

Metasearch and market concentration

Renaud Foucart*

September 7, 2018

Abstract

Competing intermediaries search on behalf of consumers among a large number of horizontally differentiated sellers. Consumers either pick the best deal offered by an intermediary, or compare the intermediaries. A higher number of intermediaries has the direct effect of decreasing their search effort. Hence, if an exogenous share of consumers do not compare, more competition hurts them. More competition however also increases the incentives for consumers to compare. A higher share of informed consumers in turns increases the search effort of intermediaries. If consumers are ex-ante identical and rationally choose whether to become informed, the total effect of a higher number of intermediaries is to make each of them (weakly) choosier. Moreover, it always decreases the price offered by sellers. Allowing intermediaries to bias their advice by making sponsored links prominent has a similar effect of making all consumers better off in expectation.

Keywords: search, advice, competition

JEL: D43, D83, L13, L86

1 Introduction

Consumers often rely on intermediaries to help them find the product that suits the best to their needs. In the case of online intermediaries, it is easy - yet costly - for consumers to compare the different recommendations received and pick the best offer. A natural question on this market is whether consumers benefit from having a large number of intermediaries at disposal. More precisely, could limiting entry or, to the contrary, mergers of intermediaries increase consumer welfare and market efficiency?

*University of Nottingham, renaud.foucart@gmail.com. I am grateful to Mark Armstrong, Alessandro Bonatti, Alexandre de Corniere, Paula Herrera Idarraga, Heiko Karle, Oliver Pardo, Martin Pollrich and Andrew Rhodes for useful comments. Financial support by Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft through CRC TRR 190 is gratefully acknowledged.

In this paper, I show that higher market concentration helps protecting uninformed buyers if consumer information is a “behavioural” trait: an exogenous share of buyers do not understand the market. If consumer information is a rational choice of ex-ante identical buyers however, higher market concentration lowers consumer welfare. The reason is that it decreases the incentive a buyer has to compare recommendations - the “metasearch” among intermediaries searching on one’s behalf-, and the positive externalities it generates on the others by doing so. This in turns has three consequences. First, the quality of advice provided by intermediaries becomes (weakly) lower. Second, if intermediaries are less choosy, demand on the product market is less elastic and prices increase. Third, for a given choosiness of intermediaries, a lower share of informed consumers makes demand less elastic on the product market, and increases prices. In terms of aggregate market efficiency, there is therefore a trade-off between better advice for consumers and the additional cost of intermediaries investing in advice and receiving smaller market shares. Finally, I show that introducing the possibility for deal finders to bias their results and offer prominent sponsored recommendations alongside their truthful organic ones actually helps ex-ante identical consumers. The reason is - again - that the existence of “fake” advice makes it more interesting for consumers to compare their options.

A deal finder can be an individual recruitment agency hired to search for job candidates, a real estate agency searching for prospective tenants (for the owner) or properties (for the tenants), an insurance broker, or one of the many “deal finding websites” on the Internet. The question of whether free entry should be granted on these markets is a long-lasting debate. Historically, intermediaries have been subject to limitations and certifications to protect consumers from dishonest advisors. For instance in the UK, from 1977 to 2005, the Insurance Broker Registration Act limited entry on the market to make sure no deal finder was acting as a representative of a single insurance company.¹ This point is however much less obvious on the Internet, where consumers are only a few clicks away from comparing their options. Moreover, digital markets seem to often converge towards very concentrated structures making the question of excessive entry less relevant.² For instance, in 2015 in the US, Expedia³ (Expedia.com, tripadvisor.com, orbitz.com, hotels.com, venere.com, trivago.com,...) and Priceline⁴ (priceline.com, kayak.com, booking.com,...)

¹See Insurance Brokers (Registration) Act 1977, 11.1.(c). Similarly, most US states require a special license to be a recognized broker.

²Malik (2015) summarizes the dynamic of concentration on digital markets as consisting of three phases: “The first is when there is a new idea, product, service, or technology dreamed up by a clever person or group of people. For a brief while, that idea becomes popular, which leads to the emergence of dozens of imitators, funded in part by the venture community. Most of these companies die. When the dust settles, there are one or two or three players left standing.”

³<http://www.expediainc.com/expedia-brands/>

⁴<http://ir.pricelinegroup.com/>

controlled 95 percent of the online travel-marketplace after a number of successful fusions and acquisitions.⁵

Innovation in search quality is an essential part of the competition in advice markets. To keep the travel example, Andrew Warner of Expedia reports in a 2014 interview⁶ that “for a standard trip from LA to New York, Expedia has 65,000,000,000 different combinations of travel for each consumer - given variations in flight times, airlines, car rentals, hotels, offers.” Being able to use consumer data to provide the best personalized advice (and beat competitors) is thus a huge and costly challenge, with Expedia claiming to spend £500 million yearly in R&D. Warner describes the objective of such investment as being able to do more than mechanically answering a query and providing the cheapest price. Today’s competition in the online travel industry is thus largely based on being able to provide a good individual match to a specific consumer.⁷

I set up in section a model in which a large number of consumers want to buy one unit of a product in a market with a large number of horizontally differentiated sellers. I assume that competing deal finders search (at a cost) for the best product to recommend to a specific consumer. I use two standard search models. In the main part of the paper I study a linear random sequential search within a distribution of deals, in the tradition of Wolinsky (1986) and Anderson and Renault (1999). In Appendix B I use a model of non-sequential search and show that my results are robust to this alternative setup.

I start by solving a benchmark model in which consumers are of two exogenous types. Some are “savvy” and pick the best deal among all the deal finders. Some are “non-savvy” and take the best deal offered by a deal finder chosen at random. I borrow this dichotomy from a literature started by Varian (1980) to study price dispersion. Through the paper, I compare this setting to one in which consumers bear a linear cost of observing an additional deal finder, in the spirit of Burdett and Judd (1983). I also start by making the assumption that the revenue of deal finders depends linearly on the volume of sales. This is the case for instance if they are financed by selling information about buyers on a competitive market for advertising, or if they collect fixed commissions.⁸ I find the “direct” effect that lower market concentration decreases the quality of

⁵See for instance Sun, sea and surfing, *The Economist*, June 21, 2014 ; Competition is shaking up the online travel market, *Forbes*, January 5, 2015 and Expedia and Orbitz are merging. Here’s what it means for you, Cecilia Kang and Brian Fung, *The Washington Post*, September 16, 2015.

⁶“Expedia is investing billions in data to create personalized travel-graphs”, Derek du Preez, March 24, 2014, diginomica.com

⁷On this topic, see “Expedia Thinks It Can Help You Find the Dream Vacation You Didn’t Know You Wanted”, Drake Bennet, *Bloomberg Business Week*, February 25, 2016 and “How Expedia, Hopper and Skyscanner Use Big Data to Find You the Cheapest Airfares”, Isabel Thottam, *Paste Magazine*, January 16, 2017

⁸In practice, deal finders are financed in various ways. Some charge a fixed amount of “administrative fees,” others get rewarded by a commission paid by either the buyer or seller (that can be fixed per purchase or per-click, or propor-

advice. The intuition behind that result is that competition among deal finders resembles an all-pay-auction (see for instance Baye *et al.*, 1996): each sale benefits one deal finder only, but all bear the cost of providing the search technology. Hence, the higher the number of competitors, the smaller the marginal return from providing a better service.

Then, I solve the model for endogenous consumer information. I first derive a classic result from this literature: the existence of search externalities (Armstrong, 2015). The savvy consumers protect the non-savvy, as deal finders cannot discriminate among types, so that fiercer competition for the savvy types make all consumers better off. Thus, in any equilibrium, not enough consumers choose to be informed. I find that lower market concentration has the indirect effect that savviness matters more, hence increasing the incentives to become informed. This indirect effect outweighs the direct one in the Varian setting, and exactly compensates it in the Burdett and Judd setting. In both settings, as more consumers are savvy, demand on the product market is more elastic, and prices decrease. Hence, lower concentration actually benefits all consumers.

I compare this welfare gain for consumers to aggregate market efficiency. I identify the following trade-off: while more competition on the market for deal finders always makes consumers better off, it also increase the aggregate costs for deal finders. Hence, while the number of deal finders maximizing aggregate welfare is often not equal to 2, it is not an infinite number either.

Finally, I solve a version of the model in which deal finders auction prominent sponsored links to sellers, displayed alongside their truthful recommendation. As the existence of those “fake” advices decreases the expected payoff of uninformed consumers, they increase the incentives to become informed. Hence, if the information choice of consumers is endogenous, the existence of sponsored links benefits all consumers in expectation.

Related literature:

To the best of my knowledge, this paper is the first to study how competition among intermediaries affects the incentives to invest in the quality of the advice they offer.

This paper relates to the literature on advice and delegated search. In the literature on delegated search, it relates to Lewis (2012) and Ulbricht (2016). I share with the latter the assumption that the relationship between the buyer and the deal finders combines a problem of moral hazard (the effort of the deal finder) and of asymmetric information (the fact that the deal finders know the market better). The novelty of my approach is to add competition on the side of the deal finders,

tional to the value of the purchase), and finally a part of the revenue of online deal finders comes from advertisement on the website, and from gathering information on the consumers and selling by-products. These sources of revenue are however constrained by the fact that buyers always have the possibility of bypassing the deal finder that made the recommendation in order to directly buy from the sellers.

and to study different types of buyers. I therefore have two related yet different problems. The moral hazard problem is partly alleviated by competition among intermediaries. The asymmetric information is modified by the fact that buyers have different and privately known information.

I consider a world in which consumers face a consideration set (Eliaz and Spiegler, 2011a), but this set is not directly determined by competition among firms. Buyers instead rely on intermediaries to make them a recommendation. In the advice market, most of the focus has been on a single intermediary. For instance, Armstrong and Zhou (2011) and Chen and Zhang (2017) study a large number of possible transactions between sellers of a product and the adviser choosing how to present the information to consumers.

The question of competition among advisers has been discussed in an extension of Inderst and Ottaviani (2012), who study financial advice and compare the case of competitive advisors to the one of a monopolist. Competition among two search engines is also studied in Section 5 of de Cornière (2016), in a two-sided framework where search engines compete in order to attract both consumers and advertisers by auctioning “keywords.” In a related model, Eliaz and Spiegler (2011b) study competition among two search engines. None of these papers however study specific investment to be made by the advisers to improve the quality of their advice. Another difference is that I compare duopoly to more intense competition. As I make the assumption that the market is fully covered, the case of a monopoly would be trivial in my model as such a deal finder would provide no effort and sellers would offer the monopoly price.

2 Model setup

A mass 1 of consumers wants to buy a single unit of a particular product which is supplied by a continuum of sellers of mass M at a marginal production cost of zero. Building on the specification of Anderson and Renault (1999), each consumer i has tastes described by a conditional utility function of the form

$$u_{i,j}(p_j) = v - p_j - \varepsilon_{i,j}, \quad (1)$$

if she buys product j at price p_j . The intrinsic valuation of the product v is assumed to be sufficiently high for each consumer to always buy. The parameter $\varepsilon_{i,j}$ is the realization of a random variable with log-concave probability density function $f(\varepsilon)$, cumulative density function $F(\varepsilon)$ and support over $[0, b]$, with $b > 0$. The distribution of ε is common knowledge. The assumption of log-concavity applies to most commonly used density functions (see Caplin and Nalebuff, 1991

and Anderson and Renault, 1999). The random component ε represents the (exogenous) distance between a particular version of the product j and the ideal product given the taste of buyer i . I denote this parameter as the mismatch value.⁹

The economy is composed of three types of players. Sellers offer horizontally differentiated products, for which they individually set a price. Consumers want to buy exactly one product, and either trust the recommendation of a deal finder or compare recommendations. Deal finders gather information on products and prices on behalf of consumers and truthfully recommend the best deal they are aware of.

