

# Incentives for Collective Innovation\*

Gregorio Curello<sup>†</sup>

December 10, 2021

## Abstract

Identical agents exert hidden effort to produce randomly-sized improvements in a technology they share. Their payoff flow grows as the technology develops, but so does the opportunity cost of effort, due to a resource trade-off between using and improving the technology. In the unique strongly symmetric equilibrium, small innovations may hurt all agents as they severely reduce effort. Allowing each agent to discard the innovations she produces (after observing their size) increases equilibrium effort and welfare. If agents can instead conceal innovations for a period of time, under linear payoffs, there exists an equilibrium in which improvements are refined in secret until they are sufficiently large, and progress stops after disclosure. Although concealment is inefficient due to forgone benefits and the risk of redundancy, under natural conditions, this equilibrium induces higher welfare than the one with forced disclosure.

## 1 Introduction

Technological innovation frequently has the features of a dynamic collective-action problem. Firms in the same ‘network’ gradually expand a stock of shared knowledge, concerning e.g. a production process, or a technology to be sold as part of a product.<sup>1</sup> Moreover, progress eventually decreases the incentive to contribute further.<sup>2</sup> This ‘collective’ form

---

\*I thank Péter Esó, John Quah, Sven Rady, Meg Meyer, Martin Cripps, Francesc Dilmé, George Georgiadis, Johannes Hörner, Ludvig Sinander, Matteo Escudé, Mathijs Janssen, Claudia Herresthal, Alessio Piccolo, and the seminar participants at Oxford, Bonn, and Aalto universities for helpful comments.

<sup>†</sup>Institute for Microeconomics, University of Bonn. E-mail: [gcurello@uni-bonn.de](mailto:gcurello@uni-bonn.de).

1. This occurs not only within R&D partnerships, but also among larger groups of firms with shared interests. See Powell and Giannella (2010) for a survey on networks of innovators and their ‘collective’ output, and Pénin (2007) for one on the free revealing of innovations. Recent empirical studies of knowledge spillovers among innovators include Akcigit et al. (2018) and Kerr (2008). Free revealing is characteristic of ‘user’ innovation as well: Harhoff and Lakhani (2016) is a recent analysis.

2. According to Meyer (2003): ‘With the establishment of a profitable industry, technological uncertainty is reduced and the collective invention process evaporates. Surviving firms run private research and development.’ Similarly, Powell and Giannella (2010) argues that: ‘as technological uncertainty

of innovation drove progress in the biotechnology, semiconductor, and software industries, among others.<sup>3</sup>

However, collective innovation differs from traditional ‘games’ of public-good provision in at least two respects. First, the magnitude of discoveries is uncertain, as the value of new technologies is often hard to predict. As a consequence, it is difficult for firms to monitor the research effort exerted by their partners.<sup>4</sup> Second, firms face a resource trade-off between exploiting an existent technology and exploring new possibilities.<sup>5</sup> In particular, as a technology improves, the opportunity cost of refining it rises.

In this paper, I study this problem in a general model that captures these key features. Long-lived identical agents exert hidden effort to induce randomly-sized increments in the stock of a public good. Agents’ flow payoffs are a general function of their effort and of the current stock, and the marginal cost of effort increases (weakly) with the stock. In the main interpretation of the model, agents are firms and the public good is a technology that they share. The stock of the good corresponds to the quality of the technology, and an increment in the stock is an innovation. Firms invest in R&D to obtain innovations, as well as in other activities (e.g. production, or marketing). The latter induce a private flow of profits that grows as the technology improves. In another interpretation, agents are nonprofit organisations that allocate resources between activities with guaranteed returns and the search for more effective interventions, and share their findings.<sup>6</sup>

I characterise the social-welfare benchmark (Theorem 1) and show that the game admits a unique strongly symmetric equilibrium (Theorem 2). Equilibrium effort is pinned down by the current stock; that is to say, no form of punishment is sustainable in equilibrium, even though the trajectory of the stock may be an arbitrarily precise (but imperfect) signal of aggregate effort. Moreover, continuation payoffs may *fall* after an innovation (i.e. an increment in the stock), even though a higher stock would be beneficial absent its incentive effects.<sup>7</sup> This is because opponents exert less effort as the stock grows, delaying future innovations, and this may offset the benefit of a moderately larger stock. I obtain a necessary and sufficient condition for the risk of ‘detrimental’ innovations to persist

---

recedes, firms develop private R&D and focus on their own specific applications. Reliance on collective invention accordingly wanes.’ Decreasing returns are ubiquitous in the literature on dynamic games of public-good provision, from Fershtman and Nitzan (1991) to Battaglini, Nunnari, and Palfrey (2014).

3. See e.g. Powell, Koput, and Smith-Doerr (1996) for biotechnologies, and Chesbrough (2003) and Lim (2009) for the semiconductor industry. See also Von Hippel (1987) for evidence of collective innovation from the steel industry, and Bessen and Nuvolari (2016) for historical examples.

4. For example, Geroski (1995) notes that ‘co-operative R&D ventures may be unable to overcome moral hazard problems that lead participants to invest less than promised in the joint venture, divert the energies of people nominally assigned to [it, and] assign less talented researchers to [it...].’

5. There is empirical evidence that financial constraints hold back innovation activities (e.g. Hottenrott and Peters 2012), and that the latter often rely on internal funds. Thus, firms face a trade-off between financing innovation and other costly activities, such as production or marketing.

6. See e.g. Grant and Crutchfield (2007) and Dover and Lawrence (2012) for the importance of information-sharing and of innovation, respectively, in the nonprofit sector.

7. That is to say, agents would be better off provided they behaved as if the innovation did not occur.

as long as effort is exerted in equilibrium (Corollary 5) and show that, under natural assumptions, all but the last innovation produced are harmful.

Because innovations have adverse effects on incentives, agents who obtain them may wish to delay their disclosure and adoption. To explore this idea, I first enrich the model by allowing agents to *discard* innovations, after observing their size. While this is a strong assumption, it leads to sharp results.<sup>8</sup> Namely, the ensuing game admits a unique strongly symmetric equilibrium in which, after any history, both effort and continuation payoffs are higher than in the equilibrium of the baseline game with forced disclosure (Theorem 3). Moreover, if innovations are beneficial with certainty when disclosure is compulsory, disposal does not occur even if allowed, and the equilibria coincide. Otherwise, the ex-ante payoffs in the equilibrium with disposal are strictly higher. Thus, in spite of the fact that discarding innovations is clearly inefficient, allowing the agents to do so enhances equilibrium welfare.

In reality, a firm that does not wish to disclose an innovation is more likely to conceal it than to discard it, and may disclose a refined version at a more profitable time. To check the robustness of the social benefits of selective disclosure, I enrich the baseline game by allowing agents who obtain innovations to conceal them from their opponents, forgoing the larger payoff flow. At any later time, possibly after having obtained and concealed further innovations, each agent may disclose any portion of the *total* increment, increasing her payoffs and the public stock. Moreover, undisclosed increments obtained by different agents are ‘perfect substitutes’, so that concealment leads to redundant innovations.

If payoffs are linear, no strongly symmetric equilibrium with full disclosure exists in this environment (Lemma 3). In spite of this fact and of the richness of the setting, a tractable equilibrium exists. Namely, under linear payoffs, there exists a symmetric perfect Bayesian equilibrium in which a single innovation is disclosed (the first to exceed a common, time-varying cutoff) and, after this occurs, no effort is exerted (Theorem 4). If the number of agents is sufficiently large and the size of innovations sufficiently uncertain, ex-ante payoffs exceed those of the equilibrium with forced disclosure (Proposition 3). Thus, even though concealing innovations is clearly inefficient, doing so is incentive-compatible and may improve equilibrium welfare.

This model predicts that minor innovations within a technological field are not unambiguously beneficial, as they may discourage further progress, and innovators may fail to internalise the social benefit of their research efforts. Thus, an investor may favour a promising technology in its early days over one which already became profitable, as she may expect the former to develop faster and ‘overtake’ the latter. As a consequence of this ‘discouragement effect’, firms within a network of innovators may wish to hide their

---

8. Nothing would change if agents could instead conceal innovations, provided they cannot covertly refine the improvements that they hide. This is justified if innovations are aimed at solving a given problem (so that any two are perfect substitutes), and a new problem is tackled after a solution is adopted. See Section 5.1 for details.

advances from their partners, even if this is reputationally costly and has no direct benefit.<sup>9</sup> Doing so may be socially beneficial, especially within large networks of innovators and in fields where the magnitude of innovations is heavy-tailed.<sup>10</sup>

The rest of the paper is organised as follows. I summarise the relevant literature in Section 1.1. Section 2 contains a description of the model and a discussion of the assumptions. In Section 3, I present the social-welfare benchmark. In Section 4, I characterise the unique strongly symmetric equilibrium. I analyse the game with disposal in Section 5, and the game with concealment in Section 6. The conclusion is in Section 7.

## 1.1 Literature review

This paper belongs to the literature on dynamic games of public-good provision. The baseline model is closely related to Fershtman and Nitzan (1991), Marx and Matthews (2000), and Battaglini, Nunnari, and Palfrey (2014), as agents are long-lived and gradually add to the stock of a public good, and the returns to production decrease as the stock grows.<sup>11</sup> I contribute to this literature in three ways. First, by making the trajectory of the stock an imperfect signal of agents' investments, I show that the symmetric equilibrium in Markov strategies is unique in the class of strongly symmetric equilibria. Second, I impose weaker restrictions on the payoff function and, in particular, allow the production cost to depend on the current stock. I show that, although a higher initial stock is beneficial absent its incentive effects, it may lead to lower equilibrium payoffs. Third, by allowing the stock to make discrete, randomly-sized jumps, I show that agents may have an incentive to discard or conceal increments in the stock,<sup>12</sup> and I analyse the impact of allowing the agents to do so.

Another strand of the literature on dynamic public-good games assumes that agents are rewarded only once aggregate effort reaches a given threshold.<sup>13</sup> Thus, even though free-riding remains a central concern, the incentive to exert effort *grows* with the total amount exerted to date. While this is not the case in the baseline model that I analyse, I show that a similar structure arises *in equilibrium* if agents are allowed to conceal the innovations that they obtain (Section 6). However, in contrast to the literature, increments obtained by different agents are perfect substitutes.<sup>14</sup>

---

9. If innovations must be shared in order to be implemented due to contractual arrangements, or if they are to be sold as part of a product, concealing them has no direct benefit.

10. See Azevedo et al. (2020) and the references therein for the importance of large and rare innovations.

11. See also Bliss and Nalebuff (1984), Gradstein (1992), and Lockwood and Thomas (2002).

12. To the best of my knowledge, studies on games of experimentation (which I discuss below) are the only ones within the literature on dynamic provision of public goods to feature either a production cost that varies with the stock, or production involving randomly-sized lumps. The (joint) study of these two features is justified since they are *necessary* to obtain the adverse effects just described, as I show in Appendices L and M.

13. Major contributions include Radner, Myerson, and Maskin (1986), Admati and Perry (1991), Strausz (1999), Compte and Jehiel (2004), Yildirim (2006), and Georgiadis (2015).

14. In Campbell, Ederer, and Spinnewijn (2014), agents obtain 'successes' at random times, and may

This paper is also related to the literature on strategic experimentation, even though it does not itself feature experimentation.<sup>15</sup> Indeed, games of experimentation may be viewed as a class of dynamic public-good games, where the ‘stock’ is the public belief about the quality of the risky arm, and ‘producing’ the good amounts to pulling this arm. Moreover, in these games as in my model, production is stochastic and the (net) production cost varies with the stock. Hörner, Klein, and Rady (Forthcoming) show that strongly symmetric equilibria improve upon Markov-perfect ones in games of experimentation, and are sometimes efficient. However, the unique strongly symmetric equilibrium involves Markov strategies in my model. This is because (unlike in games of experimentation) monitoring is imperfect.<sup>16</sup> Another distinguishing feature of games of experimentation is the fact that payoffs and incentives to produce move jointly: ‘good news’ simultaneously makes agents better off and the risky arm more attractive.<sup>17</sup> This implies that agents have no incentive to conceal goods news in equilibrium, and continuation payoffs are increasing in the probability that the risky arm is ‘good’.<sup>18</sup> That is to say, the aforementioned phenomena that I analyse do not arise.

Finally, this paper is related to the large theoretical literature on innovation. Reinganum (1983), part of the strand concerning industrial organisation, argues that industry leaders are likely to be overtaken by new entrants in the innovation race.<sup>19</sup> Even though firms do not compete in my model, overtaking occurs as well. However, it is more severe in that the ‘leader’ may be ex-ante worse off than the ‘follower’.<sup>20</sup> In the endogenous-growth models of Lucas and Moll (2014) and Perla and Tonetti (2014), agents face a resource trade-off between using an existing technology and improving it, exactly as in my model. However, innovations are always beneficial in their models, as aggregate technological

---

conceal them in order to preserve their partners’ incentive to exert effort. Discarding or concealing innovations in my model is beneficial for the same reason. However, successes obtained by different agents in Campbell, Ederer, and Spinnewijn (2014) are perfect *complements*, whether or not they are concealed. As I show in Appendix M, if innovations have a fixed value in my model (as successes do in theirs), agents do not conceal them in equilibrium, as concealed increments are perfect substitutes.

15. Important contributions to this literature include Bolton and Harris (1999), Keller, Rady, and Cripps (2005), Keller and Rady (2010), Bonatti and Hörner (2011), Klein and Rady (2011), Heidhues, Rady, and Strack (2015), and Keller and Rady (2015, 2020).

16. See the discussion at the end of Section 4 for details.

17. In standard public-good games as well as in my model, an increase in the stock is beneficial absent its incentive effects, but *discourages* further production in equilibrium.

18. Nevertheless, concealing information plays an important role in models involving strategic experimentation. See e.g. Akcigit and Liu (2015) and Halac, Kartik, and Liu (2017).

19. Important contributions to this literature include Brander and Spencer (1983), Spence (1984), Katz (1986), d’Aspremont and Jacquemin (1988), Kamien, Muller, and Zang (1992), Suzumura (1992), and Leahy and Neary (1997). An overtaking phenomenon also features in Jovanovic and Nyarko (1996) and Redding (2002), which belong to the literature on endogenous growth.

20. In detail, consider two groups of agents (e.g. two distinct R&D partnerships) playing the equilibrium of the baseline game (Theorem 2). If the first innovation obtained across groups makes the group who obtained it (the ‘leaders’) worse off, the group of ‘followers’ (which therefore has a lower stock at the time of the innovation) is likely to have a higher stock in the near future. This is because the continuation payoffs of the followers are higher, even though their *flow* payoffs are lower as long as their stock lies below that of the leaders.

progress is deterministic.<sup>21</sup>

## 2 Model and assumptions

In this section, I describe the model and discuss the assumptions underlying it.

Time is continuous and indexed by  $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$ . There are  $n \geq 2$  identical agents, indexed by  $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ , and a public good. Its time- $t$  stock is denoted  $x_t \geq 0$ . At any time  $t \geq 0$ , agent  $i$  exerts effort  $a_t^i \in [0, 1]$  and receives a flow payoff  $u(a_t^i, x_t)$ , where  $u : [0, 1] \times \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ . The payoff is discounted at rate  $r > 0$ .

The stock  $x_t$  takes some initial value  $x_0 \geq 0$  and, for  $t > 0$ , is determined as follows. Agent  $i$  produces an increment in  $x_t$  at rate  $\lambda a_t^i$ , where  $\lambda > 0$ . Each increment has (possibly) random size  $z$ , drawn from a CDF  $F$  with mean  $\mu < \infty$  and such that  $F(0) = 0$ . For some of the results, we shall assume that

$$F(z) > 0 \quad \text{for all } z > 0. \quad (1)$$

This means that increments of arbitrarily small (but strictly positive) size are possible. The production and the size of increments are independent across agents, time, and from each other. By rescaling the rate  $\lambda$  of arrival of increments by  $1/r$ , we may assume without loss of generality that  $r = 1$ . The arrival of increments, their size, as well as the identity of the agents inducing them, are public. Agents' effort is private, and agents are constrained to play pure strategies.

Assume that  $u(a, x)$  is twice continuously differentiable, and increasing and concave in  $x$ .<sup>22</sup> That is, keeping the effort fixed, the payoff increases as the stock grows, but at a decreasing rate. Note that

$$u(a, x) = b(x) - c(a, x)$$

where  $b(x) := u(0, x)$  are gross benefits, and  $c(a, x) := u(0, x) - u(a, x)$  is the opportunity cost of effort. Suppose that  $c(a, x)$  is increasing and convex in  $a$ , and strictly increasing in  $a$  if  $x > 0$ . Suppose also that  $c_1(a, x)$  and  $c_{11}(a, x)$  are increasing in  $x$ ; that is, the cost of effort becomes steeper and more convex as the stock grows.<sup>23</sup> Suppose also that

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \lambda \mu n b'(x) - c_1(a, x) < 0 \quad \text{for all } 0 < a \leq 1. \quad (2)$$

This means that any fixed amount of positive effort is inefficiently large if the stock is large enough. In particular,  $\lambda \mu n b'(x)$  approximates the marginal social benefit of effort

---

21. In Hopenhayn and Squintani (2011), firms refine their technologies in secret (as in the extension of Section 6), but compete in a patent race.

22. Notions such as 'increasing' and 'concave' are always meant in the weak sense.

23. The conditions on  $c$  are equivalent to the following conditions on  $u$ :  $u$  is decreasing and concave in  $a$ , and strictly decreasing in  $a$  if  $x > 0$ ;  $u_1$  and  $u_{11}$  are decreasing in  $x$ .



when the stock  $x$  is large, whereas  $c_1(a, x)$  is its marginal cost.<sup>24</sup> For some results, we shall further assume that payoffs take the following *linear multiplicative* form:

$$b(x) = x \quad \& \quad c(a, x) = ax. \quad (3)$$

In the main interpretation of the model, the stock  $x_t$  denotes the (quality of a shared) *technology*, and increments in  $x_t$  are *innovations*. These terms are used throughout the discussion. Given this interpretation, linear multiplicative payoffs may be understood as follows. In each period, agents face a binary decision between using and improving the technology. Improving the technology ( $a_t^i = 1$ ) yields no payoff, and using it ( $a_t^i = 0$ ) yields a payoff equal to its current quality,  $x_t$ . We may interpret  $0 < a_t^i < 1$  as improving the technology with probability  $a_t^i$  and using it with probability  $1 - a_t^i$ . Assuming that agents are expected-utility maximisers, their payoff function is (3).

We shall illustrate the results using linear multiplicative payoffs and the distribution

$$F(z) = \rho \mathbf{1}_{z \geq \zeta} + (1 - \rho)(1 - e^{-\frac{z}{\epsilon}}), \quad (4)$$

where  $\rho \in [0, 1)$  and  $\zeta > \epsilon > 0$ . Thus, with probability  $\rho$ , the innovation is ‘substantial’ and it has size  $\zeta$ ; otherwise, it is a small improvement, with size drawn from the exponential distribution with mean  $\epsilon$ .<sup>25</sup>

Below is a brief description of histories, strategies and continuation payoffs. Formal definitions are in Appendix A. Note that (almost surely) only finitely many innovations are produced within any bounded period of time. A *history* is a finite sequence

$$h_m := (x_0, (t_1, z_1, i_1), \dots, (t_m, z_m, i_m)) \quad (5)$$

such that agent  $i_1$  obtains an innovations of size  $z_1$  at time  $t_1$ , agent  $i_2$  one of size  $z_2$  at time  $t_2 > t_1$ , and so on. In particular, the stock after the  $m^{\text{th}}$  innovation is

$$X(h_m) := x_0 + \sum_{l=1}^m z_l.$$

Agents simultaneously reach a new (public) history whenever an innovation is produced. A *strategy*  $\sigma^i$  specifies, for each history  $h_m$  (including  $h_0 := x_0$ ), an effort schedule  $\sigma^i(h_m) : (t_m, \infty) \rightarrow [0, 1]$  (where  $t_0 := 0$ ). Agent  $i$  exerts effort  $[\sigma^i(h_m)](t)$  at any

24. The (individual) benefit of obtaining one innovation,  $\mathbb{E}_F[b(x + \tilde{z})] - b(x)$ , is approximately  $\mu b'(x)$  when  $x$  is large. This is because  $b$  is increasing and concave, hence approximately linear for large  $x$ .

25. The mean of  $F$  is  $\mu = \rho\zeta + (1 - \rho)\epsilon$ . Solutions are simpler if the size of the small improvement is exponentially-distributed than if it is fixed, whereas they do not change if the size of the substantial innovation is stochastic, provided it is guaranteed to be sufficiently large. The special case  $\rho = 0$  affords the simplest non-trivial solutions. We will also consider the limit case in which moderate improvements become arbitrarily small and frequent, while their aggregate size remains fixed (formally, we let  $\lambda$  grow and  $\rho$  and  $\epsilon$  vanish while keeping  $\lambda\rho$  and  $\lambda\epsilon(1 - \rho)$  fixed).

time  $t > t_m$  such that no innovation was produced within the time interval  $[t_m, t)$ . Note that it is not necessary for histories to keep track of past exerted effort, since past effort has no direct payoff relevance and agents do not randomise. For the same reason, beliefs about opponents' past effort play no role, and subgames beginning at any given history are well-defined.<sup>26</sup> If agents play a strategy profile  $\sigma := (\sigma^i)_{i=1}^n$ , agent  $i$ 's continuation payoff at a history  $h_m$  may be expressed as

$$v_\sigma^i(h_m) := \mathbb{E} \left( \sum_{l=m}^{\tilde{m}} \int_{\tilde{t}_l}^{\tilde{t}_{l+1}} e^{t_m-t} [b(X(\tilde{h}_l)) - c([\sigma^i(\tilde{h}_l)](t), X(\tilde{h}_l))] dt \right) \quad (6)$$

where  $\tilde{m} \in \{m, m+1, \dots, \infty\}$  is the total number of innovations produced,  $\tilde{h}_l$  is the history reached upon the  $l^{\text{th}}$  innovation (at time  $\tilde{t}_l$ ),  $\tilde{h}_m := h_m$ ,  $\tilde{t}_m := t_m$  and, if  $\tilde{m} < \infty$ ,  $\tilde{t}_{\tilde{m}+1} := \infty$ .

## 2.1 Discussion of the assumptions

The literature on dynamic public-good games assumes that payoffs are separable. Formally, they may be expressed as

$$u(a_t^i, x_t) = b(x_t) - c(a_t^i). \quad (7)$$

This model is a generalisation. Namely, the cost of effort becomes steeper and more convex as the stock grows.<sup>27</sup> Another standard assumption is that the marginal benefit of increasing the stock vanishes as the stock grows (i.e.,  $\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} b'(x) = 0$ ). Condition (2) is weaker. The added generality encompasses linear payoffs, such as (3).<sup>28</sup>

Another typical assumption in the literature is that the production technology is deterministic. In this model, production is stochastic because innovations arise at random times. Coupled with the continuous-time assumption, this feature affords simple closed-form solutions and a neater analysis. Note that the *size* of innovations may, but need not, be random (formally,  $F$  may be degenerate). Condition (1), which requires innovations to have random size, is used to obtain simple characterisations of the inefficiency of equilibria (Corollary 2), of the possibility of detrimental innovations (Section 4.1), of the incentive to conceal innovations in equilibrium (Lemma 3), and a sufficient condition for concealment to be socially beneficial (Proposition 3). The other results hold whether the size of innovations is random or fixed.

---

26. The game may be viewed as a discrete-time, simultaneous-move stochastic game, with stochastic discounting and horizon. As I show in Appendix A, action spaces are compact and per-period payoffs continuous, so that best responses against any (suitably measurable) strategies exist after every history.

27. Requiring that the cost become more convex as well as steeper as the stock grows is necessary to guarantee that the efficient level of effort decreases, a central feature in the literature.

28. Condition (2) ensures that the strongly symmetric equilibrium is unique (Theorem 2).



For simplicity, I require the distribution of the size of increments to be independent of the effort of the agent producing them. In Appendix K, I show via an example that the main insights of the analysis carry over to a model where exerting more effort improves the distribution of the size of innovations (and alters their frequency).<sup>29</sup>

### 3 Social-welfare benchmark

In this section, I describe how non-strategic agents should behave in order to maximise aggregate payoffs. The main features of this benchmark are common in dynamic public-good games. In particular, any innovation is beneficial.

A strategy is Markov if effort is pinned down by the current stock. Formally, a *Markov strategy* (for agent  $i$ ) is a Borel measurable map  $\alpha : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow [0, 1]$  such that  $a_t^i = \alpha(x_t)$  for all  $t \geq 0$ .<sup>30</sup> If agents play a Markov profile  $\alpha := (\alpha^i)_{i=1}^n$ , the time- $t$  continuation payoff of each agent  $i$  is a function  $v_\alpha^i(x_t)$  of the current stock  $x_t$ . Moreover, for all  $x \geq 0$ ,

$$v_\alpha^i(x) = b(x) - c(\alpha^i(x), x) + \lambda \sum_{j=1}^n \alpha^j(x) \{ \mathbb{E}_F[v_\alpha^i(x + \tilde{z})] - v_\alpha^i(x) \}. \quad (8)$$

That is to say, agent  $i$ 's continuation payoff is the sum of the current payoff flow  $b(x) - c(\alpha^i(x), x)$ , and the net expected future benefit. This is given by the rate  $\lambda \sum_{j=1}^n \alpha^j(x)$  at which innovations occur, times their expected social value; that is, the difference between the continuation payoff  $v_\alpha^i(x + z)$  after an innovation of size  $z > 0$ , and the current payoff  $v_\alpha^i(x)$ , weighted by the distribution  $F$  of  $z$ .

*Welfare* is the average of ex-ante payoffs across agents. Since agents are identical, the cost of effort  $c(a, x)$  is convex in  $a \in [0, 1]$ , and the rate of arrival of innovations  $\lambda a$  is linear in effort, it is efficient for all agents to exert the same amount of effort. Then, from (8), the Bellman equation for the maximal welfare achievable in the game is

$$v(x) = \max_{a \in [0, 1]} \{ b(x) - c(a, x) + a \lambda n \{ \mathbb{E}_F[v(x + \tilde{z})] - v(x) \} \}. \quad (9)$$

Standard dynamic-programming arguments imply that, if (9) admits a (well-behaved) solution  $v_*$  then, for any initial stock  $x_0 \geq 0$ ,  $v_*(x_0)$  is the maximal achievable welfare,

29. Note also that I require effort to be bounded, as allowing for unbounded effort while keeping the rest of the assumptions unchanged necessarily leads to separable payoffs. Indeed, unless (7) holds,  $c(\bar{a}, \hat{x}) > c(\bar{a}, \bar{x})$  for some  $\bar{a}$  and  $\hat{x} > \bar{x}$ . Moreover, for any  $\hat{a} \geq \bar{a}$ ,  $b(\hat{x}) - b(\bar{x}) \geq c(\hat{a}, \hat{x}) - c(\hat{a}, \bar{x}) \geq (\hat{a} - \bar{a})[c(\bar{a}, \hat{x}) - c(\bar{a}, \bar{x})]$ , where the first inequality holds since  $b(x) - c(\hat{a}, x)$  is increasing in  $x$ , and the second since  $c_1(\hat{a}, \hat{x}) - c_1(\bar{a}, \bar{x})$  is positive and increasing in  $a$ . Then, effort must be bounded.

30. Measurability ensures that the process  $(x_t)_{t \geq 0}$  is well-defined for any Markov profile  $(\alpha^i)_{i=1}^n$ .

31. To derive (8) note that, for a small time interval  $dt$ ,  $v_\alpha^i(x) = [b(x) - c(\alpha^i(x), x)]dt + e^{-dt} \mathbb{E}[v_\alpha^i(\tilde{x}_{t+dt}) | \tilde{x}_t = x]$  and, up to a first-order approximation,  $\mathbb{E}[v_\alpha^i(\tilde{x}_{t+dt}) | \tilde{x}_t = x] = \lambda \sum_{j=1}^n \alpha^j(x) dt \mathbb{E}_F[v_\alpha^i(x + \tilde{z})] + (1 - \lambda \sum_{j=1}^n \alpha^j(x) dt) v_\alpha^i(x)$ . Neglecting terms in  $dt^2$  (and dropping the subscript  $t$ ) yields (8).

across all (Markov and non-Markov) strategy profiles.<sup>32</sup> Moreover, any Markov strategy  $\alpha$  solving, for all  $x \geq 0$ ,

$$\alpha(x) \in \arg \max_{a \in [0,1]} \{a\lambda n\{\mathbb{E}_F[v_*(x + \tilde{z})] - v_*(x)\} - c(a, x)\} \quad (10)$$

induces welfare  $v_*(x_0)$ .

The following result shows that, in order to maximise welfare, agents should exert less effort as the stock grows. Moreover, any increment in  $x_t$  makes agents better off. The proof is in Appendix E.

**Theorem 1.** *There exists a Markov strategy  $\alpha_*$  that, if played by all agents, maximises welfare for all initial stocks  $x_0 \geq 0$ . Effort  $\alpha_*(x_t)$  is decreasing in the stock  $x_t$ , and  $\alpha_*(\tilde{x}_t) \rightarrow 0$  a.s. as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ . Maximal welfare  $v_*(x_0)$  is increasing in  $x_0$ , and  $v_*(x_0) - b(x_0)$  is decreasing.<sup>33</sup>*

The fact that effort  $\alpha_*$  is decreasing is standard in dynamic public-good games, and is generally due to concave payoffs. In this model, not only are payoffs concave in  $x_t$ , but the cost of effort becomes steeper and more convex as  $x_t$  grows (formally,  $c_1(a, x)$  and  $c_{11}(a, x)$  are increasing in  $x$ ). The latter force adds to the former and does not alter the qualitative features of the social-welfare benchmark. However, as shown in the next section, it plays an important role in equilibrium.

Maximal welfare  $v_*$  is increasing in the initial stock  $x_0$  because higher  $x_0$  yields a larger payoff flow ( $b(x) - c(a, x)$  is increasing in  $x$ ) without altering the productivity of effort (the frequency and size of innovations does not depend on  $x$ ). Moreover, since each agent's time- $t$  continuation payoff when  $\alpha_*$  is played equals  $v_*(x_t)$ , any increment in the stock (that is, any innovation) is beneficial. We shall see that, despite this, welfare need not increase with  $x_0$  in equilibrium, so that innovations may be detrimental.

The next result gives a necessary and sufficient condition for effort to cease in finite time. It is proved in Appendix E.

