

Eliciting Information with Partial Signals in Repeated Games

Yutong Wu,¹ Ali Khodabakhsh,¹ Bo Li,² Evdokia Nikolova,¹ Emmanouil Pountourakis³

¹ The University of Texas at Austin

² The Hong Kong Polytechnic University

³ Drexel University

{yutong.wu,ali.kh}@utexas.edu, comp-bo.li@polyu.edu.hk, nikolova@austin.utexas.edu, manolis@drexel.edu

Abstract

We consider an information elicitation game where the center needs the agent to self-report her actual usage of a service and charges her a payment accordingly. The center can only observe a partial signal, representing part of the agent's true consumption, that is generated randomly from a publicly known distribution. The agent can report any information, as long as it does not contradict the signal, and the center issues a payment based on the reported information. Such problems find application in prosumer pricing, tax filing, etc., when the agent's actual consumption of a service is masked from the center and verification of the submitted reports is impractical. The key difference between the current problem and classic information elicitation problems is that the agent gets to observe the full signal and act strategically, but the center can only see the partial signal. For this seemingly impossible problem, we propose a penalty mechanism that elicits truthful self-reports in a repeated game. In particular, besides charging the agent the reported value, the mechanism charges a penalty proportional to her inconsistent reports. We show how a combination of the penalty rate and the length of the game incentivizes the agent to be truthful for the entire game, a phenomenon we call "fear of tomorrow verification". We show how approximate results for arbitrary distributions can be obtained by analyzing Bernoulli distributions. We extend our mechanism to a multi-agent cost sharing setting and give equilibrium results.

1 Introduction

In the literature of information elicitation, the center is interested in eliciting private knowledge from agents regarding an event. The center is often able to observe the realization of the event, verify the submitted information, and distribute rewards accordingly (Chen and Pennock 2010). However, many real-life problems work in a different way. The center still tries to elicit some private information, usually an agent's true consumption of a service, to determine the amount of the agent's payment. Part of the agent's consumption is revealed as public information, and the agent must report at least the publicly revealed value. Since there is no way for the center to verify the submitted reports, the agents have the opportunity to reduce their payment by under-reporting.

A typical example is the net metering of the modern electricity prosumers. Prosumers is a special class of consumers who not only consumes energy but also produces electricity via distributed energy resources such as rooftop solar panels and electric vehicles (energy.gov 2011). Currently, utilities charge prosumers by reading their net meter, which records a prosumer's net consumption, i.e., gross consumption minus the production (Solar Energy Industry Associations 2017). This pricing scheme is called *net metering*, which is demonstrated in Fig. 1.




Figure 1: Net metering for energy prosumers

Research has shown that net metering is highly unfair because prosumers fail to pay their fair share of the grid costs (Gautier, Jacqmin, and Poudou 2018). Even though the electricity usage of a prosumer is offset by the production, the network usage is still proportional to her gross consumption. Net metering unevenly shifts grid costs to traditional consumers (Hoarau and Perez 2019). Many works suggested that prosumers should pay a part of the grid costs proportionally to their gross consumption, not net consumption (Harirchi, Vincent, and Yang 2014; Khodabakhsh et al. 2019). However, gross consumption is unfortunately hidden from utilities. There is also no incentive for prosumers to voluntarily report their true consumption as it will only increase their electricity bills.

Similar situations arise in many other real-world problems that require self-reporting. A company relies on the reports from employees to reward gym or volunteer hours. Taxpayers receive deductibles to their income taxes by self-reporting their charity donations, home mortgage debt, student loan interest, etc., sometimes without having to provide the corresponding proof. In both cases, only the agent knows the realization of the event (i.e., weekly gym hours or annual charity contributions) and can obtain a direct financial gain by over-reporting. On the other hand, the center, either the company or the government, is unaware of the event outcomes and suffers a loss by giving out undeserving rewards.

At a glance, it is impossible for the center to elicit truthful information with partial signals, or no signals at all. Indeed, the crucial “verification” step that is necessary for truthful reporting (Waggoner and Chen 2014) is missing. In typical information elicitation settings, the center can either verify the reports by observing the outcomes of the events directly (Lambert and Shoham 2009) or by comparing submitted answers with consensus (Miller, Resnick, and Zeckhauser 2005). Neither method would work in our problems because the agents’ reports are not always correlated and it is often impossible to obtain a full signal for each agent.

In this paper, we investigate a truthful mechanism that elicits truthful reports from agents in a repeated game setting when only partial signals are available to the center. In particular, we propose the *Flux Mechanism*, where in each round, an agent is charged her reported value as well as a penalty due to inconsistency in consecutive reports.¹

The use of penalty sometimes installs fear and distrust in agents. However, penalty mechanisms have been widely adopted and proven to be effective in different application areas such as supply chain (Wang, Ding, and Sun 2018; Chen and Akmalul’Ulya 2019), performance-based regulations (Jooshaki et al. 2014), waste recycling (Tang et al. 2019), etc. It is also suggested that truthful players are willing to punish “free-riders” (Fehr and Gächter 2000).

In our mechanism, the penalty rate only acts as a deterrent for agents to act truthfully. The main goal is to ensure that agents report their private values and no penalty payment will be collected at all. In particular, we show that the combining effect of (i) the penalty rate and (ii) the length of the game is sufficient for inducing truthful behavior from the agent for the entire game. As the horizon of the game increases, the minimum penalty rate for truth-telling to be an optimal strategy decreases. We name this intriguing phenomenon as the “*fear of tomorrow verification*”. It is the fear for the uncertainty in the future rounds that incentivizes the agent to be truthful in the current round.

1.1 Our Contribution

In this work, we address the information elicitation problem where the center can only see part of the agent’s private value based on some publicly known distribution. The agent can report any value that is at least the publicly revealed value, and be charged a payment accordingly. We propose a truth-eliciting mechanism, *flux mechanism*, that utilizes the agent’s fear of future uncertainties to achieve truthfulness. In particular, the center sets up a penalty rate r before the game starts. In the first round, the agent is only charged for the consumption she reports (“regular payment”). Starting from the second round, besides the regular payment, the agent is also charged a penalty which is r times the (absolute) difference between the reports in the current and the previous rounds (“penalty payment”).

Intuitively, in each round, an agent can save her regular payment by under-reporting her consumption, but she will then face the uncertainty of paying penalties in the future rounds due to inconsistent reports. It is possible that the publicly revealed value for the next day is very high and she will have to pay a high penalty based on the rate r . If we set the penalty rate to be infinitely high, the agents will be completely truthful to avoid any penalty payment in most settings. However, a severe punishment rule is undesirable and could dis-incentivize the agents to participate. Therefore, we want to understand the following question.

What is the minimum penalty rate such that the agent is willing to report their true gross consumption?

We observe that no finite penalty can achieve complete truthfulness for arbitrary distribution, even for uniform distributions, since an agent’s true consumption will never be revealed exactly. We can, however, obtain approximate truthfulness for a general distribution from analyzing complete truthfulness for a corresponding Bernoulli distribution. For $Ber(p)$, the net consumption (i.e., the publicly revealed signal) equals to the true gross consumption with probability p and equals to 0 with probability $1 - p$ for $p \in (0, 1)$. We give the results for Bernoulli distributions in Main Results 1 and 2. For arbitrary distributions, we can reuse the argument by redefining p as the probability for having a partial signal that is at least α times the true consumption, for $\alpha \in [0, 1]$, to obtain α -truthfulness (Main Result 3).

¹In this paper, we focus on a payment mechanism in which a center provides some service and the agents pay the center based on their reported usage. The same mechanism can be easily rewritten as a reward system where the center gives out rewards based on the reported contribution of each agent.

Main Result 1 (Theorem 3.1) *For a T -round game with Bernoulli distribution $Ber(p)$, the agent is completely truthful if and only if the penalty rate is at least*

$$\frac{1 - (1 - p)^T}{p - p(1 - p)^{T-1}}.$$

Main Result 1 gives the minimum penalty rate that guarantees complete truthfulness for $Ber(p)$ distributions. We also want to understand what agents would behave if the penalty rate is not as high, which describes the situation when a society is willing to sacrifice some degree of truthfulness by lowering the penalty rate. Given any penalty rate, we show that the agent's optimal strategies can be described as one or a combination of three basic strategies, *lying-till-end*, *lying-till-busted* and *honest-till-end*. Specifically, with a low penalty rate, the agent is always untruthful to save regular payment, i.e., lying-till-end is optimal. As the penalty rate increases, the agent's optimal strategy *gradually* moves to lying-till-busted; that is to be untruthful until the partial signal is revealed as the true consumption for the first time and then stays truthful for the rest of the game. When the penalty rate is sufficiently high, the agent would avoid lying completely and reports the truth from the beginning, i.e., she is honest-till-end.

Bernoulli Probability	Penalty Rate	Optimal Strategy
$p \geq 0.5$	$r \leq \frac{1}{2p}$	lying-till-end
	$\frac{1}{2p} < r \leq 1$	lying-till-busted+lying last round
	$1 < r < \frac{1-(1-p)^T}{p-p(1-p)^{T-1}}$	lying-till-busted
	$r \geq \frac{1-(1-p)^T}{p-p(1-p)^{T-1}}$	honest-till-end
$p < 0.5$	$r \leq 1$	lying-till-end
	$h(t-1) < r \leq h(t)$	lying-till-end first t rounds+lying-till-busted for rest
	$h(T-1) < r < \frac{1-(1-p)^T}{p-p(1-p)^{T-1}}$	lying-till-busted
	$r \geq \frac{1-(1-p)^T}{p-p(1-p)^{T-1}}$	honest-till-end

Table 1: Optimal strategy given penalty rate r under $Ber(p)$ distributions

Main Result 2 (Theorems 3.1 and 3.2) *For a T -round game with Bernoulli distribution $Ber(p)$, given any penalty rate r , the agent's optimal strategy is summarized in Table 1, where*

$$h(t) = \frac{1 - (1 - p)^t}{2p - p(1 - p)^{t-1}}, \text{ for } 1 \leq t \leq T.$$

For arbitrary distributions, including the uniform distributions, it is impossible to obtain complete truthfulness without setting penalty to infinity. Main Result 3 gives a reduction from Bernoulli distributions to general distributions for approximate truthfulness.

Main Result 3 (Theorem 4.1) *Given $\alpha \in [0, 1]$ and an arbitrary distribution with CDF F , if a penalty rate r achieves complete truthfulness for $Ber(p)$ where $p = 1 - F(\alpha D)$ and D is the agent's true gross consumption, then the same r achieves α -approximate truthfulness for distribution F .*

Finally, we extend our results to deal with multiple agents. If the agents can be charged independently, then applying the flux mechanism to each individual agent can elicit truthful reports. However, a more complicated but realistic setting, especially in the prosumer pricing problem, is the cost sharing problem when the agents are splitting an overhead cost based on their submitted reports. Therefore, we consider the *multi-agent flux mechanism* where each agent's cost consists of a regular payment that is proportional to her reported value and a penalty payment for inconsistent reports. If the penalty rate is sufficiently high, the agents are always truthful, regardless of others' behavior, to avoid any penalty payment, i.e., the truthful report profile forms a *dominant strategy equilibrium*. As the penalty rate decreases, the agents may still be truthful, but it depends on other agents' actions. That is, with a lower penalty rate, a truthful report profile forms a *Nash equilibrium*. For both equilibrium definitions, we are interested in the following question.

What is the minimum penalty rate for truthful reports to form a dominant strategy or Nash equilibrium?

We give the exact penalty thresholds for both truthful equilibria under Bernoulli distributions and use a reduction to obtain upper bounds for the penalty thresholds under arbitrary distributions.

Main Result 4 (Theorems 5.1, 5.2, C.1 and C.2) *For any T -round game with Bernoulli distribution $Ber(p)$, truthful strategy profile is a dominant strategy equilibrium if and only if*

$$r \geq \frac{C}{nD} \frac{1 - (1 - p)^{n-1}}{p} \frac{1 - (1 - p)^T}{p - p(1 - p)^{T-1}},$$

and a Nash equilibrium if and only if

$$r \geq \frac{C}{nD} \frac{1 - (1 - p)^T}{p - p(1 - p)^{T-1}}.$$

Given $\alpha \in [0, 1]$ and any distribution with cumulative distribution function F , let $p = 1 - F(\alpha D)$, where D is the true gross consumption. Then α -approximate truthful profile is a Nash equilibrium if

$$r \geq \frac{1}{\alpha} \frac{C}{nD} \frac{1 - (1 - p)^T}{p - p(1 - p)^{T-1}},$$

and the α -approximate truthful profile is a dominant strategy equilibrium if

$$r \geq \frac{1}{\alpha} \frac{C}{nD} \frac{1 - (1 - p)^n}{p} \frac{1 - (1 - p)^T}{p - p(1 - p)^{T-1}}.$$

1.2 Related Work

Our work is closely related to eliciting truthful information. Truthful reports can be incentivized from an agent if her reward is based on the distance between her answer and the actual realization (Savage 1971; Gneiting and Raftery 2007; Zohar and Rosenschein 2008; Lambert and Shoham 2009). If the center is not able to observe the objective event outcomes, truthfulness can still be achieved via peer prediction (Miller, Resnick, and Zeckhauser 2005; Jurca and Faltings 2006, 2007; Goel, Reeves, and Pennock 2009). The peer prediction method, however, is not applicable in our problem because the private values for each agent do not necessarily come from the same prior.

