

Exercise 4

ECON / MATH C103 - Mathematical Economics

Philipp Strack

due Tue Feb 14, 4:59pm

Each sub-exercise is weighted equally.

Helpful Material:

- Last week's lecture notes.

Exercise 1: (28 points) There are n agents, each agent's willingness to pay is given by $\theta_i \geq 0$. There is a single object, we set $x_i = 1$ if agent i gets the object and $x_i = 0$ otherwise. Each agent i 's utility function is quasi-linear and given by

$$u((x_i, t_i), \theta_i) = x_i \theta_i - t_i.$$

Assume furthermore, that θ_i are identically and independently distributed (iid) according to some distribution $F : [0, \bar{\theta}] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ with strictly positive density $f > 0$ and bounded support $\bar{\theta} < \infty$.

Consider the following *second price auction* or Vickrey auction: Each agent submits a message (called bid) $m_i \in M_i = \mathbb{R}_+$. The agent who submitted the highest bid receives the object and pays the *second highest bid*, all other players make no payments and receive nothing.

- (a) Describe the second price auction formally as a mechanism, by stating $(M, (x, t))$.
- (b) Let m_{-i} denote the vector of bids submitted the agents $j \neq i$. Derive the bid(s) which maximizes agent i 's utility given m_{-i} as a function of his type θ_i .
- (c) Does there exist a strategy which maximizes agent i 's utility for any m_{-i} . If your answer is yes derive it, if no argue why not.
- (d) Does the second price auction have a unique dominant strategy equilibrium? If yes, what is the expected revenue in equilibrium?

Consider the following strategy player 1 always bids $\bar{\theta}$ and all other players always bid 0.

- (e) Is this strategy vector a dominant strategy equilibrium?
- (f) Is this strategy vector a Bayes Nash equilibrium?
- (g) What is the expected revenue in this strategy profile?

Exercise 2: (20 points)

- (a) (12 points) Prove formally (!) that every dominant strategy equilibrium is also a Bayes Nash equilibrium.
- (b) (8 points) Provide an example of a mechanism which has no dominant strategy equilibrium.