

When is Assortment Optimization Optimal?

Will Ma

Graduate School of Business, Columbia University, New York, NY 10027, wm2428@gsb.columbia.edu

A classical question in economics is whether complex, randomized selling protocols can improve a firm’s revenue beyond that of simple, take-it-or-leave-it posted prices. In 1981, Myerson answered this question with an emphatic “No” for a monopolist selling a single product. By contrast, there is no crisp answer for multiple products, and a major focus of Bayesian mechanism design has been understanding the increase in revenue from pricing lotteries over products instead of deterministic products, under different classes of valuation functions and different families of prior customer distributions.

In this paper, we ask the same question for assortment optimization, where products have exogenously-fixed prices, and the decision is on a set of substitute products to offer. To formalize such a question, we introduce a Bayesian mechanism design problem where customers have ordinal preferences for products with fixed prices, in which assortments correspond to deterministic mechanisms. Meanwhile, randomized mechanisms correspond to lotteries whose payment is restricted equal the fixed price of the randomly-allocated product, a significant departure from the lotteries currently studied in Bayesian mechanism design.

We first show that for general ordinal preference distributions, lotteries under this restriction can still earn higher revenue than any deterministic assortment. We then derive a natural sufficient condition on the distribution which ensures the optimality of assortments. Importantly, this sufficient condition captures common distributions used in the assortment optimization literature, including Multi-Nomial Logit (MNL), Markov Chain choice models, Tversky’s Elimination by Aspects model, and mixtures of any one of these with Independent Demand Models. The takeaway is that unless a firm has a very sophisticated model for consumer choice, fixed-price lotteries do not increase revenue, and hence assortments are optimal.

1. Introduction

A ubiquitous question faced by online and brick-and-mortar retailers alike is which *assortment* of products to carry. On one hand, carrying a wide variety of products allows the retailer to satisfy more customers’ needs, capturing greater market share. On the other hand, carrying many cheap brands can *cannibalize* the sales of luxury brands, hurting the retailer’s margins. Correctly designing the assortment of products can have tremendous impact on a retailer’s bottom line (Kök et al. 2008).

This is a well-studied problem in the area of revenue management, and can be formalized as follows. There is a universe of n substitute products j , each with a fixed price r_j that has been

pre-determined by the manufacturer or competition. The retailer must decide on a subset S of products to carry. Cannibalization is modeled as follows—every buyer has an a-priori *ranking* of the products in the universe, including the “no-purchase” option represented by $j = 0$. This ranking can be interpreted as the products sorted in decreasing order of $v_j - r_j$, where v_j denotes the buyer’s cardinal valuation for product j , with $v_0 = r_0 = 0$. After seeing subset S , the buyer chooses their most-preferred product from $S \cup \{0\}$, paying fixed price r_j . The *assortment optimization* problem is then: given exogenous prices r_j and a distribution of rankings (or valuations) for the buyers, compute a single subset S^* to offer which maximizes expected revenue.

Our paper asks—can the retailer “do better” than the best assortment S^* ? To motivate this question, we first take a detour into the classical question of pricing. There, the seller faces a similar conundrum: a lower price captures greater market share, but fails to extract from price-insensitive buyers. Consequently, it is natural to wonder whether the seller can “do better” through complex selling protocols involving haggling or randomized lotteries (Riley and Zeckhauser 1983). However, Myerson (1981) famously showed this to not be the case when selling a single item, by describing all selling protocols using randomized mechanisms, and then proving that a deterministic mechanism (corresponding to a posted price) is always optimal. On the other hand, lotteries can generally increase revenue when selling multiple items, and much subsequent work in Bayesian mechanism design has focused on the power of randomization in multi-item mechanisms—we review this literature in Subsection 1.3.

In this paper, we ask an analogous¹ question for assortment optimization, where multiple items are being sold, but the pricing is *fixed*. This is a question of increasing relevance in practice, where there has been a trend in designer fashion to sell items in weekly launches using the “fixed-price lotteries” studied in this paper. Whereas traditional lotteries (studied in the existing literature) have enticed customers through deep discounts, for fashion designers like *End Clothing*², some items with fixed price tags are available *exclusively* through lotteries. The winner of such an item through any lottery pays the same *undiscounted* price tag, which is important for protecting the brand value of End Clothing’s premium products.

We investigate whether End Clothing is increasing its revenue by using these lotteries instead of making an optimized assortment of products deterministically available. Before formally defining this space of possible “fixed-price lotteries” via mechanism design, we provide an example of a simple such lottery which can outperform any assortment.

Top- k Lottery: the buyer reports up to k *distinct* items they are willing to purchase, i.e. ranked above 0. The lottery selects one of these items, with probability $1/k$ each, and sells it to the buyer. (If the buyer reported fewer than k items, then there is a chance that they receive nothing.)

¹ Our title “When is Assortment Optimization Optimal?” is motivated by that of Haghpanah and Hartline (2019).

² See endclothing.com.

EXAMPLE 1 (GENERAL SUBOPTIMALITY OF ASSORTMENTS). There are four items A, B, C, D with prices $r_A = 2, r_B = r_C = r_D = 1$. The ranking is uniformly drawn from $\{(BA), (CA), (CB), (DA), (DB), (DC)\}$, where we have expressed each ranking as a *list* of items in decreasing order of preference, omitting the items ranked below 0. On this example, a top-2 lottery has expected revenue $(1.5 + 1.5 + 1 + 1.5 + 1 + 1)/6 = \mathbf{7.5/6}$, while it is easy to check that one cannot do better with an assortment than offering $\{A, B\}$ or $\{A, B, C\}$, both of which have expected revenue $\mathbf{7/6}$.

Example 1 shows that even when pricing is fixed, making some items A, B, C, D available exclusively through a lottery can indeed increase revenues. In essence, the top-2 lottery has allowed the retailer to capture the full market share, making a sale w.p. 1, while minimizing the cannibalized sales of the premium item A .

However, our paper’s key finding is that this phenomenon actually cannot arise for most families of distributions used to model consumers in practice, such as Multi-Nomial Logit (MNL) and Markov Chain. Therefore, unless End Clothing has a sophisticated, idiosyncratic model of its customers’ preferences like the one in Example 1, lotteries cannot do a better job of increasing market share while minimizing cannibalization. To formalize this finding, we now define a space of randomized mechanisms capturing all fixed-price lotteries within which deterministic mechanisms correspond to assortments, and investigate when there is guaranteed to exist a deterministic optimal solution.

1.1. Definition of Mechanism Design Problem

By the revelation principle, any protocol that the seller could announce can be represented by a direct mechanism, to which a buyer *reports* their private preferences, and is then assigned an *outcome*. The mechanism must satisfy some *incentive constraint* so that the buyer truthfully reports their preferences and agrees to the mechanism’s outcome. We now define these for our problem.

Definition of Direct Mechanism:

Report - ordered *list* of items $\ell = (\ell_1, \dots, \ell_s)$ ranked above item 0;

Outcome - (randomly-assigned) single item, which could be 0, for the buyer to purchase;

Incentive Constraint - truthfully participating in the mechanism maximizes the buyer’s probability of receiving one of their k most-preferred items, *simultaneously* for all $k = 1, \dots, s + 1$.

Note that by not participating in the mechanism, the buyer can receive one of their $s + 1$ most-preferred items (namely item 0, ranked $s + 1$) with probability 1. Therefore, setting $k = s + 1$ in the incentive constraint imposes that the probability of the buyer receiving one of their $s + 1$ most-preferred items, through truthful participation in the mechanism, must also be 1. Thus, the mechanism is *ex-post individually rational*: it always assigns the buyer an item they are willing to purchase or item 0. This also explains why the buyer need not report their ranking below 0.

Discussion of incentive constraint. The constraint above can be called “strong truthfulness”, because it equivalently says that for *any* set of cardinal utilities consistent with the reported list, the mechanism must maximize expected buyer utility. This constraint was pioneered by Gibbard (1977) and is standard for an ordinal ranking facing a randomized outcome. Alternatively, one could consider a weaker constraint where the mechanism only needs to maximize expected buyer utility for a *reported* set of cardinal utilities. In this paper we choose not to allow these less-constrained mechanisms, for the following reasons.

1. The weaker incentive constraint does not imply ex-post individual rationality, which we believe to be necessary for implementation in practice, because otherwise the buyer could just not pay for their assigned item after seeing an unfavorable realization.

2. It is much cognitively much easier for buyers to report an ordinal ranking to the mechanism, than to have to decide on cardinal utilities³. This also allows us to make a characterization based purely on the combinatorics of the ranking distribution.

3. It appears difficult for assortments to be competitive with these less-constrained mechanisms, unless severe⁴ restrictions are placed on the ranking distribution.

Hereafter we proceed with our strong incentive constraint and refer to mechanisms satisfying it (along with the implied ex-post individual rationality) as “IC”.

Examples of IC mechanisms and their implementation. An assortment S has the following implementation as a mechanism which is easily seen to be IC—ask the buyer to report their list, and then choose for them their most-preferred item from $S \cup \{0\}$. Top- k lotteries have a similar direct implementation. More generally, our class of randomized mechanisms allows for uniform lotteries with constraints on the number of times each item can be submitted, non-uniform lotteries where the buyer is more likely to receive their first choice than second choice, etc.—see Chakrabarty and Swamy (2014) for more examples.

Discussion of ranking assumption. From the start we assumed the buyer to have an intrinsic, privately-known ranking (or equivalently, utility) for every item. We acknowledge that there are limits to such models (Jagabathula and Rusmevichientong 2018), and more generally the customer may not know their own ranking, or the customer’s utilities could be influenced by the assortment shown. To capture such models, the mechanism’s output would have to be an assortment. However,

³ Although the buyer’s preference under uncertainty can be robustly described as maximizing the expectation of some underlying von Neumann-Morgenstern utilities, the buyer may not know what these are. Our mechanisms guarantee the buyer that as long as they decided their ranking correctly, they will not regret their report to the mechanism.

⁴ For example, if there is any item with a small $\varepsilon \geq 0$ probability of being ranked above 0, then that item could be given a price approaching ∞ . By offering the item as part of a lottery, the weakly-constrained mechanisms would be able to sell it with probability $\omega(\varepsilon)$, while for any assortment, the item would only get chosen with probability $O(\varepsilon)$.

in this paper we will assume the buyer to have this a-priori private ranking, which limits the scope to mechanisms whose output is a single⁵ item.

Comparison with personalized assortments. The optimality of posting a single assortment in our model suggests that the seller cannot benefit by discriminatively showing items to buyers. However, it is not to suggest that an online retailer cannot benefit by showing *personalized assortments* (Golrezaei et al. 2014) to different users based on available information such as IP address. Crucially, our model assumes the buyers to be indistinguishable to the seller, except through preferences that they strategically disclose. If buyers can be segmented based on IP address, then our result should be applied at the segment level, determining for each indistinguishable segment whether the online retailer should show a single assortment or ask the buyers from that segment to report preferences.

1.2. Choice Models for which Assortments are Optimal


Our paper’s main result is to derive a *sufficient condition* under which our mechanism design problem always admits an optimal solution corresponding to an assortment. While the description of this condition is deferred to Section 2, it shows that under any of the following families of list distributions known as *choice models* in the literature, assortments are optimal. Full definitions of these choice models and proofs that they satisfy our sufficient condition are deferred to Section 5.

1. **Multi-Nomial Logit (MNL):** the simplest choice model to capture non-trivial substitution, and also a common deployment of assortment optimization in practice (Feldman et al. 2018);
2. **Markov Chain choice models:** a list distribution defined through sequential memoryless generation by a Markov chain, which captures MNL (Blanchet et al. 2016);
3. **Tversky’s Elimination by Aspects model:** corresponds to the special case of a Nested Logit model whose dissimilarity parameters all approach 0;
4. **Mixtures** of any of the models above with **Singleton** lists.

A hierarchy of these choice models, along with references to assortment optimization on them, is displayed in Figure 1. Our sufficient condition does not capture some choice models like the Mallows model (Désir et al. 2016) or general Nested Logit (Gallego and Topaloglu 2014, Davis et al. 2014), for which assortments may not be optimal. Nonetheless, our sufficient condition shows assortments to be optimal even in some models where it is not known how to compute this optimal assortment (e.g. mixture of Markov Chain with singletons)! Moreover, we believe our sufficient condition can be useful as a basis for describing these models in a unified manner (to our knowledge, there is no shorter condition which captures e.g. both Markov Chain and Elimination by Aspects).

⁵ This is because instead of outputting multiple items, the mechanism would just choose from among them the one most-preferred according to the buyer’s report.

Figure 1 Hierarchy of choice models for which assortments are optimal, including references which emphasize the assortment optimization problem on those choice models.



*Abbreviated references: TvR04 (Talluri and Van Ryzin 2004), RSS10 (Rusmevichientong et al. 2010), BGG16 (Blanchet et al. 2016), FT17 (Feldman and Topaloglu 2017), DGSY20 (Désir et al. 2020), M20 (Ma 2020).

