

Simultaneous Auctions for Complementary Goods

Wiroy Shin

December 9, 2013

Abstract

This paper studies an environment of simultaneous, separate, first-price auctions for complementary goods. Agents observe private values of each good before making bids, and the complementarity between goods is explicitly incorporated in their utility. For simplicity, a model is presented with two first-price auctions and two bidders. We show that a monotone pure-strategy Bayesian Nash Equilibrium exists in the environment.

Keywords : simultaneous auctions, multi-object auction, first-price auction, equilibrium existence, monotone pure-strategies.

1 Introduction

This paper studies an environment of simultaneous, separate, first-price auctions for complementary goods. Agents observe private values of each good before making bids, and the complementarity between goods is explicitly incorporated in their utility. For simplicity, a model is presented with two first-price auctions and two bidders. We show that a monotone pure-strategy Bayesian Nash Equilibrium exists in the environment. This model, in which the auction mechanism has an exogenous (albeit widely used) form and in which sellers do not interact strategically with one another, is intended to provide a tractable framework for applied research focusing on competition among buyers. Each buyer is trying to acquire a portfolio of objects that must be purchased by auction from several unrelated sellers. eBay's various sealed-bid auctions under same collectibles category which are run by different sellers with similar closing time can be an example of this environment. Also, less explicit, but equally compelling, auctions for acquisition of firms manufacturing a final good and an intermediate good input can be another example. Here, a buyer intends to create a vertically integrated firm and the

First draft : August 15, 2012

Department of Economics, The Pennsylvania State University, University Park, PA, 16802, USA.

E-mail address: wus130@psu.edu

I thank to Edward J. Green for his guidance and support throughout this project. I also gratefully acknowledge the comments of James Jordan, Leslie Marx, Ed Coulson, and Paul Grieco. All errors are mine.

two acquired firms can be viewed as complements when they are merged.

There are several branches of existing auction research that are similar to, but distinct from, what is being done here. Let us comment briefly on those contributions, and on how the present research is distinguished from them. A literature on multi-unit auctions, including Bresky (1999) and McAdams (2003), studies sale of multiple identical goods in an auction with specific pricing rules. As modeled, multiple identical objects resemble substitutable distinct objects rather than complementary ones modeled here. Package auctions(see Bernheim and Whinston (1986) and Ausubel and Milgrom (2002)) model multiple goods without assuming substitutability only. They suppose that an explicit bid can be offered for a package of objects, which is not possible when various objects are auctioned by distinct and unrelated sellers.

There are a few prior research contributions on simultaneous auctions, including Krishna and Rosenthal (1996) and Bikhchandani (1999). They either assume complete information on bidders' valuations or employ a single parameter for private value signals of multiple objects. However, such parameterization is too rigid to model heterogeneity of bidders' preferences on each item and complementarity. In this paper, we relax those restrictions so that the environment in which each bidder receives private independent signals for each heterogeneous object is permitted.

We follow Reny (2011) to prove the existence of a monotone pure-strategy equilibrium. Along with basic assumptions on the Bayesian games(G.1-G.6, p.509 Reny (2011)), *weak single crossing property* and *weak quasi supermodularity* are sufficient for the existence theorem in his paper.¹

The remainder of this paper as follows. In the next section, we present an environment of simultaneous separate complementary first-price auctions in detail, and proposes a theorem for the existence of a monotone pure-strategy equilibrium. Section 3 provides the proof, and section 4 discusses an extension of the study to a continuum bid space setting.

2 Simultaneous first-price auctions for complementary goods

In this section, we define simultaneous first-price auctions for complementary goods with 2 non-identical objects and 2 bidders. This specific auction environment is denoted by \mathbb{M} . At the end of the section, we propose a theorem for the existence of monotone pure-strategy equilibrium.

¹Reny (2011), Theorem 4.1 and Proposition 4.4

2.1 Environment

Bidder $i \in \{1, 2\}$.

Object $k \in \{1, 2\}$, Values of objects² are represented by vector $x_i = (x_{i1}, x_{i2})$. $x_{ik} \sim F(\cdot)$ and $x_{ik} \in X = [0, 1]$. Let $F(\cdot)$ be atomless.
 ; x_{ik} is a random variable with a CDF $F(\cdot)$, which has a support X and a PDF $f : X \rightarrow [0, 1]$. Each object k is distributed *i.i.d.* Therefore, joint CDF and joint PDF for two objects (x_{i1}, x_{i2}) are given by $G(x_{i1}, x_{i2}) = F(x_{i1}) \times F(x_{i2})$, and $g(x_{i1}, x_{i2}) = f(x_{i1}) \times f(x_{i2})$, respectively.

