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Abstract

We study a vertical market with an upstream supplier and multiple downstream retailers. Demand uncertainty falls to the supplier who acts first and sets a uniform wholesale price before the retailers observe the realized demand and engage in retail competition. Our focus is on the supplier’s optimal pricing decision. We express the price elasticity of expected demand in terms of the mean residual demand (MRD) function of the demand distribution. This allows for a closed form characterization of the points of unitary elasticity that maximize the seller’s profits and the derivation of a mild unimodality condition for the seller’s objective function that generalizes the widely used increasing generalized failure rate (IGFR) condition. A direct implication is that optimal prices between different markets can be ordered if the markets can be stochastically ordered according to their MRD functions or equivalently to their elasticities. Based on this, we apply the theory of stochastic orders to study the response of the supplier’s optimal price to various features of the demand distribution. Our findings challenge previously established economic insights about the effects of market size, demand transformations and demand variability on wholesale prices and indicate that the conclusions largely depend on the exact notion that will be employed. We then turn to measure market performance and derive a distribution free and tight bound on the probability of no trade between the supplier and the retailers. If trade takes place, our findings indicate that overall performance depends on the interplay between demand uncertainty and level of retail competition. We illustrate our results with numerical examples.
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1 Introduction

Economic globalization and rapidly evolving digital marketplaces have added complexity to the firms’ pricing decisions. While firms are more efficient in the production and trade of large amounts of goods at low cost over the globe, contemporary markets exhibit some inherent variabilities that cannot be eliminated. Based on technological innovations or marketing competition, sellers often launch new or differentiated products for which demand is unknown or they introduce existing ones to new and rather unpredictable emerging markets. In other cases, firms sell their products as wholesalers in markets for which they have asymmetrically less information than local retailers. Or they sell the same product over competitive online platforms that are characterized by highly diversified clienteles and large demand volatility. In all these cases, the firms employ elaborate marketing strategies and contract with their counterparts to mitigate uncertainties and gain access to more information about market characteristics.
However, after all efforts, some uncertainty persists and the final point of interaction between wholesaler and retailer or more generally, between seller and buyer remains the single selling price, [38, 31]. Under these circumstances, it is still relevant to ask: How should firms (sellers) price under demand uncertainty?

1.1 Motivation, Objectives and Results

In the present study, we formulate this problem in the context of a two-stage vertical market: in the first stage, a monopolistic firm sets a uniform price knowing only the distribution of the retail demand, and in the second stage, the retailers compete after the market demand has been realized. The timing of demand realization aids the study of optimal pricing under uncertainty instead of optimal stocking decisions, [8]. To further isolate the effects of the seller’s pricing decision from the various strategic considerations about negotiation power, marketing and production, we consider price-only contracts. Accordingly, we assume that the monopolistic firm can produce unlimited quantities at zero cost and that the downstream retailers are symmetric. As [46] argues, the assumption of symmetry enables the focus on purely competitive aspects without getting into the issue of heterogeneity between the retailers. However, we allow for product differentiation and multiple forms of competition between the retailers, cf. Table 1. This only aims to show the generality of the present setting from the seller’s perspective. All considered market structures can be essentially reduced to the problem of a firm selling a product to a linear market with stochastic demand. This follows from the fact that under subgame perfection, i.e., under the assumption that the retailers will follow their equilibrium strategies (order quantities) in the second stage, there exists a unique equilibrium quantity which is the same – up to a constant – for all the incorporated downstream market structures, cf. Table 1. This implies a unique optimization problem for the monopolistic supplier, cf. [4].

The supplier’s optimal price is determined in Theorem 3.1 along with necessary and sufficient conditions on the demand distribution for its existence and uniqueness. The novelty of this result is the closed form characterization of the optimal price and the derivation of a mild unimodality condition for the seller’s objective function. Both statements utilize the mean residual demand (MRD) function \( m(r) := \mathbb{E}(\alpha - r \mid \alpha > r) \) of the random demand level \( \alpha \), cf. [5], which measures the expected additional demand given that demand has reached or exceeded a threshold \( r \), see [26, 6]. Specifically, by expressing the price elasticity of expected demand (PEED) in terms of the MRD function, cf. [5], we obtain that the demand has the increasing PEED (IPEED) property if the expression \( m(r)/r \) is decreasing. Hence, optimal prices that correspond to points of unitary PEED are expressed as fixed points of the MRD function, cf. [5], which measures the expected additional demand given that demand has reached or exceeded a threshold \( r \), see [26, 6]. Specifically, by expressing the price elasticity of expected demand (PEED) in terms of the MRD function, cf. [5], we obtain that the demand has the increasing PEED (IPEED) property if the expression \( m(r)/r \) is decreasing. Hence, optimal prices that correspond to points of unitary PEED are expressed as fixed points of the MRD function, cf. [5]. The generality of the unimodality condition implies that Theorem 3.1 incorporates essentially most distributions that are commonly used in economic modeling, [37, 3]. The trade-off is the assumption of linear demand. Yet, linear markets have been consistently in the spotlight of economic research not only due to their tractability but also due to their accurate modeling of real situations. More importantly, the recent result by [12] that linear demand is a good approximation for many of the currently studied theoretical models, indicates that linear markets are not restrictive and provide an incentive for their systematic study.

The characterization of the IPEED property and the seller’s optimal price in terms of the MRD function, which conclude the technical part of the paper, offer a new viewpoint to the...
otherwise standard two-stage linear model that is studied here. In particular, the MRD function establishes the link between the seller’s decision and the probabilistic theory of stochastic orders, [43]. This provides the means to derive comparative statics results on the response of the optimal price to various market characteristics (expressed as properties of the demand distribution) and to measure market performance. This is done in Section 4 and Section 5 respectively. Without loss of generality, we restrict our attention to Cournot competition among the retailers. The key intuition, which is formally established in Lemma 4.1 is that the seller’s optimal price is higher in less elastic markets which are precisely markets that can be ordered in the MRD stochastic order, cf. [43]. In other words, if two demand distributions can be ordered in terms of their MRD functions, then the supplier’s optimal price is higher in the market with the dominating MRD function. In this way, Lemma 4.1 brings to the fore the full power of the theory of stochastic orders [43], [26] and [5] as a tool to compare prices in markets with different characteristics.

First, we focus on the effects of market size on the seller’s optimal price. Theorems 4.2 and 4.3 present a collection of results on transformations that are applied on an initially given demand distribution. The statements capture an intuitive property of monotonicity: the seller’s optimal price is higher in markets that are in some sense larger. However, they hinge on specific assumptions on the demand distribution and it becomes obvious that the general statement “larger markets give rise to higher prices” does not hold. This statement fails even if the most straightforward setting of stochastic dominance as we show via an example in Section 4.1.3. We then turn to the effect of demand variability. Does the seller charge higher/lower prices in more variable markets? The answer to this question is inconclusive and largely depends on the notion of variability that will be employed. Theorem 4.4 gives two variability orders that preserve monotonicity under mild additional assumptions: in both cases the seller charges a lower price in the less variable market. This conclusion remains true under the mean preserving transformation that is also used by [32, 31]. However, Theorem 4.4 requires some additional assumptions and it becomes again apparent that the general statement “more variable markets give rise to higher prices” does not hold. As we show in Section 4.2.3, this fails in the standard case of parametric families of distributions that are compared in terms of their coefficient of variation. The results from the comparative statics analysis are summarized in Table 2.

We then turn to measure market performance and efficiency. In Theorem 5.1, we derive a distribution-free upper bound – over the class of distributions with decreasing MRD function – on the probability of a stockout, i.e., of no trade between the supplier and the retailers. As shown in Examples 5.2, 5.3 and 5.4, this bound is tight and cannot be further generalized to IPEED distributions. In case that trade takes place, we measure market efficiency in terms of the realized profits and their distribution between the supplier and the retailers, cf. Table 3. The supplier’s profits are always higher if he is informed about the exact demand level. However, there exists a range of intermediate demand realizations for which the supplier captures a larger share of the aggregate profits in the stochastic market. In any case, retail competition benefits the supplier. As intuitively expected, the retailers make higher profits for larger values of realized demand if the supplier has priced under uncertainty. These results are summarized in Theorem 5.5. Finally, in Theorem 5.6 we compare the aggregate realized profits between the deterministic and stochastic markets. The outcomes depend on the interplay between demand uncertainty and the level of retail competition. More specifically, there exists an interval of demand realizations for which the aggregate profits of the stochastic market are higher than the profits of the deterministic market. The interval reduces to a single point as the number of downstream retailers increases, but is unbounded in the case of 2 retailers. In particular, for \( n = 1, 2 \), the aggregate profits of the stochastic market remain strictly higher than the profits of the deterministic market for all large enough realized demand levels. However, the performance of the stochastic market in comparison to the deterministic market degrades linearly in the number of competing retailers for demand realizations beyond this interval. This shows that
uncertainty on the side of the supplier is more detrimental for the aggregate market profits when the level of retail competition is high.

Our findings imply that even in the special case of linear demand uncertainty, general predictions about the movements of prices in response to variable market characteristics can only be made with caution. This conclusion hinges on the obtained characterization of the increasing price elasticity property and the seller’s optimal price in terms of the demand distribution and the utilization of the diverse theory of stochastic orders. In comparison to existing studies, this treatment of the linear model provides a novel perspective. Its main contribution is that the mean residual demand order is the most appropriate stochastic order to compare different markets. Otherwise, the exact response of optimal prices depends on the exact measurement of size or variability that will be used and broad statements are remarkably difficult. Intuitively, this explains the diversity of price responses to market characteristics that is observed in practice and indicates that many existing results can be challenged as model specific. Thus, the trade-off between the restrictive linear demand assumption and a more general theoretical model seems worth exploring in view of the flexibility of the stochastic orders approach and the resulting managerial insight.

1.2 Related Literature

The motivation and modeling assumptions of the present study are more closely related to [12] who study pricing of new products for which demand is unknown. They show that if the demand curve is one of many commonly used, then a seller who prices as if demand was linear does not perform far from optimal. This is a simple rule that highlights the wide applicability of the linear model. [11] study the effects demand uncertainty under minimal information on the customers’ valuation distribution and provide an optimal robust price that is lower than the mean valuation. The optimal price becomes lower as the variance increases. [32] argue that firms have to take important decisions when market information is still poor. By restricting to the additive demand model and IFR demand distributions, they find that the firm is better off when variability is reduced and that the optimal price decreases as variability increases.

