

Selling Multiple Complements with Packaging Costs*

Simon Finster[†]

June 25, 2023

Abstract

I consider a package assignment problem where multiple units of indivisible items are allocated among individuals. The seller specifies allocation preferences as cost savings on packages. I propose a social welfare maximising, sealed-bid auction with a novel cost function graph to express seller preferences. It facilitates the use of linear programming to find anonymous, competitive, package-linear prices. If agents bid truthfully, these prices support a Walrasian equilibrium. I provide necessary and sufficient conditions, and additional sufficient conditions, for the existence of Walrasian equilibria. The auction guarantees fair and transparent pricing and admits preferences over the market concentration.

Keywords: package assignment, non-linear pricing, Walrasian equilibrium, allocation preferences, linear programming, non-additive costs

JEL codes: C62, D44, D50, D62

*I thank Elizabeth Baldwin, Péter Eső, Ian Jewitt, Bernhard Kasberger, Paul Klemperer, Maciej Kotowski, Edwin Lock, Bary Pradelski and Alex Teytelboym for helpful comments and suggestions.

[†]CREST-ENSAE (Paris) and CNRS/Université Grenoble Alpes, simon.finster@ensae.fr.

1 Introduction

In many multi-item auctions, it is standard that agents can submit bids on packages of indivisible items. Preferences over allocations in the market, on the other hand, are typically not allowed, even though cost savings from specific allocations may arise naturally. In procurement auctions, for instance, a manufacturer may want to favour package allocations: by obtaining multiple products or services from a single supplier, they can save transaction costs. Conversely, a social planner may wish to discourage package allocations to achieve a more equitable allocation in the market. To date, the literature on Walrasian equilibrium with indivisibilities has not yet considered preferences allowing for such costs or cost savings.

I study a competitive market setting for multiple, indivisible goods in which the seller's preferences may depend on the *partitioning of supply* among buyers. The objective is to find a socially efficient allocation. I model the seller's preferences over allocations as *packaging costs*, where the key ingredient is a novel graph structure to express marginal cost functions. The *cost function graph* allows me to obtain anonymous, Walrasian equilibrium prices, which are linear in packages¹ and reflect the structure of marginal costs. This guarantees transparency in pricing, while the anonymity of prices ensures fairness. The seller's marginal costs can reflect cost savings or additional costs arising from bundling certain items together; at the same time, there is flexibility to sell individual items separately if demand requires it. The graph structure also offers flexibility to model a wide range of cost interdependencies between packages. On the buyers' side, I also allow for a rich set of preferences admitting complementarities as well as some substitutabilities between items. I characterise Walrasian equilibria and derive necessary and sufficient conditions for the existence of a Walrasian equilibrium. In addition, I provide sufficient conditions in terms of the agents' preferences for the existence of an equilibrium.

In my model, a seller supplies multiple indivisible units of multiple varieties. Several buyers want to buy multiple units of each variety, and each buyer has a preference over combinations of these varieties. Similar settings, with the goal of characterising Walrasian equilibria, have been studied by Bikhchandani & Mamer (1997) and Bikhchandani & Ostroy (2002). However, they consider an exchange economy and a seller whose reservation utility (or marginal cost) is normalised to zero, respectively. Their model can be straightforwardly extended to marginal costs which are additive between items, but these do not admit preferences over the partitioning of supply among buyers. For example, a marginal cost function *for each item* would be allowed, but cost interdependencies between items and related bundles, for instance, are not. For the partitioning problem, I develop a tractable version of non-additive marginal costs, which, to the best of my knowledge, is the first to model preferences over allocations in a competitive equilibrium model.

In the real world, non-additive marginal costs are present whenever the bundling of items results in cost savings or additional expenses for the seller; I call these *packaging costs*. They can take the form of transaction costs (delivery, drawing up a contract), cost savings from realised synergies in the allocation, or even subsidies. Many examples for realised synergies

¹Under package-linear pricing, the same price applies to identical packages, and the price of a collection of several packages equals the sum of prices of the packages contained in the collection. A package-linear pricing function is non-linear in items, i.e. the price of a bundle may be different to the sum of prices of the items contained.

can be found in procurement. Consider a company holding a procurement auction for two input factors, which could be two different legal services for the same department. One legal team providing both services is likely more effective than two different legal teams, so the company would prefer to obtain the two services from the same law firm. At the same time, it wants to maintain flexibility to be supplied by two different firms if this is significantly cheaper. The two products may also be machines with a servicing contract. One supplier could provide maintenance and employee training for the machines more efficiently than two different suppliers. The literature in operations research has taken an interest in related procurement issues. Bichler et al. (2011), for instance, propose a bidding language that accommodates various types of discounts a procurement manager may want to offer, although not in the context of Walrasian equilibrium. Some decision support systems used in practice² also allow for different types of discounts and sophisticated bids (Gartner 2008, Giunipero et al. 2009, Bichler et al. 2011).

Subsidies are especially relevant in auctions held by the government. Consider the allocation of plots of farmland: a government with expert knowledge of land productivity may want to subsidise the allocation of complementary plots in order to achieve higher land productivity in the long run.³ In auctions for biodiversity conservation contracts,⁴ certain allocations may also be favoured because different conservation measures can be synergetic if implemented on the same piece of land. Applications may extend to transportation,⁵ telecommunication licensing, and many others.

While my main results characterise Walrasian equilibria and their existence, my work also contributes to the literature on bidding languages. The Product-Mix auction language (Klemperer 2008, 2010, 2018) allows OR-of-XOR bids⁶ whereby items may repeatedly appear in the OR-part of the bid, allowing bidders to win multiple copies of an item. The XOR-part may contain any *distinct items*, allowing bidders to express substitute preferences between those items. The Product-Mix auction has been in use by the Bank of England following the financial crisis in 2007 until today. XOR bids are standard in combinatorial auctions⁷ and a comprehensive account is given, e.g., in Nisan (2000) and Lehmann et al. (2006). However, high-dimensional XOR bids increase the computational complexity of the allocation problem; using the OR-of-XOR language whenever possible aims to address this (see also Section 4.3). In my model, each buyer can have OR-of-XOR valuations, where the XOR-part may contain *any distinct packages*. Under some conditions, bidders are even allowed to ‘repackage’ their allocated bundles, that is to sort any items received as a collection of packages into those packages they desire most. The possibility of repackaging a collection of bundles in the most profitable way is natural for some, but not all settings.

Work by Baldwin & Klemperer (2019b) implies that OR-of-XOR preferences without allowing repackaging satisfy the strong substitutes (between packages) property,^{8,9} and it is well

²Giunipero et al. (2009) interviewed the companies Ariba/Procuri, CombineNet, Emptoris, and Iasta.

³Market design approaches to land allocation have been studied, e.g., in Bryan et al. (2017).

⁴See, e.g., the BushTender auctions in Victoria (Australia) studied by Stoneham et al. (2003) and others.

⁵A notable combinatorial auction in the transport sector is analysed in Cantillon & Pesendorfer (2005).

⁶An XOR bid allows the expression of values for any number of items, where the bidder may win at most one. An OR-of-XOR bid allows submission of any number of XOR bids, each of which the bidder may win or not.

⁷For instance, the early package auction *i*Bundle (Parkes 1999) and many others use such bids.

⁸See Milgrom & Strulovici (2009) or Baldwin & Klemperer (2019b) for a definition of strong substitutes.

⁹The attribute ‘between packages’ signifies that packages, not items, are priced individually. Thus, a buyer

known that Walrasian equilibrium exists if all buyers have strong substitutes valuations and the supply bundle is fixed (up to reserve prices) (Danilov et al. 2001, Baldwin & Klemperer 2019b). Consequently, a package-linear pricing Walrasian equilibrium exists if all buyers have strong substitutes valuations between packages and the *supply vector of packages* is fixed. However, if the seller partitions a given supply vector of different items into packages and package-linear prices are allowed, this preference cannot satisfy the ‘strong substitutes between packages’ property (details are given in Appendix C). The partitioning problem is significantly more difficult precisely because this property is lacking. Nevertheless, I derive a condition for the existence of Walrasian equilibrium, using linear programming techniques in the spirit of Bikhchandani & Mamer (1997). While their result is well established, my model is significantly more complex due to the graph structure embedded in the linear programme. I show that the graph structure admits a convenient ‘characteristic function’ which makes the allocation preferences tractable. An additional advantage of this approach is to provide a framework that is computationally feasible, fixing the number of packages.¹⁰ Given my integer programming formulation of the allocation problem, the linear programming relaxation can be solved in polynomial time, and even for the original integer programme, duality theory provides avenues for practical computation (see, e.g., Vries & Vohra (2003)).

Equilibrium existence in the presence of complementarities and indivisibilities is not well understood in the literature, but important contributions have been made in recent years. For ‘gross substitutes and complements’ preferences, existence of a linear pricing Walrasian equilibrium was shown in Sun & Yang (2006) and generalised by Teytelboym (2014). These preferences were generalised once more by the concept of demand types in Baldwin & Klemperer (2019b), whose unimodularity theorem provides very general conditions for equilibrium existence. Candogan et al. (2016) study pricing equilibria for economies where buyers have graphical valuations with pairwise complementarities or substitutabilities, and Candogan et al. (2015) establish existence of a linear pricing Walrasian equilibrium for an environment where one unit per variety is sold and buyers have sign-consistent tree valuations, implying each two goods must be either substitutes or complements for all buyers. In all those studies, preferences over the partitioning of supply are not considered.

Most notably, Sun & Yang (2014) establish existence of a non-linear pricing Walrasian equilibrium when buyers and the seller have superadditive values. They also propose an incentive-compatible mechanism for their setting, and results in a similar spirit are established in Fujishige & Yang (2020) for unimodular demand types. However, neither of these contributions allow for preferences over allocations. I extend the ascending procedure by Sun & Yang (2014) to establish sufficient conditions for the existence of an integer-valued equilibrium in my setting when only one unit per item is supplied.

In Section 1.1, I illustrate the complications with Walrasian equilibrium in the partitioning problem. I describe the general model in Section 2, and discuss the sealed-bid auction market and the main result in Section 3. In Section 4, I present the second existence result and provide

may substitute one package for another.

¹⁰My model with preferences over packages is inherently exponential in the number of distinct items offered in the market. The pricing function, as an output of the allocation problem, is also exponential in the number of distinct items. However, treating the number of packages as a constant, the linear programme is a computationally benevolent formulation.

closed form solutions for an important class of cost function graphs. Section 5 is a conclusion. Appendices A to E detail buyer preferences, an example, the seller’s demand type, the extended ascending auction, and proofs.

1.1 Walrasian equilibrium and packaging costs: example and outlook

Consider a seller, e.g. the government, who wants to allocate two distinct and indivisible plots of land between two buyers. Plot A is especially suited to growing alfalfa, and plot B is suited to beans. Buyer 1 wants to buy either plot, but not both, and values plot A at 40 and plot B at 50. Buyer 2, on the other hand, wants to buy both plots, but is not interested in a single plot. He values the combination of both plots AB at 70. To start with, I assume that the seller (indexed by 0) has a marginal cost of zero for plot A and B . All agents have quasi-linear utility.

We are interested in a Walrasian equilibrium, i.e. allocations to buyers and the seller and a pricing function $p : \{\emptyset, A, B, AB\} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ with $p(\emptyset) = 0$, such that, at given prices, buyers obtain their preferred bundle, the seller maximises their utility, and demand equals supply. The example illustrates the workings of competitive equilibrium with packaging costs in a simple setting.¹¹ If $p(A)$, $p(B)$, and $p(AB)$ are such that $p(AB) = p(A) + p(B)$, the equilibrium satisfies the standard notion of a linear pricing Walrasian equilibrium. It is not hard to verify that no linear pricing Walrasian equilibrium exists.¹² This paper is concerned with a more general notion of Walrasian equilibrium, in which $p(AB) \neq p(A) + p(B)$.¹³ Surprisingly, even the non-linear pricing Walrasian equilibrium fails: there exists no assignment of prices to bundles $p(A)$, $p(B)$, and $p(AB) \neq p(A) + p(B)$ for which demand equals supply.¹⁴

Suppose now that buyer 1 also wants to buy both plots and she values the combination AB at 90 (and plot A at 40 and plot B at 50 as before). Suppose buyer 2 is also interested in plot A alone at value 50 (and the bundle AB at 70 as before). The agents’ valuations v^i are summarised in Table 1. The seller’s marginal cost is still normalised to zero (Case 1). A non-linear pricing Walrasian equilibrium exists if all agents have superadditive values (Sun & Yang 2014), i.e. $v^i(AB) \geq v^i(A) + v^i(B)$ for all $i \in \{0, 1, 2\}$, which is satisfied.¹⁵ The seller allocates plot A to buyer 2 and plot B to buyer 1 at prices $p(A) = 49$, $p(B) = 49$, and $p(AB) = 91$. It is easy to verify that both buyers and the seller strictly prefer this allocation at the given prices. Note that the equilibrium prices are not unique.

Now consider a seller who prefers the two plots to be allocated to a single farmer (Case 2

¹¹The example, of course, does not intend to suggest that competitive equilibrium is the appropriate equilibrium concept with only two buyers in a market, as they might not act as price takers.

¹²Suppose $p(A) + p(B) \leq 70$, then buyer 2 demands AB . However, buyer 1 also demands either A or B , unless $p(A) + p(B) > 90$, so markets cannot clear. Suppose $p(A) + p(B) > 70$, then buyer 2 demands nothing. Buyer 1 demands either plot A or plot B (or nothing), but at the given prices, the seller wants to supply both (or the plot that is not demanded if one of p_A or p_B equals zero).

¹³If only a single unit of each of multiple distinct items is sold, this is also called a non-linear pricing Walrasian equilibrium.

¹⁴Because no linear pricing equilibrium exists, it must be either (i) $p(A) + p(B) < p(AB)$ or (ii) $p(A) + p(B) > p(AB)$. If (i), the seller wants to sell the bundle AB . For buyer 2 to demand AB , it must be that $p(AB) \leq 70$. For buyer 1 to demand neither A nor B , it must be that $p(A) > 40$ and $p(B) > 50$, a contraction. If (ii), the seller prefers to sell A and B separately, but in this case markets do not clear.

¹⁵Note that a linear pricing Walrasian equilibrium also exists in this example, supported by $p(A) = p(B) = 50$. In general, this is not the case as shown in Example 1 in Sun & Yang (2014).

Table 1: Agents' values and marginal costs over bundles

	\emptyset	A	B	AB
Buyer 1 values	0	40	50	90
Buyer 2 values	0	50	0	70
Seller marg. cost (Case 1)	0	0	0	0
Seller marg. cost (Case 2)	0	40	50	60

in Table 1).¹⁶ The seller does not care about the buyers' identity as long as one of the buyers obtains both plots, and provided the social gain from a separate allocation does not outweigh the seller's preference. In the example, this is expressed by the seller's marginal cost function $c^0(A) = 40$, $c^0(B) = 50$, and $c^0(AB) = 60$. Utility is quasi-linear and defined as revenue minus marginal costs of all sold bundles. Now plot AB is allocated to buyer 1. This is because in the presence of a seller with marginal cost function c^0 , cost savings of $30 = 40 + 50 - 60$ are realised when allocating the bundle to a single buyer instead of allocating plot A and B separately. Prices $p(A) = 51$, $p(B) = 51$, and $p(AB) = 89$, for example, support this allocation. A package-linear pricing Walrasian equilibrium always implements an efficient allocation (Proposition 1) and it always exists, with any number of distinct plots of land for sale, if all buyers have superadditive values and the seller has subadditive marginal costs over the partitioning of supply (Theorem 2).¹⁷

In real world applications, we want to go significantly beyond the example above, as a model of pure complements may not always be applicable. More realistically, multiple units of distinct varieties might be allocated, e.g. two plots of type A , two plots of type B , and three plots of type C . Distinct or identical plots may be complements for some buyers but substitutes for others. The seller may also have richer preferences over the partitioning, e.g., she may prefer allocations in which plots of type A and B are allocated to a single buyer, but plots of type B and C are each allocated to different buyers. She may prefer a more equal distributions of land among buyers, or she may prefer allocations where plots of the same type are allocated to a single buyer. She may not only favour a specific *type* of concentration (or equal distribution), she may also favour a certain *degree* of concentration: the cost savings from allocating A and B to a single buyer may be decreasing in the number of packages AB allocated that are simultaneously allocated. The marginal cost of allocating a plot of a given type may be increasing in the number of allocated plots of this type.

Such preferences and many more interdependencies between packages are allowed in my general model. Importantly, the preferences are independent of any buyer's identity. This allows me to characterise a package-linear pricing Walrasian equilibrium with *anonymous* prices (Proposition 4 and Corollary 3), and I provide necessary and sufficient conditions for the existence of such equilibria (Theorem 1).

¹⁶For example, a farm growing different crops may be less susceptible to weather extremes or demand fluctuations, and thus be more likely to thrive and yield higher long-term productivity.

¹⁷Note in case 2 of the example, a linear pricing Walrasian equilibrium does not exist: to implement the efficient allocation where buyer 1 gets AB , we must have $p(A) > 50$ so that buyer 2 demands nothing, but buyer 1 demands AB over B only if $90 - p(A) \geq 50$, a contradiction.

2 A model of a competitive market with packaging costs

2.1 Preliminaries

There are n indivisible, distinguishable varieties (or items) in the economy, denoted $j \in N := \{1, \dots, n\}$, with a maximum supply of Ω_j units per variety.

Definition 1 (Package). A *package* is defined as a set $S \subseteq N$.

A package contains at most one unit of each variety. Consequently, there exist 2^n distinct packages in the economy, including the empty package. The powerset of N is denoted 2^N . A multiset generalises a set by allowing multiple copies of each item. Given some ground set with distinguishable elements, a multiset can be defined by simply counting the multiplicities of each element of the ground set (with multiplicity zero if an element is not contained). Occurrences of the same element are indistinguishable.¹⁸

Definition 2 (Multiset). Given a finite ground set $A = \{a_1, \dots, a_n\}$, a *multiset* is defined as a mapping $m : A \rightarrow \mathbb{N}_0$, and written as a vector $\mathbf{m} := (m(a_1), \dots, m(a_n))$.

