

Approximately Efficient Bilateral Trade

Yuan Deng[†] Jieming Mao[†] Balasubramanian Sivan[†] Kangning Wang[‡]

Abstract

We study bilateral trade between two strategic agents. The celebrated result of Myerson and Satterthwaite states that in general, no incentive-compatible, individually rational and weakly budget balanced mechanism can be efficient. I.e., no mechanism with these properties can guarantee a trade whenever buyer value exceeds seller cost. Given this, a natural question is whether there exists a mechanism with these properties that guarantees a *constant fraction* of the first-best gains-from-trade, namely a constant fraction of the gains-from-trade attainable whenever buyer’s value weakly exceeds seller’s cost. In this work, we positively resolve this long-standing open question on constant-factor approximation, mentioned in several previous works, using a simple mechanism.

1 Introduction

In a bilateral trade, a seller holds an item and is trying to sell it to a buyer. The buyer’s private value v is drawn from a cumulative distribution function (CDF) F , and the seller’s private cost c for selling the item is independently drawn from a CDF G . If a transaction happens between v and c , the society as a whole gains utility of $v - c$. The *gains-from-trade* (GFT) refer to the expected utility gain from trading. If trading probability between v and c is $x(v, c)$, then

$$\text{GFT} = \mathbb{E}_{\substack{v \sim F \\ c \sim G}} [(v - c) \cdot x(v, c)].$$

Ideally, to maximize GFT, a trade should always happen when $v > c$ and never happen when $v < c$. The resulting optimal GFT is termed the *first best* (FB). Namely,

$$\text{FB} = \mathbb{E}_{\substack{v \sim F \\ c \sim G}} [(v - c) \cdot \mathbb{1}\{v \geq c\}].$$

The seminal work of Myerson and Satterthwaite [1983] shows that if both agents are self-interested, it is impossible to devise a Bayesian incentive-compatible (BIC), individually rational (IR) and weakly budget balanced¹ (WBB) mechanism that achieves the first-best GFT, as long as the distribution supports of F and G “overlap”. This impossibility result motivates the natural question of whether there exists a mechanism with these properties (BIC, IR, and WBB) that guarantees a *constant fraction* of the first-best GFT.

[†]Google Research. Email: {dengyuan,maojm,balusivan}@google.com.

[‡]Duke University. Email: knwang@cs.duke.edu.

¹A mechanism is weakly budget balanced if the total payment of the participants is ex-post non-negative, i.e., the payment from the buyer is always at least the revenue of the seller. Moreover, a mechanism is strongly budget balanced if the total payment of the participants is ex-post exactly 0, i.e., the payment from the buyer is always the revenue of the seller.

Benchmarks and Simple Mechanisms To better explain related work and our results, we first introduce some benchmarks and simple mechanisms. For simplicity, we assume F and G are both continuous distributions supported on a bounded interval $[0, 1]$ with positive densities. We show in Remark 2 why this is without loss of generality. We slightly overload the notations below and use them to denote both the mechanisms and the gains-from-trade they obtain.

- **FB**: the first best. It captures the optimal GFT if the agents are not strategic and there is a trade whenever $v \geq c$. Formally, $\text{FB} = \int_0^1 \int_c^1 (v - c) dF(v) dG(c)$.
- **SB**: the second best. It captures the optimal GFT achieved by any Bayesian incentive-compatible (BIC), individually rational (IR) and weakly budget balanced (WBB) mechanism.
- **FixedP**: the fixed-price mechanism. The mechanism sets a fixed price p , and there is a trade if buyer’s value is at least p and seller’s cost is at most p . Formally, $\text{FixedP} = \max_p \int_0^p \int_p^1 (v - c) dF(v) dG(c)$. The mechanism is dominant-strategy incentive-compatible (DSIC, stronger than BIC), IR and strongly budget balanced (SBB, stronger than WBB).
- **SellerP**: the seller-pricing mechanism. The mechanism delegates the pricing power to the seller, who in turn posts a price r_c to maximize her profit with knowledge of c and F . The buyer then decides whether to buy depending on whether $v \geq r_c$. Formally, $\text{SellerP} = \int_0^1 \int_{r_c}^1 (v - c) dF(v) dG(c)$, where $r_c \in \arg \max_p (p - c) \cdot (1 - F(p))$ is the price the seller sets when she has cost c . The mechanism is BIC, IR and SBB.
- **BuyerP**: the buyer-pricing mechanism. Symmetric to SellerP, the mechanism delegates the pricing power to the buyer, who sets a price r'_v to maximize his utility, and then the seller decides whether to sell based on whether $c \leq r'_v$. Formally, $\text{BuyerP} = \int_0^1 \int_0^{r'_v} (v - c) dG(c) dF(v)$, where $r'_v \in \arg \max_p (v - p) \cdot G(p)$. The mechanism is BIC, IR and SBB.

