

A Quest for Knowledge*

Christoph Carnehl[†]

Johannes Schneider[‡]

August 2023

Abstract

Is more novel research always desirable? We develop a model in which knowledge shapes society’s policies and guides the search for discoveries. Researchers select a question and how intensely to study it. The novelty of a question determines both the value and difficulty of discovering its answer. We show that the benefits of discoveries are nonmonotone in novelty. Knowledge expands endogenously step-by-step over time. Through a dynamic externality, moonshots—research on questions more novel than what is myopically optimal—can improve the evolution of knowledge. Moonshots induce research cycles in which subsequent researchers connect the moonshot to previous knowledge.

*[Evolution] comes through asking the right questions, because the answer pre-exists.
... You don’t invent the answer. You reveal the answer.*

Jonas Salk, discoverer of the polio vaccine

1 Introduction

In a letter to Franklin D. Roosevelt, Vannevar Bush (1945) pleads with the president to preserve freedom of inquiry by federally funding basic research—the “pacemaker of technological progress.” That letter paved the way for the creation of the National Science Foundation (NSF) in 1950. The NSF today, like the vast majority of governments and scientific institutions, cherishes scientific freedom and allows academic researchers to select research projects independently.

*We are grateful to Arjada Bardhi, Antonio Cabrales, Steven Callander, Marco Celentani, Rahul Deb, Philipp Denter, Florian Ederer, Chiara Franzoni, Alex Frug, William Fuchs, Ben Golub, Ryan Hill, Toomas Hinosaar, Nenad Kos, Jorge Lemus, Igor Letina, David Lindequist, Gerard Llobet, Ignacio Ortuno, Marco Ottaviani, Nicola Pavoni, Harry Pei, Konrad Stahl, Carolyn Stein, Armin Schmutzler, Carlo Schwarz, Adrien Vigier, Ludo Visschers, Ralph Winkler, and audiences at the NBER SI, VSET, the Winter Meeting of the Econometric Society, Bern, Bocconi, Essex, Tilburg, Linz, Vienna, Mannheim, Northwestern, Pompeu Fabra, Cergy-Pontoise, uc3m, Urbana-Champaign, and various conferences and workshops for helpful comments.

Johannes Schneider gratefully acknowledges financial support from the German Research Foundation (DFG) through CRC TR 224 (Project B03), Agencia Estatal de Investigación (grant PID2019-111095RB-I00 and grant PID2020-118022GB-I00), Ministerio Economía y Competitividad (grant ECO2017-87769-P), and Comunidad de Madrid (grant MAD-ECON-POL-CM H2019/HUM-5891).

[†]Bocconi University, Department of Economics & IGIER; email: christoph.carnehl@unibocconi.it

[‡]Universidad Carlos III de Madrid; email: jschneid@econ.uc3m.es

With scientific freedom comes the responsibility for “asking the right questions” that Jonas Salk refers to in the epigraph. However, what are the right questions? Biologist and Nobel laureate Peter Medawar (1967) famously notes that “research is surely the art of the soluble. . . . Good scientists study the most important problems they think they can solve.” Finding the most important yet soluble question is nontrivial. One reason is that both importance and solubility depend on the current state of knowledge.

In this paper, we develop a microfounded model of knowledge creation through research. Our model captures (i) the role of existing knowledge in determining the benefits and costs of research, (ii) the spillovers a discovery creates on conjectures about similar questions, and (iii) the researcher’s freedom to choose what question to study and how intensely to study it. We determine the value of a discovery to society, characterize the researcher’s choices, and study the evolution of knowledge. Building on these findings, we answer the following questions: Should society incentivize researchers to study questions far beyond the current knowledge frontier? Do such moonshots improve the evolution of knowledge? How do the resulting research cycles compare to a step-by-step expansion of the knowledge frontier?

We model the value of knowledge as the extent to which knowledge improves decision-making. We represent society by a single decision-maker who faces problems that correspond to questions. In her response to these problems, she uses the public good of knowledge. Knowledge is the set of questions to which the answer has already been discovered. Because answers to similar questions are correlated, knowledge also provides the decision-maker with conjectures regarding questions to which the answer is undiscovered. The precision of a conjecture depends on the question’s location relative to existing knowledge.¹ We conceptualize the correlation by assuming that answers to questions follow the realization of a Brownian path. Figure 1 depicts that idea. Questions are on the horizontal axis, and the gray line represents the answers to all questions. Dots (•) represent existing knowledge. Because of the assumption of a Brownian path, all conjectures follow a normal distribution. The mean and the variance depend on existing knowledge. The solid black lines in Figure 1 represent the mean; the dashed lines provide the band of the 95% prediction interval.²

Our first contribution is to characterize the benefits of a discovery for arbitrary existing knowledge. To gain intuition, consider the left panel of Figure 1. Only the answer to question x_r is known. Assume that researchers discover the answer to question x_l . We now move to the right panel. Decision-making improves in three ways. First, the decision-maker has precise knowledge about the answer to x_l . Second, her conjectures about all questions to the left of x_r improve. Third, her conjectures improve the most in the newly created *area of questions* $[x_l, x_r]$ in which the decision-maker now has two

¹The protein folding problem in structural biology provides a case in point. Spillovers from other proteins led to Moderna’s development of the COVID-19 vaccine, which “took all of one weekend” (only). For more on the protein folding problem see Hill and Stein (2020, 2021).

²The 95% prediction intervals describe the following relation: for each question, with a probability of 95%, the answer lies between the respective dashed lines given existing knowledge.




Figure 1: *Existing knowledge and conjectures.*

pieces of knowledge that help her form conjectures.

The benefits of discovering the answer to x_l depend on the question's distance from x_r . The effect of an increase in the distance between x_l and x_r is similar to the effect of output expansion by a monopolist. Consider a discovery close to existing knowledge, which implies a narrow area $[x_l, x_r]$. There are only a few questions in the area, but the conjectures about them are precise; that is, the variance of the conjectures is low. As the distance between x_l and x_r increases, more questions lie inside the area—a marginal gain. At the same time, the conjectures become less precise—an inframarginal loss. The benefits of a discovery are maximized at an intermediate distance.

If both x_l and x_r are known initially, discoveries *expand knowledge* beyond the frontier if the discoveries concern questions $x \notin [x_l, x_r]$. Expanding beyond the frontier works in the manner described in the previous paragraph. Alternatively, discoveries *deepen knowledge* if they concern questions $x \in [x_l, x_r]$. Depending on the distance between x_l and x_r , expanding knowledge or deepening knowledge may be optimal. If x_l and x_r are close, knowledge is dense: the conjecture about any question in $[x_l, x_r]$ is already precise. In this case, expanding knowledge provides larger benefits than deepening knowledge does. If x_l and x_r are far apart, knowledge is sparse: conjectures about questions in $[x_l, x_r]$ are imprecise. Obtaining an answer to a question $x \in [x_l, x_r]$ divides this single area of imprecise conjectures into two areas with precise conjectures. In this case, deepening knowledge provides larger benefits than expanding knowledge.

Overall, the largest benefits derive from deepening knowledge between distant, yet not too distant, pieces of knowledge. Expanding knowledge beyond the frontier beats deepening knowledge only if all available areas are short.

Our second contribution is to characterize a researcher's optimal choice of which question to tackle and how much effort to invest in studying that question for arbitrary existing knowledge. We assume that the researcher's benefits of a finding are proportional to the benefits of a discovery discussed above. In addition, we conceptualize the research

process as the search for an answer. We assume that it requires effort to search for an answer and that the cost of effort is increasing and convex. We propose a cost function that derives from this idea and provide a microfoundation. The cost function relates the cost of research to *novelty* (the distance of the question from existing knowledge) and *output* (the probability that search results in discovery). The link originates in the initial conjecture, which depends on the novelty of the question. The more precise that conjecture, the higher the output for any given level of effort.

Regarding the researcher’s choices, we show that novelty and output are nontrivially related. Depending on the structure of existing knowledge, the two can substitute or complement each other. Thus, in some cases selecting a more novel question actually decreases the risk of failure. Overall, the researcher creates more output when she deepens knowledge than when she expands beyond the frontier. Output peaks for deepening knowledge in areas of intermediate length. Discoveries in these areas also provide large benefits to society.

Our third contribution is to apply our previous insights to study the evolution of knowledge. We show that if a researcher expands knowledge, no future researcher will deepen knowledge. Therefore, the evolution of knowledge takes on a ladder structure.

Starting from this observation, we study a simple policy intervention. Suppose a long-lived designer can direct the choices of one researcher. The designer aims to improve decision-making by enhancing the evolution of knowledge. Under natural conditions, the designer induces a research cycle by encouraging a moonshot discovery—a discovery far from existing knowledge. Moonshot discoveries are suboptimal in the short run. They create knowledge that is too disconnected from existing knowledge and therefore provides little immediate benefit. However, moonshots guide future researchers aiming at questions between the moonshot and previously existing knowledge. As a result of the moonshot, future researchers increase their output and pursue different questions. The knowledge they create becomes more valuable than otherwise. If the designer is patient and the cost of research is intermediate, the positive dynamic externality of moonshots dominates the implied myopic loss.

To summarize, we make three contributions. First, we offer a microfounded framework to study knowledge and research in a complex world. We quantify the value of a discovery when society extrapolates from knowledge to address a wide range of questions. Second, we shed light on the nontrivial relation between the novelty of a question and the probability that a researcher discovers its answer. Novelty and the probability of discovery are endogenously linked through a microfounded cost function. Third, we provide novel insights into a classical question in the economics of science funding: should a funder incentivize research far beyond the frontier even if the immediate benefits of such a discovery are low? Yes, if the cost of research is intermediate and society is patient. The research cycle that such a moonshot induces leads to researchers addressing more novel questions and producing more output.

1.1 Related Literature

Ample empirical literature has documented the importance of novelty and output for scientific progress. Fortunato et al. (2018) provide an extensive summary. We aim to complement the empirical approach by providing a simple yet flexible formal model of scientific knowledge production. We defer a deeper discussion of the relation between our model and recent empirical developments to Section 6.

Theoretically, we contribute to the literature modeling search as discovery on a Brownian path that builds on Callander (2011). Our focus on modeling scientific research leads us to depart from the canonical ideas in the existing literature—most notably in two dimensions.

First, our decision-maker aims to understand the entire Brownian path, as any question can become a potential problem to act on. In contrast, in Callander (2011) and Garfagnini and Strulovici (2016) knowing the location of the optimal realization along the path suffices for their decision-maker. Closer to us are Bardhi (2022) and Callander and Clark (2017). Still, in Bardhi (2022), being informed about a summary statistic of the Brownian path suffices to make an optimal decision. In Callander and Clark (2017), being informed about the roots of the Brownian path suffices to make an optimal decision. Neither of these statistics has significant value in our setting because we differ in focus. While their models are well suited to study product innovation, persuasion via attribute selection, and legal precedents, ours captures the value of knowledge accumulation for society. In all their models, discovering realizations beyond the frontier declines in value. Callander et al. (2022) is an exception where market competition slows this decline. Nevertheless, knowledge expansion eventually halts. In our model, there is a constant and endogenous desire to expand knowledge.³

Second, we conceptualize discovering the realization of the Brownian motion at a particular point as a costly search process that may fail. This generates an endogenous link between novelty and output leading to a trade-off: should the researcher choose more novel questions or higher research output? The existing literature ignores this link between novelty and output.

A key aspect of our model is that the value of research depends on existing knowledge. The theoretical literature on scientific discoveries does not explicitly model this aspect, yet it incidentally captures parts of the scientific process we have in mind. Aghion et al. (2008) consider a setting in which they assume that knowledge evolves in an exogenous step-by-step structure whereas Bramoullé and Saint-Paul (2010) provide a model of research cycles albeit without considering an intensive margin. In our framework, intensive margins are relevant. Researchers endogenously generate knowledge in a step-

³Jovanovic and Rob (1990) study a related problem. In Jovanovic and Rob (1990), expanding knowledge implies an i.i.d. draw at a fixed cost, while deepening knowledge is costless. In our model, all questions are connected. Moreover, see Callander and Hummel (2014), Callander and Matouschek (2019), Callander et al. (2021), Bardhi and Bobkova (2022), and Urgan and Yariv (2023) for applications different from ours in a related framework.

by-step structure and research cycles arise only through exogenous stimuli. Research cycles lead to a better evolution of knowledge.⁴

Finally, we relate to the theoretical literature on corporate research and development. R&D differs conceptually in that firms use innovations to gain a competitive advantage in the product market. Yet, we connect by addressing several points from that literature within our world of scientific discovery. Like Bryan and Lemus (2017) and Hopenhayn and Squintani (2021), we want to understand which discoveries researchers aim for and what these directional choices imply for the evolution of knowledge; like Letina (2016), Letina and Schmutzler (2019), Brunner et al. (2022), and Letina et al. (2023), we imagine the discovery process as a costly search for the needle in a haystack; like Antón et al. (2021), we consider the spillover effects of a given innovation.⁵

2 A Model of Knowledge and Research

In this section, we set up our static baseline model of knowledge and research. We start with a high-level summary, before providing details on each element.⁶

2.1 Players, Actions, and Timing

There are two players: society—represented by a single decision-maker—and a researcher. The researcher observes initial knowledge \mathcal{F}_k and chooses two actions: a question, x , and a probability, ρ , with which she discovers the answer, $y(x)$, to question x . With probability ρ knowledge is augmented by the question-answer pair and becomes $\mathcal{F}_k \cup \{(x, y(x))\}$. With complementary probability, knowledge remains \mathcal{F}_k . Finally, the decision-maker observes current knowledge and selects a policy $a(\cdot)$ for every question.⁷

2.2 Knowledge and Conjectures

Questions and answers. We represent the universe of questions by the real line.⁸ A *question* is an element $x \in \mathbb{R}$. Each question x has a unique answer, $y(x) \in \mathbb{R}$. A question-answer pair $(x, y(x))$ is a point in the two-dimensional Euclidean space.

⁴Other work in this area includes Liang and Mu (2020) who, like us, consider myopic researchers aiming to discover the truth. Unlike us, they focus on the choice of the learning technology. Bobtcheff et al. (2017), Akerlof and Michaillat (2018), and Andrews and Kasy (2019) consider distortions through the publication process, career concerns, or homophily. Hill and Stein (2020, 2021) provide empirical and Frankel and Kasy (2022) a normative counterparts.

⁵Prendergast (2019) studies an effort-choice problem embedded in a competitive firm setting. We relate on a high level, but scope, modeling choices, and focus differ.

⁶A graphical example highlighting the ingredients and mechanics is in Appendix G.

⁷We could equivalently assume that a single question is drawn uniformly at random from a sufficiently large convex-valued set of questions.

⁸That choice is for ease of exposition only. We discuss alternatives at the end of Section 5 and formally in Appendix B including a discussion of seminal discoveries which open up new research fields.

Truth and knowledge. The answer $y(x)$ to question x is determined by the truth. The *truth* is the graph of the realization of a random variable $Y(x)$ that follows a standard Brownian motion defined over the entire real line.⁹ This assumption captures the following notion: the answer to question x is likely to be similar to the answer to a close-by question x' . As the distance between x and x' increases, the uncertainty increases. However, a correlation remains.

Knowledge is the finite collection of known question-answer pairs. We denote it by $\mathcal{F}_k = \{(x_i, y(x_i))\}_{i=1}^k$. For notational convenience, we assume that \mathcal{F}_k is ordered such that $x_i < x_{i+1}$. We refer to x_1 and x_k as the *frontiers* of current knowledge. Knowledge \mathcal{F}_k determines a partition of the real line consisting of $k + 1$ elements

$$\mathcal{X}_k := \{(-\infty, x_1), [x_1, x_2), \dots, [x_{k-1}, x_k), [x_k, \infty)\}.$$

Each element of the partition \mathcal{X}_k is an *area*. We call $(-\infty, x_1)$ area 0, $[x_1, x_2)$ area 1, and so on until area k , which is $[x_k, \infty)$. The length of area $i \in \{1, \dots, k - 1\}$ is $X_i := x_{i+1} - x_i$, and $X_0 = X_k = \infty$.

Conjectures. A conjecture is the cumulative distribution function $G_x(y|\mathcal{F}_k)$ of the answer $y(x)$ to question x given knowledge \mathcal{F}_k . Because $Y(x)$ is determined by a Brownian motion, the conjecture about $y(x)$ is a cumulative distribution function of a normal distribution with mean $\mu_x(Y|\mathcal{F}_k)$ and variance $\sigma_x^2(Y|\mathcal{F}_k)$. Both μ_x and σ_x^2 follow from the properties of the Brownian motion.

Property 1 (Expected Value). Given \mathcal{F}_k , the conjecture $G_x(y|\mathcal{F}_k)$ has mean:

$$\mu_x(Y|\mathcal{F}_k) = \begin{cases} y(x_1) & \text{if } x < x_1 \\ y(x_i) + \frac{x-x_i}{X_i}(y(x_{i+1}) - y(x_i)) & \text{if } x \in [x_i, x_{i+1}), i \in \{1, \dots, k-1\} \\ y(x_k) & \text{if } x \geq x_k. \end{cases}$$

Property 2 (Variance). Given \mathcal{F}_k , the conjecture $G_x(y|\mathcal{F}_k)$ has variance:

$$\sigma_x^2(Y|\mathcal{F}_k) = \begin{cases} x_1 - x & \text{if } x < x_1 \\ \frac{(x_{i+1}-x)(x-x_i)}{X_i} & \text{if } x \in [x_i, x_{i+1}), i \in \{1, \dots, k-1\} \\ x - x_k & \text{if } x \geq x_k. \end{cases}$$

2.3 Actions and Payoffs

Decision-maker. For each question x , the decision-maker either takes a proactive action $a(x) \in \mathbb{R}$ or selects an outside option $a(x) = \emptyset$. The outside option represents,

⁹As in Callander (2011), the realized truth Y is a random draw from the space of all possible paths \mathcal{Y} generated by a standard Brownian motion going through an initial knowledge point $(x_0, y(x_0))$.

for example, the act of doing nothing. The decision-maker's choice is thus a function $a : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \emptyset$. The decision-maker conditions her choice on existing knowledge.

The expected payoff of selecting the outside option $a(x) = \emptyset$ is finite, safe, and question invariant. We normalize it to zero. Choosing \emptyset captures the precautionary principle of policy-making: if uncertainty is large, prudence trumps risking a poor proactive choice. The payoff of proactively addressing a question x is represented by a monotone transformation of the quadratic loss around the true answer to question x , $y(x)$. The decision-maker's payoff from taking action $a(x)$ on question x is

$$u(a(x); x) = \begin{cases} 1 - \frac{(a(x) - y(x))^2}{q} & \text{if } a(x) \in \mathbb{R} \\ 0 & \text{if } a(x) = \emptyset, \end{cases}$$

for an exogenously given $q > 0$. The scaling parameter q measures the decision-maker's error tolerance: if the proactive choice $a(x) \in \mathbb{R}$ is less than \sqrt{q} away from the true answer $y(x)$, the decision-maker prefers the proactive choice over the outside option.

We abstract from any prioritization of questions by the decision-maker and assume that the decision-maker values all questions equally. If $a(x)$ is such that $u(a(x); x)$ is locally integrable, then total payoffs to the decision-maker are

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} u(a(x); x) dx.$$

The role of q . The precise value of the scaling parameter q is not important. In all of our results, the comparative statics on q are straightforward and do not alter our results qualitatively. However, the existence of $q \in (0, \infty)$ gives decision-making and knowledge creation a meaning. To see this, consider the two limiting cases, $q \rightarrow 0$ and $q \rightarrow \infty$. As $q \rightarrow 0$, the decision-maker suffers from a proactive choice even when it misses the target only marginally. As knowledge is finite, but problems are uncountably infinite, the decision-maker chooses the outside option almost everywhere for any knowledge: knowledge becomes irrelevant to decision-making. At the other extreme, $q \rightarrow \infty$, the decision-maker prefers proactive actions even when uncertainty is high. In that case, the emphasis the decision-maker puts on the precision of her answers must be low: knowledge becomes irrelevant to decision-making.

Researcher. The researcher builds on initial knowledge \mathcal{F}_k and decides to search for an answer to a question x . In addition, she decides how much effort to exert to find the answer. Given a choice of question x , we posit a one-to-one relationship between the level of exerted effort and the resulting probability ρ of discovering $y(x)$. Thus, (x, ρ) is a sufficient statistic to capture the researcher's choice.

We allow the researcher to choose ρ directly to save on notation. We aim to capture that increasing the probability of discovery requires costly effort. In Section 4, we provide

details and a microfoundation. For now, we assume the researcher's cost to be

$$\hat{c}(\rho; x) := \eta(\text{erf}^{-1}(\rho))^2 \sigma_x^2(Y|\mathcal{F}_k),$$

where $\eta \geq 0$ is an exogenous cost parameter and $\text{erf}^{-1}(\cdot)$ is the inverse error function of the normal distribution. The cost scales in uncertainty: discovering $y(x)$ with a given probability ρ is more costly if the conjecture is less precise.

On the benefits side, we assume that the researcher's benefits align with those of the decision-maker. The researcher's total payoff is given by

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} u(a(x); x) dx - \eta(\text{erf}^{-1}(\rho))^2 \sigma_x^2(Y|\mathcal{F}_k).$$

Economically, our assumption entails that the researcher benefits from her discovery through that discovery's impact on the decision-maker's choices. We revisit this assumption and its implications in the static model when we get to the researcher's problem (Section 4) and in a dynamic version of the model in Section 5.

3 The Benefits of Discovery

Discovery occurs whenever an answer is found and the new question-answer pair is added to existing knowledge \mathcal{F}_k . In this section, we formulate a measure of the benefits of discovery for the decision-maker and study its properties.

3.1 The Value of Knowledge

Knowledge informs decision-making. For each question x , the decision-maker uses the conjecture $G_x(y|\mathcal{F}_k)$ to decide on $a(x)$. Suppose the decision-maker addresses question x proactively; that is, $a(x) \neq \emptyset$. Her expected payoff for that question is

$$E[u(a(x) \neq \emptyset; x)|\mathcal{F}_k] = \int 1 - \frac{(a(x) - y(x))^2}{q} dG_x(y|\mathcal{F}_k).$$

Because of the quadratic loss, the optimal action corresponds to the mean of the distribution, $\mu_x(Y|\mathcal{F}_k)$, with payoff

$$E[u(\mu_x(Y|\mathcal{F}_k); x)|\mathcal{F}_k] = 1 - \frac{\sigma_x^2(Y|\mathcal{F}_k)}{q}.$$

Addressing the question proactively is optimal if and only if the decision-maker's conjecture is sufficiently precise, $\sigma_x^2(Y|\mathcal{F}_k) \leq q$. Otherwise, the decision-maker prefers the outside option, $a(x) = \emptyset$, with payoff zero. The decision-maker's optimal policy is

$$a^*(x) = \begin{cases} \mu_x(Y|\mathcal{F}_k), & \text{if } \sigma_x^2(Y|\mathcal{F}_k) \leq q \\ \emptyset, & \text{if } \sigma_x^2(Y|\mathcal{F}_k) > q. \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

The *value of knowing* \mathcal{F}_k is the decision-maker's expected utility given $a^*(\cdot)$,

$$v(\mathcal{F}_k) := \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \max \left\{ \frac{q - \sigma_x^2(Y|\mathcal{F}_k)}{q}, 0 \right\} dx.$$

The right panel of Figure 2 provides a graphical representation of $v(\mathcal{F}_1)$.




Figure 2: *The value of knowing \mathcal{F}_1 .* Suppose only the answer to question 0 is known as depicted in the left panel. Then the value of that knowledge, $v(\mathcal{F}_1)$, is illustrated in the right panel.

3.2 The Benefits of Discovery

Discoveries enhance the value of knowledge. Formally, adding $(x, y(x))$ to \mathcal{F}_k provides benefits of discovery defined by

$$V(x; \mathcal{F}_k) := v(\mathcal{F}_k \cup \{(x, y(x))\}) - v(\mathcal{F}_k).$$

These benefits depend on the question being answered, x , and on existing knowledge \mathcal{F}_k . We distinguish two scenarios: expanding knowledge beyond the frontier and deepening knowledge in an area. A discovery $y(x)$ *expands* knowledge if $x \notin [x_1, x_k]$. A discovery $y(x)$ *deepens* knowledge in area i if $x \in [x_i, x_{i+1}]$.