The model of a single supplier and competing retailers has been widely studied from different perspectives. Among other results about consumer’s welfare, [16] shows that there exist market conditions for which the supplier’s optimal price is invariant to the number of downstream retailers. This finding is recovered in the present setting, cf. Section 3.3. [50] consider a similar setting but without demand uncertainty. In the case of symmetric retailers, they establish that the retailers’ profits are highest and both the supplier’s and the total system’s profits are lowest when the retailers collude. The reverse holds when the retailers engage in Cournot competition. These results are also confirmed in the present setting, cf. Table 3. By comparison, Theorem 5.6 shows that when the supplier prices under uncertainty, the fraction of the aggregate profits of the stochastic to the deterministic market, increase in the level of competition for lower demand realizations and decrease for higher realizations. [48] study a similar setting which differs from ours mainly in that there is no demand uncertainty. They recover the results of [50] and show that among several market structures, the supplier charges the highest wholesale price when he moves first and the retailers move second in a simultaneous Bertrand competition. The same market structure, with one upstream supplier and several downstream competing retailers with linear demand is also studied by [36] who focus on return policies. This leads naturally to the study of stocking rather than pricing decisions.

Similarities regarding the technical assumptions can be found between the current model and the vast literature on the price-setting newsvendor under stochastic demand, see e.g., [10, 51] and [25]. However, these models consider a combined order-pricing decision which distinguishes them from the present setting. The additive demand model with linear deterministic component is used by [52] and [39]. More closely related is the study of [49]. They assume that the additive demand has increasing price elasticity and that the demand risk distribution has the
increasing failure rate (IFR) property. Our assumptions are more restrictive concerning the demand function in the deterministic component (linearity assumption) but considerably generalize the distributions in the stochastic component. In the newsvendor setting with additive demand, they establish that a stochastically larger demand will lead to a higher selling price but not necessarily to higher order quantity or profits. By comparison, in the present model, even prices may be lower in a stochastically larger demand, cf. Section 4.1.3.

An extensive survey of further cases that use the additive demand model with linear deterministic component is provided in [19]. [51] provide a broad list of models with additive stochastic demand with linear component in chronological order up to [39]. [42] employ the additive linear model to study unimodality conditions in the price-inventory problem of the typical newsvendor. As the rest of the literature about the newsvendor, the results involve inventory considerations and hence are quite distinct from ours. However, their unimodality conditions have similarities to ones presented here, as the unimodality and elasticity conditions of [22] and [23]. [17] studies unimodality conditions in the setting of one seller and one buyer which is a special case of the present setting. Accordingly, the IGFR unimodality conditions that he derives is a restriction of the DGMRD condition (or equivalently the increasing price elasticity of expected demand) that is formulated here. His study is restricted in the technical aspects and thus is more close in nature to our companion paper, [30].

The study of price-only contracts under demand uncertainty has a strong theoretical foundation. [18] study optimal pricing schemes and show that if a supplier’s capacity is larger than any potential demand, then the single pricing scheme is optimal. The result is supported by [41] who show that the optimal pricing strategy for a monopolist facing a known demand distribution is to commit to a single price. However, [14] shows that this ceases to be the case if the monopolist does not know the distribution of demand a priori as we assume in the present paper. In this dispersed pricing is a better strategy. In contrast, [1] show that wholesale price contracts are optimal even in the case of two competing chains. They also use the assumption of symmetry to focus on the effects of pricing (or revenue sharing) contracts without any influence from supply chain heterogeneity. [20] show that wholesale price contracts, despite their simplicity, can perform well in inducing reliable supply and hence, offer an explanation for the widespread use of wholesale price contracts in business settings with unreliable supply. [38] and [8] provide strong incentives for considering price-only contracts. Apart from the practical prevalence, price-only contracts are relevant in modeling worst-case scenarios or the remaining uncertainty (after any efforts have been made to reduce the initial uncertainty through more elaborate schemes). Compelling arguments for the linear pricing scheme are also provided in [16] and references cited therein.

In an interesting study, [31] find that in a vertical market of a single manufacturer and a single retailer that is governed by a wholesale contract between them, less uncertainty may harm either or both members of the supply chain. They restrict to IFR distributions and consider the case in which demand is realized after the decision of the retailers. Their findings confirm that investing in reducing uncertainty may not be worth the cost and provide an additional motivation to study markets with (residual) demand uncertainty under price-only contracts. This is partially confirmed by our findings in Section 5.2.1 which indicate demand realizations for which the stochastic market outperforms the deterministic market in terms of aggregate profits. However, in our model, the supplier is always better off with reduced uncertainty whereas the retailers may be not. The model of demand realization after the decision of the supplier but prior to the decision of the retailers is also employed in a purely game-theoretic setting by [15].

Related to the present setting in a more general context is the work of [7] who consider a robust version of the classic problem of optimal monopoly pricing with incomplete information in which the seller only knows that the true demand distribution is in the neighborhood of a given model distribution. They show that the equilibrium price for two common decision criteria with multiple priors is lower then without demand uncertainty. [40] study the same
problem in a more elaborate setting. For static, linear demand (as in the present case), they show that increasing (decreasing/constant) pattern of demand uncertainty results in decreasing (increasing/constant) price levels. \[24\] justifies the use of the additive linear model with non-negative prices and argues that in general, the optimal prices under demand uncertainty are higher than the optimal prices for mean demand \[13\] consider the pricing problem of a risk-averse seller with private buyers valuations. Under the IGFR condition and the Bernoulli utility function, they show that a risk-averse seller will post a lower price than a risk-neutral counterpart.

Finally, in a companion paper \[30\], we recover the present elasticity condition and closed form characterization of the seller’s optimal price, but focus on the technical properties of the class of distributions that satisfy the unimodality condition of IPEED.

1.3 Outline

The rest of the paper is structured as follows. In Section 2 we define the setting of the present model and in Section 3 we establish the seller’s optimal price and the unimodality condition. Section 4 includes the comparative statics analysis and Section 5 the study of market performance. Section 6 concludes the paper with a brief summary of our results and some directions for future research.

2 The Model

We consider a vertical market with a monopolistic upstream manufacturer, distributor or service provider, henceforth \textit{eq:supplier}, selling a homogeneous product (or resource) to \( n = 2 \) downstream symmetric retailers\[4\]. The seller acts first (Stackelberg leader) and applies a linear pricing scheme without price differentiation, i.e., he chooses a unique wholesale price, \( r \geq 0 \), for all retailers. The supplier produces at a constant marginal cost which we normalize to zero. This corresponds to the situation in which the supplier has ample quantity to cover any possible demand by the retailers and his lone decision variable is his wholesale price, or equivalently his profit margin, \( r \geq 0 \).

Subsequently, the retailers compete in a market with retail demand level \( \alpha \). We focus on the market in which the supplier is less informed than the retailers about the retail demand level \( \alpha \). To model this, we assume that after the supplier’s pricing decision but prior to the retailers’ order decisions, a value for \( \alpha \) is realized from a continuous (not-atomic) cumulative distribution function (cdf) \( F \), with finite mean \( E \alpha < \infty \) and nonnegative values, i.e., \( F(0) = 0 \). Equivalently, \( F \) can be thought of as the supplier’s belief about the demand level and, hence, about the retailers’ willingness-to-pay his price. We will write \( \bar{F} := 1 - F \) for the tail distribution of \( F \) and \( f \) for its probability density function (pdf) whenever it exists. The support of \( F \) will be denoted by \( S \), with lower bound \( L = \sup \{ r \geq 0 : F(r) = 0 \} \) and upper bound \( H = \inf \{ r \geq 0 : F(r) = 1 \} \) such that \( 0 \leq L \leq H \leq \infty \). We don’t make any additional assumption about \( S \): in particular, it may or may not be an interval. The case \( L = H \) is not excluded\[4\] and corresponds to the situation where the supplier is completely informed about the retail demand level.

Given the demand realization \( \alpha \), the total quantity that the retailers will order from the supplier is a function of the posted wholesale price \( r \) and will be denoted by \( q(r | \alpha) := \sum_{i=1}^{n} q_i(r | \alpha) \). Using this notation, and under risk neutrality, the supplier aims to maximize his expected profit function \( \Pi_s \), which is equal to

\[
\Pi_s(r) = r \cdot E\alpha q(r | \alpha) \tag{1}
\]

\[3\] To ease the exposition, we restrict to \( n = 2 \) retailers. As we show in Section 3.3 our results admit a straightforward generalization to arbitrary number \( n \) of symmetric retailers.

