

# Incentivizing Truthful Data Contributions in a Marketplace for Mean Estimation

Keran Chen  
UW-Madison  
kchen429@wisc.edu

Alexander Clinton  
UW-Madison  
aclinton@wisc.edu

Kirthevasan Kandasamy  
UW-Madison  
kandasamy@cs.wisc.edu

## Abstract

We study a data marketplace where a broker facilitates transactions between buyers and contributors. Buyers seek to estimate the mean  $\mu$  of an unknown normal distribution  $\mathcal{N}(\mu, \sigma^2)$ , but have varying valuations based on their estimation error. Contributors, each with different data collection costs, gather samples from this distribution and report them (not necessarily truthfully) to the broker. The broker then sells subsets of the combined dataset to buyers at varying prices and redistributes the revenue to contributors. We formalize this as a mechanism design problem aimed at maximizing profit (total revenue minus data costs) while satisfying key market constraints: individual rationality (buyers and contributors benefit from participation), envy-freeness (no buyer prefers another’s allocation), budget balance (total payments match revenue), and incentive-compatibility (contributors are incentivized to collect a sufficient amount of data report it truthfully).

We design a mechanism which satisfies these requirements. We first establish a connection between envy-free data pricing and ordered-item pricing (OIP) for unit-demand buyers and leverage OIP algorithms to determine the optimal data allocation and expected prices for buyers. The actual prices paid by buyers are centered around these expected prices, but also vary based on discrepancies in contributors’ reported data. This variation is then passed on to the contributors via their payments. This scheme results in a Nash equilibrium (NE) where only the two lowest-cost contributors collect all the data and report it truthfully. Including this variation in the prices also helps us achieve individual rationality for buyers, as buyers will pay less if there are significant discrepancies in contributors’ datasets.

To complement these findings, we prove a nearly matching upper bound on the maximum possible profit achievable in any NE of any mechanism, thus proving that our mechanism is essentially unimprovable. We also show that no nontrivial dominant-strategy incentive-compatible mechanism exists in this problem.

## 1 Introduction

With the ubiquity of AI, *data* has become a critical economic resource driving operations and innovation across many domains. However, not everyone has the means to collect data on their own and thus must rely on *data marketplaces* to acquire the data they need. For instance, materials data platforms (e.g. [4]) aggregate datasets from proprietary sources; smaller organizations and academic researchers, who do not have access to extensive experimental infrastructure, can purchase this data to advance their research. In recent years, data marketplaces have emerged across various domains, including advertising [5, 8], computer systems [2, 32], insurance [6], freight [7], logistics [3], and others [1, 9, 10]. As shown in Fig. 1, these platforms act as intermediaries, facilitating data purchases between buyers and contributors.

**Untruthful data reporting.** In data marketplaces, buyers seek high-quality data for their learning tasks, while contributors aim to maximize their profits. Aligning these incentives of buyers and contributors presents a significant challenge. Strategic contributors seek to minimize their data collection costs, while maximizing their compensation from buyers. Buyers, on the other hand, pay for data but may question its reliability, particularly when contributors act in self-interest. These dynamics raise two critical and closely connected questions which we wish to address in this work: First, are buyers receiving reliable data commensurate with

the price they pay? Second, are contributors incentivized to provide reliable data rather than prioritizing personal profit, say, for instance, by submitting fabricated (fake) data instead of genuinely collecting it?

**Positioning.** Most prior work on data marketplaces sets prices for buyers and payments to contributors based on *quantity of data*. This overlooks the fact that buyers ultimately care about performance on a given learning task. Quantity-based pricing fails when strategic contributors can report untruthfully. For instance, naively paying contributors based on the size of the dataset they contribute, incentivizes them to report large fabricated (fake) datasets to inflate earnings.

Addressing this requires a *joint* analysis of buyer and contributor incentives. For instance, in the naive mechanism above, contributors may benefit from fabricating data, but if buyers lose trust in data quality, they may exit the market, reducing revenue and eventually harming contributors. To retain buyers, pricing must be adjusted to reflect data quality. These adjustments should then be passed on to contributors to incentivize truthful (high quality) data submissions. While there is prior work on incentivizing truthful data reporting, they do not consider broader market constraints, e.g. contributor payments must originate from buyers who derive value from the data they purchase.

**Model.** We study these questions in a mean estimation problem. A finite set of data contributors  $\mathcal{C}$ , collect data from the same but unknown normal distribution  $\mathcal{N}(\mu, \sigma^2)$ , with each contributor incurring a different cost per sample. A finite set of buyers  $\mathcal{B}$  aim to estimate the mean  $\mu$  of this distribution. Each buyer has a different valuation based on her estimation error. A broker facilitates data transactions between contributors and buyers. The contributors collect data and report it (not necessarily truthfully) to the broker. The broker evaluates these submissions, and sells different amounts of data to different buyers at different prices to maximize the cumulative profit, i.e. total revenue from buyers minus contributors' costs. In doing so, the broker should ensure that both buyers and contributors benefit from participating in the market, each buyer's price is fair relative to the others (envy-free), contributors are incentivized to collect a sufficient amount of data and report it truthfully, and that revenue from buyers balances payments to contributors.

### 1.1 Summary of contributions

**Problem Formalism.** In §3, we formalize the problem. A broker designs a mechanism specifying: (a) how much data each contributor should collect, (b) how much data is sold to each buyer, (c) the prices charged to buyers, and (d) the payments distributed to contributors. Each contributor  $i$ 's strategy determines how much data she collects (which may differ from the broker's specification), and what she submits. For instance, a contributor may only collect a small amount of data, and fabricate the rest to mislead the broker, say by fitting a distribution to the small dataset she collected, and then sampling many points from it.

*Requirements for the mechanism.* The mechanism must satisfy: (i) *Individually rational for buyers (IRB)*: buyers' prices should not exceed their valuation. (ii) *Envy-free for buyers (EFB)*: no buyer prefers another's data allocation and price. (iii) *Individually rational for contributors (IRC)*: contributor payments cover data collection costs. (iv) *Incentive-compatible for contributors (ICC)*: collecting the specified amount of data in (a) and submitting it truthfully is a Nash equilibrium (NE), i.e. the best strategy for a contributor, when




Figure 1: An illustration of a data marketplace. (1) Data contributors collect and submit their data. (2) A *broker* operating the marketplace evaluates the quality of their submissions and prices the data. (3) The broker sells subsets of this dataset to the buyers. (4) The revenue is redistributed back to the contributors.

others are doing the same. (v) *Budget balance (BB)*: total revenue from buyers equals total contributor payments. (vi) *Profit-optimality (PO)*: the mechanism should maximize profit among mechanisms satisfying (i)–(v).

*Accounting for uncertainty of underlying distribution.* A key challenge in formulating this problem is in accounting for the *unknown* underlying distribution. Evaluating a contributor’s truthfulness requires comparing her submission to others. As this comparison is based on data, it necessarily depends on the unknown distribution. Consequently, the buyer and contributor utilities, as well as the profit may also depend on it. To address this, we consider the worst-case utilities and profit over all normal distributions with the given variance.

**Profit-optimal envy-free pricing with non-strategic contributors.** In §2, we first study a simpler setting where contributors are non-strategic, i.e. they follow the broker’s specification and report data truthfully. Our first goal is to establish a profit-maximization baseline, OPT, considering only buyer incentives, which we will later try to approximate when contributors are strategic. Notably, in this baseline, the lowest-cost agent collects all the data—a natural outcome in the truthful setting but one that fails ICC with strategic contributors (see our hardness results).

Our second goal is to design algorithms for this non-strategic setting. We will later build on this procedures when designing mechanisms with strategic contributors. A key insight is that designing revenue-optimal IRB and EFB pricing schemes reduces to optimizing a posted pricing curve for ordered items [18], allowing us to leverage those algorithms for our problem.

**Hardness results.** In §4, we establish two key hardness results. First, there is no nontrivial dominant-strategy incentive-compatible mechanism for this problem, i.e. collecting the specified amount and reporting it truthfully is the best strategy regardless of others’ strategies. Second, in any NE of any mechanism, the maximum achievable profit is  $\text{OPT} - (c_2 - c_1)$  where  $c_1, c_2$  are the costs of the cheapest and second cheapest agents. Both results stem from a key insight: when others collect no data, an agent can fabricate data at no cost from an any normal distribution.

**Mechanism design.** In §5, we design mechanisms that satisfy the six requirements outlined earlier. While collecting all data from one agent is not ICC, we show that using two agents suffices. Intuitively, the broker can verify truthfulness by comparing their reported data with each other. Thus, to maximize profit, the mechanism assigns data collection to the two cheapest agents. Moreover, the cheapest contributor collects almost all of the points. The second cheapest agent collects only a minimal amount (just one point for normal mean estimation), as her primary role is to help the broker verify the reliability of the cheapest contributor’s submissions.

We employ the envy-free pricing algorithm from §2 to determine the total data collection amount, buyers’ dataset sizes, and expected prices. Buyers’ actual prices also include a term dependent on the difference between the means of the two contributors’ reported datasets, with this variation passed on to the contributors’ payments. This design helps us achieve three of our requirements; ICC: as each contributor should report truthfully when the other is doing so in order to minimize this difference, IRB: as buyers will pay less if there are significant discrepancies contributors’ submissions, which may indicate unreliable data, and BB (with probability 1): as the market must be feasible for every random realization of data.

Our proofs build on minimax lower bound techniques for normal mean estimation. Using these approaches we show that when other contributors collect and contribute data truthfully, it is best for any contributor to contribute her data truthfully regardless of how much she has collected. Furthermore, by carefully designing contributor payments, we show that the optimal amount of data for contributors to collect is exactly the amount recommended by the mechanism.

## 1.2 Related work

**Data pricing.** In recent years, a significant body of work has focused on designing markets and auctions for data. Some studies assume settings where buyers either purchase (or are allocated) the entire dataset or none

at all [11, 12, 14, 20]. However, this assumption does not align with real-world markets (e.g. [1, 3, 4, 10]), where buyers can purchase smaller subsets of data. This limitation also leaves untapped revenue from buyers willing to pay smaller amounts for small datasets. Other works develop approaches for pricing *information* [13, 15, 31, 34], but these approaches do not reflect real-world marketplaces, where brokers sell datasets directly from various sources.

*Pricing Ordered Items.* General multi-item pricing is a notoriously difficult problem, and several works have developed faster algorithms under structural assumptions on items. One pertinent line of work concerns pricing ordered items, where unit-demand buyers share a common preference ranking over goods [18, 25]. Recently, Chen et al. [19] developed methods for pricing ordered items in the context of data markets, assuming additional properties such as smoothness. As mentioned earlier, we build upon this line of research to design profit-optimal, envy-free pricing schemes in our problem.

*Principal-agent models for data collection.* Some studies have explored principal-agent models in data collection, where a principal incentivizes agents to collect data through payments or other means when data collection is costly [16, 28]. These methods assume specific forms for the valuation of the data for the principal. Our approach is more general: we only assume that buyers’ valuation decreases with their estimation error. Moreover, in these works, and the works on *Data pricing* it is assumed that contributors will report data truthfully. Indeed, in many cases, they are able to design DSIC mechanisms for contributors, which, as we demonstrate, is impossible in our problem.

**Incentivizing truthful reporting.** Previous work on incentivizing truthful reporting of already collected data [21, 35] do not consider many of the market constraints we study, such as PO, IRB, IRC, and EFB. In their model agents do not incur costs to collect data. Moreover, they assume that the principal has access to a large budget for incentivization, but do not address the source of these funds. In contrast, our setting requires that payments originate from buyers who derive value from the data contributed by contributors.

*Truthful Contributions in Collaborative Mean Estimation.* Recent work has explored collaborative mean estimation, where a group of strategic agents collaborate to estimate the mean of a distribution [22–24]. A common technique in our method and these works is comparing an agent’s reported data mean against the mean of other agents to incentivize truthful reporting. However, our analysis techniques are different from these methods, in part because we must adhere to market constraints that do not arise in collaborative learning, and in part because all three methods assume specific forms for the agents’ valuation of data.

*Moral Hazard.* The issue of contributors submitting fabricated data can also be analyzed under the framework of *moral hazard*, where agents (contributors) deviate from agreed-upon tasks (data collection) with a principal (broker) [26, 27, 29, 33]. As in classical moral hazard settings, the outcome of a contributor’s work (the collected dataset) is stochastic. However, unlike typical models, our broker lacks knowledge of the signal distribution given contributors’ effort (the learning problem would be trivial if the data distribution were known) and cannot directly observe the outcomes of these efforts, relying instead on potentially dishonest reports from the contributors themselves.

## 2 Envy-free Profit Maximization with Non-strategic Contributors

We first study a simplified setting where contributors are not strategic. Our goal is twofold: first, in §2.1, we establish a profit-maximization baseline that considers only buyer incentives, ignoring contributor incentives. In §3, we will frame our mechanism design problem as approximating this baseline while accounting for strategic contributor behavior. Second, in §2.2, we design algorithms for profit maximization with non-strategic contributors. Later in §5, we will build on these techniques when developing mechanisms for the strategic setting. Our ideas in §2 are not specific to mean estimation and apply to general data marketplaces. We begin by describing the environment.

**Data Marketplace.** A data marketplace consists of three key actors: (i) a finite set of data *contributors*  $\mathcal{C} = \{1, \dots, |\mathcal{C}|\}$ , (ii) a finite set of *buyers*  $\mathcal{B}$ , and (iii) a *trusted broker* who facilitates transactions between

contributors and buyers.

*Contributors.* Contributors collect samples from the same but *unknown* distribution. Contributor  $i$  incurs a cost of  $c_i$  to collect each sample. Without loss of generality, we assume that costs are ordered as  $c_1 \leq c_2 \leq \dots \leq c_{|\mathcal{C}|}$ . In this section, we assume contributors are non-strategic, meaning they will collect the amount of data requested by the broker and submit it truthfully.

