

Estimating Sequential Search Models Based on a Partial Ranking Representation *

Tinghan Zhang[†]

First draft: November 15, 2024

This version: January 15, 2024

Abstract

Consumers are increasingly shopping online, and more and more datasets documenting consumer search are becoming available. While sequential search models provide a framework for utilizing such data, they present empirical challenges. A key difficulty arises from the inequality conditions implied by these models, which depend on multiple unobservables revealed during the search process and necessitate solving or simulating high-dimensional integrals for likelihood-based estimation methods. This paper introduces a novel representation of inequalities implied by a broad class of sequential search models, demonstrating that the empirical content of such models can be effectively captured through a specific partial ranking of available actions. This representation reduces the complexity caused by unobservables and provides a tractable expression for joint probabilities. Leveraging this insight, we propose a GHK-style simulation-based likelihood estimator that is simpler to implement than existing ones. It offers greater flexibility for handling incomplete search data, incorporating additional ranking information, and accommodating complex search processes, including those involving product discovery. We show that the estimator achieves robust performance while maintaining relatively low computational costs, making it a practical and versatile tool for researchers and practitioners.

Keywords: Sequential search model, Partial ranking model, Empirical consumer search.

JEL Code: C50, D83, L81, M31.

*I am indebted to Tobias Klein and Christoph Walsh for their careful supervision and encouragement in accomplishing this paper. The author thanks Jaap Abbring, Rafael Greminger, Yifan Yu, Kun Zhang and Tilburg Structural Econometrics Group Lunch Seminar participants for their helpful comments.

[†]Tilburg University, Department of Econometrics and Operations Research

1 Introduction

As online shopping grows, consumer search data with detailed information about the search process becomes vital for economic and marketing research. With increasing market differentiation and the expansion of online platforms, the assumption that consumers naturally possess complete product information at purchase is becoming less valid. Instead, it becomes possible to trace that consumers actively search to obtain product information and make more informed purchases. Since searching involves time and effort input, deciding how to search becomes an integrated part of consumers' utility maximization problem. Search data often appears in click-stream form. It captures key decision-making details such as the products searched, the order of searches, and when the search ended. Such data provides a detailed view of how consumers address incomplete information, offering valuable insights into their behaviors in a more realistic context while serving as a critical tool for market strategy development and policy evaluation.

Researchers often use models to analyze decision-making within a search process comprehensively. Sequential search models are particularly prominent, assuming consumers make optimal search and purchase decisions sequentially based on the current information at each step. The implications of these models are captured by the Optimal Search Rules proposed by [Weitzman \(1979\)](#), which provide step-by-step strategies based on the valuations of actions of searching and purchasing a product. Observed search data thus indicates the inequality relationships among these valuations determined by consumers' preferences and search costs. Hence, the model enables the estimation of these parameters using search data.

However, estimating sequential search models poses empirical challenges due to their inherent complexity. Since part of the product utility is revealed during the search process, subsequent decisions based on the Optimal Search Rules rely on the outcomes of prior searches. These outcomes often involve unobservable private evaluations, creating intricate and unidentifiable dependencies between earlier and later decisions. This dependency complicates decomposing the search process and calculating the conditional probabilities of each decision step independently. Consequently, likelihood-based estimation methods must directly compute or simulate high-dimensional integrals, as iterative integration along the sequence does not effectively simplify the computation. While numerical simulation methods are often used to address this issue, they are not fully satisfactory, as they tend to increase computational costs, complicate implementation, reduce precision, or struggle to adapt to model variations.

This paper addresses the empirical challenges of estimating a broad class of sequential search models by focusing on the model structure rather than estimation methods. We propose a new representation for the sequential search model, grounded in four inequality conditions, to capture its empirical content. This representation is equivalent to, but independent of, the framework based on the Optimal Search Rules, ensuring no loss in completeness when describing optimal sequential search behavior. Unlike the Optimal Search Rules, which define inequalities among actions within each step's choice set, the proposed representation characterizes rela-

tionships among all feasible actions across the entire search process. These relationships are expressed as a ranking of all available actions within the union of choice sets throughout the process. Under this representation, sequential search and purchase behaviors are no longer interpreted as consumers following Optimal Search Rules step by step. Instead, they reflect a partial observation of the consumer’s ranking of available actions.

The Partial Ranking representation provides a new foundation for addressing the inherent complexities of sequential search models. In this representation, the probability of the observed search process is determined solely by the utility of the final purchased product, while other uncertainties revealed during the search have no substantive impact. It enables the joint probability of consumers’ search and purchase behavior to be expressed in a value-difference form, similar to those in standard discrete choice or ranking models. As a result, the likelihood for the model can be decomposed into iterated low-dimensional integrals, significantly reducing computational challenges. Using this representation, we revisit the model’s identification arguments and verify their consistency with existing empirical findings. Then, to implement this approach in practice, we develop a simulation-based likelihood estimation method using a GHK-style simulator (PR-GHK simulator). Compared to earlier GHK simulators based on the original representation, the PR-GHK simulator offers easier implementation and stronger empirical performance, making it an efficient and practical tool for the model estimation.

Beyond the baseline sequential search model, the Partial Ranking representation and the PR-GHK simulator demonstrate good flexibility in handling search data with varying levels of completeness. Existing methods for incomplete data typically follow one of two approaches: either simulating all potential search processes and summing the probabilities consistent with the available search information, or discarding search data entirely and relying on discrete choice models based on the Eventual Purchase Theorem (Armstrong, 2017; Choi et al., 2018). The former approach often results in excessive computational complexity, while the latter sacrifices valuable information from the search process. In this paper, we first show that discrete choice models based on the Eventual Purchase Theorem represent a special case of observed action rankings, where the information about the search process is entirely censored. We then demonstrate that the theorem’s conclusion can be interpreted within the PR representation as a weaker form of ranking information that can be integrated with other ranking information without introducing implementation issues. Finally, through an example using only the first search action and the final purchase, we illustrate the simplicity and robustness of the PR-GHK simulator when handling incomplete search data. Additionally, if consumers possess extra information about the unobserved part of the ranking of available actions (e.g., preferences between two unpurchased products), it can also be incorporated into the estimation. We show that leveraging such additional information enhances estimation performance without significantly increasing implementation complexity.

Finally, the Partial Ranking representation applies to a variety of model variations based on the sequential search framework, as its conditions for validity are more inclusive than those of

the baseline model. These extensions are often complicated for empirical application, such as the two-stage sequential search model proposed by [Gibbard \(2022\)](#) and the search and product discovery model introduced by [Greminger \(2022\)](#), both of which involve staged resolutions of uncertainties in product utility. Numerical estimation methods face more significant computational challenges in estimating such models, but if these models satisfy the conditions for establishing a Partial Ranking representation, the same approach used for the baseline model can be applied: establishing the partial ranking of available actions implied by the data and then estimating the model using the PR-GHK simulator. Taking [Greminger \(2022\)](#) as an example, this paper demonstrates both simplicity in implementation and robust performance for estimating such extensions of the baseline model.

This study fits into the literature on empirical methods for analyzing search data using sequential search models. Existing studies typically estimate sequential search models using simulated maximum likelihood methods based on likelihood functions constructed from Optimal Search Rules, with the employment of a range of simulation methods to facilitate computation. One early approach is the Crude Frequency Simulator ([Chen and Yao, 2017](#); [Ghose et al., 2019](#)), which uses extensive random sampling of uncertainties to simulate search sequences and fits probabilities based on the frequency of simulated sequences matching observed data. A more widely applied method is the Kernel-Smoothed Frequency Simulator ([Honka, 2014](#); [Ursu, 2018](#); [Ursu et al., 2020](#); [Yavorsky et al., 2021](#); [Ursu et al., 2023](#)). Similar to the Crude Frequency Simulator, it relies on unconstrained sampling of uncertainties but does not directly fit joint probabilities. Instead, it measures the alignment between simulated sequences and observed data by computing differences in fitted values based on Optimal Search Rules. These differences are incorporated into a monotonically increasing kernel-smoothed function, serving as the objective function for maximization. A third approach is the GHK-style simulator ([Jiang et al., 2021](#); [Chung et al., 2024](#); [Greminger, 2024](#)), which sequentially samples uncertainties according to the Optimal Search Rules, ensuring consistency with the rules between the draws between uncertainties. Additionally, alternative methods have been developed for specific model extensions. For example, [Morozov \(2023\)](#) employs importance sampling to better estimate preference heterogeneity, while [Onzo and Ansari \(2024\)](#) uses Bayesian nonparametric methods to address cases where post-search uncertainty distributions are unknown. These methods leverage advanced techniques to tackle the challenges posed by the complexity of joint probability functions in sequential search models.

This paper approaches the problem from a different perspective. Instead of relying on the Optimal Search Rules to describe the model’s empirical content, we represent it through an equivalent partial ranking. We propose a new probability function that is equivalent to the joint probability function of the original representation, allowing it to be estimated with a GHK-style simulator commonly employed in ranking models. The study most closely related to this paper is [Compiani et al. \(2024\)](#), which introduces a “double index approach.” In their framework, distinct indices are assigned to consumers’ search and purchase behaviors within a generalized

index-based search process. The model is then transformed into a ranking of these indices and estimated using the exploded logit method. This paper extends their approach by (1) providing a formal structure, establishment conditions, and decomposed joint probability for the Partial Ranking representation; (2) overcoming the logit distributional assumption by adopting a GHK-style simulator capable of accommodating diverse uncertainty distributions; and (3) enhancing flexibility to handle various data completeness and multiple action indices, enabling broader empirical applicability. Notably, even not using a GHK-style simulator, the Partial Ranking representation simplifies the implementation challenges faced by other estimation methods, including those still under development (e.g., [Wei and Jiang, 2024](#); [Koiso and Otani, 2024](#)). The work of this paper complements, rather than conflicts with, these methods.

The rest of the paper is arranged as follows: In Section 2, we define notations and set up the sequential search model, explain the Optimal Search Rules, and illustrate the relationships between values based on the representation of these rules. In Section 3, we show the Partial Ranking representation provides an equivalent full description of the empirical contents of the sequential search model. In Section 4, we present the joint probability, discuss the identification arguments, and introduce the estimation strategy based on the Partial Ranking representation with a GHK-style simulator. In Section 5, we show the new simulator is compatible with different levels of completeness of the search process data. In Section 6, we show the new simulator is flexible for the additional ranking information and identifiable structural changes in the search process with the example of the search and product discovery model proposed in [Greminger \(2022\)](#). We conclude the paper in Section 7.

2 Baseline Model and Optimal Search Rules

This section introduces the baseline optimal sequential search problem and the Optimal Search Rules proposed by [Weitzman \(1979\)](#). We begin by defining the sequence observations in the search data. Next, we present the model setup and the Optimal Search Rules that describe the optimal step-by-step strategies in the model. For a comprehensive review of the sequential search model based on the Optimal Search Rules, readers are referred to [Ursu et al. \(2024\)](#).

2.1 Sequence Observations

First, we define the observations derived from the data. Sequential search models are typically applied to click-stream data, which records consumers' purchase decisions along with their sequential interactions with alternative products prior to purchasing. These records provide a comprehensive account of the purchase decision and the search actions leading up to it. We formalize these records as sequence observations for use in the model.

Consider a representative consumer i with unit demand for alternatives in a market. We assume the consumer has complete awareness of the market: she knows all available alternatives

for her purchase. However, her information about each product is incomplete, rendering her evaluation of each product with uncertainty and preventing her from determining the exact utility of any product before searching. Let \mathcal{M}_i represent the set of all products available in consumer i 's market. This set forms the basis for consumer i 's search and purchase decisions. Notably, we assume that the consumer enters the market with no prior knowledge of product-specific uncertainties; this assumption will be revisited later in Section 5.

The uncertainty in products' utility obscures the consumer's optimal purchase choice. To address this issue, a consumer can actively reveal a product's uncertainty, obtain full information about it, and thus determine its utility through an action of *inspection*. A product can be purchased only after its utility has been determined via inspection, and the set of all inspected products is referred to as the consumer's *consideration set*. The consideration set expands as inspections continue during the search, and when the search concludes, the set of inspected products is denoted by \mathcal{S}_i , with its size represented by J_i . The consumer selects one product from \mathcal{S}_i to purchase at the end of the search. The set of uninspected products is defined as $\bar{\mathcal{S}}_i = \mathcal{M}_i \setminus \mathcal{S}_i$.

Inspecting products is generally considered costly, requiring consumers to make optimal search decisions accounting for the search costs. These decisions include determining which products to inspect or purchase and when to stop searching. Sequential search models assume that consumers make decisions at each stage of the search process based on all available information at that point, including the outcomes of previous inspections. Consequently, the observed search data reflect a series of conditionally optimal decisions informed by earlier inspections, and the order in which products are inspected matters for sequential search models.

Let the set of all inspection orders that lead to the consideration set \mathcal{S}_i be denoted by $\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{S}_i)$. The inspection order reflected in consumer i 's observed search process is noted as \mathcal{R}_i . We always have $\mathcal{R}_i \in \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{S}_i)$. Following \mathcal{R}_i , the products in \mathcal{S}_i are numbered such that the first inspected product is Product 1, the j -th inspected product is Product j , and so on. The last inspected product is numbered J_i , meaning every product with $j \leq J_i$ is inspected in the j -th position of \mathcal{R}_i and belongs to \mathcal{S}_i . Thus, the inspected products following \mathcal{R}_i are indexed by $\{1, 2, \dots, J_i\}_{\mathcal{R}_i}$. Let H_i denote the purchased product and h_i its order number. It always holds that $H_i \in \mathcal{S}_i$ and $h_i \leq J_i$.

The tuple $\{H, \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{M}\}_i$ is thus defined as a *sequence observation*, which comprehensively represents the decisions and their sequence made by consumer i during her search and purchase process. For simplicity, we will omit \mathcal{R}_i when using ordered numbers to refer to products in the remainder of this paper. Additionally, the subscript i in H_i , h_i , J_i , \mathcal{R}_i , \mathcal{S}_i , and \mathcal{M}_i will be omitted when these elements are mentioned individually.

2.2 Model Setup and Optimal Search Rules

We now describe how sequence observations fit in the sequential search model. Consumer i 's complete evaluation of a product depends on how well it aligns with her preferences after product-level uncertainties are resolved. Let u_{iH} denote the purchase value, which represents the utility consumer i expects to obtain from purchasing product H once its uncertainty is fully revealed. When entering the market, consumer i cannot know the purchase value of any product due to these uncertainties. Instead, she only knows the distribution of purchase values for each product. By paying a search cost c_{iH} , the consumer can fully reveal the uncertainty of product H and determine u_{iH} . The purchase value remains constant throughout the search process, with only its observability depending on whether the product has been inspected. Under this setup, after inspecting the $(j-1)$ th product in the sequence, a rational consumer with a stopping utility of \bar{u}_{ij} solves the following Bellman equation:

$$W(\bar{u}_{ij}, \bar{S}_{i,j}) = \max \left\{ \bar{u}_{ij}, \max_{K \in \bar{S}_{i,j}} \left\{ -c_{iK} + F_{iK}^u(\bar{u}_{ij})W(\bar{u}_{ij}, \bar{S}_{i,j} \setminus \{K\}) + \int_{\bar{u}_{ij}}^{\infty} W(u, \bar{S}_{i,j} \setminus \{K\}) f_{iK}^u(u) du \right\} \right\} \quad (1)$$

Here, $\bar{S}_{i,j}$ is a set of uninspected products at each step j . $F_{iK}^u(\cdot)$ and $f_{iK}^u(\cdot)$ are the cdf and pdf of u_{iK} . At every step j , the consumer chooses between taking \bar{u}_{ij} and inspecting another product with the highest expected value.

By assuming that the purchase values of products are conditionally independent, [Weitzman \(1979\)](#) simplifies this problem into a quasi-static multi-step discrete choice model. At each step, the consumer essentially solves a static decision problem: given an outside value, should she inspect another product? For this question, optimal decision-making relies on the comparison between the expected gains from inspecting a product and its search cost. For a product K , suppose the utility that consumer i would obtain without inspecting the product is \bar{u} . The consumer derives additional gains from inspection only if the purchase value of K exceeds \bar{u} . Therefore, inspecting product K or not is indifferent when:

$$c_{iK} = \int_{u_{iK} > \bar{u}} (u_{iK} - \bar{u}) dF_{iK}^u(u_{iK}) \quad (2)$$

Equation (2) defines an implicit function of \bar{u} . Since the right-hand side of the equation monotonically decreases with \bar{u} , there exists a unique solution, denoted as z_{iK} , which is referred to as the *reservation value* of product K for consumer i . A product K is inspected if and only if the purchase values of all products inspected by consumer i are less than z_{iK} . Intuitively, z_{iK} quantifies the value associated with inspecting product K .

With purchase and reservation value defined, [Weitzman \(1979\)](#) proposes four Optimal Search Rules. These rules fully characterize the optimal solution of the baseline sequential search model, and explain the information given in the sequence observation in the data.

