

Competitive Information Disclosure with Heterogeneous Consumer Search*

Dongjin Hwang[†] Ilwoo Hwang[‡]

Seoul National University

April 8, 2025

Abstract

We study a model of competitive information design in an oligopoly search market with heterogeneous consumer search costs. A unique class of equilibria—upper-censorship equilibria—emerges under intense competition. In equilibrium, firms balance competitive pressure with local monopoly power granted by search frictions. Notably, firms disclose only partial information even as the number of firms approaches infinity. The maximal informativeness of equilibrium decreases under first-order shifts in the search cost distribution, but varies non-monotonically under mean-preserving spreads. The model converges to the full-disclosure benchmark as search frictions vanish, and to the no-disclosure benchmark as search costs become homogeneous.

Keywords: consumer search, information design, heterogeneous search costs, upper-censorship, prior-independent comparative statics

JEL Code: D21, D39, D43, D83, L13, L15, M37

*We thank Dan Bernhardt, Dongkyu Chang, Andy Bongjune Choi, Theo Durandard, Seung-Hyun Hong, Myeong-geon Koh, Youngwoo Koh, Jinwoo Kim, Kyungmin (Teddy) Kim, Mingeon Kim, Chanjoo Lee, Jorge Lemus, Keeyoung Rhee, Lena Song, Can Urgan and the seminar participants of Seoul National University and University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign for various helpful and constructive comments. This research was supported by the BK21 FOUR funded by the Ministry of Education and NRF of Korea.

[†]Department of Economics, Seoul National University; djsteve@snu.ac.kr (first author)

[‡]Department of Economics, Seoul National University; ilwoo.hwang@snu.ac.kr (corresponding author)

1 Introduction

Consumers actively navigate markets to make informed purchase decisions. However, the information they encounter about products is rarely exogenous. Rather, it is strategically curated by firms through channels such as advertisements, product reviews, and free trials. By controlling information content, firms shape consumers’ perceptions and influence their decisions, ultimately aiming to maximize their chances of being chosen over competitors.

In many markets, consumers inherently differ in their ability or willingness to search due to factors such as technological proficiency, market experience, time constraints, or cognitive capacity.¹ These differences critically affect consumers’ willingness to explore available options. Since firms cannot observe individual consumers’ search costs, they must design their information disclosure strategies in response to the overall distribution of search costs while accounting for competitive pressures. These observations raise key questions: To what extent does competition encourage information disclosure in the presence of heterogeneous search frictions? How is equilibrium informativeness tied to the distribution of search costs, and how do firms’ incentives change as this distribution varies?

To address these questions, we study a model of competitive information disclosure in an oligopoly search market with n horizontally differentiated firms. Consumers differ in their search costs, represented by a continuous distribution H . They are initially uninformed of their match values for firms’ products, which are independently drawn from a common distribution F . Firms strategically commit to signal structures that convey information about these match values. Importantly, consumers must incur a search cost to randomly explore an unvisited firm, after which they observe *both* the firm’s signal structure and the realized signal. Search is with perfect recall.

As in traditional search models, consumers follow reservation value strategies: stopping their search when the posterior mean of the firm-specific match value exceeds their reservation value and continuing otherwise. If consumers have explored all firms, they purchase from the firm with the highest posterior mean. This behavior creates two opposing incentives for firms. On one hand, competition drives firms to disclose more information to increase the likelihood of being revisited after consumers explore all firms. On the other hand, search frictions provide firms with local monopoly power, incentivizing them to pool information just above the reservation value

¹The heterogeneity of consumer search costs is well-documented across various markets, including mutual funds markets (Hortaçsu & Syverson, 2004), e-commerce (De los Santos, 2018) local gasoline markets (Nishida & Remer, 2018), mortgage market (Allen et al., 2014; 2019), or the trade-waste market (Salz, 2022).

to deter further search. In the absence of search frictions, competitive pressure dominates, leading firms to fully disclose information as the market becomes more competitive—resembling the classical Bertrand outcome (Hwang et al., 2023). By contrast, if search costs are identical for all consumers, the hold-up problem prevails, yielding no disclosure as the unique equilibrium (Au & Whitmeyer, 2024), reminiscent of the Diamond paradox (Diamond, 1971).

Our first main result demonstrates that heterogeneous search costs yield equilibrium with *partial information disclosure*. Specifically, firms use an “upper-censorship” strategy U_a : all match values above the censorship threshold a are pooled into a single atom, while values below a are fully revealed. Notably, these upper-censorship strategies persist as an equilibrium even in the limit of intense competition (i.e., $n \rightarrow \infty$).

This equilibrium structure arises from firms’ attempts to balance competitive pressure with search frictions. Firms exploit their local monopoly power by concealing information at the top, while yielding to competitive forces at the bottom. In this equilibrium, consumers’ reservation values are dispersed over an interval $[\underline{r}, \bar{r}]$. Given this, firms strategically choose the censorship threshold so that the pooled signal precisely matches the highest reservation value, prompting immediate purchase by all consumer types. Typically, the censorship threshold a falls below the lowest reservation value \underline{r} , prompting all consumer types to continue searching. As the market becomes essentially frictionless for signals below \underline{r} , competitive forces dominate, leading to full disclosure.

We establish that a continuum of upper-censorship equilibria exists—always including equilibrium with no disclosure—and it constitutes the unique class of equilibria in the intense-competition limit. All equilibria are ranked by (Blackwell) informativeness, i.e., those with higher censorship thresholds are more informative. We focus on the equilibrium with the highest censorship threshold, which we call the *maximally informative equilibrium*.² This equilibrium not only maximizes information disclosure, but is also socially efficient and consumer-optimal.

To characterize the maximally informative equilibrium, we introduce a simple measure based on the distribution of search costs H : maximal informativeness strictly increases with the minimum average density of H , defined as $\min_c(H(c)/c)$. Roughly speaking, this measure is high when search costs are evenly distributed. To understand intuition, suppose that H is uneven and concentrated at a specific point. Then firms can profitably deviate by targeting only high-cost consumers

²While this is the maximally informative upper-censorship equilibrium, it becomes the maximally informative equilibrium overall in the limit of intense competition.

(those at or above the concentrated point), since losing low-cost consumers has minimal impact due to the distribution’s imbalance.

Using this insight, we establish our second main result, which examines how changes in H affect equilibrium informativeness. We analyze two dimensions: (1) shifts in the overall level of search costs (first-order stochastically dominating shifts) and (2) changes in search cost heterogeneity (second-order shifts). Not surprisingly, maximal equilibrium informativeness decreases with first-order shifts, as higher search costs increase firms’ incentives to exploit local monopoly power.

More intriguingly, we find that equilibrium informativeness is non-monotonic with respect to mean-preserving spreads (MPS). This result stems from the observation that informativeness increases with the “evenness” of the distribution. Clearly, the impact of an MPS shift on the evenness is non-monotonic. For instance, if H is concentrated around midpoints (i.e. has a quasi-concave density), a mean-preserving spread makes the distribution more even. However, if H is already polarized (i.e. has a quasi-convex density), a mean-preserving spread leads to a more uneven distribution.

Lastly, we establish convergence results to the benchmark cases and discuss extensions. As H approaches the frictionless case, the maximally informative equilibrium converges to full disclosure. Conversely, when H approaches the homogeneous search friction case, no disclosure emerges as the unique equilibrium. Additionally, we show that our main results remain qualitatively robust for small markets (n finite) under mild assumptions about the match value distribution F and the search cost distribution H .

1.1 Related Literature

We contribute to the growing body of literature on competitive information design. Incorporating heterogeneous search costs, we bridge the two well-studied extremes—markets with no search friction (Ivanov, 2013; Au and Kawai, 2020; Hwang et al., 2023) and homogeneous search friction (Au & Whitmeyer, 2023; He & Li, 2023). Our work is among the first to explore the role of heterogeneous search costs in firms’ information disclosure incentives.³ We offer a complete char-

³An independent concurrent work of Boleslavsky and Krasteva (2023) considers a model where firms compete in both information and prices, adopting the binary search cost framework of Stahl (1989) and focusing on the duopoly case ($n = 2$) with uniformly distributed match values. In contrast, we study an information disclosure game with a fixed price, allow for arbitrary distributions for match values and search costs, and primarily focus on the case of a large number of firms. In Section C, we provide a partial generalization of their result beyond the uniform prior and

acterization of equilibrium in the limit of intense competition, which entails partial information disclosure balancing competitive forces and search frictions.⁴ Moreover, we establish a continuity result, demonstrating that the maximally informative equilibrium converges to full information (resp. no information) as the cost distribution H approaches the no-friction case (resp. the homogeneous friction case).⁵

Au and Whitmeyer (2023) consider a setting with homogeneous search costs where consumers can observe information structures before searching and direct their search accordingly. They show that firms commit to some level of information disclosure to improve their ranking in the search order. This ‘attraction motive’ disappears when information structures are not observable prior to searching (Au & Whitmeyer, 2024) or when search is random (He & Li, 2023). Our findings complement this literature by demonstrating that search cost heterogeneity alone can induce equilibrium information disclosure—even in the absence of attraction motives.

Our study also connects to the classical consumer search literature, highlighting how differences in the nature of competition—pricing versus disclosure—affect firms’ strategies. When consumers cannot direct their search based on prices, then market prices increases with higher search costs (Anderson & Renault, 1999; Moraga-González et al., 2017).⁶ While a similar intuition applies to information disclosure in increases of the search cost distribution, the relationship diverges when considering increased dispersion—in the sense of MPS—of the search cost distribution. An MPS in search costs generally decreases market prices, yet its effect on information disclosure is non-monotonic. The key distinction lies in the nature of competition. Information disclosure is inherently stochastic, allowing firms to differentiate purchase probability over consumer types, whereas a single uniform price is offered to all consumers.

Our comparative statics result relates to several recent papers that establish *prior-independent* comparative statics in information design (Curello & Sinander, 2024; Gitmez & Molavi, 2022; Kolotilin et al., 2022), extending this literature to settings where interim payoffs arise endogenously from strategic inter-

discuss how the two papers complement each other.

⁴In many single-sender information design problems, upper censorship distributions arise as the optimal information structure (e.g., Kolotilin et al. (2022) and Arieli et al. (2023)). Ours is the first to establish such a rule as an equilibrium with multiple senders.

⁵Partial convergence result to full information have also been established in Au and Whitmeyer (2023) as search cost vanishes. In the context of pricing, the seminal work of Stahl (1989) shows similar convergence to the Diamond paradox and Bertrand pricing.

⁶On the other hand, Choi et al. (2019) shows that when search can be directed based on observed prices, prices *decrease* with respect to search costs. In this case, the ‘attraction motive’ to be visited early becomes more prominent as consumers search less.

actions.⁷ While maximal informativeness of our equilibrium depends on the prior distribution, its response to shifts in the search cost distribution H remains prior-independent. We also introduce a simple graphical method to analyze these shifts.

Finally, we situate our work within the broader literature on information design (Dworczak & Martini, 2019; Kamenica & Gentzkow, 2011) in various search markets. Recent papers have explored related themes, such as the joint design of information and pricing by a platform (Dogan & Hu, 2022) or competing firms (Au & Whitmeyer, 2024; Boleslavsky & Krasteva, 2023), in Pandora’s problem to maximize inspections (Sato & Shirakawa, 2023), optimal disclosure for search goods (Choi et al., 2019; Lyu, 2023), information disclosure regarding common values under coordination (Board & Lu, 2018), and when information structure itself constitutes the product being sold (Mekonnen et al., 2023).

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 introduces the model. Section 3 provides preliminary analysis and establishes two benchmark cases. Section 4 characterizes the set of equilibria. Section 5 provides comparative static analyses of the maximally informative equilibrium under various shifts in H , along with convergence results to the benchmark cases. Section 6 discusses several extensions of the model. Section 7 concludes. The Appendix contains omitted proofs and detailed analysis of the model extensions.

2 Model

We consider a search market with n horizontally differentiated firms and a continuum of risk-neutral consumers with unit demand. Firms, indexed by i , are ex-ante identical. Each consumer’s match value v_i for firm i is independently and identically distributed across consumers and firms according to a distribution F on $[0,1]$. We assume that F is twice continuously differentiable, admits a positive density f , and that f and f' are bounded. Each firm earns a unit payoff if a consumer purchases its product and zero otherwise.

Consumers differ in their search cost c , which is independently and identically distributed according to a distribution H on $[\underline{c}, \bar{c}]$, where $\bar{c} > \underline{c} \geq 0$. By the exact law of large numbers (Sun, 2006), the distribution function $H(c)$ also represents the exact fraction of consumers whose search cost is no greater than c .⁸ We refer to a consumer with search cost c as a c -consumer here-

⁷Existing studies have primarily focused on identifying conditions under which, for arbitrary prior distributions, specific shifts in exogenously given interim payoff functions lead to a more (or not less) informative optimal signal structure.

⁸The exact law of large numbers ensures that aggregate consumer behavior corresponds to the distribution H ,

after. As is standard in the literature, we focus on the case where $\bar{c} < \mu := E_F[v_i]$, which ensures that all consumers search at least once. We assume H is twice continuously differentiable and admits a strictly positive density h , with at most finite many local extrema.⁹

Each firm i strategically provides information about the match value v_i . In doing so, they have full flexibility in choosing their information structure $\pi_i : [0, 1] \rightarrow \Delta(S_i)$. Consumers do not observe the match value v_i directly, but receive an informative signal $s_i \in S_i$ about v_i . Hence, the risk-neutral consumer's purchasing decision depends solely on the posterior mean of the consumer, $x_i = \mathbb{E}[v_i|s_i]$.

Each information structure (π_i, S_i) induces a distribution of posterior means G_i , which is a mean-preserving contraction (MPC) of the prior distribution F .¹⁰ It is well known that a distribution G_i of posterior means can be induced by some information structure if and only if G_i is an MPC of F . This result allows us to work directly with the distribution G_i , rather than considering the full set of feasible information structures. Formally, let $\text{MPC}(F)$ denote the set of all mean-preserving contractions of F ; we say that G_i is *feasible* if $G_i \in \text{MPC}(F)$. We refer to G_i as an *information structure*, and to the induced posterior mean $x_i = \mathbb{E}[v_i|s_i]$ as a *signal*. Note that full disclosure of the match value corresponds to $G = F$, while no disclosure corresponds to $G = \delta_\mu$, a degenerate distribution on the prior mean μ .

The game proceeds as follows. Before the search process begins, each firm i simultaneously commits to an information structure $G_i \in \text{MPC}(F)$, and each consumer's search cost c is privately realized. The chosen information structures $(G_i)_{i=1}^n$ are not observable to consumers at the outset of the search process. At each stage of the search process, a consumer decides whether to continue searching or to stop. If they choose to search, they incur the search cost and randomly (with equal probability) visit one of the remaining unvisited firms. Upon visiting firm i , the consumer observes *both* the information structure G_i and their privately realized signal x_i . If they choose to stop, they may purchase from any of the previously visited firms with perfect recall.¹¹

Remark. While our model assumes that information structure is unobservable before visit and that search is random, all our results remain valid under two alternative scenarios: (1) when information

despite the stochastic nature of individual behavior.

⁹Formally, there exists a finite partition $0 = x_0 \leq \dots \leq x_K = 1$ such that h is monotone in each $[x_{k-1}, x_k]$ for all $i = 1, \dots, K$. Our results extend to the case where the continuity assumption is relaxed, allowing H to have at most finitely many one-sided interior jumps, while being twice continuously differentiable elsewhere.

¹⁰ G is a MPC of F if and only if $\int_0^1 t dF(t) = \int_0^1 t dG(t)$ and $\int_0^x G(t) dt \leq \int_0^x F(t) dt$ for all $x \in [0, 1]$.

¹¹We assume consumers with $c = 0$ use the weakly dominant strategy of visiting all firms.

structures are publicly observable before search, but search remains random, or (2) when search is directed, but information structures remain unobservable until visit.¹²

Given the ex-ante symmetry of the environment, we focus on symmetric equilibria.¹³ Denote $(\widetilde{G}_1, \dots, \widetilde{G}_n)$ as the consumers' conjecture about the firms' strategies prior to visiting them. A profile of feasible distributions (G^*, \dots, G^*) is a (*symmetric*) *equilibrium* if: (i) each firm's strategy $G_i = G^*$ is optimal given the behavior of the other firms and consumers; (ii) the consumers' search rule is optimal given their conjectures $(\widetilde{G}_1, \dots, \widetilde{G}_n)$; and (iii) the consumers' conjectures are correct on-path, i.e., $\widetilde{G}_i = G^*$ for all i . We refer to G^* as the *equilibrium distribution*.

We denote $D_i(x_i; G)$ as the *interim demand* of firm i , defined as the probability that a consumer purchases from firm i when all competing firms choose G , the consumer holds the conjecture $\widetilde{G}_i = G$ for all i , and observes a posterior mean of x_i for firm i 's product. Given this, firm i 's ex-ante payoff from an unobservable deviation to some alternative information strategy $G_i \neq G$ is

$$\mathbb{E}_{G_i}[D_i(x_i; G)] = \int_0^1 D_i(x_i; G) dG_i(x_i).$$

It follows that G^* is an equilibrium distribution if and only if

$$G^* \in \arg \max_{G_i \in \text{MPC}(F)} \int_0^1 D_i(x_i; G^*) dG_i(x_i) \quad \forall i = 1, \dots, n.$$

3 Preliminary Analysis

In this section, we first characterize each consumer's optimal search rule and derive each firm's interim demand $D_i(x_i; G)$ based on that rule. We then briefly study the benchmark results.

3.1 Consumers

Given any symmetric conjectures, each consumer's optimal search rule can be characterized by their *reservation value* (McCall, 1970; Weitzman, 1979; Wolinsky, 1986). For any $c > 0$, the reservation value $r = r(c; \widetilde{G})$ under conjecture $(\widetilde{G}, \dots, \widetilde{G})$ is uniquely defined by the following

¹²This is equivalent to the attraction motive in Au and Whitmeyer (2023) being absent.

¹³Characterizing the set of asymmetric equilibria in the competitive information disclosure game is challenging, even in the absence of search costs. In a model without search costs, a partial result is provided in Du et al. (2024), who show that no asymmetric equilibria exists when there are two firms.

indifference condition:

$$c = \int_0^1 \max(x - r, 0) d\tilde{G}(x) = \int_r^1 (1 - \tilde{G}(t)) dt. \quad (1)$$

At this reservation value, the c -consumer is indifferent between stopping and continuing to search. The left-hand side of the first equality is the cost of one additional search, while the right-hand side represents the expected incremental surplus from searching once more, given a ‘outside option’ of value r . The second equality is from integration by parts. In equilibrium, conjectures must be correct ($\tilde{G} = G^*$). Thus, we simplify notation by omitting explicit dependence on G^* , and write $r(c) = r(c; G^*)$ when clear from context.

The optimal search rule follows a simple cutoff rule: the consumer stops and purchases immediately from firm i if $x_i \geq r(c)$. If $x_i < r(c)$ for all firms i , the consumer purchases from the firm with highest x_i , breaking ties uniformly in case of multiplicity.

For convenience, we define the inverse of the reservation value function $c_G(\cdot) = r^{-1}(\cdot; G)$:

$$c_G(x) := \int_x^1 (1 - G(t)) dt. \quad (2)$$

The function $c_G(x)$ represents the search cost of the consumer whose reservation value is x (under conjecture G). Equivalently, it measures the expected incremental surplus from an additional search when the current match is x .¹⁴ Since reservation values are strictly decreasing in search costs, a consumer’s reservation value exceeds x (i.e., $r(c) > x$) if and only if their search costs is below $c_G(x)$. Thus, $H(c_G(x))$ represents the fraction of consumers who continue searching upon receiving signal x .

Heterogeneity of search costs naturally generates heterogeneity in consumers’ reservation values, distributed continuously across an interval $[\underline{r}, \bar{r}]$, where we denote $\underline{r} := r(\bar{c})$ and $\bar{r} := r(\underline{c})$ as the lowest and the highest reservation values of the consumers, respectively.¹⁵ Observe that for any consumer with $c > 0$, their reservation value satisfies $r(c) < \max(\text{supp}(G))$, since no additional surplus can be obtained from searching after receiving the highest possible signal $x = \max(\text{supp}(G))$.

¹⁴For this reason, [Dogan and Hu \(2022\)](#) refers to c_G as the *incremental-benefit* function.

¹⁵If $\underline{c} = 0$, we define $\bar{r} := \max(\text{supp}(G))$. This is a notational simplification, as 0-consumers do not follow the reservation value strategy, but follows the weakly dominant strategy of visiting all firms.

