

Ad Auction Design and User Experience

Zoë Abrams¹ and Michael Schwarz²

¹ Yahoo!, Inc., 2821 Mission College Blvd., Santa Clara, CA, USA, za@yahoo-inc.com

² Yahoo! Research, 1950 University Ave., Berkeley, CA, USA,
mschwarz@yahoo-inc.com

Abstract. When users click on poor quality advertisements, there is a hidden cost to the search engine due to the user dissatisfaction (for instance, users are less likely to click on ads in the future). We describe how to incorporate hidden costs into the GSP auction for internet ads such that it is in an advertiser's self interest to create a user experience that maximizes efficiency.

1 Introduction

In sponsored search, the behavior of users in the long run is endogenous: users continue to click on advertisements only if on average the value that a user derives from clicking on ads exceeds the cost of time required to click and to evaluate the contents of the offer. Sometimes, the value of a click to a user may be a large negative number (e.g. an unscrupulous advertiser may mislead an unsuspecting user to infect his computer with spyware).

We consider that a user's future propensity to click on ads is influenced by his experience with past clicks. An ad with disappointing quality of landing page imposes a negative externality on the search engine because the future stream of revenue from a user is reduced by some amount (some of the future clicks are lost since a disappointed user may learn to ignore ads). Of course, the externality may also be positive. A good experience with an ad may train users to pay more attention to other ads. We will refer to this externality as a hidden cost. Obviously, if an ad's hidden cost is greater than its bid, a search engine should never show the ad. How should a search engine incorporate hidden costs into an auction mechanism?

Our main contribution is the design of a mechanism that encourages advertisers to create an experience for users that maximizes efficiency.

A classic method for encouraging or discouraging certain behavior towards the social optimum is the Pigovian tax [12]. Pigovian taxes charge (or subsidize) an agent its *externality* from the transaction (i.e. the effect on agents that occurs outside of the transaction). A Pigovian tax causes an agent to internalize the externality that he imposes by his actions on other agents, creating an incentive for individual agents to take actions that maximize social welfare.

The concept of pricing externalities to encourage social welfare is one of the key insights of economic theory [14, 3, 2]. For instance, the celebrated VCG mechanism [16, 5, 8] builds on this idea.

A relevant example of Pigovian taxation is the market for renting space at a shopping mall. That market has much in common with the virtual "real estate" allocated for ads on a search result page. The shopping mall owner, much like a search engine, tends to allocate space to the stores that value space the most. The auctions for sponsored search considered in the academic literature allocate space based on the advertiser's willingness to pay per click, sometimes adjusted by ad clickability (the ads are ranked based on the product of the bid per click and the probability the ad is clicked when it is seen). The current mechanism charges higher prices for ads with low clickability but does not charge a higher price for ads with high hidden cost. No model in the literature that we know of incorporates hidden costs: usually advertisement specific information is the expected clickthrough rate [15, 6, 1, 11, 10, 13, 9]. In the case of shopping malls, reputable stores draw in customer traffic to the shopping mall, thus imposing a long term positive externality on other tenants in the mall. These externalities are huge, as apparent from the contracts between stores and mall operators: the rent paid by premium brand stores may be a few times lower than the rent paid by less reputable tenants [7]. This is because the shopping mall uses pricing to attract tenants that will impose a positive externality on other tenants by creating more traffic. Exactly the same logic applies in sponsored search. To foster efficiency, a search engine should encourage ads that give users a positive experience because it makes users more likely to click on other ads, thus enhancing the value of the virtual real estate. However, at this time, the auctions for sponsored search do not explicitly take into account the hidden costs that are created by advertisers and the literature on sponsored search does not address hidden costs. This causes a large inefficiency if the role of hidden costs in sponsored search is comparable to the role of externalities in an off line retail environment. The experience of shopping malls is not fully transferable to the sponsored search environment, because the rental agreements for shopping mall space are negotiated, while the ad space has to be sold via auction due to fluidity and the high volume of small transactions in this market. Also, the nature and volume of user traffic enables search engines to effectively measure the hidden cost of an advertisement. We show how to incorporate hidden costs in the standard pricing mechanism for ad auctions in a manner that fosters efficiency.

