Never Say Never: Optimal Exclusion and Reserve Prices with Expectations-Based Loss-Averse Buyers^{*}

Benjamin $Balzer^{\dagger}$

Antonio Rosato[‡]

June 16, 2023

Abstract

We study reserve prices in auctions with independent private values when bidders are expectationsbased loss averse. We find that the optimal public reserve price excludes fewer bidder types than under risk neutrality. Moreover, we show that public reserve prices are not optimal as the seller can earn a higher revenue with mechanisms that better leverage the "attachment effect". We discuss two such mechanisms: i) an auction with a secrete and random reserve price, and ii) a two-stage mechanism where an auction with a public reserve price is followed by a negotiation if the reserve price is not met. Both of these mechanisms expose more bidders to the attachment effect, thereby increasing bids and ultimately revenue.

JEL classification: D44, D81, D82.

Keywords: Reference-Dependent Preferences; Loss Aversion; Reserve Price; First-Price Auction; Second-Price Auction; Personal Equilibrium.

^{*}For helpful comments, we thank Zachary Breig, Jeff Ely, Leslie Marx and audiences at the 2021 Australasian Economic Theory Workshop at the University of Sydney, UTS, the 2021 INFORMS Annual Meeting in Anaheim, the 12th Conference on Economic Design in Padova, the 2022 Asia-Pacific Industrial Organization Conference in Sydney, and the 2023 Workshop on Preferences and Bounded Rationality at the BSE Summer Forum. We are also grateful to Andrew Barr, Gladys Berejiklian and, especially, Scott Morrison for the extended lockdowns that vastly improved our productivity. Rosato gratefully acknowledges financial support from the Australian Research Council (ARC) through the ARC Discovery Early Career Researcher Award DE180100190.

[†]UTS Business School, University of Technology Sydney (Benjamin.Balzer@uts.edu.au).

[‡]University of Queensland, Università di Napoli Federico II and CSEF (a.rosato@uq.edu.au).

1 Introduction

Reserve prices are a prevalent tool auctioneers use to raise their expected revenue. A reserve price acts as an additional bid placed by the auctioneer since, in order to win, a buyer must also outbid the reserve. Thus, a reserve price increases the competitiveness of an auction. Yet, this comes at a cost for the auctioneer because trade does not happen if no buyer bids at least the reserve price. Indeed, a reserve price excludes buyers with relatively low valuations from the auction and reduces the overall probability of trade. Seminal theoretical contributions by Myerson (1981) and Riley and Samuelson (1981) have characterized the revenue-maximizing reserve price as the solution to this trade-off between decreasing the probability of trade and amplifying competitive pressure. In particular, they show that with risk-neutral bidders having independent private values, the optimal reserve price coincides with the classical monopoly price; hence, it is (i) deterministic and public, (ii) always higher than the seller's own value, and (iii) under mild conditions on the distribution of bidders' values, independent of the number of bidders.

However, these features are not always empirically observed. For instance, in real-world auctions sellers often use secret reserve prices. A prime example is that of real-estate auctions in the Australian state of Queensland, where prospective buyers are allowed to know whether the seller set a reserve price, but not its exact value.¹ Moreover, some studies show that empirical reserve prices are often significantly lower than what the classical models predict; see Paarsch (1997) and Haile and Tamer (2003). There is also evidence of reserve prices that vary with the number of bidders and auctions with no reserve price at all; see Davis et al. (2011) and Gonçalves (2013). Overall, this evidence suggests that sellers may face additional trade-offs not captured by the classical risk-neutral and/or risk-averse model.²

In this paper, we analyze reserve prices in first-price auctions (FPA) and second-price auctions (SPA) where symmetric bidders have independent private values (IPV) and are expectationsbased loss averse á la Kőszegi and Rabin (2006, 2007, 2009). We derive the revenue-maximizing reserve price for each format and highlight how loss aversion modifies the seller's trade-off between increasing competitive pressure and reducing the probability of trade. In particular, we show that loss aversion can rationalize reserve prices that (i) are secret, (ii) vary with the number of bidders, and (iii) are lower than what the theory predicts for risk-neutral and risk-averse bidders.

Section 2 introduces the auction environment and bidders' preferences, and describes the solution concept. Following Kőszegi and Rabin (2006), we posit that, in addition to classical material utility, a bidder also experiences "gain-loss utility" when comparing her material outcomes to a reference point equal to her expectations regarding those same outcomes, with losses being more

¹Secret reserve prices are also documented by Elyakime et al. (1994) and Li and Perrigne (2003) in timber auctions, and by Bajari and Hortaçsu (2004) and Hasker and Sickles (2010) in internet auctions.

²With private values, Hu et al. (2010) show that risk aversion can explain low reserve prices in the FPA but not in the SPA; if in addition bidders have interdependent values, Hu et al. (2019) show that risk aversion can explain low reserve prices also in the SPA.

painful than equal-size gains are pleasant.

We apply the solution concept of "unacclimating personal equilibrium" (UPE) introduced by Kőszegi and Rabin (2007). According to this concept, bidders choose the strategy that maximizes their payoff keeping expectations fixed, and the distribution of outcomes so generated must coincide with the expectations; hence, when deviating from her equilibrium bid, a bidder holds her reference point fixed.³ As there might be multiple UPEs, we assume bidders select their preferred personal equilibrium (PPE) — the one that maximizes their utility from an ex-ante perspective.

We begin our analysis in Section 3 by deriving the revenue-maximizing public reserve price in the FPA.⁴ First, we show that the "attachment effect" (Kőszegi and Rabin, 2006) is the main driving force behind the bidding behavior of loss-averse buyers. In particular, the higher the probability with which a bidder, in equilibrium, expects to win the auction, the bigger the loss she endures if she ends up losing it. Hence, a bidder has an incentive to increase her bid, so as to win more often and avoid experiencing the loss. Thus, the attachment effect induces an upward pressure on the equilibrium bidding strategy, ensuring that a bidder's cost from an upward deviation is higher than the benefit. Importantly, the attachment effect only affects the incentives of a bidder who expects to win the auction with strictly positive probability — however small and is thus exposed to potential losses in equilibrium; yet, it does not affect those bidders who abstain from the auction since they do not incur a loss when not winning it.

The fact that bidders who do not expect to win are not exposed to the attachment effect has several implications for the characterization of the revenue-maximizing public reserve price. First, it puts downward pressure on the optimal reserve price. Indeed, by increasing the reserve price, the seller excludes a larger set of bidder types from the auction. As a bidder's attachment increases in her type, the higher the marginally excluded type, the larger the attachment effect that the seller forgoes. Thus, with expectations-based loss aversion, increasing the reserve price is more costly for the seller compared to a situation where the attachment effect is not present; e.g., with risk-neutral bidders. This finding is especially relevant for those empirical studies that first estimate the distribution of bidders' values and then use the theoretical insights of Myerson (1981) and Riley and Samuelson (1981) to estimate the revenue-maximizing reserve price as the minimum bid that excludes all bidders with a "virtual value" lower than the seller's value. For instance, Paarsch (1997) and Haile and Tamer (2003) find that sellers exclude fewer types than their estimation predicts as revenue maximizing. Yet, as our first result implies, it is theoretically optimal to include in the auction bidders with virtual values lower than the seller's own value because of the attachment effect. While risk aversion can rationalize such low reserve prices in the FPA (see Hu et al., 2010), it cannot explain it for the SPA.⁵

³For other applications of UPE see, for instance, Heidhues and Kőszegi (2008, 2014) Karle and Peitz (2014, 2017), Karle and Möller (2020), Karle and Schumacher (2017) and Rosato (2016).

⁴As shown by Balzer and Rosato (2021), under UPE the FPA and SPA are revenue equivalent; therefore, our results on the reserve price for the FPA carry over to the SPA.

⁵However, beyond risk aversion, several different explanations for low reserve prices in both the SPA and FPA

Furthermore, the optimal public reserve price varies with the number of bidders. Indeed, the more bidders are present, the less optimistic each of them is about her chances of winning, which reduces their attachment. Yet, this does not imply that the reserve price always increases in the number of bidders. Indeed, when raising the reserve price, the seller forgoes the attachment effect of the marginal type. However, with already many bidders participating, adding an extra one reduces this cost, leading to more exclusion.⁶ With risk aversion, instead, the optimal reserve price (in the FPA) is decreasing in the number of bidders; see Vasserman and Watt (2021).

The fact that the attachment effect does not operate on those bidders excluded by a public reserve price suggests that a seller could raise an even higher revenue by exposing more bidders to this effect. In Section 4 we show that this intuition is correct. In particular, we characterize two tactics whereby a seller can expose almost all bidders to the attachment effect, resulting in a strictly larger revenue than an auction with a public reserve price.

In Subsection 4.1 we show that secret and random reserve prices are revenue superior to public and deterministic ones. To see why, notice that with a secret reserve price each bidder type expects to win the auction with strictly positive — albeit potentially arbitrarily small — probability. In such an auction, therefore, every bidder is exposed to potential losses and thus has an incentive to bid more aggressively in order to avoid them. Hence, by transforming the public reserve price into a secret one, the seller can ensure that every bidder experiences the attachment effect, which enhances revenue. By doing so, however, the seller also reduces the competitive pressure on the buyers' side, which could potentially harm revenue since those low-type bidders excluded under a public reserve would be participating now. Yet, the seller can choose a distribution for the (secret) reserve price that puts large probability mass on relatively high prices and arbitrarily small mass on low ones. Such a distribution ensures that, while the seller exposes every bidder to the attachment effect, the competitive pressure is almost the same as under a public reserve price.

Thus, expectations-based loss aversion provides a novel rationale for secret *and* random reserve prices.⁷ This result is reminiscent of those in Heidhues and Kőszegi (2014) and Hancart (2022), who characterize the optimal pricing strategy for a monopolist selling to an expectations-based loss-averse buyer. In line with the findings of Azevedo and Gottlieb (2012), who showed that risk-neutral sellers benefit from offering gambles to consumers exhibiting prospect-theory preferences, these papers find that the monopolist benefits from using random prices. In particular, Heidhues and Kőszegi (2014) show that if the seller has sufficient commitment power, a stochastic pricing

have been proposed. These include correlated types (Levin and Smith, 1996), interdependent values (Quint, 2017; Hu et al., 2019), endogenous entry (McAfee, 1993; Levin and Smith, 1994; Peters and Severinov, 1997), bidders' selection neglect when sellers are privately informed about the quality of the objects they sell (Jehiel and Lamy, 2015), level-k bidders (Crawford et al., 2009) and taste projection (Gagnon-Bartsch et al., 2021).

⁶Menicucci (2021) obtains a similar result in the classical IPV risk-neutral model when the bidders' virtual values are not monotone; in contrast, our result holds also for the regular case of increasing virtual values.

⁷An indirect way of implementing a secret and random reserve price is via "shill bidding", a prominent albeit often illegal practice in real-world auctions whereby a dummy buyer submits pre-specified bids on behalf of the seller; see Ashenfelter (1989).

scheme featuring low, variable sale prices and a high, sticky regular price yields more revenue than posting a single price. Our secret and random reserve price scheme has similar features, but differs from their characterization since we consider an environment with multiple, privately-informed buyers. Nonetheless, we are able to draw a connection between the optimal reserve price and the optimal monopoly pricing scheme with expectations-based loss-averse buyers that is analogous to the well-known one for risk-neutral buyers.

