive DM should be that when an alternative outside of her consideration set is removed, her consideration set does not change. Such consideration sets are referred to as *attention filters*. The choice procedure described by a pair consisting of an attention filter and a rational preference relation is referred to as choice under limited attention by Masatlioglu et al. (2012) (henceforth, the generic CLA).

To what extent can the generic CLA model be useful for understanding DM’s welfare? Consider choice observations  $\mathbf{c}\{x, z\} = x$ ,  $\mathbf{c}\{x, y, w\} = x$ , and  $\mathbf{c}\{y, w\} = y$ . There is

---

\*We would like to thank Yuta Inoue and Koji Shirai for providing the data used in this paper. We would also like to thank Joshua Lanier and Yusufcan Masatlioglu for providing valuable comments.

<sup>†</sup>Department of Economics, University of Essex. e-mail: [m.freer@essex.ac.uk](mailto:m.freer@essex.ac.uk)

<sup>‡</sup>CORE, Université catholique de Louvain. e-mail: [seyed.nosratabadi@uclouvain.be](mailto:seyed.nosratabadi@uclouvain.be)

no violation of rational choice in these observations. If an observer believes DM is fully attentive, then she infers that  $x$  maximizes the DM’s welfare. How does  $x$  do, if she instead assumes that DM has limited attention? Under the generic CLA model, the observer would not retrieve *any* information on how good  $x$  is. This is because she casts the following interpretation: DM is disregarding everything except the chosen alternative, and thus her preference relation is completely unidentified. In other words, the *absolute revelation* of welfare optimum under full attention collapses down to *no revelation* under the generic CLA model.

The example above is not just an artificial construct that one may disregard. In fact, it speaks to a persistent issue of welfare relevance under the generic CLA model that restricts welfare analysis at two levels. The first level is due to the fact that the “only paying attention to what one chooses” interpretation is a valid one under the generic CLA model for any observation that does not violate rationality. Moreover, experimental findings suggest that a sizable proportion of subjects are consistent with rationality. This proportion, for example, is 75% in Manzini et al. (2010), 78% in Huber et al. (1982), 60% in Doyle et al. (1999), and 33% in Inoue and Shirai (2018). The second level of restriction is associated with the fact that welfare analysis under the generic CLA model is not only dependent on violations of rational choice, but further on particular patterns of such violations.<sup>1</sup> An intuitive consequence is that the generic CLA model may not provide much help when violations of rationality are not *abundant*. We empirically establish evidence for this intuition using the experimental data from Inoue and Shirai (2018). In this experiment 33% of subjects are rational for whom no welfare revelation under the generic CLA model is possible. We also find that for another 21% who demonstrate instances of irrational behavior, we still can not draw any welfare conclusions.

How can we avoid this collapse in welfare relevance without sacrificing the assumption of limited attention? In this paper, we propose a *safe* adjustment to the generic CLA model. We argue that the “only paying attention to what one chooses” interpretation is not a fair description of most economic choices since it, essentially, removes the concept of *comparison* from choice. In our view, the DM faces trade-offs in most choice scenarios. Hence, we make the orthodox assumption that she at least makes one comparison; that is, she pays attention to at least two alternatives.

How much welfare relevance does this assumption buy us? Let us go back to the example above. In the first budget set, the DM considers both alternatives and thus reveals that she likes  $x$  better than  $z$ . Her choice from the second budget set tells us that  $x$  is better than  $y$  or  $w$ . However, we do not know exactly which preference holds. If  $x$  is indeed better than  $y$ , then the fact that  $y$  is chosen over  $w$  in the last pairwise observation – is better than  $w$  – would imply that  $x$  is also better than  $w$ . Hence, we come to the conclusion that  $x$  is indeed the revealed best. The reality nonetheless, may be less promising. It could be the case that  $x$  is better than  $w$  in the second observation, in which case  $x$  is guaranteed to be the second best alternative. Thus, we can say that  $x$  is either the first or the second best alternative. That is a significant improvement over the generic CLA model which provided no welfare ranking at all.

---

<sup>1</sup>These are instances when removing an alternative from a problem produces a choice reversal. See Masatlioglu et al. (2012).

**Contribution** This paper studies welfare analysis under limited attention by imposing restrictions on the minimal cardinality of consideration sets. We do this by building a hierarchy of CLA models based on the minimum number of alternatives to which DM pays attention. We refer to the CLA model in which the DM pays attention to at least  $k$  alternatives as the  $k^{\text{th}}$ -order CLA model, which incorporates the generic CLA as the first-order model. We first characterize these theories based on complete data sets (all subsets of the universal set of alternatives are observed). While we believe complete data sets are not practical, we start with an axiomatic approach based on them in order to understand the fundamental properties of our model. We provide two axioms. The first one (SARP $^k$ ) establishes that DM should act rationally if the cardinality of the budget set she faces does not surpass the minimal cardinality of consideration sets. The second axiom (WARP(LA $^k$ )) concerns her choice on the remainder of budget sets, where she may violate rationality. This axiom establishes that such violations should only occur if her attention set is affected.

Next, we provide a revealed preference test for the model given an incomplete data set (only some subsets of the universal set are observed). In doing so, we take the common approach from the revealed preference theory with incomplete data sets, which dates back to Afriat (1967) (see Chambers and Echenique, 2016, for an overview of the literature). In particular, we characterize the model using the mixed-integer program, which is also a computationally tractable algorithm to test the consistency of a data set with the model. Our next contribution is to formally address the issue of welfare bounds within our model. We present a computationally tractable algorithm to construct “a measure of welfare relevance”. To construct this measure, we look at the size of the lower contour set of any given alternative based on potential preferences and attention filters that could generate the observed behavior. To guarantee robustness in welfare analysis, we consider the minimum size of the lower contour sets among all such preference-filter couples for any alternative. We say an alternative delivers the *guaranteed welfare bound* if it has the largest minimal lower contour set. We then treat the size of its lower contour set as the measure of welfare relevance.

We further investigate the welfare relevance of our theory by applying it to the experimental data from Inoue and Shirai (2018). The goal of this exercise is to (1) test whether our additional assumption on the minimal cardinality of consideration sets is feasible, and (2) showcase a realistic example of the improvement in welfare relevance we can achieve using our theory.

There is, as one may expect, a trade-off between the explanatory power and the welfare relevance of the CLA model as one increases the minimal cardinality of consideration sets. On the one hand, fewer patterns of choice would be consistent with the model. On the other, the model’s welfare relevance improves. With respect to the data in Inoue and Shirai (2018), we find this trade-off to be most reasonable in the second-, third-, and fourth-order CLA. The model requiring one comparison costs *only less than 1%* of explanatory power; that is, less than 1% of subjects who are consistent with the generic CLA (i.e., the first-order CLA) model, fail the test for the CLA model which requires subject to make at least one comparison (the second-order CLA). The third-order CLA model results in rejecting the hypothesis for 12% of subjects consistent with the generic CLA model, while the fourth-order CLA model does so for 21% of subjects.

Next, we look at the benefits of the assumption of minimal cardinality of consideration sets on welfare relevance. Recall that we consider the size of the lower contour set for the

alternative that delivers the guaranteed welfare bound as our measure of welfare relevance. The generic CLA model does not allow us to draw any welfare conclusions for more than half of the subjects. Looking across the full pool of subjects, the generic CLA model only guarantees (on average) the alternative delivering the guaranteed welfare bound to be strictly better than less than 10% of available alternatives. Nevertheless, in the second-order CLA model, we already see the alternative delivering the guaranteed welfare bound is (on average) strictly better than at least 40% of alternatives (an extra 30% of welfare relevance at a 1% cost in explanatory power). The third-order CLA model, increases this number to 60% (50% increase in welfare relevance at a 12% explanatory cost), while the fourth-order CLA model reaches 70% (a 60% increase in welfare relevance at a 21% explanatory cost).

**Literature** A number of variations of the generic CLA model have been studied in the literature. Examples include but are not limited to Lleras et al. (2017), Kimya (2018), Geng and Özbay (2021), and Geng (2022). However, very little focus has been given to the issue of welfare, especially in the case of incomplete data sets. Indeed, Masatlioglu et al. (2012) itself mentions the fact that one can assume that the attention sets contain at least two alternatives so that the preferences of the DM are fully retrieved from observations over doubletons. The latter conclusion only works if the observer has access to a data set that is too large even for an experimental setting with a large number of alternatives.<sup>2</sup> Welfare analysis when the DM’s choice does not have to be consistent with rationality is the main focus of Bernheim and Rangel (2009). These authors adopt a model-free approach and focus on constructing a conservative notion of welfare based on observed choice. However, this approach would generate a coarse measure of welfare (see Rubinstein and Salant, 2012; Manzini and Mariotti, 2014). Moreover, Masatlioglu et al. (2012) points out a potential welfare conflict between Bernheim and Rangel (2009)’s model-free approach and a model-based one (like Masatlioglu et al., 2012). Of course, since our model covers the generic CLA model as a special case, and thus this critique carries over to our paper. De Clippel and Rozen (2021) is closely related to our paper. They (among other results) provide a test for the generic CLA model on an incomplete data set. Their test allows them to partially identify the underlying preferences, but only for the generic CLA model. Thus, the main concern of our paper – that is, the depth of welfare analysis as a function of the minimal cardinality of consideration sets – is not the focus of De Clippel and Rozen (2021). Another notable paper is Demuynck and Seel (2018) which allows for partial identification of the underlying preference relation of the DM in a setting with prices. However, the result of Demuynck and Seel (2018) works for the case where the DM purchases a bundle of goods with prices being assigned to each unit of a good. The model we propose, on the other hand, works for any choice environment. Another related paper is the one by Guan (2022) which shows that, under the condition that DM considers at least two alternatives, the sequential elimination procedure always guarantees maximization of the DM’s underlying preference relation. However, unlike Guan (2022) we do not impose any restrictions on the decision making procedure. That is a crucial point since Guan (2022) itself shows in an experiment that unless the DM is nudged to use the sequential elimination procedure, she might end up deviating from it.

