

Goodness-of-fit and utility estimation: what's possible and what's not

Joshua Lanier and John K.-H. Quah

Abstract

A goodness-of-fit index measures the consistency of consumption data with a given model of utility-maximization. We show that for the class of well-behaved (i.e., continuous and increasing) utility functions there is no goodness-of-fit index that is continuous and *accurate*, where the latter means that a perfect score is obtained if and only if a dataset can be rationalized by a well-behaved utility function. While many standard goodness-of-fit indices are inaccurate we show that these indices are (in a sense we make precise) *essentially accurate*. Goodness-of-fit indices are typically generated by loss functions and we find that standard loss functions usually do not yield a best-fitting utility function when they are minimized. Nonetheless, welfare comparisons can be made by working out a *robust preference* relation from the data.

Keywords: revealed preferences, best-fitting utility functions, Afriat index, Varian index, Swaps index, Houtman-Maks index, welfare criterion

1 Introduction

The well-known theorem of Afriat (see Afriat (1967), Diewert (1973), and Varian (1982)) provides economists with a way to test whether a dataset consisting of purchasing decisions from a consumer is consistent with utility-maximization. This test, while easily implementable and widely applied, can be overly demanding. Indeed, researchers have found that both observational and experimental datasets often fail the test in its exact form. In other words, it is common for consumers or experimental subjects to fall short of exact utility-maximizing behavior. For this reason, researchers have developed various goodness-of-fit indices that measure the severity of a dataset's departure from utility-maximization. This paper provides a systematic examination of goodness-of-fit indices and their close relation, loss functions, and proposes a criterion for welfare comparisons based on loss functions.

Let D be a dataset consisting of a consumer's purchasing decisions. D consists of T observations where, at observation t , the consumer is observed to buy a bundle $\mathbf{q}^t \in \mathbb{R}_+^L$ of L goods at prices $\mathbf{p}^t \in \mathbb{R}_{++}^L$; thus, we may write D as $(\mathbf{q}^t, \mathbf{p}^t)_{1 \leq t \leq T}$. We say that D can be rationalized by, or is consistent with, the maximization of a well-behaved utility function $U : \mathbb{R}_+^L \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ (where *well-behaved* means that U is continuous and increasing) if the function U generates \mathbf{q}^t as demand at prices \mathbf{p}^t , for every observation t ; more formally, at each observation t , we have $U(\mathbf{q}^t) \geq U(\mathbf{q})$ for all bundles \mathbf{q} such that $\mathbf{p}^t \cdot \mathbf{q} \leq \mathbf{p}^t \cdot \mathbf{q}^t$. Afriat's Theorem states that a dataset D can be rationalized by a well-behaved utility function if and only if the dataset satisfies the generalized axiom of revealed preferences (GARP), where GARP is a condition on chosen bundles that excludes revealed preference cycles (see Section 2 for a precise statement).

A goodness-of-fit index measures the severity of a dataset's departure from exact utility-maximization. Such an index τ is a map from \mathcal{D} (the collection of all datasets with finitely many observations) to the non-negative numbers. Intuitively, a lower goodness-of-fit measurement (i.e. a lower value of $\tau(D)$) indicates that the dataset is closer to being perfectly consistent with well-behaved utility maximization whereas higher values indicate the opposite.

We focus on five popular goodness-of-fit indices in this paper. The Afriat index, from Afriat (1973), measures goodness-of-fit by measuring the fraction of the consumer's budget which is misspent. The Varian index, from Varian (1990), is similar in spirit to the Afriat index but provides a more nuanced measure of budgetary waste. The Swaps index, from Apesteguia and Ballester (2015), measures (using the Lebesgue measure) the portion of the budget set which is strictly preferred to the bundle actually purchased. The nonlinear Least Squares index measures the distance between the purchase data and the nearest GARP-satisfying dataset. The Houtman-Maks index, from Houtman and Maks (1985), reports the number of observations which must be discarded in order for the purchase data to satisfy GARP.

Accuracy and Continuity. It seems sensible to require the goodness-of-fit index τ to be a continuous function of the data¹ and also *accurate*, in the sense that the index outputs 0 if and only if D is consistent with the maximization of some well-behaved utility function. An index which is not continuous can give drastically different reports for nearly identical datasets whereas an index which is not accurate will sometimes give the wrong impression about whether the data can be explained by well-behaved utility-maximization.

¹We can think of $D = (\mathbf{q}^t, \mathbf{p}^t)_{t \leq T}$ as an element of \mathbb{R}^{2T} and so there is a natural way to define continuity for goodness-of-fit indices (see Definition 1).

The first result of this paper (Proposition 1) states that there are no goodness-of-fit indices that are continuous and accurate. Thus, all the goodness-of-fit indices used in the literature are either discontinuous or inaccurate. The reason for this is, in essence, that the datasets which obey GARP do not form a closed set. Indeed, one could construct examples where a sequence of datasets D_n obeying GARP has a limit D where GARP is violated (see Example 1 in the next section); accuracy demands $\tau(D_n) = 0$ for all n and $\tau(D) > 0$ but continuity requires $\tau(D) = \lim_n \tau(D_n) = 0$ and thus τ cannot be both accurate and continuous.

Among the commonly used indices, we show that the Afriat, Varian, Swaps, and Least Squares indices are continuous but not accurate while the Houtman-Maks index is accurate but discontinuous. That these goodness-of-fit indices have shortcomings is somewhat understood in the literature. Indeed, Andreoni and Miller (2002) and Murphy and Banerjee (2015) point out that the Afriat index is inaccurate and Halevy, Persitz, and Zrill (2018)² point out that the Varian index is inaccurate. Similarly, Fisman, Kariv, and Markovits (2007) (in appendix III) point out that the Houtman-Maks index has a continuity problem. What has been less understood is that the inaccuracy of the Afriat and Varian indices and the discontinuity of the Houtman-Maks index is not a defect of these particular goodness-of-fit indices but rather the outcome of an inevitable trade-off between accuracy and continuity.

Essential Accuracy. While the Afriat, Varian, Swaps and Least Squares indices are not accurate we do not consider this a serious shortcoming because we are able to show that all of them satisfy a weakened version of accuracy. We say that a goodness-of-fit measure τ is *essentially accurate* if (i) $\tau(D) = 0$ whenever D is consistent with well-behaved utility maximization and (ii) if $\tau(D) = 0$ then the purchased bundles in D can be perturbed by an arbitrarily small amount so that the perturbed data is consistent with well-behaved utility maximization.

Loss functions. A loss function $Q(U; D)$ assigns a non-negative number to each utility function U and purchase dataset D . Intuitively, $Q(U; D)$ reports how well the choices in D can be described as being the outcome of maximizing U . Loss functions can be used, as in Halevy et al. (2018), to estimate the utility function of the consumer by using $\operatorname{argmin}_U Q(U; D)$ as the estimator. That is, the estimator is a utility function which provides the best description of the data according to Q . There is a natural relationship between loss functions and goodness-of-fit indices: a loss function Q generates a

²See footnote 10 of their paper.

goodness-of-fit index via

$$\tau(D) = \inf_U Q(U; D)$$

where the infimum is taken over all well-behaved utility functions. It seems natural to want a loss function Q to (i) be *accurate* in the sense that it returns a perfect score of 0 if and only if D is rationalized by U ; (ii) be *concrete*, in the sense that $\operatorname{argmin}_U Q(U; D)$ is non-empty; and (iii) generate a continuous goodness-of-fit measure. Proposition 6 shows that there is no loss function satisfying these properties.

It turns out that each of the aforementioned indices is generated by an appropriately defined loss function (this point is made for the Afriat, Varian, and Houtman-Maks indices in Halevy et al. (2018)). We show that the Afriat, Varian, Swaps, and Least Squares loss functions are each accurate but not concrete. In fact, $\operatorname{argmin}_U Q(U; D)$ is (in a sense we make specific) generically empty for the aforementioned indices. The fact that these loss functions do not generically give a best-fitting (in other words, loss-minimizing) utility function leads to complications.

Robust Preference Relation. One of the main reasons for estimating the utility function of a consumer is to make welfare statements. Specifically, we might like to determine if a consumer with dataset D prefers bundle $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}$ to $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}'$. If the collection of best-fitting utility functions, i.e., the set $\operatorname{argmin}_U Q(U; D)$, is nonempty, then it is natural to reach this conclusion if every $U \in \operatorname{argmin}_U Q(U; D)$ ranks $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}$ above $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}'$. It is less obvious how one is to make statements of this type when a best-fitting utility function does not exist.

We think that there is a criterion that both makes sense and is empirically implementable. We say that the bundle $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}$ is *robustly preferred* to another bundle $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}'$ if there is a well-behaved utility function \tilde{U} so that $U(\tilde{\mathbf{q}}) \geq U(\tilde{\mathbf{q}}')$ for every well-behaved utility function U which provides a better fit than \tilde{U} in the sense that $Q(U; D) \leq Q(\tilde{U}; D)$. We show that this robust preference relation has basic properties we would expect of a good welfare measure: it is reflexive and transitive and is computationally feasible for the Afriat and Varian loss functions.

Other classes of utility functions. There are other classes of utility functions worth examining besides well-behaved utility functions. For example, it is worth asking if a dataset D can be rationalized by a homothetic utility function; in the case where consumption is over contingent commodities, it makes sense to ask if D can be rationalized by a utility function with the expected utility form. And if D cannot be rationalized by a utility function from a given class, we would be interested in measuring the size and nature of its departure from that class. In Proposition 10 we characterize those classes

of utility functions \mathcal{U} that admit accurate and concrete loss functions which generate accurate and continuous goodness-of-fit indices; in essence the characterizing condition is that the collection of datasets which admit a rationalization by a member of \mathcal{U} must form a closed set. We show that the class of homothetic utility functions and the class of utility functions with the expected utility form (with concave Bernoulli functions) satisfy this property.

Related literature. Apart from the goodness-of-fit indices we have already introduced, other examples include the money pump index of Echenique and Saito (2015) and the minimum cost index of Dean and Martin (2016). There appears to have been little in the way of a broad investigation of the properties of goodness-of-fit indices along the lines of this paper. In Apesteguia and Ballester (2015), the Swaps index is axiomatized in a finite choice space context; two of the axioms presented there are continuity and accuracy (which they refer to as “rationality”). While the finite choice set version of the Swaps index is accurate, it is inaccurate when the choice space is \mathbb{R}_+^L .³

Using the argmin of a loss function as an estimator is a standard procedure. Ordinary least squares, maximum likelihood, and the generalized method of moments are instances of this approach. In Apesteguia and Ballester (2015) the Swaps loss function is introduced as a means to estimate preferences (note that most of this paper assumes a finite choice space). Chambers, Echenique, and Lambert (2021) consider how to recover preferences from inconsistent binary choice data (i.e. agents are given pairs of alternatives and asked to select one of them). Their approach uses a version of the Kemeny distance (a way of measuring differences between preorders) as a loss function. Halevy et al. (2018) explores using the Afriat, Varian, Least Squares, and Houtman-Maks loss functions to estimate the utility function of a consumer when the utility function belongs to a parametric family. Using revealed preference conditions to make counterfactual predictions and welfare statements is explored in Varian (1982), Blundell, Browning, and Crawford (2003), Cherchye, Demuyne, and Rock (2019), and Adams (2020).

Organization of paper. Section 2 focuses on the properties of goodness-of-fit indices for well-behaved utility functions. The section provides our main impossibility result for goodness-of-fit indices and discusses the properties of the Afriat, Varian, Swaps, Least Squares, and Houtman-Maks indices. Section 3 focuses on loss functions. We state an impossibility result for loss functions and also show that the Afriat, Varian,

³Another approach to making sense of GARP violations is to test for consistency with the hypothesis of random utility maximization; examples in this literature include Kitamura and Stoye (2018) and Deb, Kitamura, Quah, and Stoye (2022). However, it makes sense to measure a consumer’s rationality even in this model. A natural idea is that a consumer is closer to well-behaved utility maximization than another if her utility functions are less stochastic (in some sense that needs to be formalized).

Swaps, and Least Squares loss functions are not concrete for the class of well-behaved utility functions. This section also develops the robust preference criterion for welfare analysis. Section 4 analyzes other classes of utility functions and characterizes those classes of utility functions (such as the class of homothetic utility functions) that admit accurate and concrete loss functions which generate accurate and continuous goodness-of-fit indices. Section 5 concludes. An appendix collects the proofs which do not appear in the body of the paper and provides a method for calculating the Afriat index exactly. An online appendix provides a characterization of the robust preference relation for the Varian loss function.

2 Goodness-of-fit indices for utility maximization

We depict consumptions bundles of L goods by a vector $\mathbf{q} = (q_1, q_2, \dots, q_L) \in \mathbb{R}_+^L$, where $q_\ell \geq 0$ is the amount of good ℓ consumed. A vector $\mathbf{p} = (p_1, p_2, \dots, p_L) \in \mathbb{R}_{++}^L$ is a price vector where $p_\ell > 0$ is the price of good ℓ . The analyst observes T purchasing decisions of a consumer and assembles these decisions into a *purchase dataset* $D = (\mathbf{q}^t, \mathbf{p}^t)_{t \leq T}$ where $\mathbf{q}^t \in \mathbb{R}_+^L \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$ is the bundle purchased by the consumer in period t when the prices of the L goods were $\mathbf{p}^t \in \mathbb{R}_{++}^L$. The purchase dataset D is *rationalized* by a utility function $U : \mathbb{R}_+^L \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ if U explains the data in the sense that $U(\mathbf{q}^t) \geq U(\mathbf{q})$ for all t and all $\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{R}_+^L$ such that $\mathbf{p}^t \cdot \mathbf{q} \leq \mathbf{p}^t \cdot \mathbf{q}^t$. A utility function which is increasing⁴ and continuous is said to be *well-behaved*; we denote the family of such utility functions by \mathcal{U}_{WB} . If a purchase dataset is rationalized by a well-behaved utility function then we say that the dataset is *rationalizable*.

A *goodness-of-fit index* is a function τ which maps purchase datasets into the non-negative numbers. Intuitively, a smaller value of $\tau(D)$ means that the behavior exhibited in the dataset is more in line with the model of utility maximization being tested. We identify some desirable properties of goodness-of-fit indices.

Definition 1. Let \mathcal{U} be some non-empty collection of utility functions and let τ be a goodness-of-fit index. We say τ is *accurate for \mathcal{U}* if we have $\tau(D) = 0$ if and only if D can be rationalized by some $U \in \mathcal{U}$. We say τ is *continuous* if, for all T , the expression $\tau((\mathbf{q}^t, \mathbf{p}^t)_{t \leq T})$ is continuous as a function of the data $(\mathbf{q}^t, \mathbf{p}^t)_{t \leq T}$.⁵

Accurate goodness-of-fit indices correctly report when a dataset is consistent with

⁴By increasing we mean $\mathbf{q} > \mathbf{q}'$ implies $U(\mathbf{q}) > U(\mathbf{q}')$.