The two main factors determining the benefits of a discovery are the length of the research area, X , and how distant x is from existing knowledge.

Definition 1 (Distance). The distance of question x from knowledge \mathcal{F}_k is the minimal Euclidean distance to a question to which the answer is known:

$$d(x) := \min_{\xi \in \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_k\}} |x - \xi|$$

Definition 2 (Variance). The variance of a question with distance d in an area of length X is

$$\sigma^2(d; X) := d(X - d)/X.$$

Note that $\sigma^2(d; X) = \sigma_x^2(Y|\mathcal{F}_k)$ whenever $d(x) = d$ and x is in an area of length X .




Figure 3: *The benefits of discovery.* The dark-shaded area illustrates the benefits of discovery; the light-shaded areas illustrate the value of initial knowledge. In the *left panel*, knowledge is expanded. In the *right panel*, knowledge is deepened.

Abusing notation, we define

$$\begin{aligned}
 V(d; X) := & \frac{1}{6q} \left(2X\sigma^2(d; X) + \mathbf{1}_{d>4q}\sqrt{d}(d-4q)^{3/2} \right. \\
 & + \mathbf{1}_{X-d>4q}\sqrt{X-d}(X-d-4q)^{3/2} \\
 & \left. - \mathbf{1}_{X>4q}\sqrt{X}(X-4q)^{3/2} \right).
 \end{aligned}$$

Our first propositions characterizes the benefits of a discovery formally. We develop the economic content in a series of corollaries (Corollaries 1 to 4).

Proposition 1. *$V(d; X)$ describes the benefits of a discovery $(x, y(x))$ that deepens knowledge with distance $d = d(x)$ in an area of length $X < \infty$. The benefits of a discovery $(x, y(x))$ expanding knowledge with distance $d = d(x)$ are $V(d; \infty) := \lim_{X \rightarrow \infty} V(d; X)$.*

The terms in $V(d; X)$ without an indicator function measure the direct reduction in the variance due to a discovery and hence the effect on decision-making conditional on a proactive action $a(x) \neq \emptyset$ (see Figure 3 for an illustration). The indicator that enters negatively becomes active if $a(x) = \emptyset$ for some question in the area *before* discovery. The indicators that enter positively become active only if $a(x) = \emptyset$ for some question *after* discovery (see Figure 4 for an illustration). The right panel of Figure 5 below illustrates the benefits-of-discovery function $V(d, X)$.

To gain intuition, we begin with the benefits of expanding knowledge.

Corollary 1. $V(d; \infty) = \frac{1}{6q} \left(6qd - d^2 + \mathbf{1}_{d>4q}\sqrt{d}(d-4q)^{3/2} \right)$

Suppose we discover a question-answer pair $(x, y(x))$ where $x < x_1$ is to the left of the left-most question with a known answer. Our discovery pushes the knowledge frontier to the left thereby generating the area $[x, x_1]$. The benefits of this knowledge expansion come from the value of this new area $[x, x_1]$ (the dark-shaded part in Figure 3's left




Figure 4: *Benefits-maximizing (left) and too large (right) distance of x given \mathcal{F}_1 .*

panel).¹⁰

The value this new area provides depends on (i) the amount of questions in it and (ii) the degree of improvement in decision-making relative to the outside option $a(\cdot) = \emptyset$. The benefits-maximizing question choice resolves a classic marginal-inframarginal trade-off: Increasing the length of the newly created area has two opposing effects on the value of discovery. The marginal gain is the increase in the amount of questions with improved conjectures. However, it comes at a cost because the increase in area length decreases the precision of conjectures about inframarginal questions in the area.

Figure 3 and Figure 4 illustrate the benefits of discovery from creating too short (left panel of Figure 3), ideal (left panel of Figure 4), and too large (right panel of Figure 4) areas. The largest benefits come at an intermediate level at which all conjectures have a variance strictly smaller than q , as the next corollary shows. The decision-maker refrains from using the outside option for all questions inside the new area. We define the benefits-maximizing distance in area X as

$$d^0(X) := \arg \max_d V(d; X).$$

Corollary 2. *The benefits of expanding knowledge are single-peaked in d . The benefits-maximizing distance is $d^0(\infty) = 3q$.¹¹*

Deepening knowledge differs conceptually. Instead of creating a new area, deepening discoveries replace an existing area with two new ones. Discovering the answer to $y(x)$ replaces the old area that contains x , $[x_i, x_{i+1})$ with the new areas $[x_i, x)$ and $[x, x_{i+1})$.

By Corollary 2, areas of length $3q$ provide the largest benefits. Thus, discovering the

¹⁰More precisely, the conjectures about questions to the left of the old frontier are replaced by conjectures inside the new research area, and conjectures to the left of the new frontier also become more precise. As can be seen in the left panel of Figure 3, the variance reduction to the left of the frontier is always the same. Hence the benefits are the same as if only the new area was added.

¹¹This corollary and the following ones follow directly from $V(\cdot; \cdot)$ derived in Proposition 1. Because their derivation is not entirely straightforward, we prove them separately in the Appendix.




Figure 5: *The benefits of discovery.* The dashed line in the *left panel* plots the benefits of discovery $V(d^0(X); X)$ against $X < \infty$. The solid line shows the maximum benefits of discovery when expanding knowledge. The *right panel* plots expanding (solid line) and deepening (dashed & dotted lines) knowledge for area lengths $X \in \{3q, 6q, 10q, \infty\}$ against d .

Note: Plots for deepening knowledge end at the maximum distance in each area, $d = X/2$.

answer to the midpoint of an area with length $X_i = 6q$ constitutes the benefits-maximizing discovery in such an area.

Finding the benefits-maximizing discovery for areas of length $X_i \neq 6q$ is less straightforward. There are two forces at play. First, there is a benefit to replacing the old area with two symmetric new areas such that each is half the length of the old area. The intuition echoes that of expanding knowledge: the inframarginal loss increases when an area becomes too large. Choosing symmetric area lengths reduces the inframarginal losses compared with asymmetric area lengths.

Second, benefits decline if the area length is greater than $3q$ because conjectures inside the area become imprecise. Maintaining symmetry when deepening in an area of length $X_i > 6q$ implies that both new areas are larger than the optimum of $3q$.

If the initial area length X_i was small, the first force would dominate. Selecting the midpoint at $d = X_i/2$ is optimal. However, if X_i was large, the trade-off would be resolved in favor of creating one high-value area at the cost of having imprecise conjectures in the other. Indeed, there is a cutoff \tilde{X}^0 such that creating two symmetric areas maximizes the benefits of discovery if and only if $X_i < \tilde{X}^0$. It turns out, that the largest benefits derive from deepening knowledge in an area of length $\tilde{X}^0 \approx 6.2q$.

Corollary 3. *There are two cutoff area lengths, $6q < \check{X}^0 < \tilde{X}^0 < 8q$ such that:*

- *Within an area, the benefits of a discovery are monotonically increasing in the distance to existing knowledge if the area is shorter than \tilde{X} . Otherwise, they peak at an intermediate distance $d^0(X_i) \in (3q, \min\{X_i/2, 4q\}]$.*
- *Across areas, the benefits of the benefits-maximizing discovery $d^0(X_i)$ is single peaked attaining its maximum at \tilde{X}^0 .*

Figure 5 illustrates the trade-off between expanding knowledge and deepening knowl-

edge. On the one hand, expanding knowledge means no knowledge is replaced and a new area is created. On the other hand, deepening knowledge means creating two areas with relatively precise conjectures. Our next result shows that only if *all areas* are shorter than a cutoff $\hat{X}^0 \approx 4.3q$, expanding knowledge is preferred over deepening knowledge in some existing area.

Corollary 4. *The benefits of expanding knowledge by $3q$ dominate the benefits of deepening knowledge in an area with length X if and only if $X < \hat{X}^0$. As the area length $X \rightarrow \infty$, both the benefits-maximizing distance and the corresponding benefits of discovery converge uniformly to the respective values from expanding knowledge.*

4 The Researcher

4.1 The Researcher's Objective

In this section, we analyze the researcher's optimal choice. Note that the researcher only benefits from research if it culminates in a discovery. Within our model, this is due to the assumption that the decision-maker bases her actions only on current knowledge. Equivalently, we could assume that the researcher only gets credited for changes in $a(\cdot)$ if her discovery implies these changes. A rationale is a moral-hazard concern: science is complex, and it is impossible to distinguish the absence of a finding from the absence of a search.¹²

Under either of these assumptions, we can rewrite the researcher's expected payoff given a choice of question x and success probability ρ as

$$u_R(d, \rho; X) := \rho V(d; X) - \underbrace{\eta \tilde{c}(\rho) \sigma^2(d; X)}_{=c(\rho, d; X)},$$

where $\tilde{c}(\rho) := (erf^{-1}(\rho))^2$. To obtain this expression, we replaced the question x by its sufficient statistics (d, X) . In addition, we subtracted the value of knowing the initial knowledge $v(\mathcal{F}_k)$, which is independent of the researcher's choices.

We also chose to abstract from any motivations other than the researcher's desire to increase the value of knowledge. We implicitly assume that the market rewards researchers exactly for the value-added they provide. This assumption allows us to provide a clean analysis of the researcher's trade-offs absent other, exogenous motives. We address potential frictions in our Conclusion.

The cost of research, $\eta c(\rho, d; X)$, derives from conceptualizing research as the search for an answer. We assume that, given a research question x , the researcher can choose a sampling interval $[a(x), b(x)] \in \mathbb{R}$ in the y -dimension. She discovers the answer if and only if $y(x) \in [a(x), b(x)]$. We interpret the interval length as the amount of effort the

¹²Our model could account for the credible communication of nonfindings. However, whether credibility in the absence of a breakthrough is feasible remains unclear (Sterling, 1959).

researcher invests into finding an answer. For simplicity, we assume a quadratic effort cost $\eta(a(x) - b(x))^2$.

Lemma 1. *For knowledge \mathcal{F}_k , probability ρ , and question x , the minimal cost of obtaining an answer to question x with probability ρ is*

$$\eta c(\rho, d; X) = \eta \tilde{c}(\rho) \sigma^2(d; X).$$

In Appendix C, we show that any (i) homogeneous, (ii) increasing, and (iii) convex sampling cost function over $b(x) - a(x)$ implies a reduced-form cost function similar to the one we impose. Therefore, such an alternative cost function would not alter our results qualitatively. A general increasing and convex $\tilde{c}(\rho)$ is possible yet harder to microfound. We discuss the desirable properties of $\tilde{c}(\rho)$ in Appendix E.

Our cost function exhibits the following properties: It is (i) multiplicatively separable in ρ and $(d; X)$, (ii) increasing in d and X , and (iii) concave in d ; the concavity decreases in X with the limiting case in which the cost function is linear in d as $X \rightarrow \infty$.

The cost of research links output and novelty. For a given level of effort, the probability of a successful search depends on the precision of the conjecture. A ceteris paribus increase in the novelty of the question or the area length without an increase in the researcher's effort implies a higher risk of failing to obtain a discovery.

4.2 The Researcher's Choice

We now characterize the researcher's optimal choice and elaborate on the resolution of the novelty-output trade-off. The researcher solves

$$\max_{X \in \{X_0, \dots, X_k\}} \underbrace{\max_{\substack{d \in [0, X/2], \\ \rho \in [0, 1]}} \rho V(d; X) - \eta c(\rho, d; X)}_{=: U_R(X)}.$$

Without cost ($\eta = 0$), we can apply Proposition 1 to derive the researcher's optimal choice. For any question x in a research area of length X , the researcher selects distance $d^0(X)$ and discovers an answer with certainty.

However, for positive cost, $\eta > 0$, the researcher's optimal decision about output, $\rho^\eta(X)$, is nontrivial and linked with her decision about the research question, $d^\eta(X)$. Choosing a question close to existing knowledge allows for a high probability of discovery at a low cost. The researcher's initial conjecture about the answer is already precise. Nevertheless, her payoff is low, as such a discovery provides little benefits. By increasing the distance, the researcher increases the benefits but also the cost, ceteris paribus. The effect on the optimal probability of discovery is ambiguous. Depending on which effect dominates, the distance and the probability of discovery are substitutes (the researcher optimally reduces the success probability when answering a more novel question) or




Figure 6: *The researcher's choices in areas of different lengths.* Solid lines depict the researcher's optimal choice given that the best available bounded area has length X .

complements (the researcher optimally increases the success probability when answering a more novel question).

Optimal choice within a research area. The following proposition captures the key aspects of the researcher's choice within a research area. Figure 6 illustrates it.

Proposition 2. *Suppose $\eta > 0$. The researcher*

1. *fails to obtain a discovery with positive probability: $\rho^\eta(X) \in (0, 1)$;*
2. *chooses a distance strictly less than the benefits-maximizing distance*
 - (a) *when expanding knowledge: $d^\eta(\infty) \in (2q, 3q)$;*
 - (b) *when deepening knowledge in research areas with $X > \tilde{X}$: $d^\eta(X) < d^0(X)$;*
3. *chooses the benefits-maximizing distance when deepening knowledge in research areas with $X \leq \tilde{X}$: $d^\eta(X) = X/2$.*

Proposition 2 implies that the researcher chooses a question closer to existing knowledge than the benefits-maximizing distance $3q$ for expanding knowledge. This is because novelty and output are substitutes. The marginal cost of increasing ρ rises with d , while the marginal benefits of increasing d approach zero as $d \rightarrow 3q$. The researcher balances novelty and output and selects a question less novel than $3q$.

That trade-off is less pronounced when the researcher deepens knowledge. The reason is that inside an area moving away from one boundary implies moving closer to the other boundary. Thus, the marginal cost of the success probability flattens in distance and becomes zero at $d = X/2$. Whether this effect is strong enough to make novelty and output complements depends on area length.

Optimal choice among intervals. Take the optimal choice inside an area X , $d^\eta(X)$ and $\rho^\eta(X)$, as given and let $U_R(X)$ denote the associated payoff. The following proposition characterizes the researcher's optimal choice among intervals and is illustrated in Figure 6.

Proposition 3. *Suppose $\eta > 0$. There is a set of cutoffs $2q < \hat{X} < \check{X} < \tilde{X} < 8q$ such that the following claims hold:*

1. The researcher expands knowledge if and only if all available finite research areas are shorter than \hat{X} .
2. The optimal choices of distance $d^n(X)$ and probability of discovery $\rho^n(X)$ are nonmonotone in X . The probability $\rho^n(X)$ has a maximum at \check{X} ; the distance $d^n(X)$ has a maximum at \tilde{X} .
3. The researcher's payoffs $U_R(X)$ are single peaked with a maximum at \check{X} .

Proposition 3 shows that the pattern in distance is qualitatively the same as in Corollary 4. However, the cost adds another dimension: the researcher's choice of success probability interacts with both the choice of distance and research area.

Consider a short area X . The scope of improving the decision-maker's policies is small because conjectures are already precise and investing in discovery thus provides a limited payoff. Consequently, the researcher does not invest much in the search for an answer despite the low cost. She opts for a low success probability. A slightly larger area length implies substantially higher benefits without a commensurate rise in cost. In response, the researcher increases both distance and success probability.

By contrast, consider a large area. The benefits of discovery trump those of the small area, yet the cost is also higher. Now, the researcher does not invest a lot in discovery due to the high marginal cost of increasing the success probability. As a result, the probability of discovery is low. If, in this case, the area length increases marginally, the researcher responds by decreasing both the distance and the success probability.

Finally, consider an area of intermediate length. The benefits of discovery are high, yet the associated cost is limited. The return on investment is large, and the probability of discovery is high. As the area length further increases, the marginal return of increasing the distance declines, while the marginal cost rises. Eventually, the researcher faces a trade-off: should she reduce the success probability to maintain maximal distance? It turns out that she should. While the researcher wants to remain at a boundary in her choice of distance, she mitigates the increased cost by lowering the success probability.

The researcher's preferred area length, \check{X} , is in a region in which a trade-off between output and novelty exists. While the researcher would prefer a larger research area to increase the benefits of research, she would prefer a smaller research area to reduce her cost. Thus, distance is increasing and the success probability is decreasing at the point at which the researcher's payoff is maximal.

Note that thus far we have not taken into account which research areas are available, which is determined by existing knowledge \mathcal{F}_k . Computing the optimal area among the available ones is straightforward.¹³ For what follows, it is particularly relevant that researchers never deepen knowledge in small areas of length $X < \hat{X}$. Conjectures in these areas are already very precise; deepening knowledge provides little benefits. If the existing knowledge is such that the researcher expands knowledge, we refer to it as *dense*.

Definition 3. Knowledge \mathcal{F}_k is *dense* if any research area has length $X_i < \hat{X}$.

¹³A computer program to numerically calculate all choices, given \mathcal{F}_k , is available on our websites.

5 Moonshots and Research Cycles

In this section, we consider a dynamic extension of our baseline model and show that a researcher can generate a positive dynamic spillover on future researchers that would improve the evolution of knowledge. In particular, a discovery sufficiently far from the current frontier inspires future researchers in their choices. These researchers will deepen knowledge in the area created. We show that endogenously short-lived researchers will never generate discoveries novel enough to inspire future researchers. However, a long-lived designer may have an incentive to launch a *moonshot*—incentivize a researcher to discover an answer to a question more novel than socially optimal in the current period. That moonshot enhances the evolution of knowledge by initiating a *research cycle*—a phase in which researchers deepen knowledge in the area created by the moonshot.

5.1 Sequential Research

Our starting point is a setting in which knowledge is dense, or, equivalently, $\mathcal{F}_0 = \{(x_0, y(x_0))\}$. For now, consider a two-period model with periods $t \in \{1, 2\}$, two short-lived researchers, R_t , and two short-lived decision-makers, DM_t . For simplicity, both researchers have the same cost parameter $\eta > 0$.

The players act as characterized in the previous sections. In particular, researcher R_t chooses novelty and output optimally given knowledge \mathcal{F}_{t-1} (see Propositions 2 and 3). Decision-maker DM_t responds optimally to \mathcal{F}_t (see equation (1)).

To simplify our analysis, we assume that all players condition their actions only on the knowledge \mathcal{F}_k available to them. Thus, if R_1 fails to obtain a discovery, neither of the other players takes note of this failure. This assumption is mild for decision-makers. Decision-makers are limited in their ability and resources to learn about and from failed research attempts. The assumption is stronger for researchers. However, in reality, even for them it is difficult to infer whether a particular direction was explored in the past without a result.¹⁴ As a benchmark, we first discuss how knowledge evolves in this model.

Proposition 4. *Independent of R_1 's success, R_2 never deepens knowledge. Instead, both researchers aim to expand knowledge by $d^n(\infty)$.*

Proposition 4 shows that no short-lived researcher endogenously inspires future researchers to deepen knowledge. The intuition follows from Propositions 1 and 3: Researchers are only rewarded for their immediate contribution to the value of knowledge. Therefore, no researcher expands knowledge beyond the benefits-maximizing $d^0(\infty) = 3q$. Deepening knowledge within areas of $X \leq 3q$, however, is unattractive as it creates too little value. Thus, all researchers aim to expand knowledge.

Proposition 4 illustrates that the static discrepancy between benefits-maximizing and researcher-optimal choices propagates into a dynamically suboptimal outcome: instead

¹⁴We revisit this and our other modeling choices in Section 5.3 below.

of twice expanding knowledge with a step size of $d^0(\infty)$, researchers expand knowledge only by a step-size of $d^\eta(\infty)$ and fail at each step with probability $\rho^\eta(\infty)$.

5.2 Inducing a Research Cycle

We now investigate how moonshots can improve upon the stepwise evolution of knowledge characterized in Proposition 4. We introduce a designer whose payoff is

$$v(\mathcal{F}_1) + \delta v(\mathcal{F}_2).$$

Suppose further that the designer can fully control R_1 's choice of the question x and the success probability ρ . For example, the designer may represent a funding institution that rewards R_1 with a prestigious award if R_1 discovers the answer to a question x . For now, we assume that the designer can costlessly provide such incentives. We discuss the financing below and provide a formal model in Appendix D.

We now study the designer's choice between inducing R_1 to expand knowledge by the myopically optimal distance $3q$ and expanding knowledge drastically by launching a *moonshot*, a discovery with a distance to existing knowledge strictly greater than $3q$. While a moonshot generates suboptimal immediate benefits in $t = 1$, it can inspire R_2 to deepen knowledge in the created area. Our next proposition shows that launching a moonshot may be optimal.

Proposition 5. *There are cost parameters $0 < \underline{\eta} < \bar{\eta} < \infty$ and a critical discount factor $\underline{\delta}(\eta) < 1$ such that for $\eta \in (\underline{\eta}, \bar{\eta})$ the designer optimally launches a moonshot if and only if $\delta > \underline{\delta}(\eta)$. If $\eta = 0$ and $\eta \rightarrow \infty$, a moonshot is suboptimal for any δ .*

To gain intuition for Proposition 5, it is useful to focus on the limiting cases. If $\eta = 0$, research is costless and each researcher expands knowledge by $d^0(\infty) = 3q$ with probability $\rho^0(\infty) = 1$. The evolution of knowledge takes a ladder-like structure. This structure constitutes the dynamic optimum as well. Therefore, the designer has no incentive to distort that evolution and induces a discovery with $d = 3q$.

If $\eta \rightarrow \infty$ instead, R_2 will fail with probability close to one for any \mathcal{F}_1 . Thus, almost surely, only R_1 generates knowledge due to the designer's incentives. Thus, the designer induces a discovery with $d = 3q$.

For intermediate cost parameters, additional effects come into consideration. Intermediate cost parameters allow for successful but distorted research. Absent incentives, researchers expand knowledge in a ladder-type structure but select questions too close to existing knowledge and fail with positive probability. In anticipation, the designer initiates a *research cycle* through a moonshot. R_2 builds on both the initial knowledge \mathcal{F}_0 and the moonshot discovery and deepens knowledge. As a consequence, if R_2 is successful, the resulting landscape of knowledge is preferable over that resulting from a myopically optimal discovery $d^0(\infty) = 3q$ by R_1 and a discovery $d^\eta(\infty)$ by R_2 . Figure 7 illustrates this first positive effect of a moonshot.




Figure 7: *Evolution of knowledge for different choices in $t = 1$.* The dots show which questions have a known answer at each time t , assuming that discovery has been successful. The designer's choice for R_1 (●) is given, R_2 's choice (○) is a best response. $F_0 = 0, y(0), \eta = 1$. The left panel assumes discovery of question $x = 3q$ in period $t = 1$, the right panel $x = 6q$.

Figure 8 illustrates the second positive effect of a moonshot. The probability that the evolution of knowledge ends because of failed research is smaller after the moonshot than after a myopic disclosure. The moonshot opens a research area with a large gap. In $t=2$, R_2 aims to fill it. Deepening knowledge in a large research area provides large benefits at a relatively low cost because researchers form conjectures using two rather than one question from existing knowledge. Consequently, R_2 selects a higher success probability.

It follows that both DM_2 and R_2 benefit from an initial moonshot. Whether these benefits outweigh the cost of too sparse knowledge in the first period vis-à-vis the myopic optimum depends on the designer's patience, δ . If the designer is sufficiently patient, she strictly prefers a moonshot over the myopic optimum.




Figure 8: *Hazard rate of science.* Cumulative probability that science has stopped by time t for different initial disclosures for $\eta = 1$. Dashed lines indicate the continuation if there were more than 2 periods.

5.3 Discussion

To keep the exposition clear, we chose a stylized setting to present Proposition 5. Its intuition, however, extends to more general settings. Here, we discuss extensions in several directions.

Infinite horizon. Our choice to study a two-period model helps us to focus on the dynamic externality of the moonshot. More realistically, we could allow the designer to care about a longer horizon. This designer may have a fixed budget for launching moonshots or periodically emerging opportunities to initiate research cycles.¹⁵ In any such model, the designer triggers research cycles whenever she would in the two-period setting. However, a complete characterization is complex because the evolution of knowledge in the implied dynamic game is both random and path dependent. To make progress, we would need to make specific ad-hoc assumptions. We consider a comprehensive study beyond the scope of our paper but want to highlight one additional effect arising in that class of models.

Suppose a researcher unsuccessfully tries to close an open research cycle. Unaware of that failure, future generations attempt the same and fail too. The result is a knowledge blockade. Suppose a designer could remove the existing knowledge blockade by disclosing an answer in the unfinished cycle. Alternatively, she could abandon that cycle by launching a new moonshot.

