

Hiring under Congestion and Algorithmic Monoculture: Value of Strategic Behavior

Jackie Baek*

Hamsa Bastani[†]

Shihan Chen[‡]

February 28, 2025

Abstract

We study the impact of strategic behavior in a setting where firms compete to hire a shared pool of applicants, and firms use a common algorithm to evaluate the applicants. Each applicant is associated with a scalar score that is observed by all firms, provided by the algorithm. Firms simultaneously make interview decisions, where the number of interviews is capacity-constrained. Job offers are given to those who pass the interview, and an applicant who receives multiple offers accept one of them uniformly at random. We fully characterize the set of Nash equilibria under this model. Defining social welfare as the total number of applicants hired, we then compare the social welfare at a Nash equilibrium to a naive baseline where all firms interview applicants with the highest scores. We show that the Nash equilibrium greatly improves upon social welfare compared to the naive baseline, especially when the interview capacity is small and the number of firms is large. We also show that the price of anarchy is small, providing further appeal for the equilibrium solution.

We then study how the firms may converge to a Nash equilibrium. We show that when firms make interview decisions sequentially and each firm takes the best response action assuming they are the last to act, this process converges to an equilibrium when interview capacities are small. However, we show that the task of computing the best response is difficult if firms have to use its own historical samples to estimate it, while this task becomes trivial if firms have information on the degree of competition for each applicant. Therefore, converging to an equilibrium can be greatly facilitated if firms have information on the level of competition for each applicant.

*Stern School of Business, New York University, baek@stern.nyu.edu

[†]Wharton School, University of Pennsylvania, hamsab@wharton.upenn.edu

[‡]Graduate Group in Applied Mathematics and Computational Science, University of Pennsylvania, gracsh@sas.upenn.edu

1 Introduction

The rise of online job platforms has dramatically transformed the hiring landscape. Applicants now have the ability to apply to a large number of jobs with minimal effort, resulting in job postings often receiving an overwhelming number of applications. To manage this influx, many employers rely on algorithmic tools to aid in the screening process — three-fourths of employers in the United States use automated tools to screen candidates (Fuller et al., 2021). These tools range from simple keyword filters to advanced machine learning models that evaluate answers to interview questions (Raghavan et al., 2020). Research has shown that algorithmic recommendations can improve job fill rates (Horton, 2017), demonstrating their potential to enhance labor market efficiency. Despite these benefits, the increasing reliance and widespread adoptions on algorithmic systems raises questions about their implications on resulting outcomes for both firms and applicants.

While larger firms may be able to develop such algorithmic systems in-house, many firms employ tools provided by external vendors (e.g., LinkedIn, HireVue, ThriveMap, etc.). This can result in multiple firms using the *same* algorithm, which raises fundamental questions about competition and efficiency in hiring outcomes in such settings. This scenario where multiple agents leverage the same algorithm is referred to as *algorithmic monoculture*, a term which draws parallels to the agricultural practice of cultivating a single crop species, which can lead to vulnerabilities such as disease outbreaks due to lack of diversity. Similarly, algorithmic monoculture can create inefficiencies and homogenization in hiring outcomes. Recent studies have highlighted potential risks associated with this phenomenon, including reduced firm utility and adverse effects on applicant welfare (Kleinberg and Raghavan, 2021; Bommasani et al., 2022; Peng and Garg, 2023). In this paper, we consider a setting where algorithmic monoculture exists, and we evaluate how firms can make *strategic* interview and hiring decisions to mitigate inefficiencies.

Concretely, consider an algorithm that evaluates candidates based on their resumes and assigns each a scalar score representing their predicted value to employers. When multiple firms use the same algorithm, they all see identical scores for each candidate. In a simplified setting where each firm can interview exactly one applicant, all firms might target the highest-scoring candidate. This is an undesirable outcome from both the perspective of the firms (at most one firm will successfully hire) as well as for the applicants (at most one applicant will be hired). However, this inefficiency is not inevitable as firms can adopt *strategic behaviors*, such as avoiding competing for top candidates when they anticipate high competition. The extent to which such strategies can mitigate inefficiencies and improve labor market outcomes is the focus of this paper.

We consider a model with N firms and a shared pool of applicants. Each firm makes interview decisions that are capacity-constrained, with the goal of maximizing the number of successful hires. Each applicant is associated with a score $s \in [0, 1]$, visible to all firms, which represents the probability that the applicant will pass an interview. Each firm decides which applicants to interview, and then gives an offer to all applicants who pass the interview. If an applicant receives offers from multiple firms, they accept one of them at random. We consider two variants of how the offer decisions are correlated across firms for the same applicant, either fully correlated or independent.

We define social welfare to be the total number of applicants who are accept a job. Under this model, we consider three different solutions that vary in the strategic nature of the firms:

1. *Naive*: All firms interview the highest scoring candidates.

2. *Nash equilibrium (NE)*: All firms are strategic in their interview decisions, and the strategies form a Nash equilibrium.
3. *Centralized*: Every firm’s decision is controlled by a centralized decision maker who chooses the outcome that maximizes overall firm and social welfare.

1.1 Summary of Results

Characterize Nash equilibria. We first fully characterize the set of Nash equilibria under our model. We characterize a strategy profile by a set of *thresholds* of applicant scores, where a pair of consecutive thresholds determine the range of applicant scores that receive a specific number of interviews. We identify a set of properties for the thresholds, where a set of strategies form a Nash equilibrium if and only if there are a set of corresponding thresholds that satisfy these properties. Interestingly, the resulting firm best responses are sometimes non-monotonic in candidate quality—for example, a firm may choose to interview the top and third deciles of candidates, but not the second decile.

We also characterize how the number of interviews each applicant receives depends on their score under the Nash equilibrium. We show that when firm’s hiring decisions are independent, all applicants who receive interviews get nearly the same number of interviews, while under correlated decisions, the number of interviews increases steadily with applicant scores.

Social welfare. We show that social welfare, the total number of applicants hired, increases as one goes down the list from Naive, to NE, to Centralized. Then, we analyze the *Price of Naive Selection (PoNS)*, the ratio of social welfare between the NE and Naive solutions. We establish that PoNS is high in regimes where there is a large number of firms and the interview capacity is small; specifically, when the interview capacity goes to 0, the PoNS goes to N . We also show that for any interview capacity, the PoNS is higher when the offer decisions are correlated across firms, compared to when they are independent. Therefore, under these regimes, naive strategies result in large inefficiencies, and there is a huge welfare gain when firms behave strategically.

We also evaluate the *Price of Anarchy (PoA)*, the ratio of welfare between the Centralized and NE solutions. In the same regimes where we show that the PoNS is high, we show that the PoA goes to 1. That is, there is essentially no loss in welfare due to the lack of a centralized decision-maker. Therefore, strategic behavior by firms is desirable from both the firms’ and the applicants’ perspectives.

Convergence. Though we show that the NE is desirable, it is unclear whether firms will be able to converge to an NE in practice. To answer this, we first show that best response dynamics will always converge to an NE. Moreover, when interview capacities are not large, a simple set of “one-turn best response” dynamics—where each firm sequentially chooses the best response assuming they are the last to act—will also converge to an NE. Therefore, if firms can compute best responses, it is relatively easy for an NE to arise.

However, firms need information on their competitors’ strategies in order to compute a best response—information that is typically not available. Our results show that it is sufficient to know how many other firms are interviewing each candidate (i.e., applicant competitiveness). Absent this information, firms may simply use historical data on whether applicants accepted their job offers, and we show that this makes convergence to a NE difficult.

1.2 Implications

Value of strategic behavior. First, we show that there is substantial value for firms to act strategically when hiring under algorithmic monoculture. This improves welfare for both sides of the market, firms and applicants. We show that a simple set of best response dynamics converge to the Nash equilibrium, showing that the equilibrium can arise as long as firms can compute their best response.

Congestion information. Our findings highlight the importance of sharing information on the level of congestion for each applicant. Without this information, it is difficult for firms to compute the best response, needed to converge to an NE. In settings where firms operate on a common algorithmic hiring platform, the platform can play a crucial role by providing firms with data on the number of competing firms interviewing each applicant. With this information, firms can make more informed and strategic decisions, reducing inefficiencies caused by overlapping interview selections. Thus, platforms that prioritize transparency and provide insights into applicant competition levels can enable more effective use of algorithmic hiring systems, benefiting both firms and the applicants.

Value of algorithmic hiring. In cases where sharing information on congestion is unavailable or infeasible, our results imply that the utility of a common algorithmic hiring platform may be limited. Without such information, firms are more likely to default to naive strategies, which can lead to significant congestion and low social welfare. This limitation highlights an important consideration for firms evaluating whether to adopt an algorithmic hiring platform. Specifically, if the platform cannot facilitate coordination or mitigate competition among firms, its adoption may fail to deliver the intended benefits and could even exacerbate inefficiencies. This is in line with existing literature that have raised concerns with algorithmic monoculture (Kleinberg and Raghavan, 2021; Peng and Garg, 2023).

Value of personalization. The above concern is predicated on the assumption that all firms receive *identical* scores for each applicant. In practice, firms can have heterogeneous preferences, which could be reflected in their hiring decisions. For example, one firm might prioritize specific technical skills, while another might focus on leadership potential or cultural fit. This raises the potential value of personalization, where a platform can tailor the recommendations to each firm’s unique preferences. By reducing uniformity in candidate rankings across firms, such personalization can alleviate congestion at the top of the applicant pool and promote a more efficient allocation of interview slots, even when firms employ naive strategies.

1.3 Related Work

Algorithmic monoculture and homogenization. The concept of algorithmic monoculture was formalized by Kleinberg and Raghavan (2021), who showed that firms relying on a common algorithm may hire weaker applicants than when each firm uses an independent, but less individually accurate, hiring method. Peng and Garg (2023) incorporate two-sided preferences and competition to compare outcomes between monoculture and polyculture (when firms make independent decisions). They leverage a two-sided matching model and evaluate the stable matching outcome under monoculture and polyculture. They show that monoculture can reduce firm utility compared to polyculture, but monoculture can improve average utility for the applicants.

Compared to the above works, the goal of this paper is not to evaluate the benefits or downsides of monoculture. Rather, we simply assume that monoculture exists, and then we evaluate how firms should make decisions in a setting with congestion effects. We show that social welfare can

drastically improve when firms make *strategic* decisions based on the algorithm’s output, compared to when they naively follow the algorithm’s recommendation.

One consequence of algorithmic monoculture is *outcome homogenization*, the idea that certain individuals systematically experience undesirable outcomes by many algorithmic systems. There is growing line of work that study homogenization caused by algorithms (Ajunwa, 2019; Bommasani et al., 2022; Jain et al., 2024; Touns et al., 2024), and the recent advances in generative AI has sparked studies on its impact on diversity of outcomes (Padmakumar and He, 2023; Anderson et al., 2024; Doshi and Hauser, 2024; Raghavan, 2024; Zhou and Lee, 2024). Our paper effectively studies outcome homogenization in the hiring context. Indeed, under the naive baseline where all firms interview the top-scoring candidates, every applicant receives the same outcome (interview decision) from every firm. We study whether this homogenization can be mitigated through strategic behavior.

Congestion in matching markets. A key difference of our model to that of Peng and Garg (2023) is that the latter uses *stable matching* as the solution concept, without specifying the *process* in which the stable matching arises. There are also papers that study stable matching in a market where interviews are conducted to learn the utility of match (Beyhaghi and Tardos, 2021; Allman et al., 2025; Ashlagi et al., 2025). A stable matching can be found, for example, iteratively using the deferred acceptance algorithm (Gale and Shapley, 1962). In contrast, our paper fixes a simple, one-step process in which firms hire applicants: firms decide simultaneously which applicants to interview and gives offers to everyone who passes the interview. This process is motivated by the fact that firms face screening costs and hence have capacity constraints on the number of applicants they can interview. This process causes issues due to congestion; i.e., reduced utility when multiple firms interview the same applicant.

Other existing papers have modeled congestion or search costs in matching models, such as Halaburda et al. (2018); Arnosti et al. (2021); Kanoria and Saban (2021). They show that various restrictions on the matching process can improve outcomes, such as reducing the number of applicants that an individuals can send, or restricting which side can initiate a matching. Compared to these works, the main difference of our paper is that we assume all firms have access to an informative signal for all applicants, while these papers assume that each agent has no a priori knowledge about other agents (i.e., no algorithmic recommendation).

Several empirical studies have evaluated various interventions to improve efficiency under congestion. Gee (2019); Besbes et al. (2023); Fradkin et al. (2023); Filippas et al. (2024) empirically show that signaling the level of competition can improve efficiency. The benefit of this intervention is also established in our paper, and therefore our work is complementary to these empirical findings. Manshadi et al. (2023) design a ranking algorithm to take congestion into account on an online platform to match volunteers to nonprofits.

Specific to application of hiring, Horton (2017) shows that leveraging algorithmic recommendations of applicants to firms substantially increase the fill rate, demonstrating the value of algorithmic hiring. Horton et al. (2024) conduct a field experiment which showed that imposing a cap on the number of applications a job opening can receive can improve efficiency. Coles et al. (2013) study a mechanism where applicants can send a signal of interest to firms, and this can improve applicant welfare. Dwork et al. (2024) studies congestion and incoordination in a social network where individuals can refer others for job opportunities.

Lastly, there is a large literature studying algorithmic hiring, on developing the algorithms themselves (e.g., Purohit et al. (2019); Epstein and Ma (2022); Aminian et al. (2023)), human

perceptions of hiring algorithms (e.g., Fumagalli et al. (2022); Zhang and Yencha (2022)), as well as evaluating bias propagated or incited by such algorithms (e.g., Raghavan et al. (2020); Li et al. (2020); Baek and Makhdoumi (2023); Komiyama and Noda (2024); Gaebler et al. (2024)).

2 Model

We consider a labor market with $N \geq 2$ firms who are hiring from a shared pool of applicants. All firms leverage a common hiring platform that evaluates all applicants and generates a score $s \in [0, 1]$ for each applicant. There is a continuum of applicants of mass 1, and the scores of these applicants follow a continuous distribution \mathcal{D} on $[0, 1]$ with density $\varphi(s)$. We assume $\varphi(s) > 0$ for all $s \in [0, 1]$.

Firms' decisions. The firms make decisions about which applicants to interview, which are made only on the basis of an applicant's score. Firm i decides on a function $f_i(s) : [0, 1] \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$, where $f_i(s) = 1$ means that they interview applicants with score s . Each firm can interview at most $c \in (0, 1]$ mass of applicants; specifically, the strategy f_i must satisfy $\mathbb{P}_{S \sim \mathcal{D}}(f_i(S) = 1) \leq c$. We restrict the strategies to ones where the applicants interviewed can be written as a union of a finite number of intervals; that is, we can write $\{s \in [0, 1] : f_i(s) = 1\} = \cup_{k=1}^{K_i} [a_k, b_k]$, for $a_k < b_k$ and $K_i \in \mathbb{Z}$. We call $\mathbf{f} = (f_1, \dots, f_N)$ a *strategy profile*, and we let \mathcal{F} be the set of all feasible strategy profiles.

We denote by $M(s; \mathbf{f}) = \sum_{i=1}^N f_i(s)$ the total number of firms that interview an applicant of score s under strategy profile \mathbf{f} . We use $M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}) = \max_{s \in [0, 1]} M(s; \mathbf{f})$ to denote the maximal number of firms competing for the same applicant.

Interview and hiring process. We assume that an applicant's score $s \in [0, 1]$ represents the probability that the applicant will pass the interview process for a firm and get an offer, which we assume is the same across all firms. If an applicant receives offers from multiple firms, we assume they accept one of them uniformly at random. We consider two decision schemes, $\theta \in \{\text{CORR}, \text{INDEP}\}$, specifying how hiring decisions are correlated across firms:

1. **Correlated** ($\theta = \text{CORR}$): The firms' offer decisions conditioned on an interview are perfectly correlated. For an applicant with score s , if n firms interview them, they will receive all n offers with probability s and zero offers with probability $1 - s$.
2. **Independent** ($\theta = \text{INDEP}$): The firms' offer decisions conditioned on an interview are independent. Each firm that interviews an applicant with score s will independently extend an offer with probability s .

Whether the decision scheme is correlated or independent (or somewhere in between) can depend on type of job and the interview process. For example, if the interview is very similar across all firms, then the results of the interview could be highly correlated for the same applicant across firms. On the other hand, if each firm uses a unique evaluation method, then the hiring decisions may be independent across firms.

An instance of the model $\mathcal{I} = (N, c, \mathcal{D}, \theta)$ is specified by the number of firms N , the capacity c , the score density function $\varphi : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, and the hiring decision scheme $\theta \in \{\text{CORR}, \text{INDEP}\}$.

Utility and social welfare. A firm’s utility is the expected mass of applicants that they successfully hire. The firm derives the same utility from any successful hire regardless of the applicant’s score s ; the score only matters insofar as much as it increases the probability that they pass the interview. If there are n firms interviewing an applicant with score s , we denote by the function $U_n(s)$ to be the expected utility derived by *one* of these n firms from this applicant. That is, $U_n(s)$ denotes the probability that a firm successfully hires an applicant of score s if they interview them, given that there are n firms interviewing them in total. We assume $U_n(0) = 0$, and that $U_n(s)$ is continuous and is strictly increasing in s and strictly decreasing in n . Under the correlated model, we have $U_n(s) = s/n$, while in the independent model, $U_n(s) = (1 - (1 - s)^n)/n$ (see Appendix A.3 for the derivation). Figure 1 plots these utility functions for $n = 1, \dots, 6$ for both $\theta \in \{\text{CORR}, \text{INDEP}\}$.




Figure 1: Plots of the utility curves $U_n(s)$ when $\theta \in \{\text{CORR}, \text{INDEP}\}$ and $n = 1, \dots, 6$.

Then, given firm i ’s action, f_i , and the actions of all other firms, f_{-i} , the utility for firm i is

$$u(f_i, f_{-i}) = \int_0^1 f_i(s) U_{M(s, \mathbf{f})}(s) \varphi(s) ds.$$

We define the social welfare to be the sum of the utilities for all firms:

$$\text{SW}(f_1, \dots, f_N) = \sum_{i=1}^N u(f_i, f_{-i}).$$

This term also represents the social welfare on the applicant’s side—since the firm’s utility is equal mass of successful hires, $\text{SW}(f_1, \dots, f_N)$ equals the mass of applicants who get a job.