⁵In other words, for each T the goodness-of-fit index τ is continuous when treated as a function which maps $((\mathbb{R}_+^L \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}) \times \mathbb{R}_{++}^L)^T$ into \mathbb{R}_+ . Note that a purchase dataset $D = (\mathbf{q}^t, \mathbf{p}^t)_{t \leq T}$ has, by definition, $\mathbf{q}^t \neq \mathbf{0}$ for each t which is why a continuous τ is thought of as a mapping from $((\mathbb{R}_+^L \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}) \times \mathbb{R}_{++}^L)^T$ into \mathbb{R}_+ instead of $(\mathbb{R}_+^L \times \mathbb{R}_{++}^L)^T$ into \mathbb{R}_+ .

the tested hypothesis and correctly report when a dataset is not consistent. Continuous goodness-of-fit indices do not report drastically different numbers for infinitesimal changes in the data. The following proposition provides an impossibility result.

Proposition 1. *There are no goodness-of-fit indices which are continuous and accurate for the family of well-behaved utility functions \mathcal{U}_{WB} .*

To explain the proposition we introduce some standard concepts from revealed preference theory. Let $D = (\mathbf{q}^t, \mathbf{p}^t)_{t \leq T}$ be a purchase dataset. If \mathbf{q} was affordable when \mathbf{q}^t was purchased (i.e. $\mathbf{p}^t \cdot \mathbf{q}^t \geq \mathbf{p}^t \cdot \mathbf{q}$) then write $\mathbf{q}^t R \mathbf{q}$; further, if \mathbf{q} was cheaper than \mathbf{q}^t when \mathbf{q}^t was purchased (i.e. $\mathbf{p}^t \cdot \mathbf{q}^t > \mathbf{p}^t \cdot \mathbf{q}$) then write $\mathbf{q}^t P \mathbf{q}$. We refer to R and P as the direct and strict direct revealed preference relations for D . The purchase dataset D satisfies the *generalized axiom of revealed preference* (GARP) if, for all t_1, t_2, \dots, t_K such that $\mathbf{q}^{t_1} R \mathbf{q}^{t_2} R \dots R \mathbf{q}^{t_K}$, it is not the case that $\mathbf{q}^{t_K} P \mathbf{q}^{t_1}$. The following result is due to Afriat (1967).

Theorem 1 (Afriat). *A purchase dataset $D = (\mathbf{q}^t, \mathbf{p}^t)_{t \leq T}$ can be rationalized by a well-behaved utility function if and only if D satisfies GARP.*

An immediate corollary of Afriat's Theorem and Proposition 1 is that there is no goodness of fit index τ which is (i) continuous and (ii) satisfies $\tau(D) = 0$ if and only if D satisfies GARP. We now explain the logic behind Proposition 1 and prove the proposition using an example.

Example 1. *For each n let $\mathbf{q}_n = (4 - \frac{1}{3n}, 4 + \frac{2}{3n})$ and $\mathbf{q} = \lim_n \mathbf{q}_n = (4, 4)$. Also, let $\mathbf{q}' = (2, 5)$, $\mathbf{p} = (2, 1)$, and $\mathbf{p}' = (1, 2)$. Assemble these objects into purchase datasets $D_n = ((\mathbf{q}_n, \mathbf{p}), (\mathbf{q}', \mathbf{p}'))$ and $D = ((\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{p}), (\mathbf{q}', \mathbf{p}'))$. The datasets D_1 and D are pictured in Figure 1. Note that $\mathbf{p} \cdot \mathbf{q} = \mathbf{p} \cdot \mathbf{q}_n = \mathbf{p}' \cdot \mathbf{q}' = 12$, $\mathbf{p} \cdot \mathbf{q}' = 9$, and $\mathbf{p}' \cdot \mathbf{q}_n = 12 + \frac{1}{n}$. Thus, $\mathbf{q}_n P \mathbf{q}'$ but $\mathbf{q}' \not R \mathbf{q}_n$ and so D_n satisfies GARP. But, $\mathbf{q} P \mathbf{q}'$ and $\mathbf{q}' R \mathbf{q}$ and so D does not satisfy GARP.*

For a contradiction suppose that τ is a goodness-of-fit index which is continuous and accurate for the family of well-behaved utility functions. As each D_n satisfies GARP we have $\tau(D_n) = 0$ for each n . As D does not satisfy GARP we have $\tau(D) > 0$. But $\mathbf{q}_n \rightarrow \mathbf{q}$ and because τ is continuous we must have $\tau(D) = \lim_n \tau(D_n) = 0$ which is a contradiction.

Remark 1. The example only uses 2 goods. If $L > 2$ then a similar example can be constructed by setting consumption to 0 for goods 3,4,5, etc and with this observation Proposition 1 is proved.

Remark 2. The datasets D_n not only satisfy GARP but they also satisfy the strong axiom of revealed preferences (SARP).⁶ Matzkin and Richter (1991) show that a dataset satisfies SARP if and only if it can be rationalized by a continuous, increasing, and strictly concave utility function. Thus, the example also shows that there are no goodness-of-fit indices which are continuous and accurate for the collection of continuous, increasing, and strictly concave utility functions.

Remark 3. One may hope to salvage the situation by weakening the notion of continuity so that $\tau((\mathbf{q}^t, \mathbf{p}^t)_{t \leq T})$ is only continuous in consumption bundles but not necessarily in prices. This weakened notion of continuity might be justified because τ is designed to evaluate the choices of the consumer and not the prices which are external to the decision of the consumer. Example 1 shows that accuracy and this weakened notion of continuity are still incompatible. To see this, simply note that all of the prices in the example are the same across the datasets D_n and D .




Figure 1: The dataset on the left, referred to as D_1 in Example 1, satisfies GARP. The sequence $\mathbf{q}_n = (4 - \frac{1}{3n}, 4 + \frac{2}{3n})$ tends to the location where the two budget lines cross (i.e. where the arrow is pointing in the figure to the left). The dataset which contains this limiting bundle, depicted on the right, does not satisfy GARP.

2.1 Loss Functions and Goodness-of-fit Indices

In this section we survey five popular goodness-of-fit indices: the Afriat index (from Afriat (1973)); the Varian index (from Varian (1990)); the Swaps index (from Apestegua

⁶A dataset satisfies SARP if, for all t_1, t_2, \dots, t_K we have $\mathbf{q}^{t_1} R \mathbf{q}^{t_2} R \dots R \mathbf{q}^{t_K} R \mathbf{q}^{t_1}$ implies $\mathbf{q}^{t_1} = \mathbf{q}^{t_2} = \dots = \mathbf{q}^{t_K}$.

and Ballester (2015)); the Houtman-Maks index (from Houtman and Maks (1985)); and the non-linear least squares (LS) index. From Proposition 1 we know that these indices cannot be both continuous and accurate for well-behaved utility functions. In Proposition 2 below we show that the Afriat, Varian, Swaps, and LS indices are inaccurate while the Houtman-Maks index is discontinuous. To proceed we first define the concept of a loss function and show how a loss function generates a goodness-of-fit index; each of the popular indices we just listed is generated by some loss function.

A *loss function*, denoted $Q(U; D)$, maps utility functions and purchase datasets to the non-negative real numbers. Intuitively, lower values of $Q(U; D)$ indicate that U provides a better description of the data. Let \mathcal{U} be some collection of utility functions. The loss function Q *generates* a goodness-of-fit index for \mathcal{U} via

$$\tau(D) = \inf_{U \in \mathcal{U}} Q(U; D). \quad (1)$$

The Afriat Index. A purchase dataset $D = (\mathbf{q}^t, \mathbf{p}^t)_{t \leq T}$ is e -rationalized (for some $e \in [0, 1]$) by utility function U if, for all t , we have $U(\mathbf{q}^t) \geq U(\mathbf{q})$ for all $\mathbf{q} \in B(\mathbf{p}^t, e\mathbf{p}^t \cdot \mathbf{q}^t)$, where

$$B(\mathbf{p}, m) = \{\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{R}_+^L : \mathbf{p} \cdot \mathbf{q} \leq m\}$$

is the linear budget set arising from price \mathbf{p} and expenditure level $m \in \mathbb{R}_+$.

The *Afriat loss function* is

$$A(U; D) = 1 - \sup \left\{ e \in [0, 1] : D \text{ is } e\text{-rationalized by } U \right\}$$

The *Afriat index* for \mathcal{U} is $A(D) = \inf_{U \in \mathcal{U}} A(U; D)$.

What does it mean for a purchase dataset to be e -rationalized? It means that in each period t the consumer never gains less utility than what she could have received by perfectly optimizing with only $e\mathbf{p}^t \cdot \mathbf{q}^t$ in money to spend. So higher levels of e indicate that the consumer is being less wasteful. The Afriat index assigns to each dataset the minimal (infimum) level of waste needed to e -rationalize the data.

The Varian Index. A purchase dataset $D = (\mathbf{q}^t, \mathbf{p}^t)_{t \leq T}$ is \mathbf{e} -rationalized (for $\mathbf{e} = (e_1, e_2, \dots, e_T) \in [0, 1]^T$) by utility function U if, for all t , we have $U(\mathbf{q}^t) \geq U(\mathbf{q})$ for all $\mathbf{q} \in B(\mathbf{p}^t, e_t \mathbf{p}^t \cdot \mathbf{q}^t)$. Let $f : [0, 1]^T \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ be a continuous and decreasing function⁷ which satisfies $f(e_1, e_2, \dots, e_T) = 0$ if and only if $e_1 = e_2 = \dots = e_T = 1$. The *Varian*

⁷ f is decreasing if $\mathbf{e} > \mathbf{e}'$ implies $f(\mathbf{e}) < f(\mathbf{e}')$.

loss function is

$$V(U; D) = \inf \left\{ f(\mathbf{e}) : D \text{ is } \mathbf{e}\text{-rationalized by } U \right\}$$

The *Varian index* for \mathcal{U} is $V(D) = \inf_{U \in \mathcal{U}} V(U; D)$.⁸

The concept of an $\mathbf{e} = (e_1, e_2, \dots, e_T)$ -rationalization has similar logic as the Afriat index's e -rationalization. Intuitively, the number e_t represents the level of efficiency exhibited by the consumer in period t . The function f serves to aggregate the period specific efficiency numbers into one number representing the aggregate level of waste exhibited by the consumer.

Notice that if we choose $f(\cdot) = 1 - \min(\cdot)$ then the Varian index becomes the Afriat index; however, this function f is only weakly decreasing rather than decreasing, and thus the Afriat index is *not* a special case of the Varian index as we have defined it. The requirement that f is decreasing is needed for Proposition 7 and Proposition 13 (in the online appendix) to hold.

The Swaps Index. Let μ be the Lebesgue measure. The *Swaps loss function* is

$$S(U; D) = \sum_{t=1}^T \mu \left\{ \mathbf{q} \in B(\mathbf{p}^t, \mathbf{p}^t \cdot \mathbf{q}^t) : U(\mathbf{q}) > U(\mathbf{q}^t) \right\}$$

The *Swaps index* for \mathcal{U} is $S(D) = \inf_{U \in \mathcal{U}} S(U; D)$.

For each t , the Swaps loss function measures (using the Lebesgue measure) the affordable part of the strict upper contour set of \mathbf{q}^t and then adds up these measures across t . As each bundle in this upper contour set is a bundle that should have been chosen over \mathbf{q}^t the size of this set represents the degree of mis-optimization exhibited by the consumer.

Non-Linear Least Squares. For each purchase dataset $D = (\mathbf{q}^t, \mathbf{p}^t)_{t \leq T}$ and each $t \leq T$ let \mathbf{W}_D^t be an $L \times L$ positive definite matrix whose entries are continuous as a function of the data D . The *non-linear least squares (LS) loss function* for dataset $D = (\mathbf{q}^t, \mathbf{p}^t)_{t \leq T}$ is

$$\text{LS}(U; D) = \inf \left\{ \sum_{t=1}^T (\mathbf{q}^t - \tilde{\mathbf{q}}^t)' \mathbf{W}_D^t (\mathbf{q}^t - \tilde{\mathbf{q}}^t) : (\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^t, \mathbf{p}^t)_{t \leq T} \text{ is rationalized by } U \right. \\ \left. \text{and } \tilde{\mathbf{q}}^t \in B(\mathbf{p}^t, \mathbf{p}^t \cdot \mathbf{q}^t) \right\}$$

⁸Of course the values taken by the Varian index depend on one's choice of f . All the results we establish hold independent of the f used and so we consider the Varian index for a fixed f .

The *LS index* for \mathcal{U} is $LS(D) = \inf_{U \in \mathcal{U}} LS(U; D)$.

$LS(U; D)$ reports the distance (where distance is measured using the weighting matrix \mathbf{W}_D^t) between the purchase dataset D and the collection of datasets which are rationalized by the utility function U and which have the same budget sets observed in D . Of course, if the dataset is rationalized by U then this distance is 0. Note that our definition of the LS loss function includes the case where distance is measured in terms of budget shares. To see this, let \mathbf{W}_D^t be the diagonal matrix with $(p_\ell^t)^2 / (\mathbf{p}^t \cdot \mathbf{q}^t)^2$ on diagonal ℓ . Now, $(\mathbf{q}^t - \tilde{\mathbf{q}}^t)' \mathbf{W}_D^t (\mathbf{q}^t - \tilde{\mathbf{q}}^t)$ measures the distance between the budget share vector for $(\mathbf{q}^t, \mathbf{p}^t)$ and the budget share vector for $(\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^t, \mathbf{p}^t)$.

The Houtman-Maks Index. The *Houtman-Maks loss function* is

$$H(U; D) ((\mathbf{q}^t, \mathbf{p}^t)_{t \leq T}) = \inf \{ |\mathcal{T}| \subseteq \{1, 2, \dots, T\} : (\mathbf{q}^t, \mathbf{p}^t)_{t \notin \mathcal{T}} \text{ is rationalized by } U \}$$

where, by convention, the empty set is rationalized by every U . The Houtman-Maks index for \mathcal{U} is $H(D) = \inf_{U \in \mathcal{U}} H(U; D)$. The Houtman-Maks loss function reports the number of observations which must be thrown out in order for the purchase data to be rationalized by the utility function.

From Proposition 1 we know that the aforementioned indices cannot be both continuous and accurate for the well-behaved utility functions. The following proposition provides the details.

Proposition 2. *The Afriat, Varian, Swaps, and LS indices are continuous but inaccurate for \mathcal{U}_{WB} . The Houtman-Maks index is accurate for \mathcal{U}_{WB} but discontinuous.*

To give an illustration of Proposition 2 we introduce a well-known result on the Afriat index. Let $D = (\mathbf{q}^t, \mathbf{p}^t)_{t \leq T}$ be a purchase dataset and let $e \in [0, 1]$. Let $\mathbf{q}^t R_e \mathbf{q}$ mean $e\mathbf{p}^t \cdot \mathbf{q}^t \geq \mathbf{p}^t \cdot \mathbf{q}$ and let $\mathbf{q}^t P_e \mathbf{q}$ mean $e\mathbf{p}^t \cdot \mathbf{q}^t > \mathbf{p}^t \cdot \mathbf{q}$. We refer to R_e and P_e as the e direct and strict direct revealed preference relations for D . We say that D satisfies e -GARP if, for all t_1, t_2, \dots, t_K

$$\mathbf{q}^{t_1} R_e \mathbf{q}^{t_2} R_e \dots R_e \mathbf{q}^{t_K} \implies \mathbf{q}^{t_K} \not P_e \mathbf{q}^{t_1}$$

Recall that A is the Afriat index. The following is a consequence of Theorem 1 in Halevy et al. (2018).

