Evaluation of

Deception For The Greater Good: Minimizing Traffic Congestion With Information Design

Steven Homer[1], Fabian Perez[2], Quinten Rosseel[2] and Matthias Humt[2]

[1]steven.t.homer@gmail.com
[2]{quinten.rosseel, fabian.ramiro.perez.sanjines, matthias.humt}@vub.be

Abstract

The paper *Reducing Congestion Through Information Design* which is reviewed in the report *Deception For The Greater Good: Minimizing Traffic Congestion With Information Design* we are going to evaluation in this article, deals with the problem of suboptimal decisions of Bayesian agents in the context of games with uncertain congestions when given complete information of the system. The reviewing group developed and used a simulation software to replicate the results seen in the aforementioned paper. Their work and its presentation are evaluated in the first section of this article while remarks can be found in the second section.

1 EVALUATION

As we deal with three different texts throughout this evaluation it might help to assign to each of them a unique name. Therefore, if we speak of the *paper* we mean the original work by Das et al (2017) titled *Reducing Congestion Through Information Desig*. The *report* denotes the review on the aforementioned paper titled *Deception For The Greater Good: Minimizing Traffic Congestion With Information Design* written by Kaïs Albichari, Raymond Lochner, Rodrigue Van Brande and Tanguy d'Hose. Lastly we will say the *article* when speaking about the evaluation you are reading right now.

The article is organized into two parts. In this one, apart from clarifying notation, we will evaluate the different sections of the report on the basis of the questions from the specification found online and the mail the report was attached to. The second part will provide overall general positive and negative remarks as well as questions on the content of the report.

1.1 INTRODUCTION

Todo: Evaluate whether the introduction explains clearly the content of the paper
The abstract should be more elaborated in terms of what the paper is about. Also using the term *agent* both for the entity being routed and a potential supervisory structure (miss)leading the former might be confusing. An interested reader might now, after having read the abstract, have a vague idea of the topics that are about to be discussed. We don't immediately see however why selfishness of agents in a traffic system is a motivation for the study.

The introduction provides a clear overview of topics that will be discussed but contains spelling mistakes, as does the abstract. Since this is your (Todo: direct speech or keep it neutral?) first impression to the reader, we highly recommend to review the phrasing. Subsequently, the second paragraph states that it is a 'very active topic' but the references that back up this claim come from the same author and date back to 2005. While 2005 is clearly a lot more recent then 1920, the year it is referring to, it would be good to find a more recent paper or remove the 'active topic' claim.

Otherwise the paper is well summarized, touching on all the major parts without getting carried away so the reader feels confident to dive in. It could be a little clearer though that your work is mainly a reproduction and revisit of the original content rather then something novel.

1.2 Background Information

Todo: Evaluate whether there is sufficient background information to understand the relevance of the work

1.3 Methods

Todo: Evaluate whether the methods are clearly explained (can the results be reproduced?)

1.4 Results

Todo: Evaluate whether the results answer the questions asked in the paper (which questions?)

1.5 Questions

Todo: Evaluate whether all questions asked in the paper are answered (which questions?)

1.6 Conclusion

Todo: Evaluate whether the conclusion is sufficient

1.7 Style

Todo: Evaluate whether the overall style is ok

1.8 Missing Content

Todo: Evaluate whether you believe things are missing in the discussion

2 Remarks

In this section we will discuss possible ways to improve the report on the basis of some specific positive and and negative examples as well as content wise questions.

2.1 POSITIVE

Todo: Name 3 positive points concerning the work, clearly specifying why you think they are well-done or interesting

2.2 NEGATIVE

Todo: Name 3 negative points, which may include missing/unclear explanations or suggestions for improvement

2.3 QUESTIONS

Todo: Name at least 3 clear and relevant questions on the content or the methods used which can be asked (next to other questions)