3.2 Firms

We first derive the type-specific interim demand $D^c(x; G)$ for each consumer type $c \in [\underline{c}, \bar{c}]$, given the optimal search rule. If $x_i \geq r(c)$, the consumer purchases immediately upon visiting firm i . A visit to firm i is made, if, and only if, all the previously visited firms have provided signals strictly below the reservation value $r(c)$. Given the random search order, the probability firm i is visited in k -th order is $\frac{1}{n}G(r(c)-)^{k-1}$ and summing over $k = 1, \dots, n$ yields¹⁶

$$D^c(x_i; G) = \sum_{k=1}^n \frac{1}{n} G(r(c)-)^{k-1} = \frac{1 - G(r(c)-)^n}{n(1 - G(r(c)-))}.$$

If $x_i < r(c)$, the consumer continues searching and eventually returns to firm i only if firm i provided the highest signal. It can be easily shown by standard argument that equilibrium distribution G must not have interior atoms. In case of a tie, any firm can profitably deviate by splitting the mass to a slightly higher signal, thereby securing a discrete increase in payoff.¹⁷ Therefore, for $x_i < r(c)$, we have $D^c(x_i; G) = G(x_i)^{n-1}$.

Hence, the type-specific interim demand $D^c(x; G)$ is summarized as:

$$D^c(x; G) = \begin{cases} G(x)^{n-1} & \text{if } x < r(c) \\ \frac{1 - G(r(c)-)^n}{n(1 - G(r(c)-))} & \text{if } x \geq r(c) \end{cases}, \quad J_G(x) := \frac{1 - G(x-)^n}{n(1 - G(x-))} - G(x)^{n-1}. \quad (3)$$

$D^c(x; G)$ always exhibits a discrete jump of size $J_G(r(c)) > 0$ at $x = r(c)$. Upon visit, a c -consumer will purchase from firm i with certainty if $x \geq r(c)$, whereas only a fraction will return and purchase from firm i if $x < r(c)$.

Integrating $D^c(x; G)$ over all search costs gives the interim demand $D(x; G) = \int_{\underline{c}}^{\bar{c}} D^c(x; G) dH(c)$:

$$D(x; G) = \begin{cases} G(x)^{n-1} & x < \underline{r} \\ \underbrace{G(x)^{n-1} H(c_G(x))}_{\text{Consumers who continue search}} + \underbrace{\int_{c_G(x)}^{\bar{c}} \frac{1 - G(r(c))^n}{n(1 - G(r(c)))} dH(c)}_{\text{Consumers who stop search}} & x \geq \underline{r} \end{cases}. \quad (4)$$

For signals below \underline{r} , the market is essentially frictionless as all consumers continue searching. Above \underline{r} , firms gain local monopoly power, since a positive fraction $1 - H(c_G(x))$ of consumers

¹⁶The left limit $G(x-) := \lim_{t \rightarrow x-} G(t)$ always exists since G is monotone increasing.

¹⁷One can deviate by splitting the mass at a into $\{a - n\epsilon, a + \epsilon\}$ for some $\epsilon > 0$ (Lemma 9).

stops immediately. This fraction increases in x , eventually retaining all consumers to stop at $x = \max(\text{supp}(G))$.¹⁸

3.3 Two Benchmark Cases

To analyze the effect of heterogeneous search costs on competitive information disclosure, we first highlight two opposing forces: competition and search frictions. We introduce two benchmark cases: (1) the **no search friction** case and (2) the **homogeneous search friction** case. Our model nests both extremes: as $\bar{c} \rightarrow 0$, our model converges to the frictionless case; as $\underline{c} \rightarrow \bar{c}$, we approach the case with homogeneous search costs. Convergence results of our equilibrium to these benchmarks are presented in Section 6.

Proposition 1 (Hwang et al. (2023)). *Assume there is no search friction (i.e., $H(c) = \delta_0$). In the unique symmetric Nash equilibrium, each firm discloses full information ($G = F$) when n is sufficiently large.*

In Bertrand competition, firms undercut prices down to marginal cost. Analogously, in information competition without search frictions, firms seek to "overcut" rivals by providing higher signals. With no search friction, demand simplifies to $D(x; G) = G(x)^{n-1}$. As competition intensifies (n increases), each firm's probability of being the highest signal provider decreases, strengthening the incentive to overcut competitors. To this end, firms truthfully reveal the match value at the top—any garbling of information necessarily results in a lower posterior mean. This process cascades to the bottom, unraveling to full disclosure of match values, i.e., $G = F$.

Proposition 2 (Informational Diamond Paradox (Au & Whitmeyer, 2024)). *Assume all consumers share a common search cost $c > 0$ (i.e., $H(c) = \delta_c$). There exists an essentially unique perfect Bayesian equilibrium, in which no firm discloses any information ($G = \delta_\mu$), and all consumers stop at their first visit.*¹⁹

The standard Diamond paradox (Diamond, 1971) exemplifies a hold-up problem: a consumer who anticipates a price p_0 will, after incurring the search cost c , accept any price below $p_0 + c$. This inelasticity grants firms local monopoly power, enabling them to incrementally raise prices until it reaches the monopoly price. A similar unraveling occurs in information competition.

¹⁸To be precise, $c = 0$ consumers continue their search but are of measure zero.

¹⁹ $G = \delta_\mu$ is *essentially unique* in the sense that any equilibrium distribution is outcome-equivalent to δ_μ : the same reservation value is induced, no useful information is learned and all consumers stop at the first visited firm.

If a consumer expects to receive some ‘useful’ information—specifically, learning that the match quality is low with a strictly positive probability $G(r(c)-) > 0$ and continue searching—firms can always profitably deviate. Since the purchase probability jumps at the reservation value $r(c)$, a firm can secure a discrete payoff increase by pooling information just above $r(c)$ in a mean-preserving way. This deviation continues to unravel until all information is pooled above the reservation value, i.e. $G(r(c)-) = 0$. Consumers are held up by information pooled above their stopping thresholds, receiving no ‘useful’ information and stopping their search at the first visited firm—the ‘Informational Diamond Paradox’.

This intuition extends to the case where consumers have different, but positive, search costs. When $\underline{c} > 0$, if a consumer with search cost \underline{c} stops upon receiving signal x , then any consumer with a higher search cost $c > \underline{c}$ will also stop at x . Therefore, heterogeneity becomes irrelevant: firms effectively treat all consumers as if they have the lowest search cost, $\underline{c} > 0$.

Proposition 3 (Persistence of Informational Diamond Paradox). *Assume $\underline{c} > 0$. Then, no information $G(x) = \delta_\mu(x)$ is the essentially unique equilibrium distribution.*

In light of Proposition 3, we restrict attention to the case where $\underline{c} = 0$ hereafter.

4 Equilibrium

In this section, we examine the equilibrium in markets with heterogeneous search costs. We demonstrate that a simple class of equilibrium always exists and that it is the unique class of equilibria when the number of firms is sufficiently large.

For each $a \geq 0$, define an *upper censorship distribution* (UCD) U_a as follows:

$$U_a(x) = \begin{cases} F(x) & x \in [0, a) \\ F(a) & x \in [a, k_a), \\ 1 & x \in [k_a, 1] \end{cases}, \quad k_a = \mathbb{E}[v \mid v \geq a] \geq \mu. \quad (5)$$

We call an equilibrium where firms play U_a an *upper censorship equilibrium* (UCE). U_a has a simple structure supported on $[0, a] \cup \{k_a\}$: all match values v below the censorship threshold a are truthfully revealed, while all values $v > a$ are pooled to an atom at k_a , through a signal that only reveals that the value exceeds a . Note that U_a is feasible by construction, with $U_0 = \delta_\mu$ (no disclosure) and $U_1 = F$ (full disclosure). Importantly, all UCDs can be ordered in terms of

Blackwell informativeness by their censorship thresholds: U_b Blackwell dominates U_a if and only if $b \geq a$.

The following theorem characterizes the set of upper censorship equilibria of the game, and show that this is the only class of equilibrium when number of firms is sufficiently large.

Theorem 1. *Let E_n be the set of all equilibria when there are n firms in the market.*

- (a) *For any n , there exists an upper censorship equilibrium.*
- (b) *If $U_b \in E_n$, then $\{U_a : a \leq b\} \subseteq E_n$.*
- (c) *There exists $N > 0$ and $a^M \in [0, 1)$ such that $\{U_a : a \leq a^M\} \subseteq E_n$ for any $n > N$, and $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} E_n = \{U_a : a \leq a^M\}$.*

Theorem 1 establishes that a continuum of upper censorship equilibria exists for any number of firms. If U_b is an equilibrium distribution, then any less informative UCD also constitutes an equilibrium. Furthermore, in the limit of intense competition ($n \rightarrow \infty$), all equilibria must be upper censorship, and there exists an upper bound a^M on the equilibrium censorship threshold.²⁰ We refer to a^M as the *maximally informative threshold*, since U_{a^M} is the most informative equilibrium distribution in the limit of intense competition.

Two key implications follow from Theorem 1. First, the maximally informative threshold a^M is strictly less than 1, implying that full disclosure does *not* occur even in the limit of intense competition—firms retain an incentive to pool information, as the local monopoly power granted by search frictions persists. Second, whenever $a^M > 0$, informative equilibria emerge despite the presence of search frictions, random search, and the unobservability of deviations. These findings stands in stark contrast with the two benchmark cases in Section 3.3, highlighting the role of consumer heterogeneity in information provision.²¹

For ease of exposition, we focus for the remainder of the paper on the case where the censorship threshold a lies below the lowest reservation value, that is, $a \leq \underline{r} = r(c; U_a)$. While the case of $a > \underline{r}$ follows a similar intuition, it introduces additional analytical complexities; Appendix B provides a comprehensive analysis for the case of $a > \underline{r}$.

²⁰Under Assumption 1, introduced on page 17, a stronger conclusion holds: $E_n = \{U_a : a \leq a^M\}$ for finite but large enough n .

²¹A direct corollary of Theorem 1 is that the informational Diamond paradox $G = \delta_\mu = U_0$ remains an equilibrium.

For any $a \leq \underline{r}$, upper censorship distribution U_a consists of two segments: the *search* signals $x \in [0, a]$ and the *purchase* signal $x = k_a = \bar{r}$.²² Anticipating U_a , the consumers' reservation values are continuously distributed over $[\underline{r}, \bar{r}] = [\underline{r}, k_a]$. Hence, search signals encourages all consumers to continue searching, regardless of their search costs, while the purchase signal $x = \bar{r}$ induces all consumers to cease their search and purchase immediately.

We first express the interim demand $D(x; U_a)$ each firm faces. The right panel of Figure 1 depicts $D(x; U_a)$ when consumers' search costs are distributed according to H on the left panel.

$$D(x; U_a) = \begin{cases} F(x)^{n-1} & x \in [0, a) \\ F(a)^{n-1} & x \in [a, \underline{r}) \\ F(a)^{n-1} + \underbrace{J_F(a) \left(1 - H(c_{U_a}(x))\right)}_{\text{Fraction of consumers stopping their search}} & x \in [\underline{r}, \bar{r}) \\ F(a)^{n-1} + J_F(a) & x \in [\bar{r}, 1] \end{cases}, \quad J_F(a) := \left(\frac{1 - F(a)^n}{n(1 - F(a))} - F(a)^{n-1} \right).$$

For signals below the lowest reservation value \underline{r} , firms essentially face a frictionless market $U_a(x)^{n-1}$. Notably, while competing firms provide no information in the region (a, \bar{r}) , the demand remains constant over (a, \underline{r}) but increases strictly over (\underline{r}, \bar{r}) .

This increase occurs because, upon receiving a *partial-purchase signal* $x \in (\underline{r}, \bar{r})$, high-cost consumers with $c \geq c_{U_a}(x)$ halts their search immediately. As a result, the term $J_F(a)(1 - H(c_{U_a}(x)))$ quantifies the additional profit of capturing high-cost consumers through a partial-purchase signal.

Over the interval (\underline{r}, \bar{r}) of partial-purchase signals, the demand $D(x; U_a)$ is a reflected and scaled version of the cost distribution H . Mathematically, this arises from the linearity of $c_{U_a}(x) = (F(a) - 1)(x - k_a)$ in this interval. Intuitively, because no information is provided under U_a in this interval, the probability of receiving a higher signal remains constant.

An UCE essentially represents an all-or-nothing gamble: each signal either prompts all consumers to continue their search or all to stop immediately. In contrast, providing partial-purchase signals serves a safer gamble by differentiating purchase probability across consumer types.

For U_a to constitute an equilibrium, deviations to partial-purchase signals must be unprofitable. Graphically, this condition is satisfied if the secant line connecting $(a, D(a; U_a))$ and $(\bar{r}, D(\bar{r}; U_a))$ remains above $D(x; U_a)$ for all $x \in [\underline{r}, \bar{r}]$, as indicated by the blue dotted line in Figure 1.

²²Hereafter, to emphasize that the search signal is precisely located at the highest reservation value \bar{r} , we will use $x = \bar{r}$ instead of $x = k_a$, unless the dependency on the censorship threshold a needs to be explicitly highlighted.




Figure 1: The cost distribution $H(c)$ (left panel) and the payoff $D(x; U_a)$ (right panel). The blue/black/red dots in the right panel corresponds to the reservation values of the consumers with different search costs (blue/black/red dots) in the left panel.

For each censorship threshold a , define the auxiliary function $\phi_a : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$:

$$\phi_a(x) := \begin{cases} D(x, U_a), & x < a, \\ \frac{D(\bar{r}, U_a) - D(a, U_a)}{\bar{r} - a}(x - a) + F(a)^{n-1}, & x \geq a \end{cases}. \quad (6)$$

On $\text{supp}(U_a) = [0, a] \cup \{\bar{r}\}$, the function $\phi_a(\cdot)$ matches the interim demand $D(\cdot; U_a)$, while over the interval $[a, 1]$, it represents the secant line of $D(\cdot; U_a)$ connecting points a and \bar{r} .

The function ϕ_a provides a straightforward equilibrium verification: U_a is an equilibrium if and only if (1) ϕ_a is convex, and (2) $\phi_a(x) \geq D(x; U_a)$ for all x .²³ Convexity ensures that redistributing mass within $\text{supp}(U_a)$ is unprofitable. The second condition, a key to subsequent analysis, guarantees any deviation outside of $\text{supp}(U_a)$ —a partial-purchase signal—is unprofitable.

When the number of firms n grows large, the convexity of ϕ_a naturally emerges.²⁴ Over $[0, a]$, $\phi_a = F^{n-1}$ reflects the distribution of the consumer's best alternative. Increased competition makes consumers more likely to encounter better alternatives, implying the convexity of F^{n-1} . Moreover, heightened competition decreases the likelihood of consumers returning after leaving a firm, intensifying the incentive to pool at signal \bar{r} , which manifests as an upward kink of ϕ_a at $x = a$.²⁵

²³The function ϕ_a is the price function in Dworczak and Martini (2019). They show that $G \in \text{MPC}(F)$ is an equilibrium if and only if there exists some $\phi : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that (a) $\phi(x)$ is convex, and $\phi(x) \geq D(x, G)$ for all x , (b) $\text{supp}(G) \subseteq \{x | \phi(x) = D(x, G)\}$, and (c) $\int_0^1 \phi(x) dF(x) = \int_0^1 \phi(x) dG(x)$. Our function ϕ_a satisfies (b) and (c) by construction. See Lemma 3.

²⁴See Lemma 5 and Lemma 6 in Appendix B.

²⁵This intuition is analogous to that of Stahl (1989), where as $n \rightarrow \infty$, the increased incentive to secure consumers

The function ϕ_a carries a deeper economic interpretation—it represents the *virtual interim demand* faced by a firm choosing the information structure U_a .²⁶ The gap between the virtual interim demand $\phi_a(x)$ and the interim demand $D(x; U_a)$ quantifies the virtual interim gain of following U_a , rather than deviating to a different distribution $G \neq U_a$ with the signal x in its support.

To illustrate, fix some consumer type $c \in (0, \bar{c})$.²⁷ Consider a deviation from U_a to a partial-purchase signal $x = r(c)$, collapsing some mass from a and \bar{r} . Such deviation entails both a cost and a gain. Shifting mass downward from the purchase signal \bar{r} to $r(c)$ forgoes low-cost consumers in $[0, c]$, who would otherwise stop searching immediately upon receiving signal \bar{r} . On the other hand, shifting mass upward from the search signal a to $r(c)$ captures high-cost consumers in $[c, \bar{c}]$, who would otherwise continue searching upon receiving signal a . As deviations must occur in a mean-preserving way, inducing an atom of size dm at $x = r(c)$ requires moving exactly $\frac{c}{c_F(a)}dm$ mass from signal a and the complementary $(1 - \frac{c}{c_F(a)})dm$ mass from \bar{r} . The net gain from the deviation is proportional to the difference between $D(\cdot; U_a)$ and ϕ_a :

$$\text{Net Gain} = J_F(a) \left(\underbrace{\frac{c}{c_F(a)}(1 - H(c))}_{\text{Gain of Capturing high-cost}} - \underbrace{\left(1 - \frac{c}{c_F(a)}\right)H(c)}_{\text{Cost of Losing low-cost}} \right) dm \quad (7)$$

$$= -\left(\phi_a(r(c)) - D(r(c); U_a)\right)dm. \quad (8)$$

The first term in (7) represents the jump in purchase probability from capturing high-cost consumers $[c, \bar{c}]$, whereas the second term represents the loss in purchase probability from forgoing low-cost consumers $[0, c]$. Hence, from (8), any deviation to a partial-purchase signal is unprofitable if and only if $\phi_a(x) \geq D(x; U_a)$ for all x .

Equation (7) clarifies why multiple UCEs exist. As the censorship threshold a increases, the weight $\frac{c}{c_F(a)}$ associated with the gain grows, making deviations increasingly attractive. Consequently, the constraint $\phi_a(x) \geq D(x; U_a)$ tightens uniformly as a increases. If U_a is an equilibrium, lowering the threshold to any $b < a$ relaxes the constraint, implying U_b is an equilibrium.

results as the price converging to the monopoly price.

²⁶In analogy to the virtual value in Myerson (1981), where it represents the Lagrange multiplier of the agent's local incentive compatibility constraint, Kim et al. (2023) adopts this terminology in the context of information design. Here, the curvature ϕ_a'' serves as the Lagrange multiplier associated with the MPC constraint $G \in \text{MPC}(F)$.

²⁷Each partial-purchase signal in $[\underline{r}, \bar{r}]$ can be identified with each consumer type in $[\underline{c}, \bar{c}]$ by $c_G(\cdot)$ (and $r(\cdot; G)$ vice-versa).

Maximally Informative Equilibrium Given the above analysis, we can characterize the maximally informative threshold a^M —the highest threshold a at which no profitable deviations exists. Rearranging (7), we derive a simple condition. Deviations to partial-purchase signals are unprofitable if and only if

$$\frac{1}{c_F(a)} \leq \min_c \frac{H(c)}{c}. \quad (9)$$

The left-hand side of (9) strictly increases in a . Thus, in the maximally informative equilibrium a^M , (9) binds with equality, implying that any further increase in a would trigger profitable deviations.

The simplicity of this condition allows us to pinpoint the optimal partial-purchase signal as targeting precisely the consumer type $c^M \in \arg \min_c \frac{H(c)}{c}$. Intuitively, firms face a trade-off when selecting partial-purchase signals. Targeting lower c reduces the fraction of low-cost consumers lost ($H(c)$), but it also increases the weight ($1 - \frac{c}{c_F(a)}$) associated with the loss. Minimizing the average density $\frac{H(c)}{c}$ balances these forces optimally.

To provide a clear characterization of the maximally informative threshold, we impose an assumption on the search cost distribution H . While relaxing this assumption introduces some technical complexity, a key qualitative feature of our analysis remains unchanged. We discuss the general case at the end of this section and present the full analysis in Appendix B.

Assumption 1. *The global minimum of $\frac{H(c)}{c}$ in $[0, \bar{c}]$ is attained at some $c^M < \bar{c}$.²⁸*


In Appendix B, we show that Assumption 1 implies $a \leq \underline{c}$, so the preceding analysis applies in this case. Moreover, the right-hand side of (9) simplifies to $\min_c \frac{H(c)}{c} = \frac{H(c^M)}{c^M} = h(c^M)$. The term $h(c^M)$ serves a sufficient statistic for our analysis and has a straightforward economic interpretation: it measures the *evenness* of the distribution H . As H approaches the uniform distribution—the most even distribution— $h(c^M)$ increases. A higher slope $h(c^M)$ indicates a distribution closer to uniformity (the diagonal), representing a more evenly spread distribution of search costs. Consequently, the uniform distribution, being the most even, attains the highest $h(c^M)$.

Assuming the solution that binds (9) with equality exists, a^M is characterized as:


$$\frac{1}{c_F(a^M)} = h(c^M), \quad a^M = c_F^{-1} \left(\frac{1}{h(c^M)} \right) \quad (10)$$

²⁸At $c = 0$, we define $\frac{H(0)}{0} := h(0)$. A necessary and sufficient condition for the assumption is that there exists some c such that $\frac{H(c)}{c} \leq \frac{1}{\bar{c}}$. Graphically, this is equivalent to H lying weakly below the uniform distribution on some interval. This condition holds for any distribution H with a symmetric density, distributions that are MPS or MPC of the uniform distribution, or whenever either $h(0) \leq \frac{1}{\bar{c}}$ or $h(\bar{c}) \geq \frac{1}{\bar{c}}$.

