

# Catch Me If You Can: Combatting Fraud in Artificial Currency Based Government Benefits Programs

Devansh Jalota\*  
Stanford University  
djalota@stanford.edu

Matthew Tsao\*  
Lyft Inc.  
mtsao@lyft.com

Marco Pavone  
Stanford University  
pavone@stanford.edu

February 27, 2024

## Abstract

Artificial currencies have grown in popularity in many real-world resource allocation settings. In particular, they have gained traction in government benefits programs, e.g., food assistance or transit benefits programs, that provide support to eligible users in the population, e.g., through subsidized food or public transit. However, such programs are susceptible to several fraud mechanisms, with a notable concern being *misreporting fraud*, wherein users can misreport their private attributes to gain access to more artificial currency (credits) than they are entitled to.

To address the problem of misreporting fraud in artificial currency based benefits programs, we introduce an audit mechanism that induces a two-stage game between an administrator and users. In our proposed mechanism, the administrator running the benefits program can audit users at some cost and levy fines against them for misreporting their information. For this audit game, we study the natural solution concept of a signaling game equilibrium and investigate conditions on the administrator’s budget to establish the existence of equilibria. In the regime when existence is guaranteed, we show that the least favorable signaling game equilibria for the administrator (in terms of misreporting fraud) are precisely the sender-preferred subgame perfect equilibria studied in the Bayesian persuasion literature. The computation of sender-preferred subgame perfect equilibria can be done via linear programming in our problem setting through an appropriate design of the audit rules. Our analysis also provides upper bounds that hold in any signaling game equilibrium on the expected excess payments made by the administrator and the probability that users misreport their information.

We further show that the decrease in misreporting fraud corresponding to our audit mechanism far outweighs the administrator’s spending to run it by establishing that its total costs are lower than that of the status quo with no audits. Finally, to highlight the practical viability of our audit mechanism in mitigating misreporting fraud, we present a case study based on Washington D.C.’s federal transit benefits program. In this case study, the proposed audit mechanism achieves several orders of magnitude improvement in total cost compared to a no-audit strategy for some parameter ranges.

---

\*Equal Contribution

## Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>4</b>
1.1	Our Contributions . . . . .	5
<b>2</b>	<b>Related Literature</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>Model and Preliminaries</b>	<b>7</b>
3.1	Audit Game Parameters . . . . .	7
3.2	Player strategies and Payoffs . . . . .	8
3.3	Misreporting Fraud as Excess Payments . . . . .	10
3.4	Equilibrium Notions . . . . .	10
3.5	Discussion . . . . .	12
<b>4</b>	<b>Budget Unconstrained Setting</b>	<b>12</b>
4.1	Main Results . . . . .	13
4.1.1	Equilibrium Existence . . . . .	13
4.1.2	Misreporting Probability and Excess Payment Bounds . . . . .	14
4.2	Key Ideas for Establishing Theorem 2 . . . . .	14
4.3	Discussion . . . . .	16
<b>5</b>	<b>Budget Constrained Setting</b>	<b>17</b>
5.1	Equilibrium Non-Existence . . . . .	17
5.2	Equilibria Exist: Sufficient Budget Case . . . . .	18
5.3	Extension to User Coalitions . . . . .	19
<b>6</b>	<b>Comparison of Audit Mechanism to Status Quo without Audits</b>	<b>19</b>
6.1	Single-User Setting . . . . .	20
6.2	Multiple-User Setting . . . . .	21
6.3	Case Study of Misreporting Fraud . . . . .	21
<b>7</b>	<b>Conclusion and Future Work</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>A</b>	<b>Proofs</b>	<b>28</b>
A.1	Proof of Theorem 2 . . . . .	28
A.2	Proof of Lemma 2 . . . . .	28
A.2.1	Step 1 . . . . .	29
A.2.2	Step 2 . . . . .	29
A.2.3	Step 3 . . . . .	30
A.3	Proof of Lemma 3 . . . . .	31
A.4	Proof of Theorem 1 . . . . .	33
A.5	Proof of Lemma 1 . . . . .	33
A.6	Proof of Corollary 1 . . . . .	35
A.7	Proof of Corollary 2 . . . . .	36
A.8	Properties of the $ \mathcal{S}  = 2$ case . . . . .	36
A.9	Proof of Proposition 1 . . . . .	38

A.10 Proof of Theorem 3 . . . . .	41
A.11 Proof of Proposition 2 . . . . .	41
A.12 Proof of Theorem 4 . . . . .	43
A.13 Proof of Theorem 5 . . . . .	44
A.14 Proof of Corollary 3 . . . . .	45
A.15 Proof of Theorem 6 . . . . .	45
<b>B Derivation of Utility Functions from Payoffs</b>	<b>46</b>
B.1 Deriving the Administrator’s Utility function . . . . .	46
B.2 Deriving the Recipient’s Utility function . . . . .	46
<b>C Non-equivalence of Signaling Game and Bayesian Persuasion Equilibria</b>	<b>47</b>
<b>D Additional Theoretical Analyses and Results</b>	<b>49</b>
D.1 Uniqueness of Equilibria for $ \mathcal{S}  = 2$ . . . . .	49
D.2 Existence of Equilibria when $ \mathcal{S}  = 2$ Regardless of Budget $B$ . . . . .	50
D.3 Generalization of Theorem 6 to Multiple-User Setting . . . . .	50
D.4 User utility in the unbudgeted two type audit game . . . . .	52
<b>E Additional Numerical Results</b>	<b>53</b>
<b>F Black Market Fraud</b>	<b>53</b>
F.1 Digital Signature Schemes . . . . .	54
F.2 An artificial currency system with digital signatures . . . . .	54
<b>G Additional Details on Black Markets for Artificial Currency</b>	<b>55</b>
G.1 Discussion on transient goods . . . . .	55
G.2 Additional Details on Signature Schemes . . . . .	56

## 1 Introduction

In many settings, the sole use of monetary pricing to mediate the allocation of scarce resources is often unacceptable, e.g., in the allocation of food to food banks [Pre17], students to courses [Bud11], and computing resources in a university [GBI21]. In each of these contexts, the use of money is often perceived as unfair as it biases the resulting allocations towards users with higher incomes. Thus, to level the playing field, there has been a growing interest in artificial currency (or “fake” money) mechanisms, wherein the allocated credits (currency) have no external value beyond the market for which these credits have been issued [HZ79].

Amongst the many applications of artificial currencies in practice, they have, in particular, gained traction in government benefits programs, i.e., welfare programs designed to provide benefits to certain users. Examples of such programs include food assistance programs [Jen02] that enable low-income households to purchase food and federal transit benefits programs [KR07] that provide federal employees with a transit benefit to cover their commuting costs to work. More recent instantiations of such programs include California’s *Community Transport Benefits Program* [Edi22], which provides low-income users with mobility credits to use tolled highway express lanes.

While benefits programs are typically well-intentioned, they often fall short of their intended goals due to fraud [Lan79]. Of particular interest in this work is the concern of *misreporting fraud*, wherein users misreport their attributes to gain more credits than they are entitled to. Misreporting fraud arises as the eligibility criteria for benefits programs, specified by an administrator running the program, typically depend on private user characteristics, which may not be directly observable to the administrator. As a result, such information asymmetry naturally creates incentives for users to game the system and strategically manipulate their private information to maximize their chances of obtaining additional credits. For instance, millions of ineligible users in India have ration cards [Tiw20] to obtain subsidized food, as ration card eligibility depends on easily concealable information, such as whether a user owns a motorized vehicle. Further, in federal transit benefits programs, users often misreport their commuting costs to obtain additional credits, e.g., one employee claimed “the maximum benefit of \$105 per month while her commute cost was only \$50” [KR07]. In fact, in Washington D.C.’s federal transit benefits program in 2006, at least \$17 million of potentially fraudulent transit benefits were claimed, which constituted about 25% of the total claims [KR07].

Given that misreporting fraud can result in millions of dollars of losses for an administrator, there is a need to design mechanisms to deter users’ gaming and manipulation of private information. One such mechanism that has gained traction and achieved great success across many related applications, including income tax audits [BEC<sup>+</sup>22], strategic resource allocation [LWF<sup>+</sup>19], and strategic algorithmic classification [EDV21, ECD<sup>+</sup>23], is that of conducting user audits, wherein audits reveal the true type of each user. The efficacy of audit mechanisms stems from the fact that it compels users to hedge between misreporting private information to receive additional credits and the risk of the potential consequences of being audited, including the associated penalties for misreporting.

While an audit mechanism offers a natural solution to deter users from misreporting private information, solving for equilibria in audit games and computing optimal audit strategies typically boils down to solving an NP-hard problem [EDV21] or a sequence of multiple large-scale optimization problems [BCD<sup>+</sup>13]. Moreover, conducting audits is often costly, and an administrator may

only be able to audit a few users. To this end, in this work, we study a natural model for an audit game capturing the application of benefits programs (and other related applications) and leverage our problem’s structure to transform the original bi-level equilibrium computation problem into a linear program that can be solved in polynomial time in the problem parameters. Moreover, we establish bounds on the probability of user misreports and excess payments as a function of the audit costs, and our results demonstrate that a small audit budget is enough to significantly reduce misreporting fraud, thereby highlighting the efficacy of our proposed audit mechanism in reducing misreporting fraud in benefits programs applications.

### 1.1 Our Contributions

In this work, we introduce an audit mechanism to address the concern of misreporting fraud in artificial currency based government benefits programs. Within this audit mechanism, the administrator running the program can audit users at some cost and levy a fine against a user if the audit reveals that the user misreported their information (or type) (Section 3). The primary goal of this audit mechanism is to reduce the probability that users misreport, thereby decreasing the excess payments to users beyond the predefined credit allocation specified by eligibility criteria set by the administrator, all while keeping audit costs low.

To achieve this goal, we consider a profit-maximizing administrator and study the resulting signaling game equilibria in an audit game between the administrator and utility-maximizing users. In this game, users signal their type to the administrator, who decides whether to audit each user. Depending on whether an audit was conducted, the administrator allocates artificial currency to users based on their reported or actual eligibility.

For this audit game, in Section 4, we first study the setting when the administrator is not budget-constrained, i.e., the administrator’s audit budget is enough to audit all users. In this setting, we establish the existence of signaling game equilibria and show that the least favorable signaling game equilibria for the administrator are precisely the sender-preferred subgame perfect equilibria of the corresponding Bayesian persuasion game, where instead of knowing their types, users only know the distribution of their type. Furthermore, by appropriately designing the audit rules and, consequently, the induced player payoffs, we show that these sender-preferred subgame perfect equilibria can be computed via linear programming. We emphasize that while the problem of computing equilibria in multi-stage games, e.g., Stackelberg equilibria, is generally NP-hard [KCP10] and often involves solving a non-convex optimization problem, we leverage our problem’s structure to transform the equilibrium computation problem to a polynomial-time solvable linear program.

For the equilibria of this audit game, we further develop upper bounds on the probability with which users will misreport their type (Corollary 1) and the excess payments made by the administrator to users (Corollary 2) as a function of the audit parameters, i.e., the cost of conducting an audit and the fine levied on users for misreporting. These results are *prescriptive* in the sense that for any given tolerance level on the probability of misreporting and excess payments, Corollaries 1 and 2 respectively give sufficient conditions on the audit cost and the fine under which the tolerances will not be violated in the resulting equilibrium.

Next, in Section 5, we consider the setting when the administrator is budget-constrained, limiting the amount it can spend on audits. While signaling game equilibria may, in general, not exist (Proposition 1), we show that if the administrator’s budget scales with the size of the largest user coalition, signaling game equilibria exist and can be computed using an analogous linear program-

ming method as in the unconstrained budget setting (Theorems 3 and 4). Since user coalitions are typically small in real world social networks [Ro19], our results imply that with a small audit budget, the administrator can significantly reduce misreporting fraud and the excess payments it makes to users.

Finally, we investigate whether the decrease in misreporting fraud due to our audit mechanism outweighs the administrator’s spending to run it in Section 6. To this end, we show that the total cost of our audit mechanism is no more than that of the setting without audits (i) for all parameter ranges when the number of user types is two and (ii) under a mild condition on the audit fine when the number of user types is more than two. Here, the total cost of a mechanism is composed of the budget required to run the audit mechanism and the excess payments made to users relative to the setting when all users report their type truthfully. Furthermore, we present numerical experiments based on an application case of a federal transit benefits program in Washington D.C., which demonstrates the practical efficacy of our proposed audit mechanism in mitigating misreporting fraud at a low cost in a real-world context.

In the appendix, we provide omitted proofs, present additional theoretical details to emphasize certain concepts, provide additional numerical results, and introduce a mechanism leveraging cryptography to address another common fraud mechanism in benefits programs, that of *black market fraud*, wherein users sell some of their credits in exchange for *real* money.

We note that while we present our model and analysis in the language of benefits programs, our results may apply to other settings where misreporting fraud may be a concern, e.g., tax evasion [AS72].

## 2 Related Literature

Informational asymmetries are present in many markets with strategic agents [MW82, MR87], including job markets [Spe73], automobile markets [Ake70], and financial markets [LP77]. As in these settings, we also study a context where one group of agents, i.e., users receiving artificial currencies, has an informational advantage that it can use to improve its payoff [Hol79]. However, unlike prior treatments of signaling, our model does not include signaling costs. In this regard, our proposed audit game is akin to “cheap talk” signaling [Gne05, CS82]. However, compared to the equilibrium characterization results in Crawford and Sobel [CS82], we develop linear programs to compute equilibria and investigate a budget-constrained setting where equilibria may not exist.

Since this work studies a law enforcement application, it is closely related to the literature on security games [Tam11], where a law enforcement agency seeks to protect resources, e.g., airport checkpoints, from an adversary. In typical security game applications [PJM<sup>+</sup>08, KJT<sup>+</sup>09], a law enforcement agency decides on a (potentially) randomized allocation of security resources to different locations to mitigate damage by an adversary that best responds by maximizing its utility. While we also study a law-enforcement application, in contrast to typical security games, where the law enforcement agency first commits to a randomized allocation strategy to which the adversaries best respond, in our setting, the role of the players is reversed as users first commit to a signal based on which the administrator (i.e., the law enforcement agency) decides whether to audit.

The problem of misreporting or manipulating private information to game the system is commonplace across many settings [PRS23], necessitating mechanisms that mitigate such manipulations. For instance, parents often fake their addresses to admit their children to better public schools in Denmark [BNCGS23] while French firms often under-report the size of their workforce

to avoid certain legal obligations [ABMP22]. Furthermore, in healthcare settings, doctors often manipulate the priority of their patients in organ transplantation waiting lists [McM22]. However, unlike these works that primarily focus on developing empirical or mechanism design approaches to address the issue of manipulating private information, we study an audit game, wherein a law enforcement agency deploys resources to verify (or audit) information reported by an individual and imposes a punishment, e.g., a fine, on users that misreport.

In this regard, our work contributes to the auditing theory (or audit games) literature [BCD<sup>+</sup>13, HCA<sup>+</sup>23]. In the context of audit games, Blocki et al. [BCD<sup>+</sup>13] develop a model akin to a Stackelberg security game where a defender seeks to dis-incentivize manipulations by an attacker that seeks to avoid detection while maximizing its utility. More recently, several works [LWF<sup>+</sup>19, EDV21, ECD<sup>+</sup>23] have studied auditing in the context of manipulating a classification or allocation system to get access to a desired resource. However, unlike the Stackelberg security games approach to auditing [BCD<sup>+</sup>13] that develops multiple optimization problems to characterize the equilibrium audit strategy, in our setting, equilibria can be computed using a single linear program that can be solved efficiently. Moreover, unlike the strategic classification setting [EDV21], we study audit games in the context of artificial currency based government benefits programs, which induces a different payoff structure for the law enforcement agency and users. Consequently, the structure of the equilibria in our studied audit game is considerably different and requires different methodological tools than prior works on audit games.

This work is also related to Becker’s seminal work [Bec68], as we investigate whether the decrease in the misreporting fraud of our audit mechanism outweighs the spending to run it. However, unlike Becker [Bec68], the interactions in our audit mechanism are strategic.

Our work is closely connected to the literature on Bayesian persuasion [BM19, Kam19, ACP13, RS10]. While we also investigate equilibrium formation under the Bayesian persuasion model (see Section 4), unlike the seminal work of Kamenica and Gentzkow [KG11] that re-expressed the problem of choosing an optimal signal as a search over a distribution of posteriors, we leverage our problem structure to directly compute the optimal signal using linear programming. Further, unlike the Bayesian persuasion literature, we also study a setting when the administrator is budget-constrained.

### 3 Model and Preliminaries

In this section, we present a model of misreporting fraud and introduce an audit mechanism that induces an audit game between the administrator and users. To this end, we first introduce some notation (Section 3.1), the payoffs of the administrator and users (Section 3.2), and the notion of misreporting fraud we study (Section 3.3). We then present the equilibrium notion we study in Section 3.4 and discuss our modeling assumptions in Section 3.5.

#### 3.1 Audit Game Parameters

We model the problem of misreporting fraud and the corresponding audit mechanism to address it as an audit game between the administrator and users. In our audit game, at a high level, a user will signal their eligibility (type) for credits to an administrator. The administrator can either accept the signal at face value or conduct an audit to learn the user’s true type. Credits are allocated to the user based on their true type or their signaled type, depending on whether an audit did or did

not occur, respectively. In this and the following subsections, we formalize this description of our audit mechanism.

To further elucidate this audit game, we first introduce some notation. In particular, we let  $\mathcal{S}$  denote the set of all possible user types. In line with existing literature, we assume that all players have a shared prior belief on the distribution of user types [CS82, KG11], given by the probability vector  $\mathbf{q} = (q_m)_{m \in \mathcal{S}}$ , where  $\mathbf{q} \geq \mathbf{0}$  and  $\sum_{m \in \mathcal{S}} q_m = 1$ . The function  $f : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$  denotes the mapping from a user type  $m \in \mathcal{S}$  to a credit allocation  $f(m)$ , which corresponds to the number of credits to be issued to each user based on particular eligibility criteria set by the administrator. To make our model more concrete, at the end of this section, we elucidate examples of the function  $f$  and state space  $\mathcal{S}$  in two benefits programs.

The administrator’s primary tool to combat the possibility of users lying about their type, e.g., to get access to additional credits than they are entitled to, is through audits, a commonly used mechanism to prevent users lying about their private characteristics [EDV21, ECD<sup>+</sup>23]. In particular, the administrator can learn a user’s type by auditing them. A cost of  $c$  is required to conduct an audit, and the administrator can levy a fine  $k$  on a user if an audit revealed that they misreported their type. Here, we assume  $0 \leq c \leq k$ . Moreover, we assume the administrator has a budget  $B > 0$ , which denotes the cap on the amount the administrator can spend on audits.

Given the complexity introduced by budget constraints, we first study the setting without budgets (Section 4), following which we investigate the more challenging budget-constrained setting (Section 5). In the remainder of this section, for ease of exposition, we introduce the notation and payoffs for the budget unconstrained setting and generalize our notation to the budget constrained setting in Section 5.

We now provide examples of the function  $f$  and state space  $\mathcal{S}$  in the context of two government benefits programs.

**Example 1** (Federal Transit Benefits Program). In a federal transit benefits program, federal employees are given a monthly transit benefit equal to their commuting costs to work. In other words, each element  $s$  in a state space  $\mathcal{S}$  represents a tuple  $s = (b_1, b_2)$ , where  $b_1$  denotes whether an individual is a federal employee and  $b_2$  represents the user’s monthly commuting costs. In this context, the function  $f$  is zero if a user is not a federal employee and  $b_2$  otherwise, i.e., federal employees receive credits based on commuting costs, while all other users receive no credits. Further, the prior belief  $\mathbf{q}^i$  of each user can correspond to the knowledge of whether a user is a federal employee, which can be determined through employee records data, and information on where the employee stays, which influences commuting costs.

**Example 2** (Food Assistance Program). In food assistance programs, such as those in California, credits (i.e., food stamps) are distributed to users based on many factors, such as a user’s income and the number of people in their household. That is, the state space  $\mathcal{S}$  corresponds to a set of tuples, each specifying a user’s monthly income and household size. For such programs, the function  $f$  can be computed using income qualification tables, as in [foo].

### 3.2 Player strategies and Payoffs

In the budget unconstrained setting, we consider a game with two players: one administrator and one user. The user has a type  $m$  that is drawn from the distribution  $\mathbf{q}$ , which is private information in the sense that only the user knows  $m$ . The setting with one administrator without a budget



constraint and  $n$  non-colluding users is a straightforward generalization, as the absence of collusion means that the  $n$  user setting is simply  $n$  single user games happening in parallel. We note that we also consider the setting with user collusion in Section 5.3. In the following, we introduce the strategies of both the users and administrator and elucidate their payoffs in our audit game.

**User strategies:** Because the user needs to demonstrate its eligibility to the administrator in order to receive credits, the user sends a signal  $s \in \mathcal{S}$  to the administrator. The user's strategy is thus a signaling strategy which specifies the conditional distribution of  $s$  given  $m$  for every possible value of  $m$ . Namely, the user's strategy has the form  $\boldsymbol{\pi} := \{\boldsymbol{\pi}(\cdot|m)\}_{m \in \mathcal{S}}$ , and the strategy set for the user is given by  $\Pi$ :

$$\Pi = \left\{ \left\{ \boldsymbol{\pi}(\cdot|m) \right\}_{m \in \mathcal{S}} : \boldsymbol{\pi}(\cdot|m) \geq \mathbf{0} \text{ and } \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \boldsymbol{\pi}(s|m) = 1 \text{ for all } m \in \mathcal{S} \right\}. \quad (1)$$

**Administrator Strategies:** Upon seeing the signal  $s$ , the administrator can choose to audit the user to learn its type  $m$ . This may be necessary if the user is misreporting its eligibility, i.e.,  $s \neq m$ . We use  $a(s)$  to denote the administrator's audit decision given the signal  $s$ .  $a(s) = 1$  represents the outcome that an audit occurred, and  $a(s) = 0$  represents the outcome that no audit occurred. To allow for randomization, an administrator strategy is given by a function  $\boldsymbol{\sigma} : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ , where  $\boldsymbol{\sigma}(s)$  is understood as  $\mathbb{P}(a(s) = 1)$ .

**Player payoffs and player utility functions:** To model the payoffs of both the users and the administrator, in this work, we study a profit-maximizing administrator (A) and a utility-maximizing user (R), whose payoffs are given as follows:

$$U^A(a(s), m) = \begin{cases} -f(s) & \text{if } a(s) = 0 \\ -c - f(m) & \text{if } a(s) = 1, s = m \\ k - c - \min(f(m), f(s)) & \text{if } a(s) = 1, s \neq m \end{cases} \quad (2)$$

$$U^R(a(s), m) = \begin{cases} f(s) & \text{if } a(s) = 0 \\ f(m) & \text{if } a(s) = 1, s = m \\ \min(f(m), f(s)) - k & \text{if } a(s) = 1, s \neq m. \end{cases} \quad (3)$$

The rationale for these payoffs is as follows. If the administrator does not conduct an audit given a signal  $s$ , it issues credits worth  $f(s)$  to the user. On the other hand, if the administrator conducts an audit with a cost  $c$  and the user truthfully reports its type, the administrator pays  $f(m)$  to the user. Conversely, if the user misreports, the administrator additionally levies a fine  $k$  against the user. The payout  $\min(f(s), f(m))$  ensures that the administrator never pays more than its intended credit allotment  $f(m)$  when it conducts an audit, while if the user asks for too little, i.e.,  $f(s) < f(m)$ , then the administrator only pays out  $f(s)$ , thereby discouraging under-reporting. This discouragement of under-reporting is for mathematical completeness to ensure that utility-maximizing users will never under-report (see Lemma 3), which is a close representation of reality.