**Corollary 1.** *If*

$$\lambda n\{\mathbb{E}_F[b(x + \tilde{z})] - b(x)\} \leq c_1(0, x) \quad (11)$$

*admits a solution then it admits a smallest solution  $x_*$ . In this case, no effort is exerted if  $x_0 \geq x_*$  and, if  $x_0 < x_*$ , effort  $\alpha_*(\tilde{x}_t)$  ceases a.s. in finite time, when  $\tilde{x}_t$  reaches  $x_*$ . If (11) holds with ' $>$ ' for all  $x \geq 0$ , then effort never ceases and  $\tilde{x}_t \rightarrow \infty$  a.s. as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ .*

When the stock  $x$  is such that equality holds in (11), the cost and benefit of exerting a small amount of effort until an innovation occurs, and no effort thereafter, even out.

---

32. See e.g. Theorem 3.1.2 of Piunovskiy and Zhang (2020). It is sufficient that (9) admits a solution  $v : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  that is Borel measurable and such that  $b(x) \leq v(x) \leq b(x) + n\lambda[b(\mu) - b(0)]$  for all  $x \geq 0$ .

33. Unless  $c$  is strictly convex, (10) may admit more than one solution  $\alpha$ .  $\alpha_*$  is the pointwise smallest.

The right-hand side of (11) is the marginal cost of effort when no effort is exerted. The left-hand side is the marginal social value of effort when the size of the stock is  $x$ , given that no effort is exerted after an innovation occurs. In particular, the net welfare benefit of an innovation of size  $z$  is  $n[b(x+z) - b(x)]$ .




Figure 1: Effort (left) and welfare (right) in the social-welfare benchmark, as functions of the stock  $x_t$ . Parameter values are  $b(x) = x$ ,  $c(a, x) = ax$ ,  $F(z) = \rho \mathbb{1}_{z \geq \zeta} + (1 - \rho)(1 - e^{-z/\epsilon})$ ,  $\lambda = 10$ ,  $\rho = \epsilon = 0.01$ , and  $\zeta = n = 5$ .

**Example.** Figure 1 depicts effort and welfare in the social-welfare benchmark of the example introduced in Section 2:  $b(x) = x$ ,  $c(a, x) = ax$ , and  $F(z) = \rho \mathbb{1}_{z \geq \zeta} + (1 - \rho)(1 - e^{-z/\epsilon})$ . Effort  $\alpha_*$  ceases as the stock reaches the cutoff  $x_* := \lambda n[\rho \zeta + (1 - \rho)\epsilon]$ . Moreover, since the cost of effort is linear,  $\alpha_*$  is ‘bang-bang’:  $\alpha_*(x) = 1$  for  $x < x_*$ , and  $\alpha_*(x) = 0$  for  $x > x_*$ . Assuming that it is efficient to exert no effort after a substantial innovation (i.e. assuming that  $\zeta \geq x_*$ ), welfare is given by

$$v_*(x) = \begin{cases} \frac{\lambda n \rho}{(1 + \lambda n \rho)^2} \left[ \epsilon \left( \frac{1}{\rho} - 1 \right) e^{\frac{1 + \lambda n \rho}{\epsilon(1 + \lambda n)}(x - x_*)} + x_* + (1 + \lambda n \rho)x + \zeta \right] & \text{if } x \leq x_* \\ x & \text{if } x \geq x_*. \end{cases} \quad (12)$$

## 4 Equilibrium

This section is devoted to the unique strongly symmetric equilibrium of the game. Among other things, I show that continuation payoffs may drop after an innovation.

Given a history  $h$  featuring  $m \in \{0, 1, \dots\}$  innovations, write  $h \frown (t, z, i)$  for the history that features  $m + 1$  innovations and extends  $h$ , and in which the last innovation is produced by agent  $i$  at time  $t$ , and has size  $z$ . Recall that, if agents play a strategy

34. The maps  $v_*$  and  $\alpha_*$ , as well as all closed-form solutions described in later sections, may be obtained using e.g. the methods in Section 2.2 of Polyanin and Manzhirov (2008). Note that  $v_*$  is not differentiable at  $x = \lambda \mu n$ . In particular, the smooth-pasting property does not hold in this setting, as the stopping boundary is not regular. See Peskir and Shiryaev (2006) for details.

profile  $\sigma := (\sigma^i)_{i=1}^n$ ,  $v_\sigma^i(h)$  is the payoff to agent  $i$  in the subgame after history  $h$ . Given  $h$  leading to some time  $t_h \geq 0$ , for all  $t > t_h$ , let  $v_{\sigma,h}^i(t)$  be agent  $i$ 's payoff at time  $t$ , given that no innovation was produced within the interval  $[t_h, t)$  (and define  $v_{\sigma,h}^i(t_h) := v_\sigma^i(h)$ ). Then, the map  $v_{\sigma,h}^i : [t_h, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is Lipschitz and, labelling  $x \geq 0$  the value of the stock that  $h$  leads to, for almost all  $t > t_h$ ,<sup>35</sup>

$$\begin{aligned} v_{\sigma,h}^i(t) &= \frac{dv_{\sigma,h}^i}{dt}(t) + b(x) - c([\sigma^i(h)](t), x) \\ &\quad + \lambda \sum_{j=1}^n [\sigma^j(h)](t) \{ \mathbb{E}_F[v_\sigma^i(h \frown (t, \tilde{z}, j))] - v_{\sigma,h}^i(t) \}. \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

Compared to (8), effort depends on the current time. As a consequence, agent  $i$ 's payoff evolves at rate  $dv_{\sigma,h}^i/dt$  even in the absence of innovations.

Suppose now that the opponents of agent  $i$  all play a given strategy  $\sigma$ , and let  $\hat{v}_\sigma^i(h)$  be the largest payoff that agent  $i$  can achieve, across all strategies, in the subgame after history  $h$ . Assuming  $h$  leads to time  $t_h \geq 0$ , for all  $t > t_h$ , let  $\hat{v}_{\sigma,h}^i(t)$  be the largest payoff achievable by agent  $i$  at time  $t$ , given that no innovation was produced within the interval  $[t_h, t)$  (and define  $\hat{v}_{\sigma,h}^i(t_h) := \hat{v}_\sigma^i(h)$ ). Then, the map  $\hat{v}_{\sigma,h}^i : [t_h, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is Lipschitz and, for almost all  $t > t_h$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{v}_{\sigma,h}^i(t) &= \frac{d\hat{v}_{\sigma,h}^i}{dt}(t) + b(x) + \max_{a \in [0,1]} \{ a\lambda \{ \mathbb{E}_F[\hat{v}_\sigma^i(h \frown (t, \tilde{z}, i))] - \hat{v}_{\sigma,h}^i(t) \} - c(a, x) \} \\ &\quad + \lambda [\sigma(h)](t) \sum_{j \neq i}^n \{ \mathbb{E}_F[\hat{v}_\sigma^i(h \frown (t, \tilde{z}, j))] - \hat{v}_{\sigma,h}^i(t) \}. \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

The strategy  $\sigma$  is a best response for agent  $i$  at all histories only if, given any history  $h$  leading to any time  $t_h$ , for almost all  $t > t_h$ ,

$$[\sigma^i(h)](t) \in \arg \max_{a \in [0,1]} \{ a\lambda \{ \mathbb{E}_F[\hat{v}_\sigma^i(h \frown (t, \tilde{z}, i))] - \hat{v}_{\sigma,h}^i(t) \} - c(a, x) \}. \quad (15)$$

A strategy  $\sigma$  induces a *strongly symmetric equilibrium* if, after any history, it is a best response for any agent against her opponents playing the same strategy.

Recall the definition of Markov strategies from Section 3. If the opponents of any given agent play a Markov strategy  $\alpha$ , the largest continuation payoff that this agent can achieve, across all strategies, is a (value) function  $\hat{v}_\alpha$  of the current stock  $x_t$  (and is symmetric across agents). From (8),  $\hat{v}_\alpha$  is the unique (well-behaved) solution to

$$v(x) = \max_{a \in [0,1]} \{ b(x) - c(a, x) + \lambda [a + (n-1)\alpha(x)] \{ \mathbb{E}_F[v(x + \tilde{z})] - v(x) \} \}.^{36} \quad (16)$$

35. See Appendix A for details on how to obtain (13), and Appendix A.1 for (14) and (15).

36. This equation and (17) follow from e.g. Theorem 3.1.2 of Piunovskiy and Zhang (2020). In particular,  $\hat{v}_\alpha$  is the unique solution to (16) among Borel measurable  $v : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  such that  $b(x) \leq v(x) \leq v_*(x)$

Then,  $\alpha$  is a best response, after any history, against opponents playing the same strategy if and only if

$$\alpha(x) \in \arg \max_{a \in [0,1]} \{a\lambda\{\mathbb{E}_F[\hat{v}_\alpha(x + \tilde{z})] - \hat{v}_\alpha(x)\} - c(a, x)\} \quad (17)$$

for all  $x \geq x_0$ . The following result characterises the unique strongly symmetric equilibrium of the game. The proof is in Appendix F.

**Theorem 2.** *There exists a unique strongly symmetric equilibrium, and it is induced by a Markov strategy  $\alpha_f$ .<sup>37</sup> Effort  $\alpha_f(x_t)$  is continuous and decreasing in the stock  $x_t$ , and lies below the benchmark  $\alpha_*(x_t)$ . Moreover,  $v_f(x_t) - b(x_t)$  is decreasing in  $x_t$ , where  $v_f(x_t)$  is the equilibrium continuation payoff given  $x_t$ .*

Equilibrium effort  $\alpha_f(x_t)$  decreases as the stock  $x_t$  grows and, moreover, it is inefficiently low in general. This is caused by *intertemporal free riding* (Marx and Matthews 2000): since  $\alpha_f$  is decreasing, agents are reluctant to exert effort as this causes their opponents to exert less effort in the future. Thus  $\alpha_f$  is inefficient, except for the trivial case in which no effort is optimal. This is the next result, proved in Appendix F.

**Corollary 2.** *Suppose that (1) holds. Then,  $v_f(x_0) < v_*(x_0)$  if and only if  $\alpha_*(x_0) > 0$ .<sup>38</sup>*

The following result parallels Corollary 1, and describes the long-run behaviour of the equilibrium effort schedule. I omit its proof as it is essentially the same as that of Corollary 1.

**Corollary 3.** *If*

$$\lambda\{\mathbb{E}_F[b(x + \tilde{z})] - b(x)\} \leq c_1(0, x) \quad (18)$$

*admits a solution then it admits a smallest solution  $x_f$ . In this case, no effort is exerted if  $x_0 \geq x_f$  and, if  $x_0 < x_f$ , then effort  $\alpha_f(\tilde{x}_t)$  ceases a.s. in finite time, when  $\tilde{x}_t$  reaches  $x_f$ . If (18) holds with ‘>’ for all  $x \geq 0$ , then effort never ceases and  $\tilde{x}_t \rightarrow \infty$  a.s. as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ .*

The ‘encouragement effect’ (Bolton and Harris 1999) does not arise in  $\alpha_f$ . That is, effort ceases in  $\alpha_f$  precisely when it would cease if there were only one agent. More specifically, in either setting, effort ceases eventually if and only if (18) admits a solution and, if so, effort stops as the stock reaches  $x_f$ .<sup>39</sup>

---

for all  $x \geq 0$ , where  $v_*$  was defined in Section 3.

37. The same Markov strategy  $\alpha_f$  induces the equilibrium for all initial stocks  $x_0 \geq 0$ .

38. Corollary 2 relies on (1). Indeed,  $\alpha_f$  is efficient if the incentive to exert effort is strong initially and is guaranteed to drop suddenly, so that  $\alpha_f(x_t)$  and  $\alpha_*(x_t)$  drop from 1 to 0 at the same time. Since  $\alpha_f$  is continuous, this can only occur if innovations are guaranteed to be sufficiently large, a phenomenon ruled out by (1).

39. In the knife-edge case that (18) admits multiple solutions, a single agent is equally well-off if she stops exerting effort as the stock reaches any given solution.

The uniqueness of the strongly symmetric equilibrium relies on the assumption that agents' effort is hidden. However, it is immediate that, if effort were observable in real time,  $\alpha_f$  would be the unique Markov perfect equilibrium of the game.<sup>40</sup> The game (with hidden effort) admits many equilibria. As in most dynamic public-good games, some of these equilibria yield efficiency gains over the strongly symmetric one, due to the agents' ability to coordinate. However, the gains are limited: as I show in Section 2 of Curello (2021), no (subgame-perfect) equilibrium features the encouragement effect.<sup>41</sup>

**Linear payoffs.** Recall from Section 2 that payoffs are *linear and multiplicative* if  $b(x) = x$  and  $c(a, x) = ax$ . In this case, effort ceases when the stock reaches the cutoff  $x_f := \lambda\mu$ , by Corollary 3. Then, if  $x_0 < \lambda\mu$ , the expected number of innovations produced in equilibrium is

$$M(x_0) := \mathbb{E} \left[ \min \left\{ m \in \mathbb{N} : x_0 + \sum_{l=1}^m \tilde{z}_l \geq \lambda\mu \right\} \right]$$

where  $z_1, z_2, \dots$  are i.i.d. draws from  $F$ . Note that there is a unique  $y_f \in (0, \lambda\mu)$  such that

$$y_f(n-1) = \int_{y_f}^{\lambda\mu} \frac{M}{\lambda}. \quad (19)$$

The following result describes equilibrium payoffs under the hypothesis that the payoff function is linear and multiplicative. The proof is in Appendix F.

**Corollary 4.** *Suppose that payoffs are linear and multiplicative. Then, equilibrium effort  $\alpha_f$  is maximal over  $[0, y_f]$  and interior over  $(y_f, \lambda\mu)$ . Moreover, for all  $y_f \leq x \leq \lambda\mu$ ,*

$$\alpha_f(x) = \frac{1}{(n-1)x} \int_x^{\lambda\mu} \frac{M}{\lambda} \quad \& \quad v_f(x) = x + \int_x^{\lambda\mu} \frac{M}{\lambda},$$

and  $v_f$  is increasing globally if and only if it is increasing over  $[y_f, \lambda\mu]$ .<sup>42</sup>

Corollary 4 implies that any given mean-preserving spread of  $F$  increases equilibrium

---

40. The game in which effort is observable in real time would be well-defined if e.g. agents were restricted to play Markov strategies. Moreover, a richer strategy set analogous to the one in Hörner, Klein, and Rady (Forthcoming) would produce superior strongly symmetric equilibria. It is immediate from their analysis that, with linear multiplicative payoffs, maximal effort would be sustainable in equilibrium until the stock reaches  $x_f$ . The same is true under hidden effort, provided effort induces a continuous drift in the stock. For instance, if  $x_t$  grows at rate  $\sum_{i=1}^n a_t^i$ , with discrete increments occurring at rate  $\lambda \sum_{i=1}^n a_t^i$ .

41. The logic is similar to that explaining the absence of this effect in the Markov equilibria with 'finite switching' of Keller, Rady, and Cripps (2005). Effort cannot be sustained after the stock exceeds a certain cutoff  $\hat{x}$ . If the current stock is below but close to  $\hat{x}$ , with high probability, no effort is exerted after an innovation. Then, the incentive to exert effort is no higher in equilibrium than in the single-agent setting. However, if effort induced a continuous drift in the stock (e.g. as described in footnote 40), there would exist an asymptotically efficient equilibrium, analogous to the equilibrium with 'infinite switching' of Keller, Rady, and Cripps (2005).

42. See Section 1 of Curello (2021) for a characterisation of maximal welfare  $v_*$  under linear multiplicative payoffs. An argument similar to that used to obtain  $v_*$  yields an expression for  $v_f$  over  $[0, y_f]$ .

effort  $\alpha_f$  pointwise and, if  $x_0 > 0$  and the number of agents is sufficiently large, it increases ex-ante payoffs  $v_f(x_0)$  as well.<sup>43</sup> Corollary 4 also implies that  $v_f$  is independent of the number of agents  $n$  over the interval  $[y_f, \infty)$ . Moreover,  $v_f$  is convex over  $[y_f, \lambda\mu]$  and is increasing (is decreasing) over this interval if  $M(y_f) \leq \lambda$  (if  $\lambda \leq 1$ ). Otherwise, assuming that (1) holds and that  $F$  is atomless,  $v_f$  is minimised over  $[y_f, \lambda\mu]$  at the unique  $x \in (y_f, \lambda\mu)$  such that  $M(x) = \lambda$ .<sup>44</sup>




Figure 2: Effort (left) and payoffs (right) in the strongly symmetric equilibrium, as functions of the stock  $x_t$ . Parameter values are  $b(x) = x$ ,  $c(a, x) = ax$ ,  $F(z) = \rho \mathbb{1}_{z \geq \zeta} + (1 - \rho)(1 - e^{-z/\epsilon})$ ,  $\lambda = 10$ ,  $\rho = \epsilon = 0.01$ , and  $\zeta = n = 5$ .

**Example.** Figure 2 depicts effort and welfare in the unique strongly symmetric equilibrium of the example introduced in Section 2. Effort ceases at  $x_f := \lambda(\rho\zeta + (1 - \rho)\epsilon)$ . Assuming that a substantial innovation raises the stock above this cutoff (i.e. that  $\zeta \geq x_f$ ), effort is given by

$$\alpha_f(x) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } x \leq y_f \\ \frac{1}{\lambda\rho(n-1)} \left\{ \frac{1}{x} \left[ \epsilon \left( \frac{1}{\rho} - 1 \right) \left( e^{\frac{\rho}{\epsilon}(x-x_f)} - 1 \right) + x_f \right] - 1 \right\} & \text{if } y_f \leq x \leq x_f \\ 0 & \text{if } x \geq x_f \end{cases}$$

43. Effort increases since mean-preserving spreads of  $F$  increase  $M$  pointwise, as the map  $(z_l)_{l=1}^\infty \mapsto \min\{m \in \mathbb{N} : x_0 + \sum_{l=1}^m z_l \geq \lambda\mu\}$  is convex. Ex-ante payoffs increase provided  $y_f \leq x_0$  after the spread. This is the case for large enough  $n$  since, clearly,  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} y_n = 0$ .

44. Condition (1) and the continuity of  $F$  ensure that  $M$  is strictly decreasing, and continuous, respectively, so that the equation  $M(x) = \lambda$  has a unique solution over  $[y_f, \lambda\mu]$  (provided  $1 < \lambda < M(y_f)$ ). In general,  $M$  is decreasing and  $v_f$  has a.e. derivative  $1 - M/\lambda$ , so that it is minimised at the point(s) where  $M$  ‘crosses’  $\lambda$ , assuming  $1 < \lambda < M(y_f)$ .



where  $y_f$  is such that  $\alpha_f$  is continuous at  $y_f$ .<sup>45</sup> Above this threshold,<sup>46</sup> payoffs satisfy

$$v_f(x) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\lambda\rho} \left[ \epsilon \left( \frac{1}{\rho} - 1 \right) \left( e^{\frac{\rho}{\epsilon}(x-x_f)} - 1 \right) - (1 - \lambda\rho)x + x_f \right] & \text{if } y_f \leq x \leq x_f \\ x & \text{if } x \geq x_f. \end{cases} \quad (20)$$

Note that  $v_f$  is not monotone given the parameters of Figure 2, so that an innovation may cause payoffs to drop.<sup>47</sup> For instance, the first innovation lowers payoffs if it has size 1 and  $x_0 = 0$ . The next section is devoted to the analysis of this phenomenon.

## 4.1 Detrimental innovations

In this section, I argue that detrimental innovations (that is, increments that cause equilibrium continuation payoffs to drop) are a prevalent phenomenon in this model. The risk of detrimental innovations may persist in the long run (Corollary 5) and it is often exacerbated in large teams, or if innovations are expected to be large and rare. Under natural conditions, *all* but the last innovation produced in equilibrium are harmful (Corollary 6).

Note first that, no matter the value of the current stock, each innovation increases the equilibrium continuation payoff *in expectation*; that is, when averaging across its possible sizes. This is Lemma 1 below. Its (easy) proof is in Appendix G, along with the proofs of the other results in this section.

**Lemma 1.** *For all  $x \geq 0$ ,  $\mathbb{E}_F[v_f(x + \tilde{z})] \geq v_f(x)$ .*

We shall see that innovations may be detrimental *ex post*. The next definition formalises this notion.

**Definition 1.** *Innovations are detrimental if  $\Pr(t \mapsto v_f(\tilde{x}_t) \text{ is increasing}) < 1$ , where  $(\tilde{x}_t)_{t>0}$  describes the evolution of the stock in the equilibrium  $\alpha_f$  of Theorem 2.*

Equivalently, innovations are detrimental whenever, when  $\alpha_f$  is played, with some (strictly positive) probability, we can find periods  $t < t'$  such that  $x_t < x_{t'}$  and  $v_f(x_t) > v_f(x_{t'})$ . Clearly, innovations are detrimental only if  $v_f$  is not increasing over  $[x_0, \infty)$ . If arbitrarily small innovations may arise, the converse holds as well:

**Lemma 2.** *Suppose that (1) holds. Then, innovations are detrimental if and only if  $v_f$  is not increasing on  $[x_0, \infty)$ .*

The next result states a sufficient and essentially necessary condition for the risk of detrimental innovations to persist as long as effort is exerted. Recall from Corollary 3 that, in equilibrium, effort is exerted until the stock reaches the threshold  $x_f$ .

45. If  $\rho = 0$ ,  $y_f = \epsilon(1 + \lambda n - \sqrt{(n^2 - 1)\lambda^2 + 2(n - 1)\lambda + 1})$ . In Figure 2,  $y_f \approx 0.19$ .

46. The expression for  $v_f$  over  $[0, y_f]$  is cumbersome in general. However, if  $\rho = 0$ , then  $v_f(x) = ny_f e^{(x-y_f)/[\epsilon(1+\lambda n)]}$  over  $[0, y_f]$ .

47. Equivalently, decreasing the initial stock  $x_0$  may be beneficial.

**Corollary 5.** *Suppose that (1) holds and (18) admits a least solution  $0 < x_f < \infty$ . Then, innovations are detrimental for any initial stock  $x_0 < x_f$  if (and only if)*

$$b'(x_f)c_{11}(0, x_f) + (n - 1)c_1(0, x_f)\{\lambda\mathbb{E}_F[b'(x_f + \tilde{z})] - c_{12}(0, x_f)\} < (\leq) 0.^{48} \quad (21)$$

Condition (21) describes the impact of a small-sized increment when the stock is close to, but below the cutoff  $x_f$ . Roughly speaking, the innovation increases the current payoff flow (first term), as well as future gross payoffs (first term inside braces), but increases the marginal cost of effort (second term inside braces). If the last force dominates, the drop in effort following the innovation is large enough to counter the aforementioned payoff increase. In short, even though innovations increase the payoff flow, they reduce its growth rate as further increments are delayed, and may be harmful overall.

From the perspective of Corollary 5, increasing the size of the population exacerbates the risk of detrimental innovations. Formally, if the conditions of the corollary are satisfied, they continue to be satisfied after an increase in the number of agents  $n$ . This is immediate since  $x_f$  does not depend on  $n$  (Corollary 3).

Under natural regularity conditions, detrimental innovations will persist in the long run, provided innovations are sufficiently large and rare, and the population is large. Specifically, suppose that  $b$  is unbounded above and  $b'(x)$  vanishes as  $x$  diverges, and that  $c_1(0, 0) = 0$  and  $c_{12}$  is strictly positive. Then,  $0 < x_f < \infty$  and, for any  $\lambda' \leq \lambda$  and  $n' \geq n$ , there is an FOSD-shift  $F'$  of  $F$  such that replacing  $\lambda$ ,  $F$  and  $n$  by  $\lambda'$ ,  $F'$  and  $n'$ , respectively, leaves  $x_f$  unchanged. Moreover, given sufficiently small  $\lambda'$  and large  $n'$ , for any such  $F'$ , (21) holds after the substitution.<sup>49</sup>

The next result characterises detrimental innovations under linear multiplicative payoffs. Recall the definitions of  $M$  and  $y_f$  from Section 4.

**Corollary 6.** *Suppose that (1) holds and that payoffs are linear and multiplicative. Then, innovations are detrimental if and only if  $x_0 < \lambda\mu$  and  $M(x_0 \vee y_f) > \lambda$ . In particular, payoffs drop with innovations raising the stock from any  $x \geq y_f$  to any  $\hat{x} \in (x, \lambda\mu)$  such that  $M(\hat{x}) > \lambda$ .*

Corollary 6 implies that, if innovations are sufficiently rare (that is, if  $\lambda < 1$ ) and,

---

48. Corollary 5 does not speak to the case in which effort is exerted perpetually. In this case, for some pathological payoff functions, innovations can be detrimental for all  $x_0 \geq 0$ . However, under the natural assumption that  $b(x) - c(a, x)$  may be expressed as  $g(a)h(x) - k(a) + l(x)$  for some maps  $g, k : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$  and  $h, l : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ , innovations are not detrimental for large enough  $x_0$ .

49. In detail, since  $b$  is unbounded above, given  $\lambda' \in (0, \lambda)$ , there exists an FOSD shift  $F'$  of  $F$  such that  $\lambda'\mathbb{E}_{F'}[b(x_f + \tilde{z})] = \lambda\mathbb{E}_F[b(x_f + \tilde{z})]$ . This guarantees that  $x_f$  is unchanged by the substitution. For the last part, note that  $c_{12}(0, x_f) > 0$  and  $c_1(0, x_f) > 0$  since  $c_{12}$  is strictly positive, and  $\mathbb{E}_F[b'(x_f + \tilde{z})] > 0$  since  $b$  is unbounded above. Take  $\lambda' < c_{12}(0, x_f)/\{2\mathbb{E}_F[b'(x_f + \tilde{z})]\}$  and  $n' > 1 + 2b'(x_f)c_{11}(0, x_f)/[c_1(0, x_f)c_{12}(0, x_f)]$ . Note that  $\mathbb{E}_{F'}[b'(x_f + \tilde{z})] \leq \mathbb{E}_F[b'(x_f + \tilde{z})]$  for any FOSD-shift  $F'$  of  $F$ , since  $b$  is concave. Then, (21) holds with  $\lambda = \lambda'$ ,  $F = F'$  and  $n = n'$ , since both terms in the left-hand side are lower than  $c_{12}(0, x_f)/2$ .

given  $x_0 \in (0, \lambda\mu)$ , the population is sufficiently large so that  $y_f \leq x_0$ ,<sup>50</sup> all but the last innovation produced in equilibrium are harmful. It also implies that innovations are detrimental if, given any frequency  $\lambda$  of innovations and any distribution  $F$  of their size, the initial technology is sufficiently unproductive (i.e.  $x_0$  is small enough), and the population is large enough.<sup>51</sup> However, as the example below illustrates, the expected share of innovations produced in equilibrium that are harmful may be arbitrarily large even if the number of agents is fixed and small increments are arbitrarily frequent, provided large ones are rare. Finally, Corollary 6 yields that innovations never cease to be detrimental after  $F$  undergoes a mean-preserving spread, provided  $x_0 > 0$  and the population is sufficiently large.<sup>52</sup>

I show in Appendices L and M that, for innovations to be detrimental, production must be stochastic *and* payoffs must not be separable. That is to say, the co-existence of the two main features distinguishing this model from the literature on public good-games are necessary for payoffs to drop after an increase in the stock.

**Example.** Under what conditions is the equilibrium payoff  $v_f$  given in (20) increasing? We know from above that this requires innovations to be sufficiently frequent (formally,  $\lambda > 1$ ) and, ceteris paribus, the number  $n$  of agents to be sufficiently small. If  $\lambda > 1$  and  $\rho > 0$ ,  $\arg \min_{[y_f, x_f]} v_f = y_f \vee \hat{x}_f$ , where

$$\hat{x}_f := \lambda\rho\zeta + \epsilon \left[ \lambda(1 - \rho) - \frac{\epsilon}{\rho} \log \left( \frac{1 - \rho}{1 - \lambda\rho} \right) \right] > 0$$

and the inequality holds since, by hypothesis,  $\lambda\rho < 1$  and  $(1 - \lambda\rho)\zeta \geq \epsilon\lambda(1 - \rho)$ . Thus,  $v_f$  is increasing if and only if  $\hat{x}_t \leq y_f$  or, equivalently,<sup>53</sup>

$$[1 + \lambda\rho(n - 1)]\hat{x}_f \leq \epsilon(1 - \lambda\rho) + \lambda\rho\zeta. \quad (22)$$

Hence, ceteris paribus, innovations are detrimental (i.e.  $v_f$  is non-monotone) if substantial innovations are sufficiently beneficial (i.e.  $\zeta$  is large enough), or small improvements have sufficiently little value (i.e.  $\epsilon$  is small enough). Moreover, if  $y_f \leq x_0 < \hat{x}_f$ , equilibrium continuation payoffs decrease with each innovation until the stock reaches  $\hat{x}_f$ . Then, if  $\epsilon$  is small, with high probability, a large fraction of the small improvements produced in equilibrium (formally, of innovations with size less than  $\zeta$ ) cause payoffs to drop, since  $x_f - \hat{x}_f$  is small in this case and effort ceases once the stock reaches  $x_f$ . These conclusions continue to hold in the limit as small improvements become arbitrarily small

---

50. Note that, from (19),  $y_f$  is decreasing in  $n$  with  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} y_f = 0$ .

51. This is because  $M > \lambda$  in a neighbourhood of 0, by (the multivariate) Jensens' inequality.

52. This is because, given  $x_0 > 0$ ,  $y_f \leq x_0$  before and after the spread for large enough  $n$ , and  $M$  increases pointwise. Thus, if  $M(x_0 \vee y_f) > \lambda$  before the spread, this holds after the spread as well.

53. To obtain (22), note that  $\hat{x}_t \leq y_f$  if and only if  $\alpha_f(\hat{x}_f) = 1$ , which is equivalent to  $n\hat{x}_f \leq v(\hat{x}_f)$ .

and frequent.<sup>54</sup>

## 5 Disposal

In this section, I extend the model by allowing each agent to freely dispose of the innovations that she produces, after observing their size. Among other things, I show that this raises equilibrium effort and improves payoffs relative to the baseline setting.

### 5.1 Model

Enrich the model as follows. Whenever agent  $i$  obtains an innovation of size  $z > 0$  at time  $t \geq 0$ , she (immediately) decides whether or not to reduce  $z$  to 0, after observing  $z$ . That is to say, agent  $i$  may either disclose the innovation (which results in its immediate adoption by all agents), or discard it. Assume that the arrival and size of innovations is private information, and that the disposal of innovations is unobserved. In particular, if an agent obtains and discards an innovation at some time  $t$ , her opponents will not be able to distinguish this event from the event that the agent does not obtain an innovation at time  $t$ . However, agents are immediately informed of any innovation that is disclosed, including its size and the identity of the agent disclosing it. For simplicity, I rule out strategies that condition on innovations discarded in the past.<sup>55</sup>

We recover the baseline model (Section 2) by restricting the agents' strategies so that all innovations produced are disclosed. I refer to the baseline model as the game *with forced disclosure*, and to this model as the game *with disposal*.

