Nonreservation-price Equilibria

Maarten Janssen Alexei Parkhonyak Anastasia Parakhonyak University of Vienna, Higher School of Economics (Moscow)

Vienna, May 2012

Euro-super 95 prices in Vienna



◆□ > ◆□ > ◆豆 > ◆豆 > ̄豆 = のへで

Euro-super 95 prices in Vienna



◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆臣▶ ◆臣▶ 三臣 - のへで

- Consumer decides to buy at current price or continue to search. At reservation price indifferent.
 - Buy now has clear pay-off for consumer
 - Continue to search yields expected evaluation v Ep s

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆三▶ ◆三▶ 三三 のへぐ

- Consumer decides to buy at current price or continue to search. At reservation price indifferent.
 - Buy now has clear pay-off for consumer
 - Continue to search yields expected evaluation v Ep s
- How to form Ep (in an equilibrium model)?

- Consumer decides to buy at current price or continue to search. At reservation price indifferent.
 - Buy now has clear pay-off for consumer
 - Continue to search yields expected evaluation v Ep s
- How to form Ep (in an equilibrium model)?
- Consumers know firms' cost and expectation based on firms' strategies
 - This is what most of the consumer search literature does
 - But, if consumers do not know prices, it is far-fetched to assume they know cost

- Consumer decides to buy at current price or continue to search. At reservation price indifferent.
 - Buy now has clear pay-off for consumer
 - Continue to search yields expected evaluation v Ep s
- How to form Ep (in an equilibrium model)?
- Consumers know firms' cost and expectation based on firms' strategies
 - This is what most of the consumer search literature does
 - But, if consumers do not know prices, it is far-fetched to assume they know cost
- Consumers do not know cost and believe that firms' prices are independent of cost
 - Not feasible as in (almost) all models, firms' optimal prices depend on their cost

- There is a literature on consumer search with uncertain cost (Benabou and Gertner (1993), Dana (1994), Fishman (1996), Tapatta (2009), Janssen, Pichler and Weidenholzer (2011))
- Sequential search along the lines of Stahl (1989, AER)
 - oligopoly, homogenous good, common production cost
- Information asymmetry: Incompletely informed consumers do not know firms' production cost
 - Consumers observe price, update beliefs about underlying cost and then decide whether to buy or to continue to search
- Literature still considers equilibria where consumers' strategy is characterized by a reservation price

• In this framework with information asymmetry there is no reason to assume reservation price is optimal strategy (Rothschild, 1974)

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆三▶ ◆三▶ 三三 のへぐ

- In this framework with information asymmetry there is no reason to assume reservation price is optimal strategy (Rothschild, 1974)
- With cost uncertainty, one would expect that there is some active search in equilibrium, but not in reservation price equilibria (as no firm will set a price above the reservation price)

- In this framework with information asymmetry there is no reason to assume reservation price is optimal strategy (Rothschild, 1974)
- With cost uncertainty, one would expect that there is some active search in equilibrium, but not in reservation price equilibria (as no firm will set a price above the reservation price)
- In fact, reservation price equilibria assume specific out-of-equilibrium beliefs (if a price above the reservation price would be observed)

- In this framework with information asymmetry there is no reason to assume reservation price is optimal strategy (Rothschild, 1974)
- With cost uncertainty, one would expect that there is some active search in equilibrium, but not in reservation price equilibria (as no firm will set a price above the reservation price)
- In fact, reservation price equilibria assume specific out-of-equilibrium beliefs (if a price above the reservation price would be observed)
- Literature shows that reservation price equilibria do not always exist (especially for large cost uncertainties)

- In this framework with information asymmetry there is no reason to assume reservation price is optimal strategy (Rothschild, 1974)
- With cost uncertainty, one would expect that there is some active search in equilibrium, but not in reservation price equilibria (as no firm will set a price above the reservation price)
- In fact, reservation price equilibria assume specific out-of-equilibrium beliefs (if a price above the reservation price would be observed)
- Literature shows that reservation price equilibria do not always exist (especially for large cost uncertainties)
- Literature shows that compared to the case where consumers know firms' cost, consumers suffer from cost uncertainty

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆臣▶ ◆臣▶ 臣 の�?