Function $m(a)$ (or m_a) denotes the multiplicity of element a in the multiset \mathbf{m} . A *multiset of varieties* (with ground set N) is written as a vector $\mathbf{m} = (m_1, \dots, m_n) \in \mathbb{Z}_+^n$. A *multiset of packages* or *package multiset* (with ground set 2^N) is written as $\mathbf{k} = (k_{S_1}, \dots, k_{S_{2^N}}) \in \mathbb{Z}_+^{|2^N|}$. Each k_S denotes the multiplicity of package S and, by assumption, $k_\emptyset = 0$. Given a set $A \subseteq 2^N$, \mathbf{k}_{-A} denotes the vector $(k'_{S_1}, \dots, k'_{S_{2^n-1}})$, where $k'_S = k_S$ if $S \notin A$ and $k'_S = 0$ if $S \in A$. The maximum supply of all units is given by the vector $\mathcal{N} := (\Omega_1, \dots, \Omega_n)$. The feasibility of multisets in the economy is restricted by the maximum supply per variety.

Definition 3 (Feasible multisets). The universe of all feasible package multisets \mathcal{K} is given by

$$\mathcal{K} := \left\{ \mathbf{k} \in \mathbb{Z}_+^{|2^N|} : \sum_{\substack{S \in 2^N \\ S \ni j}} k_S \leq \Omega_j \quad \forall j \in N \right\}.$$

I formulate my model such that packages of complementary items, or packages associated with allocation preferences, consist of distinct varieties only. Packages of identical varieties are treated as multisets of packages, or lists of packages. This will be useful in constructing a pricing function and is without loss of generality: relabelling appropriately, I can map any setting with complementarities or allocation concerns between identical varieties into my model (details in Section 4.3).

If \mathbf{k} is such that $k_S = 1$ for exactly one set $S \subseteq N$ and $k_{S'} = 0$ for all other S' , then \mathbf{k} is simply denoted by S . For a function $f : \mathbb{Z}_+^{|2^N|} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $f(S)$ is short for $f(\mathbf{k}$ with $k_S = 1, k'_{S'} = 0 \forall S' \neq S)$. I define the following basic operations for multisets:

Definition 4. Let $\mathbf{k} = (k_S)_{S \in 2^N}, \mathbf{k}' = (k'_S)_{S \in 2^N} \in \mathbb{Z}_+^{|2^N|}$.

- (i) Sum. $\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{k}' = (k_S + k'_S)_{S \in 2^N}$. The sum operator for multisets is denoted \vdash .

¹⁸See e.g. Blizard (1989) for a detailed treatment of multisets.

- (ii) Multiplication with a scalar. $\alpha \mathbf{k} = (\alpha k_S)_{S \in 2^N}$
- (iii) Unpacking. $\mathbf{k}^\star = (m_j)_{j \in N}$ with $m_j = \sum_{S \in 2^N, S \ni j} k_S \quad \forall j \in N$
- (iv) Cardinality. $|\mathbf{k}| = \sum_{S \in 2^N} k_S$

The unpacking operator \star breaks a package multiset \mathbf{k} down into a multiset of the varieties contained in \mathbf{k} . I also work with package lists to simplify the exposition of my model. A *list of packages* or *package list* may be seen as a multiset endowed with an ordering, i.e. it carries strictly more information. I write a package list as $\Sigma = (\Sigma_1, \dots, \Sigma_p)$. The empty list is denoted \emptyset .

Definition 5 (List of packages). A *list of packages* $\Sigma = (\Sigma_1, \dots, \Sigma_p)$ contains elements $\Sigma_j \in 2^N$. Σ may contain duplicates distinguished by their position in the list.

Let \mathcal{S} denote the universe of all lists than can be constructed with elements $\Sigma_j \in 2^N$. A counting function $c : \mathcal{S} \times 2^N \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_+^{|2^N|}$ allows me to map any package list into a package multiset $\mathbf{k} = (c(\Sigma, S_1), \dots, c(\Sigma, S_{2^n-1}))$ with $|\mathbf{k}| = |\Sigma| = p$ by counting the number of occurrences of each package in the list.

2.2 Agents and preferences

There is one seller ('she') in the economy, denoted by 0, and a set of L buyers ('he'), also called bidders, and denoted by $l \in \mathcal{L} := \{1, \dots, L\}$. The set of all agents is denoted by $\mathcal{L}_0 := \mathcal{L} \cup \{0\}$. To start with, I describe a model in which I do not distinguish between buyers and the seller. Each agent has a preference over lists of packages of goods, which can be summarised by a value function $V^l : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_+$ with $V^l(\emptyset) = 0$. More generally, preferences may also be expressed over multisets of goods (see Appendix A), which are often more natural. However, working with a list of packages simplifies the exposition.¹⁹ Each agent's utility is quasi-linear and given by $u^l(\Sigma, p) = V^l(\Sigma) - p(\Sigma)$ when they receive a package list Σ at prices p . I add a simple structure on the value function which facilitates its representation in my mechanism. An agent's aggregate value of a package list Σ is derived from the marginal values of these packages.

Definition 6 (Marginal values). The *marginal value function* is defined as $v^l : \mathbb{Z}_+ \times 2^N \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_+$. $v^l(q, S)$ describes the marginal value agent l derives from a package of variety $S \in 2^N$ if associated with the q th index in list Σ .

Definition 7 (Marginal value aggregation). The value of a package list Σ is defined as

$$V^l(\Sigma) = \sum_{q=1}^{|\Sigma|} v^l(q, S_q).$$

For some results, I consider preferences that bear the characteristic of superadditivity between complementary items, and, at the same time, the substitute characteristic of weakly

¹⁹If the auctioneer's objective is to maximise social welfare, a buyer with preferences over package lists will indeed obtain the same aggregate value from an allocation as a buyer with preferences over package multisets (cf. Section 3.1).

decreasing marginal values between identical varieties and packages. Note that superadditivity is the most general concept of complementarity, containing supermodularity and gross complements (Samuelson 1974, Sun & Yang 2014).

Definition 8 (Superadditivity). A marginal value function $v^l : \mathbb{Z}_+ \times 2^N \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_+$ is *superadditive* if for any disjoint sets $S_1, S_2 \in 2^N$ and $q \geq 1$ it holds that

$$v^l(q, S_1 \cup S_2) \geq v^l(q, S_1) + v^l(q, S_2).$$

Definition 9 (Decreasing marginal values). A marginal value function $v^l : \mathbb{Z}_+ \times 2^N \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_+$ is *decreasing in marginal values* if for any package $S \in 2^N$ and $q \geq 1$, it holds that

$$v^l(q, S) \geq v^l(q + 1, S).$$

I call marginal value functions *decreasing superadditive* if they are both superadditive and decreasing. The aggregate value function constructed from $v^l(q, S)$ according to Definition 7 (or the generalised Definitions 20 and 21 in Appendix A), I call *concave superadditive*.

Preferences are related to OR-of-XOR preferences (Nisan 2000, Lehmann et al. 2006) and can be mapped into a finite list of XOR bids (this is shown formally in Section 3.1). I consider three types of preferences: the one presented here is a strict subset of OR-of-XOR, and the two generalisations in Appendix A are equivalent and strictly more general than OR-of-XOR. Example 2 in Appendix B further illustrates the three types of marginal value aggregation.

2.3 Allocation preferences

I also consider a seller with much more general preferences than the agents described in Section 2.2. These *preferences over allocations* are summarised by a cost function C^0 over a universe of *multisets of packages*. The seller has quasi-linear utility given by $u^0(\mathbf{k}, p) = p(\mathbf{k}) - C^0(\mathbf{k})$ when she sells the package multiset \mathbf{k} at price p . The cost function is constructed from three elements: (i) a marginal cost function for each individual variety sold, (ii) incremental marginal cost functions to express the cost savings (or additional cost) from bundling varieties as a package, and (iii) a graph characterising cost relations, i.e. which incremental marginal cost functions take effect when a given package is sold. First, I define the graph characterising cost relations, called a *cost function graph (CFG)*.

Definition 10 (Cost function graph). A CFG is a directed graph $G := (V, E)$, with a set of vertices $V = 2^N$, and a set of edges E which define cost relations (subject to Assumption 1 below).

Whenever there exists a sequence of vertices (S_1, \dots, S_t) such that $(S_1, S_2), \dots, (S_{t-1}, S_t) \in E$, I say there exists a path from S_1 to S_t and write $\exists(S_1 \dots S_t)$. By convention, there exists a path from any package to itself (without explicitly adding an edge (S, S)). Given a path $H = (S_1, \dots, S_t)$, $|H| := t - 1$ denotes the length of path H . The CFG describes the cost relations between packages. Whenever $\exists(T \dots S)$, i.e. there exists a path from T to S , I say that ‘package T has a cost relation to package S ’. This means that *a cost increment corresponding to S also contributes to the*

marginal cost of T . Importantly, each node in the CFG is associated with an (incremental) marginal cost function (defined below).

A crucial element in the seller's problem is the configuration of varieties into packages subject to not violating supply constraints. The CFG is designed to facilitate this: by definition, variety j 's marginal cost contributes to the overall cost of a multiset, whenever a copy of j is sold, separately or as part of a package. Thus, the last step of the marginal cost function corresponding to a single variety j ensures that the supply of j is not violated. To enable the representation of cost relations and supply constraints, a CFG is required to have the following properties.

Assumption 1 (Permissible cost relations).

- (i) If $(T, S) \in E$, then $S \subset T$.
- (ii) There exists a directed path from every package S to every single variety j that is contained in S , i.e. $\forall S, \forall j \in S, \exists(S \dots j)$.

Assumption 1 (i) is intuitive in an economic sense: if a bundle has no physical relation to another package (in the sense of being a superset), it also cannot have a cost relation to it. From Assumption 1 (i) it follows that node N is always a source; but G may contain other sources as well. It also follows that G contains no cycles. Assumption 1 (i) and (ii) imply that S is a sink if and only if S is a single variety. This is required because the seller has a *supply of individual varieties* Ω_j (and not a supply of packages Ω_S). Marginal cost functions corresponding to the sinks count the number of units of each single variety allocated.²⁰ Assumption 1 (ii) ensures that whenever a unit of a given package S is allocated, the single varieties contained in that package are counted correctly. It also implies that G is weakly connected.

Each node of the CFG is associated with an incremental marginal cost function $\Delta c(\cdot, S), S \in 2^N$. Suppose one copy of package T is sold and nothing else. Then the marginal cost of T is obtained by adding all incremental marginal costs $\Delta c(\cdot, S)$ to which T has a cost relation, i.e. the marginal cost of T is $\sum_{S \in 2^N: \exists(T \dots S)} \Delta c(\cdot, S)$. Whenever a package with cost relation to S is sold, the incremental marginal cost $\Delta c(\cdot, S)$ is added to the overall cost of the supplied multiset. I allow the incremental cost to depend on q , the number of packages with cost relation to S sold.

Definition 11 (Incremental marginal cost). Incremental marginal cost functions are given by $\Delta c : \mathbb{Z}_+ \times 2^N \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$, where $\Delta c(q, S)$ is the incremental marginal cost the seller incurs from selling a copy of package T due to its cost relation to package S , when she sells $q - 1$ copies of other packages with cost relation to S . I define $\Delta c(0, S) := 0$ for all S , and $\Delta c(q, j) := \infty$ for all $j \in N$ and $q > \Omega_j$.

Note that negative incremental marginal costs are permitted.

Definition 12 (Marginal cost). Given a CFG and associated Δc , the marginal cost of a bundle $S \in 2^N$ is defined as a function $c^0 : \mathbb{Z}_+ \times 2^N \times \mathbb{Z}_+^{2^n - 1} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_+$. Given $B \subseteq 2^N$, $c^0(k, S, \mathbf{k}_{-B})$ denotes the seller's marginal cost from selling the k th 'unit' of package S , when she also sells

²⁰If the graph was such that S with $|S| > 1$ is a sink, S would have to be redefined as a new variety, available in quantity Ω_S .

the packages \mathbf{k}_{-B} . Let $S \in B$. Then

$$c^0(k, S, \mathbf{k}_{-B}) = \sum_{\substack{\gamma \in 2^N: \\ \exists(S \dots \gamma)}} \Delta c(q_\gamma, \gamma), \quad \text{where } q_\gamma := \sum_{\substack{A \in 2^N \setminus B: \\ \exists(A \dots \gamma)}} k_A + k$$

Note that k_A counts the number of packages of type A supplied, whereas q_γ counts the number of packages of any type $A : \exists(A \dots \gamma)$ supplied, excluding the packages in B . In most cases, $B = S$ but sometimes it will be necessary to work with a strict superset of S . For single varieties $j \in N$ we have $c^0(k, j, \mathbf{k}_{-j}) = \Delta c(k, j)$, so the marginal cost equals the incremental marginal cost of the k th unit of package j .

Definition 13 (Cost). Given a CFG and associated Δc , the cost of selling a package multiset $\mathbf{k} \in \mathcal{K}$ is given by $C^0 : \mathcal{K} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_+$ where

$$C^0(\mathbf{k}) = \sum_{S \in 2^N} \sum_{y=1}^{q_S} \Delta c(y, S), \quad \text{with } q_S := \sum_{\substack{\gamma \in 2^N: \\ \exists(\gamma \dots S)}} k_\gamma$$

The seller's cost of selling a package multiset is given by all incremental marginal costs that she incurs due to cost relations of the supplied packages. Importantly, the costs of packages with overlapping subsets of single varieties may be correlated. Moreover, the cost of each additionally supplied package may differ from the cost of a previously supplied, identical package. From Definition 11 it follows immediately that for any $\mathbf{k} = (k_S)_{S \in 2^N}$ for which $\exists j \in A \subseteq N : \sum_{S \in 2^N, S \ni j} k_S > \Omega_j$, we have $c^0(k, A, \mathbf{k}_{-A}) := \infty$, i.e. the multiset \mathbf{k} that contains A cannot be sold because the seller is constrained in the supply of at least one variety in A . Note that the seller cannot procure a bundle at the cost of the bundle and then split it up into subsets to be sold individually, or vice versa. I make the following assumption on the seller's preferences.

Assumption 2 (Increasing incremental marginal cost). For any package $S \in 2^N$ and for all $q \geq 1$, it holds that

$$\Delta c(q, S) \leq \Delta c(q + 1, S).$$

When selling a package multiset, the seller incurs at least the cost of each individual package in the multiset because of Definition 13 and Assumption 2. In Example 2 in Appendix B, I detail a simple cost function graph and associated incremental marginal cost functions with two distinct items A and B . Note, however, that the expressive power of cost function graphs is much greater with at least three distinct items A , B , and C . For instance, the cost savings from bundling ABC together may depend on the number of units of package AB that are simultaneously sold in the market. Cost function graphs based on three items are illustrated in Figs. 2 to 4.

For some results, I consider cost functions that bear the characteristic of subadditivity between disjoint packages.

Definition 14 (Subadditive marginal cost). Let $S_1, S_2 \in 2^N$ be two disjoint packages, and let $B := \{S_1 \cup S_2, S_1, S_2\}$. The seller's marginal cost is subadditive if it holds that, for all $\mathbf{k}_{-B} \in \mathcal{K}$,

and for all $k \geq 1$,

$$c^0(k, S_1 \cup S_2, \mathbf{k}_{-B}) \leq c^0(k, S_1, \mathbf{k}_{-B}) + c^0(k, S_2, \mathbf{k}_{-B}).$$

A cost function with an associated subadditive marginal cost function I also call subadditive. For general cost function graphs, the subadditivity of marginal cost property can only be verified from marginal cost functions. For a special class of CFGs, however, I provide a criterion in Section 4.2 that can be easily verified from incremental marginal cost functions.

2.4 Demand, supply, and equilibrium

In this section I formally define demand, supply, pricing functions, and my notion of competitive equilibrium. The aim is to develop a market model in which equilibrium prices are *package-linear*, which I define below. In what follows, I use the notation by which all agents receive (or allocate) a package multiset, allowing the most general forms of preferences I consider. Naturally, a package multiset can be equipped with an (arbitrary) ordering to transform it into a package list. All proofs are deferred to Appendix E.

Given her supply of items, the seller chooses a multiset \mathbf{k} of packages to sell. \mathbf{k} must be feasible, i.e. $\mathbf{k} \in \mathcal{K}$. An allocation of items in \mathcal{N} is defined as an assignment $\pi = (\pi(l), l \in \mathcal{L}_0)$ of these items among buyers and the seller, such that $\bigoplus_{l \in \mathcal{L}} \pi(l) = \mathbf{k}$ and $\pi(0) = \mathcal{N} - \mathbf{k}^*$. $\pi(l)$ is the package multiset assigned to agent l under the allocation π , where $\pi(l)$ may be the empty set, and $\pi(0) \neq \emptyset$ means that the items in $\pi(0)$ are not sold. For all agents $l \in \mathcal{L}_0$, the demand (or supply) correspondence and indirect utility are defined as $D^l(p) := \arg \max_{\mathbf{k} \in \mathcal{K}} u^l(\mathbf{k}, p)$ and $\mathcal{V}^l(p) := \max_{\mathbf{k} \in \mathcal{K}} u^l(\mathbf{k}, p)$. An allocation π is efficient if it holds for every allocation π' that $\sum_{l \in \mathcal{L}} V^l(\pi(l)) - C^0(\mathbf{k}) \geq \sum_{l \in \mathcal{L}} V^l(\pi'(l)) - C^0(\mathbf{k}')$, where $\mathbf{k} = \bigoplus_{l \in \mathcal{L}} \pi(l)$ and $\mathbf{k}' = \bigoplus_{l \in \mathcal{L}} \pi'(l)$. Given an efficient allocation π , the market value is defined as $V(\mathcal{N}) := \sum_{l \in \mathcal{L}} V^l(\pi(l)) - C^0(\mathbf{k})$. A pricing function is a function $p : \mathbb{Z}_+^{2^N} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ with $p(\emptyset) = 0$. This function is *nonlinear* in varieties $j \in N$, i.e. for any package $S \in 2^N$ we may have $p(S) \neq \sum_{j \in S} p(\{j\})$.

Definition 15. A pricing function $p : \mathbb{Z}_+^{2^N} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ with $p(\emptyset) = 0$ is *package-linear* if and only if, for all $\mathbf{k} \in \mathbb{Z}_+^{2^N}$, $p(\mathbf{k}) = \sum_{S \in 2^N} k_S p(S)$.