Below is a brief description of histories, strategies and continuation payoffs, which are defined in Appendix B. Each agent reaches a private history set whenever she either produces or discards an innovation, or any agent discloses. Thus (almost surely), agents reach finitely many private histories within any bounded interval of time. Public histories are formally unchanged (see (5) in Section 2), but they now only record *disclosed* innovations. A strategy  $\xi^i := (\sigma^i, \chi^i)$  specifies, for each public history  $h_m$ , an effort schedule  $\sigma^i(h_m) : (t_m, \infty) \rightarrow [0, 1]$  and a disclosure policy  $\chi^i(h_m) : (t_m, \infty) \times (0, \infty) \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ . As before, agent  $i$  exerts effort  $[\sigma^i(h_m)](t)$  at any time  $t > t_m$  such that no innovation was disclosed within the time interval  $[t_m, t)$ . Moreover, if agent  $i$  produces an innovation of size  $z$  at such a time  $t$ , she discloses it if  $[\chi(h_m)](t, z) = 1$ , and discards it other-

---

54. Formally, in the limit as  $\lambda$  grows and  $\epsilon$  and  $\rho$  vanish while  $\lambda' := \lambda\rho < 1$  and  $\epsilon' := \epsilon(1/\rho - 1)$  remain fixed,  $\hat{x}_f \rightarrow \lambda'(\epsilon' + \zeta) + \epsilon' \log(1 - \lambda')$  and (22) becomes:  $[1 + \lambda'(n - 1)]\hat{x}_f \leq \lambda'\zeta$ . Thus, innovations are detrimental for large  $n$ , large  $\zeta$ , or small  $\epsilon$ . Simple computations yield that innovations are detrimental for small enough  $\lambda'$  as well. If instead substantial innovations are infeasible (i.e. if  $\rho = 0$ ), then  $\hat{x}_f = \epsilon$  and (22) simplifies to  $n \leq 1 + \frac{1}{2}(\lambda - 1/\lambda)$ , so that the size  $\epsilon$  of innovations no longer plays a role.

55. Admitting these strategies would complicate the definition of the game without affecting the results. Welfare would be maximised by the same profile, and the unique strongly symmetric equilibrium (in which, by definition, strategies cannot condition on discarded innovations), would continue to exist.

wise. Note that it is not necessary to keep track of discarded innovations, due to the restriction to public strategies. For the same reason, beliefs play no role, and subgames beginning at any given private history are well-defined. If agents play a strategy profile  $\xi := (\sigma^i, \chi^i)_{i=1}^n$ , the continuation payoff  $v_\xi^i(h_m)$  to agent  $i$  at a public history  $h_m$  may be expressed as the right-hand side of (6), with the random path  $(\tilde{h}_l)_{l=m}^{\tilde{m}}$  obviously having a different distribution.

For the purposes of our analysis, the game with disposal is equivalent to the following richer environment. In any period  $t \geq 0$ , each agent possesses a set of concealed increments  $Z_t^i \subset (0, \infty)$ , initially empty. Whenever agent  $i$  obtains an innovation of size  $z > 0$ , she chooses  $d_t^i \in Z_t^i \cup \{z, 0\}$ . If  $d_t^i = 0$ , the value  $z$  is added to the set  $Z_t^i$  (and the stock  $x_t$  does not grow). Otherwise, the stock  $x_t$  increases by  $d_t^i$  and  $Z_t^1, \dots, Z_t^n$  are emptied.

Say that agent  $i$  *discloses* an innovation (of size  $d_t^i$  at time  $t$ ) if  $d_t^i > 0$ , and *conceals* otherwise.<sup>56</sup> Assume that the arrival and size of innovations as well as the sets  $Z_t^i$  are private information, and the concealment of innovations is unobserved. However, agents are immediately informed of any innovation that is disclosed, including its size and the identity of the agent disclosing it.

This richer environment may be interpreted as follows. At any point in time, agents collectively seek solutions to a given problem. Each agent discovers a solution whenever she produces an innovation, and the size of the innovation describes its quality. Disclosing an innovation means (disclosing and) implementing a particular solution. When this occurs, a new problem is chosen and the search for solutions begins anew.<sup>57</sup> Solutions geared towards the same problem are perfect substitutes; in particular, when one is implemented, the rest may be neglected.

As will be clear from the analysis, all results continue to hold in this richer model.<sup>58</sup>

## 5.2 Welfare benchmark

In this section, I argue that the social-welfare benchmark is unaffected by the introduction of disposal. In particular, disposal of any innovation is inefficient.

A *Markov strategy* is a pair  $\pi := (\alpha, \delta)$  of (Borel measurable) maps  $\alpha : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow [0, 1]$  and  $\delta : \mathbb{R}_+ \times (0, \infty) \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$  such that  $a_t^i = \alpha(x_t)$  for all  $t \geq 0$  and, if agent  $i$  obtains an

---

56. Since time is continuous, the times at which agents can disclose innovations must be restricted in order for the game to be well-defined. Allowing agents to immediately disclose any innovation that they obtain ensures that the strategies of the game with forced disclosure are admissible in this game. Results are unaffected if agents may also disclose at times  $T, 2T, \dots$  for some exogenous  $T > 0$ .

57. In particular, agents may not tackle future problems before a solution to the current one is adopted. This may be due to contractual restrictions if agents are firms engaged in a formal partnership. Alternatively, firms may be unable to predict future problems until a solution to the current one is implemented.

58. In particular, generically, in the unique strongly symmetric equilibrium, no increment that was previously concealed is ever disclosed, as this would require that agents reach (with some probability) heterogeneous information sets over the course of the game and, as a consequence, exert heterogeneous effort. This richer model also admits symmetric perfect Bayesian equilibria that are not strongly symmetric, and are closer in spirit to the equilibrium analysed in Section 6.

innovation of size  $z > 0$  at time  $t$ , she discloses it if  $\delta(x_t, z) = 1$  and discards it otherwise. The reasoning used to derive (8) in Section 3 implies that, fixing a profile  $\pi := (\alpha^i, \delta^i)_{i=1}^n$  of Markov strategies, for all  $x \geq 0$ ,

$$v_\pi^i(x) = b(x) - c(\alpha^i(x), x) + \lambda \mathbb{E}_F \left\{ \left[ \sum_{j=1}^n \alpha^j(x) \delta^j(x, \tilde{z}) \right] [v_\pi^i(x + \tilde{z}) - v_\pi^i(x)] \right\}. \quad (23)$$

In contrast to (8), the rate of arrival of (disclosed) innovations  $\sum_{j=1}^n \alpha^j(x) \delta^j(x, z)$  varies with their size  $z$ .

The social-welfare benchmark (characterised in Theorem 1) is unaffected by the introduction of disposal. This is because, in the non-strategic setting, the effects of disposal on incentives can be ignored. Moreover, disposal of innovations hinders the growth of the payoff flow, since  $b(x) - c(a, x)$  is increasing in  $x$ . I state the result for completeness, and omit the proof as it is straightforward.

**Proposition 1.** *The social-welfare benchmark in the game with disposal is identical to the baseline one. In particular, discarding any innovation produced under  $\alpha_*$  is inefficient.*

### 5.3 Equilibrium

In this section, I show that the game with disposal admits a unique strongly symmetric equilibrium. Moreover, equilibrium effort and payoffs are higher than in the equilibrium of the game with forced disclosure.

Given a public history  $h$  featuring  $m \in \{0, 1, \dots\}$  (disclosed) innovations, write  $h \frown (t, z, i)$  for the public history that features  $m + 1$  innovations and extends  $h$ , and in which the last innovation is disclosed by agent  $i$  at time  $t$ , and has size  $z$ . Suppose that the opponents of agent  $i$  play a strategy  $\xi := (\sigma, \chi)$ , and let  $\hat{v}_\xi^i(h)$  be the largest payoff that agent  $i$  can achieve, across all strategies, in the subgame after public history  $h$ . Given  $h$  leading to time  $t_h \geq 0$ , for all  $t > t_h$ , let  $\hat{v}_{\xi, h}^i(t)$  be the largest payoff achievable by agent  $i$  at time  $t$ , assuming that no innovation was disclosed within the interval  $[t_h, t)$ , and that agent  $i$  does not produce an innovation at time  $t$  (and define  $\hat{v}_{\xi, h}^i(t_h) := \hat{v}_\xi^i(h)$ ). Then, the map  $\hat{v}_{\xi, h}^i : [t_h, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is Lipschitz and, for almost all  $t > t_h$ ,<sup>59</sup>

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{v}_{\xi, h}^i(t) = & \frac{d\hat{v}_{\xi, h}^i}{dt}(t) + b(x) + \max_{a \in [0, 1]} \{ a \lambda \mathbb{E}_F [(\hat{v}_\xi^i(h \frown (t, \tilde{z}, i)) - \hat{v}_{\xi, h}^i(t)) \vee 0] - c(a, x) \} \\ & + \lambda [\sigma(h)](t) \sum_{j \neq i}^n \mathbb{E}_F [\chi(t, \tilde{z}) (\hat{v}_\xi^i(h \frown (t, \tilde{z}, j)) - \hat{v}_{\xi, h}^i(t))]. \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

The strategy  $\xi$  is a best response for agent  $i$  at every private history only if,<sup>60</sup> given any

59. See Appendix B for details on how to derive (24), and Appendix B.1 for (25) and (26).

60. Recall that beliefs play no role, so that information sets may be identified with private histories, and that agents reach a new private history whenever a disclosure occurs, or if they either produce or

public history  $h$  leading to any time  $t_h$ , both of the following conditions hold: for almost all  $t > t_h$ ,

$$[\sigma(h)](t) \in \arg \max_{a \in [0,1]} \{a\lambda \mathbb{E}_F[(\hat{v}_\xi^i(h \smallfrown (t, \tilde{z}, i)) - \hat{v}_{\xi,h}^i(t)) \vee 0] - c(a, x)\} \quad (25)$$

and, furthermore, for all  $t > t_h$  and  $z > 0$ ,

$$[\chi(h)](t, z) \in \arg \max_{d \in \{0,1\}} \{d(\hat{v}_\xi^i(h \smallfrown (t, z, i)) - \hat{v}_{\xi,h}^i(t))\}. \quad (26)$$

A strategy  $\xi := (\sigma, \chi)$  induces a *strongly symmetric equilibrium* if, given that the opponents play the same strategy, it is a best response at every private history.

Recall the definition of Markov strategies from Section 5.2. If the opponents of any given agent play a Markov strategy  $\pi := (\alpha, \delta)$ , the largest continuation payoff that this agent can achieve, across all strategies, is a (value) function  $\hat{v}_{\alpha,\delta}$  of the current stock  $x_t$ , solving

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{v}(x) = & b(x) + \max_{a \in [0,1]} \{a\lambda \mathbb{E}_F[(\hat{v}(x + \tilde{z}) - \hat{v}(x)) \vee 0] - c(a, x)\} \\ & + \lambda(n-1)\alpha(x)\mathbb{E}_F[\delta(x, \tilde{z})(\hat{v}_\pi(x + \tilde{z}) - \hat{v}_\pi(x))]. \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

for all  $x \geq 0$ .<sup>61</sup> Then,  $\pi$  is a best response, after any private history, against opponents playing the same strategy if and only if, for all  $x \geq 0$ , both of the following hold:

$$\alpha(x) \in \arg \max_{a \in [0,1]} \{a\lambda \mathbb{E}_F[(\hat{v}_\pi(x + \tilde{z}) - \hat{v}_\pi(x)) \vee 0] - c(a, x)\}, \quad (28)$$

$$\delta(x, z) \in \arg \max_{d \in \{0,1\}} \{d(\hat{v}_\pi(x + z) - \hat{v}_\pi(x))\} \quad \text{for all } z > 0. \quad (29)$$

The following result characterises the unique strongly symmetric equilibrium of the game. The proof is in Appendix F. The (unique strongly symmetric) equilibrium  $\alpha_f$  of the game with forced disclosure is described in Theorem 2. The notion of detrimental innovations, which applies to the equilibrium  $\alpha_f$ , is defined in Section 4.1.

**Theorem 3.** *The game with disposal admits an (essentially) unique strongly symmetric equilibrium, and it is induced by a Markov strategy  $(\alpha_d, \delta_d)$ . In the absence of innovations at time  $t$ , and for any stock  $x_t$ , effort  $\alpha_d(x_t)$  and continuation payoffs  $v_d(x_t)$  are no lower than their analogues  $\alpha_f(x_t)$  and  $v_f(x_t)$  in the equilibrium with forced disclosure.*

discard an innovation. Condition (25) (resp. (26)) is necessary for  $\xi$  to be a best response at any private history reached either after a disclosure, or after the agent discards an innovation (resp. reached after the agent produces an innovation).

61. This expression is valid as long as neither the agent nor one of her opponents produced an innovation at time  $t$ . Assuming that the agent obtains an innovation of size  $z$  at time  $t$ , the expression becomes  $\hat{v}_\pi(x + z) \vee \hat{v}_\pi(x)$  (where  $\hat{v}_\pi$  is pinned down by (27)). Assuming that one of her opponents obtains the innovation instead, the expression is valid if  $\chi(t, z) = 0$ , and becomes  $\hat{v}_\pi(x + z)$  if  $\chi(t, z) = 1$ . Equation (27) and conditions (28) and (29) follow from e.g. Theorem 3.1.2 of Piunovskiy and Zhang (2020).



Moreover, *ex-ante* payoffs  $v_d(x_0)$  strictly exceed  $v_f(x_0)$  if innovations are detrimental in  $\alpha_f$ . Otherwise, no disposal occurs in  $(\alpha_d, \delta_d)$  and the equilibria coincide.<sup>62</sup>

Allowing agents to discard innovations increases equilibrium payoffs, and strictly so unless all innovations are guaranteed to be beneficial in the equilibrium with forced disclosure. This is because, as can be seen from (29), individual and social incentives for the disposal of innovations are aligned, since the equilibrium is symmetric. That is to say, whenever an agent discloses or discards an innovation in equilibrium, her opponents benefit from it. Moreover, the fact that future detrimental innovations will be discarded increases continuation payoffs at all stock values exceeding the current one and, therefore, the current incentive to exert effort. As a result, equilibrium effort is higher in the game with disposal. This strengthens the positive externality arising from the public nature of the good, increasing payoffs further.<sup>63</sup>

The properties of  $\alpha_f$  described in Theorem 2, Corollary 2 and Corollary 3 are inherited by  $(\alpha_d, \delta_d)$ . Namely, effort  $\alpha_d(x_t)$  is continuous and decreasing in the stock  $x_t$ , and below the benchmark  $\alpha_*(x_t)$ . Assuming that (1) holds, the equilibrium  $(\alpha_d, \delta_d)$  is inefficient unless the initial stock is so large that exerting no effort is efficient (i.e. unless  $\alpha_*(x_0) = 0$ ). If (18) admits a solution then, labelling  $x_f$  the smallest one, no effort is exerted if  $x_0 \geq x_f$  and, if  $x_0 < x_f$ , effort  $\alpha_d(\tilde{x}_t)$  ceases a.s. in finite time, when  $\tilde{x}_t$  reaches  $x_f$ . If (18) admits no solution, effort never ceases and  $\tilde{x}_t \rightarrow \infty$  a.s. as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ . Finally,  $v_d(x_t) - b(x_t)$  is decreasing in  $x_t$ .

**Example.** Figure 3 depicts effort and payoffs in the equilibrium of the game with disposal with  $b(x) = x$ ,  $c(a, x) = ax$ , and  $F(z) = \rho \mathbb{1}_{z \geq \zeta} + (1 - \rho)(1 - e^{-z/\epsilon})$ , in the limit as  $\lambda$  grows and  $\rho$  and  $\epsilon$  vanish while  $\lambda' := \lambda\rho$  and  $\epsilon' := (1/\rho - 1)\epsilon$  remain fixed. In this case, effort ceases at  $x_f = \lambda'(\zeta + \epsilon')$ . Assuming that a substantial innovation raises the stock above this cutoff (i.e. that  $\zeta \geq x_f$ ), and that innovations are detrimental in the equilibrium with forced disclosure (Section 4.1),<sup>64</sup> effort is given by

$$\alpha_d(x) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } x \leq y_d \\ \frac{1}{n-1} \left( \frac{\zeta}{x} - \frac{1}{\lambda'} \right) & \text{if } y_d \leq x \leq \hat{x}_f \\ \frac{1}{\lambda' x^{(n-1)}} \left[ \epsilon' \left( e^{\frac{x-x_f}{\epsilon'}} - 1 \right) + x_f - x \right] & \text{if } \hat{x}_f \leq x \leq x_f \\ 0 & \text{if } x \geq x_f, \end{cases}$$

---

62. Although there may exist multiple equilibria, effort  $\alpha_d$  and the payoff function  $v_d$  are uniquely pinned down. Moreover, for any disclosure policy  $\delta$ , the strategy  $(\alpha_d, \delta)$  induces a strongly symmetric equilibrium if and only if (29) holds with  $\hat{v}_\pi = v_d$  for all  $x \geq 0$ . That is to say, multiplicity arises whenever agents are indifferent about the disposal of some innovations, and any way of breaking the indifferences yields an equilibrium.

63. Moreover, because harmful innovations are discarded, continuation payoffs are guaranteed to increase over time. However, as can be seen from the example below, the *ex-ante* payoffs  $v_d(x_0)$  need not be increasing in the initial stock  $x_0$ . That is, reducing the initial stock may still be beneficial.

64. That is, assuming that  $[1 + \lambda'(n-1)][\lambda'(\epsilon' + \zeta) + \epsilon' \log(1 - \lambda')] > \lambda'\zeta$ . See footnote 54 for details.




Figure 3: Effort (left) and payoffs (right) in the strongly symmetric equilibrium of the game with disposal, as functions of the stock  $x_t$ . The dotted lines are effort  $\alpha_f$  (left) and payoffs  $v_f$  (right) in the equilibrium of the game with forced disclosure. Parameter values are  $b(x) = x$ ,  $c(a, x) = ax$ ,  $n = 5$ ,  $F(z) = \rho \mathbb{1}_{z \geq \zeta} + (1 - \rho)(1 - e^{-z/\epsilon})$ ,  $\zeta = 5$ ,  $\lambda = 0.1/\rho$ , and  $\epsilon = \rho/(1 - \rho)$ , where  $\rho > 0$  is arbitrarily small.

where

$$y_d = \frac{\lambda' \zeta}{1 + \lambda'(n - 1)} \quad \& \quad \hat{x}_f = x_f + \epsilon' \log(1 - \lambda').^{65}$$

The disposal policy is such that substantial innovations are always adopted, whereas infinitesimal increments are discarded if and only if the current stock lies within  $[y_d, \hat{x}_f]$ .

Ex-ante payoffs, as a function of the initial stock, are given by

$$v_d(x) = \begin{cases} \frac{n}{1 + \lambda'n} \left\{ e^{\frac{1 + \lambda'n}{\epsilon'}(x - y_d)} \left[ y - \lambda'n \left( \zeta + \frac{\epsilon' \lambda'n}{1 + \lambda'n} \right) \right] + \lambda'n \left( x + \zeta + \frac{\epsilon' \lambda'n}{1 + \lambda'n} \right) \right\} & \text{if } x \leq y_d \\ \zeta + \left( 1 - \frac{1}{\lambda'} \right) x & \text{if } y_d \leq x \leq \hat{x}_f \\ \frac{1}{\lambda'} \left[ \epsilon' \left( e^{\frac{x - x_f}{\epsilon'}} - 1 \right) - (1 - \lambda')x + x_f \right] & \text{if } \hat{x}_f \leq x \leq x_f \\ x & \text{if } x \geq x_f. \end{cases}$$

## 6 Concealment

In this section, I extend the baseline model by allowing agents to conceal the innovations that they obtain for a period of time, after observing their size. Among other things, I show that the resulting game admits a relatively simple equilibrium which, under reasonable conditions, improves on the equilibrium  $\alpha_f$  with forced disclosure. Throughout, I restrict attention to linear multiplicative payoffs, introduced in Section 2.

65. Since innovations are detrimental,  $y_d < \hat{x}_f < x_f$ . In the picture,  $y_d \approx 0.36$  and  $\hat{x}_f \approx 0.49$ .

## 6.1 Model

As before,  $x_t$  denotes the (public) stock of the good and, at any time  $t \geq 0$ , agent  $i$  exerts hidden effort  $a_t^i \in [0, 1]$  and obtains payoff flow  $(1 - a_t^i)x_t$ .

Each agent  $i$  possesses a *private stock*  $k_t^i$  of the good, initially equal to  $x_0$ . Agent  $i$  produces increments in  $k_t^i$  (instead of  $x_t$ ) at rate  $\lambda a_t^i$ . The distribution  $F$  of the size of increments (i.e., of innovations) inherits the properties described in Section 2 and, for simplicity, is assumed to be Lipschitz continuous. Moreover, each agent  $i$  picks a *disclosure*  $d_t^i \in [x_t, k_t^i]$  whenever she obtains an innovation,<sup>66</sup> and at any time  $t$  such that  $k_t^i > x_t$  and either  $x_t = x_0$  or  $t \in \mathcal{T}$ , where  $\mathcal{T} \subset [0, \infty)$  is exogenous and  $\mathcal{T} \cap [0, T]$  is finite for all  $T > 0$ . If a (non-empty) set of agents  $I \subseteq \{1, \dots, n\}$  pick disclosures  $(d_t^i)_{i \in I}$  at time  $t$ , the public stock  $x_t$  rises (weakly) to  $\max\{d_t^i : i \in I\}$ , and the private stocks  $k_t^j$  that laid below this value rise to it, while the rest are unchanged. In particular, neither  $x_t$  nor any  $k_t^j$  increase if  $d_t^i = x_t$  for all  $i \in I$ . Whenever agent  $i$  picks  $d_t^i$  at time  $t$ , say that she *conceals* if  $d_t^i = x_t$ , *discloses fully* if  $d_t^i = k_t^i > x_t$ , and *discloses partially* if  $x_t < d_t^i < k_t^i$ .

Note that, in any period  $t$  at which agent  $i$  does not obtain an increment, and such that  $x_t > x_0$  and  $t \notin \mathcal{T}$ , agent  $i$  does *not* pick  $d_t^i$ . Thus, each agent is free to disclose at any point in time as long as no disclosure occurred but, after a disclosure occurs, she can only disclose at one of the times in  $\mathcal{T}$ , or immediately after having obtained an innovation. This and other assumptions are discussed in the next section.

Assume that agents' effort, private stocks, as well as the production and size of innovations are private information, and that the concealment of innovations is not observed. In particular, if agent  $i$  produces an innovation at time  $t$  and conceals it, her opponents will not be able to distinguish this event from the event that agent  $i$  does not produce an increment at time  $t$ . If instead agent  $i$  chooses  $d_t^i > x_t$ , the opponents of agent  $i$  are immediately informed of her identity and of the value of  $d_t^i$ . However, as they do not observe  $k_t^i$ , they cannot distinguish partial from full disclosures.

I restrict attention to pure strategies. We recover the game with forced disclosure (Section 2) by restricting the agents' strategies, namely, by imposing that agents always disclose fully. I refer to this model as the *game with concealment*.

Below is a brief description of histories, strategies, and continuation payoffs, which are defined in Appendix C. Each agent  $i$  reaches a new information set whenever one of the following events occurs: agent  $i$  produces an innovation, or one or more agents (including  $i$ ) disclose, either partially or fully. The constraint on disclosures ensures that agents reach only finitely many information sets within any bounded period of time. A

---

66. If agent  $i$  obtains an innovation at time  $t$ ,  $k_t^i$  denotes her private stock *after* the innovation.

private history for agent  $i$  is a finite sequence

$$h := (x_0, (t_1, e_1), \dots, (t_m, e_m))$$

where  $0 \leq t_1 \leq \dots \leq t_l$ , and each  $e_l$  describes one of the two aforementioned events, occurring at time  $t_l$ . Private histories pin down the current time  $t_m = T(h)$ , the public stock  $x_{t_m} = X(h)$ , as well as agent  $i$ 's private stock  $k_{t_m}^i = K^i(h)$ . A strategy  $\xi^i = (\sigma^i, \chi^i)$  specifies, for each  $h$ , an effort schedule  $\sigma^i(h) : (T(h), \infty) \rightarrow [0, 1]$  and a disclosure policy  $\chi^i(h) : [T(h), \infty) \times [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, 1]$ . Agent  $i$  exerts effort  $[\sigma^i(h)](t)$  at any time  $t > T(h)$  such that she produced no innovation within  $[T(h), t)$ , and no agent disclosed within this interval. Moreover, whenever agent  $i$  picks a disclosure  $d_t^i$  at any time  $t \geq T(h)$  with the aforementioned property,  $d_t^i = X(h) + [K^i(h) + z - X(h)][\chi^i(t)](t, z)$  if agent  $i$  produced an innovation of size  $z > 0$  at time  $t$ , and  $d_t^i = X(h) + [K^i(h) - X(h)][\chi^i(t)](t, 0)$  otherwise.<sup>67</sup> An *information set* for agent  $i$  is a pair  $(h, b)$ , where  $h$  is a private history and  $b$  is a *belief*; that is, a distribution over the most recent private histories  $(h^j)_{j \neq i}$  reached by the opponents of agent  $i$ . If agents play a strategy profile  $\xi := (\sigma^i, \chi^i)_{i=1}^n$ , the continuation payoff  $v_\xi^i(h, b)$  to agent  $i$  at information set  $(h, b)$  may be expressed as

$$v_\xi^i(h, b) := \mathbb{E} \left( \sum_{m=0}^{\tilde{m}} \int_{T(\tilde{h}_m)}^{T(\tilde{h}_{m+1})} e^{T(h)-t} (1 - [\sigma^i(\tilde{h}_l)](t)) X(\tilde{h}_l) dt \right)$$

where  $\tilde{m} \in \{0, 1, \dots, \infty\}$  is the total number of information sets reached by agent  $i$  after time  $T(h)$ ,  $\tilde{h}_l$  is the private history associated with the  $l^{\text{th}}$  information set,  $\tilde{h}_0 := h$  and, if  $\tilde{m} < \infty$ , then  $T(\tilde{h}_{\tilde{m}+1}) := \infty$ .

## 6.2 Discussion of the assumptions

Recall that, in the game *with disposal* (Section 5), agents may either discard or disclose the innovations that they produce. Concealing innovations is more profitable than discarding them, as it enables agents to ‘build’ on the hidden increment.<sup>68</sup>

However, concealing innovations leads to a stark form of redundancy. To see why, suppose that agent  $i$  obtains an innovation of size  $z$  at time  $t$ , and conceals it, while agent  $j$  obtains an innovation of size  $z' > z$  at time  $t' > t$ , and discloses fully. Then, agent  $i$ 's private stock rises from  $x_0 + z$  to  $x_0 + z'$  at time  $t'$ , but no further: the innovations are perfect substitutes and, since agent  $j$ 's innovation is superior, agent  $i$ 's innovation is discarded at time  $t'$ . A more realistic model would feature some degree of complementarity

67. The constraint on disclosures translates into the following restriction on the map  $\chi^i(h)$ : for any  $t > T(h)$  such that  $[\chi^i(h)](t, 0) > 0$ ,  $K^i(h) > X(h)$  and either  $t \in \mathcal{T}$  or  $X(h) = x_0$ .

68. To see why, consider an agent who obtains innovations of sizes  $z$  and  $z'$  at times  $t < t'$ . If, in the game with disposal, she discards the first increment and discloses the second, the stock  $x_t$  takes value  $x_0$  until time  $t'$ , then jumps up to  $x_0 + z'$ . However, if the agent conceals the first increment and discloses fully upon obtaining the second,  $x_t$  jumps to  $x_0 + z + z'$  at time  $t'$ .

between innovations. In this example, agent  $j$ 's disclosure at time  $t'$  would raise  $i$ 's stock to a value above  $x_0 + z'$ . However, despite this extreme form of redundancy, concealment may be beneficial in equilibrium (Proposition 3).

After the first disclosure, agents can only disclose at times in the set  $\mathcal{T}$ , or whenever they obtain an innovation. This constraint is imposed entirely for tractability.<sup>69</sup> Because the time of the first disclosure is unrestricted, the choice of  $\mathcal{T}$  does not affect (on path) the equilibrium that I analyse.

A simpler model would constrain the agents to either fully disclose or conceal their innovations. Formally, it would require that  $d_t^i \in \{x_t, k_t^i\}$ . With this restriction, agents may have an incentive to disclose fully as evidence to their opponents that they are not concealing more substantial innovations. Doing so would be beneficial, as it would raise the opponents' incentives to exert effort. Hence, this is likely to play an important role in equilibrium. I do not analyse this setting as it seems economically less relevant.<sup>70</sup>

### 6.3 Welfare benchmark

The social-welfare benchmark (Theorem 1) is unaffected by the introduction of concealment. This is because, in the non-strategic setting, the effects of delayed disclosure on incentives can be ignored. Moreover, concealing innovations hinders the growth of the payoff flow, and may lead to redundancy. I state the result for completeness, and omit the proof as it is straightforward.

**Proposition 2.** *The social-welfare benchmark in the game with concealment is identical to that of the game with forced disclosure. In particular, efficiency requires that all innovations produced under  $\alpha_*$  be disclosed fully.*

### 6.4 Equilibrium

In this section, I construct a symmetric perfect Bayesian equilibrium of the game with concealment. We shall see in the next section that, under reasonable conditions, ex-ante payoffs in this equilibrium exceed those of the equilibrium  $\alpha_f$  with forced disclosure.

A *perfect Bayesian equilibrium* (PBE) is composed of a profile of strategies  $\xi$  and a profile of beliefs  $\beta$ .<sup>71</sup> The equilibrium  $\alpha_f$  with forced disclosure (Theorem 2), coupled with the 'full-disclosure' policy, is a natural candidate equilibrium in the game with concealment. I begin by showing that it *is* a PBE (for some belief profile) if and only if

---

69. Without it, the game would not be well-defined, as time is continuous. Allowing agents to disclose whenever they produce an innovation ensures that the equilibrium  $\alpha_f$  of the game with forced disclosure is a well-defined strategy profile in this environment.

