

# Mechanisms for belief elicitation without ground truth

Niklas Valentin Lehmann\*

*December 9, 2024*

## Abstract

This review article examines the challenge of eliciting truthful information from multiple individuals when such information cannot be verified, a problem known as "information elicitation without verification". This article reviews over 25 mechanisms designed to incentivize truth-telling in such scenarios and their effectiveness in empirical studies. Although many mechanisms theoretically ensure truthfulness as a Bayesian Nash Equilibrium, empirical evidence regarding the effects of mechanisms on truth-telling is limited and generally weak. Consequently, more empirical research is needed to validate mechanisms. However, empirical validation is difficult because most mechanisms are very complex and cannot be easily conveyed to research subjects. This review suggests that simple and intuitive mechanisms may be easier to empirically test and apply.

**Keywords:** belief elicitation; truth serum; peer-prediction

**JEL:** D82, C91

---

\*Technical University Bergakademie Freiberg, Researcher at the Chair for General Economics and Macroeconomics. Contact: Niklas-Valentin.Lehmann@vwl.tu-freiberg.de

# 1 Introduction

Prelec (2004) introduced the "Bayesian Truth Serum" (BTS), a mechanism to "elicit truthful subjective data in situations where objective truth is unknowable". The BTS may aid us in many important areas, such as long-term forecasting<sup>1</sup>, estimating risk, data labeling, and generally improving the accuracy of self-reported data. At least this is what Prelec (2004) suggests. Since 2004, numerous mechanisms for *information elicitation without verification* (IEWV) have been proposed. It is increasingly difficult for researchers and practitioners to know which mechanism to use, or whether to use a mechanism at all. To help researchers and practitioners gain oversight over a highly disconnected literature, this article examines over 25 existing mechanisms and reviews empirical evidence regarding their effectiveness. Furthermore, this article aims to identify the problem at the heart of IEWV, putting it in context of the literature on strategic games (section 2), which establishes common ground and an intimate connection among mechanisms. Two other works also review this literature (Charness et al., 2021, Faltings, 2023), but both review just a handful of mechanisms for IEWV.

This study finds that empirical evidence regarding the mechanisms effectiveness is sparse and weak. Thus, implementing these mechanisms in science, policy or business cannot be recommended *yet*. The primary cause of this is mechanism complexity. Most mechanisms are considered "extraordinarily difficult to fathom" (Charness et al., 2021) and cannot be easily conveyed to humans. If humans do not understand the incentives, the incentives are ineffective. Consequently, mechanism complexity inhibits both research and application.

In discussing the current research, this article also suggests many directions for future research. As mechanism complexity impedes empirical analysis, a major future

---

<sup>1</sup>The research agenda of the Global Priorities Institute specifically calls for research in that direction (Greaves et al., 2020).

research direction should be the creation and assessment of more easy-to-comprehend mechanisms. Another major research direction is the large-scale empirical validation of these mechanisms to provide convincing evidence on whether and why mechanism do (not) work to improve the accuracy of reports.

The rest of this article is organized as follows: Section 2 defines the problem. Section 3 reviews some of the most widely discussed mechanisms and existing empirical evidence of their effectiveness. Section 4 gives a brief overview over some research projects in which mechanisms were used to create incentives for truth-telling. Section 5 reviews articles that use the mechanisms for forecast combination, a related problem. Section 6 critically discusses the existing research and proposes concrete future research directions. Section 7 concludes.

## 2 Belief elicitation as a Principal-Agent problem

We assume a principal that would like to gather some information that he lacks access to.<sup>2</sup> Multiple other agents receive a noisy signal of the information and can relay the information to the principal. There are many different names in the literature for the principals and agents roles. The principal is often also called the center or receiver. The agent is often called the subject, seller, consultant, player, worker, expert, forecaster, rater or sender. The agent gains utility only from the pay that the principal offers, and the agent does not care what the principal does with the information provided.<sup>3</sup> The directed graph in Figure 1 describes the interaction. Any agent can choose to submit

---

<sup>2</sup>The principal has a male identity and the agents a female identity throughout the paper, as is common in the literature on non-cooperative games.

<sup>3</sup>The IEWV problem is highly related to games of strategic information transmission. However, in games of strategic information transmission, the agent also cares about the final decision. For example, an advisor to a policy-maker usually has political beliefs of their own and may try to influence final decisions for what they believe to be better. Thus, there is an additional incentive to provide (non-)truthful answers (Osborne, 2004). Therefore, games with strategic information transmission yield very different behavior and different mechanisms are needed to align incentives.

the information to the principal. If the agent does so, she is being *truthful*. She can at no direct cost to herself also submit any other information and be *non-truthful*. There is no way for the agent to credibly signal her type.




Figure 1: Information elicitation without verification (IEWV) is a principal-agent problem

This scenario exemplifies a principal-agent problem with information asymmetry, specifically *hidden information*: The principal does not know how valuable the information that the agent offers is, because he is uncertain regarding the agents truthfulness. There are exactly 4 classes of IEWV problems that may be distinguished based on the information structure of the problem. This is because there are three directed arrows in the graph that describes the game, which makes for  $2^3 = 8$  possible combinations, but only four of them describe the situation that we are interested in.<sup>4</sup> All of the four relevant combinations have in common that the principal cannot observe the true outcome *or* cannot compare the agents report against it.

1. **The information is only ever observable by the agent.** This situation is depicted in point 1 in Figure 2. The arrows signal the direction in which information is transmitted.

---

<sup>4</sup>Specifically, the following four make no sense: There is no information, the principal has access to information, the agent has access to information but does not share it, the principal has access to information and the agent shares his (non-informed) belief.

Example 1 — Self-reported data: A drug trial is conducted and the subjects must report which side effects they felt they had or whether they consumed alcohol during the trial period.<sup>5</sup>

Example 2 — Causal effects: Policy decisions are often informed by expert opinion on the matter, with policy-makers having less insight into the likely consequences of their decision than the experts. Policy-makers need to trust the experts. They are unlikely to get evidence on the consequences of the decision not taken and thus cannot compare the information provided by the expert to truth.

Example 3 — Long-term forecasts: Whilst long-term outcomes are observable, the revelation will only occur in such a distant future that we may not live to see it. Payments in the far future do not pose a strong incentive to be truthful now, as even a small discount rate reduces the forecasters expected value of providing an accurate forecast greatly.

2. **The information is currently observable by the agent and will be observable by the principal.** This situation is depicted in point 4 in Figure 2.

Example — Short-term forecasts: A managerial decision-maker in the firm would like to forecast demand for a product in the next quarter. This information will be unveiled after the quarter. The decision-maker eventually has access to the information but will make use of the temporal precedence of the agents beliefs as a proxy for the true demand to make decisions now. The elicitation takes place

---

<sup>5</sup>Side effects of drug usage are essentially a noisy signal of the drugs side effects in the population. Thus, IEWV mechanisms can incentivize truthful answers to such self-report questions. Truthfulness can be incentivized in the case of individual-specific alcohol consumption, if the answer is used to condition on alcohol consumption. Then, correctly stating alcohol consumption and corresponding side effects should better predict the side effects of others with the same alcohol consumption, and thus increase the own reward.

without verification, but verification is occurring later. Proper Scoring Rules allow the principal to pay for accurate reports (Gneiting and Raftery, 2007).<sup>6</sup> The price of information determined via proper scoring rules is maximized in expectation for the most accurate report. There is an incentive to be truthful. Forecasting can thus be viewed as a special case of IEWV.<sup>7</sup>

- 3. The information is no longer observable, but the agent did observe it in the past.** This situation is depicted in point 2 in Figure 2.

Example — Reconstructing the scene of a crime: A police officer is tasked with reconstructing the scene of a crime. Given that he was not present at the scene itself and that the crime already occurred in the past, he must rely on reports from eyewitnesses.

- 4. The information is only observable to the agent in the present moment and future observation by the principal will render payoffs meaningless.**

In this case the situation would change from the point 1 in Figure 2 to point 3, where evaluation and rewards cannot be transferred, if the event occurs.

Example 1 — Risk of collapse: A managerial decision-maker would like to know the probability that the firm will go bankrupt next quarter. The agent cannot expect to receive any pay if the firm goes bankrupt. Thus, an agent that is only paid after the end of the quarter has a strong incentive to report zero probability

---

<sup>6</sup>This is still true if verification is unlikely as proper scoring rules are single-peaked real-valued functions that retain their properties when multiplied with a constant (the probability of evaluation) (Gneiting and Raftery, 2007). That is, if there is a non-zero chance that a report will be scored properly upon evaluation, truthfulness is a dominant strategy. A principal could incentivize truthful and effortful reports of information that he can only gain at great cost. For example, beliefs regarding the replicability of 10 studies could be elicited truthfully as long as there is a chance that at least one of them is going to be replicated.

<sup>7</sup>Although much more literature is concerned with forecasting than IEWV in general, forecasting remains a special case in the sense that it is actually the exception rather than the rule that short-term verification is possible (Faltings and Radanovic, 2017).

of bankruptcy, no matter the true risk. The agent maximizes the accuracy of her report if the firm is not bankrupt, the only scenario she cares about.

Example 2 — Global catastrophic risk: Similarly to the previous example, if a policy-maker is interested in eliciting the probability that a pandemic will cause a major catastrophe, experts will find the prospect of post-catastrophe payments not engaging.




Figure 2: Multiple cases in which verification and evaluation of correct signaling cannot occur. Dashed lines indicate temporal delays.

The principal can purchase the information from the agent unconditionally and will do so if he expects it to be accurate with high enough probability. This is *introspection*, i.e. simply asking for information without incentivizing truthfulness. One may argue: Why would the agent ever be non-truthful? Anyone who has ever tried to accurately report their own belief will find that this requires a non-zero degree of effort. We could extend the entire model to incorporate effort. Then, the agent would only obtain (additional) information at a cost  $c$ . If the agent obtains the information at this cost, she is being *effortful*. It would be irrational to be effortful (and truthful for that matter) for any  $c > 0$ , because the agent is not compensated for the additional effort.<sup>8</sup>

**Although the principal is generally unable to verify the accuracy of any**

<sup>8</sup>To further extend the model one could also assume that the principal can also observe the information at cost  $c_d$ , which is strictly greater than the cost of obtaining the information is to the agent.

**single report, the principal can create contracts that *incentivize the agent to be truthful*.** This is possible because the principal can compare reports with other agents reports, when there are multiple agents that have access to the same information. This holds true even when these agents get only noisy signals of the information and thus will have different beliefs.

Consequently, being truthful becomes a *game*. Since the payoff to the agent is only determined by others reports, the corresponding equilibrium in which everyone maximizes their payoff by being truthful is a Bayesian Nash Equilibrium (BNE), which is to say that this equilibrium depends on truthful reporting by others. This is different when reports are directly compared with true outcomes. Being truthful is a *dominant strategy*, if an agents report is verified using the information itself. Since the latter is generally preferable for the principal, IEWV mechanisms should not be used when verification is possible. The following section reviews such mechanisms that have been proposed to solve the problem of IEWV. Tables with all reviewed mechanisms can be found in the appendix.

## **3 Mechanisms**

### **3.1 Output Agreement & Proxy Scoring**

#### **3.1.1 Output Agreement**

The simplest approach to score unverifiable reports is to reward the agent if her report is identical to other reports. Von Ahn and Dabbish (2004) are the first to both propose and already apply such a mechanism. The authors create a computer game where two players are both shown an image and are asked to label it. The players gain score, if their descriptions of the image match directly. To avoid players colluding, some words or single characters are taboo and players are matched randomly for each image from a



larger pool of participants. The game has sparked wider interest in human computation via games (Von Ahn and Dabbish, 2008, Law and Von Ahn, 2011, Huang and Fu, 2013). Particularly, the game already addressed a major issue in artificial intelligence: how to inexpensively label large amounts of hard-to-verify data. This application is still of high interest.

These mechanisms have the benefit of being easy-to-describe. However, *Output Agreement* schemes that directly match answers do not elicit private information (Waggoner and Chen, 2014).<sup>9</sup> An agent that possesses private information will not choose to reveal it, as it is unlikely to be featured in another agents report. For example, if the image to be labeled shows a lynx, and the agent knows that this is an image of an iberian lynx, but finds it unlikely that others will recognize this, they are better off just reporting "lynx". Thereby, Output Agreement games are actually disguised guessing games, in which payouts are maximized by guessing majority opinion. In fact, common knowledge is the best result that can *theoretically* be hoped for (Waggoner and Chen, 2014), unless one assumes subjects to exhibit a bias where they falsely assume their own opinion to be the majority opinion, known as the "false-consensus effect" (Carvalho et al., 2017).

### 3.1.2 Proper Proxy Scoring Rules

Witkowski et al. (2017) present a related idea: Combine agents estimates and score agents against the combination of estimates. For example, subjects could be properly scored against the mean of all estimates. These scoring methods are called *Proper Proxy Scoring Rules*. The authors are aware of the fact that this mechanism is not necessarily leading to incentives for truthful elicitation, and mostly motivate it in the context of standard forecasting. However, the mechanism actually possesses strong

---

<sup>9</sup>Output Agreement must not be confused with Outcome Matching - a different elicitation method for when the truth is verifiable (Charness et al., 2021).

incentives for truthfulness if there is a wisdom-of-crowd-effect. The wisdom-of-crowds is a phenomenon that occurs when multiple individual estimates are combined to form a single consensus estimate. Such a consensus estimate is usually better (in expectation) than any individual estimate from within that group (Surowiecki, 2004, Clemen, 1989). If all subjects believe that the combined measure is a *better estimate* of truth than their own belief, and everyone else is truthful, then the own payoff is maximized for submitting the own belief. The combined estimate serves as a proxy for truth.

Papakonstantinou et al. (2011) propose a similar mechanism in which reports are combined to obtain an aggregate measure that each individual report is scored against. The paper assumes that subjects report Gaussian distributions of a real variable and that subjects need to engage in costly effort to obtain signals. By conducting a second-price auction prior to elicitation of reports, the payouts are scaled such that the cost of effort is guaranteed to be compensated. The Gaussian distributions are added up such that the combined measure that reports are compared against resembles the mean. The authors claim that this provides incentive-compatibility.

### **3.1.3 Empirical evidence on Proper Proxy Scoring rules**

Court et al. (2018) study the beliefs of subjects regarding box office revenues of Australian movies.<sup>10</sup> Subjects received a higher score if their reports were closer to the median report. However, it is not quite clear from the paper to what extent study participants were made aware of the scoring. The study finds that the subjects did predict box office revenues better than random. However, when the same subjects answered different questions and their estimates were directly compared with true outcomes, their reports were much more accurate. It is not clear whether this should be attributed to the mechanisms or the difference in difficulty between the two sets of questions.

