

Two-sided Assortment Optimization: Adaptivity Gaps and Approximation Algorithms

Omar El Housni*

Cornell Tech, Cornell University, oe46@cornell.edu

Alfredo Torrico*

CDESES, Cornell University, alfredo.torrico@cornell.edu

Ulysse Hennebelle

Ecole Polytechnique, ulysse.hennebelle@polytechnique.edu

Abstract. Two-sided matching platforms have recently proliferated thanks to their application in labor markets, dating, accommodation and ride-sharing. Due to correlated preferences, these platforms face the challenge of reducing choice congestion among popular options who receive more requests than they can handle, which may lead to suboptimal market outcomes. To address this challenge we introduce a two-sided assortment optimization framework under general choice preferences. The goal in this problem is to maximize the expected number of matches by deciding which assortments are displayed to the agents and the order in which they are shown. In this context, we identify several classes of policies that platforms can use in their design. Our goals are: (1) to measure the value that one class of policies has over another one, and (2) to approximately solve the optimization problem itself for a given class. For (1), we define the adaptivity gap as the worst-case ratio between the optimal values of two different policy classes. First, we show that the gap between the class of policies that statically show assortments to one-side first and the class of policies that adaptively show assortments to one-side first is exactly $1 - 1/e$. Second, we show that the gap between the latter class of policies and the fully adaptive class of policies that show assortments to agents one by one is exactly $1/2$. We also note that the worst policies are those who simultaneously show assortments to all the agents, in fact, we show that their adaptivity gap even with respect to one-sided static policies can be arbitrarily small. For (2), we first show that there exists a polynomial time policy that achieves a $1/4$ approximation factor within the class of policies that adaptively show assortments to agents one by one. Finally, when agents' preferences are governed by multinomial-logit models, we show that a 0.082 approximation factor can be obtained within the class of policies that show assortments to all agents at once.

Key words: Matching markets, Assortment optimization, Adaptivity gap, Approximation algorithms

1. Introduction

Two-sided online platforms have transformed the way we move around cities, how we connect and interact with others and even have facilitated how we outsource tasks and search for jobs. Classic examples include freelancing platforms like Taskrabbit and Upwork, dating platforms such as Bumble and Tinder, accommodation companies like Airbnb and Vrbo, and ride-sharing apps such as Blablacar. These choice-based matching markets are generally two-sided in nature whose participants' interaction mainly depends on the specific application. For example, some platforms are designed with one-sided interactions where one side

* The first two authors made equal contributions.

initiates a request, e.g., someone needs to design a website, while the responding side is searching to serve requests, e.g., someone looking for web design jobs. Other platforms, instead, allow for bi-directional interactions where both sides can search the market and initiate an interaction, for example, two people liking their profiles in a dating app. These matching markets do not only account for the way in which their participants interact, but also for their preferences. In general, each agent in the platform has preferences over the opposite side, for instance, the years of experience in web design or the height of a partner. These preferences may lead to *choice congestion* which occurs when the most popular participants concentrate more requests than they can handle, resulting in market inefficiencies. In summary, both the platform's design and the preferences of the participants will ultimately affect the outcome of the market. These challenges have been widely studied in the literature either for general matching markets or for some of the applications above, see e.g. (Rochet and Tirole 2003, Hitsch et al. 2010, Horton 2010, Fradkin 2015, Kanoria and Saban 2021, Rios et al. 2023, Aouad and Saban 2023, Besbes et al. 2023, Manshadi and Rodilitz 2022).

Two-sided assortment optimization has recently gained attention as an algorithmic tool to reduce choice congestion (Ashlagi et al. 2022, Torrico et al. 2023, Aouad and Saban 2023, Rios et al. 2023, Rios and Torrico 2023). Broadly speaking, a two-sided platform first elicits their participants' preferences and then carefully craft the *assortment* of alternatives that will be displayed to each of them. Then, the participants search over their options and either choose one of them or leave the platform. A match is realized when two opposite participants select each other. Therefore, the role of the platform is to serve as a mediator between both sides by designing which alternatives to display and the way in which they will be presented to the participants. This will ultimately affect how agents interact in the platform. A natural tension appears between (i) displaying relevant options to each of the participants, as an incentive to not leave the platform, and (ii) reducing choice congestion among popular alternatives. Carefully balancing these two will result in a better market outcome which may translate in improved revenue, experience and efficiency.

Our main focus is to introduce a general framework for the two-sided assortment optimization problem from a policy design perspective. By accounting for the agents' preferences, a policy determines the assortments and the order in which they are presented to each of the agents in the platform. Our goal is twofold: First, to measure the benefit that a two-sided matching platform can obtain by implementing certain classes of policies over others. For this, we define an optimization framework where we can distinguish various policy classes. Within this framework we can compare the optimal matching outcome between different policies, and show how valuable policies that *adapt* to the agents' choices are when compared to those that do not adapt. Our second goal is to answer the following: If the matching platform has already defined its design (i.e., if we fix the policy class), can we even *approximately* solve the corresponding optimization problem in an efficient manner? In the next section, we present a detailed discussion on how we approach these questions, our main results and contributions.

1.1. Our Results and Contributions

In this work, we introduce a general two-sided assortment optimization framework on a matching platform composed by customers and suppliers with general choice preferences. Our goal is to address the choice congestion challenge faced by the platform that wants to maximize the total expected number of matches, where a match occurs when two opposite agents mutually select each other. We allow customers' and suppliers' choice behavior to be modeled by a large class of discrete choice models. The matching process is determined by the agents' preferences, the assortments of alternatives that the platform displays and the order in which these menus are presented to the agents. Given this, feasible solutions in our framework correspond to policies. To simply put, in each step, a policy selects a group of agents, designs their assortments and then observes their choices; the policy continues with the remaining individuals until no more are left. Within this broad definition of a policy we identify several classes: First, we define those *fully static* policies that simultaneously present assortments to all of the agents in the platform and we denote by (Fully Static) the two-sided assortment optimization problem restricted to this class. On the other extreme, we identify the class of *fully adaptive* policies in which a single agent is selected in each step and their choice is observed before selecting the next individual, i.e., these policies are able to adapt to the choices of each agent. We denote by (Fully Adaptive) the corresponding optimization problem. Finally, we define *one-sided* policies as those which, first, show assortments to all of the agents on one side, and then continue with the opposite side. Analogous to the fully-type policies, we identify two one-sided classes: *one-sided static* and *one-sided adaptive*. We denote by (One-sided Static) and (One-sided Adaptive) the corresponding optimization problems, respectively.

Given the policy classes above, we define the concept of *adaptivity gap* as the worst-case ratio between the optimal expected number of matches achieved by two different policy classes. Roughly speaking, the adaptivity gap aims to measure how “beneficial” is a certain class over another one in terms of market outcome. This metric is of particular importance as it allows us to evaluate different matching platform designs. While the adaptive gaps provide a relative comparison between two policy classes, one may ask if the two-sided assortment optimization problem under a given policy class can be solved efficiently. In other words, if the platform has already decided for a certain design, then: Is there any policy, within the given class, that (approximately) optimizes the number of matches?

Our high-level contributions are two-fold: First, we provide an extensive analysis on the adaptivity gaps between different pairs of policy classes. We show that for one-sided adaptive and fully adaptive policies the gap is constant. We show that the gap is also constant between one-sided static and one-sided adaptive policies. However, when we compare fully static and one-sided static policies, the gap can be arbitrarily bad. Second, we separately show constant approximation guarantees for the two-sided assortment optimization problem under fully adaptive policies and under fully static policies. We emphasize that the technical

ingredients to prove each of these guarantees are completely different. The reason lies on the fact that these policy classes are in two opposite ends and one guarantee from one class does not directly translate in one guarantee for the other. We refer to Figure 1 for a summary of our contributions (our results are in blue). Now, we provide a more detailed description for each of these contributions.

Preliminary results. In Section 2.4, we provide several introductory results and discussions that may help the reader to better understand and position our work. First, in Section 2.4.1, we discuss in detail the connections between our work and the recent literature on two-sided assortment optimization. Then, in Section 2.4.2, as a warm-up, we show that there is no difference between (Fully Adaptive) and (Fully Static) in the special case when customers' and suppliers' preferences are according to the *independent demand* choice model, i.e., the adaptivity gap is 1. In Section 2.4.3, we provide our first adaptivity gap: We compare (Fully Static) with (One-sided Static). Specifically, in Proposition 2, we provide an example in which we show that the adaptivity gap between these policy classes is arbitrarily large even under a very simple choice model. In practical terms, this means that a matching platform would clearly benefit by allowing one side of the market to start choosing first as more information about the agents' preferences can be collected.

Adaptivity Gaps. Section 3 outlines our main results on adaptivity gaps, which are summarized as follows:

- (a) *Adaptivity gap between (One-sided Static) and (One-sided Adaptive):* In Theorem 1, we show that the gap between (One-sided Static) and (One-sided Adaptive) is $1 - 1/e$, which signifies that, in the worst-case scenario, the optimal value of one-sided static policies is approximately 63.2% of the optimal value of one-sided adaptive policies. We emphasize that this result is tight, namely, the adaptivity gaps between these two pairs of policy classes cannot be provably improved. The proof of Theorem 1 is structured through two lemmas. Lemma 1 presents the $1 - 1/e$ lower bound. For this result, we use a novel *linear program relaxation* which connects the choices made by the side who initiates the matching process and the responses made by the opposite side. In fact, this relaxation corresponds to an upper bound of (One-sided Adaptive), i.e., any one-sided adaptive policy can be translated into the variables of our relaxation. We note that this relaxation encodes two extreme probability distributions: The independent distribution which relates to one-sided static policies and the worst-case distribution that serves as an upper bound for the optimal one-sided adaptive policy. Under mild assumptions regarding agents' preference structures, our proof leverages the concept of *correlation gap* (Agrawal et al. 2010) to evaluate the objective values under these distinct distributions. In Lemma 4, we provide a non-trivial instance for which the gap is asymptotically close to $1 - 1/e$. This instance consists of all agents having a demand function (i.e., the probability of choosing anyone from the given alternatives) that tends to 1 as the size of the offered set increases.

(b) *Adaptivity gap between (One-sided Adaptive) and (Fully Adaptive)*: In Theorem 2, we show that the gap between (One-sided Adaptive) and (Fully Adaptive) is $1/2$. We emphasize that this adaptivity gap is tight. The proof of Theorem 2, is also divided into two lemmas. Lemma 5 establishes a $1/2$ lower bound by coupling an optimal fully-adaptive policy with two specialized one-sided adaptive policies: (1) the policy that mimics the actions of the optimal policy in every step where a supplier is processed and “skips” every step that a customer is processed (customers will be offered assortments at the end according to what the optimal policy does); (2) the opposite policy that mimics the actions of customers and skips suppliers. We show that the total number of matches produced by these last two policies is at least the number of matches achieved by the optimal fully-adaptive policy. The proof follows by noting that both policies that we created are feasible one-sided adaptive policies. Finally, Lemma 6 highlights an instance with an adaptivity gap nearing $1/2$. The instance features two distinct sub-markets: one with 1 supplier and $n - 1$ customers, and the other with 1 customer and $n - 1$ suppliers. We designed a choice structure where each sub-market operates independently, ensuring zero cross-selection probability between agents of different sub-markets; which enables us to establish the $1/2$ gap.

Approximation Algorithms. Sections 4 and 5 outline our results on approximation algorithms, which are summarized as follows:

(a) *Approximation algorithm for (Fully Adaptive)*. In Section 4, we show that a $1/4$ approximation factor can be obtained for (Fully Adaptive). In fact, we focus on approximation guarantees for (One-sided Adaptive) which, due to our adaptivity gap, leads to an approximation factor for (Fully Adaptive). Specifically, we show in Theorem 3 that there exists a one-sided policy that guarantees a $1/2$ approximation factor with respect to the optimal one-sided adaptive policy value. Consequently, in Corollary 2, we show that a $1/4$ approximation factor can be obtained for (Fully Adaptive). Our main policy in Theorem 3 uses a subroutine called *Arbitrary Order Greedy*. If customers were the initiating side, this greedy method fixes an arbitrary order over the set of customers and then, for each “arriving” customer, it displays the assortment of suppliers that maximizes the overall marginal number of matches weighted by the probabilistic choice of the customer. After the last customer, the algorithm shows to each supplier the set of customers that initially chose them. An analogous algorithm can be designed when suppliers are the initiating side. Therefore, our policy consists of running Arbitrary Order Greedy separately for each market’s side and, then, selecting the best expected outcome among the two. In the context of two-sided assortment optimization, this greedy method was initially studied in (Aouad and Saban 2023, Torrico et al. 2023), however, their analysis was either dependent on the arrival order or tailored to a specific problem, which in fact is a subclass of (One-sided Static); we refer to Section 2.4 for a detailed discussion. To prove Theorem 3, we instead need a more careful




Figure 1 The results in this work are in blue. Each adaptivity gap (presented below a bracket) corresponds to the ratio between the value on the left and the value on the right, for example, the adaptivity gap between (One-sided Static) and (One-sided Adaptive) is $(1 - \frac{1}{e})$. The approximation factors for each problem are presented on top of the arrows.

analysis adapted to (One-sided Adaptive). Our approach consists of a primal-dual analysis that relies on the linear program relaxation introduced in Section 3.1.

- (b) *Approximation algorithm for (Fully Static)*. In Section 5, we focus on the (Fully Static) problem when the choice preferences of customers and suppliers are described by multinomial-logit (MNL) models, with each agent having a unique MNL model. First, we observe that (Fully Static) is strongly NP-hard even when all customers have the same MNL model and all suppliers have the same MNL model. Our main contribution in this section is the design of an algorithm that achieves a 0.082 approximation factor (Theorem 4). To establish this, we categorize agents into groups based on their preference values being low or high. For cases with low-valued customers and low-values suppliers, we propose a linear program relaxation producing a fractional solution that we convert into a feasible solution through independent randomized rounding, with only a constant factor loss. In scenarios where one group of agents (either customers or suppliers) has high values, we formulate a relaxation as a concave optimization problem and apply randomized pipage rounding to achieve a feasible solution, again losing only a constant factor. The general 0.082 approximation guarantee is derived by upper bounding the optimal value of (Fully Static) with the sum of values from three distinct cases—where agents are segregated into high and low value, and approximating each case by a constant factor.

1.2. Related Literature

In the following, we present the most relevant streams of literature. For a more detailed discussion on related two-sided assortment optimization problems, we refer to Section 2.4.

One-sided Assortment Optimization. Traditional assortment optimization has been extensively studied in the one-sided setting where the goal is to select the subset of products that maximizes the expected revenue achieved by the purchase of a single customer. The single-customer assortment optimization problem was introduced in Talluri and Van Ryzin (2004), and, since then, numerous offline and dynamic models, in

the unconstrained and constrained settings, have been considered. Notably, Talluri and Van Ryzin (2004) show that the unconstrained offline problem can be solved in polynomial time when the customer's preferences are governed by the *multinomial choice model*. The offline problem has been studied under various choice models such as the Logit-based (Talluri and Van Ryzin 2004, Rusmevichientong et al. 2014, Davis et al. 2014), the Rank-based (Aouad et al. 2018) the Markov chain-based (Blanchet et al. 2016) and general choice models (Berbeglia and Joret 2020). Several of these optimization problems are NP-hard e.g., (Rusmevichientong et al. 2014, Aouad et al. 2018, Désir et al. 2022), and a significant portion of research in this area is dedicated to developing approximation algorithms. The constrained assortment optimization problem has also been studied under several choice models, see e.g. (Rusmevichientong et al. 2010, Sumida et al. 2021, Désir et al. 2020, El Housni and Topaloglu 2023, Barré et al. 2023). For a survey on assortment optimization, we refer to (Kök et al. 2008). The online version of the problem has also been studied under several settings and arrival models, see e.g. (Golrezaei et al. 2014, Ma and Simchi-Levi 2020, Goyal et al. 2020, Feng et al. 2022, Gong et al. 2022).

Two-sided Assortment Optimization. One of the first works to consider an assortment optimization problem in a two-sided setting was (Ashlagi et al. 2022). The authors consider a two-sided market with customers and suppliers where the goal of the platform is to simultaneously show an assortment of suppliers to each customer in order to maximize the expected number of matches. A match occurs when a customer and a supplier select each other in a two-step sequential fashion: customers pick first and suppliers choose back from the set that chose them. The authors show that the problem is strongly NP-hard and provide an algorithm that guarantees a constant approximation factor. Their results were later improved by Torrico et al. (2023) who show a $1 - 1/e$ approximation factor for a more general setting. For the same problem, parameterized guarantees are given in (Ahmed et al. 2022). Other two-sided assortment optimization models have been considered for dating markets (Rios et al. 2023, Rios and Torrico 2023), labor markets (Aouad and Saban 2023) and markets with endogenous prices (Shi 2022).

