

# RACES VS. TOURNAMENTS?

ANDREA BLASCO

## 1. ASSUMPTIONS

Consider a set  $N = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$  of risk-neutral agents. Agents ability is a random variable  $a \in [0, 1]$  with a beta-family probability mass function  $f_{[0,1]}(a; \alpha, \beta)$ , that is iid across agents. Consider that the quality of a solution is  $q \in [0, \infty)$  and the time to produce a solution of a given quality is represented by a continuous real-valued function

$$t(a, q) = a^\gamma \cdot q^\delta$$

with  $\gamma < 0$  so that the partial derivative of time with respect to ability  $t'(a) < 0$  if  $q \neq 0$  and  $\delta > 0$  so that the partial derivative of time with respect to quality  $t'(q) > 0$ .<sup>1</sup> Agents' cost of time of development is represented by strictly increasing function  $c(t(a, q)) = C \cdot t(a, q)^\kappa$ , and with no loss of generality we set  $\kappa = 1$ .

**1.1. Race.** The first agent to develop a solution that hits  $q \geq \bar{q}$  is awarded a prize  $v > 0$ . Under these rules, an agent  $i$ 's ex-post utility is:

$$U_i = \begin{cases} v - c(t(a_i, q_i)) & \text{if } q_i \geq \bar{q} \text{ and } t(a_i, q_i) < t(a_j, q_j) \forall j \in N_i = \{k \in N/i : q_k \geq \bar{q}\} \\ -c(t(a_i, q_i)) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

At an interim stage, the agent learns his type  $a_i$  and has to decide how much quality to develop (or equivalently how much time to develop a solution of a given quality). The maximization problem is (forget about ties):

$$\max_{q_i \in A} \mathbf{1}_{(q_i \geq \bar{q})} \cdot \Pr(t(a_i, q_i) < \min\{t(a_j, q_j)\}_{j \in N_k | a_i}) \cdot v - c(t(a_i, q_i))$$

where  $\mathbf{1}()$  is an indicator function. Note, fixed other agents' strategies, it is easy to show that the above problem reduces to a binary decision on  $q \in \{0, \bar{q}\}$ , as all other actions are (strictly) dominated. Indeed, the probability of winning is non-increasing in quality for any level  $q_i > \bar{q}$  and recall that costs are strictly increasing in  $q_i$ . So this can be rewritten:

$$\max_{q_i \in \{0, \bar{q}\}} \mathbf{1}_{(q_i = \bar{q})} \cdot F_A(a_i > a_j)^{n-1} \cdot v - c(t(a_i, q_i))$$

---

*Date:* First Version: April 10, 2014

*Last updated:* April 17, 2014.

Institute Quantitative Social Sciences and Nasa Tournament Laboratory.

<sup>1</sup>Here the idea is that agents commit resources at the beginning of the race in order to deliver a solution of a given quality by a certain time. It's clear that if any of the opponents wins the race, this means that the others will have some free time ex-post. Our assumption through the paper is that this extra-time is a cost that cannot be reinvested. In a more general model, we can assume that ...

Furthermore, because the above expression is monotone in  $a_i$ , we can simply look at the marginal agent to pin down a threshold level of ability  $\hat{a}$  above which all agents are going to bid  $q^* = \bar{q}$  and below which they will bid  $q^* = 0$ . That is,

$$v \cdot \left( \frac{B(\hat{a}, \alpha, \beta)}{B(\alpha, \gamma)} \right)^{n-1} = C \cdot \hat{a}^\gamma \cdot \bar{q}^\delta$$

which simplifies to the following remarkably simple expression if we assume that abilities are distributed uniformly on the unit interval:

$$\hat{a} = \left( \frac{C \cdot \bar{q}^\delta}{v} \right)^{1/(n-1-\gamma)}$$

notice that when  $\delta/(n-1-\gamma) > 1$ , the threshold grows exponentially in  $\bar{q}$ , whereas when  $\delta/(n-1-\gamma) < 1$  it grows logarithmically (or linear for the equal). This has a clear interpretation ...

For a principal, the problem is the following:

$$w_{race} = \Pr(\max\{q_i\}_{i \in N} = \bar{q}) \cdot (\bar{q} - v)$$

which for the uniform unit interval case becomes:

$$w_{race} = \left[ 1 - \left( \frac{C \cdot \bar{q}^\delta}{v} \right)^{n/(n-1-\gamma)} \right] \cdot (\bar{q} - v)$$

## 2. EQUILIBRIUM IN THE ALL-PAY TOURNAMENT

The problem here is the following:

$$\arg \max_q \quad v \cdot \Pr(q_i > \max\{q_j\}_{j \neq i}) - c(t(a_i, q_i))$$

and by following M-S (for  $n > 2$  and uniform unit interval) we have:

$$q_{allpay}^* = \left( \frac{n-1}{n-1+\gamma} v \cdot a^{n-1+\gamma} \right)^{1/\delta}$$

## 3. WHICH ONE IS BETTER?

We are in the shoes of a “principal” i.e., sponsor/crowdsourcing platform. First, suppose the principal does not care about time per se, but only as a mean to provide good incentives to participants or to save costs. Second, the principal wants to max the expected *max* quality. Third, the principal needs to optimally set the incentives. For example, in a race the problem of a principal is:

$$\max_{\rho \leq 1} \hat{w}^{races} = w/V = \{1 - [1 - F(\bar{x}(\rho))]^N\} \cdot (\rho - 1)$$

On the other hand, in a tournament the only parameter to change is  $V$ . First, given the bidding function, we want to know the expected min cost in the race:

$$F(\min(x, y) < k) = F(x < k) * F(y < k) = F(k)^2$$

Hence, for  $N=2$ ,

$$\int_{t_m}^1 F(k)^2 dk = \int_{t_m}^1 \frac{k - t_m}{1 - t_m} dk = \frac{1 - t_m}{2}$$

And the expected max value is

$$\hat{w}^{allpay} = w/V = \frac{\log(2/(1-t_m))}{1-t_m} - 1$$

#### 4. DESCRIPTION OF THE DATA