Equation (10) highlights that, in the maximally informative equilibrium, firms are indifferent to deviating to the optimal partial-purchase signal. The signal $x = r(c^M)$ maximizes the net gain from deviation but results in zero gain under U_{a^M} . Graphically, this corresponds to the virtual interim demand $\phi_{a^M}(\cdot)$ being *tangent* to the interim demand (Figure 2).



(a) Cost distribution $H(c)$ and the point of tangency from the origin (c^M)



(b) Firm's interim demand $D(x, U_{a^M})$ and the corresponding virtual interim demand $\phi_{a^M}(x)$

Figure 2: Construction of the maximally informative upper censorship equilibrium

Since $c_F(a) \leq \mu$ for all a , a solution a^M to (10) exists if and only if $h(c^M) \geq \frac{1}{\mu}$. If this condition fails ($h(c^M) < \frac{1}{\mu}$), inequality (9) cannot hold for any threshold $a > 0$, and thus the only equilibrium is no information: $U_0 = \delta_\mu$. The following proposition characterizes the set of all UCEs under Assumption 1, summarizing the preceding discussion.²⁹

Proposition 4. Assume H satisfies Assumption 1, and let c^M the global minimum of the average density of the cost distribution $\frac{H(c)}{c}$.

(a) If $h(c^M) \in (0, \frac{1}{\mu}]$, then

$$a^M = 0;$$

(b) If $h(c^M) \in (\frac{1}{\mu}, \frac{1}{c}]$, then

$$a^M = c_F^{-1}\left(\frac{1}{h(c^M)}\right).$$

The shape of the average density $\frac{H(c)}{c}$ —specifically, the evenness $h(c^M)$ —is central to determining equilibrium informativeness. When H is uniform (constant average density and the highest $h(c^M)$), all partial-purchase signals are equally profitable or unprofitable. In contrast, uneven

²⁹The general characterization without the assumption is characterized in Theorem 2 in Appendix B.

distributions—with mass concentrated at specific regions and lower $h(c^M)$ —lead to varying profitability of partial-purchase signals. Firms exploit this unevenness by targeting signals that minimize lost low-cost consumers. Consequently, maximal informativeness a^M increases in $h(c^M)$, the evenness of the distribution.

Corollary 1. *The maximally informative threshold a^M is increasing in $h(c^M)$. Among the class of distributions satisfying Assumption 1, a^M is highest in the uniform distribution.*

Importantly, the monotonic relationship between the maximal informativeness and $h(c^M)$ is independent of the prior match value distribution F . When comparing two cost distributions H_1 and H_2 , the relative informativeness of equilibrium is determined solely by their intrinsic properties and remains unaffected by F . Similarly, the optimal segmentation c^M of low- and high-cost consumers depends solely on the distribution H . A detailed comparative static analysis regarding the role of cost distributions is provided in Section 5.

Practically, $h(c^M)$ is easily identifiable through a graphical approach (see Figure 2a): it corresponds exactly to the slope of the lowest tangent line passing through the origin and supporting the distribution H . This intuitive graphical interpretation provides a simple and effective method to determine and compare maximal informativeness across different cost distributions.

Uniqueness We briefly outline why upper censorship distributions uniquely emerge as equilibria under intense competition. The necessity of complete information disclosure at lower signals ($x < \underline{r}$) mirrors the frictionless benchmark (Proposition 1): as the market is essentially frictionless for low signals, any disclosed information unravels toward full disclosure as competition intensifies.

Moreover, for *any* number of firms, equilibrium distributions must contain an atom at the highest reservation value $\bar{r} = \max(\text{supp}(G))$. Consider the marginal change in interim demand at $x \geq \underline{r}$:

$$D'(x, G) = \underbrace{(1 - G)h(c_G)J_G(x)}_{\text{Extensive Margin of Stopping}} + \underbrace{(G^{n-1})'H(c_G)}_{\text{Intensive Margin of Stopping}}.$$

The extensive margin represents the increase in purchase probability from consumers whose reservation value equals the signal x , causing them to stop immediately. The density of these critical consumers, $(1 - G(x))h(c_G(x))$, multiplies with their discrete jump in purchase probability $J_G(x)$.³⁰

³⁰Recall that $1 - H(c_G(x))$ is the fraction of stoppers. Its density is hence $(1 - H(c_G(x)))' = (1 - G(x))h(c_G(x))$.

The intensive margin captures the increased likelihood of winning over the the $H(c_G(x))$ fraction of consumers who still continue searching after receiving x .

If G were continuous at \bar{r} , both margins would vanish as $x \rightarrow \bar{r}$, resulting in a strictly concave interim demand locally. Such concavity incentivizes firms to deviate by further pooling information. Specifically, for high enough signals $x \rightarrow \bar{r}$, the intensive margin vanishes because most consumers stop searching ($H(c_G(x)) \rightarrow 0$). Simultaneously, the extensive margin disappears as firms become almost certain to capture those continuing to search ($G^{n-1} \rightarrow 1$ implies $J_G(x) \rightarrow 0$). This need for an atom persists regardless of the number of competing firms, highlighting firms' persistent incentive to leverage local monopoly power at high signals.

When competition becomes sufficiently intense, the convexity of $D(\cdot; G)$ for $x \in [\underline{r}, \bar{r}]$ is determined by the slope of $h(c_G(x))$. As competition grows, the extensive margin exponentially dominates the intensive margin.³¹ Capturing consumers upon their initial visit becomes crucial since their return probability diminishes sharply. Thus, if $h'(c_G(x)) \leq 0$, the density of critical types increases in x , raising the extensive margin and encouraging firms to provide more information. Conversely, if $h'(c_G(x)) > 0$, firms prefer to pool information. This insight implies that if $G \neq F$ locally, then any firm would strictly prefer to either provide strictly more or strictly less information locally. Therefore, any partial-purchase signals must either be fully revealed or fully concealed.

General search cost distributions We now clarify the role of Assumption 1 by describing the results under a general search cost distribution H . Recall that U_a is an equilibrium if and only if (1) ϕ_a is convex and (2) $\phi_a(x) \geq D(x; U_a)$ for all x . Assumption 1 implies that equilibrium thresholds a are always below the lowest reservation value \underline{r} , ensuring that ϕ_a is convex for large n . However, when the assumption is relaxed, the possibility of $a \geq \underline{r}$ must be considered. In such cases, the equilibrium conditions can be restated as:

$$h'(c_F(x)) \leq 0 \text{ for all } x \in [\underline{r}, a] \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{H(c_F(a))}{c_F(a)} \leq \min_{c \in [0, c_F(a)]} \frac{H(c)}{c}. \quad (11)$$

The first condition ensures convexity of ϕ_a over $[\underline{r}, a]$ in the limit of intense competition, which depending critically on the curvature of H . The second condition mirrors the earlier condition (9). Without Assumption 1, we must care both about the local and global shape of H . Full characteri-

³¹To see this, note $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{J(x)}{G(x)^{n-1}} = \infty$ for any x such that $G(x) < 1$.

zation of equilibrium under general distribution H is provided in Theorem 2 in Appendix B.

The graphical method of characterizing a^M naturally extends to cost distributions failing Assumption 1, including those with interior atoms.³² In these cases, the equilibrium condition replaces the minimum with an infimum, requiring continuity of H over the interval $[c_F(a), \bar{c}]$.³³

5 Comparative Statics

In this section, we explore how the maximally informative equilibrium responds to shifts in the cost distribution H . Specifically, we consider compositional shifts that increase search costs (first-order shifts), and that increase heterogeneity (second-order shifts). For each cost distribution H_k , we denote c_k^M as the global minimizer of $\frac{H_k(c)}{c}$ and h_k their densities.

We begin by briefly discussing how increased informativeness (higher censorship threshold a) affects welfare. Greater informativeness increases consumers' likelihood of being matched with their best alternatives, but it also encourages more active search. Increased probability of searching, $F(a)$, result in longer expected search lengths, $\frac{1-F(a)^n}{1-F(a)}$ and higher cumulative search costs, $\frac{1-F(a)^n}{1-F(a)}C$. Nonetheless, the benefits of improved matching always outweigh these additional costs. Consequently, consumers always prefer more information, and the maximally informative equilibrium is both consumer-optimal and socially optimal.³⁴

Proposition 5. *Let $CS(a; H)$ be the expected consumer surplus under U_a with search cost distribution H .*

- (a) *$CS(a; H)$ is strictly positive and strictly increasing in a .*
- (b) *Consider two distributions $H_1 \neq H_2$ with the same mean. If $a_1^M \leq a_2^M$ and $a_k^M \leq r(\bar{c}; U_{a_k^M})$ for $k = 1, 2$, then $CS(a_1^M; H_1) \leq CS(a_1^M; H_2)$.*

Part (a) establishes welfare rankings of censorship thresholds for a fixed cost distributions: higher censorship thresholds always improve welfare. Part (b) extends this comparison across different distributions, demonstrating that under mild conditions, welfare rankings depend solely on comparing censorship thresholds. Thus, by Corollary 1, comparing $h_k(c_k^M)$ suffices to rank

³²Boundary atoms are separately discussed in Section 6 and Online Appendix C.

³³Even if H is discontinuous at the point $c^M = \arg \inf_c \frac{H(c)}{c}$, equilibrium identification remains straightforward: it amounts to finding the largest linear function below H passing through the origin.

³⁴Firm profits remain constant at $\frac{1}{n}$ across all equilibria.

welfare across distributions that satisfy Assumption 1. Practically, this comparison can be easily conducted graphically.

5.1 Effect of Higher Search Costs

We begin by analyzing how first-order shifts in the search cost distribution H affect the maximally informative threshold a^M . We consider two classes of such shifts. First, we examine α -scale stretches, where the shape of the density is preserved but the support is proportionally expanded. Second, we consider shifts that preserve the support alter the distribution in the sense of first-order stochastic dominance (FOSD), skewing it toward higher search costs.

Formally, H_2 is an α -scale stretch of H_1 if $H_1(c) = H_2(\alpha c)$ for all $c \in [0, \bar{c}]$. This transformation uniformly scales all consumers' search costs upward, stretching the support to $[0, \bar{c}]$ to $[0, \alpha \bar{c}]$ while preserving the density shape. Consequently, the key sufficient statistics scale proportionally: $c_2^M = \alpha c_1^M$ and $h_2(c_2^M) = \frac{1}{\alpha} h_1(c_1^M) < h_1(c_1^M)$. From Corollary 1, it immediately follows:

Proposition 6. *Let $1 < \alpha < \frac{\mu}{\bar{c}}$ and H_2 be an α -scale stretch of H_1 . Then, $a_2^M \leq a_1^M$. Furthermore, if $a_1^M > 0$, then $a_2^M < a_1^M$.*

This result indicates that uniformly scaling up consumer search costs leads to weakly less information disclosure. If there was positive disclosure initially, informativeness strictly decreases after scaling. Aligned with the standard intuition, increased search friction weakens competition, granting firms greater local monopoly power and exacerbating hold-up incentives, thus discouraging information disclosure.

Another interpretation focuses on partial-purchase signals becoming more profitable under H_2 . Specifically, the net gain from deviating to any $x = r(c)$ (equation (7)) is greater under H_2 than H_1 :

$$J_F(a) \left(\frac{c}{c_F(a)} - H_2(c) \right) > (\geq) J_F(a) \left(\frac{c}{c_F(a)} - H_1(c) \right) \quad \forall c \in [0, \bar{c}] \quad (12)$$

Under the stretched distribution H_2 , fewer low-cost consumers are forgone, and each partial-purchase signal captures a larger range of high-cost consumers. Thus, deviations become uniformly more attractive, reducing the equilibrium's maximal informativeness.

A further observation arises directly from expression (12). Deviating to partial-purchase signals becomes weakly more profitable under H_2 compared to H_1 precisely when H_2 first-order stochastically dominates H_1 .

Proposition 7. Assume H_1 and H_2 satisfies Assumption 1, and H_2 first order stochastically dominates H_1 . Then,

$$a_2^M \leq a_1^M.$$

Moreover, if $H_2(c) < H_1(c)$ for all $c \in (0, \bar{c})$ and $a_1^M > 0$, then $a_2^M < a_1^M$.

Proposition 7 can also be directly derived from Corollary 1: $H_2(c)/c \leq H_1(c)/c$ for all c implies $h_2(c_2^M) \leq h_1(c_1^M)$.

Both notions of increased search costs (the α -scale stretch or FOSD) thus lead firms to disclose less information. In either case, deviations to partial-purchase signals become more profitable, since under H_2 , fewer low-cost consumers are lost and more high-cost consumers can be captured. An α -scale stretch disperses consumers more widely, while FOSD shifts the distribution toward higher costs, enhancing profitability of deviations.

Next, we establish a convergence results toward the benchmarks studied in Section 3.3. Consider an initial distribution H_0 and define a sequence $\{H_k\}$ obtained by repeatedly applying an $\frac{1}{\alpha}$ -scale stretch (shrinking) k times. As k increases, the support shrinks toward the degenerate distribution δ_0 , corresponding to the frictionless scenario. Because $h_k(c_k^M) = \alpha^k h_0(c_0^M)$ diverges, the maximally informative threshold $a_k^M = c_F^{-1}(\frac{1}{h_k(c_k^M)})$ converges to $c_F^{-1}(0) = 1$. Hence, the maximally informative equilibrium converges in distribution to full information. This generalizes to arbitrary sequence of distributions with shrinking support.

Corollary 2 (Convergence to the no-friction case). Assume a sequence of cost distributions $\{H_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$ converging to δ_0 in distribution, with $\text{supp}(H_k) = [0, \bar{c}_k]$ and $\bar{c}_k \searrow 0$. Then $U_{a_k^M} \xrightarrow{d} F$, or equivalently, $a_k^M \rightarrow 1$.³⁵

Similarly, we establish a convergence result toward the homogeneous friction scenario. As the lower bound \underline{c} approaches the upper bound \bar{c} , the distribution approaches a degenerate point mass at \bar{c} , a scenario already analyzed in Proposition 3. Even when the support remains fixed as $[0, \bar{c}]$, convergence to homogeneous friction can still be established: equilibrium informativeness ultimately collapses, resulting in no information disclosure.

Corollary 3 (Convergence to the homogeneous friction case). Assume a sequence of cost distributions $\{H_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$ with $\text{supp}(H_k) = [0, \bar{c}]$ converges to $\delta_{\bar{c}}$ in distribution. There exists some $K > 0$ such that $U_{a_k^M} = \delta_\mu$ for all $k > K$, or equivalently, $a_k^M = 0$ for all $k > K$.³⁶

³⁵This convergence is only in distribution since $a_k^M < 1$ for all k .

³⁶ $H_{k+1} \geq_{FOSD} H_k$ for all k is an example that satisfies the assumption. Moreover, while Proposition 2 states δ_μ is

5.2 Effect of Greater Cost Heterogeneity

A more nuanced issue concerns the effect of second-order shifts in the search costs on equilibrium information provision. Greater heterogeneity can manifest either as a more evenly dispersed distribution of search costs or, alternatively, as a more polarized distribution with costs concentrated at the extremes.

Our main finding is that the equilibrium informativeness is increasing in the *evenness* of the distribution—specifically, how closely it resembles the uniform distribution—rather than with dispersion alone. In fact, informativeness responds non-monotonically with respect to MPS shifts, precisely because their impact on evenness is non-monotonic.




Figure 3: $H_0 \neq H_1 = U[0, \bar{c}]$ and the interpolation $H_\lambda = \lambda U[0, \bar{c}] + (1 - \lambda)H_0$.

Consider an arbitrary cost distribution H_0 . For each $\lambda \in [0, 1]$, define a new distribution H_λ as a convex combination of H_0 and the uniform distribution, given by: $H_\lambda := \lambda U[0, \bar{c}] + (1 - \lambda)H_0$. This family of distributions continuously interpolates between H_0 and the uniform distribution $U[0, \bar{c}]$, becoming increasingly even as λ rises. Importantly, this representation provides a natural interpretation of our measure of evenness, $h_\lambda(c_\lambda^M) = \lambda \frac{1}{\bar{c}} + (1 - \lambda)h_0(c_0)^M$, which strictly increases in λ if H_0 satisfies Assumption 1. The following proposition directly follows from Corollary 1.

Proposition 8. Consider $H_0 \neq U[0, \bar{c}]$, and define $H_\lambda := \lambda U[0, \bar{c}] + (1 - \lambda)H_0$ for each $\lambda \in [0, 1]$.

- (a) a_λ^M is weakly increasing in $\lambda \in [0, 1)$.
- (b) If H_0 satisfies Assumption 1, then a_λ^M is strictly increasing in $\lambda \in [0, 1]$.

the essentially unique equilibrium in the output-equivalence sense, Corollary 3 states it is the *unique* equilibrium.

The intuition is clear: firms exploit the unevenness of H by providing partial-purchase signals that minimize the loss from forgoing low-cost consumers. Increased evenness hinders the profitability of such deviations, resulting in higher equilibrium informativeness.

This finding also suggests why equilibrium informativeness is generally non-monotone with respect to MPS shifts. The minimum average density $h(c^M)$ is highly sensitive to the global structure of H . Since MPS shifts can either spread mass locally or globally, their impact on $h(c^M)$ is unclear a priori. The following proposition illustrates this ambiguity by examining commonly used class of distributions, and where dispersion is introduced at a broader scale.

Proposition 9. *Suppose that H_2 is a mean-preserving spread of H_1 .*

- (a) *If both H_1 and H_2 admit strictly quasi-convex densities with interior dips, then the maximal informativeness decreases, i.e., $a_1^M \geq a_2^M$.*
- (b) *If both H_1 and H_2 admit strictly quasi-concave densities with interior peaks, then the maximal informativeness increases, i.e., $a_1^M \leq a_2^M$.*




Figure 4: Non-monotonicity of MPS on $h(c_i^M)$

Proposition 9 highlights how dispersion of distribution can either enhance or reduce equilibrium informativeness depending on its effect on evenness. If the initial density is quasi-convex, an MPS shift further polarizes the distribution, making it less even ($h_2(c_2^M) < h_1(c_1^M)$, see Figure 4a) and consequently decreasing informativeness. Conversely, if the initial density is quasi-concave, an MPS shift redistributes mass more evenly ($h_2(c_2^M) > h_1(c_1^M)$, see Figure 4b), thereby enhancing informativeness.

6 Extensions and Discussions

In this section, we briefly discuss two extensions of our main model and show that our equilibrium characterization remains qualitatively robust under alternative assumptions. A comprehensive treatment is deferred to Online Appendix C. Our equilibrium structure remains qualitatively unchanged when considering discrete cost distributions (Online Appendix C.1) or relaxing the large market assumption (Online Appendix C.2). The core intuition behind the upper-censorship equilibrium—pooling at the highest reservation value to exploit the local monopoly power, and competing at lower signals to maximize revisits—persists across these alternative settings.

First, we consider a discrete cost counterpart of our model. One example is the *shopper model* (Stahl, 1989) featuring two types of consumers: a fraction $p \in (0, 1)$ of shoppers with zero search costs, and non-shoppers with homogeneous strictly positive search cost. Unlike our continuous cost setting, equilibrium does not feature an atom at the highest reservation value, as it results in a tie involving a positive mass of shoppers.

In equilibrium, when competition is intense, firms still fully disclose low signals below \underline{r} and pool information just above the highest reservation value \bar{r} . The key difference lies on how information is pooled: rather than placing an atom, firms pool signal continuously so that G^{n-1} remains *linear* above \bar{r} . The linearity of G^{n-1} arises as a balance between competition and local monopoly. Even at high signals, shoppers continue searching, maintaining competitive pressure among firms for revisits, while non-shoppers have already stopped searching. The linearity ensures firms remain indifferent to further pooling or spreading information.

Second, we relax the large market assumption to study equilibria in small markets (small n). While the large-market assumption significantly simplifies the analysis and allows us to directly compare our results to the literature, one can still characterize equilibria in small markets under additional assumptions on the cost distribution H (Proposition 13) or the prior distribution F (Proposition 14). In equilibrium, firms still place an atom at the highest reservation value \bar{r} to retain consumers, while competing below the lowest reservation value \underline{r} . However, weaker competitive pressure reduces the incentive for complete unraveling. Instead, equilibrium information provision for low signals displays an alternating structure: intervals of full disclosure ($G = F$) alternate with intervals where information is garbled to ensure G^{n-1} -linearity. Unlike large markets, where competitive pressure forces full disclosure at lower signals, small markets permit more localized pooling, reflecting the reduced intensity of competition.

To summarize, under these variations, the central equilibrium forces we identify—the balance between pooling incentives driven by search frictions and competitive pressures for more disclosure—remain robust. The differences mainly arise in local equilibrium details, specifically in how pooling is achieved and the extent of competitive unraveling at lower signals. By concentrating on large markets, we deliver clear, prior-independent comparative statics, as equilibrium structure in smaller markets becomes more sensitive to the underlying distributions. Moreover, our continuous search cost framework clearly distinguishes between the effects of increased average costs and increased cost heterogeneity, although the key insights extend naturally to any distributions with finite discontinuities.