2 Hidden Cost GSP

We begin by describing the environment and then proceed to describe an auction mechanism that incorporate hidden costs into pricing. We assume that an advertiser can make choices about his offerings that influence the value per click for the advertiser and the user experience. For instance, an advertiser may choose to make a misleading offer that leads to poor user experience but higher profit or a more honest offer that may be somewhat less profitable. An advertiser may also choose the price of the product that he sells. The lower the price, the better the user experience. We denote the choice of the landing page for advertiser i by q_i (q_i may belong to a finite set, for instance a binary choice of being explicit or

not being explicit about the shipping charges, or it can be a continuous variable such as the price of a good or the cost of shipping).

The search engine allocates positions on a search result page to advertisers. We assume that the number of clicks that an ad receives depends only on its position. The number of clicks in position j is α_j . Ads in higher positions receive more clicks so that $\alpha_k \geq \alpha_{k+1}$. The value that an advertiser derives per click is denoted by s_i . The value per click may depend on the advertiser's choice of q and can be viewed as a function $s_i(q_i)$. The private values per click for each advertiser are denoted with the set s , indexed by value so that $s_k \geq s_{k+1}$. Let r_i be the rank of advertiser i (not necessarily the same as their value index), and K be the total number of positions on the screen, where ads can be displayed. The payoff of an advertiser is the number of clicks that an advertiser receives multiplied by the value per click minus the total cost that an advertiser pays for clicks. That is, *advertiser payoff* $= s_i(q_i)\alpha_{r_i} - \text{payment}$.

We assume that an advertiser's choice of q imposes an externality on the search engine's long term health. The hidden cost per click is denoted by $h_i = h(q_i)$. The hidden cost can be thought of as a loss in future revenues due to the user's reduction in propensity to click caused by clicking on an ad of advertiser i . With this interpretation, a search engine can statistically infer a hidden cost of an ad without examining the contents of an advertiser's offer. In light of this, our model assumes that hidden costs are common knowledge for both the advertiser and the search engine. The efficient advertisement quality, that is beneficial to the search engine but gives equal weight to the cost for the advertiser i , is $q_i^* = \arg \max_q s_i(q) - h(q)$. We design a mechanism that (i) for a given vector of offers \mathbf{q} orders ads efficiently (ii) incentivizes advertisers to make the efficient choice of offerings q_i^* . More formally,

Definition 1. Efficiency with hidden costs. For ranks and qualities $r_i, q_i, \forall i \in I$, efficiency is $\sum_i (s_i(q_i) - h(q_i))\alpha_{r_i}$.

The generalized second price auction (GSP) is defined in [6, 15]. We describe it here for completeness. Given a set of bids b_i and clickabilities $c_i, \forall i \in I$, advertisers are ranked according to their bid times clickability and charged the smallest amount necessary to maintain their position. If all advertisers have identical clickability, i.e. $c_i = c$ for every advertiser, then advertisers are ranked according to their bids and charged the bid of the advertiser ranked immediately below. Note that the GSP design does not penalize advertisers with high hidden costs and thus does not lead to an efficient outcome in an environment with hidden costs. Here we describe a modification of GSP that yields an efficient outcome (in the sense of the above definition). To keep notation as simple as possible we will assume the clickability values are all 1.

Definition 2. Hidden Cost GSP: Mechanism \mathcal{M}' . Auction \mathcal{M}' on bids and qualities $b_i, q_i, \forall i \in I$ is as follows:

1. $\forall i \in I, b'_i = b_i - h_i$.
2. Run the generalized second price (GSP) auction on b'_i .

3. $\forall i \in I$, add h_i to the price per click of bidder i . Leave the ranking from GSP in Step 2 unchanged.

Mechanism \mathcal{M}' differs from GSP. It subtracts and adds hidden costs before and after (respectively), running GSP. Note that the environment described here is different from the standard models for sponsored search environments [13, 10, 15, 6] because an advertiser controls two input values to the mechanism, b_i and q_i . Despite these differences, \mathcal{M}' maintains many of the attractive properties of the GSP auction, namely there exists an equilibrium solution that has maximum efficiency. Also like in GSP, the bid is a tight upper bound on an advertiser's payment per click in the mechanism \mathcal{M}' .

