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Abstract

We propose measurement integrity, a property related to ex post reward fairness, as a novel desideratum for peer prediction mechanisms in many natural applications, including peer assessment. We then operationalize this notion to evaluate the measurement integrity of different peer prediction mechanisms in computational experiments. Our evaluations simulate the application of peer prediction mechanisms to peer assessment—a setting in which realistic models have been validated on real data and in which ex post fairness concerns are particularly salient. We find that peer prediction mechanisms, as proposed in the literature, largely fail to demonstrate measurement integrity in our experiments. However, we also find that supplementing the mechanisms with realistic parametric statistical models can, in some cases, improve their measurement integrity.

In the same setting, we also evaluate an empirical notion of robustness against strategic behavior to complement the theoretical analyses of robustness against strategic behavior that have been the primary focus of the peer prediction literature. In this dimension of analysis, we again find that supplementing certain mechanisms with realistic parametric statistical models can improve their empirical performance. Even so, though, we find that theoretical guarantees of robustness against strategic behavior are somewhat noisy predictors of empirical robustness against strategic behavior.

As a whole, our empirical methodology for quantifying desirable mechanism properties facilitates a more nuanced comparison between mechanisms than theoretical analysis alone. Ultimately, we find that there is a trade-off between our two dimensions of analysis. The best performing mechanisms for measurement integrity are highly susceptible to strategic behavior. On the other hand, certain parametric peer prediction mechanisms are robust against all the strategic manipulations that we consider while still achieving reasonable measurement integrity.

This work is supported by the National Science Foundation under award #2007256.
The code for our experiments is hosted in the following GitHub repository: https://github.com/burrelln/Measurement-Integrity-and-Peer-Assessment
Table 1: The equilibrium concepts related to truthful reporting that are induced by each mechanism we consider and the weakest known assumption on the joint prior distribution of signals that is sufficient to guarantee that inducement. The various mechanisms are described in more detail in Section 3.1. The various equilibrium concepts and assumptions are discussed in Appendix A.

1 Introduction

Peer prediction, or information elicitation without verification, is a paradigm for designing mechanisms that elicit reports from a population of agents about questions or tasks in settings where ground truth (and therefore the possibility of spot-checking) need not exist. One particularly salient dimension of evaluation for a mechanism is the degree to which it rewards agents for their reports in a way that incentivizes effortful, truthful reporting. This dimension, which we refer to as robustness against strategic behavior, has been the overwhelming focus of the theoretical peer prediction literature. We broaden this focus by introducing a new dimension of comparison, measurement integrity, and by considering a novel, complementary perspective on robustness against strategic behavior.

In the peer prediction paradigm, we assume that agents receive a signal (perhaps at some cost) about each task, drawn from some joint prior distribution. In the current literature, mechanisms are typically characterized by two properties that attest to their robustness against strategic behavior:

1. An equilibrium concept related to truthful reporting that the mechanism induces under certain assumptions, which typically constrain the form the joint prior distribution of every agents’ signals.

2. The assumptions on the joint prior distribution of signals that are sufficient to guarantee the inducement of the equilibrium concept.

Table 1 details these two properties for each mechanism that this paper considers. However, these properties alone are insufficient to evaluate peer prediction mechanisms for a given application because they omit other important considerations. Moreover, this characterization has engendered a narrow focus on robustness against strategic behavior as the primary objective of peer prediction research, which potentially limits the applicability of its results. Considering secondary desiderata also discussed in the theoretical peer prediction literature does not help. Such properties, for example that mechanisms require little or no prior knowledge of the distribution of signals or that mechanisms only require simple reports from the agents, often fail to meaningfully differentiate the state-of-the-art mechanisms.

1.1 Measurement Integrity

We introduce a new desideratum—measurement integrity—that is of co-equal importance with robustness against strategic behavior in many natural applications of peer prediction. Measurement integrity is the property that the rewards assigned by a mechanism can be interpreted as a measurement of the quality with which each agent in a given population completed their assigned tasks. A mechanism with measurement integrity assigns rewards that reliably place the agents on some scale that quantifies the (relative) quality of their responses.

---

1See Stevens [25] for a discussion of the meaning of “measurement” that we invoke in the phrase “measurement integrity.” In particular, Stevens describes four types of scales (nominal, ordinal, interval, and ratio) that each correspond to a different interpretation of the assignment of numerical values to objects/events, but all constitute a coherent, useful form of measurement.
Measurement integrity is a fundamental property to consider whenever fairness is a concern. In particular, measurement integrity is related to \textit{ex post} fairness. In general, it is natural to assume that workers participating in crowdsourcing tasks would prefer that their payments reliably reflect the (relative) quality of their work. Likewise, from the other perspective, it is natural to assume that principals hiring crowdsourcing workers would prefer to reward the best workers with the largest payments. There are also many particular settings in which the \textit{ex post} nature of measurement integrity is especially salient compared with the \textit{ex ante} nature that is typical of theoretical properties. When agents are risk averse, for example, reliable \textit{ex post} payments are more valuable than lotteries with equivalent expected value. People typically do not want the payment for their work to be contingent on the outcome of a coin flip. Similarly, when agents only interact with the mechanism a limited number of times, e.g. by participating in a panel for tracking public opinion before an election, the tendency for the average outcomes to converge to their expected values is likely to be insignificant compared with the realized rewards when they evaluate their experience with the mechanism.

Measurement integrity is also useful for coupling information elicitation with information aggregation. Information aggregation strategies often try to estimate the relative quality of the agents involved, so that an average of their reports, weighted by some measure of agent quality, can be computed. A mechanism with reliable measurement integrity can directly facilitate the identification of high-quality agents.

Perhaps the most natural setting to consider the importance of measurement integrity, though, is the setting of peer assessment (Section 2), which provides a case study in which to explore how to quantify the measurement integrity of existing mechanisms from the peer prediction literature.

1.2 Evaluating Measurement Integrity

As mentioned above, measurement integrity is fundamentally an \textit{ex post} property—it concerns realized outcomes, not expected outcomes. As a result, it is difficult to conceptualize a general theoretical property that can attest to a mechanism’s measurement integrity. First, a formalization of measurement integrity necessarily requires a model that links some latent determinant of agent quality (e.g. \textit{effort}) to the outcomes of the mechanism being considered. No canonical model exists for this linkage, and good models are likely to vary considerably depending on the setting. Further, even given such a linking model, it is difficult to quantify latent determinants of agent quality like effort. Fortunately, in the setting of peer assessment, there is a robust literature to draw from, which allows us to adopt a model of peer assessment that is informed by empirical analyses. Starting there, we are able to operationalize a notion of measurement integrity in our model. We are also able to operationalize a novel notion of empirical robustness against strategic behavior. These notions complement theoretical properties from the current literature while facilitating a more direct comparison between mechanisms.

It is not clear how to quantify either notion in a real-world setting. Both rely on accessing unobservable latent qualities of the participants (effort and reporting strategy, respectively). Similarly, both notions are difficult to attest to as a result of experiments involving real people. In addition to suffering from the same limitations about unobservable qualities, laboratory experiments can do a poor job at predicting the behavior of agents interacting with a deployed mechanism. In an experiment, participants typically interact with a mechanism for the first time; interaction with a deployed mechanism is often repeated. As a result, care must be taken to ensure that participants in the experiment understand the mechanism and its incentive properties. Different approaches to educating participants might help to explain conflicting findings on the salience of the incentive properties of peer prediction mechanisms in experiments from the literature \cite{4, 11}.

We find that simulated experiments conducted using an agent-based model (ABM) provide a useful methodology that avoids many of the potential pitfalls of theoretical, laboratory, and real-world approaches. Simulated experiments are outcome-oriented—they readily generate the realized outcomes that are difficult to theorize. Additionally, using ABMs allows for control over and direct access to underlying attributes, e.g. effort, that must be inferred in laboratory experiments or analyses of real-world data. Simulated experiments are also much easier to replicate than laboratory experiments. Accordingly, they allow properties like measurement integrity to be evaluated over ranges of parameter values of interest in a way that is typically not possible with other experimental methods.

Lastly, the computational agents in agent-based models differ from real-world agents in a particularly useful way—their behavior is directly manipulable. This allows us to clean and disentangle the two dimensions of our analysis. In general, measurement integrity and robustness against strategic behavior are tightly
connected. A measurement of agents based on the quality of reports that have been strategically manipulated is not meaningful. However, it is useful to decouple them when evaluating peer prediction mechanisms for two reasons. First, in a setting like peer assessment where there are exogenous incentives for reporting truthfully, e.g., social norms about behavior in classroom settings, it is not realistic to assume worst-case, fully-strategic behavior from the entire population. Second, disentangling measurement integrity from robustness against strategic behavior is conceptually useful. The properties of a mechanism that lead to reliable measurement integrity appear to be distinct from the properties that lead to reliable robustness against strategic behavior, both intuitively and in our experiments. As a result, it is appropriate to study them separately. Accordingly, to study measurement integrity in isolation, we initially depart from prior work on peer prediction by requiring that agents report truthfully regardless of their incentives (Section 4). Then, to analyze empirical robustness against strategic behavior and its interaction with measurement integrity, we require agents to follow realistic reporting strategies assigned to them (Section 5). Creating analogous conditions for decoupling these dimensions in real-world or laboratory settings, where agents are unlikely to behave in prescribed ways or reliably ignore incentives, is probably not possible.

Despite the many useful properties of ABMs which suggest that they are a useful tool for evaluating empirical properties of peer prediction mechanisms, there are nonetheless limitations to our approach. Primarily, the need to specify a complete model of peer assessment—as opposed to making a few comparatively mild assumptions about a generic underlying model, as in theoretical work—potentially limits the generalizability of our results beyond the specific model of peer assessment that we adopt. These concerns, though, are mitigated by a few factors. First, our model of peer assessment is structurally similar to a model from the peer assessment literature that was validated using a large peer grading dataset from massive open online courses (MOOCs) by Piech et al. [19]. As a result, it is reasonable to expect that our results are, at the very least, applicable to that important class of peer assessment settings (i.e., MOOCs). Additionally, the relative scarcity of data in the peer assessment setting (Section 2) appears to be a significant driver of many of our results. This suggests that much of the intuition—e.g., the usefulness of parametric peer prediction mechanisms (Section 3.1.3)—that we gain from our case study in peer assessment is likely to generalize to other settings where data is similarly sparse. Ultimately, though, the strongest evidence for the utility of our methodology of employing ABMs in computational experiments is in the clear, unambiguous results that we are able to obtain by applying it.

1.3 Our Results

Through our simulated experiments, as illustrated in Figure 1, we are able to quite literally add a new dimension of analysis with which to evaluate peer prediction mechanisms, in addition to bringing a new perspective to what has been the dominant dimension of analysis in the previous literature. Along both dimensions, our experimental results robustly differentiate existing peer prediction mechanisms according to their empirical performance. Moreover, they identify an apparent trade-off inherent in seeking to simultaneously optimize each dimension.

Additionally, we are able to identify the following lessons:

• In their most general forms, out-of-the-box peer prediction mechanisms from the literature largely fail to demonstrate significant measurement integrity compared with simple baselines.

• Evaluating empirical notions of measurement integrity and robustness against strategic behavior helps to facilitate a more fine-grained comparisons between mechanisms than solely considering theoretical notions of robustness against strategic behavior, which are often not directly comparable. Using our empirical notions, for example, we find that implementation choices for some mechanisms (e.g., a choice of $\Phi$ for the $\Phi$-Div mechanism) affect their empirical performance in both dimensions. This stands in contrast to theoretical properties, which are typically defined to be agnostic about implementation choices.

• Certain peer prediction mechanisms can be augmented with parametric statistical models to improve their empirical performance along both dimensions that we consider. Consequently, parametric mechanisms warrant more attention in the peer prediction literature.
Figure 1: A direct, two-dimensional comparison of mechanisms based on aggregating mechanism performance within experiments. The y-axis value for each mechanism is computed as the average area under the curve (AUC) recorded in the Binary Effort, Unbiased Agents setting of the Quantifying Measurement Integrity experiments over all considered numbers of active graders (See Section 4). The x-axis value for each mechanism is computed as the negative of the average mean gain recorded in the Incentives for Deviating from Reporting Truthfully setting of the Quantifying Robustness Against Strategic Behavior experiments over all considered numbers of strategic graders, for all considered strategies (See Section 5).

