

Replication Data for “Improving the Organization of Knowledge in Production by Screening Problems”

Guilherme Carmona*

University of Surrey

Krittanaï Laohakunakorn[†]

University of Surrey

July 23, 2023

Contents

1	List of files	2
2	Codes for the small ξ case	2
3	Codes for intermediate values of ξ	3
3.1	Computations	3
3.1.1	$L = 1$	3
3.1.2	$L = 2$	3
3.1.3	$L = 3$	4
3.1.4	$L = 4$	5
3.2	Code description	7

*Address: University of Surrey, School of Economics, Guildford, GU2 7XH, UK; email: g.carmona@surrey.ac.uk.

[†]Address: University of Surrey, School of Economics, Guildford, GU2 7XH, UK; email: k.laohakunakorn@surrey.ac.uk.

1 List of files

We have provided the following files to allow replication of our numerical results in Sections 5.2, 5.3 and 5.5:

1. `org.py`
2. `hier.py`
3. `diff.py`
4. `orders.py`
5. `orgL2.py`
6. `orgL3.py`
7. `orgL4.py`
8. `orgLaux.py`
9. `orgL.py`
10. `orgLoptimal.py`
11. `orgLh.py`

2 Codes for the small ξ case

The following three codes are used for the computations in Section 5.2: First, `org.py` computes the optimal organization as a function of the parameters and `hier.py` computes the best hierarchy, also as a function of the parameters.¹ Then `diff.py` makes all the reported computations for the chosen parameter values.

¹Both of these codes use the built-in function `minimize`. We have tried replacing it in `org.py` with `basinhopping` and the results are virtually the same but the program takes far longer to run.

3 Codes for intermediate values of ξ

In this section, we describe the computational approach used in Sections 5.3 and 5.5.

3.1 Computations

We assume that $\pi = h$ and that $h < 1$. The former simplifies the expression for α_i for each $i \in L \setminus \{1\}$ since, by Lemma A.11, $\alpha_i = h(1 - F((\cup_{j < i} B_j) \setminus A_i))$. The latter then implies that $\alpha_i < 1$ and Lemma A.16 implies that $\alpha_i > 0$.

We use the approach described in Section A.10 to compute optimal organizations. In what follows, we describe the candidates for optimal organizations when the number of layers is L and $L \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$.

3.1.1 $L = 1$

The best organization with one layer does not depend on ξ , i.e. $B_1 \setminus A_1 = \emptyset$ always. In this case, $\mu_1 = \min \left\{ \max \left\{ \frac{a-c}{b}, 0 \right\}, 1 \right\}$ and $y_1 = F(\mu_1) - c\mu_1$.

3.1.2 $L = 2$

In this case, $\mathcal{C} = \{A_1, A_2, B_1 \setminus A_1\}$. Since $A_1 < C$ for each $C \in \mathcal{C}$, there are two possible orders:

1. $A_1 < A_2 < B_1 \setminus A_1$, and
2. $A_1 < B_1 \setminus A_1 < A_2$.

We let $\mu_0 = \mu(A_1)$, $\mu_1 = \mu(A_2)$ and $\mu_2 = \mu(B_1 \setminus A_1)$. In order 1, $A_1 = [0, \mu_0)$, $A_2 = [\mu_0, \mu_0 + \mu_1)$ and $B_1 \setminus A_1 = [\mu_0 + \mu_1, \mu_0 + \mu_1 + \mu_2)$. Hence, $\alpha_2 = h(1 - F(\mu_0) - F(\sum_{i=0}^2 \mu_i) + F(\mu_0 + \mu_1))$ and $y = (F(\mu_0 + \mu_1) - c\mu_0 - c\alpha_2\mu_1 - \xi\mu_2)/(1 + \alpha_2)$.

In order 2, $A_1 = [0, \mu_0)$, $B_1 \setminus A_1 = [\mu_0, \mu_0 + \mu_2)$ and $A_2 = [\mu_0 + \mu_2, \mu_0 + \mu_1 + \mu_2)$. Hence, $\alpha_2 = h(1 - F(\mu_0 + \mu_2))$ and $y = (F(\mu_0) + F(\sum_{i=0}^2 \mu_i) - F(\mu_0 + \mu_2) - c\mu_0 - c\alpha_2\mu_1 - \xi\mu_2)/(1 + \alpha_2)$.