\[4\] Formally, this case contradicts the assumption that \( F \) is continuous or non-atomic. It is only allowed to avoid unnecessary notation and should cause no confusion.
In general, depending on the form of second stage competition, the quantity \( q(r | \alpha) \) may vary or not be unique. In this paper, we focus on markets with linear demand as in \([33, 39]\) and \([19]\) among others, which allow for a wide range of competition structures between the retailers (Table 1). All these structures give rise – in equilibrium – to essentially the same (up to a scaling constant) \( q(r | \alpha) \) and hence to the same mathematical form for the supplier’s objective function. More importantly, in all these structures, the second-stage equilibrium between the retailers is unique and hence, \( q(r | \alpha) \) is uniquely determined under the assumption that the retailers follow their equilibrium strategies in the game induced by each wholesale price \( r \geq 0 \) (subgame perfect equilibrium). Specifically, we assume that each retailer \( i \) faces the inverse demand function
\[
p_i = \alpha - \beta q_i - \gamma q_j,
\]
for \( j = 3 - i \) and \( i = 1, 2 \). Here, \( \alpha / (\beta + \gamma) \) denotes the potential market size (primary demand), \( \beta / (\beta^2 - \gamma^2) > 0 \) the store-level factor and \( \gamma / \beta \) the degree of product differentiation or substitutability between the retailers, \([45, 48]\). As usual, we assume that \( \beta \leq \gamma \). Each retailer’s only cost is the wholesale price \( r \geq 0 \) that she pays to the supplier. Hence, each retailer aims to maximize her profit function \( \Pi_i \), which is equal to
\[
\Pi_i (q_i, q_j) = q_i (p_i - r) \tag{3}
\]
Given the demand realization \( \alpha \), the equilibrium quantities \( q_i^* := q_i^* (r | \alpha) \) that maximize \( \Pi_i \) for \( i = 1, 2 \) are given for various retail market structures in Table 1 as functions of the wholesale price \( r \). Here, \( (\alpha - r)_+ \) denotes the positive part, i.e., \( (\alpha - r)_+ := \max \{0, \alpha - r\} \). The assumption of no uncertainty on the side of retailers about the demand level \( \alpha \) implies that \( q_i^* \) corresponds both to the quantity that each retailer orders from the supplier and to the quantity that she sells to the market.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Retail market structure</th>
<th>Retailer ( i )'s equilibrium order</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cournot competition – product differentiation</td>
<td>( q_i^* = \frac{1}{2\beta + \gamma} (\alpha - r)_+ )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bertrand competition – product differentiation</td>
<td>( q_i^* = \frac{\beta}{(2\beta + \gamma)(\beta + \gamma)} (\alpha - r)_+ )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single retailer no/full returns</td>
<td>( q_i^* = \frac{1}{2\gamma} (\alpha - r)_+ )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competing retailers (orders/price) – no returns</td>
<td>( q_i^* = \frac{1}{2\beta + \gamma} (\alpha - r)_+ )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competing retailers (orders/price) – full returns</td>
<td>( q_i^* = \frac{\beta}{(2\beta - \gamma)(\beta + \gamma)} (\alpha - r)_+ )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collusion between retailers – product differentiation</td>
<td>( q_i^* = \frac{1}{\beta + \gamma} (\alpha - r)_+ )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Second-stage market structures and corresponding equilibrium quantities ordered from the supplier.

The standard Cournot and Bertrand outcomes arise as special cases of the above. In particular, for \( \gamma = 0 \), the goods are independent and we have the monopoly solution \( q_i^* = \frac{1}{2\gamma} (\alpha - r)_+ \). For \( \gamma = \beta > 0 \), the goods are perfect substitutes with \( q_i^* = \frac{1}{2\beta} (\alpha - r)_+ \) in Bertrand competition (at zero price) and \( q_i^* = \frac{1}{3\gamma} (\alpha - r)_+ \) in Cournot competition. All of the above are assumed to be common knowledge among the participants in the market (the supplier and the retailers).
3 Equilibrium analysis: supplier’s optimal wholesale price

We restrict attention to subgame perfect equilibria of the extensive form, two-stage game. Assuming that at the second stage, the retailers play their unique equilibrium strategies \((q_1^*, q_2^*)\), then, according to (11), the supplier will maximize \(\Pi^*_s (r) = r \cdot \mathbb{E}_\alpha q^*(r | \alpha)\). For the competition structures of Table 1, \(q^*(r | \alpha)\) has the general form \(q^*(r | \alpha) = \lambda_M (\alpha - r)_+,\) where \(\lambda_M > 0\) is a suitable model-specific constant. Thus, at equilibrium, the supplier’s expected profit maximization problem becomes

\[
\max_{r \geq 0} \Pi^*_s (r) = \lambda_M \cdot \max_{r \geq 0} r \mathbb{E} (\alpha - r)_+ \tag{4}
\]

From the supplier’s perspective, we are interested in finding conditions such that the maximization problem in (4) admits a unique and finite optimal wholesale price, \(r^* \geq 0\).

3.1 Deterministic Market

First, we treat the case in which the supplier knows the primary demand \(\alpha\) (deterministic market). According to the notation introduced in Section 2, this corresponds to the case \(\alpha = L = H\). In this case \(\Pi^*_s (r) = \lambda_M r (\alpha - r)_+\) and it is straightforward that \(r^*(\alpha) = \alpha/2\). Hence, the complete information two-stage game has a unique subgame perfect Nash equilibrium, under which the supplier sells with optimal price \(r^* (\alpha) = \alpha/2\) and each retailer orders quantity \(q_i^*\) as determined by Table 1.

3.2 Stochastic Market

The equilibrium behavior of the market in which the supplier does not know the demand level (stochastic market) is less straightforward. Now, \(L < H\) and the supplier is interested in finding an \(r^*\) that maximizes his expected profit in (4). For an arbitrary demand distribution \(F\), \(\Pi^*_s (r)\) may not be concave (nor quasi-concave) and, hence, not unimodal, in which case the solution to the supplier’s optimization problem is not immediate. To obtain a general unimodality condition, we proceed by differentiating the supplier’s revenue function \(\Pi^*_s (r)\), see also [30]. First, since \((\alpha - r)_+\) is nonnegative, we write \(\mathbb{E} (\alpha - r)_+ = \int_0^\infty P ((\alpha - r)_+ > u) \, du = \int_r^\infty \bar{F} (u) \, du\), for \(0 \leq r < H\). Since \(\mathbb{E} \alpha < \infty\) and \(F\) is non-atomic by assumption, we have that

\[
\frac{d}{dr} \mathbb{E} (\alpha - r)_+ = \frac{d}{dr} \left( \mathbb{E} \alpha - \int_0^r \bar{F} (u) \, du \right) = -\bar{F} (r)
\]

for any \(0 < r < H\). With this formulation, both the supplier’s revenue function and its first derivative can be expressed in terms of the mean residual demand (MRD) function of \(\alpha\). In general, the MRD function \(m (\cdot)\) of a nonnegative random variable \(\alpha\) with cumulative distribution function (cdf) \(F\) and finite expectation, \(\mathbb{E} \alpha < \infty\), is defined as

\[
m (r) := \mathbb{E} (\alpha - r | \alpha > r) = \frac{1}{F (r)} \int_r^\infty \bar{F} (u) \, du, \quad \text{for } r < H \tag{5}
\]

and \(m (r) := 0\), otherwise, see, e.g., [43] [26] or [5]. Using this notation, we obtain that \(\Pi^*_s (r) = \lambda_M r m (r) \bar{F} (r)\) and

\[
\frac{d\Pi^*_s}{dr} (r) = \lambda_M \left( m (r) - r \right) \bar{F} (r) = \lambda_M r \left( \frac{m (r)}{r} - 1 \right) \bar{F} (r) \tag{6}
\]

\(^5\)Technically, these are perfect Bayes-Nash equilibria, since the supplier has a belief about the retailers’ types, i.e. their willingness-to-pay his price, that depends on the value of the stochastic demand parameter \(\alpha\).

\(^6\)In this literature, the MRD function is known as the mean residual life function due to its origins in reliability applications.
for $0 < r < H$. Based on (6), the first order condition (FOC) for the supplier’s revenue function is that $m (r) = r$ or equivalently that $m (r) / r = 1$. We call the expression

$$
\ell (r) := \frac{m (r)}{r}, \quad 0 < r < H
$$

the \textit{generalized mean residual demand} (GMRD) function, see [30], due to its connection to the \textit{generalized failure rate} (GFR) function $g (r) := rf (r) / F (r)$, defined and studied by [27] and [29]. Its meaning is straightforward: while the MRD function $m (r)$ at point $r > 0$ measures the expected additional demand, given the current demand $r$, the GMRD function measures the expected additional demand as a percentage of the given current demand. Similarly to the GFR function, the GMRD function has an appealing interpretation from an economic perspective, as it is related to the \textit{price elasticity of expected or mean demand}, $\varepsilon (r) = -r \cdot \frac{d}{dr} \mathbb{E} q (r | \alpha) / \mathbb{E} q (r | \alpha)$, see also [49]. Specifically,

$$
\ell (r) = \frac{m (r)}{r} = \left( -\frac{-\tilde{F} (r)}{m (r) \hat{F} (r)} \cdot r \right)^{-1} = \left( -r \cdot \frac{d}{dr} \mathbb{E} (\alpha - r) \cdot r \right)^{-1} = \varepsilon^{-1} (r)
$$

which implies that $\ell (r)$ corresponds to the inverse of the price elasticity of expected demand. Hence, the FOC asserts that the supplier’s payoff is maximized at the point(s) of unitary elasticity. For an economically meaningful analysis, since realistic problems must have a price elasticity that eventually becomes greater than 1 (see [28]), we give particular attention to distributions for which $\ell (r)$ eventually becomes less than 1, i.e., distributions for which $\bar{r} := \sup \{r \geq 0 : m (r) \geq r\}$ is finite. Observe that for a nonnegative random demand $\alpha$ with continuous distribution $F$ and finite expectation $\mathbb{E} \alpha$, $m (0) = \mathbb{E} \alpha > 0$ and hence $\bar{r} > 0$.

Based on these considerations, it remains to derive conditions that guarantee the existence and uniqueness of an $r^*$ that satisfies the FOC and to show that this $r^*$ indeed corresponds to a maximum of the supplier’s revenue function. This is established in the following Theorem which is the main result of the present Section.