A relaxation of the peer prediction method is Bayesian Truth Serum (BTS) (Prelec 2004), in which an agent submits both an answer and a prediction of the empirical distribution of answers from other participants. With a proper scoring method, truthful reporting can be induced. BTS has been further developed to work with a smaller population (Witkowski and Parkes 2012) or non-binary signals (Radanovic and Faltings 2013). In particular, the divergence-based BTS exerts a penalty for inconsistency between an agent's answer and her prediction (Radanovic and Faltings 2015). Our flux mechanism is fundamentally different from BTS models because it does not elicit subjective opinions.

Verification plays a crucial role in information elicitation. In order to elicit truthful information, the center should either be able to verify the submitted information (Waggoner and Chen 2014), or has some knowledge of the prior information of the agent (Jurca and Faltings 2011). To our knowledge, we are the first to propose using both a penalty rate and repeated rounds to incentivize truthful behavior, when the center can only partially verify the submitted reports.

Finally, readers may compare our mechanism with learning models, because it aims to uncover a private value along a time horizon. Though there are learning algorithms to discover optimal reward levels for mechanisms that elicit information (Liu and Chen 2016, 2017), the focus of our mechanism is to ensure the agents to be truthful throughout the game, not necessarily discovering the actual private values.

2 Problem Statement

In this section, we formally define our problem under the single agent setting and defer the extension to multiple agents to Section 5. The agent has a gross consumption $D \geq 0$, which is her private information. The game has T rounds in total, and we assume $T > 1$ as otherwise the flux mechanism becomes invalid. In each round, the center observes a partial signal, i.e., the agent's net consumption, $y \leq D$ which is randomly and independently drawn from a distribution F supported on $[0, D]$. We use $r \geq 0$ to denote the penalty rate. In a flux mechanism, an agent cares more about the number of rounds left in the future rather than the number of rounds has passed. Thus we use $t = T, T - 1, \dots, 1$ to denote the current round, where t means there are t rounds left, including the current round. For example, the first round is *round* T , the last round is *round* 1, and the previous round of round t is round $t + 1$. For round $t \leq T$, the flux mechanism runs as follows.

- The center observes the agent's net consumption $y_t \sim F$.
- The agent submits her reported gross consumption which is at least the net consumption, $b_t \geq y_t$. The agent may not be truthful and thus b_t may not equal to D .
- When $t < T$, the agent's payment consists of *regular payment* b_t and *penalty payment* $r \cdot |b_{t+1} - b_t|$. When $t = T$, the agent only pays the regular payment.

For $t < T$, we call b_{t+1} the *history* of round t .² In each round t , the agent wants to pay the lowest expected total payment by reporting b_t without knowing the partial signals for rounds beyond t . We call the mechanism *truthful* if the agent reports $b_t = D$ for every round t . When two reports bring the same expected payment, we break tie in favor of truthfulness. For y_t 's, we use the words "partial signal" and "net consumption" interchangeably. The offline setting of this mechanism is when the agent can observe the partial signals, y_t 's, for every t before the game starts. Then finding the optimal strategy reduces to solving a linear program, and we give the analysis in Appendix A.

²The *history* usually refers to the record from the beginning of the game till the current round. In our mechanism, the history before yesterday does not affect the agent's action for today. Therefore, the history in round t only needs to be the report for the previous day, i.e., b_{t+1} .

3 Bernoulli Distributions

We start with the analysis of Bernoulli distribution as we show later how to reduce an arbitrary distribution to analyzing a Bernoulli distribution. We show it is only optimal for an agent to report zero or her true consumption in each round. In this way, the optimal strategies can be characterized by three basic strategies (Definition 3.1). The penalty thresholds can then be computed by comparing the different combinations of the basic strategies. Due to space limit, we defer proofs for this and the next section to Appendix B.

3.1 Basic Strategies

In the Bernoulli distribution setting, $F = \text{Ber}(p)$; that is in each round t , the partial signal y_t is D with probability p and 0 with probability $1 - p$. When the partial signal equals to the private value, i.e., $y_t = D$, we say that the agent is “busted” in round t . We first define three basic strategies.

Definition 3.1 (Basic Strategies) For Bernoulli distributed net consumption $y_t \sim \text{Ber}(p)$, we define the following as the three basic strategies:

- *lying-till-end*: Report $b_t = 0$ when $y_t = 0$ and $b_t = D$ otherwise;
- *lying-till-busted*: Report $b_t = 0$ until the net consumption $y_t = D$ for the first time, then report D for all future rounds;
- *honest-till-end*: Report $b_t = D$ for all rounds.

We note that an agent’s optimal strategy for a given penalty rate r can be solved by backward induction. Let $\text{OptCost}(t, r, b_{t+1})$ denote the optimal expected cost for an agent starting in round t with penalty rate r and report b_{t+1} for the previous round. Then

$$\text{OptCost}(t, r, b_{t+1}) = \min_{b_t} \text{ExpCost}(t, r, b_{t+1}, b_t),$$

where $\text{ExpCost}(t, r, b_{t+1}, b_t)$ is the expected cost for the agent starting in round t and reporting b_t (if she is allowed to), with penalty rate r and history b_{t+1} , i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{ExpCost}(t, r, b_{t+1}, b_t) &= \mathbb{E}_{y_t} [\max\{y_t, b_t\} + r |\max\{y_t, b_t\} - b_{t+1}| \\ &\quad + \text{OptCost}(t-1, r, \max\{y_t, b_t\})] \\ &= p(D + r(D - b_{t+1}) + \text{OptCost}(t-1, r, D)) \\ &\quad + (1-p)(b_t + r|b_t - b_{t+1}| + \text{OptCost}(t-1, r, b_t)). \end{aligned}$$

The first term on the right-side of the equation above refers to the cost when the partial signal is revealed as D and the agent has to report D . The second term refers to the cost when the partial signal is 0 and the agent chooses to report b_t . Let $\text{OptCost}(0, r, b_1) = 0$ for all b_1 . When $t = T$, i.e., the first round, there is no history b_{T+1} . Therefore, the agent simply wants to minimize the following total cost,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{OptCost}(T, r) &= \min_{b_T} \text{ExpCost}(T, r, b_T) \\ &= p(D + \text{OptCost}(t-1, r, D)) \\ &\quad + (1-p)(b_T + \text{OptCost}(t-1, r, b_T)). \end{aligned}$$

Solving the above recursion gives the characterization of the optimal strategies in Table 1, as we will prove in Appendix E. However, the recursion approach turns out to be tedious and complicated. In what follows, we provide a simpler and more constructive proof for optimal strategies by exploiting the properties of the flux mechanism.

3.2 Main Theorems

We observe that the agent can only behave strategically when the partial signal y_t is 0. Given $y_t = 0$, her optimal strategy depends on the following two elements.

- (1) The agent’s history, b_{t+1} for $t < T$, which directly affects the penalty payment in round t . Intuitively, an agent is more reluctant to lie if b_{t+1} is high and better off lying if b_{t+1} is small. A tricky case is the first round, when an agent does not have a history. We will show that if a penalty is high enough for an agent to be truthful in the first round, she will stay truthful for the rest of the game.
- (2) The number of rounds left to play, i.e., t , which indirectly influences the probability and the number of times an agent will be busted in remaining rounds. Intuitively, if an agent is busted in the previous round *and* there are still a large number of rounds left, she may be incentivized to go back to lying since her savings from lying may outweigh the penalties.

We show, via the following lemma, that it is not optimal for an agent to report a value that is strictly between 0 and D . Moreover, if an agent is untruthful in the previous round, it is better off to remain untruthful. With this lemma, we largely reduce the strategy space that we need to consider.

Lemma 3.1 For any round $t \leq T$, given $y_t = 0$, the optimal report in round t is $b_t \in \{0, D\}$. Moreover, if $t < T$ and $b_{t+1} = y_t = 0$, then the optimal report is $b_t = 0$.

Next, we prove that in each round t , the optimal strategy is determined by a penalty threshold such that an agent will be truthful if and only if the penalty rate r is above the threshold. We call them *critical thresholds*.

Lemma 3.2 (Critical Thresholds) For $t = T$, there is a threshold penalty rate $r_T^{(\emptyset)} \geq 0$ such that reporting D is optimal if and only if the penalty rate is at least $r_T^{(\emptyset)}$; For $t < T$, there is a threshold penalty rate $r_t^{(b_{t+1})} \geq 0$ such that reporting D is optimal for an agent in round t with history b_{t+1} if and only if the penalty rate is at least $r_t^{(b_{t+1})}$.

Lemmas 3.1 and 3.2 together imply that the optimal strategy can only be one or a combination of the basic strategies. In particular, by Lemma 3.1, $r_t^{(\emptyset)} = \infty$ for any t . Moreover, since b_{t+1} can only be 0 or D , by Lemma 3.2, we only need to determine the values of $r_t^{(\emptyset)}$ and $r_t^{(D)}$ for $t < T$ to complete the picture of optimal strategies. In the following two lemmas, we give some properties of these thresholds.

Lemma 3.3 $r_t^{(\emptyset)} \geq r_t^{(D)}$ for $t \in \{1, \dots, T\}$.

Given the same t rounds left, Lemma 3.3 says an agent is more inclined to lie without a history than with a truthful history. This is straightforward as lying with a truthful history results in an additional penalty payment of rD .

Lemma 3.4 Given $r_t^{(\emptyset)} \geq \frac{1}{p}$, $r_t^{(\emptyset)}$ decreases as t increases.

Lemma 3.4 indicates that the agent is more incentivized to be truthful as the time horizon T increases. In other words, the increasing length of the game naturally reduces the penalty threshold of truth-telling. This is a reflection of our ‘‘fear of tomorrow verification’’. Lemmas 3.3 and 3.4 together tell us the agent is least incentivized to be truthful on the first round and $r_T^{(\emptyset)}$ is the penalty threshold that guarantees truthfulness for the entire game. We give this threshold in Theorem 3.1.

Theorem 3.1 The minimum penalty for truthful reporting in a game of T rounds with $\text{Ber}(p)$ distribution is

$$r_T^{(\emptyset)} = \frac{1 - (1 - p)^T}{p - p(1 - p)^{T-1}}. \quad (1)$$

We see $r_T^{(\emptyset)} \rightarrow 1/p$ as $T \rightarrow \infty$ and $r_T^{(\emptyset)}$ decreases as T increases. This implies the increasing length of the game is beneficial for the agent to speak the truth today, even when she does not have to. To understand Theorem 3.1, we observe that it is sufficient to compare lying-till-busted and honest-till-end since $r_T^{(\emptyset)}$ ensures the agent to stay truthful after being busted. Before the agent is busted for the first time, it is not optimal to oscillate between lying and truth-telling, as it is strictly dominated by lying completely. Therefore, the only viable strategies during this time period is either to be fully truthful (report D) or completely lie (report 0). The desired threshold is then the penalty rate that makes honest-till-end preferable than lying-till-busted.

With a more involved argument provided in Appendix B, we get the exact values for the truthful threshold given a truthful history, i.e., the $r_t^{(D)}$ ’s. The values of $r_t^{(\emptyset)}$ and $r_t^{(D)}$ characterize the optimal strategies for an agent and are an alternative representation of Table 1.

Theorem 3.2 For $p \leq \frac{1}{2}$, $r_t^{(D)} = \frac{1 - (1 - p)^t}{2p - p(1 - p)^{t-1}}$. For $p > \frac{1}{2}$, $r_t^{(D)} = 1$ for $t = 1$ and $r_t^{(D)} = \frac{1}{2p}$ for $t \geq 2$.

3.3 Discussion

The optimal strategy is visualized in Figs. 2 and 3 for $p = 0.3$ and $p = 0.7$, respectively. The x-axis is the number of rounds left (t), and the y-axis is the penalty thresholds for truthfulness. We give examples of penalties via the red dashed lines. For the first round, the agent refers to the blue dot representing $r_T^{(\emptyset)}$, and will be truthful if and only if the penalty is above the blue dot. Afterwards, when there are t rounds left and the history is D , she looks at the green curve representing $r_t^{(D)}$ and will only be truthful if the penalty is above the curve. If the history is 0, she remains untruthful and reports 0. In this way, Figs. 2 and 3 visualizes the optimal strategies given in Table 1.

