Question 1 (P6.7)

Note that the risk neutral case for this problem was covered in Chapter 4 Exercises.

(*a*)   Rex with $u(x) = 1 - e^{\frac{-x}{5000}}$, satisfies the delta property.

*i.* Base Decision model:

- Expected Utility at A = 0.048771
- Certainty Equivalent = $u^{-1}(0.048771) = \$250.00$

ii. Decision model with clairvoyance on D before making decision A.


- Expected Utility of free clairvoyance on D before A = 0.057702
- Certainty Equivalent = $u^{-1}(0.057702) = \$297.17$
- Therefore, Value of clairvoyance on D before A = \$ 297.17 – 250.00 = \$47.17

Simplified decision model without 0-1 probability chance node.

iii.   Decision model with clairvoyance on D before decision C but after decision A.

- Expected Utility of free clairvoyance on D before decision C but after A = 0.048771
- Certainty Equivalent = u^{-1} (0.048771) = \$250.00
- Therefore, the Value of clairvoyance on D before C but after decision A = \$250 - \$250
  = \$ 0

The value of clairvoyance is zero because Rex will make exactly the same decisions here as he did without any information, i.e., the optimal decision policy is the same, with and without information. Hence the value of information is ZERO.

Simplified decision model without 0-1 probability chance node.

iv. Decision model with free clairvoyance on *B* before decision *A*.

- Expected Utility of free clairvoyance on *B* before making decision *A* = 0.050194
- Certainty Equivalent = $u^{-1}(0.050194)$ = $257.49
- Hence, the most Jeanne would pay for clairvoyance on *B* before *A* is $257.49 – $250.00 = $7.49.

Simplified decision model without 0-1 probability nodes:

	x	$u(x)$

(Decision tree values:)

- 0.050194 (node B)
- 0.053515 (node A, upper) — $275 → 0.053515; $250 → 0.048771
- 0.3 branch, 0.7 branch
- 0.046029 (node D, node C) — 0.5 → $375 → 0.072257; 0.5 → $100 → 0.019801
- $107 → 0.021173
- 0.048771 (lower node A) — $250 → 0.048771

(b)   Paulina utility function is $u(w) = \dfrac{w^2}{10000}$, and her current wealth is $1,000.

Note that Paulina does not follow the delta property as her utility function is neither exponential nor linear. Hence we need to consider Paulina's wealth in the analysis.

i.   Base Decision Model:

	x	$w_0 + x$	$u(w_0 + x)$
	$275	1275	162.6
	$375	1375	189.1
	$100	1100	121.0
	$107	1107	122.5
	$250	1250	156.3

(Decision tree values: 157.3 at A; 157.3 at B; 162.6; 0.3; 0.7; 155.1 at D; 0.5 / 0.5; 122.5 at C; 156.3)

- Maximum Expected Wealth Utility = 157.3.
- Wealth Certainty Equivalent = $u^{-1}(157.3) = \$\,1,254.30$.
- Certainty Equivalent for decision A is $\$\,1,254.30 – \$1,000 = \$\,254.30$.

ii. Decision model if Paulina pays $15 for clairvoyance on *D* before making decision *A*:

	x	$w_0 - 15 + x$	$u(w_0 - 15 + x)$

Decision tree:

- *D* node at value **164.8**, branches 0.5 (top) and 0.5 (bottom)

Top branch (0.5): *A* node value 177.1
- *B* node value 177.1, probabilities 0.3 and 0.7
  - 0.3 → 158.8 → $275, 1260, 158.8
  - 0.7 → *C* node value 158.0
    - 158.0 → $375, 1360, 158.0
    - → $107, 1092, 119.2
- 152.5 → $250, 1235, 152.5

Bottom branch (0.5): *A* node value 152.5
- *B* node value 131.1, probabilities 0.3 and 0.7
  - 0.3 → 158.8 → $275, 1260, 158.8
  - 0.7 → *C* node value 119.2
    - 117.7 → $100, 1085, 117.7
   - 119.2 → $107, 1092, 119.2
- 152.5 → $250, 1235, 152.5

- Expected utility when Paulina pays $15 for clairvoyance on *D* before making decision *A* = 164.8
- Expected utility without information = 157.3 < 164.8
- Hence, Paulina should pay $15 for clairvoyance on *D*.

Note that Paulina does not satisfy the delta property. Therefore, we cannot use the "CE with free clairvoyance – CE no clairvoyance" method to compute her value of clairvoyance for any of the uncertain variables.

Question 2 (P6.8)

(*a*)   Stan is risk neutral with initial wealth = $20.