Proposition 3. *For any purchase dataset D*

$$A(D) = 1 - \sup \{ e \in [0, 1] : D \text{ satisfies } e\text{-GARP} \} \quad (2)$$

A similar result could be stated for the Varian index but this proposition suffices for our purposes. We now return to Example 1 to elaborate on Proposition 2.

Example 1 (continued). Let $D = ((\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q}), (\mathbf{p}', \mathbf{q}'))$ be the dataset introduced in Example 1 and pictured in Figure 1b. Clearly, $\mathbf{q}' \not\prec_e \mathbf{q}$ for all $e < 1$ and consequentially D satisfies e -GARP for all $e < 1$. From Proposition 3 we see that $A(D) = 0$. So, D does not satisfy GARP and yet $A(D) = 0$ and so A is inaccurate. On the other hand, it is easy to see that $H(D) = 1$ and so the Houtman-Maks index does not assign D the inaccurate value of 0. But, note that $H(D_n) = 0$ for all n where D_n is the dataset defined in Example 1 (dataset D_1 is depicted in Figure 1a). Thus, $H(D_n) \rightarrow 0 \neq H(D)$ and so H is not continuous as $D_n \rightarrow D$.

2.2 Essential Accuracy

Proposition 2 shows that the Afriat, Varian, Swaps and LS indices are all inaccurate for well-behaved utility functions. We shall show that this inaccuracy is very mild.

Definition 2. A goodness-of-fit index τ is *essentially accurate* for a class of utility function \mathcal{U} if (a) $\tau(D) = 0$ when D can be rationalized by a utility function in \mathcal{U} and (b) for any purchase dataset $D = (\mathbf{q}^t, \mathbf{p}^t)_{t \leq T}$ for which $\tau(D) = 0$ and for each $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists bundles $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^1, \tilde{\mathbf{q}}^2, \dots, \tilde{\mathbf{q}}^T$ so that (i) $\tilde{D} = (\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^t, \mathbf{p}^t)_{t \leq T}$ can be rationalized by an element of \mathcal{U} , (ii) $\|\mathbf{q}^t - \tilde{\mathbf{q}}^t\| < \varepsilon$ for all t , and (iii) $\mathbf{p}^t \cdot \mathbf{q}^t = \mathbf{p}^t \cdot \tilde{\mathbf{q}}^t$ for all t .

Essential accuracy requires that (a) τ gives the “correct” value when D can be rationalized and (b) if $\tau(D) = 0$ then, for any $\varepsilon > 0$ we can perturb the bundles in D by no more than ε and the resulting dataset \tilde{D} can be rationalized and all the bundles in \tilde{D} lie on the same budget planes as in the original dataset.

Proposition 4. *The Afriat, Varian, Swaps, and LS indices are essentially accurate for \mathcal{U}_{WB} .*

This result tells us that while it may be true that the aforementioned indices are inaccurate, this inaccuracy is very modest. Note that the proposition is basically true by definition for the LS index; for the other indices, it requires a fairly delicate proof. To explain the result further we return to Example 1.

Example 1 (continued). Let $D = ((\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q}), (\mathbf{p}', \mathbf{q}'))$ be the dataset introduced in Example 1 and pictured in Figure 1b. As noted D does not satisfy GARP and further, as noted in the discussion following Proposition 2, we have $A(D) = 0$ where A is the Afriat index. Proposition 4 guarantees that we can perturb the bundles in D by an arbitrarily

small amount to restore GARP. Indeed, moving \mathbf{q} slightly north-west along its budget line produces a dataset which satisfies GARP. Note that the existence of the desired perturbations in Proposition 4 is obvious for two observation datasets. The difficulty in establishing Proposition 4 is in showing that the desired perturbations exist no matter how many observations are present in the data. The proof of the proposition uses an induction argument on the number of observations.

3 Loss functions to estimate utility

The following definition gives two desirable properties for a loss function.

Definition 3. Let \mathcal{U} be a collection of utility functions and let Q be a loss function. We say that Q is *accurate* for \mathcal{U} if, for each $U \in \mathcal{U}$ we have $Q(U; D) = 0$ if and only if D is rationalized by U . We say Q is *concrete* for \mathcal{U} if, for all datasets D , the set

$$\operatorname{argmin}_{U \in \mathcal{U}} Q(U; D)$$

is nonempty.

Accuracy says that the loss function attains a perfect score of 0 if and only if the data is perfectly explained by the utility function. Concreteness requires that best-fitting utility functions exist. This is a desirable property to have since, if $\operatorname{argmin}_{U \in \mathcal{U}} Q(U; D)$ is nonempty, then it is natural to consider its elements as estimators of the consumer's utility function. The following result relates the properties of a loss function just introduced with the accuracy of its associated index.

Proposition 5. Let \mathcal{U} be a collection of utility functions, let Q be a loss function, and let τ be defined by (1). If Q is accurate and concrete for \mathcal{U} then τ is accurate for \mathcal{U} .

Proof. Suppose Q is accurate and concrete. Suppose D is rationalized by some $U \in \mathcal{U}$. Then, $Q(U, D) = 0$ and thus $\tau(D) = 0$. On the other hand, suppose D is not rationalized by any $U \in \mathcal{U}$. As the infimum in (1) is attained there exists some $U \in \mathcal{U}$ so that $Q(U; D) = \tau(D)$. As U does not rationalize D we have $0 < Q(U; D) = \tau(D)$ and so τ is accurate. \square

An immediate consequence of Proposition 5 is the following impossibility result on loss functions.

Proposition 6. There does not exist a loss function which is accurate and concrete for \mathcal{U}_{WB} and which generates a continuous goodness-of-fit index via (1).

Proof. By Proposition 5, a loss function which is accurate and concrete for some \mathcal{U} generates an accurate goodness-of-fit index via (1). However Proposition 1 tells us that an accurate and continuous goodness-of-fit index does not exist for \mathcal{U}_{WB} . \square

Remark 4. From Remark 2 it is clear that the negative result of Proposition 6 also holds for the family of continuous, increasing, and strictly concave utility functions.

3.1 Popular Loss Functions

From Propositions 2 and 6 we know that the Afriat, Varian, Swaps, and LS loss functions cannot be accurate and concrete for well-behaved utility functions. The next result gives the precise ways in which each loss function falls short.

Proposition 7. *The Afriat, Varian, Swaps, and LS loss functions are accurate but not concrete for \mathcal{U}_{WB} . More specifically, the following holds.*

1. *Let Q be either the Varian, Swaps, or LS loss function. If D does not satisfy GARP then $\operatorname{argmin}_{U \in \mathcal{U}_{WB}} Q(U; D)$ is empty.*
2. *Let $T \in \mathbb{N}$ and let \mathcal{D} be the collection of T observation purchase datasets which do not satisfy GARP. We regard \mathcal{D} as a subset of $((\mathbb{R}_+^L \setminus \mathbf{0}) \times \mathbb{R}_{++}^L)^T$. For the Afriat loss function A , the set*

$$\{D \in \mathcal{D} : \operatorname{argmin}_{U \in \mathcal{U}_{WB}} A(U; D) \neq \emptyset\}$$

is rare, i.e., its closure has an empty interior in \mathcal{D} .

Proposition 7 asserts that the Afriat, Varian, Swaps, and LS loss functions are accurate for the family of well-behaved utility functions. Here we explain why the Afriat loss function is accurate. Similar explanations apply to the other loss functions mentioned in Proposition 7. From the definition of the Afriat loss function it is obvious that if U rationalizes D then $A(U; D) = 0$. So, suppose that some well-behaved U does not rationalize D . This means there exists some t and some $\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{R}_+^L$ so that \mathbf{q} provides more utility (according to U) than \mathbf{q}^t even though \mathbf{q} costs weakly less money than \mathbf{q}^t (i.e. $U(\mathbf{q}) > U(\mathbf{q}^t)$ and $\mathbf{p}^t \cdot \mathbf{q}^t \geq \mathbf{p}^t \cdot \mathbf{q}$). Now, as U is continuous there must exist some $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}$ which also provides more utility than \mathbf{q}^t and which costs strictly less money than \mathbf{q}^t . Clearly, $A(D) \geq 1 - \mathbf{p}^t \cdot \tilde{\mathbf{q}} / \mathbf{p}^t \cdot \mathbf{q}^t > 0$ and so we see that A is accurate.

The rest of the proof of Proposition 7 is less straightforward and is found in the appendix. In particular, the proof that $\operatorname{argmin}_{U \in \mathcal{U}_{WB}} Q(U; D)$ is empty when Q is the Varian or Swaps loss functions makes use of Theorem 2 in Nishimura, Ok, and Quah (2017) (stated, for convenience, as Lemma 1 in the appendix). We use this result to

provide a formula for $\inf_{U \in \mathcal{U}_{WB}} Q(U; D)$; based on this formula we can prove that no well-behaved utility function \tilde{U} satisfies $Q(\tilde{U}; D) = \inf_U Q(U; D)$.

We return to Example 1 to illustrate the non-concreteness of the Afriat loss function. Similar explanations apply for the other loss functions.

Example 1 (continued). *Let $D = ((\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q}), (\mathbf{p}', \mathbf{q}'))$ be the dataset introduced in Example 1 and pictured in Figure 1b. In our discussion following Proposition 2 we noted that $A(D) = 0$. We now show that $A(U; D) > 0$ for all well-behaved U which establishes that A is not concrete. So, let U be well-behaved and consider two cases (a) $U(\mathbf{q}') \geq U(\mathbf{q})$ and (b) $U(\mathbf{q}) > U(\mathbf{q}')$. Under case (a) we have $A(U; D) \geq 1 - \mathbf{p} \cdot \mathbf{q}' / \mathbf{p} \cdot \mathbf{q} > 0$ and so $A(D) \neq A(U; D)$. Under case (b) because U is well-behaved there exists some bundle $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}$ so that $\mathbf{q} > \tilde{\mathbf{q}}$ and $U(\tilde{\mathbf{q}}) \geq U(\mathbf{q}')$. Consequentially, $A(U; D) \geq 1 - \mathbf{p}' \cdot \tilde{\mathbf{q}} / \mathbf{p}' \cdot \mathbf{q}' > 0$ and so again $A(D) \neq A(U; D)$. Therefore, A is not concrete.*

Proposition 7 states that $\operatorname{argmin}_{U \in \mathcal{U}_{WB}} Q(U; D)$ does not typically exist for the Afriat, Varian, Swaps, or LS loss functions. This suggests that there could be complications to drawing conclusions about a consumer's preference, since we cannot simply rely on a best-fitting utility function. In the next subsection we propose a method for making welfare comparisons that works even when best-fitting utility functions do not exist.

3.2 Welfare when there are no best-fitting utility functions

Given a purchase dataset $D = (\mathbf{q}^t, \mathbf{p}^t)_{t \leq T}$ and two consumption bundles $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}'$ (not necessarily among the bundles observed in D), when could we conclude that the consumer prefers $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}$ to $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}'$? Suppose that D can be rationalized by some utility function in the family \mathcal{U} ; then a natural criterion for concluding that $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}$ is preferred to $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}'$ is to require $U(\tilde{\mathbf{q}}) \geq U(\tilde{\mathbf{q}}')$ for every utility function $U \in \mathcal{U}$ that rationalizes D .⁹ When D cannot be (exactly) rationalized by an element in \mathcal{U} , one could extend the criterion to require that $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}$ be preferred to $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}'$ for every best-fitting utility function (with respect to some loss function); however, as we have pointed out, best-fitting utility functions may be non-existent for a generic dataset. To overcome this difficulty we propose a criterion which requires that $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}$ be preferred to $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}'$ for all utility functions that are, in a sense, sufficiently close to minimizing the loss function. Formally, we propose the following binary relation for making welfare statements.

Definition 4. Let \mathcal{U} be a collection of utility functions, $D = (\mathbf{q}^t, \mathbf{p}^t)_{t \leq T}$ be some purchase dataset, and Q be a loss function. We say that bundle $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}$ is *Q -robustly preferred* to

⁹This is effectively the criterion proposed in Varian (1982), where \mathcal{U} is the family of well-behaved and concave utility functions.

$\tilde{\mathbf{q}}'$, and we write $\tilde{\mathbf{q}} \mathcal{R}_Q \tilde{\mathbf{q}}'$, if there exists a utility function $\tilde{U} \in \mathcal{U}$ so that $U(\tilde{\mathbf{q}}) \geq U(\tilde{\mathbf{q}}')$ for all $U \in \mathcal{U}$ satisfying $Q(U; D) \leq Q(\tilde{U}; D)$.

We refer to \mathcal{R}_Q as the *robust preference relation*.

In other words, $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}$ is Q -robustly preferred to $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}'$ if there exists some $\tilde{U} \in \mathcal{U}$ so that for any $U \in \mathcal{U}$ which provides a better fit (according to Q) than \tilde{U} it happens that U ranks $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}$ above $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}'$. Notice that in the event that $\text{argmin}_{U \in \mathcal{U}} Q(U; D)$ is non-empty and best-fitting utility functions exist, \tilde{U} can be chosen to be any best fitting utility function and we obtain the natural criterion that $\tilde{\mathbf{q}} \mathcal{R}_Q \tilde{\mathbf{q}}'$ if and only if $U(\tilde{\mathbf{q}}) \geq U(\tilde{\mathbf{q}}')$ for every best-fitting $U \in \mathcal{U}$.

The following result establishes that the robust preference relation is reflexive and transitive, which are desirable properties to have for a welfare criterion.

