

From Doubt to Devotion: Trials and Learning-Based Pricing*

[Click Here for the Latest Version](#)

Tan Gan[†] Nicholas Wu[‡]

November 3, 2023

Abstract

An informed seller designs a dynamic mechanism to sell an experience good. The seller has partial information about the product match, which affects the buyer's private consumption experience. We characterize equilibrium mechanisms of this dynamic informed principal problem. The belief gap between the informed seller and the uninformed buyer, coupled with the buyer's learning, gives rise to mechanisms that provide the skeptical buyer with limited access to the product and an option to upgrade if the buyer is swayed by a good experience. Depending on the seller's screening technology, this takes the form of free/discounted trials or tiered pricing, which are prevalent in digital markets. In contrast to static environments, having consumer data can reduce sellers' revenue in equilibrium, as they fine-tune the dynamic design with their data forecasting the buyer's learning process.

*We would like to thank Dirk Bergemann, Simon Board, Daniel Clark, Piotr Dworzak, Brett Green, Marina Halac, Kevin He, Johannes Hörner, Ryota Iijima, Jonathan Libgober, Bart Lipman, Daniel Rappoport, Philip J. Reny, Larry Samuelson, Anna Sanktjohanser, Philipp Strack, Harry Pei, Kai Hao Yang, Jidong Zhou, and participants at SITE '23, the 34th Stony Brook Game Theory Conference, the Toulouse School of Economics theory workshop and the Yale microeconomic theory lunch seminar and breakfasts for helpful comments and discussions.

[†]Department of Economics, Yale University, tan.gan@yale.edu.

[‡]Department of Economics, Yale University, nick.wu@yale.edu.

1 Introduction

In the digital marketplace, a prominent feature distinguishing software products and digital services from traditional retail goods is the implementation of dynamic pricing mechanisms that are fine-tuned by consumer preference data. To fix ideas, consider a streaming service provider offering access to a library of entertainment content. Buyers derive a base value from generic content, yet occasionally encounter content that resonates with their tastes, delivering heightened utility. On one hand, with the pervasive collection of consumer data, the streaming service is better informed about whether its library contains movies or TV shows tailored to a consumer’s preferences. On the other hand, consumers are initially uninformed but can become convinced of the service’s value by finding content they enjoy. How can the seller leverage data on consumer preferences and the buyer’s ability to learn, and what are the welfare implications in equilibrium?

We address this question by studying a dynamic mechanism design problem of an informed principal. As firms rarely disclose their data or algorithms yet often publicly adopt dynamic pricing such as trials and tiered pricing, we believe the informed principal approach, where the seller can commit to tangible pricing mechanisms but can not credibly communicate the information obtained from unpublished data, plays an important role in deepening our understanding of digital markets.

In our baseline model, a seller is privately informed about a binary match value between the service and the buyer. The informed seller then commits to a dynamic mechanism that determines the service access provided and prices charged over time. If the match value is high, the buyer stochastically and privately receives positive utility shocks from the service via a Poisson process with an arrival rate depending on the service access; if the match value is low, the buyer experiences no utility shocks. The size of the utility shocks is initially unknown to both parties but is learned perfectly by the buyer once he receives a shock. In addition to the payoff shocks, the service may give a type-independent flow payoff to the buyer.¹ In the streaming example, we interpret the payoffs as consumers getting a common flow utility from generic content, and experiencing an instantaneous positive payoff shock from finding a TV series or movie they enjoy.

To the best of our knowledge, this paper pioneers the study of dynamic mechanism design within an informed principal framework. Central to our findings is the interplay between pricing against buyer learning and the belief gap regarding the buyer’s experience between the informed seller and the uninformed buyer. In our framework, the ex-ante revenue-

¹For the purpose of exposition, we first focus on the payoff shocks in this paper, and discuss type-independent flow payoff later in extensions.

maximizing mechanism is to always provide full access to the service and charge a price at the beginning. This deters the buyer from leveraging his private consumption experience to gain information rents. Such a mechanism can be supported in equilibrium if either of our two key model components - the dynamic pricing and the belief gap regarding the dynamic learning - is removed. However, in our dynamic informed principal model, once the seller is privately informed, the seller with high match quality anticipates a greater likelihood of the buyer receiving a utility shock relative to the buyer's own expectation. When the belief gap is large enough to offset the rent loss of price discrimination on the buyer's value (the size of the utility shock), it becomes profitable for the high-type seller to deviate from the ex-ante revenue-maximizing mechanism. She can offer a free trial of a certain length t_F to "prove" herself and sell the post-trial service at a Myersonian price $v_F(T - t_F)$. Faced with this deviation, the buyer uses the free trial regardless of his belief about the match quality, and purchases the post-trial service if he is swayed by the good experience during the trial.

Having shown that the ex-ante revenue-maximizing mechanism might not be supported in equilibrium, we proceed to establish a more precise characterization of equilibrium payoffs. To this end, we first characterize the payoffs that are attainable by incentive-compatible dynamic mechanisms, which is a necessary condition for the payoffs to be achieved in equilibrium. Theorem 1 shows that payoffs on the boundary of the mechanism payoff set can be uniquely achieved by trial mechanisms. In such mechanisms, sellers of both types sell full service access up to some intermediate time t_0 , after which they set a premium price for the remaining service. Consequently, all buyers purchase the initial trial and only those who have experienced a sufficiently large positive utility shock during the trial opt to purchase the post-trial service.

Technically, the mechanism design problem arising is a multi-dimensional screening problem, since the buyer has private information about the arrival time of payoff shocks (if they arrive) and their size. Solving multi-dimensional screening problems is in general hard. However, the structure of our setting enables us to circumvent this by considering a relaxed problem.² The two most important relaxed constraints are as follows. First, we retain the standard local incentive constraints on reports of the lump-sum reward assuming the report about arrival time is truthful. Second, we retain a global inter-temporal constraint, which requires that upon receiving a payoff shock, the buyer finds it sub-optimal to stay silent about its arrival forever.

Returning to equilibrium payoffs, we show that all reasonable equilibrium payoffs are achievable in equilibria where sellers of both types propose the same trial mechanisms. In

²Our relaxation is distinct from the impulse-response approach in the literature of dynamic mechanism design.

these pooling equilibria, the sellers’ strategic choice of the mechanism and its dynamic allocation rule do not disclose any information, and the buyer only updates his belief based on private signals from the consumption experience. Nonetheless, the signaling incentives of sellers have sharp implications on the trial mechanisms selected, once equilibrium refinements are considered. Applying the D1 criterion, we show that all equilibrium trial mechanisms surviving the refinement have the same trial length t_F and price threshold v_F as the free trial.³ Compared to other trial mechanisms, the surviving trial mechanisms have the shortest trial length, and the highest price threshold, resulting in minimum ex-ante revenue/efficiency. Intuitively, the high-type seller has the incentive to signal her type by proposing dynamic mechanisms that generate higher profit from selling post-trial services, which the low type can not profit from. Consequently, the surviving trial mechanisms maximize the revenue from post-trial services and minimize the trial length.

The distortion of signaling incentives can be so large that sellers of both types benefit from not possessing private information regarding match quality. This, in conjunction with the previous impossibility result of supporting the ex-ante revenue-maximizing mechanism in equilibrium,⁴ highlights that having consumer preference data may actually decrease sellers’ revenue, as they fine-tune their dynamic mechanism with consumer data forecasting the buyer’s learning process. These findings contrast with the literature on the informed principal problem in the static environment (Koessler & Skreta 2016), where the ex-ante profit maximizing mechanism can be supported in equilibrium and survive equilibrium refinements, hence additional data about consumer preferences is always helpful.

Trial mechanisms, which are prevalent in digital markets, arise endogenously in our baseline model, because we restrict sellers to controlling only service access. This setting is relevant when the seller’s ability to customize the service is constrained, for example, when the seller can only offer either full service or no service at all. In a more general setting, we allow the seller to also alter service quality so that the buyer’s learning rate and his expected utility flows are not necessarily co-linear. In this case, Theorem 2 shows that the relevant equilibrium mechanisms take the form of other commonly seen selling practices such as tiered pricing. Streaming platforms offering ad-supported free access exemplify this. Frequent ad interjections decrease the consumption value of the content, reducing the information rent to premium service users while providing skeptical users an avenue to evaluate the platform’s content. Once the buyer becomes convinced of the value of the service, he immediately chooses to upgrade to the ad-free premium tier. In contrast to intuition in standard mech-

³The only difference of these trial mechanisms is the ex-ante price of the trial. The free trial here refers to the deviation mechanism that we discussed before.

⁴The previous result has weaker predictions but it does not require the stronger D1 equilibrium refinement.

anism design, when the seller is privately informed, enriching her screening technology may reduce both revenue and social efficiency in equilibrium.

The paper is structured as follows. The next section surveys the relevant literature. We present the formal model in Section 2. We first outline the first-best in Section 3, and show that the first-best is attainable without either the informed seller property or the dynamic nature of the problem. Section 4 characterizes the outcomes of dynamic mechanisms, and shows that trial mechanisms are the weighted-revenue-maximizing mechanisms. Section 5 characterizes the equilibrium payoff set and equilibrium refinements. Section 6 generalizes the screening technology and shows that other common pricing schemes such as tiered pricing are the weighted-revenue-maximizing mechanisms. Section 7 considers extensions and robustness, and Section 8 concludes.

1.1 Literature

This paper contributes to the literature on the informed principal stemming from Rothschild & Stiglitz (1976) and Myerson (1983). Perhaps due to its growing relevance in the era of big data, there seems to be recent resurging interests in the framework: Koessler & Skreta (2016, 2019, 2023), Dosis (2022), Nishimura (2022), Clark (2023*a,b*), Brunnermeier et al. (2023). The most related paper is Koessler & Skreta (2016). They consider a general framework of static informed principal problem, where a seller with a single indivisible good faces a buyer whose willingness to pay depends on his privately-known taste and on product characteristics privately known by the seller. They prove that the ex-ante revenue-maximizing mechanism can always be implemented in the equilibrium. Thus, more data about consumer preference helps the seller, in a static trading environment where the informed seller can flexibly design mechanisms. This result no longer holds in our dynamic market for experience goods.

Our paper contributes to this literature by pioneering the exploration of the implication of the informed principal on the design of dynamic mechanisms. As we illustrate in the paper, the key to understanding the equilibrium mechanism is how the mechanism is shaped by the belief gap between the informed designer and the uninformed agent regarding the dynamic information arrival process at the stage when the mechanism is designed and accepted. In the classical dynamic mechanism design setting, there is also a belief gap between the uninformed principal and the informed agent. These two directions are not symmetric because the mechanism designer has commitment power in the dynamic decision rules while the agent does not.

The paper also relates to studies on experience goods in a dynamic environment. There are two lines of literature that are most related, and we will use two benchmarks in Section

3 to further illustrate the difference and our distinct contribution. First, there is an early exploration of how informed sellers use prices as a signal of quality such as Milgrom & Roberts (1986), Bagwell (1987), Bagwell & Riordan (1991), Judd & Riordan (1994). Those papers consider two-period models where the informed seller has no commitment power and sequentially sets prices in both periods. By the nature of the model, all feasible pricing behaviors in these models take the form of trials. They focus on how the signaling incentive shapes the first-period price in the separating equilibrium, and whether the price path is increasing or decreasing.⁵

In our model, the informed seller has the full flexibility to design a dynamic mechanism. In particular, the seller can sell everything ex-ante to avoid buyers gaining information rent from their private experience. We prove that trial mechanisms endogenously appear as equilibrium mechanisms when the mechanism can only determine whether to provide the buyer with access to the service. When the screening technology is richer, a more sophisticated mechanism, tiered pricing, appears instead as the equilibrium mechanism. Also, in our model, the payoff boundary is achieved by pooling equilibria where sellers of both types propose the same mechanism with the same allocation rule. Thus, our analysis focuses on understanding the structure of the pooling mechanism.

The second related literature on experience goods in a dynamic environment is the literature on experimentation in markets such as Crémer (1984), Bergemann & Välimäki (2000, 2006), Yu et al. (2016), Hagiü & Wright (2020), Chen et al. (2023), where the seller is uninformed and needs to set post prices period by period or set the flow rate in continuous time model. Recent papers in this literature focus more on the competition between multiple firms. The key component of our paper, the informed seller is not discussed in this literature. Also, we allow the seller to flexibly commit to any dynamic mechanism. If the seller in our model is uninformed, she will commit to selling the entire service ex-ante to prevent the buyer from gaining information about rent. Lastly, our discussion allows within-period price discrimination, and tiered pricing mechanisms do feature actively within-period price discrimination.

2 Model

General Setting A seller dynamically sells a service to a buyer. The service is only available for a fixed time interval, so time is given by $t \in \mathcal{T} = [0, T]$. The value of the service depends on the match quality between the service and the buyer: $\theta \in \Theta = \{H, L\}$.

⁵The trial mechanism in our framework does not specifically refer to an increasing (average) rate path. In some equilibrium, it might feature a decreasing rate if the size of the shock is sufficiently dispersed.

The seller can control the buyer's access to the service $I \in [0, 1]$ at any time, where we interpret $I = 0$ as no access to the service, and $I = 1$ as full access.⁶ Access determines the rate at which a buyer privately receives instantaneous rewards from using a good service; namely, if $\theta = H$, a buyer receives instantaneous lump sum rewards according to a Poisson process with flow rate λI , where λ is an exogenous parameter. If $\theta = L$, no instantaneous rewards ever arrive. We can allow the service to deliver a type-independent flow payoff uI to the buyer and to incur a flow cost of cI to the seller, which we relegate to extensions for the purpose of exposition. In the streaming service example, we interpret the payoffs as consumers receiving a common flow utility, and experiencing an instantaneous positive payoff shock when they encounter a TV series or movie that matches their preferences.

Outcomes and Payoffs We assume both parties are risk-neutral and there is no discounting.⁷ Instantaneous rewards give a lump sum utility v to the buyer, which is persistent over time. Thus, if by time T , the buyer has cumulatively received N instantaneous rewards, and paid a total price of p , her utility is $Nv - p$, while the seller's payoff is simply p .

Beliefs and Information The common prior of $\theta = H$ is $\mu_0 \in (0, 1)$, and the common prior of v has a Myerson-regular distribution F which admits a density f with nonnegative support $V = [\underline{v}, \bar{v}]$. We normalize the expected value of v to 1.

The seller does not observe v but privately observes θ : from consumer data the seller gets partial information about whether the buyer would like the service. If the match quality is low, $\theta = L$, we say the seller is of low type; otherwise, the seller is of high type.

The buyer does not observe θ and v at the beginning but privately observes the outcome of the Poisson process as he uses the service provided by the seller. That is, he privately observes the arrival of instantaneous rewards and their value. Due to the nature of the Poisson process, he learns both θ and v perfectly at the arrival of the first instantaneous reward.

Timing The timing of the game is as follows:

1. Nature draws θ and v .
2. The seller publicly proposes a dynamic mechanism (which we specify later).

⁶In Section 6 we extend our analysis to the case where the seller has access to a richer screening technology, where she can control both the service access and service quality.

⁷No discounting merely simplifies the algebraic expressions. Our results extend to infinite time with discounting as discussed in Section 7.3.

3. The buyer either accepts or rejects the mechanism. Rejecting leads to an outside option of 0.
4. The mechanism starts and both parties start reporting messages. The game ends when the buyer exits or time expires at T .

Mechanism To deal with measure-theoretic issues, we restrict the space of mechanisms that the seller could propose in the informed principal game to be the following set of direct mechanisms \mathcal{M} .

A direct mechanism asks the seller to report $\theta \in \{H, L\}$ only at the beginning. It also asks the buyer to report the payoff-relevant information of the Poisson learning process. At time t , the buyer reports $m_t \in M_t$, where the message space $M_t(\{m_s\}_{s < t})$ is history dependent. Because of the conclusive Poisson learning structure, the mechanism asks whether the buyer has received an instantaneous reward and what the size of that lump sum is. Thus, we assume $M_0 = \{U\}$, which means that the buyer has not received any instantaneous reward at the beginning. Next, $M_t(\{m_s\}_{s < t}) = \{U\} \times V$ if $m_s = U$ for any $s < t$. The interpretation is that if the buyer has not reported the arrival of the first instantaneous reward, she can continue reporting U or report the arrival and its value by sending $v \in V$. Lastly, $M_t(\{m_s\}_{s < t}) = \{v\}$ if $m_s = v$ for some $s < t$: having elicited the payoff-relevant information, the mechanism stops eliciting information from the buyer.

A time- t history $h_t = \{\hat{\theta}, \{m_s\}_{s < t}\}$ consists of an initial type report from the seller $\hat{\theta}$ and a path of messages $\{m_s\}_{s < t}$. Let H_t be the set of all time- t histories. A mechanism is a tuple (I, p) . The first term I consists of a collection of measurable functions $I_t : H_t \rightarrow [0, 1]$ that map history to an access. The second term p is a collection of measurable functions $p_t : H_t \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ that map history to a nonnegative cumulative price. We further require that $(I, p) \in \mathcal{M}$ has sample paths of $(I_t, p_t)_{t=0}^T$ that are measurable with respect to t under any $h_T \in H_T$.

Remark 1. *We restrict the mechanism so that the only information the buyer can transmit to the seller is the time and size of the first reward; however, even if the seller could elicit more information from the buyer, these messages are sufficient to design an optimal mechanism. The restriction on the message space is purely measure-theoretic: it ensures that the sample path of the buyer's reports is always measurable with respect to time t , regardless of what message the buyer chooses to report at any point in time. The restriction is without loss in any finite approximation to the continuous time model.*

Strategies and Equilibrium The seller's strategy is $\sigma_S = (\sigma_S^P, \sigma_S^R)$, where the proposing strategy $\sigma_S^P : \Theta \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$ maps her type into a mechanism proposal; and the reporting strategy

$\sigma_S^R : \Theta \times \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \Theta$ maps her type and the accepted mechanism into an initial report to the mechanism.

The buyer's strategy is $\sigma_B = (\sigma_B^A, \sigma_B^R)$, where the accepting strategy $\sigma_B^A : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \{\text{accept, reject}\}$ maps the proposed mechanism to acceptance/rejection; the reporting strategy σ_B^R maps each triple of accepted mechanism $M \in \mathcal{M}$, realized mechanism history $\{m_s, I_s, p_s\}_{s < t}$, and realized lump-sum arrival process N_t into a valid message $M_t(\{m_s\}_{s < t})$ or an exit decision. Formally, $\sigma_B : (M, \{m_s, I_s, p_s\}_{s < t}, N_t) \mapsto M_t(\{m_s\}_{s < t}) \cup \{\text{exit}\}$. A buyer belief system $\mu(H|\cdot)$ specifies the buyer's belief of $\theta = H$. In the accept/reject phase, it conditions on the proposed mechanism M ; Once the mechanism starts, it conditions on each triple $(M, \{m_s, I_s, p_s\}_{s < t}, N_t)$.

We consider weak perfect Bayesian equilibria with one additional off-path restriction. A strategy profile (σ_S, σ_B) together with a buyer belief system⁸ μ is an equilibrium if

1. The seller's strategy σ_S is sequentially optimal given σ_B .
2. The buyer's strategy σ_B is sequentially optimal given the belief system μ and σ_S .
3. The buyer's belief system μ is consistent with the seller's strategy σ_S and Bayes' rule whenever possible.
4. The buyer belief $\mu(H|(M, \{m_s, I_s, p_s\}_{s < t}, N)) = 1$ if $N > 0$.

The first three conditions are standard for a weak perfect Bayesian equilibrium. The fourth condition imposes a very mild restriction, which states that if a lump sum has ever arrived (i.e. the stochastic counting process has realized a positive value) then the buyer must believe that $\theta = H$ with probability 1. This restriction is naturally satisfied in sequential equilibria, in any discrete approximation of the model.⁹

3 First-Best Benchmark

The two key components of our model are (1) dynamic price discrimination on dynamic buyer learning and (2) a seller who knows θ . In this section, we demonstrate that both components are vital: in the absence of either, the seller can achieve the first-best outcome. We deliberately establish the baseline model within an extreme scenario, which helps to isolate the joint effect of the two features.

⁸We do not specify the seller's belief because, at the time when the seller proposes a mechanism or reports a message, the buyer does not have a private type. Also, we do not explicitly specify the buyer's belief about v : he holds the prior F when $N = 0$ and perfectly learns v if $N > 1$.

⁹One might want to impose other reasonable belief refinements, such as the no-signaling-what-you-don't-know assumption. Adding these further refinements does not change our results.

Note that the total surplus generated by the service is λvT when $\theta = H$, and 0 otherwise. Hence, the seller's maximum expected revenue (expectation over both types) is bounded above by the ex-ante total surplus created, which is $\mu_0 \lambda T \mathbb{E}[v] = \mu_0 \lambda T$, since we normalized $\mathbb{E}[v] = 1$. Thus, the first-best revenue is exactly the total surplus $\lambda \mu_0 T$, which can be achieved by selling the entire service at the beginning at the price of $\lambda \mu_0 T$. The following result shows that by removing either of the two key components of our model, selling the entire service at the beginning at the price of $\lambda \mu_0 T$ can be implemented in equilibrium.

Proposition 1. *Suppose at least one of the following is true:*

1. *The seller can only sell the service at time 0: that is, the seller is restricted to proposing mechanisms such that the price only has a θ -dependent jump at time 0, $p(h_t) = p(\theta)$.*
2. *The seller does not observe θ .*

Then the ex-ante revenue-maximizing mechanism can be implemented in equilibrium.

The first point of Proposition 1 implies having more data does not hurt the seller if trades can only happen in a static manner. This result is proved by Koessler & Skreta (2016) in a general environment. One can also easily check that the first best equilibrium survives standard equilibrium refinements of the signaling games. The second point of Proposition 1 says the seller would optimally choose to sell the entire service at an ex-ante price if the seller is uninformed. This highlights how the seller's ability to commit to any dynamic mechanism design distinguishes our model from the literature of market experimentation stemming from Crémer (1984) and Bergemann & Välimäki (2006), where the uninformed seller must sell the service period by period, leaving information rent to the buyer.

4 Dynamic Mechanisms

In contrast to the previous section, we first show that in the dynamic informed principal game, the ex-ante revenue-maximizing mechanism may not be supported in any equilibrium. To this end, we demonstrate a deviating mechanism that a high-type seller can propose and show that this deviation is profitable under some parameter regimes. Motivated by this observation, we devote the rest of the section to characterizing the payoff boundary of IC-IR dynamic mechanisms, which is the main result we use to characterize equilibrium payoffs in the next section.

Throughout this section, we use some additional notation. Due to the conclusive good news feature of the buyer's learning process, the mechanism only needs to elicit the first

arrival of a reward from the buyer. Thus, we split the histories into histories where no signals have arrived, and histories where a lump sum of value v arrived at time t . We can express the mechanism's access I as $(I_U^\theta, \{I_{v,t}^\theta\}_t)$, where $I_U^\theta : [0, T] \rightarrow [0, 1]$, denotes access after history $h_t = \{\theta, \{U\}_{s \leq t}\}$, and $I_{v,t}^\theta : [t, T] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ denotes access after the history where the first reward is communicated at time t with value v . We notate $(p_U^\theta, \{p_{v,t}^\theta\}_t)$ similarly for the cumulative prices.

4.1 High-type Seller Deviation

Suppose that on-path, both types of seller propose to sell the entire service ex-ante at a price $\lambda\mu_0 T$. Let v_F denote the Myerson price

$$v_F := \arg \max_v \{v(1 - F(v))\},$$

where F is the distribution of buyer values. Define t_F as

$$t_F := \arg \max_t \{(1 - e^{-\lambda t})(T - t)\}.$$

It is straightforward to check that t_F is the maximizer of a strictly concave function and hence is unique. Consider the following off-path deviation, where the seller proposes the following dynamic mechanism:

$$\begin{aligned} I_U^L(t) &= I_U^H(t) = \begin{cases} 1 & t \leq t_F, \\ 0 & t > t_F, \end{cases} \\ I_{v,t}^L(t) &= I_{v,t}^H(t) = \begin{cases} 1 & v \geq v_F, \\ I_U(t) & v < v_F. \end{cases} \\ p_{v,t}^L(t) &= p_{v,t}^H(t) = \begin{cases} \lambda v_F (T - t_F) & v \geq v_F, \\ 0 & v < v_F, \end{cases} \\ p_U^L(t) &= p_U^H(t) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

To understand this off-path mechanism proposal, note that the first statement indicates that the offered mechanism provides full access to an uninformed buyer before time t_F , and no access to the uninformed buyer after time t_F . A buyer who receives a signal of size v at time t is given full access if v is greater than v_F , but is treated as an uninformed buyer otherwise. The seller never charges a payment from an uninformed buyer, but charges a payment of $\lambda v_F (T - t_F)$ from an informed buyer with value above v_F .