The utility functions for the administrator and recipient are the expected payoffs as a function of the strategy profile  $(\boldsymbol{\pi}, \boldsymbol{\sigma})$ , where the averaging is done over the player's belief and the randomness of the player strategies. In particular, the utility functions of the administrator and the user are given by:

$$\mathcal{U}^A(\boldsymbol{\pi}, \boldsymbol{\sigma}) := \mathbb{E}_{m \sim \boldsymbol{q}} \mathbb{E}_{s \sim \boldsymbol{\pi}(\cdot|m), a \sim \text{Bern}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}(s))} [U^A(a(s), m)]$$

$$= \sum_{m \in \mathcal{S}} \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \mathbf{q}_m \boldsymbol{\pi}(s|m) [-f(s) + \sigma(s) (-c + \mathbb{I}_{[s \neq m]} ([f(s) - f(m)]_+ - k))]. \quad (4)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{U}_m^R(\boldsymbol{\pi}, \boldsymbol{\sigma}) &:= \mathbb{E}_{s \sim \boldsymbol{\pi}(\cdot|m), a \sim \text{Bern}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}(s))} [U^R(a(s), m)] \\ &= \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \boldsymbol{\pi}(s|m) [f(s) - \sigma(s) \mathbb{I}_{[s \neq m]} ([f(s) - f(m)]_+ + k)]. \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

Note the asymmetry between the utility functions.  $\mathcal{U}^A$  averages over  $m$  because the administrator does not know the user's type  $m$ . On the other hand,  $\mathcal{U}_m^R$  does not average over  $m$  because the user knows its own type. For more detailed explanations and derivations of the above expected payoff functions, we refer to Appendix B.

### 3.3 Misreporting Fraud as Excess Payments

The main objective of the audit mechanism is to deter misreporting fraud whereby users receive more credits than they are entitled to. We thus formally define misreporting fraud as the excess payments that the administrator pays out, as is elucidated through the following definition.

**Definition 1** (Misreporting Fraud). Given a strategy profile  $(\boldsymbol{\pi}, \boldsymbol{\sigma})$ , the level of misreporting fraud is defined as the total excess payments, denoted  $\mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{\pi}, \boldsymbol{\sigma})$ , which is given by:

$$\mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{\pi}, \boldsymbol{\sigma}) := \mathbb{E}_{m \sim \mathbf{q}} \mathbb{E}_{s \sim \boldsymbol{\pi}(\cdot|m), a \sim \text{Bern}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}(s))} [\max(U^R(a(s), m) - f(m), 0)].$$

Despite our central goal of deterring misreporting fraud, we note that we do not explicitly model the administrator as one that minimizes the level of excess payments and instead model the administrator as a profit-maximizer. We do so, as solely minimizing the administrator's excess payments would involve the trivial solution where the administrator audits all users, which would come at a potentially exorbitant cost to the administrator, resulting in an outcome that is unlikely to be practically viable. Thus, we incorporate the cost the administrator incurs when performing audits through a profit-maximization objective of the administrator, which, as noted in Section 3.5, also achieves a low level of misreporting fraud.

### 3.4 Equilibrium Notions

In this work, the solution concept of interest is that of a signaling game equilibrium, where each user knows the realization of their type  $m$  drawn from a prior  $\mathbf{q}$ , and the administrator only knows the distribution  $\mathbf{q}$ . Such a model of the informational assumptions of the administrator and users is most appropriate for the benefits program applications we study, as it assumes users know their type. We also study the solution concept of a sender-preferred subgame perfect (i.e., Bayesian persuasion) equilibrium, wherein users do not know their type, and instead, only know a prior distribution for their type. While less practical for benefits program applications, the latter solution concept will be useful in bounding the misreporting fraud in signaling game equilibria.

**Signaling Game Equilibrium:** A strategy profile  $(\boldsymbol{\pi}', \boldsymbol{\sigma}')$  is a signaling game equilibrium [Sob09] of the audit game if and only if (a) the administrator cannot improve its utility via unilateral deviation, and (b) no single user of type  $m$  can improve its utility provided that the administrator responds to the user action so as to maximize  $\mathcal{U}^A$ .

**Definition 2** (Signaling Game Equilibria). A strategy profile  $(\pi', \sigma')$  is a signaling game equilibrium of the audit game if and only if:

$$\sigma' \in \operatorname{argmax}_{\sigma: \sigma(s) \in [0,1], \forall s \in \mathcal{S}} \mathcal{U}^A(\pi', \sigma)$$

and furthermore for every  $m \in \mathcal{S}$ , we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \pi' &\in \operatorname{argmax}_{\pi \in \Pi} \mathcal{U}_m^R(\pi, \sigma) \\ \text{s.t. } \pi(\cdot|m') &= \pi'(\cdot|m') \quad \forall m' \neq m \\ \sigma &\in \operatorname{argmax}_{\sigma_0: \sigma_0(s) \in [0,1], \forall s \in \mathcal{S}} \mathcal{U}^A(\pi, \sigma_0). \end{aligned}$$

**Sender-Preferred Subgame Perfect (Bayesian Persuasion) Equilibrium:** The notion of Sender-Preferred Subgame Perfect equilibrium [KG11], which we will henceforth refer to as Bayesian persuasion equilibrium, will be useful in our analysis of signaling game equilibria in the audit game. In a Bayesian persuasion equilibrium, it is assumed that users do not know their true type and thus choose their signaling strategy to maximize expected utility where the expectation now includes averaging over  $m$ . To this end consider the following average user utility:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{U}^R(\pi, \sigma) &:= \mathbb{E}_{m \sim q} [\mathcal{U}_m^R(\pi, \sigma)] \\ &= \sum_{m \in \mathcal{S}} \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} q_m \pi(s|m) [f(s) - \sigma(s) \mathbb{I}_{[s \neq m]} ([f(s) - f(m)]_+ + k)]. \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

A strategy profile  $(\pi^*, \sigma^*)$  is a Bayesian persuasion equilibrium of the audit game if and only if (a) the administrator responds optimally based on its posterior distribution given the signal  $s$  (i.e., subgame perfection), and (b) the user chooses their strategy to maximize their utility.

**Definition 3** (Bayesian Persuasion Equilibria). A strategy profile  $(\pi^*, \sigma^*)$  is a Bayesian persuasion equilibrium of the audit game if and only if

$$\sigma^* \in \operatorname{argmax}_{\sigma: \sigma(s) \in [0,1], \forall s \in \mathcal{S}} \mathcal{U}^A(\pi^*, \sigma),$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \pi^* &\in \operatorname{argmax}_{\pi \in \Pi} \mathcal{U}^R(\pi, \sigma) \\ \text{s.t. } \sigma &\in \operatorname{argmax}_{\sigma_0: \sigma_0(s) \in [0,1], \forall s \in \mathcal{S}} \mathcal{U}^A(\pi, \sigma_0). \end{aligned}$$

Note that the signaling game and Bayesian persuasion solution concepts are not equivalent. While every Bayesian persuasion equilibrium is a signaling game equilibrium in our setting, the converse is not true. In Appendix C, we construct an example game and show that there are signaling game equilibria that are not Bayesian persuasion equilibria.

### 3.5 Discussion

In this section, we discuss our modeling assumptions and the equilibrium notions we study.

First, in modeling the payoffs in Equations (2) and (3) of the administrator and the users, we assume users are utility maximizers, as is standard in the literature on security games [YJJ+12], and that the administrator is a profit maximizer. We model a profit-maximizing administrator, as under this objective, the administrator minimizes the sum of its excess payments to users and the cost to conduct audits. Moreover, as we discuss in Remark 2 in Section 4.3, subject to an equilibrium condition we derive, the administrator, under a profit maximization objective, minimizes excess payments at equilibrium. In addition, under a profit-maximization objective of the administrator, not only is users’ misreporting probability kept low (see Corollary 1) but also the overall budget required to run the audit mechanism is small (Section 5). In other words, our results and analysis reveal that a profit maximization objective captures the administrator’s goal of minimizing the sum of its excess payments to users and the cost of conducting audits in running a benefits program. While we focus on a profit-maximizing administrator, considering alternative models with other valid administrator objectives is an exciting direction for future research.

Next, even though we focus on the payoff functions in Equations (2) and (3), our results and analysis can be extended naturally to a broader class of payoff functions, e.g., to the more user-punishing setting where users pay a fine  $k$  without receiving any credits when an audit successfully detects a misreport (i.e., when  $a(s_i) = 1$  and  $s_i \neq m_i$ ). We emphasize that Equations (2) and (3) ensure that the administrator will pay out  $f(m_i)$  credits to all users  $i$  under truthful reporting, thus capturing the intended outcome of the benefits program that seeks to deliver the appropriate quantity of benefits to eligible users. Moreover, in this work, we also assume that the audit fine is at least the audit cost, i.e.,  $k \geq c$ , as only then is conducting audits economically viable for the administrator.

Furthermore, in line with real-world contexts, we consider a budget constraint for the administrator, which models the setting when it may not be possible for the administrator to audit all users, e.g., due to labor limitations. In this work, we also consider the possibility of fractional budgets, wherein the administrator may only be able to allocate a fraction of the audit cost  $c$  to audit some users or may not have enough budget to audit even one user (see Proposition 1). We interpret a fractional budget as the probability that an audit is conducted and assume that an audit, if conducted, will correctly determine whether a user is truthful.

Finally, in this work, we study the notion of an signaling game equilibria, where each user knows the realization of their type  $m$  drawn from a prior  $\mathbf{q}$  while the administrator only has knowledge of the distribution  $\mathbf{q}$ . Such a model of the informational assumptions of the administrator and the users is natural for benefits programs, as users typically know their types, i.e., their eligibility level for the benefits program. In studying signaling game equilibria, we also develop a linear programming characterization of Bayesian persuasion equilibria, which corresponds to the setting when users only know their distribution  $\mathbf{q}$  over types (rather than the exact realization of their types) and thus maximize expected utilities.

## 4 Budget Unconstrained Setting

We begin the study of the audit game in the setting where there is no limitation on how often the administrator can conduct audits, henceforth referred to as the unbudgeted case. In this setting, we

establish the existence of a signaling game equilibrium in our audit game and show that the least favorable signaling game equilibria with respect to the administrator can be efficiently computed using linear programming. The key insight in establishing this result involves showing that the least favorable signaling game equilibria for the administrator are precisely the sender-preferred subgame perfect equilibria of the corresponding Bayesian persuasion game, where instead of knowing their types, users only know the distribution of their type. Our analysis of the equilibria of this audit game also provides upper bounds that hold in any signaling game equilibrium on the expected excess payments made by the administrator and the probability that users misreport their type as a function of the audit parameters  $c$  and  $k$ .

In this section, we present our equilibrium characterization results (Section 4.1), elucidate the main ingredients in establishing the existence of equilibria (Section 4.2), and interpret and discuss several implications of our equilibrium characterization results (Section 4.3).

## 4.1 Main Results

This section summarizes our results on the characterization of signaling game (and Bayesian persuasion) equilibria (Section 4.1.1) and the corresponding bound on the level of misreporting fraud at any signaling game equilibrium in our audit game (Section 4.1.2).

### 4.1.1 Equilibrium Existence

We begin by presenting the main result of this section, which establishes the existence of a signaling game equilibrium.

**Theorem 1** (Signaling Game Equilibrium Existence). For any audit cost  $c > 0$  and fine  $k \geq c$ , there exists a linear program  $\mathcal{L}_{c,k}$  (defined in Equations (8)-(9)) that is always feasible and whose solutions correspond to signaling game equilibria of the audit game. Furthermore, the signaling game equilibria corresponding to the solutions of  $\mathcal{L}_{c,k}$  have the maximum excess payments among all signaling game equilibria. In particular, the optimal value of  $\mathcal{L}_{c,k}$  implies a tight upper bound on the excess payments in any signaling game equilibrium.

The proof of Theorem 1 has two main ingredients. First, we establish Lemma 1 which states that the set of Bayesian persuasion equilibria is a subset of signaling game equilibria, and also that among all signaling game equilibria, Bayesian persuasion equilibria are the least favorable for the administrator in the sense that they have the highest excess payments (i.e., misreporting fraud). Second, we show that the linear program  $\mathcal{L}_{c,k}$  precisely characterizes all of the Bayesian persuasion equilibria.

**Theorem 2** (Bayesian Persuasion Equilibrium Characterization). For any audit cost  $c > 0$  and fine  $k \geq c$ , there exists a linear program  $\mathcal{L}_{c,k}$  (defined in Equations (8)-(9)) that is always feasible and whose solutions characterize all Bayesian persuasion equilibria of the audit game. More specifically, the administrator’s strategy in all Bayesian persuasion equilibria is to not audit, i.e.,  $(\pi^*, \sigma^*)$  is a Bayesian persuasion equilibria if and only if  $\sigma^*(s) = 0$  for all  $s \in \mathcal{S}$ , and  $\pi^*$  is a solution to  $\mathcal{L}_{c,k}$ .

**Lemma 1.** Every strategy profile  $(\pi^*, \sigma^*)$  that is a Bayesian persuasion equilibrium is also a signaling game equilibrium. Furthermore, the signaling game equilibria with the largest expected excess payments (i.e., misreporting fraud) are precisely the Bayesian persuasion equilibria.

See Appendix A.1 for a proof of Theorem 2 and Appendix A.5 for a proof of Lemma 1. These two results are used to prove Theorem 1 in Appendix A.4.

The remainder of this section will present bounds on the misreporting fraud and excess payments at any Bayesian persuasion equilibrium (and, by Lemma 1, at any signaling game equilibrium), describe the ideas used to establish Theorem 2, and discuss its implications.

#### 4.1.2 Misreporting Probability and Excess Payment Bounds

One of the purposes of the audit mechanism is to deter misreporting fraud, i.e., keep excess payments low. The following corollaries give bounds on excess payments and misreporting probabilities that hold in both signaling game equilibria and Bayesian persuasion equilibria.

**Corollary 1** (Misreporting Probability Bound). Let  $(\pi^*, \sigma^*)$  be a signaling game equilibrium for the audit game. For any signal  $s$  and type  $m$  where  $s \neq m$ , it follows that  $\pi^*(s|m) \leq \min\{\frac{q_s c}{q_m(k-c+f(s)-f(m))}, 1\}$ . Because every Bayesian persuasion equilibrium is also a signaling game equilibrium, these inequalities apply to Bayesian persuasion equilibria as well.

**Corollary 2** (Excess Payments Bound). At any Bayesian persuasion equilibrium  $(\pi^*, \sigma^*)$ , we have  $\mathcal{E}(\pi^*, \sigma^*) \leq \frac{c\Delta f_{\max}}{k+\Delta f_{\max}}$ . By Lemma 1, this bound applies to all signaling game equilibria as well.

See Appendix A.6 for a proof of Corollary 1 and Appendix A.7 for a proof of Corollary 2.

Both corollaries provide insights into the influence of an administrator’s choice of fine  $k$  and audit cost  $c$  on users’ misreporting probability and excess payments, which decrease as  $c$  reduces or as  $k$  increases. Furthermore, note that the bounds on both misreporting probability and excess payments converge to zero as  $c \rightarrow 0$  or as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ . Such behavior makes sense as a low audit cost will make it easier for the administrator to audit, and a high fine  $k$  will deter users from misreporting. While choosing an exceedingly large fine  $k$  can almost completely deter misreporting, in most practical settings, the fine for violations can typically not be arbitrarily high, e.g., traffic light violations cost about \$100 in California. Thus, Corollaries 1 and 2 provide insights regarding the choice of a reasonable fine  $k$ , appropriate for the specific application, while ensuring that the misreporting probability and excess payments are within desirable limits. Further, Corollaries 1 and 2 suggest that while the administrator may have several goals when running a benefits program, the profit-maximizing objective in Equation (2) has merits. In particular, it helps keep misreporting fraud and excess payments to users under check and ensures that the administrator approximately delivers the appropriate benefits to the right groups of users for any credit allocation function  $f$ .

## 4.2 Key Ideas for Establishing Theorem 2

Theorem 2 is based on two key ingredients. First, we show that the best response of the administrator to a user strategy is always a linear threshold rule. Second, we show that the user’s strategy must avoid administrator audits for it to be optimal: any user strategy  $\pi$  for which the administrator’s best response  $\sigma_\pi$  is not identically zero (meaning there exists some signal  $s$  for which  $\sigma_\pi(s) > 0$ ) cannot be optimal. The suboptimality of  $\pi$  means that  $(\pi, \sigma_\pi)$  is not an equilibrium because the user can deviate to achieve a better utility.

Using the second ingredient, when searching for Bayesian persuasion equilibria it is sufficient to limit the search of user strategies to those for which the administrator’s best response is identically zero. Due to the first ingredient, the administrator’s audit decisions are based on a collection of

linear thresholds, i.e., the administrator’s best response is identically zero if and only if the user strategy satisfies a collection of linear inequalities. Thus the user strategies of Bayesian persuasion equilibria are precisely the solutions of a linear program  $\mathcal{L}_{c,k}$  whose objective is  $\mathcal{U}^R$  and whose constraints are the linear inequalities that ensure that the administrator’s best response will be identically zero. Furthermore, the optimal objective value of the linear program  $\mathcal{L}_{c,k}$  is the expected payment that the administrator gives in equilibrium, which is equivalent, up to an additive constant, to the excess payments that occur at equilibrium (see Observation 2 for more details).

We now present the above-mentioned key ingredients to establish Theorem 2.

**Ingredient (i):** To see why the administrator’s best response is a linear threshold rule, note that  $\mathcal{U}^A$  is affine in  $\sigma(s)$  for every  $s \in \mathcal{S}$ , where the coefficient of  $\sigma(s)$  is the expected utility gain from conducting an audit when observing the signal  $s$ . This administrator’s expected utility gain is

$$-c + \sum_{m \neq s} \mathbb{P}(m|s) (\max[f(s) - f(m)]_+ + k).$$

Indeed, the first term is the cost required to conduct an audit, and the second term is the increase in payoff that is expected from conducting an audit, where the expectation is taken over the administrator’s posterior distribution of  $m$  given that it received signal  $s$ . By re-writing the above expression using Bayes’ Rule, the administrator’s best response to a user strategy  $\pi$ , which we denote  $\sigma_\pi$ , is given by:

$$\sigma_\pi(s) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } \sum_{m \neq s} \pi(s|m) \mathbf{q}_m (\max(f(s) - f(m), 0) + k) \leq c \sum_m \pi(s|m) \mathbf{q}_m \\ 1 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (7)$$

Notice that when the inequality in Equation (7) is met with equality, any  $\sigma_\pi(s) \in [0, 1]$  is a best-response for the administrator, i.e., the administrator is indifferent between auditing and not auditing. However, as we demonstrate through Figure 3 in Appendix D.4, the user’s utility  $\mathcal{U}^R$  is maximized if and only if  $\sigma_\pi(s) = 0$  when the inequality in Equation (7) is met with equality. In other words, our audit game has an equilibrium if and only if the administrator plays  $\sigma_\pi(s) = 0$  when the inequality in Equation (7) is met with equality.

**Ingredient (ii):** Given Equation (7), we show that if a Bayesian persuasion equilibrium exists, it must correspond to a no audit strategy of the administrator.

**Lemma 2** (Sub-Optimality of Auditing). Suppose that the best-response  $\sigma_\pi$  of the administrator to a strategy  $\pi$  of the user is such that there exists a signal  $\tilde{s}$  with  $\sigma_\pi(\tilde{s}) = 1$ . Then,  $(\pi, \sigma_\pi)$  is not a Bayesian persuasion equilibrium.

The proof of Lemma 2 relies on showing the following result, which establishes that users will never under-report their type (i.e., choose  $s$  so that  $f(s) < f(m)$ ).

**Lemma 3.** For any user strategy  $\pi$ , if there exists  $s, m$  for which  $f(s) < f(m)$  and  $\pi(s|m) > 0$ , then there exists another strategy  $\tilde{\pi}$  with utility larger than  $\pi$ .

Given Lemma 3, the key idea in the proof of Lemma 2 is a procedure that takes any such  $\pi$ , where there exists a signal  $\tilde{s}$  with  $\sigma_\pi(\tilde{s}) = 1$ , and produces another feasible  $\tilde{\pi}$  with strictly greater utility. This key idea is enabled by our payoff structure, and, in particular, the choice of a profit maximizing administrator.



**Linear Programming Characterization of Bayesian Persuasion Equilibria:** Leveraging Lemma 2, the user strategies in Bayesian persuasion equilibria are strategies whose utility is maximum among all strategies for which the administrator’s best response is identically zero. In other words, user strategies at Bayesian persuasion equilibria can be computed by the following linear program  $\mathcal{L}_{c,k}$

$$\text{maximize } \sum_{\pi \in \Pi} \sum_{m \in \mathcal{S}} \mathbf{q}_m \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \pi(s|m) f(s) \quad (8)$$

$$\text{subject to } \sum_{m \in \mathcal{S} \setminus \{s\}} \pi(s|m) \mathbf{q}_m (k + [f(s) - f(m)]_+) \leq c \sum_{m \in \mathcal{S}} \pi(s|m) \mathbf{q}_m, \forall s \in \mathcal{S}, \quad (9)$$

where Objective (8) is the user’s utility  $U^R$  when the administrator plays a no-audit strategy, and Constraint (9) represents the condition in Equation (7) required for the administrator to not audit.

**Observation 1** (Linear Program and Best-Response in Bayesian Persuasion Equilibrium). An optimal solution  $\pi^*$  to the linear Program (8)-(9) is a best response to the strategy  $\sigma^* = \mathbf{0}$ .

Note that jointly Lemmas 2, 3 and Observation 1 establish Theorem 2.

### 4.3 Discussion

This section interprets and discusses some key implications of our equilibrium existence results.

First, the absence of audits in Bayesian persuasion equilibria provides a simple relationship between user utility and excess payments that is used to establish upper bounds on excess payments that occur in both signaling game and Bayesian persuasion equilibria, as described in the following observation.

**Observation 2** (Excess Payments and User Utility in the absence of audits). When  $\sigma(s) = 0$  for all  $s \in \mathcal{S}$ ,  $U^R(\pi, \sigma) = \sum_m \mathbf{q}_m \sum_s \pi(s|m) f(s)$ . Because  $\sum_m \mathbf{q}_m f(m)$  is a constant that does not depend on the user strategy  $\pi$ , maximizing  $\sum_m \mathbf{q}_m \sum_s \pi(s|m) f(s)$  is equivalent to maximizing  $\sum_m \mathbf{q}_m \sum_s \pi(s|m) (f(s) - f(m))$ , which is precisely the expression for excess payments  $\mathcal{E}(\pi, \sigma)$  once we use Lemma 3 to rule out any cases where  $f(s) < f(m)$ .

Second, a few remarks about our equilibrium existence results are in order.

**Remark 1** (Interpretation of No-Audit Equilibria). While not conducting audits is an equilibrium strategy for the administrator, it does not imply that users can arbitrarily misreport their type, as the administrator only does not audit when the users’ mixed-strategy satisfies Equation (9), which consequently limits the probability of user misreports (see Corollary 1).

**Remark 2** (Interpreting Administrator Utility in Equilibrium). Note from Equations (2) and (3), this game is almost but not quite a zero sum game due to the audit costs that the administrator incurs, which do not appear in the user’s utility  $U^R$ . However, because  $\sigma \equiv 0$  at any signaling game equilibria, in such settings the player utilities have a zero sum relationship. Thus, as the user maximizes excess payments (see Observation 2) subject to  $\sigma \equiv 0$ , the administrator, under its profit maximizing objective, minimizes excess payments in equilibrium.



