
DESIGNING AUCTIONS WHEN ALGORITHMS LEARN TO BID: THE CRITICAL ROLE OF PAYMENT RULES

Pranjal Rawat

PhD Student in Economics
Georgetown University
Washington DC, USA
pp712@georgetown.edu

ABSTRACT

This paper examines the impact of different payment rules on efficiency when algorithms learn to bid. We use a fully randomized experiment of 427 trials, where Q-learning bidders participate in up to 250,000 auctions for a commonly valued item. The findings reveal that the first price auction, where winners pay the winning bid, is susceptible to coordinated bid suppression, with winning bids averaging roughly 20% below the true values. In contrast, the second price auction, where winners pay the second highest bid, aligns winning bids with actual values, reduces the volatility during learning and speeds up convergence. Regression analysis, incorporating design elements such as payment rules, number of participants, algorithmic factors including the discount and learning rate, asynchronous/synchronous updating, feedback, and exploration strategies, discovers the critical role of payment rules on efficiency. Furthermore, machine learning estimators find that payment rules matter even more with few bidders, high discount factors, asynchronous learning, and coarse bid spaces. This paper underscores the importance of auction design in algorithmic bidding. It suggests that computerized auctions like Google AdSense, which rely on the first price auction, can mitigate the risk of algorithmic collusion by adopting the second price auction.

Keywords Market Design · Reinforcement Learning

1 Introduction

The first price auction, where winners pay the winning bid, is susceptible to coordinated bid suppression when Q-learning algorithms learn to bid in repeated auctions. On the other hand, the second price auction, where winners pay the second highest bid, aligns winning bids with actual values, reduces the volatility during learning and speeds up convergence. Payment rules play a critical role in determining auction efficiency under algorithmic bidding, surpassing the importance of other design elements such as the number of participants, bid space granularity, information disclosures, as well as algorithmic factors, including the discount and learning rate, asynchronous/synchronous updating, feedback, and exploration strategies.

These findings are particularly relevant as intelligent algorithms rapidly assume control of real-time computerized auctions across various domains, including online marketplaces for pre-owned items, display advertising, sponsored search, stock trading, electricity, transportation, and public procurement. These developments raise concerns about the efficiency of auctions traditionally designed by and for humans under algorithmic bidding. To mitigate the risk of bid suppression, exchanges like Google AdSense, which currently rely on the first price auction, could consider adopting the second price auction.

Among the various artificial intelligence algorithms available for study, I specifically concentrate on reinforcement learning. This field has witnessed remarkable advancements in robotics, self-driving cars, and strategic games like Chess and Go. The focus centers on the vanilla Q-learning algorithm, widely recognized as the foundation for many notable breakthroughs. By investigating the impact of payment rules on auction efficiency within the context of Q-learning, this study aims to provide valuable insights into the design of platforms for algorithmic bidding.

However, when algorithms learn using complex strategies, expressing the motion of the dynamical system in mathematical terms becomes impossible. This issue motivates the use of an experimental methodology that enables clean identification and efficient estimation of the effect of auction design on efficiency while adjusting and controlling for the influence of other factors. Thus, this study consists of 427 trials, with Q-learning bidders participating in up to 250,000 auctions for a commonly valued item in each trial.

Auction efficiency lies in ensuring that the item sells to the individual who values it the most and at their private valuation. In this study, auction efficiency is defined as the average winning bid to true value ratio in the last 1000 auctions of each trial. Notably, transitioning from a second to a first-price auction leads to a reduction in bids, approximately amounting to 20% of the item's actual value. Moreover, machine learning estimators reveal that this reduction is magnified in auctions characterized by fewer bidders, higher discount factors and learning rates, asynchronous learning dynamics, and coarser bid spaces.

Previous studies have considered the effect of various factors on algorithmic collusion. Waltman and Kamyak (2008), Dopologov (2021), and Abada et al. (2022) have shown how specific exploration strategies can lead to collusive outcomes. Asker et al. (2021) highlighted asynchronous vs synchronous learning. Calvano (2020) studied retaliatory strategies in simultaneous pricing games. Klein (2021) focused on sequential pricing games and the granularity of action spaces. Hansen et al. (2021) investigated collusion arising from misspecified prediction and correlated price experimentation. Hettich (2021), Han (2022), and Zhang (2021) delved into deep reinforcement learning and compared different sampling strategies. Ittoo and Petit (2017) discussed the gap between experimental research and practice.

While Banchio and Skrzypacz (2022) were the first to study auction design in a similar setting and found that the first price auction can lead to collusive outcomes while the second price auction does not, their approach did not control for other design elements and algorithmic factors that could also lead to bid suppression. Additionally, they did not explore how other factors interact with payment rules in determining auction efficiency. This paper addresses this limitation via a randomized experiment that not only controls for other covariates but also estimates how the effect of payment rules varies with them.

