# Mechanism Design with Asymmetric Information: An Analysis of Incentive Compatibility and Efficiency.

LUORA SELYNE ATIENO[1], DR. YASIN GHABON[2]
[1, 2]*School of Business and Economics, Department of Economics, Private Bag, Maseno*

***Abstract- The theoretical underpinnings of incentive compatibility and efficiency are the main emphasis of this paper's formal investigation of mechanism design in the context of asymmetric information. In particular, we investigate a static Bayesian principal-agent model where a risk-neutral principal creates a method to extract personal data from a risk-neutral participant. By applying the Revelation Principle, we reduce the study without sacrificing generality by focusing just on direct revelation methods. Using the envelope theorem, we get the necessary and sufficient criteria for incentive compatibility and describe the structure of optimum mechanisms that strike a balance between informational rents and efficiency. Our model demonstrates a basic trade-off between the goal of the principal and the agent's requirement for involvement and honest disclosure. We also analyze the impact of individual rationality limitations on the allocation and transfer rules. Our findings' practical importance is demonstrated by applications to digital platforms, regulatory policy, and auction design. By providing thorough mathematical analysis and lucid economic intuition, this study adds to the body of literature on economic design. Additionally, it offers a basis for investigating increasingly intricate dynamic and multi-agent environments, where asymmetric knowledge adds more strategic factors. The findings have wide-ranging effects on creating strong, honest, and effective institutions.***

## I. INTRODUCTION

A fundamental component of contemporary microeconomic theory, mechanism design provides a reverse-engineering approach to economic systems in which institutions are constructed to produce desired results in spite of private information. Mechanism design begins with desired results and works backward to identify the institutional arrangements that can achieve them, in contrast to standard economic analysis, which starts with institutions and deduces outcomes. It is frequently referred to as the "engineering" side of economics in this way.

Asymmetric information presents the main design problem for mechanisms. When people have access to confidential information, such as a buyer's appraisal, a seller's cost, or a regulator's incapacity to monitor quality, agents may act strategically in ways that skew efficient results. Classic economic difficulties like moral hazard, adverse selection, and hold-up issues result from this. In order to deal with these conflicts, economists have created formal models that describe what may be accomplished in equilibrium when agents are self-interested and well-informed.

In this field, one of the major accomplishments is the creation of incentive-compatible procedures, which are regulations that guarantee agents disclose their personal information honestly. The Revelation Principle is a potent simplification that enables researchers to concentrate just on direct mechanisms and asserts that any outcome that can be achieved by a mechanism can also be implemented by a direct mechanism in which agents honestly report their kinds.

This study uses a canonical principal-agent model to examine mechanism design. The principal aims to establish an effective resource allocation system according to the type of agent, which is kept secret. Both individual rationality restrictions and incentive compatibility must be considered by the principal when creating the ideal mechanism. Individual rationality guarantees that participation is voluntary, whereas incentive compatibility guarantees that the agent correctly reports their type. With the use of mathematical instruments like the envelope theorem and first-order conditions, we thoroughly examine these requirements and derive consequences for efficiency and implement ability.

It is frequently necessary to balance the informational rents paid to the agent against the efficiency of an allocation when information asymmetry is present. Many applications of mechanism design revolve around this conflict: in digital marketplaces, platform rules must protect engagement while eliciting truthful user data; in insurance markets, contracts must mitigate adverse selection while maintaining coverage; and in auctions, regulators must strike a balance between revenue maximization and market access.

In a Bayesian environment, we are especially interested in situations in which a private agent interacts with a single principal. In that they serve as the fundamental units for increasingly intricate multi-agent and dynamic systems, these models are fundamental. Even though our research starts with a static setup, the conclusions drawn from it are applicable to a variety of applications.

Historically, a number of ground-breaking contributions have shaped this field. Decentralized systems could be assessed according to their information and incentive structures, as demonstrated by Leonid Hurwitz (1972), who also codified the idea of incentive compatibility. Roger Myerson and Eric Maskin made additional advancements in the field. Myerson first proposed the concept of virtual valuations in his 1981 work on optimal auctions. Maskin also contributed to the formalization of implementation theory, which takes into account the wider circumstances in which social choice functions might be realized as equilibrium outcomes.

Computational limitations and changing types provide additional complexity in dynamic and algorithmic environments, where the theory has been expanded in recent years. Mechanism design has found useful uses in online marketplaces like Amazon and eBay, digital advertising auctions, and public policy areas like education, health care, and climate control. It is more crucial to comprehend and build systems that respect strategic behavior while accomplishing efficiency or policy objectives as the world becomes more data-driven.

