

# Application of the Kelly Criterion to Prediction Markets

Bernhard K Meister\*  
(Dated: December 19, 2024)

Betting markets are gaining in popularity. Mean beliefs generally differ from prices in prediction markets. Logarithmic utility is employed to study the risk and return adjustments to prices. Some consequences are described. A modified payout structure is proposed.

A simple asset price model based on flipping biased coins is investigated. It is shown using the Kullback-Leibler divergence how the misjudgment of the bias and the miscalculation of the investment fraction influence the portfolio growth rate.

## I. INTRODUCTION

Two questions are tackled in the paper. First, the Kelly criterion is applied to prediction markets[6] to explore the difference between expectation values and prices, which unlike in conventional financial markets[1] are bounded not just below but also above. This alters dynamics and investment possibilities. The Kelly criterion is named after John L Kelly[3], who applied logarithmic utility and more broadly information theory[2] to derive an optimal portfolio strategy for betting on horse races or other events with side information. The strategy he proposed maximizes the capital growth rate as well as the associated logarithmic utility. The identification of prices in prediction markets with probabilities is popular[2] but incorrect. How large can the gap be, and how can the betting payout be adjusted to reduce this gap?

Second, in a finite time setting the simple asset price model based on a biased coin model is investigated. Implications for the growth rate due to the misestimation of the bias or the miscalculation of the fraction invested in the risky asset are studied.

The paper commences with two sections on prediction markets, followed by a section on misestimation in biased random walk models, rounded off by a conclusion.

## II. PREDICTION MARKETS: PRICES VS PROBABILITIES

Betting markets are in the news. During the recent American election campaign Polymarket, hosted on the Solana blockchain, saw the placing of bets of several billion dollars on multiple races and various outcomes. Questions were again raised, after being earlier discussed by Manski[4] and others, about reliability of prices as a guide for expected outcomes and more recently especially about manipulability. Feedback mechanisms between observed prices, donor and voter behaviour was a subject of speculation. One issue sometimes ignored is that betting prices of simple ‘0-1’ betting markets do not normally match the probabilities that such events occur[7][3]. This follows from basic considerations in finance and betting.

In finance one distinguishes ‘real probabilities’ from ‘market probabilities’ which incorporate the risk aversion of the mythical marginal investor. This has been extensively discussed in the context of ‘changes of measure’ and the inclusion of a pricing kernel in the calculation of the expectation value of a financial assets reflects this fact.

In betting, the asymmetry of the payouts is of importance. A bet away from 50% gives one side a larger return than the other side. This means leverage and capital adjusted returns differ, which

---

\*Electronic address: [bernhard.k.meister@gmail.com](mailto:bernhard.k.meister@gmail.com)

influences the odds.

The first argument sees the prediction market as part of a larger family of investable assets shaping the overall preferences of investors. The difference between systematic and idiosyncratic risk comes to mind, whereas the second argument also applies to bets in isolation. The second route is chosen for its simplicity in the following section. To wager on even or odd number sunspots during a time interval is an example of a simple uncorrelated binary market bet.

### III. DIFFERENCES BETWEEN PRICES AND PROBABILITIES IN PREDICTION MARKETS

In this section logarithmic utility is applied to obtain the optimal investment fraction, when the market price is  $p$ , but the subjective belief of the investor is  $q$ . Afterwards we look at applications. Some background about prediction markets. In an ‘all-or-nothing’ contract, if one pays  $p$ , a value between zero and one dollar, to go long one unit, then one receives one dollar, if the event happens, but loses the initial outlay, if it does not occur at the terminal time. Often the terminal time is fixed, but sometimes there is a certain flexibility. For the American election bets there were different resolution mechanisms, e.g. a subset of national television networks had to declare a candidate a winner for a payout to occur. The initial price  $p$  is the maximal loss associated with the contract and kept by the exchange until the contract ends. There is therefore only an initial but no variation margin. This lack of dynamic margining[4] reduces the capital efficiency for investors and might require adjustment in future iterations of prediction markets. The inability to have naked short positions leads in binary outcome markets to the trading of two linked contracts. In the following analysis, the existence of mirror markets as well as the existence of fees and other costs is ignored. We also skate over the actual mechanics of the market, which are tricky, since centralised and decentralised smart contract controlled elements hosted on the blockchain are intermingled. Instead we regard the market as a black box that ‘works’.