To summarize, in this paper, I conduct a controlled random experiment with Q-learning bidders and find that second-price auctions improve efficiency, reduce volatility and speed up learning. These findings can help improve auction design for algorithms. In the following sections, I survey the literature, describe the methodology, present the results and conclude.

2 Literature

There are a few kinds of literature that are relevant. First, a theoretical literature on auctions that assumes rational actors. Second, experimental literature replaces rational actors with humans or algorithms. Third, empirical evidence on algorithmic adoption and collusion. Fourth, legal literature on possible gaps.

The first thread is theoretical literature on auctions (Milgrom and Weber 1982, Krishna 2009). The second price auction is superior to the first price auction when bidders only have a noisy signal about the actual value of the item. The first price auction suffers from the risk of the winner's curse, which leads to conservative bidding, and this reduces auction revenues. These results can break down in repeated games, and the Folk Theorem says that if bidders are patient enough, any average winning bid can be supported by a suitable and credible threat of punishment e.g., tit-for-tat or grim trigger. Tacit collusion in repeated auctions will take the form of symmetrically suppressed bids or asymmetric bid rotation.

Oligopoly theory also offers some insight into the determinants of tacit collusion in repeated games. Ivaldi et al. (2002) show that in repeated games, the degree of tacit collusion rises with a higher discount rate, fewer market participants, symmetric conditions, higher entry barriers, a high frequency of interaction, greater transparency, and data availability. The last three factors are magnified with algorithms and are often cited as the reason for concern for algorithmic collusion.

The second thread consists of experiments. The experimental evidence with humans shows a distinctive departure from theory (Kagel and Levin 2011). Bids are generally above Nash prediction in both the first and second price auctions. Experiments with noisy signals show a significant presence of the winner's curse, which even experienced bidders are unable to avoid (Levin et al., 1996). Sequential auctions of identical items often show declining prices (Keser et al., 1996, Neugebauer et al., 2007).

Experiments with algorithms have highlighted different mechanisms through which tacit collusion can occur. Waltman and Kamyak (2008), Dopologov (2021) and Abada et al (2022) show how certain exploration strategies can lead to collusive outcomes. Asker et al (2021) highlight asynchronous vs synchronous learning. Calvano (2020) studies retaliatory strategies in simultaneous pricing games. Klein (2021) studies sequential pricing games and granularity

of action spaces. Hansen et al (2021) study collusion arising from misspecified prediction and correlated price experimentation. Hettich (2021), Han (2022) and Zhang (2021) study deep reinforcement learning and compare different sampling strategies.

A few papers look at algorithms learning to bid in auctions. Bandyopadhyay et al. (2008), study reverse auctions with reinforcement learning and find that in simple cases mixed strategy equilibrium can be attained. Tellidou et al.,(2007) study electricity markets and find that tacit collusion is easy to sustain even under competitive conditions. Banchio and Skrzypacz (2022) study auction design with Q-learning bots and found that the first price auction can lead to collusive outcomes while the second price auction does not. Criticisms of simulation-based studies are that settings are too stylized, using competitive rather than monopolistic benchmarks is unrealistic, and algorithms tested are too unrealistic (Kühn & Tadelis 2017, Schwalbe 2018).

The third thread looks at the pervasive adoption of algorithms and actual evidence for algorithmic collusion. Chen et al. (2016) studied 1,641 best-seller products on Amazon and detected that about 543 had adopted some form of algorithmic pricing. A 2017 OECD report titled "Algorithms and Collusion" found that "*Two-thirds of them [ecommerce firms] use automatic software programs that adjust their own prices based on the observed prices of competitors*". A 2023 eMarketer report shows that algorithms are dominating bidding in display and sponsored search auctions across the globe. Brogaard et al., (2014) find that algorithms have come to dominate trading in the double auction markets.

These developments have led to limited evidence of algorithmic collusion. Assad et al. (2020) study the adoption of algorithmic pricing in German gasoline markets. They find that adoption increases margins by 9% in competitive markets and upto 28% in duopolies. Brown and Mackay (2021) five largest online retailers in over-the-counter allergy medications. The use of automated software to change prices quickly leads to prices that are 10 percent higher than otherwise. Musoloff (2022) studied data from Amazon Marketplace and found that adopting algorithmic pricing reduces prices on average but leads to "resetting" price cycles where participants regularly increase prices at night to cajole the others into following suit. We also see a few legal cases already.¹

The fourth thread looks at possible gaps in regulation. Tacit algorithmic collusion is currently not prohibited by law. In the United States, anti-collusion laws require evidence of "actionable agreement" over mere interdependent behavior. A report at the OECD Competition Committee² reiterates that in the U.S. firms have the freedom to decide their own prices and implement any kind of pricing technology; only decisions taken with an understanding with other competitors is prosecutable. Similarly, European Law (Article 101 TFEU) outlaws three types of collusion: agreements, decisions, and concerted practices. Again, this does not include tacit collusion.