With these notations, the result of Myerson and Satterthwaite [1983] demonstrates $\text{SB} < \text{FB}$ whenever the supports of F and G “overlap”. It has remained an open question ever since, on how far apart SB and FB can be. Specifically, is it the case that SB is always at least a constant fraction of FB? We answer this question in the positive. In particular, the better of (or a randomization over) SellerP and BuyerP guarantees at least 10% of the first-best gains-from-trade.

Theorem 1. $\text{FB} \leq 2 \cdot \text{SellerP} + 8 \cdot \text{BuyerP} \leq 10 \cdot \max(\text{SellerP}, \text{BuyerP}) \leq 10 \cdot \text{SB}$.

Remark 1. In Appendix A, we improve the constant to get a 8.23-approximation.

1.1 Related Work

There has been a large body of work towards answering whether $\text{SB} = \Omega(1) \cdot \text{FB}$. In particular, McAfee [2008] shows $\text{FixedP} \geq \frac{1}{2} \cdot \text{FB}$ when F and G are i.i.d. and Blumrosen and Mizrahi [2016] show $\text{SellerP} \geq \frac{1}{e} \cdot \text{FB}$ when F satisfies the monotone-hazard-rate condition. As for the negative direction, Blumrosen and Mizrahi [2016] show that for any $\varepsilon > 0$, $\text{SB} \leq (\frac{2}{e} + \varepsilon) \cdot \text{FB}$ in some instance. Blumrosen and Dobzinski [2016] show that for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there is some instance where $\text{FixedP} < \varepsilon \cdot \text{FB}$ (and further $\text{FixedP} < \varepsilon \cdot \text{SB}$).

A closely related question of welfare approximation has also been extensively studied before. The welfare equals GFT plus the term $E_{c \sim G}[c]$, i.e., the welfare equals buyer’s value when trade happens and it equals seller’s cost when no trade happens. Maximizing the welfare is equivalent

to maximizing the gains-from-trade, but providing a constant approximation to first-best gains-from-trade is much harder than doing the same for first-best welfare. For instance, not having any trade at all already gives a non-zero (and often good) approximation to welfare, but it gives a zero approximation to gains-from-trade. Blumrosen and Dobzinski [2016] show a $(1 - \frac{1}{e})$ -approximation to the first-best welfare. Kang, Pernice, and Vondrák [2021] improve the approximation ratio to $1 - \frac{1}{e} + 10^{-4}$.

Brustle, Cai, Wu, and Zhao [2017] present a 2-approximation against second-best gains-from-trade; in particular, they show $\text{SB} \leq \text{SellerP} + \text{BuyerP}$. Our result is “stronger” in the sense that we show the better of SellerP and BuyerP is a constant-approximation of FB and not only SB. Dütting, Fusco, Lazos, Leonardi, and Reiffenhäuser [2021] and Kang, Pernice, and Vondrák [2021] consider settings without full knowledge of the distributions.