Deal *A*: 0.5 → $15, 0.5 → -$9

Deal *B*: 0.5 → $25, 0.5 → -$10

i.   Stan's certainty equivalent for Deal A = $(0.5)(15) + (0.5)(-9) = \$3$
Since the certainty equivalent > $0, Stan should accept Deal A.

ii.   Stan's certainty equivalent for Deal B = $(0.5)(25) + (0.5)(-10) = \$7.50$.
Yes, Stan should accept Deal B also since its certainty equivalent > $0.

iii.   If Deals A and B are bundled, the situation appears as follows:

Deal *A+B*:
- 15 + 25 = $40
- 15 - 10 = $5
- -9 + 25 = $16
- -9 - 10 = -$19

Stan's certainty equivalent for the bundle = $(0.25)(40 + 5 + 16 - 19) = \$10.50$

Note that this is exactly $\text{CE}(A) + \text{CE}(B) = \$3.00 + \$7.50 = \$10.50$ (See P6.3 for the general case with delta property).

(b) Burke: $u(w)=ln(w)$, where w is total wealth. Initial wealth $w_o = \$20$.

i. Burke is offered Deal A:

Deal A	w_o+x	$ln(w_o+x)$

$$0.5 \quad 20+15=\$35 \qquad 3.55534$$
$$0.5 \quad 20-9=\$11 \qquad 2.3979$$

Expected utility for Deal A = $(0.5)\,ln(35) + (0.5)\,ln(11) = 2.9766$
Wealth CE for $A = u^{-1}(2.9766) = exp(2.9766) = \$19.62$
CE for A = Wealth CE – Initial wealth = $\$19.62 – \$20.00 = –\$0.38 < 0$
Since the Certainty Equivalent of $A < 0$, Burke should **not** accept Deal A.

ii. Burke is offered Deal B:

Deal B	w_o+x	$ln(w_o+x)$

$$0.5 \quad 20+25=\$45 \qquad 3.80666$$
$$0.5 \quad 20-10=\$10 \qquad 2.30259$$

Expected wealth utility for Deal B = $(0.5)\,ln(45) + (0.5)\,ln(10) = 3.0546$
Wealth CE for $B = u^{-1}(3.0546) = exp(3.0546) = \$21.21$
CE for A = Wealth CE - Initial wealth = $\$21.21 – \$20.00 = \$1.21 > 0$
Since the Certainty Equivalent of $B > 0$, Burke should accept Deal B.

iii. If Deals A and B are bundled, the situation appears as follows:

Deal $A+B$	w_o+x

$$0.5 \quad 0.5 \quad 15+25+20 = \$60$$
$$0.5 \quad 15-10+20 = \$25$$
$$0.5 \quad 0.5 \quad -9+25+20 = \$36$$
$$0.5 \quad -9-10+20 = \$1$$

Expected Wealth Utility for bundle $A+B$ = $(0.25)(ln(60) + ln(25) + ln(36) + ln(1)) = 2.724$
Wealth CE for bundle = $exp\,(2.724) = \$15.24$
CE for bundle = $\$15.24 – \$20.00 = –\$4.76 < 0$
Therefore Burke should not accept the bundled deal.

(c) For Stan (risk neutral $\Rightarrow$ delta property), CE(A) + CE(B) = CE($A+B$).
For Burke (non delta property), CE(A) + CE(B) $\neq$ CE($A+B$).

Question 3 (P6.9)

Kay utility function is $u(x) = 2 - 9^{\frac{-x}{1000}} \Rightarrow$ Delta property.

$$\underline{x} \qquad \underline{u(x)}$$

```
                                      B up
                                    0.9          $600      1.7324
                         A up    ⭕
                    0.4  1.56845   0.1  B down
                                               -$300      0.0668
              0.50591
                      ⭕                    B up
               Invest                   0.1          $500      1.6667
                    0.6   A down    ⭕
      0.50591 ⬜        -0.20071  0.9  B down
                                               -$400     -0.4082

              Do not invest
                                               $0         1
          1
```

(a) Expected utility for "Invest" = 0.50591

Expected utility for "Do not invest" = 1

(b) Expected dollar value for "Invest"
= (0.4)(0.9 × 600 + 0.1 × -300) + (0.6)(0.1 × 500 + 0.9 × –400) = $18.

Expected dollar value for "Do not invest" = $0.

(c) Since EU(Do not invest) $> EU$(Invest), Kay's best decision is "Do not invest"
Certainty Equivalent = $0.

(d) We use the answers found in part (*a*) and not part (*b*) because Kay is not risk neutral (even though she satisfies the delta property).