Both green curves are closely related to $\frac{1}{2p}$. An intuition is that in any round $t < T$, an agent pays D if she is truthful and roughly $2prD$ if she lies, where the penalty payment rD comes from the previous and the next round, each with probability p . The penalty that sets these two costs equal is $\frac{1}{2p}$. The actual $r_t^{(D)}$ thresholds vary upon values of t and p .

4 A Reduction for Arbitrary Distributions

We discussed in introduction how only the infinite penalty rate will guarantee complete truthfulness under arbitrary distributions, yet there is still hope to obtain approximate results. We make a key observation that being busted can be redefined as having a partial signal that is at least α times the true consumption, for $\alpha \in [0, 1]$. Then any arbitrary distribution can be




Figure 2: Critical thresholds for each round under $Ber(0.3)$ distribution with examples of optimal strategies.




Figure 3: Critical thresholds for each round under $Ber(0.7)$ distribution with examples of optimal strategies.

rewritten as $Ber(p)$ where p is the probability that the partial signal is at least αD , where D is the true consumption of the agent.

For approximate truthfulness, we define being truthful as reporting at least αD and lying as reporting less than αD . We reuse the arguments of comparing basic strategies from Section 3 to determine an upper bound for the penalty rate that guarantees α -truthfulness. We introduce the notion of approximate truthfulness in Definition 4.1 and give the reduction in Theorem 4.1. We demonstrate the effectiveness of our reduction with uniform distributions in Example 4.1.

Definition 4.1 (α -truthfulness) A reporting $\mathbf{b}$ is α -truthful when $b_t \geq \alpha D$ for all $t = 1, \dots, T$.

Theorem 4.1 Given $\alpha \in [0, 1]$ and an arbitrary distribution with CDF F , if a penalty rate r achieves complete truthfulness for $Ber(p)$ where $p = 1 - F(\alpha D)$, then the same r achieves α -approximate truthfulness for distribution F .³

Example 4.1 Assume the partial signal follows a uniform distribution $U(0, D)$. Let r be the truthful threshold of $Ber(p)$ where $p = 1 - \alpha$, i.e. $r = \frac{1-\alpha^T}{(1-\alpha)(1-\alpha^{T-1})}$. Then using r ensures α -truthfulness for $U(0, D)$. For uniform distributions, it is impossible to obtain complete truthfulness unless $r = \infty$, which can be verified by setting $\alpha = 1$.

5 Extension: A Cost Sharing Model for Multiple Agents

In this section, we extend the problem to the multi-agent setting. As we have discussed in the introduction, we focus on the cost sharing problem among homogeneous agents, where the cost is shared proportionally to the agents' reports. Let N be the set of agents with $n = |N| \geq 1$. Each agent $i \in N$ has a private value $x^i \geq 0$, and we assume all agents are symmetric, i.e., $x^i = D$ for all $i \in N$. All agents in N split an overhead cost C , which is at least the total gross consumption, i.e., $C \geq n \cdot D$. The game has T rounds in total. Given penalty rate r , we analyze the following multi-agent flux mechanism.

- The center observes a partial signal representing agent i 's net consumption $y_t^i \sim F$ for each agent $i \in N$;
- Each i submits her reported gross consumption that is at least her net consumption, $b_t^i \geq y_t^i$;

³The reduction depends on the agents' gross consumption, which is private information. In reality, if the mechanism has some information about the bounds of the gross consumption, we are still able to set a penalty rate (which may not be minimum) to obtain truthfulness.

- If $t < T$, agent i 's makes a payment that consists of regular payment $C \cdot \frac{b_t^i}{\sum_j b_t^j}$ and penalty payment $r \cdot |b_{t+1}^i - b_t^i|$. If $t = T$, the agents only pay regular payments.

For $t < T$, we call b_{t+1}^i the *history* for agent i in round t and $\mathbf{b}_{t+1}$ the *group history*. The agents want to pay a lower overall payment by reporting b_t^i 's without knowing the partial signals for rounds beyond t . We call the mechanism *truthful* if every agent reports $b_t^i = D$ for every t . When two reports bring the same expected payment, we break tie in favor of truthfulness. If every agent lies in a round, the overhead cost is split evenly among all agents.

We are interested in computing the minimum penalty rates such that truthful reports form a Nash equilibrium (NE) or a dominant strategy equilibrium (DSE). Informally, a strategy profile is a NE if no agent wants to unilaterally deviate, and it is a DSE if no agent wants to deviate no matter what the other agents do. We show that approximate results for any arbitrary distribution can be deducted from an exact analysis for a Bernoulli distribution.

Fix an arbitrary agent i and the other agents' strategy σ^{-i} . Let $\sigma_t^{-i}(\mathbf{b}_{t+1}, \mathbf{y}_t^{-i})$ denote the reported gross consumption by agents $j \neq i$ with group history $\mathbf{b}_{t+1}$ and realizations $\mathbf{y}_t^{-i}$ in round t . A strategy σ_i is called σ^{-i} 's *best response* if it is the solution of the following recursion.

$$OptCost(t, r, \sigma^{-i}, \mathbf{b}_{t+1}) = \min_{b_t^i} ExpCost(t, r, \sigma^{-i}, \mathbf{b}_{t+1}, b_t^i),$$

where the expected cost can be expanded as

$$ExpCost(t, r, \sigma^{-i}, \mathbf{b}_{t+1}, b_t^i) = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{y}_t} \left[\frac{C \cdot \max\{y_t^i, b_t^i\}}{\sum_{j \neq i} \sigma_t^j(\mathbf{b}_{t+1}, \mathbf{y}_t^{-j}) + \max\{y_t^i, b_t^i\}} + r \cdot |\max\{y_t^i, b_t^i\} - b_{t+1}^i| + OptCost(t-1, r, \sigma^{-i}, (\sigma^{-i}(\mathbf{b}_{t+1}, \mathbf{y}_t^{-i}), \max\{y_t^i, b_t^i\})) \right].$$

For the first round when $t = T$, the agent would like to minimize the total expected cost, i.e.,

$$OptCost(T, r, \sigma^{-i}) = \min_{b_T^i} ExpCost(T, r, \sigma^{-i}, b_T^i).$$

Given a strategy profile σ , if σ^i is a best response to σ^{-i} for every agent i , then σ is called a Nash equilibrium. If σ_i is a best response to any σ'^{-i} (not necessarily σ^{-i}) for any agent i , σ_i is then called a dominant strategy equilibrium.

Again, we can avoid solving the recursion to obtain the penalty thresholds for truthful equilibria. For $n = 2$, we show the multi-agent setting directly reduces to the single agent model (Lemma C.2). For general n strategic agents, we analyze the maximum difference between lying and truth-telling for agent i in round t given group history $\mathbf{b}_{t+1}$.

In a DSE, an agent achieves the biggest gain from lying if all agents were lying in the last round. We then use $\mathbf{b}_{t+1} = \mathbf{0}$ to compare lying and truth-telling for an agent. However, the analysis for truthful NE is much more complicated because we cannot simply assume every other agent stays truthful for subsequent rounds after the unilateral deviation of one agent. Instead, each agent will adopt some adaptive strategy that is based on the group history. We prove it is sufficient to show the remaining agents stay truthful when one agent deviates from truth-telling in the previous round.

Due to space limit, we give the exact penalty results for Bernoulli distributions and defer the complete analysis, including arbitrary distributions, to Appendix C.

Theorem 5.1 *For the $Ber(p)$ distribution, truthful strategy profile forms a dominant strategy equilibrium if and only if*

$$r \geq \frac{C}{nD} \frac{1 - (1-p)^{n-1}}{p} \frac{1 - (1-p)^T}{p - p(1-p)^{T-1}}. \quad (2)$$

Theorem 5.2 *For the $Ber(p)$ distribution, truthful strategy profile forms a Nash equilibrium if and only if*

$$r \geq \frac{C}{nD} \frac{1 - (1-p)^T}{p - p(1-p)^{T-1}}. \quad (3)$$

We visualize $Ber(p)$ penalty thresholds in Fig. 4 for different T 's and two values of p . The x-axis is T , the total number of rounds for a game. The y-axis is the penalty rate that guarantees the specified equilibrium. The blue and orange lines represent penalty thresholds for $p = \frac{1}{3}$ and $p = \frac{2}{3}$, respectively. The solid and dashed lines are thresholds for truthful DSE and NE, respectively.

All four thresholds in Fig. 4 decrease as T increases, suggesting that the increasing length of the game promotes truthful equilibria. The difference between the DSE and NE thresholds depends on p . From expressions (2) and (3), we see that the two thresholds differ by a ratio of $\frac{1 - (1-p)^{n-1}}{p}$. As $p \rightarrow 1$, the two thresholds tend to be the same.




Figure 4: Exact penalty thresholds for truthful DSE and NE, given total number of rounds T for $Ber(p)$ distributions. We assume $n = 20$, $D = 1$ and $C = n \cdot D = 20$.

6 Conclusion and Future Directions

We consider a truthful mechanism for eliciting information when partial signals are revealed over a period of rounds. We propose a flux mechanism that charges a penalty payment for inconsistent reports. An agent faces trade-off between saving the regular payment today by under-reporting and paying a penalty in future rounds due to the uncertainty of partial signals. We show that the length of the game naturally reduces the minimum penalty rate that incentivizes truth-telling, a phenomenon we call “fear of tomorrow verification”. Given any penalty rate, we give a characterization of the optimal strategies under both single- and multiple-agent settings for any distribution. We identify a penalty rate that achieves complete truthfulness for Bernoulli distributions, which can be used in a reduction to obtain approximate truthfulness for arbitrary distributions.

A possible future direction is to extend our results to asymmetric multi-agent settings where agents do not have the same gross consumption or the same distribution of partial signals. Once we extend to heterogeneous agents, we must consider in addition to truthfulness the fairness of the mechanism. It would be interesting to develop a definition of fairness for the cost sharing model and compute the fairness ratios accordingly. It is also worthwhile to derive other mechanisms for information elicitation with partial signals that is both truthful and fair.

References

- Chen, C.-K.; and Akmalul'Ulya, M. 2019. Analyses of the reward-penalty mechanism in green closed-loop supply chains with product remanufacturing. *International Journal of Production Economics*, 210: 211–223.
- Chen, Y.; and Pennock, D. M. 2010. Designing markets for prediction. *AI Magazine*, 31(4): 42–52.
- energy.gov. 2011. Consumer vs Prosumer: What's the Difference? <https://www.energy.gov/eere/articles/consumer-vs-prosumer-whats-difference>. Accessed: 2021-09-01.
- Fehr, E.; and Gächter, S. 2000. Cooperation and punishment in public goods experiments. *American Economic Review*, 90(4): 980–994.
- Gautier, A.; Jacqmin, J.; and Poudou, J.-C. 2018. The prosumers and the grid. *Journal of Regulatory Economics*, 53(1): 100–126.
- Gneiting, T.; and Raftery, A. E. 2007. Strictly proper scoring rules, prediction, and estimation. *Journal of the American statistical Association*, 102(477): 359–378.
- Goel, S.; Reeves, D. M.; and Pennock, D. M. 2009. Collective revelation: A mechanism for self-verified, weighted, and truthful predictions. In *Proceedings of the 10th ACM conference on Electronic commerce*, 265–274.
- Harirchi, F.; Vincent, T.; and Yang, D. 2014. Optimal payment sharing mechanism for renewable energy aggregation. In *2014 IEEE International Conference on Smart Grid Communications (SmartGridComm)*, 608–613. IEEE.
- Hoarau, Q.; and Perez, Y. 2019. Network tariff design with prosumers and electromobility: Who wins, who loses? *Energy Economics*, 83: 26–39.
- Jooshaki, M.; Abbaspour, A.; Fotuhi-Firuzabad, M.; Moeini-Aghaie, M.; and Ozdemir, A. 2014. A new reward-penalty mechanism for distribution companies based on concept of competition. In *IEEE PES Innovative Smart Grid Technologies, Europe*, 1–5. IEEE.
- Jurca, R.; and Faltings, B. 2006. Minimum payments that reward honest reputation feedback. In *Proceedings of the 7th ACM Conference on Electronic Commerce*, 190–199.
- Jurca, R.; and Faltings, B. 2007. Collusion-resistant, incentive-compatible feedback payments. In *Proceedings of the 8th ACM conference on Electronic commerce*, 200–209.
- Jurca, R.; and Faltings, B. 2011. Incentives for answering hypothetical questions. In *Workshop on Social Computing and User Generated Content, EC-11, CONF*.
- Khodabakhsh, A.; Horn, J.; Nikolova, E.; and Pountourakis, E. 2019. Prosumer Pricing, Incentives and Fairness. In *Proceedings of the Tenth ACM International Conference on Future Energy Systems*, 116–120.
- Lambert, N.; and Shoham, Y. 2009. Eliciting truthful answers to multiple-choice questions. In *Proceedings of the 10th ACM conference on Electronic commerce*, 109–118.
- Liu, Y.; and Chen, Y. 2016. Learning to incentivize: Eliciting effort via output agreement. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1604.04928*.
- Liu, Y.; and Chen, Y. 2017. Sequential peer prediction: Learning to elicit effort using posted prices. In *Thirty-First AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*.
- Miller, N.; Resnick, P.; and Zeckhauser, R. 2005. Eliciting informative feedback: The peer-prediction method. *Management Science*, 51(9): 1359–1373.
- Prelec, D. 2004. A Bayesian truth serum for subjective data. *science*, 306(5695): 462–466.
- Radanovic, G.; and Faltings, B. 2013. A robust bayesian truth serum for non-binary signals. In *Twenty-Seventh AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*.
- Radanovic, G.; and Faltings, B. 2015. Incentives for subjective evaluations with private beliefs. In *Twenty-Ninth AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*.
- Savage, L. J. 1971. Elicitation of personal probabilities and expectations. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 66(336): 783–801.
- Solar Energy Industry Associations. 2017. Net Metering. <https://www.seia.org/initiatives/net-metering>. Accessed: 2021-09-01.
- Tang, Y.; Zhang, Q.; Li, Y.; Li, H.; Pan, X.; and McLellan, B. 2019. The social-economic-environmental impacts of recycling retired EV batteries under reward-penalty mechanism. *Applied Energy*, 251: 113313.
- Waggoner, B.; and Chen, Y. 2014. Output agreement mechanisms and common knowledge. In *Second AAAI Conference on Human Computation and Crowdsourcing*.
- Wang, W.; Ding, J.; and Sun, H. 2018. Reward-penalty mechanism for a two-period closed-loop supply chain. *Journal of cleaner production*, 203: 898–917.
- Witkowski, J.; and Parkes, D. C. 2012. A robust bayesian truth serum for small populations. In *Twenty-Sixth AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*.
- Zohar, A.; and Rosenschein, J. S. 2008. Mechanisms for information elicitation. *Artificial Intelligence*, 172(16-17): 1917–1939.