A new LP relaxation for assortment optimization. We show that assortments correspond exactly to *deterministic* IC mechanisms under our definition, and define a Linear Program (LP) for the mechanism design problem whose *integer* solutions correspond to assortments (**Subsection 3.1**). Moreover, this LP is polynomially-sized in the support of the list distribution. Therefore, if the input is given as a distribution over explicit rankings, then this LP relaxation is polytime-solvable, and could be used for assortment optimization via e.g. LP-rounding.

However, there are two impediments to such an approach. First, since assortment optimization given an *arbitrary* explicit distribution is known to be NP-hard to approximate within any sublinear factor (Aouad et al. 2018), unless $P=NP$, our LP relaxation must have a linear integrality gap in the worst case. On the other hand, under many of the choice models in Figure 1 for which our main result says that the integrality gap is 0, we are impeded by the support of the list distribution being exponential in the input. As an example, even though assortment optimization for the mixture of a Markov Chain with singletons is an open problem on the frontier of Figure 1, and we can show that the integrality gap is 0 in this case, we cannot solve it using our LP which is exponentially-sized.

Despite these impediments, having our simple new LP allows for branch-and-bound heuristics (in the first situation described above), or structural attempts to solve the LP (in the second situation above). We believe this will be useful for assortment optimization in the future.

Computation of optimal mechanisms through assortment optimization. On the flip side, if one was purely interested in finding revenue-maximizing mechanisms, then our main result does have immediate computational implications. For many of the blue circles in Figure 1, e.g. Markov Chain choice models, it is a priori unclear how to solve the mechanism design problem, since as mentioned before the LP would be exponentially-sized. However, since our main result says that randomized mechanisms are no better than assortments, one can simply use a combinatorial algorithm (e.g. Désir et al. 2020) for assortment optimization on Markov Chains to solve this exponentially-sized LP.

1.3. Related Work in Bayesian Mechanism Design

Power of randomized mechanisms. Since the paper of Myerson (1981), understanding the power of randomized lotteries for selling multiple items has been a central goal in Bayesian mechanism design. Common questions (with representative papers) include:

- Identifying conditions under which deterministic mechanisms are as profitable as randomized ones (Armstrong 1996, Thanassoulis 2004, Alaei et al. 2013, Haghpanah and Hartline 2015, 2019);
- Bounding the suboptimality of simple deterministic mechanisms for a *unit demand* buyer (Chawla et al. 2007, Briest et al. 2015, Chawla et al. 2015), or
- An *additive* buyer with *independent* valuations (Hart and Reny 2015, Hart and Nisan 2017, Babaioff et al. 2020).

Two common features throughout these papers are that: (1) pricing is a decision variable; and consequently (2) the buyer’s preference is modeled using a cardinal valuation distribution. Our paper, motivated by assortment optimization and the “fixed-price lotteries” emerging in designer fashion, adds a novel dimension to this literature because: (1) pricing is exogenously-determined; and (2) the buyer’s preference is modeled using an ordinal ranking distribution.

We now elaborate on the aforementioned papers on unit demand, in which randomized lotteries allocate at most one item to the buyer, closely resembling our problem. The existing papers show that including randomized options (with fractional allocation probabilities) in the mechanism, *assuming that each option can be priced discriminatively*, increases revenue by a factor of ∞ for arbitrary distributions over item valuations (Briest et al. 2015), at most 4 if these valuations are independent, and at most 3.16 if these valuations are IID (Chawla et al. 2015). Our paper shows that including randomized options in the mechanism, *assuming that prices of options must be tied to arbitrarily-given fixed prices for items*, **does not increase revenue** for common ordinal distributions, and also particular cardinal distributions such as independent Gumbel⁶. The buyer

⁶ This is because our distributions include MNL, which can be described as a random-utility model in which the valuation of every item (including the no-purchase option) incurs an independent Gumbel shock with CDF $F(x) = e^{-e^{-x}}$ —see Train (2009, Ch.3).

in our mechanism requires a stronger IC constraint than expected utility maximization as in the existing papers, though. Nonetheless, we wanted to highlight this stark contrast in the power of randomization depending on whether pricing is a decision variable.

Mechanism design for assortments. Connections between assortment optimization and mechanism design have been previously made in Ma (2020). However, they focus solely on deterministic mechanisms, in which case the single-buyer problem is simply equivalent to assortment optimization, and the non-triviality comes from having multiple buyers in a *service-constrained* environment (as introduced in Alaei et al. (2013)). By contrast, we focus on a single buyer and randomized mechanisms, which we believe to be a fundamental question that, surprisingly, has not been studied until now. We should note that designing mechanisms for the supplier side to procure an assortment of products has been previously studied in Saban and Weintraub (2020).

Opaque products. Finally, we note that some of the mechanisms discussed here, e.g. top- k lotteries, could be implemented in a way that is similar to opaque products in practice, as described in Elmachtoub et al. (2015), Elmachtoub and Hamilton (2021).

2. Intuitive Derivation of Sufficient Condition


To aid the reader, we provide a notation-free description and discussion of our sufficient condition, which also serves as a roadmap highlighting our technical developments. The reader interested in the formal derivation can directly jump to these developments in Sections 3 and 4.

Our sufficient condition is useful for illuminating what is driving assortments to be optimal in our main result. It is based on a novel connection between IC constraints and an optimal stopping problem with constraints on its decisions across sample paths. Although our condition is somewhat abstract, this is necessarily so in that it captures the distinct set of choice models outlined in Subsection 1.2, and to our knowledge there is no simple description in the literature which can capture all of these choice models. Our condition is also easy to verify for all these choice models, as we demonstrate in Section 5.

We now build up to our sufficient condition through three steps. In Step 1, we define an optimal stopping problem based on a list distribution, in which assortments correspond to a family of “decisive” stopping policies. In Step 2, we upper-bound IC mechanisms using a larger family of “monotone” stopping policies. In Step 3, we engineer a condition which intuitively should force “monotone” stopping policies into being “decisive”, thereby showing that IC mechanisms (which are upper-bounded by monotone stopping policies) can be no better than assortments.

Step 1. All list distributions can be defined by a labeled probabilistic tree, which sequentially generates a random list from that distribution—see Figure 2 for an example. Given such a tree diagram, one can consider the following *optimal stopping problem*. A decision-maker starts from the

Figure 2 Tree diagram showing the sequential, probabilistic generation of a list that equals each of $(BA), (CA), (CB), (DA), (DB), (DC)$ w.p. $1/6$, which is from Example 1 in the Introduction.



root node and transitions probabilistically along the tree. Upon arriving at any node labeled j , the decision-maker can optionally stop to end the game with reward r_j . The game can also suddenly end with 0 reward upon a transition to a terminal node labeled “0”.

It is easy to see that the revenue an assortment S equals the reward collected by the policy which stops on a node labeled j if and only if $j \in S$. Generally, there will be multiple nodes with the same label j , but importantly, policies corresponding to assortments must be “decisive” for every item j —either stopping on all nodes labeled j or none of them.

Step 2. Meanwhile, we show that the revenue of IC mechanisms can be upper-bounded by the reward of the following class of *monotone stopping policies* in the same optimal stopping problem. A monotone stopping policy must be deterministic, and is allowed to be “indecisive” on items j . However, it is subject to the following constraints: whether it stops on a particular node labeled j can depend only on the (unordered) history H of labels seen before; additionally, if it decides to stop on a node labeled j with history H , then it must also stop on any other node labeled j with history $H' \supseteq H$ (as an unordered set).

Step 3. To motivate our condition under which a monotone stopping policy ϕ is no better than assortments, we first provide a recipe under which ϕ could plausibly be better. Recall that assortments are policies which must be *decisive* for every item j . Therefore, to be better ϕ must exploit the fact that it can be *indecisive* for some item j . To do so, for two different nodes labeled j with histories H, H' , policy ϕ must *strictly benefit* by stopping on the 1st node, with “continuation value” less than the stopping value of r_j , while not stopping on the 2nd node, with “continuation value” higher than r_j .

Our sufficient condition eliminates the recipe above by imposing that the 2nd node (with history H') can have a strictly higher “continuation value” than the 1st node (with history H) *only if*

$H' \supseteq H$. Under this condition, by the monotonicity constraint, ϕ cannot stop on the 1st node without also stopping on the 2nd node, since $H' \supseteq H$. This forces ϕ to compromise between stopping on either both nodes or none, and intuitively one could hope that this leads to ϕ wanting to be decisive for every item j .

However, one final consideration in our condition is how to formalize “continuation value”. Note that the reward ϕ expects to collect in the future from the 2nd node labeled j (with history H') depends on its stopping decisions for items $j' \notin H' \cup \{j\}$, which are constrained⁷ by monotonicity. Do we need to require $H' \supseteq H$ whenever its future reward is strictly greater, under *any* future stopping decisions? It turns out that it suffices to only consider future stopping decisions defined by an assortment S of labels *disjoint*⁸ from $H \cup H'$, on which the policy decisively stops.

THEOREM 1 (Informal Restatement of Theorem 2). *Suppose that for any two nodes with the same label j and histories H, H' , the future from the second node can only have a strictly higher “continuation value” (defined as above based on $H \cup H'$ -disjoint assortments) than the first if $H' \supseteq H$. Then given any item prices r_j , assortments are optimal.*

Sketch of techniques. There are two main gaps from the derivation of our sufficient condition. First, we need to prove that the revenue of IC mechanisms is indeed upper-bounded by the reward of monotone stopping policies in our optimal stopping problem. To do this, we first show that every IC mechanism has a sequential implementation, by which the probability of assigning a list ℓ its k 'th-most-preferred item can depend only on the prefix (ℓ_1, \dots, ℓ_k) (**Subsection 3.2**). Consequently, an IC mechanism can be naturally described using a non-anticipative stopping policy. We show that the monotonicity constraints, tying together the stopping decisions of ϕ across the different sample paths, are consequences of the original IC constraints (**Subsection 3.3**).

Having established monotone stopping policies as an upper bound, we need to prove that our sufficient condition implies them to be no better than assortments. First, we formally state our sufficient condition in the form of a domination relationship (**Subsection 4.1**), where “strictly higher continuation value” is replaced with “not dominated by”. Then we define a graph depicting the domination relationships imposed by our condition, which allows us to define equivalence classes on the unordered histories (**Subsection 4.2**). Note that our sufficient condition, by only considering continuation value under assortments, does not preclude the possibility of ϕ being locally optimal by being indecisive on some items. However, the equivalence classes allow us to make a local improvement argument, where given any monotone stopping policy ϕ that is indecisive

⁷ Consequently, the continuation value is not as typically defined via dynamic programming.

⁸ The condition would be too stringent to capture any commonly-used families of list distributions if this set was allowed to include items in $H \cup H'$. To see this, note that it would be too easy to make the continuation value from H' higher than H by only stopping on items in $H \setminus H'$, since the same label cannot be visited twice.

on a non-empty set of items, we can always make ϕ more decisive on one of these items without decreasing its reward (**Subsection 4.3**). Iterating, this allows us to show that there always exists an optimal policy which is decisive for every item j , corresponding to an assortment.

Checking that Example 1 does not satisfy our condition. Recall that assortments were not optimal in Example 1. Accordingly, it does not satisfy our condition—the B -node in the second row (whose future contains item A) can have a strictly higher continuation value than the B -nodes in the third row (whose futures are empty), despite its history (which is \emptyset) not containing the other histories.

Price-agnostic condition. Our sufficient condition only checks the list distribution, and shows that assortments are optimal under an adversarial choice of prices r_j . We note that although it seems stringent to let an adversary choose the prices, this allows our condition to focus purely on the combinatorics of the list distribution. This also makes our condition easy to verify on the families of list distributions studied in assortment optimization, in which it is also the norm to focus on the list distribution and not the prices.

Discussion of necessity. Our sufficient condition is not a tight characterization of “all list distributions for which assortments are optimal under any prices r_j ”. Nonetheless, to the best of our knowledge, such list distributions have no elementary characterization. We reiterate that our sufficient condition is useful for: (i) illuminating what is driving our main result; and (ii) being general enough to capture and unify distinct choice models of interest.

3. Notation and Upper Bound via Monotone Stopping Policies

There is a seller with n items, denoted by $N = \{1, \dots, n\}$. Each item $j \in N$ must be sold at its commonly-known, exogenously-given price $r_j \geq 0$.

There is a single buyer who is willing to purchase at most one item from N . The private type of the buyer is given by an ordered subset of N , indicating the items they are willing to purchase, in decreasing order of preference. For example, if the type is $(1, 3)$, then the buyer’s first choice is to pay r_1 for item 1, second choice is to pay r_3 for item 3, and third choice is to purchase nothing at all; the buyer is not willing to consider other items. We will refer to the type as a *list* ℓ , which is assumed to be a strictly ordered subset of N .