2.1 Deal finders

Between the consumers and the sellers are a number $N \geq 2$ of identical intermediaries, called deal finders. Assume that deal finders generate revenue from a competitive market for advertisers, bidding for the information on buyers gathered by successful deal finders. As all consumers buy exactly one unit, the willingness to pay for this information is not influenced by the search behaviour of deal finders. The willingness of advertisers to pay for the information extracted from consumers is denoted by $\chi > 0$, so that a consumer buying from a deal finder generates a revenue of χ for this deal finder. I study another source of revenue for deal finders in Section 6: sponsored links. In the main part of paper, I assume N to be exogenously given. I show in Appendix D that the model can easily be extended to study the entry decision of deal finders.

In the main part of the paper I study the following sequential search. Suppose that any deal finder receiving a query from a consumer of type i can sequentially sample sellers by each time incurring a linear search cost s to discover a price p_j and mismatch value $\varepsilon_{i,j}$. A deal finder that sampled q sellers thus bears a total cost of qs . Following a query, the N deal finders simultaneously search for deals, and when they find a satisfactory deal $p + \varepsilon$ they advertise it to the consumer. This assumption can be taken literally in the case of physical intermediaries exerting an effort to answer a customer's request, and it is also the most tractable one.

In the case of online advice, a perhaps more realistic assumption - albeit slightly less tractable - is to allow deal finders to carry search in a non-sequential way. Assume that any deal finder invests before seeing the search results in order to be able sample a number of deals q , at a cost sq . This can be interpreted as the investment in building the right algorithms and search environment

⁹The representation of ε as a positive mismatch parameter is a slight departure from the specification of Anderson and Renault (1999), who consider a random noise increasing the utility. This modification does not impact my results, but is useful in the context of advice in order to represent graphically the expected distance a consumer gets from her bliss point at equilibrium.

to be able to deal with specific preferences. I show that the results of the sequential model extend to the non-sequential one in Appendix B.

2.2 Consumers

A share σ of “savvy” consumers makes simultaneous queries and compares different advices, while the rest follows the advice of a single deal finder. The savviness of a consumer is unobservable to the deal finder, so that she does not know for whom she is competing at the time of the query. In the benchmark case (section 3), I take this share as given. This corresponds to the “behavioural” idea that consumers have different abilities to process information. Then, in section 4, I assume all consumers are ex-ante identical and only choose to become informed if it is in their interest to do so, based on rational expectations. The cost of becoming savvy is $c > 0$. I consider two types of consumer information, corresponding to the standard models of Varian (1980) and Burdett and Judd (1983) respectively.

In the Varian setting a savvy consumer observes N deals, and chooses to buy from the deal finder offering the best one. A non-savvy consumer makes only one query to a deal finder picked at random, and receives the best quote of this deal finder. In such a framework, the presence of more deal finders therefore has the mechanical effect of increasing the information of savvy consumers, as those observe more recommendations. Alternatively, in a Burdett and Judd (1983) setting, a savvy consumer observes 2 deals, and chooses to buy from the deal finder offering the best one. A non-savvy consumer makes only one query to a deal finder picked at random, and receives the best quote of this deal finder. Here, for a given strategy of deal finders and sellers, the number of deal finders has no impact of the information of consumers. Those two polar cases aim at capturing two different understanding of what consumer information means. The Varian setting describes information as bearing the cost of understanding how the market works, and being able to compare options - “not being naïve.” The Burdett and Judd setting represents a - perhaps more mechanical - linear cost of clicking on an additional website and entering the query again.¹⁰

2.3 Sellers

There is a continuum of horizontally differentiated sellers of mass M . Assuming this form of monopolistic competition simplifies a lot the analysis, as it implies that no two deal finders recommend an identical deal to a given consumer. This is however not the driving force behind the

¹⁰In contrast to the original framework in Burdett and Judd (1983), the restriction to parameter values such that consumers observe either 1 or 2 deal finders is not important and similar results can be obtained with lower search costs and consumer mixing between 2 and 3 or 3 or 4 deal finders for instance.

results: What matters is that the demand of a savvy consumer is more elastic to a change in the price of a given seller than the one of a non-savvy consumer.

The expected demand for a given seller i is given by

$$D(p_i, p, N) = (1 - \sigma)D^{ns} + \sigma D^s. \quad (2)$$

$D^{ns}(p_i, p, N)$ is the expected sales made to a mass 1 of non-savvy consumers, corresponding to the probability of being selected by a deal finder, multiplied by the probability that this deal finder is selected at random by a non-savvy consumer. $D^s(p_i, p, N)$ is the expected sales to a mass 1 of savvy consumers, corresponding to the probability of being selected by a deal finder and offering the best deal among all the recommendations received by a savvy consumer. For later reference, I need to define $\eta_{i,j} = \varepsilon_{i,j} + p - p_j$ for a seller j setting a different price than the equilibrium p . Define $\phi(\eta)$ the density of $\eta_{i,j}$ so that, at the symmetric equilibrium price $\phi(\eta) = f(\varepsilon)$. As I assume a continuum of sellers, an individual price deviation $p_j \neq p$ only affects the expected demand of seller j .

2.4 Equilibrium definition

The objective function of a seller is to maximize $p_i D(p_i, p, N)$ given the search behaviour of deal finders and the share of savvy consumers σ . As in Anderson and Renault (1999), I focus on a symmetric solution where each seller offers an identical price p , and study the optimal price p_i chosen by a seller i . A symmetric equilibrium is thus a situation in which, for each seller, the optimal $p_i = p$.

As I focus on a symmetric price, deals only vary at equilibrium by their mismatch value $\varepsilon_{i,j}$. I also look for a symmetric equilibrium for deal finders. In a sequential search model, this implies that deal finders keep searching for a deal until finding a mismatch value ε below some threshold w . As a tie-breaking rule, I assume that deal finders search when indifferent. In the Varian setting, if all deal finders follow this strategy, the probability that a given deal finder with mismatch value $\varepsilon < w$ provides the best deal to a savvy consumer is $\left(\frac{F(w) - F(\varepsilon)}{F(w)}\right)^{N-1}$. If its $N - 1$ rivals follow the above strategy, if a deal finder has found a product with mismatch value ε , its expected revenue abstracting from search costs is:

$$\pi(\varepsilon) = \left(\sigma \left(\frac{F(w) - F(\varepsilon)}{F(w)} \right)^{N-1} + \frac{1 - \sigma}{N} \right) \chi. \quad (3)$$

The first part is the demand from savvy consumers multiplied by the probability of offering the best deal among the N queries they made. The second part is the non-savvy consumers who randomly picked the deal finder and made only one query. The expected search cost to be paid by a deal finder in order to find a mismatch value below w is equal to $\frac{s}{F(w)}$ (this is a general property of a geometric distribution).¹¹

In the Burdett and Judd setting, a share σ of savvy consumers observe two deals. Hence, (3) becomes

$$\pi(\varepsilon) = \left(\frac{2\sigma}{N} \frac{F(w) - F(\varepsilon)}{F(w)} + \frac{1 - \sigma}{N} \right) \chi. \quad (4)$$

All players choose the strategy that maximizes their utility given their expectation of other players' strategies. I show in the next section that for every symmetric price and share of savvy consumers, there exists a unique search cutoff. This cutoff is independent of the symmetric price. For every search cutoff and share of savvy consumers a symmetric price equilibrium exists and is unique. The two results are sufficient to characterize a unique symmetric equilibrium in the benchmark case with exogenous share of savvy consumers. In the endogenous case, given the search cutoff of deal finders, symmetric price, and share of savvy consumers σ , each consumer chooses whether or not to be informed at a cost $c > 0$. I find a unique equilibrium share of savvy consumers σ , so that a symmetric equilibrium always exists, and there is a unique symmetric equilibrium.

To summarize, the timing of the game is as follows:

1. Sellers simultaneously set their price p_j . I focus on a symmetric equilibrium price p .
2. In the endogenous case, buyers simultaneously choose whether to send a query to a deal finder chosen at random, or to send a query to all deal finders at cost c (Varian). The equilibrium share of informed consumers is σ . I also consider a variant in which buyers observe either one or to two deal finders at a cost c (Burdett-Judd).
3. Deal finders sequentially search for each query they received until they find a mismatch value below their optimal cutoff value. I focus on a symmetric equilibrium cutoff " w ".

Buyers accept the best deal out of all the queries they made.

¹¹As I assume deal finders search a discrete number of times within a large number of sellers, the deal finders search within independent and identically distributed deals. With a more limited selection of sellers, I would have to consider overlapping suggestions by deal finders to savvy consumers, therefore limiting the incentives to become savvy.

3 The benchmark case: exogenous share of savvy consumers

In this section, I first study the equilibrium search of deal finders, and then the price, taking as given consumer information.

3.1 Search cutoff

Standard search theory indicates that for a symmetric price p the optimal threshold mismatch value w must satisfy

$$s = \int_0^w (\pi(\varepsilon) - \pi(w)) f(\varepsilon) d\varepsilon. \quad (5)$$

In the Varian case, rewriting (5) by using (3), it is easy to show that if there is an interior solution w solves

$$s = \chi \sigma \int_0^w \left(\frac{F(w) - F(\varepsilon)}{F(w)} \right)^{N-1} f(\varepsilon) d\varepsilon, \quad (6)$$

by using the fact that $\pi(w) = \chi \frac{1-\sigma}{N}$.

Proposition 1 *For a given share of informed consumers, there exists a unique symmetric search cutoff w if the market price p is symmetric, so that deal finders search until they find a mismatch value strictly lower than w . All other things held equal, the search cutoff w is weakly increasing in s and N and weakly decreasing in σ .*

The formal proof is in Appendix. As we would expect, the threshold mismatch value increases with the search cost s . The threshold w also necessarily increases with the number of deal finders, so that for a given share of savvy consumers σ a deal finder becomes less choosy when it faces more rivals. This is a direct consequence of the fact that, for a given symmetric search strategy of the competitors, the marginal benefit of an additional search is lower when the number of deal finders is higher. The qualifier “weakly” in the proposition corresponds to the possibility of $w \geq b$, so that there is no search at all. Through the paper, I focus on cases where $w < b$, so that the delegated search problem has an interior solution.

The assumption that non-savvy consumers pick deal finders at random is without loss of generality. Indeed, even if some deal finders are used more often by default, competition remains for savvy consumers only. Hence, the marginal incentives to invest are unaffected - in the Varian case, equation (6) would remain identical. The fact that savvy consumers compare either one or

all options - the Varian setting - or bear a linear cost of observing an additional deal finder - the Burdett and Judd setting - does not affect the result either. The reason is that a higher number of deal finders decreases the mass of savvy consumers possibly faced by a deal finder.

I start by studying how mismatches are affected when the share of savvy consumers is exogenous, for a given symmetric price. I first derive a result on the direct effect of market concentration on the expected mismatch received by a non-savvy consumer.