There are many ways in which algorithms can participate in collusion (Ezrachi and Maurice 2017). First, they can act as messengers and conduits for human collusion and cartels e.g., price fixing on Amazon via algorithms. Here, an agreement to collude is established clearly. Second, they can be part of a hub-and-spoke conspiracy where the developers of the hub use a single algorithm to set prices for many spokes e.g., Uber's algorithm setting taxi rates. Agreement to collude is harder to establish in such vertical agreements, and so evidence for intent must be found. Third, humans can unilaterally set up to behave in predictable ways, and some of them lead to coordination with others e.g. gasoline pricing algorithms in Brown and MacKay (2021). Here agreement is nonexistent, and intent to collude must be established. Lastly, algorithms are given the objective to maximize profits and, through sophisticated learning and experimentation, begin to collude with other similar algorithms e.g. Deep Q-learning. In this case, neither agreement nor intent can be established, and the case would be difficult to prosecute. This paper addresses this last case.

To summarize, second-price auctions are theoretically superior to first-price auctions, but in repeated auctions this may not be true. There has been widespread adoption of algorithms but only a few examples of algorithmic collusion. Simulations highlight many mechanisms through which it is possible. And there is a gap in regulation with regards tacit collusion.

¹The 2015 Topkins (US) and 2016 GB Posters (UK) cases brought to light price fixing via pricing algorithms on Amazon. In 2018, after the insolvency of Air Berlin, Lufthansa abused its temporary monopoly power by raising prices roughly by 25% through pricing algorithms. In 2021, Google was fined 2.42 billion Euro for using algorithms to exclusively place its own Shopping services on Google search while demoting rival providers. Similarly, Amazon is currently defending a claim that its algorithms put its own products over rivals on its lucrative 'Featured Offer' placement. There have also been hub-and-spoke conspiracies. In 2016, e-Turas the Lithuanian travel website, was charged for imposing caps on discount rates proposed by travel agencies. In 2018, Accenture was accused of using its software Partneo to coordinate price increases on auto parts, dramatically increasing revenue for major carmakers.

²"Algorithms and Collusion" - A note submitted by the United States to the OECD Competition Committee.

3 Methodology

3.1 Markov Decision Processes

The problem of a single agent is described by a Markov Decision Processes (MDP). A MDP is (S, P, R, γ, B) . S is the set of possible states. B is a set of actions. R is reward matrix that measures $R(b_i, b_{-i}, s)$ or the reward obtained at state s , taking action b_i (and others' playing b_{-i}). P is transition matrix that measures $P(s'|s, a)$ or the probability of moving to state s' when taking action b at state s . And γ is the discount factor. Agents follow policies to move through the environment. A policy π is a strategy of choosing actions given states such that $\pi_{b,s} = \text{Prob}(B_t = b | S_t = s)$. Let $\pi(b_t)$ be the action taken at time t according to policy π . Then the discounted reward from starting out at state s_0 is going to be $\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t r(s_t, \pi(s_t))$, the return from following policy π onwards from state s_0 in one history. The quality of state-action pair is defined as,

$$Q^\pi(s, a) = r(s, a) + \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{t=1}^{\infty} \gamma^t r(s_t, \pi(s_t)) \mid \pi \right]$$

$Q^\pi(s_0, a)$ allows us to study the impact of choosing different actions a at s_0 even while continuing to following π after the first step. There can be an infinite number of possible policies but only one can be the best (as long as the maximum expected return is not infinite). The Q function of the optimal policy satisfies the Bellman Equation:

$$Q(s, a) = r(s, a) + \gamma E[\max_{a'} Q(s', a')]$$

such that $s' \sim p(\cdot | s, a)$. Each bidder maintains an estimate of the Q that they refine over time and use to choose bids. Once the learning process ends, each bidder reaches the optimal Q (given all others' Q -tables). Converged Q -tables may be suboptimal for the auctioneer but they are always optimal for the bidder given what competitors are doing. In this way there is no communication between bidders and they learn independently.