Intuitively, the seller makes the following offer:

Instead of selling the service for the entire time interval T for the total price $\lambda\mu_0T$, I will instead give you the service up to time t_F for free. After t_F , I will give you the option to buy the remaining $T - t_F$ at price $\lambda v_F(T - t_F)$.

We will call this mechanism the *free trial* mechanism. It turns out that whether the first-best can be attained in an equilibrium exactly depends on whether the free trial is more profitable than selling the service ex-ante.

Proposition 2. *The first-best cannot be implemented in any equilibrium if and only if*

$$(1 - e^{-\lambda t_F})(1 - F(v_F))\lambda v_F(T - t_F) > \lambda\mu_0T. \quad (1)$$

The if side of the proposition comes from a straightforward comparison of profits. The proof of the only if direction requires a characterization of the payoffs attainable by all incentive compatible, individually rational (IC-IR) mechanisms, which we discuss in the next subsection.

Corollary 1. *A necessary condition for the failure of supporting revenue-maximizing mechanism in the equilibrium is*

$$1 - v_F(1 - F(v_F)) < 1 - \mu_0.$$

This corollary highlights the high-type seller's trade-off between the benefit of self-proving and the loss of giving the buyer information rent. A larger belief gap $1 - \mu_0$ between the high-type seller and the uninformed buyer creates a larger incentive for the high-type seller to use a free trial to convince the buyer. However, the free trial also allows the buyer to learn the value v , so via the post-trial price discrimination the seller can only get the Myersonian profit instead of the ex-ante surplus 1. One can also show that once the necessary condition is satisfied, the ex-ante revenue-maximizing mechanism cannot be achieved in equilibrium if the learning rate λ is sufficiently large or if the time horizon T is sufficiently large.

It will be useful for our later discussion to note the profit a high-type seller receives from offering this free trial mechanism. That is, define

$$\pi_F := (1 - e^{-\lambda t_F})(1 - F(v_F))\lambda v_F(T - t_F).$$

4.2 IC-IR Mechanisms

We now focus on characterizing the payoff that could result from an IC-IR mechanism, which is a necessary condition for the payoff to be an equilibrium payoff. An IC-IR mechanism ensures that it is incentive-compatible for the seller to report θ and for the buyer to report the private learning process truthfully. It also requires that sellers of both types and the buyer with an initial belief μ_0 receive a non-negative ex-ante payoff. Formally, we define

$$\Pi_{\text{IC-IR}} = \{(\pi_L, \pi_H) \mid \exists \text{ an IC-IR mechanism s.t. the ex ante payoff for a seller of type } \theta \text{ is } \pi_\theta\}.$$

In order to understand the incentives of the high-type seller, we will focus on characterizing the upper boundary of $\Pi_{\text{IC-IR}}$. To do so, we will consider the points of Π that maximize a weighted sum of seller payoffs, normalizing the weight for the high-type seller to 1 and allowing the weight on the low-type seller to vary, up to the weights that match the prior:

$$\partial\Pi_+ = \left\{ (\pi_L, \pi_H) \mid \exists w_L \in \left[-1, \frac{1-\mu_0}{\mu_0}\right], (\pi_L, \pi_H) \in \arg \max_{(\pi_L, \pi_H) \in \Pi_{\text{IC-IR}}} (w_L \pi_L + \pi_H) \right\}.$$

Note that the element of $\partial\Pi_+$ when $w_L = 0$ corresponds to the mechanism that maximizes the payoff of the high-type seller, when $w_L = (1 - \mu_0)/\mu_0$, the mechanism that maximizes the prior-weighted revenue across both seller types, and when $w_L = -1$, the mechanism that maximizes the difference in revenue of both types. As we show in the next section, focusing on $w_L \in [-1, \frac{1-\mu_0}{\mu_0}]$ is sufficient to characterize the equilibrium payoff.

Let τ denote the stochastic arrival time of the first lump-sum reward, with τ realized to be ∞ if no reward ever arrives. Since the low type never generates a positive arrival rate, the payoff of the low-type seller is always just $p_U^L(T)$. Hence, we can rewrite the boundary point condition in $\partial\Pi_+$ as the following maximization:

$$\max_{M \in \mathcal{M}} \left\{ w_L p_U^L(T) + \mathbb{E} \left[p_{v,\tau}^H(T) \mathbb{1}[\tau \leq T] + p_U^H(T) \mathbb{1}[\tau > T] \mid \theta = H \right] \right\} \quad (2)$$

subject to IC and IR.

To solve this maximization problem, we first define the notion of trial mechanisms. Informally, a trial mechanism consists of two phases; an initial *trial* where the seller provides access to everyone at a certain price, and a second phase where the seller sells the remaining service at a high price so that only buyers who have received a high utility shock purchases. More formally:

Definition 1. *A dynamic mechanism (I, p) is a trial mechanism if and only if there exists*

v_0, t_0 such that

$$I_U^L(t) = I_U^H(t) = \begin{cases} 1 & t \leq t_0, \\ 0 & t > t_0, \end{cases}$$

$$I_{v,t}^L(t) = I_{v,t}^H(t) = \begin{cases} 1 & v \geq v_0, \\ I_U(t) & v < v_0. \end{cases}$$

It is clear that the free trial we introduced in the previous section satisfies the definition of a trial mechanism. In addition, we note that in the special degenerate case where $t_0 = T$, $I_U^\theta = I_{v,t}^\theta = 1$. We are now ready to present our first main result. In words, the main result states that the boundary $\partial\Pi_+$ is uniquely attained by trial mechanisms.

Theorem 1. *For any payoff pair $(\pi_L, \pi_H) \in \partial\Pi_+$, there exists a trial mechanism with parameter (v_0, t_0) that outcome-uniquely attains it.¹⁰ Denote the weight associated with (π_L, π_H) as w_L , then v_0 satisfies the implicit equation*

$$v_0 = \max \left\{ v, (1 - \mu_0(w_L + 1)) \frac{1 - F(v_0)}{f(v_0)} \right\} \quad (3)$$

and t_0 satisfies one of the following:

$$\begin{cases} 0 = \lambda e^{-\lambda t_0}(T - t_0) - (1 - e^{-\lambda t_0}) + \frac{\mu_0(1+w_L)}{\pi_0} & \text{if } 1 - e^{-\lambda T} > \frac{\mu_0(1+w_L)}{\pi_0} \\ t_0 = T & \text{if } 1 - e^{-\lambda T} \leq \frac{\mu_0(1+w_L)}{\pi_0} \end{cases} \quad (4)$$

where $\pi_0 = \int_{v_0}^{\bar{v}} (v - (1 - \mu_0(w_L + 1)) \frac{1 - F(v)}{f(v)}) f(v) dv$ is the expected virtual surplus.

The content of Theorem 1 says that the boundary elements of the IC-IR payoff set, $\partial\Pi_+$, which maximize w_L -weighted revenue across seller types, are outcome-uniquely implemented by trial mechanisms with parameter (v_0, t_0) that depends on w_L .

To deliver some intuition about the basic trade off in the mechanism design problem, consider point H , as illustrated in Figure 1, where $w_L = 0$ and the mechanism designer aims to maximize the high-type seller's revenue. According to Equation 3, the threshold type to purchase the post-trial service is

$$v_H = v_0(0) = \max \left\{ v, (1 - \mu_0) \frac{1 - F(v_H)}{f(v_H)} \right\}.$$

¹⁰All players' induced interim payoffs at any time are unique. I^H is also unique.

Equivalently, v_H maximizes the expected virtual surplus:

$$v_H = \arg \max_x \int_x^{\bar{v}} \left(v - (1 - \mu_0) \frac{1 - F(v)}{f(v)} \right) f(v) dv.$$

To understand why the coefficient in front of the rent term is $(1 - \mu_0)$ instead of 1, consider the optimal design of the post-trial rate in the trial mechanism. It is true that in the second phase, the buyer who receives a signal enjoys information rents. However, the buyer knows ex-ante the probability of gaining rents if he encounters a high-type seller. Therefore, the mechanism designer can extract the surplus from the ex-ante payment. The problem is that the mechanism designer only aims to maximize the high-type seller's revenue, or equivalently, the designer believes that the seller is high type with probability 1. In contrast, the buyer only believes the seller to be high type with probability μ_0 . Thus, from the designer's point of view, the real loss of information rent comes from the belief gap $1 - \mu_0$.

Denote the maximized virtual surplus obtained by v_H as π_H , the optimal trial length t_H solves

$$\max_{t \in [0, T]} \lambda \mu_0 \cdot t + \lambda (1 - e^{-\lambda t}) \pi_H \cdot (T - t).$$

To understand this expression, consider the dual aspects of providing uniform service access to all buyers during the trial phase and enabling learning-based price discrimination after the trial. The former yields a flow profit of $\lambda \mu_0$ due to buyer's ex-ante skepticism, while the latter yields a flow profit of $\lambda (1 - e^{-\lambda t_H}) \pi_H$, which depends on the probability that a buyer received a signal in the trial. Striking an optimal balance in the design of the trial length encompasses a trade-off: extending the trial length cultivates a larger number of buyers convinced of $\theta = H$, albeit at the expense of reducing the remaining service available for price discrimination. When $\mu_0 > \lambda (1 - e^{-\lambda T}) \pi_H$, even following a trial of length T , the expected number of convinced buyers fails to make learning-based price discrimination profitable so $t_H = T$. Conversely, t_H is interior. This differs from the discussion in Corollary 1, since here the inequality $\pi_H > \mu_0$ always holds, regardless of the distribution f . Therefore, as long as λT is sufficiently large, the optimal t_H is always interior.

After characterizing the point H we turn to an overview of all boundary payoffs, starting by illustrating two important mechanisms that arise. First, from $w_L = (1 - \mu_0)/\mu_0$, the result implies the following corollary

Corollary 2. *Selling ex ante is the maximal element of $\Pi_{\text{IC-IR}}$ in the direction $(1 - \mu_0, \mu_0)$:*

$$\max_{(\pi_L, \pi_H) \in \Pi_{\text{IC-IR}}} [(1 - \mu_0) \pi_L + \mu_0 \pi_H] = \lambda \mu_0 T.$$




Figure 1: The boundary of the IC-IR mechanism payoff set $\Pi_{\text{IC-IR}}$. Point F denotes the payoffs from the free-trial mechanism, point H denotes the best mechanism for the $\theta = H$ type seller, and point B denotes the payoff outcome from selling ex-ante. Figure (a) shows an example where the first-best cannot be attained, and Figure (b) shows an example where the first-best can be attained.

and $(\lambda\mu_0 T, \lambda\mu_0 T)$ is the unique maximizer.

The mechanism here is equivalent to selling the entire service ex ante and attains the first-best. The second important mechanism we highlight follows from the analysis in direction $w_L = -1$.

Corollary 3. *The free trial is a maximal element of $\Pi_{\text{IC-IR}}$ in the direction $(-1, 1)$:*

$$\max_{(\pi_L, \pi_H) \in \Pi_{\text{IC-IR}}} [\pi_H - \pi_L] = \pi_F$$

and $(0, \pi_F)$ is a maximizer.

Figure 1 illustrates points F and B . In the figure, H denotes the best mechanism for the high type. As we analyzed earlier, H does not always have an interior trial length; it may coincide with B , but H never coincides with F . This follows intuitively because F corresponds to the free trial, and both types can be better off by charging an ex-ante payment for the duration of the trial, $\lambda\mu_0 t_F$.

Finally, we can establish the following comparative static result

Proposition 3. *The trial length t_0 is weakly increasing in w_L and μ_0 . The post-trial price v_0 is weakly decreasing in w_L and μ_0 .*

Proposition 3 concerns the comparative static about the degree of learning-based price discrimination. In the extensive margin, a shorter trial length leads to fewer buyers learning $\theta = H$; in the intensive margin, a higher post-trial price drives out more buyers with low values. In this sense, Proposition 3 shows that as the market belief μ becomes more optimistic, optimal learning-based price discrimination becomes less aggressive in both extensive and intensive margins. Furthermore, as we reduce w_L and move from point B to point F along the boundary, the degree of learning-based price discrimination increases in both margins, with point F featuring the maximum price discrimination. We will return to this observation in equilibrium refinements.

4.3 Proof of Theorem 1

This subsection sketches the proof of Theorem 1. Readers less interested in proofs may jump to the next section. First, we outline the overall steps in the proof of Theorem 1. To start, we consider a problem relaxation, in which we drop most of the IC and IR constraints. We show that for any w_L , the only solutions to the relaxed problems are trial mechanisms with the same t_0, v_0 (same trial length and second-period cutoff). Furthermore, we explicitly construct a price function for a trial mechanism that maximizes the relaxed problem and show that the construction is feasible under the original IC-IR constraints.

We begin by providing an intuitive interpretation of the relaxed problem. We consider the problem of designing a mechanism that satisfies a subset of IC-IR constraints, namely only the following four constraints:

1. A buyer who receives a lump sum v at time t does not want to misreport being uninformed forever.
2. A buyer who receives a lump sum v at time t does not want to misreport v' at time t .
3. Participation is individually rational for the buyer at time zero.
4. The low seller type is willing to participate and report truthfully.

That is, we drop constraints that prevent an uninformed buyer from reporting as informed, and constraints where a buyer who sees a lump sum v at time t *jointly* deviates to reporting v' at time t' . It turns out that in any optimal solution to this relaxation, one of the first two constraints binds, and whether the last two bind depends on the weight w_L in the objective; further, once we extend any solution to the general problem, it turns out that these constraints are the key constraints that pin down the mechanism.

To formulate the relaxed problem mathematically, we first introduce some additional notation. Let

$$I(w, t) := \int_t^T I_{w,t}^H(s) ds$$

be the cumulative access of the remainder of the service after the buyer reports w, t , and let

$$I(U, t) := \int_t^T I_U^H(s) ds$$

be the analog for an uninformed buyer. We start by considering the problem relaxation we discussed:

$$\begin{aligned} & \max_{M \in \mathcal{M}} \left\{ w_L p_U^L(T) + \mathbb{E} \left[p_{v,\tau}^H(T) \mathbb{1}[\tau \leq T] + p_U^H(T) \mathbb{1}[\tau > T] \mid \theta = H \right] \right\} & (5) \\ \text{subject to} & \quad \lambda v I(v, t) - p_{v,t}^H(T) \geq \lambda v I(U, t) - p_U^H(T) \quad \forall (v, t) & (\text{IC-U}) \\ & \quad \lambda v I(v, t) - p_{v,t}^H(T) \geq \lambda v I(v', t) - p_{v',t}^H(T) \quad \forall (v, v', t) & (\text{IC-V}) \\ & \quad \mu_0 \mathbb{E} \left[N_T v - p_{v,\tau}^H(T) \mid \theta = H \right] - (1 - \mu_0) p_U^L(T) \geq 0 & (\text{IR-0}) \\ & \quad p_U^L(T) \geq \max(p_U^H(T), 0) & (\text{IC-S}) \end{aligned}$$

where we slightly abuse notation in writing the ex-ante IR for the buyer in the third constraint; that is, if $\tau = \infty$ (no lump sum reward arrives) we denote $p_{\cdot, \infty}^\theta(T) = p_U^\theta(T)$. As is standard, we will define the interim utility of the buyer

$$u(v, t) := \lambda v I(v, t) - p_{v,t}^H(T)$$

at the time of first arrival, when the buyer has learned value v at time t . Note that since the arrival of v is conclusive good news, the belief of the buyer in this interim utility is that $\theta = H$ with probability 1.

Among the two IC constraints remained in the relaxed problem, (IC-V) is rather standard and admits an envelope representation. The main question is how to deal with the inter-temporal global constraint (IC-U). The key observation is that by rewriting $v I(U, t)$ as $\int_v^v I(U, t) ds + v I(U, t)$, we can combine both IC constraints into a local envelope representation.

Lemma 1. *The (IC-U) and (IC-V) constraints hold only if*

$$u(v, t) \geq \int_v^v \lambda r(w, t) dw + \lambda v I(U, t) - p_U^H(t),$$

where $r(w, t) := \max \{ I(U, t), I(w, t) \}$.

Proof. Note that (IC-V) implies that

$$u(v, t) = \max_{v'} \lambda v I(v', t) - p_{v', t}^H(T).$$

The standard envelope theorem then immediately implies that

$$\begin{aligned} u(v, t) &= u(\underline{v}, t) + \int_{\underline{v}}^v \lambda I(w, t) dw \\ &\geq \int_{\underline{v}}^v \lambda I(w, t) dw + \lambda \underline{v} I(U, t) - p_U^H(T), \end{aligned}$$

where the inequality comes from (IC-U). We can also rewrite (IC-U) as:

$$\begin{aligned} u(v, t) &\geq \lambda v I(U, t) - p_U^H(T) \\ &= \lambda \int_{\underline{v}}^v I(U, t) ds + \lambda \underline{v} I(U, t) - p_U^H(T). \end{aligned}$$

These two inequalities imply

$$u(v, t) \geq \lambda \int_{\underline{v}}^v \max(I(U, t), I(w, t)) ds + \lambda \underline{v} I(U, t) - p_U^H(T)$$

as desired. \square

To simplify notation further, we introduce the price variable $\Delta_{v, t}^\theta := p_{v, t}^\theta(T) - p_U^\theta(T)$; that is, $\Delta_{v, t}^\theta$ is the additional total price incurred by the buyer reporting (v, t) . With the help of Lemma 1, we consider a further relaxation of the problem, where we replace the two IC constraints with a single IC constraint.

Next, we rearrange the (IR-0) constraint. Intuitively, the (IR-0) constraint equivalently states that the expected payment that occurs with no arrivals cannot be more than the expected value of the service for the uninformed buyer plus the expected additional value a buyer gains after learning v :

$$\mu_0 (\lambda I(U, 0) + \mathbb{E} [\lambda v (I(v, \tau) - I(U, \tau)) - \Delta_{v, \tau}^H(T) \mid \theta = H]) \geq \mu_0 p_U^H(T) + (1 - \mu_0) p_U^L(T)$$

Using this, the problem becomes

$$\begin{aligned}
& \max_{M \in \mathcal{M}} \{w_L p_U^L(T) + p_U^H(T) + \mathbb{E} [\Delta_{v,\tau}^H(T) \mathbb{1}[\tau \leq T] \mid \theta = H]\} \\
\text{subject to } & \Delta_{v,t}^H(T) \leq \lambda v I(v, t) - \int_v^v \lambda r(w, t) dw - \lambda v I(U, t) \quad \forall (v, t) \quad (\text{IC}) \\
& \mu_0 (\lambda I(U, 0) + \mathbb{E} [\lambda v (I(v, \tau) - I(U, \tau)) - \Delta_{v,\tau}^H(T) \mid \theta = H]) \\
& \quad \geq \mu_0 p_U^H(T) + (1 - \mu_0) p_U^L(T) \quad (\text{IR-0}) \\
& p_U^L(T) \geq \max(p_U^H(T), 0) \quad (\text{IC-S})
\end{aligned}$$

Having condensed the IC constraints, we turn to the rest of the problem. First, we eliminate p_U^L from the problem with the following lemma:

Lemma 2. *The cumulative payment by an uninformed buyer is equal for both types:*

$$p_U^L(T) = p_U^H(T).$$

If $w_L > -1$, (IR-0) must bind at optimum.

We can then prove the unique optimality of trial mechanisms in the relaxed problem (where we replace (IC-V) and (IC-U) with (IC)).

Lemma 3. *Any optimal mechanism of the relaxed problem must be a trial mechanism, with*

$$v_0 = (1 - \mu_0(w_L + 1)) \frac{1 - F(v_0)}{f(v_0)}.$$

The trial length t_0 is T if $\frac{\mu_0(1+w_L)}{\pi_0} \geq 1 - e^{-\lambda T}$, else t_0 solves

$$\lambda e^{-\lambda t_0} (T - t_0) - (1 - e^{-\lambda t_0}) + \frac{\mu_0(1 + w_L)}{\pi_0} = 0$$

where $\pi_0 = \int_{v_0}^{\bar{v}} \left(v - (1 - \mu_0(w_L + 1)) \frac{1 - F(v)}{f(v)} \right) f(v) dv$ is the expected virtual surplus.

Proof. By Lemma 2, if $w_L > -1$, (IR-0) binds, so we can plug in for $p_U^H(T)$ to get

$$\begin{aligned}
& \max_{M \in \mathcal{M}} \left\{ (w_L + 1) \mu_0 (\lambda I(U, 0) + \mathbb{E} [\lambda v (I(v, \tau) - I(U, \tau)) - \Delta_{v,\tau}^H(T) \mid \theta = H]) \right. \\
& \quad \left. + \mathbb{E} [\Delta_{v,\tau}^H(T) \mathbb{1}[\tau \leq T] \mid \theta = H] \right\} \\
\text{subject to } & \Delta_{v,t}^H(T) \leq \lambda v I(v, t) - \int_v^v \lambda r(w, t) dw - \lambda v I(U, t) \quad \forall (v, t). \quad (\text{IC})
\end{aligned}$$

Note that this optimization is still valid if $w_L = -1$, since the first term in the maximization just becomes zero. A quick check confirms that $w_L < (1 - \mu_0)/\mu_0$ implies that $(w_L + 1)\mu_0 < 1$, and hence the coefficient of $\Delta_{v,t}^H$ must be positive, and so (IC) must bind (when $w_L = (1 - \mu_0)/\mu_0$ it is W.L.O.G. to do so). Plugging into the objective for $\Delta_{v,t}^H$, we get

$$\max_{M \in \mathcal{M}} \left\{ \begin{array}{l} (w_L + 1)\mu_0 (\lambda I(U, 0) + \mathbb{E} [\lambda(v(I(v, \tau) - I(U, \tau))) \mathbb{1}[\tau \leq T] \mid \theta = H]) \\ + (1 - \mu_0(w_L + 1)) \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\lambda v I(v, \tau) - \int_v^v \lambda r(w, \tau) dw - \lambda v I(U, \tau) \right) \mathbb{1}[\tau \leq T] \mid \theta = H \right] \end{array} \right\}$$

Using linearity of expectation and integrating by parts to eliminate the integral on the r term, we get

$$\max_{M \in \mathcal{M}} \left\{ (w_L + 1)\mu_0 \lambda I(U, 0) + \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\begin{array}{l} \lambda v I(v, \tau) - (1 - \mu_0(w_L + 1)) \frac{1 - F(v)}{f(v)} \lambda r(v, \tau) \\ - \lambda \mu_0(w_L + 1) v I(U, \tau) - (1 - \mu_0(w_L + 1)) \lambda v I(U, \tau) \end{array} \right) \mathbb{1}[\tau \leq T] \mid \theta = H \right] \right\}$$

Notice that the random arrival time τ only depends on $I(U, t)$. Thus, the only term affected by $I(v, t)$ is

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\lambda v I(v, \tau) - (1 - \mu_0(w_L + 1)) \frac{1 - F(v)}{f(v)} \lambda r(v, \tau) \mid \theta = H \right].$$

Recall that $r(v, \tau) = \max\{I(U, \tau), I(v, \tau)\}$. When $I(v, \tau) < I(U, \tau)$, reducing $I(v, \tau)$ does not decrease the rent term as it is in the standard approach. Thus, the coefficient of $I(v, \tau)$ is always positive when $I(v, \tau) < I(U, \tau)$.

Now, we fix $I(U, t)$ and optimize over $I(v, \tau)$. If $v > (1 - \mu_0(w_L + 1)) \frac{1 - F(v)}{f(v)}$, it is optimal to increase $I(v, \tau)$ as much as possible, otherwise, it is optimal to set $I(v, \tau) = I(U, \tau)$. By the Myerson regularity assumption, there exists a unique v_0 such that

$$v_0 = (1 - \mu_0(w_L + 1)) \frac{1 - F(v_0)}{f(v_0)}. \quad (6)$$

Then, it follows that the unique point-wise maximization solution is

$$I(v, t) = \begin{cases} T - t & v \geq v_0, \\ I(U, t) & v < v_0. \end{cases}$$

The remaining step is to solve for the optimal $I(U, t)$. We plug the optimal $I(v, t)$ into the unconstrained optimization problem.

