

Competitive Information Design for Pandora’s Box

Bolin Ding* Yiding Feng† Chien-Ju Ho‡ Wei Tang§ Haifeng Xu¶

February 25, 2025

Abstract

We study a natural competitive-information-design strategic variant for the celebrated Pandora’s Box problem (Weitzman 1979), where each box is associated with a strategic information sender who can design what information about the box’s prize value to be revealed to the agent when the agent inspects the box. This variant with strategic boxes is motivated by a wide range of real-world economic applications for Pandora’s Box. Our contributions are three-fold: (1) given the boxes’ information policies, we characterize the agent’s optimal search and stopping strategy; (2) we fully characterize the pure symmetric equilibrium for the game of boxes’ competitive information revelation in a symmetric environment; and (3) we reveal various insights regarding information competition and the resultant agent payoff at equilibrium, and additionally, we study informational properties of Pandora’s Box by establishing an intrinsic connection between *informativeness* of any box’s value distribution and the *utility order* of the search agent.

1

*Alibaba Group, bolin.ding@alibaba-inc.com

†Hong Kong University of Science and Technology, ydfeng@ust.hk

‡Washington University in St. Louis, chienju.ho@wustl.edu

§Chinese University of Hong Kong, weitang@cuhk.edu.hk

¶University of Chicago, haifengxu@uchicago.edu

¹An earlier conference version of this work has appeared in the proceeding of the ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithm (SODA’23) (Ding et al. 2023).

1 Introduction

The Pandora’s Box problem, as formalized in the seminal work of [Weitzman \(1979\)](#), is a foundational framework for studying how the cost of acquiring information affects the adaptive decisions about what information to acquire — the obtained information from the past will affect whether additional information is needed, and if so which information to acquire next. Specifically, the Pandora’s Box problem is described as follows. An agent is presented with n boxes; each contains an unknown random prize. The value of the prize inside each box is independently sampled from its distribution. While the agent knows each box’s prize distribution, he does not know its realized value. Nevertheless, the agent can open any box (in any order) to learn its *realized* prize value but suffers an associated opportunity cost for opening the box. The agent can stop at any time and claim one prize from some opened box, upon which the game terminates. The agent’s goal is to maximize the expected prize value minus the total box-opening costs. This basic model finds applications in numerous economic applications and thus, unsurprisingly, has been extensively studied in the economics, operations research, and computer science literature. For example, in house hunting, a home buyer incurs cost to search for information about each potential house (e.g., attending its open house) and, at some point, decide to purchase one of the searched house and terminate the procedure. Similarly, many online customers spend time on free trials to obtain information about different digital services and, at some point, decide to subscribe to some tried service.

A surprisingly simple and elegant policy provided by [Weitzman \(1979\)](#) has been shown to be optimal for the Pandora’s Box problem, despite its seemingly complex sequential decision process. Specifically, [Weitzman \(1979\)](#) defines certain *reservation value* for each box, which is determined by both the box’s prize distribution and opening cost. The optimal policy simply sorts boxes in decreasing order of their reservation values, and then open boxes in this order until the thus-far maximum realized prize value exceeds the next box’s reservation value. The agent then terminates the search by selecting that maximum realized prize.

An important assumption of the classic Pandora’s Box problem — which is the one we intend to relax in this work — is that each box is an inanimate object and, once opened, will fully disclose its realized prize to the agent. Yet this may not be the case in many real-world applications where boxes often correspond to real strategic agents who may have incentives to selectively disclose information for their own interest ([Mensch 2021](#), [Board and Lu 2018](#), [Anderson and Renault 2006](#)). This is usually the case when information is not controlled by nature but by humans or algorithms. The following are two of many such examples.

Example 1.1 (Open Houses in Housing Markets). *During open houses, many house sellers typically would design events to highlight their house qualities and these event schedules will be sent to potential buyers. This corresponds to the boxes’ design and commitment to an information disclosure policy. Informed with these policies (i.e., learning what he expects to see), a buyer will decide which open houses to visit in what sequence, and during this process the buyer may make a purchase decision (i.e., stop searching). In this example, it is costly for a buyer to obtain the information from any box due to the time spent to travel and visit. Moreover, the seller usually selectively discloses information in order to maximize the chance of sale. Built upon Weitzman’s elegant solution to the classic Pandora’s box for the buyer’s search, our work studies the house sellers’ competitive information design problem and how sellers’ revealed information affects the agent’s total utility.*

Example 1.2 (Free Trials of Digital Services). *Consider online services like YouTube Music, Spotify, and Amazon Music. To attract users for subscription, these services often offer free trials (e.g., an one-month free trial with access to a limited set of functionalities of the service) before the user*

picks one service to subscribe. These free trials, including the functionalities included in this period, can be seen as a committed information revelation policy designed by the service provider. The user needs to pay search costs (i.e., time spent to explore) to obtain the information. Moreover, these information policies are usually not full-information revealing due to limited trial periods or limited functionality access. In contrast to the fully observable prize value in classic Pandora’s Box, the user here can only form an updated belief about the service quality before choosing a subscription.

Motivated by real-world applications like the above, this paper studies a natural information design variant of the celebrated Pandora’s Box problem by viewing each box as an economic agent with its own actions and incentives. We assume that, before the agent opens any box, each box commits to an information revelation policy — a.k.a., a signaling mechanism which stochastically maps the underlying prize to a random *signal* — to selectively disclose information about the prize. Afterwards, the agent engages in a costly search across boxes, i.e., solving a standard Pandora’s Box problem, in order to collect the most-rewarding prize in expectation. Notably, after opening any box, the agent now is only able to observe a realized signal that carries partial information about the underlying prize value, but cannot directly observe the prize value.

We study a model where there are n boxes, competing with each other for being selected by the agent. The agent is assumed to initially hold the common prior belief H_i about the prize distribution of each box $i \in [n]$. We assume boxes are decentralized (e.g., corresponding to different product sellers). Each box can flexibly choose any signaling mechanism to strategically reveal information about his own prize. This gives rise to a natural competitive information design problem in the Pandora’s Box with many senders, e.g., the boxes. The main focus of this paper is how the boxes design the signal mechanisms and how these mechanisms subsequently shape the agent’s search and stopping behavior, ultimately affecting the box’s own payoff. To this end, we focus on subgame-perfect Nash equilibrium solution concept of this game with multiple leaders (i.e., the boxes) and a single follower (the agent).

1.1 Our Contribution

Our contributions are three-fold: (1) given the boxes’ information policies, we characterize the agent’s optimal search and stopping strategy; (2) we fully characterize the pure symmetric equilibrium for the boxes’ competitive information revelation in a symmetric environment; and (3) we reveal various insights regarding information competition and the resultant agent payoff at equilibrium, and additionally, we study informational properties of Pandora’s Box by establishing an intrinsic connection between *informativeness* of any box’s value distribution and the *utility order* of the search agent.

Agent’s optimal strategy. When the boxes do not strategically reveal information about the prize value, it is well-established that the agent’s optimal strategy follows the reservation-value-based approach introduced by [Weitzman \(1979\)](#). In our setting, some signaling mechanisms may be more or less informative than others, and the agent can only observe a noisy signal about the underlying prize value when inspecting the boxes. Thus, it is unclear in what order the agent should inspect the boxes or when to stop, based on the observed signals. Perhaps surprisingly, we show that when the agent is risk-neutral, even though she faces uncertainty about the prize value during box inspections, her optimal strategy still follows a structure similar to [Weitzman \(1979\)](#)’s approach. In particular, each box’s signaling mechanism can be viewed as a distribution of posterior means of the prize value. Under the optimal strategy, the game proceeds as if each box reveals the prize value according to its posterior mean distribution, and the agent searches using

Weitzman’s strategy applied to these posterior mean distributions.

A nice consequence of this characterization of the agent’s optimal strategy is that we can, without loss of generality, reformulate each box’s signaling mechanism as a distribution of posterior means. At first glance, this reformulation seems a bit surprising, given the complex interactions between the signaling mechanisms and the agent’s search strategy. However, we show that under agent’s optimal strategy, the agent determines the search order solely based on the posterior mean distributions and decides when to stop based on the realized posterior means. This search behavior justifies the reformulation of the boxes’ signaling mechanisms as posterior mean distributions, without any loss of generality.

Equilibrium characterizations. Our next main result is to identify a necessary and sufficient condition for the existence of a pure symmetric Nash equilibrium when all boxes are all ex-ante symmetry. Moreover, if a pure symmetric equilibrium exists, our result provides a straightforward, and also computationally tractable, way to identify the equilibrium strategy. Specifically, we show that a pure symmetric equilibrium strategy G , if exists, must be fully characterized by the following three conditions:

- (i) **Maximum reservation value:** strategy G must have maximum reservation value.
- (ii) **G ’s shape below reservation value:** function G^{n-1} is convex over its support, and linear whenever the strategy G does not equal to the prior H , where $H \equiv H_i, \forall i \in [n]$.
- (iii) **No deviation incentive:** there exists a reservation value σ^* such that deviating to a strategy that has this reservation value σ^* is not profitable.

Note that in our Pandora’s Box problem, each box can design his information strategy to endogenously affect the agent’s inspection order of boxes. The above condition (i) ensures that, in equilibrium, each box prefers to be inspected by the agent earlier rather than later (recall that once the boxes’ information strategies are fixed, the agent’s optimal inspection strategy is to open the box in an decreasing order of their reservation values). The condition (ii) then specifies the behavior that is below the corresponding reservation value of the equilibrium strategy. We prove that the first two conditions above can already uniquely pin down a strategy as an equilibrium candidate. Core to our characterization is the third condition which verifies whether this strategy candidate is indeed an equilibrium or not. The verification in condition (iii), including the reservation value σ^* , has a closed form and can be easily computed given the structure of the identified strategy G from conditions (i) and (ii).

We highlight two predominant challenges in deriving our main result on equilibrium characterizations, followed by our approaches to tackle these challenges. First, to see whether a strategy profile (G, \dots, G) is an equilibrium, we need to argue that no box has a profitable deviation under this strategy profile. A box’s best response problem can be formulated as a linear program, after fixing all other boxes’ strategies to be G . Prior works (Au and Kawai 2020, Hwang et al. 2019) have investigated a special case of our setting where there is no cost and the agent observes all realized prizes. They have utilized this linear program approach to demonstrate that the box’s best response strategy is indeed G itself if G is a certain equilibrium strategy candidate. Note that in their setting, no matter what the response strategy is, the box’s expected payoff when realizing prize with value $x \in [0, 1]$ has a succinct and well-structured form: $G(x)^{n-1}$. However, in our setting, different strategies have different reservation values, which impact the order of the agent inspecting the box, and thus making the box’s payoff function different and more complex. Con-

sequently, there is no single linear program that can characterize a box’s best response problem. Instead, for each possible reservation value σ , we consider a corresponding linear program which characterizes the best response strategy subject to a constraint that it has the same reservation value σ (requiring a strategy to have a reservation value σ can be formulated as a linear constraint). We then prove that the optimal objective value of the linear program, as a function of the given reservation value σ , is a single-peaked function with the peak achieved at some σ^* .

Second, for any reservation value σ , solving its corresponding linear program (i.e., the program to solve a box’s best response problem) is highly non-trivial. Let F denote the response strategy used by the box and all other boxes use the strategy G . There are two major constraints in this program: one constraint accounts for the feasibility of the strategy F , i.e., H is an MPS of F ; and the other accounts for the reservation value constraint as it requires that the reservation value of strategy F equals to σ . Dworzak and Martini (2019) developed an optimality verification technique based on strong duality for the special case with only the first constraint (later employed by Hwang et al. 2019). Unfortunately, this technique does not directly apply to our more general case in presence of the second constraint as well. To overcome this barrier, we generalize the approach in (Dworzak and Martini 2019) to account for the additional constraint and characterize corresponding optimal dual solution (of a new format). This then allows us to verify the optimality of certain desired information structure based on the complementary slackness.

Informational properties of Pandora’s Box and the agent’s payoff. Having established the agent’s optimal strategy, we also show an intrinsic connection between informativeness of any box’s value distribution and the utility order of the search agent. Formally, we prove that a distribution H is more informative than G in the Blackwell sense if and only if in an arbitrary (not necessarily symmetric) Pandora’s Box’s problem with H as some box’s value distribution, the agent’s expected payoff weakly increases when this box’s value distribution switches from H to G . This result complements a fundamental result of Blackwell (1953): i.e., a distribution H is more informative than a distribution G if and only if $\mathbb{E}_{x \sim H}[u(x)] \geq \mathbb{E}_{x \sim G}[u(x)]$ for any convex function u . Since any convex function corresponds to a *static* Bayesian decision making problem, Blackwell’s result is viewed as a decision-theoretic foundation for informativeness of a distribution. Our result extends this insight to a basic setup of *sequential* decision making. We remark that it is not obvious in hindsight that more information from *any* box would always benefit the agent. Recall that the agent’s optimal inspection strategy depends on the order of reservation values of boxes’ strategies. To prove the above result, we first show that the reservation value of a box always weakly increases when the box’s distribution becomes more informative. Thus if a box with very bad expected prize value becomes more informative, this box’s reservation value will increase and thus it will be inspected early. However, it is not clear whether inspecting such a “bad” box earlier by lowering the priority of other possibly better boxes will always benefit the agent since this may delay the agent’s stop time and thus lead to increased cost. Our main result gives an affirmative answer. Our proof heavily hinges on various properties of MPS in order to argue that the benefit of getting more information from any box can offset the possible harm of lowering the priority of other boxes.

A natural corollary of the above result in our competitive information design environment is that, when all boxes fully reveal the information about their prizes, the agent obtains the highest expected payoff. Nevertheless, we strengthen this observation by showing that the agent can derive the highest expected payoff as long as each box use a strategy which reveals full information whenever the value of the prize is *below* its reservation value. We refer to this class of strategies as *essentially*

full information strategy. We provide necessary and sufficient conditions on when this strategy is the equilibrium strategy next.

Next we describe additional insights conveyed by the above main result and discuss how the competition and the agent’s cost affect the boxes’ equilibrium strategy. Utilizing our conditions above, we can show that essentially full information strategy is the equilibrium strategy if and only if function H^{n-1} is convex in $[0, \sigma_H]$ where σ_H is the reservation value of the distribution H . Build upon this result, we are able to show that the essentially full information strategy is more likely to become the equilibrium strategy when increasing the competition (i.e., increasing the number of boxes) or increasing the cost. The former is because, intuitively, increasing competition “convexifies” the shape of function H^{n-1} and makes the condition more likely to be satisfied. The later is because the cost affects the reservation value σ_H and thus the structure of (possible) equilibrium strategy G . First, we can see that the essentially full information strategy is the equilibrium strategy under a larger cost if it is already the equilibrium strategy under a smaller cost. This is due to the monotonicity of reservation value σ_H over the cost, i.e., a larger cost leads to a smaller σ_H . Second, as the cost goes to 0, the above characterized behavior of G below its reservation value in condition (ii) spans to the whole interval $[0, 1]$.² Third, the cost also plays a role in condition (iii) as it determines the choice of reservation value σ^* .

1.2 Related Work

Our paper studies an information design variant of Pandora’s Box. The information design part follows the Bayesian persuasion setup by [Kamenica and Gentzkow \(2011\)](#). Their work has inspired an active line of research in information design games in various applications (e.g., see the surveys by [Kamenica 2019](#), [Bergemann and Morris 2019](#) for economics literature and [Dughmi 2017](#) for computer science literature). Our work complements this line of research by exploring the competition in information design in the setup of Pandora’s Box and discusses how the senders’ signaling mechanisms shape the agent’s searching behavior and ultimately affecting senders their own payoff. Since there are multiple boxes designing the information strategies, our paper relates closely to the works in the multi-sender Bayesian Persuasion literature ([Gentzkow and Kamenica 2016, 2017](#), [Gradwohl et al. 2022](#)). In particular, the equilibrium analysis part of our work relates to the works ([Boleslavsky and Cotton 2018](#), [Au and Kawai 2019, 2020](#), [Hwang et al. 2019](#)) that also study a game with *ex ante* symmetric senders. Our work differs from theirs as they focus on a non-search setting where there is no inspection cost for the agent, and the agent can simply observe all realized values and then select a best one.

Perhaps the most closely related works are [Au and Whitmeyer \(2023\)](#), [He and Li \(2023\)](#), [Board and Lu \(2018\)](#), [Hahn et al. \(2020, 2022\)](#), all of which also explore the (competitive) information design problem in search settings. In particular, [Au and Whitmeyer \(2023\)](#) examine a search setting similar to ours but focus on a simplified case where the prize value is binary, whereas we address the more involved case of a continuously distributed prize. The continuous prize setting significantly complicates the analysis: First, in the binary prize setting, for any agent’s search strategy, it is straightforward to reformulate the boxes’ signaling mechanisms as distributions of posterior means without loss of generality, which can greatly simplify subsequent analysis. In contrast, this reformulation is not generally valid in the continuous prize setting for arbitrary search strategies. Despite this challenge, we are able to establish such reformulation by a careful characterization of agent’s optimal strategy. Second, unlike the binary prize setting, our equilibrium analysis involves solving

²To ease exposition consider that the value of prize is in $[0, 1]$.

a best-response optimization problem with a second-order stochastic dominance constraint, which makes our analysis more involved. [He and Li \(2023\)](#) study a search setting where the agent uses a random search strategy, while ours focus on optimal agent’s search strategy. [Board and Lu \(2018\)](#) study a setting where sellers compete by designing experiments and buyers search sequentially. In contrast to our work, the sellers’ experiments in their work are not publicly posted and cannot shape the buyers’ search. In our setting, however, the agent’s search behavior is directly influenced by the signaling mechanisms (or “experiments”) of the boxes. [Hahn et al. \(2020, 2022\)](#), [Xiao et al. \(2022\)](#) concern a setting that there exists a central planner that can collect all information from all boxes and then strategically reveal these information to the search agent, while in our setting, each box itself is decentralized to be strategic and competes with each other for the final choice of the search agent.