Appendix: Missing Materials

A Offline Settings

In the offline settings, the net consumption for each round t , y_t , is known at the beginning of the game. To obtain the optimal reports in the single agent model, we solve the following mathematical program:

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{b_1, \dots, b_T} \quad & \sum_{t=1}^T b_t + \sum_{t=1}^{T-1} r |b_{t+1} - b_t| \\ \text{subject to} \quad & b_t \geq y_t \quad \forall t, \end{aligned}$$

which can be rewritten as a linear program and solved in polynomial time via the ellipsoid method. The formulation in the multi-agent model is similar and can be reduced to a nonlinear program. It is trivial to show that it is only possible to guarantee truthfulness via the infinite penalty rate in the offline settings. This further proves the significance of our findings – it is precisely the uncertainty of the net consumption that induces the truthful reports from agents.

B Missing Proofs in Sections 3 and 4

B.1 Proof for Lemma 3.1

Proof. To see the first sentence, we can observe that the cost function is a linear function of today's report b_t and thus either 0 or D achieves the optimality. To see the second sentence, we consider the last round t in the optimal strategy such that when $(b_{t+1}, y_t) = (0, 0)$ but $b_t > 0$. It is obvious if t is the last round, and thus we assume $t > 1$. By reporting b_t in round t , the expected total cost afterward is

$$\begin{aligned} & rb_t + b_t + \text{ExpCost}(t-1, r, b_t, b_{t-1}) \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{y_{t-1}} [(r+1)b_t + r |\max\{y_{t-1}, b_{t-1}\} - b_{t-1}| + \max\{y_{t-1}, b_{t-1}\} + \text{OptCost}(t-2, r, \max\{y_{t-1}, b_{t-1}\})] \\ &> \mathbb{E}_{y_{t-1}} [r \max\{y_{t-1}, b_{t-1}\} + \max\{y_{t-1}, b_{t-1}\} + \text{Opt}(t-2, r, \max\{y_{t-1}, b_{t-1}\})] \\ &= \text{ExpCost}(t-1, r, 0, b_{t-1}) \end{aligned}$$

where the inequality is because for any $x \geq 0$ and $b_t > 0$,

$$(r+1)b_t + r|x - b_t| \geq (r+1)b_t + r(x - b_t) > rx.$$

The last term is exactly the expected total cost by reporting 0 in round t but adopting the same strategy with the optimal one afterward, which is contradiction with $b_t > 0$ being optimal. Thus we complete the proof of the lemma. ■

B.2 Proof for Lemma 3.2

Proof. Note that by Lemma 3.1, b_{t+1} can only be 0 or D . Moreover, $r_t^{(\emptyset)} = \infty$ for any $t < T$. Therefore, we only need to show the existence of $r_t^{(\emptyset)}$ and $r_t^{(D)}$ for $t < T$. It suffices to show the following claim: For any round $T \geq t \geq 1$ with $y_t = 0$, if the optimal strategy is $b_t = 0$ given penalty rate r , then $b_t = 0$ is also optimal for any $r' \leq r$; if the optimal strategy is $b_t = D$ given penalty rate r , then $b_t = D$ is also optimal for any $r' \geq r$.

To prove the claim, we use induction on t . When $t = 1$, it is easy to see that $r_1^{(D)}$ exists and is equal to 1. Consider $t > 1$ rounds left and the optimal strategy is to report 0 given penalty r and $b_{t+1} = D$ (or no history if $t = T$). If we increase penalty r to $r' > r$, by induction, the optimal strategy for future rounds either remains the same or switch to D from 0. Given history D and report D , the payment for this round is independent from penalty rate r . Therefore, reporting D is still optimal. A similar argument can be made for reporting 0. ■

B.3 Proof for Lemma 3.3

Proof. Given the same t rounds left, it is straightforward to see that agents with a truthful history is more incentivized to lie compared to when she has no history. This is because she needs to pay an additional payment of rD whenever she has a truthful history. Mathematically, let $r \geq r_t^{(\emptyset)}$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{ExpCost}(t, r, D) \leq \text{ExpCost}(t, r, 0) \\ \implies & D + \text{OptCost}(t-1, r, D) \leq p(D + \text{OptCost}(t-1, r, D)) + (1-p) \cdot \text{OptCost}(t-1, r, 0) \\ \implies & D + \text{OptCost}(t-1, r, D) \leq \text{OptCost}(t-1, r, 0) \\ \implies & D + \text{OptCost}(t-1, r, D) \leq rD + \text{OptCost}(t-1, r, 0) \\ \implies & \text{ExpCost}(t, r, D, D) \leq \text{ExpCost}(t, r, D, 0) \end{aligned}$$

The above inequalities show that when $r \geq r_t^{(\emptyset)}$, the agent prefers truth-telling over lying when she has a truthful history, which implies $r_t^{(D)} \leq r_t^{(\emptyset)}$. ■

B.4 Proof for Lemma 3.4

Proof. An equivalent statement of Lemma 3.4 is that given a penalty $r \geq \frac{1}{p}$, if an agent is truthful when there are T rounds left, then she is also truthful when there are $T + 1$ rounds left. Let us prove the alternate statement.

Assume $r \geq \frac{1}{p}$ and that the agent is truthful when there are T rounds left. Let $OPT(*, T)$ denote the optimal cost for an agent if she reports $*$ in the current round and there are T rounds left. Since the agent is truthful when there are T rounds left, we have

$$D + OPT(D, T - 1) \leq OPT(0, T - 1).$$

Now assume there are $T + 1$ rounds left and the agent is free to lie in the first round. By Lemma 3.1, there are the following two cases.

- Agent reports D in the first round

If the agent also reports D in the second round, she pays $2D + OPT(D, T - 1)$. Otherwise she pays $D + rD + OPT(0, T - 1) \geq 2D + rD + OPT(D, T - 1)$, which is dominated by reporting D for both rounds.

- Agent reports 0 in the first round

Then the agent's total expected payment is

$$p(D + rD + OPT(D, T - 1)) + (1 - p)OPT(0, T - 1) \geq D + prD + OPT(D, T - 1) \geq 2D + OPT(D, T - 1).$$

Therefore, the optimal strategy is to report D in the first two rounds and the rest of the game is exactly the same as when there are T rounds left. ■

B.5 Proof for Theorem 3.1

Proof. Be the definitions of the thresholds, if the penalty $r \geq r_T^{(\emptyset)}$ and $r \geq r_t^{(1)}$ for any $t \leq T$, then the agent will be truthful. By Lemma 3.3 and 3.4, $r_T^{(\emptyset)} \geq r_t^{(\emptyset)} \geq r_t^{(1)}$, for any $t \leq T$. Therefore, it is only necessary to compute $r_T^{(\emptyset)}$. By Lemma 3.1 and 3.3, it is sufficient to compare lying-till-busted and honest-till-end in the first segment:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\text{honest}] &= D \cdot \mathbb{E}[\# \text{ days before busted}] = D + D \left\{ \sum_{i=0}^{T-2} i(1-p)^i p + (T-1)(1-p)^{T-1} \right\} \\ &= D + D \cdot \frac{1-p}{p} (1 - (1-p)^{T-1}); \\ \mathbb{E}[\text{lying}] &= rD \cdot \Pr(\text{busted}) = rD(1 - (1-p)^{T-1}). \end{aligned}$$

The optimal threshold can be obtained via setting these two expected costs equal,

$$r_T^{(\emptyset)} = \frac{D + D \frac{1-p}{p} (1 - (1-p)^{T-1})}{D(1 - (1-p)^{T-1})} = \frac{1 - (1-p)^T}{p - p(1-p)^{T-1}}.$$

■

B.6 Proof for Theorem 3.2

Proof. We first show the proof for $p \leq \frac{1}{2}$ by induction on t . Let $h(t) = \frac{1-(1-p)^t}{2p-p(1-p)^{t-1}}$. Assume there are t rounds left. Note that $h(t)$ increases in t , which means that if $r \geq h(t)$, then $r \geq h(t')$ for $t' \leq t$, i.e., the agent stays truthful for the rest of the t rounds. Similar to the argument in Theorem 3.1, we compare the expected payments of the two strategies, namely lying-till-busted ("lying") and being honest, within a segment. Note that the segment now starts with being busted, because the agent has a truthful history.

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\text{honest}] &= D \cdot \mathbb{E}[\# \text{ days before busted}] = D + D \cdot \frac{1-p}{p} (1 - (1-p)^{t-1}); \\ \mathbb{E}[\text{lying}] &= rD + rD \cdot \Pr(\text{busted}) = rD(2 - (1-p)^{t-1}). \end{aligned}$$

The penalty that results in truthfulness sets these two payments equal, i.e. $r = \frac{1-(1-p)^t}{2p-p(1-p)^{t-1}} = h(t)$.

The proof for $p \geq \frac{1}{2}$ is slightly different. First note that for $t = 1$, it is not hard to see the threshold $r_1^{(D)} = 1$ by comparing the cost of being honest (i.e., D) and the cost of lying (i.e., rD). For $t > 1$ rounds left, we apply the same argument above, with the consideration that the agent will switch to lying in the very last round if she is allowed to. Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\text{honest}] &= D \cdot \mathbb{E}[\# \text{ days before busted}] - (1-r)D \cdot \Pr(\text{not busted in the last day}) \\ &= D + D \cdot \frac{1-p}{p} (1 - (1-p)^{t-1}) - (1-r)D(1-p)^{t-1}; \\ \mathbb{E}[\text{lying}] &= rD + rD \cdot \Pr(\text{busted}) = rD(2 - (1-p)^{t-1}). \end{aligned}$$

The penalty that sets the above two expected costs equal is $\frac{1}{2p}$. ■

B.7 Proof for Theorem 4.1

Proof. Recall that being “busted” means the agent has a D realization. For general distributions, given $\alpha \in [0, 1]$, we redefine being busted as having a realization at least αD . Then the probability of being busted is $1 - F(\alpha D)$. Now the proof is essentially the same as that of Theorem 3.1 for $p = 1 - F(\alpha D)$. We analyze the segment between the first day and the day when the agent is busted. Assume the minimum report from the agent during the segment is βD , $\beta < \alpha$. We now compare the savings the agent gets from using this strategy versus reporting αD and the corresponding additional penalty that she needs to pay.

$$\mathbb{E}[\text{savings}] \leq (\alpha - \beta)D \cdot \mathbb{E}[\# \text{ days before busted}]$$

$$\mathbb{E}[\text{penalty}] \geq rD(\alpha - \beta) \cdot \Pr(\text{busted})$$

The agent will report αD every round in the segment when expected penalty exceeds expected savings. The $(\alpha - \beta)$ term is canceled and the rest calculation is the same as the $Ber(p)$ case where $p = 1 - F(\alpha D)$. ■

C Complete Analysis for the Multi-Agent Cost Sharing System

In this section, we give the complete analysis for the multi-agent model. The definition of the mechanism and the corresponding recursion equations can be found in Section 5. Here, we show in detail how we derive the penalty thresholds for truthful dominant strategy equilibrium (DSE) and truthful Nash equilibrium (NE) for Bernoulli distributions and arbitrary distributions.