Solution concepts. For a problem instance \mathcal{I} , we consider three different solution concepts that vary in how the strategy profiles $(f_i)_{i=1}^N$ are chosen.

1. **Naive:** The naive solution is one where all firms interview the applicants with the highest scores up to the capacity. Specifically, let $s_c \in [0, 1]$ be the threshold such that $\int_{s_c}^1 \varphi(s) ds = c$, and let $f^{\text{Naive}}(s) = 1$ for all $s \geq s_c$, and $f^{\text{Naive}}(s) = 0$ otherwise. We denote by $\text{SW}_{\text{naive}}(\mathcal{I}) = \text{SW}(f^{\text{Naive}}, \dots, f^{\text{Naive}})$ the social welfare under the naive solution.

2. **Nash equilibrium (NE):** A strategy profile (f_1, \dots, f_N) is a Nash equilibrium if no firm can unilaterally deviate to another strategy to strictly increase their utility. Specifically, for every i and for any strategy f' that satisfies the capacity constraint,

$$u(f', f_{-i}) \leq u(f_i, f_{-i}).$$

Let $\mathcal{F}_{\text{NE}} \subseteq \mathcal{F}$ be the set of all strategy profiles that is a Nash equilibrium. We define SW_{NE} to be the smallest social welfare from a Nash equilibrium solution:

$$\text{SW}_{\text{NE}}(\mathcal{I}) = \inf_{(f_1, \dots, f_N) \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{NE}}} \text{SW}(f_1, \dots, f_N).$$

3. **Centralized:** The centralized solution is one where all firms' decisions are controlled by a centralized decision maker who chooses the outcome that maximizes social welfare. We denote social welfare under this as

$$\text{SW}_{\text{max}}(\mathcal{I}) = \sup_{(f_1, \dots, f_N) \in \mathcal{F}} \text{SW}(f_1, \dots, f_N).$$

We define the *Price of Naive Selection (PoNS)* as the ratio between the social welfare under the Nash equilibrium solution to the Naive solution:

$$\text{PoNS}(\mathcal{I}) = \frac{\text{SW}_{\text{NE}}(\mathcal{I})}{\text{SW}_{\text{naive}}(\mathcal{I})}.$$

We define the *Price of Anarchy* as the ratio between the social welfare under the Centralized solution to the Nash equilibrium.

$$\text{PoA}(\mathcal{I}) = \frac{\text{SW}_{\text{max}}(\mathcal{I})}{\text{SW}_{\text{NE}}(\mathcal{I})}.$$

We discuss several of the modeling assumptions and their limitations in Section 7.

3 Characterizing the Nash Equilibrium

In this section, we characterize structure of Nash equilibrium outcomes. We first explain this characterization before rigorously formalizing the result in Theorem 3.1.

Thresholds. A key concept in our characterization is the idea of non-decreasing thresholds, $0 \leq \tau_1 \leq \tau_2 \leq \dots \leq \tau_N \leq 1$. The meaning of these thresholds is that all applicants with score $s \in [\tau_i, \tau_{i+1})$ is interviewed by exactly i firms. We show that every Nash equilibrium is associated with a set of thresholds $(\tau_i)_{i=1}^N$, and further, there are a strict set of conditions that these thresholds must satisfy. We differentiate between two classes of equilibria, dubbed “equal-utility” and “variable-utility”, based on two different classes of conditions that the thresholds satisfy.

Equal-utility equilibria. These equilibria are those in which the thresholds satisfy $U_i(\tau_i) = U_j(\tau_j)$ for $\tau_i, \tau_j \in (0, 1)$. That is, across the thresholds, the utility for a firm that is interviewing an applicant at the threshold is equal. Graphically, an equal-utility equilibrium is characterized by a *horizontal line* in the plot of the utility curves $U_n(s)$, where τ_i is the intersection of the horizontal line with the curve $U_i(s)$. We explain the significance of the horizontal lines through an example.




Figure 2: Examples of equal-utility equilibria when $N = 2$ and $\theta = \text{CORR}$. An equilibrium is characterized by the dashed red horizontal line in the upper plots. The lower plots depict two possible strategy profiles that form an NE with the corresponding thresholds. In Figure 2(a), $c = 0.2$ and the equilibrium is characterized by the horizontal line $y = 0.6$ with $\tau_1 = 0.6$. In Figure 2(b), the capacity is $c = 0.35$ and an equal-utility equilibrium is characterized by $y = 13/30$ with $\tau_1 = 13/30$ and $\tau_2 = 13/15$.

Consider an instance with two firms A and B, each with capacity $c = 0.2$, and suppose applicant scores are uniformly distributed from 0 to 1. There are infinitely many equilibria for this instance, and we illustrate two of them in Figure 2(a). Specifically, any strategy profile in which all applicants with score $s \geq 0.6$ are interviewed by exactly one firm is an equilibrium. This is characterized by a horizontal line at $y = 0.6$, and the corresponding thresholds are $\tau_1 = 0.6$ and $\tau_2 = 1$. Note that each firm derives a utility of at least 0.6 for each applicant interviewed. There is no incentive for both firms to interview the same applicant (“double-interviewing”), as the highest utility that a firm can derive from double-interviewing an applicant is 0.5. Moreover, there is also no incentive for a firm to deviate to interviewing an applicant with score less than 0.6, since that also results in a lower utility.

Next, if the capacities of the firms are increased to $c = 0.35$, then there is a gain in double-interviewing the applicants whose score is close to 1, compared to single-interviewing an applicant whose score is less than 0.5. In this case, equilibria correspond to a horizontal line at $y = 13/30$, corresponding to thresholds $\tau_1 = 13/30$ and $\tau_2 = 13/15$ (see Figure 2(b)).

Variable-utility equilibria. Not all equilibria have thresholds described by a horizontal line. Using the same instance with the capacities $c = 0.35$ (same as Figure 2(b)), Figure 3 provides an example of strategy profiles that constitute an equilibrium, but the utility at the thresholds are not equal; $U_1(\tau_1) \neq U_2(\tau_2)$.




Figure 3: Example of a variable-utility equilibrium with $N = 2$, $\theta = \text{CORR}$, and $c = 0.35$. $f_A(s) = 1$ if and only if $s \in [0.4, 0.55] \cup [0.8, 1]$, and $f_B(s) = 1$ if and only if $s \in [0.55, 0.8] \cup [0.9, 1]$. The dashed horizontal lines highlight the utility at the two thresholds τ_1 and τ_2 . Under this strategy profile, $\tau_1 = 0.4$ and $\tau_2 = 0.9$, and the utility at the thresholds are $U_1(\tau_1) = 0.4$ and $U_2(\tau_2) = 0.45$.

In this example, all applicants with score ranging from 0.4 to 0.9 are interviewed by *one* firm. This means that double-interviewing an applicant of score 0.85 yields higher utility than single-interviewing an applicant of score 0.4. However, in this example, firm A is interviewing applicants from 0.4 to 0.45, but they are also already interviewing those from 0.8 to 0.9. Therefore, firm A cannot make any deviations to improve their utility. Therefore, this is an equilibrium even though the utility at the thresholds differ.

In this example, we have $U_1(\tau_1) < U_2(\tau_2)$, and firm A interviewed applicants right above τ_1 as well as right below τ_2 . A variable-utility equilibrium has this property in general: when the utility at the thresholds differ, it must be that all firms who interview right above the lower threshold must also have interview right below the upper threshold.

3.1 Formal Characterization

We formalize the above ideas by characterizing the conditions of a Nash equilibrium in the following theorem.

Theorem 3.1. *The strategy profile $\mathbf{f} = (f_1, \dots, f_N)$ is a Nash equilibrium if and only if there exist thresholds $0 = \tau_0 \leq \tau_1 \leq \tau_2 \leq \dots, \leq \tau_N \leq \tau_{N+1} = 1$ that satisfy the following conditions:*

1. $\mathbb{P}(f_i(S) = 1) = c$ for all $i \in [N]$.
2. $M(s, \mathbf{f}) = m$ for all $s \in [\tau_m, \tau_{m+1})$ for all $m = 0, 1, \dots, M_{\max}(\mathbf{f})$.
3. $U_n(\tau_n) \leq U_m(\tau_m)$ for all $n < m \leq M_{\max}(\mathbf{f})$.

4. Consider any $n < m \leq M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}) + 1$ where $U_n(\tau_n) < U_m(\tau_m)$, and consider any firm i and score $s \in [\tau_n, \tau_{n+1})$ where $f_i(s) = 1$ and $U_n(s) < U_m(\tau_m)$. For any $s' \in [\tau_{m-1}, \tau_m)$ where $U_m(s') > U_n(s)$, we have that $f_i(s') = 1$.

The first condition states that every firm will use their entire capacity. The second condition states that exactly m firms will interview applicants between score τ_m and τ_{m+1} . The third condition states that the utilities at the thresholds are non-decreasing. The last condition states additional conditions that need to be satisfied if the utilities at the thresholds are strictly decreasing. Specifically, if $U_n(\tau_n) < U_m(\tau_m)$, then it must be that any firm who interviews applicants slightly above τ_n must also interview those slightly below τ_m .

Definition 3.1. A strategy profile $\mathbf{f} = (f_1, f_2, \dots, f_N)$ is a equal-utility Nash equilibrium if it is a Nash equilibrium where the thresholds defined in Theorem 3.1 satisfy $U_n(\tau_n) = U_m(\tau_m)$ for all $n, m \in [M_{\max}(\mathbf{f})]$. Any other Nash equilibrium is a variable-utility Nash equilibrium.

3.2 Nash Equilibrium Properties

We prove properties regarding the number of interviews received by each applicant in the NE solution, under both $\theta = \text{CORR}$ and INDEP . These properties can be visualized in Figure 4.




Figure 4: Comparison of utility curves $U_n(s)$ and the thresholds for $n \in \{1, 2, \dots, 6\}$ under $\theta = \{\text{CORR}, \text{INDEP}\}$. The dashed horizontal line $y = 0.2$ characterizes equal-utility equilibria. When $\theta = \text{CORR}$, the thresholds are evenly spaced across the applicant score s . In contrast, when $\theta = \text{INDEP}$, most thresholds are concentrated near $s = 0$; hence a large portion of applicants who receive interviews will be interviewed by the same number of firms.

Notice that under the $\theta = \text{CORR}$ scheme displayed in Figure 4(a), the thresholds τ_1 to τ_5 are evenly spaced out. This means that the number of interviews received by each applicant increases with their score s in regular intervals. In the example in the figure, the set of scores from 0 to 1 is equally divided into five sets, where the first set represents scores that receive 0 interviews, the second set of scores receive 1 interview, and so on.

Contrastingly, under $\theta = \text{INDEP}$ shown in Figure 4(b), the thresholds τ_1 to τ_4 are very close together, close to 0, while τ_5 is at the maximum value. This implies that there is a large range

of scores, $[0.331, 1]$, where every applicant in that range receive four interviews. It may seem unintuitive that an applicant with score $s = 0.5$ receives the same number of interviews as an applicant with score $s = 1$, but this is due to the independent realizations of the offer decisions. Specifically, if four firms interview an applicant with score $s = 0.5$, on average only two of the firms will give them an offer, and therefore those two firms are only competing with each other to hire that applicant. However, if four firms interview an applicant with score $s = 1$, they will all give an offer, and therefore a firm competes with three other firms for that applicant. In general, under the $\theta = \text{INDEP}$ scheme, a large portion of applicants who receive interviews will be interviewed by the same number of firms.

We formalize these properties described in the following two propositions. First, under $\theta = \text{CORR}$, we show that under an equal-utility NE, every threshold τ_m will be an exact multiple of τ_1 .

Proposition 3.1. *Fix a distribution \mathcal{D} and capacity $c \in (0, 1]$, and let $\mathcal{I}(N) = (N, c, \mathcal{D}, \text{CORR})$ be the instance with N firms and the correlated decision rule. Let \mathbf{f}_N be a Nash equilibrium for instance $\mathcal{I}(N)$. Then $\tau_m \geq m\tau_1$ for all $m \in [M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_N)]$. If \mathbf{f}_N is an equal-utility Nash equilibrium, then $\tau_m = m\tau_1$ for all $i \in [M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_N)]$.*

Next, under $\theta = \text{INDEP}$, we show that as $N \rightarrow \infty$, the number of firms that interview an applicant will differ by at most 1. That is, every applicant will be interviewed either $M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_N)$ times or $M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_N) - 1$ times.

Proposition 3.2. *Fix a distribution \mathcal{D} and capacity $c \in (0, 1]$, and let $\mathcal{I}(N) = (N, c, \mathcal{D}, \text{INDEP})$ be the instance with N firms and the independent decision rule. Let \mathbf{f}_N be a Nash equilibrium for instance $\mathcal{I}(N)$. Then, $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \Pr(|M(S; \mathbf{f}_N) - M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_N)| > 1) = 0$.*

4 Social Welfare

In this section, we evaluate how the social welfare compares under the three different solution concepts: Naive, Nash equilibrium, and Centralized. We show that the Price of Naive Selection can grow with N when the capacity is small, while the Price of Anarchy goes to 1 in the same regime.

We first establish that $\text{SW}_{\text{naive}} < \text{SW}_{\text{NE}} \leq \text{SW}_{\text{max}}$. The second inequality holds by definition of the Centralized solution, and we show that the first inequality holds under general conditions.

Theorem 4.1. *Suppose the utility functions $U_n(s)$ are continuous, strictly increasing in $s \in [0, 1]$, and strictly decreasing in $n \in [N]$. Then, $\text{SW}_{\text{NE}} > \text{SW}_{\text{naive}}$.*

Note that Theorem 4.1 uses a general condition on the utility function, which is satisfied for both $\theta \in \{\text{CORR}, \text{INDEP}\}$.

4.1 Price of Naive Selection

We compare the social welfare across the Naive and Nash equilibrium solutions using the Price of Naive Selection (PoNS). We first analyze the PoNS when the capacity c is at its extremes. Keeping N fixed, we show that the PoNS goes to N when $c \rightarrow 0$, and the PoNS goes to 1 when $c \rightarrow 1$.

Theorem 4.2. *For any distribution \mathcal{D} , number of firms N , and decision rule $\theta \in \{\text{INDEP}, \text{CORR}\}$, if $\mathcal{I}(c) = (N, c, \mathcal{D}, \theta)$ is the instance parameterized by capacity $c \in (0, 1)$, $\lim_{c \rightarrow 0^+} \text{PoNS}(\mathcal{I}(c)) = N$ and $\lim_{c \rightarrow 1^-} \text{PoNS}(\mathcal{I}(c)) = 1$.*

Theorem 4.2 establishes that there is substantial inefficiency of firms using the naive strategies when each firm has a small interview capacity. This is more pronounced with a large number of firms, as the PoNS grows with N when $c \rightarrow 0$. Conversely, as $c \rightarrow 1$, the PoNS converges to 1, indicating that strategic behavior offers little advantage when firms can interview almost every applicant.

This implies that the importance of strategic selection is thus most pronounced when capacities are low and the number of firms is large. In this regime, firms must allocate their limited capacity carefully. Naive strategies, which prioritize top scores uniformly, result in excessive competition for a small subset of candidates, leaving many applicants underutilized. Strategic selection diversifies this allocation, significantly improving social welfare.

Next, we consider a regime where the capacity c is fixed, and the number of firms N goes to infinity. In this case, we derive two results for each of the two hiring schemes. First, under the independent decision rule, we show that the PoNS goes to $\frac{1}{c}$ when $N \rightarrow \infty$.

Theorem 4.3. *For any distribution \mathcal{D} , capacity c , if $\mathcal{I}(N) = (N, c, \mathcal{D}, \text{INDEP})$ is the instance with N firms and the independent decision rule, then $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \text{PoNS}(\mathcal{I}(N)) = \frac{1}{c}$*

Next, under the correlated decision rule, when \mathcal{D} is the uniform distribution, the PoNS goes to $\frac{1}{c(2-c)}$ when $N \rightarrow \infty$.

Theorem 4.4. *Let \mathcal{D}_0 be the uniform distribution on $[0, 1]$. Let $\mathcal{I}(N) = (N, c, \mathcal{D}_0, \text{CORR})$ be the instance with N firms and the correlated decision rule. Then, $\text{PoNS}(\mathcal{I}(N))$ increases with N , and $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \text{PoNS}(\mathcal{I}(N)) = \frac{1}{c(2-c)}$. In addition, if $Nc \leq 0.5$, $\text{PoNS}(\mathcal{I}(N)) \geq 1.5$.*

The results of Theorem 4.3 and Theorem 4.4 establish how the PoNS changes for intermediate values of c . Specifically, as c decreases, the PoNS increases at a rate of $O(1/c)$. Next, comparing the two decision rule, when $N \rightarrow \infty$, for any fixed capacity, the PoNS is higher under the correlated decision rule compared to the independent decision rule. Hence, correlation in interview outcomes exacerbates the inefficiencies in naive strategies and makes strategic selection more important.

4.2 Price of Anarchy

Next, we examine the *Price of Anarchy (PoA)*, which measures the inefficiency of strategic and decentralized decisions, compared to the socially optimal outcome that can be achieved by a central decision-maker.

Theorem 4.5. *For any distribution \mathcal{D} and decision rule $\theta \in \{\text{INDEP}, \text{CORR}\}$, let $\mathcal{I}(c, N) = (N, c, \mathcal{D}, \theta)$ be the instance parameterized by the capacity c and number of firms N . For any N , we have $\lim_{c \rightarrow 0} \text{PoA}(\mathcal{I}(c, N)) = 1$, and for any $c \in (0, 1)$, we have $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \text{PoA}(\mathcal{I}(c, N)) = 1$.*

Theorem 4.5 shows that, in the regime where $N \rightarrow \infty$ or when $c \rightarrow 0$, the social welfare when firms are strategic converges to the highest possible social welfare in the system. In other words, there is little inefficiency of individual firms acting in their own self-interest.