In Subsection 4.2 we show that the seller can achieve a higher revenue than what is achievable with a public reserve price by employing a simple two-stage mechanism. In this mechanism, the seller first runs an auction with a public reserve price; then, if the reserve price is not met, with some probability, the seller posts a price that would be accepted by those bidders whose types are below the marginally excluded one. In this way, the seller exposes also the bidder type marginally excluded from the initial auction to the attachment effect; this, in turn, pushes the marginal type to bid more aggressively, thereby increasing the overall revenue.

Section 5 concludes the paper by summarizing the results of our model and discussing some further implications. All proofs are relegated to Appendix A.

2 The Model

In this section, we introduce the auction environment and bidders' preferences, and provide a formal definition of our solution concept (UPE) in the context of sealed-bid auctions.

2.1 Environment

A seller auctions off an item to $N \ge 2$ bidders via a sealed-bid auction. Each bidder $i \in \{1, 2, ..., N\}$ has a private value t_i independently drawn from the support $[\underline{t}, \overline{t}]$, with $\overline{t} > \underline{t} = 0$, according to the same cumulative distribution function F.⁸ We assume that F is continuously differentiable, with strictly positive density f on its support. Further, we impose the standard assumption that F has a monotone hazard rate; i.e., $\frac{f(x)}{1-F(x)}$ is increasing for all $x \in [\underline{t}, \overline{t}]$. This, in turn, implies that bidders' "virtual values" are increasing; i.e., $V(t_i) \equiv t_i - \frac{1-F(t_i)}{f(t_i)}$ is increasing in t_i . The seller has a commonly-known value $t^S \in [0, \overline{t})$.

We consider two canonical selling mechanisms: the first-price sealed-bid auction (FPA) and the second-price sealed-bid auction (SPA). We restrict attention to symmetric equilibria in increasing strategies; in such equilibria, the bidder with the highest type wins the auction, conditional on placing a bid above the reserve price.⁹ Let F_1 denote the cumulative distribution function of the highest order statistic among N - 1 draws, and denote by f_1 its corresponding density. Finally,

⁸We normalize $\underline{t} = 0$ to simplify the exposition. Moreover, under this assumption, a seller facing risk-neutral bidders would always choose a non-trivial reserve price; i.e., there are no corner solutions.

⁹Throughout the paper, we restrict attention to symmetric (i.e., non discriminatory) auction mechanisms; for a recent analysis of asymmetric auctions with expectations-based loss-averse bidders, see Muramoto and Sogo (2022).

let r_{RN} denote the revenue-maximizing reserve price with risk-neutral bidders, and notice that $r_{RN} > 0$ since $\underline{t} = 0$.

2.2 Bidders' Preferences and Solution Concept

Consider a bidder participating in either an FPA or an SPA; depending on her bid and her opponents' ones, she might either win the auction (q = 1) in which case she receives the item and pays a price $p \in \mathbb{R}_+$, or lose the auction (q = 0) in which case she does not obtain the good and pays nothing. We assume bidders have expectations-based reference-dependent preferences as formulated by Kőszegi and Rabin (2006, 2007, 2009). Accordingly, the utility of bidder *i* with type t_i has two components. First, her material utility is given by $q(t_i - p)$, with $q \in \{0, 1\}$. Second, the bidder also derives psychological utility from comparing the realized outcome to a reference outcome given by her recent expectations (probabilistic beliefs).¹⁰ Hence, given an outcome (q, p)and a deterministic reference point $\tilde{r} \in \{0, 1\}$, a bidder's total utility is

$$U[(q,p)|\tilde{r},t_i] = q(t_i - p) + \mu (qt_i - \tilde{r}t_i)$$

$$\tag{1}$$

where

$$\mu(x) = \begin{cases} \eta x & \text{if } x \ge 0\\ \eta \lambda x & \text{if } x < 0 \end{cases}$$

is gain-loss utility, with $\eta \ge 0$ and $\lambda > 1$. The parameter η captures the weight a bidder attaches to gain-loss utility while λ is the coefficient of loss aversion.¹¹

Because in many situations expectations are stochastic, Kőszegi and Rabin (2006, 2007, 2009) allow for the reference point to be described by a distribution H over the possible values of \tilde{r} ; then, fixing H, a bidder's total utility from the outcome (q, p) can be written as

$$U\left[\left(q,p\right)|H,t_{i}\right] = q(t_{i}-p) + \int_{\tilde{r}} \mu\left(qt_{i}-\tilde{r}t_{i}\right) dH(\tilde{r}).$$

In words, a bidder compares the realized outcome to all possible outcomes in the reference lottery, each one weighted by its respective probability.

A bidder learns her type before submitting a bid and, hence, maximizes her interim expected utility. If the distribution of the reference point is H and the distribution of consumption outcomes

 $^{^{10}}$ Banerji and Gupta (2014), Rosato and Tymula (2019) and Eisenhuth and Grunewald (2020) provide experimental support for the Kőszegi and Rabin's model in the context of sealed-bid auctions.

¹¹To clearly highlight the implications of the attachment effect on bidding incentives, we depart from the original formulation of Kőszegi and Rabin (2006, 2007, 2009) by considering buyers who are loss averse only with respect to their value for the item, but not with respect to the price they might pay; in other words, we assume buyers are risk neutral over money. As argued in Kőszegi and Rabin (2009), this assumption is reasonable if buyers' income is already subject to large background risk; relatedly, Novemsky and Kahneman (2005) propose that money given up in purchases is not generally subject to loss aversion.

is $G = (G^g, G^m)$, the interim expected utility of a bidder with type t_i is

$$EU[G|H, t_i] = \int_{\{q, p\}} \int_{\{\tilde{r}\}} U[(q, p) | \tilde{r}, t_i] dH(\tilde{r}) dG(q, p).$$

A strategy for bidder *i* is a function $\beta_i : [\underline{t}, \overline{t}] \to \mathbb{R}_+$. Fixing all other bidders' strategies, β_{-i} , the bid of bidder *i* with type t_i , $\beta_i(t_i)$, induces a distribution over the set of final consumption outcomes. Let $\Gamma(\beta_i(t_i), \beta_{-i})$ denote this distribution. According to Kőszegi and Rabin (2007), when a decision is made shortly before outcomes realize, the reference point is fixed by past expectations; then, when the decision maker chooses the bid that maximizes her expected utility, she takes the reference point as given. Being fully rational, therefore, she can plan to submit a bid only if she is willing to follow it through, given the reference point determined by the expectation to do so. This is what Kőszegi and Rabin (2007) call unacclimating personal equilibrium (UPE):

Definition 1. A strategy profile β^* constitutes an Unacclimating Personal Equilibrium (UPE) if for all *i* and for all t_i :

$$EU\left[\Gamma\left(\beta_{i}^{*}(t_{i}),\boldsymbol{\beta}_{-i}^{*}\right)|\Gamma\left(\beta_{i}^{*}(t_{i}),\boldsymbol{\beta}_{-i}^{*}\right),t_{i}\right] \geq EU\left[\Gamma\left(b,\boldsymbol{\beta}_{-i}^{*}\right)|\Gamma\left(\beta_{i}^{*}(t_{i}),\boldsymbol{\beta}_{-i}^{*}\right),t_{i}\right]$$

for any $b \in \mathbb{R}_+$.

Thus, if a bidder deviates to a different bid, her reference point does not change. Notice that there might exist multiple UPEs; that is, multiple bids that the bidder is willing to follow through. In this case, following Kőszegi and Rabin (2006, 2007), we assume that the bidder selects the UPE that provides her with the highest expected utility. Hence, bidders play according to their (symmetric) Preferred Personal Equilibrium (PPE).¹²

3 Deterministic and Public Reserve Price

This section characterizes the optimal public reserve price. Let q(t) denote the probability with which, in equilibrium, a type-t bidder wins the auction. In the FPA, without a reserve price, the highest bidder wins the good and pays her bid. Hence, in a symmetric equilibrium, it holds that $q(t) = F_1(t)$ for all $t \in [\underline{t}, \overline{t}]$. However, with a (binding) reserve price r, there is a threshold type t_r such that q(t) = 0 for all $t \in [\underline{t}, t_r)$ and $q(t) = F_1(t)$ for $t \in [t_r, \overline{t}]$; that is, all bidders with types below t_r prefer not to participate in the auction.

Fix a symmetric and increasing bidding strategy, $\beta_I : [\underline{t}, \overline{t}] \mapsto \mathbb{R}_+$. Moreover, fix r and the implied t_r , to be determined shortly, and consider a type-t bidder who mimics a *larger* type

¹²See also Heidhues and Kőszegi (2014), Rosato (2016), Freeman (2019), and Balzer and Rosato (2021).

 $\tilde{t} > t$.¹³ With a slight abuse of notation, denote her expected payoff by $EU(\tilde{t}, t)$; this is given by

$$EU(\tilde{t},t) = q(\tilde{t})(t-\beta_I(\tilde{t})) - \eta\lambda(1-q(\tilde{t}))q(t)t + \eta(1-q(t))q(\tilde{t})t,$$
(2)

where $q(x) = F_1(x)$ if $x \ge t_r$ and q(x) = 0 otherwise.

The first term on the right-hand side of (2), $q(\tilde{t})(t - \beta_I(\tilde{t}))$, is a bidder's expected material payoff. The second and third terms represent the (expected) gains and losses for a bidder who planned to bid $\beta_I(t)$, hence expecting to win with probability q(t), but then deviates and bids $\beta_I(\tilde{t})$, and thus wins with probability $q(\tilde{t})$. Whenever she loses, the bidder experiences a loss of $\eta\lambda q(t)t$ weighted by the probability of losing the auction, $1 - q(\tilde{t})$. Similarly, given that the bidder expected to lose the auction with probability 1 - q(t), if she ends up winning it she experiences a gain of $\eta(1 - q(t))t$ weighted by the probability with which that gain occurs, $q(\tilde{t})$.

Now consider a bidder with type $t \in [\underline{t}, t_r)$. In equilibrium, such a bidder does not want to mimic the threshold type t_r implying that

$$EU(t_r, t) \leq EU(t, t) \Leftrightarrow$$

$$F_1(t_r)(1+\eta)t \leq F_1(t_r)r.$$
(3)

To understand condition (3) note that, in equilibrium, bidders whose types are in $[\underline{t}, t_r)$ do not participate in the auction and thus expect to win the good with zero probability. If one of these bidders deviates and mimics type t_r , she then wins the auction with probability $F_1(t_r)$. Thus, her expected gains from deviating entail a material gain of $F_1(t_r)t$ and a psychological gain of $F_1(t_r)\eta t$, since she expected to lose the auction for sure; hence, the terms on the left-hand side of (3) represent the benefits from deviating and submitting a bid equal to the reserve price. The right-hand side of (3) captures the expected costs from such a deviation — the increase in the expected payment, $F_1(t_r)r$. Letting $t \to t_r$ from below, and making (3) hold with equality, we obtain the following relationship between the reserve price, r, and the type of the marginal bidder:

$$r = (1+\eta) t_r.^{14} \tag{4}$$

For a given type t', in the following we denote the solution to (4) by r(t') (i.e., the reserve price assuring that $t_r = t'$). Using the relationship between the threshold type t_r and the reserve price, we then apply the standard logic from auction theory: equilibrium behavior shapes the bidding function up to a constant, which is pinned down by type t_r 's expected payment, $F_1(t_r)r$. The next lemma formally states a bidder's expected payment in the PPE for a given t_r .