2 Peer Assessment

Peer assessment, where students provide feedback on the work of their peers, is associated with myriad pedagogical benefits. Peer grading, a specific form of peer assessment in which the grade awarded to a student for an assignment is computed directly from the feedback of their peers, has the additional benefit of alleviating the workload of the course staff. This consideration is especially important in MOOCs, where providing timely feedback from instructors and teaching assistants alone is intractable. In peer assessment generally, including in peer grading, it is typically necessary to specify a mechanism by which students will receive credit for the task of assessing or grading their peers. In distributed, largely anonymous settings like MOOCs, hedonic rewards for expending effort to provide good feedback to peers are likely to be less motivating. Thus, assigning credit in the form of a grade that reflects the quality of the peer assessment is an important tool for encouraging quality feedback. We call this task—assessing the quality of peer assessments or “grading the graders”—meta-grading.

In peer grading, the primary challenge is to correctly aggregate peer reports into grades that reflect the quality of a submission for an assignment. In meta-grading, on the other hand, incentive concerns are more salient. A student’s grade for an assignment depends on other students’ feedback (and the quality of their submission for that assignment). A student’s meta-grade depends directly on their own feedback for other students. As a result, poorly designed incentives will discourage rather than encourage high-quality feedback. For that reason, the peer prediction paradigm is a natural fit for the meta-grading task.

Meta-grading also presents some unique challenges for the peer prediction paradigm that make it a particularly interesting case study:

2 Note that the placement of DMI on the x-axis must be interpreted in the context of the simplifications that were necessary to ensure basic functionality in its implementation (Section 3.1.2). As a result of those simplifications, several of the strategies considered do not affect agents’ reports from the perspective of the mechanism. This potentially gives the mechanism an advantage in the experiments for quantifying robustness against strategic behavior.

3 Here, we elide the question of whether peer assessment or peer grading is an appropriate solution to the problem of generating timely feedback. That question has been explored in some detail in the literature, and the general consensus seems to be positive. See Shnayder and Parkes 23 for a brief summary.
**Heterogeneous Agent Quality.** Agents may have different skills, put forward different effort levels, and may not be fully calibrated. Mechanisms may vary in their ability to handle such differences within the data.

**Scarcity of Data.** Which mechanism performs best may be highly dependent on how much data is available. In the peer assessment setting, the amount of data is severely constrained. There are limits on the number of assignments students can be expected to complete in a course (typically on the order of 10) and the number of submissions students can be expected to grade for each assignment (typically between 4 and 6). Also, each student should receive the same amount of feedback on an assignment as their peers.

**Fairness Constraints for Meta-Grades.** Grades, by design, are intended to reflect the quality of students’ work, so the meta-grades assigned by any peer assessment mechanism should be expected to reflect the quality of each student’s performance in their assigned peer assessment tasks. Further, grades are intended to be fair *ex post*, not just in expectation. Together, these constraints indicate that peer assessment mechanisms, in order to be suitable for assigning meta-grades, need to demonstrate *measurement integrity*.

In considering these constraints, we make the assumption that if the rewards constitute reliable measurements of agent quality, then those rewards can be mapped to fair meta-grades. As a result, we focus on measurement itself and leave the final mapping to grades as a free parameter that is best chosen in a specific peer assessment context. Note that the mapping from a numerical grade to an agent’s utility, while monotone, is likely nonlinear and unpredictable due to, for example, letter grade cutoffs.

In the broader peer prediction paradigm, these challenges—which are more salient in certain settings than in others—are largely not considered. Rather, the focus is almost entirely on motivating truthful reporting for expected-utility maximizing agents. Given this narrow focus, along with the typical goal of designing mechanisms that are as widely-applicable as possible, the mechanisms proposed often rely on collecting lots of data and compensating agents with rewards that exhibit high variance. Both of these characteristics foreshadow the tendency of out-of-the-box peer prediction mechanisms to fail to demonstrate measurement integrity in our experiments.

### 2.1 Related Work

#### 2.1.1 Peer Prediction and Information Elicitation

As noted previously, the existing peer prediction literature is focused primarily on theoretical properties related to robustness against strategic behavior. However, there has been some work that explores incentive-compatibility from other perspectives. For example, Gao et al. [4] take an experimental approach and find evidence that agents are willing and able to exploit peer prediction mechanisms by coordinating on uninformative reports instead of truthful reports. On the other hand, Shnayder et al. [22] use replicator dynamics to quantify desirable incentive properties of peer prediction mechanisms. Replicator dynamics, a simulation-based method that incorporates a notion of learning within a continuum of “agents”, is quite different from our more-realistic, discrete ABM approach. Incorporating agent learning into our framework is an interesting extension that we leave for future work. We conjecture that mechanisms that strike a good balance in the trade-off between measurement integrity and robustness against strategic behavior are most likely to efficiently promote truthful reporting as an effective strategy for learning agents to adopt.

There has been some attention devoted to other properties of peer prediction mechanisms. Among these, Kong’s “Information Evaluation” is the notion most closely related to measurement integrity [13]. Like measurement integrity, information evaluation relates to the tendency of a mechanism to assign higher rewards to agents with higher-quality reports. Unlike measurement integrity, though, it is an *ex ante* property about expected payments.

Properties beyond robustness against strategic behavior have also recently been examined in other domains of information elicitation that are related to, but distinct from, peer prediction. In probabilistic forecasting [4], for example, Hartline et al. [8] and Neyman et al. [17] both consider optimizing for properties related to incentivizing effort when selecting a *proper scoring rule* with which to score forecasts. In contrast
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to peer prediction mechanisms, however, proper scoring rules (by definition) each satisfy the same particular theoretical notion of robustness against strategic behavior.

2.1.2 Peer Prediction and Peer Assessment

There has also been work that explores the specific application of peer prediction to peer assessment. Shnayder and Parkes [23] empirically analyze peer prediction mechanisms using real MOOC data. Importantly, they show that some of the underlying assumptions made in the literature—the self-dominating and self-predicting assumptions in Table 1—are likely to be violated in the peer assessment setting, especially when the report space is large. They also discuss the importance of considering the variance of rewards, as measurement integrity does, in settings where fairness concerns are salient.

Gao et al. [5] introduce the idea that coordination on partially-informative, “cheap” signals that take less effort to observe than a fully-informative signal can also present a challenge to the truthful equilibria of peer prediction mechanisms. This issue is particularly salient in peer assessment, where students might learn to coordinate on superficial qualities of a submission (e.g. frequency of typos or grammatical errors, quality of only the introduction, etc.) that may be misaligned with its holistic quality. We leave the questions of incorporating the existence of cheap signals open for future extensions of our model and framework. Kong and Schoenebeck [14] make progress toward addressing this concern.

Gao et al. [5] and Zarkoob et al. [32] explore how limited spot-checking (in the form of “ground-truth” grading by teaching assistants on certain assignments) can (theoretically) incentivize truthful reporting in grading in a simple model. Surprisingly, Gao et al. [5] find that, compared with spot checking alone, supplementing spot-checking with peer prediction increases the number of spot-checks required to obtain the desired incentive properties. However, the goal of minimizing the number of spot checks necessary to achieve theoretical incentive guarantees in a specific model is somewhat orthogonal to our goals of identifying mechanisms on the frontier of the trade-off between measurement integrity and robustness against strategic behavior (in more realistic settings). As a result, these negative results concerning the use of peer prediction do not preclude the ideas that we present here. In more practical explorations of the utility of spot-checking, Wright et al. [29] and Zarkoob et al. [31] propose and refine, respectively, a peer grading system that is centered around the deployment of teaching assistants to improve the quality of feedback.

2.1.3 Peer Assessment in Computer Science Education and MOOCs

The peer assessment literature itself is vast, even when the primary focus is restricted to two relevant areas that overlap significantly—Computer Science education and MOOCs. Søndergaard [24] and Lu et al. [16] both give good overviews of influential work on the merits of peer assessment and peer grading, respectively, in those areas. However, Søndergaard argues against peer grading in favor of peer assessment where student feedback is not used to assign grades.

Kali and Ronen [12] and Lu et al. [16] both detail the importance of meta-assessment. The term “meta-assessment” subsumes meta-grading in the same way that the term “peer assessment” subsumes peer grading. Meta-assessment involves involves the evaluation of peer feedback (e.g. “grading the graders”), but not necessarily for credit. However, Lu et al. find that meta-assessment alone is not sufficient for improving the quality of peer assessments. Rather, they conclude that beyond just knowing that their peer assessments will be assessed or being shown examples of high-quality peer assessments, “students must be shown evidence that their peers are actually producing such high-quality efforts” in order to motivate improvement in their own assessments. Implementing meta-assessment using a mechanism that demonstrates reliable measurement integrity and releasing the distribution of scores might be one way to provide such evidence to motivate, for example, students with scores in the bottom half of the distribution to work to improve their assessment quality. A mechanism that lacks reliable measurement integrity, on the other hand, is unlikely to supply any particularly motivating evidence.

2.1.4 Modeling Peer Assessment

A significant advantage of using peer assessment as a case study is that we can draw on existing work from the peer assessment literature to inform the construction of our agent-based model. For example, our model assigns 4 graders to each submission, as recommended by Bachelet et al. [11]. They find that 4 graders per
submission achieves a good balance in the trade-off between improving grading accuracy and limiting each student’s workload in their analysis of MOOC data.

The work that most influences the construction of our agent-based model is the analysis of MOOC data from the platform Coursera conducted by Piech et al. [19]. Piech et al. propose and validate a sequence of increasingly complex parametric statistical models of peer assessment. They show that estimating the parameters of each of their models is useful for estimating the true grades of student submissions that have been evaluated by peers. Grade estimates computed using their models are found to outperform grade estimates computed by the algorithm used by Coursera at the time. The inclusion of grader biases in each of their models is found to be the most significant single factor underlying this result.

The model that we adopt subsequently is not one of the models that they propose. However, it is quite similar. As suggested by the success of parametric mechanisms (Section 3.1.3) in our experiments, their model $PG_1$ (with the appropriate hyperparameters), approximates our model effectively. This bolsters the expectation that our results are pertinent to, at the very least, the setting in which they conduct their analysis—peer assessment in MOOCs.

The decision to propose a new model that is similar to the models proposed by Piech et al., instead of simply adopting one of their models, stems from a few philosophical points:

1. Their models are continuous. In practice, though, essentially all assignment scores, rubrics, and grades are discrete. Thus, the “true grade” of a submission in a model for generating grading data should be discrete—it must correspond to one of the values on the rubric, otherwise it is not well-defined. Similarly, graders’ signals—their noisy observations of a submission’s true grade—should also correspond to one of the values on the rubric, otherwise the notion of a truthful report is not well-defined.

2. Using data that is generated by a process that is not exactly described by, but is well-approximated by, some family of models more accurately simulates the scenario faced by a practitioner looking to deploy a peer assessment mechanism in real life. As a result, the application of parametric mechanisms in our experiments is more realistic. The parametric mechanisms that we consider do not rely on knowing the exact underlying process by which true grades and signals are generated. They only rely on having a model that is good enough.

3. Our concept of agent “effort” more readily generalizes to incorporate interesting, more complex cases than the concept of agent “reliability,” which performs an analogous role in the models of Piech et al. In particular, our procedure for generating agents’ signals using draws from a latent binomial distribution (Section 3) provides a natural way to model cheap signals (Section 2.1.2). Draws from a binomial distribution can be interpreted as sums of the outcomes of a sequence of independent coin flips that land as 0 or 1. As a result, agents’ signals (conditioned on the true score) can be straightforwardly correlated. Some number of these coin flips can be fixed in advance and inserted at the beginning of the sequence that generates the first draw(s) used in constructing each agent’s signal.

3 Model

Our experiments simulate a class of 100 students enrolled in a semester-long course for which there are 10 graded assignments. For each assignment, each student turns in a submission and is randomly assigned submissions from 4 other students to grade.

