

Monotonic solutions to the experts aggregation problem

Ruben Juarez

University of Hawaii

Paper available at: <http://www2.hawaii.edu/~rubenj>

June 2009

The problem

- ▶ An amount of money needs to be divided among a group of tasks.
- ▶ Experts (judges) recommend independent divisions of the money.
- ▶ An aggregator takes into account these recommendations and provides an exact division.

- ▶ Traditional social choice impossibility results starting with Arrow[1951, 1963].
- ▶ Large literature on probability aggregation: Bates[1969], Genes[1980], McConway[1981], Bordley and Wolf[1981], Dickson[1972], Morris[1977, 1974]...
- ▶ Recent literature on pooling of expert opinions: List and Pettit[2002], Dokow and Holzman[2005], Nehring and Puppe[2005]...Mostly discrete.
- ▶ **Precursors of abstract aggregation:** Wilson[1975], Fishburn and Rubinstein[1985].
- ▶ Dividing a dollar impartially: De Clippel, Moulin and Tideman[2007]
- ▶ Mathematically equivalent to non-manipulable division rules in claim problems: Ju, Miyagawa and Sakai[2007]

Two traditional requirements:

- ▶ **Unanimity:** If all experts agree on the value of a task, that task should be allocated that value.
- ▶ **Monotonicity:** Aggregator is monotonic on expert's reports for that task (independent on the other tasks!).
In spirit similar to Arrow's IIA: The value on the task should only depend on the suggested allocations for that task.

Model 1: Judges are experts on all tasks

Let $K = \{1, \dots, k\}$ the set of tasks that need money.

Let $N = \{1, \dots, n\}$ the set of experts.

Let M the amount of money to divide.

Let $\Delta_M = \{x \in \mathbb{R}_+^K \mid \sum_{i \in K} x_i = M\}$

Definition

An aggregator is a function

$$\varphi : (\Delta_M)^N \rightarrow \Delta_M$$

- ▶ **Unanimity:** For any reports $x^1, \dots, x^n \in \Delta_M$, if $x_k^i = x_k^j = \bar{x}_k$ for all $i, j \in N$, then

$$\varphi_k(x^1, \dots, x^n) = \bar{x}_k$$

- ▶ **Monotonicity:** For two different reports of agent i , x^i and \tilde{x}^i , and reports of the other agents $x^{-i} = (x^1, \dots, x^{i-1}, x^{i+1}, \dots, x^n)$. If $x_k^i \geq \tilde{x}_k^i$ for some task k , then:

$$\varphi_k(x^i, x^{-i}) \geq \varphi_k(\tilde{x}^i, x^{-i}).$$

Theorem 1. Assume $|K| \geq 3$. An aggregator meets monotonicity if and only if there exist: constants $A \in \Delta_M$, $\lambda \in [0, 1]$, and weights $\pi^1, \dots, \pi^n \geq 0$ such that $\sum_i \pi^i = 1$ and:

$$\varphi(x^1, \dots, x^n) = \lambda \left(\sum_i \pi^i x^i \right) + (1 - \lambda)A.$$

Corollary 1. Assume $|K| \geq 3$. An aggregator meets unanimity and monotonicity if and only if there exist weights $\pi^1, \dots, \pi^n \geq 0$ and $\sum_i \pi^i = 1$ such that:

$$\varphi(x^1, \dots, x^n) = \sum_i \pi^i x^i.$$

Sketch of the proof

Consider $x^1, \dots, x^n \in \Delta_M$.

By monotonicity:

$$\varphi(x^1, \dots, x^n) = (f^1(x_1^1, \dots, x_1^n), \dots, f^k(x_k^1, \dots, x_k^n)).$$

Therefore:

$$f^1(x_1^1, \dots, x_1^n) + \dots + f^{k-1}(x_{k-1}^1, \dots, x_{k-1}^n)$$

is constant and additive.

By unanimity $f^1(0, \dots, 0) = 0$. Thus $f^1 = f^2 = \dots = f^{k-1}$.

Finally, any bounded and additive function has to be linear.

Aggregators for $K = 2$ meeting Un and Mon

Let $f : [0, 1]^N \rightarrow [0, 1]$ increasing such that $f(x, \dots, x) = x$.

$$\varphi(x^1, \dots, x^n) = (f(x_1^1, \dots, x_1^n), 1 - f(x_1^1, \dots, x_1^n)).$$

Independence of the conditions.

- ▶ **Aggregator without unanimity:**

- ▶ $\tilde{\varphi}(x^1, \dots, x^n) = a$ for some fixed a .

- ▶ **Aggregators without monotonicity.**

Allocate unanonymous reports. Then divide the rest of the money proportionally (e.g. to maximal report).

Model 2: Aggregators with specialized experts

Expert i only informed about $S^i \subset K$.