Our work on focusing the competition among boxes relates to the literature about the market competitions. For example, similar to our work, [Choi et al. \(2018\)](#) also consider an oligopoly model in which consumers engage in sequential search for the best product based on partial product information (and prices), and the authors provide sufficient conditions that guarantee the existence and uniqueness of market equilibrium. A notable difference to our work is that the partial product information, in our setting, is endogenously determined by the boxes (a.k.a., sellers) themselves, while in [Choi et al. \(2018\)](#), the product information is exogenously fixed. [Bimpikis et al. \(2019\)](#) study a setting where a monopolistic information provider who can sell potentially informative signals to a collection of sellers that compete with one another in a downstream market.

We also mention recent technical developments on using the duality theory to characterize the optimal persuasion scheme in information design. In particular, [Dworczak and Martini \(2019\)](#), [Kolotilin \(2018\)](#) study the sender’s problem on how to optimize the sender’s (indirect) payoff as a function of expected value (state) he induces, subject to the feasible information strategy constraint. Our work differs from theirs as we study the equilibrium in a strategic environment. Moreover, though we can write the box’s payoff as a function of the expected prize value, this payoff function further depends on the reservation value of the box’s strategy (and other boxes’ reservation values), and thus, their results does not apply directly. Instead, we extend their results to account for the additional reservation value constraint, and use the extended results to characterize the optimal dual (primal) solution.

This paper is built on the seminar work of Pandora’s Box introduced by [Weitzman \(1979\)](#), which, together with the prophet inequality, has been widely used to model the sequential search and stopping process under uncertainty in various domains (see, e.g., [Olszewski and Weber 2015](#), [Kleinberg et al. 2016](#), [Doval 2018](#), [Beyhaghi and Kleinberg 2019](#), [Chawla et al. 2020](#), [Boodaghians et al. 2022](#), [Fu et al. 2023](#), [Correa et al. 2024a,b](#)). Our work significantly differs from the previous works as we focus on the boxes’ behavior on strategically disclosing the prize information to the agent.

2 A Model of Competitive Information Design for Pandora’s Box

In this section, we first revisit the formulation of the classic Pandora’s Box problem, and then formally introduce our setting as its natural variant with competitive information design.

The Pandora’s Box problem. In the Pandora’s Box problem, a risk-neutral agent is presented with a set of n boxes. Each box $i \in [n]$ contains a prize of value $x_i \in [0, 1]$. The value x_i is distributed according to a distribution G_i , independent of the values of other boxes. For each box i , the agent does not know the value x_i but knows the value distribution G_i . Moreover, the agent

can pay a cost c_i to inspect box i and observe the value x_i . The agent can choose to inspect any number of boxes in any order and take one of the values from the inspected boxes. The goal of the agent is to maximize the value from the chosen box minus the total cost for inspecting boxes.

The agent’s strategy π is a rule that determines adaptively, at any time $t \geq 0$, whether to terminate the inspection and, if not, which box to inspect next. The strategy also determines which box to select after the inspection ends. Given a strategy π , let \mathbb{I}_i denote the indicator for whether box i is inspected and \mathbb{A}_i denote the indicator for whether box i is chosen according to π . The agent’s goal is to choose a strategy π which maximizes the following expected payoff

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sum_i [\mathbb{A}_i x_i - \mathbb{I}_i c_i] \right]. \quad (1)$$

Importantly, the agent can *only* claim one prize but must pay for all inspection costs.

Pandora’s Box with competitive information design. In this paper, we consider a natural competitive information design variant of the Pandora’s Box problem, which is fundamentally a multi-leader (boxes) and single-follower (the agent) Stackelberg game. Specifically, each box is associated with a strategic sender³ who can design what information about the prize value the agent will see when she inspects the box. Similar to the classic problem, the agent does not know the values in boxes but holds some prior beliefs about the distribution of each value x_i . However, different from the classic problem, when the agent pays a cost to inspect box i , she does not directly observe the value x_i . Instead, she observes some information signal, designed by the sender of box i , that is related to the prize x_i . Following the literature in information design, this can be formalized as follows: each sender i is associated with an *ex ante* identical prize distribution $H_i \in \Delta([0, 1])$,⁴ which is also publicly known to the agent, and can choose a signaling mechanism $\{\Phi_i(\cdot | x), \mathcal{M}_i\}$, where \mathcal{M}_i is a signal space and $\Phi_i(q | x) \in [0, 1]$ specifies the conditional distribution of signal $q \in \mathcal{M}_i$ when the prize value $x \sim H$ is realized. The senders’ signaling mechanisms $\{\Phi_i(\cdot | x), \mathcal{M}_i\}_{i \in [n]}$ are known to the agent in advance.

Given the boxes’ signaling mechanisms, the agent can learn about the boxes’ prize values by inspecting the boxes with paying the inspection cost $c_i > 0$ and observing their signal realizations in sequence. When the agent inspects box i , she only observes a realized signal q drawn according to the conditional distribution Φ_i . After observing the signal realization of box i , the agent updates her prior to a posterior distribution about the underlying prize value x_i of box i . Importantly, the agent can observe the realized prize value x_i only if she stops the search and chooses to take the box i among which have already been inspected. The agent’s goal is to determine a strategy π to inspect boxes to maximize her expected payoff in (1).

In our setting, each box i (a.k.a., sender i) is competing with each other for the final selection from the agent. Specifically, the payoff of each sender i can be expressed as $\mathbb{1}\{\mathbb{A}_i = 1\}$. Namely, a sender obtains payoff 1 if he is selected and payoff 0 if he is not selected.⁵ **Solution concept.** The

timing of our competitive information design game can be detailed as follows: First, each sender commits to an information strategy (a.k.a., a signaling mechanism). Second, the agent observes

³In the following discussion, we interchangeably use “box” and “sender”.

⁴Our results can be readily generalized to an arbitrary interval $[a, b]$. To simplify the presentation, in this paper, we restrict our attention to the interval $[0, 1]$.

⁵Our results generalize immediately to settings where each sender i prefers being chosen over not being chosen since any such case leads to the same ultimate objective of maximizing $\Pr(\mathbb{1}\{\mathbb{A}_i = 1\})$.

all boxes' strategies, and uses an inspection strategy π to determine how to inspect and when to stop the inspection. Finally, the agent observes signal realizations among all inspected boxes, and decides which box to take the prize value. When the agent is indifferent between multiple boxes, she chooses one of them uniformly at random.

The main focus of this paper is how the boxes design the signal mechanisms and how these mechanisms subsequently shape the agent's search and stopping behavior, ultimately affecting the box's own payoff. To this end, we focus on subgame-perfect Nash equilibrium solution concept. When it comes to analyze the Nash equilibrium among boxes' game, we assume all boxes are *ex ante* symmetric in the sense that they have the identical prior prize distribution $H \equiv H_i$ and they have the same inspection cost $c \equiv c_i$. Given such *ex ante* symmetry, we thus follow the earlier works (Gentzkow and Kamenica 2016, 2017, Au and Whitmeyer 2023) and focus on the solution concept of pure-strategy equilibria among boxes' game.⁶

3 Characterizing Agent's Optimal Strategy

When the senders are not strategically revealing the prize value information, the agent's optimal inspection and the stopping rule can be characterized by an elegant threshold-based strategy proposed by Weitzman (1979). We below describe this threshold-based strategy which will be useful for our subsequent analysis. In particular, Weitzman (1979) defines a notion of *reservation value* for the corresponding prize value distribution:

Definition 3.1 (Reservation Value). *For a box with prize distribution $H \in \Delta([0, 1])$ and a cost $c > 0$ for inspecting this box, the value σ_H satisfying $\sigma_H = \sup\{\sigma : \mathbb{E}_{x \sim H}[\max\{x - \sigma, 0\}] = c\}$ is referred to as the reservation value.*

With the notion of reservation value, the agent's optimal strategy can be characterized by the simple procedure below.

Theorem 3.1 (Weitzman 1979). *Let σ_{H_i} be the reservation value of box i 's prize distribution H_i with inspection cost c_i . Then the following strategy is optimal for the agent: (i) inspects each box in order of decreasing $\{\sigma_{H_i}\}_{i \in [n]}$; (ii) stops when the largest observed prize value exceeds the next uninspected reservation value and selects box that has the largest observed prize value.*

When each sender that is associated with a box strategically reveals information about the prize value, the agent's optimal search and stopping strategy becomes less obvious. Perhaps surprisingly, we show that the agent's optimal strategy still closely resembles the structure outlined in Theorem 3.1. The main differences here are: (i) instead of computing the reservation values based on the prior prize distributions $\{H_i\}_{i \in [n]}$, the agent now computes these values based on the posterior mean distributions induced from the boxes' signaling mechanisms; (ii) the agent determines whether to stop the search based on the mean of the posterior belief induced from the observed signal and the subsequent reservation value.

Theorem 3.2. *Given boxes' signaling mechanisms $\{\Phi_i(\cdot | x), \mathcal{M}_i\}_{i \in [n]}$, let $\{G_i\}_{i \in [n]}$ where each $G_i \in \Delta([0, 1])$ is the corresponding distribution of posterior means induced from the mechanism $\{\Phi_i(\cdot | x), \mathcal{M}_i\}$. Then under the mechanisms $\{\Phi_i(\cdot | x), \mathcal{M}_i\}_{i \in [n]}$, the agent's optimal strategy is: (i) computing the reservation value σ_{G_i} for each box i based on G_i , and inspecting boxes in decreasing order of $\{\sigma_{G_i}\}_{i \in [n]}$; (ii) when inspecting box i , she observes a signal realization, computes*

⁶We will use equilibrium synonymously with pure symmetric equilibrium.

prize posterior mean and stops if the largest posterior mean exceeds the next uninspected reservation value. If she stops, she selects box that has the largest posterior mean to take the prize value.

To understand the intuition behind Theorem 3.2, notice that whenever the agent decides to stop searching, she always chooses the box with the highest expected prize value based on her posterior beliefs. This follows from the fact that the agent is risk-neutral and has a unit demand. Additionally, when deciding which box to inspect next, the agent bases her decision on the posterior beliefs formed from previously inspected boxes, along with the prior prize distributions and signaling mechanisms of the remaining boxes. Since the agent is risk-neutral, only the posterior means of the previously inspected boxes influence her subsequent search and stopping decisions. These insights are rigorously formalized in the proof of Theorem 3.2.

As a consequence of Theorem 3.2, the agent’s decisions in her optimal search and stopping strategy depend on the boxes’ signaling mechanism (and the realized signals) through the induced distributions of posterior means (and the realized posterior means). In other words, the box i ’s expected payoff remains unchanged if we consider a new game in which we replace box i ’s signaling mechanism with its corresponding posterior mean distribution. While this is a direct consequence of Theorem 3.2, we summarize this equivalence of strategies as follows.

Corollary 3.3. *Fix all other boxes’ signaling mechanisms and under the agent’s optimal strategy defined in Theorem 3.2, the box i ’s expected payoff would remain the same if we consider a new game in which we replace box i ’s signaling mechanism with its induced distribution of posterior means.*

We would like to highlight that, for tractability, reformulating the sender’s signaling mechanism as a distribution of posterior means is a common approach in previous information design literature. This reformulation is indeed without loss of generality when the sender’s payoff depends only on the expected state. This occurs when the receiver’s optimal action depends only on the expectation of the posterior belief and sender’s preferences over receiver’s actions do not depend on the realized state. However, this reformulation is not generally without loss of generality without Theorem 3.2. For example, the agent could adopt a strategy based on additional distributional information, such as the variance of the posterior belief. In such case, the boxes’ payoff would depend on more than just the posterior mean. Nevertheless, Theorem 3.2 allows us to establish this strategy equivalence by leveraging the structure of the agent’s optimal strategy. Reformulating the boxes’ signaling mechanisms as the distributions of posterior means significantly simplify our subsequent analysis. Au and Whitmeyer (2023) have studied a similar search setting to ours while they focus on binary prize value. It is worthy of note that, unlike our setting, when the prize takes binary value, this reformulation is straightforward and valid regardless of the agent’s strategy.

With Corollary 3.3, a natural next question is which distributions over posterior means can be implemented by some signaling mechanisms given the prior prize distribution. This question can be answered using the notion of mean-preserving spread (MPS), which characterizes the *feasible* distributions that can represent the sender’s information strategies.

Definition 3.2 (Mean-preserving Spread). *A distribution $H \in \Delta([0, 1])$ is a Mean-preserving Spread (MPS) of a distribution $G \in \Delta([0, 1])$, represented as $H \succeq G$, if and only if for all $\sigma \in [0, 1]$, $\int_0^\sigma H(x)dx \geq \int_0^\sigma G(x)dx$ where the inequality holds as equality for $\sigma = 0$.*

It turns out that a distribution G over posterior means can be induced by some signaling mechanism from prior prize distribution H if and only if H is an MPS of G .

Lemma 3.4 (Blackwell and Girshick 1979). *There exists a signaling mechanism that induces the distribution G over posterior means from prior prize distribution H if and only if $H \succeq G$.*

With Lemma 3.4 and Theorem 3.2, we can without loss of generality assume that each box i 's strategy⁷ is to directly choose a distribution $G_i \in \Delta([0, 1])$ that satisfies $G_i : H_i \succeq G_i$, without the need of concerning the design of the underlying signaling mechanism $\{\Phi_i(\cdot | x), \mathcal{M}_i\}$. In the following discussion, we directly refer to G_i as sender i 's strategy. Moreover, following Blackwell's ordering of informativeness (Blackwell 1953), we say a strategy G' is *more informative* than G if G' is an MPS of G , i.e., $G' \succeq G$.

4 Equilibrium Analysis

In this section, we characterize the equilibrium for the senders' game of competitive information design in a symmetric environment, namely, $H \equiv H_i, c \equiv c_i, \forall i \in [n]$. In particular, we give sufficient and necessary conditions of the existence of pure symmetric equilibrium. We also characterize the unique equilibrium strategy if the pure symmetric equilibrium exists.

Before stating our main results, we first define a special structure of senders' strategies that will be useful to help describe the structure of the equilibrium strategy.

Definition 4.1 (Alternating $(n-1)$ -linear MPS – Hwang et al. (2019)). *Given a prior H , G exhibits alternating $(n-1)$ -linear MPS behavior in the interval $[a, b]$ if whenever G is not fully revealing information in a subinterval $[x_1, x_2] \subseteq [a, b]$, G^{n-1} is linear over $[x_1, \min\{x_2, \max_{x \in [a, b]\} \{x : x \in \text{supp}[G]\}\}]$ and $H \succeq_{[x_1, x_2]} G$.*

With the above structure, our main result in this section can be stated as follows.

Theorem 4.1. *For any prior H and any cost $c \geq 0$, given a strategy G and its $\bar{x}_G := \max\{x \in [0, \sigma_H] : x \in \text{supp}[G]\}$, (G, \dots, G) is an equilibrium if and only if*

- (i) $\sigma_G = \sigma_H$;
- (ii) G^{n-1} is convex over $[0, \bar{x}_G]$ and G exhibits alternating $(n-1)$ -linear MPS behavior over $[0, \sigma_H]$;
- (iii) deviating to a strategy F where $\sigma_F = \max\{\bar{x}_G, \lambda - c\}$ is not profitable. More concretely,
 - (a) if $\lambda - c \geq \bar{x}_G$, the optimal value from deviation $G(\lambda - c)^{n-1}$ is at most $1/n$;
 - (b) if $\lambda - c < \bar{x}_G$, the optimal deviation value $\int_0^{x^\dagger} G(x)^{n-1} dH(x) + H(\sigma_H)^{n-1} (1 - H(x^\dagger)) \leq 1/n$ where x^\dagger uniquely satisfies $\int_{x^\dagger}^1 (x - \bar{x}_G) dH(x) = c$.

We interpret and examine each condition in the theorem below. Condition (i) indicates that the reservation value of the equilibrium strategy G must achieve its maximum, i.e., $\sigma_G = \sigma_H$ (recall that from Corollary 5.9, we know σ_H is the maximum reservation value that is attainable for any feasible information strategy of prior H). This aligns with the intuition that each sender prefers to be inspected earlier rather than later. Condition (ii) characterizes the structure of feasible equilibrium strategy under the reservation value σ_H . As we elaborate shortly, the first two conditions can uniquely⁸ pin down a distribution G . Lastly, condition (iii) verifies whether G

⁷We will use sender's strategy synonymously with sender's information strategy.

⁸The uniqueness here means the behavior of G over $[0, \sigma_H]$ is unique. Note that Theorem 4.1 only states the conditions for the support of G that is in $[0, \sigma_H]$. Indeed, one can show that if (G, \dots, G) is an equilibrium, then

that satisfies the first two conditions is indeed an equilibrium strategy. Essentially, there are only two scenarios: (a) If $\lambda - c \geq \bar{x}_G$, deviating to no information strategy for a sender is the most profitable. (b) If $\lambda - c < \bar{x}_G$, deviating to a strategy F that has the reservation value \bar{x}_G and satisfies $F(x) = H(x), \forall x \leq x^\dagger$ and has no support between x^\dagger and \bar{x}_G is the most profitable (we give an example on how to compute such deviation F , see the blue dotted line in Figure 1b).⁹ In either case, the optimal deviation value can be computed in a closed form, so we can verify whether G is indeed an equilibrium strategy.