Lemma 4. *Plugging in the optimal solution of $I(v, t)$ leads to the following problem:*

$$\max_{M \in \mathcal{M}} \{(w_L + 1)\mu_0\lambda I(U, 0) + \lambda\pi_0\mathbb{E}[(T - \tau - I(U, \tau))\mathbb{1}[\tau \leq T]|\theta = H]\}$$

where

$$\pi_0 := \mu_0(w_L + 1) \int_{v_0}^{\bar{v}} v f(v) dv + v_0(1 - F(v_0))(1 - \mu_0(w_L + 1)).$$

The proof is purely algebraic and we relegate it to the appendix. Lastly, we change variables to convert the maximization problem in Lemma 4 into a control problem, using the fact that the density of τ is given by $\lambda(-\dot{I}(U, t)) \exp(\lambda(I(U, t) - I(U, 0)))$. Define the *state* variable as $X(t) = \int_0^t I_U^H(t)$, and the measurable *control* variable as $U(t) = I_U^H(t)$. Then the problem is equivalent to:

$$\max_{X, U} \left\{ \pi_0 \int_0^T \left(\lambda(T - t - (X(T) - X(t))) \exp(-\lambda X(t)) + \frac{\mu_0(1 + w_L)}{\pi_0} \right) \lambda U(t) dt \right\}$$

subject to $\dot{X}(t) = U(t) \in [0, 1]$, $X(0) = 0$, $X(T)$ free.

We solve this control problem in Lemma 8, and the unique optimal policy is bang-bang:

$$I_U^H(t) = \begin{cases} 1 & t \leq t_0 \\ 0 & t > t_0 \end{cases}$$

where t_0 satisfies one of the following:

$$\begin{cases} 0 = \lambda e^{-\lambda t_0}(T - t_0) - (1 - e^{-\lambda t_0}) + \frac{\mu_0(1 + w_L)}{\pi_0} & \text{if } 1 - e^{-\lambda T} > \frac{\mu_0(1 + w_L)}{\pi_0} \\ t_0 = T & \text{if } 1 - e^{-\lambda T} \leq \frac{\mu_0(1 + w_L)}{\pi_0} \end{cases}.$$

□

To complete the proof of Theorem 1, one just needs to construct the corresponding price for the optimal solution that we obtain from the relaxed problem and verify all IC constraints we neglect actually hold. We relegate the proof to the appendix.

5 Equilibrium Analysis

Having discussed the set of payoff outcomes of IC-IR mechanisms, we can now move on to discuss equilibria. We first characterize the equilibrium payoff set and then discuss the subset of equilibria that survive stronger equilibrium refinements commonly studied in signaling

games.

5.1 Equilibrium Payoffs

In this section, we characterize the equilibrium payoff set.

Proposition 4. *A payoff pair (π_L, π_H) is an equilibrium payoff if and only if it is the outcome of a feasible IC-IR mechanism $(\pi_L, \pi_H) \in \Pi_{\text{IC-IR}}$ and the high-type seller gets at least the free-trial revenue: $\pi_H \geq \pi_F$.*




Figure 2: The equilibrium payoff sets. Point F denotes the payoffs from the free-trial mechanism, point H denotes the best mechanism for the $\theta = H$ type seller, and point B denotes the payoff outcome from selling ex-ante.

Proposition 4 and Theorem 1 provide a complete characterization of all *reasonable equilibrium payoffs*. More specifically, we define an equilibrium payoff (π_L, π_H) to be a *reasonable equilibrium payoff* if and only if $\pi_H \geq \pi_L$. When $\pi_F \geq \lambda\mu_0 T$, all equilibrium payoffs are reasonable as illustrated in Figure 2a. When $\pi_F < \lambda\mu_0 T$, as illustrated in Figure 2b, there are some payoff pairs (π_L, π_H) induced by IC-IR mechanisms where the high-type seller gets strictly less revenue: $\pi_H < \pi_L$.

We argue that any equilibrium payoff (π_L, π_H) with $\pi_H < \pi_L$ shall never appear in any reasonable equilibrium, since it does not survive a very weak refinement of off-path beliefs. To see this, consider an equilibrium payoff (π_L, π_H) such that $\pi_L > \pi_H$. From the ex-ante IR constraint of the buyer, we know

$$p = \mu_0 \pi_H + (1 - \mu_0) \pi_L < \mu_0 \lambda T.$$

Moreover, $\pi_L > p > \pi_H$. Now suppose that the high-type seller deviates and sells the entire service to the buyer at a price of p . The high-type seller makes the following informal speech:

If I were a low-type seller, this deviation would not benefit me in any way. Whether you purchase or not, the maximum I could receive is p , which is strictly lower than what I could have received in the equilibrium. Therefore, when confronted with this deviation, you should not be more concerned about me being a low-type seller than you would be in the equilibrium. Specifically, when facing this deviation, your belief should be at least $\mu \geq \mu_0$.

As long as the buyer holds a belief $\mu \geq \mu_0$ when facing this deviation, it is strictly optimal to purchase the service. Thus, the high-type seller has a profitable deviation, and the payoff cannot be supported in equilibrium.

We separate this refinement from the subsection of equilibrium refinement and embed it in the analysis of the equilibrium payoff set, because we think the assumption that the buyer is convinced by the above informal speech is fundamentally weaker than any standard signaling game refinement concepts.¹¹

In addition to providing a complete characterization of all reasonable equilibrium payoffs, Proposition 4 and Theorem 1 also show that all reasonable equilibrium payoffs can be implemented in equilibrium by trial mechanisms.¹² To achieve the interior payoff, one can pick a trial mechanism on the boundary and reduce the ex-ante payoff so that the payoff pair moves inside along a 45-degree line.

Corollary 4. *All reasonable equilibrium payoffs can be implemented by trial mechanisms.*

Note that trial mechanisms feature complete pooling, in which the allocation rule of the mechanism does not depend on the seller's report. The buyer receives no information from the mechanism itself and only updates his belief according to observed signals. If we consider an alternative model where all feasible mechanisms cannot elicit information from the seller, the equilibrium payoff set will not change and all payoffs can be achieved in pooling equilibria.

¹¹For example, it is even weaker than the Intuitive Criterion in two ways. First, the Intuitive Criterion requires that the low-type seller is strictly worse off if the buyer behaves rationally, whereas here the low-type seller is strictly worse off for any behavior of the buyer. Second, the Intuitive Criterion requires the buyer to have an extreme belief $\mu = 1$ facing this deviation, whereas here the buyer can have any belief $\mu \geq \mu_0$.

¹²In contrast to Theorem 1, which shows that any boundary payoff can be uniquely implemented by a trial mechanism, the implementation of interior payoffs is not outcome-unique.

5.2 Refinements

In the equilibrium payoff set that we just characterized, there are multiple payoffs and multiple trials with different parameters achieving those payoffs. We now use standard concepts in signaling games to discuss equilibrium refinement. As our model features binary types and dynamic interaction, we follow the signaling literature and focus on the D1 criterion. Intuitively, the refinement requires that when observing an unexpected deviating mechanism, the buyer believes that the seller is of the type that can benefit most from the deviation. To save readers' energy we leave its formal definition in the appendix. We also discuss how our results hold under other concepts that may be relevant in the appendix.

For any $\pi_L \in [0, \lambda\mu_0 T]$, denote $\Pi(\pi_L)$ as the upper bound of the high type seller's equilibrium payoff:

$$\Pi(\pi_L) = \max\{\pi_H | (\pi_L, \pi_H) \in \Pi\}.$$

The boundary set that we characterize in Theorem 1 can be expressed as $\partial\Pi_+ = \{(\pi_L, \Pi(\pi_L)) | \pi_L \in [0, \lambda\mu_0 T]\}$. Define

$$\pi_L^D = \lambda\mu_0 t_F + \mu_0(1 - e^{-\lambda t_F})\lambda(T - t_F) \int_{v_F}^{\bar{v}} (v - v_F) dv.$$

π_L^D is the maximum price that the buyer is willing to pay ex-ante for the trial mechanism with the same trial length t_F and post-trial price v_F as the free trial characterized by point F . We can show

Lemma 5. *There exists a segment of $\partial\Pi_+$ containing F that extends along the 45-degree line:*

$$\Pi(\pi_L) = \pi_L + \Pi(0) \quad \forall \pi_L \in [0, \pi_L^D].$$

Further, let $\Pi_{D1} := \{\pi_L, \Pi(\pi_L) | \pi_L \in [0, \pi_L^D]\}$ be exactly this segment. Then

$$\Pi_{D1} = \arg \max_{(\pi'_L, \pi'_H) \in \Pi_{IC-IR}} \pi_H - \pi_L.$$

Lemma 5 shows that *all* payoff points that are maximal in the direction $(-1, 1)$ are exactly payoffs of trial mechanisms with the same length and the same post-trial price as the free trial. The proof intuition is relatively straightforward; a mechanism can increase the payoffs of both seller types relative to the free-trial mechanism by charging a price for the trial period, up to the price π_L^D .




Figure 3: The payoff set surviving D1, Π_{D1} , is the segment from D to F .

Points in Π_{D1} form a 45-degree line on the boundary of the equilibrium payoff set. The trial mechanisms that achieve these points share the same trial length t_F and the same post-trial rate v_F , differing only in the entry price to the trial. It turns out that the set Π_{D1} is exactly the payoff set that survives the D1 criterion.

Proposition 5. *The payoff set of equilibrium that survives the D1 Criterion is Π_{D1} . All payoffs in Π_{D1} are Pareto dominated by point H for any prior μ_0 . They are Pareto dominated by point B if μ_0 is small.*

Among all possible trial mechanisms that achieve different boundary payoffs in $\partial\Pi_+$, the only equilibrium trial mechanisms that survive equilibrium selection have the shortest trial length t_F and the highest post-trial rate v_F . They feature the maximum degree of learning-based discrimination in both the extensive margin and the intensive margin, and lead to the minimum social surplus. As illustrated in Figure 3, all points between D and F are Pareto dominated by point H . Furthermore, they can be Pareto dominated by the ex-ante profit maximizing mechanism at point B if the market belief μ_0 is sufficiently small. Therefore, sellers of both types may be strictly worse off when the seller can predict the buyer's experience but cannot credibly communicate the information.

Compared to Proposition 2, the negative result in Proposition 5 requires a stronger assumption (equilibrium refinements) and leads to a stronger negative prediction. In Proposition 2, ex-ante revenue maximization is not possible under some parameters, and only the low-type seller suffers revenue reduction. In Proposition 5, the worst trial design is always the unique equilibrium trial mechanism that survives equilibrium refinements, and sellers of both types may suffer revenue reduction. This channel of signaling incentives does not exist

in the static environment either: selling everything ex-ante at price $\lambda\mu_0 T$ survives the D1 criterion in the benchmark environment as defined in Proposition 1.

The basic intuition of Proposition 5 is as follows. The high-type seller always has an incentive to deviate to a dynamic mechanism that features a larger degree of learning-based price discrimination, which only benefits the seller who can generate good experiences, to signal the high match quality. Consequently, only the mechanism with maximum learning-based price discrimination can be in equilibrium.

Intuition To further deliver the intuition behind Proposition 5, we show why the equilibrium that achieves point H does not survive the equilibrium refinement. Denote (π_L^H, π_H^H) as the payoff pair at point H , (t_H, v_H) as the trial length and the post-trial rate of the trial mechanism that achieves point H . To simplify the exposition, we assume $v_H \geq 1$ and $t_H < T$. By definition, the following equation holds:

$$\pi_H^H = \pi_L^H + (1 - e^{-\lambda t_H})(1 - F(v_H))\lambda v_H(T - t_H).$$

To understand the equation, note that π_L^H is the ex-ante payment for the trial service. When the match quality is high, with probability $(1 - e^{-\lambda t_H})$ the buyer receives a conclusive signal of θ . Conditioned on that, with probability $1 - F(v_H)$ the buyer has a value $v > v_H$ and purchases the post-trial service at a price $\lambda v_H(T - t_H)$.

Now suppose that for some $\varepsilon > 0$ sufficiently small, the high-type seller makes the following deviating offer. Instead of proposing the equilibrium trial mechanism, the seller sells a trial of length t_H at a price of $\pi_L^H - \varepsilon^2$. After the trial, the buyer has the option to buy the remaining $T - t_H$ at the price of $\lambda(v_H + \varepsilon)(T - t_H)$. Coped with the deviation, the seller makes the following informal speech to the buyer:

You should believe that I am not a low-type seller. To see this, note that the low type cannot generate positive signals. As long as you behave rationally, you would never purchase the post-trial service without signals. This means the low type only gets the ex-ante payment $\pi_L^H - \varepsilon^2$, which is strictly smaller than her equilibrium payoff. Thus, if I were low type, I would never make such a deviation. In contrast, I would be strictly better off if I were high-type and you believed in me.

The high-type is strictly better off because if the buyer believes $\theta = H$, he is willing to purchase the trial and then purchase the post-trial service if the value $v > v_H + \varepsilon$. Thus,

under the deviation mechanism, the high-type seller gets

$$\pi_L^H - \varepsilon^2 + (1 - e^{-\lambda t_H})(1 - F(v_H + \varepsilon))\lambda(v_H + \varepsilon)(T - t_H).$$

Because v_H is strictly lower than the Myerson price v_F , a small increase in v_H moves it closer to the Myerson price and leads to a larger discriminating revenue in the post-trial service. This increases the overall payoff of the high type: the high-type seller has a profitable deviation.

One might wonder if increasing v_H increases discriminatory revenue, why does the optimal mechanism at point H not set a higher v_H ? The key observation is that the high-type seller can profit from the constructed deviation only if he alters the buyer's belief and relaxes the ex-ante IR constraint. In the original dynamic design problem, the designer optimally balances the revenue from the ex-ante payment and the post-trial price. Although increasing the post-trial rate to $v_H + \varepsilon$ increases the discriminating revenue, it makes the buyer less willing to try the trial. If the buyer's belief remains at μ_0 , the ex-ante payment for the trial must be decreased significantly which reduces the ex-ante profit. This argument also explains which trial mechanisms can survive the criterion: where the ex-ante IR is not binding in the original design problem, namely when $w_L = -1$.

6 General Screening Technology

In the baseline model, the seller's choice of access I simultaneously determines the buyer's learning rate λI and the expected payoff flow $\lambda I v$, conditioned on $\theta = H$. This perfect co-linearity is particularly relevant when the seller's capability to customize the service is constrained, such as when the seller can only offer either full service or no service at all.

Nonetheless, within the context of digital products and online services, sellers often possess more sophisticated screening technology. For instance, software vendors may offer versions with limited or outdated functionality along with a premium version. Such functional limitations may diminish the service's value, yet they can still highlight the potential advantages of the premium service to users. Similarly, streaming platforms may permit free viewing interspersed with numerous advertisements, along with an uninterrupted premium experience. Although frequent ad interruptions are a source of displeasure for viewers, users' ability to use the service facilitates their assessment of the platform's content offerings.

Formally, in the general setup, we assume that the seller can control $(I, q) \in \mathcal{D} \subseteq [0, 1]^2$. The Poisson instantaneous reward arrives at a rate λI if and only if the $\theta = H$, and its arrival gives an instantaneous reward of vq/I . When the service (I, q) is provided at some time, the

learning rate is λI and the expected flow payoff is $\lambda v q$, conditioned on $\theta = H$. In general notations, the baseline we just analyzed is a special case where $\mathcal{D} = \{(q, q) | q \in [0, 1]\}$. We allow \mathcal{D} to be any arbitrary closed set that contains $(0, 0)$ and $(1, 1)$. The interpretation is that the seller can always choose to provide the best service or no service.

To better distinguish between the two, we label q as the service quality and I as the learning rate. A mechanism is a tuple (I, q, p) . The first term q consists of a collection of measurable functions $q_t : H_t \rightarrow [0, 1]$ that map history to service quality. The second term I is a collection of measurable functions $I_t : H_t \rightarrow [0, 1]$ that map history to learning rate. For any h_t , $(I(h_t), q(h_t)) \in \mathcal{D}$.

All results in the baseline model can be generalized under the general specification. For the purpose of exposition, we only present the formal generalization of the optimal dynamic mechanism that maximizes the linear Pareto weight $(1, w_L)$ where $w_L \in [-1, (1 - \mu_0)/\mu_0]$:

$$\max_{I, q, p} \left\{ w_L p_U^L(T) + \mathbb{E} \left[p_{v, \tau}^H(T) \mathbb{1}[\tau \leq T] + p_U^H(T) \mathbb{1}[\tau > T] \mid \theta = H \right] \right\}$$

subject to IC and IR.

We will discuss the welfare implications of enriching the seller's screening technology after characterizing the equilibrium mechanisms. To present our results, we first introduce several notations. The general closed set \mathcal{D} might seem difficult to handle at first glance, but it turns out that the relevant points are the extreme points on one side of the convex envelope. Denote the (lower) convex envelope of the set \mathcal{D} as

$$\partial^+ \text{Conv}(\mathcal{D}) = \{(I, q) \in \text{Conv}(\mathcal{D}) | q \leq q', \forall (I, q') \in \text{Conv}(\mathcal{D})\}.$$

Because \mathcal{D} is not necessarily convex, points in $\partial^+ \text{Conv}(\mathcal{D})$ is not necessarily in \mathcal{D} . However, extreme points of $\partial^+ \text{Conv}(\mathcal{D})$ are indeed in \mathcal{D} . Formally, denote

$$\mathcal{D}_* = \{\text{the extreme points of } \partial^+ \text{Conv}(\mathcal{D})\},$$

$$\Gamma = \{\gamma(\cdot) : [0, T] \rightarrow \mathcal{D}_* | \gamma(s) \geq \gamma(t) \forall s \leq t\}.$$

The set Γ contains all the service allocation rule $\gamma(t)$ that determines a service for any $t \in [0, T]$, where the service quality and learning rate are decreasing over time. As illustrated in Figure 4, as time passes, $\gamma(t)$ moves along the convex envelop $\partial^+ \text{Conv}(\mathcal{D})$. With the introduction of $\gamma(t)$, we can define tiered pricing mechanisms as follows.

Definition 2. *A dynamic mechanism (I, q, p) is a tiered pricing mechanism if and only if*




Figure 4: Dynamic mechanisms with a generalized screening technology.

there exists v_0 and $\gamma_0(t) \in \Gamma$ such that

$$I_{v,t}^L(t) = I_{v,t}^H(t) = \begin{cases} (1, 1) & v \geq v_0, \\ I_U^H(t) & v < v_0. \end{cases}$$

$$I_U^L(t) = I_U^H(t) = \gamma_0(t).$$

Trial mechanisms are a special case of tiered pricing mechanisms when $\mathcal{D} = \{(q, q) | q \in [0, 1]\}$ as in our baseline model. To see this, note that in the baseline model $\mathcal{D}_* = \{(0, 0), (1, 1)\}$ and any $\gamma(t) \in \Gamma$ takes the form $\gamma(t) = (1_{t < t_0}, 1_{t < t_0})$. The uninformed buyer enjoys the premium service $(1, 1)$ before time t_0 and leaves the market completely after t_0 . Thus, the seller never offers different versions of the service at the same time, and the information about the buyer's learning only needs to be communicated at the end of the trial phase.

In general tiered pricing mechanisms, the seller first provides a low-tier service to the buyer and offers an upgrade option to the premium service at an additional price. As illustrated in Figure 4b, the introductory phase of the basic service may include a temporary trial of premium service, which subsequently transitions to a reduced quality of service. Notably, immediate communication between buyer and seller is necessary, as the service shall be upgraded immediately after the buyer receives a high-value utility shock. In reality, many software vendors provide a very short trial of the premium version and then offer a free budget version of the software, which not only has limited functionality but also might not be updated like the premium version. Many streaming services also provide a limited trial of the premium service (ad-free etc.) and then offer a budget version after it ends.

Theorem 2. *With general screening technology, a tiered pricing mechanism with parameters $v(w_L)$ and $\gamma(w_L, t) \in \Gamma$ solves the dynamic mechanism design problem with linear weight w_L . Moreover, as w_L decreases, $v(w_L)$ increases and $\gamma(w_L, t)$ decreases.*

Theorem 2 characterizes the boundary of the payoff set of IC-IR mechanisms. The entire boundary can be achieved by sellers of both types proposing the same tiered pricing mechanism. The comparative analysis result echos the predictions in Proposition 3. As the weight w_L decreases, the low-tier service has a slower learning rate so fewer buyers get the chance to learn the match quality and use premium services: an increase of learning-based discrimination in the extensive margin. In addition, $v(w_L)$, the threshold value of the informed buyer who uses the premium service also increases as the weight w_L decreases: an increase of learning-based discrimination in the intensive margin.

Intuition To obtain intuition about why the lower-tier service $I_U^\theta(t) = \gamma(t)$ is always at \mathcal{D}_* and moves clockwise in t , it is helpful to consider the marginal profit of learning rate $A_I(t)$ and the marginal profit of expected flow payoff $A_q(t)$ at each time t . For intuition, let us consider the dynamic mechanism that maximizes the high-type seller's profit. On the one hand, a higher learning rate at any time t is always beneficial as it convinces more buyers from whom the seller can charge a higher price. However, the marginal benefit of learning diminishes over time as the value of the remaining service decreases: learning has no value at $t = T$. Thus, $A_I(t)$ is strictly decreasing and $A_I(T) = 0$.

On the other hand, the marginal profit of the expected flow payoffs can be either positive or negative. When $t = 0$, all buyers are uninformed. Increasing the expected flow payoff of the low-tier service increases all buyers' payoff and the seller can extract the surplus via the ex-ante payment. Over time, however, more and more buyers experience utility shocks and upgrade to the premium service. Now, increasing the expected flow payoff of the low-tier service only increases the payoff of these uninformed buyers. Worse, it also gives information rents to users of the premium service. Therefore, $A_q(t)$ strictly decreases with $A_q(0) > 0$ and potentially $A_q(T) < 0$.

At any time t , the mechanism optimally chooses $(I_U(t), q_U(t)) \in \mathcal{D}$ to maximize

$$A_I(t)I_U(t) + A_q(t)q_U(t).$$

Before $A_q(t)$ turns negative, the optimal solution is to choose $(1, 1)$. After $A_q(t)$ becomes negative, the slope of the indifferent curve becomes positive as illustrated in Figure 5. Because both $A_I(t)$ and $A_q(t)$ are strictly decreasing, the indifferent curve becomes flatter over time and converges to 0 as t goes to T . This explains why the optimal solution $\gamma(t)$ moves




Figure 5: Indifference curves over (I, q) as time progresses.

clockwise over time. Also, since $A_I(t)$ is always positive and the objective is linear, the solution always stays at the extreme point of the lower convex envelope.

Welfare Implications We are interested in the welfare implications of expanding the seller’s screening technology \mathcal{D} . When the seller is uninformed or has perfect commitment power over data usage, increasing the seller’s screening ability always increases her revenue and typically increases social welfare. However, this is not the case if the seller is privately informed. To make this argument precise, we briefly sketch the equilibrium payoff set, which is fully parallel to our analysis in Section 5.

As in Lemma 5, when $w_L = -1$, the mechanism designer does not care about the ex-ante payment. Thus, multiple pairs of payoffs forming a 45-degree line from D to F as illustrated in Figure 6, solve the dynamic design problem. All these points Pareto dominate the point F , where the mechanism takes the form of freemium-premium pricing (a special case of tiered pricing where the low-tier version is free) and the low-type seller gets 0. The payoff pair $(0, \pi_H^F)$ at the point F also serves as a lower bound on equilibrium payoffs as in Proposition 4. Any payoff of IC-IR mechanism that is weakly higher than $(0, \pi_H^F)$ is an equilibrium payoff. Finally, as in Proposition 5 one can also show that the segment between point F and point D , illustrated in Figure 6, are equilibrium payoff pairs that survive the D1 criterion.