Proposition 8. *Let \mathcal{U} be a collection of utility functions, $D = (\mathbf{q}^t, \mathbf{p}^t)_{t \leq T}$ be some purchase dataset, and Q be a loss function. Then \mathcal{R}_Q is transitive and reflexive.*

Proof. It is obvious that \mathcal{R}_Q is reflexive. To see that it is transitive, suppose that $\mathbf{q} \mathcal{R}_Q \mathbf{q}'$ and $\mathbf{q}' \mathcal{R}_Q \mathbf{q}''$. This means there exists \tilde{U} and \tilde{U}' in \mathcal{U} so that $U(\mathbf{q}) \geq U(\mathbf{q}')$ for all $U \in \mathcal{U}$ satisfying $Q(U; D) \leq Q(\tilde{U}; D)$ and $U(\mathbf{q}') \geq U(\mathbf{q}'')$ for all $U \in \mathcal{U}$ satisfying $Q(U; D) \leq Q(\tilde{U}'; D)$. Let $\tilde{U}'' \in \mathcal{U}$ be any utility function which satisfies $Q(\tilde{U}''; D) \leq Q(\tilde{U}; D)$ and $Q(\tilde{U}''; D) \leq Q(\tilde{U}'; D)$ (in particular, we can let \tilde{U}'' be the best-fitting utility function in $\{\tilde{U}, \tilde{U}'\}$). Now, $U(\mathbf{q}) \geq U(\mathbf{q}') \geq U(\mathbf{q}'')$ for all U satisfying $Q(U; D) \leq Q(\tilde{U}''; D)$ and therefore $\mathbf{q} \mathcal{R}_Q \mathbf{q}''$ and so \mathcal{R}_Q is transitive. \square

We next show how to calculate the robust preference relation \mathcal{R}_Q for the class of well-behaved utility functions \mathcal{U}_{WB} and the Afriat loss function (so $Q = A$). First, we need some new definitions. For two binary relations \geq and \geq' on \mathbb{R}_+^L we write $\mathbf{q} (\geq \cup \geq') \mathbf{q}'$ to mean either $\mathbf{q} \geq \mathbf{q}'$ or $\mathbf{q} \geq' \mathbf{q}'$. Further, we write $\text{tran}(\geq)$ to denote the transitive closure of \geq . In other words, $\mathbf{q} \text{tran}(\geq) \mathbf{q}'$ means there exists some $\mathbf{q}_1, \mathbf{q}_2, \dots, \mathbf{q}_N$ so that $\mathbf{q} \geq \mathbf{q}_1 \geq \mathbf{q}_2 \geq \dots \geq \mathbf{q}_N \geq \mathbf{q}'$. In what follows recall that the e -direct and strict direct revealed preference relations, denoted R_e and P_e , were introduced in the discussion preceding Proposition 3.

Proposition 9. *Given a purchase dataset $D = (\mathbf{q}^t, \mathbf{p}^t)_{t \leq T}$, let \mathcal{R}_A be the robust preference relation for $\mathcal{U} = \mathcal{U}_{WB}$ and let*

$$e^* = \sup\{e \in [0, 1] : D \text{ satisfies } e\text{-GARP}\}.$$

- (a) *If D satisfies e^* -GARP then $\tilde{\mathbf{q}} \mathcal{R}_A \tilde{\mathbf{q}}'$ if and only if $\tilde{\mathbf{q}} \text{tran}(\geq \cup R_{e^*}) \tilde{\mathbf{q}}'$.*
- (b) *If D does not satisfy e^* -GARP then $\tilde{\mathbf{q}} \mathcal{R}_A \tilde{\mathbf{q}}'$ if and only if $\tilde{\mathbf{q}} \text{tran}(\geq \cup P_{e^*}) \tilde{\mathbf{q}}'$.*

Remark 5. Proposition 9 gives us a way of computing whether or not $\tilde{\mathbf{q}} \mathcal{R}_A \tilde{\mathbf{q}}'$. Indeed, provided we can calculate e^* , it is easy to determine, using standard algorithms for calculating the transitive closure of a graph (for instance Warshall's algorithm), whether or not $\tilde{\mathbf{q}} \text{ tran}(\geq \cup R_{e^*}) \tilde{\mathbf{q}}'$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{q}} \text{ tran}(\geq \cup P_{e^*}) \tilde{\mathbf{q}}'$ hold. The value e^* can be calculated exactly by searching over a finite (and relatively small, containing no more than T^2 elements) set of possible values. Details on calculating e^* are found in Section A.5 of the appendix.¹⁰

Remark 6. In the online appendix we provide an analogous result to Proposition 9 for calculating the robust preference relation in the case of the Varian loss function.

To give a demonstration of how \mathcal{R}_A works we return to Example 1.

Example 1 (continued). Let $D = ((\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q}), (\mathbf{p}', \mathbf{q}'))$ be the dataset introduced in Example 1 and pictured in Figure 1b. We have noted that $\mathbf{q}' \not\mathcal{R}_e \mathbf{q}$ for all $e < 1$ and therefore $1 = e^* = \sup\{e \in [0, 1] : D \text{ satisfies } e\text{-GARP}\}$. As D does not satisfy 1-GARP and as $\mathbf{q} P_1 \mathbf{q}'$ and $\mathbf{q}' \not\mathcal{P}_1 \mathbf{q}$ we may use Proposition 9 to conclude that $\mathbf{q} \mathcal{R}_A \mathbf{q}'$ and $\mathbf{q}' \not\mathcal{R}_A \mathbf{q}$.

4 Other collections of utility functions

So far in the paper we have mostly focused on well-behaved utility functions and we have shown that, for this class of utility functions, loss functions and their corresponding goodness-of-fit indices must necessarily be deficient in one aspect or another. The key reason behind this phenomenon is that *the collection of datasets which can be rationalized by well-behaved utility functions do not form a closed set*. This is clear from Example 1, where a sequence of rationalizable datasets has a limit which does not admit a rationalization.

There are some classes of utility functions \mathcal{U} where the datasets which admit rationalization by a member of \mathcal{U} do form a closed set; in these cases (and only in these cases), there is a continuous and accurate goodness-of-fit index generated by a concrete and accurate loss function. The next result states this precisely.

Proposition 10. Let \mathcal{U} be a non-empty collection of continuous utility functions and let $\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{U}}$ denote the collection of purchase datasets which can be rationalized by some $U \in \mathcal{U}$. The following are equivalent.

¹⁰It is common in empirical applications of Afriat's index for e^* to be calculated via a binary search over the entire interval $[0, 1]$, with e -GARP being checked at each value of e . This approach leads to an approximation of e^* rather than its exact value. In fact, as we show in the appendix, e^* can be calculated exactly.

1. For each T , the collection of T -observation purchase datasets $\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{U}}^T = \{(\mathbf{q}^t, \mathbf{p}^t)_{t \leq T} \in \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{U}}\}$ is closed when considered as a subset of $((\mathbb{R}_+^L \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}) \times \mathbb{R}_{++}^L)^T$.¹¹
2. There exists a goodness-of-fit index τ which is continuous and accurate for \mathcal{U} .
3. There exists a loss function Q which is accurate and concrete for \mathcal{U} and whose generated goodness-of-fit index (defined by (1)) is continuous and accurate for \mathcal{U} .

Proof. In what follows we treat purchase datasets with T observations as elements of $(\mathbb{R}^L \times \mathbb{R}^L)^T$ and thus, for datasets $D = (\mathbf{q}^t, \mathbf{p}^t)_{t \leq T}$ and $\tilde{D} = (\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^t, \tilde{\mathbf{p}}^t)_{t \leq T}$ we have

$$\|D - \tilde{D}\|^2 = \sum_{t=1}^T \|\mathbf{q}^t - \tilde{\mathbf{q}}^t\|^2 + \|\mathbf{p}^t - \tilde{\mathbf{p}}^t\|^2$$

where $\|\cdot\|$ denotes the usual Euclidean norm.

Clearly 3. implies 2. We shall show 2. implies 1. implies 3. So, suppose there exists a goodness-of-fit indices τ which is continuous and accurate for \mathcal{U} . Let D_n be a sequence in $\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{U}}^T$ which converges to a purchase dataset D . We have $\tau(D_n) \rightarrow \tau(D) = 0$ as τ is continuous and accurate and $D_n \in \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{U}}^T$. Now, as τ is accurate we have $D \in \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{U}}^T$ and so indeed $\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{U}}^T$ is closed.

Next, we show that item 1. implies 3. So, suppose $\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{U}}^T$ is closed. Let $\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{U}}^T$ be the collection of datasets which have T observations and which are rationalized by U . Let

$$Q(U; D) = \inf\{\|D - \tilde{D}\| : \tilde{D} \in \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{U}}^T\}.$$

As U is continuous we see that $\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{U}}^T$ is closed (in particular, the demand correspondence generated by U is upper hemicontinuous and thus has a closed graph) and thus $Q(U; D) = 0$ if and only if D is rationalized by U and so $Q(U; D)$ is accurate for \mathcal{U} . Let τ be defined by $\tau(D) = \inf_{U \in \mathcal{U}} Q(U; D)$. Note that $\tau(D)$ just reports the Euclidean distance between D and the closed set $\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{U}}^T$. It follows that τ is continuous and further $\tau(D) = \|D - \tilde{D}\|$ for some $\tilde{D} \in \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{U}}^T$. From the definition of $\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{U}}^T$ there exists a utility function $\tilde{U} \in \mathcal{U}$ so that \tilde{D} is rationalized by U and so $\tau(D) = Q(\tilde{U}; D)$. Thus, we see that Q is concrete. Now, as Q is accurate and concrete Proposition 5 guarantees that τ is accurate. \square

Remark 7. The proof that statement 1 implies statement 3 in Proposition 10 is constructive. Specifically, let $Q(U; D)$ report the Euclidean distance between D and the collection of T observation datasets which are rationalized by U . In the proof of Proposition 10 we show that if the collection $\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{U}}^T$ is closed then the loss function $Q(U; D)$ is

¹¹More specifically, we mean that $\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{U}}^T$ is closed in the relative topology of $((\mathbb{R}_+^L \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}) \times \mathbb{R}_{++}^L)^T$.

accurate and concrete for \mathcal{U} and generates a goodness-of-fit indices for \mathcal{U} via (1) which is continuous and accurate for \mathcal{U} .

We can use Proposition 10 to show that certain classes of utility functions possess loss functions which are concrete and accurate, and generate goodness-of-fit indices via (1) which are continuous and accurate. We identify three such classes below.

Objective Concave EU. Let $\pi = (\pi_1, \pi_2, \dots, \pi_L) \in (0, 1]^L$ be a fixed probability vector (i.e. $\sum_{\ell=1}^L \pi_\ell = 1$). A utility function $U : \mathbb{R}_+^L \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is an objective concave expected utility (OCEU) function if $U(\mathbf{q}) = \sum_{\ell=1}^L \pi_\ell u(\mathbf{q}_\ell)$ where $u : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is continuous, concave, and increasing.

Given a dataset $D = (\mathbf{q}^t, \mathbf{p}^t)_{t \leq T}$ a finite sequence of pairs $(q_{\ell_i}^{t_i}, q_{\tilde{\ell}_i}^{\tilde{t}_i})_{i \leq I}$ is called an *objective test sequence* if (i) $q_{\ell_i}^{t_i} > q_{\tilde{\ell}_i}^{\tilde{t}_i}$ for all $i \leq I$ and (ii) each observation index t appears the same number of times as t_i as it appears as \tilde{t}_i . It is known that a dataset D can be rationalized by an objective concave expected utility function if and only if, for any objective test sequence $(q_{\ell_i}^{t_i}, q_{\tilde{\ell}_i}^{\tilde{t}_i})_{i \leq I}$

$$\prod_{i=1}^I \frac{\pi_{\tilde{\ell}_i} p_{\ell_i}^{t_i}}{\pi_{\ell_i} p_{\tilde{\ell}_i}^{\tilde{t}_i}} \leq 1 \quad (3)$$

(see Kubler, Selden, and Wei (2014) and Echenique, Imai, and Saito (2023)).

Subjective Concave EU. This is similar to the objective expected utility case but the probability vector is not given. So, a utility function $U : \mathbb{R}_+^L \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a subjective concave expected utility (SCEU) function if $U(\mathbf{q}) = \sum_{\ell=1}^L \pi_\ell u(q_\ell)$ where $\pi = (\pi_1, \dots, \pi_L) \in (0, 1]^L$ is a probability vector (i.e. $\sum_{\ell=1}^L \pi_\ell = 1$) and $u : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is continuous, concave, and increasing.

Given a dataset $D = (\mathbf{q}^t, \mathbf{p}^t)_{t \leq T}$, a finite sequence of pairs $(q_{\ell_i}^{t_i}, q_{\tilde{\ell}_i}^{\tilde{t}_i})_{i \leq I}$ is called a *subjective test sequence* if (i) $(q_{\ell_i}^{t_i}, q_{\tilde{\ell}_i}^{\tilde{t}_i})_{i \leq I}$ is an objective test sequence and (ii) each ℓ appears the same number of times as ℓ_i as it appears as $\tilde{\ell}_i$. Echenique and Saito (2015) show that D can be rationalized by a subjective concave expected utility function if and only if, for any subjective test sequence $(q_{\ell_i}^{t_i}, q_{\tilde{\ell}_i}^{\tilde{t}_i})_{i \leq I}$

$$\prod_{i=1}^I \frac{p_{\ell_i}^{t_i}}{p_{\tilde{\ell}_i}^{\tilde{t}_i}} \leq 1 \quad (4)$$

Homothetic Utility. A utility function $U : \mathbb{R}_+^L \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is homothetic if it satisfies $U(\mathbf{q}) \geq U(\mathbf{q}')$ if and only if $U(k\mathbf{q}) \geq U(k\mathbf{q}')$ for all $\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{q}' \in \mathbb{R}_+^L$ and all $k > 0$. It is shown

in Varian (1983) that D can be rationalized by a continuous, increasing, and homothetic utility function if and only if, for all sequences t_1, t_2, \dots, t_K with $t_1 = t_K$

$$\prod_{k=1}^{K-1} \frac{\mathbf{p}^{t_k} \cdot \mathbf{q}^{t_{k+1}}}{\mathbf{p}^{t_k} \cdot \mathbf{q}^{t_k}} \geq 1 \quad (5)$$

Proposition 11. *For the class of OCEU, SCEU, or homothetic utility functions, there exists a concrete and accurate loss function which generates an accurate and continuous goodness-of-fit index.*

Proof. Note that the conditions in (3), (4), and (5) involve weak inequalities and continuous functions of the purchase data and are thus preserved under limits. Also, note that a sequence of pairs $(q_{\ell_i}^{t_i}, q_{\tilde{\ell}_i}^{\tilde{t}_i})_{i \leq I}$ which is not an objective (subjective) test sequence will have a limit which is also not an objective (subjective) test sequence. These observations imply that the set in item 1 of Proposition 10 is closed for these families of utility functions and, therefore, Proposition 10 establishes the result. \square

5 Conclusion

We have shown in this paper that, for the class of well-behaved utility functions, there are no continuous and accurate goodness-of-fit indices, nor are there any concrete and accurate loss functions which generate continuous goodness-of-fit indices. The Afriat, Varian, Swaps, and LS loss functions are accurate but not concrete; their corresponding indices are continuous and essentially accurate but not accurate. We introduced the robust preference relation \mathcal{R}_Q and argued that it is suitable for making welfare statements even when the loss function is not concrete and so the set of best-fitting utility functions, i.e., the $\operatorname{argmin}_{U \in \mathcal{U}} Q(U; D)$ is empty. This relation can be easily calculated for the class of well-behaved utility functions when Q is the Afriat loss function. Lastly, we characterized those classes of utility functions which (unlike the class of well-behaved utility functions) do admit continuous and accurate goodness-of-fit indices.

A Appendix

The appendix is organized as follows. In Section A.1 we present a theorem from Nishimura et al. (2017). This result is used to prove Lemmas 2 and 3 below. Section A.2 presents Lemma 2 which is used to prove many of the propositions in the paper. Section A.3 proves Propositions 2, 4, and 7. Section A.4 proves Proposition 9

which provides a characterization of the relation \mathcal{R}_A (the robust preference relation for the Afriat loss function).