---

<sup>2</sup>With 10 alternatives, one would need 45 observations only on doubletons. A complete data set will consist of 1013 problems.

**Structure** Section 2 provides the necessary definitions. Section 3 presents the theoretical results. Section 4 analyzes the experimental data. Section 5 concludes. All proofs omitted in the paper are in the Appendix.

## 2 Definitions

Let  $X$  be a finite universal set of alternatives. Let  $\mathcal{B} \subseteq 2^X$  be a collection of budget sets, where  $2^X$  is the set of all non-empty subsets of  $X$ .  $\mathbf{c} : \mathcal{B} \rightarrow X$  is a *choice function* if  $\mathbf{c}(B) \in B$ . Thus an *data set* can be described as a tuple  $(\mathcal{B}, \mathbf{c})$ . A binary relation  $\succ \subseteq X \times X$  is a strict preference relation if it is complete (all elements are comparable), transitive ( $x \succ x'$  and  $x \succ x'$  implies  $x \succ x''$  for any  $x, x', x'' \in X$ ), and asymmetric ( $x \succ x'$  implies  $x' \not\succ x$  for any  $x, x' \in X$ ). We write  $x \succeq x'$  if  $x \succ x'$  or  $x = x'$  for every  $x, x' \in X$ .

Following the prominent paper of Masatlioglu et al. (2012), we consider the limited attention framework using the *attention filter* denoted by  $\Gamma : 2^X \rightarrow 2^X$  such that  $\Gamma(B) \subseteq B$  and  $\Gamma(B) = \Gamma(B \setminus \{x\})$  for every  $B \in 2^X$  and  $x \notin \Gamma(B)$ . Naturally, a DM who suffers from limited attention chooses the best alternative (according to her preference relation) from the set that she pays attention to (according to her attention filter).

In the model of Masatlioglu et al. (2012) however, there is no further restriction applied to the attention filter. Thus, A DM may, for example, only pay attention to the alternative that she is choosing ( $\Gamma(B) = \mathbf{c}(B)$ ). This pattern, of course, makes her choice inconsistent with rationality altogether. As mentioned in the introduction we aim to make an adjustment to this theory so that it *necessitates comparisons before making a final decision*. The latter principle is however formally equivalent to putting a “minimum cap” on the size of the consideration set. For example, if the cardinality of the consideration set is 1, then DM would not make any comparisons. If, on the other hand, the size is 2, then she makes one comparison. What if the size is 3? Since she is rational within her attention set, then would only need to make two comparisons to find the best alternative in this case. For example, assume that  $a, b,$ , and  $c$  are the alternatives DM pays attention to. She can start by comparing  $a$  and  $b$  and then compare the “winner” with  $c$ , and transitivity would guarantee that she finds the best among the three alternatives this way. Hence, since DM is yet rational within the alternatives she pays attention to, we can formally implement the condition that DM makes a minimum number of comparisons by form putting a limit on the size of her consideration set. Next, we formalize the model.

**Definition 1.** A data set  $(\mathcal{B}, \mathbf{c})$  is **rationalizable with  $k^{\text{th}}$ -order choice under limited attention** ( $k^{\text{th}}$ -order CLA) if there exist

- a strict preference relation  $\succ$ , and
- an attention filter  $\Gamma$  with the property that  $|\Gamma(B)| \geq \min\{|B|, k\}$  for all  $B$ ,

and such that

$$\mathbf{c}(B) = \operatorname{argmax}(\succ, \Gamma(B))$$

for any budget set  $B \in \mathcal{B}$ .<sup>3</sup>

According to Definition 2, the model of Masatlioglu et al. (2012) is the *first-order CLA* where DM may potentially only pay attention to what she chooses; thus, may not face any trade-offs. As the order in CLA representation increases, she makes more comparisons in her decision process.

## 3 Theoretical Results

### 3.1 Characterization on Complete Data Sets

In this section, we characterize the  $k$ -th order CLA model on a complete data set. That is the data set that includes all the possible subsets of a universal set of alternatives. While complete data sets are not guaranteed in applications, an axiomatization based on them provides important insights into the underlying nature of DM's behavior.

There are two fundamentals underlying our DM's behavior. The first one accounts for DM's behavior on those sets where she is fully attentive; that is, where the size of the budget does not exceed the minimum cardinality of the consideration set. On such budgets, she should act completely rationally. Hence, she should admit to the *strong axiom of revealed preference* and thus does not exhibit any *direct* and *indirect* cycles in revealed preferences. To implement this axiom in our setting, we use the following terminology. We say  $x_1$  is  $k^{\text{th}}$ -order directly chosen over  $x_2$  if there exists a budget set  $B \in \mathcal{B} : |B| \leq k$  containing  $x_1, x_2$  where  $x_1$  is chosen. We then say,  $x_1$  is  $k^{\text{th}}$ -order indirectly chosen over  $x_n$  if there exist  $\{x_2, x_3 \dots, x_{n-1}\}$  such that  $x_i$  is  $k^{\text{th}}$ -order directly chosen over  $x_{i+1}$ . Then we have the following axiom.

**Axiom 1.  $k^{\text{th}}$ -Order SARP ( $\text{SARP}^k$ )** *If  $x$  is  $k^{\text{th}}$ -order indirectly chosen over  $y$ , then  $y$  is not  $k^{\text{th}}$ -order directly chosen over  $x$ .*

The following observation is of interest. If the minimum requirement on the cardinality of consideration set is 2, then  $\text{SARP}^k$  only applies to doubletons where it imposes an acyclicity condition. Thus,  $\text{SARP}^k$  reduces to the well-known *no binary cycles* axiom in the special case of  $k = 2$ . Of course, as the requirement on the minimal cardinality of DM's consideration set expands,  $\text{SARP}^k$  demands more than solely no binary cycles. In the extreme case where DM is fully attentive in all problems – i.e., rational –  $\text{SARP}^k$  would be equivalent to the classical SARP.

The second axiom addresses the cases where the cardinality of the budget set exceeds the minimum requirement on the cardinality of the consideration sets. Since the minimal cardinality of the consideration set is not a binding condition anymore, DM's behavior does not have to be rational. But there is still some share of consistency to be preserved. To elaborate, rational behavior admits to the following *weak axiom*: the choice in a problem

---

<sup>3</sup>Note that in this definition there is a uniform cap of the attention filter's size across menus. All the results presented can be immediately generalized to the case with heterogeneous caps. Thus, it is also possible to consider the theories with relative (or mixed) restrictions on the cardinalities of the attention filters. For instance, one can assume that DM makes at least one comparison and considers at least 10% of the alternatives present in any budget set. For more details see Appendix B.

is insensitive to removing any alternative other than the choice itself. While in our model DM may generally violate this principle, she should still remain partially consistent with it. That is, DM's choice should be insensitive to the removal of an alternative she *does not pay attention to*, since such a change does not influence her consideration set. But how can we identify if an alternative is not paid attention to in a given budget set? This can be ensured by concentrating on those problems from budget sets where she pays attention to all alternatives. That is budget sets that have at most  $k$  alternatives. If she chooses an alternative  $y$  over  $x$  in a problem where she is fully attentive – which in turn means she prefers  $y$  to  $x$  – then she can only choose  $x$  over  $y$  in another problem if she is not paying attention to  $y$  therein. Hence, removing  $y$  in this latter problem should not change her choice. This idea is captured in the next axiom.

**Axiom 2. WARP for  $k^{\text{th}}$ -Order Limited Attention (WARP(LA $^k$ ))** For  $x, y \in S \cap T$  with  $|T| \leq k$ , if  $x = \mathbf{c}(S)$  and  $y = \mathbf{c}(T)$ , then  $x = \mathbf{c}(S \setminus \{y\})$ .

Recall that, when DM is fully attentive in all budgets, then SARP $^k$  is equivalent to classic SARP which, in turn, is sufficient to characterize the choice. Thus, logically speaking, WARP(LA $^k$ ) should become void in this case. Let us emphasize that this is indeed the case. To see this latter point note that, if DM's behavior is rational then the main trigger for WARP(LA $^k$ ) – that is, the choice reversal between two menus – is never observed. Hence, our second axiom is essentially void of any empirical bite in the case of full attention. The two axioms above are necessary and sufficient to characterize the class of  $k^{\text{th}}$  order limited attention theories.

**Theorem 1.** Assume the data set is complete, i.e.  $\mathcal{B} = 2^X$ . A data set  $(\mathbf{c}, \mathcal{B})$  is rationalizable with  $k^{\text{th}}$ -order CLA ( $k \geq 2$ ) if and only if it satisfies SARP $^k$ , and WARP(LA $^k$ ).<sup>4</sup>

### 3.2 Characterization on Incomplete Data Sets

In this section, we turn attention to incomplete data sets. Starting with Afriat (1967) revealed preference theory has utilized linear programming to implement revealed preference tests. The major advantage of using linear programming is computational feasibility. However, the limited attention theory is not compatible with the standard linear programming techniques. The major difference is that in the standard revealed preference one can draw inference with certainty based on the choices. That is,

$$\text{if } x = \mathbf{c}(B_i) \text{ and } y \in B_i, \text{ then } x \text{ is better than } y.$$

However, revealed preference inference cannot be certainly made under the limited attention logic as illustrated by De Clippel and Rozen (2021), and revelations of the following nature are critical.