To discuss welfare implications, we again separately discuss equilibrium payoffs with and without refinements. Without refinements, the ex-ante revenue maximization mechanism can be implemented in equilibrium if and only if $\lambda\mu_0 T \geq \pi_H^F(\mathcal{D})$ as in Proposition 2. It is immediate to see

Corollary 5. *As \mathcal{D} expands, $\pi_H^F(\mathcal{D})$ increases and it is harder to support the ex-ante revenue-maximizing mechanism in equilibrium.*

As screening technology expands, it becomes easier for the high-type seller to reduce buyers’ information rents and profit from deviating to freemium-premium pricing. Thus, it




Figure 6: Graph Revisited: The payoff set surviving D1, is the segment from D to F .

is more difficult to implement the ex-ante revenue-maximizing mechanism in equilibrium. In this sense, expanding the seller's screening technology may reduce revenue and social efficiency.

Next, let us consider refinements and focus on the segment between point D and point F . Because the mechanism achieving point D and point F differs only in the ex-ante payment, the social efficiency is the same in all surviving equilibria. We find that

Proposition 6. *The social welfare in D1-surviving equilibria may decrease when \mathcal{D} expands.*

This part is still under construction. For now we just find examples under the extreme case $\mathcal{D} = [0, 1]^2$, where the seller has the strongest ability of screening. In this case, $\gamma(t) = (1, 0)$ for any t : the low-tier service has the maximum learning rate but leads to 0 value. The social efficiency is

$$\int_0^T \left[\lambda e^{-\lambda t} (T - t) \int_{v_F}^{\bar{v}} \lambda v dv \right] dt = \int_0^T \lambda e^{-\lambda t} (T - t) s_F dt.$$

In contrast, the social efficiency in the baseline model is

$$\lambda t_F + (1 - e^{-\lambda t_F})(T - t_F) s_F.$$

Compared to the free trial, which only enables learning before time t_F , the freemium-premium pricing enables learning at any time. However, the former provides the best consumption value to uninformed buyers before time t_F while the latter provides zero value. Numerical calculations suggest the former leads to lower social efficiency when T is small and λ is large.

7 Extensions and Robustness

We now consider some extensions of our model. To simplify the exposition, we focus on the baseline model where the seller only chooses access $I \in [0, 1]$. All results generalize with general \mathcal{D} . However, we do impose a restriction that is with loss of generality. In particular, instead of assuming the seller can propose a mechanism that elicits information from both the seller and the buyer, we assume the proposed mechanism only elicits information from the buyer.

The purpose of setting the baseline model with a general mechanism that elicits information from both sides is two-fold. First, it connects our model to the informed principal approach of Myerson (1983). Second, it helps to contrast our setting with the results of Koessler & Skreta (2016), who show that the ex-ante revenue-maximizing mechanism can be supported as an equilibrium in the static setting. The inefficiency can arise even if general mechanisms are allowed. In the baseline model, the restriction to mechanisms that only elicit information from the buyer is without loss, because the boundary is achieved by a complete pooling mechanism, where the allocation does not depend on the seller's type. This is not the case in our extensions and the optimal mechanisms share some features of Cremer Mclean mechanisms, even if our model implicitly requires ex-post budget balance.

From an application point of view, we actually think the model assumption, that mechanisms can only elicit information from the buyer, is more reasonable. Firms never publicize their data or their algorithm so a mechanism that depends on the seller's private information is hard to monitor. Thus, we proceed with this assumption in this section.

7.1 Imperfectly Informed, Cost and Known Utility Flow

In this subsection, we introduce three additional features each governed by one parameter. By evaluating the parameter at the corner value, each additional feature can be shut down. The main purpose of this subsection is to show the robustness of the relevant mechanisms up to a slight modification.

First, the seller is only partially informed about the match quality. We use $S = H, L$ to denote the seller's type. The high-type seller receives a more positive signal about θ and believes $\theta = 1$ with a higher probability μ_H . In contrast, the low-type seller believes $\theta = 1$ with a lower probability μ_L . The seller receives a high signal with probability p_H and a low signal with probability p_L . Bayesian consistency requires $\mu_0 = p_H\mu_H + p_L\mu_L$. Second, regardless of the match quality, the service now always gives the buyer a constant utility flow of uI if the seller provides I access to the service. Third, regardless of the match quality, the service leads to a flow cost of cI .

We focus on the analysis of the pooling equilibria and show that the relevant mechanism takes the form of cancellable trials.

Definition 3. *A dynamic mechanism (I, p) is a cancellable trial if and only if there exists v_c, v_0, t_0 such that*

$$I_U(t) = \begin{cases} 1 & t \leq t_0, \\ 0 & t > t_0, \end{cases}$$

$$I_{v,t}(t) = \begin{cases} 1 & v \in [v_0, \bar{v}], \\ I_U(t) & v \in [v_c, v_0], \\ 0 & v \in [v, v_c]. \end{cases}$$

The word “cancellable” comes from the fact that $I_{v,t}(t)$ might equal 0 even before the trial ends at t_0 . This option gives the seller a chance to immediately stop the service once the buyer finds out that providing the service is not socially efficient during the trial. In contrast to the choice of v_0 and t_0 which varies across equilibria, the choice of v_c in any “good” equilibrium mechanism is rather mechanical: $u + \lambda v_c^* = c$. When $v_c^* < \underline{v}$, as in our baseline model, introducing early cancellation is not necessary.

Denote π_L^0 as the low type’s maximum profit when separating from the high type. The lower type achieves this payoff by using a degenerate cancellable trial, where $v_c = v_c^*$ and $t_0 = T$. Essentially, the low type’s optimal separating mechanism is a two-part tariff where the low-type seller charges an upfront payment and a flow price of c for future usage. Denote π_H^0 as the high type’s maximum profit when the buyer believes him to be a low type. The optimal mechanism to achieve π_H^0 is a cancellable trial with a similar spirit to the free trial at point F in the baseline model.¹³ However, the trial is not necessarily free when the seller only gets an imperfect signal or the constant flow utility u is larger than the cost, as the buyer understands even the low-type seller can create value.

Similar to Proposition 4, any (π_L, π_H) is a pooling equilibrium payoff pair if it Pareto dominates (π_L^0, π_H^0) and can be achieved by a (pooling) dynamic mechanism that is IC-IR to the buyer. The remaining question is to characterize the payoff boundary of IC-IR dynamic mechanisms.

$$\partial\Pi_+ = \left\{ (\pi_L, \pi_H) \mid \exists w_L \in \mathbb{R}, (\pi_L, \pi_H) \in \arg \max_{(\pi_L, \pi_H) \in \Pi_{\text{IC-IR}}} (w_L \pi_L + \pi_H) \right\}.$$

¹³The proof of Proposition 7 illustrates how to solve π_H^0 .

Proposition 7. *In the extended model of Section 7.1, there exists a cancellable trial with payoffs (π_L, π_H) for any $(\pi_L, \pi_H) \in \partial\Pi_+$. Further, in any dynamic mechanism with payoffs in $\partial\Pi_+$, the seller must offer a cancellable trial.*

7.2 Other Learning Processes

In this paper, we focus on the good news model. To have a sense of the robustness of the result, this subsection explores the implication of other Poisson learning models such as the bad news model and the mixed new model. We show that the relevant mechanisms are still in the realm of cancellable trials as introduced in Definition 3 in the previous subsection 7.1.

Bad News Model The service delivers a type-independent flow utility of uI to the buyer. However, if the match quality is low $\theta = L$, the buyer receives an instantaneous loss l according to a Poisson process with flow rate λI . If $\theta = H$, no instantaneous losses ever arrive. The buyer believes $\theta = H$ with probability μ_0 . To illustrate the new force introduced by the bad news learning, we focus on parameters such that $\lambda l > u > (1 - \mu_0)\lambda l$, which means low match quality hurts the buyer yet in expectation the service still has a positive value.

We use $I_U(t)$ to denote the access for the uninformed buyer who reports no signal up to time t , and denote $I(t)$ to denote the access for the informed buyer who reports to receive a bad signal. Again, we directly look at the IC-IR mechanism that maximizes the linear-weighted-revenue of sellers:

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{M \in \mathcal{M}} \quad & w_L \pi_L(M) + \pi_H(M), \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & M \text{ is IC-IR.} \end{aligned}$$

Proposition 8. *In the bad news model, for any $w_L \in [-1, (1 - \mu_0)/\mu_0]$, the (degenerate) cancellable trial*

$$I_U(t) = 1, \quad I(t) = 0, \quad \forall t,$$

is optimal. It is uniquely optimal for $w_L \in (-1, (1 - \mu_0)/\mu_0)$.

The optimal mechanism is a cancellable trial in a degenerate form because the trial length is T . This is intuitive as there is no good news and the uninformed buyer is the one who has the highest willingness to pay. As we show in the proof, when the buyer reports the arrival of the bad signal, he quits the service and get a maximum refund subject to the IC

constraint:

$$\int_t^T (u - \lambda l(1 - \mu_s)) I_U(s) ds.$$

μ_s denotes the posterior of θ if there is yet no signal arrived by time s . The refund is maximized as any further increase in refund makes it strictly profitable for an uninformed buyer to falsify a bad signal.

Mixed News Model The service delivers an instantaneous lump sum reward at rate λI for both types $\theta = H, L$. If the match quality is high, the lump sum reward is \bar{v} and if the match quality is low, the lump sum reward is \underline{v} . To illustrate the new force introduced by the bad signal, we focus on cases where $\bar{v} > 0 > \underline{v}$ and normalize the expectation to be 1 so $\mu_0 \bar{v} + (1 - \mu_0) \underline{v} = 1$. This means that low match quality hurts the buyer, yet in expectation, the service still has a positive value.

We use $I_U(t)$ to denote the access for the uninformed buyer who reports no signal up to time t , and use $I^{\bar{v}}(t), I^{\underline{v}}(t)$ to denote the access for the informed buyer who reports receiving a good/bad signal. Again, we directly look at the IC-IR mechanism that maximizes the linear-weighted-revenue of sellers:

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{M \in \mathcal{M}} \quad & w_L \pi_L(M) + \pi_H(M), \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & M \text{ is IC-IR.} \end{aligned}$$

Proposition 9. *In the mixed news model, for any $w_L \in [-1, (1 - \mu_0)/\mu_0]$, the cancellable trial*

$$I_U(t) = 1_{t \leq t_0(w_L)}, \quad I^{\bar{v}}(t) = 1, \quad I^{\underline{v}}(t) = 0 \quad \forall t,$$

is optimal, where $t_0(w_L)$ is the trial length.

Dealing with bad news, or a mixed news model with greater generality creates more challenges in tractability because the uninformed buyer's downward deviation is now binding as the designer tries to maximize refund. This means the designer has to track the posterior of the buyer, as well as his future option value, which is affected by future allocation and by the future refund recursively. We leave it for future research.

7.3 Infinite Horizon with Discounting

We can extend the main insights to a model where there is an infinite horizon, but both the buyer and seller discount payoffs at rate r .

Proposition 10. *Suppose that instead of a finite horizon with no discounting, both buyer and seller discount future payoffs at a rate r and experimentation takes place over an infinite horizon. Define π_0, v_0 as in Theorem 1. Then any mechanism maximizing weighted revenue with weight $(w_L, 1)$ is once again a trial mechanism, with length:*

$$t_0 = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\lambda} \ln \left(\frac{\frac{\lambda}{r} + 1}{1 - \mu_0(1 + w_L)/\pi_0} \right) & \mu_0(1 + w_L) \leq \pi_0 \\ \infty & \mu_0(1 + w_L) \geq \pi_0 \end{cases} \quad (7)$$

Further, there exist prices to support this trial mechanism.

That is, there is nothing particularly special about the finite-time horizon with no discounting. We only prove how the main results extend to the infinite horizon case with discounting, the rest follows straightforwardly.

8 Discussion and Future Work

Vertical Quality Throughout the paper, we have interpreted θ as a horizontal match quality parameter that the seller knows. This parameter θ could also be interpreted as a vertical component of product quality in the traditional adverse-selection sense in lemons markets. This suggests that trial-like mechanisms should also arise in other adverse selection settings. Indeed, trial mechanisms do predate the digital economy. In more conventional lemon-type markets such as used cars, there are rent-to-own contracts and other trial-like mechanisms. Our analysis provides a theoretical foundation for understanding why these mechanisms arise and what forms they take in more complex environments.

Moral Hazard Our model of informed principal assumes the distribution of θ is exogenously given, and the equilibrium mechanisms such as trials/tiered pricing lead to social inefficiency. However, the welfare judgment on these dynamic pricing mechanisms can be flipped if one considers a moral hazard problem where the distribution of θ is endogenous. For example, suppose the seller needs to make a private investment before entering the market. If the seller incurs a cost of c , the probability that the service has high match quality $\theta = H$ increases. Our dynamic mechanism design analysis can be easily applied to study how to provide proper incentives in such a setting.

Informed Data Seller The informed principal framework emphasizes the limited commitment power of the market participants by assuming they can commit to tangible pricing mechanisms but cannot credibly communicate information obtained from unpublished data. This paper highlights that further development of the informed principal framework might deepen the understanding of the impact of data on market behaviors. For example, consider a setting where big tech companies want to purchase data from Quora to train their chatbots. The data owner Quora is essentially an informed seller of its data, who faces a similar trade-off to the seller in our model. At the ex-ante stage, the data can only be sold at a low price as the market is skeptical. Giving out data can prove its quality yet it reduces the value of the remaining data.

References

- Ahmed, N. U. & Wang, S. (2021), *Optimal Control of Dynamic Systems Driven by Vector Measures: Theory and Applications*, Springer Cham.
URL: <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-82139-5>
- Bagwell, K. (1987), ‘Introductory price as a signal of cost in a model of repeat business’, *The Review of Economic Studies* **54**(3), 365–384.
URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2297564>
- Bagwell, K. & Riordan, M. H. (1991), ‘High and declining prices signal product quality’, *The American Economic Review* **81**(1), 224–239.
URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2006797>
- Banks, J. S. & Sobel, J. (1987), ‘Equilibrium selection in signaling games’, *Econometrica* **55**(3), 647–661.
URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1913604>
- Bergemann, D. & Välimäki, J. (2000), ‘Experimentation in markets’, *The Review of Economic Studies* **67**(2), 213–234.
URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2566980>
- Bergemann, D. & Välimäki, J. (2006), ‘Dynamic pricing of new experience goods’, *Journal of Political Economy* **114**(4), 713–743.
URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1086/506923>
- Brunnermeier, M., Lamba, R. & Segura-Rodriguez, C. (2023), Inverse Selection, Working Papers 2020-50, Princeton University. Economics Department.
URL: <https://ideas.repec.org/p/pri/econom/2020-50.html>
- Chen, Z., Stanton, C. & Thomas, C. (2023), ‘Information spillovers in experience goods competition’, *Management Science* **0**(0), null.
URL: <https://doi.org/10.1287/mnsc.2021.02754>
- Cho, I.-K. & Kreps, D. M. (1987), ‘Signaling games and stable equilibria’, *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* **102**(2), 179–221.
URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1885060>
- Clark, D. (2023a), Contracting with private information, moral hazard, and limited commitment.
URL: <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:243984493>

- Clark, D. (2023b), The informed principal with agent moral hazard.
URL: <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:243984493>
- Crémer, J. (1984), ‘On the economics of repeat buying’, *The RAND Journal of Economics* **15**(3), 396–403.
URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2555447>
- Dosis, A. (2022), ‘On the informed principal model with common values’, *The RAND Journal of Economics* **53**(4), 792–825.
URL: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/1756-2171.12424>
- Hagiu, A. & Wright, J. (2020), ‘Platforms and the exploration of new products’, *Management Science* **66**(4), 1527–1543.
URL: <https://doi.org/10.1287/mnsc.2018.3272>
- Judd, K. L. & Riordan, M. H. (1994), ‘Price and quality in a new product monopoly’, *The Review of Economic Studies* **61**(4), 773–789.
URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2297918>
- Koessler, F. & Skreta, V. (2016), ‘Informed seller with taste heterogeneity’, *Journal of Economic Theory* **165**, 456–471.
URL: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0022053116300412>
- Koessler, F. & Skreta, V. (2019), ‘Selling with evidence’, *Theoretical Economics* **14**(2), 345–371.
URL: <https://econtheory.org/ojs/index.php/te/article/view/2885/0>
- Koessler, F. & Skreta, V. (2023), ‘Informed information design’, *Journal of Political Economy* **0**(ja), null.
URL: <https://doi.org/10.1086/724843>
- Milgrom, P. & Roberts, J. (1986), ‘Price and advertising signals of product quality’, *Journal of Political Economy* **94**(4), 796–821.
URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1833203>
- Myerson, R. B. (1983), ‘Mechanism design by an informed principal’, *Econometrica* **51**(6), 1767–1797.
URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1912116>
- Nishimura, T. (2022), ‘Informed principal problems in bilateral trading’, *Journal of Economic Theory* **204**, 105498.
URL: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0022053122000886>

Rothschild, M. & Stiglitz, J. (1976), 'Equilibrium in competitive insurance markets: An essay on the economics of imperfect information', *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* **90**(4), 629–649.

URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1885326>

Yu, M., Debo, L. & Kapuscinski, R. (2016), 'Strategic waiting for consumer-generated quality information: Dynamic pricing of new experience goods', *Management Science* **62**(2), 410–435.

URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/43835015>

A Formal Treatment of Refinements in Section 5

In this section of the appendix, we give the formal definition of the D1 criterion and discuss other refinement concepts. This appendix is more than proof techniques so we put the proof of the statement jointly with the proof for section 5 into the later appendix.

To formally introduce the notion of the D1 criterion, we define the continuation game. For any off-path mechanism $m = (I, p)$, and any market belief $\mu \in [0, 1]$, the continuation game is a game where the buyer first decides whether he accepts the mechanism, and then both parties report messages. An equilibrium of the continuation game consists of both parties' strategies and the belief of the buyer, which is obtained by Bayes rule given the initial belief μ . Denote $\Sigma(m, \mu)$ as the set of continuation equilibrium. For any $\sigma \in \Sigma(m, \mu)$ denote $\pi_x(\sigma)$ as the ex-ante payoff of the seller of type x . Denote

$$\begin{aligned}\Sigma(m, H, \pi_H) &= \{\sigma | \pi_H(\sigma) > \pi_H, \sigma \in \Sigma(m, \mu) \text{ for some } \mu \in [0, 1]\}, \\ \Sigma(m, L, \pi_L) &= \{\sigma | \pi_L(\sigma) \geq \pi_L, \sigma \in \Sigma(m, \mu) \text{ for some } \mu \in [0, 1]\}.\end{aligned}$$

$\Sigma(m, H, \pi_H)$ denotes the set of continuation equilibria that strictly increases the high-type seller's payoff, relative to the equilibrium payoff π_H . $\Sigma(m, L, \pi_L)$ denotes the set of continuation equilibria that weakly increases the low-type seller's payoff, relative to the equilibrium payoff π_L .

Definition 4. *An equilibrium with equilibrium payoff (π_L, π_H) does not survive D1 Criterion if and only if there exists a deviating mechanism $m = (I, p)$ such that*

- $\Sigma(m, H, \pi_H) \supsetneq \Sigma(m, L, \pi_L)$.
- For any $\sigma \in \Sigma(m, 1)$, $\pi_H(\sigma) > \pi_H$.

Essentially, D1 criterion restricts the off-path belief of the buyer when the deviating mechanism satisfies $\Sigma(m, H, \pi_H) \supsetneq \Sigma(m, L, \pi_L)$. If under the deviating mechanism m , the low-type seller weakly benefiting from a particular continuation equilibrium implies the high-type seller strictly benefiting from the same continuation equilibrium, then the buyer should believe that it is the high-type seller who initiates the deviation. Here the definition is an adapted version of Banks & Sobel (1987) (See Cho & Kreps (1987) for a easier understanding of how it compares with other refinement concepts). In the standard signaling game, the sender (seller) does not need to take subsequent action (report message) after the initial action (the mechanism m) is chosen, so one just need to talk about the best response of the receiver (buyer). In the adapted version, we have to talk about continuation equilibria.

To prove Proposition 5, we proceed in two steps. First, we consider the equilibrium payoffs that do not survive the D1 Criterion.

Lemma 6. *An equilibrium with payoff (π_L, π_H) does not survive D1 Criterion if $(\pi_L, \pi_H) \notin \Pi_{D_1}$.*

To prove this lemma, we can restrict the possible deviation of the seller to a smaller class of mechanisms: the trial mechanisms. It is worth noting that once a trial mechanism is proposed off-path, the seller can no longer impact the outcome in the continuation game. This means to eliminate equilibrium payoffs outside of Π_{D_1} we only need the standard D1 criterion which concentrates on the buyer's individual response.

Our second step is to prove any equilibrium payoff $(\pi_L, \pi_H) \in \Pi_{D_1}$ survives the D1 criterion. In fact, we can prove a stronger result:

Lemma 7. *Any equilibrium with payoff $(\pi_L, \pi_H) \in \Pi_{D_1}$ survives the D1 criterion. In fact, there does not exist a deviating mechanism m , a belief μ and a continuation equilibrium $\sigma \in \Sigma(m, \mu)$ such that*

$$\pi_H(\sigma) > \pi_H, \quad \pi_L(\sigma) \leq \pi_L.$$

Combining Lemma 6 and 7 we reach the conclusion of Proposition 5. In fact, Lemma 7 also ensures any equilibrium payoff $(\pi_L, \pi_H) \in \Pi_{D_1}$ survives the refinement of NWBR (never-a-weak-best-response) test, which is stronger than the D1 criterion. Thus, Lemma 6 and 7 also implies

Corollary 6. *The payoff set of equilibrium that survives the NWBR test is Π_{D_1} .*

NWBR is quite strong among canonical signaling refinement concepts in signaling games. Now we turn to concepts that are weaker than the D1 criterion. In particular, we consider the intuitive criterion:

Definition 5. *An equilibrium with equilibrium payoff (π_L, π_H) does not survive Intuitive Criterion if and only if there exists a deviating mechanism (I, p) such that*

- *For any $\mu \in [0, 1]$ and any $\sigma \in \Sigma(m, \mu)$, $\pi_L(\sigma) < \pi_L$.*
- *For any $\sigma \in \Sigma(m, 1)$, $\pi_H(\sigma) > \pi_H$.*

In English, an equilibrium does not survive the Intuitive Criterion if in all continuation games consistent with some initial belief of the buyer, the low-type seller gets strictly worse off, and the high-type is strictly better off in all continuation games in which the buyer believes $\theta = H$.

Proposition 11. *The payoff set of equilibrium that survives the Intuitive Criterion is Π_{D_1} , if $v_H \geq 1$, or equivalently, $f(1) - (1 - \mu_0)(1 - F(1)) \leq 0$.*

Because the intuitive criterion is too conservative, it is not surprising that we need additional restrictions on parameters. We view the fact that the result is exactly the same with some restrictions as a reassuring robustness result. All proofs are relegated to the later subsection.

B Omitted Proofs

B.1 Omitted Proofs for Section 3 and 4

Proof of Proposition 2. We first prove the if direction. Suppose (1) holds. The probability a buyer experiences a lump-sum reward during the trial is $(1 - e^{-\lambda t_F})$, and the probability that the buyer has a value larger than v_F is $1 - F(v_F)$. The expected ex-ante profit of a high-type seller is then

$$(1 - e^{-\lambda t_F})(1 - F(v_F))\lambda v_F(T - t_F).$$

By (1), this is larger than $\lambda\mu_0 T$. From Corollary 2 we know any equilibrium that maximizes the ex-ante revenue leads to equilibrium payoff $(\lambda\mu_0 T, \lambda\mu_0 T)$ and so the free trial is always a profitable deviation.

We next prove the only if direction. Suppose (1) does not hold. It suffices to show that there is an equilibrium with the first-best revenue. Selling full-service access at the beginning at price $\lambda\mu_0 T$ is an IC-IR mechanism with payoffs $(\lambda\mu_0 T, \lambda\mu_0 T)$. Since (1) does not hold, the payoff pair $(\lambda\mu_0 T, \lambda\mu_0 T)$ satisfies the conditions of Proposition 4 and hence is an equilibrium. Thus, there is an equilibrium that attains the first-best. □

Proof of Lemma 2. We consider casework on w_L . If $w_L = -1$, then $p_V^L(T)$ must be chosen equal to $p_V^H(T)$, else we could decrease $p_V^L(T)$ and do better on the objective without affecting the other constraints and maintaining $p_V^L(T) \geq p_V^H(T)$. So $p_V^L(T) = p_V^H(T)$ in this case.

