



## **Optimal Auctions**

#### Game Theory Course: Jackson, Leyton-Brown & Shoham

Game Theory Course: Jackson, Leyton-Brown & Shoham



- So far we have considered efficient auctions.
- What about maximizing the seller's revenue?
  - she may be willing to risk failing to sell the good.
  - she may be willing sometimes to sell to a buyer who didn't make the highest bid

# Optimal auctions in an independent private values setting

- private valuations
- risk-neutral bidders
- each bidder *i*'s valuation independently drawn from a strictly increasing cumulative density function  $F_i(v)$  with a pdf  $f_i(v)$  that is continuous and bounded below
  - Allow  $F_i \neq F_j$ : asymmetric auctions
- the risk neutral seller knows each  $F_i$  and has no value for the object.

# Optimal auctions in an independent private values setting

- private valuations
- risk-neutral bidders
- each bidder *i*'s valuation independently drawn from a strictly increasing cumulative density function  $F_i(v)$  with a pdf  $f_i(v)$  that is continuous and bounded below
  - Allow  $F_i \neq F_j$ : asymmetric auctions
- the risk neutral seller knows each  $F_i$  and has no value for the object.

The auction that maximizes the seller's expected revenue subject to (ex post, interim) individual rationality and Bayesian incentive compatibility for the buyers is an optimal auction.



- 2 bidders, v<sub>i</sub> uniformly distributed on [0,1]
- Set reserve price R and and then run a second price auction:



- 2 bidders,  $v_i$  uniformly distributed on [0,1]
- Set reserve price R and and then run a second price auction:
  - no sale if both bids below R



- 2 bidders,  $v_i$  uniformly distributed on [0,1]
- Set reserve price R and and then run a second price auction:
  - no sale if both bids below R
  - sale at price R if one bid above reserve and other below



- 2 bidders,  $v_i$  uniformly distributed on [0,1]
- Set reserve price R and and then run a second price auction:
  - no sale if both bids below R
  - sale at price R if one bid above reserve and other below
  - sale at second highest bid if both bids above reserve



- 2 bidders,  $v_i$  uniformly distributed on [0,1]
- Set reserve price R and and then run a second price auction:
  - no sale if both bids below R
  - sale at price R if one bid above reserve and other below
  - sale at second highest bid if both bids above reserve
- Which reserve price R maximizes expected revenue?



• still dominant strategy to bid true value, so:



- still dominant strategy to bid true value, so:
  - no sale if both bids below R happens with probability  $R^2$  and revenue=0
  - sale at price R if one bid above reserve and other below happens with probability 2(1-R)R and revenue =R
  - sale at second highest bid if both bids above reserve happens with probability  $(1 - R)^2$  and revenue  $= E[\min v_i | \min v_i > R] = \frac{1+2R}{2}$



- still dominant strategy to bid true value, so:
  - no sale if both bids below R happens with probability  $R^2$  and revenue=0
  - sale at price R if one bid above reserve and other below happens with probability 2(1-R)R and revenue =R
  - sale at second highest bid if both bids above reserve happens with probability  $(1 - R)^2$  and revenue  $= E[\min v_i | \min v_i \ge R] = \frac{1+2R}{3}$
- Expected revenue =  $2(1-R)R^2 + (1-R)^2 \frac{1+2R}{3}$



- still dominant strategy to bid true value, so:
  - no sale if both bids below R happens with probability  $R^2$  and revenue=0
  - sale at price R if one bid above reserve and other below happens with probability 2(1-R)R and revenue =R
  - sale at second highest bid if both bids above reserve happens with probability  $(1-R)^2$  and revenue  $= E[\min v_i | \min v_i \ge R] = \frac{1+2R}{3}$
- Expected revenue  $= 2(1-R)R^2 + (1-R)^2 \frac{1+2R}{3}$
- Expected revenue =  $\frac{1+3R^2-4R^3}{3}$



- still dominant strategy to bid true value, so:
  - no sale if both bids below R happens with probability  $R^2$  and revenue=0
  - sale at price R if one bid above reserve and other below happens with probability 2(1-R)R and revenue =R
  - sale at second highest bid if both bids above reserve happens with probability  $(1-R)^2$  and revenue  $= E[\min v_i | \min v_i \ge R] = \frac{1+2R}{3}$
- Expected revenue  $= 2(1-R)R^2 + (1-R)^2 \frac{1+2R}{3}$
- Expected revenue =  $\frac{1+3R^2-4R^3}{3}$

• Maximizing: 
$$0 = 2R - 4R^2$$
, or  $R = \frac{1}{2}$ .





 Reserve price of 1/2: revenue = 5/12, Reserve price of 0: revenue = 1/3.



- Reserve price of 1/2: revenue = 5/12, Reserve price of 0: revenue = 1/3.
- Tradeoffs:
  - lose sales when both bids were below 1/2 but low revenue then in any case and probability 1/4 of happening.
  - increase price when one bidder has low value other high: happens with probability 1/2



- Reserve price of 1/2: revenue = 5/12, Reserve price of 0: revenue = 1/3.
- Tradeoffs:
  - lose sales when both bids were below 1/2 but low revenue then in any case and probability 1/4 of happening.
  - increase price when one bidder has low value other high: happens with probability 1/2
- Like adding another bidder: increasing competition in the auction.