Submissions. For each assignment $j$, each student $i$ turns in a submission $s_{i,j}$. Each submission $s_{i,j}$ has a true integer score $g_{i,j}^* \in [0, 10]$, drawn (independently at random) from the binomial distribution $B(10, \frac{7}{10})$.

The process of grading is modeled by an agent receiving a signal about the true score of a submission. The signal is a function of some number of draws from a latent distribution that depends on the true score of the submission being graded and the bias of the agent.

$^5$Model $PG_1$ strikes a good balance between simplicity and performance in the analysis conducted by Piech et al. It is also useful, because there has been subsequent work on procedures for estimating its parameters [2]. However, it is not the best-performing model that they propose. A natural extension that we leave open as an avenue for future work is to conduct additional experiments with models that incorporate features of their more complex, but slightly better-performing models.
We consider both unbiased and biased agents:

**Unbiased Agents.** For an unbiased agent, the expectation of the latent distribution is equal to the ground truth score. Their signal for an assignment $s_{i,j}$ is a function of draws from the latent distribution $B \left( 10, \frac{g^*_{i,j}}{10} \right)$.

**Biased Agents.** In practice, agents may have some bias in grading assignments. That is, the latent distribution from which draws are used to construct their signal for each assignment could have a mean that is slightly higher or lower than that assignment’s ground truth score. An agent $k$’s bias $b_k$ is sampled uniformly at random from the normal distribution $\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$. Their signal for submission $s_{i,j}$ is a function of draws from the latent distribution $B \left( 10, \frac{g^*_{i,j} + b_k}{10} \right)$.

The number of draws from an agent’s latent distribution that are used to create their signal—which determines the variance of the distribution of their signals—is a function of their effort; greater effort corresponds to lower variance.

When the signal is created using a single draw, defining the signal is trivial—the signal is equal to the outcome. When the signal is created using more than one draw from the latent distribution, the signal is defined as the simple average of the outcomes of the draws rounded to the nearest integer. This convention ensures that the space of signals is equal to the space of reports, so the notion of a “truthful report” is straightforward and well-defined. We explore two models of effort:

**Binary Effort.** Here, there are two types of agents: *active graders* exert high effort, *passive graders* exert low effort. Active graders receive signals created using three draws from their latent distribution. Passive graders receive signals created using a single draw from their latent distribution.

**Continuous Effort.** Here, effort is parameterized by a continuous value $\lambda \in (0, 2]$ drawn uniformly at random. The number of draws from the latent distribution used to create an agent’s signal is equal to $1 + X$, where $X \sim \text{Pois} (\lambda)$ is drawn according to the Poisson distribution.

Each agent’s quality is considered to be equivalent to their effort. Settings with biased agents present a complication to this notion of quality. However, consistent with the peer assessment literature [19], we find that it is useful to model bias and effort separately and correct for bias whenever possible. This is consistent with our overall approach—we assume that accurate measurements of agent quality, irrespective of agent bias, are sufficient for assigning fair meta-grades according to some rule.

### 3.1 Peer Prediction Mechanisms

In what follows, we describe the intuition behind the mechanisms that we evaluate using our agent-based modeling framework. We also discuss the challenges that the particularities of the peer assessment setting and our peer assessment model pose to the implementation of the mechanisms. For a more specific discussion of the actual implementation of the various mechanisms and how we overcome these challenges, see Appendix B.

#### 3.1.1 Baseline

One advantage of initially assuming that all agents report their signals truthfully, is that it allows us to use a simple baseline that would typically be excluded in theoretical work, because it has trivial uninformative, non-truthful equilibria:

**Mean Squared Error (MSE) Mechanism.** On each submission that they grade, agents are paid according to the mean squared error of their reports from the consensus grade of each submission. The consensus grade of a submission—a basic estimate of its unobservable true grade—is defined to be the simple average of the reports of all 4 agents that graded it. To maintain the convention that the higher rewards correspond to higher quality agents, the payments are equal to the negative of the mean squared error.

---

6If $g^*_{i,j} + b_k$ is greater than 10 or less than 0, then the value is truncated to be 10 or 0, respectively.
This choice of baseline is useful for its simplicity, but it is also used in practice. Bachelet et al. [1], for example, recommend using this method to assign grades (when the reports have been appropriately pre-processed).

### 3.1.2 Non-Parametric Mechanisms

Our first category of peer prediction mechanisms is drawn from the fundamental mechanisms proposed in the peer prediction literature. It reflects the options that a novice mechanism designer would find in an initial search for peer prediction mechanisms to deploy in some application.

In keeping with this, we implement these mechanisms as faithfully as possible to the descriptions given in the works in which they were proposed. We make minimal changes and only when necessary to ensure basic functionality within the setting of our model.

Note that for all mechanisms that involve pairing an agent with another agent in order to compute their scores on a grading task (i.e. generating a report for one submission), we take the expectation over all of the possible pairings to reduce the variance of the scores.

**Output Agreement (OA) Mechanism.** The simplest type of peer prediction mechanism, common in the literature [3], is an output agreement mechanism. To compute payments for a task in the OA mechanism, agents are paired and their reports are compared. Agents are paid 1 if their reports match and 0 otherwise.

**Peer Truth Serum (PTS) Mechanism.** Developed by Faltings et al. [3], the PTS mechanism pays agents if their report for a task agrees with the report of a randomly selected peer on the same task. The magnitude of the payment is proportional to the inverse of the frequency of their report according to a distribution $R$ over the report space.

**Φ-Divergence Pairing (Φ-Div) Mechanism.** The Φ-Div mechanism was proposed by Schoenebeck and Yu [20] and is based on applying an information-theoretic framework for understanding and designing peer prediction mechanisms described by Kong and Schoenebeck [15]. It pays agents in pairs according to an estimate of the Φ-Mutual Information between two random variables $X$ and $Y$ that are drawn, respectively, from the distribution of the reports of each agent in the pair.

Φ, a convex function chosen by the mechanism designer, defines a corresponding Φ-divergence, which measures the difference between two distributions with the same support. In turn, the Φ-divergence defines an “optimal separator” for distinguishing whether a pair of reports $x, y$ was drawn from the joint distribution of reports, $P_{X,Y}(x, y)$, or the product of the marginal distributions $P_X(x)P_Y(y)$. The optimal separator is $\partial \Phi(JP(x, y))$, where $\partial \Phi$ denotes the subgradient of Φ.

$\text{JP}(x, y) = \frac{P_{X,Y}(x, y)}{P_X(x)P_Y(y)}$

is the joint-to-marginal-product ratio of the reports $x$ and $y$.

For a given pair of agents and a task $b$, referred to as the bonus task, a pair of penalty tasks, $p$ and $q$—distinct from each other and from the bonus task—are randomly chosen (one for each agent). The pair of agents is paid the quantity

$\partial \Phi(J\hat{P}(x_b, y_b)) - \Phi^*(\partial \Phi(J\hat{P}(x_p, y_q)))$,

where $\Phi^*$ denotes the convex conjugate of Φ. $x_i$ and $y_j$ denote the first agent’s report on task $i$ and the second agent’s report on task $j$, respectively. $J\hat{P}$ is an empirical estimate of $JP$.

Ideally, we would want to estimate the joint-to-marginal-product ratio of the reports for each pair of agents, but given the limited availability of data in this setting, the best we can do is to treat the agents

---

7 Informally, the Φ-divergence between two discrete distributions $P$ and $Q$ is

$D_\Phi(P||Q) = \sum_x Q(x)\Phi \left( \frac{P(x)}{Q(x)} \right)$,

where $x$ varies over the (shared) support of the distributions. The Φ-Mutual Information between two random variables $X$ and $Y$ is $D_\Phi(P_{X,Y}||P_X P_Y)$. 
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$\Phi(x)$</th>
<th>$\Phi$-divergence</th>
<th>Notation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\frac{1}{2}|x-1|$</td>
<td>Total Variation Distance</td>
<td>TVD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$x \log x$</td>
<td>Kullback-Leibler divergence</td>
<td>KL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$x^2 - 1$</td>
<td>$\chi^2$-divergence</td>
<td>$\chi^2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$(1 - \sqrt{x})^2$</td>
<td>Squared Hellinger distance</td>
<td>$H^2$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Common choices for $\Phi$ and their associated $\Phi$-divergences.

anonymously and compute one estimate of one joint-to-marginal-product ratio, $\hat{JP}$, that applies to the entire agent population. See Appendix B.1.1 for the details of this estimation procedure.

In our experiments, we consider 4 common $\Phi$-divergences, which are described in Table 2. One important note with respect to the choice of $\Phi$-divergence is that when the total variation distance (TVD) is chosen, the $\Phi$-Div mechanism emulates the Correlated Agreement (CA) mechanism from Shnayder et al. [21].

**Deterministic Mutual Information (DMI) Mechanism.** The DMI mechanism was developed by Kong [13]. It pays each agent according to a sum of unbiased estimates of the square of the Determinant-based Mutual Information between a random variable drawn from the distribution of their reports and random variables drawn from the distributions of the reports of each other agent who completed the same tasks.

The estimate of the square of the Determinant-based Mutual Information between two random variables depends on the product of the determinants of two matrices, each encoding the frequency of pairs of reports on one part of a bifurcation of the tasks being considered for scoring. As a result, it is easy to see that in our setting, when there are 11 possible report values and agents complete only 4 grading tasks, the DMI mechanism will always pay every agent 0. Further, the DMI mechanism benefits from having the sets of tasks that agents complete overlap as much as possible. This stands in contrast to the other mechanisms we consider, where the number of tasks mutually completed by a pair of agents—as long as it is at least one—is not very significant. To make the mechanism as functional as possible while still remaining faithful to the original description of the mechanism, we make the following adjustments in our implementation:

1. We project the report space down to a space of 2 possible reports, so that each report is either 0—indicating that a submission has below average quality ($< 7$)—or 1—indicating that its quality is at least average ($\geq 7$).
2. We partition the agents into clusters of 4 agents so that each cluster grades the same 4 submissions (namely, the submissions from another cluster).

### 3.1.3 Parametric Mechanisms

Anticipating the challenges that generic mechanisms might encounter when deployed in a specific setting, we also explore how certain peer prediction mechanisms can be supplemented with domain-specific, parametric statistical models. For this, we adopt the perspective of a mechanism designer in a real peer assessment deployment. In the real world the “true” distributions and parameter values that “govern” the behavior of students participating in peer assessment are inaccessible. Instead, a mechanism designer can examine the peer assessment literature to find a model of peer assessment inspired by and validated on real data for which the hyperparameters of the model can be tuned to fit their particular application.

Here, model $\text{PG}_1$ from Piech et al. [19] meets both of these criteria. It constitutes a reasonable continuous approximation to our primarily discrete underlying model (in which an agent’s “reliability” serves as a proxy for their effort). The model, with the appropriate hyperparameters for our setting, is described below:

- **(True Score)** $g_{i,j}^* \sim N(7,2.1)$ for each submission $s_{i,j}$,
- **(Reliability)** $\tau_i \sim G(10/1.05, 10)$ for each agent $i$,
- **(Bias)** $b_i \sim N(0, 1)$ for each biased agent $i$ (and 0 for each unbiased agent),
- **(Signal)** $\zeta_{i,j}^k \sim N(g_{i,j}^* + b_k, \tau_k^{-1})$ for a grader $k$ grading submission $s_{i,j}$,
where $\mathcal{G}$ is a Gamma distribution.\(^8\)

To reiterate, the simulated data in our experiments is always generated according to the model described in Section 3. But instead of estimating parameters of that underlying model, we estimate the parameters of model $\text{PG}_1$. We then use those estimates in deploying the parametric peer prediction mechanisms described below. This simulates the situation faced mechanism designer in a real deployment. They would be unable to know the “true” underlying model, but would be able to tune a reasonable statistical model for their application using past data.