1. **Optimal Ranking:** The reservation value of products inspected earlier is always larger than the reservation value of products inspected later, i.e., consumer searches in decreasing order of reservation values.

$$t_{ij}^1 \equiv z_{ij} - \max_{k \in \mathcal{M}_i \setminus \{1, 2, \dots, j\}} z_{ik} \geq 0, \forall j \leq J.$$

Under the Optimal Ranking, the inspection order \mathcal{R}_i corresponds to the descending order of reservation values for inspected products. We number products not in S_i by $J+1, J+2, \dots$, also in descending order of their reservation values. An uninspected product is thus numbered $k > J$, where its reservation value is the k -th largest for consumer i . Therefore, $\max_{H \in \mathcal{S}_i} z_{iH}$ can be equivalently expressed as $\max_{k > J} z_{ik}$.

2. **Optimal Continuing:** consumer continues inspecting another product when the maximum of purchase values among inspected products is smaller than the maximum of reservation values of products not inspected:

$$t_{ij}^2 \equiv \max_{\ell \geq j} z_{i\ell} - \max_{\ell=1}^{j-1} u_{i\ell} \geq 0, \quad \forall j < J.$$

3. **Optimal Stopping:** consumer stops inspecting another product when the maximum of purchase values among inspected products is larger than the maximum of reservation values of products not inspected:

$$t_i^3 \equiv \max_{j \leq J} u_{ij} - \max_{k > J} z_{ik} \geq 0.$$

Optimal Continuing and Stopping govern consumers' decisions to either continue or cease the search process. By definition of reservation value, continuing is only preferred when the reservation value of product $j+1$ exceeds the maximum purchase value of inspected products. Optimal Stopping applies at the final step of the search process, while Optimal Continuing governs intermediate inspections.

4. **Optimal Purchasing:** Consumer purchases product H (numbered by h given \mathcal{R}_i) if and only if it has the largest purchase value among all inspected products.

$$t_i^4 \equiv u_{ih} - \max_{j \leq J, j \neq h} u_{ij} \geq 0.$$

The Optimal Search Rules define a set of policies guiding the consumer's decision-making. At each step, the consumer first decides whether to continue searching (Optimal Stopping or Continuing). If continue, they select the next product to inspect (Optimal Ranking). If stop, they choose which product to purchase (Optimal Purchasing). Together, these policies fully characterize the optimal solution to the sequential search problem outlined in Equation (1).




FIGURE 1 – The Sequential Search Model Represented by Optimal Search Rules

Take Figure 1 as an illustration. Upon entering the market, a consumer inspects the product with the highest reservation value, z_{i1} , according to the Optimal Ranking, revealing its purchase value, u_{i1} . Following the Optimal Continuing, she inspects if the next highest reservation value, z_{i2} , exceeds u_{i1} . The second inspection reveals u_{i2} , compared with u_{i1} , updating the maximum purchase value among inspected products. In this example, u_{i2} is smaller than z_{i3} , so the search continues. After inspecting product J , the maximum purchase value among inspected products exceeds the highest reservation value of uninspected products for the first time. The consumer terminates the search and purchases the product with the highest purchase value among inspected products, following the Optimal Stopping and Purchasing.

We refer to the structure described in Figure 1 as the Optimal Search Rules (OSR) representation of the sequential search model. It translates each step of the sequential search process into inequalities between reservation and purchase values following the Optimal Search Rules. Thus, the model can be empirically estimated using maximum likelihood methods. The joint probability of the sequential search model under the OSR representation is expressed as follows:

$$\Pr(\{H, S, R, \mathcal{M}\}_i | \mathbf{X}_i) = \Pr(t_{ij}^1 > 0, \forall j \leq J \cap t_{ij}^2 > 0, \forall j \leq J \cap t_{ij}^3 > 0 \cap t_{ij}^4 > 0) \quad (3)$$

which serves as the foundation of the sequential search model in most empirical studies.

However, applying Equation (3) for estimation remains challenging in practice. The main difficulty is that, apart from the Optimal Ranking, the optimal rules at each step rely on the maximum purchase values of products inspected up to that point. These purchase values are unknown at the start of the search process, and can only be revealed through the consumer's inspections. Moreover, their relative scale within the inspection history cannot be determined. As a result, the probabilities of decisions at subsequent steps are inherently linked to the unobserved outcomes of all earlier inspections. This ambiguity prevents the complete determination of the value relationships implied by the model, leading to dependencies between decisions throughout the search process.

This unobservable decision dependency poses a direct empirical challenge: it prevents the simplification of estimation through the decomposition of the joint probability in Equation (3). To see this, let us rewrite the joint probability as follows:

$$\Pr(\{H, S, R, \mathcal{M}\}_i | \mathbf{X}_i) = \int_{\mathbf{z}_i, \mathbf{u}_i^{insp}} \mathcal{I}(\text{Rules}) d\mathcal{F}(\mathbf{z}_i, \mathbf{u}_i^{insp} | \mathbf{X}_i) \quad (4)$$

Here, \mathbf{z}_i is the vector of reservation values of all products to consumer i , while \mathbf{u}_i^{insp} is the vector of purchase values of all products. $\mathcal{I}(\text{Rules})$ is an indicator of all Optimal Search Rules hold and $\mathcal{F}(\mathbf{z}_i, \mathbf{u}_i^{insp})$ is the cdf of the joint distribution conditional on the product attributes.

Equation (4) lacks a closed-form solution, and its computation relies on approximation through sampling over \mathbf{z}_i and \mathbf{u}_i^{insp} .¹ However, due to the decision dependency inherent in the Optimal Search Rules, it is difficult to effectively decompose the expression into iterated low-dimensional integrals to simplify its computation. This creates an empirical dilemma for simulation-based estimation methods. On the one hand, accurate simulation requires sufficient information to ensure precise estimation, necessitating the full utilization of search data. On the other hand, incorporating search information increases the complexity of the model and imposes significant computational burdens in estimation. Existing methods have employed numerical methods to address these challenges, yet the inherent limitations of these methods continue to constrain the broader application of sequential search models.²

3 The Partial Ranking Representation

This section introduces a new representation of the sequential search model to address its empirical challenges. This section outlines the baseline model, laying the basis for extensions in later sections. The proposed representation is built on four inequality conditions involving reservation and purchase values. The following proposition demonstrates that these conditions hold if and only if the optimal rules are fully satisfied, thereby capturing the empirical content of the sequential search model.

Proposition 1. *For each sequence observation $\{H, S, R, \mathcal{M}\}_i$ in the click-stream data, define $y_i = \min\{u_{ih}, z_{iJ}\}$, the minimum between the purchase value of the inspected product and the reservation value of the last inspected product, as the core value of the sequence observation i . Weitzman’s Optimal Search Rules hold if and only if the following conditions are fulfilled:*

¹An exception is provided by [Moraga-González et al. \(2023\)](#), who derive a closed-form solution by discarding search information and making strong distributional assumptions.

²In the introduction, we briefly discussed three mainstream methods for simulation-based likelihood estimation with Equation (3). The Crude Frequency Simulator is unsuitable for large search models due to its computational burden. The Kernel-Smoothed Frequency Simulator requires external determination to the scaling factors, which are crucial for its performance but difficult in accurate tuning. Furthermore, incorporating model variations requires modification through the optimal search rules, necessitating the adjustments of the scaling factors, which complicates implementation and renders cross-model comparisons unreliable. Lastly, the GHK-style simulator is complicated to implement even for the baseline model, and lacks a unified approach to handle variations.

1. *Distribution Condition*: $u_{ih} \leq z_{iJ}$ if $h < J$;
2. *Ranking Condition*: $z_{i1} \geq z_{i2} \geq \dots \geq z_{iJ}$;
3. *Choice Condition 1*: $u_{ij} \leq y_i$ for all $j < J, j \neq h$;
4. *Choice Condition 2*: $z_{ik} \leq y_i$ for all $k > J$.

Proof. we first prove in showing the necessity that violating conditions in the proposition always violates Weitzman's Optimal Search Rules.

- When the Distribution Condition is violated, Optimal Continuing is violated.
- When the Ranking Condition is violated, Optimal Ranking is violated.
- When the Choice Condition 1 is violated, there would be two cases. When $\exists j, s.t. z_{iJ} < u_{ij}$, Optimal Continuing is violated; Optimal Purchasing is violated when $\exists j, s.t. u_{ih} < u_{ij}$.
- When the Choice Condition 2 is violated, there would be two cases. In the case of $\exists k, s.t. z_{iJ} < z_{ik}$, it violates the Optimal Ranking. If $\exists k, s.t. u_{ih} < z_{ik}$, given Optimal Purchasing is not violated, i.e., $u_{ih} \geq \max_{j \leq J, j \neq h} u_{ij}$, Optimal Stopping is violated.

Next, we prove sufficiency in showing that violating Weitzman's Optimal Search Rules also violates conditions in the proposition.

- When Optimal Ranking is violated. If $\exists j_1 < j_2 < J$ such that $z_{ij_1} < z_{ij_2}$, the Ranking Condition is violated; if $\exists j < J$ such that $z_{ij} < \max_{k > J} z_{ik}$, the Choice Condition 2 is violated.
- When Optimal Stopping is violated. If the Choice Condition 1 holds, we have $u_{ih} = \max_{j \leq J} u_{ij} < \max_{k > J} z_{ik}$. Hence, $\exists k > J, s.t. z_{ik} > u_{ih}$, which violates the Choice Condition 2.
- When Optimal Continuing is violated, it is to say that $\exists \ell < j \leq J, s.t. z_{ij} < u_{i\ell}$. With the Ranking Condition holds, we have $z_{iJ} \leq z_{ij} < u_{i\ell}$. If $\ell \neq h$, the Choice Condition 1 is violated; if $\ell = h$, the Distribution Condition is violated.
- When Optimal Purchasing is violated, the Choice Condition 1 is violated.

□

Based on the four conditions provided in Proposition 1, we can reconstruct different relationships of reservation and purchase values as in Figure 2. The structure resembles a partial ranking of reservation and purchase values. The Ranking Condition ranks reservation values from the largest to the last inspection, while the two Choice Conditions describe values smaller




FIGURE 2 – The Partial Ranking Representation of the Baseline Sequential Search Model

than the core value. The Distribution Condition specifies the distribution of the two values comprising the core value based on the search process characteristics: when $h < J$, u_{ih} is smaller than z_{iJ} ; when $h = J$, their relative sizes are unidentifiable from the data.

The four conditions in Proposition 1 collectively define the Partial Ranking (PR) representation of a sequential search model. This term highlights two aspects. First, the value relationships in Figure 2 form a ranking among reservation values. Second, it refers to a partially observed ranking of reservation and purchase values for all available actions in the search process. On this ranking, we present the following key theorem:

Theorem 1. *Rank all actions available to a consumer in her entire search process — including inspecting any product or purchasing any inspected product — by their associated values in descending order. Up to the reservation value of the last inspected product, this ranking matches the sequence of reservation and purchase values from the consumer’s optimal search decisions.*

The proof of this theorem, detailed in Appendix A, builds on the branching bandit framework by Keller and Oldale (2003). In this framework, a consumer faces a series of choice sets across multiple stages, selecting actions progressively. Each selected action is removed from future choices but may branch into new actions in subsequent stages. With a weak boundary condition, the authors demonstrate that when each action is assigned a Gittins index, a Gittins index policy (selecting the action with the highest Gittins index in each stage) is both locally and globally optimal. This conclusion is based on two assumptions:

(Independence) Only the selected action branches, while the state of any other action is unaffected by the selection;

(Invariance) Unselected actions remain available for selection in subsequent stages.

We demonstrate that the following lemma also holds under these two assumptions:

Lemma 1. *Consider any two consecutive stages of a branching bandit process satisfying Independent and Invariance Assumptions. Let the choice set of the first stage be S , and the selected*

action be a_0 , and the choice set of the second stage is $T/\{a_0\}$. Rank actions in $T/\{a_0\}$ and obtain a full ranking: $\rho_0 = \{a_1 \succ a_2 \succ \dots\} = \{a_1 \succ \rho_1\} = \{a_1 \succ a_2 \succ \rho_2\} = \dots$, where a_j denotes the j -th action in ρ_0 , and ρ_j denotes the part of ρ_0 excluding a_1 to a_j . We have:

$$P_S(a_0) \cdot R_{T/\{a_0\}}(\rho_0) = R_T(a_0 \succ \rho_0) + \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} R_T(a_1 \succ \dots \succ a_{N-1} \succ a_0 \succ \rho_{N-1}), \quad (5)$$

where a_N is the first action in ρ_0 that is in the choice set S . $P_A(x)$ denotes the probability of selecting x from set A , and $R_A(\rho)$ represents the top-down probability of a full ranking ρ of all actions in set A .³

Verbally, the joint probabilities of the first-stage selection and the second-stage ranking equals the sum of probabilities of a series of rankings over the union of choice sets from both stages. Notably, when a_1 is in the choice set S , the right-hand side of Equation (5) simplifies to the probability of a full ranking where a_0 is ranked before ρ_0 .

The sequential search model fits within the branching bandit framework, where inspection and purchase behaviors correspond to actions in choice sets. Once a product is inspected, it cannot be re-inspected, but the option to purchase it is added to future choice sets. The Independence and Invariance assumptions are satisfied, making Lemma 1 applicable to sequential search models. Starting from the ranking of the choice set at the purchase point, Lemma 1 is iteratively applied, extending step by step backward to the first inspection. The union of choice sets across all stages forms a complete set of feasible actions, and the ranking is extended to fully encompass this set. The extended portion corresponds precisely to the consumer's sequence of actions, thereby proving Theorem 1. We term this complete ranking the Rankings of Available Actions (RAA).

Since the RAA provides ranking relationships among all available actions in the consumer's search process, it encapsulates the most comprehensive choice information in the sequential search model. Combined with Keller and Oldale (2003)'s conclusion, the RAA directly translates into the ranking of Gittins indices, corresponding to reservation and purchase values for inspections and purchases.⁴ However, sequence observations provide only partial information about the RAA, revealing a partial ranking of reservation and purchase values. Figure 3 illustrates this with an example involving three products. During the search process, the consumer sequentially reveals available purchase actions and their purchase values. Once a purchase occurs, the search halts immediately, fixing the choice set for the RAA but leaving the actions of inspecting uninspected products and purchasing other inspected products censored. For the censored part of the RAA, we know only that their purchase or reservation values are smaller than the core value. The final structure depicted in Figure 3 is fully characterized by Proposition

³A top-down ranking probability is the product of successive probabilities of selecting the best option among unranked alternatives, continuing until only one remains, which corresponds to the logic of the Gittins index policy.

⁴The optimality of the Gittins index policy in sequential search models is demonstrated in Kleinberg et al. (2016) and Armstrong (2017).




FIGURE 3 – Partial Observation to the RAA in Sequence Observations

1, establishing its equivalence to the Optimal Search Rules without any dependency on them.

The PR representation simplifies the challenges associated with estimating sequential search models by offering an alternative description of optimal search. In the OSR representation, it is assumed that consumers follow the Optimal Search Rules step-by-step along the inspection sequence \mathcal{R}_i , constructing the consideration set \mathcal{S}_i and ultimately purchasing product H_i . Each decision is made within distinct choice sets and conditioned on the outcomes of previous decisions, many of which are unobservable in the data, complicating model estimation. In contrast, the PR representation transforms the search process $\mathcal{R}_i \in \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{S}_i)$ into partial observations of the RAA within a given choice set. Under this representation, the sequential search model is restructured into a static framework where the ranking relationships between reservation and purchase values are directly observed from the data. By removing the unobservable dependencies that complicate the model, this transformation ensures that unobserved components revealed in search do not affect the calculation of ranking probabilities.

Without relying on the Optimal Search Rules, the PR representation achieves optimality based solely on the Independence and Invariance Assumptions, significantly enhancing the empirical flexibility of the sequential search model. Even with incomplete search information, the observed ranking conditions remain valid for estimation. Moreover, additional information on value relationships within the censored part of the RAA can be incorporated alongside the ranking information observed from the search process. Variations of the baseline model can also be analyzed using the PR representation, provided the assumptions hold and the ranking variations can be captured from the data. These extensions are discussed in detail in Sections 5 and 6.

4 Joint Probability, Identification and Estimation

In this section, we show that with a full-rank differencing matrix, the joint probability of the sequential search model under the PR representation can be reformulated into a value-difference form analogous to that used in ranking models. Leveraging this reformulation, we discuss the identification arguments for sequential search models and propose the application of the Geweke-Hajivassilou-Keane (GHK, [Hajivassiliou and Ruud, 1994](#)) method for simulation-based maximum likelihood estimation.