5 Equilibrium Convergence

The previous section establishes that the social welfare is substantially higher under the Nash equilibrium than under the Naive solution. However, the relevance of this finding depends on whether firms can reasonably arrive at an NE. To investigate this, we study whether best response dynamics converge to an NE.

Best response dynamics is a process in which firms iteratively choose their strategies to their current best responses, given the strategies of the other firms. If this iterative process converges to a point where no firm can improve its payoff by a unilateral deviation, then this corresponds to an NE. However, best response dynamics, in general, is not guaranteed to converge.

First, we show that in our model, best response dynamics is guaranteed to converge to an NE. This is established by showing that the game we study is a potential game, and all potential games have the property that best response dynamics converge to the NE.

Theorem 5.1. *The game defined by the model is a potential game, and hence best response dynamics will converge to a Nash equilibrium.*

This establishes that if firms iteratively update their action to be the best response, then eventually this process will converge to the NE.

However, Theorem 5.1 does not specify how many iterations this process will take. Next, we establish a stronger result that holds under mild assumptions, where we show that a simpler set of best response dynamics where each firm only takes one turn, will converge to an NE.

One-turn best response. We define the *one-turn best response* dynamics to be the following. Sequentially, each firm takes one turn to decide their action, starting with firm 1 and ending with firm n . On its turn, firm i selects the action that maximizes its payoff, assuming the actions of firms 1 to $i - 1$ are fixed, and treating itself as the last firm to act. In other words, firm i optimizes its action under the assumption that no subsequent firm will adjust its behavior in response to its choice. This process continues until all n firms have taken their turn.

Theorem 5.2. *Suppose there is a $\delta > 0$ such that $\varphi(s) \geq \delta \forall s \in [0, 1]$ and $c \leq 0.5\delta$ for every i . If $\theta = \text{CORR}$, one-turn best response dynamics converges to an equal-utility Nash equilibrium.*

Theorem 5.3. *Fix a distribution \mathcal{D} , number of firms N , and $\theta = \text{INDEP}$. Suppose there is a $\delta > 0$ such that $\varphi(s) \geq \delta \forall s \in [0, 1]$. There exists a c_0 such that if $c \leq c_0$, then one-turn best response dynamics converges to an equal-utility Nash equilibrium.*

The above results establish that when capacities are small, an NE can be reached even when each firm only takes one turn, and they take the best response assuming they are the last to act. This is a stronger result than showing that best response dynamics converge to an NE, and hence if each firm is able to compute their best response, it is not a strong assumption to assume that an NE would arise in practice.

5.1 Computing the Best Response

We have established that a Nash equilibrium can be reached through a sequence of best response dynamics. However, it is not clear how a firm would compute their best response, since a firm would not have access to the exact strategies of other firms in practice.

Specifically, to compute the utility $U_n(s)$ of interviewing an applicant, the firm needs both the score s , and the total number of firms who selected the applicant, n . The firm has access to s through the algorithm, but they do not know n if they do not know the strategies of the other firms. We consider a setting where a firm can aim to *estimate* the utility $U_n(s)$ using historical data on acceptance decisions. Concretely, we assume that there are pools of applicants where both s and n is the same for all applicants in the same pool. Then, for example, if a firm has made job offers to applicants from this pool in the past that were always accepted, then the firm can estimate that n is small. We calculate how many samples a firm needs to be able to accurately determine which applicants yield higher utility.

Comparing two pools of applicants. We consider a simple setting where a firm needs to determine which pool of applicants, out of two, yield higher utility. Suppose there are two pools of applicants, where every applicant in the same pool has the same score; s_1 and s_2 respectively. Consider firm 1 deciding which pool to interview from, and assume that all other firms’ strategies are fixed, but unknown to firm 1. We assume that each firm has to either interview everyone from a pool or no one from a pool, and hence two applicants from the same pool are interviewed by the same set of firms. Note that the expected utility of interviewing an applicant is equal to the probability that a firm successfully hires them, given that they get an interview. Let $p_1, p_2 \in (0, 1)$ be the probabilities that firm 1 successfully hires if they interview applicants from pool 1 and 2 respectively. Firm 1 would like to choose the pool with higher expected utility, but these values are unknown to the firm as they do not know how many other firms are interviewing.

Suppose firm 1 can collect data by interviewing k applicants from each pool, and then selects the pool with a greater number of successful hires. Then, how large does k need to be for firm 1 to correctly determine which pool yields higher utility (with high probability)? The answer depends on the exact values of p_1 and p_2 , as well as the probability guarantee. We provide the answer for a range of these values. For a given $p_1 < p_2$ and probability $q \in [0, 1]$, we find the smallest number of samples k needed that guarantees that if $X_1 \sim \text{Binom}(k, p_1)$ and $X_2 \sim \text{Binom}(k, p_2)$, we have $\mathbb{P}(X_1 < X_2) \geq q$. We vary $p_1 \in \{0.1, 0.5\}$, $p_2 \in [p_1 + 0.05, p_1 + 0.3]$ and $q \in \{0.8, 0.9, 0.95\}$ and compute the corresponding k . The results are shown in Figure 5.

When $p_1 = 0.1$ and $p_2 = 0.15$, the number of samples needed to differentiate the two pools correctly with probability 80%, 90%, and 95% are $k = 80, 162,$ and 254 respectively. Note that k is the number of samples needed from *each* pool, hence $2k$ samples are needed in total. This is a *significant* number of samples that a firm needs to collect for the goal of distinguishing between two pools of applicants, which is practically infeasible for small to moderate sized firms. The number of samples required decreases as the gap between p_1 and p_2 increases, however, it remains non-trivial. Even under a 0.2 gap between p_1 and p_2 , to differentiate between $p_1 = 0.5$ and $p_2 = 0.7$ with 90% probability, a firm needs 24 samples from each pool.

We note that the above calculations made several simplifications to the actual task of computing the best response. First, the calculation was only to differentiate between *two* pools of candidates. If there are multiple pools, the firm will need to gather samples from all pools. Second, we also assume that all other firms’ strategies stay constant, while one firm is “experimenting” to collect data. To converge an NE, all firms need to compute their best response and hence will need to experiment; if multiple firms experiment at the same time, this will interfere with each others’ estimation. Third, we also assumed that there are distinct “pools” of candidates with the same score, and there are many applicants in each pool. In reality, there may not exist discrete “pools” of candidates, or there are not enough applicants from each pool needed to correctly estimate utilities. Lastly, it may be unreasonable to assume that firms can “experiment” for the sake of collecting




Figure 5: For $p_1 \in \{0.1, 0.5\}$, $p_2 > p_1$, and $q \in \{0.8, 0.9, 0.95\}$, we compute the smallest number of samples k needed so that if $X_1 \sim \text{Binom}(k, p_1)$ and $X_2 \sim \text{Binom}(k, p_2)$, then $\mathbb{P}(X_1 < X_2) \geq q$. We vary p_2 from $p_1 + 0.05$ to $p_1 + 0.3$ in increments of 0.01.

data for better estimation as interviewing is costly.

Given the large number of samples needed, as well as the reasons stated above, it seems unrealistic to hope that firms, using their own estimates of utility, can naturally arrive at an NE.

The bottleneck in computing the best response is in estimating the utility $U_n(s)$. Even though the algorithm provides a highly informative signal, s , about the applicants, the lack of knowledge on n renders the information on s almost useless. If firms knew n , then they would be able to exactly compute the utility $U_n(s)$ and calculate their best response strategy.

6 Extension: Flexible Capacity with Fixed Welfare

So far, we have assumed that all firms have a fixed capacity c , and we showed that there is a large gap in social welfare (total number of applicants hired) when comparing the naive solution to the Nash equilibrium. However, in reality, firms may update their capacity to meet their hiring needs. In this section, we fix the total social welfare, and then we evaluate what the capacity needs to be under the different solution concepts to reach that level of social welfare.

We show that under both $\theta \in \{\text{CORR}, \text{INDEP}\}$, when the social welfare is fixed, the total capacity needed to reach the same level of welfare *scales with* N under the naive solution, while under the Nash equilibrium, the total capacity stays constant with N .

Proposition 6.1. *Fix the social welfare $W \in (0, N \int_0^1 U_N(s)\varphi(s)ds)$, decision scheme $\theta \in \{\text{CORR}, \text{INDEP}\}$. There exists a $c > 0$ such that:*

- *With N firms each with capacity c , the naive solution yields a social welfare of W .*
- *When $W \leq \int_{0.5}^1 s\varphi(s)ds$, with N firms each with capacity c/N , there is a Nash equilibrium*

that yields a social welfare of W .

This result corroborates the claim that the Nash equilibrium is a much more desirable solution than the Naive solution. Previously, we have established that when firm capacities are fixed, then the welfare is substantially higher until the NE compared to Naive. In this section, we show that the same welfare can be achieved under the NE solution with substantially less capacity compared to the Naive solution. Hence, even if the same number of applicants are eventually hired, the NE solution is more efficient in that firms can substantially reduce their interview capacity.

7 Conclusion and Discussion

To conclude, this paper studies the role of strategic behavior in algorithmic hiring environments under congestion and algorithmic monoculture. By analyzing Nash equilibrium strategies and their impact on social welfare, we demonstrate that strategic selection can mitigate the inefficiencies of congestion, which benefits both firms and applicants. Our findings highlight the value of providing firms with information about applicant congestion, as it facilitates convergence to a Nash equilibrium. This result implies that the effectiveness of algorithmic hiring platforms is contingent on their ability to enhance coordination among firms, via congestion information or providing personalized recommendations. Without mechanisms to address competition for top-scoring candidates, platforms risk exacerbating inefficiencies, limiting their value.

Lastly, we discuss several assumptions of our model, and corresponding limitations and future directions.

One-shot process. One of the main assumption of our model is that hiring is a one-shot process where all firms make one set of interview decisions, which then lead to hiring decisions. In reality, the hiring process may take multiple stages, where firms that fail to hire in the initial round may revisit the pool of candidates to interview additional applicants. At the opposite extreme, hiring could culminate in a stable matching, achieved through numerous iterations (e.g., via the deferred acceptance algorithm). This requires that provisional matches formed in earlier rounds can be broken if a blocking pair arises. Our work focuses on the “one-shot” nature of the hiring process and the congestion it induces. Real-world hiring likely falls between these two extremes, with limited rounds of iteration that neither resolve all congestion issues nor achieve full stability. We leave as an interesting direction to analyze a model that interpolates between these two regimes.

Estimating utilities. Our analysis highlights the importance of providing firms with information about applicant congestion levels to improve decision-making. In our model, since we assume that the utility for interviewing an applicant is $U_n(s)$, a firm can exactly compute this utility if they have access to both n and s . However, in reality, there are many factors that prohibit this exact calculation. First, the exact form of $U_n(s)$ depends on the decision scheme (e.g., $\theta \in \{\text{CORR}, \text{INDEP}\}$). Firms may know exactly which regime they are in, and the regime may lie in between the two we consider. Even so, we believe our results are still significant in that the utilities heavily depend on *both* s and n , and therefore having access to n can greatly help the firm make decisions. For example, if two applicants have the same value of n but the first applicant has a higher score, then clearly the first applicant dominates the second, even if the exact form of $U_n(s)$ is unknown.

Interview decision based on the score. In our model, we assume that firms make interview decisions solely based on the algorithmic score s . In reality, firms may have access to additional features about the applicant which can be used in their interview decisions. For example, firm A

might prioritize applicants with score $s = 0.6$ who graduated from college X, while firm B focuses on applicants with $s = 0.6$ from college Y. In such cases, there is no overlap between the two firms' interview pools, despite their reliance on the same score. Our model effectively accommodates this scenario by assuming that scores are continuous, allowing firms to select subsets of $[0, 1]$ with arbitrary precision. This can be interpreted as encoding additional applicant attributes in the decimal representation of s . Mathematically, this equivalence ensures that the model captures the effects of feature-based selection without loss of generality.

Interpretation of the algorithmic score. We also interpret an applicant's score s as the probability that the applicant will pass the interview. In reality, the algorithm might simply give a ranking over the candidates, or a score that does not exactly represent the probability of passing an interview. In this case, the firm will need some time and experience to understand how to interpret the output of the algorithm. Of course, the algorithmic output could simply be very inaccurate; in this case the firm will ideally eventually learn to put a small weight on this output.

Homogeneous preferences. Our model assumes that if an applicant receives multiple job offers, they choose among them uniformly at random. This is equivalent to assuming that each applicant's preferences over firms are drawn uniformly across all possible orderings. In reality, applicant preferences may be influenced by factors such as firm reputation, salary, or location, leading to correlated preference structures. Investigating models where applicant preferences are correlated could provide deeper insights into real-world hiring dynamics and is a promising direction for future research.

Homogeneous firm-side utility. We also assume that the firm receives equal utility from hiring any applicant, as long as they pass the interview. In reality, an applicant's profile is multi-dimensional, and a firm may incur different utilities from different profiles. We believe that assuming equal utility from all hires is a good approximation of hiring practices for roles with many positions (e.g., entry-level software engineering), whereas this may not be a good assumption for a specialized position (e.g., a C-suite role).

References

- I. Ajunwa. The paradox of automation as anti-bias intervention. *Cardozo L. Rev.*, 41:1671, 2019. 4
- M. Allman, I. Ashlagi, A. Saberi, and S. H. Yu. From signaling to interviews in random matching markets. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2501.14159*, 2025. 4
- M. R. Aminian, V. Manshadi, and R. Niazadeh. Fair markovian search. *Available at SSRN 4347447*, 2023. 4
- B. R. Anderson, J. H. Shah, and M. Kreminski. Homogenization effects of large language models on human creative ideation. In *Proceedings of the 16th Conference on Creativity & Cognition*, pages 413–425, 2024. 4
- N. Arnosti, R. Johari, and Y. Kanoria. Managing congestion in matching markets. *Manufacturing & Service Operations Management*, 23(3):620–636, 2021. 4
- I. Ashlagi, J. Chen, M. Roghani, and A. Saberi. Stable matching with interviews. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2501.12503*, 2025. 4

- J. Baek and A. Makhdoumi. The feedback loop of statistical discrimination. *Available at SSRN 4658797*, 2023. 5
- O. Besbes, Y. Fonseca, I. Lobel, and F. Zheng. Signaling competition in two-sided markets. *Available at SSRN 4451693*, 2023. 4
- H. Beyhaghi and É. Tardos. Randomness and fairness in two-sided matching with limited interviews. In *12th Innovations in Theoretical Computer Science Conference (ITCS 2021)*. Schloss-Dagstuhl-Leibniz Zentrum für Informatik, 2021. 4
- R. Bommasani, K. A. Creel, A. Kumar, D. Jurafsky, and P. S. Liang. Picking on the same person: Does algorithmic monoculture lead to outcome homogenization? *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:3663–3678, 2022. 1, 4
- P. Coles, A. Kushnir, and M. Niederle. Preference signaling in matching markets. *American Economic Journal: Microeconomics*, 5(2):99–134, 2013. 4
- A. R. Doshi and O. P. Hauser. Generative ai enhances individual creativity but reduces the collective diversity of novel content. *Science Advances*, 10(28):eadn5290, 2024. 4
- C. Dwork, C. Hays, J. Kleinberg, and M. Raghavan. Equilibria, efficiency, and inequality in network formation for hiring and opportunity. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.13841*, 2024. 4
- B. Epstein and W. Ma. Order selection problems in hiring pipelines. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.04059*, 2022. 4
- A. Filippas, J. J. Horton, P. Parasurama, and D. Urraca. Costly capacity signaling increases matching efficiency: Evidence from a field experiment. 2024. 4
- A. Fradkin, M. Bhole, and J. Horton. Competition avoidance vs herding in job search: evidence from large-scale field experiments on an online job board. 2023. 4
- J. B. Fuller, M. Raman, E. Sage-Gavin, K. Hines, et al. Hidden workers: Untapped talent. *Harvard Business School Project on Managing the Future of Work and Accenture*, 2021. 1
- E. Fumagalli, S. Rezaei, and A. Salomons. Ok computer: Worker perceptions of algorithmic recruitment. *Research Policy*, 51(2):104420, 2022. 5
- J. D. Gaebler, S. Goel, A. Huq, and P. Tambe. Auditing the use of language models to guide hiring decisions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.03086*, 2024. 5
- D. Gale and L. S. Shapley. College admissions and the stability of marriage. *The American Mathematical Monthly*, 69(1):9–15, 1962. 4
- L. K. Gee. The more you know: Information effects on job application rates in a large field experiment. *Management Science*, 65(5):2077–2094, 2019. 4
- H. Halaburda, M. Jan Piskorski, and P. Yıldırım. Competing by restricting choice: The case of matching platforms. *Management Science*, 64(8):3574–3594, 2018. 4
- J. J. Horton. The effects of algorithmic labor market recommendations: Evidence from a field experiment. *Journal of Labor Economics*, 35(2):345–385, 2017. 1, 4

- J. J. Horton, S. Vasserman, and M. Watt. Reducing congestion in labor markets: A case study in simple market design. 2024. 4
- S. Jain, V. Suriyakumar, K. Creel, and A. Wilson. Algorithmic pluralism: A structural approach to equal opportunity. In *The 2024 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*, pages 197–206, 2024. 4
- Y. Kanoria and D. Saban. Facilitating the search for partners on matching platforms. *Management Science*, 67(10):5990–6029, 2021. 4
- J. Kleinberg and M. Raghavan. Algorithmic monoculture and social welfare. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 118(22):e2018340118, 2021. 1, 3
- J. Komiyama and S. Noda. On statistical discrimination as a failure of social learning: A multiarmed bandit approach. *Management Science*, 2024. 5
- D. Li, L. R. Raymond, and P. Bergman. Hiring as exploration. Technical report, National Bureau of Economic Research, 2020. 5
- V. Manshadi, S. Rodilitz, D. Saban, and A. Suresh. Redesigning volunteermatch’s ranking algorithm: Toward more equitable access to volunteers. *Available at SSRN 4497747*, 2023. 4
- V. Padmakumar and H. He. Does writing with language models reduce content diversity? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.05196*, 2023. 4
- K. Peng and N. Garg. Monoculture in matching markets. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.09841*, 2023. 1, 3, 4
- M. Purohit, S. Gollapudi, and M. Raghavan. Hiring under uncertainty. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 5181–5189. PMLR, 2019. 4
- M. Raghavan. Competition and diversity in generative ai. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.08610*, 2024. 4
- M. Raghavan, S. Barocas, J. Kleinberg, and K. Levy. Mitigating bias in algorithmic hiring: Evaluating claims and practices. In *Proceedings of the 2020 conference on fairness, accountability, and transparency*, pages 469–481, 2020. 1, 5
- C. Toups, R. Bommasani, K. Creel, S. Bana, D. Jurafsky, and P. S. Liang. Ecosystem-level analysis of deployed machine learning reveals homogeneous outcomes. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36, 2024. 4
- L. Zhang and C. Yench. Examining perceptions towards hiring algorithms. *Technology in Society*, 68:101848, 2022. 5
- E. Zhou and D. Lee. Generative artificial intelligence, human creativity, and art. *PNAS nexus*, 3(3):pgae052, 2024. 4

A Proof of Main Results

A.1 Proof of Theorem 3.1

We organize the proof as follows. We first present some intermediate results before proving Theorem 3.1. Next, we show that if the strategy profile \mathbf{f} is a Nash equilibrium, it must satisfy each of the four conditions in Theorem 3.1. Finally, we prove that any strategy profile that satisfies the four conditions is a Nash equilibrium.