Thus, a package-linear pricing function can be represented as a mapping $p : 2^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$.²¹ A *package-linear* pricing Walrasian equilibrium is given by a *package-linear* pricing function $p^* : 2^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and an allocation π^* such that $\bigoplus_{l \in \mathcal{L}} \pi(l) \in D^0(p^*)$ and $\pi^*(l) \in D^l(p^*)$ for every bidder $l \in \mathcal{L}$. If the pricing function is linear in varieties, the package-linear Walrasian equilibrium is simply the standard Walrasian equilibrium. The subsequent lemma states the welfare theorems in the standard fashion. A formal proof is given in Appendix E.

Proposition 1. *If (p^*, π^*) is a package-linear Walrasian equilibrium, π^* is an efficient allocation. Furthermore, if π' is another efficient allocation, (p^*, π') is a package-linear Walrasian equilibrium as well.*

²¹Sun & Yang (2014) call a pricing function $p : 2^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ *non-linear*, and the equilibrium concept *non-linear* pricing Walrasian equilibrium. With only one unit per variety for sale, the non-linear equilibrium and the package-linear equilibrium are the same concept.

The concepts of efficiency and Walrasian equilibrium are defined independently of the buyers' marginal value aggregation. They may receive a package list, a package multiset, or possess the technology to repackage an allocated package multiset.

3 The sealed-bid package auction and Walrasian equilibrium

In this section, I describe the agents' bidding languages for submission of their preferences and how the auction is solved. I state the main result and characterise the structure of package-linear prices. The auction assumes that agents do not behave strategically, which may approximately hold with a large number of buyers and a truthful seller. The auction outcome is a Walrasian equilibrium allocation supported by competitive prices.

3.1 Buyers' language

Each buyer l submits a finite list of bids to the auctioneer in a sealed envelope. The auctioneer treats each bid as independent from other bids, including the ones made by the same agents, and processes only the aggregate bid list. It is therefore convenient to simply enumerate the bids by $i \in \mathcal{I} := \{1, \dots, m\}$. I denote the bid list submitted by buyer l by \mathcal{I}^l , where $\bigoplus_{l \in \mathcal{L}} \mathcal{I}^l = \mathcal{I}$. Note that if the seller is symmetric to buyers, naturally she also submits a list of 'buyer bids'. Each bid submitted in the auction is a *package XOR bid*. It is a vector of length 2^n specifying a maximum price v_S^i , which the agent is willing to pay, for each package (except the empty package) and an overall maximum quantity κ^i . Each bid is guaranteed to be only allocated packages which maximise its per-package surplus $\kappa^i(v_S^i - p(S))$. I denote by x_S^i the allocation of bundle S to bid i .

Package XOR bids are an extension of so called 'paired bids' used in the Product-Mix auction by Klemperer (2008, 2010, 2018) for an environment where items are sold in packages. An allocation $x_S^i, S \in 2^N, i \in \mathcal{I}^l$ maps into a multiset $\pi(l) = \mathbf{k}^l$, where $k_S^l = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}^l} x_S^i$. Naturally, this mapping is not one-to-one, as different allocations may map into the same multiset.

Definition 16. A value function V^l can be represented by a bid list \mathcal{I}^l , if (i) there exists a mapping from V^l to \mathcal{I}^l , and (ii) given any allocation $\pi(l)$, the agent's value $V^l(\pi(l))$ enters the auctioneer's objective.

Proposition 2. *If the auctioneer maximises social welfare, any value function V^l satisfying Definitions 6 and 20 can be represented by a finite list of XOR bids.*

It is an immediate corollary that preferences over package lists can also be represented, as the auctioneer may fix any ordering on a package multiset.

Corollary 1. *If the auctioneer maximises social welfare, any value function V^l satisfying Definitions 6 and 7 can be represented by a finite list of XOR bids.*

A social welfare maximising auctioneer will choose the utility-maximising allocation for every bid list. This implies that, if a buyer receives a package list instead of a package multiset, this list is already ordered optimally.

If buyers cannot repackage items, preferences can be easily translated into bids. With repackaging on the buyers' side, however, the seller cannot distinguish between bids made by one buyer or another. Two allocated items might be used separately if two different buyers acquired them, or possibly as a bundle if one buyer received both. Allowing repackaging, the XOR-language can in general not adequately represent the buyers' preferences. Given an allocation, a buyer is always weakly better off compared to the value the auctioneer assigns to the buyer's contribution of welfare. However, under further restriction of preferences repackaging can be allowed.


Proposition 3. *Suppose the buyers' values are concave superadditive (cf. Definitions 8 and 9) and the seller's costs are subadditive (cf. Definition 14). If the auctioneer maximises social welfare, any value function satisfying Definitions 6 and 21 can be represented by a finite list of XOR bids.*

Given the XOR bid structure and Proposition 2 (or Corollary 1 or Proposition 3), buyer l 's indirect utility is given by

$$\mathcal{V}^l(p) := \max_{x_S^i, i \in \mathcal{I}^l} \sum_{S, i \in \mathcal{I}^l} (v_S^i - p_S) x_S^i \quad \text{s.t.} \quad \sum_S x_S^i \leq \kappa^i \quad \forall i \in \mathcal{I}^l \quad (1)$$

For $N = \{A, B\}$, the bid $(v_A, v_B, v_{AB}, 1)$ is illustrated in price space in Fig. 1. Further details are given in Example 2 in Appendix B. Note that, if each buyer is interested in at most one unit

Figure 1: Combination XOR bid for three packages



of each variety, the package XOR-language can be fully expressive, i.e. allows the representation of any preference. Although somewhat more restrictive with multiple units per variety, buyers can still express a rich set of preferences in this language.

3.2 Seller's bidding language

The seller submits her preferences through (i) supply functions, and (ii) the graph describing the relations between supply functions. If she reports her preferences truthfully, the supply functions will correspond precisely to the incremental marginal cost functions, and the submitted graph will correspond to her cost function graph. The submitted cost function graph is called a supply function graph (SFG). The seller submits $2^n - 1$ supply functions. Analogous to incremental marginal cost functions, a supply function f_j for an individual variety j describes the marginal cost of each unit supplied of variety j . A supply function f_S for package S with

$|S| > 1$ describes the incremental marginal cost for every package $S' : \exists(S' \dots S)$, i.e. the additional cost, or the cost savings, inherited by S' , which also contains the items bundled together in S .

Each f_S is a step function, where the q th step has length l_S^q and height μ_S^q . Without loss of generality the length of each step could be normalised to one. I denote by y_S^q the amount allocated on step q of f_S . Each supply function consists of an infinite number of steps, and there exists a finite \bar{q}_S such that $\mu_S^q = \infty$ for all $q > \bar{q}_S$. Thus, any step $q > \bar{q}_S$ will never be allocated. I define $\bar{q} := \max\{\bar{q}_S | S \in 2^N\}$. Two requirements on supply function graphs ensure non-negative costs and weakly increasing incremental marginal costs.

Requirement 1 (Non-negative costs). $\forall \mathbf{k} \in \mathcal{K} : \sum_{S \in 2^N} \sum_{y=1}^{q_S} \mu_S^y \geq 0$, where $q_S := \sum_{\substack{\gamma \in 2^N: \\ \exists(\gamma \dots S)}} k_\gamma$

Requirement 2 (Weakly increasing marginal costs). $\forall S, q : \mu_S^q \leq \mu_S^{q+1}$

Recall that f_S describes the incremental marginal cost that is inherited by all packages S' with a cost relation to S , i.e. $\exists(S' \dots S)$. Thus, it is natural to require also the following.

Requirement 3 (Supply step allocation). Whenever a step on supply function f_S is allocated, a step on every supply function $f_{S'}$ is allocated, for all $S' : \exists(S \dots S')$.

The allocation on supply curve f_S is limited by the minimum number of steps with finite height among all supply curves $f_\gamma : \exists(S \dots \gamma)$. This reflects precisely the definition of incremental marginal costs: for any $\mathbf{k} = (k_S)_{S \in 2^N}$ for which $\exists j \in A \subseteq N : \sum_{S \in 2^N, S \ni j} k_S > \Omega_j$, it holds that $C^0(\mathbf{k}, A, \mathbf{k}_{-A}) := \infty$. A crucial property of the supply function graph is that an allocation $\{y_S^q\}_{S \in 2^N, q \leq \bar{q}}$ uniquely identifies a package multiset:

Lemma 1. *Given a supply function graph $G = (V, E)$ satisfying Assumption 1, there exists a linear one-to-one mapping between a supply function allocation $\{y_S^q\}_{S \in 2^N, q \leq \bar{q}}$ and a corresponding package multiset \mathbf{k} . This mapping is called the ‘characteristic function’ ϕ^G of G .*

Algorithm 1 is used to determine the package multiset $\phi^G(\{y_S^q\})$. It uses a supply function graph $G = (V, E)$ and allocation $\{y_S^q\}_{S \in G, q \leq \bar{q}}$ as input and outputs a package multiset $(k_S)_{S \in 2^N}$. A full proof to Lemma 1 is given in Appendix E.

Algorithm 1: Construct multiset from allocation on SFG

Initialise list of successfully visited nodes $\mathcal{V} := \emptyset$.

while $V \neq \mathcal{V}$ **do**

Select a node $S \in V \setminus \mathcal{V}$

if $\exists A \in V \setminus \mathcal{V} : \exists(A \dots S)$ **then** skip S ;

else

set $k_S = \sum_{q=1}^{\bar{q}} y_S^q - \sum_{A \in \mathcal{V} : \exists(A \dots S)} k_A$ and $\mathcal{V} = \mathcal{V} \cup S$

end

end

return $(k_S)_{S \in 2^N} = \phi^G(\{y_S^q\})$

Using Lemma 1, I rewrite the seller’s problem as follows. I substitute the k_γ in the second term of the sum by y_γ^q . Thus, subtracting the seller’s cost becomes equivalent to subtracting

the allocation on each step of the supply functions (weighted by the height of the corresponding step).

$$\begin{aligned}
& \max_{\mathbf{k} \in \mathcal{K}} \{p(\mathbf{k}) - C^0(\mathbf{k})\} \\
\Leftrightarrow & \max_{k_S} \left\{ \sum_{S \in 2^N} k_S p(S) - \sum_{S \in 2^N} \sum_{y=1}^{q_S} \Delta c(y, S) \right\} \quad \text{where } q_S := \sum_{\substack{\gamma \in 2^N: \\ \exists (\gamma \dots S)}} k_\gamma \\
\Leftrightarrow & \max_{k_S, y_S^q} \left\{ \sum_{S \in 2^N} k_S p(S) - \sum_{S \in 2^N} \sum_{q=0}^{\bar{q}_S} \mu_S^q y_S^q \right\} \quad \text{s.t. } y_S^q \leq l_S^q \quad \forall S, q
\end{aligned}$$

3.3 Competitive equilibrium

The input to the allocation problem consists of a bid list $\{(v_S^i)_{S \in 2^N}, \kappa^i\}_{i \in \mathcal{I}}$, a list of supply steps $(\mu_S^q, l_S^q)_{S \in 2^N, q \leq \bar{q}}$, and a supply function graph G . x_S^i denotes the allocation of bundle S to bid i , y_S^q denotes the allocation on step q of the supply function f_S , and Y_S denotes the total quantity of bundle S allocated. The objective of the allocation problem is to find the social welfare maximising partitioning of supply among bids, i.e. to find an allocation $\{x_S^i, y_S^q, Y_S\}_{S \in 2^N, i \in \mathcal{I}, q \leq \bar{q}}$ that maximises the sum of the buyers' and the seller's utilities. The SFG encodes the relations between the supply functions $(f_S)_{S \in 2^N}$ and it satisfies Assumption 1. The characteristic function of G is guaranteed to exist by Lemma 1 and denoted by $\phi^G : \mathbb{Z}_+^{2^n \times \bar{q}} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^{2^n}$, where $\phi_S^G(\{y_S^q\}) = Y_S$. The welfare maximisation problem can be written as the integer programme 'IP'.

IP

$$\max_{\{x_S^i, y_S^q, Y_S\}} \left[\sum_{i,S} v_S^i x_S^i - \sum_{S,q} \mu_S^q y_S^q \right] \quad \text{s.t.} \quad \begin{cases} \sum_S x_S^i \leq \kappa^i & \forall i & [\text{bid size constraint}] \\ y_S^q \leq l_S^q & \forall q, \forall S & [\text{step size constraint}] \\ \sum_i x_S^i \leq Y_S & \forall S & [\text{supply constraint}] \\ Y_S = \phi_S^G(\{y_S^q\}) & \forall S & [\text{SFG relations}] \\ x_S^i, y_S^q, Y_S \in \mathbb{Z}_+ & \forall S, \forall i, \forall q \end{cases}$$

The supply constraint must be binding at the optimum, so prices cancel from the buyers' and seller's objective. Substituting for Y_S , and relaxing the integrality constraints, I write the integer programme as a linear programme 'LP' with dual variables listed next to the corresponding constraints. The feasible set of LP is a non-empty, convex polytope and therefore an optimal solution always exists; by strong duality, an optimal solution to DLP exists also.

LP

$$\max_{\{x_S^i, y_S^q\}} \left[\sum_{i,S} v_S^i x_S^i - \sum_{S,q} \mu_S^q y_S^q \right]$$

$$\text{s.t. } \begin{cases} \sum_S x_S^i \leq \kappa^i \quad \forall i & b_i \quad [\text{bid size constraint}] \\ y_S^q \leq l_S^q \quad \forall q, \forall S & u_S^q \quad [\text{step size constraint}] \\ \sum_i x_S^i - \phi_S^G(\{y_S^q\}) \leq 0 \quad \forall S & z_S \quad [\text{supply constraint}] \\ x_S^i, y_S^q \geq 0 \quad \forall S, \forall i, \forall q \end{cases}$$

The corresponding dual problem ‘DLP’ is constructed using the ‘characteristic function dual’ $\psi^G(\{z_S\})$ of $\phi^G(\{y_S^q\})$. Formally, let $\phi^G(\{y_S^q\}) = \Phi \mathbf{y}^\top$, where Φ is a $|2^N| \times |2^N|$ -matrix determined by Algorithm 1, and $\mathbf{y} = \left(\sum_q y_S^q \right)_{S \in 2^N}$, i.e. a row vector each entry of which contains the total quantity allocated on supply curve f_S . $\phi_S^G(\{y_S^q\}) = \phi_S^G \mathbf{y}^\top$, i.e. the row corresponding to package S of Φ multiplied by \mathbf{y}^\top . Then $\psi^G(\{z_S\}) = \Phi^\top \mathbf{z}^\top$, where $\mathbf{z} = (z_S)_{S \in 2^N}$.

DLP

$$\begin{aligned} & \min_{\{b^i, z_S, u_S^q\}} \left[\sum_i \kappa^i b^i + \sum_{q, S} l_S^q u_S^q \right] \\ \text{s.t. } & \begin{cases} b^i + z_S \geq v_S^i \quad \forall i, S & x_S^i \quad [\text{surplus constraint}] \\ u_S^q - \psi_S^G(\{z_S\}) \geq -\mu_S^q \quad \forall q, \forall S & y_S^q \quad [\text{marginal cost constraint}] \\ b^i, u_S^q, z_S \geq 0 \quad \forall S, \forall i, \forall q \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

The pricing function is given as part of the solution of the DLP programme, which is crucial in characterising the price structure. I also establish further properties of the auction prices and state the main theorem of this section. The price of each package S is given by the dual variable of the supply constraint on bundle S , i.e. $p(S) = z_S$. Interpreted as a shadow price, it is the value of the last unit the seller supplies *on bundle* S . The price of a package multiset is given by $p(\mathbf{k}) = \sum_{S \in 2^N} k_S p(S)$.

Proposition 4. *For all $S \subseteq N$, it holds that*

- (i) *for all $q \leq \bar{q}$, $p(S) \leq \sum_{\gamma: \exists(S \dots \gamma)} (\mu_\gamma^q + u_\gamma^q)$, and*
- (ii) *if additionally $y_\gamma^{\tilde{q}} \neq 0 \quad \forall \gamma : \exists(S \dots \gamma)$, for all $q_\gamma \leq \tilde{q}_\gamma$, $p(S) = \sum_{\gamma: \exists(S \dots \gamma)} (\mu_\gamma^{q_\gamma} + u_\gamma^{q_\gamma})$*

Corollary 2. The pricing function $p(\mathbf{k})$ is uniform, anonymous, and package-linear.

Corollary 2 is immediate from Proposition 4. Note that the pricing function is a generalisation of the uniform pricing rule to a multi-package setting. Proposition 4 reveals an important property of the auction prices: setting the price for a package S of which a positive amount is allocated in the market implies setting also the price for each package which S has a cost relation to. For single varieties, the prices $P(j) = \mu_j^q + u_j^q$ if $y_j^q \neq 0$ are given by marginal costs plus a flexible increment to set non-allocated bids at least indifferent between receiving some bundle or nothing. For packages, prices $p(S)$ equal the sum of incremental marginal costs of each variety or package that S has a cost relation to, plus flexible increments u_S^q . Example 2 in Appendix B illustrates the equilibrium pricing function using Proposition 4.

Auction prices are a solution to the set of complementary slackness conditions corresponding to primal and dual constraints. A solution is not necessarily unique creating flexibility for the auctioneer to choose from a set of equilibrium prices, and she can specify additional rules to do so.²² For example, she might wish to define a rule to always choose the lowest equilibrium prices

²²Modern LP-solvers can return the set of all integer solutions.

on certain packages,²³ the highest, or some mixture. Note that b^i is the surplus gained on bid i . The following corollary provides an additional characterisation of the auction prices which is crucial in the proof of Theorem 1.

Corollary 3. Let q be the last step of supply function f_S that is allocated, i.e. $y_S^q \neq y_S^{q+1} = 0$. Let also $\tilde{y}_\gamma^{q_\gamma} \neq 0 \forall \gamma : \exists(S \dots \gamma)$. Then, for all $q_\gamma \leq \tilde{q}_\gamma$,

- (i) $u_S^q + \mu_S^q \leq \mu_S^{q+1}$
- (ii) $\psi_S^G(\{z_S\}) = z_S - \sum_{\gamma: \exists(S \dots \gamma), \gamma \neq S} (u_\gamma^{q_\gamma} + \mu_\gamma^{q_\gamma})$

The term $\psi_S^G(\{z_S\})$ defines the price gain from selling the items in S together in package S (as opposed to selling them separately) in addition to the price satisfying all other cost relations. If the price is strictly less than μ_S^q , the seller prefers not to sell the package. If the price gain is strictly greater than μ_S^{q+1} , the seller prefers to sell an additional package S .