The optimal Kelly fraction for an ‘all-or-nothing’ contract with a prohibition on borrowing follows from finding the extremum of the logarithmic utility function  $U$ :

$$\begin{aligned} U(q, p, f) &= (1 - q) \log(1 - f) + q \log \left( 1 + f \frac{1 - p}{p} \right) \\ \frac{\partial U(q, p, f)}{\partial f} &= q \frac{\frac{1-p}{p}}{1 + f \frac{1-p}{p}} - \frac{1 - q}{1 - f} = 0 \\ \Rightarrow f &= q - p \frac{1 - q}{1 - p} = \frac{Q - P}{1 + Q}. \end{aligned}$$

with  $P = \frac{p}{1-p}$  and  $Q = \frac{q}{1-q}$ .

Next we consider the maximal achievable gap between the observed price and the mean belief, which we define as the capital weighted expectation value of all the investors active in the market. Here we assume that all investors are logarithmic utility maximizers, who view the particular prediction market in isolation from other activities, and the contribution of the  $i^{th}$  investor to the expectation value, i.e. mean belief, is their subjective probability  $q_i$  times their capital  $C_i$ . Therefore, if there are  $N$  investors the mean belief is

$$\sum_{i=1}^N C_i q_i,$$

while their contribution to market activity, i.e. their position in the market, is  $C_i f_i(p, q_i)$ . For the market to clear the sum  $\sum_i C_i f_i(p, q_i)$  has to be zero at the market price  $p$ . This leads to a simple

scaling relations, for example increasing the capital of all participants by the same factor will not affect  $p$ . To get a feeling for possible bounds we assume a simplified market of just two investors. One being certain of the outcome and the other having the belief  $q$ . How big can the gap be in this case? There are two cases to consider. Let us first assume that one investor is certain that the prediction will not come true, and afterwards that one investor is certain the event will occur. In this case market clearance is achieved, assuming the supremely confident investor has capital of one dollar, by

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= C_1^- f(q_1^-, p) - 1 = C_1^- \frac{Q_1^- - P}{1 + Q_1^-} - 1, \\ \Rightarrow C_1^- &= \frac{Q_1^- + 1}{Q_1^- - P} = \frac{1 - p}{q_1^- - p}, \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

with  $Q_1^- = \frac{q_1^-}{1 - q_1^-}$  which leads to an expectation value of

$$E_-(q_1^-, p) = \frac{C_1^- q_1^-}{1 + C_1^-} = \frac{1 - p}{q_1^- - 2p + 1} q_1^-. \quad (2)$$

The different possible choices of  $q_1^-$  give in this case for  $E_-$  a range of outcomes, which are  $[0, \frac{1}{2}]$  for  $p < 1/2$ ,  $[\frac{1}{2}, 1]$  for  $p > 1/2$ , and  $1/2$  for  $p = 1/2$ .

Let us next assume that one investor is certain the event will happen. The equations for market clearance is

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= C_1^+ f(q_1^+, p) + 1 = C_1^+ \frac{Q_1^+ - P}{1 + Q_1^+} + 1, \\ \Rightarrow C_1^+ &= \frac{Q_1^+ + 1}{P - Q_1^+} = \frac{1 - p}{p - q_1^+}, \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

with  $Q_1^+ = \frac{q_1^+}{1 - q_1^+}$ , which leads to an expectation value of

$$E_+(q_1^+, p) = \frac{C_1^+ q_1^+ + 1}{1 + C_1^+} = p.$$

Even these toy examples show that the gap can be wide. Another extreme example, if all investor have either a belief of 0% or 100% in the outcome, then even the minutest imbalance drives the price to zero or one, but the expectation value does not need to budge much from  $1/2$ . One can also turn the problem around and fix  $q_1$  and vary  $p$ . The calculation is similar to the above and will not be carried out. A more complicated investor structure could also be studied, but it would not change the general insight that prices and beliefs can differ markedly.