$\mathbf{c}(B_j) \in B_i$ ,  $\mathbf{c}(B_i) \in B_j$ , and  $\mathbf{c}(B_i) \neq \mathbf{c}(B_j)$  then at least one of the following holds:

- (i) there is  $y \in B_i \setminus B_j$  such that  $y \in \Gamma(B_i)$ , **or**
- (ii) there is  $z \in B_j \setminus B_i$  such that  $z \in \Gamma(B_j)$ .

---

<sup>4</sup>We provide an alternative characterization of the model which makes use of no-binary-cycles along with a variation of *contraction* axiom in Appendix B.

The expression above directly results from the property that defines an attention filter. If we remove an alternative that is not being paid attention to, then the attention set should not change. Thus, if we observe the choice inconsistency of the form above, then it has to be the case that while moving from one budget to another (either from  $B_i$  to  $B_j$  or  $B_j$  to  $B_i$ ) at least one alternative removed was in a consideration set. Thus, we can only make inference about revealed preferences under limited attention if we use the "or-logic". To account for the presence of the "or-logic" in the revealed preference formulation, we employ mixed integer programming (MIP). That is, amending the linear program with some integer (binary) variables which would take care of the "or-logic" embedded in the condition above whenever needed.

Next, we introduce the notation necessary to introduce the MIP. Let us enumerate budgets in  $\mathcal{B}$  by  $B_i$ , and let  $u_i > 0$  denote the utility value that corresponds to the alternative chosen in  $B_i$  ( $\mathbf{c}(B_i)$ ). The second set of variables are the integers  $\delta_{ij} \in \{0, 1\}$  defined as  $\delta_{ij} = 1$  if  $x_j \in \Gamma(B_i)$  and  $\delta_{ij} = 0$  otherwise. That is,  $\delta_{ij} = 1$  if an alternative chosen in  $B_j$  ( $\mathbf{c}(B_j)$ ) is paid attention to in  $B_i$ . Finally, we introduce the big-M ( $M \rightarrow \infty$ ) that is a technical construct to implement the "or-logic" in the program, and also denote by  $b_i$  the cardinality of  $B_i$ . We can state the mixed integer program (MIP) as follows.

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{ll} u_i > u_j - (1 - \delta_{ij})M & \text{if } x_i = \mathbf{c}(B_i) \text{ and } x_j \in B_i \\ \delta_{ij} = 0 & \text{if } x_j \notin B_i \\ \sum_{x_k \in B_i \setminus B_j} \delta_{ik} + \sum_{x_k \in B_j \setminus B_i} \delta_{jk} \geq 1 & \text{if } \mathbf{c}(B_i) \neq \mathbf{c}(B_j), \mathbf{c}(B_i), \mathbf{c}(B_j) \in B_i \cap B_j \\ \sum_{j \neq i} \delta_{ij} \geq \min\{k, b_i\} & \end{array} \right. \quad (1)$$

System (1) contains a straightforward test for the models constructed. The first line implements the idea that the chosen alternative is better than any other alternative that is in the consideration set. The second line states that DM only considers alternatives if they are in  $\Gamma(B_i) \subseteq B_i$ . The third line controls for the important observation about limited attention emphasized by De Clippel and Rozen (2021). Note that the first three lines of the system (1) together specify a MIP formulation for the De Clippel and Rozen (2021) test of the generic CLA model. Thus, we only need to include the part corresponding to the minimal cardinality of consideration set restriction. This is done by the last line which ensures that the DM considers at least the assumed number of alternatives.<sup>5</sup> Finally, we constitute that finding a solution to equation (1) is necessary and sufficient for the rationalizability of the data set.

**Theorem 2.** *A data set  $(\mathcal{B}, \mathbf{c})$  is rationalizable with  $k^{\text{th}}$ -order CLA if and only if there is a solution to equation (1).*

### 3.3 Welfare Analysis: The Guaranteed Welfare Bound

In order to perform welfare judgment based on the  $k^{\text{th}}$ -order CLA model we introduce the notion of the *guaranteed welfare bound*. To obtain this bound, for each alternative we first

---

<sup>5</sup>Note that if one wants to modify the theory so that there is heterogeneity in the minimal cardinalities for the consideration sets it is enough to modify the last line of equation (1) as shown in the Appendix C.



construct lower contour sets consistent with the data observed. As illustrated in our example in the introduction, in order to provide a guaranteed measure, we consider the smallest of such contour sets. The guaranteed welfare bound is then delivered by the alternative that has the largest of such minimally constructed lower contour sets; thus, in a sense, serves as the observer’s “best guess” of DM’s welfare optimum given the data. Formally, we construct

$$L(x) = \{y : x \succ y\}$$

where  $\succ$  is the underlying preference relation. Given that we do not know the underlying preference relation and can only partially identify it, the bound does not have to be unique. Thus, we will take a conservative approach and construct the minimal (in size) bound on the lower contour sets. Finally, we need to ensure that the constructed bound is *tight*; that is, there is indeed a potential underlying preference relation such that the size of the lower contour set is exactly as in the bound constructed. Put otherwise, the conservative bound constructed cannot be further refined.

In order to identify the bound we again use the mixed integer programming approach. We modify system (1) in order to make sure that we identify minimal lower contour sets. To do so, MIP starts by fixing the alternative under consideration; i.e., a chosen alternative:  $x = \mathbf{c}(B)$  for some  $B \in \mathcal{B}$ . Note that according to both our analysis and definitions we are interested in the strict lower contour sets, and thus will remove the chosen alternative when reporting the lower contour sets at the end of the problem. Next, let  $s_j \in \{0, 1\}$  be the indicator variable defining whether the  $x_j$  is in a (weak) lower contour set of  $x$ . We also need the indicator  $\delta_{ij} \in \{0, 1\}$  and the big-M ( $M \rightarrow \infty$ ) as we still need to include the restrictions of system (1). Finally, recall that  $b_i$  denotes the cardinality of  $B_i$ . We need to propose two versions of the MIP. The first one sets up the collection of constraints that have to be satisfied for any  $k^{\text{th}}$ -order CLA rationalizable data set. The second one states the optimization problem necessary to recover the tight conservative bound on the lower contour set. Let us address the former first which aims to construct the lower contour set of an element  $x$ :

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{ll} s_i = 1 & \text{if } x_i = x \\ s_j + (1 - \delta_{ij})M \geq s_i & \text{if } x_i = \mathbf{c}(B_i), x_j \in B_i \\ \delta_{ij} = 0 & \text{if } x_j \notin B_i \\ \sum_{x_k \in B_i \setminus B_j} \delta_{ik} + \sum_{x_k \in B_j \setminus B_i} \delta_{jk} \geq 1 & \text{if } \mathbf{c}(B_i) \neq \mathbf{c}(B_j), \mathbf{c}(B_i), \mathbf{c}(B_j) \in B_i \cap B_j \\ \sum_{x_j \in B_i} \delta_{ij} \geq \min\{b_i, k\} & \end{array} \right. \quad (2)$$

System (2) provides a mixed-integer program that has to be feasible for the lower contour sets given any  $k^{\text{th}}$ -CLA rationalizable data. The first inequality initiates the value for the alternative of interest. The second inequality, to use the revealed preference jargon, speaks to *indirect revelations*: if an alternative  $x_j$  is paid attention to in a problem where  $x_i$  is chosen, and  $x_i$ , in turn, is in the lower contour set of  $x$ , then transitivity implies that  $x_j$  also belongs to lower contour set of  $x$ . The last three inequalities are simply taken from the system (1) to ensure that the data set is rationalizable with  $k^{\text{th}}$ -order CLA. However, if we want to find the previously mentioned conservative bound, we need to ensure that we find

the minimal size of the lower contour set. So we need to amend the system (2) with the minimization of the size of the lower contour set.

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{ll} \min \sum_{x_i \in X} s_i & \\ s_i = 1 & \text{if } x_i = x \\ (1 - s_i)M + \sum_{x_j \in B_i} s_j \geq \min\{k, k_i\} & \text{if } x_i = \mathbf{c}(B_i) \\ \delta_{ij} = 0 & \text{if } x_j \notin B_i \\ \sum_{x_k \in B_i \setminus B_j} \delta_{ik} + \sum_{x_k \in B_j \setminus B_i} \delta_{jk} \geq 1 & \text{if } \mathbf{c}(B_i) \neq \mathbf{c}(B_j), \mathbf{c}(B_i), \mathbf{c}(B_j) \in B_i \cap B_j \\ \sum_{x_j \in B_i} \delta_{ij} \geq \min\{b_i, k\} & \end{array} \right. \quad (3)$$

System (3) only differs from system (2) by the addition of the

$$\min \sum_{x_i \in X} s_i$$

that ensures that the size of the lower contour set is minimal. For example, assume that  $x = \mathbf{c}\{x, y_1\}$  and  $x = \mathbf{c}\{x, y_1, z_2\}$  are the observations. Since DM makes at least one comparison, then one element other than choice ( $x$ ) from each of these problems should be in the lower contour set of  $x$ . In the case of the first problem, this element has to be  $y_1$ . While it could be the case that  $z_2$  is in the lower contour set of  $x$ , system (2) adopts the case where  $y_1$  is that element. Of course, the “reality” is either the first or the second case and we have no way of differentiating the two. It is in this regard that a conservative approach behooves us to select the smaller lower contour set.