Lemma A.1. *Let X be a measurable set on $[0,1]$ with $\mathbb{P}(S \in X) = x$ where $x \in (0,1]$. Then for any $0 < x' < x$, we can always find a subset of X such that $\mathbb{P}(S \in X') = x'$.*

Proof. Consider the function $f(t) = \Pr(S \in (X \cap [0, t]))$. We will first show that $f(t)$ is continuous. First, suppose $t' < t$. Then, we can write

$$\begin{aligned} f(t) &= \mathbb{P}(S \in (X \cap [0, t])) \\ &= \mathbb{P}(S \in (X \cap [0, t'])) + \mathbb{P}(S \in (X \cap [t', t])) \\ &= f(t') + \mathbb{P}(S \in (X \cap [t', t])). \end{aligned}$$

Clearly, as $t' \rightarrow t$, the term $\mathbb{P}(S \in (X \cap [t', t]))$ goes to 0. Therefore, $\lim_{t' \rightarrow t^-} f(t') = f(t)$. Similarly, when $t' > t$, we can write $f(t') = f(t) + \mathbb{P}(S \in (X \cap [t, t']))$, which implies that $\lim_{t' \rightarrow t^+} f(t') = f(t)$. Therefore, $\lim_{t' \rightarrow t} f(t') = f(t)$, and hence $f(t)$ is continuous.

Furthermore, $f(0) = 0$ and $f(1) = x$. Hence, by the intermediate value theorem, for any $x' \in [0, x]$ there is some $t^* \in [0, 1]$ such that $f(t^*) = x'$. Let $S' = X \cap [0, t^*]$, we have $\mathbb{P}(S \in S') = x'$ as required. \square

Proof of Theorem 3.1. Suppose the strategy profile \mathbf{f} is a Nash equilibrium. We will show that there exist thresholds $0 \leq \tau_1 \leq \tau_2 \leq \dots \leq \tau_N \leq 1$ that satisfy the four conditions listed in the theorem.

1. $\mathbb{P}(f_i(S) = 1) = c$ for all $i \in [N]$.
2. $M(S) = m; s \in [\tau_m, \tau_{m+1})$ for all $m = 0, 1, \dots, N$.
3. $U_n(\tau_n) \leq U_m(\tau_m)$ for all $n < m \leq M_{\max}(\mathbf{f})$.
4. Consider any $n < m \leq M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}) + 1$ where $U_n(\tau_n) < U_m(\tau_m)$, and consider any firm i and score $s \in [\tau_n, \tau_{n+1})$ where $f_i(s) = 1$ and $U_n(s) < U_m(\tau_m)$. For any $s' \in [\tau_{m-1}, \tau_m)$ where $U_m(s') > U_n(s)$, we have that $f_i(s') = 1$.

Let's start by proving the **first condition**. Given capacity c , we want to show that $\mathbb{P}(f_i(S) = 1) = c$ for all $i \in [N]$. Suppose, by contradiction, that $\mathbb{P}(f_i(S) = 1) < c$ for some $i \in [N]$. We will show that firm i can deviate from f_i to strictly improve its strategy. Let $K = \{s \in [0, 1] : f_i(s) = 1\}$ be the applicants interviewed by firm i under \mathbf{f} . Under the strategy profile \mathbf{f} , by equation (1), the utility derived by firm i is

$$\begin{aligned} u(f_i, f_{-i}) &= \int_0^1 f_i(s) U_{M(s, \mathbf{f})}(s) \varphi(s) ds \\ &= \int_K U_{M(s, \mathbf{f})}(s) \varphi(s) ds. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\mathbb{P}(f_i(S) = 1) < c$, by Lemma A.1, there is a subset $E \subseteq [0, 1] \setminus K$ such that $Pr(S \in E) = c - Pr(f_i(S) = 1)$.

Consider an alternative strategy f'_i where $f'_i(s) = 1$ if and only if $s \in K \cup E$. We have $\mathbb{P}(f'_i(S) = 1) = \mathbb{P}(S \in K) + \mathbb{P}(S \in E) = c$, hence f'_i satisfies the capacity requirement. We will now show $u(f'_i, f_{-i}) > u(f_i, f_{-i})$. Let $\mathbf{f}' = (f_1, \dots, f'_i, \dots, f_N)$ be the strategy profile after firm i deviates from f_i . By construction, $M(s, \mathbf{f}') = M(s, \mathbf{f})$ on K . As a result, the utility derived by firm i under \mathbf{f}' is

$$\begin{aligned} u(f'_i, f_{-i}) &= \int_0^1 f'_i(s) U_{M(s, \mathbf{f}')} (s) \varphi(s) ds \\ &= \int_K U_{M(s, \mathbf{f}')} (s) \varphi(s) ds + \int_E U_{M(s, \mathbf{f}')} (s) \varphi(s) ds \\ &= \int_K U_{M(s, \mathbf{f})} (s) \varphi(s) ds + \int_E U_{M(s, \mathbf{f}')} (s) \varphi(s) ds \\ &= u(f_i, f_{-i}) + \int_E U_{M(s, \mathbf{f}')} (s) \varphi(s) ds. \end{aligned}$$

By assumption, $U_{M(s, \mathbf{f}')} (s) > 0$ and $\varphi(s) > 0$ whenever $s > 0$. We must have $\int_E U_{M(s, \mathbf{f}')} (s) \varphi(s) ds > 0$ since $\mathbb{P}(S \in E) > 0$. Therefore, $u(f'_i, f_{-i}) > u(f_i, f_{-i})$. This is a contradiction to \mathbf{f} being an NE, and hence it must be that $\mathbb{P}(f_i(S) = 1) = c$ for all $i \in [N]$.

We will then prove the **second condition**. Our goal is to show that there exist thresholds $\tau_1 \leq \dots \leq \tau_N$ such that $M(s; \mathbf{f}) = m; s \in [\tau_m, \tau_{m+1})$ for all $m \in [M_{\max}(\mathbf{f})]$. We will prove the statement by constructing a sequence of thresholds τ_1, \dots, τ_N that satisfy the requirements. Define the thresholds as follows:

$$\tau_m = \begin{cases} \min\{s \in [0, 1]; M(s; \mathbf{f}) \geq m\} & \text{if } m \leq M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}), \\ 1 & \text{if } M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}) < m \leq N \end{cases}$$

We will show $M(s; \mathbf{f}) = m; s \in [\tau_m, \tau_{m+1})$ for all $m \in [M_{\max}(\mathbf{f})]$.

We will first prove the statement for $m = 0$. By assumption, $\tau_1 = \min\{s \in [0, 1]; M(s; \mathbf{f}) \geq 1\}$. Therefore, for any $s \in [0, \tau_1)$, we must have $M(s; \mathbf{f}) = 0$. Hence, $M(s; \mathbf{f}) = 0$ for all $s \in [0, \tau_1)$.

Next, we will show that for any $0 < m \leq M_{\max}(\mathbf{f})$, $M(s; \mathbf{f}) = m$ for any $s \in [\tau_m, \tau_{m+1})$. We will first show that $M(s; \mathbf{f}) \leq m$ for all $s \in [\tau_m, \tau_{m+1})$. Consider the following two cases: $m < M_{\max}(\mathbf{f})$ and $m = M_{\max}(\mathbf{f})$. If $m < M_{\max}(\mathbf{f})$, by assumption, $\tau_{m+1} = \min\{s \in [0, 1]; M(s; \mathbf{f}) \geq m+1\}$, and, as a result, we must have $M(s; \mathbf{f}) \leq m$ for all $s < \tau_{m+1}$. If $m = M_{\max}(\mathbf{f})$, then clearly $M(s; \mathbf{f}) \leq m$ for all $s < \tau_{m+1}$. Hence, $M(s; \mathbf{f}) \leq m$ for any $s \in [\tau_m, \tau_{m+1})$. Next, we will show $M(s; \mathbf{f}) \geq m$ for $s \in [\tau_m, \tau_{m+1})$. Suppose, by contradiction, $M(s; \mathbf{f}) < m$ for some $s_0 \in [\tau_m, \tau_{m+1})$. Since for each strategy the applicants interviewed can be written as a union of a finite number of intervals, there exists an interval $s_0 \in [a_1, b_1] \subset [\tau_m, \tau_{m+1})$ with $a_1 < b_1$ such that $M(s; \mathbf{f}) < m$ on this interval. Similarly, since $\tau_m = \min\{s \in [0, 1]; M(s; \mathbf{f}) \geq m\}$, there exists an interval $[\tau_m, b_2]$ with $b_2 > \tau_m$ such that $M(s; \mathbf{f}) = m$ on this interval. We notice that $b_2 < a_1$ by construction and $[\tau_m, b_2]$ and $[a_1, b_1]$ are disjoint intervals. There are strictly fewer firms competing for applicants with score $s \in [a_1, b_1]$ than applicants with score $s \in [\tau_m, b_2]$. Therefore, there must exist some firm i with $K_i = \{s \in [0, 1]; f_i(s) = 1\}$ such that firm i interviews some applicants in $[\tau_m, b_2]$ but not all applicants in $[a_1, b_1]$. Mathematically, $K_i \cap [\tau_m, b_2] \neq \emptyset$ and $K_i^c \cap [a_1, b_1] \neq \emptyset$. We also notice that

$$U_{M(s; \mathbf{f})+1}(s) \geq U_m(s) > U_m(a_1) > U_m(b_2)$$

for $s \in (a_1, b_1]$ since U_n is strictly increasing in s and decreasing in n . This implies that if firm i interviews an applicant with score $s \in [a_1, b_1]$, the resulting utility is strictly higher than the utility firm i can derive by interviewing an applicant with score $s \in [\tau_m, b_2]$. Therefore, firm i can deviate from f_i by moving support from $K_i \cap [\tau_m, b_2]$ to $K_i^c \cap [a_1, b_1]$, where firm i would earn strictly more utility. This is a contradiction to \mathbf{f} being a Nash equilibrium, and hence it must be that $M(s, \mathbf{f}) \geq m$ for all $s \in [\tau_m, \tau_{m+1}]$. Since $M(s, \mathbf{f}) \leq m$ and $M(s, \mathbf{f}) \geq m$ for all $s \in [\tau_m, \tau_{m+1}]$, we must have $M(s, \mathbf{f}) = m$ for all $s \in [\tau_m, \tau_{m+1}]$.

We will then prove the **third condition**. Assume \mathbf{f} is a Nash equilibrium and the thresholds are defined as in condition 2. We will show that $U_m(\tau_m) \leq U_{m+1}(\tau_{m+1})$ for all $m \leq M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}) - 1$. Consider two cases: $c = 1$ and $c < 1$. If $c = 1$, then each firm will interview all applicants, and we have $\tau_1 = \dots = \tau_N = 0$. Accordingly, $U_1(\tau_1) = \dots = U_N(\tau_N) = 0$. We get the desired result.

If $c < 1$, we will first show that $\tau_1 > 0$. Suppose, by contradiction, $\tau_1 = 0$. Then there exists a firm i and $\delta > 0$ such that firm i interviews all applicants with score in $[0, \delta]$. Since $c < 1$, there exists an interval $[a, b] \subset [\delta, 1]$ with $a < b$ such that $f_i(s) = 0$ for $s \in [a, b]$. Since $U_n(s)$ is continuous and monotone, $\min_{s \in [a, b]} U_{M(s; \mathbf{f})+1}(s) > 0$ and $U_n(0) = 0$, there exists $0 < \epsilon \leq \delta$ such that $U_{M(s; \mathbf{f})}(s) < \min_{s \in [a, b]} U_{M(s; \mathbf{f})+1}(s)$ for $s \in [0, \epsilon]$. By construction, if firm i interviews an applicant with score $s \in [a, b]$, the utility is strictly higher than interviewing any applicant with score $s \in [0, \epsilon]$. Therefore, firm i can deviate from f_i by moving support from $[0, \epsilon]$ to within $[a, b]$, where firm i would earn strictly more utility. This is a contradiction to \mathbf{f} being a Nash equilibrium. Hence, we must have $\tau_1 > 0$.

Next, we will show that $\tau_m \neq \tau_{m+1}$ for all $m = 1, \dots, M_{\max}(\mathbf{f})$. Suppose, by contradiction, $\tau_m = \tau_{m+1}$ for some m . Since $M(s, \mathbf{f}) < m$ for $s < \tau_m$ and $M(s, \mathbf{f}) \geq m + 1$ for $s \geq \tau_{m+1}$, there exists firm i , $\delta_1 > 0$, and $\delta_2 > 0$ such that $f_i(s) = 0$ if $s \in [\tau_m - \delta_1, \tau_m]$ and $f_i(s) = 1$ if $s \in [\tau_{m+1}, \tau_{m+1} + \delta_2]$. We notice that $U_m(\tau_m) > U_{m+1}(\tau_m) = U_{m+1}(\tau_{m+1})$ since $U_n(s)$ is strictly decreasing in n . Since $U_n(s)$ is continuous, there exists $0 < \epsilon_1 < \delta_1$ and $0 < \epsilon_2 < \delta_2$ such that

$$U_m(\tau_m) > U_m(\tau_m - \epsilon_1) > U_{m+1}(\tau_{m+1} + \epsilon_2) > U_{m+1}(\tau_{m+1}).$$

Therefore, the utility firm i can derive by interviewing an applicant with score $s \in [\tau_m - \epsilon_1, \tau_m]$ is strictly higher than the utility it can derive by interviewing an applicant with score $s \in [\tau_{m+1}, \tau_{m+1} + \epsilon_2]$. As a result, firm i can deviate from f_i by moving support from $[\tau_{m+1}, \tau_{m+1} + \epsilon_2]$ to $[\tau_m - \epsilon_1, \tau_m]$. This is a contradiction to f being a Nash equilibrium. Hence, we must have $\tau_m \neq \tau_{m+1}$ for all $m = 1, \dots, M_{\max}(\mathbf{f})$.

We will then show that $U_m(\tau_m) \leq U_{m+1}(\tau_{m+1})$ for all $m < M_{\max}(\mathbf{f})$. Suppose, by contradiction, $U_m(\tau_m) > U_{m+1}(\tau_{m+1})$ for some $m = 1, \dots, M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}) - 1$. Since $\tau_1 > 0$ and $U_n(s)$ is strictly increasing in s , there exists $s_1 < \tau_m$ and $s_2 \in [\tau_m, \tau_{m+1}]$ such that $U_m(\tau_m) > U_m(s_1) > U_{m+1}(s_2) > U_{m+1}(\tau_{m+1})$. We also notice that there exists at least one firm i such that, under \mathbf{f} , firm i interviews some applicants with score in $[s_2, \tau_{m+1}]$ but not all applicants with score in $[s_1, \tau_m]$. If firm i interviews an applicant with score $s \in [s_1, \tau_m]$, the utility firm i can derive is at least $U_m(s_1)$, which is strictly higher than the utility derived by interviewing an applicant with score $s \in [s_2, \tau_{m+1}]$. Therefore, firm i can deviate from f_i by moving support from $[s_2, \tau_{m+1}]$ to within $[s_1, \tau_m]$ to earn strictly more utility. This contradicts to the assumption that f is a Nash equilibrium. Therefore, we must have $U_m(\tau_m) \leq U_{m+1}(\tau_{m+1})$ for all $m < M_{\max}(\mathbf{f})$.

Finally, we will prove the **fourth condition**. Suppose $U_n(\tau_n) < U_m(\tau_m)$ for some $n < m \leq M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}) + 1$. Let firm i be a firm such that $f_i(s_1) = 1$ and $U_n(s_1) < U_m(\tau_m)$ for some score $s_1 \in [\tau_n, \tau_{n+1}]$. We will show that $f_i(s_2) = 1$ for any $s_2 \in [\tau_{m-1}, \tau_m]$ with $U_m(s_2) > U_n(s_1)$. Suppose, in contradiction, $f_i(s_2) = 0$ for some $s_2 \in [\tau_{m-1}, \tau_m]$ with $U_m(s_2) > U_n(s_1)$. Since the

support of firm i can be written as a union of intervals and $U_n(s)$ is continuous, there exists an interval such that $s_1 \in [a_1, b_1]$ with $a_1 < b_1$ and $f_i(s) = 1$ for $s \in [a_1, b_1]$. Similarly, there exists an interval such that $s_2 \in [a_2, b_2]$ with $a_2 < b_2$, $f_i(s) = 0$ for $s \in [a_2, b_2]$, and $U_m(s) > U_n(b_1)$ for $s \in [a_2, b_2]$. We notice that the utility firm i can derive by interviewing an applicant with score $s \in [a_1, b_1]$ is strictly less than the utility firm i can derive by interviewing an applicant with score $s \in [a_2, b_2]$. Therefore, firm i can increase its utility by moving some support from $[a_1, b_1]$ to $[a_2, b_2]$. This is a contradiction to \mathbf{f} being a Nash equilibrium. Hence, we must have $f_i(s_2) = 1$ for any $s_2 \in [\tau_{m-1}, \tau_m]$ with $U_m(s_2) > U_n(s_1)$.