Theorem 1. *Mechanism \mathcal{M}' implements an efficient outcome.*

To prove Theorem 1, we start out by defining VCG and proving some properties of the VCG solution. We then draw conclusions about the GSP auction based on previous work relating it to VCG. Finally, the properties of GSP are used to prove properties of the mechanism \mathcal{M}' .

2.1 VCG for Sponsored Search

We denote the total VCG payment for the advertiser ranked k_{th} highest in s with $t_k^{(s,\alpha)}$. Let r be a ranking function such that $r(u, s)$ is the rank of value u if it were to be inserted into the set s . Similarly, $r^{-1}(r, s)$ is the value at rank r in vector s . We prove the following property of the VCG outcome:

Lemma 1. *For any set of values V , $\operatorname{argmax}_{v \in V} (v \cdot \alpha_{r(v,s)} - t_{r(v,s)}^{(s+v,\alpha)}) = \operatorname{max}_{v \in V} v$. In words, given a choice of values per click, an advertiser's utility in the VCG outcome is highest if they choose the highest value per click.*

Proof First, we show that for the VCG outcome, the higher an advertiser's value, the larger their utility. By definition, $s_k - s_{k+1} \geq 0$. Multiplying by α_k and adding $s_{k+1}\alpha_{k+1} - t_{k+1}^{s,\alpha}$ to both sides, we see that the utility of the advertiser with the k_{th} largest value is larger than the utility of the advertiser with the $k+1_{th}$ largest value.

Take two potential values, $u > w$ for an advertiser i . Let x be the value of the advertiser at rank $r(w, s)$ in the set of values $s + u$ (this is analogous to taking the value of the advertiser ranked immediately above w in $s + w$). For conciseness, $\Delta_{\alpha_k} = \alpha_k - \alpha_{k-1}$. Using value u gives utility

$$u\alpha_{r(u,s)} - \sum_{k=P+1}^{k=r(u,s)} \Delta_{\alpha_k} r^{-1}(k-1, s+u) \geq x\alpha_{r(w,s)} - \sum_{k=P+1}^{k=r(w,s)} \Delta_{\alpha_k} r^{-1}(k-1, s+u).$$

Since both w and u are ranked higher than any value of k in the summation,

$$\sum_{k=P+1}^{k=r(w,s)} \Delta_{\alpha_k} r^{-1}(k-1, s+u) = \sum_{k=P+1}^{k=r(w,s)} \Delta_{\alpha_k} r^{-1}(k-1, s+w).$$

Because w is ranked lower than x in the set of values $s + w$,

$$x\alpha_{r(w,s)} - \sum_{k=P+1}^{k=r(w,s)} \Delta_{\alpha_k} r^{-1}(k-1, s+u) \geq w\alpha_{r(w,s)} - \sum_{k=P+1}^{k=r(w,s)} \Delta_{\alpha_k} r^{-1}(k-1, s+w).$$

Combining the inequalities, we see that the larger value u brings higher utility in VCG than the lower value w . \square

We define $b(s, \alpha, u)$ to be $\frac{r^s(u, s-u)}{\alpha_{r(u, s-u)}}$. The function b relies on the rankings and pricing that VCG outputs (based on s and α).

2.2 Relating VCG to GSP

The following Lemma restates the results from [6], which we will use to prove Theorem 1.

Lemma 2. *All bidders i bidding $b(s, \alpha, s_i)$ is an envy-free bidder optimal equilibrium. Furthermore, the ranking and the price charged to each bidder is equivalent to the ranking and price charged to each bidder in the VCG mechanism.*

Corollary 1. *Since in the bidder optimal equilibrium in GSP advertisers receive the same utility as in VCG, an advertiser with a choice of values per click receives highest utility in the bidder optimal equilibrium by bidding their highest choice of value.*

Although there exist other equilibria, it is reasonable to expect the auction to converge to the bidder optimal equilibrium. The result in [6] describes a generalized English auction that leads to the bidder optimal equilibrium. Also, in [4], it is shown that there exists a simple greedy bidding strategy that leads to the bidder optimal equilibrium. For simplicity, we assume there is only one bidder optimal equilibrium solution, since ties can be broken according to a predetermined ordering.

To show the efficiency of \mathcal{M}' , we first prove the efficiency of \mathcal{M} .