DEFINITION 1. We define the following notation on lists ℓ :

- Let $|\ell|$ denote the length of a list ℓ . For example, if $\ell = (1, 3)$, then $|\ell| = 2$.
- For $k = 1, \dots, |\ell|$, let ℓ_k denote the k 'th item on ℓ , and $\ell_{1:k}$ denote the sublist formed by the first k items given in order. For example, if $\ell = (1, 3, 2)$, then $\ell_1 = 1$, and $\ell_{1:2} = (1, 3)$.
- If we apply set-specific operations to a list or sublist, then we are referring to the set of items on that list or sublist. For example, if $\ell = (1, 3, 2)$, then $\ell \cap \{2, 3\} = \{2, 3\}$ and $\ell_{1:2} \cap \{2, 3\} = \{3\}$.

The buyer's type is drawn from a commonly-known *list distribution*, given by a support \mathcal{L} of ordered subsets and a probability $p(\ell)$ for each list $\ell \in \mathcal{L}$. We will refer to the list distribution using p , which satisfies $\sum_{\ell \in \mathcal{L}} p(\ell) = 1$.

An *assortment* S is a subset of items which is offered to the buyer. For each $j \in S$, the buyer chooses to purchase item j if and only if j appears on their randomly-drawn list and is earliest (i.e. most preferred) among items in S on their list. We let $\Pr[j \succeq S_0]$ denote the probability of this event, suppressing the dependence on p but adding a subscript "0" as a reminder that j has to be preferred over the "no-purchase" option. The expected revenue collected by an assortment S can then be expressed as

$$\text{REV}[S] := \sum_{j \in S} r_j \Pr[j \succeq S_0]. \quad (1)$$

Given item prices r_1, \dots, r_n and list distribution p , the *assortment optimization* problem is to find a subset $S \subseteq N$ which maximizes (1). We let OPT^S denote its optimal objective value.

3.1. Mechanism Design Generalization of Assortment Optimization

A (direct revelation) mechanism takes in a reported list, and then possibly using randomness, assigns up to one item for the buyer to purchase. As discussed in Subsection 1.1, we impose the incentive constraint that for any k , truthfully participating in the mechanism must maximize the buyer's probability of receiving one of their k most-preferred items. This implies that the mechanism cannot assign an item less-preferred than the "no-purchase" option. We hereafter make no distinction between the buyer's reported list vs. true list and assume that they will pay the price of any item they are assigned.

DEFINITION 2. For any list ℓ and item $j \in \ell$, let $x_j(\ell)$ specify the probability of the mechanism assigning j given report ℓ . Our mechanism design problem is then formulated by the following LP:

$$\begin{aligned} \max \quad & \sum_{\ell \in \mathcal{L}} p(\ell) \sum_{j \in \ell} r_j x_j(\ell) \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \sum_{j \in \ell_{1:k}} x_j(\ell) \geq \sum_{j \in \ell_{1:k} \cap \ell'} x_j(\ell') \quad \forall \ell \in \mathcal{L}, k \leq |\ell|, \ell' \in \mathcal{L} \quad (2) \\ & \sum_{j \in \ell} x_j(\ell) \leq 1 \quad \forall \ell \in \mathcal{L} \quad (3) \\ & x_j(\ell) \geq 0 \quad \forall \ell \in \mathcal{L}, j \in \ell \quad (4) \end{aligned}$$

We refer to a *mechanism* using x and say that it is *IC* if it feasibly satisfies (2)–(4). We let $\text{REV}[x]$ denote the objective at a given x and use OPT^x to refer to the optimal objective value of the LP.

Note that the mechanism only needs to be defined on lists ℓ in the buyer's support \mathcal{L} , and the feasible region depends only on \mathcal{L} , with the probabilities $p(\ell)$ appearing in the objective. Constraints (3) ensure that the buyer is assigned at most one item, with $1 - \sum_{j \in \ell} x_j(\ell)$ understood as the probability of the buyer receiving nothing after reporting ℓ .

PROPOSITION 1. For any assortment $S \subseteq N$, setting

$$x_j(\ell) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } j \text{ appears before any other item in } S \text{ on } \ell \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad \forall \ell \in \mathcal{L}, j \in \ell \quad (5)$$

defines an IC mechanism with $\text{REV}[x] = \text{REV}[S]$. Therefore, $\text{OPT}^S \leq \text{OPT}^x$. On the other hand, any deterministic IC mechanism can be described by (5) for some corresponding assortment S .

Proposition 1 is proved in Section A, but we only need the forward direction, which is straightforward, to proceed. The statement as a whole is our analogue of the fact that in classical single-buyer auctions, a mechanism is deterministic if and only if it corresponds to posted pricing. Here, a deterministic mechanism corresponds to an assortment.

3.2. Sequential Implementation of IC Mechanisms

Proposition 1 showed that $\text{OPT}^S \leq \text{OPT}^x$, and in this paper we are interested in identifying conditions under which $\text{OPT}^S = \text{OPT}^x$. To aid in upper-bounding OPT^x , our goal in this subsection is to describe every IC mechanism as a sequential exchange between the buyer and seller.

To begin, we rewrite $\text{REV}[x]$ as

$$\sum_{\ell \in \mathcal{L}} p(\ell) \sum_{k=1}^{|\ell|} r_{\ell_k} x_{\ell_k}(\ell),$$

where we are now summing over the items on list ℓ in decreasing order of preference. We aim to express each variable $x_{\ell_k}(\ell)$ as a difference in an increasing set function.

DEFINITION 3. For an increasing set function $f : 2^N \rightarrow [0, 1]$, define its “revenue” as

$$\text{REV}[f] := \sum_{\ell \in \mathcal{L}} p(\ell) \sum_{k=1}^{|\ell|} r_{\ell_k} (f(\ell_{1:k}) - f(\ell_{1:k-1})).$$

Let OPT^f denote the supremum value of $\text{REV}[f]$ over all increasing set functions $f : 2^N \rightarrow [0, 1]$.

PROPOSITION 2. For any IC mechanism x , setting

$$f(S) = \max_{\ell \in \mathcal{L}} \sum_{j \in S \cap \ell} x_j(\ell) \quad \forall S \subseteq N \quad (6)$$

defines an increasing set function $f : 2^N \rightarrow [0, 1]$ with

$$x_{\ell_k}(\ell) = f(\ell_{1:k}) - f(\ell_{1:k-1}) \quad \forall \ell \in \mathcal{L}, k = 1, \dots, |\ell| \quad (7)$$

and $\text{REV}[f] = \text{REV}[x]$. Therefore, $\text{OPT}^x \leq \text{OPT}^f$.

Proposition 2 is proved in Section A, but is easy to understand in the following way. Given any mechanism x , defining $f(S)$ as in (6) represents the maximum probability the buyer could have of

being assigned an item in S . This probability is clearly increasing in S and takes values in $[0, 1]$. Finally, the IC constraints (2) can then be used to establish identity (7).

An important consequence of Proposition 2 is that every IC mechanism x can be implemented by the following sequential procedure. First, the buyer draws their most-preferred item ℓ_1 and reports it to the mechanism. The mechanism assigns this item w.p. $f(\{\ell_1\})$, with f defined according to (6), in which case this probability equals $x_{\ell_1}(\ell)$ (since $f(\emptyset) = 0$). If ℓ_1 is not assigned, then the buyer draws and reports their second-most-preferred item ℓ_2 . The mechanism can assign this item according to an independent coin flip w.p. $\frac{f(\{\ell_1, \ell_2\}) - f(\{\ell_1\})}{1 - f(\{\ell_1\})}$, to ensure that the ex-ante probability of ℓ_2 being assigned is $f(\{\ell_1, \ell_2\}) - f(\{\ell_1\})$, equaling $x_{\ell_2}(\ell)$ by (7). This process repeats until either an item is assigned, or the buyer's list terminates when they attempt to draw their next-most-preferred item, in which case there is no recourse to sell the buyer a previously-reported item.

As emphasized by this sequential description, the probability of a list ℓ receiving its k 'th-most-preferred item under an IC mechanism can depend only on the first k items on the list, and nothing afterward. We will refer to these initial items as a *prefix*.

DEFINITION 4. A *prefix* ρ is an ordered subset of N , referring to all lists with the same (ordered) beginning as ρ . The probability of a prefix ρ occurring is

$$\Pr[\rho] := \sum_{\ell \in \mathcal{L}: \ell_{1:|\rho|} = \rho} p(\ell)$$

where we use ρ inside the $\Pr[\cdot]$ operator to refer to the event that the randomly-drawn list begins with ρ . We say that a prefix ρ is *realizable* if $\Pr[\rho] > 0$. Any operations we defined for ordered lists ℓ in Definition 1 will also apply to prefixes ρ . We let $\rho_{\text{end}} := \rho_{|\rho|}$ denote the *endpoint* item of ρ , and $\rho_{\text{pre}} := \rho_{1:|\rho|-1}$ denote the sequence of items on ρ before its endpoint.

We can now rewrite the revenue of function f as

$$\text{REV}[f] = \sum_{\rho} r_{\rho_{\text{end}}} (f(\rho) - f(\rho_{\text{pre}})) \left(\sum_{\ell \in \mathcal{L}: \ell_{1:|\rho|} = \rho} p(\ell) \right), \quad (8)$$

by exchanging sums in the original definition of $\text{REV}[f]$ and letting ρ denote $\ell_{1:k}$. Note that in (8), the sum in large parentheses can be replaced by $\Pr[\rho]$.

A note about computation. We originally presented our mechanism design LP to be polynomial in the type space \mathcal{L} , to show off its computational tractability, and relate its corresponding Integer Programming problem to the (intractable) assortment optimization problem of Aouad et al. (2018). In our transformed expressions like (8), we make no attempt to preserve this polytime-tractability, which simplifies expressions without affecting our main result (which is about the existence of an optimal assortment solution and not its computation). In fact, if we did this initially

and presented our mechanism design LP to have variables and constraints for *every* ordered subset ℓ of N (setting $p(\ell) = 0$ accordingly for the lists ℓ lying outside the support \mathcal{L}), then there would be a surprising correspondence between IC mechanisms and *submodular* functions. We establish this in Section B, for general interest.

3.3. Relaxing to Monotone Stopping Policies

Previously we had upper-bounded OPT^x by the maximum value of (8) over increasing set functions $f : 2^N \rightarrow [0, 1]$. However, this relaxed optimization problem is still difficult to analyze, because the value of f on any set S has consequences across a wide range of sample paths. In this subsection we interpret (8) as the reward collected by an optimal stopping policy, and introduce a relaxed “cross-path” constraint under which the optimal stopping decisions can be analyzed.

We now describe the optimal stopping problem, first defining a tree diagram which probabilistically generates the buyer’s list. An example of such a tree diagram and an informal description of the stopping problem was given in Figure 2 in the Introduction.

DEFINITION 5. Consider a list distribution which is given by its realizable prefixes ρ with $\Pr[\rho] > 0$. We define its *tree diagram* as follows. There is a node for every realizable prefix ρ , labeled by the endpoint ρ_{end} . There is one additional node labeled “root”, and an imaginary “terminal” node 0. For every realizable ρ , there is an arc from the node for prefix ρ_{pre} to the node for ρ , with transition probability $q(\rho) := \Pr[\rho] / \Pr[\rho_{\text{pre}}]$. (The node for prefix ρ_{pre} is understood to be “root”, with $\Pr[\rho_{\text{pre}}] = 1$, if $|\rho| = 1$.) $q(\rho)$ can be interpreted as a conditional probability, of the next item being ρ_{end} when a random list starts with ρ_{pre} . Note that the sum of outgoing transition probabilities from the node for any ρ is $\sum_{\rho' : \Pr[\rho'] > 0, \rho'_{\text{pre}} = \rho} \Pr[\rho'] / \Pr[\rho]$, which is upper-bounded by 1.

Therefore, we can define the following *optimal stopping problem* on this tree diagram. Starting from “root”, the player transitions along the tree diagram according to the outgoing probabilities from the current node. Upon arriving at a node labeled j , the player can either stop to end the game with reward r_j , or proceed with the next transition. The game could also end with 0 reward upon transitioning to the “terminal” node, which occurs with probability $1 - \sum_{\rho' : \Pr[\rho'] > 0, \rho'_{\text{pre}} = \rho} \Pr[\rho'] / \Pr[\rho]$ (which is non-negative) when starting from the node for prefix ρ .

We have defined an optimal stopping problem whose reward will be used to upper-bound OPT^x . However, we do not want to allow for any online stopping policy, i.e. the optimal one obtained from dynamic programming, which would be too loose. Therefore, we still maintain a simplified “monotonicity” constraint on the stopping decisions across sample paths, dependent on the history. Importantly though, we do allow the policy to indicate its stopping decisions based on the label j of the current node, which affects the stopping reward r_j . (Contrast this with the function f , which had to be defined on sets S , without being able to favor an item j with high reward r_j).