Lemma 1 *For a given price and share of informed consumers, a non-savvy consumer receives an expected mismatch ϵ^{ns} , that is weakly increasing in the search cost of deal finders (s), weakly decreasing in the share of savvy types (σ) and weakly increasing in the number of deal finders (N).*

The formal proof is in Appendix. The expected mismatch of a non-savvy consumer is a random draw on the interval $[0, w]$, where w is the threshold at which deal finders stop searching. A non-savvy consumer is always worse off when this threshold increases. The impact of the different variables on the threshold derives directly from proposition 1. The fact that the share of savvy types benefits the non-savvy types is the classic search externalities. The intuition is that the higher the share of savvy types, the more the deal finders compete for them (and search), and the individual efforts of deal finders also benefit the non-savvy. This lemma also conveys the direct effect of lower market concentration (higher N) on the deals received by the non-savvy types. Because, when there are more deal finders, each deal finder searches with lower intensity (proposition 1), a consumer buying from a deal finder chosen at random receives deals of lower quality when there is more competition. The qualifier that the share of savvy types is exogenous is however crucial.

I can now turn to the expected mismatch for savvy consumers.

Lemma 2 *For a given symmetric price and share of informed consumers, a savvy consumer receives an expected mismatch ϵ^s , that is increasing in the search cost of deal finders (s) and decreasing in the share of savvy types (σ).*

1. *In the Varian case, the impact of the number of deal finders (N) is ambiguous. The presence of more deal finders decreases ϵ^s if and only if*

$$-\frac{\partial \epsilon^s}{\partial N} \geq \frac{\partial \epsilon^s}{\partial w} \frac{\partial w}{\partial N}. \quad (7)$$

2. *In the Burdett and Judd case, ϵ^s is weakly increasing in the number of deal finders N .*

The proof is in Appendix. In the Varian case, the impact of market concentration N on the expected mismatch value of a savvy type ϵ^s is ambiguous. The right-hand side of (7) represents

the effect that a higher number of deal finders makes each deal finder less choosy (higher w). The left-hand side represents the effect that it also increases the number of options a savvy consumer can choose from. The Varian setting therefore departs from the Burdett and Judd one. If consumers compare either 1 or 2 options, there is no direct benefit from a higher number of deal finders. Hence, the left-hand side of inequality (7) is equal to zero. Two well-documented consequences follow immediately from the observation of the two mismatch values, both in the Varian and Burdett and Judd setting. First, savvy consumers always have a better deal than non-savvy ones. Second, savvy consumers “protect” the others by decreasing the mismatch value received by all consumers.

3.2 Symmetric price

I now turn to the equilibrium price offered by a continuum of sellers of mass M . I assume a symmetric market price p , and study the optimal price p_i chosen by a seller i .

Lemma 3 *The expected demand a seller i receives from a mass 1 of non-savvy consumers is given by*

$$D^{ns}(p_i, p, N) = \frac{F(w + p - p_i)}{MF(w)}. \quad (8)$$

The formal proof is in appendix. This expression corresponds to the probability of being selected by a deal finder following the search strategy defined in (6), with i being the only seller off the price equilibrium path, so that the density of $\eta_j = \varepsilon_j + p - p_j$ for all sellers $j \neq i$ is $\phi(\eta) = f(\varepsilon)$. As deal finders are selected at random by non-savvy consumers, this is equivalent to N times the probability of being selected by each of the deal finders, divided by the probability that a non-savvy consumer picks a deal finder N . The numerator $F(w + p - p_i)$ is the probability of offering a mismatch below w for a specific consumer, that can be alleviated by offering a different price than the market. If all deal finders play the same strategy w , all deal finders share the demand from non-savvy consumers equally. As I assume a continuum of sellers of mass M , the probability of being selected by two deal finders is zero.

Denote by $r(j)$ the probability that a random draw between $p_i - p$ and w be lower than j random draws between 0 and w ,

$$r(j) = \int_0^{w+p-p_i} \frac{f(\varepsilon)}{F(w+p-p_i)} \left(\frac{F(w) - F(\varepsilon + p - p_i)}{F(w)} \right)^j d\varepsilon. \quad (9)$$

Lemma 4 *The expected demand a seller i receives from a mass 1 of savvy consumers is given by,*

$$D^s(p_i, p, N) = ND^{ns}r(N-1) \quad (10)$$

in the Varian setting, and $D^s(p_i, p) = 2D^{ns}r(1)$ in the Burdett and Judd one.

The formal proof is in Appendix. The expression (10) corresponds N times the probability of being selected by a given deal finder, multiplied by the probability of offering a better deal than the $N-1$ other selected sellers. Again, the assumption of a continuum of sellers considerably simplifies the computations, as the probability that a given seller is selected by two deal finders is zero.

Lemma 5 *For a given search cutoff w and share of informed consumers σ , there exists a unique symmetric price p . All other things held equal, the symmetric price is increasing in the search cutoff w and decreasing in the share of savvy consumers σ .*

1. *In the Varian setting, all other things held equal, the symmetric price is decreasing in the number of intermediaries N .*
2. *In the Burdett and Judd setting, all other things held equal, the symmetric price is unaffected by the number of intermediaries N .*

The formal proof is in Appendix. As the expected profit of a seller is equal to $p_i D(p_i, p, n)$, it follows that the equilibrium symmetric price p posted by sellers solves

$$p = \frac{-D(p, p, N)}{D_{p_i}(p_i, p, N)} = \frac{-D(p, p, N)}{\sigma D_{p_i}^s(p_i, p, N) + (1-\sigma)D_{p_i}^{ns}(p_i, p, N)}, \quad (11)$$

where $D(p, p, n) = \frac{1}{M}$ as all sellers post an identical price in equilibrium. The difference with standard models of monopolistic competition is that there are two parts in the demand, one being more elastic than the other. Indeed, while being recommended by a deal finder is enough to sell to non-savvy consumers, a seller needs to offer the best deal among all the ones selected by intermediaries to attract the savvy ones. When deal finders become more selective (lower cutoff w), both parts of the demand become more elastic, so that prices decrease. When the share of savvy consumers σ increase, the most elastic part of the demand becomes more important, so that prices decrease. Finally, in the Varian setting, all other things held equal, increasing the number of deal finders make the most elastic part of the demand even more elastic, hence decreasing the prices. One can observe that if the number of deal finders is very high - but of a magnitude smaller

than the number of sellers for our assumption on each seller being selected at most by one seller to hold - and if all consumers are savvy ($\sigma \rightarrow 1$), how choosy the deal finders are has no impact on the equilibrium price, and this price converges to the Perloff and Salop (1985) model (see Proposition 1 in Anderson and Renault, 1999). This is not true in the Burdett and Judd setting. If consumers observe either 1 or 2 intermediaries, the number of deal finders has no direct effect on the elasticity of demand for a given seller. Thus, N has no direct influence on price.

Proposition 2 *In the benchmark case with an exogenous share of informed consumers σ :*

1. *In the Varian setting, a higher number of intermediaries N increases the expected mismatch of uninformed consumers ϵ^{ns} , and has an ambiguous effect on the expected mismatch of informed consumers ϵ^s and the equilibrium price p .*
2. *In the Burdett and Judd setting, a higher number of intermediaries increases the expected mismatch of both uninformed and informed consumers, and increases the equilibrium price.*

The formal proof is in Appendix and follows directly from the above lemmas. In the Varian setting, while lower market concentration makes each deal finder less choosy, there is still a potential benefit from competition: to provide more information to savvy consumers. As in this setting savvy consumers observe all deal finders, they are not necessarily worse off, because the additional information can compensate for the lack of precision of each intermediary. This, in turns, can lead to higher or lower price depending on whether the lower elasticity of demand for non-savvy consumers is more important than the (possibly) higher elasticity of demand for savvy ones. There is no such ambiguity in the Burdett and Judd setting. As deal finders provide lower quality of information, everyone is worse off when there is more competition. Savvy consumers still observe the same number of deals, albeit of lower quality. Hence, demand becomes less elastic and prices increase.

While the Varian setting may well illustrate the “behavioural” idea that some consumers do not understand the market, the Burdett and Judd one reflects a cost of observing an additional recommendation. It is therefore natural - as it is the case in the two original papers - to let the share of informed consumers be the result of utility maximization with rational expectations on the expected mismatches and prices in equilibrium. This is what I study in the next section.

4 Metasearch: Endogenous share of savvy consumers

I can now solve for the equilibrium share of savvy consumers σ . Given their expectation on a symmetric cutoff w and price p consumers simultaneously choose whether or not to become “savvy”, at a constant cost c . I show in Appendix F that this assumption is not innocuous, as allowing for different consumers to have different costs of becoming savvy may revert the results.¹²

Define

$$\Delta = \epsilon^{ns} - \epsilon^s, \quad (12)$$

as the expected premium (in terms of expected mismatch) paid by uninformed consumers.

Lemma 6 *The difference between the expected mismatch received by a non-savvy and a savvy consumer Δ is increasing in the search cutoff of deal finders, $\frac{d\Delta}{dw} > 0$.*

The formal proof is in appendix, and corresponds to the idea that one benefits more from comparing two “bad” advices than from comparing two “good” advices. This is guaranteed by the log-concavity of the mismatch distribution.

If there exists an interior solution, the equilibrium share σ is found by solving

$$\Delta(\sigma) = c, \quad (13)$$

else $\sigma = 0$ if $\Delta(0) \leq c$ and $\sigma = 1$ if $\Delta(1) \geq c$.

It is therefore possible to identify the impact of market concentration on the share of savvy consumers.

Proposition 3 *If the market price p is symmetric, there exists a unique equilibrium share of savvy consumers. If σ has an interior solution, this share is increasing in the number of deal finders (N).*

The proof is in Appendix, and the result holds in both the Varian and the Burdett and Judd settings. This Proposition describes the indirect effect of market concentration. It follows from proposition 1 and lemma 6 that the presence of more deal finders increases the difference between the best deal a savvy and a non-savvy consumer observe. It thus becomes more interesting for a consumer to invest in being informed. It also holds that $\frac{\partial(\epsilon^{ns} - \epsilon^s)}{\partial\sigma} < 0$, so that the incentives to become informed decrease when the number of informed consumers increases. This is a pretty

¹²Assuming consumers with heterogeneous costs of becoming savvy is an intermediary case between the fixed share of savviness assumed in the benchmark case and the ex-ante identical consumers assumed here.

standard intuition, as the protection of non-savvy consumers increases with the number of savvy consumers. As becoming informed is a positive externality on all all consumers, it holds that in equilibrium σ is always too low as compared to what would be consumer efficient (see Appendix E for a discussion).

From proposition 1, lemma 5 and proposition 3 it follows that there exists a unique equilibrium with symmetric prices. Both the cutoff w in proposition 1 and the share of savvy consumers in proposition 3 are independent of the symmetric price. As σ increases with w and w decreases with σ , the equilibrium pair $\{w, \sigma\}$ is unique if the price is symmetric. By lemma 5, a symmetric equilibrium price exists and is unique for a given pair $\{w, \sigma\}$.

Thus, it is possible to characterize the impact of the exogenous parameter N on the equilibrium mismatch and price for all consumers. As all consumers are ex-ante identical, and as consumers choose to become savvy up to the point where

$$u^s - c = u^{ns}, \quad (14)$$

all consumers have an identical expected surplus. As I have assumed the utility to be quasi-linear so that all payments are directly subtracted from the utility, the expected surplus of each consumer is equal to

$$u = u^s - c = u^{ns} = v - p - \varepsilon^{ns}. \quad (15)$$

Thus, it is enough to characterize the expected surplus received by a non-savvy consumer in equilibrium in order to understand the effect of market concentration on consumer welfare. To do so, I study separately the effect on equilibrium price and equilibrium expected mismatch.