*Buyers.* Each buyer  $i$  has a valuation function  $v_i : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ , where  $v_i(m)$  represents her value for  $m$  data points. Since more data is preferable,  $v_i(m)$  is non-decreasing in  $m$ . We will assume  $v_i(0) = 0$ . If a buyer pays price  $p_j \in [0, 1]$  for  $m_j \in \mathbb{N}$  data points, her utility is given by  $u_j^b(m_j, p_j) = v_j(m_j) - p_j$ .

*Broker.* The broker requests each contributor  $i \in \mathcal{C}$  to collect  $N_i \in \mathbb{N}$  data points. Let  $N^{\text{tot}} = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}} N_i$  denote the total data collected. The broker then allocates subsets of size  $\{m_j\}_{j \in \mathcal{B}} \in \{0, \dots, N^{\text{tot}}\}^{|\mathcal{B}|}$  from all contributors' submissions to each buyer, and charges them prices  $\{p_j\}_{j \in \mathcal{B}} \in [0, 1]^{|\mathcal{B}|}$ . We denote the broker's mechanism<sup>1</sup> as  $M = (\{N_i\}_{i \in \mathcal{C}}, \{m_j\}_{j \in \mathcal{B}}, \{p_j\}_{j \in \mathcal{B}})$ . The cumulative profit of this mechanism is given by,  $\text{profit}(M) = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{B}} p_j - \sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}} c_i N_i$ .

## 2.1 A baseline for profit maximization

**Envy-Free Profit Maximization.** Given a set of buyers  $\mathcal{B}$  along with their valuations  $\{v_j\}_{j \in \mathcal{B}}$ , and a set of contributors  $\mathcal{C}$  along with their costs  $\{c_i\}_{i \in \mathcal{C}}$ , the broker aims to design a mechanism  $M$ , that maximizes profit. Without any constraints this problem is poorly defined, as the broker can simply ask all buyers to "pay more" to maximize profit. We will require the buyers' prices  $\{p_j\}_{j \in \mathcal{B}}$  and dataset sizes  $\{m_j\}_{j \in \mathcal{B}}$  to satisfy the following two constraints:

1. *Individually rational for buyers (IRB):*  $M$  is IRB if  $u_j^b(m_j, p_j) \geq 0$  for all buyers  $j \in \mathcal{B}$ .
2. *Envy-free for buyers (EFB):*  $M$  is EFB if no buyer prefers another's allocation and price over her own, i.e.  $u_j^b(m_j, p_j) \geq u_j^b(m_k, p_k) \quad \forall j, k \in \mathcal{B}$ .

The first constraint ensures that buyers benefit from the market, as they would otherwise choose not to participate. The second constraint ensures fairness, as otherwise the broker could sell all  $N^{\text{tot}}$  points collected to all buyers and charge each buyer  $p_j = v_j(N^{\text{tot}})$ . This maximizes profit while satisfying IRB; however, in this scheme different buyers would pay different prices for the same dataset, which would be unfair to buyers who have to pay more.

We will refer to all  $\{p_j, m_j\}_{j \in \mathcal{B}}$  values which satisfy IRB and EFB as *envy-free pricing schemes*. Let  $\mathbf{EF}(N)$  denote all envy-free pricing schemes where the maximum amount of data sold is at most  $N$ , i.e.,  $\max_j m_j \leq N$ , and let  $\mathbf{EF} = \bigcup_{N \geq 0} \mathbf{EF}(N)$ .

*Optimal baseline profit.* The optimal baseline profit OPT, subject to the IRB and EFB constraints, can therefore be written as shown in (1). Here, OPT depends on the buyer valuations  $\{v_j\}_{j \in \mathcal{B}}$  and contributor costs  $\{c_i\}_{i \in \mathcal{C}}$ , but we have suppressed this dependence for simplicity. We have,

$$\text{OPT} = \max_{\{m_j, p_j\}_j \in \mathbf{EF}, \{N_i\}_{i \in \mathcal{N}^{|\mathcal{C}|}}} \left( \sum_{j \in \mathcal{B}} p_j - \sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}} c_i N_i \right) \quad (1)$$

*Revenue-optimal envy-free pricing schemes.* To better understand OPT, we first note that as buyer valuations only depend on the amount of data they receive (and not which contributors collected the data), the broker's decisions for buyers' dataset sizes  $\{m_j\}_{j \in \mathcal{C}}$  and prices  $\{p_j\}_{j \in \mathcal{C}}$  need to depend on  $\{N_i\}_{i \in \mathcal{C}}$  only through their sum  $N^{\text{tot}} = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}} N_i$ , i.e. the total amount of data collected. The revenue  $\text{rev}$  for specific prices  $\{p_j\}_{j \in \mathcal{B}}$ ,

<sup>1</sup>To minimize jargon, we use the term *mechanism* to describe the broker's design of  $(\{N_i\}_{i \in \mathcal{C}}, \{m_j\}_{j \in \mathcal{B}}, \{p_j\}_{j \in \mathcal{B}})$ , even though neither buyers nor contributors require incentives to report truthfully in this setting. Later, we will use the term mechanism again when incentivizing truthful reporting from contributors becomes necessary.

and the optimal revenue  $\text{rev}^{\text{OPT}}$  under IRB, EFB constraints when the seller has received  $N^{\text{tot}}$  total data points can be written as shown below:

$$\text{rev}(\{p_j\}_{j \in \mathcal{B}}) = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{B}} p_j, \quad \text{rev}^{\text{OPT}}(N) = \max_{\{m_j, p_j\}_{j \in \mathcal{B}} \in \mathbf{EF}(N^{\text{tot}})} \text{rev}(\{p_j\}_{j \in \mathcal{B}}). \quad (2)$$

*From optimal revenue to optimal profit.* The following straightforward calculations lead to the following expression for the optimal envy-free profit OPT (1):

$$\begin{aligned} \text{OPT} &= \max_{\{m_j, p_j\}_{j \in \mathcal{B}} \in \mathbf{EF}, \{N_i\}_i} \left( \text{rev}(\{p_j\}_{j \in \mathcal{B}}) - \sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}} c_i N_i \right) \\ &= \max_{\{N_i\}_i} \left( \max_{\{m_j, p_j\}_{j \in \mathcal{B}} \in \mathbf{EF}(\sum_i N_i)} \text{rev}(\{p_j\}_{j \in \mathcal{B}}) - \sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}} c_i N_i \right) \\ &= \max_{\{N_i\}_i} \left( \text{rev}^{\text{OPT}} \left( \sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}} N_i \right) - \sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}} c_i N_i \right) = \text{rev}^{\text{OPT}}(N_1^{\text{OPT}}) - c_1 N_1^{\text{OPT}}. \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

where  $N_1^{\text{OPT}} = \text{argmax}_{N \in \mathbb{N}} \text{rev}^{\text{OPT}}(N) - c_1 N$ . The last step uses the observation that agent 1 has the smallest cost. Intuitively, the broker should ask the cheapest agent to collect all the data.

As we will see, we will not be able to achieve, or even be arbitrarily close to, OPT when contributors are strategic and can misreport report data. In particular, if the broker relies on a single agent to collect all the data, the agent can simply fabricate it, and the broker has no way to verify authenticity. We formalize this rigorously through our hardness results in §4.

## 2.2 Designing envy-free profit-optimal mechanisms with non-strategic Contributors

We outline an algorithm for designing an approximately profit-optimal mechanism  $M$  with non-strategic contributors. In §5, we will build on the methods here with strategic contributors.

**Designing revenue-optimal envy-free pricing schemes.** Our first key insight here is that designing an envy-free pricing scheme reduces to constructing a revenue-optimal pricing curve (Lemma 1). Here, the seller posts a pricing curve  $q : \{0, \dots, N\} \rightarrow [0, 1]$  with  $q(0) = 0$ , and buyers choose their purchase quantities to maximize utility (in contrast, in our setting, the broker directly determines dataset sizes and prices for each buyer). When buyers have monotonic valuations, revenue-optimal pricing aligns with the ordered item pricing problem [18], allowing us to leverage existing algorithms. We first define the ordered item pricing problem below. To simplify the exposition, we do so in the context of data pricing<sup>2</sup>.

**Definition 1.** (*Ordered item pricing [18]*) Suppose the broker has  $N^{\text{tot}} \in \mathbb{N}$  data points and posts a pricing curve  $q$ . Buyers then decide how much to purchase based on  $q$ . A utility-maximizing buyer  $j$  selects  $m \in \{0, \dots, N^{\text{tot}}\}$  to maximize utility,  $v_j(m) - q(m)$ . If multiple values of  $m$  yield the same maximum utility, the buyer chooses the largest dataset. Thus, buyer  $j$  purchases  $\tilde{m}_j(N^{\text{tot}}, q)$  data points, where

$$\tilde{m}_j(N^{\text{tot}}, q) := \max \left\{ \text{argmax}_{m \leq N^{\text{tot}}} (v_j(m) - q(m)) \right\}. \quad (4)$$

It follows that the revenue from buyer  $j$  is  $q(\tilde{m}_j(N^{\text{tot}}, q))$ . Hence, the total revenue  $\overline{\text{rev}}(N^{\text{tot}}, q)$  of a pricing curve  $q$  is as defined below. The broker wishes to find a pricing function  $q^{\text{opt}}$  which maximizes the cumulative revenue. The optimal revenue  $\overline{\text{rev}}^{\text{OPT}}$  can be defined as:

$$\overline{\text{rev}}(N^{\text{tot}}, q) := \sum_{j \in \mathcal{B}} q(\tilde{m}_j(N^{\text{tot}}, q)), \quad \overline{\text{rev}}^{\text{OPT}}(N^{\text{tot}}) := \max_q \overline{\text{rev}}(N^{\text{tot}}, q). \quad (5)$$

<sup>2</sup>In Chawla et al. [18], the seller has  $N^{\text{tot}} \in \mathbb{N}$  items, and a set of *unit-demand* buyers, i.e. wish to purchase only a single item, with non-decreasing valuations  $v_i : [N^{\text{tot}}] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ . While buyers may have different valuations for the same good, their preference ranking is the same. The seller should choose a pricing function  $q : [N^{\text{tot}}] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$  to maximize revenue.

Algorithm	Assumptions on buyer valuations	Time complexity
Hartline and Koltun [25]	–	$\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(2^N \epsilon^{-N})$
Chawla et al. [18]	Monotonicity	$N^{\mathcal{O}(\epsilon^{-2} \log \epsilon^{-1})}$
Chen et al. [19]	Monotonicity, $K$ types	$\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(N^K \epsilon^{-K})$
	Monotonicity, $K$ types, smoothness	$\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\epsilon^{-2K})$
	Monotonicity, $K$ types, diminishing return	$\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\epsilon^{-3K} \log^K(N))$

Table 1: Algorithms from prior work applicable for pricing ordered items, along with their assumptions on buyer valuations and time complexities to obtain an  $|\mathcal{B}|\mathcal{O}(\epsilon)$ -optimal solution when there are  $N$  total points. Chawla et al. [18] were the first to study this problem, assuming monotonic buyer valuations. Chen et al. [19] studied this problem in the context of data pricing, introducing additional assumptions on buyer valuations, such as finite buyer types, smoothness, and diminishing returns.

*From ordered item pricing to revenue-optimal envy-free mechanisms.* Given a pricing curve  $q$  with  $N^{\text{tot}}$  points, it is straightforward to construct an envy-free pricing scheme  $\{m_j, p_j\}_{j \in \mathcal{B}} \in \mathbf{EF}(N^{\text{tot}})$  while achieving the same revenue as  $q$ , i.e.  $\overline{\text{rev}}(N^{\text{tot}}, q) = \text{rev}(\{p_j\}_{j \in \mathcal{B}})$  (see (2) and (5)).

To do so, we can set  $m_j = \tilde{m}_j(N^{\text{tot}}, q)$  and  $p_j = q(m_j)$  (see (4)). Since each buyer selects data to maximize utility in (4), it follows that  $u_j^b(m_j, p_j) \geq u_j^b(m, q(m))$  for every other  $m \in [N]$ , and in particular, for all other buyers' dataset sizes  $\{m_k\}_{k \neq j}$ . This ensures EFB. Moreover, as buying no data ( $m_j = 0$  at  $p_j = 0$ ) yields zero utility, IRB is also satisfied.

This also implies that the revenue of the optimal envy-free pricing scheme is at least as large as the revenue of the optimal pricing curve, i.e.  $\text{rev}^{\text{OPT}}(N^{\text{tot}}) \geq \overline{\text{rev}}^{\text{OPT}}(N^{\text{tot}})$  (see (2) and (5)).

Our next lemma shows the converse, thus establishing an equivalence between optimizing ordered item pricing curves and envy-free pricing schemes. Thus, we have  $\text{rev}^{\text{OPT}}(N^{\text{tot}}) = \overline{\text{rev}}^{\text{OPT}}(N^{\text{tot}})$ . The proof is provided in §2.3.

**Lemma 1.** *Given the set of buyers  $\mathcal{B}$ , along with their valuations  $\{v_i\}_{i \in \mathcal{B}}$ . Let  $N^{\text{tot}}$  be the amount of data available to the broker. For every envy-free pricing scheme  $(\{m_j\}_{j \in \mathcal{B}}, \{p_j\}_{j \in \mathcal{B}}) \in \mathbf{EF}(N^{\text{tot}})$ , there exists a pricing curve  $q$  which achieves a higher revenue, i.e.,  $\overline{\text{rev}}(N^{\text{tot}}, q) \geq \text{rev}(\{p_j\}_{j \in \mathcal{B}})$ .*

*Algorithms for ordered item pricing.* The ordered item pricing problem is known to be NP-hard [17, 25]. As a result, prior work has developed approximation algorithms. An ordered item pricing algorithm takes as input the buyer valuations  $\{v_j\}_{j \in \mathcal{B}}$ , the total amount of data  $N^{\text{tot}}$ , and an approximation parameter  $\epsilon$ . It outputs a pricing curve  $q$  such that the cumulative revenue satisfies  $\overline{\text{rev}}(N^{\text{tot}}, q) \geq \overline{\text{rev}}^{\text{OPT}}(N^{\text{tot}}) - |\mathcal{B}|\mathcal{O}(\epsilon)$ . Table 1 summarizes algorithms from prior work under various assumptions on buyer valuations.