Can one structure a betting market, which is better at attracting liquidity? Instead of trying to find an optimal model, we just show how a simple change in the payout can change the utility and the optimal fraction:

$$\begin{aligned} U_\alpha(q, p, f) &= (1 - q) \log(1 - f) + q \log\left(1 + f\left(\frac{p}{1 - p}\right)^\alpha\right) \\ \frac{\partial U_\alpha(q, p, f)}{\partial f} &= \frac{\left(\frac{p}{1 - p}\right)^\alpha}{1 + f\left(\frac{p}{1 - p}\right)^\alpha} - \frac{1 - q}{1 - f} = 0 \\ \Rightarrow f &= \frac{\hat{P}_\alpha - Q}{Q + 1} \end{aligned}$$

with  $\hat{P}_\alpha = \left(\frac{p}{1-p}\right)^\alpha$ , where for  $\alpha = 1$  one gets the conventional result, and for  $0 \leq \alpha \leq 1$  one gets a smoothing and reduction of the gap close to a price of 1 and the opposite close to 0, whereas for  $\alpha \geq 1$  the behaviour close to prices 1 and 0 is reversed. As an example, if  $\alpha$  moves from one towards zero the high probability bets with low relative pay-out become more attractive. This suggests that if the initial price is close to either boundary one chooses an appropriate  $\alpha$  to increase the attractiveness, and as a consequence the liquidity of the market. These adjustments are not a panacea, since if the market flips to the other extreme liquidity would drain away. The modification of  $\alpha$  effects the gap between prices and mean beliefs. Various cases have to be considered and the result will be presented elsewhere.

Next a section on misestimation in biased random walk models.

#### IV. THE RELATIVE PERFORMANCE OF DIFFERENT STRATEGIES IN THE DOUBLE-OR-NOTHING GAME

Various measures, see for example Breiman[1], have been proposed to compare the performance of a portfolio following the Kelly criterion with other strategies. In the long-term the portfolio growth of the Kelly investor beats all other strategies. What happens over finite times is studied in this section. The biased discrete random walk of  $N$  steps with a probability  $p$  has the following probability mass function

$$\binom{N}{k} p^k (1-p)^{N-k},$$

where  $k$  is the number ‘upward steps’, and this allows the definition of

$$F(k, N, p) = \sum_{i=0}^{\lfloor k \rfloor} \binom{N}{i} p^i (1-p)^{N-i},$$

which is the probability that number of ‘upward steps’ is less or equal to  $k$ . There are various ways to interpolate sums between integers, i.e replace  $\lfloor k \rfloor$  by  $k$  and still have a meaningful definition of the sum, but the gain would be limited. Here instead we just replace  $k$  by the nearest smaller natural number and, where possible, choose other parameters such that  $k$  is a whole number. The Chernoff inequality gives the bound

$$F(k, N, p) \leq e^{-ND \left(\frac{k}{N} \parallel p\right)},$$

with

$$D\left(\frac{k}{N} \parallel p\right) = \frac{k}{N} \log\left(\frac{k}{pN}\right) + \left(1 - \frac{k}{N}\right) \log\left(\frac{1 - \frac{k}{N}}{1-p}\right),$$

which goes by the name of Kullback-Leibler divergence function and relative entropy. Besides an upper bound one can also obtain a lower bound[5] of the form

$$F(k, N, p) \geq \frac{1}{\sqrt{2N}} e^{-ND \left(\frac{k}{N} \parallel p\right)}.$$