3.1.3 $L = 3$

In this case, $\mathcal{C} = \{A_3 \cap (B_1 \setminus A_1), A_1, A_2, A_3 \cap (B_1 \setminus A_1)^c, (B_1 \setminus A_1) \cap A_3^c, B_2 \setminus A_2\}$. We have that $A_1 < C$ for each $C \in \mathcal{C} \setminus \{A_1\}$ and $A_2 < A_3 \cap (B_1 \setminus A_1)^c$ by Corollary 2. Moreover, Corollary 1 implies that $A_3 \cap (B_1 \setminus A_1) < A_3 \cap (B_1 \setminus A_1)^c$, $A_3 \cap (B_1 \setminus A_1) < (B_1 \setminus A_1) \cap A_3^c$, $(B_1 \setminus A_1) \cap A_3^c < B_2 \setminus A_2$ and $A_2 < B_2 \setminus A_2$.

When $L = 3$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} B_1 \setminus A_2 &= A_1 \cup (A_3 \cap (B_1 \setminus A_1)) \cup ((B_1 \setminus A_1) \cap A_3^c) \text{ and} \\ (B_1 \cup B_2) \setminus A_3 &= A_1 \cup ((B_1 \setminus A_1) \cap A_3^c) \cup A_2 \cup (B_2 \setminus A_2). \end{aligned}$$

Then:

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_2 &= h(1 - F(A_1) - F(A_3 \cap (B_1 \setminus A_1)) - F((B_1 \setminus A_1) \cap A_3^c)), \\ \alpha_3 &= h(1 - F(A_1) - F((B_1 \setminus A_1) \cap A_3^c) - F(A_2) - F(B_2 \setminus A_2)), \\ \gamma &= 1 + \alpha_2 + \alpha_3 \text{ and} \\ \theta &= F(A_1) + F(A_2) + F(A_3 \cap (B_1 \setminus A_1)) + F(A_3 \cap (B_1 \setminus A_1)^c) \\ &\quad - c\mu(A_1) - \xi\mu((B_1 \setminus A_1) \cap A_3^c) - c\alpha_2\mu(A_2) - \xi\alpha_2\mu(B_2 \setminus A_2) \\ &\quad - c\alpha_3\mu(A_3 \cap (B_1 \setminus A_1)^c) - (c\alpha_3 + \xi)\mu(A_3 \cap (B_1 \setminus A_1)). \end{aligned}$$

There are eight possible orders consistent with Corollaries 1 and 2:

1. $A_1 < A_3 \cap (B_1 \setminus A_1) < A_2 < A_3 \cap (B_1 \setminus A_1)^c < (B_1 \setminus A_1) \cap A_3^c < B_2 \setminus A_2$.
2. $A_1 < A_3 \cap (B_1 \setminus A_1) < A_2 < (B_1 \setminus A_1) \cap A_3^c < A_3 \cap (B_1 \setminus A_1)^c < B_2 \setminus A_2$.
3. $A_1 < A_3 \cap (B_1 \setminus A_1) < (B_1 \setminus A_1) \cap A_3^c < A_2 < A_3 \cap (B_1 \setminus A_1)^c < B_2 \setminus A_2$.
4. $A_1 < A_2 < A_3 \cap (B_1 \setminus A_1) < A_3 \cap (B_1 \setminus A_1)^c < (B_1 \setminus A_1) \cap A_3^c < B_2 \setminus A_2$.
5. $A_1 < A_2 < A_3 \cap (B_1 \setminus A_1) < (B_1 \setminus A_1) \cap A_3^c < A_3 \cap (B_1 \setminus A_1)^c < B_2 \setminus A_2$.
6. $A_1 < A_3 \cap (B_1 \setminus A_1) < A_2 < (B_1 \setminus A_1) \cap A_3^c < B_2 \setminus A_2 < A_3 \cap (B_1 \setminus A_1)^c$.
7. $A_1 < A_3 \cap (B_1 \setminus A_1) < (B_1 \setminus A_1) \cap A_3^c < A_2 < B_2 \setminus A_2 < A_3 \cap (B_1 \setminus A_1)^c$.
8. $A_1 < A_2 < A_3 \cap (B_1 \setminus A_1) < (B_1 \setminus A_1) \cap A_3^c < B_2 \setminus A_2 < A_3 \cap (B_1 \setminus A_1)^c$.

It turns out that, in fact, order 1 is the optimal one in all of our simulations.

3.1.4 $L = 4$

In this case, $\mathcal{C} = \{A_1, A_3 \cap (B_1 \setminus A_1), A_4 \cap (B_1 \setminus A_1), A_2, A_4 \cap (B_2 \setminus A_2), A_3 \cap (B_1 \setminus A_1)^c, A_4 \cap (B_1 \setminus A_1)^c \cap (B_2 \setminus A_2)^c, (B_1 \setminus A_1) \cap A_3^c \cap A_4^c, (B_2 \setminus A_2) \cap A_4^c, B_3 \setminus A_3\}$.