The *double auction* is a generalized version of bilateral trade, where there are multiple buyers and sellers in the market. There has been a significant amount of work on characterizing and approximating the efficient solutions in related settings; see e.g. [Colini-Baldeschi, de Keijzer, Leonardi, and Turchetta, 2016, Colini-Baldeschi, Goldberg, de Keijzer, Leonardi, Roughgarden, and Turchetta, 2017, Brustle, Cai, Wu, and Zhao, 2017, Babaioff, Cai, Gonczarowski, and Zhao, 2018, Balseiro, Mirrokni, Paes Leme, and Zuo, 2019, Babaioff, Goldner, and Gonczarowski, 2020, Cai, Goldner, Ma, and Zhao, 2021].

2 Proof of Constant Approximation

Recall that F and G are independent continuous CDFs supported on $[0, 1]$ with positive densities (see Remark 2 for why everything apart from independence is without loss of generality). Let $\mu(x)$ be the median of $F_{\geq x}$ (where $F_{\geq x}(z) = 0$ for $z < x$ and $F_{\geq x}(z) = \frac{F(z) - F(x)}{1 - F(x)}$ for $z \geq x$), i.e., $\mu(x) = F^{(-1)}\left(\frac{1 + F(x)}{2}\right)$. Let $\mu^{(k)}(\cdot)$ be the composition of k functions of $\mu(\cdot)$, and $\mu^{(-k)}(\cdot)$ be its inverse (0 if it does not exist). We first give immediate bounds for FB, SellerP and BuyerP:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{FB} &= \int_0^1 \int_c^1 (v - c) dF(v) dG(c) \\ &\leq 2 \int_0^1 \int_{\mu(c)}^1 (v - c) dF(v) dG(c), \end{aligned}$$

where the second step holds since $\mu(x)$ is the median of $F_{\geq x}$, and we preserve the better half.

For SellerP, we have

$$\text{SellerP} \geq \int_0^1 \int_{\mu(c)}^1 (\mu(c) - c) dF(v) dG(c).$$

The right-hand side (RHS) is the seller’s expected profit when setting the price at $\mu(c)$ for each c , which is at most her optimal profit and thus at most the gains-from-trade in the profit-optimal seller-pricing mechanism (which is the left-hand side (LHS)).

Similarly, for BuyerP, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{BuyerP} &\geq \int_0^1 \int_{\mu^{(2)}(0)}^{\mu^{(-2)}(v)} (v - \mu^{(-2)}(v)) dG(c) dF(v) \\ &= \int_0^1 \int_{\mu^{(2)}(c)}^1 (v - \mu^{(-2)}(v)) dF(v) dG(c). \end{aligned}$$

Again, the RHS is the buyer's expected utility when setting the price at $\mu^{(-2)}(v)$ for each v , which is at most the gains-from-trade in the utility-optimal buyer-pricing mechanism (the LHS).

For each cost c , define $\text{FB}(c) = 2 \int_{\mu(c)}^1 (v - c) dF(v)$, $\text{SellerP}(c) = \int_{\mu(c)}^1 (\mu(c) - c) dF(v)$ and $\text{BuyerP}(c) = \int_{\mu^{(2)}(c)}^1 (v - \mu^{(-2)}(v)) dF(v)$. The bounds above simplify to:

$$\text{FB} \leq \int_0^1 \text{FB}(c) dG(c), \quad \text{SellerP} \geq \int_0^1 \text{SellerP}(c) dG(c), \quad \text{BuyerP} \geq \int_0^1 \text{BuyerP}(c) dG(c).$$

We now show that, for any c , $\text{FB}(c) \leq 2 \cdot \text{SellerP}(c) + 8 \cdot \text{BuyerP}(c)$, thus proving our result. The crux of our proof is a partition of value space by quantile. We decompose $\text{FB}(c)$ into two parts and bound them by $\text{SellerP}(c)$ and $\text{BuyerP}(c)$ separately.