7 Conclusion

This paper analyzes how competition and heterogeneous search costs jointly shape firms’ incentives for information disclosure in search market. Firms balance the opposing incentives of competition and the local monopoly power granted by search frictions by adopting a two-faced strategy: aggressively providing information for low match values, while pooling information for high match values to induce consumers to stop searching, regardless of their search costs. This balance results in partial disclosure rather than complete transparency or full concealment. We highlight that the evenness of the search cost distribution H is the critical determinant of equilibrium informativeness. Firms can strategically induce different purchase probability across different consumer groups by providing partial-purchase signals. Greater evenness of the distribution weakens firms’ ability to exploit consumer heterogeneity, resulting in more informative equilibria.

References

- Allen, J., Clark, R., & Houde, J.-F. (2014). The effect of mergers in search markets: Evidence from the canadian mortgage industry. *American Economic Review*, 104(10), 3365–3396.
- Allen, J., Clark, R., & Houde, J.-F. (2019). Search frictions and market power in negotiated-price markets. *Journal of Political Economy*, 127(4), 1550–1598.
- Anderson, S. P., & Renault, R. (1999). Pricing, product diversity, and search costs: A bertrand-chamberlin-diamond model. *The RAND Journal of Economics*, 719–735.
- Arieli, I., Babichenko, Y., Smorodinsky, R., & Yamashita, T. (2023). Optimal persuasion via bi-pooling. *Theoretical Economics*, 18(1), 15–36.

- Au, P. H., & Kawai, K. (2020). Competitive information disclosure by multiple senders. *Games and Economic Behavior*, 119, 56–78.
- Au, P. H., & Whitmeyer, M. (2023). Attraction versus persuasion: Information provision in search markets. *Journal of Political Economy*, 131(1), 202–245.
- Au, P. H., & Whitmeyer, M. (2024). Attraction via prices and information. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.11754*.
- Board, S., & Lu, J. (2018). Competitive information disclosure in search markets. *Journal of Political Economy*, 126(5), 1965–2010.
- Boleslavsky, R., & Krasteva, S. (2023). *Information and pricing in search markets* [mimeo].
- Choi, M., Kim, K., & Pease, M. (2019). Optimal information design for search goods. *AEA Papers and Proceedings*, 109, 550–556.
- Curello, G., & Sinander, L. (2024). The comparative statics of persuasion. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2204.07474*.
- De los Santos, B. (2018). Consumer search on the internet. *International Journal of Industrial Organization*, 58, 66–105.
- Diamond, P. (1971). A model of price adjustment. *Journal of Economic Theory*.
- Dogan, M., & Hu, J. (2022). Consumer search and optimal information. *The RAND Journal of Economics*, 53(2), 386–403.
- Du, Z., Tang, W., Wang, Z., & Zhang, S. (2024). Competitive information design with asymmetric senders. *Proceedings of the 25th ACM Conference on Economics and Computation (EC)*.
- Dworczak, P., & Martini, G. (2019). The simple economics of optimal persuasion. *Journal of Political Economy*, 127(5), 1993–2048.
- Feinberg, E. A., Kasyanov, P. O., & Zadoianchuk, N. V. (2014). Fatou’s lemma for weakly converging probabilities. *Theory of Probability & Its Applications*, 58(4), 683–689.
- Gitmez, A. A., & Molavi, P. (2022). Informational autocrats, diverse societies. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.12698*.
- He, W., & Li, J. (2023). Competitive information disclosure in random search markets. *Games and Economic Behavior*, 140, 132–153.
- Hortaçsu, A., & Syverson, C. (2004). Product differentiation, search costs, and competition in the mutual fund industry: A case study of s&p 500 index funds. *The Quarterly journal of economics*, 119(2), 403–456.
- Hwang, I., Kim, K., & Boleslavsky, R. (2023). Competitive advertising and pricing. *Working Paper*.
- Ivanov, M. (2013). Information revelation in competitive markets. *Economic Theory*, 52, 337–365.
- Kamenica, E., & Gentzkow, M. (2011). Bayesian persuasion. *American Economic Review*, 101(6), 2590–2615.
- Kim, K., Krishna, R. V., & Ryvkin, D. (2023). Choosing your own luck: Strategic risk taking and effort in contests.

- Kohn, M. G., & Shavell, S. (1974). The theory of search. *Journal of Economic Theory*, 9(2), 93–123.
- Kolotilin, A., Mylovanov, T., & Zapechelnyuk, A. (2022). Censorship as optimal persuasion. *Theoretical Economics*, 17(2), 561–585.
- Lyu, C. (2023). Information design for selling search goods and the effect of competition. *Journal of Economic Theory*, 213, 105722.
- McCall, J. J. (1970). Economics of information and job search. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 84(1), 113–126.
- Mekonnen, T., Murra-Anton, Z., & Pakzad-Hurson, B. (2023). Persuaded search. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.13409*.
- Moraga-González, J. L., Sándor, Z., & Wildenbeest, M. R. (2017). Prices and heterogeneous search costs. *The RAND Journal of Economics*, 48(1), 125–146.
- Myerson, R. B. (1981). Optimal auction design. *Mathematics of operations research*, 6(1), 58–73.
- Nishida, M., & Remer, M. (2018). The determinants and consequences of search cost heterogeneity: Evidence from local gasoline markets. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 55(3), 305–320.
- Salz, T. (2022). Intermediation and competition in search markets: An empirical case study. *Journal of Political Economy*, 130(2), 310–345.
- Sato, H., & Shirakawa, R. (2023). Persuasion in ordered search. *Available at SSRN 4483732*.
- Stahl, D. O. (1989). Oligopolistic pricing with sequential consumer search. *The American Economic Review*, 700–712.
- Sun, Y. (2006). The exact law of large numbers via fubini extension and characterization of insurable risks. *Journal of Economic Theory*, 126(1), 31–69.
- Weitzman, M. L. (1979). Optimal search for the best alternative. *Econometrica*, 47(3), 641–654.
Retrieved July 10, 2024, from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1910412>
- Wolinsky, A. (1986). True monopolistic competition as a result of imperfect information. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 101(3), 493–511.

A Omitted Proofs

In Appendix A, all proofs of the results are provided, except the equilibrium characterization of Theorem 1 and Proposition 4, which are deferred to Appendix B.

Proof of Proposition 1 See Corollary 1 and Theorem 1 of Hwang et al. (2023) for existence and uniqueness, respectively. \square

Proof of Proposition 2 and Proposition 3 We first prove that if $G \in MPC(F)$ is an equilibrium, then $G(r-) = 0$ where $r = r(c; G)$. Let $M = \max(\text{supp}(G))$. Assume G is an equilibrium but $G(r-) > 0$, and choose intervals $[a, b] \subset [0, r)$ and $[M - \delta, M] \subset (r, M]$ with positive mass under G . We construct a profitable deviation G_ϵ , which collapses an $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$ fraction of mass of $[a, b]$ and total the mass of $[M - \delta, M]$ to its barycenter μ_ϵ . Formally, for $\epsilon > 0$, define $G_\epsilon := (1 - p_\epsilon)G + p_\epsilon \delta_{\mu_\epsilon}$ where $p_\epsilon := \epsilon G([a, b]) + G([M - \delta, M])$ and $\mu_\epsilon := \frac{\epsilon G([a, b])}{p_\epsilon} \int_{[a, b]} x dG(x) + \frac{G([M - \delta, M])}{p_\epsilon} \int_{[M - \delta, M]} x dG(x)$. Since $\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \mu_\epsilon = \int_{[M - \delta, M]} x dG(x) > r$ and μ_ϵ is continuous in ϵ , there exist some $\epsilon_1 > 0$ such that $\mu_{\epsilon_1} > r$. Such G_{ϵ_1} is indeed a profitable deviation:

$$\mathbb{E}_{G_{\epsilon_1}}[D(x, G)] - \mathbb{E}_G[D(x, G)] = \frac{\epsilon_1 G([a, b])}{p_{\epsilon_1}} \left(D(r, G) - \int_a^b D(x, G) dG(x) \right) > 0.$$

The inequality holds because $D(x; G)$ weakly increases and exhibits a discrete jump at $x = r$.

Now assume $G(r-) = 0$. Then, $r = \mu - c$ and $D(x; G) = \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{I}(x \geq \mu - c)$. Any best response to G must put all the probability measure above $\mu - c$. Hence G is a best response to itself. This proves Proposition 2. Replacing c with \underline{c} and r with $r(\underline{c}; G)$ proves Proposition 3. \square

Proof of Theorem 1 and Proposition 4 See Appendix B. \square

Proof of Proposition 5 We first start by showing for all $c > 0$, there exists a unique censorship threshold a_c such that the reservation value of a c -consumer under U_{a_c} matches the censorship threshold itself.

Lemma 1. For each $c > 0$, define $a_c := c_F^{-1}(c)$. Then, $a_c = r(c; U_{a_c})$. Furthermore, $a \leq r(c; U_a)$ if and only if $a \leq a_c$.

Proof. Note for any feasible G , $c_G(x) = \int_x^1 (1 - G(t)) dt = \mu - \int_0^x (1 - G(t)) dt$. Since $U_{a_c} = F$ over $[0, a_c]$, we have $c = c_F(a_c) = c_{U_{a_c}}(a_c)$. Taking the inverse, this shows $a_c = r(c; U_{a_c})$. For the second

part, observe that $a \leq r(c; U_a)$ if and only if $c_{U_a}(a) \geq c$. Since $U_a = F$ over $[0, a]$, $c_{U_a}(a) = c_F(a)$. Hence, $a \leq r(c; U_a)$ if and only if $c_F(a) \geq c$, which is equivalent to $a \leq c_F^{-1}(c) = a_c$. \square

We first prove (a). For each c -consumer with $c > 0$, let a_c as in Lemma 1. Define the expected value of the purchased product as $B_c(a)$ and the expected accumulated search cost as $C_c(a)$:

$$B_c(a) := \begin{cases} \int_0^a xd(F(x)^n) + k_a(1 - F(a)^n) & \text{if } a \leq a_c \\ \int_0^{a_c} xd(F(x)^n) + k_a(1 - F(a_c)^n) & \text{if } a > a_c \end{cases}$$

$$C_c(a) := \begin{cases} (1 - F(a)) \cdot (c + 2cF(a) + \dots + (n-1)cF(a)^{n-2}) + ncF(a)^{n-1} = \frac{1 - F(a)^n}{1 - F(a)}c & \text{if } a \leq a_c \\ (1 - F(a_c)) \cdot (c + 2cF(a_c) + \dots + (n-1)cF(a_c)^{n-2}) + ncF(a_c)^{n-1} = \frac{1 - F(a_c)^n}{1 - F(a_c)}c & \text{if } a > a_c \end{cases}$$

Define the consumer surplus of the c -consumer $CS_c(a) := B_c(a) - C_c(a)$, and the total consumer surplus $CS(a) := \int_0^{\bar{c}} CS_c(a)dH(c)$. We show that $CS_c(a)$ is strictly positive and strictly increasing in a , which implies the same for $CS(a)$. Since $CS_c(0) = \mu - c > 0$, it suffices to show $CS'_c(a) > 0$. Since $\frac{d}{da}k_a > 0$, $CS_c(a)$ is strictly increasing for $a > a_c$. For $a \leq a_c$, direct calculation yields:

$$CS'_c(a) = f(a) \times \left(\frac{1 - F(a)^n}{1 - F(a)} - nF(a)^{n-1} \right) \times \left(k_a - \frac{c}{1 - F(a)} - a \right) = f(a) \times nJ_F(a) \times (r(c; U_a) - a)$$

The last bracket is strictly positive from Lemma 1.

To prove (b), observe $a_k^M \leq r(\bar{c}; U_{a_k^M})$ for each $k = 1, 2$ and $a_1^M \leq a_2^M$ both holding is equivalent to $a_1^M \leq a_2^M \leq a_{\bar{c}}$. Defining $B(a) := \int_0^{\bar{c}} B_c(a)dH(c)$, we have $CS(a; H) = B(a) - \frac{1 - F(a)^n}{1 - F(a)}\mathbb{E}_H[c]$ for $a \leq a_{\bar{c}}$. Since $\mathbb{E}_{H_1}[c] = \mathbb{E}_{H_2}[c]$ by assumption, $CS(a_1^M; H_1) = CS(a_1^M; H_2) \leq CS(a_2^M; H_2)$ follows. \square

Proof of Proposition 6 We prove the result maintaining Assumption 1. (The general case without the assumption is deferred to Online Appendix D.1.) Fix H_1 satisfying Assumption 1 and $\alpha \in (1, \frac{\mu}{\epsilon})$. Note an α -scale shift H_2 of H_1 also satisfies the assumption. By Corollary 1, it suffices to show $h_2(c_2^M) \leq h_1(c_1^M)$. Define $S_k(c) := \frac{H_k(c)}{c}$ for $c > 0$ and $S_k(0) := h_k(0)$. Then,

$$h_2(c_2^M) = \min_{c \in [0, \alpha\bar{c}]} S_2(c) = \frac{1}{\alpha} \min_{c \in [0, \bar{c}]} S_1(c) < \min_{c \in [0, \bar{c}]} S_1(c) = h_1(c_1^M).$$

If $h_1(c_1^M) > \frac{1}{\mu}$, they by Proposition 4, $a_1^M > 0$. By Corollary 1, $a_2^M < a_1^M$. If $h_1(c_1^M) \leq \frac{1}{\mu}$, we obtain $a_1^M = a_2^M = 0$. \square

Proof of Proposition 7 Assume H_1, H_2 both satisfy Assumption 1 and H_2 first order stochastically dominates H_1 . Since $H_2(c) \leq H_1(c)$ for all c , we have $S_2(c) \leq S_1(c)$, implying $h_2(c_2^M) = \min_{c \in [0, \bar{c}]} S_2(c) \leq \min_{c \in [0, \bar{c}]} S_1(c) = h_1(c_1^M)$. By Corollary 1, $a_2^M \leq a_1^M$. If $H_2(c) < H_1(c)$ for all c , then the inequality is strict, hence implying $a_2^M < a_1^M$ whenever $a_1^M > 0$. \square

Proof of Corollary 2 Assume each H_k satisfies Assumption 1. (The general case without the assumption is deferred to Online Appendix D.1.) Suppose $H_k \rightarrow \delta_0$ weakly and $\text{supp}(H_k) \searrow \{0\}$. We claim that $h_k(c_k^M) \rightarrow \infty$, which, by continuity of $c_F(\cdot)$, implies $a_k^M = c_F^{-1}\left(\frac{1}{h_k(c_k^M)}\right) \rightarrow c_F^{-1}(0) = 1$.

Assume to the contrary that $\{h_k(c_k^M)\}_{k=1}^\infty$ is bounded above by some constant M . Then, $H_k(c_k^M) \leq M c_k^M$ for all k . Since $\text{supp}(H_k) \searrow \{0\}$, we have $c_k^M \rightarrow 0$, and thus $H_k(c_k^M) \rightarrow 0$. Define the indicator functions $f_k = \mathbb{I}[c \leq c_k^M]$, so that $\int f_k dH_k = H_k(c_k^M) \rightarrow 0$. Also, since $\text{supp}(H_k) \searrow \{0\}$, we have $\liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty, c \rightarrow c'} f_k(c') = \mathbb{I}[c \leq 0]$. Applying Fatou's lemma for weakly converging measures (Theorem 1.1, [Feinberg et al. \(2014\)](#)) yields:

$$1 = \int \mathbb{I}[c \leq 0] d\delta_0 = \int \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty, c \rightarrow c'} f_k(c') d\delta_0 \leq \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int f_k dH_k = \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} H_k(c_k^M) = 0,$$

which is a contradiction. Hence $h_k(c_k^M) \rightarrow \infty$. \square

Proof of Corollary 3 Assume the sequence $\{H_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$ converges to $\delta_{\bar{c}}$ weakly and $\text{supp}(H_k) = [0, \bar{c}]$ for all k . We show that for large enough k , each H_k satisfies Assumption 1 and $h_k(c_k^M) \leq \frac{1}{\mu}$, which by Proposition 4 implies $a_k^M = 0$. Fix $\epsilon > 0$. Since $H_k \rightarrow \delta_{\bar{c}}$ weakly and the point of discontinuity of $\mathbb{I}[c \leq \bar{c} - \epsilon]$ is measure zero under $\delta_{\bar{c}}$,

$$\int_0^1 \mathbb{I}[c \leq \bar{c} - \epsilon] dH_k(c) = H_k(\bar{c} - \epsilon) \rightarrow \int_0^1 \mathbb{I}[c \leq \bar{c} - \epsilon] d\delta_{\bar{c}}(c) = 0.$$

Hence, there exists some $K > 0$ such that for all $k > K$, $H_k(\bar{c} - \epsilon) < (\bar{c} - \epsilon) \frac{1}{\mu}$ which implies $\frac{H_k(\bar{c} - \epsilon)}{\bar{c} - \epsilon} < \frac{1}{\mu} < \frac{1}{\bar{c}}$. This inequality guarantees that Assumption 1 holds for H_k , and moreover, $h_k(c_k^M) < \frac{1}{\mu}$. \square

Proof of Proposition 8 We show part (a). Part (b) is deferred to Appendix D.1. Assume H_0 satisfies Assumption 1. By Corollary 1, it suffices to show $h_\lambda(c_\lambda^M) \geq h_0(c_0^M)$ and that $h_\lambda(c_\lambda^M)$ is strictly increasing in λ . Note the average density associated with H_λ is given by $S_\lambda(c) = \frac{\lambda}{c} + (1 - \lambda)S_0(c)$, so $H_\lambda(c)$ also satisfies the assumption. Because $H_0 \neq U[0, \bar{c}]$, Assumption 1 implies $\min_c S_0(c) = h_0(c_0^M) < \frac{1}{\bar{c}}$. Hence, for all $\lambda \in (0, 1]$,

$$h_0(c_0^M) < \lambda \frac{1}{\bar{c}} + (1 - \lambda)h_0(c_0^M) = \min_c S_\lambda(c) = h_\lambda(c_\lambda^M).$$

Finally, differentiating with respect to λ gives $\frac{d}{d\lambda}h_\lambda(c_\lambda^M) = \frac{1}{\bar{c}} - h_0(c_0^M) > 0$.

Proof of Proposition 9 Assume H_1 and H_2 both satisfy Assumption 1 and H_2 is an MPS of H_1 . The general case without the assumption is proved in Online Appendix D.1. Under Assumption 1, the global minimum $c_k^M \in [0, \bar{c})$ of $S_k(c)$ must satisfy the first- and second-order conditions: $S_k(c_k^M) = h_k(c_k^M)$ and $h'_k(c_k^M) \geq 0$, respectively.

To prove (a), assume H_1 and H_2 both admit strictly quasi-convex densities. Note H_2 single crosses H_1 from above at some $s \in (0, \bar{c})$, i.e. $H_2(c) > H_1(c)$ for $c \in (0, s)$ and $H_2(c) < H_1(c)$ for $c \in (s, \bar{c})$. Note each c_k^M must both lie above s . Hence, we have $S_2(c_2^M) \leq S_2(c_1^M) < S_1(c_1^M)$, i.e. $h_2(c_2^M) < h_1(c_1^M)$. By Corollary 1, $a_2^M \leq a_1^M$.

To prove (b), assume both H_1 and H_2 have strictly quasi-concave densities. We show $c_k^M = 0$ for $k = 1, 2$, which proves the desired result: since H_2 is a MPS of H_1 , it follows that $h_2(0) \geq h_1(0)$, and thus $a_2^M \geq a_1^M$ by Corollary 1. Because H_k admits a strictly quasi-concave density with some interior peak $p_k \in (0, \bar{c})$, the density h_k is strictly increasing over $[0, p_k]$ and strictly decreasing over $[p_k, \bar{c}]$. By the mean value theorem, for every $c \in (0, p_k)$, there exists some $m_c \in (0, c)$ such that $\frac{H_k(c)}{c} = S_k(c) = h_k(m_c)$. It follows that $S'_k(c) = \frac{1}{c}(h_k(c) - S_k(c)) = \frac{1}{c}(h_k(c) - h_k(m_c)) > 0$, where the last inequality holds because h_k is increasing over $[0, p_k]$. Hence, $S_k(c)$ is strictly increasing over $(0, p_k)$ and $m_c < c$. Since $h'_k(c_k^M) \geq 0$ by the second order condition, we must have $c_k^M \in [0, p_k]$. But S_k is strictly increasing over this interval, so the global minimum is attained only at the left endpoint. Therefore, $c_k^M = 0$. \square

B Existence and Uniqueness of the Upper Censorship Equilibria

This appendix aims to prove the existence and uniqueness of upper censorship equilibria. Section B.1 provides preliminary analysis essential for the subsequent results. Section B.2 proves Theorem 1-(b), showing that if an upper censorship equilibrium exists, there must be a continuum of them. Section B.3 proves the existence (Theorem 1-(a)) by explicitly constructing the maximally informative upper censorship equilibrium, without relying on Assumption 1 and thus extending the results to arbitrary cost distributions H (Theorem 2 generalizes Proposition 4). Finally, Section B.4 establishes that upper censorship equilibria are the only limit equilibria.

First, we begin with Lemma 2, which restates relevant results in Dworczak and Martini (2019).