Given the solution of system (3) we can reconstruct the strict lower contour set by removing the chosen alternative from the solution:

$$\hat{L}(x) = \{x_j : s_j = 1 \text{ and } x_j \neq x\}.$$

**Corollary 1.** *If a data set is rationalizable by  $k^{\text{th}}$ -order CLA, then*

- (i) *there is a solution to system (2)*
- (ii) *system (3) generates a tight bound for  $L(x)$  for every  $x \in X$ .*

Given the Corollary 1, we can define the *guaranteed welfare bound* by maximizing lower contour sets ( $|\hat{L}(x)|$ ) over all alternatives. Formally, it can be defined as

$$W(\mathcal{B}, \mathbf{c}) = \max_{x \in X} |\hat{L}(x)|.$$

Taking the maximal size of the lower contour set allows us to get the best possible judgment of the welfare ranking. To elaborate, in light of Corollary 1, we know that the guaranteed welfare bound provides the *best certain judgment* of welfare optimum the observer can infer given a data set and a given order of the CLA model. The *certainty* of this bound is assured

by the fact that  $\hat{L}(x)$  indeed corresponds to some filter-preference pair rationalizing the data set. The *best* part instead is implied by the fact that  $\hat{L}(x)$  is a tight bound and also that we further pick the maximal (in size) lower contour set over all alternatives.

Finally, let us note that the max min-logic used in the definition of  $W(\mathcal{B}, \mathbf{c})$  has a specific way to interact with the or-logic embedded in revealed preferences (De Clippel and Rozen, 2021). To elaborate, consider a violation of WARP of the type De Clippel and Rozen (2021) finds to be critical in revealing information:

$\mathbf{c}(B_j) \in B_i$ ,  $\mathbf{c}(B_i) \in B_j$ , and  $\mathbf{c}(B_i) \neq \mathbf{c}(B_j)$  then at least one of the following holds:

- (i) there is  $y \in B_i \setminus B_j$  such that  $y \in \Gamma(B_i)$ , **or**
- (ii) there is  $z \in B_j \setminus B_i$  such that  $z \in \Gamma(B_j)$ .

Given an observation as such, we would know that there is at least one alternative with a non-empty lower contour set ( $x_i$  or  $x_j$ ), but we are not able to point to either as an alternative that is guaranteed to be better than at least one alternative. The intuitive justification for using max min regardless of this artifact indeed comes from practice. If an observer comes to an “unspecified” conclusion on revealed preferences, she then might not be able to confidently use it for welfare analysis.

## 4 Experimental Illustration

In this section, we illustrate how the theoretical results we established in the previous sections play out in practice. We use the data from the experiment conducted by Inoue and Shirai (2018).<sup>6</sup> Let us present the essential details of the experiment. Subjects are asked to choose between a bundle of intertemporal installments. Each bundle consists of three installments: in 1 month, in 3 months, and in 5 months. Each remuneration bundle consists of 2400 Japanese yen, split into three installments. The universal set consists of 10 alternatives presented in Table 1. Each subject was presented with 20 different budgets to choose from. Budgets were generated to contain from 2 to 8 alternatives. A total of 113 subjects (students of Waseda University, Japan) participated in the experiment that was run in 4 sessions.

	$x_1$	$x_2$	$x_3$	$x_4$	$x_5$	$x_6$	$x_7$	$x_8$	$x_9$	$x_{10}$
in 1 month	450	800	1150	450	450	800	850	1200	1550	500
in 3 months	800	800	800	450	1500	1150	0	0	0	0
in 5 months	1150	800	450	1500	450	450	1550	1200	850	1900

Table 1: Universal space of alternatives. Payments are in Japanese yen.

Given that the maximal size of the budget set is 8, we are going to present results for all 8 versions of the theory, which range from  $|\Gamma| \geq 1$  to  $|\Gamma| \geq 8$ . The first version ( $|\Gamma| \geq 1$ ) is

---

<sup>6</sup>Let us note that this data set has the lowest pass rates (for rational behavior) among the data sets we referred to in the introduction (33% of subjects are rational). Recall that if an observation is consistent with rational behavior, then the generic CLA has no welfare implications. Hence, in terms of welfare relevance, the generic CLA’s performance would have been only worse if we used other data sets.

equivalent to the generic CLA model of Masatlioglu et al. (2012), while the last ( $|\Gamma| \geq 8$ ) is equivalent to rational choice since all alternatives are considered. We start by presenting goodness of fit results to see which of the theories is best in describing the observed behavior. We then follow by presenting the welfare bounds for these theories.

	Pass Rate	Power		PSI	
		Bronars	Bootstrap	Bronars	Bootstrap
$ \Gamma  \geq 1$	1 (.95; .99)	.96 (.95; .97)	.88 (.87; .91)	.04	.12
$ \Gamma  \geq 2$	.99 (.95; .99)	.46 (.43; .49)	.35 (.32; .38)	.53	.64
$ \Gamma  \geq 3$	.88 (.80; .93)	.24 (.22; .27)	.17 (.04; .07)	.64	.71
$ \Gamma  \geq 4$	.69 (.59; .77)	.01 (.01; .02)	.02 (.01; .03)	.68	.67
$ \Gamma  \geq 5$	.61 (.51; .70)	.00 (.00; .01)	.00 (.00; .01)	.61	.61
$ \Gamma  \geq 6$	.50 (.41; .60)	0	0	.50	.50
$ \Gamma  \geq 7$	.40 (.31; .49)	0	0	.40	.40
$ \Gamma  \geq 8$	.34 (.25; .43)	0	0	.34	.34

Table 2: Goodness of fit analysis. Pass rates and power computations contain the 95% confidence intervals in the parenthesis. All confidence intervals are computed using the Clopper-Pearson procedure. Confidence intervals for values of 0 and 1 are omitted as those are not defined.

## 4.1 Testing the Theories

Table 2 presents the goodness of fit results. Each row corresponds to the minimal bound on the cardinality of the consideration set used for the theory. The second column presents the pass rates; that is, the share of the subjects who pass the test for each theory. We see that all subjects are consistent with the first-order CLA model (Masatlioglu et al. (2012)) and, 99% are with the second-order CLA model (one comparison). Numbers start dropping rapidly the larger the threshold on the minimum size of the attention is, going all the way down to 33% for the case of full attention ( $|\Gamma| \geq 8$ ).

Given that different tests impose different restrictions, we need to control for the “power” of the test. In words, we need to establish the probability that a random set of choices would look consistent with a theory. We consider two standard power tests in the literature: Bronars’ power (see Bronars, 1987) and bootstrap power. The difference between these tests is the distributional assumption on the random choice. Bronars’ power assumes that the choices are taken according to a uniform distribution among all available options. Bootstrap

power uses the observed empirical distribution of choices to generate random subjects. To compute each of these power indices, we generate 1000 random subjects and estimate their pass rate. We observe that 96% of random Bronars subjects and 88% of random bootstrap are consistent with the first-order CLA model. Note that the change moving from the first order to the second is drastic as the number of random consistent subjects drops from 88-96% to 35-46% with further dropping to 17-24% assuming  $|\Gamma| \geq 3$ . Starting with  $|\Gamma| \geq 6$  none of the random subjects are passing the tests, showing that at this point our test becomes powerful enough to exclude the false positives. However, we do see that the pass rates among real subjects are also going quite low at this point.

Columns 5 and 6 present the predictive success indices (PSI, see Selten, 1991; Beatty and Crawford, 2011). PSI is computed by taking the difference between the pass rate and the power index. Therefore, it corrects the pass rate for the probability of “false positive”. PSI takes values between -1 and 1, if PSI equals -1, then all real subjects failed the test while all random subjects passed; if PSI equals 1 then all real subjects passed the test while all random subjects failed. We present two versions of PSI for Bronars’ and bootstrap power corrections. Considering the PSI performance we see that the third-order CLA ( $|\Gamma| \geq 3$ ) and the fourth-order CLA ( $|\Gamma| \geq 4$ ) models deliver the highest rates among all other models for bootstrap and Bronars’ correspondingly. The second-order CLA model that only requires a single comparison performs comparably well to  $|\Gamma| \geq 3$  and  $|\Gamma| \geq 4$  delivering the PSIs of .53 using Bronars’ and .64 for bootstrap controls. The PSIs for the first-order CLA model (.04 for Bronars and .12 for bootstrap) and fully attentive behavior (.34) are significantly lower than those for the  $|\Gamma| \geq 4$ ,  $|\Gamma| \geq 3$ , and  $|\Gamma| \geq 2$  theories.

## 4.2 The Guaranteed Welfare Bounds

Table 3 presents results for the guaranteed welfare bounds. Recall that the guaranteed welfare bound is constructed in the following way. We, first, construct the minimal (in size) lower contour set for every alternative. Then, we maximize (over alternatives) the cardinalities of these minimal lower contour sets.

Let us first note that the experiment is “rich enough”; that is, if we assume that  $|\Gamma| \geq 8$  (rational choice), then the alternative that delivers the guaranteed welfare bound is indeed the best one – better than any other alternative. Hence, under the assumption of fully-attentive DM we can guarantee the welfare optimum using the data set from the experiment. On the other extreme, the generic CLA model without additional restrictions ( $|\Gamma| \geq 1$ ) does not allow to derive any welfare conclusions for 54% of the sample. Note that only 33% of subjects are consistent with rationality. Thus for 21% of subjects who violate the standard axioms we still cannot perform any sensible welfare analysis under the assumption of the generic CLA model.

As reported in Table 3, in the best case under the first-order CLA model we can only say that the alternative that delivers the guaranteed welfare bound is better than 4 other alternatives. In fact, on average we cannot even guarantee that this alternative is the second worst. If we make the minimal assumption we suggest in this paper – that subjects make at least one comparison before choosing ( $|\Gamma| \geq 2$ ) – then we gain a significant boost in welfare judgment, guaranteeing that the revealed best alternative is, on average, better than at least 4 other alternatives. The boost is even more seen in the fact that the *worst welfare*

	Mean (Standard Deviation)	Quartiles of the Distribution				
		min	25%	50%	75%	max
$ \Gamma  \geq 1$	0.65 (0.89)	0	0	0	1	4
$ \Gamma  \geq 2$	4.34 (0.98)	3	4	4	5	8
$ \Gamma  \geq 3$	5.91 (0.95)	5	5	6	7	8
$ \Gamma  \geq 4$	7.26 (0.86)	6	6	8	8	8
$ \Gamma  \geq 5$	8.58 (0.55)	7	8	9	9	9
$ \Gamma  \geq 6$	8.67 (0.48)	8	8	9	9	9
$ \Gamma  \geq 7$	8.98 (0.15)	8	9	9	9	9
$ \Gamma  \geq 8$	9.00 (0.00)	9	9	9	9	9

Table 3: The Guaranteed Welfare Bounds. Hence, 0 means that the alternative that delivers guaranteed welfare bound might be the worst, and 9 means that it is actually the best. Numbers are only computed for the subjects consistent with the given theory.

