

Wisdom of crowds: much ado about nothing

Sandro M. Reia¹ and José F. Fontanari¹

¹*Instituto de Física de São Carlos, Universidade de São Paulo, Caixa Postal 369, 13560-970 São Carlos, São Paulo, Brazil*

The puzzling idea that the combination of independent estimates of the magnitude of a quantity results in a very accurate prediction, which is superior to any or, at least, to most of the individual estimates is known as the wisdom of crowds. Here we use the Federal Reserve Bank of Philadelphia's Survey of Professional Forecasters database to confront the statistical and psychophysical explanations of this phenomenon. Overall we find that the data do not support any of the proposed explanations of the wisdom of crowds. In particular, we find a positive correlation between the variance (or diversity) of the estimates and the crowd error in disagreement with some interpretations of the diversity prediction theorem. In addition, contra the predictions of the psychophysical augmented quincunx model, we find that the skew of the estimates offers no information about the crowd error. More importantly, we find that the crowd beats all individuals in less than 2% of the forecasts and beats most individuals in less than 70% of the forecasts, which means that there is a sporting chance that an individual selected at random will perform better than the crowd. These results contrast starkly with the performance of non-natural crowds composed of unbiased forecasters which beat most individuals in practically all forecasts. The moderate statistical advantage of a real-world crowd over its members does not justify the ado about its wisdom, which is most likely a product of the selective attention fallacy.

I. INTRODUCTION

The wisdom of crowds usually refers to the notion that a collection of individuals – the crowd – can solve problems better than most individuals within it, including experts [1]. The idea was brought to light by Galton's 1907 analysis of a contest to guess the weight of an ox at the West of England Fat Stock and Poultry Exhibition in Plymouth [2, 3]. Despite being more than a century old, the wisdom of crowds is still a subject of fascination for lay people and scientists as well. This fascination stems from reports of the remarkably accurate appraisal produced by the statistical average of independent estimates of the magnitude of an unknown quantity. For instance, in the ox-weighing contest, the crowd overestimated the weight of the ox by less than 1% of the true weight [2].

There are a few attempts to explain the wisdom of crowds using purely statistical arguments. The first idea that comes to mind is that the individual estimates are unbiased, that is, that the errors spread in equal proportion around the true value of the unknown quantity so that they cancel out when the estimates are combined together [4, 5]. Although it is hard to accept the nonexistence of systematic errors on the individual estimates, this explanation is rather popular perhaps because its underlying assumption is difficult to verify [6].

A somewhat more sophisticated explanation for the wisdom of crowds is offered by the diversity prediction theorem [7], which asserts that the error of the collective estimate is never greater than the average individual error. Moreover, as hinted by its name, the theorem has a say in the role of the diversity of the individual estimates. In fact, since it asserts that the quadratic collective error equals the average quadratic individual error minus the diversity of the estimates, one is tempted to think that the increase of the diversity would improve the crowd ac-

curacy, which harmonizes neatly with the zeitgeist of the 21st century [7].

In addition to the statistical explanations, there is a psychophysical model of the wisdom of crowds, viz., the augmented quincunx model of probabilistic cue categorization [8], which assumes that there exists a typical value of the estimated quantity that is common knowledge of the population. The real object, say, Galton's ox is then compared with the prototypical object through a number of perceptible cues that may be categorized incorrectly by the individuals. The main prediction of the model is that the collective error can be inferred from the skewness of the distribution of the estimates [8].

In order to test the predictions, as well as the relevance, of the aforementioned explanations for the wisdom of crowds, we use forecasts of economic indicators that are publicly available in the Federal Reserve Bank of Philadelphia's (FRBP) Survey of Professional Forecasters [9]. As this database offers quarterly projections of the economic indicators, we can tune the difficulty of the forecasts by controlling for the forecast range. We find that the collective error, the diversity and the skew of the estimates are affected significantly by that range. Most interestingly, we find that the difficulty of the forecast is typically associated with a large variance and a long left tail of the distribution of estimates.

Overall we find that the data do not support any of the proposed explanations for the wisdom of crowds. First, contra the diversity prediction theorem, we find a positive correlation between the collective error and the diversity of estimates. Second, we find that, once the range of the forecasts is accounted for, the skewness of the distribution of estimates does not influence significantly the crowd accuracy, contra the predictions of the augmented quincunx model. Third, we find that the unbiased estimates assumption confers on the crowd an enormous ad-

vantage over the individuals within it, which is at great variance with the data.

