Econ C103: Game Theory and Networks Module I (Game Theory): Lecture 12

Instructor: Matt Leister

Fall 2019, UC Berkeley

Readings:

Osborne (2004) Section 9.6

Auctions with asymetric information: i.i.d. values

- n > 1 bidders in an auction have independent and identically distributed (i.i.d.) values for a single non-divisible good.
- Each v_i is distributed via continuous increasing cdf $F(\cdot)$, $\underline{v} \leq v_i \leq \overline{v}$.
- Private signals equal private valuations.
- Auction mechanism: $P(\mathbf{b})$ denotes price paid by winning bidder.
- Payoffs given i's value $v_i \ge 0$ and bids **b** is:

$$u_i(v_i, \mathbf{b}) = \begin{cases} (v_i - P(\mathbf{b}))/m & \text{if : } b_j \leq b_i, \ \forall j \neq i, \\ & \& \ b_j = b_i \ \text{for m players} \end{cases}.$$

- Strategies $S_i = \{b_i(v) : v \in [\underline{v}, \overline{v}]\}$; restrict $b_i(v)$ to be continuous increasing \Rightarrow inverse b_i^{-1} exists for each $i \in N$.
- Denote the probability of winning given bid b and strategies \mathbf{b}_{-i} :

$$\phi(b|\mathbf{b}_{-i}) = \prod_{i \neq i} F(b_j^{-1}(b)).$$

• If $b_j(v) = b^*(v)$ for each $j \neq i$, $\phi(b|\mathbf{b}_{-i}) = (F(b^{*-1}(b))^{n-1}$.

Auctions with asymetric information: i.i.d. values

First-price auction: $P(\mathbf{b}) = \text{highest bid.}$

• Expected payoff to *i* given $(b, v, (b_i(\cdot))_{i \neq i})$ is:

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{v}_{-i}}[u_{i}(v_{i},(b,(b_{j}(v_{j}))_{j\neq i})]$$

$$= \phi(b|\mathbf{b}_{-i})(v_{i} - \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{v}_{-i}}[P(\mathbf{b})|b_{j}(v_{j}) < b_{i}, \forall j \neq i])$$

$$\stackrel{1P}{=} (F(b^{*-1}(b)))^{n-1}(v_{i} - b).$$

• First-order condition for optimal $b^*(v_i)$ (by inverse function theorem):

$$\frac{(n-1)(F(b^{*-1}(b)))^{n-2}F'(b^{*-1}(b))}{b^{*'}(v_i)}(v_i-b^*(v_i))=(F(v_i))^{n-1}$$

$$\Leftrightarrow (n-1)F'(b^{*-1}(b))(v_i - b^*(v_i)) = F(v_i)b^{*'}(v_i).$$

• If $\underline{v}=0$, $\overline{v}=1$, F(v)=v, & assume $b^*(v_i)=s^*v_i$, f.o.c. becomes:

$$(n-1)(v_i-s^*v_i)=v_is^* \Leftrightarrow s^*=\frac{n-1}{n}.$$

• Conclusion: each player i shades their bid by v_i/n to attempt to acquire good at a bargain (with a probability-of-winning tradeoff).

Auctions with asymmetric information: i.i.d. values

First-price auction: $P(\mathbf{b}) = \text{highest bid.}$

- $v^{[k]} \equiv k$ 'th order statistic (i.e. k'th highest value among n values; $v^{[1]} \geq v^{[2]} \ldots$). $v^{[k]}$ has cdf $F^{[k]}(\cdot)$ (can look up form to $F^{[k]}(\cdot)$).
- Expected revenue to auctioneer:

$$ER(P) \equiv \mathbb{E}[P(\mathbf{b}^*)] \stackrel{1P}{=} ER(1P) \equiv \int_{\mathbf{v}}^{\overline{\mathbf{v}}} b^*(\mathbf{v}) dF^{[1]}(\mathbf{v}).$$

• If v = 0, $\overline{v} = 1$ and F(v) = v:

$$ER_{1P} = \int_0^1 \frac{n-1}{n} v n v^{n-1} dv$$

$$= \frac{n-1}{n+1} v^{n+1} \Big|_0^1$$

$$= \frac{n-1}{n+1} \text{ (this is increasing in } n\text{)}.$$

• Larger $n \to \text{more competitive bidding} \to \text{greater expected revenue}$.

Auctions with asymmetric information: i.i.d. values

Second-price auction: $P(\mathbf{b}) = \text{second-highest bid.}$

- Bidding your value: $b(v_i) = v_i$ is weakly dominant (for almost all v_i):
 - Denote \bar{b}_{-i} the highest bid among others' bids.
 - \mathbf{b}_{-i} case 1: $\bar{b}_{-i} < v$, then b(v) = v clearly optimal.
 - \mathbf{b}_{-i} case 2: $\bar{b}_{-i} > v$, then any $b(v) \leq v$ optimal.
- Therefore, $b^*(v_i) = v_i$ gives BNE in weakly dominant strategies.
- Expected revenue to auctioneer:

$$ER(P) \stackrel{2P}{=} ER(2P) \equiv \int_{\underline{v}}^{\overline{v}} v dF^{[2]}(v).$$

• If $\underline{v} = 0$, $\overline{v} = 1$ and F(v) = v, then it is an easy to show Fact:

$$ER(2P) = \int_0^1 v dF^{[2]}(v) = \frac{n-1}{n+1} = ER(1P).$$

Auctions w/ asymmetric information: revenue equivalence

Other auction mechanisms:

- **1** Third price auction: $P(\mathbf{b}) = \text{third-highest bid.}$
- All-pay auction: item allocated to highest bidder, and each bidder pays their bid even if they don't win.
- Direct revelation auction: no incentive to misreport your value (different to bid shading, as values not reported in 1'st-price auction).
- ullet k'th-price $(k=1,\ldots,n)$ and all-pay are direct revelation auctions.

