

# Prices and the Winner's Curse

forthcoming, *Rand Journal of Economics*, 2002

the latest version of this paper, and related material, is at  
[www.paulklempere.org](http://www.paulklempere.org)

Jeremy Bulow\*

and

Paul Klemperer\*\*

October 2001

*We usually assume increases in supply, allocation by rationing, and exclusion of potential buyers reduce prices. But all these activities raise the expected price in an important set of cases when common-value assets are sold. Furthermore, when we make the assumptions needed to rule out these “anomalies” for symmetric buyers, small asymmetries among the buyers necessarily cause the anomalies to reappear. Our results help explain rationing in Initial Public Offerings, and outcomes of spectrum auctions. We illustrate our results in the “Wallet Game” and in another new game we introduce, the “Maximum Game”.*

**Keywords:** Auction theory, common value, winner's curse, PCS auction, spectrum auction, airwaves auction, initial public offerings, IPO, Wallet Game, Maximum Game.

**JEL No:** D44 (Auctions), G30 (Corporate Finance), G24 (Investment Banking), L96 (Telecommunications)

\* Graduate School of Business, Stanford University, Stanford, USA, Tel: 650 723 2160, Fax: 650 725 0468, email: [jbulow@stanford.edu](mailto:jbulow@stanford.edu)

\*\*Nuffield College, Oxford University, U.K., Int Tel: +44 1865 278588, Int Fax: +44 1865 278557, email: [paul.klemperer@economics.ox.ac.uk](mailto:paul.klemperer@economics.ox.ac.uk)

**Acknowledgement :** We are very grateful to colleagues and seminar participants, especially Alan Beggs, Meg Meyer, David Myatt, Marco Pagnozzi, Marciano Siniscalchi, Chuck Thomas, Chris Wallace and two anonymous referees and the Editor for numerous helpful suggestions.

© Jeremy Bulow and Paul Klemperer, 2001

# 1. Introduction

“Increases in supply lower prices. It is never profitable to commit to rationing at a price at which there is surely excess demand. Excluding potential buyers cannot raise prices.”

Although economists from Veblen (1899) to Becker (1991) have shown counterexamples, these statements are still often taken almost for granted. However, this paper shows why it is perfectly reasonable for these statements to be false in auction markets, without any special assumptions, and when this is likely to happen.

To understand our results, it is important to understand how a bidder determines the maximum he will be willing to pay for an asset. If a buyer’s estimate of an asset’s value is affected only by his own perceptions and not by the perceptions of others, he should be willing to pay up to his valuation. This is the Adam Smith world, where a buyer can easily maximize his utility given any set of prices, and a firm can easily maximize its profits. In this sort of “private value” model, the statements in the first paragraph are generally true.<sup>1</sup>

But in many important markets others’ perceptions are informative. The extreme cases are “common-value” assets, or assets all buyers would value equally if they shared the same information. Financial assets held by non-control investors may be the best example; oil fields are commonly cited. Most assets have both a private and common value element, particularly if imperfect substitutes exist. For example, a house’s value will have both common and idiosyncratic (private) elements.

With common values, buyers may find it prudent to exit an ascending price auction at more or less than their pre-auction estimate of the value, so the statements in the first paragraph are often false in common-value auctions.

The reason is the “winner’s curse”. Buyers must bid more conservatively the more bidders there are, because winning implies a greater winner’s curse. This effect can more than compensate for the increase in competition caused by more bidders, so more bidders can *lower* expected prices. Conversely, adding more supply, and/or rationing, creates more winners, so reduces the bad news learned by winning, and so may raise bids enough to *increase* expected prices. This paper shows when this happens and why it is surprisingly often.

A good example is provided by the market for Initial Public Offerings (IPOs). Rather than

---

<sup>1</sup>They are always true for ascending auctions, on which we focus. Counterexamples can be constructed for first-price sealed-bid auctions with affiliated private values. See Pinkse and Tan (2000).

being priced to clear the market, many IPOs are made at prices that guarantee excess demand. By pricing low enough so that everyone will want to buy, potential shareowners are absolved of the winner's curse of only being buyers when they are among the most optimistic investors. This allows the pooling price to be quite high and, under quite reasonable conditions, as high or higher than the expected price in a standard auction.

Similarly, in a descending-price (or Dutch) auction, in which the price is lowered continuously until a bidder accepts the current price, selling to *more* bidders can *lower* the expected price, that is, mean waiting *longer* on average until someone jumps in to buy. The result is analogous to the phenomenon that giving a seminar to a larger audience can yield fewer questions. With more listeners each is more concerned that "if my question is so good, why hasn't someone else asked it?", while with more bidders each worries more that "if the price is fair, why hasn't someone else bought it?"; these effects can dominate both the competitive effect that more competition leads (*ceteris paribus*) to more aggressive behavior, and the direct effect that (even holding individual behavior constant) more people results in faster bidding and a faster flow of questions.

Our results are especially likely in asymmetric "almost common value" ascending auctions in which some competitors have a small advantage, because the other bidder(s) then face an exacerbated winner's curse.

Again this point is similar to the observation that the presence of a single audience member who is thought to be smarter than her colleagues can significantly dampen everyone else's questioning.

For a more significant application consider the A and B band spectrum ascending auction held in 1994-95 by the U.S. Federal Communications Commission. Pacific Telesis was the natural buyer of the single Los Angeles license available for sale,<sup>2</sup> and was able to acquire it very cheaply. Markets where two licenses were sold generally yielded more competitive prices relative to their demographic characteristics.<sup>3</sup> Even where one bidder had an advantage, the

---

<sup>2</sup>AT&T was ineligible to bid, and PacTel benefited from its name recognition and experience in California, as well as its familiarity with the California wireless market in which it was a duopolist prior to its spinoff of its cellular subsidiary, Airtouch. No one knew what PCS licenses were really worth, but it is fair to say that the LA license was worth more to PacTel than anyone else.

<sup>3</sup>For example, Chicago yielded about \$31 per head of population for each of the two licenses, compared with less than \$26 per head of population for Los Angeles' single license, in spite of Chicago's inferior demographics. (The famous long commutes of Angelenos and the population density in the area makes it a particularly desirable place to own a wireless telephone franchise.) The single New York license yielded only \$17 per head of population. See Klemperer and Pagnozzi (2002).

prices of both licenses were determined by aggressive competition for the second license. So prices were better, even though the third-highest bid set the price in these markets while the second-highest bid set the price in Los Angeles.<sup>4</sup>

The recent European “third generation” mobile-phone license auctions also yielded low prices in ascending auctions when the number of clearly advantaged incumbent bidders equalled the number of licenses. The license prices were over 100 euros per capita each in the U.K. where there were five licenses and just four incumbent bidders and in Germany where there were six licenses and four incumbents, but were less than 35 euros per capita in the Netherlands where there were equal numbers (five) of licenses and incumbents.<sup>5,6</sup>

Our results for the asymmetric case apply even when the differences between players’ actual valuations are arbitrarily small. However, we do assume that the advantaged player is much the most likely to have the highest actual valuation, so in this sense our asymmetric results do depend on a particular firm being clearly advantaged—as in the examples above of the Los Angeles and European spectrum license auctions.

Section 2 sets up a simple model of a standard ascending auction among bidders with “almost” common values.<sup>7</sup> Section 3 develops the intuition behind our results. Section 4 shows when higher prices are associated with selling more units in the symmetric case.<sup>8</sup> Section 5 shows that the results are dramatically different when bidders are asymmetric: greater supply *raises* price precisely when it does not with symmetric bidders!

Section 6 shows when rationing, as in Initial Public Offerings, is an *optimal* mechanism. Section 7 shows when restricting participation in an auction can raise expected revenues.<sup>9</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup>In our model, one bidder has a small private-value advantage. Bulow, Huang, and Klemperer (1996) analyse a similar almost-common-value model in which one bidder has a small ownership advantage and show that in this context, too, a small advantage can lead to large profits for the advantaged bidder and to low revenues for the seller.

<sup>5</sup>Our formal model does not allow for more than one advantaged bidder, and it is unclear how far our results generalize in this direction (see Section 9). But the results of the model would probably be reinforced by incorporating entry and bidding costs which were probably significant in the European auctions and, of course, our results would be reinforced by larger advantages than those we consider. (See Avery (1998), Daniel and Hirshleifer (1995), Hirshleifer (1995), and Klemperer (2000a) for a general discussion of bidding costs.)

<sup>6</sup>Klemperer was the principal auction theorist advising the U.K. government on its auction. Bulow was also an advisor. See Binmore and Klemperer (2002), and Klemperer (2002a, b).

<sup>7</sup>Recent papers that use similar models to ours are Avery and Kagel (1997), and de Frutos and Rosenthal (1998), but these papers address very different concerns from ours. See also Bikhchandani and Riley (1991). Klemperer (1998) and de Frutos and Pechlivanos (2002) build on the current paper.

<sup>8</sup>In our model, the ascending auction always allocates a single object to the highest valuer—see Maskin (1992) for more general conditions under which this holds—but does not always allocate multiple objects efficiently.

<sup>9</sup>Externalities between bidders, (Jehiel and Moldovanu (1996, 2000), Caillaud and Jehiel (1998)) provide a different reason why an auctioneer may want to limit the participation of bidders. In Compte and Jehiel’s (2001) mixed private/common value setting, bidders have different amounts of information, and adding bidders may hurt revenues.

Section 8 considers first-price auctions.

Section 9 extends the model to more bidders and more units, and to more general value functions. In particular, we introduce another natural structure of valuation function, the “Maximum Game”, which yields extreme “perverse” results, independent of the distribution of bidder-types: if  $n$  symmetric bidders have a common value for an object equal to the maximum of their signals, then in a pure ascending auction every bidder bids up to his own signal, and the price equals the actual second-highest of all  $n$  signals. But if the object is simply rationed at a fixed price, every bidder (even one with the lowest possible signal) will be willing to pay the expected highest of the other  $n - 1$  signals, which is *greater* in expectation. Other “perverse” results of prices decreasing in demand and increasing in supply in the symmetric case are equally easy to obtain. Our main model uses an additive value-function, as in the “Wallet Game”,<sup>10</sup> but the Maximum Game structure underlies models such as Matthews (1984), Harstad and Bordley (1996), Levin (2001), and Parlour and Rajan (2001), which explains why they have obtained some related results to ours.<sup>11</sup> Section 10 concludes.

## 2. The Model

We use the simplest possible model to make our points: each of 3 risk-neutral potential bidders observes a private signal  $t_i$  independently and identically distributed according to the distribution  $F(t_i)$ ,  $i = 1, 2, 3$ . We assume  $F(\cdot)$  has a strictly positive continuous finite derivative  $f(\cdot)$  everywhere on its range, and the lowest possible signal is  $\underline{t} > 0$ , so  $F(\underline{t}) = 0$ . Conditional on all the signals, the expected value,  $v_i$ , of a unit to  $i$  is

$$\begin{aligned} v_1 &= (1 + \alpha_1)t_1 + t_2 + t_3 \\ v_2 &= t_1 + (1 + \alpha_2)t_2 + t_3 \\ v_3 &= t_1 + t_2 + (1 + \alpha_3)t_3 \end{aligned}$$

That is, each unit has a *common value*,  $v = \sum_{i=1}^3 t_i$ , to all the bidders, plus a *private value*,  $\alpha_i t_i$ , to each bidder  $i$ . We will focus on two cases, “the symmetric case” in which  $\alpha_1 = \alpha_2 = \alpha_3 = \alpha > 0$  and “the asymmetric case” in which  $\alpha_1 > \alpha_2 = \alpha_3 = \alpha > 0$ . In the latter case

<sup>10</sup>The Wallet Game was introduced in Bulow and Klemperer (1997) and Klemperer (1998).

<sup>11</sup>Matthews focuses on first-price auctions, and obtains results related to our Section 7. Harstad and Bordley and Parlour and Rajan examine rationing mechanisms and obtain results related to our Section 6. All these papers use more complex models with affiliation. Levin obtains results similar to our Section 4 results, while Krishna and Morgan (2001) obtain results equivalent to the symmetric case of our Section 7. Our paper shows why results like ours and theirs can arise, and shows they are surprisingly likely and that affiliation is not important for them.

we will refer to bidder 1 as the “advantaged” bidder, and bidders 2 and 3 as “disadvantaged” bidders. To make our points most starkly and straightforwardly, we consider the case in which the private-value components, that is, the  $\alpha_i$ ’s, are all small, and consider the asymmetric case in which  $\alpha/\alpha_1$  is also small; we state our results throughout for the limits in which  $\alpha_i \rightarrow 0, \forall_i$ , so  $v_1 \approx v_2 \approx v_3 \approx v$  and, for the asymmetric case,  $\alpha/\alpha_1 \rightarrow 0$ .

Thus the limit of the symmetric game is just the “Wallet Game”, in our previous terminology.<sup>12</sup>

Since  $\alpha_1$  is small, bidder 1’s private-value “advantage” in the asymmetric case is small. However, because  $\alpha/\alpha_1$  is also small, bidder 1 is much the most likely to have the highest actual value for a unit (and as  $\alpha/\alpha_1 \rightarrow 0$  bidder 1 always has the highest actual value). So bidder 1’s advantage is not small in this sense.

No bidder wants more than one unit. We consider two cases: the auctioneer has one unit to sell, and the auctioneer has two units to sell. (The number of units is common knowledge.)