Congestion in Two-sided Markets. There is an extensive literature on market congestion starting with the seminal work of Rochet and Tirole (2003). Since then, the literature has studied several market interventions to reduce congestion such as matchmaking strategies (Shi 2023), signaling competition levels (Besbes et al. 2023), market recommendations (Horton 2017) and ranking (Fradkin 2015), limiting the visibility (Halaburda et al. 2018, Arnosti et al. 2021) and choice (Immorlica et al. 2021), and controlling who initiates contact (Kanoria and Saban 2021, Ashlagi et al. 2020). We emphasize that most of this literature focuses on analyzing specific design features of the market rather than an algorithmic approach, which is the main focus of this work.

2. Model

2.1. Problem Formulation

Consider a two-sided platform represented by a bipartite graph where, on one side, we have a set \mathcal{C} with n customers and, on the opposite side, we have a set \mathcal{S} with m suppliers. The entire set of agents in the platform will be denoted as $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{C} \cup \mathcal{S}$. In this platform, customers and suppliers are looking to match with each other, so we assume that each agent has preferences over the agents on the opposite side. These preferences are captured by *discrete choice models* which, informally, means that each agent probabilistically picks one option from a given *assortment* of alternatives. The platform aims to facilitate the matching between both sides by presenting an assortment to each agent. In the following, we formalize the agents' preferences and the platform's objective.

Agents' Preferences. The preferences of each customer $i \in \mathcal{C}$ are captured by a discrete choice model $\phi_i : (\mathcal{S} \cup \{0\}) \times 2^{\mathcal{S}} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ where $\{0\}$ represents the outside option (e.g., a different platform). For any assortment of suppliers $S \subseteq \mathcal{S}$ presented to customer i , the value $\phi_i(j, S)$ corresponds to the probability that customer i chooses option $j \in \mathcal{S} \cup \{0\}$, where these values are such that $\sum_{j \in \mathcal{S} \cup \{0\}} \phi_i(j, S) = 1$ and $\phi_i(j, S) = 0$ for any $j \notin \mathcal{S} \cup \{0\}$. In other words, for a given assortment, the customer probabilistically chooses either the outside option or one alternative from the assortment. We denote the demand function of customer i as $f_i : 2^{\mathcal{S}} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ that, for any subset $S \subseteq \mathcal{S}$, returns $f_i(S) = \sum_{j \in S} \phi_i(j, S)$, i.e., the probability that customer i chooses someone from S . Similarly, the preferences of each supplier $j \in \mathcal{S}$ are determined by a choice model $\phi_j : (\mathcal{C} \cup \{0\}) \times 2^{\mathcal{C}} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ whose demand function will be denoted as f_j . We emphasize that agents can have heterogeneous preferences, i.e., we do not assume the same choice model for each agent. Throughout this work, we consider the following standard assumptions which have been previously considered in the two-sided assortment optimization literature, e.g., (Aouad and Saban 2023, Torrico et al. 2023).

ASSUMPTION 1. *We consider the following assumptions:*

1. **Single-agent Assortment Optimization Oracle.** *For every agent $a \in \mathcal{A}$, there exists a polynomial-time algorithm that solves the single-customer assortment optimization problem.*
2. **Monotone Submodular Demand Functions.** *The demand function of any agent $a \in \mathcal{A}$ is a monotone submodular set function.¹*

We remark that we do not restrict the first assumption to any particular family of constraints since our results easily carry over with the more general assumption of an efficient approximate oracle. In fact,

¹ A non-negative set function $f : 2^{\mathcal{E}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ defined over a set of elements \mathcal{E} is *monotone* if for every pair of subsets $E \subseteq E' \subseteq \mathcal{E}$, we have $f(E) \leq f(E')$. Function f is *submodular* if for every $e \in \mathcal{E}$ and $E \subseteq E' \subseteq \mathcal{E} \setminus \{e\}$, we have $f(E \cup \{e\}) - f(E) \geq f(E' \cup \{e\}) - f(E')$.

there exist polynomial-time algorithms and approximation guarantees for several choice models and constraints, for instance, the logit-based models (Talluri and Van Ryzin 2004, Rusmevichientong et al. 2014, Sumida et al. 2021, Davis et al. 2014) and the Markov-chain model (Blanchet et al. 2016, Désir et al. 2020). On the other hand, we note that the wide class of random utility choice models satisfy our second assumption (Berbeglia and Joret 2020).

The Platform's Objective. As we mentioned before, the goal of the platform is to facilitate the matching between both sides. To achieve this, the platform aims to clear the market by showing an assortment to each agent (possibly in an adaptive way) such that the total expected number of matches is maximized, where a match between a customer and a supplier is realized when both mutually select each other. Formally, the design of the assortments and the order in which they are presented to the agents are determined by a *policy*. A feasible policy π consists of a sequence of actions such that, in each step, π decides to *process* a subset of the agents, specifically: (1) it selects a subset of agents $A \subset \mathcal{A}$ and (2) it presents an assortment to each agent $a \in A$. We assume that there are no constraints on the assortments, i.e., any subset of suppliers $S \subseteq \mathcal{S}$ can be displayed to customers and any subset of customers $C \subseteq \mathcal{C}$ can be shown to suppliers. Once the assortments are shown to the subset of agents, the policy observes the choices made by each agent in A^2 and continue to the next step with the remaining agents $\mathcal{A} \setminus A$, if any. The policy stops when no agents remain to be processed. To simply put, a policy corresponds to a decision tree where each node indicates the action (agents to be processed and the corresponding assortments) and each outgoing arc corresponds to one of the possible outcome combinations (choices made by the processed agents). We denote by Π the space of all feasible policies and, for a policy $\pi \in \Pi$, let M_π be the random variable that indicates the total number of matches obtained under π . The platform then is interested in solving the following two-sided assortment optimization problem:

$$\max \left\{ \mathbb{E}[M_\pi] : \pi \in \Pi \right\} \quad (1)$$

where the expectation is taken over the agents' choices and the possible randomized actions made by the policy. Note that the optimal value of Problem (1) largely depends on how much freedom to *adapt* to the agents' choices the platform has. Intuitively, if the platform restrict Π to policies that process all of the agents in one step, then the optimal value would be different than if Π is constrained to policies that process agents one by one. In this work, our first goal is to measure the *gap* that exists between optimal values when the problem is restricted to policies in different classes. By doing this, we aim to quantify how valuable for matching platforms is to focus on policies that *adapt* to the agents' preferences and choices. Our second goal is to obtain provable approximation guarantees for specific policy classes. We emphasize that by knowing the gap between different policy classes is of particular relevance. This is because the complexity of Problem (1) highly depends on the space Π and the *approximation guarantees* of an algorithm

²The agents' choices are done independently, irrevocably and simultaneously.

designed for one policy class will carry over to a larger class, up to the measured gap. Formally, we say that a feasible policy π guarantees an α -approximation factor with $\alpha \in [0, 1]$ if it runs in polynomial-time and $\mathbb{E}[M_\pi] \geq \alpha \cdot \text{OPT}$ where OPT is the optimal objective value of the problem being analyzed. In the following section, we introduce various problems for different policy spaces and we formally define our main metric, the *adaptivity gap* of the two-sided assortment optimization problem.

2.2. Policy Classes and Problems of Interest

Policies can be largely classified on how much past information (agents' choices) can be used to design the assortments in future steps or how many agents can be processed in each step. On the one hand, we define $\Pi_{(\text{FS})}$ as the class of *fully static* policies that process all the agents at the same time. Note that these policies are not able to adapt to the agents choices since the assortments are simultaneously designed. On the other hand, we define $\Pi_{(\text{FA})}$ as the class of *fully adaptive* policies that process agents one by one. These policies are allowed to process different types of agents in consecutive iterations. Moreover, in each iteration, these policies can use the information obtained from the choices made by previous processed agents. We note that $\Pi_{(\text{FA})} \supset \Pi_{(\text{FS})}$ since any policy in $\Pi_{(\text{FS})}$ can be simulated by a policy in $\Pi_{(\text{FA})}$ as follows: Agents are processed one by one but the assortments are the ones from the fully static policy.

We observe that the classes above can be further distinguished by which side is entirely processed first; we call these policies *one-sided*. In this context, we consider two policy classes. First, we define $\Pi_{(\text{OS})}$ as the class of *one-sided static* policies which either: (1) simultaneously process all the customers first, it observes their choices and then it processes all the suppliers; or (2) simultaneously process all the suppliers first, it observes their choices and then it processes all the customers. Note that once one side is entirely processed, then the decision-maker cannot obtain extra information by adaptively processing the opposite side, since our model assumes that their choices are done independently. Therefore, processing the opposite side one by one or all at the same time would achieve the same market outcome. Second, we define $\Pi_{(\text{OA})}$ as the class of *one-sided adaptive* policies which either: (1) process all the customers one by one (observing their choices), and then all the suppliers; or (2) process all the suppliers one by one, and then all the customers. As we noted with the fully adaptive and static policies, we have that $\Pi_{(\text{OA})} \supset \Pi_{(\text{OS})}$, since any one-sided static policy can be simulated by a policy in $\Pi_{(\text{OA})}$.

OBSERVATION 1. All the policy classes defined above are nested in the following way:

$$\Pi_{(\text{FS})} \subset \Pi_{(\text{OS})} \subset \Pi_{(\text{OA})} \subset \Pi_{(\text{FA})}.$$

Given the definitions above, we now define our main problems of interest. On one extreme, we have Problem (1) restricted to $\Pi_{(\text{FS})}$, i.e., to the class of policies that simultaneously process all the agents in \mathcal{A} .

DEFINITION 1. We define the *fully static* problem and its optimal objective value as

$$\text{OPT}_{(\text{FS})} = \max \left\{ \mathbb{E}[M_\pi] : \pi \in \Pi_{(\text{FS})} \right\}. \quad (\text{Fully Static})$$

On the other extreme, we have Problem (1) restricted to $\Pi_{(\text{FA})}$, i.e., to the class of policies that process agents in \mathcal{A} one by one.

DEFINITION 2. We define the *fully adaptive* problem and its optimal objective value as

$$\text{OPT}_{(\text{FA})} = \max \left\{ \mathbb{E}[M_\pi] : \pi \in \Pi_{(\text{FA})} \right\}. \quad (\text{Fully Adaptive})$$

We observe that (Fully Adaptive) can be solved via a dynamic programming formulation with exponentially many states and variables, which we include in Appendix A. Also, from Observation 1, we note that $\text{OPT}_{(\text{FA})}$ is at least $\text{OPT}_{(\text{FS})}$, since the optimal solution of the latter can be used as a feasible policy in the former. Moreover, any other general policy for Problem (1) in Π has an objective value that lies between $\text{OPT}_{(\text{FA})}$ and $\text{OPT}_{(\text{FS})}$.

Let us now focus on the problems defined by one-sided policies. On the one hand, we have Problem (1) restricted to $\Pi_{(\text{OS})}$, i.e., to the class of policies that simultaneously process one entire side first.

DEFINITION 3. We define the *one-sided static* problem and its optimal objective value as

$$\text{OPT}_{(\text{OS})} = \max \left\{ \mathbb{E}[M_\pi] : \pi \in \Pi_{(\text{OS})} \right\}. \quad (\text{One-sided Static})$$

Note that we can further restrict (One-sided Static) to one specific side, for example, Ashlagi et al. (2022) introduced the problem in which policies are required to simultaneously process first all customers. Formally, we define (*C*-One-sided Static) and (*S*-One-sided Static) as Problem (1) restricted to $\Pi_{(\text{OS})}^{\text{C}}$ and $\Pi_{(\text{OS})}^{\text{S}}$, respectively, where the superscript represents the initial side. We denote by $\text{OPT}_{(\text{C-OS})}$ and $\text{OPT}_{(\text{S-OS})}$ their respective optimal objective values. Note that

$$\text{OPT}_{(\text{OS})} = \max \left\{ \text{OPT}_{(\text{C-OS})}, \text{OPT}_{(\text{S-OS})} \right\}.$$

Finally, we have Problem (1) restricted to $\Pi_{(\text{OA})}$, i.e., to the class of policies that process first an entire side one by one.

DEFINITION 4. We define the *one-sided adaptive* problem and its optimal objective value as

$$\text{OPT}_{(\text{OA})} = \max \left\{ \mathbb{E}[M_\pi] : \pi \in \Pi_{(\text{OA})} \right\}. \quad (\text{One-sided Adaptive})$$

Similarly to the one-sided static setting, we can further restrict (One-sided Adaptive) to a specific side. Formally, we define (*C*-One-sided Adaptive) and (*S*-One-sided Adaptive) as Problem (1) restricted to

$\Pi_{(OA)}^C$ and $\Pi_{(OA)}^S$, respectively. We denote by $\text{OPT}_{(C-OA)}$ and $\text{OPT}_{(S-OA)}$ their respective optimal objective values. We analogously observe that

$$\text{OPT}_{(OA)} = \max \left\{ \text{OPT}_{(C-OA)}, \text{OPT}_{(S-OA)} \right\}.$$

As we noted with the fully static and fully adaptive problems, $\text{OPT}_{(OA)}$ is at least $\text{OPT}_{(OS)}$ since any optimal solution in the former problem can be transformed into a feasible policy for the latter problem. In fact, these two values lie in between $\text{OPT}_{(FS)}$ and $\text{OPT}_{(FA)}$ as shown in Figure 1.

2.3. The Adaptivity Gap

Note that a policy that processes certain agents earlier than others may output a better outcome than a policy that shows assortments to everyone at once. This simply happens because, in the former type of policy, the platform is able to “collect” more information and, subsequently, to adapt to the agents’ choices. In this section, we define our main metric, the *adaptivity gap*, which aims to measure the benefit (in terms of optimal expected number of matches) that one policy class has over another one. Formally, we define the adaptivity gap as:

DEFINITION 5. For a given pair of policy classes $\Pi', \Pi'' \subseteq \Pi$ such that $\Pi' \subseteq \Pi''$ we define the adaptivity gap between them as:

$$\text{GAP}(\Pi', \Pi'') = \min_{\text{all instances } I} \left\{ \frac{\text{OPT}_{\Pi'}(I)}{\text{OPT}_{\Pi''}(I)} \right\},$$

where an instance I is determined by \mathcal{C} , \mathcal{S} and the choice models ϕ . In the expression above, $\text{OPT}(I)$ indicates the dependence of the optimal value on I . To minimize notation, in the remainder of the paper, we do not write this dependence when it is understood from context.

We emphasize that in the definition above, $\Pi' \subseteq \Pi''$ means that any policy in Π' can be simulated by some policy in Π'' . Note that since $\Pi' \subseteq \Pi''$, then we have that $\text{GAP}(\Pi', \Pi'') \in [0, 1]$, where 1 means that the amount of information used by policies in Π'' does not result in a better matching outcome when compared to policies in Π' . Our first goal is to analyze the gap between four main classes of policies: $\Pi_{(FS)}$, $\Pi_{(OS)}$, $\Pi_{(OA)}$ and $\Pi_{(FA)}$. Since these classes are nested, we are interested in three adaptivity gaps, which are shown in blue brackets in Figure 1. Our second goal is to obtain provable approximation guarantees for (Fully Static) and (Fully Adaptive). In the following section, we provide a warm-up discussion on the two-sided assortment optimization problem, its relation with the literature, the case of the independent demand model and our first result: The adaptivity gap between $\Pi_{(FS)}$ and $\Pi_{(OS)}$.

2.4. Preliminary Discussion and Results

2.4.1. Connection with the Related Literature. One of the first works to study a two-sided assortment optimization model was (Ashlagi et al. 2022). Specifically, the authors consider the (*C-One-sided Static*) problem with homogeneous customers' choices governed by a multinomial-logit choice model. On the other hand, suppliers' preferences follow a "uniform" model where preference values over customers are the same but the outside option value differs by supplier. Ashlagi et al. (2022) show that this problem is strongly NP-hard and provide a polynomial time algorithm that guarantees roughly a 10^{-5} approximation factor. Their algorithm consists of partitioning the customers' preference values in low- and high-valued suppliers. The most intricate case is when suppliers are low-valued, for which their analysis considers a linear programming relaxation constructed by *bucketing* suppliers according to their values. Later, Torrico et al. (2023) study the same problem but for general choice models that satisfy Assumption 1, general assortment constraints and supplier-dependent revenue objective function. The authors show that a variation of the well-known continuous greedy algorithm guarantees a $1 - 1/e$ factor, which is the best possible. This algorithm consists of: First, sampling an order over the set of customers and, then, in every step, simultaneously selecting the fractional assortments that maximize the marginal revenue. This fractional solutions are aggregated to construct a distribution over assortments which is then used to sample a feasible solution. Torrico et al. (2023) also show that a discrete version of the continuous greedy guarantees a $1/2$ approximation factor. We use this method to show our approximation guarantee for (*One-sided Adaptive*). However, we need to make a more intricate analysis than the one in (Torrico et al. 2023) since (*One-sided Adaptive*) allows for more complex policies than (*C-One-sided Static*). We emphasize that our framework is a generalization of the settings studied in (Ashlagi et al. 2022, Torrico et al. 2023) as we allow a wide range of policy classes ranging from (*Fully Static*) to (*Fully Adaptive*).