Note that in the special case where the inspection cost $c = 0$, our problem reduces to a simpler setting, in which the agent does not need to choose which senders to inspect and in what order as he can inspect all senders for free. In this setting, Hwang et al. (2019)¹⁰ show that there always exists a unique symmetric equilibrium strategy (G, \dots, G) satisfying that G^{n-1} is convex over the support of G , and G exhibits the above alternating behavior over $[0, 1]$ as defined in Definition 4.1. Our result strictly generalizes their result. First, we can see that our conditions (i)–(iii) are always satisfied when $c = 0$: When there is no inspection cost, both σ_G and σ_H approach $+\infty$. For our condition (ii), G exhibiting alternating behavior over $[0, \sigma_H]$ is equivalent to exhibiting alternating behavior over $[0, 1]$. For condition (iii), given a distribution G satisfying condition (ii) over $[0, 1]$, we always have $\lambda - c = \lambda < \bar{x}_G$ as G has no support over $[\bar{x}_G, 1]$. When $c = 0$, we have $x^\dagger = 1$, and $\int_0^{x^\dagger} G(x)^{n-1} dH(x) + H(\sigma_H)^{n-1}(1 - H(x^\dagger)) = \int_0^1 G(x)^{n-1} dH(x) \leq 1/n$ holds for sure. To see this, note that Hwang et al. (2019) have showed that such G is the equilibrium strategy when $c = 0$. Thus, by definition, we have $\int_0^1 G(x)^{n-1} dH(x) \leq \int_0^1 G(x)^{n-1} dG(x) = 1/n$.

When inspection cost $c > 0$, a pure symmetric equilibrium might not exist. We present two examples (see Figure 1) where the pure symmetric equilibrium does not exist. Each of the examples violates one of the cases in condition (iii).

Example 4.2 (Equilibrium Non-Existence: Violation of case (a) in condition (iii)). Consider prior $H(x) = x^{0.3}$ (the gray solid line in Figure 1a), $n = 2$, and a cost $c = 0.11$. With this prior, one can compute $\lambda = 0.2308$, $\sigma_H = 0.2431$, and $\sigma_{NI} = \lambda - c = 0.1208$. Using the conditions (i)–(ii) in Theorem 4.1, one can compute a unique G with $\bar{x}_G = 0.1122$ (notice that the CDF G is linear over $[0, \bar{x}_G]$ and \bar{x}_G is the unique solution satisfying: $\frac{1}{2}\bar{x}_G H(\sigma_H) + (\sigma_H - \bar{x}_G)H(\sigma_H) = \int_0^{\sigma_H} H(x)dx$). However, such G is not an equilibrium strategy as one can deviate to a No information disclosure strategy G_{NI} to achieve a higher payoff $G(\sigma_{NI}) = 0.6542 > 0.5$.

Example 4.3 (Equilibrium Non-Existence: Violation of case (b) in condition (iii)). Consider prior $H(x) = \frac{1}{1+(\frac{x}{1-x})^{-3}}$ (the gray solid line in Figure 1b), $n = 2$, and a cost $c = 0.005$. With this prior, one can compute $\lambda = 0.5$, and $\sigma_H = 0.6938$. Using the conditions (i)–(ii) in Theorem 4.1, one can compute a unique G where $\bar{x}_G = 0.6571$ (notice that from the conditions (i)–(ii), the distribution G first equals to the prior H over $[0, x']$ for some point x' , then is linear over $[x', \bar{x}_G]$, and furthermore, the slope of the linear part exactly equals to $H'(x')$). Thus, \bar{x}_G and x' is the unique solution satisfying $\bar{x}_G = x' + \frac{H(\sigma_H) - H(x')}{H'(x')}$; $\int_0^{x'} H(x)dx + \frac{H(x') + H(\bar{x}_G)}{2}(\bar{x}_G - x') + (\sigma_H - \bar{x}_G)H(\sigma_H) = \int_0^{\sigma_H} H(x)dx$.

(G, \dots, G', \dots, G) is also an equilibrium as long as $G'(x) = G(x), \forall x \in [0, \sigma_H]$. The reason is that once we pin down the reservation value of all senders' strategies to be σ_H , each sender's expected payoff only depends on the behavior of his strategy in $[0, \sigma_H]$ (see Corollary 4.4 for detailed discussions).

⁹This specific structure of F is largely due to the convexity of G^{n-1} over $[0, \bar{x}_G]$, it will be proved in Lemma 4.6.

¹⁰In their model, the agent firstly observes all realized prize values $\{x_i\}_{i \in [n]}$, and then selects the sender that has the maximum value. This is equivalent to our setting with $c = 0$. To see this, note when $c = 0$, the reservation value of any strategy goes to infinity. Thus, though the agent sequentially inspects senders, he would inspect all senders and select the best one.




Figure 1: In both figures, the prior H is the gray solid line, the distribution G that satisfies conditions (i)–(ii) in Theorem 4.1 is the deep gray solid line. The profitable deviation F is then the black dashed line. See the detailed descriptions in Example 4.2 and Example 4.3. (a): Equilibrium does not exist as it violates the the case (a) in condition (iii). (b): Equilibrium does not exist as it violates the case (b) in condition (iii).

However, such G is not an equilibrium as one can deviate to a strategy F with $x^\dagger = 0.5961$ to a higher payoff $0.5048 > 0.5$. F has reservation value $\sigma_F = \bar{x}_G$, and $F(x) = H(x), \forall x \in [0, x^\dagger]$, and F has no support over $[x^\dagger, \bar{x}_G]$.

4.1 Proof of Theorem 4.1

In this section, we present our proof for Theorem 4.1.

Technical challenges and proof overview. Determining whether a particular strategy profile (G, \dots, G) is a symmetric equilibrium can be challenging, as it depends on the full set \mathcal{H} of feasible strategies, i.e., $\mathcal{H} := \{F : H \succeq F\}$, that each sender can deviate to. When the agent uses the optimal inspection strategy, however, using the observation we obtain in Proposition 5.8, one can first show that a strategy G can be an equilibrium strategy only if it satisfies $\sigma_G = \sigma_H$. This observation shrinks the set that contains any possible equilibrium strategy to the set $\mathcal{H}(\sigma_H) := \{F : H \succeq F \wedge \sigma_F = \sigma_H\}$. Next, using the conditions provided in Corollary 5.9, and examining the fixed point problem over the set $\mathcal{H}(\sigma_H)$, we can uniquely pin down the behavior of G over the interval $[0, \sigma_H]$ if G is the equilibrium strategy.

The above procedure helps us pin down the necessary conditions for G to be the equilibrium strategy. To verify whether the identified G is indeed the equilibrium strategy, we need to show that no sender has profitable deviation under the strategy profile (G, \dots, G) . This step is challenging since we again need to examine all possible deviations that one sender can deviate to when all other senders use strategy G . Different deviation strategies have different reservation values, which impact the order that the agent inspects the boxes, and subsequently change the deviation payoff. In a more detail, when a deviation strategy F has reservation value $\sigma_F = \sigma < \sigma_H$, let $U^S(x)$ be the sender's deviation payoff as a function of the realized value $x \sim F$, it can be shown that $U^S(x) = \min\{G(x)^{n-1}, G(\sigma)^{n-1}\}$, in which the shape of $U^S(\cdot)$ depends on the choice of σ . Thus, there is no single program that can encode sender's deviation problem. Instead, our solution is

that, for every possible reservation value σ , we consider the corresponding linear program (note that the constraint $\sigma_F = \sigma$ can be formulated as a linear constraint), and then characterize its optimal deviation strategy. We then show that the optimal deviation value is single-peaked (with the peak at $\sigma^* := \max\{\sigma_{\text{NI}}, \bar{x}_G\}$) w.r.t. $\sigma \in [\sigma_{\text{NI}}, \sigma_H]$. To this end, to account for the additional constraint $\sigma_F = \sigma$, we extend the verification tool provided in Dworczak and Martini (2019) to show what the optimal dual solution must look like, and then show there exists an optimal primal solution that satisfies complementary slackness.

To summarize, the analysis mainly consists of following steps:

- **Step 1.** In this step, we prove the condition (i) in Theorem 4.1, namely, for any prior H , if there exists a symmetric equilibrium (G, \dots, G) , it must be that $\sigma_G = \sigma_H$ (see Lemma 4.2).
- **Step 2.** In this step, we show that no sender has profitable deviation to a strategy $F \in \mathcal{H}(\sigma_H)$ if all other senders use strategy satisfying conditions (i)–(ii) in Theorem 4.1 (see Lemma 4.3).
- **Step 3.** In this step, we show that when all other senders use strategy G satisfying conditions (i)–(ii) in Theorem 4.1, then no sender has profitable deviation if and only if condition (iii) holds (see Lemma 4.5).

Below, we first provide detailed analysis of the above steps. The proof of the main result Theorem 4.1 follows from combining the results of these steps.

Step 1 – Characterizing the reservation value of equilibrium strategy.

Lemma 4.2. *For any H , if there exists a symmetric equilibrium (G, \dots, G) , it must be that $\sigma_G = \sigma_H$. Each sender’s expected payoff is $1/n$ at any symmetric equilibrium.*

Proof Sketch of Lemma 4.2. Given any symmetric strategy (G, \dots, G) where $\sigma_G < \sigma_H$, each sender i ’s expected payoff $u_i^S(G, \dots, G)$ can be expressed as

$$u_i^S(G, \dots, G) := \Pr[A_i = 1 | \mathbb{I}_i = 1] \cdot \Pr[\mathbb{I}_i = 1] ,$$

where $\Pr[\mathbb{I}_i = 1]$ is the probability of sender i being inspected by the agent and $\Pr[A_i = 1 | \mathbb{I}_i = 1]$ is the expected payoff conditional on being inspected. As there always exists probability such that sender i is never inspected by the agent, we have

$$\Pr[\mathbb{I}_i = 1] \equiv 1 - \delta < 1 .$$

Now let $U_i^S(x)$ denote the sender i ’s expected payoff conditional on being inspected and the value x realizing. Then we have

$$\Pr[A_i = 1 | \mathbb{I}_i = 1] = \int_0^1 U_i^S(x) dG(x) .$$

Now let $F : H \succeq F$ be a strategy satisfying $\sigma_F > \sigma_G$ and also

$$\int_0^1 U_i^S(x) dF(x) > \int_0^1 U_i^S(x) dG(x) - \varepsilon ,$$

for a small $\varepsilon > 0$. Note as $\sigma_G < \sigma_H$, such F must exist (we defer the detailed construction of such F to the Appendix B). Then by deviating to strategy F , from Proposition 5.8, we know sender i ’s

probability of being inspected is increased to 1. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} u_i^S(G, \dots, F, \dots, G) - u_i^S(G, \dots, G) &> \int_0^1 U_i^S(x) dF(x) - \int_0^1 U_i^S(x) dG(x) \cdot (1 - \delta) \\ &= \delta \cdot \int_0^1 U_i^S(x) dG(x) - \varepsilon > 0, \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality is by choosing a sufficiently small ε . As a result, such deviation is profitable.

Clearly, each sender's expected payoff is $1/n$ at any equilibrium. Suppose not, then the sender who has expected payoff smaller than $1/n$ can improve his expected payoff by simply mimicking another sender's strategy who has higher payoff than $1/n$. \square

Step 2 – Characterizing the behavior of G over the interval $[0, \sigma_H]$. Now we use the result in Lemma D.2 and the characterization in Corollary 5.9 to prove the condition (ii).

Lemma 4.3. *Given prior H , under the strategy profile (G, \dots, G) where G satisfies the conditions (i)–(ii) in Theorem 4.1, then no sender has a profitable deviation to a strategy F where $\sigma_F = \sigma_H$. Meanwhile, if (G, \dots, G) is an equilibrium, then the behavior of G over the interval $[0, \sigma_H]$ must satisfy the condition (ii) in Theorem 4.1.*

The intuition behind the proof for the above result is as follows. Given all other senders using strategy G and sender i using strategy F where $\sigma_F = \sigma_H$, with the result in Lemma D.2, it can be shown that sender i 's expected payoff only depends on the behavior of F over the interval $[0, \sigma_H]$. Then using the characterization in Corollary 5.9, and the earlier results in Hwang et al. (2019), we show sender i 's best deviation in the set $\mathcal{H}(\sigma_H)$ is indeed G itself.

Step 3 – Verifying whether G is indeed an equilibrium strategy. Now to argue whether G , which satisfies the conditions (i)–(ii) in Theorem 4.1, is an equilibrium strategy, it remains to show that no sender has a profitable deviation to a strategy F that has $\sigma_F < \sigma_H$ if all other senders use the strategy G . In other words, we need to show that whenever we fix a $\sigma \in [\sigma_{NI}, \sigma_H)$, the best payoff for a sender i to deviate to a strategy $F \in \mathcal{H}(\sigma) := \{F : H \succeq F \wedge \sigma_F = \sigma\}$ is no larger than $1/n$. Given sender i using F where $\sigma_F = \sigma < \sigma_H$, and other senders using G , we have

$$u_i^S(G, \dots, F, \dots, G) = G(\sigma)^{n-1} \cdot \int_\sigma^1 dF(x) + \int_0^\sigma G(x)^{n-1} dF(x).$$

Using integral by parts and rearranging the terms, we can get

$$u_i^S(G, \dots, F, \dots, G) = \int_0^1 \min \{G(x)^{n-1}, G(\sigma)^{n-1}\} dF(x). \quad (2)$$

The proof of Lemma 4.3 and the above payoff deviation have following implication that only the behavior over the interval $[0, \sigma_H]$ of the strategy G matters for the equilibrium.

Corollary 4.4. *Given a prior H , if (G, \dots, G) is an equilibrium, then the strategy profile (G_1, \dots, G_n) where $\forall i, G_i(x) = G(x), \forall x \in [0, \sigma_H]$ is also the equilibrium.*

Fix a $\sigma \in [\sigma_{\text{NI}}, \sigma_H)$, we now consider following sender i 's best response strategy that is subject to the constraint $\sigma_F = \sigma$

$$\max_{F \in \mathcal{H}(\sigma)} \int_0^1 \min \{G(x)^{n-1}, G(\sigma)^{n-1}\} dF(x). \quad (3)$$

Given σ , let OPT_σ denote the optimal value of the above program. Essentially, G is equilibrium strategy must satisfy that

$$\max_{\sigma: \sigma \in [\sigma_{\text{NI}}, \sigma_H)} \text{OPT}_\sigma \leq \frac{1}{n}. \quad (4)$$

In below analysis, we characterize the most profitable deviation given all other senders using strategy G . In particular, to guarantee (4), we show that, depending on the relative value σ_{NI} and \bar{x}_G , it suffices to only consider one deviation: either deviating to no information disclosure strategy (if $\sigma_{\text{NI}} > \bar{x}_G$) or deviating to a strategy whose reservation value equals to \bar{x}_G (if $\sigma_{\text{NI}} \leq \bar{x}_G$).

Lemma 4.5. *Fix a prior H and the cost $c > 0$, given all other senders using G that meets the conditions (i)–(ii) in Theorem 4.1, then*

- (a) *if $\sigma_{\text{NI}} = \lambda - c > \bar{x}_G$, the most profitable deviation is no information strategy;*
- (b) *if $\sigma_{\text{NI}} = \lambda - c \leq \bar{x}_G$, the most profitable deviation is a strategy F where $\sigma_F = \bar{x}_G$.*

The condition (iii) in Theorem 4.1 simply follows by ensuring that the value of most profitable deviation is no larger than $1/n$. To prove Lemma 4.5, for the case $\sigma_{\text{NI}} \leq \bar{x}_G$, we separate our discussions in two regimes: for $\sigma \in [\sigma_{\text{NI}}, \bar{x}_G)$ we show the optimal value OPT_σ is increasing w.r.t. σ ; for $\sigma \in [\bar{x}_G, \sigma_H)$, we show the optimal value OPT_σ is decreasing w.r.t. σ . The analysis of other case where $\sigma_{\text{NI}} > \bar{x}_G$ follows similarly. To show the monotonicity of OPT_σ , we first characterize optimal solution F_σ for any $\sigma \in [\sigma_{\text{NI}}, \sigma_H)$, and then examine the optimal deviation value OPT_σ under the deviation F_σ . In the remaining of the paper, due to the space limit, we mainly present the proof for first regime of the case $\sigma_{\text{NI}} \leq \bar{x}_G$.

Lemma 4.6. *Given a prior H , and distribution G satisfying the conditions (i)–(ii) in Theorem 4.1, when $\sigma_{\text{NI}} \leq \bar{x}_G$, then for any $\sigma \in [\sigma_{\text{NI}}, \bar{x}_G]$, a distribution F_σ that satisfies following structure is an optimal solution to the program (3)*

$$F_\sigma(x) = \begin{cases} H(x), & \forall x \in [0, x^\dagger) \\ H(x^\dagger), & \forall x \in [x^\dagger, x^\ddagger) \\ 1, & \forall x \in [x^\ddagger, 1] \end{cases} \quad (5)$$

where x^\dagger satisfies that $\int_0^\sigma F_\sigma(x) dx = \sigma - (\lambda - c)$. Furthermore, the optimal value OPT_σ is increasing w.r.t. $\sigma \in [\sigma_{\text{NI}}, \bar{x}_G]$.

The structure of the optimal solution F_σ admits the following interpretations. Let $u(x) := \min \{G(x)^{n-1}, G(\sigma)^{n-1}\}$. As we can see, for any $\sigma \leq \bar{x}_G$, u is convex over $[0, \sigma]$ (recall the convexity G^{n-1} in $[0, \bar{x}_G]$) and is constant over $[\sigma, 1]$. Then if a solution F has support below σ , ideally, by Jensen's inequality, F should allocate its support as much dispersed as possible in this interval. In other words, the MPS constraint should bind for the support of F that is in $[0, \sigma]$. At the same time, u attains maximum for any values above σ , F thus should put as much mass as possible above σ . Due to the equal-mean constraint (i.e., $\int x dF(x) = \lambda$), F should put their support that is in $[0, \sigma]$ as close to 0 as possible (and simultaneously as much dispersed as possible) so that F can allocate more

mass above σ . Note that the constraint $\sigma_F = \sigma$ is a linear constraint, and it thus determines the cutoff x^\dagger of the portion where F satisfies the property in Lemma D.1.

For the value OPT_σ for $\sigma \in [\bar{x}_G, \sigma_H)$, we show that it is monotone decreasing w.r.t. $\sigma \in [\bar{x}_G, \sigma_H)$.