DEFINITION 6. A *monotone stopping policy* ϕ is defined by n increasing, boolean-valued functions $\phi_j : 2^{N \setminus \{j\}} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$, one for every item j . For every $j \in N$ and (unordered) history $H \subseteq N \setminus \{j\}$, the value $\phi_j(H) \in \{0, 1\}$ indicates whether to deterministically stop on a node labeled j after encountering exactly the set of labels H (in any order). Define the “revenue” of ϕ as

$$\text{REV}[\phi] := \sum_{\rho} r_{\rho_{\text{end}}} \Pr[\rho] \left(\phi_{\rho_{\text{end}}}(\rho_{\text{pre}}) \prod_{k=1}^{|\rho|-1} (1 - \phi_{\rho_k}(\rho_{1:k-1})) \right). \quad (9)$$

Let OPT^{ϕ} denote the maximum value of $\text{REV}[\phi]$ over all monotone stopping policies ϕ .

Assortments S corresponds to monotone stopping policies for which every ϕ_j is a constant function—the all-1 function if $j \in S$, and the all-0 function otherwise. For a general deterministic stopping policy ϕ , objective $\text{REV}[\phi]$ represents the expected reward collected by ϕ in the aforementioned optimal stopping problem. To see this, consider any realizable prefix ρ . Since ϕ takes values in $\{0, 1\}$, the large parentheses in (9) evaluates to 1 if and only if $\phi_{\rho_{\text{end}}}(\rho_{\text{pre}}) = 1$ (i.e. ϕ would stop on ρ_{end} after visiting a sequence of nodes labeled $\rho_1, \dots, \rho_{k-1}$) and $\phi_{\rho_k}(\rho_{1:k-1}) = 0$ for all $k < |\rho|$ (i.e. ϕ would not have stopped earlier in this sequence). Therefore, (9) counts the contribution from all prefixes ρ which the policy would reach and stop on (collecting reward $r_{\rho_{\text{end}}}$), thereby equaling the total expected reward of ϕ .

PROPOSITION 3. *The optimization problem for OPT^f always has an optimal solution which is an increasing boolean set function. Moreover, for any increasing boolean $f : 2^N \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$, setting*

$$\phi_j(H) = f(H \cup \{j\}) \quad \forall j \in N, H \subseteq N \setminus \{j\} \quad (10)$$

defines a monotone stopping policy ϕ with $\text{REV}[\phi] = \text{REV}[f]$. Therefore, $\text{OPT}^f \leq \text{OPT}^{\phi}$.

Proposition 3 is proved in Section A. The key observation is that the constraints enforcing f to be increasing describe a totally unimodular system, which allows us to restrict our attention *boolean*-valued functions f . To show $\text{REV}[\phi] = \text{REV}[f]$, one has to check that the linear term $f(\rho) - f(\rho_{\text{pre}})$ in (8) equals the non-linear expression $f(\rho) \prod_{k=1}^{|\rho|-1} (1 - f(\rho_{1:k}))$ when f is boolean.

4. Sufficient Condition and Proof of Main Result

In Section 3 we defined a sequence of optimization problems satisfying

$$\text{OPT}^S \leq \text{OPT}^x \leq \text{OPT}^f \leq \text{OPT}^{\phi}. \quad (11)$$

Our goal is now to identify conditions under which $\text{OPT}^{\phi} \leq \text{OPT}^S$, which would cause the hierarchy (11) to collapse and hence imply that assortments S are as powerful as mechanisms x .

4.1. Sufficient Condition

In Subsection 3.3 we interpreted OPT^ϕ as an optimal stopping reward, and we would like to describe an optimal policy for this problem. However, we cannot simply for each node ρ use dynamic programming to compute its continuation value, because ϕ is bound by monotonicity constraints on its stopping decisions across paths. Therefore, we introduce a notion of *domination* based on the distribution of suffixes that could complete the list from a prefix ρ , which we refer to as the *future* from ρ . A prefix with a dominating future will have a higher continuation reward as long as the future stopping decisions are described by an assortment S .

DEFINITION 7. Given realizable prefixes ρ, ρ' , the future from ρ is said to *dominate* the future from ρ' if for all $S \subseteq N \setminus (\rho \cup \rho')$ and items $j \in S$,

$$\Pr[j \succeq S_0 | \rho] \geq \Pr[j \succeq S_0 | \rho']. \quad (12)$$

In Definition 7, S is interpreted as an assortment to be offered, and domination of futures requires the probability of j being purchased (i.e. j being more-preferred than any other item in S and the no-purchase option) to be higher conditional on prefix ρ than prefix ρ' , simultaneously for all items $j \in S$. Moreover, this must hold for every S disjoint from $\rho \cup \rho'$.

EXAMPLE 2 (DOMINATION). Consider the following futures with two items A and B :

- Future 1, which is (A) w.p. $1/2$ and $()$ w.p. $1/2$ (where $()$ indicates that the list terminates);
- Future 2, which is (A) w.p. $1/2$ and (B) w.p. $1/2$;
- Future 3, which is (BA) w.p. $1/2$ and $()$ w.p. $1/2$.


Assume that the prefixes under consideration contain neither of the items A nor B . It is trivial to see that Future 2 dominates Future 1. On the other hand, Future 3 does not dominate Future 1, because the probability of selling item $j = A$ under assortment $S = \{A, B\}$ is not higher for Future 3. Also note that Future 2 dominates Future 3, because it is always easier to sell items when A and B appear on different branches of the possible suffix realizations.

REMARK 1. In our preceding example, Future 1 did not dominate Future 2, and Future 3 did not dominate Future 1, only because the prefixes contained neither A nor B . By contrast, if $\rho = (B)$ and $\rho' = ()$, then ρ with Future 1 would actually dominate ρ' with Future 2, because comparisons for item B (which lies in $\rho \cup \rho'$) are ignored. Similarly, $\rho = (B)$ with Future 3 would dominate $\rho' = ()$ with Future 1, because $\{A, B\}$ would no longer be a valid choice for S .

Having explained the notion of dominating futures, we now introduce our sufficient condition.

DEFINITION 8. A list distribution is said to have *history-monotone futures* if for all realizable prefixes ρ, ρ' with $\rho_{\text{end}} = \rho'_{\text{end}}$, whenever $\rho_{\text{pre}} \not\subseteq \rho'_{\text{pre}}$ (i.e. ρ_{pre} viewed as a set is not contained within ρ'_{pre}), the future from ρ dominates the future from ρ' . Equivalently, prefix ρ' can have a future which is *not dominated* by ρ only if $\rho_{\text{pre}} \subseteq \rho'_{\text{pre}}$.

Figure 3 Example illustrating the details in the definition of history-monotone futures.



History-monotone futures are sufficient for assortments to be as powerful as monotone stopping policies ϕ , by the following intuition. Recall that assortments correspond to policies which stop on either all or none of the prefixes with the same endpoint. If a general ϕ were to do strictly better, then for some prefixes ρ, ρ' with the same endpoint $\rho_{\text{end}} = \rho'_{\text{end}}$, it must continue from ρ' while stopping on ρ , and benefit from doing so because it earns strictly greater profit in the future from ρ' than ρ . However, strictly greater profit generally requires the future from ρ' to not be dominated by ρ , which under the definition of history-monotone futures, can occur only if $\rho'_{\text{pre}} \supseteq \rho_{\text{pre}}$. Therefore, the monotonicity constraints on ϕ would impose $\phi_{\rho_{\text{end}}}(\rho_{\text{pre}}) \leq \phi_{\rho'_{\text{end}}}(\rho'_{\text{pre}})$, forcing ϕ to compromise between stopping on either both or none of the prefixes ρ, ρ' . In the end, this allows us to show (Subsection 4.3) that the best monotone stopping policy corresponds to an assortment.

4.2. Partitioning of History-monotone Futures into Tiers

First we provide an example which illustrates the details of history-monotone futures, and prove a structural lemma partitioning the prefixes into tiers that will be needed for our main result.

EXAMPLE 3 (HISTORY-MONOTONE FUTURES). Consider the list distribution over four items A, B, C, D whose tree diagram is shown in Figure 3. We verify that it has history-monotone futures.

There are four realizable prefixes with endpoint A — $(CBA), (CDBA), (DBA), (DCBA)$. Definition 8 is satisfied since all of their futures are empty, dominating each other.

There are five realizable prefixes with endpoint B — $(B), (CB), (DB), (CDB), (DCB)$. Since A is the only item that can appear in the future, domination is fully determined by the probabilities of

visiting A from these prefixes, which are $0, 1/2, 1/2, 3/4, 1$ respectively. We verify Definition 8 using the “equivalent” condition stated at the end. (CB) and (DB) have futures which are *not dominated by* (B) , which causes no violation, since their respective histories are $\{C\}$ and $\{D\}$, which contain \emptyset . Meanwhile, (CDB) and (DCB) have futures which are not dominated by the previous ones, which also causes no violation, since for both (CDB) and (DCB) the history is $\{C, D\}$, which contains the previous ones. Finally, (DCB) has a future which is not dominated by (CDB) , which again causes no violation, since its history $\{C, D\}$ weakly contains (more specifically, is identical to) the history for (CDB) .

There are two realizable prefixes with endpoint C — $(C), (DC)$. The future from (DC) must dominate in order to satisfy Definition 8, which it does, because it is (BA) w.p. 1 while the future from (C) (ignoring item D) is (BA) w.p. $5/8$ and (B) w.p. $3/8$. Note it was important here to ignore D in the definition of domination.

There are two realizable prefixes with endpoint D — $(D), (CD)$. The future from (CD) must dominate in order to satisfy Definition 8, which it does, because ignoring item C , both futures are (BA) w.p. $3/4$ and (B) w.p. $1/4$. Note that Definition 8 would be violated if the transition probability from prefix (CDB) to A was reduced below $3/4$. \square

Motivated by Example 3, history-monotone futures can be understood as follows. Fix an assortment $S \subsetneq N$ along with an item $j \notin S$, and consider the realizable prefixes ρ with $\rho_{\text{end}} = j$ and $\rho \cap S = \emptyset$. Construct an undirected graph, with a vertex for each such prefix, and an edge between two prefixes ρ, ρ' if and only if $\rho_{\text{pre}} \not\supseteq \rho'_{\text{pre}}$ and $\rho'_{\text{pre}} \not\supseteq \rho_{\text{pre}}$ (neither is contained within the other when viewed as sets). Definition 8 implies that the futures from adjacent prefixes ρ, ρ' in this graph must dominate each other, and since S intersects neither ρ nor ρ' , it must be that inequality (12) holds with equality:

$$\Pr[j' \succeq S_0 | \rho] = \Pr[j' \succeq S_0 | \rho'] \quad \forall j' \in S. \quad (13)$$

Consider the connected components of this graph. By transitivity, the probability $\Pr[j' \succeq S_0 | \rho]$ must be identical across all vertices ρ in a connected component, for all $j' \in S$. Note that it was important for the graph to only include vertices for the *realizable* prefixes ρ with $\Pr[\rho] > 0$; otherwise there can only be very few⁹ connected components. We now show that these connected components can be further grouped into “tiers” which satisfy the properties below.

LEMMA 1. *Suppose the list distribution has history-monotone futures, and for a fixed $S \subsetneq N$ and $j \notin S$, consider the set of realizable prefixes ρ with $\rho_{\text{end}} = j$ and $\rho \cap S = \emptyset$. These prefixes can be partitioned into T_j^S tiers, denoted by $\mathcal{T}_j^S(1), \dots, \mathcal{T}_j^S(T_j^S)$, which satisfy (after suppressing the superscript S and subscript j):*

⁹ If all prefixes were included, then there would be exactly three connected components: one for vertex (j) , one for all the prefixes ρ with $\rho_{\text{end}} = j$ and $\rho_{\text{pre}} = N \setminus S \setminus \{j\}$, and one for all other prefixes satisfying $\rho_{\text{end}} = j$ and $\rho \cap S = \emptyset$.

1. For any two distinct tiers t, t' satisfying $t > t'$ and any prefixes $\rho \in \mathcal{T}(t), \rho' \in \mathcal{T}(t')$, we have that $\rho \supseteq \rho'$ (when viewed as sets) and $\Pr[j' \succeq S_0 | \rho] \geq \Pr[j' \succeq S_0 | \rho']$ for all $j' \in S$;

2. Within any single tier $t \in [T]$, either:

(a) For all distinct prefixes $\rho, \rho' \in \mathcal{T}(t)$, we have that $\rho \not\subseteq \rho'$ and $\rho' \not\subseteq \rho$ (when viewed as sets) and $\Pr[j' \succeq S_0 | \rho] = \Pr[j' \succeq S_0 | \rho']$ for all $j' \in S$; or

(b) For all prefixes $\rho, \rho' \in \mathcal{T}(t)$, we have that ρ and ρ' are identical when viewed as sets.