This study addresses a central question in the field: under what conditions can a system involving people who hold private information promote sincere behavior and yield positive outcomes? Our objective is to use rigorous mathematical reasoning to illuminate the related trade-offs in order to arrive at a theoretically sound understanding of these situations. We work in this manner: The related literature is reviewed in Section 2. The model is introduced in Section 3, where the primitives, agent kinds, and information structure are outlined. The Revelation Principle is used in Section 4 to generate the primary theoretical results. Applications to optimum auctions and regulatory mechanisms are examined in Section 5. Our findings' policy significance is covered in Section 6, and Section 7 wraps up.

## II. LITERATURE REVIEW

The discipline of mechanism design was founded by Leonid Hurwicz (1972), who established the formal study of how rules and institutions might be set up to accomplish specific goals when players have access to private information. By creating the idea of incentive compatibility, a fundamental component of contemporary information economics, Hurwicz set the stage.

In order to create the formal framework of contemporary mechanism design, Eric Maskin and Roger Myerson built upon these concepts. A framework for creating revenue-maximizing auctions under private knowledge was presented in Myerson's (1981) groundbreaking paper on optimal auction design, which also introduced the idea of virtual valuations. Through his work, a thorough process for determining allocation and payment criteria that support behavior that is compatible with incentives was devised. Maskin investigated the circumstances in which social choice functions could be implemented with co-authors like Riley, resulting under the renowned implementation theory.

To address contract design with asymmetric information, the principal-agent literature developed concurrently. While Grossman and Hart (1983) addressed adverse selection, Holmström (1979) examined moral hazard issues. Together, their contributions established the groundwork for contemporary contract theory and highlighted the influence of information restrictions in forming ideal contracts.

The use of mechanism design ideas in public policy and market design saw a boom in the 1990s and early 2000s. In 1993, Laffont and Tirole made significant contributions to the regulation of public service delivery and monopolies. Mechanism design has lately been used in blockchain-based governance systems, digital platforms, spectrum auctions, and matching marketplaces (such as kidney and school choice exchanges). These days, algorithms carry out procedures in real time, frequently while adhering to privacy or computational restrictions.

This paper adds to the theoretical literature by focusing on Bayesian mechanism design in a single-agent setting and deriving necessary and sufficient conditions for incentive compatibility and individual rationality. The results here synthesize classical and modern approaches to illuminate the fundamental trade-offs inherent in designing mechanisms under asymmetric information. Recent research continues to push the boundaries of mechanism design; dynamic mechanisms, like those studied by Pavan, Segal, and Toikka (2014), consider environments where agents' types evolve over time; and multi-agent settings, like those analyzed in team incentive problems or public good provision, add layers of complexity involving collusion or interdependence of types.

## III. MODEL AND ASSUMPTIONS

We look at a static Bayesian principal-agent model that has one risk-neutral agent and one risk-neutral principal. The agent has access to confidential information about their kind, which influences the cost or desirability of particular outcomes. A mechanism that performs an efficient allocation and elicits truthful admission of the agent's type is the principal's goal.

### 3.1 Economic Environment

Let $\theta \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ represent the set of potential agent types, and let $\theta \in \Theta$ represent the agent's personal data. A known cumulative distribution function $F(\theta)$ with a strictly positive density $f(\theta) > 0$ on $\Theta$ is used to determine the agent's type $\theta$. Only the agent is aware of the types, which are dispersed separately and identically.

The principal provides a mechanism $M = (x(\cdot), t(\cdot))$, in which $t(\theta)$ is the transfer (payment) from the agent to the principal, and $x(\theta)$ is the allocation rule, signifying the good or service rendered or the action performed.

$U(\theta) = v(x(\theta), \theta) - t(\theta)$, where $v(x, \theta)$ is growing in x and $\theta$, represents the agent's quasi-linear utility in money. The formula $\Pi(\theta) = t(\theta) - c(x(\theta))$, where $c(x)$ is the cost of giving the allocation x, provides the principal's utility.

### 3.2 Direct Revelation Mechanisms and the Revelation Principle

The Revelation Principle allows us to restrict attention to direct mechanisms in which the agent directly reports their type $\theta'$ to the principal. The principal then chooses $x(\theta')$ and $t(\theta')$ accordingly. The mechanism is incentive compatible if truth-telling is a Bayesian-Nash equilibrium: $\theta \in$ argmax_{$\theta'$} $[v(x(\theta'), \theta) - t(\theta')]$.