Lemma 4.7. *For any prior H , given a strategy G that satisfies conditions (i)–(ii) in Theorem 4.1, the value OPT_σ is monotone decreasing w.r.t. $\sigma \in [\bar{x}_G, \sigma_H)$.*

To prove this result, for each $\sigma \in [\bar{x}_G, \sigma_H)$, we first characterize the optimal solution F_σ to the program (3) using a much more involved duality argument (see Lemma B.1 and its proof in Appendix B). Then with the obtained F_σ , we prove the monotonicity of OPT_σ . The proof uses the convexity of G^{n-1} over $[0, \bar{x}_G]$, and is in Appendix B. Combine Lemma 4.6 and Lemma 4.7 will prove Lemma 4.5. Putting all pieces together can prove Theorem 4.1 (see the end of Appendix B).

5 Applications and Implications of Theorem 4.1

In this section, we discuss implications and provide applications of Theorem 4.1.

5.1 The Effect of the Competition and Inspection Cost on the Equilibrium

Theorem 4.1 provides a general characterization of the equilibrium for competitive information design for Pandora’s Box. Here we discuss the applications of the theorem in some interesting/important cases and their implications. Proofs in this section are in Appendix C.

First of all, as discussed in Corollary 5.7, every sender deploying essentially full information strategy is a desired equilibrium as it leads to the highest agent payoff and the highest social welfare. Utilizing Theorem 4.1, we can characterize the sufficient and necessary condition for essentially full information strategy to be the equilibrium.

Corollary 5.1. *Essentially full information strategy is the equilibrium strategy if and only if H^{n-1} is convex over $[0, \sigma_H]$.*

Intuitively, when all other senders use the essentially full information strategy, sender i ’s expected payoff by using a strategy G_i can be characterized as follows: $\sum_{j=0}^{n-1} H(\sigma_H)(1 - H(\sigma_H))^j/n + \int_0^{\sigma_H} H(x)^{n-1} dG_i(x)$. Thus, to maximize the expected payoff, it suffices to maximize the expected payoff $\int_0^{\sigma_H} H(x)^{n-1} dG_i(x)$ whenever realizing a prize x whose value is smaller than σ_H . Now note that when H^{n-1} is convex over $[0, \sigma_H]$, by Jensen’s inequality, sender i would strictly prefer to spread the strategy G_i as much as possible since it leads to higher payoff. Thus, according to Lemma 3.4, it is optimal for the sender i to also use essentially full information strategy.

We can also observe a couple of interesting implications of Corollary 5.1. First, increasing competition makes it more likely to reach essential full information disclosure. This implication is from the fact that when we fix inspection cost, the shape of the function H^{n-1} becomes more convex as n increases. Moreover, for an arbitrary prior H and any cost, one can show that there always exists a number of senders such that essentially full information is the equilibrium. We can also show that for any prior H , as long as the number of senders is high enough, essentially full information strategy can be the equilibrium strategy, as formalized below.

Corollary 5.2. *For any prior H and cost $c \geq 0$, there exists a $\underline{n} \in \mathbb{N}_+$, such that for any $n \geq \underline{n}$, essentially full information strategy is the equilibrium strategy.*

Another implication of Corollary 5.1 is that, increasing inspection cost makes it more likely to reach essential full information disclosure. This implication follows from when we fix the number of senders, if essentially full information is the equilibrium with a smaller inspection cost, it is also the equilibrium with a larger cost. This is because when increasing the cost, the corresponding reservation value σ_H is decreasing. Therefore, if H^{n-1} is already convex on a larger interval $[0, \sigma_H]$, it is also convex on a smaller interval. To illustrate this observation, for a general class of priors – the prior that has single-peaked density – we can characterize the lower bound cost for the essentially full information to be the equilibrium. In particular, when H^{n-1} has single-peaked density,¹¹ it is always first convex and then concave (see example in Figure 1b). Thus, as long as the reservation value σ_H falls below the inflection point (i.e., the point where the function H^{n-1} changes from being convex to concave) of H^{n-1} , essentially full information is the equilibrium.

Corollary 5.3. *Fix n and H such that H^{n-1} has single-peaked density over $[0, \sigma_H]$ and its inflection point \underline{x} , let \underline{c} be an inspection cost where $\sigma_H = \underline{x}$, then for any cost $c \geq \underline{c}$, essentially full information is the equilibrium.*

In below, we exemplify the use of Corollary 5.3 to identify the condition of the inspection cost for common distributions that admit the existence of essentially full information equilibrium strategy when there are two senders.

Example 5.1 (Uniform Prior). *Suppose H is the uniform prior over $[a, b]$ with $a \geq 0$, it can be shown that for any inspection cost $c \geq 0$, essentially full information strategy is an equilibrium strategy, namely, a strategy $G = H$ satisfies all conditions in Theorem 4.1.*

Example 5.2 (Gaussian Prior). *Suppose H is the Gaussian prior with mean $\lambda > 0$ and variance v^2 where $v \geq 0$, it can be shown that essentially full information strategy is an equilibrium strategy if and only if the inspection cost c satisfies $c \geq \lambda/2 + v/\sqrt{2\pi}$.*

Example 5.3 (Laplace Prior). *Suppose H is the Laplace prior with mean $\lambda > 0$ and scale parameter $b > 0$, it can be shown that essentially full information strategy is an equilibrium strategy if and only if the inspection cost c satisfies $c \geq b/2$.*

Intuitively, fix an inspection cost $c > 0$ and the prior mean, both Example 5.2 and Example 5.3 suggest that it is more likely to have essentially full information strategy as the equilibrium strategy when the prior distribution has smaller variance.

In addition to characterizing the equilibrium conditions, we can also show that, under the condition that essentially full information is the equilibrium, the agent's payoff decreases as the inspection cost increases and increases as the number of senders increases.

Corollary 5.4. *Under essentially full information equilibrium, the agent's payoff is decreasing with respect to the inspection cost, and increasing with respect to the number of senders.*

Intuitively, the above results follow from the fact that agent's expected payoff $\sigma_H - \int_0^{\sigma_H} H(x)^n dx$ under essentially full information equilibrium is an increasing function over the reservation value σ_H , which is decreasing with respect to the inspection cost; and the payoff is an increasing function with respect to the number of senders.

Below we provide one more example on how Theorem 4.1 can help us characterize the equilibrium in different cases. When H^{n-1} is concave over $[0, \sigma_H]$, using the conditions (i)–(ii), we can characterize

¹¹As long as the density function h is log-concave over $[0, \sigma_H]$, H^{n-1} has single-peaked density over $[0, \sigma_H]$ for any n .

a unique distribution G such that G^{n-1} will be firstly linear over $[0, \bar{x}_G]$ and then flat over $[\bar{x}_G, \sigma_H]$ (see the example in Figure 1a). Using the linearity of G^{n-1} , we can show that to verify whether such G is an equilibrium strategy, it only suffices to check whether $G(\lambda - c)^{n-1} \leq 1/n$.

Corollary 5.5. *Given prior H such that H^{n-1} is concave over $[0, \sigma_H]$. Let G be a distribution satisfying the conditions (i)–(ii) in Theorem 4.1, then G is an equilibrium strategy if and only if $G(\lambda - c)^{n-1} \leq 1/n$.*

We also exemplify below the use of corollary 5.5 to identify the condition of the inspection cost for common distribution that admit the existence of equilibrium strategy when there are two senders.

Example 5.4 (Exponential Prior). *Suppose H is the exponential prior over $[0, +\infty)$ with the parameter $\mu \geq 0$, namely, $H(x) = 1 - \exp(-\mu x)$. Since H is concave over the whole support $[0, +\infty)$, it can be shown that there exists an equilibrium strategy G (in particular, one can deduce the behavior of strategy G over $[0, \sigma_H]$ where $\sigma_H = -\ln(\mu c)/\mu$ as follows: $G(x) = \frac{H(\sigma_H)}{2\sigma_H - \frac{2(\sigma_H - (1/\mu - c))}{H(\sigma_H)}}x, \forall x \in [0, 2\sigma_H - \frac{2(\sigma_H - (1/\mu - c))}{H(\sigma_H)}]$; $G(x) = H(\sigma_H), \forall x \in [2\sigma_H - \frac{2(\sigma_H - (1/\mu - c))}{H(\sigma_H)}, \sigma_H]$) if and only if the inspection cost $c \geq 0$ and the parameter μ satisfy $(\mu c)^3 - 3(\mu c)^2 + 2\mu c + \mu c \ln(\mu c) \geq 0$. Note that when fixing any inspection cost $c > 0$, function $(xc)^3 - 3(xc)^2 + 2xc + xc \ln(xc)$ crosses x -axis over $(0, 1/c)$ once and it crosses from below. Intuitively, this suggests that for any fixed cost $c > 0$, it is more likely to admit the existence of a symmetric equilibrium if the parameter μ is larger, i.e., the prior has smaller variance.*

5.2 Informational Properties of Pandora’s Box

In this section, we investigate how senders’ strategies affect the agent’s payoff under optimal inspection strategy and how agent’s optimal payoff can be used to inform the informativeness of box’s information strategy. To this end, we provide several properties about the reservation values which will be useful for our later equilibrium analysis in Section 4. While reservation values have been well-studied in the Pandora’s Box problem, to our knowledge, the informational properties we present in this section are not known before.

Below we present the main result in this section, which characterizes an intrinsic connection between informativeness of any box’s value distribution and the optimal payoff order of the search agent. We use $u^A(G_i, G_{-i})$ to denote agent’s optimal expected payoff under the boxes’ strategies (G_i, G_{-i}) where $G_{-i} := (G_j)_{j \in [n], j \neq i}$ contains all boxes’ prize distributions excluding box i ’s prize distribution.

Theorem 5.6. *The distribution G'_i is a mean-preserving spread of distribution G_i , i.e., $G'_i \succeq G_i$, if and only if $u^A(G'_i, G_{-i}) \geq u^A(G_i, G_{-i})$ for all other boxes’ strategies G_{-i} , all $(c_i)_{i \in [n]}$, and G_i, G'_i have the same mean.*

It is worth noting that the above results do not require any assumption of symmetric prior prize distribution or symmetric cost for opening all boxes. Intuitively, the “if” part of the above results provides another way to compare the Blackwell’s informativeness via comparing the agent’s optimal payoff in a basic setup of Pandora’s Box problem (recall that the Blackwell’s informativeness says that a strategy G' is *more informative* than G if G' is an MPS of G). The “only if” part of the above results shows that the agent obtains a higher payoff whenever a box becomes more informative. With this implication, an important corollary is that, when all boxes are performing full information strategy, i.e., $G_i = H_i$ for all i , the agent obtains the highest payoff. Below we

demonstrate a stronger version of this claim. In particular, we define the following *essentially* full information strategy which fully reveals information whenever the prize value is no larger than the reservation value of this information strategy:

Definition 5.5 (Essentially Full Information Strategy). *For any box $i \in [n]$, a strategy $G : H_i \succeq G$ is essentially full information strategy for box i if G satisfies that $G(x) = H_i(x), \forall x \in [0, \sigma_{H_i}]$, where σ_{H_i} is the reservation value of the prior H_i .*

We can show that, for the agent to achieve the highest payoff, it suffices that all senders use essentially full information strategy.

Corollary 5.7. *Let G_i be an essentially full information strategy for box $i \in [n]$. Then agent obtains the highest expected payoff under (G_1, \dots, G_n) among all possible (symmetric or asymmetric) strategy profiles. Moreover, when $H \equiv H_i, \forall i \in [n]$, the agent's highest expected payoff can be computed as $\sigma_H - \int_0^{\sigma_H} H(x)^n dx$.*

The basic intuition behind the above Corollary 5.7 is that in Pandora's Box, when the agent uses the optimal inspection strategy, after she inspects sender i , as long as the mean of the posterior for sender i after inspection is higher than his reservation value, the agent will take the same action: stop inspection and choose sender i . This observation implies that the distribution above the reservation value of the sender's strategy does not change the agent's decisions and payoffs.

Note that since the agent chooses exactly one sender at the end, the total payoff to all senders is 1 no matter what the agent's inspection strategy is and what the senders' strategies are. Therefore, when all senders use essentially full information strategy, it not only maximizes the agent's payoff, it also achieves the maximum social welfare. Given this desired property for essentially full information strategy, in Section 4, we characterize the sufficient and necessary condition for all senders to use essentially full information strategy (see Corollary 5.1) in equilibrium.

Additional useful properties. Before presenting the proof of Theorem 5.6, we describe a few other informational properties of Pandora's Box. First, recall that we say a distribution G' is *more informative* than G if G' is an MPS of G , i.e., $G' \succeq G$. This partial order of informativeness is from Blackwell's information theorem (Blackwell 1953). En route to proving Theorem 5.6, we also show the following total order on the reservation values induced by information strategies.

Proposition 5.8. *For any cost $c \geq 0$ and two distributions G' and G , if $G' \succeq G$, $\sigma_{G'} \geq \sigma_G$.*

That is, a more informative sender strategy leads to a higher reservation value. Since the agent inspects the senders in an decreasing order of their reservation values, the proposition confirms the intuition that the agent would first inspect the sender who uses more informative strategy. Below we give the lower and upper bounds of the reservation values for any feasible sender's strategy G given prior of this sender. Moreover, we provide conditions on when the sender's strategy G has the lowest or highest reservation value, corresponding to the most uninformative or most informative strategy.

Corollary 5.9. *Fix any box i , given the prior H_i and the cost $c_i \geq 0$, for any strategy G that satisfies $H_i \succeq G$, we have $\lambda_i - c_i \leq \sigma_G \leq \sigma_{H_i}$ where $\lambda_i = \mathbb{E}_{x \sim H_i}[x]$. Moreover,*

- $\sigma_G = \lambda_i - c$ if and only if G has no support over $[0, \lambda_i - c_i]$;
- $\sigma_G = \sigma_{H_i}$ if and only if H_i is an MPS of G over the interval¹² $[0, \sigma_{H_i}]$, denoted by $H_i \succeq_{[0, \sigma_{H_i}]}$

¹²Let $W(y) := \int_0^y [H_i(x) - G(x)] dx$. We say H_i is an MPS of G over $[a, b]$ if and only if $W(a) = W(b) = 0$, and

G .

The above corollary characterizes the sender’s strategies that reach the lowest and highest reservation values. We should expect when the sender uses no (full) information strategy, the strategy should lead to the lowest (highest) reservation value. As a sanity check, when the sender i uses no information strategy, the corresponding G contains a single point mass at λ_i , and it is easy to see that corresponding reservation value is $\lambda_i - c_i$. When the sender uses full information strategy, i.e., the corresponding G equals to the prior, the reservation value is σ_{H_i} .

We provide a proof overview of Theorem 5.6. In the agent’s optimal inspection strategy (as specified in Theorem 3.1), both the selection rule and the stopping rule depend on the reservation value. To see how the agent’s payoff changes if one sender uses a different strategy, one needs to understand how the reservation value ties with sender’s strategy. Thanks to Theorem 5.6, we know that the reservation value is always weakly larger if the strategy is more informative (see Proposition 5.8). With this result, armed with an already known result which shows the expected payoff of any inspection policy is bounded above by the expectation of highest “capped” reservation value (see Lemma D.3), we can then prove Theorem 5.6.

We conclude this section by noting that our proof for the “only if” direction essentially shows that the capped value of a more informative strategy is *second-order* stochastically dominated by the capped value of a less informative strategy. Then by the convexity of the maximum operator, one can also achieve the “only if” result of Theorem 5.6.

6 Conclusion

In this paper, we study the competitive information design for the Pandora’s Box problem. We characterize the informational properties of Pandora’s Box by analyzing how a box’s partial information disclosure affects the agent’s optimal decisions. We fully characterize the pure symmetric equilibrium for the boxes’ competitive information disclosure with providing necessary and sufficient conditions that guarantee the existence and uniqueness of competition equilibrium, and reveal various insights regarding information competition and the resultant agent payoff at equilibrium.

References

- Simon P Anderson and Régis Renault. Advertising content. *American Economic Review*, 96(1):93–113, 2006.
- Pak Hung Au and Keiichi Kawai. Competitive disclosure of correlated information. *Economic Theory*, pages 1–33, 2019.
- Pak Hung Au and Keiichi Kawai. Competitive information disclosure by multiple senders. *Games and Economic Behavior*, 119:56–78, 2020.
- Pak Hung Au and Mark Whitmeyer. Attraction versus persuasion: Information provision in search markets. *Journal of Political Economy*, 131(1):202–245, 2023.
- Dirk Bergemann and Stephen Morris. Information design: A unified perspective. *Journal of Economic Literature*, 57(1):44–95, 2019.
- Hedyeh Beyhaghi and Robert Kleinberg. Pandora’s problem with nonobligatory inspection. In *Proceedings of the 2019 ACM Conference on Economics and Computation*, pages 131–132, 2019.
- Kostas Bimpikis, Davide Crippis, and Alireza Tahbaz-Salehi. Information sale and competition. *Management Science*, 65(6):2646–2664, 2019.

$W(y) \geq 0, \forall y \in [a, b]$.