Using model $\text{PG}_1$ is also useful because there is existing work from the peer assessment literature on estimating the parameters. Chakraborty et al. \(^2\) propose a method for estimating the parameters of model $\text{PG}_1$ (and computing meta-grades) using limited access to ground truth. In the absence of ground truth, their estimation method (though not their meta-grading method) can be adapted to estimate the parameters of the model using an expectation-maximization-style algorithm with Bayesian priors for the reliability and bias \(^9\) of each agent.\(^10\)

This procedure is detailed in Appendix B.1.2 and may be of independent interest for estimating true scores from real data for which ground truth scores are not available and for improving peer grading mechanisms in general.\(^11\) We find that, in our experiments, the estimates of ground truth scores it computes are highly accurate (See Appendix E.3).

**Parametric MSE (MSE\(_P\)) Mechanism.** After applying the estimation procedure described above, we can compute a more sophisticated MSE value for paying the agents. Under this mechanism, each agent is awarded according to the mean squared error of their reports, corrected for their estimated bias, from the estimated true scores. As with the baseline, the payments are equal to the negative of the mean squared error.

**Parametric $\Phi$-Divergence Pairing ($\Phi$-Div\(_P\)) Mechanism.** Instead of using empirical estimates of the joint-to-marginal-product ratio of reports, we can pre-compute the joint-to-marginal-product ratio $\text{JP}(x, y)$ analytically under model $\text{PG}_1$ and score the tasks after estimating the parameters of model $\text{PG}_1$ using the estimation procedure described above. See Appendix C for the calculation. This allows us to individualize the joint-to-marginal-product ratio for each pair of agents, which as we noted earlier is desirable but intractable for the non-parametric version of this mechanism, given the scarcity of data.

In simulations, we find that the mechanism performs best when the reliability estimates are heavily regularized and the simplest way to achieve close-to-optimal (if not optimal) performance is to set all the reliability estimates equal to the approximate reliability of an active grader (1/0.7). This is akin to replacing model $\text{PG}_1$ with model $\text{PG}_1$-$\text{bias}$ \(^11\). Consequently, only the bias estimates given by the estimation procedure are used (and only in settings with biased agents).\(^12\)

For each task, agents are paired and scored according to the same procedure used for the non-parametric $\Phi$-Div mechanism, but using the closed-form expression we derived for $\text{JP}(x, y)$ instead of an empirical estimate.

Lastly, we note that the $\Phi$-Div\(_P\) mechanism raises a question for subsequent theoretical work. Our derivation in Appendix C yields a closed-form expression for a separator $\partial \Phi(\text{JP}(x, y))$ that is optimal given point estimates of the bias and reliability parameters of model $\text{PG}_1$. Our estimation procedure, though, computes complete posterior distributions over the values of those parameters; the point estimates are simply the means of those posterior distributions. It is not yet known how to compute a separator $\partial \Phi(\text{JP}(x, y))$ that is optimal given the posterior distributions themselves.

---

8The hyperparameters $\alpha_0 = 10/1.05$ and $\beta_0 = 10$ for the Gamma distribution used to model reliability were chosen by inspection subject to having the correct expected value for a continuous effort agent (and for a uniformly random agent chosen from a population of binary effort agents with an equal number of active and passive graders). See Appendix B for more details.

9Note that for model settings with unbiased agents, we skip the step of estimating the bias and fix all the biases as 0.

10Chakraborty et al. \(^2\) use non-Bayesian estimates of bias and reliability in defining their mechanism; we find that adding the prior improves bias and, especially, reliability estimates for our simulated data.

11We note that some of the hyperparameters may need to be adjusted when adapting the procedure to a new setting.

12We conjecture that the sub-optimal performance of the mechanism when using the estimated reliability for each agent is at least in part a consequence of the mismatch between the continuous signals from model $\text{PG}_1$ and the discrete signals that agents in our model actually see and report.
4  Quantifying Measurement Integrity with Simulated Experiments

4.1  Methods

In this setting, in order to disentangle measurement integrity from robustness against strategic behavior, we require agents to report their signals truthfully. We conduct two experiments.

First, we evaluate the ability of mechanisms to measure the agents according to their quality. For each mechanism under consideration, the experiment consists of a number of simulated semesters, each of which proceeds as follows:

1. A population of 100 students is initialized.
2. For each of 10 assignments:
   i. Each student turns in a submission with a true grade drawn from the true grade distribution.
   ii. A random 4-regular graph is constructed with a vertex for each agent.
   iii. Each agent grades the submissions of their neighbors in the graph according to our peer assessment model.
   iv. The reported grades are collected by the mechanism, which assigns a reward to each student for their performance in peer assessment for that assignment.
3. The total reward accrued by each student, which is the sum of their rewards for each of the 10 individual assignments, is used to calculate the value of the relevant evaluation metric.
4. At the end of all simulated semesters, the mean, median, and variance of the evaluation metrics are calculated.

For both the binary effort and continuous effort cases, we simulate 500 semesters without varying any underlying parameters. In the binary effort case, the performance of the mechanisms as the number of active graders varies is also of interest. For those experiments, we iterate the above procedure as we vary the number of active graders from 10 to 90 in increments of 10, simulating 100 semesters each time.

Second, we quantify the variance of the quality of the measurements (given the reports) in the continuous effort setting with biased agents. We perform the following procedure, for each of 50 iterations:

1. An agent population (100 students) and the submissions for a semester’s worth of assignments (10) are fixed.
2. For each of 50 iterations:
   i. A semester, with the fixed agent population and fixed submission pool, is simulated—graders are assigned to submissions, reports are collected, and rewards for each assignment are computed according to the given mechanism, as described above.
   ii. The evaluation metric is computed.
3. The variance of the evaluation metric over the 50 simulations of that semester is computed.

4.2  Evaluation

Our choice of evaluation metric depends on the way that we model agent effort. In settings where effort is binary—i.e. when there are only two types of agents—the natural goal is to be able to accurately classify each agent according to their type. This establishes a clear notion of measurement. We need to quantify the ability of the mechanisms to place agents on a nominal scale, where their assigned value is indicative only of their placement in one of the two categories. The area-under-the-curve (AUC) of the receiver operating characteristic (ROC) curve is well-suited to this task. AUC can be interpreted in several ways. First, it is the

\[ \text{The DMI mechanism is not functional using this procedure, so for that mechanism the agents are instead randomly partitioned into disjoint 4-cliques, and each agent in a clique grades all 4 submissions from another clique.} \]
probability that an active grader chosen uniformly at random is scored higher by a mechanism than a passive grader chosen uniformly at random. Second, it summarizes how useful the (real-valued) rewards assigned by the mechanism are in being translated into a binary-value nominal scale (i.e., a binary classification) via the selection of a threshold such that all students with rewards above the threshold are classified as active graders and all students with rewards below the threshold are classified as passive graders. An AUC score of 1 indicates a perfect classifier, an AUC score of 0.5 is the expected value of a random classifier, and an AUC score of 0 indicates a fully incorrect classifier.

In the settings where effort is continuous, the constraints of our model similarly establish a clear notion of measurement. In particular, the absolute magnitude of an agent’s effort parameter \( \lambda \), as well as the differences between two agents’ effort parameters, does not have a straightforward interpretation in our model. Can we expect an agent with \( \lambda = 1 \) to be “twice as good” as an agent with \( \lambda = 0.5 \) in some clearly appreciable way? Or similarly, can we expect an agent with \( \lambda = 1 \) to be the same amount “better” than an agent with \( \lambda = 0.5 \) as an agent with \( \lambda = 1.5 \) would be “better” than an agent with \( \lambda = 1.0 \) in some clearly appreciable way? It seems unlikely that either question has an affirmative answer. Rather, it is most natural in our model to assign no meaning to the magnitude of the effort parameter beyond that higher values for the effort parameter should tend to correspond to more accurate reports. This interpretation implies that the appropriate notion of measurement for the continuous effort settings is an ordinal scale, i.e., a ranking. For rankings, the Kendall rank correlation coefficient (Kendall’s \( \tau_B \)) is an effective evaluation metric. Kendall’s \( \tau_B \) is related to the number of pairs that appear in the same order (concordant pairs) and in the opposite order (discordant pairs) in the two rankings being compared. In the case that there are no ties in either ranking, \( \tau_B \) (or simply \( \tau \) in that case) is equal to the proportion of pairs that are concordant minus the proportion of pairs that are discordant.

4.3 Results

**Binary Effort, Unbiased Agents.** In this simple case, for which the evaluation metric has the clearest interpretation, we can gain intuition about the relative performance of various mechanisms. The results are shown in Figure 2.

First, we compare the choices of \( \Phi \) among the various well-known candidates in the \( \Phi \)-divergence pairing mechanism (Figures 2a and 2b). Then, taking the best-performing \( \Phi \)-divergences, we can compare them with the other non-parametric mechanisms from the literature. Immediately, we see an example of the disconnect between theoretical properties, for which the DMI mechanism is perhaps the most exemplary and the OA mechanism perhaps the least, and empirical performance, where the roles are starkly reversed (Figures 2c and 2d). We can also see the immediate advantage of the best-performing parametric mechanisms over the non-parametric mechanisms when we compare OA with the parametric mechanisms and the baseline (Figures 2e and 2f). Ultimately, only \( \text{MSE}_P \) outperforms the baseline \( \text{MSE} \) mechanism.

**Binary Effort, Biased Agents.** Unsurprisingly, we find that in the presence of biased agents, the performance of the mechanisms that do not attempt to correct for agent bias, degrades significantly compared to settings with unbiased agents. This includes the baseline and the best-performing non-parametric peer prediction mechanisms.

On the other hand, for parametric mechanisms that do account for bias, their relative performance compared to the baseline is not equally affected by the presence of biased agents. As shown in Figure 3, the performance of the \( \text{MSE}_P \) mechanism degrades less significantly than the performance of the \( \Phi \text{-Div}_P \) mechanisms. Further, while the best performing \( \Phi \text{-Div}_P \) mechanism, \( (\Phi \text{-Div}_P : H^2) \) outperforms the baseline in this setting, the same does not hold for some other choices of \( \Phi \)-divergence.

**Continuous Effort, Biased Agents.** In our most complex and realistic model, with continuous effort and biased agents, we focus on the three best-performing mechanisms thus far: \( \text{MSE}_P \), \( \text{MSE} \), and \( \Phi \text{-Div}_P : H^2 \). The results are shown in Figure 4.

In Figure 4a, we see that as before \( \text{MSE}_P \) clearly has the best performance. \( \Phi \text{-Div}_P : H^2 \) still outperforms the baseline, but not by much. The \( \tau_B \) statistic in general does not have as clear of an interpretation as

\[ \text{Note that for } \Phi \text{-Div}_P \text{(in contrast to } \Phi \text{-Div}) \text{ } H^2, \text{ not TVD, consistently performs best; see Figure E.1a of Appendix E.1.} \]

\[ \text{See Figure E.1b of Appendix E.1.} \]
Figure 2: Binary Effort, Unbiased Agents. Among the choices for Φ-divergences, TVD performs best, especially as the number of active graders increases. $H^2$ and KL have similar performance, with $H^2$ having a slight edge. $\chi^2$ is clearly dominated by the other choices. When considering all non-parametric mechanisms, OA has the clear advantage, whereas DMI does only slightly better than random. Lastly, the best-performing parametric mechanisms clearly dominate the non-parametric mechanisms, though MSE$_P$ is the only mechanism that outperforms the baseline MSE mechanism.
Figure 3: Binary Effort, Biased Agents. In the presence of biased agents, the mechanism performance degrades, but the effect is not equal among the different mechanisms. MSE$_P$ clearly has the best performance and $\Phi$-Div$_P$: $H^2$ now outperforms the baseline. The choice of $\Phi$-divergence is important, though; for a different choice (TVD), the $\Phi$-Div$_P$ mechanism does not outperform the baseline.

Figure 4: Continuous Effort, Biased Agents. When effort is continuous, MSE$_P$ still exhibits the best performance and $\Phi$-Div$_P$: $H^2$ still (narrowly) outperforms the baseline mechanism. All 3 mechanisms exhibit relatively low variance in the quality of their rankings.

