## MATH4994 - Capstone Projects in Mathematics and Economics

## Solution to Homework Two

Course instructor: Prof. Y.K. Kwok

1. In this problem, woman $w_{1}$ is the first choice of every man, and man $m_{1}$ is the first choice of every woman. No two men would agree on what is the best matching, since each man's favorite matching is one at which he is married to woman $w_{1}$. Similarly, no two women agree on what is the best matching. But let us now turn our attention to the set of stable matching. Any matching that does not pair $m_{1}$ with $w_{1}$ is unstable, since $m_{1}$ and $w_{1}$ are each other's first choice, and so form a blocking pair for any matching at which they are not mates. Consequently there are only two stable matchings. These are

$$
\mu_{M}=\begin{array}{ccc}
w_{1} & w_{2} & w_{3} \\
m_{1} & m_{2} & m_{3}
\end{array} \quad \text { and } \quad \mu_{W}=\begin{array}{ccc}
w_{1} & w_{3} & w_{2} \\
m_{1} & m_{2} & m_{3}
\end{array} .
$$

2. We consider the following 3 cases:
(i) All matchings that give $m_{1}$ (respectively $m_{2}$ and $w_{2}$ ) a better family than $\left(m_{1}, w_{1}, c_{1}\right)$ [respectively, $\left(m_{2}, w_{2}, c_{2}\right)$ ] are unstable.
To see this, note that any matching containing either $\left(m_{1}, w_{1}, c_{3}\right)$ or ( $m_{2}, w_{2}, c_{3}$ ) is blocked by $\left(m_{3}, w_{3}, c_{3}\right)$, and any matching containing $\left(m_{1}, w_{2}, c_{3}\right)$ is blocked by $\left(m_{2}, w_{3}, c_{3}\right)$.
(ii) Any matching that does not contain $\left(m_{1}, w_{1}, c_{1}\right)$ [respectively, $\left.\left(m_{2}, w_{2}, c_{2}\right)\right]$ is either blocked by $\left(m_{1}, w_{1}, c_{1}\right)$ [respectively, $\left(m_{2}, w_{2}, c_{2}\right)$ ] or is unstable as already shown in part 1 above.
(iii) Finally, $\left(m_{1}, w_{2}, c_{3}\right)$ blocks any matching that contains $\left(m_{1}, w_{1}, c_{1}\right)$ and $\left(m_{2}, w_{2}, c_{2}\right)$. So all matchings are unstable.
3. We observe that

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \mu_{1}= \begin{array}{cc}
F_{1} & F_{2}, \\
\left\{w_{1}, w_{3}\right\} & \left\{w_{2}\right\}
\end{array} \\
& \mu_{2}= \text { which is blocked by }\left(F_{2}, w_{1}\right) \\
& F_{1} \quad F_{2}, \\
&\left\{w_{1}, w_{2}\right\}\left\{w_{3}\right\}
\end{aligned} \text { which is blocked by }\left(F_{2},\left\{w_{1}, w_{3}\right\}\right)
$$

4. (a) Consider $\mu_{1}$, we check whether a blocking pair can be found for $m_{1}, m_{2}$ and $m_{3}$.
(i) $m_{1}$ is matched to one of his best choice $w_{2}$ under $\mu_{1}$;
(ii) $m_{2}$ may want to match with $w_{2}$, but $w_{2}$ has been matched with her best choice under $\mu_{1}$;
(iii) $m_{3}$ is matched to his best choice $w_{3}$ under $\mu_{1}$.
(b) The sets of achievable men for $w_{1}, w_{2}$ and $w_{3}$ are

$$
A\left(w_{1}\right)=\left\{m_{2}, m_{3}\right\}, \quad A\left(w_{2}\right)=\left\{m_{1}, m_{2}\right\}, \quad A\left(w_{3}\right)=\left\{m_{1}, m 3\right\} .
$$

Consider $\mu_{2}, w_{1}$ is matched to $m_{3}$, who is the worst choice within $A\left(w_{1}\right) ; w_{2}$ is matched to $m_{2}$, who is the worst choice within $A\left(w_{2}\right) ; w_{3}$ is matched to $m_{1}$, who happens to be the best choice within $A\left(w_{3}\right)$. Note that not all women achieve their best achievable partner. Therefore, woman-optimality is not achieved under $\mu_{2}$.
5. (a) $S_{1}$ comes to $c_{2}$ first; $S_{2}$ and $S_{3}$ compete for $c_{1}$, but $S_{3}$ wins; lastly, $S_{2}$ settles with $c_{3}$. The outcome is

$$
\begin{array}{lll}
S_{1} & S_{2} & S_{3} \\
c_{2} & c_{3} & c_{1} .
\end{array}
$$