## Designing optimal auctions



Definition (virtual valuation)

Bidder *i*'s virtual valuation is  $\psi_i(v_i) = v_i - \frac{1 - F_i(v_i)}{f_i(v_i)}$ .

Let us assume this is increasing in  $v_i$  (e.g., for a uniform distribution it is  $2v_i - 1$ ).

## Designing optimal auctions

Bayesian Normal-form and the common series and the seri

Definition (virtual valuation)

Bidder *i*'s virtual valuation is  $\psi_i(v_i) = v_i - \frac{1 - F_i(v_i)}{f_i(v_i)}$ 

Let us assume this is increasing in  $v_i$  (e.g., for a uniform distribution it is  $2v_i - 1$ ).

Definition (bidder-specific reserve price) Bidder *i*'s bidder-specific reserve price  $r_i^*$  is the value for which  $\psi_i(r_i^*) = 0$ .

## Myerson's Optimal Auctions



#### Theorem (Myerson (1981))

The optimal (single-good) auction in terms of a direct mechanism: The good is sold to the agent  $i = \arg \max_i \psi_i(\hat{v}_i)$ , as long as  $v_i \ge r_i^*$ . If the good is sold, the winning agent i is charged the smallest valuation that he could have declared while still remaining the winner:  $\inf\{v_i^* : \psi_i(v_i^*) \ge 0 \text{ and } \forall j \ne i, \ \psi_i(v_i^*) \ge \psi_j(\hat{v}_j)\}.$ 

## Myerson's Optimal Auctions



#### Corollary (Myerson (1981))

In a symmetric setting, the optimal (single-good) auction is a second price auction with a reserve price of  $r^*$  that solves  $r^* - \frac{1-F(r^*)}{f(r^*)} = 0$ .

- winning agent:  $i = \arg \max_i \psi_i(\hat{v}_i)$ , as long as  $v_i \ge r_i^*$ .
- *i* is charged the smallest valuation that he could have declared while still remaining the winner,  $\inf\{v_i^*: \psi_i(v_i^*) \ge 0 \text{ and } \forall j \ne i, \ \psi_i(v_i^*) \ge \psi_j(\hat{v}_j)\}.$
- Is this VCG?



- winning agent:  $i = \arg \max_i \psi_i(\hat{v}_i)$ , as long as  $v_i \ge r_i^*$ .
- *i* is charged the smallest valuation that he could have declared while still remaining the winner,  $\inf\{v_i^*: \psi_i(v_i^*) \ge 0 \text{ and } \forall j \ne i, \ \psi_i(v_i^*) \ge \psi_j(\hat{v}_j)\}.$
- Is this VCG?
  - No, it's not efficient.



- winning agent:  $i = \arg \max_i \psi_i(\hat{v}_i)$ , as long as  $v_i \ge r_i^*$ .
- *i* is charged the smallest valuation that he could have declared while still remaining the winner,  $\inf\{v_i^*: \psi_i(v_i^*) \ge 0 \text{ and } \forall j \ne i, \ \psi_i(v_i^*) \ge \psi_j(\hat{v}_j)\}.$
- Is this VCG?
  - No, it's not efficient.
- How should bidders bid?



- winning agent:  $i = \arg \max_i \psi_i(\hat{v}_i)$ , as long as  $v_i \ge r_i^*$ .
- *i* is charged the smallest valuation that he could have declared while still remaining the winner,  $\inf\{v_i^*: \psi_i(v_i^*) \ge 0 \text{ and } \forall j \ne i, \ \psi_i(v_i^*) \ge \psi_j(\hat{v}_j)\}.$
- Is this VCG?
  - No, it's not efficient.
- How should bidders bid?
  - it's a second-price auction with a reserve price, held in virtual valuation space.
  - neither the reserve prices nor the virtual valuation transformation depends on the agent's declaration
  - thus the proof that a second-price auction is dominant-strategy truthful applies here as well.



- winning agent:  $i = \arg \max_i \psi_i(\hat{v}_i)$ , as long as  $v_i > r_i^*$ .
- *i* is charged the smallest valuation that he could have declared while still remaining the winner,  $\inf\{v_i^*: \psi_i(v_i^*) \ge 0 \text{ and } \forall j \ne i, \ \psi_i(v_i^*) \ge \psi_j(\hat{v}_j)\}.$
- Why does this work?



- winning agent:  $i = \arg \max_i \psi_i(\hat{v}_i)$ , as long as  $v_i > r_i^*$ .
- *i* is charged the smallest valuation that he could have declared while still remaining the winner,  $\inf\{v_i^*: \psi_i(v_i^*) \ge 0 \text{ and } \forall j \ne i, \ \psi_i(v_i^*) \ge \psi_j(\hat{v}_j)\}.$
- Why does this work?
  - reserve prices are like competitors: increase the payments of winning bidders
  - the virtual valuations can increase the impact of weak bidders' bids, making them more competitive.
  - bidders with higher expected valuations bid more aggressively

![](_page_26_Picture_8.jpeg)