AUC, but because these two parametric mechanisms tend not to produce ties in the rewards, we are able to draw some conclusions about them. When there are no ties, the number of correctly ranked pairs is equal to $\frac{\tau_B+1}{2}$. Thus, we can conclude, for example, that about half the time, MSE$_P$ ranks at least 65% of the pairs of agents appropriately with respect to their effort, because the median $\tau_B$ for MSE$_P$ is about 0.3. Further, our experiments in the previous setting (Figure 3) show that for agents whose effort level is sufficiently distinct, like the levels of active and passive graders, MSE$_P$ separates the groups with high accuracy. Consequently, it is likely that among the 35% of pairs of agents who are not ranked correctly, few have differ drastically in their effort levels.

In Figure 4b, we plot the variances of the rankings assigned by the best performing mechanisms for a fixed agent population with a fixed pool of submissions for each assignment. Although MSE performs best along this metric, the variance for all 3 mechanisms is negligible. For reference, nearly every variance recorded in the experiment is less than 0.006. A change in $\tau_B$ of 0.006 (when there are no ties) would correspond to a change in the relative ranking of about 15 out of the 4950 possible pairs.\footnote{The derivative of the number of concordant pairs with respect to $\tau_B$ is $\frac{1}{2}$, so a change of 0.006 in $\tau_B$ corresponds to a change of 0.003 in the number of concordant pairs.}
4.4 Conclusions

By setting aside incentive concerns and investigating the ability of the mechanisms to measure agents according to their underlying quality (i.e. effort), we are able to demonstrate that out-of-the-box peer prediction mechanisms from the literature generally fail to exhibit measurement integrity. This is significant, because mechanisms that fail to exhibit measurement integrity in a stylized agent-based model setting are unlikely to exhibit it in a real-world deployment.

We also collect evidence that parametric mechanisms, specifically MSE_P and \( \Phi \)-Div_P: \( H^2 \) are able to consistently measure agents according to their quality. The robustness of the measurement quality of the best performing mechanisms in our most realistic setting, in particular, demonstrates that peer prediction mechanisms can be supplemented with parametric modeling to address the unique challenges, e.g. sparse data, that are present in the setting of peer assessment. However, a simple baseline—the MSE mechanism—also overcomes these challenges to some degree.

5 Quantifying Robustness Against Strategic Behavior with Simulated Experiments

Of course, the success of any of the peer prediction mechanisms in the experiments regarding measurement integrity is predicated on the requirement of truthful reporting that we impose. Thus, we now return to the problem of evaluating robustness against strategic behavior. The key question is, to what extent are agents able to strategically manipulate their reports in order to achieve higher rewards under a given mechanism?

In the context of peer assessment, we expect that it is unlikely for students to expend the effort required to compute optimal deviations or play particularly complex strategies. Thus, in this line of inquiry, we seek to depart from the typical theoretical approach of considering all possible strategies. Instead, we focus on the relative performance of a few intuitive, easy-to-compute strategies.

5.1 Strategies

Here, we incorporate our notions of strategic behavior into the same model defined in Section 4 in Continuous Effort, Biased Agents setting. In addition to truthful reporting, we consider the following types of strategies:

**Report All 10s.** Agents following this strategy constantly report 10, the highest possible score.

**Revert to the Prior.** Agents following this strategy constantly report 7, the expected value of the prior distribution of true scores.

The more interesting strategies are the *informed strategies*, which define a procedure by which agents manipulate their signals to generate their reports. We consider simple strategies for which there is some intuition as to why they might be present in or perform well in a peer assessment application:

**Hedge.** A more realistic strategy for incorporating prior beliefs than fully reverting to the prior is to hedge reports back toward the prior. Piech et al. find some evidence for this tendency in their MOOC peer grading data [19]. Agents following this strategy apply Bayesian reasoning by adopting a prior Beta (7, 3) on \( p \), the value of the ground truth score divided by 10. After receiving their signal, they update their prior and report 10 times the mean of their posterior distribution, which is given by \( \frac{\text{signal} + 7}{2} \), rounded to the nearest integer.

**Fix Bias.** Real students may have some indication of the direction of their bias—whether they tend to assign grades that are too high or too low—and attempt to correct for that bias. To model this, agents following this strategy are given the sign of their bias. At the beginning of a semester, they each draw a constant “bias correction” term \( \beta \) from the half-normal distribution that models the magnitude of biases drawn according to the bias distribution \( \mathcal{N}(0, 1) \). For each submission that they grade, they report their signal plus or minus \( \beta \)—depending on the sign of their bias—rounded to the nearest integer in the report space.
Table 3: Summary of the mapping of signals to reports for agents following the Merge Signals strategy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signal</th>
<th>Report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1, 2, 3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4, 5, 6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7, 8, 9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Add Noise. On the other hand, students who do not have some indication of the direction of their bias, or who think the direction of their bias varies from submission to submission, might still try to perform some correction. Similarly, students might try to guess (without any outside information) whether their signal is above or below the average or their peers and try to adjust their report accordingly. The result of either of these actions would look a lot like adding noise to their signal to generate their report. To model this, agents following this strategy draw a value $\nu \sim N(0, 1)$ for each submission that they grade and report the sum of their signal and $\nu$, rounded to the nearest integer in the report space.

Merge Signals. There is some evidence that when the report space is sufficiently large, students tend to under-utilize certain report values (particularly values that are low, but non-zero) [23]. To model this, agents following this strategy map the signal space to a lower-dimensional report space and report the outcome of applying that map to their signal. The map from signals to reports is detailed in Table 3.

5.2 Methods

Here, we focus on the best performing mechanisms from the measurement integrity experiments, with the goal of identifying mechanisms that perform well in both dimensions of our analysis. However, the degree to which the remaining mechanisms create incentives for deviating from truthful reporting is still of interest, so we record the results of our first experiment in this section with those mechanisms in Appendix E.2. For each strategy, we perform two experiments in the Continuous Effort, Biased Agents setting.

First, we explore how the incentives for deviating from truthful reporting change as the number of agents adopting some non-truthful strategy grows. We perform the following:

1. The number of strategic agents is varied from 10 to 90, in steps of size 10.
   For each step, we perform 100 iterations of the following procedure:
   i. A population of 100 agents is initialized.
   ii. A semester’s worth of submissions and reports for grading those submissions are generated, as in Section 4.
   iii. Rewards are assigned twice according to the given mechanism with a fixed random seed. In the first assignment, the number of truthful and strategic agents is as given by the current step. In the second assignment, one agent that reported truthfully in the first assignment is randomly selected. That agent modifies their reports according to the prescribed strategy. Due to the fixed random seed, every other factor is consistent with the first reward assignment.
   iv. The gain in rank achieved by that single agent, i.e difference in the ranks according to the two reward assignments computed by the mechanism, is recorded$^{17}$

2. The mean and variance of the gains in rank over the 100 iterations is computed for each step.

3. The AUC achieved by considering the mechanism’s rewards as scores with which to classify the agents as either truthful or strategic is also recorded. This gives a more population-level view of the incentives for reporting truthfully or strategically.

$^{17}$For example, if the agent was given the 5th highest payment when they reported truthfully and the 10th highest payment when they reported strategically, a gain of -5, the difference in the ranks, would be recorded.
Second, we examine how the value of the ordinal measurements (i.e. rankings) produced by a mechanism deteriorates in the presence of strategic agents. For this, we replicate the measurement integrity experiment in the Continuous Effort, Biased Agents setting from Section 4 while varying the number of strategic agents from 0 to 100 in steps of 10. We simulate 100 semesters at each step.

Note that for both of these experiments, we consider strategy profiles for which it is unlikely that they would be observed in real-world data or laboratory experiments. Certain strategy profiles, e.g. where nearly every student uses the Report All 10s strategy, strain the incentive properties of many mechanisms (even those that are robust against strategic behavior for many of the other strategy profiles that we consider). However, many such strategy profiles are unlikely to arise organically from students learning via repeated interactions with a mechanism. This more comprehensive exploration of the space of strategy profiles that is possible in our experiments—though not as exhaustive as theoretical results, which often consider the entire space—is a useful advantage that we gain by applying ABMs. As a result, we are able to give a more nuanced accounting of the properties of the mechanisms than is likely possible with other empirical approaches.

5.3 Results

Incentives for Deviating from Reporting Truthfully. As shown in Figure 5, we find that the individual incentives for deviating from truthful reporting are strong under the MSE$P$ and MSE mechanisms, whereas $\Phi$-Div$P$: $H^2$ is much more robust against strategic behavior.

In Figure 6, we compare the relative rewards of truthful and strategic agents by interpreting the rewards as scores that can be used for classification and calculating the AUC. For clarity, the plots are shown in steps of size 20 instead of 10. Here, AUC can be interpreted as the probability that a uniformly random truthful agent is ranked higher than a uniformly random strategic agent. This analysis corroborates the analysis of Figure 5. For the $\Phi$-Div$P$: $H^2$ mechanism, truthful agents tend to be paid more than strategic agents (AUC $> 0.5$), whereas for certain strategies under the MSE$P$ and MSE mechanisms, the strategic agents are almost certainly paid more than the truthful agents (AUC $\approx 0$).

There are some noteworthy strategies that stand out: Hedge exhibits both high average rank gain (that does not depend too much on the number of other strategic agents) and relatively low variance under the MSE$P$ and MSE mechanisms, which makes it a very attractive strategy for students deviating from truthful reporting. Report All 10s is also a very potent strategy, under all 3 mechanisms, when the number of strategic agents is high. On the other hand, Add Noise appears universally ineffective and Fix Bias seems approximately neutral in all cases.

Quality of Rankings in the Presence of Strategic Agents. Although there is a general focus on deterring strategic manipulation of reports, not all strategic manipulations are necessarily equally damaging to the mechanism. Uninformed strategies are clearly detrimental, since the mechanism receives no information about the signals of agents following those strategies. However, for some informed strategies, it is possible that the mechanism might still be able to demonstrate measurement integrity even if those strategies become common among the agents. For example, it is reasonable to expect the Fix Bias strategy to only minimally affect the performance of parametric mechanisms, which take bias into account. Indeed, we find that this is the case in Figure 7a, which shows that the performance of all 3 mechanisms is relatively constant as the number of agents adopting the Fix Bias strategy grows.

On the other hand, though, other strategies do significantly affect the performance of the mechanisms. In our previous experiment, we singled out Hedge as a particularly attractive strategy for agents participating in the MSE and MSE$P$ mechanisms. In Figure 7b, we see that additionally, the number of agents adopting the Hedge strategy has a clear effect on the performance on those mechanisms (although the effect is not monotonic). When 40 agents adopt the Hedge strategy, for example, $\Phi$-Div$P$: $H^2$ arguably supplants MSE$P$ as the best mechanism. Note that in Figure 7, we again plot results in steps of size 20 instead of 10 for clarity.

5.4 Conclusions

In shifting our focus back to incentive-compatibility, we find that there is an apparent trade-off between measurement integrity, for which the MSE$P$ mechanism is best, and incentivizing truthful reporting, for which $\Phi$-Div$P$ mechanisms are much more robust. In practice, more information about the specific strategies
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(a) For each mechanism and each strategy, the mean gain in rank achieved, *ceteris paribus*, by a single agent changing their reports from truthful to strategic. The mean is taken over the outcomes of 100 simulated semesters as the number of other strategic agents varies in steps of size 10.

(b) In the same setting as Figure 5a, the variance of the gain in rank achieved by the agent changing their reports from truthful to strategic.

Figure 5: *Incentives for Deviating from Reporting Truthfully*. The Φ-Div$_P$: $H^2$ mechanism deters strategic behavior in nearly every case—the mean gain is negative or close to 0 for nearly every considered strategy profile. On the other hand, the MSE$_P$ and MSE mechanisms are easily exploited by strategic reporting in almost every case. Many of the strategies have high variance in the rank gain achieved, which may factor into the decision-making of risk-averse students.

Figure 6: *Incentives for Deviating from Reporting Truthfully*. Comparing the relative rewards of strategic and truthful agents using AUC scores for classifying agents as truthful using rewards from each mechanism. This population-level view tells largely the same story about the incentives for deviating created by each strategy as the individual-level view in Figure 5.
Figure 7: Quality of Rankings in the Presence of Strategic Agents. Kendall’s $\tau_B$ for 100 semesters each as the number of strategic agents varies. Comparing these two strategies, it is easy to see that different strategies have different effects on the performance of the mechanisms.

that are common among students participating in peer assessment mechanisms and the relative frequency of those strategies would be needed to make more specific recommendations about navigating that trade-off.