On a different note, Aouad and Saban (2023) introduce an online version of the (*C-One-sided Static*) model. In this setting, customers arrive one by one in an online fashion and suppliers' availability also varies from stage to stage. Both arrivals and availability may be adversarially chosen. The authors show that in the general case, under Assumption 1, an online greedy method attains a $1/2$ competitive ratio, which is the best possible. This greedy method corresponds to the online version of the Arbitrary Order Greedy. The main difference is that the order of the customers is set by the arrival pattern and not the uniform sample. They provide improved guarantees under certain arrival assumptions, for example, for the i.i.d. arrival setting, they show that a $1 - 1/e$ is possible if the whole set of suppliers is available in every step. Their online model is different than ours since we allow the platform to make adaptive decisions on not only which assortments are displayed depending on past choices, but also on the order that agents are processed. Moreover, our model allows for a true two-sided setting in which assortments are adaptively constructed for agents in either side. Our framework is also general in the sense of policy classes. Possibly,

the closest setting to compare our framework and the model in (Aouad and Saban 2023) corresponds to (\mathcal{C} -One-sided Adaptive) for the former and the online model under random order arrivals for the latter. In this intersection, the Arbitrary Order Greedy method plays an important role.

Finally, let us briefly discuss the model in (Rios et al. 2023, Rios and Torrico 2023). Motivated by dating platforms, both works consider the following setting: Given T periods and agents in two opposite sides, the goal of the platform is to show assortments to every agent in each stage with the objective of maximizing the total number of matches. Agents' preferences are determined by pair-dependent probabilities (independent of the assortment), agents can choose more than one individual in each stage and assortments are restricted by cardinality constraints. Rios et al. (2023) show that this problem is NP-hard and focus mostly on an empirical analysis. Later, Rios and Torrico (2023) provide several approximation guarantees for different platform designs. The latter work identify one-directional and two-directional sequential matches, in which the interaction is initiated by one fixed side or both (in different stages), respectively. They also study the case of simultaneous interactions when opposite agents interact in the same stage. This model differs to our framework in various levels: (1) We consider general choice models and constraints, (2) we allow for a wide range of policies and (3) we do not assume any number of stages in advance. The most crucial differences are that, in their model, agents make independent choices and the platform must show assortments to either the entire market or only one side, while in our setting there is a substitution effect captured by general choice preferences and the platform is allowed to process agents in an adaptive fashion.

2.4.2. (Fully Static) and (Fully Adaptive) are Equivalent for the Independent Demand Model. As a warm-up, in this section, we analyze our problem in the special case where every agent follows the independent demand choice model. This is one of the most simple choice models where the choice probability of an item does not depend on the other offered alternatives. Formally, for any customer $i \in \mathcal{C}$, the probability that i chooses j when assortment $S \subseteq \mathcal{S}$ is offered is

$$\phi_i(j, S) = \begin{cases} \phi_{i,j} & \text{if } j \in S, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad \text{and} \quad \phi_i(0, S) = 1 - \sum_{j \in S} \phi_{i,j},$$

where the values $\phi_{i,j} \in [0, 1]$ satisfy $\sum_{j=1}^m \phi_{i,j} \leq 1$. Analogously, we define the independent demand choice model of every supplier j with probability values $\phi_{j,i}$ for any $i \in \mathcal{C}$. Given these choice models, we show that (Fully Static) and (Fully Adaptive) coincide, which collapses the whole hierarchy in Observation 1.

PROPOSITION 1. *If every agent follows an independent demand choice model, then the adaptivity gap between (Fully Static) and (Fully Adaptive) is 1.*

This result follows by observing that (Fully Static) corresponds to the problem of selecting the set of edges that maximizes the weight of the subgraph, where the weight is determined by the choice probabilities. Since the assortments are not restricted to any constraint, then the optimal solution of this problem is to

select every edge. On the other hand, by analyzing the DP formulation (14) in the Appendix for the independent demand choice model, we obtain the same value as (Fully Static). We defer the formal proof of Proposition 1 to Appendix B.

2.4.3. Gap Between (Fully Static) and (One-sided Static). As shown in the previous section, (Fully Adaptive) and (Fully Static) coincide when every agent's choices are governed by an independent demand choice model. However, in general, this is not the case as we illustrate in the following example:

Example. Consider a platform composed by 2 customers and 1 supplier. Agents' choice probabilities are uniform with respect to the size of the assortment and the outside option, i.e., for every agent a and assortment A with $|A| = k$, $k \geq 1$ then the agent chooses an individual with probability $1/(k + 1)$. In (Fully Static), the optimal value is $1/3$: Note that customers can see only one supplier, so the probability of choosing that supplier is $1/2$; on the other hand, if the supplier sees only one customer, then probability of a match is $1/4$, while if the supplier sees both customers then the probability of a match is $2 \cdot (1/2) \cdot (1/3) = 1/3$. For (Fully Adaptive), instead, there is a feasible policy whose objective value is $5/12$: Show the supplier to each customer and observe their choices. If only one of them chooses the supplier, then show only this customer to the supplier. If both of them choose the supplier, then show both. Clearly, the value is $2 \cdot (1/2)^2 \cdot (1/2) + (1/2)^2 \cdot (2/3) = 5/12 > 1/3$.

This example shows that, even when preferences are simple, there is a clear gap between (Fully Static) and (Fully Adaptive). In fact, the feasible policy that we show for (Fully Adaptive) is a one-sided policy. This motivates our first worst-case result which states that fully-static policies can perform arbitrarily worse than one-sided static policies.

PROPOSITION 2. *There exists an instance such that $\text{OPT}_{(\text{FS})} = \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{n}\right) \cdot \text{OPT}_{(\text{OS})}$.*

To simply put, the result in Proposition 2 implies that a platform would clearly benefit by allowing (the best possible) side to initiate the matching process since this would give more information about the agents' choices. Observe that, in the example of Proposition 2, if we compare (\mathcal{S} -One-sided Static) and (Fully Static), then the gap is actually 1. So, it is important to note that in our definition of (One-sided Static) we consider the best between (\mathcal{C} -One-sided Static) and (\mathcal{S} -One-sided Static). We defer the proof of Proposition 2 to Appendix B.

3. Adaptivity Gaps

In this section, we provide the adaptivity gaps between: (1) (One-sided Static) and (One-sided Adaptive), (2) (One-sided Adaptive) and (Fully Adaptive). In particular, in Section 3.1, our focus is to show the following main result:

THEOREM 1. *The adaptivity gap between (One-sided Static) and (One-sided Adaptive) is $1 - \frac{1}{e}$.*

The proof of this result is separated in two lemmas. First, in Lemma 1, we present a novel LP relaxation of (One-sided Adaptive), which along with the notion of *correlation gap* introduced in (Agrawal et al. 2010), allows us to show that the adaptivity gap is at least $1 - 1/e$ thanks to the monotonicity and submodularity of the suppliers' demand functions. In Lemma 4, we present a non-trivial instance where the gap is arbitrarily close to $1 - 1/e$ as the size of the market grows.

In Section 3.2, our focus is to show the following second main result:

THEOREM 2. *The adaptivity gap between (One-sided Adaptive) and (Fully Adaptive) is $1/2$.*

As before, the proof of this result is separated in two lemmas. First, in Lemma 5, we show that the adaptivity gap is at least $1/2$ via a coupling argument between fully adaptive and one-sided adaptive policies. Finally, in Lemma 6, we present an instance for which the gap is arbitrarily close to $1/2$ as the market's size increases.

3.1. Gap Between (One-sided Static) and (One-sided Adaptive)

First, we focus on the following lower bound of the adaptivity gap between (One-sided Static) and (One-sided Adaptive).

LEMMA 1. *For every instance, we have that $\text{OPT}_{(\text{OS})} \geq \left(1 - \frac{1}{e}\right) \cdot \text{OPT}_{(\text{OA})}$.*

Proof. Fix the initiating side to \mathcal{C} . We will show that for any instance, we have

$$\text{OPT}_{(\mathcal{C}\text{-OS})} \geq \left(1 - \frac{1}{e}\right) \cdot \text{OPT}_{(\mathcal{C}\text{-OA})}. \quad (2)$$

The same result can be analogously obtained when \mathcal{S} is the initiating side. In this proof, we use that for one-sided policies (either static or adaptive), once a policy processes all the customers, then processing all the suppliers simultaneously or one by one achieves the same objective value, because their choices are independent. In fact, due to the monotonicity of the demand functions (Assumption 1), and since there are no constraints, if C is the set of customers that chose supplier j after all customers were processed, then the best decision is to show exactly C to j because: (i) showing anything outside C cannot lead to a match (customers outside C did not pick j); (ii) showing a smaller set will decrease the probability that j picks someone, i.e., their demand $f_j(\cdot)$.

To prove Inequality (2), we introduce a novel LP relaxation which upper bounds $\text{OPT}_{(\mathcal{C}\text{-OA})}$. Specifically, we consider the following formulation:

$$\begin{aligned} \max \quad & \sum_{j \in \mathcal{S}} \sum_{C \subseteq \mathcal{C}} f_j(C) \cdot \lambda_{j,C} \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \sum_{C \subseteq \mathcal{C}} \lambda_{j,C} = 1, & \text{for all } j \in \mathcal{S} \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{C:C \ni i} \lambda_{j,C} &= \sum_{S:S \ni j} \tau_{i,S} \cdot \phi_i(j, S), & \text{for all } i \in \mathcal{C}, j \in \mathcal{S} \\ \sum_{S \subseteq \mathcal{S}} \tau_{i,S} &= 1, & \text{for all } i \in \mathcal{C}, \\ \lambda_{j,C}, \tau_{i,S} &\geq 0, & \text{for all } j \in \mathcal{S}, C \subseteq \mathcal{C}, i \in \mathcal{C}, S \subseteq \mathcal{S}. \end{aligned}$$

We can interpret $\lambda_{j,C}$ as the probability that supplier j gets chosen by exactly customers in C and $\tau_{i,S}$ as the probability that we show assortment S to customer i . Note that both C and S can potentially be \emptyset . The first and third constraints are distribution constraints. The second constraint corresponds to the probability that a customer i is in the “backlog” of supplier j , i.e., the probability that i sees and chooses j . We note that a closely related relaxation was studied for the i.i.d. online arrival model introduced by Aouad and Saban (2023), however, our relaxation is more general in that it applies to the adaptive setting that we consider in this paper and to the online model studied in (Aouad and Saban 2023). Problem (3) will play a crucial role in our proof and, in fact, it is an upper bound of (\mathcal{C} -One-sided Adaptive):

LEMMA 2. *Problem (3) is a relaxation of (\mathcal{C} -One-sided Adaptive).*

We provide the proof of Lemma 2 in Appendix C.1. One important aspect of Problem (3) is that it computes the best possible distribution over assortments for each supplier and it correlates that distribution with the distribution over assortments for customers. This will be crucial when we compare it with the solution of (\mathcal{C} -One-sided Static). Now we focus on (\mathcal{C} -One-sided Static). Note that this setting corresponds to the model introduced by Ashlagi et al. (2022). In this problem, a policy can be simply viewed as simultaneously selecting a family of assortments S_1, \dots, S_n where subset S_i will be shown to customer $i \in \mathcal{C}$. As noted in (Torrico et al. 2023), we can consider a randomized solution in which for each customer $i \in \mathcal{C}$, we have a distribution τ_i over assortments and the objective value in (\mathcal{C} -One-sided Static) corresponds to

$$\sum_{j \in \mathcal{S}} \sum_{C \subseteq \mathcal{C}} f_j(C) \cdot \prod_{i \in C} \left(\sum_{\substack{S \subseteq \mathcal{S}: \\ S \ni j}} \tau_{i,S} \cdot \phi_i(j, S) \right) \prod_{i \in \mathcal{C} \setminus C} \left(1 - \sum_{\substack{S \subseteq \mathcal{S}: \\ S \ni j}} \tau_{i,S} \cdot \phi_i(j, S) \right), \quad (4)$$

In fact, the following distribution, for all $j \in \mathcal{C}$, $C \subseteq \mathcal{C}$,

$$\lambda_{j,C}^{\text{ind}} = \prod_{i \in C} \left(\sum_{S \subseteq \mathcal{S}: S \ni j} \tau_{i,S} \cdot \phi_i(j, S) \right) \prod_{i \in \mathcal{C} \setminus C} \left(1 - \sum_{S \subseteq \mathcal{S}: S \ni j} \tau_{i,S} \cdot \phi_i(j, S) \right), \quad (5)$$

is a feasible solution in Problem (3) which can be easily checked by the reader. A distribution of this form is referred to as the *independent distribution* and we will denote it as λ^{ind} . We are now ready to finalize the proof of Lemma 1. Agrawal et al. (2010) define the *correlation gap* between the “worst-case” distribution and the independent distribution. In particular, for any monotone submodular objective function, Agrawal et al. (2010) show the following:

LEMMA 3 (Agrawal et al. (2010)). *For any monotone submodular function g , we have that $\mathbb{E}_{A \sim D^{\text{ind}}}[g(A)] \geq (1 - \frac{1}{e}) \cdot \mathbb{E}_{A \sim D}[g(A)]$, where D^{ind} is the independent distribution and D is any distribution over subsets with the same marginals.*

We conclude the proof of Lemma 1 as follows: let τ^* and λ^* be an optimal solution of Problem (3). Therefore, by Lemma 2 we know that $\text{OPT}_{(\mathcal{C}\text{-OA})}$ is upper bounded by the optimal value of Problem (3) which is determined by λ^* . On the other hand, we construct the independent distribution λ^{ind} as in Equation (5) with marginal values $\sum_{S \subseteq \mathcal{S}: S \ni j} \tau_{i,S}^* \cdot \phi_i(j, S)$. Note that λ^* and λ^{ind} have the same marginal values. Then, we obtain the following bound for the ratio between the optimal values of (\mathcal{C} -One-sided Static) and (\mathcal{C} -One-sided Adaptive),

$$\frac{\text{OPT}_{(\mathcal{C}\text{-OS})}}{\text{OPT}_{(\mathcal{C}\text{-OA})}} \geq \frac{\sum_{j \in \mathcal{S}} \sum_{C \subseteq \mathcal{C}} f_j(C) \cdot \lambda_{j,C}^{\text{ind}}}{\sum_{j \in \mathcal{S}} \sum_{C \subseteq \mathcal{C}} f_j(C) \cdot \lambda_{j,C}^*} \geq 1 - \frac{1}{e},$$

where the first inequality follows by noting that τ^* can be used as a randomized feasible solution in (\mathcal{C} -One-sided Static) whose objective value is equal to Expression (4) evaluated in τ^* and is exactly the expected value with respect to the independent distribution λ^{ind} . Also note that $\text{OPT}_{(\mathcal{C}\text{-OA})}$ is upper bounded by the optimal objective value of Problem (3). The last inequality is due to Lemma 3. Finally, an analogous relaxation can be constructed when \mathcal{S} is the initiating side and the analysis follows to show that $\text{OPT}_{(\mathcal{S}\text{-OS})} \geq (1 - \frac{1}{e}) \cdot \text{OPT}_{(\mathcal{S}\text{-OA})}$. \square

The second part of the proof of Theorem 1 consists of upper bounding the gap between (One-sided Static) and (One-sided Adaptive).

LEMMA 4. *There exists an instance such that $\text{OPT}_{(\text{OS})} = (1 - \frac{1}{e} + \mathcal{O}(\frac{\log n}{n})) \cdot \text{OPT}_{(\text{OA})}$. In particular, the adaptivity gap tends to $1 - 1/e$ as n goes to ∞ .*

We provide the proof of this lemma in Appendix C.

3.2. Gap Between (One-sided Adaptive) and (Fully Adaptive)

First, we focus on the following lower bound of the adaptivity gap between (One-sided Adaptive) and (Fully Adaptive).

LEMMA 5. *For every instance, we have that $\text{OPT}_{(\text{OA})} \geq \frac{1}{2} \cdot \text{OPT}_{(\text{FA})}$.*

Proof. Consider an optimal policy π^* for (Fully Adaptive). For each agent $a \in \mathcal{A}$, we denote as X_a the random variable which takes value 1 if a is matched in π^* and 0 otherwise. We denote by Y_a the random variable which takes value 1 if a is matched to an opposite agent that was processed before a in π^* and 0 otherwise. We denote by Z_a the random variable which takes value 1 if a is matched to an opposite agent that was processed after a in π^* and 0 otherwise. Clearly, we have $X_a = Y_a + Z_a$. Given this notation,

observe that $\sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}} Y_i = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{S}} Z_j$ and $\sum_{j \in \mathcal{S}} Y_j = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}} Z_i$. Let M_{π^*} be the number of matches obtained by π^* which is given by

$$M_{\pi^*} = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}} X_i = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}} Y_i + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}} Z_i = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}} Y_i + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{S}} Y_j.$$

Let us define a feasible (randomized) one sided adaptive policy $\pi_{\mathcal{S}}$ that processes suppliers first. We will couple this policy with π^* . In particular, $\pi_{\mathcal{S}}$ offers exactly the same assortment as π^* whenever π^* processes a supplier. If π^* processes a customer before finishing all suppliers at some time, then $\pi_{\mathcal{S}}$ does not process any agent at that time but just simulates the choice of the customer so that π^* and $\pi_{\mathcal{S}}$ follow the same decision tree. Note that $\pi_{\mathcal{S}}$ is a randomized policy because of the simulation. After processing all suppliers, $\pi_{\mathcal{S}}$ offers to each customer the same subset of suppliers as in π^* . Let $M_{\mathcal{S}}$ denote the number of matches obtained by $\pi_{\mathcal{S}}$, we will show that for each customer $i \in \mathcal{C}$, the probability of matching i in the policy $\pi_{\mathcal{S}}$ is greater than $\mathbb{E}[Y_i]$. Recall that $\mathbb{E}[Y_i]$ corresponds to the probability of matching i in the optimal policy π^* to a supplier that was processed before i . In fact, suppose π^* is processing customer i at some point (a node in the decision tree of π^*) and offers her assortment S . We can write S as $S = S_o \cup S_f$ where S_o is the subset of suppliers who already chosen customer i (it is always optimal to include this subset) and S_f is a subset from the set of suppliers that have not been processed yet by π^* . These are the scenarios right after processing i :

- Customer i chooses a user in S_f or the outside option, this happens with a total probability of $\sum_{j \in S_f \cup \{0\}} \phi_i(j, S)$. In that case, we have $Y_i = 0$.
- Customer i chooses an element in S_o , this happens with a total probability of $\sum_{j \in S_o} \phi_i(j, S)$. In that case, we have $Y_i = 1$.