\textbf{Theorem 3.1} (Equilibrium wholesale prices in the stochastic market). \textit{Assume that the non-negative demand parameter, $\alpha$, follows a continuous (non-atomic) distribution $F$ with support $S$ within $L$ and $H$.}

\begin{itemize}
\item[(a)] \textit{Necessary condition:} If an optimal price $r^*$ for the supplier exists, then $r^*$ satisfies the fixed point equation

$$
r^* = m (r^*)
$$

\item[(b)] \textit{Sufficient conditions:} If the generalized mean residual demand (GMRD) function, $\ell (r)$, of $F$ is strictly decreasing and $\mathbb{E} \alpha^2$ is finite, then at equilibrium, the supplier’s optimal price $r^*$ exists and is the unique solution of (9). In this case, $r^* = \mathbb{E} \alpha / 2$, if $\mathbb{E} \alpha / 2 < L$, and $r^* \in [L, H)$, otherwise.
\end{itemize}

\textit{Proof.} Since $\tilde{F} (r) > 0$ for $0 < \alpha < H$, the sign of the derivative $\frac{d\Pi^\alpha_r}{dr} (r)$ is determined by the term $m (r) - r$ and any critical point $r^*$ satisfies $m (r^*) = r^*$. Hence, the necessary part of the theorem is obvious from (6) and the continuity of $\frac{d\Pi^\alpha_r}{dr} (r)$. For the sufficiency part, it remains to check that such a critical point exists and corresponds to a maximum under the assumptions that $\ell (r)$ is strictly decreasing and $\mathbb{E} \alpha^2 < \infty$. Clearly, $m (r) - r$ is continuous and $\lim_{r \to 0^+} m (r) - r = \mathbb{E} \alpha > 0$. Hence, $\Pi^\alpha_r (r)$ starts increasing on $(0, H)$. However, the limiting behavior of $m (r) - r$ and hence of $\frac{d\Pi^\alpha_r}{dr} (r)$ as $r$ approaches $H$ from the left, may vary depending on whether $H$ is finite or not. If $H$ is finite, i.e., if the support of $\alpha$ is bounded, then $
lim_{r \to H^-} m (r) - r = -H$. Hence, $\ell (r)$ eventually becomes less than 1 and a critical point $r^*$ that corresponds to a maximum exists without any further assumptions. Strict monotonicity of $\ell (r)$ implies that this $r^*$ is unique. If $H = \infty$, then an optimal solution $r^*$ may not exist.
because the limiting behavior of \( m(r) \) as \( r \to \infty \) may vary, see Example 3.3 or [9]. In this case, the condition of finite second moment ensures that \( r < \infty \). In particular, as shown in [30], if the GMRD function \( \ell(r) \) of a random variable \( \alpha \) with unbounded support is decreasing, then \( \lim_{r \to \infty} \ell(r) < 1 \) if and only if \( \mathbb{E} \alpha^2 \) is finite. This establishes existence. Uniqueness follows again from strict monotonicity of \( \ell(r) \) which precludes intervals of the form \( m(r) = r \) that give rise to multiple optimal solutions.

To prove the second claim of the sufficiency part, note that \( \mathbb{E} \alpha < 2L \) is equivalent to \( m(L) < L \). Then, the DGMRD property implies that \( m(r) < r \) for all \( r > L \), hence \( r^* < L \).

In this case, \( m(r^*) = \mathbb{E} \alpha - r^* \) and hence \( r^* \) is given explicitly by \( r^* = \mathbb{E} \alpha / 2 \), which may be compared with the optimal \( r^* \) of the complete information case. On the other hand, if \( \mathbb{E} \alpha \geq 2L \), then for all \( r < L \), \( m(r) = \mathbb{E} \alpha - r \geq 2L - r > r \) which implies that \( r^* \) must be in \([L, H] \).

The economic interpretation of the sufficiency conditions in part (b) of Theorem 3.1 is immediate. By [5], demand distributions with the DGMRD property are precisely distributions that exhibit increasing price elasticity of expected demand. By [30], Theorem 3.2, finiteness of the second moment is required to ensure that the expected demand will eventually become elastic, even in the case of unbounded support. In sum, part (b) characterizes demand distributions that model linear markets with monotone and eventually elastic expected demand in terms of their mathematical properties. These conditions are derived in a broad probabilistic context and apply to distributions that may neither be absolutely continuous (do not possess a density) nor have a connected support.

**Remark 3.2.** Strict monotonicity can be relaxed to weak monotonicity in the statement of Theorem 3.1 without significant loss of generality. This relies on the explicit characterization of distributions with MRD functions that contain linear segments which is given in Proposition 10 of [17]. Namely, \( m(r) = r \) on some interval \( J = [a, b] \subseteq S \) if and only if \( \bar{F}(r) r^2 = \bar{F}(a) a^2 \) for all \( r \in J \). If \( J \) is unbounded, this implies that \( \alpha \) has the Pareto distribution on \( J \) with scale parameter 2. In this case, \( \mathbb{E} \alpha^2 = \infty \), see Example 3.3 which is precluded by the requirement that \( \mathbb{E} \alpha^2 < \infty \). Hence, to replace strict by weak monotonicity – but still retain equilibrium uniqueness – it suffices to exclude distributions that contain intervals \( J = [a, b] \subseteq S \) with \( b < \infty \) in their support, for which \( \bar{F}(r) r^2 = \bar{F}(a) a^2 \) for all \( r \in J \).

**Example 3.3** (Pareto distribution). The Pareto distribution is the unique distribution with constant GMRD and GFR functions over its support. Let \( \alpha \) be Pareto distributed with pdf \( f(r) = k L r^{-(k+1)} 1_{\{L \leq r\}} \), and parameters \( 0 < L \) and \( k > 1 \) (for \( 0 < k \leq 1 \) we get \( \mathbb{E} \alpha = \infty \), which contradicts the basic assumptions of our model). To simplify, let \( L = 1 \), so that \( f(r) = k r^{-k-1} 1_{\{1 \leq r < \infty\}} \), \( \bar{F}(r) = (1 - r^{-k}) 1_{\{1 \leq r < \infty\}} \), and \( \mathbb{E} \alpha = \frac{k}{k-1} \). The mean residual demand of \( \alpha \) is given by \( m(r) = \frac{r}{k-1} + \frac{k}{k-1} (1 - r) 1_{\{0 \leq r < 1\}} \) and, hence, is decreasing on \([0, 1]\) and increasing on \([1, \infty]\). However, the GMRD function \( \ell(r) = m(r) / r \) is decreasing for \( 0 < r < 1 \) and is constant thereafter, hence, \( \alpha \) is DGMRD. Similarly, for \( 1 \leq r \) the failure (hazard) rate \( h(r) = k r^{-1} \) is decreasing, but the generalized failure rate \( g(r) = k \) is constant and, hence, \( \alpha \) is IGFR. The payoff function of the supplier is

\[
\Pi_s^* (r) = \lambda M r m(r) \bar{F}(r) = \frac{\lambda M}{(k-1)} \begin{cases} r (r - rk + k) & \text{if } 0 \leq r < 1 \\ r^{2-k} & \text{if } r \geq 1 \end{cases}
\]

which diverges as \( r \to \infty \), for \( k < 2 \) and remains constant for \( k = 2 \). In particular, for \( k \leq 2 \), the second moment of \( \alpha \) is infinite, i.e., \( \mathbb{E} \alpha^2 = \infty \), which shows that for DGMRD distributions, the assumption that the second moment of \( F \) is finite may not be dropped for part (b) of Theorem 3.1 to hold. On the other hand, for \( k > 2 \), we get \( r^* = \frac{k}{\pi (k-1)} \) as the unique optimal wholesale price, which is indeed the unique fixed point of \( m(r) \).
3.3 General case with \( n \) identical retailers

To ease the exposition, we restricted our presentation to \( n = 2 \) identical retailers. However, the present analysis applies to arbitrary number \( n \geq 1 \) of symmetric retailers for all competition-structures that give rise to a unique second-stage equilibrium in which the total ordered quantity depends on \( \alpha \) via the term \( (\alpha - r)_+ \) as in Table 1. This relies on the fact, that in such markets, the total quantity that is ordered from the supplier depends on \( n \) only up to a scaling constant.

Thus, the approach to the supplier’s expected profit maximization in the first-stage remains the same independently of the number of second-stage retailers. To avoid unnecessary notation, we present the general case for the classic Cournot competition.

Formally, let \( N = \{1,2,\ldots,n\} \), with \( n \geq 1 \) denote the set of symmetric retailers. A strategy profile (retailers’ orders from the supplier) is denoted by \( q = (q_1,q_2,\ldots,q_n) \) with \( q = \sum_{j=1}^{n} q_j \) and \( q_{-i} := q - q_i \). Assuming linear inverse demand function \( p = \alpha - \beta q \), the payoff function of retailer \( i \), for \( i \in N \), is given by \( \Pi_i(q,q_{-i}) = q_i (p - r) \). Under these assumptions, the second stage corresponds to a linear Cournot oligopoly with constant marginal cost, \( r \). Hence, each retailer’s equilibrium strategy, \( q_i^* (r) \), is given by \( q_i^* (r) = \frac{1}{r n (n+1)} (\alpha - r)_+ \), for \( r \geq 0 \). Accordingly, in the first stage, the supplier’s expected revenue function on the equilibrium path is given by \( \Pi_s^* (r) = r q^* (r) = \frac{n}{r n (n+1)} r E(\alpha - r)_+ \). Hence, it is maximized again at \( r^* (\alpha) = \alpha/2 \) if the supplier knows \( \alpha \) or at \( r^* = m (r^*) \) if the supplier only knows the distribution \( F \) of \( \alpha \).

Based on the above, the number of second-stage retailers affects the supplier’s revenue function only up to a scaling constant and Theorem 3.1 is stated unaltered for any \( n \geq 1 \).

4 Comparative Statics

The closed form expression of (9) facilitates a comparative statics and sensitivity analysis on the demand distribution’s parameters via the rich theory of stochastic orders, see [43], [26] and [30]. Because in equilibrium, both the total quantity \( q^* = \frac{n}{n+1} (\alpha - r^*)_+ \) that will be sold to the market and the retail price \( p^* = \alpha - q^* \) are monotone in the wholesale price \( r^* \), we restrict henceforth attention to changes in \( r^* \) as the distribution characteristics vary.

To obtain a meaningful comparison between different markets, we assume throughout equilibrium uniqueness and hence, unless stated otherwise, we consider only distributions for which Theorem 3.1 applies. First, we introduce some notation. Let \( X_1 \sim F_1, X_2 \sim F_2 \) be two nonnegative random variables (or equivalently demand distributions) with MRD functions \( m_1 (r) \) and \( m_2 (r) \), respectively, such that \( m_1 (r) \leq m_2 (r) \) for every \( r \geq 0 \). Then, we say that \( X_1 \) is less than \( X_2 \) in the mean residual demand order, denoted by \( X_1 \preceq_{\text{mrd}} X_2 \). This order plays a key role in the present model. Specifically, by (8), we have that \( m_1 (r) \leq m_2 (r) \) for any \( r \geq 0 \) if and only if \( \varepsilon_2 (r) \leq \varepsilon_1 (r) \) for any \( r \geq 0 \), i.e., if and only if the price elasticity of expected demand in market \( X_2 \) is less than the price elasticity of expected demand in market \( X_1 \) for any wholesale price \( r \geq 0 \). This motivates the following definition: we will say that market \( X_2 \) is less elastic than market \( X_1 \), denoted by \( X_2 \preceq_{\text{el}} X_1 \), if \( \varepsilon_2 (r) \leq \varepsilon_1 (r) \) for every \( r \geq 0 \). Based on the above, \( X_2 \preceq_{\text{el}} X_1 \) if and only if \( X_1 \preceq_{\text{mrd}} X_2 \). Using this notation, the following Lemma captures the importance of the characterization in (9).