Another important consideration in an educational setting is that there are other ways to motivate honest, effortful grading, e.g. appealing to students’ sense of fairness or providing instruction and practice in grading accurately, that can complement the incentive properties of the peer assessment mechanism being used.

6 Discussion

We have introduced a novel desideratum for peer prediction mechanisms—the property of measurement integrity. We showed how to quantify this property using computational experiments involving agent-based models of peer assessment. We then showed how the same approach can be used to quantify an empirical notion of robustness against strategic behavior, which—as a theoretical property—has been the primary focus of previous work on peer prediction.

We find that there is an apparent trade-off between measurement integrity and robustness against strategic behavior. However, certain peer prediction mechanisms—particularly those that can be supplemented with parametric statistical modeling—are able to somewhat effectively balance these two important properties. In experiments with additional mechanisms that have largely not yet been studied in the peer prediction literature (Appendix D), we have found this trade-off to be persistent. None of the novel mechanisms that we considered were able to significantly extend the Pareto frontier, illustrated in Figure 1, of the trade-off established by the mechanisms from the current peer prediction literature that we consider in this work.

Although our results are established within the context of our specific agent-based model of peer assessment, we expect that many of our results will continue to hold in other settings. For example, the usefulness of parametric mechanisms is likely to extend to other settings characterized by a relative scarcity of data. We also expect the persistent trade-off between measurement integrity and robustness against strategic behavior will remain in other settings. On the other hand, there are particular challenges of peer assessment—particularly the scarcity of data—that are not a concern in other settings of interest. This indicates that a mechanism’s performance in our experiments will not necessarily predict its performance universally. For example, there is some theoretical evidence that the DMI mechanism is a good candidate to demonstrate measurement integrity in settings where there is enough data to support its full power [13].

More generally, our unambiguous results suggest that our methodology itself—performing computational experiments that employ realistic agent-based models to quantify the empirical properties of peer prediction mechanisms—is a useful technique for evaluating desirable mechanism properties, including but not limited to measurement integrity and robustness against strategic behavior. In particular, that our approach facilitates more direct comparisons between mechanisms may be useful to practitioners looking select a peer prediction mechanism to deploy in a particular application.

We also identify several lines of inquiry to be explored in subsequent work. Future theoretical work is
needed to design peer prediction mechanisms that are less reliant on an abundance of data than the current mechanisms from the literature. Parametric mechanisms, in particular, appear to be promising for that purpose. On a smaller scale, theoretical work is also needed to derive a procedure for computing an optimal separator for the $\Phi$-Div$_P$ mechanism given posterior distributions, instead of just point estimates, of the relevant parameters. Future work in our modeling framework is needed to understand the how the existence of cheap signals affects mechanisms’ robustness against strategic behavior. We are also interested in modeling the dynamics of grade inflation—persistent upward pressure on the average report value—which could lead to a loss of information available to the mechanism and could motivate students to adopt strategies similar to Report All 10s in large numbers. This, as we saw in Section 5 can create incentive problems even for mechanisms that are generally robust against strategic behavior. These and other subsequent experiments in our framework could also incorporate more complex peer assessment models, e.g. models PG$_1$ and PG$_3$ from Piech et al. [19], which add additional complexity to the simpler model PG$_1$ that informs our agent-based model of peer assessment. Lastly, future experimental work is needed to understand the type and prevalence of different strategies employed in practice in peer grading mechanisms and to continue to refine and validate the statistical models of peer assessment that can be applied in parametric mechanisms.
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Supplementary Material

A Definitions from Table 1

A.1 Equilibrium Concepts

Helpful Reporting. See Faltings et al. [3]. An agent with prior belief $\Pr[\cdot]$ is said to follow a helpful reporting strategy with respect to a publicly-known distribution $R$ if both:

1. The agent reports truthfully when $R$ is "close enough" to $\Pr[\cdot]$.

2. When the agent is not truthful, their report is never "over-represented" in $R$. That is, if $R[x] \geq \Pr[x]$, given that their signal is $x' \neq x$, the agent does not report $x$.

A strategy profile $\sigma$ is an ex post subjective equilibrium if no agent can improve their expected payoff by deviating from $\sigma$, given that all other agents' posterior beliefs given their signals (and their observations of the publicly-known distribution of reports $R$) respect any assumption made (e.g. the self-predicting assumption) that constrains the form of the joint prior distribution of signals.

A helpful reporting equilibrium is an ex post subjective equilibrium in which each agent adopts a helpful reporting strategy.

A helpful reporting mechanism admits a helpful reporting equilibrium.

Truthful. See Faltings et al. [3]. A truthful equilibrium is an ex post subjective equilibrium in which each agent adopts a truthful reporting strategy, i.e reports their observed signal $s$.

A truthful mechanism admits a truthful equilibrium.

Strongly Truthful. See Schonebeck and Yu [20]. A strongly truthful mechanism admits a Bayes-Nash equilibrium in which agents report truthfully and in which the following properties hold:

1. The expected payment to each agent is maximized over the set of payments to that agent in any Bayes-Nash equilibrium.

2. The expected payment to each agent is strictly higher than their payment in any Bayes-Nash equilibrium induced by a strategy profile that is not a permutation strategy profile.

A permutation strategy is a strategy in which an agent fixes a permutation of the signal space and then, for each task, reports the image of their signal for that task under the permutation. A permutation strategy profile is a strategy profile in which each agent adopts a permutation strategy.

Dominantly Truthful. See Kong [13]. A dominantly truthful mechanism admits a dominant strategy equilibrium in which agents report truthfully. That is, it admits an equilibrium in which both:

1. For every agent, truthful reporting maximizes their expected payment no matter what strategies other agents play (i.e. truthful reporting is a dominant strategy.)

2. For every agent, if they believe that at least one of their informative peers will tell the truth, then reporting truthfully pays strictly higher, in expectation, than any non-permutation strategy (see above).

A.2 Sufficient Assumptions

Self-Dominating. See Faltings et al. [3]. The joint prior distribution of signals is self-dominating if and only if, for each agent, their observed signal $s$ is the most-probable outcome under the posterior distribution conditioned on having observed $s$ (for each possible signal $s$):

$$\Pr[s|s] > \Pr[x|s], \forall x \neq s.$$

[18]Peers with whom the agent forms a pair with strictly correlated signals, see below.
The posterior distribution mentioned in the latter expression of the definition (after the “iff”) is a distribution for the signal of a peer whose signal is independent (conditioned on the ground truth) from the agent’s own signal.

**Self-Predicting.** See Falkings et al. [3]. The joint prior distribution of signals is *self-predicting* if and only if, for each agent, the relative increase in probability for their observed signal $s$ from the agent’s prior distribution to their posterior distribution is greater than for any other possible outcome:

$$\frac{\Pr[s|x]}{\Pr[x]} > \frac{\Pr[s]}{\Pr[x]}, \forall x \neq s.$$  

As above, the prior and posterior distributions in the latter expression of this definition (after the “iff”) are distributions for the signal of a peer whose signal is independent (conditioned on the ground truth) from the agent’s own signal.

**Strictly Correlated.** See Kong [13] or Schoenebeck and Yu [20]. A pair of agents $(a_1, a_2)$ have *strictly correlated* signals (represented by random variables $S_1$ and $S_2$, respectively) if the determinant of the agents’ joint probability distribution of signals (written as a matrix $P$ with entries $P_{ij} = \Pr[S_1 = s_i, S_2 = s_j]$ for each pair of possible signals $(s_i, s_j)$) is non-zero. The *strictly correlated* assumption on the joint prior distribution of signals that is sufficient to guarantee the full theoretical power of the DMI mechanism is that each agent has at least one informative peer—a peer with whom the agent forms a pair with *strictly correlated* signals.

**Stochastically Relevant.** See Schoenebeck and Yu [20]. The joint prior distribution of signals is *stochastically relevant* if each agent’s posterior distribution given their own signal $s$ is unique for each possible signal. That is,

$$\Pr[S|s] \neq \Pr[S|s']$$

for each pair $s, s'$ such that $s' \neq s$,

where $\Pr[S|\cdot]$ denotes the entire distribution over the possible signals of a peer whose signal is independent (conditioned on the ground truth) from the agent’s own signal. This is in contrast to the expression $\Pr[s|\cdot]$, used above, which denotes the specific probability $\Pr[S = s|\cdot]$ for a possible signal $s$ under that distribution.

### B Implementation Details

#### B.1 Implementing Peer Prediction Mechanisms

Note that in mechanisms that involve pairing an agent with another agent in order to compute their scores on a grading task (i.e. generating a report for one submission), we take the expectation over all of the possible pairings to reduce the variance of the scores.

#### B.1.1 Non-Parametric Mechanisms

**Output Agreement (OA) Mechanism.** The implementation is trivial.

**Peer Truth Serum (PTS) Mechanism.** To score a grading task for a given submission, a pair of agents that completed that task is selected and their reports are compared. If their reports are equal, then they are awarded $\frac{1}{R[\text{report}]}$, where $R[\text{report}]$ is the probability of the given report under the distribution $R$.

$R$ is repeatedly updated over the course of a simulated semester via a histogram $H$ of report values. After the payments for an assignment are computed by the mechanism, the report values submitted for that assignment are added to $H$. Then, $R$ is recomputed by normalizing $H$ with Laplace (add-one) smoothing. In particular, this means that $R$ is initialized to the uniform distribution.

**Φ-Divergence Pairing (Φ-Div) Mechanism.** The mechanism randomly divides the tasks in half and uses one half of the tasks to compute $\hat{J}_P$, an estimate of $J_P$, the joint-to-marginal-product ratio of the reports.\(^{19}\)

\(^{19}\)The value of the joint distribution of reports evaluated at the given pair of reports divided by the value of the product of the marginal distributions of reports evaluated at the given pair of report.
for the other half of the tasks by counting the frequency of pairs of report values given by pairs of agents grading the same submission (to estimate the joint distribution of reports) and counting the overall frequency of report values (to estimate the marginal distribution of reports).

Using these estimates, scores are computed for each grading task, as follows: For each task $b$, referred to as the bonus task, agents are paired with another agent who completed $b$. Then, a pair of penalty tasks $p$ and $q$, distinct from each other and from the bonus task, are randomly chosen (one for each agent). The pair of agents is awarded the quantity $\partial \Phi(\hat{J}P(x_b, y_b)) - \Phi^\ast(\partial \Phi(JP(x_p, y_q)))$, where $\Phi^\ast$ denotes the convex conjugate of $\Phi$, $x_i$ and $y_j$ denote the first agent’s reports on task $i$ and the second agent’s report on task $j$, respectively, and $J$ is the empirical estimate of $JP$ computed using the other half of the tasks.

**Deterministic Mutual Information (DMI) Mechanism.** The DMI mechanism pays agents according to a sum of unbiased estimates of the square of the Determinant-based Mutual Information between a random variable drawn from the distribution of their reports and random variables drawn from the distributions of the reports of each other agent who completed the same tasks.

The estimate of the square of the Determinant-based Mutual Information between two random variables depends on the product of the determinants of two matrices, each encoding the frequency of pairs of reports on one part of a bifurcation of the tasks being considered for scoring.

As a result, it is easy to see that, in our setting, when the report space has 11 possible reports and agents complete only 4 grading tasks, the DMI mechanism will always pay every agent 0. Further, in contrast to the other mechanisms we consider, where a pair of agents that have mutually completed only one task can be scored by the mechanism, the DMI mechanism benefits from having the sets of tasks that agents complete overlap as much as possible.

So, to make the mechanism function as well as we can in our setting while remaining faithful to the original description of the mechanism, we make the following adjustments in our implementation:

First, we project the report space down to 2 possible reports, so that each report is either 0—indicating that a submission has below average quality ($<7$)—or 1—indicating that its quality is at least average ($\geq7$). Second, we partition the agents into clusters of 4 agents so that each cluster grades the same 4 submissions (the submissions from another cluster).