A.1 Nishimura, Ok, and Quah's Theorem 2

Here we present a version of Theorem 2 in Nishimura et al. (2017). A *choice dataset* is a finite collection of pairs $D = (\mathbf{q}^t, B^t)_{t \leq T}$ where $\mathbf{q}^t \in B^t$ and $B^t \subseteq \mathbb{R}_+^L$ is a compact set. We say that D is *rationalized* by U if, for all t , we have $U(\mathbf{q}^t) \geq U(\mathbf{q})$ for all $\mathbf{q} \in B^t$. We write $\mathbf{q}^t R \mathbf{q}^s$ if there exist some $\tilde{\mathbf{q}} \in B^t$ so that $\tilde{\mathbf{q}} \geq \mathbf{q}^s$ and $\mathbf{q}^t P \mathbf{q}^s$ if there exists $\tilde{\mathbf{q}} \in B^t$ so that $\tilde{\mathbf{q}} > \mathbf{q}^s$. We refer to R and P as the direct and strict direct revealed preference relations for D . We say that D satisfies *cyclical consistency* if, for all t_1, t_2, \dots, t_K we have $\mathbf{q}^{t_1} R \mathbf{q}^{t_2} R \dots R \mathbf{q}^{t_K}$ implies not $\mathbf{q}^{t_K} P \mathbf{q}^{t_1}$. The following is a version of Theorem 2 in Nishimura et al. (2017).

Lemma 1 (NOQ, 2017). *The choice dataset $D = (\mathbf{q}^t, B^t)_{t \leq T}$ is rationalized by a well-behaved utility function if and only if it satisfies cyclical consistency.*

A.2 Lemma 2

Recall that A , V , and S are the Afriat, Varian, and Swaps loss functions, respectively. Also, recall that f is the function in the definition of the Varian loss function and μ is the Lebesgue measure.

Lemma 2. *Let $D = (\mathbf{q}^t, \mathbf{p}^t)_{t \leq T}$ be a purchase dataset and let $\mathcal{Q} = \{\mathbf{q}^t\}_{t \leq T}$. Let \mathcal{P}_D be the collection of all transitive and complete binary relations \geq on \mathcal{Q} which satisfy $\mathbf{q}^t \geq (>) \mathbf{q}^s$ implies $\mathbf{q}^t \geq (>) \mathbf{q}^s$.¹² For $\geq \in \mathcal{P}_D$ let $\mathbf{e}^\geq = (e_1^\geq, e_2^\geq, \dots, e_T^\geq)$ be defined by*

$$e_t^\geq = \min_{s \in \{s' : \mathbf{q}^{s'} \geq \mathbf{q}^t\}} \frac{\mathbf{p}^t \cdot \mathbf{q}^s}{\mathbf{p}^t \cdot \mathbf{q}^t}$$

Let $A(\geq; D) = \min_t e_t^\geq$, $V(\geq; D) = f(\mathbf{e}^\geq)$, and $S(\geq; D) = \sum_{t=1}^T \mu(\{\mathbf{q} \in B(\mathbf{p}^t, \mathbf{p}^t \cdot \mathbf{q}^t) : \exists s \text{ s.t. } \mathbf{q} \geq \mathbf{q}^s \geq \mathbf{q}^t\})$. Then, for any $Q \in \{A, V, S\}$,

$$\inf_{U \in \mathcal{U}_{WB}} Q(U; D) = \inf_{\geq \in \mathcal{P}_D} Q(\geq; D) \tag{6}$$

Proof. Let $Q \in \{A, V, S\}$ and let τ be defined by (1). It is obvious that $\inf_{U \in \mathcal{U}_{WB}} Q(U; D) \geq \inf_{\geq \in \mathcal{P}_D} Q(\geq; D)$ and so, to complete the proof, we must show that $\inf_{\geq \in \mathcal{P}_D} Q(\geq; D) \geq \inf_{U \in \mathcal{U}_{WB}} Q(U; D)$.

¹²As usual $\mathbf{q}^t > \mathbf{q}^s$ means $\mathbf{q}^t \geq \mathbf{q}^s$ and $\mathbf{q}^s \not\geq \mathbf{q}^t$.

As \mathcal{P}_D contains only finitely many elements the infimum in (6) is attained by some \geq^* $\in \mathcal{P}_D$. For each $\varepsilon > 0$ and each t let $B_\varepsilon^t = \{\mathbf{q} \in B(\mathbf{p}^t, \mathbf{p}^t \cdot \mathbf{q}^t) : \forall s \in \{1, 2, \dots, T\} \text{ s.t. } \mathbf{q}^t \geq^* \mathbf{q}^s \text{ we have } \mathbf{q} \not\geq (1-\varepsilon)\mathbf{q}^s\} \cup \{\mathbf{q}^t\}$. Let $D_\varepsilon = (\mathbf{q}^t, B_\varepsilon^t)_{t \leq T}$. It is easy to see that D_ε satisfies cyclical consistency and so, by Theorem 2 in Nishimura et al. (2017) (Lemma 1 above), there exists a well-behaved U_ε which rationalizes D_ε . It is easy to see (if Q is Swaps then use the continuity-from-below property of measures) that $Q(U_\varepsilon; D) \rightarrow Q(\geq^*; D)$ as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ and so $\inf_{U \in \mathcal{U}_{WB}} Q(U; D) \leq \inf_{\geq \in \mathcal{P}_D} Q(\geq; D)$ and the proof is complete. \square

A.3 Propositions

Proof of Proposition 2. Houtman Maks is obviously accurate from its definition. The continuity of the Afriat, Varian, and Swaps indices follows from Lemma 2. Let $\mathcal{D} \subseteq ((\mathbb{R}_+^L \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}) \times \mathbb{R}_{++})^T$ be the collection of all T observation datasets which satisfy GARP and let $\bar{\mathcal{D}}$ denote the topological closure of \mathcal{D} . For two T observation datasets $D = (\mathbf{q}^t, \mathbf{p}^t)_{t \leq T}$ and $\tilde{D} = (\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^t, \tilde{\mathbf{p}}^t)_{t \leq T}$ let $d(D, \tilde{D}) = \sum_{t=1}^T (\mathbf{q}^t - \tilde{\mathbf{q}}^t)' \mathbf{W}_D^t (\mathbf{q}^t - \tilde{\mathbf{q}}^t)$ where \mathbf{W}_D^t is the matrix which appears in the definition of the LS loss function. Let $\Gamma((\mathbf{q}^t, \mathbf{p}^t)_{t \leq T}) = \{(\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^t, \tilde{\mathbf{p}}^t)_{t \leq T} \in \bar{\mathcal{D}} : \tilde{\mathbf{q}}^t \in B(\mathbf{p}^t, \mathbf{p}^t \cdot \mathbf{q}^t) \text{ for all } t\}$. Note that $\text{LS}(D) = \inf_{\tilde{D} \in \Gamma(D)} d(D, \tilde{D})$. Now, the continuity of LS follows from the Berge Maximum Theorem.

The negative results for the indices now follow from Proposition 1. \square

Proof of Proposition 4. In what follows, recall that A , V , S , and LS refers to the Afriat, Varian, Swaps, and LS indices, respectively. From Lemma 2 we see that $A(D) = 0 \iff V(D) = 0 \iff S(D) = 0$. Also, it is obvious that $\text{LS}(D) = 0$ implies $A(D) = 0$ and so it suffices to prove the result for the Afriat index.

So we have to show that whenever $A(D) = 0$ we can, for any $\varepsilon > 0$, perturb the bundles so that the perturbed purchase dataset is rationalizable. Clearly this perturbation is possible for purchase datasets with one observation (indeed one observation datasets are always rationalizable and so the dataset need not be perturbed at all). So we assume that such perturbations are possible for all purchase datasets with T observations and will show that it is also possible for purchase datasets with $T + 1$ observations.

Let D be a purchase dataset with $T + 1$ observations which has $A(D) = 0$. From Proposition 3 we see that D satisfies e -GARP for any $e < 1$. This means that for any sequence t_1, t_2, \dots, t_K with $t_1 = t_K$ there exists $k < K$ so that $\mathbf{q}^{t_k} \not\geq \mathbf{q}^{t_{k+1}}$. Thus, there must exist an observation s such that $\mathbf{q}^s \not\geq \mathbf{q}^t$ for all t because if no such observation existed then we could find a sequence t_1, t_2, \dots, t_K with $t_1 = t_K$ which satisfied $\mathbf{q}^{t_k} \geq \mathbf{q}^{t_{k+1}}$ for all $k < K$.

So, remove the observation $(\mathbf{q}^s, \mathbf{p}^s)$ from the set of $T + 1$ observations. The remaining collection D' has T observations and, by our induction assumption, there is a perturbed

dataset $\tilde{D}' = \{(\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^t, \mathbf{p}^t)\}_{t \leq T}$ that is rationalizable and so there is a well-behaved utility function $U : \mathbb{R}_+^L \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ which rationalizes \tilde{D}' .

Let $\hat{\mathbf{q}}^s$ be a bundle on $B(\mathbf{p}^s, \mathbf{p}^s \cdot \mathbf{q}^s)$ that maximizes utility function U . We claim that the dataset formed by appending $(\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^s, \mathbf{p}^s)$ to \tilde{D}' is still rationalizable, where $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^s = \alpha \mathbf{q}^s + (1 - \alpha) \hat{\mathbf{q}}^s$ for some $\alpha \in (0, 1)$.

Suppose not. Then $(\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^s, \mathbf{p}^s)$ must be part of a GARP-violating cycle. Then there is another observation r such that $\mathbf{p}^r \cdot \tilde{\mathbf{q}}^r \geq \mathbf{p}^r \cdot \tilde{\mathbf{q}}^s$. Since $\mathbf{p}^r \cdot \tilde{\mathbf{q}}^r \leq \mathbf{p}^r \cdot \mathbf{q}^s$ by our choice of observation s , we have $\mathbf{p}^r \cdot \tilde{\mathbf{q}}^r \geq \mathbf{p}^r \cdot \hat{\mathbf{q}}^s$. But this means that if we replace $(\mathbf{p}^s, \tilde{\mathbf{q}}^s)$ with $(\mathbf{p}^s, \hat{\mathbf{q}}^s)$, there will still be a GARP-violating cycle. But that's impossible since \tilde{D}' with observation $(\mathbf{p}^s, \hat{\mathbf{q}}^s)$ appended can be rationalized by U . By choosing α arbitrarily close to 1 we find the desired perturbed dataset. \square

Proof of Proposition 7. In what follows, recall that A , V , S , and LS refers to the Afriat, Varian, Swaps, and LS loss functions and indices, respectively. We first prove that the loss functions are accurate and then we prove the empty argmin results.

Accuracy of loss functions. Let $Q \in \{A, V, S, \text{LS}\}$. If D is rationalized by $U \in \mathcal{U}_{WB}$ then it is easy to see that $Q(U; D) = 0$. On the other hand, suppose D is not rationalized by $U \in \mathcal{U}_{WB}$. As U does not rationalize D there exist some observation t and bundle $\tilde{\mathbf{q}} \in \mathbb{R}_+^L$ so that $U(\tilde{\mathbf{q}}) > U(\mathbf{q}^t)$ and $\mathbf{p}^t \cdot \mathbf{q}^t \geq \mathbf{p}^t \cdot \tilde{\mathbf{q}}$. As U is continuous there exists $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}'$ so that $U(\tilde{\mathbf{q}}') > U(\mathbf{q}^t)$ and $\mathbf{p}^t \cdot \mathbf{q}^t > \mathbf{p}^t \cdot \tilde{\mathbf{q}}'$. It is now easy to show that $Q(U; D) > 0$ using the existence of $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}'$.

Varian and Swaps empty argmin. Let $D = (\mathbf{q}^t, \mathbf{p}^t)_{t \leq T}$ be a purchase dataset which does not satisfy GARP and let $\mathcal{Q} = \{\mathbf{q}^t\}_{t \leq T}$. Let $Q \in \{V, S\}$. Define $Q(\geq; D)$ as in Lemma 2. For a contradiction suppose there exists $U^* \in \argmin_{U \in \mathcal{U}_{WB}} Q(U; D)$. Let \geq^* be the binary relation on \mathcal{Q} generated by U^* in the sense that $\mathbf{q}^t \geq^* \mathbf{q}^s$ iff $U^*(\mathbf{q}^t) \geq U^*(\mathbf{q}^s)$. From Lemma 2 it is clear that $Q(U^*; D) = Q(\geq^*; D)$. We write $\mathbf{q}^t P^* \mathbf{q}^s$ if either (i) $\mathbf{q}^t R \mathbf{q}^s$ and $U^*(\mathbf{q}^s) > U^*(\mathbf{q}^t)$ or (ii) $\mathbf{q}^t P \mathbf{q}^s$ and $U^*(\mathbf{q}^s) = U^*(\mathbf{q}^t)$. As D does not satisfy GARP there must be some \tilde{t} and \tilde{s} so that $\mathbf{q}^{\tilde{t}} P^* \mathbf{q}^{\tilde{s}}$. Without loss of generality we assume that \tilde{s} satisfies $\mathbf{q}^{\tilde{t}} P^* \mathbf{q}^r$ for all \mathbf{q}^r satisfying $\mathbf{q}^{\tilde{s}} > \mathbf{q}^r$ (if \tilde{s} does not satisfy this property for some r then just redefine \tilde{s} to be r and repeat this process until \tilde{s} satisfies the desired property). Now, if case (i) in the definition of P^* holds (i.e. $\mathbf{q}^{\tilde{t}} R \mathbf{q}^{\tilde{s}}$ and $U^*(\mathbf{q}^{\tilde{s}}) > U^*(\mathbf{q}^{\tilde{t}})$) then it is easy to see (as U^* is continuous) that $Q(U^*; D) > Q(\geq^*; D)$ which is a contradiction. We infer that case (ii) must hold and so $\mathbf{q}^{\tilde{t}} P \mathbf{q}^{\tilde{s}}$ and $U^*(\mathbf{q}^{\tilde{s}}) = U^*(\mathbf{q}^{\tilde{t}})$. Now, let \geq^{**} be any linear order on \mathcal{Q} which satisfies (i) $\mathbf{q}^t \geq^{**} \mathbf{q}^s$ implies $\mathbf{q}^t \geq^* \mathbf{q}^s$ and (ii) $\mathbf{q}^{\tilde{t}} \geq^{**} \mathbf{q}^{\tilde{s}}$. Consider two cases; (a) $Q = V$ and (b) $Q = S$. Under case (a) let \mathbf{e}^{\geq} be defined as in Lemma 2 and note that $e_t^{\geq^{**}} \geq e_t^{\geq^*}$ for all t and $e_t^{\geq^{**}} > e_t^{\geq^*}$. Therefore, as f is decreasing, we have $V(\geq^*; D) > V(\geq^{**}; D)$

which contradicts equation (6) in Lemma 2. We conclude that $\operatorname{argmin}_{U \in \mathcal{U}_{WB}} V(U; D)$ is empty. Under case (b) let $h_t(\geq) = \mu\{\mathbf{q} \in B(\mathbf{p}^t, \mathbf{p}^t \cdot \mathbf{q}^t) : \mathbf{q} \geq \mathbf{q}^s \geq \mathbf{q}^t\}$. Clearly, $h_t(\geq^*) \geq h_t(\geq^{**})$ for all t and $h_{\tilde{t}}(\geq^*) > h_{\tilde{t}}(\geq^{**})$ and thus, $S(\geq^*; D) > S(\geq^{**}; D)$ which contradicts equation (6) in Lemma 2. We conclude that $\operatorname{argmin}_{U \in \mathcal{U}_{WB}} S(U; D)$ is empty.