**Lemma 4.1.** Let \( X_1 \sim F_1, X_2 \sim F_2 \) be two nonnegative, continuous and strictly DGMRD demand distributions with finite second moments. If \( X_2 \) is less elastic than \( X_1 \), then the supplier’s optimal wholesale price is lower in market \( X_1 \) than in market \( X_2 \). In symbols, if \( X_2 \preceq_{\text{el}} X_1 \), then \( r_1^* \leq r_2^* \).

---

7Since the DGMRD property is satisfied by a very broad class of distributions, see [31], [22] and [30], we do not consider this as a significant restriction. Still, since it is sufficient (together with finiteness of the second moment) but not necessary for the existence of a unique optimal price, the analysis naturally applies to any other distribution that guarantees equilibrium existence and uniqueness.

8As mentioned above, the \( m (r) \) function is originally known as the mean residual life function. Accordingly the mrd-order is known as the mrl-order, [43].
Proof. By definition, $X_2 \preceq_{\text{d}1} X_1$ implies that $\varepsilon_2 (r) \leq \varepsilon_1 (r)$ for every $r \geq 0$ which by [5] is equivalent to $\ell_1 (r) \leq \ell_2 (r)$ for all $r \geq 0$. Hence, by [9], $1 = \ell_1 (r_1^*) \leq \ell_2 (r_1^*) < \ell_2 (r)$ for all $r < r_2^*$, where the second inequality follows from the assumption that $X_2$ is strictly DGMRD. Since $\ell_2 (r_2^*) = 1$, it follows that $r_1^* \leq r_2^*$. \hfill \□

In short, Lemma [4.1] states that the supplier charges a lower price in a more elastic market. Although trivial to prove once Theorem 3.1 has been established, it is key to the comparative statics analysis in the present model. Indeed, combining the above, the task of comparing the optimal wholesale price $r^*$ for varying demand distribution parameters – such as market size or demand variability – essentially reduces to comparing demand distributions (markets) according to their elasticities or equivalently according to their MRD functions. Such conditions can be found in [43] and provide the framework for the subsequent analysis. Tractable conditions that enable the comparison of two distributions in terms of their MRD functions are given in [6].

4.1 Market Size

We start with the response of the equilibrium wholesale price $r^*$ to transformations that intuitively correspond to a larger market. Unless otherwise stated, we assume that the random demand is such that it satisfies the sufficiency conditions of Theorem 3.1 and hence that the supplier’s optimal wholesale price exists and is unique.

4.1.1 Reestimating Demand

Let $X$ denote the random demand in an instance of the market under consideration. Let $c \geq 1$ denote a positive constant and $Z$ an additional random source of demand that is independent of $X$. Moreover, let $r_X^*$ denote the equilibrium wholesale price in the initial market and $r_X^*, r_{X+Z}^*$ the equilibrium wholesale prices in the markets with random demand $cX$ and $X+Z$ respectively. How does $r_X^*$ compare to $r_{cX}^*$ and $r_{X+Z}^*$?

While the answer for $r_{cX}^*$ is rather straightforward, see Theorem 4.2 below, the case of $X + Z$ is more complicated. Specifically, since DGMRD random variables are not closed under convolution, see [30], the random variable $X+Z$ may not be DGMRD. This may lead to multiple equilibrium wholesale prices in the $X+Z$ market, irrespectively of whether $Z$ is DGMRD or not. To deal with the possible multiplicity of equilibria, we will write $r_{W}^* := \{ r : r = m_W (r) \}$ to denote the set of all possible equilibrium wholesale prices. Here, $m_W$ denotes the MRD function of a $W \sim F_W$ demand distribution, e.g., $W := X + Z$. To ease the notation, we will also write $r_{W}^* \leq r_1$, when all elements of the set $r_{W}^*$ are less or equal than all elements of the set $r_1$.

Theorem 4.2 largely confirms the intuition that wholesale prices are higher in the larger $cX$ and $X+Z$ markets. However, it also reveals that this is not always the case, and particularly for the $X+Z$ market, that it hinges on additional, more restrictive assumptions for $X$ and $Z$.

**Theorem 4.2.** Let $X \sim F$ be a nonnegative and continuous demand distribution with finite second moment.

(i) If $X$ is DGMRD and $c \geq 1$ is a positive constant, then $r_X^* \leq r_{cX}^*$.

(ii) If $X$ is DMRD and $Z$ is a nonnegative, continuous demand distribution with finite second moment and independent of $X$, then $r_X^* \leq r_{X+Z}^*$, i.e., $r_X^* \leq r_{X+Z}^*$ for any equilibrium wholesale price $r_{X+Z}^*$ of the $X+Z$ market.

Proof. The proof of part (i) follows directly from the preservation property of the $\preceq_{\text{mrd}}$-order that is stated in Theorem 2.A.11 of [43]. Specifically, since $m_{cX} (r) = cm_X (r/c)$ is the MRD function of $cX$, we have that $m_{cX} (r) = r \cdot \frac{m_X (r/c)}{r/c} = r \cdot \ell (r/c) \geq r \cdot \ell (r) = m_X (r)$, for all $r > 0$, with the inequality following from the assumption that $X$ is DGMRD. Hence, $X \preceq_{\text{mrd}} cX$ which by Lemma 4.1 implies that $r_X^* \leq r_{cX}^*$.
Part (ii) follows from Theorem 2.A.11 of [30]. The proof necessitates that \( X \) is DMRD and hence requiring that \( X \) is merely DGMRD is not enough. Since, \( X \) is DMRD, we know that \( r < m_X(r) \) for all \( r < r_X^* \). Together with \( X \preceq_{\text{mrd}} X + Z \), this implies that \( r < m_X(r) \leq m_{X+Z}(r) \), for all \( r < r_X^* \). Hence, \( r_{X+Z}^* \subseteq [r_X^*, \infty) \), which implies that in this case, \( r_X^* \) is a lower bound to the set of all possible wholesale equilibrium prices in the \( X + Z \) market. 

4.1.2 Preservation of Market Size & Wholesale Price

Next, we turn attention to operations on demand distributions that preserve the \( \preceq_{\text{mrd}} \)-order and hence the order of wholesale prices. Specifically, let \( X_1 \sim F_1, X_2 \sim F_2 \) denote two different demand distributions, such that \( X_1 \preceq_{\text{mrd}} X_2 \). In this case, we know by Lemma 4.1 that \( r_1^* \leq r_2^* \).

We are interested in determining transformations of \( X_1, X_2 \) that preserve the \( \preceq_{\text{mrd}} \)-order and hence the ordering \( r_1^* \leq r_2^* \). Again, to avoid extensive case discriminations, we will restrict attention to demand distributions that satisfy the sufficiency conditions of Theorem 4.3.

**Theorem 4.3.** Let \( X_1 \sim F_1, X_2 \sim F_2 \) denote two nonnegative, continuous and strictly DGMRD demand distributions, with finite second moments, such that \( X_1 \preceq_{\text{mrd}} X_2 \).

(i) If \( Z \) is a nonnegative, IFR distribution, independent of \( X_1 \) and \( X_2 \), then \( r_{X_1+Z}^* \leq r_{X_2+Z}^* \).

(ii) If \( \phi \) is an increasing, convex function, then \( r_{\phi(X_1)}^* \leq r_{\phi(X_2)}^* \).

(iii) If \( X_1 \sim pF_1 + (1-p)F_2 \) for some \( p \in (0, 1) \), then \( r_{X_1}^* \leq r_{X_p}^* \leq r_{X_2}^* \).

**Proof.** Part (i) follows from Lemma 2.A.8 of [30]. Since the resulting distributions \( X_1+Z, i = 1, 2 \) may not be DGMRD nor DMRD, the setwise notation is necessary. Part (ii) follows from Theorem 2.A.19 (ibid). Equilibrium uniqueness is retained in the transformed markets, \( \phi(X_i), i = 1, 2 \), since the DGMRD class of distributions is closed under increasing, convex transformations, see [30]. Finally, part (iii) follows from Theorem 2.A.19. However, the DGMRD class is not closed under mixtures and hence, in this case, the \( X_p \) market may have multiple equilibria, which necessitates, as in part (i), the setwise statement for the wholesale equilibrium prices of the \( X_p \) market.

In the case that \( X_1 \) and \( X_2 \) are strictly ordered in the mrl-order, then [33] show that the mrl-order is closed under monotonically non-decreasing transformations and closed in a reversed sense under monotonically non-increasing transformations. The mrl-order is also closed under convolutions, provided that the convoluting distribution has log-concave density (as is the case with many commonly used distributions, [2]), [33]. If instead of \( X_1 \preceq_{\text{mrd}} X_2, X_1 \) and \( X_2 \) are ordered in the stronger hazard rate, \( \preceq_{\text{hr}} \)-order, i.e., if \( h_1(r) \leq h_2(r) \) for all \( r \geq 0 \), denoted by \( X_1 \preceq_{\text{hr}} X_2 \), then part (i) of Theorem 4.3 remains true by Lemma 2.A.10 of [33], even if \( Z \) is merely DMRD (instead of IFR).

Although Theorems 4.2 and 4.3 are immediate once Theorem 3.1 and Lemma 4.1 have been established, they provide non-trivial economic intuitions. In general, both Theorems imply that if the supplier reestimates his expectations about the stochastic demand upwards, then he will charge a higher wholesale price. Yet, these conclusions rest on additional conditions, e.g. that \( Z \) is IFR in part (i) of Theorem 4.3 and do not hold in full generality. This point is further elaborated in Section 4.1.3.

4.1.3 Stochastically Larger Market

If we compare markets according to the usual stochastic order, then the conclusion that larger markets give rise to higher wholesale prices seizes to hold and there exist instances of stochastically larger markets, in which the supplier may charge a lower price. This relies on the fact that the usual stochastic order does not imply (nor is implied by) the \( \preceq_{\text{mrd}} \)-order, see [30]. This
observation is in line with the intuition of [29] that “size is not everything” and that prices are driven by different forces.

