Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews xx (xxxx) xxxx–xxxx

Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews

journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/rser

Considering the investment decisions with real options games approach

Abdollah Arasteh

Industrial Engineering Department, Babol Noshirvani University of Technology, Shariati Ave., P.O. Box: 484, Babol, Iran

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords:
Investment analysis
Option games
Incomplete information
Asymmetric information
Least Squares Monte Carlo

ABSTRACT

The mix of games theory with the real options has been a dynamic range of exploration in the most recent decade. The engaging quality of the specialists for displaying aggressive speculation choices by blending ideas from both hypotheses is on account of a venture choice in a focused business sector can be seen, in its substance, as a "game" between firms. In this paper, we expand a model to consider finite horizon real option games under incomplete information with various parameters. In incomplete information games, firms' actions express significant information about profitability to contestants. The encapsulation of this information proposed original blocks in models with strategic interactions. This is because of circularity where best exercise decisions are based on previous decisions taken, which at a given time are quiet to be mentioned because about the dynamic programming principle. We expand an extended version of the Least Squares Monte Carlo algorithm to confront these results. The model can aid in understanding the relation between strategic optionality and information besides how this influences the best decision policy and its value results. We find the informational feature is of great significance for firms' best decision policy and optimization of project values.

1. Introduction

As of late, a developing number of papers in the real options writing join amusement theoretic ideas. The explanation behind this propensity, it has been contended, is that such approach is frequently alluring as far as real options applications since numerous ventures are portrayed by both vulnerability and key associations. Game theory has been the center of incredible consideration in the scholastic field in the course of the most recent decades and has impacted the advancement of an extensive variety of exploration zones from financial aspects, science and arithmetic to political science. Real options theory, then again, developed in the eighties as a valuation method, particularly suitable for speculations with high instability, and is today instructed in any MBA and Postgraduate courses.

A venture choice in aggressive markets can be seen, in its pith, as a "game" among firms, following in their speculation choices firms verifiably check what they think will be the other firms' responses to their own behavior, and they realize that their rivals think the same way. In strategic settings firms, investment decisions affect competitors' actions. Thus, firms' decisions are conditional on the information accessible about competitors. Most models choose firms' investment decisions under a complete information framework. Looking at the real world it is difficult to consider the basis for stating such a supposition. In competitive R & D markets, research programs are managed privately, and competitors realize little about developing opponents [16,27,4]. How a firm selects to apply its operating decisions expresses information to market participants, among these its rivals. The real options exercise strategy is a significant information transmission mechanism.

This paper mostly follows in the steps of the real options literature and is assigned to the subset of papers underlined on models with competitive interactions and on the information dimension. Game theoretical considerations have been included in several significant papers. Smets [35], Grenadier [12–14], Weeds [39] and Murto [29] to name a few. Grenadier [12] models incomplete information in a real options model by supposing that information is an external signal that is handed to the firm and learning comes in the form of more exact signals. Miltersen and Schwartz [34] consider a model with competitive interactions when there is both market-wide uncertainty about the size of the market and firm-specific uncertainty about the completion time of the R & D project. The competitive nature of Miltersen and Schwartz are similar to this article. Lambrecht and Perraudin [25] and Hsu and Lambrecht [17] consider games of incomplete information. In Lambrecht and Perraudin a symmetric incomplete information case is modeled and the firms update its opinion about its competitor's investment trigger relied on in the way of the underlying state variable [25]. Morellec and Schürhoff analyze corporate investment and financing when corporate members have better information about the firm's growth views [28]. A few papers have considered real options problems using the Least Squares Monte Carlo algorithm of Longstaff and Schwartz [26], among others, Schwartz [34], Miltersen and Schwartz [27] and Grenadier and Malenko [15].

E-mail address: arasteh@nit.ac.ir.

http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2016.10.043
Received 30 December 2013; Received in revised form 25 August 2016; Accepted 25 October 2016
Available online xxxx
1364-0321/

The story of our model is as follows. Two firms are engaging in an R & D game. Both firms are in an R & D period, investing in a product that is to be sold in the same part of the market. At a limited horizon, the R & D period ends and both firms start their product in the marketplace at the same time. The firms' market portions rely on their product quality compared with competitors. A higher product quality is presented as a sustainable competitive benefit giving a higher market share. That is, a higher market share is got by getting a higher product quality than the competitors.

The game has an asymmetric informational framework in that one firm has complete information about the growth of both products. Therefore, the firm can notice the product quality level of both competing firms. The asymmetric information framework of the model can be arrested for one firm (i) having higher competitor consideration capabilities, (ii) having formerly started a similar product and its competitor on this ground realizes what it is competing against, (iii) having engaged a standard technology in expanding the product, whereas the competitor is using an unproven and more uncertain technology and/or the other firm (iv) being a PLC and adjusted to reveal information [2,30].

If the market visions become gloomy, because of the proportional power of the competitor, there is a strategic option to cut losses and abandon the R & D project. In the standard complete information case, the best abandonment strategy will rely on equating the instant benefits of exercise with the borderline value of continuing. In the asymmetric information case, the firms will also consider the benefits of waiting for other firms to show information through their (in)actions. This impact is expressed in equilibrium [24]. We suppose the expected technological growth of the two competitors' R & D projects is symmetric. Our model can easily manage with asymmetries about this feature.