C.1 Bernoulli Distributions

As in the single agent model, we could solve the recursion and obtain penalty thresholds for truthful NE and DSE. Instead, we present an alternative yet constructive proof to get the penalty thresholds without solving the recursion. First, similar to Lemma 3.1, we show it is optimal to report zero with a zero history and that it is sub-optimal to report anything strictly between 0 and D for any agent at any time. We denote this as Lemma C.1.

Lemma C.1 *Reporting anything strictly between 0 and D is sub-optimal for the Bernoulli distributions. Moreover, if $b_{t+1}^i = y_t^i = 0$, it is optimal to report $b_t^i = 0$.*

Proof. We can use a similar argument in the proof for Lemma 3.1 to prove that if an agent lied yesterday, it is better off to lie today. We consider the last round t in the optimal strategy such that when $(b_{t+1}^i, y_t^i) = (0, 0)$ but $b_t^i > 0$. It is obvious if t is the last round, and thus we assume $t > 1$. By reporting b_t^i in round t , the expected total cost afterward is

$$\begin{aligned} & rb_t^i + \frac{C \cdot b_t^i}{\sum_j b_t^j} + \text{ExpCost}(t-1, r, \sigma^{-i}, \mathbf{b}_t, b_{t-1}^i) \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{y_{t-1}} \left[\left(r + \frac{C}{\sum_j b_t^j} \right) b_t^i + r |\max\{y_{t-1}^i, b_{t-1}^i\} - b_t^i| + \frac{C \cdot \max\{y_{t-1}^i, b_{t-1}^i\}}{\sum_{j \neq i} \sigma_t^j(\mathbf{b}_t, \mathbf{y}_{t-1}^{-j}) + \max\{y_{t-1}^i, b_{t-1}^i\}} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \text{OptCost}(t-2, r, \sigma^{-i}, (\sigma^{-i}(\mathbf{b}_t, \mathbf{y}_{t-1}^{-i}), \max\{y_{t-1}^i, b_{t-1}^i\})) \right] \\ &> \mathbb{E}_{y_{t-1}} \left[r \max\{y_{t-1}^i, b_{t-1}^i\} + \frac{C \cdot \max\{y_{t-1}^i, b_{t-1}^i\}}{\sum_{j \neq i} \sigma_t^j(\mathbf{b}_t, \mathbf{y}_{t-1}^{-j}) + \max\{y_{t-1}^i, b_{t-1}^i\}} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \text{OptCost}(t-2, r, \sigma^{-i}, (\sigma^{-i}(\mathbf{b}_t, \mathbf{y}_{t-1}^{-i}), \max\{y_{t-1}^i, b_{t-1}^i\})) \right] \\ &= \text{ExpCost}(t-1, r, \sigma^{-i}, (\mathbf{b}_t^{-i}, 0), b_{t-1}^i), \end{aligned}$$

which is the expected total cost by reporting 0 in round t but adopting the same strategy with the optimal one afterward. This contradicts that $b_t^i > 0$ is optimal.

To see that partial reporting is optimal, rewrite the payment for the current round as

$$C \left(1 - \frac{\sum_{j \neq i} b_t^j}{\sum_{j \neq i} b_t^j + b_t^i} \right) + r |b_{t+1}^i - b_t^i|,$$

whose second derivative is negative with respect to b_t^i . This means that the payment function is concave in b_t^i and will take minimum at either of the endpoints 0 and D . ■

Starting from this point, we assume that every agent reports either 0 or D . When $n = 2$, we show that the multi-agent model reduces to the single agent model with a multiplicative factor of $\frac{C}{2D}$. The reason of the reduction is that the savings of switching to lying from being truthful for an agent is always $\frac{C}{2}$, regardless of what the other agent does.

Lemma C.2 When $n = 2$, the multi-agent model reduces to single agent model. The truthful penalty threshold is $\frac{C}{2D}$ times (1).

Proof. In the single agent model, if an agent switches to lying from being honest, she saves D for regular payment and then pays penalty rD if she has a truthful history. Now in the two agent model, since agents are symmetric, we fix the action of Agent 2 and see what happens with Agent 1.

		Agent 2	
		Honest	Lying
Agent 1	Honest	$(C/2, C/2)$	$(C, 0)$
	Lying	$(0, C)$	$(C/2, C/2)$

Table 2: Expected payment in every round for each agent in the multi-agent model with $n = 2$.

No matter if Agent 2 is honest or lying, for Agent 1, switching to lying would save $C/2$ and may cost a penalty payment of rD . By applying the same argument seen in Section 3.1 with the new expected savings and penalties, we get the same penalty threshold, except with a $C/2D$ multiplicative factor. ■

For $n \geq 2$, the multi-agent model does not directly reduce to the single agent model. For general n strategic agents, we develop an alternative way to compute the penalty thresholds for NE and DSE. Interestingly, we only need to make use of the following important definition, $\Delta EC_t^i(\mathbf{b}_{t+1})$, to derive a universal framework for equilibrium proofs.

Definition C.1 Let $EC_t^i(\mathbf{b}_{t+1})$ denote the expected cost for agent i with when there are t rounds left and the group history is $\mathbf{b}_{t+1}$. Define

$$\Delta EC_t^i(\mathbf{b}_{t+1}^{-i}) \triangleq EC_t^i(b_{t+1}^i = D, \mathbf{b}_{t+1}^{-i}) - EC_t^i(b_{t+1}^i = 0, \mathbf{b}_{t+1}^{-i})$$

as the difference in the expected payments by reporting D versus 0 for agent i , given t rounds left and the reports of other agents, $\mathbf{b}_{t+1}^{-i}$.

To simplify the notation, we remove the superscript i in the definition and write $\Delta EC_t(\mathbf{b}_{t+1}^{-i})$. By Lemma C.1, $\mathbf{b}_{t+1}^{-i}$ is a string of size $n - 1$ consisting of 0's and D 's. An important property of $\Delta EC_t(\mathbf{b}_{t+1}^{-i})$ is that it is monotone increasing as the number of 0's in $\mathbf{b}_{t+1}^{-i}$ increases. One way to understand this property is that an agent $j \neq i$ with a zero history is more likely to lie in the next rounds, which in turn increases the expected regular payment if agent i is truthful. We prove this property mathematically in Lemma C.3.

Lemma C.3 If $\hat{\mathbf{b}}_{t+1}^{-i}$ contains more zeros than $\mathbf{b}_{t+1}^{-i}$, then

$$\Delta EC_t(\mathbf{b}_{t+1}^{-i}) \leq \Delta EC_t(\hat{\mathbf{b}}_{t+1}^{-i}).$$

Proof. First note that the only non-trivial case is when the penalty is just high enough such that agents with truthful history stay truthful and agents with 0 history lie whenever realization is 0. Since every agent is symmetric, agents with the same history will act the same. If the penalty is too low, $\Delta EC_t(\mathbf{b}_{t+1}^{-i})$ does not depend on $\mathbf{b}_{t+1}^{-i}$ and $\Delta EC_t(\mathbf{b}_{t+1}^{-i}) - \Delta EC_t(\hat{\mathbf{b}}_{t+1}^{-i}) = 0$. Same when the penalty is too high then agents will be truthful regardless of history. Now we can assume agents with truthful history stay truthful regardless of the realization and agents with zero history lie whenever possible. We prove by induction on t .

Base case. $t = 1$. Let $\Delta EC_1(\mathbf{b}_{t+1}^{-i})$ contain k zero's (and $n - k - 1$ D 's). Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta EC_1(\mathbf{b}_{t+1}^{-i}) &= p(-rD) + (1-p) \sum_{i=0}^k \binom{k}{i} p^i (1-p)^{k-i} \frac{C}{n-k+i} - \mathbb{1}_{\{k=n-1\}} \cdot \frac{C}{n} (1-p)^n \\ &= p(-rD) + (1-p) \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \alpha(j, k) H(j) \quad \text{letting } j = k - i \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\alpha(j, k) = \begin{cases} \binom{k}{k-j} p^{k-j} (1-p)^j & \text{for } 0 \leq j \leq k \\ 0 & \text{for } k < j \leq n-1 \end{cases}$$

and

$$H(j) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{n-j} \cdot C & \text{for } 0 \leq j < n-1 \\ \frac{n-1}{n} \cdot C & \text{for } j = n-1 \end{cases}$$

Note that $\sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \alpha(j, k) = 1$ and $\alpha(j, k)$'s depend on k . On the other hand, $H(j)$'s do not depend on k and is an increasing sequence in j . Now consider $\hat{\mathbf{b}}_{t+1}^{-i}$ that contains $\hat{k}$ zeros, and $k < \hat{k}$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\Delta EC_1(\hat{\mathbf{b}}_{t+1}^{-i}) - \Delta EC_1(\mathbf{b}_{t+1}^{-i}) &= (1-p) \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \left\{ \alpha(j, \hat{k}) - \alpha(j, k) \right\} H(j) \\
&= (1-p) \left\{ \sum_{j=k+1}^{\hat{k}} \alpha(j, \hat{k}) H(j) - \sum_{j=0}^k (\alpha(j, k) - \alpha(j, \hat{k})) H(j) \right\} \\
&\geq (1-p) \left\{ \sum_{j=k+1}^{\hat{k}} \alpha(j, \hat{k}) H(k) - \sum_{j=0}^k (\alpha(j, k) - \alpha(j, \hat{k})) H(k) \right\} \\
&= (1-p) H(k) \left\{ \sum_{j=0}^{\hat{k}} \alpha(j, \hat{k}) - \sum_{j=0}^k \alpha(j, k) \right\} \\
&= 0
\end{aligned}$$

Induction step. Assume the lemma is true for t . We prove for $t+1$ rounds left. Assume again $\mathbf{b}_{t+1}^{-i}$ contains k zero's.

$$\begin{aligned}
&\Delta EC_{t+1}(\mathbf{b}_{t+1}^{-i}) \\
&= EC_{t+1}(D, \mathbf{b}_{t+1}^{-i}) - EC_{t+1}(0, \mathbf{b}_{t+1}^{-i}) \\
&= (1-p) \left\{ \sum_{i=0}^k \binom{k}{i} p^i (1-p)^{k-i} \left(\frac{C}{n-k+i} + \Delta EC_t(k-i \text{ lying}) \right) \right\} - prD - \mathbb{1}_{\{k=n-1\}} (1-p)^n \left\{ \frac{C}{n} - EC_t(0, 0) \right\} \\
&= -prD + (1-p) \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \alpha(j, k) H(j)
\end{aligned}$$

where $\alpha(j, k)$'s are the same as earlier, and $H(j)$'s are now

$$H(j) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{n-j} \cdot C + \Delta EC_t(j \text{ lying}) & 0 \leq j < n-1 \\ \frac{n-1}{n} \cdot C + \Delta EC_t(n-1 \text{ lying}) & j = n-1 \end{cases}$$

By induction, $\Delta EC_t(j \text{ lying})$ increases in j . Thus, $H(j)$'s is again an increasing sequence in j . We re-use the argument in the base case and prove $\Delta EC_{t+1}(\hat{\mathbf{b}}_{t+1}^{-i}) \geq \Delta EC_{t+1}(\mathbf{b}_{t+1}^{-i})$ for $\hat{\mathbf{b}}_{t+1}^{-i}$ with $\hat{k} > k$ zeros. ■

With this property, we develop a framework for the equilibrium proofs of both DSE and NE:

- Determine what $\mathbf{b}_{t+1}^{-i}$ look like based on the type of the equilibrium we are trying to compute;
- Upper bound $\Delta EC_t(\mathbf{b}_{t+1}^{-i})$ with an expression using C, D, t, p and r (see Appendix D);
- Compare agent i 's expected payment on the first round when she lies or tells the truth using $\Delta EC_{T-1}(\mathbf{b}_T^{-i})$;
- Find the penalty rate that sets the two expected payments equal, and that is the desired penalty threshold.

Dominant Strategy Equilibrium (DSE)

In a DSE, an agent is truthful regardless of the behavior of the remaining agents. By Lemma C.3, the situation that maximizes the difference in payments when agent i is lying or truth-telling, is when the other agents are lying as much as possible. In other words, to compute the threshold for DSE, we set $\mathbf{b}_{t+1}^{-i} = \mathbf{0}$ and find the penalty that makes agent i indifferent in lying and truth-telling.