• Is the first to look at equilibria in asymmetric information game that do not exhibit a reservation price property

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆三▶ ◆三▶ 三三 のへぐ

- Is the first to look at equilibria in asymmetric information game that do not exhibit a reservation price property
- Shows that reservation price equilibria are not consistent with the economic considerations underlying the D1 refinement on out-of-equilibrium beliefs

- Is the first to look at equilibria in asymmetric information game that do not exhibit a reservation price property
- Shows that reservation price equilibria are not consistent with the economic considerations underlying the D1 refinement on out-of-equilibrium beliefs
- Shows that in any non-reservation price equilibrium, there is active search

- Is the first to look at equilibria in asymmetric information game that do not exhibit a reservation price property
- Shows that reservation price equilibria are not consistent with the economic considerations underlying the D1 refinement on out-of-equilibrium beliefs
- Shows that in any non-reservation price equilibrium, there is active search
- Intends to show that a non-reservation price equilibrium always exist

- Is the first to look at equilibria in asymmetric information game that do not exhibit a reservation price property
- Shows that reservation price equilibria are not consistent with the economic considerations underlying the D1 refinement on out-of-equilibrium beliefs
- Shows that in any non-reservation price equilibrium, there is active search
- Intends to show that a non-reservation price equilibrium always exist
- Shows that compared to the case where consumers know firms' cost, consumers may be better off under cost uncertainty (as it induces them to actively (and rationally) search, which puts downward pressure on prices)
- Implies new challenge for empirical research on consumer search

Literature

- Diamond (1971, JET), Rothschild (1974, JPE)
 - Search with unknown but exogenous price distribution
- Stahl (1989, AER)
 - Sequential search with an endogenous price distribution and complete information
- Benabou and Gertner (1993, RESTUD), Dana (1994, IER)
 - Non-sequential search under incomplete information
- Fishman (1996, QJE), Yang and Ye (2008, RAND), Tappata (2009, RAND)

The model

• 2 firms

- produce homogenous good at marginal cost c, compete in prices
- c is either high or low: c_H, c_L with prob. α , 1α
- realization of c identical for all firms

• [0,1] consumers

- unit demand and valuation v; payoff v p
- search for low prices to maximize payoff
- observe 1st price for free, pay search cost s to obtain 1 additional price quote (sequential search)
- fraction λ are shoppers (s = 0); 1λ non-shoppers (s > 0)
- consumers do not observe realized c

Reservation Price Equilibria

Firms

- Let F(p|c) be the cumulative distr. corresponding to f(p|c)
- Expected profit when setting p:

$$\pi(p, c, F) = \frac{1 - \lambda}{2} (p - c) + (1 - F(p|c)) \lambda (p - c)$$
(1)
= $\frac{1 - \lambda}{2} (\rho - c)$ (2)

since firms must be indifferent between any price in $p \in [\underline{p}(c), \overline{p}(c)]$ with $\overline{p}(c) = \rho$.

Consumers' reservation price

$$\rho = s + \Pr(c_L|\rho)E(p|c_L) + \Pr(c_H|\rho)E(p|c_H)$$
(3)

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

Price distributions for different c



▲□ > ▲圖 > ▲ 臣 > ▲ 臣 > → 臣 = ∽ 의 < ⊙ < ⊙

Out-of-equilibrium beliefs

◆□ ▶ < 圖 ▶ < 圖 ▶ < 圖 ▶ < 圖 • 의 Q @</p>

 What should a consumer believe about cost after observing a price *p* > *ρ*?