Theorem (Revenue Equivalence Theorem)

Suppose bidders have i.i.d. valuations, are risk neutral, and $\underline{v}=0$. Then any symmetric and increasing equilibrium of a direct revelation auction that assigns the good to the highest bidder, and such that the expected payment of a bidder with value 0 is 0, yields the same expected revenue.

 From 1'st- to 2'nd- price auction: bidders no longer have incentive to shade, but at the revenue-cost of a more generous pricing mechanism.

Common-value (component) auction:

- n > 1 bidders in an auction have independent and identically distributed (i.i.d.) types $(t_i)_{i=1}^n$.
- Fixing $\alpha \ge \gamma > 0$, player *i*'s value for a single non-divisible good:

$$v = \alpha t_i + \gamma \sum_{j \neq i} t_j.$$

When $\alpha = \gamma$ then (exact) common value of the good is ν .

- Each t_i is distributed i.i.d. via continuous increasing cdf $F(\cdot)$, $t < t_i < \overline{t}$.
- Payoffs given state of the world **t** and bids **b** is:

$$u_i(\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{b}) = \begin{cases} (v - P(\mathbf{b}))/m & \text{if : } b_j \leq b_i, \ \forall j \neq i, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}.$$

- Strategies $S_i = \{b_i(t) : t \in [\underline{t}, \overline{t}]\}$; monotone increasing $b_i(t)$.
- If $b_j(t)=b^*(t)$ for each $j\neq i$, $\phi(b|\mathbf{b}_{-i})=(F(b^{*-1}(b))^{n-1}.$
- Rational expectations: if i wins with bid b, she conditions on $t_j < b_j^{-1}(b) \stackrel{EQ}{=} b^{*-1}(b)$ when taking expectation of v:

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{t}_{-i}}[u_{i}\left(\mathbf{t},\left(b,\left(b_{j}(t_{j})\right)_{j\neq i}\right)]\right)$$

$$=\phi(b|\mathbf{b}_{-i})\left(\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{t}_{-i}}\left[v-P(\mathbf{b})\left|t_{j}< b_{j}^{-1}(b),\forall j\neq i\right.\right]\right)$$

$$\stackrel{1P}{=}\phi(b|\mathbf{b}_{-i})\left(\alpha t_{i}+\gamma\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{t}_{-i}}\left[\sum_{j\neq i}t_{j}\left|t_{j}< b_{j}^{-1}(b),\forall j\neq i\right.\right]-b\right)$$

$$\stackrel{EQ}{=}\left(F(b^{*-1}(b))\right)^{n-1}\left(\alpha t_{i}+\gamma(n-1)\frac{\int_{\underline{t}}^{b^{*-1}(b)}tdF(t)}{F(b^{*-1}(b))}-b\right).$$

ullet ...can solve for (possibly nonlinear) equilibrium bidding strategy $b^*(t)$.

• The "winner's curse" is due to the following inequality:

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{t}_{-i}}\left[v\,\middle|\,t_{j} < b^{*-1}(b), \forall j \neq i\,\right] = \alpha t_{i} + \gamma (n-1) \underbrace{\frac{\int_{\underline{t}}^{b^{*-1}(b)} t dF(t)}{F(b^{*-1}(b))}}_{\mathbb{E}\left[t_{j}\middle|\,t_{j} < b^{*-1}(b)\right]} < \alpha t_{i} + \gamma (n-1) \mathbb{E}\left[t_{j}\right].$$

- In words: If a bidder fails to condition on the information from winning the auction, precisely, that others' private types are lower than her own type, then she will overbid for the good.
- Example: 1P auction, n=2, $\alpha=\gamma=1$ and F(t)=t for $t\in[0,1]$: $b^*(t)=t$ in symmetric BNE (so $b^*(t)< t+\frac{1}{2}$). Exercise: show this.

• The "winner's curse" is due to the following inequality:

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{t}_{-i}} \left[v \, \middle| \, t_{j} < b^{*-1}(b), \forall j \neq i \, \right] = \alpha t_{i} + \gamma (n-1) \frac{\int_{\underline{t}}^{b^{*-1}(b)} t dF(t)}{F(b^{*-1}(b))} < \alpha t_{i} + \gamma (n-1) \mathbb{E} \left[t_{j} \right].$$

winning the auction, precisely, that others' private types are lower than her own type, then she will overbid for the good.
Example: 1P auction, n = 2, α = γ = 1 and F(t) = t for t ∈ [0,1]:

In words: If a bidder fails to condition on the information from

- $b^*(t) = t$ in symmetric BNE (so $b^*(t) < t + \frac{1}{2}$). Exercise: show this. Fact 1: In common-value auctions with i.i.d. types (i.e. as above;
- e.g., auction for management rights of collective farm land), revenue equivalence holds.
- Fact 2: However, if signals are correlated (i.e. not i.i.d.; e.g., auction for oil tract of uncertain yield), revenue equivalence can fail in common value actions: $ER_{1P} < ER_{2P}$.