70. Requiring instead that  $d_t^i \in \{k_s^i : 0 \leq s \leq t\} \cap [x_t, \infty)$  would not affect the analysis.

71. Definitions of strategies, beliefs, and PBE are in Appendix C. Since agents reach finitely many information sets within any bounded interval of time, the standard notion of PBE (for discrete-time games) applies to this setting.

the initial stock is so large that no effort is exerted. Since effort  $\alpha_f(x_t)$  is decreasing in the current stock  $x_t$ , no effort is exerted in equilibrium if and only if  $\alpha_f(x_0) = 0$ . From Corollary 3,  $\alpha_f(x_0) = 0$  if and only if  $x_0 \geq \lambda\mu$ , where  $\mu$  is the average size of innovations.

**Lemma 3.** *Suppose that (1) holds. Then, the effort schedule  $\alpha_f$ , coupled with the ‘full-disclosure’ policy, forms a symmetric PBE of the game with concealment (for some profile of beliefs) if and only if  $x_0 \geq \lambda\mu$ .*

Lemma 3 is proved in Appendix I. It shows that agents may have an incentive to conceal innovations even if they are not detrimental in equilibrium (in the sense defined in Section 4.1). For instance, in the example introduced in Section 2, innovations are detrimental if and only if (22) fails. Yet, full disclosure is incentive-compatible if and only if  $x_0 \geq \lambda\mu$ . This is because innovations are detrimental if and only if agents have an incentive to discard them (see Section 5), and concealment is more profitable than disposal as it allows agents to ‘build’ on the concealed increments.<sup>72</sup>

The next result describes a symmetric PBE of the game with concealment. The proof is in Appendix I.

**Theorem 4.** *There exists a symmetric PBE  $(\xi_c, \beta_c)$  such that, in any period  $t$  prior to which no disclosure occurred, agent  $i$  exerts effort  $\alpha_t^c(k_t^i)$  and conceals (resp. discloses fully) if  $k_t^i < (\geq) q(t)$ , where  $\alpha_t^c(k)$  is increasing in  $k$  and  $\lambda\mu \leq q(t) \leq \lambda\mu n$ . Moreover, agent  $i$ ’s continuation payoff in any such period  $t$  may be expressed as  $v_t^c(k_t^i)$ , where  $v_t^c(k)$  is increasing in  $k$ . On the equilibrium path, no effort is exerted after a disclosure occurs.<sup>73</sup>*

The equilibrium  $(\xi_c, \beta_c)$  is chosen so that no effort is exerted if  $x_0 \geq \lambda\mu$ . The rest of the discussion focuses on the case  $x_0 < \lambda\mu$ . In this case, agents conceal innovations as long as their respective stocks  $k_t^i$  lie below the common, time-varying cutoff  $q(t)$ . As soon as  $k_t^i$  reaches  $q(t)$  for some  $i$ , agent  $i$  discloses fully. Moreover, at the time of the disclosure,  $k_t^i \geq q(t) \geq k_t^j$  for all  $j \neq i$ , so that each  $k_t^j$  rises to  $k_t^i$ . That is to say, the first innovation disclosed (on the equilibrium path) is the best available at the time of disclosure. No effort is exerted past this time. From Lemma 3, this is incentive-compatible since the disclosure raises the public stock above  $\lambda\mu$ .

At any time  $t$  before the disclosure, agents believe that the private stocks of their opponents are i.i.d. with the same distribution (call it  $G_t$ ). As time passes *without a*

---

72. See footnote 68 for an illustration of the benefits of concealment over disposal. I show in Appendices L and M that, if either payoffs are separable (that is, if they satisfy (7)) or the size of innovations is fixed, then the effort schedule  $\alpha_f$ , coupled with the full-disclosure policy, forms an equilibrium of the game with concealment. That is to say, the two main features distinguishing this model from the public-good games literature are necessary to induce agents to not only discard, but also conceal innovations.

73. To prove Theorem 4, I obtain a Bellman equation for the map  $v^c$  and derive a condition guaranteeing that candidates  $\alpha^c$  and  $q$  induce a Bayes Nash equilibrium. I then construct a sequence of triplets  $(\alpha^c, q, v^c)$  satisfying this condition for an increasingly precise approximation of the Bellman equation, and argue that it converges to a triplet inducing a Bayes Nash equilibrium. I end by specifying off-path behaviour and beliefs inducing a PBE.

*disclosure*, agents need not become more optimistic about their opponents' progress. Formally,  $G_t$  need not grow in the FOSD-sense over time and, therefore, the cutoff  $q(t)$  need not be increasing in  $t$ . Hence, the disclosure may be due to a drop in  $q(t)$  as well as to an innovation.

Equilibrium effort  $\alpha_t^c(k_t^i)$  is increasing in  $k_t^i$ . This is because effort is beneficial ex-post if and only if it leads to a disclosure. The smaller the distance between  $k_t^i$  and the cutoff  $q(t)$ , the larger the impact of effort on the time to a disclosure, and thus, the higher the benefit of exerting effort. Moreover, the cost of effort does not grow as  $k_t^i$  grows, since it is determined by the public stock  $x_t$ , which is constant at  $x_0$  until the disclosure.

The payoff  $v_t^c(k_t^i)$  is increasing in the private stock  $k_t^i$  since a higher  $k_t^i$  brings agent  $i$  closer to a disclosure, but does not weaken her opponents' incentives for effort, as they do not observe  $k_t^i$ . As a consequence, when the disclosure occurs, all agents are better off. Indeed, if agent  $i$  discloses at time  $t$ , then she discloses  $k_t^i \geq q(t)$ , so that the payoff to any opponent  $j$  rises from  $v_t^c(k_t^j)$  to  $k_t^i = v_t^c(k_t^i)$ , as  $k_t^j \leq q(t)$ .

The equilibrium  $(\xi_c, \beta_c)$  involves 'punishments' for any agent  $i$  disclosing a value  $d_t^i < q(t)$  at any time  $t$  before which no disclosure occurred. If agent  $i$  does so, her opponents believe her private stock to be large and, as a consequence, exert no effort and never disclose after time  $t$ , no matter how agent  $i$  behaves.<sup>74</sup>

## 6.5 The benefits of concealment

In this section, I derive a sufficient condition for the ex-ante payoffs in the equilibrium  $(\xi_c, \beta_c)$  of the game with concealment to exceed those of the equilibrium  $\alpha_f$  of the game with forced disclosure. This is the case if e.g. there are sufficiently many agents, and the size of innovations is sufficiently 'uncertain'.

Recall that,  $(\xi_c, \beta_c)$  and  $\alpha_f$  coincide if  $x_0 \geq \lambda\mu$ , as no effort is exerted in either equilibrium. Outside of this trivial case, the impact of concealment on equilibrium payoffs is less obvious than that of disposal, analysed in Theorem 3. This is because private and social incentives for the disposal of innovations are aligned in equilibrium (i.e. agents discard innovations whenever this benefits their opponents), whereas incentives for their concealment are misaligned. Indeed, in  $(\xi_c, \beta_c)$ , an agent with private stock  $k_t^i < q(t)$  prefers to conceal than to disclose fully, even though full disclosure would benefit any

---

74. To see why this punishment is sustainable, note that the opponents of agent  $i$  expect her to disclose fully as soon as she obtains an innovation and, in some cases, no later than some given time  $t' \in \mathcal{T}$ . If agent  $i$  discloses a value lower than expected (at any time after  $t$ ), or does not disclose at time  $t'$ , her opponents will detect another deviation, and continue to believe her private stock to be large. This equilibrium does not satisfy the Intuitive Criterion (Cho and Kreps 1987) as, if  $k_t^i$  were indeed large, agent  $i$  would be strictly better off if she disclosed  $k_t^i$  at time  $t$  than a value  $d_t^i < q(t)$ . An equilibrium that satisfies the Intuitive Criterion and features the 'cutoff' disclosure pattern of  $(\xi_c, \beta_c)$  is unlikely to exist, as no sustainable punishments could discourage agent  $i$  from disclosing at time  $t$  if  $q(t)$  is large and  $k_t^i > x_0$  is small compared to  $q(t)$ .



opponent with a given stock  $k_t^j < q(t)$ , provided  $k_t^i$  is sufficiently close to  $q(t)$ .<sup>75</sup>

Despite the misaligned incentives, concealment is beneficial under general conditions, as the following result shows. Recall that the ex-ante payoffs in  $(\xi_c, \beta_c)$  and  $\alpha_f$  are  $v_0^c(x_0)$  and  $v_f(x_0)$ , respectively.

**Proposition 3.** *Suppose that  $x_0 < \lambda\mu$ , (1) holds and*

$$x_0 < \lambda \mathbb{E}_F[(\tilde{z} + x_0 - \lambda\mu) \vee 0]. \quad (30)$$

*Then, if the number of agents  $n$  is sufficiently large,  $v_0^c(x_0) > v_f(x_0)$  for any PBE  $(\xi_c, \beta_c)$  satisfying the conditions of Theorem 4.*

Proposition 3 is proved in Appendix J. Condition (30) holds as long as  $\lambda \leq 1$ , or if  $F(\lambda\mu) < 1$  and  $x_0$  is sufficiently small,<sup>76</sup> or if the size of innovations is sufficiently ‘uncertain’. For instance, in the example introduced in Section 2, (30) holds as long as the size  $\zeta$  of substantial innovations is sufficiently large, even in the limit as small increments become arbitrarily small and frequent.<sup>77</sup>

Condition (30) is essentially equivalent to a single innovation being disclosed in the equilibrium  $(\alpha_d, \delta_d)$  of the game with disposal. This ensures that  $v_0^c(x_0)$  exceeds ex-ante payoffs in  $(\alpha_d, \delta_d)$  (and, therefore, exceeds  $v_f(x_0)$ ), unless maximal effort is exerted at the outset in  $(\xi_c, \beta_c)$ . In the latter case,  $v_0^c(x_0) > v_f(x_0)$  as the number of agents is large.

If the conditions of Proposition 3 are not met, agents may in principle be *worse off* in the equilibrium with concealment than in the equilibrium with forced disclosure. Among other things, this is because agents cannot build on each others’ innovations in  $(\xi_c, \beta_c)$ . This suggests that the game with concealment admits other, potentially superior PBE with a richer disclosure pattern.<sup>78</sup>

75. Since full disclosure results in the payoff of each agent  $j$  to jump from  $v_t^c(k_t^j)$  to  $k_t^i$ , it suffices to show that  $k < v_t^c(k) < q(t)$  for any  $k < q(t)$ . The first inequality holds since  $q$  is lower-semicontinuous (Proposition 5 in Appendix I). For the second, note that  $v_t^c(k) < v_t^c(q(t)) = q(t)$  where the first inequality holds since  $v_t^c(k)$  is increasing in  $k$  and, clearly, non-constant over  $[k, q(t)]$ , and the second follows from Proposition 5 and Lemma 5.

76. In detail, (30) is equivalent to  $\psi(x_0) \geq 0$ , where  $\psi(x_0) := \lambda \mathbb{E}_F[(\tilde{z} + x_0 - \lambda\mu) \vee 0] - x_0$ . Moreover,  $\psi$  is absolutely continuous on  $\mathbb{R}_+$  with  $\psi(\lambda\mu) = 0$  and a.e. derivative  $\psi'(x_0) = \lambda[1 - F((\lambda\mu - x_0) \vee 0)] - 1$ . Then, if  $\lambda \leq 1$ ,  $\psi$  is decreasing and hence positive on  $[0, \lambda\mu]$ . If  $\lambda > 1$  then  $\psi(0) > 0$  and  $\psi$  is convex, so that it crosses 0 from above on  $[0, \lambda\mu]$ .

77. Indeed, if  $F$  is given by (4), (30) becomes:  $x_0 < \lambda[\rho(\zeta - \lambda\epsilon \frac{1-\rho}{1-\lambda\rho}) + \epsilon \frac{1-\rho}{1-\lambda\rho} e^{-\{\lambda[\rho\zeta + (1-\rho)\epsilon] - x_0\}/\epsilon}]$ . Moreover, in the limit as  $\lambda$  diverges and  $\rho$  and  $\epsilon$  vanish while  $\lambda' := \lambda\rho < 1$  and  $\epsilon' := (1/\rho - 1)\epsilon$  remain fixed, (30) becomes:  $x_0 < \lambda'[\zeta - \lambda'\epsilon'/(1 - \lambda')]$ .

78. In order for a direct comparison with  $\alpha_f$  to remain possible it is necessary that, immediately after an agent discloses, her belief about her opponents’ private stocks matches their beliefs about her own stock. Indeed, if the beliefs differed, the agent would likely exert a different amount of effort than her opponents after the disclosure. Thus, the candidate equilibrium would require a substantially larger degree of co-ordination between agents than  $\alpha_f$ . The following two-stage disclosure policy guarantees that beliefs ‘match’ in the aforementioned sense. Given some  $\hat{q}, \bar{q} : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow (x_0, \infty)$  such that  $\hat{q}(t) < \bar{q}(t)$  for all  $t \geq 0$ , and some  $\gamma : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ , at any time  $t$  prior to which no disclosure occurred, each agent  $i$  conceals if  $k_t^i < \hat{q}(t)$ , discloses fully if  $k_t^i \geq \bar{q}(t)$ , and discloses the value  $\hat{q}(t)$  at rate  $\gamma(t)$  if  $\hat{q}(t) \leq k_t^i < \bar{q}(t)$ .

## 7 Conclusion

In this paper, agents exert hidden effort to produce randomly-sized improvements in a shared technology, modelled as increments in the stock of a public good. There is a trade-off between using and improving the technology: not only does the payoff flow grow as progress is made, but so does the opportunity cost of effort. Because effort is imperfectly monitored, there is a unique strongly symmetric equilibrium, and effort is pinned down by the current stock. Moreover, small-sized innovations may cause continuation payoffs to drop in equilibrium, as further progress is delayed. As a consequence, if agents can discard the innovations that they produce after observing their size, they would do so in equilibrium, and this would enhance welfare. Under realistic assumptions, the same is true if agents can instead conceal innovations for a period of time, forgoing their benefits.

The fact that concealing innovations may be socially beneficial suggests that the optimal design of transparency rules is a non-trivial and important problem in this setting. Moreover, the tractability of the baseline environment, and the fact that it admits a unique equilibrium in a rich class, make it a promising building block for richer models. A relevant one for the literature on innovation would involve firms cooperating to improve a shared technology while simultaneously competing in product markets. Another would concern teams of firms competing in an innovation race. Finally, the assumption that the technology is a perfect public good could be relaxed in a model where spillovers are governed by a network.

## References

- Admati, A., and M. Perry. 1991. “Joint projects without commitment.” *The Review of Economic Studies* 58 (2): 259–276.
- Akcigit, U., S. Caicedo, E. Miguelez, S. Stantcheva, and V. Sterzi. 2018. *Dancing with the stars: Innovation through interactions*. Working Paper 24466. National Bureau of Economic Research.
- Akcigit, U., and Q. Liu. 2015. “The role of information in innovation and competition.” *Journal of the European Economic Association* 14 (4): 828–870.
- Azevedo, E. M., A. Deng, J. L. Montiel Olea, J. Rao, and E. G. Weyl. 2020. “A/b testing with fat tails.” *Journal of Political Economy* 128 (12): 4614–4672.

---

After the first disclosure, agents disclose according to some cutoff  $\check{q}(t)$ , which may depend on the time and value of the first disclosure. (The restriction on the times of disclosures would have to be weakened for this disclosure policy to be admissible.)

- Battaglini, M., S. Nunnari, and T. R. Palfrey. 2014. “Dynamic free riding with irreversible investments.” *American Economic Review* 104 (9): 2858–2871.
- Bessen, J., and A. Nuvolari. 2016. “Knowledge sharing among inventors: some historical perspectives.” Chap. 7 in *Revolutionizing Innovation: Users, Communities and Open Innovation*, 135–157. MIT Press.
- Billingsley, P. 2012. *Probability and Measure*. Wiley.
- Bliss, C., and B. Nalebuff. 1984. “Dragon-slaying and ballroom dancing: The private supply of a public good.” *Journal of Public Economics* 25 (1-2): 1–12.
- Bolton, P., and C. Harris. 1999. “Strategic experimentation.” *Econometrica* 67 (2): 349–374.
- Bonatti, A., and J. Hörner. 2011. “Collaborating.” *American Economic Review* 101 (2): 632–63.
- Brander, J. A., and B. J. Spencer. 1983. “Strategic commitment with R&D: the symmetric case.” *The Bell Journal of Economics* 14 (1): 225–235.
- Brunk, H. D., G. M. Ewing, and W. R. Utz. 1956. “Some Helly theorems for monotone functions.” *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society* 7 (5): 776–783.
- Campbell, A., F. Ederer, and J. Spinnewijn. 2014. “Delay and deadlines: Freeriding and information revelation in partnerships.” *American Economic Journal: Microeconomics* 6 (2): 163–204.
- Chesbrough, H. W. 2003. *Open innovation: The new imperative for creating and profiting from technology*. Harvard Business Press.
- Cho, I.-K., and D. M. Kreps. 1987. “Signaling games and stable equilibria.” *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 102 (2): 179–221.
- Compte, O., and P. Jehiel. 2004. “Gradualism in bargaining and contribution games.” *The Review of Economic Studies* 71 (4): 975–1000.
- Curello, G. 2021. “Incentives for Collective Innovation: Omitted material.” Working paper, Sep 2021.
- d’Aspremont, C., and A. Jacquemin. 1988. “Cooperative and noncooperative R & D in duopoly with spillovers.” *The American Economic Review* 78 (5): 1133–1137.
- Davis, M. H. A. 2018. *Markov models and optimization*. Routledge.

- Dover, G., and T. B. Lawrence. 2012. “The role of power in nonprofit innovation.” *Non-profit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 41 (6): 991–1013.
- Fershtman, C., and S. Nitzan. 1991. “Dynamic voluntary provision of public goods.” *European Economic Review* 35 (5): 1057–1067.
- Georgiadis, G. 2015. “Projects and team dynamics.” *The Review of Economic Studies* 82 (1): 187–218.
- Geroski, P. 1995. “Markets for technology: knowledge, innovation and appropriability.” Chap. 4 in *Handbook of the Economics Innovation and Technological Change*, 90–131. Blackwell.
- Gradstein, M. 1992. “Time dynamics and incomplete information in the private provision of public goods.” *Journal of political Economy* 100 (3): 581–597.
- Grant, Heather M, and Leslie R Crutchfield. 2007. “Creating high-impact nonprofits.” *Stanford Social Innovation Review* 5 (4): 32–41.
- Halac, M., N. Kartik, and Q. Liu. 2017. “Contests for Experimentation.” *Journal of Political Economy* 125 (5): 1523–1569.
- Harhoff, D., and K. R. Lakhani. 2016. *Revolutionizing innovation: Users, communities, and open innovation*. MIT Press.
- Heidhues, P., S. Rady, and P. Strack. 2015. “Strategic experimentation with private payoffs.” *Journal of Economic Theory* 159 (1): 531–551.
- Hopenhayn, H. A., and F. Squintani. 2011. “Preemption games with private information.” *The Review of Economic Studies* 78 (2): 667–692.
- Hörner, J., N. Klein, and S. Rady. Forthcoming. “Overcoming Free-Riding in Bandit Games.” *Review of Economic Studies*.
- Hottenrott, H., and B. Peters. 2012. “Innovative capability and financing constraints for innovation: more money, more innovation?” *Review of Economics and Statistics* 94 (4): 1126–1142.
- Jovanovic, B., and Y. Nyarko. 1996. “Learning by Doing and the Choice of Technology.” *Econometrica* 64 (6): 1299–1310.
- Kamien, M. I., E. Muller, and I. Zang. 1992. “Research joint ventures and R&D cartels.” *The American Economic Review* 82 (5): 1293–1306.
- Katz, M. L. 1986. “An analysis of cooperative research and development.” *The RAND Journal of Economics* 17 (4): 527–543.

- Keller, G., and S. Rady. 2015. “Breakdowns.” *Theoretical Economics* 10 (1): 175–202.
- . 2010. “Strategic experimentation with Poisson bandits.” *Theoretical Economics* 5 (2): 275–311.
- . 2020. “Undiscounted bandit games.” *Games and Economic Behavior* 124 (1): 43–61.
- Keller, G., S. Rady, and M. Cripps. 2005. “Strategic experimentation with exponential bandits.” *Econometrica* 73 (1): 39–68.
- Kerr, W. R. 2008. “Ethnic scientific communities and international technology diffusion.” *The Review of Economics and Statistics* 90 (3): 518–537.
- Klein, N., and S. Rady. 2011. “Negatively correlated bandits.” *The Review of Economic Studies* 78 (2): 693–732.
- Kolodner, I. I. 1968. “On Completeness of Partially Ordered Sets and Fixpoint Theorems for Isotone Mappings.” *The American Mathematical Monthly* 75 (1): 48–49.
- Leahy, D., and J. P. Neary. 1997. “Public policy towards R&D in oligopolistic industries.” *The American Economic Review* 87 (4): 642–662.
- Lim, K. 2009. “The many faces of absorptive capacity: spillovers of copper interconnect technology for semiconductor chips.” *Industrial and Corporate Change* 18 (6): 1249–1284.
- Lockwood, B., and J. P. Thomas. 2002. “Gradualism and irreversibility.” *The Review of Economic Studies* 69 (2): 339–356.
- Lucas, R. E., and B. Moll. 2014. “Knowledge growth and the allocation of time.” *Journal of Political Economy* 122 (1): 1–51.
- Marx, L., and S. Matthews. 2000. “Dynamic voluntary contribution to a public project.” *The Review of Economic Studies* 67 (2): 327–358.
- Meyer, P. B. 2003. *Episodes of collective invention*. Working Paper 368. U.S. Bureau of Labour Statistics.
- Milgrom, Paul, and Ilya Segal. 2002. “Envelope theorems for arbitrary choice sets.” *Econometrica* 70 (2): 583–601.
- Pénin, J. 2007. “Open knowledge disclosure: An overview of the evidence and economic motivations.” *Journal of Economic Surveys* 21 (2): 326–347.

- Perla, J., and C. Tonetti. 2014. “Equilibrium imitation and growth.” *Journal of Political Economy* 122 (1): 52–76.
- Peskir, G., and A. Shiryaev. 2006. *Optimal stopping and free-boundary problems*. Springer.
- Piunovskiy, A., and Y. Zhang. 2020. *Continuous-Time Markov Decision Processes*. Springer.
- Polyanin, A. D., and A. V. Manzhirov. 2008. *Handbook of integral equations*. CRC press.
- Powell, W. W., and E. Giannella. 2010. “Collective invention and inventor networks.” Chap. 13 in *Handbook of the Economics of Innovation*, 1:575–605. North Holland.
- Powell, W. W., K. W. Koput, and L. Smith-Doerr. 1996. “Interorganizational collaboration and the locus of innovation: Networks of learning in biotechnology.” *Administrative science quarterly* 41 (1): 116–145.
- Radner, R., R. Myerson, and E. Maskin. 1986. “An example of a repeated partnership game with discounting and with uniformly inefficient equilibria.” *The Review of Economic Studies* 53 (1): 59–69.
- Redding, S. 2002. “Path dependence, endogenous innovation, and growth.” *International Economic Review* 43 (4): 1215–1248.
- Reinganum, J. F. 1983. “Uncertain innovation and the persistence of monopoly.” *The American Economic Review* 73 (4): 741–748.
- Spence, M. 1984. “Cost reduction, competition, and industry performance.” *Econometrica: Journal of the Econometric Society* 52 (1): 101–121.
- Strausz, R. 1999. “Efficiency in sequential partnerships.” *Journal of Economic Theory* 85 (1): 140–156.
- Suzumura, K. 1992. “Cooperative and Noncooperative R&D in an Oligopoly with Spillovers.” *The American Economic Review* 82 (5): 1307–1320.
- Von Hippel, E. 1987. “Cooperation between rivals: Informal know-how trading.” *Research Policy* 16 (6): 291–302.
- Yildirim, H. 2006. “Getting the ball rolling: Voluntary contributions to a large-scale public project.” *Journal of Public Economic Theory* 8 (4): 503–528.

# Appendix

## A The baseline game with forced disclosure

This appendix is devoted to the formal description of the baseline model, introduced informally in Section 2.

**Histories.** Given  $m \in \{0, 1, \dots\}$ , a *history featuring  $m$  innovations* is a

$$h_m := \begin{cases} x_0 & \text{if } m = 0 \\ (x_0, (t_1, z_1, i_1), \dots, (t_m, z_m, i_m)) & \text{if } m \geq 1 \end{cases} \quad (31)$$

where  $x_0 \geq 0$  is given,  $0 < t_1 < \dots < t_m$ , and  $z_l > 0$  and  $i_l \in \{1, \dots, n\}$  for all  $l = 1, \dots, m$ . Let  $H_m$  be the set of histories featuring  $m$  innovations, and define  $H := \bigcup_{m=0}^{\infty} H_m$  with typical element  $h$ . Let  $X, T : H \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$  be given by

$$T(h_m) := \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } m = 0 \\ t_m & \text{if } m \geq 1 \end{cases} \quad \& \quad X(h_m) := \begin{cases} x_0 & \text{if } m = 0 \\ x_0 + \sum_{l=1}^m z_l & \text{if } m \geq 1 \end{cases} \quad (32)$$

for all  $m \geq 0$  and  $h_m \in H_m$  given by (31). Given  $m \geq 0$ ,  $h_m \in H_m$  given by (31), and  $e := (t, z, i)$ , let

$$h \frown e := \begin{cases} (x_0, e) & \text{if } m = 0 \\ (x_0, (t_1, z_1, i_1), \dots, (t_m, z_m, i_m), e) & \text{if } m \geq 1. \end{cases}$$

**Strategies.** Throughout, ‘measurable’ means ‘Borel measurable’. Let  $\mathcal{P}([0, 1])$  be the set of probability measures over  $[0, 1]$ , endowed with the topology of weak convergence, and let  $\underline{A}$  be the quotient space of measurable maps  $\underline{a} : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathcal{P}([0, 1])$  by the equivalence relation ‘a.e. equal’, endowed with the topology such that  $\underline{a}^m \rightarrow \underline{a}$  if and only if

$$\int_0^{\infty} v(t, a) d\underline{a}_t^m(a) dt \rightarrow \int_0^{\infty} v(t, a) d\underline{a}_t(a) dt$$

for all maps  $v : \mathbb{R}_+ \times [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  that are measurable in the first argument, continuous in the second, and such that

$$\int \max_{a \in [0, 1]} |v(t, a)| dt < \infty.$$

For all  $t \geq 0$ , let  $A_t$  be the quotient space of measurable  $a : (t, \infty) \rightarrow [0, 1]$  by the equivalence relation ‘a.e. equal’. Identify each  $a \in A_0$  with the  $\underline{a} \in \underline{A}$  such that  $\underline{a}(t)$  is degenerate with value  $a(t)$  for a.e.  $t > 0$ , and  $A_t$  with the subset of  $a \in A_0$  taking value



0 over  $[0, t]$ . Note that  $H$  is a Borel space, and that  $\underline{A}$  is compact.<sup>79</sup>

A *strategy* is a measurable map  $\sigma : H \rightarrow A_0$  such that  $\sigma(h) \in A_{T(h)}$  for all  $h \in H$ . Let  $\Sigma$  be the set of all these strategies. A strategy  $\sigma \in \Sigma$  is *Markov* if there is a (necessarily measurable) map  $\alpha : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow [0, 1]$  such that  $[\sigma(h)](t) = \alpha(X(h))$  for any  $h \in H$  and  $t > T(h)$ . We shall often express Markov strategies as  $\alpha$ 's.

**Payoffs.** Throughout, given a Borel space  $E$ ,  $\mathcal{B}(E)$  is the Borel  $\sigma$ -algebra of  $E$ . Let  $E := (\mathbb{R}_+ \times \{1, \dots, n\}) \cup \{(\infty, 0)\}$ , and define the stochastic kernel  $\nu : \mathcal{B}(E) \times A^n \times \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow [0, 1]$  by

$$\nu([0, s] \times \{i\}, (a, t)) := \nu_t([0, s] \times \{i\}, a) := \int_t^{s \vee t} a_r^i \lambda e^{-\lambda \int_t^r \sum_{j=1}^n a^j} dr.$$

Assuming that agents exert effort after time  $r \geq 0$  according to the profile  $a \in A_r^n$ ,  $\nu_t(\cdot, a)$  is the distribution of the time  $s \geq t \vee r$  of the first innovation, and of the identity  $i$  of the agent producing it, given that that no innovation occurs within the time interval  $[r, r \vee t]$ , (with  $s = \infty$  and  $i = 0$  if no innovation occurs). Note that  $\nu$  is strongly continuous.<sup>80</sup> Define  $\pi_A : \underline{A} \rightarrow A_0$  by  $[\pi_A(\underline{a})](t) := \int \hat{a} d\underline{a}_t(\hat{a})$  for all  $t > 0$ , and note that  $\nu$  extends to a stochastic kernel  $\mathcal{B}(E) \times \underline{A}^n \times \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow [0, 1]$  through  $\pi_A$ . Moreover, this extension is strongly continuous since  $\pi_A$  is continuous.

Given  $h \in H_m$  for some  $m \geq 0$  and  $\sigma := (\sigma^i)_{i=1}^n \in \Sigma^n$ , define the family  $(\nu_{h,l}^\sigma)_{l=m}^\infty$  where  $\nu_{h,m}^\sigma$  is the measure over  $H_m \times E$  such that  $\nu_{h,m}^\sigma(C \times C') := \mathbb{I}_{h \in C} \nu_0(C', \sigma(h_m))$  for all  $C \in \mathcal{B}(H_m)$  and  $C' \in \mathcal{B}(E)$  and, for all  $l \geq m$ ,  $\nu_{h,l+1}^\sigma$  is the measure over  $H_{l+1} \times E$  such that

$$\nu_{h,l+1}^\sigma(C \times C') := \int_{h_l \frown (s,z,i) \in C} \nu_0(C', \sigma(h_l \frown (s, z, i))) \nu_{h,l}^\sigma(d(h_l, (s, z, i)))$$

for all  $C \in \mathcal{B}(H_{l+1})$  and  $C' \in \mathcal{B}(E)$ . Let  $U : A \times \mathbb{R}_+^2 \times [0, \infty] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be given by

$$U(a, x, t, s) := \int_t^s e^{t-r} [b(x) - c(a_r, x)] dr.$$

Note that  $U$  extends to a map  $\underline{A} \times \mathbb{R}_+^2 \times [0, \infty] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  through  $\pi_A$ , and that both  $U$  and its extension are continuous.