4.1 Joint Probability

Different from Equation (3), the joint probability of a sequence observation following the PR representation of the sequential search model can be expressed as:

$$\Pr(\{H, S, R, \mathcal{M}\}_i) = \Pr(z_{iJ} \geq u_{ih} \text{ if } h < J \cap z_{i1} \geq \dots \geq z_{iJ} \cap \max_{j \leq J} u_{ij} \leq y_i \cap \max_{k > J} z_{ik} \leq y_i) \quad (6)$$

We consider an additive specification on purchase and reservation values between the expected value from observed attributes and other potentially stochastic components determined by unobservables. The baseline setup is as follows:

$$u_{ij} = \delta_i^u(X_{ij}^u) + \xi_{ij}^u + \varepsilon_{ij} \quad (7)$$

$$z_{ij} = \delta_i^z(X_{ij}^z) + \xi_{ij}^u + \xi_{ij}^z \quad (8)$$

Here, $\delta_i^u(X_{ij}^u)$ and $\delta_i^z(X_{ij}^z)$ are two deterministic components of product values. Both consumers and researchers can observe X_{ij}^u and X_{ij}^z that directly affect consumers' evaluation of inspecting or purchasing product j . The two components are identical in most empirical settings. At the same time, they can be differentiated with additional components in X_{ij}^z , such as an advertisement or a featured recommendation, which only affects inspections but not purchases.

We incorporate three additional components (potentially random) to account for potential unobservables in the model. The first component, ξ_{ij}^u , is a shared factor influencing both inspection and purchase decisions. It represents the part of a product's purchase value known to the consumer before inspection but unobservable in the dataset. As also a part of the reservation value, ξ_{ij}^u is often interpreted as the consumer's subjective preference for the product and typically exhibits heterogeneity. The second component, ε_{ij} , captures product-level uncertainty resolved through inspections. In this linear specification, it is modeled as a unidimensional additive term to the deterministic part of the product's value. Without loss of generality, we assume ε_{ij} is i.i.d. with a mean of 0 across all products and consumers. Its cdf is denoted by $F^\varepsilon(\cdot)$, and pdf by $f^\varepsilon(\cdot)$, both of which are known to consumers at the start of the search process.

Lastly, ξ_{ij}^z affects the reservation value, but not the purchase value, primarily reflecting the

search propensity generated by the search cost c_{ij} .⁵ When c_{ij} is zero, the reservation value is positive infinity. For positive search costs, the difference between the reservation value and the part of purchase value from the deterministic component represents the search propensity. In a linear specification, the propensity depends only on the distribution of ε and the magnitude of c_{ij} , represented as $m_\varepsilon(c_{ij})$, a strictly decreasing function.⁶ Additionally, unobservable random factors unrelated to search costs, such as unobserved platform rankings (Ursu, 2018), search refinement mechanisms (Chen and Yao, 2017), or behavioral shocks, may also influence search behavior. To summarize, we have:

$$\xi_{ij}^z = m_\varepsilon(c_{ij}) + \zeta_{ij}^z$$

The following assumptions, including the Independence and Invariance Assumptions, hold:

Assumption 1: (Independence) Inspecting a product j does not lead to information on ε_{ik} for any $k \neq j$.

Assumption 2: (Invariance) Products not inspected and not purchased in each step remain available in the next step.

Assumption 3: Consumer observes the values of ξ_{ij}^u, ξ_{ij}^z at the beginning of search.

Assumption 4: ε_{ij} distributes independently and identically. Consumers know $F^\varepsilon(\cdot)$ but not the value of each ε_{ij} until product j is inspected.

To express the joint probability, we categorize the sequence observations into two cases. First, we consider the case where the purchased product h is not the last inspected product J . We represent the reservation values of inspected products as \mathbf{z}^k , the reservation values of uninspected products as \mathbf{z}^n , and the purchase values of inspected products, excluding the purchased one, as \mathbf{u}^k . These are expressed in ordered vectorized forms as follows:

$$\mathbf{z}_i^k := (z_{i,J}, z_{i,J-1}, \dots, z_{i,1})^\top, \quad \mathbf{z}_i^n := (z_{i,J+1}, \dots, z_{i,|\mathcal{M}|})^\top, \quad \mathbf{u}_i^k := (u_{i,1}, \dots, u_{i,h-1}, u_{i,h+1}, \dots, u_{i,J})^\top;$$

$$\mathbf{z}_i^k = \vec{\delta}_i^{z,k}(\mathbf{X}_i^{z,k}) + \boldsymbol{\xi}_i^{u,k} + \boldsymbol{\xi}_i^{z,k}, \quad \mathbf{z}_i^n = \vec{\delta}_i^{z,n}(\mathbf{X}_i^{z,n}) + \boldsymbol{\xi}_i^{u,n} + \boldsymbol{\xi}_i^{z,n}, \quad \mathbf{u}_i^k = \vec{\delta}_i^{u,k'}(\mathbf{X}_i^{u,k'}) + \boldsymbol{\xi}_i^{u,k'} + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_i^k$$

Following Equation (6), the joint probability of the sequence is:

$$\Pr(\{H, \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{M}\}_i) = \Pr \left(\underbrace{\hat{D}}_{(J+|\mathcal{M}|-1) \times (J+|\mathcal{M}|)} \begin{pmatrix} u_{ih} \\ \mathbf{z}_i^k \\ \mathbf{z}_i^n \\ \mathbf{u}_i^{k'} \end{pmatrix}_{(J+|\mathcal{M}|) \times 1} \leq \mathbf{0} \right), \quad \text{where } \hat{D} = \begin{pmatrix} \hat{D}_1 & \hat{D}_2 \\ \hat{D}_3 & \hat{D}_4 \end{pmatrix}$$

⁵We use the term ‘‘search propensity’’ to describe the nonlinear impact of search cost on consumers’ inspection decision following Morozov (2023) and Onzo and Ansari (2024). This concept is referred to by different terms in different literature.

⁶The additivity of the search propensity and the monotonicity of $m_\varepsilon(\cdot)$ are proved in Appendix B.

The difference matrix \hat{D} consists of four blocks:

$$\hat{D}_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & -1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & -1 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & 1 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 1 & -1 \end{pmatrix}_{J \times (J+1)}, \quad \hat{D}_2 = \{0\}_{J \times (|\mathcal{M}|-1)}$$

$$\hat{D}_3 = \begin{pmatrix} -1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ -1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ -1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \end{pmatrix}_{(|\mathcal{M}|-1) \times (J+1)}, \quad \hat{D}_4 = I_{(|\mathcal{M}|-1) \times (|\mathcal{M}|-1)}.$$

Hence, \hat{D} is of rank $J + |\mathcal{M}| - 1$, and its form is determined by the sequence observation.

Now, we consider the case when the purchased product h is the last inspected. Following the vectorized form in the previous case, the joint probability of the sequence is:

$$\Pr(\{H, S, \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{M}\}_i) = \Pr \left(\begin{pmatrix} \underbrace{\tilde{D}}_{(J+2|\mathcal{M}|-3) \times (J+|\mathcal{M}|)} \begin{pmatrix} u_{ih} \\ z_i^k \\ z_i^n \\ \mathbf{u}_i^{k'} \end{pmatrix}_{(J+|\mathcal{M}|) \times 1} \leq \mathbf{0} \right), \text{ where } \tilde{D} = \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{D}_1 & \tilde{D}_2 \\ \tilde{D}_3 & \tilde{D}_4 \\ \tilde{D}_5 & \tilde{D}_6 \end{pmatrix}$$

The difference matrix \tilde{D} consists of six parts, in which:

$$\tilde{D}_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & -1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & -1 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 1 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 1 & -1 \end{pmatrix}_{(J-1) \times (J+1)}, \quad \tilde{D}_2 = \{0\}_{(J-1) \times (|\mathcal{M}|-1)},$$

$$\tilde{D}_3 = \begin{pmatrix} -1 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ -1 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \end{pmatrix}_{(|\mathcal{M}|-1) \times (J+1)}, \quad \tilde{D}_4 = I_{(|\mathcal{M}|-1) \times (|\mathcal{M}|-1)}$$

$$\tilde{D}_5 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & -1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \end{pmatrix}_{(|\mathcal{M}|-1) \times (J+1)}, \quad \tilde{D}_6 = I_{(|\mathcal{M}|-1) \times (|\mathcal{M}|-1)}$$

Notice that \tilde{D} is also of rank $J + |\mathcal{M}| - 1$. In the remainder of this paper, the difference matrix is denoted as D , which is selected from \hat{D}, \tilde{D} based on \mathcal{R}_i . Accordingly, the joint probability of

a sequence observation under the baseline model is expressed as:

$$\Pr(\{H, \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{M}\}_i) = \Pr \left(D \begin{pmatrix} u_{ih} \\ \mathbf{z}_i^k \\ \mathbf{z}_i^n \\ \mathbf{u}_i^{k'} \end{pmatrix} \leq \mathbf{0} \right) = \Pr \left(D \begin{pmatrix} \xi_{ih}^u + \varepsilon_{ih} \\ \boldsymbol{\xi}_i^{u,k} + \boldsymbol{\xi}_i^{z,k} \\ \boldsymbol{\xi}_i^{u,n} + \boldsymbol{\xi}_i^{z,n} \\ \boldsymbol{\xi}_i^{u,k'} + \varepsilon_i^{k'} \end{pmatrix} \leq -D \begin{pmatrix} \delta_i^u(X_{ih}^u) \\ \vec{\delta}_i^{z,k}(\mathbf{X}_i^{z,k}) \\ \vec{\delta}_i^{z,n}(\mathbf{X}_i^{z,n}) \\ \vec{\delta}_i^{u,k'}(\mathbf{X}_i^{u,k'}) \end{pmatrix} \right) \quad (9)$$

Equation (9) presents the joint probability of the sequential search model in a value-difference form. To the best of my knowledge, this is the first formal decomposition of the joint probability for sequential search models. The expression comprises two components: a deterministic term on the right-hand side, identifiable from the data, and stochastic terms on the left-hand side, which rely on specific structural assumptions. While this baseline model incorporates multiple sources of stochasticity, the structural assumptions for these components depend on the particular model specification. The value-difference formulation closely resembles the joint probability in standard discrete choice and ranking models. Compared to the probabilities for such models described in Sections 5.6.3 and 7.3.2 of Train (2009), Equation (9)'s primary distinction only lies in its use of a different full-rank difference matrix.

4.2 Identification

We explore the identification arguments in sequential search models using Equation (9). For the empirical analysis, we assume a linear deterministic component and focus on identifying the structure of the stochastic component. Existing literature often relies on heuristic approaches to link data variations with specific model parameters, but a formalized discussion of identification is crucial, particularly for addressing model variations. Morozov et al. (2021), Ursu et al. (2024) and Onzo and Ansari (2024) take an important step by offering more formalized discussions, which rely on conditional probabilities due to the inherent complexity of the joint probabilities in Equation (3). However, this approach leaves some ambiguities, as different parameter combinations can lead to indistinguishable changes in a single conditional probability, while multiple decisions within the search process may contribute to identifying a single parameter. For example, stopping decisions depend simultaneously on preferences, search costs, and the scale of uncertainties, while preferences can also be inferred from the ranking decisions made by consumers.

Equation (9) enables us to revisit model identification with the full joint probability in a manner analogous to discrete choice models. Although detailed identification arguments may depend on specific model specifications, there are two fundamental principles that applies to discrete choice models here: ‘‘Only differences in utility matter’’ and ‘‘The scale of utility is arbitrary.’’ These principles correspond to location and scale normalizations, which remain essential in sequential search models.

Let us examine the first point. In the baseline model specification, the absolute levels of reservation and purchase values are irrelevant due to the value-difference formulation. Adding a constant to the deterministic component of all values (i.e., to the right-hand side of the inequality) cancels out through the difference matrix, leaving both the consumer’s behavior and the joint probability of the observed data unchanged.

This irrelevance holds under the assumption that both reservation and purchase values consist of a deterministic component and a conditionally independent stochastic component, ensuring the validity of the second equality in Equation (9). The stochasticity of purchase values is guaranteed by ε_{ij} , while the stochasticity of reservation values requires additional assumptions on ξ_{ij}^u and ξ_{ij}^z , among which at least one component needs to have a positive variance. Without the stochastic components, adding a constant to the deterministic values would no longer be irrelevant, leading to two crucial problems. First, incorporating alternative-specific constants as controls becomes problematic because both the relative and absolute sizes of these constants would affect the estimation of other parameters. Second, the absence of consumer-specific controls introduces a uniform shift in all product values, potentially leading to omitted variable bias in estimation. As in discrete choice models, avoiding these issues is critical for the proper application of sequential search models.⁷ In more complex extensions of the baseline model, any newly introduced value to consumers’ rankings should include an additive stochastic component that remains conditionally independent of other options.

We now turn to the second point, “The scale of utility is arbitrary,” under the assumption of linear deterministic components. In discrete choice models with linear preferences, scale is typically irrelevant, and identification is achieved by normalizing the variance of the error term. However, in sequential search models, the scale significantly impacts the estimation of search costs and heterogeneities, even with a linear deterministic specification. This distinction arises because the distribution of ε_{ij} influences the reservation value through $m_\varepsilon(c_{ij})$, a function that is generally nonlinear. Without specific assumptions on $F^\varepsilon(\cdot)$, a proportional scale change in $m_\varepsilon(c_{ij})$ does not produce an identical scale change in c_{ij} . Consequently, even if ξ_{ij}^z is identifiable, c_{ij} cannot be identified unless $F^\varepsilon(\cdot)$ itself is identified. However, identifying $F^\varepsilon(\cdot)$ in empirical studies is theoretically applicable but often proves challenging, requiring researchers to impose distributional assumptions on ε_{ij} . These assumptions are necessary to disentangle the scale effects and ensure the proper identification of search costs and related parameters.

We illustrate this difficulty with two examples in the literature. In [Kim et al. \(2010\)](#), they considered a context where the consumer has a pre-search mean-zero taste shock before revealing the product unknowns via inspection. The taste shock is noted by ξ_{ij} and affects both the

⁷Many studies in the search literature highlight that without additional stochasticity in reservation values, inspection order becomes fully determined by the given parameters, causing identical preferences and search costs to yield identical inspection orders. While this issue exists, it is not entirely insurmountable. When the number of products is small, introducing more control variables and increasing heterogeneity in preference parameters can expand the uncertainty dimension and mitigate this problem.

reservation and the purchase values. Specifically, their model is:

$$u_{ij} = X_{ij}\beta_i + \xi_{ij} + \varepsilon_{ij} \quad (10)$$

$$c_{ij} = e^{c_0} \quad (11)$$

$$z_{ij} = X_{ij}\beta_i + \xi_{ij} + m_\varepsilon(c) \quad (12)$$

Their specification introduces $\xi_{ij}^u = \xi_{ij}$ as the unobserved stochasticity while assuming zero standard deviation for $\xi_{ij}^z = m_\varepsilon(c_0)$. Hence, we decompose the joint probability in the stacked vectorized form as follows:

$$\Pr(\{H, S, R, \mathcal{M}\}_i) = \Pr \left(D \begin{pmatrix} \xi_{ih} + \varepsilon_{ih} \\ \xi_i^k \\ \xi_i^n \\ \xi_i^{k'} + \varepsilon_i^{k'} \end{pmatrix} \leq -D \begin{pmatrix} X_{ih}\beta_i \\ \mathbf{X}_i^k \beta_i + \vec{m}_\varepsilon(c_0) \\ \mathbf{X}_i^n \beta_i + \vec{m}_\varepsilon(c_0) \\ \mathbf{X}_i^{k'} \beta_i \end{pmatrix} \right).$$

The identification arguments for this specification are detailed in [Ursu et al. \(2024\)](#) and summarized here for comparison. Following [Berry and Haile \(2014\)](#), the random coefficient setup can be identified once the distributions of ε_{ij} and ξ_{ij} are identified. Assuming both follow mean-zero i.i.d. normal distributions, we discuss whether additional assumptions on their standard deviations (σ_ε and σ_ξ) are required.