Lemma 2 (Dworczak and Martini (2019)). *Assume $u : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is continuous and has bounded slope. Then,*

$$G^* \in \arg \max_{G \in \text{MPC}(F)} \int_0^1 u(x) dG(x)$$

if and only if there exists some convex function $\phi : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that (a) $\int_0^1 \phi dF = \int_0^1 \phi dG^$, (b) $\phi(x) \geq u(x)$, and (c) $\text{supp}(G^*) \subseteq \{x | \phi(x) = u(x)\}$. Moreover, for any $[a, b] \subseteq [0, 1]$:*

1. *if ϕ is strictly convex in $[a, b]$, then $\phi(x) = u(x)$ and $G^*(x) = F(x)$ for all $x \in [a, b]$, or*
2. *if ϕ is affine in $[a, b]$ and $[a, b]$ is the maximal interval on which ϕ is affine, then*

$$G(a) = F(a), \quad G(b) = F(b), \quad \int_a^b tG(t) = \int_a^b tF(t), \quad \phi(c) = u(c) \text{ for some } c \in [a, b] \quad (\text{B.1})$$

We introduce multiple definitions:

- When the distribution G satisfies the conditions in (B.1), we say G is a *strict MPC of F over $[a, b]$* , or just *strict MPC* when the context is clear.
- Define the average slope of $H(\cdot)$ in $[0, c]$ as $S(c) := \begin{cases} h(0) & \text{if } c = 0 \\ \frac{H(c)}{c} & \text{if } c > 0 \end{cases}$
- Define $c_{cav} \in [0, \bar{c}]$ as

$$c_{cav} := \inf_c \{c : h'(t) \leq 0 \text{ for all } t \in (c, \bar{c}]\}. \quad (\text{B.2})$$

If the set in (B.2) is empty, we define $c_{cav} := \bar{c}$. If the set in (B.2) is nonempty, $[c_{cav}, \bar{c}]$ characterizes the maximal interval including \bar{c} where H is concave.

- Define $\bar{a} := c_F^{-1}(\bar{c})$. By Lemma 1, $a \leq \underline{a}$ if and only if $a \leq \bar{a}$.

B.1 Preliminary Analysis

In this section, we prove the following proposition, which serves a key role in characterizing and verifying whether an upper censorship distribution U_a is an equilibrium. It states that when the competition is sufficiently intense, it suffices to check conditions related to the cost distribution H .

Proposition 10. *There exists some $N > 0$ such that U_a is an equilibrium for $n > N$ if and only if*

- (a) $a \leq \bar{a}$ and $S(c) \geq \frac{1}{c_F(a)}$ for all $c \in [0, \bar{c}]$.
- (b) $a > \bar{a}$ and the following conditions all hold:
 - (i) $S(c) \geq S(c_F(a)) > h(c_F(a))$ for all $c \in [0, c_F(a)]$
 - (ii) $c_F(a) \geq c_{cav}$

Proof of Proposition 10 We prove the proposition in multiple steps. First, we show that verifying whether U_a is an equilibrium reduces to analyzing the virtual interim demand ϕ_a . Then, we establish lemmas connecting the properties of ϕ_a to those of the cost distribution H .

Lemma 3. *For any $a > 0$, define the auxiliary function ϕ_a as follows:*

$$\phi_a(x) := \begin{cases} D(x; U_a) & x \leq a \\ \frac{D(k_a; U_a) - D(a; U_a)}{k_a - a}(x - a) + D(a; U_a) & x > a \end{cases}$$

then, U_a is an equilibrium if and only if (i) ϕ_a is convex and (ii) $\phi_a(x) \geq D(x; U_a)$.

Proof. The if direction is trivial by construction and Lemma 2. To prove the only if part, assume U_a is an equilibrium. Then, there exists some function ϕ satisfying conditions of Lemma 2. We prove $\phi = \phi_a$. Clearly, $\phi(x) = D(x; U_a) = \phi_a(x)$ over $[0, a]$. Since U_a is a strict MPC of F over $[a, 1]$, ϕ must be linear over $[a, 1]$. Furthermore, $\{a, k_a\} \subseteq \{x | \phi(x) = D(x; U_a)\}$ implies $\phi = \phi_a$ at $x = a$ and $x = k_a$. Since both ϕ, ϕ_a are both linear over $[a, 1]$ and coincide in two points of the interval, they must be equal over $[a, 1]$. Hence, $\phi = \phi_a$. \square

We can restate the conditions of ϕ_a from Lemma 3 in terms of H . Since ϕ_a is linear over $[a, 1]$, establishing the convexity of ϕ_a over $[0, 1]$ reduces to verifying whether ϕ_a is (i) convex over $[0, a]$, and (ii) has an increasing kink at $x = a$. Each of these conditions are established in Lemma 5 and Lemma 6. Additionally, Lemma 7 establishes conditions ensuring $\phi_a \geq D$.

If $a \geq \underline{r}$, then the convexity of $\phi_a(x) = D(x; U_a)$ over $x \in [\underline{r}, a]$ is directly tied to the curvature of the search cost distribution H , specifically the sign of the second derivative $h'(c)$. This relationship is formalized in the lemma below.

Lemma 4. *Let $G \in \text{MPC}(F)$ and fix some $x \geq \underline{r} = r(\bar{c}; G)$ such that $(x - \epsilon, x + \epsilon) \subset \text{supp}(G)$ for some $\epsilon > 0$. Assume $D(x; G)$ is twice differentiable at x for some $n = m$. Then, there exists some $N_{x,G} > 0$ such that if $n > N_{x,G}$,*

(a) *if $h'(c_G(x)) > 0$, then $D''(x; G) < 0$.*

(b) *if $h'(c_G(x)) \leq 0$, then $D''(x; G) > 0$*

Furthermore, if $h'(c) \leq 0$ for all $c \in [c_F(x), \bar{c}]$, then there exists some $N > 0$ such that $D''(t; F) > 0$ for all $t \in [\underline{r}, x]$.

Proof. See Online Appendix D. □

Lemma 5 (Convexity of $\phi_a(x)$ over $[0, a]$). *Fix a and let $\underline{r} = r(\bar{c}; U_a)$.*

(a) *There exists some $N > 0$ such that if $n > N$, $\phi_a(x)$ is convex over $[0, \min(a, \underline{r})]$.*

(b) *Assume $a \in (\bar{a}, 1)$. There exists some $N > 0$ such that if $n > N$, ϕ_a is convex over $[0, a]$ if and only if $h'(c_F(x)) \leq 0$ for all $x \in [\underline{r}, a]$.*

Proof. Since $\phi_a(x) = F^{n-1}(x)$ over the interval $[0, \min(a, \underline{r})]$, we prove the convexity of F^{n-1} for large enough n . Direct calculation gives

$$(F^{n-1})'' = (n-1)F^{n-1}[(n-2)f^2 + f'F] \geq (n-1)F^{n-1}[(n-2)m_f^2 - M_{f'}],$$

where $m_f := \min_{x \in [0,1]} f(x)$ and $M_{f'} := \max_{x \in [0,1]} f'(x)$, which are guaranteed to exist because f, f' is continuous over a compact interval $[0, 1]$. Strictly positive density f implies $m_f > 0$, ensuring the term inside the square bracket is strictly positive for large enough n . This proves part (a) of the lemma. To prove (b), it suffices to prove the convexity of ϕ_a over $[\underline{r}, a]$. Since $D(x; U_a) = D(x; F)$ over $[\underline{r}, a]$, the result follows from Lemma 4. □

Part (a) and (b) of the following lemma links the kink of ϕ_a at $x = a$ to the cost distribution H . Part (c) proves that if ϕ_a is convex over $[0, 1]$, so is ϕ_b for all $b < a$.

Lemma 6 (Convexity of $\phi_a(x)$ at $x = a$). *There exists some $N > 0$ such that $\lim_{x \rightarrow a+} \phi'_a(x) \geq \lim_{x \rightarrow a-} \phi'_a(x)$ for all $n > N$ if and only if either*

(a) $a \leq \bar{a}$ or

(b) $a > \bar{a}$ and $S(c_F(a)) > h(c_F(a))$.

Moreover,

(c) Assume $\lim_{x \rightarrow a+} \phi'_a(x) \geq \lim_{x \rightarrow a-} \phi'_a(x)$ and $D(x; F)$ is convex over $[0, a]$, then

(i) $\lim_{x \rightarrow b+} \phi'_b(x) \geq \lim_{x \rightarrow b-} \phi'_b(x)$ holds for all $b < a$.

(ii) The right derivative $\lim_{x \rightarrow b+} \phi'_b(x)$ is a increasing function in $b \in [0, a]$ and $\frac{H(c_F(b))}{c_F(b)}$ is a increasing function in $b \in [\bar{a}, a]$.

Proof. We first prove the case of $a < \bar{a}$. Observe that for any $a > 0$,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{J_F(a)}{(n-1)F(a)^{n-2}f(a)} = \infty \quad (\text{B.3})$$

since the denominator vanishes exponentially faster than the numerator $J_F(a) = \frac{1-F(a)^n}{n(1-F(a))} - F(a)^{n-1}$.

Calculation gives $\lim_{x \rightarrow a+} \phi'_a(x) = \frac{J_F(a)}{k_a - a}$ and $\lim_{x \rightarrow a-} \phi'_a(x) = (n-1)F(a)^{n-2}f(a)$. Hence, $\lim_{x \rightarrow a+} \phi'_a(x) \geq \lim_{x \rightarrow a-} \phi'_a(x)$ if and only if $\frac{J_F(a)}{(n-1)F(a)^{n-2}f(a)} \geq k_a - a$, which holds for large enough n from (B.3).

Now assume $a \geq \bar{a}$ and $S(c_F(a)) = \frac{H(c_F(a))}{c_F(a)} > h(c_F(a))$. We need to show

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow a+} \phi'_a(x) = \frac{J_F(a)}{k_a - a} H(c_F(a)) \geq \lim_{x \rightarrow a-} \phi'_a(x) = (1 - F(a))h(c_F(a))J_F(a) + (n-1)F(a)^{n-2}f(a)H(c_F(a))$$

The inequality holds if and only if $\frac{J_F(a)}{(n-1)F(a)^{n-2}f(a)}(1 - F(a))\left(\frac{H(c_F(a))}{c_F(a)} - h(c_F(a))\right) \geq H(c_F(a))$. The term inside the bracket is strictly positive by assumption. Hence from (B.3), the inequality holds for large enough n .

The proof of (c) is deferred to the Online Appendix D; we only sketch the argument here. Define $R(a)$ and $L(a)$ as the right and left derivatives of $\phi_a(x)$ at $x = a$, respectively. The kink size $\Delta(a) := R(a) - L(a)$ can be explicitly characterized by solving a first-order ordinary differential

equation $\Delta'(a) = \frac{1}{k_a - a}\Delta(a) - L'(a)$. Using the boundary condition $\Delta(a) \geq 0$ and the monotonicity of $L(t)$, we show $\Delta(b) \geq 0$ for all $b < a$, which proves part (i). A straightforward calculation then establishes part (ii) as a corollary. \square

Lemma 7 (Conditions for $\phi_a \geq D$). (a) If $a < \bar{a}$, then $\phi_a(x) \geq D(x; U_a)$ for all x if and only if $S(c) \geq \frac{1}{c_F(a)}$ for all $c \in [0, \bar{c}]$.

(b) If $a \geq \bar{a}$, then $\phi_a(x) \geq D(x; U_a)$ for all x if and only if $S(c) \geq S(c_F(a))$ for all $c \in [0, c_F(a)]$.

Proof. We only need to check over the interval $[a, 1]$, where $\phi_a(x) = \frac{J_F(a)H(c_{U_a}(a))}{k_a - a}(x - a) + D(a; U_a)$. First, consider $a < \bar{a}$. This implies $H(c_{U_a}(a)) = 1$. Thus, $\phi_a(x) \geq D(x; U_a)$ for all $x \in [a, 1]$ if and only if

$$\frac{J_F(a)}{k_a - a}(x - a) \geq J_F(a)(1 - H(c_{U_a}(x))) \quad \forall x \in [a, k_a]. \quad (\text{B.4})$$

Using $c_{U_a}(x) = (F(a) - 1)(x - k_a)$ for $x \in [a, k_a]$, we rewrite the left-hand side as $\frac{1}{k_a - a}(x - a) = 1 + \frac{c_{U_a}(x)}{(F(a) - 1)(k_a - a)}$. Therefore, (B.4) holds if and only if $\frac{H(c_{U_a}(x))}{c_{U_a}(x)} \geq \frac{1}{(F(a) - 1)(a - k_a)} = \frac{1}{c_F(a)}$ for all x . Therefore, the inequality holds if and only if $S(c) = \frac{H(c)}{c} \geq \frac{1}{c_F(a)}$ for all c .

If $a \geq \bar{a}$, then $H(c_{U_a}(a)) < 1$. The condition $\phi_a(x) \geq D(x; U_a)$ becomes

$$\frac{J_F(a)}{k_a - a}H(c_{U_a}(a))(x - a) \geq J_F(a)(H(c_{U_a}(a)) - H(c_{U_a}(x))). \quad (\text{B.5})$$

Using the same substitution as in (a), this simplifies to $\frac{H(c_{U_a}(x))}{c_{U_a}(x)} \geq \frac{H(c_{U_a}(a))}{c_{U_a}(a)} = \frac{H(c_F(a))}{c_F(a)}$ for all $x \in [a, \bar{r}]$. Under $c_{U_a}(\cdot)$, this range corresponds to $c \in [0, c_F(a)]$. The lemma is proved. \square

Now, Proposition 10 follows from Lemmas 3, 5, 6 and 7. \square

B.2 Proof of Theorem 1-(b)

Assume U_a is an equilibrium. Let $b < a$. Since $\phi_a(x)$ is convex, $\phi_b(x) = \phi_a(x)$ is convex over $[0, b] \subseteq [0, a]$. Furthermore, by Lemma 6-(c), ϕ_b exhibits an increasing kink at $x = b$. By Lemma 3, it remains to show $\phi_b(x) \geq D(x; U_b)$ for all x to prove U_b is an equilibrium. If $a \leq \bar{a}$, then by Lemma 7-(a), we have $S(c) \geq \frac{1}{c_F(a)}$ for all $c \in [0, \bar{c}]$. Since $c_F(\cdot)$ is a strictly decreasing function, for any $b < a$, we have $S(c) \geq \frac{1}{c_F(a)} > \frac{1}{c_F(b)}$ for all c . Hence, $\phi_b(x) \geq D(x; U_b)$ by Lemma 7-(a). If $a > \bar{a}$, then by Lemma 7-(b), $S(c) \geq S(c_F(a))$ for all $c \in [0, c_F(a)]$. Lemma 6-(c) implies $S(c_F(a)) \geq S(c_F(b))$ for $\bar{a} \leq b \leq a$. Plugging $b = \bar{a}$, this implies $S(c) \geq S(\bar{c}) = \frac{1}{\bar{c}}$ for all c . Hence, $S(c) \geq \frac{1}{\bar{c}} > \frac{1}{c_F(b)}$ if $b < \bar{a}$. This prove $\phi_b(x) \geq D(x; U_b)$ for all x by Lemma 7-(b). \square

B.3 Existence and Characterization of Upper Censorship Equilibria (Theorem 1-(a) and Proposition 4)

We now construct the maximally informative upper-censorship equilibrium U_{a^M} , establishing existence as stated in Theorem 1-(a). Theorem 2 generalizes Proposition 4 by characterizing the maximally informative upper-censorship equilibria without relying on Assumption 1. According to Proposition 10, identifying an equilibrium U_a reduces to characterizing the set of feasible values $c_F(a)$ that satisfy the conditions of Proposition 10.

Define $m(H)$ as the set of critical points $c_0 \in [0, \bar{c}]$ where $S'(c_0) = 0$ and $S(c_0)$ is global minimum of S over the interval $[0, c_0]$, and define c_{loc} as follows:

$$m(H) = \{c_0 : S'(c_0) = 0 \text{ and } S(c) \geq S(c_0) \text{ for all } c \leq c_0\} \quad (\text{B.6})$$

$$c_{loc} = \begin{cases} c_{cav} & \text{if } m(H) = \emptyset \text{ or } m(H) = \{\bar{c}\} \\ \max_{c \in m(H)} \left(\arg \min S(c) \right) & \text{if } m(H) \neq \emptyset \text{ and } m(H) \neq \{\bar{c}\} \end{cases} \quad (\text{B.7})$$

Since S' is continuous, $m(H)$ is closed and c_{loc} is well-defined. If $m(H)$ is nonempty, then c_{loc} is the point at which S attains the smallest local minimum. If there are multiple points where the smallest local minimum is attained, we define c_{loc} be the largest minimizer. If $m(H) = \emptyset$ or if it is the boundary case of $m(H) = \{\bar{c}\}$, we set $c_{loc} := c_{cav}$. Note $m(H) = \emptyset$ or $m(H) = \{\bar{c}\}$ if and only if H is convex over $[0, \bar{c}]$ and strictly convex over some subinterval. We first establish the properties of c_{loc} .

Lemma 8. Assume $m(H) \neq \emptyset$ and $c_{loc} < \bar{c}$.

(a) Then, the equation

$$S(c) = S(c_{loc}) \quad (\text{B.8})$$

admits either one or no solution in $c \in (c_{loc}, \bar{c}]$.

(b) The solution $c_{sol} \in (c_{loc}, \bar{c})$ to (B.8) exists if and only if $S(c_{loc}) > \frac{1}{\bar{c}}$. Moreover, $c_{sol} = \bar{c}$ if and only if $S(c_{loc}) = \frac{1}{\bar{c}}$.

(c) $S'(c_{sol}) < 0$ (equivalently, $S(c_{sol}) > h(c_{sol})$). Moreover, $S'(c) < 0$ for all $c \in (c_{sol}, \bar{c}]$.

(d) $S(c) \geq S(c_{sol})$ for all $c \in [0, c_{sol}]$ with the equality holding only at $c \in \{c_{loc}, c_{sol}\}$. Moreover, if $S(c_{loc}) \leq \frac{1}{\bar{c}}$, then $S(c) \geq S(c_{loc})$ for all $c \in [0, \bar{c}]$, with $S(c) > S(c_{loc})$ for all $c \in (c_{loc}, \bar{c}]$.

Proof. See Appendix D. □

Note if $S(c_{loc}) > \frac{1}{\bar{c}}$, choosing a such that $c_F(a) = \max(c_{sol}, c_{cav})$ satisfies the conditions in Proposition (10)-(b). The condition $S(c) \geq S(c_F(a)) > h(c_F(a))$ follows from directly Lemma 8-(c,d), while $c_F(a) \geq c_{cav}$ follows by construction. If $S(c_{loc}) \leq \frac{1}{\bar{c}}$ and $m(H) \neq \emptyset, \{\bar{c}\}$, this is equivalent to Assumption 1 in the text, implying that Proposition 4 corresponds to Theorem 2-(a,b).

Theorem 2. Fix N large enough that Lemma 5 and Lemma 6 holds. Then, the maximally informative upper censorship equilibrium threshold a^M is characterized as follows.

(a) If $m(H) \neq \emptyset$ and $S(c_{loc}) \leq \frac{1}{\mu}$,

$$a^M = 0$$

(b) If $m(H) \neq \emptyset, \{\bar{c}\}$ and $\frac{1}{\mu} < S(c_{loc}) \leq \frac{1}{\bar{c}}$,

$$a^M = c_F^{-1} \left(\frac{1}{S(c_{loc})} \right)$$

(c) If $m(H) \neq \emptyset$ and $S(c_{loc}) > \frac{1}{\bar{c}}$, then

$$a^M = c_F^{-1} (\max(c_{cav}, c_{sol}))$$

(d) If $m(H) = \emptyset$ or $m(H) = \{\bar{c}\}$

$$a^M = c_F^{-1}(c_{cav})$$

B.3.1 (a): $m(H) \neq \emptyset$ and $S(c_{loc}) \leq \frac{1}{\mu}$

Equilibrium Check: $a^M = 0$ is identical to $G = \delta_\mu$. Let $\phi(x) := \frac{1}{n}$, then, $\phi(x) \geq D(x, G)$, $\text{supp}(G) = \{\mu\} \subset \{x | \phi(x) = D(x, G)\} = [\mu, 1]$, and $\int_0^1 \phi(x) dG(x) = \int_0^1 \phi(x) dF(x)$. By Lemma 2, G_{a^M} is an equilibrium.

Maximality: By Lemma 8-(d), $S(c) \geq S(c_{loc})$ holds for all $c \in [0, \bar{c}]$. For any $a > 0$, we have $c_F(a) < \mu$ by definition. Since $S(c_{loc}) \leq \frac{1}{\mu}$ whereas $\frac{1}{c_F(a)} > \frac{1}{\mu}$, there exists some c such that $S(c) < \frac{1}{c_F(a)}$. Hence, U_a with $a \in (0, \bar{a}]$ cannot be an equilibrium by Proposition 10. This implies that any U_a with $a \in (\bar{a}, 1]$ also cannot be an equilibrium by Theorem 1-(b). Hence a^M is maximal. □

B.3.2 (b): $m(H) \neq \emptyset, \{\bar{c}\}$ and $\frac{1}{\mu} < S(c_{loc}) \leq \frac{1}{c}$

Equilibrium Check: Observe that $a^M = c_F^{-1}\left(\frac{1}{S(c_{loc})}\right) \leq \bar{a} = c_F^{-1}(\bar{c})$ since $c_F(\cdot)$ is decreasing. Hence, $S(c) \geq S(c_{loc}) = \frac{1}{c_F(a^M)}$ for all $c \in [0, \bar{c}]$ by Lemma 8-(d). By Proposition 10, U_{a^M} is an equilibrium.