Lemma 1. *For any c , $\text{FB}(c) \leq 2 \cdot \text{SellerP}(c) + 8 \cdot \text{BuyerP}(c)$.*

Proof. We first have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{FB}(c) &= 2 \int_{\mu(c)}^1 (v - c) dF(v) \\ &= 2 \int_{\mu(c)}^1 (\mu(c) - c) dF(v) + 2 \int_{\mu(c)}^1 (v - \mu(c)) dF(v) \\ &= 2 \cdot \text{SellerP}(c) + 2 \int_{\mu(c)}^1 (v - \mu(c)) dF(v). \end{aligned}$$

We now proceed to show that $\int_{\mu(c)}^1 (v - \mu(c)) dF(v) \leq 4 \cdot \text{BuyerP}(c)$. Observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mu(c)}^1 (v - \mu(c)) dF(v) &= \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \int_{\mu^{(k)}(c)}^{\mu^{(k+1)}(c)} (v - \mu(c)) dF(v) \\ &\leq \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \int_{\mu^{(k)}(c)}^{\mu^{(k+1)}(c)} (\mu^{(k+1)}(c) - \mu(c)) dF(v) \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \sum_{t=1}^k \int_{\mu^{(k)}(c)}^{\mu^{(k+1)}(c)} (\mu^{(t+1)}(c) - \mu^{(t)}(c)) dF(v) \\ &= \sum_{t=1}^{\infty} \sum_{k=t}^{\infty} \int_{\mu^{(k)}(c)}^{\mu^{(k+1)}(c)} (\mu^{(t+1)}(c) - \mu^{(t)}(c)) dF(v) \\ &= 2 \sum_{t=1}^{\infty} \int_{\mu^{(t)}(c)}^{\mu^{(t+1)}(c)} (\mu^{(t+1)}(c) - \mu^{(t)}(c)) dF(v). \end{aligned}$$

The last step uses the definition of $\mu(\cdot)$: $k = t$ counts for half the probability of all $k \geq t$.

On the other hand, for $\text{BuyerP}(c)$, recall that $\text{BuyerP}(c) = \int_{\mu^{(2)}(c)}^1 (v - \mu^{(-2)}(v)) dF(v)$ and we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mu^{(2)}(c)}^1 (v - \mu^{(-2)}(v)) dF(v) &= \sum_{t=2}^{\infty} \int_{\mu^{(t)}(c)}^{\mu^{(t+1)}(c)} (v - \mu^{(-2)}(v)) dF(v) \\ &\geq \sum_{t=2}^{\infty} \int_{\mu^{(t)}(c)}^{\mu^{(t+1)}(c)} (\mu^{(t)}(c) - \mu^{(t-1)}(c)) dF(v) \\ &= \sum_{t=1}^{\infty} \int_{\mu^{(t+1)}(c)}^{\mu^{(t+2)}(c)} (\mu^{(t+1)}(c) - \mu^{(t)}(c)) dF(v) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{t=1}^{\infty} \int_{\mu^{(t)}(c)}^{\mu^{(t+1)}(c)} (\mu^{(t+1)}(c) - \mu^{(t)}(c)) dF(v), \end{aligned}$$

where the last step again applies the definition of $\mu(\cdot)$. Therefore, we conclude the proof that $\text{FB}(c) \leq 2 \cdot \text{SellerP}(c) + 8 \cdot \text{BuyerP}(c)$. \square

Remark 2. It is without loss of generality to consider bounded continuous distributions with positive densities: For any general distributions F and G on $[0, 1]$, there is a sequence of continuous distributions on $[0, 1]$ with positive densities converging to it in the Lévy metric. All of FB , seller's profit in SellerP and buyer's utility in BuyerP are continuous in F and G (in the Lévy metric). It is also without loss of generality to consider bounded supports: As long as FB is finite, almost all of the contribution comes from $(v, c) \in [-M, M]^2$ for some M .

Remark 3. By symmetry, we also have $\text{FB} \leq 8 \cdot \text{SellerP} + 2 \cdot \text{BuyerP}$. Thus, using SellerP with probability α and BuyerP with probability $1 - \alpha$ for any $\alpha \in [0.2, 0.8]$ gives a 10-approximation to FB .

Remark 4. We can use a parameter to control the quantile of $\mu(x)$ (instead of using the median) in $F_{\geq x}$. This improves the approximation constant to 8.23. The details are deferred to Appendix A.