¹³As shown by Balzer and Rosato (2021), in the PPE bidders' upward incentive constraints are the binding ones. ¹⁴Note that $r > t_r$ follows from our assumption of no loss aversion over money. If a bidder is also loss averse over money and expects to not pay anything, she experiences a loss of $\eta\lambda r$ when winning at the reserve price; in this case the mapping between the reserve price and the marginal type becomes $r = (1 + \eta) t_r / (1 + \eta\lambda)$.

Lemma 1. Consider the PPE of an FPA with deterministic reserve price. Let t_r be the lowest type that receives the good with strictly positive probability. The expected payment from a bidder with type $t \ge t_r$ is:

$$F_1(t)\beta_I^*(t) = \int_{t_r}^t [1 + \eta\lambda F_1(x) + \eta(1 - F_1(x))]f_1(x)xdx + (1 + \eta)F_1(t_r)t_r$$
(5)

and 0 for any $t < t_r$.

Notice that expressions (4) and (5), and hence $\beta_I^*(t)$, reduce to their well-known risk-neutral analogues if $\eta = 0$. For $\eta > 0$ and $t \ge t_r$, instead, $\beta_I^*(t)$ is strictly larger than its risk-neutral counterpart since buyers have an additional incentive to raise their bids in order to try to win more often and reduce their expected losses.¹⁵ This is the attachment effect: the larger the probability with which a bidder expects to win, the bigger the loss she feels if she loses, and hence the stronger her incentive to raise her bid. Hence, because of the attachment effect, bidders' willingness to pay endogenously depends on their expectations. In what follows, we will focus on the relationship between the attachment effect and the bidders' marginal willingness to pay, and its implications for the seller's choice of the optimal reserve price.

Consider a type-t bidder who expects to win the auction with probability q. How much does this bidder value an increase, $\Delta q > 0$, in her probability of winning? If her probability of winning increases by Δq , the bidder obtains the good more often; hence, she makes a material gain equal to $t\Delta q$. Moreover, the bidder's chances of enjoying a psychological gain increase, which she values at $\eta(1-q)\Delta qt$, given that she expected to lose with probability 1-q. Similarly, by winning more often, the bidder's chances of experiencing a loss are also reduced; she values this reduction in the probability of making a loss at $\eta\lambda q\Delta qt$. Adding up all these terms, the bidder's marginal willingness to pay for such an increase in the probability of obtaining the good is equal to

$$\underbrace{t\left(1+\eta\lambda q+\eta(1-q)\right)}_{MWTP(t;q)}\Delta q.$$
(6)

It easy to see that MWTP(t;q) increases not only in the bidder's type t, but also in the probability q with which she already expects to win since $\lambda > 1$; in particular, a bidder who expects to never get the good (i.e., q = 0) is willing to pay less for a given Δq than a bidder who expects to obtain the good with strictly positive probability (i.e., q > 0). This is because only a bidder who rationally expects to win the good experiences a loss when not winning.

Consider now a bidder with a type arbitrarily below the threshold type, t_r , i.e., $t \to t_r$. In equilibrium, as under risk neutrality, the seller charges her an expected payment equal to her entire

 $^{^{15}}$ As shown in Balzer and Rosato (2021), when buyers are also loss averse over money, they might bid less than in the risk-neutral benchmark if their type is sufficiently low.

willingness to pay. That is,

$$F_1(t_r)r = \int_0^{t_r} MWTP(t_r; 0)f_1(s)ds = F_1(t_r)(1+\eta)t_r.$$

In other words, in equilibrium the reserve price makes the threshold type indifferent between participating or not.

Next, consider a type-t bidder with $t > t_r$. In equilibrium, $q(t) = F_1(t)$ and thus $\Delta q = f_1(t)$; hence, such a bidder's MWTP(t;q) from mimicking a slightly larger type (and thus increasing her winning probability by $f_1(t)$) must equal the increase in the expected payment, $(F_1(t)\beta_I^*(t))'$, from such a deviation. That is, $F_1(t)\beta_I^*(t) = \int_{t_r}^t MWTP(s;F_1(s))f_1(s)ds + F_1(t_r)r$, i.e., (5).

The preceding discussion shows that the attachment effect, which is revenue enhancing for the seller, has a bigger influence on the behavior of those bidder types who expect to win with strictly positive probability (i.e., $t > t_r$) than on the behavior of the threshold type who bids the reserve price. This occurs because the seller can charge the threshold type a price capturing only to the additional gain from winning, but not the benefit from avoiding losses. This asymmetry is crucial for the determination of the optimal reserve price under loss aversion r^* and, in turn, the degree of bidder exclusion, as the next result shows.

Proposition 1. The optimal threshold type in the FPA, t_r^* , is smaller than that under risk neutrality, t^{RN} . Moreover, for sufficiently large λ , $t_r^* = r^* = 0$, even if $t^S > 0$.

Hence, with expectations-based loss-averse bidders, the seller optimally excludes fewer types than in the risk-neutral benchmark. To see the intuition, consider the seller's trade-off when setting the optimal threshold type; she chooses t_r in order to maximize her expected profit given by

$$N\int_{t_r}^{\bar{t}} F_1(s)\beta_I^*(s)f(s)ds + F(t_r)^N t^S,$$
(7)

where the integral term represents the expectation over buyer's expected payments, as given in equation (5), and the last term is the seller's payoff if no trade takes place. The derivative of the seller's profit with respect to t_r takes the following form:

$$N\Big[(1+\eta)f(t_r)\left(\frac{1-F(t_r)}{f(t_r)}-t_r\right)+f(t_r)t^S-\eta(\lambda-1)(1-F(t_r))f_1(t_r)t_r\Big]F_1(t_r).$$
(8)

Note first that, because this is a symmetric environment, all terms in the first-order condition are multiplied by the number of bidders, N. The first term is proportional to the (negative of the) virtual value of the threshold type, and it captures the standard trade-off between raising competitive pressure and risking not to sell the good at all. The second term captures the standard effect of the seller's opportunity cost of selling: reducing the probability of trade by marginally raising the threshold type is less costly the higher is the seller's own value for the good. Finally, the last term captures a novel trade-off due to expectations-based loss aversion. Indeed, using (6), it is easy to see that this term equals $(MWTP(t_r, 0) - MWTP(t_r, F_1(t_r)))f_1(t_r)$; i.e., the difference between the threshold type's marginal willingness to pay when expecting to lose for sure, $MWTP(t_r, 0)$, and her marginal willingness to pay when expecting to win with probability $F_1(t_r)$, $MWTP(t_r, F_1(t_r))$, multiplied by the change of the winning probability when marginally increasing the threshold type, $f_1(t_r)$. If the seller raises the threshold type, she transforms an interior type (a type that expects to win with probability $F_1(t_r)$) into the new threshold type. By doing so, she loses the attachment effect of that new threshold type.

Therefore, the attachment effect creates an additional cost for the seller of raising the threshold type and thus excluding more types. Moreover, this additional cost increases in the degree of bidders' loss aversion. Indeed, for a large enough λ , the optimal reserve price is equal to zero even though the seller's value for the item is strictly positive. As a consequence, the optimal threshold type with loss aversion is lower than under risk neutrality, which in turn implies less bidder exclusion.

By relating the optimal threshold type under expectations-based loss aversion to its risk-neutral counterpart, Proposition 1 is relevant not only from a theoretical point of view but also from an applied one. Indeed, several empirical papers (e.g., Paarsch, 1997; Haile and Tamer, 2003) use bids submitted in actual auctions to estimate the distribution of bidders' values and, given these estimates, conclude that sellers in the field set reserve prices, and hence threshold types, that are lower than Myerson (1981)'s optimal one (i.e., the one that equates a bidder's "virtual value" with the seller's value), resulting in too little exclusion. Proposition 1, however, shows that such seller behavior is consistent with profit maximization if bidders are expectations-based loss averse.

The next proposition describes how the optimal threshold type, and hence the reserve price, vary with the number of bidders.

Proposition 2. The probability of no trade and the reserve price depend on the number of bidders. For any $t^S \ge 0$, the no-trade probability and the optimal reserve price increase in N if and only if $ln(F(t_r^*)) < -1/(N-1)$. Moreover, if $t^S = 0$ (resp. $t^S > 0$), as $N \to \infty$, the no-trade probability converges to (resp. is strictly lower than) its risk-neutral counterpart.

From Proposition 1, we already know that $t_r^* \leq t^{RN}$. Then, to see the intuition behind Proposition 2, suppose first that $t^S = 0$ and recall that the optimal threshold type in the risk-neutral benchmark is independent of N. With expectations-based loss aversion the optimal level of bidder exclusion depends also on the attachment to which the marginal type is exposed, as captured by the last term in expression (8). It is easy to see that this term depends on $f_1(t_r)$ and hence on N. In particular, when $f_1(t_r^*)$ decreases in N, which happens if and only if $ln(F(t_r^*)) < -1/(N-1)$, the seller's cost of raising the threshold type due to the forgone attachment effect decreases in the number of bidders; consequently, she excludes more types.

In line with this intuition, as $N \to \infty$ every bidder type except \bar{t} expects to win the auction

with (almost) zero probability (i.e., if N is sufficiently large $f_1(t_r^*)$ decreases in N and converges to zero); in turn, the attachment effect of any bidder type but the highest one becomes negligible. In this case, the seller does not affect any such type's expectations of winning when raising the reserve price, and thus sets the same threshold type as in the risk-neutral benchmark. However, the limit probability of no trade under loss aversion is lower than its risk-neutral counterpart if $t^S > 0$. The reason is that loss-averse buyers bid more aggressively than risk-neutral ones; i.e., the seller raises more revenue from a loss-averse buyer than from a risk-neutral buyer with the same type. Hence, the seller has a weaker incentive to exclude them.

Finally, note that with risk-averse bidders the optimal reserve price depends on the number of bidders in the FPA, but not in the SPA; see Hu et al. (2010) and Hu (2011). In contrast, all the results for loss-averse bidders derived in this section hold also for the SPA. Indeed, Balzer and Rosato (2021) show that both auction formats yield the same expected revenue to the seller. Moreover, since the threshold type t_r does not face any risk in her payment conditional on winning, the relationship between r and t_r satisfies (4) also in the SPA. Hence, the optimal reserve price and the optimal threshold type in the SPA coincide with those in the FPA.