### 3.3 Incentive Compatibility and the Envelope Theorem

To ensure incentive compatibility, the mechanism must satisfy the first-order incentive compatibility condition. Under differentiability and the single-crossing condition ($\partial^2 v / \partial x \partial\theta > 0$), the agent's utility $U(\theta)$ satisfies the envelope formula: $dU(\theta)/d\theta = \partial v(x(\theta), \theta)/\partial\theta$. This implies that the utility function $U(\theta)$ is strictly increasing if $\partial v / \partial\theta > 0$.

### 3.4 Individual Rationality (Participation Constraint)

The agent must prefer participation in the mechanism to opting out. If the outside option yields utility $\bar{U}$, the individual rationality constraint is: $U(\theta) \geq \bar{U}, \forall\ \theta \in \Theta$. This typically binds at the lowest type $\underline{\theta}$, i.e., $U(\underline{\theta}) = \bar{U}$.

### 3.5 Assumptions Summary

1. Risk Neutrality: Both principal and agent are risk-neutral.
2. Quasi-linear Preferences: Agent's utility is linear in money.
3. Single-Dimensional Type: The agent's type $\theta$ is one-dimensional.
4. Monotonicity: The value function $v(x, \theta)$ is strictly increasing in x and $\theta$.
5. Single-Crossing Condition: $\partial^2 v / \partial x \partial\theta > 0$ to ensure implementability.
6. Full Support: The type distribution $f(\theta) > 0$ for all $\theta \in \Theta$.
7. Differentiability: All relevant functions are continuously differentiable.

These assumptions are standard in the mechanism design literature and allow for tractable derivation of the optimal mechanism in subsequent sections.

## IV. APPLICATIONS OF MECHANISM DESIGN WITH ASYMMETRIC INFORMATION

In many different disciplines, especially those where decision-making is influenced by private knowledge, the idea of mechanism design has wide-ranging applications, particularly where asymmetric information is present. We look at several important real-world situations in this section where the theory of mechanism design's insights are applied or can greatly enhance results.

### 5.1 Auction Design

Among the most well-known uses of mechanism design is in auction design. Auctions serve as a means of allocating commodities or services in markets with a large number of buyers and sellers, when confidential information about costs, preferences, or valuations is essential. A key component of auction design is the theory of incentive compatibility, especially in marketplaces where bidders have their own private estimates of the items up for auction. As an illustration: Auctions for Spectrum Governments selling radio frequency bands to telecom firms through spectrum auctions are a prominent example. The value that each bidder places on the spectrum is confidential and is determined by their infrastructure, the need for data services, and the anticipated revenue from spectrum deployment.

These situations frequently involve the use of Myerson's optimal auction theory's theoretical findings. Auction designers can determine the allocation and payment criteria that optimize societal welfare while guaranteeing honest bids with the use of Myerson's virtual values. Keeping bidders from manipulating the auction by placing bids that are inconsistent with their actual worth on the spectrum is a major difficulty.

Mechanisms must be created in the context of spectrum auctions to encourage bidders to honestly disclose their genuine valuations, especially in situations when they could be tempted to minimize their bids in an effort to pay less for the spectrum. Through careful auction rule structure (e.g., Vickrey or second-price auctions), regulators can optimize government income and enhance market efficiency while guaranteeing honest bidders.

### 5.2 Regulatory Design

Governments and regulators must create systems that elicit honest information from businesses, consumers, or other stakeholders in a variety of regulatory contexts, including public utilities, environmental laws, and healthcare, while guaranteeing that the results are both effective and fair.
As an illustration, Rules pertaining to the environment Examine the example of cap-and-trade schemes intended to control pollution emissions. Companies in these markets have confidential knowledge about how much it costs to cut emissions, and the regulator must create a system that incentivizes companies to disclose this information honestly while still allocating pollution allowances effectively.

In this case, incentive compatibility is crucial. In order to engage in the system in a way that minimizes the overall cost of decreasing emissions, the regulator must make sure that businesses disclose their expenses honestly. Allowing businesses to understate their expenses could lead to inefficient allowance distribution by the regulator, raising societal costs overall.

Regulators can set up the system to encourage enterprises to disclose their costs honestly by using mechanism design. For example, pollution permits can be distributed through a uniform price auction for emission allowances. To achieve an efficient market outcome, the mechanism design in this context makes sure that enterprises have an incentive to report their cost structures honestly in order to earn a fair allocation of allowances.