The designer’s trade-off is as follows. Abandoning the open cycle and initiating a new one provides the same benefits as the moonshot discussed in Proposition 5. The downside of that strategy appears once the newly started cycle is concluded. Because researchers are symmetric and naive, they revert to the question that would close the open cycle. They inevitably fail. The benefit of removing the knowledge blockade is that it removes that inevitable failure. However, it comes at the cost of forgoing the benefits of a new cycle. Which strategy is better depends on the cost parameter, the designer’s patience, and the frequency of the designer’s interventions.

Costly moonshots. Our analysis separates the designer and R_1 . Moreover, we assume that the designer does not take R_1 ’s cost of producing the initial moonshot into account. This assumption highlights that it is not sufficient to fully eliminate the cost of research to inspire the path of future researchers. As long as researchers are rewarded for the marginal value of their discovery, only the static distortion of researchers’ choices is overcome. Including the cost in the designer’s considerations is straightforward and does not alter the statement of Proposition 5. However, we would need to optimize over the induced success probability in the first period. Since those are determined up to the product log only, closed-form solutions are infeasible.

Learning by doing. Our assumption that decision-makers only condition on existing knowledge abstracts from a learning-by-doing channel through realized payoffs. We believe that this is reasonable when the mapping from policies to outcomes is complex. While bureaucrats may be able to adjust their policy responses to expert opinions, they often lack the capacity and expertise to infer predecessors’ choices—let alone the

¹⁵Notably, longer time horizons may lead to the optimality of moonshots that inspire multiple generations of future researchers.

mapping into payoffs. Yet, there may be situations in which decision-makers learn by policy experimentation (see, e.g., Callander and Hummel, 2014). However, these channels are complex and thus left for future research.

Sophisticated researchers. With a long time horizon, our assumption that researchers ignore the potential of learning from failures generates a noteworthy pattern. If some researcher fails on a given question, future researchers will eventually select the same research question and fail too. We view this feature as a strength of our model. Discovery fails if the truth takes an unexpected turn and without learning from such failures, future researchers remain unaware of this turn. They will continuously fail, and progress in that particular direction stops. It can only resume through exogenous forces—for example, paradigm shifts (Kuhn, 1962), importing new researcher types (Moser et al., 2014), or genius researchers (Benzell and Brynjolfsson, 2019). We consider the absence of learning from failures reasonable for various reasons. Failed research is difficult to convey credibly (for example, due to moral hazard concerns) and, in particular, in a world in which the question space goes beyond the real line, a researcher would have to form beliefs about the direction of past failed research attempts.

Beyond the real line. While we chose to represent the set of research questions by the real line, our analysis extends to richer structures of the set of potential research questions. We provide a formal extension in Appendix B. The main insight is that our results extend to settings with the following properties: (i) existing knowledge \mathcal{F}_k determines a set of research areas $\mathcal{X}(\mathcal{F}_k)$, (ii) each research area is an interval, possibly of infinite length, (iii) each element of the interval is a research question and the answers to questions on the boundary of a research area are known, (iv) answers to questions in each research area of finite length are determined by a realized path of a Brownian bridge between the two boundary question-answer pairs, and (v) answers to questions in each research area of infinite length are determined by a realized path of a standard Brownian motion initialized at the boundary question-answer pair. While our baseline model adheres to these properties, various alternative settings also satisfy them, including multidimensional settings where knowledge can expand in diverse directions.

Because the models are essentially identical, Propositions 1 to 5 apply. However, our assumption about the naivety of researchers and decision-makers regarding unsuccessful attempts is much weaker in a world in which researchers can expand knowledge in many directions than it appears in the baseline model.

6 Implications

In this section, we broaden the perspective and relate our findings to recent discussions on the design of incentives for researchers.

Although the dynamic extension of our static baseline model in Section 5 is stylized, we reconcile empirical findings in the economics of science (see, for example, Rzhetsky et al., 2015; Fortunato et al., 2018, documenting a lack of novelty in research) and the economics of innovation (e.g., Jaffe et al., 2003, documenting the inspiring nature of the original moonshot). In reality, a researcher’s value of any given discovery, especially in the basic sciences, depends on the institutional framework a researcher operates in. Our findings in Section 5 suggest that focusing only on direct policy relevance when designing researchers’ incentives is suboptimal for patient societies when research is costly. In the following, we discuss some alternative incentive structures.

Future-oriented rewards. It follows from Proposition 3 that, even if a researcher’s cost is fully removed, she will not select a question novel enough to initiate a research cycle. The reason is that a short-lived researcher exclusively cares about the value of her research to decision-makers today but not about the indirect value a moonshot discovery generates by guiding future researchers.

To incentivize moonshot discoveries, researchers need future-oriented rewards that go beyond the instantaneous value of their findings. Apart from prizes for novel findings, the value of citations for promotion decisions or scientific reputation may serve such purpose. That insight is reminiscent of recent empirical work on firm-level R&D. Frankel et al. (2023) estimate the value of dynamic spillovers from discoveries of drugs. In line with our model, they provide suggestive evidence that the lack of appropriability of these spillovers harms novelty in pharmaceutical innovation.

Research consortia. The idea of research consortia has been put forward in some fields of basic science to improve the evolution of knowledge. Research consortia formed by scientists of different backgrounds operate on missions different from the “publish or perish” or “marketability” paradigms. Hill and Stein (2021) document that the incentives and choices of consortia in structural biology differ from those of university researchers. In line with our model, they find that consortia provide more novel discoveries, but, also discoveries of lower immediate value.

Section 5 suggests that the underlying reason is not particular to structural biology. Establishing institutions that alleviate some researchers from the need to provide immediate benefits can guide those in traditional incentive schemes. Section 5 suggests that a mix in incentives may be key to improving the evolution of knowledge.

Direction of science. As we noted above, funding measures that only target the researcher’s cost do not alter the way knowledge progresses qualitatively. However, it may alter the direction of science. Recall that a researcher’s question choice in our model can be interpreted as choosing from a set of directions and then picking novelty along that direction (see the discussion in Section 5.3). Reducing the cost of research in one

of the available directions distorts the marginal researcher in favor of the subsidized direction.

Recent empirical work is consistent with this observation. Nagaraj and Tranchero (2023) suggest that data availability affects the direction of sciences. Kim (2023) finds that novel technologies can incentivize researchers to focus on more explored rather than unexplored areas. Myers (2020) shows that topic-specific grants can lead to a change in the direction of science. These findings can be interpreted in our model as a change in the cost of research: some directions become less cost intensive than others.

When a researcher chooses a moonshot in some direction, she affects future generations through the implied research cycle suggesting that the effect is persistent. Moonshots determine the direction science takes in the medium run. That coordination may provide additional network benefits currently outside our model. A potential counterforce has been identified in the literature in corporate R&D which emphasizes the role of competition (see, for example, Bryan and Lemus, 2017).¹⁶ While beyond the scope of this paper, considering the effect of competition and dynamic spillovers on the direction of science is an exciting avenue for future research.

7 Conclusion

We propose a tractable and flexible model based on three simple premises: (i) the pool of available research questions is large, (ii) questions close to existing knowledge are easier to answer than questions far from existing knowledge, and (iii) society applies knowledge when selecting policies. We conceptualized research as the choice of a research question and the costly search for an answer. Our model endogenously links novelty and research output and highlights the importance of existing knowledge for research and knowledge accumulation. A dynamic extension delivers rich insights into how funding affects knowledge over time.

We began our paper by emphasizing the role of scientific freedom. Preserving that freedom remains a challenging task for science-funding institutions when society designs a funding architecture (see, for example, Bourguignon, 2019). The NSF emphasizes that it aims at funding groundbreaking research to advance the knowledge frontier. Our findings in Section 5 demonstrate a key trade-off such an institution faces. In Appendix D, we provide a step toward a more complete theory of optimal research funding.

Several known frictions absent in our model hinder efficient funding in reality. These range from publication bias (Andrews and Kasy, 2019) to the emphasis on priority (Bobtcheff et al., 2017; Hill and Stein, 2020, 2021) to career concerns (Akerlof and Michailat, 2018; Heckman and Moktan, 2020). While the question of optimal market design is beyond our scope here, our framework is flexible enough to incorporate these frictions straightforwardly. It may thus be a stepping stone toward developing structural

¹⁶Hill and Stein (2020, 2021) provide empirical evidence.

models of science funding including such frictions. Such models could help to evaluate funding schemes and provide meaningful counterfactuals to inform decision-makers about the optimal provision of research incentives.

Appendix

A Proofs

We relegate straightforward algebraic reformulations to Appendix F to preserve clarity. Some proofs rely on properties of $\tilde{c}(\rho) = (erf^{-1}(\rho))^2$ provided in Appendix E.

Notation: We use subscripts to denote partial derivatives; omit function arguments when clarity is preserved; and use $\frac{df(x,y)}{dx}$ for the total derivative $(f_x + f_y y_x)$.

A.1 Proof of Proposition 1

Proof. The value of knowing \mathcal{F}_k is

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \max \left\{ \frac{q - \sigma_x^2(y|\mathcal{F}_k)}{q}, 0 \right\} dx.$$

No matter which point of knowledge $(x, y(x))$ is added to \mathcal{F}_k , the value of knowledge outside the frontier is identical for both \mathcal{F}_k and $\mathcal{F}_k \cup \{(x, y(x))\}$. Area lengths $X_1 = X_k = \infty$ do not depend on \mathcal{F}_k and neither does the variance for a question $x < x_1$ or $x > x_k$ with a given distance d to \mathcal{F}_k . The conjectures about all questions outside $[x_1, x_k]$ deliver a total value of

$$2 \int_0^q \frac{q - x}{q} dx = q,$$

which is independent of \mathcal{F}_k .

Moreover, if the answer to a question \hat{x} , deepens knowledge, that is, $\hat{x} \in [x_i, x_{i+1}]$ with $(x_i, y(x_i)), (x_{i+1}, y(x_{i+1})) \in \mathcal{F}_k$, it only affects questions in the area $[x_i, x_{i+1}]$, i.e., $G(x|\mathcal{F}_k) = G(x|\mathcal{F}_k \cup \{(\hat{x}, y(\hat{x}))\}) \forall x \notin [x_i, x_{i+1}]$.

The value of a given area $[x_i, x_{i+1}]$ is (with abuse of notation)

$$v(X) = \int_0^X \max \left\{ \frac{q - \frac{d(X-d)}{X}}{q}, 0 \right\} dd.$$

Note that whenever $X \leq 4q$, $\frac{d(X-d)}{X} \leq q$. Hence, we can directly compute the value of

any area with length $X \leq 4q$ as

$$v(X) = X - \frac{X^2}{6q}.$$

Whenever $X > 4q$, a positive value is generated only on a subset of points in the area. As the variance is a symmetric quadratic function with midpoint $X/2$, there is a symmetric area centered around $X/2$ which has a variance exceeding q . On all such points, the decision maker's losses are limited to zero. The points with variance equal to q are $\bar{d}_{1,2} = \frac{X}{2} \pm \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{X}\sqrt{X-4q}$. Hence, the value of an area with $X > 4q$ is (due to symmetry)

$$\begin{aligned} v(X) &= 2 \int_0^{\bar{d}_1} \frac{q - \frac{d(X-d)}{X}}{q} dd \\ &= X - \frac{X^2}{6q} + \frac{X-4q}{6q} \sqrt{X}\sqrt{X-4q}. \end{aligned}$$

If knowledge expands beyond the frontier, a new area is created and no area is replaced. The value created is thus

$$V(d; \infty) = v(d) = d - \frac{d^2}{6q} + \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } d \leq 4q \\ \frac{d-4q}{6q} \sqrt{d}\sqrt{d-4q}, & \text{if } d > 4q. \end{cases}$$

If a knowledge point is added inside an area with length X with distance d to the closest existing knowledge, it generates two new areas with length d and $X-d$ that replace the old area with length X . The total value of the two new intervals is

$$\begin{aligned} v(d) + v(X-d) &= d - \frac{d^2}{6q} + \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } d \leq 4q \\ \frac{d-4q}{6q} \sqrt{d}\sqrt{d-4q}, & \text{if } d > 4q \end{cases} \\ &+ X - d - \frac{(X-d)^2}{6q} + \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } X-d \leq 4q \\ \frac{X-d-4q}{6q} \sqrt{X-d}\sqrt{X-d-4q}, & \text{if } X-d > 4q \end{cases}. \end{aligned}$$

The benefits of discovery are then $V(d; X) = v(d) + v(X-d) - v(X)$. Noticing that $\sigma^2(d; X) = d(X-d)/X$ and replacing accordingly results in the expression in the proposition. Taking the limit of $X \rightarrow \infty$ corresponds to the value of expanding research beyond the frontier. \square

A.2 Proof of Corollary 2

Proof. The first-order condition for $d \leq 4q$ is

$$V_d(d; \infty | d \leq 4q) = 1 - \frac{d}{3q} = 0.$$

Moreover, the benefits are decreasing in d for $d > 4q$ which can be seen from the derivative with respect to d which is

$$V_d(d; \infty | d > 4q) = -\frac{d}{3q} + 1 + \sqrt{\frac{d-4q}{d}} \frac{d-q}{3q} < 0,$$

which holds by Lemma 27 in Appendix F. \square

A.3 Proof of Corollary 3 and 4

We prove Corollaries 3 and 4 jointly via a series of lemmata.

- Lemmata 2 to 4 shows that the distance that maximizes deepening knowledge is $d^0(X) = X/2$ for small X and $d^0(X) < X/2$ for large X .
- Lemma 5 shows that $d^0(X) < X/2$ implies decreasing benefits in X .
- Lemma 6 shows that once $d^0(X) < X/2$ for some X it is true for all $X' > X$ and thus establishes the existence of the cutoff \tilde{X}^0 .
- Lemma 7 shows the convergence of $d^0(X)$ as $X \rightarrow \infty$ and $d^0(X > 6q) > 3q$.
- Lemmata 8 and 9 establish the single-peakedness of the benefits of deepening knowledge and determine \tilde{X}^0 and \hat{X}^0 .
- Lemma 10 determines the order of the cutoffs.

Proof.

Lemma 2. $d^0(X) = X/2$ if $X \leq 6q$.

Proof.

1. Assume $X \leq 4q$.

The benefits of discovery are

$$V(d; X | X \leq 4q) = \frac{1}{3q}(Xd - d^2)$$

which are increasing in d for $d \in [0, X/2]$ and hence maximized at $d = X/2$. Moreover, $V(X/2; X | X \leq 4q) = X^2/(12q)$ which increases in X .

2. Assume $X \in (4q, 6q]$.

(i) $d \geq X - 4q$ implies (since $d \leq 3q$)

$$V(d; X | d \geq X - 4q, X \in (4q, 6q]) = \frac{1}{6q} \left(2dX - 2d^2 - \sqrt{X}(X - 4q)^{3/2} \right)$$

which are the same as in the first case up to the constant $-\sqrt{X}(X - 4q)^{3/2}$. Thus, the optimal d conditional on $d \geq X - 4q$ is $d = X/2$.

(ii) For $d \leq X - 4q$ the benefits are

$$V(d; X|d \leq X - 4q, X \in (4q, 6q]) = \frac{1}{6q} \left(2dX - 2d^2 + \sqrt{X-d}(X-d-4q)^{3/2} - \sqrt{X}(X-4q)^{3/2} \right),$$

with derivative

$$V_d(d; X|\cdot) = \frac{1}{3q} \left(X - 2d - (X - d - q) \sqrt{\frac{X-d-4q}{X-d}} \right) > 0$$

where the inequality comes from Lemma 28 in Appendix F. Hence, $V_d(d; X|d \leq X - 4q, X \in [4q, 6q]) > 0$ for all d and X in the considered domain. Thus, $d = X - 4q$ maximizes $V(d; X|d \leq X - 4q, X \in (4q, 6q])$ and by (i) $d = X/2$ maximizes $V(d; X|X \in (4q, 6q])$. \square

Lemma 3. For any $X < \infty$, $V_d(X/2; X) = 0$.

Proof.

$$V(d; X) = \frac{1}{6q} \left(\underbrace{2X\sigma^2(d; X)}_{(I)} + \underbrace{\mathbf{1}_{d>4q} \sqrt{d}(d-4q)^{3/2}}_{(II)} + \underbrace{\mathbf{1}_{X-d>4q} \sqrt{X-d} (X-d-4q)^{3/2}}_{(III)} - \underbrace{\mathbf{1}_{X>4q} \sqrt{X}(X-4q)^{3/2}}_{(IV)} \right).$$

At $d = X/2$ either both (II) and (III) are active or neither is. Moreover, (IV) is independent of d , and at $d = X/2$ we have $\partial(II)/\partial d = -\partial(III)/\partial d$, and $\partial(I)/\partial d = 0$. \square

Lemma 4. If $X > 8q$ then $d^0(X) \neq X/2$. If $d^0(X) \neq X/2$, then $d^0(X) \leq 4q$.

Proof. Take $\bar{d} = 4q < X/2$. That implies

$$V(\bar{d}; X|X > 8q) = \frac{1}{6q} \left(8Xq - 32q^2 - \sqrt{X}(X-4q)^{3/2} + \sqrt{(X-4q)}(X-8q)^{3/2} \right).$$

By comparison

$$V(X/2; X|X > 8q) = \frac{1}{6q} \left(\frac{X^2}{2} - \sqrt{X}(X-4q)^{3/2} + \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{X}(X-8q)^{3/2} \right)$$

The difference of the two is thus

$$V(\bar{d}; X|\cdot) - V(X/2; X|\cdot) = \frac{1}{6q} \frac{(X-8q)^{3/2}}{2} \left(2\sqrt{X-4q} - \sqrt{X} - \sqrt{(X-8q)} \right),$$

which is positive if

$$4(X-4q) > 2X-8q \Leftrightarrow X > 4q$$

and, thus, holds by assumption.

To establish the second part of the lemma, note that $d > 4q$ can only occur for $X > 8q$. We will show that $V_d(d; X) < 0$ for all $d > 4q$ when $X > 8q$. Towards this, observe that

$$V_{dd}(d; X > 8q) = -\frac{24q^3}{(X-d)^{\frac{5}{2}}(X-d-4q)^{\frac{3}{2}}} < 0,$$

because $X > 8q$ and $X-d \geq X/2 > 4q$. Thus, $V_{dd}(d; X > 8q)$ is lowest for $X \rightarrow \infty$ which is

$$V_{dd}(d; X > 8q)|_{\lim_{X \rightarrow \infty}} = 2 \frac{d^2 - d^{\frac{3}{2}}\sqrt{d-4q} - 2q(d+q)}{d^{\frac{3}{2}}\sqrt{d-4q}} > 0.$$

Thus, $V_d(d; X)$ is highest for $d = \frac{X}{2}$ which by Lemma 3 is 0. Hence, $V(d; X)$ decreases in d for $X > 8q$ and $d > 4q$. The optimal distance cannot be greater than $4q$. \square

Lemma 5. $d^0(X) < X/2 \Rightarrow \frac{dV(d^0(X); X)}{dX} < 0$.

Proof. By the envelope theorem,

$$\frac{dV(d^0(X); X)}{dX} = V_X(d^0(X); X)$$

which is negative for $X \geq 4q$ and $d \in [0, X-4q]$ by Lemma 29 in Appendix F. If $X \geq 8q$, that negativity is sufficient. By Lemma 2 we know that $X \geq 6q$ whenever $d^0(X) \neq X/2$. Moreover,

$$V_d(d; X | X/2 > d > X-4q, X < 8q) = \frac{1}{3q}(X-2d) + \mathbf{1}_{d>4q}2(d-q)\sqrt{\frac{d-4q}{d}} > 0$$

Hence, $d^0(X) \neq X/2 \Rightarrow d^0(X) \leq X-4q$. Lemma 29 applies which proves Lemma 5. \square

Lemma 6. $d^0(X) < X/2$ for some $X \in [6q, 8q] \Rightarrow d^0(X) < X/2$ for all $X' > X$.

Proof. It suffices to consider $X' < 8q$ by Lemma 4. We prove the claim by showing that $V(d_c^0(X); X)$ for any interior critical point $d_c^0(X) < X/2$ cuts $V(X/2; X)$ from below at any potential intersection. Thus, there is at most one switch from $d^0(X) = X/2$ to $d^0(X) < X/2$ and no switch back. Continuity then implies the statement.

$V(d; X)$ is a continuously differentiable function in X and d . Thus, any interior (local) optimum $d_c^0(X)$ is continuous as well and so are $V(d_c^0(X); X)$ and $V(X/2; X)$. We now show that if $V(d_c^0(X); X) = V(X/2; X)$ for some local optimum $d_c^0(X) < X/2$ and $X \in [6q, 8q]$, then $dV(d_c^0(X); X)/dX > dV(X/2; X)/dX$. Note that $dV(d_c^0(X), X)/dX < 0$ by Lemma 5. The first intersection therefore can occur only in a region when $V(X/2, X)$ decreases and must be such that $dV(X/2, X)/dX < dV(d_c^0(X), X)/dX$. We prove that this is the only potential intersection in Lemma 30 in Appendix F where we show that $d^2V(X/2, X)/(dX)^2 < 0$ and $d^2V(d_c^0(X), X)/(dX)^2 > 0$. \square

Lemma 7. $V(d^0(X); X)$ is continuous in X . As $X \rightarrow \infty$, it converges uniformly to $V(d; X)$ and $d^0(X) \rightarrow d^0(\infty)$. For any $X > 6q$, we have $d^0(X) > 3q$ and $V(d^0(X), X) > V(3q, \infty)$.

Proof. Continuity follows because $V(d^0(X); X) = \max_d V(d; X)$ with $V(d; X)$ continuous in both $d \in [0, X/2]$ and X . Now take any sequence of increasing X_n with $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} X_n = \infty$. For any $\delta(d)$, $\exists n$ such that $V_n(d; X_n) - V(d; \infty) < \delta(d)$ as can be seen from the formulation in the proof of Proposition 1. Hence, $V(d; X_n)$ converges uniformly to $V(d; \infty)$. By uniform convergence the maximizer $d^0(X_n)$ of $V(d; X_n)$ converges too. To see convergence from above, observe that $V(3q; X) > V(3q; \infty)$ for any $6q < X < \infty$.

Finally, from Corollary 2 and the proof of Proposition 1 we know that $V(d; \infty)$ describes the value of an area of length d . That value increases for $d < 3q$ and decreases for $d > 3q$. Now suppose $X > 6q$ and $d^0(X) < 3q$. Then by increasing d both areas created become closer to $3q$ and are thus increasing in value. A contradiction to $d^0(X)$ being the maximizer. \square

Lemma 8. $V(d^0(X); X)$ is single-peaked with an interior peak at $\tilde{X}^0 \approx 6.204q$ with $d^0(\tilde{X}^0) \approx 3.102q$.

Proof. Lemma 8 follows from continuity of $V(X/2; X)$ (by Lemma 7) and Lemmata 2 to 6. The peak can be computed. It is the (real) solution to

$$\frac{X}{X - q} = 2 \frac{\sqrt{X - 4q}}{\sqrt{X}}. \quad (2)$$

Defining $m := \frac{X}{q}$, the above reduces to

$$\frac{m}{m - 1} = 2 \sqrt{\frac{(m - 4)}{m}}.$$

For $m > 4$, the LHS decreases and the RHS increases in m . The solution is:

$$m = \frac{2}{3} \left(4 + (19 - 3\sqrt{2})^{(1/3)} + (19 + 3\sqrt{2})^{(1/3)} \right) \approx 6.204. \quad \square$$

Lemma 9. Expanding knowledge trumps deepening knowledge if and only if $X < \hat{X}^0 \approx 4.338q$.

Proof. $V(3q; X) > V(3q; \infty)$ for $X \geq 6q$ by direct comparison at $X = 6q$ and Lemmata 5, 7 and 8. For $X \in [0, 6q]$ we need to consider only $d^0(X) = X/2$ by Lemma 2. We compare

$$V(X/2; X) = \frac{X^2}{12q} - \frac{\sqrt{X}(X - 4q)^{3/2}}{6q}$$

with $V(3q; \infty) = \frac{3q}{2}$. Using $m = \frac{X}{q}$ from the previous proof, the two intersect at

$$\left(\frac{m^2}{12} - \frac{\sqrt{m}}{6} (m-4)^{(3/2)} - 3/2 \right) = 0$$

which has one solution such that $m \leq 6$ at $m \approx 4.338$. \square

Lemma 10. $4q < \hat{X}^0 < 6q < \check{X}^0 < \tilde{X}^0 < 8q$.