3.2 Experimental Setup

The experiment consists of 427 trials. Each trial i consists of N_i bidders competing in upto 250,000 auctions in a sequential manner. Each bidder can bid $b \in B = \{b_0 < b_1 < \dots < b_K\}$, such that $b_K = 1$ and $b_0 = 0$, for a commodity that is commonly-valued to be 1. K represents the granularity of the bid space B . Each bidder j has a valuation $Q_j(b, s)$ for each possible bid which represents the "long term" reward for playing bid b in state s (see Appendix). Here s represents the state or feedback that each bidder receives from the environment. For instance, it can represent the winning bid in the previous auction. It can also be omitted completely.

The Q -table is initial with random values for all bidders and for a while bidders play randomly. Depending on the auction rules and the bids played $(b_1, b_2 \dots b_N)$, each bidder i gets reward $r_i(b_1, b_2 \dots b_N)$ from that game. For instance, under the first price auction the winner w gets $1 - b_w$, while all others get 0. This is because everyone values the commodity at 1. In case of a ties, there is a random winner. As bidders gain experience from playing in auctions they update their valuations $Q_j(b, s)$. This can be done in a piece-meal asynchronous fashion (only at particular bid b) or for all bids $b \in B$. The latter is only possible when the winning bid and number of winners is known.

Once bidders gain sufficient experience they begin to cease playing randomly. They begin to choose bids b in state s that have higher valuation $Q_i(b, s)$. Towards the end the bidders play $b_j(s) = \text{argmax}_b Q_j(b, s)$. At the end of the trial data is collected regarding the initial conditions (auction design, learning rate, etc.) and the outcomes. This process is repeated for each trial.

3.3 Q-learning

One of the most popular algorithms to approximate the Q function is the Q-learning algorithm which can be operationalised in an "online" setup.

- Guess $Q_0(s, a)$
- at t , do:
 - observe s_t
 - take action a_t from suitable exploratory strategy

- collect reward r_t
- observe transition s_{t+1}
- update Q at point (s_t, a_t) :

$$Q_{t+1}(s_t, a_t) = (1 - \alpha)Q_t(s_t, a_t) + \alpha(r_t + \gamma \max_{a'} Q_t(s_{t+1}, a'))$$

Exploratory strategies are methods to take actions given states. In this study I use two popular exploratory strategies, that pick a_t given s_t . This first is ϵ -Greedy that plays randomly with $1 - \epsilon$ and greedily with ϵ . The other is Boltzmann exploration which uses the Q -tables to play randomly: $P(a_t|s_t) = e^{Q_t(s_t, a_t)/\beta} / \sum_{a'} e^{Q_t(s_t, a')/\beta}$. I set $\epsilon = 1$ and $\beta = 1$ and have them decay at an exponential rate of 0.9999 or 0.99999 until they reach 0.01. This ensures that for active exploration happens for roughly half of the total 250000 games possible in each trial. This ensures sufficient exploration and sufficient exploitation. I set the initial valuation as $Q_0 \sim UNIF(0, 1)$.

Q-learning has some important guarantees. Watkins and Dayan (1992) show that with sufficient exploration and a stationary environment a single Q-learner will get to the optimal Q with probability 1. This guarantee does not hold in multi-agent settings, but practical experience has shown that Q-learning can solve very complex control problems to a sufficient degree.

3.4 Data

Table 1 describes the outcome variables. *bid2val* is the average winning bid to true value ratio in the last 1000 auctions, and measures “efficiency”. *vol* measures the standard deviation of winning bids across the learning process. This measures overall volatility during learning. *episodes* measures number of games to convergence. Table 2 describes the covariates or initial conditions for each trial. The treatment in this case is the auction *design*. It is 1 when I use a first price auction and 0 when I use a second price auction. Other covariates include: the number of bidders N , the speed of learning *alpha* in Q-learning, the discount factor *gamma* which governs how much current reward bidders are willing to trade off for future rewards, an indicator for the nature of updating mechanism *asynchronous* which is 1 when bidders only update the valuation of bid b , the granularity of the bid space *num_actions*, whether prior winning bids are revealed or not *feedback* and an indicator for the nature of exploration *egreedy*. The variable *decay* is the decay rate for the exploration hyperparameters ϵ or β .

Table 1: Outcome Variables

Outcome	Range	Description
bid2val	[0,1]	Average winning bid to true value ratio in the last 1000 auctions.
vol	(0,∞)	Standard deviation of winning bids across the learning process.
episodes	[0, 250000]	Number of games to convergence.

Table 2: Initial Conditions/Covariates

Covariate	Values	Description
N	[2,4]	Number of bidders in the auction.
alpha	[0.01,0.1]	Learning rate in learning step.
gamma	[0.0,0.95]	Discount Factor or Patience.
egreedy	[0,1]	1 if ϵ -greedy, 0 if Boltzmann exploration
design	[0,1]	0 if second-price, 1 if first-price format.
asynchronous	[0,1]	0 if synchronous, 1 if asynchronous.
feedback	[0,1]	1 if previous winning bid is permitted as state variable, else 0.
num_actions	[6,11]	Size of bid space.
decay	[0.9999,0.99995]	Decay rate of exploration parameters ϵ or β .