Our main finding, which was obtained using almost 10^4 forecast experiments for several economic indicators in the FRBP forecast database, is that only rarely the crowd beats all individuals within it. More precisely, this happens in less than 2% of the forecast experiments that we analyzed. In addition, the crowd beats most individuals within it in less than 70% of our experiments, which means that there is a sporting chance that an individual selected at random will perform better than the crowd. Clearly, the purely statistical advantage of the crowd over its members does not justify the high esteem it enjoys, which is most likely a product of the selective attention fallacy.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. In section II we offer an outline of the main ideas used to explain the wisdom of crowds, viz., the diversity prediction theorem [7], the augmented quincunx model [8] and the unbiased estimates assumption [4]. In section III we describe briefly the FRBP forecast database [9] from where we have extracted the forecast experiments. In section IV we present and analyze the results of those experiments in the light of the known explanations for the wisdom of crowds. In the Appendix we replicate those forecast experiments using virtual unbiased agents so as to verify the predictions of the unbiased estimates assumption. Finally, section V is reserved to our concluding remarks.

II. THREE FRAMEWORKS FOR UNDERSTANDING THE WISDOM OF CROWDS

Here we describe briefly three frameworks that claim to explain the wisdom of crowds, viz., the diversity prediction theorem, the augmented quincunx model and the unbiased estimates assumption. These proposals make a variety of specific predictions that will be tested using the FRBP forecast database in section III.

A. The diversity prediction theorem

The diversity prediction theorem is viewed as a main achievement to those allured by the idea that the performance of groups can be boosted by increasing the diversity of their members [7], although even simple agent-based models indicate that the effects of diversity can be rather unpredictable in nontrivial problem-solving scenarios [10]. This theorem shows that the quadratic collective error is related in a very simple manner to the average quadratic individual error and to a measure of the diversity of the estimates. More pointedly, let us denote by g_i the estimate of some unknown quantity by individual $i = 1, \dots, N$, and by G the true value of the unknown quantity. The collective estimate is defined as

the arithmetic mean of the individual estimates, that is,

$$\langle g \rangle = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N g_i, \quad (1)$$

as usual. We note, however, that Galton used the median of the individual estimates as the crowd estimate in his seminal ox-weighing experiment [2], though the arithmetic mean proved to be a much better estimator in that case [3]. Thus, the collective error is defined as

$$\gamma = G - \langle g \rangle. \quad (2)$$

Defining the average quadratic individual error as

$$\epsilon = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N (g_i - G)^2 \quad (3)$$

and the diversity of the estimates as

$$\delta = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N (g_i - \langle g \rangle)^2, \quad (4)$$

we have the identity

$$\gamma^2 = \epsilon - \delta, \quad (5)$$

which is Page's diversity prediction theorem [7]. It asserts that the quadratic collective error equals the average quadratic individual error minus the prediction diversity. This result is sometimes viewed as indication that the increase of the prediction diversity δ results in the decrease of the quadratic collective error γ^2 . Of course, since δ and ϵ cannot be varied independently of each other, this interpretation is not correct. Nevertheless, the relationship, if any, between the diversity of the estimates and the collective error is a very interesting issue that can be investigated using a large number of equivalent forecast experiments, which is the approach we follow in this paper. We note that the diversity of estimates δ is known in the statistical literature as the precision of the estimates, that is, the closeness of repeated estimates (of the same quantity) to one another [11].

We stress that the diversity prediction theorem guarantees only that the quadratic collective error γ^2 is never greater than the mean quadratic individual error ϵ . As we will see in section III, this is not a very useful result from the practical perspective since, for instance, it does not imply that the crowd is better than most individuals. In particular, we will report an experiment where the collective estimate is worse than the estimate of about 85% of the individuals. Hence, $\gamma^2 \leq \epsilon$ does not imply that it is always advantageous to favor the collective estimate over the estimate of a randomly chosen individual in the group.

As an amusing side note, we mention the resemblance between the discussions about the value of the diversity prediction theorem and the arguments about the relevance of the celebrated Price equation for evolutionary

biology [12]. We note that Price's equation, which has a straightforward derivation from the definition of fitness, is considered by many researchers as a mere mathematical tautology that has no predictive value at all [13].