Proof. The first two inequalities follow from Lemma 9, the third from Lemma 8. Existence of \tilde{X}^0 and the fourth inequality follow from Lemma 6. Lemma 4 implies the last inequality. \square

\square

A.4 Proof of Proposition 2

Throughout, we make use of the first-order necessary conditions for interior solutions.

$$\eta \tilde{c}_\rho(\rho) = \frac{V(d; X)}{\sigma^2(d; X)}, \quad (\text{FOC}^\rho)$$

$$\rho V_d(d; X) = \eta \tilde{c}(\rho) \sigma_d^2(d; X). \quad (\text{FOC}^d)$$

Proof.

Part 1: Expanding Knowledge We begin by showing that the optimal solution for d and ρ is interior.

Lemma 11. *There is a non-trivial optimal choice with $\infty > d > 0, 1 > \rho > 0$ on any interval with positive length, $X \in \mathbb{R}^+ \cup \{\infty\}$. The first-order condition, (FOC^ρ) , is necessary for optimality of $\rho^\eta(X)$.*

Proof. The researcher can guarantee a non-negative payoff by choosing $d = 0$ or $\rho = 0$. Hence, her value is bounded from below, $U_R(X) \equiv \max_{d, \rho} u_R(d, \rho; X) \geq 0$. Next, note that $u_R(\rho = 0, d > \varepsilon; X) = 0$ for any $\varepsilon > 0$ and that $\frac{\partial u_R(\rho=0, d>\varepsilon; X)}{\partial \rho} = V(\varepsilon, X) > 0$ by Proposition 1. Therefore, on any interval X there is a maximum with $d > 0, \rho > 0$.

Moreover, by Lemma 8, the benefits of discovery are bounded $V(d, X) \leq M < \infty$ and $\lim_{\rho \rightarrow 1} \tilde{c}(\rho) = \infty$. Therefore, the optimal $\rho < 1$. Finally, $V(d, \infty)$ decreases in d for d large enough while the cost $\eta \tilde{c}(\rho) \sigma^2(d, \infty)$ increases in d . Hence, the optimal distance is bounded $d^\eta(\cdot) \leq D < \infty$.

Because the optimal choice is interior and the objective is continuously differentiable, a necessary condition for the optimal $\rho^\eta(X)$ is that it solves (FOC^ρ) . Note that for the distance, $d^\eta(X)$, this result is not immediate as for deepening intervals the distance has an exogenous upper bound at $X/2$. \square

Next, we characterize the optimal distance when expanding knowledge.

Lemma 12. *When expanding knowledge, the optimal choice is characterized by the first-order conditions (FOC^d) and (FOC^ρ). These FOCs suffice and $d^n(\infty) \in (2q, 3q)$. The researcher's value is strictly positive $U_R(\infty) > 0$.*

Proof. We proceed in three steps. First, we show that the distance is at most $3q$. Second, we show that the first-order conditions are sufficient when expanding knowledge. Third, we characterize the optimal choice of the researcher.

Step 1. $d \leq 3q$. Fix any $\rho \geq 0$. Since $\sigma^2(d; \infty)$ increases in d , it is immediate that the researcher's utility is non-increasing in d if $V(d; \infty)$ decreases in d . Combining this observation with Corollary 2, it is sufficient to restrict attention to $d \leq 3q$.

Step 2. FOCs sufficient. By Lemma 11, the researcher's optimal choice is interior and, hence, characterized by the first-order conditions. To see the sufficiency of the first-order conditions, note that the first principal minor of Hessian is $\rho V_{dd} - \eta c \sigma_{dd}^2 = -\rho \frac{1}{3q} < 0$ as $\sigma_{dd}^2 = 0$ and that the second principal minor is given by the determinant of the Hessian at the critical point:

$$\begin{aligned} & -\rho V_{dd}(d; \infty) \eta \tilde{c}_{\rho\rho}(\rho) \sigma^2(d; \infty) - (V_d - \eta \tilde{c}_\rho(\rho) \sigma_d^2(d; \infty))^2 \\ &= \rho \frac{1}{3q} \eta \tilde{c}_{\rho\rho}(\rho) d - \left(-\frac{d}{3q} + 1 - \eta \tilde{c}_\rho(\rho) \right)^2 \\ &= \rho \frac{\tilde{c}_{\rho\rho}(\rho)}{\tilde{c}_\rho(\rho)} \frac{V(d; \infty)}{3q} - \left(-\frac{d}{3q} + 1 - \frac{V(d; \infty)}{\sigma^2(d; \infty)} \right)^2. \end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

The first equality follows from $V_{dd} = -\frac{1}{3q}$ and $\sigma^2(d; \infty) = d$. The second equality follows from combining $\sigma^2(d; \infty) = d$ with the necessary (FOC^ρ) via $\eta \sigma^2(d; \infty) = \frac{V(d; \infty)}{\tilde{c}_\rho(\rho)}$ and replacing accordingly.

Substituting for $V(d; \infty) = d - d^2/(6q)$ (as $d \leq 3q$ by Step 1) yields the following condition for a positive second principal minor:

$$\begin{aligned} & 0 < \rho \frac{\tilde{c}_{\rho\rho}(\rho)}{\tilde{c}_\rho(\rho)} \frac{V(d; \infty)}{3q} - \left(-\frac{d}{3q} + 1 - \frac{V(d; \infty)}{\sigma^2(d; \infty)} \right)^2 \\ & \Leftrightarrow \rho \frac{\tilde{c}_{\rho\rho}(\rho)}{\tilde{c}_\rho(\rho)} > \frac{d}{2(6q - d)}. \end{aligned}$$

The inequality in the last line holds because the properties of $\tilde{c}(\rho)$ imply $LHS \geq 1$ while $RHS \leq \frac{1}{2}$ for $d \leq 3q$.

Step 3. Characterization. Substituting the expressions for $V(d; \infty)$ and $\sigma^2(d; \infty)$ for expanding knowledge into the first-order condition (FOC^d) yields

$$\rho \left(1 - \frac{d}{3q} \right) = \eta \tilde{c}(\rho). \tag{4}$$

Replacing η via equation (FOC $^\rho$) and solving for d we obtain

$$d^\eta(\infty) = 3q \left(1 - \frac{\tilde{c}(\rho)}{2\tilde{c}_\rho(\rho)\rho - \tilde{c}(\rho)} \right) \in (2q, 3q)$$

where the bounds follow from the properties of \tilde{c} . \square

Part 2. Deepening knowledge.

Lemma 13. *The researcher's optimal choice of distance is on the midpoint of the area, $d^\eta(X) = \frac{X}{2}$, for $X \leq \tilde{X}$ and interior, $d^\eta(X) < \frac{X}{2}$ otherwise. At \tilde{X} , the payoff $U_R(X)$ decreases. Further, $\lim_{X \rightarrow \infty} d^\eta(X) = d^\eta(\infty)$ and the convergence is from above. Any optimal distance satisfies $d^\eta(X) \leq 4q$.*

Proof. Define $d^b := X/2$ which we refer to as the boundary solution, and d^i as the solution d to (FOC d) assuming $d < X/2$ (whenever it exists) which we refer to as the interior solution.

Step 1. d^b always a candidate solution. Note first that the choice d^b always constitutes a local maximum as the marginal cost of distance is zero at this point, $\frac{\partial \sigma^2(d, X)}{\partial d} = 1 - \frac{2d}{X}$. Moreover, by Lemma 3 also the marginal benefit is zero at $d = X/2$. Finally, for any choice of d , there is a unique ρ that solves (FOC $^\rho$) because, given d , (FOC $^\rho$) has a continuous, strictly increasing, left-hand side that starts at $\tilde{c}_\rho(0) = 0$, has limit $\lim_{\rho \rightarrow 1} \tilde{c}_\rho(\rho) = \infty$ and has a constant right-hand side. Hence, the boundary solution with d^b is always a candidate solution.

Step 2. $d^\eta(X) = X/2$ if $X \leq 4q$. Recall the first-order conditions (FOC $^\rho$) and (FOC d). Assuming an interior solution d^i , replacing η via (FOC $^\rho$) in (FOC d) we obtain for (FOC d)

$$\frac{V_d(d, X)}{\sigma_d^2(d, X)} \bigg/ \frac{V(d, X)}{\sigma^2(d, X)} = \frac{\tilde{c}(\rho)}{\rho} \bigg/ \tilde{c}_\rho(\rho).$$

It follows from the properties of $\tilde{c}(\rho)$ that the $RHS \in [0, 1/2]$ and decreasing. Thus, if the $LHS > 1/2$, it is beneficial to increase d if possible and the boundary choice d^b is optimal. For $X \leq 4q$

$$\frac{V_d}{\sigma_d^2} \bigg/ \frac{V}{\sigma^2} = \frac{2(X-2d)}{\frac{X-2d}{X}} \bigg/ \frac{2(dX-d^2)}{\frac{d(X-d)}{X}} = 1.$$

Hence, for small areas, the boundary choice is indeed optimal.

Step 3. $d^\eta(X) < X/2$ if $X > 8q$. Note first that the variance of the question on the boundary is always larger than for any interior question as $\sigma^2 = \frac{d(X-d)}{X}$ increases in d . Hence, if the benefits of a discovery, V , are larger for an interior question than for the boundary question, the researcher can obtain a higher payoff by choosing an

interior question with the same ρ as for the boundary question: the cost are lower, the success probability is the same, and the benefits upon success are higher. The benefits of discovery on the boundary of an area with $X > 8q$ are always smaller than for some interior distance by Lemma 4. Hence, an interior choice is optimal for $X > 8q$.

Step 4.

Lemma 14. *If d^i is optimal it must be that $d^i < 4q$ and that $X - d^i > 4q$.*

Proof. For $X \in (4q, 8q)$ and $X - d < 4q$,

$$\frac{\frac{V_d(d, X)}{\sigma_d^2(d, X)}}{\frac{V(d, X)}{\sigma^2(d, X)}} = \frac{2d(X - d)}{-2d^2 + 2dX - \sqrt{X}(X - 4q)^{3/2}}$$

which decreases in d with limit

$$\lim_{d \rightarrow X/2} \frac{2d(X - d)}{-2d^2 + 2dX - \sqrt{X}(X - 4q)^{3/2}} = \frac{X^2/2}{X^2/2 - \sqrt{X}(X - 4q)^{3/2}}$$

which, in turn, increases in X and one for $X = 4q$. Hence, any interior solution must be such that $X - d > 4q$ for the same reasons given in step 2 of this proof. For $X - d < 4q$, the first-order condition with respect to d is always positive. For any area with $X > 8q$, $X - d^i > 4q$. That $d^i < 4q$ follows from the benefits of a discovery being decreasing in d whenever $d > 4q$ by Lemma 4. \square

Summary Step 1-4. We know that (i) in areas with $X < 4q$, the researcher's distance choice on the deepening area will be d^b , (ii) in areas with $X > 8q$ the researcher's distance choice will be d^i , (iii) in areas with $X \in [4q, 8q]$ the researcher's distance choice may d^i or d^b , but (iv) if the solution is d^i , it has to satisfy $X - d > 4q$ and $d < 4q$. The latter two imply $d < X/2$ in this case.¹⁷

Step 5. Single crossing of the payoffs. Next, we show using three observations that the payoffs, $U_R(d^b; X)$ and $U_R(d^i; X)$, cross only once assuming $\rho(d, X)$ is chosen optimally.

1. At area length X for which $U_R(d^b; X) = U_R(d^i; X)$, the payoff at the boundary solution must be decreasing faster than at the interior solution.
2. On the interval $[4q, 8q]$, the payoff of the boundary solution has a strictly lower second derivative with respect to X for all X than that of the interior solution. Hence, the two values can cross at most once on this interval.
3. $U_R(d^b; X) \leq U_R(d^i; X)$ if $X \geq 8q$.

The first observation follows because the first switch is from the boundary solution to the interior solution by continuous differentiability of all terms and the observation from above that $d^\eta(X) = X/2$ for $X < 4q$. The third observation is shown in Step 3 above.

¹⁷From Lemmata 4, 6 and 7 any interior choice that maximizes V (ignoring cost) satisfies $X - d > 4q$ and $d < 4q$.

The second observation follows from totally differentiating U_R for the two types of local maxima. Using envelope conditions, we obtain that the payoff is concave in the boundary solution and convex in the interior solution which implies the second observation. Define $\varphi(X) := \max_{\rho} u(d = X/2, \rho, X)$ for the boundary; we show in Lemma 31 in Appendix F that $\varphi(X)$ is concave. In Lemma 32 in Appendix F we show that $U_R(X) = \max_{\rho, d} u(d, \rho, X)$ is convex in X provided that the maximizer satisfies $d^\eta(X) < X/2$. The result follows.

Step 6. Asymptotics. It remains to show the asymptotics. As $X \rightarrow \infty$, $V(d, X)$ converges to $V(d, \infty)$ and $\sigma^2(d, X)$ to $\sigma^2(d, \infty)$ and the researcher's optimization on the deepening interval converges to the optimization on the expanding interval which has a unique and interior maximum at $(d^\eta(\infty), \rho^\eta(\infty))$. In particular, if such an interior optimum exists, the envelope condition implies that

$$\frac{dU_R(d^i(X); X)}{dX} = \rho V_X(d^i, X) - \eta \tilde{c}(\rho) \sigma_X^2(d^i, X) < 0$$

as $V_X(d, X) < 0$ according to Lemma 29 in Appendix F for $X > 4q$ and $X - d > 4q$ and $\sigma_X^2(d, X) > 0$. Hence, the payoff of any optimal interior choice decreases in X . \square

\square

A.5 Proof of Proposition 3

We prove the statements in Proposition 3 in reverse order. A side-product of this proof is that we show: $4q < \tilde{X} \leq \tilde{X}^0$, $\dot{X} \approx 4.548q$ and $\hat{X} \leq \hat{X}^0$.

Proof.

Step 1: Proof of Item 3. We use a series of lemmata to show that a local maximum, \tilde{X} , exists (Lemmata 15 and 16) and that it is global (Lemma 17).

Lemma 15. *Fix $d = X/2$ and assume that an interior optimum exists. Then $U_R(X|d = X/2)$ is maximal only if the total differential $\frac{dV(d=X/2;X)}{dX} \geq 0$.*

Proof. Under the assumption that $d = X/2$, $U_R(X)$ is defined and continuously differentiable for all $X \in [0, \infty)$ despite the indicator functions.¹⁸ Because $X = 0$ implies $U_R(X = 0) = 0$, because $U_R(X)$ declines for X large enough and because Lemma 11 holds, there is an interior X at which $U_R(X)$ is maximized.

Then, because $U_R(X)$ is maximal for some interior X and differentiable, it needs to satisfy

$$\frac{\partial U_R}{\partial X} = 0.$$

¹⁸Note that the terms appearing in the indicator functions are of the form $\sqrt{a}(a - 4q)^{3/2}$. Taking the limit of their derivative from above to $4q$ yields zero such that the left and right derivative coincide at the point at which the indicator functions become active.

By assumption, we have $d(\check{X}) = X/2$ and the first-order condition with respect to ρ holds. Thus,

$$\rho \frac{dV(d = X/2; X)}{dX} = \frac{\eta}{4} \tilde{c}(\rho).$$

The right-hand side is non-negative, which implies the desired result.¹⁹ \square

Lemma 16. *The value of the deepening boundary solution $U_R(X; d \equiv \frac{X}{2})$ peaks in X at $\check{X} \in (4q, \check{X}^0]$.*

Proof. Define $\hat{U}_R(X) = U_R(X; d \equiv X/2)$. Note that $\hat{U}'_R(X) > 0$ for $X \in [0, 4q]$. This follows because in this case $\hat{U}_R(X) = \rho \frac{X^2}{12q} - \eta \tilde{c}(\rho) \frac{X}{4}$ and, hence, $\hat{U}'_R(X) = \rho \frac{X}{6q} - \eta \tilde{c}(\rho) \frac{1}{4}$. Using optimality of ρ via the (FOC $^\rho$),

$$\frac{X}{3q} = \eta \tilde{c}_\rho(\rho) \Rightarrow \frac{X}{6q} = \frac{\eta \tilde{c}_\rho(\rho)}{2}$$

which yields

$$\hat{U}'_R(X) = \frac{\tilde{c}_\rho(\rho)}{4} \rho \eta \left(2 - \frac{\tilde{c}(\rho)}{\rho \tilde{c}_\rho(\rho)} \right) > 0$$

where the inequality follows again from the properties of $\tilde{c}(\rho)$.

Moreover, $\hat{U}_R(X)$ is strictly concave on $[4q, 8q]$ as $\hat{V}(X) := V(d = X/2, X)$ is concave by Lemma 30 in Appendix F and $\text{dd}\sigma^2(d = X/2, X)/(\text{d}X \text{d}X) = 0$ implying²⁰

$$\hat{U}''_R(X) = \rho \hat{V}_{XX} < 0.$$

For $X > \check{X}^0$, $\frac{dV(d=X/2; X)}{dX} < 0$ by the definition of \check{X}^0 implying that for $X > \check{X}^0$ the researcher's value increases. By Lemma 15, it follows that the value-maximizing area length $\check{X} \in (4q, \check{X}^0]$. \square

Lemma 17. *The researcher's payoff $U_R(X)$ is single-peaked in X with the maximum attained at \check{X} .*

Proof. The result follows from 3 observations: First, $\check{X} > \check{X} > 4q$ by Lemmata 13 and 16. Second, $V_X(d; X) < 0$ if $X > 4q$ and $d < X/2$ by Lemma 5. Third, by the envelope theorem, if $d^\eta(X) < X/2$ it holds that $\partial U_R(X)/\partial X = \rho^\eta(X) V_X(d^\eta(X); X) - \eta \tilde{c}(\rho^\eta(X)) \sigma_X(d^\eta(X); X) < \rho^\eta(X) V_X(d^\eta(X); X)$. Thus, the payoff of the interior solution cuts the payoff of the boundary solution from below at an area where both payoffs are decreasing. \square

¹⁹The RHS is only 0 if $\eta = 0$, $\rho^\eta(X) = 1$ and $U_R(X) = V(X)$.

²⁰Where $\rho'(x) = 0$ by optimality and the property of the first-order condition.

Step 2. Proof of Item 2.

Step 2.1 Maximum of $d^\eta(X)$ at \tilde{X} . By Lemma 13, $d^\eta(X)$ increases for $X < \tilde{X}$. By Lemma 14, we know that any interior solution d^i is such that $d^i < 4q < X - d^i$ and thus strictly smaller than $X/2$. Thus, $d^\eta(X)$ decreases when it switches from the boundary to an interior solution.

Step 2.2 Maximum of $\rho^\eta(X)$ at \dot{X} . We guess (and verify in step 4. below) that a maximum of $\rho^\eta(X)$ exists in the range $[\hat{X}, \tilde{X}]$, that is the region in which it is optimal to deepen knowledge and to select the mid-point $d = X/2$.

Lemma 18. *Suppose $d = X/2$ is optimal for a range $[\underline{X}, \bar{X}]$ such that $d^\eta(X) = X/2$. Then the optimal $\rho^\eta(X)$ is single-peaked in that range. It is highest at $\dot{X} = \frac{8 \cos(\frac{\pi}{18})}{\sqrt{3}}$*

Proof. By Lemma 15, we know that $\frac{dV(d=X/2; X)}{dX} \geq 0$ and by Lemma 16 $\bar{X} > \hat{X}^0$. Moreover, recall $\sigma^2(d = X/2; X) = X/4$. The first-order condition with respect to ρ becomes

$$\frac{V(X/2; X)}{X} = \frac{\eta}{4} \tilde{c}_\rho(\rho),$$

with

$$\frac{V(X/2; X)}{X} = \frac{X}{12q} - \mathbf{1}_{X > 4q} \frac{(X - 4q)^{3/2}}{\sqrt{X} 6q}.$$

The latter is continuous and concave. Since $\tilde{c}(\rho)$ is an increasing, twice continuously differentiable and convex function, ρ increases in X if and only if $V(X/2; X)/X$ increases in X . By concavity of $V(X/2; X)/X$ that implies single peakedness.

Thus, \dot{X} is independent of η and given by $\dot{X} = \frac{8 \cos(\frac{\pi}{18})}{\sqrt{3}} \approx 4.548q$. \square

Step 3. Proof of Item 1. The following lemma proves the item.

Lemma 19. *\hat{X} exists, $\lim_{X \searrow \hat{X}} \rho^\eta(X) > \rho^\eta(\infty)$, and \hat{X} decreases in η .*

Proof. As $X \rightarrow 0$, $d^\eta(X) \rightarrow 0$ and thus $U_R(X) \rightarrow 0$. By Lemma 12, $U_R(\infty) > 0$. Thus, by continuity of $U_R(X)$, $\exists \hat{X} > 0$ such that expanding research dominates deepening research for all $X < \hat{X}$. Cost are increasing in X and by Corollary 4, $V(d; X \in (\hat{X}^0, \infty)) > V(d; \infty)$ which implies $U_R(X \in (\hat{X}^0, \infty)) > U_R(\infty)$. By Lemma 17 and again continuity of $U_R(X)$, that payoff is maximal at \tilde{X} . Thus, we obtain that \hat{X} exists and that $\hat{X} < \tilde{X}$.

We now show that $\lim_{X \searrow \hat{X}} \rho^\eta(X) > \rho^\eta(\infty)$ holds if $\hat{X} < 6q$, then we show \hat{X} decreases in η which together with the observation that $\hat{X}^0 < 6q$ is sufficient to prove the lemma.

At \hat{X} we have $U_R(\hat{X}) = U_R(\infty)$:

$$\rho(\hat{X})V(\hat{X}/2; \hat{X}) - \eta \tilde{c}(\rho(\hat{X})) \frac{\hat{X}}{4} = \rho^\eta(\infty)V(d^\eta(\infty); \infty) - \eta \tilde{c}(\rho^\eta(\infty))d^\eta(\infty), \quad (5)$$

where the fact that $d(\hat{X}) = \hat{X}/2$ follows from Lemmata 13, 16 and 17. Moreover, the following holds by optimality

$$V(d^\eta(\infty); \infty) = \eta \tilde{c}_\rho(\rho^\eta(\infty)) d^\eta(\infty) \quad (\text{FOC } \rho^\eta(\infty))$$

$$V(\hat{X}/2; \hat{X}/2) = \eta \tilde{c}_\rho(\rho(\hat{X})) \frac{\hat{X}}{4} \quad (\text{FOC } \rho(\hat{X}))$$

Claim 1: $\rho^\eta(\infty) < \rho(\hat{X})$ if $\hat{X} < 6q$. Using (FOC $\rho^\eta(\infty)$) and (FOC $\rho(\hat{X})$) we obtain that by the properties of the error function $\rho(\hat{X}) > \rho^\eta(\infty)$ if and only if

$$4 \frac{V(\hat{X}/2; \hat{X}/2)}{\hat{X}} > \frac{V(d^\eta(\infty); \infty)}{d^\eta(\infty)}.$$

Case 1: $\hat{X} > 4q$. Substituting for the $V(\cdot)$'s the above becomes²¹

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\hat{X}}{3q} - \frac{2}{3q} \frac{(\hat{X} - 4q)^{3/2}}{\sqrt{\hat{X}}} &> 1 - \frac{d^\eta(\infty)}{6q} \\ \Leftrightarrow \quad d^\eta(\infty) + 2\hat{X} - 4 \underbrace{\frac{(\hat{X} - 4q)^{3/2}}{\sqrt{\hat{X}}}}_{< (\hat{X} - 4q)} &> 6q. \end{aligned}$$

A sufficient condition for the above to hold is thus that

$$d^\eta(\infty) - 2\hat{X} + 10q > 0.$$

Using that $d^\eta(\infty) > 2q$ by Lemma 12 we obtain that a sufficient condition for $\rho(\hat{X}) > \rho^\eta(\infty)$ is that $\hat{X} < 6q$.

Case 2: $\hat{X} \in (2q, 4q]$. Performing the same steps only assuming that $\hat{X} \in [2q, 4q]$ the claim holds if and only if

$$\frac{\hat{X}}{3q} > 1 - \frac{d^\eta(\infty)}{6q} \Leftrightarrow 2\hat{X}6q - d^\eta(\infty) > 4q$$

which implies the desired result.