**Remark 3** (Equilibrium Computation Using Linear Programming). Our proof of the existence of Bayesian persuasion equilibria is constructive, and, in particular, the linear Program (8)-(9) provides a polynomial time equilibrium computation method (in the cardinality of the set  $\mathcal{S}$ ). We obtain a linear program to compute equilibria in our audit game, due to our choice of a profit maximizing administrator and the way that the audit fine and costs are incorporated into the user payoffs, wherein being caught misreporting leads to a lower payoff than telling the truth. We emphasize that this result is in contrast to the NP-hardness of computing equilibria in two-stage games, e.g., Stackelberg equilibria [KCP10], in general, which typically involves solving a mixed-integer and non-convex optimization problem. In particular, we leverage the structure of our problem setting to reduce the space of possible equilibria to those that satisfy the inequality in Equation (7), which enables us to compute equilibria using the linear Program (8)-(9). Theorem 2 also contributes to the literature on developing linear programming approaches in Bayesian persuasion contexts [Kol18]; however, in contrast to [Kol18], where equilibria are guaranteed to exist, we also consider a budget-constrained setting in Section 5 where equilibria may, in general, not exist.

## 5 Budget Constrained Setting

We now investigate the setting when the administrator is budget-constrained, i.e., it does not have enough budget to audit all  $n$  users ( $B < nc$ ), in line with real-world applications where budget constraints may arise for several reasons, e.g., labor limitations or caps on government spending to run a benefits program. The presence of a budget constraint introduces a coupling of the administrator’s decisions across different users and thus requires a more nuanced equilibrium analysis. Moreover, since the administrator’s decisions are coupled across users in the presence of budget-constraints, we can no longer model this setting as  $n$  parallel single-user games. As a result, in this section and in the analysis of the associated results, we introduce a superscript or a subscript  $i$ , corresponding to each user  $i \in [n]$ , in the notation for the signal  $s$ , type  $m$ , and strategies  $\pi, \sigma$ .

To this end, we first show that signaling game equilibria may, in general, not exist with a budget constraint (Section 5.1). Despite this result, we establish that signaling game equilibria exist if the administrator has enough budget to audit even one user (Section 5.2). Further, we extend the notion of a signaling game equilibrium to the setting where users can collude and show that equilibria exist if the budget scales with the size of the largest user coalition (Section 5.3). Since equilibria are guaranteed to exist under a small audit budget, from our bounds on the misreporting probability and excess payments to users in Section 4, we have that the administrator can effectively mitigate misreporting fraud at a low overall cost.

### 5.1 Equilibrium Non-Existence

While signaling game equilibria always exist in the absence of a budget constraint (Theorem 1), in this section, we present an example demonstrating that signaling game equilibria may not exist when the administrator is budget-constrained. To this end, we first note that the notion of a signaling game equilibrium in Definition 2 can be readily generalized to the budget-constrained setting by adding a budget constraint to the administrator’s profit maximization problem. We now present Proposition 1, which establishes a counterexample where no signaling game equilibria exist when the budget of the administrator is below a specified threshold.

**Proposition 1** (Non-Existence of Signaling Game Equilibria). Suppose  $|\mathcal{S}| = 2$  with  $\mathcal{S} = \{s_{\min}, s_{\max}\}$  and  $\mathbf{q} = (q_{\min}, q_{\max})$ , and  $0 < B < c \frac{\Delta f_{\max} (1 - \min\{\frac{q_{\max} c}{q_{\min}(k - c + \Delta f_{\max})}, 1\})}{k + \Delta f_{\max}}$ . Then, even when  $n = 2$  users have the same prior  $\mathbf{q}$ , no signaling game equilibria  $(\{\pi_i^*\}_{i=1}^n, \sigma^*)$  exist.

*Proof (Sketch).* We prove this claim by contradiction. In particular, we begin by noting that any equilibrium strategy for a setting with two users must be one of two types: (i) both users play the same strategy, i.e.,  $\pi_1^* = \pi_2^*$ , or (ii) there is some type  $m$  such that  $\pi_1^*(\cdot|m) \neq \pi_2^*(\cdot|m)$ . In both cases, we derive contradictions by showing that one of the two users has a profitable deviation, which follows as the budget of the administrator is below a specified threshold.  $\square$

For a complete proof of Proposition 1, see Appendix A.9. Proposition 1 indicates that if the administrator's budget is too small, where it does not have enough budget to audit even one user, it may not be possible to achieve an equilibrium outcome. Similar counterexamples can be constructed for the  $|\mathcal{S}| > 2$  and  $n > 2$  settings.

Further, the example in Proposition 1 is the smallest instance where equilibria do not exist and we refer to Appendix D.2 for a proof of equilibrium existence in the setting with one user when  $|\mathcal{S}| = 2$  irrespective of the budget. Finally, we reiterate that this non-existence result in the budget-constrained setting is in contrast to general equilibrium existence results in signaling games [CS82].

## 5.2 Equilibria Exist: Sufficient Budget Case

We now show that if the administrator has enough budget to audit at least one user, signaling game equilibria exist. We first establish the general equilibrium existence result for any  $|\mathcal{S}|$ , following which we present a stronger result when  $|\mathcal{S}| = 2$ .

**Theorem 3** (Existence of Equilibria with Sufficient Budget). Suppose that the budget  $B \geq c \max_{s_k, s_o \in \mathcal{S}} \{ \frac{f(s_k) - f(s_o)}{k + f(s_k) - f(s_o)} \} = c \frac{\Delta f_{\max}}{k + \Delta f_{\max}}$ . Then, a signaling game equilibrium  $(\{\pi_i^*\}_{i=1}^n, \sigma^*)$  exists and can be computed via the linear program  $\mathcal{L}_{c,k}$  (defined in Equations (8)-(9)) for each user  $i \in [n]$ .

For a proof of Theorem 3, see Appendix A.10. In addition to equilibrium existence, we note that the corresponding equilibrium properties reduce to that in the setting without budget constraints and that equilibria can be computed using the linear programming approach in Section 4. Consequently, given our obtained upper bounds on the probability of user misreports and excess user payments in the budget-unconstrained setting (see Section 4), Theorem 3 implies that our proposed audit mechanism can effectively mitigate misreporting fraud at a low cost.

While signaling game equilibria may, in general, not exist if  $B < c \max_{s_k, s_l \in \mathcal{S}} \{ \frac{f(s_k) - f(s_l)}{k + f(s_k) - f(s_l)} \}$ , we show that when  $|\mathcal{S}| = 2$  and users have the same prior  $\mathbf{q}$ , signaling game equilibria exist under a weaker condition on the budget.

**Proposition 2** (Equilibrium Existence with  $|\mathcal{S}| = 2$ ). Suppose  $|\mathcal{S}| = 2$  and all users have the same prior  $\mathbf{q}$ . Then, a signaling game equilibrium  $(\{\pi_i^*\}_{i=1}^n, \sigma^*)$  exists if  $B \geq c \frac{\Delta f_{\max} (1 - \min\{\frac{q_{\max} c}{q_{\min}(k - c + \Delta f_{\max})}, 1\})}{k + \Delta f_{\max}}$ .

For a proof of Proposition 2, see Appendix A.11. We reiterate that Proposition 2 is stronger than Theorem 3 due to its lower budget requirement. Further, the budget threshold in Proposition 2 is when the inequality in Proposition 1 is met with equality, highlighting the tightness of this budget requirement for equilibria to exist when  $|\mathcal{S}| = 2$  and users have the same prior  $\mathbf{q}$ .

### 5.3 Extension to User Coalitions

We now allow for the possibility of user collusion, as may happen in real-world social networks, and show that equilibria exist if the administrator’s budget scales with the size of the largest coalition.

To elucidate our result, we first extend the signaling game equilibrium notion in Definition 2 to the setting with user coalitions of size at most  $l$ , a stronger requirement than the setting without coalitions as users can collude with other users to increase payoffs. We define  $(\{\pi_i^*\}_{i=1}^n, \sigma^*)$  to be a signaling game equilibrium under  $l$ -coalitions if there is no coalition of size at most  $l$ , such that users in the coalition can deviate in a way where all users weakly improve their payoffs, with at least one user strictly increasing its payoff.

We show that signaling game equilibria under  $l$ -coalitions exist if the administrator’s budget scales with the largest coalition size.<sup>1</sup>

**Theorem 4** (Equilibrium Existence with User Coalitions). Suppose the largest user coalition size is  $l$ , all users have the same prior  $\mathbf{q}$ , and  $B \geq lc \max_{s_k, s_o \in \mathcal{S}} \left\{ \frac{f(s_k) - f(s_o)}{k + f(s_k) - f(s_o)} \right\}$ . Then, a signaling game equilibrium  $(\{\pi_i^*\}_{i=1}^n, \sigma^*)$  under  $l$ -coalitions exists and is such that a no audit strategy is the best-response for the administrator and the best-response for all users can be computed via the linear program  $\mathcal{L}_{c,k}$  (defined in Equations (8)-(9)) for all users  $i \in [n]$ .

The proof of Theorem 4 follows similar ideas to Theorem 3 and we refer to Appendix A.12 for its proof. While signaling game equilibria may, in general, not exist (see Section 5.1), Theorem 4 implies that if the administrator has enough budget to audit all users in the largest coalition, equilibria exist and the corresponding equilibrium strategies reduce to that in the setting without user coalitions and a budget constraint.

Since the coalition size  $l \ll n$  in real-world social networks [Ro19], our audit mechanism helps mitigate misreporting fraud (see Section 4) at a low cost even with user coalitions.

## 6 Comparison of Audit Mechanism to Status Quo without Audits

In this section, we investigate whether the decrease in misreporting fraud resulting from our audit mechanism outweighs the budget spent to run it. To this end, we compare the total cost of our audit mechanism to the status quo without audits, where the total cost is composed of: (i) the budget required to run the audit mechanism and (ii) the excess payments made to users relative to when all users report their types truthfully. We show that the total cost of our audit mechanism is no more than that of the setting without audits (i) for all parameter ranges when  $|\mathcal{S}| = 2$  and (ii) under a mild condition on the audit fine  $k$  when  $|\mathcal{S}| > 2$ .

For ease of exposition, we first focus on the single-user setting in Section 6.1 and present the extension of these results (for  $|\mathcal{S}| = 2$  and  $|\mathcal{S}| > 2$ ) to the multiple-user setting in Section 6.2. Then, in Section 6.3, we present numerical experiments to compare the costs of our audit mechanism to the status quo without audits based on an application case of a federal transit benefits program.

---

<sup>1</sup>As with Theorem 4, which is an analog of Theorem 3, a corresponding analog of Proposition 2 can also be developed for the setting with user coalitions.

## 6.1 Single-User Setting

We first establish conditions under which the total cost of our audit mechanism ( $C^{\text{Audit}}$ ) is lower than that of the status quo without audits ( $C^{\text{No Audit}}$ ) in the single-user setting. To compare the costs of these mechanisms, we consider the cases when  $|\mathcal{S}| = 2$  and  $|\mathcal{S}| > 2$  separately, as signaling game equilibria are unique only when  $|\mathcal{S}| = 2$  (see Appendices C and D.1), which enables a stronger guarantee in this setting.<sup>2</sup>

We begin by considering the setting when  $|\mathcal{S}| = 2$ , in which case we establish that the total cost of our audit mechanism is at most that of the status quo with no audits for all values of  $q_{\min} \in [0, 1]$ .

**Theorem 5** (Cost Comparison ( $|\mathcal{S}| = 2$ )). Let  $|\mathcal{S}| = 2$ , where  $\mathbf{q} = (q_{\min}, q_{\max})$ , the number of users  $n = 1$ , and suppose that  $B = \frac{c}{k + \Delta f_{\max}} (\Delta f_{\max}) (1 - \min\{\frac{q_{\max} c}{q_{\min}(k - c + \Delta f_{\max})}, 1\})$ . Then, for any  $q_{\min} \in [0, 1]$ ,  $C^{\text{Audit}} \leq C^{\text{No Audit}}$ .

*Proof (Sketch).* To prove this claim, we first note that the total cost of the status quo without audits is  $C^{\text{No Audit}} = q_{\min} \Delta f_{\max}$ , as all users of the low type will misreport their type. Next, to analyse the total cost of our audit mechanism, we consider two cases: (i)  $q_{\min} \leq \frac{c}{k + \Delta f_{\max}}$  and (ii)  $q_{\min} \geq \frac{c}{k + \Delta f_{\max}}$ . In the first case, we show that our audit mechanism reduces to the no audit setting, as the administrator sets aside no budget to conduct audits when  $q_{\min}$  is below this specified threshold. On the other hand, in case (ii), since the administrator sets aside a budget to audit the user, we leverage the properties of the equilibria in our audit game derived in the proof of Proposition 2 to establish that  $C^{\text{Audit}} \leq C^{\text{No Audit}}$  in this setting as well, establishing our claim.  $\square$

For a complete proof of Theorem 5, see Appendix A.13. We reiterate that this result is unconditional as it does not impose any restriction on the range of different problem parameters to establish that  $C^{\text{Audit}} \leq C^{\text{No Audit}}$ . The key to establishing this unconditional guarantee is the uniqueness of equilibria when  $|\mathcal{S}| = 2$ .

However, the unconditional guarantee of Theorem 5 does not directly extend to the regime where  $|\mathcal{S}| > 2$ , as in this case the equilibria of our audit game may not be unique (Appendix C). Yet, we show that if the fine  $k$  is sufficiently large, the cost of our audit mechanism is no more than that of the status quo with no audits.

**Theorem 6** (Cost Comparison ( $|\mathcal{S}| > 2$ )). Let  $|\mathcal{S}| > 2$  and  $k \geq \Delta f_{\max} (\frac{c}{\max_{s'} f(s') - \mathbb{E}_{(s,m) \sim \pi} [f(s)]} - 1)$ . Then  $C^{\text{Audit}} \leq C^{\text{No Audit}}$ .

*Proof (Sketch).* First, note that  $C^{\text{Audit}} = B + \mathbb{E}_{\pi} [f(s) - f(m)]$ . Next, since  $B = \frac{c \Delta f_{\max}}{k + \Delta f_{\max}}$ , we have

$$k \geq \Delta f_{\max} \left( \frac{c}{\max_{s'} f(s') - \mathbb{E}_{s \sim \pi} [f(s)]} - 1 \right) \implies B \leq \max_{s'} f(s') - \mathbb{E}_{\pi} [f(s)],$$

and hence  $C^{\text{Audit}} \leq \max_{s'} f(s') - \mathbb{E}_{\pi} [f(s)] + \mathbb{E}_{\pi} [f(s) - f(m)] = \max_{s'} f(s') - \mathbb{E}_{\pi} [f(m)]$ .

On the other hand, in an absence of an audit, users will always signal  $s' := \arg \max_{s \in \mathcal{S}} f(s)$ , leading to  $C^{\text{No Audit}} = \max_{s'} f(s') - \mathbb{E}_{\pi} [f(m)]$ , and hence  $C^{\text{Audit}} \leq C^{\text{No Audit}}$ .  $\square$

<sup>2</sup>Note that when  $|\mathcal{S}| = 1$ , there is no scope to misreport; hence we consider  $|\mathcal{S}| \geq 2$ .

For a complete proof of Theorem 6, see Appendix A.15. A few comments about the bound on the fine  $k$  in Theorem 6 are in order. First, this bound scales linearly with the maximum difference in the credit allocation  $\Delta f_{\max}$  and the audit cost  $c$ . Such a result is intuitive as the fine  $k$  should be at least  $c$  for it to be economically viable for the administrator to audit users, and the fine should scale proportionally to  $\Delta f_{\max}$  to deter the lowest type users from misreporting. Further, the bound on the fine is inversely proportional to the term  $\max_{s'} f(s') - \mathbb{E}_{\pi}[f(s)]$ . Thus, while the fine  $k$  must be high when the term  $\max_{s'} f(s') - \mathbb{E}_{\pi}[f(s)]$  is small, this term is small only when  $q_{\max}$  is very close to one. Hence, for most distributions  $\mathbf{q}$  likely to occur in practice, the term  $\max_{s'} f(s') - \mathbb{E}_{\pi}[f(s)]$  is comparable in order of magnitude to  $\Delta f_{\max}$ . Consequently, the condition on the fine  $k$  in Theorem 6 is mild. Yet, we note that developing an unconditional bound, independent of  $k$ , in the setting when  $|\mathcal{S}| > 2$  is an important direction for future research.

Together, Theorems 5 and 6 imply that the total cost of our audit mechanism is no more than that of the setting without audits for most parameter ranges. Such a result establishes that the decrease in misreporting fraud resulting from our audit mechanism outweighs the spending to run it, suggesting its practical viability.

## 6.2 Multiple-User Setting

In this section, we extend the results in the single-user setting to that with multiple users. Here, we denote the cost of not conducting audits with  $n$  users as  $C_n^{\text{No Audit}}$  and the total cost of the audit mechanism with a maximum coalition of size  $l$  as  $C_{(n,l)}^{\text{Audit}}$ .

We now extend Theorem 5 (when  $|\mathcal{S}| = 2$ ) to the multiple-user setting by showing that our audit mechanism achieves a lower total cost than the no audit setting for all  $q_{\min} \in [0, 1]$ .

**Corollary 3** (Cost Comparison Multiple Users). Let  $|\mathcal{S}| = 2$ , the size of the largest coalition among  $n$  users be  $l$ , and let  $B = lc \frac{(\Delta f_{\max}) \left(1 - \min\left\{\frac{q_{\max} c}{q_{\min}(k-c+\Delta f_{\max})}, 1\right\}\right)}{k + \Delta f_{\max}}$ . Further, suppose all users have the same prior  $\mathbf{q}$ . Then, for any  $q_{\min} \in [0, 1]$ ,  $C_{(n,l)}^{\text{Audit}} \leq C_n^{\text{No Audit}}$ .

For a proof of Corollary 3, see Appendix A.14. Corollary 3 also extends to the setting where users have different priors by taking a maximum of the budget bound across all priors  $\mathbf{q}$ , which we note reduces to the relation on the budget in Theorem 4. We also note that a corresponding generalization of Theorem 6 holds when  $|\mathcal{S}| > 2$  (see Appendix D.3). Thus, irrespective of the number of users or the size of the largest user coalition, Corollary 3 and its corresponding generalization for  $|\mathcal{S}| > 2$  suggest that a small audit budget can help alleviate misreporting fraud, highlighting our audit mechanism’s practical viability.

## 6.3 Case Study of Misreporting Fraud

To evaluate our audit mechanism, we conduct numerical experiments based on an application case of Washington D.C.’s federal transit benefits program (FTBP) designed to provide federal employees with transit passes equal to their monthly commuting costs to work. However, many federal employees provide inaccurate commuting cost information on their transit benefits applications and the “amount of potentially fraudulent transit benefits claimed during 2006 was at least \$17 million,” which constituted about 25% of the total claims [KR07]. These numbers were based on an extrapolation of the fraudulent claims of 4000 employees, where it was found that of the \$4 million claimed, \$1 million was fraudulent. In the following, we present our model calibration and

results comparing the total cost of our audit mechanism to the misreporting fraud in this benefits program (and to that of the setting without audits).

*Model Calibration:* To design a numerical experiment that reflects Washington D.C.’s federal transit benefits program, we focus on the fraudulent claims of the 4000 employees at the headquarters of the federal agencies in the National Capital Region. Furthermore, since transit benefits are distributed every month, with a maximum of \$105 a month per person, we focus on a monthly time horizon, which corresponds to approximately \$83,333 of fraudulent claims for these  $n = 4000$  employees. For ease of exposition, we assume that users have two possible types, i.e.,  $|\mathcal{S}| = 2$ , where  $f_{min} = 50$  and  $f_{max} = 105$ <sup>3</sup>.

Finally, we calibrate the parameters  $c$  and  $k$  of our proposed audit mechanism. To calibrate the fine  $k$ , we assume that  $k$  varies in the range  $\{\$100, \$300, \$500\}$ , where we note that  $k = \$300$  corresponds to the fine for the first time offense of not declaring items at airport customs in the United States [cus23] and is on the same order of magnitude as the fines corresponding to traffic violations, e.g., speeding tickets or skipping red lights, in the United States. For the cost  $c$  of conducting an audit, we assume this to be equivalent to the cost of hiring an individual to look through the data records or visit an employee’s home to validate their approximate commuting costs for a month. Given that the average hourly wage in Washington D.C. is around \$23.99 as of 2024 [Zip24] and that looking through data records or auditing an individual will at most take a couple of hours, we allow the cost  $c$  to vary in the following range:  $c \in \{\$25, \$75, \$125\}$ , corresponding the approximate average wage for one hour, three hours, and five hours.

**Results:** Figures 1 and 2 depict the total costs of our audit mechanism and that of the setting without audits (termed “No Audit”) as a function of the probability of the low type  $q_{min}$  for three different audit costs  $c \in \{\$25, \$75, \$125\}$  and audit fines  $k \in \{\$100, \$300, \$500\}$ , respectively. Here, we depict the total costs of our audit mechanism when users do not collude, i.e., the coalition size is one, and when users form coalitions with a maximum size of 150 [Ro19]. Further, we depict a line corresponding to the \$83,333 of monthly fraudulent claims in Washington D.C.’s FTBP (termed “Fraud FTBP”). We note here that the total cost of the no audit setting analysed in Sections 6.1 and 6.2 is likely to differ from the \$83,333 of misreporting fraud in Washington D.C.’s FTBP, as our analysis for the no audit setting assumes that all users are rational and thus any user of a low type will misreport. However, in practice, many users may be risk averse; hence, the \$83,333 of misreporting fraud will likely be lower than that predicted by theory. Thus, since the total cost of the no audit setting under rational user behavior intersects the line corresponding to the \$83,333 of monthly fraudulent claims at  $q_{min} = 0.4$  in Figure 1, it suggests that  $q_{min} \geq 0.4$  in practice.

From Figures 1 and 2, we first note that our obtained results validate Theorem 5 and Corollary 3, as the total costs of our audit mechanisms (irrespective of coalition size) are no more than that of the no audit setting. Note that the total cost of our audit mechanisms and that of the “No Audit” setting are identical up to a certain threshold of  $q_{min}$ , following which our audit mechanism has a strictly smaller total cost, where the gap in the total costs of the two mechanisms is monotonically non-decreasing in  $q_{min}$  (see Theorem 5). Above this  $q_{min}$  threshold, it is profitable for the administrator to set aside an audit budget, resulting in a lower overall cost of the audit

<sup>3</sup>We note that  $f_{max} = \$105$  corresponds to the maximum allowable monthly benefit that a user could claim in 2006 and  $f_{min} = \$50$  is obtained by adjusting the minimum monthly pass for the Washington D.C. metro in 2024 to 2006 prices. In particular, as the minimum monthly pass is \$64 and the minimum daily pass is \$13 in 2024 prices, while the minimum daily pass in 2004 was around \$9, the estimate of \$50 serves as a ball-park for the minimum monthly commuting prices in the National Capital Region in 2006.



mechanism as the reduction in the excess user payments outweighs the budget required to run the audit mechanism.

Next, we observe from Figure 1 that as the audit cost  $c$  increases, the total cost of our audit mechanisms increase, which aligns with the properties of the equilibria in our two-stage game (see Section 4). Despite this observation, for each value of  $c$  in Figure 1, the total cost of our audit mechanisms, under both coalition sizes and all values of  $q_{\min}$ , are lower than the \$83,333 of fraudulent claims. While an audit cost  $c$  that is much larger than \$125 would result in the total cost of our audit mechanism exceeding \$83,333 for particular ranges of  $q_{\min}$ , an audit cost greater than \$125 implies that it would take more than five hours to audit a user to determine if they misreported their commuting costs, which is unlikely in practice. Thus, for all practical ranges of the audit cost  $c$ , our audit mechanism reduces the total cost compared to the \$83,333 of fraudulent claims.