---

<sup>10</sup>The authors call this mechanism "Guess of Guesses", and do not cite Witkowski et al. (2017). That the method coincides with Proper Proxy Scoring Rules seems to be unintentional.

### 3.1.4 Reciprocal Scoring

*Reciprocal Scoring* is a variation of Proper Proxy Scoring (Karger et al., 2021). Subjects are randomized into groups. The subjects are then asked to provide their estimates or reports. After all subjects have submitted their reports on the question, the groups median report is computed.<sup>11</sup> Subjects within a group are rewarded based on how close the median estimate is to a reference groups median estimate. Therefore, Reciprocal Scoring is output agreement in groups. However, the median estimate may display a wisdom-of-crowd effect too. Thus, there is a stronger incentive to reveal private information, as with Proper Proxy Scoring. Moreover, colluding on simple answers is arguably more difficult in groups.

### 3.1.5 Empirical evidence on Reciprocal Scoring

Karger et al. (2021) also test their proposed Reciprocal Scoring in two separate empirical studies. The first study serves to investigate how forecasters respond to the incentives posed by Reciprocal Scoring. The second study showcases the use of Reciprocal Scoring (or similar mechanisms) by providing estimates on the effect of different policy measures on COVID-19 deaths. In the first study, the authors conducted a randomized trial, assigning 1284 subjects recruited via Prolific to ten forecasting tasks. The subjects were randomly assigned to three different incentivization schemes: Introspection, Proper Scoring and Reciprocal Scoring. Although the authors did not confront participants with the exact workings of their mechanisms, they tried to convey the general intuition of the different mechanisms by using examples. The study implements Reciprocal Scoring as follows: The participants randomly assigned to Reciprocal Scoring are informed that they will maximize their earnings if they closely predict the predictions

---

<sup>11</sup>Reciprocal scoring may very well work with other combinations of estimates such as e.g. the mean.




Figure 3: How subjects were scored in the study by Karger et al. (2021)

of a set of 'superforecasters', which is recruited separately and scored properly.<sup>12</sup>

Instead of splitting the subjects into two groups that would predict each other, the authors implemented a separate superforecaster team as the reference to be scored against. This experimental design has the merit of retaining full sample size. However, it is distinctively different from the core idea of dividing the sample up into at least two equal groups. What the study actually measures is whether participants recruited via Prolific act differently when subjected to a scoring as described by Figure 3 compared to proper scoring or introspection. Subjects might have assumed that superforecasters predictions proxy truth closely, and much better than their own belief. If so, they had a stronger incentive to be truthful in this setup than if they had to predict another group with similar predictive skill. In this sense, the experimental setup is much closer to Proper Proxy Scoring Rules than to Reciprocal Scoring itself.

The result of the study is that both proper scoring and Reciprocal Scoring are significantly more accurate than introspection. Reciprocal Scoring is a little less accurate than proper scoring, but this difference is insignificant. Subjects that were scored with Reciprocal Scoring took as much time to answer questions and consulted as many

---

<sup>12</sup>The participants from the Prolific sample were not told how superforecasters were scored.

sources as the subjects that were properly scored. Overall, the results look very promising. Most interesting would be whether Reciprocal Scoring also works well outside of the study’s setup. Skilled forecasters may respond differently to this situation and may be more adapt at colluding. Furthermore, it is not clear whether experts will be discouraged to share private information in this setup, as it may be unlikely that this information is reflected in the reference groups estimate.

In a second study, two teams of experienced forecasters are asked to predict the other teams forecast regarding the effect of COVID-19 policy-measures on COVID-19 deaths. The teams estimates are relatively similar and show large differences in effect size across policy interventions. Since the outcome is not observable, this study simply demonstrates how Reciprocal Scoring would be implemented in practice.

## 3.2 Peer-Prediction Mechanisms and Truth Serums

### 3.2.1 Peer-Prediction

To overcome the problems of Output Agreement, mechanisms need to take into account more than pure agreement. Zhang and Chen (2014) furthermore show that *some* assumptions regarding the *belief formation process* need to be made in order to arrive at the result that truth-telling is a strict Bayesian Nash Equilibrium (BNE) of a game.

Miller et al. (2005) put forward *Peer-Prediction*, a mechanism in which subjects predict the prediction of other subjects. Peer-Prediction assumes a most simplistic situation: It is assumed that all subjects have a common prior belief and observe a *noisy* signal of the information of interest. This situation shall be called the *common-prior-single-signal* (CPSS) case. Most mechanisms reviewed throughout this text assume this case. All subjects incorporate the signal in the same way into their beliefs.<sup>13</sup> The subjects report to the principal who also knows the common prior of all subjects. Figure

---

<sup>13</sup>That is, the posterior belief is identical across subjects who have received the same signal. This assumption is called impersonal updating.

4 outlines the games structure.




Figure 4: The information structure of Peer-Prediction

The key idea behind Peer-Prediction is based on the directed graph in Figure 4: The subjects reported beliefs (if truthful) should be strongly correlated because the signals that they received have a common cause. For example, consider an academic peer review. If the submitted paper is good, their ought to be many positive peer reports. If the paper is bad, more reports should be negative.<sup>14</sup> Although the principal (here the journal editor) does not observe the actual truth (paper quality), they can make use of the chain *Information of interest*  $\rightarrow$  *subjects beliefs*  $\rightarrow$  *reported beliefs* to gather the unobserved information. A full numerical example is detailed in the Appendix.

Peer-Prediction is about predicting the prediction of peers. Essentially, the editor (principal) is asking: What is the probability that another (reference) reviewer will recommend to publish the draft? The answer to this question is scored properly. Assuming a common prior belief that 20% of reviewed papers are good, a reviewer that liked the paper would predict a probability greater 20%. A reviewer that did not like the paper would predict a probability smaller than 20%.

Peer-Prediction rewards agreement on probabilities. But Peer-Prediction does not

<sup>14</sup>The authors call this 'stochastic relevance'. This means that the beliefs are strictly correlated with the information. Different information leads necessarily to different beliefs.

require that subjects explicitly estimate probabilities.<sup>15</sup> By simply asking whether the reviewer liked the paper, and moving the Bayesian updating to the scoring function, reviewers can simply state their impression, thereby implicitly making the probabilistic Peer-Prediction. This greatly simplifies the practical application. This requires the principal to know the prior *and* how subjects are updating in light of their private information. These assumptions are unlikely to hold in most real-world applications. A lot of literature points out that matching probabilities can be gamed just as Output Agreement can, and the reviewers/agents have an incentive to collude as this yields higher payments (Gao et al., 2014, Dasgupta and Ghosh, 2013, Shnayder et al., 2016, Kong and Schoenebeck, 2018, Faltings and Radanovic, 2017, Jurca and Faltings, 2009). For example, if all reviewers simply decline all drafts this would yield them at least as much pay as if they were all truthful. The truthful BNE is not necessarily the one with the highest expected payout.

### 3.2.2 Empirical evidence on Peer-Prediction

Gao et al. (2014) are the first to put Peer-Prediction to the test. Subjects recruited via MTurk play a minimalistic Peer-Prediction game. A key difference between the games setup and the original design is that the subjects play the game *repeatedly*. Furthermore, the subjects only receive binary signals and submit binary reports. Thus, the game takes the simplest possible form. The researchers do not explain the mathematics or intention behind Peer-Prediction but they do explain the general mechanism and explicitly calculate and display payoffs to subjects. The latter is possible due to the fact that the game is so simple. There are only 4 potential outcomes per round of play. The result of the study is that subjects quickly start to coordinate their reports around non-truthful but higher-paying equilibria. In other words, the subjects quickly start

---

<sup>15</sup>Peer-Prediction can work for continuous information too. It is not required that there are only two (or  $n$ ) states.

to game the system. The researchers compare the behavior to a control group that is paid a fixed amount (introspection) each round. They find that introspection yields strictly more truthful reports than the Peer-Prediction mechanism. In this sense, Peer-Prediction makes things worse by incentivizing coordination on non-truthful equilibria, whereas subjects that have no incentive to be truthful often choose to do so. However, this finding comes with a couple of caveats. The game is set up in a way such that it is very straightforward for subjects to game the system. Subjects can learn to coordinate over many rounds, which they do. In practice, this could be avoided. Secondly, there is no effort involved in truth-telling. The subjects simply need to report the signal that they have gotten. This heavily favors introspection in this analysis. In real-world applications that do not only involve honest rating, but e.g. forecasting complex events, truthfulness often comes at a significant cost.<sup>16</sup> Since introspection does not incentivize investment in obtaining additional information introspection may perform relatively less well on more complex tasks.

Mandal et al. (2020) attempt to study the effectiveness of Peer-Prediction mechanisms for long-term forecasting. A most honorable quest, as long-term forecasting is one of the main underexplored IEWV problems (Gruetzemacher et al., 2021). The authors conduct a randomized trial with subjects recruited via MTurk. The authors create four groups with slightly different variations of the mechanism. The authors did not match subjects directly but compared reports with averaged values of reports sourced from a forecasting tournament (Ungar et al., 2012). Unfortunately, this sabotages the whole idea of the study, as subjects from the forecasting tournament are incentivized with proper scoring. In other words, the subjects are not actually playing against each other, but against other subjects from the tournament, which are incentivized to be

---

<sup>16</sup>In the case of forecasting complex events, this cost would be the time and energy spent researching the subject matter.



truthful. Furthermore, it is not clear how subjects were instructed or whether they did comprehend the scoring mechanism. The study finds no significant differences in accuracy between groups. However, the average prediction error in *all groups* is worse than that of a random guesser. The subjects did possess no insight whatsoever. Lastly, the study’s methodology is not related to long-term forecasting at all, if it were not for the dubious conjecture that ”since the hybrid scheme also improves user engagement, this suggests that the hybrid scheme would provide the best accuracy for longer term forecasting events”.<sup>17</sup>

### 3.2.3 Bayesian Truth Serum

Prelec (2004) proposes the Bayesian Truth Serum (BTS) to solve the elicitation problem. The BTS is very similar to Peer-Prediction. The BTS works with the same information structure and assumptions as Peer-Prediction, but it does not require that the principal knows the common prior. Instead, the principal learns about the common prior from the subjects. The subjects are each asked two questions:

1. What is your belief?
2. Which beliefs will your peers submit?

Notice that the second question *is* the Peer-Prediction. Returning to the example of academic peer review: The referee would state whether they recommend publishing the draft (Yes/No) *and* what the probability that others do so is. The Peer-Prediction mechanism is able to elicit the information in one of the two questions because the common prior is known. With the BTS, private belief and prediction of peers *imply*

---

<sup>17</sup>The ‘hybrid scheme’ refers to one of the treatments where payoffs depend on a mixture of proper scoring and a version of the Peer-Prediction mechanisms called Correlated Agreement (see section 3.2.6)

the common prior (Witkowski and Parkes, 2012b).<sup>18</sup> Thus, the prior need not be known to the principal.

The scoring is similar to Peer-Prediction. However, the estimate on the peers belief is scored against the actually observed frequency of endorsed beliefs (first question). For example, a referee may decline a draft and estimate that 1 in 16 referees will recommend publishing it. The actual frequency of publish/decline reports is compared to the latter estimate. This showcases a major drawback of the BTS: It requires a large pool of subjects to arrive at smooth frequencies. Peer-Prediction has the major advantage over the BTS that it works with as little as three subjects.

Prelec (2004) shows that being truthful is a BNE of the mechanism. Because of the categorical nature of the first question, the BTS can only be applied to questions that have categorical answers. The BTS has the advantage that it allows to easily check whether priors are indeed the same, but no study reported to ever do so. Publicly available datasets collected for studies such as e.g. Palley and Satopää (2023) show that subjects often have very different priors regarding the variable in question. As with Peer-Prediction, other researchers have pointed out that the BTS has non-truthful equilibria that pay at least as much as honest reporting (Jurca and Faltings, 2009, Waggoner and Chen, 2014).

### **3.2.4 The intimidation method**

The BTS has been criticized for its unrealistic assumptions and high complexity (Charness et al., 2021). The author acknowledges the inherent complexity of the mechanism in the paper and suggests that the BTS must not be explained to participants, but that subjects can instead be reassured that they maximize their payouts by being truthful. This is similar to the use of proper scoring in forecasting. Proper Scoring rules are com-

---

<sup>18</sup>If one were to take the common priors assumption seriously, it would actually be sufficient to ask the second question to just one of the subjects.

plex too, but forecasters rarely ever need to calculate payouts because more accurate forecasts yield strictly higher expected value. Being truthful is a dominant strategy. But being truthful is a BNE in the BTS. This means that payouts are maximized in expectation *if* everyone plays truthful *and* all assumptions hold. This can clearly never be guaranteed to subjects ex ante.<sup>19</sup> The BTS is different to proper scoring in this regard. Telling subjects that they maximize their payouts by being truthful, and leaving them in the dark about the actual mechanism shall be called the *intimidation method*, a potentially deceptive tool.<sup>20</sup>

It does not matter whether an actual mechanism is implemented at all, as the method relies on the subjects blindly trusting the principals claim (Charness et al., 2021, Schoenegger and Verheyen, 2022). Clearly, the intimidation method is the simplest way of eliciting information, if subjects believe the claim. If used excessively, subjects may learn that the claim is not fully correct and start to mistrust the experimenters instructions, which would be a very undesirable consequence. Ethical considerations regarding the use of such methods are not yet present, but needed.

A handful of studies have attempted to empirically validate the BTS. Since these studies actually just tell subjects that they will maximize their payout when they are being truthful, this only provides us with evidence regarding the intimidation method. Ironically, the intimidation method is much better empirically tested than the BTS or any other mechanism reviewed in this article. The bottom line is that the intimidation method slightly yet robustly improves accuracy of reports.

A prime example is delivered by Frank et al. (2017), who try to validate the truth-telling incentives of the BTS in large-scale online experiments. Their statement to

---

<sup>19</sup>It can be checked ex post: In at least one study (Zhou et al., 2019) subjects did not maximize their payouts in expectation if they were truthful. (see section 4)

<sup>20</sup>In fact, the intimidation method is similar to the *bogus pipeline*, a technique in which subjects are told that they are hooked up to a lie-detector, and that has been successfully used in psychology research for decades (Roese and Jamieson, 1993).

Recent work by researchers at MIT has lead to the development of an algorithm for detecting truth telling and information.

We will assign an *iscore* to your response below which indicates how truthful and informative you are being about the average person.

Once we have collected all of the responses to this survey, we will rank the survey responders by the sum of their information scores and award a **\$0.50** bonus to the responders in the top 1/3rd. This bonus is in addition to the base pay for participating in the survey and the reward that you select for completing the multiple choice questions successfully.