If $w_L \in (-1, (1 - \mu_0)/\mu_0]$ then note that (IR-0) is a linear constraint on $p_V^H(T)$ and $p_V^L(T)$, and the objective is linear in both. Since $w_L \leq (1 - \mu_0)/\mu_0$, the objective assigns a higher relative weight to $p_V^H(T)$, and hence if $p_V^L(T) > p_V^H(T)$, the objective would increase by decreasing $p_V^L(T)$ by $\mu_0\epsilon$ and increasing p_V^H by $(1 - \mu_0)\epsilon$, while maintaining (IR-0); thus, at optimum, $p_V^L(T) = p_V^H(T)$. It is then clear to see that it is optimal to increase $p_V^H(T)$ as much as possible since $w_L > -1$, and so (IR-0) must bind. □

Denote the set of measurable controls as

$$\mathcal{U}_{ad} = \{U(t) \mid U(t) \in [0, 1] \forall t, U(t) \text{ is measurable w.r.t. } t\}.$$

Lemma 8. *The optimal control function for the control problem:*

$$\begin{aligned} & \max_{U \in \mathcal{U}_{ad}} \left\{ \int_0^T (\lambda(T-t - (X(T) - X(t))) \exp(-\lambda X(t)) + K) \lambda U(t) dt \right\} \\ & \text{subject to } \dot{X}(t) = U(t) \in [0, 1], X(0) = 0, X(T) \text{ free} \end{aligned}$$

where K is some constant, $U(t)$ is a measurable control, is

$$U(t) = \begin{cases} 1 & t \leq t_0 \\ 0 & t > t_0 \end{cases}$$

where t_0 solves

$$\lambda e^{-\lambda t_0} (T - t_0) - (1 - e^{-\lambda t_0}) + K = 0$$

if $K < 1 - e^{-\lambda T}$, and $t_0 = T$ otherwise.

Proof of Lemma 8. First, rearrange the objective:

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_0^T (\lambda(T-t - (X(T) - X(t))) e^{-\lambda X(t)} + K) \lambda U(t) dt \\ &= \int_0^T (\lambda(T-t + X(t)) e^{-\lambda X(t)} + K) \lambda U(t) dt - \lambda X(T) \int_0^T \lambda U(t) e^{-\lambda X(t)} dt \\ &= \int_0^T (\lambda(T-t + X(t)) e^{-\lambda X(t)} + K) \lambda U(t) dt - \lambda X(T) (1 - e^{-\lambda X(T)}) \\ &= \int_0^T (\lambda(T-t + X(t)) e^{-\lambda X(t)} + K) \lambda U(t) dt - \int_0^T (1 - e^{-\lambda X(t)} + \lambda X(t) e^{-\lambda X(t)}) \lambda U(t) dt \\ &= \int_0^T (\lambda(T-t) e^{-\lambda X(t)} - (1 - e^{-\lambda X(t)}) + K) \lambda U(t) dt \end{aligned}$$

Now, we invoke the Pontryagin maximum principle. For a more specific reference, we apply Theorem 4.2.4 in Ahmed & Wang (2021) which proves there exists an optimal control, and apply Theorem 5.2.3 in Ahmed & Wang (2021) to prove for any optimal measurable control

U, X , there exists a costate variable ρ such that

$$U(t) \begin{cases} = 1 & J(t) > 0 \\ \in [0, 1] & J(t) = 0 \\ = 0 & J(t) < 0 \end{cases} \quad (8)$$

$$J(t) = \lambda (\lambda (T - t) e^{-\lambda X(t)} - (1 - e^{-\lambda X(t)}) + K) - \rho(t) \quad (9)$$

$$\dot{\rho}(t) = -(\lambda (T - t) + 1) \lambda e^{-\lambda X(t)} \lambda U(t) \quad (10)$$

$$\rho(T) = 0 \quad (11)$$

where (10) is the costate evolution, and (11) is the upper boundary constraint, (8) and (9) follow from Hamiltonian maximization.¹⁴ Note that by differentiating (9) wherever differentiable, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{J}(t) &= -\lambda (\lambda e^{-\lambda X(t)} - \lambda U(t) \lambda (T - t) e^{-\lambda X(t)} - \lambda U(t) e^{-\lambda X(t)}) - \dot{\rho}(t) \\ &= -\lambda^2 e^{-\lambda X(t)} \end{aligned}$$

since (10) cancels the other terms. Note that this implies that J is always decreasing; since X is continuous, \dot{J} is continuous.

First, if $K \geq 1 - e^{-\lambda T}$, then $J(T) = \lambda(K - (1 - e^{-\lambda T})) \geq 0$, so J is nonnegative. Hence, the unique solution to the Pontryagin conditions is $U(t) = 1$ everywhere; since Pontryagin is necessary, this must be the only solution to the control problem.

Now, consider the case where $K < 1 - e^{-\lambda T}$. First, we show there exists a unique t_0 such that $J(t_0) = 0$. Consider $J(0) = \lambda(\lambda T + K) - \rho(0)$. If this is positive, the fact that $J(T) = \lambda(K - (1 - e^{-\lambda T})) < 0$ and J is strictly decreasing, implies that such a t_0 exists and unique by the intermediate value theorem. If $J(0) < 0$, then (8) implies that $U(t) = 0$ always, and so $\rho(t) = 0$ by (10). But this implies that $J(0) = \lambda(\lambda T + K) > 0$, a contradiction.

Given there exists a unique t_0 such that $J(t_0) = 0$, note that since J is decreasing, $U(t)$ is zero for $t > t_0$. This implies that $\dot{\rho} = 0$ for $t > t_0$, and combined with (11), this implies that $\rho(t_0) = 0$. Additionally, $U(t)$ must be 1 for $t < t_0$, and so $X(t) = t$ for $t < t_0$, and

¹⁴The maximization technically should hold for *a.e.* t , but for any optimal control and the corresponding costate, we can always find essentially the same control such that the optimality condition holds for any t instead of *a.e.* t . Thus, without loss, we assume the optimality condition holds for any t .

$X(t) = t_0$ for $t \geq t_0$. Hence, t_0 must satisfy:

$$\begin{aligned} J(t_0) &= \lambda (\lambda (T - t_0) e^{-\lambda X(t_0)} - (1 - e^{-\lambda X(t_0)}) + K) - \rho(t_0) = 0 \\ \lambda (\lambda (T - t_0) e^{-\lambda t_0} - (1 - e^{-\lambda t_0}) + K) &= 0 \\ \lambda (T - t_0) e^{-\lambda t_0} - (1 - e^{-\lambda t_0}) + K &= 0 \end{aligned}$$

Hence, the Pontryagin conditions once again admit a unique solution, and so this is the optimal control. \square

Proof of Proposition 1. Consider the candidate equilibrium where the seller proposes the mechanism with $I(h_t) = 1$ and $p(h_t) = \lambda\mu_0 T$. The buyer's beliefs in this equilibrium are that $\theta = H$ with probability μ_0 on-path prior to any message history (with beliefs updated according to Bayes' rule during the game), and that off-path $\theta = H$ with probability zero (unless a lump-sum reward arrives in some history).¹⁵

We first argue that if the seller can only propose mechanisms where $p(h_t) = p(\theta)$, then this is an equilibrium. Since the buyer gets ex-ante a surplus of $\lambda\mu_0 T$ from the service, the buyer's participation condition is satisfied, and the buyer's strategy is a best-response. Additionally, the buyer's belief system is consistent, so it suffices to check that the seller's proposal of such a mechanism is a best-response to the buyer's strategy and belief system. Note that on-path, the seller (of either type) gets $\lambda\mu_0 T$. Suppose the seller has a profitable deviation. Since p is constant over time, the deviating mechanism proposed by the buyer must charge some $p > \lambda\mu_0 T$, else the seller could not benefit. But the buyer's belief system dictates $\mu(H|\cdot)$ for such a mechanism proposal is zero, and hence the buyer is unwilling to participate and buy the service because the buyer believes that $\theta = L$ almost surely. This implies that the seller could only get zero by proposing this mechanism, a contradiction.

Now, suppose the seller does not observe θ or can commit to not observe θ . Once again, we can confirm that the buyer's strategy is a best-response and the belief system is consistent with the candidate seller's strategy. We confirm that the seller's strategy is also a best-response. Since the seller does not observe θ (or commits to not observing θ), the seller's strategy must be independent of θ . Note that the candidate equilibrium would grant the seller a payoff of $\lambda\mu_0 T$, regardless of type. Suppose the seller could do better. That

¹⁵We did not specify the buyer's mechanism participation strategy off-path, but we suppose the buyer takes some arbitrary best-response on any off-the-equilibrium history given the belief system. This turns out to be sufficient for our argument.

implies some mechanism, that would be accepted, has some price function such that

$$\mathbb{E}_\theta[\mathbb{E}_{h_T}[p(h_T)]] > \lambda\mu_0 T,$$

where the expectation is taken with respect to the lump-sum arrival process and the buyer's strategy. But the buyer's expected payoff at the terminal time is

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{\theta, h_T}[N_t v - p(h_T)] &= \mathbb{E}_{\theta, h_T}[N_t v] - \mathbb{E}_{\theta, h_T}[p(h_T)] \\ &< \mu_0 \mathbb{E}[v] \mathbb{E}[N_t | \theta = H] - \lambda\mu_0 T \\ &= \mu_0 \mathbb{E}_I \left[\int_0^T \lambda I_s ds \right] - \lambda\mu_0 T \\ &\leq \lambda\mu_0 T - \lambda\mu_0 T = 0 \end{aligned}$$

where we used the fact that v is drawn independently and with expectation 1, and the fact that I is always bounded above by 1. But this implies the buyer has a negative ex-ante payoff from participating, and so this contradicts the buyer's initial participation constraint. \square

Proof of Lemma 4. When $v < v_0$, $I(v, t) = I(U, t)$, so the expectation term is

$$\begin{aligned} &(1 - \mu_0(w_L + 1)) \left(\lambda v I(v, \tau) - \int_v^v \lambda r(w, \tau) dw - \lambda v I(U, \tau) \right) \\ &= (1 - \mu_0(w_L + 1)) \left(\lambda v I(U, \tau) - \int_v^v \lambda I(U, \tau) dw - \lambda v I(U, \tau) \right) = 0 \end{aligned}$$

When $v \geq v_0$, the expectation term is

$$\begin{aligned} &\mu_0(w_L + 1) \lambda v (I(v, \tau) - I(U, \tau)) + (1 - \mu_0(w_L + 1)) \left(\lambda v I(v, \tau) - \int_v^v \lambda r(w, \tau) dw - \lambda v I(U, \tau) \right) \\ &= \mu_0(w_L + 1) \lambda v (T - \tau - I(U, \tau)) + (1 - \mu_0(w_L + 1)) (\lambda v_0 (T - \tau) - \lambda v_0 I(U, \tau)) \end{aligned}$$

Hence, taking the expectation over v , the term becomes

$$\begin{aligned} &\mu_0(w_L + 1) \lambda \int_{v_0}^{\bar{v}} v f(v) dv (T - \tau - I(U, \tau)) + \lambda v_0 (1 - F(v_0)) (1 - \mu_0(w_L + 1)) (T - \tau - I(U, \tau)) \\ &= \lambda \left(\mu_0(w_L + 1) \int_{v_0}^{\bar{v}} v f(v) dv + v_0 (1 - F(v_0)) (1 - \mu_0(w_L + 1)) \right) (T - \tau - I(U, \tau)) \end{aligned}$$

For notational convenience, denote

$$\pi_0 := \mu_0(w_L + 1) \int_{v_0}^{\bar{v}} v f(v) \, dv + v_0(1 - F(v_0))(1 - \mu_0(w_L + 1))$$

With some algebra, we can rearrange π_0 into an interpretable quantity:

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_0 &= \mu_0(w_L + 1) \int_{v_0}^{\bar{v}} v f(v) \, dv + v_0(1 - F(v_0))(1 - \mu_0(w_L + 1)) \\ &= \int_{v_0}^{\bar{v}} v f(v) \, dv - (1 - \mu_0(w_L + 1)) \left(\int_{v_0}^{\bar{v}} v f(v) \, dv - v_0(1 - F(v_0)) \right) \\ &= \int_{v_0}^{\bar{v}} v f(v) \, dv - (1 - \mu_0(w_L + 1)) \left(\int_{v_0}^{\bar{v}} (1 - F(v)) \, dv \right) \\ &= \int_{v_0}^{\bar{v}} \left(v - (1 - \mu_0(w_L + 1)) \frac{1 - F(v)}{f(v)} \right) f(v) \, dv \end{aligned}$$

where we utilized the integration-by-parts identity in the third step. The final line shows that π_0 is the desired virtual surplus. Using this definition of π_0 , the objective becomes

$$\max_{M \in \mathcal{M}} \{ (w_L + 1) \mu_0 \lambda I(U, 0) + \lambda \pi_0 \mathbb{E}[(T - \tau - I(U, \tau)) \mathbb{1}[\tau \leq T] | \theta = H] \}$$

□

Proof of Theorem 1. We first prove the optimality of trial mechanisms and then prove the uniqueness result. Lemma 3 showed that the maximal payoffs of the *relaxed* problem are only attained by trial mechanisms, with v_0 given by (3) and t_0 given by (4). Thus, to finish the proof, it remains to show that for any w_L , we can construct a trial mechanism in the original problem that is feasible, and attains the maximal payoffs in the relaxed problem. Specifically, we need to construct an appropriate price function. We will construct the feasible mechanism as follows. Take $I^L = I^H$, $p^L = p^H$, and define the price functions:

$$p_U(t) = \lambda \mu_0 t_0 + \lambda (\pi_0 - v_0(1 - F(v_0))) (T - t_0) (1 - e^{-\lambda t_0}) \quad (12)$$

$$p_{v,\cdot}(t) = \begin{cases} p_U(t) + \lambda v_0 (T - t_0) & v \geq v_0 \\ p_U(t) & v < v_0 \end{cases} \quad (13)$$

One can check that the implied $\Delta = \lambda v_0 (T - t_0)$, which exactly makes the relaxed IC bind, and that when p_U is positive, it makes (IR-0) bind. Hence, this price function obtains the

maximum value of the relaxed problem. We now argue that this price function, together with the trial mechanism, is feasible in the original problem.

First, note that the mechanism is invariant to the seller's report and both sellers get a nonnegative revenue, so this is IC-IR for the seller.

Additionally, the payment scheme (in absence of any rewards arriving) frontloads payment: p_U is constant and has no dependence on t . This means the buyer pays a lump-sum up front at time 0, and then nothing more if no lump sums occur. If a lump sum is reported, the payment scheme implies the buyer pays another lump-sum at the time of the report, and no more payments thereafter. Hence, in the absence of any actions, continuing to participate is free (costs no additional continuation payments from the buyer), and hence we only have to check IC and IR at the initial time and at the reported lump sum arrival time.

Recall that p_U was constructed to make (IR-0) bind, and hence IR is satisfied initially. To see that the mechanism is IC-IR at the time of reported lump-sum, note that the report of a lump sum changes the continuation access to $I_{v,t}$ to 1 for times t_0 to T . Since the buyer knows the seller is good, this increase in future access is worth $\lambda(T - t_0)$ to the buyer, and this is exactly the additional lump sum he is asked to pay upon report. Hence participation and truthful reporting are weakly optimal (in particular, the buyer is indifferent between reporting at any time after the initial arrival, so reporting truthfully is an optimal strategy).

Thus, the constructed mechanism is IC-IR for the original problem, and since it attains the maximal value of the relaxed problem, it must be optimal.

Finally, we prove the uniqueness. Lemma 3 showed that the maximal payoffs of the *relaxed* problem are only attained by trial mechanisms, with v_0 given by (3) and t_0 given by (4). Thus, in any optimal mechanism $I_U^H(t)$ and $I_{v,s}^H(t)$ must be the same as the trial mechanism that we just solved. In fact, by revisiting all binding constraints in the proof of optimality, one can see that $p_U^\theta(T)$ and $p_{v,t}^H(T)$ are uniquely pinned down. What remains flexible are $I_U^L(t)$, $p_{v,t}^L(t)$, and $p_U^L(t)$ for $t < T$. $I_U^L(t)$ does not affect any player's payoff and also does not affect the arrival of signals; $p_{v,t}^L(t)$ is completely off-path as low-type seller does not generate signal; $p_U^L(t)$ for $t < T$ does not affect on-path payoff as what alternately matters is the final payment.

Thus, interim payoffs of all parties are unique at any time t . More specifically, in any optimal mechanism, the interim payoffs are uniquely pinned down as follows.

- The low-type seller always gets $p_U^L(T)$ in the end.
- At any time t , with probability $1 - e^{-\lambda \min\{t_0, t\}}$, the buyer has received the signal. The high-type seller gets $p_U(t) + \lambda v_0(T - t_0)$ and the buyer enjoys full service and pays $p_U(t) + \lambda v_0(T - t_0)$.

- At any time t , with probability $e^{\lambda \min\{t_0, t\}}$, the buyer has not received the signal. In this case, with probability $(1 - e^{\lambda \max\{t_0 - t, 0\}})$ the high-type seller gets $p_U(t) + \lambda v_0(T - t_0)$ and the buyer enjoys full service and pays $p_U(t) + \lambda v_0(T - t_0)$. With probability $e^{\lambda \max\{t_0 - t, 0\}}$ the high-type seller gets $p_U(t)$ and the buyer enjoys service of length t_0 and pays $p_U(t)$.

□

Proof of Proposition 3. The fact that v_0 is decreasing in μ_0 and w_L follows from the regularity assumption. For t_0 , note that we can rewrite π as follows:

$$\pi(\mu_0, w_L) = \max_{v'} \int_{v'}^{\bar{v}} v f(v) - (1 - \mu_0(1 + w_L))(1 - F(v)) dv.$$

From the envelope theorem we know

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial \pi}{\partial \mu_0} &= (1 + w_L) \int_{v_0}^{\bar{v}} (1 - F(v)) dv, \\ \frac{\partial \pi}{\partial w_L} &= \mu_0 \int_{v_0}^{\bar{v}} (1 - F(v)) dv. \end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial}{\partial \mu_0} \left(\frac{\pi}{\mu_0} \right) &= \frac{\frac{\partial \pi}{\partial \mu_0} \mu_0 - \pi}{\mu_0^2} = \frac{1}{\mu_0^2} \left(\int_{v_0}^{\bar{v}} \mu_0(1 + w_L)(1 - F(v)) - v f(v) + (1 - \mu_0(1 + w_L))(1 - F(v)) dv \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{\mu_0^2} \left(\int_{v_0}^{\bar{v}} 1 - F(v) - v f(v) dv \right) = -\frac{v_0(1 - F(v_0))}{\mu_0^2} < 0 \end{aligned}$$

So π/μ_0 is decreasing in μ_0 , and therefore μ_0/π is increasing in μ_0 . Similarly, for w_L ,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial}{\partial w_L} \left(\frac{\pi}{1 + w_L} \right) &= \frac{\frac{\partial \pi}{\partial w_L}(1 + w_L) - \pi}{(1 + w_L)^2} \\ &= \frac{1}{(1 + w_L)^2} \left(\int_{v_0}^{\bar{v}} \mu_0(1 + w_L)(1 - F(v)) - v f(v) + (1 - \mu_0(1 + w_L))(1 - F(v)) dv \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{(1 + w_L)^2} \left(\int_{v_0}^{\bar{v}} 1 - F(v) - v f(v) dv \right) = -\frac{v_0(1 - F(v_0))}{(1 + w_L)^2} < 0 \end{aligned}$$

So $\pi/(1 + w_L)$ is decreasing in w_L , and therefore $(1 + w_L)/\pi$ is increasing in w_L . Since t_0 solves

$$\lambda e^{-\lambda t_0}(T - t_0) - (1 - e^{-\lambda t_0}) + \frac{\mu_0(1 + w_L)}{\pi_0} = 0$$

or equivalently

$$\lambda e^{-\lambda t_0}(T - t_0) + \frac{\mu_0(1 + w_L)}{\pi_0} = 1 - e^{-\lambda t_0}$$

The right-hand side is increasing in t_0 , and the left-hand side is decreasing in t_0 . Since $\mu_0(1 + w_L)/\pi$ is increasing in μ_0 and w_L , t_0 is also increasing in both. \square

B.2 Omitted Proof for Section 5 & Appendix A

Proof of Proposition 4. For the if direction, suppose $(\pi_L, \pi_H) \in \Pi_{\text{IC-IR}}$ with $\pi_H \geq \pi_F$. We construct an equilibrium that attains these payoffs. Since $(\pi_L, \pi_H) \in \Pi_{\text{IC-IR}}$, there exists some IC-IR mechanism M with these payoffs. Consider the strategy profile where the seller always proposes M and reports truthfully, the buyer always accepts M and reports truthfully, and the buyer belief system is given by $\mu(H | M', \{m_s, I_s, p_s\}_{s < t}, N_t = 0) = 0$ for any mechanism $M' \neq M$.¹⁶ Since M is IC-IR, it is weakly optimal for all players to report truthfully. Thus, to show this is an equilibrium, it suffices to show that no seller cannot gain from proposing any $M' \neq M$.

At the node where the deviating mechanism M' is proposed, sellers of both types have their reporting strategy $\hat{\theta}$ if the buyer accepts the mechanism. The reporting strategy should be optimal given the buyer's subsequent reporting strategy which is rational under the belief system. Note that we are considering a specific belief system where $\mu(H | M', \{m_s, I_s, p_s\}_{s < t}, N_t = 0) = 0$ and $\mu(H | M', \{m_s, I_s, p_s\}_{s < t}, N_t = 0) = 1$. This belief system is consistent with Bayes updating with initial belief $\mu = 0$, so it is without loss to consider direct mechanisms to discuss the feasible payoff of sellers. Consider the same set of necessary conditions of IC-IR constraints as in Theorem 1

$$\Delta_{v,t}^H(T) \leq \lambda v I(v, t) - \int_v^v \lambda r(w, t) dw - \lambda v I(U, t) \quad \forall(v, t) \quad (\text{IC})$$

$$0 \geq p_U^L(T) \quad (\text{IR-0})$$

$$p_U^L(T) \geq \max(p_U^H(T), 0) \quad (\text{IC-S})$$

This immediately implies the low-type gets at most $p_U^L(T) \leq 0 \leq \pi_L$, so low type seller does not have strictly profitable deviation.

Now, consider the high-type seller. Denote M' grants ex-ante payoff π'_H to the high-type

¹⁶As before, we did not specify the buyer's mechanism participation strategy off-path, but we suppose the buyer takes some arbitrary best-response on any off-the-equilibrium history given the belief system.

seller. Because in any IC-IR direct mechanism $p_U^H(T) \leq p_U^L(T) \leq 0$, we must have:

$$\begin{aligned} \pi'_H &\leq \max_{M \in \mathcal{M}} \mathbb{E} [\Delta_{v,\tau}^H(T) \mathbb{1}[\tau \leq T] \mid \theta = H] \\ \text{subject to } \Delta_{v,t}^H(T) &\leq \lambda v I(v, t) - \int_v^v \lambda r(w, t) dw - \lambda v I(U, t) \quad \forall (v, t) \end{aligned} \quad (\text{IC})$$

One can check this is exactly the same optimization problem in Theorem 1 for the case where $w_L = -1$. Thus, $\pi'_H \leq \pi_F$.