Proposition 4 *When the share of informed consumers σ is endogenous and has an interior solution:*

1. *In the Varian setting, the expected equilibrium mismatch of a non-savvy consumer is decreasing in the number of intermediaries.*
2. *In the Burdett and Judd setting, the expected equilibrium mismatch of a non-savvy consumer is unaffected by the number of intermediaries.*

The formal proof is in appendix. To see this, one has to put together the effects documented in propositions 1 and 3. By proposition 1, we know that the direct effect of a higher number of

intermediaries is to decrease the intensity of search of intermediaries, hence making a non-savvy buyer worse off. By proposition 3, we however know that this has the indirect effect of increasing the share of savvy consumers, thereby protecting the non-savvy ones by making deal finders more selective (see again proposition 1). This effect only exists when σ has an interior solution. Else, we go back to the benchmark case of an exogenous share of informed consumers.

It is possible to show that the latter effect dominates in a Varian setting. As consumers compare either one or all deal finders, we know that the share of savvy consumers increases if the number of deal finders goes from N to $N' > N$ up to the point where the cutoff w' is such that comparing N' options has the same marginal benefit (c) as comparing N options with cutoff w . It is straightforward that $w = w'$ cannot hold, as comparing N' recommendations of a similar quality is always better than comparing N recommendations. Hence, the only solution is that $w' < w$, the higher number of deal finders actually makes all deal finders more selective through the indirect effect.

Consider now a Burdett and Judd setting, where consumers sample either one or two deal finders. As a higher number of deal finders N decreases the search effort of deal finders (proposition 1), the marginal benefit from comparing two options instead of one also increases with N . Indeed, the expected gain from comparing two “bad” advices is always higher than the gain from comparing two “good” ones (lemma 6). It follows that the share of consumers comparing two options increases with N , up to the level where the expected gain from comparing options equals c . This implies that changes in σ always exactly compensate the impact of an increase in N on the search behaviour. Indeed, for a given distribution of ε , there is a unique w such that the expected difference between one and two draws over the interval $[0, w]$ is equal to exactly c .

I illustrate the different effects for the Varian setting on Figure 1, using a uniform distribution. The complete resolution of the uniform case is in Appendix C. On the left panel, I take the share of savvy types σ as given. We see that for a given σ , a higher number of deal finders increases the mismatch value received by non-savvy consumers and (slightly) increases the mismatch value received by the savvy types. This is the direct effect of deal finders becoming less choosy. When the number of deal finders is equal to $N = 10$, these just pick one seller at random, so that a non-savvy customer receives an expected mismatch value of 0.5. For more deal finders, there is no interior solution for w . I do not study this case as it would imply making further assumptions about deal finder and non-savvy consumers.¹³ We also observe that the difference between the expected

¹³In particular, if deal finders need at least one price quote in order to attract the non-savvy types, they may still benefit from searching once up to a certain point.




Figure 1: The impact of market concentration on expected mismatch in the Varian setting, with $s = 0,02$, $F(\epsilon) = \epsilon$.

mismatches of the two types of consumers Δ increases with the number of deal finders N . On the right panel, I allow for the share of savvy types σ to be endogenous. Because the difference between the expected mismatch value received by a savvy and a non-savvy type increases with N , more and more consumers choose to become savvy. The effect of higher rates of savviness is to decrease the expected mismatch value received by both types of consumers in equilibrium. Hence, for a given price, market concentration is bad for consumers as even if a smaller number of deal finders has the direct positive effect of making each of them more choosy, it also has the indirect effect of making consumers less informed, thus allowing deal finders to become less choosy.

Proposition 5 *When the share of informed consumers σ is endogenous and has an interior solution, the symmetric equilibrium price p is decreasing in the number of intermediaries. This result holds in both the Varian and the Burdett and Judd setting.*

The formal proof is in Appendix, and is driven by a combination of three effects. First, sellers have an incentive to offer lower prices if deal finders become choosier. This is the case when the number of deal finders is higher, by proposition 4, albeit weakly so as this effect is null in the Burdett and Judd setting. If deal finders become more choosy, sellers have to offer better prices on all segments of the market, in order to have a chance of being selected. The consequence is one of a virtuous circle: the choosier the deal finders are, the more a seller wants to provide a low price. Second, sellers also want to lower the price if savvy consumers observe more options. This is mechanically the case when the number of deal finders increases in a Varian setting, and again

there is no impact in the Burdett and Judd setting. Third, sellers decrease the prices if the share of savvy consumers increases, which strictly holds when the number of deal finders increase in both settings, as from proposition 3. As fewer consumers pick a deal finder at random, the competitive segment of the market matters more to sellers. This last effect is the only one driving the result of higher concentration leading to lower prices in the Burdett and Judd setting.

5 Welfare and market concentration

I now turn to the welfare impact of market concentration. I start with consumer welfare, a direct consequence of the above results. I then discuss aggregate welfare, defined as the sum of consumers, deal finders, and sellers payoffs.

5.1 Consumer welfare

The answer to the initial research question - whether market concentration benefits consumers' welfare - directly follows from the above results.

Corollary 1 *When the share of informed consumers σ is endogenous and has an interior solution, lower market concentration increases the expected utility of all consumers. This result holds in both the Varian and the Burdett and Judd setting.*

The proof is straightforward from propositions 4 and 5. I report on table 1 the impact of market concentration in the Varian and the Burdett and Judd settings. As the expected mismatch received by non-savvy consumers is weakly decreasing in N , and as prices decrease with N the total effect of lower market concentration on consumer welfare is always positive when metasearch is a rational choice of ex-ante identical consumers.

Table 1: Effect of a higher number of deal finders N .

	<i>share of savvy consumers σ</i>	<i>search cutoff w</i>	<i>price p</i>
Varian	+	-	-
Burdett and Judd	+	=	-

Using the uniform distribution $F(\varepsilon) = \varepsilon$ and the same parameters as on Figure 1, Figure 2 represents the sum of the mismatch and the price effect on the equilibrium welfare (see again Appendix C for the computations). The dashed lines represent the expected mismatch of a non-savvy consumer and the expected price (both decreasing with N). The solid line represents the consumer welfare u , equal to $v - p - \varepsilon^{ns}$, and is increasing with N . On the left-hand side is the




Figure 2: Equilibrium price and consumer welfare, with $s = 0,02$, $F(\varepsilon) = \varepsilon$, $c = 0.1$, $v = 2$.

Varian setting. The signs of the effect of concentration on price and mismatch are identical, but it is striking that, at least for the highest levels of market concentration, the most important impact on consumer welfare is not so much the search effort by deal finders, but the price competition among sellers. What really benefits consumers is the externality generated by more consumers observing more than one product, even more so than the fact that deal finders are more selective.

On the right-hand side is the Burdett and Judd setting where consumers compare either one or two options. We see that only the price effect matters, and that this effect is less important than in the Varian setting. This suggests that whether we consider consumer information as some sort of naïvity or as a rational choice of acquiring information influences to what extent higher market concentration hurts consumer welfare.

5.2 Aggregate welfare

Up to now, I have focused on consumer welfare, as this is often the objective function of competition policy. Taking into account the welfare of sellers and deal finders however yields another tradeoff. Define aggregate welfare W as the sum of consumer utilities, sellers and deal finders profit:

$$W = (1 - \sigma)(v - p - \varepsilon^{ns}) + \sigma(v - \varepsilon^s - c - p) + M \frac{p}{M} + N(\chi - \frac{s}{F(w)}). \quad (16)$$

As the market is fully covered, prices cancel out and are not relevant to the welfare analysis. Moreover, at equilibrium $\varepsilon^s + c = \varepsilon^{ns}$ and the expression simplifies to

$$W = v - \varepsilon^{ns} - N\left(\chi - \frac{s}{F(w)}\right). \quad (17)$$

If there exists an interior solution, the number of deal finders that maximize aggregate welfare therefore solve $\frac{dW}{dN} = 0$,

$$\frac{d\varepsilon^{ns}}{dN} = \frac{d\frac{Ns}{F(w)}}{dN}. \quad (18)$$

We immediately see that in the Burdett and Judd framework - when consumers compare either one or two deal finders - as $\frac{dw}{dN} = 0$, there is no interior solution, and the number of deal finders maximizing aggregate welfare is the smallest that guarantees competition, $N = 2$.

In the Varian framework, $\frac{d\varepsilon^{ns}}{dN} < 0$ and $\frac{dw}{dN} < 0$, so that the solution implies a trade-off between a better matching quality and the cost paid by intermediaries. In particular, taking deal finders and sellers into account limits the idea that a very large number of deal finders is optimal. Indeed, under a consumer standard, as price and cutoff always decrease with N , there is no limit to how many deal finders should enter as long as the share of savvy consumers is below 100%.

Taking into account the costs of deal finders, the optimal number of intermediaries can never go towards infinity, and can even go back to the minimum in the model $N = 2$. The complete expression is pretty long to reproduce here, but it is easy to obtain numerical solutions. With a uniform distribution over $[0, 1]$ - in both the Varian and the Burdett and Judd setting - the sum of all payoffs is given by:

$$W = v + \chi - \frac{w}{2} - \frac{s}{w}. \quad (19)$$

Replacing w by the equilibrium value in the Varian setting and differentiating with respect to N , the maximum aggregate welfare corresponds to the solution to

$$\frac{s - N(N+2)s}{2c(N+1)^2} + \frac{2c}{(N-1)^2} = 0. \quad (20)$$

With the parameters used in the linear examples of the paper ($s = .02, c = 01$), the number of intermediaries maximizing aggregate welfare is $N = 2.54$. With a higher search cost for firms s , this number decreases. With higher information cost for consumers c , this number increases.




Figure 3: Aggregate welfare, with $s = 0,02$, $F(\varepsilon) = \varepsilon$, $v + \chi = 1.5 = 2$. The three curves correspond to different cost of consumer information: $c = 0.1$ (plain black), $c = 0.2$ (gray), $c = 0.3$ (dashed).

I illustrate how aggregate welfare changes with consumer information costs on Figure 3. With $c = 0.2$, the number of firms that maximizes aggregate welfare is $N = 3.95$ and with $c = 0.3$ it is $N = 5.35$.

6 Sponsored links

Consider a variant of the main model, in which deal finders can auction a “sponsored link,” displayed prominently to all consumers on top of the “organic link” that is the truthful recommendation studied in the previous sections. While an organic link contains information of the form $\{e_{ij}, p_j\}$, a sponsored link displays a price p_j as well as the information that it is “recommended” by the platform: the actual mismatch is obfuscated. I make this last assumption as it is hard to imagine why even a naïve consumer would ever buy from the sponsored link if she could immediately see the two mismatch values. It also makes computations more convenient, as the only thing I need to rule out is that an organic recommendation is never worse than the expected value of a random draw among all existing sellers.

I make the assumption that “non-savvy” consumers still pick a deal finder at random, and observe the sponsored link. With an exogenous probability $\gamma \in (0, 1)$, they are “inattentive” and pick the sponsored link conditional on it not being more expensive than the rationally expected symmetric equilibrium price p .¹⁴ With probability $1 - \gamma$ they see both the sponsored and the organic recommendation and pick the latter if the expected utility it yields is higher than the expected

¹⁴I could also assume that non-savvy consumers do not understand the price when they are inattentive but given the assumption that the market is fully covered, this would yield infinite prices for any strictly positive share of non-savvy consumers.

mismatch from a sponsored link. Savvy consumers always observe all the information.

I first start by studying two equivalent possibilities of auctioning prominence, per-display or per-sale. A non-savvy consumer buys from the sponsored link with probability γ if the price is below or equal to p and if $w \leq \int_0^b f(\varepsilon)\varepsilon d\varepsilon$. I make the assumption that the latter condition always holds, this is that deal finders are not so bad that they could recommend a mismatch higher than the expected value of a random draw among all sellers. I continue to focus on an equilibrium with a symmetric price p .