- David Blackwell. Equivalent comparisons of experiments. *The annals of mathematical statistics*, pages 265–272, 1953.
- David A Blackwell and Meyer A Girshick. *Theory of games and statistical decisions*. Courier Corporation, 1979.
- Simon Board and Jay Lu. Competitive information disclosure in search markets. *Journal of Political Economy*, 126(5):1965–2010, 2018.
- Raphael Boleslavsky and Christopher Cotton. Limited capacity in project selection: Competition through evidence production. *Economic Theory*, 65(2):385–421, 2018.
- Shant Boodaghians, Federico Fusco, Philip Lazos, and Stefano Leonardi. Pandora’s box problem with order constraints. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 2022. URL <https://doi.org/10.1287/moor.2022.1271>.
- Shuchi Chawla, Evangelia Gergatsouli, Yifeng Teng, Christos Tzamos, and Ruimin Zhang. Pandora’s box with correlations: Learning and approximation. In *2020 IEEE 61st Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*, pages 1214–1225. IEEE, 2020.
- Michael Choi, Anovia Yifan Dai, and Kyungmin Kim. Consumer search and price competition. *Econometrica*, 86(4):1257–1281, 2018.
- José Correa, Andrés Cristi, Boris Epstein, and José A Soto. Sample-driven optimal stopping: From the secretary problem to the iid prophet inequality. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 49(1):441–475, 2024a.
- José Correa, Andrés Cristi, Laurent Feuilloley, Tim Oosterwijk, and Alexandros Tsigonias-Dimitriadis. The secretary problem with independent sampling. *Management Science*, 2024b.
- Bolin Ding, Yiding Feng, Chien-Ju Ho, Wei Tang, and Haifeng Xu. Competitive information design for pandora’s box. In *Proceedings of the 2023 Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA)*, pages 353–381, 2023.
- Laura Doval. Whether or not to open pandora’s box. *Journal of Economic Theory*, 175:127–158, 2018.
- Shaddin Dughmi. Algorithmic information structure design: a survey. *ACM SIGecom Exchanges*, 15(2): 2–24, 2017.
- Piotr Dworzak and Giorgio Martini. The simple economics of optimal persuasion. *Journal of Political Economy*, 127(5):1993–2048, 2019.
- Hu Fu, Jiawei Li, and Daogao Liu. Pandora box problem with nonobligatory inspection: Hardness and approximation scheme. In *Proceedings of the 55th Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*, pages 789–802, 2023.
- Matthew Gentzkow and Emir Kamenica. Competition in persuasion. *The Review of Economic Studies*, 84(1):300–322, 2016.
- Matthew Gentzkow and Emir Kamenica. Bayesian persuasion with multiple senders and rich signal spaces. *Games and Economic Behavior*, 104:411–429, 2017.
- Ronen Gradwohl, Niklas Hahn, Martin Hoefer, and Rann Smorodinsky. Reaping the informational surplus in bayesian persuasion. *American Economic Journal: Microeconomics*, 14(4):296–317, 2022.
- Niklas Hahn, Martin Hoefer, and Rann Smorodinsky. Prophet inequalities for bayesian persuasion. In *IJCAI*, pages 175–181, 2020.
- Niklas Hahn, Martin Hoefer, and Rann Smorodinsky. The secretary recommendation problem. *Games and Economic Behavior*, 134:199–228, 2022.
- Wei He and Jiangtao Li. Competitive information disclosure in random search markets. *Games and Economic Behavior*, 140:132–153, 2023.
- Ilwoo Hwang, Kyungmin Kim, and Raphael Boleslavsky. Competitive advertising and pricing. *Emory University and University of Miami*, 2019.
- Emir Kamenica. Bayesian persuasion and information design. *Annual Review of Economics*, 11:249–272, 2019.

- Emir Kamenica and Matthew Gentzkow. Bayesian persuasion. *American Economic Review*, 101(6):2590–2615, 2011.
- Robert Kleinberg, Bo Waggoner, and E Glen Weyl. Descending price optimally coordinates search. In *Proceedings of the 2016 ACM Conference on Economics and Computation*, pages 23–24, 2016.
- Anton Kolotilin. Optimal information disclosure: A linear programming approach. *Theoretical Economics*, 13(2):607–635, 2018.
- Jeffrey Mensch. Screening inattentive buyers. *American Economic Review*, 2021.
- Wojciech Olszewski and Richard Weber. A more general pandora rule? *Journal of Economic Theory*, 160: 429–437, 2015.
- Martin L Weitzman. Optimal search for the best alternative. *Econometrica: Journal of the Econometric Society*, pages 641–654, 1979.
- Yangge Xiao, Zhenyu Hu, and Shouqiang Wang. Information design of a delegated search. *Available at SSRN 4249165*, 2022.

A Missing proof of Section 3

Proof of Theorem 3.2. For each box $i \in [n]$, let $\{\Phi_i(\cdot | x), \mathcal{M}_i\}$ be the sender i 's signaling mechanism. Given a signal realization $q_i \sim \Phi_i(\cdot | x)$, together with the prior prize distribution H_i , the agent will form a posterior belief, denoted by $\mu_i(\cdot | q_i) \in \Delta([0, 1])$, for the underlying realized prize. Let $x_i \triangleq \mathbb{E}_{x \sim \mu_i(\cdot | q_i)}[x]$ be the corresponding posterior mean. Slightly abusing the notation, we use $\Phi_i(\cdot) \in \Delta(\mathcal{M}_i)$ to denote the marginal distribution of realized signals. Let $G_i \in \Delta([0, 1])$ be the corresponding distribution of posterior mean jointly induced from the $\{\Phi_i(\cdot | x), \mathcal{M}_i\}$ and the prior prize distribution. Let $\tilde{x}_i \in [0, 1]$ be the realized prize value if the agent decides to take the prize from box i . Clearly, by definition, we have $x_i \sim G_i$. Let π be the agent's any search and stopping strategy, then we can express the agent's expected payoff from the strategy π as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E}_{(\mathbb{A}_i, \mathbb{I}_i) \sim \pi, \forall i} \left[\sum_{i \in [n]} \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{x}_i \sim H_i} [\mathbb{A}_i \tilde{x}_i - \mathbb{I}_i c_i] \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E}_{(\mathbb{A}_i, \mathbb{I}_i) \sim \pi, \forall i} \left[\mathbb{E}_{q_i \sim \Phi_i(\cdot), \forall i} \left[\sum_{i \in [n]} \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{x}_i \sim \mu_i(\cdot | q_i)} [\mathbb{A}_i \tilde{x}_i - \mathbb{I}_i c_i] \right] \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E}_{(\mathbb{A}_i, \mathbb{I}_i) \sim \pi, \forall i} \left[\mathbb{E}_{q_i \sim \Phi_i(\cdot), \forall i} \left[\sum_{i \in [n]} \mathbb{A}_i \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{x}_i \sim \mu_i(\cdot | q_i)} [\tilde{x}_i] - \mathbb{I}_i c_i \right] \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E}_{(\mathbb{A}_i, \mathbb{I}_i) \sim \pi, \forall i} \left[\mathbb{E}_{x_i \sim G_i, \forall i} \left[\sum_{i \in [n]} \mathbb{A}_i x_i - \mathbb{I}_i c_i \right] \right] \\
&= \sum_{i \in [n]} \mathbb{E}_{x_i \sim G_i} [\mathbb{E}_{(\mathbb{A}_i, \mathbb{I}_i) \sim \pi} [\mathbb{A}_i x_i - \mathbb{I}_i c_i]]
\end{aligned}$$

We next proceed the proof by establishing the following upper bound

$$\sum_{i \in [n]} \mathbb{E}_{x_i \sim G_i} [\mathbb{E}_{(\mathbb{A}_i, \mathbb{I}_i) \sim \pi} [\mathbb{A}_i x_i - \mathbb{I}_i c_i]] \leq \sum_{i \in [n]} \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{A}_i \kappa_i]$$

where κ_i for every $i \in [n]$ satisfies that $\kappa_i \triangleq \min\{x_i, \sigma_{G_i}\}$ and the expectation in right hand side of above inequality is over all randomness. To see this, let $b_i \triangleq \max\{x_i - \sigma_{G_i}, 0\}$. Then by definition, we have $\mathbb{E}[b_i] = c_i$, and also we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{i \in [n]} \mathbb{E}_{x_i \sim G_i} [\mathbb{E}_{(\mathbb{A}_i, \mathbb{I}_i) \sim \pi} [\mathbb{A}_i x_i - \mathbb{I}_i c_i]] &= \sum_{i \in [n]} \mathbb{E}_{x_i \sim G_i} [\mathbb{E}_{(\mathbb{A}_i, \mathbb{I}_i) \sim \pi} [\mathbb{A}_i (\kappa_i + b_i) - \mathbb{I}_i \mathbb{E}[b_i]]] \\
&= \sum_{i \in [n]} \mathbb{E}_{x_i \sim G_i} [\mathbb{E}_{(\mathbb{A}_i, \mathbb{I}_i) \sim \pi} [\mathbb{A}_i (\kappa_i + b_i) - \mathbb{I}_i b_i]] \\
&= \sum_{i \in [n]} \mathbb{E}_{x_i \sim G_i} [\mathbb{E}_{(\mathbb{A}_i, \mathbb{I}_i) \sim \pi} [\mathbb{A}_i \kappa_i - (\mathbb{I}_i - \mathbb{A}_i) b_i]] \\
&\leq \sum_{i \in [n]} \mathbb{E}_{x_i \sim G_i} [\mathbb{E}_{(\mathbb{A}_i, \mathbb{I}_i) \sim \pi} [\mathbb{A}_i \kappa_i]] .
\end{aligned}$$

Here in second equality, we observe that the decision variable \mathbb{I}_i on whether to inspect box i can only depend on information that is not dependent on the realized posterior mean x_i . Thus, we have $\mathbb{E}[\mathbb{I}_i \mathbb{E}[b_i]] = \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{I}_i b_i]$. The last inequality is due to the fact that $b_i \geq 0, \mathbb{A}_i \leq \mathbb{I}_i$ for all i . Since

$\sum_i \mathbb{A}_i \leq 1$, for any agent's strategy, we further have the following upper bound of agent's expected payoff:

$$\sum_{i \in [n]} \mathbb{E}_{x_i \sim G_i} \left[\mathbb{E}_{(\mathbb{A}_i, \mathbb{I}_i) \sim \pi} [\mathbb{A}_i \kappa_i] \right] \leq \mathbb{E}_{x_i \sim G_i, \forall i} \left[\max_{i \in [n]} \kappa_i \right].$$

We next argue that the strategy characterized in Theorem 3.2 can indeed obtain above expected payoff upper bound $\mathbb{E}[\max_i \kappa_i]$. To see this, consider that the strategy characterized in Theorem 3.2 ends up with selecting box i to take the prize value, but instead there exists another box j that has $\kappa_j > \kappa_i$. We below show that this case cannot happen. There are two possible cases

- (i) $\sigma_{G_i} < \sigma_{G_j}$: in this case, the agent first inspects box j . Consider following two scenarios: (a) If the realized posterior mean $x_j \geq \sigma_{G_j}$, then the agent would have to select box j as x_j is larger than all remaining reservation values of uninspected boxes. (b) If the realized posterior mean $x_j < \sigma_{G_j}$, then $\kappa_j = x_j$, and we have $x_j > \kappa_i$ by assumption. Meanwhile, we must also have $x_j < \sigma_{G_i}$ as the agent would never inspect box i . However, since we also have $x_j > \kappa_i$, together with $x_j < \sigma_{G_i}$, we also have $x_j > x_i$, which also leads to a contradiction as the agent would have to select box j to take the prize.
- (ii) $\sigma_{G_i} \geq \sigma_{G_j}$: in this case, the agent first inspects box i . Consider following two scenarios: (a) If the realized posterior mean $x_j \geq \sigma_{G_j}$, then we have $\kappa_j = \sigma_{G_j} > \kappa_i$. When $x_i \leq \sigma_{G_i}$, then agent would not select box i to take the prize as $x_i = \kappa_i < \sigma_{G_j}$. When $x_i > \sigma_{G_i}$, then $\kappa_i = \sigma_{G_i} < \sigma_{G_j}$ which leads to a contradiction. (b) If the realized posterior mean $x_j < \sigma_{G_j}$, then we have $\kappa_j = x_j > \kappa_i$. Similarly, when $x_i \leq \sigma_{G_i}$, then agent would not select box i to take the prize as $x_i = \kappa_i < x_j < \sigma_{G_j}$. When $x_i > \sigma_{G_i}$, then $\kappa_i = \sigma_{G_i} < x_j < \sigma_{G_j}$ which leads to a contradiction.

Putting above pieces together, we can show that the agent strategy described in Theorem 3.2 can indeed achieve highest payoff upper bound $\mathbb{E}_{x_i \sim G_i, \forall i} [\max_{i \in [n]} \kappa_i]$. We thus finish the proof. \square

B Missing Proofs for Section 4

Proof of Lemma 4.2. We prove the lemma using two senders case. The analysis for multiple senders can be easily carried over. Given a symmetric strategy (G, G) where $\sigma_G \neq \sigma_H$, let $\bar{x}_G = \max\{x : x \in \text{supp}[G] \wedge x \leq \sigma_G\}$, we now consider following possible scenarios:

- $G(x) = H(x), \forall x \in [0, \bar{x}_G]$. In this case, we must have $\bar{x}_G < \sigma_G$, otherwise we have $\sigma_G = \sigma_H$. Consider (sufficiently small) ε and ε' , and let $x^\dagger := \min\{x : G(x) \geq H(\bar{x}_G + \varepsilon)\}$. Consider sender 1 deviating to a new strategy F where

$$F(x) = \begin{cases} G(x), & \forall x \in [0, \bar{x}_G) \\ H(x), & \forall x \in [\bar{x}_G, \bar{x}_G + \varepsilon) \\ H(\bar{x}_G + \varepsilon), & \forall x \in [\bar{x}_G + \varepsilon, x^\dagger + \varepsilon') \\ G(x), & \forall x \in [x^\dagger + \varepsilon', 1], \end{cases}$$

where ε' further satisfies that

$$\int_{\bar{x}_G}^{x^\dagger} (F(x) - G(x)) dx = \int_{x^\dagger}^{x^\dagger + \varepsilon'} (G(x) - F(x)) dx.$$

By construction, we have $F \succeq G$ as $\int_0^\sigma (F(x) - G(x))dx \geq 0, \forall \sigma$, and $H \succeq F$ as $\int_0^\sigma (H(x) - F(x))dx \geq 0, \forall \sigma$. Let $\Delta_\varepsilon := H(\bar{x}_G + \varepsilon) - H(\bar{x}_G)$. Now consider

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\sigma_G}^1 (x - \sigma_G)dF(x) - \int_{\sigma_G}^1 (x - \sigma_G)dG(x) &= \int_0^{\sigma_G} F(x)dx - \int_0^{\sigma_G} G(x)dx > 0, \\ \Rightarrow \int_{\sigma_G}^1 (x - \sigma_G)dF(x) &> c. \end{aligned}$$

As $\int_{\sigma}^1 (x - \sigma)dF(x)$ is strictly decreasing w.r.t σ , we thus have $\sigma_F > \sigma_G$. Now let $u_a^S := p_G + \int_0^{\sigma_G} G(x)dG(x)$ and consider

$$\begin{aligned} u_1^S(F, G) - u_a^S &= \int_{\sigma_G}^1 dF(x) + \int_0^{\sigma_G} G(x)dF(x) - u_a^S \\ &= \int_{\bar{x}_G}^{\bar{x}_G + \varepsilon} G(x)dF(x) - \Delta_\varepsilon = (1 - p_G) - \Delta_\varepsilon = -p_G \Delta_\varepsilon \end{aligned}$$

Choose ε such that $p_G \Delta_\varepsilon < u_a^S - \frac{1}{2}$, we then have

$$u_1^S(F, G) = u_a^S - p_G \Delta_\varepsilon > \frac{1}{2} = u_1^S(G, G).$$

• $\exists x \in [0, \bar{x}_G], G(x) \neq H(x)$. In this case, we consider two possible scenarios:

1. When $G(\sigma_G) > H(\sigma_G)$. In this case, as we have $\int_0^{\sigma_G} G(x)dx < \int_0^{\sigma_G} H(x)dx$, there must exist a point $x^\dagger := \max\{x \in [0, \bar{x}_G] : G(x) \geq H(x) \wedge G(x) < H(x)\}$. Now consider following new strategy F :

$$F(x) = \begin{cases} G(x), & \forall x \in [0, x^\dagger - \varepsilon) \\ H(x), & \forall x \in [x^\dagger - \varepsilon, x^\dagger) \\ G(x), & \forall x \in [x^\dagger, x^\ddagger) \\ G(x^\ddagger), & \forall x \in [x^\ddagger, x^\ddagger + \varepsilon') \\ G(x), & \forall x \in [x^\ddagger + \varepsilon', 1], \end{cases}$$

where $x^\ddagger \geq \sigma_G$ and $\varepsilon, \varepsilon'$ are sufficiently small such that they satisfy the following

$$\int_{x^\dagger - \varepsilon}^{x^\dagger} (F(x) - G(x))dx = \int_{x^\ddagger}^{x^\ddagger + \varepsilon'} (G(x) - F(x))dx.$$

By construction, $F \succeq G$ as $\int_0^\sigma (F(x) - G(x))dx \geq 0, \forall \sigma$, and $H \succeq F$ as $\int_0^\sigma (H(x) - F(x))dx \geq 0, \forall \sigma$. Now consider

$$\int_{\sigma_G}^1 (x - \sigma_G)dF(x) - \int_{\sigma_G}^1 (x - \sigma_G)dG(x) = \int_0^{\sigma_G} F(x)dx - \int_0^{\sigma_G} G(x)dx > 0.$$

Thus, we have $\sigma_F > \sigma_G$. As a result, let $u_a^S := p_G + \int_0^{\sigma_G} G(x)dG(x)$ and

$$\begin{aligned} u_1^S(F, G) - u_a^S &= \int_{\sigma_G}^1 dF(x) + \int_0^{\sigma_G} G(x)dF(x) - u_a^S \\ &= \int_{x^\dagger - \varepsilon}^{x^\dagger} G(x) \cdot (h(x) - f(x))dx \end{aligned}$$

Choose ε such that $\int_{x^\dagger-\varepsilon}^{x^\dagger} G(x) \cdot (h(x) - f(x))dx < u_a^S - \frac{1}{2}$, we then have

$$u_1^S(F, G) = u_a^S - \int_{x^\dagger-\varepsilon}^{x^\dagger} G(x) \cdot (h(x) - f(x))dx > \frac{1}{2} = u_1^S(G, G).$$

2. When $G(\sigma_G) \leq H(\sigma_G)$. In this case, consider the point $x^\dagger := \max\{x \in [0, \bar{x}_G] : G(x) \leq H(x) \wedge G(x) > H(x)\}$. Now consider following new strategy F :

$$F(x) = \begin{cases} G(x), & \forall x \in [0, x^\dagger) \\ H(x), & \forall x \in [x^\dagger, x^\dagger + \varepsilon) \\ H(x^\dagger + \varepsilon), & \forall x \in [x^\dagger + \varepsilon, \bar{x}) \\ G(x), & \forall x \in [\bar{x}, x^\ddagger) \\ G(x^\ddagger), & \forall x \in [x^\ddagger, x^\ddagger + \varepsilon') \\ G(x), & \forall x \in [x^\ddagger + \varepsilon', 1], \end{cases}$$

where $x^\ddagger \geq \sigma_G$, and \bar{x} satisfies $G(\bar{x}) = H(x^\dagger + \varepsilon)$. Moreover, $\varepsilon, \varepsilon'$ are sufficiently small such that they satisfy the following

$$\int_{x^\dagger}^{\bar{x}} (F(x) - G(x))dx = \int_{x^\ddagger}^{x^\ddagger + \varepsilon'} (G(x) - F(x))dx.$$

Follow the earlier analysis, we have $\sigma_F > \sigma_G$, and with sufficiently small $\varepsilon, \varepsilon'$, we have $u_1^S(F, G) > u_1^S(G, G)$.