It is not possible to investigate the influence of the diversity of the estimates on the collective error using a single forecast experiment since the values of γ , ϵ and δ are fixed for a particular experiment. The solution is to consider a large ensemble of roughly equivalent experiments and to look at the correlations between those quantities. This can be achieved artificially by selecting random subsamples of the estimates of a single experiment to produce many virtual experiments with fewer estimates than the original one [14]. The problem with that approach is that the resulting virtual experiments are not independent. Here we use the FRBP forecast database to collect the independent forecast experiments necessary for the correlation analysis. We note that since the collective estimate $\langle g \rangle$ and the true value G may have different values for different experiments, it is necessary to introduce the dimensionless quantities γ/G , $\epsilon^{1/2}/G$ and $\delta^{1/2}/\langle g \rangle$ to properly compare the experiments.

B. The augmented quincunx model of judgment

The augmented quincunx is a psychophysical model of probabilistic cue categorization [8], whose name was inspired by a probability device invented by Galton in 1873 to demonstrate the central limit theorem [15]. The basic idea behind this model is the assumption that there is a typical value of the unknown quantity that is common knowledge gained through experience. For instance, in the ox-weighting experiment, it is assumed that the population (or at least the participants of the contest) share the knowledge that the typical weight of oxen is \hat{G} . In order to estimate the weight G of a particular ox, the contestants focus on a number of perceptible cues $c = 1, \dots, C$ that are correlated with G (e.g., the height of the ox or the degree to which its ribs are showing). If a cue c indicates that the ox is heavier (lighter) than the prototype ox then the typical weight is increased (decreased) by a factor η_c . Hence

$$G = \hat{G} + \sum_{c=1}^C \eta_c, \quad (6)$$

where η_c can be positive or negative depending on the correlation between cue c and the ox weight. Stochasticity enters the augmented quincunx model because the contestants can perceive a cue incorrectly. More pointedly, the estimate of contestant i is

$$g_i = \hat{G} + \sum_{c=1}^C u_c \eta_c, \quad (7)$$

where u_c is a random variable that takes on the value +1 with probability p and the value -1 with probability

$1-p$ [8]. This means that a cue is perceived correctly with probability p and incorrectly with probability $1-p$. In particular, if individual i can perceive all cues correctly (i.e., $p = 1$) then its estimate is perfect (i.e., $g_i = G$), despite the fact that $\hat{G} \neq G$. For simplicity, the model assumes that all contestants are equivalent, i.e., the cue categorization probability p is the same for all individuals.

Although \hat{G} , C and η_c are hard to access quantities, the augmented quincunx model makes some interesting general predictions. For instance, the model predicts that the collective error γ can be inferred from the degree and direction of the skewness of the distribution of individual estimates: estimate distributions have greater negative (positive) skew when the mean estimate $\langle g \rangle$ underestimates (overestimates) the true value G by greater margin [8]. This claim means that there is a negative correlation between γ/G and the skewness μ_3 . We recall that the skewness μ_3 of a distribution is a dimensionless measure of its asymmetry, which is defined as

$$\mu_3 = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \left(\frac{g_i - \langle g \rangle}{\delta^{1/2}} \right)^3, \quad (8)$$

where δ is the variance and $\langle g \rangle$ is the mean of the distribution of estimates.

We stress that it is only because of the prediction of the augmented quincunx model that $\gamma < 0$ is associated to $\mu_3 > 0$ and vice-versa that we have defined the collective error as a signed quantity in equation (2). In fact, except when testing that particular prediction, we will consider the unsigned collective error $|\gamma|$ throughout the paper.

C. The unbiased estimates assumption

A natural explanation for the wisdom of crowds involves the well-known fact that the combination of unbiased and independent estimates guarantees the accuracy of the statistical average, provided the number of estimates is large (see, e.g., [4, 5]). In other words, if the estimates made by numerous different people scatter symmetrically around the truth, then the collective estimate is likely to be very accurate. Of course, the trouble with this explanation is the assumption that the individual estimates are unbiased, that is, that their means coincide with the true value of the unknown quantity. If correct, this assumption would imply that one could harvest the benefits of the wisdom of crowds by asking a single individual to make several estimates at different times (see, e.g., [16]). The unbiased estimates assumption is the limit of the augmented quincunx model where $\hat{G} = G$ and $p = 1/2$.

In the Appendix we use the unbiased estimates assumption as a null hypothesis and replicate our analysis of the FRBP forecast experiments by replacing the expert economists by virtual unbiased forecasters.