*judgment under  $|\Gamma| \geq 3$  is effectively more informative than the best welfare judgment under Masatlioglu et al. (2012).* This is seen in the fact that under the second-order CLA model at least 75% of the sample the welfare bound is at least as good as the best welfare bound under the first-order CLA model.

Although the same applies when moving from a minimum attention threshold of 2 to 3. Intuitively speaking, this result is not purely mechanical, but an indication that while subjects violate axioms of rationality, they don't do so too frequently. It is also seen in Table 3 that the marginal gain in the guaranteed welfare bound is decreasing rapidly as the cardinality of the attention filter grows. This reduction in the marginal gain is most visible after  $|\Gamma| \geq 5$ . Finally, in regards to theories with seemingly most reasonable trade-offs between costs in explanatory power and benefits in welfare, ( $|\Gamma| \geq 2$  and  $|\Gamma| \geq 3$ ), it is observed that the revealed best alternative is, on average, surely better than 4 (for  $|\Gamma| \geq 2$ ) and 5 (for  $|\Gamma| \geq 3$ ) alternatives.

### 4.3 Summary

The following conclusions summarize our analysis above. First, in terms of describing the real behavior, constraints ( $|\Gamma| \geq 3$  or  $|\Gamma| \geq 4$ ) perform best across different orders of CLA models. The minimal constraint of  $|\Gamma| \geq 2$  performs comparably well (controlling for the power of the test) at the negligible loss in explanatory power (99% of subjects are consistent). Second, these constraints guarantee rich and tight welfare bounds (rich compared to the benchmark

of the generic CLA model).

## 5 Conclusion

In this paper, we provide a model of choice which enables an observer to draw reasonable conclusions about DM's preferences while assuming that she suffers from a lack of attention. We do this by incorporating a minimal assumption that DM makes at least one comparison in the decision process. We provide a characterization of our model based on both complete and incomplete data sets. Based on the latter characterization we develop an algorithm to perform the welfare judgment for the  $k$ -th order CLA model. In order to see the contribution of our models in practice, we next apply them to the experimental data. We show that this assumption could almost be costless in terms of the explanatory power of the model while enriching in terms of welfare relevance.

## References

- Sydney N Afriat. The construction of utility functions from expenditure data. *International economic review*, 8(1):67–77, 1967.
- Timothy KM Beatty and Ian A Crawford. How demanding is the revealed preference approach to demand? *American Economic Review*, 101(6):2782–95, 2011.
- B Douglas Bernheim and Antonio Rangel. Beyond revealed preference: choice-theoretic foundations for behavioral welfare economics. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 124(1):51–104, 2009.
- Stephen G Bronars. The power of nonparametric tests of preference maximization. *Econometrica: Journal of the Econometric Society*, pages 693–698, 1987.
- Christopher P Chambers and Federico Echenique. *Revealed preference theory*, volume 56. Cambridge University Press, 2016.
- Geoffroy De Clippel and Kareen Rozen. Bounded rationality and limited data sets. *Theoretical Economics*, 16(2):359–380, 2021.
- Thomas Demuynck and Christian Seel. Revealed preference with limited consideration. *American Economic Journal: Microeconomics*, 10(1):102–31, 2018.
- John R Doyle, David J O'Connor, Gareth M Reynolds, and Paul A Bottomley. The robustness of the asymmetrically dominated effect: Buying frames, phantom alternatives, and in-store purchases. *Psychology & Marketing*, 16(3):225–243, 1999.
- Sen Geng. Limited consideration model with a trigger or a capacity. *Journal of Mathematical Economics*, page 102692, 2022.
- Sen Geng and Erkut Y Özbay. Shortlisting procedure with a limited capacity. *Journal of Mathematical Economics*, 94:102447, 2021.

- Rui Guan. Individual rationality under cognitive limitations: The effect of sequential elimination. *working paper*, 2022.
- Joel Huber, John W Payne, and Christopher Puto. Adding asymmetrically dominated alternatives: Violations of regularity and the similarity hypothesis. *Journal of consumer research*, 9(1):90–98, 1982.
- Yuta Inoue and Koji Shirai. Limited consideration and limited data: revealed preference tests and observable restrictions. *School of Economics, Kwansei Gakuin University Discussion Paper Series*, (176-2), 2018.
- Mert Kimya. Choice, consideration sets, and attribute filters. *American Economic Journal: Microeconomics*, 10(4):223–47, 2018.
- Juan Sebastian Lleras, Yusufcan Masatlioglu, Daisuke Nakajima, and Erkut Y Ozbay. When more is less: Limited consideration. *Journal of Economic Theory*, 170:70–85, 2017.
- Paola Manzini and Marco Mariotti. Welfare economics and bounded rationality: the case for model-based approaches. *Journal of Economic Methodology*, 21(4):343–360, 2014.
- Paola Manzini, Marco Mariotti, and Luigi Mittone. Choosing monetary sequences: Theory and experimental evidence. *Theory and Decision*, 69(3):327–354, 2010.
- Yusufcan Masatlioglu, Daisuke Nakajima, and Erkut Y Ozbay. Revealed attention. *American Economic Review*, 102(5):2183–2205, 2012.
- Trout Rader. The existence of a utility function to represent preferences. *The Review of Economic Studies*, 30(3):229–232, 1963.
- Ariel Rubinstein and Yuval Salant. Eliciting welfare preferences from behavioural data sets. *The Review of Economic Studies*, 79(1):375–387, 2012.
- Reinhard Selten. Properties of a measure of predictive success. *Mathematical social sciences*, 21(2):153–167, 1991.



# A Proofs

## A.1 Proof of Theorem 1

*Proof.* ( $\Leftarrow$ ) Define  $x \succ y \iff x = \mathbf{c}\{x, y\}$ . As discussed before,  $\text{SARP}^k$  implies no binary cycles on pairs. This implies that  $\succ$  is a preference relation. Next, for  $S$  define  $\Gamma(S) = \mathbf{c}(S) \cup \{y \in S : x = \mathbf{c}\{x, y\}\}$ . It follows from the definition that  $\Gamma$  is an attention filter, and also that  $\mathbf{c}(S) = \text{argmax}(\succ, \Gamma(S))$  for all  $S$ . Hence, it only remains to prove that  $|\Gamma(S)| \geq \min\{|S|, k\}$ , for all  $S$ . Take  $S : |S| \leq k$  and let  $x = \mathbf{c}(S)$ . We need to show  $\Gamma(S) = S$ .  $\text{SARP}^k$  implies that  $x \in \mathbf{c}\{x, y\}$  for all  $y \in S$ . Hence the desired conclusion follows.

To finish the proof of this direction, take  $S : |S| > k$ . We need to show that  $|\Gamma(S)| \geq k$ . Assume by contradiction that  $|\Gamma(S)| < k$ . Since  $x = \mathbf{c}(S) \in \Gamma(S)$  by definition, then let  $\Gamma(S) = \{x, y_1, y_2, \dots, y_n\} : n \leq k - 2$ . Note that  $x = \mathbf{c}\{x, y_i\}$ . Also let  $\Gamma(S) \setminus S = A = \{z_1, z_2, \dots, z_m\}$  be the set of elements DM does not pay attention to in  $S$ . Note that  $z_i = \mathbf{c}\{x, z_i\}$ . Thus, by  $\text{WARP}(\text{LA}^k)$ , we can remove  $z_i$  from  $S$ , one by one, while preserving  $x$  as choice. Thus, we conclude that  $x = \mathbf{c}\{x, y_1, y_2, \dots, y_n, z^*\}$ , for  $z^* \in \{z_1, z_2, \dots, z_m\}$ . Since  $n \leq k - 2$ , then  $|\{x, y_1, y_2, \dots, y_n, z^*\}| \leq k$ . Thus  $\text{SARP}^k$  implies that  $x \in \mathbf{c}\{x, z^*\}$  which is a contradiction.

( $\Rightarrow$ ) Assume that  $\mathbf{c}$  is a  $k^{\text{th}}$ -order CLA with the preference relation  $\succ$ . To establish  $\text{SARP}^k$ , assume that  $x$  is  $k^{\text{th}}$ -order indirectly chosen over  $y$ . Since DM's attention span is at least  $k$ , we conclude that  $x \succ y$ . Now consider a choice problem containing no more than  $k$  elements and that includes both  $x$  and  $y$ . Note that DM is fully attentive in such a problem and thus, since  $x \succ y$ , she will not choose  $y$  over  $x$ . That is,  $y$  is not  $k^{\text{th}}$ -order directly chosen over  $x$ . This establishes  $\text{SARP}^k$ .