We will prove the **other direction** of the statement which states that any strategy profile \mathbf{f} that satisfies the four conditions listed is a Nash equilibrium. We want to show that any firm i cannot earn a higher utility by deviating from its current strategy profile. Let f_i be the current strategy profile of firm i and f'_i be an arbitrary alternative strategy profile. We will show that $u(f_i, f_{-i}) \geq u(f'_i, f_{-i})$ if \mathbf{f} satisfies the four conditions.

Denote $K_i = \{s \in [0, 1], f_i(s) = 1\}$. Under \mathbf{f} , we can express the utility of firm i as

$$u(f_i, f_{-i}) = \int_{K \cap K'} U_{M(s, \mathbf{f})}(s) \varphi(s) ds + \int_{K \setminus K'} U_{M(s, \mathbf{f})}(s) \varphi(s) ds. \quad (1)$$

Let \mathbf{f}' denote the strategy profile after firm i deviates from f_i , and denote $K'_i = \{s \in [0, 1], f'_i(s) = 1\}$. We notice that $M(s, \mathbf{f}') = M(s, \mathbf{f}) + 1$ if $s \in K' \setminus K$, and $M(s, \mathbf{f}') = M(s, \mathbf{f})$ if $s \in K \cap K'$. Therefore, the utility under the alternative strategy is

$$\begin{aligned} u(f'_i, f_{-i}) &= \int_{K \cap K'} U_{M(s, \mathbf{f}')} (s) \varphi(s) ds + \int_{K' \setminus K} U_{M(s, \mathbf{f}')} (s) \varphi(s) ds \\ &= \int_{K \cap K'} U_{M(s, \mathbf{f})} (s) \varphi(s) ds + \int_{K' \setminus K} U_{M(s, \mathbf{f})+1} (s) \varphi(s) ds. \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

To show $u(f_i, f_{-i}) \geq u(f'_i, f_{-i})$, we only need to show the second part of equation (2) is less or equal to the second part of equation (1). To show this, we will prove that for any $s \in K_i \setminus K'_i$, $U_{M(s, \mathbf{f})}(s) \geq U_{M(s', \mathbf{f})+1}(s')$ for all $s \in K_i \setminus K'_i$. Let $s \in K_i \setminus K'_i$, $s' \in K'_i \setminus K_i$ be arbitrary. Suppose $s \in [\tau_m, \tau_{m+1}]$ and $s' \in [\tau_n, \tau_{n+1}]$ for some $m, n \in [M_{\max}(\mathbf{f})]$. Consider the following two cases: $U_m(\tau_m) \geq U_{n+1}(\tau_{n+1})$ or $U_m(\tau_m) < U_{n+1}(\tau_{n+1})$.

If $U_{\tau_m}(\tau_m) \geq U_{\tau_{n+1}}(\tau_{n+1})$, by monotonicity of $U_n(s)$, we have

$$U_m(s) \geq U_m(\tau_m) \geq U_{n+1}(\tau_{n+1}) \geq U_{n+1}(s').$$

Hence $U_m(s) \geq U_{n+1}(s')$.

If $U_m(\tau_m) < U_{n+1}(\tau_{n+1})$, by condition 3, we must have $m < n + 1$. Suppose, by contradiction, $U_m(s) < U_{n+1}(s')$. By condition 4, given that $s \in K_i \setminus K'_i$, we must have $s' \in K_i$ as well. This is a contradiction to $s' \in K'_i \setminus K_i$. Hence we must have $U_m(s) \geq U_{n+1}(s')$.

Therefore, we conclude that for any $s \in K_i \setminus K'_i$, $s' \in K'_i \setminus K_i$, we must have $U_{M(s, \mathbf{f})}(s) \geq U_{M(s', \mathbf{f})+1}(s')$. As a result, $\min_{s \in K_i \setminus K'_i} U_{M(s, \mathbf{f})}(s) \geq \max_{s' \in K'_i \setminus K_i} U_{M(s', \mathbf{f})+1}(s')$. Furthermore, by condition 1, $\mathbb{P}(S \in K_i) = \mathbb{P}(S \in K'_i) = c$. Hence,

$$\mathbb{P}(S \in K_i \setminus K'_i) = \mathbb{P}(S \in K_i) - \mathbb{P}(S \in K_i \cap K'_i) \quad (3)$$

$$= Pr(S \in K'_i) - \mathbb{P}(S \in K_i \cap K'_i) \quad (4)$$

$$= \mathbb{P}(S \in K'_i \setminus K_i) \quad (5)$$

We can rewrite equation (2) as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
u(f'_i, f_{-i}) &\leq \int_{K_i \cap K'_i} U_{M(s, \mathbf{f})}(s) \varphi(s) ds + \mathbb{P}(S \in K'_i \setminus K_i) \left(\max_{s' \in K'_i \setminus K_i} U_{M(s', \mathbf{f})+1}(s') \right) \\
&\leq \int_{K_i \cap K'_i} U_{M(s, \mathbf{f})}(s) \varphi(s) ds + \mathbb{P}(S \in K_i \setminus K'_i) \left(\min_{s \in K_i \setminus K'_i} U_{M(s, \mathbf{f})}(s) \right) \\
&\leq \int_{K \cap K'} U_{M(s, \mathbf{f})}(s) \varphi(s) ds + \int_{K \setminus K'} U_{M(s, \mathbf{f})}(s) \varphi(s) ds \\
&= u(f_i, f_{-i}).
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, $u(f'_i, f_{-i}) \leq u(f_i, f_{-i})$ for any arbitrary firm i and alternative strategy f'_i . We conclude that none of the firms is able to increase their utility by deviating from the current strategy profile, and \mathbf{f} is at Nash equilibrium. □

A.2 Proof of Proposition 3.1

Proof. Let \mathcal{D} be an arbitrary distribution and $c \in (0, 1]$ be arbitrary. Suppose $\mathcal{I}(N) = (N, c, \mathcal{D}, \text{CORR})$ is an instance with N firms and $\mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{N}}$ is a Nash equilibrium for the instance.

We will first show that $\tau_m \geq m\tau_1$ for all $m \in [M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{N}})]$. For $m = 1$, we have $\tau_m = \tau_1$ and the inequality holds for $m = 1$. For $1 < m \leq M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{N}})$, the third condition in Theorem 3.1 gives $U_1(\tau_1) \leq U_m(\tau_m)$. Under the correlated decision rule, the utility function can be expressed as $U_n(s) = s/n$. Therefore, the above condition can be written as $\tau_1 \leq \frac{\tau_m}{m}$. Hence, $m\tau_1 \leq \tau_m$ for all $1 < m \leq M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{N}})$. Therefore, we can conclude that $\tau_m \geq m\tau_1$ for all $m \in [M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{N}})]$.

Next, we want to show that if $\mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{N}}$ is an equal-utility Nash equilibrium, then $\tau_m = m\tau_1$ for all $m \in [M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{N}})]$. For $m = 1$, we have $\tau_m = \tau_1$ and the equality holds. For $1 < m \leq M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{N}})$, by Definition 3.1, $U_1(\tau_1) = U_m(\tau_m)$. Since the instance is under the correlated decision rule, we have $m\tau_1 = \tau_m$ for all $1 < m \leq M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{N}})$. Hence, we've shown that $\tau_m = m\tau_1$ for all $m \in [M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{N}})]$. □

A.3 Derivation of $U_n(s)$ when $\theta = \text{Indep}$

When hiring decisions are independent, the probability that a firm successfully hires an applicant of score s if they interview them is

$$\begin{aligned}
U_n(s) &= s \left(\sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \binom{n-1}{i} s^i (1-s)^{n-1-i} \frac{1}{i+1} \right) \\
&= \frac{s}{ns} \left(\sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \binom{n}{i+1} s^{i+1} (1-s)^{n-1-i} \right) \\
&= \frac{1}{n} (1 - (1-s)^n)
\end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

A.4 Proof of Proposition 3.2

Before proving Proposition 3.2, let's first prove the following lemmas:

Lemma A.2. *For any distribution \mathcal{D} , capacity $c \in (0, 1)$ and decision rule $\theta \in \{\text{INDEP}, \text{CORR}\}$, let $\mathcal{I}(N) = (N, c, \mathcal{D}, \theta)$ is the instance parameterized by number of firms N . Let \mathbf{f}_N be a Nash equilibrium for instance $\mathcal{I}(N)$. Then, $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_N) = \infty$.*

Proof. We will first show that $Nc \leq M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_N)$. By condition 1 of Theorem 3.1, $\mathbb{P}(f_i(S) = 1) = c$ for each firm i . As a result, the total capacity of N firms is $\sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{P}(f_i(S) = 1) = Nc$. By condition 2 of Theorem 3.1, there exists thresholds $\tau_1, \tau_2, \dots, \tau_{M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_N)}$ such that $M(s; \mathbf{f}_N) = m$ for $s \in [\tau_m, \tau_{m+1})$ for $m = [M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_N)]$. Therefore, the total capacity of N firms can also be written as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
Nc &= \mathbb{P}(S \in [\tau_1, \tau_2]) + 2\mathbb{P}(S \in [\tau_2, \tau_3]) \cdots + M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_N)\mathbb{P}(S \in [\tau_{M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_N)}, 1]) \\
&= \int_{\tau_1}^{\tau_2} \varphi(s) ds + 2 \int_{\tau_2}^{\tau_3} \varphi(s) ds \cdots + M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_N) \int_{\tau_{M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_N)}}^1 \varphi(s) ds \\
&\leq M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_N) \int_{\tau_1}^{\tau_2} \varphi(s) ds + M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_N) \int_{\tau_2}^{\tau_3} \varphi(s) ds \cdots + M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_N) \int_{\tau_{M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_N)}}^1 \varphi(s) ds \\
&= M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_N) \int_{\tau_1}^1 \varphi(s) ds \\
&\leq M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_N) \int_0^1 \varphi(s) ds \\
&= M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_N).
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, $Nc \leq M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_N)$. As N goes to infinity, for the inequality to hold, we must have $M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_N)$ go to infinity as well. Therefore, $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_N) = \infty$. \square

Lemma A.3. *For any distribution \mathcal{D} and capacity $c \in (0, 1)$, let $\mathcal{I}(N) = (N, c, \mathcal{D}, \text{INDEP})$ is the instance parameterized by number of firms N . Let \mathbf{f}_N be a Nash equilibrium for instance $\mathcal{I}(N)$. Then $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \tau_{M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_N)-1} = 0$.*

Proof. Suppose \mathbf{f} is a Nash equilibrium. $U(\tau_{M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_N)-1}, M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_N)-1) = t$. When the hiring decisions are independent, by equation 6 we have

$$U(\tau_{M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_N)-1}, M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_N)-1) = \frac{1}{M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_N)-1} (1 - (1 - \tau_{M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_N)-1})^{M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_N)-1}) = t.$$

As a result, we can express $\tau_{M_{\max}-1}$ as

$$\tau_{M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_N)-1} = 1 - (1 - (M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_N) - 1)t)^{\frac{1}{M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_N)-1}}.$$

Define $f(t) = 1 - (1 - (M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_N) - 1)t)^{\frac{1}{M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_N)-1}}$, we will show $f(t)$ is strictly decreasing in t .

We will first show that $t \leq \frac{1}{M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_N)}$. Suppose, by contradiction, $t > \frac{1}{M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_N)}$. Since $\frac{1}{M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_N)} = U(1, M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_N))$, we must have $U(\tau_{M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_N)-1}, M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_N)-1) > U(1, M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_N))$. By condition 4 of Theorem 3.1, \mathbf{f}_N is not a Nash equilibrium, which leads to a contradiction. Therefore, we must have $t \leq \frac{1}{M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_N)}$.

Next, we will show that $f(t)$ is strictly decreasing in t . The derivative of $f(t)$ is

$$\begin{aligned} f'(t) &= (M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{N}}) - 1) \frac{1}{M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{N}}) - 1} (1 - (M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{N}}) - 1)t)^{\frac{2 - M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{N}})}{M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{N}}) - 1}} \\ &= (1 - (M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{N}}) - 1)t)^{\frac{2 - M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{N}})}{M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{N}}) - 1}}. \end{aligned}$$

Given that $t \leq \frac{1}{M_{\max}(\mathbf{f})}$, we have

$$1 - (M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{N}}) - 1)t \geq 1 - (M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{N}}) - 1) \frac{1}{M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{N}})} = \frac{1}{M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{N}})} > 0.$$

Hence, $f'(t) > 0$ and $f(t)$ decreases with t . Given that $t \leq \frac{1}{M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{N}})}$, we get

$$\tau_{M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{N}}) - 1} \leq 1 - \left(1 - \frac{M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{N}}) - 1}{M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{N}})}\right)^{\frac{1}{M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{N}}) - 1}} = 1 - \frac{1}{M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{N}})^{\frac{1}{M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{N}}) - 1}}}.$$

Taking the logarithm of $M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{N}})^{\frac{1}{M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{N}}) - 1}}$ we can show that $\lim_{M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{N}}) \rightarrow \infty} M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{N}})^{\frac{1}{M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{N}}) - 1}} = 1$. Hence, $\lim_{M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{N}}) \rightarrow \infty} \tau_{M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{N}}) - 1} = 0$. By Lemma A.2, $M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{N}}) \rightarrow \infty$ as $N \rightarrow \infty$, we must have

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \tau_{M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}) - 1} = 0.$$

*

□

Proof of Proposition 3.2. We first notice that $|M(s; \mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{N}}) - M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{N}})| > 1$ if and only if $M(s; \mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{N}}) < M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{N}}) - 1$ for any $s \in [0, 1]$. By condition 2 of Theorem 3.1, there exists thresholds $\tau_1, \tau_2, \dots, \tau_{M_{\max}(\mathbf{f})}$ such that $M(s; \mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{N}}) = m$ for $s \in [\tau_m, \tau_{m+1}]$ for $m = \lfloor M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}) \rfloor$. Therefore, $M(s; \mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{N}}) < M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{N}}) - 1$ is equivalent to $S \in [0, \tau_{M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{N}}) - 1}]$.

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(|M(S; \mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{N}}) - M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{N}})| > 1) &= \mathbb{P}(M(S; \mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{N}}) < M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{N}}) - 1) \\ &= \mathbb{P}(S \in [0, \tau_{M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{N}}) - 1})). \end{aligned}$$

By lemma A.3, $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \tau_{M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}) - 1} = 0$. As a result, we must have $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}(S \in [0, \tau_{M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{N}}) - 1}]) = 0$ and $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}(|M(S; \mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{N}}) - M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{N}})| > 1) = 0$ as desired. □

A.5 Proof of Theorem 4.1

Proof. Let $(f_1^{Naive}, \dots, f_N^{Naive})$ be the strategy profile for the Naive solution, and let $(f_1^{NE}, \dots, f_N^{NE})$ be a Nash equilibrium solution. We will show $u(f_i^{NE}, f_{-i}^{NE}) > u(f_i^{Naive}, f_{-i}^{Naive})$ for every firm $i \in [N]$, which will imply $SW_{NE} > SW_{naive}$. Let $s_c = \min\{s \in [0, 1] : f_1^{Naive}(s) = 1\}$ be the score threshold in which the naive strategy interviews everyone above s_c .

Fix a firm $i \in [N]$. We will show the following two inequalities:

$$u(f_i^{NE}, f_{-i}^{NE}) \geq u(f_i^{Naive}, f_{-i}^{NE}) \geq u(f_i^{Naive}, f_{-i}^{Naive}). \quad (7)$$

The first inequality holds by definition of a Nash equilibrium. The second inequality holds since if firm i chooses the naive strategy f_i^{Naive} , its utility is the lowest when all other firms choose the naive strategy. This is because for any score $s \geq s_c$, the total number of firms competing for applicant s is N under $(f_i^{Naive}, f_{-i}^{Naive})$, but may be smaller under $(f_i^{Naive}, f_{-i}^{NE})$.

We will show that at least one of the two inequalities in (7) is strict. Suppose, by contradiction, that both are equalities. We will first show that $f_{-i}^{NE} = f_{-i}^{Naive}$. Under $(f_i^{Naive}, f_{-i}^{Naive})$, every applicant that firm i interviews is interviewed by N firms in total. For the equality $u(f_i^{Naive}, f_{-i}^{NE}) = u(f_i^{Naive}, f_{-i}^{Naive})$ to hold, it must be that under the strategy profile $(f_i^{Naive}, f_{-i}^{NE})$, every applicant that firm i interviews is also interviewed by N firms in total. If there was an applicant interviewed by strictly fewer firms, then it would be that $u(f_i^{Naive}, f_{-i}^{NE}) > u(f_i^{Naive}, f_{-i}^{Naive})$, since the utility function $U_n(s)$ are strictly monotonic in n . Therefore, it must be that $f_{-i}^{NE} = f_{-i}^{Naive}$.

We will now show that firm i can deviate from f_i^{NE} to strictly improve their utility. Since we assume $u(f_i^{NE}, f_{-i}^{NE}) = u(f_i^{Naive}, f_{-i}^{NE})$, and that $f_{-i}^{NE} = f_{-i}^{Naive}$, we will show that firm i can strictly improve from f_i^{Naive} , when all other firms are at f_{-i}^{Naive} . Let $s' < s_c$ be a score such that $U_1(s') > U_N(s_c)$, which exists since $U_1(s_c) > U_N(s_c)$ and $U_1(s)$ is a continuous and strictly increasing function in s . Under $(f_i^{Naive}, f_{-i}^{Naive})$, no firm is interviewing scores in $[s', s_c]$. Then, if firm i interviews an applicant with score $s \in [s', s_c]$, their utility is strictly higher than $U_N(s_c)$. Therefore, there exists an $\epsilon > 0$ where firm i can deviate from the naive strategy by moving support from $[s_c, s_c + \epsilon]$ to within $[s', s_c]$, where they would earn strictly more utility. This is a contradiction to (f_i^{NE}, f_{-i}^{NE}) being a Nash equilibrium, and hence it must be that one of the two inequalities in (7) is strict. Therefore, $SW_{NE} > SW_{naive}$. \square

A.6 Proof of Theorem 4.2

We will first prove the following lemma before proving the theorem.

