

KING SOLOMON'S DILEMMA: A SIMPLE SOLUTION

H. Reiju Mihara

<http://www5.atwiki.jp/reiju/>

KING SOLOMON'S DILEMMA

- Problem
- Solution
- Comparison

PROBLEM



Giuseppe Cades: Judgement of Solomon; altered

THE JUDGMENT OF SOLOMON

MODEL

- n agents, $1, \dots, n$
- k indivisible objects, where $k < n$
- At Stage 0, God announces (v, H) ,
 - $v = (v_1, \dots, v_n)$; v_i is agent i 's valuation
 - $i \in H$ if v_i is among the top k valuations
- The problem is to allocate the k objects to the agents in H .

INFORMATIONAL ASSUMPTION

- The planner (King) does not observe (v, H) .
- The planner and the agents know:
if $i \in H$ and $j \notin H$, then $v_i - v_j > \delta > 0$.
- [Incomplete Info] Each agent i observes:
 - v_i , own valuation,
 - whether $i \in H$ or not.

SOLUTION

A FIRST ATTEMPT

- An auction?
 - For example, the $(k+1)$ st-price auction, e.g., 2nd-price auction:
 - If i is among the k highest bidders, i gets the object but pays the $(k+1)$ st bid.
 - Always best for i to bid $b_i = v_i$, true valuation. Why?
 - No-good---The goal is to give the object without taking away or giving money.

A FIRST ATTEMPT

- An auction?

- Second-price auction

- For example, the $(k+1)$ st-price auction, e.g., 2nd-price auction.

Suppose your valuation of a good is \$100.

Let b_j be the highest bid other than yours.

If $b_j > 100$, say 109, . . .

If $b_j < 100$, say 96, . . .

without taking away or giving money.

“SIMPLE” MECHANISMS

- But the $(k+1)$ st-price auction is useful for constructing a mechanism that solves the problem.
- E.g., Olszewski’s mechanism (2003) uses a 2nd-price auction, modified by adding an extra payment from the planner:
 - If $b_1 > b_2$, then
$$u_1 = v_1 - b_2 + (b_2 - \delta) = v_1 - \delta$$
$$u_2 = 0 + (b_1 - \delta) = b_1 - \delta$$
 - A bit strange? More later.

NOW,
3000 YEARS AFTER
SOLOMON . . .

MIHARA'S MECHANISM

- Stage 1
 - Each agent either claims the object or not.
 - If at most k agents claim, they get the object.
 - Otherwise, go to Stage 2.
- Stage 2
 - The $(k+1)$ st-price auction with entry fees δ

That's it!

HOW IT WILL WORK

- Each agent i bids $b_i = v_i$ in Stage 2.
- $i \in H$ claims the object since she enjoys a surplus of
 - $v_i > 0$ (if an auction not held) or
 - $v_i - b(k+1) - \delta > 0$ (if held),
where $b(k+1)$ is the $(k+1)$ st highest bid (by someone not in H).
- $j \notin H$ does not claim it since she has to pay δ if she claims it.

COMPARISON

OLSZEWSKI'S MECHANISM

- Each i bids $b_i = v_i$ in Stage 2.
- Given that, Stage 1 payoffs (assuming $b_1 > b_2$) are:

	hers	mine
hers	$v_1 - \delta, b_1 - \delta$	$0, v_2$
mine	$v_1, 0$	$0, 0$

BRIBE FROM 2 TO 1

	hers	mine
hers	$v_1 - \delta + t, b_1 - \delta - t$	$0, v_2$
mine	$v_1, 0$	$0, 0$

- Suppose $v_1 = 100$, $v_2 = 50$, $\delta = 20$.
Equilibrium payoffs are $(100, 0)$.
- 2 bids $b_2 = 0$ and gives $t = \$1000$ to 1.
In return, 1 bids $b_1 = 2,000$.
The payoffs are $(1080, 980)$!

- A pair of agents can gain in Olszewski's mechanism by bribing each other.
- No pair of agents can gain in this way in Mihara's mechanism.

REFERENCES

- H. R. Mihara, The second-price auction solves King Solomon's dilemma.
Available from
<http://econpapers.repec.org/RAS/pmi193.htm>
- H. Reiju Mihara's website
<http://www5.atwiki.jp/reiju/>