Bid $b_i = (b_{i1}, b_{i2}) \in B \times B = A \subset \mathbb{R}^2$. Each bidder i places bids b_{i1} and b_{i2} simultaneously. B is a finite subset of \mathbb{R} . That is, we assume that the action space of this game, A , is finite.

Utility Each bidder has a quasi linear ex-post utility $U_i(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot, \cdot)$.

$$U_i(b_i, b_j, x_i, x_j) = \begin{cases} u(x_{i1}, x_{i2}) - (b_{i1} + b_{i2}) & \text{if } b_{i1} > b_{j1} \text{ and } b_{i2} > b_{j2}, \text{ where } i \neq j \\ u(x_{i1}, 0) - b_{i1} & \text{if } b_{i1} > b_{j1} \text{ and } b_{i2} < b_{j2} \\ u(0, x_{i2}) - b_{i2} & \text{if } b_{i1} < b_{j1} \text{ and } b_{i2} > b_{j2} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

Note that when ties occur the object is allocated randomly to one of two bidders with $\frac{1}{2}$ probability. The ex-post utility can be interpreted as follows. An agent realizes his utility from objects he wins, through a function $u : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. $u(\cdot, \cdot)$ transforms the independent values of goods to utility which counts a synergy effect between two objects, *e.g.* $u(x_{i1}, x_{i2}) = x_{i1} + x_{i2} + \alpha \cdot \mathbb{1}_{\{x_{ik} > 0, k \in \{1, 2\}\}}$, where $\alpha > 0$. And then, the bidding values for the objects he wins are subtracted from $u(\cdot, \cdot)$.

Here are additional assumptions on the $u(\xi)$.

(A1) $u(x_i)$ is increasing in x_i .

(A2) $\lambda(x_{i1}, x_{i2}) = u(x_{i1}, x_{i2}) - [u(x_{i1}, 0) + u(0, x_{i2})] \geq 0$, where $x_{i1} \geq 0$ and $x_{i2} \geq 0$; This assumption implies that regardless of values of objects, agents realize that utility from winning both objects is greater than or equal to sum of utilities of each good. (e.g. Goods are complementary, Owning all bike shops in New York City yields monopolistic positioning benefit in the business)

(A3) Let \geq be a coordinatewise partial order on types. That is, $[x_i \geq y_i \Leftrightarrow (x_{i1} \geq y_{i1}) \text{ and } (x_{i2} \geq y_{i2})]$. Assume $[x_i \geq y_i \Rightarrow \lambda(x_i) \geq \lambda(y_i)]$. In other words, λ is monotone in $x_i = (x_{i1}, x_{i2})$.

²It can be interpreted as a type of an agent.

In summary, bidders expect an extra synergy by obtaining both items, and the value of the synergy is weakly increasing with values of obtained goods.

Since it is reasonable not to bid more than the maximum of utility an agent can earn, we restrict the minimum and maximum bid on one good as $u(0, 0)$ and $u(1, 1)$ respectively. Let $u(1, 1)$ be denoted by \bar{u} . Without loss of generality, we impose $u(0, 0) = 0$ and constant increments on bids. Accordingly, the action space is $A = \{0, \frac{1}{n}, \frac{2}{n}, \dots, \bar{u}\} \times \{0, \frac{1}{n}, \frac{2}{n}, \dots, \bar{u}\}, n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$.

2.2 Monotone pure-strategy equilibrium

A *pure-strategy* for bidder i is a function $s_i : X^2 \rightarrow A$ and it is *monotone* if $x'_i \geq x_i$ implies $s_i(x'_i) \geq s_i(x_i)$, for all $x'_i, x_i \in X^2$. Let S_i be a set of monotone pure strategies of i . Based on the environment in section 2.1, bidder i 's expected utility can be written as follows.