Figure 5: Information displayed to subjects in Frank et al. (2017)

subjects is detailed in Figure 5. The authors run a randomized trial with one group being subject to the intimidation method, one group that in addition to the intimidation treatment receives dynamic score feedback after each report and one control group. Frank et al. (2017) ask subjects to flip coins and roll dice and report their results. A bias is induced by paying extra for heads and higher integers when throwing dice. The main result is that the intimidation method succeeds in lowering the induced bias. The dynamic score feedback has not much of an effect, most of the boost in honesty comes from the intimidation. The methodology is an ill fit to test any IEWV mechanism because the outcomes of dice rolls and coin flips are public knowledge. There is no reason for subjects to actually flip a coin, i.e. obtain a signal of the information of interest.

Shaw et al. (2011) test layperson ability to report content quality correctly, given several incentive schemes. The researchers find that the intimidation method led to a higher reporting accuracy than proper scoring. The effect that they find is highly significant.

Baillon, Bleichrodt, and Granic (2022) study survey responses: The authors employ a randomized trial, where the one group is paid a flat fee (introspection) and the other group is treated with the intimidation method and paid according to the BTS. They find

that for questions regarding subjective own health, well-being and language knowledge, there is no difference in responses between the two groups. Additionally, the authors conduct the same study with a default-option to induce bias. That is, one of the survey answers is pre-selected. Empirical research shows that default options are more likely to be chosen (Johnson and Goldstein, 2003). In this setting, defaults answers were also chosen significantly more often than in the standard setting. However, the intimidated group showed a slightly lower default bias, i.e. the answers are closer to the unbiased survey setting. This may indicate that subjects indeed spent more effort on the questions and answered more truthfully.

Lee et al. (2018) test the intimidation method by forecasting the results of NFL games. When filtering reports by subjects who self-identify as "extremely knowledgeable", the predictions generated by the intimidation method perform slightly worse than media experts, which is already not an impressive benchmark.<sup>21</sup> The study was replicated and similar results were found in the replicated study (Rutchick et al., 2020).

Weaver and Prelec (2013) ask subjects to signal truthfully whether they recognized a name. Names included those of historic personas, authors and characters but also technical jargon. The set of terms shown to subjects also included "foils" i.e. made-up names that cannot be recognized. The authors run five different randomized trials in which subjects are either in a condition where they are just paid a flat fee (introspection) or paid according to the BTS. The authors do not explain how the BTS works but use the intimidation method, except for experiment 3 where no explanation occurred (see next section). The result is that subjects who are subject to the intimidation method claim significantly fewer items as recognized and are more accurate in the detection of made-up names. In some experiments, a bias is induced by paying

---

<sup>21</sup>The results as it appears in the original paper is that the intimidated group performs slightly better than media experts. However, the authors corrected their results in a corrigendum.

for each recognized item. Thus, subjects that are not intimidated claim to recognize significantly more made-up items. Surprisingly, when combining the incentive to claim items as recognized with the intimidation method, the induced bias vanishes almost entirely. The intimidation method succeeds in inducing more truthful answers in the presence of a strong incentive to be untruthful. In experiment 5 subjects are asked to state their willingness-to-donate. In one group subjects actually donate their money that they would otherwise receive. In this group the subjects chose to donate 44% of their earnings. In contrast, another group which was simply asked to state their willingness-to-donate reports that they would donate 77% of their earnings. This is a clear example of social desirability bias (Krumpal, 2013). Another group that is subject to the intimidation method stated a willingness-to-donate of 47%, much closer to the real willingness-to-donate of the first group. Again, the intimidation method largely mitigates the bias.

Barrage and Lee (2010) ask subjects to collectively vote on whether to donate funds for a public good. If the majority decides in favor of the donation, the donation is realized. The researchers set up a randomized trial with students, which features a "hypothetical" group that was told to state how they would vote if the event were real, and three additional treatment groups with treatments to induce honesty, among them the intimidation method (with the BTS as the mechanisms). The study finds that 40% of subjects vote to donate, if donations are realized, and 81% of the subjects in the hypothetical group state that they would vote to donate, showing a clear social desirability bias.<sup>22</sup> The intimidation method does not fully mitigate this bias, 66% of subjects vote to donate. The intimidation method is as effective in this study as telling subjects about the social desirability bias beforehand. The study also finds that the

---

<sup>22</sup>The study features two votes regarding two different public goods. The answers are averaged here for brevity.

intimidation method induces honesty in women and inexperienced subjects only. This is very interesting insofar as it suggests that the intimidation method may not work well for panels predominantly featuring experienced males.

### **3.2.5 Empirical evidence on the BTS**

Experiment 3 of Weaver and Prelec (2013) poses evidence regarding the BTS itself because the subjects were *not* informed that the mechanism will score honest answers. This experiment is not preceded by an intimidation statement. The subjects answered multiple questions in sequence and saw their BTS scores that were dynamically updated after each question. Again, subjects claimed to recognize fewer made-up items as the survey progressed, i.e. subjects became more accurate over time. This creates some weak evidence that the BTS (communicated via score feedback) is a cause of more truthful reports.

Experiment 2 of Weaver and Prelec (2013) also poses some evidence that the BTS affects behavior. Subjects were intimidated but they also had access to their BTS scores after answering each question. Therefore, they could adjust their strategy as a result of this feedback. Subjects claimed to recognize fewer made-up items as the survey progressed. This could be because they learned that BTS scores are greater when they assess the statement accurately.

### **3.2.6 Variations of Peer-Prediction and the BTS**

The papers by Miller et al. (2005) and Prelec (2004) sparked the development of a large amount of research in the field of mechanism design. Mechanism designers tried to alleviate some of the obvious practical and theoretical limitations of the two mechanisms. This section provides a brief overview. Some mechanisms are discussed in Faltings (2023) in more technical detail.

**Crowd size:** Whilst the original BTS is only applicable for large crowds, Witkowski and Parkes (2012a) have discovered a version of the BTS that achieves incentive compatibility with only 3 or more participants. However, this mechanism requires that information is *binary*. Radanovic and Faltings (2013) build upon this to achieve a mechanism that works for 3 or more participants but can handle categorical information.

**Common priors and posteriors:** Witkowski and Parkes (2013) show that the common prior in Peer-Prediction must not be known if the information of interest is binary. If subjects only report a binary state, the prior can theoretically be estimated from the reports themselves, given a sufficient sample size of reports. The authors also develop a "divergence-based-BTS", which penalizes inconsistency between predictions of others reports and own beliefs (Radanovic and Faltings, 2014, Radanovic and Faltings, 2015). This mechanism does not require binary signals, large crowds or common priors. Radanovic et al. (2016) extend the Peer-Prediction mechanism by relaxing the common prior and common posterior assumption. However, this requires multiple questions (Radanovic and Faltings, 2015). They call this mechanism the Peer Truth Serum (PTS). The PTS (Radanovic et al., 2016) has also been subjected to preliminary empirical trials. Radanovic et al. (2016) use a modified version of the mechanism to implement a peer-grading scheme in a real-world class. Similarly, Timko et al. (2023) collect self-report data from clickworkers. Both studies use a treatment group in which the "basic features" of the mechanism are conveyed. Although the authors check for comprehension it is not clear whether participants understood the mechanism itself. Both studies find that the treatment slightly but significantly improves data quality. Goel and Faltings (2020) show that a version of this mechanism can exploit covariance across multiple questions, which makes it theoretically applicable for purely idiosyncratic estimations, such as incentivizing the honest statement of personal height and



gender.

**Undesirable Nash equilibria:** Dasgupta and Ghosh (2013) show that the truth-telling equilibrium in the Peer-Prediction mechanism can become "focal" in the sense that it becomes the highest-grossing equilibrium for all subjects (Kong and Schoenebeck, 2018). However, this requires common priors, binary reports and multiple questions per subject. These questions also need to be the same across subjects because the mechanism requires panel data. Other works build upon this by relaxing further assumptions necessary to arrive at this feat (Radanovic et al., 2016, Agarwal et al., 2017). For example, Shnayder et al. (2016) propose an altered mechanism which they call *Correlated Agreement*. This mechanism still has the benefit of truth-telling being the highest-paying equilibrium, without requiring binary reports as in Dasgupta and Ghosh (2013). The mechanism still requires that each subject answers multiple questions.

Kong and Schoenebeck (2019) describe a family of mechanisms with the interesting property that truth-telling is the highest-grossing equilibrium (Kong, 2024, Kong, 2022) and all-out-agreement receives a minimal score. This feature is called *dominant truthfulness*, which is not to be confused with dominant strategies.<sup>23</sup> These mechanisms are very complicated. The proposed mechanism requires that the number of tasks is greater than twice the number of possible choices per question. With 10 potential reports per question, 20 questions per subject would be required. However, the Square-Root-Agreement Rule seems to be more intuitive and also has many of the advertised features and fewer requirements (Kamble et al., 2023).

**Learning and adversarial behavior:** Feng et al. (2022) discuss the role of learning in sequential Peer-Prediction. Most of the literature focuses only on the situation where elicitation occurs at one point in time, so it is not clear what the effect of repeated

---

<sup>23</sup>It is impossible to elicit information without verification in dominant strategy as the payout is always depending on other subjects (Gao et al., 2020).

interaction is. Feng et al. (2022) find that the Correlated Agreement mechanism still provides a truthful equilibrium if subjects are assumed to exhibit reward-based learning behavior. Liu and Chen (2017) also propose a mechanism that can benefit from sequential reporting. Their model also incorporates subjects choice to be effortful but is limited to binary information.

Schoenebeck et al. (2021) consider adversarial agents. The paper draws upon methods from robust learning to identify adversarial data. Liu et al. (2022) study a different class of belief elicitation mechanisms where *some* noisy information on truth exists. The authors build upon algorithms for unsupervised learning that also need to verify data as correct. They couple this with the use of Peer-Prediction mechanisms to elicit probabilistic beliefs.

### 3.2.7 Choice-matching

Choice-Matching can be considered a variation of the BTS that is designed to be more intuitive (Cvitanić et al., 2019). As in the BTS, the subjects are asked to answer two questions: One unverifiable multiple-choice question and a verifiable *auxiliary* question. Subjects are rewarded for accuracy on the verifiable auxiliary question. The answers to the non-verifiable first question sorts subjects into groups. Subjects are also rewarded for the accuracy of *other respondents from their own group* on the auxiliary question. Specifically, the subjects are assigned a weighted sum of the own score and the average groups score. Answering the verifiable auxiliary question truthfully is the best strategy, since it is scored with a proper scoring rule. Answering the non-verifiable question truthfully is best, if one believes the other subjects which share the own belief to be the most accurate on the verifiable question (and everyone plays truthfully).

Choice-matching is no less complex than the BTS, but possesses a stronger intuition and may be easier to convey. Consider the purely illustrative question: "What percent-




Figure 6: Choice-matching relies on strict correlation between beliefs

age of global energy will come from fusion in the year 2100?” The auxiliary question is: ”Will a company have reached a near-term fusion energy milestone in 2030?” A fusion-skeptic should report a low probability of the fusion-milestone being reached. If the fusion-skeptic reports a low percentage of fusion-energy by 2100 this effectively assigns her a score on the auxiliary (fusion-milestone) question from another subject who also reports a low fusion-energy percentage. This report is likely to better match her own belief than the reports from subjects who report a higher percentage of fusion by 2100. Therefore, she is better off by being truthful. Essentially, choice-matching substitutes the scoring of an unverifiable report (see Figure 6) by making an implied verifiable report.

The key assumption is that subjects assume a steady correlation between the reported beliefs on both questions. That way, a unverifiable truthful report implies a truthful verifiable report. If this assumption is not met, incentives can be dramatically different. For example, if belief A in Figure 6 is believed to correspond to the same implied verifiable report as B (red arrow), there is no difference between choosing A or B for the subjects.

Zawojka and Krawczyk (2022) use choice-matching to elicit the willingness-to-pay (WTP) of the inhabitants of Warsaw regarding new solar panels. These solar panels

are a hypothetical intervention of the city of Warsaw. The second auxiliary question is: Given that you have 1000 zloty, how much of this budget are you going to spend on reforestation? The key assumption here is that subjects preferences regarding reforestation and willingness-to-pay for solar panels are strictly correlated. There is no score score in this study. Instead the subjects want to get their preferred share of zlotys donated to reforestation. They were informed that the true donation towards reforestation will be determined by their own choice and the choice of others who stated a similar WTP for solar panels. Assuming that the mechanism works, stating a high WTP for solar panels would imply a high donation to reforestation and vice versa. The study showcases multiple issues with the real-world implementation of choice-matching:

1. The choice of auxiliary question is not straightforward. A strict correlation of beliefs is required, which is not satisfied in the study by Zawojka and Krawczyk (2022). They run a survey to find out that only 54% of participants believed in a positive correlation and as much as 25% of respondents believed WTP for solar panels and reforestation to be negatively correlated.
2. In this particular study there is the additional issue of donations: One could claim a low WTP for solar panels and then simply donate the full share of funds to reforestation anyhow. This would additionally increase the average donation in the low-WTP/low-donation group. Had the person chosen to state a high WTP for solar panels, they would not affect actual donations by as much, because they enter a high-WTP/high-donation group.
3. Choice-matching requires categorical choices to "group" reports and subjects. In this study, seven groups were constructed post-hoc based on the elicitation of WTP with numerical values. This way, full accuracy is maintained.<sup>24</sup> However,

---

<sup>24</sup>Just having seven categorical choices would be a very inaccurate for belief elicitation.

this post-hoc grouping (through the experimenter) determines the outcomes of all subjects and may thus be seen as an unfair and unwanted feature.

When faced with choice-matching, the subjects report a significantly higher average willingness-to-pay for solar energy when compared with a control group that is not incentivized. Another interesting finding from the study is that the introduction of choice-matching impedes reported understanding, but this is to be expected. Since the study cannot compare the outcomes with observable measures of WTP for solar energy, it does not provide evidence for or against choice-matching.

### **3.2.8 Square Root Agreement Rule**

With the Square Root Agreement Rule, subjects receive a reward if their report matches the report of another randomly chosen reference subject. The difference to Output Agreement is that subjects are not paid a constant amount if their answers match. Rather, a constant payment is divided by the square root of a popularity index that indicates how many others have chosen this answer. In other words, the Square Root Agreement Rule incentivizes matching answers that are rare in the general population. Assuming common priors, multiple questions and a sufficient sample size,<sup>25</sup> the mechanism also makes truth-telling a BNE which is the highest-grossing equilibrium. To find out which answer pays highest, the subject should first estimate what other responses are likely to look like. Then, the subject would choose the answer which it assumes is highest-grossing, which, given a set of assumptions, coincides with its true belief regarding the question. An obvious downside is that the probability of matching a random peer is small with many similar but distinct reports. For example, consider a probability elicitation: "What is the probability of X happening?". If two matched peers submit 9% and 8% respectively, they get no payout although they are almost

---

<sup>25</sup>It is necessary to arrive at "smooth" frequencies for answers. This issue is the same with the BTS.

agreeing. Kong (2024) criticizes the Square Root Agreement Rule for having a comparably "weak truthfulness property", as the truthful equilibrium is only guaranteed to be higher-grossing if all subjects engage in the same strategy across questions.