4 Exposing More Bidders to the Attachment Effect

As the previous section highlighted, the seller benefits from the attachment effect, as it pushes buyers to bid more aggressively; however, the excluded buyers are not exposed to this effect. In this section, we investigate tactics that expose more bidders to the attachment effect, thereby boosting the seller's revenue. We focus on two such tactics. The first one is a standard auction with a secrete and random reserve-price regime. Heidhues and Kőszegi (2014) and Hancart (2022) show that for a monopolist facing a loss-averse buyer, committing to a stochastic pricing strategy yields a higher revenue than posting a single price, as in this way the seller ensures that the consumer is fully attached to the good. In our setting with multiple buyers, a public (and deterministic) reserve price corresponds to a single posted price whereas a secret and random reserve price corresponds to a stochastic pricing strategy. The second tactic is an auction with a public reserve price followed by a take-it-or-leave-it (TIOLI) negotiation if the reserve price is not met.

4.1 Random and Secret Reserve Prices

In what follows, we first assume that every bidder type is exposed to the attachment effect — even those excluded — and solve for the revenue-maximizing auction under this assumption. This exercise leads to a strict upper bound on the seller's revenue. We then relax the assumption that all bidders are exposed to the attachment effect, and show that an auction mechanism using secret and random reserve prices achieves a revenue arbitrarily close to this upper bound.

Start by considering a pseudo auction where every bidder type is exposed to the attach-

ment effect that arises in a symmetric auction without exclusion; that is, let $\widehat{MWTP}(t; F_1(t)) \equiv MWTP(t; q)|_{q=F_1(t)}$ (as defined in (6)), even for bidder types that are excluded, i.e., bidders for whom q(t) = 0. We then calculate the bidding function, $\hat{\beta}$, for this hypothetical situation. Given this pseudo bidding function, the seller maximizes her revenue by using a public reserve price \hat{r} that, if $t^S = 0$, excludes the same set of types as the optimal auction under risk neutrality; this is because if buyers were to bid according to $\hat{\beta}$, the seller would not face the additional cost from the foregone attachment effect of the marginally excluded type.

Consider now a bidder with type $t = t_{\hat{r}}$ who in equilibrium bids \hat{r} ; i.e., the threshold type. As under risk neutrality, in equilibrium her expected payment equals her entire willingness to pay:

$$F_1(t_{\hat{r}})\hat{r} = \int_0^{t_{\hat{r}}} \widehat{MWTP}(t_{\hat{r}}; F_1(s)) f_1(s) ds = [1 + \eta + \eta(\lambda - 1)F_1(t_{\hat{r}})/2]F_1(t_{\hat{r}}) t_{\hat{r}}.$$

In other words, the reserve price makes the threshold type indifferent between participating or not.

Next, consider a type-t bidder with $t > t_{\hat{r}}$. In this hypothetical equilibrium, $q(t) = F_1(t)$ and thus $\Delta q = f_1(t)$; hence, such a bidder's (pseudo) marginal willingness to pay to increase her winning probability by $f_1(t)$ must equal the increase in the expected payment, $(F_1(t)\hat{\beta}(t))'$, from such deviation. Thus,

$$F_{1}(t)\hat{\beta}(t) = \int_{t_{\hat{r}}}^{t} \widehat{MWTP}(s;F_{1}(s))f_{1}(s)ds + F_{1}(t_{\hat{r}})\hat{r}$$
(9)
$$= \int_{t_{\hat{r}}}^{t} s\Big(1 + \eta\lambda F_{1}(s) + \eta(1 - F_{1}(s))\Big)f_{1}(s)ds + [(1 + \eta) + \eta(\lambda - 1)F_{1}(t_{\hat{r}})/2]F_{1}(t_{\hat{r}})t_{\hat{r}},$$

for all $t \geq t_{\hat{r}}$.

Given these expected payments, the seller chooses the threshold type to maximize her profit:

$$N \times \left(\max_{t_{\hat{r}}} \int_{t_{\hat{r}}}^{\hat{t}} F_1(t)\hat{\beta}(t)f(t)dt\right) + F^N(t_{\hat{r}})t^S$$
(10)

Notice that $F_1(t)\hat{\beta}(t)$ represents an upper bound on the expected payment of a type-t bidder since $\hat{\beta}(t)$ is the (pseudo) bidding function of a posited equilibrium where every bidder type is exposed to the attachment effect, even those who are excluded by the reserve price. Indeed, in this hypothetical case, the threshold type is the same as in the risk-neutral benchmark since its determination is not affected by the attachment effect. Hence, the solution to the above problem provides an upper bound on the seller's profit, as formally stated in the next proposition.

Proposition 3. In the FPA, under PPE, a strict upper bound on the seller's objective function is given by the maximum value of (10).

Next, we show that the seller can garner a profit arbitrarily close to the maximum value of (10) by using secret and random reserve prices. Specifically, before buyers submit their bids, the

seller publicly announces the distribution of the reserve price and commits to drawing a reserve price according to this distribution; then, after the buyers submit their bids, the seller reveals the realization of the reserve price. While such a selling mechanism undoubtedly requires some commitment on the part of the seller, there are some real-world examples where sellers seem to have such commitment power.¹⁶ For instance, Li and Perrigne (2003) study timber auctions conducted by a French government agency who naturally has commitment power, and where the reserve price is revealed only after all bids are submitted.¹⁷ The next proposition formally states the result.

Proposition 4. In the FPA, under PPE, there exists a distribution of random and secret reserve prices that yields a revenue arbitrarily close to the maximum value of (10).

To gain some intuition, consider an FPA with a secret reserve price drawn from a commonly known distribution over some interval $[\underline{r}, \overline{r}]$; then, in a symmetric equilibrium in increasing strategies, for each possible realization of the reserve price, $r \in [\underline{r}, \overline{r}]$, there exists a corresponding threshold type, \tilde{t}_r , whose bid coincides with r.¹⁸ Hence, a bidder with a type below the highest such threshold type, $\tilde{t}_{\overline{r}}$, wins the good if both (i) her type is larger than that of all other bidders, and (ii) she bids higher than the secretly drawn reserve price. In what follows, it will prove convenient to directly work with the implied distribution of threshold types. That is, suppose that the seller first draws $\tilde{t}_r \in [\tilde{t}_{\underline{r}}, \tilde{t}_{\overline{r}}]$ according to some distribution F_0 . Then, the seller computes the reserve price $r(\tilde{t}_r)$ that matches the equilibrium bid of a bidder with type \tilde{t}_r , who expects to win the good with probability $q(t) = F_1(\tilde{t}_r)F_0(\tilde{t}_r)$.¹⁹

Note that the above framework nests a public reserve price as a special case that occurs if all probability mass is on one threshold type, say, $\tilde{t}_r^p \in [\tilde{t}_{\underline{r}}, \tilde{t}_{\overline{r}}]$; that is, $F_0(\tilde{t}_r) = 0$ if $\tilde{t}_r < \tilde{t}_r^p$ and $F_0(\tilde{t}_r) = 1$ otherwise. However, as argued in Section 3, with such a discontinuous threshold-type distribution, the seller forgoes the attachment effect of the marginal bidder with type \tilde{t}_r^p . Indeed, the implied winning probability, q(t), jumps from 0 to $F_1(\tilde{t}_r^p)$ at the threshold type and, in a PPE, this type has the same attachment level as a type that loses the auction for sure. More generally, consider an arbitrary threshold-type distribution that might have discontinuous jump points. At each such jump point, the corresponding threshold type has the attachment level of the type immediately below her. As the seller's revenue increases in the bidders' attachment level, the seller prefers continuous distributions that smooth out jump points (see the left panel of Figure 1).

¹⁶The commitment power needed to implement a random reserve-price regime is similar to the commitment power that the monopolist in Heidhues and Kőszegi (2014) and Rosato (2016) needs to implement a stochastic pricing strategy. Hancart (2022) shows that such commitment power is essential in their setting.

¹⁷Li and Perrigne (2003) report that in such auctions interested bidders would first submit sealed bids; the auctioneer would then open the bids and announce the reserve price. The government agency did not use a fixed rule to determine the reserve price but instead considered various factors, such as market conditions and its own financial constraints. See also Andreyanov and Caoui (2022) for examples of sellers committing to a distribution of secret reserve prices.

¹⁸We start by positing the existence of an equilibrium such that for every r there exists a \tilde{t}_r for which $\beta(\tilde{t}_r) = r$; then, using the implied properties of this equilibrium, we verify its existence by deriving a closed-form expression for the bidding function.

¹⁹The equilibrium bid depends on the distribution of the reserve prices itself; see equation (11) below.

In fact, in the proof of Proposition 4 we show that the seller can achieve a revenue arbitrarily close to the maximum value of (10) by using a continuous distribution of threshold types. This distribution is such that every bidder type expects to win the auction with strictly positive probability, as tiny as that might be; that is, $\tilde{t}_{\underline{r}} = \underline{t}$. More precisely, the distribution is such that bidders with types strictly below $\tilde{t}_{\overline{r}}$ expect to win the auction with a small probability, and this probability steeply increases for types in a neighborhood below $\tilde{t}_{\overline{r}}$. Moreover, the seller chooses $\tilde{t}_{\overline{r}}$ such that the virtual value of the largest threshold type is equal the seller's value; i.e., $\tilde{t}_{\overline{r}} = (1 - F(\tilde{t}_{\overline{r}}))/f(\tilde{t}_{\overline{r}}) + t^S$. One way for the seller to implement such a distribution of threshold types is to use the CDF $F_0(\tilde{t}_r) = (\frac{\tilde{t}_r}{\tilde{t}_{\overline{r}}})^K$, with $K \in \mathbb{R}_+$ and "large". The right panel of Figure 1 depicts F_0 when $\tilde{t}_{\overline{r}} = 0.5$ and K = 30.

Therefore, with a secret and random reserve price, all bidders with type below the largest threshold type $\tilde{t}_{\overline{r}}$ expect to win with strictly positive probability and are thus exposed to (potential) losses. In particular, the steep increase of q(t) from (almost) zero to (almost) $F_1(\tilde{t}_{\overline{r}})$ in the neighborhood below $\tilde{t}_{\overline{r}}$ ensures that types slightly below $\tilde{t}_{\overline{r}}$ have an incentive to bid aggressively in order to reduce their potential losses.

A second rationale behind the steep increase in the reserve price follows from the usual rationing effect that is also present under risk neutrality. By imposing a larger minimal bid, the seller increases the competitive pressure on the bidders' side at the cost of decreasing the probability of trade. In the risk-neutral benchmark, where the attachment effect is absent, the optimal resolution of this trade-off entails excluding all types with virtual values below the seller's value. With the above-described secret and random reserve price, the attachment effect does not modify the seller's trade-off since all bidder types are exposed to it. However, in contrast to the case of a public and deterministic reserve price, the probability of receiving the good does not drop from $F_1(\tilde{t}_{\bar{r}})$ to 0 if the threshold type marginally lowers her bid. Thus, one might wonder whether secret and random reserve prices also intensify the competitive pressure on the bidders' side in the same way as a public reserve price. The answer is yes since, as the distribution of the secrete reserve price increases steeply below the threshold type, if a bidder with such type were to marginally lower her bid, her probability of receiving the good would suddenly drop to almost zero.