Lemma 7 *The expected profit of a seller from a sponsored link is equal to zero, and the expected revenue of a deal finder from auctioning a sponsored link is equal to $\gamma \frac{(1-\sigma)}{N} p$ in both types of auctions.*

The formal proof is in Appendix. As deal finders can auction the sponsored link and all sellers are ex-ante identical, deal finders can extract the entire expected surplus from those links. Hence, the only demand that matters to the profit of sellers is the one from organic links.

The expected profit of a deal finder discovering a deal ε_{ij} when prices are symmetric is a small modification of (3):

$$\pi(\varepsilon) = \left(\sigma \left(\frac{F(w) - F(\varepsilon)}{F(w)} \right)^{N-1} + (1 - \gamma) \frac{1 - \sigma}{N} \right) \chi + \gamma \frac{1 - \sigma}{N} p. \quad (21)$$

It is easy to see that the modification does not change anything to the equilibrium condition for w identified in (6). I have assumed that the revenue from a sponsored link is the revenue from the auction, assuming it is $\gamma \frac{1-\sigma}{N} (p + \chi)$ would however not affect the equilibrium search behavior as the outcome remains independent of the mismatch found. Quite unsurprisingly, this result implies that if the share of savvy consumers is exogenous, non-savvy consumers receive a higher expected mismatch in the presence of sponsored links than in its absence. I first turn on the effect of sponsored links on prices, and then move to the incentives to become informed.

The demand for a seller from organic links - the only ones that affect her profit - is given by

$$D(p_i, p, N) = (1 - \sigma)(1 - \gamma)D^{ns} + \sigma D^s, \quad (22)$$

where D^{ns} and D^s are defined as in the main model.

Proposition 6 *As compared to the model with organic recommendations only and for a given share of savvy consumers, the presence of sponsored links yields lower price. The higher the level*

of inattention of non-savvy consumers γ , the lower the expected price. This result holds in both the Varian and the Burdett and Judd setting.

The formal proof is in Appendix and follows from the fact that there is less weight put on the most inelastic segment of the market. The more non-savvy consumers are captured by sponsored links, the less they become relevant to sellers, as those make more money from organic recommendations.

I can now turn to the incentives to become informed. For a given share of savvy consumers σ , the expected mismatch of a savvy consumer ε^s is as before, because the cutoff value w is not directly affected by the presence of sponsored link. The expected mismatch of a non-savvy consumers is however higher as there is now a probability of observing a random deal when inattentive. Hence, for a given share of informed consumer σ , the difference between the expected mismatch of a savvy and a non-savvy consumer is higher.

Proposition 7 *As compared to the model with organic recommendations only, the presence of sponsored links yields a higher share of savvy consumers and lower expected mismatch for all consumers. The higher the level of inattention of non-savvy consumers γ , the lower the expected mismatch. This result holds in both the Varian and the Burdett and Judd setting, as long as the share of savvy consumers σ has an interior solution.*

This result comes from the same logic as in the main model. Because the expected deal of a non-savvy consumer becomes less attractive, the incentives to become informed are higher. More consumers become informed up to the point where the difference between the two types of consumers becomes equal to the cost of being savvy c . As the difference for a given w is higher in the presence of sponsored links, the only way to have all consumers ex-ante indifferent is that σ increases so that w decreases more. The logic is also reminiscent of Armstrong *et al.* (2009), who find in a model of price dispersion that other consumer protection policies - price caps and the possibility to opt out of advertisement lists - may make consumer worse off by decreasing their incentives to become informed.

Finally, as the share of savvy consumers increases with the presence of sponsored links and inattention, there is an additional effect on prices. Hence, the following general result.

Corollary 2 *As compared to the model with organic recommendations only, the presence of sponsored links yields a higher expected utility for all consumers if the share of savvy consumers σ has an interior solution. The higher the level of inattention of non-savvy consumers γ , the higher the expected utility.*

The dynamic that leads to higher utility is that the risk of buying the wrong product by mistake leads to higher incentives of being informed. As for the main model, the assumption that all consumers are ex-ante identical is crucial. Another important assumption is that even inattentive consumers know what price to expect. If sellers were allowed to extract more surplus from naïve consumers by charging much higher prices, an interior solution to the share of savvy consumers would be less likely, and never exists if I keep the assumption of a fully covered market.

7 Conclusions

The present paper puts together the incentives deal finders have to invest in search with the incentives consumers have to become informed and the incentives for sellers to offer low prices. This conjunction leads to two opposite effects of the impact of market concentration on the search behaviour of deal finders. The first effect is that more competition decreases the incentives for deal finders to invest in search. The second effect is that more competition increases the share of consumers choosing to become informed. These two effects alone do not suffice to characterize the impact of competition on consumer welfare, as they also influence the price offered by sellers. I show that, if the metasearch of consumers among deal finders is a rational choice, more competition on the market for deal finders makes these intermediaries more choosy and increases price competition among sellers. Taking into account the profit of deal finder on aggregate welfare leads to a tradeoff between firms' profits and consumer surplus: the optimal number of deal finders is not necessarily 2, but each additional deal finders needs to bring a sufficiently high decrease in the expected mismatch received by consumers to justify the higher costs for the industry.

More generally, this paper aims at contributing to the general debate about the impact of the multiplication of sources of information available on the Internet. The main message from this study of deal finders is that by ignoring the indirect effect of market concentration on consumer education one might draw incorrect conclusions overestimating the benefits from an economy with a limited number of (presumably) high quality source. As long as a strictly positive share of consumers are informed and another one uninformed, the impact bad information has on internalizing the search externality dominates. Even “fake news” such as sponsored links actually benefit every consumer once equilibrium effects are factored in.

I also identify two important limitations to my results. First, the idea of “search externalities” relies on deal finders being unable to tell who is savvy and who is not. Without this assumption, if consumers are ex-ante identical, the only candidate equilibria is that either all consumers are

informed, all consumers are uninformed, or all are indifferent. Second, the result of a Pareto improvement identified in corollary 1 relies on all consumers being ex-ante identical. Even without an exogenous share of naïve consumers, one needs to consider distributional effects if buyers have different exogenous abilities to process information.

Bibliography

- ANDERSON, S. P. and RENAULT, R. (1999). Pricing, product diversity, and search costs: A bertrand-chamberlin-diamond model. *The RAND Journal of Economics*, pp. 719–735.
- ARMSTRONG, M. (2015). Search and ripoff externalities. *Review of Industrial Organization*, **47** (3), 273–302.
- , VICKERS, J. and ZHOU, J. (2009). Consumer protection and the incentive to become informed. *Journal of the European Economic Association*, **7** (2-3), 399–410.
- and ZHOU, J. (2011). Paying for prominence. *The Economic Journal*, **121** (556), F368–F395.
- BAGNOLI, M. and BERGSTROM, T. (2005). Log-concave probability and its applications. *Economic theory*, **26** (2), 445–469.
- BAYE, M. R., KOVENOCK, D. and DE VRIES, C. G. (1996). The all-pay auction with complete information. *Economic Theory*, **8** (2), 291–305.
- BURDETT, K. and JUDD, K. L. (1983). Equilibrium price dispersion. *Econometrica: Journal of the Econometric Society*, pp. 955–969.
- CAPLIN, A. and NALEBUFF, B. (1991). Aggregation and imperfect competition: On the existence of equilibrium. *Econometrica: Journal of the Econometric Society*, pp. 25–59.
- CHEN, Y. and ZHANG, T. (2017). Intermediaries and consumer search. *International Journal of Industrial Organization*.
- DE CORNIÈRE, A. (2016). Search advertising. *American Economic Journal: Microeconomics*, **8** (3), 156–188.
- ELIAZ, K. and SPIEGLER, R. (2011a). Consideration sets and competitive marketing. *The Review of Economic Studies*, **78** (1), 235–262.

- and — (2011b). A simple model of search engine pricing. *The Economic Journal*, **121** (556), F329–F339.
- INDERST, R. and OTTAVIANI, M. (2012). How (not) to pay for advice: A framework for consumer financial protection. *Journal of Financial Economics*, **105** (2), 393–411.
- LEWIS, T. R. (2012). A theory of delegated search for the best alternative. *The RAND Journal of Economics*, **43** (3), 391–416.
- MALIK, O. (2015). In silicon valley now, it's almost always winner takes all. *The New Yorker*, December 30, 2015.
- MISRA, N. and VAN DER MEULEN, E. C. (2003). On stochastic properties of m-spacings. *Journal of Statistical Planning and Inference*, **115** (2), 683–697.
- PERLOFF, J. M. and SALOP, S. C. (1985). Equilibrium with product differentiation. *The Review of Economic Studies*, **52** (1), 107–120.
- ULBRICHT, R. (2016). Optimal delegated search with adverse selection and moral hazard. *Theoretical Economics*, **11**.
- VARIAN, H. R. (1980). A model of sales. *The American Economic Review*, **70** (4), 651–659.
- WOLINSKY, A. (1986). True monopolistic competition as a result of imperfect information. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, pp. 493–511.

Appendix A: Proofs

Proof of Proposition 1.

Proof. From (6), it is straightforward that the left-hand side increases with s while the right-hand side increases with σ and w . There exists no corner solution $w = 0$ as $s > 0$, and there exists a corner solution $w = b$ if and only if $s \geq \chi\sigma \int_0^b (1 - F(\varepsilon))^{N-1} f(\varepsilon) d\varepsilon$.

Consider a variant of the model where instead of observing either all or one deal finder, consumers bear a linear search cost c to (non sequentially) observe an additional finder. In line with Burdett and Judd (1983), for an equilibrium where some - but not all - consumers choose to observe only one deal finder to exist, I can focus on equilibria where consumers mix between observing 1 or 2 deal finders (because the marginal benefit of an additional observation is decreasing in the

number of observations). The same exercise can easily be extended to any indifference between N and $N + 1$ deal finders as, unlike in Burdett and Judd (1983), there is no need for a share of consumers observing only one result.