Let $\mu_{s_{-i}}$ be a distribution of an opponent's bids constructed by $s_{-i}(x_{-i})$ and $G(x_{-i})$. Define

$$\begin{aligned}
P_3(b_i) &= \mu_{s_{-i}}([0, b_{i1}] \times [0, b_{i2}]) + \frac{1}{2}\mu_{s_{-i}}([b_{i1}, b_{i1}] \times [0, b_{i2}]) \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{2}\mu_{s_{-i}}([0, b_{i1}] \times [b_{i2}, b_{i2}]) + \frac{1}{4}\mu_{s_{-i}}([b_{i1}, b_{i1}] \times [b_{i2}, b_{i2}]); \\
P_1(b_i) &= \mu_{s_{-i}}([0, b_{i1}] \times (b_{i2}, \bar{u}]) + \frac{1}{2}\mu_{s_{-i}}([0, b_{i1}] \times [b_{i2}, b_{i2}]) \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{2}\mu_{s_{-i}}([b_{i1}, b_{i1}] \times (b_{i2}, \bar{u}]) + \frac{1}{4}\mu_{s_{-i}}([b_{i1}, b_{i1}] \times [b_{i2}, b_{i2}]); \\
P_2(b_i) &= \mu_{s_{-i}}((b_{i1}, \bar{u}] \times [0, b_{i2}]) + \frac{1}{2}\mu_{s_{-i}}([b_{i1}, b_{i1}] \times [0, b_{i2}]) \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{2}\mu_{s_{-i}}((b_{i1}, \bar{u}] \times [b_{i2}, b_{i2}]) + \frac{1}{4}\mu_{s_{-i}}([b_{i1}, b_{i1}] \times [b_{i2}, b_{i2}]).
\end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

$P_3(b_i)$ denotes a probability that bidder i wins both objects with b_i when the opponent plays s_{-i} . $P_1(b_i)$ and $P_2(b_i)$ indicate probabilities for winning object 1 *only* and object 2 *only*, respectively. Then, if an agent with type x_i bids b_i , the bidder i 's expected utility is

$$V_i(b_i, x_i, s_{-i}) = P_3(b_i)[u(x_{i1}, x_{i2}) - (b_{i1} + b_{i2})] + P_1(b_i)[u(x_{i1}, 0) - b_{i1}] + P_2(b_i)[u(0, x_{i2}) - b_{i2}]. \tag{3}$$

To make proofs easy in section 3, we modify a representation of the expected utility. Define

$$\begin{aligned}
Q_3(b_{i1}, b_{i2}) &= P_3(b_i); \\
Q_1(b_{i1}, b_{i2}) &= \mu_{s_{-i}}([0, b_{i1}] \times [0, \bar{u}]) + \frac{1}{2}\mu_{s_{-i}}([b_{i1}, b_{i1}] \times [0, \bar{u}]); \\
Q_2(b_{i1}, b_{i2}) &= \mu_{s_{-i}}([0, \bar{u}] \times [0, b_{i2}]) + \frac{1}{2}\mu_{s_{-i}}([0, \bar{u}] \times [b_{i2}, b_{i2}]).
\end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

$Q_1(b_{i1}, b_{i2})$ denotes a probability that bidder i with a bid b_{i1} wins the object 1 at least. $Q_2(b_{i1}, b_{i2})$ also describes a probability that bidder i with a bid b_{i2} wins the object 2 at least. Note that Q_1 only depends on b_{i1} and is increasing in b_{i1} , and Q_2 only depends on b_{i2} and is increasing in b_{i2} . For notational convenience, we eliminate b_{i2} and b_{i1} in Q_1 and Q_2 's argument respectively. Q_3 is increasing in both b_{i1} and b_{i2} .

The way that constructing Q_1, Q_2 and Q_3 infers $[P_3(b_i) = Q_3(b_i), P_1(b_{i1}) = Q_1(b_{i1}) - Q_3(b_i), P_2(b_i) = Q_2(b_{i2}) - Q_3(b_i)]$.

Then, (3) becomes

$$\begin{aligned}
V_i(b_i, x_i, s_{-i}) &= Q_1(b_{i1})[u(x_{i1}, 0) - b_{i1}] + Q_2(b_{i2})[u(0, x_{i2}) - b_{i2}] \\
&\quad + Q_3(b_{i1}, b_{i2})[u(x_{i1}, x_{i2}) - (b_{i1} + b_{i2}) - (u(x_{i1}, 0) - b_{i1}) - (u(0, x_{i2}) - b_{i2})] \\
&= Q_1(b_{i1})[u(x_{i1}, 0) - b_{i1}] + Q_2(b_{i2})[u(0, x_{i2}) - b_{i2}] \\
&\quad + Q_3(b_{i1}, b_{i2})[u(x_{i1}, x_{i2}) - u(x_{i1}, 0) - u(0, x_{i2})] \\
&= Q_1(b_{i1})[u(x_{i1}, 0) - b_{i1}] + Q_2(b_{i2})[u(0, x_{i2}) - b_{i2}] + Q_3(b_{i1}, b_{i2})\lambda(x_i).
\end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

Under the auction \mathbb{M} , $(s_1, s_2) \in S_1 \times S_2$ is a *monotone pure-strategy equilibrium*, if for every bidder $i \in \{1, 2\}$ and every $x_i \in X^2$,

$$V_i(s_i(x_i), x_i, s_{-i}) \geq V_i(b_i, x_i, s_{-i}) \tag{6}$$

for all $b_i \in A$.