5.3 Matching Markets

Matching markets represent yet another significant mechanism design theory application. There are two different participant groups in these marketplaces, each with their own private preferences. The objective is to match members of each group in a way that respects these interests while still being efficient. Kidney exchange programs, labor market matching, and school choice programs are a few examples.

School Choice, for instance. Think of a school system that must assign kids to seats in public schools. In addition to each school having a restricted capacity and a set of preferences for which students they would like to enroll, each student has a private preference ranking among the available schools. In order to ensure that students and schools accurately report their preferences, the system must be created to distribute school seats in an efficient and fair manner.

Compatibility of incentives guarantees that students accurately report their school preferences in this context, and efficiency guarantees that, given the limitations, the distribution of school placements promotes overall happiness. The Deferred Acceptance Algorithm, which was first created by Gale and Shapley in 1962 and subsequently expanded to accommodate a variety of matching markets, including kidney exchange programs and college admissions, is a well-known example of mechanism design in this context.

This algorithm is an illustration of a system that ensures strategy-proofness (no participant can profit from lying about their preferences) and Pareto efficiency (no one can be made better off without making someone else worse off). In situations when several parties need to be matched according to their individual preferences, the process aids in achieving effective and equitable results by guaranteeing these qualities.

5.4 Digital Platforms and Online Marketplaces

The use of mechanism design in online platforms and markets has grown in importance as digital technologies have advanced. In order to facilitate transactions between buyers and sellers or between customers and service providers, platforms like eBay, Amazon, Google AdWords, and Uber rely on intricate systems, all of which may hold private information that affects their choices.

Google Ad Auctions, for instance Google AdWords, an advertising auction, is one of the most well-known examples of a mechanism design application. Advertisers put bids to be displayed in Google's search results, and the system decides which ads are displayed and how much each click costs. Advertisers possess confidential data regarding the cost of a click and their financial limitations. To encourage advertisers to bid honestly and disclose the actual value they set on a click, the mechanism must be created. Allowing advertisers to understate their valuations could result in inefficient ad placement allocation on the site, which would reduce revenue and negatively impact user experience.

The foundation of Google's auction system is the Vickrey-Clarke-Groves (VCG) auction, a well-known outcome of mechanism design that guarantees honest bidding even when private valuations are present. In a VCG auction, the second-highest bid determines the winner, and the payment is also equal to the second-highest bid. In order to achieve an effective allocation of advertisements and maximize the overall surplus, this guarantees that each participant's best course of action is to bid their genuine value.

5.5 Blockchain-Based Governance Systems

Numerous industries, such as distributed autonomous organizations (DAOs), cryptocurrency exchanges, and decentralized finance (DeFi), are seeing an increase in the use of blockchain technology and decentralized systems. In order to encourage players to behave in the network's best interests while preserving openness and equity, mechanism design can be used to create consensus protocols, voting procedures, and governance mechanisms. DAOs, or decentralized autonomous organizations, are one example. Voters in DAOs make choices about protocol updates and fund distributions. Designing a voting system that allows token holders to participate in decision-making and vote honestly in spite of their personal preferences and varying assessments of possible outcomes is the difficult aspect of this process.

Creating a voting rule that encourages participants to cast their ballots in accordance with their actual preferences is known as incentive compatibility. DAOs can better represent participant preferences by structuring voting rights, for example, using convex hull voting or quadratic voting. This ensures that decisions are taken in a way that promotes societal utility and coincides with the interests of token holders as a whole.

### 5.6 Implications and Future Research Directions

- The aforementioned applications show how far-reaching mechanism design is in both conventional marketplaces and contemporary technological platforms. Even though the field has advanced, there are still a number of unanswered questions and potential study topics:
- In what ways can the design of mechanisms incorporate machine learning approaches to enhance dynamic, real-time decision-making in platforms such as digital advertising or auction systems?
- In settings like online marketplaces and blockchain administration, how can privacy issues be taken into account when designing mechanisms?
- How can asymmetric knowledge and strategic conduct affect more intricate situations with several agents, like group incentive issues or the provision of public goods?

These queries demonstrate mechanism design theory's ongoing significance as well as its potential for practical use in a variety of fields and sectors.