In order to obtain the distribution of the secret reserve price, start by fixing F_0 , the distribution of the threshold types \tilde{t}_r . Then, substitute the drawn \tilde{t}_r into the equilibrium bidding function that applies without a reserve price, but where a type-t bidder wins the auction with probability $q(t) = F_0(t)F_1(t)$; that is, for $\tilde{t}_r \in [\underline{t}, \tilde{t}_{\overline{t}}]$, we have

$$\beta_I^*(\tilde{t}_r) = \frac{\int_{\underline{t}}^{t_r} [1 + \eta \lambda q(x) + \eta (1 - q(x))] q'(x) x dx}{q(\tilde{t}_r)}.$$
(11)

In equilibrium, bidders correctly anticipate that the seller implements reserve price $r = \beta_I^*(\tilde{t}_r)$ when drawing \tilde{t}_r according to CDF $F_0(\tilde{t}_r)$, and their optimal response is given by the bidding



Figure 1: The solid red lines in the left panel depict the distribution of threshold types under an (arbitrary) secrete reserve price scheme with two reserve prices, r_1 and r_2 . The dashed curve is a continuous approximation that leaves the seller with strictly larger revenue and uses infinitely many reserve prices. The right panel depicts the optimal CDF of the threshold types when bidders' types are distributed according to a Unif[0, 1]. The induced distribution of secret reserve prices, $\beta_I^*(\tilde{t}_r)$, can be obtained from (11).

function in (11), replacing \tilde{t}_r with a buyer's type t.

As argued by Bajari and Hortaçsu (2004), secret reserve prices are common in internet auctions. However, different from our result, these secret reserve prices are usually deterministic. Yet, from the bidders' perspective, the secret reserve price might appear as random if they do not observe how precisely the seller chooses it. Indeed, as shown in Figure 1, the distribution of the secret reserve price has most of the mass on the upper bound of its support, and arbitrarily little mass everywhere else. This characterization is consistent with the notion of bidders expecting the seller to make small "mistakes" when choosing the secret reserve price. Moreover, an alternative way of implementing a secret and random reserve price is via "shill bidding", a prominent phenomenon in real-world auctions whereby a dummy buyer submits pre-specified bids on behalf of the seller.²⁰

Thus, expectations-based reference points offer a novel explanation for the use of secret and random reserve prices. Rosenkranz and Schmitz (2007) provided an earlier rationale for secret (but not random) reserve prices; in their model, publicly announcing the reserve price plants a reference point in the bidders' minds, making it less attractive to win at a price higher than the reserve. While their explanation is also a reference-dependent one, it is based on loss aversion in money, whereas ours leverages the attachment effect. Secret reserve prices can also be rationalized under risk aversion and in common-value auctions *if* the seller's value is privately known.²¹ Furthermore,

²⁰While Ashenfelter (1989) provides some early examples of shill bidding in art auctions, this phenomenon appears to be even more common in online auctions, where sellers can use multiple accounts to bid on their own items; see Grether et al. (2015). With risk-neutral bidders, this practice can be particularly effective in dynamic auction formats, as it enables a seller to adjust the reserve price based on information that emerges as the auction unfolds

[—] be it information about bidders' type distributions as in Graham et al. (1990), or information about the number of participating bidders as in Wang et al. (2001).

 $^{^{21}}$ Li and Tan (2017) show that a seller with a privately known value may prefer a secret reserve price to a public one when facing risk-averse buyers. The reason is that, as the optimal reserve price depends on the seller's value, the fact that the seller is privately informed makes the reserve price random from the buyers' perspective. However, if the seller's value was commonly known, as in our model, a public reserve price would then be optimal. A similar argument holds in common-value auctions with risk-neutral bidders; see Vincent (1995).

secret reserve prices can emerge with uninformed bidders who learn their value as the auction unfolds (Hossain, 2008), with an uninformed seller who uses the information in submitted bids to decide whether to trade (Andreyanov and Caoui, 2022), or with competing sellers if not all buyers correctly anticipate the distribution of reserve prices across sellers (Jehiel and Lamy, 2015).

Our final result in this section compares the degree of bidder exclusion under the optimal secret and random reserve-price scheme with that under risk neutrality.

Proposition 5. Under the optimal secret and random reserve-price scheme, the following holds:

- 1. If $t^S = 0$, the probability of trade is arbitrarily close to that under risk neutrality.
- 2. If $t^S > 0$, the probability of trade
 - (a) is strictly larger than that under risk neutrality;
 - (b) converges to a limit value larger than that under risk neutrality as $N \to \infty$.

The results of Proposition 5 and the intuition behind them are similar to those in Propositions 1 and 2 under a public and deterministic reserve price. Indeed, because with secret reserve prices the attachment effect does not affect the optimal no-trade probability anymore, differences with the risk-neutral benchmark are driven solely by the fact that, in contrast to the bidders, the seller is not loss averse. Therefore, the level of bidder exclusion, and hence inefficiency, is lower with loss-averse bidders than with risk-neutral ones. Finally, we re-emphasize that the analysis and the results in this section carry over to the SPA.

4.2 Auctions Followed by Negotiation

In this section, we show that the seller can achieve a larger revenue with an auction followed by a take-it-or-leave-it (TIOLI) negotiation, rather than by holding a standard auction with a (revenue-maximizing) public reserve price and committing to not selling the good if the reserve price is not met — the latter being the optimal mechanism with risk-neutral bidders.

Consider the following two-stage mechanism. The seller first runs a standard auction with a public reserve price r; the highest bidder wins the auction provided that her bid is (weakly) above the reserve price. If instead the reserve price is not met, with probability $\nu \in [0, 1]$, the seller posts another price p with p < r at which any bidder can buy the good.²² If more than one bidder wants to buy the good at this price, the seller breaks ties uniformly.

Fixing the reserve price r and posted price p, there are two threshold types, t_r and t_p with $t_r > t_p$. The first one, t_r , is the bidder type that submits a bid exactly equal to the reserve price. The other threshold type, t_p , is the smallest type who is willing to buy the good at the posted price in case the reserve price is not met. In addition, let $q(t_p)$ be the (ex-ante) probability that

²²Note that the seller must commit to both ν and p at the beginning of the mechanism.

type t_p receives the good and let $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ denote the solution to $\alpha F_1(t_r) = q(t_p)$; note that $q(t_p)$, and hence α , depend on ν .²³

Fixing p, α , and r, the following two conditions must hold:

$$(1+\eta)t_p = p, (12)$$

$$t_r \Big((1-\alpha)(1+\eta) + \eta(\lambda-1)(1-\alpha)\alpha F_1(t_r) \Big) + (1+\eta)\alpha t_p = r.$$
(13)

The first condition, $(1+\eta)t_p = p$, is intuitive: in the PPE, the threshold type t_p is the lowest type for which not buying at the posted price is not a personal equilibrium. Given the first condition, the second one pins down the threshold type t_r as the highest type who, in equilibrium, is willing to buy at the posted price; that is, the type who, when expecting not to participate in the auction, is just indifferent between bidding the reserve price or bidding below the reserve price and buying the good at the posted price with probability $\alpha F_1(t_r)$. Crucially, notice that, in contrast to a situation without the possibility of buying at the posted price, when not participating in the auction the threshold type t_r still expects to obtain the good with strictly positive probability, $\alpha F_1(t_r)$. In turn, participating in the auction by submitting a bid equal to the reserve price becomes more attractive for this bidder type, as it reduces her potential losses.

Given these threshold types, equilibrium behavior is then straightforward. Bidders whose type is strictly below t_p abstain from the auction and do not accept the posted price. Bidders with types in $[t_p, t_r)$ do not bid in the auction, but accept the posted price if the reserve price is not met. Finally, bidders with types weakly higher than t_r participate in the auction by bidding $\beta(t) = \int_{t_r}^t (1 + \eta + \eta(\lambda - 1)F_1(s))sf_1(s)ds + F_1(t_r)r.$

The next proposition states that, by exposing more bidders to the attachment effect, the above described selling mechanism can generate more revenue than a standard auction with a public reserve price.

Proposition 6. Consider either an FPA or an SPA. Under PPE, for every auction with a public reserve price, there exists an auction followed by a TIOLI that raises more revenue.

Proposition 6 states that there exists choices of ν and p (with an implied α), such that the seller strictly benefits from using a TIOLI mechanism after the auction.

There are many real-world examples of auctions followed by some form of negotiation if the reserve price is not cleared. For instance, sellers may choose to negotiate with interested parties

²³Consider a bidder with type $t \in [t_p, t_r)$. If she accepts the posted price, the bidder receives the good with probability 1/# where # is the number of competitors with types in $[t_p, t_r)$. Conditional on the event that no other buyer bids above the reserve (which happens with probability $F_1(t_r)$), # is a random variable that follows a binomial distribution with success probability $1 - F(t_p)/F(t_r)$. Let Pr(#; N - 1) be the probability that exactly # out of N - 1 bidders have type above t_p , conditional on having a type below t_r . Then, $q(t_p) = \nu F_1(t_r) \sum_{\#=0}^{N-1} Pr(\#; N - 1)/(\# + 1) = \nu F_1(t_r) \sum_{w=0}^{N-1} {N-1 \choose \#} (1 - F(t_p)/F(t_r))^{\#} (F(t_p)/F(t_r))^{N-1-\#}/(\# + 1) = \nu F_1(t_r) \frac{1 - (F_1(t_p)/F_1(t_r))^N}{M(1 - F_1(t_p)/F_1(t_r))}$ and thus $\alpha = \nu \frac{1 - (F_1(t_p)/F_1(t_r))^N}{N(1 - F_1(t_p)/F_1(t_r))}$.

who did not meet the reserve; see Elyakine et. al (1997) on timber sales, Bulow and Klemperer (1996) on fine-art auctions, and Ashenfelter and Genesove (1992) and Ong (2006) on real-estate auctions.²⁴ Perhaps strikingly, Proposition 6 shows that the auctioneer benefits from engaging in some post-auction negotiation even though a TIOLI offer is not necessarily the optimal post-auction form of negotiation from the seller's perspective. Moreover, with risk-neutral bidders a seller would optimally commit to never negotiate with them after the auction if no one bids above the reserve.²⁵ In contrast, Proposition 6 shows that such negotiations are not necessarily a sign that a seller does not have the necessary commitment power; rather, the possibility of such post-auction negotiations can be beneficial for the seller if bidders are expectations-based loss averse.

The intuition for why the seller benefits from post-auction negotiation is as follows. By granting a probability of winning also to types below the margin, the seller attaches them to the good. This induces a competitive pressure, due to psychological motives, on the threshold type's bid, as lower types now have a stronger incentive to bid more in order to reduce their losses. In other words, by not excluding a set of types below the threshold type t_r , the seller inflates the attachment of the threshold type, who then bids more aggressively. However, there is also a cost for the seller since the larger the probability with which a type below the margin receives the good, the lower the competitive pressure, due to the material motives, on the threshold type. The seller optimally trades off these two effects — increasing the competitive pressure on the threshold type via the attachment effect vs. decreasing it by allowing some post-auction negotiation — by choosing a posted price p that only types that are very close to t_r would accept.