Next the logarithms is applied to  $F(k, N, p)$  and the result is divided by  $N$ . For large  $N$  one gets approximately  $D\left(\frac{k}{N} \parallel p\right)$  for both the lower and upper bound, which is linked to the ‘rate function’ from large deviation theory. Furthermore we choose the value  $k$  to be

$$k_Q(f) = \frac{Q - N \log(1-f)}{\log(1+f) - \log(1-f)}.$$

due to

$$(1 + f)^{kQ}(1 - f)^{N-kQ} = e^Q.$$

The Kullback-Leibler divergence  $D(\frac{k}{N} \parallel p)$  is now a tool to analyze the performance of different strategies in the double-or-nothing game. The sensitivity analysis of the expression  $D(\frac{kQ}{N} \parallel p)$  is carried out in two cases, which correspond to the misestimation of the probability and the misjudgment of the optimal investment fraction. The first case corresponds to holding  $f$  fixed and varying the probability  $p$  in  $D(\frac{k}{N} \parallel p)$  and the second one to holding  $p$  fixed and varying the investment fraction  $f$ . If  $p$  is varied by  $\epsilon$ , then one has

$$D\left(\frac{k}{N} \parallel p + \epsilon\right) - D\left(\frac{k}{N} \parallel p\right) = \frac{p - \frac{k}{N}}{p(1-p)}\epsilon + O(\epsilon^2).$$

If  $k$  is varied, then the expression is more involved, but the leading term in the expansion is again linear. In contrast, if one varies the entropy  $U(p, f)$ , which corresponds to the portfolio growth rate, around the optimal fraction  $2p - 1$ , then the leading term is quadratic, i.e.

$$U(p, 2p - 1 + \epsilon) - U(p, 2p - 1) = -\frac{1}{4(1-p)p}\epsilon^2 + O(\epsilon^3).$$

Extensions to the quantum case[5] are possible, and will be carried out elsewhere. Next, there is a brief conclusion to round off the paper.

## V. CONCLUSION

Information theory even in its simplest form can shed light on prediction markets. It was shown how mean beliefs differ from prices, and how the market might be modified by stretching or compressing the pay-out ratio close to the boundaries.

The Kullback-Leibler divergence, a tool to analyze the performance of different strategies in the double-or-nothing game, was applied to calculate differences in the achievability of growth thresholds due to the misestimation of the random walk bias and the miscalculation of the portfolio fraction.

- [1] Breiman, L, "Optimal gambling systems for favorable games." The Kelly Capital Growth Investment Criterion (1961): 47-60.
- [2] Cover, T M, & J A Thomas, "Elements of Information Theory." New York: Wiley-Interscience, (1991).
- [3] Kelly, J L, "A New Interpretation of Information Rate." Bell System Technical Journal. 35 (4) (1956): 917-926.
- [4] Manski, C, "Interpreting the Predictions of Prediction Markets.", NBER Working Paper #10359, (2004).
- [5] Meister, B K, & H C W Price, "A Quantum Double-or-Nothing Game: An Application of the Kelly Criterion to Spins." Entropy 26.1 (2024): 66.
- [6] Wolfers, J, & E Zitzewitz, "Prediction markets." Journal of economic perspectives 18.2 (2004): 107-126.

[7] Wolfers, J, & E Zitzewitz, “Interpreting prediction market prices as probabilities.” (2006).

---

- [1] Bond prices, if one assumes positive interest rates, are also bounded below and above, since for zero discounting, the maximal cash flow over the lifetime of a (non-perpetual) bond is bounded above.
- [2] The sentence, “[p]rices (odds) on Polymarket represent the current probability of an event occurring”, could be found on December 11<sup>th</sup> on the webpage <https://learn.polymarket.com/docs/guides/get-started/what-is-polymarket/>.
- [3] An informative summary of the argument with examples is Quantian’s blog from October 24<sup>th</sup>: <https://quantian.substack.com/p/market-prices-are-not-probabilities>
- [4] Dynamic margining in an anonymous setting, preferred by many market participants, is harder to implement, but this hasn’t stopped decentralised finance venues from adopting a variety of approaches.
- [5] The inequalities of this section can be found on the Wikipedia page for binomial distributions.