Formally, let $X \sim F, Y \sim G$ denote two market instances, such that $G(r) \leq F(r)$ for all $r \geq 0$. In this case, $Y$ is said to be less than $X$ in the usual stochastic order, denoted by $Y \leq_{st} X$. It is immediate that $Y \leq_{st} X$ implies $EY \leq EX$. The following example, adopted from [44], shows that wholesale prices can be lower in stochastically larger markets. Specifically, let $X \sim F$ be uniformly distributed on $[0, 1]$ and let $Y \sim G$ have a piecewise linear distribution with $G(0) = 0, G(1/3) = 7/9, G(2/3) = 7/9$ and $G(1) = 1$. Then, as the shown in Figure 1, $Y \leq_{st} X$ (right panel) but $r^*_X \leq r^*_Y$ (left panel).

Figure 1. $F$ stochastically dominates $G$ (right panel), yet $r^*_F < r^*_G$ (left panel).

### 4.2 Market Demand Variability

The response of the equilibrium wholesale price to increasing (decreasing) demand variability is even less straightforward. There exist several notions of stochastic orders that compare random variables. The answer to this question largely depends on the notion of variability that we will employ. [43] use the more general $\preceq_{cx}$-order to conclude that under mild additional assumptions, less variability implies higher prices. Concerning the present setting, ordering two demand distributions $X \sim F$ and $Y \sim G$ in the $\preceq_{cx}$-order does not in general suffice to conclude that wholesale prices in the $X$ and $Y$ markets are ordered respectively. This is due to the fact that the $\preceq_{cx}$-order does not imply the $\preceq_{ew}$-order. An illustration is provided in Figures 2 and 3.

In Figure 2, we consider two demand distributions, $X \sim F$, Lognormal ($\mu = 0.5, \sigma = 1$) and $Y \sim G$, Gamma ($\alpha = 2, \beta = 0.25$). For this choice of parameters, $EX = EY = 0.5$ and
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Figure 2. Comparison of $X \sim F$, with $F$ Lognormal ($\mu = 0.5, \sigma = 1$) and $Y \sim G$ with $G$ Gamma ($\alpha = 2, \beta = 0.25$). $Y \preceq X$ (right panel) and $r_Y^* < r_X^*$ (left panel).

hence $X, Y$ are ordered in the $\preceq_{cx}$-order if and only if the tail-integrals of $F$ and $G$ are ordered, see [43] Theorem 3.A.1. The right panel depicts the log of the ratio of these integrals, i.e., $\log \left( \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} F(x) \, dx / \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} G(x) \, dx \right)$ which remains throughout positive (and increasing). Hence, $Y \preceq_{cx} X$. The left panel depicts the price elasticities of expected demand in the $X$ and $Y$ markets. As can be seen, the supplier charges a higher price in the $X$ market (distribution $F$) than in the less variable (according to the $\preceq_{cx}$-order) $Y$ market (distribution $G$).

The above conclusion is reversed in the case of Figure 3. In this example, we consider two demand distributions, $X \sim F$ with $F$, as above, Lognormal ($\mu = 0.5, \sigma = 1$) and $Y \sim G$, Gamma ($\alpha = 8, \beta = 0.25/4$). The choice of parameters ensures that the equality $EX = EY = 0.5$ is retained and hence that $X, Y$ can be ordered in the $\preceq_{cx}$-order if and only if the tail-integrals of $F$ and $G$ can be ordered. Again, the right panel depicts the log of the ratio of these integrals which remains throughout positive (and increasing). Hence, $Y \preceq_{cx} X$. However, the picture in the left panel is now reversed. As can be seen, the supplier now charges a lower price in the $X$ market (distribution $F$) than in the less variable (according to the $\preceq_{cx}$-order) $Y$ market (distribution $G$).

More can be said, if we restrict attention to the $\preceq_{ew}$- and $\preceq_{disp}$-orders. We will write $L_i$ to denote the lower end of the support of variable $X_i$ for $i = 1, 2$.

**Theorem 4.4.** Let $X_1 \sim F_1, X_2 \sim F_2$ be two nonnegative, continuous, strictly DGMRD demand distributions with finite second moment. In addition,

(i) if either $X_1$ or $X_2$ are DMRD and $X_1 \preceq_{ew} X_2$, and if $L_1 \leq L_2$, then $r_{X_1}^* \leq r_{X_2}^*$.
(ii) if either $X_1$ or $X_2$ are IFR and $X_1 \preceq_{\text{disp}} X_2$, then $r_1^* \leq r_2^*$.

The first part of Theorem 4.4 follows directly from Theorem 3.C.5 of [13]. Based on its proof, the assumption that at least one of the two random variables is DMRD (and not merely DGMRD) cannot be relaxed. Part (ii) follows directly from Theorem 3.B.20 (b) of [13] and the fact that the $\preceq_{\text{hr}}$-order implies the $\preceq_{\text{mrd}}$-order. As in part (i), the condition that both $X_1$ and $X_2$ are DGMRD does not suffice and we need to assume that at least one is IFR. Recall, that $\text{IFR} \subset \text{DMRD} \subset \text{DGMRD}$ with all inclusions being strict, see e.g. [30].

The first implication of Theorem 4.4 is that there exist classes of distributions for which less variability implies lower wholesale prices. This is in contrast with the results of [29] and [49] and sheds light on the effects of upstream demand uncertainty. In these models, uncertainty falls to the retailer, and the supplier charges a higher price to capture an increasing share of all supply chain profits as variability reduces. Contrarily, if uncertainty falls to the supplier as in the present model, then the supplier may charge a lower price as variability increases.

The second implication is that these results, albeit general, do not apply to all distributions that are comparable according to some variability order. As illustrated with the examples in Figures 2 and 3, there exist notions of variability and demand distributions that can be ordered according to these notions, for which less variability may not lead to conclusions about wholesale prices. This demonstrates the usefulness of the characterization in [3]. In contrast to existing studies, by means of Lemma 4.1, one may use the diverse theory of stochastic orders to show that conclusions regarding the effect of demand variability on prices crucially depend on the setting of linear demand that is studied here.

### 4.2.2 Mean preserving transformation

To further study the effects of demand variability, one may use the mean preserving transformation $X_\kappa := \kappa X + (1 - \kappa) \mu$, where $\mu = EX$ and $\kappa \in [0, 1]$, see [32] and [31]. Indeed, $EX_\kappa = EX$ and $\text{Var} \left( X_\kappa \right) = \kappa^2 \text{Var} \left( X \right) \leq \text{Var} \left( X \right)$, i.e., $X_\kappa$ has the same mean and support as but is “less variable” than $X$. In this case, the following Theorem shows that $X_\kappa \preceq_{\text{mrd}} X$ and hence, by Lemma 4.1 the supplier always sets a higher price in market $X$ than in the “less variable” market $X_\kappa$.

**Theorem 4.5.** Let $X \sim F$ be a nonnegative, continuous, DGMRD demand distribution with finite mean, $\mu$, and variance, $\sigma^2$, and let $X_\kappa := \kappa X + (1 - \kappa) \mu$, for $\kappa \in [0, 1]$. Then, $X_\kappa \preceq_{\text{mrd}} X$ and $r_\kappa^* \leq r^*$.

**Proof.** It suffices to show that $Y \equiv \mu$ is smaller than $X$ in the mrl-order, i.e., that $Y \preceq_{\text{mrd}} X$. The conclusion then follows from Theorem 2.A.18 of [13] and Lemma 4.1. In turn, to show that $Y \preceq_{\text{mrd}} X$, it suffices to show that $\int_x^\infty F_X (u) \, du / \int_x^\infty F_Y (u) \, du$ increases in $x$ over $\left\{ x : \int_x^\infty F_Y (u) \, du > 0 \right\}$, cf. [13] (2.A.3). Since $F_Y (u) = 1_{\{x \leq \mu\}}$, this is equivalent to showing that $\int_x^\infty F_X (u) \, du / (\mu - x)$ increases in $x$ for $x < \mu$. Differentiating with respect to $x$ and reordering the terms, we obtain that the previous expression increases in $x$ for $x < \mu$ if and only if $m_X (x) \geq \mu - x$ for $x \in [0, \mu)$. However, this is immediate, since $m (x) \geq \int_x^\infty F_X (u) \, du = \mu - \int_0^x F_X (u) \, du \geq \mu - x$. \hfill \Box

### 4.2.3 Parametric families of distributions

To further elaborate on the fact that different variability notions may lead to different responses on wholesale prices, we consider the parametric approach of [29]. Given a random variable $X$ with distribution $F$, let $X_i := \delta_i + \lambda_i X$ with $\delta_i \geq 0$ and $\lambda_i > 0$ for $i = 1, 2$. [29] show that in this case, the wholesale price is dictated by the coefficient of variation, $CV_i = \sqrt{\text{Var} \left( X_i \right) / EX_i}$. Specifically, if $CV_2 < CV_1$, then $r_1^* < r_2^*$, i.e., in their model, a lower $CV$, or equivalently a lower relative variability, implies a higher price. This is not true for our model.
To see this, we consider two normal demand distributions $X_1 \sim N(\mu_1, \sigma_1^2)$ and $X_2 \sim N(\mu_2, \sigma_2^2)$. By Table 2.2 of [5], if $\sigma_1 < \sigma_2$ and $\mu_1 \leq \mu_2$, then $X_1 \preceq_{\text{mrd}} X_2$ and hence, by Lemma 4.1 $r^*_1 \leq r^*_2$. However, by choosing $\sigma_i$ and $\mu_i$ appropriately, we can trivially achieve an arbitrary ordering of their relative variability in terms of their CV’s. The reason for this ambiguity is that changing $\mu_i$ for $i = 1, 2$, not only affects $\text{CV}_i$, i.e., the relative variability, but also the central location of the respective demand distribution. In contrast, under the assumption that $\mathbb{E}X_1 = \mathbb{E}X_2$, the stochastic orders approach of the previous paragraph provides a more clear insight. The results of the comparative statics analysis are summarized in Table 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demand Transformations</th>
<th>Optimal Prices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$X_1 \preceq_{\text{mrd}} X_2$</td>
<td>$Z \geq 0$, IFR, independent of $X_1, X_2$ $r^<em>_{X_1+Z} \leq r^</em>_{X_2+Z}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\phi(x)$ increasing and convex</td>
<td>$r^<em>_{\phi(X_1)} \leq r^</em>_{\phi(X_2)}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X_p \sim pF_1 + (1-p)F_2$, $p \in (0,1)$</td>
<td>$r^<em>_{X_1} \leq r^</em><em>{X_p} \leq r^*</em>{X_2}$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Market size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$X$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X \text{ DMRD}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X_1 \preceq_{\text{st}} X_2$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demand variability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$X_1 \preceq_{\text{cx}} X_2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X_1 \preceq_{\text{ew}} X_2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X_1 \preceq_{\text{disp}} X_2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X_i := \delta_i + \lambda_i X$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X_\kappa := \kappa X + (1-\kappa)\mathbb{E}X$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Summary of the main comparative statics results on the seller’s optimal price. If not stated otherwise, $X, X_1, X_2$ satisfy throughout the unimodality conditions of Theorem 3.1, i.e., they are strictly DGMRD and have finite second moment.