### 3.2.9 Source differential peer prediction

Three subjects (or more) which submit their reports regarding a shared unverifiable phenomena are randomly and unknowingly assigned different roles (Schoenebeck and Yu, 2020).<sup>26</sup> The roles are expert, source and target (see Figure 7).<sup>27</sup> All subjects are asked to report their true beliefs simultaneously. The expert is paid based on how accurate her report predicts the targets report. The target is not paid at all. The sources report is handed to the expert *after* the expert made her prediction. The expert then *revises* her report and predicts the targets report a second time. Both the expert and the source are paid based on the accuracy of this revised report. What are the incentives set up via this game? The expert is best off accurately predicting the targets signal. However, no one knows who is source or target. Thus, the expert is incentivized to predict the average subjects report. Since source and target do not know which role they have, they have the same incentives. If they are the source they will maximize their payouts if the expert makes the best possible revised prediction. Therefore, the source/target is incentivized to supply the expert with the best possible information. This theoretically results in both target and source reporting the truth. Truth-telling is the highest-paying BNE in this game.

---

<sup>26</sup>Actually, the authors propose two mechanisms. The other mechanism is called *target differential peer prediction*. The two are not described separately here because they are two versions of the same mechanism.

<sup>27</sup>Actually, the expert does know that she is the expert, and which role the others have. However, leaving the expert uncertain regarding her role is possible. Srinivasan and Morgenstern (2021) shows this in a hypothetical application. This is an avenue for future research.




Figure 7: In source differential peer prediction the expert makes two predictions of the targets prediction, one before and one after the sources prediction has been unveiled to the expert.

### 3.3 Market-based mechanisms

#### 3.3.1 Bayesian Market

Baillon (2017) applies the fundamental idea behind the BTS and Peer-Prediction to a market. On a *Bayesian Market* subjects purchase assets and consequently reveal their true beliefs. Belief elicitation and aggregation on conventional markets and prediction markets is well studied (Koessler et al., 2012, Kenneth J. Arrow et al., 2008).<sup>28</sup> The Bayesian Market is similar to a prediction market, but differs in several key features. Mainly, the assets fundamental value on a Bayesian Market is the relative frequency of 'Yes' or 'Buy' positions. That is, if 60% of the subjects choose to purchase the asset, the value of the asset is 0.60\$. The subjects can either take a 'Yes' or 'No' position, i.e. buy or sell (short) the asset. All trading occurs via the market maker and not directly

<sup>28</sup>For example, bond prices predict economic growth and recessions (Estrella et al., 2003). Betting odds on sports games accurately predict game outcomes (Spann and Skiera, 2009).

between subjects. Thus, the market maker (principal) determines the price of the asset. An example illustrates the Bayesian Market best. An hypothetical panel of agents is asked: Will the company fail? Let the market maker set a price of 0.35\$.<sup>29</sup> If an agent believes that more than 35% of agents will purchase, i.e. take a 'Yes' position, than it is profitable to purchase, taking a 'Yes' position oneself. If less than 35% of agents take a 'Yes' position the asset is not worth its price, and it is profitable to take a 'No' position. The market maker facilitates the transactions at a strictly positive cost to himself, and in turn receives a frequency of 'Yes' positions. From these, the subjects true beliefs are deductible if one assumes the CPSS case. In the example, the common prior could be that 30% of the agents believes the company to fail. Agents who received information that the company is going to fail update their peer beliefs and assume that more than 35% of others also believe the company to fail. They will take 'Yes' positions. Agents who received contrary information will take a 'No' position. Truth-telling is a BNE.

At a second glance, the Bayesian Market does not resemble a market. The market maker fully controls the price and all subjects are simply confronted with a betting decision. The Bayesian Market has many advantages over other mechanisms that make similar assumptions, mainly reducing complexity for agents. The agents have a simple decision to make: to buy or to sell. Agents still need to reason about the behavior of other subjects, as this determines the asset price, but how the mechanism works can be explained easily. Furthermore, the mechanisms does away with equilibria where everyone simply submits the same answer, as no trading occurs then.

The Bayesian Market seems like a very promising candidate for actual application, but there are major limitations. The Bayesian Market can only elicit *binary* information. The issue can be resolved by running multiple Bayesian Markets. Every probabil-

---

<sup>29</sup>The price of the asset could also be determined randomly. However, the market maker might already know which price is sensible to make the market work as intended.



ity distribution can be approximated by discrete versions, which could be elicited with binary questions. This would result in questions like: "Do you think that the probability with which humanity is going face a major crisis because of AI is exactly  $x\%$  this century (Yes/No)?" Having 100 questions of this kind theoretically allows to elicit probabilistic beliefs. However, this would be extremely cumbersome and impractical.

Baillon and Xu (2021) further develop the Bayesian Market by showing that there exist other settings in which simple betting decisions can reveal private signals without the need for common priors. By relaxing several assumptions relative to other mechanisms such bet-based mechanisms may be more robust in practical applications. The paper by Baillon and Xu (2021) tentatively suggests that there is still room for improvement concerning bet-based mechanisms. Many promising and practical mechanisms may still be undiscovered.

### **3.3.2 Empirical evidence on the Bayesian Market**

Baillon, Peker, and van der Zee (2022) test the Bayesian Market in an abstract experiment.<sup>30</sup> The authors conduct a randomized trial, with three groups that differ in the way that they are incentivized: Introspection, Bayesian Market and simple bets (verified outcome). The subjects are presented with two boxes, each of which is with 50% probability the "actual" or "true" box. The true box is predetermined and known to the experimenter, the outcome is verifiable. The boxes each have marbles of blue and yellow color in them. The subjects know the sum of blue and the sum of yellow marbles across the two boxes as well as a the minimum amount of either yellow or blue marbles in each box. This gives the subjects minimal but important information on the potential distributions of marbles across the two boxes. The subjects are then faced with a choice: They can at all times pick a box, trying to predict the "true" one. They

---

<sup>30</sup>The tested mechanism is not precisely the Bayesian Market but a slightly tweaked version. The general idea remains the same.

can also draw a marble from the true box.<sup>31</sup> To draw the marble and make this valuable observation, subjects have to take an additional task that is not rewarded, engaging in effort to update their own beliefs. Most notably, the payouts are completely explained to subjects. The subjects do not even get the hint that truth-telling is best or an equilibrium strategy. Therefore, this empirical analysis actually tests the mechanism itself. The main result of the study is that the three treatments induce significantly different levels of effort. Additional effort is most often observable in the "betting" group, where subjects are directly rewarded if they guess the box correctly. The Bayesian Market group engaged in fewer additional tasks, showing less effort. However, the Bayesian Market group did engage in additional tasks significantly more often than the control group (introspection). The authors fail to report how treatment affected prediction accuracy, but this can be reconstructed from their results. Prediction accuracy was positively affected by engaging in effort. The study's results support the plausible causal chain:

Incentives → Effort → Additional information → Prediction Accuracy

Thereby, this study provides an extremely valuable insight. Subjects performed a prediction task in absence of verification with greater accuracy than if they were not incentivized because they were motivated to gather additional information.

### 3.3.3 Self-resolving prediction markets

On *self-resolving prediction markets*, subjects buy or sell an asset *sequentially*, as in an actual market (Srinivasan et al., 2023). All trading occurs via a market maker, which also makes self-resolving prediction markets a misnomer, as it is more of a sequential Peer-Prediction mechanism than a traditional market. The value of the asset is equal to

---

<sup>31</sup>The marble is placed back into the box. Drawing the marbles does not affect the contents of the boxes.

the closing price. The market terminates at any trade with a pre-specified probability. Essentially, subjects try to predict the closing value of the asset. Srinivasan et al. (2023) prove that, if everyone engages in truth-telling, truth-telling is a BNE in approximation.

This raises the question: Why not use a conventional market? This idea has been put forward (Ahlstrom-Vij, 2020, Slamka et al., 2012). For example, Ahlstrom-Vij (2020) proposes to use a market that terminates at a random point in time and where the fundamental value of an asset is the closing price.<sup>32</sup> Thus, the idea is similar to the one in Srinivasan et al. (2023). However, this constitutes a bubble without a clear equilibrium strategy. Ahlstrom-Vij (2020) argues however, that in absence of any clear equilibrium strategy, truth-telling may be a focal strategy because humans prefer to be truthful (Abeler et al., 2019).

### 3.3.4 Empirical evidence on self-resolving prediction markets

Ahlstrom-Vij (2020) conducts a randomized trial. One group is assigned to play on self-resolving prediction markets, whereas the control group plays on a regular prediction market. The subjects acted with play-money only and were paid a flat fee. The most successful trader got a small bonus payment. The predictive accuracy of both markets were compared to determine whether self-resolving prediction markets are significantly worse. The studies design is as follows: The task is to predict the share of black balls in an urn. The subjects individually observed independent draws from the urn over time and the evolving price on the market. The market price is of course shared among all individuals. Thereby, individuals did get information on the observations of

---

<sup>32</sup>Regular prediction markets can also be self-resolved in case evaluation becomes difficult. The Many Labs 2 study, a large-scale replication project for psychology research, was taken as an opportunity to test how well psychologists can predict replication outcomes. Forsell et al. (2019) set up a prediction market that ended up correctly predicting 75% of replication outcomes. Because the replications took far longer than anticipated, the researchers decided to resolve the prediction markets based on the final prices. No participating psychologist objected to this, which suggests that the participants seemed to find the self-resolution fair. This provides no evidence in favor of self-resolving markets, as participants believed the market to be a regular prediction market when they made predictions.

other individuals via the market price. Surprisingly, self-resolving prediction markets are as accurate as regular prediction markets in predicting the share of black balls. This finding is also highly significant. However, the groundbreaking result must be interpreted with respect to the study's setting. Participants were recruited via Prolific and had a shockingly low rate of passing the comprehension check. Maybe players did not understand how the self-resolving prediction market differs from a regular prediction market. This would explain why there is no difference between the two markets. More generally, it is uncertain how this 10-minute Prolific experience generalizes to settings with experts.

Unrelated to the study by Ahlstrom-Vij (2020), Slamka et al. (2012) also ran an experiment to investigate prediction markets that do not resolve based on outcomes. Slamka et al. (2012) compare three different proposed designs: A market that terminates randomly, a market that terminates at a fixed date and a market whose assets value is the volume-weighted average market price across time. In the case of the self-terminating markets, the fundamental asset value is the closing price. The authors run an experiment with an additional control group that plays on a regular prediction market. Therefore, the study design is similar to the one by Ahlstrom-Vij (2020), but with two additional treatments. However, the total sample size is much lower ( $N=78$ ), leading to small treatment groups. The result is that all treatments, i.e. self-resolving markets, perform slightly worse than the regular market. Since prediction markets are widely recognized to be one of the best ways of producing accurate forecasts (Kenneth J. Arrow et al., 2008) both the study by Ahlstrom-Vij (2020) and Slamka et al. (2012) set a high bar for their self-resolving prediction markets (see also section 6.4). Worrysome for this study is not the difference in predictive accuracy between treatment and control, but the absolute error displayed by all groups. All three treatment groups performed

no better than chance on binary questions.<sup>33</sup> It is highly questionable whether subjects actually had insight at all into the outcomes of binary questions. This greatly dilutes the result that otherwise would have been largely favorable regarding the application of self-resolving prediction markets.

## 4 Applied research

John et al. (2012) try to estimate how many psychologists engage in questionable research practices and outright fraud. The authors conduct a randomized trial, in which one group is subject to the intimidation method, i.e. the authors link to the paper by Prelec (2004) and assure participants that the BTS "rewards truthful answers". The control group is incentivized with introspection. Since subjects were anonymized, payments were instead made to charities on behalf of the subjects. The subjects were asked the following questions for ten different questionable research practices:

1. Did you cheat? (private prediction/self-admission)
2. What percentage of your peers cheated? (community prediction/prevalence)
3. How many of your cheating peers will admit to cheating?

The private prediction is idiosyncratic, i.e. refers to the *own* engagement in questionable research practices. The BTS still incentivizes truthfulness on such a idiosyncratic variable if one understands the own engagement in questionable research practices as the private signal that updates the prevalence (community prediction) of questionable research practices from a common prior. This implies that the expected prevalence of questionable research practices is *exclusively* informed by the own behavior. Question-

---

<sup>33</sup>The reported t-value implies a 36% chance of achieving a more accurate forecast than the *regular* prediction market provided via adopting random guessing.

able research practices are relatively private, but it is still a bold assumption. Furthermore, the authors ask a third question that aims to estimate how many psychologists will be untruthful and not admit to questionable research practices in the survey. The BTS only incentivizes truth-telling if everyone else is truth-telling. Given that the authors assumed this assumption to be violated, the BTS cannot have been incentivizing truth-telling. Yet, the authors did not inform participants about this.

The data shows that telling psychologists that they are being scored with the BTS increases self-admission rates of questionable research practices slightly. Even psychology researchers seem to fall for the intimidation method. The study reports shockingly high numbers of questionable research practices. Van De Schoot et al. (2021) use the same method as John et al. (2012), to also study questionable research practices. Their study has similar results and the same shortcomings.

In a similar study Loughran et al. (2014) investigate the effects of BTS on self-reporting criminal conducts and misdemeanors. One of the question sets was:

1. Did you engage in drunk driving?
2. What percentage of your peers engage in drunk driving?

The authors compute BTS scores from these two questions, treating the answer to the first question as the subject-specific signal and the second as the peer-prediction. Although this is an interesting application, it is unlikely that key assumptions for the BTS to work properly are met because the experimenters assume that the own behavior exclusively informs prevalence estimates and that everyone shares a common prior, which is questionable. The authors deployed the intimidation method and did not explain the BTS. The result of the study is that subjects assigned to the intimidation method are reporting a higher willingness to offend.