Theorem 5.1 (restated) *For the $\text{Ber}(p)$ distribution, truthful strategy profile forms a dominant strategy equilibrium if and only if*

$$r \geq \frac{C}{nD} \frac{1 - (1-p)^{n-1}}{p} \frac{1 - (1-p)^T}{p - p(1-p)^{T-1}}. \quad (4)$$

Proof. Fix an agent i . To show that being truthful is a dominant strategy for agent i , we want to look at the situation that maximizes the difference between truth-telling and lying for agent i , which is precisely when every other agent is lying as much

as possible. Now we assume every other agent reports 0 whenever they can. We compare the expected cost of being truthful and lying on the very first round.

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[\text{lying}] &= (1-p)^{n-1} \frac{C}{n} + EC_{T-1}(0, \mathbf{0}); \\ \mathbb{E}[\text{honest}] &= \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \binom{n-1}{k} p^k (1-p)^{n-1-k} \left\{ \frac{C}{k+1} + EC_{T-1}(D, \mathbf{0}) \right\},\end{aligned}$$

where k represents the number of agents in $N \setminus \{i\}$ that are busted in round T . We would like to find the penalty rate such that $\mathbb{E}[\text{honest}] - \mathbb{E}[\text{lying}] \leq 0$. By Lemma D.1, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[\text{honest}] - \mathbb{E}[\text{lying}] &= \frac{C}{n} \frac{1 - (1-p)^n}{p} - (1-p)^{n-1} \frac{C}{n} + \Delta EC_{T-1}(\mathbf{0}) \\ &\leq \frac{C}{n} \frac{1 - (1-p)^{n-1}}{p} \frac{1 - (1-p)^T}{p} - rD(1 - (1-p)^{T-1}),\end{aligned}$$

which is negative when $r \geq \frac{C}{nD} \frac{1 - (1-p)^{n-1}}{p} \frac{1 - (1-p)^T}{p - p(1-p)^{T-1}}$. Since we are analyzing the case that maximizes the differences in lying and truth-telling, we can say that truthfulness is a Nash equilibrium if and only if the penalty rate is above the given threshold. ■

Nash Equilibrium (NE)

If we slowly lower the penalty from (4), we will hit a threshold such that truth-telling is an NE. The difference between the truthful NE and the DSE is that now we can assume that every agent $j \neq i$ is truthful in the first round and show that agent i would not deviate unilaterally. However, we shall not assume that agent $j \neq i$ remains truthful for the rest of the game. This is because if agent i lies in the first round, agent j can observe the report of i in the second round and deviate from truthful behavior. Therefore, we first show that if $r \geq \frac{C}{nD} \frac{1}{p}$, agents with truthful history stays truthful. Then we can safely assume agent $j \neq i$ remains truthful throughout the game. In this way, truthful NE is reduced to the case where there is one sophisticated agent and $n - 1$ truthful agents. It is not hard to see the threshold is precisely $\frac{C}{nD} \frac{1 - (1-p)^T}{p - p(1-p)^{T-1}}$.

Theorem 5.2 (restated) *For the Ber(p) distribution, truthful strategy profile forms a Nash equilibrium if and only if*

$$r \geq \frac{C}{nD} \frac{1 - (1-p)^T}{p - p(1-p)^{T-1}}. \quad (5)$$

Proof. Based on the discussion, we first assume that every agent $j \neq i$ is truthful in the first round and $r \geq \frac{C}{nD} \frac{1}{p}$. We want to prove that some agent $j \in N \setminus \{i\}$ does not want to deviate from being truthful in the next round. Then it follows that the threshold for truthful NE is equivalent to the case with single sophisticated agent and $n - 1$ truthful agents. Since the threshold (5) is exact in the model with one sophisticated and $n - 1$ truthful agents, this threshold is the exact threshold for truthful Nash equilibrium.

Fix some agent $j \neq i$. Assume there are $t + 1$ rounds left. Again, we compare the expected payments of lying and being honest for agent j .

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[\text{honest}] &= p \left\{ \frac{C}{n} + EC_t(D, \mathbf{D}) \right\} + (1-p) \left\{ \frac{C}{n-1} + EC_t(D, (0, \mathbf{D})) \right\} \\ \mathbb{E}[\text{lying}] &= rD + p \cdot EC_t(0, \mathbf{D}) + (1-p) \cdot EC_t(D, (0, \mathbf{D}))\end{aligned}$$

By Lemma C.3 and Lemma D.1, we have

$$\mathbb{E}[\text{honest}] - \mathbb{E}[\text{lying}] \leq \frac{C}{n-1} - rD + \Delta EC_t(0, \mathbf{D}) \leq 0,$$

for $r \geq \frac{C}{nD} \frac{1}{p}$. Thus, agent j will not deviate from being truthful, even when agent i is lying in the previous round. ■

C.2 Arbitrary Distributions

Similar to the single agent model, we can extend the results for Bernoulli distributions to approximate results for the general distributions. Given $\alpha \in [0, 1]$, as before, we re-define being busted as having a net consumption at least αD . For the dominant strategy equilibrium, we find the threshold such that being α -truthful is a dominant strategy.

Theorem C.1 *Given $\alpha \in [0, 1]$ and some general distribution F , let $p = 1 - F(\alpha D)$. The α -truthful strategy profile forms a dominant strategy equilibrium if*

$$r \geq \frac{1}{\alpha} \frac{C}{nD} \frac{1 - (1-p)^n}{p} \frac{1 - (1-p)^T}{p - p(1-p)^{T-1}}. \quad (6)$$

Proof. Let $p = 1 - F(\alpha D)$. Assume, for contradiction, that the agent adopts some strategy that has a minimum reporting of βD , $0 \leq \beta \leq \alpha$. We compare the expected costs of this strategy and the strategy of being α -truthful. We re-define $\Delta EC_t(\mathbf{b}_{t+1}^{-i})$ as follows:

$$\Delta EC_t(\mathbf{b}_{t+1}^{-i}) \triangleq EC_t(\alpha D, \mathbf{b}_{t+1}^{-i}) - EC_t(\beta D, \mathbf{b}_{t+1}^{-i}).$$

Similar to the proof in Theorem 5.1, we want to upper bound $\Delta EC_t(\mathbf{0})$. Here we show the computation of $\Delta EC_t(\mathbf{0})$ for $t = 1$ and using the recursion argument in the proof of Lemma D.1, we can show that

$$\Delta EC_t(\beta) = \frac{C}{n} \frac{1 - (1-p)^n}{p} \sum_{i=1}^t (1-p)^i - \alpha p r D \sum_{i=0}^{t-1} (1-p)^i. \quad (7)$$

After that, we use the same argument in the proof of Theorem 5.1 to obtain the threshold for the first day and Theorem C.1 follows. Now we prove the statement for $t = 1$. If the net consumption for the last day exceeds αD (which happens with probability p), then the difference between the penalty payments is $(\alpha - \beta)rD$. Otherwise the agent can save some regular payment by reporting some $\beta' D$ where $\beta \leq \beta' \leq \alpha$. Let X denote the number of agents being busted beside the target agent. Then $X \sim \text{Bin}(n-1, p)$ and $P(X = k) = \binom{n-1}{k} p^k (1-p)^{n-1-k}$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta EC_1(\beta) &= EC_1(\alpha D) - EC_1(\beta D) \leq \max_{\beta \leq \beta' \leq \alpha} (1-p) \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} P(X = k) \left(\frac{C\alpha}{k\alpha + \alpha} - \frac{C\beta'}{k\alpha + \beta'} \right) - prD(\alpha - \beta) \\ &\leq \frac{\alpha - \beta}{\alpha} (1-p)M - (\alpha - \beta)prD, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\max_{0 \leq \beta \leq \alpha} \Delta EC_1(\beta) = (1-p)M - \alpha prD,$$

given $r > \frac{(1-p)M}{\alpha p D}$, which is satisfied because actual threshold for r in (6) is higher. Using the recursion argument in Lemma D.1, we can obtain the expression (7). ■

The penalty threshold is approximately $\frac{1}{9}$ times (4), the threshold for truthful DSE for distribution $\text{Ber}(1 - F(\alpha D))$. Now we turn to the truthful NE for general distribution F . We first define the approximate truthful NE, which is a natural extension of the complete truthful NE.

Definition C.2 (α -truthful Nash equilibrium) Given $\alpha \in [0, 1]$, a reporting profile $\mathbf{b} \in [0, D]^{n \times T}$ is an α -truthful Nash equilibrium if $\mathbf{b}_t^i \geq \alpha D$ for all i, t and no agent wants to deviate from being α -truthful in any round.

Theorem C.2 Given $\alpha \in [0, 1]$ and some general distribution F , let $p = 1 - F(\alpha D)$. The α -truthful strategy profile forms a Nash equilibrium if

$$r \geq \frac{1}{\alpha} \frac{C}{nD} \frac{1 - (1-p)^T}{p - p(1-p)^{T-1}}. \quad (8)$$

Proof. Similar to the proof of Theorem 5.2, we only need to show that agents who had a α -truthful history would stay truthful. We redefine $\Delta EC_t(\mathbf{b}_{t+1}^{-i})$ as in the proof of Theorem C.1 and use a similar argument in Theorem 5.2 to show that $\Delta EC_t(\beta D, \tilde{\alpha} D) \leq 0$ for $0 \leq \beta \leq \alpha$ and $\tilde{\alpha} \geq \alpha$. Then we can safely assume that agents $j \neq i$ stays α -truthful in the entire game. Now we compare agent i 's expected savings and penalties by reporting some βD from being α -truthful.

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\text{savings}] &\leq \left\{ \frac{C \cdot \alpha D}{(n-1)\alpha D + \alpha D} - \frac{C \cdot \beta D}{(n-1)\alpha D + \beta D} \right\} \cdot \mathbb{E}[\# \text{ days before busted}] \\ \mathbb{E}[\text{lying}] &\geq rD(\alpha - \beta) \cdot \Pr(\text{busted}). \end{aligned}$$

Expected penalties exceed expected savings when $r = \frac{1}{\alpha} \frac{C}{nD} \frac{1 - (1-p)^{t+1}}{p - p(1-p)^t}$. ■

We note that both penalty rates (6) and (8) are upper bounds for the actual thresholds. This is due to the fact that we treat any report greater than αD as αD . Since the focus of this paper is to show a simple reduction from the Bernoulli distributions to arbitrary distributions, we leave the analyses for exact thresholds in multi-agent models to future work. We conjecture that the exact thresholds are not far from thresholds (6) and (8).

D Some Upper Bounds of $\Delta EC_t(\mathbf{b}_{t+1}^{-i})$

In this section, we present a technique to obtain upper bounds of $\Delta EC_t(\mathbf{b}_{t+1}^{-i})$ (described in Definition C.1) given $\mathbf{b}_{t+1}^{-i}$.

Lemma D.1 Some upper bounds of $\Delta EC_t(\mathbf{b}_{t+1}^{-i})$:

(i) $\Delta EC_t(\mathbf{0})$

$$\leq \frac{C}{n} \frac{1 - (1-p)^{n-1}}{p} \sum_{i=1}^t (1-p)^i - prD \sum_{i=0}^{t-1} (1-p)^i$$

(ii) $\Delta EC_t(b_{t+1}^j = 0, \mathbf{b}_{t+1}^{-i,j} = D)$

$$\leq \frac{C}{n-1} \sum_{i=1}^t (1-p)^i - prD \sum_{i=0}^{t-1} (1-p)^i$$

Proof. We prove (i) where $\mathbf{b}_{t+1}^{-i} = \mathbf{0}$ and the proof for (ii) is similar. Let $M = \frac{C}{n} \frac{1 - (1-p)^{n-1}}{p}$. We prove by induction.

Base case. $t = 1$. With probability p , having a D or 0 history pays the same regular payment and the 0 history needs to pay penalty. With probability $1 - p$, only the D history pays the regular payment.

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta EC_1 &= EC_1(D) - EC_1(0) = (1-p) \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \binom{n-1}{k} p^k (1-p)^{n-1-k} \frac{C}{k+1} - (1-p)^n \frac{C}{n} - prD \\ &= (1-p) \frac{C}{n} \frac{1 - (1-p)^{n-1}}{p} - prD \\ &= (1-p)M - prD. \end{aligned}$$

Note that k in the second equality represents the number of agents being busted in $N \setminus \{i\}$.

Induction step. Assume Lemma D.1 is true for ΔEC_t . Consider $t + 1$ rounds left.

