

# Peer Prediction

Reading Questions for Wednesday, February 3, 2016

We ask you to submit comments on the following papers by midnight Tuesday February 2:

- Eliciting Honest Feedback: The Peer-Prediction Method, N. Miller, P. Resnick, and R. Zeckhauser, *Management Science*, 51(9): 1359-1373, 2005. (Read sections 1 and 2. The rest is optional.)
- Crowdsourced Judgement Elicitation with Endogenous Proficiency, A Dasgupta, and A. Ghosh. WWW'13.

Your comments should include both answers to the specific reading questions and generic response about the papers. You are welcome to include any questions you have about the papers in your comments. After submitting your own comments, you'll be able to see others' submitted comments. You can comment on others' submissions and answer raised questions on Canvas. Discussion on Canvas is strongly encouraged.

## 1 Reading Questions

1. What are some assumptions/flaws in the Miller et al. paper and the Dasgupta and Ghosh paper?
2. Are these practical algorithms, i.e. do you think the intended strategies will occur in reality?
3. In the Dasgupta and Ghosh paper, what would be the difference between everyone playing  $(1, X)$  at an equilibrium and everyone playing  $(0, p[H])$  at an equilibrium, i.e. what's the difference between giving full effort and randomly choosing based on your proficiency to choose H? Comment on participants' expected payoff at these two equilibria and why the expected payoff is the same or different at these two equilibria.

## 2 Generic Response

Respond to the papers following the guidelines in the course syllabus (under "Submit Comments and Presenting Papers").