The main theorem of this section states that the defined auction prices support a competitive equilibrium. Moreover, this equilibrium exists *if and only if* it can be characterised by an optimal solution of LP.

Theorem 1. A package-linear pricing Walrasian equilibrium exists if and only if any optimal solution to IP is also an optimal solution to LP, i.e. the optimum values of IP and LP coincide.

Theorem 1 generalises the well known result by Bikhchandani & Mamer (1997) and Bikhchandani & Ostroy (2002): preferences in my model are non-additive in varieties, introducing a richer and more complex price structure. The analysis and identification of the price structure through Proposition 4 and Corollary 3 and the supply function graph are crucial in several parts of the proof of Theorem 1, including Lemmas 5 and 6 which rely on this structure to prove the equivalence between competitive equilibrium prices and a solution to the dual programme. To the best of my knowledge, my Theorem 1 is first to accommodate allocation preferences among IP-LP characterisations of Walrasian equilibrium.

The auction I describe is a uniform price auction for multiple differentiated packages. Because the allocation rule is such that not only units of the same variety, but also packages composed of different varieties compete against one another for an efficient allocation, my auction can be seen as a set of simultaneous uniform-price auctions for packages, with *additional competition between packages*. Thus, the results from Swinkels (2001) on asymptotic efficiency apply to my setting. Under asymptotic environmental similarity²⁴ and other standard assumptions, they show that any equilibrium must be asymptotically ex-ante efficient. If a large number of buyers *for each package* participate in my auction, with the assumptions of Swinkels (2001) being satisfied for each package separately, my auction is also asymptotically ex-ante efficient.²⁵

²³However, note that a set of lowest equilibrium prices on *all* packages may not always exist (see Example 2 in Appendix B).

²⁴Asymptotic environmental similarity requires the probability of some buyer i winning the h th unit with bid b to converge uniformly to the probability of any buyer j winning the h 'th unit with bid b , for all i, j, h, h', b .

²⁵Related results have been shown by Cripps & Swinkels (2006) and Fan et al. (2003).

4 Further results and extensions

4.1 Pure complements and packaging costs

In a market where all items are complements for buyers, the seller favours larger package allocations, and with a supply of $\Omega_j = 1$ for all items j , I derive sufficient conditions for the existence of Walrasian equilibrium. Each buyer's aggregate value function for a package $\mathbf{k} \in \{0, 1\}^{|2^N|-1}$ equals the marginal value function for the first 'unit' of each package $v^l : 2^N \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_+$. The seller's marginal cost from selling a package $S \in 2^N$ is given by $c^0 : 2^N \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_+$ and aggregate costs from selling a package multiset $\mathbf{k} \in \{0, 1\}^{|2^N|-1}$ are given by $C^0(\mathbf{k}) = \sum_{S \in 2^N} k_S c^0(S)$.

The setting is now similar to Sun & Yang (2014) who model a 'revenue maximising' seller, whose preferences are symmetric to buyers' preferences (cf. Section 2.2). If the buyer-symmetric seller does not sell some package S , she derives utility $v^0(S)$ from it. In contrast, my seller has *allocation preferences* expressed through a cost function. In Appendix D, I provide an equivalence characterisation between revenue maximisation and utility maximisation based on cost functions. Moreover, I demonstrate how a revenue maximising and a utility maximising seller relate through the set function dual.

Theorem 2. If the buyers' value functions v^l satisfy superadditivity and the seller's marginal cost function c^0 satisfies subadditivity, there exists a package-linear Walrasian equilibrium.

The proof of Theorem 2 proceeds by constructing an equilibrium through a modified version of the ascending auction by Sun & Yang (2014) (henceforth 'SY'). My version of the ascending auction strictly generalises SY's auction: as a buyer-symmetric seller does not care about the partitioning of supply (as long as reserve prices are met), she can 'disguise' herself as a buyer in the auction. Thus, in addition to a buyer-symmetric seller, a third agent (e.g. a regulator, or simply the auctioneer) can participate in the auction with a preference over allocations. The buyer-symmetric seller surrenders her supply to the auctioneer and attempts to buy back her items; so she may win a bundle herself and, in addition, receive the price of every bundle sold to other agents. This is stated formally in Proposition 8 in Appendix D.

Theorem 2 is especially relevant in markets with many small buyers²⁶ (e.g. a market for the redistribution of plots of farmland), where the regulator may have concerns about fragmented allocations introducing long term inefficiencies in the market after the auction. A subadditive cost function over the partitioning of supply can help balance out fragmentation. Sufficient conditions on the existence of Walrasian equilibrium have been demonstrated for markets with only substitutes or only complements (Sun & Yang 2014) and very few markets with a mixture of substitutes and complements (cf. discussion in Section 1). More abstract conditions like 'buyers are substitutes'²⁷ have also been proven sufficient for equilibrium existence (Bikhchandani & Ostroy 2002). To the best of my knowledge, Theorem 2 is first to allow allocation preferences.

²⁶Note that superadditivity of valuations does not prohibit buyers being interested in a particular item only.

²⁷That is, the *marginal product* of any subset of buyers is greater than the sum of the marginal products from each individual buyer in the subset.

4.2 Closed form solutions for complete graphs

In general, cost function graphs can be analysed through their characteristic function. Computing the characteristic function relies on Algorithm 1. For a special class of cost function graphs, however, a closed form solution of the characteristic function can be derived and is presented in this section. To simplify notation I first define ‘levels’ within a graph.


Definition 17 (Levels). Let $x, y \in 2^N$. Then $x \subset_r y := \{x \mid x \subseteq y, |y| - |x| = r\}$. y is said to be r levels above x , and x is r levels below y . Similarly, I define $x \subset_{\geq r} y$ and $x \subset_{\leq r} y$, whereby $|y| - |x| = r$ is replaced with $|y| - |x| \geq r$ and $|y| - |x| \leq r$, respectively. $x \supset_0 y$ implies $x = y$.

A complete CFG is such that each package has a cost relation to all of its subsets. These cost relations are achieved with a minimal number of edges, i.e. there are directed edges from each package S to its subsets of size $|S| - 1$ only.

Definition 18 (Complete CFG). A CFG is complete if and only if, for each S , for all $\gamma \subset_1 S$, we have $(S, \gamma) \in G$, and, for all other $\gamma \subset_{\geq 2} S$, for all $\gamma \not\subseteq S$, we have $(S, \gamma) \notin G$.

An example of a complete CFG is shown in Fig. 2. The next proposition states the closed

Figure 2: Complete CFG with three different varieties A, B, C



form solution for the characteristic function of a complete CFG.

Proposition 5. Let G be a complete cost function graph. Then its characteristic function is given by $\phi_S^G(\{y_S^q\}) = \sum_{r=0}^{n-|S|} \sum_{q, \gamma \supset_r S} (-1)^r y_\gamma^q$.

Using linear programming duality, a closed form solution can also be derived for the characteristic function dual.

Corollary 4. Let G be a complete cost function graph. Then its characteristic function dual is given by $\psi^G(\{z_S\}) = \sum_{r=0}^{|S|-1} \sum_{\gamma \subset_r S} (-1)^r z_\gamma$.

Complete CFGs may be especially relevant in the procurement of factor inputs: if services A and B are delivered by the same provider, the manufacturer incurs cost savings, and similarly for services A and C . However, if services B and C are delivered by the same provider, additional costs arise, e.g. because of substitutability between B and C paired with a high contingency risk of the provider. If all three services A , B , and C were delivered by the same provider, cost savings from A and B , A and C , and additional costs from pairing B and C enter the cost function, plus an additional cost savings term to account for the interaction of A , B , and C together.

Finally, I provide a straightforward way to characterise (or verify) subadditivity of complete cost function graphs (cf. Sections 2.3 and 4.1).

Proposition 6. Consider a complete CFG and associated incremental marginal cost functions. If $\Delta c(q, S) \geq 0 \forall S : |S| = 1$ and $\Delta c(q, S) \leq 0 \forall S : |S| > 1$, then marginal costs are subadditive.

4.3 Packaging costs between identical items

If the market designer anticipates packaging costs (or complementarities on the buyers' side) on identical items, they may want to allow agents to specify preferences accordingly. This can be achieved by appropriately relabelling and 'preprocessing' items. In terms of computational complexity it is most efficient to only relabel those items on which packaging costs or complementarities are expected. I illustrate the preprocessing with an example.

Example 1. There are two distinct items A and B supplied with $\Omega_A = \Omega_B = 2$. The two units of variety A are associated with a packaging cost and the designer wishes to allow for the multiset $\{AA\}$ to be treated as a package with a separate price $p(AA)$ not necessarily equal to $2p(A)$. The auctioneer collects XOR bids as vectors $\mathbf{b} := (v_A^i, v_B^i, v_{AA}^i, v_{AB}^i, v_{AAB}^i)$ and then reformulates the auction input such that each unit of supply of variety A obtains a different index, i.e. $N := \{A_1, A_2, B\}$. Bid vectors are augmented as $\tilde{\mathbf{b}} = (v_{A_1}^i, v_{A_2}^i, v_B^i, v_{A_1A_2}^i, v_{A_1B}^i, v_{A_2B}^i, v_{A_1A_2B}^i)$, where $v_{A_1}^i = v_{A_2}^i = v_A^i$, $v_{A_1A_2}^i = v_{AA}^i$, $v_{A_1B}^i = v_{A_2B}^i = v_{AB}^i$, and $v_{A_1A_2B}^i = v_{AAB}^i$.

The seller submits supply functions f_A, f_B, f_{AA}, f_{AB} , and f_{AAB} , and a supply function graph defining the cost relations between those packages as shown in Fig. 3. The auctioneer augments supply functions and the graph defining $f_{A_1}, f_{A_2}, f_{A_1A_2}, f_{A_1B}, f_{A_2B}, f_{A_1A_2B}$ such that $\mu_{A_1}^1 = \mu_A^1$, $\mu_{A_2}^1 = \mu_A^2$, $\mu_{A_1B}^1 = \mu_{AB}^1$, $\mu_{A_2B}^1 = \mu_{AB}^2$, $\mu_{A_1A_2}^1 = \mu_{AA}^1$, and $\mu_{A_1A_2B}^1 = \mu_{AAB}^1$. All other μ_S^q are set to ∞ , step lengths are normalised to one, and f_B remains unchanged. The supply function graph is augmented, for example, as shown in Fig. 4. The outgoing edges are all implied by the original graph. All my results hold for the augmented bids, supply

Figure 3: SFG with package AA





Figure 4: Augmented SFG



functions, and graph. Note that the auction prices must satisfy $p(A) = \min\{p(A_1), p(A_2)\}$, $p(AA) = p(A_1A_2)$, and $p(AB) = \min\{p(A_1B), p(A_2B)\}$. If A_1 and A_2 are both allocated it must hold that $p(A) = p(A_1) = p(A_2)$, and similarly for $p(AB)$. This follows from $v_{A_1}^i = v_{A_2}^i = v_A^i$ and the surplus constraints of DLP.

5 Conclusion

In many combinatorial auctions and markets for bundled items, it is natural for the seller to have preferences over the partitioning of items among buyers. I develop a new graph structure

to express such preferences, while maintaining tractability of the allocation problem through a linear programming formulation. To the best of my knowledge, mine is the first Walrasian-equilibrium auction model in which preferences over allocations are allowed.

I characterise the existence of an indivisible Walrasian equilibrium with package-linear pricing and provide necessary and sufficient conditions for the existence of such equilibria. The crucial and novel element facilitating this result is the graph structure I develop, which admits a characteristic function and its dual. I also provide additional sufficient conditions for equilibrium existence relying only on primitives of the model. This result builds on a dual relationship between valuations and costs defined on sets of indivisible goods.

While the results are theoretical, this paper aims to inspire practical auction design. My methods allow the seller to express vastly richer preferences than described in the previous literature and used in present-day auction design. The equilibrium prices derived in my setting have a modular structure: the price of a given package is tied to the marginal costs of varieties or subsets of varieties contained in the given package, according to the cost relations specified by the seller. This guarantees transparency in pricing between different packages that contain identical items. It also addresses an important concern in combinatorial auctions with non-linear pricing: even if not all bundles are bid for, plausible and transparent equilibrium bundle prices can be easily constructed. In practice, allowing sellers to express richer preferences is likely to improve efficiency.

Finally, the graph structure I develop in this paper may be of independent interest in other allocation problems, where the distribution of goods, services, or matchings in the market matters.

References

- Baldwin, E. & Klemperer, P. (2019a), ‘Notes on Linear Programming to solve the Product-Mix Auction’, Mimeo.
- Baldwin, E. & Klemperer, P. (2019b), ‘Understanding Preferences: ”Demand Types”, and The Existence of Equilibrium with Indivisibilities’, *Econometrica* **87**(3), 867–932.
- Beviá, C., Quinzii, M. & Silva, J. A. (1999), ‘Buying several indivisible goods’, *Mathematical social sciences* **37**(1), 1–23.
- Bichler, M., Schneider, S., Guler, K. & Sayal, M. (2011), ‘Compact bidding languages and supplier selection for markets with economies of scale and scope’, *European Journal of Operational Research* **214**(1), 67–77.
- Bikhchandani, S. & Mamer, J. W. (1997), ‘Competitive Equilibrium in an Exchange Economy with Indivisibilities’, *Journal of Economic Theory* **74**, 385–413.
- Bikhchandani, S. & Ostroy, J. M. (2002), ‘The Package Assignment Model’, *Journal of Economic Theory* **107**(2), 377–406.
- Blizard, W. D. (1989), ‘Multiset Theory’, *Notre Dame Journal of Formal Logic* **30**(1), 36–66.

- Bryan, G., De Quidt, J., Wilkening, T. & Yadav, N. (2017), ‘Land Trade and Development: A Market Design Approach’, Working Paper.
- Candogan, O., Ozdaglar, A. & Parrilo, P. (2016), ‘Pricing Equilibria and Graphical Valuations’, *ACM Transactions on Economics and Computation* **1**(1), 1–26.
- Candogan, O., Ozdaglar, A. & Parrilo, P. A. (2015), ‘Iterative Auction Design for Tree Valuations’, *Operations Research* **63**(4), 751–771.
- Cantillon, E. & Pesendorfer, M. (2005), Auctioning Bus Routes: The London Experience, in P. Cramton, Y. Shoham & R. Steinberg, eds, ‘Combinatorial Auctions’, MIT Press.
- Cripps, M. W. & Swinkels, J. M. (2006), ‘Efficiency of Large Double Auctions’, *Econometrica* **74**(1), 47–92.
- Danilov, V., Koshevoy, G. & Murota, K. (2001), ‘Discrete convexity and equilibria in economies with indivisible goods and money’, *Mathematical Social Sciences* **41**(3), 251–273.
- Fan, M., Stallaert, J. & Whinston, A. B. (2003), ‘Decentralized Mechanism Design for Supply Chain Organizations Using an Auction Market’, *Information Systems Research* **14**(1), 1–22.
- Fujishige, S. (2005), *Submodular Functions and Optimization (Second Edition)*.
- Fujishige, S. & Yang, Z. (2020), ‘A Universal Dynamic Auction for Unimodular Demand Types: An Efficient Auction Design for Various Kinds of Indivisible Commodities’, Working Paper.
- Gartner (2008), Magic quadrant for sourcing application suites, Technical report, Gartner Consulting.
- Giunipero, L. C., Carter, P. L. & Fearon, H. E. (2009), The Role of Optimization in Strategic Sourcing, Technical report, CAPS Research.
- Gul, F. & Stacchetti, E. (2000), ‘The English Auction with Differentiated Commodities’, *Journal of Economic Theory* **92**(1), 66–95.
- Klemperer, P. (2008), ‘A New Auction for Substitutes: Central Bank Liquidity Auctions, the U.S. TARP, and Variable Product-Mix Auctions’, Working Paper.
- Klemperer, P. (2010), ‘The Product-Mix Auction: a New Auction Design for Differentiated Goods’, *Journal of the European Economic Association* (8), 526–36.
- Klemperer, P. (2018), ‘Product-Mix Auctions’, Nuffield College Working Paper 2018-W07, <http://www.nuffield.ox.ac.uk/users/klemperer/productmix.pdf>.
- Lehmann, B., Lehmann, D. & Nisan, N. (2006), ‘Combinatorial auctions with decreasing marginal utilities’, *Games and Economic Behavior* **55**(2), 270–296.
- Milgrom, P. & Strulovici, B. (2009), ‘Substitute goods, auctions, and equilibrium’, *Journal of Economic Theory* **144**(1), 212–247.

- Nisan, N. (2000), ‘Bidding and Allocation in Combinatorial Auctions’, *EC '00: Proceedings of the 2nd ACM conference on Electronic commerce* .
- Parkes, D. C. (1999), ‘iBundle: An efficient ascending price bundle auction’, *Proceedings of the ACM Conference on Electronic Commerce (EC'99): November 3-5, 1999, Denver, Colorado*, ed. S. Feldman, and ACM Special Interest Group on Electronic Commerce pp. 148–157.
- Samuelson, P. A. (1974), ‘Complementarity: An Essay on the 40th Anniversary of the Hicks-Allen Revolution in Demand Theory’, *Journal of Economic Literature* **12**(4), 1255–89.
- Stoneham, G., Chaudhri, V., Ha, A. & Strappazzon, L. (2003), ‘Auctions for conservation contracts: An empirical examination of Victoria’s BushTender trial’, *Australian Journal of Agricultural and Resource Economics* **47**(4), 477–500.
- Sun, N. & Yang, Z. (2006), ‘Equilibria and indivisibilities: Gross substitutes and complements’, *Econometrica* **74**(5), 1385–1402.
- Sun, N. & Yang, Z. (2014), ‘An Efficient and Incentive Compatible Dynamic Auction for Multiple Complements’, *Journal of Political Economy* **122**(2), 422–466.
- Swinkels, J. M. (2001), ‘Efficiency of Large Private Value Auctions’, *Econometrica* **69**(1), 37–68.
- Teytelboym, A. (2014), ‘Gross substitutes and complements: A simple generalization’, *Economics Letters* **123**(2), 135–138.
- Vries, S. D. & Vohra, R. V. (2003), ‘Combinatorial Auctions : A Survey’, *INFORMS Journal on Computing* **15**(3), 284–309.