**Designing profit-optimal envy-free mechanisms.** The above observations suggest the following procedure to design an approximately profit-optimal mechanism, by leveraging an algorithm for ordered item pricing. For any given  $N^{\text{tot}} \in \mathbb{N}$ , we apply  $A$  to determine an approximately optimal pricing curve. To maximize profit, we assign all data collection to contributor 1 and optimize over  $N^{\text{tot}}$  to maximize revenue minus  $c_1 N^{\text{tot}}$ .

Algorithm 1 outlines this procedure. It takes as input buyer valuations  $\{v_j\}_{j \in \mathcal{B}}$ , contributor costs  $\{c_i\}_{i \in \mathcal{C}}$ , an ordered item pricing algorithm  $A$ , and an approximation parameter  $\epsilon$ . It returns the optimal data quantity  $N^+$ , the corresponding pricing curve  $q_{N^+}$ , and dataset allocations  $\{m_{N^+, j}\}_{j \in \mathcal{B}}$ . Since buyer valuations are bounded in  $[0, 1]$ , the maximum total buyer value is  $|\mathcal{B}|$ . Thus, it suffices to search for  $N^{\text{tot}} \leq |\mathcal{B}|/c_1$ . While our brute-force approach is admittedly inefficient; we leave it to future work to develop more computationally efficient procedures to find the optimal  $N^{\text{tot}}$ . The following lemma lower bounds the profit of Algorithm 1, with the proof given in Appendix B.

---

**Algorithm 1**


---

- 1: **Input:** Buyer valuations  $\{v_j\}_{j \in \mathcal{B}}$ , contributor costs  $\{c_i\}_{i \in \mathcal{C}}$ , an algorithm for ordered item pricing  $A$ , approximation parameter  $\epsilon$ .
  - 2: **for**  $N \in \{1, 2, \dots, \frac{|\mathcal{B}|}{c_1}\}$ :
  - 3:      $q_N \leftarrow A(\{v_j\}_{j \in \mathcal{B}}, N, \epsilon)$ . #Execute  $A$  to obtain an  $|\mathcal{B}|\mathcal{O}(\epsilon)$ -optimal pricing curve.
  - 4:      $m_{N,j} \leftarrow \tilde{m}_j(N, q_N)$  for all  $j \in \mathcal{B}$ . #Compute buyer dataset sizes. See (4).
  - 5:      $\text{profit}_N \leftarrow \sum_{i \in \mathcal{B}} q_N(m_{N,i}) - c_1 N$ . #Compute the profit if collecting  $N$  data.
  - 6:  $N^+ \leftarrow \operatorname{argmax}_{N \in \{1, 2, \dots, \frac{|\mathcal{B}|}{N^{\text{tot}}}\}} \text{profit}_N$ . #Find the optimal data collection amount.
  - 7:  $m_j^+ \leftarrow m_{N^+,j}$ ,     $q_j^+ \leftarrow q_{N^+}(m_j^+)$ . #Optimal prices and dataset sizes for buyer.
  - 8: **Return:**  $N^+$ ,  $\{m_j^+\}_{j \in \mathcal{B}}$ ,  $\{q_j^+\}_{j \in \mathcal{B}}$
- 

**Lemma 2.** *Suppose we execute Algorithm 1 with an algorithm  $A$  for ordered item pricing. Let  $N^+$ ,  $q^+$ , and  $\{m_{N^+,j}\}_{j \in \mathcal{B}}$  be the returned values. Consider the envy-free mechanism  $M = (\{N_i\}_{i \in \mathcal{C}}, \{m_j\}_{j \in \mathcal{B}}, \{p_j\}_{j \in \mathcal{B}})$  obtained by choosing  $N_1 = N^+$ ,  $N_i = 0$  for all  $i \in \mathcal{C} \setminus \{1\}$ ,  $m_j = m_{N^+,j}$  for all  $j \in \mathcal{B}$ , and  $p_j = q_{N^+}(m_j)$ . We then have  $\text{profit}(M) \geq \text{OPT} - |\mathcal{B}|\mathcal{O}(\epsilon)$ .*

### 2.3 Proof of Lemma 1

We need to show that for any envy-free pricing scheme  $\{(m_j, p_j)\}_{j \in \mathcal{B}}$ , there exists a non-decreasing price curve  $q : \{0, 1, \dots, N^{\text{tot}}\} \rightarrow [0, 1]$  that yields a revenue of at least  $\sum_{j \in \mathcal{B}} p_j$ . Without loss of generality, we assume  $m_1 \leq m_2 \leq \dots \leq m_{|\mathcal{B}|}$ . We define  $q$  as follows:

$$q(m) := \begin{cases} p_1, & \text{if } m \leq m_1 \\ p_2, & \text{if } m_1 < m \leq m_2 \\ \vdots & \\ p_{|\mathcal{B}|}, & \text{if } m_{|\mathcal{B}|-1} < m \leq N^{\text{tot}} \end{cases}$$

This price function  $q$  is non-decreasing and has at most  $|\mathcal{B}|$  steps. By the purchase model of ordered item pricing (4), each buyer  $j$  would purchase  $\tilde{m}_j(N^{\text{tot}}, q)$  data points under price curve  $q$ , where

$$\tilde{m}_j(N^{\text{tot}}, q) := \max \left\{ \operatorname{argmax}_{m \leq N^{\text{tot}}} (v_j(m) - q(m)) \right\}$$

It is sufficient to show that  $\tilde{m}_j(N^{\text{tot}}, q) \geq m_j$  holds for every buyer  $j$ . Then, as the price curve is non-decreasing, the revenue from each buyer when using the pricing curve  $q$  would be larger than her price in the envy-free pricing scheme. Therefore,

$$\overline{\text{rev}}(N^{\text{tot}}, q) = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{B}} q(\tilde{m}_j(N^{\text{tot}}, q)) \geq \sum_{j \in \mathcal{B}} q(m_j) = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{B}} p_j = \text{rev}(\{p_j\}_{j \in \mathcal{B}}).$$

which will complete the proof.

To show that  $\tilde{m}_j(N^{\text{tot}}, q) \geq m_j$ , let us first consider an arbitrary  $m \leq m_{|\mathcal{B}|}$ . For any  $m \leq m_{|\mathcal{B}|}$ , let  $k \in [|\mathcal{B}|]$  be such that  $m_{k-1} < m \leq m_k$ . As valuations are non-decreasing we have,

$$v_j(m) - q(m) \leq v_j(m_k) - q(m) = v_j(m_k) - q(m_k) \leq v_j(m_j) - q(m_j).$$

This implies that  $m_j \in \operatorname{argmax}_{m \leq m_{|\mathcal{B}|}} (v_j(m) - q(m))$ . Finally, as  $m_{|\mathcal{B}|} \leq N^{\text{tot}}$ , we have

$$m_j \leq \max \left( \operatorname{argmax}_{m \leq m_{|\mathcal{B}|}} (v_j(m) - q(m)) \right) \leq \max \left( \operatorname{argmax}_{m \leq N^{\text{tot}}} (v_j(m) - q(m)) \right) = \tilde{m}_j(N^{\text{tot}}, q).$$

□



### 3 Problem set up with strategic contributors

In §2, we modeled the data marketplace based on the quantity of data transacted. However, this framework breaks down in the presence of strategic contributors. We will now study strategic contributor behavior. Our goal will be to approximate the baseline in §2.1 while accounting for strategic contributor behavior. We study such strategic considerations in the restricted, yet nontrivial setting of normal mean estimation.

In §3.1, we describe the environment, including the mechanism, the contributors' strategy spaces, and contributor and buyer utilities. §3.2 formulates the mechanism design problem, aiming to maximize profit while satisfying constraints on buyer and seller incentives and market feasibility. In §3.3, we discuss our modeling choices. We begin by briefly describing normal mean estimation.

**Normal mean estimation.** A finite dataset  $X = \{x_i\}_i$  consists of i.i.d points drawn from a normal distribution  $\mathcal{N}(\mu, \sigma^2)$ , where the variance  $\sigma^2$  is known, but the mean  $\mu$  is not. A finite dataset  $Y = g(X) = \{y_i\}_i$  is reported to a learner, where the (possibly random) *reporting function*  $g$  maps the collected dataset  $X$  to a dataset  $Y$ . The learner estimates  $\mu$  via the sample mean  $\hat{\mu}(Y) = \frac{1}{|Y|} \sum_{y \in Y} y$ . Conventionally, one studies the *loss* the learner incurs as a function of the estimation error  $|\hat{\mu}(Y) - \mu|$ , where the loss increases with error. Here, we instead model the *value* the learner derives as a decreasing function  $v^e : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow [0, 1]$ , where  $v^e(e')$  is her instantaneous value if her error is  $e'$ . We can write the learner's valuation  $v$  for a reporting function  $g$  as:

$$v(g) = \inf_{\mu \in \mathbb{R}} \mathbb{E}_{g, \mu} [v^e (|\hat{\mu}(g(X)) - \mu|)]. \quad (6)$$

The expectation  $\mathbb{E}_{g, \mu}$  is over the randomness in generating data  $X$  from the *unknown* distribution  $\mathcal{N}(\mu, \sigma^2)$ , and possibly the reporting function  $g$ . The  $\inf_{\mu}$  accounts for the fact that the  $\mu$  is unknown and a learner wishes for a good reporting function to yield good estimates for all unknown distributions. To illustrate, let  $\tilde{\mu} \in \mathbb{R}$  be some arbitrary value. A pathological reporting function  $g(\cdot) = (\tilde{\mu}, \dots, \tilde{\mu})$  which always reports a vector of repeated  $\tilde{\mu}$  values will achieve maximum value when the true mean is  $\tilde{\mu}$ , but does poorly elsewhere.

Typically,  $g$  is either the identity function or selects a random subset of  $X$ , in which case  $Y$  remains an i.i.d. dataset. In a marketplace, although data is sampled i.i.d., strategic contributors may fabricate or misreport data to maximize their personal benefit. This strategic behavior can result in situations where the reported data is no longer i.i.d samples from  $\mathcal{N}(\mu, \sigma^2)$ .

#### 3.1 Description of the environment

**Data marketplace for normal mean estimation.** In the data marketplace, each contributor draws i.i.d. samples from the same but *unknown* distribution  $\mathcal{N}(\mu, \sigma^2)$ , and submits a dataset (potentially misreported) to the broker. Buyers wish to estimate  $\mu$ , but have different valuations  $\{v_i^e\}_{i \in \mathcal{B}}$  based on their estimation errors. Once contributors have submitted datasets, the broker sells subsets of the combined dataset to buyers, and redistributes the revenue among contributors. These interactions proceed in the following order follows:

1. *Mechanism design:* The broker designs and publishes a mechanism to collect data from contributors, allocate subsets and set prices for buyers, and redistribute the revenue back to contributors. She also instructs contributors to collect amounts  $\{N_i\}_{i \in \mathcal{C}} \in \mathbb{N}^{|\mathcal{C}|}$ .
2. *Data collection:* Each contributor  $i \in \mathcal{C}$  collects  $n_i \in \mathbb{N}$  i.i.d. data points at cost  $c_i n_i$ , to produce a dataset  $X_i \in \mathbb{R}^{n_i}$ . Here  $n_i$  is not necessarily equal to  $N_i$ .
3. *Data submission:* Each contributor submits  $Y_i = f_i(X_i) \in \bigcup_{\ell=0}^{\infty} \mathbb{R}^{\ell}$ , where the submission function  $f_i$  may modify the collected dataset. This enables strategic alterations (e.g. fabrication) to maximize personal benefit by reducing costs and/or increasing their payment.
4. *Data allocation and purchases:* The broker allocates independent subsets of size  $\{m_j\}_{j \in \mathcal{B}} \in \mathbb{N}^{|\mathcal{B}|}$  of all contributors' submissions  $\bigcup_{i \in \mathcal{C}} Y_i$  to each buyer, and charges them *prices*  $\{p'_j\}_{j \in \mathcal{B}} \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{B}|}$ .

5. *Revenue redistribution*: The broker redistributes the total revenue  $\sum_{j \in \mathcal{B}} p'_j$  from buyers via *payments*  $\{\pi'_i\}_{i \in \mathcal{C}} \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{C}|}$  to contributors.

*Problem instance.* Let  $c := \{c_i\}_{i \in \mathcal{C}} \in \mathbb{R}_+^{|\mathcal{C}|}$  denote all contributor costs, and  $v^e := \{v_j^e\}_{j \in \mathcal{B}}$  denote all buyer valuations. An instance of this market design problem is specified by the tuple  $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{B}, c, v^e, \sigma^2)$ , which we assume is *public information*, i.e. known to the broker and all contributors and buyers. Neither the contributors, buyers, or broker has any additional information (e.g. a prior on  $\mu$ ).

*Notational convention.* We will use primed quantities to denote specific realizations of quantities that are otherwise functions of the reported dataset. For instance, a contributor's payment  $\pi_j$  will be a function of the reported data, but above  $\pi'_j \in \mathbb{R}$  denotes the specific amount paid to the contributor. The amount charged to a buyer for a dataset is referred to as the *price* denoted  $p_j, p'_j$ , while the amount given to a contributor for their work is called a *payment*, denoted  $\pi_j, \pi'_j$ .