For the only-if direction, by the inscrutability principle Myerson (1983), any equilibrium can be reconstructed as a direct IC-IR mechanism where both types propose the same mechanism but report their type differently. It then follows that an equilibrium payoff pair must also be the payoff pair of some IC-IR mechanism. To see that the high-type seller must get at least the free-trial revenue, consider the free-trial described earlier in Section 4.1. For the second condition, if some equilibrium had $\pi_H < \pi_F$, then it follows that the free-trial is a profitable deviation for the high-type seller, a contradiction. \square

Proof of Lemma 5. We start by proving the last part of the lemma. In Theorem 1, we show that when $w_L = -1$, any IC-IR mechanism that maximizes $\pi_H - \pi_L$ must be a trial mechanism with trial length t_F and post-trial price v_F . From an ex-ante payoff (π_L, π_H) point of view, what remains undetermined is $p_U(T) = P_U^L(T) = P_U^H(T)$, because the ex-ante constraint is not necessarily binding when $w_L = -1$. Clearly, $p_U(T) \geq 0$ otherwise it violates the IR constraint of the low type. Also, $p_U(T) \leq \pi_L^D$ otherwise it violates the buyer's ex-ante IR constraint. This proves

$$\Pi_{D1} = \arg \max_{(\pi'_L, \pi'_H) \in \Pi_{\text{IC-IR}}} \pi_H - \pi_L.$$

The trial with length t_F , post trial v_F and ex-ante price π_L for the trial also gives a lower bound of $\Pi(\pi_L)$:

$$\Pi(\pi_L) \geq \pi_L + \Pi(0) \quad \forall \pi_L \in [0, \pi_L^D]$$

Because these trials maximize the difference $\pi_H - \pi_L$ among all IC-IR mechanisms, this bound has to be tight. \square

Proof of Lemma 6. To prove Lemma 6, it is sufficient to focus on a restricted class of deviating mechanisms: the trial mechanisms. Because in trial mechanism, the seller's report does not matter, the continuation equilibria of the mechanism reduces to rational responses of the buyer. Furthermore, the buyer's rational response upon receiving a Poisson signal in

the trial is essentially unique: procuring the post-trial service if and only if the price is less than the value. Thus, the choices for the buyer revolve around 1) whether to engage in the trial and 2) whether to acquire the post-trial service when no signal is received during the trial.

Consequently, we denote the strategy space as a finite set $\Sigma_{tr}^b = (B, B), (B, N), N$, where (B, B) implies purchasing the trial and the post-trial service even in the absence of signals, (B, N) implies purchasing the trial but not the post-trial service in the absence of signals, and N implies purchasing nothing. We define

$$\begin{aligned}\Sigma_{tr}(m, \mu) &= \{\sigma \in \Sigma_{tr}^b \mid \sigma \text{ is optimal with belief } \mu \text{ when the trial mechanism } m \text{ is proposed}\}, \\ \Sigma_{tr}(m, H, \pi_H) &= \{\sigma \mid \pi_H(\sigma) > \pi_H, \sigma \in \Sigma_{tr}(m, \mu) \text{ for some } \mu \in [0, 1]\}, \\ \Sigma_{tr}(m, L, \pi_L) &= \{\sigma \mid \pi_L(\sigma) \geq \pi_L, \sigma \in \Sigma_{tr}(m, \mu) \text{ for some } \mu \in [0, 1]\}.\end{aligned}$$

$\Sigma_{tr}(m, H, \pi_H)$ denotes the set of the buyer's rational response which strictly increases the high-type seller's payoff (relative to the equilibrium payoff). $\Sigma_{tr}(m, L, \pi_L)$ denotes the set of the buyer's rational response which weakly increases the low-type seller's payoff.

We discuss two cases. First, for any equilibrium with equilibrium payoff (π_L, π_H) such that $\pi_L > \pi_L^D$. Recall there is a trial mechanism that achieves $(\pi_L, \Pi(\pi_L))$, which sells the trial with length t_0 at a price π_L and sells the post-trial service at a price $v_0(T - t_0)$. We know from the comparative analysis that $t_0 > t_F$. Now consider the deviation to a trial mechanism m' that is very close to this mechanism. The deviation sells the trial with length $t_0 - \varepsilon$ at a price $\pi_L - \varepsilon^2$ and sells the post-trial service at a price $v_0(T - t_0 + \varepsilon)$ for some ε sufficiently small.

Under the deviating trial mechanism, if the buyer's response is N , then seller of both types get $0 < \pi_L \leq \pi_H$, so both types get worse off and $N \notin (\Sigma_{tr}(m, H, \pi_H) \cup \Sigma_{tr}(m, L, \pi_L))$. If the buyer's response is (B, B) , then seller of both types get $\pi_L + v_0(T - t_0 + \varepsilon) > \pi_H \geq \pi_L$, so both types get better off and $(B, B) \in (\Sigma_{tr}(m, H, \pi_H) \cap \Sigma_{tr}(m, L, \pi_L))$. Lastly, if the buyer's response is (B, N) , then low type seller gets $\pi_L - \varepsilon^2 < \pi_L$, while the high type seller gets

$$\pi_L - \varepsilon^2 + (1 - e^{-\lambda(t_0 - \varepsilon)})(T - t_0 + \varepsilon)\mathbb{P}(v > v_0)v_0.$$

In contrast,

$$\Pi(\pi_L) = \pi_L + (1 - e^{-\lambda t_0})(T - t_0)\mathbb{P}(v > v_0)(v_0).$$

Because the function $(T - t)(1 - \exp(-\lambda t))$ is a strictly concave function maximized at

t_F and $t_0 > t_F$, the high-type seller gets better off. Thus, $(B, N) \in \Sigma_{tr}(m, H, \pi_H)$ but $(B, N) \notin \Sigma_{tr}(m, L, \pi_L)$. Because for any $\mu = \mu_0$, $(B, N) \in \Sigma_{tr}(m, \mu_0)$ so we have proved

$$\Sigma_{tr}(m, H, \pi_H) \supsetneq \Sigma_{tr}(m, L, \pi_L).$$

In addition, note that $\Sigma_{tr}(m, 1) \subseteq \{(B, N), (B, B)\}$ so $\pi_H(\sigma) > \pi_H$ for any $\sigma \in \Sigma_{tr}(m, 1)$. These two points prove that (π_L, π_H) obviously does not survive D1 Criterion.

Second, for any equilibrium with equilibrium payoff (π_L, π_H) such that $\pi_H < \Pi(\pi_L)$. Recall there is a trial mechanism that achieves $(\pi_L, \Pi(\pi_L))$, which sells the trial with length t_F at a price π_L and sells the post-trial service at a price $v_F(T - t_F)$. Now consider the deviation to a trial mechanism m that is very close to this mechanism. The deviation sells the trial with length t_F at a price $\pi_L - \varepsilon$ and sells the post-trial service at a price $v_F(T - t_0)$ for some ε sufficiently small.

We can use the same argument as above to show $\Sigma_{tr}(m, H, \pi_H) \supsetneq \Sigma_{tr}(m, L, \pi_L)$. There is one little difference at the corner case where $\pi_L = 0$: $N \notin \Sigma_{tr}(m, \mu)$ for any μ . It is also clear that $\Sigma_{tr}(m, 1) \subseteq \{(B, N), (B, B)\}$ so $\pi_H(\sigma) > \pi_H$ for any $\sigma \in \Sigma_{tr}(m, 1)$. These two points prove that (π_L, π_H) does not survive D1 Criterion. \square

Proof of Lemma 7. We prove by contradiction, suppose there exists a $\pi_L \in [0, \pi_L^D]$ such that $(\pi_L, \Pi(\pi_L))$ does not “obviously survive D1 criterion”. Then there exists a deviating mechanism m , a belief μ and a continuation equilibrium $\sigma \in \Sigma(m, \mu)$ such that

$$\pi_H(m, \mu) > \Pi(\pi_L), \quad \pi_L(m, \mu) \leq \pi_L.$$

This implies $E(\pi_L) > \Pi(\pi_L)$ where $E(\pi_L)$ is the solution of the following problem

$$\begin{aligned} E(\pi_L) &= \max_{q, p_U^\theta(T), \{\Delta_{v,t}^\theta\}} p_U^H(T) + \mathbb{E} [\Delta_{v,\tau}^H \mid \theta = H] \\ \text{s.t.} \quad \Delta_{v,t}^H(t) &\leq vI(v, t) - \int_v^v r(w, t)dw - vI(U, t) \quad \forall t, v \\ \mu p_U^H(T) + (1 - \mu)p_U^L(T) &\leq \mu I(U, 0) + \mu \mathbb{E} [v(I(v, \tau) - I(U, \tau)) - \Delta_{v,\tau} \mid \theta = H], \\ p_U^H(T) &\leq p_U^L(T) \leq \pi_L. \end{aligned}$$

In this problem, we solve for the relaxed IC-IR mechanism that maximizes the high-quality seller subject to the additional constraint that the buyer believes the seller is of high quality with probability μ , and we require the payoff to the lower-quality seller to be bounded by

π_L . Denote the solution to the above problem as m^* . Clearly,

$$\mathbb{E} [\Delta_{v,\tau}^H \mid \theta = H] |_{m^*} = E^*(\pi_L)_{m^*} - p_U^H(T) |_{m^*} > \Pi(\pi_L) - \pi_L. \quad (14)$$

On the other hand, from our previous analysis in Lemma 5 we know there is a trial mechanism that achieves $(\pi_L, \Pi(\pi_L))$ and solves

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{q,p} \quad & -p_U^L(T) + p_U^H(T) + \mathbb{E} [\Delta_{v,\tau}^H \mid \theta = H] \\ \text{subject to} \quad & \text{IC, IR} \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, our analysis in () has shown that when $w_L = -1$, the ex-ante IR constraint can be neglected and $p_U^H(T) = p_U^L(T)$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi(\pi_L) - \pi_L &= \max_{q, p_U^\theta(T), \{\Delta_{v,t}^\theta\}} \mathbb{E} [\Delta_{v,\tau}^H \mid \theta = H] \\ \text{s.t.} \quad \Delta_{v,t}^H(t) &\leq vI(v, t) - \int_v^v r(w, t)dw - \underline{v}I(U, t) \quad \forall t, v. \end{aligned}$$

Note that m^* is a feasible solution to this relaxed problem so

$$\mathbb{E} [\Delta_{v,\tau}^H \mid \theta = H] |_{m^*} \leq \Pi(\pi_L) - \pi_L.$$

This contradicts the inequality 14. Thus, we proved that any equilibrium payoff $(\pi_L, \pi_H) \in \Pi_{D_1}$ obviously survives D1 Criterion. \square

Proof of Proposition 11. Recall that the payoff at point H is (π_L^H, π_H^H) . First, we prove that for any equilibrium with payoff $(\pi_L, \pi_H) \in \Pi$ such that $\pi_L > \pi_L^H$, the equilibrium does not survive Intuitive Criterion. To see this, recall the trial mechanism corresponding to point H leads to a payoff pair (π_L^H, π_H^H) . Now consider the deviation to a trial mechanism m'' that is very close to point H trial mechanism. It sells the trial with length t_H at a price π_L^H and sells the remaining service at a price $(v_H + \varepsilon)(T - t_H)$. Under the deviation mechanism m'' , because the post-trial rate $v_H + \varepsilon > 1$ the buyer who never receives the signal would not purchase the post-trial service regardless of the belief of θ . Thus, the low type seller gets at most $\pi_L^H < \pi_L$. In contrast, if the buyer believes $\theta = 1$ then for sufficiently small ε , the buyer would be willing to purchase the trial and purchase the post-trial service if $v > v_H + \varepsilon$. Thus, the high type gets a payoff that is close to $\pi_H^H > \Pi(\pi_L) \geq \pi_H$ (this comes from the uniqueness of the payoff as in). In conclusion, the payoff (π_L, π_H) does not survive Intuitive Criterion.

Second, we prove that for any equilibrium with payoff $(\pi_L, \pi_H) \in \Pi$ such that $\pi_L \in (\pi_L^D, \pi_L^H]$, the equilibrium does not survive Intuitive Criterion. To see this, recall there is a trial mechanism that achieves $(\pi_L, \Pi(\pi_L))$, which sells the trial with length t_0 at a price π_L and sells the post-trial service at a price $v_0(T - t_0)$. We know from the comparative analysis that $t_0 > t_F$ and $v_0 \geq v_H$. Now consider the deviation to a trial mechanism m' that is very close to this mechanism. The deviation sells the trial with length $t_0 - \varepsilon$ at a price $\pi_L - \varepsilon^2$ and sells the post-trial service at a price $(v_0 + \varepsilon^2)(T - t_0)$ for some ε sufficiently small. Under the deviation mechanism m' , because the post-trial rate $v_0 + \varepsilon^2 > 1$ the buyer who never receives the signal would not purchase the post-trial service regardless of the belief of θ . Thus, the low type seller gets at most $\pi_L - \varepsilon^2 < \pi_L$. However, if the buyer believes $\theta = 1$, the high type gets

$$\pi_L - \varepsilon^2 + (1 - e^{-\lambda(t_0 - \varepsilon)})(T - t_0 + \varepsilon)\mathbb{P}(v > v_0 + \varepsilon^2)(v_0 + \varepsilon^2).$$

In contrast,

$$\Pi(\pi_L) = \pi_L + (1 - e^{-\lambda t_0})(T - t_0)\mathbb{P}(v > v_0)(v_0).$$

Because the function $(T - t)(1 - \exp(-\lambda t))$ is a strictly concave function maximized at t_F , the deviation leads to an increase of the high type's payoff.

Now for $\pi_L \in [0, \pi_L^D]$, one can easily show any equilibrium payoff (π_L, π_H) such that $\pi_L < \Pi(\pi_L)$ does not survive Intuitive Criterion by using a deviation that modifies the trial mechanism that achieves $(\pi_L, \Pi(\pi_L))$.

To complete the proof, we finally argue any equilibrium payoff $(\pi_L, \pi_H) \in \Pi_{D_1}$ survives Intuitive Criterion. We prove by contradiction, suppose not, then there exists a deviation mechanism $m = (I, p)$ such that

- For any $\mu \in [0, 1]$ and any $\sigma \in \Sigma(m, \mu)$, $\pi_L(\sigma) < \pi_L$.
- For any $\sigma \in \Sigma(m, 1)$, $\pi_H(\sigma) > \pi_H$.

In particular, there exists $\sigma \in \Sigma(m, 1)$ such that $\pi_L(\sigma) < \pi_L$ and $\pi_H(\sigma) > \pi_H$. This means $E^*(\pi_L) > \Pi(\pi_L)$, where $E^*(\pi_L)$ is defined as the solution of the following optimization

problem:

$$\begin{aligned}
E^*(\pi_L) &= \max_{q, p_U^\theta(T), \{\Delta_{v,t}^\theta\}} p_U^H(T) + \mathbb{E} [\Delta_{v,\tau}^H \mid \theta = H] \\
\text{s.t.} \quad \Delta_{v,t}^H(t) &\leq vI(v, t) - \int_{\underline{v}}^v r(w, t)dw - \underline{v}I(U, t) \quad \forall t, v \\
p_U^H(T) &\leq I(U, 0) + \mathbb{E} [v(I(v, \tau) - I(U, \tau)) - \Delta_{v,\tau} \mid \theta = H], \\
p_U^H(T) &\leq p_U^L(T) \leq \pi_L.
\end{aligned}$$

In this problem, we solve for the relaxed IC-IR mechanism that maximizes the high-quality seller subject to the additional constraint that the buyer believes the seller is of high quality, and we require the payoff to the lower-quality seller to be bounded by π_L .

Denote the solution to the above problem as m^* . Clearly,

$$\mathbb{E} [\Delta_{v,\tau}^H \mid \theta = H] |_{m^*} = E^*(\pi_L)_{m^*} - p_U^H(T) |_{m^*} > \Pi(\pi_L) - \pi_L. \quad (15)$$

On the other hand, from our previous analysis in Lemma 5 we know there is a trial mechanism that achieves $(\pi_L, \Pi(\pi_L))$ and solves

$$\begin{aligned}
\max_{q, p} \quad &- p_U^L(T) + p_U^H(T) + \mathbb{E} [\Delta_{v,\tau}^H \mid \theta = H] \\
&\text{subject to IC, IR}
\end{aligned}$$

Moreover, our analysis in () has shown that when $w_L = -1$, the ex-ante IR constraint can be neglected and $p_U^H(T) = p_U^L(T)$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}
\Pi(\pi_L) - \pi_L &= \max_{q, p_U^\theta(T), \{\Delta_{v,t}^\theta\}} \mathbb{E} [\Delta_{v,\tau}^H \mid \theta = H] \\
\text{s.t.} \quad \Delta_{v,t}^H(t) &\leq vI(v, t) - \int_{\underline{v}}^v r(w, t)dw - \underline{v}I(U, t) \quad \forall t, v.
\end{aligned}$$

Note that m^* is a feasible solution to this relaxed problem so

$$\mathbb{E} [\Delta_{v,\tau}^H \mid \theta = H] |_{m^*} \leq \Pi(\pi_L) - \pi_L.$$

This contradicts the inequality 15. Thus, we proved that any equilibrium payoff $(\pi_L, \pi_H) \in \Pi_{D_1}$ survives Intuitive Criterion. \square

B.3 Omitted Proof for Section 6

Proof of Theorem 2. Even in the general framework, we can still apply the exact same argument as in the proof of Theorem 1 to consider the following relaxed problem.

$$\begin{aligned}
& \max_{M \in \mathcal{M}} \{w_L p_U^L(T) + p_U^H(T) + \mathbb{E} [\Delta_{v,\tau}^H(T) \mathbb{1}[\tau \leq T] \mid \theta = H]\} \\
\text{subject to } & \Delta_{v,t}^H(T) \leq \lambda v q(v, t) - \int_v^v \lambda r(w, t) dw - \lambda v q(U, t) \quad \forall (v, t) \\
& \mu_0 (\lambda q(U, 0) + \mathbb{E} [\lambda v (q(v, \tau) - q(U, \tau)) - \Delta_{v,\tau}^H(T) \mid \theta = H]) \\
& \geq \mu_0 p_U^H(T) + (1 - \mu_0) p_U^L(T) \\
& p_U^L(T) \geq \max(p_U^H(T), 0)
\end{aligned}$$

where $q(w, t)$ and $q(U, t)$ and $r(w, t)$ are defined as

$$\begin{aligned}
q(w, t) &:= \int_t^T q_{w,t}^H(s) ds, \\
q(U, t) &:= \int_t^T q_U^H(s) ds, \\
r(w, t) &:= \max\{q(w, t), q(U, t)\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Then, following the same trick as in Theorem 1 we reduce the problem to:

$$\max_{M \in \mathcal{M}} \{(w_L + 1) \mu_0 \lambda q(U, 0) + \lambda \pi_0 \mathbb{E}[(T - \tau - q(U, \tau)) \mathbb{1}[\tau \leq T] \mid \theta = H]\}$$

Denote $\mu_L = (w_L + 1) \mu_0 / \pi_0$. The above problem is equivalent to

$$\max_{M \in \mathcal{M}} \{\mu_L q(U, 0) + \mathbb{E}[(T - \tau - q(U, \tau)) \mathbb{1}[\tau \leq T] \mid \theta = H]\}$$

Now, we use the fact that τ given I_U is distributed according to density $\lambda I_U^H(t) e^{-\int_0^t \lambda I_U^H(s) ds}$. Plugging this in, the problem is

$$\max_{I, q} \int_0^T \mu_L q_U^H(t) dt + \int_0^T \left(\int_t^T 1 - q_U^H(s) ds \right) \lambda I_U^H(t) e^{-\int_0^t \lambda I_U^H(s) ds} dt$$

To simplify the notation we neglect the subscript H and simply use $I_U(t)$ and $q_U(t)$. We

change the variable to reformulate the problem as an optimal control. Define

$$I(t) = \int_0^t I_U(s)ds$$

$$Q(t) = \int_0^t q_U(s)ds$$

We rewrite the objective function in its equivalent form:

$$\int_0^T (T - t + Q(t) - Q(T))e^{-\lambda I(t)} \lambda I_U(t) dt + \mu_L Q(T)$$

$$= \int_0^T (T - t + Q(t))e^{-\lambda I(t)} \lambda I_U(t) dt + (e^{-\lambda I(T)} - 1 + \mu_L)Q(T)$$

Denote $Conv(\mathcal{D})$ as the convex hull of the choice set \mathcal{D} . We first consider a relaxed control problem where (I, q) can be chosen within $Conv(\mathcal{D})$. Denote the set of measurable controls as

$$\mathcal{U}_{ad} = \{(I_U(\cdot), q_U(\cdot)) \mid (I_U(t), q_U(t)) \in Conv(\mathcal{D}) \forall t, I_U(t), q_U(t) \text{ are measurable w.r.t. } t\}.$$

The control problem is

$$\max_{(I_U(\cdot), q_U(\cdot)) \in \mathcal{U}_{ad}} \int_0^T (T - t + Q(t))e^{-\lambda I(t)} \lambda I_U(t) dt + (e^{-\lambda I(T)} - 1 + \mu_L)Q(T)$$

$$\dot{I}(t) = I_U(t)$$

$$\dot{Q}(t) = q_U(t)$$

$$Q(0) = I(0) = 0,$$

$$(I_U(t), q_U(t)) \in \mathcal{D}.$$

Define the contingent set $X(I, Q, t)$ as follow:

$$X(I, Q, t) = \{(\zeta, \eta) \in \mathcal{R} \times \mathcal{R}^2 \mid \zeta \geq (T - t + Q)e^{-\lambda I} \lambda I_U, \eta = (I_U, q_U) \text{ for some } (I_U, q_U) \in \mathcal{D}\}$$

Note that the function

$$(T - t + Q)e^{-\lambda I} \lambda I_U$$

is linear in (I_U, q_U) and has bounded derivatives with respect to (I, Q) . As a correspondence, $X(I, Q, t)$ is closed convex valued, and it is upper and lower hemicontinuous in (I, Q) , so

$X(I, Q, t)$ has the weak Cesari property. One can apply Theorem 4.2.4 in Ahmed & Wang (2021) to show that there exists an optimal control.

Further, for any optimal control $(I_U^*(t), q_U^*(t))$ and the corresponding state functions $(I^*(t), Q^*(t))$, Theorem 5.2.3 in Ahmed & Wang (2021) ensures there exists absolute continuous functions $\rho_I(t)$ and $\rho_Q(t)$ such that

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{\rho}_Q(t) &= -e^{-\lambda I^*(t)} \lambda I_U^*(t) \\ \dot{\rho}_I(t) &= (T - t + Q(t)) e^{-\lambda I^*(t)} \lambda^2 I_U^*(t) \\ (I_U^*(t), q_U^*(t)) &\in \arg \max_{(I, q) \in \text{Conv}(\mathcal{D})} \left((T - t + Q^*(t)) \lambda e^{-\lambda I^*(t)} + \rho_I(t) \right) I + \rho_Q(t) q, \text{ a.e.} \\ \rho_I(T) &= -\lambda Q^*(T) e^{-I^*(T)}, \\ \rho_Q(T) &= e^{-\lambda I^*(T)} - 1 + \mu_L.\end{aligned}$$

Define

$$A_I(t) = (T - t + Q^*(t)) \lambda e^{-\lambda I^*(t)} + \rho_I(t).$$

For any optimal control $(I_U^*(t), q_U^*(t))$ and the corresponding $(I^*(t), Q^*(t))$ and $\rho_I(t), \rho_Q(t)$, we can always find an essentially the same control $(I_U^*(t), q_U^*(t))$ such that the optimality condition holds for any t instead of *a.e.* t . Thus, without loss, we assume the optimality condition holds for any t .

Now we try to derive some properties of the optimal solution from this set of necessary conditions. Note that

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\partial A_I}{\partial t}(t) &= (q_U^*(t) - 1) \lambda e^{-\lambda I^*(t)} \leq 0, \\ A_I(T) &= 0, \\ \rho_Q(t) &= \mu_L - 1 + e^{-\lambda I^*(t)}.\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, $A_I(t)$ is weakly decreasing in t and is weakly positive. ρ_Q is decreasing and $\rho_Q(0) = \mu_L \geq 0$. We discuss two scenarios.

When $\mu_L \geq 1 - e^{-\lambda T}$. In this case we know $\rho_Q(t) \geq \rho_Q(T) \geq 0$. In fact, for any $t < T$ $\rho_Q(t) > 0$. Because $(1, 1) \in \mathcal{D}$, for any $t < T$ we must have

$$(I_U^*(t), q_U^*(t)) = \begin{cases} (1, 1) & \text{if } A_I(t) > 0, \\ (I, 1) \in \text{Conv}(\mathcal{D}) & \text{if } A_I(t) = 0. \end{cases}$$

Because $q_U^*(t) = 1$ for any $t < T$, the objective value is simply $\mu_L T$.

When $\mu_L < 1 - e^{-\lambda T}$. We already know $A_I(t)$ is weakly decreasing and weakly positive. Now we claim $A_I(0) > 0$ for any system associated with optimal control.

Suppose not, then $A_I(t) = 0$ for any t , so $q_U^*(t) = 1$ for almost all t . This leads to an objective value of $\mu_L T$. However, by simply using a trial mechanism the objective can be higher than $\mu_L T$ when $\mu_L < 1 - e^{-\lambda T}$. This is a contradiction. Thus, for any optimal control, we know the associated $A_I(t)$ must have $A_I(0) > 0$.