Putting pieces together, the proof then completes. \square

Proof of Lemma 4.3. We first prove the first part of the statement. Given a prior H , let G be the distribution satisfying conditions (i)–(ii) in Theorem 4.1. We now consider sender i 's best response strategy F that is subject to $\sigma_F = \sigma_H$ given all other senders using strategy G . For notation simplicity, define following quantile value $p_F := 1 - F(\sigma_F)$, $p_G := 1 - G(\sigma_G)$, and $p_H := 1 - H(\sigma_H)$. Observe that whenever sender i is inspected, there are two possible cases, either the realized $x_i \geq \sigma_H$ where the agent will stop the inspection and claim x_i from sender i ; or the realized $x_i < \sigma_H$ where the agent claims x_i from sender i only if he inspects all senders and finds out $i = \arg \max_j x_j$. With the above observation, we have following sender i 's expected payoff on deviating to strategy F :

$$\begin{aligned} u_i^S(G, \dots, F, \dots, G) &= \sum_{j=1}^n \left(p_F \cdot (1 - p_G)^{j-1} + \int_0^{\sigma_H} G(x)^{n-1} dF(x) \right) \cdot \frac{1}{n} \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{=} \frac{1}{n} \cdot \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} p_F \cdot (1 - p_G)^j + \int_0^{\sigma_H} G(x)^{n-1} dF(x), \end{aligned}$$

where in (a) we use $p_F = p_H = p_G$ due to Lemma D.2. Now we consider following sender i 's best response problem that is subject to deviating to strategies in $\mathcal{H}(\sigma_H)$:

$$\max_{F \in \mathcal{H}(\sigma_H)} \frac{1}{n} \cdot \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} p_H \cdot (1 - p_H)^j + \int_0^{\sigma_H} G(x)^{n-1} dF(x).$$

Given a prior H , p_H is a constant. The above program can be further reduced to

$$\max_{F \in \mathcal{H}(\sigma_H)} \int_0^{\sigma_H} G(x)^{n-1} dF(x). \quad (6)$$

Recall that from Corollary 5.9, the constraint $\sigma_F = \sigma_H$ is equivalent to requiring $H \succeq_{[0, \sigma_H]} F$. To complete the proof, we note that Hwang et al. (2019) have shown when $c = 0$, a strategy G that satisfies the properties in Definition 4.1 over the interval $[0, 1]$ is the best response strategy to itself, i.e., G is the solution to the program $\max_{F \in \mathcal{H}} \int_0^1 G(x)^{n-1} dF(x)$. Now given a strategy that satisfies the conditions (i)–(iii), it is easy to see that any strategy G^* that satisfies $G^*(x) = G(x), \forall x \in [0, \sigma_H]$ is the optimal solution to the program (6). The second part of the statement follows from the necessity the equilibrium strategy G when $c = 0$ in (Hwang et al. 2019). \square

Proof of Corollary 4.4. It suffices to show that given (G_1, \dots, G_n) , no sender has profitable deviation. Consider following two kinds of deviation: one is deviating to a strategy that has reservation value σ_H , then from Lemma 4.3, we know there exists no such profitable deviation; for any $\sigma < \sigma_H$, the other is deviating to a strategy that has reservation value σ , then from (2) and the definition of (G, \dots, G) , we know there exists no such profitable deviation. \square

Lemma B.1. *Given a prior H , and a unique distribution G satisfying the conditions (i)–(ii) in Theorem 4.1, for any $\sigma \in [\max\{\sigma_{\text{NI}}, \bar{x}_G\}, \sigma_H)$, let Δ satisfy $\sigma - (\lambda - c) + H(\sigma + \Delta) \cdot \Delta = \int_0^{\sigma + \Delta} H(x) dx$, and let $x^* := x_m$, i.e., the last point where G^{n-1} is strictly convex, a distribution F_σ satisfying following structure is an optimal solution to the program (3)*

1. if $\int_0^{x^*} H(x) dx + (\bar{x}_G - x^*) \cdot H(x^*) + (\sigma - \bar{x}_G) \cdot H(\sigma + \Delta) > \sigma - (\lambda - c)$, then

$$F_\sigma(x) = \begin{cases} H(x), & \forall x \in [0, x^\dagger) \\ H(x^\dagger), & \forall x \in [x^\dagger, \bar{x}_G) \\ H(\sigma + \Delta), & \forall x \in [\bar{x}_G, x^\ddagger) \\ 1, & \forall x \in [x^\ddagger, 1] \end{cases} \quad (7)$$

where $x^\dagger \in [0, x^*)$ satisfies $\int_0^\sigma F_\sigma(x) dx = \sigma - (\lambda - c)$.

2. if $\int_0^{x^*} H(x) dx + (\bar{x}_G - x^*) \cdot H(x^*) + (\sigma - \bar{x}_G) \cdot H(\sigma + \Delta) \leq \sigma - (\lambda - c)$, then

$$F_\sigma(x) = \begin{cases} H(x), & \forall x \in [0, x^*) \\ H(x^*), & \forall x \in [x^*, x') \\ H(\sigma + \Delta), & \forall x \in [x', x^\ddagger) \\ 1, & \forall x \in [x^\ddagger, 1] \end{cases} \quad (8)$$

where $x' \in [x^*, \bar{x}_G]$ satisfies $\int_0^\sigma F_\sigma(x) dx = \sigma - (\lambda - c)$.

Proof of Lemma B.1. We first show the unique existence of Δ such that $\sigma - (\lambda - c) + H(\sigma + \Delta) \cdot \Delta = \int_0^{\sigma + \Delta} H(x) dx$. Fix $\sigma \in [\bar{x}_G, \sigma_H)$, consider a function $f(x) := \sigma - (\lambda - c) + H(\sigma + x) \cdot x - \int_0^{\sigma + x} H(t) dt$. Clearly, $f(\cdot)$ is continuously differentiable and increasing over $[0, 1 - \sigma]$. Note that

$$\begin{aligned} f(\sigma_H - \sigma) &= (\sigma_H - \sigma) \cdot (H(\sigma_H) - 1) \leq 0 \\ f(1 - \sigma) &= \sigma - (\lambda - c) + H(1) \cdot (1 - \sigma) - \int_0^1 H(t) dt = c > 0. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, there must exist a unique $\Delta \in (\sigma_H - \sigma, 1 - \sigma)$ such that $f(\Delta) = 0$. In below, we show the optimality of solution (7) and (8) via constructing a dual solution that satisfies the complementary slackness conditions in Equations (13) and (14). Fix a $\sigma \in [\bar{x}_G, \sigma_H)$, and its corresponding Δ . For notation simplicity, we define $p^\dagger := H(x^\dagger)^{n-1}$ in first case and $p^* := H(x^*)^{n-1}$ in second case, and $p_H := H(\sigma_H)^{n-1}$.

- When $\int_0^{x^*} H(x)dx + (\bar{x}_G - x^*) \cdot H(x^*) + (\sigma - \bar{x}_G) \cdot H(\sigma + \Delta) > \sigma - (\lambda - c)$, in this case, let $\alpha_G := \frac{p_H - p^\dagger}{\bar{x}_G - x^\dagger}$, and consider following dual solution

$$\alpha = -\frac{\alpha_G \cdot (\sigma + \Delta - x^\dagger) + p^\dagger - p_H}{\Delta};$$

$$p(x) = \begin{cases} G(x)^{n-1} - \alpha \cdot (\sigma - x), & \forall x \in [0, x^\dagger) \\ \alpha_p \cdot (x - x^\dagger) + p^\dagger - \alpha \cdot (\sigma - x^\dagger), & \forall x \in [x^\dagger, \sigma + \Delta) \\ p_H, & \forall x \in [\sigma + \Delta, 1] \end{cases}$$

where $\alpha_p := \alpha + \alpha_G$. We now show that the above constructed $p(\cdot)$ is global convex over $[0, 1]$, and $p(\cdot), \alpha$ satisfy the complementary slackness conditions in Equations (13) and (14).

To see the convexity of p , note that for any $x \in [0, x^\dagger]$, $\frac{\partial p(x)}{\partial x} = (G(x)^{n-1})' + \alpha$ is increasing due to the convexity G^{n-1} over $[0, x^\dagger]$. Moreover,

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow (x^\dagger)^-} \frac{\partial p(x)}{\partial x} = (G(x^\dagger)^{n-1})' + \alpha \leq \alpha_p = \alpha + \alpha_G;$$

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow (\sigma + \Delta)^-} \frac{\partial p(x)}{\partial x} = -\frac{\alpha_G \cdot (\sigma - x^\dagger) - (p_H - p^\dagger)}{\Delta} = -(p_H - p^\dagger) \cdot \frac{\frac{\sigma - x^\dagger}{\bar{x}_G - x^\dagger} - 1}{\Delta} \leq 0.$$

To check the continuity of p , note that

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow (x^\dagger)^-} p(x) = G(x^\dagger)^{n-1} - \alpha \cdot (\sigma - x^\dagger) = p^\dagger - \alpha \cdot (\sigma - x^\dagger) = p(x^\dagger);$$

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow (\sigma + \Delta)^-} p(x) = \alpha_p \cdot (\sigma + \Delta - x^\dagger) + p^\dagger - \alpha \cdot (\sigma - x^\dagger)$$

$$= \alpha \cdot \Delta + \alpha_G \cdot (\sigma + \Delta - x^\dagger) + p^\dagger = p_H.$$

Thus, $p(\cdot)$ is convex over $[0, 1]$.

To satisfy the condition (14), note that for $x \in [x^\dagger, \bar{x}_G)$, we have

$$p(x) + \alpha \cdot (\sigma - x) - G(x)^{n-1} = (x - x^\dagger)(\alpha_p - \alpha) - (G(x)^{n-1} - p^\dagger)$$

$$= \alpha_G \cdot (x - x^\dagger) - (G(x)^{n-1} - p^\dagger) \stackrel{(a)}{\geq} 0,$$

$$\Rightarrow p(x) + \alpha \cdot (\sigma - x) \geq G(x)^{n-1},$$

where (a) is from the convexity of G^{n-1} over $[0, \bar{x}_G)$. Note F_σ has non-zero support on \bar{x}_G . For $x \in [\bar{x}_G, \sigma)$, we know

$$p(\bar{x}_G) = p_H - \alpha(\sigma - \bar{x}_G);$$

$$p(x) + \alpha \cdot (\sigma - x) - G(x)^{n-1} = \alpha_G \cdot (x - x^\dagger) - (p_H - p^\dagger) \geq 0$$

$$\Rightarrow p(x) + \alpha \cdot (\sigma - x) \geq p_H.$$

For $x \in [\sigma, \sigma + \Delta]$, we already know $\alpha_p \leq 0$ and $p(\sigma + \Delta) = p_H$, thus we have $p(x) \geq p_H, \forall x \in [\sigma, \sigma + \Delta]$.

Lastly, to satisfy condition (13), as $F_\sigma(x) = H(x), \forall x \in [0, x^\dagger]$, it suffices to ensure

$$\int_{x^\dagger}^1 p(x) dF_\sigma(x) = \int_{x^\dagger}^1 p(x) dH(x) .$$

Now note that

$$\int_{x^\dagger}^1 p(x) dF_\sigma(x) = (H(\sigma + \Delta) - H(x^\dagger)) \cdot p(\bar{x}_G) + (1 - H(\sigma + \Delta)) \cdot p_H . \quad (9)$$

$$\int_{x^\dagger}^1 p(x) dH(x) = p_H - p(x^\dagger) \cdot H(x^\dagger) - \alpha_p \cdot \int_{x^\dagger}^{\sigma + \Delta} H(x) dx . \quad (10)$$

Consider

$$\begin{aligned} & (9) - (10) \\ & \stackrel{(a)}{=} -\alpha_p \cdot \left(H(x^\dagger) \cdot (\bar{x}_G - x^\dagger) + H(\sigma + \Delta) \cdot (\sigma + \Delta - \bar{x}_G) - \int_{x^\dagger}^{\sigma + \Delta} H(x) dx \right) \\ & \stackrel{(b)}{=} -\alpha_p \cdot \left(\sigma - (\lambda - c) + H(\sigma + \Delta)\Delta - \int_0^{\sigma + \Delta} H(x) dx \right) \stackrel{(c)}{=} 0 , \end{aligned}$$

where (a) uses the definition of $p(\cdot)$ over $[x^\dagger, \sigma + \Delta]$, (b) uses the definition of x^\dagger , namely, $\int_0^{x^\dagger} H(x) dx + (\bar{x}_G - x^\dagger)H(x^\dagger) + (\sigma - \bar{x}_G)H(\sigma + \Delta) = \sigma - (\lambda - c)$, and (c) is from the definition of Δ .

Putting all pieces together, we know the above α , and p is a dual solution that satisfies the complementary slackness, leading the optimality of F_σ in (7).

- When $\int_0^{x^*} H(x) dx + (\bar{x}_G - x^*) \cdot H(x^*) + (\sigma - \bar{x}_G) \cdot H(\sigma + \Delta) \leq \sigma - (\lambda - c)$, in this case, let $\alpha_G := \frac{p_H - p^*}{\bar{x}_G - x^*}$, i.e., the slope of the last linear portion of G , and consider following dual solution

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha &= -\frac{\alpha_G \cdot (\sigma + \Delta - x^*) + p^* - p_H}{\Delta} ; \\ p(x) &= \begin{cases} G(x)^{n-1} - \alpha \cdot (\sigma - x), & \forall x \in [0, x^*) \\ \alpha_p \cdot (x - x^*) + p^* - \alpha \cdot (\sigma - x^*), & \forall x \in [x^*, \sigma + \Delta) \\ p_H, & \forall x \in [\sigma + \Delta, 1] \end{cases} \quad (11) \end{aligned}$$

where $\alpha_p := \alpha_G + \alpha$. Follow the analysis in earlier case, one can show that the above constructed p is convex over $[0, 1]$, and α, p satisfy the complementary slackness conditions in (13) and (14), showing that the solution in (8) is an optimal solution.

The proof then completes. \square

Proof of Lemma 4.6. We first prove the optimal structure of F_σ for $\sigma \in [\sigma_{\text{NI}}, \bar{x}_G]$. We begin with analyzing following general problem for any $\sigma \in [\sigma_{\text{NI}}, \sigma_H)$,

$$\max_{F \in \mathcal{H}} \int_0^1 u(x) dF(x) \quad \text{s.t.} \quad \int_0^\sigma F(x) dx = \sigma - (\lambda - c) . \quad (12)$$

The above program has two major constraints, one is $F \in \mathcal{H}$ to account for the feasibility of strategy F , and the other one accounts for $\sigma_F = \sigma$ (recall Lemma D.1). The above optimization problem

is non-trivial as sender i can deviate to any possible strategy $F \in \mathcal{H}(\sigma)$, and this is an infinite-dimensional linear program. Nevertheless, some recent technical developments in the information design literature are useful to our problem. In particular, we use the following result obtained by [Dworczak and Martini \(2019\)](#), which provides a duality theory for optimization problems with MPS constraints. To be more precise, they consider the problem $\max_{F: H \succeq F} \int_0^1 u(x) dF(x)$, and show that if F is the solution to this program, then there must exist a convex function $p(x) : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such

$$\int_0^1 p(x) dF(x) = \int_0^1 p(x) dH(x), \quad (13)$$

and F is also the optimal solution to the program $\max_{\tilde{F} \in \Delta([0,1])} \int_0^1 (u(x) - p(x)) d\tilde{F}(x)$. In our problem, additional to the MPS constraint, we also have a linear constraint that the strategy F has $\sigma_F = \sigma$. Follow the similar analysis, one can deduce that if F_σ is the optimal solution to the program (12), it must also exist a convex function $p(\cdot)$ where (13) holds for F_σ , and there exists $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$F_\sigma \in \arg \max_{\tilde{F} \in \Delta([0,1])} \left\{ \int_0^1 (u(x) - p(x)) d\tilde{F}(x) - \alpha \cdot \left(\sigma \int_0^\sigma d\tilde{F}(x) - \int_0^\sigma x d\tilde{F}(x) - \sigma + (\lambda - c) \right) \right\},$$

where we have used integration by parts in the reservation value constraint. Observe that we can always add a constant to $p(\cdot)$ without changing any of its properties. Thus, by complementary slackness, one must have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{if } x \in [0, \sigma] \wedge x \in \text{supp}[F_\sigma] : & \quad u(x) = p(x) + \alpha \cdot (\sigma - x) \\ \text{if } x \in [0, \sigma] \wedge x \notin \text{supp}[F_\sigma] : & \quad u(x) \leq p(x) + \alpha \cdot (\sigma - x) \\ \text{if } x \in [\sigma, 1] \wedge x \in \text{supp}[F_\sigma] : & \quad u(x) = p(x) \\ \text{if } x \in [\sigma, 1] \wedge x \notin \text{supp}[F_\sigma] : & \quad u(x) \leq p(x). \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

Now to prove the optimal solution defined as in (5), it suffices to show that there exists a convex function $p(\cdot)$ and a value $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ that satisfies the conditions in (13) and (14) with $u(x) = \min \{G(x)^{n-1}, G(\sigma)^{n-1}\}$. We consider

$$\alpha = -\frac{G(\sigma)^{n-1} - G(x^\dagger)^{n-1}}{\sigma - x^\dagger}; \quad p(x) = \begin{cases} G(x)^{n-1} - \alpha \cdot (\sigma - x), & \forall x \in [0, x^\dagger] \\ G(\sigma)^{n-1}, & \forall x \in [x^\dagger, 1] \end{cases}$$

To check the convexity of p , note that $\frac{\partial p(x)}{\partial x} = \frac{\partial G(x)^{n-1}}{\partial x} + \alpha$ is increasing over $[0, x^\dagger]$ since G^{n-1} is convex over $[0, x^\dagger]$. Moreover, $\frac{\partial p(x^\dagger)}{\partial x^\dagger} = (G(x^\dagger)^{n-1})' + \alpha \leq 0$ as G^{n-1} is convex over $[0, \sigma]$, and $\lim_{x \rightarrow (x^\dagger)^-} p(x) = G(\sigma)^{n-1}$. Thus, $p(\cdot)$ is global convex over $[0, 1]$.