We assume a conventional ascending bid “English” auction in which the price,  $p$ , starts at zero and rises continuously until the number of bidders who are still willing to pay the current price equals the number of units the auctioneer has for sale. Each bidder observes the price at which any other bidder drops out, and a bidder who drops out cannot reenter the auction.<sup>13</sup>

Each player’s pure strategy specifies the price level up to which he will remain in the bidding, as a function of his private signal and of the price (if any) at which any other player quit previously. We look for Perfect Bayesian Equilibria, but restrict attention to those equilibria in which symmetric bidders follow symmetric strategies. We also restrict attention to equilibria in which each bidder stays in the bidding just so long as he would be happy to find himself a winner, and stops bidding at that price at which he would be just indifferent were he to find himself a winner on the assumptions that any opponent(s) who drop out to make him a winner are of their lowest possible types assuming they have followed the equilibrium strategies prior to the current price.<sup>14</sup> Appendix B shows that this yields a unique (Perfect Bayesian) equilibrium.

---

<sup>12</sup>A classroom example involves three students, each of whom knows only the amount of money,  $t_i$ , in his or her own wallet. They compete for a prize equal to the combined contents of their wallets,  $v = t_1 + t_2 + t_3$ . See Klemperer (1998).

<sup>13</sup>Auction theorists call this a “Japanese auction”. See Bikhchandani and Riley (1993), or the Working Paper version of our paper for a formal description.

<sup>14</sup>These restrictions both avoid trivialities (although there are other equilibria, they do not seem very natural—see Appendix B) and greatly reduces the technical burden: Bikhchandani and Riley (1993) show how cumbersome and lengthy is a fully general analysis of even the completely symmetric version of our model. They too make assumptions to obtain a unique equilibrium (the same equilibrium as ours, though their model is a special case of ours).

We write the actual  $i^{\text{th}}$  highest signal among all the potential bidders as  $t_{(i)}$ , and write the highest and second-highest of two bidders as  $t_{(1,2)}$  and  $t_{(2,2)}$  respectively.

We write  $h(t_i) \equiv \frac{f(t_i)}{1-F(t_i)}$  for  $i$ 's hazard rate, and compress notation by writing  $h_i$  for  $h(t_i)$ . Bidder  $i$ 's *marginal revenue*<sup>15,16</sup> is defined as

$$MR_i = v_i - \frac{1}{h_i} \frac{\partial v_i}{\partial t_i}.$$

Note that since (we assumed) the  $\alpha_i$  are all small,  $MR_i \approx v - \frac{1}{h_i}$ .

We write  $E(t)$  and  $E(v)$  for the (unconditional) expectations of  $t$  and  $v$ , and  $E(t | t \geq z)$  for the expectation of the signal  $t$  conditional on it exceeding  $z$ , etc. Recall that if hazard rates are increasing (decreasing) the expected “time” ( $t - z$ ) to arrival of a signal,  $t$ , conditional on it not yet having arrived at time  $z$ , is decreasing (increasing) in  $z$ , that is,

*Lemma 1.*  $E(t - z | t \geq z)$  is increasing (decreasing) in  $z$  if the hazard function  $h$  is decreasing (increasing).

*Proof.* See appendix B.

### 3. Intuition

This Section uses “marginal revenues” to develop the intuition behind our main results, recalling from Bulow and Klemperer (1996) that *the expected price from the auction equals the expected marginal revenue of the winning bidder(s)*.<sup>17</sup>

#### The Symmetric Case

When bidders are symmetric, the bidder(s) with the highest signal(s) win(s) the unit(s).

---

<sup>15</sup>The marginal revenue of bidder  $i$  with signal  $t_i$  is exactly the marginal revenue extracted from the customer who is the same fraction of the way down the distribution of potential buyers of a monopolist whose demand is such that it has  $q = 1 - F(t_i)$  customers who have values  $\geq p = v_i(t_i)$  (i.e., there are  $F(t_i)$  customers with values less than  $v_i(t_i)$ ).

<sup>16</sup>Bulow and Roberts (1989) first showed how to interpret independent private-value auctions in terms of marginal revenues, and Bulow and Klemperer (1996) extended their interpretation to more general settings such as this one. This interpretation allows the translation of results from monopoly theory into auction theory, and so facilitates the analysis of auctions and the development of intuition about them.

<sup>17</sup>The result assumes that a bidder with the lowest possible signal never makes money; our asymmetric, multi-unit, decreasing-hazard-rate case does give expected profits to a bidder with the lowest-possible signal, but the required correction does not affect our results (see Section 5).

Klemperer (1999, Appendix B) gives a simple exposition of the result.

Now in a pure private-value auction in which a bidder's value,  $v_i$ , just equals his own signal,  $t_i$ ,  $i$ 's marginal revenue  $MR_i = v_i - \frac{1}{h_i} = t_i - \frac{1}{h_i}$  is increasing in  $t_i$  under weak assumptions which are satisfied by most standard distributions. Thus the standard single-unit auctions which assign a single unit to the high-value bidder thereby assign it to the bidder with the highest marginal revenue. Since in a two-unit auction one unit goes to the second-highest-value bidder who has a lower marginal revenue, it follows that revenue per unit is lower in the two-unit case.

However, in an (almost) pure common-value auction in which  $v_i \approx v_j \approx v$ , so  $MR_i \approx v - \frac{1}{h_i}$ , the bidder with the highest signal only has the highest marginal revenue if hazard rates,  $h_i$ , are increasing in signals. This is a much more stringent condition. The intuition is that with private values, when a bidder has a higher signal it affects only his own value and marginal revenue. But with common values, when a bidder has a higher signal it also raises the other bidders' values and so raises the others' marginal revenues. So it takes a much stronger distributional condition to ensure that bidders with higher signals have higher marginal revenues.

If indeed bidders with higher signals do have higher marginal revenues in the common-value case, then the logic is the same as for the private-value case and revenue per unit is lower when selling two units than selling one unit. But if instead bidders with higher signals have lower marginal revenues, as will be the case if hazard rates are decreasing in signals, a standard auction which sells to the bidder(s) with the highest signal(s) will sell to the *lowest*-marginal revenue bidder(s). So in this case revenue per unit is higher when selling two units than when selling one unit.

### **The Asymmetric Case**

The difference in the asymmetric case is that the bidder with the highest signal does not necessarily win a standard ascending auction.

In our case, in which it is common knowledge that bidder 1 is much the most likely to have the highest actual value, this bidder is much the most likely to win an ascending auction for a single unit. The reason is that the other bidders have greatly exaggerated "winner's curses" from beating bidder 1 so must bid very cautiously, which also reduces 1's "winner's curse".

But, with increasing hazard rates, bidder 1 is *not* much more likely than bidders 2 and 3

to win an ascending auction for two units. The reason is that 2 and 3 compete against each other, symmetrically, for the second unit and do not face an abnormally large winner's curse in that competition. Because the prices of both units will be the same, the more aggressive bidding by 2 and 3 increases 1's winner's curse which causes 1 to bid more cautiously and further reduces 2's and 3's winners' curses; we will show that when 1's value advantage is small it has only a small effect on the equilibrium.

So when three bidders compete for two units, and hazard rates are increasing, the bidders with the two highest signals who also have the two highest marginal revenues (almost) always win. But when three bidders compete for a single unit in the asymmetric case, bidder 1, who on average only has the average signal and average marginal revenue (almost) always wins. So expected prices are higher when two units are sold.

The analysis of the decreasing hazard rate case is a little more complex (see Section 5), but in this case too, the asymmetric case is the exact reverse of the symmetric case.

## 4. The Symmetric Case

To develop our results more formally, we begin with the symmetric case in which  $\alpha_1 = \alpha_2 = \alpha_3 = \alpha > 0$  (but  $\alpha \approx 0$ ).<sup>18</sup>

When three bidders compete for a single object, the lowest bidder, with signal  $t_{(3)}$ , quits when the price reaches the level where he would just be indifferent about winning if both his opponents dropped out, that is, at  $(3 + \alpha)t_{(3)}$ . To see this, observe that conditional on winning at price  $p' = (3 + \alpha)t'$  (and assuming the kind of equilibrium behaviour we are looking for) his inferred value of the unit equals  $v' = (1 + \alpha)t_{(3)} + 2t'$  and  $v' > p' \Leftrightarrow t_{(3)} > t'$ . So if he were to find himself a winner at any higher price than  $(3 + \alpha)t_{(3)}$ , he would lose money, and conversely he would make money if he won at any lower price, so should not quit earlier. So the equilibrium is a separating one in which the other bidders can then infer (assuming equilibrium behaviour) his actual signal,  $t_{(3)}$ . The next-lowest bidder then quits when the price reaches the point at which he would just be indifferent about winning were he the marginal winner, that is, were he tied for the highest signal, so he quits at  $p = t_{(3)} + (2 + \alpha)t_{(2)}$ .<sup>19</sup> But  $v = t_{(3)} + t_{(2)} + t_{(1)}$ ,

<sup>18</sup>As  $\alpha \rightarrow 0$ , the equilibrium of this case approaches the symmetric equilibrium of the pure common values model.

<sup>19</sup>If he were to find himself a winner at any higher price he would lose money, since at price  $p' = t_{(3)} + (2 + \alpha)t'$  with  $t' > t_{(2)}$ , the inferred value of the unit equals  $t_{(3)} + (1 + \alpha)t_{(2)} + t'$  conditional on winning at price  $p'$ , and conversely he would make money at any lower price, so should not quit before  $p$ .

so (since  $\alpha \approx 0$ )  $p \approx v - (t_{(1)} - t_{(2)}) \Rightarrow E(p) \approx E(v) - E(t - t_{(2)} \mid t \geq t_{(2)})$ .

*Lemma 2.* When 3 symmetric bidders compete for 1 object, the bidder with the highest signal wins and (for small  $\alpha$ ) the expected price  $\approx E(v) - E(t - t_{(2)} \mid t \geq t_{(2)})$ .

*Proof.* See appendix B.

If instead, three bidders compete for two objects, the lowest quits in symmetric equilibrium at the price at which he would just be indifferent about winning were he the marginal winner, that is, were he tied with the second-highest signal. So the actual lowest-signal bidder with signal  $t_{(3)}$  quits at the value to him if the second-highest-signal bidder has the same signal,  $(t_{(3)})$ , and the remaining signal equals its expected value given the two lowest signals are  $t_{(3)}$ , that is,  $E(t \mid t \geq t_{(3)})$ . So the lowest-signal bidder quits at  $p = (1 + \alpha)t_{(3)} + t_{(3)} + E(t \mid t \geq t_{(3)})$ .<sup>20</sup> But  $E(v) = E(t_{(3)}) + 2E(t \mid t \geq t_{(3)})$ , so  $E(p) \approx E(v) - E(t - t_{(3)} \mid t \geq t_{(3)})$ .

*Lemma 3.* When 3 symmetric bidders compete for 2 objects, the bidders with the highest signals win and (for small  $\alpha$ ) the expected price  $\approx E(v) - E(t - t_{(3)} \mid t \geq t_{(3)})$ .

*Proof.* See appendix B.

From Lemmas 2 and 3 selling two units rather than one lowers (raises) the per-unit price obtained if  $E(t - t_{(3)} \mid t \geq t_{(3)})$  is greater than (less than)  $E(t - t_{(2)} \mid t \geq t_{(2)})$ . But for any realization of  $t_{(3)}$  we know from Lemma 1 that this is true when hazard rates are increasing (decreasing). So increasing hazard rates imply the expected price is greater with one unit and decreasing hazard rates imply the expected price is greater with two units.

*Proposition 1.* With 3 symmetric bidders, the expected price per unit is higher when 1 unit is sold than when 2 units are sold if hazard rates,  $h_i$ , are increasing in the signals,  $t_i$ . The expected price per unit is lower when 1 unit is sold than when 2 units are sold if hazard rates

<sup>20</sup>If either of the other bidders were to quit and leave him as a winner at any higher price,  $p' = (2 + \alpha)t' + E(t \mid t \geq t')$  with  $t' > t_{(3)}$ , he would expect to lose money since he would then infer a unit's value to be  $(1 + \alpha)t_{(3)} + t' + E(t \mid t \geq t') < p'$ , and conversely he would expect to profit from a victory at any lower price.

are decreasing.

The difference between the prices in the one-unit and two-unit auctions, that is, the difference between  $E(t - t_{(2)} \mid t \geq t_{(2)})$  and  $E(t - t_{(3)} \mid t \geq t_{(3)})$ , is just the difference between the information rents of the winning bidders. Since the seller’s revenue equals the social surplus less the information rent of the bidders, and the social surplus is (almost) independent of the allocation in (almost) common value auctions, a higher information rent implies a lower price.

It is now easy to find examples in which selling more units raises the expected price. (See Example 1 below.)