Zhou et al. (2019) study the effectiveness of the BTS for long-term energy price forecasts. However, the paper has some methodological flaws that limit the interpretability of its results. The authors elicit binned forecasts regarding future energy price changes from experts. That is, the experts select in which range their forecast lies. This makes sense as they are using the BTS to score answers, and the number of choices needs to be limited. However, the number of choices could arguably have been larger. The authors only provide 7 possible forecast bins, which relate to price changes in percent relative to 2015 prices.<sup>34</sup> The ranges are very large, have varying width, and are open to negative and positive infinity, making interpretation of the forecasts difficult (Krüger and Pavlova, 2024). The authors do not use proper scores or any other error measure for the observed outcomes and simply state the short-term forecasts (for which outcomes are available) "accurately predicted" outcomes. Given the absence of error measures or forecasting benchmarks, this statement lacks any meaning. Overall, the study completely ignored state-of-the-art forecasting techniques. The study does provide an interesting result in its own way, which the authors fail to discuss: The scores for different answers as calculated by the BTS are non-steadily decreasing across possible responses. An expert that predicts oil prices to increase by 51% or more in Australia would have received a high positive score. An expert who predicted an oil price increase of 11% to 25% would have too received a high positive score. However, an expert who predicted an oil price increase of 26% to 50% would have gotten a negative score. This simply makes no sense.<sup>35</sup> Furthermore, the authors show the study participants three videos outlining different future scenarios prior to eliciting beliefs. These videos are clearly a form of conceptual cues and may have affected forecasts (Weingarten et al.,

---

<sup>34</sup>The intervals are:  $(-\infty; -16]$ ,  $[-15; -8]$ ,  $[-7; -3]$ ,  $[-2; 2]$ [3; 7][8; 15][16;  $\infty$ )

<sup>35</sup>A forecast of 26-50% cannot be worse than both the predictions of 11-25% and 51%. This also implies that assumption regarding the BTS are violated because the BTS revives the logarithmic scoring rule, which is proper and single-peaked, when assumptions are met.

2016). The authors carried out another almost identical study, using *the same* scenarios to "stretch the thinking of survey participants (experts) and to help focus their minds [...]" to better forecast car-sharing market penetration (Zhou et al., 2017), but do not discuss or study the effects of these cues.

Schoenegger (2023) proposes to use incentives in experimental philosophy. Incentivization in experimental philosophy is not straightforward as ground truth is exactly the subject to be debated. However, most IEWV mechanisms are built around the assumption that subjects perceive a noisy signal from a *shared* observable truth. Whether this is the case in areas of philosophy is not clear. The author conducted a randomized controlled trial where one group of subjects did receive a base payment and one group was scored with the BTS. The study too deployed the intimidation method. Subjects were sourced from Prolific. The study finds that telling subjects that they will be scored better, if they honestly answer, changes responses on four out of seven philosophical questions significantly. However, a follow-up investigation by Schoenegger and Verheyen (2022) produced a null result. The second study employed different questions albeit not completely different topics. Therefore, it is hard to attribute causes for the different results. Overall, the studies results still support the notion that changing incentives and using the intimidation method affects responses, but the results warrant closer examination and more future research is needed to disentangle the effects of incentives on answers in experimental philosophy.

Output Agreement mechanisms have been used in experimental research to elicit unverifiable opinions from participants. A short discussion of some of these studies can be found in Charness et al. (2021) (section 2.2.4).

The studies reviewed in this section do not provide any evidence for or against the use of certain mechanisms because we cannot compare answers to objective probabilities or elicited beliefs. Thus, we do not know whether the mechanisms actually work.



Nonetheless, significant shortcomings of the mechanisms can be observed because the elicitation is not even coherent at times, which allows us to conjecture that mechanisms sometimes did not work as intended.

## 5 Forecast combination

Some of the mechanisms for IEWV have been repurposed for combining or aggregating forecasts. Forecast combination refers to distilling a single estimate from multiple estimates. Simple combination schemes, such as taking the mean, have been found to robustly improve upon individual forecasts (Clemen, 1989). It is important to remark that forecast combination is a post-hoc analysis and is unrelated to the *elicitation* of beliefs.

Prelec et al. (2017) propose to use the BTS as a way of combining forecasts.<sup>36</sup> Most existing approaches to forecast combination require multiple questions in order to assess the relative performance of forecasters. Since the BTS employs the peer-prediction as a second question, this second question can be used to assess the relative performance of forecasters, assuming that accurate forecasters also make accurate peer-predictions. Prelec et al. (2017) engage in empirical studies across multiple domains and subject groups where they use the BTS to combine forecasts. These forecasts are then compared to majority opinion and confidence-weighted combination schemes. The result is that the BTS combination scheme provides the correct answer more often than other combination schemes. However, the chosen benchmarks are not state-of-the-art combination schemes.<sup>37</sup> A problem is that the study by Prelec et al. (2017)

---

<sup>36</sup>In fact, the authors use a new name for this method, "surprisingly popular", but the core does not differ from the general idea of the BTS.

<sup>37</sup>None of the benchmark combination schemes is reviewed in the extensive reviews by Clemen (1989) or X. Wang et al. (2023). Whilst Prelec et al. (2017) aim to fix majority voting, the author is not aware of any serious forecasting tasks where majority voting would have even been considered as a way of combining forecasts.

only considers binary or categorical choices, i.e. no probabilistic predictions are being made. It would be standard forecasting practice to make probabilistic predictions, thus expressing uncertainty (Gneiting and Katzfuss, 2014). Moreover, even the mean predictions are not much better than chance on all datasets and individual predictions are not much better than chance (Liu et al., 2022).<sup>38</sup>

Wilkening et al. (2022) run another study to test the BTS proposed by Prelec et al. (2017) against a slightly different combination scheme proposed by Martinie et al. (2020). This combination scheme still asks for two predictions: A private prediction and a prediction of others. The forecasts are then weighted by the difference between the own prediction and the prediction of others prediction. Intuitively, this mechanism should identify forecasters which possess a lot of private information. Wilkening et al. (2022) find that their method is significantly better than the BTS in combining predictions. However, the BTS does not improve significantly upon majority voting or confidence-weighted combinations in this study.<sup>39</sup> Peker and Wilkening (2023) furthermore show that a peer-prediction-based combination method can improve the calibration of forecasts under specific circumstances.

Palley and Soll (2019) motivate the use of the BTS as a forecast combination scheme by explaining how it solves the "shared-information-problem". Generally, forecast combination seems to improve upon individual forecasts because it aggregates diverse information that different forecasters possess (Clemen, 1989). However, if multiple forecasters have shared information, this information is over-emphasized when taking the mean of forecasts. That is, forecasters that are similar to each other do not provide additional benefits to the combined forecasts, but skew the final forecast. By posing the additional

---

<sup>38</sup>The brier scores of means are between 0.333 and 0.480 (J. Wang et al., 2021). The mean predictions are almost certainly better than individual predictions. The high brier scores come from the fact that forecasters made definitive statements.

<sup>39</sup>The authors also replicate the study by Prelec et al. (2017) and find the results to be robust.

question: "What will your peers forecast?", the BTS can *in theory* detect forecasters with shared information. This is of course only the case if the assumptions regarding the beliefs of forecasters are correct. The authors propose multiple weighting-schemes based on different scenarios regarding the theoretical information structure. Palley and Soll (2019) further run four empirical studies to investigate the properties of their forecast combination mechanisms. In studies 1 and 2, the authors set up a very abstract scenario that matches the theoretical assumptions well. Subjects recruited via MTurk are asked to estimate the bias in a biased coin based on a limited number of private and public observations. In these studies the combination schemes improve upon the mean estimate slightly but significantly. In study 3, students are asked to estimate the price of groceries. In this setting, all methods again improve upon simple averaging, but the improvement is much smaller than in the studies 1 and 2. In study 4, subjects recruited via MTurk forecast NCAA basketball game outcomes, where the forecast combination schemes reduce error only by approximately one percent compared to the mean. Overall, the studies are favorable regarding the potential benefits of using the combination schemes. However, the studies also show that the effectiveness of the combination scheme depends on the situation. Particularly, the benefits seem to fade as the prediction task becomes less lab-controlled and closer to real-world forecasting tasks. Furthermore, there are two factors that may have impacted the results of study 3 and 4. First, students in study 3 did not actually purchase groceries and were not otherwise scored for accuracy. Subjects in study 4 had poor knowledge of basketball game outcomes, barely beating chance.<sup>40</sup> In a follow-up study Palley and Satopää (2023) add to the experimental data and further develop their forecast combination method. The results remain unchanged. Rilling (2024) develops a variation of this combination method that improves accuracy on some of the data.

---

<sup>40</sup>The average brier score was 0.232.

Howie et al. (2010) use the BTS to predict adoption of new pharmaceutical products. The authors ask physicians regarding the probability that they would recommend a new drug, given that it becomes available. The physicians were not incentivized to answer truthfully. The authors use the BTS to combine the forecasts and find that the combination beats the mean of all private forecasts. However, the study has the minor methodological flaw that product adoption is measured via a commercially available database, whereas the physicians were asked whether they *personally* would recommend the product, which remains unobserved. The authors understand the physicians personal responses as being representative of the population of physicians that affect product adoption as is measured in the commercial database. Overall, this study and many others throughout this section are not satisfyingly explaining why combining forecasts with the BTS should improve accuracy. There are multiple possible explanations. Are subjects engaging in meta-cognition when thinking about what their peers might say? Or is the computation of the final forecast fully responsible for the improvement?

Other studies that try to repurpose the BTS for forecast combination provide mixed evidence. Radas and Prelec (2019) ask subjects from MTurk to state their willingness to pay for new gadgets. They find in successive randomized trials that combining predictions via the BTS reduces error in reported willingness to pay. Olsson et al. (2021) run an election poll in the US. They ask for a prediction of the outcome as well as the own intention to vote and a judgment of their social circles voting behavior. The BTS-weighted forecast yields the lowest error most often when compared to averaged election predictions and social-circle-predictions.<sup>41</sup> Rutchick et al. (2020) also test the BTS as a forecast combination method. In three studies, one of which replicates Lee et al. (2018), the authors investigate whether weighting subjects answers with the BTS improves forecasts. However, subjects are barely better than chance in the studies so

---

<sup>41</sup>Related papers are: Olsson et al., 2019, Galesic et al., 2018.

that there is little to wisdom to combine. The authors find that the method did not perform better than simpler alternatives.

Dai et al. (2021) try to extend the idea of aggregating predictions on prediction markets with the BTS. The authors develop a predictive model that combines market participants information to aggregate a more truthful result. The authors also test their model on a sports betting database, but are forced to make strong assumptions to do so. Overall, it is unclear what the main benefit of this mechanism is, given the ability of subjects to express confidence in bets by buying more shares. Therefore, prediction markets already very accurate (Kenneth J. Arrow et al., 2008).

J. Wang et al. (2021) build upon the aforementioned papers by testing the use of Peer-Prediction mechanisms for forecast combination. An important difference between Peer-Prediction mechanisms and the BTS is that Peer-Prediction mechanisms usually do not require to elicit prior beliefs via a second question that is posed to subjects. Therefore, Peer-Prediction mechanisms can be used to combine single forecasts when a common prior is assumed. This has the additional benefit that the methods can be tested on historical forecasting data. The authors use Surrogate Scoring Rules, the Peer Truth Serum, Proxy Scoring Rules, Determinant based Mutual Information and Correlated Agreement to rank forecasters in historical forecasting datasets. The bottom 90% of forecasters, as measured by the IEWV scores, is eliminated and only the remaining forecasts are used for further forecast combination. Surprisingly, forecast combination with all five Peer-Prediction algorithms improve total accuracy in many datasets slightly. Particularly, accuracy in the GoodJudgment Forecasting Project is improved, even compared to a very tough benchmark (Satopää et al., 2014). This tentatively suggests that Peer-Prediction mechanisms may be discovering skilled forecasters in a crowd when no additional information is available on the forecasters. All five Peer-Prediction mechanisms achieve very similar performance in combining the forecasts.




Figure 8: Full Accuracy Scoring leverages information from predictions about future and past events

Atanasov et al. (2023) take the idea of using IEWV mechanisms for forecast combination much further: Their proposed combination scheme *Full Accuracy Scoring* scores yet-to-be-verified forecasts with IEWV methods and those that have been resolved with proper scoring. Thus, individual forecasters (or models) are evaluated regarding their "full accuracy" as opposed to their "past accuracy" (see Figure8).

The paper largely focuses on discovering skilled forecasters in a forecasting tournament setting. The main research question is: How well do full accuracy scores predict final proper scores? The authors investigate the idea empirically by computing Full Accuracy Scores on two past forecasting tournaments. The authors chose Proper Proxy Scoring Rules as the IEWV method for scoring yet-to-be-evaluated forecasts. Forecasting skill, as measured by proper scores after all questions have resolved, is indeed better predicted by Full Accuracy Scoring than past track-records at any point in time. However, the advantage of Full Accuracy Scoring diminishes as the share of events that have happened in the past increases.

Whilst many papers have focused on the single-question setting, where forecasts need to be combined lacking a track record, Full Accuracy Scoring is generally applicable as long as the number of forecasting questions is greater than 2. The single-question setting (where the population-frequency-question would be employed as a second ques-

tion) is just a specific instance of the more general case of lacking track records that Full Accuracy Scoring addresses. Thus, Full Accuracy Scoring is more widely applicable and looks like a very promising candidate for additional empirical verification. Full Accuracy Scoring seems to be particularly interesting for improving the combination of long-term-forecasts.

Overall, despite the large amount of literature on this subject, the evidence regarding the aptitude of mechanisms for forecast combination is quite mixed. There are very few studies that compare the mechanisms with state-of-the-art combination methods. This is an avenue for future research.

## 6 Discussion and future research directions

### 6.1 Truthfulness in theory and practice

Whilst the existence of a BNE in which everyone is truth-telling seems to be a useful requirement for any IEWV mechanism, there is no theoretical property that guarantees strong incentives to be truthful, and there is no fully collusion-resistant mechanism. Subjects can always collude to maximize their payouts.<sup>42</sup>

**Assumptions are unlikely to hold in reality.** Almost all mechanisms assume the CPSS, a Bayesian update from a common prior based on a single signal. Collecting self-reports (e.g. in medicine) and data labeling might reflect the CPSS case well. However, any situation that does not just involve regurgitating a simple signal does not. Consequently, we should expect mechanisms to work well only for situations that reflect the CPSS.