By taking an expectation over the scenarios described above we get $\mathbb{E}[Y_i] = \sum_{j \in S_o} \phi_i(j, S)$. On the other hand, note that in all the scenarios above the policy $\pi_{\mathcal{S}}$ offers at the end the set $S = S_o \cup S_f$ to customer i . From the set S , we know that all suppliers in S_o chose i , but suppliers in S_f might or might not have chosen i depending on each scenario. Therefore, the probability of matching i in the policy $\pi_{\mathcal{S}}$ is greater or equal than $\sum_{j \in S_o} \phi_i(j, S)$. This implies that the probability of matching i in the policy $\pi_{\mathcal{S}}$ is greater than $\mathbb{E}[Y_i]$. By taking the sum over all i and the expectation over all sample paths, we get $\mathbb{E}[M_{\mathcal{S}}] \geq \mathbb{E}[\sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}} Y_i]$. Therefore, for (*S-One-sided Adaptive*) we have, $\text{OPT}_{(\mathcal{S}\text{-OA})} \geq \mathbb{E}[\sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}} Y_i]$. Similarly, we have $\text{OPT}_{(\mathcal{C}\text{-OA})} \geq \mathbb{E}[\sum_{j \in \mathcal{S}} Y_j]$. Finally, we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{OPT}_{(\text{OA})} &= \max \left\{ \text{OPT}_{(\mathcal{C}\text{-OA})}, \text{OPT}_{(\mathcal{S}\text{-OA})} \right\} \geq \frac{1}{2} \cdot (\text{OPT}_{(\mathcal{C}\text{-OA})} + \text{OPT}_{(\mathcal{S}\text{-OA})}) \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2} \cdot \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{j \in \mathcal{S}} Y_j \right] + \frac{1}{2} \cdot \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}} Y_i \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \cdot \mathbb{E}[M_{\pi^*}] = \frac{1}{2} \cdot \text{OPT}_{(\text{FA})}. \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

We conclude this section by presenting an instance in which the adaptivity gap is arbitrarily close to 1/2.

LEMMA 6. *There exists an instance such that $\text{OPT}_{(\text{OA})} = \left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{n}\right) \cdot \text{OPT}_{(\text{FA})}$. In particular, the adaptivity gap tends to $1/2$ as n goes to ∞ .*

We defer the proof of this result to Appendix C.

4. Approximation Guarantees for (Fully Adaptive)

In the previous section, we explored the adaptivity gaps between different policy classes which inform us how much the market outcome can be improved by employing different processing policies. However, a natural question is whether the two-sided assortment optimization problem for a given policy class can be (approximately) solved. In this section, we focus on approximation guarantees for (One-sided Adaptive) and (Fully Adaptive).

First, we know that (Torrico et al. 2023) show a $(1 - \frac{1}{e})$ -approximation for (\mathcal{C} -One-sided Static). Therefore, by applying this result to both sides of the market and using our adaptivity gaps obtained in Section 3, we can immediately conclude the following constant guarantees:

COROLLARY 1. *There exists a policy that runs in polynomial-time and guarantees a $(1 - 1/e)^2 \approx 0.399$ approximation factor for (One-sided Adaptive) and a $\frac{1}{2} \cdot (1 - 1/e)^2 \approx 0.199$ for (Fully Adaptive).*

We defer the details of the proof of Corollary 1 to Appendix D.1. Our main goal in this section is to obtain better guarantees than in Corollary 1. We first show that:

THEOREM 3. *There exists a policy that runs in polynomial-time and achieves a $1/2$ approximation factor for (One-sided Adaptive).*

With this theorem and Lemma 5, we can easily conclude the following corollary:

COROLLARY 2. *There exists a policy that runs in polynomial-time and achieves a $1/4$ approximation factor for (Fully Adaptive).*

The remainder of this section is focused on the proof of Theorem 3 which relies on the relaxation that we introduced in Section 3 and it is inspired on the randomized primal-dual analysis initially introduced by Devanur et al. (2013) for the classic online matching setting. Before proceeding to the proof, we note that Aouad and Saban (2023) introduced a greedy algorithm for the online two-sided assortment optimization problem. We emphasize that we cannot directly apply this algorithm to (One-sided Adaptive). Even if their algorithm guarantees a $1/2$ competitive ratio for the random-order arrival model, the online optimal solution in their setting defines only a feasible policy for our problem which is not necessarily the optimal one. The main issue is that their analysis is dependent on the arrival order. Our goal is to show that a version of their greedy algorithm, in fact, achieves a $1/2$ approximation factor with respect to a benchmark that does not depend on the arrival order.

Algorithm 1 (Arbitrary Order) Greedy

Input: A set of customers \mathcal{C} , a set of suppliers \mathcal{S} and choice models ϕ .

Output: Assortments S_i for all $i \in \mathcal{C}$.

- 1: Consider an arbitrary permutation i_1, \dots, i_n over the set of customers \mathcal{C} .
 - 2: For each $j \in \mathcal{S}$, set $C_j^0 = \emptyset$.
 - 3: **for** $t = 1, \dots, n$ **do**
 - 4: $S_{i_t} \in \arg \max \left\{ \sum_{j \in \mathcal{S}} [f_j(C_j^{t-1} \cup \{i_t\}) - f_j(C_j^{t-1})] \cdot \phi_{i_t}(j, S) : S \subseteq \mathcal{S} \right\}$
 - 5: Observe the choice $\ell \in S_{i_t} \cup \{0\}$ of customer i_t which happens w.p. $\phi_{i_t}(\ell, S_{i_t})$.
 - 6: If $\ell \neq 0$, update $C_\ell^t \leftarrow C_\ell^{t-1} \cup \{i_t\}$ and $C_j^t \leftarrow C_j^{t-1}$ for all $j \in \mathcal{S} \setminus \{\ell\}$. Otherwise, $C_j^t \leftarrow C_j^{t-1}$ for all $j \in \mathcal{S}$.
-

Algorithm 2 Adaptive Policy for (One-sided Adaptive)

Input: Choice models ϕ .

Output: Assortments S_i for all $i \in \mathcal{C}$ and C_j for all $j \in \mathcal{S}$.

- 1: Run Algorithm 1 to approximately solve (\mathcal{C} -One-sided Adaptive). Denote by $\pi_{\mathcal{C}}$ this policy.
 - 2: Run the adaptation of Algorithm 1 to approximately solve (\mathcal{S} -One-sided Adaptive). Denote by $\pi_{\mathcal{S}}$ this policy.
 - 3: Select the policy with the highest value between $\mathbb{E}[M_{\pi_{\mathcal{C}}}]$ and $\mathbb{E}[M_{\pi_{\mathcal{S}}}]$.
-

4.1. Our Main Policy

Torrico et al. (2023) show that the greedy algorithm (Algorithm 1) achieves a $1/2$ factor for the (\mathcal{C} -One-sided Static) problem. We will show, via a novel primal-dual analysis in the context of two-sided assortment optimization, that this algorithm actually achieves a $1/2$ approximation guarantee for (\mathcal{C} -One-sided Adaptive). Roughly speaking, this algorithm considers an arbitrary permutation over the set of customers and treats that order as a stream of customers arrivals. For each arriving customer, the algorithm greedily offers the assortment of suppliers that maximizes the *weighted* probability of choosing a supplier. For completeness, we formalize this method in Algorithm 1 for (\mathcal{C} -One-sided Adaptive). Torrico et al. (2023) considers this algorithm for a revenue maximizing objective, however, we are interested only on the expected size of the matching. Note that the subproblem in Line 4 can be efficiently solved thanks to the first point in Assumption 1. We remark that in Line 5, the method in (Torrico et al. 2023) writes “simulate the choice of” instead of “observe the choice of”. We make this distinction here because for (\mathcal{C} -One-sided Static) the platform cannot access the choices of each customer but it can rather simulate them. Instead, for (\mathcal{C} -One-sided Adaptive), the platform can actually observe these choices as they are made and, subsequently, design the future assortments. These observations serve to construct the sets C_j^n which, for each supplier j , corresponds to the set of customers that chose j . In this way, we are

able to control the demand of each supplier by using the marginals $f_j(C_j^{t-1} \cup \{i_t\}) - f_j(C_j^{t-1})$. Finally, note that Algorithm 1 can be easily adapted for (\mathcal{S} -One-sided Adaptive), we simple exchange the roles of customers and suppliers (Assumption 1 applies to all agents).

We formalize our policy for (One-sided Adaptive) in Algorithm 2. Observe that, in the last step, we compare the expected values of two different policies. Even though the exact values cannot be obtained, we can run enough simulations of Algorithm 1 to get values arbitrarily close (this creates a vanishing additive error in the approximation factor). To ease the exposition of our approach, let us assume that we have access to the exact expected values. We are now ready to prove Theorem 3.

4.2. Proof of Theorem 3

We will show that Algorithm 1 achieves a $1/2$ approximation factor for (\mathcal{C} -One-sided Adaptive) via a randomized primal-dual analysis. Analogously, this analysis can be done for (\mathcal{S} -One-sided Adaptive) and, consequently, the guarantee of Policy 2 will follow.

Consider an arbitrary permutation i_1, \dots, i_n where each customer is treated as an arrival. The dual program of Problem (3) is:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \min \quad & \sum_{j \in \mathcal{S}} \beta_j + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}} \alpha_i & (6) \\
 \text{s.t.} \quad & \beta_j + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}} \gamma_{i,j} \geq f_j(C), & \text{for all } C \subseteq \mathcal{C}, j \in \mathcal{S}, \\
 & \alpha_i - \sum_{j \in \mathcal{S}} \gamma_{i,j} \cdot \phi_i(j, S) \geq 0, & \text{for all } S \subseteq \mathcal{S}, i \in \mathcal{C}, \\
 & \alpha_i, \beta_j, \gamma_{i,j} \in \mathbb{R}, & \forall i \in \mathcal{C}, j \in \mathcal{S}.
 \end{aligned}$$

We now construct random variables $\tilde{\alpha}_i$, $\tilde{\gamma}_{i,j}$ and $\tilde{\beta}_j$ from the actions taken by Algorithm 1 according to the customer arrivals. As observed in (Devanur et al. 2013), this solution does not necessarily need to be feasible in the dual, but its expected values must be feasible. Moreover, we need to show that the dual objective value achieved by these random variables is a constant factor away from the primal objective value.

Construction of the Variables. For each arriving customer $i = i_t$ at step t and assortment S_i output by Algorithm 1, set $\tilde{\alpha}_i$ to $\left[f_\xi(C_\xi^{t-1} \cup \{i\}) - f_\xi(C_\xi^{t-1}) \right]$ where $\xi := \xi_i(S_i)$ is the random variable that indicates the supplier that i chooses when assortment S_i is presented (if i chooses the outside option, set $\tilde{\alpha}_i = 0$). So for $j \in S_i \cup \{0\}$, we have $\mathbb{P}(\xi_i(S_i) = j) = \phi_i(j, S_i)$ and zero otherwise. Note that $\tilde{\alpha}_i$ is, in fact, a random variable that depends on the past customers' choices and the current choice. Finally, set $\tilde{\gamma}_{i,j}$ for every $j \in \mathcal{S}$ to $\left[f_j(C_j^{t-1} \cup \{i\}) - f_j(C_j^{t-1}) \right]$. Note that $\tilde{\gamma}_{i,j}$ is also a random variable since it depends on the set C_j^{t-1} . Finally, set $\tilde{\beta}_j = f_j(C_j^n)$, which is the random value obtained from supplier j at the end of the process.

Feasibility and Objective Value. Now, we show that the expected value of these variables form a feasible solution in the dual and that their dual objective value is a constant factor away from the primal objective value. First, let us compute their objective value. Denote by ξ_t the supplier (if any) chosen by customer i_t . Clearly,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{t=1}^n \tilde{\alpha}_{i_t} &= \sum_{t=1}^n \left[f_{\xi_t}(C_{\xi_t}^{t-1} \cup \{i_t\}) - f_{\xi_t}(C_{\xi_t}^{t-1}) \right] = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{S}} \sum_{t=1}^n \left[f_j(C_j^t) - f_j(C_j^{t-1}) \right] \\ &= \sum_{j \in \mathcal{S}} f_j(C_j^n) - f_j(\emptyset) = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{S}} f_j(C_j^n), \end{aligned}$$

where in the second equality we use that for every $j \in \mathcal{S}$ and $t \in [n]$, the set $C_j^t = C_j^{t-1}$ if i_t does not choose j and $C_j^t = C_j^{t-1} \cup \{i_t\}$ if i_t does choose j . In that equality, we also observe that C_1^n, \dots, C_j^n are disjoint sets (each customer chooses only one option). The following equality corresponds to a telescopic sum. Therefore, the dual objective value is

$$\sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}} \tilde{\alpha}_i + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{S}} \tilde{\beta}_j = 2 \cdot \sum_{j \in \mathcal{S}} f_j(C_j^n),$$

and the primal value is exactly 1/2 of that expression, i.e., $\sum_{j \in \mathcal{S}} f_j(C_j^n)$ since we get a value $f_j(C_j^n)$ for every supplier.

Now, we prove that the expected value of the variables are feasible in the dual program. Recall that the first constraint is: For any $C \subseteq \mathcal{C}$ and $j \in \mathcal{S}$, the variables must satisfy

$$\mathbb{E}[\tilde{\beta}_j] + \sum_{i \in C} \mathbb{E}[\tilde{\gamma}_{i,j}] \geq f_j(C),$$

where the expectation is over the customers' choices. The left hand side of the inequality satisfy

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\tilde{\beta}_j] + \sum_{i \in C} \mathbb{E}[\tilde{\gamma}_{i,j}] &= \mathbb{E} \left[f_j(C_j^n) + \sum_{t=1}^n [f_j(C_j^{t-1} \cup \{i_t\}) - f_j(C_j^{t-1})] \cdot \mathbb{1}_{\{i_t \in C\}} \right] \\ &\geq \mathbb{E} \left[f_j(C_j^n) + \sum_{t=1}^n [f_j(C_j^n \cup \{i_t\}) - f_j(C_j^n)] \cdot \mathbb{1}_{\{i_t \in C\}} \right] \\ &\geq \mathbb{E} [f_j(C_j^n) + f_j(C_j^n \cup C) - f_j(C_j^n)] \\ &\geq f_j(C), \end{aligned}$$

where the first equality follows from observing that the sum is over $i \in C$ the following two inequalities are due to submodularity of f_j . On the other hand, the expected value of the variables must also satisfy the second family of constraints: For any $i \in \mathcal{C}$ and $S \subseteq \mathcal{S}$

$$\mathbb{E}[\tilde{\alpha}_i] - \sum_{j \in S} \mathbb{E}[\tilde{\gamma}_{i,j}] \cdot \phi_i(j, S_i) \geq 0.$$

Let us condition first on C_j^{t-1} for all j , where t is the time period that customer i arrives. Given this, variables $\tilde{\gamma}_{i,j}$ are deterministic and the following expectation is only over the random choice ξ of i which we denote by $\mathbb{E}_\xi[\cdot]$:

$$\mathbb{E}_\xi[\tilde{\alpha}_i] = \mathbb{E}_\xi [f_\xi(C_\xi^{t-1} \cup \{i\}) - f_\xi(C_\xi^{t-1})] = \sum_{j \in S_i} [f_j(C_j^{t-1} \cup \{i\}) - f_j(C_j^{t-1})] \cdot \phi_i(j, S_i). \quad (7)$$

Finally, note that

$$\sum_{j \in S} \tilde{\gamma}_{i,j} \cdot \phi_i(j, S_i) = \sum_{j \in S_i \cap S} [f_j(C_j^{t-1} \cup \{i\}) - f_j(C_j^{t-1})] \cdot \phi_i(j, S_i), \quad (8)$$

where we used that $\phi_i(j, S_i) = 0$ for any $j \notin S_i$. The constraint then follows by taking expectation over C_j^{t-1} and because there are more terms in (7) than in (8).

