# Quasilinear Mechanism Design

S&LB §10.3-10.4

CMPUT 654: Modelling Human Strategic Behaviour

# Recap: Revelation Principle

**Theorem:** (Revelation Principle) If there exists any mechanism that implements a social choice function C in dominant strategies, then there exists a direct mechanism that implements Cin dominant strategies and is truthful.





(Image: Shoham & Leyton-Brown 2008)



### Recap: General Dominant-Strategy Implementation

**Theorem:** (Gibbard-Satterthwaite) least three outcomes),

1. C is onto; that is, for every outcome  $o \in O$  there is a preference profile [ > ] such that C([ > ]) = o (this is sometimes called **citizen** sovereignty), and

2. *C* is dominant-strategy **truthful**, then C is dictatorial.

Consider any social choice function C over N and O. If |O| > 2 (there are at

### Recap: Quasilinear Preferences

#### **Definition:**

Agents have quasilinear preference when

- 1. the set of outcomes is  $O = X \times \mathbb{R}^n$  for a finite set X,
- 2. the utility of agent *i* given type profile  $\theta$  for an element  $(x, p) \in O$  is  $u_i((x, p), \theta) = v_i(x, \theta) f_i(p_i)$ , where
- 3.  $v_i: X \times \Theta \to \mathbb{R}$  is an **arbitrary** function, and
- 4.  $f_i : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$  is a monotonically increasing function.

Agents have quasilinear preferences in an *n*-player Bayesian game setting

### Recap: Direct Quasilinear Mechanism

#### **Definition:**

A direct quasilinear mechanism is a pair  $(\chi, p)$ , where

- outcomes, and
- types to a payment for each agent.

•  $\chi: \Theta \to \Delta(X)$  is the choice rule (often called the allocation rule), which maps from a profile of reported types to a distribution over nonmonetary

•  $p: \Theta \to \mathbb{R}^n$  is the payment rule, which maps from a profile of reported

# Logistics

- Next week is **reading week**; no lectures
- Assignment 2 will be released at the end of this week
  - Due Thu March 7
- On Tue Feb 27 (first day after reading week) we will choose the schedule for project presentations
  - Using the random dictatorship mechanism as for paper assignments

# Paper Presentations

Paper presentations start after reading week:

- There will be 2 or 3 presentations per class
  - (Rabin 2000 is rescheduled to Oct 31)
- Each paper is allocated **25 minutes** for talk + questions  $\bullet$ 
  - Budget for about a 15-20 minute talk and 5-10 minutes for questions  $\bullet$
  - will be **ruthless** about the 25 minute time limit  $\bullet$
- Summarize the **important parts** of the paper
- Paper summaries are due before class starts (200-500 words)
  - Submit via eClass

• The eClass assignment description will tell you what these should include

## Lecture Outline

- 1. Recap & Logistics
- 2. Efficient Quasilinear Mechanisms
- 3. Properties of Quasilinear Mechanisms

## Groves Mechanisms

#### **Definition:**

**Groves mechanisms** are direct quasilinear mechanisms  $(\chi, p)$  for which

- $\chi(\hat{v}) = \arg$
- $p_i(\hat{v}) = h_i(\hat{v})$
- function in **dominant strategies**

$$\max_{x} \sum_{i} \hat{v}_{i}(x)$$
$$\hat{v}_{-i}(x) - \sum_{j \neq i} \hat{v}_{j}(\chi(\hat{v}))$$

• Where  $h_i$  is an **arbitrary** function of the reports of the other agents

Groves mechanisms implement any social welfare maximizing choice

### Proof Sketch: Dominant Strategies

1. Suppose that every other agent j declares arbitrary  $\hat{v}_j$ 

2. Agent *i* wants to report  $\hat{v}_i$  that solv

3. Substitute 
$$p_i: \max_{\hat{v}_i} \left( v_i(\hat{v}_i, \hat{v}_{-i})) - h_i(\hat{v}_{-i}) + \sum_{j \neq i} \hat{v}_j(\chi(\hat{v}_i, \hat{v}_{-i})) \right)$$

4.  $h_i(\hat{v}_{-i})$  doesn't depend on  $\hat{v}_i$ 

$$\operatorname{ves}\max_{\hat{v}_i}\left(v_i\left(\chi(\hat{v}_i,\hat{v}_{-i})\right) - p_i(\hat{v}_i,\hat{v}_{-i})\right).$$

## Proof S

#### 5. So *i* should report arg n

6. But Groves will choose arg m  $\chi(\hat{v}_i)$ 

7. So *i* should report  $\hat{v}_i = v_i$ .

Dominant strategies, because this argument is for arbitrary  $\hat{v}_{-i}$ .