We will define three types of (related) valuation functions for buyers. First the non-increasing function  $v_j^e(e')$  is buyer  $j$ 's valuation as a function of her estimation error  $e'$ . Second,  $v_j^{\text{ms}}(M, s)$  is  $j$ 's valuation as a function of the *mechanism*  $M$  and contributor strategies  $s$ —we will define this in (8). Third,  $v_j^{\text{d}}(m)$  is  $j$ 's valuation as a function of the *dataset size*  $m$  when the reported data is *truthful*—we have defined this in (11); in particular,  $v_j^{\text{d}}$  is related to the valuations in §2.

Finally, we will denote the contributor and buyer utilities by  $u_i^c(M, s)$  and  $u_i^b(M, s)$  respectively, in a mechanism  $M$  under contributor strategies  $s$ —we will define them in (7) and (9) respectively.

**Mechanism.** A broker's mechanism determines how much data each contributor should collect, the buyers' dataset sizes, buyers' prices, and contributors' payments. To define this, let  $\mathcal{X} = \bigcup_{\ell=0}^{\infty} \mathbb{R}^{\ell}$  be the space of datasets that each contributor may submit. A mechanism is specified by the following tuple of (possibly randomized) quantities  $M = (\{N_i\}_{i \in \mathcal{C}}, \{m_j\}_{j \in \mathcal{B}}, \{p_j\}_{j \in \mathcal{B}}, \{\pi_i\}_{i \in \mathcal{C}})$ . Here  $N_i \in \mathbb{N}$  is an *specification* to contributor  $i$  on how much data she should collect (contributors need not follow this specification). Next,  $m_j \in \mathbb{N}$  is the dataset size for buyer  $j$ , which satisfies  $m_j \leq \sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}} N_i$ . Finally,  $p_j : \mathcal{X}^{|\mathcal{C}|} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is the pricing rule for buyer  $j$ , and  $\pi_i : \mathcal{X}^{|\mathcal{C}|} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is the payment rule for contributor  $i$ . These quantities may depend on the public information  $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{B}, c, v, \sigma^2)$ , but we have suppressed this dependence.

To incentivize truthful reporting from contributors, we would like to pay them based on the quality of the data they have submitted and not just the amount of data they report; if the payment only depended on the size of the reported datasets, contributors would find it advantageous to fabricate data. Hence contributor payments  $\pi_i$  should depend on the reported datasets. To ensure the market remains feasible, we should also allow the prices  $p_j$  to also depend on the reported datasets.

Due to the stochastic nature of data collection and the mechanism's randomness, prices and payments will also be random. We allow *ex post* (i.e. stochastic) negative prices (where the broker pays a buyer) and negative payments (where a contributor pays the broker). Although unconventional, this enables the design of mechanisms with strong guarantees. Notably, in our mechanism, the *ex-ante* (i.e. expected) prices and payments are always non-negative.

**Contributors.** After the mechanism is published, each contributor decides how much data to collect and what to submit to the broker. A contributor  $i$ 's strategy is a possibly randomized pair  $s_i = (n_i, f_i)$ . First, the contributor samples  $n_i \in \mathbb{N}$  points to collect an initial dataset  $X_i = \{x_{i,j}\}_{j=1}^{n_i}$ , incurring a cost of  $c_i n_i$ . Here, each  $x_{i,j}$  is drawn independently from the unknown normal distribution  $\mathcal{N}(\mu, \sigma^2)$ . She then submits  $Y_i = \{y_{i,j}\}_j = f_i(X_i)$ , where  $f_i : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$  maps the collected dataset to a possibly altered dataset of potentially different size. Let  $s = \{s_j\}_{j \in \mathcal{C}}$  denote the strategy profile of all contributors, and  $s_{-i} = \{s_j\}_{j \in \mathcal{C} \setminus \{i\}}$  the strategies of all contributors except  $i$ .

*Strategic behaviors.* A strategic contributor may not collect the amount specified by the broker, i.e.  $n_i$  may differ from  $N_i$ . She may under-collect to reduce costs. To provide reliable mean estimates for buyers, the broker wishes to incentivize contributors to submit data truthfully, i.e., use the identity function  $f_i = \mathbf{I}$  which maps the dataset to itself. However, in naive mechanisms, contributors may benefit from misreporting, i.e., using  $f_i \neq \mathbf{I}$  to fabricate or falsify data. Our formalism allows contributors to modify their submission based

on their collected dataset  $X_i$ . For instance, a contributor could collect a small dataset ( $n_i \ll N_i$ ), fit a normal distribution to it, and sample additional synthetic points to mislead the broker into believing a larger dataset was collected.

*Contributor utility.* If a contributor samples  $n_i$  points and receives payment  $\pi'_i \in \mathbb{R}$ , her *ex post* utility is  $\pi'_i - c_i n_i$ . As these quantities depend on the mechanism  $M$  and the contributors' strategies  $s$ , her *ex ante* utility  $u_i^c$  is defined as,

$$u_i^c(M, s) := \inf_{\mu \in \mathbb{R}} \mathbb{E}_{M, s, \mu} [\pi_i(\{f_i(X_i)\}_{i \in \mathcal{C}}) - c_i n_i]. \quad (7)$$

Here, the expectation  $\mathbb{E}_{M, s, \mu}$  is taken over the randomness in the mechanism, the contributor strategies  $s = \{(n_i, f_i)\}_{i \in \mathcal{C}}$ , and the stochasticity of i.i.d. datasets  $\{X_i\}_{i \in \mathcal{C}}$  drawn from  $\mathcal{N}(\mu, \sigma^2)$ . We consider the infimum for a similar reason to (6). Since the true distribution  $\mathcal{N}(\mu, \sigma^2)$  is unknown to the contributor *a priori*, a contributor's strategy should perform well for all values of  $\mu$ . To illustrate further consider an arbitrary  $\tilde{\mu} \in \mathbb{R}$ . Suppose a contributor chooses to not collect any data (incurring zero cost) and report a large vector consisting of multiple copies of  $\tilde{\mu}$ , i.e.  $(\tilde{\mu}, \dots, \tilde{\mu})$ . This strategy benefits the buyers, as they could obtain arbitrarily good approximations of  $\mu$  using the sample mean. As a result, buyers will be willing to pay more, which in turn increases the contributor's expected payment, without incurring any cost. However, such a strategy is only feasible if the contributor *a priori* knew that  $\mu = \tilde{\mu}$ . Taking the infimum over all  $\mu$  accounts for the fact that  $\mu$  is unknown, ensuring the problem is well-defined<sup>3</sup>.

**Buyers.** Buyers receive data from the mechanism, pay the specified price to the broker, and then estimate  $\mu$  via the sample mean of the dataset they received. Different buyers may have differing valuations for varying errors, modeled by buyer-specific non-increasing functions  $v_j^e : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow [0, 1]$ , where  $v_j^e(e')$  is her *ex-post* value if her estimation error is  $e'$ . Her value  $v_j^e$  in a mechanism  $M$  under a strategy profile  $s$  can be written as (with slight abuse of notation),

$$v_j^{\text{ms}}(M, s) := v_j^{\text{ms}}(m_j, s) := \inf_{\mu \in \mathbb{R}} \mathbb{E}_{M, s, \mu} [v_j^e(|\hat{\mu}(g_{s, m_j}(\{X_i\}_{i \in \mathcal{C}})) - \mu|)]. \quad (8)$$

Here,  $g_s$  is the “reporting function” (see (6)) induced by the contributor strategies  $s = \{(n_i, f_i)\}_{i \in \mathcal{C}}$  and the mechanism  $M = (\{m_j\}_{j \in \mathcal{B}}, \{p_j\}_{j \in \mathcal{B}}, \{\pi_i\}_{i \in \mathcal{C}})$ ; this accounts for each contributor sampling  $n_i$  i.i.d. points  $X_i$ , submitting  $Y_i = f_i(X_i)$ , and the mechanism then sampling an independent subset of size  $m_j$  ( $\{f_i(X_i)\}_{i \in \mathcal{C}}$ ) from the the combined dataset of all contributors. Similar to (6) and (7), the infimum is necessary for  $v_j$  to be well-defined as  $\mu$  is unknown.

*Buyer utility.* Defining a buyer's utility is a bit tricky in our setting and infimum and expectations do not commute. For this, we may consider two options shown below in (9) and (10):

$$u_j^{\text{b}}(M, s) := u_j^{\text{b}}(m_j, p_j, s) := v_j^{\text{ms}}(m_j, s) - \sup_{\mu \in \mathbb{R}} \mathbb{E}_{M, s, \mu} [p_j(\{f_i(X_i)\}_{i \in \mathcal{C}})]. \quad (9)$$

$$u_j^{\text{b}}(M, s) := u_j^{\text{b}}(m_j, p_j, s) := \inf_{\mu \in \mathbb{R}} \mathbb{E}_{M, s, \mu} [v_j^e(|\hat{\mu}(g_{s, m_j}(\{X_i\}_{i \in \mathcal{C}})) - \mu|) - p_j(\{f_i(X_i)\}_{i \in \mathcal{C}})]. \quad (10)$$

Here, (9) captures the difference between the buyer's worst-case expected value (see (8)) and worst-case expected price, while (10) considers her *ex-post* utility,  $v_j^e(e') - p'_j$ , for error  $e'$  and price  $p'_j$ , and then takes the worst-case expectation. Clearly, (9)  $\leq$  (10), so guarantees on (9) extend to (10). Thus, we adopt (9) as the utility measure. That said in our mechanism, *both quantities are equal*, as the expected price is independent of the underlying distribution  $\mathcal{N}(\mu, \sigma^2)$ .

*Buyer valuation for i.i.d data.* For what follows, we define the buyer's valuation  $v_j^{\text{d}}$  as a function of the amount of i.i.d data she receives. We have

$$v_j^{\text{d}}(m) := \inf_{\mu \in \mathbb{R}} \mathbb{E}_{X \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu, \sigma^2)^m} [v_j^e(|\hat{\mu}(X) - \mu|)]. \quad (11)$$

<sup>3</sup>An alternative approach to account for uncertainty of  $\mu$  is to consider a prior over  $\mu$  and take expectation with respect to this prior. While we do not study this Bayesian setting here, our high-level techniques can also be applied in that context.

Comparing this with (8), we see that for any mechanism  $M = (\{N_i\}_{i \in \mathcal{C}}, \{m_j\}_{j \in \mathcal{B}}, \{p_j\}_{j \in \mathcal{B}}, \{\pi_i\}_{i \in \mathcal{C}})$ , we have  $v_j^{\text{ms}}(M, \{(N_i, \mathbf{I})\}) = v_j^{\text{d}}(m_j)$ . That is, buyers achieve  $v_j^{\text{d}}(m_j)$  when contributors collect the instructed amounts and report truthfully (recall that the mechanism always chooses  $m_j \leq \sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}} N_i$ .) In particular, note that  $v_j^{\text{d}}$  is the same as the buyers' quantity-based utility we studied in §2.

**Cumulative profit.** If the contributors collect data in amounts  $\{n_i\}_{i \in \mathcal{C}} \in \mathbb{N}^{|\mathcal{C}|}$  and the buyers are charged prices  $\{p'_j\}_{j \in \mathcal{B}} \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{B}|}$ , the cumulative profit for contributors is  $\sum_{j \in \mathcal{B}} p'_j - \sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}} c_i n_i$ . Hence, the expected cumulative profit is given by,

$$\text{profit}(M, s; \mu) = \mathbb{E}_{M, s, \mu} \left[ \sum_{j \in \mathcal{B}} p_j (\{f_i(X_i)\}_{i \in \mathcal{C}}) - \sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}} c_i n_i \right], \quad \text{profit}(M, s) = \inf_{\mu \in \mathbb{R}} \text{profit}(M, s; \mu). \quad (12)$$

As before, the infimum accounts for the fact that  $\mu$  is unknown. For an arbitrary mechanism, profit may depend on reported data, which itself depends on the actual distribution. We wish for a mechanism to achieve high profit for all unknown distributions  $\{\mathcal{N}(\mu, \sigma^2) : \mu \in \mathbb{R}\}$ , and not just do well for some specific distributions. However, we will see that for our mechanism and contributor strategies, the expected cumulative profit  $\text{profit}(M^*, s^*; \mu)$  is independent of  $\mu$ .

### 3.2 The mechanism design problem

Our goal is to design a mechanism  $M^* = (\{N_i^*\}_{i \in \mathcal{C}}, \{m_j^*\}_{j \in \mathcal{B}}, \{p_j^*\}_{j \in \mathcal{B}}, \{\pi_i^*\}_{i \in \mathcal{C}})$  to maximize the cumulative profit for contributors, while ensuring that all buyers and contributors do not lose by participation, charge fair prices to buyers, fully redistribute revenue from buyers to contributors, and incentivize contributors to collect the instructed amounts ( $n_i = N_i^*$ ) and report it truthfully ( $f_i = \mathbf{I}$ ). To state these requirements formally, let  $s^* = \{(N_i^*, \mathbf{I})\}_{i \in \mathcal{C}}$  denote the “well-behaved” contributor strategy profile. The mechanism should satisfy the following requirements:

1. *Individually rational for buyers (IRB):*  $M^*$  is *ex ante* individually rational for the buyers if  $u_j^{\text{b}}(M^*, s^*) \geq 0$  for all buyers  $j \in \mathcal{B}$ .
2. *Envy-free for the buyers (EFB):*  $M^*$  is envy-free for the buyers if no buyer prefers another buyer's dataset size selection rule and pricing rule to her own, i.e.  $u_j^{\text{b}}(m_j^*, p_j^*, s^*) \geq u_j^{\text{b}}(m_k^*, p_k^*, s^*)$  for all buyers  $j, k \in \mathcal{B}$ .
3. *Individually rational for contributors (IRC):*  $M$  is *ex-ante* individually rational for the contributors if  $u_i^{\text{c}}(M^*, s^*) \geq 0$  for all contributors  $i \in \mathcal{C}$ .
4. *Incentive-compatible for contributors (ICC):*  $M^*$  is incentive-compatible for contributors if  $s^*$  is a Nash equilibrium. That is, for all contributors  $i \in \mathcal{C}$ , and for every alternative strategy  $s_i$  for  $i$ , we have  $u_i^{\text{c}}(M^*, s^*) \geq u_i^{\text{c}}(M^*, (s_i, s_{-i}^*))$ . (In §4, we show that no DSIC mechanisms are possible).
5. *Budget balance (BB):*  $M^*$  satisfies budget balance if the total revenue is equal to total payments with probability 1, i.e. for *every realization of the data*  $\{X_k\}_{k \in \mathcal{C}}$  we have  $\sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}} \pi_i^* (\{X_k\}_{k \in \mathcal{C}}) = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{B}} p_j^* (\{X_k\}_{k \in \mathcal{C}})$ . (Note that contributors submit truthfully, i.e.  $f_k = \mathbf{I}$ , in  $s^*$ ).
6. *Profit optimality (PO):* Let OPT in (1) and (3) be the optimum envy-free revenue with non-strategic contributors, when using the valuation functions  $\{v_j^{\text{d}}\}_{j \in \mathcal{B}}$  for i.i.d. data, as defined in (11). We say  $M^*$  is  $\epsilon$ -PO if  $\text{profit}(M^*, s^*) \geq \text{OPT} - \epsilon$ .