Analogously, the results depicted in Figure 2 show that as the audit fine is increased, the total cost of our proposed audit mechanism is reduced. Such a result holds as users will misreport with a lower probability at a higher audit fine (see Corollary 1), and thus the total excess payments corresponding to our proposed audit mechanism will consequently be lower (see Corollary 2). Yet, we note from Figure 2 that for all the tested fines, the cost of our audit mechanism is lower than that of the setting without audits, and also the \$83,333 of monthly fraudulent claims for all values of  $q_{\min}$ . Akin to our observations with the variation in the audit costs, we note that while an audit fine  $k$  that is much smaller than \$100 would result in the total cost of our audit mechanism exceeding \$83,333 for particular ranges of  $q_{\min}$ , a fine that is significantly smaller than \$100 is unlikely in practice for a city like Washington D.C..

Finally, the total cost of our audit mechanism without coalitions is smaller than that with a coalition size of 150, as the administrator’s budget scales with the size of the largest coalition (Theorem 4). However, from Figures 1 and 2, for most values of  $q_{\min}$ , we note that the gap in the total costs of the two audit mechanisms is small, suggesting that the excess payments far outweigh the budget required for audits.

Overall, our results demonstrate the promise of our audit mechanism in alleviating misreporting fraud, which can improve upon the costs of the status quo of not conducting audits by several orders of magnitude for certain parameter ranges, e.g., higher values of  $q_{\min}$ .




Figure 1: Comparison of the total costs of the no audit mechanism to our audit mechanism with a coalition size  $l = 1$  and  $l = 150$  for a fine  $k = 300$  and for audit costs  $c = 25$  (left),  $c = 75$  (center), and  $c = 125$  (right) as  $q_{\min}$  varies. Each plot also depicts the \$83,333 of monthly fraud in Washington D.C.’s FTBP.




Figure 2: Comparison of the total costs of the no audit mechanism to our audit mechanism with a coalition size  $l = 1$  and  $l = 150$  for a cost  $c = 75$  and for audit fines  $k = 100$  (left),  $k = 300$  (center), and  $k = 500$  (right) as  $q_{\min}$  varies. Each plot also depicts the \$83,333 of monthly fraud in Washington D.C.'s FTBP.

## 7 Conclusion and Future Work

In this work, we developed an audit mechanism to address misreporting fraud in artificial currency based government benefits programs at a low overall cost to the administrator.

There are several future research directions. First, there is scope to generalize our model to a broader range of audit mechanisms, e.g., where the fine  $k$  depends on the extent of user misreports. Further, it would be valuable to investigate settings when the prior distribution  $\mathbf{q}$  is unknown to the administrator and analyse the influence of other administrator objectives in mitigating misreporting fraud beyond the profit-maximization objective studied in this work.

## References

- [ABMP22] Philippe Askenazy, Thomas Breda, Flavien Moreau, and Vladimir Pecheu. Do French companies under-report their workforce at 49 employees to get around the law? PSE Working Papers halshs-03828729, HAL, March 2022.
- [ACP13] Paul Asquith, Thom Covert, and Parag Pathak. The effects of mandatory transparency in financial market design: Evidence from the corporate bond market. Technical report, NBER, 2013.
- [Ake70] George A. Akerlof. The market for "lemons": Quality uncertainty and the market mechanism. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 84(3):488–500, 1970.
- [AS72] Michael G. Allingham and Agnar Sandmo. Income tax evasion: a theoretical analysis. *Journal of Public Economics*, 1(3):323–338, 1972.
- [BCD<sup>+</sup>13] Jeremiah Blocki, Nicolas Christin, Anupam Datta, Ariel D Procaccia, and Arunesh Sinha. Audit games. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1303.0356*, 2013.
- [Bec68] Gary S Becker. Crime and punishment: An economic approach. *Journal of political economy*, 76(2):169–217, 1968.
- [BEC<sup>+</sup>22] Emily Black, Hadi Elzayn, Alexandra Chouldechova, Jacob Goldin, and Daniel Ho. Algorithmic fairness and vertical equity: Income fairness with irs tax audit models. In *Proceedings of the 2022 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*, FAccT '22, page 1479–1503, New York, NY, USA, 2022. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [BM19] Dirk Bergemann and Stephen Morris. Information design: A unified perspective. *Journal of Economic Literature*, 57(1):44–95, 2019.
- [BNCGS23] Andreas Bjerre-Nielsen, Lykke Sterll Christensen, Mikkel Høst Gandil, and Hans Hen-



- rik Sievertsen. Playing the system: address manipulation and access to schools. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.18949*, 2023.
- [BS20] Dan Boneh and Victor Shoup. *A Graduate Course in Applied Cryptography*. 2020.
- [Bud11] Eric Budish. The combinatorial assignment problem: Approximate competitive equilibrium from equal incomes. *Journal of Political Economy*, 119(6):1061–1103, 2011.
- [CS82] Vincent P. Crawford and Joel Sobel. Strategic information transmission. *Econometrica*, 50(6):1431–1451, 1982.
- [cus23] U.s. customs and border protection. <https://www.cbp.gov/travel/us-citizens/know-before-you-go/prohibited-and-restricted-items>, 2023. [Accessed: 2024-01-30].
- [ECD<sup>+</sup>23] Andrew Estornell, Yatong Chen, Sanmay Das, Yang Liu, and Yevgeniy Vorobeychik. Incentivizing recourse through auditing in strategic classification. In *Proceedings of the Thirty-Second International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, pages 400–408, 2023.
- [Edi22] Editor. San mateo 101 express lanes open with a first-of-its-kind equity program. Everything South City, 2022. [Online](#).
- [EDV21] Andrew Estornell, Sanmay Das, and Yevgeniy Vorobeychik. Incentivizing truthfulness through audits in strategic classification. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 35, pages 5347–5354, 2021.
- [foo] Apply for calfresh. [Online](#).
- [GBI21] Artur Gorokh, Siddhartha Banerjee, and Krishnamurthy Iyer. From monetary to nonmonetary mechanism design via artificial currencies. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 46(3):835–855, 2021.
- [Gne05] Uri Gneezy. Deception: The role of consequences. *American Economic Review*, 95(1):384–394, March 2005.
- [Gre23] Patrick Greenfield. Revealed: more than 90% of rainforest carbon offsets by biggest certifier are worthless, analysis shows, 2023. [Online](#).
- [HCA<sup>+</sup>23] Peter Henderson, Ben Chugg, Brandon Anderson, Kristen Altenburger, Alex Turk, John Guyton, Jacob Goldin, and Daniel E. Ho. Integrating reward maximization and population estimation: sequential decision-making for internal revenue service audit selection. In *Proceedings of the Thirty-Seventh AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Thirty-Fifth Conference on Innovative Applications of Artificial Intelligence and Thirteenth Symposium on Educational Advances in Artificial Intelligence*, AAAI’23/IAAI’23/EAAI’23. AAAI Press, 2023.
- [Hol79] Bengt Holmström. Moral hazard and observability. *The Bell Journal of Economics*, 10(1):74–91, 1979.
- [HZ79] Aanund Hylland and Richard Zeckhauser. The efficient allocation of individuals to positions. *Journal of Political Economy*, 87(2):293–314, 1979.
- [Jen02] Helen H. Jensen. Food insecurity and the food stamp program. *American Journal of Agricultural Economics*, 84(5):1215–1228, 2002.
- [Kam19] Emir Kamenica. Bayesian persuasion and information design. *Annual Review of Economics*, 11(1):249–272, 2019.
- [KCP10] Dmytro Korzhyk, Vincent Conitzer, and Ronald Parr. Complexity of computing optimal stackelberg strategies in security resource allocation games. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 24, pages 805–810, 2010.

- [KG11] Emir Kamenica and Matthew Gentzkow. Bayesian persuasion. *American Economic Review*, 101(6):2590–2615, 2011.
- [KJT<sup>+</sup>09] Christopher Kiekintveld, Manish Jain, Jason Tsai, James Pita, Fernando Ordóñez, and Milind Tambe. Computing optimal randomized resource allocations for massive security games. In *Proceedings of The 8th International Conference on Autonomous Agents and Multiagent Systems - Volume 1*, AAMAS '09, page 689–696, Richland, SC, 2009. International Foundation for Autonomous Agents and Multiagent Systems.
- [Kol18] Anton Kolotilin. Optimal information disclosure: A linear programming approach. *Theoretical Economics*, 13(2):607–635, 2018.
- [KR07] Gregory D Kutz and John J Ryan. *Federal Transit Benefits Program: Ineffective Controls Result in Fraud and Abuse by Federal Workers: Testimony Before the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, US Senate*. US Government Accountability Office, 2007.
- [Lan79] Andrea G Lange. *Fraud and Abuse in Government Benefit Programs*. US Department of Justice, Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, 1979.
- [LP77] Hayne E. Leland and David H. Pyle. Informational asymmetries, financial structure, and financial intermediation. *The Journal of Finance*, 32(2):371–387, 1977.
- [LWF<sup>+</sup>19] Taylor Lundy, Alexander Wei, Hu Fu, Scott Duke Kominers, and Kevin Leyton-Brown. Allocation for social good: Auditing mechanisms for utility maximization. In *Proceedings of the 2019 ACM Conference on Economics and Computation*, EC '19, page 785–803, New York, NY, USA, 2019. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [McM22] Benjamin J McMichael. Stealing organs? *Ind. LJ*, 97:135, 2022.
- [MR87] Paul Milgrom and John Roberts. Informational asymmetries, strategic behavior, and industrial organization. *The American Economic Review*, 77(2):184–193, 1987.
- [MW82] Paul R. Milgrom and Robert J. Weber. A theory of auctions and competitive bidding. *Econometrica*, 50(5):1089–1122, 1982.
- [PJM<sup>+</sup>08] James Pita, Manish Jain, Janusz Marecki, Fernando Ordóñez, Christopher Portway, Milind Tambe, Craig Western, Praveen Paruchuri, and Sarit Kraus. Deployed armor protection: the application of a game theoretic model for security at the los angeles international airport. In *Proceedings of the 7th international joint conference on Autonomous agents and multiagent systems: industrial track*, pages 125–132, 2008.
- [Pre17] Canice Prendergast. How food banks use markets to feed the poor. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 31(4):145–62, November 2017.
- [PRS23] Eduardo Perez-Richet and Vasiliki Skreta. Fraud-proof non-market allocation mechanisms. Technical report, Working paper, 2023.
- [Ro19] Christine Ro. Dunbar’s number: Why we can only maintain 150 relationships, 2019. [Online](#).
- [RS10] Luis Rayo and Ilya Segal. Optimal information disclosure. *Journal of Political Economy*, 118(5):949–987, 2010.
- [Sob09] Joel Sobel. *Signaling Games*, pages 8125–8139. Springer New York, New York, NY, 2009.
- [Spe73] Michael Spence. Job market signaling. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 87(3):355–374, 1973.
- [Tam11] Milind Tambe. *Security and game theory: algorithms, deployed systems, lessons learned*. Cambridge university press, 2011.

- [Tiw20] Rituraj Tiwari. Government weeds out 44 million bogus ration cards to plug leakage, 2020. .
- [Whi23] Natasha White. Bogus carbon credits are a 'pervasive' problem, scientists warn, 2023. [Online](#).
- [YJJ<sup>+</sup>12] Zhengyu Yin, Albert Jiang, Matthew Johnson, Milind Tambe, Christopher Kiekintveld, Kevin Leyton-Brown, Tuomas Sandholm, and John Sullivan. Trusts: Scheduling randomized patrols for fare inspection in transit systems. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 26, pages 2348–2355, 2012.
- [Zip24] ZipRecruiter. Hourly rate salary in washington, dc. <https://www.ziprecruiter.com/Salaries/Hourly-Rate-Salary-in-Washington,DC>, 2024. [Accessed: 2024-02-06].

## A Proofs

### A.1 Proof of Theorem 2

By Definition 3, a strategy profile  $(\boldsymbol{\pi}^*, \boldsymbol{\sigma}^*)$  is a Bayesian persuasion equilibrium for the audit game if and only if

$$\boldsymbol{\sigma}^* \in \operatorname{argmax}_{\boldsymbol{\sigma}} \mathcal{U}^A(\boldsymbol{\pi}^*, \boldsymbol{\sigma}),$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \boldsymbol{\pi}^* &\in \operatorname{argmax}_{\boldsymbol{\pi} \in \Pi} \mathcal{U}^R(\boldsymbol{\pi}, \boldsymbol{\sigma}) \\ \text{s.t. } \boldsymbol{\sigma} &\in \operatorname{argmax}_{\boldsymbol{\sigma}_0} \mathcal{U}^A(\boldsymbol{\pi}, \boldsymbol{\sigma}_0). \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 2 shows, however, that any  $\boldsymbol{\pi}$  for which  $\boldsymbol{\sigma}^* \not\equiv 0$  cannot be optimal. Therefore, the addition of constraints (9) for every  $s \in \mathcal{S}$  does not change the solution set or objective value of the optimization problem. Hence the Bayesian persuasion equilibria conditions are equivalent to

$$\begin{aligned} \boldsymbol{\pi}^* &\in \operatorname{argmax}_{\boldsymbol{\pi} \in \Pi} \mathcal{U}^R(\boldsymbol{\pi}, 0) \\ \text{s.t. } 0 &\in \operatorname{argmax}_{\boldsymbol{\sigma}_0} \mathcal{U}^A(\boldsymbol{\pi}, \boldsymbol{\sigma}_0). \end{aligned}$$

Substituting the definition for  $\mathcal{U}^R$  and the best response rule of the administrator defined in (7), the Bayesian persuasion equilibria conditions are equivalent to:

$$\begin{aligned} \boldsymbol{\pi}^* &\in \operatorname{argmax}_{\boldsymbol{\pi} \in \Pi} \sum_{m \in \mathcal{S}} \mathbf{q}_m \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \boldsymbol{\pi}(s|m) f(s) \\ \text{subject to } &\sum_{m \in \mathcal{S} \setminus \{s\}} \boldsymbol{\pi}(s|m) \mathbf{q}_m (k + [f(s) - f(m)]_+) \leq c \sum_{m \in \mathcal{S}} \boldsymbol{\pi}(s|m) \mathbf{q}_m, \forall s \in \mathcal{S}. \end{aligned}$$

and  $\boldsymbol{\sigma}^* \equiv 0$ . Thus the Bayesian persuasion equilibrium user strategies can be computed from the linear program  $\mathcal{L}_{c,k}$  defined in (8)-(9), establishing the desired result.

### A.2 Proof of Lemma 2

Consider  $\boldsymbol{\pi} := \{\boldsymbol{\pi}(\cdot|m)\}_{m \in \mathcal{S}}$  for which there exists  $s'$  so that  $\boldsymbol{\sigma}^*(s') = 1$ . Throughout this proof, we will use  $\boldsymbol{\pi}(s, m)$  to denote the probability that the true type is  $m$  and the reported type is  $s$ , as shorthand for  $\boldsymbol{\pi}(s|m) \mathbf{q}_m$ . Additionally, due to Lemma 3, we can assume that  $\boldsymbol{\pi}(s, m) > 0$  only if  $f(s) \geq f(m)$ .

The proof has 3 main steps:

1. First, we show how to construct a new action  $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\pi}}$  from  $\boldsymbol{\pi}$  (which we will show has a better expected utility for the user than  $\boldsymbol{\pi}$  does).
2. Next, we show that the probability that the administrator audits when responding to  $\boldsymbol{\pi}$  is always at least as large as the probability of the administrator auditing when responding to  $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\pi}}$ .
3. Finally, we use the first two ingredients to show that  $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\pi}}$  has a higher expected utility for the user than  $\boldsymbol{\pi}$ .

### A.2.1 Step 1

To construct another policy with better utility than  $\pi$ , first define the following sets:

$$\begin{aligned} E_1 &= \{(s, m) : m = s', s \neq m\}, \\ E_2 &= \{(s, m) : m \neq s', s = m\}, \\ E_3 &= (\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{S}) \setminus (E_1 \cup E_2). \end{aligned}$$

We define  $\tilde{\pi}$  from  $\pi$  by moving the probability mass from  $E_1$  to  $E_2$ . Namely,

$$\tilde{\pi}(s, m) := \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } (s, m) \in E_1, \\ \pi(s, m) + \pi(s', m) & \text{if } (s, m) \in E_2, \\ \pi(s, m) & \text{if } (s, m) \in E_3. \end{cases}$$

By construction,  $\tilde{\pi}$  is a valid strategy (i.e., the marginal distribution of  $m$  is equal to  $\mathbf{q}$ ) since for any  $m \in \mathcal{S}$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \tilde{\pi}(s, m) &= \tilde{\pi}(m, m) + \tilde{\pi}(s', m) + \sum_{s \notin \{m, s'\}} \tilde{\pi}(s, m) \\ &= (\pi(m, m) + \pi(s', m)) + 0 + \sum_{s \notin \{m, s'\}} \pi(s, m) \\ &= \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \pi(s, m) = \mathbf{q}_m. \end{aligned}$$

### A.2.2 Step 2

We use  $\tilde{\sigma}^*$  to denote the administrator's best response to  $\tilde{\pi}$  as defined in (7). There are two cases to consider:  $s = s'$  and  $s \neq s'$ .

*Case 1:* When  $s = s'$ , we note that by construction  $\sum_{m \neq s'} \tilde{\pi}(s', m) = 0$  and hence  $\tilde{\sigma}^*(s') = 0 \leq \sigma^*(s')$ .

*Case 2:* When  $s \neq s'$ , we have

- $\pi(s, m) = \tilde{\pi}(s, m)$  whenever  $s \neq m$  (since in this case  $(s, m) \in E_3$ ).
- $\pi(s, m) \leq \tilde{\pi}(s, m)$  whenever  $s = m$  (since in this case  $(s, m) \in E_2$ ).

Thus in case 2 we have

$$\begin{aligned} k \sum_{m \neq s} \pi(s, m) &= k \sum_{m \neq s} \tilde{\pi}(s, m) \\ &\text{and} \\ \sum_{m \in \mathcal{S}} \pi(s, m)(c + f(m) - f(s)) &\leq \sum_{m \in \mathcal{S}} \tilde{\pi}(s, m)(c + f(m) - f(s)). \end{aligned}$$

Thus according to (7),  $\tilde{\sigma}^*(s) = 1$  only if  $\sigma^*(s) = 1$ , and hence  $\tilde{\sigma}^*(s) \leq \sigma^*(s)$ . To conclude, we have shown that  $\tilde{\sigma}^*(s) \leq \sigma^*(s)$  for every  $s \in \mathcal{S}$ .

### A.2.3 Step 3

Recall that  $U^i(\boldsymbol{\sigma}^*(s), m)$  represents the utility obtained by user  $i$  when its true type is  $m$  and it sends signal  $s$ . User  $i$ 's expected utility when playing according to  $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\pi}}$  is thus:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{(s,m) \sim \tilde{\boldsymbol{\pi}}} [U^i(\boldsymbol{\sigma}^*(s), m)] &= \sum_{(s,m) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{S}} \tilde{\boldsymbol{\pi}}(s, m) (f(s) + \tilde{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}^*(s) \mathbb{I}_{[s \neq m]}(f(m) - f(s) - k)) \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{=} \underbrace{\sum_{(s,m) \in E_2} \tilde{\boldsymbol{\pi}}(s, m) (f(s) + \tilde{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}^*(s) \mathbb{I}_{[s \neq m]}(f(m) - f(s) - k))}_{\text{Term 1}} \\ &\quad + \underbrace{\sum_{(s,m) \in E_3} \tilde{\boldsymbol{\pi}}(s', m) (f(s') + \tilde{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}^*(s') \mathbb{I}_{[s' \neq m]}(f(m) - f(s') - k))}_{\text{Term 2}} \end{aligned}$$

Equality (a) is because  $\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{S} = E_1 \cup E_2 \cup E_3$ , and  $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\pi}}(s, m) = 0$  for every  $(s, m) \in E_1$ . We can lower bound Term 1 as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Term 1} &= \sum_{(s,m) \in E_2} \tilde{\boldsymbol{\pi}}(s, m) (f(s) + \tilde{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}^*(s) \mathbb{I}_{[s \neq m]}(f(m) - f(s) - k)) \\ &\stackrel{(b)}{=} \sum_{m \neq s'} \tilde{\boldsymbol{\pi}}(m, m) f(m) \\ &\stackrel{(c)}{=} \sum_{m \neq s'} (\boldsymbol{\pi}(m, m) + \boldsymbol{\pi}(s', m)) f(m) \\ &= \sum_{m \neq s'} \boldsymbol{\pi}(s', m) f(m) + \sum_{m \neq s'} \boldsymbol{\pi}(m, m) f(m) \\ &\stackrel{(d)}{=} \sum_{m \neq s'} \boldsymbol{\pi}(s', m) f(m) + \sum_{(s,m) \in E_2} \boldsymbol{\pi}(m, m) (f(m) + \boldsymbol{\sigma}^*(s) \mathbb{I}_{[s \neq m]}(f(m) - f(s) - k)) \\ &\stackrel{(e)}{\geq} \sum_{m \neq s'} \boldsymbol{\pi}(s', m) (f(s') + \boldsymbol{\sigma}^*(s') (f(m) - f(s') - k)) \\ &\quad + \sum_{(s,m) \in E_2} \boldsymbol{\pi}(m, m) (f(m) + \boldsymbol{\sigma}^*(s) \mathbb{I}_{[s \neq m]}(f(m) - f(s) - k)) \\ &= \sum_{(s,m) \in E_1 \cup E_2} \boldsymbol{\pi}(s, m) (f(s) + \boldsymbol{\sigma}^*(s) \mathbb{I}_{[s \neq m]}(f(m) - f(s) - k)). \end{aligned}$$

Equalities (b), (d) are because by construction  $s = m$  for every  $(s, m) \in E_2$ , and as a consequence,  $\mathbb{I}_{[s \neq m]} = 0$ . Equality (c) is by the definition of  $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\pi}}$ . Inequality (e) holds whenever  $\boldsymbol{\sigma}^*(s') \geq \frac{f(s') - f(m)}{k + f(s') - f(m)}$ , which is true since we know  $\boldsymbol{\sigma}^*(s') = 1$ .

Next, we can lower bound Term 2 as follows:

$$\text{Term 2} = \sum_{(s,m) \in E_3} \tilde{\boldsymbol{\pi}}(s', m) (f(s') + \tilde{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}^*(s') \mathbb{I}_{[s' \neq m]}(f(m) - f(s') - k))$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 &\stackrel{(f)}{=} \sum_{(s,m) \in E_3} \pi(s', m) (f(s') + \tilde{\sigma}^*(s') \mathbb{I}_{[s' \neq m]}(f(m) - f(s') - k)) \\
 &\stackrel{(g)}{\geq} \sum_{(s,m) \in E_3} \pi(s', m) (f(s') + \sigma^*(s') \mathbb{I}_{[s' \neq m]}(f(m) - f(s') - k)).
 \end{aligned}$$

Equation (f) is because  $\pi$  is equal to  $\tilde{\pi}$  on  $E_3$ . Inequality (g) is because  $\sigma^*(s) \geq \tilde{\sigma}^*(s)$  for all  $s$  (shown in step 2), and  $f(m) - f(s) - k$  is always non-positive (see Lemma 3).

Putting everything together,

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathbb{E}_{(s,m) \sim \tilde{\pi}} [U^i(\tilde{\sigma}^*(s), m)] &= \text{Term 1} + \text{Term 2} \\
 &> \sum_{(s,m) \in E_1 \cup E_2 \cup E_3} \pi(s', m) (f(s') + \sigma^*(s') \mathbb{I}_{[s' \neq m]}(f(m) - f(s') - k)) \\
 &= \mathbb{E}_{(s,m) \sim \pi} [U^i(\sigma^*(s), m)],
 \end{aligned}$$

which establishes the desired result.