**Therefore, empirical research is needed to verify that mechanisms work in practice.** Since we are interested in "what works", comparing mechanisms is a

---

<sup>42</sup>Even mechanisms that are entirely built around the idea of avoiding this, such as in Kong (2024), cannot distinguish between true reports and collective permutations of it (such as everyone reporting the opposite).

fundamentally empirical matter (Charness et al., 2021). However, this review article documents that empirical research has been gravely neglected. There are only a few mechanisms for which some empirical evidence has been collected. Many authors try to verify their mechanism empirically ”with real human forecasters”. The researchers usually use synthetic forecasting data to compare proper scores with scores computed with IEWV mechanisms, claiming success if the two match. This is a fruitless exercise and provides no evidence, because the whole point of IEWV is to change incentives and behavior in the first place. If the forecasters had not been incentivized with proper scoring, forecasts might have been different. We would not need any mechanism if we knew that reports are already truthful. In fact, what researchers actually test is whether mechanisms assign fair scores conditional on truthful play.<sup>43</sup>

## 6.2 Mechanism complexity impedes research and application

**Many mechanisms that were proposed are very complex and this impedes research and application.** It is important that subjects understand how mechanisms work. If there is no way to convey the mechanism to subjects, it cannot have any effect on their behavior. Consequently, if a mechanism is too complicated to be understood by research subjects, it cannot be tested.

Mechanism designers have neglected complexity in pursuit of more strongly truthful mechanisms. Mechanisms that were published later are often more complicated, but tend to have more desirable theoretical properties.<sup>44</sup> Mechanism designers are aware of the problem that elicitation may occur with large amounts of perhaps unmotivated subjects with limited attention. Thus, mechanisms were built to be ”detail-free and minimal”, i.e. to require minimal input. However, this made mechanisms even more

---

<sup>43</sup>I am assuming that proper scoring leads to truthful play here, but even this is not clear either.

<sup>44</sup>This includes mainly truthful BNE that are highest-paying.



complicated. Most empirical studies have tried to sidestep this problem by resorting to measures that avoid explanation of the actual mechanism. However, subjects did not comprehend the actual mechanisms and these studies consequently fail to provide convincing evidence that mechanisms incentivize truthfulness.

The solution is clear: Make mechanisms easier to understand. Interestingly, this is also the bottom line of Charness et al. (2021), who review elicitation methods generally and thus reach this conclusion using different evidence. More specifically, they conclude that there is a trade-off between complexity and theoretical appeal of the elicitation method and "that the tendency of researchers studying belief elicitation to design ever-more theoretically-robust methods with little consideration of complexity has not led to systematic improvements in empirical belief measurements". This is true for methods studied in this review as well. Recent research suggests that the search for easy-to-comprehend and truthful mechanisms is far from over, and that significant improvements can be made. Choice-matching is much more intuitive than the BTS, and the Bayesian Market is easier to explain than Peer-Prediction, all whilst fully retaining desired theoretical properties.

### **6.3 Subject selection and incentivization in empirical research**

**Oftentimes, empirical studies fail to provide convincing evidence of the effectiveness of mechanisms because the subjects display little foresight. This impedes empirical research.** If subjects have no foresight, then there is nothing to study, as treatment will not measurably affect the accuracy of reports. In two of the reviewed studies, the subjects are not better than a random guesser. There is good reason to believe that crowdworkers, who constitute most research subjects, may be poor forecasters and estimators. For example, some studies ask subjects to make probabilistic predictions, although we know that untrained subjects tend to make poor

probabilistic statements due to miscalibration (Lichtenstein et al., 1977, Keren, 1987). Expertise in the subject matter and the ability to make accurate forecasts typically varies a lot across subjects (Tetlock and Gardner, 2015). However, it is not clear why many subjects report inaccurate data. Peer et al. (2022) study respondents data quality on crowdsourcing platforms such as Amazon MTurk and Prolific in a large empirical trial. They conclude that the data quality on crowdsourcing platforms is satisfactory, but that there are significant differences across samples. Furthermore, the data quality provided depends on the type of research conducted. Thus, additional research that investigates the aptitude of crowdsourcing platforms for this kind of research would be valuable. Sourcing participants from online forecasting tournaments or universities may be better and more representative regarding applications involving expert elicitation (Tetlock et al., 2014).

**Many of the reviewed studies do not stick to the mechanisms that they test, but add lotteries or bonus payouts, which sabotages the incentive structure.** Most empirical studies pay only top scorers a fixed bonus, e.g. the top 1/3 of subjects, as determined by IEWV scores. This massively distorts the original incentives of the mechanism, completely wrecking any considerations regarding truthful play along the way (Witkowski et al., 2023). This is a mostly theoretical remark since the mechanisms themselves are rarely understood by participants. However, researchers should pay attention to this in future empirical work.

## 6.4 Benchmarking mechanisms with introspection

**Introspection is the benchmark to beat, not proper scoring.** A lot of the focus on truthful equilibria stems from the misguided sense of having to recreate perfect incentives for truth-telling as provided by proper scoring. This is how Prelec (2004) motivates the BTS. This would be great, but it is not necessary. When ground truth

is not accessible, no proper scoring is available. There should be no doubt that introspection is currently the method that is used to elicit beliefs when ground truth is inaccessible. Introspection is the standard even in research practice outside of economics (Schoenegger, 2023, Charness et al., 2021). Furthermore, introspection mostly does just fine (Charness et al., 2021, Baillon, Bleichrodt, and Granic, 2022, Dana et al., 2019). IEWV mechanisms are *helpful* if they lead to more accurate reports than introspection. Output Agreement, as studied by Von Ahn and Dabbish (2004), shows that even the simplest mechanism can potentially improve upon introspection.

**Mechanisms can also be harmful by distracting and incentivizing collusion.** The study by Gao et al. (2014) shows that this may be a very real problem. Charness et al. (2021) argue that the complexity of mechanisms reduces the accuracy of reports because it confuses subjects. Furthermore, if applied in the expert elicitation case, the use of mechanisms may discourage effort because it may reduce or otherwise interfere with the experts intrinsic motivation to answer accurately (Frey and Jegen, 2001). Mechanisms need to be applied with great care and only after additional field-work is done to make sure that mechanisms do not pose adversarial incentives.

## 6.5 Future research directions

### 6.5.1 Open theoretical research questions

- Are there simpler mechanisms that have truth-telling as a BNE?

How can they be made more robust to collusion? Can they be varied such that the incentives become more intuitive? For example: What is the optimal number of groups for reciprocal scoring? Should the subjects know in which group they are in? Should source differential peer prediction be carried out in groups?

- The costly opportunity to get more signals should be modeled.

The paper by Liu and Chen (2017) is a good start, but considers a very narrow case. It would be interesting more broadly to which degree effort is incentivized in different mechanisms. Few empirical studies, Baillon, Peker, and van der Zee (2022) being a notable exception, even consider effort as a relevant mediator of accuracy.

- Could the Bayesian Market be extended to elicit probabilistic information?

For example, subjects could be asked to state their WTP for the asset. That is, they would answer the question: "How many others will purchase 'Yes'?" The subjects would not know about the price at which they can purchase. Trading would take place automatically based on a randomly determined price. If the price is lower than the stated WTP the asset is purchased. Thus, incentives to be truthful would be unchanged. But now probabilistic statements would be elicited. This is similar to probability matching for verifiable reports.<sup>45</sup>

- Assumptions regarding the agents are frequently made. Are they met? How can we know?

The assumptions make testable predictions about the elicited data. For example, a common prior and impersonal updating implies that the Peer-Prediction implies the private prediction. This can be tested post-hoc with the data sampled for studies involving the BTS. Since verification is possible in studies (to see whether mechanisms have an effect on accuracy), the scores of a hypothetical additional subject can be analyzed. They can be compared to the proper scores to see whether mechanisms do revive them, as theoretically promised. If the incentives are "screwed up", assumptions are likely to be violated.

---

<sup>45</sup>I admit that in suggesting such a mechanism I contradict this articles suggestion to design mechanisms to be easy-to-comprehend. The mechanism is more theoretically appealing, but also more complex. In this case, I feel that the complexity is manageable, as it is with probability matching.

### 6.5.2 Open empirical and experimental research questions

Convincing evidence on the effectiveness of mechanisms can only come from randomized trials because they allow to compare the mechanisms with introspection. Given the thin layer of empirical evidence, more basic empirical analysis is necessary first. Smaller trials of promising mechanisms can inform which mechanisms should be tested on a larger scale. There are a three key considerations that apply to most empirical work:

1. *Perception* of incentives affects behavior, not the actual mechanism. Since the mechanisms need to be explained to the participating subjects, the actual treatment is the explanation and how subjects perceive the mechanism based on that explanation. Perception can be tested by creating two equally correct explanations of a mechanisms and test whether they actually yield the same behavior.
2. Perception may depend very much on the subject itself. A mechanism that helps to improve accuracy in inexpert self-reports does not necessarily improve the accuracy of expert judgment. Different mechanisms may be needed for different applications.
3. A second path to affect perception of the incentives is *repeated interaction*. Subjects can learn about the mechanisms through scoring of their responses, and the study by Weaver and Prelec (2013) suggests that this is perhaps a powerful path to affect perception.

Open research questions include:

- Are subjects effortful?

Experiments can test whether the incentives induce the subjects to engage in more effort. A good example of this is the study by Baillon, Peker, and van der Zee (2022), where subjects can engage in additional tasks to obtain more signals.

- How well do self-resolving information markets work in practice?

Self-resolving information markets look great in existing empirical studies. Empirical studies that are closer to real-world application are needed. One could again run a randomized trial, comparing the estimates with introspection. A simpler first step could be to test self-resolving information markets on existing play-money markets. Self-resolving markets could be created there and the accuracy compared to chance. Thus, it would be a test to find out whether subjects that have more experience trading start to game the self-resolving market.

- Does the Bayesian Market work for the elicitation of binary signals, e.g. in experimental economics?

In a situation where truth would be accessible, the Bayesian Market could be compared to a standard incentive-compatible design. By comparing behavior between the two treatments, evidence regarding the effectiveness of the Bayesian Market to elicit beliefs would be created.

- What is the role of the "false-consensus-effect"?

Carvalho et al. (2017) argues that a false-consensus-effect, (falsely) believing that the own opinion is the majority opinion, explains why Output Agreement works well. Is the false-consensus-effect a rational belief when agents update based on their information, as is exploited in Peer-Prediction and Truth Serums?

- Why do mechanisms (not) work?

Experiments should distinguish between different ways in which the instructions might affect truth-telling-behavior of subjects. Subjects may be unconditionally honest (Abeler et al., 2019), actually react to incentives posed, or blindly trust a claim that truth-telling is in their own best interest.

- How collusion-resistant are different mechanisms?

Since the payment to the subjects is only dependent on their reports, subjects can always collude to maximize their payouts, regardless of what the truth is. There is no mechanism that can completely avoid this. Thus, a key property of the mechanisms is to make collusion as difficult as possible. The collusion-resistance of mechanisms can be experimentally verified by giving groups a question or task, controlled access to mechanisms and the opportunity to collude on answers. If collusion is straightforward, the group will collude to get a higher reward. If collusion is more difficult, the group might find that answering the question honestly is the easier way to receive a high reward.

- Are there ways to improve upon Proper Proxy Scoring? Which proxies would provide the strongest incentives to be accurate?

Should we take the simple mean? Or should we resort to extremizing (Baron et al., 2014) or other complicated proxies that work well in forecast combination? Does Proper Proxy Scoring benefit from linking multiple questions?

- Who is truthful? Within-subject design vs. treatment groups.

After subjects answer a question which is incentivized with an IEWV mechanism, the same question could be asked again, but now reformulated as an actual bet against the true outcome. If the betting decision is not in line with the first answer, this can be interpreted as evidence of being non-truthful in the first stage. An upside of this within-subject design is that it allows to identify non-truthful individuals.

- What is the effect of the intimidation method across studies? Should we employ the intimidation method when it is credible?

By gathering the data of multiple studies the treatment effect of the intimidation method could be assessed. The more important question should be when and whether to use the intimidation method. It could do great harm to science and the credibility of research to make false claims, even if they are well-intended. Ethical considerations are necessary.

- Are crowdsourcing platforms a good source of participants for studies on forecasting and IEWV?

By gathering the data from the studies that are reviewed here, and studies on forecasting, the total accuracy of participants could be assessed. Which factors predict accuracy? A randomized trial involving subjects from multiple sources could assess differences in performance.

- Can Full Accuracy Scoring improve (existing) long-term forecasts?

Given that full accuracy scoring seems to improve forecasts, it would be interesting to look at long-term forecasts, made either by models or individuals, who also made short-term forecasts. Then, the long-term forecast could be revised using information from the short-term forecasts.<sup>46</sup>

- Do subjects believe key assumptions to be met?

This could simply be asked for. All mechanisms require that all subjects are truthful and expect others to be truthful too. Eliciting the expected truthfulness of other subjects is thus very interesting.

---

<sup>46</sup>Atanasov et al. (2023) report results for two different forecasting datasets that they employ in their empirical analysis. Whilst Proper Proxy Scores are barely predicting proper scores in study 1, they predict proper scores in study 2 extremely well, outperforming the past track record for much of the time. Why is that? The paper lacks an explanation for this observation and other key differences between the two datasets.



## 7 Conclusion

This review article provides an overview over mechanisms which incentivize truth-telling in absence of verification. We are reliant on accurate and truthful self-reports for sound decision-making in areas such as long-term forecasting, estimating risk and data labeling.

Although there has been extensive theoretical research into mechanisms which provide incentives for truth-telling in absence of verification, this article shows that empirical evidence is lacking. It is difficult to gather empirical evidence on the effectiveness of mechanisms because their complexity makes it hard to convey them to research subjects. Therefore, devising simpler mechanisms, and testing them, is an avenue for future research.

Furthermore, this review suggests that many research questions remain to be solved. We do not yet understand when or if to use mechanisms, whether assumptions are violated, what the role of cognitive biases is, where to source research subjects, and how these mechanisms could be implemented at scale. I am looking forward to future research that equips us with the tools necessary to more accurately elicit beliefs in absence of verifiable truth.