Case 3: $\hat{X} < 2q$. We show that case 3 never occurs, that is $\hat{X} > 2q$. To do so, we compare $U_R(d = 2q; \infty)$ with $U_R(d = 1q; X = 2q)$ and show that the former is always larger. Hence, $X = 2q < \hat{X}$ for any η . For $X = d = 2q$ we have that

$$\frac{X}{3q} = 1 - \frac{d}{6q},$$

and thus $\rho(X = 2q) = \rho(d; \infty) = \rho$ (cf. case 2). Moreover, we have that

$$V(1q; 2q) = q/3 \quad V(2q; \infty) = 4q/3,$$

²¹Since $\hat{X} \leq \tilde{X} \leq 8q$ that case is irrelevant.

and (FOC ρ^X) implies

$$4V(1q; 2q)/2q = 2/3 = \eta \tilde{c}_\rho(\rho)$$

Since $\tilde{c}_\rho(\rho) > \tilde{c}(\rho)/\rho$ for any $\rho > 0$ that implies $\eta \tilde{c}(\rho)/\rho < 2/3$.

Now take

$$\begin{aligned} & U_R(d = 2q; \infty) - U_R(X = 2q) \\ & \quad \rho \frac{4q}{3} - \eta \tilde{c}(\rho) - \rho \frac{q}{3} + \eta \tilde{c}(\rho) \frac{q}{2} \\ & \quad q \left(\rho - \frac{3}{2} \eta \tilde{c}(\rho) \right), \end{aligned}$$

which is positive whenever $\eta \tilde{c}(\rho)/\rho < 2/3$ which we know must hold. Thus, $U_R(d = 2q; \infty) > U_R(X = 2q)$ and therefore $\hat{X} > 2q$.

Claim 2: If $\rho^\eta(\infty) < \rho(\hat{X})$ then \hat{X} decreases in η .

Using (FOC $\rho^\eta(\infty)$) and (FOC $\rho(\hat{X})$) to replace the $V(\cdot)$'s in equation (5) and dividing by η we obtain

$$d^\eta(\infty) (\rho^\eta(\infty) \tilde{c}_\rho(\rho^\eta(\infty)) - \tilde{c}(\rho^\eta(\infty))) = \tilde{X}/4 \left(\rho(\hat{X}) \tilde{c}_\rho(\rho(\hat{X})) - \tilde{c}(\rho(\hat{X})) \right)$$

from which we get

$$\hat{X}/4 = d^\eta(\infty) \frac{(\rho^\eta(\infty) \tilde{c}_\rho(\rho^\eta(\infty)) - \tilde{c}(\rho^\eta(\infty)))}{\left(\rho(\hat{X}) \tilde{c}_\rho(\rho(\hat{X})) - \tilde{c}(\rho(\hat{X})) \right)}.$$

Now we use the envelope theorem to calculate

$$\frac{\partial U_R(\hat{X}) - U_R(\infty)}{\partial \eta} = \tilde{c}(\rho(\hat{X})) \frac{\hat{X}}{4} - \tilde{c}(\rho^\eta(\infty)) d^\eta(\infty).$$

Replacing for \hat{X} implies that the RHS is positive if and only if

$$(\tilde{c}(\rho^\eta(\infty))) - \tilde{c}(\rho(\hat{X})) \frac{\rho^\eta(\infty) \tilde{c}_\rho(\rho^\eta(\infty)) - \tilde{c}(\rho^\eta(\infty))}{\rho(\hat{X}) \tilde{c}_\rho(\rho(\hat{X})) - \tilde{c}(\rho(\hat{X}))} > 0.$$

Using that $\rho \tilde{c}_\rho(\rho) > \tilde{c}(\rho)$ by the properties of the inverse error function and factoring out the denominator of the first term, the above holds if and only if

$$\begin{aligned} & \tilde{c}(\rho^\eta(\infty)) \rho^\eta(\infty) \tilde{c}_\rho(\rho(\hat{X})) - \tilde{c}(\rho(\hat{X})) \rho^\eta(\infty) \tilde{c}_\rho(\rho^\eta(\infty)) > 0 \\ & \quad \frac{\rho(\hat{X}) \tilde{c}_\rho(\rho(\hat{X}))}{\tilde{c}(\rho(\hat{X}))} > \frac{\rho^\eta(\infty) \tilde{c}_\rho(\rho^\eta(\infty))}{\tilde{c}(\rho^\eta(\infty))} \end{aligned}$$

which holds if and only if $\rho(\hat{X}) > \rho^\eta(\infty)$ by the properties of the error function. Thus, \hat{X} decreases if $\rho(\hat{X}) > \rho^\eta(\infty)$.

Conclusion: Since $\hat{X}^0 \in [2q, 6q]$, $\rho^\eta(\infty) < \rho(\hat{X})$ implying that \hat{X} decreases in η . \square

Step 4.

Lemma 20. $\hat{X} < \dot{X} < \check{X} < \tilde{X}$.

Proof. We first show that $\check{X} > \dot{X}$. Then we show the entire order. By the envelope theorem we need for $X = \check{X}$

$$\frac{\partial U_R(\check{X})}{\partial X} = \rho \frac{dV(d = \check{X}/2; \check{X})}{dX} - \frac{\eta}{4} \tilde{c}(\rho) = 0. \quad (6)$$

The FOC for ρ implies

$$\frac{V}{\check{X}} = \frac{\eta}{4} \tilde{c}_\rho(\rho).$$

Now assume for a contradiction that $\rho(\check{X})$ increases, then $V(\cdot)/\check{X}$ must be increasing which holds if and only if

$$\frac{dV(d = \check{X}/2; \check{X})}{dX} \check{X} > V(d = \check{X}/2; \check{X}).$$

But then we obtain the following contradiction to $U_R(\check{X})$ being maximal

$$\frac{dV(d = \check{X}/2; \check{X})}{dX} > \frac{V(d = \check{X}/2; \check{X})}{\check{X}} = \frac{\eta}{4} \tilde{c}_\rho(\rho) > \frac{\eta}{4} \frac{\tilde{c}(\rho)}{\rho}.$$

The first inequality follows because $V(d = \check{X}/2; \check{X})/\check{X}$ must be increasing, the equality follows by equation (6). The last inequality is a consequence of the properties of the inverse error function. By Lemma 18, $\rho^\eta(X)$ is single-peaked in the relevant range which proves the claim.

Ordering. By Lemma 19 we know that $\hat{X} < \hat{X}^0$. Thus, because $\hat{X}^0 < \dot{X} \Rightarrow \hat{X} < \dot{X}$. Moreover, $\tilde{X} > \check{X}$ by Lemma 13 which concludes the proof. \square

\square

A.6 Proof of Proposition 4

Proof. By assumption knowledge is dense, and thus R_1 chooses $d^\eta(\infty)$. We have to show that $\hat{X} < d^\eta(\infty)$ to show that knowledge is dense in $t = 2$. Suppose the opposite holds, then from (FOC $^\rho$) we know

$$\frac{6q - d^\eta(\infty)}{6q} = \frac{V(d^\eta(\infty); \infty)}{\sigma^2(d^\eta(\infty); \infty)} = \eta \tilde{c}_\rho(\rho^\eta(\infty))$$

implying

$$\rho^\eta(\infty) = \text{erf} \left(\sqrt{\frac{W \left(\frac{36q^2 - 12qd^\eta(\infty) + (d^\eta(\infty))^2}{18q^2\eta^2\pi} \right)}{2}} \right),$$

where $W(\cdot)$ is the Lambert W function.

Similarly,

$$\frac{d^\eta(\infty)}{6q} = \frac{V(d^\eta(\infty)/2; d^\eta(\infty))}{\sigma^2(d^\eta(\infty)/2; d^\eta(\infty))} = \eta \tilde{c}_\rho(\rho(d^\eta(\infty)))$$

implying

$$\rho(d^\eta(\infty)) = \text{erf} \left(\sqrt{\frac{W \left(\frac{(d^\eta(\infty))^2}{18q^2\eta^2\pi} \right)}{2}} \right).$$

Because $d^\eta(\infty)$ is linear in q by Lemma 33 in Appendix F and $d^\eta(\infty) < 3q$ by Proposition 2, it follows that $36q^2 - 12qd^\eta(\infty) > 0$ which implies that $\rho^\eta(\infty) > \rho(d^\eta(\infty))$ by the monotonicity of the Lambert W function.

By Lemma 18, we know that $\rho^\eta(X)$ increases for $X < \dot{X} = 8\cos(\pi/18)/\sqrt{3}$. By Lemma 19, we know $\rho(\hat{X}) > \rho^\eta(\infty)$. By Lemma 20, $\hat{X} < \dot{X}$. Thus, $d^\eta(\infty) < \hat{X}$ which implies that if R_1 expands knowledge, so does R_2 . \square

A.7 Proof of Proposition 5

Proof. We begin with the negative benchmark result for $\eta \rightarrow \infty$ and $\eta = 0$.

If $\eta \rightarrow \infty$, research becomes infinitely costly. Hence, $\rho \rightarrow 0$ and $u_R(d^\eta(X); \rho^\eta(X); X) \rightarrow 0$ for any X . Thus, absent interventions, research creates no value. Any disclosure by the designer should maximize the immediate payoff $V(d; \infty)$.

If $\eta = 0$, $\rho^0(\cdot) = 1$ and $u_R(d, \rho^0; X) = V(d; X)$. Thus, each researcher maximizes $V(d; X)$. By construction, maximizing the per-period $V(d; X)$ corresponds to maximizing the long-run objective of the decision maker.

Intermediate Ranges of η . To prove the claim for intermediate ranges, we show that selecting a moonshot of length $6q$ is preferred to selecting the myopically optimal $d = 3q$ for some $(\underline{\eta}, \bar{\eta})$ and $\delta(\eta) < 1$.

We first list the respective data. We restrict attention to η -levels such that $d(6q) = 3q$. These levels exist by continuity of the cost factor and the fact that $\tilde{X}^0 > 6q$ by Lemma 10. MOONSHOT:

- Value in $t = 1$: $V(6q; \infty) = \frac{2}{\sqrt{3}}q$
- Value in $t = 2$ (if successful): $V(3q; 6q) = \left(3 - \frac{2}{\sqrt{3}}\right)q$
- Success probability in $t = 2$: Solution to researcher's first-order condition

$$\frac{4V(3q; 6q)}{6q\eta} = \tilde{c}_\rho(\rho^\eta(6q))$$

implying

$$\rho^\eta(6q) = \text{erf} \left(\sqrt{\frac{W \left(\frac{8}{27\eta^2\pi} (31 - 12\sqrt{3}) \right)}{2}} \right).$$

MYOPIC OPTIMUM:

- Value in $t = 1$: $V(3q; \infty) = \frac{3}{2}q$

- *Value in $t = 2$ (if successful):* $V(d^\eta(\infty); \infty) = d^\eta(\infty) - (d^\eta(\infty))^2/6q$
- *Success Probability in $t = 2$:* Given $d^\eta(\infty)$ it is the solution to

$$\frac{V(d^\eta(\infty); \infty)}{\eta d^\eta(\infty)} = \tilde{c}_\rho(\rho^\eta(\infty))$$

implying

$$\rho^\eta(\infty) = \operatorname{erf} \left(\sqrt{\frac{W \left(\frac{2 \left(\frac{6q - d^\eta(\infty)}{6q\eta} \right)^2}{\pi} \right)}{2}} \right).$$

- *Distance in $t = 2$:* Solution to

$$d^\eta(\infty) = 3q - \eta \frac{\tilde{c}(\rho^\eta(\infty))}{\rho^\eta(\infty)}$$

The values follow from Proposition 1, the first-order conditions are discussed in the proof of Proposition 2.

The moonshot has two benefits: $\rho^\eta(6q) > \rho^\eta(\infty)$, that is, discovery is more likely in period $t = 2$ (by construction and Proposition 3) and $V(3q; 6q) > V(d^\eta(\infty); \infty)$, that is, conditional on a discovery that discovery is more valuable (by Proposition 1). It comes at the cost in the first period as $V(6q; \infty) < V(3q; \infty)$, that is, the first-period discovery is suboptimal (by Corollary 2). The losses of a moonshot in $t = 1$ are

$$\left(3/2 - \frac{2}{\sqrt{3}} \right) q. \quad (7)$$

The relative gains from the moonshot are (in $t = 1$ values)

$$\begin{aligned} & \delta (\rho^\eta(6q)V(3q; 6q) - \rho^\eta(\infty)V(3q; \infty)) \\ &= \delta \left(\rho^\eta(6q) \left(3 - \frac{2}{\sqrt{3}} \right) q - \rho^\eta(\infty) d^\eta(\infty) \left(1 - \frac{d^\eta(\infty)}{6q} \right) \right). \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

By continuity in η and δ it suffices to show that, for $\delta = 1$ and some $\eta > 0$, we have that (7) < (8). (Numerically) solving for $d^\eta(\infty), \rho^\eta(\infty), \rho^\eta(6q)$ using, e.g., $\eta = 1$ verifies that this is the case.²² In Lemma 33 in Appendix F, we show that $d^\eta(\infty)$ is linear in q implying that $\rho^\eta(\infty)$ is constant in q . Linearity of distance and invariance of probability in the moonshot case can directly be observed. Thus, restricting attention to, e.g., $q = 1$ is without loss. \square

²²In this case, $\rho^\eta(6q) = 0.5431, \rho^\eta(\infty) = 0.3587, d^\eta(\infty) = 2.0922$. This yields as benefit of the moonshot: 0.1681.

References

- Aghion, P., M. Dewatripont, and J. C. Stein (2008). “Academic freedom, private-sector focus, and the process of innovation”. *RAND J of Economics* 39 (3), pp. 617–635.
- Akerlof, G. A. and P. Michailat (2018). “Persistence of false paradigms in low-power sciences”. *PNAS* 115 (52), pp. 13228–13233.
- Andrews, I. and M. Kasy (2019). “Identification of and Correction for Publication Bias”. *American Economic Review* 109 (8), pp. 2766–94.
- Antón, M., F. Ederer, M. Giné, and M. C. Schmalz (2021). “Innovation: the bright side of common ownership?” *mimeo*.
- Azoulay, P., J. S. Graff Zivin, and G. Manso (2011). “Incentives and creativity: evidence from the academic life sciences”. *RAND J of Economics* 42 (3), pp. 527–554.
- Bardhi, A. (2022). “Attributes: Selective Learning and Influence”. *mimeo*.
- Bardhi, A. and N. Bobkova (2022). “Local Evidence and Diversity in Minipublics”. *Journal of Political Economy* forthcoming.
- Benzell, S. G. and E. Brynjolfsson (2019). “Digital abundance and scarce genius: Implications for wages, interest rates, and growth”. *mimeo*.
- Bobtcheff, C., J. Bolte, and T. Mariotti (2017). “Researcher’s Dilemma”. *The Review of Economic Studies* 84 (3), pp. 969–1014.
- Bourguignon, J.-P. (2019). *Conditions for Building a Successful Global Scientific World*. International symposium for the CNRS 80th anniversary. URL: <https://erc.europa.eu/news/conditions-building-successful-global-scientific-world>.
- Bramoullé, Y. and G. Saint-Paul (2010). “Research cycles”. *Journal of Economic Theory* 145 (5), pp. 1890–1920.
- Brunner, P., I. Letina, and A. Schmutzler (2022). “Research joint ventures: The role of financial constraints”. *mimeo*.
- Bryan, K. A. and J. Lemus (2017). “The direction of innovation”. *Journal of Economic Theory* 172, pp. 247–272.
- Bush, V. (1945). *Science—The Endless frontier*. Report to the President—Letter of Transmittal. URL: <https://www.nsf.gov/od/lpa/nsf50/vbush1945.htm>.
- Callander, S. (2011). “Searching and learning by trial and error”. *American Economic Review* 101 (6), pp. 2277–2308.
- Callander, S. and T. S. Clark (2017). “Precedent and doctrine in a complicated world”. *The American Political Science Review* 111 (1), pp. 184–203.
- Callander, S. and P. Hummel (2014). “Preemptive policy experimentation”. *Econometrica* 82 (4), pp. 1509–1528.

- Callander, S., N. Lambert, and N. Matouschek (2021). “The power of referential advice”. *Journal of Political Economy* 129 (11), pp. 3073–3140.
- (2022). “Innovation and Competition on a Rugged Technological Landscape”. *mimeo*.
- Callander, S. and N. Matouschek (2019). “The risk of failure: Trial and error learning and long-run performance”. *AEJ:Micro* 11 (1), pp. 44–78.
- Dominici, D. (2008). “Some properties of the inverse error function”. *Tapas in Experimental Mathematics*: ed. by T. Amdeberhan and V. H. Moll. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, pp. 191–203.
- Fortunato, S., C. T. Bergstrom, K. Börner, J. A. Evans, D. Helbing, S. Milojević, A. M. Petersen, F. Radicchi, R. Sinatra, B. Uzzi, A. Vespignani, L. Waltman, D. Wang, and A.-L. Barabási (2018). “Science of science”. *Science* 359 (6379).
- Frankel, A. and M. Kasy (2022). “Which findings should be published?” *AEJ:Micro* 14 (1), pp. 1–38.
- Frankel, A. P., J. L. Krieger, D. Li, and D. Papanikolaou (2023). “Evaluation and Learning in R&D Investment”. *mimeo*.
- Garfagnini, U. and B. Strulovici (2016). “Social Experimentation with Interdependent and Expanding Technologies”. *Review of Economic Studies* 83 (4), pp. 1579–1613.
- Heckman, J. J. and S. Moktan (2020). “Publishing and Promotion in Economics: The Tyranny of the Top Five”. *Journal of Economic Literature* 58 (2), pp. 419–70.
- Hill, R. and C. Stein (2020). “Scooped! Estimating Rewards for Priority in Science”. *mimeo*.
- (2021). “Race to the Bottom: Competition and Quality in Science”. *mimeo*.
- Hopenhayn, H. and F. Squintani (2021). “On the direction of innovation”. *Journal of Political Economy* 129 (7), pp. 1991–2022.
- Jaffe, A. B., M. S. Fogarty, and B. A. Banks (2003). “Evidence from Patents and Patent Citations on the Impact of NASA and Other Federal Labs on Commercial Innovation”. *The Journal of Industrial Economics* 46 (2), pp. 183–205.
- Jovanovic, B. and R. Rob (1990). “Long waves and short waves: Growth through intensive and extensive search”. *Econometrica*, pp. 1391–1409.
- Kim, S. (2023). “Shortcuts to Innovation: The Use of Analogies in Knowledge Production”. *mimeo*.
- Kuhn, T. S. (1962). *The structure of scientific revolutions*. University of Chicago Press.
- Letina, I. (2016). “The road not taken: competition and the R&D portfolio”. *RAND J of Economics* 47 (2), pp. 433–460.
- Letina, I. and A. Schmutzler (2019). “Inducing variety: A theory of innovation contests”. *International economic review* 60 (4), pp. 1757–1780.
- Letina, I., A. Schmutzler, and R. Seibel (2023). “Killer acquisitions and beyond: policy effects on innovation strategies”. *mimeo*.

- Liang, A. and X. Mu (2020). “Complementary Information and Learning Traps”. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 135 (1), pp. 389–448.
- Medawar, P. B. (1967). *The Art of the Soluble Creativity and Originality in Science*. London: Penguin Books.
- Moser, P., A. Voena, and F. Waldinger (2014). “German Jewish Émigrés and US Invention”. *American Economic Review* 104 (10), pp. 3222–55.
- Myers, K. (2020). “The elasticity of science”. *AEJ:Applied* 12 (4), pp. 103–34.
- Nagaraj, A. and M. Tranchero (2023). “How Does Data Access Shape Science? Evidence from the Impact of US Census’s Research Data Centers on Economics Research”. *mimeo*.
- Prendergast, C. (2019). “Creative Fields”. *mimeo*.
- Rzhetsky, A., J. G. Foster, I. T. Foster, and J. A. Evans (2015). “Choosing experiments to accelerate collective discovery”. *PNAS* 112 (47), pp. 14569–14574.
- Sterling, T. D. (1959). “Publication decisions and their possible effects on inferences drawn from tests of significance—or vice versa”. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 54 (285), pp. 30–34.
- Urgun, C. and L. Yariv (2023). “Contiguous Search: Exploration and Ambition on Uncharted Terrain”. *mimeo*.

Online Appendix

B Different Universe of Questions

Our baseline model assumes that the universe of questions can be represented on the real line. That is, we implicitly assume an order on questions. In this part, we show that all our results extend to a more general question space.

To begin with, consider our baseline model and fix some knowledge \mathcal{F}_m . As described in Section 2, knowledge pins down \mathcal{X}_k —a set composed of (half-)open intervals: bounded intervals $[x_i, x_{i+1})$ of length X_i each, and two unbounded intervals $(-\infty, x_1)$ and $[x_k, \infty)$ of length ∞ . As we describe in Propositions 1 to 3, we can determine the benefits and cost of every new discovery to both researcher and decision maker by replacing the exact identity of the question x with the tuple (d, X) , that is, through the distance of the question x to existing knowledge and the length of the research area in which x lies.

Now, consider any set $\hat{\mathcal{X}}_m = \hat{\mathcal{X}}_k \cup \hat{\mathcal{X}}_n$ that contains $k + n$ elements: $k \geq 0$ convex-valued and bounded intervals on \mathbb{R} with Euclidean distance between its upper and lower bound, $X_{i \in \hat{\mathcal{X}}_k}$, and $n > 0$ convex-valued but unbounded intervals on \mathbb{R} of infinite length, $X_{i \in \hat{\mathcal{X}}_n} = \infty$. For any tuple (d, X) with $X \in \hat{\mathcal{X}}_m$ and $d \in [0, X/2]$ all our definitions and expressions for benefits and cost are well-defined regardless of how $\hat{\mathcal{X}}_m$ was generated.

For any given set $\hat{\mathcal{X}}_m$ generated by some existing knowledge \mathcal{F}_m , suppose that the truth-generating process Y is such that the answer to question x characterized by (d, X) is normally distributed with a variance of $\sigma^2(d; X)$.²³ Then, all of our results continue to hold.

Using this formulation, it becomes clear which formal requirements we impose on the set of questions: (i) There are no circular paths in the set of questions $\hat{\mathcal{X}}_m$, (ii) the set of questions is piecewise convex-valued, (iii) there is at least one unbounded area. One way to interpret these requirements is to assume a forest network in which the set of nodes represents knowledge and each edge represents an area. We augment this network with (at least) one “frontier”—a standard Wiener process, and define Brownian bridges over each edge of the network.

We now describe two specific extensions to our baseline setting to illustrate the abstract discussion above.

B.1 Generalization to a Multidimensional Universe of Questions

Here, we show a mapping from a model with an n —dimensional question space. Suppose that the set of research questions consists of n real lines, $\mathcal{I} = \{I_1, \dots, I_n\}$. In addition, the answers on each of these real lines are determined by a realized path of a one-dimensional standard Brownian motion, such that the truth-generating process is an n -dimensional independent Brownian motion $W_z = (W_z^1, \dots, W_z^n)$.²⁴ Suppose $\mathcal{F}_{j(i)}^i$ is the finite set of $j(i)$ known realizations of the Brownian path in dimension i and $\mathcal{F}_k = \cup_{i=1}^n \mathcal{F}_{j(i)}^i$ is

²³Note that the dependence of the variance of the conjecture depends only on d and X . Thus, the truth-generating process has to satisfy a Markov property as the Brownian motion on the real line in our main model. Moreover, note that the specification of the expected value of the answer is not relevant for our results as long as it is well-defined given \mathcal{F}_m .