FIG. 1. Histograms of the number of participants in the 205 short-range forecasts (left panel), in the 203 medium-range forecasts (middle panel) and in the 196 long-range forecasts on the nominal gross domestic product of the Federal Reserve Bank of Philadelphia’s Survey of Professional Forecasters.

III. THE FRBP FORECAST DATABASE

The Federal Reserve Bank of Philadelphia’s (FRBP) Survey of Professional Forecasters offers quarterly projections for five quarters of a variety of economic indicators [9]. In order to lighten the analysis, here we will focus on semestrial forecasts of the nominal gross domestic product (NGDP) mainly, as our conclusions apply to the other indicators as well. In particular, we consider the forecast for the current quarter, that is, the quarter when the survey was conducted and the forecasts for two and four quarters later. Henceforth we will refer to these forecasts as short-range, medium-range and long-range forecasts. We use the NGDP forecasts available in the FRBP database from the fourth quarter of 1968 to the fourth quarter of 2019. This amounts to 205 estimate distributions for short-range, 203 for medium-range and 196 for long-range forecasts. All forecasters are select economists and the mean number of forecasters in each experiment is about 37. Figure 1 shows the histograms of the number of participants N in each experiment for the three forecast ranges. The minimum number of participants is $N = 9$ and the maximum is $N = 87$ in any forecast range.

The separation of the experiments on short-range, medium-range and long-range forecasts allows the control of the difficulty of the forecasts and the study of its influence on the distribution of the individual estimates. We note that in Ref. [8] these distinct forecast ranges were clumped together to form a single large forecast database on the NGDP. We think, however, that this procedure is not appropriate as the range of the forecasts has a major effect on the distribution of the estimates, as we will see next.




FIG. 2. Scatter plots of the scaled diversity $\delta^{1/2}/\langle g \rangle$ and the relative collective error $|\gamma|/G$ for the short-range (left panel), medium-range (middle panel) and long-range (right panel) NGDP forecasts. The filled symbols and the horizontal and vertical lines indicate the means and the standard deviations. The solid lines are linear fittings of the data.

IV. RESULTS

We begin our analysis with the study of the correlation between the properly scaled crowd accuracy $|\gamma|/G$ and the diversity of the estimates $\delta^{1/2}/\langle g \rangle$. Figure 2 shows the scatter plots for the three different forecast ranges, where each data point represents a particular forecast experiment. We recall that each experiment produces a distribution of estimates from where we extract the relevant summary statistics. For instance, figure 3 illustrates two distributions of estimates for the short-range forecast scenario, which correspond to two different data points in the left panel of figure 2. As already pointed out, since the number of participants N as well as the NGDP true value G may vary in different experiments for the same forecast range (see figure 1), it is necessary to consider dimensionless summary statistics to properly compare the outcomes of the experiments.

Figure 2 shows that the accuracy $|\gamma|/G$ and the dispersion $\delta^{1/2}/\langle g \rangle$ of the estimates vary considerably as the forecast range increases, indicating that clumping those forecasts together as done in Ref. [8] may not be a judicious choice. In particular, the short-range forecasts are on the average about three times more accurate and four times less disperse than the long-range forecasts. This is somewhat expected since the farther the forecast range, the greater the odds that the predicted indicator will be influenced by unforeseen factors.

The Pearson correlation coefficient between $\delta^{1/2}/\langle g \rangle$ and $|\gamma|/G$ is 0.24 for the short-range, 0.27 for the medium-range and 0.16 for the long-range forecasts. The unfounded interpretation of the diversity prediction theorem that associates a high prediction diversity to a low collective error implies a negative correlation between $\delta^{1/2}/\langle g \rangle$ and $|\gamma|/G$, which is clearly not supported by our findings. In fact, given that the forecasters are all expert




FIG. 3. Histograms of the relative estimates $g_i/\langle g \rangle$ for two short-range forecasts. The vertical red lines indicate the ratio between the true value of the NGDP indicator and the crowd estimate, i.e., $G/\langle g \rangle$. In the left panel there are $N = 40$ participants and none of them fared better than the crowd, whereas in the right panel there are $N = 63$ participants and 43% of them predicted more accurately than the crowd.

economists, it is somewhat intuitive to expect that the less disperse their estimates, the closer they are to the true value. For the long-range forecast, their expertise becomes less influential to the success of the predictions and so the positive correlation between collective error and diversity decreases [17]. We note that the positive correlation between these two quantities is a prediction of the augmented quincunx model [8]. However, as shown in the Appendix, this intuitive result holds also for the unbiased estimates assumption, which produces a much stronger positive correlation between $\delta^{1/2}/\langle g \rangle$ and $|\gamma|/G$ than the original forecasts.