In BB, we require total payments to equal total revenue. Payments cannot exceed revenue to ensure market feasibility. We additionally require equality to ensure that trade benefits are fully distributed to contributors, leaving no unallocated excess revenue. Unlike the other five requirements, BB must hold always and not just in expectation, as the market must be feasible for every realization of data.

We note that the baseline mechanism achieving OPT in (1) satisfies IRB and EFB by design, as well as IRC and BB, since all revenue can be allocated to contributor 1. However, this mechanism is not ICC. Intuitively, if a single agent collects all the data, she can fabricate it without detection, as the broker has no basis for verification. We prove this rigorously in Claim 6.

### 3.3 Discussion of modeling choices

We conclude this section with a few observations on our modeling choices.

*Knowledge of buyer valuations and contributor costs.* We assume buyer valuations  $v = \{v_j\}_{j \in \mathcal{B}}$  and contributor costs  $\{c_i\}_{i \in \mathcal{C}}$  are public information. This allows us to focus on our key challenges: incentivizing truthful data contribution while adhering to market constraints, and analyzing its impact on buyer incentives. Extending our model to cases where these are unknown but can be elicited via bids or learned in repeated markets is left for future work.

*Better but untruthful Nash equilibria.* Our requirements in §3.2 assume that  $s^*$  is a truthfully reporting NE. This is without loss of generality—if a non-truthful NE achieves higher profit, then one can obtain truth-telling NE with the same profit via the revelation principle.

*Buyers using the sample mean.* We assume that buyers estimate  $\mu$  using the sample mean. While it is possible that other estimators could be optimal for different valuations  $v_i$ , general techniques for constructing optimal estimators based on specific loss/valuation functions remains an open problem in the statistics literature and are beyond the scope of this work.

*Broker returning biased or corrupted data to buyers.* In §3.1, we assume that the broker sells an *independent* subset of contributor submissions to buyers, with the sizes of the subsets given by  $\{m_j\}_{j \in \mathcal{B}}$  values. One might ask whether brokers could extract more revenue by biasing the selection or even corrupting the data. While this is technically possible, such practices could undermine trust in the market if buyers suspect data manipulation by a broker. Returning an independent subset is less controversial.

*Impact of (un)truthful reporting on buyer valuations.* We do not explicitly model the fact that truthfully reported data from contributors maximizes buyer valuations, even though this is generally expected in practice. Modeling how different types of untruthful behaviors could affect buyer valuations will be unwieldy, as it would require additional assumptions on  $v_i$  and an analysis of optimal estimators for different  $v_i$ . Our approach instead is to define a profit-optimal baseline where *non-strategic* contributors *always* follow the mechanism’s data collection and truthful reporting rules. Instead of explicitly modeling how untruthful reporting can help or hurt buyers, we frame our goal as designing a mechanism which *incentivizes* strategic contributors to follow the broker’s rules, while still approximating the profit in the baseline.

## 4 Hardness results

We will first present two hardness results for this problem. Our first theorem, states that it is not possible to design a nontrivial dominant-strategy incentive-compatible mechanism for this problem. To state this recall that  $s_i$  is said to be dominant strategy for agent  $i$  if for all strategies  $s_{-i}$  of other agents, and all alternative strategies  $s'_i$  for agent  $i$  we have  $u_i^c(M, s_i^*, s_{-i}) \geq u_i^c(M, s'_i, s_{-i})$ .

**Theorem 3.** *If  $s = \{(n_i, f_i)\}_{i \in \mathcal{C}}$  is a dominant strategy profile under any mechanism  $M$ , then  $\forall i \in \mathcal{C}, n_i = 0$ .*

Our next theorem provides an upper bound on the maximum profit achievable in any Nash equilibrium of any mechanism. In §5, we will design a mechanism whose profit is arbitrarily close to this upper bound.

**Theorem 4.** *Let OPT be as defined in OPT (1). Let  $M$  be any mechanism satisfying EFB and IRB properties, and let  $s$  be a Nash equilibrium of this mechanism. Then  $\text{profit}(M, s) \leq \text{OPT} - (c_2 - c_1)$ .*

### 4.1 Proofs of Theorems 3 and 4

The following lemma is the key technical ingredient in proving both results above. It states that when other agents are not collecting any data, then, regardless of their submission functions, the best response for an agent is to also not collect any data. Note that even when an agent has not collected any data, an untruthful submission functions may actually report some data.

**Lemma 5.** Let  $M$  be any mechanism and let  $s_{-i} = \{(0, f_j)\}_{j \neq i}$  be a strategy profile for all agents except  $i$ , where  $\{f_j\}_{j \neq i}$  are arbitrary submission functions. If  $s_i = (n_i, f_i)$  is the best response of agent  $i$  to  $s_{-i}$ , then  $n_i = 0$ .

We will prove Lemma 5 in §4.2. We first prove Theorem 3 and Theorem 4 using Lemma 5.

*Proof of Theorem 3.* Let  $s'_{-i} = \{(0, f'_j)\}_{j \neq i}$  be a strategy profile for all agents except  $i$ , where  $\{f'_j\}_{j \neq i}$  are arbitrary submission functions. Since  $s$  is a dominant strategy profile we know that  $\forall s'_i$

$$u_i^c(M, (s_i, s_{-i})) \geq u_i^c(M, (s'_i, s_{-i}))$$

i.e.  $s_i$  is the best response to  $s_{-i}$ . By Lemma 5 we conclude that  $n_i = 0$ .  $\square$

We now present and prove a short claim that will be used in the proof of Theorem 4 that follows.

**Claim 6.** If  $s = \{(n_i, f_i)\}_{i \in \mathcal{C}}$  is a NE under  $M$  and  $\forall j \neq i, n_j = 0$ , then  $n_i = 0$ .

*Proof.* Since  $s$  is a NE under  $M$ ,  $\forall s'_i$  we have that  $u_i^c(M, (s_i, s_{-i})) \geq u_i^c(M, (s'_i, s_{-i}))$ , i.e.  $s_i$  is the best response to  $s_{-i}$ . By hypothesis we also know that  $s_{-i} = \{(0, f_j)\}_{j \neq i}$ . Therefore, we can apply Lemma 5 to conclude  $n_i = 0$ .  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 4.* Claim 6 tells us that under any Nash equilibrium  $s = \{(n_i, f_i)\}_{i \in \mathcal{C}}$ , at least two contributors must collect data. Assuming that  $c_1 \leq c_2 \leq \dots \leq c_{|\mathcal{B}|}$ , we have that the cheapest way for at least two contributors to collect a total of  $N^{\text{tot}} := \sum_i n_i$  points is to have agent 1 collect  $N^{\text{tot}} - 1$  points and agent 2 collect 1 point. Combining this with the fact that  $\text{rev}^{\text{OPT}}(N^{\text{tot}})$  is the best revenue achievable when selling  $N^{\text{tot}}$  data points under IRB and EFB, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \text{profit}(M, s) &\leq \text{rev}^{\text{OPT}}(N^{\text{tot}}) - \sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}} c_i N_i \leq \text{rev}^{\text{OPT}}(N^{\text{tot}}) - c_1(N^{\text{tot}} - 1) - c_2 \\ &= \text{rev}^{\text{OPT}}(N^{\text{tot}}) - c_1(N^{\text{tot}}) - (c_2 - c_1) \leq \max_N \{\text{rev}^{\text{OPT}}(N) - c_1 N\} - (c_2 - c_1) \\ &= \text{OPT} - (c_2 - c_1). \end{aligned}$$

The last step follows from equation (3), the definition of OPT.  $\square$

## 4.2 Proof of Lemma 5

At a high level, Lemma 5 claims that when the other agents do not collect data, it is best for agent  $i$  to not collect data. This is because the mechanism has no knowledge of the true value of  $\mu \in \mathbb{R}$  and thus cannot penalize agent  $i$  for submitting fabricated data since the others do not provide data to validate against. Therefore, agent  $i$  has the ability to forgo the cost of data collection without decreasing the payment they receive. Hence, agents  $i$ 's best response involves collecting no data.

*Proof.* Suppose for a contradiction that  $n_i > 0$ . Define the strategy  $s_{i, \mu'} = (n_i, f_{i, \mu'})$  where  $f_{i, \mu'}$  is the submission function which disregards  $X_i$  and instead samples and submits  $n_i$  points from  $N(\mu', \sigma^2)$  using  $f_i$ , i.e.  $f_{i, \mu'}(\cdot) := f_i(Z_i)$ ,  $Z_i \sim N(\mu', \sigma^2)^{n_i}$ . Applying the definition of contributor  $i$ 's utility we see that

$$\begin{aligned} \inf_{\mu \in \mathbb{R}} \mathbb{E}_{X_i \sim N(\mu, \sigma^2)^{n_i}} \left[ \pi_i \left( f_i(X_i), (f_j(\emptyset))_{j \neq i} \right) \right] - c_i n_i &\geq \inf_{\mu \in \mathbb{R}} \mathbb{E}_{Z_i \sim N(\mu', \sigma^2)^{n_i}} \left[ \pi_i \left( f_i(Z_i), (f_j(\emptyset))_{j \neq i} \right) \right] - c_i n_i \\ \Rightarrow \inf_{\mu \in \mathbb{R}} \mathbb{E}_{X_i \sim N(\mu, \sigma^2)^{n_i}} \left[ \pi_i \left( f_i(X_i), (f_j(\emptyset))_{j \neq i} \right) \right] &\geq \inf_{\mu \in \mathbb{R}} \mathbb{E}_{Z_i \sim N(\mu', \sigma^2)^{n_i}} \left[ \pi_i \left( f_i(Z_i), (f_j(\emptyset))_{j \neq i} \right) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

For clarity we omit writing the dependence on  $M$  and  $s_{-i}$  under the expectation as it is not relevant to the proof. Now notice that since all of the other agents are not collecting data we have

$$\inf_{\mu \in \mathbb{R}} \mathbb{E}_{Z_i \sim N(\mu', \sigma^2)^{n_i}} \left[ \pi_i \left( f_i(Z_i), (f_j(\emptyset))_{j \neq i} \right) \right] = \mathbb{E}_{Z_i \sim N(\mu', \sigma^2)^{n_i}} \left[ \pi_i \left( f_i(Z_i), (f_j(\emptyset))_{j \neq i} \right) \right]$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\geq \inf_{\mu' \in \mathbb{R}} \mathbb{E}_{Z_i \sim N(\mu', \sigma^2)^{n_i}} \left[ \pi_i \left( f_i(Z_i), (f_j(\emptyset))_{j \neq i} \right) \right] \\
&= \inf_{\mu \in \mathbb{R}} \mathbb{E}_{X_i \sim N(\mu, \sigma^2)^{n_i}} \left[ \pi_i \left( f_i(X_i), (f_j(\emptyset))_{j \neq i} \right) \right].
\end{aligned}$$

Because we have both matching upper and lower bounds, we conclude that  $\forall \mu' \in \mathbb{R}$

$$\inf_{\mu \in \mathbb{R}} \mathbb{E}_{X_i \sim N(\mu, \sigma^2)^{n_i}} \left[ \pi_i \left( f_i(X_i), (f_j(\emptyset))_{j \neq i} \right) \right] = \mathbb{E}_{Z_i \sim N(\mu', \sigma^2)^{n_i}} \left[ \pi_i \left( f_i(Z_i), (f_j(\emptyset))_{j \neq i} \right) \right].$$

Intuitively this says that the expected payment an agent receives is independent of which normal distribution they submit data from. But this means that agent  $i$  can avoid the cost of data collection by submitting fabricated data with no reduction in payment. More formally, for any  $\mu' \in \mathbb{R}$ , consider the strategy  $\tilde{s}_i := (0, f_{i, \mu'})$ . Under this strategy agent  $i$ 's utility is

$$\begin{aligned}
u_i^c(M, (\tilde{s}_i, s_{-i})) &= \inf_{\mu \in \mathbb{R}} \mathbb{E}_{Z_i \sim N(\mu, \sigma^2)^{n_i}} \left[ \pi_i \left( f_i(Z_i), (f_j(\emptyset))_{j \neq i} \right) \right] \\
&= \inf_{\mu \in \mathbb{R}} \mathbb{E}_{X_i \sim N(\mu, \sigma^2)^{n_i}} \left[ \pi_i \left( f_i(X_i), (f_j(\emptyset))_{j \neq i} \right) \right] \\
&> \inf_{\mu \in \mathbb{R}} \mathbb{E}_{X_i \sim N(\mu, \sigma^2)^{n_i}} \left[ \pi_i \left( f_i(X_i), (f_j(\emptyset))_{j \neq i} \right) \right] - c_i n_i = u_i^c(M, (s_i, s_{-i})).
\end{aligned}$$