Section 3 provided some intuition for our result; the key is that the expected price equals the expected marginal revenue of the winner(s), that is of the highest-signal bidder(s) in the symmetric case. So the expected price is decreasing in the number of winners only if lower-signal bidders have lower marginal revenues. In a private-value model the condition for lower-signal bidders to have lower marginal revenues is just that a bidder’s marginal revenue is downward sloping, that is, that a monopoly firm with demand  $q = 1 - F(p)$  has marginal revenue downward sloping in its *own* output.<sup>21, 22</sup> But with common values when a bidder has a higher signal it also raises the other bidders’ values, and so raises the others’ marginal revenues; the corresponding condition in the common-value case is that the same firm’s marginal revenue is steeper than its demand curve.<sup>23</sup>

Equivalently, the firm’s marginal revenue must be downward sloping in an *opponent’s* output; this is exactly the condition required to guarantee that firm’s outputs in a quantity-setting oligopoly are “strategic substitutes”, in the terminology of Bulow, Geanakoplos, and Klemperer (1985a). And the assumption of strategic substitutes, while commonly made, and *perhaps* more plausible than the converse assumption of strategic complements, is not a reasonable general assumption.<sup>24</sup> Indeed, among the most commonly used demand curves, linear

<sup>21</sup>The demand curve  $q = 1 - F(p)$  is just the conventional demand curve that would be created by a very large number of buyers with values  $v_i(t_i)$  when the  $t_i$  are drawn independently from the distribution  $F(t_i)$ . (Buyers are atomistic with total mass 1.) For more discussion of the analogy between a bidder with signal distributed as  $F(t_i)$  and a market with demand curve  $1 - F(p)$  see Bulow and Klemperer (1996).

<sup>22</sup>Note that the expected marginal revenue of the second-highest bidder is always below the expected marginal revenue of the highest bidder in a private-value model, because the second-highest value both equals the expected marginal revenue of the highest bidder and exceeds the actual marginal revenue of the second-highest bidder.

<sup>23</sup>If  $MR_j = v - \frac{1}{h_j(t_j)}$  then the slope of the “demand curve” is  $\partial v / \partial t_j$  while the slope of marginal revenue is  $\partial v / \partial t_j + \frac{\partial h_j / \partial t_j}{(h_j(t_j))^2}$ . The latter is greater (less) than the former if  $h$  is increasing (decreasing). In the common value auction this determines whether an increase in  $j$ ’s signal increases his marginal revenue relative to  $i$ ’s. In oligopoly it determines whether an increase in  $j$ ’s output increases  $i$ ’s marginal revenue and thus  $i$ ’s output.

<sup>24</sup>See Bulow, Geanakoplos and Klemperer (1985b) for an example in which a monopolist facing a new entrant

demand ( $p = A - Bq \Leftrightarrow q = \frac{A-p}{B}$ ) yields strategic substitutes, constant elasticity demand ( $p = Aq^{\frac{1}{\eta}} \Leftrightarrow q = \left(\frac{p}{A}\right)^{\eta}, \eta < -1$ ) yields strategic complements, and logarithmic demand ( $p = A - \frac{1}{\lambda} \log q \Leftrightarrow q = e^{-\lambda(p-A)}$ , i.e. quantity is exponential in price) yields strategic independence (neither strategic substitutes nor strategic complements) for a monopolist facing a small new entrant.

Corresponding exactly to the oligopoly cases we have:

*Example 1.* With uniformly distributed signals,  $F(t) = \left(\frac{t-t}{t-t}\right)$ , expected price is decreasing in supply.<sup>25</sup> With constant-elasticity distributed signals,  $F(t) = 1 - \left(\frac{t}{t}\right)^{\eta}$ , expected price is increasing in supply.<sup>26</sup> With exponentially distributed signals,  $F(t) = 1 - e^{-\lambda(t-t)}$ , expected price is independent of supply.

So, just as in oligopoly it is an empirical matter whether firms' outputs are strategic substitutes or strategic complements, so in symmetric pure common-value auctions it must be an empirical matter whether price is increasing or decreasing in supply.

The next section, however, will show that even small asymmetries can make the relationship between supply and price even less predictable.

## 5. The Asymmetric Case

This section will show that when the result that greater supply lowers expected price holds for the perfectly symmetric case, it can fail when there are small asymmetries between the bidders. In particular it fails if the item(s) for sale are arbitrarily close to pure common-values but one bidder, say bidder 1, almost certainly has a (slightly) higher actual value than the others. We assume  $\alpha_1 > \alpha_2 = \alpha_3 = \alpha > 0$ , but  $\alpha_1 \approx 0$  and  $(\alpha/\alpha_1) \approx 0$ .

We begin by analyzing bidding behaviour in more detail:

---

views products as strategic complements in their terminology.

<sup>25</sup>For example,  $F(t) = \frac{t}{4}$  for  $4 \geq t \geq 0$  (which corresponds probabilistically to a linear demand curve) the expected values of the three signals would be 1, 2, and 3. The expected price in a 3 for 1 auction would be  $1 + 2 + 2 = 5$ , and the expected price in a 3 for 2 auction would be  $1 + 1 + \frac{2+3}{2} = 4.5$ .

<sup>26</sup>For example, if  $F(t) = 1 - t^{-2}$  for  $t \geq 1$  (which corresponds probabilistically to a demand curve  $q \equiv 1 - F(p) = p^{-2}$ , that is, constant elasticity of -2) the expected values of the three signals would be 1.2, 1.6, 3.2. So the expected price in a 3 for 1 auction would be  $1.2 + 1.6 + 1.6 = 4.4$ , and the expected price with 3 for 2 would be  $1.2 + 1.2 + \frac{1.6+3.2}{2} = 4.8$ .

*Lemma 4.* When 3 bidders compete for 1 object in the asymmetric case (i.e. small  $\alpha_i$  and small  $\alpha/\alpha_1$ ), the advantaged bidder (almost always) wins and the expected price  $\approx E(v) - E(t - \underline{t})$ .

*Proof.* See appendix B.

The logic is straightforward. Bidder  $i$  quits where he would be just indifferent about finding himself a winner, so his marginal type  $\underline{t}_i$  quits at price  $p = (1 + \alpha_i)\underline{t}_i + \underline{t}_j + \underline{t}_k$ , where  $\underline{t}_j$  and  $\underline{t}_k$  are his expectations of  $j$ 's and  $k$ 's signals conditional on his winning at this price. That is,  $\underline{t}_j$  is the marginal type of bidder  $j$  who is just quitting if any type of  $j$  is currently quitting,<sup>27</sup> and similarly for  $\underline{t}_k$ . Likewise, type  $\underline{t}_j$  of  $j$  is in fact just quitting iff  $p = \underline{t}_i + (1 + \alpha_j)\underline{t}_j + \underline{t}_k$ . So types  $\underline{t}_i$  and  $\underline{t}_j$  quit simultaneously iff  $(1 + \alpha_i)\underline{t}_i + \underline{t}_j + \underline{t}_k = \underline{t}_i + (1 + \alpha_j)\underline{t}_j + \underline{t}_k \Leftrightarrow \alpha_i \underline{t}_i = \alpha_j \underline{t}_j$ , and  $\underline{t}_i$  quits before (after)  $\underline{t}_j$  iff  $\alpha_i \underline{t}_i < (>) \alpha_j \underline{t}_j$ . So since  $\alpha_1 \underline{t} > \alpha t_2$  and  $\alpha_1 \underline{t} > \alpha t_3$  for almost all actual signals  $t_2$  and  $t_3$  of bidders 2 and 3 for sufficiently large  $\alpha_1/\alpha$ , bidder 1 is almost always the winner. If, for example, in fact  $\alpha_1 \underline{t} > \alpha t_2 > \alpha t_3$ , then bidder 3 quits first at  $(1 + \alpha)t_3 + t_3 + \underline{t}$  (since at this price he knows  $t_2 \geq t_3$  so the current lowest types of bidders 2 and 1 that could remain are  $t_2 = t_3$  and  $\underline{t}_1 = \underline{t}$ ), and bidder 2 quits next at  $p = (1 + \alpha)t_2 + t_3 + \underline{t} \approx t_2 + t_3 + \underline{t} = v - (t_1 - \underline{t})$ .

The intuition is that because bidder 1 (almost always) values the asset the most, bidders 2 and 3 face enormous winner's curses if bidder 1 ever exits, and they must therefore assume  $t_1 \approx \underline{t}$  whenever he bids. So they quit at  $\approx t_2 + t_3 + \underline{t}$ , and bidder 1 almost always wins.

However, with three bidders competing for two units and increasing hazard rates, bidder 1's advantage is almost eliminated and he wins only when he has one of the two highest signals:

*Lemma 5.* When 3 bidders compete for 2 objects, in the asymmetric case (i.e. small  $\alpha_i$  and small  $\alpha/\alpha_1$ ) (i) if hazard-rates,  $h_i$ , are increasing in signals, the bidders with the highest signals (almost always) win and the expected price  $\approx E(v) - E(t - t_{(3)} \mid t \geq t_{(3)})$ , (ii) if hazard-rates are decreasing, the advantaged bidder and the disadvantaged bidder with the higher signal win and the expected price  $\approx E(v) - E(t - t_{(2,2)} \mid t \geq t_{(2,2)})$ .

*Proof.* See appendix B.

---

<sup>27</sup>If  $j$  has already quit  $\underline{t}_j$ 's is  $j$ 's inferred signal, and if  $j$  has not quit but no type of  $j$  is quitting then  $\underline{t}_j$  is  $j$ 's lowest possible signal consistent with equilibrium.

To understand Lemma 5, again begin by observing that bidder  $i$  quits where he would be just indifferent about finding himself a winner. If  $\underline{t}_i, \underline{t}_j$ , and  $\underline{t}_k$  are the lowest possible signals of bidders  $i, j$  and  $k$  assuming equilibrium behaviour up to the current price, type  $\underline{t}_i$  of bidder  $i$  has expected value  $(1 + \alpha_i)\underline{t}_i + \underline{t}_j + E(t_k | t_k \geq \underline{t}_k)$  if  $j$  quits now, and expected value  $(1 + \alpha_i)\underline{t}_i + E(t_j | t_j \geq \underline{t}_j) + \underline{t}_k$  if  $k$  quits now. So type  $\underline{t}_i$  quits at  $p = (1 + \alpha_i)\underline{t}_i + \underline{t}_j + \underline{t}_k + x_j \text{Prob}(k \text{ quits now} | j \text{ or } k \text{ quits now}) + x_k \text{Prob}(j \text{ quits now} | j \text{ or } k \text{ quits now})$  in which  $x_j \equiv E(t_j - \underline{t}_j | t_j \geq \underline{t}_j)$  and  $x_i$  and  $x_k$  are defined similarly. Since  $\alpha_2 = \alpha_3 = \alpha < \alpha_1$ , some types of bidders 2 and 3 quit (symmetrically) before any types of bidder 1 quits. Now note that for small enough  $\alpha$  and  $\alpha_1$  the differences between  $\alpha_1 \underline{t}_1$  and  $\alpha \underline{t}_2 (= \alpha \underline{t}_3)$  are very small relative to differences between  $x_1$  and  $x_2 (= x_3)$  (except if hazard rates are constant). So if hazard rates are increasing, so  $x_i$  is decreasing in  $\underline{t}_i$ , then if  $\underline{t}_1$  were to fall much behind  $\underline{t}_2 (= \underline{t}_3)$  then  $x_2$  would become small relative to  $x_1$  and  $\underline{t}_1$  would wish to quit at a lower price than  $\underline{t}_2$ . So types of bidder 1 would have to quit until  $\underline{t}_1$  roughly caught up to the value of  $\underline{t}_2 (= \underline{t}_3)$ . Therefore increasing hazard rates require  $\underline{t}_1 \approx \underline{t}_2 = \underline{t}_3$ . So bidder  $i$  quits at (approximately)  $(1 + \alpha_i)t_i + t_i + E(t_k | t_k \geq t_j = t_i)$ , just as in symmetric equilibrium with symmetric bidders, and the bidder with the lowest signal,  $t_{(3)}$ , (approximately) quits first. So the expected price  $\approx E(t_{(3)} + t_{(3)} + E(t | t \geq t_{(3)})) \approx E(v) - E(t - t_{(3)} | t \geq t_{(3)})$  and we have part (i) of the lemma.

In words, a bidder exits when the current price equals (P), the private value component of the bidder's signal, *plus* (C), the common value to the bidder if all others exited immediately, *plus* (X), the expected value in excess of (C) conditional on the auction ending immediately. (C) is the same for everyone. With only one unit available for sale (X) is necessarily zero, so the bidder with the highest private value component always wins. But with more than one unit available (X) swamps (P) if hazard rates are increasing and the private values are small, so the bidders with the highest signals win.

The intuition is that even if bidder 1 had a large advantage, bidders 2 and 3 would compete against each other for the second unit, and would not face an abnormally large winner's curse in that competition. So bidders 2 and 3 bid more aggressively than when there is just one unit for sale, which forces bidder 1 to pay more and may cause bidder 1 to exit if his signal is low enough, which further reduces the other bidders' winner's curses.

So bidder 1's position is greatly weakened by the sale of the second unit in the "normal"

increasing hazard-rates case. When just one unit is for sale, bidder 1 always wins it. But when there are two units for sale, he wins barely more often than his opponents do.

Notice that although this turns out to be good for revenue, there is a (small) efficiency cost in that bidder 1 (almost always) has the highest value for a unit.

On the other hand, if hazard rates are decreasing,  $x_i$  is increasing in  $\underline{t}_i$ , so once  $\underline{t}_1$  falls behind  $\underline{t}_2 (= \underline{t}_3)$  then  $x_2$  becomes large relative to  $x_1$  so  $\underline{t}_1$  wishes to quit at a still higher price relative to  $\underline{t}_2$ , so (since some types of bidders 2 and 3 start quitting first) no type of bidder 1 ever quits. As the auction proceeds and more types of bidders 2 and 3 quit,  $x_2 \equiv E(t_2 - \underline{t}_2)$  and  $x_3 \equiv E(t_3 - \underline{t}_3)$  increase while  $x_1 \equiv E(t_1 - \underline{t}_1)$  remains unchanged and so even the lowest type of bidder 1 expects a larger and larger surplus conditional on winning; the higher the bidding goes, the more *underpriced* bidder 1 thinks the object is. Since bidders 2 and 3 are symmetric, the bidder with the lower of their two signals loses so, writing this signal as  $t_{(2,2)}$ , he quits at price  $p = E(t_1) + (1 + \alpha)t_{(2,2)} + t_{(2,2)}$ . But  $E(v) = E(t_1 + t_{(1,2)} + t_{(2,2)})$ , so  $E(p) \approx E(v) - E(t - t_{(2,2)} \mid t \geq t_{(2,2)})$ , giving us part (ii) of the lemma.