To establish  $\text{WARP}(\text{LA}^k)$ , take  $x, y \in S \cap T$  with  $|T| \leq k$ ,  $x = \mathbf{c}(S)$  and  $y = \mathbf{c}(T)$ . Since DM is fully attentive in  $T$ , it follows that  $y \succ x$ . Since  $x$  is chosen over  $y$  in  $S$  – an alternative that is preferred to  $x$  – it has to be the case that DM does not pay attention to  $y$  in  $S$ ; that is,  $y \notin \Gamma(S)$ . Since  $\Gamma$  is an attention filter, then removing  $y$  should not affect DM's attention set. That is,  $\Gamma(S \setminus \{y\}) = \Gamma(S)$ . Since  $x$  was a maximum on  $\Gamma(S)$ , then it is also on  $\Gamma(S \setminus \{y\})$ . That is,  $x = \mathbf{c}(S \setminus \{y\})$ . This finishes the proof of this direction.  $\square$

## A.2 Proof of Theorem 2

*Proof.* ( $\Rightarrow$ ) Consider a rationalizable data set. That is, there is an underlying preference relation  $\succ$  and attention filter  $\Gamma$  (where  $|\Gamma(B)| \geq k$ ) such that

$$\mathbf{c}(B) \succ y \text{ for every } y \in \Gamma(B).$$

Let us show that the system (1) is satisfied. Given that  $\succ$  is complete and transitive binary relation on no more than countable set of alternatives there is a utility function  $u : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  representing the  $\succ$  (See Rader (1963)). Moreover, this utility function is bounded. Then, we can assign

$$u_i = u(\mathbf{c}(B_i))$$

for every  $B_i \in \mathcal{B}$ . Next, we define the  $\delta_{ij}$  using the attention filter. Let

$$\delta_{ij} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } x_j \in \Gamma(B_i) \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

for every  $x_j \in X$ . Then,

$$\delta_{ij} = 0 \text{ for every } x_j \notin B_j$$

is satisfied because  $\Gamma(B_i) \subseteq B_i$ , and

$$\sum_{j \neq i} \delta_{ij} \geq \min\{k, k_i\}$$

is satisfied by construction since  $|\Gamma(B_i)| \geq \min\{k, k_i\}$ . Next, we show that

$$u_i > u_j - (1 - \delta_{ij})M \text{ if } x_j \in B_i$$

is satisfied. If  $x_j \notin \Gamma(B_i)$ , then  $\delta_{ij} = 0$  and given that  $u$  is bounded and  $M \rightarrow \infty$ . If  $x_j \in \Gamma(B_i)$ , then  $x_i = \mathbf{c}(B_i) \succ x_j$  (given that  $(\succ, \Gamma)$  rationalizes the data set), and therefore  $u_i > u_j$  since  $u(x)$  represents  $\succ$ . Finally, we show that

$$\sum_{x_k \in B_i \setminus B_j} (\delta_{ik} + \sum_{x_k \in B_j \setminus B_i} \delta_{jk}) \geq 1 \text{ if } \mathbf{c}(B_i) \neq \mathbf{c}(B_j), \mathbf{c}(B_i), \mathbf{c}(B_j) \in B_i \cap B_j$$

is satisfied. Assume on the contrary that regardless

$$\mathbf{c}(B_i) \neq \mathbf{c}(B_j) \text{ and } \mathbf{c}(B_i), \mathbf{c}(B_j) \in B_i \cap B_j$$

there  $\Gamma(B_i) \cap (B_i \setminus B_j) = \emptyset$  and  $\Gamma(B_j) \cap (B_j \setminus B_i) = \emptyset$ . Then,  $\Gamma(B_i \cap B_j) = \Gamma(B_i)$  and  $\Gamma(B_i \cap B_j) = \Gamma(B_j)$  since  $\Gamma$  is an attention filter (removing element not in attention filter does not alter the filter). Thus, we have  $\Gamma(B_i) = \Gamma(B_j)$  and given that we have defined a strict preference relation equality of attention filters implies that  $\mathbf{c}(B_i) = \mathbf{c}(B_j)$ , that is a contradiction.

( $\Leftarrow$ ) We start from showing that if there is a solution to system (1), then we can construct a revealed preference relation that is acyclic and thus can be completed. Let  $\hat{\Gamma}(B_i)$  be a temporary attention filter, that is  $x \in \hat{\Gamma}(B_i)$  if and only if  $\delta_{ij} = 1$ . Let  $\hat{\succ}$  be a revealed preference relation, that is,  $x_i \hat{\succ} x_j$  if  $x_i \in \mathbf{c}(B_i)$  and  $x_j \in \hat{\Gamma}(B_i)$ .

**Claim 1.** If  $x_i \hat{\succ} x_j$  then  $u_i > u_j$ .

Assume that  $x_i \hat{\succ} x_j$ , then  $x_i \in \mathbf{c}(B_i)$  and  $x_j \in \hat{\Gamma}(B_i)$ . The latter implies that  $\delta_{ij} = 0$  by construction of  $\hat{\Gamma}(B_i)$ . Then inequality  $u_i > u_j - \delta_{ij}M$  has to hold as  $u_i > u_j$ .

Claim 1 links the constructed revealed preference relation to the solution of the system (1). Let  $\succ^{tc}$  be a transitive closure, that is  $(x, y) \in \succ^{tc}$  if there is a sequence  $x = x_1, \dots, x_n = y$  such that  $(x_j, x_{j+1}) \in \succ$  for every  $j \leq n - 1$ . In order to show that there is a complete extension of  $\hat{\succ}$  it is enough to show that  $\hat{\succ}^{tc}$  extends  $\hat{\succ}$ . That is, there are not  $z, w \in X$  such that  $(z, w) \in \hat{\succ}$  and  $(w, z) \in \hat{\succ}^{tc}$ . Since  $(w, z) \in \hat{\succ}^{tc}$ , then there is a sequence

$w = x_1, \dots, x_n = z$  such that  $(x_j, x_{j+1}) \in \succ$  for every  $j \leq n - 1$ . Then using Claim 1 we know that  $u_j > u_{j+1}$  and given the transitivity of  $>$  relation we know that  $u_{x_1} > u_{x_n}$ . At the same time Claim 1 implies that  $u_{x_n} > u_{x_1}$  since  $z = x_n \succ x_1 = w$ . That is a contradiction.

Thus, there is a complete and transitive extension of  $\hat{\succ}$ , we denote by  $\succ^*$ . Given that  $\succ^*$  extends  $\hat{\succ}$  we know that  $x \hat{\succ} y$ , then  $x \succ^* y$ . Thus, we are left to construct the attention filter. If  $B \in \mathcal{B}$  let

$$\Gamma(B) = \{y \in B : \mathbf{c}(B) \succ^* y\} \cup \{\mathbf{c}(B)\}.$$

Thus already constructed  $\Gamma(B)$  allow to show that the data is rationalized, given that  $\succ^*$  extends  $\hat{\succ}$ , since  $\hat{\Gamma}(B) \subseteq \Gamma(B)$  for every  $B \in \mathcal{B}$ . By construction  $|\hat{\Gamma}(B_i)| \geq \min\{k_i, k\}$ , thus  $|\Gamma(B_i)| \geq \min\{k_i, k\}$ . Next, we extend the attention filter to  $S \in 2^X \setminus \mathcal{B}$ . Let

$$\hat{\Gamma}(S) = \bigcup_{B \in \mathcal{B}: S \subseteq B; \Gamma(B) \subseteq S} \Gamma(B)$$

be the candidate attention filter. However, the candidate attention filter might be empty, thus we need to consider a different construct for that case. Let

$$\Gamma(S) = \begin{cases} \hat{\Gamma}(S) & \text{if } \hat{\Gamma}(S) \neq \emptyset \\ S & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

for every  $S \in 2^X \setminus \mathcal{B}$ . Note that  $|\Gamma(S)| \geq \min\{k_i, k\}$  in the case then it is the entire set (if  $|\hat{\Gamma}(S)| = \emptyset$ ). If  $|\hat{\Gamma}(S)| \neq \emptyset$ , then we need to consider two cases.

**Case 1:**  $|S| \leq k$ . Suppose that  $|\Gamma(S)| < k$ . If  $\hat{\Gamma}(S) \neq \emptyset$ , then there is  $B \in \mathcal{B}$  such that  $\Gamma(B) \subseteq S \subseteq B$ . Note that  $|\Gamma(B)| \geq \{k_i, k\}$  by construction, thus  $\Gamma(B) = S = B$  that is a contradiction to  $S \notin \mathcal{B}$ .

**Case 2:**  $|S| > k$ . Then for every  $B \in \mathcal{B}$  such that  $S \subseteq B$  we know that  $|B| > k$  and thus  $|\Gamma(B)| \geq k$ . Hence,  $|\Gamma(S)| \geq k$  since  $\Gamma(B) \subseteq \Gamma(S)$ .

Finally, we are left to show that  $\Gamma(S)$  is an *attention filter*. That is, if we take  $S \in 2^X$  and  $x \notin \Gamma(S)$ , then  $\Gamma(S \setminus \{x\}) = \Gamma(S)$ . Let  $S' = S \setminus \{x\}$ , for the further simplicity of the notation. In order to finish the proof we need to consider the following four cases.

**Case 1:**  $S \notin \mathcal{B}; S' \notin \mathcal{B}$ . Take  $y \in \Gamma(S)$ , then there is  $B \in \mathcal{B}$  such that  $\Gamma(B) \subseteq S \subseteq B$ . Given that  $S' \subset S$ , we know that  $S' \subset B$ . Since  $x \notin \Gamma(S)$ , then  $x \notin \Gamma(B)$ , thus  $\Gamma(B) \subseteq S'$  and thus  $\Gamma(B) \subseteq \Gamma(S')$ . Take  $y \in \Gamma(S')$ , then there is  $B \in \mathcal{B}$  such that  $\Gamma(B) \subseteq S' \subseteq B$ . Assume on the contrary that  $y \notin \Gamma(S)$ , thus for all  $B' \in \mathcal{B}$  such that  $\Gamma(B') \subseteq S \subseteq B'$ , then  $y \notin \Gamma(B')$ . By construction we know that  $\mathbf{c}(B) \neq \mathbf{c}(B')$ , then there is  $z \in (\Gamma(B) \setminus B') \cup (\Gamma(B') \setminus B)$ . If  $z \in \Gamma(B) \setminus B'$ , then  $z \in S' \subset S$ , that is a contradiction to  $S \subseteq B'$ . If  $z \in \Gamma(B') \setminus B$ , then  $z \in S$  and  $z \neq x$ , thus  $z \in S'$  that is contradiction to  $z \subseteq B$ .