We have to compare expected utilities and not expected dollar values. It would be okay to use expected dollar values if Kay was risk neutral.

If we had used expected dollar values instead, we would have ignored Kay's risk attitude and may get a wrong answer since expected dollar values are not the same as the certainty equivalents.

(e) Since Kay satisfies the delta property, we can easily find her value of clairvoyance on A using the difference of CEs method.

Decision model with free clairvoyance on Stock A:

	$\underline{x}$	$\underline{u(x)}$

Decision tree labels (top to bottom):
- *B* up, 0.9 → $600, 1.7324
- Invest, 1.56584
- *B* down, 0.1 → -$300, 0.0668
- *A* up, 1.56584, 0.4
- Do not invest, 1 → $0, 1
- 1.22634
- *B* up, 0.1 → $500, 1.6667
- Invest, -0.2007
- 0.6, 1
- *B* down, 0.9 → -$400, -0.4082
- *A* down
- Do not invest, 1 → $0, 1

Expected Utility with free clairvoyance = 1.22634.

To find the certainty equivalent: $2 - 9^{-\frac{x}{1000}} = 1.22634 \Rightarrow x = \$116.8$

Certainty equivalent with free clairvoyance on A = \$116.80
Hence value of clairvoyance on A = \$116.80 – \$0 = \$116.80 > \$10.
Therefore Kay should pay \$10 for clairvoyance on A.

(f) Decision model with free clairvoyance on Stock B:

	$\underline{x}$	$\underline{u(x)}$

Decision tree labels (top to bottom):
- *A* up, 6/7 → $600, 1.7324
- Invest, 1.7230
- *A* down, 1/7 → $500, 1.6667
- *B* up, 1.7230, 0.42
- Do not invest, 1 → $0, 1
- 1.30366
- *A* up, 2/29 → -$300, 0.0668
- Invest, -0.3754
- 0.58, 1
- *A* down, 27/29 → -$400, -0.4082
- *B* down
- Do not invest, 1 → $0, 1

Expected utility with free clairvoyance on B = 1.30366

$2 - 9^{-\frac{x}{1000}} = 1.30366 \Rightarrow x = \$164.71$

Certainty equivalent with free clairvoyance on B = \$164.71

Hence value of clairvoyance on B = \$164.71 – \$0 = \$164.71 > \$10.
Therefore Kay should pay \$10 for clairvoyance on B.

(g)   Decision model with free joint clairvoyance on Stock *A* & Stock *B*:

	x	$u(x)$
Invest	$600	1.7324
Do not invest	$0	1
Invest	-$300	0.0668
Do not invest	$0	1
Invest	$500	1.6667
Do not invest	$0	1
Invest	-$400	-0.4082
Do not invest	$0	1

Expected utility with free clairvoyance on both *A* and *B* = 1.30366

Certainty Equivalent with free clairvoyance on both *A* and *B* = u^{-1} (1.30366) = $164.71

Kay's value of clairvoyance on *A* and *B* together = $164.71 –$ 0 = $164.71.

Question 4 (P6.10)

Daniel: $u(w) = \begin{cases} w+10, & w \geq 0 \\ 6w+10, & w < 0 \end{cases}$, where w is total assets in dollars. $w_o =$ \$20.

Mad Dog: $u(x) = 2^{\frac{x}{50}}$; $w_o =$ \$75. Note that Mad Dog has the delta property.

(a) Daniel's expected wealth utility
$$= (0.7)\, u(80 + 20) + (0.3)\, u(-40 + 20)$$
$$= (0.7)\, u(100) + (0.3)\, u(-20)$$
$$= (0.7)\,(110) + (0.3)(-110) = 44$$

Wealth Certainty Equivalent = 44 – 10 = \$34.00

Daniel's Certainty Equivalent for deal = \$34.00 – \$20.00 = \$14.00

(b) Daniel personal indifferent selling price is \$14.00

We need to compute Mad Dog personal indifferent buying price. Since Mad Dog has exponential utility curve, he satisfies the delta property.

Furthermore, personal indifferent buying price = personal indifferent selling price = certainty equivalent.

CE for Mad Dog
$$= u^{-1}\,(0.7\, u(80) + 0.3\, u(-40))$$
$$= u^{-1}\,(0.7\,(2\wedge(80/50)) + 0.3\,(2\wedge(-40/50)))$$
$$= u^{-1}\,(2.2943)$$
$$= \$59.90$$
$$= \text{Personal indifferent buying price for Mad Dog.}$$

Therefore, we can make a maximum of \$59.90 – \$14.00 = \$45.90 by buying the deal from Daniel and selling it to Mad Dog.