### A.3 Proof of Lemma 3

Consider any  $\pi$  for which there exists  $m', s' \in \mathcal{S}$  such that  $\pi(s'|m') > 0$  and  $f(s') < f(m')$ . We will show that there exists another user strategy  $\tilde{\pi}$  which leads to a higher expected utility for the user.

Throughout this proof, we will use  $\pi(s, m)$  to denote the probability that the true type is  $m$  and the reported type is  $s$ , as shorthand for  $\pi(s|m)\mathbf{q}_m$ .

Consider the following policy  $\tilde{\pi}$ :

$$\tilde{\pi}(s, m) = \begin{cases} \pi(s, m) & \text{if } (s, m) \neq (s', m') \\ \pi(s', m') + \pi(m', m') & \text{if } s = m = m' \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

In other words,  $\tilde{\pi}$  is identical to  $\pi$  except in one situation: any time when  $m = m'$  and  $\pi$  would signal  $s = s'$ ,  $\tilde{\pi}$  would instead signal  $m'$ .

Let  $\sigma^*$  be the best response to  $\pi$  and let  $\tilde{\sigma}^*$  be the best response to  $\tilde{\pi}$ . Next we will show that  $\tilde{\sigma}^*(s) \leq \sigma^*(s)$  for any  $s \in \mathcal{S}$ . This will be useful because the user's expected utility is a decreasing function of  $\sigma$ . To this end, recall that the administrator's best response to a user strategy is given by (7), which, by using the law of total probability, we can re-write as

$$\sigma^*(s) = \begin{cases} 0 & \sum_{m \neq s} \frac{\pi(s, m)}{\sum_{m''} \pi(s, m'')} (\max(f(s) - f(m), 0) + k) \leq c \\ 1 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

There are three cases to consider:

Case 1:  $s \notin \{s', m'\}$ . Since  $\tilde{\pi}(s, m) = \pi(s, m)$  whenever  $m \neq m'$ , we have  $\tilde{\sigma}^*(s) = \sigma^*(s)$  whenever  $s \notin \{s', m'\}$ .

Case 2:  $s = m'$ . By definition of  $\tilde{\pi}$ ,  $\tilde{\pi}(s', m') = 0 < \pi(s', m')$  and  $\tilde{\pi}(s', m) = \pi(s', m)$  for any  $m \neq m'$ . Using this information, we see that

$$\begin{aligned} & c \sum_{m \in \mathcal{S}} \tilde{\pi}(s', m) - \sum_{m \neq s'} \tilde{\pi}(s', m) (\max(f(s') - f(m), 0) + k) \\ &= \left( c \sum_{m \in \mathcal{S}} \pi(s', m) \right) - \left( \sum_{m \neq s'} \pi(s', m) (\max(f(s') - f(m), 0) + k) \right) \\ &\quad - c\pi(s', m') + (\max(f(s') - f(m'), 0) + k)\pi(s', m') \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{\geq} \left( c \sum_{m \in \mathcal{S}} \pi(s', m) \right) - \left( \sum_{m \neq s'} \pi(s', m) (\max(f(s') - f(m), 0) + k) \right). \end{aligned}$$

Here (a) is because  $\max(f(s') - f(m), 0) + k = k \geq c$ . Hence  $\tilde{\sigma}^*(s') = 1$  only if  $\sigma^*(s') = 1$ , i.e.,  $\tilde{\sigma}^*(s') \leq \sigma^*(s')$ .

Case 3:  $s = m'$ . By definition of  $\tilde{\pi}$ ,  $\tilde{\pi}(m', m') > \pi(m', m')$  and  $\tilde{\pi}(m', m) = \pi(m', m)$  for any  $m \neq m'$ . Therefore  $\frac{\tilde{\pi}(m', m)}{\sum_{m''} \tilde{\pi}(m', m'')} < \frac{\pi(m', m)}{\sum_{m''} \pi(m', m'')}$  for any  $m \neq m'$ . We can then conclude that

$$\sum_{m \neq m'} \frac{\tilde{\pi}(m', m)}{\sum_{m''} \tilde{\pi}(m', m'')} \max(f(m') - f(m) + k, 0) \leq \sum_{m \neq m'} \frac{\pi(m', m)}{\sum_{m''} \pi(m', m'')} \max(f(m') - f(m) + k, 0).$$

Hence  $\tilde{\sigma}^*(m') = 1$  only if  $\sigma^*(m') = 1$ . This implies  $\tilde{\sigma}^*(m') \leq \sigma^*(m')$ .

So we see that  $\tilde{\sigma}^*(s') \leq \sigma^*(s')$  for any  $s \in \mathcal{S}$ . Putting everything together, the expected utility for the user under  $\pi$  is:

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{(s,m) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{S}} \pi(s, m) (f(s) + \sigma(s) \mathbb{I}_{[s \neq m]} (\min(f(m) - f(s), 0) - k)) \\ &\stackrel{(b)}{\leq} \sum_{(s,m) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{S}} \pi(s, m) (f(s) + \tilde{\sigma}(s) \mathbb{I}_{[s \neq m]} (\min(f(m) - f(s), 0) - k)) \\ &= \sum_{(s,m) \notin \{(s', m'), (m', m')\}} \pi(s, m) (f(s) + \tilde{\sigma}(s) \mathbb{I}_{[s \neq m]} (\min(f(m) - f(s), 0) - k)) \\ &\quad + \pi(s', m') (f(s') + \tilde{\sigma}(s') \mathbb{I}_{[s \neq m]} (\min(f(m) - f(s), 0) - k)) + \pi(m', m') f(m') \\ &\stackrel{(c)}{\leq} \sum_{(s,m) \notin \{(s', m'), (m', m')\}} \pi(s, m) (f(s) + \tilde{\sigma}(s) \mathbb{I}_{[s \neq m]} (\min(f(m) - f(s), 0) - k)) \\ &\quad + \pi(s', m') f(m') + \pi(m', m') f(m') \\ &\stackrel{(d)}{=} \sum_{(s,m) \notin \{(s', m'), (m', m')\}} \tilde{\pi}(s, m) (f(s) + \tilde{\sigma}(s) \mathbb{I}_{[s \neq m]} (\min(f(m) - f(s), 0) - k)) \\ &\quad + \tilde{\pi}(m', m') f(m') \\ &= \sum_{(s,m) \notin \{(s', m')\}} \tilde{\pi}(s, m) (f(s) + \tilde{\sigma}(s) \mathbb{I}_{[s \neq m]} (\min(f(m) - f(s), 0) - k)) \end{aligned}$$



$$\stackrel{(e)}{=} \sum_{(s,m) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{S}} \tilde{\pi}(s,m) (f(s) + \tilde{\sigma}(s) \mathbb{I}_{[s \neq m]} (\min(f(m) - f(s), 0) - k)).$$

Since the first term in this chain of inequalities is the user's expected utility under  $\pi$ , and the last term in this chain of inequalities is the user's expected utility under  $\tilde{\pi}$ , we have shown that  $\tilde{\pi}$  gives more expected utility to the user than  $\pi$ , establishing the desired result.

Inequality (b) is because  $\tilde{\sigma}^*(s') \leq \sigma^*(s')$  for any  $s \in \mathcal{S}$ , and because the expected user utility is a decreasing function of  $\sigma^*$ . Inequality (c) is because  $f(s') + \tilde{\sigma}(s) \mathbb{I}_{[s \neq m]} (\min(f(m) - f(s), 0) - k) \leq f(s') \leq f(m')$ . Equality (d) is by definition of  $\tilde{\pi}$ , indeed by construction we have  $\tilde{\pi}(m', m') = \pi(s', m') + \pi(m', m')$ . Finally, equality (e) is because  $\tilde{\pi}(s', m') = 0$  by construction.

#### A.4 Proof of Theorem 1

Theorem 2 tells us that the user strategies corresponding to Bayesian persuasion equilibria are precisely those which maximize excess payments subject to satisfying (7) for every  $s \in \mathcal{S}$  (See Observation 2 for the equivalence between user utility and excess payments in any Bayesian persuasion equilibrium). Hence, for any Bayesian persuasion equilibrium  $(\pi^*, \sigma_{\pi^*})$ , we have

$$\mathcal{E}(\pi^*, \sigma_{\pi^*}) = \max_{\pi \in \Pi} \mathcal{E}(\pi, \sigma_{\pi}) \mathbb{1}[\pi \text{ satisfies (7) for all } s \in \mathcal{S}].$$

From Observation 3, for every signaling game equilibrium  $(\pi', \sigma_{\pi'})$ ,  $\pi'$  satisfies (7) for every  $s \in \mathcal{S}$ . In other words,  $\pi'$  is feasible for the linear program  $\mathcal{L}_{c,k}$  defined in equations (8)-(9). Hence we can deduce

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}(\pi^*, \sigma_{\pi^*}) &= \max_{\pi \in \Pi} \mathcal{E}(\pi, \sigma_{\pi}) \mathbb{1}[\pi \text{ satisfies (7) for all } s \in \mathcal{S}] \\ &\geq \max_{\pi \in \Pi} \mathcal{E}(\pi, \sigma_{\pi}) \mathbb{1}[(\pi, \sigma_{\pi}) \text{ is a signaling game equilibrium}]. \end{aligned}$$

Hence  $\mathcal{E}(\pi^*, \sigma_{\pi^*})$ , which is also the optimal objective value for  $\mathcal{L}_{c,k}$  is an upper bound on the excess payments that occur in any signaling game equilibrium.

Conversely, this bound is tight, because Lemma 1 shows that every Bayesian persuasion equilibrium is also a signaling game equilibrium.

#### A.5 Proof of Lemma 1

Let  $(\pi^*, \sigma_{\pi^*})$  be any Bayesian Persuasion equilibrium. We will show that  $(\pi^*, \sigma_{\pi^*})$  is also a signaling game equilibrium. To this end, we will need the following observation.

**Observation 3** (No-Audit Optimality in Signaling Games). Consider any strategy profile  $(\pi, \sigma_{\pi})$  where  $\sigma_{\pi}$  denotes the administrator's best response to the user strategy  $\pi$  as described in (7). If  $\sigma_{\pi}$  is not identically zero, i.e., there exists  $s \in \mathcal{S}$  for which  $\sigma_{\pi}(s) = 1$ , then  $(\pi, \sigma_{\pi})$  cannot be a signaling game equilibria.

*Proof of Observation 3.* Suppose there exists  $s$  for which  $\sigma_{\pi}(s) = 1$ . According to (7), there must exist some  $m \neq s$  for which  $\pi(s|m) > 0$ . Consider  $\pi'(\cdot|m)$  defined as follows:

$$\pi'(s'|m) = \begin{cases} \pi(s'|m) & \text{if } s' \notin \{s, m\} \\ 0 & \text{if } s' = s \\ \pi(m|m) + \pi(s|m) & \text{if } s' = m. \end{cases}$$

For every  $s' \notin \{s, m\}$ ,  $\pi(s'|m) = \pi'(s'|m)$ , so by (7),  $\sigma_\pi(s') = \sigma_{\pi'}(s')$ . For  $s' = m$ , when replacing  $\pi$  with  $\pi'$ , the right hand side of (7) increases while the left hand side stays the same, implying  $\sigma_\pi(m) \geq \sigma_{\pi'}(m)$ . Using these observations, we note that

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathcal{U}_m^R(\pi, \sigma_\pi) &= \sum_{s' \in \mathcal{S}} \pi(s'|m) \left[ f(s') - \sigma_\pi(s') \mathbb{I}_{[s' \neq m]} \left( [f(s') - f(m)]_+ + k \right) \right] \\
 &= \sum_{s' \notin \{s, m\}} \pi(s'|m) \left[ f(s') - \sigma_\pi(s') \mathbb{I}_{[s' \neq m]} \left( [f(s') - f(m)]_+ + k \right) \right] \\
 &\quad + \pi(s|m) \left[ f(s) - \sigma_\pi(s) \mathbb{I}_{[s \neq m]} \left( [f(s) - f(m)]_+ + k \right) \right] + \pi(m|m) f(m) \\
 &\leq \sum_{s' \notin \{s, m\}} \pi'(s'|m) \left[ f(s') - \sigma_{\pi'}(s') \mathbb{I}_{[s' \neq m]} \left( [f(s') - f(m)]_+ + k \right) \right] \\
 &\quad + \pi(s|m) [f(m) - k] + \pi(m|m) f(m) \\
 &= -k\pi(s|m) + \sum_{s' \in \mathcal{S}} \pi'(s'|m) \left[ f(s') - \sigma_{\pi'}(s') \mathbb{I}_{[s' \neq m]} \left( [f(s') - f(m)]_+ + k \right) \right] \\
 &= -k\pi(s|m) + \mathcal{U}_m^R(\pi', \sigma_{\pi'}).
 \end{aligned}$$

Since  $\pi(s|m) > 0$ , we see that under the strategy profile  $(\pi, \sigma_\pi)$ , type  $m$  can improve its utility by changing its signaling strategy, hence  $(\pi, \sigma_\pi)$  cannot be a signaling game equilibrium.  $\square$

Because  $(\pi^*, \sigma_{\pi^*})$  is a Bayesian persuasion equilibrium, from Theorem 2 we can deduce that  $\sigma_{\pi^*} \equiv 0$ , and  $\pi^*$  satisfies inequality (7) for every  $s \in \mathcal{S}$ .

Now pick any  $m \in \mathcal{S}$ . We will show that there does not exist  $\pi'(\cdot|m)$  which can replace  $\pi^*(\cdot|m)$  to increase  $\mathcal{U}_m^R$  given the signaling strategies of the other user types:  $\{\pi^*(\cdot|m')\}_{m' \neq m}$ . For notational convenience, let  $\tilde{\pi}$  denote the user strategy obtained from  $\pi^*$  by replacing  $\pi^*(\cdot|m)$  with  $\pi'(\cdot|m)$ .

Using the reasoning from Observation 3, we can limit the search of  $\pi'(\cdot|m)$  to those for which  $\tilde{\pi}$  satisfies (7) for all  $s \in \mathcal{S}$ . To see why this is true, note that if  $\sigma_{\tilde{\pi}}(s') = 1$  for some  $s' \in \mathcal{S}$ , then it must be the case that  $\pi'(s'|m) > 0$  (otherwise  $\sigma_{\pi^*}$  would not have been identically zero in the first place). Then, as shown in the proof of Observation 3, we can construct  $\pi''(\cdot|m)$  from  $\pi'(\cdot|m)$  which (a) gives strictly greater utility for type  $m$  players and (b) the set  $\{s \in \mathcal{S} : \sigma_{\tilde{\pi}}(s) = 1\}$  has strictly smaller cardinality when replacing  $\pi^*(\cdot|m)$  with  $\pi''(\cdot|m)$ , as compared to replacing  $\pi^*(\cdot|m)$  with  $\pi'(\cdot|m)$ . Hence, if the administrator audits multiple signals under  $\pi'(\cdot|m)$ , applying the technique from Observation 3 recursively will eventually produce a signaling strategy  $\pi''(\cdot|m)$  for which  $\tilde{\pi}$  satisfies (7) for all  $s \in \mathcal{S}$ , and provides a larger value of  $\mathcal{U}_m^R$  than  $\pi'(\cdot|m)$ .

Hence the optimal deviation for type  $m$  users can be computed from the following linear program:

$$\begin{aligned}
 &\text{maximize } \mathcal{U}_m^R(\tilde{\pi}, 0) \\
 &\quad \text{s.t. } \tilde{\pi}(\cdot|m') = \pi^*(\cdot|m') \text{ for all } m' \neq m, \\
 &\quad \tilde{\pi} \text{ satisfies (7) for all } s \in \mathcal{S}.
 \end{aligned}$$

Next, we note that when  $\sigma(s) = 0$  for all  $s \in \mathcal{S}$ ,  $\mathcal{U}^R$  is *separable*, meaning that  $\mathcal{U}_{m'}^R$  depends

only on  $\pi(\cdot|m)$  and not one any of the signaling strategies of the other types. Hence, if we write

$$\mathcal{U}^R(\tilde{\pi}, \sigma_{\tilde{\pi}}) = \underbrace{\mathbf{q}_m}_{a} \mathcal{U}_m^R(\tilde{\pi}, \sigma_{\tilde{\pi}}) + \underbrace{\sum_{m' \neq m} \mathbf{q}_{m'} \mathcal{U}_{m'}^R(\tilde{\pi}, \sigma_{\tilde{\pi}})}_b,$$

then when  $\sigma_{\tilde{\pi}} \equiv 0$ ,  $a, b$  are positive constants that do not depend on  $\pi'(\cdot|m)$ , meaning maximizing  $\mathcal{U}_m^R(\tilde{\pi}, \sigma_{\tilde{\pi}})$  under constraints (7) is equivalent to maximizing  $\mathcal{U}^R(\tilde{\pi}, \sigma_{\tilde{\pi}})$  under constraints (7). From this, the optimal deviation for type  $m$  can be computed from the following linear program:

$$\begin{aligned} & \underset{\tilde{\pi} \in \Pi}{\text{maximize}} \mathcal{U}^R(\tilde{\pi}, 0) \\ & \text{s.t. } \tilde{\pi}(\cdot|m') = \pi^*(\cdot|m') \text{ for all } m' \neq m, \\ & \quad \tilde{\pi} \text{ satisfies (7) for all } s \in \mathcal{S}. \end{aligned}$$

However, by construction of  $(\pi^*, \sigma_{\pi^*})$ ,  $\pi^*(\cdot|m)$  is a solution to this optimization problem because  $(\pi^*, \sigma_{\pi^*})$  is a Bayesian persuasion equilibrium. Hence there does not exist a  $\pi'(\cdot|m)$  that can replace  $\pi^*(\cdot|m)$  to increase  $\mathcal{U}_m^R$  given the other signaling strategies  $\{\pi^*(\cdot|m')\}_{m' \neq m}$ , meaning that  $(\pi^*, \sigma_{\pi^*})$  is also a signaling game equilibrium.

To show that the excess payments in a Bayesian persuasion equilibria are an upper bound on the excess payments in any signaling game equilibria, let  $(\pi_1, \sigma_1)$  be a Bayesian persuasion equilibrium and  $(\pi_2, \sigma_2)$  be a signaling game equilibrium. By Observation 3,  $\pi_2$  satisfies (7) for all  $s \in \mathcal{S}$  and hence it is feasible for the linear program (8)-(9). Because  $(\pi_1, \sigma_1)$  is a Bayesian persuasion equilibrium,  $\pi_1$  is an optimal solution to this linear program, meaning that  $\mathcal{U}^R(\pi_1, \sigma_1) \geq \mathcal{U}^R(\pi_2, \sigma_2)$ . Finally, from Observation 2 we have:

$$\mathcal{E}(\pi_1, \sigma_1) = \mathcal{U}^R(\pi_1, \sigma_1) - \sum_m \mathbf{q}_m f(m) \geq \mathcal{U}^R(\pi_2, \sigma_2) - \sum_m \mathbf{q}_m f(m) = \mathcal{E}(\pi_2, \sigma_2).$$

## A.6 Proof of Corollary 1

Let  $(\pi^*, \sigma^*)$  be a signaling game equilibrium. We can deduce from Observation 3 that  $\pi^*$  satisfies (7) for every  $s \in \mathcal{S}$ . Thus we have

$$\begin{aligned} & k \sum_{m \in \mathcal{S} \setminus \{s\}} \mathbf{q}_m \pi(s|m) \leq \sum_{m \in \mathcal{S}} \mathbf{q}_m \pi(s|m)(c + f(m) - f(s)) \\ \iff & \sum_{m \in \mathcal{S} \setminus \{s\}} \mathbf{q}_m \pi(s|m)(k - c + f(s) - f(m)) \leq \mathbf{q}_s \pi(s|m = s)c \\ \implies & \sum_{m \in \mathcal{S} \setminus \{s\}} \mathbf{q}_m \pi(s|m)(k - c + f(s) - f(m)) \leq \mathbf{q}_s c \end{aligned}$$

Thus for any  $m \neq s$ , the above inequality implies

$$\mathbf{q}_m \pi(s|m)(k - c + f(s) - f(m)) \leq \mathbf{q}_s c,$$

implying that  $\pi(s|m) \leq \frac{\mathbf{q}_s c}{\mathbf{q}_m(k - c + f(s) - f(m))}$ , which implies the desired result, since  $\pi(s|m) \leq 1$  is always true.

## A.7 Proof of Corollary 2

Let  $(\boldsymbol{\pi}, \boldsymbol{\sigma})$  be a Bayesian persuasion equilibrium in the audit game. To prove the desired result, we first establish the following two inequalities:

$$\mathbb{E}_{(s,m) \sim \boldsymbol{\pi}}[f(s)] - \mathbb{E}_{m \sim q}[f(m)] \leq \Delta f_{\max} \mathbb{P}_{\boldsymbol{\pi}}(s \neq m), \quad (10)$$

$$\mathbb{E}_{(s,m) \sim \boldsymbol{\pi}}[f(s)] - \mathbb{E}_{m \sim q}[f(m)] \leq c - k \mathbb{P}_{\boldsymbol{\pi}}(s \neq m). \quad (11)$$

Once we establish these two inequalities, the desired result follows directly, since

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{(s,m) \sim \boldsymbol{\pi}}[f(s)] - \mathbb{E}_{m \sim q}[f(m)] &\leq \max_{\mathbb{P}_{\boldsymbol{\pi}}(s \neq m)} \min(\Delta f_{\max} \mathbb{P}_{\boldsymbol{\pi}}(s \neq m), c - k \mathbb{P}_{\boldsymbol{\pi}}(s \neq m)) \\ &= \frac{c \Delta f_{\max}}{k + \Delta f_{\max}}, \end{aligned}$$

which is achieved when  $\mathbb{P}_{\boldsymbol{\pi}}(s \neq m) = \frac{c}{k + \Delta f_{\max}}$ . Thus all that remains is to establish (10) and (11).

*Establishing (10):* By Hölder's inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{(s,m) \sim \boldsymbol{\pi}}[f(s)] - \mathbb{E}_{m \sim q}[f(m)] &= \mathbb{E}[(f(s) - f(m)) \mathbb{I}_{[s \neq m]}] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}[\Delta f_{\max} \mathbb{I}_{[s \neq m]}] = \Delta f_{\max} \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{I}_{[s \neq m]}] \\ &= \Delta f_{\max} \mathbb{P}_{\boldsymbol{\pi}}(s \neq m), \end{aligned}$$

where the inequality is because  $f(s) - f(m) \leq \max_{s,s'} f(s) - f(m) = \Delta f_{\max}$  with probability 1.

*Establishing (11):* Recall from (7) that the administrator will conduct an audit upon seeing a signal  $s$  if and only if  $\sum_{m \neq s} \boldsymbol{\pi}(m|s)(k + f(s) - f(m)) > c$ . For an equilibrium  $(\boldsymbol{\pi}, \boldsymbol{\sigma})$ , the administrator will never audit, which means that  $\sum_{m \neq s} \boldsymbol{\pi}(m|s)(k + f(s) - f(m)) \leq c$  for every  $s \in \mathcal{S}$ . Taking expectation over  $s$ , we see that

$$\begin{aligned} c &\geq \mathbb{E}_{s \sim \boldsymbol{\pi}} \left[ \sum_{m \neq s} \boldsymbol{\pi}(m|s)(k + f(s) - f(m)) \right] \\ &= \sum_s \boldsymbol{\pi}(s) \sum_{m \neq s} \boldsymbol{\pi}(m|s)(k + f(s) - f(m)) \\ &= \sum_{s,m} \boldsymbol{\pi}(s,m)(f(s) - f(m)) + k \sum_{s,m \neq s} \boldsymbol{\pi}(s,m) \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{(s,m) \sim \boldsymbol{\pi}}[f(s)] - \mathbb{E}_{m \sim q}[f(m)] + k \mathbb{P}_{\boldsymbol{\pi}}(s \neq m), \end{aligned}$$

which establishes (11).