To satisfy the condition (14), note for $x \in [x^\dagger, \sigma]$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & p(x) + \alpha \cdot (\sigma - x) - G(x)^{n-1} \\ &= (\sigma - x) \cdot \left(\frac{G(\sigma)^{n-1} - G(x)^{n-1}}{\sigma - x} - \frac{G(\sigma)^{n-1} - G(x^\dagger)^{n-1}}{\sigma - x^\dagger} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we have $p(x) + \alpha \cdot (\sigma - x) \geq G(x)^{n-1}$. Together with $p(x) = G(\sigma)^{n-1}, \forall x \in [\sigma, 1]$, we know that $p(\cdot)$ satisfies the condition (14).

Lastly, to satisfy the condition (13), as $F_\sigma(x) = H(x), \forall x \in [0, x^\dagger]$, it suffices to ensure

$$\int_{x^\dagger}^1 p(x) dF_\sigma(x) = \int_{x^\dagger}^1 p(x) dH(x) ,$$

where the above holds true as they both equal to $G(\sigma)^{n-1} \cdot (1 - H(x^\dagger))$. Thus the constructed p and α satisfy the conditions in (13)–(14), implying the solution in (5) is an optimal solution.

With the above characterized F_σ , we now prove the second part of the above result, i.e., OPT_σ is monotone increasing w.r.t. $\sigma \in [\sigma_{\text{NI}}, \bar{x}_G]$. By definition, we have

$$\text{OPT}_\sigma = \int_0^{x^\dagger} G(x)^{n-1} dH(x) + G(\sigma)^{n-1} \cdot (1 - H(x^\dagger)) . \quad (15)$$

Recall that x^\dagger satisfies $\int_0^{x^\dagger} H(x) dx + (\sigma - x^\dagger) \cdot H(x^\dagger) = \sigma - (\lambda - c)$, thus, $\sigma = \frac{\int_0^{x^\dagger} H(x) dx - x^\dagger H(x^\dagger) + (\lambda - c)}{1 - H(x^\dagger)}$.

Define a function $\sigma(x) := \frac{\int_0^x H(t) dt - x H(x) + (\lambda - c)}{1 - H(x)}$. Now back to (15), we have

$$\text{OPT}_\sigma = \int_0^{x^\dagger} G(x)^{n-1} dH(x) + G(\sigma(x^\dagger))^{n-1} \cdot (1 - H(x^\dagger)) .$$

Consider a function $f(x) := \int_0^x G(t)^{n-1} dH(t) + G(\sigma(x))^{n-1} \cdot (1 - H(x))$. Let $g(\cdot)$ denote the density function of distribution G . Now observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial f(x)}{\partial x} &= G(x)^{n-1} h(x) + (n-1) G(\sigma(x))^{n-2} g(\sigma(x)) \sigma(x)' (1 - H(x)) - G(\sigma(x))^{n-1} h(x) \\ &= h(x) \cdot \left(\left(G(x)^{n-1} - G(\sigma(x))^{n-1} \right) + \frac{\partial G(\sigma(x))^{n-1}}{\partial \sigma(x)} \cdot (\sigma(x) - x) \right) \stackrel{(a)}{\geq} 0 , \end{aligned}$$

where in (a), we use the convexity of G^{n-1} over its support in $[0, \bar{x}_G]$, and $\sigma(x) \geq x, \forall x \in [0, \bar{x}_G]$, and $h(x) \geq 0, \forall x$. This implies that the optimal deviation payoff is increasing w.r.t. x^\dagger , and thus increasing w.r.t. $\sigma \in [\sigma_{\text{NI}}, \bar{x}_G]$. \square

To prove Lemma 4.7, we first show the following monotonicity result.

Claim B.2. *Fix a $\sigma \in (\bar{x}_G, \sigma_H)$ and its corresponding Δ such that $\sigma - (\lambda - c) + H(\sigma + \Delta) \cdot \Delta = \int_0^{\sigma + \Delta} H(x) dx$. When σ increases, the value $\sigma + \Delta$ will decrease.*

Proof of Claim B.2. To prove the above result, consider a function $\nu(\sigma, y) := \sigma - (\lambda - c) + H(y) \cdot (y - \sigma) - \int_0^y H(t) dt$. Clearly $\frac{\partial \nu(\sigma, y)}{\partial \sigma} = 1 - H(y) \geq 0$ and $\frac{\partial \nu(\sigma, y)}{\partial y} = H(y) + h(y)(y - \sigma) - H(y) \geq 0$ for $y \geq \sigma$. Consider σ_1, σ_2 where $\sigma_1 < \sigma_2$, and their corresponding Δ_1, Δ_2 such that $\nu(\sigma_1, \sigma_1 + \Delta_1) = 0$ and $\nu(\sigma_2, \sigma_2 + \Delta_2) = 0$. Then by monotonicity of $\tau(\sigma, \cdot)$ and $\tau(\cdot, y)$, we have

$$\tau(\sigma_2, \sigma_2 + \Delta_2) = 0 = \tau(\sigma_1, \sigma_1 + \Delta_1) \leq \tau(\sigma_2, \sigma_1 + \Delta_1) \Rightarrow \sigma_2 + \Delta_2 \leq \sigma_1 + \Delta_1 .$$

\square

We are now ready to present our proof for Lemma 4.7.

Proof of Lemma 4.7. We consider following possible cases based on the value of $\sigma_{\text{NI}} = \lambda - c$ and \bar{x}_G .

- When $\lambda - c \geq \bar{x}_G$, we know that $\sigma > \bar{x}_G, \forall \sigma \in [\sigma_{\text{NI}}, \sigma_H)$. Thus, for any $\sigma \in [\sigma_{\text{NI}}, \sigma_H)$, the optimal deviation F_σ follows the characterizations in Lemma B.1. Fix a σ and its corresponding Δ where $\sigma - (\lambda - c) + H(\sigma + \Delta) \cdot \Delta = \int_0^{\sigma + \Delta} H(t) dt$.

In first case of Lemma B.1, with structure of F_σ , we can write the payoff of deviating to F_σ as follows:

$$\text{OPT}_\sigma = \int_0^{x^\dagger} G(x)^{n-1} dH(x) + H(\sigma_H)^{n-1} \cdot (1 - H(x^\dagger)) . \quad (16)$$

We will now show that OPT_σ is decreasing w.r.t $\sigma \in [\sigma_{\text{NI}}, \sigma_H)$. Recall that $x' = x^\dagger$ satisfies

$$\int_0^{x^\dagger} H(x) dx + (\bar{x}_G - x^\dagger) H(x^\dagger) + (\sigma - \bar{x}_G) H(\sigma + \Delta) = \sigma - (\lambda - c) .$$

Thus, with the definition of Δ , we have

$$H(\sigma + \Delta) \cdot (\sigma + \Delta - \bar{x}_G) + H(x^\dagger) \cdot (\bar{x}_G - x^\dagger) = \int_{x^\dagger}^{\sigma + \Delta} H(t) dt .$$

Now consider following function $\tau : [\sigma, 1] \times [0, \bar{x}_G] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$

$$\tau(y, x) := H(y) \cdot (y - \bar{x}_G) + H(x) \cdot (\bar{x}_G - x) - \int_x^y H(t) dt .$$

Clearly, we have

$$\frac{\partial \tau(y, x)}{\partial y} = h(y) \cdot (y - \bar{x}_G) \geq 0; \quad \frac{\partial \tau(y, x)}{\partial x} = h(x)(\bar{x}_G - x) \geq 0 .$$

Consider σ_1, σ_2 where $\sigma_1 < \sigma_2$, and their corresponding $\Delta_1, \Delta_2, x_1^\dagger, x_2^\dagger$, such that $\tau(\sigma_1 + \Delta_1, x_1^\dagger) = 0$ and $\tau(\sigma_2 + \Delta_2, x_2^\dagger) = 0$. Then by monotonicity of $\tau(y, \cdot)$ and $\tau(\cdot, x)$, we have

$$\tau(\sigma_2 + \Delta_2, x_2^\dagger) = 0 = \tau(\sigma_1 + \Delta_1, x_1^\dagger) \geq \tau(\sigma_2 + \Delta_2, x_1^\dagger) \Rightarrow x_2^\dagger \geq x_1^\dagger ,$$

where we have used the result in Claim B.2. Thus, we have showed that when σ increases, the value x^\dagger will also increase.

Now back to (16), consider a function $f(x) := \int_0^x G(t)^{n-1} dH(t) + H(\sigma_H)^{n-1} \cdot (1 - H(x))$, then $\forall x \in [0, \bar{x}_G]$,

$$\frac{\partial f(x)}{\partial x} = G(x)^{n-1} h(x) - H(\sigma_H)^{n-1} h(x) = h(x) \cdot (G(x)^{n-1} - H(\sigma_H)^{n-1}) \leq 0 ,$$

implying that $f(x)$ is strictly decreasing w.r.t $x \in [0, \bar{x}_G]$. Consequently, we have showed that the value OPT_σ is decreasing w.r.t σ .

In second case of Lemma B.1, we have

$$\text{OPT}_\sigma = \int_0^{x^*} H(x) dx + (H(\sigma + \Delta) - H(x^*)) \cdot G(x_1)^{n-1} + H(\sigma_H)^{n-1} \cdot (1 - H(\sigma + \Delta)) , \quad (17)$$

where x_1 satisfies that $x_1 = \frac{\int_0^{x^*} H(x)dx - x^*H(x^*) + (\sigma + \Delta)H(\sigma + \Delta) - \int_0^{\sigma + \Delta} H(t)dt}{H(\sigma + \Delta) - H(x^*)}$. Recall that $\Delta \in (\sigma_H - \sigma, 1 - \sigma)$, and $x_1 \in [x^*, \bar{x}_G]$. Define a function $\kappa(x) : [\sigma_H, 1] \rightarrow [x^*, \bar{x}_G]$

$$\kappa(x) := \frac{\int_0^{x^*} H(x)dx - x^*H(x^*) + xH(x) - \int_0^x H(t)dt}{H(x) - H(x^*)}.$$

Now back to (17) and consider following function $f : [\sigma_H, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$:

$$f(x) := \int_0^{x^*} H(t)dt + (H(x) - H(x^*)) \cdot G(\kappa(x))^{n-1} + H(\sigma_H)^{n-1}(1 - H(x)).$$

Observe that

$$\frac{\partial f(x)}{\partial x} = h(x) \cdot \left(G(\kappa(x))^{n-1} - H(\sigma_H)^{n-1} + \frac{\partial G(\kappa(x))^{n-1}}{\partial \kappa(x)} \cdot (x - \kappa(x)) \right) \geq 0. \quad (18)$$

Recall that in Claim B.2, we have showed larger σ will induce smaller $\sigma + \Delta$. Together with (18), we can conclude that the value OPT_σ is decreasing w.r.t σ .

Combined with the earlier analysis for the first case of Lemma B.1, we can conclude that

$$\max_{\sigma: \sigma \in [\sigma_{\text{NI}}, \sigma_H)} \text{OPT}_\sigma = \text{OPT}_{\sigma_{\text{NI}}} = G(\sigma_{\text{NI}})^{n-1} = G(\lambda - c)^{n-1}.$$

Thus, to ensure $\text{OPT}_\sigma \leq 1/n$, it suffices to ensure $G(\lambda - c)^{n-1} \leq 1/n$.

- When $\lambda - c < \bar{x}_G$. Follow the analysis in case (i), for any $\sigma \in [\bar{x}_G, \sigma_H)$, we know

$$\text{OPT}_\sigma \leq \text{OPT}_{\bar{x}_G}.$$

Now consider the deviation F which satisfies $\sigma_F \in [\sigma_{\text{NI}}, \bar{x}_G]$, from the proof for Lemma 4.6, we know

$$\max_{\sigma \in [\sigma_{\text{NI}}, \bar{x}_G]} \text{OPT}_\sigma = \text{OPT}_{\bar{x}_G} = \int_0^{x^\dagger} G(x)^{n-1} dH(x) + H(\sigma_H)^{n-1}(1 - H(x^\dagger)), \quad (19)$$

where x^\dagger satisfies $\int_0^{x^\dagger} H(x)dx + (\bar{x}_G - x^\dagger) \cdot H(x^\dagger) = \bar{x}_G - (\lambda - c)$, i.e., $\int_{x^\dagger}^1 (x - \bar{x}_G)dH(x) = c$. As a result, to ensure $\text{OPT}_\sigma \leq 1/n$, it suffices to ensure (19) $\leq 1/n$. □

Combine the above results, we now prove our main theorem.

Proof of Theorem 4.1. For the “if” direction, it suffices to show that no sender has profitable deviation under the strategy profile (G, \dots, G) where G satisfies conditions (i)–(iii) in Theorem 4.1. Consider following two kinds of deviations: one is deviating to a strategy F where $\sigma_F = \sigma_H$, i.e., $F \in \mathcal{H}(\sigma_H)$, and the other is deviating to a strategy F where $\sigma_F = \sigma < \sigma_H$, i.e., $F \in \mathcal{H}(\sigma)$. From the first part of Lemma 4.3, we know there is no such profitable deviation to a strategy $F \in \mathcal{H}(\sigma_H)$. From Lemma 4.5 and Lemma 4.6, we know there is no such profitable deviation to a strategy $F \in \mathcal{H}(\sigma), \forall \sigma < \sigma_H$. Thus, (G, \dots, G) must be an equilibrium. For the “only if” direction, Lemma 4.2 proves the condition (i). The condition (ii) follows from the second part of Lemma 4.3. The conditions (iii) follows from the definition of equilibrium. Namely, it is not profitable to deviate to a strategy that has the reservation value $\max\{\sigma_{\text{NI}}, \bar{x}_G\}$, thus the optimal deviation value is no larger than $1/n$, with Lemma 4.6, this is exactly the statement of the condition (iii). □

C Missing proofs of Section 5.1

Proof of Corollary 5.1. When H^{n-1} is convex over $[0, \sigma_H]$, it is easy to see that the unique distribution G that meets conditions (i)–(ii) in Theorem 4.1 must satisfy that $G(x) = H(x), \forall x \in [0, \sigma_H]$. We now show how the condition (iii) always holds when H^{n-1} is convex over $[0, \sigma_H]$. In this case, we know $\bar{x}_G = \sigma_H$, and $\sigma_{\text{NI}} = \lambda - c < \sigma_H = \bar{x}_G$, thus, it suffices to show the case (b) in condition (iii) holds. Clearly, when $\bar{x}_G = \sigma_H$, we have $x^\dagger = \bar{x}_G$, and

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_0^{x^\dagger} G(x)^{n-1} dH(x) + H(\sigma_H)^{n-1}(1 - H(x^\dagger)) \\ &= \frac{1}{n} \cdot H(\sigma_H)^n + H(\sigma_H)^{n-1}(1 - H(\sigma_H)) \leq \frac{1}{n}, \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality always holds by algebra for any $n \geq 2$. Thus, G , i.e., the essentially full information disclosure, is the equilibrium strategy. \square

Proof of Corollary 5.2. Consider the second-order derivative of function H^{n-1} :

$$\frac{\partial^2 H^{n-1}(x)}{\partial x^2} = (n-1)H^{n-3}(x) \left((n-2)h(x)^2 + H(x)h'(x) \right)$$

where $h(x), h'(x)$ are the first-order, second-order derivative of the prior H , respectively. As we can see, when n is large enough, one can ensure that the right-hand side of the above equality is always larger than 0, which guarantees the convexity of the function H^{n-1} . \square

Proof of Corollary 5.4. Recall that from Corollary 5.7, we know under essentially full information equilibrium, we have $u^A(G, \dots, G) = \sigma_H - \int_0^{\sigma_H} H(x)^n dx$. Consider function $f(x, n) := x - \int_0^x H(t)^n dt$. Clearly, we have $\frac{\partial f(x, n)}{\partial x} = 1 - H(x)^n > 0$. Thus, agent's payoff under essentially full information equilibrium is strictly increasing w.r.t. σ_H . This implies that agent's payoff is decreasing w.r.t. the cost. On the other hand, when n increases, we have H^n is more convex and the integral $\int_0^x H(t)^n dt$ is smaller, implying that agent's payoff is increasing. \square