References

- Moshe Babaioff, Yang Cai, Yannai A. Gonczarowski, and Mingfei Zhao. The best of both worlds: Asymptotically efficient mechanisms with a guarantee on the expected gains-from-trade. In *EC*, page 373, 2018.
- Moshe Babaioff, Kira Goldner, and Yannai A. Gonczarowski. Bulow-klemperer-style results for welfare maximization in two-sided markets. In *SODA*, pages 2452–2471, 2020.
- Santiago R. Balseiro, Vahab S. Mirrokni, Renato Paes Leme, and Song Zuo. Dynamic double auctions: towards first best. In *SODA*, pages 157–172, 2019.
- Liad Blumrosen and Shahar Dobzinski. (Almost) efficient mechanisms for bilateral trading. *CoRR*, abs/1604.04876, 2016.

- Liad Blumrosen and Yehonatan Mizrahi. Approximating gains-from-trade in bilateral trading. In *WINE*, pages 400–413, 2016.
- Johannes Brustle, Yang Cai, Fa Wu, and Mingfei Zhao. Approximating gains from trade in two-sided markets via simple mechanisms. In *EC*, pages 589–590, 2017.
- Yang Cai, Kira Goldner, Steven Ma, and Mingfei Zhao. On multi-dimensional gains from trade maximization. In *SODA*, pages 1079–1098, 2021.
- Riccardo Colini-Baldeschi, Bart de Keijzer, Stefano Leonardi, and Stefano Turchetta. Approximately efficient double auctions with strong budget balance. In *SODA*, pages 1424–1443, 2016.
- Riccardo Colini-Baldeschi, Paul W. Goldberg, Bart de Keijzer, Stefano Leonardi, Tim Roughgarden, and Stefano Turchetta. Approximately efficient two-sided combinatorial auctions. In *EC*, pages 591–608, 2017.
- Paul Dütting, Federico Fusco, Philip Lazos, Stefano Leonardi, and Rebecca Reiffenhäuser. Efficient two-sided markets with limited information. In Samir Khuller and Virginia Vassilevska Williams, editors, *STOC*, pages 1452–1465, 2021.
- Zi Yang Kang, Francisco Pernice, and Jan Vondrák. Fixed-price approximations in bilateral trade. *CoRR*, abs/2107.14327, 2021.
- R Preston McAfee. The gains from trade under fixed price mechanisms. *Applied economics research bulletin*, 1(1):1–10, 2008.
- Roger B. Myerson and Mark A. Satterthwaite. Efficient mechanisms for bilateral trading. *Journal of economic theory*, 29(2):265–281, 1983.

A Improving the Constant

To improve the approximation constant of Theorem 1, instead of setting $\mu(x)$ to be the median of $F_{\geq x}$, we introduce a parameter λ to control the quantile of $\mu(x)$ in $F_{\geq x}$:

$$\mu(x) := F^{(-1)}\left(\lambda + (1 - \lambda)F(x)\right).$$

Similar to the proof of Theorem 1, we have

$$\text{FB} = \int_0^1 \int_c^1 (v - c) dF(v) dG(c) \leq \frac{1}{1 - \lambda} \int_0^1 \int_{\mu(c)}^1 (v - c) dF(v) dG(c),$$

$$\text{SellerP} \geq \int_0^1 \int_{\mu(c)}^1 (\mu(c) - c) dF(v) dG(c),$$

and

$$\text{BuyerP} \geq \int_{\mu^{(2)}(0)}^1 \int_0^{\mu^{(-2)}(v)} (v - \mu^{(-2)}(v)) dG(c) dF(v) = \int_0^1 \int_{\mu^{(2)}(c)}^1 (v - \mu^{(-2)}(v)) dF(v) dG(c).$$