In this specification, ξ_{ij} appears in both purchase and reservation values, creating a shared component between the two. Rescaling ξ_{ij} does not affect the relative scale of the linear parameters or $m_\varepsilon(c_{ij})/\sigma_\xi$, necessitating a scale normalization on ξ_{ij} . In contrast, σ_ε governs the nonlinear relationship between search costs and propensities and also influences purchase probabilities. Although σ_ε is theoretically identifiable without additional assumptions, empirical studies consistently report challenges in estimating it without supplementary information ([Yavorsky et al., 2021](#); [Morozov et al., 2021](#); [Greminger, 2024](#); [Ursu et al., 2024](#)). The source of such difficulty becomes evident in our joint probability representation: the unobserved heterogeneity in ξ_{ij} introduces an unobserved correlation between purchase and reservation values for the same product. As demonstrated by [Keane \(1992\)](#) in multinomial probit models, identifying σ_ε robustly requires observable attributes that influence only purchase or reservation values, but not both. Without such exclusion restrictions on observable regressors, identification becomes fragile, particularly for heteroskedastic settings. In practice, imposing exclusion restrictions is often impeded by limited data availability or challenges in providing economically meaningful interpretations. Consequently, many empirical studies simplify the specification by assuming $\varepsilon_{ij}/\sigma_\varepsilon = 1$, effectively sidestepping these identification issues.⁸

The other specification is proposed in [Chung et al. \(2024\)](#). They introduce stochasticity to the reservation value through heterogeneous search costs across products. Their model is given

⁸An exception is [Yavorsky et al. \(2021\)](#), which introduces additional search cost shifters affecting only reservation values, successfully imposing exclusion restrictions and achieving identification of σ_ε .

by the following:

$$u_{ij} = X_{ij}\beta_i + \varepsilon_{ij} \quad (13)$$

$$c_{ij} \sim \text{Exp}(\lambda_0) \quad (14)$$

$$z_{ij} = X_{ij}\beta_i + \xi_{ij}^z = X_{ij}\beta_i + m_\varepsilon(c_{ij}) \quad (15)$$

Their specification assumes a stochastic ξ_{ij}^z with a random search cost. The joint probability can then be written as:

$$\Pr(\{H, S, R, \mathcal{M}\}_i) = \Pr \left(D \begin{pmatrix} \varepsilon_{ih} \\ \xi_i^{z,k} \\ \xi_i^{z,n} \\ \varepsilon_i^{k'} \end{pmatrix} \leq -D \begin{pmatrix} X_{ih}\beta_i \\ X_i^k\beta_i \\ X_i^n\beta_i \\ X_i^{k'}\beta_i \end{pmatrix} \right)$$

Under this specification, the mean of the preference parameter β_i remains insensitive to scale changes, maintaining stability in its relative scale. On the other hand, the independence between ε_{ij} and c_{ij} eliminates the correlation between the reservation and purchase values for the same product. This reduces the susceptibility of parameter estimates to weak identification issues in heteroskedasticity.⁹ However, a new challenge arises: the mean of ξ_{ij}^z is not zero under this specification. Even with the variance of ε_{ij} assumed, if the distribution of c_{ij} depends on more than one parameter, it becomes difficult to simultaneously identify these parameters from probability variations from the data. If this issue prevents the correct identification of the variance of ξ_{ij}^z , neither the mean of ξ_{ij}^z nor the heterogeneity of β_i can be reliably estimated. To address this, [Chung et al. \(2024\)](#) propose strong assumptions in both their working paper and published version, respectively: that c_{ij} follows a log-normal distribution with known variance, or an exponential distribution (Equation 14). Both assumptions ensure that the distribution of ξ_{ij}^z is determined by a single parameter, thereby addressing the model's identification issue.

The discussion on identification arguments aids in applying sequential search models and their extensions in empirical research. First, the principle that “only utility differences matter” necessitates introducing additional randomness into reservation values. This requirement extends to further variants in ranking conditions: for instance, if other observed behaviors in search data are incorporated into the RAA, their values must include conditionally independent linear random components maintain the identifiability of the variant model. Second, the principle that “the scale of utility is arbitrary” generally does not apply to sequential search models. This is because addressing identification challenges introduced by stochasticity needs additional distributional assumptions to overcome practical identification issue, and the estimation of search costs is highly sensitive to these assumptions. Consequently, the estimated search costs are conditional on the assumed distributions. This implies that, in principle, search costs

⁹Empirical validation of this comparison is reported in Table 4 of [Chung et al. \(2024\)](#).

should not be directly monetized or used to compute consumer welfare without verification to these distributional assumptions.

4.3 Estimation

The PR representation reduces the complexity caused by unobservables in the OSR representation. Thus, when applying a sequential search model to handle search data, we can first find the model's PR representation, then employ methods suitable for ranking models to estimate the model. Given the value-difference form of the joint probability in Equation (9), a GHK-style simulator for simulation-based maximum likelihood estimation becomes a natural choice. Consider a specification where a pre-search shock is introduced to both reservation and purchase values as in Equations (10) - (12). The implementation steps are as follows: ¹⁰

1. Draw preference heterogeneity to obtain β_i^d . Draw ξ_{iJ} to determine z_{iJ}^d for each draw.
2. Sequentially draw $\xi_{i,J-1}, \xi_{i,J-2}, \dots, \xi_{i2}$ to determine $z_{i,J-1}^d, z_{i,J-2}^d, \dots, z_{i2}^d$ conditional on $z_{ij} > z_{i,j+1}^d$. Compute $p_{i1}^d = \prod_{1 \leq j \leq J-1} \Pr(z_{ij} \geq z_{i,j+1}^d)$.
3. If $h \neq J$, draw ε_{ih} conditional on $u_{ih} < z_{iJ}^d$ and compute $p_{i2}^d = \Pr(u_{ih} \leq z_{iJ}^d)$; if $h = J$, draw ε_{ih} randomly and assign $p_{i2}^d = 1$. Determine $y_i^d = \min\{u_{ih}^d, z_{iJ}^d\}$.
4. Compute $p_{i3}^d = \prod_{J < k \leq |\mathcal{M}_i|} \Pr(z_{ik} < y_i^d)$ and $p_{i4}^d = \prod_{1 \leq j \leq J, j \neq h} \Pr(u_{ij} < y_i^d)$.
5. Compute the likelihood contribution of each draw $L_i^d = p_{i1}^d \cdot p_{i2}^d \cdot p_{i3}^d \cdot p_{i4}^d$. Take the average across draws to obtain the simulated likelihood.

We compare the performances of the GHK-style simulator employed in [Jiang et al. \(2021\)](#) (with formalized Matlab code thanks to [Ursu et al. \(2024\)](#)) to the simulator proposed here with a Monte Carlo simulation. To distinguish between the simulators, we call the GHK-style simulator employed in literature the OSR-GHK simulator, while the simulator proposed in this paper is referred to as the PR-GHK simulator. The detailed specification is as follows:

$$u_{ij} = \sum_{s=1}^3 \gamma_i x_j^s + \beta_{ij} p_{ij} + \zeta_{ij} + \varepsilon_{ij}, \quad \text{where } \beta_{ij} \sim N(\bar{\beta}, \sigma_\beta^2) \text{ and } \zeta_{ij} \sim N(0, \sigma_\zeta^2); \quad (16)$$

$$c_{ij} = \exp(\bar{c}_0); \quad (17)$$

$$z_{ij} = \sum_{s=1}^3 \gamma_i x_j^s + \beta_{ij} p_j + \zeta_{ij} + m_\varepsilon(c_{ij}). \quad (18)$$

¹⁰The implementation coincides to the main idea of simulated likelihood construction in [Chung et al. \(2024\)](#), but we do not split observations into cases of purchasing the outside option, the last inspected product, or an earlier inspected product, avoiding case-specific probability calculations. In addition, we confine the comparison between z_{ij} and u_{ih} to p_{i2} , while [Chung et al. \(2024\)](#) further divides this into two subcases to compute full probabilities.

Here, x_j^s are dummy product attributes, while p_j indicate product prices. As discussed in Section 4.2, while it is theoretically possible to estimate σ_ε , it is challenging to do so with simulation-based methods. Therefore, in addition to normalizing $\sigma_\zeta = 1$, we further assume σ_ε is known and set to 1 in the estimation.

We generated a dataset for 2,000 consumers who make search and purchase decisions in a setting with 8 products and an outside option. The utility function of each product is a linear combination of three binary attributes and a price, and the eight products correspond to the eight combinations of these attributes, with the observed value of the product with attributes $[0, 0, 0]$ serving as the normalized mean-zero alternative. The preferences for product attributes are homogeneous, while the price sensitivity is a normally distributed random coefficient across consumers. The search costs are assumed to be constant. The result is recorded in Table 1.¹¹

TABLE 1 – Monte Carlo Simulation Results between the GHK-style simulators

	True value	Estimates	
		OSR-GHK	PR-GHK
$\gamma^{outside}$: Outside option mean	-1	-0.707 (0.025)	-0.950 (0.037)
γ_1 : Attribute 1 coefficient	1	0.987 (0.007)	0.998 (0.007)
γ_2 : Attribute 2 coefficient	0.5	0.501 (0.003)	0.505 (0.004)
γ_3 : Attribute 3 coefficient	-0.2	-0.186 (0.004)	-0.190 (0.004)
$\bar{\beta}$: Price coefficient mean	-0.6	-0.545 (0.007)	-0.558 (0.008)
σ_β : Price coefficient deviation	0.2	0.099 (0.051)	0.202 (0.055)
\bar{c}_0 : Log search cost mean	-1.5	-1.524 (0.002)	-1.528 (0.004)
Log-Likelihood (True value)		-9202	-9209
Log-Likelihood (Estimates)		-9196	-9206
Average Iteration Running Time (s)		1.48	1.29
Average Convergence Time (s)		1169	869

Notes: Data are simulated for 2,000 consumers, and the reported results are obtained after averaging 50 estimations with different seeds and with 1,000 error draws each. The standard deviation of the mean estimate across these simulations is reported in parentheses.

Compared to the simulation verification in Table 1 of Ursu et al. (2024), the main difference is that we simulate a partially heterogeneous model with an outside option. Notably, except

¹¹We do not further compare the performance of the PR-GHK simulator with other methods (crude frequency simulator, kernel-smoothed frequency simulator, and importance sampling method) used in the empirical literature. We attribute the credit to Ursu et al. (2024) and Chung et al. (2024), which conduct extensive simulation-based validation between these alternative methods and the OSR-GHK simulator.

for the similarly well-estimated search cost and preference means, $\gamma^{outside}$ and σ_β are the two coefficients that perform poorly in estimation using the OSR-GHK simulator. This occurs because the OSR-GHK simulator draws all uncertainties throughout the search process, including β_i , ξ_{ij} of inspected products, and ε_{ij} of inspected products. In contrast, the PR-GHK simulator avoids requiring draws for ε_{ij} of unpurchased products, which improves the estimation of heterogeneity parameters and the outside option, for which reservation values do not apply.

Beyond estimation performance, the PR-GHK simulator offers a distinct advantage in implementation simplicity compared to the OSR-GHK simulator, addressing a significant limitation of the latter. Implementing the OSR-GHK simulator involves constructing the likelihood function through a process of enumerating, decomposing, and recombining inequality conditions derived from the Optimal Search Rules. This process is often cumbersome and depends on researchers' personal choices on decomposition and recombination. For instance, [Jiang et al. \(2021\)](#) and [Chung et al. \(2024\)](#) categorize sequence observations into three to four cases by the product purchased, designing specific implementation procedures tailored to each case. In contrast, the PR-GHK simulator directly estimates the ranking model implied by the RAA that is partially observed, or censored, in the sequence observation. The process is formalized in two main stages. The first stage, corresponding to the Distribution and Ranking Conditions, simulates the likelihood of the ranking of reservation values conditional on the simulated reservation value of the last inspected product. The second stage, aligned with the Choice Conditions, addresses the probabilities that the values of uninspected or unpurchased products are being 'censored' given the simulated core value. These two stages are conditionally independent, eliminating the need for case-by-case handling. This streamlined approach reduces programming complexity and is applicable to larger market or longer sequences, making the PR-GHK simulator a highly practical and efficient tool for researchers.

Another method for estimating ranking models is the exploded logit ([Beggs et al., 1981](#); [Chapman and Staelin, 1982](#)). [Compiani et al. \(2024\)](#) employed this method to sequential search model and referred to as a 'double logit' approach.¹² Although the paper does not formalize equivalence, it takes a similar approach by transforming the consumer's search and purchase process into a ranking of actions corresponding to the RAA proposed in our study, enabling estimation using the exploded logit method. This approach relies on the Gumbel distributional assumption for ζ_{ij} and requires the ranking information to be coherent and complete. Due to the lack of search process data in the Expedia database used in this paper, their method requires enumerating all potential rankings, calculating the probability for each, and summing over all scenarios. In the next section, we demonstrate that the PR-GHK estimator can effectively handle such information incompleteness while also accommodating a broader range of distributions for stochastic components in the value functions.

¹²Traditional crude or kernel-smoothed frequency simulators, as well as other recently developed estimation approaches such as importance sampling ([Morozov et al., 2021](#)) are also applicable to the partial ranking representation. As these methods are less commonly used for ranked data, we do not elaborate further here.

5 Extension 1: Varying Availability of Search Data

In many practical scenarios, search data may be incomplete. For example, datasets may only record the final purchases without revealing the preceding search process or may include partial search process with missing records in the inspection order. With the OSR representation, the outcomes from the unobservable search process affects the conditions of subsequent search and purchase decisions, thereby influencing estimation results. On the other hand, the PR representation becomes particularly advantageous because under the Invariance Assumption the content implied by the RAA does not change regardless of whether it is fully observed. When only partial search process information is observable, we can calculate the probability of the partial information available conditional only on the core value. Hence, we can leverage incomplete search process information at virtually no additional cost while maintaining the validity of the estimation method. Additional ranking information, such as relative preferences inferred from external signals or experimental data, can also be incorporated seamlessly.

Building on the baseline model, this section explores several scenarios involving incomplete search process data or additional ranking information. We demonstrate how the PR-GHK estimator effectively addresses these situations and fully utilizes all available ranking information for estimation.

5.1 Incomplete Search Data

We first consider the case where a consumer knows the purchase values of certain products before the search begins. These products do not enter the search process, so their reservation values are missing from observation, and only their purchase values are included in the joint probability. If a known product is purchased, it becomes part of the core value; if not, it is smaller than the core value. We formalize it in the following corollary:

Corollary 1. *When a product’s purchase value is known to the consumer without inspection. If it is not purchased, its purchase value follows Choice Condition 2; if it is purchased, all other products follow conditions in Proposition 1.*

Corollary 1 is straightforward but important. One common example of a known product is the outside option. The search sequence data can incorporate consumers who search in the market but ultimately choose to exit. Without purchasing, these consumers’ search data naturally identify the outside option’s market share without relying on other assumptions. In practice, we often assume that the purchase value of the outside option is revealed after the first inspection to guarantee at least one inspection, while Corollary 1 enables these consumers to be incorporated into estimation as other purchasers.¹³ Another important instance is when the purchase values of all products are known without searching. In this case, the partial ranking collapses, and the

¹³Note that with only search and purchase data, we cannot identify consumers who opt for the outside option without any inspection.

core value becomes the purchase value of the purchase product. Conditions in Proposition 1, except Choice Condition 1, become trivial, and the sequential search model reduces to a standard discrete choice model. Therefore, with the supplement of Corollary 1, the full-information discrete choice model can be taken as a particular case of the sequential search model.

The second variation is when researchers only observe the purchased product but neither the search path nor the consideration set. In this case, we do not have any search information, so we take the aggregation of the probability of all potential inspection orders that lead to the final purchase, and we obtain the following proposition.

Proposition 2. *Define $w_{ij} = \min\{z_{ij}, u_{ij}\}$ the Effective Value of product j to consumer i . If $w_{iH} \geq w_{iL}, \forall L \in \mathcal{M}_i \setminus \{H\}$, then following Proposition 1, H is always inspected and purchased. On contrary, $w_{ih} \geq w_{ij}, \forall j \neq h$ must hold for any $\{H, \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{M}\}_i$ fulfilling conditions in Proposition 1.*

Proof. We separate this proposition into three parts. First, a product with the largest effective value must be inspected in any sequence that fulfills the conditions in Proposition 1; second, given that the highest effective value product is inspected, it must be purchased; third, any purchased product in the Ranking Conditional Discrete Framework must have the largest effective value in the market.

We start with proving the first part of the proposition. Suppose there is a consumer i , a product H satisfying $\min\{z_{iH}, u_{iH}\} \geq \min\{z_{iL}, u_{iL}\}, \forall L \in \mathcal{M} \setminus \{H\}$ is not inspected in her search sequence. Denote the order of the purchased product by h' and the last inspected product by J' . According to the Choice Condition 2, $z_{iH} < y_i = \min\{u_{ih'}, z_{ij'}\}$. If $h' = J'$, $\min\{u_{ih'}, z_{ih'}\} = \min\{u_{ih'}, z_{ij'}\} > z_{iH} \geq \min\{u_{iH}, z_{iH}\}$; if $h' < J'$, we know $z_{ih'} \geq z_{ij'}$ holds according to the Distribution Condition. Hence, $\min\{u_{ih'}, z_{ih'}\} > \min\{u_{ih'}, z_{ij'}\} > z_{iH} \geq \min\{u_{iH}, z_{iH}\}$. In either case, the effective value of the purchased product is larger than that of product H , which contradicts H 's effective value condition. Therefore, product H is always inspected.

Next, we prove the second part of the proposition. Given that product H is inspected in any sequence i , we denote H 's position by h .