²⁴Each process starts at an initial point $(0, 0)$, has a drift of zero, a variance of one, and independent, normal increments.

knowledge. As described in Section 2, each $\mathcal{F}_{j(i)}^i$ determines a partition of the domain of W_z^i denoted by $\mathcal{X}_{j(i)}^i$ with $j(i) + 1$ elements. As in the baseline case, the knowledge in dimension i decomposes the dimension- i process into $j(i) - 1$ independent Brownian bridges each associated with a length X_l^i , $l = \{1, \dots, j(i) - 1\}$ and two independent Brownian motions. Therefore, the union \mathcal{F}_k determines $k = (\sum_{i=1}^n j(i)) - n$ independent Brownian bridges of length X_l^i each and $2n$ Brownian motions. By the martingale property of the Brownian motion and the fact that realizations are not directly payoff relevant, the setting is isomorphic to one in which we have k independent *standard* Brownian bridges of length X_l^i each and $2n$ *standard* Brownian motions. Thus, the set $\hat{\mathcal{X}}_k = \{X_{l(i)}^i\} \cup \{\infty\}$ is a sufficient statistic to calculate any of the results in the text. However, the set $\hat{\mathcal{X}}_k = \{X_{l(i)}^i\} \cup \{\infty\}$ can also be generated with an appropriate realized path of a one-dimensional Brownian motion with a corresponding \mathcal{F}_k .

B.2 Seminal Discoveries

We conclude this part by presenting a model with *seminal discoveries*—discoveries that open new fields of research—that builds on the multidimensional universe of questions described above. For example, Friedrich Miescher’s isolation of the “nuclein” in 1869 was initially intended to contribute to the study of neutrophils, yet, in addition, it opened up the new and, to a large extent, orthogonal field of DNA biochemistry.

Formally, consider the following model of the evolution of knowledge. Initially, there is a single field of research A and a single known question-answer pair, $(x_0, y(x_0)) = (0, 0)$. The set of all questions in field A is known to be one-dimensional and represented by \mathbb{R} . The truth is known to be generated by a standard Brownian path Y passing through $(0, 0)$. However, with an exogenous probability $p \in [0, 1]$ any discovery $(x, y(x))$ is *seminal* and opens a new, independent field of research B_x . A seminal discovery is a question-answer pair $(x, y(x))$ that is an element of two independent Brownian paths crossing only at $(x, y(x))$. Thus, upon occurrence, a seminal discovery generates knowledge in multiple dimensions. Because it is a priori unknown whether a discovery is seminal, the payoff from generating knowledge in another dimension is constant in expected terms—it does not influence a researcher’s (or designer’s) choices. After the seminal discovery, the updated model of truth and knowledge is the one described above with the multi-dimensional universe of questions. As we argued above, that model can, in turn, be mapped into our baseline. The special case with $p = 0$ is our baseline model.

It should become clear from our discussion that even the case in which the probability of a seminal discovery depends on the question is qualitatively similar to what we discuss in the baseline model. The quantitative differences in such a model come from the fact that questions which are likely to be a seminal discovery are more attractive to address for all parties involved.

C The Cost of Research and Proof of Lemma 1

In this section, we provide a detailed derivation of the cost of research. Lemma 1 is a corollary to the results we obtain. The cost implies an endogenous measure of the productivity of research. We model research as sampling a set of candidate answers to question x with the goal of discovering the actual answer, $y(x)$.

Formally, we assume that, conditional on a question x , the sampling decision consists of selecting an interval $[a, b] \in \mathbb{R}$. If the true answer lies inside the chosen interval, such




Figure 9: *Cost of research and interference.* The dotted vertical lines represent the 95% prediction intervals for the answers to questions $x = -0.2$ and $x' = 0.2$, assuming the answer to questions 0 and -0.4 are known. Both x and x' have distance $d = 0.2$ to existing knowledge. However, the 95% prediction interval at question x is shorter because the variance is smaller because researching $x = -0.2$ deepens knowledge. Research on question $x = 0.2$ expands knowledge, which implies a larger variance.

that $y(x) \in [a, b]$, research succeeds and a discovery is made. If $y(x) \notin [a, b]$, research fails and no discovery is made. Thus, the choice of the research interval entails an ex-ante probability of successful research. Restricting the sampling decision to a single interval $[a, b]$ comes without loss for our purposes, as conjectures $G_x(y|\mathcal{F}_k)$ follow a normal distribution.

We now characterize the cost of research in terms of the three variables of interest: the research area, X , the novelty of the question, d , and the expected output, ρ .

We begin by defining a prediction interval.

Definition 4 (Prediction Interval). The prediction interval $\alpha(x, \rho)$ is the shortest interval $[a, b] \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ such that the answer to question x is in the interval $[a, b]$ with probability ρ .

Next, we describe the prediction interval $\alpha(x, \rho)$ based on the conjecture $G_x(y|\mathcal{F}_k)$.

Proposition 6. Suppose $\alpha(x, \rho)$ is the prediction interval for probability ρ and question x when answer $y(x)$ is normally distributed with mean μ and standard deviation σ . Then, any prediction interval has the following two features:

1. The interval is centered around μ .
2. The length of the prediction interval is $2^{3/2} \text{erf}^{-1}(\rho) \sigma$, where erf^{-1} is the inverse of the Gaussian error function.

Proof. The normal distribution is symmetric around the mean with a density decreasing in both directions starting from the mean. It follows directly that the smallest interval that contains the realization with a particular likelihood is centered around the mean.

Take an interval $[z_l, z_r]$ of length $Z < \infty$ that is symmetric around the mean μ and let it be such that it contains a total mass of $\rho < 1$ in the interval. Then, a probability mass of $(1 - \rho)/2$ lies to the left of the interval by symmetry of the normal distribution. Moreover, the left bound z_l of the interval has (by symmetry of the interval around the mean μ) a distance $\mu - Z/2$ from the mean. From the properties of the normal distribution,

$$\Phi(z_l) = 1/2 \left(1 + \text{erf} \left(\frac{z_l - \mu}{\sigma \sqrt{2}} \right) \right) = 1/2 \left(1 + \text{erf} \left(\frac{-Z/2}{\sigma \sqrt{2}} \right) \right).$$

Solving, using the symmetry of erf , yields

$$1/2 \left(1 - \text{erf} \left(\frac{Z}{\sigma 2^{3/2}} \right) \right) = \frac{1 - \rho}{2}$$

or equivalently

$$\text{erf} \left(\frac{Z}{\sigma 2^{3/2}} \right) = \rho \Leftrightarrow Z = 2^{3/2} \text{erf}^{-1}(\rho) \sigma. \quad \square$$

The properties of the prediction interval can be seen in the figures depicting the Brownian path. The dashed lines depict the $\rho = 95\%$ prediction interval (as, for example, in Figure 9). Figure 9 indicates that the prediction interval depends on the location of the question. Two questions with the same distance from existing knowledge (that is, distance from question $x = 0$) have different 95% prediction intervals depending on whether research deepens knowledge or expands it. That difference translates into different costs.

Proposition 6 implies that if the cost function is homogeneous of any degree in interval length $(b - a)$, we can represent it with an alternative cost function proportional to $c(\rho, d, X)$ that is multiplicatively separable in (d, X) and ρ without having to keep track of the exact location of the search interval $[a, b]$, which proves to be convenient.

It also implies that, fixing ρ , the changes in the cost with respect to novelty d and area length X vary in their effect on $\sigma(d; X)$ only. Similarly, holding distance and area length constant, changes in ρ translate into cost changes according to a function of $\text{erf}^{-1}(\rho)$ —a convex increasing function.

Proposition 6 intuitively links the cost of research effort to the probability of a discovery. Because the inverse error function is increasing and convex, the cost of finding an answer with probability ρ is increasing and convex in ρ . Discovering an answer with certainty implies an infinitely large interval; short of certainty, there is always a chance that the answer is outside the sampled interval.

Importantly, Proposition 6 also links output and novelty: for a given level of effort, the probability of success depends on the precision of the conjecture about a question. Research on a more novel question inside the same research area with the same level of effort entails a higher risk.

In the paper we assume, that cost to be proportional to $(a - b)^2$. As should be clear from Proposition 6, the quadratic formulation is for convenience only. What matters for our results qualitatively is that the cost is (i) homogeneous, (ii) increasing, and (iii) convex in the sampling interval $(a - b)$. Under the quadratic assumption, the cost function is characterized by a simple corollary to Proposition 6—Lemma 1.

Corollary 5. *For knowledge \mathcal{F}_k , probability ρ , and question x , the minimal cost of obtaining an answer to question x with probability ρ is proportional to*

$$c(\rho, d; X) = \tilde{c}(\rho) \sigma^2(d; X).$$

D Research Funding

In this section, we consider a simple model of research funding from the perspective of a budget-constrained funder that could be applied to our setting both with a dynamic and a myopic objective.

In the main text, we abstract from any additional incentives provided to the researchers beyond the static value of her discovery. Instead, we focus on the effects that an exogenous

moonshot has on the evolution of knowledge. We now turn to the incentive provision problem. As our analysis is—in part—motivated by the emphasis on scientific freedom, we assume that a funding institution respects scientific freedom.²⁵

We begin with a discussion of myopically optimal funding. After that, we turn to forward-looking funding. Throughout, we consider a funding system with two instruments: *ex-ante cost reductions* (for example, through grants) and *ex-post rewards* (for example, through prizes). Cost reductions are reductions of the agent’s cost parameter η . In particular, the agent’s initial cost parameter is η^0 and a cost reduction of h leads to a new cost parameter $\eta = \eta^0 - h$. Rewards are an ex-post utility transfer of ζ toward the agent. We assume that rewards are provided for pathbreaking contributions. The more difficult and novel the problem, the larger the chance of receiving a reward. We proxy the ex-post relation by the function $f(\sigma_{\mathcal{F}_k}) : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow [0, 1]$. It determines the probability of receiving a reward. To keep the funding scheme as simple as possible, we assume a piecewise linear relation:

$$f(\sigma) = \begin{cases} \frac{\sigma^2}{s} & \text{if } \sigma^2 < s \\ 1 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

for some $s \geq 4q$. That is, we assume that the marginal probability of obtaining the reward is constant and positive in difficulty (in terms of variance) up to some level s . Beyond s , the marginal probability drops to 0.²⁶ The parameter restriction on s is to simplify the proofs only.

Further, we assume that the funder is budget constrained and cannot invest more than K in the funding scheme. The relative price of cost reductions is κ such that the funder’s budget constraint is

$$K = \zeta + \kappa h.$$

We assume that $\kappa > K/\eta^0$ implying that the funder cannot eliminate the cost of research entirely with her budget. To simplify our discussion, we consider a dense existing knowledge such that the researcher, for any $\eta > 0$, will expand knowledge.

The Feasible Set. Based on this budget constraint, we determine the set of novelty and output combinations the funder can implement with some funding scheme given the parameters (K, κ, s, η^0) . The construction is based on the researcher’s optimal choice given the funding mix (h, ζ) , which is based on the solution to the researcher’s problem

$$\max_{d, \rho} \rho \left(V(d; \infty) + \frac{\sigma^2(d; \infty)}{s} \zeta \right) - \eta \tilde{c}(\rho) \sigma^2(d; \infty).$$

Because the funder is budget constrained, any funding choice implies an output $\rho < 1$ bounded away from a guaranteed success. The funder, therefore, chooses her preferred implementable combination (ρ, d) in the feasible set determined by the parameters (K, κ, s) .

Definition 5. The *research-possibility frontier* $d(\rho; K)$ describes the largest distance a funder with budget K can implement for a given level of ρ .

²⁵The NIH, for example, awards most grants via investigator-initiated competitions without a specific research topic suggested. For an empirical investigation of the effects of the alternative, “Request for Applications” grants, on researchers’ choices, see Myers (2020). Azoulay et al. (2011) show that long-term grants guaranteeing freedom of research impact researchers’ choices.

²⁶In Appendix D.1, we also discuss an alternative, non-linear reward technology, $f(\sigma^2) = 1 - e^{-s\sigma^2}$.

Proposition 7. For any budget $K < \kappa\eta^0$, there is an $s(K) < \infty$ such that whenever $s > s(K)$, all funding schemes imply novelty $d < s$. Moreover,

if $s > s(K)$. The set of implementable (d, ρ) combinations for a given cost ratio κ and budget K is described by the research-possibility frontier $d(\rho; K)$ defined over $[\underline{\rho}, \bar{\rho}]$, where $\underline{\rho}$ and $\bar{\rho}$ are the endogenous upper and lower bounds of ρ . These bounds are determined by the extreme funding schemes $(\zeta = 0, \eta = \eta^0 - K/\kappa)$ and $(\zeta = K, \eta = \eta^0)$. The research-possibility frontier is

$$d(\rho; K) = 6q(K + s - \kappa\eta^0) \frac{\rho\tilde{c}_\rho(\rho) - \tilde{c}(\rho)}{2s\rho\tilde{c}_\rho(\rho) - s\tilde{c}(\rho) - \kappa\rho}. \quad (9)$$

if $s < s(K)$. Whenever the researcher's choice given (ζ, η) is such that $d \neq s$, then (9) describes the relation between $d(\rho)$. Moreover, there is a $\xi > 0$ such that $d \neq s$ for $\zeta < \xi$.²⁷

Proof.

Part 1. Existence of $s(K)$ and ξ .

Step 1. $d \leq s$, interior $d \leq 4q$, and continuity. First notice that $\zeta f(\sigma^2)$ is constant if $d \geq s$. Because $s > 3q$ by assumption it follows from Lemma 12 that the optimal novelty $d^* \leq s$. Moreover, by Proposition 2, $d \leq 3q$ if $\zeta = 0$. The researcher's problem is

$$U_R(d, \rho) = \rho \left(V(3q; \infty) + \frac{\sigma^2(3q; \infty)}{s} \right) - \eta c(\rho(3q; s)\sigma^2(3q; \infty))$$

We can re-write the researcher's problem substituting from the budget constraint as

$$\max_{d, \rho} \rho \left(V(d; \infty) + \frac{\sigma^2(d; \infty)}{s} \zeta \right) - \left(\eta - \frac{K - \zeta}{\kappa} \right) \tilde{c}(\rho) \sigma^2(d; \infty)$$

which is continuous in ζ for any (d, ρ) . Thus, its maximum is continuous too.

Note that by Lemma 28, $V_d < 0, V_{dd} > 0$ for $d > 4q$. Thus, if an interior solution exists, it must be such that $d \leq 4q$. Suppose otherwise and that an interior solution with $d \in (4q, s)$ exists with corresponding ρ . Then, the researcher can increase her payoff by marginally increasing d and keeping ρ constant. By the first-order condition with respect to d , $V_d + \zeta/s - \eta\tilde{c}(\rho)/\rho = 0$. Therefore, a marginal increase of d increases the payoff as $V_{dd} > 0$ implies that $V_d(d + \varepsilon) > V_d(d)$ while all other terms remain the same. Thus, any interior $d \leq 4q$.

Step 2. Existence of ξ . Again, because $s \geq 3q$ and Lemma 12, for $\zeta = 0$, it holds that

$$U_R(d^\infty, \rho(d^\infty)) > U_R(s, \rho(s)),$$

with d^∞ the arg max in d . Because both terms are continuous in ζ , the inequality has to hold in a positive neighborhood of $\zeta = 0$.

Define ξ to be $\min_{\zeta \leq K} \{\zeta : U_R(d^\infty, \rho(d^\infty)) = U_R(s, \rho(s))\}$ if it exists or $\xi := K$ otherwise. Then, by definition of ξ and continuity, for $\zeta \in [0, \xi]$, $d < s$.

Step 3. Existence of $s(K)$. As $s \rightarrow \infty$ the researcher's payoff assuming $d = s$ goes to q . To see this fix ζ, η and consider the researcher's problem assuming $d = s$ and let $s \rightarrow \infty$.

²⁷If $d=s$, then ρ is the unique solution to $\frac{V(s; \infty) + \zeta}{\eta s} = c_\rho(\rho)$.

By construction, $f(\sigma^2) = 1$ and, by Proposition 1, $\lim_{s \rightarrow \infty} V(s; \infty) \rightarrow q$. Because $\sigma^2 \rightarrow \infty$ the optimal $\rho(s) \rightarrow 0$ and so does U_R . By Lemma 12, the researcher's payoff assuming $f(\cdot) \equiv 0$ is positive for any $\eta < \infty$ with some $d^\infty \leq 3q$. Thus, for $\zeta > 0$ and $f(\cdot) > 0$, the payoff for the distance defined in Lemma 12 is strictly larger than for $d = s$. Continuity implies that there is an $\bar{s} > 0$ such that for any $s > \bar{s}$, $d^\infty \leq 4q$ is optimal by step 1.

Note that the cutoff s depends on K . First observe that for any K , $s(K) \leq \bar{s}$. However, observe that for $K = 0$, $d < 3q$ by Lemma 12 and by continuity $s(K) = 0$ in a positive neighborhood of $K = 0$.

Part 2. Proof of relationship (9). We make use of the Marginal Rate of Substitution (MRS) between ζ and η for the probability ρ and the distance d . The MRS describes the slope of the iso- ρ curve and the iso- d curve, respectively, in the (η, ζ) -space.

Step 0. Defining the MRS. The MRS for ρ is

$$MRS_{\zeta\eta}^\rho := -\frac{\frac{\partial \rho}{\partial \eta}}{\frac{\partial \rho}{\partial \zeta}},$$

and $MRS_{\zeta\eta}^d$ analogously.

Lemma 21.

$$MRS_{\zeta\eta}^\rho = s(2\tilde{c}_\rho(\rho) - \tilde{c}(\rho)/\rho), \quad (10)$$

and

$$MRS_{\zeta\eta}^d = \tilde{c}_\rho \frac{\tilde{c}/\rho - \tilde{c}_\rho + \frac{\tilde{c}}{\tilde{c}_\rho} \tilde{c}_{\rho\rho}}{\tilde{c}/\rho - \tilde{c}_\rho + \rho \tilde{c}_{\rho\rho}}. \quad (11)$$

Proof. For any (η, ζ) the system of first-order conditions for a non-boundary choice is given by

$$\begin{aligned} V_d(d, \infty) + \zeta \sigma_d^2(d, \infty)/s &= \eta \tilde{c}(\rho)/\rho \\ \frac{V(d, \infty) + \zeta \sigma_d^2(d, \infty)/s}{d} &= \eta \tilde{c}_\rho(\rho) \end{aligned}$$

For an interior optimal choice of (d, ρ) , we obtain using $\sigma^2(d, X) = d$, $\sigma_d^2(d, X) = 1$ and $\sigma_{dd}^2(d, X) = 0$

$$\begin{pmatrix} \frac{dd}{d\eta} \\ \frac{dd}{d\zeta} \\ \frac{d\rho}{d\eta} \\ \frac{d\rho}{d\zeta} \end{pmatrix} = -\frac{1}{\det(\mathcal{H})} \begin{pmatrix} d(\tilde{c}_\rho(V_d + \zeta/s - \eta \tilde{c}_\rho) + \eta \tilde{c} \tilde{c}_{\rho\rho}) \\ -d(V_d + \zeta/s - \eta \tilde{c}_\rho + \rho \eta \tilde{c}_{\rho\rho}) \\ -\rho \sigma^2 \tilde{c}_\rho V_{dd} + \tilde{c}(V_d + \zeta/s - \eta \tilde{c}_\rho) \\ -\rho/s(V_d + \zeta/s - \eta \tilde{c}_\rho - dV_{dd}) \end{pmatrix}$$

where $\det(\mathcal{H})$ is the determinant of the Hessian matrix of the objective function which is

given by

$$-\eta\sigma^2\tilde{c}_{\rho\rho}\rho V_{dd} - (V_d + \zeta/s - \eta\tilde{c}_\rho)^2 > 0.$$

Note that the determinant of the Hessian matrix for a local maximum is positive as the Hessian is negative semidefinite and the first principal minor $-\eta\tilde{c}_{\rho\rho}\sigma^2 < 0$ by convexity of the inverse error function.²⁸

It follows that the sign of the derivatives are determined only by the negative of the sign of the respective terms in the matrix. Using the first-order conditions to rewrite these equations yields

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{dd}{d\eta} &= -\frac{d\eta}{\det(\mathcal{H})} \left(\tilde{c}_\rho \left(\frac{\tilde{c}}{\rho} - \tilde{c}_\rho \right) + \tilde{c}\tilde{c}_{\rho\rho} \right) < 0 \\ \frac{dd}{d\zeta} &= \frac{d\eta}{\det(\mathcal{H})} \left(\frac{\tilde{c}}{\rho} - \tilde{c}_\rho + \rho\tilde{c}_{\rho\rho} \right) > 0\end{aligned}$$

where the inequalities hold due to the properties of the inverse error function.

$$\frac{d\rho}{d\eta} = -\frac{\rho\eta}{\det(\mathcal{H})} (2\tilde{c}_\rho - \tilde{c}/\rho) (\tilde{c}_\rho - \tilde{c}/\rho) < 0$$

where we have used that $\sigma^2 V_{dd} = -\frac{d}{3q}$ and from the first-order conditions we know that $\frac{d}{3q} = 2\eta(\tilde{c}_\rho - \tilde{c}/\rho)$. The properties of \tilde{c} imply that $\tilde{c}_\rho > \tilde{c}/\rho$. Finally,

$$\frac{d\rho}{d\zeta} = \frac{\rho\eta/s}{\det(\mathcal{H})} (\tilde{c}_\rho - \tilde{c}/\rho) > 0$$

where the analogous reasoning as for the previous inequality applies. To conclude, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{dd}{d\eta} &< 0 & \frac{dd}{d\zeta} &> 0 \\ \frac{d\rho}{d\eta} &< 0 & \frac{d\rho}{d\zeta} &> 0.\end{aligned}$$

We obtain for the marginal rate of substitution between ζ and η on the expanding interval

$$-\frac{\frac{d\rho}{d\eta}}{\frac{d\rho}{d\zeta}} = MRS_{\zeta\eta}^\rho = s(2\tilde{c}_\rho - \tilde{c}/\rho)$$

where we used the simplifications from above.

Similarly, we obtain

$$-\frac{\frac{dd}{d\eta}}{\frac{dd}{d\zeta}} = MRS_{\zeta\eta}^d = \tilde{c}_\rho \frac{\tilde{c}/\rho - \tilde{c}_\rho + \frac{\tilde{c}}{\tilde{c}_\rho}\tilde{c}_{\rho\rho}}{\tilde{c}/\rho - \tilde{c}_\rho + \rho\tilde{c}_{\rho\rho}}. \quad \square$$

Step 1. Deriving the Research Possibility Frontier. Note that because rewards do not increase beyond s and $s > 3q$, the researcher is never selecting a distance $d > s$.

²⁸In our case, one can actually show that this has to hold given that $d < \infty$. Plugging in from the first-order conditions yields

$$\eta^2(\tilde{c}_\rho - \tilde{c}/\rho)2(\rho\tilde{c}_{\rho\rho} - \tilde{c}_\rho + \tilde{c}/\rho) > 0$$

where the inequality follows from the properties of \tilde{c} .

Assuming $d < s$, we can use the two first-order conditions of the researcher and solve for ζ and η . We obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\eta &= \frac{d}{6q} \frac{\rho}{\rho\tilde{c}_\rho - \tilde{c}} \\ \zeta &= \left(\frac{d}{3q} - 1 + \frac{d}{6q} \frac{\tilde{c}}{\rho\tilde{c}_\rho - \tilde{c}} \right) s.\end{aligned}\tag{12}$$

Replacing in $MRS_{\zeta\eta}^\rho$ and $MRS_{\zeta\eta}^d$ we observe that any (ρ, d) can be implemented through at most one (η, ζ) -combination because each iso- ρ curve crosses each iso- d curve at most once: both slopes (the respective MRS) are positive and $MRS_{\zeta\eta}^\rho > MRS_{\zeta\eta}^d$ if $s > 0.1$ by the properties of $\tilde{c}(\rho)$.

Plugging $h = \eta^0 - \eta$ as well as conditions (12) into the budget line, $K = \zeta + \kappa h$, and solving for d yields the interior solution

$$d(\rho) = 6q(K + s - \kappa\eta^0) \frac{\rho\tilde{c}_\rho(\rho) - \tilde{c}(\rho)}{2s\rho\tilde{c}_\rho(\rho) - s\tilde{c}(\rho) - \kappa\rho}.\tag{13}$$

The minimum then constitutes the research possibility frontier.

Step 2. Deriving the bounds $\underline{\rho}$, $\bar{\rho}$.

Step 2.1. Assuming $s > s(K)$.

Recall from the proof of Proposition 2 that

$$d^\infty = 3q \left(1 - \frac{\tilde{c}(\rho)}{2\tilde{c}_\rho(\rho)\rho - \tilde{c}(\rho)} \right).$$

Replacing d in its first order condition (FOC^d) (equation (4) on page 32) yields

$$\underline{\eta}(\rho) = \frac{\rho}{(2\rho\tilde{c}_\rho(\rho) - \tilde{c}(\rho))}$$

which describes the largest cost parameter $\underline{\eta}(\rho)$ (assuming $\zeta = 0$) that implies a probability ρ selected by the researcher. The parameter $\underline{\eta}$ is decreasing in ρ .