5 Conclusion

This paper belongs to a recent and growing literature on the market implications of expectationsbased loss aversion. Indeed, over the last decade, the model of expectations-based loss aversion developed by Kőszegi and Rabin (2006, 2007, 2009) has found many fruitful applications in several areas of economics, including firms' pricing and advertising strategies (Heidhues and Kőszegi, 2008, 2014; Rosato, 2016; Karle and Peitz, 2014, 2017; Karle and Schumacher, 2017), incentive provision (Herweg et al., 2010; Daido and Murooka, 2016; Macera, 2018), bargaining (Rosato, 2017; Herweg et al., 2018; Benkert, 2022), labor supply (Crawford and Meng, 2011), school choice (Dreyfus et al., 2022; Meisner and von Wangenheim, 2023), asset pricing (Pagel, 2016, 2018; Meng and Weng, 2018), and life-cycle consumption (Pagel, 2017). In particular, there have been several studies on the implications of expectations-based loss aversion in auctions; see Lange and Ratan (2010),

²⁴Moreover, while not exactly the same, eBay's "Second Chance Offer", by allowing the seller to make an offer to the highest bidder below the (secret) reserve, is in a similar spirit.

²⁵There is a substantial theoretical literature focusing on (optimal) selling mechanisms for auctioneers lacking power to commit not to trade; see, for instance, McAfee and Vincent (1997) on price-posting sellers, and Skreta (2015) and Liu et. al (2015) on sellers having access to more general mechanisms. All these contributions show that the seller is hurt by being unable to commit to not selling the good if her initial mechanism does not allocate it.

Eisenhuth (2019) and Balzer and Rosato (2021) on sealed-bid auctions, and von Wangenheim (2021), Balzer et al. (2022) and Rosato (2023) on dynamic ones.

While the prior literature has mostly abstracted from considering reserve prices, the focus of our paper is on how expectations-based loss aversion affects the optimal reserve price, and the resulting level of bidder exclusion, in the FPA and SPA.²⁶ Our analysis reveals that loss aversion delivers new implications for the design of optimal auctions that are likely to be of interest for both theorists as well as practitioners. In particular, we find that random and secret reserve prices outperform deterministic and public ones in both the FPA and SPA. Indeed, by using random and secret reserve prices, the seller introduces a small risk that exposes all bidders to the attachment effect, which in turn leads them to bid more aggressively. This result establishes a tight link between the optimal level of exclusion in an auction and the optimal monopoly pricing scheme with loss-averse consumers derived by Heidhues and Kőszegi (2014) and Hancart (2022), that is analogous to the well-known one under risk neutrality. More generally, our result implies that with loss-averse agents mechanisms that level the playing field by giving every player a chance to win might be better suited to generate competitive pressure than mechanisms with steeper incentives (e.g., winner-take-all contests).

If the seller is forced to use a deterministic and public reserve price, we find that its optimal level depends the number of bidders in the auction and is typically lower than the optimal reserve price under risk neutrality. Moreover, we show that sellers can raise even more revenue by committing to engage in some post-auction haggling if the reserve price is not met, as this also exposes more bidders to the attachment effect; this is in stark contrast to the case of risk-neutral (or risk-averse) buyers, where post-auction negotiations are never optimal. Hence, expectations-based loss aversion rationalizes several features of reserve prices observed in real-world auctions which are hard to reconcile with the classical risk-neutral and risk-averse frameworks.

²⁶Three notable exceptions are Rosenkranz and Schmitz (2007), Eisenhuth (2019) and Muramoto and Togo (2022). Using a different solution concept, Choice-acclimating personal equilibrium (CPE), Eisenhuth (2019) shows that the optimal reserve price in the all-pay auction implies the same no-trade probability as under risk neutrality, while Muramoto and Togo (2022) focus on asymmetric auction design, allowing for bidder-specific reserve prices. In Rosenkranz and Schmitz (2007), differently from our setting, bidders are loss averse only with respect to their monetary payment and use the (public) reserve price as a reference point.

A Appendix A

Proof of Lemma 1

Proof. Let $P(t) \equiv F_1(t)\beta_I^*(t)$ be the expected payment from a bidder with type $t \ge t_r$. We know from Balzer and Rosato (2021) that in the FPA, a bidder's first-order condition satisfies

$$\frac{(1+\eta\lambda F_1(t)+\eta[1-F_1(t)])f_1(t)t}{1+\eta^m\lambda^m} = P'(t).$$
(14)

The solution to differential equation (14) is

$$P(t) = \int_{t_r}^t (1 + \eta \lambda F_1(x) + \eta [1 - F_1(x)]) f_1(x) x dx + C,,$$

where C is a constant. Since $P(t) = F_1(t)\beta_I^*(t)$, the constant satisfies $P(t_r) = F_1(t_r)\beta_I^*(t_r) = F_1(t_r)r$. Thus, $C = P(t_r)$.

Proof of Proposition 1

Proof. Fix t_r with corresponding r (see equation (4)). The seller's objective is:

$$N \times \left(\int_{t_r}^{\bar{t}} \left[\int_{t_r}^t \{f_1(x)x(1+F_1(x)\lambda\eta + [1-F_1(x)]\eta)\}dx + F_1(t_r)t_r(1+\eta)\right]f(t)dt + \frac{F(t_r)^N}{N}t^S\right)$$
(15)

Notice first that the t_r which maximizes (15) is either $t_r = \underline{t}$, $t_r = \overline{t}$ or an interior solution. In the first case, the derivative of (15) is negative at $t_r = \underline{t}$, in the second-case it is positive at $t_r = \overline{t}$, while in the third case the derivative is zero at an interior solution and negative for a slightly larger t_r . Moreover, define

$$\tilde{V}(t_r) \equiv \frac{1}{f(t_r)} \int_{t_r}^{\bar{t}} \left(1 - \frac{\eta(\lambda - 1)}{1 + \eta} f_1(t_r) t_r \right) f(t) dt.$$

$$\tag{16}$$

It is straightforward to show that the derivative of (15) with respect to t_r is increasing in t_r if and only if

$$\tilde{V}(t_r) + \frac{t^S}{1+\eta} - t_r \ge 0.$$
(17)

Note that equation (17) rules out the potential solution $t_r = \bar{t}$ as $\tilde{V}(\bar{t}) = 0$ and $\bar{t} > t^S$. Using expression (17), we see that the seller's revenue increases in t_r as long as

$$V(t_r) - t^S \le -t^S \frac{\eta}{1+\eta} - \frac{\eta(\lambda-1)}{1+\eta} \frac{[1-F(t_r)]}{f(t_r)} f_1(t_r) t_r,$$
(18)

where $V(t_r) = t_r - [1 - F(t_r)]/f(t_r)$ is the 'virtual value'. If $t_r = \underline{t} = 0$, the left-hand side is lower than the right-hand side.

The right-hand side of equation (18) is negative. This implies that at the optimal threshold type, t_r^* , (no matter whether it is at the lower bound or in the interior) we have $V(t_r^*) - t^S < 0$. Since V is an increasing function, it must be that $t_r^* < t^{RN}$ where the optimal threshold is interior, i.e., $V(t^{RN}) - t^S = 0$ (because $\underline{t} = 0$).

Finally, notice that for λ sufficiently large, we have that $t_r^* \to \underline{t} = 0$ as, for any t > 0, the righthand side of (18) becomes arbitrarily negative when λ becoming arbitrarily large. Obviously, for such sufficiently large λ , the optimal reserve price, r^* , is $r^* = (1 + \eta)t_r^* < t^S \leq r_{RN}$.

Proof of Proposition 2

Proof. If, for some N, the optimal $t_r^* = 0$ it trivially follows that it is weakly increasing in the number of bidders. Thus, without of loss of generality, that the optimal threshold type is in the interior. We know that (18) from the proof of Proposition 1 holds with equality, so that

$$V(t_r^*) - t^S \frac{1}{1+\eta} + \frac{\eta(\lambda-1)}{1+\eta} \frac{[1-F(t_r^*)]}{f(t_r^*)} f_1(t_r^*) t_r^* = 0,$$
(19)

Moreover, note that the derivative of the left-hand side w.r.t. t_r , say $LHS_{t_r}(t_r^*)$, is positive at the optimal t_r^* , as otherwise, increasing t_r at t_r^* increased the seller's profit. Applying the implicit function theorem to (19) we have

$$\frac{dt_r^*}{dN} = -\frac{LHS_N(t_r^*, N)}{LHS_{t_r}(t_r^*)},\tag{20}$$

where the term $LHS_N(t_r^*, N)$ denotes the derivative of the left-hand side of (19) w.r.t. N at $t_r = t_r^*$. We thus need to a derive a condition ensuring that this term is negative. Note that $LHS_N(t_r^*, N) = \frac{\eta(\lambda-1)}{1+\eta} \frac{[1-F(t_r^*)]}{f(t_r^*)} t_r^* \frac{df_1(t_r^*)}{dN}$. We thus need to figure out when $\frac{df_1(x)}{dN} = \frac{d((N-1)F^{N-2}(t_r^*)f(t_r^*))}{dN} < 0$, or, equivalently, when $\frac{dln(f_1(t_r^*))}{dN} = 1/(N-1) + ln(F(t_r^*)) < 0$, which is the condition from the proposition.

Proof of Proposition 3

Proof. We prove the proposition in two steps. First, we present a function that bounds the seller's expected-revenue function (with the reserve price being the argument) from above. Second, we find the public reserve price that maximizes that upper bound.

Step 1: Bounding the Seller's Revenue. Recall that the seller's revenue under a deterministic reserve price is given by

$$\int_{t_r}^{\bar{t}} \Big(\int_{t_r}^t \{F_1'(s)s(1+F_1(s)\lambda\eta + [1-F_1(s)]\eta)\} ds + F_1(t_r)t_r(1+\eta) \Big) f(t) dt.$$

We replace $F_1(t_r)t_r(1+\eta)$ with an upper bound, say, $\hat{P}(t_r)$, where

$$\hat{P}(t_{\hat{r}}) = (1+\eta)t_{\hat{r}}F_1(t_{\hat{r}}) + \eta(\lambda-1)t_{\hat{r}}F_1(t_{\hat{r}})^2/2.$$
(21)

Further define $h(s) \equiv F'_1(s)sv(s)$ with $v(s) \equiv 1 + \eta + \eta(\lambda - 1)F_1(s)$, then the expected revenue's upper bound, $\hat{R}(t_{\hat{r}})$, (divided by N) is

$$\hat{R}(t_{\hat{r}}) = \int_{t_{\hat{r}}}^{\bar{t}} \left(\int_{t_{\hat{r}}}^{t} h(s) ds + \hat{P}(t_{\hat{r}}) \right) f(t) dt.$$
(22)

Step 2: Maximizing the upper Bound.