But this contradicts that  $s_i$  is the best response to  $s_{-i}$ . Therefore,  $n_i = 0$ .  $\square$

## 5 Profit-optimal mechanisms with strategic contributors

---

### Algorithm 2

---

- 1: **Input:** Buyer valuations  $\{v_j\}_{j \in \mathcal{B}}$ , contributor costs  $\{c_i\}_{i \in \mathcal{C}}$ , algorithm for ordered item pricing  $A$ , approximation parameter  $\epsilon$ .
- 2: **The broker:**
- 3:  $N^+, \{m_j^+\}_{j \in \mathcal{B}}, \{q_j^+\}_{j \in \mathcal{B}} \leftarrow$  Execute Algorithm 1 with  $\{v_j\}_{j \in \mathcal{B}}, \{c_i\}_{i \in \mathcal{C}}, A, \epsilon$ .
- 4: Instruct contributors to collect  $\{N_i^*\}_{i \in \mathcal{C}}$  where,

$$N_1^* = N^+ - 1, \quad N_2^* = 1, \quad N_j^* = 0 \text{ for all } j \in \{3, \dots, |\mathcal{C}|\}.$$

- 5: **Each contributor**  $i \in \mathcal{C}$ :
  - 6: Chooses a strategy  $s_i = (n_i, f_i)$ .
  - 7: Collects  $n_i$  data points  $X_i$ , and submits  $Y_i = f_i(X_i)$ .
  - 8: **The broker:**
  - 9: Receive  $\{Y_i\}_{i \in \mathcal{C}}$  from contributors.
  - 10: Let  $Y \leftarrow Y_1 \cup Y_2$  be the combined dataset of the first two contributors.
  - 11: Allocate  $m_j^*$  ( $= m_j^+$ ) randomly chosen points from  $Y$  to each buyer  $j \in \mathcal{B}$ .
  - 12: Charge  $p_j^*$  from each buyer  $j \in \mathcal{B}$  (see (14)).
  - 13: Pay  $\pi_i^*$  to each contributor  $i \in \mathcal{C}$  (see (15)).
- 

We have outlined our mechanism in Algorithm 2. We will first describe it procedurally, specify our choices for  $M^* = (\{N_i^*\}_{i \in \mathcal{C}}, \{m_j^*\}_{j \in \mathcal{B}}, \{p_j^*\}_{j \in \mathcal{B}}, \{\pi_i^*\}_{i \in \mathcal{C}})$ , and then motivate our design choices.

Algorithm 2 takes as inputs the buyer valuations, contributor costs, an algorithm for ordered item pricing, and an approximation parameter. First, we execute Algorithm 1 to obtain  $N^+, \{m_j^+\}_{j \in \mathcal{B}}, \{q_j^+\}_{j \in \mathcal{B}}$ . We then set  $\{N_i^*\}_{i \in \mathcal{C}}, \{m_j^*\}_{j \in \mathcal{B}}$  as shown below.

$$N_1^* = N^+ - 1, \quad N_2^* = 1, \quad N_i^* = 0 \text{ for } i \geq 3. \quad m_j^* = m_j^+ \text{ for } j \in \mathcal{B} \quad (13)$$

That is, the broker instructs contributor 1 to collect  $N_1^*$  points, contributor 2 to collect  $N_2^* = 1$  point, and the rest to collect none. Then these two contributors (and possibly others), collect  $n_i$  points each to collect a dataset  $X_i$ , and submit  $Y_i = f_i(X_i)$ .

Let  $Y = Y_1 \cup Y_2$  be the union of the first two contributors' submissions (the broker ignores the others' submissions). She then allocates  $m_j^*$  points to buyer  $j$  and charges them prices  $p_j^*$  as shown below in (14). She then issues payments  $\pi_i^*$  to the contributors as shown below in (15).

For  $i \in \{1, 2\}$ , let  $Y_{-i}$  denote the data submitted by the agent other than  $i$ , let  $N_{-i}^* = N^+ - N_i^*$  be the amount of data that the other agent should collect, and let  $d_i = c_i \cdot (N_i^*)^2 / \sigma^2$ . Denote  $W = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{B}} q_j^+ - c_1(N^+ - 1) - c_2$ , where, recall  $\{q_j^+\}_j$  are the prices computed in Algorithm 1. As we will show,  $W$  will be the expected profit of our mechanism. We can now state  $p_j^*$  as follows:

$$p_j^* (\{Y_i\}_i) = \sum_{i \in \{1, 2\}} \mathbb{I}(|Y_i| = N_i^*) \left( q_j^+ \frac{N_i^*}{N^+} + \frac{d_i}{|\mathcal{B}|} \frac{\sigma^2}{N_{-i}^*} + \frac{d_i}{|\mathcal{B}|} \frac{\sigma^2}{N_i^*} \right) - \sum_{i \in \{1, 2\}} \frac{d_i}{|\mathcal{B}|} \left( \hat{\mu}(Y_i) - \hat{\mu}(Y_{-i}) \right)^2. \quad (14)$$

Next the payments  $\pi_i^* (\{Y_i\}_i) = 0$  for all  $i \in \{3, \dots, |\mathcal{C}|\}$ . For agents  $i \in \{1, 2\}$  we have,

$$\pi_i^* (\{Y_i\}_i) = \mathbb{I}(|Y_i| = N_i^*) \left( W \frac{N_i^*}{N^+} + c_i N_i^* + d_i \frac{\sigma^2}{N_{-i}^*} + d_i \frac{\sigma^2}{N_i^*} \right) - d_i \left( \hat{\mu}(Y_i) - \hat{\mu}(Y_{-i}) \right)^2. \quad (15)$$

**Design choices.** Here, the payments to buyers are designed so that the *expected payment* matches the value  $q_j^+$  obtained from Algorithm 1. Similarly, the payments to contributors ensure that cumulative profit is distributed in proportion to their contributions. Specifically, contributor  $i$ 's *expected payment* is given by  $c_i N_i^* + W N_i^* / N^+$ .

However, the actual prices and payments are further adjusted based on the difference between the means of the datasets provided by the two contributors. If this difference is large, buyers pay less; if it is small, they pay more. These adjustments are then passed on to the two contributors. This design allows us to achieve three requirements: ICC: each contributor should report truthfully when the other does so, to minimize this difference; IRB: buyers pay less if there are significant discrepancies in contributors' submissions, which may indicate unreliable data; BB: the market must remain feasible for every random realization of data, *i.e.*, with probability 1.

Finally, we set  $m_j^* = m_j^+$  since Algorithm 1 is designed to maximize profit. However, if contributor 1 were to collect all the data, she could fabricate it. Fortunately, as we prove in Theorem 5.1, using just one data point from contributor 2 is sufficient to incentivize contributor 1 to follow the rules.

The following theorem summarizes the key properties of our mechanism. It satisfies all the required constraints while achieving a profit arbitrarily close to the upper bound in Theorem 4, demonstrating that the mechanism is essentially unimprovable.

**Theorem 5.1.** *Let  $A$  be an algorithm for ordered item pricing which takes in an approximation parameter  $\epsilon$  and returns a  $|\mathcal{B}|\mathcal{O}(\epsilon)$  approximation to the optimal revenue. Let  $M^*$  denote the mechanism in Algorithm 2 when executed with  $A$ . Let  $s^* = \{(N_i^*, \mathbf{I})\}_{i \in \mathcal{C}}$  denote the strategy profile where contributors are collecting the amounts specified in (13) and reporting it truthfully. Then  $M^*$  satisfies IRB, EFB, IRC, ICC, and BB. Moreover, its expected profit is*

$$\text{profit}(M^*, s^*) \geq \text{OPT} - (c_2 - c_1) - |\mathcal{B}|\mathcal{O}(\epsilon),$$

The proof is given in Appendix A. We have outlined the key ideas of our ICC proof in §5.1.

**Discussion.** We highlight two observations. 1) *Multiple minimum cost agents.* If there are multiple agents with the same minimum cost, we can distribute the data collection evenly among them to achieve OPT. This also reduces the variance of the comparison terms in (14) and (15), which in turn lowers the variance in prices and payments. This may be desirable in practical settings.



2) *Beyond mean estimation.* We believe many of our insights extend to learning tasks beyond mean estimation. For instance, we expect that no nontrivial DSIC mechanism exists and that two contributors would still suffice to induce a profit-optimal Nash equilibrium. However, the requirement of only one sample from the second contributor is specific to normal mean estimation, where there is only a single learnable parameter. More generally, we expect the number of required samples from the second contributor to scale with the model's degrees of freedom, as their primary role is to help the broker verify the reliability of the first contributor's submissions.

## 5.1 Proof sketch of ICC in Theorem 5.1

To prove ICC we must show that  $s^*$  is a Nash equilibrium of  $M^*$ . That is, we will show,  $\forall i \in \mathcal{C}, \forall (n_i, f_i)$ ,

$$u_i^c(M^*, ((n_i, f_i), s_{-i}^*)) \leq u_i^c(M^*, (s_i^*, s_{-i}^*)).$$

Note that because we are only asking the two agents with the lowest collection costs to collect data, we can focus on  $\{1, 2\} \in \mathcal{C}$  as the above inequality is immediately satisfied for all other agents. We now prove the inequality for these agents in three steps, each with a corresponding lemma.

**Step 1.** Let  $(n_i, f_i)$  be given. First we show that a contributor can improve her utility by switching their strategy from  $(n_i, f_i)$  to  $(n_i, f_a)$ , where  $f_a$  is a function that always submits exactly  $N_i^*$  points while maintaining the same sample mean as  $f_i$ . This is true as our mechanism determines a contributors penalty based on the sample mean of their submitted data and whether or not they submitted exactly  $N_i^*$  points. This is stated formally in the lemma below.

**(Lemma 7):** Fix any  $(n_i, f_i)$ . Let  $f_a : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{N_i^*}$  be a function such that  $\forall X_i \in \mathcal{X}, \hat{\mu}(f_a(X_i)) = \hat{\mu}(f_i(X_i))$ . Then,

$$u_i^c(M, ((n_i, f_i), s_{-i}^*)) \leq u_i^c(M, ((n_i, f_a), s_{-i}^*)).$$

**Step 2.** The second step is showing that a contributor can improve their utility by switching their strategy from  $(n_i, f_a)$  to  $(n_i, f_b)$ , where  $f_b$  is a function that always submits exactly  $N_i^*$  points and whose sample mean agrees with the sample mean of the original data  $X_i$ . We will show that this is a result of a standard fact from normal mean estimation that the sample mean is minimax optimal [30]. This is stated formally in the lemma below.

**(Lemma 8):** Fix any  $n_i$ . Consider any  $f_a : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{N_i^*}$  and let  $f_b : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{N_i^*}$  be a function such that  $\forall X_i \in \mathcal{X}, \hat{\mu}(f_b(X_i)) = \hat{\mu}(X_i)$ . Then,

$$u_i^c(M, ((n_i, f_a), s_{-i}^*)) \leq u_i^c(M, ((n_i, f_b), s_{-i}^*)).$$

**Step 3.** The final step is showing a contributor can improve their utility by switching their strategy from  $(n_i, f_b)$  to  $(N_i^*, f_b)$ . We will show that when a contributor is using  $f_b$  their utility is a concave function in  $n_i$  which is maximized at  $(N_i^*, f_b)$ . We then show the utility under  $(N_i^*, f_b)$  is the same as under  $(N_i^*, \mathbf{I}) = s_i^*$ .

**(Lemma 9):** Fix any  $n_i$ . Let  $f_b : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{N_i^*}$  be a function such that  $\forall X_i \in \mathcal{X}, \hat{\mu}(f_b(X_i)) = \hat{\mu}(X_i)$ . Then,

$$u_i^c(M, ((n_i, f_b), s_{-i}^*)) \leq u_i^c(M, (s_i^*, s_{-i}^*)).$$

These three steps now combine to prove ICC as follows. Fix any  $(n_i, f_i)$ , we then have that

$$\begin{aligned} u_i^c(M, ((n_i, f_i), s_{-i}^*)) &\leq u_i^c(M, ((n_i, f_a), s_{-i}^*)) && \text{(Lemma 7)} \\ &\leq u_i^c(M, ((n_i, f_b), s_{-i}^*)) && \text{(Lemma 8)} \\ &\leq u_i^c(M, (s_i^*, s_{-i}^*)). && \text{(Lemma 9)} \end{aligned}$$

## 6 Conclusion

We design a data marketplace where a broker facilitates transactions between buyers, who seek to estimate the mean of an unknown normal distribution, and strategic data contributors, who collect data from these distributions at a cost. Our mechanism admits a Nash equilibrium (NE) in which the two lowest-cost contributors collect all the data and report it truthfully. In this equilibrium, we maximize profit while satisfying key market constraints. Furthermore, we show that our mechanism is essentially unimprovable, as it achieves a profit arbitrarily close to the maximum possible in any NE of any mechanism. An interesting and challenging direction for future work is to extend our framework to learning tasks beyond mean estimation.