5 Market Performance

We now turn to study the effect of upstream demand uncertainty on the efficiency of the vertical market. Unless stated otherwise, and to avoid unnecessary notation, we consider the classic Cournot competition with linear demand and arbitrary number $n$ of competing retailers in the second stage (Section 3.3). After scaling $\beta$ to 1, this implies that the equilibrium order quantities are $q_i^*(r) = \frac{1}{n+1} (\alpha - r)_+$ for each $i = 1, \ldots, n$ and any wholesale price $r \geq 0$. The supplier’s optimal wholesale price, $r^*$, is given by Theorem 3.1

5.1 Probability of no-trade

Markets with incomplete information are usually inefficient in the sense that trades that are profitable for all market participants may actually not take place. In the current model, such inefficiencies appear as values of $\alpha$ for which a transaction does not occur in equilibrium under
incomplete information, although such a transaction would have been beneficial for all parties involved, i.e., supplier, retailers and consumers.

If $\alpha < r^*$, then the retailers buy 0 units and there is an immediate stockout. Hence, for a continuous distribution $F$ of $\alpha$, the probability of no-trade in equilibrium under incomplete information is equal to $P (\alpha \leq r^*) = F (r^*)$. To study this probability as a measure of market inefficiency, we restrict attention to the family of DMRD distributions, i.e., distributions for which $m(r)$ is non-increasing. In this case, we have

**Theorem 5.1.** For any demand distribution $F$ with the DMRD property, the probability $F (r^*)$ of no-trade at the equilibrium of the stochastic market cannot exceed the bound $1 - e^{-1}$. This bound is tight over all DMRD distributions.

*Proof.* Expressing the distribution function $F$ in terms of the MRD function, e.g. see [16], we get $F (r^*) = 1 - \frac{m(0)}{m(r^*)} \exp \left\{ - \int_0^{r^*} \frac{1}{m(u)} du \right\}$. Hence, by the DMRD property and the monotonicity of the exponential function, it follows that $F (r^*) \leq 1 - \frac{m(0)}{m(r^*)} \exp \left\{ - \frac{r^*}{m(r^*)} \right\}$. Since $r^* = m(r^*) \leq m(0)$, we conclude that $F (r^*) \leq 1 - e^{-1}$. If the MRD function is constant, as is the case for the exponential distribution, see Example 5.2, then all inequalities above hold as equalities, which establishes the second claim of the Theorem.

Examples [5.2] and [5.3] highlight the tightness of the no-trade probability bound that is derived in Theorem 5.1. Example 5.4 shows that this bound cannot be extended to the class of DGMRD distributions. The conclusions are summarized in Figure 4.

**Example 5.2** (Exponential distribution). Let $\alpha \sim \exp (\lambda)$, with $\lambda > 0$, and pdf $f(r) = \lambda e^{-\lambda r}$ $1_{\{0 \leq r < \infty\}}$. Since $m(r) = 1/\lambda$, for $r > 0$, the MRD function is constant over its support and, hence, $F$ is both DMRD and IMRD but strictly DGMRD, as $\ell(r) = 1/\lambda r$, for $r > 0$. By Theorem 5.1, the optimal strategy $r^*$ of the supplier is $r^* = 1/\lambda$. The probability of no transaction $F (r^*)$ is equal to $F (r^*) = F (1/\lambda) = 1 - e^{-1}$, confirming that the bound derived in Theorem 5.1 is tight. Thus, the exponential distribution is the least favorable, over the class of DMRD distributions, in terms of efficiency at equilibrium.

**Example 5.3** (Beta distribution). This example refers to a special case of the Beta distribution, also known as the Kumaraswamy distribution, see [21]. Let $\alpha \sim \text{Beta}(1, \lambda)$ with $\lambda > 0$, and pdf $f(r) = \lambda (1 - r)^{\lambda - 1} 1_{\{0 < r < 1\}}$. Then, $F(r) = 1 - (1 - r)^\lambda$ and $m(r) = (1 - r) / (1 + \lambda)$ for $0 < r < 1$. Since the MRD function is decreasing, Theorem 5.1 applies and the optimal price of the supplier is $r^* = 1/(\lambda + 2)$. Hence, $F (r^*) = 1 - (1 - 1/(\lambda + 2))^\lambda \rightarrow 1 - e^{-1}$ as $\lambda \rightarrow \infty$. This shows that the upper bound of $F(r^*)$ in Theorem 5.1 is still tight over distributions with strictly decreasing MRD, i.e., it is not the flatness of the exponential MRD that generated the large inefficiency.

**Example 5.4** (Generalized Pareto or Pareto II distribution). This example shows that the bound of Theorem 5.1 does not extend to the class of DGMRD distributions. Let $\alpha \sim \text{GPareto} (\mu, \sigma, k)$, with pdf $f(r) = (1 + k z)^{-\left(1+1/k\right)}/\sigma$ and cdf $F(r) = 1 - (1 + k z)^{-1/k}$, with $z = (r - \mu)/\sigma$. For the parametrization $\mu < \sigma r$ and $\sigma = k r = (2 + \epsilon)^{-1}$, with $\epsilon > 0$, the cdf becomes $F_\epsilon(r) = 1 - (1 + r - \mu)^{-2+\epsilon}$. Moreover, $E_\epsilon^2 < \infty$, since $k_\epsilon < 1/2$ for any $\epsilon > 0$. Hence, by a standard calculation, $m_\epsilon(r) = (1 + r - \mu) / (1 + \epsilon)$, which shows that $F_\epsilon(r)$ is DGMRD but not DMRD. In this case, $r^* = (1 - \mu) / \epsilon$ and $F_\epsilon(r^*) = 1 - ((1 + \epsilon) (1 - \mu) / \epsilon)^{-2+\epsilon}$, which shows that the probability of a stockout may become arbitrarily large for values of $\epsilon$ close to 0. The “pathology” of this example relies on the fact that $E_\epsilon^2 \rightarrow \infty$ as $\epsilon \searrow 0$. 
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Figure 4. Probability $F(r^*)$ of no-trade for the Exponential ($\lambda$), Beta (1, $\lambda$) and Pareto II ($\mu=0.02, \sigma=k=(2+\epsilon)^{-1}$) distributions: left, center and right panel respectively. The Exponential and Beta distributions are DMRD and satisfy the $1-e^{-1}$ bound. In contrast, for the chosen range of parameter values, the Pareto II (or Generalized Pareto) is DGMRD but not DMRD and exhibits no-trade probability that is arbitrarily close to 1.

### 5.2 Division of realized market profits

If the realized value of $\alpha$ is larger than $r^*$, then a transaction between the supplier and the retailers takes place. In this case, we measure market efficiency in terms of the realized market profits. Specifically, we fix a demand distribution $F$ (which satisfies the sufficiency conditions of Theorem 3.1) with support $S$ (with upper and lower bounds $L$ and $H$ respectively, as defined in Section 2) and a realized demand level $\alpha \in S$ and compare the individual realized profits of the supplier and each retailer between the deterministic and the stochastic markets. For clarity, we summarize the necessary quantities in Table 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Upstream Demand for the Supplier</th>
<th>Uncertain $\alpha \sim F$</th>
<th>Deterministic $\alpha$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Equilibrium Wholesale Price</strong></td>
<td>$r^* = m_F(r^*)$</td>
<td>$r^* = \alpha/2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Realized Profits at Equilibrium</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplier</td>
<td>$\Pi^U_s = \frac{n}{n+1} r^* (\alpha - r^*)_{+}$</td>
<td>$\Pi^D_s = \frac{n}{n+1} (\alpha/2)^2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retailer $i$</td>
<td>$\Pi^U_i = \frac{1}{(n+1)^2} ((\alpha - r^*)_{+})^2$</td>
<td>$\Pi^D_i = \frac{1}{(n+1)^2} (\alpha/2)^2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggregate</td>
<td>$\Pi^U_{Agg} = \Pi^U_s + \sum_{i=1}^n \Pi^U_i$</td>
<td>$\Pi^D_{Agg} = \Pi^D_s + \sum_{i=1}^n \Pi^D_i$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Wholesale price and realized profits in equilibrium for the stochastic (left column) and the deterministic (right column) markets. The realized equilibrium profits correspond to fixed demand level $\alpha \in S$.

We are interested in addressing the following questions: First, how do the supplier’s (retailers’) realized profits compare between the stochastic and the deterministic market? Second, how does retail competition and demand uncertainty affect the supplier’s (retailers’) share of realized market profits? Third, how does the level or retail competition – number $n$ of retailers – affect supplier’s profits in both markets? The answers are summarized in Theorem 5.5, which follows rather immediately from Table 3. To avoid technicalities, we assume throughout that the upper bound $H$ of the support $S$ is large enough, so that $H > 2r^*$ (e.g. $H = \infty$).