Lemma 1 is proved in Section A, but its details can be illustrated using the previous Example 3. Specifically, consider the case where $S = \{A\}, j = B$, and recall that there were five realizable prefixes with endpoint j — $(B), (CB), (DB), (CDB), (DCB)$ —none of which intersect S . The graph described above will have four connected components, with an edge between $(CB), (DB)$ along with three isolated vertices. $(CDB), (DCB)$, will later be put into the same tier, resulting in

$$\mathcal{T}(1) = \{(B)\}, \quad \mathcal{T}(2) = \{(CB), (DB)\}, \quad \mathcal{T}(3) = \{(CDB), (DCB)\}.$$

Property (1) in Lemma 1 is immediately verified from the calculations in Example 3. Meanwhile, tier $t = 2$ satisfies property (2a) while tier $t = 3$ satisfies property (2b). Note that it is possible for two prefixes in a tier of type (2b) to have different futures; in this example, $\Pr[A \succeq \{A\}_0 | (CDB)] = 3/4$ which is different from $\Pr[A \succeq \{A\}_0 | (DCB)] = 1$.

4.3. Statement and Proof of Main Result

THEOREM 2. *For a list distribution with history-monotone futures, given any item prices r_1, \dots, r_n , there exists an assortment whose revenue equals that of an optimal IC mechanism.*

Proof outline. Recall that our goal is to show $\text{REV}^\phi \leq \text{REV}^S$, so take any monotone stopping policy ϕ . Generally, we take this line of argument: if $\phi_j(\rho_{\text{pre}}) = 1$ while $\phi_j(\rho'_{\text{pre}}) = 0$ for two prefixes ρ, ρ' with the same endpoint j , then by monotonicity, $\rho_{\text{pre}} \not\subseteq \rho'_{\text{pre}}$. Using the condition of history-monotone futures, the future from ρ must dominate that from ρ' .

However, one challenge facing the line of argument above is that ϕ could still collect strictly more reward in the future from ρ' than ρ . To see this, consider Example 2, in which Future 2 (equaling (A) w.p. $1/2$, (B) w.p. $1/2$) dominates Future 3 (equaling (BA) w.p. $1/2$). Yet, if $\phi_A(\emptyset) = 0$ and $\phi_A(\{B\}) = 1$, then ϕ collects strictly more reward from item A by continuing from the dominated Future 3. Returning to the original example, this means that it is possible for the stopping decisions $\phi_j(\rho_{\text{pre}}) = 1, \phi_j(\rho'_{\text{pre}}) = 0$ to be locally optimal, even if the future from ρ dominates ρ' .

Therefore, we instead make an extremal argument where we take the counterexample ϕ that maximizes the number of 1-entries. We let S denote the set of items j for which ϕ_j is the all-1 function, and treat this as the “assortment”. We consider the change $\text{REV}[\phi] - \text{REV}[S]$, which must be positive. We define S -adjusted prices for a prefix ρ , as an extension of the *externality-adjustment*

paradigm in Désir et al. (2020) to general list distributions. Since S is now a fixed assortment, this overcomes the challenge above. Using our lemma about tiers, we now focus on a specific $j \notin S$ defined through a *maximin* S -adjusted price. We show that ϕ_j can be modified to have one more 1-entry without lowering revenue, causing a contradiction and completing the proof.

Proof of Theorem 2. By Propositions 2 and 3, $\text{OPT}^x \leq \text{OPT}^f \leq \text{OPT}^\phi$, and hence the revenue of an optimal IC mechanism x is upper-bounded by the revenue of an optimal monotone stopping policy ϕ taking values in $\{0, 1\}$. We show that at least one of these optimal policies ϕ corresponds to offering an assortment. Suppose for contradiction this is not the case, and take an optimal policy ϕ which *maximizes* the number of 1-entries, i.e. maximizes $|\{j \in N, H \subseteq N \setminus \{j\} : \phi_j(H) = 1\}|$.

Let S denote the set of j for which ϕ_j is the all-1 function. Since ϕ does not correspond to offering an assortment, it must be that $S \neq N$. For items j not in S , the value of $\phi_j(H)$ is inconsequential on histories H that intersect S , because ϕ would have already stopped on any item in S . Since ϕ maximizes the number of 1-entries, we can WOLOG assume that $\phi_j(H) = 1$ for all $j \notin S$ and $H \subseteq N \setminus \{j\}$ such that $H \cap S \neq \emptyset$, which does not violate the monotonicity of ϕ . We next analyze the impact that values $\{\phi_j(H) : j \notin S, H \cap S = \emptyset\}$ have on the revenue of ϕ .

LEMMA 2 (Externality Adjustment for General Ranking Distributions).

$$\text{REV}[\phi] - \text{REV}[S] = \sum_{\rho: \rho \cap S = \emptyset} \left(r_{\rho_{\text{end}}} - \sum_{j \in S} r_j \Pr[j \succeq S_0 | \rho] \right) \Pr[\rho] \phi_{\rho_{\text{end}}}(\rho_{\text{pre}}) \prod_{k=1}^{|\rho|-1} (1 - \phi_{\rho_k}(\rho_{1:k-1})). \quad (14)$$

The proof of Lemma 2 is deferred to Section A, but the identity (14) is quite intuitive. The expression inside large parentheses can be interpreted as an “ S -adjusted” price, which accounts for the fact that should the policy stop on prefix ρ , it gains the reward $r_{\rho_{\text{end}}}$ but loses out on the reward from any items in S that would have been encountered in the future from ρ . In our setting, the notion of adjusted price is more complex than the original notion from Désir et al. (2020), because it depends not just on item ρ_{end} but on the entire prefix ρ .

DEFINITION 9 (ADJUSTED PRICE FOR PREFIX). Fix an assortment S . The S -adjusted price of a realizable prefix ρ disjoint from S is defined to be

$$r^S(\rho) := r_{\rho_{\text{end}}} - \sum_{j' \in S} r_{j'} \Pr[j' \succeq S_0 | \rho]. \quad (15)$$

An important property stemming from the list distribution having history-monotone futures, and the resulting partitioning in Lemma 1, is that the S -adjusted prices are “monotone” over tiers.

PROPOSITION 4. For any $j \notin S$, consider the partitioning of realizable S -disjoint prefixes with endpoint j into tiers. For tiers t, t' and prefixes $\rho \in \mathcal{T}_j^S(t), \rho' \in \mathcal{T}_j^S(t')$, the S -adjusted prices satisfy $r^S(\rho) \leq r^S(\rho')$ whenever: $t > t'$; or $t = t'$, and $\rho \neq \rho'$ when viewed as sets.

Proof of Proposition 4. Lemma 1 says that $\Pr[j' \succeq S_0 | \rho] \geq \Pr[j' \succeq S_0 | \rho']$ for all $j' \in S$ whenever: $t > t'$ (corresponding to (1) in Lemma 1); or $t = t'$, and $\rho \neq \rho'$ when viewed as sets (corresponding to (2a), in which case $\Pr[j' \succeq S_0 | \rho] = \Pr[j' \succeq S_0 | \rho']$ for all j'). The proof is completed by the fact that all of the original prices $r_{j'}$ subtracted in (15) are non-negative. \square

Modifying ϕ to have one more 1-entry. Equipped with Proposition 4, we now look for a local modification to ϕ which creates one more 1-entry while preserving optimality. This would cause a contradiction and complete the proof. We first rewrite (14) using S -adjusted prices:

$$\text{REV}[\phi] - \text{REV}[S] = \sum_{\rho: \rho \cap S = \emptyset} r^S(\rho) \Pr[\rho] \phi_{\rho_{\text{end}}}(\rho_{\text{pre}}) \prod_{k=1}^{|\rho|-1} (1 - \phi_{\rho_k}(\rho_{1:k-1})). \quad (16)$$

DEFINITION 10. Fix an assortment S . Let Ω^S denote $\{\rho \in \Omega : \rho \cap S = \emptyset\}$. For item $j \notin S$ and history $H \subseteq N \setminus S \setminus \{j\}$, let $\Omega^S(j, H)$ denote the subset of prefixes in Ω^S which first contain the elements in H in any order, followed by j . That is, $\Omega^S(j, H) = \{\rho \in \Omega^S : \rho_{1:|H|} = H, \rho_{|H|+1} = j\}$.

Recall that for items $j \notin S$, function ϕ_j is not 1 everywhere, but $\phi_j(H) = 1$ whenever $H \cap S \neq \emptyset$. Consequently, for each such j , the collection of histories $\{H \subseteq N \setminus S \setminus \{j\} : \phi_j(H) = 0\}$ is non-empty; arbitrarily choose a history H_j from this collection which is *set-wise maximal*. By this we mean that there does not exist another history H' from the same collection which contains H_j , implying that changing $\phi_j(H_j)$ from 0 to 1 would not violate the monotonicity of ϕ_j . We now note that $\phi_j(H_j)$ only appears in the RHS of (16) if $\rho \in \Omega^S(j, H_j)$: in the form of $\phi_{\rho_{\text{end}}}(\rho_{\text{pre}})$ if ρ has length exactly $|H_j| + 1$, and in the form of $(1 - \phi_{\rho_k}(\rho_{1:k-1}))$ if ρ has length greater than $|H_j| + 1$. In either case, if $\Pr[\rho] = 0$ for all $\rho \in \Omega^S(j, H_j)$, then changing $\phi_j(H_j)$ from 0 to 1 would have no impact on $\text{REV}[\phi]$, which means that we have found a feasible and optimal perturbation of ϕ which increases the number of 1-entries, leading to a contradiction.

Therefore, we can proceed assuming that for every $j \notin S$, the history H_j chosen has at least one prefix $\rho \in \Omega^S(j, H_j)$ with $\Pr[\rho] > 0$. This allows us to define

$$j^* \in \arg \max_{j \notin S} \min_{\rho \in \Omega^S(j, H_j), \Pr[\rho] > 0} r^S(\rho); \quad r^* = \min_{\rho \in \Omega^S(j^*, H_{j^*}), \Pr[\rho] > 0} r^S(\rho) \quad (17)$$

where we note that the set $j \notin S$ is also non-empty because $S \neq N$. We now argue that

$$r^* \geq r^S(\rho) \quad \forall \rho : \rho \in \Omega^S, \Pr[\rho] > 0, \phi_{\rho_{\text{end}}}(\rho_{\text{pre}}) = 1. \quad (18)$$

To establish (18), let $j = \rho_{\text{end}}$. Since r^* was defined using a *maximin* in (17), it must be at least the minimum S -adjusted price of a realizable prefix $\rho' \in \Omega^S(j, H_j)$, i.e. $r^* \geq \min_{\rho' \in \Omega^S(j, H_j), \Pr[\rho'] > 0} r^S(\rho')$. Thus, (18) would be established by showing that for any realizable $\rho' \in \Omega^S(j, H_j)$, we have $r^S(\rho') \geq r^S(\rho)$. Since both ρ and ρ' are realizable prefixes in Ω^S which share the same endpoint j , we can apply the tier decomposition for such prefixes, where we let $\rho \in \mathcal{T}_j^S(t)$ and $\rho' \in \mathcal{T}_j^S(t')$ for tiers t, t' . We show that $r^S(\rho') \geq r^S(\rho)$ in all of the following cases.

- If $t > t'$, then $r^S(\rho) \leq r^S(\rho')$ follows immediately from Proposition 4.
- If $t < t'$, then by Lemma 1, we have $\rho' \supsetneq \rho$. Since $\rho_{\text{end}} = \rho'_{\text{end}} = j$, this implies that $\rho'_{\text{pre}} \supsetneq \rho_{\text{pre}}$. However, recall that ρ, ρ' were chosen so that $\phi_j(\rho_{\text{pre}}) = 1$ (by definition in (18)) and $\phi_j(\rho'_{\text{pre}}) = 0$ (because ρ'_{pre} equals H_j as a set, and H_j was chosen so that $\phi_j(H_j) = 0$). Since $\rho'_{\text{pre}} \supsetneq \rho_{\text{pre}}$, the monotonicity of ϕ_j would be violated, and hence this case cannot occur.
- If $t = t'$, then as long as $\rho \neq \rho'$ when viewed as sets, Proposition 4 states that $r^S(\rho) \leq r^S(\rho')$. Otherwise, we have $\phi_j(\rho_{\text{pre}}) = \phi_j(\rho'_{\text{pre}})$, which again contradicts the facts $\phi_j(\rho_{\text{pre}}) = 1, \phi_j(\rho'_{\text{pre}}) = 0$.

Having completed the proof of (18), we now argue that r^* is also non-negative. While adjusted revenues $r^S(\rho)$ could generally be negative, if $r^* < 0$, then (18) implies that $r^S(\rho) < 0$ for all realizable prefixes ρ within Ω^S which policy ϕ stops on. However, in this case it would be impossible for the RHS of (16) to be positive, which means that $\text{REV}[\phi] \leq \text{REV}[S]$, contradicting the presumption that an assortment S could not be optimal.

