

Untestability of Average Slutsky Symmetry

Haruki Kono *

MIT

February 3, 2025

Abstract

Slutsky symmetry and negative semidefiniteness are necessary and sufficient conditions for the rationality of demand functions. While the empirical implications of Slutsky negative semidefiniteness in repeated cross-sectional demand data are well understood, the empirical content of Slutsky symmetry remains largely unexplored. This paper takes an important first step toward addressing this gap. We demonstrate that the average Slutsky matrix is not identified and that its identified set always contains a symmetric matrix. A key implication of our findings is that the symmetry of the average Slutsky matrix is untestable, and consequently, individual Slutsky symmetry cannot be tested using the average Slutsky matrix.

Keywords— Slutsky symmetry, rationality, cross-sectional demand, continuity equation

1 Introduction

Rationality is a central concept in economic theory, serving as a fundamental assumption in the analysis of consumer behavior. It assumes that consumers make decisions consistent with

*Email: hkono@mit.edu. I am grateful to Alberto Abadie, Isaiah Andrews, Kengo Kato, Whitney Newey, and participants in MIT econometrics lunch seminar for their feedback and helpful discussions. I acknowledge financial support from the Jerry A. Hausman Fellowship.

maximizing utility, a principle that supports many economic models and empirical research. Testing this assumption is crucial for validating theoretical models and understanding consumer decision-making.

When individual demand functions are available, the Hurwicz-Uzawa theorem (Hurwicz and Uzawa (1971)) provides a complete characterization of rationality. To state the theorem, let p be a d -dimensional price vector and y be an income, both of which are relative to the price of the numeraire. Let $q(p, y)$ be the d -dimensional vector of quantities demanded when the price is p and the income is y . We say that a demand function q is rational if it maximizes a utility function subject to the budget constraint. According to the Hurwicz-Uzawa theorem, a demand function q is rational if and only if its Slutsky matrix, which is defined as a $d \times d$ matrix

$$S_q(p, y) := D_p q(p, y) + D_y q(p, y) q(p, y)',$$

is both symmetric and negative semidefinite.

In many real-world applications, individual demand functions are not observed and only cross-sectional data is available. To investigate the population rationality, researchers have explored the rationalizability of the average demand function conditional on observable characteristics, such as price and income, treating it as if it is generated by an individual representing the population. See, for example, Lewbel (1995), Lewbel (2001), Haag et al. (2009), and Hoderlein (2011). However, this approach involves some disadvantages. For instance, as Theorem 1 of Lewbel (2001) demonstrates, the rationality of the average demand function is unrelated to the rationality of individual demand functions: it is possible for all individuals in a population to be rational while the average demand is not, and vice versa. Moreover, it is often reported that cross-sectional mean regressions fail to explain the variation of demand adequately because of the unobserved preference heterogeneity. (Hoderlein (2011), Hausman and Newey (2016).) This fact indicates the need to investigate all the information about the heterogeneity contained in the data.

Testing rationality for cross-sectional demand data is a harder problem than that for individual demands because individual Slutsky matrices are not observed. This difficulty raises a fundamental question: can we infer the rationality of a population from such data?

More specifically, is it possible to construct statistical tests with nontrivial power to detect consumer irrationality using only distributional data?

Recent research has made progress in addressing this question. Hausman and Newey (2016) provide a necessary and sufficient condition for cross-sectional demand distributions to be rationalizable when only two goods are present. For cases involving more than two goods, Dette et al. (2016) provide the empirical content of the negative semidefiniteness of the Slutsky matrix. Specifically, they show that the quadratic form of the average Slutsky matrix $\mathbb{E}[S_{Q^*}(p, y)]$ conditional on price and income, where Q^* is the random demand function representing the population, is identified. If an estimate of the quadratic form is significantly positive, then it means that the observed data is likely to be inconsistent with a population having an negative semidefinite Slutsky matrix—let alone rationality. These studies demonstrate the feasibility of testing rationality by focusing on the negative semidefiniteness of the Slutsky matrix. However, these methods neglect the symmetry condition, leading to statistical tests that are overly conservative and fail to fully leverage the implications of rationality. The symmetry condition can be more critical to the rationality than the negative semidefiniteness, given that the former is highly sensitive to small perturbations while the latter is not. If Slutsky symmetry is testable, one should be able to construct a much more powerful test for rationality by testing both conditions.

Despite its theoretical importance, the empirical content of the Slutsky symmetry condition remains poorly understood. This paper provides a first step toward elucidating the implications of individual Slutsky symmetry for cross-sectional demand distributions. We demonstrate that the average Slutsky matrix is not identified unlike its quadratic form, which is identified as shown by Dette et al. (2016). Moreover, its identified set always contains a symmetric matrix. To prove these results, we construct a stochastic demand system that is observationally equivalent to the true demand system while ensuring that the average Slutsky matrix is symmetric.

An immediate consequence of our result is the fundamental untestability of individual Slutsky symmetry via the average Slutsky matrix. This fact indicates that the Slutsky symmetric condition is totally distinct to the negative semidefiniteness condition, which is testable based on the quadratic form of the average Slutsky matrix (Dette et al. (2016)). Note

also that it does not immediately rule out the possibility of testing Slutsky symmetry from cross-sectional distributional data. It remains an open question whether individual symmetry has observable implications through nonlinear statistics, a topic that is not explored in this paper.

The key theoretical contribution of this paper is the introduction of the continuity equation as a tool to construct a random demand function that satisfies given marginal distributions and adheres to conditions on the Slutsky matrix. The continuity equation originates from fluid dynamics, where it describes the time evolution of fluid density. It is expressed as:

$$\partial_t \rho_t + \nabla \cdot (\rho_t v_t) = 0^1$$

where ∇ is the divergence operator defined as $\nabla \cdot f = \sum_{i=1}^d \partial f_i / \partial x_i$ for a vector-valued function $f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$, ρ_t is the fluid density, and v_t is the flow velocity vector field at time t . The first term of the LHS represents the change in fluid volume within the system, while the second term accounts for the net flow difference (inflow minus outflow). This equation describes situations where all changes in fluid volume are due to particle transport, with no external sources or sinks present. In the context of demand analysis, heterogeneous individuals are conceptualized as a fluid, with price and income interpreted as “multidimensional time.” The continuity equation then captures how demand distributions evolve as price and income change. The velocity field v_t corresponds to the derivatives of demand with respect to price and income, which are components of the Slutsky matrix. Our approach to constructing a desired random demand function involves finding a “velocity” field that obeys the continuity equation while satisfying the rationality condition.

Related literature. Hurwicz and Uzawa (1971) investigate the integrability of individual demand functions and give a necessary and sufficient condition for rationality based on the Slutsky matrix. Lewbel (2001) considers a population that is heterogeneous in preference and provides conditions for the average demand function to be rational. Haag et al. (2009) and Hoderlein (2011) among others consider the estimation and inference on the average demand function under the rationality shape restriction.

For cross-sectional demand distributions, Hausman and Newey (2016) give a necessary

and sufficient condition for observed datasets to be consistent with a rational demand system for the cases when there are only two goods. When more than two goods are present, the characterization of rationalizability is largely open. Dette et al. (2016) provide a necessary condition that the data needs to satisfy for it to be rationalizable focusing on the negative semidefiniteness of the Slutsky matrix and propose a statistical testing for rationality. Maes and Malhotra (2024) construct a testing procedure of rationality based on higher order moments of demand distributions. They also observe that the average Slutsky matrix is not identified from those moments.