Lemmas 4 and 5 yield:

*Proposition 2.* In the asymmetric case, the expected price per unit is *lower* when 1 unit is sold than when 2 units are sold if hazard rates,  $h_i$ , are increasing in the signals,  $t_i$ . The expected price per unit is *higher* when 1 unit is sold than when 2 units are sold if hazard rates are decreasing.

*Proof.* Since  $\underline{t}$  is the lowest possible value of  $t$  we know from lemma 1 that  $E(t - \underline{t})$  is greater than (less than)  $E(t - t_{(3)} \mid t \geq t_{(3)})$  and  $E(t - t_{(2,2)} \mid t \geq t_{(2,2)})$  if hazard rates are increasing (decreasing). The proposition then follows directly from lemmas 4 and 5. Q.E.D.

As with the symmetric case, marginal revenues help us understand these results better (see Section 3): When a single unit is sold it always goes to bidder 1, so the expected price equals the expected marginal revenue of a randomly drawn signal.

When two units are sold, and hazard-rates are increasing, the winners are the bidders with the two highest signals, and increasing hazard-rates imply that these bidders have the highest marginal revenues. So two units sell at a higher per-unit price, on average, than one unit.

When hazard-rates are decreasing, on the other hand, and two units are sold, they are won by bidder 1, whose expected marginal revenue is that of a randomly drawn signal, and by the other bidder who has the higher of the other signals and the *lower* of the other marginal revenues. So the expected marginal revenue of a winner, and therefore expected price, is lower when two units are sold than when just one unit is sold.

There is a further reason why with decreasing hazard-rates two units yields a lower per-unit price than a single unit. Recall that the expected revenue from an auction equals the expected marginal revenue of the winner only when any bidder with the lowest feasible signal receives no expected surplus (just as the Revenue Equivalence Theorem applies only to auctions where bidders with the worst possible signals make no money). If the assumption fails, expected revenue is reduced by the sum of the expected profits of the bidders conditional on their having their lowest possible signals. In most standard auctions the assumption holds trivially, but our decreasing hazard-rate multi-unit asymmetric auction is an exception in which even the lowest type of bidder 1 always wins and makes positive expected surplus: this type makes zero expected surplus at the lowest feasible sale price, and an ever increasing expected surplus at higher sale prices. So the two-unit decreasing hazard-rate auction is even less profitable relative to any of our other auctions which do all satisfy the standard assumption.

In short, selling more units leads to higher prices when bidders are asymmetric and hazard rates are increasing, and when bidders are symmetric and hazard rates are decreasing.

## 6. Rationing and Initial Public Offerings

Selling two half-units yields the same per-unit prices as selling two whole units in our model. So rationing each bidder to buy only a half-unit yields a higher expected price than selling a single unit in those cases in which increasing supply raises price. The intuition is that creating additional winners reduces the winners' curse that any of them face, and so elicits more aggressive bidding behaviour. By the same logic, the seller can do better still in the decreasing hazard rate case by simply offering each buyer one-third of a unit at a fixed price, or alternatively by choosing the winner randomly among those prepared to pay the fixed price.

*Proposition 3.* Rationing to all 3 bidders at the fixed price  $\underline{t} + 2E(t) = E(v) - E(t - \underline{t})$  is the

optimal way to sell the good when hazard rates are decreasing.<sup>28</sup>

*Proof.* See appendix B.

The result that rationing among all bidders is more profitable than raising the price to clear the market requires decreasing hazard rates.<sup>29</sup> The more general point, however, is that the difference between the expected revenues from choosing a price that guarantees an immediate sell-out and from searching for the best possible price may be small; because searching for a high price may reveal some negative information (about where low bidders quit), it can lead to either a higher or a lower price than the pooling equilibrium that rationing induces. If the seller is risk averse, it may prefer the sure price that rationing guarantees.

In many finance and oil-lease models, signals are assumed to be distributed lognormally, so hazard rates are first increasing and then decreasing. In these cases, with symmetric bidders, the seller does best to gradually raise price to eliminate the buyers with the lowest signals but then ration when a high enough price is reached; Example 2 illustrates. This fits closely with practice in Initial Public Offerings where a range of prices may be explored, but the final price is often fixed at a point where excess demand is most likely.<sup>30</sup> More mildly stated, it may be surprisingly inexpensive for sellers to choose a rationing price in IPOs, making the practice sustainable even if it is not necessarily optimal.

*Example 2.* With signals distributed according to the standard lognormal distribution (in which  $\ln(t)$  is normally distributed with mean 0 and standard deviation 1), symmetric bidders and 1 unit, it is optimal to run an ascending auction that separates all bidders with signals less than  $t^* \approx .24$ , and to then ration among bidders with signals above  $t^*$ , if there are any. Thus if no bidder has a signal below  $t^*$ , the price will rise continuously to  $3t^*$  at which point the seller will announce a rationing price of  $t^* + 2y^*$  in which  $y^* \equiv E(t \mid t \geq t^*) \approx 1.77$  (and all three bidders will then accept this price). If  $t_{(3)} < t^*$  the lowest-signal bidder will quit at  $3t_{(3)}$ , and if no further bidder quits before price  $t_{(3)} + 2t^*$  the good will be rationed at price

<sup>28</sup>We are restricting ourselves to mechanisms that always yield a sale. Sometimes a seller can do better in expectation by having minimum prices that may lead to no sale.

<sup>29</sup>Rationing is *strictly* more profitable than raising the price to clear the market in the symmetric case, and/or when two units are available. In the asymmetric case, rationing a single unit to all three bidders is equally profitable in expectation as the standard ascending auction (independent of hazard rates.) (See Appendix B.)

<sup>30</sup>This is true even when the final IPO price is set above the initially specified range. For other theories of rationing, see De Graba (1995), De Graba and Mohammed (1999), Denicolo and Garella (1999), Gilbert and Klemperer (2000) and the references they cite.

$t_{(3)} + t^* + y^*$  (which both remaining bidders will then accept). Expected price is 3.414; by contrast a pure ascending auction (or a sealed-bid auction) would yield 3.06.

With 2 units, it is again optimal to start with an ascending auction, but then to ration at a price of  $t^* + 2y^*$  if all three bidders have signals above  $t^*$ . Expected price is 3.411, just below the expected price in the optimal one-unit mechanism.<sup>31</sup>

## 7. Restricting the number of bidders

It is also evident that when increasing supply raises price, so can restricting demand.

Again the intuition is that reducing the number of bidders reduces each bidder's winner's curse. Since in a private-value ascending auction bidders follow the same strategy regardless of the number of bidders (they bid up to their true value), it should be no surprise that with common values each bidder bids more aggressively when there are fewer of them.<sup>32, 33</sup> This effect can dominate the effect of the winner having a lower signal, on average, when there are fewer bidders.

As before it is quickest to see the results using marginal revenues, though we will offer proofs using more traditional methods.

When  $n$  symmetric bidders compete for one unit, the expected price equals the expected marginal revenue of the winner, equals the expected marginal revenue of the bidder with the highest signal among the  $n$  bidders.<sup>34</sup> So if hazard rates are decreasing, that is, the bidders with the higher signals have the lower marginal revenues, then the expected price is decreasing in  $n$ .

On the other hand, when bidders are asymmetric and all three bidders are present, bidder 1 is the winner and, in expectation, has the marginal revenue of a randomly selected bidder.

However, when only two bidders are selected, the winner will be the bidder with the higher of

<sup>31</sup>Because of the decreasing hazard rates for higher signals, the expected price in a pure ascending auction for 2 units (3.31) exceeds the expected price in a pure ascending auction for 1 unit.

<sup>32</sup>In the symmetric case, with two bidders  $i$  bids up to  $2t_i + E(t)$ . With three bidders  $i$  bids up to  $2t_i + t_{(3)}$ .

<sup>33</sup>Kagel, Levin and Harstad (1995) noted that bidders bid more aggressively when there are fewer of them in sealed second-price auctions and Matthews (1984) argues this also typically applies in first-price auctions. Our result applies equally to the asymmetric case.

<sup>34</sup>Any bidder's actual marginal revenue is a function of all the other active bidders' signals, so depends on  $n$ . But with independent signals a bidder's marginal revenue,  $\overline{MR}_i(t_i, t_j)$ , when  $i$  and  $j$  are active, equals his expected marginal revenue conditional on  $t_i$  and  $t_j$ ,  $E_{t_k}\{MR_i(t_i, t_j, t_k)\}$ , when an additional bidder  $k$  is active. So with two bidders and decreasing hazard rates, expected profits =  $E \min(\overline{MR}_1(t_1, t_2), \overline{MR}_2(t_1, t_2)) = E \min(E_{t_3}\{MR_1(t_1, t_2, t_3)\}, E_{t_3}\{MR_2(t_1, t_2, t_3)\}) \geq \min(MR_1(t_1, t_2, t_3), MR_2(t_1, t_2, t_3)) > E \min(MR_1(t_1, t_2, t_3), MR_2(t_1, t_2, t_3), MR_3(t_1, t_2, t_3)) =$  expected profits when all three bidders are present.

their two signals when bidders 2 and 3 are selected (and the winner will be bidder 1 otherwise). So if marginal revenues are higher (lower) for the higher-signal bidders, the expected price will be higher (lower) when the number of bidders is arbitrarily restricted to two. That is, the results for the asymmetric case are again opposite to those for the symmetric case.

*Proposition 4.* In the symmetric case the expected price when 1 unit is sold is lower when only 2 bidders are allowed to participate than when all 3 compete if hazard rates,  $h_i$ , are increasing in the signals. The price is higher when only 2 bidders are allowed to participate than when all 3 compete if hazard rates are decreasing.

In the asymmetric case the opposite results apply.

*Proof.* See appendix B.

In sum, restricting the number of bidders who are allowed to participate is likely to be a profitable strategy when bidders are asymmetric if hazard rates are increasing, or when bidders are completely symmetric (in what is publicly known about them) but hazard rates are decreasing.<sup>35</sup> So our model can explain strategies such as, for example, a merger-target opening negotiations with only a limited number of potential acquirers.

Of course these results contrast with our earlier work, Bulow and Klemperer (1996), which emphasised conditions under which restricting bidding is not merely undesirable for the seller, but is even a bad idea for a seller who can gain additional negotiating power by limiting participation. The point of this section is that while the conditions specified in our earlier work are very natural for private-value auctions with symmetric bidders, they are less compelling for symmetric common-value or almost-common-value auctions, and perhaps even unnatural for asymmetric almost-common-value auctions.

## 8. Sealed-Bid Auctions

How are our results affected if the other of the two most common auction forms, that is, a

---

<sup>35</sup>We are assuming that the participants are chosen randomly when their numbers are restricted. Restricting numbers by requiring bidders to pay an entry fee would be very unprofitable, since it would select precisely those bidders (higher signals in the symmetric case, and advantaged bidders in the asymmetric case) that the seller wishes to exclude.

sealed-bid or first-price auction, is used?<sup>36</sup>

The answer is hardly at all when bidders are symmetric, since the highest-signal bidder(s) win in any standard auction, so it follows from the Revenue Equivalence Theorem that expected revenues are the same in any standard auction.<sup>37</sup> So Lemmas 2 and 3 apply in expectation, and Proposition 1 applies exactly as before.

However the outcome of a sealed-bid auction, in stark contrast to that of an ascending auction is, it is believed, almost unaffected by small asymmetries between the bidders.<sup>38</sup> Assuming this is true, it then follows easily that in the asymmetric case, the expected revenue is higher for 1 unit and is the same for 2 units from a sealed-bid auction than from an ascending auction if bidders' hazard-rates are increasing, and is lower for 1 unit and higher for 2 units from a sealed-bid than from an ascending auction if hazard-rates are decreasing (see Appendix A). In the symmetric case the two auction types are always equally profitable.

In sum, without detailed information about the distribution of bidders' signals, it is very hard to make any predictions about which of sealed-bid and ascending auctions are more profitable.<sup>39</sup>

## 9. Extensions, and the “Maximum Game ”

### More Bidders and More Units

Extending our results to  $n > 3$  bidders and  $k$  units is trivial for the symmetric case. As before, whether more or less units raises expected price depends on whether hazard rates are decreasing or increasing. Appendix A gives more detail, and shows that with decreasing hazard rates a larger  $k$  may yield a significantly higher expected price, even when  $n$  is very large. It also seems straightforward that the asymmetric case generalizes to more than two disadvantaged bidders in the obvious way.<sup>40</sup>

---

<sup>36</sup>In a sealed-bid or first-price auction for two units, bidders simultaneously and independently submit bids. The winners are the two high bidders and each pays his actual bid.

<sup>37</sup>The Revenue Equivalence Theorem is due to Myerson (1981) and Riley and Samuelson (1981). For a simple exposition see Appendix A of Klemperer (1999).