## A.8 Properties of the $|\mathcal{S}| = 2$ case

In this section we derive some results that will be helpful for proofs that pertain to the  $|\mathcal{S}| = 2$  setting.

Let  $S = \{L, H\}$  where  $L, H$  represent the low and high types respectively with  $f(H) > f(L)$  and  $\Delta f_{\max} = f(H) - f(L)$ . Let  $\mathbf{q}_L, \mathbf{q}_H$  denote the probabilities that a recipient has type  $L, H$  respectively. In this simplified setting, we make the following observations:

1. If  $m = H$ , choosing  $s = H$  is a dominant strategy for the user. Indeed, if  $m = H, s = H$  then the user receives utility  $f(H)$  regardless of whether or not the administrator audits. On the other hand, if  $m = H, s = L$ , then the user receives  $f(L)$  if the administrator does not audit, and  $f(H) - k$  if the administrator audits.
2. If  $s = L$ , then not auditing is a dominant strategy for the administrator. Indeed, by the first observation,  $s = L$  only if  $m = L$ . Therefore the administrator's utility is  $f(L)$  if no audit is conducted, and  $f(L) - c$  if an audit is conducted.

From the first observation, an action  $\pi$  has optimal utility only if  $\pi(s = H|m = H) = 1$ . From the second observation, we can conclude that  $\sigma'(L) = 0$ .

We now prove the following lemmas which will be helpful in the proofs of Proposition 1, Proposition 2, Theorem 4, and Theorem 5.

**Lemma 4.** Let  $\pi$  be an action for which  $\pi(s = H|m = H) = 1$ . Then the expected utility of  $\pi$  is given by

$$\mathbb{E}_{m \sim q, s \sim \pi(\cdot|m)} [U^i(\sigma(s), m)] = q_L f(L) + q_H f(H) + q_L \pi(s = H|m = L) (\Delta f_{\max} - \sigma(H)(k + \Delta f_{\max}))$$

*Proof of Lemma 4.* We show the result by direct calculation. By definition, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_{m \sim q, s \sim \pi(\cdot|m)} [U^i(\sigma(s), m)] \\ &= q_L \pi(s = L|m = L) f(L) + q_L \pi(s = H|m = L) (f(H) + \sigma(H)(f(L) - f(H) - k)) + q_H f(H) \\ &= q_L f(L) + q_H f(H) + q_L \pi(s = H|m = L) (\Delta f_{\max} - \sigma(H)(k + \Delta f_{\max})). \end{aligned}$$

We used the equality  $\pi(s = L|m = L) = 1 - \pi(s = H|m = L)$  to go from the second line to the third line.  $\square$

**Lemma 5.** We characterize the administrator's best response  $\sigma$ . First, from the second observation, we have  $\sigma(L) = 0$ . Furthermore,

$$\sigma(H) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } \pi(s = H|m = L) \leq \frac{q_H c}{q_L(k - c + \Delta f_{\max})} \\ \min(1, \frac{B}{c}) & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

*Proof of Lemma 5.* From (7), note that the administrator's utility is an affine function of  $\sigma(H)$ . The coefficient of  $\sigma(H)$  is non-positive (i.e.,  $\sigma(H) = 0$ ) if and only if

$$\begin{aligned} & k q_L \pi(s = H|m = L) \leq q_L \pi(s = H|m = L) (c - \Delta f_{\max}) + q_H \pi(s = H|m = H) c \\ \iff & q_L \pi(s = H|m = L) (k - c + \Delta f_{\max}) \leq q_H c \\ \iff & \pi(s = H|m = L) \leq \frac{q_H c}{q_L(k - c + \Delta f_{\max})}. \end{aligned}$$

If this condition is not satisfied, then the administrator will make  $\sigma(H)$  as large as possible.  $\square$

**Lemma 6.** Let  $\Pi$  be the set of all user strategies for which the administrator's best response is to never audit, i.e.,  $\sigma(H) = \sigma(L) = 0$ . The optimal user utility obtainable by a strategy in  $\Pi$  is

$$\max_{\pi \in \Pi} \mathbb{E}_{m \sim \mathbf{q}, s \sim \pi(\cdot|m)} [U^i(\sigma(s), m)] = \mathbf{q}_L f(L) + \mathbf{q}_H f(H) + \mathbf{q}_L \min \left( 1, \frac{\mathbf{q}_H c}{\mathbf{q}_L(k - c + \Delta f_{\max})} \right) \Delta f_{\max}.$$

Furthermore, the unique strategy  $\pi' \in \Pi$  which attains this optimal utility is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \pi'(s = H|m = L) &:= \min \left( 1, \frac{\mathbf{q}_H c}{\mathbf{q}_L(k - c + \Delta f_{\max})} \right), \\ \pi'(s = H|m = H) &:= 1. \end{aligned}$$

*Proof of Lemma 6.* Let  $\pi'$  be any optimal user utility strategy in  $\Pi$ , and let  $\sigma'$  be the administrator's best response to  $\pi'$ . From the first observation, we can conclude that  $\pi'(s = H|m = H) = 1$  and  $\pi'(s = L|m = H) = 0$ .

From Lemma 5,  $\pi \in \Pi$  if and only if  $\sigma(H) = 0$ , which gives

$$\pi(s = H|m = L) \leq \frac{\mathbf{q}_H c}{\mathbf{q}_L(k - c + \Delta f_{\max})}.$$

From Lemma 4, the expected utility of a strategy  $\pi \in \Pi$  is given by

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}_{m \sim \mathbf{q}, s \sim \pi(\cdot|m)} [f(s) + \sigma(s) \mathbb{I}_{[s \neq m]}(f(m) - f(s) - k)] \\ &= \mathbf{q}_L (\pi(s = L|m = L)f(L) + \pi(s = H|m = L)f(H)) + \mathbf{q}_H f(H) \\ &= \mathbf{q}_L f(L) + \mathbf{q}_H f(H) + \mathbf{q}_L \pi(s = H|m = L) \Delta f_{\max}. \end{aligned}$$

This reveals that the expected utility is an affine function of  $\pi(s = H|m = L)$ . To maximize expected utility,  $\pi(s = H|m = L)$  should be maximized subject to the constraints imposed by  $\Pi$ , which also means that the optimal policy is unique. Hence,  $\pi'(s = H|m = L) = \min(1, \frac{\mathbf{q}_H c}{\mathbf{q}_L(k - c + \Delta f_{\max})})$ . □

## A.9 Proof of Proposition 1

Let  $B < c \frac{\Delta f_{\max} (1 - \min\{\frac{\mathbf{q}_{\max} c}{\mathbf{q}_{\min}(k - c + \Delta f_{\max})}, 1\})}{k + \Delta f_{\max}}$ . Consider a setting with two users, i.e.,  $n = 2$ . Let  $S = \{L, H\}$  where  $L, H$  represent the low and high types respectively with  $f(H) > f(L)$  and  $\Delta f_{\max} = f(H) - f(L)$ . Let  $\mathbf{q}_L, \mathbf{q}_H$  denote the probabilities that a recipient has type  $L, H$  respectively.

The proof has three main steps:

1. First, we show that the best response of the administrator is to audit the user  $i'$  which most frequently misreports their type, i.e.,  $i' = \arg \max_{i \in \{1, 2\}} \pi_i(s = H|m = L)$ .
2. Second, we show that because the administrator's budget is very small, the audit penalty is not sufficient to deter users from misreporting their preferences. In other words,  $\pi(s = H|m = L) > \frac{\mathbf{q}_H c}{\mathbf{q}_L(k - c + \Delta f_{\max})}$  gives users more utility than  $\pi(s = H|m = L) = \frac{\mathbf{q}_H c}{\mathbf{q}_L(k - c + \Delta f_{\max})}$ .

3. Third, we show that the first two steps leads to a race-to-the-bottom behavior. By the second step, both users want to misreport their preferences to increase their utility. However, the first step establishes that the administrator will audit the user which misreports most frequently. Thus both users want a misreporting probability that is positive but also smaller than the other user's misreporting probability. Such settings are a classical example where equilibria do not exist.

*Step 1:* We show in the beginning of Appendix A.8 that choosing  $s = H$  is a dominant strategy for the user whenever  $m = H$ . As a consequence, the administrator should never audit if  $s = L$ . With this in mind, when  $\pi(s = H|m = H) = 1$  and  $\sigma(L) = 0$ , the expected utility of the administrator when interacting with user  $i \in \{1, 2\}$  is given by:

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{q}_L \pi_i(s = L|m = L) f(L) \\ & + \mathbf{q}_L \pi_i(s = H|m = L) (f(H) + \sigma_i(H) (-c + \mathbb{I}_{[s \neq m]}(k + f(H) - f(L)))) \\ & + \mathbf{q}_H \pi_i(s = H|m = H) (f(H) + \sigma_i(H) (-c + \mathbb{I}_{[s \neq m]}(k + f(H) - f(L)))) \\ & = \mathbf{q}_L \pi_i(s = L|m = L) f(L) + \mathbf{q}_L \pi_i(s = H|m = L) f(H) + \mathbf{q}_H f(H) \\ & + \sigma_i(H) (\mathbf{q}_L \pi_i(s = H|m = L) (k + f(H) - f(L)) - [\mathbf{q}_H + \mathbf{q}_L \pi_i(s = H|m = L)] c). \end{aligned}$$

Let  $\rho_i := \mathbf{q}_L \pi_i(s = H|m = L) (k + f(H) - f(L)) - [\mathbf{q}_H + \mathbf{q}_L \pi_i(s = H|m = L)] c$ . The important observation here is that the administrator's utility when interacting with user  $i$  is affine in  $\sigma_i(H)$ . Furthermore, the administrator will prioritize auditing the user whose coefficient of  $\sigma_i(H)$  is largest and positive. In other words, the administrator will audit user  $i'$  where

$$i' = \arg \max_{i \in \{1, 2\}} \rho_i$$

and if  $\rho_{i'} > 0$ .

Equivalently, the administrator will audit user  $i'$  if

$$i' \in \arg \max_{i \in \{1, 2\}} \rho_i \text{ and } \pi_i(s = H|m = L) > \frac{\mathbf{q}_H c}{\mathbf{q}_L (k - c + \Delta f_{\max})}.$$

*Step 2:* Using Lemma 4 from Appendix A.8, the expected utility received by user  $i$  from action  $\pi$  is given by

$$\mathbb{E}_{m \sim \mathbf{q}, s \sim \pi_i(\cdot|m)} [U^i(\sigma(s), m)] = \mathbf{q}_L f(L) + \mathbf{q}_H f(H) + \mathbf{q}_L \pi(s = H|m = L) (\Delta f_{\max} - \sigma_i(H) (k + \Delta f_{\max}))$$

Note that for a fixed value of  $\sigma_i^*(H)$ , the expected utility is an affine function of  $\pi_i(s = H|m = L)$ . Furthermore, according to Lemma 5,

$$\sigma_i(H) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } \pi_i(s = H|m = L) \leq \frac{\mathbf{q}_H c}{\mathbf{q}_L (k - c + \Delta f_{\max})} \\ \frac{B}{c} & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Hence the optimal value of  $\mathbb{E}_{m \sim \mathbf{q}, s \sim \pi(\cdot|m)} [U^i(\sigma(s), m)]$  must be attained at  $\pi_i(s = H|m = L) \in \{0, \frac{\mathbf{q}_H c}{\mathbf{q}_L (k - c + \Delta f_{\max})}, 1\}$ . From Lemma 6, we know that 0 cannot be the optimum. For  $\pi_i(s = H|m = L) = 1$ , we note that

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \mathbb{E}_{m \sim \mathbf{q}, s \sim \pi(\cdot|m)} [U^i(\sigma(s), m)] \\
 &= \mathbf{q}_L f(L) + \mathbf{q}_H f(H) + \mathbf{q}_L \left( \Delta f_{\max} - \frac{B}{c}(k + \Delta f_{\max}) \right) \\
 &> \mathbf{q}_L f(L) + \mathbf{q}_H f(H) + \mathbf{q}_L \left( \Delta f_{\max} - \frac{\Delta f_{\max} (1 - \min\{\frac{\mathbf{q}_L c}{\mathbf{q}_L(k-c+\Delta f_{\max})}, 1\}) (k + \Delta f_{\max})}{k + \Delta f_{\max}} \right) \\
 &= \mathbf{q}_L f(L) + \mathbf{q}_H f(H) + \mathbf{q}_L \left( \Delta f_{\max} - \Delta f_{\max} (1 - \min\{\frac{\mathbf{q}_L c}{\mathbf{q}_L(k-c+\Delta f_{\max})}, 1\}) \right) \\
 &= \mathbf{q}_L f(L) + \mathbf{q}_H f(H) + \mathbf{q}_L \left( \Delta f_{\max} \min\{\frac{\mathbf{q}_L c}{\mathbf{q}_L(k-c+\Delta f_{\max})}, 1\} \right)
 \end{aligned}$$

which shows that  $\pi_i(s = H|m = L) = 1$  has greater utility than  $\pi_i(s = H|m = L) = \frac{\mathbf{q}_L c}{\mathbf{q}_L(k-c+\Delta f_{\max})}$ , since the final line is the expected utility obtained by the user when  $\pi_i(s = H|m = L) = \frac{\mathbf{q}_L c}{\mathbf{q}_L(k-c+\Delta f_{\max})}$  (established by Lemma 6).

*Step 3:* For notational convenience, let  $p_i := \pi_i(s = H|m = L)$ . Consider any action profile  $(p_1, p_2)$  for the players. We will show that no equilibrium exists by showing that there is always at least one player that can improve its utility by changing its probability of misreporting. There are three cases to consider:

1. There exists  $i$  for which  $p_i < \frac{\mathbf{q}_L c}{\mathbf{q}_L(k-c+\Delta f_{\max})}$ . By Lemma 6, user  $i$  can improve its utility by increasing  $p_i$  to  $\frac{\mathbf{q}_L c}{\mathbf{q}_L(k-c+\Delta f_{\max})}$ . By step 2 of this proof, user  $i$  can further increase its utility by increasing  $p_i$  from  $\frac{\mathbf{q}_L c}{\mathbf{q}_L(k-c+\Delta f_{\max})}$  to 1. Hence user  $i$  can improve its utility by unilaterally changing its action.
2.  $p_1, p_2 > \frac{\mathbf{q}_L c}{\mathbf{q}_L(k-c+\Delta f_{\max})}$  and  $p_1 \neq p_2$ . Assume without loss of generality that  $p_1 < p_2$ . Due to step 1, we know that user 1 will not be audited (i.e.,  $\sigma_1(H) = 0$ ) provided that  $p_1 \in [0, p_2)$ . From Lemma 4, when  $\sigma_1(H) = 0$ , the expected utility of user 1 is an increasing and affine function of  $p_1$ . Therefore user 1 can unilaterally improve its utility by changing  $p_1$  to any value in the open interval  $(p_1, p_2)$ .
3.  $p_1, p_2 > \frac{\mathbf{q}_L c}{\mathbf{q}_L(k-c+\Delta f_{\max})}$  and  $p_1 = p_2$ . In this case, it is possible that both  $\sigma_1(H)$  and  $\sigma_2(H)$  are positive. Due to the budget constraint, we have  $\sigma_1(H) + \sigma_2(H) = \frac{B}{c}$ . Without loss of generality suppose  $\sigma_1(H) > \sigma_2(H)$ , implying that  $\sigma_1(H) \geq \frac{B}{2c}$ . From Lemma 4, the expected utility for user 1 is:

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \mathbf{q}_L f(L) + \mathbf{q}_H f(H) + \mathbf{q}_L p_1 (\Delta f_{\max} - \sigma_1(H)(k + \Delta f_{\max})) \\
 & \leq \mathbf{q}_L f(L) + \mathbf{q}_H f(H) + \mathbf{q}_L p_1 \left( \Delta f_{\max} - \frac{B}{2c}(k + \Delta f_{\max}) \right).
 \end{aligned}$$

By the reasoning of step 1, if user 1 chooses a misreporting probability  $\pi_1(s = H|m = L) < p_1$ , then they will no longer be audited. Thus user 1 can reduce  $p_1$  by an infinitesimal amount so that it is no longer tied for having the highest misreporting probability, thereby eliminating its audit penalty. In particular, changing  $p_1$  to  $p'_1 < p_2$  changes user 1's audit probability from  $\sigma_1(H)$  to  $\sigma'_1(H) = 0$ . User 1's new utility after this change is thus

$$\mathbf{q}_L f(L) + \mathbf{q}_H f(H) + \mathbf{q}_L p'_1 \Delta f_{\max}.$$



This change leads to a utility improvement if

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{q}_L p'_1 \Delta f_{\max} &> \mathbf{q}_L p_1 \left( \Delta f_{\max} - \frac{B}{2c}(k + \Delta f_{\max}) \right) \\ \iff p'_1 &> p_1 \frac{\Delta f_{\max} - \frac{B}{2c}(k + \Delta f_{\max})}{\Delta f_{\max}}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus user 1 can unilaterally improve its utility by changing  $p_1$  to any value in the open interval  $\left( p_2 \frac{\Delta f_{\max} - \frac{B}{2c}(k + \Delta f_{\max})}{\Delta f_{\max}}, p_2 \right)$ .

### A.10 Proof of Theorem 3

The proof is nearly identical to that of Lemma 2. The only difference is regarding inequality (e). In the original proof we used the fact that  $\sigma^*(s') = 1$  to justify inequality (e). However, in the budgeted setting, if  $B < c$ , then  $\sigma^*(s) \in [0, \frac{B}{c}]$  for all  $s \in \mathcal{S}$ , and hence  $\sigma^*(s)$  can never be 1. Thus the budgeted setting requires slightly more careful analysis, which will leverage the fact that inequality (e) hold whenever  $\sigma^*(s') \geq \frac{f(s') - f(m)}{k + f(s') - f(m)}$ .

To begin, first note that whenever  $B < c$ , the administrator's best response is given by the following modification of (7):

$$\sigma^*(s; B) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } k \sum_{m \in \mathcal{S} \setminus \{s\}} \pi(s|m) q_m \leq \sum_{m \in \mathcal{S}} q_m \pi(s|m) (c + f(m) - f(s)) \\ \frac{B}{c} & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Next, note that whenever  $B \geq \frac{c \Delta f_{\max}}{k + \Delta f_{\max}}$ , for any  $s, m \in \mathcal{S}$  with  $f(s) \geq f(m)$  we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{B}{c} &\geq \frac{\Delta f_{\max}}{k + \Delta f_{\max}} \\ &= 1 - \frac{k}{k + \Delta f_{\max}} \\ &\geq 1 - \frac{k}{k + f(s) - f(m)} \\ &= \frac{f(s) - f(m)}{k + f(s) - f(m)}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus  $\sigma^*(s; B) \geq \frac{f(s) - f(m)}{k + f(s) - f(m)}$  for all  $s$ . In particular, it holds for  $s'$ , and therefore inequality (e) holds even in the budgeted setting provided  $B \geq \frac{c \Delta f_{\max}}{k + \Delta f_{\max}}$ . The remainder of the proof follows identically to the proof of Lemma 2.

### A.11 Proof of Proposition 2

We will show that under the condition  $B \geq c \frac{\Delta f_{\max} \left( 1 - \min \left\{ \frac{q_{\max} c}{q_{\min} (k - c + \Delta f_{\max})}, 1 \right\} \right)}{k + \Delta f_{\max}}$ , an equilibrium exists where the administrator does not audit, and all users's strategies satisfy constraints (7). Throughout the proof we will use some results from Appendix A.8.

Let  $S = \{L, H\}$  where  $L, H$  represent the low and high types respectively with  $f(H) > f(L)$  and  $\Delta f_{\max} = f(H) - f(L)$ . Let  $\mathbf{q}_L, \mathbf{q}_H$  denote the probabilities that a recipient has type  $L, H$  respectively.

First note that the budgeted setting is equivalent to the unlimited budget setting if  $B \geq c$ , in which case Theorem 2 establishes existence and computability of equilibria. Thus in the rest of the proof we consider the  $B < c$  case.

We show in the beginning of Appendix A.8 that choosing  $s = H$  is a dominant strategy for the user whenever  $m = H$ . Therefore all that remains is to determine the optimal value for  $\pi(s = H|m = L)$ .

Using Lemma 4 from Appendix A.8, the expected utility of any user action  $\pi$  is given by

$$\mathbb{E}_{m \sim \mathbf{q}, s \sim \pi(\cdot|m)} [U^i(\sigma(s), m)] = \mathbf{q}_L f(L) + \mathbf{q}_H f(H) + \mathbf{q}_L \pi(s = H|m = L) (\Delta f_{\max} - \sigma(H)(k + \Delta f_{\max}))$$

Note that for a fixed value of  $\sigma(H)$ , the expected utility is an affine function of  $\pi(s = H|m = L)$ . Furthermore, according to Lemma 5,

$$\sigma(H) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } \pi(s = H|m = L) \leq \frac{\mathbf{q}_H c}{\mathbf{q}_L(k - c + \Delta f_{\max})} \\ \frac{B}{c} & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Hence the optimal value of  $\mathbb{E}_{m \sim \mathbf{q}, s \sim \pi(\cdot|m)} [U^i(\sigma(s), m)]$  must be attained at  $\pi(s = H|m = L) \in \{0, \frac{\mathbf{q}_H c}{\mathbf{q}_L(k - c + \Delta f_{\max})}, 1\}$ . From Lemma 6, we know that 0 cannot be the optimum. For  $\pi(s = H|m = L) = 1$ , we note that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_{m \sim \mathbf{q}, s \sim \pi(\cdot|m)} [U^i(\sigma(s), m)] \\ &= \mathbf{q}_L f(L) + \mathbf{q}_H f(H) + \mathbf{q}_L \left( \Delta f_{\max} - \frac{B}{c} (k + \Delta f_{\max}) \right) \\ &\leq \mathbf{q}_L f(L) + \mathbf{q}_H f(H) + \mathbf{q}_L \left( \Delta f_{\max} - \frac{\Delta f_{\max} (1 - \min\{\frac{\mathbf{q}_{\max} c}{\mathbf{q}_{\min}(k - c + \Delta f_{\max})}, 1\}) (k + \Delta f_{\max})}{k + \Delta f_{\max}} \right) \\ &= \mathbf{q}_L f(L) + \mathbf{q}_H f(H) + \mathbf{q}_L \left( \Delta f_{\max} - \Delta f_{\max} (1 - \min\{\frac{\mathbf{q}_{\max} c}{\mathbf{q}_{\min}(k - c + \Delta f_{\max})}, 1\}) \right) \\ &= \mathbf{q}_L f(L) + \mathbf{q}_H f(H) + \mathbf{q}_L \left( \Delta f_{\max} \min\{\frac{\mathbf{q}_{\max} c}{\mathbf{q}_{\min}(k - c + \Delta f_{\max})}, 1\} \right) \end{aligned}$$

The final line is the expected utility obtained when  $\pi(s = H|m = L) = \frac{\mathbf{q}_H c}{\mathbf{q}_L(k - c + \Delta f_{\max})}$ , due to Lemma 6. The inequality is due to the lower bound on  $B$  in the condition of Proposition 2.

Hence the optimal user action is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \pi(s = H|m = L) &= \frac{\mathbf{q}_H c}{\mathbf{q}_L(k - c + \Delta f_{\max})}, \\ \pi(s = H|m = H) &= 1 \end{aligned}$$

and by Lemma 6, the administrator's best response is to never audit.

### A.12 Proof of Theorem 4

Let  $S = \{L, H\}$  where  $L, H$  represent the low and high types respectively with  $f(H) > f(L)$  and  $\Delta f_{\max} = f(H) - f(L)$ . Let  $\mathbf{q}_L, \mathbf{q}_H$  denote the probabilities that a recipient has type  $L, H$  respectively.

