

99% Revenue via Enhanced Competition

Michal Feldman (2,3), Ophir Friedler (2), Aviad Rubinfeld (1)

(1) Harvard University, (2) Tel-Aviv University, (3) Microsoft Research

MOTIVATION

Single item, n buyers:

$v_i \sim F_i$ Myerson's mechanism (81) is optimal.
For one buyer: price at $\max_p p \cdot \Pr[v \geq p]$

Many additive items: Hard even for one buyer.

$v(\text{🌍}) \sim F_{\text{🌍}}, v(\text{💻}) \sim F_{\text{💻}}$
 $v(\text{🌍, 💻}) = v(\text{🌍}) + v(\text{💻})$

Optimal Mechanisms: Require randomization, Revenue Non-monotonicity, Infinite menu size, Hard to find [HR 15, HN 13, DDT 14]

Research Agenda 1: Approximation

How much revenue can simple mechanisms **guarantee**, compared to the (impractical, unachievable) optimal revenue?

Simple Mechanisms:

1. Rev – Optimal (impractical, unachievable) revenue.
2. $SRev$ – Optimal revenue from selling each item separately.
3. $BRev$ – Optimal revenue from selling the grand bundle.
4. $VCGE$ – VCG with entry fees.

Previous Results [HN12, CH13, LY13, BILW14, CDW16]:

One Buyer	Many Buyers
$Rev \leq O(\log \#items) \cdot SRev$	$Rev \leq O(1) \cdot \max\{BRev, VCGE\}$
$Rev \leq O(1) \cdot \max\{BRev, SRev\}$	$Rev \leq 0.99 \cdot SRev$ *IID, MHR

Research Agenda 2: Enhanced Competition

How much more **competition** is required, for simple mechanisms to **exceed** the (impractical, unachievable) optimal revenue?

Previous Results:

- n I.I.D. buyers, m items, regular distributions.
- $VCG(x)$ – revenue from VCG with x buyers.

[BK96]: $m=1$:	$Rev(n) \leq VCG(n+1)$
[RTY 12]: unit-demand buyers:	$DET-Rev(n) \leq VCG(n+m)$
[EFFTW17]: additive buyers	$Rev(n) \leq VCG(O(n+m))$

This work: Combine agendas

How much more **competition** is required, for simple mechanisms to **almost exceed** the (impractical, unachievable) optimal revenue?

MAIN MESSAGE

99% Rev requires much less competition!

MODEL

- m item distributions: F_1, \dots, F_m
- n buyers at first, buyer j's value for item i: $v_i^j \sim F_i$
- Values drawn independently, and $v^j(S) = \sum_{i \in S} v_i^j$
- Truthfulness: Seller selects a Bayesian Individually Rational and Incentive Compatible mechanism M.
- M = (allocation function, payment function)
- Objective: Maximize expected total payment
- $Rev(n)$ = Optimal revenue from n i.i.d. buyers.

UPPER BOUNDS

$$99\% Rev(n) \leq SRev \left(O \left(n \cdot \log \frac{m}{n} \right) \right)$$

If $n \gg m$:

$$99\% Rev(n) \leq SRev(n)$$

If $n = 1$:

$$99\% Rev(1) \leq \max\{BRev, SRev\}(O(1))$$

If distributions are **regular**:

$$99\% Rev(1) \leq BVCG(O(1))$$

BVCG = second price for the grand bundle.

LOWER BOUNDS

If $m \gg 1$ and $\frac{m}{n} > CONST$, there are instances where

$$SRev \left(O \left(n \cdot \log \frac{m}{n} \right) \right) \ll Rev(n)$$

COMPARISON TO PREVIOUS WORK

Upper bounds:

When $m \gg n$:

- [EFFTW17] showed for **regular distributions**: $Rev(n) \leq VCG(n+m)$, we improve $O(m)$ to $O \left(n \cdot \log \frac{m}{n} \right)$, at a loss of 1% revenue.

When $n \gg m$:

- [CH13] showed $99\% Rev(n) \leq SRev(n)$ for n larger than some constant, for **MHR distributions**, our result is an analogue for **general distributions**.
- [EFFTW17] showed $50\% Rev(n) \leq VCG(n)$ for **regular distributions**, we improve to 99%.

When $n = 1$:

- [GK16] shows Random(sell separately, sell bundle) using a single sample guarantees a constant fraction of Rev . Our result implies: "sell bundle for the price of a single sample" suffices.

Lower bounds:

Generalizes a result for $n = 1$ ([EFFTW17]).

References

- [BILW14] M. Babaiof, N. Immorlica, B. Lucier, and S. M. Weinberg. A Simple and Approximately Optimal Mechanism for an Additive Buyer. FOCS 2014.
- [BK96] J. Bulow and P. Klemperer. Auctions versus Negotiations. American Economic Review 1996.
- [CDW16] Y. Cai, N. R. Devanur, and S. M. Weinberg. A Duality Based Unified Approach to Bayesian Mechanism Design. STOC 2016.
- [DDT14] C. Daskalakis, A. Deckelbaum, and C. Tzamos. The Complexity of optimal Mechanism Design. SODA14.
- [HN12] S. Hart and N. Nisan. Approximate Revenue Maximization with Multiple Items. EC 2012.
- [HN13] S. Hart and N. Nisan. The Menu-Size Complexity of Auctions. EC 2013.
- [HR15] S. Hart and P. J. Reny. Maximal Revenue with Multiple Goods: Nonmonotonicity and Other Observations. In Theoretical Economics 2015.
- [GK16] Kira Goldner and Anna Karlin. A Prior-Independent Revenue-Maximizing Auction for Multiple Additive Bidders. WINE16
- [EFFTW17] Alon Eden, Michal Feldman, Ophir Friedler, Inbal Talgam-Cohen, and S. Matthew Weinberg. The competition complexity of auctions: A bulow-klemperer result for multi-dimensional bidders. EC17

*The work was partially supported by the ERC under the EU's Seventh Framework Programme (FP7/2007-2013) / ERC grant agreement number 337122, and the Rabin Postdoctoral Fellowship