The (*continuation*) *payoff* to agent  $i$  after history  $h \in H_m$  when  $\sigma := (\sigma^i)_{i=1}^n \in \Sigma^n$  is played is:

$$v_\sigma^i(h) := \sum_{l=m}^\infty \int e^{T(h)-T(h_l)} U(\sigma^i(h_l), X(h_l), T(h_l), s) \nu_{h,l}^\sigma(d(h_l, (s, z, j)))$$

79. For the latter claim, see e.g. Proposition 43.3 of Davis (2018).

80. Indeed, for any  $C \in \mathcal{B}(E)$ , the following map  $A^n \times \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow [0, 1]$  is continuous:

$$(a, t) \mapsto \nu_t(C, \underline{a}) = \sum_{i=1}^n \left( \int_t^\infty \mathbb{1}_{(s,i) \in C} a_s^i \lambda e^{-\lambda \int_t^s \sum_{j=1}^n a^j} ds \right) + \mathbb{1}_{(\infty,0) \in C} e^{-\lambda \int_t^\infty \sum_{j=1}^n a^j}.$$

By standard arguments,  $v_\sigma^i : H \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is measurable, and thus

$$\begin{aligned} v_\sigma^i(h) &= \int U(\sigma^i(h), X(h), T(h), s) \nu_0(d(s, z, j), \sigma(h)) \\ &\quad + \int_{h \frown (s, z, j) \in H} e^{T(h)-s} v_\sigma^i(h \frown (s, z, j)) \nu_0(d(s, z, j), \sigma(h)). \end{aligned}$$

*Welfare* after history  $h \in H$  when  $\sigma \in \Sigma^n$  is played is

$$v_\sigma(h) := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n v_\sigma^i(h).$$

**Best responses.** Value functions and best responses are defined in the usual way. Given  $\sigma', \sigma \in \Sigma$  and  $i$ , let  $\sigma'_i \sigma$  be the strategy profile with  $i^{\text{th}}$  entry equal to  $\sigma'$  and all other entries equal to  $\sigma$ . The *value* to agent  $i$  at history  $h \in H$  against all opponents playing a strategy  $\sigma \in \Sigma$  is

$$\hat{v}_\sigma^i(h) := \sup_{\sigma' \in \Sigma} v_{\sigma'_i \sigma}^i(h).$$

A strategy  $\sigma' \in \Sigma$  is a *best response* for agent  $i$  at  $h$  against opponents playing  $\sigma$  if  $v_{\sigma'_i \sigma}^i(h) = \hat{v}_\sigma^i(h)$ .

## A.1 Recursive formulations and optimality criteria

In this section, I derive (13), (14) and (15). Let  $\bar{w} : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be given by

$$\bar{w}(x) := b(x) + n\lambda[b(\mu) - b(0)] \quad (33)$$

and  $V_H$  be the set of all measurable  $v : H \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  that are bounded below by  $b(0)$  and such that  $v(h) \leq \bar{w}(X(h))$  for all  $h \in H$ . Note that  $v_\sigma^i \in V_H$  for all  $i$  and  $\sigma \in \Sigma$ .

To obtain (13) note that, given  $t > T(h)$ , the payoff to agent  $i$  at time  $t$ , given that no innovation was produced within the interval  $[T(h), t)$ , is

$$\begin{aligned} v_{\sigma, h}^i(t) &:= \int U(\sigma^i(h), X(h), t, s) \nu_t(d(s, z, j), \sigma(h)) \\ &\quad + \int_{h \frown (s, z, j) \in H} e^{t-s} v_\sigma^i(h \frown (s, z, j)) \nu_t(d(s, z, j), \sigma(h)). \end{aligned} \quad (34)$$

Then, setting  $v_{\sigma, h}^i(T(h)) := v_\sigma^i(h)$  yields that  $v_{\sigma, h}^i$  is absolutely continuous over  $[T(h), \infty)$ ,

and differentiating (34) yields

$$v_{\sigma,h}^i(t) = \frac{dv_{\sigma,h}^i}{dt}(t) + b(x) - c([\sigma^i(h)](t), x) + \lambda \sum_{j=1}^n [\sigma^j(h)](t) \{ \mathbb{E}_F[v_{\sigma}^i(h \frown (t, \tilde{z}, j))] - v_{\sigma,h}^i(t) \}. \quad (35)$$

This yields (13) for symmetric  $\sigma \in \Sigma$ . Then the fact that  $v_{\sigma,h}^i$  is Lipschitz follows from (13) since  $v_{\sigma}^i \in V_H$ .

To derive (14) let, for any  $a, a' \in A$  and  $i$ ,  $a'_i a$  be the element of  $A_0^n$  with  $i^{\text{th}}$  entry equal to  $a'$  and all other entries equal to  $a$ . Standard dynamic-programming results yield that,<sup>81</sup> given  $\sigma \in \Sigma$  and  $i$ ,  $\hat{v}_{\sigma}^i$  is the unique  $v \in V_H$  solving, for all  $h \in H$ ,

$$v(h) = \max_{a \in A_{T(h)}} \left\{ \int U(a, X(h), T(h), s) \nu_0(d(s, z, j), (a_i \sigma(h))) + \int_{h \frown (s, z, j) \in H} e^{T(h)-s} v(h \frown (s, z, j)) \nu_0(d(s, z, j), (a_i \sigma(h))) \right\}.$$

Then, the value of agent  $i$  against  $\sigma \in \Sigma$  at time  $t > T(h)$  after history  $h \in H$ , given that no innovation occurred within  $[T(h), t)$ , is

$$\hat{v}_{\sigma,h}^i(t) := \max_{a \in A_t} \left\{ \int U(a, X(h), t, s) \nu_t(d(s, z, j), (a_i \sigma(h))) + \int_{h \frown (s, z, j) \in H} e^{t-s} \hat{v}_{\sigma}^i(h \frown (s, z, j)) \nu_t(d(s, z, j), (a_i \sigma(h))) \right\}. \quad (36)$$

Setting  $\hat{v}_{\sigma,h}^i(T(h)) := \hat{v}_{\sigma}^i(h)$  yields that  $\hat{v}_{\sigma,h}^i$  is absolutely continuous over  $[T(h), \infty)$ , by Theorem 2 of Milgrom and Segal (2002). Then, differentiating (36) with respect to  $t$  yields (14). The fact that  $\hat{v}_{\sigma,h}^i$  is Lipschitz follows from (14), by the reasoning used to derive Lipschitz continuity of  $v_{\sigma,h}^i$  from (13).

It remains to derive (15). Let  $x, t \geq 0$ ,  $\hat{w}, \tilde{w} : [t, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be measurable and bounded, and  $G$  be a CDF over  $\mathbb{R}_+$  such that  $G(t) < 1$ . For all  $s \geq t$  with  $G(s) < 1$ , define  $w_s : A_s \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  by

$$w_s(a) := \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_s^{\tilde{\pi} \wedge \tilde{\tau}} e^{s-r} [b(x) - c(a_r, x)] dr + e^{s-\tilde{\pi} \wedge \tilde{\tau}} [\mathbb{I}_{\tilde{\pi} < \tilde{\tau}} \hat{w}(\tilde{\pi}) + \mathbb{I}_{\tilde{\tau} < \tilde{\pi}} \tilde{w}(\tilde{\tau})] \Big| \tilde{\pi} \wedge \tilde{\tau} > s \right]$$

where  $\tilde{\tau}$  and  $\tilde{\pi}$  are independent,  $\tilde{\tau} \sim G$  and  $\Pr(\tilde{\pi} \leq r) = 1 - e^{-\lambda \int_0^r a_q}$  for all  $r \geq 0$ . The following result is proved in Curello (2021).

---

81. In particular, the maximum is attained in  $A_{T(h)}$  on the right-hand side. Indeed, the objective is defined for any  $a \in \underline{A}$ , and the maximum is attained in  $\underline{A}$  (by some  $\underline{a}$ , say) since  $\underline{A}$  is compact,  $U$  is continuous, and  $\nu_0$  is strongly continuous. Then, the maximum is attained in  $A_{T(h)}$  as the objective takes the same value at  $\underline{a}$  and at  $a \in A_{T(h)}$  given by  $a_t := \int \hat{a} d\underline{a}_t(\hat{a})$  for all  $t > T(h)$ .

**Lemma 4.** Given  $a' \in A_t$ ,  $w_t(a') = \sup w_t$  only if, for almost all  $s \geq t$  such that  $G(s) < 1$ ,

$$a'_s \in \arg \max_{a \in [0,1]} \{a\lambda(\hat{w}(s) - \sup w_s) - c(a, x)\}.$$

The fact that (15) is necessary for  $\sigma$  to be a best response for agent  $i$  at history  $h$  (that is, to ensure that  $v_{\sigma_i\sigma}^i(h) = \hat{v}_\sigma^i(h)$ ) follows from Lemma 4 with  $t = T(h)$ ,  $x := X(h)$ ,  $\hat{w}(s) := \mathbb{E}_F[\hat{v}_\sigma^i(h \curvearrowright (s, \tilde{z}, i))]$ ,  $\tilde{w}(s) := \frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{j \neq i} \mathbb{E}_F[\hat{v}_\sigma^i(h \curvearrowright (s, \tilde{z}, j))]$ , and  $G(s) := 1 - e^{-\lambda(n-1) \int_0^s \sigma(h)}$ . Indeed, under these conditions,  $v_\sigma^i(h) = w_t(\sigma(h))$  and, for all  $s \geq T(h)$ ,  $\hat{v}_{\sigma,h}^i(s) = \sup w_s$ .

## B The game with disposal

This appendix contains the definition of the game with disposal, which I described informally in Section 5.1. The discussion relies on the concepts introduced in Appendix A.

**Histories.** Recall the definition of histories  $h \in H$  of the game with forced adoption (Appendix A). We shall rename them *public histories*. A *history leading to an innovation* is a triplet  $(h, t, z)$  where  $h \in H$ ,  $t > T(h)$ , and  $z > 0$ . Agent  $i$  reaches  $(h, t, z)$  whenever, after  $h$ , no innovation is disclosed within the time interval  $[T(h), t)$ , and she produces an increment of size  $z$  at time  $t$ . Label  $H'$  the set of all such triplets. A *private history* for agent  $i$  is either an  $h \in H \cup H'$ , or a pair  $(h, t)$  where  $h \in H$  and  $t > T(h)$ . Agent  $i$  reaches the history  $(h, t)$  if, after  $h$ , no innovation is disclosed within the time interval  $[T(h), t)$ , and she produces and discards an increment at time  $t$ .<sup>82</sup> Let  $H^\dagger$  be the set of all private histories, and extend the definition of  $T$  to  $H^\dagger$  by setting  $T(h, t) = t$  and  $T(h, t, z) = t$  for all  $h \in H$ ,  $t > T(h)$ , and  $z > 0$ .

**Strategies.** For all  $t \geq 0$ , let  $D_t$  be the set of measurable  $d : (t, \infty) \times (0, \infty) \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ . We shall write  $d : (s, z) \mapsto d_s(z)$ , and view  $d_s$  as a map  $(0, \infty) \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$  for all  $s > t$ . Identify each  $D_t$  with the subset of  $d \in D_0$  taking value 0 over  $[0, t] \times (0, \infty)$ .

Recall the definition of strategies  $\sigma \in \Sigma$  of the game with forced adoption (Appendix A), and note that  $H'$  is a Borel space. A *strategy* is a pair  $\xi := (\sigma, \chi')$  where  $\sigma \in \Sigma$  and  $\chi' : H' \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$  is measurable. Equivalently, it is a measurable map  $\xi : H \rightarrow A_0 \times D_0$  such that  $\xi(h) \in A_{T(h)} \times D_{T(h)}$  for all  $h \in H$ . It may also be expressed as a pair  $(\sigma, \chi)$  where  $\sigma \in \Sigma$  and  $\chi : H \rightarrow D_0$  is measurable and such that  $\chi(h) \in D_{T(h)}$  for all  $h \in H$ .<sup>83</sup> Let  $\Xi$  be the set of all strategies. A strategy  $(\sigma, \chi) \in \Xi$  is *Markov* if there is a pair  $(\alpha, \delta)$  of (necessarily measurable) maps  $\alpha : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow [0, 1]$  and  $\delta : \mathbb{R}_+^2 \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$  such that, for any

<sup>82.</sup> As noted in Section 5.1, since we restrict attention to public strategies, it is not necessary for private histories to keep track of innovations discarded in the past.

<sup>83.</sup> The correspondence between  $\chi'$  and  $\chi$  is:  $[\chi(h)](t, z) = \chi'(h, t, z)$  for all  $h \in H$ ,  $t > T(h)$  and  $z > 0$  (equivalently, for all  $(h, t, z) \in H'$ ).

$h \in H$ ,  $t > T(h)$ , and  $z > 0$ ,

$$[\xi(h)](t) = \alpha(X(h)) \quad \& \quad [\chi(h)](t, z) = \delta(X(h), z).$$

We shall often express Markov strategies as pairs  $(\alpha, \delta)$ .

**Payoffs.** Throughout, given a Borel space  $E$ ,  $\mathcal{B}(E)$  is the Borel  $\sigma$ -algebra of  $E$ . Recall the definitions of the stochastic kernel  $\nu$  and of the map  $\pi_A$  from Appendix A. Let  $E' := (\mathbb{R}_+^2 \times \{1, \dots, n\}) \cup \{(\infty, 0, 0)\}$ , and define the stochastic kernel  $\nu' : \mathcal{B}(E') \times (A_0 \times D_0)^n \times \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow [0, 1]$  by

$$\begin{aligned} \nu' \left( [0, s] \times [0, z] \times \{i\}, \left( (a^j, d^j)_{j=1}^n, t \right) \right) &:= \nu'_t \left( [0, s] \times [0, z] \times \{i\}, (a^j, d^j)_{j=1}^n \right) \\ &:= \nu_t \left( [0, s] \times \{i\}, \left( s \mapsto a_s^i \int_{[0, z]} d_s^i dF, (s \mapsto a_s^j \int d_s^j dF)_{j \neq i} \right) \right). \end{aligned}$$

Assuming that, after any given time  $r \geq 0$ , each agent  $j$  exerts effort  $a^j \in A_r$  and discloses innovations according to  $d^j \in D_r$ ,  $\nu'_t$  is the distribution of the time  $s \geq t \vee r$  of the first disclosed innovation, of its size  $z$  and of the identity  $i$  of the agent producing it, given that no innovation is disclosed within  $[r, r \vee t]$ , (with  $s = \infty$  and  $z = i = 0$  if no innovation is disclosed). Note that, endowing  $D_0$  with the topology of  $\ell \times F$ -a.e. convergence, where  $\ell$  is the Lebesgue measure, makes  $\nu'$  strongly continuous.<sup>84</sup> Moreover,  $\nu'$  extends to a strongly continuous kernel  $\mathcal{B}(E') \times (\underline{A} \times D_0)^n \times \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow [0, 1]$  through the map  $\pi_A$ .

Given  $h \in H_m$  for some  $m \geq 0$  and  $\xi := (\sigma^i, \chi^i)_{i=1}^n \in \Xi^n$ , define the family  $(\nu_{h,l}^\xi)_{l=m}^\infty$  where  $\nu_{h,m}^\xi$  is the measure over  $H_m \times E$  such that  $\nu_{h,m}^\xi(C \times C') := \mathbb{I}_{h \in C} \nu_0(C', \xi(h_m))$  for all  $C \in \mathcal{B}(H_m)$  and  $C' \in \mathcal{B}(E')$  and, for all  $l \geq m$ ,  $\nu_{h,l+1}^\xi$  is the measure over  $H_{l+1} \times E$  such that

$$\nu_{h,l+1}^\xi(C \times C') := \int_{h_l \frown (s, z, i) \in C} \nu_0(C', \xi(h_l \frown (s, z, i))) \nu_{h,l}^\xi(d(h_l, (s, z, i)))$$

for all  $C \in \mathcal{B}(H_{l+1})$  and  $C' \in \mathcal{B}(E')$ .

Recall the definition of  $U$  from Appendix A. The (*continuation*) *payoff* to agent  $i$  after a public history  $h \in H_m$  when  $\xi := (\sigma^i, \chi^i)_{i=1}^n \in \Xi^n$  is played is:

$$v_\xi^i(h) := \sum_{l=m}^{\infty} \int e^{T(h)-T(h_l)} U(\sigma^i(h_l), X(h_l), T(h_l), s) \nu_{h,l}^\xi(d(h_l, (s, z, j))).$$

---

84. Indeed, for any  $C \in \mathcal{B}(E')$ , the following map  $(A_0 \times D_0)^n \times \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow [0, 1]$  is continuous:

$$\begin{aligned} \left( (a^i, d^i)_{i=1}^n, t \right) \mapsto \nu'_t \left( C, (a^i, d^i)_{i=1}^n \right) &= \sum_{i=1}^n \left( \int_t^\infty a_s^i \int d_s^i(z) \mathbb{1}_{(s, z, i) \in C} F(dz) \lambda e^{-\lambda \int_t^s \sum_{j=1}^n a^j \int d^j dF} ds \right) \\ &\quad + \mathbb{1}_{(\infty, 0, 0) \in C} e^{-\lambda \int_t^\infty \sum_{j=1}^n a^j \int d^j dF}. \end{aligned}$$

By standard arguments,  $v_\xi^i : H \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is measurable, and thus

$$v_\xi^i(h) = \int U(\sigma^i(h), X(h), T(h), s) \nu_0(d(s, z, j), \xi(h)) \\ + \int_{h \frown (s, z, j) \in H} e^{T(h)-s} v_\xi^i(h \frown (s, z, j)) \nu_0(d(s, z, j), \xi(h)).$$

The payoff to agent  $i$  after a history  $(h, t) \in H^\dagger$  when  $\xi$  is played is

$$v_\xi^i(h, t) := v_{\xi, h}^i(t) := \int U(\sigma^i(h), X(h), t, s) \nu_t(d(s, z, j), \xi(h)) \\ + \int_{h \frown (s, z, j) \in H} e^{t-s} v_\xi^i(h \frown (s, z, j)) \nu_t(d(s, z, j), \xi(h)). \quad (37)$$

The payoff to agent  $i$  after a history  $(h, t, z) \in H'$  when  $\xi$  is played is:

$$v_\xi^i(h, t, z) := v_{\xi, h}^i(t, z) := \begin{cases} v_{\xi, h}^i(t) & \text{if } [\chi^i(h)](t, z) = 0 \\ v_\xi^i(h \frown (t, z, i)) & \text{if } [\chi^i(h)](t, z) = 1. \end{cases}$$

*Welfare* after a public history  $h \in H$  when  $\xi \in \Xi^n$  is played is  $v_\xi(h) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n v_\xi^i(h)$ .

**Best responses.** Value functions and best responses are defined in the usual way. Given  $\xi', \xi \in \Xi$  and  $i$ , let  $\xi'_i \xi$  be the strategy profile with  $i^{\text{th}}$  entry equal to  $\xi'$  and all other entries equal to  $\xi$ . The value to agent  $i$  at history  $h \in H^\dagger$  against all opponents playing a strategy  $\xi \in \Xi$  is

$$\hat{v}_\xi(h) := \sup_{\xi' \in \Xi} v_{\xi'_i \xi}(h),$$

and  $\xi' \in \Xi$  is a best response for agent  $i$  against opponents playing  $\xi$  if  $v_{\xi'_i \xi}^i(h) = \hat{v}_\xi^i(h)$ .

## B.1 Recursive formulations and optimality criteria

In this section, I derive (24), (25), and (26). Define the stochastic kernel  $\nu'' : \mathcal{B}(E') \times A_0 \times (A_0 \times D_0)^{n-1} \times \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow [0, 1]$  by

$$\nu''(\cdot, a, (a^i, d^i)_{i=1}^{n-1}, t) := \nu_t''(\cdot, a, (a^i, d^i)_{i=1}^{n-1}) := \nu_t'(\cdot, ((a^1, d^1), \dots, (a^{n-1}, d^{n-1}), (a, d^f)))$$

where  $d^f \in D_0$  is constant with value 1. Assuming that, after any given time  $r \geq 0$ , each opponent of agent  $n$  exerts effort  $a^j \in A_r$  and discloses innovations according to  $d^j \in D_r$ , and agent  $n$  exerts effort according to  $a$ ,  $\nu_t''$  is the distribution of the time  $s \geq t \vee r$  of the first innovation that is either produced by agent  $n$  or disclosed by one of her opponents, of its size  $z$  and of the identity  $i$  of the agent producing or disclosing it, given that agent  $n$  produces no innovation within  $[r, r \vee t]$  and that none of her opponents discloses any within this time interval, (with  $s = \infty$  and  $z = i = 0$  if no innovation is either produced

by agent  $n$  or disclosed by one of her opponents). Then, for all  $\xi := (\sigma^i, \chi^i)_{i=1}^n \in \Xi^n$ ,  $i$ ,  $h \in H$  and  $t \geq T(h)$ ,

$$v_{\xi,h}^i(t) = \int U(\sigma^i(h), X(h), t, s) \nu_t''(d(s, z, j), (\sigma^i(h), \xi^{-1}(h))) \\ + \int e^{t-s} [\mathbb{1}_{j=i} v_{\xi,h}^i(s, z) + \mathbb{1}_{j \notin \{0,i\}} v_{\xi}^i(h \frown (s, z, j))] \nu_t''(d(s, z, j), (\sigma^i(h), \xi^{-1}(h)))$$

where  $v_{\xi,h}^i(T(h)) := v_{\xi}^i(h)$ .

Given any map  $v : H^\dagger \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  and any  $h \in H$ , define  $v_h(T(h)) := v(h)$ , and  $v_h(t) := v(h, t)$  and  $v_h(t, z) := v(h, t, z)$  for all  $t > T(h)$  and  $z > 0$ . Let  $V_{H^\dagger}$  be the set of measurable  $v : H^\dagger \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  that are bounded below by  $b(0)$  and such that  $v_h(t) \vee v_h(t, z) \leq \bar{w}(X(h))$  for all  $h \in H$ ,  $t \geq T(h)$  and  $z > 0$ . Note that  $v_{\xi}^i \in V_{H^\dagger}$  when viewed as a map  $H^\dagger \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ . Then, by standard dynamic-programming results, given  $\xi \in \Xi$  and  $i$ ,  $\hat{v}_{\xi}^i$  is the unique  $v \in V_{H^\dagger}$  satisfying the following two conditions. For all  $h \in H$  and  $t \geq T(h)$ ,<sup>85</sup>

$$v_h(t) = \max_{a \in A_t} \left\{ \int U(a, X(h), t, s) \nu_t''(d(s, z, j), (a, (\xi(h))^{n-1})) \right. \\ \left. + \int_{s < \infty} e^{t-s} [\mathbb{1}_{j=i} v_h(s, z) + \mathbb{1}_{j \notin \{0,i\}} v(h \frown (s, z, j))] \nu_t''(d(s, z, j), (a, (\xi(h))^{n-1})) \right\} \quad (38)$$

and, furthermore, for all  $t > T(h)$  and  $z > 0$ ,

$$v_h(t, z) = v_h(t) \vee v(h \frown (t, z, i)) \quad (39)$$

By Theorem 2 of Milgrom and Segal (2002),  $\hat{v}_{\xi,h}^i$  is absolutely continuous over  $[T(h), \infty)$ . Then, (24) follows by differentiating (38) with respect to  $t$ , and implies that  $\hat{v}_{\xi,h}^i$  is Lipschitz.

By (39), it is clear that  $v_{\xi,h}^i(t, z) = \hat{v}_{\xi,h}^i(t, z)$  only if (26) holds. Moreover, (25) is equivalent to

$$[\sigma(h)](t) \in \arg \max_{a \in [0,1]} \{ a \lambda (\mathbb{E}_F [\hat{v}_{\xi,h}^i(t, \tilde{z})] - \hat{v}_{\xi,h}^i(t)) - c(a, x) \}.$$

Then, (25) follows from Lemma 4 with  $t = T(h)$ ,  $x := X(h)$ ,  $\hat{w}(s) := \mathbb{E}_F [\hat{v}_{\xi,h}^i(s, \tilde{z})]$ ,  $\check{w}(s) := \frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{j \neq i} \mathbb{E}_F \{ \hat{v}_{\xi}^i(h \frown (s, \tilde{z}, j)) | [\chi(h)](s, \tilde{z}) = 1 \}$ , and

$$G(s) := 1 - e^{-\lambda(n-1) \int_0^s [\sigma(h)](r) f[\chi(h)](r, z) F(dz) dr}$$

Indeed, under these conditions,  $v_{\xi}^i(h) = w_t(\xi(h))$  and, for all  $s \geq t$ ,  $\hat{v}_{\xi,h}^i(s) = \sup w_s$ .

---

85. The maximum is attained in (38) by the reasoning in footnote 81.



## C The game with concealment

This appendix is devoted to the rigorous definition of the game with concealment, described informally in Section 6.1.

**Histories.** An *innovation event* is a pair  $(z, i) \in E_z := (0, \infty) \times \{1, \dots, n\}$ . A *disclosure event* is a  $y = (y^i)_{i=1}^n \in E_y := \mathbb{R}_+^n \setminus \{(0, \dots, 0)\}$ . The set of all events is  $E_c := E_z \cup E_y$ . The event  $(z, i) \in E_z$  states that agent  $i$  produced an innovation of size  $z$ , whereas the event  $y$  states that each agent  $i$  disclosed  $d_t^i = x_t + y^i$  if  $y^i > 0$ , and did not disclose otherwise.

Let  $\bar{E}_c = \mathbb{R}_+ \cup (\bigcup_{m=1}^{\infty} (\mathbb{R}_+ \cup (\mathbb{R}_+ \times E_c)^m))$ , with typical element  $h = x_0$  or

$$h = (x_0, (t_1, e_1), \dots, (t_m, e_m)) \quad (40)$$

for some  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ . Define  $T, X : \bar{E}_c \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$  by  $T(x_0) = 0$ ,  $X(x_0) = x_0$ , and

$$T(h) := t_m \quad \& \quad X(h) := x_0 + \sum_{l: e_l \in E_y} \max_i e_m^i$$

for  $h \in \bar{E}_c$  given by (40). Let  $K : \bar{E}_c \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+^n$  be given by

$$K^i(h) := \begin{cases} x_0 & \text{if } m = 0 \\ X(h) \vee K(h \setminus \{(t_m, e_m)\}) & \text{if } m \geq 1 \text{ and } e_m \in E_y, \\ K(h \setminus \{(t_m, e_m)\}) + z & \text{if } m \geq 1 \text{ and } e_m = (z, i) \in E_z, \\ K(h \setminus \{(t_m, e_m)\}) & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

for any  $i$  and  $h \in H^*$  given by (40). An *omniscient history featuring  $m$  events* is an  $h \in \bar{E}_c$  such that either  $h = x_0$ , or  $h$  is given by (40),  $t_1 \leq \dots \leq t_m$  and, for each  $l = 1, \dots, m$  and  $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$  such that  $e_l \in E_y$  and  $e_l^i > 0$ , both of the following hold:

- (i)  $l > 1$  and  $K^i(h') - X(h') \geq e_l^i$ , where  $h' := (x_0, (t_1, e_1), \dots, (t_{l-1}, e_{l-1}))$
- (ii) either  $t_l \in \mathcal{T}$ , or  $t_{l-1} = t_l$  and  $e_{l-1} = (z, i)$  for some  $z > 0$ , or  $e_r^j = 0$  for all  $j$  and  $r < l$  such that  $e_r \in E_y$ .

An omniscient history  $h$  featuring  $m \geq 1$  events records the events occurred up to time  $t_m$ . Condition (i) states that, if agent  $i$  discloses a value  $x_t + y_t^i$  at time  $t := t_l$ , then  $k_t^i > x_t$ . Condition (ii) further requires that either  $t_l \in \mathcal{T}$ , or agent  $i$  produced an innovation at time  $t_l$ , or  $x_{t_l} = 0$  (that is, no agent disclosed in the past). Let  $H^*$  be the set of all omniscient histories. The maps  $T$ ,  $X$ , and  $K$  keep track of the current time  $t$ , the public stock  $x_t$ , and the private stocks  $(k_t^i)_{i=1}^n$ , respectively. Given  $h \in H^*$  and  $(t, e) \in \mathbb{R}_+ \times E_c$ ,

let

$$h \curvearrowright (t, e) := \begin{cases} (x_0, e) & \text{if } h = x_0 \\ (x_0, (t_1, e_1), \dots, (t_m, e_m), (t, e)) & \text{if } h \text{ is given by (40).} \end{cases}$$

For each  $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$  and  $h \in H^*$ , let  $\eta^i(h)$  be the subsequence of all entries of  $h$  which cannot be expressed as  $(t, (z, j)) \in \mathbb{R}_+ \times E_z$  for some  $j \neq i$ . The map  $\eta^i$  describes the events of omniscient histories that are observed by agent  $i$ . Each agent observes all disclosures, as well as the innovations that she produces, but does not observe the innovations produced by her opponents. The set of agent  $i$ 's *private histories* is  $H^i := \eta^i(H^*)$ . For each  $h \in H^* \cup (\bigcup_{i=1}^n H^i)$ , let  $\eta^0(h)$  be the subsequence of  $h$  with all entries that lie in  $\mathbb{R}_+ \times E_z$  removed. The map  $\eta^0$  describes the events of either omniscient or private histories that are observed by all agents. The set of *public histories* is  $H^0 := \eta^0(H^*)$ .

**Strategies.** Recall the definition of  $A_t$  for  $t \geq 0$  from Appendix A. For all  $t \geq 0$ , let  $D_t^c$  be the quotient space of measurable  $d : [t, \infty) \times \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow [0, 1]$  such that  $d(s, 0) > 0$  for at most one  $s \geq t$ , by the equivalence relation identifying any  $d$  and  $d'$  if and only if both of the following hold:  $d(s, 0) = d'(s, 0)$  for all  $s \geq t$ , and  $d = d'$  ( $\ell_t \times F$ )-almost everywhere, where  $\ell_t$  denotes the Lebesgue measure over  $(t, \infty)$ . For each  $t > 0$ , identify  $D_t^c$  with the subset of  $d \in D_0^c$  such that  $d(s, z) = 0$  for all  $s \in (0, t)$ , and endow  $D_0$  with the topology such that  $d^m \rightarrow d$  if and only if both of the following hold:  $d^m(\cdot, 0) \rightarrow d(\cdot, 0)$  pointwise and  $d^m \rightarrow d$  ( $\ell_0 \times F$ )-almost everywhere.