## References

- Abeler, J., Nosenzo, D., & Raymond, C. (2019). Preferences for Truth-Telling. *Econometrica*, 87(4), 1115–1153. <https://doi.org/10.3982/ECTA14673>
- Agarwal, A., Mandal, D., Parkes, D. C., & Shah, N. (2017). Peer Prediction with Heterogeneous Users. *Proceedings of the 2017 ACM Conference on Economics and Computation*, 81–98. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3033274.3085127>
- Ahlstrom-Vij, K. (2020). Self-resolving Information Markets: A Comparative Study. *The Journal of Prediction Markets*, 13(1). <https://doi.org/10.5750/jpm.v13i1.1687>

- Atanasov, P. D., Karger, E., & Tetlock, P. (2023). Full Accuracy Scoring Accelerates the Discovery of Skilled Forecasters. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4357367>
- Baillon, A. (2017). Bayesian markets to elicit private information. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, *114*(30), 7958–7962. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1703486114>
- Baillon, A., Peker, C., & van der Zee. (2022). Peer prediction markets to elicit unverifiable information [Working Paper].
- Baillon, A., Bleichrodt, H., & Granic, G. D. (2022). Incentives in surveys. *Journal of Economic Psychology*, *93*, 102552. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joep.2022.102552>
- Baillon, A., & Xu, Y. (2021). Simple bets to elicit private signals. *Theoretical Economics*, *16*(3), 777–797. <https://doi.org/10.3982/TE4343>
- Baron, J., Mellers, B. A., Tetlock, P. E., Stone, E., & Ungar, L. H. (2014). Two Reasons to Make Aggregated Probability Forecasts More Extreme. *Decision Analysis*, *11*(2), 133–145. <https://doi.org/10.1287/deca.2014.0293>
- Barrage, L., & Lee, M. S. (2010). A penny for your thoughts: Inducing truth-telling in stated preference elicitation. *Economics Letters*, *106*(2), 140–142. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.econlet.2009.11.006>
- Carvalho, A., Dimitrov, S., & Larson, K. (2017). Inducing honest reporting of private information in the presence of social projection. *Decision*, *4*(1), 25–51. <https://doi.org/10.1037/dec0000052>
- Charness, G., Gneezy, U., & Rasocho, V. (2021). Experimental methods: Eliciting beliefs. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, *189*, 234–256. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jebo.2021.06.032>
- Clemen, R. T. (1989). Combining forecasts: A review and annotated bibliography. *International Journal of Forecasting*. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0169-2070\(89\)90012-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/0169-2070(89)90012-5)
- Court, D., Gillen, B., McKenzie, J., & Plott, C. R. (2018). Two information aggregation mechanisms for predicting the opening weekend box office revenues of films: Boxoffice Prophecy and Guess of Guesses. *Economic Theory*, *65*(1), 25–54. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00199-017-1036-1>
- Cvitanić, J., Prelec, D., Riley, B., & Tereick, B. (2019). Honesty via Choice-Matching. *American Economic Review: Insights*, *1*(2), 179–192. <https://doi.org/10.1257/aeri.20180227>
- Dai, M., Jia, Y., & Kou, S. (2021). The wisdom of the crowd and prediction markets. *Journal of Econometrics*, *222*(1), 561–578. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeconom.2020.07.016>
- Dana, J., Atanasov, P., Tetlock, P., & Mellers, B. (2019). Are markets more accurate than polls? The surprising informational value of “just asking”. *Judgment and Decision Making*, *14*(2), 135–147. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1930297500003375>
- Dasgupta, A., & Ghosh, A. (2013). Crowdsourced judgement elicitation with endogenous proficiency. *Proceedings of the 22nd international conference on World Wide Web*, 319–330. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2488388.2488417>

- Estrella, A., Rodrigues, A. P., & Schich, S. (2003). How Stable is the Predictive Power of the Yield Curve? Evidence from Germany and the United States. *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 85(3), 629–644. <https://doi.org/10.1162/003465303322369777>
- Faltings, B. (2023). Game-theoretic Mechanisms for Eliciting Accurate Information. *Proceedings of the Thirty-Second International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 6601–6609. <https://doi.org/10.24963/ijcai.2023/740>
- Faltings, B., & Radanovic, G. (2017). *Game Theory for Data Science: Eliciting Truthful Information*. Springer International Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-01577-9>
- Feng, S., Yu, F. Y., & Chen, Y. (2022). Peer Prediction for Learning Agents [Version Number: 2]. <https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.2208.04433>
- Forsell, E., Viganola, D., Pfeiffer, T., Almenberg, J., Wilson, B., Chen, Y., Nosek, B. A., Johannesson, M., & Dreber, A. (2019). Predicting replication outcomes in the Many Labs 2 study. *Journal of Economic Psychology*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joep.2018.10.009>
- Frank, M. R., Cebrian, M., Pickard, G., & Rahwan, I. (2017). Validating Bayesian truth serum in large-scale online human experiments. *PLOS ONE*. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0177385>
- Frey, B. S., & Jegen, R. (2001). Motivation Crowding Theory. *Journal of Economic Surveys*, 15(5), 589–611. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-6419.00150>
- Galesic, M., Bruine De Bruin, W., Dumas, M., Kapteyn, A., Darling, J. E., & Meijer, E. (2018). Asking about social circles improves election predictions. *Nature Human Behaviour*, 2(3), 187–193. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41562-018-0302-y>
- Gao, A., Mao, A., Chen, Y., & Adams, R. P. (2014). Trick or treat: Putting peer prediction to the test. *Proceedings of the fifteenth ACM conference on Economics and computation*, 507–524. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2600057.2602865>
- Gao, A., Wright, J., & Leyton-Brown, K. (2020). Incentivizing Evaluation with Peer Prediction and Limited Access to Ground Truth. *Proceedings of the Twenty-Ninth International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 5140–5144. <https://doi.org/10.24963/ijcai.2020/723>
- Ghosh, A., Ligett, K., Roth, A., & Schoenebeck, G. (2014). Buying private data without verification. *Proceedings of the fifteenth ACM conference on Economics and computation*, 931–948. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2600057.2602902>
- Gneiting, T., & Katzfuss, M. (2014). Probabilistic Forecasting. *Annual Review of Statistics and Its Application*, 1(1), 125–151. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-statistics-062713-085831>
- Gneiting, T., & Raftery, A. E. (2007). Strictly Proper Scoring Rules, Prediction, and Estimation. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 102(477), 359–378. <https://doi.org/10.1198/016214506000001437>
- Goel, N., & Faltings, B. (2020). Personalized Peer Truth Serum for Eliciting Multi-Attribute Personal Data. *Proceedings of The 35th Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence Conference*. <http://proceedings.mlr.press/v115/goel20a.html>

- Greaves, H., MacAskill, W., O’Keeffe-O’Donovan, R., Trammell, P., Tereick, B., Mogenssen, A., Tarsney, C., Alexandrie, G., & Sévricourt, M. C. (2020). A research agenda for the Global Priorities Institute. <https://globalprioritiesinstitute.org/wp-content/uploads/GPI-research-agenda-version-2.1.pdf>
- Gruetzemacher, R., Dorner, F. E., Bernaola-Alvarez, N., Giattino, C., & Manheim, D. (2021). Forecasting AI progress: A research agenda. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, *170*, 120909. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2021.120909>
- Howie, P. J., Wang, Y., & Tsai, J. (2010). Predicting new product adoption using Bayesian truth serum. *Journal of Medical Marketing*. <https://doi.org/10.1057/jmm.2010.19>
- Huang, S.-W., & Fu, W.-T. (2013). Enhancing reliability using peer consistency evaluation in human computation. *Proceedings of the 2013 conference on Computer supported cooperative work*, 639–648. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2441776.2441847>
- John, L. K., Loewenstein, G., & Prelec, D. (2012). Measuring the Prevalence of Questionable Research Practices With Incentives for Truth Telling. *Psychological Science*, *23*(5), 524–532. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797611430953>
- Johnson, E. J., & Goldstein, D. (2003). Do Defaults Save Lives? *Science*, *302*(5649), 1338–1339. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1091721>
- Jurca, R., & Faltings, B. (2009). Mechanisms for Making Crowds Truthful. *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research*, *34*, 209–253. <https://doi.org/10.1613/jair.2621>
- Jurca, R., & Faltings, B. (2008). Incentives for expressing opinions in online polls. *Proceedings of the 9th ACM conference on Electronic commerce*, 119–128. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1386790.1386812>
- Kamble, V., Shah, N., Marn, D., Parekh, A., & Ramchandran, K. (2023). The Square Root Agreement Rule for Incentivizing Truthful Feedback on Online Platforms. *Management Science*, *69*(1), 377–403. <https://doi.org/10.1287/mnsc.2022.4375>
- Karger, E., Monrad, J., Mellers, B., & Tetlock, P. (2021). Reciprocal Scoring: A Method for Forecasting Unanswerable Questions. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3954498>
- Kenneth J. Arrow, Robert Forsythe, Michael Gorham, Robert W. Hahn, Robin Hanson, John O. Ledyard, Saul Levmore, Robert E. Litan, Paul Milgrom, Forrest D. Nelson, George R. Neumann, Marco Ottaviani, Thomas C. Schelling, Robert J. Shiller, Vernon L. Smith, Erik Snowberg, Cass R. Sunstein, Paul C. Tetlock, Philip E. Tetlock, . . . Eric Zitzewitz. (2008). The Promise of Prediction Markets. *Science*. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1157679>
- Keren, G. (1987). Facing uncertainty in the game of bridge: A calibration study. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, *39*(1), 98–114. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0749-5978\(87\)90047-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/0749-5978(87)90047-1)
- Koessler, F., Noussair, C., & Ziegelmeyer, A. (2012). Information aggregation and belief elicitation in experimental parimutuel betting markets. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, *83*(2), 195–208. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jebo.2012.02.017>

- Kong, Y. (2020). Dominantly Truthful Multi-task Peer Prediction with a Constant Number of Tasks. *Proceedings of the Fourteenth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms*, 2398–2411.
- Kong, Y. (2022). More Dominantly Truthful Multi-Task Peer Prediction with a Finite Number of Tasks. *LIPICs, Volume 215, ITCS 2022*, 215, 95:1–95:20. <https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPICS.ITCS.2022.95>
- Kong, Y. (2024). Dominantly Truthful Peer Prediction Mechanisms with a Finite Number of Tasks. *Journal of the ACM*, 71(2), 1–49. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3638239>
- Kong, Y., & Schoenebeck, G. (2018). Equilibrium Selection in Information Elicitation without Verification via Information Monotonicity. *LIPICs, Volume 94, ITCS 2018*, 94, 13:1–13:20. <https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPICS.ITCS.2018.13>
- Kong, Y., & Schoenebeck, G. (2019). An Information Theoretic Framework For Designing Information Elicitation Mechanisms That Reward Truth-telling. *ACM Transactions on Economics and Computation*, 7(1), 1–33. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3296670>
- Krüger, F., & Pavlova, L. (2024). Quantifying subjective uncertainty in survey expectations. *International Journal of Forecasting*, 40(2), 796–810. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijforecast.2023.06.001>
- Krumpal, I. (2013). Determinants of social desirability bias in sensitive surveys: A literature review. *Quality & Quantity*, 47(4), 2025–2047. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11135-011-9640-9>
- Law, E., & Von Ahn, L. (2011). *Human Computation*. Springer International Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-01555-7>
- Lee, M. D., Danileiko, I., & Vi, J. (2018). Testing the ability of the surprisingly popular method to predict NFL games. *Judgment and Decision Making*, 13(4), 322–333. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1930297500009207>
- Lichtenstein, S., Fischhoff, B., & Phillips, L. D. (1977). Calibration of Probabilities: The State of the Art. In H. Jungermann & G. De Zeeuw (Eds.), *Decision Making and Change in Human Affairs* (pp. 275–324). Springer Netherlands. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-010-1276-8\\_19](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-010-1276-8_19)
- Liu, Y., & Chen, Y. (2017). Sequential Peer Prediction: Learning to Elicit Effort using Posted Prices. *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 31(1). <https://doi.org/10.1609/aaai.v31i1.10619>
- Liu, Y., Wang, J., & Chen, Y. (2022). Surrogate Scoring Rules. *ACM Transactions on Economics and Computation*, 10(3), 1–36. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3565559>
- Loughran, T. A., Paternoster, R., & Thomas, K. J. (2014). Incentivizing Responses to Self-report Questions in Perceptual Deterrence Studies: An Investigation of the Validity of Deterrence Theory Using Bayesian Truth Serum. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, 30(4), 677–707. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10940-014-9219-4>
- Mandal, D., Goran, R., & Parkes, D. C. (2020). The Effectiveness of Peer Prediction in Long-Term Forecasting. *AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*. <https://doi.org/10.1609/aaai.v34i02.5591>

- Martinie, M., Wilkening, T., & Howe, P. D. L. (2020). Using meta-predictions to identify experts in the crowd when past performance is unknown (F. Schwenker, Ed.). *PLOS ONE*, *15*(4), e0232058. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0232058>
- Miller, N., Resnick, P., & Zeckhauser, R. (2005). Eliciting Informative Feedback: The Peer-Prediction Method. *Management Science*, *51*(9), 1359–1373. <https://doi.org/10.1287/mnsc.1050.0379>
- Olsson, H., De Bruin, W. B., Galesic, M., & Prelec, D. (2019, December). Harvesting the wisdom of crowds for election predictions using the Bayesian Truth Serum. <https://doi.org/10.31219/osf.io/rdjhs>
- Olsson, H., De Bruin, W. B., Galesic, M., & Prelec, D. (2021). Combining survey questions with a Bayesian bootstrap method improves election forecasts. <https://doi.org/10.31219/osf.io/nqcg8>
- Osborne, M. J. (2004). *An Introduction to Game Theory*. Oxford University Press.
- Palley, A. B., & Satopää, V. A. (2023). Boosting the Wisdom of Crowds Within a Single Judgment Problem: Weighted Averaging Based on Peer Predictions. *Management Science*, *69*(9), 5128–5146. <https://doi.org/10.1287/mnsc.2022.4648>
- Palley, A. B., & Soll, J. B. (2019). Extracting the Wisdom of Crowds When Information Is Shared. *Management Science*, *mnsc.2018.3047*. <https://doi.org/10.1287/mnsc.2018.3047>
- Papakonstantinou, A., Rogers, A., Gerding, E. H., & Jennings, N. R. (2011). Mechanism design for the truthful elicitation of costly probabilistic estimates in distributed information systems. *Artificial Intelligence*, *175*(2), 648–672. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.artint.2010.10.007>
- Peer, E., Rothschild, D., Gordon, A., Evernden, Z., & Damer, E. (2022). Data quality of platforms and panels for online behavioral research. *Behavior Research Methods*, *54*(4), 1643–1662. <https://doi.org/10.3758/s13428-021-01694-3>
- Peker, C., & Wilkening, T. (2023). Robust recalibration of aggregate probability forecasts using meta-beliefs.
- Prelec, D. (2004). A Bayesian Truth Serum for Subjective Data. *Science*. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1102081>
- Prelec, D., Seung, H. S., & McCoy, J. (2017). A solution to the single-question crowd wisdom problem. *Nature*, *541*(7638), 532–535. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature21054>
- Radanovic, G., & Faltings, B. (2013). A robust Bayesian truth serum for non-binary signals. *AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*. <https://doi.org/10.1609/aaai.v27i1.8677>
- Radanovic, G., & Faltings, B. (2014). Incentives for Truthful Information Elicitation of Continuous Signals. *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, *28*(1). <https://doi.org/10.1609/aaai.v28i1.8797>
- Radanovic, G., & Faltings, B. (2015). Incentives for Subjective Evaluations with Private Beliefs. *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, *29*(1). <https://doi.org/10.1609/aaai.v29i1.9311>