Since this analysis does not depend on the specific order in which customers arrive, we conclude that Algorithm 1 achieves a $1/2$ approximation factor for (\mathcal{C} -One-sided Adaptive). The proof of the $1/2$ -approximation of Policy 2 then follows. \square

For general interest, the proof above recovers the $1/2$ -approximation for the setting with online arrivals in the adversarial model initially studied in (Aouad and Saban 2023).

5. Approximation Guarantees for (Fully Static) under MNL

In this section, we focus on the (Fully Static) problem under the multinomial logit model (MNL). Specifically, each agent (i.e., supplier or customer) makes choices according to an MNL model. We allow agents to have different MNL models. Specifically, the MNL model for a customer $i \in \mathcal{C}$ is defined as follows: We use w_{ji} to denote the preference weight of customer i for supplier $j \in \mathcal{S}$. The preference weight for the outside option is normalized to 1. Therefore, for any assortment of suppliers $S \subseteq \mathcal{S}$, the probability that customer i chooses supplier $j \in S$ under the MNL model is given by $\phi_i(j, S) = \frac{w_{ji}}{1 + \sum_{\ell \in S} w_{\ell i}}$. The outside option is chosen with probability $\phi_i(0, S) = \frac{1}{1 + \sum_{\ell \in S} w_{\ell i}}$. Similarly, the MNL model for a supplier $j \in \mathcal{S}$ is defined as follows: We use v_{ij} to denote the preference weight of supplier j for customer $i \in \mathcal{C}$. The preference weight for the outside option is normalized to 1. Hence, for any assortment of customers $C \subseteq \mathcal{C}$, the probability that supplier j chooses customer $i \in C$ under the MNL model is given by $\phi_j(i, C) = \frac{v_{ij}}{1 + \sum_{k \in C} v_{kj}}$. The outside option is chosen with probability $\phi_j(0, C) = \frac{1}{1 + \sum_{k \in C} v_{kj}}$.

In the (Fully Static) problem, the decision maker must decide the assortment to offer each agent, with all assortments displayed simultaneously. It is clear that in an optimal solution, if a customer i is shown to a supplier j , then supplier j should also be shown to customer i . This is because a match can only occur if both agents choose each other, making it useless to offer an agent to another without reciprocation. Therefore, the (Fully Static) problem is reduced to selecting edges (i, j) where $i \in \mathcal{C}$ and $j \in \mathcal{S}$. Selecting an edge (i, j) implies including customer i in the assortment offered to supplier j and vice versa. For each pair $(i, j) \in$

$\mathcal{C} \times \mathcal{S}$, let the binary decision variable x_{ij} indicate whether (i, j) is selected, i.e., $x_{ij} = 1$ if and only if (i, j) is selected. Recall that m is the number of suppliers and n is the number of customers. Using this notation, the probability that customer i chooses supplier j given the offered assortment is $\frac{w_{ji}x_{ij}}{1 + \sum_{k=1}^m w_{ki}x_{ik}}$, and the probability that supplier j chooses customer i given the offered assortment is $\frac{v_{ij}x_{ij}}{1 + \sum_{\ell=1}^n v_{\ell j}x_{\ell j}}$. Therefore, the (Fully Static) problem can be formulated as

$$\text{OPT}_{(\text{FS})} = \max_{\mathbf{x} \in \{0,1\}^{n \times m}} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^m \frac{w_{ji}}{1 + \sum_{k=1}^m w_{ki}x_{ik}} \cdot \frac{v_{ij}}{1 + \sum_{\ell=1}^n v_{\ell j}x_{\ell j}} \cdot x_{ij}. \quad (9)$$

First, we observe that the (Fully Static) problem is strongly NP-hard, a conclusion that we can derive directly from the analysis presented in Proposition 1 of (Ashlagi et al. 2022). Specifically, Ashlagi et al. (2022) demonstrates the strong NP-hardness of the (\mathcal{C} -One-sided Static) problem using a reduction from the three-partition problem. To prove this result, they construct an instance where the optimal solution involves offering disjoint subsets of suppliers to individual customers (see their Lemma B2). Hence, in this instance, the (\mathcal{C} -One-sided Static) and (Fully Static) problems are equivalent. This equivalence arises because, in this instance of (\mathcal{C} -One-sided Static) problem, each supplier is offered to precisely one customer; thus, irrespective of the customer's decision to select the supplier or not, it is always optimal to offer that customer to the supplier. In other words, adapting to the decisions of customers does not change the expected number of matches. Consequently, the (Fully Static) is also strongly NP-hard. Given this hardness result, we focus on developing approximation algorithms for (Fully Static).

Our main result in this section is to provide a constant-approximation algorithm for (Fully Static). Specifically, we present the following theorem.

THEOREM 4. *There exists a 0.082-approximation algorithm for the (Fully Static) problem when customers and suppliers make choices according to MNL models.*

To prove Theorem 4, we fix a parameter $\alpha > 0$. In Section 5.1, we first consider cases where both suppliers and customers have low values, i.e., $w_{ji} \leq \alpha$ and $v_{ij} \leq \alpha$. In this scenario, we develop a randomized polynomial-time algorithm that yields a $\frac{1}{(2+\alpha)^2}$ -approximation for (Fully Static). Then, in Section 5.2, we address cases where either all suppliers have high values ($w_{ji} \geq \alpha$) or all customers have high values ($v_{ij} \geq \alpha$). By symmetry, we focus on high-value suppliers ($w_{ji} \geq \alpha$) and provide a randomized algorithm that achieves $\frac{\alpha}{(1+\alpha)}$ -approximation for (Fully Static). Building on this analysis, we combine our results to present an algorithm that achieves 0.082-approximation for the general case, as demonstrated in Section 5.3.

5.1. Low Value Customers and Low Value Suppliers

In this section, we assume that $w_{ji} \leq \alpha$ and $v_{ij} \leq \alpha$ for all $(i, j) \in \mathcal{C} \times \mathcal{S}$ for some $\alpha > 0$ that we set up later. We refer to this case as low value customers and low value suppliers. Under this assumption, we have the following theorem.

THEOREM 5. *Suppose $w_{ji} \leq \alpha$ and $v_{ji} \leq \alpha$ for all $(i, j) \in \mathcal{C} \times \mathcal{S}$ for some $\alpha > 0$. There exists a randomized polynomial time algorithm that gives a $\frac{1}{(2+\alpha)^2}$ -approximation to (Fully Static).*

To show Theorem 5, we present a linear program (LP) which is a relaxation to Problem (9). We use the optimal solution of the LP to construct a randomized solution for Problem (9) whose expected objective value is within $\frac{1}{(2+\alpha)^2}$ of the optimal objective value of (9). In particular, consider the following linear program:

$$\begin{aligned}
z_{\text{LP}} = \max \quad & \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^m v_{ij} w_{ji} y_{ij} & (10) \\
& y_{0j} + \sum_{i=1}^n v_{ij} y_{ij} \leq 1, & \forall j \in [m], \\
& y_{i0} + \sum_{j=1}^m w_{ji} y_{ij} \leq 1, & \forall i \in [n], \\
& 0 \leq y_{ij} \leq y_{i0}, & \forall i \in [n], \forall j \in [m], \\
& 0 \leq y_{ij} \leq y_{0j}, & \forall i \in [n], \forall j \in [m].
\end{aligned}$$

In the next lemma, we show that the optimal value of the above LP gives an upper bound to the (Fully Static) problem given in (9). The proof of the lemma is given in Appendix E.2

LEMMA 7. $\text{OPT}_{(\text{FS})} \leq z_{\text{LP}}$.

Now, we give our randomized algorithm for (Fully Static) for the low value setting. Our algorithm is based on a randomized rounding of the optimal solution of the LP given in (10). Consider $\mathbf{y}^* \in \mathbb{R}^{(n+1) \times (m+1)}$ an optimal solution of (10). From the third constraint in (10), we have $0 \leq y_{ij}^* \leq y_{i0}^*$ and the second constraint implies that $y_{i0}^* \leq 1$. Therefore, for any $i \in [n]$ and $j \in [m]$, we have $0 \leq y_{ij}^* \leq 1$.

Independent Randomized Rounding. Our proposed randomized solution for (Fully Static) is the following. For $i \in [n]$ and $j \in [m]$, we define

$$\tilde{x}_{ij} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{with probability } y_{ij}^* \\ 0 & \text{with probability } 1 - y_{ij}^*. \end{cases} \quad (11)$$

All the variables \tilde{x}_{ij} are independent and well defined because $0 \leq y_{ij}^* \leq 1$.

We show that, in expectation, the randomized solution (11) gives $\frac{1}{(2+\alpha)^2}$ -approximation to (Fully Static), which enables us to prove Theorem 5. We defer the remaining details to Appendix E.

5.2. High Value Suppliers

In this section, we assume that $w_{ji} \geq \alpha$ for all $(i, j) \in \mathcal{C} \times \mathcal{S}$. We refer to this case as suppliers having high values. Under this assumption, we establish the following theorem.

THEOREM 6. *Suppose $w_{ji} \geq \alpha$ for all $(i, j) \in \mathcal{C} \times \mathcal{S}$. There exists a randomized polynomial time algorithm that provides a $\frac{\alpha}{1+\alpha}$ -approximation to (Fully Static).*

To demonstrate Theorem 6, we introduce a formulation that serves as a relaxation of Problem (9). We prove that this problem constitutes a concave optimization problem subject to linear constraints and thus can be optimally solved. We utilize the optimal solution of the relaxed problem to construct a randomized solution for our main problem (9), whose expected objective value is within $\frac{\alpha}{1+\alpha}$ of the optimal objective value of (9). Specifically, consider the following optimization problem:

$$z_C = \max \left\{ \sum_{j=1}^m \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n v_{ij} y_{ij}}{1 + \sum_{i=1}^n v_{ij} y_{ij}} : \sum_{j=1}^m y_{ij} \leq 1, \quad \forall i \in [n], \quad y_{ij} \geq 0, \quad \forall i \in [n], \forall j \in [m]. \right\} \quad (12)$$

Next, we show that Problem (12) constitutes an upper bound to the (Fully Static) problem described in (9). The proof of the lemma is given in Appendix E.3

LEMMA 8. $\text{OPT}_{(\text{FS})} \leq z_C$.

Before proving our main result in this section, we note the following:

LEMMA 9. *Problem (12) can be efficiently solved to optimality.*

The proof of the lemma above follows by noting that the constraints are linear and the objective function is concave; we defer the proof of the latter to Appendix E.4. We now focus on how to obtain a binary vector $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}$ by appropriately rounding an optimal solution of Problem (12).

LEMMA 10 (Calinescu et al. (2011)). *There exists a randomized rounding algorithm that, given an optimal solution \mathbf{y}^* of Problem (12), returns a point $\tilde{\mathbf{x}} \in \{0, 1\}^{n \times m}$ such that:*

1. For all $i \in [n]$, $\sum_{j=1}^m \tilde{x}_{ij} \leq 1$.
2. The expected objective value of $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}$ satisfies $\mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{j=1}^m \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n v_{ij} \tilde{x}_{ij}}{1 + \sum_{i=1}^n v_{ij} \tilde{x}_{ij}} \right] = z_C$

Proof. We first note that the linear constraints in (12) corresponds to the relaxation of a partition matroid. Moreover, the objective function is concave, as we showed in Lemma 9, which is a particular case of continuous submodular function. Therefore, we can use the randomized pipage rounding method introduced in (Calinescu et al. 2011) to obtain $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}$. \square

Finally, we demonstrate that, in expectation, the randomized solution obtained from Lemma 10 achieves an $\frac{\alpha}{1+\alpha}$ -approximation to (Fully Static), which proves Theorem 6. The detailed proof is provided in Appendix E.

5.3. Proof of Theorem 4

In this section, we address the general case for any values of w_{ji} and v_{ij} without imposing restrictive assumptions and present the proof of our main result as stated in Theorem 4. We partition the pairs in $\mathcal{C} \times \mathcal{S}$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{E}_1 &= \{(i, j) \in \mathcal{C} \times \mathcal{S} \mid w_{ji} \geq \alpha\}, & \mathcal{E}_2 &= \{(i, j) \in \mathcal{C} \times \mathcal{S} \mid v_{ij} \geq \alpha, w_{ji} < \alpha\}, \\ \mathcal{E}_3 &= \{(i, j) \in \mathcal{C} \times \mathcal{S} \mid v_{ij} < \alpha, w_{ji} < \alpha\}.\end{aligned}$$

The triplet $(\mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_2, \mathcal{E}_3)$ forms a partition of $\mathcal{C} \times \mathcal{S}$. For each $t \in \{1, 2, 3\}$, we define

$$\text{OPT}_{(\text{FS})}^t = \max_{\mathbf{x} \in \{0,1\}^{|\mathcal{E}_t|}} \sum_{(i,j) \in \mathcal{E}_t} \frac{w_{ji}}{1 + \sum_{k:(i,k) \in \mathcal{E}_t} w_{ki} x_{ik}} \cdot \frac{v_{ij}}{1 + \sum_{\ell:(\ell,j) \in \mathcal{E}_t} v_{\ell j} x_{\ell j}} \cdot x_{ij}. \quad (13)$$

LEMMA 11. $\text{OPT}_{(\text{FS})} \leq \text{OPT}_{(\text{FS})}^1 + \text{OPT}_{(\text{FS})}^2 + \text{OPT}_{(\text{FS})}^3$.

Proof. Consider \mathbf{x}^* , an optimal solution for Problem (9). We observe that

$$\begin{aligned}\text{OPT}_{(\text{FS})} &= \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^m \frac{w_{ji}}{1 + \sum_{k=1}^m w_{ki} x_{ik}^*} \cdot \frac{v_{ij}}{1 + \sum_{\ell=1}^n v_{\ell j} x_{\ell j}^*} \cdot x_{ij}^* \\ &= \sum_{t=1}^3 \sum_{(i,j) \in \mathcal{E}_t} \frac{w_{ji}}{1 + \sum_{k=1}^m w_{ki} x_{ik}^*} \cdot \frac{v_{ij}}{1 + \sum_{\ell=1}^n v_{\ell j} x_{\ell j}^*} \cdot x_{ij}^* \\ &\leq \sum_{t=1}^3 \sum_{(i,j) \in \mathcal{E}_t} \frac{w_{ji}}{1 + \sum_{k:(i,k) \in \mathcal{E}_t} w_{ki} x_{ik}^*} \cdot \frac{v_{ij}}{1 + \sum_{\ell:(\ell,j) \in \mathcal{E}_t} v_{\ell j} x_{\ell j}^*} \cdot x_{ij}^* \leq \sum_{t=1}^3 \text{OPT}_{(\text{FS})}^t,\end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality arises because denominators in the fractions are reduced, and the second inequality follows directly from feasibility. \square

For problem (13), when $t = 1$ (case $w_{ji} \geq \alpha$), Theorem 6 provides a randomized algorithm that achieves a $\frac{\alpha}{1+\alpha}$ -approximation for $\text{OPT}_{(\text{FS})}^1$. By symmetry, the case $t = 2$ ($v_{ij} \geq \alpha$) mirrors the case of high-value suppliers and by inverting the roles of suppliers and customers we apply Theorem 6 to obtain a $\frac{\alpha}{1+\alpha}$ -approximation for $\text{OPT}_{(\text{FS})}^2$. For $t = 3$ ($w_{ji} \leq \alpha$ and $v_{ij} \leq \alpha$), we use Theorem 5 to obtain a $\frac{1}{(2+\alpha)^2}$ -approximation of $\text{OPT}_{(\text{FS})}^3$.

Our algorithm. Our algorithm for Problem (9) operates as follows: For each $t \in \{1, 2, 3\}$, we apply our algorithms to solve problem (13) approximately. Let val^t denote the objective value of our approximate solution for Problem (13). Therefore, we obtain $\text{val}^t \geq \frac{\alpha}{1+\alpha} \cdot \text{OPT}_{(\text{FS})}^t$ for $t = 1, 2$ and $\text{val}^3 \geq \frac{1}{(2+\alpha)^2} \cdot \text{OPT}_{(\text{FS})}^3$. Our algorithm then selects the solution with the highest val^t among $t \in \{1, 2, 3\}$, which we denote by t^* . We obtain then

$$\begin{aligned}\text{OPT}_{(\text{FS})} &\leq \text{OPT}_{(\text{FS})}^1 + \text{OPT}_{(\text{FS})}^2 + \text{OPT}_{(\text{FS})}^3 \\ &\leq \frac{1+\alpha}{\alpha} \cdot \text{val}^1 + \frac{1+\alpha}{\alpha} \cdot \text{val}^2 + (2+\alpha)^2 \cdot \text{val}^3\end{aligned}$$

$$\leq \left(2 + \frac{2}{\alpha} + (2 + \alpha)^2\right) \cdot \text{val}^{t^*}.$$

We choose $\alpha > 0$ that minimizes $\left(2 + \frac{2}{\alpha} + (2 + \alpha)^2\right)$, which gives $\alpha \approx 0.6180$. This leads to $\text{val}^{t^*} \geq 0.0827 \cdot \text{OPT}_{(\text{FS})}$. We remark that our 0.082-approximate solution for $\text{OPT}_{(\text{FS})}$ is constructed by setting x_{ij} equal to our approximate solution for $\text{OPT}_{(\text{FS})}^{t^*}$ for $(i, j) \in \mathcal{E}^{t^*}$ and $x_{ij} = 0$ otherwise.