(b) Both $S_{1}$ and $S_{3}$ receive their top choice already, so they do not game around. Can $S_{2}$ gain by gaming? His top choice is $c_{1}$ but $c_{1}$ places $S_{2}$ the lowest priority. Therefore, $S_{2}$ cannot gain by gaming to improve his assignment of $c_{3}$, which is his second choice already.
6. (a) The expected utility of $i_{1}$ under the lottery is given by

$$
\frac{1}{6} u\left(h_{1}\right)+\frac{3}{6} u\left(h_{2}\right)+\frac{2}{6} u\left(h_{3}\right)=\frac{3}{6}+\frac{12}{6}+\frac{2}{6}=\frac{17}{6} .
$$

The utility of $i_{1}$ if he chooses keeping his house $h_{1}$ is 3 , which is higher than $\frac{17}{6}$. Therefore, $i_{1}$ should choose keeping $h_{1}$.
(b) The two possible outcomes are

$$
\left(\begin{array}{ccc}
i_{1} & i_{2} & i_{3} \\
h_{1} & h_{2} & h_{3}
\end{array}\right) \quad \text { or } \quad\left(\begin{array}{ccc}
i_{1} & i_{2} & i_{3} \\
h_{1} & h_{3} & h_{2}
\end{array}\right),
$$

both with $1 / 2$ probability. Among these two matchings the first is Pareto dominated by

$$
\left(\begin{array}{ccc}
i_{1} & i_{2} & i_{3} \\
h_{2} & h_{1} & h_{3}
\end{array}\right) .
$$

Therefore, this mechanism may lead to Pareto inefficient outcomes.
(c) The lottery can result in six orderings. If the ordering is one of $i_{1}-i_{2}-i_{3}, i_{1}-i_{3}-i_{2}$, or $i_{3}-i_{1}-i_{2}$, then agent $i_{1}$ leaves before anyone demands house $h_{1}$ and therefore the resulting allocation is not affected:

| initial <br> ordering | modified <br> ordering | assignment <br> of $i_{1}$ | assignment <br> of $i_{2}$ | assignment <br> of $i_{3}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $i_{1}-i_{2}-i_{3}$ | $i_{1}-i_{2}-i_{3}$ | $h_{2}$ | $h_{1}$ | $h_{3}$ |
| $i_{1}-i_{3}-i_{2}$ | $i_{1}-i_{3}-i_{2}$ | $h_{2}$ | $h_{3}$ | $h_{1}$ |
| $i_{3}-i_{1}-i_{2}$ | $i_{3}-i_{1}-i_{2}$ | $h_{1}$ | $h_{3}$ | $h_{2}$ |

If the ordering is $i_{2}-i_{1}-i_{3}$ or $i_{2}-i_{3}-i_{1}$, then in the first step agent $i_{2}$ demands house $h_{1}$. In both cases the ordering is changed to $i_{1}-i_{2}-i_{3}$ and the resulting outcome is as follows:

| initial <br> ordering | modified <br> ordering | assignment <br> of $i_{1}$ | assignment <br> of $i_{2}$ | assignment <br> of $i_{3}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $i_{2}-i_{1}-i_{3}$ | $i_{1}-i_{2}-i_{3}$ | $h_{2}$ | $h_{1}$ | $h_{3}$ |
| $i_{2}-i_{3}-i_{1}$ | $i_{1}-i_{2}-i_{3}$ | $h_{2}$ | $h_{1}$ | $h_{3}$ |

Finally if the ordering is $i_{3}-i_{2}-i_{1}$, then in the first step agent $i_{3}$ is assigned house $h_{2}$ and in the next step agent $i_{2}$ demands house $h_{1}$. The remainder of the ordering is changed to $i_{1}-i_{2}$ and this results in the following outcome:

| initial <br> ordering | modified <br> ordering | assignment <br> of $i_{1}$ | assignment <br> of $i_{2}$ | assignment <br> of $i_{3}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $i_{3}-i_{2}-i_{1}$ | $i_{3}-i_{1}-i_{2}$ | $h_{1}$ | $h_{3}$ | $h_{2}$ |

Therefore, the modified mechanism selects one of

$$
\left(\begin{array}{ccc}
i_{1} & i_{2} & i_{3} \\
h_{2} & h_{1} & h_{3}
\end{array}\right),\left(\begin{array}{ccc}
i_{1} & i_{2} & i_{3} \\
h_{2} & h_{3} & h_{1}
\end{array}\right), \quad \text { or }\left(\begin{array}{ccc}
i_{1} & i_{2} & i_{3} \\
h_{1} & h_{3} & h_{2}
\end{array}\right),
$$

with probabilities of $1 / 2,1 / 6$, and $1 / 3$ respectively. Note that all these matchings are Pareto efficient.