Out-of-equilibrium beliefs

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

- What should a consumer believe about cost after observing a price *p* > *ρ*?
- At $p = \rho$, $\rho = s + \Pr(c_L|\rho)E(p|c_L) + \Pr(c_H|\rho)E(p|c_H)$
 - We know $E(p|c_L) < E(p|c_H)$
 - If at p > ρ, Pr(c_L|p) < Pr(c_L|ρ), then consumer would like to buy at price just above ρ

Out-of-equilibrium beliefs

- What should a consumer believe about cost after observing a price *p* > *ρ*?
- At $p = \rho$, $\rho = s + \Pr(c_L|\rho)E(p|c_L) + \Pr(c_H|\rho)E(p|c_H)$
 - We know $E(p|c_L) < E(p|c_H)$
 - If at p > ρ, Pr(c_L|p) < Pr(c_L|ρ), then consumer would like to buy at price just above ρ
- Thus, reservation price equilibrium requires out-of-equilibrium beliefs to satisfy Pr(c_L|p) ≤ Pr(c_L|ρ) for p > ρ



• Which type of firm has more incentives to deviate to higher prices?

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆臣▶ ◆臣▶ 臣 の�?

- Which type of firm has more incentives to deviate to higher prices?
- Denote by $\beta(p)$ probability that non-shoppers buy after observing price p

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

- Which type of firm has more incentives to deviate to higher prices?
- Denote by β(p) probability that non-shoppers buy after observing price p
- D1: if for all β(p) for which it is profitable for type L to deviate to p, it is also profitable to deviate for type H, but not vice versa, then consumer should assign Pr(c_L|p) = 0) to p > ρ

- Which type of firm has more incentives to deviate to higher prices?
- Denote by β(p) probability that non-shoppers buy after observing price p
- D1: if for all β(p) for which it is profitable for type L to deviate to p, it is also profitable to deviate for type H, but not vice versa, then consumer should assign Pr(c_L|p) = 0) to p > ρ
 - Equilibrium profits of type *i*, are given by $\pi_i = \frac{1-\lambda}{2}(\rho c_i)$

- Which type of firm has more incentives to deviate to higher prices?
- Denote by β(p) probability that non-shoppers buy after observing price p
- D1: if for all β(p) for which it is profitable for type L to deviate to p, it is also profitable to deviate for type H, but not vice versa, then consumer should assign Pr(c_L|p) = 0) to p > ρ
 - Equilibrium profits of type *i*, are given by $\pi_i = \frac{1-\lambda}{2}(\rho c_i)$
 - Deviating to $p > \rho$ yields $\pi_i = \frac{1-\lambda}{2}\beta(p)(p-c_i), i = 1, 2.$

- Which type of firm has more incentives to deviate to higher prices?
- Denote by β(p) probability that non-shoppers buy after observing price p
- D1: if for all β(p) for which it is profitable for type L to deviate to p, it is also profitable to deviate for type H, but not vice versa, then consumer should assign Pr(c_L|p) = 0) to p > ρ
 - Equilibrium profits of type *i*, are given by $\pi_i = \frac{1-\lambda}{2}(\rho c_i)$
 - Deviating to $p > \rho$ yields $\pi_i = \frac{1-\lambda}{2}\beta(p)(p-c_i), \tilde{i} = 1, 2.$
 - Deviating profitable if

$$\beta(p) > \frac{
ho - c_i}{p - c_i}$$

- Which type of firm has more incentives to deviate to higher prices?
- Denote by β(p) probability that non-shoppers buy after observing price p
- D1: if for all β(p) for which it is profitable for type L to deviate to p, it is also profitable to deviate for type H, but not vice versa, then consumer should assign Pr(c_L|p) = 0) to p > ρ
 - Equilibrium profits of type *i*, are given by $\pi_i = \frac{1-\lambda}{2}(\rho c_i)$
 - Deviating to $p > \rho$ yields $\pi_i = \frac{1-\lambda}{2}\beta(p)(p-c_i), \overline{i} = 1, 2.$
 - Deviating profitable if

$$\beta(p) > \frac{\rho - c_i}{p - c_i}.$$

 As RHS is decreasing in c_i for all p > ρ, high cost firms have a wider range of responses from the consumers for which it is profitable to deviate