Appendix

A Preferences over multisets

Agents may also have a preference over multisets of packages of goods, which can be summarised by a value function $V^l : \mathbb{Z}_+^{|2^N|} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_+$ with $V^l(\emptyset) = 0$. In this case, agents can freely adjust the order of their assigned packages, or they may simply be given a multiset without an ordering. In other words, agents may assign packages to positions $\{1, \dots, |\mathbf{k}|\}$ of a hypothetical list (where not all positions have to be filled), treating each copy of a package as a separate element of the list. Assuming agents behave rationally, the aggregate value of \mathbf{k} is defined by the value-maximal assignment of the packages in \mathbf{k} to positions.

Definition 19 (Marginal values). A marginal value function is defined as $v^l : \mathbb{Z}_+ \times 2^N \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_+$. $v^l(q, S)$ describes the marginal value agent l derives from package $S \in 2^N$ if associated with the q th position in an ordering of \mathbf{k} .

Definition 20 (Marginal value aggregation). For any multiset \mathbf{k} , a bidder's overall value is defined as

$$V^l(\mathbf{k}) = \max_{\{x_{q,S}\}} \sum_{S \in 2^N} \sum_{q=1}^{\bar{M}} v^l(q, S) x_{q,S} \quad \text{s.t.} \quad \sum_{q=1}^{\bar{M}} x_{q,S} \leq k_S \quad \forall S, \quad \sum_{S \in 2^N} x_{q,S} \leq 1 \quad \forall q, \quad x_{q,S} \in \{0, 1\} \quad \forall S, q$$

where $\bar{M} := \max_{q,S} \{q : v^l(q, S) > 0\}$. $x_{q,S}$ is one if package S is assigned to the q th position in $(1, \dots, |\mathbf{k}|)$, and zero otherwise.

An agent may have even further liberties given an assigned multiset: they may be able to repackage the varieties contained in the package multiset into a configuration of items that is most valuable to them. The absence of the possibility of repackaging may be motivated with physical or contractual constraints.²⁸

Definition 21 (Marginal value aggregation with repackaging). For any multiset \mathbf{k} , a bidder's overall value is defined as

$$\tilde{V}^l(\mathbf{k}) = \max_{\{x_{q,S}\}} \sum_{S \in 2^N} \sum_{q=1}^{\bar{M}} v^l(q, S) x_{q,S} \quad \text{s.t.} \quad \sum_{S \ni j} \sum_{q=1}^{\bar{M}} x_{q,S} \leq \mathbf{k}_j^* \quad \forall j, \quad \sum_{S \in 2^N} x_{q,S} \leq 1 \quad \forall q, \quad x_{q,S} \in \{0, 1\} \quad \forall S, q$$

where $\bar{M} := \max_{q,S} \{q : v^l(q, S) > 0\}$. $x_{q,S}$ is one if package S is assigned to the q th position in $(1, \dots, |\mathbf{k}|)$, and zero otherwise.

Assuming agents behave rationally, the aggregate value of \mathbf{k} is now defined by the value-maximal assignment of packages derived from items in \mathbf{k}^* to positions.

B Additional example

Example 2. Consider the sale of two units of good A and two units of good B , which may be sold separately or in packages. Only $\{AB\}$ is considered a package; e.g., the multiset $\{A, A, B\}$

²⁸E.g., if a manufacturer is given two distinct production inputs as separate items, they may not be able to or not be allowed to process them in the same factory.

must be bundled as $\{\{AB\}, \{A\}\}$.

Buyer values. Suppose there is one buyer with the concave-superadditive value function given by Table B1. I consider three types of marginal value aggregation. If the buyer receives a package list, marginal values are aggregated according to Definition 7. We then have, e.g., $V([A]) = 3$, $V([B]) = 5$, $V([A, B]) = 3 + 2$, $V([B, A]) = 5 + 1$, $V([A, AB]) = 3 + 9$, $V([B, A, AB]) = 5 + 1 + 0$, etc. If the buyer receives a package multiset (k_A, k_B, k_{AB}) , marginal values are aggregated according to Definition 20, or Definition 21 if the buyer can repackage. Using Definition 20, we have, e.g., $V(1, 0, 0) = 3$, $V(0, 1, 0) = 3$, $V(1, 1, 0) = 5 + 1$, $V(1, 0, 1) = 3 + 9$, $V(0, 1, 1) = 5 + 9$, and $V(1, 1, 1) = 5 + 9 + 0$. If the buyer *can* repackage, then $V(1, 1, 0) = V(0, 0, 1) = 9$, $V(0, 1, 1) = V(1, 2, 0) = 5 + 9$, and $V(1, 1, 1) = V(0, 0, 2) = 9 + 9$.

Table B1: The buyer's marginal values

q	$v^1(q, A)$	$v^1(q, B)$	$v^1(q, AB)$
1	3	5	9
2	1	2	9
≥ 3	0	0	0

Seller's cost. The seller's preferences are given by the incremental marginal cost function in Table B2 and the cost function graph in Fig. B1. The overall cost is given by Definition 13, that is, for example, $C^0(1, 0, 0) = 1$, $C^0(0, 0, 1) = 1 + 1 - 1$, $C^0(2, 1, 0) = 1 + 2 + 1$, and $C^0(1, 1, 1) = 1 + 1 + 2 + 2 - 1$.

Figure B1: Cost function graph




Table B2: Incremental marginal cost


q	$\Delta c(q, A)$	$\Delta c(q, B)$	$\Delta c(q, AB)$
1	1	1	-1
2	2	2	0
≥ 3	∞	∞	∞

Table B3: Seller's marginal cost

k_{-S}	$c^0(1, A, k_{-A})$	$c^0(2, A, k_{-A})$	$c^0(1, B, k_{-B})$	$c^0(2, B, k_{-B})$	$c^0(1, AB, k_{-AB})$	$c^0(2, AB, k_{-AB})$
(0,0)	1	2	1	2	1	4
(1,0)	1	2	1	2	2	∞
(0,1)	2	∞	2	∞	2	∞
(1,1)	2	∞	2	∞	3	∞
(0,2)	∞	∞	∞	∞	∞	∞
(2,0)	1	2	1	2	∞	∞
(2,2)	∞	∞	∞	∞	∞	∞
(1,2)	∞	∞	∞	∞	∞	∞
(2,1)	2	∞	2	∞	∞	∞

The seller's preferences can also be represented as marginal costs as in Table B3. Note that $k_{-A} = (k_B, k_{AB})$, $k_{-B} = (k_A, k_{AB})$, and $k_{-AB} = (k_A, k_B)$. The marginal costs expresses how

Figure B2: Marginal cost function f_A



much the sale of an additional package costs when a given multiset of other package is also sold in the market. However, the marginal cost representation does not lend itself to straightforward aggregation to overall costs. The cost of other packages sold in the market is counted multiple times if one were to aggregate overall costs in a naive way. For example, we have $C^0(1, 1, 1) = c^0(1, A, (1, 1)) + c^0(1, B, (1, 1)) + c^0(1, AB, (1, 1)) = 2 + 2 + 3$, which is higher than the aggregation of incremental marginal costs above. If one were to prescribe an order in which to add packages to the overall multiset sold, we might arrive at the same overall cost as by aggregating incremental marginal costs. However, it will depend on the chosen order. Moreover, the representation of marginal costs is much less compact than incremental marginal costs.

Value representation. The buyer's preferences (Table B1) can be expressed simply by submitting his two sets of marginal values in two XOR bids, $(v_A, v_B, v_{AB}, \kappa) = (3, 5, 9, 1)$ and $(1, 2, 9, 1)$. How marginal value are aggregated is not important to the auctioneer in solving the auction.

The bids can be represented geometrically; the first bid is shown in Fig. 1. The black dot at $(3, 5, 9)$ corresponds to the bid. At prices beyond the light blue facets, the bid demands nothing. The remaining area is divided in three parts. At prices above the blue and left of the red facet bundle $\{A\}$ is demanded, at prices above the green and right of the red facet bundle $\{B\}$ is demanded, and at prices below the blue and the green facet bundle $\{AB\}$ is demanded. At prices on the red facet, the bid is indifferent between receiving $\{A\}$ or $\{B\}$, and similarly for prices on the green or blue facet. Where all three facets intersect, the bid is indifferent between $\{A\}$, $\{B\}$, and $\{AB\}$. At prices on any of the light blue facets, the bid is indifferent between receiving nothing and the bundle from the neighbouring region. A detailed description of the geometric representation of such preferences is given in Baldwin & Klemperer (2019b).

Cost representation. The preference given by Table B2 and Fig. B1 can be directly submitted to the auctioneer and serves as input in the auction algorithm. $\Delta c(q, S)$ is simply renamed into μ_S^q . The incremental marginal cost function corresponding to package A from Table B2 is illustrated as an example in Fig. B2.

Solving the auctions. Suppose now there two additional buyers labelled 3 and 4, and buyer 1 submits the bids labelled $i = 1, 2$. Supply schedule and bids are listed as auction input in Table B4. The efficient allocation is underlined in the bid list. The seller has a cost saving if she sells one unit of A and one unit of B as a package, hence bid 4 obtains $\{AB\}$. For the second unit of A and B , the seller is indifferent between selling separately or as a package, so bid 1 and 3 win.

Prices have to satisfy the set of equations corresponding to the constraints of DLP. One can verify that the set of equilibrium prices is given by $(z_A, z_B, z_{AB}) \in \{(4, 5, 9), (5, 4, 9), (5, 5, 9), (5, 5, 10)\}$, which all support the unique equilibrium allocation. From Proposition 4 (ii) we have that, e.g., $z_{AB} = z_A + z_B + \mu_{AB}^1 + u_{AB}^1$. Corollary 3 (i) tells us that $\mu_{AB}^1 + u_{AB}^1 \leq \mu_{AB}^2 = 0$. Thus, equilibrium prices must satisfy either $z_A + z_B = z_{AB}$ or $z_A + z_B = z_{AB} - 1$. The surplus constraints of DLP pin down the set of equilibrium prices precisely.

Table B4: Auction input

q	μ_A^q	μ_B^q	μ_{AB}^q	i	v_A^i	v_B^i	v_{AB}^i	κ^i
1	1	1	-1	1	3	5	9	1
2	2	2	0	2	1	2	9	1
≥ 3	∞	∞	∞	3	5	3	8	1
				4	6	2	11	1

C The seller's demand type

If all buyers have strong substitutes valuations and supply is fixed, it is well known that Walrasian equilibrium exists. If the seller is partitioning a supply of different items into packages, however, her preferences are not strong-substitutes-between-packages under non-linear (or package-linear) pricing (see also Footnote 9). Consequently, a Walrasian non-linear pricing equilibrium need not exist. Example 2 in Sun & Yang (2014) (also Beviá et al. (1999)) illustrates this: There are three items A, B, C for sale, one unit of each, and there are three bidders 1, 2, and 3. The bidders' values are given in Table C1, and the seller's reserve prices are zero for all possible packages. It can be verified that Walrasian equilibrium does not exist under linear pricing (Beviá et al. 1999) or non-linear pricing (Sun & Yang 2014). All bidders demand only one package, hence their valuation is trivially strong-substitutes-between-packages type. However, the seller's valuation is *not* strong-substitutes-between-packages. The reason is that she may be induced by an infinitesimal price change to switch from, e.g., selling the partition $\{AB\}$ to selling the partition $\{A, B\}$. Baldwin & Klemperer (2019b) show that a valuation is strong-substitutes if and only if it is concave and corresponds to a strong substitutes demand type, which is defined by strong substitute vectors with at most one +1 entry, at most one -1 entry, and no other nonzero entries. A demand type contains all the vectors describing the directions in which demand could change due to an infinitesimal generic price change. The seller's 'demand' type characterisation would contain the vectors $\pm(1, 1, 0, -1, 0, 0, 0)$. The entries of the vector correspond to the change in supply of packages $(A, B, C, AB, AC, BC, ABC)$ induced by an arbitrary, small price change, i.e. there exists an arbitrary, small price change that could make the seller prefer selling the partition $\{AB\}$ to selling the partition $\{A, B\}$. Hence, the seller's demand type and valuation are not strong-substitutes-between packages.

Table C1: Bidders' valuations of bundles

	\emptyset	A	B	C	AB	AC	BC	ABC
Bidder 1	0	10	8	2	13	11	9	14
Bidder 2	0	8	5	10	13	14	13	15
Bidder 3	0	1	1	8	2	9	9	10

D Pure complements and packaging costs

All proofs of this section are deferred to Appendix E.1. The market consists of distinct items and multiset notation is not required. Instead of a vector \mathbf{k} I characterise a set of packages as a partition δ of N into packages, i.e. $\delta = \{A_1, \dots, A_k\}$ where $A_t \subseteq N, t = 1, \dots, k, A_{t_1} \cap A_{t_2} = \emptyset$ for all $A_{t_1} \neq A_{t_2}$, and $\bigcup_{t=1}^k A_t \subseteq N$. As before, \mathcal{K} denotes the universe of all partitions of N . Consequently, the seller's utility is given by $u^0(\delta, p) = \sum_{S \in \delta} (p(S) - c^0(S))$ when she sells the set of packages δ . The definitions of demand and supply correspondences, and indirect utilities remain unchanged. Note that an allocation $\pi = (\pi(0), \pi(1), \dots, \pi(L))$ can also be interpreted as a partition δ of N defined by $\delta = \{\pi(l) | \pi(l) \neq \emptyset \text{ and } l \in \mathcal{L}_0\}$, where $\pi(l)$ disappears if it is the empty set.

Here, the notion of package-linear pricing Walrasian equilibrium coincides with the non-linear pricing Walrasian equilibrium in Sun & Yang (2014) (henceforth 'SY'). While SY consider a 'revenue maximising' seller, I model a 'utility maximising' seller. I prove that revenue maximisation is indeed equivalent to utility maximisation with an appropriately chosen cost function, but I will use the terminology nonetheless for distinction. In SY, the seller has a 'reserve price' function $v^0 : 2^N \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_+$, which is superadditive. If package S remains unsold, $v^0(S)$ is the value she derives from S . From all sold packages she obtains the market price. The sum of prices of sold packages and her value of the unsold bundle is defined as revenue. In my model, the seller's cost of supplying several packages is the sum of their marginal costs. The overall cost depends on the partitioning of supply. The sum of prices minus the costs of sold packages is defined as her utility. Example 3 demonstrates the subtlety in defining values and reserve prices. The utility maximising seller's marginal cost in my model straightforwardly implies reserve prices.

Example 3. The seller's supply bundle $\{AB\}$ is worth 60 to her, she values good A alone at 10, and good B alone at 20. At auction prices (p_A, p_B, p_{AB}) , the seller chooses to sell good A individually only if $p_A + 20 \geq 60$ and $p_A + 20 \geq p_{AB}$. Thus, her true reserve price for good A (B) is 40 (50), as she is indifferent between keeping AB and selling good A (B) at this price.

The seller's revenue maximisation can be reformulated as utility maximisation with a well-defined cost function. To state this relationship formally, I introduce set functions duals²⁹ and a new notion of submodularity. Let S^c denote the complement for any set $S \in 2^N$, i.e. $S^c = N \setminus S$.

Definition 22 (Set function dual). For any bundle $S \in 2^N$, given $f : 2^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ with $f(\emptyset) = 0$, define the transformation $g(f, S) = f(N) - f(S^c)$. $g(f, \cdot)$ is called the *dual* of f . Note that $g(f, N) = f(N)$.

²⁹Set function duals are common in matroid theory, see e.g. Gul & Stacchetti (2000) or Fujishige (2005).

Definition 23 (Set-cover submodularity). Given a finite set N , a function $f : 2^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is *set-cover submodular* if $\forall S_1, S_2 \in 2^N$ with $S_1 \cup S_2 = N$,

$$f(S_1) + f(S_2) \geq f(S_1 \cup S_2) + f(S_1 \cap S_2).$$

If the inequality sign is reversed, f is *set-cover supermodular*, and if replaced with an equality sign, f is *set-cover modular*. Set-cover submodularity is weaker than submodularity, because it is only required for every two subsets of N the union of which *fully covers* N . In particular, set-cover submodularity does not imply subadditivity. However, the following lemma exhibits an important connection between superadditive and set-cover submodular functions.³⁰

Lemma 2. *Given a superadditive (subadditive) function $f : 2^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, its dual $g(f, \cdot)$ is set-cover submodular (set-cover supermodular).*

Now we formalise the relationship between ‘revenue maximisation’ and ‘utility maximisation’.

Proposition 7. *Given a value function $v^0 : 2^N \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_+$, $v^0(\emptyset) = 0$, the objective of maximising revenue is equivalent to maximising utility, where (i) the marginal costs $c^0 : 2^N \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_+$ are given by the dual of v^0 , and (ii) overall costs for any partition of sold packages $\delta \in \mathcal{K}$ are given by $C^0(\delta) = c^0(\bigcup_{S \in \delta} S)$.*

From Lemma 2 and Proposition 7 the subsequent corollary is immediate.

Corollary 5. The revenue maximising seller’s implied marginal cost is set-cover submodular.

Note that a set-cover submodular cost function can have strictly subadditive and strictly superadditive elements, as shown in Example 4. A revenue maximiser only takes into account the *set of sold items*, whereas a utility maximiser cares about the partitioning of items among buyers. Thus, even with identical marginal costs, the overall cost function is different.

Example 4. The function v^0 in Table D1 is superadditive and its dual c^* is set-cover submodular. Note that bundles A and BC are strictly subadditive in c^* , but items B and C are superadditive. Selling B costs 2, and selling C costs 0. Both selling $\{BC\}$ and $\{B, C\}$ (each item to a different buyer) cost 3. Selling any partition of $\{A, B, C\}$ at 4, however, is cheaper again than selling $\{B, C\}$ (3) and A (2), i.e. both negative and positive synergies are present.