This paper is also related to the literature on random utility models. McFadden and Richter (1990) and McFadden (2005) show that the Axiom of Revealed Stochastic Preference characterizes rationalizability of stochastic choice functions defined on a finite number of choice sets. In a similar setup, Kitamura and Stoye (2018) constructed a statistical test for the axiom.

In the context of discrete choice, Bhattacharya (2025) recently gives the complete characterization of the rationalizability of demand distributions.

2 Setup and Main Result

For $d \geq 2$, we consider an economy with $d + 1$ goods. Relative to the first good, their prices are encoded into a price vector $p \in \mathcal{P} \subset \mathbb{R}_+^d$ where $\mathbb{R}_+ := (0, \infty)$. Let $y \in \mathcal{Y} \subset \mathbb{R}_+$ be the relative income. For given price p and income y , a consumer demands $q(p, y) \in \mathbb{R}_+^d$. Notice that we assume the homogeneity of demand functions at this point. We also assume Walras' law, i.e., the demand for the numeraire is $y - p'q(p, y)$, and consequently, $p'q(p, y) < y$ is assumed.

We assume

$$\mathcal{P} = \prod_{i=1}^d [\underline{p}_i, \bar{p}_i] \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{Y} = [\underline{y}, \bar{y}]$$

for $0 < \underline{p}_i < \bar{p}_i$ and $0 < \underline{y} < \bar{y}$. Let $\mathcal{X} := \mathcal{P} \times \mathcal{Y} \subset \mathbb{R}_+^{d+1}$. We restrict ourselves to demand

functions that are in the space

$$\mathcal{Q} := \left\{ q : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+^d \mid \begin{array}{l} q \text{ is continuously differentiable in each argument.}^2 \\ p'q(p, y) < y \text{ for all } (p, y) \in \mathcal{X}. \end{array} \right\}.$$

In the real world, consumer's preference heterogeneity is present. In this sense, consumer's demand is stochastic from the perspective of an econometrician. Let Q^* be a random individual demand function drawn from a probability distribution on \mathcal{Q} . The econometrician is assumed to observe cross-sectional demand distributions, that is, (s)he observes the distribution μ_x of $Q^*(x)$ for each $x \in \mathcal{X}$, but no joint distribution of demands across different price-income levels is available. Regarding Q^* as a stochastic process indexed by \mathcal{X} , we often call μ_x the (one-dimensional) marginal distribution of Q^* at x . Note that although $(\mu_x)_{x \in \mathcal{X}}$ is a population object, we assume that it is available since we are interested in identification. Assume that the interior of the support of μ_x , denoted by Ω_x , is not empty.

Example 1. For the three-good case ($d = 2$), consider a random Cobb-Douglas demand $Q_i^*(p, y) = y\eta_i/p_i$ where $(\eta_1, \eta_2)'$ is a random vector such that $\eta_1, \eta_2 > 0$ and $\eta_1 + \eta_2 < 1$. Then $Q^* = (Q_1^*, Q_2^*)'$ is a \mathcal{Q} -valued random element. The demand distribution μ_x conditional on $x = (p, y)$ is a distribution supported on a subset of the triangle generated by $(0, 0)$, $(y/p_1, 0)$, and $(0, y/p_2)$.

Recall that an individual demand function $q \in \mathcal{Q}$ is said *rational* if it is induced by utility maximization. The Hurwicz-Uzawa theorem states that q is rational if and only if its Slutsky matrix

$$S_q(x) := D_p q(x) + D_y q(x)q(x)' \tag{1}$$

is symmetric and negative semidefinite for each $x = (p, y)$.

As we discussed in the previous section, Dette et al. (2016) propose a method to test individual rationality based on the negative semidefiniteness. Their testing procedure is roughly as follows. In their Theorem 1, they show that the quadratic form of the average

²This is a weaker condition than the demand function being C^1 because the partial derivative of one argument need not be continuous in other arguments.

Slutsky matrix is identified, that is, $v'\mathbb{E}[S_{Q^*}(x)]v$ is identified for each $v \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $x \in \mathcal{X}$. If the population consists of rational individuals, then $S_{Q^*}(x)$ is negative semidefinite almost surely, and hence, $v'\mathbb{E}[S_{Q^*}(x)]v \leq 0$ should hold. One can reject the null hypothesis that the population is rational if an estimate of $v'\mathbb{E}[S_{Q^*}(x)]v$ is significantly positive for some x and v .³

Although this method has nontrivial power, it is likely to be overly conservative since it completely neglects the other critical component of rationality, Slutsky symmetry. We shall investigate its testability based on the average Slutsky matrix. This question is important since the symmetry property is not robust to small perturbations while the negative semidefiniteness is. If Slutsky symmetry is testable, one should be able to construct a much more powerful test for rationality by testing both conditions.

Unfortunately, the following theorem shows that Slutsky symmetry is not testable based on the average Slutsky matrix. The proof is illustrated in the next section.

Theorem 2.1. *Suppose $(\mu_x)_{x \in \mathcal{X}}$ satisfies Assumption B.1. There exists a \mathcal{Q} -valued random demand function such that $Q(x) \sim \mu_x$ and $\mathbb{E}[S_Q(x)]$ is symmetric for all $x \in \mathcal{X}$.*

Theorem 2.1 particularly implies that the average Slutsky matrix $\mathbb{E}[S_{Q^*}(x)]$ is not identified in our setup. The difficulty arises from the second term of (1). The expectation of the second term is written as

$$\mathbb{E}[D_y Q^*(x) Q^*(x)'] = \lim_{\Delta y \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{\Delta y} (\mathbb{E}[Q^*(p, y + \Delta y) Q^*(p, y)'] - \mathbb{E}[Q^*(p, y) Q^*(p, y)']), \quad (2)$$

but it is unclear how to identify $\mathbb{E}[Q^*(p, y + \Delta y) Q^*(p, y)']$ because it involves the joint distribution of demand at different income levels, and it is indeed not identifiable as we see in the proof of Theorem 2.1.

Theorem 2.1 implies that no matter what cross-sectional demand distributions satisfying the regularity condition we observe, there always exists a stochastic demand system such that it is observationally equivalent to the true demand system and its average Slutsky matrix is symmetric. Hence, there is no way to infer whether $\mathbb{E}[S_{Q^*}(x)]$ is symmetric or not from

³To be more precise, Dette et al. (2016) show a stronger result that the quadratic form of the average Slutsky matrix conditional on the value of Q^* . Thus, their test is more powerful than what is described here.

$(\mu_x)_{x \in \mathcal{X}}$.

Theorem 2.1 does not immediately rule out the possibility of testing Slutsky symmetry from cross-sectional distributional data. It can be still possible that individual symmetry has observable implications through nonlinear statistics, but we leave this for future work.