Theorem 1. *Suppose an auction satisfies the environment \mathbb{M} which is defined in section 2.1. Then, there exist a monotone pure-strategy equilibrium for the auction \mathbb{M} .*

3 Proof of Theorem 1

Under the auction \mathbb{M} , we have an atomless CDF for object values with a two-dimensional compact support. Therefore, by proposition 3.1 in Reny (2011), assumptions G.1-G.5 on the Bayesian game (p.509 Reny (2011)) are satisfied. Also, with a finite action space A defined in section 3.1, the action space is a lattice, and the ex-post utility U_i is bounded, jointly measurable and continuous in $b_i \in A$ for every $x_i \in X^2$. By the proposition 4.4(i) in Reny (2011), if the interim utility $V_i(b_i, x_i, s_{-i})$ satisfies weak single crossing property and quasi supermodularity, **Theorem 1** is proved.

3.1 Weak single crossing property of $V_i(b_i, x_i, s_{-i})$

Definition 1. $V_i(b_i, x_i, s_{-i})$ satisfies *weak single crossing* if for all monotone pure strategies s_{-i} of the opponent, if for all $b'_i \geq b_i$, and for all $x'_i \geq x_i$,

$$V_i(b'_i, x_i, s_{-i}) \geq V_i(b_i, x_i, s_{-i}) \text{ implies } V_i(b'_i, x'_i, s_{-i}) \geq V_i(b_i, x'_i, s_{-i}). \tag{7}$$

Let $b'_i = (b_{i1}^h, b_{i2}^h)$, $b_i = (b_{i1}^l, b_{i2}^l)$, $x'_i = (x_{i1}^h, x_{i2}^h)$, $x_i = (x_{i1}^l, x_{i2}^l)$.

Lemma 1. *With b_i, b'_i, x_i and x'_i , (γ) holds. That is,*

$$V_i(b_{i1}^h, b_{i2}^h, x_i, s_{-i}) - V_i(b_{i1}^l, b_{i2}^l, x_i, s_{-i}) \geq 0 \quad (8)$$

implies

$$V_i(b_{i1}^h, b_{i2}^h, x'_i, s_{-i}) - V_i(b_{i1}^l, b_{i2}^l, x'_i, s_{-i}) \geq 0. \quad (9)$$

Proof. (8) gives

$$\begin{aligned} & Q_1(b_{i1}^h)[u(x_{i1}^l, 0) - b_{i1}^h] + Q_2(b_{i2}^h)[u(0, x_{i2}^l) - b_{i2}^h] \\ & + Q_3(b_{i1}^h, b_{i2}^h)[u(x_{i1}^l, x_{i2}^l) - u(x_{i1}^l, 0) - u(0, x_{i2}^l)] \\ \geq & Q_1(b_{i1}^l)[u(x_{i1}^l, 0) - b_{i1}^l] + Q_2(b_{i2}^l)[u(0, x_{i2}^l) - b_{i2}^l] \\ & + Q_3(b_{i1}^l, b_{i2}^l)[u(x_{i1}^l, x_{i2}^l) - u(x_{i1}^l, 0) - u(0, x_{i2}^l)] \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \Leftrightarrow & [Q_3(b_{i1}^h, b_{i2}^h) - Q_3(b_{i1}^l, b_{i2}^l)]\lambda(x_i) \\ \geq & [Q_1(b_{i1}^l)[u(x_{i1}^l, 0) - b_{i1}^l] - Q_1(b_{i1}^h)[u(x_{i1}^l, 0) - b_{i1}^h]] \\ & + [Q_2(b_{i2}^l)[u(0, x_{i2}^l) - b_{i2}^l] - Q_2(b_{i2}^h)[u(0, x_{i2}^l) - b_{i2}^h]] \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

We want to show that (11) gives (9). Rewriting (9),

$$\begin{aligned} & [Q_3(b_{i1}^h, b_{i2}^h) - Q_3(b_{i1}^l, b_{i2}^l)]\lambda(x'_i) \\ \geq & [Q_1(b_{i1}^l)[u(x_{i1}^h, 0) - b_{i1}^l] - Q_1(b_{i1}^h)[u(x_{i1}^h, 0) - b_{i1}^h]] \\ & + [Q_2(b_{i2}^l)[u(0, x_{i2}^h) - b_{i2}^l] - Q_2(b_{i2}^h)[u(0, x_{i2}^h) - b_{i2}^h]] \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