- Which type of firm has more incentives to deviate to higher prices?
- Denote by β(p) probability that non-shoppers buy after observing price p
- D1: if for all β(p) for which it is profitable for type L to deviate to p, it is also profitable to deviate for type H, but not vice versa, then consumer should assign Pr(c_L|p) = 0) to p > ρ
 - Equilibrium profits of type *i*, are given by $\pi_i = \frac{1-\lambda}{2}(\rho c_i)$
 - Deviating to $p > \rho$ yields $\pi_i = \frac{1-\lambda}{2}\beta(p)(p-c_i), \overline{i} = 1, 2.$
 - Deviating profitable if

$$\beta(p) > \frac{\rho - c_i}{p - c_i}.$$

- As RHS is decreasing in c_i for all p > ρ, high cost firms have a wider range of responses from the consumers for which it is profitable to deviate
- D1 refinement requires $Pr(c_L|p) = 0$ for all $p > \rho$. Inconsistent with reservation price equilibrium.

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆臣▶ ◆臣▶ 臣 の�?

• If $F_i(p)$ does not have a mass point, upper bound \overline{p} should be the same for low and high cost.

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆臣▶ ◆臣▶ 臣 の�?

• If $F_i(p)$ does not have a mass point, upper bound \overline{p} should be the same for low and high cost.

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

- If $F_i(p)$ does not have a mass point, upper bound \overline{p} should be the same for low and high cost.
- At $p = \overline{p}$, $\Pr(c_H | \overline{p}) = 1$. Thus, $f_L(\overline{p}) = 0$

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

- If $F_i(p)$ does not have a mass point, upper bound \overline{p} should be the same for low and high cost.
- At $p = \overline{p}$, $\Pr(c_H | \overline{p}) = 1$. Thus, $f_L(\overline{p}) = 0$
- In (p
 - ε, p

 both types charge prices with strictly positive probability.

- If $F_i(p)$ does not have a mass point, upper bound \bar{p} should be the same for low and high cost.
- At $p = \overline{p}$, $\Pr(c_H | \overline{p}) = 1$. Thus, $f_L(\overline{p}) = 0$
- In (p
 - ε, p

 both types charge prices with strictly positive probability.
- By selling only to nonshoppers, profit of low cost firm reaches a maximum at p = p
 : Maximizing 1-λ/2 β(p)(p − c_L) gives

$$\beta'(\overline{p})(\overline{p}-c_L)+\beta(\overline{p})=0.$$

- If $F_i(p)$ does not have a mass point, upper bound \bar{p} should be the same for low and high cost.
- At $p = \overline{p}$, $\Pr(c_H | \overline{p}) = 1$. Thus, $f_L(\overline{p}) = 0$
- In (p
 - ε, p

 both types charge prices with strictly positive probability.
- By selling only to nonshoppers, profit of low cost firm reaches a maximum at p = p
 : Maximizing 1-λ/2 β(p)(p − c_L) gives

$$\beta'(\overline{p})(\overline{p}-c_L)+\beta(\overline{p})=0.$$

- If $F_i(p)$ does not have a mass point, upper bound \overline{p} should be the same for low and high cost.
- At $p = \overline{p}$, $\Pr(c_H | \overline{p}) = 1$. Thus, $f_L(\overline{p}) = 0$
- In (p
 - ε, p

 both types charge prices with strictly positive probability.
- By selling only to nonshoppers, profit of low cost firm reaches a maximum at p = p
 : Maximizing 1-λ/2 β(p)(p − c_L) gives

$$\beta'(\overline{p})(\overline{p}-c_L)+\beta(\overline{p})=0.$$

- As $\beta(\overline{p}) > 0$, it follows that $\beta'(\overline{p}) < 0$ and therefore, $\beta(\overline{p}) < 1$.
- Thus, there is an interval of prices where consumers search with strictly positive probability
- Indifferent over interval of prices where $p = s + \Pr(c_L|p)E(p|c_L) + \Pr(c_H|p)E(p|c_H)$

CDF in Nonreservation Price Equilibria without Mass Point

Firms' demand when setting price p and cost is $c_i, i = H, L$ is $D(p|c_i) =$

$$\lambda(1-F_i(p)) + \frac{1-\lambda}{2}\beta(p) + \frac{1-\lambda}{2}(1-\beta(p))(1-F_i(p)) + \frac{1-\lambda}{2}\int_p^{\overline{p}}(1-\beta(\widetilde{p}))f_i(\widetilde{p})d\widetilde{p}$$
(4)