A nontrivial prediction of the augmented quincunx model is the negative correlation between the (signed) collective error and the skewness of the distribution of estimates [8], which we assay in Figure 4 for the different forecast ranges. The Pearson correlation coefficient between μ_3 and γ/G is 0.08 for the short-range, -0.01 for the medium-range and -0.06 for the long-range forecasts. The low values of these coefficients, as well as the wrong sign in the short-range forecast experiments, point to the little relevance of the skewness of the estimate distributions to the wisdom of crowds, in disagreement with the claims of Ref. [8]. Nevertheless, these results show that the skewness is strongly affected by the forecast range, similarly to the dispersion of the estimates, although this is barely seen in figure 4 due to the scale of the x-axis. For instance, the x-coordinate of the center of mass of the data is located at $\mu_3 = -0.07$ for the short-range forecasts, at $\mu_3 = -0.2$ for the medium-range forecast and at $\mu_3 = -0.4$ for the long-range forecasts.

Interestingly, our results suggest that the more difficult the forecasts, in the sense that there are more room for noise to alter the future outcome, the greater the variance and the longer the left tail of the distributions of




FIG. 4. Scatter plots of the skewness μ_3 and the (signed) relative collective error γ/G for short-range (left panel), medium-range (middle panel) and long-range (right panel) NGDP forecasts. The filled symbols and the horizontal and vertical lines indicate the means and the standard deviations. The solid lines are linear fittings of the data.




FIG. 5. Scatter plots of the skewness μ_3 and the scaled diversity $\delta^{1/2}/\langle g \rangle$ for short-range (left panel), medium-range (middle panel) and long-range (right panel) NGDP forecasts. The filled symbols and the horizontal and vertical lines indicate the means and the standard deviations. The solid lines are linear fittings of the data.

estimates. Figure 5 confirms this inference by showing the scatter plot of μ_3 and $\delta^{1/2}/\langle g \rangle$. In particular the Pearson correlation coefficient between these quantities is -0.16 for the short-range, -0.35 for the medium-range and -0.37 for the long-range forecasts. This correlation is not predicted by the augmented quincunx model since the sign of the skewness is not affected by the variance in that model [8]. We note that the unbiased estimates assumption produces inconclusive results regarding the correlation between μ_3 and $\delta^{1/2}/\langle g \rangle$ (see Appendix).

We conclude our analysis by challenging the common view that the crowd is superior to most of its integrants [1]. In fact, if people believed that an individual selected at random had a sporting chance of beating the crowd,




FIG. 6. Histograms of the number of experiments for which the fraction ξ of the individual estimates are more accurate than the collective estimate for short-range (left panel), medium-range (middle panel) and long-range (right panel) forecasts.

the idea of the wisdom of crowds would probably never have taken off. Here we address this issue quantitatively by measuring the fraction of individual estimates that are superior to the collective estimate for each forecast experiment. The results are presented in form of histograms in figure 6, where the height of the bars is the number of experiments for which that fraction equals $\xi \in [0, 1]$. There are a few experiments with $\xi = 0$ so that the crowd beats all individuals and one short-range forecast experiment where 85% of the individuals beat the crowd. The fraction of experiments for which the crowd is less accurate than the majority of the participants is $55/205 \approx 0.27$ for the short-range forecasts, $58/203 \approx 0.29$ for the medium-range forecasts and $66/196 \approx 0.37$ for the long-range forecasts. Hence, a randomly chosen individual has probability greater than $1/2$ of beating the crowd in about 30% of the experiments reported here.

We stress that finding that 85% of the individuals beat the crowd in a particular forecast experiment does not contradict Page’s diversity prediction theorem, which asserts that the collective error is always less than the average individual error, i.e., $|\gamma| \leq \epsilon^{1/2}$. In fact, that experiment involved $N = 39$ participants among which 4 outliers produced completely off the mark estimates resulting in the inflation of the mean individual error. This point betrays the fact that the theorem (5) is largely irrelevant for practical issues concerning the use or not of the crowd as an effective forecaster.