Maximality: Assume first that $a^M < \bar{a}$, and fix some $a \in (a^M, \bar{a}]$. Then, $c_F(a) < c_F(a^M) = \frac{1}{S(c_{loc})}$, which implies $S(c_{loc}) < \frac{1}{c_F(a)}$. By the continuity of S , there exists some c such that $\frac{H(c)}{c} < \frac{1}{c_F(a)}$. By Proposition 10, such U_a cannot be an equilibrium. Furthermore, by Theorem 1-(b), no $a > \bar{a}$ can be an equilibrium.

Now suppose $a^M = \bar{a}$, which is equivalent to $S(c_{loc}) = \frac{1}{c}$. We consider 2 cases depending on whether $c_{loc} = \bar{c}$ or $c_{loc} < \bar{c}$. If $c_{loc} = \bar{c}$, let $A := \arg \min_{c \in m(H)} S(c)$. Since $m(H) \neq \{\bar{c}\}$, we have $|A| > 1$. Consider two subcases depending on whether \bar{c} is an isolated point of A or not. Consider the first case where \bar{c} is isolated point in A . For small enough $\epsilon > 0$, $A \cap (\bar{c} - \epsilon, \bar{c}) = \emptyset$. Then there exists some $c_1 < \bar{c} - \epsilon$ such that $c_1 \in A$. Moreover, $S(c) > S(\bar{c})$ for $c \in (\bar{c} - \epsilon, \bar{c})$, implying $S(c_1) < S(c)$ on this interval. Hence, for such c , any U_a with $a = c_F^{-1}(c) > a^M$ cannot be an equilibrium by Lemma 7-(b). Thus, U_{a^M} is maximal. The case of $c_{loc} < \bar{c}$ follows exactly the same reasoning.

Now consider the second case where \bar{c} is not an isolated point of A . Then there exists some $\delta > 0$ such that $(\bar{c} - \delta, \bar{c}) \subseteq A$, implying that $S(c)$ is constant over $(\bar{c} - \delta, \bar{c})$. Thus, $S(c) = h(c)$ over $(\bar{c} - \delta, \bar{c})$. By Lemma 6-(b), for all such c , $a = c_F^{-1}(c) > a^M$ cannot be an equilibrium. Again, U_{a^M} is maximal. \square

B.3.3 (c): $m(H) \neq \emptyset$ and $S(c_{loc}) > \frac{1}{c}$ and **(d):** $m(H) = \emptyset$ or $m(H) = \{\bar{c}\}$.

Equilibrium Check: Let $\hat{c} = \max(c_{cav}, c_{sol})$. Note $\hat{c} \leq \bar{c}$ implies $a^M \geq \bar{a}$.

We first show (c). Assume first that $m(H) \neq \emptyset$ and $S(c_{loc}) > \frac{1}{c}$. First consider the case $\hat{c} = c_{sol} \geq c_{cav}$. We have $S(c) \geq S(c_{sol}) > h(c_{sol})$ for all $c \in [0, c_{sol}]$, where the first and second inequalities follow from Lemma 8-(d) and (c), respectively. Thus, $S(c) \geq S(\hat{c}) > h(\hat{c})$ for all $c \in [0, \hat{c}]$, and $\hat{c} \geq c_{cav}$. It follows from Proposition 10 that U_{a^M} is an equilibrium. Now consider the case $\hat{c} = c_{cav} > c_{sol}$. Since $c_{cav} > c_{sol}$, Lemma 8-(c) implies $S'(c_{cav}) < 0$, so $S(c) \geq S(c_{cav}) > h(c_{cav})$ for all $c \in [0, c_{cav}]$. Again, U_{a^M} is an equilibrium by Proposition 10-(b).

Now we show (d). Assume $m(H) = \emptyset$. Then, $S'(c_{cav}) < 0$, since otherwise $c_{cav} \in m(H)$. The function $S(\cdot)$ is monotonically decreasing on $[0, \bar{c}]$, so in particular $S(c) \geq S(c_{cav}) > h(c_{cav})$ for all $c \in [0, c_{cav}]$. Hence, U_{a^M} is an equilibrium by Proposition 10. If $m(H) = \{c\}$, then again

$S'(c_{cav}) < 0$, as otherwise $c_{cav} \in m(H)$. The same argument shows U_{a^M} is an equilibrium.

Maximality: Fix $a > a^M$. If $\hat{c} = c_{cav}$, then $c_F(a) < c_{cav}$, violating the requirement $c_F(a) \geq c_{cav}$ from Proposition 10-(b). Hence, U_a is not an equilibrium. If $\hat{c} = c_{sol}$, then $c_F(a) < c_{sol}$, but $S(c_F(a)) > S(c_{sol}) = S(c_{loc})$, which violates the equilibrium condition from Proposition 10 that $S(c) \geq S(c_F(a))$ for all $c \in [0, c_F(a)]$. Again, U_a is not an equilibrium. \square

B.4 Upper censorship equilibria as the unique class of equilibrium (Theorem 1-(c))

In this section, we prove the following Proposition, which encompasses Theorem 1-(c) as a corollary. The result shows that only upper censorship distributions U_a can be limit equilibrium when competition becomes sufficiently intense.

Proposition 11. *If $G \notin \{U_a : a \leq a^M\}$, then there exist some $N_G > 0$ such that $G \notin E_n$ for all $n > N_G$. Moreover, if there exists some $N > 0$ such that G is an equilibrium for all $n > N$, then $G \in \{U_a : a \in [0, 1]\}$.*

Proof of Theorem 1-(c) By Theorem 2, there exists some $N > 0$ such that if $n > N$, $\{U_a : a \leq a^M\} \subseteq E_n$. This implies $\{U_a : a \leq a^M\} \subseteq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} E_n, \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} E_n$. Assume $G \notin \{U_a : a \in [0, 1]\}$. Proposition 11 implies $G \notin \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} E_n$ as well as $G \notin \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} E_n$. Furthermore, since U_{a^M} is maximal, $\{U_a : a > a^M\} \cap E_n = \emptyset$ for all n . Hence, $\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} E_n = \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} E_n = \{U_a : a \leq a^M\}$. \square

Proof of Proposition 11 We prove necessary lemmas. Lemma 9 establishes that equilibrium G must have an atom at the maximum of its support, and continuous elsewhere. Lemma 10 and Lemma 11 address characterizes equilibrium properties over $[0, \underline{x}]$ and $[\underline{x}, 1]$, respectively. Combining these lemmas proves Proposition 11, which is presented at the end of this section.

Lemma 9 (Necessity of continuity and atom). *Assume G is an equilibrium and $k_G := \max(\text{supp}(G))$.*

(a) *G is continuous at $[0, k_G)$.*

(b) *G has an atom at k_G .*

Proof. The proof of (a) is deferred to Online Appendix D; we sketch the proof here. Suppose to the contrary that G has an atom at some $x_0 \in (0, k_G)$ with size $\alpha = G(\{x_0\})$. For small enough $\epsilon > 0$, consider a deviation G_ϵ that splits the mass α at x_0 into mass $\frac{1}{n+1}\alpha$ at $x_0 - n\epsilon$ and mass $\frac{n}{n+1}\alpha$ at $x_0 + \epsilon$. We show this constitutes a profitable deviation:

$$\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \left(\int_0^1 D(x; G) dG_\epsilon(x) - \int_0^1 D(x; G) dG(x) \right) \geq \frac{\alpha H(c_G(x_0))}{n(n+1)} (G(x_0)^{n-1} - G(x_0-)^{n-1}) > 0.$$

To prove (b), assume, to the contrary, that G is an equilibrium but is continuous in k_G . We show this implies $D(x; G)$ to be strictly concave locally around k_G , which contradicts the convexity of $D(x; G)$ (Lemma 2). Let $\epsilon > 0$ be small enough such that $(k_G - \epsilon, k_G) \subset \text{supp}(G)$. Since G is an equilibrium, Lemma 2 implies that $\phi(x) = D(x; G)$ is convex over $(k_G - \epsilon, k_G)$. Therefore, $D(x; G)$ is almost everywhere differentiable over this interval, with the derivative

$$D'(x; G) = (1 - G(x))h(c_G(x))J_G(x) + (n-1)G(x)^{n-2}g(x)H(c_G(x)) \geq 0.$$

The first term is strictly positive for $x < k_G$ and the second term is weakly positive. This implies $D'(x; G) > 0$ for all $x < k_G$. Moreover, $\lim_{x \rightarrow k_G-} G(x) = 1$ implies $\lim_{x \rightarrow k_G-} D'(x; G) = 0$.

Now, fix some $y \in (k_G - \epsilon, k)$, and choose $\delta \in (0, D'(y; G))$. By the assumption of continuity, $\lim_{x \rightarrow k-} D'(x; G) = 0$. Therefore, there exists some ϵ_δ such that $D'(x; G) < \delta$ for all $x \in (k - \epsilon_\delta, k)$. But this implies that $D'(y; G) > D'(x; G)$ for all $\max(y, k - \epsilon_\delta) < x < k$, which contradicts the weak convexity of $D(x; G)$ over $(k_G - \epsilon, k_G)$. Therefore, G must have an atom at k_G . \square

Lemma 10 (Equilibrium properties of G over $[0, \underline{r}]$). *There exists some $N > 0$ such that for any $n > N$, any equilibrium G must either*

(a) $G = 0$ over $[0, \underline{r}]$, or

(b) $G = F$ over $[0, a]$ and constant over $[a, \underline{r}]$ for some $a \leq \underline{r}$.

Furthermore, if G does not satisfy either (a) or (b), then there exists some N_G such that G is not an equilibrium if $n > N_G$.

Proof. The detailed proof of the steps are deferred to Online Appendix D. Here, we outline the main steps of the proof. Assume G is an equilibrium. We first show that $m := \min(\text{supp}(G))$ must be either 0 or \underline{r} . If $m = \underline{r}$, then the statement (a) of the lemma holds. So, we focus on the case $m = 0$.

We then establish that $\text{supp}(G) \cap [0, \underline{r}]$ is connected, meaning that for some $a \leq \underline{r}$, G is increasing over $[0, a]$ and flat over $[a, \underline{r}]$. Next, we prove that $G = F$ over $[0, \epsilon]$ for some $\epsilon > 0$. If this were not true, then the linearity of G^{n-1} over some interval of 0 (Lemma 2) implies $\lim_{x \rightarrow 0+} g(x) = \infty$, contradicting the assumption that G is an MPC of F . We then show the full information region $\{x | G(x) = F(x)\} \cap [0, \underline{r}]$ must be connected. To see why, suppose $G = F$ over some $[0, x_1]$ and again over $[x_2, x_3]$ with G^{n-1} being linear over $[x_1, x_2]$. If N is sufficiently large, F^{n-1} is convex, implying $G^{n-1} > F^{n-1}$ over $[x_1, x_2]$. Since $G = F$ over $[0, x_1]$, this implies $\int_0^x G(t)dt > \int_0^x F(t)dt$ over $x \in [x_1, x_2]$, contradicting that G is an MPC of F . Finally, we rule out the possibility that $G = F$ over some $[0, a]$ and G^{n-1} is linear over $[a, \underline{r}]$. Let $[a, b]$ be the maximal interval where G is a strict MPC of F . If $b = \underline{r}$, then by the same reasoning above, G cannot be an MPC of F . If $b > \underline{r}$, then $D(x; G)$ always exhibits a strictly increasing kink at $x = \underline{r}$, contradicting the linearity of $D(x; G)$ over $[a, b]$. \square

Lemma 11 (Equilibrium properties of G over $[\underline{r}, 1]$). *If there exists some N such that G is an equilibrium for all $n > N$, then either*

(a) $\text{supp}(G) \cap (\underline{r}, k_G) = \emptyset$, or

(b) $\text{supp}(G) \cap (\underline{r}, k_G) = (\underline{r}, a] \cup \{k_G\}$ where $G = F$ over $[\underline{r}, a]$.

Furthermore, if G does not satisfy either (a) or (b), then there exists some N_G such that G is not an equilibrium if $n > N_G$.

Proof. Let $A := \text{supp}(G) \cap (\underline{r}, k_G)$. We focus on the case where $A \neq \emptyset$. By Lemma 2, $D(x; G)$ must be a convex function over $\text{supp}(G)$ and a necessary condition for the convexity (Lemma 4) is that $h'(c_G(x)) \leq 0$ for all $x \in A$. Since $D(x; G)$ is strictly convex over A , Lemma 2 implies that $A \subseteq \{x | G(x) = F(x)\}$. Since G has an atom at k_G , G is a strict MPC of F over $(k_G - \epsilon, k_G + \epsilon)$. Therefore, $\max A \neq k_G$. This implies that G is constant over $[\max A, k_G)$ and jumps to 1 at k_G . Let $\beta := \inf A$. Suppose that $\beta > \underline{r}$. From Lemma 10, $G = F$ over some $[0, a]$ and is constant over $[a, \underline{r}]$. Since $\beta > \underline{r}$, G is also constant over $[\underline{r}, \beta]$ and hence over $[a, \beta]$. This is a contradiction because $F(a) = G(a) = G(\beta) = F(\beta) > F(a)$. Hence, we must have $\beta = \underline{r}$, implying that $G = F$ over $[\underline{r}, \max A)$.

The last part follows from the Lemma 4: if G is a strict MPC of F over some $(x - \epsilon, x + \epsilon) \subseteq \text{supp}(G) \cap (\underline{r}, k_G)$, either $D(\cdot; G)$ is strictly concave or strictly convex over $(x - \epsilon, x + \epsilon)$ for large enough $n > N_G$, contradicting Lemma 2. \square

Proposition 11 directly follows from Lemmas 9, 10 and 11. Assume there exists some $N > 0$ such that G is an equilibrium for all $n > N$. By Lemma 9, G must have an atom at k_G and continuous over $[0, k_G]$. Lemma 10 shows that either $G = 0$ over $[0, \underline{r}]$ or $G = F$ over some $[0, a_1]$ and remains constant over $[a_1, \underline{r}]$. We consider three cases:

First, if $G = 0$ over $[0, \underline{r}]$, then by Lemma 11, $\text{supp}(G) \cap (\underline{r}, k_G) = \emptyset$. Therefore, G must be a point mass $G = \delta_{k_G} = \delta_\mu$. Second, if $G = F$ over $[0, a_1]$ with $a_1 < \underline{r}$, then Lemma 11 again implies that $\text{supp}(G) \cap (\underline{r}, k_G) = \emptyset$. Therefore, $G = U_{a_1}$. Finally, assume $G = F$ over $[0, \underline{r}]$. If Lemma 11 applies, we have $G = U_{a_1}$. Otherwise, if $\text{supp}(G) \cap (\underline{r}, k_G) \neq \emptyset$, then $G = F$ over some interval $[\underline{r}, a_1]$. Therefore, $G = U_{a_2}$. For all three cases, $G \in \{U_a : a \in [0, 1]\}$. This completes the proof of Proposition 11.

Assume $G \notin \{U_a : a \in [0, 1]\}$. If the conditions of Lemma 9-(a,b) fail, then G is not an equilibrium for any n . If they hold, then G must violate at least one of the necessary conditions stated in Lemma 10-(a,b) or Lemma 11-(a,b). Hence, there exists some $N > 0$ such that G is not an equilibrium for any $n > N$. \square

Supplemental Materials for Online Publication

C Extensions of the Model

This Online Appendix provides detailed analyses of the model extensions discussed briefly in Section 6 of the main text.

C.1 Discrete cost distributions

Our main analysis considers continuous search cost distributions H with support $[0, \bar{c}]$. A common alternative in the literature is the binary "shopper model" introduced by Stahl (1989), where consumers fall into two categories: a fraction $p \in (0, 1)$ are *shoppers* with zero search costs, and the remaining fraction $(1 - p)$ of *searchers* have a positive, homogeneous search cost $c > 0$. Since all searchers share a homogeneous search cost $c > 0$, firms need only consider single reservation value r instead of the range $[\underline{r}, \bar{r}]$. Furthermore, the demand $D(x; G)$ now exhibits a discrete jump at r , with the jump size given by $(1 - p)J_G(r)$.

In this binary setting, an upper-censorship distribution is no longer an equilibrium. With a continuous search cost distribution, the tie at the purchase signal k_a was immaterial—it only affected a measure-zero set of consumers with $c = 0$. However, under the binary search cost framework, any tie at an atom affects a strictly positive mass p of consumers. As a result, firms can profitably deviate by splitting the atom to enjoy a discrete increase in profit.

Instead, equilibria take the form of *pseudo*-upper censorship distributions, preserving core characteristics of UCE. Firms pool information just above the reservation value to secure non-shoppers while still providing competitive signals at lower levels to attract revisits by shoppers. However, pooling no longer occurs at a single atom; rather, it is spread continuously above r , ensuring that the payoff function $(1 - p)J_G(r) + pG(x)^{n-1}$ remains linear. This linearity balances competing incentives: although non-shoppers have stopped searching, firms must still compete for shoppers who continue searching even at high signal values.

This result generalizes naturally to any discrete cost distribution, as formally stated below.

Proposition 12. *Let $\text{supp}(H) = \{0 < c_1 < \dots < c_d\}$ and for each $i = 1, \dots, d$, denote r_i the reservation value for each c_i -consumer. If G is an equilibrium, then*

- (a) *(Pooling above the highest reservation value) G^{n-1} is linear over $(r_1, r_1 + \epsilon)$ for some $\epsilon > 0$.*

(b) *(Full disclosure below the lowest reservation value)* There exist some $N > 0$ such that if $n > N$ and $G(r_d) > 0$, then for some $a \in (0, r_d]$, $G = F$ over $[0, a]$ and G is flat over $[a, r_d]$.

The above proposition generalizes the result of [Boleslavsky and Krasteva \(2023\)](#). In their paper, they adopt the shopper model, focusing on the duopoly case with a uniform prior $F = U[0, 1]$. They showed that the equilibrium information structure is linear above the reservation value r , and any information disclosed below r must be fully disclosed. Proposition 12 extends their equilibrium characterization partially to general priors F and discrete cost distributions H . However, full disclosure below the lowest reservation value requires sufficiently intense competition (large n). This dependence on n arises to guarantee the convexity of F^{n-1} . If the prior F is already convex—as in the uniform case analyzed by [Boleslavsky and Krasteva \(2023\)](#)—a duopoly ($n = 2$) suffices to guarantee full disclosure below r .

While our paper exclusively analyzes information provision, [Boleslavsky and Krasteva \(2023\)](#) integrates pricing into their model, uncovering non-monotonic effects of search costs on equilibrium prices and informativeness. Thus, our studies complement each other: we focus deeper into the dimension of information competition, especially emphasizing the role of consumer heterogeneity, while they highlight the interplay between pricing and information provision.

Our modeling approach, using a continuum of search costs, centers on delivering clear comparative static results. In the binary shopper model, changes in parameters (such as p or c) simultaneously affect both the level and heterogeneity of search costs, making it difficult to disentangle these two effects. A continuous framework permits a clearer distinction between "increased costs" and "increased heterogeneity," without imposing parametric assumptions. Nonetheless, our core results and intuitions naturally extend to discrete distributions that include positive-mass atoms at arbitrary cost levels.

C.2 Small market equilibria

Throughout the paper, we have focused on large markets (large but finite n) and its limit ($n \rightarrow \infty$). In real-world settings, the large market assumption—together with the random search process—is justified in context such as online marketplaces, digital platforms, and large-scale service industries. In these environments, consumers often face a vast number of options and engage in search without a predetermined order, making random search a reasonable approximation.

We adopt the large market assumption for two key reasons. First, from a theoretical standpoint, our objective is to explore the extent competition can promote (or deter) information disclosure under search cost heterogeneity. Since established results in the literature rely on sufficiently competitive settings, adopting this assumption directly compare our findings with those in the existing literature.

Second, the large market assumption helps mitigate the technical complexities associated with small markets. As noted in Dworczak and Martini (2019), the objective function $D(x; G)$ must be convex in the region of full-disclosure ($G = F$) and linear in every subinterval of $\text{supp}(G)$ where G is a strict MPC of F .³⁷ The inherent non-linearity and complexity of the objective function (see Equation (4)), makes the small market characterization exceedingly difficult.³⁸

Nevertheless, if we relax some generality of our framework by imposing additional structure on either the cost distribution H (Proposition 13) or the prior distribution F (Proposition 14), we can still characterize equilibria in small markets.