Table D1: Superadditive function and set-cover submodular dual

S	A	B	C	AB	AC	BC	ABC
v^0	1	2	0	4	2	2	4
$c^*(v^0, \cdot)$	2	2	0	4	2	3	4

I use an extended version of the basic ascending auction by SY to determine a package-linear Walrasian equilibrium. For buyers, the rules of the extended auction are identical to SY’s, but they differ for the seller. Moreover, the extended version allows for participation of a revenue

³⁰Set-cover submodular and set-cover supermodular functions can both be subadditive or superadditive.

maximising seller as well as an auctioneer with allocation preferences, or only a seller with allocation preferences. I let $p(t, S)$ denote the price of bundle $S \in 2^N$ at time t . Bidder l bids straightforwardly with respect to his values v^l if at every time $t \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ for any prices $p(t)$, he bids $A_l(t) \in D^l(p(t)) = \arg \max_{S \subseteq N} \{v^l(S) - p(t, S)\}$, where $A_l(t) = \emptyset$ when $\emptyset \in D^l(p(t))$. That is, in each round, he bids maximising his utility given the current auction prices.

For ease of exposition, I first introduce the extended ascending auction with a seller with allocation preferences. In each round of the auction, the seller states her supply and bidders state their demand at current prices. If a package is overdemanded, the price on this package is increased by one in the next round. The procedure stops as soon as no package is overdemanded.

Formally, the procedure is described as follows:

Step 1: The seller states initial reserve prices c^0 setting the the initial price vector to $p(0, S) = c^0(S)$ for every $S \in 2^N$. The counter is set to $t = 0$ and the auction continues with step 2.

Step 2: The auctioneer announces current prices $p(t)$ and chooses a supply set $\delta \in D^0(p(t))$. Every bidder l reports demand $A_l(t)$ given the current prices. Then, the auctioneer determines for each package S if it is overdemanded with respect to δ and $A_l, l \in \mathcal{L}$, i.e. if it is demanded by more than one bidder or demanded but not in δ . If no package is overdemanded, continue with step 3. For all packages S , if S is overdemanded, set $p(t+1, S) = p(t, S) + 1$, otherwise $p(t+1, S) = p(t, S)$. The counter is set to $t = t + 1$ and the auction continues with step 2.

Step 3: Every package $S \in A_l(t)$ is allocated to bidder l at price $p(t, S)$. If there is a package $B \in \delta(t)$ that is not demanded by any bidder at $p(t)$, B remains with the seller if $p(t, B) = c^0(B)$. If $p(t, B) > c^0(B)$, B is allocated at price $p(t, B)$ to a bidder who reported B in his demand set in a previous round and was among the last to forfeit B . The auction terminates.

Lemma 3. *If all bidders bid straightforwardly, the extended ascending auction terminates in a package-linear Walrasian equilibrium after a finite number of rounds.*

Theorem 2 is then immediate from Lemma 3. Example 5 further illustrates that the extended ascending auction can lead to different outcomes depending on if a revenue maximising seller or a utility maximising seller computes the supply correspondence in step 2, even when marginal costs and value are equivalent in the sense of Proposition 7 (i).

Example 5. Buyers are labelled B1 to B6. Their values and the seller's values v^0 and dual marginal costs c^0 are given in Table D2. Table D3 details the ascending auction where the seller maximises revenue or, equivalently, utility based on the cost function $C^0(\delta) = c^0(\bigcup_{S \in \delta} S)$, in each round. Table D4 details the extended ascending auction where the seller maximises utility based on the cost function $\tilde{C}^0(\delta) = \sum_{S \in \delta} c^0(S)$ in each round. If the seller maximises revenue, the two individual items A and B are allocated, e.g. to B1 and B3. If the seller maximises utility based on \tilde{C}^0 , bundle AB is allocated, e.g. to B5.

Now consider the extended ascending auction with a revenue maximising seller as well as an auctioneer with allocation preferences. The auctioneer does not have its own supply³¹ but receives the seller's supply who then participates in the auction as a buyer attempting to buy

³¹If a second, or even multiple sellers, were participating in the auction, a rule for surplus sharing would have to be defined. Sun & Yang (2014) propose Shapley's allocation rule for sharing surplus in an extension to multiple sellers.

Table D3: Ascending auction

Table D2: Values and costs

	A	B	AB
B1	5	0	5
B2	5	0	5
B3	0	7	7
B4	0	7	7
B5	0	0	11
B6	0	0	11
v^0	2	4	8
c^0	4	6	8

current price	supply set	demand						squeezed-out
		B1	B2	B3	B4	B5	B6	
$p(0) = (2, 4, 8)$	$\{AB\}$	A	A	B	B	AB	AB	
$p(1) = (3, 5, 9)$	$\{AB\}$	A	A	B	B	AB	AB	
$p(2) = (4, 6, 10)$	$\{AB\}$	A	A	B	B	AB	AB	
$p(3) = (5, 7, 11)$	$\{A, B\}$	\emptyset	\emptyset	\emptyset	\emptyset	\emptyset	\emptyset	A,B

Table D4: Extended ascending auction

current price	supply set	demand						squeezed-out
		B1	B2	B3	B4	B5	B6	
$p(0) = (4, 6, 8)$	$\{AB\}$	A	A	B	B	AB	AB	
$p(1) = (5, 7, 9)$	$\{A, B\}$	\emptyset	\emptyset	\emptyset	\emptyset	AB	AB	
$p(2) = (5, 7, 10)$	$\{AB\}$	\emptyset	\emptyset	\emptyset	\emptyset	AB	AB	
$p(3) = (5, 7, 11)$	$\{AB\}$	\emptyset	\emptyset	\emptyset	\emptyset	\emptyset	\emptyset	AB

back her items. She may win a bundle back and, in addition, she receives the price of every bundle sold to real buyers.

Lemma 4. *If the auctioneer's marginal costs are zero, the extended ascending auction and SY's ascending auction terminate in the same allocation (up to ties).*

Proposition 8. *Suppose the auctioneer's marginal costs are zero and the extended ascending auction starts at prices $p(-1, S) = v^0(S) - 1 \forall S \in 2^N$. Then, there exists a price path that is identical in the extended ascending auction and in SY's ascending auction, resulting in final prices that support the same allocation in both auctions.*

E Proofs

Proof of Proposition 1. This proof proceeds like Sun & Yang (2014) who show the result in a setting with a single unit per per variety and no seller's costs. Let \mathcal{A} denote the universe of all feasible allocations, i.e.

$$\mathcal{A} := \left\{ \pi \in \mathbb{Z}_+^{2^N \times |\mathcal{L}_0|} : \bigoplus_{l \in \mathcal{L}} \pi(l) = \mathbf{k} \text{ for some } \mathbf{k} \in \mathcal{K}, \text{ and } \pi(0) = \mathcal{N} - \mathbf{k}^* \right\}$$

(p^*, π^*) is a package-linear pricing Walrasian equilibrium, so for any bidder $l \in \mathcal{L}$ and any allocation $\pi' \in \mathcal{A}$, we have

$$V^l(\pi^*(l)) - \sum_{S \in \pi^*(l)} p^*(S) \geq V^l(\pi'(l)) - \sum_{S \in \pi'(l)} p^*(S)$$

Let $\bigoplus_{l \in \mathcal{L}} \pi^*(l) = \mathbf{k}$ and $\bigoplus_{l \in \mathcal{L}} \pi'(l) = \mathbf{k}'$. I sum over $l \in \mathcal{L}$ and add and subtract the seller's cost

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{l \in \mathcal{L}} V^l(\pi^*(l)) - C^0(\mathbf{k}) - \left(\sum_{l \in \mathcal{L}} V^l(\pi'(l)) - C^0(\mathbf{k}') \right) \\ & \geq \sum_{l \in \mathcal{L}} \sum_{S \in \pi^*(l)} p^*(S) - C^0(\mathbf{k}) - \left(\sum_{l \in \mathcal{L}} \sum_{S \in \pi'(l)} p^*(S) - C^0(\mathbf{k}') \right) \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

Because $\pi^* \in D^0(p^*)$, we have, for all $\pi' \in \mathcal{A}$,

$$\sum_{l \in \mathcal{L}} \sum_{S \in \pi^*(l)} p^*(S) - C^0(\mathbf{k}) \geq \sum_{l \in \mathcal{L}} \sum_{S \in \pi'(l)} p^*(S) - C^0(\mathbf{k}')$$

From Eq. (2), it follows that, for all $\pi' \in \mathcal{A}$,

$$\sum_{l \in \mathcal{L}} V^l(\pi^*(l)) - C^0(\mathbf{k}) - \left(\sum_{l \in \mathcal{L}} V^l(\pi'(l)) - C^0(\mathbf{k}') \right) \geq 0$$

and so π^* is efficient.

Now let π' be an efficient allocation. Then $V(\mathcal{N}) = \sum_{l \in \mathcal{L}} V^l(\pi'(l)) - C^0(\mathbf{k}')$. It also holds that $V(\mathcal{N}) = \sum_{l \in \mathcal{L}} V^l(\pi^*(l)) - C^0(\mathbf{k})$ because π^* is efficient as part of the equilibrium. The equilibrium is also bidder-optimal and seller-optimal, given prices. Thus, we obtain the following two inequalities:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{V}^l(p^*) & \geq V^l(\pi'(l)) - \sum_{S \in \pi'(l)} p^*(S), \quad \text{for all } l \in \mathcal{L} \text{ and} \\ \sum_{l \in \mathcal{L}} \sum_{S \in \pi^*(l)} p^*(S) - C^0(\mathbf{k}) & = \mathcal{V}^0(p^*) \geq \sum_{l \in \mathcal{L}} \sum_{S \in \pi'(l)} p^*(S) - C^0(\mathbf{k}') \end{aligned}$$

Suppose that one of these two inequalities were strict, then we would obtain

$$\begin{aligned} V(\mathcal{N}) & = \sum_{l \in \mathcal{L}} V^l(\pi^*(l)) - C^0(\mathbf{k}) \\ & = \sum_{l \in \mathcal{L}} \left[V^l(\pi^*(l)) - \sum_{S \in \pi^*(l)} p^*(S) + \sum_{S \in \pi^*(l)} p^*(S) \right] - C^0(\mathbf{k}) \\ & = \sum_{l \in \mathcal{L}} \mathcal{V}^l(p^*) + \mathcal{V}^0(p^*) \\ & > V^l(\pi'(l)) - \sum_{S \in \pi'(l)} p^*(S) + \sum_{l \in \mathcal{L}} \sum_{S \in \pi'(l)} p^*(S) - C^0(\mathbf{k}') \\ & = \sum_{l \in \mathcal{L}} V^l(\pi'(l)) - C^0(\mathbf{k}') \\ & = V(\mathcal{N}), \end{aligned}$$

This is a contradiction, and consequently it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{V}^l(p^*) &= V^l(\pi^l(l)) - \sum_{S \in \pi^l(l)} p^*(S), \quad \text{for all } l \in \mathcal{L} \text{ and } , \\ \mathcal{V}^0(p^*) &= \sum_{l \in \mathcal{L}} \sum_{S \in \pi^l(l)} p^*(S) - C^0(\mathbf{k}^*), \quad \text{i.e., } \pi^l \in D^0(p^*). \end{aligned}$$

It follows that (p^*, π^l) is also a package-linear pricing Walrasian equilibrium. \square

Proof of Proposition 2. I show that both conditions of Definition 16 hold. (a) is straightforward given the structure on V^l , which is defined by bidder l 's marginal values $v^l(q, S)$, $S \in 2^N$, $q \leq \bar{M}$. The bidder can simply make a set of bids $\{(v^l(q, S), 1)_{S \in 2^N}, q = 1, \dots, \bar{M}\}$. (b) follows from the bidder's aggregation of marginal values. The value entering the welfare maximising auctioneer's objective is given by $\sum_{S, i \in \mathcal{I}^l} v_S^i x_S^i$. A bidder's allocation $\pi(l) = \{x_S^i\}_{S \in 2^N, i \in \mathcal{I}^l}$ is aggregated to a multiset such that $k^l = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}^l} x_S^i$. For a given allocation x_S^i , $S \in 2^N$, $i \in \mathcal{I}^l$, the bidder's overall value is defined as

$$V^l(\{x_S^i\}) = \max_{\{x_{q,S}\}} \sum_{S \in 2^N} \sum_{q=1}^{\bar{M}} v^l(q, S) x_{q,S} \quad \text{s.t.} \quad \sum_{q=1}^{\bar{M}} x_{q,S} \leq \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}^l} x_S^i, \quad \sum_{S \in 2^N} x_{q,S} \leq 1 \quad \forall q, x_{q,S} \in \{0, 1\}$$

Note that every allocation x_S^i , $S \in 2^N$, $i \in \mathcal{I}^l$, respects $\sum_S x_S^i \leq \kappa^i$ because of the definition of an XOR bid, and we can normalise $\kappa^i = 1$. Thus, $x_{q,S} = x_S^i$ is feasible in bidder l 's value aggregation for some order of bids in \mathcal{I}^l . It follows immediately that $V^l(\{x_S^i\}) \geq \sum_{S, i \in \mathcal{I}^l} v_S^i x_S^i$. Suppose that $V^l(\{x_S^i\}) > \sum_{S, i \in \mathcal{I}^l} v_S^i x_S^i$. Then, in the marginal value aggregation, the positions of at least two packages must have switched compared to the auctioneer's assignment $\pi(l)$. But all marginal values were available to the auctioneer to choose from, i.e. the bidder's marginal value aggregation was feasible in the social welfare maximisation problem. Thus $\pi(l)$ was not optimal and it follows that $V^l(\{x_S^i\}) = \sum_{S, i \in \mathcal{I}^l} v_S^i x_S^i$. \square

Proof of Proposition 3. Because the bidder's marginal values are superadditive between varieties and disjoint packages, the bidder could never gain from repackaging a given package into two (or more) disjoint subsets of that package. Consequently, repackaging can only occur if the bidder is allocated two disjoint packages and merges them.

Because the seller's marginal cost is subadditive between varieties and disjoint packages, she would never have a strict incentive to sell two disjoint packages separately if she could sell them bundled in one larger package. For contradiction, suppose that the bidder received two disjoint packages S_1 and S_2 on two different bids. Let $v^l(S_1, q)$ and $v^l(S_2, q')$ denote the corresponding marginal values submitted, with $q \geq q'$. Then, by assumption of MU-concave superadditive preferences, it must be that

$$v^l(S_1 \cup S_2, q) \geq v^l(S_1, q) + v^l(S_2, q') \quad (3)$$

By subadditivity of the seller's marginal cost, we have

$$c^0(q, S_1 \cup S_2, \mathbf{k}_{-(S_1 \cup S_2, S_1, S_2)}) \leq c^0(q, S_1, \mathbf{k}_{-(S_1 \cup S_2, S_1, S_2)}) + c^0(q, S_2, \mathbf{k}_{-(S_1 \cup S_2, S_1, S_2)}) \quad (4)$$

Adding Eq. (3) and Eq. (4) yields the auctioneer's (partial) social welfare objective

$$\begin{aligned} v^l(S_1 \cup S_2, q) - c^0(q, S_1 \cup S_2, \mathbf{k}_{-(S_1 \cup S_2, S_1, S_2)}) &\geq v^l(S_1, q) + v^l(S_2, q') \\ &\quad - c^0(q, S_1, \mathbf{k}_{-(S_1 \cup S_2, S_1, S_2)}) - c^0(q, S_2, \mathbf{k}_{-(S_1 \cup S_2, S_1, S_2)}), \end{aligned}$$

hence a contradiction to allocating S_1 and S_2 on two different bids. In case of indifference, the bidder must also be indifferent between repackaging S_1 and S_2 to $S_1 \cup S_2$, and leaving them as separate bundles. \square

Proof of Lemma 1. First, I show that given a supply function graph G , any supply function allocation $(y_S^q)_{S \in 2^N, q \leq \bar{q}}$ maps into a unique vector $(k_S)_{S \in 2^N}$. To proof that Algorithm 1 constructs a unique image from any permissible input, I demonstrate that (a) Algorithm 1 terminates after a finite number of steps, (b) each node S is successfully visited at some point, and (c) the time at which S is successfully visited is irrelevant. The mapping is linear by the definition of k_S in the algorithm.

(a) and (b) follow because Assumption 1(i) implies that there are no cycles in G . Thus, as long as $V \neq \mathcal{V}$, there exists some $S \in V \setminus \mathcal{V}$ for which the if-condition is false. Consequently, all nodes are added to \mathcal{V} at some point. It is without loss of generality to require that the algorithm does not get stuck in a trivial loop, i.e. it does not select a sequence of nodes that allow no successful visit and are skipped and revisited indefinitely. (c) follows because once the if-condition is false for a given node S , the set of nodes $A \in \mathcal{V} : \exists(A \dots S)$ remains unaltered. Once S *could* be successfully visited, it does not matter when it is actually selected for the successful visit, i.e. other nodes may be selected first.

The reverse mapping is straightforward. Given a supply function graph G , a multiset $\mathbf{k} = (k_S)_{S \in 2^N}$ maps in the following supply function allocation: for all $S \in 2^N$, $y_S^{q_S} = 1 \forall q_S \leq \sum_{A: \exists(A \dots S)} k_A$ and $y_S^{q_S} = 0 \forall q_S > \sum_{A: \exists(A \dots S)} k_A$. \square

Proof of Proposition 4. To prove this proposition I use a slightly different formulation of the auctioneer's partitioning problem. The supply function graph required that whenever a step on supply function f_S is allocated, a step on every supply function f_γ for all $\gamma : \exists(S \dots \gamma)$ is allocated as well. Therefore, I reformulate objective and constraints in the following way: Summing over the steps q , I introduce the identity of the package due to which a step on a supply curve is allocated. Formally, I call these steps $q'(S)$; they are the steps which are allocated on a given supply curve due to the allocation of package S . I suppress S in the problem; but it is important that the steps q' are different for each S .

Note that this problem formulation is not practical for solving the auction because the q' would have to be linked to the corresponding package S , and additional rules would have to be specified for which packages are allocated on which steps. However, this alternative problem formulation is useful to find out more about the price structure.