- Suppose a product $j' \leq J, j' \neq h$ with $u_{ij'} > \min\{u_{ih}, z_{iJ}\}$ exist. If $h = J$, according to the largest effective value assumption, we have $u'_{ij'} > \min\{u_{ih}, z_{ih}\} > \min\{u_{ij'}, z_{ij'}\}$, hence $z_{ij'} < \min\{u_{ih}, z_{ih}\} < z_{ih}$. This violates the Ranking Condition. If $h < J$, $u_{ij'} > \min\{u_{ih}, z_{iJ}\}$ is equivalent to $u_{ij'} > u_{ih}$. Because of the Distribution and the Ranking Conditions, we know that $z_{ij'} \geq z_{iJ} > u_{ih}$. Combine the two inequalities, we have $\min\{u_{ij'}, z_{ij'}\} > u_{ih} \geq \min\{u_{ih}, z_{ih}\}$. This contradicts the largest effective value assumption on product H .
- Suppose a product $k' > J > h$ with $z_{ik'} > \min\{u_{ih}, z_{iJ}\}$ exist. Following Choice Condition 2, we have $\min\{u_{ih}, z_{iJ}\} < z_{ik'} \leq y_i$. The condition contradicts itself when h is purchased, so we assume that a product $h' < J, h' \neq h$ is purchased. In this case, with the Ranking Condition and Choice Condition 1, we have $\min\{u_{ih'}, z_{ih'}\} \geq \min\{u_{ih'}, z_{iJ}\} \geq u_{ih} \geq \min\{u_{ih}, z_{ih}\}$, which violates the largest effective value assumption.

Hence, whether product H is the last inspected product or not. $\min\{u_{ih}, z_{iJ}\}$ fulfills the Choice Conditions of the core value. Because purchase in the Ranking Conditional Discrete Choice framework is unique, H is the purchased product.

Last, we prove the third part of the proposition. When product h is purchased, any inspected product $j \neq h$ fulfills $\min\{u_{ij}, z_{ij}\} \leq u_{ij} < y_i = \min\{u_{ih}, z_{iJ}\}$. Because $h \leq J$, following the Ranking Condition, $\min\{u_{ih}, z_{iJ}\} \leq \min\{u_{ih}, z_{ih}\}$. Therefore, $\min\{u_{ij}, z_{ij}\} < \min\{u_{ih}, z_{ih}\}$. Similarly, for any uninspected product $k > J$, we have $\min\{u_{ik}, z_{ik}\} \leq z_{ik} < \min\{u_{ih}, z_{iJ}\} < \min\{u_{ih}, z_{ih}\}$. \square

Proposition 2, corresponding to the Eventual Purchase Theorem proposed by [Armstrong \(2017\)](#) and [Choi et al. \(2018\)](#), indicates that in the optimal search outcomes, a consumer will purchase a product if and only if its effective value exceeds that of all alternatives. Thus, a standard discrete choice model based on effective values can be established to directly derive consumer demand in a background of sequential search models without requiring knowledge of the exact search process. However, as the probability of a discrete choice structure significantly differs from that of a sequential search model under the OSR representation (Equation (3)), effective values are typically not utilized in the models when search process information is considered as important. Proposition 2 states that in the PR representation, a discrete choice framework based on effective values represents an extreme case of sequential search model with incomplete search information, in which no search information is available.

Specifically, we note that when the purchased product is given, the product's effective value is numerically equivalent to the core value of the search sequence. To illustrate, we classify sequence observations into two scenarios. When $\min z_{iH}, u_{iH} = u_{iH}$, any product $L \in \mathcal{M} \setminus H$ satisfies either $z_{iL} \geq u_{iH} \geq u_{iL}$ or $u_{iH} \geq z_{iL}$. Let S_i denote the set of products meeting the first condition, and \bar{S}_i the set of products meeting the second. This scenario corresponds to a consumer purchasing a product either inspected in a prior step or inspected in the last step with its purchase value lower than the reservation value. Conversely, when $\min z_{iH}, u_{iH} = z_{iH}$, any product $\ell \neq H$ satisfies either $u_{i\ell} \geq z_{iH} \geq z_{i\ell}$ or $z_{iH} \geq u_{i\ell}$. Here, S_i represents the set of products meeting the second condition, and \bar{S}_i the set meeting the first. This scenario corresponds to a consumer purchasing the last product whose purchase value exceeds the reservation value.

Therefore, when only the purchased product is known, its effective value can be taken as the core value of the potential search sequence, providing incomplete ranking information. To see this, notice that all sequences satisfying conditions in Proposition 1 that lead to the consideration set S and the purchase of product H if and only if the following conditions are satisfied:

$$\begin{cases} \min\{u_{iH}, z_{iH_0}\} > u_{iL}, \forall L \in S \setminus \{H\} \\ \min\{u_{iH}, z_{iH_0}\} > z_{iL'}, \forall L' \in \bar{S} \\ z_{iH_0} > u_{iH} \text{ if } H_0 \neq H \end{cases} \quad (19)$$

Here, $H_0 \in S$ indicates the product with the smallest reservation value among all inspected

products. Without loss of generality, we assume that the product is unique. In this case, the following proposition holds:

Proposition 3. *Conditions (19) are satisfied if and only if the following conditions are satisfied:*

$$\begin{cases} w_{iH} > u_{iL}, \forall L \in S \setminus \{H\} \\ w_{iH} < z_{iL}, \forall L \in S \setminus \{H\} \\ w_{iH} > z_{iL'}, \forall L' \in \bar{S} \end{cases} \quad (20)$$

Proof. First, notice that $\min\{u_{iH}, z_{iH}\} = w_{iH}$ in Conditions (20) satisfy $w_{iH} \geq w_{iL}, \forall L \in \mathcal{M} \setminus \{H\}$. With Proposition 2, product H is also inspected and purchased under Conditions (20).

Consider the sufficiency. If $H_0 = H$, the first and third inequalities in Conditions (20) are immediately satisfied. For any product L with $L \in S \setminus \{H\}$, L is inspected. Following Proposition 1, L is inspected before H_0 and $z_{iL} > z_{H_0} = z_{iH} \geq \min\{u_{iH}, z_{iH}\}$. If $H_0 \neq H$, we have $z_{iH} > z_{iH_0}$. So $\min\{u_{iH}, z_{iH}\} \geq \min\{u_{iH}, z_{iH_0}\} > u_{iL}, \forall L \in S \setminus \{H\}$ and $\min\{u_{iH}, z_{iH}\} \geq \min\{u_{iH}, z_{iH_0}\} > z_{iL'}, \forall L' \in \bar{S}$. For any product L with $L \in S \setminus \{H\}$, L is inspected. Following Proposition 1, L is inspected before H_0 and $z_{iL} > z_{H_0} > u_{iH} \geq \min\{u_{iH}, z_{iH}\}$.

Consider the necessity. If $H_0 = H$, the first and second inequalities in Conditions (19) are immediately satisfied. If $H_0 \neq H$, according to the definition of H_0 , we have $z_{iH_0} < z_{iH}$; H_0 is inspected, so $H_0 \in S \setminus \{H\}$. Therefore, $\min\{u_{iH}, z_{iH}\} < z_{iH_0} < z_{iH}$, implying $u_{iH} < z_{iH_0} < z_{iH}$, which is the third inequality in Condition (19). In addition, $\min\{u_{iH}, z_{iH}\} = \min\{u_{iH}, z_{iH_0}\} = u_{iH_0}$. The first and second inequalities in Conditions (19) are immediately fulfilled. \square

Propositions 1 and 3 correspond to two different informational scenarios:

- If product J is known, then for any other product j , it is inspected before J if and only if $z_{ij} > z_{iJ}$.
- If product J is unknown, then for any product j , it is inspected if and only if $z_{ij} > w_{iH}$.

When the last inspected product is unknown, the effective value of the purchased product can provide suboptimal ranking information, which can be combined with other ranking information and used for estimation.

As a conclude to this extension, we show this with a specific scenario: we can only observe the first product consumers inspect and the product they eventually get. In this case, the search data is partially missing, and applying the optimal search rules seems impossible without a full simulation of the search process. To utilize the remaining part of the search path, we can reconstruct the partial ranking and implement the PR-GHK simulator for the model in Equations (10) - (12) as follows:

1. Draw heterogeneities to determine $\delta_i(\cdot)$. Draw ζ_{ih} to determine z_{ih}^d for each draw.

2. If $h \neq 1$, draw ζ_{i1} conditional on $z_{i1} > z_{ih}^d$ and compute $p_{i1}^d = \Pr(z_{i1} \geq z_{ih}^d)$; if $h = 1$, draw z_{i1} randomly and assign $p_{i1}^d = 1$.
3. Draw ε_{ih} randomly to determine u_{ih}^d . Compute $w_i^d = \min\{u_{ih}^d, z_{ih}^d\}$.
4. Draw c_{ij} for all $j \neq 1$ and $j \neq h$ conditional on $z_{ij} < z_{i1}^d$, compute $p_{i2}^d = \prod_{j \neq 1, h} \Pr(z_{ij} \geq z_{i1}^d)$.
5. Compute $p_{i3}^d = \prod_{k \in \{j: z_{ij}^d > w_i^d\}} \Pr(u_{ik} \leq w_i^d)$.
6. Compute the likelihood contribution of the draw $L_i^d = p_{i1}^d \cdot p_{i2}^d \cdot p_{i3}^d$. Take the average across draws to obtain the simulated likelihood.

Thus, even without knowing the last inspected product or the consideration set, relying solely on the purchased product and the first inspected product can still maximize the use of the ranking information they provide for estimation. We validate the effectiveness of this method through a Monte Carlo simulation following the specification in Equations (16) - (18). Leaving the outside option out, we generate a dataset of search and purchases of 10,000 consumers on 8 products and estimate the model using three different implementations: (1) utilizing all search and purchase information, (2) using only the first inspection and purchase information, and (3) relying solely on purchase information. For each implementation, we conduct 100 estimations with different groups of error draws, using 1,000 draws per group. In the first 50 estimations, the starting values are set to the true parameter values, while in the remaining 50, all starting values are set to 0. We show the following Monte Carlo simulation results.

All three implementations perform well when the starting values are set to the true parameter values. However, as the amount of utilized information decreases, there is a slight decline in the performance of estimators, except for σ_β . The inaccuracy in estimating σ_β primarily arises because, when utilizing the complete search path data for estimation, the PR-GHK simulator sequentially samples more ζ_{ij} for inspected products, which are embedded in both their reservation values and purchase values, introducing correlations within the ranking to be estimated from the variation of the ranking, which is also used for identifying preference heterogeneity. As a result, with the same number of simulated consumers and draws, using more search information can paradoxically reduce the precision of σ_β estimates. This issue is particularly noticeable in models with parameter heterogeneity.

A noticeable finding under the specification of Equations (10) - (12) is that when the starting values are away from the true values, using only the first inspection and purchase information for estimation outperforms not only the case of using no search information but potentially even the case of using all search information. On the one hand, insufficient information leads to significant challenges in empirical identification for the Eventual Purchase Theorem-based model that does not use search information for estimation. Without a closed-form solution, it is highly prone to falling into local optima in the numerical optimization. On the other hand,

TABLE 2 – Monte Carlo Simulation Results with Different Levels of Search Data Use

	True value	Estimates (Start from true value)			Estimates (Start from all zero)		
		Full Info	1st Inspection	No Info	Full Info	1st Inspection	No Info
γ_1	1	0.999 (0.003)	0.999 (0.003)	1.008 (0.007)	0.887 (0.215)	0.957 (0.164)	0.513 (0.253)
γ_2	0.5	0.503 (0.002)	0.501 (0.002)	0.495 (0.005)	0.401 (0.185)	0.505 (0.045)	0.326 (0.120)
γ_3	-0.2	-0.197 (0.002)	-0.202 (0.002)	-0.200 (0.004)	-0.075 (0.124)	-0.141 (0.115)	-0.010 (0.118)
$\bar{\beta}$	-0.6	-0.602 (0.003)	-0.608 (0.003)	-0.619 (0.006)	-0.438 (0.188)	-0.549 (0.161)	-0.125 (0.259)
σ_β	0.2	0.227 (0.019)	0.208 (0.003)	0.196 (0.009)	0.431 (0.294)	0.324 (0.194)	0.287 (0.192)
\bar{c}_0	-1.5	-1.513 (0.002)	-1.454 (0.010)	-1.547 (0.061)	-1.474 (0.087)	-1.346 (0.117)	-0.188 (0.338)
Log-L (True value)		-45747 (10.38)	-31548 (6.41)	-19473 (6.45)	-45752 (11.86)	-31547 (7.00)	-19474 (6.05)
Log-L (Estimates)		-45746 (10.44)	-31547 (6.38)	-19472 (6.40)	-46158 (434.14)	-31655 (257.15)	-19890 (277.45)

Notes: Data are simulated for 10,000 consumers, and the reported results are obtained after averaging 50 estimations with different seeds and with 1,000 error draws each. The standard deviation of the mean estimate across these simulations is reported in parentheses.

while the full search path model utilizes more information, the weak identification issue caused by the increased number of sampled ζ_{ij} values can outweigh its benefits, negatively impacting the estimation accuracy given the same amount of draws.¹⁴

The simulation results in Table 2 depend on parameter settings and distributional assumptions, including some randomly chosen parameters such as unusual negative preference values to test the simulator’s robustness. While full search data make a better estimation of search costs, the simulator using only first-inspection data shows a comparable performance in estimating preference parameters. With incomplete search path data, the PR-GHK simulator offers a practical and effective approach to utilizing available information.¹⁵

¹⁴As shown in Appendix C, based on specifications following Equations (13) - (15), using the full information consistently outperforms using only the first-view data, as the additionally sampled heterogeneity in search costs only account for the variations in the observed ranking of reservation values, while it is not a part of the purchase values. Hence, no unobserved correlation is introduced.

¹⁵Note that though the search path information can be incomplete, the PR-GHK simulator does rely on the availability of final purchase information in the data. Researchers may need to infer the purchased product when missing purchase information. For example, if only the first three inspections are observed, four joint probabilities need to be computed: three for the consumer purchasing each of the three products and one for not purchasing any of them. These probabilities can be simulated and summed up for estimation.

5.2 Additional Ranking Information

Let us consider the case of additional ranking information. If there exists an external mechanism providing ranking information for the censored part of the RAA (i.e., the part outside the observed search process), then with Lemma 1, such additional ranking information related to the censored values can be treated as partial observations of the RAA, just like search information, and incorporated into the estimation without requiring adjustments through optimal search rules.¹⁶ Imagine a scenario where if a consumer inspects at least two products, she must compare the second inspected product with the first and mark her preference among the two products. Assuming this action incurs no cost and the information is entirely truthful, this marking provides additional ranking information for consumers who purchase the third or later searched products.

We continue to explore the contribution of this additional information to estimation with Monte Carlo simulations. For this purpose, we generate a smaller search dataset with 2,000 consumers following the specification in Equation (16) - (18) without the outside option. We consider two scenarios: incorporating and not incorporating the information from marking in model estimation. Incorporating this information requires slightly adjusting the PR-GHK implementation in Step 4. The detailed process is as follows:

1. Draw preference heterogeneity to obtain β_i^d . Draw ξ_{iJ} to determine z_{iJ}^d for each draw.
2. Sequentially draw $\xi_{i,J-1}, \xi_{i,J-2}, \dots, \xi_{i2}$ to determine $z_{i,J-1}^d, z_{i,J-2}^d, \dots, z_{i2}^d$ conditional on $z_{ij} > z_{i,j+1}^d$. Compute $p_{i1}^d = \prod_{1 \leq j \leq J-1} \Pr(z_{ij} \geq z_{i,j+1}^d)$.
3. If $h \neq J$, draw ε_{ih} conditional on $u_{ih} < z_{iJ}^d$ and compute $p_{i2}^d = \Pr(u_{ih} \leq z_{iJ}^d)$; if $h = J$, draw ε_{ih} randomly and assign $p_{i2}^d = 1$. Determine $y_i^d = \min\{u_{ih}^d, z_{iJ}^d\}$.
- 4.1. If the purchased product is inspected in the third place or later, denote $s = 1$ or 2 as the preferred between the first two inspected products. Draw ε_{is} to determine u_{is}^d conditional on $u_{is} < y_i^d$. Compute $p_{i3} = \Pr(u_{is} \leq y_i^d) \cdot \Pr(u_{i,3-s} \leq u_{is}^d) \cdot \prod_{3 \leq j \leq J, j \neq h} \Pr(u_{ij} < y_i^d)$. Otherwise, compute $p_{i3}^d = \prod_{1 \leq j \leq J, j \neq h} \Pr(u_{ij} < y_i^d)$.
- 4.2. Compute $p_{i4}^d = \prod_{J < k \leq |\mathcal{M}_i|} \Pr(z_{ik} < y_i^d)$.
5. Compute the likelihood contribution of each draw $L_i^d = p_{i1}^d \cdot p_{i2}^d \cdot p_{i3}^d \cdot p_{i4}^d$. Take the average across draws to obtain the simulated likelihood.

The Monte Carlo simulation results are shown in Table 3.