The value of the product development projects and the best abandonment strategies are getting from implementing an extended recursive version of the Least Square Monte Carlo Algorithm (RLSM) by Longstaff and Schwartz [26]. This algorithm permits us to solve our complex problem given the number of state variables in our model and the incomplete information game setting.

2. Literature review

The primary paper in real options literature to consider collaborations between firms was Smets [35]. Since Smets' work another branch of real options models, checking the communications between firms, emerged, being Grenadier [12], Smit and Trigeorgis [36], Huisman [18], Murto and Keppo [29], Weeds [39], Lambrecht and Perraudin [25], Huisman and Kort [19,20], Smit and Trigeorgies [37], Paxson and Pinto [32], Pawlina and Kort [31] and Kong and Kwok [23] and Azevedo and Paxson [3] great case of this kind of models.

In the real options literature, a "standard" real options game (ROG) model can be depicted as a model where the estimation of the venture is dealt with as a state variable that takes after a known procedure; time is viewed as vast and consistent; the speculation expense is sunk, unbreakable and settled; firms are accepted to have enough inward assets to attempt ventures when it is ideal to do as such; the venture diversion is played on a solitary venture; the quantity of firms holding the choice to contribute is typically two (duopoly); and the center of the examination is the determination of the organizations' worth capacities and their individual venture edge under the suspicion that either firms are danger unbiased or the stochastic development of the variable(s) hidden the speculation quality is spread over by the current prompt comes back from an arrangement of securities that can be exchanged constantly without exchange costs in a consummately aggressive capital business sector.

As indicated by game theory, the three most essential components that describe a game are the players and their strategies and payoffs. Making an interpretation of these to a ROG we have that the players are the organizations that hold the choice to contribute (speculation opportunity), the systems are the decisions "invest"/"defer" and the settlements are the organizations' quality capacities.

Moreover, to be completely described, a diversion still should be determined as far as what kind of learning (complete/incomplete) and data (perfect/imperfect, symmetric/asymmetric) the players have at every point in time (node of the game-tree) and with respect to the historical backdrop of the diversion; what sort of amusement is being played (a "one-shot" game, a "zero-sum" game, a cooperative/non-cooperative game, a sequential/simultaneous game); and whether blended methodologies are permitted. Besides, firms can just enhance their benefits by decreasing the benefits of its rival (zero-sum game) and are thought to be ex-risk symmetric and symmetric/asymmetric after the venture.

Moreover, the way the firm' speculation limits are characterized, in the association's technique space, relies on upon the quantity of fundamental variables utilized. In any case, paying little heed to the quantity of basic variables utilized as a part of the genuine choices show, the rule fundamental the utilization of the speculation threshold(s), inferred through the genuine alternatives valuation procedure, continues as before: "a firm ought to contribute when its venture edge is crossed the first run through". By "non-standard" real options game models we mean models which, because of one or a few of their attributes, don't fit into the definition expressed previously.

Despite the fact that, at a first look, the versatility of diversion hypothesis ideas to real options models appears glaringly evident and direct, there are a few contrasts between a "standard" ROG and a "standard" game like those which represent fundamental game theory course readings. Beginning from the contrasts between a "standard" diversion in both speculations, one distinction that is quickly perceived respects the way the player's settlements are given: in "standard" games utilized as a part of a large portion of the game theory course books, for occasion, "the prisoners' dilemma", the "grab-the-dollar", or the "burning the bridge" recreations, the player's adjustments are deterministic while in "standard" ROGs they are given by, once in a while, complex numerical capacities that rely on upon one, or more, stochastic hidden variables. These progressions fundamentally the tenets under which the diversion harmony is resolved.

Likewise, other potential formal issues may likewise emerge when we consolidate real options and game theories. Case in point, the danger nonpartisan presumption ordinarily made in the real option literature, in light of which firms' adjustments and their separate venture edges are determined, won't be intelligent with the world under which the guideline of Nash equilibrium works.

The primary guideline fundamental game theory is that those included in key choices are influenced by their own particular decisions as well as by the choices of others. Game theory began with the work of John von Neumann in the 1920s, which finished in his book with Oskar Morgenstern distributed in 1944. With the development of game theory, a formal investigation of focused associations got to be conceivable in financial aspects and business technique. Game theory gives an approach to consider social associations of people, by uniting them and looking at the balance of the diversion in which these methodologies interface, on the supposition that each individual (financial operator) has his own particular points and procedures. It describes a diversion in four fundamental measurements: the players, the activities accessible to them, the planning of these activities and the resulting structure of every conceivable result. The players are thought to be judicious and their soundness is acknowledged as a typical learning.

Game-theoretic models can be isolated into diversions with or without "perfect information" and with or without complete information. "Perfect information" implies that the players know every single past choice of the considerable number of players in every choice hub; "complete information" implies that the complete structure of the game, including every one of the activities of the players and the conceivable results, is basic knowledge. All things considered, the