To prove lemma, it is sufficient to show that $[(LHS(12) \geq LHS(11)) \text{ and } (RHS(11) \geq RHS(12))]$.

$$LHS(12) - LHS(11) = [Q_3(b_{i1}^h, b_{i2}^h) - Q_3(b_{i1}^l, b_{i2}^l)][\lambda(x'_i) - \lambda(x_i)] \geq 0. \quad (13)$$

The inequality comes from the fact that both terms are positive. Q_3 is increasing in its argument. Also, $\lambda(x_i)$ is monotone by (A3) in section 2.1, and $x'_i \geq x_i$.

$$\begin{aligned} RHS(11) - RHS(12) &= Q_1(b_{i1}^l)[u(x_{i1}^l, 0) - u(x_{i1}^h, 0)] - Q_1(b_{i1}^h)[u(x_{i1}^l, 0) - u(x_{i1}^h, 0)] \\ &+ Q_2(b_{i2}^l)[u(0, x_{i2}^l) - u(0, x_{i2}^h)] - Q_2(b_{i2}^h)[u(0, x_{i2}^l) - u(0, x_{i2}^h)] \\ &= [Q_1(b_{i1}^l) - Q_1(b_{i1}^h)][u(x_{i1}^l, 0) - u(x_{i1}^h, 0)] \\ &+ [Q_2(b_{i2}^l) - Q_2(b_{i2}^h)][u(0, x_{i2}^l) - u(0, x_{i2}^h)] \\ &\geq 0 \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

The inequality comes from the fact that Q_1, Q_2 and u is increasing in its argument. \blacklozenge

Therefore, by Lemma 1, $V_i(b_i, x_i, s_{-i})$ satisfies weak single crossing property.

3.2 Weak quasi-supermodularity of $V_i(b_i, x_i, s_{-i})$

Definition 2. $V_i(b_i, x_i, s_{-i})$ is *weakly quasisupermodular* if for all monotone pure strategies s_{-i} of the opponent, if for all $b_i, b'_i \in A$, and every $x_i \in X^2$,

$$V_i(b_i, x_i, s_{-i}) \geq V_i(b_i \wedge b'_i, x_i, s_{-i}) \text{ implies } V_i(b_i \vee b'_i, x_i, s_{-i}) \geq V_i(b'_i, x_i, s_{-i}). \quad (15)$$

If $b'_i \geq b_i$, where \geq is a coordinatewise partial order, (15) holds trivially. Therefore, we focus on the case $[(b_{i1} > b'_{i1}) \text{ and } (b_{i2} < b'_{i2})]$. Let $b_{ik}^h, b_{ik}^l \in B$ and $b_{ik}^h > b_{ik}^l$ for any $k \in \{1, 2\}$. For the current case, let $b_i = (b_{i1}^h, b_{i2}^l)$ and $b'_i = (b_{i1}^l, b_{i2}^h)$.

Substitute b_i, b'_i , to (15). That is,

$$V_i(b_{i1}^h, b_{i2}^l, x_i, s_{-i}) - V_i(b_{i1}^l, b_{i2}^h, x_i, s_{-i}) \geq 0 \quad (16)$$

implies

$$V_i(b_{i1}^h, b_{i2}^h, x_i, s_{-i}) - V_i(b_{i1}^l, b_{i2}^h, x_i, s_{-i}) \geq 0. \quad (17)$$

(16) gives

$$\begin{aligned} & Q_1(b_{i1}^h)[u(x_{i1}, 0) - b_{i1}^h] + Q_2(b_{i2}^l)[u(0, x_{i2}) - b_{i2}^l] \\ & + Q_3(b_{i1}^h, b_{i2}^l)[u(x_{i1}, x_{i2}) - u(x_{i1}, 0) - u(0, x_{i2})] \\ \geq & Q_1(b_{i1}^l)[u(x_{i1}, 0) - b_{i1}^l] + Q_2(b_{i2}^h)[u(0, x_{i2}) - b_{i2}^h] \\ & + Q_3(b_{i1}^l, b_{i2}^h)[u(x_{i1}, x_{i2}) - u(x_{i1}, 0) - u(0, x_{i2})] \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

$$\Leftrightarrow Q_1(b_{i1}^h)[u(x_{i1}, 0) - b_{i1}^h] - Q_1(b_{i1}^l)[u(x_{i1}, 0) - b_{i1}^l] \geq [Q_3(b_{i1}^l, b_{i2}^h) - Q_3(b_{i1}^h, b_{i2}^l)]\lambda(x_i). \quad (19)$$