To keep the experiment simple, I permitted only two arms for every covariate (see Table 2). A single trial consists of randomly drawing a set of initial conditions, initializing algorithms that begin from scratch and play upto 250,000 auctions sequentially. Upon convergence, which is defined as either breaching the 250,000 limit or winning bids stabilising, the outcome variables are measured. I conduct 427 such trials to construct a dataset of $(bid2val_i, vol_i, episodes_i, design_i, N_i, alpha_i, gamma_i, asynchronous_i, num_actions_i, feedback_i, egreedy_i, decay_i)_{i=1}^{427}$ where i indexes the trial. I use this dataset for inference.

3.5 Potential Outcomes

I follow Athey and Imbens (2016) in this section. The data I have is independent and identical observations of $(Y_i, W_i, X_i)_{i=1}^M$ where Y_i is the observed outcome, W_i is the binary vector of treatment assignment, X_i is a vector of covariates and M is the sample size. Let X, W, Y be data matrices of corresponding variables. M_t and M_c are the size of the treatment and control group respectively. $Y_i(0), Y_i(1)$ are potential outcomes for any unit i which tell us what would be observed if treatment was assigned to unit i or not. The treatment effect is defined on potential outcomes i.e. $\tau_i = Y_i(1) - Y_i(0)$ is the individual treatment effect and $\tau = E[Y_i(1) - Y_i(0)]$ is the average treatment effect.

I make the following assumptions for inference. First, is the Stable Unit Treatment Value Assumption (SUTVA) which implies that the potential outcomes of any unit are not affected by other units' interventions, and interventions always take one of two values. Secondly, any unit could receive either intervention with a positive probability. Thirdly, because of the explicit randomization of the treatment, I am assured of unconfoundedness as well. Fourthly, since I randomized all other covariates as well I can also estimate the effect of other possible interventions. Fifthly, I will also impose that interventions affect potential outcomes in a linear fashion i.e. they "add up". Machine learning estimators help relax this last assumption.

3.6 Regression Analysis

With a suitable definition of ϵ_i , the observed outcome can be written in terms of the treatment as a regression model:

$$Y_i = \alpha + \tau W_i + \epsilon_i$$

Due to randomization, the zero conditional mean assumption is satisfied, $E[\epsilon_i|W_i] = 0$. This implies that τ can be consistently via the OLS estimator. $\hat{\tau}_{OLS} = (W'W)^{-1}W'Y \rightarrow \tau$. Note that in general homoskedasticity is violated and heteroskedasticity-robust standard errors are used. Incorporating additional pre-treatment covariates into regression analysis can improve precision, correct for faulty randomization, permit interactions and help generalize the results. However, an assumption of linearity has to be made. Then the model is,

$$Y_i = \alpha + \tau W_i + \beta X_i + \epsilon_i$$

Due to randomization, $E[\epsilon_i|W_i, X_i] = 0$. This enables consistent estimation of τ through OLS. Machine learning methods (Chernozhukhov 2016, Athey and Wagner 2017) further relax the assumptions of linearity and permit estimation with high dimensional covariates. Consider the partially linear model,

$$Y_i = \Theta(X_i)W_i + g(X_i) + \epsilon_i$$

with $E[\epsilon_i|W_i, X_i] = 0$. Here $\Theta(X_i)$ captures the heterogenous treatment effect, permitting each unit to have a different causal impact of W_i , depending on X_i . g is a nonlinear function and X_i can now be high dimensional.

4 Results

4.1 Examples

Figure 1 and 2 presents two separate trials with identical initial conditions except for the payment rule. The averaging is done over 1000 games. The other conditions were $N = 4, \alpha = 0.1, \gamma = 0.99, \text{egreedy} = 0, \text{asynchronous} = 1, \text{feedback} = 1, \text{num_actions} = 6, \text{decay} = 0.9999$. In the first price auction we saw a slow convergence to the second highest bid possible. In the second price auction we saw a quick convergence to true value. Once that was attained bidders became indifferent between bids.

Figure 1: Avg Bids in the First Price Auction





Figure 2: Avg Bids in the Second Price Auction



4.2 Data Description


Table 3 presents the summary statistics. On average, auction efficiency at the end of the trial was below 1 and near 0.9. There were cases where auction efficiency was as low as 0.11. On average it took 170,000 rounds to reach convergence, but in many iterations, the upper bound of 250,000 was breached. This implies that sometimes winning bids did not stabilize even after a long period.