Based on our value settings, this marking information provides substantial supplemental ranking information for 9% of the simulated consumers. The sampling processes of the two

¹⁶Note that the information must represent a top-down ranking to satisfy the ranking postulate, which allows ranking probabilities to be summed. For example, among three products, A, B, and C, ranking information such as $u_{iA} > u_{iB}$ and $u_{iA} > u_{iC}$ can be incorporated, while information like $u_{iA} > u_{iC}$ and $u_{iB} > u_{iC}$ cannot be incorporated, as the latter does not establish a top-down order.

TABLE 3 – Monte Carlo Simulation Results with Additional Ranking Information

	True value	Estimates (Start from true value)		Estimates (Start from all zero)	
		Full Info	Additional Info	Full Info	Additional Info
γ_1	1	1.040 (0.006)	1.040 (0.006)	0.858 (0.252)	0.911 (0.264)
γ_2	0.5	0.491 (0.003)	0.491 (0.003)	0.287 (0.208)	0.298 (0.218)
γ_3	-0.2	-0.255 (0.004)	-0.254 (0.003)	-0.088 (0.110)	-0.103 (0.156)
$\bar{\beta}$	-0.6	-0.668 (0.007)	-0.668 (0.006)	-0.438 (0.188)	-0.467 (0.233)
σ_β	0.2	0.202 (0.048)	0.206 (0.040)	0.373 (0.287)	0.330 (0.243)
\bar{c}_0	-1.5	-1.505 (0.004)	-1.504 (0.005)	-1.468 (0.113)	-1.434 (0.118)
Log-L (True value)		-9082 (5.39)	-9221 (5.36)	-9083 (4.77)	-9222 (4.71)
Log-L (Estimates)		-9079 (5.37)	-9218 (5.43)	-9207 (87.53)	-9341 (110.02)

Notes: Data are simulated for 2,000 consumers, and the reported results are obtained after averaging 50 estimations with different seeds and with 1,000 error draws each. The standard deviation of the mean estimate across these simulations is reported in parentheses.

methods are identical in the first three steps, and the same random seed is used for corresponding simulations. Consequently, the performance of the two methods is nearly identical when the true parameter values are used as starting points for estimation. However, when the starting values deviate significantly from the true values, incorporating the additional ranking information greatly improves the model’s estimation performance. This enhancement reduces the likelihood of falling into local optima and yields average preference estimates closer to the true values. These results demonstrate that incorporating supplemental ranking information can significantly improve the estimation performance of the PR-GHK simulator with only a minor increase in computational burden, offering practical value for estimating models using real-world datasets.

6 Extension 2: Model Variations

From Lemma 1, we establish that a Partial Ranking representation can be constructed for any branching bandit process under the Independence and Invariance Assumptions. This extends the applicability of the PR representation and the PR-GHK simulator beyond the baseline sequential search model to include a wide range of model variations while keeping the framework of the branching bandit process. These model variations can describe various departures from fundamental assumptions during the search process to describe the market in a more realistic

fashion. A prominent example is the multi-stage sequential search (Gibbard, 2022; Greminger, 2022). In these models, consumers must perform multiple actions on a product in several stages to fully reveal its purchase value, with the action in each stage deemed to reveal a given part of the information. Actions in subsequent stages can only proceed after earlier-stage actions have been taken. Despite its complexity, the structure satisfies the Independence and Invariance Assumptions. It is, therefore, considered a branching bandit process that allows for constructing a Partial Ranking representation and applying the PR-GHK simulator for estimation.

Here, we take Greminger (2022)'s search and product discovery model as an example for exploration.¹⁷ In this model, consumers are not inherently aware of all products in the market; instead, they only know about a subset of products initially. At the beginning of the search process, consumers can only inspect a limited number of products. In the search process, besides inspections and purchases, consumers can engage in a different type of action named *discovery*: at any stage, they can incur a cost to expand their awareness set—the set of products they know about. This behavior can be thought of as exploring additional floors or areas in a large shopping mall, flipping through list pages or scrolling down the screen on an online shopping platform, or simply visiting another marketplace. Discovery actions can take various forms, referred to as different routes. For example, online shoppers might flip through pages on a general product list or a section that only contains discounted items.

This model setup is more complicated compared to the baseline sequential search model, but it is worth noting that it still fits in a branching bandit process. Consumers must first discover a product before they can inspect it, and within the same route, consumers must complete one discovery before proceeding to the next. Therefore, with certain assumptions, this extended model can be estimated in a manner similar to the baseline model based on a partial ranking representation with a modified PR-GHK simulator.

The additional conditions to establish the PR representation of this extended model require that discovery behaviors also satisfy the Independence and Invariance Assumptions to ensure the optimality of the Gittins index. The application of the PR-GHK estimator further depends on the ability to compute the Gittins index for discovery actions. For the former, it must be ensured that the consumer's belief about the payoff of a discovery action remains unaffected by inspections, purchases, or discoveries conducted for other products or routes. Additionally, the information revealed by a discovery action must remain consistent regardless of when the discovery occurs.¹⁸ For the latter, Greminger (2022) introduces a weak decreasing condition: the consumer correctly anticipates that after performing a discovery on the same route, the expected payoff of the next discovery on that route will not increase. When this condition is satisfied through, for example, the consumer expecting an infinite number of products available for discovery, the Gittins index for the discovery, or the *discovery value*, for a specific route r

¹⁷For an introduction to Gibbard (2022) two-stage sequential search model and its estimation method, see Appendix E.

¹⁸For a detailed explanation and justification of these assumptions, see Greminger (2022). Here, we focus on the estimation approach for such models rather than the validity of these assumptions.

satisfies the following condition:

$$c_{ir}^d = \int_{q_{ir}^d}^{\infty} [1 - G_{ir}(w)] dw$$

Here q_{ir}^d is the discovery value, c_{ir}^d is the discovery cost of a discovery route r for consumer i , and $G_{ir}(w)$ is the cdf of consumers' expectation of the largest effective value obtained in one discovery. Under the assumption that the expectation to the characteristics of to-be-discovered products are seen as independent random variables, [Greminger \(2022\)](#) proves that consumer i 's discovery value on route r for the t -th time takes the form of:

$$q_{irt} = \Theta_i(\mathbb{E}(X_{ijr}), \text{Var}(X_{ijr}), c_{ijr}^{ins}, c_{ir}^{dis}, n_r) + \tau_{irt}, \quad \text{where } \Pr(\tau_{irt} < x) = F^\tau(x)$$

Here, $\Theta_i(\cdot)$ is a deterministic function of the empirical mean of product characteristics on route r , the empirical variance of product characteristics on route r , the inspection search cost c_{ijr}^{ins} , the discovery cost c_{ir}^{dis} , and the number of discovered products within one discovery n_r . Notice that we allow an external stochasticity of τ_{irt} with known distribution for the discovery behavior. The reason is the same as the stochastic reservation value specified in Section 4.2: to maintain the identification of the modified model.

For the search and product discovery model, the most detailed data should capture the complete sequence of consumers' actions, including discovery. Since each discovery introduces new inspections and another discovery action on the same route, a practical implementation strategy is to segment the consumer's search process based on discovery actions. Starting with the segment containing the final purchase and working backward, the likelihood for the Ranking Condition can be constructed within the choice set of each segment. This approach enables the estimator to retain a structure similar to that used for the baseline model. Only minor adjustments are needed to account for discovery actions and the reservation values incorporated into the rankings through these discoveries.

We show the effectiveness of the modified PR-GHK simulator with a Monte Carlo simulation following the specifications below:

$$\begin{aligned} u_{ij} &= \sum_{s=1}^3 \gamma_s x_j^s + \beta p_{ij} + \xi_{ij}^u + \varepsilon_{ijr}, \quad \text{where } \xi_{ij}^u \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1) \text{ and } \varepsilon_{ij} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1); \\ c_{ij}^{ins} &= c^{ins} = \exp(c^0); \\ z_{ij} &= \sum_{s=1}^3 \gamma_s x_j^s + \beta p_{ij} + \xi_{ij}^u + m_\varepsilon(c^{ins}); \\ \log(c_{irt}^{dis}) &\sim N(c^1, \sigma_c^2), \quad \text{where } \sigma_c = 0.25; \\ q_{irt} &= \Theta_i(\mathbb{E}_r(X_{ir}, P_{ir}, n_d), \text{Var}_r(X_{ir}, P_{ir}, n_d), c^{ins}, c_{irt}^{dis}). \end{aligned}$$

From the perspective of identification, since the discovery cost c_{irt}^{dis} is stochastic, τ_{irt} is not

required. Additionally, the distributions of all random variables are assumed to be known.

We consider a market scenario with 2,000 consumers searching among 1,000 products, divided into two routes: Route 1, which contains 600 products, and Route 2, which contains 400 products. Route 2 is characterized by lower prices but smaller attribute variances. Each consumer initially encounters a market with only one product and an outside option. Consumers can subsequently discover up to a maximum of 15 products randomly assigned from the two routes. Each discovery event reveals $n_d = 2$ products, except when only one product remains undiscovered in a route.¹⁹ Appendix D summarizes the detailed implementation procedure. The Monte Carlo estimation results are presented below:

TABLE 4 – Monte Carlo Simulation Results with Search and Product Discovery

	True value	Estimates	
γ_1	0.3	0.292	(0.034)
γ_2	0.2	0.180	(0.058)
γ_3	0.1	0.096	(0.037)
β	-0.6	-0.572	(0.017)
c^0	-2	-1.953	(0.047)
c^1	-2.5	-2.474	(0.052)
N:		2000	
D:		1000	

Notes: Data are simulated for 2,000 consumers, and the reported results are obtained after averaging across 100 estimations with different seeds and with 1,000 error draws each. The standard deviation of the mean estimate across these simulations is reported in parentheses.

The empirical applications of the search and product discovery model can also be found in Zhang et al. (2023), which employs a modified Kernel-Smoothed Frequency Simulator.²⁰ Since Greminger (2022) provides alternative optimal rules, it is feasible to follow the OSR representation to estimate the model. However, the more complex model structure makes the tuning to scaling factors more challenging. In contrast, the PR-GHK simulator avoids such complications. It demonstrates excellent performance with a straightforward implementation.

Finally, we note that the PR representation and the estimation method proposed in this paper is also applicable to other extension models that align with the branching bandit process. These include models established in Ursu et al. (2023), which introduces additional “search later to realize fatigue” actions into the baseline search process; Ibragimov et al. (2024), which accounts for potential losses incurred by consumers returning purchased products, altering the reservation and purchase values of the baseline model; and Klein et al. (2024), which considers

¹⁹Consumers are not assumed to know the availability of products to be discovered, which means they remain the same belief that they will always discover n_d products for each discovery.

²⁰Greminger (2024) provides an estimation method for cases where the search process data is incomplete.

a scenario where consumers gradually discover their preferences in their search process and revise their search decisions accordingly after the selection is made. This latter model connects multiple baseline models through Bayesian learning. For these more complex extensions of the baseline sequential search model, the computational and implementation challenges of existing estimation methods become even more pronounced. In contrast, under the Independence and Invariance Assumptions, the PR-GHK simulator based on a Partial Ranking representation provides a unique, feasible, and computationally efficient solution for these models, making it a valuable tool for tackling the intricacies of advanced sequential search contexts.

7 Conclusion

This paper’s primary goal is to reduce the empirical constraints faced by researchers studying consumer search and purchase behavior. Despite significant efforts to enhance the rigor and feasibility of the widely applied sequential search model, its estimation complexity and lack of flexibility often deter researchers from using structural models to estimate search data.

This paper introduces a new Partial Ranking representation to reformulate the empirical content of the sequential search model proposed by [Weitzman \(1979\)](#), transforming the original multi-step sequential decision-making process across different choice sets into a ranking problem within a single choice set. We demonstrate that this representation is equivalent to Weitzman’s Optimal Search Rules but does not depend on them.

The Partial Ranking representation allows empirical researchers to analyze search data using sequential search models without considering whether consumers make subsequent decisions based on uncertainties observed during earlier inspections. This eliminates the decision interdependencies caused by such uncertainties, simplifying the original model into a static framework. Within this framework, we provide a joint probability expression for the sequential search model in a value-difference form, enabling a formal discussion of the model’s identification arguments. Based on this expression, we propose a new PR-GHK simulator for simulation-based maximum likelihood estimation. This new estimation method demonstrates superior performance, is simpler to implement, and can flexibly adjust to the amount of observed ranking information, such as incomplete or missing search data and additional ranking information. Finally, since this transformation applies to all sequential decision-making processes that satisfy the Independence and Invariance Assumptions, the proposed method can be used to estimate various extension models built on sequential search frameworks. This includes models with structural changes, such as the two-stage Sequential Search and Product Discovery model.

The Partial Ranking representation lays a new foundation for applying sequential search models in empirical studies, particularly in analyzing strategies or policies that influence the search process. As predicted in [Honka et al. \(2024\)](#), leveraging search data for research holds great potential in the digital age. This paper’s work lowers the barrier to broader applications of search data, making it a practical and versatile tool for future researchers and practitioners.

References

- Armstrong, M. (2017). Ordered consumer search. *Journal of the European Economic Association*, 15(5):989–1024.
- Beggs, S., Cardell, S., and Hausman, J. (1981). Assessing the potential demand for electric cars. *Journal of econometrics*, 17(1):1–19.
- Berry, S. T. and Haile, P. A. (2014). Identification in differentiated products markets using market level data. *Econometrica*, 82(5):1749–1797.
- Chapman, R. G. and Staelin, R. (1982). Exploiting rank ordered choice set data within the stochastic utility model. *JMR, Journal of Marketing Research (pre-1986)*, 19(000003):288.
- Chen, Y. and Yao, S. (2017). Sequential search with refinement: Model and application with click-stream data. *Management Science*, 63(12):4345–4365.
- Choi, M., Dai, A. Y., and Kim, K. (2018). Consumer search and price competition. *Econometrica*, 86(4):1257–1281.
- Chung, J. H., Chintagunta, P., and Misra, S. (2024). Simulated maximum likelihood estimation of the sequential search model. *Quantitative Marketing and Economics*, pages 1–60.
- Compiani, G., Lewis, G., Peng, S., and Wang, P. (2024). Online search and optimal product rankings: An empirical framework. *Marketing Science*, 43(3):615–636.
- Ghose, A., Ipeirotis, P. G., and Li, B. (2019). Modeling consumer footprints on search engines: An interplay with social media. *Management Science*, 65(3):1363–1385.
- Gibbard, P. (2022). A model of search with two stages of information acquisition and additive learning. *Management Science*, 68(2):1212–1217.
- Gittins, J., Glazebrook, K., and Weber, R. (2011). *Multi-armed bandit allocation indices*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Greminger, R. P. (2022). Optimal search and discovery. *Management Science*, 68(5):3904–3924.
- Greminger, R. P. (2024). Heterogeneous position effects and the power of rankings. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.16408v4*.
- Hajivassiliou, V. A. and Ruud, P. A. (1994). Classical estimation methods for ldv models using simulation. *Handbook of econometrics*, 4:2383–2441.
- Honka, E. (2014). Quantifying search and switching costs in the us auto insurance industry. *The RAND Journal of Economics*, 45(4):847–884.

- Honka, E., Seiler, S., and Ursu, R. (2024). Consumer search: What can we learn from pre-purchase data? *Journal of Retailing*, 100(1):114–129.
- Ibragimov, M., El Kihal, S., and Hauser, J. R. (2024). From clicks to returns: Website browsing and product returns. *Available at SSRN 4709851*.
- Jiang, Z., Chan, T., Che, H., and Wang, Y. (2021). Consumer search and purchase: An empirical investigation of retargeting based on consumer online behaviors. *Marketing Science*, 40(2):219–240.
- Keane, M. P. (1992). A note on identification in the multinomial probit model. *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics*, 10(2):193–200.
- Keller, G. and Oldale, A. (2003). Branching bandits: a sequential search process with correlated pay-offs. *Journal of Economic Theory*, 113(2):302–315.
- Kim, J. B., Albuquerque, P., and Bronnenberg, B. J. (2010). Online demand under limited consumer search. *Marketing Science*, 29(6):1001–1023.
- Klein, T., Walsh, C., and Zhang, T. (2024). Do i really want to buy this? preference discovery and consumer search. *Working Paper*.
- Kleinberg, R., Waggoner, B., and Weyl, E. G. (2016). Descending price optimally coordinates search. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1603.07682*.
- Koiso, S. and Otani, S. (2024). An mpec estimator for the sequential search model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2409.04378*.
- Luce, R. D. (1959). *Individual choice behavior*, volume 4. Wiley New York.
- Moraga-González, J. L., Sándor, Z., and Wildenbeest, M. R. (2023). Consumer search and prices in the automobile market. *The Review of Economic Studies*, 90(3):1394–1440.
- Morozov, I. (2023). Measuring benefits from new products in markets with information frictions. *Management Science*, 69(11):6988–7008.
- Morozov, I., Seiler, S., Dong, X., and Hou, L. (2021). Estimation of preference heterogeneity in markets with costly search. *Marketing Science*, 40(5):871–899.
- Onzo, K. and Ansari, A. (2024). Bayesian nonparametric sequential search. *Journal of Marketing Research*, page 00222437241274660.
- Train, K. E. (2009). *Discrete choice methods with simulation*. Cambridge university press.
- Ursu, R., Seiler, S., and Honka, E. (2024). The sequential search model: A framework for empirical research. *SSRN Electronic Journal*.