Lemma A.4. *For any distribution \mathcal{D} and decision rule $\theta \in \{\text{CORR}, \text{INDEP}\}$, let $\mathcal{I}(c, N) = (N, c, \mathcal{D}, \theta)$ be the instance parameterized by capacity c and number of firms N , and \mathbf{f}_c be a Nash equilibrium for instance $\mathcal{I}(c, N)$. If $Nc < \int_{0.5}^1 \varphi(s)ds$, we must have $M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_c) = 1$ and $\mathbb{P}(S \in [\tau_1, 1]) = Nc$. The social welfare under \mathbf{f}_c is*

$$SW_{NE}(\mathcal{I}(c)) = \int_{\tau_1}^1 U_1(s)\varphi(s)ds.$$

Proof. Suppose $Nc < \int_{0.5}^1 \varphi(s)ds$ and \mathbf{f}_c is a Nash equilibrium. The lowest possible utility a firm can derive without double-interviewing any applicant is 0.5, which is higher than the highest possible utility a firm can derive by double-interviewing any applicant. As a result, we must have $M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_c) = 1$. Since \mathbf{f}_c is a Nash equilibrium, by condition 1 and 2 of Theorem 3.1, $M(s, \mathbf{f}_c) = 1$ on $[\tau_1, 1]$ and $\mathbb{P}(S \in [\tau_1, 1]) = Nc$. Therefore, the social welfare under \mathbf{f}_c is

$$SW_{NE}(\mathcal{I}(c)) = \int_{\tau_1}^1 U_1(s)\varphi(s)ds$$

as desired. \square

Proof of Proposition 4.2. Let \mathbf{f}_c be a Nash equilibrium of the instance $\mathcal{I}(c)$. We will first show $\lim_{c \rightarrow 0^+} \text{PoNS}(\mathcal{I}(c)) = N$. If N is fixed, as $c \rightarrow 0^+$, eventually we will have $c < \int_{0.5}^1 \varphi(s)ds$. By

lemma A.4, $\lim_{c \rightarrow 0^+} M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_c) = 1$ and $\mathbb{P}(S \in [\tau_1, 1]) = Nc$. The social welfare under \mathbf{f}_c is

$$\text{SW}_{\text{NE}}(\mathcal{I}(c)) = \int_{\tau_1}^1 U_1(s) \varphi(s) ds.$$

Let $s_c = \min\{s \in [0, 1] : f_1^{\text{naive}}(s) = 1\}$ be the score threshold in which the naive strategy interviews everyone above s_c . The social welfare under the naive solution is

$$\text{SW}_{\text{naive}}(\mathcal{I}(c)) = N \int_{s_c}^1 U_N(s) \varphi(s) ds.$$

We also notice that $\lim_{c \rightarrow 0^+} U_n(s) = \frac{1}{n}$. Therefore, when $c \rightarrow 0^+$ we have

$$\lim_{c \rightarrow 0^+} \text{PoNS}(\mathcal{I}(c)) = \lim_{c \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{\text{SW}_{\text{NE}}(\mathcal{I}(c))}{\text{SW}_{\text{naive}}(\mathcal{I}(c))} = \frac{\int_{\tau_1}^1 \varphi(s) ds}{N \int_{s_c}^1 \frac{1}{N} \varphi(s) ds} = \frac{\mathbb{P}(S \in [\tau_1, 1])}{\mathbb{P}(S \in [s_c, 1])} = \frac{Nc}{c} = N.$$

Next, we will show $\lim_{c \rightarrow 1^-} \text{PoNS}(\mathcal{I}(c)) = 1$. As $c \rightarrow 1^-$, by condition 1 of Theorem 3.1, $\lim_{c \rightarrow 1^-} \mathbb{P}(f_i(S) = 1) = 1$. Therefore, each firm will interview all the applicants, and we must have $\tau_1 = \dots = \tau_N = 0$. Hence, $\lim_{c \rightarrow 1^-} \text{SW}_{\text{NE}}(\mathcal{I}(c)) = \int_0^1 U_N(s) \varphi(s) ds$. Similarly, $s_c = 0$ and $\lim_{c \rightarrow 1^-} \text{SW}_{\text{naive}}(\mathcal{I}(c)) = \int_0^1 U_N(s) \varphi(s) ds$. Therefore, we have

$$\lim_{c \rightarrow 1^-} \text{PoNS}(\mathcal{I}(c)) = \lim_{c \rightarrow 1^-} \frac{\text{SW}_{\text{NE}}(\mathcal{I}(c))}{\text{SW}_{\text{naive}}(\mathcal{I}(c))} = \frac{\int_0^1 U_N(s) \varphi(s) ds}{\int_0^1 U_N(s) \varphi(s) ds} = 1.$$

□

A.7 Proof of Theorem 4.3

Proof. Let $\mathcal{I}(N) = (N, c, \mathcal{D}, \text{INDEP})$ be an instance with N firms and the independent decision rule. Let $s_c = \min\{s \in [0, c] : f_1^{\text{naive}}(s) = 1\}$ be the score threshold in which the naive strategy interviews everyone above s_c .

$$\begin{aligned} \text{PoNS}(\mathcal{I}(N)) &= \frac{\text{SW}_{\text{NE}}(\mathcal{I}(N))}{\text{SW}_{\text{naive}}(\mathcal{I}(N))} \\ &= \frac{\int_{\tau_1}^{\tau_2} U_1(s) \varphi(s) ds + 2 \int_{\tau_2}^{\tau_3} U_2(s) \varphi(s) ds + \dots + n \int_{\tau_n}^1 U_{M_{\max}(\mathbf{f})}(s) \varphi(s) ds}{N \int_{s_c}^1 U_N(s) \varphi(s) ds}. \end{aligned}$$

By lemma A.3, $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \tau_{M_{\max}(\mathbf{f})-1} \rightarrow 0$ and $U_N(s) \rightarrow \frac{1}{N}$. Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \text{PoNS}(\mathcal{I}(N)) &= \frac{(M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}) - 1) \int_0^{\tau_{M_{\max}(\mathbf{f})}} \frac{1}{M_{\max}(\mathbf{f})-1} \varphi(s) ds + M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}) \int_{\tau_{M_{\max}(\mathbf{f})}}^1 \frac{1}{M_{\max}(\mathbf{f})} \varphi(s) ds}{N \int_{s_c}^1 \frac{1}{N} \varphi(s) ds} \\ &= \frac{\int_0^1 \varphi(s) ds}{\int_{s_c}^1 \varphi(s) ds} \\ &= \frac{1}{c}. \end{aligned}$$

□

A.8 Proof of Theorem 4.4

Before proving Theorem 4.4, we first present the following intermediate result.

Lemma A.5. *For any distribution \mathcal{D} and decision rule $\theta = \{\text{CORR}, \text{INDEP}\}$, let $\mathcal{I}(N) = (N, c, \mathcal{D}, \text{CORR})$ is the instance with N firms and \mathbf{f}_N be the nash equilibrium of the instance. Let τ_1 be the threshold defined in Theorem 3.1, $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \tau_1 = 0$.*

Proof. By condition 3 of Theorem 3.1, $U_1(\tau_1) \leq U_{M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_N)}(\tau_{M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_N)})$. Since $U_n(s)$ is strictly increasing in s , we have $U_{M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_N)}(\tau_{M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_N)}) < U_{M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_N)}(1)$. Given that $U_1(\tau_1) = \tau_1$ and $U_{M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_N)}(1) = \frac{1}{M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_N)}$, we have

$$\tau_1 \leq U_{M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_N)}(\tau_{M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_N)}) < \frac{1}{M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_N)}.$$

By lemma A.2, $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_N)} = 0$. As a result, $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \tau_1 = 0$. \square

Proof of Theorem 4.4. Let $\mathcal{I}(N) = (N, c, \mathcal{D}, \text{CORR})$ be an instance with N firms and the correlated decision rule.

We will first show that $\text{PoNS}(\mathcal{I}(N))$ increases when N increases. Under the correlated decision rule, the utility function takes the form $U_n(s) = s/n$. The social welfare under the Nash equilibrium can be written as:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{SW}_{\text{NE}}(\mathcal{I}(N)) &= \int_{\tau_1}^{\tau_2} U_1(s)\varphi(s)ds + \cdots + M_{\max} \int_{\tau_{M_{\max}}}^1 U_{M_{\max}}(s)\varphi(s)ds \\ &= \int_{\tau_1}^{\tau_2} s\varphi(s)ds + \cdots + M_{\max} \int_{\tau_{M_{\max}}}^1 \frac{s}{M_{\max}}\varphi(s)ds \\ &= \int_{\tau_1}^{\tau_2} s\varphi(s)ds + \cdots + \int_{\tau_{M_{\max}}}^1 s\varphi(s)ds \\ &= \int_{\tau_1}^1 s\varphi(s)ds. \end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

Let $s_c = \min\{s \in [0, c] : f_1^{\text{naive}}(s) = 1\}$ be the score threshold in which the naive strategy interviews everyone above s_c . The social welfare under the naive solution is

$$\text{SW}_{\text{naive}}(\mathcal{I}(N)) = \int_{s_c}^1 U_N(s)\varphi(s)ds = N \int_{s_c}^1 \frac{s}{N}\varphi(s)ds = \int_{s_c}^1 s\varphi(s)ds. \tag{9}$$

Therefore, we can express $\text{PoNS}(\mathcal{I}(N))$ as follows:

$$\text{PoNS}(\mathcal{I}(N)) = \frac{\text{SW}_{\text{NE}}(\mathcal{I}(N))}{\text{SW}_{\text{naive}}(\mathcal{I}(N))} = \frac{\int_{\tau_1}^1 s\varphi(s)ds}{\int_{s_c}^1 s\varphi(s)ds}. \tag{10}$$

By lemma A.5, τ_1 decreases as N increases. Since $s\varphi(s) > 0$, $\int_{\tau_1}^1 s\varphi(s)ds$ increases as τ_1 decreases. Given that the denominator of (10) is fixed, we can conclude that $\text{PoNS}(\mathcal{I}(N))$ increases as N increases.

Next, we want show that in the limit when N goes to infinity, $\text{PoNS}(\mathcal{I}(N))$ converges to $\frac{\mathbb{E}S}{\int_{s_c}^1 s\varphi(s)ds}$. By lemma A.5, $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \tau_1 = 0$. Therefore, the numerator of the equation (10) converges to $\int_0^1 s\varphi(s)ds = \mathbb{E}S$. We conclude that

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \text{PoNS}(\mathcal{I}(N)) = \frac{\mathbb{E}S}{\int_{s_c}^1 s\varphi(s)ds}. \quad (11)$$

Next, we will consider the special case where $\mathcal{D} = \text{UNIF}$. Under $\mathcal{D} = \text{UNIF}$, $\mathbb{E}S = 0.5$ and equation (11) can be written as

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \text{PoNS}(\mathcal{I}(N)) = \frac{\frac{1}{2}}{\int_{1-c}^1 s ds} = \frac{1}{2c - c^2}.$$

Therefore, under the uniform distribution, $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \text{PoNS}(\mathcal{I}(N)) = \frac{1}{2c - c^2}$. We only need to show that if $Nc \leq 0.5$, then $\text{PoNS}(\mathcal{I}(N)) \geq 1.5$. By lemma A.4, when $Nc \leq \int_{0.5}^1 \varphi(s)ds = 0.5$, $M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_N) = 1$ and $\mathbb{P}(S \in [\tau_1, 1]) = Nc$. Since $\mathcal{D} = \text{UNIF}$, $\tau_1 = 1 - Nc$. By equation (10),

$$\begin{aligned} \text{PoNS}(\mathcal{I}(N)) &= \frac{1 - \tau_1^2}{1 - (1 - c)^2} \\ &= \frac{2Nc - N^2c^2}{2c - c^2} \\ &= \frac{2N - N^2c}{2 - c} \\ &\geq \frac{2N - N/2}{2 - c} \\ &= \frac{3N}{2(2 - c)} \\ &\geq \frac{6}{2(2 - c)} \\ &\geq \frac{3}{2} = 1.5. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, under the uniform distribution, if $Nc \leq 0.5$, $\text{PoNS}(\mathcal{I}(N)) \geq 1.5$. □

A.9 Proof of Theorem 4.5

We will first derive an expression for the highest possible social welfare before proving the theorem.

Lemma A.6. *For any distribution \mathcal{D} , let $\mathcal{I}(c, N) = (N, c, \mathcal{D}, \text{CORR})$ be the instance parameterized by the capacity c and the number of firms N . Suppose $\mathbb{P}(S \in [s_{Nc}, 1]) = Nc$, then*

$$SW_{\max}(\mathcal{I}(c, N)) = \begin{cases} \int_{s_{Nc}}^1 s\varphi(s)ds, & \text{if } Nc \leq 1 \\ \mathbf{E}[S]. & \text{o.w.} \end{cases}$$

Proof. Let $\mathcal{I}(c, N) = (N, c, \mathcal{D}, \theta)$ be the instance parameterized by the capacity c and number of firms N . Let $s_{Nc} \in [0, 1]$ such that $\mathbb{P}(S \in [s_{Nc}, 1]) = Nc$. Our goal is to show that for any

arbitrary strategy profile with the same capacity and number of firms, the social welfare is at most $\int_{s_{Nc}}^1 s\varphi(s)ds$ when $Nc \leq 1$, and $\mathbf{E}[S]$ when $Nc > 1$.

Let's first consider the case when $Nc \leq 1$. We will first show that $\text{SW}_{\max}(\mathcal{I}(c, N)) \geq \int_{s_{Nc}}^1 s\varphi(s)ds$. First, since $\mathbb{P}(S \in [s_{Nc}, 1]) = Nc$ and $Nc \leq 1$, there exists $s_{Nc} = s_1 < s_2 < \dots < s_N < s_{N+1} = 1$ such that $\mathbb{P}(S \in [s_i, s_{i+1}]) = c$. Let \mathbf{f} be a strategy such that $f_i(s) = 1$ if and only if $s \in [s_i, s_{i+1}]$ for $i \in [N]$. Under \mathbf{f} , we have $M(s, \mathbf{f}) = 1$ for $s \in [s_{Nc}, 1]$ and $M(s, \mathbf{f}) = 0$ otherwise. Therefore, the social welfare is $\int_{s_{Nc}}^1 s\varphi(s)ds$. Hence we must have $\text{SW}_{\max}(\mathcal{I}(c, N)) \geq \int_{s_{Nc}}^1 s\varphi(s)ds$.

We will then show $\text{SW}_{\max}(\mathcal{I}(c, N)) \leq \int_{s_{Nc}}^1 s\varphi(s)ds$. Let \mathbf{f}_{arb} be an arbitrary strategy profile with N firms each with capacity c . Define $S_n = \{s \in [0, 1], M(s; \mathbf{f}_{\text{arb}}) = n\}$. The social welfare under \mathbf{f}_{arb} is

$$\begin{aligned} \text{SW}_{\text{arb}}(\mathcal{I}(c, N)) &= N \int_{S_N} U_N(s)\varphi(s)ds + (N-1) \int_{S_{N-1}} U_{N-1}(s)\varphi(s)ds + \dots + \int_{S_1} s\varphi(s)ds \\ &= N \int_{S_N} \frac{s}{N}\varphi(s)ds + (N-1) \int_{S_{N-1}} \frac{s}{N-1}\varphi(s)ds + \dots + \int_{S_1} s\varphi(s)ds \\ &= \int_{\cup S_i} s\varphi(s)ds. \end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

Since $\mathbb{P}(S \in \cup S_i) \leq Nc$ and s is strictly increasing, we must have $\text{SW}_{\text{arb}}(\mathcal{I}(c, N)) \leq \int_{s_{Nc}}^1 s\varphi(s)ds$. Therefore, $\text{SW}_{\max}(\mathcal{I}(c, N)) \leq \int_{s_{Nc}}^1 s\varphi(s)ds$. We've shown that $\text{SW}_{\max}(\mathcal{I}(c, N)) \geq \int_{s_{Nc}}^1 s\varphi(s)ds$ and $\text{SW}_{\max}(\mathcal{I}(c, N)) \leq \int_{s_{Nc}}^1 s\varphi(s)ds$. As a result, $\text{SW}_{\max}(\mathcal{I}(c, N)) = \int_{s_{Nc}}^1 s\varphi(s)ds$ when $Nc \leq 1$.