Table 3: Summary Statistics

Variable	N	Mean	St. Dev.	Min	Max
bid2val	427	0.900	0.136	0.113	1.000
episodes	427	168,617.800	86,586.950	50,000	249,999
vol	427	0.020	0.036	0.000	0.301
N	427	3.073	0.999	2	4
alpha	427	0.054	0.045	0.010	0.100
gamma	427	0.441	0.474	0.000	0.950
egreedy	427	0.494	0.501	0	1
asynchronous	427	0.525	0.500	0	1
design	427	0.511	0.500	0	1
feedback	427	0.513	0.500	0	1
num_actions	427	8.482	2.503	6	11
decay	427	1.000	0.00002	1.000	1.000

Figure 3 presents the boxplot of terminal bid-to-value ratios, volatility over the learning process and episodes to convergence against the auction design used. We see that when the second price auction was used (orange boxplots), regardless of other experimental conditions, auction efficiency was very close to 1 (but not exactly 1). When the first price auction was used (blue boxplots) we see that a much broader range of efficiencies that could be supported. Further, we see that in the first price auction, the volatility over the learning process was much higher than the second price auction. And the average episodes to convergence is much lower in the second price auction and considerably higher in the first price auction. Thus simple mean comparisons show that the second price auction has (1) greater efficiency, (2) lower volatility across the learning process and (3) faster convergence.

Figure 3: Boxplot of outcomes vs design.



4.3 Regression Analysis

The dataset generated is used to run regression models with three outcomes - average bid to value ratio in last 1000 games, standard deviation of winning bids across the entire learning process and number of episodes until convergence. In all regressions the covariates remain the same - these are the trial conditions before the trial was run. With a large sample of trials narrow confidence intervals can be attained. Since all other covariates were also randomized their coefficients are also estimates of average treatment effects.

Table 4: Regression of Bids to Value Ratio in last 1000 games against covariates.

	<i>Dependent variable: bid2val</i>	
	(1)	(2)
Intercept	0.998***	135.948
N		0.025***
alpha		-0.079
asynchronous		-0.031***
decay		-135.023
design	-0.192***	-0.193***
egreedy		-0.015*
feedback		0.009
gamma		-0.032***
num_actions		0.003
Observations	427	427
R^2	0.503	0.572
F Statistic	430.471*** (df = 1.0; 425.0)	61.915*** (df = 9.0; 417.0)
<i>Note:</i>	*p<0.1; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01	

Table 4 presents a regression of the bid-to-value ratio i.e. efficiency on the covariates. The effect of design on efficiency is negative and statistically significant. Moving from the first price to the second price increases bids-to-value by roughly 20% of the actual value. Furthermore, comparing the R^2 suggests that auction design is the most important factor behind efficiency. The number of bidders is statistically significant and is positive. Adding one extra bidder increases the average efficiency by 2.5% percentage points. The use of asynchronous learning has a small negative but significant effect on efficiency. Further, the use of higher discount rates also reduces efficiency. Other factors like learning rate levels, whether feedback was used, and exploratory strategies do not matter.

Table 5: Regression of volatility across the entire learning process against covariates

	<i>Dependent variable: Vol</i>	
	(1)	(2)
Intercept	0.010***	-139.829**
N		-0.010***
alpha		0.100***
asynchronous		0.001
decay		139.853**
design	0.020***	0.021***
egreedy		-0.007**
feedback		0.008**
gamma		0.008**
num_actions		0.002***
Observations	427	427
R^2	0.081	0.224
F Statistic	37.288*** (df = 1.0; 425.0)	13.360*** (df = 9.0; 417.0)
<i>Note:</i>	*p<0.1; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01	

Table 5 presents a regression of standard deviation of winning bids across the entire learning process against covariates. Here moving away from the first price to the second price reduces overall volatility in the learning process. The

impact of design is not overwhelming and other factors can also play a role. The volatility of the learning process rises with lesser number of bidders, faster learning rates, faster decay of exploration parameters, moving from ϵ -greedy to Boltzmann exploration, when algorithms use feedback about past winning bids, a higher discount rate and more fine bid spaces. However, there is much more variation in the volatility in the learning process that is unexplained.

Table 6: Regression of number of episodes until convergence against covariates.