With the new definition of q' , it holds that $\sum_{q'} y_S^{q'} = Y_S$. I rewrite LP as follows:

LP

$$\begin{aligned} & \max_{\{x_S^i, y_S^{q'}\}} \left[\sum_{i,S} v_S^i x_S^i - \sum_{q'} y_S^{q'} \left(\sum_{\gamma: \exists(S \dots \gamma)} \mu_\gamma^{q'} \right) \right] \\ \text{s.t. } & \begin{cases} \sum_S x_S^i \leq \kappa^i \quad \forall i & b_i \quad [\text{constraint on bid size}] \\ y_S^{q'} \leq l_\gamma^{q'} \quad \forall q', \forall S, \forall \gamma : \exists(S \dots \gamma) & u_\gamma^{q'} \quad [\text{constraint on step size}] \\ \sum_i x_S^i - \sum_{q'} y_S^{q'} \leq 0 \quad \forall S & z_S \quad [\text{supply constraint}] \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

and all variables are non-negative. Then, the corresponding dual problem is

DLP

$$\begin{aligned} & \min_{\{b^i, z_S, u_\gamma^{q'}\}} \left[\sum_i \kappa^i b^i + \sum_{q', S, \gamma: \exists(S \dots \gamma)} l_\gamma^{q'} u_\gamma^{q'} \right] \\ \text{s.t. } & \begin{cases} b^i + z_S \geq v_S^i \quad \forall i, S & x_S^i \quad [\text{surplus constraint}] \\ \sum_{\gamma: \exists(S \dots \gamma)} u_\gamma^{q'} - z_S \geq - \sum_{\gamma: \exists(S \dots \gamma)} \mu_\gamma^{q'} \quad \forall q', \forall S & y_S^{q'} \quad [\text{marginal cost constraint}] \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

and all variables b^i , $u_\gamma^{q'}$ and z_S are non-negative. From the marginal cost constraint it follows that $z_S \leq \sum_{\gamma: \exists(S \dots \gamma)} (u_\gamma^{q'} + \mu_\gamma^{q'})$ for all S and for all q' . Complementary slackness implies that, if $y_S^{q'} > 0$, $z_S = \sum_{\gamma: \exists(S \dots \gamma)} (u_\gamma^{q'} + \mu_\gamma^{q'})$. As described above, $q' = q'(S)$ refers to the specific steps on which package S is allocated. However, in the original problem formulation, it does not matter which package is allocated on which step, because only the entirety of allocated steps is relevant for the seller's cost. Because $q'(S)$ could indeed be any of the steps on f_S , on which a positive amount is allocated, the equality holds for all $q_\gamma \leq \tilde{q}_\gamma$, when $y_{\tilde{q}_\gamma} \neq 0$. The inequality holds for any $q \leq \bar{q}$ because of the marginal cost constraint. \square

Proof of Corollary 3. From CC 7 and CC 8 follows

$$\mu_S^q \leq \psi^G(\{z_S\}) \leq \mu_S^{q+1}$$

Together with CSC 4, (i) follows. (ii) is immediate from Proposition 4 and CSC 4. \square

Proof of Theorem 1. First, I note the complementary slackness conditions (CSC) from LP and DLP. The CSC and useful 'characteristic conditions' are derived similar to Baldwin & Klemperer (2019a).

CSC 1 : If $x_S^i \neq 0$, then $b^i = v_S^i - z_S$, for all $i \in \mathcal{I}, S \subseteq N$.

CSC 2 : If $\sum_S x_S^i < \kappa^i$, then $b^i = 0$, for all $i \in \mathcal{I}$.

CSC 3 : If $\sum_i x_S^i - \phi^G(\{y_S^q\}) < 0$, then $z_S = 0$, for all $S \subseteq N$.

CSC 4 : If $y_S^q \neq 0$, then $u_\gamma^q + \mu_\gamma^q = \psi^G(\{z_S\})$, for all $q \leq \bar{q}, S \subseteq N$.

CSC 5 : If $y_S^q < l_\gamma^q$, then $u_\gamma^q = 0$, for all $q \leq \bar{q}, S \subseteq N$.

I first establish Lemmas 5 and 6 to characterise a solution of LP.

Lemma 5. *If $\{x_S^i, y_S^q\}$ and $\{b^i, u_S^q, z_S\}$, respectively, are solutions to LP and DLP, $\{x_S^i, y_S^q\}$ and $\{b^i, u_S^q, z_S\}$ satisfy the following characteristic conditions:*

$$CC\ 1 : \sum_S x_S^i \leq \kappa^i, \text{ for all } i \in \mathcal{I}.$$

$$CC\ 2 : y_S^q \leq l_S^q, \text{ for all } q \leq \bar{q}, S \subseteq N.$$

$$CC\ 3 : \sum_{i, \gamma: \exists(\gamma \dots S)} x_\gamma^i \leq \sum_q y_S^q, \text{ for all } S \subseteq N.$$

$$CC\ 4 : \text{If } z_S > 0, \text{ then } \sum_{i, \gamma: \exists(\gamma \dots S)} x_\gamma^i = \sum_q y_S^q, \text{ for all } S \subseteq N.$$

$$CC\ 5 : \text{If } v_S^i - z_S < \max_{S' \neq S} \{v_{S'}^i - z_{S'}, 0\}, \text{ then } x_S^i = 0, \text{ for all } i \in \mathcal{I}, S \subseteq N.$$

$$CC\ 6 : \text{If } \max_S \{v_S^i - z_S\} > 0, \text{ then } \sum_S x_S^i = \kappa^i, \text{ for all } i \in \mathcal{I}, S \subseteq N.$$

$$CC\ 7 : \text{If } \mu_S^q < \psi^G(\{z_S\}), \text{ then } y_S^q = l_S^q, \text{ for all } S \subseteq N.$$

$$CC\ 8 : \text{If } \mu_S^q > \psi^G(\{z_S\}), \text{ then } y_S^q = 0, \text{ for all } S \subseteq N.$$

Proof. CC 1 and CC 2 follow from the constraint on the bid size, and the constraint on the step size in LP. CC 3 is obtained by summing up the bundle S supply constraints from LP. In particular, I sum over all $\gamma : \exists(\gamma \dots S)$. By definition of the supply functions, $\sum_{\gamma: \exists(\gamma \dots S)} Y_\gamma = \sum_q y_S^q$ for any package $S \subseteq N$. CC 4 follows from CSC 3: the contrapositive of CSC 3 states that, if $z_S > 0$, $\sum_i x_S^i - \phi^G(\{y_S^q\}) = 0$ (> 0 is ruled out by the supply constraint of LP). If $z_S > 0$, then by Proposition 4, Requirement 1, and because $u_S^q \geq 0 \forall S, q$, it holds that $z_\gamma > 0$ for all $\gamma : \exists(\gamma \dots S)$ on which *some* y_γ^q is allocated. Therefore, I can take the sum of tight supply constraints across $\gamma : \exists(\gamma \dots S)$ (if $x_\gamma^i > 0$ for some i , then we must also have $y_\gamma^q > 0$ for some q); we obtain CC 4. CC 5 is derived from CSC 1: Assume $x_S^i > 0$ and $x_{S'}^i > 0$ for some $S \neq S'$. Then, by CSC 1, $v_S^i - z_S = v_{S'}^i - z_{S'} = b^i$. So if $v_S^i - z_S < v_{S'}^i - z_{S'}$ for some S' , then $x_S^i = 0$. Also note that it always holds that $b^i \geq 0$ and $b^i \geq v_S^i - z_S$, by the surplus constraint of DLP. So if $v_S^i - z_S < 0$, then it cannot be that $v_S^i - z_S = b^i$, and thus $x_S^i = 0$. Together, we obtain CC 5. $b^i \geq v_S^i - z_S$ also implies that, if $\max_S \{v_S^i - z_S\} > 0$, then $b^i > 0$. The contrapositive of CSC 2 then implies $\sum_S x_S^i = \kappa^i$, and thus CC 6. The marginal cost constraint of DLP is $u_S^q \geq \psi^G(\{z_S\}) - \mu_S^q$. Thus, if $\mu_S^q < \psi^G(\{z_S\})$, then $u_S^q > 0$, and so CC 7 follows by the contrapositive of CSC 5. Finally, if $\mu_S^q > \psi^G(\{z_S\})$, then we cannot have $u_S^q = \psi^G(\{z_S\}) - \mu_S^q$, because u_S^q is positive. Hence, the contrapositive of CSC 4 implies $y_S^q = 0$, and therefore CC 8. \square

Lemma 6. *Prices $\{z_S\}$ given by the solution of DLP support the allocation $\{x_S^i, y_S^q\}$ given by the solution of LP as a package-linear pricing Walrasian equilibrium.*

Proof. Assume the allocation $\{x_S^i, y_S^q\}$ and prices $\{z_S\}$ are solutions of LP and DLP as defined above. Then, by Lemma 5, conditions CC 1 - CC 8 hold. I show that CC 1 - CC 8, together with the CSC and the constraints of LP and DLP, imply that the $\{z_S\}$ support $\{x_S^i, y_S^q\}$ as a package-linear pricing Walrasian equilibrium. I prove (a) that there is no surplus improvement possible for any bid i , (b) that for a bidder who received a package multiset no surplus improvement is

possible from receiving a different partition of the package multiset, (c) that, given a partition of the allocated supply and given the final auction prices, the seller cannot improve her utility by allocating more or less of a given package, and (d) that, given a partition of the allocated supply and given the final auction prices, the seller cannot improve her utility by choosing a different partition of supply.

(a): If there is no positive surplus on any of the packages of a bid i , CC 5 ensures that this bid is allocated nothing. CC 6 implies that, if a strictly positive surplus can be made on any of the packages, the bid is allocated the maximum quantity bid for, and from CC 5 follows that the maximum quantity is allocated only on packages that maximise the bid's surplus. CC 1 ensures that the maximum quantity bid for is always respected.

(b): A bidder does not desire to repackage goods that he received in a certain partition (Proposition 3), or is prohibited from doing so, i.e. if he received the multiset of items \mathbf{k} , he does not rearrange single varieties to obtain a different multiset \mathbf{k}' with $\mathbf{k}^* = \mathbf{k}'^*$. However, I still have to show that the bidder would not be strictly better off with a different partitioning of supply at the given auction prices. Let \mathbf{k} denote the multiset of items received by bidder l through the set of winning bids \mathcal{W}^l (this set contains only those bids of l with a strictly positive allocation), i.e. $\mathbf{k} = (\sum_{i \in \mathcal{W}^l} x_S^i)_{S \in 2^N}$. First, recall Proposition 2: given an allocation \mathbf{k} , the bidder's value derived from \mathbf{k} equals its contribution to social welfare as it appears in the auctioneer's objective, i.e. $V^l(\mathbf{k}) = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{W}^l, S} x_S^i v_S^i$. Then, the bidder's utility is given by $u^l(\mathbf{k}, z) = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{W}^l, S} (v_S^i - z_S) x_S^i$. Suppose there is a different partitioning $\mathbf{k}' \neq \mathbf{k}$ where $\mathbf{k}^* = \mathbf{k}'^*$, with a corresponding set of winning bids \mathcal{W}'^l and allocation $\{x_S^i\}$, which gives bidder l strictly higher utility, i.e. $u(\mathbf{k}', z) = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{W}'^l, S} (v_S^i - z_S) x_S^i > u(\mathbf{k}, z)$. There exist at least two bids $i, j \in \mathcal{W}'^l$, for which $x_S^i \neq x_S^i$ and $x_S^j \neq x_S^j$ for some S . Let $\mathcal{D} := \{i \in \mathcal{W}^l \cap \mathcal{W}'^l : \exists S \text{ s.t. } x_S^i \neq x_S^i\}$, i.e. \mathcal{D} contains the winning bids in \mathcal{W} which are also in \mathcal{W}'^l , but with some allocations shifted to different packages. By the surplus constraint of DLP we have $v_S^i - z_S \leq b^i$ for all $i \in \mathcal{D}, S \in 2^N$; so no additional surplus can be generated through shifting allocations on those bids. Let $\mathcal{C} := \mathcal{W}'^l \setminus \mathcal{W}^l$, i.e. the bids in \mathcal{W}'^l that were not winning in the auction. By the contraposition of CC 6 it must hold that $z_S \geq v_S^i$ for all $i \in \mathcal{C}, S \in 2^N$. It follows that $u^l(\mathbf{k}', z) = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{W}'^l, S} (v_S^i - z_S) x_S^i \leq \sum_{i \in \mathcal{W}^l, S} b^i x_S^i = u^l(\mathbf{k}, z)$, i.e. bidder l maximises his surplus with the multiset received in the partition prescribed by the auction.

(c): If a step on supply curve f_S is allocated, i.e. $y_S^q > 0$, then CC 8 implies $\psi^G(\{z_S\}) \geq \mu_S^q$. Together with Corollary 3 we have $z_S \geq \sum_{\gamma: \exists (S \dots \gamma), \gamma \neq S} (u_\gamma^q + \mu_\gamma^q) + \mu_S^q$, i.e. the seller always sells package S at a weakly positive surplus. Furthermore, if $z_S > 0$, it follows by CC 4 that $\sum_{i, \gamma: \exists (\gamma \dots S)} x_\gamma^i = \sum_q y_S^q \forall S \subseteq N$, i.e. the amount of all packages with cost relation to S sold equals $\sum_q y_S^q$. Suppose $z_S > \mu_S^q + \sum_{\gamma: \exists (S \dots \gamma), \gamma \neq S} (u_\gamma^q + \mu_\gamma^q) \Leftrightarrow z_S - \sum_{\gamma: \exists (S \dots \gamma), \gamma \neq S} (u_\gamma^q + \mu_\gamma^q) > \mu_S^q$, i.e. a strictly positive surplus is made on package S . Then, Proposition 4(i) implies that

$$\sum_{\gamma: \exists (S \dots \gamma)} (u_\gamma^q + \mu_\gamma^q) - \sum_{\gamma: \exists (S \dots \gamma), \gamma \neq S} (u_\gamma^q + \mu_\gamma^q) \geq z_S - \sum_{\gamma: \exists (S \dots \gamma), \gamma \neq S} (u_\gamma^q + \mu_\gamma^q) > \mu_S^q$$

and thus $u_S^q + \mu_S^q > \mu_S^q$. With CSC 5, $u_S^q > 0$ implies that the entire supply function step is allocated. Conversely, let $z_S < \mu_S^q + \sum_{\gamma: \exists (S \dots \gamma), \gamma \neq S} (u_\gamma^q + \mu_\gamma^q)$, i.e. a strict loss would be made on a package. For contradiction, suppose $y_S^q > 0$. Then, by Corollary 3, $\psi^G(\{z_S\}) < \mu_S^q$, and

therefore, by CC 8, $y_S^q = 0$, a contradiction. Hence, the supply function step cannot be not allocated at all. Finally, by CC 2, a supply step is never allocated more than its maximum step size.

(d) I claim that, given a partition of supply that is a solution to LP, the seller cannot improve her utility by choosing a different partition of supply. To see this, recall Lemma 1, which states that the mapping from the allocation on the supply function graph to a package multiset, i.e. $(y_S^q)_{S \in 2^N, q \leq \bar{q}} \rightarrow (Y_S)_{S \in 2^N}$, is one-to-one. In (c), I have shown that the seller cannot improve upon the allocation on the supply function graph, given the dual prices. Then, it is immediate that the resulting partition of allocated supply is seller-optimal also. \square

Using the lemma above, a standard argument establishes the theorem. O_P denotes the value of an optimal solution to P, O_{LP} the value of an optimal solution to LP, and O_{DLP} the value of an optimal solution to DLP. First, let $O_P = O_{LP}$. Then, there exists $\{x_S^i, y_S^q\}$ as an optimal solution to IP and LP, and $\{x_S^i, y_S^q\}$ is efficient. By Lemma 6, the dual variables $\{z_S\}$ of DLP support this allocation as a package-linear pricing Walrasian equilibrium.

Now suppose there exists an equilibrium, i.e. prices $\{z_S\}$ that support $\{x_S^i, y_S^q\}$ as an equilibrium allocation. By Proposition 1, the allocation is efficient. Let $b_i := v_S^i - z_S$ for all $i \in \mathcal{I} : x_S^i > 0$, and let $u_S^q := \psi_S^G(\{z_S\}) - \mu_S^q$ for all $q \leq \bar{q}_S : y_S^q > 0, S \in 2^N$. Note that the u_S^q are defined recursively by Corollary 3: for $j \in N$, we have $\psi^G(\{z_j\}) = z_j$, so $u_j^q := z_j - \mu_j^q$ for all $q \leq \bar{q}_j, j \in N$. Given the u_j^q , one can go on to define u_S^q for all S , for which it holds that for all $\{\gamma : \exists(S \dots \gamma), \gamma \neq S\}, \gamma \in N$, and so on. The u_S^q are the seller's surplus on each individual supply step, and the b^i are the buyers' surplus on each bid. Because the $\{z_S\}$ are Walrasian equilibrium prices, it must be that $u_S^q, b^i \geq 0$. Efficiency implies that

$$\sum_{i,S} v_S^i x_S^i - \sum_{S,q} \mu_S^q y_S^q \geq \sum_{i,S} v_S^i (x_S^i)' - \sum_{S,q} \mu_S^q (y_S^q)' \quad \forall (x_S^i)', (y_S^q)'$$

i.e. u_S^q and b^i are feasible in DLP and $\{x_S^i, y_S^q\}$ are optimal in LP. By strong duality it holds that $O_{LP} = O_{DLP}$. Thus, we have

$$\begin{aligned} O_{LP} &= O_{DLP} \\ &\stackrel{(1)}{\leq} \sum_i \kappa^i b^i + \sum_{q,S} l_S^q u_S^q \\ &\stackrel{(2)}{=} \sum_{S,i: x_S^i = \kappa^i} \kappa^i (v_S^i - z_S) + \sum_{q,S: y_S^q = l_S^q} l_S^q (\psi_S^G(\{z_S\}) - \mu_S^q) \\ &\stackrel{(3)}{=} \sum_{S,i: x_S^i = \kappa^i} \kappa^i (v_S^i - z_S) + \sum_{q,S: y_S^q = l_S^q} l_S^q \left(z_S - \sum_{\gamma: \exists(S \dots \gamma), \gamma \neq S} (u_\gamma^{q'} + \mu_\gamma^{q'}) - \mu_S^q \right) \\ &\stackrel{(4)}{=} \sum_{S,i} x_S^i (v_S^i - z_S) + \sum_S Y_S z_S - \sum_{q,S} y_S^q \mu_S^q \\ &\quad + \underbrace{\sum_S \left(\sum_{\gamma: \exists(\gamma \dots S), \gamma \neq S} Y_\gamma \right) z_S - \sum_S \left(\sum_{\gamma: \exists(\gamma \dots S)} Y_\gamma \right) \left(\sum_{\gamma: \exists(S \dots \gamma), \gamma \neq S} (u_\gamma^{q'} + \mu_\gamma^{q'}) \right)}_{:=F} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\stackrel{(5)}{=} \sum_{i,S} v_S^i x_S^i - \sum_{S,q} \mu_S^q y_S^q \\
&\stackrel{(6)}{=} O_{IP}
\end{aligned}$$

(1) follows from DLP's objective function. (2) follows by definition of b_i and u_S^q above. (3) follows from Corollary 3. (4) follows because the amount on a given supply curve allocated equals the sum of the quantities of all packages sold that have a cost relation to the given supply curve, i.e.

$$\sum_{q,S:y_S^q=l_S^q} l_S^q z_S = \sum_S Y_S z_S + \sum_S \left(\sum_{\gamma:\exists(\gamma\dots S),\gamma\neq S} Y_\gamma \right) z_S$$

(5) follows because $\sum_i x_S^i = Y_S$ for all S for which $z_S > 0$, and because, using Proposition 4 (substituting for z_S) and simplifying sums, we have

$$F = \sum_S Y_S \left(\sum_{\gamma:\exists(S\dots\gamma)} (u_\gamma^{q'} + \mu_\gamma^{q'}) \right) - \sum_S \left(\sum_{\gamma:\exists(\gamma\dots S)} Y_\gamma \right) (\mu_S^{q'} + u_S^{q'}) = 0$$

The previous equation is equal to zero simply because of the distributive law in arithmetic. Finally, (6) follows from the definition of the auctioneer's indivisible allocation problem P. I have shown that $O_{LP} \leq O_{IP}$. It also holds that $O_{LP} \geq O_{IP}$ because any solution of IP is feasible in LP, and the claim follows. \square

Proof of Proposition 5. Let $W \subseteq S \subseteq \delta \subseteq N$, and let $y(S, \delta, t, W)$ denote the amount allocated on supply function f_S that is due to the allocation of a bundle $\delta \supset_t W$, t levels above W . Let $dist(x, y) := ||x| - |y||$ for any $x, y \subseteq N$. I first establish a series of facts.