LS empty argmin. Let $D = (\mathbf{q}^t, \mathbf{p}^t)_{t \leq T}$ be a purchase dataset which does not satisfy GARP and let $\mathcal{Q} = \{\mathbf{q}^t\}_{t \leq T}$. Let $\mathcal{D} = \{(\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^t, \mathbf{p}^t)_{t \leq T} : \mathbf{p}^t \cdot \tilde{\mathbf{q}}^t = \mathbf{p}^t \cdot \mathbf{q}^t, \forall t\}$ (i.e. \mathcal{D} is the collection of all T observation purchase datasets with the same budget sets as in D). For any two datasets $\tilde{D} = (\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^t, \mathbf{p}^t)_{t \leq T}$ and $\hat{D} = (\hat{\mathbf{q}}^t, \mathbf{p}^t)_{t \leq T}$ in \mathcal{D} we let $\alpha \tilde{D} + (1 - \alpha) \hat{D} = (\alpha \tilde{\mathbf{q}}^t + (1 - \alpha) \hat{\mathbf{q}}^t, \mathbf{p}^t)_{t \leq T}$ for all $\alpha \in [0, 1]$ and we let $d(\tilde{D}, \hat{D}) = \sum_{t=1}^T (\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^t - \hat{\mathbf{q}}^t)' \mathbf{W}_D^t (\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^t - \hat{\mathbf{q}}^t)$. Now, for a contradiction suppose that $U^* \in \operatorname{argmin}_{U \in \mathcal{U}_{WB}} \text{LS}(U; D)$. As U^* is continuous (and thus, the subset of \mathcal{D} which is rationalized by U^* is closed) there exists some purchase dataset $\tilde{D} = (\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^t, \mathbf{p}^t)_{t \leq T}$ which is rationalized by U^* which satisfies $d(D, \tilde{D}) = \text{LS}(U^*; D)$. Let R and P be the revealed preference relations for D and let \tilde{R} and \tilde{P} be the revealed preference relations for \tilde{D} . Note that $d(D, \tilde{D}) > 0$ as D does not satisfy GARP and that $\alpha D + (1 - \alpha) \tilde{D}$ does not satisfy GARP for every $\alpha \in (0, 1]$ and therefore there must exist some \tilde{t} and \tilde{s} so that $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{\tilde{t}} \tilde{R} \tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{\tilde{s}}$ and $\mathbf{q}^{\tilde{t}} P \mathbf{q}^{\tilde{s}}$ (that is, a revealed preference relation which is strict in D is weak in \tilde{D}). For all $\alpha \in [0, 1]$ define \mathbf{q}_α^t so that (i) $\mathbf{q}_\alpha^t = \alpha \mathbf{q}^t + (1 - \alpha) \tilde{\mathbf{q}}^t$ if $t = \tilde{s}$ and (ii) $\mathbf{q}_\alpha^t = \tilde{\mathbf{q}}^t$ if $t \neq \tilde{s}$. Let $D_\alpha = (\mathbf{q}_\alpha^t, \mathbf{p}^t)_{t \leq T}$. Let R_α and P_α be the revealed preference relations for D_α . Let $\alpha > 0$ be small enough so that $\mathbf{q}_\alpha^t R_\alpha \mathbf{q}_\alpha^{\tilde{s}}$ implies $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^t \tilde{R} \tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{\tilde{s}}$. It is easy to see that D_α satisfies e -GARP for all $e < 1$ and thus, by Proposition 3, we have $A(D_\alpha) = 0$. As the Afriat index is weakly accurate (Proposition 4) this means $\inf_{U \in \mathcal{U}_{WB}} \text{LS}(U; D_\alpha) = 0$ and, as $d(D, D_\alpha) < d(D, \tilde{D})$ we attain a contradiction and so $\operatorname{argmin}_{U \in \mathcal{U}_{WB}} \text{LS}(U; D)$ is empty.

Afriat generic empty argmin. Let \mathcal{D} be the collection of all T observation purchase datasets which do not satisfy GARP. Let $\mathcal{D}' \subseteq \mathcal{D}$ be the collection of all T observation purchase dataset $D = (\mathbf{q}^t, \mathbf{p}^t)_{t \leq T}$ which (i) do not satisfy GARP and (ii) satisfy $\mathbf{p}^t \cdot \mathbf{q}^s / (\mathbf{p}^t \cdot \mathbf{q}^t) \neq \mathbf{p}^s \cdot \mathbf{q}^r / (\mathbf{p}^s \cdot \mathbf{q}^s)$ for all t, s, r such that $t \neq s$ and $s \neq r$ (note $t = r$ is allowed). It is easy to see that (a) $\operatorname{argmin}_{U \in \mathcal{U}_{WB}} A(U; D)$ is empty for all $D \in \mathcal{D}'$ (use Proposition 3 for this), (b) \mathcal{D}' is open, and (c) \mathcal{D}' is dense in \mathcal{D} . It follows that the datasets $D \in \mathcal{D}$ for which $\operatorname{argmin}_{U \in \mathcal{U}_{WB}} A(U; D)$ is non-empty is rare. \square

A.4 Afriat Welfare Proposition Proof

For convenience let $a(U; D) = \sup\{e \in [0, 1] : D \text{ is } e\text{-rationalized by } U\}$. Of course, $A(U; D) = 1 - a(U; D)$. Further, from the definition of \mathcal{R}_A we have $\tilde{\mathbf{q}} \mathcal{R}_A \tilde{\mathbf{q}}'$ if and only if there exists a well-behaved \tilde{U} so that $U(\tilde{\mathbf{q}}) \geq U(\tilde{\mathbf{q}}')$ for all well-behaved utility functions U satisfying $a(U; D) \geq a(\tilde{U}; D)$.

Lemma 3. Let $e \in [0, 1]$ and let $D = (\mathbf{q}^t, \mathbf{p}^t)_{t \leq T}$ be a purchase dataset which satisfies e -GARP. Let R_e be the e -direct revealed preference relation for D . For each t let $B_e^t = \{\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{R}_+^L : e\mathbf{p}^t \cdot \mathbf{q}^t \geq \mathbf{p}^t \cdot \mathbf{q}\} \cup \{\mathbf{q}^t\}$ and let \tilde{D}_e be the choice dataset $\tilde{D}_e = (\mathbf{q}^t, B_e^t)$ with direct revealed preference relation \tilde{R}_e . The data \tilde{D}_e satisfies cyclical consistency and $\text{tran}(\geq \cup R_e) = \text{tran}(\geq \cup \tilde{R}_e)$.

Proof. Let P_e be the e strict direct revealed preference relation for D and let \tilde{P}_e be the strict direct revealed preference relation for \tilde{D}_e . Suppose \tilde{D}_e does not satisfy cyclical consistency. This means there exists t_1, t_2, \dots, t_K so that $\mathbf{q}^{t_1} \tilde{R}_e \mathbf{q}^{t_2} \tilde{R}_e \dots \tilde{R}_e \mathbf{q}^{t_K}$ and $\mathbf{q}^{t_K} \tilde{P}_e \mathbf{q}^{t_1}$. Note that if $\mathbf{q}^{t_k} \geq \mathbf{q}^{t_{k+1}}$ for some k then $\mathbf{q}^{t_{k-1}} \tilde{R}_e \mathbf{q}^{t_{k+1}}$ and so without loss of generality we may assume that $\mathbf{q}^{t_k} \not\geq \mathbf{q}^{t_{k+1}}$ for all k . But this implies $\mathbf{q}^{t_1} R_e \mathbf{q}^{t_2} R_e \dots R_e \mathbf{q}^{t_K}$ and $\mathbf{q}^{t_K} P_e \mathbf{q}^{t_1}$ and so D does not satisfy e -GARP. We conclude that if D satisfies e -GARP then \tilde{D}_e satisfies cyclical consistency. The equality $\text{tran}(\geq \cup R_e) = \text{tran}(\geq \cup \tilde{R}_e)$ follows from the fact that $\tilde{R}_e = (\geq \cup R_e)$. \square

Lemma 4. Let $e \in [0, 1]$ and let $D = (\mathbf{q}^t, \mathbf{p}^t)_{t \leq T}$ be a purchase dataset. There exists a well-behaved utility function U which satisfies $a(U; D) \geq e$ if and only if D satisfies e -GARP.

Proof. Suppose U is a well-behaved utility function which satisfies $a(U; D) \geq e$. From the definition of $a(U; D)$ we see that $U(\mathbf{q}^t) \geq U(\mathbf{q})$ for all $\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{R}_+^L$ satisfying $e\mathbf{p}^t \cdot \mathbf{q}^t \geq \mathbf{p}^t \cdot \mathbf{q}$ and therefore $\mathbf{q}^t R_e (P_e) \mathbf{q}$ implies $U(\mathbf{q}^t) \geq (>) U(\mathbf{q})$. From this it is clear that D satisfies e -GARP.

For the “if” part of the proof let \tilde{D}_e denote the choice dataset in Lemma 3. As \tilde{D}_e satisfies cyclical consistency (we know this from Lemma 3) we may use the NOQ Theorem (Lemma 1) to see that there exists a well-behaved utility function U which rationalizes \tilde{D}_e . This utility function satisfies $U(\mathbf{q}^t) \geq U(\mathbf{q})$ for all $\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{R}_+^L$ satisfying $e\mathbf{p}^t \cdot \mathbf{q}^t \geq \mathbf{p}^t \cdot \mathbf{q}$ and therefore $a(U; D) \geq e$. \square

Lemma 5. Let $e \in [0, 1]$ and let $D = (\mathbf{q}^t, \mathbf{p}^t)_{t \leq T}$ be a purchase dataset which satisfies e -GARP. For any two bundles $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}'$ we have $\tilde{\mathbf{q}} \text{ tran}(\geq \cup R_e) \tilde{\mathbf{q}}'$ if and only if $U(\tilde{\mathbf{q}}) \geq U(\tilde{\mathbf{q}}')$ for all well-behaved U satisfying $a(U; D) \geq e$.

Proof. Note that if U is a well-behaved utility function satisfying $a(U; D) \geq e$ then clearly $\mathbf{q}^t R_e \mathbf{q}$ implies $U(\mathbf{q}^t) \geq U(\mathbf{q})$ and so the “only if” part of the proof is straightforward. So, suppose that it is not the case that $\tilde{\mathbf{q}} \text{ tran}(\geq \cup R_e) \tilde{\mathbf{q}}'$. Let \tilde{D}_e be the choice dataset defined in Lemma 3 and let \tilde{R}_e be the direct revealed preference relation for \tilde{D}_e . From Lemma 3 we see that it is not the case that $\tilde{\mathbf{q}} \text{ tran}(\geq \cup \tilde{R}_e) \tilde{\mathbf{q}}'$. For each $\varepsilon > 0$ let \tilde{D}_e^ε be the $T + 1$ observation choice dataset formed by appending the

observation $(\tilde{\mathbf{q}}', \tilde{\mathbf{q}} + (\varepsilon, \varepsilon, \dots, \varepsilon))$ to \tilde{D}_e . Let \tilde{R}_e^ε and \tilde{P}_e^ε be the direct and strict direct revealed preference relations for \tilde{D}_e^ε . By selecting $\varepsilon > 0$ sufficiently small we may ensure that for all t we have $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}' \tilde{R}_e^\varepsilon \mathbf{q}^t$ implies either $\tilde{\mathbf{q}} \geq \mathbf{q}^t$ or $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}' \geq \mathbf{q}^t$. We claim that \tilde{D}_e^ε satisfies cyclical consistency. For a contradiction suppose there is a t_1, t_2, \dots, t_K satisfying $\mathbf{q}^{t_1} \tilde{R}_e^\varepsilon \mathbf{q}^{t_2} \tilde{R}_e^\varepsilon \dots \tilde{R}_e^\varepsilon \mathbf{q}^{t_K}$ and $\mathbf{q}^{t_K} \tilde{P}_e^\varepsilon \mathbf{q}^{t_1}$. As \tilde{D}_e satisfies cyclical consistency there must be some k so that $\mathbf{q}^{t_k} = \tilde{\mathbf{q}}'$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{q}} \geq \mathbf{q}^{t_{k+1}}$. From this it is clear that $\tilde{\mathbf{q}} \text{ tran}(\geq \cup \tilde{R}_e) \tilde{\mathbf{q}}'$ but we have already shown that this is not the case and so we have arrived at a contradiction. We conclude that \tilde{D}_e^ε satisfies cyclical consistency and so by the NOQ Theorem (Lemma 1) there exists a well-behaved utility function \tilde{U} which rationalizes \tilde{D}_e^ε . Clearly $\tilde{U}(\tilde{\mathbf{q}}') > \tilde{U}(\tilde{\mathbf{q}})$ and $\tilde{U}(\mathbf{q}^t) \geq \tilde{U}(\mathbf{q})$ for all $\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{R}_+^L$ satisfying $e\mathbf{p}^t \cdot \mathbf{q}^t \geq \mathbf{p}^t \cdot \mathbf{q}$ and so $a(U; D) \geq e$. Thus, we see it is not the case that $U(\tilde{\mathbf{q}}) \geq U(\tilde{\mathbf{q}}')$ for all well-behaved U satisfying $a(U; D) \geq e$ and the proof is complete. \square

Proof of Proposition 9. Suppose D satisfies e^* -GARP. From Lemma 4 there exists a well-behaved \tilde{U} satisfying $a(U; D) = e^*$. From Lemma 5 we see that $\tilde{\mathbf{q}} \text{ tran}(\geq \cup R_{e^*}) \tilde{\mathbf{q}}'$ if and only if $U(\tilde{\mathbf{q}}) \geq U(\tilde{\mathbf{q}}')$ for all well-behaved U satisfying $A(U; D) \leq A(\tilde{U}; D)$ and so indeed we have $\tilde{\mathbf{q}} \text{ tran}(\geq \cup R_{e^*}) \tilde{\mathbf{q}}'$ if and only if $\tilde{\mathbf{q}} \mathcal{R}_A \tilde{\mathbf{q}}'$. Next, let us suppose that D does not satisfy e^* -GARP.