## References

- [1] Aws data exchange overview. <https://aws.amazon.com/data-exchange/>, 2024.
- [2] AWS Data Hub. <https://aws.amazon.com/blogs/big-data/tag/datahub/>, 2024. Accessed: 2024-05-11.
- [3] Bloomberg Enterprise Access Point. <https://www.bloomberg.com/professional/product/enterprise-access-point/>, 2024.
- [4] Citrine Informatics – Accelerating Materials Innovation. URL: <https://citrine.io/>, 2024. Accessed: March 9, 2024.
- [5] DataBricks Delta Sharing. [databricks.com/product/delta-sharing](https://databricks.com/product/delta-sharing), 2024.
- [6] Datarade. <https://datarade.ai/>, 2024.
- [7] DAT Freight and Analytics. URL: [www.dat.com/sales-inquiry/freight-market-intelligence-consortium](http://www.dat.com/sales-inquiry/freight-market-intelligence-consortium), 2024. Accessed: July 9, 2024.
- [8] Ads Data Hub. [developers.google.com/ads-data-hub/guides/intro](https://developers.google.com/ads-data-hub/guides/intro), 2024. Accessed: 2022-05-10.
- [9] IBM Data Fabric. <https://www.ibm.com/data-fabric>, 2024.
- [10] Snowflake Data Marketplace. URL: <https://www.snowflake.com/en/>, 2024. Accessed: December 26, 2024.
- [11] A. Agarwal, M. Dahleh, and T. Sarkar. A marketplace for data: An algorithmic solution. In *Proceedings of the 2019 ACM Conference on Economics and Computation*, pages 701–726, 2019.
- [12] A. Agarwal, M. Dahleh, T. Horel, and M. Rui. Towards data auctions with externalities. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2003.08345*, 2020.
- [13] M. Babaioff, R. Kleinberg, and R. Paes Leme. Optimal mechanisms for selling information. In *Proceedings of the 13th ACM Conference on Electronic Commerce*, pages 92–109, 2012.
- [14] D. Bergemann and A. Bonatti. Markets for information: An introduction. *Annual Review of Economics*, 11(1):85–107, 2019.
- [15] D. Bergemann, A. Bonatti, and A. Smolin. The design and price of information. *American economic review*, 108(1):1–48, 2018.
- [16] Y. Cai, C. Daskalakis, and C. Papadimitriou. Optimum statistical estimation with strategic data sources. In *Conference on Learning Theory*, pages 280–296. PMLR, 2015.
- [17] S. Chawla, J. D. Hartline, and R. Kleinberg. Algorithmic pricing via virtual valuations. In *Proceedings of the 8th ACM Conference on Electronic Commerce*, pages 243–251, 2007.

- [18] S. Chawla, R. Rezvan, Y. Teng, and C. Tzamos. Pricing ordered items. In *Proceedings of the 54th Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing*, pages 722–735, 2022.
- [19] K. Chen, J. S. Huh, and K. Kandasamy. Learning to Price Homogeneous Data. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2024.
- [20] Y. Chen and S. Hossain. Equilibrium and learning in fixed-price data markets with externality. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.08012*, 2023.
- [21] Y. Chen, Y. Shen, and S. Zheng. Truthful data acquisition via peer prediction. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33:18194–18204, 2020.
- [22] Y. Chen, X. Zhu, and K. Kandasamy. Mechanism Design for Collaborative Normal Mean Estimation. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2023.
- [23] A. Clinton, Y. Chen, X. Zhu, and K. Kandasamy. Data Sharing for Mean Estimation Among Heterogeneous Strategic Agents. 2024.
- [24] F. E. Dorner, N. Konstantinov, G. Pashaliev, and M. Vechev. Incentivizing Honesty among Competitors in Collaborative Learning and Optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.16272*, 2023.
- [25] J. D. Hartline and V. Koltun. Near-optimal Pricing in Near-linear Time. In *Proceedings of the 9th International Conference on Algorithms and Data Structures*, 2005.
- [26] E. Helpman and J.-J. Laffont. On moral hazard in general equilibrium theory. *Journal of Economic Theory*, 10(1):8–23, 1975.
- [27] B. Holmström. Moral hazard and observability. *The Bell journal of economics*, pages 74–91, 1979.
- [28] B. Huang, S. P. Karimireddy, and M. I. Jordan. Evaluating and incentivizing diverse data contributions in collaborative learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.05592*, 2023.
- [29] J.-J. Laffont and D. Martimort. The theory of incentives: the principal-agent model. In *The theory of incentives*. Princeton university press, 2009.
- [30] E. L. Lehmann and G. Casella. *Theory of point estimation*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2006.
- [31] S. Mehta, M. Dawande, G. Janakiraman, and V. Mookerjee. How to sell a data set? pricing policies for data monetization. *Information Systems Research*, 32(4):1281–1297, 2021.
- [32] Microsoft. Azure data share overview. *Microsoft Documentation*, 2023.
- [33] J. A. Mirrlees. The theory of moral hazard and unobservable behaviour: Part i. *The Review of Economic Studies*, 66(1):3–21, 1999.
- [34] J. Pei. A survey on data pricing: from economics to data science. *IEEE Transactions on knowledge and Data Engineering*, 34(10):4586–4608, 2020.
- [35] S. Zheng, Y. Kwon, X. Qi, and J. Zou. Truthful dataset valuation by pointwise mutual information. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.18253*, 2024.

## A Proof of Theorem 5.1

**(ICC):** Under  $M$ ,  $s^*$  is a Nash equilibrium for contributors.

*Proof.* We will show that  $s^*$  is a Nash equilibrium of  $M^*$ . That is, we will show,  $\forall i \in \mathcal{C}, \forall (n_i, f_i)$ ,

$$u_i^c(M^*, ((n_i, f_i), s_{-i}^*)) \leq u_i^c(M^*, (s_i^*, s_{-i}^*)).$$

Fix any  $(n_i, f_i)$ . Let  $f_a : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{N_i^*}$  be a function such that  $\forall X_i \in \mathcal{X}, \widehat{\mu}(f_a(X_i)) = \widehat{\mu}(f_i(X_i))$ . Let  $f_b : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{N_i^*}$  be a function such that  $\forall X_i \in \mathcal{X}, \widehat{\mu}(f_b(X_i)) = \widehat{\mu}(X_i)$ . We then have that

$$u_i^c(M, ((n_i, f_i), s_{-i}^*)) \leq u_i^c(M, ((n_i, f_a), s_{-i}^*)) \quad (\text{Lemma 7})$$

$$\leq u_i^c(M, ((n_i, f_b), s_{-i}^*)) \quad (\text{Lemma 8})$$

$$\leq u_i^c(M, (s_i^*, s_{-i}^*)). \quad (\text{Lemma 9})$$

□

**(IRC):** Under  $M$ ,  $s^*$  is individually rational for contributors.

*Proof.* Under the recommended strategy, the utility for contributor  $i$  is

$$\begin{aligned} u_i^c(M, s^*) &= \inf_{\mu \in \mathbb{R}} \mathbb{E} \left[ \mathbb{I}(|Y_i| = N_i^*) \left( W \frac{N_i^*}{N^+} + c_i N_i^* + \frac{d_i \sigma^2}{N_{-i}^*} + \frac{d_i \sigma^2}{N_i^*} \right) - d_i (\widehat{\mu}(f_i(X_i)) - \widehat{\mu}(Y_{-i}))^2 - c_i N_i^* \right] \\ &= \left( W \frac{N_i^*}{N^+} + c_i N_i^* + \frac{d_i \sigma^2}{N_{-i}^*} + \frac{d_i \sigma^2}{N_i^*} \right) - c_i N_i^* - d_i \sup_{\mu \in \mathbb{R}} \mathbb{E} \left[ d_i (\widehat{\mu}(X_i) - \widehat{\mu}(Y_{-i}))^2 \right] \\ &= \left( W \frac{N_i^*}{N^+} + c_i N_i^* + \frac{d_i \sigma^2}{N_{-i}^*} + \frac{d_i \sigma^2}{N_i^*} \right) - c_i N_i^* - \left( \frac{d_i \sigma^2}{N_{-i}^*} + \frac{d_i \sigma^2}{N_i^*} \right) \\ &= W \frac{N_i^*}{N^+} \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

□

**(IRB):** Under  $M$ ,  $s^*$  is individually rational for buyers.

*Proof.* Under the recommended strategy, the expected payment for buyer  $i$  is

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} [p_j^*(M, s^*)] &= \sum_{i \in \{1,2\}} \mathbb{I}(|Y_i| = N_i^*) \left( q_j^+ \frac{N_i^*}{N^+} + \frac{d_i \sigma^2}{|\mathcal{B}| N_{-i}^*} + \frac{d_i \sigma^2}{|\mathcal{B}| N_i^*} \right) - \sum_{i \in \{1,2\}} \frac{d_i}{|\mathcal{B}|} \mathbb{E} \left[ \left( \widehat{\mu}(Y_i) - \widehat{\mu}(Y_{-i}) \right)^2 \right] \\ &= \left( q_j^+ + \sum_{i \in \{1,2\}} \frac{d_i \sigma^2}{|\mathcal{B}| N_{-i}^*} + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}} \frac{d_i \sigma^2}{|\mathcal{B}| N_i^*} \right) - \sum_{i \in \{1,2\}} \frac{d_i}{|\mathcal{B}|} \left( \frac{\sigma^2}{N_i^*} + \frac{\sigma^2}{N_{-i}^*} \right) \\ &= q_j^+. \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

Therefore, combing with definition of buyer's utility (9), and buyers's value for i.i.d. data (11), buyer  $j$ 's utility under recommended strategy is

$$\begin{aligned} u_j^b(M, s^*) &:= u_j^b(m_j^*, p_j^*, s^*) := \inf_{\mu \in \mathbb{R}} \mathbb{E}_{M, s^*, \mu} \left[ v_j^c \left( \widehat{\mu}(g_{s^*, m_j^*}(\{X_i\}_{i \in \mathcal{C}})) - \mu \right) - p_j^*(\{f_i(X_i)\}_{i \in \mathcal{C}}) \right] \\ &= v_j^d(m_j^*) - \sup_{\mu \in \mathbb{R}} \mathbb{E}_{M, s^*, \mu} \{ p_j^*(\{f_i(X_i)\}_{i \in \mathcal{C}}) \} = v_j^d(m_j^*) - q_j^+ = v_j^d(m_j^+) - q_j^+ \geq 0. \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

In the last step, recall that  $(m_j^+, q_j^+)_{j \in \mathcal{B}}$  are generated by Algorithm 1, combing with the buyer's purchase model in (4), we have  $v_j^d(m_j^+) - q_j^+ \geq 0$ .

□

**(BB):** The mechanism  $M$  satisfies the budget balance property.

*Proof.* From the definition of the payment rule in  $M$  and a sequence of algebraic manipulations we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}} \pi_i^*(M, s^*) &= \sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}} \left( \left( W \frac{N_i^*}{N^+} + c_i N_i^* + \frac{d_i \sigma^2}{N_i^*} + \frac{d_i \sigma^2}{N_{-i}^*} \right) - d_i (\hat{\mu}(X_i) - \hat{\mu}(X_{-i}))^2 \right) \\
&= \frac{W}{N^+} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}} N_i^* + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}} c_i N_i^* + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}} \left( \frac{d_i \sigma^2}{N_{-i}^*} + \frac{d_i \sigma^2}{N_i^*} - d_i (\hat{\mu}(X_i) - \hat{\mu}(X_{-i}))^2 \right) \\
&= W + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}} c_i N_i^* + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{B}} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}} \left( \frac{d_i \sigma^2}{|\mathcal{B}| N_{-i}^*} + \frac{d_i \sigma^2}{|\mathcal{B}| N_i^*} - \frac{d_i}{|\mathcal{B}|} (\hat{\mu}(X_i) - \hat{\mu}(X_{-i}))^2 \right) \\
&= \sum_{j \in \mathcal{B}} q_j^+ + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{B}} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}} \left( \frac{d_i \sigma^2}{|\mathcal{B}| N_{-i}^*} + \frac{d_i \sigma^2}{|\mathcal{B}| N_i^*} - \frac{d_i}{|\mathcal{B}|} (\hat{\mu}(X_i) - \hat{\mu}(X_{-i}))^2 \right) \\
&= \sum_{j \in \mathcal{B}} \left( \sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}} \left( \frac{q_j^+ N_i^*}{N^+} + \frac{d_i \sigma^2}{|\mathcal{B}| N_{-i}^*} + \frac{d_i \sigma^2}{|\mathcal{B}| N_i^*} - \frac{d_i}{|\mathcal{B}|} (\hat{\mu}(X_i) - \hat{\mu}(X_{-i}))^2 \right) \right) \\
&= \sum_{j \in \mathcal{B}} p_j^*(M, s^*).
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore,  $M$  satisfies the budget balance property.  $\square$

**(EFB):** Under  $M$ , following  $s^*$  is envy-free for buyers.

*Proof.* To show that when contributors follow  $s^*$ ,  $M$  is envy-free for buyers, we must prove that  $u_j^b(m_j^*, p_j^*, s^*) \geq u_j^b(m_k^*, p_k^*, s^*)$ ,  $\forall j, k \in \mathcal{B}$ . As demonstrated in (17), we know  $u_j^b(M, s^*) := u_j^b(m_j^*, p_j^*, s^*) = v_j^d(m_j^+) - q_j^+ \geq 0$ . Similarly, by the definition of buyers utility (9) and buyer's valuation for i.i.d. data (11), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
u_j^b(m_k^*, p_k^*, s^*) &:= \inf_{\mu \in \mathbb{R}} \mathbb{E}_{M, s^*, \mu} [v_j^e(|\hat{\mu}(g_{s^*, m_k^*}(\{X_i\}_{i \in \mathcal{C}}) - \mu|) - p_k^*(\{f_i(X_i)\}_{i \in \mathcal{C}}))] \\
&= v_j^d(m_k^*) - \sup_{\mu \in \mathbb{R}} \mathbb{E}_{M, s^*, \mu} \{p_k^*(\{f_i(X_i)\}_{i \in \mathcal{C}})\} = v_j^d(m_k^*) - q_k^+ = v_j^d(m_k^+) - q_k^+ \leq v_j^d(m_j^+) - q_j^+.
\end{aligned}$$

The last step is by the definition of  $\{q_j^+\}_{j \in \mathcal{B}}$  in Algorithm 1, and buyer's purchase model (4).  $\square$

**Approximately optimal profit:** Under  $M$ , when the contributors follow following  $s^*$ , the expected profit of buyers approximates the optimal profit upper bound (defined in Theorem 4) with additive error  $|\mathcal{B}|\mathcal{O}(\epsilon)$ .