First, we rule out as many orders as we can. Corollaries 1 and 2 imply that:

1. $A_1 < C$ for each $C \in \mathcal{C} \setminus \{A_1\}$ (Corollary 2).
2. $A_3 \cap (B_1 \setminus A_1) < A_3 \cap (B_1 \setminus A_1)^c$ (Corollary 1).
3. $A_3 \cap (B_1 \setminus A_1) < (B_1 \setminus A_1) \cap A_3^c \cap A_4^c$ (Corollary 1).
4. $A_4 \cap (B_1 \setminus A_1) < A_4 \cap (B_2 \setminus A_2)$ (Corollary 2).
5. $A_4 \cap (B_1 \setminus A_1) < A_4 \cap (B_1 \setminus A_1)^c \cap (B_2 \setminus A_2)^c$ (Corollary 1).
6. $A_4 \cap (B_1 \setminus A_1) < (B_1 \setminus A_1) \cap A_3^c \cap A_4^c$ (Corollary 1).
7. $A_4 \cap (B_2 \setminus A_2) < A_4 \cap (B_1 \setminus A_1)^c \cap (B_2 \setminus A_2)^c$ (Corollary 1).
8. $A_4 \cap (B_2 \setminus A_2) < (B_2 \setminus A_2) \cap A_4^c$ (Corollary 1).
9. $A_2 < (B_2 \setminus A_2) \cap A_4^c$ (Corollary 1).
10. $A_3 \cap (B_1 \setminus A_1)^c < B_3 \setminus A_3$ (Corollary 1).
11. $(B_1 \setminus A_1) \cap A_3^c \cap A_4^c < (B_2 \setminus A_2) \cap A_4^c$ (Corollary 2).
12. $(B_1 \setminus A_1) \cap A_3^c \cap A_4^c < B_3 \setminus A_3$ (Corollary 2).
13. $A_2 < A_3 \cap (B_1 \setminus A_1)^c$ (Corollary 2).
14. $A_3 \cap (B_1 \setminus A_1)^c < A_4 \cap (B_1 \setminus A_1)^c \cap (B_2 \setminus A_2)^c$ (Corollary 2).
15. $(B_2 \setminus A_2) \cap A_4^c < B_3 \setminus A_3$ (Corollary 2).
16. $A_2 < A_4 \cap (B_2 \setminus A_2)$ (Corollary 2).

When $L = 4$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
B_1 \setminus A_2 &= (A_3 \cap (B_1 \setminus A_1)) \cup (A_4 \cap (B_1 \setminus A_1)) \\
&\cup ((B_1 \setminus A_1) \cap (A_3^c \cap A_4^c)) \cup A_1, \\
(B_1 \cup B_2) \setminus A_3 &= ((B_1 \setminus A_1) \cap A_4) \cup ((B_1 \setminus A_1) \cap (A_3^c \cap A_4^c)) \cup A_1 \\
&\cup (A_4 \cap (B_2 \setminus A_2)) \cup ((B_2 \setminus A_2) \cap A_4^c) \cup A_2, \text{ and} \\
(B_1 \cup B_2 \cup B_3) \setminus A_4 &= (A_3 \cap (B_1 \setminus A_1)) \cup ((B_1 \setminus A_1) \cap (A_3^c \cap A_4^c)) \cup A_1 \\
&\cup ((B_2 \setminus A_2) \cap A_4^c) \cup A_2 \cup (B_3 \setminus A_3) \cup (A_3 \cap (B_1 \setminus A_1)^c).
\end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned}
\alpha_2 &= h(1 - F(A_3 \cap (B_1 \setminus A_1)) - F(A_4 \cap (B_1 \setminus A_1)) \\
&\quad - F((B_1 \setminus A_1) \cap (A_3^c \cap A_4^c)) - F(A_1)), \\
\alpha_3 &= h(1 - F((B_1 \setminus A_1) \cap A_4) - F((B_1 \setminus A_1) \cap (A_3^c \cap A_4^c)) - F(A_1) \\
&\quad - F(A_4 \cap (B_2 \setminus A_2)) - F((B_2 \setminus A_2) \cap A_4^c) - F(A_2)), \text{ and} \\
\alpha_4 &= h(1 - F(A_3 \cap (B_1 \setminus A_1)) - F((B_1 \setminus A_1) \cap (A_3^c \cap A_4^c)) - F(A_1) \\
&\quad - F((B_2 \setminus A_2) \cap A_4^c) - F(A_2) - F(B_3 \setminus A_3) - F(A_3 \cap (B_1 \setminus A_1)^c)).
\end{aligned}$$