Sketch #2  

$$\max_{\hat{v}_{i}} \left( v_{i} \left( \chi(\hat{v}_{i}, \hat{v}_{-i}) \right) + \sum_{j \neq i} \hat{v}_{j} \left( \chi(\hat{v}_{i}, \hat{v}_{-i}) \right) \right)$$

$$\max_{i, \hat{v}_{-i}} \left( \hat{v}_{i} \left( \chi(\hat{v}_{i}, \hat{v}_{-i}) \right) + \sum_{j \neq i} \hat{v}_{j} \left( \chi(\hat{v}_{i}, \hat{v}_{-i}) \right) \right)$$

### Vickrey-Clarke-Groves Mechanism

#### **Definition:**

The Vickery-Clarke-Groves mechanism is a direct quasilinear mechanism  $(\chi, p)$ , where

$$\chi(\hat{v}) = \arg \max_{x} \sum_{i} \hat{v}_{i}(x)$$

$$p_{i}(\hat{v}) = \sum_{j \neq i} \hat{v}_{j}(\chi(\hat{v}_{-i})) - \sum_{j \neq i} \hat{v}_{j}(\chi(\hat{v}))$$
namism with  $h_{i}(\hat{v}_{-i}) = \sum_{j \neq i} \hat{v}_{j}(\chi(\hat{v}_{-i})).$ 

- i.e., it's a Groves mech
- there and the other agents' utility given that *i* is there.
- **Question:** Why don't we use this for **everything**?

• Each agent pays their externality: difference between other agents' utility if *i* weren't

### Second Price Auctions Are VCG

The second price auction is VC setting:

- Agents are not permitted unrestricted preferences over the outcome space of allocations and payments
- Object is awarded to agent with highest valuation; this maximizes the sum of (non-monetary) agent valuations for the outcome
- Externality of winning agent is the value that next-highest-valuation agent could have gotten by winning the auction
- Externality of **losing agent** is nothing; if they weren't there, the outcome would be no different

The second price auction is VCG in the quasilinear single-item auction

## Externalities: Example

- 1. Who wins the second-price auction? i.e.,  $\chi(\hat{v})$
- 2. Who would win if Alice weren't in the auction? i.e.,  $\chi(\hat{v}_{-Alice})$
- 3. How much does Alice pay?
- 4. What is the VCG payment?



 $v_{Alice}$ (Alice gets object) = 10  $v_{Bob}$ (Bob gets object) = 6  $v_{Carol}$ (Carol gets object) = 3  $v_{Dave}$ (Dave gets object) = 1



# Mechanism Properties

#### **Definition:**

equilibrium strategy is to adopt the strategy  $\hat{v}_i = v_i$ .

#### **Definition:**

equilibrium it selects a choice x such that



- A quasilinear mechanism is **truthful** if it is direct and  $\forall i \in N, \forall v_i$ , agent *i*'s
- A quasilinear mechanism is **Pareto efficient**, or just **efficient**, if for all v in

$$(x) \ge \sum_{i} v_i(x').$$

# Budget Balance

#### **Definition:** A quasilinear mechanism is weakly budget balanced when

where  $s^*$  is the equilibrium strategy profile.

 $\forall v, \sum_{i} p_i(s^*(v)) \ge 0,$ 

#### **Definition:**

A quasilinear mechanism is *ex-interim* individually rational when

$$\forall i \forall v_i, \mathbb{E}_{v_{-i}|v_i} \left[ v_i(\chi(s_i(v_i), s_{-i}(v_{-i}))) - p_i(s_i(v_i), s_{-i}(v_{-i})) \right] \ge 0.$$

# Individual Rationality

### All Efficient Dominant Strategy Mechanisms are Groves Mechanisms

**Theorem:** (Green-Laffont)

$$p_i(\hat{v}) = h_i(\hat{v}_{-i}) - \sum_{j \neq i} \hat{v}_j(\chi(\hat{v})).$$

An efficient social choice function  $C : \mathbb{R}^{X \times N} \to X \times \mathbb{R}^N$  can be implemented in dominant strategies for agents with unrestricted quasilinear utilities only if

# One Last Impossibility Result

**Theorem:** (Myerson-Satterthwaite) agents are restricted to quasilinear utility functions.

- It does turn out to be possible to get any two of the three
- **Question:** Wait a minute, doesn't the second-price auction satisfy all  $\bullet$ three conditions?
- No Bayes-Nash incentive-compatible mechanism is always simultaneously efficient, weakly budget-balanced, and ex-interim individually rational, even if

# Summary

- functions *can* be implemented in **dominant strategies**
- **Groves mechanisms** are the unique class of mechanisms that implement  $\bullet$ efficient social choice functions in dominant strategies
  - **VCG** is the pre-eminent Groves mechanism
  - Second-price auctions turn out to be VCG in the single-item auction setting
- You can only have two of efficiency, weak budget balance, and ex*interim* individual rationality, even in the quasilinear setting

### • When agents are restricted to quasilinear preferences, social choice