Suppose that $\tilde{\mathbf{q}} \text{ tran}(\geq \cup P_{e^*}) \tilde{\mathbf{q}}'$. Let $\tilde{e} < e^*$ be some number chosen large enough so that $\tilde{\mathbf{q}} \text{ tran}(\geq \cup R_{\tilde{e}}) \tilde{\mathbf{q}}'$. As D satisfies \tilde{e} -GARP Lemma 4 shows that there exists a well-behaved \tilde{U} satisfying $a(\tilde{U}; D) \geq \tilde{e}$. Lemma 5 shows that for any well-behaved utility function U satisfying $a(U; D) \geq a(\tilde{U}; D)$ we have $U(\tilde{\mathbf{q}}) \geq U(\tilde{\mathbf{q}}')$ and so indeed $\tilde{\mathbf{q}} \mathcal{R}_A \tilde{\mathbf{q}}'$.

Next, suppose that it is not the case that $\tilde{\mathbf{q}} \text{ tran}(\geq \cup P_{e^*}) \tilde{\mathbf{q}}'$, let \tilde{U} be any well-behaved utility function, and let $\tilde{e} = a(\tilde{U}; D)$. Because D does not satisfy e^* -GARP Lemma 4 shows that $e^* > \tilde{e}$. Because it is not the case that $\tilde{\mathbf{q}} \text{ tran}(\geq \cup P_{e^*}) \tilde{\mathbf{q}}'$ it is also not the case that $\tilde{\mathbf{q}} \text{ tran}(\geq \cup R_{\tilde{e}}) \tilde{\mathbf{q}}'$ and therefore Lemma 5 guarantees that there exists a well-behaved U so that $a(U; D) \geq \tilde{e}$ and $U(\tilde{\mathbf{q}}') > U(\tilde{\mathbf{q}})$. As \tilde{U} was taken to be any well-behaved utility function we see that indeed $\tilde{\mathbf{q}} \mathcal{R}_A \tilde{\mathbf{q}}'$ as required. \square

A.5 Calculating e^*

In Proposition 9 we defined e^* as

$$e^* = \sup\{e \in [0, 1] : D \text{ satisfies } e\text{-GARP}\}$$

As noted, it is common in empirical applications to calculate an approximation of e^* by performing a binary search over the interval $[0, 1]$. Here we show how e^* can be

calculated exactly.

Recall that $\mathbf{q}^t P_e \mathbf{q}^s$ means $e\mathbf{p}^t \cdot \mathbf{q}^t > \mathbf{p}^t \cdot \mathbf{q}^s$. We say that D is e -acyclic if, for all t_1, t_2, \dots, t_K , it is not the case that $\mathbf{q}^{t_1} P_e \mathbf{q}^{t_2} P_e \mathbf{q}^{t_3} P_e \dots P_e \mathbf{q}^{t_K} P_e \mathbf{q}^{t_1}$. Define a set $G \subseteq [0, 1]$ by

$$G = \left\{ \frac{\mathbf{p}^t \cdot \mathbf{q}^s}{\mathbf{p}^t \cdot \mathbf{q}^t} \in [0, 1] : t, s \in \{1, 2, \dots, T\} \right\}$$

Clearly, G has no more than T^2 elements. Note that a dataset D which satisfies e -GARP is e -acyclic but the reverse implication need not hold. However, the next result shows that the largest value of $e \in G$ at which D is e -acyclic coincides with e^* .

Proposition 12. *For any purchase dataset $D = (\mathbf{q}^t, \mathbf{p}^t)_{t \leq T}$ we have*

$$e^* = \max\{e \in G : D \text{ is } e\text{-acyclic}\} \quad (7)$$

Proof. Let $\tilde{e} = \max\{e \in G : D \text{ is } e\text{-acyclic}\}$ and let $\tilde{e}' = \sup\{e \in [0, 1] : D \text{ is } e\text{-acyclic}\}$. We first show that $\tilde{e} = \tilde{e}'$. To this end, let us enumerate the elements of G as $e_1 > e_2 > \dots > e_N$ and let $e_{N+1} = 0$. Let $\mathcal{M} = \{(e_{k+1}, e_k] \subseteq [0, 1] : k \in \{1, 2, \dots, N\}\}$. From the definition of P_e we see that, for any $M \in \mathcal{M}$, we have $P_e = P_{e'}$ for all $e, e' \in M$. It follows that the supremum in the definition of \tilde{e}' is obtained at some point in G and thus $\tilde{e} = \tilde{e}'$.

As every dataset which satisfies e -GARP is e -acyclic we see that $e^* \leq \tilde{e}'$ and as we have just seen that $\tilde{e} = \tilde{e}'$ we conclude that $e^* \leq \tilde{e}$. So, to complete the proof we show that $e^* \geq \tilde{e}$.

Clearly if D satisfies \tilde{e} -GARP then $e^* \geq \tilde{e}$ so let us suppose that D does not satisfy \tilde{e} -GARP. Thus, there must be some t_1, t_2, \dots, t_K so that $\mathbf{q}^{t_1} P_{\tilde{e}} \mathbf{q}^{t_2} P_{\tilde{e}} \mathbf{q}^{t_3} P_{\tilde{e}} \dots P_{\tilde{e}} \mathbf{q}^{t_K}, \mathbf{q}^{t_K} R_{\tilde{e}} \mathbf{q}^{t_1}$. As D is \tilde{e} -acyclic it must be that $\mathbf{q}^{t_K} \not P_{\tilde{e}} \mathbf{q}^{t_1}$ or, in other words, $\tilde{e}\mathbf{p}^{t_K} \cdot \mathbf{q}^{t_K} = \mathbf{p}^{t_K} \cdot \mathbf{q}^{t_1}$. Therefore, for any $e < \tilde{e}$ we have $\mathbf{q}^{t_K} \not R_e \mathbf{q}^{t_1}$. From this it follows that D satisfies e -GARP for any $e < \tilde{e}$ and therefore $e^* = \tilde{e}$. \square

From Proposition 12 we see that we can use $\max\{e \in G : D \text{ is } e\text{-acyclic}\}$ as a formula for calculating e^* . Thus, e^* can be computed by determining if D is e -acyclic or not (this can be accomplished with Warshall's algorithm) for each $e \in G$ and then taking the largest value of e for which D is e -acyclic. This approach is computationally feasible because G has at most T^2 elements. In general, one does not have to work out whether D is e -acyclic for each $e \in G$. One could start from the largest element in G and work their way down until a value of e was found for which D is e -acyclic.

References

- Adams, A. Mutually consistent revealed preference demand predictions. *American Economic Journal: Microeconomics*, 12(1):pp. 42–74, 2020.
- Afriat, S. The construction of utility functions from expenditure data. *International Economic Review*, 8(1):67–77, 1967.
- Afriat, S. On a system of inequalities in demand analysis: An extension of the classical method. *International Economic Review*, 14(2):460–472, 1973.
- Andreoni, J. and Miller, J. Giving according to garp: An experimental test of the consistency of preferences for altruism. *Econometrica*, 70(2):737–753, 2002.
- Apesteguia, J. and Ballester, M. A. A measure of rationality and welfare. *Journal of Political Economy*, 123(6):1278–1310, 2015.
- Blundell, R. W., Browning, M., and Crawford, I. A. Nonparametric engel curves and revealed preference. *Econometrica*, 71(1):205–240, 2003.
- Chambers, C. P., Echenique, F., and Lambert, N. S. Recovering preferences from finite data. *Econometrica*, 89(4):1633–1664, 2021.
- Cherchye, L., Demuynck, T., and Rock, B. D. Bounding counterfactual demand with unobserved heterogeneity and endogenous expenditures. *Journal of Econometrics*, 211(2):483–506, 2019.
- Dean, M. and Martin, D. Measuring Rationality with the Minimum Cost of Revealed Preference Violations. *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, 98(3):524–534, 2016.
- Deb, R., Kitamura, Y., Quah, J. K. H., and Stoye, J. Revealed Price Preference: Theory and Empirical Analysis. *The Review of Economic Studies*, 90(2):707–743, 2022.
- Diewert, W. E. Afriat and revealed preference theory. *The Review of Economic Studies*, 40(3):419–425, 1973.
- Echenique, F. and Saito, K. Savage in the market. *Econometrica*, 83(4):1467–1495, 2015.
- Echenique, F., Imai, T., and Saito, K. Approximate Expected Utility Rationalization. *Journal of the European Economic Association*, page jvad028, 2023.
- Fisman, R., Kariv, S., and Markovits, D. Individual preferences for giving. *American Economic Review*, 97(5):1858–1876, 2007.

- Halevy, Y., Persitz, D., and Zrill, L. Parametric recoverability of preferences. *Journal of Political Economy*, 126(4):1558–1593, 2018.
- Houtman, M. and Maks, J. A. H. Determining all maximal data subsets consistent with revealed preference. *Kwantitatieve Methoden*, 6(19):89–104, 1985.
- Kitamura, Y. and Stoye, J. Nonparametric analysis of random utility models. *Econometrica*, 86(6):1883–1909, 2018.
- Kubler, F., Selden, L., and Wei, X. Asset demand based tests of expected utility maximization. *American Economic Review*, 104(11):3459–80, 2014.
- Matzkin, R. L. and Richter, M. K. Testing strictly concave rationality. *Journal of Economic Theory*, 53(2):287–303, 1991.
- Murphy, J. H. and Banerjee, S. A caveat for the application of the critical cost efficiency index in induced budget experiments. *Experimental Economics*, 18:356–365, 2015.
- Nishimura, H., Ok, E. A., and Quah, J. K.-H. A comprehensive approach to revealed preference theory. *American Economic Review*, 107(4):1239–1263, 2017.
- Varian, H. R. The non-parametric approach to demand analysis. *Econometrica*, 50(4):945–973, 1982.
- Varian, H. R. Non-parametric tests of consumer behaviour. *The Review of Economic Studies*, 50(1):99–110, 1983.
- Varian, H. R. Goodness-of-fit in optimizing models. *Journal of Econometrics*, 46(1):125–140, 1990.

B Online Appendix

In this section we present a characterization of \mathcal{R}_V (the robustly preferred relation for the Varian loss function). Let $D = (\mathbf{q}^t, \mathbf{p}^t)_{t \leq T}$ be a purchase dataset. For a vector $\mathbf{e} = (e_1, e_2, \dots, e_T) \in [0, 1]^T$ write $\mathbf{q}^t R_e (P_e) \mathbf{q}$ when $e_t \mathbf{p}^t \cdot \mathbf{q}^t \geq (>) \mathbf{p}^t \cdot \mathbf{q}$. We refer to R_e and P_e as the \mathbf{e} direct and strict direct revealed preference relations for D . The dataset D satisfies \mathbf{e} -GARP if, for all t_1, t_2, \dots, t_K

$$\mathbf{q}^{t_1} R_e \mathbf{q}^{t_2} R_e \dots R_e \mathbf{q}^{t_K} \implies \mathbf{q}^{t_K} \not P_e \mathbf{q}^{t_1}$$

It turns out that \mathbf{e} -GARP is a necessary and sufficient condition (see Lemma 11 below) for there to exist a well-behaved utility function U which \mathbf{e} -rationalizes the data. The dataset D is \mathbf{e} -acyclic if, for all t_1, t_2, \dots, t_K

$$\mathbf{q}^{t_1} P_e \mathbf{q}^{t_2} P_e \dots P_e \mathbf{q}^{t_K} \implies \mathbf{q}^{t_K} \not P_e \mathbf{q}^{t_1}$$

Note that a dataset which satisfies \mathbf{e} -GARP is \mathbf{e} -acyclic but in general the reverse implication need not hold. The following proposition provides a characterization of \mathcal{R}_V .

Proposition 13. *Let \mathcal{U} in Definition 4 be the collection of well-behaved utility functions. Let $D = (\mathbf{q}^t, \mathbf{p}^t)_{t \leq T}$ be a purchase dataset, let R be the direct revealed preference relation, and let P_e be the \mathbf{e} strict direct revealed preference relations for D . Define sets E and E^* by*

$$E = \{\mathbf{e} \in [0, 1]^T : D \text{ is } \mathbf{e}\text{-acyclic}\} \quad \text{and} \quad E^* = \underset{\mathbf{e} \in E}{\operatorname{argmin}} f(\mathbf{e})$$

If D satisfies GARP then $\tilde{\mathbf{q}} \mathcal{R}_V \tilde{\mathbf{q}}'$ if and only if $\tilde{\mathbf{q}} \operatorname{tran}(\geq \cup R) \tilde{\mathbf{q}}'$. If D does not satisfy GARP then $\tilde{\mathbf{q}} \mathcal{R}_V \tilde{\mathbf{q}}'$ if and only if $\tilde{\mathbf{q}} \operatorname{tran}(\geq \cup P_e) \tilde{\mathbf{q}}'$ for all $\mathbf{e} \in E^$*

Proposition 13 provides a way for computing whether or not $\tilde{\mathbf{q}} \mathcal{R}_V \tilde{\mathbf{q}}'$. When GARP is satisfied then the approach is straightforward. One merely works out whether or not $\tilde{\mathbf{q}} \operatorname{tran}(\geq \cup R) \tilde{\mathbf{q}}'$ which can be accomplished using Warshall's algorithm. When D does not satisfy GARP one must determine if $\tilde{\mathbf{q}} \operatorname{tran}(\geq \cup P_e) \tilde{\mathbf{q}}'$ for all $\mathbf{e} \in E^*$. This again can be accomplished using Warshall's algorithm provided one can derive E^* . It turns out that E^* can be calculated using an approach similar to our calculation of e^* in Section A.5 of the appendix. We pursue this in the next subsection. The proof of Proposition 13 follows in Section B.2.

B.1 Calculating E^*

Here we provide a method for computing E^* as defined in Proposition 13. For each t , let $G_t \subseteq [0, 1]$ be the set defined by

$$G_t = \left\{ \frac{\mathbf{p}^t \cdot \mathbf{q}^s}{\mathbf{p}^t \cdot \mathbf{q}^t} \in [0, 1] : s \in \{1, 2, \dots, T\} \right\}$$

and let $\hat{G} = G_1 \times G_2 \times \dots \times G_T \subseteq [0, 1]^T$. The following proposition suggests that when computing $E^* \subseteq [0, 1]^T$ it suffices to confine our attention to the finite set $\hat{G} \subseteq [0, 1]^T$.

Proposition 14. *For any purchase dataset $D = (\mathbf{q}^t, \mathbf{p}^t)_{t \leq T}$ we have $E^* \subseteq \hat{G}$.*

Proof. For each t , let us enumerate the elements of G_t as $e_1^t > e_2^t > \dots > e_{N_t}^t$ and let $e_{N_t+1}^t = 0$. For each t , let $\mathcal{M}_t = \{(e_{k+1}^t, e_k^t) \subseteq [0, 1] : k \in \{1, 2, \dots, N_t\}\}$ and let $\mathcal{M} = \{M_1 \times M_2 \times \dots \times M_T \subseteq [0, 1]^T : \text{for each } t \text{ we have } M_t \in \mathcal{M}_t\}$. From the definition of P_e we see that, for any $M \in \mathcal{M}$ we have $P_e = P_{\tilde{e}}$ for all $\mathbf{e}, \tilde{\mathbf{e}} \in M$. As f is decreasing it is now clear that $E^* \subseteq \hat{G}$. \square

Proposition 14 shows that E^* only takes values in the finite set \hat{G} . Thus, when computing E^* we may confine our attention to this set. One may thus compute E^* by first determining, for each $\mathbf{e} \in \hat{G}$, whether or not D is \mathbf{e} -acyclic. The set E^* is then computed by taking those vectors $\mathbf{e} \in \hat{G}$ which minimize $f(\mathbf{e})$ among the elements $\tilde{\mathbf{e}} \in \hat{G}$ for which D is $\tilde{\mathbf{e}}$ -acyclic.