If there is a share σ of consumers observing 2 deal finders, $\pi(\varepsilon)$ becomes

$$\pi(\varepsilon) = \chi \left(\frac{1 - \sigma}{N} + \frac{2\sigma}{N} \frac{F(w) - F(\varepsilon)}{F(w)} \right), \quad (23)$$

so that in the second stage w solves

$$s = \chi \left(\frac{2\sigma}{N} \int_0^w \frac{F(w) - F(\varepsilon)}{F(w)} f(\varepsilon) d\varepsilon \right), \quad (24)$$

with identical properties as in the “Varian” setting. ■

Proof of Lemma 1

Proof. Using the result from proposition 1, it is easy to show that the expected mismatch of a non-savvy consumer ε^{ns} is equal to the expected value of a random draw over the interval $[0, w]$,

$$\varepsilon^{ns} = \int_0^w \varepsilon \frac{f(\varepsilon)}{F(w)} d\varepsilon. \quad (25)$$

First, it holds that $\frac{d\varepsilon^{ns}}{dw} > 0$. For any $w' > w$, we want to show that the expected value of a random draw on the interval $[0, w]$ is smaller than the expected value of a random draw on the interval $[0, w']$, $\varepsilon^{ns}(w) < \varepsilon^{ns}(w')$:

$$\int_0^w \varepsilon \frac{f(\varepsilon)}{F(w)} d\varepsilon < \int_0^{w'} \varepsilon \frac{f(\varepsilon)}{F(w')} d\varepsilon$$

This expression is equivalent to

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^w \varepsilon \frac{f(\varepsilon)}{F(w)} d\varepsilon &< \int_0^w \varepsilon \frac{f(\varepsilon)}{F(w')} d\varepsilon + \int_w^{w'} \varepsilon \frac{f(\varepsilon)}{F(w')} d\varepsilon \\ \Leftrightarrow \frac{F(w')}{F(w)} \varepsilon^{ns} &< \frac{F(w)}{F(w')} \varepsilon^{ns} + \int_w^{w'} \varepsilon \frac{f(\varepsilon)}{F(w')} d\varepsilon \\ \Leftrightarrow \varepsilon^{ns} &< \int_w^{w'} \varepsilon \frac{f(\varepsilon)}{F(w') - F(w)} d\varepsilon, \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

where the right-hand side is the expected value of a random draw between w and w' , by definition higher than w . We also know by Proposition 1 that $\frac{dw}{ds} \geq 0$, $\frac{dw}{d\sigma} \leq 0$ and $\frac{dw}{dN} \geq 0$. Hence, as the expected utility of a non-savvy type is given by $u^{ns} = v - p - \varepsilon^{ns}$, the proposition follows. ■

Proof of Lemma 2

Proof. In the Varian setting, savvy consumers obtain an expected mismatch equal to the expected value of the minimum of N random draws between 0 and w . The probability density of a random draw over the interval $[0, w]$ is $g(\varepsilon) = \frac{f(\varepsilon)}{F(w)}$, with cumulative density $G(\varepsilon) = \frac{F(\varepsilon)}{F(w)}$ (the probability density function is therefore specific to a given value of w). The expected value of the first order statistic of N independent draws of $g(\varepsilon)$ is given by the standard formula

$$\varepsilon^s = \int_0^w N(1 - G(\varepsilon))^{N-1} \varepsilon g(\varepsilon) d\varepsilon. \quad (27)$$

Using the definition of $g(\varepsilon)$, this rewrites

$$\varepsilon^s = \int_0^w N \left(1 - \frac{F(\varepsilon)}{F(w)}\right)^{N-1} \varepsilon \frac{f(\varepsilon)}{F(w)} d\varepsilon. \quad (28)$$

By the same logic as in lemma 1, $\frac{d\varepsilon^s}{dw} \geq 0$. The impact of s and σ are unambiguous, as these variables only affect w . For a given value of w , the marginal impact of N is to decrease ε^s . However, as from proposition 1, $\frac{dw}{dN} \geq 0$, the overall effect is ambiguous. By totally differentiating $\varepsilon^s(N, P(N))$, the expression in the Proposition follows. In the Burdett and Judd setting, $N = 2$ in equation (28) so that only the impact of N on w affects ε^s . ■

Proof of Lemma 3

Proof. The probability that a seller i offering price p_i is below the threshold $P(\eta_{ij} < w)$ is equal to $P(\varepsilon_{ij} + p_i - p < w) = F(w + p - p_i)$. The probability that any seller setting the equilibrium price is below the threshold is $P(\varepsilon_{ij} + p - p < w) = F(w)$. At equilibrium, the mass of deal finders below the threshold is thus $MF(w)$. The probability of being selected by a mass 1 of non-savvy consumers is equal to the probability of being below the threshold over the mass of sellers below the threshold, $D^{ns} = \frac{P(\varepsilon_{ij} + p_i - p < w)}{MP(\varepsilon_{ij} + p - p < w)} = \frac{F(w + p - p_i)}{MF(w)}$. ■

Proof of lemma 4.

Proof. In the Varian case, a seller is chosen by a savvy consumer if it offers the best deal amongst N deals selected by deal finders. In order to do so, it first needs to be selected by a deal finder. The probability that a mass 1 of savvy consumers is selected by a given deal finder is equal to $D^{ns}(p_i, p, N)$, and the probability of being selected by more than one deal finder for a given consumer is zero (as there is a continuum of sellers). Hence, the probability of be-

ing selected by exactly one deal finder is equal to $ND^{ns}(p_i, p, N)$. The probability of offering a better deal η_{ij} than all other sellers conditional on being selected by a deal finder is $r(N - 1)$. Hence, the probability for a seller to be selected by a mass one of savvy consumers is equal to $D^s(p_i, p, N) = ND^{ns}(p_i, p, N)r(N - 1)$. In the Burdett and Judd case, the price solves a similar problem as in the Varian case, with as only difference

$$D^s = 2D^{ns}r(2). \quad (29)$$

■

Proof of Lemma 5

Proof. The expected demand for a given seller i is

$$D(p_i, p, N) = (1 - \sigma)D^{ns} + \sigma D^s. \quad (30)$$

As the expected profit of a seller is equal to $p_i D(p_i, p, n)$, it follows that the equilibrium symmetric price p posted by sellers solves

$$p = \frac{-D(p, p, N)}{D_{p_i}(p_i, p, N)} = \frac{-D(p, p, N)}{\sigma D_{p_i}^s(p_i, p, N) + (1 - \sigma)D_{p_i}^{ns}(p_i, p, N)}, \quad (31)$$

where $D(p, p, n) = \frac{1}{M}$ as all sellers post an identical price in equilibrium.

It is easy to show that, with a continuum of sellers of mass M ,

$$D_{p_i}^{ns} = \frac{-f(w)}{MF(w)}, \quad (32)$$

so that with $\sigma = 0$, the unique symmetric equilibrium price would be $p = \frac{F(w)}{f(w)}$. For $D_{p_i}^s$ the expression is less straightforward, as it takes the derivative of D^{ns} multiplied by the probability of being smaller than the first order statistic of $N - 1$ draws over $[0, w]$, $r(N - 1)$. In the Varian case, the demand D^s is presented in (9) and (10):

$$D^s = ND^{ns}r(N - 1). \quad (33)$$

In the Burdett and Judd case,

$$D^s = 2D^{ns}r(2). \quad (34)$$

Define $\beta = Nr(N-1)$, so that $D^s = D^{ns}\beta$. At equilibrium $p_i = p$, for $D^s = D^{ns}$ to hold, it must be that $\beta = 1$. We can thus differentiate D_s :

$$D_{p_i}^s = D_{p_i}^{ns} + D^{ns} \frac{d\beta}{dp_i}. \quad (35)$$

It follows that the direct effect of a higher w is to increase prices, as it decreases both $D_{p_i}^s$ and $D_{p_i}^{ns}$. The direct effect of a higher N is to decrease prices, as it does not affect $D_{p_i}^{ns}$ and increases $D_{p_i}^s$.

The direct impact of σ is to increase the weight put on $D_{p_i}^s$. Hence, to see that higher σ decreases prices it is enough to show that the savvy part of the demand is more elastic. At equilibrium, $D^s = D^{ns} = \frac{1}{M}$. As $D^{ns} = \frac{1}{M}$, it is enough to show that $\frac{d\beta}{dp_i} < 0$ in order to show that $D_{p_i}^s < D_{p_i}^{ns}$, and thus the savvy part of the demand is more elastic. This result is straightforward as $\frac{dr(j)}{dp_i} < 0$, $\forall j > 0$. ■

Proof of Lemma 6

Proof. Using the values of ε^s and ε^{ns} , Δ rewrites

$$\Delta = \int_0^w \left(1 - N\left(1 - \frac{F(\varepsilon)}{F(w)}\right)^{N-1}\right) \frac{f(\varepsilon)}{F(w)} \varepsilon d\varepsilon. \quad (36)$$

Differentiating with respect to w yields

$$\frac{d\Delta}{dw} = \frac{f(w)}{F(w)} \left(w - \int_0^w \left(1 - N\left(1 - \frac{F(\varepsilon)}{F(w)}\right)^{N-1}\right) \frac{f(\varepsilon)}{F(w)} \varepsilon d\varepsilon - \int_0^w N(N-1) \frac{F(\varepsilon)}{F(w)} \left(1 - \frac{F(\varepsilon)}{F(w)}\right)^{N-2} \frac{f(\varepsilon)}{F(w)} \varepsilon d\varepsilon \right). \quad (37)$$

In terms of order statistics, with $\bar{x}_{(k,N)}$ being the expected value of the k -th smallest of N draws, so that $\bar{x}_{(1,N)} = \varepsilon^s$ and $\bar{x}_{(1,1)} = \varepsilon^{ns}$, this expression rewrites

$$\frac{d\Delta}{dw} = \frac{f(w)}{F(w)} \left(w - \bar{x}_{(1,1)} + \bar{x}_{(1,N)} - \bar{x}_{(2,N)} \right). \quad (38)$$

Hence, $\frac{d\Delta}{dw} \geq 0$ if and only if for all w

$$w - \bar{x}_{(1,1)} \geq \bar{x}_{(2,N)} - \bar{x}_{(1,N)}. \quad (39)$$

As the left-hand side is independent of N and the right-hand side is decreasing in N for log-concave distributions (Misra and van der Meulen, 2003), if the proposition holds for $N = 2$ it holds for all $N > 1$, so that the following is a sufficient condition:

$$w - \bar{x}_{(1,1)} \geq \bar{x}_{(2,2)} - \bar{x}_{(1,2)}. \quad (40)$$

This is also the condition corresponding to the Burdett and Judd case. Rearranging the terms yields

$$w - \int_0^w \left(\frac{4F(\varepsilon)}{F(w)} - 1 \right) \frac{f(\varepsilon)}{F(w)} \varepsilon d\varepsilon \geq 0. \quad (41)$$

We know from Theorem 9 in Bagnoli and Bergstrom (2005) that truncating a distribution (here between 0 and w) does not affect log-concavity. We also know from Misra and van der Meulen (2003) that if $f(\varepsilon)$ is log-concave, the density of $x_{(2,2)} - x_{(1,2)} = \left(\frac{4F(\varepsilon)}{F(w)} - 2 \right) \frac{f(\varepsilon)}{F(w)}$ is also log-concave. Rearranging (41), we obtain

$$w - \int_0^w \left(\left(\frac{4F(\varepsilon)}{F(w)} - 2 \right) \frac{f(\varepsilon)}{F(w)} + \frac{f(\varepsilon)}{F(w)} \right) \varepsilon d\varepsilon \geq 0. \quad (42)$$

As the sum of two log-concave distributions is also log concave, the density $\left(\frac{4F(\varepsilon)}{F(w)} - 2 \right) \frac{f(\varepsilon)}{F(w)} + \frac{f(\varepsilon)}{F(w)}$ is log-concave. By Theorem 5 in Bagnoli and Bergstrom (2005) log-concavity implies that the left-hand side of (42) is increasing in w . As the expression converges to zero when w goes to 0, the condition is fulfilled. ■

Proof of Proposition 2

Proof.

1. **Varian setting.** The effect of N on the mismatch value is independent on the symmetric price p , so that the first part of the proposition is a direct corollary of lemma 1 and lemma 2. The effect on price is a combination of two effects. First, by lemma 5, the direct effect of N is to lower p . Second, by lemma 1 the indirect effect is to increase w , and by lemma 5 an increase in w leads to higher prices.
2. **Burdett and Judd setting.** The effect of N on the mismatch value is independent on the

symmetric price p , so that the first part of the proposition is a direct corollary of lemma 1 and lemma 2. The effect on price is a combination of two effects. First, by lemma 5, N has no direct influence on p . Second, by lemma 1 the indirect effect is to increase w , and by lemma 5 an increase in w leads to higher prices.

■

Proof of Proposition 3

Proof. First, I show that there exists a unique equilibrium σ . $\Delta(\sigma)$ is continuous and decreasing. Indeed, from proposition 1, w decreases with σ . As neither σ nor p directly enters Δ , σ only affects Δ through its effect on w . From lemma 6, $\frac{d\Delta}{dw} \leq 0$, so that $\frac{d\Delta}{d\sigma} \leq 0$. As c is a constant, it is either a dominant strategy to be uninformed $\sigma = 0$ if $\Delta(1) < \Delta(0) < c$, a dominant strategy to be informed $\sigma = 1$ if $c < \Delta(1) < \Delta(0)$, or there exists a unique intersection $\Delta(\sigma) = c$ if $\Delta(1) < c < \Delta(0)$.