Finally, equipped with (18) and the fact that $r^* \geq 0$, we argue that changing $\phi_{j^*}(H_{j^*})$ from 0 to 1, which is a feasible perturbation preserving the monotonicity of ϕ_{j^*} (since H_{j^*} was set-wise maximal), does not decrease $\text{REV}[\phi]$. To argue this, we manipulate the RHS of (16) back into a summation over lists ℓ . Let $\kappa^S(\ell)$ denote the minimum k for which $\ell_k \in S$, with $\kappa^S(\ell) = |\ell| + 1$ if $\ell \cap S = \emptyset$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \text{REV}[\phi] - \text{REV}[S] &= \sum_{\rho: \rho \cap S = \emptyset} r^S(\rho) \left(\sum_{\ell: \ell_{1:|\rho|} = \rho} p(\ell) \right) \phi_{\rho_{\text{end}}}(\rho_{\text{pre}}) \prod_{k=1}^{|\rho|-1} (1 - \phi_{\rho_k}(\rho_{1:k-1})) \\ &= \sum_{\ell \in \mathcal{L}} p(\ell) \sum_{k < \kappa^S(\ell)} r^S(\ell_{1:k}) \phi_{\ell_k}(\ell_{1:k-1}) \prod_{k'=1}^{k-1} (1 - \phi_{\ell_{k'}}(\ell_{1:k'-1})). \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

$\phi_{j^*}(H_{j^*})$ only has an impact on the RHS of (19) for sample paths ℓ with $p(\ell) > 0$, $\ell_{1:|H_{j^*}|} = H_{j^*}$, $\ell_{|H_{j^*}|+1} = j^*$, and $\phi_{\ell_{k'}}(\ell_{1:k'-1}) = 0$ for all $k' = 1, \dots, |H_{j^*}|$. On these sample paths, changing $\phi_{j^*}(H_{j^*})$ from 0 to 1 gains a revenue of $r_{j^*}^S(H_{j^*})$, but could lose a revenue of $r^S(\ell_{1:k})$ for some $k > |H_{j^*}| + 1$ such that $\phi_{\ell_k}(\ell_{1:k-1}) = 1$. However, the lost revenue $r^S(\ell_{1:k})$ must be no more than the gained revenue $r_{j^*}^S(H_{j^*})$, because $r_{j^*}^S(H_{j^*}) \geq r^*$ by definition of r^* in (17) while $r^* \geq r^S(\ell_{1:k})$ since $\ell_{1:k}$ is a valid ρ in (18) (in these assertions, we have made use of the fact that $p(\ell) > 0$ and hence all of its prefixes are realizable). Alternatively, on sample paths without a $k > |H_{j^*}| + 1$ for which $\phi_{\ell_k}(\ell_{1:k-1}) = 1$, we have only gained a revenue of $r_{j^*}^S(H_{j^*})$, which is non-negative. Therefore, for all ℓ we have shown that the change on the RHS of (19) is non-negative, thereby establishing that the perturbed ϕ must also be an optimal policy, contradicting the presumption that the original ϕ had a maximum number of 1-entries among optimal policies. We have reached a contradiction in all cases, completing the proof of our main result Theorem 2. \square

5. Implications for Assortment Optimization

We provide formal definitions for common choice models from the literature, stated in the form of how to generate a random list governing the customer’s choice. We then verify these choice models to satisfy our sufficient condition, implying that assortments are optimal.

DEFINITION 11 (MULTI-NOMIAL LOGIT (MNL)). Consider an urn which starts with balls $j = 0, \dots, n$, each with a weight $w_j > 0$. Let W denote the total weight of balls remaining in the urn. Sequentially, sample a ball *without* replacement from the urn, where each remaining ball j is drawn with probability w_j/W , adding its label to the end of the list. The list terminates upon drawing the 0-ball.

The list distribution from Definition 11 is consistent with the closed-form MNL choice probabilities $\Pr[j \succeq S_0] = \frac{w_j}{\sum_{j' \in S \cup \{0\}} w_{j'}}$ indicating the likelihood of item j being chosen from an assortment S (Plackett 1975, Luce 1959). MNL fits under the larger family of Markov Chain choice models (Blanchet et al. 2016).

DEFINITION 12 (MARKOV CHAIN CHOICE MODEL). There is a Markov chain with states $N \cup \{0\}$ and a probability $\sigma_{jj'}$ for transitioning from any state $j \in N$ to any state $j' \in N \cup \{0\}$, where 0 is a terminal state with no outgoing transitions. Start at each state j with probability λ_j (where $\sum_j \lambda_j = 1$) and then transition along the Markov chain according to probabilities $\sigma_{jj'}$. Every time a state $j \in N$ is visited for the *first* time, add j to the end of the random list. The list terminates upon reaching state 0, which is assumed to occur w.p. 1.

Next we consider the Elimination by Aspects model (Tversky 1972), which is equivalent to a Nested Logit model whose dissimilarity parameters approach 0 (Train 2009, Ch.4). We describe this as a combinatorial list distribution below.

DEFINITION 13 (TVERSKY’S ELIMINATION BY ASPECTS MODEL). Consider the MNL model, where $N \cup \{0\}$ has been partitioned into disjoint *nests* N_0, \dots, N_m , with $N_0 = \{0\}$. The list is generated as in the MNL model (where balls j are drawn with probabilities proportional to their weights w_j), except upon any ball j in nest i being drawn, the subsequent draws are constrained to balls from the same nest i (one way to implement this is to keep redrawing until the ball drawn is from nest i), all of which must be drawn before proceeding to other nests. The list terminates upon drawing the 0-ball.

In this choice model, the buyer’s utility for items within the same nest are *perfectly* positively correlated, and hence they always form a contiguous block in the buyer’s ranking. It is not captured by a Markov Chain choice model, since there would have to be a positive transition probability between every pair of items, which would allow for nests to be traversed in a non-contiguous fashion.

Definition 13 describes Nested Logit using a list distribution in a very extreme case. For general dissimilarity parameters in $(0, 1)$, Nested Logit corresponds to a random-utility model (Train 2009,

Ch.4), but to our knowledge there is no combinatorial description of how to generate a random list consistent with these utilities. Consequently, we leave the relationship between general Nested Logit and our condition of history-monotone futures as future work.

Finally, any list distribution can be mixed with a *collection of singleton lists*, also known as an *independent demand model* in the literature (Gallego et al. 2004). Although seemingly naive, Cao et al. (2020) shows that mixing MNL with singletons significantly improves its ability to capture choice behavior.

DEFINITION 14 (MIXTURE WITH SINGLETONS). The mixture of any list distribution p and singleton probabilities $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n$, with $\sum_j \alpha_j \leq 1$, is defined as follows. The random list equals the singleton (j) with probability α_j , for all j . Otherwise, with probability $1 - \sum_j \alpha_j$, the random list is drawn according to p .

5.1. Verifying these List Distributions to have History-Monotone Futures

PROPOSITION 5. *A Markov Chain choice model has history-monotone futures.*

PROPOSITION 6. *The Elimination by Aspects model has history-monotone futures.*

PROPOSITION 7. *If a list distribution has history-monotone futures, then the mixture of that list distribution with any singletons has history-monotone futures.*

All of these are quite immediate to check so their proofs are deferred to Section A. The intuition behind Proposition 7 is illustrative—mixing with singletons can only “dilute” the futures of prefixes with history \emptyset , which can only “help” in creating history-monotone futures.

COROLLARY 1. *For any Markov Chain choice model (which captures MNL) or Elimination by Aspects model mixed with singleton lists, assortments are optimal.*

References

- Saeed Alaei, Hu Fu, Nima Haghpanah, and Jason Hartline. 2013. The simple economics of approximately optimal auctions. In *2013 IEEE 54th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*. IEEE, 628–637.
- Ali Aouad, Vivek Farias, Retsef Levi, and Danny Segev. 2018. The approximability of assortment optimization under ranking preferences. *Operations Research* 66, 6 (2018), 1661–1669.
- Mark Armstrong. 1996. Multiproduct nonlinear pricing. *Econometrica: Journal of the Econometric Society* (1996), 51–75.
- Moshe Babaioff, Nicole Immorlica, Brendan Lucier, and S Matthew Weinberg. 2020. A simple and approximately optimal mechanism for an additive buyer. *Journal of the ACM (JACM)* 67, 4 (2020), 1–40.
- Jose Blanchet, Guillermo Gallego, and Vineet Goyal. 2016. A markov chain approximation to choice modeling. *Operations Research* 64, 4 (2016), 886–905.

- Patrick Briest, Shuchi Chawla, Robert Kleinberg, and S Matthew Weinberg. 2015. Pricing lotteries. *Journal of Economic Theory* 156 (2015), 144–174.
- Yufeng Cao, Paat Rusmevichientong, and Huseyin Topaloglu. 2020. *Revenue management under a mixture of multinomial logit and independent demand models*. Technical Report. Working paper.
- Deeparnab Chakrabarty and Chaitanya Swamy. 2014. Welfare maximization and truthfulness in mechanism design with ordinal preferences. In *Proceedings of the 5th conference on Innovations in theoretical computer science*. ACM, 105–120.
- Shuchi Chawla, Jason D Hartline, and Robert Kleinberg. 2007. Algorithmic pricing via virtual valuations. In *Proceedings of the 8th ACM conference on Electronic commerce*. ACM, 243–251.
- Shuchi Chawla, David Malec, and Balasubramanian Sivan. 2015. The power of randomness in bayesian optimal mechanism design. *Games and Economic Behavior* 91 (2015), 297–317.
- James M Davis, Guillermo Gallego, and Huseyin Topaloglu. 2014. Assortment optimization under variants of the nested logit model. *Operations Research* 62, 2 (2014), 250–273.
- Antoine Désir, Vineet Goyal, Srikanth Jagabathula, and Danny Segev. 2016. Assortment optimization under the mallows model. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 29 (2016), 4700–4708.
- Antoine Désir, Vineet Goyal, Danny Segev, and Chun Ye. 2020. Constrained assortment optimization under the Markov chain-based choice model. *Management Science* 66, 2 (2020), 698–721.
- Iain Dunning, Joey Huchette, and Miles Lubin. 2017. JuMP: A Modeling Language for Mathematical Optimization. *SIAM Rev.* 59, 2 (2017), 295–320. <https://doi.org/10.1137/15M1020575>
- Adam N Elmachtoub and Michael L Hamilton. 2021. The power of opaque products in pricing. *Management Science* (2021).
- Adam N Elmachtoub, Yehua Wei, and Yeqing Zhou. 2015. Retailing with opaque products. *Available at SSRN 2659211* (2015).
- Jacob Feldman, Dennis Zhang, Xiaofei Liu, and Nannan Zhang. 2018. Customer choice models versus machine learning: Finding optimal product displays on Alibaba. *Available at SSRN 3232059* (2018).
- Jacob B Feldman and Huseyin Topaloglu. 2017. Revenue management under the markov chain choice model. *Operations Research* 65, 5 (2017), 1322–1342.
- Guillermo Gallego, Garud Iyengar, Robert Phillips, and Abha Dubey. 2004. Managing flexible products on a network. (2004).
- Guillermo Gallego and Huseyin Topaloglu. 2014. Constrained assortment optimization for the nested logit model. *Management Science* 60, 10 (2014), 2583–2601.
- Allan Gibbard. 1977. Manipulation of schemes that mix voting with chance. *Econometrica: Journal of the Econometric Society* (1977), 665–681.