Denote $t_0 = \min\{t \in [0, T] | A_I(t) = 0\} > 0$. We argue $t_0 = T$. Suppose $t_0 < T$, then there exists $\delta > 0$ such that $q_U^*(t) < 1, A_I(t) > 0$ for a.e. $t \in (t_0 - \delta, t_0)$; and $q_U^*(t) = 1, A_I(t) = 0$ for a.e. $t \in (t_0, T]$. From $q_U^*(t) = 1, A_I(t) = 0$ for a.e. $t \in (t_0, T]$ we know $\rho_Q(t) \geq 0$ for a.e. $t \in (t_0, T]$. From monotonicity of $\rho_Q(t)$ we know $\rho_Q(t) \geq 0$ for any $t \in (t_0 - \delta, T]$. On the other hand, from $q_U^*(t) < 1, A_I(t) > 0$ for a.e. $t \in (t_0 - \delta, t_0)$ we know $\rho_Q(t) \leq 0$ for a.e. $t \in (t_0 - \delta, t_0]$ otherwise $q_U^*(t)$ would be 1. These two inequalities imply $\rho_Q(t) = 0$ for any $t \in (t_0 - \delta, t_0]$, which further implies $I_U^*(t) = 1$ for a.e. $t \in (t_0 - \delta, t_0]$. However, this means $\rho_Q(t)$ is strictly decreasing in $t \in (t_0 - \delta, t_0]$, a contradiction.

We have proved $A_I(t) > 0$ for any $t < T$. Now denote $t_1 = \max\{t \in [0, T] | q_U^*(s) = 1, a.e. s \in [0, t]\} < T$. First, we first prove $\rho_Q(t) < 0$ for any $t > t_1$. Suppose it is not true, then combing with the definition of t_1 we know there exists $\delta > 0$ such that $q_U^*(t) < 1, \rho_Q(t) \geq 0, a.e. t \in [t_1, t_1 + \delta]$. However, this implies $I_U^*(t) = 1 a.e. t \in [t_1, t_1 + \delta]$ and so $\rho_Q(t)$ is strictly decreasing in $[t_1, t_1 + \delta]$, a contradiction. Second, we prove $q_U^*(t) < 1 a.e. \forall t > t_1$. Suppose not, then there exists t_2 and δ such that $q_U^*(t) = 1 a.e. t \in [t_2 - \delta, t_2]$. Because $A_I(t) > 0$ we know $I_U^*(t) = 1 a.e. t \in [t_2 - \delta, t_2]$. Thus we know for a $t_3 \in [t_1, t_1 + \delta]$, the following holds:

$$\begin{aligned} (q_U^*(t_3) - 1)\rho_Q(t_3) + (I_U^*(t_3) - 1)A_I(t_3) &\geq 0 \\ (q_U^*(t_2) - 1)\rho_Q(t_2) + (I_U^*(t_2) - 1)A_I(t_2) &\leq 0 \end{aligned}$$

However, both $\rho_Q(t)$ and $A_I(t)$ is decreasing and q_U^* is strictly decreasing over $[t_2 - \delta, t_2]$. This leads to a contradiction.

In summary, we have proved the following facts.

- When $t \leq t_1, I_U^*(t) = q_U^*(t) = 1$ a.e..
- When $t > t_1, q_U^*(t) < 1$ a.e. so $A_I(t)$ is strictly decreasing in t .
- When $t > t_1, A_I(t) > 0$ and $\rho_Q(t) < 0$.

Because the indifference curve of the linear optimization problem

$$\max_{(I,q) \in \mathcal{D}} \left((T - t + Q^*(t)) \lambda e^{-\lambda I^*(t)} + \rho_I(t) \right) I + \rho_Q(t) q$$

is $A_I(t)/\rho_Q(t)$. When $t > t_1$, we know

- $A_I(t)/\rho_Q(t)$ is negative and continuous,
- The absolute value $|A_I(t)/\rho_Q(t)|$ is strictly decreasing,
- $A_I(T)/\rho_Q(T) = 0$.

Thus, we know as t ranges from t_1 to T , the optimal control $(I_U^*(t), q_U^*(t))$ moves along the boundary of $Conv(\mathcal{D})$:

$$\partial^+ Conv(\mathcal{D}) = \{(I, q) \in Conv(\mathcal{D}) | I \geq I', \forall (I', q) \in Conv(\mathcal{D})\}.$$

Because the slope of the indifference curve $|A_I(t)/\rho_Q(t)|$ is strictly decreasing, for almost all t , the control is at the extreme point:

$$(I_U^*(t), q_U^*(t)) \in \partial^+ Conv(\mathcal{D}) \cap \mathcal{D} \text{ a.e. } t \in [0, T].$$

Thus, any optimal control of the relaxed control problem (with the control set $Conv(\mathcal{D})$) is also feasible with the control set \mathcal{D} .

For the comparative result, first notice that $v(w_L)$ has the same expression as in theorem 1 (the same proof). To prove the comparative analysis for $\gamma(w_L, t)$, we point out that w_L only affects the system of Pontryagin equations via the end-point value of the costate $\rho_Q(T) = e^{-\lambda I^*(T)} - 1 + \mu_L$, and μ_L is increasing in w_L . Thus, as w_L increases, the coefficient on the quality $\rho_Q(t)$ is also smaller. \square

B.4 Omitted Proof for Section 7

Proof of Proposition 7. We consider a similar relaxed problem as follows

$$\begin{aligned}
& \max_{I,p,\Delta} (1 + w_L)(p_U(T) - cI(U, 0)) + w_L \mathbb{E} [\Delta_{v,\tau} + cI(U, \tau) - cI(v, \tau) \mid S = L] \\
& \quad + \mathbb{E} [\Delta_{v,\tau} + cI(U, \tau) - cI(v, \tau) \mid S = H] \\
& \quad \text{s.t.} \\
& \quad \Delta_{v,t} \leq (u + \lambda v)I(v, t) - \lambda \int_v^v r(w, t)dw - (u + \lambda v)I(U, t) \quad \forall t, v \\
& \quad p_U(T) \leq \mu_L(u + \lambda)I(U, 0) + \mu_L \mathbb{E} [(u + \lambda v) (I(v, \tau) - I(U, \tau)) - \Delta_{v,\tau} \mid \theta = H].
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$r(w, t) = \max\{I(U, t), I(w, t)\}.$$

Note that the objective function can be rewritten as

$$(1 + w_L)(p_U(T) - cI(U, 0)) + (w_L \mu_L + \mu_G) \mathbb{E} [\Delta_{v,\tau} + cI(U, \tau) - cI(v, \tau) \mid \theta = H]$$

It is without loss of generality to assume the ex-ante IR constraint binds. Plugging it in, the objective becomes:

$$\begin{aligned}
& (1 + w_L)(\mu_0(u + \lambda)I(U, 0) + \mu_0 \mathbb{E} [(u + \lambda v) (I(v, \tau) - I(U, \tau)) - \Delta_{v,\tau} \mid \theta = H] - cI(U, 0)) \\
& \quad + (w_L \mu_L + \mu_G) \mathbb{E} [\Delta_{v,\tau} + cI(U, \tau) - cI(v, \tau) \mid \theta = H] \\
& = (1 + w_L)(\mu_0(u + \lambda)I(U, 0) + \mu_0 \mathbb{E} [(u + \lambda v) (I(v, \tau) - I(U, \tau)) \mid \theta = H] - cI(U, 0)) \\
& \quad + \mathbb{E} [(\mu_G - \mu_0 - w_L(\mu_0 - \mu_L))\Delta_{v,\tau} + (w_L \mu_L + \mu_G)(I(U, \tau) - I(v, \tau))c \mid \theta = H]
\end{aligned}$$

Because we focus on $w_L \leq p_B/p_G$ we have

$$\mu_G - \mu_0 - w_L(\mu_0 - \mu_L) \geq 0$$

Thus, we plug in the IC constraint and get

$$\begin{aligned}
& (1 + w_L)(\mu_0(u + \lambda)I(U, 0) + \mu_0 \mathbb{E} [(u + \lambda v) (I(v, \tau) - I(U, \tau)) \mid \theta = H] - cI(U, 0)) \\
& \quad + \mathbb{E} [(w_L \mu_L + \mu_G)(I(U, \tau) - I(v, \tau))c \mid \theta = H] + (\mu_G - \mu_0 - w_L(\mu_0 - \mu_L)) \\
& \quad \mathbb{E} \left[(u + \lambda v)I(v, \tau) - \lambda \int_v^v r(w, \tau)dw - (u + \lambda v)I(U, \tau) \mid \theta = H \right]
\end{aligned}$$

Rearranging terms we get

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} [(\mu_G + w_L \mu_L)(u + \lambda v - c)I(v, \tau) - (\mu_G + w_L \mu_L)(u - c)I(U, \tau) \mid \theta = 1] \\
& - \mathbb{E} [(\lambda(\mu_G - \mu_0 - w_L(\mu_0 - \mu_L))v + \lambda\mu_0(1 + w_L))I(U, \tau) \mid \theta = 1] \\
& - \lambda(\mu_G - \mu_0 - w_L(\mu_0 - \mu_L))\mathbb{E} \left[\int_{\underline{v}}^v r(w, \tau)dw \mid \theta = H \right] \\
& + (1 + w_L)(\mu_0(u + \lambda) - c)I(U, 0).
\end{aligned}$$

Now we fix the design of $I(U, t)$ and do point-wise maximization with respect to $I(v, t)$. To do so, denote

$$b_1 = \mu_G - \mu_0 - w_L(\mu_0 - \mu_L), \quad b_2 = \mu_G + w_L \mu_L$$

Now note that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} \left[(u + \lambda v - c)I(v, \tau) - \frac{\lambda b_1}{b_2} \int_{\underline{v}}^v r(w, \tau)dw \mid \theta = 1 \right] \\
& = \mathbb{E} \left[(u + \lambda v - c)I(v, \tau) - \frac{\lambda b_1}{b_2} \frac{1 - F(v)}{f(v)} r(v) \mid \theta = 1 \right]
\end{aligned}$$

Denote v_c such that $u + \lambda v_c = c$ and define the virtual value as

$$\phi(v) = u + \lambda v - c - \frac{\lambda b_1}{b_2} \frac{1 - F(v)}{f(v)}$$

Denote v_0 such that $\phi(v_0) = 0$. The point-wise maximization leads to

$$I(v, t) = \begin{cases} T - t & \text{if } v \in [v_0, \bar{v}] \\ I(U, t) & \text{if } v \in [v_c, v_0) > 0, \\ 0 & \text{if } v \in [\underline{v}, v_c) < 0. \end{cases}$$

Denote the virtual surplus π_v and π_w as

$$\begin{aligned}
\pi_v &= \int_{v_0}^{\bar{v}} \phi(v) f(v) dv, \\
\pi_w &= \int_{\underline{v}}^{v_c} (u + \lambda v - c) f(v) dv.
\end{aligned}$$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned}
\pi_v + \int_v^{v_0} \phi(v)f(v)dv &= \int_v^{\bar{v}} (u + \lambda v - c)f(v) - \frac{\lambda b_1}{b_2}(1 - F(v))dv \\
&= u + \lambda - c - \frac{\lambda b_1}{b_2} \left(\int_v^{\bar{v}} (1 - F(v))dv \right) \\
&= u + \lambda - c - \frac{\lambda b_1}{b_2} (1 - v)
\end{aligned}$$

Plugging in the point-wise maximization, the objective function becomes

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E} \left[b_2 \pi_v (T - \tau) + b_2 \left(-\pi_w + (u + \lambda - c - \frac{\lambda b_1}{b_2} (1 - v) - \pi_v) - (u - c) \right) I(U, \tau) \mid \theta = 1 \right] \\
&\quad - \mathbb{E} \left[(\lambda b_1 v + \lambda \mu_0 (1 + w_L)) I(U, \tau) \mid \theta = 1 \right] + (1 + w_L) (\mu_0 (u + \lambda) - c) I(U, 0) \\
&= \mathbb{E} [b_2 \pi_v (T - \tau) - b_2 (\pi_v + \pi_w) I(U, \tau) \mid \theta = 1] + (1 + w_L) (\mu_0 (u + \lambda) - c) I(U, 0)
\end{aligned}$$

Denote

$$\begin{aligned}
b_3 &= \frac{(1 + w_L) (\mu_0 (u + \lambda) - c)}{b_2 (\pi_v + \pi_w)} = \frac{(1 + w_L) (\mu_0 (u + \lambda) - c)}{(\pi_v + \pi_w) (\mu_G + w_L \mu_L)} \\
b_4 &= \frac{\pi_v}{\pi_v + \pi_w}.
\end{aligned}$$

The remaining work is essentially adopting the proof of Lemma 8. We neglect some of the detailed explanations and only list the main calculation. When $b_4 < 0$, then the optimal solution is clearly to set $I_U(t) = 1$ always (a degenerate trial length). Otherwise, denote $U(t) = I_U(t)$ and $X(t) = \int_0^t I_U(s) ds$. We have the following optimal control problem:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\max_{U \in \mathcal{U}_{ad}} \left\{ \int_0^T (b_4 (T - t) - (X(T) - X(t))) e^{-\lambda X(t)} \lambda U(t) dt + b_3 X(T) \right\} \\
&\text{subject to } \dot{X}(t) = U(t) \in [0, 1], \quad X(0) = 0, \quad X(T) \text{ free}
\end{aligned}$$

First, rearrange the objective:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_0^T (b_4 (T - t) - (X(T) - X(t))) e^{-\lambda X(t)} \lambda U(t) dt + b_3 X(T) \\
&= \int_0^T (b_4 (T - t) + X(t)) e^{-\lambda X(t)} \lambda U(t) dt - X(T) (1 - e^{-\lambda X(T)}) + b_3 X(T)
\end{aligned}$$

For any optimal measurable control U, X , there exists a costate variable ρ such that

$$\begin{aligned}
U(t) & \begin{cases} = 1 & J(t) > 0 \\ \in [0, 1] & J(t) = 0 \\ = 0 & J(t) < 0 \end{cases} \\
J(t) & = \lambda(b_4(T-t) + X(t))e^{-\lambda X(t)} - \rho(t) \\
\dot{\rho}(t) & = -(\lambda(b_4(T-t) + X(t)) - 1)\lambda e^{-\lambda X(t)}U(t) \\
\rho(T) & = 1 - b_3 + (\lambda X(T) - 1)e^{-\lambda X(T)}
\end{aligned}$$

Taking derivatives we get

$$\dot{J}(t) = -\lambda b_4 e^{-\lambda X(t)}$$

since (10) cancels the other terms. Note that this implies that J is always strictly decreasing; since X is continuous, \dot{J} is continuous. Therefore, the optimal control $U(t)$ features bang-bang control. Namely, there exists a time t_0 such that $U(t) = 1$ for $t < t_0$ and $U(t) = 0$ for $t > t_0$. Given this optimal mechanism for the relaxed problem. It is straightforward to verify it satisfies all the omitted IC constraints so it is indeed the optimal IC-IR mechanism. \square

Proof of Proposition 8. For any IC-IR mechanism (I, p) denote μ_t as the buyer's of $\theta = H$ at time t if no bad news ever arrived. By definition

$$\mu_t = \frac{\mu_0}{\mu_0 + (1 - \mu_0)e^{-\lambda(I(U, T) - I(U, t))}}, \quad \text{where } I(U, t) = \int_t^T I_U(s) ds.$$

Denote $I(t) = \int_t^T I_t(s) ds$. The relaxed design problem with linear Pareto weight is

$$\begin{aligned}
& \max_{I, p_U(T), \{\Delta_t\}} (1 + w_L)p_U(T) + w_L \mathbb{E}[\Delta_\tau | \theta = 0] \\
& \text{s.t.} \\
& (u - \lambda l)I(t) - \Delta_t \geq 0 \quad \forall t, \\
& uI(U, t) + (1 - \mu_t)\mathbb{E}[-\lambda l I(U, t) + (u - \lambda l)(I(\tau) - I(U, \tau)) - \Delta_\tau \mid \theta = 0, \tau > t] \\
& \geq (u - \lambda(1 - \mu_t)l)I(t) - \Delta_t, \quad \forall t, \\
& p_U(T) \leq uI(U, 0) + (1 - \mu_0)\mathbb{E}[-\lambda l I(U, 0) + (u - \lambda l)(I(\tau) - I(U, \tau)) - \Delta_\tau \mid \theta = 0].
\end{aligned}$$

The first constraint requires the agent who receives the signal at time t does not want to

quit. The second constraint requires that the uninformed buyer does not want to pretend to receive a signal at time t . The third constraint is the ex-ante IR constraint.

Because $w_L \geq -1$, the ex-ante IR constraint should bind so

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{I, \{\Delta_t\}} \quad & u(1 + w_L)I(U, 0) + (1 - \mu_0)(1 + w_L)\mathbb{E}[-\lambda I(U, 0) + (u - \lambda)(I(\tau) - I(U, \tau)) \mid \theta = 0] \\ & - (1 - \mu_0(1 + w_L))\mathbb{E}[\Delta_\tau \mid \theta = 0] \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \\ & (u - \lambda)I(t) - \Delta_t \geq 0 \quad \forall t, \\ & uI(U, t) + (1 - \mu_t)\mathbb{E}[-\lambda I(U, t) + (u - \lambda)(I(\tau) - I(U, \tau)) - \Delta_\tau \mid \theta = 0, \tau > t] \\ & \geq (u - \lambda(1 - \mu_t)l)I(t) - \Delta_t, \quad \forall t. \end{aligned}$$

Because $\lambda l > u > (1 - \mu_0)\lambda l$, and $\mu_t \geq \mu_0$ for any t , it is clearly optimal to set $I(t) = 0$ for any t , as it increases the objective and relaxes the constraint. Now the design problem can be simplified as

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{I, \{\Delta_t\}} \quad & u(1 + w_L)I(U, 0) + (1 - \mu_0)(1 + w_L)\mathbb{E}[-\lambda I(U, 0) - (u - \lambda)I(U, \tau) \mid \theta = 0] \\ & - (1 - \mu_0(1 + w_L))\mathbb{E}[\Delta_\tau \mid \theta = 0] \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \Delta_t \leq 0 \quad \forall t, \\ & uI(U, t) + (1 - \mu_t)\mathbb{E}[-\lambda I(U, t) - (u - \lambda)I(U, \tau) - \Delta_\tau \mid \theta = 0, \tau > t] \geq -\Delta_t, \quad \forall t. \end{aligned}$$

We discuss two cases. First, if $w_L \geq (1 - \mu_0)/\mu_0$, the coefficient of Δ_τ is negative. Clearly, it is optimal to set $\Delta_t = 0$ and set $I(U, t) = T - t$. The optimal mechanism is just to sell everything ex-ante.

Second, if $w_L < (1 - \mu_0)/\mu_0$, the coefficient of Δ_τ is positive. Note that from the two constraint, we get $\Delta_T = 0$. We keep $\Delta_T = 0$ and neglect all constraints such that $\Delta_t \leq 0$. For any fixed measurable control $I_U(t)$, the fixed function $I(U, t)$ is absolute continuous in t . Note $\Delta_T = 0$ and denote

$$\Gamma(-\Delta_t) = uI(U, t) + (1 - \mu_t)\mathbb{E}[-\lambda I(U, t) - (u - \lambda)I(U, \tau) - \Delta_\tau \mid \theta = 0, \tau > t].$$

Γ is clearly increasing in $-\Delta_t$, so according to Grönwall's inequality, the point-wise minimum feasible Δ_t is the one such that equality always holds:

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\int_t^\tau (u - \lambda(1 - \theta))I_U(t)ds - \Delta_\tau \mid \tau > t\right] = -\Delta_t, \quad \forall t.$$

The above integration equation has a unique solution. One can easily verify that the solution is

$$-\Delta_t = \int_t^T (u - \lambda l(1 - \mu_s)) I_U(s) ds.$$

To see this, plugging in the candidate solution to the equation we get

$$\begin{aligned} -\Delta_t - \mathbb{E}[-\Delta_\tau \mid \tau > t] &= \mathbb{E}\left[\int_t^\tau (u - \lambda l(1 - \mu_s)) I_U(s) ds \mid \tau > t\right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}\left[\int_t^\tau 1_{s \leq \tau} (u - \lambda l(1 - \mu_s)) I_U(s) ds \mid \tau > t\right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}\left[\int_t^\tau 1_{s \leq \tau} (u - \lambda l(1 - \theta)) I_U(s) ds \mid \tau > t\right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}\left[\int_t^\tau (u - \lambda l(1 - \theta)) I_U(s) ds \mid \tau > t\right] \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we prove the candidate solution is indeed the unique solution. Plug this into the objective we have an unconstrained maximization problem

$$\max_I (1 + w_L) \mathbb{E}\left[\int_0^\tau (u - \lambda l(1 - \mu_s)) I_U(s) ds\right] + (1 - \mu_0(1 + w_L)) \mathbb{E}\left[\int_\tau^T (u - \lambda l(1 - \mu_s)) I_U(s) ds\right].$$

Clearly, it is optimal to set $I_U(t) = 1$ for any t . Given this optimal mechanism for the relaxed problem. It is straightforward to verify it satisfies all the omitted IC constraints so it is indeed the optimal IC-IR mechanism. □

Proof of Proposition 9. We consider a relaxed design problem as follows

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{I, p_U(T), \{\Delta_t\}} & (1 + w_L) p_U(T) + \mathbb{E}[\Delta_\tau^{\bar{v}} + w_L \Delta_\tau^v] \\ \text{s.t.} & \\ & \lambda \bar{v} I(\bar{v}, t) - \Delta_t^{\bar{v}} \geq \lambda \bar{v} I(U, t), \quad \forall t, \\ & \lambda \bar{v} I(\bar{v}, t) - \Delta_t^{\bar{v}} - \lambda \bar{v} I(U, t) \geq \lambda \bar{v} I(\bar{v}, s) - \Delta_s^{\bar{v}} - \lambda \bar{v} I(U, s), \quad \forall t < s, \\ & \lambda I(U, t) + \mathbb{E}[\lambda(\mu_0 \bar{v} I(\bar{v}, \tau) + (1 - \mu_0) v I(v, \tau) - I(U, \tau)) - \mu_0 \Delta_\tau^{\bar{v}} - (1 - \mu_0) \Delta_\tau^v \mid \tau > t] \\ & \geq \lambda I(v, t) - \Delta_t^v, \quad \forall t, \\ & p_U(T) \leq \lambda I(U, 0) + \mathbb{E}[\lambda(\mu_0 \bar{v} I(\bar{v}, \tau) + (1 - \mu_0) v I(v, \tau) - I(U, \tau)) - \mu_0 \Delta_\tau^{\bar{v}} - (1 - \mu_0) \Delta_\tau^v]. \end{aligned}$$

The second constraint is the new constraint which ensures the buyer who receives the high signal at time t does not want to delay the report to a later time $s > t$. The third constraint is the old one which requires the uninformed buyer does not want to deviate to report the arrival of a low signal. We can plug in the second line into the third line and get a relaxed expression

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\lambda(\mu_0 \bar{v}(I(\bar{v}, t) - I(U, t)) + (1 - \mu_0)v(I(v, \tau) - I(U, \tau))) - \mu_0 \Delta_t^{\bar{v}} - (1 - \mu_0) \Delta_\tau^v \mid \tau > t] \\ + \lambda I(U, t) \geq \lambda I(v, t) - \Delta_t^v, \quad \forall t, \end{aligned}$$

We use this new relaxed constraint to replace the second and third constraints. It is also clear the ex-ante IR constraint must bind so the objective becomes:

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda(1 + w_L) \left(I(U, 0) + \mathbb{E}[\mu_0 \bar{v} I(\bar{v}, \tau) + (1 - \mu_0)v I(v, \tau) - I(U, \tau)] \right) \\ + \mathbb{E}[(1 - \mu_0(1 + w_L))(\Delta_\tau^{\bar{v}} - \Delta_\tau^v)] \end{aligned}$$

As we focus on the case where $w_L \leq (1 - \mu_0)/\mu_0$, the coefficient for $\Delta_t^{\bar{v}}$ is positive while coefficient for Δ_t^v is negative. Because increasing $I(\bar{v}, t)$ strictly increases the objective and relaxes all constraints (recall the second constraint is replaced by the new constraint), it is optimal to set $I(\bar{v}, t) = T - t$. Also, because decreasing $I(v, t)$ strictly increases the objective and relaxes all constraints, it is optimal to set $I(v, t) = 0$.