6. Conclusions

In this work, we presented a general framework for the two-sided assortment optimization problem, in which a wide range of policies are permitted, ranging from (Fully Static) to (Fully Adaptive). We studied the adaptivity gaps between different policy classes under general choice models and provided strong approximation guarantees for (Fully Adaptive) and (Fully Static). Several research questions remain open. Firstly, our main adaptivity gaps are between (One-sided Static) and (One-sided Adaptive), and between (One-sided Adaptive) and (Fully Adaptive). Our results immediately imply that the adaptivity gap between (One-sided Static) and (Fully Adaptive) is at least $(1 - e^{-1})/2$. However, it is not clear if this gap is tight, making it an interesting future question to investigate. Secondly, our model focuses on optimizing the expected size of the matching between suppliers and customers. It would be intriguing to explore a generalization of the objective function, where the goal is to maximize the total expected revenue of a matching, with a defined revenue value for each pair of customers and suppliers. Finally, our framework focuses on a bipartite graph of customers and suppliers. Generalizing this framework to non-bipartite graphs, where a match can occur between arbitrary nodes, represents an interesting future direction.

References

- Agrawal S, Ding Y, Saberi A, Ye Y (2010) Correlation robust stochastic optimization. *Proceedings of the twenty-first annual ACM-SIAM symposium on Discrete Algorithms*, 1087–1096 (SIAM).
- Ahmed A, Sohoni MG, Bandi C (2022) Parameterized approximations for the two-sided assortment optimization. *Operations Research Letters* 50(4):399–406.
- Aouad A, Farias V, Levi R, Segev D (2018) The approximability of assortment optimization under ranking preferences. *Operations Research* 66(6):1661–1669.
- Aouad A, Saban D (2023) Online assortment optimization for two-sided matching platforms. *Management Science* 69(4):2069–2087.
- Arnosti N, Johari R, Kanoria Y (2021) Managing congestion in matching markets. *Manufacturing & Service Operations Management* 23(3):620–636.
- Ashlagi I, Braverman M, Kanoria Y, Shi P (2020) Clearing matching markets efficiently: Informative signals and match recommendations. *Management Science* 66(5):2163–2193.
- Ashlagi I, Krishnaswamy AK, Makhijani R, Saban D, Shiragur K (2022) Technical note—assortment planning for two-sided sequential matching markets. *Operations Research* 70(5):2784–2803.

- Barré T, Housni OE, Lodi A (2023) Assortment optimization with visibility constraints. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.13656* .
- Berbeglia G, Joret G (2020) Assortment optimisation under a general discrete choice model: A tight analysis of revenue-ordered assortments. *Algorithmica* 82(4):681–720.
- Besbes O, Fonseca Y, Lobel I, Zheng F (2023) Signaling competition in two-sided markets. *Available at SSRN* .
- Blanchet J, Gallego G, Goyal V (2016) A Markov chain approximation to choice modeling. *Operations Research* 64(4):886–905.
- Calinescu G, Chekuri C, Pál M, Vondrák J (2011) Maximizing a monotone submodular function subject to a matroid constraint. *SIAM Journal on Computing* 40(6):1740–1766.
- Davis JM, Gallego G, Topaloglu H (2014) Assortment optimization under variants of the nested logit model. *Operations Research* 62(2):250–273.
- Désir A, Goyal V, Segev D, Ye C (2020) Constrained assortment optimization under the markov chain–based choice model. *Management Science* 66(2):698–721.
- Désir A, Goyal V, Zhang J (2022) Capacitated assortment optimization: Hardness and approximation. *Operations Research* 70(2):893–904.
- Devanur NR, Jain K, Kleinberg RD (2013) Randomized primal-dual analysis of ranking for online bipartite matching. *Proceedings of the twenty-fourth annual ACM-SIAM symposium on Discrete algorithms*, 101–107 (SIAM).
- El Housni O, Topaloglu H (2023) Joint assortment optimization and customization under a mixture of multinomial logit models: On the value of personalized assortments. *Operations research* 71(4):1197–1215.
- Feng Y, Niazadeh R, Saberi A (2022) Near-optimal bayesian online assortment of reusable resources. *Proceedings of the 23rd ACM Conference on Economics and Computation*, 964–965.
- Fradkin A (2015) Search frictions and the design of online marketplaces. Technical report, Working Paper, MIT.
- Golrezaei N, Nazerzadeh H, Rusmevichientong P (2014) Real-time optimization of personalized assortments. *Management Science* 60(6):1532–1551.
- Gong XY, Goyal V, Iyengar GN, Simchi-Levi D, Udvani R, Wang S (2022) Online assortment optimization with reusable resources. *Management Science* 68(7):4772–4785.
- Goyal V, Iyengar G, Udvani R (2020) Asymptotically optimal competitive ratio for online allocation of reusable resources. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2002.02430* .
- Halaburda H, Jan Piskorski M, Yıldırım P (2018) Competing by restricting choice: The case of matching platforms. *Management Science* 64(8):3574–3594.
- Hitsch GJ, Hortaçsu A, Ariely D (2010) Matching and sorting in online dating. *American Economic Review* 100(1):130–63.
- Horton JJ (2010) Online labor markets. *International workshop on internet and network economics*, 515–522 (Springer).
- Horton JJ (2017) The effects of algorithmic labor market recommendations: Evidence from a field experiment. *Journal of Labor Economics* 35(2):345–385.
- Immorlica N, Lucier B, Manshadi V, Wei A (2021) Designing approximately optimal search on matching platforms. *Proceedings of the 22nd ACM Conference on Economics and Computation*, 632–633.
- Kanoria Y, Saban D (2021) Facilitating the search for partners on matching platforms. *Management Science* 67(10):5990–6029.

- Kök AG, Fisher ML, Vaidyanathan R (2008) Assortment planning: Review of literature and industry practice. *Retail supply chain management*, 99–153 (Springer).
- Ma W, Simchi-Levi D (2020) Algorithms for online matching, assortment, and pricing with tight weight-dependent competitive ratios. *Operations Research* 68(6):1787–1803.
- Manshadi V, Rodilitz S (2022) Online policies for efficient volunteer crowdsourcing. *Management Science* 68(9):6572–6590.
- Rios I, Saban D, Zheng F (2023) Improving match rates in dating markets through assortment optimization. *Manufacturing & Service Operations Management* 25(4):1304–1323.
- Rios I, Torrico A (2023) Platform design in matching markets: A two-sided assortment optimization approach. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.02584* .
- Rochet JC, Tirole J (2003) Platform competition in two-sided markets. *Journal of the European Economic Association* 1(4):990–1029.
- Rusmevichientong P, Shen ZJM, Shmoys DB (2010) Dynamic assortment optimization with a multinomial logit choice model and capacity constraint. *Operations research* 58(6):1666–1680.
- Rusmevichientong P, Shmoys D, Tong C, Topaloglu H (2014) Assortment optimization under the multinomial logit model with random choice parameters. *Production and Operations Management* 23(11):2023–2039.
- Shi P (2022) Optimal match recommendations in two-sided marketplaces with endogenous prices. *Available at SSRN 4034950* .
- Shi P (2023) Optimal matchmaking strategy in two-sided marketplaces. *Management Science* 69(3):1323–1340.
- Sumida M, Gallego G, Rusmevichientong P, Topaloglu H, Davis J (2021) Revenue-utility tradeoff in assortment optimization under the multinomial logit model with totally unimodular constraints. *Management Science* 67(5):2845–2869.
- Talluri K, Van Ryzin G (2004) Revenue management under a general discrete choice model of consumer behavior. *Management Science* 50(1):15–33.
- Torrico A, Carvalho M, Lodi A (2023) Multi-agent assortment optimization in sequential matching markets. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2006.04313* .

Appendix A: DP Formulation for (Fully Adaptive)

In (Fully Adaptive), the number of steps that a policy makes is equal to the number of agents, i.e., $|\mathcal{A}| = n + m$. Let us denote by $T = n + m$ the total number of steps and $t \in [T]$ a step in which a policy decides to process an agent.

Fix a step $t \in [T]$. Let N_a be the agents in the opposite side of $a \in \mathcal{A}$, i.e., for $i \in \mathcal{C}$ we have $N_i = \mathcal{S}$ and for $j \in \mathcal{S}$ we have $N_j = \mathcal{C}$. Denote by $B_a \subseteq N_a$ the subset of agents that have chosen agent $a \in \mathcal{A}$ in a stage before a is processed, which we call backlogs. For any subset $A \subseteq \mathcal{A}$ of agents that remain to be processed and their current backlogs $\{B_k\}_{k \in A}$, define $V_t(A, \{B_k\}_{k \in A})$ as the maximum expected number of matches we can obtain from stage t forward (value to-go function). Then, in each time period $t \in [T]$ we have the following Bellman equation in which we decide the agent to be processed:

$$V_t(A, \{B_k\}_{k \in A}) = \max_{\substack{a \in A, \\ S \subseteq N_a}} \left\{ \sum_{a' \in S \cap B_a} \phi_a(a', S) \cdot \left(1 + V_{t+1}(A \setminus \{a\}, \{B_k\}_{k \in A \setminus \{a\}}) \right) \right\}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + \sum_{a' \in S \cap B_a^c} \phi_a(a', S) \cdot \mathbb{1}_{\{a' \in A\}} \cdot V_{t+1} \left(A \setminus \{a\}, \left\{ \{B_k\}_{k \in A \setminus \{a, a'\}}, B_{a'} \cup \{a\} \right\} \right) \\
& + \phi_a(0, S) \cdot V_{t+1} \left(A \setminus \{a\}, \{B_k\}_{k \in A \setminus \{a\}} \right), \tag{14}
\end{aligned}$$

where the first sum corresponds to $a \in A$ selecting someone in the backlog; in that case, the matches increase by one and we just remove a from non-processed agents. The second sum corresponds to the case when a selects someone that is not in the backlog. In this sum, the only term that could generate a match is when a selects someone that will be processed in the future (in this case we update the backlog of a'). The last term corresponds to the case in which a chooses the outside option in which case we do not gain anything.

Appendix B: Missing Proofs in Section 2.4

B.1. Proof of Proposition 1

First, note that in (Fully Static) an optimal solution will show supplier j to customer i if and only if customer i is offered to j . This means that (Fully Static) is reduced to choosing edges between pairs of customers and suppliers. Formally, when customers and suppliers follow independent demand choice models, then (Fully Static) corresponds to the following problem

$$\text{OPT}_{(\text{FS})} = \max \left\{ \sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}, j \in \mathcal{S}} \phi_{ij} \cdot \mathbb{1}_{\{j \in S_i\}} \cdot \phi_{ji} \cdot \mathbb{1}_{\{i \in C_j\}} : S_i \subseteq \mathcal{S}, C_j \subseteq \mathcal{C}, \forall i \in \mathcal{C}, j \in \mathcal{S} \right\},$$

where $\mathbb{1}_{\{j \in S_i\}}$ is 1 if $j \in S_i$ and zero otherwise. As mentioned, the problem can be equivalently formulated as selecting the subset of edges that maximizes the expected number of matches, i.e.,

$$\text{OPT}_{(\text{FS})} = \max \left\{ \sum_{(i,j) \in E'} \phi_{ij} \phi_{ji} : E' \subseteq \mathcal{C} \times \mathcal{S} \right\}.$$

Clearly, the optimal solution of this problem is $E' = \mathcal{C} \times \mathcal{S}$, i.e., show everyone to everyone. The objective value in this case is $\sum_{(i,j) \in \mathcal{C} \times \mathcal{S}} \phi_{ij} \phi_{ji}$.

Let us now study (Fully Adaptive) by analyzing the DP formulation given in Appendix A. Recall that for any agent $a \in \mathcal{A}$, N_a and B_a denote respectively the set of individuals on the opposite side of a and the set of agents that have chosen a before a was processed (the backlog of a). For the independent demand choice model, Expression (14) corresponds to

$$\begin{aligned}
V_t(A, \{B_k\}_{k \in A}) & = \max_{\substack{a \in A, \\ S \subseteq N_a}} \left\{ \sum_{a' \in S \cap B_a} \phi_{aa'} \cdot \left(1 + V_{t+1} \left(A \setminus \{a\}, \{B_k\}_{k \in A \setminus \{a\}} \right) \right) \right. \\
& + \sum_{a' \in S \cap B_a^c} \phi_{aa'} \cdot \mathbb{1}_{\{a' \in A\}} \cdot V_{t+1} \left(A \setminus \{a\}, \left\{ \{B_k\}_{k \in A \setminus \{a, a'\}}, B_{a'} \cup \{a\} \right\} \right) \\
& \left. + \left(1 - \sum_{a' \in S} \phi_{aa'} \right) \cdot V_{t+1} \left(A \setminus \{a\}, \{B_k\}_{k \in A \setminus \{a\}} \right) \right\}, \tag{15}
\end{aligned}$$

for any $t \in [T]$ where $T = n + m$ is the total number of agents in the platform. Consider $t = T$, i.e., the last agent to be processed, say a (it could be either a customer or a supplier). Then, (15) is

$$V_T(a, B_a) = \max_{S \subseteq N_a} \left\{ \sum_{a' \in S \cap B_a} \phi_{aa'} \right\},$$

where we used that $V_{T+1}(\emptyset, \emptyset) = 0$. Clearly, the optimal solution is such that $V_T(a, B_a) = \sum_{a' \in B_a} \phi_{aa'}$ i.e., show everyone that has chosen a in the previous steps.

Consider the case $t = T - 1$, i.e., two agents left to be processed, say a and \hat{a} . Then, we can write (15) as $V_{T-1}(\{a, \hat{a}\}, \{B_a, B_{\hat{a}}\}) = \max\{U_a, U_{\hat{a}}\}$ where

$$\begin{aligned} U_a &= \max_{S \subseteq N_a} \left\{ \sum_{a' \in S \cap B_a} \phi_{aa'} \cdot \left(1 + V_T(\hat{a}, B_{\hat{a}})\right) + \phi_{a\hat{a}} \cdot \mathbb{1}_{\{\hat{a} \in S\}} \cdot V_T(\hat{a}, B_{\hat{a}} \cup \{a\}) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \left(1 - \sum_{a' \in S} \phi_{aa'}\right) \cdot V_T(\hat{a}, B_{\hat{a}}) \right\} \\ &= \max_{S \subseteq N_a} \left\{ \sum_{a' \in S \cap B_a} \phi_{aa'} \cdot \left(1 + \sum_{b \in B_{\hat{a}}} \phi_{\hat{a}b}\right) + \phi_{a\hat{a}} \cdot \mathbb{1}_{\{\hat{a} \in S\}} \cdot \left(\sum_{b \in B_{\hat{a}}} \phi_{\hat{a}b} + \phi_{\hat{a}a}\right) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \left(1 - \sum_{a' \in S} \phi_{aa'}\right) \cdot \sum_{b \in B_{\hat{a}}} \phi_{\hat{a}b} \right\} \\ &= \sum_{a' \in B_a} \phi_{aa'} + \sum_{b \in B_{\hat{a}}} \phi_{\hat{a}b} + \phi_{a\hat{a}} \phi_{\hat{a}a}, \end{aligned}$$

where in the second equality we used that $V_T(a, B_a) = \sum_{a' \in B_a} \phi_{aa'}$ which is valid for any a and B_a . In the last equality, we use that the optimal assortment for agent a must include everyone in B_a and \hat{a} ; the rest follows from simple algebra. Analogously, we can obtain that $U_{\hat{a}} = U_a$. Therefore, we conclude that for any $a, \hat{a}, B_a, B_{\hat{a}}$ we have

$$V_{T-1}(\{a, \hat{a}\}, \{B_a, B_{\hat{a}}\}) = \sum_{a' \in B_a} \phi_{aa'} + \sum_{b \in B_{\hat{a}}} \phi_{\hat{a}b} + \phi_{a\hat{a}} \phi_{\hat{a}a}.$$

Along the same lines, we can prove that for any $t \in [T]$, set of agents A_t and backlogs $\{B_a\}_{a \in A_t}$

$$V_t(A_t, \{B_a\}_{a \in A_t}) = \sum_{a \in A_t} \sum_{a' \in B_a} \phi_{aa'} + \sum_{a \in A_t, \hat{a} \in N_a \cap A_t} \phi_{a\hat{a}} \phi_{\hat{a}a}.$$

The optimal value of (Fully Adaptive) corresponds to $\text{OPT}_{(\text{FA})} = V_1(\mathcal{A}, \emptyset)$ (recall $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{C} \cup \mathcal{S}$) which is exactly the optimal value of (Fully Static), i.e.,

$$\sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}, \hat{a} \in N_a} \phi_{a\hat{a}} \phi_{\hat{a}a} = \sum_{(i,j) \in \mathcal{C} \times \mathcal{S}} \phi_{ij} \phi_{ji}.$$

□

B.2. Proof of Proposition 2

Consider an instance with n customers and 1 supplier. For each customer $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, the choice model of i is defined such that, $\phi_i(1, \{1\}) = 1/n$ and $\phi_i(0, \{1\}) = 1 - 1/n$. The choice model of supplier 1 is given such that, for any $C \subseteq \mathcal{C}$, $\phi_1(i, C) = \frac{1}{|C|}$ if $i \in C$ and $\phi_1(i, C) = 0$ if $i \notin C$ or $i = 0$. It is easy to check that these choice models satisfy Assumption 1.