To support these findings, in figure 7 we clump together 8650 experiments of the FRBP forecast database without regard to the economic indicator (there are ten distinct indicators) or to the range of the forecast (there are five distinct ranges). We find that the crowd is superior to any individual in only 1.7% of the experiments (viz., those for which $\xi = 0$), whereas it is superior to most individuals in 66.8% of the experiments (viz., those for which $\xi \leq 1/2$). Hence the widespread claims about




FIG. 7. Histogram of the number of experiments for which the fraction ξ of the individual estimates are more accurate than the collective estimate. The data comprises the 8650 experiments of the FRBP forecast database for ten distinct economic indicators and five forecast ranges.

the superiority of the crowd over the individuals [1] is most likely an artifice of selective attention that gives prominence to successful outcomes only. Those claims are legitimate only for unrealistic crowds composed of unbiased forecasters, as shown in the Appendix.

V. DISCUSSION

It is almost a cliché to remark that a group of cooperating individuals can solve problems more efficiently than when those individuals work in isolation [18, 19]. Cooperation is, in general, a successful problem solving strategy [20], though it is not clear whether it merely speeds up the time to find the solutions, or whether it alters qualitatively the statistical signature of the search for the solutions [21, 22]. Yet, in some cases, cooperation may well lead the group astray resulting in the madness of crowds [23] or, less dramatically, it may simply undermine the benefits of combining independent forecasts [24, 25].

A rather peculiar manner to circumvent the potential negative effects of cooperation while still benefiting from the group intelligence is the so-called wisdom of crowds, i.e., the notion that a collection of independently deciding individuals is likely to predict better than individuals or even experts within the group [1], which ironically seems to have become itself a piece of crowd wisdom [26]. The first report of this phenomenon in the literature was probably Galton’s account of the surprisingly accurate estimate of the weight of an ox given by the median of the sample of the individual guesses [2].

Although much of the evidence of the wisdom of crowds is anecdotal (see, e.g., [1, 6]), there are a few efforts aiming at explaining this phenomenon either using a purely statistical rationale [5, 7] or using psychophysical arguments on the nature of the individual estimates [8]. Typ-

ically, these approaches aim at inferring the quality of the crowd estimate using information about the distribution of individual estimates (see, e.g., figure 3), such as the variance and the skew of the estimates. Here we address the soundness of those explanations using forecasts of economic indicators from the Federal Reserve Bank of Philadelphia's (FRBP) Survey of Professional Forecasters database [9]. The difficulty of the forecasts can be tuned by controlling for the forecast range.

Our results suggest that the difficulty of the forecasts is associated to large variances and to long left tails of the distributions of estimates. In addition, we find that a large variance is associated to a poor crowd accuracy, in disagreement with the interpretation of the diversity prediction theorem that the increase of the diversity of the estimates leads to a decrease of the collective error [7]. Moreover, when controlling for the forecast range, we find no evidence of an association between the skew of the estimates and the collective error, in disagreement with the predictions of the augmented quincunx model [8].

We pay special attention to the unbiased estimates assumption that explains the accuracy of the crowd by conjecturing that the errors of the individual estimates spread in equal proportion around the true value of the unknown quantity so that they cancel out when those estimates are combined together [4]. In particular, in the Appendix we replicate the forecast experiments by replacing the economists by (virtual) unbiased forecasters and found that much of the hailed features of the wisdom of crowds are properties of the combination of unbiased forecasts instead.

The wisdom of real crowds is very different from the apocryphal wisdom of crowds of unbiased forecasters. For instance, the crowd beats all individuals in only around 2% of the FRBP forecast experiments and it beats most individuals in about 70% of those experiments, whereas the corresponding figures for the unbiased forecasters are about 16% and 100%, respectively. Hence, since there is a sporting chance that a randomly chosen individual will beat the crowd in real-world forecasts, the only explanation that we can find for the popularity of the wisdom of crowds is selective attention (or cherry picking) that gives prominence to outcomes that tally with Galton's conclusions.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The research of JFF was supported in part by Grant No. 2020/03041-3, Fundação de Amparo à Pesquisa do Estado de São Paulo (FAPESP) and by Grant No. 305058/2017-7, Conselho Nacional de Desenvolvimento Científico e Tecnológico (CNPq). SMR was supported by the Coordenação de Aperfeiçoamento de Pessoal de Nível Superior - Brasil (CAPES) - Finance Code 001.