Second, I show that σ increases with N . From proposition 1, we know that w increases with N for a given σ . For a given number of deal finders, we know from lemma 6 that the larger the interval of the draws $[0, w]$, the higher the expected absolute gain from observing more draws. From the properties of the first order statistic, for any expected value of the first order statistic of k random draws, $X(1, k)$, over an interval it is always true that $X(1, k) < X(1, k')$ if and only if $k' < k$. Hence, the two effects (higher w and higher N) go in the same direction, to increase Δ for a given σ . It follows from $\frac{\partial \Delta}{\partial N} > 0$ that $\frac{\partial \sigma}{\partial N} \geq 0$.

In the Burdett and Judd setting, σ solves

$$c = \int_0^w \varepsilon g(\varepsilon) d\varepsilon - \int_0^w 2(1 - G(\varepsilon)) \varepsilon g(\varepsilon) d\varepsilon, \quad (43)$$

with $g(\varepsilon) = \frac{f(\varepsilon)}{F(w)}$ and w from (24). As in the Varian setting, the difference increases with w , so that the indirect effect of higher N is to increase σ . For such a mixed strategy to be an equilibrium, c must not be too low, as consumers must strictly prefer to observe 2 deal finders over 3,

$$c > \int_0^w 2(1 - G(\varepsilon)) \varepsilon g(\varepsilon) d\varepsilon - \int_0^w 3(1 - G(\varepsilon))^2 \varepsilon g(\varepsilon) d\varepsilon. \quad (44)$$

■

Proof of Proposition 4

Proof. I want to assess the impact of N on ε^{ns} for a given value of p .

1. **Varian setting.** In any equilibrium where σ and w have an interior solution, for a given number of deal finders $\Delta(w, N) = \varepsilon^{ns}(w) - \varepsilon^s(w, N) = c$, where w is itself a function of N and σ . Consider $N' > N$ and assume w remains the same, it holds that $\Delta(w, N') = \varepsilon^{ns}(w) - \varepsilon^s(w, N') > c$, as $\varepsilon^s(w, N') < \varepsilon^s(w, N)$ - a savvy consumer is always better off on expectation by observing more deal finders, all other things held equal. Hence, as by lemma 6, $\frac{d\Delta}{dw} \geq 0$, the only possibility to reach an equilibrium is that σ increases until the search threshold of deal finders reaches some $w' < w$ such that $\varepsilon^{ns}(w') - \varepsilon^s(w', N') = c$.
2. **Burdett and Judd setting.** In any equilibrium where σ and w have an interior solution, for a given number of deal finders $\Delta(w) = \varepsilon^{ns}(w) - \varepsilon^s(w) = c$, where w is itself a function of N and σ , and $\varepsilon^s(w)$ does not directly depend on N as savvy consumers always observe exactly 2 deal finders. Hence, for any $N' \neq N$, the only possibility to reach an equilibrium w' is that the equilibrium σ ensures $w' = w$ always holds.

■

Proof of Proposition 5

Proof. The impact of N can be decomposed into several effects,

$$D_{p_i}^s(p, p, N) \frac{d\sigma}{dN} + D_{p_i}^{ns}(p, p, N) \left(-\frac{d\sigma}{dN}\right) + (1 - \sigma) \frac{dD_{p_i}^{ns}(p, p, N)}{dN} + \sigma \frac{dD_{p_i}^s(p, p, N)}{dN} \leq 0. \quad (45)$$

The sum of the first two terms in (45) is always negative, as $\frac{d\sigma}{dN} \geq 0$ (Proposition 3) and $D_{p_i}^s(p, p, N) < D_{p_i}^{ns}(p, p, N)$ (the “savvy” segment of the market is more elastic than the non-savvy one). The third term and fourth terms are negative as $\frac{dw}{dN} \leq 0$ (proposition 4), as the elasticity of demand is higher if the deal finders are more selective (lower w). In the Burdett and Judd setting, it holds that $\frac{dw}{dN} = 0$, and the first two terms remain negative. ■

Proof of Lemma 7

Proof.

1. I have assumed that the production cost of sellers is equal to 0. Hence, the expected profit of a seller paying a price q^d for a sponsored link “per display” is equal to

$$\pi^d = \gamma \frac{(1 - \sigma)}{N} p - q^d. \quad (46)$$

As sellers are symmetric, the optimal strategy in a second-price sealed-bid auction is to bid one's valuation, the equilibrium bid is thus equal to

$$q^d = \gamma \frac{(1-\sigma)}{N} p. \quad (47)$$

2. The expected profit of a seller paying a price q^s for a sponsored link "per sale" is equal to

$$\pi^s = \gamma \frac{(1-\sigma)}{N} (p - q^s). \quad (48)$$

As sellers are symmetric, the optimal strategy in a second-price sealed-bid auction is to bid one's valuation, the equilibrium bid is thus equal to

$$q^s = p. \quad (49)$$

■

Proof of Proposition 6

Proof. Equation (31) becomes

$$p = \frac{-D(p, p, N)}{D_{p_i}(p_i, p, N)} = \frac{-D(p, p, N)}{\sigma D_{p_i}^s(p_i, p, N) + (1-\sigma)(1-\gamma)D_{p_i}^{ns}(p_i, p, N)}. \quad (50)$$

The equilibrium demand from buyers using organic links is now $D(p, p, N) = \frac{\sigma + (1-\sigma)(1-\gamma)}{M}$, so that the expression becomes (with β defined in the proof of lemma 5)

$$p = -\frac{\sigma + (1-\sigma)(1-\gamma)}{M \left((\sigma + (1-\sigma)(1-\gamma))D_{p_i}^{ns} + \sigma \frac{d\beta}{dp_i} D^{ns} \right)}. \quad (51)$$

Hence, for any $\gamma > 0$ the price with sponsored link is lower than without. Differentiating with respect to γ yields

$$\frac{dp}{d\gamma} = \frac{(1-\sigma) \frac{d\beta}{dp_i} D^{ns}}{M \left(\frac{d\beta}{dp_i} D^{ns} + D_{p_i}^{ns} - D_{p_i}^{ns} (1-\sigma) \right)^2} < 0. \quad (52)$$

■

Proof of Proposition 7

Proof. The expected mismatch of a non-savvy consumer becomes

$$\varepsilon_{sponsored}^{ns} = (1 - \gamma)\varepsilon^{ns} + \gamma \int_0^b f(\varepsilon)\varepsilon d\varepsilon > \varepsilon^{ns}. \quad (53)$$

Thus, $\Delta_{sponsored}(w, \sigma) > \Delta(w, \sigma)$ and the only possibility to have $\Delta_{sponsored}(w, \sigma) = c$ is to have a lower search cutoff $w' < w$. As at equilibrium it must hold that $\varepsilon^s + c = \varepsilon_{sponsored}^{ns}$ and γ does not influence ε^s , all buyers are better off in expectation with w' than with w . Indeed, as $w' < w$, at equilibrium, $\varepsilon^s(w') < \varepsilon^s(w)$ (see lemma 2). As $\frac{\partial \varepsilon_{sponsored}^{ns}}{\partial \gamma} > 0$, it also holds that the equilibrium w decrease with γ . Note that this result holds both in the Varian and in the Burdett and Judd setting.

■

Appendix B: Non-sequential search

In this Appendix, I consider a non-sequential variant of the model. Instead of linearly searching until they find a deal below a threshold value w , I assume deal finders simultaneously choose the number of sellers they sample before observing the results. Denote by q the symmetric equilibrium number of sellers sampled by a deal finder, and assume a symmetric equilibrium price p , the expected profit of deal finder i sampling q_i prices is

$$\pi(q_i, q) = \chi \left(\sigma \left(\int_0^b f_{(1),q_i}(\varepsilon)(1 - F_{(1),q}(\varepsilon))^{N-1} d\varepsilon \right) + \frac{1 - \sigma}{N} \right), \quad (54)$$

where $f_{(1),x}(\varepsilon)$ is the density of the first order statistic of x independent draws with individual density $f(\varepsilon)$, and similarly $F_{(1),x}$ is the cumulative density. The first part of the profit is thus the probability that the smallest of q_i random draws be lower than the smallest of q random draws, times the $N - 1$ other deal finders, multiplied by the share of savvy consumers σ . The second part is identical to the sequential model, and represents the fact that a share $1 - \sigma$ of non-savvy consumers choose the best of the q deals offered by a deal finder chosen at random. Using the properties of the order statistics, this expression rewrites:

$$\pi(q_i, q) = \chi \left(\sigma \left(\int_0^b q_i f(\varepsilon)(1 - F(\varepsilon))^{q_i-1+q(N-1)} d\varepsilon \right) + \frac{1 - \sigma}{N} \right). \quad (55)$$

The symmetric equilibrium q is such that

$$\frac{d\pi(q_i, q)}{q_i} = s, \quad (56)$$

for all deal finders i . As q is an integer, a continuous value of q has to be interpreted as a mixed strategy. It is straightforward that for a given q the marginal benefit of an additional search is decreasing in q_i . As in Lemma 1, a simple inspection of (55) and (56) shows that $\frac{\partial q}{\partial s} < 0$ (if the marginal cost increases, the marginal benefit must also increase). It is also clear that $\frac{\partial q}{\partial \sigma} > 0$, as σ directly multiplies the marginal benefit of an additional search, and $\frac{\partial q}{\partial N} < 0$, as N only enters the expression $(1 - F(\varepsilon))^{q_i - 1 + q(N-1)}$.

The expected mismatch obtained by a non-savvy consumer is the minimum of q random draws by one deal finder,

$$\varepsilon^{ns} = \int_0^b q(1 - F(\varepsilon))^{q-1} \varepsilon f(\varepsilon) d\varepsilon, \quad (57)$$

so that $\frac{\partial \varepsilon^{ns}}{\partial q} < 0$. The expected mismatch obtained by a savvy consumer is the minimum of q random draws by N deal finders,

$$\varepsilon^s = \int_0^b Nq(1 - F(\varepsilon))^{Nq-1} \varepsilon f(\varepsilon) d\varepsilon, \quad (58)$$

with $\frac{\partial \varepsilon^s}{\partial N} < 0$, and $\frac{\partial \varepsilon^s}{\partial q} < 0$. Hence, as $\frac{\partial q}{\partial N} < 0$, the sign of $\frac{d\varepsilon^s}{dN}$ is ambiguous. The presence of an additional deal finder decreases ε^s if and only if

$$-\frac{\partial \varepsilon^s}{\partial N} \geq \frac{\partial \varepsilon^s}{\partial q} \frac{\partial q}{\partial N}. \quad (59)$$

From (57) and (58) it follows directly that $\frac{\partial \Delta}{\partial N} > 0$, so that $\frac{d\sigma}{dN} > 0$. Proposition 4 thus holds: $\frac{dq}{dN} \geq 0$. Indeed, with $N' > N$, the gain from comparing Nq and q and $N'q'$ and q' must be equal, which is only possible with $q' > q$.