Fact (1). Given any reference supply set $W \subseteq S$, I can write the amount allocated on supply function f_S as

$$\sum_q y_S^q = \sum_{t=dist(S,W)}^{n-|W|} \sum_{\delta \supset_t W} y(S, \delta, t, W).$$

Lemma 7. Given are sets $x \subseteq z \subseteq N$, and a number q with $|x| \leq q \leq |z|$. Let $R := \{y \subseteq N | x \subseteq y \subseteq z, |y| = q\}$. Then, $|R| = \binom{|z|-|x|}{q-|x|}$.

Proof. This is a standard combinatorics problem. First, note that $q - |x|$ items can be added to x such that y contains q items. These items also need to be different from those contained in x , and they need to be contained in z . Hence, there are $|z| - |x|$ different items, of which $q - |x|$ many can be added to x . This is possible in $\binom{|z|-|x|}{q-|x|}$ different ways. \square

Fact (2). Given S, δ, W , let $r := dist(S, W)$ and $t := dist(\delta, W)$. By Lemma 7 above, there exist $\binom{t}{r}$ supply functions f_S relative to f_W , on which the amount $y(S, \delta, t, W)$ is allocated. Of course, t (or δ or W) is redundant; it is only written for clarity of exposition.

Fact (3). $y(S, \delta, t, W)$ does not depend on S . If a step on supply function f_δ is allocated, then a step on each supply function $\gamma \subseteq \delta$ is allocated. Thus, the allocation of bundles on supply functions in the graph ‘between’ W and δ due to the allocation of bundle δ has to be the same amount.

Fact (4). For any $t \geq 1$, we have, by the binomial theorem, $\sum_{r=0}^t \binom{t}{r} (-1)^r = 0$.

We now have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{r=0}^{n-|S|} \sum_q \sum_{\gamma \supset_r S} (-1)^r y_\gamma^q \\
= & \sum_{r=0}^{n-|S|} \sum_{\gamma \supset_r S} (-1)^r \sum_q y_\gamma^q \\
\stackrel{(1)}{=} & \sum_{r=0}^{n-|S|} \sum_{\gamma \supset_r S} (-1)^r \sum_{t=\text{dist}(\gamma, S)}^{n-|S|} \sum_{\delta \supset_t S} y(\gamma, \delta, t, S) \\
= & \sum_{r=0}^{n-|S|} \sum_{\gamma \supset_r S} (-1)^r \sum_{t=r}^{n-|S|} \sum_{\delta \supset_t S} y(\gamma, \delta, t, S) \\
\stackrel{(2),(3)}{=} & \sum_{r=0}^{n-|S|} (-1)^r \sum_{t=r}^{n-|S|} \binom{t}{r} \sum_{\delta \supset_t S} y(\cdot, \delta, t, S) \\
\stackrel{(4)}{=} & \sum_{t=0}^{n-|S|} \sum_{\delta \supset_t S} y(\cdot, \delta, t, S) \sum_{r=0}^t (-1)^r \binom{t}{r} \\
= & \sum_{\delta \supset_0 S} y(\cdot, \delta, 0, S) \sum_{r=0}^0 (-1)^r \binom{0}{r} \\
= & y(\cdot, S, 0, S) \\
= & Y_S
\end{aligned}$$

□

Proof of Proposition 6. First, note that for complete CFG, the definition of marginal cost simplifies to

$$c^0(k, S, \mathbf{k}_{-(B_1, \dots, B_t)}) = \sum_{\gamma \subseteq S} \Delta c(q_\gamma, \gamma), \quad \text{where } q_\gamma := \sum_{A \supset \gamma, A \in 2^N \setminus \{B_1, \dots, B_t\}} k_A + k$$

Let $B := (S_1 \cup S_2, S_1, S_2)$ and let $q_\gamma := \sum_{A \supset \gamma, A \in 2^N \setminus B} k_A + k$. Then we have, for any disjoint sets $S_1, S_2 \in 2^N$,

$$\begin{aligned}
& c^0(k, S_1, \mathbf{k}_{-B}) + c^0(k, S_2, \mathbf{k}_{-B}) \\
= & \sum_{\gamma \subseteq S_1} \Delta c(q_\gamma, \gamma) + \sum_{\gamma \subseteq S_2} \Delta c(q_\gamma, \gamma) \\
= & \sum_{\gamma \subseteq S_1 \cup S_2} \Delta c(q_\gamma, \gamma) - \sum_{\gamma \subseteq S_1 \cup S_2, \gamma \not\subseteq S_1, S_2} \Delta c(q_\gamma, \gamma) \\
\geq & \sum_{\gamma \subseteq S_1 \cup S_2} \Delta c(q_\gamma, \gamma) \\
= & c^0(k, S_1 \cup S_2, \mathbf{k}_{-S})
\end{aligned}$$

□

E.1 Proofs for Appendix D

Proof of Lemma 2. To simplify notation, I write $c^*(v^0, S)$ as $c^*(S)$ for any $S \in 2^N$. Let $S_1^c, S_2^c \in 2^N$ and $S_1^c \cap S_2^c = \emptyset$. Note that $c^*(N) = v^0(N)$ and $S_1^c \cap S_2^c = \emptyset \Leftrightarrow S_1 \cup S_2 = N$. Because v^0 is superadditive we have

$$\begin{aligned} v^0(S_1^c \cup S_2^c) &\geq v^0(S_1^c) + v^0(S_2^c) \\ \Leftrightarrow v^0(N) - c^*((S_1^c \cup S_2^c)^c) &\geq 2v^0(N) - c^*(S_1) - c^*(S_2) \\ \Leftrightarrow c^*(S_1) + c^*(S_2) &\geq c^*(S_1 \cup S_2) + c^*(S_1 \cap S_2) \end{aligned}$$

The proof for subadditive v^0 is analogous. □

Proof of Proposition 7. In SY, the seller's supply correspondence is defined as

$$S(p) = \arg \max_{\delta \in \mathcal{K}} \left\{ \sum_{A \in \delta} p(A) \right\}$$

In my ascending auction the seller's supply correspondence is defined as

$$D^0(p) = \arg \max_{\delta \in \mathcal{K}} \left\{ \sum_{A \in \delta} (p(A) - c^0(A)) \right\}$$

In SY's ascending auction, it holds that $p(B) = v^0(B)$ for any bundle B that is assigned to the seller during the procedure and $p(\pi(0)) = v^0(\pi(0))$. Hence, we have

$$\begin{aligned} S(p) &= \arg \max_{\delta \in \mathcal{K}} \left\{ \sum_{A \in \delta \setminus B} p(A) + v^0(B) \right\} \\ &= \arg \max_{\delta \in \mathcal{K}} \left\{ \sum_{A \in \delta \setminus B} p(A) + v^0(B) - v^0(N) \right\} \\ &= \arg \max_{\delta \in \mathcal{K}} \left\{ \sum_{A \in \delta \setminus B} p(A) - c^*(N \setminus B) \right\} \\ &= \arg \max_{\delta \in \mathcal{K}} \left\{ \sum_{A \in \delta \setminus B} p(A) - c^* \left(\bigcup_{A \in \delta \setminus B} A \right) \right\} \end{aligned}$$

c^* is by definition the dual of v^0 , and $c^* \left(\bigcup_{A \in \delta \setminus B} A \right)$ may be interpreted as the seller's cost function. Thus, part (i) and (ii) of the proposition follow. □

Proof of Lemma 3. The proof proceeds by analogy with Sun & Yang (2014), but the detailed arguments differ. The auction terminates at some time t^* , because buyers' values are finite, i.e. demand ceases at some point. The empty package is always priced at zero.

Let $p^* = p(t^*)$ and let $A_l^* = A_l(t^*)$. Furthermore, let $\delta^* = \delta(t^*) \in D^0(p^*)$ denote the supply set in $D^0(p^*)$ that is chosen at time t^* by the seller. First, I establish an allocation π^* such that (p^*, π^*) constitutes a package-linear Walrasian equilibrium. Because at p^* no package is overdemand, for any bidder $l \in \mathcal{L}$ with $A_l^* \neq \emptyset$, his demand A_l^* must be in δ^* . If $\bigcup_{l \in \mathcal{L}} A_l^* = N$ holds, let $\pi^*(l) = A_l^*$ for all $l \in \mathcal{L}$ and $\pi^*(0) = \emptyset$. Then (p^*, π^*) is a package-linear Walrasian equilibrium. If $\bigcup_{l \in \mathcal{L}} A_l^* \subset N$, there is at least one package B in the chosen supply set δ^* which is not demanded by any bidder at time t^* . By analogy with SY, B is called a *squeezed-out* package. We distinguish multiple cases:

Case 1: $p^*(B) = c^0(B)$. The final price of bundle B is still fixed at the starting price, so B was never overdemand. If a buyer demanded it in some earlier round, this buyer demands now a different, more profitable package. Let $\delta_0^* = \{B \in \delta^* \mid p^*(B) = c^0(B) \text{ and } B \neq A_l^* \text{ for all } l \in \mathcal{L}\}$ be the set of all squeezed-out packages. Let $\pi^*(0) = \bigcup_{B \in \delta_0^*} B$ and allocate $\pi^*(0)$ to the seller at zero cost. Let \mathcal{K}_0^* denote the universe of all partitions of the items contained in δ_0^* . Because $\delta^* \in D^0(p^*)$, we have

$$\sum_{B \in \gamma} [p^*(B) - c^0(B)] \leq \sum_{B \in \delta_0^*} [p^*(B) - c^0(B)] = 0$$

for all $\gamma \in \mathcal{K}_0^*$. Hence, the seller is indifferent between selling $\pi^*(0)$ or not.

Case 2: $p^*(B) > c^0(B)$. Package B was demanded by some bidder in an earlier round. Denoting by t the last round in which B was demanded by some bidder l , B may be allocated to bidder l at the current price $p^*(B)$ by the auction rule. Thus, we need to demonstrate that it is still utility maximising for bidder l to receive package B at the current price. By the auction rule, we must have $\mathcal{V}^l(p(t)) = u^l(B, p(t)) = v^l(B) - p(t, B) \geq 1$ and $p^*(B) = p(t, B)$ or $p^*(B) = p(t, B) + 1$. Thus, we have for bidder l , who is allocated the squeezed-out package B ,

$$u^l(B, p^*) = v^l(B) - p^*(B) \geq 0 \tag{5}$$

Now two sub-cases need to be distinguished:

Case 2A: If $A_l^* = \emptyset$, assign bidder l the squeezed-out bundle, i.e. $\pi^*(l) = B$. $A_l^* \in D^l(p^*)$ and $A_l^* = \emptyset$ imply that $\mathcal{V}^l(p^*) = 0$. By definition of \mathcal{V}^l we have $\mathcal{V}^l(p^*) \geq u^l(B, p^*)$. Together with Eq. (5) this implies $u^l(B, p^*) = 0$, and hence $\pi^*(l) \in D^l(p^*)$.

Case 2B: If $A_l^* \neq \emptyset$, assign bidder l what he demanded at time t^* and the squeezed-out bundle, i.e. $\pi^*(l) = A_l^* \cup B$. Because the seller chose a supply set $\delta^* \ni \{A_l^*, B\}$, we have

$$p^*(A_l^*) - c^0(A_l^*) + p^*(B) - c^0(B) \geq p^*(\pi^*(l)) - c^0(\pi^*(l)). \tag{6}$$

Superadditivity of l 's utility, subadditivity of the seller's cost, and $A_l^* \in D^l(p^*)$ imply

$$v^l(\pi^*(l)) \geq v^l(A_l^*) + v^l(B) \tag{7}$$

$$c^0(\pi^*(l)) \leq c^0(A_l^*) + c^0(B) \tag{8}$$

$$v^l(A_l^*) - p^*(A_l^*) \geq v^l(\pi^*(l)) - p^*(\pi^*(l)). \tag{9}$$

From Eqs. (6) and (8) follows

$$p^*(A_l^*) + p^*(B) \geq p^*(\pi^*(l)). \quad (10)$$

Then, using equation Eq. (10), Eq. (7), and Eq. (5) (in this order), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} v^l(\pi^*(l)) - p^*(\pi^*(l)) &\geq v^l(\pi^*(l)) - [p^*(A_l^*) + p^*(B)] \\ &\geq [v^l(A_l^*) - p^*(A_l^*)] + [v^l(B) - p^*(B)] \\ &\geq v^l(A_l^*) - p^*(A_l^*). \end{aligned}$$

By Eq. (9), $v^l(\pi^*(l)) - p^*(\pi^*(l)) = v^l(\pi^*(l)) - [p^*(A_l^*) + p^*(B)] = v^l(A_l^*) - p^*(A_l^*)$, and thus

$$p^*(\pi^*(l)) = p^*(A_l^*) + p^*(B). \quad (11)$$

Bidder l is therefore happy to receive bundle B in addition to his demanded bundle A_k^* , and pay the price that is set for the bundle $\pi^*(l)$. This process can be repeated for every squeezed-out bundle B with $p^*(B) > c^0(B)$. Every buyer l who is not allocated any squeezed-out bundle receives his demanded package, i.e. $\pi^*(l) = A_l^*$. δ^* is a partition of N chosen by the seller, and thus $(\pi^*(0), \dots, \pi^*(L))$ is an allocation of N . By Eq. (11), the seller's utility is

$$\sum_{l \in \mathcal{L}} [p^*(\pi^*(l)) - c^0(\pi^*(l))] = \sum_{A \in \delta^*} [p^*(A) - c^0(A)] = \mathcal{V}^0(p^*)$$

It follows that (p^*, π^*) is a package-linear pricing Walrasian equilibrium. \square

Proof of Lemma 4. With a revenue maximising seller, an allocation π is efficient if it holds for every allocation π' that

$$\sum_{l \in \mathcal{L}_0} [v^l(\pi(l))] \geq \sum_{l \in \mathcal{L}_0} [v^l(\pi'(l))] \quad (12)$$

With a utility maximising seller, an allocation π is efficient if for every allocation π' it holds that

$$\sum_{l \in \mathcal{L}} [v^l(\pi(l)) - c^0(\pi(l))] \geq \sum_{l \in \mathcal{L}} [v^l(\pi'(l)) - c^0(\pi'(l))] \quad (13)$$

SY's ascending auction terminates in an efficient allocation π in the sense of Eq. (12). The extended ascending auction terminates in an efficient allocation π in the sense of Eq. (13). If the auctioneer's marginal costs are zero, the efficient allocation in the extended ascending auction is equivalent to the efficient allocation in the sense of Eq. (12): running the auction with the set of buyers $\mathcal{L}' = \mathcal{L} + \{0\} = \mathcal{L}_0$, Eq. (12) and Eq. (13) are equivalent and the claim follows. \square

Proof of Proposition 8. Note that every conventional bidder bids identically in the ascending auction and the extended ascending auction, up to ties. I split the revenue maximising seller

into 2^n dummy bidders, denoted by $l_S, S \in 2^N$. Define dummy l_S 's utility function as follows:

$$v^{l_S}(B) := \begin{cases} v^0(S) & \text{if } B \supseteq S \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Each dummy l_S has the highest bid on bundle S among all dummies because v^0 is superadditive. Let dummy l_S demand bundle S whenever he weakly prefers S to any other bundle except the empty set and let him demand the empty set when she weakly prefers to do so.

Let the extended ascending auction start at $t = -1$ with starting prices $p(-1, S) = v^0(S) - 1 \forall S \in 2^N$. Let two instances of each dummy l_S participate. Dummies $l_S, S \in 2^N$ each demand bundle S . The auctioneer offers some supply set. Regardless of the non-dummy bidders' demand, each bundle $S \in 2^N$ is overdemanded in $t = -1$, so prices in $t = 0$ are increased by one. The dummies all demand the empty set for all $t = 0, 1, \dots$, so if at some round $t \geq 0$ the auction ends with squeezed-out bundles, they can be allocated to the dummies if they were the last to demand them. It is without loss of generality to stipulate that the squeezed-out bundles *are* allocated to dummies in this case, and not to regular bidders who might have demanded them at $t = -1$ as well. Then, in all rounds $t = 0, 1, \dots$, the supply correspondence and the demand correspondences are chosen to maximise identical utility functions in both auctions. Hence, the supply correspondence and demand correspondences are identical in every round of both auctions, and it follows that an identical price path resulting in the same allocation exists. \square