• Profit equals $\pi(p|c_i) = D(p|c_i)(p-c_i) = \frac{1-\lambda}{2}\beta(\overline{p})(\overline{p}-c_i).$

CDF in Nonreservation Price Equilibria without Mass Point

Firms' demand when setting price p and cost is c_i , i = H, L is $D(p|c_i) =$

$$\lambda(1-F_i(p)) + \frac{1-\lambda}{2}\beta(p) + \frac{1-\lambda}{2}(1-\beta(p))(1-F_i(p)) + \frac{1-\lambda}{2}\int_p^{\overline{p}}(1-\beta(\widetilde{p}))f_i(\widetilde{p})d\widetilde{p}$$
(4)

- Profit equals $\pi(p|c_i) = D(p|c_i)(p-c_i) = \frac{1-\lambda}{2}\beta(\overline{p})(\overline{p}-c_i)$.
- By solving an inexact differential equation, equilibrium price distribution in interval where 0 < β(p) < 1 can be solved for

$$F_{i}(p) = \frac{\int_{\underline{P}_{i}}^{p} \frac{(1-\lambda)\beta(\overline{p})(\overline{p}-c_{i})}{(\overline{p}-c_{i})^{2}\sqrt{1-(1-\lambda)\beta(\overline{p})}} d\widetilde{p} + C_{i}}{2\sqrt{1-(1-\lambda)\beta(p)}}.$$
(5)



 $\lambda{=}0.1,\,\alpha{=}0.6,\,ch{=}10,\,cl{=}1,\,s{=}2,\,\beta{=}0.76$ (at upper bound) $_{\rm Prob}$



Nonreservation Price Equilibria with a Mass Point

Consumers

• Buy for sure up to ρ . Search for sure after observing a price $\rho and a price <math>p > \overline{p}$ Buy with probability β at $p = \overline{p}$.

$$\rho = s + \Pr(c_L|\rho)E(\rho|c_L) + \Pr(c_H|\rho)E(\rho|c_H)$$
(6)

$$\bar{p} = s + E(p|c_H) \tag{7}$$

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

Firms

- Low cost firms set prices at or below ρ
- High cost firms choose \bar{p} with probability γ and set prices at or below ρ with probability 1γ .

Nonreservation Price Equilibria with a Mass Point

- At ρ
 This is consistent with D1 if β > γ/(1-λ)[(1-γ)(1-x)+γ], where x > 1 is a number measuring how much larger is the equilibrium profit of a low cost firm compared to if it would set p̄.
- Undercutting is not optimal given these beliefs if *beta* is large enough.
- For any $\gamma > 0$ there is active search in this equilibrium with positive probability.
- For γ converging to 0, equilibrium effectively converges to equilibrium in Dana (1994) and generalized in Janssen et al. (2011)





Existence of Nonreservation Price Equilibria?

・ロト < 団ト < 三ト < 三ト ・ 三 ・ のへの

· Equilibrium with mass point does not exist for large cost differences

Existence of Nonreservation Price Equilibria?

- Equilibrium with mass point does not exist for large cost differences
- Equilibrium without mass point does not exist for low cost differences
 - For this equilibrium to exist we should have that at $p(H) \beta(p) < 1$.
 - In other words, nonshoppers should randomize over the whole interval of prices set by high cost firms. And there should be a gap in the low cost distribution.

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

• Simulation results suggest either one or the other or both types of equilibria exist for any choice of parameter values.





Conclusion

- If consumers do not know prices, it is likely they also do not know firms' cost.
- When consumers are uncertain about firms' cost, reservation price strategy is unreasonable
- Forces us to inquire about equilibria where consumers do not have a reservation price
- We show these equilibria always have active search along equilibrium path
- "Show" they always exist. Work in progress
- Equilibrium price distributions very different from previous characterizations. Some "parametric" freedom. New challenge for people doing empirical work.
- Numerical simulations suggest that expected prices are lower than those in reservation price equilibria and sometimes even lower than in case cost is known