Let us study (One-sided Static). First, for (\mathcal{S} -One-sided Static), we note that the outside option probability is always equal to 0 for supplier 1 independently of the assortment C that we offer. So, regardless of the assortment, supplier 1 chooses some customer $i \in C$, and the best decision to do after that is to offer supplier 1 to customer i . Hence we will have a match with probability $1/n$. For (\mathcal{C} -One-sided Static), the only option is to offer supplier 1 to every customer. Then, supplier 1 will get chosen by at least one customer with probability $1 - (1 - 1/n)^n$ and supplier 1 will choose one customer back with probability 1. Therefore, $\text{OPT}_{(\text{OS})} = 1 - (1 - 1/n)^n \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 1 - 1/e$.

Now consider (Fully Static). Suppose we offer an assortment C to supplier 1 and show supplier 1 to every customer in the assortment C . The probability that we get a match between a customer in C and supplier 1 is $\frac{1}{n} \cdot \frac{1}{|C|}$. The probability that we get a match over all is $\sum_{i \in C} \frac{1}{n} \cdot \frac{1}{|C|} = 1/n$ for any C . Therefore, $\text{OPT}_{(\text{FS})} = 1/n$. We conclude that $\text{OPT}_{(\text{FS})}/\text{OPT}_{(\text{OS})} = \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{n}\right)$. \square

Appendix C: Missing Proofs in Section 3

C.1. Proof of Lemma 2

We prove Lemma 2 by constructing a feasible solution λ, τ of Problem (3) from the sample paths produced by an optimal policy in (\mathcal{C} -One-sided Adaptive). Let π^* be an optimal policy in (\mathcal{C} -One-sided Adaptive) and denote by Ω the set of sample paths of this policy, where a particular sample path is denoted by ω . A sample path can be viewed as a path, from the root (first customer is processed) to a leaf (last customer is processed and makes its choice), in the decision tree defined by π^* . Recall that in (\mathcal{C} -One-sided Adaptive) we are processing customers first one by one, and then we process all of the suppliers. As we discussed in Section 3.1, in any sample path of π^* , the assortments for suppliers will be the set of customers that choose each of them.

For a given sample path ω , let S_i^ω be the assortment shown to customer $i \in \mathcal{C}$ and $\xi_i^\omega \in S_i^\omega \cup \{0\}$ be the alternative that i chose. Note that when fixing ω , ξ_i^ω is deterministic. On the other hand, for a given ω , we denote as C_j^ω the set of customers that chose supplier $j \in \mathcal{S}$. For $\omega \in \Omega$, we denote as $\mathbb{P}(\omega)$ the probability of that path, which is equal to

$$\mathbb{P}(\omega) = \prod_{i \in \mathcal{C}} \phi_i(\xi_i^\omega, S_i^\omega).$$

With this, we define our variables as follows: for all $j \in \mathcal{S}$, $C \subseteq \mathcal{C}$,

$$\lambda_{j,C} = \sum_{\omega \in \Omega: C_j^\omega = C} \mathbb{P}(\omega) = \sum_{\omega \in \Omega: C_j^\omega = C} \prod_{i \in \mathcal{C}} \phi_i(\xi_i^\omega, S_i^\omega)$$

$$= \sum_{\substack{\omega \in \Omega: \\ C_j^\omega = C}} \prod_{i \in C} \phi_i(j, S_i^\omega) \prod_{i \in C \setminus C} \phi_i(\xi_i^\omega, S_i^\omega),$$

and for all $i \in C$, $S \subseteq S$,

$$\tau_{i,S} = \sum_{\omega \in \Omega: S_i^\omega = S} \mathbb{P}(\omega_{-i}) = \sum_{\substack{\omega \in \Omega: \\ S_i^\omega = S}} \prod_{k \in C \setminus \{i\}} \phi_k(\xi_k^\omega, S_k^\omega),$$

where $\mathbb{P}(\omega_{-i}) = \prod_{k \in C \setminus \{i\}} \phi_k(\xi_k^\omega, S_k^\omega)$ denotes the probability of the path ω but excluding the choice of customer i in the decision tree. This is because the probability that π^* shows S to i does not depend on the choice of i . Let us prove these variables satisfy the constraints: First, for any $j \in S$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{C \subseteq C} \lambda_{j,C} &= \sum_{C \subseteq C} \sum_{\substack{\omega \in \Omega: \\ C_j^\omega = C}} \prod_{i \in C} \phi_i(\xi_i^\omega, S_i^\omega) = \sum_{\omega \in \Omega} \left(\sum_{C \subseteq C} \mathbb{1}_{\{C_j^\omega = C\}} \right) \prod_{i \in C} \phi_i(\xi_i^\omega, S_i^\omega) \\ &= \sum_{\omega \in \Omega} \prod_{i \in C} \phi_i(\xi_i^\omega, S_i^\omega) = \sum_{\omega \in \Omega} \mathbb{P}(\omega) = 1, \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathbb{1}_{\{C_j^\omega = C\}}$ is the indicator that equals 1 when $C_j^\omega = C$ and zero otherwise. The second equality is a change of the sum operands, the next equality holds because in each path there exists exactly one set of customers equal to C_j^ω . The last equality holds because we are summing over all possible paths.

We can prove analogously that for any $i \in C$ we have

$$\sum_{S \subseteq S} \tau_{i,S} = 1.$$

Now we prove the final constraint that correlates λ and τ . For any $i \in C$ and $j \in S$,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{C \subseteq C: C \ni i} \lambda_{j,C} &= \sum_{\substack{C \subseteq C: \\ C \ni i}} \sum_{\substack{\omega \in \Omega: \\ C_j^\omega = C}} \prod_{k \in C} \phi_k(\xi_k^\omega, S_k^\omega) \\ &= \sum_{\substack{C \subseteq C: \\ C \ni i}} \sum_{\substack{\omega \in \Omega: \\ C_j^\omega = C}} \phi_i(j, S_i^\omega) \cdot \prod_{k \neq i} \phi_k(\xi_k^\omega, S_k^\omega) \\ &= \sum_{\substack{C \subseteq C: \\ C \ni i}} \sum_{\substack{\omega \in \Omega: \\ C_j^\omega = C}} \left(\sum_{\substack{S \subseteq S: \\ S \ni j}} \phi_i(j, S) \cdot \mathbb{1}_{\{S=S_i^\omega\}} \right) \cdot \prod_{k \neq i} \phi_k(\xi_k^\omega, S_k^\omega) \\ &= \sum_{\omega \in \Omega} \sum_{\substack{C \subseteq C: \\ C \ni i}} \sum_{\substack{S \subseteq S: \\ S \ni j}} \phi_i(j, S) \cdot \mathbb{1}_{\{S=S_i^\omega\}} \cdot \mathbb{1}_{\{C=C_j^\omega\}} \cdot \prod_{k \neq i} \phi_k(\xi_k^\omega, S_k^\omega) \\ &= \sum_{\omega \in \Omega} \sum_{\substack{S \subseteq S: \\ S \ni j}} \phi_i(j, S) \cdot \mathbb{1}_{\{S=S_i^\omega\}} \left(\sum_{C \subseteq C \setminus \{i\}} \mathbb{1}_{\{C_j^\omega = C \cup \{i\}\}} \right) \cdot \prod_{k \neq i} \phi_k(\xi_k^\omega, S_k^\omega) \\ &= \sum_{\substack{S \subseteq S: \\ S \ni j}} \sum_{\omega \in \Omega: S_i^\omega = S} \phi_i(j, S) \cdot \mathbb{P}(\omega_{-i}) \end{aligned}$$

$$= \sum_{S \subseteq \mathcal{S}: S \ni j} \phi_i(j, S) \cdot \tau_{i,S},$$

where in the second to last equality we used that in each path there is exactly one set of customers equal to C_j^ω .

For a fix path $\omega \in \Omega$, the probability that supplier $j \in \mathcal{S}$ chooses back one of the customers that chose her initially is $f_j(C_j^\omega)$. Therefore, the objective value achieved by π^* corresponds to

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\omega \in \Omega} \left(\sum_{j \in \mathcal{S}} f_j(C_j^\omega) \right) \cdot \mathbb{P}(\omega) &= \sum_{\omega \in \Omega} \left(\sum_{j \in \mathcal{S}} \sum_{C \subseteq \mathcal{C}} f_j(C) \cdot \mathbb{1}_{\{C=C_j^\omega\}} \right) \cdot \mathbb{P}(\omega) \\ &= \sum_{j \in \mathcal{S}} \sum_{C \subseteq \mathcal{C}} f_j(C) \sum_{\omega \in \Omega} \mathbb{1}_{\{C=C_j^\omega\}} \cdot \mathbb{P}(\omega) \\ &= \sum_{j \in \mathcal{S}} \sum_{C \subseteq \mathcal{C}} f_j(C) \sum_{\substack{\omega \in \Omega: \\ C_j^\omega = C}} \mathbb{P}(\omega) \\ &= \sum_{j \in \mathcal{S}} \sum_{C \subseteq \mathcal{C}} f_j(C) \cdot \lambda_{j,C}. \end{aligned}$$

□

C.2. Proof of Lemma 4

Consider an instance with n customers and n suppliers. On the one hand, all customers have the same choice model, such that for any $i \in \mathcal{C}$, any subset of suppliers $S \subseteq \mathcal{S}$, $\phi_i(j, S) = 1/|S|$ for all $j \in S$ and $\phi(0, S) = 0$. For any $k \in [n]$, define the sequence $\beta_k = k \cdot (1 - e^{-\frac{1}{k}})$ and $\beta_0 = 0$. Note that $0 \leq \beta_k \leq 1$. On the other hand, all suppliers have the same choice model: for any $j \in \mathcal{S}$, any subset of customers $C \subseteq \mathcal{C}$ with $|C| = k$, we consider $\phi_j(i, C) = \beta_k/k$ for all $i \in C$ and $\phi(0, C) = 1 - \beta_k$. It is easy to see that all these choice models are monotone and submodular, satisfying the second point in Assumption 1.

First, let us compute the optimal solution of (One-sided Static). For this, consider (\mathcal{S} -One-sided Static) and denote by M_1 the number of matches obtained under a family of assortments $C_1, \dots, C_n \subseteq \mathcal{C}$ where for each $j \in \mathcal{S}$, C_j is the feasible assortment offered to supplier j with $|C_j| = k_j$. Since the probability of remaining unmatched in the choice model of customers (the responding side) is always 0, then the number of matches is equal to the number of customers who are chosen after suppliers are processed, i.e., $M_1 = \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{1}_{\{i \text{ is chosen}\}}$. Therefore, $\mathbb{E}[M_1] = n - \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{P}(i \text{ is not chosen})$. Moreover, we have for any $i \in \mathcal{C}$,

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{P}(i \text{ is not chosen}) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \prod_{\substack{j \in \mathcal{S}: \\ i \in C_j}} \left(1 - \frac{\beta_{k_j}}{k_j} \right) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \exp \left(- \sum_{\substack{j \in \mathcal{S}: \\ i \in C_j}} \frac{1}{k_j} \right),$$

where the first equality is because $\mathbb{P}(i \text{ is not chosen})$ is equal to the product of the probabilities that each j did not choose i , for each $j \in \mathcal{S}$ that sees i . The following equality is due to the definition of β_{k_j} . Finally, by Jensen's inequality, we can prove that

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \exp \left(- \sum_{j \in \mathcal{S}: i \in C_j} \frac{1}{k_j} \right) \geq \exp \left(- \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j \in \mathcal{S}: i \in C_j} \frac{1}{k_j} \right) = \exp \left(- \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{1}_{\{i \in C_j\}} \cdot \frac{1}{k_j} \right) = e^{-1},$$

which implies that $\mathbb{E}[M_1] \leq n - ne^{-1}$. Now, consider the (**C-One-sided Static**) problem and denote by M_2 the number of matches obtained by showing a family of assortments $S_1, \dots, S_n \subseteq \mathcal{S}$ where for each $i \in \mathcal{C}$, S_i is a feasible assortment offered to customer i . After customers make their choices, for each $j \in \mathcal{S}$, let $\alpha_j \in \{0, 1, \dots, n\}$ be the random number of customers who choose supplier j . Since the remaining unmatched probability in the customers' choice models is 0, then $\sum_{j=1}^n \alpha_j = n$. Therefore, conditioned on $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n$:

$$\mathbb{E}[M_2 | \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n] = \sum_{j=1}^n \beta_{\alpha_j} = \sum_{j=1}^n \alpha_j \cdot (1 - e^{-\frac{1}{\alpha_j}}) = n - \sum_{j=1}^n \alpha_j \cdot e^{-\frac{1}{\alpha_j}},$$

where in the first equality we use that supplier j sees α_j customers and the demand equals $f_j(C_j) = \beta_{\alpha_j}$. Thus, by applying Jensen's inequality, we get

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n \alpha_j \cdot e^{-\frac{1}{\alpha_j}} \geq e^{-\frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n \alpha_j \cdot \frac{1}{\alpha_j}} = e^{-1},$$

which implies that $\mathbb{E}[M_2 | \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n] \leq n - ne^{-1}$. Therefore, by taking expectation over $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n$ we conclude $\text{OPT}_{(\text{OS})} \leq n \cdot (1 - 1/e)$. To show that is equal to $n \cdot (1 - 1/e)$, we now provide a feasible solution. Consider the following solution for (**C-One-sided Static**): each customer is offered exactly and exclusively one supplier. Then, each customer will choose the supplier with probability 1, and the supplier will choose back that customer with probability $\beta_1 = 1 - 1/e$. Hence, the expected number of matches is $n \cdot (1 - 1/e)$ which implies that $\text{OPT}_{(\text{OS})} = n \cdot (1 - 1/e)$.

To get an upper bound of the adaptivity gap we just need a feasible policy for the (**One-sided Adaptive**). Consider the following: We start processing suppliers in any random order one by one. For each supplier, we offer all customers who are not chosen yet. In particular, the first supplier is offered all customers in \mathcal{C} and makes a choice. If the supplier chooses a customer i , we update the list of customers who are not chosen yet to $\mathcal{C} \setminus \{i\}$ and proceed to the next supplier. Recall that all customers and suppliers in our instance are similar. Let $M_{p,q}$ be the number of matches under our policy when we have a sub-instance with p customers and q suppliers. By conditioning on the choice of first supplier, we get

$$\mathbb{E}[M_{n,n}] = (1 + \mathbb{E}[M_{n-1,n-1}]) \cdot \beta_n + \mathbb{E}[M_{n,n-1}] \cdot (1 - \beta_n).$$

Since adding one customer can only make the matching better then we have $\mathbb{E}[M_{n,n-1}] \geq \mathbb{E}[M_{n-1,n-1}]$, which implies that $\mathbb{E}[M_{n,n}] \geq \beta_n + \mathbb{E}[M_{n-1,n-1}]$. Hence, by induction, we get

$$\text{OPT}_{(\text{OA})} \geq \mathbb{E}[M_{n,n}] \geq \sum_{k=1}^n \beta_k = \sum_{k=1}^n k \cdot (1 - e^{-1/k}) \geq \sum_{k=1}^n k \cdot \left(\frac{1}{k} - \frac{1}{2k^2} \right) = n - \frac{1}{2} \cdot \sum_{k=1}^n \frac{1}{k},$$

where in the third inequality we use $e^{-x} \leq 1 - x + x^2/2$. In other words, we have that $\text{OPT}_{(\text{OA})} = n - \mathcal{O}(\log n)$. Finally, we conclude that

$$\frac{\text{OPT}_{(\text{OS})}}{\text{OPT}_{(\text{OA})}} = (1 - 1/e + \mathcal{O}(\log n/n)).$$

□

C.3. Proof of Lemma 6

The proof considers 2 “inverted” copies of the instance given in the proof of Proposition 2. Formally, consider an instance with n customers and n suppliers. The choice models of customers are defined as follows. For any customer $i \in \{2, \dots, n\}$, for any subset of suppliers $S \subseteq \mathcal{S}$, if S contains supplier 1, then $\phi_i(1, S) = 1/n$, $\phi_i(0, S) = 1 - 1/n$ and $\phi_i(j, S) = 0$ for any $j \neq 1$. If S does not contain supplier 1, then $\phi_i(j, S) = 0$ for any $j \in S$. In other words, customers $i \in \{2, \dots, n\}$ choose supplier 1 with probability $1/n$ if it is offered, otherwise they remain unmatched. The choice model of customer 1 is such that:

- For any $S \subseteq \mathcal{S}$ such that $S \neq \emptyset$ and $1 \notin S$ (supplier 1 is not in S), $\phi_1(j, S) = 1/|S|$ for all $j \in S$.
- For any $S \subseteq \mathcal{S}$ such that $S \neq \emptyset$ and $1 \in S$, $\phi_1(j, S) = 1/(|S| - 1)$ for all $j \in S \setminus \{1\}$ and $\phi_1(1, S) = 0$.
- For $S = \emptyset$, $\phi_1(0, S) = 1$.