The derivative of $t^S F(t_{\hat{r}})^N / N + \hat{R}(t_{\hat{r}})$ with respect to $t_{\hat{r}}$ is

$$t^{S}f(t_{\hat{r}})F_{1}(t_{\hat{r}}) - f(t_{\hat{r}})\hat{P}(t_{\hat{r}}) + \left(-h(t_{\hat{r}}) + \hat{P}'(t_{\hat{r}})\right)(1 - F(t_{\hat{r}}))$$

$$= t^{S}f(t_{\hat{r}})F_{1}(t_{\hat{r}}) - f(t_{\hat{r}})c\hat{P}(t_{\hat{r}}) + \frac{\hat{P}(t_{\hat{r}})}{t_{\hat{r}}}(1 - F(t_{\hat{r}}))$$

$$= t^{S}f(t_{\hat{r}})F_{1}(t_{\hat{r}}) - \frac{\hat{P}(t_{\hat{r}})}{t_{\hat{r}}}\left(f(t_{\hat{r}})t_{\hat{r}} - [1 - F(t_{\hat{r}})]\right), \qquad (23)$$

where we used that

$$\hat{P}'(t_{\hat{r}}) = \frac{\hat{P}(t_{\hat{r}})}{t_{\hat{r}}} + (1+\eta)F_1'(t_{\hat{r}})t_{\hat{r}} + \eta(\lambda-1)F_1(t_{\hat{r}})f_1(t_{\hat{r}})t_{\hat{r}}$$

Recall that V(t) = t - [1 - F(t)]/f(t). (23) reveals that the optimal threshold type of the upper bound, say $t_{\hat{t}}^*$, satisfies

$$V(t_{\hat{r}}^*) = \frac{F_1(t_{\hat{r}}^*)t_{\hat{r}}^*}{\hat{P}(t_{\hat{r}}^*)}t^S .$$
(24)

Proof of P	coposition 4
------------	--------------

Proof. We show that the seller can achieve the maximized upper bound with the following secret and random reserve-price scheme. For given $K \in \mathbb{R}^+$, introduce a random variable, \tilde{T}_r , with realization $\tilde{t}_r \in [\underline{t}, \tilde{t}_{\overline{r}}]$, with $\tilde{t}_{\overline{r}} = t_{\hat{r}}^*$ (as defined in the proof of Proposition 3), drawn according to CDF $F_0(\tilde{t}_r) = (\frac{\tilde{t}_r}{\tilde{t}_{\overline{r}}})^K$. Moreover, for $q(t) = F_0(t)F_1(t)$ consider

$$\beta_I^*(\tilde{t}_r) = \left(\int_{\underline{t}}^{\tilde{t}_r} (1 + \eta \lambda q(s) + \eta [1 - q(s)]) q'(s) s ds + \right) / q(\tilde{t}_r).$$

$$\tag{25}$$

If the secret reserve price follows the random function $\beta_I^* \circ \tilde{T}_r : [\underline{t}, \tilde{t}_{\overline{r}}] \mapsto \Delta([\beta_I^*(\underline{t}), \beta_I^*(\tilde{t}_{\overline{r}})])$, then, in a symmetric equilibrium in increasing strategies, type-t bidder expects to win the auction with probability

 $q(t) = F_0(t)F_1(t)$, which by Lemma 1 reinforces (25) as the equilibrium bidding strategy (when replacing $F_1(t)$ with q(t) and replacing the support of (25) with $[\underline{t}, \overline{t}]$). Define $h_q(s) \equiv q'(s)sv(s)$ with $v_q(s) \equiv 1 + \eta + \eta(\lambda - 1)q(s)$. Then, replacing F_1 with q it is straightforward to observe that the expected payment, P(t), satisfies

$$P(t) = \int_{\underline{t}}^{t} h_q(s)ds + P(\underline{t}), \qquad (26)$$

for some constant $P(\underline{t})$ (see Lemma (1)). Obviously, $P(\underline{t}) = \beta_I^*(\underline{t})q(\underline{t}) = 0$, as $q(\underline{t}) = 0$.

Finally, we want to show that for $K \to \infty$ the seller's payoff converges to the maximized upper bound (22). Indeed, first note that

$$P(t) = \int_{\tilde{t}_{\bar{r}}}^{t} h_q(s) ds + \underbrace{\int_{\underline{t}}^{\tilde{t}_{\bar{r}}} h_q(s) ds}_{P(\tilde{t}_{\bar{r}})}.$$
(27)

Observe first that, for any $t \geq \tilde{t}_{\bar{r}} = t^*_{\hat{r}}$, we have $q(t) = F_1(t)$, implying $h_q(t) = h(t)$. Thus, the expectation of the first integral of P(t) stated in (27) is equal to $\hat{R}(t^*_{\hat{r}}) - \hat{P}(t^*_{\hat{r}})(1 - F(t^*_{\hat{r}}))$ (see (22)).

It thus remains to show that $P(\tilde{t}_{\bar{r}})$ (stated in the under-bracket of (27)) converges to $\hat{P}(t_{\hat{r}}^*)$ with $K \to \infty$. Applying partial integration reveals that

$$P(\tilde{t}_{\bar{r}}) = (1+\eta)q(\tilde{t}_{\bar{r}})\tilde{t}_{\bar{r}} + \eta(\lambda-1)(\frac{q(\tilde{t}_{\bar{r}})^2}{2}\tilde{t}_{\bar{r}} - \int_{\underline{t}}^{\tilde{t}_{\bar{r}}}\frac{q(s)^2}{2}ds).$$

We now use that $q(t) \to 0$ if $t < \tilde{t}_{\bar{r}} = t^*_{\hat{r}}$. Thus $P(\tilde{t}_{\bar{r}}) \to \hat{P}(t^*_{\hat{r}})$ and the claim follows.

Proof of Proposition 5

Proof. Consider equation (24) from Step 2 of Proposition 3's proof. Assume that $t^S = 0$. The largest optimal threshold $t_{\hat{r}}^*$, satisfies $V(t_{\hat{r}}^*) = 0$, and thus the threshold coincides with the risk-neutral one. Now assume that $t^S > 0$. The optimal threshold then satisfies $V(t_{\hat{r}}^*) = t^S / (1 + \eta + F_1(t_{\hat{r}}^*)\eta(\lambda - 1)/2) < t^S$. Since V is increasing in $t, t_{\hat{r}}^*$ is strictly smaller than the risk-neutral threshold type. Moreover, it is easy to observe that $V(t_{\hat{r}}^*)$ converges to $t^S / (1 + \eta)$ if $N \to \infty$ and thus is lower than the risk-neutral optimal threshold.

Proof of Proposition 6

Proof. Take any auction with public reserve price, where the seller commits not to sell the good in case no bidder meets the reserve. The corresponding threshold type is t_r . In the following, we show that there exists an auction followed by TIOLI negotiations that yields the seller larger revenues. For fixed t_r (as in the auction without TIOLI negotiations) and t_p , this latter mechanism is characterized by an interval from $[t_p, t_r)$. Types in that interval receive the good with constant probability $\alpha F_1(t_r)$, where $\alpha < 1$ and pay price $(1 + \eta)t_p$ if they get the good. In the following we derive the bid function of t_r , that is, the reserve price, and show that there exist feasible choices of t_p (i.e., p) and μ such that the seller raises more revenue than without having TIOLI negotiations.

Note that $F_1(t_r)r$ is determined by $\inf\{t|t < t_r\}$'s incentive constraints. We have

$$F_{1}(t_{r})t_{r} - \eta\lambda\alpha F_{1}(t_{r})(1 - F_{1}(t_{r}))t_{r} + \eta F_{1}(t_{r})(1 - \alpha F_{1}(t_{r}))t_{r} - F_{1}(t_{r})r$$

$$\leq \alpha F_{1}(t_{r})t_{r} - \eta\lambda\alpha F_{1}(t_{r})(1 - \alpha F_{1}(t_{r}))t_{r} + \eta\alpha F_{1}(t_{r})(1 - \alpha F_{1}(t_{r}))t_{r} - \alpha F_{1}(t_{r})(1 + \eta)t_{p}$$

$$\Leftrightarrow (1 - \alpha)F_{1}(t_{r})t_{r} + \eta\lambda(1 - \alpha)\alpha F_{1}(t_{r})^{2}t_{r} + \eta(1 - \alpha F_{1}(t_{r}))(1 - \alpha)F_{1}(t_{r})t_{r} + (1 + \eta)\alpha F_{1}(t_{r})t_{p} \leq F_{1}(t_{r})r$$

Dividing by $F_1(t_r)$ we have

$$t_r \Big((1-\alpha) + \eta \lambda (1-\alpha) \alpha F_1(t_r) + \eta (1-\alpha F_1(t_r))(1-\alpha) \Big) + (1+\eta) \alpha t_p \le r$$
$$\Leftrightarrow t_r \Big((1-\alpha)(1+\eta) + \eta (\lambda-1)(1-\alpha) \alpha F_1(t_r) \Big) + (1+\eta) \alpha t_p \le r$$

In equilibrium, the above condition holds with equality and pins down the reserve price. Suppose the seller chooses $t_p \to t_r$ and $\alpha = 1/2$ (as α continuously increases from 0 to 1 with μ , there exist a feasible choice of μ to implementing $\alpha = 1/2$), in which case the reserve price becomes $t_r \left(1 + \eta + \eta(\lambda - 1)F_1(t_r)/4\right)$ which is strictly larger than the counterpart under no commitment $t_r \left(1 + \eta\right)$.

References

- [1] ANDREYANOV, P. and E. CAOUI (2022), "Secret reserve prices by uninformed sellers" *Quantitative Economics*, 3(13), 1203-1256.
- [2] ASHENFELTER, O. (1989), "How Auctions Work for Wine and Art" Journal of Economic Perspective, 3(3), 23-36.
- [3] ASHENFELTER, O. and D. GENESOVE (1992), "Testing for Price Anomalies in Real-Estate Auctions" American Economic Review, 82(2), 501-505.
- [4] AZEVEDO, E. and D. GOTTLIEB (2012), "Risk-Neutral Firms Can Extract Unbounded Profits from Consumers with Prospect Theory Preferences" *Journal of Economic Theory*, 147(3), 1291-1299
- [5] BAJARI, P. and A. HORTAÇSU (2004), "Economic Insights from Internet Auctions" Journal of Economic Literature, 42(2), 457-486.
- [6] BALZER, B. and A. ROSATO (2021), "Expectations-Based Loss Aversion in Auctions with Interdependent Values: Extensive vs. Intensive Risk" *Management Science*, 67(2), 1056-1074.
- [7] BALZER, B., A. ROSATO and J. VON WANGENHEIM (2022), "Dutch vs. First-Price Auctions with Expectations-Based Loss-Averse Bidders" *Journal of Economic Theory*, 205, 105545.
- [8] BANERJI, A. and N. GUPTA (2014), "Detection, Identification and Estimation of Loss Aversion: Evidence from an Auction Experiment" *American Economic Journal: Microeconomics*, 6(1), 91-133.
- [9] BENKERT, J.M. (2022), "Bilateral Trade with Loss-Averse Agents" Working Paper.
- [10] BULOW, J. and P. KLEMPERER (1996), "Auctions versus Negotiations" American Economic Review, 86(1), 180-194.
- [11] CRAWFORD, V. and J.J. MENG (2011), "New York City Cabdrivers' Labor Supply Revisited: Reference-Dependent Preferences with Rational Expectations Targets for Hours and Income" American Economic Review, 101(5), 1912-1932.
- [12] CRAWFORD, V., T. KUGLER, Z. NEEMAN and A. PAUZNER (2009), "Behaviorally Optimal Auction Design: Examples and Observations" *Journal of the European Economic Association*, 7(2-3), 377-387.
- [13] DAIDO, K. and T. MUROOKA (2016), "Team Incentives and Reference-Dependent Preferences" Journal of Economics and Management Strategy, 25(4), 958-989.
- [14] DAVIS, A., E. KATOK and A. KWASNICA (2011), "Do Auctioneers Pick Optimal Reserve Prices?" Management Science, 57(1), 177-192.
- [15] DREYFUSS, B., O. HEFFETZ and M. RABIN (2022), "Expectations-Based Loss Aversion May Help Explain Seemingly Dominated Choices in Strategy-Proof Mechanisms" American Economic Journal: Microeconomics, 14(4), 515-555.