-
- Negin Golrezaei, Hamid Nazerzadeh, and Paat Rusmevichientong. 2014. Real-time optimization of personalized assortments. *Management Science* 60, 6 (2014), 1532–1551.
- Nima Haghpanah and Jason Hartline. 2015. Reverse mechanism design. In *Proceedings of the Sixteenth ACM Conference on Economics and Computation*. 757–758.
- Nima Haghpanah and Jason Hartline. 2019. When Is Pure Bundling Optimal? *Review of Economic Studies* 1 (2019).
- Sergiu Hart and Noam Nisan. 2017. Approximate revenue maximization with multiple items. *Journal of Economic Theory* 172 (2017), 313–347.
- Sergiu Hart and Philip J Reny. 2015. Maximal revenue with multiple goods: Nonmonotonicity and other observations. *Theoretical Economics* 10, 3 (2015), 893–922.
- Srikanth Jagabathula and Paat Rusmevichientong. 2018. The limit of rationality in choice modeling: Formulation, computation, and implications. *Management Science* 65, 5 (2018), 2196–2215.
- A Gürhan Kök, Marshall L Fisher, and Ramnath Vaidyanathan. 2008. Assortment planning: Review of literature and industry practice. *Retail supply chain management* (2008), 99–153.
- R Duncan Luce. 1959. Individual choice behavior. (1959).
- Will Ma. 2020. Revenue-Optimal Deterministic Auctions for Multiple Buyers with Ordinal Preferences over Fixed-Price Items. In *International Conference on Web and Internet Economics*. Springer, 162–176.
- Roger B Myerson. 1981. Optimal auction design. *Mathematics of operations research* 6, 1 (1981), 58–73.
- Robin L Plackett. 1975. The analysis of permutations. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series C (Applied Statistics)* 24, 2 (1975), 193–202.
- John Riley and Richard Zeckhauser. 1983. Optimal selling strategies: When to haggle, when to hold firm. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 98, 2 (1983), 267–289.
- Paat Rusmevichientong, Zuo-Jun Max Shen, and David B Shmoys. 2010. Dynamic assortment optimization with a multinomial logit choice model and capacity constraint. *Operations research* 58, 6 (2010), 1666–1680.
- Daniela Saban and Gabriel Y Weintraub. 2020. Procurement mechanisms for assortments of differentiated products. (2020).
- Alexander Schrijver. 1998. *Theory of linear and integer programming*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Kalyan Talluri and Garrett Van Ryzin. 2004. Revenue management under a general discrete choice model of consumer behavior. *Management Science* 50, 1 (2004), 15–33.
- John Thanassoulis. 2004. Hagglng over substitutes. *Journal of Economic theory* 117, 2 (2004), 217–245.
- Kenneth E Train. 2009. *Discrete choice methods with simulation*. Cambridge university press.
- Amos Tversky. 1972. Elimination by aspects: A theory of choice. *Psychological review* 79, 4 (1972), 281.

Acknowledgments

The author would like to thank Joey Huchette and Juan Pablo Vielma for help with using the JuMP package (Dunning et al. 2017) to computationally check the integrality of certain polytopes arising from randomized ordinal IC constraints. The author would also like to thank Nick Arnosti and Santiago Balseiro for detailed comments on a very preliminary presentation of this work.

Appendix A: Deferred Proofs

Proof of Proposition 1. We first prove the forward direction, which is easy to see. To show that x is IC, note that constraints (3) and (4) are satisfied by definition. Constraints (2) are satisfied by considering two cases. First, if $\ell \in \mathcal{L}$ is such that $x_{\ell_{k'}}(\ell) = 1$ for some $k' \leq |\ell|$, then the LHS of (2) is 1 (and hence (2) is satisfied) as long as $k \geq k'$. On the other hand, if $k < k'$, then it must be the case that ℓ_1, \dots, ℓ_k are not in the assortment S , by definition of $x_j(\ell)$ in (5). Therefore, the RHS of (2) is 0 (and hence (2) is again satisfied). In the second case, ℓ is such that $x_j(\ell) = 0$ for all $j \in \ell$. This means that none of the items j on ℓ are in the assortment S . Then no matter what ℓ' the buyer reports, it is not possible for them to receive an item on their list, and thus the RHS of (2) is always 0 (and hence (2) is still satisfied). Finally, to see that $\text{REV}[x] = \text{REV}[S]$, note that $\Pr[j \succeq S_0]$ equals the sum of probabilities $p(\ell)$ over lists ℓ such that $x_j(\ell) = 1$, by definition, completing the proof of the forward direction.

To prove the converse direction, take any IC mechanism with $x_j(\ell) \in \{0, 1\}$ for all $\ell \in \mathcal{L}$ and $j \in \ell$. Define S to be the set of $j \in N$ for which there exists an ℓ' such that $x_j(\ell') = 1$, i.e. the set of items that are possible to obtain through some “lie” ℓ' . To show that (5) is satisfied, we again consider two cases. First, if $\ell \in \mathcal{L}$ is such that $x_{\ell_{k'}}(\ell) = 1$ for some $k' \leq |\ell|$, then IC constraints (2) imply that $x_{\ell_k}(\ell) = 0$ for any $k < k'$ and $\ell' \in \mathcal{L}$. In other words, none of the items lying before position k' in list ℓ are in the assortment S we defined, and hence $x_{\ell_{k'}}(\ell) = 1$ satisfies the description in (5). For the other part of description (5), the fact that $x_j(\ell) = 0$ for all $j \neq \ell_{k'}$ holds by constraints (3) and (4). In the second case, ℓ is such that $x_j(\ell) = 0$ for all $j \in \ell$. We can again use constraints (2) to see it must be the case that $j \notin S$ for any $j \in \ell$, completing the proof of the converse direction. \square

Proof of Proposition 2. It is immediate that f is non-negative and increasing, from the non-negativity constraints (4) on mechanism x . It is also immediate that f is upper-bounded by 1, from constraints (3). To establish (7), note that by the LP constraints (2), the probability of a type ℓ receiving one of their k' most-preferred items equals f evaluated on this set of items, i.e.

$$\sum_{j \in \ell_{1:k'}} x_j(\ell) = f(\ell_{1:k'}) \quad \forall \ell \in \mathcal{L}, k' = 1, \dots, |\ell|. \quad (20)$$

For any $\ell \in \mathcal{L}$ and $k = 1, \dots, |\ell|$, subtracting (20) with $k' = k - 1$ from (20) with $k' = k$ (or subtracting $f(\emptyset) = 0$ if $k = 1$), we see that the probability $x_{\ell_k}(\ell)$ of type ℓ receiving their k -th most preferred item equals $f(\ell_{1:k}) - f(\ell_{1:k-1})$, completing the proof. \square

Proof of Proposition 3. The optimization problem for OPT^f , using (8) as the expression for $\text{REV}[f]$, can be formulated by the following LP with decision variables $f(S)$:

$$\begin{aligned} \max \sum_{\rho} r_{\rho_{\text{end}}} (f(\rho) - f(\rho_{\text{pre}})) \Pr[\rho] \\ f(S) \leq f(S \cup \{j\}) & \quad \forall S \subsetneq N, j \notin S & (21) \\ f(S) \in [0, 1] & \quad \forall S \subseteq N & (22) \end{aligned}$$

The matrix formed by the LHS of constraints (21) is totally unimodular, because all of its entries lie in $\{-1, 0, +1\}$, and every row contains exactly one +1 entry and one -1 entry (Schrijver 1998). Therefore, the

feasible region defined by (21)–(22) is integral, and moreover since the objective function is linear, there must exist an integer optimal solution with $f(S) \in \{0, 1\}$ for all S . This defines an increasing boolean set function f , completing the proof of the first statement.

To show that $\text{REV}[\phi] = \text{REV}[f]$, note that when f is increasing and boolean-valued, $f(\rho) - f(\rho_{\text{pre}}) = f(\rho) \prod_{k=1}^{|\rho|-1} (1 - f(\rho_{1:k}))$. This in turn equals $\phi_{\rho_{\text{end}}}(\rho_{\text{pre}}) \prod_{k=1}^{|\rho|-1} (1 - \phi_{\rho_k}(\rho_{1:k-1}))$, by the definition of ϕ in (10). Substituting into the expression for $\text{REV}[f]$, we see that

$$\text{REV}[f] = \sum_{\rho} r_{\rho_{\text{end}}} \phi_{\rho_{\text{end}}}(\rho_{\text{pre}}) \prod_{k=1}^{|\rho|-1} (1 - \phi_{\rho_k}(\rho_{1:k-1})) \Pr[\rho],$$

completing the proof of the second statement. \square

Proof of Lemma 1. Fix an assortment $S \subsetneq N$ and consider the realizable prefixes ending on $j \notin S$. Consider the undirected graph discussed for (13), which says that for any prefixes ρ, ρ' in the same connected component of this graph, $\Pr[j' \succeq S_0 | \rho] = \Pr[j' \succeq S_0 | \rho']$ for all items $j' \in S$. Moreover, there is an edge between ρ, ρ' whenever $\rho \not\subseteq \rho'$ and $\rho \not\supseteq \rho'$. Let C be an integer denoting the number of components in this graph.

Consider ρ, ρ' in different components of this graph. Since ρ and ρ' are not adjacent, it must be that one of them contains the other, say $\rho \supseteq \rho'$. We claim that then any other prefix ϱ adjacent to ρ must also satisfy $\varrho \supseteq \rho'$. This is easy to see—since ϱ is non-adjacent to ρ' , either $\varrho \supseteq \rho'$ or $\varrho \subseteq \rho'$, but if $\varrho \subseteq \rho'$, then $\varrho \subseteq \rho$ by transitivity, contradicting the fact that ϱ is adjacent to ρ . By propagating this argument throughout the connected component containing ρ , we establish that all prefixes in this component contain ρ' . Similarly, we can argue that all prefixes in the connected component of ρ' are contained within ρ (and also contained within any ϱ in the component of ρ).

Therefore, we can take a single representative ρ_c from each of the components $c = 1, \dots, C$, and know that for any c, c' , either $\rho_c \subseteq \rho_{c'}$ or $\rho_{c'} \subseteq \rho_c$ (or both). This defines a *total preorder* on the connected components—a binary relation \subseteq which is reflexive, transitive, and any pair of elements are comparable, but the relation is not necessarily antisymmetric ($\rho \subseteq \rho'$ and $\rho' \subseteq \rho$ does not imply that $\rho = \rho'$ as ordered prefixes). Nonetheless, we can take the equivalence classes with respect to this preorder to get a total order.

Suppose that there are T equivalence classes, where $T \leq C$, and let $\mathcal{T}(t)$ denote set of all prefixes lying in connected components belonging to equivalence class t , ordered so that whenever $t > t'$, and $\rho \in \mathcal{T}(t), \rho' \in \mathcal{T}(t')$, we have that $\rho \supseteq \rho'$ and $\rho \not\subseteq \rho'$. This implies that $\rho \supsetneq \rho'$ as sets. In conjunction with (13), this completes the proof of condition 1 in Lemma 1.

To establish condition 2, we claim that: an equivalence class either consists of a single component, or all of its components are isolated vertices. To show this, suppose for contradiction that an equivalence class includes two components, one which includes two vertices. Let ρ, ϱ denote adjacent prefixes in the same component and ρ' denote a prefix in another component. Since the components are in the same equivalence class, we have that $\rho \subseteq \rho' \subseteq \varrho$, but this implies that $\rho \subseteq \varrho$, contradicting the adjacency of ρ and ϱ . Having shown our claim, we can now see that equivalence classes consisting of a single component satisfy condition (2b) (where we again used (13)), while equivalence classes consisting of isolated vertices satisfy condition (2a). This completes the proof of Lemma 1. \square

Proof of Lemma 2. We start with the definition of $\text{REV}[\phi]$ for an arbitrary monotone stopping policy ϕ , and expand $\Pr[\rho]$ as $\prod_{k=1}^{|\rho|} q(\rho_{1:k})$ (which holds by the definition of q in Definition 5):

$$\text{REV}[\phi] = \sum_{\rho} r_{\rho_{\text{end}}} \phi_{\rho_{\text{end}}}(\rho_{\text{pre}}) q(\rho) \prod_{k=1}^{|\rho|-1} (1 - \phi_{\rho_k}(\rho_{1:k-1})) q(\rho_{1:k}).$$

We split the sum on the RHS into the contribution from prefixes ρ that do not intersect S , and prefixes ρ' that end on S but do not intersect S before the end:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{REV}[\phi] &= \sum_{\rho: \rho \cap S = \emptyset} r_{\rho_{\text{end}}} \phi_{\rho_{\text{end}}}(\rho_{\text{pre}}) q(\rho) \prod_{k=1}^{|\rho|-1} (1 - \phi_{\rho_k}(\rho_{1:k-1})) q(\rho_{1:k}) \\ &\quad + \sum_{\substack{\rho': \rho'_{\text{end}} \in S, \\ \rho'_{\text{pre}} \cap S = \emptyset}} \phi_{\rho'_{\text{end}}}(\rho'_{\text{pre}}) \left(r_{\rho'_{\text{end}}} q(\rho') \prod_{k=1}^{|\rho'|-1} (1 - \phi_{\rho'_k}(\rho'_{1:k-1})) q(\rho'_{1:k}) \right). \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

Note that we did not need to account for the contribution from prefixes that intersect S before the end, because policy ϕ would have stopped on the first intersection with S .