A (*pure*) *strategy* for agent  $i$  is a measurable  $\xi^i : H^i \rightarrow (A_0 \times D_0^c)$  such that  $\xi^i(h) \in A_{T(h)} \times D_{T(h)}^c$  for all  $h \in H^i$  and, writing  $\xi^i := (\sigma^i, \chi^i)$  where  $\sigma^i : H^i \rightarrow A_0$  and  $\chi^i : H^i \rightarrow D_0^c$ , for all  $h \in H^i$  and  $t \geq T(h)$  such that  $[\chi^i(h)](t, 0) > 0$ ,  $K^i(h) > X(h)$  and either  $t \in \mathcal{T}$  or  $X(h) = x_0$ . Label  $\Xi_c^i$  the set of agent  $i$ 's strategies, and let  $\Xi_c := \prod_{i=1}^n \Xi_c^i$ .

**Beliefs and information sets.** A *belief* for agent  $i$  is a family  $b := (b^j)_{j \neq i}$  where  $b^j$  is a probability measure over  $H^j$  for each  $j \neq i$  and, for some probability measure  $b^*$  over  $H^*$ , the pushforward of  $b^*$  by  $(\eta^j)_{j \neq i}$  equals  $\prod_{j \neq i} b^j$ .<sup>86</sup> Let  $\underline{B}^i$  be the set of all beliefs for agent  $i$ . Given  $h \in H^i$ , say that  $b$  is *admissible* at  $h$  if there exists (a necessarily unique)  $b^*$  satisfying the above property and such that the pushforward of  $b^*$  by  $\eta^i$  is degenerate with value  $h$ .<sup>87</sup> Define  $\eta^{-1}(b) := b^*$ , and let  $\underline{B}^i(h)$  be the set of beliefs for agent  $i$  that are admissible at  $h$ . An *information set for agent  $i$*  is a pair  $\theta = (h, b)$  such that  $h \in H^i$  and  $b \in \underline{B}^i(h)$ . Let  $\Theta^i$  be the set of all information sets for agent  $i$ . A *system of beliefs for agent  $i$*  is a map  $\beta^i : H^i \rightarrow \underline{B}^i$  such that  $(h, \beta^i(h)) \in \Theta^i$  for any  $h \in H^i$ . Given  $\beta^i$ ,  $h \in H^i$ , and  $j \neq i$ , let  $\beta_j^i(h) := b^j$  where  $\beta^i(h) := (b^j)_{j \neq i}$ . The probability measure  $\beta_j^i(h)$  describes agent  $i$ 's belief about the private history reached by agent  $j$ , given that agent  $i$  reached  $h$ . Let  $B^i$  be the set of systems of beliefs for each agent  $i$ , and  $B := \prod_{i=1}^n B^i$ .

<sup>86</sup>. Note that the pushforward of  $b$  by  $\eta^j$  is well-defined since  $\eta^j : H^* \rightarrow H^j$  is measurable.

<sup>87</sup>. The measure  $b^*$  is unique since the map  $(\eta^j)_{j=1}^n : H^* \rightarrow \prod_{j=1}^n H^j$  is invertible.

**Payoffs.** Fix a strategy profile  $\xi \in \Xi_c$ ,  $i$ , and an information set  $\theta := (h, b) \in \Theta^i$ . If agents play  $\xi$ , a random path of play arises after agent  $i$  reaches  $\theta$ , involving a total number  $\tilde{m} \in \{0, 1, \dots, \infty\}$  of events. Moreover, the path of play may be expressed as a sequence  $(\tilde{h}_m)_{m=0}^{\tilde{m}} \subset H^*$  where  $\tilde{h}_0 \sim \eta^{-1}(b)$  and, for all  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ , conditional on  $\tilde{m} \geq m$ ,  $\tilde{h}_m = \tilde{h}_{m-1} \frown \tilde{e}_m$  for some  $\tilde{e}_m \in E_c$ . The (*continuation*) *payoff* to agent  $i$  at information set  $\theta := (h, b)$ , when the strategy profile  $\xi$  is played, is

$$v_\xi^i(\theta) := \mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{m=0}^{\tilde{m}} \int_{T(\tilde{h}_m)}^{T(\tilde{h}_{m+1})} e^{T(h)-t} [b(X(\tilde{h}_m)) - c([\sigma^i(\eta^i(\tilde{h}_m))](t), X(\tilde{h}_m))] dt \right]$$

where  $T(\tilde{h}_{\tilde{m}+1}) := \infty$  if  $\tilde{m} < \infty$ .

**Equilibrium.** Given  $\xi := (\xi^i)_{i=1}^n \in \Xi_c$  and  $i$ , let  $\xi^{-i} := (\xi^j)_{j \neq i}$ . Given  $\theta \in \Theta$ ,  $\xi^i$  is a *best response* for agent  $i$  against  $\xi^{-i}$  at  $\theta$  if

$$\xi^i \in \arg \max_{\hat{\xi}^i \in \Xi^i} v_{(\hat{\xi}^i, \xi^{-i})}^i(\theta).$$

For each  $i$ , let  $\underline{b}^i \in \underline{B}^i(x_0)$  be the belief  $(b^j)_{j \neq i}$  such that  $b^j$  is degenerate with value  $x_0$  for each  $j \neq i$ . A pair  $(\xi, \beta)$  where  $\xi := (\xi^i)_{i=1}^n \in \Xi_c$  and  $\beta := (\beta^i)_{i=1}^n \in B$ , is a (*weak*) *perfect Bayesian equilibrium* if, for all  $i$ ,  $\beta^i(x_0) = \underline{b}^i$  and, for all  $h \in H^i$ , all of the following hold:

- (I)  $\xi^i$  is a best response for agent  $i$  against  $\xi^{-i}$  at  $(h, \beta^i(h))$
- (II) for all  $j \neq i$  and  $h' \in H^j$  such that  $T(h) = T(h')$  and  $\eta^0(h) = \eta^0(h')$ , and any  $l \notin \{i, j\}$ ,  $\beta_l^i(h) = \beta_l^j(h')$
- (III) for  $j \neq i$ ,  $t \geq T(h)$  and  $e_1, e_2 \in E_c$  such that  $h \frown (t, e), h \frown (t, e') \in H^i$  and, if  $e_k \in E_y$  and  $e_k^j > 0$  for some  $k \in \{1, 2\}$ , then  $e_1, e_2 \in E_y$  and  $e_1^j = e_2^j$ , it is the case that  $\beta_j^i(h \frown e) = \beta_j^i(h \frown e')$
- (IV) for all  $h' \in H^i$  such that  $\Pr(\tilde{c} \neq \emptyset) > 0$  where  $\tilde{c} := \{m \in \{0, \dots, \tilde{m}\} : \eta^i(\tilde{h}_m) = h'\}$  and  $(\tilde{h}_m)_{m=0}^{\tilde{m}}$  is the random path of play (defined above) arising after  $(h, \beta^i(h))$  when  $\xi$  is played,  $(\eta^j(\tilde{h}_{\min \tilde{c}}) | \tilde{c} \neq \emptyset) \sim \beta_j^i(h')$  for each  $j \neq i$ .

Condition (II) states that the beliefs of agents  $i$  and  $j$  about agent  $l$ 's private information are identical at private histories that contain the same public information. Condition (III) states that, agent  $i$ 's beliefs about agent  $j$ 's private information are identical at any two private histories that differ only in their last events, as long as agent  $j$ 's role is identical across these two events. Finally, Condition (IV) states that, for any private history  $h'$  that is reached with strictly positive probability from agent  $i$ 's information set  $(h, \beta^i(h))$  when  $\xi$  is played, the belief  $\beta^i(h')$  of agent  $i$  at  $h'$  is derived from her belief  $\beta^i(h)$  at  $h$  using Bayes' rule.

## D Preliminary definitions and results

This section contains definitions and preliminary results used in various proofs. Recall from Appendix A that we abbreviate ‘Borel measurable’ to ‘measurable’. Given maps  $v, w : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , write ‘ $v \leq w$ ’ for ‘ $v(x) \leq w(x)$  for all  $x \geq 0$ ’. Given a measurable  $v : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  bounded below by  $b(0)$ , define the maps  $L_f v, L_d v : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty\}$  by

$$L_f v(x) := \mathbb{E}_F[v(x + \tilde{z})] \quad \& \quad L_d v(x) := \mathbb{E}_F[v(x) \vee v(x + \tilde{z})]. \quad (41)$$

*Claim 1.* Let  $v : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be measurable, bounded below by  $b(0)$ , and such that  $v - b$  is decreasing. Then  $L_k v - b$  is decreasing for  $k \in \{f, d\}$ .

*Proof.* To prove that  $L_f v - b$  is decreasing, fix  $0 \leq x_1 \leq x_2$  and note that

$$\begin{aligned} L_f v(x_2) - L_f v(x_1) &= \mathbb{E}_F[v(x_2 + \tilde{z}) - v(x_1 + \tilde{z})] \leq \mathbb{E}_F[b(x_2 + \tilde{z}) - b(x_1 + \tilde{z})] \\ &\leq b(x_2) - b(x_1) \end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality holds since  $v - b$  is decreasing, and the second since  $b$  is concave.

To prove that  $L_d v$  is decreasing, fix  $0 \leq x_1 \leq x_2$  and note that

$$\begin{aligned} L_d v(x_2) - L_d v(x_1) &= \mathbb{E}_F[v(x_2 + \tilde{z}) \vee v(x_2) - v(x_1 + \tilde{z}) \vee v(x_1)] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}_F[(v(x_2 + \tilde{z}) - v(x_1 + \tilde{z})) \vee (v(x_2) - v(x_1))] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}_F[(b(x_2 + \tilde{z}) - b(x_1 + \tilde{z})) \vee (b(x_2) - b(x_1))] \\ &= b(x_2) - b(x_1). \end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality holds since  $v - b$  is decreasing. □

Recall the definition of  $\bar{w}$  from Appendix A.1. Given a map  $w : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  that is bounded below by  $b(0)$ , let  $B_w$  be the set of measurable  $v : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  that are bounded below by  $b(0)$  and such that  $v \leq w$ . Let  $\Gamma_* : [0, 1] \times [0, n] \times \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be given by

$$\Gamma_*(a, \hat{a}, x, l) := \frac{b(x) - c(a, x) + \hat{a}\lambda l}{1 + \hat{a}\lambda} \quad (42)$$

and  $\Gamma : [0, 1] \times \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be given by  $\Gamma(a, x, l) := \Gamma_*(a, na, x, l)$ .

*Claim 2.*  $\Gamma_*(a, \hat{a}, x, L_k v(x)) \leq \bar{w}(x)$  for all  $a \in [0, 1]$ ,  $\hat{a} \in [0, n]$ ,  $x \geq 0$ ,  $v \in B_{\bar{w}}$  and  $k \in \{f, d\}$ .

*Proof.* Fix  $x, v$  and  $k$  and note that

$$L_k v(x) \leq L_k \bar{w}(x) \leq b(x + \mu) + n\lambda[b(\mu) - b(0)]$$

where the first inequality holds since  $v \leq \bar{w}$ , and the second since  $b$  is increasing and concave. Then, fixing  $a$  and  $\hat{a}$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned}\Gamma_*(a, \hat{a}, x, L_k v(x)) &\leq \frac{b(x) + \hat{a}\lambda\{b(x + \mu) + n\lambda[b(\mu) - b(0)]\}}{1 + \hat{a}\lambda} \\ &\leq \frac{b(x) + n\lambda\{b(x + \mu) + n\lambda[b(\mu) - b(0)]\}}{1 + n\lambda} \leq \bar{w}(x)\end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality holds as  $b$  is increasing and  $\hat{a} \leq n$ , and the last since  $b(\mu + x) - b(x) \leq b(\mu) - b(0)$ , as  $b$  is concave.  $\square$

## E Proofs of Theorem 1 and Corollary 1

Recall the definition of  $\bar{w}$  from Appendix A.1, and of  $L_f$ ,  $B_{\bar{w}}$  and  $\Gamma$  from Appendix D.

*Proof of Theorem 1.* The proof has several steps.

*Step 1.* (9) admits a solution in  $v_* \in B_{\bar{w}}$ ,  $v_*$  is increasing, and  $v_* - b$  is decreasing.

Given  $v \in B_{\bar{w}}$ , let  $P_*v : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be given by

$$P_*v(x) := \max_{a \in [0,1]} \Gamma(a, x, L_f v(x)). \quad (43)$$

Let  $V_*$  be the set of increasing  $v \in B_{\bar{w}}$  such that  $v - b$  is decreasing. Note that  $v \in B_{\bar{w}}$  solves (9) if (and only if) it is a fixed point of  $P_*$ .<sup>88</sup> Then, it suffices to show that  $P_*$  has a fixed point in  $V_*$ . Note that  $V_*$ , endowed with the point-wise order, is a complete lattice,<sup>89</sup> and  $P_*$  is increasing. Then, from Tarski's fixed-point theorem, it suffices to show that  $P_*v \in V_*$  for all  $v \in V_*$ .

Fix  $v \in V_*$  and note that  $P_*v(x) \geq \Gamma(0, x, L_f v(x)) = b(x)$  and, from Claim 2,  $Pv \leq \bar{w}$ . Moreover,  $v$  is continuous and  $b'(x)$ -Lipschitz over  $[x, \infty)$  for any  $x > 0$ , since  $b$  is increasing and concave. Then, so is  $L_f v$ .<sup>90</sup> In particular,  $L_f v$  is absolutely continuous. Then, given any  $a \in [0, 1]$ ,  $\gamma : x \mapsto \Gamma(a, x, L_f v(x))$  is absolutely continuous on  $\mathbb{R}_+$  and,

---

88. Indeed,  $v = P_*v$  if and only if

$$0 = \max_{a \in [0,1]} L_f v(x) + \frac{b(x) - c(a, x) - L_f v(x)}{1 + a\lambda n} - v(x) \Leftrightarrow 0 = \max_{a \in [0,1]} a\lambda n L_f v(x) + b(x) - c(a, x) - v(x)(1 + a\lambda n)$$

and the second equation is clearly equivalent to (9).

89. It suffices to show that, for any  $V \subseteq V_*$ , the maps  $\hat{v} : x \mapsto \sup_{v \in V} v(x)$  and  $\check{v} : x \mapsto \inf_{v \in V} v(x)$  belong to  $V_*$ . For the former, note that  $b \leq \hat{v} \leq \bar{w}$  since  $b \leq v \leq \bar{w}$  for all  $v \in V$ . Moreover, given  $y \geq x \geq 0$ , for each  $v \in V$ ,  $0 \leq v(y) - v(x) \leq \hat{v}(y) - v(x)$  and  $v(y) - \hat{v}(x) \leq v(y) - v(x) \leq b(y) - b(x)$ . As  $v \in V$  is arbitrary,  $0 \leq \hat{v}(y) - \hat{v}(x) \leq b(y) - b(x)$ . As  $x$  and  $y$  are arbitrary,  $\hat{v}$  is increasing and  $\hat{v} - b$  is decreasing, so that  $\hat{v}$  is continuous and, therefore, measurable. Hence  $\hat{v} \in B_{\bar{w}}$  and, thus,  $\hat{v} \in V_*$ . The argument for  $\check{v}$  is similar.

90. Continuity at 0 follows easily from the dominated convergence theorem.

for any  $x > 0$  at which  $L_f v$  is differentiable,  $\gamma$  is differentiable as well and

$$\gamma'(x) = \frac{b'(x) - c_2(a, x) + a\lambda n(L_f v)'(x)}{1 + a\lambda n} \leq \frac{b'(x) - c_2(a, x) + a\lambda n b'(x)}{1 + a\lambda n} \leq b'(x)$$

where the second inequality follows from Claim 1, and the third holds since  $c_2 \geq 0$ . Note also that  $L_f v$  is increasing since  $v$  is, so that  $\gamma'(x) \geq 0$ , as  $u$  is increasing in  $x$ . Then, Theorem 2 and Theorem 1 of Milgrom and Segal (2002) imply that  $P_* v$  is absolutely continuous, and that  $0 \leq (P_* v)'(x) \leq b'(x)$  for any  $x > 0$  at which  $P_* v$  is differentiable, respectively. Thus  $P_* v \in B_{\bar{w}}$ ,  $P_* v$  is increasing and  $P_* v - b$  is decreasing, so that  $P_* v \in V_*$ .

*Step 2.*  $v_*$  is induced by a decreasing Markov strategy  $\alpha_*$ . Let  $\alpha_*$  given by

$$\alpha_*(x) := \min \arg \max_{a \in [0,1]} a\lambda n \{ \mathbb{E}_F[v_*(x + \tilde{z})] - v_*(x) \} - c(a, x). \quad (44)$$

Since  $v_* \in B_{\bar{w}}$  solves (9),  $v_*$  is induced by  $\alpha_*$ .<sup>91</sup> Moreover,  $\alpha_*$  is symmetric, so that it remains to show that  $\alpha_*$  is decreasing. From the argument in footnote 88,

$$\alpha_*(x) \in \min \arg \max_{a \in [0,1]} \Gamma(a, x, L_f v_*(x))$$

for all  $x \geq 0$ . Let  $\gamma^* : [0, 1] \times \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be given by

$$\gamma^*(a, x) := L_f v_*(x) - [b(x) - c(a, x)] - \left( \frac{1}{n\lambda} + a \right) c_1(a, x). \quad (45)$$

Note that  $a \mapsto \Gamma(a, x, L_f v_*(x))$  is differentiable on  $(0, 1)$  for all  $x \geq 0$ , and its derivative has the same sign as  $\gamma^*(a, x)$ . Then, it suffices to show that  $\gamma^*$  is decreasing in  $a$  (so that  $\Gamma(a, x, L_f v_*(x))$  is quasi-concave in  $a$ ) as well as in  $x$ . To this end note that, since  $v_* \in V_*$  (from Step 1) and  $u$  is twice continuously differentiable,  $\gamma^*$  is absolutely continuous and, for almost every  $(a, x)$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_1^*(a, x) &= - \left( \frac{1}{n\lambda} + a \right) c_{11}(a, x) \\ \gamma_2^*(a, x) &= (L_f v_*)'(x) - [b'(x) - c_2(a, x)] - \left( \frac{1}{n\lambda} + a \right) c_{12}(a, x). \end{aligned}$$

As  $\gamma^*$  is absolutely continuous and  $c_{11} \geq 0$ ,  $\gamma^*$  is decreasing in  $a$ . It remains to prove that  $\gamma_2^*(a, x) \leq 0$  whenever it exists. Note that, since  $c_{12}$  is increasing in  $a$ ,  $\gamma_2^*$  is decreasing in  $a$ . Then

$$\gamma_2^*(a, x) \leq \gamma_2^*(0, x) \leq (L_f v_*)'(x) - b'(x) \leq 0$$

where the second inequality holds since  $c_2(0, x) = 0$  and  $c_{12} \geq 0$ , and the last follows from Claim 1, since  $v_* \in V_*$ .

---

91. This follows from e.g. Theorem 3.1.2 of Piunovskiy and Zhang (2020).

*Step 3.*  $\alpha_*(\tilde{x}_t) \rightarrow 0$  as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ , and  $\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \alpha_*(x) = 0$ . Note that  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{x}_t$  exists since  $\tilde{x}_t$  is increasing in  $t$ . Since  $\alpha_*$  is decreasing, it is clear that  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{x}_t > x$  a.s. for any  $x \geq 0$  such that  $\alpha_*(x) > 0$ . Then,  $\alpha_*(\tilde{x}_t) \rightarrow 0$  as  $t \rightarrow \infty$  as long as  $\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \alpha_*(x) = 0$ .<sup>92</sup>

To prove that  $\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \alpha_*(x) = 0$  note that, for  $x > 0$ ,

$$\mathbb{E}_F[v_*(x + \tilde{z}) - v_*(x)] \leq \mathbb{E}_F[b(x + \tilde{z}) - b(x)] \leq b'(x)\mu$$

where the first inequality holds since  $v_* - b$  is decreasing, and the second follows from the mean-value theorem, since  $b$  is concave. Then, for all  $a \in (0, 1]$ , (2) implies that

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \lambda n \{ \mathbb{E}_F[v_*(x + \tilde{z})] - v_*(x) \} - c_1(a, x) < 0$$

so that, by definition of  $\alpha_*$ ,  $\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \alpha_*(x) < a$ . As  $a$  is arbitrary,  $\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \alpha_*(x) = 0$ .  $\square$

*Proof of Corollary 1.* Suppose first that (11) admits a solution  $x \geq 0$ . By continuity, it admits a smallest solution  $\hat{x} \geq 0$ , and (11) holds with equality at  $\hat{x}$ . Since  $\alpha_*(\tilde{x}_t) \rightarrow 0$  a.s. as  $t \rightarrow \infty$  (Theorem 1), it suffices to show that  $\alpha_*(\hat{x}) = 0$  and  $\alpha_*(x) > 0$  for all  $0 \leq x < \hat{x}$ . For the former, note that the left-hand side of (11) is decreasing in  $x$ , since  $b$  is concave, whereas the right-hand side is increasing. Then, (11) holds with ‘ $\leq$ ’ for all  $x \geq \hat{x}$ . Hence,  $b$  solves (9) at all  $x \geq \hat{x}$ . Therefore,  $v_*(x) = b(x)$  for all  $x \geq \hat{x}$ , as  $v_*$  is the unique solution to (9) in  $B_{\bar{w}}$  (Step 1 of the proof of Theorem 1). Then, from (44),  $\alpha_*(\hat{x}) = 0$ .

For the latter, suppose that  $\alpha_*(\tilde{x}) = 0$  for some  $0 \leq \tilde{x} < \hat{x}$ , and seek a contradiction. Then, since  $\alpha_*$  is decreasing (Theorem 1),  $\alpha_*(x) = 0$  for all  $x \geq \tilde{x}$  and, since  $\alpha_*$  induces  $v_*$ ,  $v_*(x) = b(x)$  for all  $x \geq \tilde{x}$ . Moreover, (11) holds with ‘ $>$ ’ at  $x = \tilde{x}$  as  $\tilde{x} < \hat{x}$ . But this contradicts the fact that  $\alpha_*$  solves (10) at  $x = \tilde{x}$ .

Suppose now that (11) holds with ‘ $<$ ’ for all  $x \geq 0$ . Then, from the argument in the previous paragraph,  $\alpha_*$  is strictly positive, so that effort never ceases. Finally,  $\tilde{x}_t \rightarrow \infty$  a.s. as  $t \rightarrow \infty$  since  $\alpha_*(\tilde{x}_t) \rightarrow 0$  a.s. as  $t \rightarrow \infty$  (Theorem 1).  $\square$

## F Proofs of Theorem 2 and of Corollaries 2 and 4

The proofs of Theorem 2 and of Corollaries 2 and 4 are based on two results (Theorem 5 and Proposition 4 below), proved at the end of this section. The proof of Theorem 3 relies on these results as well.

Recall the definitions of  $L_f$ ,  $L_d$  and  $B_w$  from Appendix D, and of  $v_*$  and  $\alpha_*$  from Appendix E. For  $k \in \{f, d\}$ , let  $V_k$  be the set of pairs  $(\alpha_k, v_k)$ , where  $\alpha_k$  is a Markov

---

92. Indeed, if  $\alpha_*(x) > 0$  for all  $x \geq 0$  then  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{x}_t = \infty$  a.s., so that  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \alpha_*(\tilde{x}_t) \stackrel{\text{a.s.}}{=} \lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \alpha_*(x) = 0$ . If instead  $\alpha_*(x) = 0$  for some  $x \geq 0$ , let  $\hat{x} := \inf\{x \geq 0 : \alpha_*(x) = 0\}$ . By definition of  $\alpha_*$ ,  $\alpha_*(\hat{x}) = 0$ . Then  $\Pr(\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \alpha_*(\tilde{x}_t) = 0) = \Pr(\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{x}_t \geq \hat{x}) = \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \Pr(\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{x}_t > \hat{x} - 1/m) = 1$ .



strategy and  $v_k \in B_{v_*}$ , satisfying both of the following for all  $x \geq 0$ :

$$v_k(x) = \max_{a \in [0,1]} [b(x) - c(a, x)] + \lambda[a + (n-1)\alpha_k(x)][L_k v_k(x) - v_k(x)] \quad (46)$$

$$\alpha_k(x) \in \arg \max_{a \in [0,1]} a\lambda[L_k v_k(x) - v_k(x)] - c(a, x). \quad (47)$$

**Theorem 5.** *Given  $k \in \{f, d\}$ ,  $V_k = \{(\alpha_k, v_k)\}$ . Moreover,  $\alpha_k$  is continuous and decreasing, and lies below  $\alpha_*$ . Finally,  $v_k$  and  $L_k v_k$  are continuous, and  $v_k - b$  is decreasing.*

Recall from Appendices A and B that  $H$  is the set of histories in the baseline game with forced disclosure, as well as the set of public histories in the game with disposal.

**Proposition 4.** *The Markov strategy  $\alpha_f$  induces the unique strongly symmetric equilibrium of the baseline game with forced disclosure, and generates payoff  $v_f(X(h))$  after any history  $h \in H$ . Moreover, a strategy  $\xi := (\sigma, \chi)$  of the game with disposal induces a strongly symmetric equilibrium if and only if  $\sigma = \alpha_d$  and*

$$[\chi(h)](t, z) \in \arg \max_{d \in \{0,1\}} \{d[v_d(x+z) - v_d(x)]\} \quad \text{for all } t > 0 \text{ and } z > 0. \quad (48)$$

Finally, at any public history  $h \in H$ , any such  $\xi$  yields continuation payoff  $v_d(X(h))$  to each agent.

*Proof of Theorem 2.* Immediate from Proposition 4 and Theorem 5.  $\square$

*Proof of Corollary 2.* Note first that, if  $\alpha_*(x_0) = 0$  then  $\alpha_f(x_0) = 0$  by Theorem 1, so that  $v_*(x_0) = b(x_0) = v_f(x_0)$ . Suppose now that  $\alpha_*(x_0) > 0$ , and let  $\hat{x} = \max\{x_0\} \cup \{x \geq x_0 : \alpha_f(x) = 1\}$ . By Theorems 1 and 2,  $\hat{x} < \infty$ . Then, (10) and (17) imply that  $\alpha_f < \alpha_*$  over  $(\hat{x}, \bar{x})$  for some  $\bar{x} > 0$ . Hence,  $v_f < v_*$  over  $(\hat{x}, \bar{x})$ , from (9) and (16). Therefore,  $v_f(x_0) < v_*(x_0)$  by (1).  $\square$

*Proof of Corollary 4.* Let  $\alpha : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow [0, 1]$  be given by

$$\alpha(x) := \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } x \leq y_f \\ \frac{1}{(n-1)x} \int_x^{\lambda\mu} \frac{M}{\lambda} & \text{if } y_f \leq x \leq \lambda\mu \\ 0 & \text{if } x \geq \lambda\mu. \end{cases}$$

It suffices to show that there exists a continuous  $v : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  such that

$$v(x) := \begin{cases} x & \text{if } x \geq \lambda\mu \\ x + \int_x^{\lambda\mu} \frac{M}{\lambda} & \text{if } y_f \leq x \leq \lambda\mu \\ \frac{\lambda n}{1 + \lambda n} \mathbb{E}_F[v(x + \tilde{z})] & \text{if } x < y_f, \end{cases} \quad (49)$$

that  $v$  solves (16) and  $\alpha$  solves (17) with  $\hat{v}_\alpha = v$ , and that  $v$  is globally increasing if it is increasing over  $[y_f, \lambda\mu]$ .

To this end, let  $v_0 : [y_f, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  satisfy (49) for all  $x \geq y_f$ . Note that  $v_0$  solves (16) for  $x \geq \lambda\mu$ . Moreover,  $v_0$  is absolutely continuous and

$$\lambda\{\mathbb{E}_F[v'_0(x + \tilde{z})] - v'_0(x)\} = 1$$

for all  $x \in [y_f, \lambda\mu)$ . Since

$$\lambda\{\mathbb{E}_F[v_0(x + \tilde{z})] - v_0(x)\} = x \tag{50}$$

holds at  $x = \lambda\mu$ , it follows that it holds at all  $y_f \leq x \leq \lambda\mu$ . Then, substituting (50) into (16) yields that  $v_0$  solves (16) for all  $x \geq y_f$ , and that  $\alpha$  solves (17) with  $\hat{v}_\alpha = v_0$  for all  $x \geq y_f$ . At  $x = y_f$ , (16) yields

$$v_0(x) = \frac{\lambda n}{1 + \lambda n} \mathbb{E}_F[v_0(x + \tilde{z})].$$

Then, by the contraction-mapping theorem, there exists a continuous  $v : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  satisfying (49) and such that  $x \mapsto v(x) - x$  is decreasing, and  $v$  is increasing if  $v_0$  is increasing. Since  $x \mapsto v(x) - x$  is decreasing,  $v$  solves (16) and  $\alpha$  solves (17) with  $\hat{v}_\alpha = v$ . This completes the proof.  $\square$

The following two claims are used in the proofs of Theorem 5 and Proposition 4. They are proved at the end of this section.

*Claim 3.* Let  $\bar{v}, \underline{v} : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be measurable, bounded below, and such that  $\bar{v} \geq \underline{v}$  and  $\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \bar{v}(x) - \underline{v}(x) = 0$ . Then  $\bar{v} = \underline{v}$  if one of the following holds:

- $\bar{v} - \underline{v} \leq L_f \bar{v} - L_f \underline{v}$ , or
- $\bar{v} - \underline{v} \leq L_d \bar{v} - L_d \underline{v}$  and  $\lim_m \bar{v}(x_m) - \underline{v}(x_m) = 0$  for any bounded sequence  $(x_m)_{m \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathbb{R}_+$  such that  $\lim_m \Pr_F(\bar{v}(x_m + \tilde{z}) \leq \bar{v}(x_m)) = 1$ .

*Claim 4.*  $\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} v_*(x) - b(x) = 0$

Recall the definition of  $\Gamma$  from Appendix D.

*Proof of Theorem 5. Step 1.* There are  $(\underline{\alpha}_k, \underline{v}_k), (\bar{\alpha}_k, \bar{v}_k) \in V_k$  such that  $\bar{\alpha}_k \leq \alpha_*$  and, for all  $(\alpha, v) \in V_k$ ,  $\underline{\alpha}_k \leq \alpha_k \leq \bar{\alpha}_k \leq \alpha_*$  and  $\underline{v}_k \leq v_k \leq \bar{v}_k$ . There are  $(\underline{\alpha}_k, \underline{v}_k), (\bar{\alpha}_k, \bar{v}_k) \in V_k$  such that  $\bar{\alpha}_k \leq \alpha_*$  and, for all  $(\alpha, v) \in V_k$ ,  $\underline{\alpha}_k \leq \alpha_k \leq \bar{\alpha}_k \leq \alpha_*$  and  $\underline{v}_k \leq v_k \leq \bar{v}_k$ .