$\cup_{i \in N} S^i = K$.

Let $\bar{\Delta}_M^{S^i} = \{x \in \mathbb{R}_+^{S^i} \mid \sum_{j \in S^i} x_j \leq M\}$ the space of reports of expert i .

Definition

An aggregator is a function

$$\varphi : \prod_{i \in N} \bar{\Delta}_M^{S^i} \rightarrow \Delta_M$$

Catch: I should allocate the full amount of money M even if it is not needed!

- ▶ **Strong Monotonicity:** Fix reports x^{-i} and consider two reports of agent i , x^i and \tilde{x}^i , such that $x_S^i \geq \tilde{x}_S^i$ for some subset $S \subset S^i$, then:

$$\varphi_S(x^i, x^{-i}) \geq \varphi_S(\tilde{x}^i, x^{-i}).$$

- ▶ Rules out priority solutions.
- ▶ When the experts do not have a common intersection, there is no compelling definition of unanimity!

Quasi-linear aggregators

For any agent i , an extension is a function

$$f^i : \bar{\Delta}_M^{S^i} \rightarrow \bar{\Delta}_M^{K \setminus S^i}$$

such that $\sum_{j \in S^i} x_j + \sum_{l \in K \setminus S^i} f_l^i(x) = M$.

Definition

Given an arbitrary set of weights $\pi^1, \dots, \pi^n \geq 0$ such that $\sum_i \pi^i = 1$, constants $A \in \Delta_M$, $\lambda \in [0, 1]$ and arbitrary extensions as above f^1, \dots, f^n , a quasi-linear aggregator is such that:

$$\varphi(x^1, \dots, x^n) = \lambda \left(\sum_{i \in N} \pi^i (x^i, f^i(x^i)) \right) + (1 - \lambda)A.$$

Examples

- ▶ Same distortion for uninformed tasks:

$$f^i(x) = \left(\frac{M - \sum_i x_i}{k - s^i} \right)_{k \in N \setminus S^i}$$

- ▶ Priority to remaining tasks:

$$f_j^i(x) = M - \sum_i x_i$$

where j has highest priority on $N \setminus S^i$ with some arbitrarily order σ^i .

Examples (cont'd)

Quasi-linear aggregators are very inefficient:

Let $N = \{1, 2, 3\}$ and consider $S^1 = 1$ and $S^2 = N$.

Let $\pi^1 = 1$, $\pi^2 = 0$, $f_1(0) = (M, 0)$.

Let $u_1 = (0)$, $u_2 = (0, 0, M)$,

then $\varphi(u_1, u_2) = (0, M, 0)$.

Theorem 2. Assume $|K| \geq 3$ and all experts are *connected*. An aggregator meets strong-monotonicity if and only if it is a quasi-linear aggregator.

Efficiency:

If $\sum_{k \in K} \max(x_k^i)_{\{i | k \in S^i\}} < M$ then
 $\varphi_k(x^1, \dots, x^n) \geq \max(x_k^i)_{\{i | k \in S^i\}}$ for each k .

Corollary 2.

If $|S^i| \leq K - 2$ for all i . Then there is no aggregator that meets strong-monotonicity and efficiency.

Sketch of the Proof:

By theorem 2, for every i there is a weight π^i and extension f^i such that

$$\varphi(x^1, \dots, x^n) = \sum_{i \in N} \pi^i(x^i, f^i(x^i)).$$

Consider i such that $\pi^i > 0$. Let $x^i = \vec{0}$ and set $y^i = f^i(x^i)$. Since $|S^i| \leq N - 2$ then $y_k^i < M$ for some $k \notin S^i$.

Let j such that $k \in S^j$. Consider $x^j = (M - \epsilon, \vec{0}_{-k})$.

Let $x^l = \vec{0}$ for $l \neq k$.

Then

$$\varphi_k(x^i, x^j, x^{-i,j}) = \pi^i y_k^i + \sum_{\{l | k \notin S^l, l \neq i, j\}} \pi^l f_k^l(\vec{0}) + \pi^j (M - \epsilon) < M - \epsilon$$

for ϵ close to zero.

Aggregator without independence

Follow priority of goods and agents.

Serve S^1 , $(S^1 \cup S^2) \setminus (S^1)$, $(S^1 \cup S^2 \cup S^3) \setminus (S^1 \cup S^2)$, etc...

Aggregators when experts are not connected

$|S^i| = 1$ for all $i \in N$, then too many SM aggregators!

Partition N in the indifference classes of K .

Let P_k the agents in N that reports on task k .

Let $\varphi : [0, M]^N \rightarrow \delta_M^K$ such that $\varphi_k(x)$ is increasing in coordinates P^k .

Open problems:

- ▶ Appealing definition of Unanimity.
- ▶ How inefficient are quasi-linear aggregators? Can we find the optimal mechanism?