Proposition 13. *Assume G is an equilibrium. For any $n > 0$,*

- (a) *(Atom at the top) G must have an atom at $\max(\text{supp}(G)) = \underline{r}$.*
- (b) *(Disclosure at the bottom) If $G(\underline{r}) > 0$, there exist some partition $0 = x_0 < \dots < x_{k-1} \leq x_k = \underline{r}$ that for each $i = 0, \dots, k-2$, on the interval $[x_i, x_{i+1}]$, either $G = F$ or G^{n-1} is linear. These intervals alternate, and G is constant for the final interval $[x_{k-1}, \underline{r}]$.*

Furthermore, if H is strictly convex, strictly concave or linear,

- (c) *(No partial-purchase signals) if $x_{k-1} < \underline{r}$, then $\text{supp}(G) \cap (\underline{r}, \bar{r}) = \emptyset$*

The general intuition behind the upper-censorship distribution remains unchanged. Firms place an atom at \bar{r} to retain all consumer types, and they compete below \underline{r} to maximize their chances of being revisited. The only difference lies in how firms compete in low signals below \underline{r} . For small n , the competition is not intense enough to promote full disclosure. The alternating equilibrium structure below \underline{r} is exactly that of Hwang et al. (2023). Locally, firms either fully disclose information

³⁷We say $G \in \text{MPC}(F)$ is a strict MPC of F over $[a, b]$ if $G(a) = F(a)$, $G(b) = F(b)$, $\int_a^b x dF = \int_a^b x dG$ and there doesn't exist any $\epsilon > 0$ where $G = F$ over $(x - \epsilon, x + \epsilon)$ for any $x \in (a, b)$.

³⁸For instance, while Au and Whitmeyer (2023) mainly focus on discrete priors, they also resolve the continuous prior case only under the assumption of sufficiently large markets.

($G = F$), or garble information in such a way that G^{n-1} is linear, ensuring indifference. Note this pooling structure was already observed in Section C.1.

If instead, we relax the generality of the prior distribution by considering binary match values, we obtain a similar pooling structure:

Proposition 14. *Assume the match values are binary $\{0, 1\}$, i.e. $F \in \Delta(\{0, 1\})$ and that H is strictly convex, strictly concave, or linear. For any n , if G is an informative equilibrium, there exist some $a \leq \underline{r}$ such that*

- (a) G^{n-1} is linear over $[0, a]$
- (b) The complementary mass is placed at $\max(\text{supp}(G))$.

D Other Omitted Proofs

D.1 Omitted Proofs of Appendix A without Assumption 1

In Appendix A, all distributions H_k were assumed to satisfy Assumption 1, corresponding to cases (a) and (b) of Theorem 2. In this section, we address the remaining cases (c) and (d), where Assumption 1 fail.

Proof of Proposition 6 Since $H_2(c)$ is an α -scale shift of H_1 , all relevant quantities scale accordingly: $c_{2,cav} = \alpha c_{1,cav}$, $c_{2,loc} = \alpha c_{1,loc}$, as well as $c_{2,sol} = \alpha c_{1,sol}$ if $c_{1,sol}$ exists. Note H_1 and H_2 both must fall into the same case of Theorem 2. Consider case (c). By definition, $m(H_1) = m(H_2)$ and $S_1(c_{1,loc}) > \frac{1}{\bar{c}}$ implies $S_2(c_{2,loc}) = \frac{1}{\alpha} S_1(c_{1,loc}) > \frac{1}{\alpha \bar{c}}$. Moreover, since $\max(c_{2,cav}, c_{2,loc}) = \alpha \max(c_{1,cav}, c_{1,loc})$, we conclude:

$$a_2^M = c_F^{-1}(\max(c_{2,cav}, c_{2,sol})) < c_F^{-1}(\max(c_{1,cav}, c_{1,sol})) = a_1^M.$$

Case (d) also follows from this inequality.

Proof of Corollary 2 Assume all H_k satisfies Assumption (d). As $\text{supp}(H_K) \searrow \{0\}$, $c_{k,cav} \searrow 0$. Hence, $a_k^M = c_F^{-1}(c_{k,cav}) \rightarrow c_F^{-1}(0) = 1$. Now assume all H_k satisfies Assumption (c). Similarly, $c_{k,cav}$, $c_{k,loc}$ and $c_{k,sol}$ all vanishes to zero. Hence, $\max(c_{k,cav}, c_{k,sol}) \searrow 0$, implying $a_k^M \rightarrow 1$.

Now consider an arbitrary sequence of $\{H_k\}$. For any subsequence of $\{H_{k_i}\}_i$, we can find subsequence $\{H_{k_{ij}}\}_j$ where all the elements fall into the same case in Theorem 2. We already proved that $a_{k_{ij}}^M \rightarrow 1$ if all elements fall into the same case. Hence, $a_k^M \rightarrow 1$. \square

Proof of Proposition 8 Note that $S_\lambda(c) = \lambda \frac{1}{c} + (1-\lambda)S_0(c)$, so its derivatives satisfy $S'_\lambda = (1-\lambda)S'_0$ and $S''_\lambda = (1-\lambda)S''_0$. It follows that $S(c) \geq S(c_0)$ if and only if $S_\lambda(c) \geq S_\lambda(c_0)$, implying that the sets $m(H_\lambda) = m(H_0)$ coincide for all $\lambda \in (0, 1)$, and in particular, $c_{0,cav} = c_{\lambda,cav}$ for all $\lambda \in (0, 1)$. Additionally, if $m(H_0) \neq \emptyset$, then $c_{0,loc} = c_{\lambda,loc}$ for all $\lambda \in (0, 1)$. Hence, we suppress the subscript λ and write simply c_{cav}, c_{loc} throughout.

Case (c): Assume $m(H_0) \neq \emptyset$ and $S_0(c_{loc}) > \frac{1}{c}$. Fix $\lambda \in (0, 1)$. Then, $S_\lambda(c_{loc}) = \lambda \frac{1}{c} + (1-\lambda)S_0(c_{loc}) > \frac{1}{c}$. By Lemma 8-(b), the equation $S_0(c) = h_0(c_{loc})$ admits a unique solution $c_{0,sol} \in (c_{loc}, \bar{c})$ and $S_\lambda(c) = h_\lambda(c_{loc})$ admits a unique solution in $c_{\lambda,sol} \in (c_{loc}, \bar{c})$. Observe

$$S_\lambda(c_{\lambda,sol}) = h_\lambda(c_{loc}) = \lambda \frac{1}{c} + (1-\lambda)h_0(c_{loc}) = \lambda \frac{1}{c} + (1-\lambda)S_0(c_{0,sol}) = S_\lambda(c_{0,sol}).$$

By the uniqueness of solutions, we must have $c_{\lambda,sol} = c_{0,sol}$. Therefore,

$$a_\lambda^M = c_F^{-1}(\max(c_{cav}, c_{\lambda,sol})) = c_F^{-1}(\max(c_{cav}, c_{0,sol})) = a_0^M$$

Case (d): Follows directly since c_{cav} remains constant for all $\lambda \in [0, 1)$, implying $a_\lambda^M = c_F^{-1}(c_{cav}) = a_0^M$. \square

Proof of Proposition 9 Assume H_1 and H_2 both admits strictly quasi-concave densities. Note H_1 single crosses H_2 from below. Note $c_{k,cav} = \bar{c}$ for both $k = 1, 2$. Either only H_1 fails Assumption 1 or both does. First consider the case only H_1 fails Assumption 1. Since $h_2(c_1^M) \leq \frac{1}{c}$, we have $a_2^M = c_F^{-1}(\frac{1}{h(c_{2,loc})}) \leq c_F^{-1}(\bar{c}) = \bar{a}$ by Theorem 2. $a_1^M = c_F^{-1}(\bar{c}) = \bar{a}$. Hence, $a_1^M \geq a_2^M$. If both H_1 and H_2 fails Assumption 1, $a_k^M = c_F^{-1}(c_{k,cav}) = \bar{a}$ by Theorem 2. Hence, $a_1^M = a_2^M$,

For (b), assume H_1 and H_2 both admit strictly quasi-concave densities with interior peaks. Denote the peaks p_k as in Appendix A. Since H_1 single crosses H_2 from below, either only H_1 satisfies Assumption 1 or both doesn't. Note that $c_{k,loc} = 0$ for both $k = 1, 2$ and $c_{k,cav} = p_k$, where p_k is the peak of h_k , for both $k = 1, 2$.

Assume only H_1 satisfies Assumption 1. By Theorem 2, $a_1^M = c_F^{-1}(\frac{1}{h(c_{1,loc})}) \leq c_F^{-1}(\bar{c}) = \bar{a}$. On the other hand, $a_2^M = c_F^{-1}(c_{k,sol}) \geq c_F^{-1}(\bar{c}) = \bar{a}$. Hence, $a_1^M \leq a_2^M$.

If both H_1 and H_2 fails Assumption 1, $m(H_k) \neq \emptyset$ as $c_{k,loc} = 0$ for $k = 1, 2$. Since the solution $c_{k,sol}$ must lie in the concave region of H , $a_k^M = c_F^{-1}(\max(c_{k,sol}, c_{k,cav})) = c_F^{-1}(c_{k,sol})$. It is enough we prove $c_{1,sol} \geq c_{2,sol}$. Note both solutions must lie in the region where $H_1(c) \geq H_2(c)$ since H_1 single crosses H_2 from below. Let \hat{c} be the solution to $S_1(\hat{c}) = h_2(0)$. The solution \hat{c} exists from Lemma 8-(b) since $h_2(0) > \frac{1}{\bar{c}}$. By replicating the proof of Lemma 8-(c), we can show $S'_1(\hat{c}) < 0$, with $S'_1(c) < 0$ for all $c > \hat{c}$.

We first show $c_{2,sol} \leq \hat{c}$, and $\hat{c} \leq c_{1,sol}$. Observe

$$S_1(c_{2,sol}) > S_2(c_{2,sol}) = h_2(0)$$

where the strict inequality follows from single-crossing. Since $S_1(\bar{c}) = \frac{1}{\bar{c}} \leq h_2(0)$, a solution to $S_1(c) = h_2(0)$ must exist between $(c_{2,sol}, \bar{c})$. Since this solution is unique, it must be $c_{2,sol} \leq \hat{c}$. Now, $\hat{c} \leq c_{1,sol}$ follows from

$$S_1(\hat{c}) = h_2(0) \geq h_1(0) = S_1(c_{1,sol}).$$

□

D.2 Omitted Proofs of Appendix B

Proof of Lemma 4 Since $D(x; G)$ is twice differentiable, we have:

$$D''(x; G) = (n-1)G^{n-3} \left[(n-1)g^2H(c_G) + g'GH - 2(1-G)Ggh(c_G) \right] - (1-G)^2J_Gh'(c_G) \quad (\text{D.1})$$

$$= (n-1)G^{n-3} \left[(n-1)g^2H(c_G) + g'GH - 2(1-G)Ggh(c_G) - \frac{(1-G)^2J_G}{(n-1)G^{n-3}}h'(c_G) \right]. \quad (\text{D.2})$$

Let M_h and m_h be the global minimum and maximum of h over $[0, \bar{c}]$. Likewise, define $M_f, M_{|f'|}$ and $m_f, m_{|f'|}$ analogously for f and $|f'|$.

First consider the case $h'(c_G(x)) \leq 0$. Since $x < k_G$, there exist some $\epsilon > 0$ such that $H(c_G(x)) > \epsilon$. From (D.1),

$$D''(x; G) \geq (n-1)G^{n-3} \left[(n-1)g^2\epsilon - |g'| - 2gM_h \right]$$

The term inside the bracket is strictly positive for large enough n . This proves (a).

Now assume $h'(c_F(x)) > 0$. We show the term inside the square bracket in (D.2) is negative for

large enough n . The term inside the square bracket in (D.2) is strictly less than

$$a_n := (n-2)g^2 + g' - \frac{(1-G(x))^2 J_G(x)}{(n-1)G(x)^{n-3}} h'(c_G(x)).$$

As n increases, $\frac{(1-G)^2 J_G}{(n-1)G^{n-3}}$ diverges exponentially faster than $(n-2)g^2$, implying $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} a_n = -\infty$. Therefore, $D''(x; G) \leq (n-1)G^{n-3}a_n < 0$ for large enough n .

Now consider $D(x; F)$ and that $h'(c) \leq 0$ for all $c \in [c_F(x), \bar{c}]$. For any $t \in [\underline{r}, x]$,

$$D''(t; F) \geq (n-1)F(\underline{r})^{n-3}[(n-1)m_f^2 H(c_G(x)) - M_{|f'|} - 2M_f M_h]$$

Hence there exists some $N > 0$ such that if $n > N$, then $D''(t; F) > 0$ for all $t \in [\underline{r}, x]$. \square

Proof of Lemma 6 To prove (c), we distinguish cases depending on whether $a \leq \bar{a}$ or $a > \bar{a}$. First, consider $a \leq \bar{a}$. For $t \leq \bar{a}$, define $R(t) := \frac{J_F(t)}{k_t - t}$ and $L(t) := (n-1)F(t)^{n-2}f(t)$ the right and left derivative of $\phi_t(x)$ at $x = t$, respectively, and $\Delta(t) := R(t) - L(t)$ the kink size. By assumption, $\Delta(a) \geq 0$ and $L'(t) \geq 0$ for $t \in [0, a]$. We wish to show $\Delta(b) \geq 0$ for all $b \leq a$. Note that $R(0) = \frac{1}{n\mu} > 0 = L(0)$. Direct differentiation yields:

$$\frac{d}{dt}R(t) = \frac{1}{k_t - t} \left(\frac{J_F(t)}{k_t - t} - (n-1)F(t)^{n-2}f(t) \right) = \frac{1}{k_t - t} (R(t) - L(t))$$

so that $\Delta'(t) = C(t)\Delta(t) - L'(t)$ where $C(t) := \frac{1}{k_t - t}$. This is a first-order ordinary differential equation. Let $E(t) := \exp\left(-\int_0^t C(s)ds\right) > 0$, which allows us to express the solution:

$$E(t)\Delta(t) - E(0)\Delta(0) = -\int_0^t L'(s)E(s)ds \quad \text{or equivalently} \quad \Delta(t) = \frac{1}{E(t)} \left(\Delta(0) - \int_0^t L'(s)E(s)ds \right)$$

Since $L'(t) \geq 0$ and $E(t) > 0$, the integrand is non-negative and increasing in t . Hence, the expression in brackets is decreasing. Hence $\Delta(a) \geq 0$ implies $\Delta(t) \geq 0$ for all $t \leq a$.

If $a > \bar{a}$, define similarly for $t \in [\bar{a}, a]$, $\hat{R}(t) := \frac{J_F(t)H(c_F(t))}{k_t - t}$, $\hat{L}(t) = (n-1)F(t)^{n-2}f(t)H(c_F(t)) + (1-F(t))h(c_F(t))J_F(t)$ and $\hat{\Delta}(t) := \hat{R}(t) - \hat{L}(t)$. Calculation again yields $\hat{R}'(t) = C(t)(\hat{R}(t) - \hat{L}(t))$. Defining $\hat{E}(t) := \int_{\bar{a}}^t C(s)ds$, we obtain the solution $\hat{\Delta}(t) = \frac{1}{\hat{E}(t)} \left(\hat{E}(\bar{a})\hat{\Delta}(\bar{a}) - \int_{\bar{a}}^t \hat{L}'(s)E(s)ds \right)$. Again, since the term in the bracket is decreasing in t , $\hat{\Delta}(a) \geq 0$ implies $\hat{\Delta}(b) \geq 0$ for all $b \in [\bar{a}, a]$. The result over $[0, \bar{a}]$ follows from the preceding paragraph.

For the second part of (c), note $\hat{R}'(t) = C(t)\hat{\Delta}(t) \geq 0$ for $t \leq a$ implies that $\hat{R}(t)$ and $R(t)$ is

increasing in t . Furthermore, $\frac{H(c_F(a))}{c_F(a)} = \frac{\hat{R}(a)}{(1-F(a))J_F(a)}$. Calculation shows

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial b} \frac{H(c_F(b))}{c_F(b)} = \frac{\hat{R}'(a)(1-F(a))J_F(a) + R(b)(n-1)F(b)^{n-2}f(b)(1-F(b))}{(1-F(b))^2 J_F(b)^2} \geq 0.$$

The inequality follows since $\hat{R}'(a) \geq 0$. Hence, $\frac{H(c_F(b))}{c_F(b)}$ is increasing in b for $b \in [\bar{a}, a]$.

Proof of Lemma 8 We first prove (a). Let $A = \{c \mid S(c) = S(c_{loc}) \text{ and } c \in (c_{loc}, \bar{c}]\}$ be the set of solutions to (B.8). Assume to the contrary $|A| \geq 2$. Let $c_1 < c_2$ be distinct elements of A . We must have $S(c) \geq S(c_{loc})$ for all $c \in (c_{loc}, c_1)$. Otherwise, there exists some local minima $\hat{c} \in (c_{loc}, c_1)$ of $S(\cdot)$. However, this implies $\hat{c} \in m(H)$ while $S(\hat{c}) < S(c_{loc})$, contradicting minimality of c_{loc} . Applying the same logic to the interval (c_1, c_2) , we have $S(c) \geq S(c_{loc})$ for all $c \in (c_1, c_2)$. However, since $S(c) \geq S(c_{loc})$ for all $[0, c_1]$ and c_1 is a local minimum, this contradicts the maximality of c_{loc} . Thus, A must be either empty or singleton.

We now prove (b). Since c_{loc} is a local minimum, there exists some $\epsilon > 0$ such that $S(c) > S(c_{loc}) > \frac{1}{c}$ over $c \in (c_{loc}, c_{loc} + \epsilon)$. Since $S(\bar{c}) = \frac{1}{\bar{c}}$, a solution to (B.8) exists in $(c_{loc} + \epsilon, \bar{c}]$ by the intermediate value theorem (IVT). This proves the "if" part.

The proof of the "only if" part is a direct and repeated application of the IVT. Suppose the solution c_{sol} exists and $S(c_{loc}) \leq \frac{1}{c}$. We consider 3 cases, where $S'(c_{sol})$ is strictly greater, strictly smaller, and equal to 0. If $S'(c_{sol}) > 0$, then $S(c) < S(c_{sol}) = S(c_{loc})$ locally over $c \in (c_{sol} - \epsilon, c_{sol})$, implying the existence of another solution of (B.8) over $c \in (c_{loc}, c_{sol})$. Similarly, if $S'(c) < 0$, then $S(c) < S(c_{sol}) = S(c_{loc}) \leq \frac{1}{c} = S(\bar{c})$ over $c \in (c_{sol}, c_{sol} + \epsilon)$, implying the existence of another solution of (B.8) over $c \in (c_{sol} + \epsilon, \bar{c})$. If $S'(c_{sol}) = 0$, we consider three subcases based on the sign of $S''(c_{sol})$. If $S''(c_{sol}) > 0$ then c_{sol} is a local maximum, implying another solution of (B.8) over $c \in (c_{loc}, c_{sol})$. If $S''(c_{sol}) < 0$, then $c_{loc} < c_{sol} \in m(H)$ with $S(c_{sol}) = S(c_{loc})$, contradicting the maximality of c_{loc} . If $S''(c_{sol}) = 0$, define $\hat{c} := \inf_c \{S''(c) \leq 0, c \geq c_{sol}\}$. If $S''(\hat{c}) > 0$, \hat{c} is again a local minimum of $S(\cdot)$ and $S(\hat{c}) = S(c_{loc})$, contradicting the maximality of c_{loc} . If $S''(\hat{c}) < 0$, then IVT implies another solution exists of (B.8) in (\hat{c}, \bar{c}) .

To prove (c), assume $S'(c_{sol}) > 0$. Then $S(c) > S(c_{loc}) > \frac{1}{c}$ locally at $(c_{sol}, c_{sol} + \epsilon)$. By IVT, there exists another solution to (B.8), contradiction. If $S'(c_{sol}) = 0$, this implies c_{sol} is a local minimum with value equal to $S(c_{loc})$, and global minimum of S over $[0, c_{sol}]$. This contradicts the maximality of c_{loc} . Hence, $S'(c_{sol}) < 0$ or equivalently, $S(c_{sol}) > h(c_{sol})$. To prove the second part, assume to the contrary that $S'(c) \geq 0$ for some $c \in (c_{sol}, \bar{c}]$. Let $\hat{c} = \inf_{c > c_{sol}} \{c \mid S'(c) \geq 0\}$.

If $\hat{c} > c_{sol}$, continuity of $S'(\cdot)$ implies $S'(\hat{c}) = 0$. Since $S'(c) < 0$ for all $c \in (c_{sol}, \hat{c})$, \hat{c} is a local minimum of S with $S(\hat{c}) < S(c_{sol}) = S(c_{loc})$, contradicting the minimality of c_{loc} . If $\hat{c} = c_{sol}$, this again implies that c_{sol} is a local minimum of S with $S(c_{sol}) = S(c_{hat})$, contradicting the maximality of c_{loc} . Hence, $S' < 0$ for all $c > c_{sol}$.

We now prove (d). $S(c) \geq S(c_{loc})$ for all $c \in [0, c_{loc}]$ holds by definition, and over $c \in [c_{loc}, c_{sol}]$ was proved in part (a) of this lemma. This proves the first part. To prove the second part, assume $S(c_{loc}) < \frac{1}{\bar{c}}$. If $S(c) < S(c_{loc})$ for some $c > c_{loc}$ IVT implies the existence of solution to (B.8), contradicting Lemma 8-(a). Hence, $S(c) \geq S(c_{loc})$ for all $c \in [0, \bar{c}]$.