	<i>Dependent variable: Episodes</i>	
	(1)	(2)
Intercept	122248.536***	-855973322.698***
N		-11287.328***
alpha		42714.500
asynchronous		-16849.662**
decay		856174164.216***
design	90824.129***	89211.029***
egreedy		6707.839
feedback		4220.911
gamma		822.856
num_actions		2398.109*
Observations	427	427
R^2	0.276	0.370
F Statistic	161.684*** (df = 1.0; 425.0)	27.170*** (df = 9.0; 417.0)
<i>Note:</i>	*p<0.1; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01	

Table 6 presents a regression of the number of episodes until convergence against covariates. Here moving away from the first price to the second price ensures that convergence happens much later. Thus the second price auction is also helpful in enabling faster convergence. The impact of design is large and only a few factors contribute further. The speed of convergence rises with fewer bidders. As expected, asynchronous learning is also much slower than synchronous learning and a faster decay of exploration parameters will lead to faster convergence. Further, increasing the bid space granularity also reduces the pace of convergence. However, there is quite a bit of variation in the speed of the learning process that is unexplained.

To summarize, moving from a first price to a second price auction will (1) ensure efficiency, (2) reduce volatility in the learning process and (3) speed up convergence. Another equally important factor that affects volatility in the learning process is the learning rate. Other factors that can also influence the speed of convergence are the learning rate and rate of decay of exploration. All in all, payment rules play a critical role in improving outcomes even after controlling for algorithmic factors.

4.4 Interactions

To dig deeper into the determinants of efficiency, the following model was estimated using double machine learning methods described in Chernozhukhov (2016),

$$Y_i = (\beta_0 + \sum_j \beta_j X_{ij})W_i + g(X_i) + \epsilon_i$$

with the assumption $E[\epsilon_i|W_i, X_i] = 0$. Machine learning methods to approximate g and partial out its effect on Y_i before estimating (β_0, β_j) . The term $(\beta_0 + \sum_j \beta_j X_{ij})$ is the conditional average treatment effect of design on outcomes.

Table 7 presents the estimates for (β_0, β_j) . The average effect of design on efficiency is negative (Table 2). So if β_j is positive, it implies that an increase in covariate j shrinks the effect of auction design by bringing it closer to 0. If β_j is negative, it implies that an increase in covariate j raises the effect of auction design by taking it further away from 0. Thus a smaller number of bidders, a larger discount factor, asynchronous learning, and a smaller number of possible actions, all make the bid suppression in the first price auction even worse. Thus payment rules interact with algorithmic factors in determining efficiency.

Table 7: Heterogenous Treatment Effect of Design on Efficiency

	point_estimate	stderr	zstat	pvalue	ci_lower	ci_upper
N	0.043	0.009	4.999	0.000	0.026	0.059
alpha	-0.121	0.178	-0.678	0.498	-0.469	0.228
gamma	-0.054	0.016	-3.374	0.001	-0.085	-0.023
egreedy	-0.024	0.016	-1.495	0.135	-0.055	0.007
asynchronous	-0.063	0.016	-3.943	0.000	-0.094	-0.032
feedback	0.005	0.016	0.288	0.773	-0.026	0.035
num_actions	0.007	0.003	2.255	0.024	0.001	0.013
decay	-285.723	321.264	-0.889	0.374	-915.389	343.942
cate_intercept	285.396	321.240	0.888	0.374	-344.223	915.016

5 Conclusion

Algorithms are increasingly shaping markets, necessitating a deeper understanding of their behavior. This research focuses on multi-agent Q-learning in auctions to explore algorithmic behavior in market settings. Our study provides strong evidence supporting the superiority of the second-price auction over the first-price auction under algorithmic learning. The second-price auction demonstrates better efficiency, accelerated learning, and reduced volatility. These findings are validated through robust experimental evidence, improving upon previous literature by utilizing a fully randomized experiment.

Our study incorporates a large number of covariates and considers the interaction between auction design and other factors, enhancing our understanding of the nuanced relationship between auction mechanisms and algorithmic behavior. The implications of our results suggest potential risks of algorithmic collusion for platforms like Google AdSense, which currently use the first-price auction. Platforms are recommended to experiment with alternative auction rules in controlled environments and policymakers are advised to consider algorithmic factors that can amplify collusion.

In practice, firms often use forecasting models and reinforcement learning to predict bids and rewards. Future research can adopt this pragmatic approach and explore alternative algorithms, such as Deep Q-learning. However, it is important to acknowledge a limitation of our study: the slow nature of vanilla Q-learning, making it impractical for real-world scenarios. Overcoming this limitation calls for further exploration of efficient algorithms. Additionally, investigating auctions with descending or ascending bids presents an intriguing avenue for future research.

By incorporating these recommendations and addressing the limitations, future studies can build upon our findings, advancing our understanding of algorithmic behavior in market auctions. This research contributes to the development of effective auction mechanisms within algorithmic environments, benefiting stakeholders across various auction-based platforms and markets.