In conclusion, the design problem reduces to

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{I, \{\Delta_t^v\}} \lambda(1 + w_L) \left(I(U, 0) + \mathbb{E}[\mu_0 \bar{v}(T - \tau) - I(U, \tau)] \right) + \mathbb{E}[(1 - \mu_0(1 + w_L))(\Delta_\tau^{\bar{v}} - \Delta_\tau^v)] \\ \text{s.t.} \\ \lambda \bar{v}(T - t) - \Delta_t^{\bar{v}} \geq \lambda \bar{v} I(U, t), \quad \forall t, \\ \mu_0(\lambda \bar{v}(T - t - I(U, t)) - \Delta_t^{\bar{v}}) - \mathbb{E}[\lambda(1 - \mu_0)v I(U, \tau) + (1 - \mu_0) \Delta_\tau^v \mid \tau > t] \\ + \lambda I(U, t) \geq -\Delta_t^v, \quad \forall t, \end{aligned}$$

Note $\Delta_T^v = 0$ and denote

$$\Gamma(-\Delta_t^v) = \mu_0(\lambda \bar{v}(T - t - I(U, t)) - \Delta_t^{\bar{v}}) - (1 - \mu_0) \mathbb{E}[\lambda v I(U, \tau) + \Delta_\tau^v \mid \tau > t] + \lambda I(U, t)$$

Γ is clearly increasing in $-\Delta_t^v$, so according to Grönwall's inequality, the point-wise minimum

feasible Δ_t^v is the one such that equality always holds:

$$-\Delta_t^v = \lambda I(U, t) + \mu_0(\lambda \bar{v}(T - t - I(U, t)) - \Delta_t^{\bar{v}}) - (1 - \mu_0) \int_t^T (\lambda v I(U, \tau) + \Delta_\tau^v) f(\tau|t) d\tau$$

where $f(s|t) = \lambda I_U(s) e^{-\lambda(I(U, t) - I(U, s))}$ is the conditional density of the arrival time. Take derivative on both sides give us

$$\begin{aligned} -\dot{\Delta}_t^v &= -\lambda I_U(t) + \mu_0(\lambda \bar{v}(I_U(t) - 1) - \dot{\Delta}_t^{\bar{v}}) + \lambda I_U(t)(1 - \mu_0)(\lambda v I(U, t) + \Delta_t^v) \\ &\quad - \lambda I_U(t)(\Delta_t^v + \lambda I(U, t) + \mu_0(\lambda \bar{v}(T - t - I(U, t)) - \Delta_t^{\bar{v}})) \\ \dot{\Delta}_t^v &= \lambda I_U(t)(1 + \lambda \mu_0 \bar{v}(T - t) - \mu_0 \Delta_t^{\bar{v}} + \mu_0 \Delta_t^v) - \mu_0(\lambda \bar{v}(I_U(t) - 1) - \dot{\Delta}_t^{\bar{v}}) \\ \Delta_t^v &= - \int_t^T (\lambda I_U(s)(1 + \lambda \mu_0 \bar{v}(T - s)) - \lambda \mu_0 \bar{v}(I_U(s) - 1)) e^{-\mu_0 \lambda(I(U, t) - I(U, s))} ds \\ &\quad + \int_t^T \mu_0(\lambda I_U(s) \Delta_s^{\bar{v}} - \dot{\Delta}_s^{\bar{v}}) e^{-\mu_0 \lambda(I(U, t) - I(U, s))} ds \\ &= \mu_0 \Delta_t^{\bar{v}} - \int_t^T (\lambda I_U(s)(1 + \lambda \mu_0 \bar{v}(T - s)) - \lambda \mu_0 \bar{v}(I_U(s) - 1)) e^{-\mu_0 \lambda(I(U, t) - I(U, s))} ds \end{aligned}$$

Plug this equation back to the objective and focus on the parameter of $\Delta_t^{\bar{v}}$ we have

$$(1 - \mu(1 + w_L))(1 - \mu_0) \mathbb{E}[\Delta_\tau^v]$$

Thus, the objective is strictly increasing in Δ_t^v so the only remaining constraint is also binding:

$$\lambda \bar{v}(T - t) - \Delta_t^{\bar{v}} = \lambda \bar{v} I(U, t), \quad \forall t.$$

With this equation, we know

$$\begin{aligned} -\Delta_t^v &= \lambda I(U, t) - (1 - \mu_0) \mathbb{E}[\lambda v I(U, \tau) + \Delta_\tau^v \mid \tau > t] \\ -\dot{\Delta}_t^v &= -\lambda I_U(t) + \lambda I_U(t)(1 - \mu_0)(\lambda v I(U, t) + \Delta_t^v) - \lambda I_U(t)(\Delta_t^v + \lambda I(U, t)) \\ \dot{\Delta}_t^v &= \lambda I_U(t)(1 + \mu_0 \lambda \bar{v} I(U, t) + \mu_0 \Delta_t^v) \\ \Delta_t^v &= - \int_t^T \lambda I_U(s)(1 + \mu_0 \lambda \bar{v} I(U, s)) e^{-\mu_0 \lambda(I(U, t) - I(U, s))} ds. \end{aligned}$$

Plug in this expression in the objective we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\max_I & \lambda(1 + w_L) \left(I(U, 0) + \mathbb{E}[\mu_0 \bar{v}(T - \tau) - I(U, \tau)] \right) + (1 - \mu_0(1 + w_L)) \mathbb{E}[\lambda \bar{v}(T - \tau - I(U, \tau))] \\
& + (1 - \mu_0(1 + w_L)) \mathbb{E} \left[\int_{\tau}^T \lambda I_U(s) (1 + \mu_0 \lambda \bar{v} I(U, s)) e^{-\mu_0 \lambda (I(U, \tau) - I(U, s))} ds \right] \\
\Leftrightarrow \max_I & \lambda(1 + w_L) I(U, 0) + \lambda \mathbb{E}[\bar{v}(T - \tau - (1 + (1 - \mu_0)(1 + w_L)) I(U, \tau))] \\
& + (1 - \mu_0(1 + w_L)) \mathbb{E} \left[(1 + \mu_0 \lambda \bar{v} I(U, \tau)) \frac{e^{\lambda(1 - \mu_0)(I(U, 0) - I(U, \tau))} - 1}{1 - \mu_0} \right]
\end{aligned}$$

The second line can be expressed as

$$\begin{aligned}
& (1 - \mu_0(1 + w_L)) \int_0^T (1 + \mu_0 \lambda \bar{v} I(U, \tau)) \frac{e^{\lambda(1 - \mu_0)(I(U, 0) - I(U, \tau))} - 1}{1 - \mu_0} \lambda I_U(\tau) e^{-\lambda(I(U, 0) - I(U, \tau))} d\tau \\
= & (1 - \mu_0(1 + w_L)) \int_0^{I(U, 0)} (1 + \mu_0 \lambda \bar{v} I(U, \tau)) \frac{e^{\lambda(1 - \mu_0)(I(U, 0) - I(U, \tau))} - 1}{1 - \mu_0} \lambda e^{-\lambda(I(U, 0) - I(U, \tau))} dI(U, \tau)
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, the second line is just a function of $I(U, 0)$ and does not depend on any other $I(U, t)$ for $t > 0$. Similarly, the only term in the first line that does depend on $I(U, t)$ is

$$\lambda \bar{v} \int_0^T (T - \tau) \lambda I_U(\tau) e^{-\lambda(I(U, 0) - I(U, \tau))} d\tau.$$

For any fixed $I(U, 0)$ it is optimal to minimize $I(U, t)$ so it is optimal to frontload access $I_U(t)$ as much as possible so that a trial $I_U(t) = 1_{t \leq t_0}$ is optimal. Given this optimal mechanism for the relaxed problem. It is straightforward to verify it satisfies all the omitted IC constraints so it is indeed the optimal IC-IR mechanism. □

Proof of Proposition 10. Once again, focus first on the relaxed problem. Since there is discounting now, we let $p_U, p_{v,t}$ functions denote the time-zero *discounted* cumulative flow payments. We consider the same problem relaxation, and the same logic as Theorem 1 implies

that $p_U^L(\infty) = p_U^H(\infty)$, so the problem is

$$\max_{q,p} w_L p_U(\infty) + \mathbb{E} [p_\tau(v, \infty) \mathbb{1}[\tau \leq T] + p_U(\infty) \mathbb{1}[\tau > T] \mid \theta = H] \quad (16)$$

$$\text{s.t. } \int_t^\infty e^{-r(x-t)} \lambda v I_{v,t}(x) dx - e^{rt} (p_{v,t}(\infty) - p_U(t)) \geq \int_t^\infty e^{-r(x-t)} \lambda v I_U(x) dx - e^{rt} (p_U(\infty) - p_U(t)) \quad \forall t, \quad (17)$$

$$\int_t^\infty e^{-r(x-t)} \lambda v I_{v,t}(x) dx - e^{rt} (p_{v,t}(\infty) - p_U(t)) \geq \int_t^\infty e^{-r(x-t)} \lambda v I_{v',t}(x) dx - e^{rt} (p_{v',t}(\infty) - p_U(t)) \quad (18)$$

$$\mu_0 \int_0^\infty e^{-rs} \lambda I_U(s) ds + \mu_0 \mathbb{E} \left[\int_\tau^\infty e^{-rs} \lambda v (I_\tau(s) - I_U(s)) ds - \Delta_{v,\tau} \mid \theta = H \right] - p_U(0) \geq 0. \quad (19)$$

The only difference is we now have discounting here, and the horizon is taken to be infinite. Once again, define $\Delta_{v,t} = p_{v,t}(\infty) - p_U(\infty)$, and set $\Delta_{\cdot,\infty} = 0$, so that Δ_t is well-defined for any realization t of τ . We change the problem into these price variables as before. The objective can be rewritten:

$$\begin{aligned} & w_L p_U(\infty) + \mathbb{E} [p_\tau(\infty) \mathbb{1}[\tau \leq \infty] + p_U(\infty) \mathbb{1}[\tau > \infty] \mid \theta = H] \\ &= (w_L + 1) p_U(\infty) + \mathbb{E} [(p_\tau(\infty) - p_U(\infty)) \mathbb{1}[\tau \leq \infty] \mid \theta = H] \\ &= (w_L + 1) p_U(\infty) + \mathbb{E} [\Delta_{v,\tau} \mid \theta = H] \end{aligned}$$

Define

$$u(v, t) = \int_t^\infty e^{-rx} \lambda v I_{v,t}(x) dx - p_{v,t}(\infty)$$

and the discounted cumulative intensities

$$I(v, t) = \int_t^\infty e^{-rx} I_{v,t}(x) dx,$$

$$I(U, t) = \int_t^\infty e^{-rx} I_U(x) dx$$

We can apply the envelope theorem to (18), and we get

$$\begin{aligned} u(v, t) &= u(v, t) + \int_v^v \lambda I(w, t) dw \\ &\geq \int_v^v \lambda I(w, t) dw + \lambda v I(U, t) - p_U(\infty) \end{aligned}$$

Again, (17) gives

$$u(v, t) \geq \int_v^v \lambda I(U, t) \, dw + \lambda v I(U, t) - p_U(\infty)$$

Combining,

$$u(v, t) \geq \int_v^v \lambda \max(I(U, t), I(w, t)) \, dw + \lambda v I(U, t) - p_U(\infty)$$

which can be rewritten

$$\Delta_{v,t} \leq \lambda v I(v, t) - \int_v^v \lambda \max(I(U, t), I(w, t)) \, dw - \lambda v I(U, t)$$

Once again, it is straightforward to see that the IR constraint must bind; otherwise, we could increase $p_U(\infty)$ and do better on the objective. So we can plug $p_U(\infty)$ into the objective, and the objective becomes

$$\begin{aligned} & \lambda \mu_0(w_L + 1) I(U, 0) + \mu_0(w_L + 1) \mathbb{E} [\lambda v (I(v, \tau) - I(U, \tau)) - \Delta_{v,\tau} | \theta = H] + \mathbb{E} [\Delta_\tau | \theta = H] \\ &= \lambda \mu_0(w_L + 1) I(U, 0) + \mu_0(w_L + 1) \mathbb{E} [\lambda v (I(v, \tau) - I(U, \tau)) | \theta = H] + (1 - \mu_0(w_L + 1)) \mathbb{E} [\Delta_{v,\tau} | \theta = H] \end{aligned}$$

Note that only the last term depends on Δ_t , and it is strictly increasing, so it is optimal to raise Δ_t to make the combined IC bind. So we can again reduce the optimization problem to

$$\max_I \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \lambda \mu_0(w_L + 1) I(U, 0) + \mu_0(w_L + 1) \mathbb{E} [\lambda v (I(v, \tau) - I(U, \tau)) | \theta = H] \\ + (1 - \mu_0(w_L + 1)) \mathbb{E} \left[\lambda v I(v, t) - \int_v^v \lambda \max(I(U, t), I(w, t)) \, dw - \lambda v I(U, t) \mid \theta = H \right] \end{array} \right\}.$$

Or equivalently,

$$\max_{M \in \mathcal{M}} \left\{ \mu_0(w_L + 1) \lambda I(U, 0) + \mathbb{E} \left[\begin{pmatrix} \lambda v I(v, \tau) - (1 - \mu_0(w_L + 1)) \frac{1 - F(v)}{f(v)} \lambda r(v, \tau) \\ -\lambda \mu_0(w_L + 1) v I(U, \tau) - (1 - \mu_0(w_L + 1)) \lambda v I(U, \tau) \end{pmatrix} \mathbb{1}[\tau \leq T] \mid \theta = H \right] \right\}$$

As before, pointwise maximization of $I(v, \tau)$ dictates that

$$I_{v,t}(s) = \begin{cases} 1 & v \geq v_0 \\ I_U(s) & v < v_0 \end{cases}$$

where

$$v_0 = (1 - \mu_0(w_L + 1)) \frac{1 - F(v_0)}{f(v_0)}$$

Plugging in, we find that the expectation term becomes

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\lambda \left(\mu_0(w_L + 1) \int_{v_0}^{\bar{v}} v f(v) \, dv + v_0(1 - F(v_0))(1 - \mu_0(w_L + 1)) \right) (T - \tau - I(U, \tau)) \right]$$

Defining

$$\pi_0 = \mu_0(w_L + 1) \int_{v_0}^{\bar{v}} v f(v) \, dv + v_0(1 - F(v_0))(1 - \mu_0(w_L + 1))$$

as before, we have that π_0 is still the expected virtual surplus. So the problem becomes

$$\max_{M \in \mathcal{M}} \{ \mu_0(w_L + 1) \lambda I(U, 0) + \mathbb{E} [\lambda \pi_0 (T - \tau - I(U, \tau))] \}$$

Equivalently,

$$\max_{I_U} \left\{ \frac{\mu_0(w_L + 1)}{\pi_0} \int_0^\infty e^{-rs} \lambda I_U(s) \, ds + \mathbb{E} \left[\int_\tau^\infty e^{-rs} \lambda (1 - I_U(s)) \, ds \mid \theta = H \right] \right\}$$

Now, we use the fact that τ given I_U is distributed according to density $\lambda I_U(t) e^{-\int_0^t \lambda I_U(s) \, ds}$.

Plugging this in, the problem is

$$\max_I \int_0^\infty e^{-rt} \frac{\mu_0(w_L + 1)}{\pi_0} \lambda I_U(t) \, dt + \int_0^\infty \left(\int_t^\infty e^{-rs} \lambda (1 - I_U(s)) \, ds \right) \lambda I_U(t) e^{-\int_0^t \lambda I_U(s) \, ds} \, dt$$

We change the variable to reformulate the problem as an optimal control. Define the cumulative access

$$I(t) = \int_0^t \lambda I_U(s) \, ds$$

Note that $\dot{I}(t) = \lambda I_U(t)$. We rewrite the objective function in its equivalent form:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_0^\infty e^{-rt} \lambda \frac{\mu_0(w_L + 1)}{\pi_0} I_U(t) dt + \int_0^\infty \left(\int_t^\infty e^{-rs} \lambda (1 - I_U(s)) ds \right) \lambda I_U(t) e^{-\int_0^t \lambda I_U(s) ds} dt \\
&= \int_0^\infty e^{-rt} \frac{\mu_0(w_L + 1)}{\pi_0} \dot{I}(t) dt + \int_0^\infty \left(\int_t^\infty e^{-rs} \lambda (1 - I_U(s)) ds \right) \dot{I}(t) e^{-I(t)} dt \\
&= \int_0^\infty e^{-rt} \frac{\mu_0(w_L + 1)}{\pi_0} \dot{I}(t) dt + \int_0^\infty \left(\frac{\lambda}{r} e^{-rt} - \lambda \int_t^\infty e^{-rs} I_U(s) ds \right) \dot{I}(t) e^{-I(t)} dt \\
&= \int_0^\infty e^{-rt} \dot{I}(t) \left(\frac{\mu_0(w_L + 1)}{\pi_0} + \frac{\lambda}{r} e^{-I(t)} \right) dt - \lambda \int_0^\infty \left(\int_t^\infty e^{-rs} I_U(s) ds \right) \dot{I}(t) e^{-I(t)} dt \\
&= \int_0^\infty e^{-rt} \dot{I}(t) \left(\frac{\mu_0(w_L + 1)}{\pi_0} + \frac{\lambda}{r} e^{-I(t)} \right) dt - \lambda \int_0^\infty \left(\int_0^s e^{-rs} I_U(s) \dot{I}(t) e^{-I(t)} dt \right) ds \\
&= \int_0^\infty e^{-rt} \dot{I}(t) \left(\frac{\mu_0(w_L + 1)}{\pi_0} + \frac{\lambda}{r} e^{-I(t)} \right) dt + \int_0^\infty \lambda e^{-rs} I_U(s) (e^{-I(s)} - 1) ds \\
&= \int_0^\infty e^{-rt} \dot{I}(t) \left(\frac{\mu_0(w_L + 1)}{\pi_0} + \frac{\lambda}{r} e^{-I(t)} \right) dt + \int_0^\infty e^{-rt} \dot{I}(t) (e^{-I(t)} - 1) dt \\
&= \int_0^\infty e^{-rt} \dot{I}(t) \left(\frac{\mu_0(w_L + 1)}{\pi_0} - 1 + \left(\frac{\lambda}{r} + 1 \right) e^{-I(t)} \right) dt
\end{aligned}$$

where in the fourth step, we changed the order of integration. All together, we have the control problem

$$\begin{aligned}
& \max_{I_U(t)} \int_0^\infty e^{-rt} \left(\left(\frac{\lambda}{r} + 1 \right) e^{-I(t)} + \frac{\mu_0(w_L + 1)}{\pi_0} - 1 \right) \lambda I_U(t) dt \quad (20) \\
& \text{subject to } \dot{I}(t) = \lambda I_U(t) \\
& I_U(t) \in [0, 1], \quad I(0) = 0, \quad I(T) \text{ free.}
\end{aligned}$$

Again for convenience, define $u = \lambda I_U$, as the control variable. According to the Pontryagin maximum principle, for any optimal solution $(I(t), u(t))$, there exists a piece-wise differen-

tiabile costate $\rho(t)$ such that the following holds:

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \dot{\rho}(t) = 0, \quad (21)$$

$$\dot{\rho}(t) = - \left(\frac{\lambda}{r} + 1 \right) e^{-I(t)} u(t), \quad (22)$$

$$\dot{I}(t) = u(t) \begin{cases} = \lambda & \text{if } J(t) > 0 \\ \in [0, \lambda] & \text{if } J(t) = 0 \\ = 0 & \text{if } J(t) < 0 \end{cases} \quad (23)$$

$$J(t) = \left(\frac{\lambda}{r} + 1 \right) e^{-I(t)} + \frac{\mu_0(w_L + 1)}{\pi_0} - 1 - \rho(t). \quad (24)$$

The difference is now we have a transversality condition, instead of a free end-time fixed point. By differentiating equation (24) (at wherever J is differentiable) and plugging in equation (22), we get

$$\dot{J}(t) = -\lambda e^{-I(t)} - u(t) \left(\frac{\lambda}{r} + 1 \right) e^{-I(t)} - \dot{\rho}(t),$$

$$\dot{J}(t) = -\lambda e^{-I(t)}.$$

Because ρ is piece-wise differentiable and so is J , for any t the right (left) derivative of J always exists and equals the right (left) limit of derivatives. Formally:

$$J^+(t) = \lim_{s \searrow t} \dot{J}(s), \quad J^-(t) = \lim_{s \nearrow t} \dot{J}(s).$$

From the continuity of $I(t)$, we know J is always differentiable and $\dot{J}(t) = -\lambda e^{-I(t)} < 0$. If $\frac{\mu_0(w_L+1)}{\pi_0} \geq 1$, it follows that in the limit $t \rightarrow \infty$, the limit of J is positive, and hence J is positive everywhere, so the mechanism sells the entire service ex ante.

Suppose $\frac{\mu_0(w_L+1)}{\pi_0} < 1$. We now argue there exists t_0 such that $J(t_0) = 0$. Suppose not; then either $J(t)$ is either always positive or always negative. If $J(t)$ is always positive, then according to equation (23), $u(t) = \lambda$ and $I(t) = \lambda t$. This implies

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} J(\infty) = \frac{\mu_0(w_L + 1)}{\pi_0} - 1 < 0.$$

This is a contradiction. Suppose $J(t)$ is always negative, then according to equation (23),

$u(t) = I(t) = 0$. This implies

$$\begin{aligned}\rho(t) &= \dot{\rho}(t) = 0, \\ J(0) &= \frac{\lambda}{r} + \frac{\mu_0(w_L + 1)}{\pi_0} > 0\end{aligned}$$

This is a contradiction.

Now because $J(t_0) = 0$ and $\dot{J}(t) < 0$, we know

$$J(t) \begin{cases} > 0, & \text{if } t < t_0, \\ < 0, & \text{if } t > t_0. \end{cases} \implies u(t) = \begin{cases} \lambda, & \text{if } t < t_0, \\ 0, & \text{if } t > t_0. \end{cases}$$

This implies $I(t) = \lambda \min\{t, t_0\}$. We also know $\rho(t) = 0$ for any $t > t_0$ and so $\rho(t_0) = 0$ from the continuity. Then we can check equation (24) at t_0 :

$$J(t_0) = \left(\frac{\lambda}{r} + 1\right) e^{-\lambda t_0} + \frac{\mu_0(w_L + 1)}{\pi_0} - 1 = 0.$$

This equation has a unique solution. In fact, we can analytically solve for t_0 in this case:

$$\begin{aligned}\left(\frac{\lambda}{r} + 1\right) e^{-\lambda t_0} + \frac{\mu_0(w_L + 1)}{\pi_0} - 1 &= 0 \\ \left(\frac{\lambda}{r} + 1\right) e^{-\lambda t_0} &= 1 - \frac{\mu_0(w_L + 1)}{\pi_0} \\ e^{-\lambda t_0} &= \frac{1 - \frac{\mu_0(w_L + 1)}{\pi_0}}{\frac{\lambda}{r} + 1} \\ -\lambda t_0 &= \ln\left(\frac{1 - \frac{\mu_0(w_L + 1)}{\pi_0}}{\frac{\lambda}{r} + 1}\right) \\ t_0 &= \frac{1}{\lambda} \ln\left(\frac{\frac{\lambda}{r} + 1}{1 - \frac{\mu_0(w_L + 1)}{\pi_0}}\right)\end{aligned}$$

To finish characterizing the optimal solution to our original design problem, we now construct the appropriate payment scheme. Consider

$$p_U(t) = \mu_0 \frac{\lambda}{r} (1 - e^{-rt_0}) + \frac{\lambda}{r} (\pi_0 - v_0(1 - F(v_0))) e^{-rt_0} (1 - e^{-\lambda t_0})$$

$$p_{v,t}(s) = p_U(t) + \frac{\lambda}{r} v_0 e^{-rt_0}$$

Once again, the payment scheme frontloads payment, so the IR needs to be checked only at

the initial time and the time of report. By the same arguments as before, IR and IC holds. Since the $I_U(t)$, $I_{v,t}(s)$ constructed maximizes the value of the relaxed problem, and we have just constructed a mechanism that is feasible in the original problem with all of the IC and IR constraints, it follows that this mechanism must be optimal. \square