Next, consider the case when $Nc > 1$. By equation (12), for any arbitrary strategy profile \mathbf{f}_{arb} the social welfare is

$$\text{SW}_{\text{arb}}(\mathcal{I}(c, N)) = \int_{\cup S_i} s\varphi(s)ds \leq \int_0^1 s\varphi(s)ds = \mathbf{E}[S].$$

Hence, $\text{SW}_{\max}(\mathcal{I}(c, N)) \leq \mathbf{E}[S]$. We will then show $\text{SW}_{\max}(\mathcal{I}(c, N)) \geq \mathbf{E}[S]$. Since $Nc > 1$, there exists $0 = s_1 \leq s_2 \leq \dots \leq s_N \leq s_{N+1} = 1$ with $p \leq N$ such that $\mathbb{P}(S \in [s_i, s_{i+1}]) \leq c$. Let \mathbf{f} be a strategy such that $f_i(s) = 1$ if and only if $s \in [s_i, s_{i+1}]$ for $i \in [N]$. In this case, $\cup S_i = [0, 1]$ and $\mathbb{P}(S \in \cup S_i) = 1$. Hence, by equation (12), the social welfare under \mathbf{f} is $\int_0^1 s\varphi(s)ds = \mathbf{E}[S]$. Hence, $\text{SW}_{\max}(\mathcal{I}(c, N)) \geq \mathbf{E}[S]$. As a result, we must have $\text{SW}_{\max}(\mathcal{I}(c, N)) = \mathbf{E}[S]$ when $Nc > 1$. □

Lemma A.7. *For any distribution \mathcal{D} , let $\mathcal{I}(c, N) = (N, c, \mathcal{D}, \text{INDEP})$ be the instance parameterized by the capacity c and the number of firms N . Suppose $\mathbb{P}(S \in [s_{Nc}, 1]) = Nc$, then*

$$\lim_{c \rightarrow 0} \text{SW}_{\max}(\mathcal{I}(c, N)) = \int_{s_{Nc}}^1 s\varphi(s)ds.$$

Proof. Let \mathbf{f}_{\max} be the strategy profile for instance $\mathcal{I}(c, N)$ that maximizes the social welfare. We will first show that $M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_{\max}) = 1$. Define $S_n = \{s \in [0, 1], M(s; \mathbf{f}_{\max}) = n\}$. We want to show that $S_i = \emptyset$ for all $i > 1$. Suppose, by contradiction, $S_i \neq \emptyset$ for some $i > 1$. We want to show that there exist some set $S'_1 \notin \cup_i S_i$ such that $i \int_{S_i} \varphi(s)ds = \int_{S'_1} \varphi(s)ds$ and $i \int_{S_i} U_i(s)\varphi(s)ds < \int_{S'_1} s\varphi(s)ds$. Under the utility constraint, we have $\sum_{i=1}^{M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_{\max})} i\mathbb{P}(S \in S_i) \leq Nc$. Hence, $\mathbb{P}(S \in \cup_i S_i) \leq \sum_{i=1}^{M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_{\max})} \mathbb{P}(S \in S_i) \leq \sum_{i=1}^{M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_{\max})} i\mathbb{P}(S \in S_i) \leq Nc$. Since $c \rightarrow 0$, $Nc \rightarrow 0$ as well. When Nc

is small enough, we can always find some $S'_1 \subset (0.5, 1] \setminus \cup_i S_i$ such that $i \int_{S_i} \varphi(s) ds = \int_{S'_1} \varphi(s) ds$. Therefore, the total social welfare derived by interviewing applicants in S_i is

$$i \int_{S_i} U_i(s) \varphi(s) ds \leq i \int_{S_i} \frac{1}{i} \varphi(s) ds = \frac{1}{i} \int_{S'_1} \varphi(s) ds \leq \frac{1}{2} \int_{S'_1} \varphi(s) ds < \int_{S'_1} s \varphi(s) ds,$$

which is strictly less than the social welfare that can be derived by interviewing applicants in S'_1 . Therefore, for each $S_i \neq \emptyset$, we can always move the support from S_i to some set $S'_1 \notin \cup_i S_i$ to yield a higher utility. This contradicts the assumption that \mathbf{f}_{\max} maximizes the social welfare. Hence, $S_i = \emptyset$ for all $i > 1$ and $M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_{\max}) = 1$. Since $\mathbb{P}(S \in S_1) \leq Nc$, $U_1(s) = s$ is strictly increasing and $\varphi(s) > 0$, we have $\int_{S_1} s \varphi(s) ds \leq \int_{s_{Nc}}^1 s \varphi(s) ds$ where $\mathbb{P}(S \in [s_{Nc}, 1]) = Nc$. Therefore, $\text{SW}_{\max}(\mathcal{I}(c, N)) = \int_{s_{Nc}}^1 s \varphi(s) ds$ when c is small enough. Hence, we conclude that $\lim_{c \rightarrow 0} \text{SW}_{\max}(\mathcal{I}(c, N)) = \int_{s_{Nc}}^1 s \varphi(s) ds$. \square

Proof of Theorem 4.5. We first show the first part of the statement is true. That is, for any N , we have $\lim_{c \rightarrow 0} \text{PoA}(\mathcal{I}(c, N)) = 1$. Let $\mathcal{I}(c, N)$ be an instance with N fixed. Let \mathbf{f}_c be a Nash equilibrium of the instance $\mathcal{I}(c, N)$ with thresholds $\tau_1, \dots, \tau_{M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_c)}$ defined as in Theorem 3.1. As $c \rightarrow 0$, we have $Nc \rightarrow 0$. Hence, we must have $Nc < \int_{0.5}^1 \varphi(s) ds$ for small enough c . By lemma A.4, the social welfare under \mathbf{f}_c is $\lim_{c \rightarrow 0} \text{SW}_{\text{NE}}(\mathcal{I}(c, N)) = \int_{\tau_1}^1 s \varphi(s) ds$. and $\mathbb{P}(S \in [\tau_1, 1]) = Nc$. Next we will show $\lim_{c \rightarrow 0} \text{SW}_{\max}(\mathcal{I}(c, N)) = \int_{\tau_1}^1 s \varphi(s) ds$ for $\theta = \{\text{CORR}, \text{INDEP}\}$. If $\theta = \text{CORR}$, since $Nc \rightarrow 0$ and $\mathbb{P}(S \in [\tau_1, 1]) = Nc$, by lemma A.6, $\lim_{c \rightarrow 0} \text{SW}_{\max}(\mathcal{I}(c, N)) = \int_{\tau_1}^1 s \varphi(s) ds$ as desired. If $\theta = \text{INDEP}$, since $\mathbb{P}(S \in [\tau_1, 1]) = Nc$, by lemma A.7, $\lim_{c \rightarrow 0} \text{SW}_{\max}(\mathcal{I}(c, N)) = \int_{\tau_1}^1 s \varphi(s) ds$ as well. Hence, $\lim_{c \rightarrow 0} \text{SW}_{\max}(\mathcal{I}(c, N)) = \int_{\tau_1}^1 s \varphi(s) ds$ for $\theta = \{\text{CORR}, \text{INDEP}\}$. Therefore,

$$\lim_{c \rightarrow 0} \text{PoA}(\mathcal{I}(c)) = \lim_{c \rightarrow 0} \frac{\text{SW}_{\text{NE}}(\mathcal{I}(c))}{\text{SW}_{\max}(\mathcal{I}(c))} = \frac{\int_{\tau_1}^1 s \varphi(s) ds}{\int_{\tau_1}^1 s \varphi(s) ds} = 1.$$

Next, we will show for any $c \in (0, 1)$, we have $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \text{PoA}(\mathcal{I}(c, N)) = 1$. We will first prove the case when $\theta = \text{CORR}$. By equation (8), when hiring decisions are correlated, $\text{SW}_{\text{NE}}(\mathcal{I}(c, N)) = \int_{\tau_1}^1 s \varphi(s) ds$. Moreover, by lemma A.5, $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \tau_1 = 0$. Therefore, we must have

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \text{SW}_{\text{NE}}(\mathcal{I}(c)) = \lim_{\tau_1 \rightarrow 0} \int_{\tau_1}^1 s \varphi(s) ds = \int_0^1 s \varphi(s) ds = \mathbf{E}[S].$$

When N is large enough, we must have $Nc > 1$. By lemma A.6, $\text{SW}_{\max}(\mathcal{I}(c)) = \mathbf{E}[S]$. Therefore,

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \text{PoA}(\mathcal{I}(c, N)) = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\text{SW}_{\text{NE}}(\mathcal{I}(c, N))}{\text{SW}_{\max}(\mathcal{I}(c, N))} = \frac{\mathbf{E}[S]}{\mathbf{E}[S]} = 1.$$

If $\theta = \text{INDEP}$, by lemma A.3, $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \tau_{M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_c)-1} \rightarrow 0$ and $U_N(s) \rightarrow \frac{1}{N}$. Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} & \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \text{SW}_{\text{NE}}(\mathcal{I}(c, N)) \\ &= (M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_c) - 1) \int_0^{\tau_{M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_c)}} \frac{1}{M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_c) - 1} \varphi(s) ds + M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_c) \int_{\tau_{M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_c)}}^1 \frac{1}{M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_c)} \varphi(s) ds \\ &= \int_0^1 \varphi(s) ds = 1. \end{aligned}$$

We will then show $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \text{SW}_{\max}(\mathcal{I}(c, N)) = 1$ as well. We will first show $\text{SW}_{\max}(\mathcal{I}(c, N)) \leq 1$. Let \mathbf{f}_{arb} be an arbitrary strategy profile and define $S_n = \{s \in [0, 1], M(s; \mathbf{f}_{\text{arb}}) = n\}$ for $n \in [M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_{\text{arb}})]$. The social welfare under \mathbf{f}_{arb} is

$$\begin{aligned} \text{SW}_{\text{arb}}(\mathcal{I}(c, N)) &= N \int_{S_N} U_N(s) \varphi(s) ds + (N-1) \int_{S_{N-1}} U_{N-1}(s) \varphi(s) ds + \cdots + \int_{S_1} s \varphi(s) ds \\ &\leq N \int_{S_N} \frac{1}{N} \varphi(s) ds + (N-1) \int_{S_{N-1}} \frac{1}{N-1} \varphi(s) ds + \cdots + \int_{S_1} \varphi(s) ds \\ &= \int_{\cup_{i=1}^N S_i} \varphi(s) ds \\ &= \mathbb{P}(S \in \cup_{i=1}^N S_i). \end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

By equation (13), we have $\text{SW}_{\text{arb}}(\mathcal{I}(c, N)) \leq \mathbb{P}(S \in \cup_{i=1}^N S_i) \leq 1$. Hence, $\text{SW}_{\max}(\mathcal{I}(c, N)) \leq 1$. As a result, $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \text{SW}_{\max}(\mathcal{I}(c, N)) \leq 1$. Moreover, by definition, $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \text{SW}_{\max}(\mathcal{I}(c, N)) \geq \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \text{SW}_{\text{NE}}(\mathcal{I}(c, N)) = 1$. Therefore, $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \text{SW}_{\max}(\mathcal{I}(c, N)) \geq 1$. As a result, we conclude $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \text{SW}_{\max}(\mathcal{I}(c, N)) = 1$. Therefore,

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \text{PoA}(\mathcal{I}(c, N)) = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\text{SW}_{\text{NE}}(\mathcal{I}(c, N))}{\text{SW}_{\max}(\mathcal{I}(c, N))} = 1$$

for $\theta = \{\text{CORR}, \text{INDEP}\}$. □

A.10 Proof of Theorem 5.1

Proof. To show that the game defined is a congestion game, we only need to find an exact potential function. Suppose there are N firms in the market and the strategy profile is \mathbf{f} . Consider an arbitrary firm i in the market. The change in the utility of the firm after the firm switches its strategy from f_i to f'_i is

$$u(f_i, f_{-i}) - u(f'_i, f_{-i}) = \int_{A_i \setminus A'_i} U_{M(s; \mathbf{f})}(s) \varphi(s) ds - \int_{A'_i \setminus A_i} U_{M(s; \mathbf{f})+1}(s) \varphi(s) ds,$$

where $A_i = \{s \in [0, 1], f_i(s) = 1\}$ and $A'_i = \{s \in [0, 1], f'_i(s) = 1\}$.

Now define the function $P(f_i, f_{-i})$ as

$$P(f_i, f_{-i}) = \int_0^1 \sum_{j=1}^{M(s; \mathbf{f})} U_j(s) \varphi(s) ds.$$

We will verify P is an exact potential function. Let \mathbf{f}' be the strategy profile with (f'_i, f_{-i}) . Note that $M(s, \mathbf{f}')$ differs from $M(s, \mathbf{f})$ only on sets $A_i \setminus A'_i$ and $A'_i \setminus A_i$. Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
P(f_i, f_{-i}) - P(f'_i, f_{-i}) &= \int_{A_i \setminus A'_i} \sum_{j=1}^{M(s, \mathbf{f}')} U_j(s) \varphi(s) ds + \int_{A'_i \setminus A_i} \sum_{j=1}^{M(s, \mathbf{f}')} U_j(s) \varphi(s) ds \\
&\quad - \left(\int_{A_i \setminus A'_i} \sum_{j=1}^{M(s, \mathbf{f}')-1} U_j(s) \varphi(s) ds + \int_{A'_i \setminus A_i} \sum_{j=1}^{M(s, \mathbf{f}')+1} U_j(s) \varphi(s) ds \right) \\
&= \int_{A_i \setminus A'_i} U_{M(s, \mathbf{f})}(s) \varphi(s) ds - \int_{A'_i \setminus A_i} U_{M(s, \mathbf{f})+1}(s) \varphi(s) ds \\
&= u(f_i, f_{-i}) - u(f'_i, f_{-i}).
\end{aligned}$$

By definition, P is an exact potential function. Since this game has an exact potential function, it is a congestion game. \square

A.11 Proof of Theorem 5.2

We first prove some intermediate results before proving the main theorem.

Lemma A.8. *Suppose there is a $\delta > 0$ such that $\varphi(s) \geq \delta \forall s \in [0, 1]$ and there are N firms in the market that form an equal-utility Nash equilibrium $\mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{N}}$ with $\theta = \text{CORR}$. Let $0 = \tau_0 \leq \dots \leq \tau_{N+1} = 1$ be the set of thresholds corresponds to $\mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{N}}$. For a new firm $N + 1$, as long as $c \leq 0.5\delta$ for every firm i , there exists $0 = \tau'_0 \leq \dots \leq \tau'_{N+2} = 1$ such that $\tau_m < \tau'_{m+1} \leq \tau_{m+1}$ for each $i \in [M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{N}})]$, $\sum_{m=0}^N \int_{\tau'_{m+1}}^{\tau_{m+1}} \varphi(s) ds = c$ and $U_n(\tau'_n) = U_m(\tau'_m)$ for all $0 < \tau'_m < \tau'_n < 1$. Let $f_{N+1}(s) = 1$ if and only if $s \in \cup_{m=0}^N [\tau'_{m+1}, \tau_{m+1})$. Then f_{N+1} is the unique best response for firm $N + 1$ and the strategy profile forms an equal-utility nash equilibrium.*

Proof. Let $f(t) = \sum_{m=0}^N \int_{(m+1)t}^{\tau_{m+1}} \varphi(s) ds$ for $t \in [0, \tau_1]$. We will show that for all $t \in [\frac{\tau_{M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{N}})}}{M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{N}})+1}, \tau_1)$, thresholds defined by

$$\tau'_m = \begin{cases} mt, & \text{if } mt \leq 1 \\ 1, & \text{o.w.} \end{cases} \quad (14)$$

satisfy $\tau_m < \tau'_{m+1} \leq \tau_{m+1}$ for each $m \in [M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{N}})]$. Let $m \in [M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{N}})]$ be arbitrary, we will first check the inequality when $t^* = \frac{\tau_{M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{N}})}}{M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{N}})+1} = \frac{M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{N}})\tau_1}{M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{N}})+1}$. If $\tau_{M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{N}})+1} < 1$, then for any $m \in [M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{N}})]$

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\tau'_{m+1}}{\tau_m} &> \frac{(m+1) \frac{M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{N}})\tau_1}{M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{N}})+1}}{m\tau_1} \\
&= \frac{m+1}{M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{N}})+1} \frac{M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{N}})}{m} \\
&= \left(1 + \frac{1}{m}\right) \left(1 - \frac{1}{M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{N}})+1}\right) \\
&\geq \left(1 + \frac{1}{M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{N}})}\right) \left(1 - \frac{1}{M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{N}})+1}\right) \\
&= \frac{M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{N}})+1}{M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{N}})} \frac{M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{N}})}{M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{N}})+1} = 1.
\end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

If $\tau_{M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{N}})+1} = 1$, then clearly, $\tau_{M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{N}})} < \tau'_{M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{N}})+1} \leq \tau_{M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{N}})+1}$. The equation (15) holds for $m < [M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{N}})]$. Therefore, the inequality holds for all m . We conclude that $\tau_{m+1}^* > \tau_m$ if $t^* = \frac{\tau_{M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{N}})}}{M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{N}})+1}$ for all $m \in [M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{N}})]$. For any $t' \in [t^*, \tau_1]$, if $\tau'_{m+1} < 1$, then $\tau'_{m+1} = (m+1)t' > (m+1)t^* = \tau_{m+1}^* \geq \tau_m$. If $\tau'_{m+1} = 1$, then clearly $\tau'_{m+1} > \tau_m$ since by definition $\tau_m < 1$ for all $m \in [M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{N}})]$. Moreover, $mt \leq m\tau_1 = \tau_m$ for any $m \in [M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{N}}) + 1]$. Therefore, $\tau_m < \tau'_{m+1} \leq \tau_{m+1}$ for each $m \in [M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{N}})]$.

Next, we want to show $f(t)$ is continuous. Note that each integral $\int_{(m+1)t}^{\tau_{m+1}} \varphi(s)ds$ is continuous in t , and as a result, we must have $f(t)$ is continuous as well. Moreover, by proposition 3.1, if $\theta = \text{CORR}$, we must have $\tau_m = m\tau_1$ for each $m \in [M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{N}})]$. Hence, $\lim_{t \rightarrow \tau_1} f(t) = \sum_{m=0}^N \int_{\tau_{m+1}}^{\tau_{m+1}} \varphi(s)ds = 0$. Furthermore,

$$\begin{aligned}
\lim_{t \rightarrow t^*} f(t) &= \sum_{m=0}^{M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{N}})} \int_{\tau'_{m+1}}^{\tau_{m+1}} \varphi(s)ds \\
&\geq \sum_{m=0}^{M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{N}})} \int_{\tau'_{m+1}}^{\tau_{m+1}} \delta ds \\
&= \delta \sum_{m=0}^{M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{N}})} (\tau_{m+1} - \tau'_{m+1}) \\
&= \delta \left(\sum_{m=0}^{M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{N}})} \left(\frac{m\tau_{M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{N}})}}{M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{N}})} - \frac{m\tau_{M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{N}})}}{M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{N}})+1} \right) + (1 - \tau'_{M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{N}})+1}) \right) \\
&= \delta \left(\sum_{m=1}^{M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{N}})} \frac{m\tau_{M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{N}})}}{M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{N}})(M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{N}})+1)} + (1 - \tau'_{M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{N}})+1}) \right) \\
&= \delta \left(\frac{M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{N}})(M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{N}})+1)}{2} \frac{\tau_{M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{N}})}}{M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{N}})(M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{N}})+1)} + (1 - \tau'_{M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{N}})+1}) \right) \\
&= \delta \left(1 + \frac{\tau_{M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{N}})}}{2} - \tau'_{M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{N}})+1} \right) \\
&\geq \delta \left(1 + \frac{\tau_{M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{N}})}}{2} - \tau_{M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{N}})} \right) \\
&= \delta \left(1 - \frac{\tau_{M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{N}})}}{2} \right) > 0.5\delta.
\end{aligned}$$

Since $0 < c \leq 0.5\delta$, by intermediate value theorem, there exists $t_0 \in [t^*, \tau_1]$ such that $f(t_0) = c$. In addition, the thresholds defined by (14) satisfy the desired inequalities.