**Case 2:**  $S \in \mathcal{B}, S' \in \mathcal{B}$ . By construction  $y \in \Gamma(S)$  if and only if  $\mathbf{c}(S) \succ^* y$ . Thus  $\Gamma(S) = \Gamma(S')$ , since  $x \notin \Gamma(S)$ .

**Case 3:**  $S \in \mathcal{B}, S' \notin \mathcal{B}$ .  $x \notin \Gamma(S)$ , then  $\Gamma(S) \subseteq S' \subseteq S$ . Thus by construction  $\Gamma(S) \subseteq \Gamma(S')$ . Next we show that  $\Gamma(S') \subseteq \Gamma(S)$ . Take  $y \in \Gamma(S')$  and assume that  $y \notin \Gamma(S)$ . Then, there is  $B \in \mathcal{B}$  such that  $\Gamma(B) \subseteq S' \subseteq B$  and  $y \in \Gamma(B)$ . Thus, either  $y \in \Gamma(S)$  that is a direct

contradiction or  $\mathbf{c}(B) \neq \mathbf{c}(S)$ . The latter implies that  $\Gamma(B) \setminus S \neq \emptyset$ , that is a contradiction to  $\Gamma(B) \subseteq S' \subset S$ .

**Case 4:**  $S \notin \mathcal{B}$ ,  $S' \in \mathcal{B}$ . Take  $y \in \Gamma(S)$ , then there is  $B \in \mathcal{B}$  such that  $\Gamma(B) \subseteq S \subseteq B$ . Thus,  $\Gamma(B) \subseteq S'$  since  $x \notin \Gamma(B)$  as  $x \notin \Gamma(S)$ . Assume that  $y \notin \Gamma(S')$ , then  $\mathbf{c}(S') \neq \mathbf{c}(B)$  and thus  $\Gamma(B) \setminus S' \neq \emptyset$ , that is a contradiction. Take  $y \in \Gamma(S')$  and assume that  $y \notin \Gamma(S)$ . Then, for every  $B \in \mathcal{B}$  such that  $\Gamma(B) \subseteq S \subseteq B$ ,  $y \notin \Gamma(B)$ . Since  $x \notin \Gamma(S)$ , then  $\Gamma(B) \subseteq S'$ . At the same time  $y \in \Gamma(S')$  and  $y \notin \Gamma(B)$  implies that  $\mathbf{c}(B) \neq \mathbf{c}(S')$ . The latter implies that there is  $z \in \Gamma(B) \setminus S'$  that is a contradiction to  $\Gamma(B) \subseteq S'$ . □

### A.3 Proof of Corollary 1

*Proof.* (i) The last three inequalities are satisfied given that the data set is rationalizable and Proposition 2. Recall that the rationalizability of the data set implies that there are transitive and complete preference relation ( $\succ$ ) and attention filter ( $\Gamma$ ) such that

$$\mathbf{c}(B) = \operatorname{argmax}(\succ, \Gamma(B)).$$

Then, we can assign  $\delta_{ij} = 1$  if  $x_j \in \Gamma(B_i)$  (see proof of Proposition 2). Next, we assign solutions to  $s_i$  to complete the solution to the system. In particular, we assign  $s_i = 1$  if  $x_i = x$  or  $x_i \in L(x)$ , where  $L(x)$  is the strict lower contour set of  $x$ . Thus,  $s_i = 1$  if  $x_i = x$  is satisfied by construction. Next, let us show that

$$s_j + (1 - \delta_{ij})M \geq s_i \text{ if } x_i = \mathbf{c}(B_i), x_j \in B_i$$

is satisfied. If  $\delta_{ij} = 0$ , then inequality is trivially satisfied since  $M \rightarrow \infty$ . If  $s_i = 0$ , then the inequality is also trivially satisfied. Hence, we consider the case of  $\delta_{ij} = 1$  and given the construction of  $\delta_{ij}$  we know that  $x_j \in \Gamma(B_i)$ . Recall  $s_i = 1$  implies that  $x_i \in L(x) \cup \{x\}$  and  $x_i = \mathbf{c}(B_i)$ , then  $x_i \succ x_j$  and by transitivity of  $\succ$  we know that  $x \succ x_j$ , that is,  $x_j \in L(x)$ . Then, by construction  $s_j = 1$  and  $s_j \geq s_i$ . Finally, we show that given the construction

$$(1 - s_i)M + \sum_{x_j \in B_i} s_j \geq \min\{k, k_i\} \text{ if } x_i = \mathbf{c}(B_i)$$

holds. If  $s_i = 0$ , then the inequality is trivially satisfied because  $M \rightarrow \infty$ . If  $s_i = 1$ , then given the transitivity of  $\succ$ ,  $s_j = 1$  for every  $x_j$  such that  $x_i \succ x_j$ . Given the construction we also know that  $x_i \succ x_k$  for every  $x_k \in \Gamma(B_i)$  and  $\Gamma(B_i) \geq \min\{k_i, k\}$  and for every of those  $x_k$  we know that  $s_k = 1$ . Hence, this inequality is satisfied.

(ii) In order to prove this part we are going to reconstruct a (transitive and complete) preference relation and attention filter that rationalize the data. Thus we start by assuming that there is a solution to system (3). Given the solution for the system (3) let  $x_j \in \Gamma(B_i)$  if  $\delta_{ij} = 1$ . Let  $\hat{\succ}$  be a revealed preference relation, that is  $x_i \hat{\succ} x_j$  if  $x_i = \mathbf{c}(B_i)$ ,  $x_j \in \Gamma(B_i)$ . Let us define the lower contour set given the revealed preference relation.

$$L_{\hat{\succ}}(x) = \{y : x \hat{\succ} y\}$$

Given the same logic as in the proof of the part (i) we can easily show that  $x_i \in L_{\prec}(x) \cup \{x\}$  if and only if  $s_i = 1$ . Next, we define  $\succ^0$ , such that  $x_i \succ^0 x$  if and only if  $x_i \notin L_{\prec}(x) \cup \{x\}$ . Thus, if we complete the preference relation  $\succ = \succ^0 \cup \hat{\succ}$  then the lower contour set of  $x$  would be exactly the  $L_{\prec}(x)$ . Recall that  $\succ^{tc}$  defines the transitive closure.

**Claim 1:**  $\succ^0$  is consistent with  $\hat{\succ}^{tc}$ , that is there is no  $y \in X$  such that  $y \succ^0 x$  and  $x \hat{\succ}^{tc} y$ .

Suppose on the contrary, that there is  $y \in X$  such that  $y \succ^0 x$  and  $x \hat{\succ}^{tc} y$ . Since  $x \hat{\succ}^{tc} y$  there is a sequence  $x = x_1, \dots, x_n = y$  such that

$$x_j \hat{\succ} x_{j+1} \text{ for every } j \leq n - 1.$$

Let us show that  $x_n \in L_{\prec}(x)$  using induction. For the first entry, we have direct inclusion  $x_1 = x = \mathbf{c}(B_i)$  and  $x_2 \in \Gamma(B_i)$ . Then, we know that  $x_j \in L_{\prec}(x)$  and need to show that  $x_{j+1} \in L_{\prec}(x)$ . Given that  $x_j \hat{\succ} x_{j+1}$  we know that  $x_j = \mathbf{c}(B_j)$  and  $x_{j+1} \in \Gamma(B_j)$ . Then,  $\delta_{jj+1} = 1$  and given that

$$s_{j+1} + (1 - \delta_{jj+1})M \geq s_j$$

we know that  $s_{j+1} = 1$  and thus  $s_{j+1} \in L_{\prec}(x)$  by construction.

**Claim 2:**  $\succ^{tc}$  extends  $\succ$ , that is  $\hat{\succ} \subseteq \succ^{tc}$  and there are no  $z, w \in X$  such that  $(z, w) \in \succ$  and  $(w, z) \in \succ^{tc}$ .

Note that  $\hat{\succ} \subseteq \succ^{tc}$  is rather trivial. Hence, we are left to show that there are no  $z, w \in X$  such that  $(z, w) \in \succ$  and  $(w, z) \in \succ^{tc}$ . Suppose on the contrary there is  $z, w \in X$  such that  $(z, w) \in \succ$  and  $(w, z) \in \succ^{tc}$ .

**Case 1:**  $(z, w) \in \hat{\succ}$ . Since  $(w, z) \in \succ^{tc}$  then there is a sequence  $x = x_1, \dots, x_n = y$  such that

$$x_j \hat{\succ} x_{j+1} \text{ for every } j \leq n - 1.$$

Note that the sequence should contain at least one inclusion of  $x_k \succ^0 x_{k+1}$ . Then, we can take the first and the last entry of pairs from  $\succ^0$  to the sequence and given that  $(z, w) \in \hat{\succ}$  we can construct

$$x_{k_m+1}, \dots, z, w, \dots, x_{k_1},$$

where each pair is an element of  $\hat{\succ}$ . Recall that given the construction of  $\succ^0$  we know that  $x_{k_m+1} = x_{k_1+1} = x$ . That is,  $(x, x_{k_1+1}) \in \hat{\succ}^{tc}$  and  $x_{k_1} \succ^0 x$  that is a contradiction to Claim 1.