- Radanovic, G., Faltings, B., & Jurca, R. (2016). Incentives for Effort in Crowdsourcing Using the Peer Truth Serum. *ACM Transactions on Intelligent Systems and Technology*, 7(4), 1–28. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2856102>
- Radas, S., & Prelec, D. (2019). Whose data can we trust: How meta-predictions can be used to uncover credible respondents in survey data. *PLOS ONE*, 14(12), e0225432. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0225432>
- Rilling, J. (2024). Neutral Pivoting: Strong Bias Correction for Shared Information [Version Number: 1]. <https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.2404.17737>
- Roese, N. J., & Jamieson, D. W. (1993). Twenty years of bogus pipeline research: A critical review and meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 114(2), 363–375.
- Rutchick, A. M., Ross, B. J., Calvillo, D. P., & Mesick, C. C. (2020). Does the “surprisingly popular” method yield accurate crowdsourced predictions? *Cognitive Research: Principles and Implications*, 5(1), 57. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41235-020-00256-z>
- Satopää, V. A., Baron, J., Foster, D. P., Mellers, B. A., Tetlock, P. E., & Ungar, L. H. (2014). Combining multiple probability predictions using a simple logit model. *International Journal of Forecasting*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijforecast.2013.09.009>
- Schoenebeck, G., & Yu, F.-Y. (2020). Two Strongly Truthful Mechanisms for Three Heterogeneous Agents Answering One Question [Series Title: Lecture Notes in Computer Science]. In *Web and Internet Economics* (pp. 119–132, Vol. 12495). Springer International Publishing. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-64946-3\\_9](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-64946-3_9)
- Schoenebeck, G., Yu, F.-Y., & Zhang, Y. (2021). Information Elicitation from Rowdy Crowds. *Proceedings of the Web Conference 2021*, 3974–3986. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3442381.3449840>
- Schoenegger, P. (2023). Experimental Philosophy and the Incentivisation Challenge: A Proposed Application of the Bayesian Truth Serum. *Review of Philosophy and Psychology*, 14(1), 295–320. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13164-021-00571-4>
- Schoenegger, P., & Verheyen, S. (2022). Taking a Closer Look at the Bayesian Truth Serum: A Registered Report. *Experimental Psychology*, 69(4), 226–239. <https://doi.org/10.1027/1618-3169/a000558>
- Shaw, A. D., Horton, J. J., & Chen, D. L. (2011). Designing incentives for inexpert human raters. *Proceedings of the ACM 2011 conference on Computer supported cooperative work*, 275–284. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1958824.1958865>
- Shnayder, V., Agarwal, A., Frongillo, R., & Parkes, D. C. (2016). Informed Truthfulness in Multi-Task Peer Prediction. *Proceedings of the 2016 ACM Conference on Economics and Computation*, 179–196. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2940716.2940790>
- Slamka, C., Jank, W., & Skiera, B. (2012). Second-Generation Prediction Markets for Information Aggregation: A Comparison of Payoff Mechanisms. *Journal of Forecasting*, 31(6), 469–489. <https://doi.org/10.1002/for.1225>

- Spann, M., & Skiera, B. (2009). Sports forecasting: A comparison of the forecast accuracy of prediction markets, betting odds and tipsters. *Journal of Forecasting*, *28*(1), 55–72. <https://doi.org/10.1002/for.1091>
- Srinivasan, S., Karger, E., & Chen, Y. (2023). Self-Resolving Prediction Markets for Unverifiable Outcomes [Version Number: 1]. <https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.2306.04305>
- Srinivasan, S., & Morgenstern, J. (2021). Auctions and Peer Prediction for Academic Peer Review [Version Number: 2]. <https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.2109.00923>
- Surowiecki, J. (2004). *The Wisdom of Crowds: Why the Many Are Smarter Than the Few and How Collective Wisdom Shapes Business, Economies, Societies and Nations*. Anchor.
- Tetlock, P. E., & Gardner, D. (2015). *Superforecasting: The art and science of prediction* (First edition). Crown Publishers.
- Tetlock, P. E., Mellers, B. A., Rohrbaugh, N., & Chen, E. (2014). Forecasting Tournaments: Tools for Increasing Transparency and Improving the Quality of Debate. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, *23*(4), 290–295. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0963721414534257>
- Timko, C., Niederstadt, M., Goel, N., & Faltings, B. (2023). Incentive Mechanism Design for Responsible Data Governance: A Large-scale Field Experiment. *Journal of Data and Information Quality*, *15*(2), 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3592617>
- Ungar, L., Mellors, B., Satopää, V., Baron, J., Tetlock, P., Ramos, J., & Swift, S. (2012). The Good Judgment Project: A Large Scale Test of Different Methods of Combining Expert Predictions. *AAAI Technical Report FS-12-06*.
- Van De Schoot, R., Winter, S. D., Griffioen, E., Grimmelikhuijsen, S., Arts, I., Veen, D., Grandfield, E. M., & Tummers, L. G. (2021). The Use of Questionable Research Practices to Survive in Academia Examined With Expert Elicitation, Prior-Data Conflicts, Bayes Factors for Replication Effects, and the Bayes Truth Serum. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *12*, 621547. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.621547>
- Von Ahn, L., & Dabbish, L. (2004). Labeling images with a computer game. *Proceedings of the SIGCHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, 319–326. <https://doi.org/10.1145/985692.985733>
- Von Ahn, L., & Dabbish, L. (2008). Designing games with a purpose. *Communications of the ACM*, *51*(8), 58–67. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1378704.1378719>
- Waggoner, B., & Chen, Y. (2014). Output Agreement Mechanisms and Common Knowledge. *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Human Computation and Crowdsourcing*, *2*, 220–226. <https://doi.org/10.1609/hcomp.v2i1.13151>
- Wang, J., Liu, Y., & Chen, Y. (2021). Forecast Aggregation via Peer Prediction. *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Human Computation and Crowdsourcing*, *9*, 131–142. <https://doi.org/10.1609/hcomp.v9i1.18946>
- Wang, X., Hyndman, R. J., Li, F., & Kang, Y. (2023). Forecast combinations: An over 50-year review. *International Journal of Forecasting*, *39*(4), 1518–1547. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijforecast.2022.11.005>



- Weaver, R., & Prelec, D. (2013). Creating Truth-Telling Incentives with the Bayesian Truth Serum. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 50(3), 289–302. <https://doi.org/10.1509/jmr.09.0039>
- Weingarten, E., Chen, Q., McAdams, M., Yi, J., Hepler, J., & Albarracín, D. (2016). From primed concepts to action: A meta-analysis of the behavioral effects of incidentally presented words. *Psychological Bulletin*, 142(5), 472–497. <https://doi.org/10.1037/bul0000030>
- Wilkening, T., Martinie, M., & Howe, P. D. L. (2022). Hidden Experts in the Crowd: Using Meta-Predictions to Leverage Expertise in Single-Question Prediction Problems. *Management Science*, 68(1), 487–508. <https://doi.org/10.1287/mnsc.2020.3919>
- Witkowski, J., Atanasov, P., Ungar, L., & Krause, A. (2017). Proper Proxy Scoring Rules. *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 31(1). <https://doi.org/10.1609/aaai.v31i1.10590>
- Witkowski, J., Freeman, R., Vaughan, J. W., Pennock, D. M., & Krause, A. (2023). Incentive-Compatible Forecasting Competitions. *Management Science*, 69(3), 1354–1374. <https://doi.org/10.1287/mnsc.2022.4410>
- Witkowski, J., & Parkes, D. C. (2012a). A robust Bayesian truth serum for small populations. *AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*. <https://doi.org/10.1609/aaai.v26i1.8261>
- Witkowski, J., & Parkes, D. C. (2012b). Peer prediction without a common prior. *Proceedings of the 13th ACM Conference on Electronic Commerce*, 964–981. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2229012.2229085>
- Witkowski, J., & Parkes, D. C. (2013). Learning the Prior in Minimal Peer Prediction. *Proceedings of the 3rd Workshop on Social Computing and User Generated Content at the ACM Conference on Electronic Commerce*.
- Zawojka, E., & Krawczyk, M. W. (2022). Incentivizing Stated Preference Elicitation with Choice-Matching in the Field. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4052462>
- Zhang, P., & Chen, Y. (2014). Elicitability and knowledge-free elicitation with peer prediction. *Adaptive Agents and Multi-Agent Systems*.
- Zhou, F., Page, L., Perrons, R. K., Zheng, Z., & Washington, S. (2019). Long-term forecasts for energy commodities price: What the experts think. *Energy Economics*, 84, 104484. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eneco.2019.104484>
- Zhou, F., Zheng, Z., Whitehead, J., Perrons, R., Page, L., & Washington, S. (2017). Projected prevalence of car-sharing in four Asian-Pacific countries in 2030: What the experts think. *Transportation Research Part C: Emerging Technologies*, 84, 158–177. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.trc.2017.08.023>

# Appendix A

## Tabloid overview over mechanisms

The following tables contain most mechanisms that are mentioned in some form in the main text. The mechanisms are assigned a ✓ in the category 'Nash' in case that truthfulness is a BNE of the mechanisms and in the category 'Emp.' in case that empirical evidence regarding the mechanism exists. The ✓ is in brackets for the Peer-Prediction because the only existing empirical evidence brings forward negative results.

Table 1: Peer-Prediction Mechanisms & Truth serums

Reference	Mechanism name	Emp.	Nash
Prelec, 2004	Bayesian Truth Serum	✓	✓
Miller et al., 2005	Peer-Prediction	(✓)	✓
Jurca and Faltings, 2008	-		✓
Papakonstantinou et al., 2011	Fusion		✓
Witkowski and Parkes, 2012a	Robust BTS		✓
Dasgupta and Ghosh, 2013	-		✓
Ghosh et al., 2014	differentially private peer-prediction mechanism		✓
Zhang and Chen, 2014	-		✓
Radanovic and Faltings, 2014	Divergence-based Truth Serum		✓
Radanovic and Faltings, 2015	Logarithmic peer truth serum		✓
Radanovic et al., 2016	Peer Truth Serum (PTS)	✓	✓
Liu and Chen, 2017	Sequential Peer Prediction		✓
Shnayder et al., 2016	Correlated Agreement		✓
Cvitanić et al., 2019	Choice-Matching		✓
Goel and Faltings, 2020	Personalized PTS		✓
Kong, 2020	Determinant based Mutual Information		✓
Schoenebeck and Yu, 2020	Source-differential Peer Prediction		✓
Kamble et al., 2023	Square Root Agreement Rule		✓
Kong, 2024	Volume mutual information		✓

Table 2: Market-based mechanisms

Reference	Mechanism name	Emp.	Nash
Baillon, 2017	Bayesian Market	✓	✓
Ahlstrom-Vij, 2020	Self-resolving information markets	✓	
Srinivasan et al., 2023	Self-resolving Prediction Markets		✓

Table 3: Output Agreement & Proxy Scoring Mechanisms

Reference	Mechanism name	Emp.	Nash
Von Ahn and Dabbish, 2008	Output Agreement	✓	
Witkowski et al., 2017	Proper Proxy Scoring Rules	✓	
Karger et al., 2021	Reciprocal Scoring	✓	

## A numerical example of the Peer-Prediction Method

As an example, consider an academic journal: Three reviewers are asked to report whether a paper should be published or not. They read the paper, i.e. receive the signal  $s$ , and report  $(a)$  to the editor (principal).

Let's assume that 20% of all papers are good and should be published and 80% of all papers should be rejected. Furthermore, we will assume that this journal employs a set of particularly pessimistic, inaccurate and sour reviewers. The probability that a reviewer will get the signal (i.e. understand) that a paper is good, if it actually is good shall be:

$$P(s = \text{publish} | \text{Paper} = \text{good}) = 0.4$$

If the paper is objectively bad, the chance of the reviewer mistaking it for a good paper is:

$$P(s = \text{publish} | \text{Paper} = \text{bad}) = 0.1$$

The editor employs the peer-prediction mechanism and asks the reviewers:

"What is the probability that a randomly chosen reference reviewer will suggest to publish the paper?"

Reviewer 1 thinks the paper is good, i.e. she received the signal  $s = \text{publish}$ . Given that the prior probability of the paper being good (20%) is publicly known, and that she knows of the inaccuracy of other reviewers, what should she report. Her payoff,  $u$  is the squared difference between her reported probability of a peer suggesting to publish ( $a_1$ ), and a reference peer's probability of suggesting to publish ( $a_i$ ):

$$u = -(a_1 - a_i)^2$$

Clearly, as the quadratic function is a proper scoring rule, it is maximized for  $a_1 - a_i$ . **If we assume that all other reviewers are truthful, what should reviewer 1 report?** What is the prediction that the reference reviewer  $a_i$  will make? Given that we assume that the reference reviewer reports truthfully, she will base her report on her signal:

$$P(a_i) = P(s_i)$$

Given that the reference reviewer has received a signal that the paper is good, the chance of the paper being objectively good is:

$$P(\text{Paper} = \text{good} | s_1 = \text{publish}) = \frac{P(s_1 = \text{publish} | \text{Paper} = \text{good})}{P(s_1 = \text{publish})} \cdot P(\text{Paper} = \text{good})$$

$$P(\text{Paper} = \text{good} | s_1 = \text{publish}) = \frac{0.4}{0.8 \cdot 0.1 + 0.4 \cdot 0.2} \cdot 0.2 = 0.5$$

The paper is objectively good with 50% probability, given that reviewer 1 thinks it is good. Based on that knowledge, we can determine what the probability is, that the reference reviewer received the signal that the paper is good and should be published.

$$P(a_i = s_i = \text{publish} | s_1 = \text{publish}) = \underbrace{0.5 \cdot 0.4}_{\text{Paper is good}} + \underbrace{0.5 \cdot 0.1}_{\text{Paper is bad}} = 0.25$$

Consequently, reviewer 1 should expect the reference reviewer to report a 25% prediction, and is best off predicting 25%. This is informative for the editor insofar that this prediction is far higher than the prior (uninformed prediction):

$$P(a_i = s_i = \text{publish}) = \underbrace{0.2 \cdot 0.4}_{\text{Paper is good}} + \underbrace{0.8 \cdot 0.1}_{\text{Paper is bad}} = 0.16$$

And if the reviewer 1 had gotten the signal that the paper is bad, her prediction would have been even lower,  $\frac{1}{7}$  to be precise. Consequently, the editor can make an inference on whether the reviewer thought the paper is good based on her peer-prediction. The procedure can be adapted such that the reviewers simply directly state whether to publish or reject, and the peer-prediction is automatically calculated from that using the common prior and Bayes rule as shown. The paper by Miller et al. (2005) explains that in more detail.