<sup>38</sup>To our knowledge there is no general theorem proving this, although Avery and Kagel (1997) theorem 2.6 demonstrates the results for a model that is almost a special case of ours, and Bulow, Huang, and Klemperer (1999) proves the result in a related context.

<sup>39</sup>Klemperer (1998) builds on the first draft of this paper, to discuss how auctions of PCS licenses and auctions of companies can be designed to capture the benefits that first-price auctions offer. See also Klemperer (2000b, 2002a, b).

<sup>40</sup>The results seem less clear cut if there are multiple units for sale and multiple advantaged bidders.

## General Value Functions

Both for tractability, and to make a clear contrast with the pure private-value case,  $v_i = t_i$ , we restricted analysis to value functions which are the sum of bidders' signals. However, our “perverse” results in no way depend on this.

More generally, if  $i$ 's value is  $v_i(t_1, t_2, t_3)$ , then  $i$ 's marginal revenue,  $MR_i$ , equals  $v_i - \frac{\partial v_i}{\partial t_i} \cdot \frac{1}{h_i}$ , so in the symmetric case, for example, fewer bidders or more units raise prices if  $\frac{\partial v_i}{\partial t_i} \cdot \frac{1}{h_i}$  is increasing in  $t_i$ , which can clearly be satisfied *either* because hazard rates  $h_i$  are (sufficiently) decreasing *or* because  $\frac{\partial v_i}{\partial t_i}$  is (sufficiently) increasing.

Most of our results hold quite generally if we substitute the condition “the bidders with the higher signals have the higher MRs (i.e.,  $t_i > t_j \Leftrightarrow MR_i > MR_j$ )” for the condition “hazard rates are increasing in the signals”, and substitute the condition “the bidders with the higher signals have the lower MRs” for the condition “hazard rates are decreasing”, throughout.<sup>41</sup>

## The Maximum Game

Example 3, which we call the Maximum Game, provides a good illustration of how a different choice of value function than the one we used can make it easy to obtain extreme “perverse” results :

*Example 3. The Maximum Game.* Assume bidders' common value equals the *maximum* of the signals,  $v_i = v = \max\{t_i\}$ . Then with  $n$  bidders competing for one unit in an ascending auction, every bidder bids up to his signal, and the price will equal the actual second-highest of the  $n$  signals. But if one bidder is randomly chosen for a take-it-or-leave-it offer, he will be willing to pay at least the expected highest of the  $n - 1$  other signals, which is greater in expectation.

More generally, with  $k$  units, and if only a random  $m \geq k$  of the  $n$  bidders are allowed to compete, the expected price is, we show below,  $(1 - \frac{m}{nk})E(t_{(1)}) + \frac{m}{nk}E(t_{(2)})$ . So the more units, and the fewer bidders, the higher the expected price. Likewise, a rationing mechanism which selects the top  $l$  bidders and sells each of them  $1/l$  of the available supply yields an expected price of  $(1 - \frac{1}{l})E(t_{(1)}) + \frac{1}{l}E(t_{(2)})$ ; the *best* of these mechanisms sets  $l = n$ , that is, rations the available supply to all  $n$  bidders at the highest price (the expected highest of  $n - 1$  signals) at

---

<sup>41</sup>We conjecture this applies to Lemma 5, and hence to Propositions 2 and 4, as well as (more obviously) to Proposition 1.

which potential buyers will want to buy, while the *worst* of these mechanisms sets  $l = 1$ , that is, is a pure ascending auction.

The results of the Maximum Game are best understood using marginal revenues. For all bidders but the one with the highest signal  $\frac{\partial v_i}{\partial t_i} = 0$ , so marginal revenue for these bidders simply equals the value of the highest bidder, which in expectation is  $E(t_{(1)})$ . Furthermore, recall that the expected revenue in any auction equals the expected marginal revenue of the winning bidder. If a single-unit Maximum Game were conducted as an ascending auction, the bidder with the highest signal would win and pay the second-highest signal. So the expected revenue in such an auction is  $E(t_{(2)})$ , and this must therefore be the expected marginal revenue of the bidder with the highest signal.<sup>42</sup> So the bidder with the highest signal has the lowest marginal revenue.

Since the expected price is the expected marginal revenue of the winners, and since the highest-signal bidder is always a winner whenever he is allowed to participate and so on average wins a fraction  $(\frac{m}{nk})$  of the units while other bidders win the remaining units, the expected sale price is  $(1 - \frac{m}{nk})E(t_{(1)}) + \frac{m}{nk}E(t_{(2)})$ .<sup>43</sup> Clearly, it is optimal to minimize the fraction of units that will be sold to the highest-signal bidder—so rationing, restricting participation, and increasing supply all raise the average sale price.

The Maximum Game may be a more natural model than our additive model if, for example, oil or other mineral rights are being sold. (Conditional on one bidder's test finding substantial oil, the results of other tests that find little or no oil may be irrelevant.)

Several symmetric common-value models whose results are driven by the Maximum Game's logic have been analysed by other authors. In Matthews (1984), the signals are distributed as  $F(t) = (\frac{t}{v})^\theta$  ( $\theta > 0$ ,  $0 \leq t \leq v$ ), so the maximum signal is a sufficient statistic for the true value,  $v$ . Of course, bidders' signals are affiliated in this model, which complicates matters, and Matthews examines sealed-bid auctions, but he finds expected price is often decreasing in the number of bidders, just as in our Maximum Game.

Harstad and Bordley (1996) examine an example in which bidders have diffuse priors about the true value  $v$ , and their signals are drawn from a uniform distribution on  $[v - \theta, v + \theta]$

<sup>42</sup>See Bulow and Klemperer (1996) and Appendix B of Klemperer (1999) for more details.

<sup>43</sup>The results can, of course, be confirmed directly by noting that the price is set by the actual  $(k + 1)$ <sup>st</sup> highest-signal participant who quits at his expectation of the maximum signal among the  $(k + 1)$  remaining bidders (including himself) and the  $(n - m)$  excluded bidders, conditional on the  $k$ <sup>th</sup> highest-signal remaining bidder having the same signal as he does (since he would be indifferent about finding himself a winner at this price).

( $\theta > 0$ ), so the expected value of  $v$  conditional on all  $n$  signals is the average of the highest and lowest signal—and independent of all the other signals. So, as we would expect, Harstad and Bordley find that profitable selling mechanisms are those that avoid selling to the highest and lowest signal bidders. Rationing equally to all except the lowest-signal bidder is the most profitable mechanism they examine. Again bidders’ signals are affiliated, but again the results are driven by the “Maximum Game” structure that is embedded within the model.<sup>44</sup>

Two other papers subsequent to ours also have the Maximum Game underlying them. Levin (2001) emphasises a model in which a weighted average of the two highest signals is a sufficient statistic for the true value, while in Parlour and Rajan (2001) all the signals are drawn from a distribution centered on the true value. Since their very rich model neither restricts this distribution to be uniform, nor restricts priors about the true value to be diffuse, the highest and lowest signals are no longer sufficient statistics for the true value. However, exactly as we would expect, they find that as the priors became more diffuse and the distribution of the signals conditional on the value becomes more uniform (so their model more closely approximates the Maximum Game) rationing performs relatively better.

## Affiliation

Finally, we noted that bidders’ signals are affiliated in several other authors’ models. We conjecture that affiliation makes rationing less likely to be optimal and makes our other “perverse” results harder to obtain. Excluding bidders or rationing or adding more winners means less information is shared in the auction. This tends to mean lower prices with affiliation because of the conservatism that affiliation creates in marginal bidders; see Milgrom and Weber (1982, 2000). So the standard intuition that more bidders and fewer winners will lead to higher prices will be more likely to hold if signals are affiliated. For example, when rationing to all bidders in the Maximum Game, the seller must offer each bidder a take-it-or-leave-it price equal to the expected highest of  $n - 1$  signals contingent on the  $n^{\text{th}}$  signal being the minimum possible. With affiliation this could easily be below the unconditional expected second highest of  $n$  signals, the expected price in an ascending auction with a single winner.

---

<sup>44</sup>Of course, in this and other models with affiliated signals, there exist selling mechanisms, albeit implausible ones, that extract bidders’ entire surplus (Cremer and McLean, 1985.)

## 10. Conclusions

Economists' intuition has been developed from the partial equilibrium analysis of fully-informed buyers and sellers. These agents know the value they place on assets. So in "private-value" auctions, more buyers raise prices, more quantity implies a lower price, and if demand exceeds supply it always makes sense for a seller to try to raise price.

We have shown this intuition does not carry over to "common-value" settings such as financial markets where buyers have different assessments of assets that would be valued similarly by all if they shared their information.

With symmetric agents, the standard results only occur with a rather strong distributional assumption, equivalent to what is needed for strategic substitutes in Cournot competition. When this assumption fails, setting a price that guarantees excess demand and rationing, as in Initial Public Offerings, may be more profitable than finding the price that clears the market. Furthermore, restricting entry to an auction may increase expected revenues.

With asymmetric agents the standard results fail under exactly the conditions for which they hold under symmetry. This may explain why, in the FCC's initial PCS auction, prices seemed to be low in some regions where a single license was sold, relative to markets where two licenses were available.

## Appendix A. Extensions

This Appendix discusses extensions of the model to more bidders and more units, and to sealed-bid auctions.

### More bidders and more units

Generalizing from Lemmas 2 and 3, the expected price in a symmetric common value auction in which the true value to the bidders,  $v$ , is the sum of the signals of  $n$  bidders, and the top  $k < n$  bidders win, is  $E(p_k) = E(v) - E(t - t_{(k+1)} \mid t \geq t_{(k+1)})$ . Example 4 (which extends Example 1) illustrates that, as for just 3 bidders, whether more or less units raises expected price depends on whether hazard rates are decreasing or increasing.

*Example 4.* With  $n$  symmetric bidders competing for  $k$  units and uniformly distributed signals,  $F(t) = \frac{t-\underline{t}}{t-\underline{t}}$ , we have  $E(p_k) = E(v) - \frac{\bar{t} - \underline{t}}{2(n+1)} \frac{k+1}{2(n+1)}$ . With exponentially distributed signals,  $F(t) = 1 - e^{-\lambda(t-\underline{t})}$ , we have  $E(p_k) = E(v) - \frac{1}{\lambda}$ . With constant-elasticity distributed signals,  $F(t) = 1 - (\frac{t}{\underline{t}})^\eta$ , we have  $E(p_k) = E(v) + \frac{1}{\eta+1} E(t_{(k+1)}) = E(v) + \frac{1}{\eta+1} \underline{t} \prod_{j=k+1}^n \frac{j\eta}{j\eta+1}$ . In all three cases the ratio of buyer surplus (i.e., expected value minus expected price) with one winner to  $k$  winners is independent of  $n$ .

The limit of Example 4 as  $n$  becomes large can be looked at in different ways: In the uniform case, for any  $k$  the winner's expected surplus goes to 0 as  $n$  becomes large. In the constant hazard-rate case, the winner's expected surplus is independent of  $n$  but does therefore become small both relative to the expectation of  $v$  (which is proportional to  $n$ ) and to the standard deviation in  $v$ , which rises with the square root of  $n$ . In the constant elasticity case, the winner's expected surplus rises as  $n$  increases, but becomes small relative to the expected value of  $v$ . Relative to the standard deviation in  $v$ , however, the expected surplus becomes larger (smaller) with  $n$  depending on whether the absolute value of  $\eta$  is smaller (larger) than 2.

The conclusion, then, is that for the “normal” case of increasing or constant hazard rates  $k$  becomes irrelevant as  $n$  grows because buyer surplus becomes relatively small—and hence expected price approximates value—under all mechanisms. But in the “abnormal” case of decreasing hazard rates a larger  $k$  may still yield a significantly lower buyer surplus, and hence also a significantly higher expected price, even when  $n$  becomes large.

## Comparison of Sealed-Bid and Ascending Auctions

In the asymmetric case, when 1 unit is sold, the ascending auction yields  $\approx t + 2E(t) = E(v) - E(t - t)$  in expectation (Lemma 4). The sealed-bid auction yields  $\approx E(v) - E(t - t_{(2)} \mid t \geq t_{(2)})$  in expectation — we assume the conjecture in Section 8 that the expected revenue from the sealed-bid auction is almost unaffected by the small asymmetries between the bidders, so is almost Revenue Equivalent to the situation in Lemma 2. Applying Lemma 1, then the ascending auction yields less (more) expected revenue when hazard rates are increasing (decreasing).

When 2 units are sold in a sealed bid auction expected price  $\approx E(v) - E(t - t_{(3)} \mid t \geq t_{(3)})$  in expectation, assuming approximate Revenue Equivalence to the situation in Lemma 3. The ascending auction yields the same in expectation if hazard-rates are increasing, but  $\approx E(v) - E(t - t_{(2,2)} \mid t \geq t_{(2,2)})$  in expectation if hazard-rates are decreasing (Lemma 5). But with decreasing hazard rates  $E(t - t_{(2,2)} \mid t \geq t_{(2,2)}) > E(t - t_{(3)} \mid t \geq t_{(3)})$  since for any random three signals  $t_{(2,2)} \geq t_{(3)}$ . Therefore expected revenue is less in the ascending auction when there are two units and decreasing hazard rates.

(Thinking about marginal revenues is the quickest way to see the result for the 1 unit case, since the sealed bid and ascending auctions yield the expected marginal revenue of the highest-signal bidder and the average bidder, respectively. For the 2 unit, decreasing hazard-rate case, however, marginal revenue calculations are trickier since this is the special case in which the ascending auction gives positive expected surplus to the lowest type of bidder 1 (see Section 5), so the expected revenue from the ascending auction is the sum of the expected marginal revenues of the winning bidders minus this expected surplus.)