**Case 1:**  $(z, w) \in \succ^0$ . Note that by construction of  $\succ^0$  we know that  $w = x$ . Since  $(w, z) \in \succ^{tc}$  then there is a sequence  $x = x_1, \dots, x_n = y$  such that

$$x_j \hat{\succ} x_{j+1} \text{ for every } j \leq n - 1.$$

Note that the sequence should include at least one entry from  $\succ^0$  otherwise there would be a direct contradiction to Claim 1. Then, take the first entry of such a pair, that is  $x_k \succ^0 x_{k+1}$ , where  $x_{k+1} = x$  by construction of  $\succ^0$ . Then, we know that  $x = w \hat{\succ}^{tc} x_{k+1}$  and  $x_{k+1} \succ^0 x$  that is a contradiction to Claim 1.

Case 2 shows that  $\succ = \hat{\succ} \cup \succ^0$  is an acyclic relation that extends the revealed preference relation. Thus, there is an extension of  $\succ$  that is transitive and complete. Furthermore, we can complete the  $\Gamma$  as in the proof of Proposition 2. Hence, the data is rationalized by

the reconstructed combination of the preference relation and attention filter. Finally, the complete preference relation  $\succ^*$  is such that  $L_{\succ^*}(x) = L_{\succ}(x)$  given the construction of  $\succ$  ( $x$  was compared to any other alternative in  $X$ ). Thus, the bound is tight.  $\square$

## B Another Characterization based on Complete Data Sets

In this section we provide another characterization of our model based on complete data sets. The first axiom only concerns the doubletons. Since DM at least pays attention to two alternatives in our model, then she should act completely rational on pairs; that is, transitive. Thus, she should not exhibit any cycles therein.

**Axiom 3. No Binary Cycles (NBC)** *If  $x = \mathbf{c}\{x, y\}$  and  $y = \mathbf{c}\{y, z\}$ , then  $x = \mathbf{c}\{x, z\}$*

In addition, since a DM who admits to  $k^{\text{th}}$ -order CLA makes transitive choice over doubletons (for  $k \geq 2$ ), her preference relation can be pinned down using her choice over such problems. What about her choice in larger sets? If she was rational, then she would maximize her preference relation in any set; that is, her behavior would submit to the well-known *contraction* principle:  $x \in \mathbf{c}(S) \implies x \in \mathbf{c}\{x, y\}$ , for all  $y \in S$ . Nevertheless, in our model she may not necessarily maximize her preference relation. But she should at least prefer her choice over  $k - 1$  other elements. Thus, her choice should satisfy  *$k^{\text{th}}$ -order contraction*, which is our second axiom here.

**Axiom 4.  $k^{\text{th}}$ -order Contraction** *If  $x = \mathbf{c}(B)$ , then there exists disjoint elements:  $y_1, y_2, \dots, y_n$  :  $y_i \neq x, \min\{|B|, k\} - 1 \leq n \leq |B| - 1$ , such that  $x = \mathbf{c}\{x, y_i\}$*

It turns out that NBC along with  $k^{\text{th}}$ -order Contraction also characterize our model. This result is provided in the next theorem.

**Theorem 3.** *A choice function  $\mathbf{c}$  is a  $k^{\text{th}}$ -order CLA for  $k \geq 2$ , if and only if it satisfies NBC and  $k^{\text{th}}$ -order Contraction.*

*Proof.* ( $\Leftarrow$ ) Define  $x \succ^* y \iff x = \mathbf{c}\{x, y\}$ . Also, for  $S$  define  $\Gamma^*(S) = \mathbf{c}(S) \cup \{y \in S : \mathbf{c}(S) \succ^* y\}$ . It follows from  $k^{\text{th}}$ -order Contraction that  $\min\{|S|, k\} \leq |\Gamma^*(S)| \leq |S|$ . NBC along with the fact that  $|\Gamma^*(S)| \geq 2$  for all  $S$ , implies that  $\succ$  is a strict preference relation. Next, it also directly follows from the definition that  $\Gamma^*$  is an attention filter. Finally, it follows from the definition that  $\mathbf{c}(S) = \text{argmax}(\succ, \Gamma^*(S))$ , for all  $S$ .

( $\Rightarrow$ ) It is straightforward.  $\square$

## C Heterogeneous Thresholds

The model we provided in the main text assumes that the minimal thresholds on DM's attention span is uniform across the menus. One may, on the other hand, perceive a scenario

in which these thresholds vary across menus. For instance, DM's attention may be allocated proportional to the size of the menu— e.g., 20% of the menu is considered. We address this latter variation of our model in this section.

**Definition 2.** We say an experiment  $(\mathcal{B}, \mathbf{c})$  is rationalizable with limited attention theory with heterogeneous attention (HCLA) thresholds numbers  $k_S \geq 2$  for each budget  $S$  if there exist a strict preference relation  $\succ$ , and an attention filter  $\Gamma$ , with the property that  $|\Gamma(S)| \geq \min\{|S|, k_S\}$  for all  $S$ , and such that

$$\mathbf{c}(B) = \operatorname{argmax}(\succ, \Gamma(B))$$

for any budget  $B$ .

We next provide a characterization of HCLA. We start by addressing the case of complete data sets. We say  $x_1$  is directly chosen over  $x_2$  in heterogeneous sense if there exists a choice problem  $S : |S| = k_S$  containing  $x_1, x_2$  where  $x_1$  is chosen. We then say,  $x_1$  is indirectly chosen over  $x_n$  in heterogeneous sense if there exist  $\{x_2, x_3 \dots, x_{n-1}\}$  such that  $x_i$  is directly chosen over  $x_{i+1}$  in heterogeneous sense.

**Axiom 5.  $SARP^{het}$**  If  $x$  is indirectly chosen over  $y$  in heterogeneous sense, then  $y$  is not directly chosen over  $x$  in heterogeneous sense.

**Axiom 6.  $WARP$  for heterogeneous Limited Attention ( $WARP(LA^{het})$ )** For all  $x, y \in S \cap T$ , with  $k_T = |T|$ , if  $x = \mathbf{c}(S)$  and  $y = \mathbf{c}(T)$ , then  $x = \mathbf{c}(S \setminus \{y\})$ .

**Theorem 4.**  $\mathbf{c}$  is HCLA if and only if it satisfies  $SARP^{het}$  and  $WARP(LA^{het})$ .

*Proof.*  $(\Rightarrow)$  To see  $SARP^{het}$ , assume that  $x$  is indirectly chosen over  $y$  in heterogeneous sense. It follows that  $x \succ y$ . Thus,  $y$  can not be directly chosen over  $x$  in heterogeneous sense. This establishes  $SARP^{het}$ . To see  $WARP(LA^{het})$  take  $x, y \in S \cap T$ , with  $k_T = |T|$ ,  $x = \mathbf{c}(S)$  and  $y = \mathbf{c}(T)$ . This means that  $y \succ x$ , which in turn implies  $y \notin \Gamma(S)$ . This latter implies that  $x = \mathbf{c}(S \setminus \{y\})$ .

$(\Leftarrow)$  Using the same definition for  $\succ$  and  $\Gamma$  as in the proof of Theorem 1, we only need to establish here that  $|\Gamma(S)| \geq \min\{|S|, k_S\}$ . Take  $S$  and assume  $x = \mathbf{c}(S)$ . If  $|S| \leq k_S$ , then  $SARP^{het}$  implies that  $x = \mathbf{c}\{x, y\}$  for all  $y \in S$ . That is,  $\Gamma(S) = S$  as desired.

So assume that  $|S| \geq k_S$ . We must show  $|\Gamma(S)| \geq k_S$ . Assume by contradiction that  $|\Gamma(S)| < k_S$ . Since  $x = \mathbf{c}(S) \in \Gamma(S)$  by definition, then let  $\Gamma(S) = \{y_1, y_2, \dots, y_n\} : n \leq k_S - 2$ . Note that  $x = \mathbf{c}\{x, y_i\}$ . Also let  $A = \{z_1, z_2, \dots, z_m\} : m = |S| - (n + 1)$  be the set of elements DM does not pay attention to in  $S$ . Note that  $z_i = \mathbf{c}\{x, z_i\}$ . Thus, by  $WARP(LA^{het})$ , we can remove  $z_i$  from  $S$ , one by one, while protecting  $x$  as the choice. Thus, we conclude that  $x = \mathbf{c}\{x, y_1, y_2, z^* \dots, y_n\}$ , for  $z^* \in \{z_1, z_2, \dots, z_m\}$ . Since  $n \leq k_S - 2$ , then  $|\{x, y_1, y_2, \dots, y_n, z^*\}| \leq k_S$ . Also, since  $\Gamma$  is an attention filter and we have only removed alternatives DM does not pay attention to it follows that  $\Gamma\{x, y_1, y_2, \dots, y_n, z^*\} = \Gamma(S)$ . Thus,  $k_{\{x, y_1, y_2, \dots, y_n, z^*\}} = k_S$ . Hence,  $SARP^{het}$  implies that  $x \in \mathbf{c}\{x, z^*\}$  which is a contradiction. □

## C.1 HCLA and Incomplete Data Sets: Modifying MIPs

Note that the modification for the Mixed Integer Programs can be done easily by modifying the last line in systems (1) and (3). That is the last inequality in the systems ensures that the cardinality of the attention filter is at least as large as the minimal bound  $k$ :

$$b_i - \sum_{j \neq i} \delta_{ij} \geq \min\{k, b_i\}$$

Thus if one wants to introduce heterogeneous thresholds, then it is enough to use  $k_i$  for  $B_i$  instead of universal bound  $k$ . Thus, the corresponding inequality would look as follows.

$$b_i - \sum_{j \neq i} \delta_{ij} \geq \min\{k_i, b_i\}$$

Hence, using this inequality instead of the one in systems (1) and (3), Propositions 2 and 1 can be updated for the case of heterogeneous bounds.