Remark 2.1. In addition to the marginal distribution μ_x of $Q^*(x)$, let us assume that the joint distribution $\mu_{x, \tilde{x}}$ of $(Q^*(x), Q^*(\tilde{x}))$ is available for all $(x, \tilde{x}) \in \mathcal{X}^2$. This setup corresponds to the situation where we can observe each individual’s choice twice. In this case, the average Slutsky matrix is identified because the RHS of (2) is identified. Hence, it is possible to test the Slutsky symmetry by testing whether $\mathbb{E}[S_{Q^*}(x)]$ is symmetric or not.

Remark 2.2. Proposition 2 of Maes and Malhotra (2024) asserts that the average Slutsky matrix is not “automatically” identified. They explain that the quantity (2) is not identified in the same way that the other term $\mathbb{E}[D_p Q^*(x)]$ is identified through the equation $\mathbb{E}[D_p Q^*(x)] = D_p \mathbb{E}[Q^*(x)]$. Their argument is not complete, as it merely rules out a particular strategy for identifying the average Slutsky matrix without addressing the possibility of alternative identification approaches. Consequently, Maes and Malhotra (2024) do not establish whether there exists an observationally equivalent demand system whose average Slutsky matrix is symmetric.

3 Construction of Stochastic Demand Systems

In this section, we illustrate how a stochastic demand system with the properties of Theorem 2.1 is constructed for the three-good case ($d = 2$). General cases are discussed in the appendix. Remember that for given $(\mu_x)_{x \in \mathcal{X}}$, we need to construct a \mathcal{Q} -valued random element Q such that $Q(x) \sim \mu_x$ and $\mathbb{E}[S_Q(x)]$ is symmetric. We first focus on the first condition, the marginal compliance. Let $\underline{x} := (\underline{p}_1, \dots, \underline{p}_d, \underline{y})$.

Lemma 3.1. *Let $(\mu_x)_{x \in \mathcal{X}}$ be such that Assumption B.1. Then, there exists a measurable function $\bar{\Phi} : \mathcal{X} \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ such that*

1. *it is continuously differentiable in each argument,*

2. $\omega \mapsto \bar{\Phi}(x, \omega)$ is a homeomorphism for each x ,

3. $\bar{\Phi}(\underline{x}, \omega) = \omega$ for each ω , and

4. $\bar{\Phi}(x, \cdot)_{\#} \mu_{\underline{x}} = \mu_x$ for each x .

In particular, the \mathcal{Q} -valued random function $\bar{Q}(x) := \bar{\Phi}(x, \omega)$, where $\omega \sim \mu_{\underline{x}}$, complies the marginal distributions, $\bar{Q}(x) \sim \mu_x$.

In the random demand function constructed in Lemma 3.1, consumers' preference heterogeneity, or "type," is encoded in $\omega \sim \mu_{\underline{x}}$. By the third property of $\bar{\Phi}$, consumer's type ω is understood as the demand at $\underline{x} = (\underline{p}_1, \dots, \underline{p}_d, y)$. Observe that the demand system constructed in Lemma 3.1 is degenerated in the sense that consumers are completely characterized by the demand at \underline{x} . More specifically, if an individual demands ω at \underline{x} , (s)he demands $\bar{\Phi}(x, \omega)$ at x for sure.

Although \bar{Q} in Lemma 3.1 satisfies the marginal compliance, it does not satisfy the average Slutsky symmetry condition $\mathbb{E}[S_{\bar{Q}}(x)] = \mathbb{E}[S_{\bar{Q}}(x)']$ in general. Our strategy is to construct another random demand function Q satisfying both conditions by modifying \bar{Q} . The following lemma gives a condition equivalent to the symmetry.

Lemma 3.2. *Let $(\mu_x)_{x \in \mathcal{X}}$ be such that Assumption B.1. Suppose that a \mathcal{Q} -valued random function $Q = (Q_1, Q_2)'$ satisfies $Q(x) \sim \mu_x$ for all $x \in \mathcal{X}$. Then, its average Slutsky matrix $\mathbb{E}[S_Q(x)]$ is symmetric if and only if*

$$\mathbb{E}[D_y Q_1(x) \cdot Q_2(x)] = \frac{1}{2} \left(D_{p_1} \int q_2 d\mu_x(q) - D_{p_2} \int q_1 d\mu_x(q) + D_y \int q_1 q_2 d\mu_x(q) \right) \quad (3)$$

holds.

We shall modify \bar{Q} so that it satisfies equation (3). Fix $p \in \mathcal{P}$. Let $\bar{v}_{p,y} : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ be the income derivative of the demand function of consumer ω ,

$$\bar{v}_{p,y}(q) := D_y \bar{\Phi}(p, y, \omega),$$

where $\bar{\Phi}(p, y, \omega) = q$. Notice that this is well-defined since $\bar{\Phi}(x, \cdot)$ is homeomorphic. The family $(\bar{v}_{p,y})_{p,y}$ of vector fields, combined with an initial condition, pins down the demand

function, as $\bar{\Psi}(y) = \bar{\Phi}(p, y, \omega)$ is the unique solution to the ODE

$$\begin{cases} D_y \bar{\Psi}(y) = \bar{v}_{p,y}(\bar{\Psi}(y)) \\ \bar{\Psi}(\underline{y}) = \bar{\Phi}(p, \underline{y}, \omega) \end{cases}$$

under the global Lipschitz condition on $\bar{v}_{p,y}$ by the Cauchy-Lipschitz theorem. Since $\mathbb{E}[D_y \bar{Q}_1(x) \bar{Q}_2(x)] = \mathbb{E}[\bar{v}_{p,y,1}(\bar{Q}(x)) \bar{Q}_2(x)]$ is not equal to the RHS of (3) in general, we shall rectify $\bar{v}_{p,y}$ with an auxiliary vector field $w_{p,y}$ constructed in the following lemma.

Lemma 3.3. *Fix $p \in \mathcal{P}$. Let $a_{p,y}$ be such that $(p, y) \mapsto a_{p,y}$ is smooth. There exists a vector field $w_{p,y} : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ that is Lipschitz uniformly in (p, y) and satisfies*

$$\begin{cases} \nabla \cdot (\mu_{p,y} w_{p,y}) = 0 \text{ in } \Omega_{p,y} \\ \langle \mu_{p,y} w_{p,y}, \mathbf{n}_{p,y} \rangle = 0 \text{ on } \partial\Omega_{p,y} \\ \int w_{p,y,1}(q) q_2 d\mu_{p,y}(q) = a_{p,y} \end{cases} . \quad (4)$$

For

$$a_{p,y} = \frac{1}{2} \left(D_{p_1} \int q_2 d\mu_x(q) - D_{p_2} \int q_1 d\mu_x(q) + D_y \int q_1 q_2 d\mu_x(q) \right) - \mathbb{E}[\bar{v}_{p,y,1}(\bar{Q}(x)) \bar{Q}_2(x)],$$

solve the partial differential equation (PDE) (4) and let $v_{p,y} := \bar{v}_{p,y} + w_{p,y}$. Consider the following ODE

$$\begin{cases} D_y \Psi(y) = v_{p,y}(\Psi(y)) \\ \Psi(\underline{y}) = \bar{\Phi}(p, \underline{y}, \omega) \end{cases} .$$

By the Cauchy-Lipchitz theorem, this ODE admits a unique solution $\Psi(y) = \Psi_{p,\omega}(y)$ for each (p, ω) . Define

$$\Phi(p, y, \omega) := \begin{cases} \bar{\Phi}(p, \underline{y}, \omega) & \text{if } y = \underline{y} \\ \Psi_{p,\omega}(y) & \text{if } y > \underline{y} \end{cases} .$$

Lemma 3.4. *Let $(\mu_x)_{x \in \mathcal{X}}$ be such that Assumption B.1. Then*

1. *the function Φ is continuously differentiable in each argument,*

2. $\omega \mapsto \Phi(x, \omega)$ is a homeomorphism for each x ,

3. $\Phi(\underline{x}, \omega) = \omega$ for each ω , and

4. $\Phi(x, \cdot) \# \mu_{\underline{x}} = \mu_x$ for each x .