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta EC_{t+1} &= EC_{t+1}(D) - EC_{t+1}(0) = (1-p) \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \binom{n-1}{k} p^k (1-p)^{n-1-k} \left\{ \frac{C}{k+1} + EC_t(D) \right\} \\ &\quad - (1-p) \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \binom{n-1}{k} p^k (1-p)^{n-1-k} \cdot EC_t(0) \\ &\quad - prD - (1-p)^n \frac{C}{n} \\ &\leq (1-p) \{M + \Delta EC_t\} - prD \\ &\leq M \sum_{i=1}^{t+1} (1-p)^i - prD \sum_{i=0}^t (1-p)^i. \end{aligned}$$

■

E Recursion Approach

In Section 3.1, we briefly mentioned that we can solve for the optimal cost for the Bernoulli distribution via recursion. In the recursion proof, we compute explicitly the expression for $OptCost(t, r, b_{t+1})$ for $t < T$ and $ExpCost(T, r, b_T)$ for the first round. Here, we provide such expressions and optimal strategies can be easily derived from these expressions. We note that we presented the alternative proof in the main article because it showcases the essence of our proposed mechanism. Moreover, the recursion approach would be computationally heavy for continuous distributions whereas the proof in the main body can be extended to any general distributions.

The following is the complete proof via backward induction. For simplicity, we set $D = 1$, which does not affect the results. We break the proof into 4 cases and together, the 4 cases paint the picture of the optimal strategy under the Bernoulli distributions for the single agent model.

Case 1	$p \leq \frac{1}{2}$ and $r \leq 1$ OR $p > \frac{1}{2}$ and $r \leq \frac{1}{2p}$
Case 2	$p > \frac{1}{2}$ and $\frac{1}{2p} < r \leq 1$
Case 3	$p > \frac{1}{2}$ and $r > 1$
Case 4	$p \leq \frac{1}{2}$ and $r > 1$

Case 1. $p \leq \frac{1}{2}$ and $r \leq 1$ OR $p > \frac{1}{2}$ and $r \leq \frac{1}{2p}$

Lemma E.1 For any $1 \leq t < T$, when $p \leq \frac{1}{2}$ and $r \leq 1$ OR when $p > \frac{1}{2}$ and $r \leq \frac{1}{2p}$, given yesterday's arbitrary report b_{t+1} ,

$$OptCost(t, r, b_{t+1}) = (1 - 2p)rb_{t+1} + (t - 1)p(1 - 2p)r + tp(1 + r),$$

which is achieved by setting $b_t = 0$. If $r < 1$, $b_t = 0$ is the unique optimal report; if $r = 1$, the optimal report is any value $b_t \leq b_{t+1}$.

Proof of Lemma E.2. We prove the lemma by induction. When $t = 1$,

$$ExpCost(1, r, b_2, b_1) = p(1 + r) + (1 - p)b_1 - prb_2 + (1 - p)r|b_2 - b_1|. \quad (9)$$

The coefficient for b_1 is either $(1 - p)(1 - r)$ (if $b_2 \geq b_1$) or $(1 - p)(1 + r)$ (if $b_2 < b_1$). Both are non-negative for $r \leq 1$. Therefore, by setting $b_1 = 0$, we achieved the optimal cost:

$$OptCost(1, r, b_2) = \min_{b_1} ExpCost(1, r, b_2, b_1) = r(1 - 2p)p_2 + p(1 + r).$$

Assume the lemma is true for round $t - 1 \geq 1$. For round t and given yesterday's report b_{t+1} ,

$$\begin{aligned} ExpCost(t, r, b_{t+1}, b_t) &= p(1 + r) + (1 - p)b_t - prb_{t+1} + (1 - p)r|b_{t+1} - b_t| + pOptCost(t - 1, r, 1) + (1 - p)OptCost(t - 1, r, b_t) \\ &= p(1 + r) + (1 - p)b_t - prb_{t+1} + (1 - p)r|b_{t+1} - b_t| \\ &\quad + p[(1 - 2p)r + (t - 2)p(1 - 2p)r + (t - 1)p(1 + r)] \\ &\quad + (1 - p)[(1 - 2p)rb_t + (t - 2)p(1 - 2p)r + (t - 1)p(1 + r)] \\ &= tp(1 + r) + (t - 1)p(1 - 2p)r + (1 - p)[1 + (1 - 2p)r]b_t + (1 - p)r|b_{t+1} - b_t| - prb_{t+1}. \end{aligned}$$

The coefficient for b_t is as follows

$$\begin{cases} (1 - p)(1 + (1 - 2p)r + r) = (1 - p)(1 + 2(1 - p)r) & b_t > b_{t+1} \\ (1 - p)(1 + (1 - 2p)r - r) = (1 - p)(1 - 2pr) & b_t \leq b_{t+1} \end{cases}$$

When $r \leq \frac{1}{2p}$, both coefficients are non-negative. Therefore, choosing $b_t = 0$ is optimal and the optimal cost is

$$\begin{aligned} OptCost(t, r, b_{t+1}) &= \min_{b_t} ExpCost(t, r, b_{t+1}, b_t) = tp(1 + r) + (t - 1)p(1 - 2p)r + (1 - p)rb_{t+1} - prb_{t+1} \\ &= tp(1 + r) + (t - 1)p(1 - 2p)r + (1 - 2p)rb_{t+1}. \end{aligned}$$

By induction, we proved the lemma. ■

Theorem E.1 If $p \leq \frac{1}{2}$ and $r \leq 1$, or if $p > \frac{1}{2}$ and $r \leq \frac{1}{2p}$, the agent's optimal strategy is lying-till-end.

Proof of Theorem E.1. Lemma E.2 showed that the theorem is true for every day except the first day. We now show that the theorem is true for the first day.

$$\begin{aligned} ExpCost(T, r, b_T) &= p(1 + OptCost(T - 1, r, 1)) + (1 - p)(b_T + OptCost(T - 1, r, b_T)) \\ &= p[1 + (1 - 2p)r + (T - 2)p(1 - 2p)r + (T - 1)p(1 + r)] \\ &\quad + (1 - p)[b_T + (1 - 2p)rb_T + (T - 2)p(1 - 2p)r + (T - 1)p(1 + r)] \\ &= (T - 1)p(1 + r) + (T - 2)p(1 - 2p)r + p + (1 - p)(1 + r - 2pr)b_T + (1 - 2p)pr \end{aligned}$$

The coefficient for b_T is non-negative in both cases. So the optimal choice for the first day is also zero. Along with the Lemma E.2, we've shown the optimal strategy is lying-till-end for $p \leq \frac{1}{2}, r \leq 1$ and $p > \frac{1}{2}, r \leq \frac{1}{2p}$ with optimal cost

$$OptCost(T, r) = \min_{b_T} ExpCost(T, r, b_T) = (T - 1)p(1 + r) + (T - 2)p(1 - 2p)r + p + (1 - 2p)pr.$$

■

Case 2. $p > \frac{1}{2}$ and $\frac{1}{2p} < r \leq 1$

When $p > \frac{1}{2}$ and $\frac{1}{2p} < r \leq 1$, as we have seen in Equation (9),

$$OptCost(1, r, b_2) = (1 - 2p)rb_2 + p(1 + r),$$

by setting $b_1 = 0$. Next we consider round $2 \leq t < T$.

Lemma E.2 For any $2 \leq t < T$, when $p > \frac{1}{2}$ and $\frac{1}{2p} < r \leq 1$, given yesterday's arbitrary report b_{t+1} ,

$$OptCost(t, r, b_{t+1}) = \left[2(1-p)^t r + \sum_{l=2}^{t-1} (1-p)^l + (1-p-r) \right] b_{t+1} + const.,$$

which is achieved by setting $b_t = b_{t+1}$.

Proof of Lemma E.2. We prove the lemma by induction. When $t = 2$,

$$ExpCost(2, r, b_3, b_2) = \begin{cases} (1-p)[1 + (1-2p)r - r]b_2 + (1-2p)rb_3 + 2p(1+r) + p(1-2p)r, & b_2 \leq b_3 \\ (1-p)[1 + (1-2p)r + r]p_2 - rb_3 + 2p(1+r) + p(1-2p)r, & b_2 > b_3 \end{cases}$$

Since $r > \frac{1}{2p}$, $1 + (1-2p)r - r \leq 0$ and $1 + (1-2p)r + r \geq 0$. Thus $ExpCost(2, r, b_3, b_2)$ is a valley function with respect to b_2 and takes minimum by setting $b_2 = b_3$. Therefore, $OptCost$ can be written as

$$OptCost(2, r, b_3) = [2(1-p)^2 r + (1-p-r)]b_3 + 2p(1+r) + p(1-2p)r.$$

Assume up to round $t-1 \geq 1$, the lemma holds. For round t and yesterday's report b_{t+1} ,

$$\begin{aligned} ExpCost(t, r, b_{t+1}, b_t) &= p(1+r) + (1-p)b_t - prb_{t+1} + (1-p)r|b_{t+1} - b_t| \\ &\quad + (1-p) \left[2(1-p)^{t-1} r + \sum_{l=2}^{t-2} (1-p)^l + (1-p-r) \right] b_t \\ &\quad + p(1-2p)r + (t-1)p(1+r) + (t-3)p(1-p-r) + \sum_{i=2}^{t-2} \left[2(1-p)^i r + \sum_{l=2}^{i-1} (1-p)^l \right] \\ &\quad + p \left[2(1-p)^{t-1} r + \sum_{l=2}^{t-2} (1-p)^l + (1-p-r) \right] \\ &\triangleq M(b_{t+1}, b_t) + const., \end{aligned}$$

where

$$M(b_{t+1}, b_t) = (1-p)b_t - prb_{t+1} + (1-p)r|b_{t+1} - b_t| + (1-p) \left[2(1-p)^{t-1} r + \sum_{l=2}^{t-2} (1-p)^l + (1-p-r) \right] b_t.$$

If $b_t \leq b_{t+1}$,

$$\begin{aligned} M(b_{t+1}, b_t) &= (1-p)b_t - prb_{t+1} + (1-p)r|b_{t+1} - b_t| + (1-p) \left[2(1-p)^{t-1} r + \sum_{l=2}^{t-2} (1-p)^l + (1-p-r) \right] b_t \\ &= (1-p) \left[1 - r + 2(1-p)^{t-1} r + \sum_{l=2}^{t-2} (1-p)^l + (1-p-r) \right] b_t + (1-2p)rb_{t+1}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that the coefficient of b_t is $(1-p)$ times the following

$$\begin{aligned} 1 - r + 2(1-p)^{t-1} r + \sum_{l=2}^{t-2} (1-p)^l + (1-p-r) &= 1 + \sum_{l=1}^{t-2} (1-p)^l - 2r[1 - (1-p)^{t-1}] \\ &= \sum_{l=0}^{t-2} (1-p)^l (1-2pr) \leq 0, \end{aligned}$$

where the inequality is due to $r \geq \frac{1}{2p}$.

If $b_t > b_{t+1}$,

$$M(b_{t+1}, b_t) = (1-p) \left[1 + r + 2(1-p)^{t-1} r + \sum_{l=2}^{t-2} (1-p)^l + (1-p-r) \right] b_t - rb_{t+1},$$

where the coefficient of b_t is positive. Thus the minimum of $M(b_{t+1}, b_t)$ is achieved at $b_t = b_{t+1}$, i.e.,

$$OptCost(t, r, b_{t+1}) = \left[2(1-p)^t r + \sum_{l=2}^{t-1} (1-p)^l + (1-p-r) \right] b_{t+1} + const.$$

By induction, we proved the lemma. ■

Theorem E.2 When $p > \frac{1}{2}$ and $\frac{1}{2p} < r \leq 1$, the optimal strategy is lying-till-busted for the first $T - 1$ rounds and lying in the last round.

Proof of Theorem E.2. Let us consider the first day.

$$\begin{aligned} \text{ExpCost}(T, r, b_T) &= p(1 + \text{OptCost}(T - 1, r, 1)) + (1 - p)(b_T + \text{OptCost}(T - 1, r, p_T)) \\ &= (1 - p) \left[1 + 2(1 - p)^t r + \sum_{l=2}^{t-1} (1 - p)^l + (1 - p - r) \right] b_T + \text{const.} \end{aligned}$$

The coefficient for b_T is positive when $\frac{1}{2p} < r < 1$, thus $b_T = 0$. ■

Case 3. $p > \frac{1}{2}$ and $r > 1$

Lemma E.3 For $p > \frac{1}{2}$, $r > 1$, and any $1 \leq t < T$, given yesterday's arbitrary report b_{t+1} ,

$$\text{OptCost}(t, r, b_{t+1}) = \left[(1 - p - pr) \sum_{i=0}^{t-1} (1 - p)^i \right] b_{t+1} + \text{const.},$$

which is achieved by setting $b_t = b_{t+1}$.