6 References

- Abada, Ibrahim, Xavier Lambin, and Nikolay Tchakarov. 2022. ‘Collusion by Mistake: Does Algorithmic Sophistication Drive Supra-Competitive Profits?’ SSRN Electronic Journal. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4099361>.
- Asker, John, Chaim Fershtman, and Ariel Pakes. 2022. ‘Artificial Intelligence, Algorithm Design, and Pricing’. AEA Papers and Proceedings 112 (May): 452–56. <https://doi.org/10.1257/pandp.20221059>.
- Assad, Stephanie, Robert Clark, Daniel Ershov, and Lei Xu. 2020. ‘Algorithmic Pricing and Competition: Empirical Evidence from the German Retail Gasoline Market’. SSRN Electronic Journal. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3682021>.
- Athey, Susan, and Guido Imbens. 2016. ‘The Econometrics of Randomized Experiments’. arXiv. <http://arxiv.org/abs/1607.00698>.
- Banchio, Martino, and Giacomo Mantegazza. 2022. ‘Adaptive Algorithms and Collusion via Coupling’. arXiv. <http://arxiv.org/abs/2202.05946>.
- Banchio, Martino, and Andrzej Skrzypacz. 2022. ‘Artificial Intelligence and Auction Design’. In Proceedings of the 23rd ACM Conference on Economics and Computation, 30–31. Boulder CO USA: ACM. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3490486.3538244>.

- Bandyopadhyay, Subhajyoti, Jackie Rees, and John M. Barron. 2008. 'Reverse Auctions with Multiple Reinforcement Learning Agents'. *Decision Sciences* 39 (1): 33–63. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-5915.2008.00181.x>.
- , Zach Y, and Alexander MacKay. n.d. 'Competition in Pricing Algorithms'.
- Calvano, Emilio, Giacomo Calzolari, Vincenzo Denicolò, and Sergio Pastorello. 2020. 'Artificial Intelligence, Algorithmic Pricing, and Collusion'. *American Economic Review* 110 (10): 3267–97. <https://doi.org/10.1257/aer.20190623>.
- Cavallo, Alberto. 2018. 'More Amazon Effects: Online Competition and Pricing Behaviors'. w25138. Cambridge, MA: National Bureau of Economic Research. <https://doi.org/10.3386/w25138>.
- Chen, Le, Alan Mislove, and Christo Wilson. 2016. 'An Empirical Analysis of Algorithmic Pricing on Amazon Marketplace'. In *Proceedings of the 25th International Conference on World Wide Web*, 1339–49. Montréal Québec Canada: International World Wide Web Conferences Steering Committee. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2872427.2883089>.
- Freedman, David A. 2008a. 'On Regression Adjustments in Experiments with Several Treatments'. *The Annals of Applied Statistics* 2 (1). <https://doi.org/10.1214/07-AOAS143>. ———. 2008b. 'On Regression Adjustments in Experiments with Several Treatments'. *The Annals of Applied Statistics* 2 (1). <https://doi.org/10.1214/07-AOAS143>.
- Klein, Timo. 2021. 'Autonomous Algorithmic Collusion: Q-learning under Sequential Pricing'. *The RAND Journal of Economics* 52 (3): 538–58. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1756-2171.12383>.
- Leisten, Matthew. n.d. 'Algorithmic Competition, with Humans'.
- Lin, Winston. 2013. 'Agnostic Notes on Regression Adjustments to Experimental Data: Reexamining Freedman's Critique'. *The Annals of Applied Statistics* 7 (1). <https://doi.org/10.1214/12-AOAS583>.
- Mehra, Salil K. n.d. 'Antitrust and the Robo-Seller: Competition in the Time of Algorithms'. MINNESOTA LAW REVIEW.
- Noel, Michael D. 2008. 'Edgeworth Price Cycles and Focal Prices: Computational Dynamic Markov Equilibria'. *Journal of Economics & Management Strategy* 17 (2): 345–77. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1530-9134.2008.00181.x>.
- Tesauro, Gerald, and Jeffrey O. Kephart. 2002. 'Pricing in Agent Economies Using Multi-Agent Q-Learning'. In *Game Theory and Decision Theory in Agent-Based Systems*, edited by Simon Parsons, Piotr Gmytrasiewicz, and Michael Wooldridge, 5:293–313. *Multiagent Systems, Artificial Societies, and Simulated Organizations*. Boston, MA: Springer US. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4615-1107-6-14>.
- Zhao, Jun, Guang Qiu, Ziyu Guan, Wei Zhao, and Xiaofei He. 2018. 'Deep Reinforcement Learning for Sponsored Search Real-Time Bidding'. In *Proceedings of the 24th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery & Data Mining*, 1021–30. London United Kingdom: ACM. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3219819.3219918>.