- Ursu, R. M. (2018). The power of rankings: Quantifying the effect of rankings on online consumer search and purchase decisions. *Marketing Science*, 37(4):530–552.
- Ursu, R. M., Wang, Q., and Chintagunta, P. K. (2020). Search duration. *Marketing Science*, 39(5):849–871.
- Ursu, R. M., Zhang, Q., and Honka, E. (2023). Search gaps and consumer fatigue. *Marketing Science*, 42(1):110–136.
- Wei, Y. and Jiang, Z. (2024). A pre-trained estimator for consumer search models. *Available at SSRN 4856490*.
- Weitzman, M. L. (1979). Optimal search for the best alternative. *Econometrica*, pages 641–654.
- Yavorsky, D., Honka, E., and Chen, K. (2021). Consumer search in the us auto industry: The role of dealership visits. *Quantitative Marketing and Economics*, 19:1–52.
- Zhang, X. L., Ursu, R., Honka, E., and Yao, Y. O. (2023). Product discovery and consumer search routes: Evidence from a mobile app. *Available at SSRN 4444774*.

Appendix

A Optimality of the Partial Ranking Representation

In this section, we prove Theorem 1, which demonstrate that the consumer’s optimal sequential search process, based on reservation and purchase values, is equivalent to her partial ranking of all observed reservation and purchase values at the end of the search. We begin with a heuristic example to introduce the branching bandit process described in Keller and Oldale (2003). Consider a branching structure of actions in which a consumer makes multi-stage sequential selections. Each action can be selected only once. After an action is taken at a given stage, it cannot be selected again; however, the actions branching off from the selected action become available in subsequent stages. As illustrated in Figure A.1, the consumer initially faces a choice set of three actions, A, B, C . Selecting A reveals two new actions, D and E , which become available. Similarly, selecting B or C each reveals one additional action. Under the Invariance Assumption, this branching structure remains unchanged across all stages.




FIGURE A.1 – The Equivalence between Selection and Ranking in Different Choice Sets and Ranking in the Unified Choice Set

Consider two consecutive stages within the branching bandit process. Suppose the consumer selects action A from $S_1 = \{A, B, C\}$ in stage 1, and in the next stage, she has a choice set of $S_2 = \{B, C, D, E\}$ and has a ranking of alternatives over S_2 , supposed to be $\rho = \{B \succ C \succ D \succ E\}$. Intuitively, such two relationships in two different choice sets can be merged into

a new ranking over a choice set of $T = S_1 \cup S_2$, that is $\rho_0 = \{A \succ B \succ C \succ D \succ E\}$. With Lemma 1, the product of the probability of selecting A in S_1 and the probability of ranking ρ_1 in S_2 is equal to the probability of ranking ρ_0 in T . This equivalence allows us to transform the problem of sequential selection into a unified ranking problem over the combined set T . Similar equivalence also hold according to Lemma 1 even if B is not the best alternative in ρ_1 .

Assume that a Gittins index \mathcal{G}_i can be assigned to each action i , depending only on its current state.¹ Since taking an action reveals only the subsequent actions branching from that node and provides no information about other available actions, the structure is independent: the states of other actions remain unaffected. Under these conditions, Keller and Oldale (2003) demonstrated that the Gittins index policy - where the consumer always selects the action with the highest Gittins index in the current choice set - is optimal. Consequently, the consumer's choices and rankings are determined by the Gittins indices, naturally transforming the ranking of actions into a ranking of the Gittins index values. In the sequential search model, this corresponds to a ranking of reservation values and purchase values.

It remains to prove Lemma 1 to convert consumers' selection and ranking with different choice sets in two consecutive stages into a unified ranking within a single choice set. The proof of Lemma 1 follows closely with Luce (1959). Let $P_A(x)$ denote the probability of selecting x from a choice set of A , and with slight generality, $P_A(B)$ denote the probability that the selected element lies in B with $B \subset A$. $R_B(\rho)$ denote the probability of a full ranking ρ of all alternatives within a choice set B .

1. *The Choice Axioms* (Luce, 1959, p. 6): Let T be a finite set. For every $S \subset T$, P_S is defined.

- (i) If $P_{\{x,y\}}(x) \neq 0, 1$ for all $x, y \in T$, then for $R \subset S \subset T$, $P_T(R) = P_S(R)P_T(S)$;
- (ii) If $P_{\{x,y\}}(x) = 0$ for some $x, y \in T$, then for every $S \subset T$, $P_T(S) = P_{T-\{x\}}(S - \{x\})$.

2. *The Ranking Postulates* (Luce, 1959, p. 72): The alternatives are ranked by sequentially deciding the alternative that is superior to the remaining alternatives. It leads to the following ranking postulate:

- (i) $R_{\{x,y\}}(x \succ y) = P_{\{x,y\}}(x)$;
- (ii) $R_T(x \succ \rho) = P_T(x)R_{T/\{x\}}(\rho)$.

We prove the equation in Lemma 1 with the Choice Axioms and the Ranking Postulates:

$$P_S(a_0)R_{T/\{a_0\}}(\rho_0) = R_T(a_0 \succ \rho_0) + \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} R_T(a_1 \succ \dots \succ a_{N-1} \succ a_0 \succ \rho_{N-1}).$$

¹Following Gittins et al. (2011), a Gittins index can be assigned to an action when a stopping problem in a branching structure involves a trade-off between a hypothetical fallback option with a fixed immediate payoff and continuing branching. The smallest fallback value that makes the consumer indifferent between stopping and continuing is the Gittins index of the action.

where $\rho_0 = \{a_1 \succ a_2 \succ \dots\} = \{a_1 \succ \rho_1\} = \{a_1 \succ a_2 \succ \rho_2\} = \dots$ is a full ranking on the choice set T , a_j denotes the j -th action in ρ_0 , and ρ_j denotes the part of ρ_0 excluding a_1 to a_j . Following the transitivity of ranks and Ranking Postulate (i), we have $P_{T/\{a_0\}}(a_1) = 1$.

We first consider the case where $a_1 \in S$, indicating that a_1 is available in the first stage:

$$\begin{aligned} P_S(a_0)R_{T/\{a_0\}}(a_1 \succ \rho_1) &= P_{T/(T/S)}(\{a_0\}/(T/S)) \cdot R_{T/\{a_0\}}(a_1 \succ \rho_1) \\ &= P_T(a_0) \cdot R_{T/\{a_0\}}(a_1 \succ \rho_1) \\ &= R_T(a_0 \succ a_1 \succ \rho_1) \\ &= R_T(a_0 \succ \rho_0) \end{aligned}$$

The first equality uses the fact that a_0 is not in the set T/S . The second equality applies the Choice Axiom (ii) given that $P_{T/\{a_0\}}(a_1) = 1$. The third equality applies the Ranking Postulate (ii).

We then consider the case of $a_1 \notin S$. This is the case where a_1 is a revealed action branched off from a_0 . Notice that in this case, we cannot compare the ranking between a_1 and a_0 from the data. In general, we have $P_{\{a_0, a_1\}}(a_0) \neq 0, 1$. In this case, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} P_S(a_0)R_{T/\{a_0\}}(a_1 \succ \rho_1) &= \frac{P_T(a_0)}{P_T(S)} \cdot R_{T/\{a_0\}}(a_1 \succ \rho_1) \\ &= \frac{1}{P_T(S)} \cdot R_T(a_0 \succ a_1 \succ \rho_1) \\ &= R_T(a_0 \succ a_1 \succ \rho_1) + \frac{P_T(T/S)}{P_T(S)} \cdot R_T(a_0 \succ a_1 \succ \rho_1) \\ &= R_T(a_0 \succ \rho_0) + \frac{P_T(a_1)}{P_T(S)} \cdot R_T(a_0 \succ a_1 \succ \rho_1) \\ &= R_T(a_0 \succ \rho_0) + \frac{P_T(a_1)}{P_T(S)} P_T(a_0) P_{T/\{a_0\}}(a_1) R_{T/\{a_0, a_1\}}(\rho_1) \\ &= R_T(a_0 \succ \rho_0) + \frac{P_T(a_1) P_T(a_0)}{P_T(S)} R_{T/\{a_0, a_1\}}(\rho_1) \\ &= R_T(a_0 \succ \rho_0) + \underline{P_T(a_1) \cdot P_S(a_0) R_{T/\{a_0, a_1\}}(a_2 \succ \rho_2)} \end{aligned}$$

The first inequality is the application of the Choice Axiom (i). The second equality applies the Ranking Postulate (ii). The fourth equality combines the fact that $P_{T/S}(a_1) = P_{T/a_0}(a_1) = 1$ and Choice Axiom (ii). The fifth equality again applies the Ranking Postulate (ii). The sixth equality follows with $P_{T/a_0}(a_1) = 1$. The last equality follows the Choice Axiom (i).

Notice that the underlined part in the last equality corresponds to the left hand side of the equation with $\{a_1\}$ removed from ρ_0 and the choice set T . We can therefore repeat the above

derivation process for the underlied part:

$$\begin{aligned}
& P_S(a_0)R_{T/\{a_0\}}(a_1 \succ \rho_1) \\
&= R_T(a_0 \succ \rho_0) + P_T(a_1) \cdot P_S(a_0)R_{T/\{a_0, a_1\}}(a_2 \succ \rho_2) \\
&= R_T(a_0 \succ \rho_0) + P_T(a_1) \cdot (R_{T/\{a_1\}}(a_0 \succ \rho_1) + P_{T/\{a_1\}}(a_2) \cdot P_S(a_0)R_{T/\{a_0, a_1, a_2\}}(a_3 \succ \rho_3)) \\
&= R_T(a_0 \succ \rho_0) + P_T(a_1)R_{T/\{a_1\}}(a_0 \succ \rho_1) + P_T(a_1)P_{T/\{a_1\}}(a_2) \cdot P_S(a_0)R_{T/\{a_0, a_1, a_2\}}(a_3 \succ \rho_3) \\
&= R_T(a_0 \succ \rho_0) + R_{T/\{a_1\}}(a_1 \succ a_0 \succ \rho_1) + P_T(a_1)P_{T/\{a_1\}}(a_2) \cdot P_S(a_0)R_{T/\{a_0, a_1, a_2\}}(a_3 \succ \rho_3) \\
&= \dots
\end{aligned}$$

The iteration lasts until that the first action in ρ , marked as a_N , is in the choice set S . Then we have $P_S(a_0)R_{T/\{a_0, a_1, \dots, a_{N-1}\}}(a_N \succ \rho_N) = R_{T/\{a_1, \dots, a_{N-1}\}}(a_0 \succ a_N \succ \rho_N)$. Taking it back to the derivation, we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned}
& P_S(a_0)R_{T/\{a_0\}}(a_1 \succ \rho_1) \\
&= R_T(a_0 \succ \rho_0) + R_{T/\{a_1\}}(a_1 \succ a_0 \succ \rho_1) + P_T(a_1)P_{T/\{a_1\}}(a_2) \cdot P_S(a_0)R_{T/\{a_0, a_1, a_2\}}(a_3 \succ \rho_3) + \dots \\
&\quad + P_T(a_1)P_{T/\{a_1\}}(a_2) \dots P_{T/\{a_1, \dots, a_{N-2}\}}(a_{N-1}) \cdot R_{T/\{a_1, \dots, a_{N-1}\}}(a_0 \succ a_N \succ \rho_N) \\
&= R_T(a_0 \succ \rho_0) + R_{T/\{a_1\}}(a_1 \succ a_0 \succ \rho_1) + P_T(a_1)P_{T/\{a_1\}}(a_2) \cdot P_S(a_0)R_{T/\{a_0, a_1, a_2\}}(a_3 \succ \rho_3) + \dots \\
&\quad + R_{T/\{a_1, \dots, a_{N-1}\}}(a_1 \succ a_2 \succ \dots \succ a_{N-1} \succ a_0 \succ a_N \succ \rho_N)
\end{aligned}$$

The second equality follows from Ranking Postulate (ii). Summing up the terms yields Equation (5), completing the proof of Lemma 1.

Applying Lemma 1 to the sequential search model is straightforward. Throughout the search process, the consumer conducts multiple inspections and makes a single purchase. Inspections are inherently part of the choice sets for all selections until being taken, Therefore, inspections can be directly incorporated into consumers' RAA. If the purchased product is in the choice set of the final inspection (meaning the product was inspected prior to the last inspection), then it must hold that $z_{iJ} > u_{ih}$. This allows us to integrate the purchase decision and all search decisions into a single ranking, transforming them directly to the Ranking Condition and the two Choice Conditions in Proposition 1.

On the other hand, if the purchased product is the last product to be inspected, Lemma 1 states that the ranking probability at the final inspection can be expressed as the sum of two probabilities. These probabilities correspond to two mutually exclusive cases: $z_{ih} > u_{ih}$ and $z_{ih} < u_{ih}$, where both values exceed the Gittins indices of all other unselected actions. Note that the other inspections corresponding to these two cases are identical. According to Theorem 9 in Luce (1959), the ranking probabilities with identical ranking conditions can be directly aggregated to obtain selection probabilities. Summing up the probability implied in these two cases yields the joint probability given in Equation (6). As a result, the Ranking Condition in Proposition 1 is irrelevant to the relative size between z_{ih} and u_{ih} .

It can be observed that the proof of Proposition 1 can rely solely on Lemma 1 rather than Weitzman's Optimal Search Rules. Therefore, Proposition 1 establishes an equivalence between the PR representation and the Optimal Search Rules in describing the optimal search outcomes, but not implying any dependency. In fact, the PR representation can be applied to all models where Lemma 1 holds. This means it can be extended to any complex model satisfying the Independence and Invariance Assumptions. Such models may require additional or different search rules for a full description to its empirical contents, but by leveraging Lemma 1, they can all be equivalent to a ranking of available actions over a single and unified choice set.

B The Search Cost Rent in a Linear Specification

Without loss of generality, consider the case where $\delta_i^z(X_{ij}^z) = \delta_i^u(X_{ij}^u)$. Denote $\delta_i^u(X_{ij}^u) + \xi_{ij}^u$ in Equation (7) by v_{ij} , which represents the value of the observed part of product j before inspection. Taking it into Equation (2) leads to:

$$\begin{aligned}
c_{ij} &= \int_{u_{ij} > \bar{u} - v_{ij}} (\varepsilon_{ij} - (\bar{u} - v_{ij})) dF^\varepsilon(\varepsilon_{ij}) \\
&= \left(1 - F^\varepsilon\left(\frac{\bar{u} - v_{ij}}{\sigma_\varepsilon}\right)\right) \int_{\varepsilon_{ij} > (\bar{u} - v_{ij})} (\varepsilon_{ij} - (\bar{u} - v_{ij})) \frac{f(\varepsilon_{ij})}{1 - F\left(\frac{\bar{u} - v_{ij}}{\sigma_\varepsilon}\right)} d\varepsilon_{ij} \\
&= \left(1 - F^\varepsilon\left(\frac{\bar{u} - v_{ij}}{\sigma_\varepsilon}\right)\right) \cdot E(\varepsilon_{ij} - (\bar{u} - v_{ij}) \mid \varepsilon_{ij} > (\bar{u} - v_{ij})) \\
&= \left(1 - F^\varepsilon\left(\frac{\bar{u} - v_{ij}}{\sigma_\varepsilon}\right)\right) \cdot \left[\sigma_\varepsilon \cdot \frac{f^\varepsilon\left(\frac{\bar{v} - v_{ij}}{\sigma_\varepsilon}\right)}{1 - F^\varepsilon\left(\frac{\bar{v} - v_{ij}}{\sigma_\varepsilon}\right)} - \sigma_\varepsilon \cdot \frac{\bar{v} - v_{ij}}{\sigma_\varepsilon} \right] \\
&= \sigma_\varepsilon \left[f^\varepsilon\left(\frac{\bar{v} - v_{ij}}{\sigma_\varepsilon}\right) - \frac{\bar{v} - v_{ij}}{\sigma_\varepsilon} \left(1 - F^\varepsilon\left(\frac{\bar{v} - v_{ij}}{\sigma_\varepsilon}\right)\right) \right]
\end{aligned}$$

We see the above equation is only about $\frac{\bar{u} - v_{ij}}{\sigma_\varepsilon}$. In addition, notice that

$$\frac{\partial \sigma_\varepsilon [f^\varepsilon(x) - x(1 - F^\varepsilon(x))]}{\partial x} = -\sigma_\varepsilon (1 - F^\varepsilon(x))$$

which is always negative with a finite x . Notice that the left-hand side has a positive derivative, it implies a bijection between \bar{v} and c_{ij} . Therefore, we have a unique solution of \bar{v} , denoted by z_{ij} . Define $m_\varepsilon(x) = \sigma_\varepsilon [f^\varepsilon(x) - x(1 - F^\varepsilon(x))]^{-1}$, we can represent the expression of reservation value in Equation (7) by $z_{ij} = v_{ij} + m_\varepsilon(c_{ij})$, consistent with Equation (8). Here, ξ_{ij}^z remains unspecified in the model, and $m_\varepsilon(c_{ij})$ is strictly decreasing with respect to c_{ij} .