Note that, for any  $x \geq (>) 0$  and  $l > (\geq) b(x)$ , there is a unique  $p(x, l) \in [0, 1]$  such that

$$p(x, l) \in \arg \max_{a \in [0, 1]} a \lambda \frac{l - [b(x) - c(p(x, l), x)]}{1 + \lambda n p(x, l)} - c(a, x). \tag{51}$$

Indeed, the objective is continuously differentiable and concave in  $a$ , and its derivative has the same sign as  $\gamma(p(x, l), x, l)$  where

$$\gamma(a, x, l) := l - [b(x) - c(a, x)] - \left(\frac{1}{\lambda} + na\right)c_1(a, x) \quad (52)$$

is decreasing in  $a$ , as  $c(a, x)$  is convex in  $a$ .<sup>93</sup> Moreover,  $p$  is continuous (when viewed as a map  $(\{0\} \times (b(0), \infty)) \cup \{(x, l) \in (0, \infty) \times \mathbb{R} : l \geq b(x)\} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ ).<sup>94</sup> Given  $v \in B_{v_*}$ , let  $P_kv : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be given by

$$P_kv(x) := \Gamma(p(x, L_kv(x)), x, L_kv(x)).$$

*Claim 5.*  $\Gamma(a, x, L_kv(x)) \leq P_kv(x)$  for all  $x \geq 0$ ,  $v \in B_{v_*}$ , and  $0 \leq a \leq p(x, L_kv(x))$ .

Claim 5 is proved at the end of this proof. I prove that  $P_k$  maps  $B_{v_*}$  to itself. Note that

$$L_kv \leq L_kv_* = L_f v_* \quad \text{for all } v \in B_{v_*} \quad (53)$$

where the inequality holds since  $v \leq v_*$ , and the equality since  $v_*$  is increasing (Theorem 1). Fix  $v \in B_{v_*}$ . Note that  $L_kv$ ,<sup>95</sup>  $p$  and, therefore,  $P_kv$  are measurable. Fix  $x \geq 0$ . Since  $p(x, L_kv(x)) \geq 0$ , from Claim 5,  $P_kv(x) \geq \Gamma(0, x, L_kv(x)) = b(x)$ . Moreover,

$$P_kv(x) \leq \Gamma(p(x, L_kv(x)), x, L_f v_*(x)) \leq P v_*(x) = v_*(x)$$

where the first inequality follows from (53) since  $\Gamma(a, x, l)$  is increasing in  $l$ , the second follows from (43), and the equality from Step 1 of the proof of Theorem 1. Since  $x \geq 0$  is arbitrary,  $P_kv \in B_{v_*}$  as desired.

I show that  $P_k$  is increasing (in the pointwise order). Fix  $v, w \in B_{v_*}$  such that  $w \leq v$ , and  $x \geq 0$ . Then  $L_kw(x) \leq L_kv(x)$ . Then  $P_kw(x) \leq \Gamma(p(x, L_kw(x)), x, L_kv(x))$  as  $\Gamma(a, x, l)$  is increasing in  $l$ , and  $p(x, L_kw(x)) \leq p(x, L_kv(x))$  as  $p(x, l)$  is increasing in  $l$  (since  $\gamma(a, x, l)$  is). Together with Claim 5, the latter implies that

$$\Gamma(p(x, L_kw(x)), x, L_kv(x)) \leq P_kv(x).$$

Hence,  $P_kw(x) \leq P_kv(x)$  and, since  $x \geq 0$  is arbitrary,  $P_k$  is increasing.

Note that any countable set in  $B_{v_*}$  admits a supremum and an infimum (in the point-

---

93. In particular,  $p(x, l) = 0$  for  $l < \underline{a}(x) := b(x) - c_1(0, x)/\lambda$ ,  $p(x, l) = 1$  for  $l > \bar{a}(x) := b(x) - c_1(1, x) - (\frac{1}{\lambda} + n)c_1(1, x)$  and, for  $\underline{a}(x) \leq l \leq \bar{a}(x)$ ,  $p(x, l)$  is the unique root of  $\gamma(\cdot, x, l)$  in  $[0, 1]$ . To see why the root is unique, note that  $\gamma(\cdot, x, l)$  is strictly increasing for  $x > 0$  and, for  $x = 0$ , there is  $\hat{a} \in [0, 1]$  such that  $c(a, x) = 0$  for  $a \leq \hat{a}$ , and  $c(\cdot, x)$  is strictly increasing over  $[\hat{a}, 1]$ . Then,  $\gamma(a, 0) = b(0) < l$  for  $a \leq \hat{a}$  so that, since  $l \leq \bar{a}(0)$ ,  $\hat{a} < 1$  and  $\gamma(\cdot, 0, l)$  has a unique root over  $[\hat{a}, 1]$ .

94. This is because, when viewed as a correspondence,  $p$  is clearly upper-hemicontinuous, since the correspondence  $(x, \gamma) \mapsto \arg \max_{a \in [0, 1]} a\gamma - c(a, x)$  is as well.

95. This follows from e.g. Theorem 18.3 of Billingsley (2012) since  $(x, z) \mapsto v(x + z)$  is measurable and bounded below by  $b(0)$ .

wise order) in  $B_{v_*}$ . Moreover,  $P_k(\lim_m v_m) = \lim_m P_k(v_m)$  for any monotone sequence  $(v_m)_{m \in \mathbb{N}} \subset B_{v_*}$ , since  $\lim_m L_k v_m = L_k(\lim_m v_m)$  by monotone convergence, and  $p$  and  $\Gamma_*$  are continuous. Then,  $P_k$  has smallest and largest fixed points  $\underline{v}_k, \bar{v}_k \in B_{v_*}$ .<sup>96</sup> Define the Markov strategies  $\underline{\alpha}_k$  and  $\bar{\alpha}_k$  by  $\underline{\alpha}_k(x) := p(x, L_k \underline{v}_k(x))$  and  $\bar{\alpha}_k := p(x, L_k \bar{v}_k(x))$ . Note that, for any Markov strategy  $\alpha_k$ ,  $v_k \in B_{v_*}$ , and  $x \geq 0$ , ‘(46) and (47)’ is equivalent to ‘ $v_k(x) = P_k v_k(x)$  and  $\alpha_k(x) = p(x, L_k v_k(x))$ ’.<sup>97</sup> Then  $(\underline{\alpha}_k, \underline{v}_k), (\bar{\alpha}_k, \bar{v}_k) \in V_k$ . Moreover, for any  $(\alpha_k, v_k) \in V_k$ ,  $v_k$  is a fixed point of  $P_k$ , and  $\alpha_k(x) = p(x, L_k v_k(x))$  for all  $x \geq 0$ . Then,  $\underline{v}_k \leq v_k \leq \bar{v}_k$  so that  $L_k \underline{v}_k \leq L_k v_k \leq L_k \bar{v}_k$  and therefore  $\underline{\alpha}_k \leq \alpha_k \leq \bar{\alpha}_k$ , as  $p(x, l)$  is increasing in  $l$ .

It remains to prove that  $\bar{\alpha}_k(x) \leq \alpha_*(x)$  for all  $x \geq 0$ . Fix  $x \geq 0$  and assume without loss of generality that  $\bar{\alpha}_k(x) > 0$  and  $\alpha_*(x) < 1$ . Then, from Step 2 of the proof of Theorem 1, it suffices to show that  $\gamma^*(\bar{\alpha}_k(x), x) > 0$  where  $\gamma^*$  was defined in (45). Note that

$$\gamma^*(\bar{\alpha}_k(x), x) > \gamma(\bar{\alpha}_k(x), x, L_k \bar{v}_k(x)) \geq 0$$

where the first inequality follows from (53) (as  $\bar{v}_k \in B_{v_*}$ ) and the fact that  $c_1(\bar{\alpha}_k(x), x) > 0$  (as  $\bar{\alpha}_k(x) > 0$ ), and the second holds since  $\bar{\alpha}_k(x) > 0$ .

*Step 2:  $V_k$  is a singleton.* From Step 1, it suffices to show that  $(\underline{\alpha}_k, \underline{v}_k) = (\bar{\alpha}_k, \bar{v}_k)$ . By definition of  $\underline{\alpha}_k$  and  $\bar{\alpha}_k$ , it is enough to show that  $\underline{v}_k = \bar{v}_k$ . Note that  $v_* \geq \bar{v}_k \geq \underline{v}_k \geq b$  since  $\bar{v}_k, \underline{v}_k \in B_{v_*}$ , so that  $\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \bar{v}_k(x) - \underline{v}_k(x) = 0$  by Claim 4. Moreover,  $\lim_m \bar{v}_k(x_m) - b(x_m) = 0$  for any bounded sequence  $(x_m)_{m \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathbb{R}_+$  such that  $\lim_m \Pr_F(\bar{v}(x_m + \tilde{z}) \leq \bar{v}(x_m)) = 1$ , by (46). Then, in light of Claim 3, it suffices to show that

$$\bar{v}_k(x) - \underline{v}_k(x) \leq L_k \bar{v}_k(x) - L_k \underline{v}_k(x) \tag{54}$$

for all  $x \geq 0$ . Fix  $x$  and consider three cases. Suppose first that  $\bar{\alpha}_k(x) = 0$ . Then  $\underline{\alpha}_k(x) = 0$  as  $\bar{\alpha}_k \geq \underline{\alpha}_k$ , so that  $\bar{v}_k(x) = b(x) = \underline{v}_k(x)$  and, therefore, (54) holds since  $\bar{v}_k \geq \underline{v}_k$ . Suppose now that  $\underline{\alpha}_k(x) = 1$ . Then,  $\bar{\alpha}_k(x) = 1$  so that, from (46),

$$[L_k \bar{v}_k(x) - \bar{v}_k(x)] - [L_k \underline{v}_k(x) - \underline{v}_k(x)] = \frac{\bar{v}_k(x) - \underline{v}_k(x)}{\lambda n} \geq 0$$

and thus (54) holds. Finally, assume that  $\bar{\alpha}_k(x) > 0$  and  $\underline{\alpha}_k(x) < 1$ . Then, from (47),

$$L_k \bar{v}_k(x) - \bar{v}_k(x) \geq \frac{c(\bar{\alpha}_k(x), x)}{\lambda} \geq \frac{c(\underline{\alpha}_k(x), x)}{\lambda} \geq L_k \underline{v}_k(x) - \underline{v}_k(x)$$

where the first inequality holds since  $\bar{\alpha}_k(x) > 0$ , the second since  $\bar{\alpha}_k(x) \geq \underline{\alpha}_k(x)$ , and the

96. See e.g. Theorem 2 of Kolodner (1968).

97. Indeed, given (47), (46) is equivalent to ‘ $v_k(x) = b(x) - c(\alpha_k(x), x) + n\alpha_k(x)[L_k v_k(x) - v_k(x)]$ ’, i.e. ‘ $v_k(x) = \Gamma(\alpha_k(x), x, L_k v_k(x))$ ’. Given ‘ $v_k(x) = \Gamma(\alpha_k(x), x, L_k v_k(x))$ ’, (47) is equivalent to ‘(51) with  $l = L_k v_k(x)$  and  $p(x, l) = \alpha_k(x)$ ’, which is equivalent to ‘ $\alpha_k(x) = p(x, L_k v_k(x))$ ’. Finally, given ‘ $\alpha_k(x) = p(x, L_k v_k(x))$ ’, ‘ $v_k(x) = \Gamma(\alpha_k(x), x, L_k v_k(x))$ ’ is equivalent to ‘ $v_k(x) = P_k v_k(x)$ ’.

third since  $\underline{\alpha}_k(x) < 1$ . Then, (54) holds.

*Step 3:*  $v_k - b$  and  $\alpha_k$  are decreasing. Let  $\widehat{V}$  be the set of  $v \in B_{v_*}$  such that  $v - b$  is decreasing. From Steps 1 and 2, it suffices to show that  $p(x, L_k v(x))$  is decreasing in  $x$  for any  $v \in B_{v_*}$ , and to find a fixed point  $v$  of  $P_k$  in  $\widehat{V}$ . For the former, fix  $v \in \widehat{V}$ . From Claim 1,  $L_k v(x) - b(x)$  is decreasing. Then,  $\gamma(a, x, L_k v(x))$  is decreasing in  $x$ , as  $c_1$  and  $c_{11}$  are increasing in  $x$ .<sup>98</sup> Hence  $p(x, L_k v(x))$  is decreasing in  $x$ .

To show that  $P_k$  admits a fixed point in  $\widehat{V}$ , note that  $\widehat{V}$  is a complete lattice<sup>99</sup> and, from Step 1,  $P_k$  is increasing on  $\widehat{V}$ . Then, from Tarski's fixed-point theorem, it suffices to show that  $P_k$  maps  $\widehat{V}$  to itself. To this end, fix  $v \in \widehat{V}$ . From Step 1,  $P_k v \in B_{v_*}$ . Then, it suffices to show that  $P_k v(x_2) - P_k v(x_1) \leq b(x_2) - b(x_1)$  for all  $0 \leq x_1 \leq x_2$ . Fix  $x_1$  and  $x_2$ , and let  $p_i = p(x_i, L_k v(x_i))$  for  $i = 1, 2$ , so that  $p_1 \geq p_2$  from the previous paragraph. Then

$$\begin{aligned} P_k v(x_2) - P_k v(x_1) &\leq \Gamma(p_2, x_2, L_k v(x_2)) - \Gamma(p_2, x_1, L_k v(x_1)) \\ &\leq \frac{b(x_2) - b(x_1) + \lambda n p_2 [L_k v(x_2) - L_k v(x_1)]}{1 + \lambda n p_2} \leq b(x_2) - b(x_1) \end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality follows from Claim 5 since  $p_2 \leq p_1$ , the second holds since  $c$  is increasing in  $x$ , and the third follows from Claim 1. Hence  $P_k v \in \widehat{V}$ , as desired.

*Step 5.*  $v_k, L_k v_k$  and  $\alpha_k$  are continuous. Given a map  $\phi : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , define

$$\phi(x^+) := \lim_{y \downarrow x} \phi(y) \quad \& \quad \phi(x^-) := \begin{cases} b(0) & \text{if } x = 0 \\ \lim_{y \uparrow x} \phi(y) & \text{if } x > 0. \end{cases}$$

Let  $\bar{v}, \underline{v} : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be given by  $\bar{v}(x) := v_k(x^-)$  and  $\underline{v}(x) := v_k(x^+)$ , and note that  $\bar{v}$  and  $\underline{v}$  are well-defined and lie in  $B_{v_*}$ , since  $v_k - b$  is decreasing and  $b$  is concave. Since  $\alpha_k$  is decreasing,  $\bar{\alpha}, \underline{\alpha} : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow [0, 1]$  given by  $\bar{\alpha}(x) := \alpha_k(x^-)$  and  $\underline{\alpha}(x) := \alpha_k(x^+)$  are well-defined Markov strategies.

Note that, for all  $x \geq 0$ ,  $L_k v_k(x^-) = L\bar{v}(x)$  and  $L_k v_k(x^+) = L\underline{v}(x)$  by dominated convergence. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\alpha}(x) &= p(x, L\bar{v}(x)) \quad \& \quad \bar{v}(x) = \Gamma(\bar{\alpha}(x), x, L_k \bar{v}(x)) = P_k \bar{v}(x), \\ \underline{\alpha}(x) &= p(x, L\underline{v}(x)) \quad \& \quad \underline{v}(x) = \Gamma(\underline{\alpha}(x), x, L_k \underline{v}(x)) = P_k \underline{v}(x), \end{aligned}$$

since  $p$  and  $\Gamma$  are continuous, so that  $(\bar{\alpha}, \bar{v}), (\underline{\alpha}, \underline{v}) \in V_k$  by the argument in footnote 97. Then,  $(\bar{\alpha}, \bar{v}) = (\underline{\alpha}, \underline{v})$  from Step 2, and thus  $v_k, L_k v$ , and  $\alpha_k$  are continuous.  $\square$

98. In detail,  $\gamma(a, x, L_k v(x)) = [L_k v(x) - b(x)] - [\frac{1}{\lambda} + (n-1)a]c_1(a, x) - \int_0^a \int_{a'}^a c_{11}(a'', x) da'' da'$ , and the first term is increasing, whereas the other two are decreasing.

99. The argument is similar to that of footnote 89. Measurability follows from the fact that, clearly, the variation of any map  $v : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  such that  $b \leq v \leq v_*$  and  $v - b$  is decreasing, is bounded by  $|v_*(x) - b(0)| + 2|b(x) - b(0)|$  over  $[0, x]$  for any  $x \geq 0$ .

*Proof of Proposition 4.* The argument relies on the notation introduced in Appendices A and B. To show that  $\alpha_f$  induces a strongly symmetric equilibrium of the game with forced disclosure, it suffices to show that  $v_f$  solves (16) with  $\alpha = \alpha_f$ , and  $\alpha_f$  solves (17) with  $\hat{v}_\alpha = v_f$ . This holds since  $(\alpha_f, v_f) \in V_f$ . Moreover, it is clear that  $v_{\alpha_f}^i(h) = v_f(X(h))$  for any  $i$  and  $h \in H$ .

Similarly, to show that a strategy  $\xi := (\alpha_d, \chi)$  of the game with disposal such that (48) holds induces a strongly symmetric equilibrium, it suffices to show that  $v_d$  solves (27) with  $\alpha = \alpha_d$  and (any)  $\delta$  such that (29) holds, and that  $\alpha_d$  solves (28) with  $\hat{v}_\pi = v_d$ . This holds since  $(\alpha_d, v_d) \in V_d$ . Moreover, it is clear that  $v_\xi^i(h) = v_d(X(h))$  for any  $i$  and public history  $h \in H$ .

It remains to show that a strategy  $\sigma$  of the game with forced disclosure induces a strongly symmetric equilibrium only if  $\sigma = \alpha_f$ , and that a strategy  $(\sigma, \chi)$  of the game with disposal induces a strongly symmetric equilibrium only if  $\sigma = \alpha_d$  and (48) holds. To this end, note that the games with forced disclosure and disposal are parametrised by the initial stock  $x_0$ . To make this explicit, express the sets  $H$ ,  $\Sigma$  and  $\Xi$  as  $H(x_0)$ ,  $\Sigma(x_0)$  and  $\Xi(x_0)$ , respectively. For any  $x \geq 0$ , Let  $\Xi_f^*(x)$  ( $\Xi_d^*(x)$ ) be the set of  $\sigma \in \Sigma(x)$  ( $\xi \in \Xi(x)$ ) inducing strongly symmetric equilibria in the game with forced disclosure (with disposal) and initial stock  $x$ . Fix  $x_0$  and  $k \in \{f, d\}$ .

I claim that it suffices to show that  $v_{\xi, h}$  is constant with value  $v_k(X(h))$  for all  $h \in H(x_0)$  and  $\xi \in \Xi_k^*(x_0)$ . To see why note first that, given  $x \geq 0$ ,  $L_k v_k(x) \geq v_k(x)$  where the inequality is strict unless  $x > 0$ . Indeed, if  $L_k v_k(x) \leq v_k(x)$  then  $v_k(x) = b(x)$  by (16) for  $k = f$  and (27) for  $k = d$ , so that  $L_k v_k(x) = b(x)$  and  $b$  must be constant over  $[x, \infty)$  since it is increasing and  $v_k \geq b$ , and thus  $x > 0$ .

Now suppose that  $v_{\xi, h}$  is constant with value  $v_k(X(h))$  for all  $h \in H(x_0)$  and  $\xi \in \Xi_k^*(x_0)$ . Fix  $\xi := (\sigma, \chi) \in \Xi_k^*(x_0)$  and a history  $h \in H(x_0)$ . Note that (48) follows from (26) if  $k = d$ , so that it is enough to show that  $\sigma(h) = \alpha_k(X(h))$  a.e. If  $L_k v_k(X(h)) > v_k(X(h))$ , then  $\sigma(h) = \alpha_k(X(h))$  a.e. by (14) and (16) for  $k = f$ , and (24) and (27) for  $k = d$ . If instead  $L_k v_k(X(h)) = v_k(X(h))$  then  $X(h) > 0$ , and thus  $\sigma(h) \stackrel{\text{a.e.}}{=} 0 = \alpha_k(X(h))$  by (15) and (17) for  $k = d$ , and (25) and (28) for  $k = f$ . Hence  $\sigma(h) = \alpha_k(X(h))$  a.e. as desired.

To prove that  $v_{\xi, h}$  is constant with value  $v_k(X(h))$  for all  $h \in H(x_0)$  and  $\xi \in \Xi_k^*(x_0)$ , define  $\bar{v}_k, \underline{v}_k : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  by

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{v}_k(x) &:= \inf_{\epsilon > 0} \sup \{v_\xi(y) : (x - \epsilon) \vee 0 \leq y \leq x + \epsilon, \xi \in \Sigma_k^*(y)\} \\ \underline{v}_k(x) &:= \sup_{\epsilon > 0} \inf \{v_\xi(y) : (x - \epsilon) \vee 0 \leq y \leq x + \epsilon, \xi \in \Sigma_k^*(y)\}.\end{aligned}$$

Note that  $\bar{v}_k \geq \underline{v}_k$  and  $v_{\xi, h}$  takes values in  $[\underline{v}_k(X(h)), \bar{v}_k(X(h))]$  for all  $\xi \in \Xi_k^*(x_0)$  and

$h \in H(x_0)$ .<sup>100</sup> Then, it suffices to show that  $\bar{v}_k = v_k = \underline{v}_k$ .

I show that  $\bar{v}_k = v_k$ , relying on Claim 3. A similar reasoning yields that  $v_k = \underline{v}_k$ . Note first that  $\bar{v}_k$  is upper-semicontinuous and, hence, measurable. Moreover,  $b \leq v_k \leq \bar{v}_k \leq v_*$  where the last inequality holds since  $v_*$  is continuous and  $v_\xi(x) \leq v_*(x)$  for all  $x \geq 0$  and  $\xi \in \Xi_k^*(x)$ , so that  $\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \bar{v}_k - v_k = 0$  by Claim 4.

I show that, if  $k = d$ , then  $\lim_m \bar{v}_d(x^m) - b(x^m) = 0$  for any bounded sequence  $(x^m)_{m \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathbb{R}_+$  such that  $\lim_m \Pr_F(\bar{v}_d(x^m + \tilde{z}) \leq \bar{v}_d(x^m)) = 1$ . Fix  $(x^m)_{m \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathbb{R}_+$  and note that  $\lim_m \mathbb{E}_F[0 \vee (\bar{v}_d(x^m + \tilde{z}) - \bar{v}_d(x^m))] = 0$  and that, for all  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $y \mapsto \mathbb{E}_F[0 \vee (\bar{v}_d(y + \tilde{z}) - \bar{v}_d(x^m))]$  is upper-semicontinuous at  $x_m$ , since  $\bar{v}_d$  is upper-semicontinuous. Then, it is clear that there exist sequences  $(y_m)_{m \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathbb{R}_+$  and  $(\xi^m)_{m \in \mathbb{N}} := (\sigma^m, \chi^m)_{m \in \mathbb{N}} \in \prod_{m \in \mathbb{N}} \Xi^*(y_m)$  such that  $(y_m)_{m \in \mathbb{N}}$  is bounded and  $b(y^m) - b(x^m)$ ,  $\bar{v}_d(x^m) - v_{\xi^m}(y^m)$ , and  $\mathbb{E}_F[0 \vee (\bar{v}_d(y^m + \tilde{z}) - v_{\xi^m}(y^m))]$  all vanish as  $m \rightarrow \infty$ . Hence, it suffices to show that  $\lim_m v_{\xi^m}(y^m) - b(y^m) = 0$ . Since  $(y_m)_{m \in \mathbb{N}}$  is bounded,  $(v_{\xi^m, y^m})_{m \in \mathbb{N}}$  is uniformly  $l$ -Lipschitz for some  $l > 0$ , as argued in Appendix A.1. Also, for all  $\epsilon > 0$  and  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ , as  $v_{\xi^m, y^m}$  is bounded, there is  $t_m \geq \epsilon$  such that  $v_{\xi^m, y^m}$  is increasing over  $[0, t_m - \epsilon]$ , and differentiable at  $t_m$  with derivative lower than  $\epsilon$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} v_{\xi^m}(y^m) &= v_{\xi^m, y^m}(0) \leq v_{\xi^m, y^m}(t_m - \epsilon) \leq l\epsilon + v_{\xi^m, y^m}(t_m) \\ &\leq (l + 1)\epsilon + b(y^m) - c([\sigma^m(h)](t_m), y^m) \\ &\quad + \lambda[\sigma^m(h)](t_m) \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}_F[0 \vee (v_{\xi^m}(y^m \frown (t_m, \tilde{z}, i)) - v_{\xi^m, y^m}(t_m))] \\ &\leq [l(1 + \lambda n) + 1]\epsilon + b(y^m) + \lambda n \mathbb{E}_F[0 \vee (\bar{v}_d(y^m + \tilde{z}) - v_{\xi^m}(y^m))] \end{aligned}$$

where the third inequality follows from (26) and (35), and the last inequality holds since  $v_{\xi^m}(y^m \frown (t_m, z, i)) \leq \bar{v}_d(y^m + z)$  for all  $i$ . Result follows since taking the limit  $m \rightarrow \infty$  yields that  $\lim_m v_{\xi^m}(y^m) - b(y^m) \leq [l(1 + \lambda n) + 1]\epsilon$ , and  $\epsilon > 0$  is arbitrary.

In light of Claim 3, it remains to show that  $\bar{v}_k - v_k \leq L_k \bar{v}_k - L_k v_k$ . Since  $v_k$  is continuous, it is enough to show that, for all  $x \geq 0$  and  $\xi \in \Xi_k^*(x)$ ,

$$v_\xi(x) - v_k(x) \leq L_k \bar{v}_k(x) - L_k v_k(x).^{101} \tag{55}$$

100. This is because  $\underline{v}_k(x) \leq v_\xi(x) \leq \bar{v}_k(x)$  for any  $x \geq 0$  and  $\hat{\xi} \in \Xi_k^*(x)$  and, given  $\xi, h$  and any  $t \geq 0$ , there is  $\hat{\xi} \in \Xi^*(X(h))$  such that  $v_{\hat{\xi}, h}(t) = v_\xi(X(h))$ . To construct  $\hat{\xi}$ , define  $\phi : \Xi(X(h)) \rightarrow \Xi(x_0)$  by  $\phi((X(h), (t_1, z_1, i_1), \dots, (t_m, z_m, i_m))) := h \frown ((t + t_1, z_1, i_1), \dots, (t + t_m, z_m, i_m))$  for all  $m \geq 0$  and  $(X(h), (t_1, z_1, i_1), \dots, (t_m, z_m, i_m)) \in H(X(h))$ , and let  $[\hat{\xi}(h')](s) = [\xi(\phi(h'))](t + s)$  for all  $h' \in H(X(h))$  and  $s \geq T(h')$ . Note that  $\hat{\xi}$  must be a strongly symmetric equilibrium. In particular,  $\hat{\xi}^i$  is a best response for agent  $i$  at any history  $h' \in H(X(h))$ , as  $\xi^i$  is a best response for agent  $i$  at history  $\phi(h')$ .

101. Indeed, given  $x \geq 0$ , there are  $(x_m)_{m \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathbb{R}_+$  and  $(\xi^m)_{m \in \mathbb{N}} \in \prod_{m \in \mathbb{N}} \Xi_k^*(x_m)$  such that  $x_m \rightarrow x$  and  $v_{\xi^m}(x_m) \rightarrow \bar{v}_k(x)$ . We obtain  $v_{\xi^m}(x_m) - v_k(x_m) \leq L_k \bar{v}_k(x_m) - L_k v_k(x_m)$  for all  $m \in \mathbb{N}$  and letting  $m \rightarrow \infty$  yields  $\bar{v}_k(x) - v_k(x) \leq L_k \bar{v}_k(x) - L_k v_k(x)$ , since  $L_k \bar{v}_k$  is upper semicontinuous (as  $\bar{v}_k$  is), and  $v_k$  and  $L_k v_k$  are continuous.



I show that  $L\bar{v}_k \geq \bar{v}_k$ . Suppose that  $L\bar{v}_k(\hat{x}) < \bar{v}_k(\hat{x})$  for some  $\hat{x} \geq 0$  and seek a contradiction. If so, then  $k = f$  and, since  $L_f\bar{v}_f$  is upper-semicontinuous (as  $\bar{v}_f$  is), there exists  $\epsilon > 0$  such that  $L_f\bar{v}_f < \bar{v}_f(\hat{x})$  over  $I := [(\hat{x} - \epsilon) \vee 0, \hat{x} + \epsilon]$ . Then, there is  $x \in I$  and  $\sigma \in \Xi_f^*(x)$  such that  $v_\sigma(x) > L_f\bar{v}_f(x)$ . Let  $t := \sup\{s \geq 0 : v_{\sigma,x} > L_f\bar{v}_f(x) \text{ over } [0, s]\}$  and note that  $t > 0$  since  $v_{\sigma,x}$  is continuous and  $v_{\sigma,x}(0) = v_\sigma(x)$ . But then  $\mathbb{E}_F[v_\sigma(x \frown (s, \tilde{z}, i)) - v_{\sigma,x}(s)] < 0$  for all  $i$  and  $s \in [0, t)$ , since  $v_\sigma(x \frown (s, z, i)) \leq \bar{v}_f(x + z)$  for all  $z > 0$ , and thus  $\sigma(x) = 0$  a.e. over  $(0, t)$  by (15). Hence  $v_\sigma(x) = b(x)$  if  $t = \infty$  and  $v_\sigma(x) = (1 - e^{-t})b(x) + e^{-t}v_{\sigma,x}(t) = (1 - e^{-t})b(x) + e^{-t}L_f\bar{v}_f(x)$  otherwise (as  $v_{\sigma,x}$  is continuous at  $t$ ). This contradicts the fact that  $v_\sigma(x) > L_f\bar{v}_f(x)$ , since  $L_f\bar{v}_f(x) \geq L_fb(x) \geq b(x)$ .