Similarly, the choice models of suppliers are defined as follows. For any supplier $j \in \{2, \dots, n\}$, for any subset of customers $C \subseteq \mathcal{C}$, if C contains customer 1, then $\phi_j(1, C) = 1/n$, $\phi_j(0, C) = 1 - 1/n$ and $\phi_j(i, C) = 0$ for any $i \neq 1$. If C does not contain customer 1, $\phi_j(i, C) = 0$ for any $i \in C$. The choice model of supplier 1, we define it analogously to the one of customer 1, i.e.:

- For any $C \subseteq \mathcal{C}$ such that $C \neq \emptyset$ and $1 \notin C$ (customer 1 is not in C), $\phi_1(i, C) = 1/|C|$ for all $i \in C$.
- For any $C \subseteq \mathcal{C}$ such that $C \neq \emptyset$ and $1 \in C$, $\phi_1(i, C) = 1/(|C| - 1)$ for all $i \in C \setminus \{1\}$ and $\phi_1(1, C) = 0$.
- For $C = \emptyset$, $\phi_1(0, C) = 1$.

Clearly, these choice models have a monotone submodular demand function.

First, let us compute the optimal solution of (**One-sided Adaptive**). For this, we study first (**\mathcal{S} -One-sided Adaptive**). Since the set of customers feasible to match with supplier 1 does not intersect with the set of customers feasible to match with suppliers $2, \dots, n$, it doesn't matter which supplier we process first. Assume, without loss of generality, that we start with supplier 1. We note that, for this supplier, the outside option probability is always equal to 0 independently of the assortment C that we offer. So, regardless of the assortment, supplier 1 chooses some customer $i' \in C$. For suppliers $j \in \{2, \dots, n\}$, the only option is to offer customer 1. Then, the probability that at least one supplier in $\{2, \dots, n\}$ choose customer 1 is $1 - (1 - 1/n)^{n-1}$. Now, we process the customers' side. Show supplier 1 to customer i' which results in a match with probability $1/n$. For customer 1, show some supplier $j \in \{2, \dots, n\}$ that initially chose customer 1, then a match occurs with probability $1 - (1 - 1/n)^{n-1}$. Therefore, the total number of matches is $1 - (1 - \frac{1}{n})^{n-1} + \frac{1}{n}$ which tends to $1 - 1/e$ as n goes to infinity. A similar analysis can be done for (**\mathcal{C} -One-sided Adaptive**).

Now let us present a feasible policy of (**Fully Adaptive**). Show customer 1 to every supplier $j \in \{2, \dots, n\}$ and supplier 1 to every customer $i \in \{2, \dots, n\}$. Customer 1 gets chosen by at least one supplier with probability $1 - (1 - 1/n)^{n-1}$ and, similarly, for supplier 1. Show the correspond supplier to customer 1 and the corresponding customer to supplier 1. The expected number of matches is $2 \cdot [1 - (1 - 1/n)^{n-1}]$ which tends to $2 \cdot (1 - 1/e)$ as n increases. \square

Appendix D: Missing Proofs in Section 4

D.1. Proof of Corollary 1

Torrico et al. (2023) show that a variant of the continuous greedy algorithm achieves a $1 - 1/e$ factor for (\mathcal{C} -One-sided Static). Note that this algorithm can be easily adapted to (\mathcal{S} -One-sided Static), we just have to assume that the matching process is initiated by suppliers. This is possible since our setting optimizes the expected size of the matching and not the revenue. Therefore, the following policy guarantees a $1 - 1/e$ factor to (\mathcal{O} -One-sided Static): Run the algorithm in (Torrico et al. 2023) with \mathcal{C} being the initiating side and, separately, with \mathcal{S} being the initiating side, then output the solution that achieves the highest objective value between the two. Let us denote the objective value of this method by ALG. By using Theorem 1, we obtain:

$$\text{ALG} \geq (1 - 1/e) \cdot \max \{ \text{OPT}_{(\mathcal{C}\text{-OS})}, \text{OPT}_{(\mathcal{S}\text{-OS})} \} = (1 - 1/e) \cdot \text{OPT}_{(\text{OS})} \geq (1 - 1/e)^2 \cdot \text{OPT}_{(\text{OA})},$$

where the last inequality follows from Lemma 1. Finally, the last result follows from Lemma 5 which states that $\text{OPT}_{(\text{OA})} \geq \frac{1}{2} \cdot \text{OPT}_{(\text{FA})}$. \square

Appendix E: Missing Proofs in Section 5

E.1. Proof of Theorem 5.

Consider \tilde{x} the randomized solution defined in (11). Let $i \in [n]$ and $j \in [m]$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{w_{ji}}{1 + \sum_{k=1}^m w_{ki} \tilde{x}_{ik}} \cdot \frac{v_{ij}}{1 + \sum_{\ell=1}^n v_{\ell j} \tilde{x}_{\ell j}} \cdot \tilde{x}_{ij} \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{w_{ji}}{1 + \sum_{k=1}^m w_{ki} \tilde{x}_{ik}} \frac{v_{ij}}{1 + \sum_{\ell=1}^n v_{\ell j} \tilde{x}_{\ell j}} \cdot \tilde{x}_{ij} \mid \tilde{x}_{ij} = 1 \right] \mathbb{P}(\tilde{x}_{ij} = 1) \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{w_{ji}}{1 + w_{ji} + \sum_{k=1, k \neq j}^m w_{ki} \tilde{x}_{ik}} \frac{v_{ij}}{1 + v_{ij} + \sum_{\ell=1, \ell \neq i}^n v_{\ell j} \tilde{x}_{\ell j}} \right] \cdot y_{ij}^* \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{w_{ji}}{1 + w_{ji} + \sum_{k=1, k \neq j}^m w_{ki} \tilde{x}_{ik}} \right] \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{v_{ij}}{1 + v_{ij} + \sum_{\ell=1, \ell \neq i}^n v_{\ell j} \tilde{x}_{\ell j}} \right] \cdot y_{ij}^* \\ &\geq \frac{w_{ji}}{1 + w_{ji} + \sum_{k=1, k \neq j}^m w_{ki} \mathbb{E}[\tilde{x}_{ik}]} \frac{v_{ij}}{1 + v_{ij} + \sum_{\ell=1, \ell \neq i}^n v_{\ell j} \mathbb{E}[\tilde{x}_{\ell j}]} \cdot y_{ij}^* \\ &= \frac{w_{ji}}{1 + w_{ji} + \sum_{k=1, k \neq j}^m w_{ki} y_{ik}^*} \frac{v_{ij}}{1 + v_{ij} + \sum_{\ell=1, \ell \neq i}^n v_{\ell j} y_{\ell j}^*} \cdot y_{ij}^* \\ &\geq \frac{w_{ji}}{1 + \alpha + 1} \cdot \frac{v_{ij}}{1 + \alpha + 1} y_{ij}^* \\ &= \frac{1}{(2 + \alpha)^2} \cdot w_{ji} v_{ij} y_{ij}^*. \end{aligned}$$

The first equality holds because \tilde{x}_{ij} is a Bernoulli random variable. The third equality holds because the random variables \tilde{x}_{ik} for $k \neq j$ and $\tilde{x}_{\ell j}$ for $\ell \neq i$ are independent. The first inequality follows from Jensen inequality (i.e., $\mathbb{E}[1/X] \geq 1/\mathbb{E}[X]$). The second inequality holds because $w_{ji} \leq \alpha$ and $v_{ij} \leq \alpha$ according to the assumption in this section. Moreover, we have $\sum_{\ell=1, \ell \neq i}^n v_{\ell j} y_{\ell j}^* \leq 1$ and $\sum_{k=1, k \neq j}^m w_{ki} y_{ik}^* \leq 1$ which

follow from the first and second constraints in Problem 10. Finally, by talking the sum over all i and j , we get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^m \frac{w_{ji}}{1 + \sum_{k=1}^m w_{ki} \tilde{x}_{ik}} \frac{v_{ij}}{1 + \sum_{\ell=1}^n v_{\ell j} \tilde{x}_{\ell j}} \cdot \tilde{x}_{ij} \right] &\geq \frac{1}{(2 + \alpha)^2} \cdot \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^m w_{ji} v_{ij} y_{ij}^* \\ &= \frac{1}{(2 + \alpha)^2} z_{\text{LP}} \\ &\geq \frac{1}{(2 + \alpha)^2} \text{OPT}_{(\text{FS})}, \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows from Lemma 7. This concludes our proof. \square

E.2. Proof of Lemma 7

Consider an optimal solution $\mathbf{x}^* \in \{0, 1\}^{n \times m}$ of Problem (9). We will construct a feasible solution $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^{(n+1) \times (m+1)}$ for the linear program (10). For any $i \in [n]$ and $j \in [m]$, let

$$\begin{aligned} y_{ij} &= \frac{1}{1 + \sum_{k=1}^m w_{ki} x_{ik}^*} \frac{1}{1 + \sum_{\ell=1}^n v_{\ell j} x_{\ell j}^*} \cdot x_{ij}^*, \\ y_{0j} &= \frac{1}{1 + \sum_{\ell=1}^n v_{\ell j} x_{\ell j}^*}, \\ y_{i0} &= \frac{1}{1 + \sum_{k=1}^m w_{ki} x_{ik}^*}. \end{aligned}$$

This solution satisfy the constraints of Problem (10). In fact, for any $j \in [m]$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} y_{0j} + \sum_{i=1}^n v_{ij} y_{ij} &= \frac{1}{1 + \sum_{\ell=1}^n v_{\ell j} x_{\ell j}^*} + \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{1 + \sum_{k=1}^m w_{ki} x_{ik}^*} \frac{v_{ij} x_{ij}^*}{1 + \sum_{\ell=1}^n v_{\ell j} x_{\ell j}^*} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{1 + \sum_{\ell=1}^n v_{\ell j} x_{\ell j}^*} + \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{v_{ij} x_{ij}^*}{1 + \sum_{\ell=1}^n v_{\ell j} x_{\ell j}^*} \\ &= 1. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, for any $i \in [n]$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} y_{i0} + \sum_{j=1}^m w_{ji} y_{ij} &= \frac{1}{1 + \sum_{k=1}^m w_{ki} x_{ik}^*} + \sum_{j=1}^m \frac{w_{ji} x_{ij}^*}{1 + \sum_{k=1}^m w_{ki} x_{ik}^*} \frac{1}{1 + \sum_{\ell=1}^n v_{\ell j} x_{\ell j}^*} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{1 + \sum_{k=1}^m w_{ki} x_{ik}^*} + \sum_{j=1}^m \frac{w_{ji} x_{ij}^*}{1 + \sum_{k=1}^m w_{ki} x_{ik}^*} \\ &= 1. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, we have for any $i \in [n]$ and $j \in [m]$,

$$0 \leq y_{ij} = \frac{1}{1 + \sum_{k=1}^m w_{ki} x_{ik}^*} \frac{1}{1 + \sum_{\ell=1}^n v_{\ell j} x_{\ell j}^*} \cdot x_{ij}^* \leq \frac{1}{1 + \sum_{\ell=1}^n v_{\ell j} x_{\ell j}^*} = y_{0j}$$

and

$$0 \leq y_{ij} = \frac{1}{1 + \sum_{k=1}^m w_{ki} x_{ik}^*} \frac{1}{1 + \sum_{\ell=1}^n v_{\ell j} x_{\ell j}^*} \cdot x_{ij}^* \leq \frac{1}{1 + \sum_{k=1}^m w_{ki} x_{ik}^*} = y_{i0}.$$

This means that the solution \mathbf{y} is feasible for the LP (10). Therefore,

$$z_{\text{LP}} \geq \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^m v_{ij} w_{ji} y_{ij} = \text{OPT}_{(\text{FS})}.$$

□

E.3. Proof of Lemma 8

Consider an optimal solution $\mathbf{x}^* \in \{0, 1\}^{n \times m}$ of Problem (9). We construct a feasible solution for Problem (12). For any $i \in [n]$ and $j \in [m]$, let

$$y_{ij} = \frac{w_{ji} x_{ij}^*}{1 + \sum_{k=1}^m w_{ki} x_{ik}^*}.$$

It is clear that for any $i \in [n]$, we have $\sum_{j=1}^m y_{ij} \leq 1$ and $y_{ij} \geq 0$ for all i and j . Thus, this solution satisfies the constraints of Problem (12). Hence,

$$z_{\text{C}} \geq \sum_{j=1}^m \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n v_{ij} y_{ij}}{1 + \sum_{i=1}^n v_{ij} y_{ij}} \geq \sum_{j=1}^m \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n v_{ij} y_{ij}}{1 + \sum_{i=1}^n v_{ij} x_{ij}^*} = \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^m \frac{w_{ji}}{1 + \sum_{k=1}^m w_{ki} x_{ik}^*} \frac{v_{ij} x_{ij}^*}{1 + \sum_{\ell=1}^n v_{\ell j} x_{\ell j}^*} = \text{OPT}_{(\text{FS})},$$

where the first inequality follows from the feasibility of y_{ij} , and the second holds because, we have $y_{ij} \leq x_{ij}^*$.

In fact, since x_{ij}^* is a binary variable, we have $(x_{ij}^*)^2 = x_{ij}^*$ and, consequently,

$$y_{ij} = \frac{w_{ji} x_{ij}^*}{1 + \sum_{k=1}^m w_{ki} x_{ik}^*} = \frac{w_{ji} x_{ij}^*}{1 + \sum_{k=1}^m w_{ki} x_{ik}^*} \cdot x_{ij}^* \leq x_{ij}^*.$$

□

E.4. Proof of Lemma 9

In the following, we briefly prove that the objective function of Problem (12) is concave. First, note the function is separable in j . To ease the exposition, we remove the dependency on j and study the function

$$f(\mathbf{y}) = \frac{\sum_{k=1}^n v_k y_k}{1 + \sum_{k=1}^n v_k y_k} = g\left(\sum_{k=1}^n v_k y_k\right),$$

where $g(z) = z/(1+z)$ and $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^n$. We note that for every $i \in [n]$ we have

$$\frac{\partial f}{\partial y_i}(\mathbf{y}) = v_i \cdot g'\left(\sum_{k=1}^n v_k y_k\right).$$

For every $i, \ell \in [n]$ we have then

$$\frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial y_i \partial y_\ell}(\mathbf{y}) = v_i v_\ell \cdot g''\left(\sum_{k=1}^n v_k y_k\right) = -2 \cdot \frac{v_i v_\ell}{(1 + \sum_{k=1}^n v_k y_k)^3}.$$

Finally, we note that the rank of the Hessian of f is 1 since it can be written as

$$-\frac{2}{(1 + \sum_{k=1}^n v_k y_k)^3} \cdot (v_1, \dots, v_n)(v_1, \dots, v_n)^\top,$$

which consequently can be used to prove that the Hessian is semi-definite negative. The proof follows by noting that Hessian of the original objective in (12) is a block diagonal matrix.

□

E.5. Proof of Theorem 6

Consider $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}$, the randomized solution obtained from the rounding method in Lemma 10. Let $i \in [n]$ and $j \in [m]$. We first establish that

$$\frac{w_{ji}\tilde{x}_{ij}}{1 + \sum_{k=1}^m w_{ki}\tilde{x}_{ik}} \geq \frac{\alpha}{1 + \alpha} \cdot \tilde{x}_{ij}. \quad (16)$$

Note that if $\tilde{x}_{ij} = 0$, then both sides of the inequality are zero, making the inequality valid. Conversely, if $\tilde{x}_{ij} = 1$, it follows from our construction that $\sum_{k=1}^m \tilde{x}_{ik} \leq 1$, implying that $\tilde{x}_{ik} = 0$ for all $k \neq j$. Thus,

$$\frac{w_{ji}\tilde{x}_{ij}}{1 + \sum_{k=1}^m w_{ki}\tilde{x}_{ik}} = \frac{w_{ji}}{1 + w_{ji}} \geq \frac{\alpha}{1 + \alpha} = \frac{\alpha}{1 + \alpha} \cdot \tilde{x}_{ij},$$

where the inequality holds because $w_{ji} \geq \alpha$ according to the assumption in this section and the function $x \rightarrow \frac{x}{1+x}$ is increasing. This proves the inequality (16). Therefore, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^m \frac{w_{ji}\tilde{x}_{ij}}{1 + \sum_{k=1}^m w_{ki}\tilde{x}_{ik}} \frac{v_{ij}}{1 + \sum_{\ell=1}^n v_{\ell j}\tilde{x}_{\ell j}} \right] &\geq \frac{\alpha}{1 + \alpha} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^m \frac{v_{ij}\tilde{x}_{ij}}{1 + \sum_{\ell=1}^n v_{\ell j}\tilde{x}_{\ell j}} \right] = \frac{\alpha}{1 + \alpha} \cdot z_C \\ &\geq \frac{\alpha}{1 + \alpha} \cdot \text{OPT}_{(\text{FS})}, \end{aligned}$$

where the equality follows from Lemma 10, and the last inequality is derived from Lemma 8. This concludes our proof. □