C PR-GHK Simulator with Different Model Specification

Consider a specification following Equations (13) - (15) as below:

$$u_{ij} = \sum_{s=1}^3 \gamma x_j^s + \beta_i p_{ij} + \varepsilon_{ij}, \quad \text{where } \beta_{ij} \sim N(\bar{\beta}, \sigma_{\beta}^2);$$

$$c_{ij} \sim \text{Exp}(\lambda_0);$$

$$z_{ij} = \sum_{s=1}^3 \gamma x_j^s + \beta_{ij} p_j + m_{\varepsilon}(c_{ij}).$$

The idea behind this specification is inspired by [Chung et al. \(2024\)](#), which attributes the source of stochasticity to post-search information and search costs. Compared to the specification in [Kim et al. \(2010\)](#) and the corresponding GHK-style simulator proposed in [Jiang et al. \(2021\)](#), this approach eliminates the interaction between the reservation value and the match value for the same product. As a result, the implementation procedure for the PR-GHK simulator requires a slight adjustment in the step order, as outlined below:

1. Draw preference heterogeneity to obtain β_i^d . Draw ε_{ih} to determine u_{ih}^d for each draw.
2. If $h \neq J$, draw c_{ij} conditional on $z_{ij} > u_{ih}^d$ and compute $p_{i2}^d = \Pr(z_{ij} \geq u_{ih}^d)$;
if $h = J$, draw c_{ij} randomly and assign $p_{i2}^d = 1$. Determine $y_i^d = \min\{u_{ih}^d, z_{iJ}^d\}$.
3. Sequentially draw $\xi_{i,J-1}, \xi_{i,J-2}, \dots, \xi_{i2}$ to determine $z_{i,J-1}^d, z_{i,J-2}^d, \dots, z_{i2}^d$ conditional on $z_{ij} > z_{i,j+1}^d$. Compute $p_{i1}^d = \prod_{1 \leq j \leq J-1} \Pr(z_{ij} \geq z_{i,j+1}^d)$.
4. Compute $p_{i3}^d = \prod_{J < k \leq |\mathcal{M}_i|} \Pr(z_{ik} < y_i^d)$ and $p_{i4}^d = \prod_{1 \leq j \leq J, j \neq h} \Pr(u_{ij} < y_i^d)$.
5. Compute the likelihood contribution of each draw $L_i^d = p_{i1}^d \cdot p_{i2}^d \cdot p_{i3}^d \cdot p_{i4}^d$. Take the average across draws to obtain the simulated likelihood.

The Monte Carlo simulation results of using the full search path information, using only the first inspection and purchase, and using only purchase information are shown in [Table C.1](#).

It can be seen that when the starting value matches the true value, the simulation maximum likelihood estimation results remain similarly accurate across different levels of search data usage. However, when the starting value deviates from the true value, and without the disturbances caused by the correlation between reservation and purchase values for the same product, estimates using full search information outperform those based only on the first inspection. Meanwhile, estimates for preference parameters from the EPT-based discrete choice model perform slightly worse than those using complete search path information, while its estimate of the search costs performs poorly.

It can be seen that even with the heterogeneity framework not introducing interdependencies between reservation and purchase values, the estimates do not naturally converge and can

TABLE C.1 – Monte Carlo Simulation Results of Table 2 with Different Specification

	True value	Estimates (Start from true value)			Estimates (Start from all zero)		
		Full Info	1st Inspection	No Info	Full Info	1st Inspection	No Info
γ_1	1	0.991 (0.002)	1.002 (0.004)	0.994 (0.008)	0.902 (0.116)	0.757 (0.369)	0.903 (0.070)
γ_2	0.5	0.486 (0.001)	0.488 (0.004)	0.475 (0.007)	0.481 (0.027)	0.175 (0.288)	0.626 (0.058)
γ_3	-0.2	-0.204 (0.001)	-0.204 (0.003)	-0.209 (0.005)	-0.102 (0.063)	-0.281 (0.135)	-0.003 (0.079)
$\bar{\beta}$	-0.6	-0.593 (0.002)	-0.592 (0.004)	-0.584 (0.007)	-0.433 (0.136)	-0.674 (0.279)	-0.209 (0.151)
σ_β	0.2	0.208 (0.012)	0.195 (0.009)	0.180 (0.014)	0.437 (0.149)	0.711 (0.421)	0.685 (0.069)
$\frac{1}{\lambda_0}$	-1.5	0.783 (0.002)	0.826 (0.009)	0.833 (0.046)	0.807 (0.036)	0.809 (0.234)	1.131 (0.402)
Log-L (True value)		-27572 (6.01)	-17255 (5.04)	-9193 (3.80)	-27572 (5.50)	-17256 (4.00)	-9192 (5.26)
Log-L (Estimates)		-27571 (6.01)	-17253 (4.96)	-9189 (3.89)	-27680 (89.00)	-18352 (873.78)	-9457 (83.19)

Notes: Data are simulated for 2,000 consumers, and the reported results are obtained after averaging 50 estimations with different seeds and with 1,000 error draws each. The standard deviation of the mean estimate across these simulations is reported in parentheses.

easily fall into early termination in the optimization process when the starting value is far away from true parameter values. This emphasizes the importance of selecting appropriate starting values and a suitable optimizer for simulation-based estimation with a non-logit uncertainty distribution. To improve the performance of the estimators, increasing the number of draws in the estimation process is a viable approach, albeit at the expense of a more significant computational burden.

D PR-GHK Simulator Implementation for the Search and Product Discovery Model

We divide the implementation of the PR-GHK simulator for the search and product discovery sequence as follows. First, we divide the sequence based on observed discoveries, with each segment consists of a non-negative number of inspections and ends with a discovery, except for the last segment, which ends with a purchase. Next, we number these segments in reverse order: the last segment is labeled as Segment 0, the second-to-last as Segment 1, and so on. Finally, we denote the number of the last inspected product just before the end of a segment t as $J(t)$. For example, $J(0)$ represents the last inspected product, $J(1)$ corresponds to the last inspected product in Segment 1, and so on. Notice that when the consumer does not inspect any product

in Segment 0, $J(0) = J(1)$. We start from Segment 0.

1. Check if $J(0) > J(1)$. If not, assign $p_{i,1,0}^d = p_{i,2,0}^d = p_{i,3,0}^d = 1$, skip Steps 2 to 3.
2. Draw $\xi_{i,J(0)}^u$ to determine $z_{i,J(0)}^d$ for each draw. Assign $p_{i,1,0}^d = 1$.
3. Sequentially draw $\xi_{i,J(0)-1}^u, \xi_{i,J(0)-2}^u, \dots, c_{i,J(1)+1}$ to determine $z_{i,J(0)-1}^d, \dots, z_{i,J(1)+1}^d$ conditional on $z_{i,j} > z_{i,j+1}^d$. Compute $p_{i,2,0}^d = \prod_{J(1)+1 \leq j \leq J(0)-1} \Pr(z_{i,j} \geq z_{i,j+1}^d)$.

So far, we have accomplished the simulation of the ranking conditions for the last segment, similar to the implementation procedure for the specification in Equations (10) - (12).

Starting from Segment $t \geq 1$, the simulation procedure is as follows:

4. Draw $c_{i,r(t),t}^{dis}$ to determine $q_{i,r(t),t}$, which is the discovery value realized in Segment 1. It corresponds to the value of discovering more alternatives through the route observed at the end of Segment t , or $r(t)$. Several conditions need to be satisfied:
 - $q_{i,r(t),t}$ is larger than the reservation values of products discovered before or in Segment t while inspected in Segment $1 \leq t' < t$;
 - $q_{i,r(t),t}$ is larger than any $q_{i,r(t'),t'}$ for all $r' \neq r(t)$.

Compute $p_{i,0,t}$, the probability that $q_{i,r(t),t}$ satisfies these conditions. For any route $r' \neq r(t)$ that is chosen in any previous Segment $t' < t$, let $q_{i,r',t}^d = q_{i,r',t-1}^d$; for any

5. Check if $J(t) > J(t+1)$. If not, assign $p_{i,1,t}^d = p_{i,2,t}^d = p_{i,3,t}^d = 1$, skip Steps 6 to 7.
6. Draw $\xi_{i,J(t)}^u$ to determine $z_{i,J(t)}^d$ conditional on $z_{i,J(t)} > q_{i,r(t),t}^d$, calculate $p_{i,1,t}^d = \Pr(z_{i,J(t)} \geq q_{i,r(t),t}^d)$.
7. Sequentially draw $\xi_{i,J(t)-1}^u, \xi_{i,J(t)-2}^u, \dots, c_{i,J(t)+1}$ to determine $z_{i,J(t)-1}^d, \dots, z_{i,J(t)+1}^d$ conditional on $z_{i,j} > z_{i,j+1}^d$. Compute $p_{i,2,t}^d = \prod_{J(t)+1 \leq j \leq J(t)-1} \Pr(z_{i,j} \geq z_{i,j+1}^d)$.
8. Repeat Steps 4 to 7 until exhausting the sequence up to the last Segment T .

So far, we finished the simulation of the observed ranking conditions in the overall search and product discovery sequence.

9. If $J(t+1) < h \leq J(t)$, draw ε_{ih} conditional on $u_{ih} < \min_{1 \leq t' \leq t} \{q_{i,r(t'),t'}^d\}$ to determine u_{ih}^d for each draw, calculate $p_{i,3,t} = \Pr(u_{ih} < \min_{1 \leq t' \leq t} \{q_{i,r(t'),t'}^d\})$; else, do not draw ε_{ih} and assign $p_{i,3,t} = 1$.
10. Compute the sub-core values: for $t = 0$, $y_{i0} = \min\{z_{i,J(0)}^d, u_{ih}^d\}$; for $t > 0$, $y_{it} = q_{i,r(t),t}^d$.
11. Compute the core values for all segments: $Y_{it} = \min_{1 \leq t' \leq t} \{y_{it'}\}$.

12. Compute \bar{q}_{ir}^d for each route r , which is equal to the drawn discovery value on r with the smallest t . For any route r' that has not been discovered throughout the search process, set $\bar{q}_{i,r'}^d = +\infty$.
13. Compute $p_{i,4}^d = \prod_{1 \leq r' \leq N_R} q_{i,r',0} < \min\{y_{i0}^d, \min_{1 \leq r'' \leq N_R, r'' \neq r'} \{\bar{q}_{i,r''}^d\}\}$.
14. Compute $p_{i,5}^d$ for the product of probabilities of the purchase values of all products inspected but not purchased smaller than the core value of the segment in which they were inspected.
15. Compute $p_{i,6}^d$ for the product of probabilities of the reservation values of all products discovered but not inspected smaller than the core value of the segment in which they were discovered.
16. Take products of all $p_{i,0,t}^d, p_{i,1,t}^d, p_{i,2,t}^d, p_{i,3,t}^d, p_{i,4}^d, p_{i,5}^d$ and $p_{i,6}^d$ as the simulated likelihood contribution of the draw. Take the average across draws to obtain the simulated likelihood.

Hence, we have finished computing the probabilities of the censored part of the ranking conditions, which consists of unrealized discovery, reservation, and purchase values.

E PR-GHK Simulator for the Two-Stage Sequential Search Model

This section introduces the estimation method for the Two-stage Sequential Search model (Gibbard, 2022). This model assumes that consumers can observe all products in the market, but each product involves two parts of uncertainty. Consumers must sequentially resolve these uncertainties to determine the product's utility before it becomes available for purchase. Following the original notation, the first-stage action is referred to as browsing, the second-stage action is considered, and the action of purchasing a product after resolving both uncertainties is called acquisition. Consumers can sequentially take actions on products until a purchase is made.

Since each action on a product can only be taken once, and completing one action adds the subsequent action on the same product to the future choice sets, this extension model adheres to the branching bandit process structure. Therefore, as long as it satisfies the Independence and Invariance Assumptions, the model has a Partial Ranking Representation. If the Gittins index for actions in both stages can be determined, we can also apply the PR-GHK simulator to estimate the model.

Gibbard (2022) demonstrates the existence and availability of Gittins indices under certain conditions. We denote the Gittins indices for browsing, considering, and acquisition actions on a product j as $\mathcal{G}_{b,j}$, $\mathcal{G}_{c,j}$, and $\mathcal{G}_{a,j}$, respectively. These three values are conditionally independent,

each with an additive stochastic component. Hence, one can sample $\mathcal{G}_{c,j}$ conditional on a draw of $\mathcal{G}_{b,j}$, and sample \mathcal{G}_{aj} conditional on a draw of $\mathcal{G}_{c,j}$.

Notably, if for a given product j , $\mathcal{G}_{b,j} < \mathcal{G}_{c,j}$, then the product, once browsed, will immediately be considered. This implies that if a product's browsing and considering actions are interrupted by actions on other products, it must hold that $\mathcal{G}_{b,j} > \mathcal{G}_{c,j}$. Otherwise, we only know that $\min(\mathcal{G}_{b,j}, \mathcal{G}_{c,j})$ is greater than the Gittins indices of subsequent actions. This relationship closely resembles the core value in the baseline model, and its proof similarly relies solely on Lemma 1.

To estimate the consumer decision-making model, a complete sequence of consumer actions is required, including all browsing and considering actions related to the products. For example, a consumer may go through the following sequence:

- Browse Product 1, Browse Product 2, Consider Product 2, Browse Product 3, Browse Product 4, Consider Product 4, Consider Product 3, Acquire Product 4.

To simplify the analysis, consecutive actions on the same product are treated as one stage. For example, the above sequence can be divided into six stages. Each stage may contain one, two, or three actions. The implementation procedure of the PR-GHK simulator is verbally described as follows:

1. Randomly draw the Gittins index for the product corresponding to the last browsing action. (Sample $\mathcal{G}_{b,4}^d$).
2. Starting from the last browsing action, sample the Gittins indices for all previous stages' browsing and considering actions in reverse order until the first browsing. The following conditions must be satisfied:
 - If a stage contains only one action, its stage value is defined as the Gittins index of that action. The Gittins index of the action must be greater than the stage value of the subsequent stage. (Sample $\mathcal{G}_{b,3}^d$ conditional on $\mathcal{G}_{b,3} > \mathcal{G}_{b,4}^d$)
 - If a stage contains two actions, we first sample the Gittins indices for browsing, then considering. Both indices must be greater than the stage value of the subsequent stage. The browsing action's Gittins index serve as the stage value for the two-action stage: (Sample $\mathcal{G}_{b,2}^d$ conditional on $\mathcal{G}_{b,2} > \mathcal{G}_{b,3}^d$; sample $\mathcal{G}_{c,2}^d$ conditional on $\mathcal{G}_{c,2} > \mathcal{G}_{b,3}^d$; sample $\mathcal{G}_{c,1}^d$ conditional on $\mathcal{G}_{c,1} > \mathcal{G}_{b,2}^d$)
3. Starting from the last browsing action, sample the Gittins indices for potential considering actions in sequence, ensuring the following conditions are met:
 - If the considering action immediately following the last browsing action is on the same product, sample the Gittins index randomly. (Sample $\mathcal{G}_{c,4}^d$)

- Otherwise, all subsequent Gittins indices must be smaller than the Gittins index of the previous action. (Sample $G_{c,3}^d$ conditional on $G_{c,3} < G_{c,4}^d$).

This process continues until the last considering action.

4. If the product purchased is not the last one considered, the Gittins index for the acquisition action must be smaller than that of the last considering action. Otherwise, the Gittins index is randomly drawn. (Sample $G_{a,4}^d$ conditional on $G_{a,4} < G_{c,3}^d$).
5. The likelihood is constructed similarly to the PR-GHK simulator for the baseline model:
 - (a) For each sampled sequence, calculate the product of the conditional probabilities from the above steps.
 - (b) For each sampled sequence, compute the probability that products not browsed, not considered, and not acquired have Gittins index values smaller than the minimum Gittins index among all actions in the last stage. ($\Pr(G_{c,1} < G_{a,4}^d)$, $\Pr(G_{a,2} < G_{a,4}^d)$, $\Pr(G_{a,3} < G_{a,4}^d)$)
 - (c) Finally, the product of all probabilities above is treated as the simulated likelihood for the sequence.