Moreover, the \mathcal{Q} -valued random function $Q(x) := \Phi(x, \omega)$, where $\omega \sim \mu_{\underline{x}}$ complies the marginal distributions and satisfies equation (3).

The random function constructed in this lemma satisfies the conditions of Theorem 2.1.

In a similar idea, we can explicitly write down the identified set of the average Slutsky matrix.

Proposition 3.1. *Let $(\mu_x)_{x \in \mathcal{X}}$ be such that Assumption B.1. Suppose that a \mathcal{Q} -valued random function Q satisfies $Q(x) \sim \mu_x$ for all $x \in \mathcal{X}$. The identified set of $\mathbb{E}[S_Q(x)]$ is*

$$\left\{ \begin{pmatrix} D_{p_1} \int q_1 d\mu_x(q) + \frac{1}{2} D_y \int q_1^2 d\mu_x(q) & D_{p_1} \int q_2 d\mu_x(q) + U \\ D_{p_2} \int q_1 d\mu_x(q) + L & D_{p_2} \int q_2 d\mu_x(q) + \frac{1}{2} D_y \int q_2^2 d\mu_x(q) \end{pmatrix} \mid U + L = D_y \int q_1 q_2 d\mu_x(q) \right\}.$$

It is easy to see that the identified set always contains a symmetric matrix, which is consistent with the consequence of Theorem 2.1. We also observe that cross-sectional demand distributions put no restriction on the off-diagonal entries except for an trivial restriction $U + L = D_y \int q_1 q_2 d\mu_x(q)$.

4 Conclusion

In this paper, we addressed a question whether the symmetry of the average Slutsky matrix has empirical implications for cross-sectional demand distributions. We showed that the answer is negative: for any regular cross-sectional demand distributions, there exists a stochastic demand system that has a symmetric average Slutsky matrix. This result implies the untestability of individual Slutsky symmetry based on the average Slutsky matrix. Nonetheless, it does not rule out the possibility that individual Slutsky symmetry could have the empirical content through nonlinear relationship, which remains an important open question for future research.

A Preliminaries

Let $(\mu_t)_{t \in [0,1]}$ be a path of probability measures on \mathbb{R}^d .

Assumption A.1.

A.1.1 $\text{supp}(\mu_t) = \bar{\Omega}_t$ where Ω_t is a bounded $C^{2,\alpha}$ -domain.

A.1.2 $T_t : \bar{\Omega}_0 \rightarrow \bar{\Omega}_t$ is a C^2 -diffeomorphism satisfying $\sup_{t \in [0,1]} \|T_t^{-1}\|_{C^{2,\alpha}(\bar{\Omega}_t)} < \infty$.

A.1.3 μ_t has density ρ_t with respect to Lebesgue measure, $\rho_t|_{\bar{\Omega}_t} \in C^{1,\alpha}(\bar{\Omega}_t)$, and $\sup_{t \in [0,1]} \|\rho_t\|_{C^{1,\alpha}(\bar{\Omega}_t)} < \infty$.

A.1.4 There is $c > 0$ such that $\inf_{t \in [0,1], x \in \Omega_t} \rho_t(x) > c$.

A.1.5 For each $t \in [0, 1]$ and $x \in \Omega_t$, $(t - \varepsilon, t + \varepsilon) \ni s \mapsto \rho_s(x)$ is in C^1 for small $\varepsilon > 0$.

A.1.6 For each $t \in [0, 1]$, $x \mapsto \partial_t \rho_t(x)$ is in $C^{0,\alpha}(\bar{\Omega}_t)$, and $\sup_{t \in [0,1]} \|\partial_t \rho_t\|_{C^{0,\alpha}(\bar{\Omega}_t)} < \infty$.

A.1.7 $\sup_{t \in [0,1]} \|\nabla \rho_t\|_{C^0(\bar{\Omega}_t)} < \infty$.

A.1.8 For $\tilde{f}_t(x) := \partial_t \rho_t \circ T_t(x)$ and $A_t(x) := (DT_t(x))^{-1}$, $\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \|\tilde{f}_{t+\varepsilon} - \tilde{f}_t\|_{C^{0,\alpha}(\bar{\Omega}_0)} = 0$, and $\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \|A_{t+\varepsilon} - A_t\|_{C^{1,\alpha}(\bar{\Omega}_0)} = 0$ hold.

Theorem A.1. *If $(\mu_t)_{t \in [0,1]}$ satisfies Assumption A.1, then there exists a map $\Psi : [0, 1] \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ such that it is continuously differentiable in both arguments on $[0, 1] \times \Omega_0$ and $\Psi(t, U) \sim \mu_t$ where U is a random variable drawn from μ_0 .*

Proof. For each $t \in [0, 1]$, define $f_t : \Omega_t \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ as $f_t(x) := \partial_t \rho_t(x)$. Note that $f_t \in C^{0,\alpha}(\bar{\Omega}_t)$ by (A.1.6). Consider the following Poisson equation with a Neumann boundary condition:

$$\begin{cases} \Delta u = -f_t \text{ in } \Omega_t \\ \langle \nabla u, \mathbf{n}_t \rangle = 0 \text{ on } \partial\Omega_t \end{cases},$$

where $\mathbf{n}_t : \partial\Omega_t \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ is the outward unit normal vector on $\partial\Omega_t$. This PDE admits a unique solution $u = u_t \in C^{2,\alpha}(\bar{\Omega}_t)$ such that $\int_{\Omega_t} u_t = 0$ by Nardi (2015). Define a vector field $v_t : \bar{\Omega}_t \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ as $v_t(x) := \nabla u_t(x) / \rho_t(x)$. We first establish the regularity of v_t .

Lemma A.1. *The vector field $v_t : \Omega_t \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$*

1. *is Lipschitz continuous uniformly over t , that is,*

$$\sup_{t \in [0,1]} \sup_{x, y \in \Omega_t, x \neq y} \frac{\|v_t(x) - v_t(y)\|}{\|x - y\|} < \infty,$$

and

2. *is differentiable with a Hölder continuous derivative uniformly over t , that is,*

$$\sup_{t \in [0,1]} \sup_{x, y \in \Omega_t, x \neq y} \frac{\|Dv_t(x) - Dv_t(y)\|}{\|x - y\|^\beta} < \infty$$

for some $\beta \in (0, 1]$.

Moreover, for $t \in [0, 1]$ and $x \in \Omega_t$, the map $[(t - \varepsilon) \vee 0, (t + \varepsilon) \wedge 1] \ni s \mapsto Dv_s(x)$, which is well-defined for small $\varepsilon > 0$, is continuous at t .