Consider the strategy profile  $\boldsymbol{\pi}^* := \{\boldsymbol{\pi}_i^*\}_{i \in [n]}$  where users play the following strategy:

$$\begin{aligned}\boldsymbol{\pi}_i^*(s = H|m = L) &= \frac{\mathbf{q}_H c}{\mathbf{q}_L(k - c + \Delta f_{\max})}, \\ \boldsymbol{\pi}_i^*(s = H|m = H) &= 1.\end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 5, the administrator's best response is to never audit.

We will show that the strategy profile  $\boldsymbol{\pi}^*$  is an equilibrium under  $l$ -coalitions by showing that no coalition of size at most  $l$  can unilaterally deviate and receive pareto-improvements to their utilities. Let  $\mathcal{C}$  be any coalition of size at most  $l$ , and consider any action profile  $p = \{p_i\}_{i \in \mathcal{C}}$  where  $p_i := \boldsymbol{\pi}_i(s = H|m = L)$ . There are two cases to consider.

*Case 1:* If  $\max_{i \in \mathcal{C}} p_i \leq \frac{\mathbf{q}_H c}{\mathbf{q}_L(k - c + \Delta f_{\max})}$ , then by Lemma 5, the administrator will not audit any of the users in  $\mathcal{C}$ , but by Lemma 6, none of the users in  $\mathcal{C}$  have better utility than they would have if they play according to  $\boldsymbol{\pi}^*$ . Hence  $p$  does not lead to pareto-improvement for all members of the coalition.

*Case 2:* If  $\max_{i \in \mathcal{C}} p_i > \frac{\mathbf{q}_H c}{\mathbf{q}_L(k - c + \Delta f_{\max})}$ , then define the set  $\mathcal{C}' := \arg \max_{i \in \mathcal{C}} p_i$ . We showed in [step 1](#) of the proof of Proposition 1 that by maximizing its utility, it prioritizes auditing users with the largest value of  $\boldsymbol{\pi}_i(s = H|m = L)$ . Since non-coalition users are playing according to  $\boldsymbol{\pi}^*$  and are therefore never audited by the administrator, the administrator prioritize its budget to audit the users in  $\mathcal{C}'$ . Depending on how large the administrator's budget is, there are two things that can happen:

- If  $B > c|\mathcal{C}'|$ , then  $\boldsymbol{\sigma}_i(H) = 1$  for all  $i \in \mathcal{C}'$ , i.e., the administrator can fully audit every member of  $\mathcal{C}'$ .
- If  $B \leq c|\mathcal{C}'|$ , then  $\sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}'} \boldsymbol{\sigma}_i(H) = \frac{B}{c}$ , i.e., the administrator does not have enough budget to fully audit all members of  $\mathcal{C}'$ , but nevertheless it will spend its entire budget to audit  $\mathcal{C}'$ . In particular, there must exist some  $j \in \mathcal{C}'$  for which  $\boldsymbol{\sigma}_j(H) \geq \frac{B}{c|\mathcal{C}'|}$ .

Regardless of whether  $B$  is bigger than  $c|\mathcal{C}'|$ , there exists some  $j \in \mathcal{C}'$  for which  $p_j = \boldsymbol{\pi}_j(s = H|m = L) > \frac{\mathbf{q}_H c}{\mathbf{q}_L(k - c + \Delta f_{\max})}$  and  $\boldsymbol{\sigma}_j(H) \geq \frac{B}{c|\mathcal{C}'|}$ .

If  $B \geq lc \frac{\Delta f_{\max}}{k + \Delta f_{\max}}$  as specified by the conditions of Theorem 4, then

$$\boldsymbol{\sigma}_j(H) \geq \frac{B}{c|\mathcal{C}'|} \geq \frac{l}{|\mathcal{C}'|} \frac{\Delta f_{\max}}{k + \Delta f_{\max}} \geq \frac{\Delta f_{\max}}{k + \Delta f_{\max}}.$$

In other words, user  $j$  is violating constraint 7, and the administrator has allocated a budget of at least  $c \frac{\Delta f_{\max}}{k + \Delta f_{\max}}$  to audit user  $j$ . Theorem 3 thus implies that user  $j$  has a lower utility under  $p$  than it would have if it followed  $\boldsymbol{\pi}^*$ . Therefore  $p$  does not provide a pareto-improvement in utility for all members of  $\mathcal{C}$ .

Since we showed that no coalition of at most  $l$  users can unilaterally deviate from  $\boldsymbol{\pi}^*$  to obtain a pareto-improvement to their utilities,  $\boldsymbol{\pi}^*$  is an equilibrium under  $l$ -coalitions, which establishes the desired result.

### A.13 Proof of Theorem 5

Let  $S = \{L, H\}$  where  $L, H$  represent the low and high types respectively with  $f(H) > f(L)$  and  $\Delta f_{\max} = f(H) - f(L)$ . Let  $\mathbf{q}_L, \mathbf{q}_H$  denote the probabilities that a recipient has type  $L, H$  respectively.

Recall that the cost of a mechanism is comprised of (i) its budget required to run the mechanism and (ii) the excess payments made to the users relative to the setting when all users report their types truthfully.

First, note that if there is no audit, then a user's optimal action is to always signal the high type, i.e.  $\pi(s = H|m = L) = 1, \pi(s = H|m = H) = 1$ . Therefore,

$$C^{\text{No Audit}} = f(H) - (q_L f(L) + q_H f(H)) = q_L (f(H) - f(L)) = q_L \Delta f_{\max}.$$

For the audit mechanism, note that its budget is

$$B = \frac{c \Delta f_{\max}}{k + \Delta f_{\max}} \left( 1 - \min \left( \frac{q_H c}{q_L (k - c + \Delta f_{\max})}, 1 \right) \right)$$

and by Lemma 6, its excess payments is

$$\begin{aligned} & q_L f(L) + q_H f(H) + q_L \min \left( 1, \frac{q_H c}{q_L (k - c + \Delta f_{\max})} \right) \Delta f_{\max} - (q_L f(L) + q_H f(H)) \\ &= q_L \min \left( 1, \frac{q_H c}{q_L (k - c + \Delta f_{\max})} \right) \Delta f_{\max}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore the audit mechanism's cost is

$$C^{\text{Audit}} = \frac{c \Delta f_{\max}}{k + \Delta f_{\max}} \left( 1 - \min \left( \frac{q_H c}{q_L (k - c + \Delta f_{\max})}, 1 \right) \right) + q_L \min \left( 1, \frac{q_H c}{q_L (k - c + \Delta f_{\max})} \right) \Delta f_{\max}.$$

When comparing  $C^{\text{Audit}}$  to  $C^{\text{No Audit}}$ , there are two cases to consider.

*Case 1:* If  $q_L < \frac{c}{k + \Delta f_{\max}}$ , then  $\min \left( 1, \frac{q_H c}{q_L (k - c + \Delta f_{\max})} \right) = 1$ , and therefore

$$C^{\text{Audit}} = q_L \Delta f_{\max} = C^{\text{No Audit}}.$$

*Case 2:* If  $q_L \geq \frac{c}{k + \Delta f_{\max}}$ , then  $\min \left( 1, \frac{q_H c}{q_L (k - c + \Delta f_{\max})} \right) = \frac{q_H c}{q_L (k - c + \Delta f_{\max})}$ , and therefore

$$\begin{aligned} C^{\text{Audit}} &= \frac{c \Delta f_{\max}}{k + \Delta f_{\max}} \left( 1 - \frac{q_H c}{q_L (k - c + \Delta f_{\max})} \right) + q_L \frac{q_H c}{q_L (k - c + \Delta f_{\max})} \Delta f_{\max} \\ &\leq q_L \Delta f_{\max} \left( 1 - \frac{q_H c}{q_L (k - c + \Delta f_{\max})} \right) + q_L \frac{q_H c}{q_L (k - c + \Delta f_{\max})} \Delta f_{\max} \\ &= q_L \Delta f_{\max}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence in either case we have shown that  $C^{\text{Audit}} \leq C^{\text{No Audit}}$ , which establishes the desired result.

### A.14 Proof of Corollary 3

To prove this claim, we first note that the total cost of not performing an audit is  $C_n^{\text{No Audit}} = nq_{\min}\Delta f_{\max} = nC^{\text{No Audit}}$ . Next, we consider two cases (as in the proof of Theorem 5): (i)  $q_{\min} \leq \frac{c}{k+\Delta f_{\max}}$  and (ii)  $q_{\min} \geq \frac{c}{k+\Delta f_{\max}}$ . In the regime when  $q_{\min} \leq \frac{c}{k+\Delta f_{\max}}$ , no budget is set aside for the audit and thus the audit mechanism reduces to the no audit setting as the budget  $B = 0$  in this case. Hence, the total expected cost when  $q_{\min}$  is below the above specified threshold is  $C_{(n,m)}^{\text{Audit}} = nq_{\min}\Delta f_{\max} = C_n^{\text{No Audit}}$ . On the other hand, in the regime when  $q_L \geq \frac{c}{k+\Delta f_{\max}}$ , the administrator sets aside a budget scaling with the size of the largest coalition  $m$  to conduct audits and thus the total expected cost is given by

$$\begin{aligned} C_{(n,m)}^{\text{Audit}} &\stackrel{(a)}{=} mc \frac{(\Delta f_{\max}) \left(1 - \frac{(1-q_{\min})c}{q_{\min}(k-c+\Delta f_{\max})}\right)}{k + \Delta f_{\max}} + n\pi^*(s_{\max}|s_{\min}), \\ &\stackrel{(b)}{=} mc \frac{(\Delta f_{\max}) \left(1 - \frac{q_{\max}c}{q_{\min}(k-c+\Delta f_{\max})}\right)}{k + \Delta f_{\max}} + n \frac{q_{\max}c}{k - c + \Delta f_{\max}}, \end{aligned}$$

where (a) follows from the definition of  $C_{(n,m)}^{\text{Audit}}$ , which is a sum of the budget threshold corresponding to Proposition 2 for the setting when the size of the largest user coalition is  $m$  and the associated excess payments that are made to the low type users, and (b) follows from the fact that  $\pi^*(s_{\max}|s_{\min}) = \frac{q_{\max}c}{q_{\min}(k-c+\Delta f_{\max})}$  at the equilibrium. Finally, noting that  $C^{\text{Audit}} = c \frac{(\Delta f_{\max}) \left(1 - \frac{(1-q_{\min})c}{q_{\min}(k-c+\Delta f_{\max})}\right)}{k + \Delta f_{\max}} + \frac{q_{\max}c}{k-c+\Delta f_{\max}}$  in the proof of Theorem 5,  $C^{\text{Audit}} \leq C^{\text{No Audit}}$ , and  $m \leq n$ , it follows that

$$C_{(n,m)}^{\text{Audit}} \leq nC^{\text{Audit}} \leq nC^{\text{No Audit}} = C_n^{\text{No Audit}},$$

which establishes our claim.

### A.15 Proof of Theorem 6

First, note that  $C^{\text{Audit}} = B + \mathbb{E}_{\pi}[f(s) - f(m)]$ . Since  $B = \frac{c\Delta f_{\max}}{k+f_{\max}}$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} k &\geq \Delta f_{\max} \left( \frac{c}{\max_{s'} f(s') - \mathbb{E}_{s \sim \pi}[f(s)]} - 1 \right) \\ \implies B &\leq \frac{c\Delta f_{\max}}{\Delta f_{\max} \left( \frac{c}{\max_{s'} f(s') - \mathbb{E}_{s \sim \pi}[f(s)]} - 1 \right) + \Delta f_{\max}} \\ &= \max_{s'} f(s') - \mathbb{E}_{\pi}[f(s)], \end{aligned}$$

and hence  $C^{\text{Audit}} \leq \max_{s'} f(s') - \mathbb{E}_{\pi}[f(s)] + \mathbb{E}_{\pi}[f(s) - f(m)] = \max_{s'} f(s') - \mathbb{E}_{\pi}[f(m)]$ .

On the other hand, in an absence of an audit, recipients will always signal  $s' := \arg \max_{s \in \mathcal{S}} f(s)$ , leading to  $C^{\text{No Audit}} = \max_{s'} f(s') - \mathbb{E}_{\pi}[f(m)]$ , and hence  $C^{\text{Audit}} \leq C^{\text{No Audit}}$ .

## B Derivation of Utility Functions from Payoffs

### B.1 Deriving the Administrator's Utility function

The administrator's utility is intended to represent its expected payoffs. Thus in this section we will show that  $\mathbb{E}[U^A(a(s), m)] = \mathcal{U}_A(\boldsymbol{\pi}, \boldsymbol{\sigma})$ , where the randomness is taken over the recipient's signaling strategy, their type and the administrator's audit strategy. To this end, it is sufficient to show that

$$U^A(a(s), m) = -f(s) + a(s) \left( -c + \max(f(s) - f(m), 0) + \mathbb{I}_{[s \neq m]}k \right), \quad (12)$$

since taking expectation on both sides gives the desired result (since the expectation of  $a(s)$  is  $\sigma(s)$ ). We proceed by considering 3 different cases.

**Case 1:** If the administrator does not audit, then  $a(s) = 0$ . Hence,

$$-f(s) + a(s) \left( -c + \max(f(s) - f(m), 0) + \mathbb{I}_{[s \neq m]}k \right) = -f(s).$$

**Case 2:** If the administrator conducts an audit, and the recipient is signalling truthfully, then  $a(s) = 1$  and  $s = m$ . Hence,

$$-f(s) + a(s) \left( -c + \max(f(s) - f(m), 0) + \mathbb{I}_{[s \neq m]}k \right) = -c - f(s) = -c - f(m).$$

**Case 3:** If the administrator conducts an audit, and the recipient is signalling untruthfully, then  $a(s) = 1$  and  $s \neq m$ . If  $f(s) > f(m)$ , we have:

$$\begin{aligned} -f(s) + a(s) \left( -c + \max(f(s) - f(m), 0) + \mathbb{I}_{[s \neq m]}k \right) &= -f(s) + (-c + f(s) - f(m) + k) \\ &= k - c - f(m). \end{aligned}$$

If instead  $f(s) < f(m)$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} -f(s) + a(s) \left( -c + \max(f(s) - f(m), 0) + \mathbb{I}_{[s \neq m]}k \right) &= -f(s) + (-c + k) \\ &= k - c - f(s). \end{aligned}$$

Hence in either situation we have  $-f(s) + a(s) \left( -c + \max(f(s) - f(m), 0) + \mathbb{I}_{[s \neq m]}k \right) = k - c - \min(f(s), f(m))$ .

Comparing the outcomes of the three cases with the definition of  $U^A(a(s), m)$  from (2), we see that (12) holds, and thus  $\mathbb{E}[U^A(a(s), m)] = \mathcal{U}_A(\boldsymbol{\pi}, \boldsymbol{\sigma})$ .

### B.2 Deriving the Recipient's Utility function

The recipient's utility is intended to represent its expected payoffs. Thus in this section we will show that  $\mathbb{E}[U(a(s), m)] = \mathcal{U}_R(\boldsymbol{\pi}, \boldsymbol{\sigma})$ , where the randomness is taken over the recipient's signaling strategy, their type and the administrator's audit strategy. This derivation follows very similarly to that of Section B.1. To this end, it is sufficient to show that

$$U(a(s), m) = f(s) + a(s) \left( \min(f(m) - f(s), 0) - \mathbb{I}_{[s \neq m]}k \right), \quad (13)$$

since taking expectation on both sides gives the desired result (since the expectation of  $a(s)$  is  $\sigma(s)$ ). We proceed by considering 3 different cases.

**Case 1:** If the administrator does not audit, then  $a(s) = 0$ . Hence,

$$f(s) + a(s) (\min(f(m) - f(s), 0) - \mathbb{I}_{[s \neq m]}k) = f(s).$$

**Case 2:** If the administrator conducts an audit, and the recipient is signalling truthfully, then  $a(s) = 1$  and  $s = m$ . Hence,

$$f(s) + a(s) (\min(f(m) - f(s), 0) - \mathbb{I}_{[s \neq m]}k) = f(s) = f(m).$$

**Case 3:** If the administrator conducts an audit, and the recipient is signalling untruthfully, then  $a(s) = 1$  and  $s \neq m$ . If  $f(s) > f(m)$ , we have:

$$\begin{aligned} f(s) + a(s) (\min(f(m) - f(s), 0) - \mathbb{I}_{[s \neq m]}k) &= f(s) + (f(m) - f(s) - k) \\ &= f(m) - k. \end{aligned}$$

If instead  $f(s) < f(m)$ , we have

$$f(s) + a(s) (\min(f(m) - f(s), 0) - \mathbb{I}_{[s \neq m]}k) = f(s) - k.$$

Hence in either situation we have  $f(s) + a(s) (\min(f(m) - f(s), 0) - \mathbb{I}_{[s \neq m]}k) = \min(f(s), f(m)) - k$ .

Comparing the outcomes of the three cases with the definition of  $U(a(s), m)$  from (3), we see that (13) holds, and thus  $\mathbb{E}[U(a(s), m)] = \mathcal{U}_R(\boldsymbol{\pi}, \boldsymbol{\sigma})$ .

## C Non-equivalence of Signaling Game and Bayesian Persuasion Equilibria

In this section we will show that there are some signaling game equilibria that are not Bayesian persuasion equilibria for the audit game.

Consider a setting with three user types  $\mathcal{S} = \{x, y, z\}$  with  $f(z) = f(y) + \Delta f$ ,  $f(y) = f(x) + \Delta f$  for some positive value  $\Delta f$ . Furthermore,  $\mathbf{q}_x = \mathbf{q}_y = \mathbf{q}_z = 1/3$ . There are 4 players in this game: the administrator, type  $x$  users, type  $y$  users, and type  $z$  users. We will also require that  $\Delta f \geq 2c$ . As a reminder, we consider the setting where  $k \geq c$ .

Consider the following signaling strategy profile<sup>4</sup>  $(\boldsymbol{\pi}_x, \boldsymbol{\pi}_y, \boldsymbol{\pi}_z, \boldsymbol{\sigma}_\pi)$  defined by

$$\begin{aligned} \boldsymbol{\pi}_x(x) &= \frac{\Delta f + k - 2c}{\Delta f + k - c}, & \boldsymbol{\pi}_x(y) &= \frac{c}{\Delta f + k - c}, & \boldsymbol{\pi}_x(z) &= 0. \\ \boldsymbol{\pi}_y(x) &= 0, & \boldsymbol{\pi}_y(y) &= \frac{\Delta f + k - 2c}{\Delta f + k - c}, & \boldsymbol{\pi}_y(z) &= \frac{c}{\Delta f + k - c}. \\ \boldsymbol{\pi}_z(x) &= 0, & \boldsymbol{\pi}_z(y) &= 0, & \boldsymbol{\pi}_z(z) &= 1. \end{aligned}$$

<sup>4</sup>where  $\boldsymbol{\pi}_u(v) := \mathbb{P}(m = v | s = u)$



As a reminder,  $\sigma_\pi$  is the administrator's best response to the users' signaling strategies as defined in (7). We will first show that  $(\pi_x, \pi_y, \pi_z, \sigma_\pi)$  is a signaling game equilibrium for the audit game. Let  $\sigma_0$  denote the administrator strategy that does not audit any of the signals.

By Bayes Rule, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(m = x|s = z) &= 0, & \mathbb{P}(m = y|s = z) &= \frac{c}{\Delta f + k}, & \mathbb{P}(m = z|s = z) &= \frac{\Delta f + k - c}{\Delta f + k}, \\ \mathbb{P}(m = x|s = y) &= \frac{c}{\Delta f + k}, & \mathbb{P}(m = y|s = y) &= \frac{\Delta f + k - c}{\Delta f + k}, & \mathbb{P}(m = z|s = y) &= 0, \end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{m \neq z} \mathbb{P}(m|s = z) ((f(z) - f(m))_+ + k) &= \mathbb{P}(m = y|s = z)(\Delta f + k) = c, \\ \sum_{m \neq y} \mathbb{P}(m|s = y) ((f(y) - f(m))_+ + k) &= \mathbb{P}(m = x|s = y)(\Delta f + k) = c. \end{aligned}$$

Thus according to (7), the administrator's best response to  $(\pi_x, \pi_y, \pi_z)$  is to not audit any of the signals.

For users of type  $z$ , signalling anything other than  $z$  will result in the same or smaller payoff, so  $\pi_z$  is optimal given the strategies of other players  $(\pi_x, \pi_y, \sigma_\pi)$ .

For users of type  $y$ , increasing  $\pi_y(x)$  leads to lower payoff (you are better off giving this probability to  $\pi_y(y)$  instead, as reporting  $y$  gives both higher payoff and cannot be punished by an audit as it is a truthful signal). Thus we will focus on the setting where  $\pi_y(x) = 0$ . Given that the administrator is not auditing any signals, a user of type  $y$  has an expected payoff of  $(1 - \pi_y(z))f(y) + \pi_y(z)f(z) = f(y) + \pi_y(z)\Delta f$ . Hence choosing  $\pi_y(z) < \frac{c}{\Delta f + k - c}$  decreases the expected utility. On the other hand, for any  $\pi_y(z) > \frac{c}{\Delta f + k - c}$  we have

$$\sum_{m \neq z} \mathbb{P}(m|s = z) ((f(z) - f(m))_+ + k) > c,$$

meaning that the administrator will now audit whenever receiving the signal  $z$ . Hence, in this case the expected utility is  $(1 - \pi_y(z))f(y) + \pi_y(z)(f(y) - k) = f(y) - \pi_y(z)k$ , which is less than what the user gets for choosing  $\pi_y(z) = \frac{c}{\Delta f + k - c}$ . Hence  $\pi_y$  is optimal given the strategies of other players  $(\pi_x, \pi_z, \sigma_\pi)$ .

For users of type  $x$ , given that the administrator does not audit any signals, the expected payoff is  $\pi_x(x)f(x) + \pi_x(y)f(y) + \pi_x(z)f(z) = f(x) + \pi_x(y)\Delta f + \pi_x(z)2\Delta f$ . By construction,  $\pi_x(y), \pi_x(z)$  are the largest possible values, given the strategies of the other user types, so that the administrator will not audit any of the signals. Hence  $\pi_x$  has better utility than any other strategy for which the administrator's best response conducts no audits.

To address the remaining strategies, consider  $(p_x, p_y, p_z)$  for which the administrator audits signal  $y$  but not  $z$ . The expected utility of this strategy is then  $p_x f(x) + p_y (f(x) - k) + p_z f(z)$ . This strategy is inferior to the strategy  $(p_x + p_y, 0, p_z)$  which has an expected utility of  $(p_x +$

$p_y f(x) + p_z f(z)$ . Note that when the user plays  $(p_x + p_y, 0, p_z)$ , the administrator does not audit any of the signals, meaning  $(p_x + p_y, 0, p_z)$  is inferior to  $\pi_x$ . Hence  $(p_x, p_y, p_z)$  is inferior to  $\pi_x$ . An analogous argument shows that all strategies for which the administrator audits signal  $z$  and/or  $y$  must also be inferior to  $\pi_x$ . Hence  $\pi_x$  is optimal given the strategies of other players  $(\pi_y, \pi_z, \sigma_\pi)$ .