FIG. A1. Scatter plots of the scaled diversity $\delta^{1/2}/\langle g \rangle$ and the relative collective error $|\gamma|/G$ for short-range (left panel), medium-range (middle panel) and long-range (right panel) unbiased forecasts. The filled symbols and the horizontal and vertical lines indicate the means and the standard deviations. The solid lines are linear fittings of the data.

APPENDIX

In this appendix we examine the predictions of the unbiased estimates assumption for the forecast experiments considered in the main text. In particular, for each experiment with a given number N of participants, we calculate the variance of the estimates δ and use it to produce N independent unbiased estimates distributed according to a Gaussian of mean G (the true value of the economic indicator) and variance δ , i.e.,

$$P_u(g_i) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi\delta}} \exp\left[-\frac{(g_i - G)^2}{2\delta}\right] \quad (\text{A1})$$

for $i = 1, \dots, N$. Hence, by construction, the diversity of the virtual unbiased estimates equals the diversity of the economists' forecasts. Although we split the data in three forecast ranges, as done in the main text, we stress that from the perspective of the unbiased forecasters the only difference between those ranges is the variance δ of the estimates. In addition, we note that for the values of N considered here (figure 1), the arithmetic average $\langle g \rangle$, equation (1), is expected to differ from G .

Figure A1 shows the scatter plots of $\delta^{1/2}/\langle g \rangle$ and $|\gamma|/G$ for the unbiased forecasters. As expected, the crowd estimate in this case is about ten times more accurate than in the original forecast experiments. The Pearson correlation coefficient between $\delta^{1/2}/\langle g \rangle$ and $|\gamma|/G$ is 0.41 for the short-range, 0.38 for the medium-range and 0.45 for the long-range forecasts. Hence, the (positive) correlation between the diversity of the estimates and the crowd accuracy is more pronounced for the unbiased forecasts than for the economists forecasts.

Figure A2 shows the scatter plots of μ_3 and γ/G for the unbiased forecasters. The noteworthy aspect here is the small range of variation of the skewness values as com-




FIG. A2. Scatter plots of the skewness μ_3 and the (signed) relative collective error γ/G for short-range (left panel), medium-range (middle panel) and long-range (right panel) unbiased forecasts. The filled symbols and the horizontal and vertical lines indicate the means and the standard deviations. The solid lines are linear fittings of the data.




FIG. A3. Scatter plots of the skewness μ_3 and the scaled diversity $\delta^{1/2}/\langle g \rangle$ for short-range (left panel), medium-range (middle panel) and long-range (right panel) unbiased forecasts. The filled symbols and the horizontal and vertical lines indicate the means and the standard deviations. The solid lines are linear fittings of the data.

pared to that of figure 4. Of course, the nonzero values of μ_3 are due to the small number of estimates N in each experiment, since the expected skewness of a Gaussian is zero. The Pearson correlation coefficient between μ_3 and γ/G is -0.06 for the short-range, 0.11 for the medium-range and 0.10 for the long-range forecasts. These coefficients are similar to those of the real experiments and their uncertain signs indicate that the skewness of the estimates offers no information on the wisdom of crowds, regardless of the nature of the forecasters.

An unexpected result of our analysis of the economists' forecasts is the negative correlation between the diversity and the skewness of the estimates (figure 5), which implies that a large variance is associated to a long left tail




FIG. A4. Histograms of the number of experiments for which the fraction ξ of the individual estimates are more accurate than the collective estimate for short-range (left panel), medium-range (middle panel) and long-range (right panel) unbiased forecasts.




FIG. A5. Histogram of the number of experiments for which the fraction ξ of the individual unbiased estimates are more accurate than the collective estimate. The expert forecasts of the 8650 experiments of the FRBP database were replaced by virtual unbiased forecasters.

of the distribution of estimates. The results of figure A3, which shows the scatter plots of μ_3 and $\delta^{1/2}/\langle g \rangle$ for the unbiased forecasters, point to a different conclusion. In fact, the Pearson correlation coefficient between these quantities is -0.17 for the short-range, 0.16 for the medium-range and -0.08 for the long-range forecasts. Again, the low values and the inconsistency of the signs of these coefficients suggest that the skewness plays no role at all on the outcome of unbiased forecasts.

Although the previous scatter plots show only mild quantitative differences between the economists and the unbiased forecasters, the advantage conferred to the crowd over its members differs starkly between these two types of forecasters. Figure A4, which shows the histograms of the number of experiments for which a fraction ξ of individuals beat the crowd, illustrates this point.