Lemma A.2. *There exists a continuous vector field $\bar{v} : [0, 1] \times \mathbb{R}^d \ni (t, x) \mapsto \bar{v}_t(x) \in \mathbb{R}^d$ such that it is Lipschitz in x uniformly over t and $\bar{v}|_{\{t\} \times \bar{\Omega}_t} = v$ for $t \in [0, 1]$.*

For simplicity, the extension \bar{v} is also denoted by v . We observe that (μ_t, v_t) solves the continuity equation

$$\partial_t \mu_t + \nabla \cdot (\mu_t v_t) = 0$$

in the weak sense (see Chapter 4 of Santambrogio (2015)), i.e, for $\psi \in C_c^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$, the map $t \mapsto \int \psi d\mu_t$ is absolutely continuous and it holds

$$\frac{d}{dt} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \psi d\mu_t = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \langle \nabla \psi, v_t \rangle d\mu_t.$$

Indeed, the first condition follows because the map is an antiderivative of $t \mapsto \int \psi f_t$, and the second holds because

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \langle \nabla \psi, v_t \rangle d\mu_t = \int_{\Omega_t} \langle \nabla \psi, \nabla u_t \rangle = - \int_{\Omega_t} \psi \Delta u_t = \int_{\Omega_t} \psi f_t = \frac{d}{dt} \int_{\Omega_t} \psi d\mu_t,$$

where the second equality holds since the boundary integral vanishes due to the Neumann condition.

Consider the ODE

$$\frac{d}{dt}X_t = v_t(X_t), \quad X_0 = x. \quad (5)$$

By Lemma A.2 and the Cauchy-Lipchitz theorem, there exists a unique solution $t \mapsto \Psi(t, x)$ that is in $C^1([0, 1])$, and its flow $\mathbb{R}^d \ni x \mapsto \Psi(t, x) \in \mathbb{R}^d$ is a homeomorphism.

Let $\tilde{\mu}_t := \Psi(t, \cdot)_{\#}\mu_0 \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Then, $(\tilde{\mu}_t, v_t)$ satisfies the continuity equation in the weak sense by the standard argument. By the uniqueness of the solution of the continuity equation (Theorem 4.4 of Santambrogio (2015)), we have $\mu_t = \tilde{\mu}_t$. Hence, for a fixed random variable $U \sim \mu_0$, the random process $t \mapsto \Psi(t, U)$ has a continuously differentiable sample path and $\Psi(t, U) \sim \mu_t$.

We finally show that $x \mapsto \Psi(t, x)$ is continuously differentiable. Recall that $\Psi(t, \cdot) |_{\bar{\Omega}_0}$ is a homeomorphism between $\bar{\Omega}_0$ and $\bar{\Omega}_t$. Let $x \in \Omega_0$. Since $[0, 1] \ni t \mapsto Dv_t(\Psi(x, t))$ is continuous by Lemma A.1, there exists a unique matrix-valued valued function $Z : [0, 1] \times \Omega_0 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ that satisfies the linear ODE

$$\frac{d}{dt}Z(t, x) = Dv_t(\Psi(x, t))Z(t, x), \quad Z(0, x) = I$$

(Theorem 3.9 of Teschl (2012)). Let $x_0 \in \Omega_0$. Letting

$$\psi_t(x) := \Psi(t, x) - \Psi(t, x_0) - Z(t, x_0)(x - x_0)$$

for $x \in \Omega_0$, we observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt}\psi_t(x) &= v_t(\Psi(t, x)) - v_t(\Psi(t, x_0)) - Dv_t(\Psi(x_0, t))Z(t, x_0)(x - x_0) \\ &= Dv_t(\Psi(t, x_0))\psi_t(x) \\ &\quad + \left(\int_0^1 (Dv_t((1-h)\Psi(t, x_0) + h\Psi(t, x)) - Dv_t(t, x_0)) dh \right) (\Psi(t, x) - \Psi(t, x_0)). \end{aligned}$$

(Notice that $(1-h)\Psi(t, x_0) + h\Psi(t, x) \in \Omega_t$ for x close enough to x_0 .) Since $\psi_0(x) = 0$, we

have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\psi_t(x)\| &\leq \int_0^t \|Dv_s(\Psi(s, x_0))\| \|\psi_s(x)\| ds \\ &\quad + \int_0^1 \sup_{h \in [0,1]} \|Dv_s((1-h)\Psi(s, x_0) + h\Psi(s, x)) - Dv_s(s, x_0)\| ds \cdot \text{Lip}(\Psi(t, \cdot)) \|x - x_0\|. \end{aligned}$$

By Gronwall's inequality, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|\psi_t(x)\| &\leq \sup_{s \in [0,1], h \in [0,1]} \|Dv_s((1-h)\Psi(s, x_0) + h\Psi(s, x)) - Dv_s(s, x_0)\| \cdot \text{Lip}(\Psi(t, \cdot)) \|x - x_0\| \\ &\quad \cdot \exp\left(\int_0^1 \|Dv_s(\Psi(s, x_0))\| ds\right) \\ &\leq C \|x - x_0\|^{1+\beta} \end{aligned}$$

for some universal constant $C > 0$, because $\Psi(t, \cdot)$ is Lipschitz by Theorem 2.8 of Teschl (2012) and Dv_s is uniformly Hölder by Lemma A.1. Hence, $\|\psi_t(x)\| / \|x - x_0\| \rightarrow 0$ as $x \rightarrow x_0$, which immediately implies $\Psi(t, \cdot)$ is differentiable at x_0 with derivative

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial x} \Psi(t, x_0) = Z(t, x_0) = \exp\left(\int_0^t Dv_s(\Psi(s, x_0)) ds\right),$$

which is continuous in x_0 . □

Next, we investigate whether the random function constructed in Theorem A.1 depends on the given path of probability measure smoothly. Let $\Theta \subset \mathbb{R}$ be an open interval. Let $(\mu_t^\theta)_{t \in [0,1], \theta \in \Theta}$ be a parametrized family of paths of probability measures on \mathbb{R}^d .

Assumption A.2.

A.2.1 For each $\theta \in \Theta$, the path $(\mu_t^\theta)_{t \in [0,1]}$ satisfies Assumption A.1.

A.2.2 $\theta \mapsto \rho_t^\theta(x)$ is continuously differentiable.