**Theorem 5.5.** Let $F$ denote a demand distribution with support $S$ within $L$ and $H$, $r^*$ the respective optimal wholesale price in the stochastic market such that $H > 2r^*$, and $\alpha \in S$, with $\alpha > r^*$, a realized demand level, for which trading between supplier and retailers takes place
in both the stochastic and the deterministic market. Let, also, \( \Pi^U_s/\Pi^U_{\text{Agg}} \) and \( \Pi^D_s/\Pi^D_{\text{Agg}} \) denote the supplier’s share of realized profits in the stochastic and deterministic markets respectively. Then,

(i) \( \Pi^U_s \leq \Pi^D_s \), with equality only for \( \alpha = 2r^* \). In particular, \( \Pi^U_s/\Pi^D_s = 4(r^*/\alpha)(1-r^*/\alpha) \) for any \( \alpha > r^* \).

(ii) \( \Pi^U_s/\Pi^U_{\text{Agg}} \) decreases in the realized demand level \( \alpha \).

(iii) \( \Pi^D_s/\Pi^D_{\text{Agg}} \) is independent of the demand level \( \alpha \).

(iv) \( \Pi^U_s/\Pi^U_{\text{Agg}} \) is higher than \( \Pi^D_s/\Pi^D_{\text{Agg}} \) for values of \( \alpha \in (r^*, 2r^*) \), equal for \( \alpha = 2r^* \), and lower otherwise.

(v) \( \Pi^D_s/\Pi^D_{\text{Agg}} \) and \( \Pi^U_s/\Pi^U_{\text{Agg}} \) both increase in the level \( n \) of retail competition.

Finally, each retailer’s profit in the stochastic market, \( \Pi^U_i \), is strictly higher than her profit in the deterministic market \( \Pi^D_i \) for all demand levels \( \alpha > 2r^* \) and less otherwise, with equality for \( \alpha = 2r^* \) only.

Proof. By Table 3 we have that: (i) \( \Pi^U_s \leq \Pi^D_s \) if and only if \( \frac{\alpha}{n+1}r^*(\alpha-r^*)_+ \leq \frac{\alpha}{n+1}(\alpha/2)^2 \) which holds with strict inequality for all values of \( \alpha \), except for \( \alpha = 2r^* \) for which the quantities are equal. The second part of statement (i) is immediate. For (ii) \( \Pi^U_s/\Pi^U_{\text{Agg}} = (nr^* + r^*)/(nr^* + \alpha) \), and for (iii) \( \Pi^D_s/\Pi^D_{\text{Agg}} = (n+1)/(n+2) \). Now, (iv) and (v) directly follow from the previous calculations. Finally, \( \Pi^U_i \geq \Pi^D_i \) if and only if

\[
\frac{1}{(n+1)^2}((\alpha-r^*)_+)^2 \geq \frac{1}{(n+1)^2}(\alpha/2)^2
\]

which holds with strict inequality for all values of \( \alpha > 2r^* \) and with equality for \( \alpha = 2r^* \).

The statements of Theorem 5.5 are rather intuitive. (i) The supplier is always better off if he is informed about the retail demand level. (ii) In the stochastic market, he captures a larger share of the realized market profits for lower values of realized demand (but not lower than the no-trade threshold of \( r^* \)) whereas in the deterministic market (iii) his share of profits is constant with respect to the demand level. (iv) Yet, in the stochastic market, there exists an interval of demand realizations, namely \( (r^*,2r^*) \), for which the supplier’s profits (although less than in the deterministic market) represent a larger share of the aggregate market profits. In any case, (v) retail competition benefits the supplier. Finally, in the case that the supplier prices under uncertainty, each retailer makes a larger profit for higher realized demand values which abides to intuition. These observations confirm the existence of conflicting incentives regarding demand-information disclosure between the retailers and the supplier.

### 5.2.1 Deterministic and stochastic markets: aggregate profits

We next turn to the comparison of the aggregate market profits between the deterministic and the stochastic market. As before, we fix a demand distribution \( F \) (which is again assumed to satisfy the sufficiency conditions of Theorem 3.1) with support \( S \) within \( L \) and \( H \), and evaluate the ratio \( \Pi^U_{\text{Agg}}/\Pi^D_{\text{Agg}} \) of the aggregate realized market profits in the stochastic market to the aggregate market profits in the deterministic market. To study market performance under the two scenarios, we need to evaluate the combined effect of two competing forces: demand uncertainty and retail competition. For a realized demand \( \alpha \leq r^* \), there is a stockout and the realized aggregated profits \( \Pi^U_{\text{Agg}} \) are equal to 0. In this case, the stochastic market performs arbitrarily worse than the deterministic market and the ratio is equal to 0 for any number \( n \geq 1 \) of competing retailers. Hence, for a non-trivial analysis, we study the question of how good can the stochastic market perform when compared to the deterministic market. We have the following
Theorem 5.6. Let $F$ denote a demand distribution with support $S$ within $L$ and $H$, $r^*$ the respective optimal wholesale price in the stochastic market and $\alpha \in S$, with $\alpha > r^*$, a realized demand level, for which trading between supplier and retailers takes place in both the stochastic and the deterministic market. Again, to avoid technicalities, and to ensure that $H > 2r^*/(n-2)$ for any $n \geq 3$, we assume that $H$ is large enough, e.g. $H = \infty$. Let, also, $\Pi_{Agg}^U/\Pi_{Agg}^D$ denote the ratio of the aggregate realized profits in the stochastic market to the aggregate profits in the deterministic market. Then,

\begin{enumerate}[(i)]
\item $\Pi_{Agg}^U/\Pi_{Agg}^D > 1$ for $\alpha \in (r^*, \infty)$, if $n = 1$, $\alpha \in (2r^*, \infty)$ if $n = 2$ and $\alpha \in \left(2r^*, \frac{2n}{n-2}r^*\right)$ if $n \geq 3$.
\item $\Pi_{Agg}^U/\Pi_{Agg}^D$ is maximized for $\alpha^* = 2nr^*/(n-1)$ for $n \geq 2$, for which it is equal to $1 + (n(n+2))^{-1}$. Moreover, $\Pi_{Agg}^U/\Pi_{Agg}^D$ converges to $4/(n+2)$ as $\alpha \to \infty$ for any $n \geq 1$.
\item $\Pi_{Agg}^U/\Pi_{Agg}^D$ increases in the level of competition for demand levels $\alpha < 2r^*$ and decreases thereafter.
\end{enumerate}

Proof. By Table 3, a direct substitution yields that

$$
\Pi_{Agg}^U/\Pi_{Agg}^D = \frac{4(\alpha - r^*)(\alpha + nr^*)}{[(n+2)\alpha^2]}
$$

for $\alpha > r^*$. Taking the derivative of the ratio with respect to $\alpha$ yields

$$
\frac{\partial}{\partial \alpha} \left( \frac{4(\alpha - r^*)(\alpha + nr^*)}{(n+2)\alpha^2} \right) = \frac{4}{(n+2)\alpha^3} (2nr^* - (n-1)\alpha)
$$

which shows that the ratio is increasing $\left[r^*, \frac{2n}{n-2}r^*\right)$, and decreasing thereafter. In particular, the values of $\alpha$ for which the ratio is larger than or equal to 1 are $\alpha \in (r^*, \infty)$, for $n = 1$, $\alpha \in [2r^*, \infty)$ for $n = 2$ and $\alpha \in \left[2r^*, \frac{2n}{n-2}r^*\right]$ for $n \geq 3$. This establishes (i) and after some trivial algebra, also (ii). To obtain (iii) we take the partial derivative of $\Pi_{Agg}^U/\Pi_{Agg}^D$ with respect to $n$.

Theorem 5.6 asserts that there exists an interval of realized demand values, whose upper bound depends on the number $n$ of competing retailers, for which the stochastic market outperforms the deterministic market in terms of aggregate profits, (i). The effect of increasing retail competition on the aggregate profits of the stochastic market is twofold. First, the range (interval) of demand values for which the ratio of aggregate profits exceeds 1 reduces to a single point as competition increases ($n \to \infty$). Second, for larger values of realized demand, the ratio converges to $4/(n+2)$ as $\alpha \to \infty$. This shows that uncertainty on the side of the supplier is less detrimental for the aggregate market profits when the level of retail competition is low. In particular, for $n = 1, 2$, the aggregate profits of the stochastic market remain strictly higher than the profits of the deterministic market for all large enough realized demand levels. As competition increases this remains true only for lower (but still above the no-trade threshold) demand levels. However, for higher demand realizations, the ratio degrades linearly in the number of competing retailers.

The statements of Theorem 5.6 are illustrated in Figure 5. Here $\alpha \sim$ Gamma $(2, 2)$ but the picture is essentially the same for any choice of demand distribution that satisfies the sufficiency conditions of Theorem 3.1 and for which $H$ is large enough, i.e., $H > 2r^*$.

6 Conclusions

In this paper, we studied optimal pricing by a monopolist who is facing linear stochastic demand. By characterizing the price elasticity of expected demand and the seller’s optimal price in terms of the mean residual demand (MRD) function of the demand distribution, we analyzed
Figure 5. The left panel depicts the ratio $\Pi_{\text{Agg}}^U / \Pi_{\text{Agg}}^D$ for $n = 2, 5$ and $8$, where $\alpha \sim \text{Gamma}(2, 2)$. The dashed line shows the points $\alpha = 2nr^*/(n - 1)$ in which the ratios are maximized, taking the value $1 + (n(n + 2))^{-1}$. The right panel magnifies the interval $[4, 7]$ around the intersection point $\alpha = 2r^*$ of the three curves. The ratio increases in $n$ prior to the intersection point, $2r^* \approx 5.657$, and decreases in $n$ thereafter.

responses of optimal prices to various market characteristics. The main theoretical finding is that if two markets can be ordered in terms of their mean residual demand function, then the seller’s optimal prices can be ordered accordingly. In economic terms, the MRD function describes the expected additional demand given that current demand has reached or exceeded a certain threshold. Further movements of prices in response to market size, demand updates and variability largely depend on the exact measure or notion that will be used. This is illustrated via the theory of stochastic orders in Table 2. For instance, comparing markets in terms of their coefficients of variation and in terms of variability stochastic orders may result in different conclusions about the effect of demand variability on optimal prices. Further managerial insight from the present analysis indicates that market performance and division of profits among market participants depend on the competing forces of retail competition and demand uncertainty.
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