We have shown that  $(\pi_x, \pi_y, \pi_z, \sigma_0)$  is a signaling game equilibrium in the audit game. However, this is not a Bayesian persuasion equilibrium because the following signaling strategy has higher excess payments (i.e., a coordinated deviation by all user types can increase the average utility of players):

$$\begin{aligned} \pi'_x(x) &= 1 - \frac{c}{\Delta f + k - c} - \frac{c}{2\Delta f + k - c}, & \pi'_x(y) &= \frac{c}{\Delta f + k - c}, & \pi'_x(z) &= \frac{c}{2\Delta f + k - c}, \\ \pi'_y(x) &= 0, & \pi'_y(y) &= 1, & \pi'_y(z) &= 0, \\ \pi'_z(x) &= 0, & \pi'_z(y) &= 0, & \pi'_z(z) &= 1. \end{aligned}$$

The excess payments under  $(\pi_x, \pi_y, \pi_z)$  is:

$$\mathbf{q}_x \mathbb{P}(s = y | m = x) \Delta f + \mathbf{q}_y \mathbb{P}(s = z | m = y) \Delta f = \frac{2c\Delta f}{3(\Delta f + k - c)}.$$

However, the excess payments under  $(\pi'_x, \pi'_y, \pi'_z)$  is larger:

$$\mathbf{q}_x \mathbb{P}(s = y | m = x) \Delta f + \mathbf{q}_x \mathbb{P}(s = z | m = x) 2\Delta f = \frac{c\Delta f}{3(\Delta f + k - c)} + \frac{c2\Delta f}{3(2\Delta f + k - c)}.$$

## D Additional Theoretical Analyses and Results

### D.1 Uniqueness of Equilibria for $|\mathcal{S}| = 2$

Let  $S = \{L, H\}$  where  $L, H$  represent the low and high types respectively with  $f(H) > f(L)$  and  $\Delta f_{\max} = f(H) - f(L)$ . Let  $\mathbf{q}_L, \mathbf{q}_H$  denote the probabilities that a recipient has type  $L, H$  respectively.

We prove this result by using Lemma 4 and Lemma 6. Consider the user strategy defined in Lemma 6:

$$\begin{aligned} \pi'(s = H | m = L) &:= \min \left( 1, \frac{\mathbf{q}_H c}{\mathbf{q}_L (k - c + \Delta f_{\max})} \right), \\ \pi'(s = H | m = H) &:= 1. \end{aligned}$$

Let  $\Pi$  be the set of no-audit strategies for the user, i.e., user strategies for which the administrator's best response is to never audit, meaning  $\sigma(H) = \sigma(L) = 0$

By construction of  $\pi'$ , the administrator's best response to  $\pi'$  is  $\sigma(H) = \sigma(L) = 0$ , and the administrator cannot improve its utility by unilaterally changing its strategy.

On the other hand, choosing any other strategy will lead to a strictly lower utility for the user. If  $\pi(s = H | m = L) < \min \left( 1, \frac{\mathbf{q}_H c}{\mathbf{q}_L (k - c + \Delta f_{\max})} \right)$ , then by Lemma 6, a unilateral switch from  $\pi$  to  $\pi'$

strictly increases the user's utility. On the other hand if  $\pi(s = H|m = L) > \min\left(1, \frac{q_H c}{q_L(k-c+\Delta f_{\max})}\right)$ , then  $\sigma(H) = 1$ , and by Lemma 4, changing  $\pi(s = H|m = L)$  to 0 strictly increases the user's utility.

For the strategy profile  $(\pi', \sigma \equiv 0)$ , neither player can improve their utility via unilateral deviation, thus this strategy profile is an equilibrium. Furthermore, for any other user strategy  $\pi$ , the user can improve its utility via unilateral deviation. Therefore  $(\pi', \sigma \equiv 0)$  is the unique equilibrium.

## D.2 Existence of Equilibria when $|\mathcal{S}| = 2$ Regardless of Budget $B$

Let  $S = \{L, H\}$  where  $L, H$  represent the low and high types respectively with  $f(H) > f(L)$  and  $\Delta f_{\max} = f(H) - f(L)$ . Let  $q_L, q_H$  denote the probabilities that a recipient has type  $L, H$  respectively.

Using Lemma 4 from Appendix A.8, the expected utility of any user action  $\pi$  is given by

$$\mathbb{E}_{m \sim q, s \sim \pi(\cdot|m)} [U^i(\sigma(s), m)] = q_L f(L) + q_H f(H) + q_L \pi(s = H|m = L)(\Delta f_{\max} - \sigma(H)(k + \Delta f_{\max}))$$

Note that for a fixed value of  $\sigma^*(H)$ , the expected utility is an affine function of  $\pi(s = H|m = L)$ . Furthermore, according to Lemma 5,

$$\sigma(H) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } \pi(s = H|m = L) \leq \frac{q_H c}{q_L(k-c+\Delta f_{\max})} \\ \frac{B}{c} & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Hence the optimal value of  $\mathbb{E}_{m \sim q, s \sim \pi(\cdot|m)} [U^i(\sigma(s), m)]$  must be attained at  $\pi(s = H|m = L) \in \{0, \frac{q_H c}{q_L(k-c+\Delta f_{\max})}, 1\}$ .

We discuss at the beginning of Appendix A.8 why  $\pi(s = H|m = H) = 1$  is a dominant strategy for the user. As a consequence,  $\sigma(L) = 0$  will always hold at an equilibrium. As for  $\pi(s = H|m = L)$  and  $\sigma(H)$ , there are two cases to consider:

If  $B \leq c \frac{\Delta f_{\max}(1 - \min\{\frac{q_H c}{q_L(k-c+\Delta f_{\max})}, 1\})}{k + \Delta f_{\max}}$ , then  $\pi(s = H|m = L) = 1$  is optimal, and thus it and its best response  $\sigma(H) = B/c$  is an equilibrium.

If  $B > c \frac{\Delta f_{\max}(1 - \min\{\frac{q_H c}{q_L(k-c+\Delta f_{\max})}, 1\})}{k + \Delta f_{\max}}$ , then  $\pi(s = H|m = L) = \frac{q_H c}{q_L(k-c+\Delta f_{\max})}$  is optimal, and thus it and its best response  $\sigma(H) = 0$  is an equilibrium.

## D.3 Generalization of Theorem 6 to Multiple-User Setting

Let  $q_1, q_2, \dots, q_n$  be the marginal distribution of the  $n$  users' types, and let  $\pi_1, \dots, \pi_n$  denote equilibrium actions of the  $n$  players, i.e., the solutions to (8)-(9). We use  $(s_i, m_i) \sim \pi_i$  to represent sampling  $s_i, m_i$  from their joint distribution by first sampling  $m_i$  from  $q_i$ , and then sampling  $s_i$  from  $\pi_i(\cdot|m_i)$ .

In such a setting, if

$$k \geq \Delta f_{\max} \left( \frac{c}{\sum_{i=1}^n \max_{s'} f(s') - \mathbb{E}_{(s,m) \sim \pi_i} [f(s)]} - 1 \right),$$

then by the same reasoning as Theorem 6, we have

$$B \leq \sum_{i=1}^n \max_{s'} f(s') - \mathbb{E}_{(s,m) \sim \pi_i} [f(s)],$$

meaning that

$$\begin{aligned} C^{\text{Audit}} &:= \text{Budget} + \text{Excess Payments} \\ &\leq \sum_{i=1}^n \max_{s'} f(s') - \mathbb{E}_{(s,m) \sim \pi_i} [f(s)] + \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}_{(s,m) \sim \pi_i} [f(s)] - \mathbb{E}_{m \sim q_i} [f(m)] \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^n \max_{s'} f(s') - \mathbb{E}_{m \sim q_i} [f(m)] \\ &= C^{\text{No Audit}}. \end{aligned}$$

#### D.4 User utility in the unbudgeted two type audit game




Figure 3: User utility  $\mathcal{U}^R$  in a two type setting  $\mathcal{S} = \{L, H\}$  with  $f(H) - f(L) = \Delta f \geq 0$ . The plot is made assuming that (a) users of type  $H$  will always signal truthfully, since this is a dominant strategy and (b) the administrator is always playing a best response according to (7). Under these assumptions, the user strategy is entirely determined by the misreporting probability  $\pi(s = H|m = L)$ . We analyze the plot by looking at three different regimes: regime 1 is  $[0, \frac{q_H}{q_L} \frac{c}{\Delta f + k - c})$ , regime 2 is  $(\frac{q_H}{q_L} \frac{c}{\Delta f + k - c}, 1]$  and regime 3 is when  $\pi(s = H|m = L) = \frac{q_H}{q_L} \frac{c}{\Delta f + k - c}$ . Regime 1 corresponds to the case where  $\sigma(H) = 0$  is the administrator's unique best response. In the absence of an audit,  $\mathcal{U}^R$  is an increasing function of the misreporting probability. Regime 2 corresponds to the case where  $\sigma(H) = 1$  is the administrator's unique best response. In this regime,  $\mathcal{U}^R$  is decreasing, since a higher misreporting probability increases the probability of getting caught and paying the fine. In regime 3 the administrator is indifferent between auditing and not auditing, and hence any  $\sigma(H) \in [0, 1]$  is a best response. In terms of the user utility,  $\mathcal{U}^R$  interpolates from the blue point to the red point along the dashed line as  $\sigma(H)$  varies from 0 to 1. Importantly, this figure shows that  $\mathcal{U}^R$  has a maximum if and only if  $\sigma(H)$  is chosen to be 0 in regime 3. As a consequence, this says that the game has an equilibrium if and only if the administrator plays  $\sigma(H) = 0$  in regime 3. Fortunately, despite equilibria not existing when  $\sigma(H) > 0$  in regime 3, we still have  $\epsilon$ -equilibria for any  $\epsilon \geq 0$  by choosing  $\pi(s = H|m = L) \in [\frac{q_H}{q_L} \frac{c}{\Delta f + k - c} - \frac{\epsilon}{q_L \Delta f}, \frac{q_H}{q_L} \frac{c}{\Delta f + k - c})$ .

## E Additional Numerical Results

In this section, we depict the variation in the maximum misreporting probability of users for different ranges of the audit fine  $k$  and audit cost  $c$  for the model parameters presented in Section 6.3 for three different values of  $q_{\min} \in \{0.25, 0.5, 0.75\}$  in Figure 4. In particular, we let the audit fine  $k$  vary in \$100 increments between \$100 to \$1000 and the audit cost  $c$  vary between \$25 to \$50 and observe from Figure 4 that as the audit fine increases and the audit cost reduces, the maximum misreporting probability also reduces (see Corollary 1). Furthermore, we observe that the misreporting probability of users increases as  $q_{\min}$  decreases, which follows as the administrator is less likely to conduct audits when a larger proportion of the population are of the high type, which enables lower type users to misreport more when  $q_{\min}$  is small.




Figure 4: Variation in the maximum misreporting probability of users for a range of audit fines  $k$  and audit costs  $c$  for three different values of  $q_{\min}$ .

## F Black Market Fraud

In this section, we describe how digital signature schemes can be used in artificial currency systems to prevent the exchange of artificial currency for money, thereby preventing black market fraud. To this end, we first describe the mathematical properties of digital signatures and refer the readers to chapter 13 of [BS20] for additional details. Then, we show how digital signatures can be used to create artificial currency systems where users cannot purchase others’ credits with money. The digital signatures also provide a principled defense against double-spending and counterfeit attempts, which are important challenges facing existing credit systems [Whi23, Gre23] for tracking greenhouse emissions.

As a reminder, artificial currency systems often give rise to black markets which facilitate the following two types of exchange: (a) artificial currency can be directly exchanged for money, or (b) artificial currency is first exchanged for goods, which are then exchanged for money. The existence of such markets will bias the allocation of goods toward high income individuals, thus undermining the desired equity properties of the artificial currency system.

We focus our discussion on preventing type (a) exchanges since this is sufficient to prevent formation of black markets if the artificial currency is only exchangeable for *transient* goods. By

transient, we mean that the goods that must be either immediately consumed or discarded forever (e.g., food banks serving thanksgiving dinner, and federal transit benefits under sufficient supervision. See Appendix G for more details). In particular, transient goods cannot be re-sold once they are obtained, preventing type (b) exchange. However, if the goods are non-transient, there is nothing preventing a recipient from exchanging their artificial currency for goods, and then selling the goods for money, and we defer a deeper exploration of this setting to future research.

## F.1 Digital Signature Schemes

A digital signature scheme is a mathematical object that allows users to endorse (i.e., sign) messages in an unforgeable way. In a digital signature scheme, each participant has two keys: a secret key and a public key. As the names suggest, the value of the secret key should only be known by its owner, and the value of the public key is known to all participants. The secret key serves as the participant’s digital identity that it can use to sign messages. The public key serves as a mailbox or address that can be used to verify the validity of signatures.

Mathematically, a digital signature scheme is a tuple  $(\text{gen}, \text{sign}, \text{verify})$ .  $\text{gen}$  is a randomized function which outputs valid a secret key and public key pair  $(\text{sk}, \text{pk})$  that satisfy certain mathematical relationships. Users obtain their credentials by running this  $\text{gen}$  function. The probability that  $\text{gen}$  produces any key pair is very low, which is important to ensure that no two users have the same secret keys.  $\text{sign}$  is a randomized function used to sign messages. Given a message  $\theta$ , a user with keys  $(\text{sk}, \text{pk})$  can sign  $\theta$  by evaluating  $\sigma := \text{sign}(\text{sk}, \theta)$ . The  $\text{verify}$  function is used to verify the legitimacy of signatures. Namely, given a message  $m$  and a signature  $\sigma$ ,  $\text{verify}(\text{pk}, \theta, \sigma)$  will evaluate to 1 if  $\sigma$  is a possible output to the randomized function  $\text{sign}(\text{sk}, \theta)$ , where  $\text{sk}$  is the secret key corresponding to  $\text{pk}$ . Otherwise  $\text{verify}(\text{pk}, \theta, \sigma) = 0$ .

Digital signature schemes that are used in practice have two additional properties:

**Correctness:** For a key pair  $(\text{sk}, \text{pk})$  produced by  $\text{gen}$ , signatures produced by  $\text{sk}$  will be accepted by the  $\text{verify}(\text{pk}, \cdot)$  function with high probability. Namely, for any  $m$  and any valid key pair  $(\text{sk}, \text{pk})$ ,  $\mathbb{P}[\text{verify}(\text{pk}, \theta, \text{sign}(\text{sk}, \theta))] \approx 1$ .

**Security:** It is hard to forge a valid signature for a public key  $\text{pk}$  without knowledge of the corresponding secret key  $\text{sk}$ . Namely, for any valid key pair  $(\text{sk}, \text{pk})$  and any message  $m$  that has never been signed by  $\text{sk}$ , it is computationally infeasible to find  $\sigma'$  satisfying  $\mathbb{P}[\text{verify}(\text{pk}, \theta, \sigma') = 1] > 0.01$  without knowledge of  $\text{sk}$ .

We refer the readers to Appendix G and [BS20] for more details on secure digital signature schemes.

## F.2 An artificial currency system with digital signatures

We now present an artificial currency which uses a secure digital signature scheme during the minting and spending of currency to prevent the exchange of the currency for money. First, we introduce an assumption on the value of identity which we will need for our scheme. We then sketch the key ideas, after which we describe the cryptographic setup, minting, and spending procedures.

**Assumption 1.** No person would willingly give away their identity (including ownership rights to all of their possessions and credentials) regardless of what is being offered in return.

Assumption 1 is reasonable, as people do not often share their passwords or social security numbers with others, and identity theft can be charged as a felony in the United States.



**Key Ideas:** At a high level, each unit of artificial currency (e.g., coin) contains (a) a signature from the administrator and (b) a public key. The former ensures that any user can check the validity of the coin, i.e., that it was minted by the administrator and is not a counterfeit coin. The latter ensures that the only person who can spend the coin is the one who owns the secret key corresponding to the public key specified in the coin. Since a person’s secret key is their digital identity, no one is willing to reveal their secret key to anyone else under Assumption 1. Thus, in order to use someone else’s coin, one must know that person’s secret key. However, because no one is willing to reveal their secret key, there is no incentive for one person to try buying another person’s coins, thereby eliminating black markets for the artificial currency.

**Cryptographic Setup:** Let  $(\text{gen}, \text{sign}, \text{verify})$  be a digital signature scheme that satisfies the correctness and security properties. The administrator has a key pair  $(\text{sk}^*, \text{pk}^*)$  and each of the  $n$  users have a key pair  $\{(\text{sk}_i, \text{pk}_i)\}_{i=1}^n$ .  $\text{sk}_i$  is the digital representation of user  $i$ ’s identity, and under Assumption 1, user  $i$  is not willing to share this with anyone else for any reason. Each person knows everyone else’s public key. Only the administrator knows  $\text{sk}^*$  and only the  $i$ ’th user knows  $\text{sk}_i$ . All key pairs are obtained by running the gen function.

**Minting Artificial Currency:** To issue one unit of artificial currency (i.e., a coin) to the  $i$ ’th user, the administrator first constructs the coin’s metadata  $\theta$ .  $\theta$  is a tuple that must contain a unique coin number to distinguish it from other coins issued to user  $i$ . It can also include other information, like the timeframe for which the coin is valid. The full coin is then the tuple  $(\text{pk}_i, \theta, \tau^*(\text{pk}_i, \theta))$ , where  $\tau^*(\text{pk}_i, \theta) = \text{sign}(\text{sk}^*, (\text{pk}_i, \theta))$  is a signature on  $(\text{pk}_i, \theta)$  created by the administrator’s secret key. Any user can thus check the validity of the coin by checking whether  $\text{verify}(\text{pk}^*, (\text{pk}_i, \theta), \tau^*(\text{pk}_i, \theta))$  evaluates to 1 or not. Because the signature scheme is secure, only the administrator can create coins that pass the validity check, and therefore creating counterfeit coins is not computationally feasible in this system.

**Spending Artificial Currency:** When user  $i$  wants to spend its artificial currency to receive goods from the administrator, user  $i$  and the administrator first construct a raw receipt  $r_0$ . This raw receipt contains a description of the goods being purchased, the price (in artificial currency) and a list of coins to be spent for the purchase. The administrator then sends a large random number  $Z$  to the user. User  $i$  will sign the tuple  $(r_0, Z)$ , i.e., compute  $\tau_i := \text{sign}(\text{sk}_i, (r_0, Z))$  and give the full receipt,  $r := (r_0, Z, \tau_i)$  to the administrator. The administrator approves the transaction if and only if (a) the public key listed on each of the coins in  $r_0$  match the public key of user  $i$ , (b) none of the coins listed in  $r_0$  appear in any previously approved receipt, and (c)  $\text{verify}(\text{pk}_i, (r_0, Z), \tau_i) = 1$ . If  $r$  is approved, it is added to the administrator’s database of approved receipts, thus preventing any of the coins listed in  $r_0$  from ever being spent a second time. By design, a receipt  $r$  will be approved only if all coins listed in  $r_0$  have the same public key  $\text{pk}_i$ , and  $\tau_i$  is a valid signature on  $(r_0, Z)$  with respect to  $\text{pk}_i$ . Because the digital signature scheme is secure, only user  $i$  can use a coin which contains  $\text{pk}_i$ , and any coin can be used only once.

## G Additional Details on Black Markets for Artificial Currency

### G.1 Discussion on transient goods

Transient goods are goods which, upon purchase, must be either immediately consumed or discarded forever. In particular, the goods cannot be traded or sold in an after-market. In practice, transience is often enforced by supervision or surveillance, as is the case for Thanksgiving food banks and

federal transit benefits, which we will elaborate on in the following paragraphs.

During Thanksgiving, many food banks offer free meals for those in need. In pre-pandemic settings, these meals are typically consumed at the food bank. The volunteers at the food banks verify the identities of those who enter, and act as supervisors preventing entry of ineligible users and preventing anyone from taking large volumes of food out of the food bank. These properties make such Thanksgiving dinners transient. Because ineligible users are now allowed entry, and the food must be consumed at the food bank, it cannot be taken out and sold in an after-market.

Federal transit benefits programs provide affordable transit to eligible users. Such goods are transient provided (a) the screening process is sufficiently thorough so that ineligible users do not gain access to benefits, and (b) there is sufficient supervision at public transit centers (workers who monitor the ticket machines and the turnstiles) to prevent an eligible user’s benefits from being used by an ineligible user.

## G.2 Additional Details on Signature Schemes

Mathematically, a digital signature scheme is a tuple  $(\lambda, \text{gen}, \mathcal{M}, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}, \Sigma, \text{sign}, \text{verify})$  where

1.  $\lambda \in \mathbb{Z}_+$  is a security parameter, where larger values correspond to stronger security.
2.  $\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}, \Sigma$  are the domains of messages, secret keys, public keys and signatures respectively.
3.  $\text{gen}$  is a randomized function which outputs valid a secret key and public key pair  $(\text{sk}, \text{pk})$ . The runtime of  $\text{gen}$  must be polynomial in  $\lambda$ . For any valid key pair  $(\text{sk}, \text{pk})$ , the probability that  $\text{gen}$  outputs  $(\text{sk}, \text{pk})$  must be upper bounded by  $2^{-\lambda}$ .
4.  $\text{sign} : \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \Sigma$  is a function that uses a secret key to create a signature on a message. The runtime of  $\text{sign}$  must be polynomial in  $\lambda$ .
5.  $\text{verify} : \mathcal{B} \times \mathcal{M} \times \Sigma \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$  is a function that uses a public key to determine whether a signature on a message is valid. The runtime of  $\text{verify}$  must be polynomial in  $\lambda$ .

If a user whose secret and public key pair is  $(\text{sk}, \text{pk})$  wants to sign a message  $\theta$  (to show endorsement of the data contained within  $\theta$ ), they evaluate the  $\text{sign}$  function with their secret key  $\text{sk}$  and the message  $\theta$  as input to produce a signature  $\tau \sim \text{sign}(\text{sk}, \theta)$ , which means we sample  $\tau$  from the distribution specified by  $\text{sign}(\text{sk}, \theta)$ . Then, any observer can check the validity of  $\tau$  by evaluating the  $\text{verify}$  function, i.e., compute  $\text{verify}(\text{pk}, \theta, \tau)$  and check if the result is 1.

Digital signature schemes that are used in practice have two additional properties:

**Correctness:** For a key pair  $(\text{sk}, \text{pk})$  produced by  $\text{gen}$ , signatures produced by  $\text{sk}$  will be accepted by the  $\text{verify}(\text{pk}, \cdot)$  function with high probability. Mathematically, this means that for every message  $\theta \in \mathcal{M}$ ,

$$\mathbb{P}(\text{verify}(\text{pk}, \theta, \text{sign}(\text{sk}, \theta)) = 1) \geq 1 - 2^{-\lambda}.$$

**Security:** It is hard to forge a valid signature for a public key  $\text{pk}$  without knowledge of the corresponding secret key  $\text{sk}$ . Concretely, consider the following game between Alice and Bob:

1. Alice uses  $\text{gen}$  to create a key pair  $(\text{sk}, \text{pk})$ . She reveals  $\text{pk}$  to Bob.

2. Bob picks  $k$  messages  $\{\theta_i\}_{i=1}^k$  and sends them to Alice, where  $k \leq c_0 \lambda^{c_1}$  for some constants  $c_0, c_1$ . Alice responds with signatures  $\{\tau_i\}_{i=1}^k$  where  $\tau_i \sim \text{sign}(\text{sk}, \theta_i)$ .
3. Given the signatures received from Alice, Bob picks a new message  $\theta \notin \{\theta_i\}_{i=1}^k$  and tries to forge a signature  $\tau$  for  $\theta$ .

Bob wins the game if  $\text{verify}(\text{pk}, \theta, \tau) = 1$ . A signature scheme is secure if the probability of Bob winning the game is sufficiently low:

$$\mathbb{P}(\text{verify}(\text{pk}, \theta, \tau) = 1) \leq \varepsilon(\lambda)$$

where  $\varepsilon$  is a non-negative decreasing function (which depends on  $c_0, c_1$ ) where  $\lim_{\lambda \rightarrow \infty} \lambda^c \varepsilon(\lambda) = 0$  for all  $c > 0$ , i.e., it is a function decaying faster than any polynomial.