## V. POLICY IMPLICATIONS OF MECHANISM DESIGN WITH ASYMMETRIC INFORMATION

Policy-making is significantly impacted by mechanism design theory, especially when asymmetric knowledge is present. It offers guidance on how to set up markets, laws, and institutions to produce socially acceptable results—even when participants have access to private information that could skew the results. Policymakers can design systems that match individual incentives with group objectives by utilizing the concepts of incentive compatibility, efficiency, and information revelation. This section examines the theory of mechanism design's policy implications, emphasizing how it might help build more just and efficient economic systems. In areas like public regulation, healthcare, education, environmental policy, and digital platforms, the application of mechanism design tools is crucial to accomplishing policy goals.

### 6.1 Designing Efficient Regulatory Policies

Balancing the interests of the public and private companies is a common task for regulatory regulation. Businesses typically have access to confidential data about their expenses, competencies, and internal procedures, and they may be motivated to conceal or alter this data. By guaranteeing honest reporting and effective business practices, mechanism design offers the means to develop policies that produce socially optimal results.

Example: Cap-and-Trade Systems for Environmental Regulation

Cap-and-trade schemes are frequently employed in environmental policy to reduce pollution. Businesses are given pollution allowances under these schemes, which they can exchange with one another. Because businesses with lower costs are more likely to sell allowances, while businesses with higher costs can try to manipulate the system by underreporting their emissions, it is difficult to ensure that businesses disclose their full costs of decreasing emissions.

Policymakers can create cap-and-trade schemes that incentivize companies to disclose their costs honestly by implementing incentive-compatible methods. This guarantees that emissions reductions take place in areas where they are most economical. Myerson's virtual valuation approach, for instance, can be used to create auction systems for permit allocation that optimize overall welfare while guaranteeing that businesses' confidential information on their emission reduction expenses is disclosed honestly. Policy Implication: By providing incentives for businesses to reveal truthful information and make economical choices regarding pollution control, mechanism design provides instruments for enhancing the effectiveness of environmental legislation. This strategy can be used to various regulatory contexts, such regulating utility prices or deciding how to provide public services in the face of uncertainty.

6.2 Designing Public Service Provision and Welfare Systems

Particularly in sectors like healthcare, education, and welfare systems, where people or organizations hold private information that influences the best use of resources, mechanism design can be crucial to the delivery of public services.

Example: Health Care Rationing and Insurance

The distribution of medical resources in the healthcare industry frequently hinges on people's private health information. Insurance firms, for instance, have to choose how to distribute coverage while making sure that applicants disclose their actual health status. It can result in adverse selection, where high-risk persons are overrepresented in the insurance pool, making insurance more costly and less effective, if people are encouraged to conceal their medical issues in order to obtain lower insurance rates. Mechanism design proposes drafting insurance contracts that encourage people to disclose their health information honestly in order to combat this, for example, by offering differentiating prices.

or premiums subject to risk. Through incentive-aligned pricing and coverage alternatives, policymakers can create effective health care systems that offer fair coverage while lowering the possibility of moral hazard and adverse selection. Implication for Policy: Mechanism design ensures that people provide their genuine information and that the system distributes resources efficiently, which helps develop policies that increase the effectiveness and equity of public service delivery, particularly in industries like healthcare.

6.3 Designing Education and School Choice Systems

There are difficulties in motivating families and schools to take actions that enhance educational results because of the way educational systems are designed, especially when it comes to school choice. Families usually have confidential information on their preferences for various schools under school choice systems, while schools may have preferences for the pupils they accept.

Example: School Choice Mechanisms

The ideas of mechanism design have been used in the development of school choice systems to guarantee that students are matched with schools in a fair and effective manner. One such technique is the Deferred Acceptance Algorithm (DAA), created by Gale and Shapley in 1962 and used extensively in real-world applications. Students rank schools according to their criteria (e.g., test scores, location, etc.) while schools rank students according to their listed preferences.

In order to prevent students from lying about their preferences and skewing the matching process, the DAA makes sure that students are paired with schools according to their genuine preferences. As a result, no student can be matched to a better school without another student being matched to a worse school, a situation known as Pareto efficiency. Policy Implication: By using mechanism design theory, policymakers can allocate educational opportunities more effectively and make sure that students and schools are matched in a way that maximizes equity and overall satisfaction. Scholarship distribution, college entrance procedures, and other educational resources might all be included in this.