Next, recall that $MRS_{\zeta\eta}^\rho$ describes the slope of the iso- ρ curve in the (η, ζ) -plane. As $MRS_{\zeta\eta}^\rho(\rho)$ is independent of η that slope is constant and each iso- ρ curve is given by

$$\zeta(\eta; \rho) = (\eta - \underline{\eta}(\rho))MRS_{\zeta\eta}^\rho(\rho).$$

Because $MRS_{\zeta\eta}^\rho(\rho)$ is increasing (and convex) in ρ and $\underline{\eta}(\rho)$ decreases in ρ , iso- ρ curves are ordered in the (η, ζ) -space. If $\rho' > \rho$ the iso- ρ curve of ρ' is steeper and than the iso- ρ curve of ρ .

Now, consider the budget line in the (η, ζ) -plane which is

$$\zeta = K - \kappa(\eta^0 - \eta)$$

which is linearly increasing with slope κ and root at $\check{\eta} = \eta^0 - K/\kappa$, the polar case ($\zeta = 0, h = K/\kappa$). Let $\check{\rho}$ be the probability of discovery at that root. Then, by construction $\check{\eta} = \underline{\eta}(\check{\rho})$.

If $MRS_{\zeta\eta}^\rho(\check{\rho}) > \kappa$, then the iso- ρ curve for $\check{\rho}$ is steeper than the budget line. Because iso- ρ curves are ordered and the budget line is increasing, all iso- ρ curves that cross the

budget line must have $\rho < \check{\rho}$ which implies $\bar{\rho} = \check{\rho}$. The minimum implementable $\underline{\rho}$ crosses the budget line at the largest attainable $\eta = \eta^0$ and hence corresponds to the other polar case.

If instead $MRS_{\zeta\eta}^{\rho}(\check{\rho}) < \kappa$ then all iso- ρ curves that cross the budget line must have $\rho > \check{\rho}$ which implies that $\underline{\rho} = \check{\rho}$ and the largest attainable $\bar{\rho}$ is induced by $\eta = \eta^0$ and $\zeta = K$.

Step 2.2. Assuming $s < s(K)$.

Restricting the domain of ζ to $[0, \xi)$ and applying the arguments from Step 2.1. yields the result.

Part 3. Substitutes or Complements. We focus on the case $s > s(K)$.²⁹ To show that d and ρ can be both substitutes and complements from the funder's perspective, we need to consider the slope of (13). The first term in brackets is independent of ρ but may be positive or negative depending on parameters.

For the second term, let $num(\rho)$ be the numerator of the last term of (13) and $den(\rho)$ its denominator. Then, that last term is increasing in ρ if and only if

$$num'(\rho)den(\rho) > num(\rho)den'(\rho)$$

or equivalently using that $num'(\rho) = \rho\tilde{c}_{\rho\rho}(\rho) > 0$, $den'(\rho) = s(2\rho\tilde{c}_{\rho\rho} + \tilde{c}_{\rho}) - \kappa$ if and only if

$$\frac{\kappa}{s} < \underbrace{\frac{\tilde{c}_{\rho}(\rho)\tilde{c}(\rho) + \rho\tilde{c}(\rho)\tilde{c}_{\rho\rho}(\rho) - \rho(\tilde{c}_{\rho}(\rho))^2}{\tilde{c}_{\rho\rho}(\rho)\rho^2 - \rho\tilde{c}_{\rho}(\rho) + \tilde{c}(\rho)}}_{=MRS_{\zeta\eta}^d(\rho)}.$$

Thus, $d(\rho)$ is increasing if and only if

$$(K + s - \kappa\eta^0)(sMRS_{\eta\zeta}^d(\rho) - \kappa) > 0. \quad (14)$$

Which, depending on parameters, may or may not hold. The figures in the main text provide examples for both cases. \square

Myopic Funding. We now turn to the problem of myopic funding in period $t = 1$. We assume that the funder wants to maximize $\rho V(x; \mathcal{F}_1)$. The first-best benchmark follows directly from Corollary 2.

Corollary 6. *A myopic and unconstrained funder optimally sets $\eta = 0$ and induces $d = 3q$ and $\rho = 1$.*

As our funder is budget constrained, she cannot eliminate the cost entirely and the optimal myopic funding mix is non-trivial. We now describe the optimal funding scheme of a funder that aims to maximize $\rho V(x; \mathcal{F}_1)$. We begin with a corollary to Proposition 7.

Corollary 7. *A budget-constrained funder cannot implement her first best. Moreover, she cannot implement $d \geq 3q$ with $\zeta = 0$.*

²⁹For the case of $s < s(K)$ observe that for a (generic) funding schemes such that $d = s$, d does not vary with local changes in to the funding scheme and only ρ adjusts, the results are thus not particularly interesting.

The corollary provides structure on the funder’s problem. The funds are insufficient to eliminate the cost friction. Thus, the funder either implements novelty *below* the optimal level or uses research prizes as an instrument. Which option the funder prefers depends on the model parameters.

Inspection of equation (9) reveals that $d(\rho)$ can be an increasing function, a decreasing function or a non-monotone function. Thus, inducing more novelty may imply more or less output depending on parameters and the current level of novelty. The reason is straightforward and follows the discussion on the researcher’s perspective in Section 4. If the researcher’s benefits increase sufficiently in novelty, she is willing to increase her research efforts significantly despite the cost—output increases. If these benefits do not increase sufficiently, more novelty implies greater risk—output decreases.

By offering the researcher a ceteris paribus higher reward, the funder increases the marginal benefits of research, thereby inducing greater complementarity between output and novelty and thus inducing an increase in effort. However, there is a countervailing force. The cost of increasing rewards is a higher cost parameter η , reducing incentives to exert effort.

The optimal funding mix depends on parametric specifications. We conclude our discussion on optimal myopic funding with a possibility result implied by the discussion above.

Proposition 8. *Suppose the funder aims at maximizing the myopic expected benefit from research, $\rho V(d; \infty)$. The optimal funding scheme can be a combination of the two instruments ($\zeta > 0, h > 0$) or can focus only on one of the two ($\zeta = 0, h > 0$ or $\zeta > 0, h = 0$). Moreover, the following statements are true:*

1. *If output decreases in novelty on the research possibility frontier throughout, optimal funding cannot induce excessive novelty.*
2. *Otherwise, optimal funding may induce excessive novelty. If output increases in novelty for funding schemes that induce $d < s$, moderate excessive novelty $d \in (3q, s)$ can be optimal.*

Proof.




Figure 10: *Funding schemes that maximize immediate benefits.* In both panels we have $\kappa = 7, q = 1$. In the left panel we have in addition $K = 30, \eta^0 = 10, s = 6$, in the right panel we have $K = 3, \eta^0 = 1, s = 600$.

Step 1. Restrained Novelty. Assume that $d(\rho; K)$ is monotone and decreasing. It follows that it is beneficial for the funder to induce a marginally higher ρ whenever




Figure 11: *Funding schemes that maximize immediate benefits.* The dashed elliptical curves depict all points that deliver the same expected value $\rho V(d; \infty)$. The solid line is the funder's budget line. In both panels, $K = 3, s = 6, q = 1$, and $\eta^0 = 1$. In the left panel, the relative price of cost reductions is $\kappa = 7$; on the right, that price is $\kappa = 16$. The funder's optimal choice (\bullet) in both cases consists of a mix of ex-ante cost reductions and ex-post rewards, $(\zeta, h) > 0$. The circle (\circ) depicts the outcome if the funder invest exclusively into rewards, $\zeta = K, h = 0$; the square (\square) the outcome if the funder invests exclusively into cost reductions, $\zeta = 0, h = K/\kappa$.

$d \in (3q, s)$. This increase in ρ decreases d marginally. Both effects increase $\rho V(d; \infty)$ if $d > 3q$. What remains is to show that inducing $d = s$ is never optimal from the funder's perspective.

Consider the (ζ, h) -combination that induces the largest \tilde{d} such that (13) applies.

Because $d(\rho; K)$ decreases by assumption and $\tilde{d} \leq s$ we have that the associated $\rho(\tilde{d}) \geq \rho(s)$. Thus, for any implementable $d < s$, $\rho(d < s) > \rho(s)$ because $d(\rho; K)$ is decreasing. It suffices to find an implementable $\tilde{d} < s$ such that $V(\tilde{d}; \infty) \geq V(s; \infty)$ to prove the claim.

Let \underline{d} be the distance induced by the funding scheme $(\zeta, \eta) = (0, K/\kappa)$. Because $\zeta = 0$, Proposition 2 implies $\underline{d} > 2q$.

Now, recall from Proposition 1 that V is symmetric around $d = 3q$ on the interval $d \in [2q, 4q]$, increasing in d if $d < 3q$ and decreasing if $d > 3q$. Because $s \geq 4q$ we have that $V(s; \infty) < V(4q; \infty) = V(2q; \infty) < V(\underline{d}; \infty)$ and hence $\rho(\underline{d})V(\underline{d}; \infty) \geq \rho(s)V(s; \infty)$ which proves the statement.

Step 2. Excessive Novelty. The parameters used to calculate the example leading to Figure 13, right panel provide an example of moderate excessive novelty, $d \in (3q, s)$. Using, e.g., parameters $K = 30, \eta^0 = 10, \kappa = 7, q = 1, s = 6$ provides an example in which it is optimal to incentives $d = s$ and to focus exclusively on rewards. However, even if ρ and d are complements throughout, excessive novelty need not be optimal. An example is $K = 3, \eta^0 = 1, \kappa = 7, q = 1, s = 600$. Here it is optimal to focus entirely on cost reductions. Figure 10 provides the respective graphs. \square

Figure 11 illustrates Proposition 8. It highlights the fundamental difference between the case when output and novelty complement each other in the budget constraint, and when they are not. In the left panel, output and novelty do not complement each other. Thus, the funder trades off novelty and output and settles optimally for a funding mix in the interior of what can be achieved in terms of novelty and output. The optimal funding scheme is a mix of both instruments. In the right panel, there are complementarities. The funder chooses to combine the two instruments. The funder's optimal solution includes




Figure 12: Moonshot $d(x^m) = 6q$ versus the myopic optimum $d(x^m) = 3q$ for different parameters. The *left panel* plots the difference between the period-zero net present value of a $6q$ moonshot and that of the myopic optimum $3q$ for different η 's. The discount factor is $\delta = 0.9$. The moonshot is strictly preferred for the interval $[\eta, \bar{\eta}] \approx (0.01, 2.13)$. The *right panel* plots the difference between the period-zero net present value of a $6q$ moonshot and that of the myopic optimum $3q$ for different δ 's. The cost parameter is $\eta = 1$. The moonshot is strictly preferred for $\delta > \underline{\delta} \approx 0.6$.

excessive novelty: the novelty induced is larger than the value-maximizing level $d = 3q$. The reason for excessive novelty is that it comes with higher output. The researcher's desire to win the award induces her to work harder on finding a solution, meaning output increases. However, the funder does not want to go to the extreme $d = s$ as that would imply a reduction in output.

The optimal funding scheme combines ex-ante cost reductions and ex-post rewards. If the funder were to concentrate on awards alone, she would induce novelty $d = s$. In response, the researcher takes too much risk in her effort to win the award. Output—and thus the expected benefits—decline.

Forward-Looking Funding. We conclude this part by considering a forward-looking funder. As we have seen in Section 5, incentivizing a moonshot can be beneficial. However, in that part, we have ignored both the funds needed to incentivize said moonshot and the risks involved.

Invoking Corollary 7, it is immediate that rewards are necessary to implement moonshots. However, a budget-constrained funder cannot guarantee a certain discovery and must trade off the value of a successful moonshot against its (potentially) greater risk.

However, as indicated by Figure 12, the benefits of more novel research today are non-monotone. That implies that—as in the static case—the funder's indifference curves are non-monotone as well. The dashed lines on the right panel of Figure 13 depict the indifference curves of the forward-looking decision maker in the (d, ρ) space. Low levels of novelty of period-1 discovery imply that researchers in period 2 will not choose to deepen knowledge. There is no intertemporal externality. Only if the initial moonshot is sufficiently novel this externality arises. The discontinuity in the funder's indifference curves occurs at the minimum level of knowledge that induces deepening knowledge of the period-2 researcher. To the right of the discontinuity, the funder is willing to accept a lower first-period output in return. The solid line depicts the same research possibility frontier as in the left panel. We conclude with a simple corollary summarizing our discussion.

Corollary 8. *If a moonshot is optimal, the optimal funding mix always includes strictly positive rewards.*




Figure 13: *Static vs Dynamic Optimal Funding*. The solid line is the funder's budget line. Dashed-line depict the decision maker's indifference curves if she is myopic (left panel) and forward looking with discount factor $\delta = 0.9$ (right panel). In both panels, $K = 3, s = 6, q = 1, \kappa = 16$ and $\eta^0 = 1$. The funder's optimal choice (●) consists of a mix of ex-ante cost reductions and ex-post rewards, $(\zeta, h) > 0$ in the left panel and focuses exclusively on rewards in the right panel. The circle (○) depicts the outcome if the funder invest exclusively into rewards, $\zeta = K, h = 0$; the square (□) the outcome if the funder invests exclusively into cost reductions, $\zeta = 0, h = K/\kappa$.

D.1 Different Rewarding Technology

In this section, we briefly discuss a variant of the model from above. The model is identical to that above apart from the functional form $f(\sigma^2)$. Instead of assuming a linear relationship, we assume

$$f(\sigma^2) = 1 - e^{-s\sigma^2}.$$

Changing the reward technology in this way has two implications. First, rewards are not guaranteed no matter how difficult to answer the question is. Second, the likelihood to receive an ex-post reward is now strictly concave in the variance, which implies a decreasing return to novelty in the reward function.

Using this specification, we lose the closed-form expression of the research possibility frontier from Proposition 7; however, the findings we discuss around Proposition 8 remain largely unchanged as Figure 14 illustrates: d and ρ can be substitutes (left panel) or complements (right panel) from the funder's perspective; if they are complements, it may be optimal to induce excessive novelty to increase output (right panel); if they are substitutes, excessive novelty is never optimal (left panel). A combination of the two funding schemes may be optimal to maximize the expected benefits to society (both panels).

E Properties of \tilde{c}

Summary. The function $\tilde{c}(\rho)$ is convex and increasing on $[0, 1)$ with $\tilde{c}(0) = 0$ and $\lim_{\rho \rightarrow 1} \tilde{c}(\rho) = \infty$.³⁰ The derivative

$$\tilde{c}_\rho(\rho) = \sqrt{\pi} e r f^{-1}(\rho) e^{\tilde{c}(\rho)}$$

³⁰Due to this limit and the researcher's ability to choose $\rho = 1$, we augment the support of the cost function to include $\rho = 1$ with $\tilde{c}(1) = \infty$. However, the optimal ρ is always strictly interior unless the cost parameter η is chosen to be zero in which case we assume that $\eta \tilde{c}(\rho = 1) = 0$.




Figure 14: *Funding schemes that maximize immediate benefits.* The dashed elliptical curves depict all points that deliver the same expected value $\rho V(d; \infty)$. The solid line is the funder's budget line. In both panels, $K = 30, \kappa = 70, q = 1$, and $\eta^0 = 1$. In the left panel, the return parameter $s = 6$; in the right panel, that parameter is $s = .6$. The funder's optimal choice (●) in both cases consists of a mix of ex-ante cost reductions and ex-post rewards, $(\zeta, h) > 0$. The circle (○) depicts the outcome if the funder invests exclusively into rewards, $\zeta = K, h = 0$; the square (□) the outcome if the funder invests exclusively into cost reductions, $\zeta = 0, h = K/\kappa$.

is increasing and convex with the same limits.

We make use of the fact that, for $\rho \in (0, 1)$, $\tilde{c}(\rho)$ has a convex and increasing elasticity bounded below by 2 and unbounded above. Its derivative $\tilde{c}_\rho(\rho)$ has an increasing elasticity bounded below by 1 and unbounded above. We want to emphasize that these properties are not special to our quadratic cost assumption. To the contrary, $\text{erf}^{-1}(x)^k$ for any $k \geq 2$ admits similar properties with only the lower bounds changing. Formally, the following properties are invoked in the proofs:

$$\begin{aligned} \rho \frac{\tilde{c}_\rho(\rho)}{\tilde{c}(\rho)} &\in (2, \infty) \text{ and increasing,} \\ \rho \frac{\tilde{c}_{\rho\rho}(\rho)}{\tilde{c}_\rho(\rho)} &\in (1, \infty) \text{ and increasing,} \\ \rho \tilde{c}_\rho(\rho) - \tilde{c}(\rho) &\in (0, \infty) \text{ and increasing,} \\ \tilde{c}_\rho^{-1}(x) &= \text{erf} \left(\sqrt{\frac{W(2x^2/\pi)}{2}} \right). \end{aligned}$$

with $W(\cdot)$ the principal branch of the Lambert W function. We formally prove the properties that do not directly follow from the definition of the inverse of the error function below.

E.1 Proofs of properties of $\tilde{c}(\rho)$

Here, we provide the formal proofs. To simplify notation, we suppress the argument ρ and denote the inverse error function by $\iota := \text{erf}^{-1}(\rho)$.

Lemma 22. *The derivatives of the inverse error function satisfy*

1. $\frac{d}{d\rho}\iota = \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{\pi}e^{\iota^2}$
2. $\frac{d^2}{d\rho^2}\iota = 2\iota\iota'$
3. $\frac{d^3}{d\rho^3}\iota = 2\iota'^3(1 + 4\iota^2)$.

Proof. See Dominici (2008). □

Lemma 23. 1. $\lim_{\rho \rightarrow 0} \rho \frac{\iota'}{\iota} = 1$

2. $\lim_{\rho \rightarrow 1} \rho \frac{\iota'}{\iota} = \infty$

3. $\lim_{\rho \rightarrow 0} \frac{d}{d\rho} \left(\rho \frac{\iota'}{\iota} \right) = 0$

4. $\lim_{\rho \rightarrow 0} \frac{d^2}{d\rho^2} \left(\rho \frac{\iota'}{\iota} \right) = \frac{\pi}{3}$

Proof. We will make use of L'Hôpital's rule and the derivative properties from Lemma 22 in the following.

The first item follows from

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{\rho \downarrow 0} \rho \frac{\iota'}{\iota} &= \lim_{\rho \downarrow 0} \frac{\iota' + \rho \iota''}{\iota'} \\ &= \lim_{\rho \downarrow 0} \frac{\iota' + 2\rho \iota'^2}{\iota'} \\ &= \lim_{\rho \downarrow 0} (1 + \rho \iota') \\ &= 1. \end{aligned}$$

The second item follows from

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{\rho \uparrow 1} \rho \frac{\iota'}{\iota} &= \lim_{\rho \uparrow 1} \frac{\iota' + \rho \iota''}{\iota'} \\ &= \lim_{\rho \uparrow 1} \frac{\iota' + 2\rho \iota'^2}{\iota'} \\ &= \lim_{\rho \uparrow 1} (1 + 2\rho \iota') \\ &= \infty. \end{aligned}$$

The third item follows from

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{\rho \rightarrow 0} \frac{d}{d\rho} \left(\rho \frac{\iota'}{\iota} \right) &= \lim_{\rho \rightarrow 0} \frac{\iota'}{\iota} \left(1 - \rho \frac{\iota'}{\iota} \right) + \lim_{\rho \rightarrow 0} \rho \frac{\iota''}{\iota} \\ &= \underbrace{\lim_{\rho \rightarrow 0} \frac{\iota'}{\iota}}_{=\sqrt{\pi}/2} \lim_{\rho \rightarrow 0} \frac{\iota - \rho \iota'}{\iota^2} + \underbrace{\lim_{\rho \rightarrow 0} 2\rho \iota'^2}_{=0} = - \lim_{\rho \rightarrow 0} \frac{\sqrt{\pi}}{2} \frac{\rho \iota''}{2\iota'} \\ &= - \lim_{\rho \rightarrow 0} \frac{\sqrt{\pi}}{2} \frac{\rho \iota (\iota')^2}{2\iota'} = - \lim_{\rho \rightarrow 0} \frac{\sqrt{\pi}}{2} \rho \iota' = 0. \end{aligned}$$

The fourth item follows from³¹

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{\rho \rightarrow 0} \frac{d^2}{d\rho^2} \left(\rho \frac{\iota'}{\iota} \right) &= \lim_{\rho \rightarrow 0} 2 \frac{\iota'' \iota - \iota'^2}{\iota^2} \left(1 - \rho \frac{\iota'}{\iota} \right) + \lim_{\rho \rightarrow 0} 4\rho \underbrace{\frac{\iota' \iota''}{=2(\iota')^3 \iota}}_{=0} \\ &= \lim_{\rho \rightarrow 0} 2 \frac{\iota'' \iota - \iota'^2}{\iota^2} \left(1 - \rho \frac{\iota'}{\iota} \right) \end{aligned}$$

³¹To arrive at the first line let $\lambda := \iota'/\iota$ and observe that $(\rho\lambda)'' = (\lambda + \rho\lambda')' = 2\lambda' + \rho\lambda''$ and $\lambda' = 2(\iota')^2 - \lambda^2$ which implies $\lambda'' = 4\iota'\iota'' - 2\lambda\lambda'$.

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \lim_{\rho \rightarrow 0} 2 \frac{\iota'' \iota}{\iota^2} \left(1 - \rho \frac{\iota'}{\iota}\right) - 2 \lim_{\rho \rightarrow 0} \frac{\iota'^2}{\iota^2} \left(1 - \rho \frac{\iota'}{\iota}\right) \\
&= \lim_{\rho \rightarrow 0} \underbrace{4 \iota'^2 \left(1 - \rho \frac{\iota'}{\iota}\right)}_{=0} - 2 \lim_{\rho \rightarrow 0} \frac{\iota'^2}{\iota^2} \left(1 - \rho \frac{\iota'}{\iota}\right) \\
&= -2 \lim_{\rho \rightarrow 0} \left(\rho \frac{\iota'}{\iota}\right)^2 \frac{\iota - \rho \iota'}{\rho^2 \iota} \\
&= 2 \lim_{\rho \rightarrow 0} \frac{\rho \iota''}{2 \rho \iota + \rho^2 \iota'} \\
&= 4 \lim_{\rho \rightarrow 0} \frac{\iota'^2}{2 + \rho \frac{\iota'}{\iota}} \\
&= \frac{4}{3} \lim_{\rho \rightarrow 0} \iota'^2 = \frac{\pi}{3}. \quad \square
\end{aligned}$$

Lemma 24. *The following statements hold:*

1. For all $\rho \in (0, 1)$, $\frac{d}{d\rho} (\rho \tilde{c}_\rho(\rho) - \tilde{c}(\rho)) > 0$
2. For all $\rho \in (0, 1)$, $\rho \tilde{c}_\rho(\rho) - \tilde{c}(\rho) > 0$
3. $\lim_{\rho \rightarrow 0} \rho \frac{\tilde{c}_\rho(\rho)}{\tilde{c}(\rho)} = 2$
4. $\lim_{\rho \rightarrow 1} \rho \frac{\tilde{c}_\rho(\rho)}{\tilde{c}(\rho)} = \infty$

Proof. The first statement holds because

$$\frac{d}{d\rho} (\rho \tilde{c}_\rho(\rho) - \tilde{c}(\rho)) = \rho \tilde{c}_{\rho\rho}(\rho) > 0.$$

by convexity of the inverse error function.

The second statement holds because of the first statement and $(\rho \tilde{c}_\rho(\rho) - \tilde{c}(\rho))|_{\rho=0} = 0$.

The third statement holds by observing that the elasticity is equal to $2\rho \frac{\iota'}{\iota}$ and the first statement of Lemma 23.

The fourth statement holds by the same observations and the second statement of Lemma 23. \square

Lemma 25. *The elasticity of $\tilde{c}(\rho)$, $\rho \frac{\tilde{c}_\rho(\rho)}{\tilde{c}(\rho)}$, is increasing in ρ .*

Proof. Recall that $\rho \frac{\tilde{c}_\rho(\rho)}{\tilde{c}(\rho)} = 2\rho \frac{\iota'}{\iota}$ and that it is therefore sufficient to prove that the inverse error function has an increasing elasticity.