## Appendix B. Proofs

Proofs of Propositions 3-4 and Lemmas 1-5 follow.

### Proof of Proposition 3

For any allocation mechanism, let  $P_i(t_i)$  be the probability that  $i$  will receive the object, in equilibrium, and let  $S_i(t_i)$  be the equilibrium expected surplus to bidder  $i$ . Incentive compatibility requires that  $S_i(t_i + dt_i) \geq S_i(t_i) + (1 + \alpha_i)dt_i P_i(t_i)$  (since  $v_i$  is  $(1 + \alpha_i)dt_i$  higher for type  $t_i + dt_i$  than for type  $t_i$ , independent of the other bidders' signals). Likewise  $S_i(t_i) \geq S_i(t_i + dt_i) - (1 + \alpha_i)dt_i P_i(t_i + dt_i)$ , so  $(1 + \alpha_i)P_i(t_i + dt_i) \geq \frac{S_i(t_i + dt_i) - S_i(t_i)}{dt_i} \geq (1 + \alpha_i)P_i(t_i)$ .

So  $P_i(t_i)$  must be a (weakly) increasing function.

Also  $S_i(t_i)$  has derivative  $(1 + \alpha_i)P_i(t_i)$ , so

$$\begin{aligned}
S_i(t_i) &= S_i(\underline{t}) + \int_{\underline{t}}^{t_i} (1 + \alpha_i)P_i(t)dt, \quad \text{and} \\
E_{t_i}(S_i(t_i)) &= S_i(\underline{t}) + \int_{\underline{t}}^{\infty} \int_{\underline{t}}^{t_i} (1 + \alpha_i)P_i(t)dt f(t_i)dt_i \\
&= S_i(\underline{t}) + \int_{\underline{t}}^{\infty} (1 - F(t_i))(1 + \alpha_i)P_i(t_i)dt_i \quad (\text{integrating by parts}) \\
&= S_i(\underline{t}) + E_{t_i}\left(\frac{1}{h_i}(t_i)(1 + \alpha_i)P_i(t_i)\right).
\end{aligned}$$

Now expected seller profits are the expected value of the good to the winning bidder less the expected surplus of the bidders. Since the value of the good to the winner is the same for all mechanisms (ignoring the  $\alpha_i$ ), profits are maximized by minimizing the bidder's surplus. But  $\frac{1}{h_i}(t_i)$  is increasing when hazard rates are decreasing, so since  $P_i(t_i)$  is required to be increasing,  $\sum_{i=1}^3 E_{t_i}\left(\frac{1}{h_i}(t_i)(1 + \alpha_i)P_i(t_i)\right)$  is minimized (ignoring the  $\alpha_i$ ) among all schemes that always sell (i.e. have  $\sum_{i=1}^3 P_i(t_i) = 1$ ) by choosing  $P_i(t_i) = \text{constant}$ ,  $\forall i$ . And selling at price  $\underline{t} + 2E(t)$  yields  $S_i(\underline{t}) = 0$  (individual rationality implies  $S_i(t_i) \geq 0 \quad \forall t_i$ ). So rationing equally to all three bidders at price  $\underline{t} + 2E(t)$  maximizes the seller's expected profits. Q.E.D.

(The expected profit from rationing is  $E(\underline{t} + 2E(t)) = E(v) - E(t - \underline{t})$  which exceeds the expected profits from a standard auction to clear the market of either one unit (apply Lemma 1 to Lemmas 2 and 4) or two units (apply Lemma 1 to Lemmas 3 and 5). In the asymmetric, two-unit, decreasing hazard-rate case rationing yields the same profits as the ascending auction.)

#### Proof of Proposition 4

In the symmetric case, with three bidders the expected price  $\approx v - E(t - t_{(2)} \mid t \geq t_{(2)})$ , by Lemma 2. When only two bidders, say  $i$  and  $j$ , are permitted to participate the loser, say bidder  $i$ , quits at the point at which he would just be indifferent about winning conditional on being tied with bidder  $j$ , that is,  $2t_i + E(t_k)$  so the expected price  $\approx E(v) - E(t - t_{(2,2)} \mid t \geq t_{(2,2)})$ . Since  $t_{(2)}$  is the second highest of three signals while  $t_{(2,2)}$  is the lower of two signals then for any set of three signals  $t_{(2)} \geq t_{(2,2)}$ . So the symmetric case of the Proposition follows from Lemma 1.

In the asymmetric case, with three bidders the price  $\approx \underline{t} + t_2 + t_3$  and the expected price  $\approx E(v) - E(t - \underline{t})$ —see Lemma 4. Likewise if bidder 2 is excluded the price  $\approx \underline{t} + t_3 + E(t_2)$  and the expected price  $\approx E(v) - E(t - \underline{t})$ . Similarly, if bidder 3 is excluded the expected price  $\approx E(v) - E(t - \underline{t})$ . But if bidder 1 is excluded and bidder  $i$  loses then the price  $\approx 2t_i + E(t_1)$  so the expected price  $\approx E(v) - E(t - t_{(2,2)} \mid t \geq t_{(2,2)})$  (as for the symmetric case). But  $E(t - \underline{t}) > (<) E(t - t_{(2,2)} \mid t \geq t_{(2,2)})$  if hazard-rates are increasing (decreasing) by Lemma 1, so the asymmetric case of the Proposition fol-

**Proof of Lemma 1**

$E(t - z \mid t \geq z) = \frac{1}{1-F(z)} \int_z^\infty tf(t)dt - z = \int_z^\infty \frac{1-F(t)}{1-F(z)} dt$  (integrating by parts with  $u = t$ ,  $du = dt$ ,  $v = -(1 - F(t))$ ,  $dv = f(t)dt$ ). But  $1 - F(t) = e^{-\int_{\underline{t}}^t h(x)dx}$  (the probability that a signal exceeds  $t$  equals 1 discounted by all the hazard rates between  $\underline{t}$  and  $t$ ). So  $E(t - z \mid t \geq z) = \int_z^\infty e^{-\int_z^t h(x)dx} dt = \int_{\underline{t}}^\infty e^{-\int_{\underline{t}}^t h(x+z-\underline{t})dx} dt$ . This final formula is clearly increasing (decreasing) in  $z$  if  $h$  is a decreasing (increasing) function. Q.E.D.

**Proof of Lemmas 2-5**

At a given price  $p$  and for a given history (i.e. the first quitter's quit price if there has been a quit), we write  $\underline{t}_i$  for the lowest (or infimum), i.e. marginal, type of bidder  $i$  remaining in equilibrium, or write  $\underline{t}_i$  for bidder  $i$ 's expected signal if he has already exited, and write  $w_i = (1 + \alpha_i)\underline{t}_i + \underline{t}_j + \underline{t}_k$ . Write  $x_i = E(t_i - \underline{t}_i \mid t_i \geq \underline{t}_i)$ . (Thus  $\underline{t}_i$ ,  $w_i$  and  $x_i$  are all functions of  $p$  and the history, but we will not usually write this dependence explicitly.) It will be convenient to write  $\underline{x} = E(t_i - \underline{t})$ .

**Analysis of the 1 unit auction**

We are looking for an equilibrium in which  $i$  stays in the bidding iff  $p < w_i$ . Now  $\alpha_i \underline{t}_i \geq \alpha_j \underline{t}_j \Rightarrow w_i \geq w_j \Rightarrow$  type  $\underline{t}_i$  of  $i$  cannot quit if type  $\underline{t}_j$  of  $j$  remains in the bidding. So types  $t_i$  of  $i$  and  $t_j$  of  $j$  quit simultaneously iff  $\alpha_i t_i = \alpha_j t_j$ . So if  $\alpha_1 \geq \alpha_2 = \alpha_3 = \alpha$ , bidders  $i = 2, 3$  quit according to  $\underline{t}_2 = \underline{t}_3$  with  $t_i$  quitting at price  $p = \underline{t} + (1 + \alpha)t_i + t_i$  for  $p < (1 + \alpha_1)\underline{t} + \frac{\alpha_1}{\alpha}\underline{t} + \frac{\alpha_1}{\alpha}\underline{t}$ , and if bidder  $i$  quits in this range, then type  $t_j$  of the other of these two bidders quits at price  $p = \underline{t} + \underline{t}_i + (1 + \alpha)t_j$  for  $p < (1 + \alpha_1)\underline{t} + \underline{t}_i + \frac{\alpha_1}{\alpha}\underline{t}$ , and beyond this price bidder  $j$  and bidder 1 both quit according to  $\alpha_1 \underline{t}_1 = \alpha \underline{t}_j$  and  $p = (1 + \alpha_1)\underline{t}_1 + \underline{t}_i + \frac{\alpha_1}{\alpha}\underline{t}_1 = \underline{t}_1 + \underline{t}_i + (1 + \alpha)\underline{t}_j$  ( $j = 2, 3; j \neq i$ ). (Bidders 1 and  $j$  infer  $i$ 's actual signal  $\underline{t}_i$  from the price at which he quit.)

No type of bidder 1 quits until  $p = (1 + \alpha_1)\underline{t}_1 + \underline{t}_2 + \underline{t}_3$ . If neither of the other bidders quit before this price (so then  $p = (1 + \alpha_1)\underline{t} + \frac{\alpha_1}{\alpha}\underline{t} + \frac{\alpha_1}{\alpha}\underline{t}$  and  $\alpha_1 \underline{t} = \alpha \underline{t}_2 = \alpha \underline{t}_3$ ), then all three bidders quit according to  $\underline{t}_2 = \underline{t}_3 = \frac{\alpha_1}{\alpha}\underline{t}_1$  (and  $p = w_1 = w_2 = w_3$ ) thereafter, and after one bidder has quit the remaining bidders  $l$  and  $m$  quit according to  $\alpha_l \underline{t}_l = \alpha_m \underline{t}_m$  and  $p = w_l = w_m$ . It is straightforward that this is a (Perfect Bayesian) equilibrium and is unique under our assumptions.

Thus if  $\alpha_1 = \alpha_2 = \alpha_3 = \alpha$  the final price is  $(1 + \alpha)t_{(2)} + t_{(2)} + t_{(3)} \approx 2t_{(2)} + t_{(3)}$  for small  $\alpha$ . If  $\alpha_1 > \alpha_2 = \alpha_3 = \alpha$ , then as  $\left(\frac{\alpha}{\alpha_1}\right) \rightarrow 0$  the probability of bidder 1 winning approaches 1 so the final

price is (almost always)  $\underline{t} + t_2 + t_3 + \alpha \max(t_2, t_3) \approx \underline{t} + t_2 + t_3$ . This proves Lemmas 2 and 4.

### Analysis of the 2 unit auction

We look for an equilibrium in which a bidder quits when he would be just indifferent were he to find himself a winner. In such an equilibrium let  $H_i(p)$  be the hazard-rate with which  $i$  quits at price  $p$ , that is,

$$H_i(p) = \frac{\underline{t}'_i(p)f(\underline{t}_i(p))}{1 - F(\underline{t}_i(p))}.$$

So type  $t_i$  of  $i$  quits when

$$p = (1 + \alpha_i)t_i + \underline{t}_j + \underline{t}_k + x_j \left( \frac{H_k}{H_j + H_k} \right) + x_k \left( \frac{H_j}{H_j + H_k} \right)$$

that is, the price equals  $i$ 's expected value conditional on winning since, in this case, with probability  $\left( \frac{H_j}{H_j + H_k} \right)$  it is  $j$  who has quit so  $t_j = \underline{t}_j$  and  $E(t_k) = \underline{t}_k + x_k$ .

We begin with the asymmetric case. Let  $\alpha_1 > \alpha_2 = \alpha_3 = \alpha$ .