Let $\text{FB}(c) = \frac{1}{1-\lambda} \int_{\mu(c)}^1 (v-c) dF(v)$, $\text{SellerP}(c) = \int_{\mu(c)}^1 (\mu(c)-c) dF(v)$ and $\text{BuyerP}(c) = \int_{\mu^{(-2)}(c)}^1 (v - \mu^{(-2)}(v)) dF(v)$. We have

$$\text{FB} \leq \int_0^1 \text{FB}(c) dG(c), \quad \text{SellerP} \geq \int_0^1 \text{SellerP}(c) dG(c), \quad \text{BuyerP} \geq \int_0^1 \text{BuyerP}(c) dG(c).$$

Fix any c from now on.

$$\begin{aligned} \text{FB}(c) &= \frac{1}{1-\lambda} \int_{\mu(c)}^1 (v-c) dF(v) \\ &= \frac{1}{1-\lambda} \int_{\mu(c)}^1 (\mu(c)-c) dF(v) + \frac{1}{1-\lambda} \int_{\mu(c)}^1 (v-\mu(c)) dF(v) \\ &= \frac{1}{1-\lambda} \cdot \text{SellerP}(c) + \frac{1}{1-\lambda} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \int_{\mu^{(k)}(c)}^{\mu^{(k+1)}(c)} (v-\mu(c)) dF(v) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{1-\lambda} \cdot \text{SellerP}(c) + \frac{1}{1-\lambda} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \int_{\mu^{(k)}(c)}^{\mu^{(k+1)}(c)} (\mu^{(k+1)}(c) - \mu(c)) dF(v) \\ &= \frac{1}{1-\lambda} \cdot \text{SellerP}(c) + \frac{1}{1-\lambda} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \sum_{t=1}^k \int_{\mu^{(k)}(c)}^{\mu^{(k+1)}(c)} (\mu^{(t+1)}(c) - \mu^{(t)}(c)) dF(v) \\ &= \frac{1}{1-\lambda} \cdot \text{SellerP}(c) + \frac{1}{1-\lambda} \sum_{t=1}^{\infty} \sum_{k=t}^{\infty} \int_{\mu^{(k)}(c)}^{\mu^{(k+1)}(c)} (\mu^{(t+1)}(c) - \mu^{(t)}(c)) dF(v) \\ &= \frac{1}{1-\lambda} \cdot \text{SellerP}(c) + \frac{1}{\lambda(1-\lambda)} \sum_{t=1}^{\infty} \int_{\mu^{(t)}(c)}^{\mu^{(t+1)}(c)} (\mu^{(t+1)}(c) - \mu^{(t)}(c)) dF(v). \end{aligned}$$

The last step uses the definition of $\mu(\cdot)$: $k = t$ counts for λ -fraction of the probability of all $k \geq t$. Additionally, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{BuyerP}(c) &= \int_{\mu^{(2)}(c)}^1 (v - \mu^{(-2)}(v)) dF(v) \\ &= \sum_{t=2}^{\infty} \int_{\mu^{(t)}(c)}^{\mu^{(t+1)}(c)} (v - \mu^{(-2)}(v)) dF(v) \\ &\geq \sum_{t=2}^{\infty} \int_{\mu^{(t)}(c)}^{\mu^{(t+1)}(c)} (\mu^{(t)}(c) - \mu^{(t-1)}(c)) dF(v) \\ &= \sum_{t=1}^{\infty} \int_{\mu^{(t+1)}(c)}^{\mu^{(t+2)}(c)} (\mu^{(t+1)}(c) - \mu^{(t)}(c)) dF(v) \\ &= (1-\lambda) \sum_{t=1}^{\infty} \int_{\mu^{(t)}(c)}^{\mu^{(t+1)}(c)} (\mu^{(t+1)}(c) - \mu^{(t)}(c)) dF(v). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, $\text{FB}(c) \leq \frac{1}{1-\lambda} \cdot \text{SellerP}(c) + \frac{1}{\lambda(1-\lambda)^2} \cdot \text{BuyerP}(c)$. Setting $\lambda = 0.311$ gives $\text{FB} \leq 8.23 \cdot \max(\text{SellerP}, \text{BuyerP})$.