			Subscribe
		SHARE	LATEST
Fall Flash Sale. Save 30%	Subscribe		

HEALTH

The Doping Game: Payoffs That Make Cheaters Into Losers

April 2, 2008

ADVERTISEMENT

Editors note: This story is part of a Feature "The Doping Dilemma" from the April 2008 issue of Scientific American.

Why do cyclists cheat? The game theory analysis of doping in cycling (below), which is closely modeled on the game of prisoner's dilemma, shows why cheating by doping is rational, based solely on the incentives and expected values of the payoffs built into current competition. (The expected value is the value of a successful outcome multiplied by the probability of achieving that outcome.) The payoffs assumed are not unrealistic,

Support science journalism.

"low" in the matrices correspond to the standard names of strategies in prisoner's dilemma. It is also assumed that if competitors are playing "on a level playing field" (all are cheating, or all are rule-abiding), their winnings will total \$1 million each, without further adjustment for a doping advantage.

—Peter Brown, Staff E	Editor		

ADVERTISEMENT

Game Assumptions: Current Competition

Value of winning the Tour de France: \$10 million

Likelihood that a doping rider will win the Tour de France against nondoping competitors: 100%

Value of cycling professionally for a year, when the playing field is level: \$1 million

Cost of getting caught cheating (penalties and lost income): \$1 million

Likelihood of getting caught cheating: 10%

Cost of getting cut from a team (forgone earnings and loss of status): \$1 million

Support science journalism.

2 of 7 10/27/21, 11:34 AM

50%

Case I:		Case 2:		
My opponent abides by the rules (he "cooperates"). I have two options:		My opponent cheats by doping (he "defects"). Again, I have two options:		
High Payoff		Sucker Payoff		
I abide by the rules (I "cooperate," too field is level.). The playing	I abide by the rules (I "cooperate"). I can earn the average winnings for a competitive racer only if the opponent gets caught cheating and is disqualified.		
Value of competing for one year:	\$1 million	Expected value of competing for one year: \$1 million*10%=		
Since I am not cheating, I expect no penalties:	\$0	Expected cost of getting cut from a team: \$1 million*50%=	-\$0.5million	
Total expected High Payoff: \$1 million		Total expected Sucker Payoff:	\$0.4million	
_		_		
Temptation Payoff		Low Payoff	Low Payoff	
I cheat by doping (I "defect").		I also cheat by doping (I "defect"). The playing is level.		
Expected value of winning the Tour de France (if I do not get caught cheating): \$10 million*90%=	\$9.0million	Expected value of competing for one year (if I do not get caught): \$1 million*90%		
Expected penalty for cheating (if I do get caught): \$1 million*10%=	-\$0.1million	Expected penalty for cheating (if I do get caught): \$1 million*10%=		
Total expected Temptation Payoff:	\$8.9 million	Total expected Low Payoff:	\$0.8million	
Because \$8.9 million is greater than \$1		My incentive in Case II is also to cheat.		

Support science journalism.

Th	Thanks for reading Scientific American. Knowledge awaits.					
ADVEDTISEME	NT					

Game Assumptions: After Reforms

New, higher cost of getting caught cheating (penalties and lost income): \$5 million

New, higher likelihood of getting caught cheating: 90%

Consequent new, lower likelihood that a non-doping rider will get cut from a team for being noncompetitive: 10%



Sign up for *Scientific American*'s free newsletters.

Sign Up

Case I:	Case 2:
My apparent shides by the rules (he	My apparent cheats by doning (be

Support science journalism.

4 of 7 10/27/21, 11:34 AM

I have two options:		o options: Again, I have two options:	
High Payoff		Sucker Payoff	
I abide by the rules (I "cooperate," too). The playing field is level.		I abide by the rules (I "cooperate"). I can earn the average winnings for a competitive racer only if ropponent gets caught cheating and is disqualified	
Value of competing for one year:	\$1 million	Expected value of competing for one year: \$1 million*90%=	
Since I am not cheating, I expect no penalties:	\$0	Expected cost of getting cut from a team: \$1 million*10%=	-\$0.1million
Total expected High Payoff:	\$1 million	n Total expected Sucker Payoff: \$0.8n	
-		_	
Temptation Payoff		Low Payoff	
I cheat by doping (I "defect").		I also cheat by doping (I "defect"). The playing f is level.	
Expected value of winning the Tour de France (if I do not get caught cheating): \$10 million*10%=	\$1.0million	Expected value of competing for one year (if I do not get caught): \$1 million*10%	\$0.1million
Expected penalty for cheating (if I do get caught): \$5 million*90%=	-\$4.5million	n Expected penalty for cheating (if I do get caught): \$5 million*90%=	
Total expected Temptation Payoff:	\$-3.5 million		
Because earning \$1 million is better than losing \$3.5 million, my incentive in Case I has changed to abiding by the rules.		My incentive in Case II has also changed to playing by the rules.	

Support science journalism.

5 of 7 10/27/21, 11:34 AM

ADVE	RTISI	EMEN	IΤ	
REA	DТ	HIS	INI	7XT

SPONSORED

Narcolepsy and Histamine: An Important Relationship

NEWSLETTER

Get smart. Sign up for our email newsletter.

Sign Up

Support Science Journalism

Support science journalism.

Subscribe Now!

FOLLOW US

SCIENTIFIC AMERICAN ARABIC

العربية

Return & Refund Policy FAQs

About Contact Us

Press Room Site Map

Advertise Privacy Policy

SA Custom Media California Consumer Privacy Statement

Terms of Use Use of cookies/Do not sell my data

International Editions

Scientific American is part of Springer Nature, which owns or has commercial relations with thousands of scientific publications (many of them can be found at www.springernature.com/us). Scientific American maintains a strict policy of editorial independence in reporting developments in science to our readers.

© 2021 SCIENTIFIC AMERICAN, A DIVISION OF SPRINGER NATURE AMERICA, INC.

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED.

Support science journalism.