A.2.3 Let $\tilde{f}_t^\theta(x) := \partial_t \rho_t^\theta \circ T_t^\theta(x)$ and $A_t^\theta(x) := (DT_t^\theta(x))^{-1}$. There exist functions $D_\theta \tilde{f}_t^\theta$ and $D_\theta A_t^\theta$ such that $\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \left\| \frac{\tilde{f}_t^{\theta+\varepsilon} - \tilde{f}_t^\theta}{\varepsilon} - D_\theta \tilde{f}_t^\theta \right\|_{C^{0,\alpha}(\bar{\Omega}_0)} = 0$, $\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \left\| D_\theta \tilde{f}_t^{\theta+\varepsilon} - D_\theta \tilde{f}_t^\theta \right\|_{C^{0,\alpha}(\bar{\Omega}_0)} = 0$, $\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \left\| D_\theta \tilde{f}_{t+\varepsilon}^\theta - D_\theta \tilde{f}_t^\theta \right\|_{C^{0,\alpha}(\bar{\Omega}_0)} = 0$, $\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \left\| \frac{A_t^{\theta+\varepsilon} - A_t^\theta}{\varepsilon} - D_\theta A_t^\theta \right\|_{C^{1,\alpha}(\bar{\Omega}_0)} = 0$, $\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \left\| D_\theta A_t^{\theta+\varepsilon} - D_\theta A_t^\theta \right\|_{C^{1,\alpha}(\bar{\Omega}_0)} = 0$, and $\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \left\| D_\theta A_{t+\varepsilon}^\theta - D_\theta A_t^\theta \right\|_{C^{1,\alpha}(\bar{\Omega}_0)} = 0$ hold.

Theorem A.2. *Suppose that $(\mu_t^\theta)_{t \in [0,1], \theta \in \Theta}$ satisfies Assumption A.2. For each $\theta \in \Theta$, let $\Psi(\cdot, \theta, \cdot) : [0, 1] \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ be the map stated in Theorem A.1 for $(\mu_t^\theta)_{t \in [0,1]}$. Then the map $\Theta \ni \theta \mapsto \Psi(t, \theta, x)$ is continuously differentiable for each $(t, x) \in (0, 1) \times \Omega_0$.*

Proof. By Theorem A.1, $\Psi(\cdot, \theta, \cdot)$ satisfies

$$\frac{d}{dt} \Psi(t, \theta, x) = v_t^\theta(\Psi(t, \theta, x)), \quad \Psi(0, \theta, x) = x,$$

where v_t^θ is the extension of $\nabla u_t^\theta / \rho_t^\theta$ by Lemma A.2. We first show that $(t, \theta, x) \mapsto v_t^\theta(x)$ is smooth in the following sense.

Lemma A.3. *The vector field $v_t^\theta(x)$ is differentiable in θ and x , and*

1. $t \mapsto Dv_t^\theta(x)$ is continuous,
2. $t \mapsto D_\theta v_t^\theta(x)$ is continuous,
3. $\theta \mapsto Dv_t^\theta(x)$ is continuous uniformly in x , and
4. $\theta \mapsto D_\theta v_t^\theta(x)$ is continuous uniformly in x

Consider the ODE

$$\frac{d}{dt} Z(t, \theta, x) = A(t, \theta, x)Z(t, \theta, x) + g(t, \theta, x), \quad Z(0, \theta, x) = 0,$$

where

$$A(t, \theta, x) := D_x v_t^\theta(x), \quad g(t, \theta, x) := D_\theta v_t^\theta(x).$$

By Lemma A.3 and Theorem 3.12 of Teschl (2012), this ODE admits a unique solution $t \mapsto Z(t, \theta, x)$ for each (θ, x) . By Theorem 2.8 of Teschl (2012), we have

$$\left\| Z(t, \theta, x) - Z(t, \tilde{\theta}, x) \right\| \leq \frac{C \left\| Dv_t^\theta - Dv_t^{\tilde{\theta}} \right\|_{C^0} + \left\| D_\theta v_t^\theta - D_\theta v_t^{\tilde{\theta}} \right\|_{C^0}}{\text{Lip}(Dv_t^\theta)} \exp(\text{Lip}(Dv_t^\theta)t - 1)$$

for some constant $C > 0$. Since the RHS converges to zero as $|\theta - \tilde{\theta}| \rightarrow 0$ by Lemma A.3, the map $\theta \mapsto Z(t, \theta, x)$ is continuous for each (t, x) . Finally, Lemma A.3 and Gronwall's inequality show $Z(t, \theta, x) = D_\theta \Psi(t, \theta, x)$. \square

B Regularity Conditions on $(\mu_x)_{x \in \mathcal{X}}$

Assumption B.1 (Regularity of $(\mu_x)_{x \in \mathcal{X}}$).

1. Let $1 \leq i < j \leq d$. For $1 \leq k < j$ such that $k \neq i$, fix $\tilde{p}_k \in \mathcal{P}_k$. Let $\mu_{\tilde{p}_i}^{p_j} := \mu_{(\tilde{p}_1, \dots, \tilde{p}_{i-1}, p_i, \tilde{p}_{i+1}, \dots, \tilde{p}_{j-1}, p_j, \underline{p}_{j+1}, \dots, \underline{p}_d, \underline{y})}$. Consider $p_i \mapsto \mu_{\tilde{p}_i}^{p_j}$ as a path of probability measures parametrized by p_j . The family $(\mu_{\tilde{p}_i}^{p_j})_{p_i \in \mathcal{P}_i, p_j \in \mathcal{P}_j}$ satisfies Assumption A.2.
2. Let $1 \leq i \leq d$. For $1 \leq k \leq d$ such that $k \neq i$, fix $\tilde{p}_k \in \mathcal{P}_k$. Let $\mu_y^{p_i} := \mu_{(\tilde{p}_1, \dots, \tilde{p}_{i-1}, p_i, \tilde{p}_{i+1}, \dots, \tilde{p}_d, y)}$. Consider $y \mapsto \mu_y^{p_i}$ as a path of probability measures parametrized by p_i . The family $(\mu_y^{p_i})_{y \in \mathcal{Y}, p_i \in \mathcal{P}_i}$ satisfies Assumption A.2.

C Omitted Proofs

Proof of lemma 3.1. For simplicity, we consider the case of $d = 2$. There exists a continuously differentiable function $R_1 : \mathcal{P}_1 \times \Omega_{\underline{x}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+^d$ such that $R_1(p_1, \cdot) \# \mu_{\underline{x}} \sim \mu_{(p_1, \underline{p}_2, \underline{y})}$ for $p_1 \in \mathcal{P}_1$ by applying Theorem A.2 to the family $(\mu_{(p_1, \underline{p}_2, \underline{y})})_{p_1 \in \mathcal{P}_1}$. Next, fix $p_1 \in \mathcal{P}_1$. There exists a continuously differentiable function $R_2(\cdot, \cdot | p_1) : \mathcal{P}_2 \times \Omega_{(p_1, \underline{p}_2, \underline{y})} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+^d$ such that $R_2(p_2, \cdot | p_1) \# \mu_{(p_1, \underline{p}_2, \underline{y})} = \mu_{(p_1, p_2, \underline{y})}$ for $p_2 \in \mathcal{P}_2$ by applying Theorem A.2 to the family $(\mu_{(p_1, p_2, \underline{y})})_{p_2 \in \mathcal{P}_2}$. Finally, fix $(p_1, p_2) \in \mathcal{P}$. There exists a continuously differentiable function $R(\cdot, \cdot | p_1, p_2) : \mathcal{Y} \times \Omega_{(p_1, p_2, \underline{y})} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+^d$ such that $R(y, \cdot | p_1, p_2) \# \mu_{(p_1, p_2, \underline{y})} = \mu_{(p_1, p_2, y)}$ for $y \in \mathcal{Y}$ by applying Theorem A.2 to the family $(\mu_{(p_1, p_2, y)})_{y \in \mathcal{Y}}$. Let $Q(p_1, p_2, y, \omega) := R(y, R_2(p_2, R_1(p_1, \omega) | p_1) | p_1, p_2)$ for $p = (p_1, p_2) \in \mathcal{P}$ and $\omega \in \Omega_{\underline{x}}$. By construction, $Q(x, \cdot) \# \mu_{\underline{x}} = \mu_x$ holds. The partial differentiability of Q in p_i and y follows by Theorem A.2. \square