Let $\mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{N}+1} = (f_1, \dots, f_N, f'_{N+1})$ be the strategy profile after firm $N+1$ makes the above response. We want to show that f_{N+1} is the best response strategy by showing $\mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{N}+1}$ is an equal-utility Nash equilibrium. Since $\tau_m < \tau'_{m+1} \leq \tau_{m+1}$ for each $m \in [M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{N}})]$, $\cup_{m=1}^{N+1} [\tau'_{m+1}, \tau_{m+1})$ is the union of disjoint sets. Hence, $\mathbb{P}(s \in [0, 1], f_{N+1} = 1) = \cup_{m=1}^{N+1} \mathbb{P}(S \in [\tau'_{m+1}, \tau_{m+1})) = c$. As a result, $\mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{N}+1}$ satisfies the first condition of Theorem 3.1. In addition, since $\tau_m < \tau'_{m+1} \leq \tau_{m+1}$ and the strategies (f_1, \dots, f_N) remain unchanged, we have $M(s, \mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{N}+1}) = M(s, \mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{N}}) + 1$ for $s \in \cup_{m=1}^{N+1} [\tau'_{m+1}, \tau_{m+1})$. Hence, $M(s, \mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{N}+1}) = m$ for $s \in [\tau'_m, \tau'_{m+1})$ and the thresholds satisfy the second condition of Theorem 3.1. Next, the thresholds defined by (14) satisfy $U_m(\tau'_m) = U_n(\tau'_n)$ for all $0 < \tau'_m < \tau'_n < 1$. Therefore, $\mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{N}+1}$ satisfies all the conditions of Theorem 3.1 and is an equal-utility Nash equilibrium. By definition of a Nash equilibrium, f'_{N+1} is the best response strategy. We only need to show this strategy is unique. Let $K = \{s \in [0, 1], f_{N+1}(s) = 1\}$. We claim that the utility firm

$N + 1$ can derive by interviewing an applicant with score $s \notin K$ is strictly less than the worst utility it can derive by interviewing an applicant with in K . Given that the thresholds satisfy $\tau_m < \tau'_{m+1} \leq \tau_{m+1}$ for each $m \in [M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_N)]$ and $U_m(\tau'_m) = U_n(\tau'_n)$ for all $0 < \tau'_m < \tau'_n < 1$, $\min_{s \in K} U_{M(s, \mathbf{f}_{N+1})}(s) = t_0$. Since $U_n(s)$ is strictly increasing in s , for any applicant with $s \notin K$, the utility firm $N + 1$ can derive by interviewing this applicant is $U_{M(s, \mathbf{f}_{N+1+1})}(s) < t_0$. Hence, $U_{M(s, \mathbf{f}_{N+1+1})}(s) < \min_{s \in K} U_{M(s, \mathbf{f}_{N+1})}(s)$. This implies that moving any support from K to K^c will lead to a strictly smaller utility. Therefore, f_{N+1} yields a strictly higher utility than any other strategy. Hence, f_{N+1} is the unique best response. \square

Proof of Theorem 5.2. We will prove the theorem by induction. When $n = 1$, the best response strategy is $f_1(s) = 1$ if and only if $s \in [s_c, 1]$ with $\mathbb{P}(S \in [s_c, 1]) = c$. Since $c < 0.5\delta$, we have $\int_{0.5}^1 \varphi(s) ds \geq \int_{0.5}^1 \delta ds = 0.5\delta$. Hence, $c < \int_{0.5}^1 \varphi(s) ds$. Let \mathbf{f}_1 denote the strategy profile. \mathbf{f}_1 satisfies the conditions established in Theorem 3.1, and thus it is at an equal-utility Nash equilibrium.

Next, suppose the strategy profile \mathbf{f}_k with $M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_k) = k$ is at an equal-utility Nash equilibrium and there are n firms. By lemma A.8, since the best response strategy is unique, the new strategy profile \mathbf{f}'_k after firm $n + 1$ makes the best response is still at an equal-utility Nash equilibrium. Therefore, the one-turn best response dynamics converges to an equal-utility Nash equilibrium. \square

A.12 Proof of Theorem 5.3

To show the statement is true, we first present some intermediate results.

Lemma A.9. *Suppose $\tau_1 \in [0, 1]$ and $\tau_m = 1 - (1 - m\tau_1)^{\frac{1}{m}}$ such that $\tau_m \leq 1$, then τ_m is strictly decreasing when τ_1 decreases. Fix an integer $n \geq 1$, $\tau_{n+1} - \tau_n$ is strictly decreasing when τ_1 decreases.*

Proof. Let $f(t) = 1 - (1 - mt)^{\frac{1}{m}}$ and m be fixed. We will show that $f(t)$ decreases when t decreases. When t decreases, $(1 - mt)^{\frac{1}{m}}$ is strictly increasing and therefore $f(t)$ is strictly decreasing. Then the conclusion follows. Next, we fix an integer $n \geq 1$, and we want to show $\tau_{n+1} - \tau_n$ is strictly decreasing with τ_1 . Let $g(t) = \tau_{n+1} - \tau_n = (1 - nt)^{\frac{1}{n}} - (1 - (n+1)t)^{\frac{1}{n+1}}$. The derivative is $g'(t) = \frac{1}{(1 - (n+1)t)^{1 - \frac{1}{n+1}}} - \frac{1}{(1 - nt)^{1 - \frac{1}{n}}}$. Since $0 < 1 - \frac{1}{n} < 1 - \frac{1}{n+1} < 1$ and $1 - nt > 1 - (n+1)t$, we must have $(1 - (n+1)t)^{1 - \frac{1}{n+1}} < (1 - nt)^{1 - \frac{1}{n}}$. Therefore, $g'(t) = \frac{1}{(1 - (n+1)t)^{1 - \frac{1}{n+1}}} - \frac{1}{(1 - nt)^{1 - \frac{1}{n}}} > 0$.

We conclude that $\tau_{n+1} - \tau_n$ is strictly decreasing with τ_1 . \square

Lemma A.10. *Fix the total number of firms N_0 . Suppose there is a $\delta > 0$ such that $\varphi(s) \geq \delta \forall s \in [0, 1]$ and there are $N < N_0$ firms in the market that form an equal-utility Nash equilibrium \mathbf{f}_N with $\theta = \text{INDEP}$, $\tau_1 > \frac{1}{M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_N) + 1}$. Let $0 = \tau_0 \leq \dots \leq \tau_{N+1} = 1$ be the set of thresholds corresponds to \mathbf{f}_N . Let $c_0 = \delta(\min_{m \in [N_0]}((1 - \frac{m}{N_0+1})^{\frac{1}{m}} - (1 - \frac{m+1}{N_0+1})^{\frac{1}{m+1}}))$. For a new firm $N + 1$, as long as $c \leq c_0$ for every firm i , there exists $0 = \tau'_0 \leq \dots \leq \tau'_{N+2} = 1$ such that $\tau_m < \tau'_{m+1} \leq \tau_{m+1}$ for each $m \in [M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_N)]$, $\sum_{m=0}^N \int_{\tau'_m}^{\tau_{m+1}} \varphi(s) ds = c$ and $U_m(\tau'_m) = U_n(\tau'_n)$ for all $0 < \tau'_m < \tau'_n < 1$. Let $f_{N+1}(s) = 1$ if and only if $s \in \cup_{m=0}^N [\tau'_{m+1}, \tau_{m+1})$. f_{N+1} is the unique best response for firm $N + 1$, and the strategy profile \mathbf{f}'_N defined by $\mathbf{f}'_N = (f_1, \dots, f_N, f'_{N+1})$ forms an equal-utility nash equilibrium with $\tau'_1 > \frac{1}{M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}'_N) + 1}$.*

Proof. By equation (6), given τ_1 , under $\theta = \text{INDEP}$, we have $\tau_m = 1 - (1 - \tau_1 m)^{1/m}$ for $m \leq M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{N}})$. Let $t^* = \max_{m \in [M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{N}})]} U_{m+1}(\tau_m)$. We will show that for all $t \in (t^*, \tau_1)$, thresholds defined by

$$\tau'_m = \begin{cases} 1 - (1 - mt)^{\frac{1}{m}}, & \text{if } 1 - (1 - mt)^{\frac{1}{m}} \leq 1 \\ 1, & \text{o.w.} \end{cases} \quad (16)$$

satisfy $\tau_m < \tau'_{m+1} \leq \tau_{m+1}$ for each $m \in [M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{N}})]$. First, we note that $U_{m+1}(\tau'_{m+1}) = t$ under construction. Suppose, by contradiction, $\tau_m \geq \tau'_{m+1}$ for some m , then we have $U_{m+1}(\tau_m) \geq U_{m+1}(\tau'_{m+1}) = t$. This contradicts the assumption that $t^* = \max_{m \in [M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{N}})]} U_{m+1}(\tau_m) < t$. Moreover, $\tau'_{m+1} \leq \tau_{m+1}$ since $t < \tau_1$ by lemma A.9. Therefore, we conclude that $\tau_m < \tau'_{m+1} \leq \tau_{m+1}$ for each $m \in [M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{N}})]$.

Next, let $f(t) = \sum_{m=0}^N \int_{1-(1-tm)^{1/m}}^{\tau_{m+1}} \varphi(s) ds$ for $t \in [0, \tau_1]$. We want to show that there exists t such that $f(t) = c$. Since $\int_{1-(1-tm)^{1/m}}^{\tau_{m+1}} \varphi(s) ds$ is continuous for each m , $f(t)$ is continuous. We also notice that $\lim_{t \rightarrow \tau_1} f(t) = \sum_{m=0}^N \int_{\tau_{m+1}}^{\tau_{m+1}} \varphi(s) ds = 0$. Define $c_0 = \delta(\min_{m \in [N_0]} ((1 - \frac{m}{N_0+1})^{\frac{1}{m}} - (1 - \frac{m+1}{N_0+1})^{\frac{1}{m+1}}))$. By lemma A.9, for any $\tau_1 > \frac{1}{N+1}$, we must have $\tau_{m+1} - \tau_m \geq (1 - \frac{m}{N+1})^{\frac{1}{m}} - (1 - \frac{m+1}{N+1})^{\frac{1}{m+1}} \geq \min_{m \in [N_0]} ((1 - \frac{m}{N_0+1})^{\frac{1}{m}} - (1 - \frac{m+1}{N_0+1})^{\frac{1}{m+1}})$. Since $\mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{N}}$ is an equal-utility nash equilibrium, clearly $\tau_1 > \frac{1}{N+1}$. Furthermore, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{t \rightarrow t^*} f(t) &= \sum_{m=0}^{M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{N}})} \int_{\tau'_{m+1}}^{\tau_{m+1}} \varphi(s) ds \\ &\geq \sum_{m=0}^{M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{N}})} \int_{\tau'_{m+1}}^{\tau_{m+1}} \delta ds \\ &= \delta \sum_{m=0}^{M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{N}})} (\tau_{m+1} - \tau'_{m+1}) \\ &> \delta \sum_{m=0}^{M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{N}})} (\tau_{m+1} - \tau_m) \\ &> \delta \left(\max_{m \in [M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{N}})]} \tau_{m+1} - \tau_m \right) \\ &> c_0. \end{aligned}$$

Since $c \leq c_0$, by intermediate value theorem, there exists $t_0 \in [t^*, \tau_1)$ such that $f(t_0) = c$. In addition, the thresholds defined by $\tau_m = 1 - (1 - \tau_1 m)^{1/m}$ such that $\tau_m \leq 1$ satisfy the desired inequalities.

Let $\mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{N}+1} = (f_1, \dots, f_N, f'_{N+1})$ be the strategy profile after firm $N+1$ makes the above response. We want to show that f'_{N+1} is the best response strategy by showing $\mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{N}+1}$ is an equal-utility Nash equilibrium. Since $\tau_m < \tau'_{m+1} \leq \tau_{m+1}$ for each $m \in [M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{N}})]$, $\cup_{m=1}^{N+1} [\tau'_{m+1}, \tau_{m+1})$ is the union of disjoint sets. Hence, $\mathbb{P}(s \in [0, 1], f_{N+1} = 1) = \cup_{m=1}^{N+1} \mathbb{P}(S \in [\tau'_{m+1}, \tau_{m+1})) = c$. As a result, $\mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{N}+1}$ satisfies the first condition of Theorem 3.1. In addition, since $\tau_m < \tau'_{m+1} \leq \tau_{m+1}$ and the strategies (f_1, \dots, f_N) remain unchanged, we have $M(s, \mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{N}+1}) = M(s, \mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{N}}) + 1$ for $s \in \cup_{m=1}^{N+1} [\tau'_{m+1}, \tau_{m+1})$. Hence, $M(s, \mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{N}+1}) = m$ for $s \in [\tau'_m, \tau'_{m+1})$ and the thresholds satisfy the second condition of Theorem 3.1. Next, the thresholds defined by (16) satisfy $U_m(\tau'_m) = U_n(\tau'_n)$ for all $0 < \tau'_m < \tau'_n < 1$.

Therefore, \mathbf{f}_{N+1} satisfies all the conditions of Theorem 3.1 and is an equal-utility Nash equilibrium. Furthermore, $\tau'_1 > \frac{1}{M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}'_{N+1})}$ by construction. By definition of a Nash equilibrium, f'_{N+1} is the best response strategy. We only need to show this strategy is unique. Let $K = \{s \in [0, 1], f_{N+1}(s) = 1\}$. We claim that the utility firm $N + 1$ can derive by interviewing an applicant with score $s \notin K$ is strictly less than the worst utility it can derive by interviewing an applicant with in K . Given that the thresholds satisfy $\tau_m < \tau'_{m+1} \leq \tau_{m+1}$ for each $m \in [M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{N}})]$ and $U_m(\tau'_m) = U_n(\tau'_n)$ for all $0 < \tau'_m < \tau'_n < 1$, $\min_{s \in K} U_{M(s, \mathbf{f}_{N+1})}(s) = t_0$. Since $U_n(s)$ is strictly increasing in s , for any applicant with $s \notin K$, the utility firm $N + 1$ can derive by interviewing this applicant is $U_{M(s, \mathbf{f}_{N+1+1})}(s) < t_0$. Hence, $U_{M(s, \mathbf{f}_{N+1+1})}(s) < \min_{s \in K} U_{M(s, \mathbf{f}_{N+1})}(s)$. This implies that moving any support from K to K^c will lead to a strictly smaller utility. Therefore, f_{N+1} yields a strictly higher utility than any other strategy. Hence, f_{N+1} is the unique best response. \square

Proof of Theorem 5.3. Fix the total number of firms N , let $c_0 = \min(0.5\delta, \delta(\min_{m \in [N]}((1 - \frac{m}{N+1})^{\frac{1}{m}} - (1 - \frac{m+1}{N+1})^{\frac{1}{m+1}})))$. We will prove the theorem by induction. When $n = 1$, the best response strategy is $f_1(s) = 1$ if and only if $s \in [s_c, 1]$ with $\mathbb{P}(S \in [s_c, 1]) = c$. Since $c < 0.5\delta$, we have $\int_{0.5}^1 \varphi(s)ds \geq \int_{0.5}^1 \delta ds = 0.5\delta$. Hence, $c < \int_{0.5}^1 \varphi(s)ds$ and $\tau_1 = s_c > 0.5$. Let \mathbf{f}_1 denote the strategy profile. \mathbf{f}_1 satisfies the conditions established in Theorem 3.1, and thus it is at an equal-utility Nash equilibrium with $\tau_1 > 0.5$.

Next, suppose the strategy profile \mathbf{f}_k with $M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_k) = k$ and n firms is at an equal-utility Nash equilibrium with $\tau_1 > \frac{1}{M_{\max}(\mathbf{f}_k)+1}$. By lemma A.10, since the best response strategy is unique, the new strategy profile \mathbf{f}'_k after firm $n + 1$ makes the best response is still at an equal-utility Nash equilibrium. Therefore, the one-turn best response dynamics converges to an equal-utility Nash equilibrium. \square

A.13 Proof of Proposition 6.1

Proof. We will start with the first part of the statement. We notice that the function $f(x) = N \int_x^1 U_N(s)\varphi(s)ds$ is continuous in x and $f(0) = N \int_0^1 U_N(s)\varphi(s)ds$, $f(1) = 0$. Moreover, since $s\varphi(s) > 0$ for $s > 0$, $f(x)$ is strictly decreasing in x . Therefore, given $W \in (0, N \int_0^1 U_N(s)\varphi(s)ds)$, there exist a unique $x^* \in (0, 1)$ such that $f(x^*) = W$. Let $c = \mathbb{P}(S \in [x^*, 1])$. The social welfare under the naive solution is

$$\text{SW}_{\text{naive}} = N \int_{x^*}^1 U_N(s)\varphi(s)ds = W$$

as desired.

Now suppose $W \leq \int_{0.5}^1 s\varphi(s)ds$. Let $\mathcal{I}(N) = (N, c/N, \mathcal{D}, \theta)$ be the instance parameterized by the number of firms N . The total capacity of the N firms is c , and there exists disjoint sets K_1, \dots, K_N such that $\cup K_i = [x^*, 1]$ and $\mathbb{P}(S \in K_i) = c/N$. Define the strategy profile $\mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{N}} = (f_1, \dots, f_N)$ such that $K_i = \{s \in [0, 1], f_i(s) = 1\}$. We will show that $\mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{N}}$ is a Nash equilibrium with social welfare W . We will first show $x^* \geq 0.5$. Given that $\int_{x^*}^1 s\varphi(s)ds = W \leq \int_{0.5}^1 s\varphi(s)ds$ and $f(x)$ is strictly decreasing in x . We must have $x^* \geq 0.5$. By construction, we have the thresholds $\tau_0 = 0, \tau_1 = x^*, \tau_2 = \dots = \tau_{N+1} = 1$. Moreover, $M(s, \mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{N}}) = 1$ for $s \in [\tau_1, 1]$. Hence, $\mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{N}}$ satisfies all the conditions in Theorem 3.1. As a result, $\mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{N}}$ is a Nash equilibrium. The social welfare under $\mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{N}}$ is $\text{SW}_{\text{NE}} = \int_{x^*}^1 s\varphi(s)ds = W$ as desired.