*Proof.* By definition of contributors' cumulative profit (12),

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{profit}(M, s^*) &= \inf_{\mu \in \mathbb{R}} \mathbb{E}_{M, s^*, \mu} \left[ \sum_{j \in \mathcal{B}} p_j^*(\{f_i(X_i)\}_{i \in \mathcal{C}}) - \sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}} c_i n_i \right] \\
&= \inf_{\mu \in \mathbb{R}} \mathbb{E}_{M, s^*, \mu} \left[ \sum_{j \in \mathcal{B}} p_j^*(\{f_i(X_i)\}_{i \in \mathcal{C}}) \right] - \sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}} c_i N_i^* \\
&= \sum_{j \in \mathcal{B}} q_j^+ - \sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}} c_i N_i^* \quad (\text{By proof of IRB, equation (16)})
\end{aligned}$$

Recall that  $\overline{\text{rev}}(N^+, q_{N^+}) = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{B}} q_j^+$  and that  $N^+ = \sum_i N_i^*$ ,  $N_1^* = N^+ - 1$ ,  $N_2^* = 1$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{profit}(M, s^*) &= \overline{\text{rev}}(N^+, q_{N^+}) - c_1 (N^+) - (c_2 - c_1) \geq \overline{\text{rev}}(N^{\text{tot}}, q_{N^{\text{tot}}}) - c_1 (N^{\text{tot}}) - (c_2 - c_1) \\
&\geq \overline{\text{rev}}^{\text{OPT}}(N^{\text{tot}}) - c_1 (N^{\text{tot}}) - |\mathcal{B}|\mathcal{O}(\epsilon) - (c_2 - c_1) = \text{OPT} - (c_2 - c_1) - |\mathcal{B}|\mathcal{O}(\epsilon),
\end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality is by the optimality of  $N^+$  in Algorithm 1, the second inequality is because algorithm  $A$  returns a  $|\mathcal{B}|\mathcal{O}(\epsilon)$  approximation.  $\square$

## B Proofs of technical lemmas

**Lemma 7.** Fix any  $(n_i, f_i)$ . Let  $f_a : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{N_i^*}$  be a function such that  $\forall X_i \in \mathcal{X}, \widehat{\mu}(f_a(X_i)) = \widehat{\mu}(f_i(X_i))$ . Then,

$$u_i^c(M, ((n_i, f_i), s_{-i}^*)) \leq u_i^c(M, ((n_i, f_a), s_{-i}^*)).$$

*Proof.* Under  $M$  we have that

$$\begin{aligned} & u_i^c(M, ((n_i, f_i), s_{-i}^*)) \\ &= \inf_{\mu \in \mathbb{R}} \mathbb{E} \left[ \mathbb{I}(|Y_i| = N_i^*) \left( W \frac{N_i^*}{N^+} + c_i N_i^* + \frac{d_i \sigma^2}{N_{-i}^*} + \frac{d_i \sigma^2}{N_i^*} \right) - d_i (\widehat{\mu}(f_i(X_i)) - \widehat{\mu}(Y_{-i}))^2 - c_i n_i \right] \\ &\leq \inf_{\mu \in \mathbb{R}} \mathbb{E} \left[ \left( W \frac{N_i^*}{N^+} + c_i N_i^* + \frac{d_i \sigma^2}{N_{-i}^*} + \frac{d_i \sigma^2}{N_i^*} \right) - d_i (\widehat{\mu}(f_a(X_i)) - \widehat{\mu}(Y_{-i}))^2 - c_i n_i \right] \\ &= u_i^c(M, ((n_i, f_a), s_{-i}^*)). \end{aligned}$$

The inequality follows from the definition of  $f_a$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 8.** Fix any  $n_i$ . Consider any  $f_a : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{N_i^*}$  and let  $f_b : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{N_i^*}$  be a function such that  $\forall X_i \in \mathcal{X}, \widehat{\mu}(f_b(X_i)) = \widehat{\mu}(X_i)$ . Then,

$$u_i^c(M, ((n_i, f_a), s_{-i}^*)) \leq u_i^c(M, ((n_i, f_b), s_{-i}^*)).$$

*Proof.* From the definition of  $f_a$  we have

$$\begin{aligned} u_i^c(M, ((n_i, f_a), s_{-i}^*)) &= \inf_{\mu \in \mathbb{R}} \mathbb{E} \left[ \left( W \frac{N_i^*}{N^+} + c_i N_i^* + \frac{d_i \sigma^2}{N_{-i}^*} + \frac{d_i \sigma^2}{N_i^*} \right) - d_i (\widehat{\mu}(f_a(X_i)) - \widehat{\mu}(Y_{-i}))^2 - c_i n_i \right] \\ &= \left( W \frac{N_i^*}{N^+} + c_i N_i^* + \frac{d_i \sigma^2}{N_{-i}^*} + \frac{d_i \sigma^2}{N_i^*} \right) - c_i n_i + d_i \inf_{\mu \in \mathbb{R}} \mathbb{E} \left[ -(\widehat{\mu}(f_a(X_i)) - \widehat{\mu}(Y_{-i}))^2 \right] \\ &= \left( W \frac{N_i^*}{N^+} + c_i N_i^* + \frac{d_i \sigma^2}{N_{-i}^*} + \frac{d_i \sigma^2}{N_i^*} \right) - c_i n_i - d_i \sup_{\mu \in \mathbb{R}} \mathbb{E} \left[ (\widehat{\mu}(f_a(X_i)) - \widehat{\mu}(Y_{-i}))^2 \right]. \quad (18) \end{aligned}$$

Now notice that because the other agents truthfully submit a combined  $N_{-i}^*$  points under  $s_{-i}^*$ , we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{\mu \in \mathbb{R}} \mathbb{E} \left[ (\widehat{\mu}(f_a(X_i)) - \widehat{\mu}(Y_{-i}))^2 \right] &= \sup_{\mu \in \mathbb{R}} \left( \mathbb{E} \left[ (\widehat{\mu}(f_a(X_i)) - \mu)^2 \right] + \mathbb{E} \left[ (\widehat{\mu}(Y_{-i}) - \mu)^2 \right] \right) \\ &= \sup_{\mu \in \mathbb{R}} \left( \mathbb{E} \left[ (\widehat{\mu}(f_a(X_i)) - \mu)^2 \right] \right) + \frac{\sigma^2}{N_{-i}^*}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we can rewrite (18), using the fact that the sample mean is minimax optimal [30] and the definition of  $f_b$ , to get

$$\begin{aligned} & \left( W \frac{N_i^*}{N^+} + c_i N_i^* + \frac{d_i \sigma^2}{N_{-i}^*} + \frac{d_i \sigma^2}{N_i^*} \right) - c_i n_i - \frac{d_i \sigma^2}{N_{-i}^*} - d_i \sup_{\mu \in \mathbb{R}} \mathbb{E} \left[ (\widehat{\mu}(f_a(X_i)) - \mu)^2 \right] \\ &\leq \left( W \frac{N_i^*}{N^+} + c_i N_i^* + \frac{d_i \sigma^2}{N_{-i}^*} + \frac{d_i \sigma^2}{N_i^*} \right) - c_i n_i - \frac{d_i \sigma^2}{N_{-i}^*} - d_i \sup_{\mu \in \mathbb{R}} \mathbb{E} \left[ (\widehat{\mu}(X_i) - \mu)^2 \right] \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \left( W \frac{N_i^*}{N^+} + c_i N_i^* + \frac{d_i \sigma^2}{N_{-i}^*} + \frac{d_i \sigma^2}{N_i^*} \right) - c_i n_i - d_i \sup_{\mu \in \mathbb{R}} \mathbb{E} \left[ (\hat{\mu}(X_i) - \hat{\mu}(Y_{-i}))^2 \right] \\
&= u_i^c(M, ((n_i, f_b), s_{-i}^*)).
\end{aligned}$$

□

**Lemma 9.** Fix any  $n_i$ . Let  $f_b : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{N_i^*}$  be a function such that  $\forall X_i \in \mathcal{X}, \hat{\mu}(f_b(X_i)) = \hat{\mu}(X_i)$ . Then,

$$u_i^c(M, ((n_i, f_b), s_{-i}^*)) \leq u_i^c(M, (s_i^*, s_{-i}^*)).$$

*Proof.* From the definition of  $f_b$  we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
u_i^c(M, ((n_i, f_b), s_{-i}^*)) &= \inf_{\mu \in \mathbb{R}} \mathbb{E} \left[ \left( W \frac{N_i^*}{N^+} + c_i N_i^* + \frac{d_i \sigma^2}{N_{-i}^*} + \frac{d_i \sigma^2}{N_i^*} \right) - d_i (\hat{\mu}(f_b(X_i)) - \hat{\mu}(Y_{-i}))^2 - c_i n_i \right] \\
&= \left( W \frac{N_i^*}{N^+} + c_i N_i^* + \frac{d_i \sigma^2}{N_{-i}^*} + \frac{d_i \sigma^2}{N_i^*} \right) - c_i n_i - d_i \sup_{\mu \in \mathbb{R}} \mathbb{E} \left[ (\hat{\mu}(X_i) - \hat{\mu}(Y_{-i}))^2 \right] \\
&= \left( W \frac{N_i^*}{N^+} + c_i N_i^* + \frac{d_i \sigma^2}{N_{-i}^*} + \frac{d_i \sigma^2}{N_i^*} \right) - c_i n_i - \frac{d_i \sigma^2}{n_i} - \frac{d_i \sigma^2}{N_{-i}^*}.
\end{aligned}$$

Define the concave function  $l : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , given by  $l(n_i) = -c_i n_i - \frac{d_i \sigma^2}{n_i}$ . Observe that  $l'(n_i) = -c_i + \frac{d_i \sigma^2}{n_i^2}$  so  $l'(n_i) = 0 \iff n_i = \sigma \sqrt{\frac{d_i}{c_i}} = N_i^*$ . Therefore the choice of  $n_i$  which maximizes  $u_i^c(M, ((n_i, f_b), s_{-i}^*))$  is  $N_i^*$ . Together with the fact that  $\hat{\mu}(f_b(X_i)) = \hat{\mu}(X_i) = \hat{\mu}(\mathbf{I}(X_i))$  we conclude

$$u_i^c(M, ((n_i, f_b), s_{-i}^*)) \leq u_i^c(M, ((N_i^*, f_b), s_{-i}^*)) = u_i^c(M, ((N_i^*, \mathbf{I}), s_{-i}^*)) = u_i^c(M, (s_i^*, s_{-i}^*)).$$

□

**Lemma 2.** Suppose we execute Algorithm 1 with an algorithm  $A$  for ordered item pricing. Let  $N^+, q^+$ , and  $\{m_{N^+, j}\}_{j \in \mathcal{B}}$  be the returned values. Consider the envy-free mechanism  $M = (\{N_i\}_{i \in \mathcal{C}}, \{m_j\}_{j \in \mathcal{B}}, \{p_j\}_{j \in \mathcal{B}})$  obtained by choosing  $N_1 = N^+, N_i = 0$  for all  $i \in \mathcal{C} \setminus \{1\}$ ,  $m_j = m_{N^+, j}$  for all  $j \in \mathcal{B}$ , and  $p_j = q_{N^+}(m_j)$ . We then have  $\text{profit}(M) \geq \text{OPT} - |\mathcal{B}| \mathcal{O}(\epsilon)$ .

*Proof of Lemma 2.* First, let  $q' = A(\{v_j\}_{j \in \mathcal{B}}, N_1^{\text{OPT}}, \epsilon)$  denote the price curve obtained by applying  $A$  to the buyers' valuations  $\{v_j\}_{j \in \mathcal{B}}$ , total amount of data  $N_1^{\text{OPT}}$ , and the approximation parameter  $\epsilon$ . Using the definition of OPT in equation (3) and the equivalence between envy-free pricing schemes and ordered item pricing curves (see Lemma 1 and the discussion above it), we have

$$\text{OPT} = \text{rev}^{\text{OPT}}(N_1^{\text{OPT}}) - c_1 N_1^{\text{OPT}} = \overline{\text{rev}}^{\text{OPT}}(N_1^{\text{OPT}}) - c_1 N_1^{\text{OPT}}.$$

Since algorithm  $A$  returns a  $|\mathcal{B}| \mathcal{O}(\epsilon)$  solution we get

$$\overline{\text{rev}}^{\text{OPT}}(N_1^{\text{OPT}}) - c_1 N_1^{\text{OPT}} \leq \overline{\text{rev}}(N_1^{\text{OPT}}, q') + |\mathcal{B}| \mathcal{O}(\epsilon) - c_1 N_1^{\text{OPT}}.$$

Finally, from the definition of  $N^+$ :  $N^+ = \arg \max_{N \in \{1, 2, \dots, \frac{|\mathcal{B}|}{N_{\text{tot}}}\}} \text{profit}_N$ , since  $N_1^{\text{OPT}} \leq \frac{|\mathcal{B}|}{N_{\text{tot}}}$ , we have  $\text{profit}_{N^+} = \overline{\text{rev}}(N^+, q_{N^+}) - c_1 N^+ \geq \overline{\text{rev}}(N_1^{\text{OPT}}, q') - c_1 N_1^{\text{OPT}}$ . Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
\overline{\text{rev}}(N_1^{\text{OPT}}, q') + |\mathcal{B}| \mathcal{O}(\epsilon) - c_1 N_1^{\text{OPT}} &\leq \overline{\text{rev}}(N^+, q_{N^+}) - c_1 N^+ + |\mathcal{B}| \mathcal{O}(\epsilon) \\
&= \text{profit}(M) + |\mathcal{B}| \mathcal{O}(\epsilon)
\end{aligned}$$

so we conclude that

$$\text{profit}(M) \geq \text{OPT} - |\mathcal{B}| \mathcal{O}(\epsilon).$$

□