Switching to the sellers' side, the demand from non-savvy consumers is

$$D^{ns}(p_i, p, N) = \frac{q}{M} \int_0^b f(\varepsilon)(1 - F(\varepsilon - p + p_i))^{q-1} d\varepsilon, \quad (60)$$

the probability of being selected by each deal finder, of offering the best deal among the q random draws of this deal finder, and the probability that each deal finder is chosen at random by a

consumer. The demand from savvy consumers is

$$D^s(p_i, p, N) = \frac{Nq}{M} \int_0^b f(\varepsilon)(1 - F(\varepsilon - p + p_i))^{Nq-1} d\varepsilon, \quad (61)$$

the probability of offering the best deal among Nq random independent draws. The demand for a given seller is $D = \sigma D^s + (1 - \sigma)D^{ns}$, and the profit is $p_i D(p, p_i, N)$. As, at a symmetric price equilibrium $D^s = D^{ns} = \frac{1}{M}$, D^s is more elastic. Thus, following a similar reasoning as for the sequential search, p decreases with N if

$$D_{p_i}^s(p, p, N) \frac{d\sigma}{dN} + D_{p_i}^{ns}(p, p, N) \frac{d(1 - \sigma)}{dN} + (1 - \sigma) \frac{dD_{p_i}^{ns}(p, p, N)}{dN} + \sigma \frac{dD_{p_i}^s(p, p, N)}{dN} \leq 0, \quad (62)$$

which is always true as $\frac{d\sigma}{dN} > 0$ and $\frac{dq}{dN} \geq 0$.

Appendix C: uniform example

The Varian setting.

In the special case of uniformly distributed ε over $[0, 1]$ and $\chi = 1$, in the Varian case, if there is an interior solution,

$$w = \frac{sN}{\sigma}, \quad (63)$$

where N is the number of deal finders on the market, and σ the endogenous share of savvy consumers. The expected mismatch of a non-savvy consumer is given by

$$\varepsilon^{ns} = \frac{w}{2} = \frac{sN}{2\sigma}. \quad (64)$$

More deal finders make the savvy type worse off as ε^s simplifies to

$$\varepsilon^s = \frac{sN}{\sigma(1 + N)}. \quad (65)$$

The demand can be rewritten as

$$D = D^{ns}((1 - \sigma) + \sigma Nr(N - 1)). \quad (66)$$

Denoting $\beta = (1 - \sigma) + \sigma Nr(N - 1)$, I find

$$\begin{aligned} D_{p_i} &= D_{p_i}^{ns} + \frac{1}{M} \frac{d\beta}{dp_i} \\ &= -\frac{1}{Mw} - \frac{1}{Mw}(N - 1)\sigma, \end{aligned} \quad (67)$$

so that

$$\begin{aligned} p &= -\frac{\frac{1}{M}}{-D_{p_i}} \\ &= \frac{w}{1 + (N - 1)\sigma}. \end{aligned} \quad (68)$$

The premium for being informed rewrites $\Delta = \frac{sN(N-1)}{2\sigma(N+1)}$ and (13) solves

$$\sigma = \frac{sN(N-1)}{2c(N+1)}, \quad (69)$$

if σ has an interior solution (if $c > \frac{sN(N-1)}{2(N+1)}$) and $\sigma = 1$ else.

Plugging (69) into (63) yields

$$w = \frac{2c(N+1)}{N-1}, \quad (70)$$

if σ has an interior solution and $w = sN$ if $\sigma = 1$.

I have shown in (68) that the equilibrium price solves $p = \frac{w}{1+(N-1)\sigma}$, with w and σ defined in (69) and (70). We immediately see that the equilibrium price always decreases with N , as w decreases with N and σ increases with N . Using the equilibrium values for these parameters, if σ has an interior solution, (68) simplifies to

$$p = \frac{4c^2(1+N)^2}{2c(N^2-1) + (N-1)^3Ns}. \quad (71)$$

Note that equation (71) only represents the case where σ has an interior solution, for $c > \frac{sN(N-1)}{2(N+1)}$.

When c becomes smaller, the price does not converge to zero as suggested by (71), but to $p = s$.

Introducing sponsored links in section 6, the equilibrium price is

$$p = \frac{w((1-\gamma) + \sigma\gamma)}{1 + (N-1)\sigma - \gamma(1-\sigma)}, \quad (72)$$

with $\frac{dp}{d\gamma} = -\frac{(N-1)(1-\sigma)\sigma w}{(1-\sigma+(N-1+\gamma)\sigma)^2} < 0$ when σ is taken as given.

The equilibrium share of informed consumers is

$$\sigma = \frac{sN((1+N)\gamma - 2)}{(1+N)(\gamma - 1 + 2c)} \quad (73)$$

if σ has an interior solution. The search cutoff is given by

$$w = \frac{(1+N)(2c - (1-\gamma))}{\gamma N - (1 - (1-\gamma))}. \quad (74)$$

The Burdett and Judd setting.

In the special case of uniformly distributed ε over $[0, 1]$ and $\chi = 1$, in the Burdett and Judd case, applying the same method I obtain:

$$w(\sigma) = \frac{sN}{\sigma}, \quad (75)$$

$$\sigma = \frac{Ns}{6c}, \quad (76)$$

$$w^* = 6c, \quad (77)$$

$$p = \frac{w}{1 + \sigma} = \frac{36c^2}{6c + Ns}. \quad (78)$$

Appendix D: Endogenous entry

Until now, I have taken as exogenous the number of deal finders on the market. It is however possible to solve the model by making entry endogenous. Assume now that a deal finder enters the market at a fixed cost α until expected profit equals zero. It is easy to show that N is fully determined by c , α and s . In equilibrium, all symmetric deal finders get a share $1/N$ of the customers. Hence, the expected profit of a deal finder including search and entry costs is

$$\pi = \frac{\chi}{N} - \frac{s}{F(w)} - \alpha, \quad (79)$$

and the equilibrium number of deal finders is

$$N = \lfloor \chi \frac{F(w)}{s - \alpha F(w)} \rfloor, \quad (80)$$

where $\lfloor x \rfloor$ is the highest integer smaller than x . It follows that N is - unsurprisingly - decreasing in α , allowing us to fully characterize the equilibrium. Assuming identical cost for consumers to be

informed c , a lower entry cost for deal finders increases entry, but not in a linear way (in the Varian setting). Indeed, as shown in (70), a consequence of entry in this case is that deal finders invest more in search as they become more choosy. Hence, entry decreases the market share of each deal finder and increases search costs.

If ε is uniformly distributed on $[0, 1]$ and $\chi = 1$ in the Varian setting, I find by replacing w by its value found in (70), the equilibrium number of deal finders N as

$$N = \lfloor \chi \left(\frac{\sqrt{(-2c\alpha + 2c + s)^2 - 8c(-2c\alpha - s)} - 2c\alpha + 2c + s}{2(2c\alpha + s)} \right) \rfloor. \quad (81)$$

I represent this example on Figure 4, with identical parameter values as in the right panel of Figure 1. For a given level of effort, dividing by 2 the cost of entry would double the number of deal finders. Here, it is not the case as more entry implies higher search costs.




Figure 4: Endogenous entry, with $c = 0.1$, $s = 0.02$

Appendix E: Search externality at equilibrium

As consumer information creates an externality on all consumers, it is straightforward that the equilibrium share of savvy consumers is never the one that maximizes consumer aggregate welfare. Define the sum of all consumers utilities as

$$W^c = (1 - \sigma)(v - p - \varepsilon^n s) + \sigma(v - \varepsilon^s - c - p). \quad (82)$$

Taking the derivate with respect to σ , we find

$$\frac{dW^c}{d\sigma} = \varepsilon^{ns} - \varepsilon^s - c - (1 - \sigma) \left(\frac{d\varepsilon^{ns}}{d\sigma} \right) - \sigma \frac{d\varepsilon^s}{d\sigma} - \frac{dp}{d\sigma}. \quad (83)$$

As, at equilibrium, $\varepsilon^{ns} - c = \varepsilon^s$ and as $\frac{d\varepsilon^{ns}}{d\sigma} < 0$, $\frac{d\varepsilon^s}{d\sigma} < 0$ and $\frac{dp}{d\sigma} < 0$ it follows that $\frac{dW^c}{d\sigma} > 0$.

The expression is pretty long to reproduce here. I display on table 2 the optimal and equilibrium values for the uniform example used throughout the paper. We see that the difference is particularly large for a small number of intermediaries.

N	equilibrium σ	consumer optimal σ
2	0.07	0.72
3	0.15	0.81
4	0.24	0.88
5	0.33	0.93
6	0.43	0.98
7	0.52	1
8	0.62	1
9	0.72	1

Table 2: Equilibrium and consumer optimal share of informed consumers

Appendix F: Heterogenous costs of savviness

The assumption of an homogenous cost of information c is crucial to my results. Assume for instance that the ability for a consumer to become savvy depends on a parameter θ , randomly drawn from a uniform distribution over $[0, 1]$, so that the cost for a consumer i to become savvy is equal to $c(\theta_i) = \gamma\theta_i$. This means that the most able consumer has no cost of becoming informed, that the least able has a cost c of becoming informed, and that the cost of acquiring information is linear in the ability. For a given expected value of the mismatch differential between informed and uninformed consumers Δ , if a consumer of type j with $\theta_j > \theta_i$ prefers to become savvy, a consumer of type i also prefers to become savvy. Consumers can thus be ranked by their ability to acquire information, so that the cost for the σ th consumer to become savvy is $c(\sigma) = \gamma\sigma$. This also implies that the more consumers become savvy, the higher the expected difference between the mismatch received by a savvy and a non-savvy consumer in equilibrium.

It is possible that when σ increases savvy consumers are made better off, but those who cannot afford becoming savvy are worse off. If even the non-savvy consumers are made better off however, it means that more competition on the market for deal finders is Pareto improving. The

intuition is relatively straightforward, as allowing for heterogeneous costs of savviness is an intermediary case between assuming an exogenous share of σ and ex-ante identical consumers.

In the uniform case with $\chi = 1$ in the Varian setting, I can rewrite (13) as

$$\sigma = \sqrt{\frac{sN(N-1)}{2\gamma(N+1)}}, \quad (84)$$

where the share of savvy consumers still increases with N , but the increase is slower due to the marginally increasing cost of becoming informed. Plugging (84) into (63) yields

$$w = \frac{sN\sqrt{2\gamma(N+1)}}{\sqrt{sN(N-1)}}, \quad (85)$$

which can be shown to be increasing in N . This means that when market concentration decreases, (i) the share of consumers choosing to be informed increases, (ii) the expected mismatch received by informed consumers decreases, but (iii) the expected mismatch received by the remaining uninformed consumers increases. The difference between (70) and (85) is the existence of a distributional impact of the level of concentration on the market for deal finders. A key assumption for more competition on the market for deal finders to be Pareto improving for consumers is that the cost of becoming informed does not vary too much among consumers.

I illustrate this idea on Figure 5, by comparing the case studied in the Figure 1 with $c = 0.1$, to a cost function $c(\theta) = 0.2\theta$, so that as θ is drawn from a uniform distribution on $[0, 1]$, the average cost of becoming savvy is identical in both examples, $\bar{c} = 0.1$. The left panel is just the right panel of Figure 1. On the right panel, we see the impact of heterogeneous costs of savviness. When a small number of deal finders are active on the market, the expected mismatch received by both types of consumers is pretty close, and is lower than on the left panel for both types as some consumers have almost no cost of being savvy. When the number of deal finders increases, the share of savvy consumers increases. The impact of N on σ however quickly becomes insufficient to make non-savvy consumers better off. Hence, in this case market concentration does not have a uniform impact on all consumers. The less able consumers, with the highest cost of becoming savvy γ , benefit from mergers until the number of deal finders is equal to $N = 3$, while the most able consumers always prefer a higher number of deal finders.




Figure 5: The importance of an homogenous cost of savviness.