Proof of Lemma 9-(a) Fix $c > 0$. We first derive the payoff $D_c(x; G)$ in Section 2 including the case of atoms. If $x < r(c)$, firm i is chosen if and only if $i \in \arg \max_j x_j$, with fair tie-breaking in case of multiplicity. The probability i is chosen is $\frac{1}{m}G(x-)^{n-1-k}G(\{x\})^m$ where m is the number of firms in tie with i . Summing over all $\binom{n-1}{m}$ combinations for each m ,

$$D_c(x; G) = \sum_{m=0}^{n-1} \binom{n-1}{m} \frac{1}{m} G(x-)^{n-1-m} G(\{x\})^m = \begin{cases} \frac{G(x)^n - G(x-)^n}{nG(\{x\})} & \text{if } x < r(c) \text{ and } G(\{x\}) \neq 0 \\ G(x)^{n-1} & \text{if } x < r(c) \text{ and } G(\{x\}) = 0 \end{cases}$$

Assume G has an atom at some $x_0 \in (0, k_G)$. Denote the size of the atom $\alpha := G(\{x_0\})$. We construct a profitable deviation G_ϵ that spreads the atom at x_0 to $x_0 - n\epsilon$ and $x_0 + \epsilon$ in a mean-preserving way. Formally, $G_\epsilon := G_1 + G_2$, where $G_1(A) = (1 - \alpha)G(A)$ for all $A \subseteq [0, 1] \setminus \{x_0\}$ and $G_2 = \frac{1}{n+1}\alpha\delta_{x_0-n\epsilon} + \frac{n}{n+1}\alpha\delta_{x_0+\epsilon}$. We consider 3 subcases depending on the position of the atom x_0 .

Case 1 ($x_0 < \underline{r}$): Fix some ϵ small enough such that $x_0 + \epsilon < \underline{r}$. Then,

$$\mathbb{E}_{G_\epsilon}[D(x; G)] - \mathbb{E}_G[D(x; G)] = \alpha H(c_G(x_0)) \left(\frac{1}{n+1} G(x_0 - n\epsilon)^{n-1} + \frac{n}{n+1} G(x_0 + \epsilon)^{n-1} - \frac{G(x_0)^n - G(x_0-)^n}{n\alpha} \right)$$

Taking $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$, we have

$$\alpha H(c_G(x_0)) \left(\frac{1}{n+1} G(x_0-)^{n-1} + \frac{n}{n+1} G(x_0)^{n-1} - \frac{G(x_0)^n - G(x_0-)^n}{n\alpha} \right) \geq \frac{\alpha H(c_G(x_0))}{n(n+1)} (G(x_0)^{n-1} - G(x_0-)^{n-1}) > 0. \quad (\text{D.3})$$

Case 2 ($x_0 > \underline{r}$): Fix some ϵ small enough such that $x_0 - n\epsilon > \underline{r}$. Note $\int_{c_G(x)}^{\bar{c}} \frac{1-G(r(c-))^n}{n(1-G(r(c-)))} dH(c)$ is still continuous in x while G is discontinuous. Since $H(c_G(x_0 - n\epsilon))$ and $H(c_G(x_0 + \epsilon))$ both converges to $H(c_G(x_0))$ as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$, the deviation payoff $\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0+} \mathbb{E}_{G_\epsilon}[D(x; G)] - \mathbb{E}_G[D(x; G)]$ is exactly (D.3).

Case 3 ($x_0 = \underline{r}$): As $\epsilon \rightarrow 0+$, $c_G(x_0 + \epsilon) \rightarrow \bar{c}$ and $\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow +} \int_{c_G(x_0 + \epsilon)}^{\bar{c}} \frac{1-G(r(c)-)^n}{n(1-G(r(c)-))} dH(c) = 0$. Hence, calculation gives exactly (D.3). \square

Proof of Lemma 10 Assume G is an equilibrium and ϕ as in Lemma 2. We prove in multiple steps.

Step 1: $m := \min(\text{supp}(G)) \notin (0, \underline{r})$.

Assume to the contrary that $m \in (0, \underline{r})$. For some $\epsilon > 0$, G is a strict MPC of F over $[0, m + \epsilon]$. $D(x; G)$ is zero over $[0, m]$ and is positive for $(m, m + \epsilon)$. However, Lemma 2 implies that ϕ is linear over $(0, m + \epsilon)$ while $\phi(0) = \phi(m) = 0$ and $\phi(m + \epsilon) > 0$, which is a contradiction. Therefore, it must be either $m = 0$ or $m \geq \underline{r}$. The latter proves (a). To prove (b), we assume $m = 0$ for the remainder of proof.

Step 2: $\text{supp}(G) \cap [0, \underline{r}]$ is connected.

Assume not. Then, there exist $x_1, x_2 \in \text{supp}(G) \cap [0, \underline{r}]$ with $x_1 < x_2$ such that $(x_1, x_2) \cap \text{supp}(G) = \emptyset$ and $G(x_1) > 0$. For some $\epsilon > 0$, $D(x; G) = \phi(x)$ is strictly increasing over $(x_1 - \epsilon, x_1)$ and $(x_2, x_2 + \epsilon)$, while constant over (x_1, x_2) . But no convex function can be strictly increasing, then flat, and then strictly increasing again. Contradiction.

Step 3: There exists some $\epsilon > 0$ such that $G(x) = F(x)$ for $x \in [0, \epsilon]$.

Assume not. Then, G is a strict MPC of F over some $[0, \epsilon]$ and $\phi = D = G^{n-1}$ is linear over $[0, \epsilon]$. There exists some $a_n > 0$ such that $G(x)^{n-1} = a_n x$ over $[0, \epsilon]$, or equivalently, $G(x) = (a_n x)^{\frac{1}{n-1}}$ over $[0, \epsilon]$. Then G admits a density $g(x) = \frac{a_n}{n-1} (a_n x)^{\frac{1}{n-1}-1}$ in $(0, \epsilon)$ which satisfies $\lim_{x \rightarrow 0+} g(x) = \infty$. Since f is bounded, there exists some $\bar{\epsilon} < \epsilon$ where $g(x) > f(x)$ for all $x \in (0, \bar{\epsilon})$, implying $G(x) > F(x)$ over the interval. This leads to $\int_0^x G(t)dt > \int_0^x F(t)dt$ over the interval, contradicting that $G \in \text{MPC}(F)$.

Step 4: $\{x \mid G(x) = F(x)\} \cap [0, \underline{r}]$ is connected for large enough $n > N$.

Assume not. Then we can find some $0 \leq x_1 < x_2 < x_3 \leq \underline{r}$ where $G = F$ over $[0, x_1]$, G is a strict MPC of F over $[x_1, x_2]$, and again $G = F$ over $[x_2, x_3]$. Fix n large enough so that F^{n-1} is strictly convex in $[0, 1]$. By definition, $G(x_1)^{n-1} = F(x_1)^{n-1}$ and $G(x_2)^{n-1} = F(x_2)^{n-1}$. Moreover, $G(x)^{n-1}$ is linear over $[x_1, x_2]$ by Lemma 2, while $F(x)^{n-1}$ is strictly convex over the same interval. Hence, $G^{n-1} > F^{n-1}$ and $G > F$ over (x_1, x_2) . This contradicts that G is an MPC of F because $\int_0^x G(t)dt > \int_0^x F(t)dt$ for $x \in (x_1, x_2)$.

Step 5: $G(x) = F(x)$ for all $x \in \text{supp}(G) \cap [0, \underline{r}]$

From Step 4, we must have $G(x) = F(x)$ for some $x \in [0, a]$. If $a = \underline{r}$, there is nothing to be proven. Assume $a < \underline{r}$ so that G is a strict MPC of F over $[a, b]$ for some b . By the same logic of Step 4, it must be the case $b > \underline{r}$. Since $\text{supp}(G) \cap [0, \underline{r}]$ is connected, either G is constant over $[a, \underline{r}]$ or $(a, a + \epsilon) \subseteq \text{supp}(G)$ for some $\epsilon > 0$. For the first case, from Lemma 4, for N large enough, $D(x; G)$ is either strictly convex or strictly concave over $(b - \epsilon, b)$, contradicting the linearity in Lemma 2.

For the latter, let $\alpha = \max(\text{supp}(G) \cap [0, \underline{r}])$ and $\beta = \min(\text{supp}(G) \cap [\underline{r}, k_G])$. By Lemma 2, there exists some ϕ such that ϕ is linear over $[a, b]$. Note $[\alpha, \beta] \subseteq [a, b]$. Over $[a, \alpha]$, $\phi(x) = G(x)^{n-1}$. Since ϕ is convex, the kink must be increasing at $x = a$, i.e. $\phi'(a+) = (n-1)F(a)^{n-2}g(a+) \geq \phi'(a-) = (n-1)F(a)^{n-2}f(a)$. By the MPC constraint, we also obtain $g(a+) \leq f(a)$. Hence, $g(a+) = f(a)$. Moreover, since ϕ is linear, the slope over $[\alpha, \beta]$ must coincide with $\phi'(a+)$, i.e.

$$\phi'(a+) = (n-1)F(a)^{n-2}f(a) = \frac{J_F(\alpha)(1 - H(c_G(\beta)))}{\beta - \alpha} = \frac{D(\beta; G) - D(\alpha; G)}{\beta - \alpha}$$

Rearranging,

$$\frac{f(a)}{1 - H(c_G(\beta))} = \frac{J_F(\alpha)}{(n-1)F(a)^{n-2}}.$$

The right hand side diverges as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Such G cannot be a limit equilibrium.

D.3 Omitted Proofs of Appendix C

Proof of Proposition 12 We prove for the case where H is binary. The case where H is discrete is analogous. Let $N_c > 0$ be large enough so that F^{n-1} is convex for all $n > N_c$ (Lemma 5). If $G(r) > 0$, following Step 1 to 4 of proof in Lemma 10, there exists $a \in (0, r)$ such that if $n > N$, then $G = F$ over $[0, a]$.

Since $D(x; G)$ exhibits a discrete jump of $pJ_G(r)$ at $x = r$, there exists some $\epsilon > 0$ such that G is constant over $(r - \epsilon, r)$. If not, i.e., $(r - \epsilon, r) \subset \text{supp}(G)$ for some $\epsilon > 0$, there cannot exist any convex function ϕ such that $\phi(r) = \lim_{x \rightarrow r-} \phi(x) + pJ_G(r)$, since convex functions are continuous. Moreover, it must be the case $r \in \text{supp}(G)$. Assume not, and let $\beta := \min(\text{supp}(G) \cap [r, 1]) > r$. Then, $D(x; G)$ is constant over $[r, \beta]$. There exists no convex ϕ that is strictly increasing in $[0, a]$ but constant over $[r, \beta]$ since $a < r$.

For later use, fix some $\delta > 0$. Then, there exists some $N_\delta > 0$ such that if $n > N_\delta$, then the function $\frac{1-x^n}{n(1-x)} - x^{n-1}$ is strictly increasing over $x \in [0, 1 - \delta]$. Hence, if $n > N_\delta$, $J_F(x)$ is strictly

increasing for $x \in [0, F^{-1}(1 - \delta)]$.

It remains to show that G is flat over $[a, r]$. If not, since $\text{supp}(G) \cap [0, r]$ is connected, it must be the case where G^{n-1} is linear over $[a, b]$ and flat over $[b, r]$. Let ϕ be as in Lemma 2. Since ϕ is convex, ϕ must have an increasing kink at $x = a$. However, since G is an MPC of F , $g(a+) \leq f(a)$. Hence, the slope of ϕ at $x = a$ is $(n-1)G(a)^{n-2}g(a+) = (n-1)F(a)^{n-2}f(a)$. Since ϕ is linear over $[a, r]$, the slope $\phi'(a)$ must satisfy $\phi'(a) = \frac{D(r;G) - D(a;G)}{r-a}$. If $n > \max(N_c, N_\delta)$,

$$(n-1)F(a)^{n-2}f(a) = \frac{pJ_F(b)}{r-a} \geq \frac{pJ_F(a)}{r-a} \geq \frac{pJ_F(a)}{c_F^{-1}(c) - a}.$$

The first inequality follows from the fact that J_F is increasing, and the second follows from the fact that $r = c_G^{-1}(c) \leq c_F^{-1}(c)$ because reservation values are increasing in the MPS order (Kohn & Shavell, 1974). Rearranging,

$$\frac{pJ_F(a)}{(n-1)F(a)^{n-2}} \leq f(a)(c_F^{-1}(c) - a) \leq M_f$$

must hold. However, the left hand side of the inequality diverges to infinity as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Hence, there exists some $N_a > 0$ such that if $n > N_a$, then $\frac{pJ_F(a)}{(n-1)F(a)^{n-2}} \geq M_f$, contradicting that g is an equilibrium. Furthermore, N_a is increasing in a . We can choose $\delta > 0$ such that $F(c_F^{-1}(c)) < 1 - \delta$.

Finally, if $n > N := \max(N_c, N_\delta, \max_{a \in [0, c_F^{-1}(c)]} N_a)$, then $G = F$ over $[0, a]$ and flat over $[a, r]$ for some $a \leq r$. \square

Proof of Proposition 13 By Lemma 9-(b), G must have an atom at $\max(\text{supp}(G))$ and be continuous over $[0, \max(\text{supp}(G))]$, proving (a). Assume $G(\underline{r}) > 0$. Then, by Steps 1 and 2 of the proof of Lemma 10, we have $\min(\text{supp}(G)) = 0$ and $\text{supp}(G) \cap [0, \underline{r}]$ is connected. Over this convex interval $\text{supp}(G) \cap [0, \underline{r}]$, $D(x; G) = \phi(x)$ is convex by Lemma 2. We can partition $[0, \underline{r}]$ into intervals $0 = x_0 < \dots < x_{k-1} = \max(\text{supp}(G)) \cap [0, \underline{r}]$, such that on each interval $[x_i, x_{i+1}]$ ($i = 1, \dots, k-2$), either $D(x; G)$ is strictly convex, or linear. By Lemma 2, in the former case where $D(x; G)$ is strictly convex, it must be $G = F$, whereas the latter case implies $D(x; G) = G^{n-1}$ is linear. This establishes part (b). Now we prove (c).

Case 1: Strictly Convex H .

Assume $\text{supp}(G) \cap [\underline{r}, \max(\text{supp}(G))] \neq \emptyset$ and let $M := \sup(\text{supp}(G) \cap [\underline{r}, \max(\text{supp}(G))])$. We first show that $M < k_G$. If this is the case, G is flat over $[M, k_G]$, implying $D(x; G) = D(M; G) + J_G(M)(H(c_G(M)) - H(c_G(x)))$ is strictly concave over this interval. However, it is impossible to

have any convex $\phi(x)$ such that $\phi(x) = D(x; G)$ for all $x \in \text{supp}(G)$, especially at $x = M$ and $x = k_G$. Hence, $\text{supp}(G) \cap [\underline{r}, \max(\text{supp}(G))] \neq \emptyset$.

Suppose instead $M = k_G$, i.e. $G(x)$ is continuous at $x = k_G$. Note G must be a strict MPC of F over some $(k_G - \epsilon, k_G)$. But under the strict convexity of H (i.e. $h' > 0$), the second derivative satisfies:

$$\begin{aligned} D''(x; G) &= (n-1)G^{n-3} \left[(n-1)g^2 H(c_G) + g'GH - 2(1-G)Ggh(c_G) \right] - (1-G)^2 J_G h'(c_G) \\ &< (n-1)G^{n-3} \left[(n-1)g^2 H(c_G) + g'GH - 2(1-G)Ggh(c_G) \right] \end{aligned}$$

As $x \rightarrow k_G^-$, $H(c_G(x)) \rightarrow 0$, so the first two terms in the bracket vanishes to zero, whereas the last term remains weakly positive. Thus, $\lim_{x \rightarrow k_G^-} D''(x; G) < 0$, implying $D(x; G)$ is strictly concave over some interval $(k_G - \epsilon, k_G)$. This again contradicts that $\phi = D(x; G)$ must be convex over $(k_G - \epsilon, k_G)$ by Lemma 2.

Case 2, 3: Strictly Concave H or Linear H

Assume $\text{supp}(G) \cap [\underline{r}, \max(\text{supp}(G))] \neq \emptyset$ and define $m := \min(\text{supp}(G) \cap [\underline{r}, \max(\text{supp}(G))])$. Since $x_{k-1} < \underline{r}$, we must have $m > \underline{r}$. Otherwise, $m = \underline{r}$ implies $D(x; G)$ is flat over $[x_{k-1}, \underline{r}]$, which contradicts the existence of convex ϕ in Lemma 2.

We consider 2 cases, $\partial_+ G(m) > 0$ and $\partial_+ G(m) = 0$. First, assume $\partial_+ G(m) > 0$. In this case, $D(x; G)$ has a strictly increasing kink at $x = m$.

$$D'(m+; G) = \underbrace{(n-1)G^{n-2}(m)\partial_+ G(m)H(c_G(m))}_{D'(m-; G)} + \underbrace{J_G(m)(1-G(m))h(c_G(m))}_{>0}$$

Since G is a strict MPC of F over some interval $(m - \epsilon, m + \epsilon)$, Lemma 2 implies that the associated ϕ must be linear and satisfy $\phi(x) \geq D(x; G)$. But this is impossible, as ϕ would lie strictly below $D(x; G)$ just to the left of m due to the kink. Contradiction.

Now suppose $\partial_+ G(m) = 0$. Then, $D'(m; G) = J_G(m)(1-G(m))h(c_G(m))$. To be consistent with $\phi(x) \geq D(x; G)$ and ϕ linear near m , we must have $D''(m-; G) \leq 0$. However, if H is strictly concave, then $h'(c) < 0$ implies $D''(m-) = -(1-G(m))^2 J_G(m)h'(c_G(m)) > 0$, a contradiction.

Assume H is linear. From the linearity of ϕ over $[x_{k-1}, m]$, we must have:

$$\frac{D(m; G) - D(x_{k-1}; G)}{m - x_{k-1}} = D'(m; G)$$

Substituting expressions and simplifying:

$$\frac{J_G(m)(1 - H(c_G(m)))}{m - x_{k-1}} = J_G(m)(1 - G(m))h(c_G(m))$$

Using $H(c) = \frac{c}{\bar{c}}$ and $h(c) = \frac{1}{\bar{c}}$:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{\bar{c}}(\bar{c} - c_G(m)) &= \frac{1}{\bar{c}}(m - x_{k-1})(1 - G(x_{k-1})) \\ &= \frac{1}{\bar{c}}(c_G(x_{k-1}) - c_G(m)) \end{aligned}$$

The last equality follows from the fact that $c_G(x)$ is decreasing and linear with slope $(1 - G(x_{k-1}))$ over $[x_{k-1}, m]$. This implies $c_G(x_{k-1}) = \bar{c}$, which contradicts $x_{k-1} < \underline{r}$ (since $c_G(x)$ is decreasing). Contradiction.

Thus, in all cases, we reach a contradiction. Therefore, $\text{supp}(G) \cap [\underline{r}, \max(\text{supp}(G))] = \emptyset$.

□

Proof of Proposition 14 Note since F is a binary distribution supported at $\{0, 1\}$ with mean μ , choosing a distribution of posterior means $G \in \Delta([0, 1])$ is equivalent to choosing a Bayes-plausible distribution over posteriors, $\mu = \mathbb{E}_G[x]$, as in [Kamenica and Gentzkow \(2011\)](#). By their result, any equilibrium must satisfy $\text{cav}(D(x; G)) = D(x; G)$ for all $x \in \text{supp}(G)$, where $\text{cav}(D)$ denotes the concave closure of D . Furthermore, by Lemma 2, $\phi(x) = D(x; G)$ must be convex for all $x \in \text{supp}(G)$. These two conditions together imply that $\phi(x) = D(x; G)$ must be linear over all $x \in \text{supp}(G)$.

By Lemma 9, G must have an atom at $\max(\text{supp}(G))$ and continuous over $[0, \max(\text{supp}(G))]$. Moreover, if $G(\underline{r}) > 0$, then by Steps 1 and 2 of the proof in Lemma 10, $\min(\text{supp}(G)) = 0$ and $\text{supp}(G) \cap [0, \underline{r}]$ must be connected. Hence G^{n-1} must be linear over $\text{supp}(G) \cap [0, \underline{r}]$.

Let $a := \max(\text{supp}(G) \cap [0, \underline{r}])$. Suppose $a = \underline{r}$. Then,

$$D'(a+; G) = \underbrace{(n-1)G(a)^{n-2}g(a)}_{=D'(a-; G)} + (1 - G(a))h(c_G(a))J_G(a),$$

implying $D(x; G)$ exhibits an upward kink at $x = \underline{r}$. Therefore, $\underline{r} \notin \{x : \text{cav}(D(x; G)) = D(x; G)\}$, implying $a < \underline{r}$. This proves part (a). Proof of part (b) follows directly from the argument in Proposition 13.

□