### Increasing hazard rates

Begin with the standard case in which the hazard rate,  $\frac{f(t_i)}{1-F(t_i)}$  is increasing in  $t_i$ , so  $x_i$  is decreasing in  $\underline{t}_i$ . No-one quits until  $p = (3 + \alpha)\underline{t} + \underline{x}$ , at which price the lowest types of bidders 2 and 3 quit. Since 2 and 3 behave symmetrically,  $\underline{t}_2 = \underline{t}_3$ , and  $p = \underline{t} + (2 + \alpha)\underline{t}_2 + \underline{x}$  until  $\alpha_1 \underline{t} + x_2 = \alpha \underline{t}_2 + \underline{x}$  at which price, say  $\underline{p}$ , bidder 1 is also just indifferent about finding himself a winner. For types of all three bidders to be quitting simultaneously, we require

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_1 \underline{t}_1 + x_2 \left( \frac{H_3}{H_2 + H_3} \right) + x_3 \left( \frac{H_2}{H_2 + H_3} \right) &= \alpha \underline{t}_2 + x_1 \left( \frac{H_3}{H_1 + H_3} \right) + x_3 \left( \frac{H_1}{H_1 + H_3} \right) \\ &= \alpha \underline{t}_3 + x_1 \left( \frac{H_2}{H_1 + H_2} \right) + x_2 \left( \frac{H_1}{H_1 + H_2} \right), \end{aligned}$$

so using the symmetry of bidders 2 and 3 yields

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_1 \underline{t}_1 + x_2 &= \alpha \underline{t}_2 + x_1 \left( \frac{H_2}{H_1 + H_2} \right) + x_2 \left( \frac{H_1}{H_1 + H_2} \right) \\ \Rightarrow \frac{\alpha_1 \underline{t}_1 - \alpha \underline{t}_2}{x_1 - x_2} &= \frac{H_2}{H_1 + H_2} = \frac{1}{\frac{d\underline{t}_1}{d\underline{t}_2} \frac{h_1}{h_2} + 1} \Rightarrow \frac{d\underline{t}_1}{d\underline{t}_2} = \frac{h_2}{h_1} \left[ \left( \frac{x_1 - x_2}{\alpha_1 \underline{t}_1 - \alpha \underline{t}_2} \right) - 1 \right] \end{aligned}$$

in which  $h_i(\underline{t}_i) \equiv \frac{f(\underline{t}_i)}{1-F(\underline{t}_i)}$  (i.e., as defined Section 2). Since  $h_i(\underline{t}_i)$  is finite everywhere this yields  $\underline{t}_1$  as a continuous upward-sloping function of  $\underline{t}_2$ , that is,  $\infty > \frac{d\underline{t}_1}{d\underline{t}_2} \geq 0$  everywhere, and  $\underline{t}_2 > \underline{t}_1, x_1 >$

<sup>1</sup>More precisely, the equilibrium functions  $\underline{t}_i(p)$  are defined by the equilibrium hazard-rates  $H_i(p)$ , since otherwise  $\underline{t}'_i(\cdot)$  might not be defined by  $\underline{t}_i(\cdot)$ . The condition that a bidder quits when he is just indifferent about winning ensures that

$x_2$  and  $\alpha_1 \underline{t}_1 > \alpha \underline{t}_2$  everywhere. (As  $(\alpha_1 \underline{t}_1 - \alpha \underline{t}_2) \rightarrow 0, \frac{d\underline{t}_1}{d\underline{t}_2} \rightarrow \infty \Rightarrow \alpha_1 \underline{t}_1 > \alpha \underline{t}_2$  everywhere. As  $(x_1 - x_2) - (\alpha_1 \underline{t}_1 - \alpha \underline{t}_2) \rightarrow 0, \frac{d\underline{t}_1}{d\underline{t}_2} \rightarrow 0$  so also  $\frac{d\underline{t}_1}{d\underline{t}_2} \rightarrow 0$  while  $\frac{d\underline{t}_2}{d\underline{t}_1} < 0, \Rightarrow (x_1 - x_2) - (\alpha_1 \underline{t}_1 - \alpha \underline{t}_2) > 0$  everywhere when  $\underline{t}_1 > \underline{t}$ . So also  $\infty > \frac{d\underline{t}_1}{d\underline{t}_2} > 0$  when  $\underline{t}_1 > \underline{t}$ .)

Does the (unique) solution to this differential equation define a (Perfect Bayesian) Nash equilibrium? To see that it does, first note that having  $\underline{t}_1$  as a function of  $\underline{t}_2$  (uniquely) defines  $\underline{t}_1(p)$  and  $\underline{t}_2(p)$  using  $p = (1 + \alpha_1)\underline{t}_1 + 2\underline{t}_2 + x_2$  (since  $\underline{t}_1$  and  $\underline{t}_2 + x_2$  and hence  $p$  are all continuous and upward-sloping functions of  $\underline{t}_2$ ). Now assume bidders 2 and 3 bid according to  $\underline{t}_2(p)$  (and  $\underline{t}_3(p) = \underline{t}_2(p)$ ). Then type  $t_1$  of bidder 1's profits from finding himself a winner at price  $p$  are  $p - ((1 + \alpha_1)t_1 + 2\underline{t}_2 + x_2) = (1 + \alpha_1)(\underline{t}_1 - t_1)$  and we have shown  $\underline{t}_1$  is continuous and increasing in  $p$  for  $p \geq \underline{p}$  (i.e. where  $\underline{t}_1 > \underline{t}$ ) so type  $t_1$ 's uniquely optimal strategy is to quit at  $t_1 = \underline{t}_1$ . Similarly, assume bidders 1 and 3 bid according to  $\underline{t}_1(p)$  and  $\underline{t}_2(p)$ , respectively. Then type  $t_2$  of bidder 2's profits from finding himself a winner at price  $p$  are

$$p - \left( (1 + \alpha)t_2 + \underline{t}_1 + \underline{t}_2 + x_1 \left( \frac{H_2}{H_1 + H_2} \right) + x_2 \left( \frac{H_1}{H_1 + H_2} \right) \right) = (1 + \alpha)(\underline{t}_2 - t_2)$$

and  $\underline{t}_2$  is continuous and increasing in  $p$  (for  $p \geq \underline{p}$  from our analysis of the differential equation, and for  $p \in ((3 + \alpha)\underline{t} + \underline{x}, \underline{p})$  from our earlier argument). So type  $t_2$  quits at  $t_2 = \underline{t}_2$ . So our equations define a (Perfect Bayesian) Nash equilibrium. (If there is an upper bound,  $\bar{t}$ , on  $t_i$ , then above the price where  $\underline{t}_2 = \underline{t}_3 = \bar{t}$ , we can continue to define 1's strategy according to  $p = (1 + \alpha)\underline{t}_1 + \bar{t} + \bar{t} + 0$ .)

Finally, it is easy to check that there are no other candidate equilibria in the increasing hazard-rate case. At any price after  $\underline{p}$  (at which price

$$p - (\underline{t}_1 + \underline{t}_2 + \underline{t}_3) = \alpha_1 \underline{t}_1 + x_2 = \alpha \underline{t}_2 + x_1 \left( \frac{H_2}{H_1 + H_2} \right) + x_2 \left( \frac{H_1}{H_1 + H_2} \right)$$

is first satisfied) it yields a straightforward contradiction for there to be no types of 1 quitting, or no types of 2 and 3 quitting, or no types of any of 1, 2 and 3 quitting, as the price rises.<sup>2</sup>

So the equilibrium we have found is unique under our assumptions. Finally, note from the differential equation that  $x_1 - x_2$  is of order  $\alpha_1 \underline{t}_1 - \alpha \underline{t}_2$ . ( $\frac{h_2}{h_1} > 1$ , so  $\frac{d\underline{t}_1}{d\underline{t}_2} > \left( \frac{x_1 - x_2}{\alpha_1 \underline{t}_1 - \alpha \underline{t}_2} - 1 \right)$ , so  $x_1 - x_2$  cannot become much larger than  $\alpha_1 \underline{t}_1 - \alpha \underline{t}_2$  without  $\frac{d\underline{t}_1}{d\underline{t}_2}$  becoming large so reducing  $x_1 - x_2$ .) So as  $\alpha_1 \rightarrow 0, x_1 \rightarrow x_2$  and so  $\underline{t}_2 \rightarrow \underline{t}_1$  along the equilibrium path.<sup>3</sup> So the winners are almost always the bidders with the higher signals, and the price is almost always set by the bidder with the lowest signal,  $t_{(3)}$ , who quits

<sup>2</sup>If 2 and 3 alone stop quitting, their marginal types would earn  $(\underline{t}_1 + \underline{t}_2 + \underline{t}_3) + \alpha \underline{t}_2 + x_2 - p$ , i.e. strictly lose money in expectation, if they found themselves winners; if 1 alone stops quitting the marginal types of 2 and 3 would earn  $(\underline{t}_1 + \underline{t}_2 + \underline{t}_3) + \alpha \underline{t}_2 + x_1 - p$  by winning so would also stop quitting; if all stopped quitting 1 would earn  $(\underline{t}_1 + \underline{t}_2 + \underline{t}_3) + \alpha_1 \underline{t}_1 + x_2 - p$  so 1 would instead continue to quit.

<sup>3</sup>More precisely,  $\forall \varepsilon, \forall K, \exists \delta$  s.t.  $\{\alpha_1 < \delta \Rightarrow |\underline{t}_2 - \underline{t}_1| < \varepsilon \quad \forall \underline{t}_2 < K\}$ . To see this let  $\min_{0 \leq t_i \leq K} \{-x'_i(t_i)\} = \phi > 0$  (this minimum exists since  $-x'_i(t_i) = 1 - x_i(t_i)(h_i(t_i))$  and  $f_i(t_i)$  and hence  $-x'_i(t_i)$  is continuous, and  $\phi > 0$  since  $x_i(t_i) < 1/h_i(t_i)$  follows from the increasing hazard-rate). So  $x_1 - x_2 > \phi(\underline{t}_2 - \underline{t}_1)$ . So if  $\delta < \phi\varepsilon/4K$  then  $(\underline{t}_2 - \underline{t}_1) > \varepsilon/2 \Rightarrow \frac{d\underline{t}_1}{d\underline{t}_2} < \frac{\phi(\varepsilon/2)}{1 - \delta} = \frac{\phi\varepsilon}{2(1 - \delta)}$  can never increase above  $\varepsilon/2$ .

at  $\approx (1 + \alpha)t_{(3)} + t_{(3)} + E(t | t \geq t_{(3)})$ .

### Decreasing hazard rates

As for the increasing hazard-rate case, no-one quits until  $p = (3 + \alpha)\underline{t} + \underline{x}$  at which price the lowest types of bidders 2 and 3 start quitting symmetrically according to  $\underline{t}_2 = \underline{t}_3$  and  $p = \underline{t} + (2 + \alpha)\underline{t}_2 + \underline{x}$ . Now with decreasing hazard rates as  $\underline{t}_2$  increases so does  $x_2$  so if, as we assume,  $\alpha$  is small,  $(1 + \alpha_1)\underline{t} + 2\underline{t}_2 + x_2 > \underline{t} + (2 + \alpha)\underline{t}_2 + \underline{x} = p$  for all  $\underline{t}_2$ . That is, for bidder 1 to never quit while bidders 2 and 3 quit symmetrically satisfies the first-order conditions for equilibrium everywhere. It is straightforward that this also defines a (Perfect Bayesian) Nash equilibrium: if bidders 2 and 3 bid according to  $\underline{t}_2(p)$  no types of player 1 ever wish to quit. If no type of bidder 1 ever quits, while bidder 3 bids according to  $\underline{t}_2(p)$ , then the expected profits of type  $t_2$  of bidder 2 if he finds himself a winner at price  $p$  are  $p - ((1 + \alpha)t_2 + \underline{t} + \underline{t}_2 + \underline{x}) = (1 + \alpha)(\underline{t}_2 - t_2)$  which is continuous and increasing in  $p$  so  $t_2$  optimally quits at  $t_2 = \underline{t}_2$ .

Are there any other equilibria in the decreasing hazard-rate case? Clearly, as the price rises with  $p = \underline{t} + (2 + \alpha)\underline{t}_2 + \underline{x}$  there is no point at which some types of 1 start quitting. (Their expected values from being a winner always exceed the price.) However we need to consider the possibility that at some price at or above  $(3 + \alpha)\underline{t} + \underline{x}$  no types of any players are quitting. This would require beliefs that conditional on the out-of-equilibrium event that player 2 does find himself a winner, he believes that player 3 quit with probability  $\leq \lambda$  where  $p = \underline{t} + (2 + \alpha)\underline{t}_2 + \lambda\underline{x} + (1 - \lambda)x_2$ .

Note that as  $p$  rises,  $\lambda$  falls since  $x_2 > \underline{x}$ . So no types of players 2 and 3 can ever start quitting again unless types of player 1 also do, since if the marginal types of 2 and 3 (but not 1) quit their expected value conditional on being a winner is  $\underline{t} + (2 + \alpha)\underline{t}_2 + \underline{x} - p = (1 - \lambda)(\underline{x} - x_2) < 0$ , so an atom of types of 2 and 3 wish to quit, so (almost) all of these types lose money conditional on winning, which is a contradiction.

Now one possibility is  $\alpha_1\underline{t} > \alpha\underline{t}_2$ , so no types of player 1 would ever quit since their expected values from being a winner exceed  $(1 + \alpha_1)\underline{t} + 2\underline{t}_2 + x_2 > \underline{t} + (2 + \alpha)\underline{t}_2 + \lambda\underline{x} + (1 - \lambda)x_2 = p, \forall \lambda \in [0, 1]$ . In this case we have a contradiction at the price that yields  $\lambda = 0$  (this price is reached with positive probability—as are all prices—since the hazard rate is decreasing): The price cannot rise above this price without at least the marginal types of 2 wishing to quit, so an atom of types 2 and 3 wish to quit (as above), so (almost) all of these lose money conditional on winning which is a contradiction.

Another possibility is  $\alpha_1\underline{t} = \alpha\underline{t}_2$ . In this case the marginal types of 1 also wish to quit at  $\lambda = 0$ .

But the price cannot then rise higher without any types of 2 and 3 quitting since 1's marginal condition would imply  $p = (1 + \alpha_1)t_1 + 2t_2 + x_2 \geq t_1 + (2 + \alpha)t_2 + x_2$  which implies types of 2 and 3 must quit, but for any (actual) relative probability  $\lambda = \left(\frac{H_3}{H_1+H_3}\right)$  with which player 2 believes that another player who quits is player 3, player 2's expected value from winning is  $t_1 + (2 + \alpha)t_2 + \lambda x_1 + (1 - \lambda)x_2 < p$  so an atom of types of 2 and 3 must quit, which is a contradiction, as before.