6.4 Promoting Efficient Market Design and Digital Platforms

As the digital economy grows, it is essential to create effective online marketplaces and platforms that can manage vast volumes of personal data. In order to connect buyers and sellers, service providers and consumers, while handling the private preferences and private information of participants, platforms like eBay, Amazon, Uber, and Google AdWords rely on auctions and other market mechanisms. Google Ad Auctions, for instance Each advertiser receives confidential information about the value they place on each click when they bid for positions in search engine results through Google AdWords. The Vickrey-Clarke-Groves (VCG) auction theory is the basis for Google's auction system, which ensures that advertisers bid honestly. The highest bidder wins the auction, but the price paid is the second-highest bid. In order to get an efficient result in the ad allocation process, this approach encourages bidders to disclose their actual click value.

Policy Implication: By making sure that market participants are motivated to behave honestly and effectively, mechanism design can enhance the operation of digital platforms. Better user experiences, improved social welfare, and more effective pricing are all possible outcomes of this. In order to prevent platforms from unfairly using users' private information for their own gain, policymakers can also employ these principles to address privacy and data protection concerns.

6.5 Addressing Information Asymmetry in Political Systems

Applications of mechanism design can also be found in political systems, specifically in the creation of voting procedures, public decision-making processes, and political campaigns. Private information held by political agents (voters, politicians, and parties) frequently has the potential to skew election results or policy choices. Designing mechanisms makes it possible for political processes to match the interests of the public with the motivations of political actors.

Example: Voting Mechanisms and Electoral Systems

Individual preferences' representation in group decision-making can be influenced by voting system design in democratic elections. Even though voters may be motivated to falsify their choices in order to obtain a tactical edge, voting procedures such as proportional representation or quadratic voting can be employed to guarantee that votes accurately reflect their preferences.

In order to avoid strategic manipulation and promote honest campaign pledges, incentive-compatible procedures might be created for political campaigns. When it comes to the provision of public goods, such as infrastructure projects, health care, or education, governments can employ tools like the Clarke-Groves mechanisms to persuade voters to honestly express their choices. Policy Implications: Designing mechanisms that balance the interests of the public and political actors can result in more open, effective, and equitable political processes. It can be used with governance structures that aim to encourage inclusive and democratic decision-making as well.

6.6 Future Research Directions in Policy Design

Even with the progress gained in extending mechanism design to different policy domains, there are still many obstacles to overcome, especially when considering dynamic environments, multi-agent systems, and privacy issues. Potential avenues for future investigation include:

- Dynamic Mechanism Design: How to design systems that adapt over time, especially in markets and platforms where participants' information or preferences evolve.
- Privacy-Preserving Mechanisms: How to design mechanisms that respect the privacy of participants while still achieving efficient outcomes (e.g., using differential privacy in auctions or voting systems).
- Multi-Agent Coordination: How to design mechanisms that ensure efficient cooperation among multiple agents, such as in collective bargaining or public goods provision.

## CONCLUSION

In modern economics, the study of mechanism design under asymmetric information has had significant theoretical and practical ramifications, especially in the creation of incentive-compatible and efficient organizations. In order to better understand the constraints and potential for attaining socially desired outcomes despite informational frictions, mechanism design focuses on the interactions of agents with private information inside an economic system. With an emphasis on incentive compatibility, individual rationality, and efficiency, this work has investigated the theoretical foundations of mechanism design and its applications in a range of real-world contexts, from digital platforms to public regulation.

The fundamental trade-offs that policymakers and institution designers must make are highlighted in this paper's main results. Creating mechanisms that encourage honest behavior, such insurance contracts, public goods provision, or auctions, frequently necessitates paying agents for their informational rents, which can lower total efficiency. However, these systems are required to match public welfare objectives with private incentives. The optimal contract or auction design is an example of how efficiency and honesty clash, highlighting the difficulty of making decisions in the actual world.

In terms of theoretical contribution, this study expands on the knowledge of how individual rationality and incentive compatibility influence the design of optimum mechanisms in the face of asymmetric information, building on the traditional principal-agent models. By putting these ideas into mathematical form and determining the requirements for telling the truth, the study highlights how crucial it is to create institutions that can manage strategic behavior while producing favorable social and economic results.

## REFERENCES

[1] Holmström, B. (1979). Moral hazard and observability. *The Bell Journal of Economics*, 10(1), 74-91.

[2] Hurwicz, L. (1972). On informationally decentralized systems. *Decision and Organization*, 297–336.

[3] Maskin, E., & Riley, J. (1984). Optimal auctions with risk averse buyers. *Econometrica*, 52(6), 1473–1518.

[4] Myerson, R. B. (1981). Optimal auction design. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 6(1), 58–73.

[5] Grossman, S., & Hart, O. (1983). An analysis of the principal-agent problem. *Econometrica*, 51(1), 7–45.