Proof of Lemma E.3. We prove the lemma by induction. When $t = 1$, the expected cost is

$$\text{ExpCost}(1, r, b_2, b_1) = p(1 + r) + (1 - p)b_1 - prb_2 + (1 - p)r|b_2 - b_1|.$$

The coefficient for b_1 is $(1 - p)(1 + r)$ for $b_1 \geq b_2$ and is positive. The coefficient is $(1 - p)(1 - r)$ for $b_1 < b_2$ and is negative. This implies that $\text{ExpCost}(1, t, b_2, b_1)$ is a valley function and the minimum is achieved by setting $b_1 = b_2$. Thus the optimal cost for $t = 1$ is

$$\text{OptCost}(1, r, b_2) = p(1 + r) + (1 - p - pr)b_2.$$

Assume up to round $t - 1 \geq 1$, the lemma holds. For round t and yesterday's report b_{t+1} ,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{ExpCost}(t, r, b_{t+1}, b_t) &= p(1 + r) + (1 - p)b_t - prb_{t+1} + (1 - p)r|b_{t+1} - b_t| + p(t - 1) \\ &\quad + (1 - p) \left[b_t(1 - p - pr) \sum_{i=0}^{t-2} (1 - p)^i + (1 + r)p \sum_{i=0}^{t-2} (1 - p)^i + t - 1 - \sum_{i=0}^{t-2} (1 - p)^i \right] \\ &= M(b_{t+1}, b_t) + \text{const.}, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$M(b_{t+1}, b_t) = (1 - p)b_t - prb_{t+1} + (1 - p)r|b_{t+1} - b_t| + p_t(1 - p - pr)(1 - p) \sum_{i=0}^{t-2} (1 - p)^i.$$

When $b_t \geq b_{t+1}$, the coefficient for b_t is as follows

$$\begin{aligned} (1 - p) \left\{ 1 + (1 - p) \sum_{i=0}^{t-2} (1 - p)^i - pr \sum_{i=0}^{t-2} (1 - p)^i + r \right\} &= (1 - p) \left\{ \sum_{i=0}^{t-1} (1 - p)^i + r \left[1 - p \sum_{i=0}^{t-2} (1 - p)^i \right] \right\} \\ &= (1 - p) \left\{ \sum_{i=0}^{t-1} (1 - p)^i + r(1 - p)^{t-1} \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

which is always positive. When $b_t < b_{t+1}$, the coefficient is as follows

$$(1 - p) \left\{ 1 + (1 - p) \sum_{i=0}^{t-2} (1 - p)^i - pr \sum_{i=0}^{t-2} (1 - p)^i + r \right\} = (1 - p) \left\{ 1 + (1 - p) \sum_{i=0}^{t-2} (1 - p)^i - r \left[1 + p \sum_{i=0}^{t-2} (1 - p)^i \right] \right\},$$

which is negative when

$$r > \frac{1 + (1 - p) \sum_{i=0}^{t-2} (1 - p)^i}{1 + p \sum_{i=0}^{t-2} (1 - p)^i} = \frac{\sum_{i=0}^{t-1} (1 - p)^i}{2 - (1 - p)^{t-1}} = \frac{1 - (1 - p)^t}{2p - p(1 - p)^{t-1}} \quad (10)$$

Note that from Equation (10), we see when $p > \frac{1}{2}$, the right-hand-side is smaller than 1. Thus given $r > 1$, the M function is a valley function, and the minimum is achieved by setting $b_t = b_{t+1}$. The optimal cost in round t is then

$$\begin{aligned} \text{OptCost}(t, r, b_{t+1}) &= M(b_{t+1}, b_{t+1}) + \text{const.} = (1 - p - pr) \left[1 + (1 - p) \sum_{i=0}^{t-2} (1 - p)^i \right] b_t + \text{const.} \\ &= \left[(1 - p - pr) \sum_{i=0}^{t-1} (1 - p)^i \right] b_t + \text{const.} \end{aligned}$$

By induction, we proved the lemma. ■

Theorem E.3 When $p > \frac{1}{2}$, if $r \geq \frac{1-(1-p)^T}{p(1-(1-p)^{T-1})}$, *honest-till-end is the optimal strategy*; if $1 < r < \frac{1-(1-p)^T}{p(1-(1-p)^{T-1})}$, *lying-till-busted is optimal*.

Proof of Theorem E.3. We write out the expected cost on the first round, i.e., $t = T$.

$$\begin{aligned} \text{ExpCost}(T, r, b_T) &= p(1 + \text{OptCost}(T - 1, r, 1)) + (1 - p)(b_T + \text{OptCost}(T - 1, r, b_T)) \\ &= (1 - p) \left[1 + (1 - p - pr) \sum_{i=0}^{T-2} (1 - p)^i \right] b_T + \text{const.} \\ &= (1 - p) \left[1 + (1 - p) \sum_{i=0}^{T-2} (1 - p)^i - pr \sum_{i=0}^{T-2} (1 - p)^i \right] b_T + \text{const.} \\ &= (1 - p) \left[\sum_{i=0}^{T-1} (1 - p)^i - pr \sum_{i=0}^{T-2} (1 - p)^i \right] b_T + \text{const.} \end{aligned}$$

The coefficient for b_T is positive when

$$r < \frac{\sum_{i=0}^{T-1} (1 - p)^i}{p \sum_{i=0}^{T-2} (1 - p)^i} = \frac{\frac{1-(1-p)^T}{p}}{p \frac{1-(1-p)^{T-1}}{p}} = \frac{1 - (1 - p)^T}{p(1 - (1 - p)^{T-1})}. \quad (11)$$

The optimal strategy for the first day is therefore setting $b_T = 0$ when r smaller than (11) and $b_T = 1$ otherwise. Along with Lemma E.3, we have proved the theorem. ■

Case 4. $p \leq \frac{1}{2}$ and $r \geq 1$

For any $2 \leq t \leq T - 1$, let

$$h(t) = \frac{\sum_{i=0}^{t-1} (1 - p)^i}{1 + p \sum_{i=0}^{t-2} (1 - p)^i} = \frac{1 - (1 - p)^t}{2p - p(1 - p)^{t-1}},$$

and

$$A(t) = (1 - r) \sum_{i=1}^{t-1} (1 - p)^i + (1 - p - pr)(1 - p)^{t-1} + (1 - 2p)r \sum_{i=1}^{t-1} (1 - p)^{i-1}.$$

Claim E.1 When $p < \frac{1}{2}$, $1 = h(1) < h(2) < \dots < h(T - 1) < h(T) < \frac{1}{2p}$.

Proof of Claim E.1. The derivative of $h(t)$ with respect to t is strictly positive:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} h(t) &= \frac{d}{dt} \frac{1 - (1 - p)^t}{2p - p(1 - p)^{t-1}} = \frac{[2p - p(1 - p)^{t-1}] [-(1 - p)^t \ln(1 - p)] - [1 - (1 - p)^t] [-p(1 - p)^{t-1} \ln(1 - p)]}{[2p - p(1 - p)^{t-1}]^2} \\ &= \frac{p(1 - p)^{t-1} \ln(1 - p) [1 - 2p(1 - p)]}{[2p - p(1 - p)^{t-1}]^2} \\ &> \frac{p(1 - p)^{t-1} \ln(1 - p) [1 - 2p]}{[2p - p(1 - p)^{t-1}]^2} \\ &\geq 0 \end{aligned}$$

The edge cases can be checked manually. Thus, $h(t)$ is increasing w.r.t. t . ■

Claim E.2 When $p < \frac{1}{2}$ and $t \geq 2$, $A(t) + (1 - r) \geq 0$ if and only if $r \leq h(t + 1)$.

Proof of Claim E.2. We simplify the expression $A(t) + 1 - r$ as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} A(t) + 1 - r &= (1 - r) \sum_{i=0}^{t-1} (1 - p)^i + (1 - p - pr)(1 - p)^{t-1} + (1 - 2p)r \sum_{i=1}^{t-1} (1 - p)^{i-1} \\ &= \frac{1 - (1 - p)^t}{p} + (1 - p)^t - r(2 - (1 - p)^t). \end{aligned}$$

Thus $A(t) + 1 - r \geq 0$ if and only if

$$r \leq \frac{\frac{1 - (1 - p)^t}{p} + (1 - p)^t}{2 - (1 - p)^t} = \frac{1 - (1 - p)^{t+1}}{2p - p(1 - p)^t} = h(t + 1).$$

■

Next, we further distinguish the following subcases $h(t - 1) < r \leq h(t)$ for each $t = 2, \dots, T - 1$.

SubCase 4.1. $p \leq \frac{1}{2}$ and $h(t - 1) < r \leq h(t)$

We start with the last day,

$$\text{ExpCost}(1, r, b_2, b_1) = \begin{cases} (1 - p)(1 - r)b_1 + (1 - 2p)rb_2 + \text{const.}, & b_2 \geq b_1 \\ (1 - p)(1 + r)b_1 - rb_2 + \text{const.}, & b_2 < b_1. \end{cases}$$

Given $r \geq h(t - 1) \geq 1$, $\text{OptCost}(1, r, b_2) = (1 - p - pr)b_2 + \text{const.}$, achieved by setting $b_1 = b_2$.

Now we consider the rounds after the first t rounds, i.e., the last $T - t$ rounds.

Lemma E.4 When $p < \frac{1}{2}$ and $h(t - 1) < r \leq h(t)$, given yesterday's arbitrary report $b_{t'+1}$,

$$\text{OptCost}(t', r, b_{t'+1}) = A(t')b_{t'+1} + \text{const.}, \quad (12)$$

which is achieved by setting $b_{t'} = b_{t'+1}$ for any $2 \leq t' < t$ and by setting $b_{t'} = 0$ for $t \leq t' \leq T - 1$.

Proof of Lemma E.4. For $t' = 2$,

$$\text{ExpCost}(2, r, b_3, b_2) = \begin{cases} (1 - p)[1 - r + (1 - p - pr)]b_2 + (1 - 2p)rb_3 + \text{const.}, & b_3 \geq b_2 \\ (1 - p)[1 + r + (1 - p - pr)]b_2 - rb_3 + \text{const.}, & b_3 < b_2. \end{cases}$$

Given $p < \frac{1}{2}$ and $r > h(t - 1) \geq h(2) = \frac{2-p}{1+p}$, $\text{ExpCost}(2, r, b_3, b_2)$ is a valley function and takes minimum at $b_2 = b_3$. Thus,

$$\text{OptCost}(2, r, b_3) = (2 - p)(1 - p - pr)b_3 + \text{const.} = A(2)b_3 + \text{const.}$$

In general, for any $t' \geq 3$,

$$\text{ExpCost}(t', r, b_{t'+1}, b_{t'}) = \begin{cases} (1 - p)[1 - r + A(t' - 1)]b_{t'} + (1 - 2p)rb_{t'+1} + \text{const.}, & b_{t'+1} \geq b_{t'} \\ (1 - p)[1 + r + A(t' - 1)]b_{t'} - rb_{t'+1} + \text{const.}, & b_{t'+1} < b_{t'}. \end{cases}$$

By Claim E.2, for $2 \leq t' < t$, $1 - r + A(t' - 1) \leq 0$ since $r > h(t - 1) > h(t' - 1)$. Then $\text{ExpCost}(t', r, b_{t'+1}, b_{t'})$ is a valley function and takes minimum at $b_{t'} = b_{t'+1}$. For $t \leq t' \leq T - 1$, $1 - r + A(t' - 1) \geq 0$ since $r \leq h(t) \leq h(t')$. Then the coefficient for $b_{t'}$ in both cases is positive and the expected cost takes minimum at $b_{t'} = 0$. ■

Finally, we consider the first day,

$$\text{ExpCost}(T, r, p_T) = (1 - p)[1 + A(T - 1)]b_T + \text{const.},$$

where the coefficient for b_T is positive. Thus on the first day, the optimal $b_T = 0$. In conclusion, we have the following theorem.

Theorem E.4 When $p < \frac{1}{2}$, $2 \leq t \leq T - 1$, and $h(t - 1) < r \leq h(t)$, the optimal strategy is lying-till-end for the first t rounds, and lying-till-busted for the rest of the game.

SubCase 4.2. $r \geq h(T-1)$

When $r \geq h(T-1)$, as we have seen in previous subcase,

$$ExpCost(T, r, b_T) = (1-p)[1 + A(T-1)]b_T + const.,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} 1 + A(T-1) &= 1 + (1-r) \sum_{i=1}^{T-2} (1-p)^i + (1-p-pr)(1-p)^{T-2} + (1-2p)r \sum_{i=1}^{T-2} (1-p)^{i-1} \\ &= 1 + (1-p-pr) \sum_{i=1}^{T-1} (1-p)^{i-1}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus $1 + A(T-1) \geq 0$ if and only if

$$r \leq \frac{1 - (1-p)^T}{p(1 - (1-p)^{T-1})}.$$

In conclusion, we have the following theorem.

Theorem E.5 When $p < \frac{1}{2}$, if $\frac{1-(1-p)^{T-1}}{2p-p(1-p)^{T-2}} < r \leq \frac{1-(1-p)^T}{p(1-(1-p)^{T-1})}$, the optimal strategy is lying-till-busted; if $r > \frac{1-(1-p)^T}{p(1-(1-p)^{T-1})}$, the optimal strategy is honest-till-end.