Proposition 14 is analogous to Proposition 12 in Section A.5 of the appendix, which gives a means to compute $e^* = \{e \in [0, 1] : D \text{ satisfies } e\text{-GARP}\}$. The key insight behind Proposition 12 is that when trying to compute e^* we can confine our attention to the finite set G which contains at most T^2 elements.¹³ The key insight behind Proposition 14 is that when computing E^* we can confine our attention to the set \hat{G} . Note however, \hat{G} contains at most T^T elements and thus it can be very large even for datasets of moderate size. And so, computing E^* can still be very demanding in practice.

B.2 Proof of Proposition 13

To prove the proposition we introduce a function $\mathbf{v}(U; D)$ and prove some lemmas. So, let $D = (\mathbf{q}^t, \mathbf{p}^t)_{t \leq T}$ be a purchase dataset and let U be a well-behaved utility function. For each t , let

$$v_t(U; D) = \sup \left\{ e \in [0, 1] : U(\mathbf{q}^t) \geq U(\mathbf{q}) \text{ for all } \mathbf{q} \in B(\mathbf{p}^t, e\mathbf{p}^t \cdot \mathbf{q}^t) \right\}$$

¹³That is, e^* happens to be the largest element $e \in G$ for which D is e -acyclic.

and let

$$\mathbf{v}(U; D) = (v_1(U; D), v_2(U; D), \dots, v_T(U; D)) \quad (8)$$

The following lemma relates $\mathbf{v}(U; D)$ to $V(U; D)$.

Lemma 6. *Let $D = (\mathbf{q}^t, \mathbf{p}^t)_{t \leq T}$ be a purchase dataset, let U be a well-behaved utility function, and let $\mathbf{v}(U; D)$ be defined by (8). Then $V(U; D) = f(\mathbf{v}(U; D))$.*

Proof. If $\mathbf{e} = (e_1, e_2, \dots, e_T) \in [0, 1]^T$ satisfies $e_t > v_t(U; D)$ for some t then there exists a $\mathbf{q} \in B(\mathbf{p}^t, e_t \mathbf{p}^t \cdot \mathbf{q}^t)$ such that $U(\mathbf{q}) > U(\mathbf{q}^t)$. This implies that D is not \mathbf{e} -rationalized by U and so the result follows as f is decreasing. \square

We next present several additional lemmas which we use to prove Proposition 13.

Lemma 7. *Let $\mathbf{e}^* \in (0, 1]^T$ and let $D = (\mathbf{q}^t, \mathbf{p}^t)_{t \leq T}$ be a purchase dataset which is \mathbf{e}^* -acyclic. For any $\mathbf{e} \ll \mathbf{e}^*$ the purchase data D satisfies \mathbf{e} -GARP.*

Proof. Follows from the fact that $\mathbf{q}^t R_{\mathbf{e}} \mathbf{q}^s$ implies $\mathbf{q}^t P_{\mathbf{e}^*} \mathbf{q}^s$ whenever $\mathbf{e}^* \gg \mathbf{e}$. \square

Lemma 8. *Let K_1, K_2, \dots be a sequence of compact sets satisfying $K_1 \supseteq K_2 \supseteq K_3 \supseteq \dots$ and let \mathcal{E} be an open set satisfying $\bigcap_n K_n \subseteq \mathcal{E}$. There exists an N so that $K_N \subseteq \mathcal{E}$.*

Proof. Suppose the result is false and thus for each n there exists an element $k_n \in K_n$ satisfying $k_n \notin \mathcal{E}$. As each $k_n \in K_1$ and K_1 is compact we may, by proceeding to sub-sequences if necessary, assume there exists some $k \in K_1$ so that $k_n \rightarrow k$. For each n the set K_n is compact (and therefore closed) and thus $k \in K_n$. Therefore $k \in \bigcap_n K_n \subseteq \mathcal{E}$. But, as \mathcal{E} is open there must exist some N so that $k_N \in \mathcal{E}$. Having achieved a contradiction we have completed the proof. \square

Lemma 9. *Let $D = (\mathbf{q}^t, \mathbf{p}^t)_{t \leq T}$ be a purchase dataset, let $P_{\mathbf{e}}$ be the \mathbf{e} strict direct revealed preference relations for D . Let $E = \{\mathbf{e} \in [0, 1]^T : D \text{ is } \mathbf{e}\text{-acyclic}\}$ and let $E^* = \operatorname{argmin}_{\mathbf{e} \in E} f(\mathbf{e})$. The set E is compact, E^* is non-empty, and for each $\mathbf{e} \in E^*$ we have $\mathbf{e} \gg \mathbf{0}$.*

Proof. Let $\mathbf{e}_n \in E$ be some sequence which converges to $\mathbf{e} \in [0, 1]^T$. For a contradiction suppose there exists some t_1, t_2, \dots, t_K so that $\mathbf{q}^{t_1} P_{\mathbf{e}} \mathbf{q}^{t_2} P_{\mathbf{e}} \dots P_{\mathbf{e}} \mathbf{q}^{t_K} P_{\mathbf{e}} \mathbf{q}^{t_1}$. But, clearly this means that there exists N so that for all $n \geq N$ we have

$\mathbf{q}^{t_1} P_{\mathbf{e}_n} \mathbf{q}^{t_2} P_{\mathbf{e}_n} \dots P_{\mathbf{e}_n} \mathbf{q}^{t_K} P_{\mathbf{e}_n} \mathbf{q}^{t_1}$ which contradicts the assumption that $\mathbf{e}_n \in E$.

Therefore, E is closed and thus compact. As E is compact E^* is non-empty as f is continuous. Next, let $\mathbf{e} = (e_1, e_2, \dots, e_T) \in E^*$ be a vector satisfying $e_t = 0$ for some t . This means $\mathbf{q}^t \not P_{\mathbf{e}} \mathbf{q}^s$ for all s . Clearly there is some sufficiently small $\varepsilon > 0$ so that $\mathbf{e}' = (e_1, e_2, \dots, e_{t-1}, \varepsilon, e_{t+1}, \dots, e_T)$ satisfies $\mathbf{q}^t \not P_{\mathbf{e}'} \mathbf{q}^s$ for all s . As $\mathbf{e} \in E$ it is clear that

also $\mathbf{e}' \in E$ and because f is decreasing we know that $f(\mathbf{e}') < f(\mathbf{e})$. We conclude that $\mathbf{e} \notin E^*$ and the proof is complete. \square

The following lemma can be proved in a straightforward manner by adapting the arguments used to prove Lemma 3 and thus we omit the proof (the only difference between the proofs is that now there is a number e_t for each observation whereas in Lemma 3 there is a single number e for all observations).

Lemma 10. *Let $\mathbf{e} = (e_1, e_2, \dots, e_T) \in [0, 1]^T$ and let $D = (\mathbf{q}^t, \mathbf{p}^t)_{t \leq T}$ be a purchase dataset which satisfies \mathbf{e} -GARP. Let $R_{\mathbf{e}}$ be the \mathbf{e} direct revealed preference relation for D . For each t let $B_{\mathbf{e}}^t = \{\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{R}_+^L : e_t \mathbf{p}^t \cdot \mathbf{q}^t \geq \mathbf{p}^t \cdot \mathbf{q}\} \cup \{\mathbf{q}^t\}$ and let $\tilde{D}_{\mathbf{e}}$ be the choice dataset $\tilde{D}_{\mathbf{e}} = (\mathbf{q}^t, B_{\mathbf{e}}^t)$ with direct revealed preference relation $\tilde{R}_{\mathbf{e}}$. The data $\tilde{D}_{\mathbf{e}}$ satisfies cyclical consistency and $\text{tran}(\geq \cup R_{\mathbf{e}}) = \text{tran}(\geq \cup \tilde{R}_{\mathbf{e}})$.*

The following two lemmas can be proved in a straightforward manner by adapting the arguments used to prove Lemmas 4 and 5 (using Lemma 10 in place of Lemma 3) and thus we omit the proofs.

Lemma 11. *Let $\mathbf{e} \in [0, 1]^T$ and let $D = (\mathbf{q}^t, \mathbf{p}^t)_{t \leq T}$ be a purchase dataset and let $\mathbf{v}(U; D)$ be defined by (8). There exists a well-behaved utility function U which satisfies $\mathbf{v}(U; D) \geq \mathbf{e}$ if and only if D satisfies \mathbf{e} -GARP.*

Lemma 12. *Let $\mathbf{e} = (e_1, e_2, \dots, e_T) \in [0, 1]^T$, let $D = (\mathbf{q}^t, \mathbf{p}^t)_{t \leq T}$ be a purchase dataset which satisfies \mathbf{e} -GARP, and let $\mathbf{v}(U; D)$ be defined by (8). For any two bundles $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}'$ we have $\tilde{\mathbf{q}} \text{ tran}(\geq \cup R_{\mathbf{e}}) \tilde{\mathbf{q}}'$ if and only if $U(\tilde{\mathbf{q}}) \geq U(\tilde{\mathbf{q}}')$ for all well-behaved U satisfying $\mathbf{v}(U; D) \geq \mathbf{e}$.*

We now prove the result.

Proof of Proposition 13. Suppose D satisfies GARP. Clearly, this means D satisfies $(1, 1, \dots, 1)$ -GARP and so Lemma 11 delivers a well-behaved utility function \tilde{U} which satisfies $V(\tilde{U}; D) = 0$. From Lemma 12 we see that $\tilde{\mathbf{q}} \text{ tran}(\geq \cup R) \tilde{\mathbf{q}}'$ if and only if $U(\tilde{\mathbf{q}}) \geq U(\tilde{\mathbf{q}}')$ for all well-behaved utility functions which satisfies $V(U; D) = 0$. Therefore, we have $\tilde{\mathbf{q}} \text{ tran}(\geq \cup R) \tilde{\mathbf{q}}'$ if and only if $\tilde{\mathbf{q}} \mathcal{R}_V \tilde{\mathbf{q}}'$. Next, let us suppose that D does not satisfy GARP.

Suppose $\tilde{\mathbf{q}} \text{ tran}(\geq \cup P_{\mathbf{e}}) \tilde{\mathbf{q}}'$ for all $\mathbf{e} \in E^*$. Let \mathcal{E} be an open set which contains E^* and which satisfies $\tilde{\mathbf{q}} \text{ tran}(\geq \cup P_{\mathbf{e}}) \tilde{\mathbf{q}}'$ for all $\mathbf{e} \in E^*$ (such an open set can be found by placing a sufficiently small open ball around each element of E^* and then taking the union of these open balls). Let v_n be sequence satisfying $v_1 > v_2 > \dots$ and $v_n \rightarrow v_*$. Let $K_n = f^{-1}(\{v \in \mathbb{R} : v_* \leq v \leq v_n\}) \cap E$. As E is compact (see Lemma 9) we see that each

K_n is compact. Note that $\bigcap_n K_n = E^* \subseteq \mathcal{E}$ and therefore, from Lemma 8 there exists an N so that $K_N \subseteq \mathcal{E}$. Let \mathbf{e}^* be any element of E^* (the set E^* is non-empty from Lemma 9). As $\mathbf{e}^* \gg \mathbf{0}$ (see Lemma 9) and f is continuous there exists some $\tilde{\mathbf{e}} \ll \mathbf{e}^*$ so that $\tilde{\mathbf{e}} \in K_N$. As D is \mathbf{e}^* -acyclic (as $\mathbf{e}^* \in E$) Lemma 7 implies that D satisfies $\tilde{\mathbf{e}}$ -GARP and so by Lemma 11 there exists a well-behaved utility function \tilde{U} so that $\mathbf{v}(\tilde{U}; D) \geq \tilde{\mathbf{e}}$. Let U be any well-behaved utility function which satisfies $V(U; D) \leq V(\tilde{U}; D)$ and let $\mathbf{e} = \mathbf{v}(U; D)$. Lemma 11 shows that D satisfies \mathbf{e} -GARP and therefore $\mathbf{e} \in E$. From Lemma 6 we see that $f(\mathbf{e}) = V(U; D) \leq V(\tilde{U}; D) = f(\mathbf{v}(\tilde{U}; D)) \leq f(\tilde{\mathbf{e}})$ and so $\mathbf{e} \in K_N \subseteq \mathcal{E}$ and therefore we see (from the way \mathcal{E} was chosen) that $\tilde{\mathbf{q}} \text{ tran}(\geq \cup P_{\mathbf{e}}) \tilde{\mathbf{q}}'$. Lemma 12 implies that $U(\tilde{\mathbf{q}}) \geq U(\tilde{\mathbf{q}}')$ and because U was an arbitrary well-behaved utility function satisfying $V(U; D) \leq V(\tilde{U}; D)$ we conclude that $\tilde{\mathbf{q}} \mathcal{R}_V \tilde{\mathbf{q}}'$.

Next, suppose that it is not the case that $\tilde{\mathbf{q}} \text{ tran}(\geq \cup P_{\mathbf{e}^*}) \tilde{\mathbf{q}}'$ for some $\mathbf{e}^* \in E^*$. Let \tilde{U} be any well-behaved utility function. As D does not satisfy GARP we see that Proposition 7 and Lemma 6 imply that $v_* < f(\mathbf{v}(\tilde{U}; D))$. Therefore (from the continuity of f) there exists some $\mathbf{e} \ll \mathbf{e}^*$ (note that $\mathbf{e}^* \gg \mathbf{0}$ by Lemma 9) so that (i) $f(\mathbf{v}(\tilde{U}; D)) \geq f(\mathbf{e})$ and (ii) it is not the case that $\tilde{\mathbf{q}} \text{ tran}(\geq \cup R_{\mathbf{e}}) \tilde{\mathbf{q}}'$. As D is \mathbf{e}^* -acyclic Lemma 7 implies that D satisfies \mathbf{e} -GARP and so Lemma 12 shows that there exists a well-behaved utility function U which satisfies $\mathbf{v}(U; D) \geq \mathbf{e}$ and $U(\tilde{\mathbf{q}}') > U(\tilde{\mathbf{q}})$ and from Lemma 6 we see that $V(U; D) = f(\mathbf{v}(U; D)) \leq f(\mathbf{e}) \leq f(\mathbf{v}(\tilde{U}; D)) = V(\tilde{U}; D)$ and so because \tilde{U} was an arbitrary well-behaved utility function we see that $\tilde{\mathbf{q}} \not\mathcal{R}_V \tilde{\mathbf{q}}'$. \square