Rewriting (17),

$$Q_1(b_{i1}^h)[u(x_{i1}, 0) - b_{i1}^h] - Q_1(b_{i1}^l)[u(x_{i1}, 0) - b_{i1}^l] \geq [Q_3(b_{i1}^l, b_{i2}^h) - Q_3(b_{i1}^h, b_{i2}^h)]\lambda(x_i). \quad (20)$$

Since LHS of (19) and (20) are identical, a sufficient condition for weak quasisupermodularity is $[\text{RHS (19)} \geq \text{RHS (20)}]$.

$$\begin{aligned} \text{RHS(19)} - \text{RHS(20)} = & \lambda(x_i) \cdot \\ & [[Q_3(b_{i1}^h, b_{i2}^h) - Q_3(b_{i1}^h, b_{i2}^l)] - [Q_3(b_{i1}^l, b_{i2}^h) - Q_3(b_{i1}^l, b_{i2}^l)]] \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

With the assumption(A2), $\lambda(x_i) \geq 0$, for weak quasisupermodularity, it is sufficient to show that $[\text{RHS (19)} - \text{RHS (20)}]$ is positive. That is,

$$[Q_3(b_{i1}^h, b_{i2}^h) - Q_3(b_{i1}^h, b_{i2}^l)] - [Q_3(b_{i1}^l, b_{i2}^h) - Q_3(b_{i1}^l, b_{i2}^l)] \geq 0. \quad (22)$$

Lemma 2. Recall that in the auction \mathbb{M} , $X^2 = [0, 1]^2$ and $A = \{0, \frac{1}{n}, \frac{2}{n}, \dots, \bar{u}\} \times \{0, \frac{1}{n}, \frac{2}{n}, \dots, \bar{u}\}, n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$. In this environment, inequality (22) holds for all monotone pure-strategies of the opponent.

Proof. Let $x_j \in X \times X$ and $p(x_j) = \text{prob}(x_j)$. Also, define an ex-post two objects winning probability function for i , $q(b_i, b_j)$ as follows.

$$q(b_i, b_j) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } b_i > b_j \\ 1/2 & \text{if } [(b_{i1} > b_{j1}) \text{ and } (b_{i2} = b_{j2})] \text{ or } [(b_{i1} = b_{j1}) \text{ and } (b_{i2} > b_{j2})] \\ 1/4 & \text{if } b_i = b_j \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (23)$$

Suppose the opponent plays an arbitrary monotone pure-strategy $\beta_j(x_j) = (\beta_{j1}(x_j), \beta_{j2}(x_j))$, for all x_j . Then, given β_j , bidder i 's interim probability for winning both objects $Q_3(b_i, \beta_j)$ is

$$Q_3(b_i, \beta_j) = \int_{x_j \in X^2} p(x_j) \cdot q(b_i, \beta_j(x_j)) dx_j \quad (24)$$

As a result, the LHS of (22) can be expressed as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} & [Q_3(b_{i1}^h, b_{i2}^h, \beta_j) - Q_3(b_{i1}^h, b_{i2}^l, \beta_j)] - [Q_3(b_{i1}^l, b_{i2}^h, \beta_j) - Q_3(b_{i1}^l, b_{i2}^l, \beta_j)] \\ = & \int_{x_j \in X^2} p(x_j) [\{q(b_{i1}^h, b_{i2}^h, \beta_j(x_j)) - q(b_{i1}^h, b_{i2}^l, \beta_j(x_j))\} \\ & - \{q(b_{i1}^l, b_{i2}^h, \beta_j(x_j)) - q(b_{i1}^l, b_{i2}^l, \beta_j(x_j))\}] dx_j \\ = & \int_{x_j \in X^2} p(x_j) [H(b_{i1}^h, b_{i2}^l, b_{i2}^h, \beta_j(x_j)) - D(b_{i1}^l, b_{i2}^l, b_{i2}^h, \beta_j(x_j))] dx_j. \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

Note that $H(b_{i1}^h, b_{i2}^l, b_{i2}^h, \beta_j(x_j)) = q(b_{i1}^h, b_{i2}^h, \beta_j(x_j)) - q(b_{i1}^h, b_{i2}^l, \beta_j(x_j))$ and $D(b_{i1}^l, b_{i2}^l, b_{i2}^h, \beta_j(x_j)) = q(b_{i1}^l, b_{i2}^h, \beta_j(x_j)) - q(b_{i1}^l, b_{i2}^l, \beta_j(x_j))$. That is, H represents an increase in q , ex post winning probability for both objects, when the agent i increases the second object's bid, while bidding high for the first object. D describes the same effect when i bids low for the first object.