Proof of Lemma 3.2. Recall that the average Slutsky matrix at $x = (p_1, p_2, y)$ is

$$\mathbb{E}[S_Q(x)] = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbb{E}[D_{p_1} Q_1(x)] + \mathbb{E}[D_y Q_1(x) \cdot Q_1(x)] & \mathbb{E}[D_{p_1} Q_2(x)] + \mathbb{E}[D_y Q_1(x) \cdot Q_2(x)] \\ \mathbb{E}[D_{p_2} Q_1(x)] + \mathbb{E}[D_y Q_2(x) \cdot Q_1(x)] & \mathbb{E}[D_{p_2} Q_2(x)] + \mathbb{E}[D_y Q_2(x) \cdot Q_2(x)] \end{pmatrix}.$$

The symmetry of this matrix is equivalent to

$$\mathbb{E}[D_y Q_1(x) \cdot Q_2(x)] - \mathbb{E}[D_y Q_2(x) \cdot Q_1(x)] = \mathbb{E}[D_{p_2} Q_1(x)] - \mathbb{E}[D_{p_1} Q_2(x)],$$

where the RHS is identified from the marginal distributions μ_x because

$$\mathbb{E}[D_{p_i} Q_j(x)] = D_{p_i} \mathbb{E}[Q_j(x)] = D_{p_i} \int q_j d\mu_x(q)$$

holds. Since

$$\mathbb{E}[D_y Q_1(x) \cdot Q_2(x)] + \mathbb{E}[D_y Q_2(x) \cdot Q_1(x)] = D_y \mathbb{E}[Q_1(x) Q_2(x)],$$

holds, the symmetry is equivalent to

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[D_y Q_1(x) \cdot Q_2(x)] &= \frac{1}{2} (D_{p_1} \mathbb{E}[Q_2(x)] - D_{p_2} \mathbb{E}[Q_1(x)] + D_y \mathbb{E}[Q_1(x) Q_2(x)]) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \left(D_{p_1} \int q_2 d\mu_x(q) - D_{p_2} \int q_1 d\mu_x(q) + D_y \int q_1 q_2 d\mu_x(q) \right), \end{aligned}$$

which completes the proof. \square

Proof of Lemma 3.3. Let $\psi_x : \Omega_x \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a continuously differentiable function that has a compact support, is smooth in x , and

$$\int_{\Omega_x} \psi_x(q) dq \neq 0$$

For given a_x , let

$$\psi_x^a(q) := \frac{a_x \psi_x(q)}{\int_{\Omega_x} \psi_x(q) dq},$$

and

$$w_x^a(q) := \frac{1}{\mu_x(q)} \begin{pmatrix} -\partial_2 \psi_x^a(q) \\ \partial_1 \psi_x^a(q) \end{pmatrix}.$$

It is clear that $\nabla \cdot (\mu_x w_x^a) = 0$ in Ω_x and $\langle \mu_x w_x^a, \mathbf{n}_x \rangle = 0$ on $\partial\Omega_x$. We also have

$$\int_{\Omega_x} w_{x,1}^a(q) q_2 d\mu_x(q) = - \int_{\Omega_x} \partial_2 \psi_x^a(q) q_2 dq = \int_{\Omega_x} \psi_x^a(q) dq = a_x$$

where the second equality holds by the integration by parts. Now, it is clear that $w_x = w_x^a$ satisfies the PDE (4). \square

Proof of Lemma 3.4. Since the second and third properties are obvious by construction, we shall prove the other two. The marginal compliance is shown using the continuity equation. Let $\psi \in C_c^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$ be a test function. Then, the map $y \mapsto \int \psi d\mu_{p,y}$ is absolutely continuous and it holds

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \langle \nabla \psi, v_{p,y} \rangle d\mu_{p,y} = \int_{\Omega_{p,y}} \langle \nabla \psi, \bar{v}_{p,y} \rangle d\mu_{p,y} + \int_{\Omega_{p,y}} \langle \nabla \psi, w_{p,y} \rangle d\mu_{p,y} = \frac{d}{dt} \int_{\Omega_t} \psi d\mu_t,$$

where the last equality holds by Lemma 3.3. For the partial differentiability, it suffices to show $p_i \mapsto \bar{\Psi}_{p,\omega}(y)$ is differentiable, which is a consequence of Theorem A.2. Finally, the average symmetry condition (3) holds since

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[D_y Q_1(x) \cdot Q_2(x)] &= \mathbb{E}[(\bar{v}_{p,y,1}(Q(x)) + w_{p,y,1}(Q(x))) \cdot Q_2(x)] \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \left(D_{p_1} \int q_2 d\mu_x(q) - D_{p_2} \int q_1 d\mu_x(q) + D_y \int q_1 q_2 d\mu_x(q) \right) \end{aligned}$$

holds by Lemma 3.3 and the definition of $a_{p,y}$. \square

Proof of Proposition 3.1. Find $w_{p,y}$ of Lemma 3.3 for

$$a_{p,y} = D_{p_1} \int q_2 d\mu_x(q) + U - \mathbb{E}[\bar{v}_{p,y,1}(\bar{Q}(x)) \bar{Q}_2(x)].$$

The same procedure as Lemma 3.4 for $v_{p,y} = \bar{v}_{p,y} + w_{p,y}$ yields the desired random demand function. \square

Proof of Lemma A.1. By the change-of-variable formula (see, for example, Lemma 2.62 of

Sokolowski and Zolésio (1992)), $u = \tilde{u}_t := u_t \circ T_t$ solves

$$\begin{cases} \nabla \cdot (A_t \nabla u) = -\tilde{f}_t \text{ in } \Omega_0 \\ \langle A_t \nabla u, \mathbf{n}_0 \rangle = 0 \text{ on } \partial\Omega_0 \end{cases}, \quad (6)$$

where $A_t := (DT_t)^{-1}$ and $\tilde{f}_t := f_t \circ T_t$. By (A.1.2), (A.1.6), and Theorem 2.1 of Kono (2024), $u = \tilde{u}_t$ is a unique solution satisfying $\int_{\Omega_0} u = 0$, and by his Theorem 3.1, an Schauder estimate

$$\|\tilde{u}_t\|_{C^{2,\alpha}} \leq C \|\tilde{f}_t\|_{C^{0,\alpha}}$$

holds for some $C > 0$ independent of t .⁴ Using the equality $Du_t = (D\tilde{u}_t \circ T_t^{-1})DT_t^{-1}$, we have

$$\|v_t(x) - v_t(y)\| = \left\| \frac{\nabla u_t(x)}{\rho_t(x)} - \frac{\nabla u_t(y)}{\rho_t(y)} \right\| \leq \tilde{C} \|x - y\|,$$

where $\tilde{C} > 0$ is independent of t , which shows the uniform Lipschitzness of v_t .