To compute the payments for the agents in each cluster, we randomly divide the 4 grading tasks for the cluster into two equal-size groups. For each pair of agents in the cluster, two answer matrices (one for each group of grading tasks), which record the number of times a pair of reports was generated by that pair of agents for some task in that group, are computed. Agents are paid according to the sum, over all the other agents in the cluster, of the product of the determinants of the answer matrices for the pair consisting of themselves and that other agent.

**B.1.2 Parametric Mechanisms**

Recall model $PG_1$ from Piech et al. [19], which, with the appropriate parameters, provides a reasonable continuous approximation to our mostly discrete model from Section 3 in which reliability is a proxy for effort:

- **(True Score)** $g_{i,j}^* \sim \mathcal{N}(7, 2.1)$ for each submission $s_{i,j}$,
- **(Reliability)** $\tau_i \sim \mathcal{G}(10/1.05, 10)$ for each agent $i$,
- **(Bias)** $b_i \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ for each biased agent $i$ (and 0 for each unbiased agent),
- **(Observed Score)** $z_{i,j}^k \sim \mathcal{N}(g_{i,j}^* + b_k \tau^{-1}_k)$ for each submission $s_{i,j}$ and assigned grader $k$,

where $\mathcal{G}$ is a Gamma distribution. Note that the hyperparameters $\alpha_0 = 10/1.05$ and $\beta_0 = 10$ for the Gamma distribution used to model reliability were chosen by inspection subject to having the correct expected value for a continuous effort agent (and for a uniformly random agent chosen from a population of binary effort agents with an equal number of active and passive graders). The PDF of the Gamma function with those hyperparameters is plotted in Figure 3.1a.

Our procedure for estimating the parameters of model $PG_1$, inspired by Chakraborty et al. [2], is as follows:
Initialize: Set the bias and reliability of each agent and the score for each submission equal to their expectation (0, 1/1.05, and 10 respectively).

Update: For each submission $s_{i,j}$, update the true score estimate $\hat{g}_{i,j}$ as in equation (1) from Chakraborty et al. [2]:

$$\hat{g}_{i,j} = \frac{7 \cdot \sqrt{(2.1)^{-1} + \sum_k \sqrt{\tau_k}(r_{i,j}^k - \hat{b}_k)}}{\sqrt{(2.1)^{-1} + \sum_k \sqrt{\tau_k}}},$$

where the $k$ in both sums varies over the graders of submission $s_{i,j}$, $\hat{\tau}_k$ and $\hat{b}_k$ are the estimated reliability and estimated bias, respectively, of grader $k$, and $r_{i,j}^k$ is grader $k$’s report for submission $s_{i,j}$.

For each agent $k$, update the bias estimate $\hat{b}_k$ as the mean of the posterior distribution of a Bayesian update from the conjugate prior $\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ given the agent’s reports and the estimated true scores:

$$\hat{b}_k = \frac{\hat{\tau}_k \cdot \sum_{s_{i,j}} (r_{i,j}^k - \hat{g}_{i,j})}{1 + n \cdot \hat{\tau}_k},$$

where the sum in the numerator varies over the submissions graded by agent $k$ for the fixed assignment $j$ and $n$ is the number terms in that sum.

For each agent $k$, update the reliability estimate $\hat{\tau}_k$ as the mean of the posterior distribution of a Bayesian update from the conjugate prior $\mathcal{G}(10/1.05, 10)$ given the agent’s reports, the agent’s estimated bias, and the estimated true scores:

$$\hat{\tau}_k = \frac{10 + \frac{n}{2}}{10 + \frac{1}{2} \cdot \sum_{s_{i,j}} (r_{i,j}^k - (\hat{g}_{i,j} + \hat{b}_k))^2},$$

where the sum in the denominator varies over the submissions graded by agent $k$ for the fixed assignment $j$ and $n$ is the number of terms in that sum.

Terminate: When the $\ell_2$ norm of the difference between the vector of estimated true scores after the previous round and the vector of estimated true scores after the current round is less than or equal to 0.0001, terminate.

In our implementation, we also imposed a maximum of 1000 iterations of the update procedure, after which the procedure would terminate even if the $\ell_2$ norm condition were not met, but after adding the priors to the bias and reliability estimates, this extra termination condition was never applicable.

Given the estimation procedure outlined above and the descriptions from Section 3.1.3 (and the derivation from Appendix C), the implementation of the parametric mechanisms is trivial.

---

Note that for model settings with unbiased agents, we skip the step of estimating the bias and fix all the biases as 0.
B.2 Software

Our ABM and all experiments are implemented Python 3.8.5 and use the NetworkX [9], NumPy [7], SciPy [26], and Scikit-learn [18] packages. Results of the experiments are plotted using the pandas [10; 28], Matplotlib [9], and seaborn [27] packages.

C Computing the Joint-to-Marginal-Product Ratio under model $\mathbf{PG}_1$

Recall that in model $\mathbf{PG}_1$, the true score for any submission is $g^* \sim \mathcal{N}(7, 2.1)$, and each grader $i$ has an underlying bias score $b_i$ and reliability score $\tau_i$. Then, $i$’s observed grade is $s_i \sim \mathcal{N}(g_i^* + b_i, \tau_i^{-1})$ [21].

Here, we consider two agents $i$ and $j$ receiving signals $x = s_i$ and $y = s_j$. For the purposes of the $\Phi$-divergence pairing mechanism, we need to compute the joint-to-marginal-product ratio of $x$ and $y$:

$$JP(x, y) = \frac{P_{X,Y}(x, y)}{P_X(x)P_Y(y)}.$$

Considering random variables $X$ and $Y$ [22] such that

$$X \sim \mathcal{N}(7 + b_i, 2.1 + \tau_i^{-1}) \text{ and } Y \sim \mathcal{N}(7 + b_j, 2.1 + \tau_j^{-1})$$

and setting $\mu_i = 7 + b_i$ and $\mu_2 = 7 + b_j$, we have

$$P_X(x) = \frac{\exp \left( -\frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{x - \mu_i}{\sqrt{2.1 + \tau_i^{-1}}} \right)^2 \right)}{\sqrt{2.1 + \tau_i^{-1}} \sqrt{2\pi}}$$ \text{ and } 
$$P_Y(y) = \frac{\exp \left( -\frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{y - \mu_j}{\sqrt{2.1 + \tau_j^{-1}}} \right)^2 \right)}{\sqrt{2.1 + \tau_j^{-1}} \sqrt{2\pi}},$$

and so we can write the product of the marginal distributions of $X$ and $Y$ as

$$P_X(x)P_Y(y) = \frac{\exp \left( -\frac{1}{2} [x - \mu_i, y - \mu_j] \cdot \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ \frac{1}{2.1 + \tau_i^{-1}} & 0 \\ \frac{1}{2.1 + \tau_j^{-1}} & \frac{1}{2.1 + \tau_j^{-1}} \end{bmatrix} \cdot [x - \mu_i, y - \mu_j] \right)}{2\pi \sqrt{2.1 + \tau_i^{-1}} \sqrt{2.1 + \tau_j^{-1}}}.$$

Then, we can compute that the joint distribution of $X$ and $Y$ is the following multivariate Gaussian:

$$\begin{bmatrix} X \\ Y \end{bmatrix} \sim \mathcal{N} \left( \begin{bmatrix} \mu_i \\ \mu_j \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} 2.1 + \tau_i^{-1} & 2.1 \\ 2.1 & 2.1 + \tau_j^{-1} \end{bmatrix} \right).$$

Let

$$\Sigma = \begin{bmatrix} 2.1 + \tau_i^{-1} & 2.1 \\ 2.1 & 2.1 + \tau_j^{-1} \end{bmatrix},$$

and as a result

$$|\Sigma| = (2.1 + \tau_i^{-1})(2.1 + \tau_j^{-1}) - 2.1^2 = \frac{2.1\tau_i + 2.1\tau_j + 1}{\tau_i\tau_j},$$

$$\Sigma^{-1} = \frac{1}{|\Sigma|} \begin{bmatrix} 2.1 + \tau_j^{-1} & -2.1 \\ -2.1 & 2.1 + \tau_i^{-1} \end{bmatrix}.$$
Now, let
\[
G(x, y) = (x - \mu_i, y - \mu_j) \cdot \left( |\Sigma| : \Sigma^{-1} \right) \cdot (x - \mu_i, y - \mu_j)^T
\]
\[
= (x - \mu_i, y - \mu_j) \cdot \begin{bmatrix} 2.1 + \tau_j^{-1} & -2.1 \\ -2.1 & 2.1 + \tau_i^{-1} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} x - \mu_i \\ y - \mu_j \end{bmatrix},
\]
be a quadratic form on \(x\) and \(y\).

We can write the joint distribution of \(X\) and \(Y\) as
\[
PX,Y(x, y) = \frac{\exp\left( -\frac{1}{2} [x - \mu_i, y - \mu_j] : \Sigma^{-1} : [x - \mu_i, y - \mu_j] \right)}{\sqrt{(2\pi)^2|\Sigma|}}.
\]

Then, we can write out the joint-to-marginal-product ratio explicitly and simplify:
\[
JP(x, y) = \frac{PX,Y(x, y)}{PX(x)PY(y)} = \frac{\frac{\exp\left( -\frac{1}{2} [x - \mu_i, y - \mu_j] : \Sigma^{-1} : [x - \mu_i, y - \mu_j] \right)}{2\pi \sqrt{|\Sigma|}}}{\exp\left( -\frac{1}{2} [x - \mu_i, y - \mu_j] : \begin{bmatrix} 2.1 + \tau_i^{-1} & 0 \\ 0 & 2.1 + \tau_j^{-1} \end{bmatrix} : [x - \mu_i, y - \mu_j] \right) \frac{2\pi \sqrt{2.1 + \tau_i^{-1}} \sqrt{2.1 + \tau_j^{-1}}}{\sqrt{(2\pi)^2|\Sigma|}}}
\]
\[
= \frac{\sqrt{\frac{(2.1 + \tau_i^{-1})(2.1 + \tau_j^{-1})}{|\Sigma|}}} {\exp\left( -\frac{1}{2} [x - \mu_i, y - \mu_j] \left( \Sigma^{-1} - \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{1}{2.1 + \tau_j^{-1}} \end{bmatrix} \right) \right) \exp\left( -\frac{1}{2} [x - \mu_i, y - \mu_j] \right)}
\]
\[
\propto \exp\left( -\frac{1}{2} [x - \mu_i, y - \mu_j] \begin{bmatrix} 2.1(2.1 + \tau_j^{-1}) & -(2.1 + \tau_i^{-1})(2.1 + \tau_j^{-1}) \\ -(2.1 + \tau_i^{-1})(2.1 + \tau_j^{-1}) & 2.1(2.1 + \tau_i^{-1}) \end{bmatrix} \right)
\]
\[
\propto \exp\left( -\frac{1}{2} [x - \mu_i, y - \mu_j] \begin{bmatrix} 2.1(2.1 + \tau_j^{-1}) & -(2.1 + \tau_i^{-1})(2.1 + \tau_j^{-1}) \\ -(2.1 + \tau_i^{-1})(2.1 + \tau_j^{-1}) & 2.1(2.1 + \tau_i^{-1}) \end{bmatrix} \right)
\]
\[
\frac{2.1(2.1 + \tau_j^{-1})}{-(2.1 + \tau_i^{-1})(2.1 + \tau_j^{-1})} \begin{bmatrix} x - \mu_i \\ y - \mu_j \end{bmatrix}.
\]

Finally, setting
\[
G(x, y) = [x - \mu_i, y - \mu_j] \begin{bmatrix} 2.1(2.1 + \tau_j^{-1}) & -(2.1 + \tau_i^{-1})(2.1 + \tau_j^{-1}) \\ -(2.1 + \tau_i^{-1})(2.1 + \tau_j^{-1}) & 2.1(2.1 + \tau_i^{-1}) \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} x - \mu_i \\ y - \mu_j \end{bmatrix},
\]
and simplifying, we can write
\[
JP(x, y) = \sqrt{\frac{(2.1 + \tau_i^{-1})(2.1 + \tau_j^{-1})}{(2.1 + \tau_i^{-1})(2.1 + \tau_j^{-1}) - 4.41}} \exp\left( -\frac{1.05 \tau_i \tau_j}{(2.1 \tau_i + 2.1 \tau_j + 1)(2.1 + \tau_i^{-1})(2.1 + \tau_j^{-1})} \right) G(x, y).
\]
D Considering Novel Mechanisms

In this section, we give a brief description of some novel (to our knowledge) mechanisms that we used in an effort to push the Pareto frontier, illustrated in Figure 1, delineated by the established mechanisms from the peer prediction literature that we consider in the body of the paper.