Now, we want to show $\forall x_j, \forall \vec{b}_i \in \{(b_{i1}^l, b_{i2}^l, b_{i1}^h, b_{i2}^h) \mid b_{ik}^h > b_{ik}^l, k = 1, 2\}$,

$$H(b_{i1}^h, b_{i2}^l, b_{i2}^h, \beta_j(x_j)) - D(b_{i1}^l, b_{i2}^l, b_{i2}^h, \beta_j(x_j)) \geq 0.$$

Pick arbitrary x_j and β_j , and let's calculate $H(b_{i1}^h, b_{i2}^l, b_{i2}^h, \beta_j(x_j)) - D(b_{i1}^l, b_{i2}^l, b_{i2}^h, \beta_j(x_j))$, for every possible case between \vec{b}_i and $\beta_j(x_j)$.³ We start from the first main category, which describes the case that the second bid of the opponents is located between bidder

³There are 5 main categories defined by $[b_{i2}^h, b_{i2}^l, \text{ and } \beta_{j2}(x_j)]$ and 5 sub categories defined by $[b_{i1}^h, b_{i1}^l, \text{ and } \beta_{j1}(x_j)]$. The main categories are $[b_{i2}^h > \beta_{j2}(x_j) > b_{i2}^l]$, $[b_{i2}^h > \beta_{j2}(x_j) = b_{i2}^l]$, $[b_{i2}^h > b_{i2}^l > \beta_{j2}(x_j)]$, $[b_{i2}^h = \beta_{j2}(x_j) > b_{i2}^l]$ and $[\beta_{j2}(x_j) > b_{i2}^h > b_{i2}^l]$. Sub categories are shown in Table. 1.

i 's high and low bids for the second object. In this case, the low bid always gives value 0 for $q(\cdot, b_{i2}^l, \beta_j(x_j))$.

1. $b_{i2}^h > \beta_{j2}(x_j) > b_{i2}^l$

For b_{i1}^l , there are 3 possibilities.

- i) $b_{i1}^l < \beta_{j1}(x_j)$

$$D_1^1 = q(b_{i1}^l, b_{i2}^h, \beta_j(x_j)) - q(b_{i1}^l, b_{i2}^l, \beta_j(x_j)) = 0 - 0 = 0^4$$

- ii) $b_{i1}^l = \beta_{j1}(x_j)$

$$D_1^2 = q_j(b_{i1}^l, b_{i2}^h, \beta_j(x_j)) - q(b_{i1}^l, b_{i2}^l, \beta_j(x_j)) = 1/2 - 0 = 1/2$$

- iii) $b_{i1}^l > \beta_{j1}(x_j)$

$$D_1^3 = q(b_{i1}^l, b_{i2}^h, \beta_j(x_j)) - q(b_{i1}^l, b_{i2}^l, \beta_j(x_j)) = 1 - 0 = 1$$

For b_{i1}^h , there are 3 possibilities.

- a) $b_{i1}^h < \beta_{j1}(x_j)$

$$H_1^1 = q(b_{i1}^h, b_{i2}^h, \beta_j(x_j)) - q(b_{i1}^h, b_{i2}^l, \beta_j(x_j)) = D_1^1 = 0$$

The second equality holds, since b_{i1}^h plays a same role with b_{i1}^l in D_1^1 .

- b) $b_{i1}^h = \beta_{j1}(x_j)$

$$H_1^2 = D_1^2 = 1/2$$

- c) $b_{i1}^h > \beta_{j1}(x_j)$

$$H_1^3 = D_1^3 = 1$$

⁴The subscript of D (or H) denotes the main category number, and the superscript describes the cases defined by first bids.

Table 1: $H - D$ category

		H^1	H^2	H^3
		$b_1^h < \beta_{j1}(x_j)$	$b_1^h = \beta_{j1}(x_j)$	$b_1^h > \beta_{j1}(x_j)$
D_1	$b_1^l < \beta_{j1}(x_j)$	$H^1 - D^1$	$H^2 - D^1$	$H^3 - D^1$
D_2	$b_1^l = \beta_{j1}(x_j)$	\emptyset	\emptyset	$H^3 - D^2$
D_3	$b_1^l > \beta_{j1}(x_j)$	\emptyset	\emptyset	$H^3 - D^3$

Cells with \emptyset are not defined,
because $[b_1^l > \beta_{j1} > b_1^h]$ contradicts to $[b_1^h > b_1^l]$.