The fact that $u_t \in C^{2,\alpha}(\bar{\Omega}_t)$, combined with (A.1.1) and (A.1.3), implies the differentiability of $v_t(x) = \nabla u_t(x)/\rho_t(x)$, and the derivative is

$$Dv_t(x) = \frac{1}{\rho_t(x)^2} (\rho_t(x)D^2u_t(x) - \nabla u_t(x)(\nabla \rho_t(x))').$$

By (A.1.3) and (A.1.4), it is standard to show that Dv_t is Hölder continuous uniformly over t .

We finally show that Dv_t is continuous in t . Observe that the solution of (6) satisfies

$$\begin{cases} \nabla \cdot (A_t \nabla (u_{t+\varepsilon} - u_t)) = \tilde{f}_{t+\varepsilon} - \tilde{f}_t - \nabla \cdot ((A_{t+\varepsilon} - A_t) \nabla u_{t+\varepsilon}) \text{ in } \Omega_0 \\ \langle A_t \nabla (u_{t+\varepsilon} - u_t), \mathbf{n}_0 \rangle = -\langle (A_{t+\varepsilon} - A_t) \nabla u_{t+\varepsilon}, \mathbf{n}_0 \rangle \text{ on } \partial\Omega_0 \end{cases}.$$

By the Schauder estimate, we have

$$\|u_{t+\varepsilon} - u_t\|_{C^{2,\alpha}(\bar{\Omega}_0)} \leq C \left(\left\| \tilde{f}_{t+\varepsilon} - \tilde{f}_t - \nabla \cdot ((A_{t+\varepsilon} - A_t) \nabla u_{t+\varepsilon}) \right\|_{C^{0,\alpha}(\bar{\Omega}_0)} + \|\langle (A_{t+\varepsilon} - A_t) \nabla u_{t+\varepsilon}, \mathbf{n}_0 \rangle\|_{C^{1,\alpha}(\bar{\Omega}_0)} \right)$$

⁴Note that the coefficient A_t is fixed in the original version of Theorem 3.1 of Kono (2024), but Theorem 6.30 of Gilbarg et al. (1977) ensures that C depends on A_t only through $\|A_t\|_{C^{1,\alpha}(\bar{\Omega}_0)}$, which is bounded by A.1.2.

$\rightarrow 0$

as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ by Assumption A.1.8 and Theorem 3.1 of Kono (2024). In particular, $t \mapsto Dv_t(x)$ is continuous (even uniformly in x). \square

Proof of Lemma A.2. Let

$$L := \sup_{t \in [0,1]} \sup_{x, y \in \Omega_t, x \neq y} \frac{\|v_t(x) - v_t(y)\|}{\|x - y\|},$$

which is finite by Lemma A.1. For $i = 1, \dots, d$, define

$$\bar{v}_{t,i}(x) := \sup_{y \in \bar{\Omega}_t} (v_{t,i}(y) - L \|x - y\|)$$

for $(t, x) \in [0, 1] \times \mathbb{R}^d$. Since $(x, t) \mapsto v_{t,i}(x)$ is continuous, so is $(x, t) \mapsto \bar{v}_{t,i}(x)$ by Berge's maximum theorem. Also, McShane's extension theorem implies that $\bar{v}_{t,i}$ is Lipschitz uniformly over t . \square

Proof of Lemma A.3. The differentiability of $v_t^\theta(x)$ in x is obvious. The first and third bullet points are shown in the same way as Lemma A.1. To show the second and fourth points, observe that the following PDE holds:

$$\begin{cases} \nabla \cdot (A_t^\theta \nabla (D_\theta u_t^\theta)) = -D_\theta \tilde{f}_t^\theta - \nabla \cdot (D_\theta A_t^\theta \nabla u_t^\theta) \\ \langle A_t^\theta \nabla (D_\theta u_t^\theta), \mathbf{n}_0 \rangle = -\langle D_\theta A_t^\theta \nabla u_t^\theta, \mathbf{n}_0 \rangle \end{cases}.$$

The standard Schauder estimate shows the differentiability of $\theta \mapsto \nabla u_t^\theta$ by Assumption A.2.3. Since the derivative is continuous in t and θ by Assumption A.2.3, the second and fourth bullet points are confirmed. \square

References

Bhattacharya, Debopam (2025). "Integrability and identification in multinomial choice models". In: *Journal of Economic Theory* 223, p. 105938.

- Dette, Holger, Stefan Hoderlein, and Natalie Neumeyer (2016). “Testing multivariate economic restrictions using quantiles: the example of Slutsky negative semidefiniteness”. In: *Journal of Econometrics* 191(1), pp. 129–144.
- Gilbarg, David, Neil S Trudinger, David Gilbarg, and NS Trudinger (1977). *Elliptic partial differential equations of second order*. Vol. 224. 2. Springer.
- Haag, Berthold R, Stefan Hoderlein, and Krishna Pendakur (2009). “Testing and imposing Slutsky symmetry in nonparametric demand systems”. In: *Journal of Econometrics* 153(1), pp. 33–50.
- Hausman, Jerry A and Whitney K Newey (2016). “Individual heterogeneity and average welfare”. In: *Econometrica* 84(3), pp. 1225–1248.
- Hoderlein, Stefan (2011). “How many consumers are rational?” In: *Journal of Econometrics* 164(2), pp. 294–309.
- Hurwicz, Leonid and Hirofumi Uzawa (1971). “On the integrability of demand functions”. In: *Preferences, utility and demand*.
- Kitamura, Yuichi and Jörg Stoye (2018). “Nonparametric analysis of random utility models”. In: *Econometrica* 86(6), pp. 1883–1909.
- Kono, Haruki (2024). “Well-Posedness of Second-Order Uniformly Elliptic PDEs with Neumann Conditions”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.19397*.
- Lewbel, Arthur (1995). “Consistent nonparametric hypothesis tests with an application to Slutsky symmetry”. In: *Journal of Econometrics* 67(2), pp. 379–401.
- Lewbel, Arthur (2001). “Demand Systems with and without Errors”. In: *American Economic Review* 91(3), pp. 611–618.
- Maes, Sebastiaan and Raghav Malhotra (2024). “Beyond the Mean: Testing Consumer Rationality through Higher Moments of Demand”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.01538*.
- McFadden, Daniel (2005). “Revealed stochastic preference: a synthesis”. In: *Economic Theory* 26(2), pp. 245–264.
- McFadden, Daniel and Marcel K Richter (1990). “Stochastic rationality and revealed stochastic preference”. In: *Preferences, Uncertainty, and Optimality, Essays in Honor of Leo Hurwicz*, Westview Press: Boulder, CO, pp. 161–186.

- Nardi, Giacomo (2015). “Schauder estimate for solutions of Poisson’s equation with Neumann boundary condition”. In: *L’enseignement Mathématique* 60(3), pp. 421–435.
- Santambrogio, Filippo (2015). “Optimal transport for applied mathematicians”. In: *Birkäuser, NY*.
- Sokolowski, Jan and Jean-Paul Zolésio (1992). *Introduction to shape optimization*. Springer.
- Teschl, G. (2012). *Ordinary Differential Equations and Dynamical Systems*. Graduate studies in mathematics. American Mathematical Society. ISBN: 9780821891056.