Definition 3. Mechanism \mathcal{M} . *Auction \mathcal{M} on bids $b_i, \forall i \in I$ is as follows:*

1. *Run the generalized second price (GSP) auction on b_i .*
2. *$\forall i \in I$, add h_i to the ppc of bidder i . Leave the ranking from GSP unchanged.*

Theorem 2. *All bidders $i \in I$ implementing websites with quality q_i^* and submitting bids $b(s(q_i^*) - h(q_i^*), \alpha)$ is an equilibrium point for mechanism \mathcal{M} . Furthermore, this equilibrium point has maximum efficiency.*

Proof For a fixed quality q_i , the utility of advertiser i in auction \mathcal{M} is $(s(q_i) - h(q_i) - p_i)\alpha_i$, where p_i and α_i are the price and clicks allocated by GSP. By Lemma 2 and the definition of function b , the bid $b(s(q_i) - h(q_i), \alpha)$ must maximize $(s(q_i) - h(q_i) - p_i)\alpha_i$ in the bidder optimal GSP outcome. By Lemmas 1 and 2, the value of q_i that maximizes $(s(q_i) - h(q_i) - p_i)\alpha_i$ is q_i^* . The bidder optimal GSP outcome, since it ranks by $s(q_i^*) - h(q_i^*)$, maximizes $\sum_i \alpha_i (s(q_i^*) - h(q_i^*))$. \square

Corollary 2. *All bidders $i \in I$ implementing websites with quality q_i^* and submitting bids $b(s(q_i^*) - h(q_i^*), \alpha) + h(q_i^*)$ is an equilibrium point for mechanism \mathcal{M}' . Furthermore, this equilibrium point has maximum efficiency.*

Since the addition of $h(q_i^*)$ is immediately subtracted in the first step of \mathcal{M}' , and the utility of the bidder is unchanged from \mathcal{M} , the maximizing behavior of the bidder is unchanged from Theorem 2.

References

1. Z. Abrams and A. Ghosh. Auctions with revenue guarantees for sponsored search. *Workshop on Sponsored Search Auctions*, 2007.
2. M. Backmann, C. B. McGuire, and C. B. Winsten. Pigouvian pricing and stochastic evolutionary implementation. *Studies in the Economics of Transportation*, 1956.
3. E. Basker. Job creation or destruction? labor market effects of wal-mart expansion. *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 87:1:327–353, 1982.
4. M. Cary, A. Das, B. Edelman, I. Giotis, K. Heimerl, A. Karlin, C. Mathieu, and M. Schwarz. Greedy bidding strategies for keyword auctions. *Conference on Electronic Commerce (EC)*, 2007.
5. E. Clarke. Multipart pricing of public goods. *Public Choice*, 11:17-33, 1971.
6. B. Edelman, M. Ostrovsky, and M. Schwarz. Internet advertising and the generalized second price auction: Selling billions of dollars worth of keywords. *American Economic Review*, 97(1):242–259, 2007.
7. E. D. Gould, B. P. Pashigian, and C. J. Prendergast. Contracts, externalities, and incentives in shopping malls. *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, 2005.
8. T. Groves. Incentives in teams. *Econometrica*, 41:617-631, 1973.
9. N. Immorlica, K. Jain, M. Mahdian, and K. Talwar. Click fraud resistant methods for learning click-through rates. *Workshop on Internet and Network Economics*, 2005.
10. S. Lahaie and D. M. Pennock. Revenue analysis of a family of ranking rules for keyword auctions. *ACM Conference on Electronic Commerce*, 2007.
11. S. Pandey and C. Olston. Handling advertisements of unknown quality in search advertising. *Neural Information Processing Systems Conference*, 2006.
12. A. C. Pigou. *Wealth and Welfare*. 1912.
13. T. Roughgarden and M. Sundararajan. Is efficiency expensive? *Third Workshop on Sponsored Search Auctions*, 2007.
14. B. Sandholm. Negative externalities and evolutionary implementation. *Review of Economic Studies*, 72:885–915, 2005.
15. H. R. Varian. Position auctions. *International Journal of Industrial Organization*, 2005.
16. W. Vickrey. Counterspeculation, auctions, and competitive sealed tenders. *Journal of Finance*, 16:8-37, 1961.