# CS395T Agent-Based Electronic Commerce Fall 2006

**Peter Stone** 

Department or Computer Sciences The University of Texas at Austin

Week 2b

## **Logistics**

• Any registration problems?



# Logistics

- Any registration problems?
- Any questions?



- Winner's curse
  - 2 reasons for shading bids



- Winner's curse
  - -2 reasons for shading bids
- Marginal revenue view



- Winner's curse
  - 2 reasons for shading bids
- Marginal revenue view
- Dominant strategy equilibrium vs. Nash equilibrium
  - Nash always exists!



- Winner's curse
  - 2 reasons for shading bids
- Marginal revenue view
- Dominant strategy equilibrium vs. Nash equilibrium
  - Nash always exists!
- Surplus: auction's vs. bidder's



- Winner's curse
  - 2 reasons for shading bids
- Marginal revenue view
- Dominant strategy equilibrium vs. Nash equilibrium
  - Nash always exists!
- Surplus: auction's vs. bidder's
- Efficiency: should the auctioneer care?



- Winner's curse
  - 2 reasons for shading bids
- Marginal revenue view
- Dominant strategy equilibrium vs. Nash equilibrium
  - Nash always exists!
- Surplus: auction's vs. bidder's
- Efficiency: should the auctioneer care?
- Entry costs



• Linkage principle, higher prices in English with affiliation



- Linkage principle, higher prices in English with affiliation
- Revelation principle



- Linkage principle, higher prices in English with affiliation
- Revelation principle
- Collusion: bidding rings



- Linkage principle, higher prices in English with affiliation
- Revelation principle
- Collusion: bidding rings
  - Sidepayments



- Linkage principle, higher prices in English with affiliation
- Revelation principle
- Collusion: bidding rings
  - Sidepayments
- Multiunit auctions
  - Simultaneous vs. sequential auctions



- Linkage principle, higher prices in English with affiliation
- Revelation principle
- Collusion: bidding rings
  - Sidepayments
- Multiunit auctions
  - Simultaneous vs. sequential auctions
- Budget constraints
- Jump bids



### Problem (from Klemperer on-line)

An auctioneer of a single object faces n risk-neutral bidders with private valuations for the object that are independently drawn from a uniform distribution  $[0, \overline{v}]$ .



An auctioneer of a single object faces n risk-neutral bidders with private valuations for the object that are independently drawn from a uniform distribution  $[0, \overline{v}]$ .

Consider an "all pay" first-price auction (sealed-bid auction in which high bidder wins, but every bidder pays her bid). What should a bidder with value v bid?



An auctioneer of a single object faces n risk-neutral bidders with private valuations for the object that are independently drawn from a uniform distribution  $[0, \overline{v}]$ .

Consider an "all pay" first-price auction (sealed-bid auction in which high bidder wins, but every bidder pays her bid). What should a bidder with value v bid?

Hint: Expected kth highest of n random draws from a uniform distribution [0,1] is  $\frac{n+1-k}{n+1}$ .



• In a 2nd-price auction,  $v_i$  expects to pay 2nd highest value =  $\frac{n-1}{n} * v_i$  if she wins.



- In a 2nd-price auction,  $v_i$  expects to pay 2nd highest value =  $\frac{n-1}{n} * v_i$  if she wins.
- $v_i$  wins with probability  $(\frac{v_i}{\overline{v}})^{n-1}$  (probability that all the other values are lower)



- In a 2nd-price auction,  $v_i$  expects to pay 2nd highest value =  $\frac{n-1}{n} * v_i$  if she wins.
- $v_i$  wins with probability  $(\frac{v_i}{\overline{v}})^{n-1}$  (probability that all the other values are lower)
- So expected payment in 2nd price auction is  $\left(\frac{n-1}{n}\right)\left(\frac{v_i^n}{v_i^{n-1}}\right)$



- In a 2nd-price auction,  $v_i$  expects to pay 2nd highest value =  $\frac{n-1}{n} * v_i$  if she wins.
- $v_i$  wins with probability  $(\frac{v_i}{\overline{v}})^{n-1}$  (probability that all the other values are lower)
- So expected payment in 2nd price auction is  $(\frac{n-1}{n})(\frac{v_i^n}{v^{n-1}})$
- In an all pay auction, win in exactly same cases, but always pay, so make the same expected payment that's the bid.



# Auction Efficiency - game theory view

In the asymmetric case, first-bid auctions aren't necessarily efficient in equilibrium.

- Bidder 1 has value of \$101
- Bidder 2 has value of \$50 4/5 of time, \$75 1/5 of time
- Bidder 1 bids \$51 gives \$50 profit 4/5 of the time, so expected profit of \$40
- Bidder 1 bids more than \$62 gives less profit even if he wins
- So if bidder 2 has value of \$75, she can win by bidding \$62.
- That's an inefficient outcome