Finally, we may have  $\alpha_1 t < \alpha t_2$  at the price at which types of 2 and 3 stop quitting. In this case types of player 1 start quitting at price  $p = (1 + \alpha_1)t + 2t_2 + x_2 = t + (2 + \alpha)t_2 + \lambda x + (1 - \lambda)x_2$  for some  $\lambda \in (0, 1)$ . At this price the marginal types of players 2 and 3 must also start quitting at hazard rates such that  $\lambda = \left(\frac{H_2}{H_1+H_2}\right) \left(= \left(\frac{H_3}{H_1+H_3}\right)\right)$ . (If not, the marginal types of players 2 and 3 would either be strictly losing or strictly making money (in expectation) conditional on winning. Both are contradictions; the latter because the types just below the current marginal types of 2 and 3 would not have been willing to quit earlier where their first-order conditions were satisfied.)

Now where types of 1 start quitting we have  $t_1 = t < \left(\frac{\alpha}{\alpha_1}\right)t_2$  and  $x_2 > x_1$  so when  $\alpha_1$  is small we require  $\lambda$  small, that is,  $\frac{H_1}{H_2}$  large, hence  $\frac{dt_1}{dt_2}$  is large. So  $\alpha_1 t_1 - \alpha t_2 \rightarrow 0$  and  $\alpha_1 t_1 = \alpha t_2$  is achieved for finite  $t_2$ . (Until this point  $t_1$  and  $t_2$  must just be following the differential equation determined by  $p = (1 + \alpha_1)t_1 + 2t_2 + x_2 = t_1 + (2 + \alpha)t_2 + \left(\frac{H_2}{H_1+H_2}\right)x_1 + \left(\frac{H_1}{H_1+H_2}\right)x_2$ , that is, the same differential equation as in the increasing hazard-rate case.) But at  $\alpha_1 t_1 = \alpha t_2$ , and hence  $\left(\frac{H_2}{H_1+H_2}\right) = 0$ , we have the same contradiction that we had with  $\alpha_1 t = \alpha t_2$  and  $\lambda = 0$ . (Any finite rate of quitting of player 2 would imply all types close to  $t_2$  strictly wished to quit which is a contradiction, but if no types of player 2 quit as the price, and hence  $t_1$ , rises, then we will have  $p = (1 + \alpha_1)t_1 + 2t_2 + x_2 > t_1 + (2 + \alpha)t_2 + x_2$  which is also a contradiction.)

So the equilibrium we found, in which player 1 never quits while players 2 and 3 quit symmetrically according to  $t_2 = t_3$  and  $p = t + (2 + \alpha)t_2 + x$ , is the unique (Perfect Bayesian) Nash equilibrium satisfying our assumptions, and the final price is  $t + x + (2 + \alpha)\min(t_2, t_3) = E(t) + (2 + \alpha)\min(t_2, t_3) \approx E(t) + 2\min(t_2, t_3)$  in which  $t_2$  and  $t_3$  are the actual signals of bidders 2 and 3.

### The Symmetric Case

When  $\alpha_1 = \alpha_2 = \alpha_3 = \alpha$  it is straightforward that it is a (Perfect Bayesian) equilibrium for bidders to quit according to  $t_1 = t_2 = t_3$  and  $p = (3 + \alpha)t_1 + x_1$ , and that this is the unique equilibrium satisfying our assumptions. In this case the final price is  $(3 + \alpha)t_{(3)} + x_{(3)} \approx 2t_{(3)} + E(t \mid t \geq t_{(3)})$ .

Thus we have proved Lemmas 3 and 5.

### Other Equilibria

Note that there are other equilibria of the ascending auction that do not satisfy the additional assumptions we imposed in Section 2. In particular,

(i) when three bidders compete for a single unit, and player 2 or 3 receives a sufficiently low signal ( $\alpha_2 t_2 < \alpha_1 t$  or  $\alpha_3 t_3 < \alpha_1 t$ ) that he knows he will surely lose to player 1, different equilibria can be constructed by making different assumptions about how far he bids up the price in such a case (however different assumptions than ours would not importantly affect our results),

(ii) when three bidders compete for a single unit, the chance of both opponents quitting at any point is of second-order, so equilibria can be constructed in which a player may bid beyond the point where he would wish to win but then drop out immediately another player does (allowing equilibria of these kinds would not affect any of our results assuming symmetric players behave symmetrically; note also that these equilibria would not survive if bids increased in discrete jumps so that there was generally positive probability of both opponents quitting simultaneously),

(iii) even when just two players  $i$  and  $j$  compete for a single unit, it is an equilibrium for  $i$  to quit immediately while  $j$  never quits. (With unbounded supports of the signals, this is a Perfect Bayesian Nash equilibrium supported by  $j$  believing that if he were to observe the out-of-equilibrium behavior that  $i$  stays in to price  $p$  then  $i$ 's signal is at least  $p$ ; such equilibria can be ruled out by having a largest possible signal, or by insisting each player bids up at least as far as his minimum possible value given his own information.) Obviously these kinds of equilibria also arise when three bidders compete for either one or two units,

(iv) when three bidders compete for two units, it seems possible to construct equilibria in which symmetric bidders behave asymmetrically; beyond a certain price just one bidder is quitting so that there is no restriction on this bidder's beliefs about who has quit conditional on the out-of-equilibrium event that he finds himself a winner, and the careful choice of beliefs may support an equilibrium,

(v) when three players compete for two units and hazard rates are decreasing, equilibria can be constructed in which the first-order conditions fail because a player initially expects to lose money conditional on winning, but he expects to make up these losses (in expectation) if the bidding continues for a while. These equilibria also seem particularly unnatural since they require symmetric players to behave asymmetrically.

## References

- AVERY, C. "Strategic Jump Bidding in English Auctions." *Review of Economic Studies*, Vol. 65 (1998), pp. 185-210.
- AND KAGEL, J. "Second-Price Auctions with Asymmetric Payoffs: An Experimental Investigation." *Journal of Economics and Management Strategy*, Vol. 6 (1997), pp. 573-603.
- BECKER, G. "A Note on Restaurant Pricing and Other Examples of Social Influences on Price." *Journal of Political Economy*, Vol. 99 (1991), pp. 1109-1116.
- BIKCHANDANI, S. AND RILEY, J. "Equilibria in Open Common Value Auctions." *Journal of Economic Theory*, Vol. 53 (1991), pp. 101-30.
- AND —————. "Equilibrium in Open Auctions." Working Paper, University of California at Los Angeles, 1993.
- BINMORE, K. AND KLEMPERER, P. "The Biggest Auction Ever." *Economic Journal*, Vol. 112 (2002), forthcoming.
- BULOW, J. AND KLEMPERER, P. "Auctions vs Negotiations." *American Economic Review*, Vol 86 (1996), pp. 180-194.
- AND —————. "Prices and the Winner's Curse". Working Paper, Stanford Graduate School of Business and Nuffield College, Oxford, 1997.
- BULOW, J., GEANAKOPOLOS, J., AND KLEMPERER, P. "Multimarket Oligopoly: Strategic Substitutes and Complements." *Journal of Political Economy*, Vol. 93 (1985a), pp. 488-511.
- , —————, AND —————. "Holding Idle Capacity to Deter Entry." *Economic Journal*, Vol. 95 (1985b), pp. 178-182.
- BULOW, J., HUANG, M., AND KLEMPERER, P. "Toeholds and Takeovers." *Journal of Political Economy*, Vol. 107 (1999), pp. 427-454 .
- BULOW, J. AND ROBERTS, D. J. "The Simple Economics of Optimal Auctions." *Journal of Political Economy*, Vol. 97 (1989), pp. 1060-90.
- CAILLAUD, B. AND JEHIEL, P. "Collusion in Auctions with Externalities." *RAND Journal of Economics*, Vol. 29 (1998), pp. 680-702.
- COMPTE, O. and JEHIEL, P. "On the Value of Competition in Procurement Auctions." *Econometrica*, forthcoming.
- CREMER, J. and MCLEAN, R. "Optimal Selling Strategies under Uncertainty for a Discriminatory Monopolist when Demands Are Interdependent." *Econometrica*, Vol. 53 (1985), pp. 345-61.
- DANIEL, K. AND HIRSHLEIFER, D. "A Theory of Costly Sequential Bidding." Mimeo, University of Chicago Business School and University of Michigan Business School, 1995.
- DeGRABA, P. "Buying Frenzies and Seller-Induced Excess Demand." *RAND Journal of Economics*, Vol. 26 (1995), pp. 331-42.
- AND MOHAMMED, R. "Intertemporal Mixed Bundles and Buying Frenzies." *RAND Journal of Economics*, Vol. 30 (1999), pp. 694-718.

- DENICOLO, V. AND GARELLA, P. "Rationing in a Durable Goods Monopoly." *RAND Journal of Economics*, Vol. 30 (1999), pp. 44-55.
- de FRUTOS, M. AND PECHLIVANOS, L. "Second-Price Common-Value Auctions under Multidimensional Uncertainty." Working Paper, Universidad Carlos III de Madrid, 2002.
- de FRUTOS, M. AND ROSENTHAL, R. "On Some Myths about Sequenced Common-value Auctions." *Games and Economic Behavior*, Vol. 23 (1998), pp. 201-21.
- GILBERT, R. AND KLEMPERER, P. "An Equilibrium Theory of Rationing." *RAND Journal of Economics*, Vol. 31 (2000), pp. 1-21.
- HARSTAD, R. AND BORDLEY, R. "Lottery Qualification Auctions." *Advances in Applied Microeconomics*, Vol. 6 (1996), pp. 157-183.
- HIRSHLEIFER, D. "Mergers and Acquisitions: Strategic and Informational Issues." Chapter 26 of R. A. Jarrow, V. Maksimovic, and W. T. Ziemba, eds., *Finance*. North-Holland: Handbooks in Operations Research and Management Science, Vol. 9, 1995.
- JEHIEL, P. AND MOLDOVANU, B. "Strategic Nonparticipation." *RAND Journal of Economics*, Vol. 27 (1996), pp. 84-98.
- AND —————. "Auctions with Downstream Interaction Among Buyers." *RAND Journal of Economics*, Vol. 31 (2000), pp. 768-791.
- KAGEL, J., LEVIN, D., AND HARSTAD, R. "Comparative Static Effects of Number of Bidders and Public Information on Behaviour in Second-Price Common Value Auctions." *International Journal of Game Theory*, Vol. 24 (1995), pp. 239-319.
- KLEMPERER, P. "Auctions with Almost Common Values: the Wallet Game and its Applications." *European Economic Review Conference Volume*, Vol. 42 (1998), pp. 757-69.
- . "Auction Theory: A Guide to the Literature." *Journal of Economic Surveys*, Vol. 13 (1999), pp. 227-86. (Also reprinted in S. Dahiya, ed., *The Current State of Economic Science*, Vol. 2 (1999), pp. 711-66.)
- . ed. *The Economic Theory of Auctions*. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar, 2000a.
- . "Why Every Economist Should Learn Some Auction Theory." Invited Lecture to 8th World Congress of the Econometric Society, 2000. Forthcoming in M. Dewatripont, L. Hansen and S. Turnovsky, eds., *Advances in Economic Theory and Econometrics*. Working Paper, Nuffield College, Oxford University, at [www.pauklemperer.org](http://www.pauklemperer.org), 2000b.
- . "What Really Matters in Auction Design." *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, Vol. 16 (2002a), forthcoming.
- . "How (Not) to Run Auctions: the European 2000-2001 Telecom Auctions." *European Economic Review*, Vol. 46 (2002b), forthcoming.
- AND PAGNOZZI, M. "Advantaged Bidders and Spectrum Prices: An Empirical Analysis", Working Paper, Nuffield College, Oxford University, at [www.pauklemperer.org](http://www.pauklemperer.org), 2002.
- KRISHNA, V. AND MORGAN, J. "(Anti-) Competitive Effects of Joint Bidding and Bidder Restrictions." Mimeo, Penn State and Princeton University, 2001.
- LEVIN, D. "Joint Bidding in Multiple-Units Uniform-Price Auctions: Adverse Selection Reduction Versus Demand Reduction." Working Paper, Ohio State University, 2001.

- , KAGEL, J., AND RICHARD, J-F. “Revenue Effects and Information Processing in English Common Value Auctions.” *American Economic Review*, Vol. 86 (1996), pp. 442-460.
- MASKIN, E. “Auctions and Privatization.” In H. Siebert, ed., *Privatization*, 1992, pp. 115-36.
- MATTHEWS, S. “Information Acquisition in Discriminatory Auctions.” Chapter 11 in M. Boyer and R. E. Kihlstrom, eds., *Bayesian Models in Economic Theory*. Elsevier Science, 1984.
- MILGROM, P. AND WEBER, R. “A Theory of Auctions and Competitive Bidding.” *Econometrica*, Vol. 50 (1982), pp. 1089-1122.
- AND ————. In P. Klemperer, ed. *The Economic Theory of Auctions*. Cheltenham, U.K.: Edward Elgar, 2000.
- MYERSON, R. “Optimal Auction Design”. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, Vol. 6, 1981, pp. 58-73.
- PARLOUR, C. AND RAJAN, U. “Rationing and Common Values.” Working Paper, Carnegie Mellon University, 2001.
- PINKSE, J. AND TAN, G. “Fewer Bidders can Increase Price in First-Price Auctions with Affiliated Private Values.” Working Paper, University of British Columbia, August 2000.
- RILEY, J. AND SAMUELSON, W. “Optimal Auctions”. *American Economic Review*, Vol. 71, 1981, pp. 381-92.
- VEBLEN, T. *The Theory of the Leisure Class: An Economic Study of Institutions*. London: Unwin Books, 1899. Reprinted New York: Dover Publications, 1994.