Proof of Corollary 5.5. When H^{n-1} is concave over $[0, \sigma_H]$, it is easy to see that the unique distribution G that meets condition (i)–(ii), must be that G^{n-1} is linear over $[0, \bar{x}_G]$, and G has no support over $[\bar{x}_G, \sigma_H]$. If $\lambda - c \geq \bar{x}_G$, then G is equilibrium strategy if and only if $G(\lambda - c)^{n-1} \leq 1/n$. If $\lambda - c < \bar{x}_G$, we now show that the case (b) in condition (iii) is equivalent to ensure $G(\lambda - c)^{n-1} \leq 1/n$. To see this, let $k := \frac{H(\sigma_H)^{n-1}}{\bar{x}_G}$ denote the slope of the linear portion of G^{n-1} . Then, for x^\dagger satisfying $\int_{x^\dagger}^1 (x - \bar{x}_G) dH(x) = c$, i.e., $\int_0^{x^\dagger} H(x) dx + (\bar{x}_G - x^\dagger)H(x^\dagger) = \bar{x}_G - (\lambda - c)$, note that

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_0^{x^\dagger} G(x)^{n-1} dH(x) + H(\sigma_H)^{n-1}(1 - H(x^\dagger)) \\ &= G(x^\dagger)^{n-1}H(x^\dagger) - k \int_0^{x^\dagger} H(x) dx + H(\sigma_H)^{n-1}(1 - H(x^\dagger)) \\ &= k \cdot (\lambda - c) = G(\lambda - c)^{n-1}, \end{aligned}$$

where we have used the linearity of G^{n-1} over $[0, \bar{x}_G]$. Thus, combining above two cases, to guarantee G is the equilibrium strategy, it suffices to ensure $G(\lambda - c)^{n-1} \leq 1/n$. \square

D Missing proofs of Section 5.2

Proof of Corollary 5.7. Recall that from Theorem 5.6, we know

$$u^A(H_1, \dots, H_n) = \max_{G'_i: H_i \geq G'_i, \forall i} u^A(G'_1, \dots, G'_n). \quad (20)$$

Let us fix all boxes' strategies $G'_{-i} = (G'_j)_{j \in [n] \setminus \{i\}}$. Note that from Lemma D.3,

$$\mathbb{E}_{G'_1, \dots, G'_n} \left[\max_i \kappa_{G'_i} \right] = \mathbb{E}_{G'_{-i}} \left[\mathbb{E}_{G'_i} \left[\max \left\{ \kappa_{G'_i}, \kappa_{G'_{-i}} \right\} \right] \right],$$

where $\kappa_{G'_{-i}} := \{\kappa_{G'_1}, \dots, \kappa_{G'_{i-1}}, \kappa_{G'_{i+1}}, \dots, \kappa_{G'_n}\}$. For every possible $\kappa_{G'_{-i}} = b$, we have $\mathbb{E}_{x \sim G'_i} \left[\max \left\{ \kappa_{G'_i}, b \right\} \right] = \mathbb{E}_{x \sim G'_i} \left[\max \left\{ \min \{x_i, \sigma_{G'_i}\}, b \right\} \right]$. Notice that when $b \leq \sigma_{G'_i}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{x \sim G'_i} \left[\max \left\{ \min \{x_i, \sigma_{G'_i}\}, b \right\} \right] &= \int_{\sigma_{G'_i}}^1 \sigma_{G'_i} dG'_i(x) + \int_b^{\sigma_{G'_i}} b dG'_i(x) + \int_0^b x dG'_i(x) \\ &= \sigma_{G'_i} (1 - G'_i(\sigma_{G'_i})) + b G'_i(\sigma_{G'_i}) - \int_0^b G'_i(x) dx. \end{aligned}$$

When $b > \sigma_{G'_i}$, we have

$$\mathbb{E}_{x \sim G'_i} \left[\max \left\{ \min \{x_i, \sigma_{G'_i}\}, b \right\} \right] = b.$$

Recall that under essentially full information strategy G_i for box i , we have $\sigma_{G_i} = \sigma_{H_i}$, $G_i(\sigma_{G_i}) = H_i(\sigma_{H_i})$, and $G_i(x) = H_i(x)$, $\forall x \in [0, \sigma_{H_i}]$. Thus, for any b , we have

$$\mathbb{E}_{x \sim G_i} \left[\max \left\{ \min \{x_i, \sigma_{G_i}\}, b \right\} \right] = \mathbb{E}_{x \sim H_i} \left[\max \left\{ \min \{x_i, \sigma_{H_i}\}, b \right\} \right], \quad (21)$$

which gives us for any G'_{-i} , we have $\mathbb{E}_{G_i, G'_{-i}} \left[\max \left\{ \kappa_{G_i}, \kappa_{G'_{-i}} \right\} \right] = \mathbb{E}_{H_i, G'_{-i}} \left[\max \left\{ \kappa_{H_i}, \kappa_{G'_{-i}} \right\} \right]$, implying $u^A(G_i, G'_{-i}) = u^A(H_i, G'_{-i})$. Similarly arguments can be carried over to all boxes' strategies. Thus, for an essentially full information strategy profile G_1, \dots, G_n , we have $u^A(G_1, \dots, G_n) = u^A(H_1, \dots, H_n)$.

When $H \equiv H_i, \forall i \in [n]$, from Lemma D.3, we know

$$\begin{aligned} u^A(H, \dots, H) &= \mathbb{E}_{x_i \sim H, \forall i} \left[\max \left\{ \min \{x_1, \sigma_H\}, \dots, \min \{x_n, \sigma_H\} \right\} \right] \\ &= \sigma_H \cdot (1 - H(\sigma_H)^n) + \int_0^{\sigma_H} x dH(x)^n = \sigma_H - \int_0^{\sigma_H} H(x)^n dx. \end{aligned}$$

For an essentially full information disclosure strategy G , we have $G(x) = H(x)$, $\forall x \in [0, \sigma_H]$. Thus,

$$u^A(G, \dots, G) = \sigma_H - \int_0^{\sigma_H} G(x)^n dx \stackrel{(a)}{=} \sigma_H - \int_0^{\sigma_H} H(x)^n dx = u^A(H, \dots, H), \quad (22)$$

where (a) is from the definition of strategy G . \square

Proof of Proposition 5.8. When inspection cost $c = 0$, we have the reservation values $\sigma_G = \sigma_{G'} = +\infty$. Below we prove the result for cost $c > 0$. From Lemma D.1, we know

$$\sigma_{G'} - \sigma_G \stackrel{(a)}{=} \int_{\sigma_G}^1 G(x)dx - \int_{\sigma_{G'}}^1 G'(x)dx \stackrel{(b)}{\geq} \int_{\sigma_G}^1 G(x)dx - \int_{\sigma_{G'}}^1 G(x)dx ,$$

where equality (a) is due to the definition $G' \succeq G$ which implies that $\mathbb{E}_{x \sim G'}[x] = \mathbb{E}_{x \sim G}[x]$, inequality (b) is due to Definition 3.2. Now suppose $\sigma_{G'} < \sigma_G$,

$$\sigma_G - \sigma_{G'} \leq \int_{\sigma_{G'}}^{\sigma_G} G(x)dx \stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \sigma_G - \sigma_{G'} ,$$

where inequality (a) holds only when $G(x) = 1, \forall x \in [\sigma_{G'}, \sigma_G]$. However we note that it cannot be $G(\sigma_{G'}) = 1$ when $\sigma_{G'} < \sigma_G$. Suppose $G(\sigma_{G'}) = 1$ when $\sigma_{G'} < \sigma_G$, then we have $G(\sigma_G) = 1$ and $\mathbb{E}_{x \sim G}[(x - \sigma_G)_+] = 0 \neq c$. As a result, when $G(\sigma_{G'}) < 1$, we have $\sigma_G - \sigma_{G'} \leq \int_{\sigma_{G'}}^{\sigma_G} G(x)dx < \sigma_G - \sigma_{G'}$, which contradicts itself. Thus, we must have $\sigma_{G'} \geq \sigma_G$. \square

Proof of Corollary 5.9. The condition for $\sigma_G = \lambda_i - c_i$ is straightforward from Lemma D.1. We next prove the condition for $\sigma_G = \sigma_{H_i}$. For the “if” direction, note that from the definition of $H_i \succeq_{[0, \sigma_{H_i}]} G$, we know $W(\sigma_{H_i}) = 0$, i.e., $\int_0^{\sigma_{H_i}} H_i(x) = \int_0^{\sigma_{H_i}} G(x)$, thus $\int_0^{\sigma_{H_i}} G(x) = \sigma_{H_i} - (\lambda_i - c_i)$. From Lemma D.1, we then know $\sigma_G = \sigma_{H_i}$. For the “only if” direction, from $\sigma_G = \sigma_{H_i}$, we know $\int_0^{\sigma_{H_i}} G(x) = \sigma_{H_i} - (\lambda_i - c_i)$, thus $\int_0^{\sigma_{H_i}} G(x)dx = \int_0^{\sigma_{H_i}} H_i(x)dx$, implying $W(\sigma_{H_i}) = 0$. As $H_i \succeq G$, we know $W(y) \geq 0, \forall y \in [0, \sigma_{H_i}]$. Thus, $H_i \succeq_{[0, \sigma_{H_i}]} G$. \square

Lemma D.1. *For any G with mean λ and for any $c \geq 0$, $\sigma_G = \sigma$ if and only if $\int_0^\sigma G(x)dx = \sigma - (\lambda - c)$.*

Proof of Lemma D.1. By definition, we have

$$c = \mathbb{E}_{x \sim G}[\max\{x - \sigma_G, 0\}] = \int_{\sigma_G}^1 (x - \sigma_G)dG(x) = \lambda + \int_0^{\sigma_G} G(x)dx - \sigma_G ,$$

where we have used the fact $\int x dG(x) = \lambda$ and integral by parts. Rearranging the terms gives us the result. \square

Lemma D.2. *For any H , a strategy $G : H \succeq G$ satisfying $\sigma_G = \sigma_H$ must have $G(\sigma_H) = H(\sigma_H)$.*

Proof of Lemma D.2. Recall that if G satisfies $\sigma_G = \sigma_H$, from Lemma D.1, we have $\int_0^{\sigma_H} G(x)dx = \sigma_H - (\lambda - c) = \int_0^{\sigma_H} H(x)dx$. We now consider following two possible cases:

- Suppose that $G(\sigma_H) > H(\sigma_H)$, as H is continuous over $[0, 1]$, and G is nondecreasing, then there exists $x' > \sigma_H$ such that $G(x) > H(x), \forall x \in (\sigma_H, x')$, then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^{x'} G(x)dx &= \int_0^{\sigma_H} G(x)dx + \int_{\sigma_H}^{x'} G(x)dx > \int_0^{\sigma_H} H(x)dx + \int_{\sigma_H}^{x'} H(x)dx \\ &= \int_0^{x'} H(x)dx , \end{aligned}$$

which violates the definition of $H \succeq G$.

- Suppose that $G(\sigma_H) < H(\sigma_H)$, as H is continuous over $[0, 1]$, and G is nondecreasing, then there exists $x' < \sigma_H$ such that $H(x) > G(x), \forall x \in (x', \sigma_H)$, then consider

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^{\sigma_H} H(x)dx &= \int_0^{x'} H(x)dx + \int_{x'}^{\sigma_H} H(x)dx > \int_0^{x'} G(x)dx + \int_{x'}^{\sigma_H} G(x)dx \\ &= \int_0^{\sigma_H} G(x)dx , \end{aligned}$$

which violates the condition that $\sigma_G = \sigma_H$.

□

Proof of Theorem 5.6. To prove Theorem 5.6, we use the following result which characterizes the best payoff that any central planner can possibly hope to achieve. Fix a strategy G and its corresponding σ_G , define following *capped value*:

$$\kappa_G := \min\{x, \sigma_G\}, \quad x \sim G .$$

Given a strategy profile (G_1, \dots, G_n) , the below lemma shows that the optimal agent's payoff is the highest capped value among senders.

Lemma D.3 (Kleinberg et al. (2016)). *The procedure defined in Theorem 3.1 can achieve the agent's optimal expected payoff $\mathbb{E}[\max_i \kappa_{G_i}]$, i.e., the highest expected capped value he obtains.*

Recall that $u^A(G_i, G_{-i})$ denote the agent's expected payoff when the agent is using the *optimal* inspection strategy, i.e., $u^A(G_i, G_{-i}) = \mathbb{E}_{G_1, \dots, G_n}[\max_i \kappa_{G_i}]$.

We are now ready to prove Theorem 5.6. We first observe that for any strategy G such that $\mathbb{E}_{x \sim G}[x] = \lambda$, we have $\mathbb{E}_G[\kappa_G] = \lambda - c$. To see this, note that

$$\mathbb{E}_G[\kappa_G] = \int_0^{\sigma_G} x dG(x) + \sigma_G \int_{\sigma_G}^1 dG(x) = \lambda - c .$$

Given a strategy profile (G_i, G_{-i}) , from Lemma D.3, the agent's optimal expected payoff is the expectation of the maximum of n independent random variables $\{\kappa_{G_i}\}_{i \in [n]}$ where each random variable κ_{G_i} has the mean $\lambda_i - c_i$. Let $\kappa_{G_{-i}} := \{\kappa_{G_1}, \dots, \kappa_{G_{i-1}}, \kappa_{G_{i+1}}, \dots, \kappa_{G_n}\}$. Now observe that,

$$\mathbb{E}_{G_1, \dots, G_n} \left[\max_i \kappa_{G_i} \right] = \mathbb{E}_{G_{-i}} \left[\mathbb{E}_{G_i} \left[\max \{ \kappa_{G_i}, \kappa_{G_{-i}} \} \right] \right] .$$

We first prove the “only if” direction. Below, we first show that for all possible $\kappa_{G_{-i}} = b$, the following holds

$$\mathbb{E}_{G'_i}[\max \{ \kappa_{G_i}, b \}] \geq \mathbb{E}_{G_i}[\max \{ \kappa_{G_i}, b \}] . \quad (23)$$

Recall that from Proposition 5.8, we have $\sigma_{G'_i} \geq \sigma_{G_i}$. We now consider the following two cases:

- When $b \geq \sigma_{G_i}$, we have $\mathbb{E}_{G_i}[\max \{ \kappa_{G_i}, b \}] = b$, and $\mathbb{E}_{G'_i}[\max \{ \kappa_{G_i}, b \}] \geq b$, thus (23) holds true.

- When $b < \sigma_{G_i}$, in this case, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}_{G_i}[\max\{\kappa_{G_i}, b\}] &= \int_0^b bdG(x) + \int_b^1 \max\{\kappa_{G_i}, b\}dG_i(x) \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{=} bG(b) + \lambda_i - c_i - \int_0^b xdG_i(x) \stackrel{(b)}{=} \lambda_i - c_i + \int_0^b G_i(x)dx ,\end{aligned}$$

where equality (a) uses the earlier observation $\mathbb{E}_{G_i}[\kappa_{G_i}] = \lambda_i - c_i$, and equality (b) uses integration by parts. Recall that G'_i is an MPS of G_i , we have $\int_0^b G_i(x)dx \leq \int_0^b G'_i(x)dx, \forall b$. As a result, we conclude that $\mathbb{E}_{G_i}[\max\{\kappa_{G_i}, b\}] \leq \mathbb{E}_{G'_i}[\max\{\kappa_{G_i}, b\}]$.

Putting all pieces together, (23) holds for any $b \in [0, 1]$, which completes the proof for the “only if” direction.

We now prove the “if” direction. Recall that from Lemma D.3, $u^A(G'_i, G_{-i}) \geq u^A(G_i, G_{-i})$ is equivalent to $\mathbb{E}_{G_{-i}}[\mathbb{E}_{G'_i}[\max\{\kappa_{G'_i}, \kappa_{G_{-i}}\}]] \geq \mathbb{E}_{G_{-i}}[\mathbb{E}_{G_i}[\max\{\kappa_{G_i}, \kappa_{G_{-i}}\}]]$. Now consider a no information strategy G_j for every box j where $j \neq i$. Then we have $\kappa_{G_j} = \lambda_j - c_j$. We now choose the mean $\lambda_j = \mathbb{E}_{x \sim G_j}[x]$ and the cost c_j for each box j such that $b \equiv \lambda_j - c_j, \forall j \in [n] \setminus \{i\}$ for some $b \in [0, 1]$. Notice that we can vary $\lambda_j, c_j, \forall j \in [n] \setminus \{i\}$ to ensure that b can take any value between 0 and 1. Then $\mathbb{E}_{G_{-i}}[\mathbb{E}_{G'_i}[\max\{\kappa_{G'_i}, \kappa_{G_{-i}}\}]] \geq \mathbb{E}_{G_{-i}}[\mathbb{E}_{G_i}[\max\{\kappa_{G_i}, \kappa_{G_{-i}}\}]]$ for all G_{-i} and all cost $(c_i)_{i \in [n]}$ implies that the following holds

$$\mathbb{E}_{G'_i}[\max\{\kappa_{G'_i}, b\}] \geq \mathbb{E}_{G_i}[\max\{\kappa_{G_i}, b\}], \quad \forall b \in [0, 1]. \quad (24)$$

Suppose the mean $\mathbb{E}_{x \sim G_i}[x] = \mathbb{E}_{x \sim G'_i}[x] = \lambda_i$, consider a cost c_i for box i satisfying $c_i = \lambda_i$, then we have the reservation value for box i satisfying $\sigma_{G_i} = 0$. Thus, $\mathbb{E}_{x \sim G_i}[\max\{\kappa_{G_i}, b\}] = \mathbb{E}_{x \sim G_i}[\max\{x, b\}] = \lambda_i + \int_0^b G_i(x)dx$. Similarly, we also have $\mathbb{E}_{G'_i}[\max\{\kappa_{G'_i}, b\}] = \lambda_i + \int_0^b G'_i(x)dx$. Thus, From inequality (24), we have

$$\int_0^b G'_i(x)dx \geq \int_0^b G_i(x)dx, \quad \forall b \in [0, 1].$$

Recall the fact that both G_i, G'_i has the same mean λ_i , this implies that $\int_0^1 G'_i(x)dx = \int_0^1 G_i(x)dx$. Namely, the above inequality holds as equality for $b = 1$. Then from Definition 3.2, we conclude that distribution G'_i is an MPS of distribution G_i . \square