- [16] EISENHUTH, R. (2019), "Reference Dependent Mechanism Design" Economic Theory Bulletin, 7(1), 77-103.
- [17] EISENHUTH, R. and M. GRUNEWALD (2020), "Auctions with Loss Averse Bidders" International Journal of Economic Theory, 16(2), 129-152.
- [18] ELYAKIME, B., J.J. LAFFONT, P. LOISEL and Q. VUONG (1994), "First-Price Sealed-Bid Auctions with Secret Reservation Prices" Annales d'Économie et de Statistique, 34, 115-141.
- [19] FREEMAN, D. (2019), "Expectations-Based Reference-Dependence and Choice under Risk" Economic Journal, 129(662), 2424-2458.
- [20] GAGNON-BARTSCH, T., M. PAGNOZZI and A. ROSATO (2021), "Projection of Private Values in Auctions" American Economic Review, 111(10), 3256-3298.
- [21] GONÇALVES, R. (2013), "Empirical Evidence on the Impact of Reserve Prices in English Auctions" Journal of Industrial Economics, 61(1), 202-242.
- [22] GRAHAM, D., R. MARSHALL and R. JEAN-FRANCOIS (1990), "Phantom Bidding against Heterogeneous Bidders" *Economics Letters*, 32(1), 13-17.
- [23] GRETHER, D., D. PORTER and M. SHUM (2015), "Cyber-Shilling in Automobile Auctions: Evidence from a Field Experiment" American Economic Journal: Microeconomics, 7(3), 85-103.
- [24] HAILE, P. and E. TAMER (2003) "Inference with an Incomplete Model of English Auctions" Journal of Political Economy, 111(1), 1-51.
- [25] HANCART, N. (2022), "Managing the Expectations of Buyers with Reference-Dependent Preferences" Working Paper.
- [26] HASKER, K. and R. SICKELS (2010) "eBay in the Economic Literature: Analysis of an Auction Marketplace" *Review of Industrial Organization*, 37(1), 3-42.
- [27] HEIDHUES, P. and B. KŐSZEGI (2008) "Competition and Price Variation when Consumers are Loss Averse" American Economic Review, 98(4), 1245-1268.
- [28] HEIDHUES, P. and B. KŐSZEGI (2014) "Regular Prices and Sales" Theoretical Economics, 9(1), 217-251.
- [29] HERWEG, F., H. KARLE and D. MÜLLER (2018), "Incomplete Contracting, Renegotiation, and Expectation-Based Loss Aversion" Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization, 145, 176-201.
- [30] HERWEG, F., D. MÜLLER and P. WEINSCHENK (2010), "Binary Payment Schemes: Moral Hazard and Loss Aversion" American Economic Review, 100(5), 2451-2477.
- [31] HOSSAIN, T. (2008), "Learning by Bidding" RAND Journal of Economics, 39(2), 509-529.
- [32] HU, A. (2011), "How Bidder's Number Affects Reserve Price in First-Price Auction under Risk Aversion" *Economic Letters*, 113(1), 29-31.

- [33] HU, A., S. MATTHEWS, and L. ZOU (2010), "Risk Aversion and Optimal Reserve Prices in Firstand Second-price Auctions" *Journal of Economic Theory*, 145(3), 1188-1202.
- [34] HU, A., S. MATTHEWS, and L. ZOU (2019), "Low Reserve Prices in Auctions" *Economic Journal*, 129(622), 2563-2580.
- [35] JEHIEL, P., and L. LAMY (2015), "On Absolute Auctions and Secret Reserve Prices" RAND Journal of Economics, 46(2), 241-270.
- [36] KARLE, H. and M. MÖLLER (2020), "Selling in Advance to Loss-Averse Consumers" International Economic Review, 61(1), 441-468.
- [37] KARLE, H. and M. PEITZ (2014), "Competition under Consumer Loss Aversion" RAND Journal of Economics, 45(1), 1-31.
- [38] KARLE, H. and M. PEITZ (2017), "De-Targeting: Advertising an Assortment of Products to Loss-Averse Consumers" *European Economic Review*, 95, 103-124.
- [39] KARLE, H. and H. SCHUMACHER (2017), "Advertising and Attachment: Exploiting Loss Aversion through Pre-Purchase Information" RAND Journal of Economics, 48(4), 927-948.
- [40] KÖSZEGI, B. and M. RABIN (2006), "A Model of Reference-Dependent Preferences" Quarterly Journal of Economics, 121(4), 1133-1165.
- [41] KŐSZEGI, B. and M. RABIN (2007), "Reference-Dependent Risk Attitudes" American Economic Review, 97(4), 1047-1073.
- [42] KŐSZEGI, B. and M. RABIN (2009), "Reference-Dependent Consumption Plans" American Economic Review, 99(3), 909-936.
- [43] LANGE, A. and A. RATAN (2010), "Multi-dimensional Reference-dependent Preferences in Sealedbid auctions: How (most) Laboratory Experiments Differ from the Field" Games and Economic Behavior, 68(2), 634-645.
- [44] LEVIN, D. and J. SMITH (1994), "Equilibrium in Auctions with Entry" American Economic Review, 84(3), 585-599.
- [45] LEVIN, D. and J. SMITH (1996), "Optimal Reservation Prices in Auctions" Economic Journal, 106(438), 1271-1283.
- [46] LI, G. and G. TAN (2017), "Hidden Reserve Prices with Risk-Averse Bidders" Frontiers of Economics in China, 12(3), 341-370.
- [47] LI, T. and I. PERRIGNE (2003), "Timber Sale Auctions with Random Reserve Prices" Review of Economics and Statistics, 85(1), 189-200.
- [48] LIU, Q., K. MIERENDORFF, X. SHI and W. ZHONG (2019), "Auctions with Limited Commitment" American Economic Review, 109(3), 876-910.

- [49] MACERA, R. (2018) "Intertemporal Incentives Under Loss Aversion" Journal of Economic Theory, 178, 551-594.
- [50] MCAFEE, P. (1993) "Mechanism Design by Competing Sellers" Econometrica, 61(6), 1281-1312.
- [51] MCAFEE, P. and D. VINCENT (1997), "Sequentially Optimal Auctions" Games and Economic Behavior, 18(2), 246-276.
- [52] MEISNER, V. and J. VON WANGENHEIM (2023), "Loss Aversion in Strategy-proof School-choice Mechanisms" Journal of Economic Theory, 207, 105588.
- [53] MENG, J.J. and X. WENG (2017), "Can Prospect Theory Explain the Disposition Effect? A New Perspective on Reference Points" *Management Science*, 64(7), 2973-3468.
- [54] MENICUCCI, D. (2021) "In the Basic Auction Model, the Optimal Reserve Price May Depend on the Number of Bidders" *Journal of Economic Theory*, 198, 105371.
- [55] MURAMOTO, A. and T. SOGO (2022), "Asymmetric Optimal Auction Design with Loss-Averse Bidders" Working Paper.
- [56] MYERSON, R. (1981) "Optimal Auction Design" Mathematics of Operations Research, 6(1), 58-73.
- [57] NOVEMSKY, N. and D. KAHNEMAN (2005), "The Boundaries of Loss Aversion" Journal of Marketing Research, 42(2), 119-128.
- [58] ONG, S. (2006) "Price Discovery in Real Estate Auctions: The Story of Unsuccessful Attempts" Journal of Real Estate Research, 28(1), 39-60.
- [59] PAARSCH, H. (1997), "Deriving an Estimate of the Optimal Reserve Price: An Application to British Columbian Timber Sales" *Journal of Econometrics*, 78(2), 333-357.
- [60] PAGEL, M. (2016), "Expectations-Based Reference-Dependent Preferences and Asset Pricing" Journal of the European Economic Association, 14(2), 468-514.
- [61] PAGEL, M. (2017), "Expectations-Based Reference-Dependent Life-Cycle Consumption" Review of Economic Studies, 84(2), 885-934.
- [62] PAGEL, M. (2018), "A News-Utility Theory for Inattention and Delegation in Portfolio Choice" Econometrica, 86(2), 491-522.
- [63] PETERS, M., and S. SEVERINOV (1997), "Competition among Sellers who Offer Auctions instead of Prices" Journal of Economic Theory, 75(1), 141-179.
- [64] QUINT, D. (2017) "Common Values and Low Reserve Prices" Journal of Industrial Economics, 65(2), 363-396.
- [65] RILEY, J., and W. SAMUELSON (1981), "Optimal Auctions" American Economic Review, 71(3), 381-392.

- [66] ROSATO, A. (2016), "Selling Substitute Goods to Loss-Averse Consumers: Limited Availability, Bargains and Rip-offs" RAND Journal of Economics, 47(3), 709-733.
- [67] ROSATO, A. (2017), "Sequential Negotiations with Loss-Averse Buyers" European Economic Review, 91, 290-304.
- [68] ROSATO, A. (2023), "Loss Aversion in Sequential Auctions" Theoretical Economics, 18(2), 561–596.
- [69] ROSATO, A. and A. TYMULA (2019), "Loss Aversion and Competition in Vickrey Auctions: Money Ain't No Good" *Games and Economic Behavior*, 115, 188-208.
- [70] ROSENKRANZ, S. and P. SCHMITZ (2007), "Reserve Prices in Auctions as Reference Points" *Economic Journal*, 117(520), 637-653.
- [71] SKRETA, V. (1015), "Optimal Auction Design under Non-commitment" Journal of Economic Theory, 159, 854-890.
- [72] VASSERMAN, S. and M. WATT (2021), "Risk Aversion and Auction Design: Theoretical and Empirical evidence" International Journal of Industrial Organization, 79, 102758.
- [73] VINCENT, D. (1995), "Bidding off the Wall: Why Reserve Prices may be Kept Secret" Journal of Economic Theory, 65(2), 575-584.
- [74] VON WANGENHEIM, J. (2021), "English Auctions versus Vickrey Auctions with Loss-Averse Bidders" Journal of Economic Theory, 197, 105328.
- [75] WANG, W., Z. HIDVÉGI and A. WHINSTON (2001), "Shill Bidding in English Auctions." Working Paper.