We now rewrite the expression inside the large parentheses in (23) as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} &r_{\rho'_{\text{end}}} q(\rho') \prod_{k=1}^{|\rho'|-1} (1 - \phi_{\rho'_k}(\rho'_{1:k-1})) q(\rho'_{1:k}) \\ &= r_{\rho'_{\text{end}}} \left(\prod_{k=1}^{|\rho'|} q(\rho'_{1:k}) \right) \left(1 - \sum_{k=1}^{|\rho'|-1} \phi_{\rho'_k}(\rho'_{1:k-1}) \prod_{k'=1}^{k-1} (1 - \phi_{\rho'_{k'}}(\rho'_{1:k'-1})) \right) \\ &= r_{\rho'_{\text{end}}} \prod_{k=1}^{|\rho'|} q(\rho'_{1:k}) - \sum_{k=1}^{|\rho'|-1} \left(r_{\rho'_{\text{end}}} \prod_{k'=k+1}^{|\rho'|} q(\rho'_{1:k'}) \right) \phi_{\rho'_k}(\rho'_{1:k-1}) q(\rho'_{1:k}) \left(\prod_{k'=1}^{k-1} (1 - \phi_{\rho'_{k'}}(\rho'_{1:k'-1})) q(\rho'_{1:k'}) \right). \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

The first equality holds because $\prod_{k=1}^{|\rho'|-1} (1 - \phi_{\rho'_k}(\rho'_{1:k-1})) + \sum_{k=1}^{|\rho'|-1} \phi_{\rho'_k}(\rho'_{1:k-1}) \prod_{k'=1}^{k-1} (1 - \phi_{\rho'_{k'}}(\rho'_{1:k'-1}))$ sums to unity, describing the mutually exclusive and collectively exhaustive events of policy ϕ not stopping on any of the first $|\rho'| - 1$ elements of prefix ρ' , or stopping on one of them (say the k 'th element) after not stopping before that (not stopping on elements $k' = 1, \dots, k-1$).

Substituting (24) into the expression inside large parentheses in (23), we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{REV}[\phi] &= \sum_{\rho: \rho \cap S = \emptyset} r_{\rho_{\text{end}}} \phi_{\rho_{\text{end}}}(\rho_{\text{pre}}) q(\rho) \prod_{k=1}^{|\rho|-1} (1 - \phi_{\rho_k}(\rho_{1:k-1})) q(\rho_{1:k}) + \sum_{\substack{\rho': \rho'_{\text{end}} \in S, \\ \rho'_{\text{pre}} \cap S = \emptyset}} r_{\rho'_{\text{end}}} \prod_{k=1}^{|\rho'|} q(\rho'_{1:k}) \\ &\quad - \sum_{\substack{\rho': \rho'_{\text{end}} \in S, \\ \rho'_{\text{pre}} \cap S = \emptyset}} \sum_{k=1}^{|\rho'|-1} \left(r_{\rho'_{\text{end}}} \prod_{k'=k+1}^{|\rho'|} q(\rho'_{1:k'}) \right) \phi_{\rho'_k}(\rho'_{1:k-1}) q(\rho'_{1:k}) \left(\prod_{k'=1}^{k-1} (1 - \phi_{\rho'_{k'}}(\rho'_{1:k'-1})) q(\rho'_{1:k'}) \right) \\ &= \sum_{\rho: \rho \cap S = \emptyset} r_{\rho_{\text{end}}} \phi_{\rho_{\text{end}}}(\rho_{\text{pre}}) q(\rho) \prod_{k=1}^{|\rho|-1} (1 - \phi_{\rho_k}(\rho_{1:k-1})) q(\rho_{1:k}) + \text{REV}[S] \\ &\quad - \sum_{\rho: \rho \cap S = \emptyset} \phi_{\rho_{\text{end}}}(\rho_{\text{pre}}) q(\rho) \left(\prod_{k'=1}^{|\rho|-1} (1 - \phi_{\rho_{k'}}(\rho_{1:k'-1})) q(\rho_{1:k'}) \right) \sum_{\substack{\rho': \rho'_{\text{end}} \in S, \\ \rho'_{\text{pre}} \cap S = \emptyset, \\ \rho'_{1:|\rho|} = \rho}} \left(r_{\rho'_{\text{end}}} \prod_{k'=|\rho|+1}^{|\rho'|} q(\rho'_{1:k'}) \right). \end{aligned}$$

In the third line above, we have used $\text{REV}[S]$ to replace a sum from the first line which described the revenue of the policy that stops on assortment S and stops nowhere else. In the fourth line above, we have let ρ denote $\rho'_{1:k}$ (a prefix disjoint from S) and exchanged the sums from the second line, pulling forward the terms which only depend on the first k elements of ρ' and rewriting them in terms of ρ . The inner sum in the fourth line is then over the ρ' which start identically as ρ , end on S , but do not intersect S before the end.

Having performed this exchange, we can now conveniently merge the sums from the third and fourth lines above to see that

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{REV}[\phi] - \text{REV}[S] \\ &= \sum_{\rho: \rho \cap S = \emptyset} \left(r_{\rho_{\text{end}}} - \sum_{\substack{\rho': \rho'_{\text{end}} \in S, \\ \rho'_{\text{pre}} \cap S = \emptyset, \\ \rho'_{1:|\rho|} = \rho}} r_{\rho'_{\text{end}}} \prod_{k=|\rho|+1}^{|\rho'|} q(\rho'_{1:k}) \right) \phi_{\rho_{\text{end}}}(\rho_{\text{pre}}) q(\rho) \prod_{k=1}^{|\rho|-1} (1 - \phi_{\rho_k}(\rho_{1:k-1})) q(\rho_{1:k}). \end{aligned}$$

Note that $q(\rho) \prod_{k=1}^{|\rho|-1} q(\rho_{1:k}) = \Pr[\rho]$ by the definition of q . Moreover, since ρ is disjoint from S , the expression inside large parentheses for such ρ equals exactly that from identity (14) in Lemma 2, proving the desired result. \square

Proof of Proposition 5. Take realizable prefixes ρ, ρ' with the same endpoint. We show that regardless of any containment relations between ρ_{pre} and ρ'_{pre} , as long as assortment S is disjoint from both ρ and ρ' , it will be the case that $\Pr[j \succeq S_0 | \rho] = \Pr[j \succeq S_0 | \rho']$ for any $j \in S$. To see this, consider the future from ρ . This is generated by a random path on the Markov Chain starting from state ρ_{end} , where any newly-visited items not on ρ are added to the list. The future from ρ' is generated by an identically-distributed path, except the newly-visited items on ρ' are excluded instead. However, these differences do not affect the event $j \succeq S_0$, since $j \in S$ and S is disjoint from both ρ and ρ' . Therefore, $\Pr[j \succeq S_0 | \rho] = \Pr[j \succeq S_0 | \rho']$ for all $j \in S$, satisfying the condition (12) for domination as equality and completing the proof of Proposition 5. \square

Proof of Proposition 6. Take realizable prefixes ρ, ρ' with the same endpoint j , and suppose that j is in nest i . By the rules of drawing the balls, ρ and ρ' can only setwise differ in the items from N_i which have been drawn. Take any assortment S disjoint from ρ and ρ' , and we would like to show that $\Pr[j' \succeq S_0 | \rho] = \Pr[j' \succeq S_0 | \rho']$ for all $j' \in S$. Clearly if $j' \in N_i$ then this is true, since S is disjoint from any items in N_i which have already appeared on ρ or ρ' . On the other hand, if $j' \notin N_i$, then this is also true, because either both probabilities are 0 (if S contains any items in N_i), or both probabilities are calculated from an identical starting point where the items in nest N_i have all been drawn (recall that ρ and ρ' do not setwise differ outside of N_i). \square

Proof of Proposition 7. Take realizable prefixes ρ, ρ' with $\rho_{\text{end}} = \rho'_{\text{end}}$ and $\rho_{\text{pre}} \not\subseteq \rho'_{\text{pre}}$. Note that this implies $\rho_{\text{pre}} \neq \emptyset$, so ρ has length at least 2. Therefore, the future conditional on ρ did not change from before. On the other hand, the future conditional on ρ' either did not change (if $|\rho'| \geq 2$), or $\Pr[j \succeq S_0 | \rho']$ decreased for every $j \in S$ (if $|\rho'| = 1$). In either case, the future from ρ continues to dominate the future from ρ' , verifying the definition of history-monotone futures and completing the proof. \square

Appendix B: Correspondence Between IC Mechanisms and Submodular Functions

We establish the following 1-to-1 correspondence between the class of ordinal IC mechanisms we defined and the class of monotone submodular functions, which could be of general interest.

PROPOSITION 8 (Generalization of Proposition 2 assuming full support \mathcal{L}). *Suppose \mathcal{L} includes every ordered subset of N , some of which can have zero probability. Then for any IC mechanism x , setting*

$$f(S) = \max_{\ell \in \mathcal{L}} \sum_{j \in S \cap \ell} x_j(\ell) \quad \forall S \subseteq N \quad (25)$$

defines an increasing submodular¹⁰ set function $f : 2^N \rightarrow [0, 1]$ which also satisfies

$$x_{\ell_k}(\ell) = f(\ell_{1:k}) - f(\ell_{1:k-1}) \quad \forall \ell \in \mathcal{L}, k = 1, \dots, |\ell|. \quad (26)$$

Conversely, for any increasing submodular set function $f : 2^N \rightarrow [0, 1]$, setting x as in (26) defines an IC mechanism.

Proof of Proposition 8. For the forward direction, only the submodularity of f has not already been established in Proposition 2. We now prove¹¹ this assuming \mathcal{L} has full support. Take any $S \subseteq N$ and distinct items $j, j' \in N \setminus S$. Let ℓ denote the list consisting of the items in S in any fixed order, followed by j . Let ℓ' denote the list consisting of the items in S in the same fixed order, followed by j' , and then j . If ℓ reports truthfully, then their probability of receiving an item in $S \cup \{j\}$ is $f(S \cup \{j\})$, by identity (26). On the other hand, if ℓ misreports ℓ' , then their probability of receiving an item in $S \cup \{j\}$ is $f(S) + x_j(\ell') = f(S) + f(S \cup \{j', j\}) - f(S \cup \{j'\})$, again making use of identity (26). Substituting $k = |S| + 1$ into the IC constraints (2), we see that the former probability must be lower-bounded by the latter, i.e. $f(S \cup \{j\}) \geq f(S) + f(S \cup \{j', j\}) - f(S \cup \{j'\})$, which suffices for establishing submodularity.

For the converse direction, fix any increasing submodular set function $f : 2^N \rightarrow [0, 1]$, and define x according to (26). The non-negativity constraints (4) follow from f being increasing, and the constraints (3) follow from f having a range of at most 1. To establish the IC constraints (2), take lists ℓ, ℓ' and index $k \leq |\ell|$. Using definition (26), the RHS of (2) can be expressed as

$$(f(\ell_{1:i_1}) - f(\ell_{1:i_1-1})) + (f(\ell_{1:i_2}) - f(\ell_{1:i_2-1})) + \dots + (f(\ell_{1:i_{k'}}) - f(\ell_{1:i_{k'}-1})) \quad (27)$$

where $i_1 < \dots < i_{k'}$ are the indices i such that $\ell'_i \in \ell_{1:k}$, with $k' \leq k$. Applying submodularity, (27) can be upper-bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} (f(\ell_{i_1}) - f(\emptyset)) + (f(\{\ell_{i_1}, \ell_{i_2}\}) - f(\ell_{i_1})) + \dots + (f(\{i_1, \dots, i_{k'}\}) - f(\{i_1, \dots, i_{k'-1}\})) &= f(\{i_1, \dots, i_{k'}\}) - f(\emptyset) \\ &\leq f(\ell_{1:k}) - f(\emptyset) \end{aligned}$$

¹⁰ A *submodular* set function $f : 2^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ has the property that $f(S \cup S') + f(S \cap S') \leq f(S) + f(S')$ for any subsets $S, S' \subseteq N$. To establish submodularity, it suffices to show that $f(S) + f(S \cup \{j, j'\}) \leq f(S \cup \{j\}) + f(S \cup \{j'\})$ for all $S \subseteq N$ and distinct items $j, j' \in N \setminus S$.

¹¹ We note that although (25) has already established f to be a *modular* function (when $x_j(\ell)$ is understood to be 0 for $j \notin \ell$), this only results in f being a *subadditive* function, which satisfies the property $f(S \cup S') \leq f(S) + f(S')$ for all $S, S' \subseteq N$. To see this, let ℓ be such that $f(S \cup S') = \sum_{j \in S \cup S'} x_j(\ell)$; it then follows that $f(S) + f(S') \geq \sum_{j \in S} x_j(\ell) + \sum_{j \in S'} x_j(\ell) \geq f(S \cup S')$.

However, this may not result in a submodular function. As a concrete example, suppose $N = \{1, 2, 3\}$ and \mathcal{L} consists of four lists ℓ_1, \dots, ℓ_4 with $x_j(\ell_i) = 3 \cdot \mathbb{1}(i = j)$ for $i \leq 3$ and $x_1(\ell_4) = x_2(\ell_4) = x_3(\ell_4) = 2$. Then setting $S = \{1, 2\}, S' = \{2, 3\}$, we get $f(S \cup S') + f(S \cap S') = 6 + 3 > 4 + 4 = f(S) + f(S')$, which violates submodularity.

This is why we have to make further use of the IC constraints to establish submodularity.

where $f(\{i_1, \dots, i_{k'}\}) \leq f(\ell_{1:k})$ because the indices $i_1, \dots, i_{k'}$ are contained within $\ell_{1:k}$ and f is increasing. The final expression equals the LHS of (2), completing the proof of the converse direction. \square