In fact, the most probable outcome is that the crowd beats all individuals ($\xi = 0$) in the case of unbiased forecasters, in contrast to our findings for the human experts (figure 6).

Finally, figure A5 shows the results for the case that all forecasts of the FRBP database are clumped together and replaced by unbiased forecasts. In this case, the

crowd is superior to any individual in 16.3% of the experiments (viz., those for which $\xi = 0$), whereas it is superior to most individuals in 99.8% of the experiments (viz., those for which $\xi \leq 1/2$). Therefore, a crowd of unbiased forecasters exhibits all the exalted attributes of the wisdom of crowds, but a crowd of human experts does not. Hence our qualms about the generality and usefulness of that phenomenon.

-
- [1] Surowiecki J 2004 *The Wisdom of Crowds: Why the Many Are Smarter than the Few and How Collective Wisdom Shapes Business, Economies, Societies, and Nations* (New York: Doubleday and Company)
- [2] Galton F 1907 Vox Populi *Nature* **75** 450
- [3] Wallis K F 2014 Revisiting Francis Galton's Forecasting Competition *Stat. Sci.* **29** 420
- [4] Bates J M and Granger C W J 1969 The combination of forecasts *Oper. Res. Q.* **20** 451
- [5] Armstrong J S 2001 Combining Forecasts in *Principles of forecasting: a handbook for researchers and practitioners*, edited by Armstrong J S (Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishing) pp. 417-439
- [6] Sunstein C 2006 *Infotopia: How Many Minds Produce Knowledge* (New York: Oxford University Press)
- [7] Page S E 2007 *The Difference: How the Power of Diversity Creates Better Groups, Firms, Schools, and Societies* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press)
- [8] Nash U W 2014 The Curious Anomaly of Skewed Judgment Distributions and Systematic Error in the Wisdom of Crowds *PLoS ONE* **9** e112386
- [9] <https://www.philadelphiafed.org/research-and-data/real-time-center/survey-of-professional-forecasters>
- [10] Fontanari J F 2016 When more of the same is better *EPL* **113** 28009
- [11] Tan P-N, Steinbach M and Kumar V 2014 *Introduction to Data Mining* (Essex: Pearson Education Limited)
- [12] Price G R 1970 Selection and Covariance *Nature* **227** 520
- [13] Frank S A 2012 Natural selection. IV. The Price equation *J. Evol. Biol.* **25** 1002
- [14] Nobre D A and Fontanari J F 2020 Prediction diversity and selective attention in the wisdom of crowds *arXiv:2001.10039v2*
- [15] Stigler S M 1989 Francis Galton's account of the invention of correlation *Stat. Sci.* **4** 73
- [16] Vul E and Pashler H 2008 Measuring the crowd within: Probabilistic representations within individuals *Psychol. Sci.* **19** 645
- [17] Mauboussin M J 2012 *The Success Equation: Untangling Skill and Luck in Business, Sports, and Investing* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard Business Review Press)
- [18] Huberman B A 1990 The performance of cooperative processes *Physica D* **42** 38
- [19] Clearwater S H, Huberman B A and Hogg T 1991 Cooperative Solution of Constraint Satisfaction Problems *Science* **254** 181
- [20] Bloom H 2001 *Global Brain: The Evolution of Mass Mind from the Big Bang to the 21st Century* (New York, Wiley)
- [21] Reia S M, Amado A C and Fontanari J F 2019 Agent-based models of collective intelligence *Phys. Life Rev.* **31** 320
- [22] Reia S M, Aquino L F and Fontanari J F 2020 The surprising little effectiveness of cooperative algorithms in parallel problem solving *Eur. Phys. J. B* **93** 140
- [23] MacKay C 1841 *Extraordinary Delusions and the Madness of Crowds* (London: Richard Bentley)
- [24] King A J, Cheng L, Starke S D and Myatt J P 2011 Is the true 'wisdom of the crowd' to copy successful individuals? *Biol. Lett.* **8** 197
- [25] Lorenz J, Rauhut H, Schweitzer F and Helbing D 2011 How social influence can undermine the wisdom of crowd effect *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA* **108** 9020
- [26] Prelec D, Seung H S and McCoy J 2017 A solution to the single-question crowd wisdom problem *Nature* **541** 532