In summary,

$$\begin{aligned}
 H_1^1 &= D_1^1 = 0 \\
 H_1^2 &= D_1^2 = 1/2 \\
 H_1^3 &= D_1^3 = 1
 \end{aligned} \tag{26}$$

See the *Table 1*. We want to show that values of the cells defined are positive or zero, and it holds with the results in (26). It also holds for below 4 cases.

2. $b_{i2}^h > \beta_{j2}(x_j) = b_{i2}^l$

$$\begin{aligned}
 H_2^1 &= D_2^1 = 0 - 0 = 0 \\
 H_2^2 &= D_2^2 = 1/2 - 1/4 = 1/4 \\
 H_2^3 &= D_2^3 = 1 - 1/2 = 1/2
 \end{aligned} \tag{27}$$

3. $b_{i2}^h > b_{i2}^l > \beta_{j2}(x_j)$

$$\begin{aligned}
 H_3^1 &= D_3^1 = 0 - 0 = 0 \\
 H_3^2 &= D_3^2 = 1/2 - 1/2 = 0 \\
 H_3^3 &= D_3^3 = 1 - 1 = 0
 \end{aligned} \tag{28}$$

4. $b_{i2}^h = \beta_{j2}(x_j) > b_{i2}^l$

$$\begin{aligned}
H_4^1 &= D_4^1 = 0 - 0 = 0 \\
H_4^2 &= D_4^2 = 1/4 - 0 = 1/4 \\
H_4^3 &= D_4^3 = 1/2 - 0 = 1/2
\end{aligned}
\tag{29}$$

$$5. \beta_{j2}(x_j) > b_{i2}^h > b_{i2}^l$$

$$\begin{aligned}
H_5^1 &= D_5^1 = 0 \\
H_5^2 &= D_5^2 = 0 \\
H_5^3 &= D_5^3 = 0
\end{aligned}
\tag{30}$$

We have shown that $H(b_{i1}^h, b_{i2}^l, b_{i2}^h, \beta_j(x_j)) - D(b_{i1}^l, b_{i2}^l, b_{i2}^h, \beta_j(x_j)) \geq 0$ holds for every cases. Therefore, the inequality (22) holds. Note that no restriction exists for $p(x_j)$. Hence, any distribution on X is allowed. \blacklozenge

Therefore, by Lemma 2, the interim utility $V_i(b_i, x_i, s_{-i})$ is weakly quasi-supermodular.

4 Conclusion

This paper has shown the existence of monotone pure-strategy equilibrium in simultaneous first-price auctions, where the objects have synergy in bidders' utility. Under the complementarity assumptions, weak single crossing property and weak quasi supermodularity of interim utility are satisfied, so Reny (2011)'s existence theorem is applicable in this environment.

As a future research, it is meaningful to think about the environment in a continuum action space setting. As Athey (2001) argues in the paper, it would support a differential equation approach to verify existence conditions. She provides the extension with a continuum action space by showing ties do not occur in the game. Reny (2011) also presents the extension through a better-reply secure game and a limit of a pure-strategy of ϵ equilibria.

References

- Athey, Susan (2001) "Single crossing properties and the existence of pure strategy equilibria in games of incomplete information," *Econometrica*, Vol. 69, No. 4, pp. 861–889.
- Ausubel, Lawrence M and Paul Milgrom (2002) "Ascending auctions with package bidding," *Frontiers of theoretical economics*, Vol. 1, No. 1, pp. 1–42.

- Bernheim, B Douglas and Michael D Whinston (1986) “Menu auctions, resource allocation, and economic influence,” *The quarterly journal of economics*, Vol. 101, No. 1, pp. 1–31.
- Bikhchandani, Sushil (1999) “Auctions of heterogeneous objects,” *Games and Economic Behavior*, Vol. 26, No. 2, pp. 193–220.
- Bresky, Michal (1999) “Equilibria in multi-unit auctions,” *CERGE-EI Working paper series, Prague*.
- Krishna, Vijay and Robert W Rosenthal (1996) “Simultaneous auctions with synergies,” *Games and economic behavior*, Vol. 17, No. 1, pp. 1–31.
- McAdams, David (2003) “Isotone equilibrium in games of incomplete information,” *Econometrica*, Vol. 71, No. 4, pp. 1191–1214.
- Reny, Philip J (2011) “On the existence of monotone pure-strategy equilibria in Bayesian games,” *Econometrica*, Vol. 79, No. 2, pp. 499–553.