Also,

$$\begin{aligned}
\gamma &= 1 + \alpha_2 + \alpha_3 + \alpha_4 \text{ and} \\
\theta &= F(A_1) + F(A_3 \cap (B_1 \setminus A_1)) + F(A_4 \cap (B_1 \setminus A_1)) + F(A_2) \\
&\quad + F(A_4 \cap (B_2 \setminus A_2)) + F(A_3 \cap (B_1 \setminus A_1)^c) + F(A_4 \cap (B_1 \setminus A_1)^c \cap (B_2 \setminus A_2)^c) \\
&\quad - c\mu(A_1) - (c\alpha_3 + \xi)\mu(A_3 \cap (B_1 \setminus A_1)) - (c\alpha_4 + \xi)\mu(A_4 \cap (B_1 \setminus A_1)) \\
&\quad - c\alpha_2\mu(A_2) - (c\alpha_4 + \xi\alpha_2)\mu(A_4 \cap (B_2 \setminus A_2)) - c\alpha_3\mu(A_3 \cap (B_1 \setminus A_1)^c) \\
&\quad - c\alpha_4\mu(A_4 \cap (B_1 \setminus A_1)^c \cap (B_2 \setminus A_2)^c) - \xi\mu((B_1 \setminus A_1) \cap A_3^c \cap A_4^c) \\
&\quad - \xi\alpha_2\mu((B_2 \setminus A_2) \cap A_4^c) - \xi\alpha_3\mu(B_3 \setminus A_3).
\end{aligned}$$

We use `orders.py` to find all orders consistent with the above results; there are 192 in total which are listed in the code.

We note that as it was the case where $L = 3$, order 1, which is now

$$\begin{aligned} A_1 &< A_4 \cap (B_1 \setminus A_1) < A_3 \cap (B_1 \setminus A_1) < A_2 < A_3 \cap (B_1 \setminus A_1)^c < A_4 \cap (B_2 \setminus A_2) \\ &< A_4 \cap (B_1 \setminus A_1)^c \cap (B_2 \setminus A_2)^c < (B_1 \setminus A_1) \cap A_3^c \cap A_4^c < (B_2 \setminus A_2) \cap A_4^c < B_3 \setminus A_3, \end{aligned}$$

is optimal in all our simulations.

3.2 Code description

The starting point are the codes `orgL2.py`, `orgL3.py` and `orgL4.py`, each of which computes the optimal organization for the corresponding number of layers. In each of these codes, each possible optimal ordering of \mathcal{C} is considered and the built-in function `minimize` is used to find the size of each element of \mathcal{C} and corresponding output.² Then the order that leads to the highest such output is selected; the code returns the order of \mathcal{C} , the size of each element of \mathcal{C} , the output of the optimal organization, the size β_i of each layer and the costs of learning ν_i of each layer.

One aspect of the above codes which is worth discussing concerns the choice of the ordering of \mathcal{C} , which we illustrate in the case where $L = 2$. In this case there are two possible orderings: $\psi_1 = (A_1 < A_2 < B_1 \setminus A_1)$ and $\psi_2 = (A_1 < B_1 \setminus A_1 < A_2)$. These two orders are the same if $B_1 \setminus A_1 = \emptyset$, namely $A_1 < A_2$. Hence, in `orgL2.py`, the order $A_1 < B_1 \setminus A_1 < A_2$ is the optimal one only if $y_{L,\psi_2} > y_{L,\psi_1}$ and $\mu(B_1 \setminus A_1) > 1/100000$, i.e. $\mu(B_1 \setminus A_1)$ is significantly above 0.³

The next step is performed by `orgLaux.py`, which solves $\max_{L \in \{1,2,3,4\}} y_L$. One issue with this maximization problem is that often $y_{L+1} \geq y_L$ (and then possibly $y_{L+1} > y_L$ due to approximation errors) by simply taking the organization that yields y_L and adding layer $L + 1$ with $B_{L+1} = A_{L+1} = \emptyset$. To avoid this, for e.g. $L = 3$

²We use the solution to the optimal organization with $L = 1$ as the initial guess except when it features $\mu(A_1) = 0$. In this case, we use `basinhopping` instead of `minimize`.

³This approach requires checking that the relevant sets that distinguish between certain orders are (significantly) nonempty. An alternative approach is to require that $y_{L,\psi_2} > y_{L,\psi_1} + 1/1000000$ for ψ_2 to be considered better than ψ_1 , which also ensures that differences between the orders are not just the result of the approximate nature of the `minimize` algorithm. We take the latter approach in `orgL4.py`, where it is more convenient because of the large number of possible orders.

to be better than $L = 2$, we require not only that $y_3 > y_2$ but also that $\mu(A_3) = \mu(A_3 \cap (B_1 \setminus A_1)) + \mu(A_3 \cap (B_1 \setminus A_1)^c) > 1/100000$.

Finally, the computations and graphs reported in Section 5.3 and 5.5 are produced using `orgL.py`, `orgLoptimal.py` and `orgLh.py`.