Note that

$$\frac{d}{d\rho} \left(\rho \frac{\iota'}{\iota}\right) = \frac{\iota'}{\iota} + \rho \frac{\iota'' \iota - \iota'^2}{\iota^2}.$$

From Lemma 23 know that

$$\begin{aligned}
\lim_{\rho \rightarrow 0} \frac{d}{d\rho} \left(\rho \frac{\iota'}{\iota}\right) &= 0 \\
\lim_{\rho \rightarrow 0} \frac{d^2}{d\rho^2} \left(\rho \frac{\iota'}{\iota}\right) &= \frac{\pi}{3}.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, there exists an $\varepsilon > 0$ such that the elasticity is increasing for $\rho \in (0, \varepsilon)$. To show that it is increasing for all $\rho \in (0, 1)$ suppose –toward a contradiction– that the

derivative of the elasticity crosses 0. In this case, it has to hold that

$$\frac{\iota''\iota - \iota'^2}{\iota^2} = -\frac{\iota'}{\rho\iota}.$$

Consider the second derivative of the elasticity at such a critical point

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d^2}{d\rho^2} \left(\rho \frac{\iota'}{\iota} \right) \Big|_{\frac{d}{d\rho}(\rho \frac{\iota'}{\iota})=0} &= 2 \frac{\iota''\iota - \iota'^2}{\iota^2} \left(1 - \rho \frac{\iota'}{\iota} \right) + \rho \frac{\iota'''\iota - \iota''\iota'}{\iota^2} \\ &= -2 \frac{\iota'}{\iota\rho} \left(1 - \rho \frac{\iota'}{\iota} \right) + \rho \frac{\iota'''\iota - \iota''\iota'}{\iota^2} \\ &= 2 \frac{\iota'}{\iota\rho} \left(\rho \frac{\iota'}{\iota} - 1 \right) + 2\rho \frac{\iota'^3}{\iota} 4\iota^2 \\ &> 0 \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows because the elasticity is weakly greater than one and all other terms are positive.

Thus, any critical point must be a minimum. However, the elasticity is continuous and increasing at $\rho \in (0, \varepsilon)$. Thus, there is no interior maximum and the elasticity is increasing throughout. \square

Lemma 26. *The elasticity of $\tilde{c}_\rho(\rho)$, $\rho \frac{\tilde{c}_{\rho\rho}(\rho)}{\tilde{c}_\rho(\rho)}$, is increasing in ρ .*

Proof. The derivative of the corresponding inverse error function elasticity (which is one half the one of our cost function) is

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{d\rho} \left(\rho \frac{\iota'}{\iota} \right) &= \frac{\iota''}{\iota'} + \rho \frac{\iota'''\iota' - \iota''^2}{\iota'^2} \\ &= \frac{\iota''}{\iota'} + 2\rho\iota''^2(1 + 2\iota(2\iota - 1)). \end{aligned}$$

Next, we will show that $1 + 2\iota(2\iota - 1) > 0$. Note that this is a convex function of ρ with a minimum at $\iota' = \frac{1}{4}$ which is solved by $\rho = \text{erf} \left(\sqrt{\frac{W(\frac{1}{2\pi})}{2}} \right) \approx 0.29$ where W denotes the principal branch of the Lambert-W function. Evaluating $1 + 2\iota(2\iota - 1)$ at this minimum yields

$$1 + \left(\sqrt{2W\left(\frac{1}{2\pi}\right)} - 1 \right) \sqrt{2W\left(\frac{1}{2\pi}\right)} \approx 0.75. \square$$

F Omitted Proofs

Here, we provide the steps that we have omitted in the proofs because they involve cumbersome algebraic manipulation with little economic or mathematical insight.

Lemma 27. $\frac{\partial V(d; \infty | d > 4q)}{\partial d} < 0$.

Proof.

$$\frac{\partial V(d; \infty | d > 4q)}{\partial d} = -\frac{d}{3q} + 1 + \sqrt{\frac{d-4q}{d}} \frac{d-q}{3q}$$

Letting $\tau := d/q (> 4$ by assumption) the statement is negative if

$$\frac{3 - \tau}{3} + \sqrt{\frac{\tau - 4}{\tau}} \frac{\tau - 1}{3} < 0$$

The left-hand side is increasing in τ and converges to 0 as $\tau \rightarrow \infty$. \square

Lemma 28. $V_d(d; X) > 0$ if $d \in [0, X - 4q]$ and $X \in (4q, 6q]$.

Proof. We show that the derivative V_d is a convex function which is positive at its minimum on $[0, X - 4q]$ and hence throughout on that domain.

The relevant derivatives to consider are

$$\begin{aligned} V_d &= \frac{1}{3q} \left(X - 2d - (X - d - q) \sqrt{\frac{X - d - 4q}{X - d}} \right). \\ V_{dd} &= \frac{1}{3q} \left(-2 + \frac{1}{\sqrt{X - d - 4q}(X - d)^{3/2}} ((X - d - 4q)(X - d) + (X - d - q)2q) \right). \\ V_{ddd} &= \frac{4q^2}{(X - d)^{5/2}(X - d - 4q)^{3/2}} > 0. \end{aligned}$$

where $V_{ddd} > 0$ follows immediately from $(X - d) > 0$ and $(X - d - 4q) > 0$. It follows that, V_d is strictly convex over the relevant range. The maximal distance in this range, $d = X - 4q$, $V_d|_{d=X-4q} = \frac{8q-X}{3q} > 0$.

Hence, the minimum of the first derivative is either at $d = 0$ or at some interior d such that $V_{dd} = 0$. Suppose the minimum is at $d = 0$, then $V_d|_{d=0} = \frac{1}{3q} \left(X - (X - q) \sqrt{\frac{X-4q}{X}} \right) > 0$ because $\frac{X-4q}{X} < 1$.

Hence, the only remaining case is when V_d attains an interior minimum. In this case, $V_{dd} = 0$ must hold at the minimum and hence

$$\sqrt{X - d - 4q}(X - d)^{3/2} = \frac{(X - d - 4q)(X - d) + (X - d - q)2q}{2}.$$

The first derivative can be rewritten as

$$V_d = \frac{1}{3q} \left(X - 2d - \frac{1}{\sqrt{X - d - 4q}(X - d)^{3/2}} (X - d - q)(X - d - 4q)(X - d) \right)$$

and plugging in for the minimum condition we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} V_d|_{V_{dd}=0} &= \frac{1}{3q} \left(X - 2d - \frac{2(X - d - q)(X - d - 4q)(X - d)}{(X - d - 4q)(X - d) + (X - d - q)2q} \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{3q} \frac{(X - 2d)((X - d - 4q)(X - d) + (X - d - q)2q) - 2(X - d - q)(X - d - 4q)(X - d)}{(X - d - 4q)(X - d) + (X - d - q)2q}. \end{aligned}$$

As the denominator and $\frac{1}{3q}$ are both positive, the sign of V_d at its minimum is determined by the sign of its numerator only. Note that the numerator is increasing in d because its derivative is $2(X - 6q)(X - d - q) > 0$. Thus, the numerator of the derivative of V_d evaluated at the interior minimum d such that $V_{dd} = 0$ is greater than

$$-X(X^2 - 8qX + 10q^2) = -X((X - 4q)^2 - 6q^2) > 0. \quad \square$$

Lemma 29. $V_X(d^0(X); X) < 0$ if $X \geq 4q$ and $d \in [0, X - 4q]$.

Proof. Observe that for any $X \geq 4q$ and $d \leq X - 4q$

$$V_{Xd} = \frac{1}{24q} \left(8 - 3\sqrt{\frac{X-d}{X-d-4q}} - (5(X-d) + 4q) \frac{\sqrt{X-d-4q}}{(X-d)^{3/2}} \right).$$

Denote $a := X - d$, this is an increasing function in a as

$$\frac{dV_{Xd}}{da} = \frac{4q^2}{a^{5/2}(a-4q)^{3/2}} > 0.$$

Hence, the highest value of V_{Xd} is attained for $a \rightarrow \infty$ and

$$\lim_{a \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{24q} \left(8 - 3 \underbrace{\sqrt{\frac{a}{a-4q}}}_{\rightarrow 1} - 5 \underbrace{\frac{a\sqrt{a-4q}}{a^{3/2}}}_{\rightarrow 1} + 4q \underbrace{\frac{\sqrt{a-4q}}{a^{3/2}}}_{\rightarrow 0} \right) = 0.$$

It follows that the V_{Xd} converges to zero from below implying that $V_{Xd} < 0$. Thus, $V_X(d^0(X), X) < V_X(d=0, X)$ and we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & V_X(d, X | d \leq 4q, X - d \geq 4q) \\ &= \frac{1}{3q} \left(d + (X - d - q) \sqrt{\frac{X-d-4q}{X-d}} - (X - q) \sqrt{\frac{X-4q}{X}} \right) \\ &< V(d=0, X | d \leq 4q, X - d \geq 4q) \\ &= \frac{1}{3q} \left((X - q) \sqrt{\frac{X-4q}{X}} - (X - q) \sqrt{\frac{X-4q}{X}} \right) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

as desired. □

Lemma 30. If $X \in (4q, 8q)$, $d^2V(X/2, X)/dX^2 < 0$ and $d^2V(d^0(X), X)/(dX)^2 > 0$.

Proof. Considering the boundary solution we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d^2V(X/2, X)}{dX^2} &= -\frac{X^2 - 2qX - 2q^2}{3qX^{3/2}\sqrt{X-4q}} + \frac{1}{6q} \\ \frac{d^3V(X/2, X)}{dX^3} &= \frac{4q^2}{X^{5/2}(X-4q)^{3/2}} > 0 \end{aligned}$$

implying that $\frac{d^2V(X/2, X)}{dX^2} \leq \frac{d^2V(4q, 8q)}{dX^2}$ with

$$\frac{d^2V(4q, 8q)}{dX^2} = -\frac{64q^2 - 16q^2 - 2q^2}{3q8^{3/2}q^{3/2}2q^{1/2}} + \frac{1}{6q} = -\frac{46q^2}{96\sqrt{2}q^3} + \frac{1}{6q} = \frac{8 - 23/\sqrt{2}}{48q} < 0.$$

Next, consider the value of any interior solution and apply the envelope and implicit function theorem to obtain

$$\frac{dV(d^0(X), X)}{dX} = V_X + \underbrace{d'(X) V_d}_{=0 \text{ by optimality of } d} = V_X$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{d^2V(d^0(X), X)}{dX^2} &= V_{XX} + d'(X)V_{dX} + d'(X) \underbrace{(V_{Xd} + V_{dd}d'(X))}_{=0 \text{ by IFT on FOC}} + d''(X) \underbrace{V_d}_{=0 \text{ by optimality}} \\
&= V_{XX}(d^0(X), X) + d'(X)V_{dX} \\
&= V_{XX}(d^0(X), X) - \underbrace{\frac{V_{dX}^2}{V_{dd}}}_{>0 \text{ as } V_{dd} < 0}.
\end{aligned}$$

Observing that

$$V_{XXd}(d, X | d \leq 4q, X - d \geq 4q) = \frac{4q^2}{(X - d)^{5/2}(X - d - 4q)^{3/2}} > 0$$

we can compute as lower bound for

$$\begin{aligned}
V_{XX}(d^0(X), X) &= \frac{1}{24q} \left(3 \left(\sqrt{\frac{X-d}{X-d-4q}} - \sqrt{\frac{X}{X-4q}} \right) + 6 \left(\sqrt{\frac{X-d-4q}{X-d}} - \sqrt{\frac{X-4q}{X}} \right) \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \left(\frac{X-4q}{X} \right)^{3/2} - \left(\frac{X-d-4q}{X-d} \right)^{3/2} \right) \\
&\geq V_{XX}(d=0, X) = 0
\end{aligned}$$

implying that $d^2V(d^0(X), X)/(dX^2) \geq 0$. \square

Lemma 31. Assume $X \in [4q, 8q]$, then $d^2U_R(d = X/2; X)/(dX)^2 < 0$.

Proof. Take the case of the boundary solution: we are analyzing a one-dimensional optimization problem with respect to ρ . Denote the objective $f(\rho; X)$ and the optimal value by $\varphi(X) = \max_{\rho} f(\rho; X)$. Then, the optimal ρ solves $f_{\rho} = 0$. We obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\varphi'(X) &= \underbrace{f_{\rho}}_{=0 \text{ by optimality}} \rho'(X) + f_X \\
\varphi''(X) &= \underbrace{f_{\rho\rho}}_{=0 \text{ by optimality}} \rho''(X) + \underbrace{(f_{\rho\rho\rho}\rho'(X) + f_{X\rho\rho})}_{=0 \text{ by total differentiation of FOC}} \rho'(X) + f_{XX} + \rho'(X)f_{X\rho} \\
&= f_{XX} - \frac{f_{X\rho}^2}{f_{\rho\rho}} \\
&= \rho^{\eta}(X)V_{XX}(X/2; X) + \frac{(V_X - \frac{V}{X})^2}{V \frac{c''}{c'}}
\end{aligned}$$

which yields as condition for the value to be concave

$$\rho^{\eta}(X) \frac{c''}{c'} > -\frac{(V_X - \frac{V}{X})^2}{V_{XX}V}$$

where the inequality sign changed direction as $V_{XX} < 0$.

Note that at the boundary solution the right-hand side simplifies to

$$\frac{X^{3/2} - 2(X + 2q)\sqrt{X - 4q}}{X^{3/2} - 2(X - 4q)\sqrt{X - 4q}} \frac{16q^2 + 4qX - 2X^2 + X^{3/2}\sqrt{X - 4q}}{8q^2 + 8qX - 4X^2 + 2X^{3/2}\sqrt{X - 4q}}$$

where both fractions are less than one. Finally, we know that the left-hand side is above two by the properties of the inverse error function. Hence, the optimal value at the boundary solution is strictly concave as $\sigma_{XX}^2(X/2; X) = 0$ and $V_{XX}(X/2; X) < 0$ in the region considered by Lemma 30 \square

Lemma 32. *Let $d^i < X/2$ be a local maximum of $u_R(\rho, d, X)$. If $d^i(X)$ exists on $X \in [4q, 8q]$, then $d^2 U_R(d = d^i(X); X)/(dX)^2 > 0$.*

Proof. The implicit function theorem yields for $d'(X)$ and $\rho'(X)$

$$\begin{pmatrix} d'(X) \\ \rho'(X) \end{pmatrix} = -\frac{1}{f_{dd}f_{\rho\rho} - f_{\rho d}^2} \begin{pmatrix} f_{dX}f_{\rho\rho} - f_{\rho X}f_{d\rho} \\ f_{\rho X}f_{dd} - f_{dX}f_{d\rho} \end{pmatrix}.$$

Note that $-\frac{1}{f_{dd}f_{\rho\rho} - f_{\rho d}^2} < 0$ as this is $-\frac{1}{\det(\mathcal{H})}$ and the determinant of the second principal minor being positive is a necessary second order condition for a local maximum given that the first ($f_{\rho\rho}$) is negative.

Denote the objective $f(\rho, d; X)$ and the optimal value by $\varphi(X) = \max_{\rho, d} f(d, \rho; X)$. Then, the optimal (d, ρ) solves $f_\rho = 0$ and $f_d = 0$. Differentiating the value of the researcher twice with respect to X yields

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi'(X) &= \underbrace{f_\rho}_{=0 \text{ by optimality}} \rho'(X) + \underbrace{f_d}_{=0 \text{ by optimality}} d'(X) + f_{XX} \\ \varphi''(X) &= \underbrace{f_\rho}_{=0 \text{ by optimality}} \rho''(X) + \underbrace{f_d}_{=0 \text{ by optimality}} d''(X) \\ &\quad + d'(X) \underbrace{(f_{dX} + f_{dd}d'(X) + f_{d\rho}\rho'(X))}_{=0 \text{ by total differentiation of foc wrt } d} \\ &\quad + \rho'(X) \underbrace{(f_{\rho X} + f_{\rho d}d'(X) + f_{\rho\rho}\rho'(X))}_{=0 \text{ by total differentiation of foc wrt } \rho} \\ &\quad + f_{dX}d'(X) + f_{\rho X}\rho'(X) + f_{XX} \\ &= f_{dX}d'(X) + f_{\rho X}\rho'(X) + f_{XX}. \end{aligned}$$

Observe first that $f_{XX} > 0$ as $f_{XX} = \rho V_{XX}(d; X) - \eta \tilde{c}(\rho) \sigma_{XX}^2(d; X)$ and $V_{XX} > 0$ by proof of Corollary 4 (in particular, Lemma 30) and $\sigma_{XX}^2(d; X) = -\frac{2d^2}{X^3}$. Next, we show $f_{dX}d'(X) + f_{\rho X}\rho'(X) > 0$ using the implicit function theorem together with the property of the local maximum that $f_{\rho\rho}f_{dd} > f_{\rho d}^2$.

$$f_{dX}d'(X) + f_{\rho X}\rho'(X) = -f_{dX} \left(\frac{f_{dX}f_{\rho\rho} - f_{\rho X}f_{d\rho}}{f_{dd}f_{\rho\rho} - f_{\rho d}^2} \right) - f_{\rho X} \left(\frac{f_{\rho X}f_{dd} - f_{dX}f_{d\rho}}{f_{dd}f_{\rho\rho} - f_{\rho d}^2} \right).$$

As we only need the sign of this expression we can ignore the positive denominator to verify

$$\begin{aligned} -f_{dX}(f_{dX}f_{\rho\rho} - f_{\rho X}f_{d\rho}) - f_{\rho X}(f_{\rho X}f_{dd} - f_{dX}f_{d\rho}) &> 0 \\ f_{dX}^2 f_{\rho\rho} + f_{\rho X}^2 f_{dd} - 2f_{dX}f_{\rho X}f_{d\rho} &< 0 \\ \frac{f_{dX}}{f_{\rho X}} \frac{f_{\rho\rho}}{f_{d\rho}} + \frac{f_{\rho X}}{f_{dX}} \frac{f_{dd}}{f_{\rho d}} &> 2. \end{aligned}$$

where we used the signs of the terms that follow because

$$\begin{aligned}
f_{\rho\rho} &= -\eta\tilde{c}_{\rho\rho}(\rho)\sigma^2 < 0 \\
f_{\rho X} &= V_X - \eta\tilde{c}_\rho(\rho)\sigma_X^2 \\
&< V_X - \eta\frac{\tilde{c}(\rho)}{\rho}\sigma_X^2 < 0 \\
f_{d\rho} &= V_d - \eta\tilde{c}_\rho(\rho)\sigma_d^2 \\
&< V_d - \eta\frac{\tilde{c}(\rho)}{\rho}\sigma_d^2 = 0 \\
f_{dX} &= \rho V_{dX} - \eta\tilde{c}(\rho)\sigma_{dX}^2 < 0
\end{aligned}$$

which in turn follow from the first-order conditions and Corollary 4.

Because $f_{\rho\rho}f_{dd} - f_{\rho d}^2 > 0$, we can replace $\frac{f_{\rho\rho}}{f_{d\rho}}$ with $\frac{f_{d\rho}}{f_{dd}}$ as $\frac{f_{\rho\rho}}{f_{d\rho}} > \frac{f_{d\rho}}{f_{dd}}$ yielding

$$2 < \frac{f_{dX}}{f_{\rho X}} \frac{f_{d\rho}}{f_{dd}} + \frac{f_{\rho X}}{f_{dX}} \frac{f_{dd}}{f_{\rho d}}$$

which is true as the right-hand side can be written as $g(a) = a + \frac{1}{a}$ with $a = \frac{f_{dX}}{f_{\rho X}} \frac{f_{d\rho}}{f_{dd}} > 0$. Note that $g(a)$ is a strictly convex function for $a > 0$ and minimized at $a = 1$ with $g(a = 1) = 2$. \square

Lemma 33. $d^\eta(\infty)$ is linear in q and $\rho^\eta(\infty)$ is constant in q .

Proof. The lemma follows because $\sigma^2(mq; \infty) = mq$ and thus (by Proposition 1) the functions $f(m, q) := V(mq; \infty)/\sigma^2(mq; \infty)$ and $g(m, q) := V_d(mq; \infty)$ are homogeneous of degree 0 in q .

It is then immediate from (FOC^d) and (FOC^{\rho}) that $d^\eta(\infty)$ is homogeneous of degree 1 in q and $\rho^\eta(\infty)$ is homogeneous of degree 0. Noticing that $d^\eta(\infty)(q = 0) = 0$ implies the result. \square

G Graphical example

Here, we present a short graphical example to highlight our model ingredients and foster intuition. Suppose the following snapshot of the realization of the Brownian path constitutes the truth on $[-2, 2]$.




Figure 15: *The color of the truth is gray.*




Figure 16: *Conjectures and their precision under \mathcal{F}_1 (left) and \mathcal{F}_2 (right).* The red dots represent known question-answer pairs. The solid lines represent the expected answer to each question x given the existing knowledge. The dashed line represents the 95-percent prediction interval—that is, the interval in which the answer to question x lies, with a probability of 95 percent, given \mathcal{F}_k .




Figure 17: *Distributions of answers for different distances to knowledge when $\mathcal{F}_1 = (0, 42)$.* Given that the only question to which the answer is known is $x = 0$, we can determine knowledge about questions of distances 1, 4, and 16 from $x = 0$. All answers have the same mean (42), but the variance and thus the precision of the conjecture differ. For $x = 0$, the answer is known and $G_0(y|\mathcal{F}_1)$ is a step function. Questions with longer distances have larger variances. The left panel depicts the respective distribution functions; the right panel depicts the densities.

Figure 16 depicts knowledge if the answer to a single question is known, $\mathcal{F}_1 = \{(0, 42)\}$, and in if two answers are known, $\mathcal{F}_2 = \{(-1.2, 46.6), (0, 42)\}$. Figure 17 illustrates the conjectures for different distances given $\mathcal{F}_1 = \{(0, 42)\}$.

In the situation represented in the left panel of Figure 16, under \mathcal{F}_1 , only the answer to question 0, which is 42, is known. We represent that knowledge by a dot (•). Given the martingale property of a Brownian motion, the current conjecture is that the answer to all other questions is normally distributed with a mean of 42. We represent the mean of the conjecture by the solid lines. However, the farther a question is from 0, the less precise the conjecture (see Figure 17). We depict the level of precision by the dashed 95-percent prediction interval. For each question x , the truth lies, with a probability of 95 percent, between the two dashed lines given the knowledge \mathcal{F}_k .

In the right panel of Figure 16, in addition to \mathcal{F}_1 , the answer to question $x = -1.2$, which is 46.6, is known. The additional knowledge changes the conjectures for questions in the negative domain compared to the left panel. The conjecture about questions

between -1.2 and 0 is represented by a Brownian bridge. The expectation of answers is decreasing from -1.2 to 0 and is 46.6 to the left of -1.2 . Moreover, uncertainty decreases for all questions in the negative domain, and the prediction bands become narrower. The positive domain is unchanged because of the martingale property of the Brownian motion.




Figure 18: *Conjectures and their precision under \mathcal{F}_3 (left) and \mathcal{F}_4 (right).*

Now, consider moving to knowledge $\mathcal{F}_3 = \{(-1.2, 46.6), (0, 42), (1.2, 41.8)\}$ (left panel of Figure 18) and then to $\mathcal{F}_4 = \{(-1.6, 46.6), (0, 42), (0.8, 40.8), (1.2, 41.8)\}$ (right panel of Figure 18).

Moving from \mathcal{F}_2 to \mathcal{F}_3 , the change is similar to that from \mathcal{F}_1 to \mathcal{F}_2 , but this time in the positive domain. All conjectures in the positive domain become more precise, but the negative domain is unaffected. Further, a Brownian bridge between the known points $(0, 42)$ and $(1.2, 41.8)$ arises.

Moving from \mathcal{F}_3 to \mathcal{F}_4 , knowledge of an answer to a question that lies between two already-answered questions is added. Conjectures about answers to questions between 0 and 1.2 become more precise. Further, since $40.8 < 41.8$, answers to all questions between 0 and 1.2 are expected to be lower compared to the conjecture based on knowledge \mathcal{F}_3 . Moreover, the expected answers are decreasing in x from 0 to 0.8 and increasing from 0.8 and 1.2 .