Although these novel mechanisms do not significantly expand the Pareto frontier in our setting, we expect that many of them may be useful in other settings where data is more readily available. In particular, as with some of the established parametric mechanisms discussed in the body of the paper (Section 3.1.3), the robustness against strategic behavior of certain mechanisms may be compromised by the fact that agent’s reports, through the estimation procedure, have an effect on the ground truth estimates that are later used in scoring their reports. In settings with more data, it may be possible to get good ground truth score estimates that are independent of the reports of the particular agent being scored by the mechanism.

Lastly, note that each of our novel mechanisms is parametric. Thus, each mechanism begins by estimating the parameters of model $PG_1$ according to our estimation procedure.

Coefficient of Determination ($R^2$) Mechanism. This mechanism pays each agent the coefficient of determination (denoted $R^2$) between the set of their bias-corrected reports (which constitute the “predicted values” in the definition of $R^2$) and the set of true score estimates on those same tasks (which constitute the “observed data” in the definition of $R^2$).

The intuition behind this mechanism is that $R^2$ can be interpreted as the proportion of the variance in the observed data that can be explained from the predicted values. Thus, agents who report accurately ought to do well—their reports explain a high fraction of the variance in the ground truth, because most of the variance in the reports of a reliable grader comes from variation in the ground truth scores (as opposed to coming from noise in the process of generating their signals of the ground truth scores.) Further, conditioned on their signal, any strategy that an agent applies cannot depend on the ground truth, since the signal contains all of an agent’s private information about the ground truth. As a result, the coefficient of determination between an agent’s signals and the ground truth scores cannot be increased by applying a strategy to the signals to generate non-truthful reports. (Note, however, that this statement is a simplification in our setting, since it ignores the role that reports play in the estimation procedure.)

Correlation (CORR) Mechanism. This mechanism pays agents the (sample) Pearson correlation coefficient, $r$, between the set of their bias-corrected reports for the submissions that they graded and the set of true score estimates computed for those submissions.

The intuition here is similar to that of the previous mechanism. Accurate reports ought to be more highly correlated with the ground truth. Further, as described above, the correlation between an agent’s signals and the ground truth scores cannot be increased by applying a strategy to the signals to generate non-truthful reports because—given their signal—any strategy that an agent applies cannot depend on additional private information about the ground truth score. (As above, though, this statement is a simplification in our setting, since it ignores the role that reports play in the estimation procedure.)

Leave-One-Out (LOO) Mechanism. The idea of this mechanism is to capture the value of an agent’s report by determining how much the quality of the true score estimate deteriorates (for each submission that they grade) when they are omitted from the population of agents. The mechanism estimates the parameters of model $PG_1$ using our estimation procedure once with the entire population of $n$ agents, then $n$ more times with a population of $n - 1$ agents, leaving out a different agent each time. Note that, as a result, this mechanism takes significantly longer to run than the other mechanisms.

In implementing this mechanisms, especially in settings with more data, reliable ground truth estimates for each submission should not be difficult to compute, even when leaving one agent at a time out of the estimation procedure. In our setting, however, we found that reliable ground truth estimates would not be sufficient to make this mechanism worthwhile to run (particularly in light of the significantly increased computational resources it requires compared to the other mechanisms).

To gauge the potential of this mechanism, we gave it access to the underlying ground truth scores. Each agent was paid according to the reduction in squared error that resulted from including them in the agent population. That is, for each submission that they graded, each agent was paid the squared error of the true score estimate with them left out (with respect to the ground truth) minus the squared error of the true
score estimate with them included (also with respect to the ground truth).

Even with access to the ground truth scores, this mechanism did not demonstrate significant measurement integrity compared to the best-performing mechanisms. Moreover—because of the access to the true scores—it would not be fair to compare it to the other mechanisms (especially with respect to robustness against strategic behavior). Consequently, this mechanism is omitted from Figure D.1a.

**Maximum Correlation Coefficient (MCC) Mechanism.** This mechanism, along with the intuition behind it, was suggested by Fang-Yi Yu. Given a pair of random variables \((X, Y) \sim P_{X, Y}\), the maximum correlation coefficient between \(X, Y\) is

\[
\rho^*(X, Y) = \max_{f, g} \{ E[f(X)g(Y)] : E[f(X)] = E[g(Y)] = 0, E[f(X)^2] = E[g(Y)^2] = 1 \}.
\]  

For a bivariate normal distribution, it is known that \(\rho^*(X, Y) = |\rho(X, Y)|\), where \(\rho\) is the typical correlation coefficient [30]. Since a pair of signals in model \(\text{PG}_1\) follows a bivariate normal distribution, we can apply that principle to a mechanism and pay each pair of agents that completed the same task according to the maximum correlation coefficient between their reports.

According to model \(\text{PG}_1\), for a pair of agents \(i\) and \(j\) who receive signals given by the random variables \(X\) and \(Y\) (respectively):

\[
\rho^*(X, Y) = \left| \frac{2.1}{\sqrt{2.1 + \tau_i^{-1}} \sqrt{2.1 + \tau_j^{-1}}} \right| (1)
\]

In general, the intuition for the incentive-compatibility of this mechanism follows from the revelation principle. The mechanism, in maximizing the correlation coefficient, applies the “optimal strategy” for the agents once it receives their reports. Therefore, agents need not perform their own strategic manipulations.

In our setting specifically, there is an even more straightforward argument: Each agent’s reports do not play a direct role in determining their payments. That is, the reports do not appear in eq. (1), above. Note, however, that the reports do have an indirect effect, since they are used for computing estimates of \(\tau_i\) and \(\tau_j\) according to our estimation procedure.

**Parametric Φ-Divergence* Pairing (Φ-Div*P) Mechanism.** This mechanism, as implied by the name, is quite similar to the Φ-Div_P mechanism. The only difference is, in the Φ-Div*P mechanism, agents are “paired” with the ground truth instead of with other agents. For the bonus task, the second report is an estimated true score that is computed (using the formula and parameters in the estimation procedure) with only the other three agents’ reports on that task. Thus, the agent who is being scored by the mechanism is not taken into consideration when computing the estimated true score with which they are “paired.” For the penalty task, the second report is an estimated true score (given by the estimation procedure, i.e. computed using all 4 agents that submitted a report) for a task that was not completed by the agent who is being scored.

**Parametric Adjusted Mean Squared Error (AMSE_P) Mechanism.** To discourage agents from hedging, this mechanism introduces a penalty for being too close to the mean of the prior distribution (i.e. 7) into the scores computed in the established MSE_P mechanism. For each submission \(s_{i,j}\), each agent \(k\) who graded that submission is assigned the following reward:

\[
-(r^k_{i,j} - \hat{b}_k - \hat{g}_{i,j})^2 + 0.1 \cdot ((r^k_{i,j} - \hat{b}_k) - 7)^2,
\]

where \(\hat{b}_k\) is the estimated bias of grader \(k\), and \(r^k_{i,j}\) is grader \(k\)’s report for submission \(s_{i,j}\), and \(\hat{g}_{i,j}\) is the estimated true score for submission \(s_{i,j}\).
D.1 Revisiting Figure 1

Figure D.1a: The novel mechanisms that we consider do not significantly expand the Pareto frontier delineated by the established mechanisms from the peer prediction literature that we consider in the body of the paper. The most notable change is that some of the Φ-Div_P mechanisms fill in the space in the lower right section of the figure, narrowly supplanting their counterpart Φ-Div_P mechanisms as the mechanisms that are most robust against strategic behavior in our experiments, but at the cost of lower measurement integrity.

E Additional Experimental Results

In this section, we plot the results of the experiments from Sections 4 and 5 conducted with the remaining mechanisms, for which the results were not shown in the main body of the paper. As a result, the best-performing mechanisms with respect to identifying agent quality (MSE_P, Φ-Div_P: H^2, and MSE) are typically omitted here. The exception is the Quality of Rankings in the Presence of Strategic Agents, which was only conducted with those mechanisms—we show the results of that experiment for the two informed strategies that were not shown in the main body of the paper in Figure E.2d.

E.1 Measurement Integrity

Binary Effort, Unbiased Agents. See Figure E.1a

Binary Effort, Biased Agents. See Figure E.1b

Continuous Effort, Biased Agents. See Figure E.1c

E.2 Robustness Against Strategic Behavior

Incentives for Deviating from Reporting Truthfully. See Figures E.2a and E.2b for the individual perspective on deviation measured by the mean (Figure E.2a) and variance (Figure E.2b) of the rank gain achieved by a single student deviating from truthful to strategic reporting.

See Figure E.2c to compare the payments between strategic and truthful agents using AUC.

Quality of Rankings in the Presence of Strategic Agents. See Figure E.2d.
(i) Comparing choices of $\Phi$-divergence for the $\Phi$-Div$P$ mechanism.

Figure E.1a: Binary Effort, Unbiased Agents.

(i) Comparing non-parametric mechanisms.

Figure E.1b: Binary Effort, Biased Agents.

(i) Comparing non-parametric mechanisms.

Figure E.1c: Continuous Effort, Biased Agents.
Figure E.2a: Incentives for Deviating from Reporting Truthfully. Average rank gain achieved by a single student deviating from truthful to strategic reporting.

We find that the various Φ-DivP mechanisms shown here are quite robust to strategic behavior, even more so than their counterpart Φ-DivP: \( H^2 \), which performs better at identifying agent quality. This corroborates our observation of the trade-off between performance in identifying agent quality and robustness against strategic behavior.

Note that for the DMI mechanism, the effect of the strategies is different, because of the mapping down to only 2 report options. This explains why several of the strategies are completely neutral under DMI; they don’t affect the value of the report after the mapping.
Figure E.2b: Incentives for Deviating from Reporting Truthfully. Variance of the rank gain achieved by a single student deviating from truthful to strategic reporting.
Figure E.2c: Incentives for Deviating from Reporting Truthfully. Comparing the rewards between strategic and truthful agents using AUC.

E.3 Estimating Ground Truth Scores

Here, we provide evidence for the utility of our parameter estimation procedure that is described in Appendix B.1.2.

In the Continuous Effort, Unbiased Agents setting with truthfully reporting agents, we simulate the grading of 1000 assignments with 100 submissions each and record the mean squared error of the estimation of the ground truth scores for each of the following two methods:

1. Consensus Grade. Estimates the true score of a submission as the mean of the graders’ reports.

2. Parameter Estimation Procedure, No Bias (Procedure-NB). Estimates the true score of a submission using the parameter estimation procedure from Appendix B.1.2 but without estimating agent biases. All agent biases are assumed to be 0 and the Update step in which biases are estimated is skipped in each iteration of the procedure.

We do the same in the Continuous Effort, Biased Agents setting for each of the following 3 methods:

1. Consensus Grade. Estimates the true score of a submission as the mean of the graders’ reports.
Figure E.2d: Quality of Rankings in the Presence of Strategic Agents.

(i) Continuous Effort, Unbiased Agents.

(ii) Continuous Effort, Biased Agents.

2. Parameter Estimation Procedure, No Bias (Procedure-NB). Estimates the true score of a submission using the parameter estimation procedure from Appendix B.1.2 but without estimating agent biases. All agent biases are assumed to be 0 and the Update step in which biases are estimated is skipped in each iteration of the procedure.


The results of both experiments are plotted in Figure E.3a. We find that our estimation procedure improves over the consensus grade in both cases. We also, once again, see the value of modeling the bias of agents in Figure E.3a.ii.