To prove (55), fix  $x$  and  $\xi := (\sigma, \chi)$  and assume without loss of generality that  $v_\xi(x) > v_k(x)$ . Let

$$t := \sup\{0\} \cup \{s > 0 : \sigma(x) \leq \alpha_k(x) \text{ a.e. on } (0, s)\}$$

and define

$$\phi_* := \begin{cases} L_k\bar{v}_k(x) - L_kv_k(x) + v_k(x) & \text{if } t < \infty \\ 0 & \text{if } t = \infty \end{cases} \quad \& \quad \phi := \begin{cases} v_{\xi,x}(t) & \text{if } t < \infty \\ 0 & \text{if } t = \infty. \end{cases}$$

I claim that  $\phi \leq \phi_*$ . Indeed, if  $t < \infty$  then  $\alpha_k(x) < 1$  and, for a.e.  $s \geq t$  such that  $[\sigma(x)](s) > \alpha_k(x)$ , and each  $i$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} L_k\bar{v}_k(x) - v_{\xi,x}(s) &\geq \mathbb{E}_F\{[\chi(x)](s, \tilde{z})(v_\xi(x \frown (s, \tilde{z}, i)) - v_{\xi,x}(s))\} \\ &\geq \frac{c_1([\sigma(x)](s), x)}{\lambda} \geq \frac{c_1(\alpha_k(x), x)}{\lambda} \geq L_kv_k(x) - v_k(x) \end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality holds since  $\chi(x)$  is constant with value 1 if  $k = f$ ,  $L_k\bar{v}_k(x) \geq \bar{v}_k(x) \geq v_{\xi,x}(s)$  if  $k = d$ , and  $\bar{v}_k(x + z) \geq v_\xi(x \frown (s, z, i))$  for all  $z \geq 0$ , the second follows from (15) if  $k = f$ , and from (25) and (26) if  $k = d$ , since  $[\sigma(x)](s) > 0$ , the third holds since  $[\sigma(x)](s) \geq \alpha_k(x)$ , and the last follows from (47), since  $\alpha_k(x) < 1$ . Then, since  $v_{\xi,x}$  is continuous at  $t$ ,  $\phi = v_{\xi,x}(t) \leq L_k\bar{v}_k(x) - L_kv_k(x) + v_k(x) = \phi_*$ .

Define  $\Phi : A_0^n \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  by

$$\Phi(a, v, w) := \int U(a^1, x, 0, s \wedge t) + e^{-s \wedge t}(\mathbb{I}_{s \leq t}v + \mathbb{I}_{s > t}w)\nu_0(d(s, i), a),$$

where  $A_0$ ,  $U$  and  $\underline{\nu}$  were defined in Appendix A, and let

$$\hat{v} := \max_{a \in A_0} \Phi((a, \alpha_k(x)^{n-1}), L_k\bar{v}_k(x), \phi_*).$$

Note that, writing  $a^n := (a, \dots, a) \in A_0^n$  for any  $a \in A_0$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} v_\xi(x) &= \begin{cases} \Phi(\sigma(x)^n, \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}_F[v_\xi(x \frown (s, \tilde{z}, i)), \phi]) & \text{if } k = f \\ \Phi(\sigma(x)^n, \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}_F[v_{\xi,x}(s) \vee v_\xi(x \frown (s, \tilde{z}, i))], \phi) & \text{if } k = d \end{cases} \\ &\leq \Phi(\sigma(x)^n, L_k \bar{v}_k(x), \phi_*) \leq \hat{v} \end{aligned}$$

where the equality follows from (26) for  $k = d$ , the first inequality holds since  $v_{\xi,x}(s) \leq \bar{v}_k(x)$  and  $v_\xi(x \frown (s, z, i)) \leq \bar{v}_k(x + z)$  for all  $s, z \geq 0$  and  $i$ , and  $\phi \leq \phi_*$ , and the second since  $\sigma(x) \leq \alpha_k(x)$  over  $[0, t)$ ,  $L_k \bar{v}_k(x) \geq b(x)$ , and  $L_k \bar{v}_k(x) \geq \phi_*$  (since  $L_k v_k \geq v_k$ ).

Therefore, it suffices to show that  $\hat{v} - v_k(x) \leq L_k \bar{v}_k(x) - L_k v_k(x)$ . To this end, let  $\hat{a} \in A_0$  achieve  $\hat{v}$ , and note that

$$v_k(x) = \max_{a \in A} \Phi((a, \alpha_k(x)^{n-1}), L_k v_k(x), v_k(x)) \geq \Phi((\hat{a}, \alpha_k(x)^{n-1}), L_k v_k(x), v_k(x))$$

so that

$$\hat{v} - v_k(x) \leq [L_k \bar{v}_k(x) - L_k v_k(x)] \int e^{-s \wedge t} \nu_0(d(s, i), (\hat{a}, \alpha_k(x)^{n-1})) \leq L_k \bar{v}_k(x) - L_k v_k(x).$$

Thus (55) holds, and therefore  $\bar{v}_k = v_k$ , by Claim 3. A similar argument yields that  $v_k = \underline{v}_k$ .  $\square$

*Proof of Claim 4.* From Step 1 of the proof of Theorem 2,  $v_* - b$  is decreasing. Then, for any  $x \geq 1$ ,  $v_*(x) \leq v_*(1) - b(1) + b(x)$ , so that

$$L_f v_*(x) \leq v_*(1) - b(1) + L_f b(x) \leq v_*(1) - b(1) + b(x) + b'(1)\mu$$

where the second inequality holds since  $b$  is concave. Hence

$$\begin{aligned} v_*(x) &= \frac{b(x) - c(\alpha_*(x), x) + \alpha_*(x)\lambda n L_f v_*(x)}{1 + \alpha_*(x)\lambda n} \\ &\leq b(x) + \frac{\alpha_*(x)\lambda n [v_*(1) - b(1) + b'(1)\mu] - c(\alpha_*(x), x)}{1 + \alpha_*(x)\lambda n} \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, since  $\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \alpha_*(x) = 0$  (Step 3 of the proof of Theorem 2),

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} v_*(x) - b(x) \leq - \lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} c(\alpha_*(x), x) \leq 0.$$

Then  $\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} v_*(x) - b(x) = 0$  since  $v_* \geq b$ .  $\square$

Recall the definition of  $\Gamma_*$  from Appendix D.

*Proof of Claim 3.* Suppose that  $\bar{v}(x) - \underline{v}(x) \geq \epsilon$  for some  $\epsilon > 0$  and  $x \geq 0$ , and seek a

contradiction. Let

$$\hat{x} := \inf \left\{ x \geq 0 : \sup_{(x, \infty)} \bar{v} - \underline{v} < \epsilon \right\}$$

and note that  $\hat{x} < \infty$  since  $\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \bar{v} - \underline{v} = 0$ . Consider a sequence  $(x_m)_{m \in \mathbb{N}} \subset [0, \hat{x}]$  with  $\lim_m x_m = \hat{x}$  and such that  $\lim_m \bar{v}(x_m) - \underline{v}(x_m) \geq \epsilon$ . By hypothesis,  $\bar{v} - \underline{v} \leq L_k \bar{v} - L_k \underline{v}$  for some  $k \in \{d, e\}$ . Then, it suffices to show that

$$\limsup_{m \rightarrow \infty} L_k \bar{v}(x_m) - L_k \underline{v}(x_m) < \epsilon. \quad (56)$$

By definition of  $\hat{x}$ ,  $\bar{v}(x) - \underline{v}(x) < \epsilon$  for all  $x > \hat{x}$ . Then, if  $k = e$ , (56) holds since  $F(0) = 0$ . Hence, assume that  $k = d$ . Let  $\tilde{z} \sim F$  and, for all  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ , let  $E_m$  be the event ' $\bar{v}(x_m + \tilde{z}) > \bar{v}(x_m)$ '. By considering an appropriate subsequence, we may assume without loss of generality that  $\Pr(E_m) > 0$  for all  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ , and  $\lim_m \Pr(E_m) > 0$ .

Fix  $m \in \mathbb{N}$  and note that

$$\begin{aligned} L_d \bar{v}(x_m) - L_d \underline{v}(x_m) &= \mathbb{E}[\bar{v}(x_m + \tilde{z}) \vee \bar{v}(x_m) - \underline{v}(x_m + \tilde{z}) \vee \underline{v}(x_m)] \\ &\leq \Pr(E_m) \mathbb{E}[\bar{v}(x_m + \tilde{z}) - \underline{v}(x_m + \tilde{z}) | E_m] \\ &\quad + [1 - \Pr(E_m)] [\bar{v}(x_m) - \underline{v}(x_m)] \\ \Rightarrow L_d \bar{v}(x_m) - L_d \underline{v}(x_m) &\leq \mathbb{E}[\bar{v}(x_m + \tilde{z}) - \underline{v}(x_m + \tilde{z}) | E_m] \end{aligned}$$

where the last step holds since  $\bar{v} - \underline{v} \leq L_k \bar{v} - L_k \underline{v}$  and  $\Pr(E_m) > 0$ . Then, taking the limit  $m \rightarrow \infty$  yields (56) since  $\lim_m \Pr(E_m) > 0$ ,  $F(0) = 0$  and, by definition of  $\hat{x}$ ,  $\sup_{(x, \infty)} \bar{v} - \underline{v} < \epsilon$  for all  $x > \hat{x}$ .  $\square$

*Proof of Claim 5.* Fix  $x$ ,  $v$ , and  $a$ , and let  $\hat{a} := p(x, L_k v(x))$  and  $\phi : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be given by

$$\phi(e) := \Gamma_*(e, e + (n-1)\hat{a}, L_k v(x)).$$

Note that  $\phi$  is differentiable with

$$\phi'(e) = \lambda \frac{L_k v(x) - [b(x) - c(e, x)] - \left[\frac{1}{\lambda} + e + (n-1)\hat{a}\right] c_1(e, x)}{\{1 + \lambda[e + (n-1)\hat{a}]\}^2}. \quad (57)$$

Then,  $\phi$  is quasi-concave since  $c(e, x)$  is convex in  $e$ , and  $\phi'(\hat{a})$  has the same sign as  $\gamma(\hat{a}, x, L_k v(x))$ , where  $\gamma$  was defined in (52). Hence,  $\phi$  is maximised at  $e = \hat{a}$ . Moreover,  $\phi(\hat{a}) = P_k v(x)$  so that  $P_k v(x) \geq \phi(a)$ .

Then, it suffices to show that  $\phi(a) \geq \Gamma(a, x, L_k v(x))$ . Since  $\phi$  is quasi-concave and maximised at  $e = \hat{a}$ , and  $a \leq \hat{a}$ ,  $\phi'(a) \geq 0$ . Then, (57) implies that  $b(x) - c(a, x) \leq L_k v(x)$ ,

so that

$$\begin{aligned}\phi(a) &= \frac{b(x) - c(a, x)}{1 + \lambda[a + (n-1)\hat{a}]} + \left[1 - \frac{1}{1 + \lambda[a + (n-1)\hat{a}]}\right] L_k v(x) \\ &\geq \frac{b(x) - c(a, x)}{1 + \lambda na} + \left[1 - \frac{1}{1 + \lambda na}\right] L_k v(x) = \Gamma(a, x, L_k v(x))\end{aligned}$$

where the inequality holds since  $a \leq \hat{a}$ .  $\square$

## G Proofs for Section 4.1

*Proof of Lemma 1.* Fix  $x \geq 0$ . If  $\alpha_f(x) > 0$  then, from (17),

$$\lambda\{\mathbb{E}_F[v_f(x + \tilde{z})] - v_f(x)\} \geq c_1(\alpha_f(x), x) \geq 0.$$

If instead  $\alpha_f(x) = 0$ ,  $\alpha_f(y) = 0$  for all  $y \geq x$ , as  $\alpha_f$  is decreasing (Theorem 2). Then

$$\mathbb{E}_F[v_f(x + \tilde{z})] = \mathbb{E}_F[b(x + \tilde{z})] \geq b(x) = v_f(x)$$

where the inequality holds since  $b$  is increasing.  $\square$

*Proof of Lemma 2.* The ‘only if’ part is immediate, since  $\tilde{x}_t$  increases over time. For the ‘if’ part, suppose that  $v_f$  is not increasing on  $[x_0, \infty)$ . Then, there are  $x_0 \leq x' < x''$  such that  $v_f(x') > v_f(x'')$ .

We claim that we may choose  $x''$  such that  $\alpha_f(x'') > 0$ . Without loss of generality, we may assume that  $\alpha_f(x) = 0$  for some  $x \geq 0$ . Since  $\alpha_f$  is continuous, we may define

$$x_f := \min\{x \geq 0 : \alpha_f(x) = 0\}.$$

As  $\alpha_f$  is decreasing,  $\alpha_f = 0$  over  $[x_f, \infty)$ , so that  $v_f$  matches  $b$  on  $[x_f, \infty)$ . In particular,  $v_f$  is increasing on  $[x_f, \infty)$  and thus  $x' < x_f$ . Moreover, we may assume without loss of generality that  $x'' \geq x_f$ , so that  $v_f(x_f) \leq v_f(x'')$ . Since  $v_f$  is continuous and  $v_f(x') > v_f(x'')$ ,  $v_f(x') > v_f(\hat{x}'')$  for  $\hat{x}'' \in (x', x_f)$  sufficiently close to  $x_f$ . Then,  $x'$  and  $\hat{x}''$  satisfy the requirements of the claim.

Since  $v_f$  and  $\alpha_f$  are continuous, there are neighbourhoods  $U'$  and  $U''$  of  $x'$  and  $x''$  such that  $v_f(y') > v_f(y'')$  and  $\alpha_f(y'') > 0$  for all  $y' \in U'$  and  $y'' \in U''$ . Since  $\alpha_f$  is decreasing,  $\alpha_f$  is strictly positive on  $[x_0, \sup U')$ . Then, from (1),  $\Pr(\exists t \geq 0, \tilde{x}_t^{\alpha_f} \in U' | x_0) > 0$ , and  $\Pr(\exists T > t, \tilde{x}_t^{\alpha_f} \in U'' | \exists t \geq 0, \tilde{x}_t^{\alpha_f} \in U') > 0$ .  $\square$

*Proof of Corollary 5.* We may assume without loss of generality that  $c_1(0, x_f) > 0$ , for otherwise  $b'(x_f) = 0$  by Corollary 3, so that (21) holds with equality and there is nothing to prove. By Corollary 3,  $\alpha_f(x) = (>) 0$  for all  $x \geq (<) x_f$ . Then  $v_f(x) = x$  for all

$x \geq x_f$ , and so innovations are detrimental for any initial stock  $x_0 < x_f$  if and only if  $v_f$  is non-monotone on  $(x, x_f)$  for all  $x < x_f$ , by Lemma 2. Hence, it suffices to show that, for any  $x < x_f$  sufficiently large and any  $\hat{x} \in (x, x_f)$ ,  $v_f(x) < (>) v_f(\hat{x})$  if (21) holds with ‘<’ (with ‘>’).

Since  $\alpha_f$  is continuous (Theorem 2),  $y_f := \max\{x \geq 0 : \alpha_f(x) = 1\} < x_f$ . Then, as  $v_f$  is also continuous, for any  $x \in [y_f, x_f]$ ,

$$\lambda\{\mathbb{E}_F[v_f(x + \tilde{z})] - v_f(x)\} = c_1(\alpha_f(x), x)$$

by (17). Hence, given  $y_f > x > \hat{x} > x_f$ , writing  $\Delta v := v_f(x) - v_f(\hat{x})$ ,

$$\lambda(\Delta \mathbb{E} - \Delta v) = c_1(\alpha_f(x), x) - c_1(\alpha_f(\hat{x}), \hat{x}) = \Delta c_1 + c_1(\alpha_f(x), \hat{x}) - c_1(\alpha_f(\hat{x}), \hat{x}) \quad (58)$$

where  $\Delta \mathbb{E} := \mathbb{E}_F[v_f(x + \tilde{z}) - b(\hat{x} + \tilde{z})]$  and  $\Delta c_1 := c_1(\alpha_f(x), x) - c_1(\alpha_f(x), \hat{x})$ . Note that  $v_f(x) - b(x) + c(\alpha_f(x), x) = n\alpha_f(x)c_1(\alpha_f(x), x)$  for any  $x \in [y_f, x_f]$ , by (8). Then, given  $y_f < x < \hat{x} < x_f$  such that  $c_1(\alpha_f(x), \hat{x}) > c_1(\alpha_f(\hat{x}), \hat{x})$ , there are  $a, \hat{a} \in [\alpha_f(\hat{x}), \alpha_f(x)]$  such that  $c(\alpha_f(x), \hat{x}) - c(\alpha_f(\hat{x}), \hat{x}) = [\alpha_f(x) - \alpha_f(\hat{x})]c_1(a, \hat{x})$  and  $c_1(\alpha_f(x), \hat{x}) - c_1(\alpha_f(\hat{x}), \hat{x}) = [\alpha_f(x) - \alpha_f(\hat{x})]c_{11}(\hat{a}, \hat{x})$ . Hence, setting  $\Delta c := c(\alpha_f(x), x) - c(\alpha_f(x), \hat{x})$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta v - b(x) + b(\hat{x}) + \Delta c &= n\alpha_f(x)[c_1(\alpha_f(x), x) - c_1(\alpha_f(\hat{x}), \hat{x})] \\ &\quad + [nc_1(\alpha_f(\hat{x}), \hat{x}) - c_1(a, \hat{x})][\alpha_f(x) - \alpha_f(\hat{x})] \\ &= n\alpha_f(x)\lambda(\Delta \mathbb{E} - \Delta v) + [nc_1(\alpha_f(\hat{x}), \hat{x}) - c_1(a, \hat{x})] \frac{\lambda(\Delta \mathbb{E} - \Delta v) - \Delta c_1}{c_{11}(\hat{a}, \hat{x})} \end{aligned}$$

where the second equality follows by (58). Then  $\Delta v$  has the sign of

$$\{b(x) - b(\hat{x}) - \Delta c + n\alpha_f(x)\lambda\Delta \mathbb{E}\}c_{11}(\hat{a}, \hat{x}) + [nc_1(\alpha_f(\hat{x}), \hat{x}) - c_1(a, \hat{x})](\lambda\Delta \mathbb{E} - \Delta c_1).$$

Note that, as  $x \uparrow x_f$ ,

$$\frac{b(x) - b(\hat{x})}{x - \hat{x}} \rightarrow b'(x_f) \quad \& \quad \frac{\Delta c}{x - \hat{x}} \rightarrow 0 \quad \& \quad \frac{\Delta \mathbb{E}}{x - \hat{x}} \rightarrow \mathbb{E}_F[b'(x_f + \tilde{z})] \quad \& \quad \frac{\Delta c_1}{x - \hat{x}} \rightarrow c_{12}(0, x_f)$$

uniformly for all  $\hat{x} \in (x, x_f)$ , since  $\alpha_f(x) \rightarrow 0$ . Thus, for  $x < x_f$  sufficiently large,  $v_f(x) - v_f(\hat{x}) > (<) 0$  if (21) holds with ‘<’ (‘>’).

Finally, suppose that, for all  $x < x_f$ , there exists  $\hat{x} \in (x, x_f)$  such that  $c_1(\alpha_f(x), \hat{x}) = c_1(\alpha_f(\hat{x}), \hat{x})$ . Then  $c_{11}(0, x_f) = 0$  and, by (58), for  $x < x_f$  sufficiently large and any  $\hat{x} \in (x, x_f)$  such that  $c_1(\alpha_f(x), \hat{x}) = c_1(\alpha_f(\hat{x}), \hat{x})$ ,  $v_f(x) > (<) v_f(\hat{x})$  if (21) holds with ‘<’ (with ‘>’), as desired.  $\square$

*Proof of Corollary 6.* For the first part, note that innovations are detrimental if and only if  $v_f$  is not increasing on  $[x_0, \infty)$ , by Lemma 2. Since  $v_f(x) = x$  over  $[\lambda\mu, \infty)$  by

Corollary 3, innovations are detrimental if and only if  $x_0 < \lambda\mu$  and  $x \mapsto x + \int_x^{\lambda\mu} \frac{M}{\lambda}$  is not increasing over  $[x_0, \lambda\mu)$ , by Corollary 4. Then, innovations are detrimental if and only if  $x_0 < \lambda\mu$  and  $M(y_f \vee x_0) > \lambda$ , since  $M$  is decreasing. The last part holds since, for any such  $x$  and  $\hat{x}$ ,  $v_f$  is strictly decreasing over  $[x, \hat{x}]$ , by Corollary 4.  $\square$

## H Proof of Theorem 3

The proof of Theorem 3 relies on Theorem 5 and Proposition 4 (Appendix F).

*Proof of Theorem 3.* The first part follows from Proposition 4 with  $k = d$ . I show that  $v_d \geq v_f$ . From Steps 1 and 2 of the proof of Theorem 5, it suffices to show that the map  $(P_f, P_d)$  admits a fixed point in the set  $\tilde{V}$  of pairs  $(v, w) \in \hat{V} \times \hat{V}$  such that  $v \leq w$ . From Step 1,  $\tilde{V}$  is a complete lattice and  $(P_f, P_d)$  is increasing on  $\tilde{V}$ . Then, from Tarski's fixed-point theorem, it suffices to show that  $(P_f, P_d)$  maps  $\tilde{V}$  to itself.

Fix  $(v, w) \in \tilde{V}$ . From Step 1,  $(P_f v, P_d w) \in \hat{V} \times \hat{V}$ . Moreover,  $L_f v \leq L_d w$  since  $v \leq w$ . Then,  $p(x, L_f v(x)) \leq p(x, L_d w(x))$ , since  $p(x, l)$  is increasing in  $l$  (Step 1 of the proof of Theorem 5). Hence, for all  $x \geq 0$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} P_f v(x) = \Gamma(p(x, L_f v(x)), x, L_f v(x)) &\leq \Gamma(p(x, L_f v(x)), x, L_d w(x)) \\ &\leq \Gamma(p(x, L_d w(x)), x, L_d w(x)) = P_d w(x) \end{aligned} \quad (59)$$

where the first inequality holds since  $\Gamma(a, x, l)$  is increasing in  $l$ , and the second follows from Claim 5, since  $p(x, L_f v(x)) \leq p(x, L_d w(x))$ . Then,  $(P_f v, P_d w) \in \tilde{V}$ , as desired.

To show that  $\alpha_d \geq \alpha_f$ , note that  $L_d v_d \geq L_f v_f$  since  $v_d \geq v_f$ . Then,  $\alpha_d \geq \alpha_f$  as  $\alpha_k(x) = p(x, L_k v_k(x))$  for all  $x \geq 0$  and  $k \in \{e, d\}$ , and  $p(x, l)$  is increasing in  $l$ .

For the last part, suppose first that innovations are not detrimental. Then, it is clear that the game with disposal admits a strongly symmetric equilibrium that coincides on path with  $\alpha_f$ . Then,  $(\alpha_d, \delta_d)$  coincides with  $\alpha_f$  since it is the unique strongly symmetric equilibrium of the game. Suppose now that innovations are detrimental. Let  $X_0 = \{x \geq x_0 : \alpha_f(x) > 0 \text{ and } \Pr_F(v_f(x + \tilde{z}) < v_f(x)) > 0\}$  and define  $(X_m)_{m=1}^\infty$  recursively by  $X_m := \{x \geq x_0 : \alpha_f(x) > 0 \text{ and } \Pr_F(x + \tilde{z} \in X_{m-1}) > 0\}$  for all  $m \geq 1$ . By hypothesis,  $x_0 \in X_m$  for some  $m \geq 0$ . Then, it suffices to show that  $v_d > v_f$  over  $X_m$  for all  $m \geq 0$ . I proceed by backward induction on  $m$ . For the base case  $m = 0$ , fix  $x \in X_0$  and note that  $L_d v_d(x) \geq L_d v_f(x) > L_f v_f(x)$ , where the first inequality holds since  $v_d \geq v_f$ . Then,  $v_d(x) > v_f(x)$  by the argument used to derive (59), as  $\alpha_f(x) > 0$ . For the induction step, fix  $m \geq 0$  and suppose that  $v_d > v_f$  over  $X_m$ . Fix  $x \in X_{m+1}$  and note that  $L_d v_d \geq L_f v_d > L_f v_f$ . Then,  $v_d(x) > v_f(x)$  by the argument used to derive (59), as  $\alpha_f(x) > 0$ .  $\square$

# I Proofs of Lemma 3 and Theorem 4

*Proof of Lemma 3.* The ‘if’ part is immediate, since concealment has no value if opponents exert no effort. For the ‘only if’ part, fix an initial stock  $x_0 < \lambda\mu$ . It remains to show that  $\alpha_f$ , coupled with the full-disclosure policy, does not form a PBE. Label this strategy profile  $\xi_f$ . From (1), there exists  $z < \lambda\mu - x_0$  in the support of  $F$ .

Suppose that  $\xi_f$  is played at initial stock  $\lambda\mu - z$  and the first innovation, obtained by some agent  $i$  at some time  $t$ , has size  $z$ . Then, agent  $i$  discloses fully at time  $t$ , and no agent exerts any effort thereafter. This raises the public stock to  $\lambda\mu$ , so that the time- $t$  continuation payoff (to each agent) is  $\lambda\mu$ . Because  $\lambda\mu$  solves (18), after time  $t$ , agent  $i$  would also earn  $\lambda\mu$  if she exerted maximal effort until she obtained a further innovation, disclosed it fully, and exerted no effort thereafter. Consider the time- $t$  deviation for agent  $i$  in which she does precisely this, *but* conceals fully at time  $t$ . Conditional on the opponents of agent  $i$  obtaining no innovation after time  $t$ , agent  $i$ ’s continuation payoff is again  $\lambda\mu$ . This is because exerting full effort yields no flow of payoff (i.e.  $u(1, x_t) \equiv 0$ ), so the fact that the public stock  $x_t$  equals  $\lambda\mu - z$  instead of  $\lambda\mu$  after time  $t$  has no effect. Because  $z > 0$ , Corollary 3 implies that  $\alpha_f(\lambda\mu - z) > 0$ . Then, the above deviation is profitable, as the opponents of agent  $i$  will obtain an innovation before her with strictly positive probability.

By continuity, there are open neighbourhoods  $X$  of  $\lambda\mu - z$  and  $Z$  of  $z$  such that, if  $\xi_f$  is played at  $x_0$ , and an agent obtains an innovation of size within  $Z$  at some time  $t$  such that  $x_t \in X$ , agent  $i$  has a profitable deviation at time  $t$ . From (1), this occurs with strictly positive probability, so that  $\xi_f$  does not form a PBE.  $\square$

The proof of Theorem 4 has two parts. In this appendix, I show that there exist an effort schedule  $\alpha_t^c(k)$  that is increasing in  $k$ , and a disclosure cutoff  $q(t)$  taking values in  $[\lambda\mu, \lambda\mu n]$ , such that a family of strategy profiles matching on path the one described by Theorem 4 constitute Bayes-Nash equilibria. The formal statement of this intermediary result is Proposition 5 below. I complete the proof of Theorem 4 in Curello (2021), by choosing a particular profile from the aforementioned family, and specifying off-path beliefs inducing a PBE.

The rest of the argument is structured as follows. I begin with several definitions, and state Proposition 5. I then state a dynamic-programming result (Lemma 5 below), and show that Proposition 5 holds as long as a given Bellman equation admits a solution (Lemma 6 below). In Appendix I.1, I define a discrete-time, finite-horizon approximation of this Bellman equation and show that it admits a solution for any time length and horizon (Lemma 8). I then prove Proposition 5 in Appendix I.2, relying on continuity and compactness arguments.

As noted in Section 6.4, Theorem 4 is immediate from Lemma 3 if  $x_0 \geq \lambda\mu$ , so that we may assume without loss of generality that  $x_0 < \lambda\mu$ . Let  $\mathcal{S}$  be the quotient space

of Borel measurable  $\alpha : \mathbb{R}_+^2 \rightarrow [0, 1]$  such that  $\alpha_t : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow [0, 1]$  is increasing for all  $t \geq 0$ , with respect to the equivalence relation  $\sim_{\mathcal{S}}$ , defined by  $\alpha \sim_{\mathcal{S}} \alpha'$  if and only if  $\int_0^t \alpha_s(k) ds = \int_0^t \alpha'_s(k) ds$  for each  $t, k \geq 0$ . Let  $\mathcal{Q}$  be the set of  $q : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$  such that  $q(t) \leq \liminf_{s \downarrow t} q(s)$  for all  $t \geq 0$ , and  $\mathcal{Q}_0$  be the set of lower-semicontinuous  $q \in \mathcal{Q}$  with image in  $[\lambda\mu, \lambda\mu n]$ , such that  $q(0) = \liminf_{t \downarrow 0} q(t)$ . Recall from Appendix C the formal definition of the game with concealment. Given  $q \in \mathcal{Q}$ , let  $H_q^i$  be the set of private histories  $h \in H^i$  for agent  $i$  featuring at least one disclosure and such that either (i)  $K^i(h) = X(h) \geq \lambda\mu$ , or (ii)  $K^i(h) \leq \lambda\mu n$ , agent  $i$  did not disclose, and the first disclosure occurred at some time  $t \leq T(h)$  and raised the stock to some value  $x < q(t)$ . Given  $\alpha \in \mathcal{S}$ , let  $\Xi_{\alpha, q}$  be the set of symmetric strategy profiles  $\xi$  such that, (i) in any period  $t$  prior to which no disclosure occurred, agent  $i$  exerts effort  $\alpha_t(k_t^i)$ , conceals fully if either  $k_t^i = x_0$  or  $k_t^i < q(t)$ , and discloses fully otherwise and (ii) agent  $i$  exerts no effort and does not disclose after any history in  $H_q^i$ . Suppose that the opponents of agent  $i$  play some  $\xi \in \Xi_{\alpha, q}$ . Note that, given  $t > 0$ , if no disclosure occurs within  $[0, t)$ , agent  $i$  believes that the private stocks  $(k_t^j)_{j \neq i}$  of her opponents are i.i.d. with some CDF pinned down by  $t, \alpha$  and  $q$ . Label it  $G_t(\alpha, q)$ , and let  $G_0(\alpha, q)$  be the degenerate CDF with value  $x_0$ . Recall the definitions of beliefs  $b$  and information sets  $(h, b)$  from Appendix C. Given  $t \geq 0$ , let  $\underline{B}_{\alpha, q}^i(t)$  be the set of agent  $i$ 's beliefs  $b := \prod_{j \neq i} b^j$  such that, for all  $j \neq i$ , the pushforward of  $b^j$  by  $K^j$  is  $G_t(\alpha, q)$ .

**Proposition 5.** *If  $x_0 < \lambda\mu$ , there are  $\alpha \in \mathcal{S}$  and  $q \in \mathcal{Q}_0$  such that, for any  $i$ ,  $\xi^i$  is a best response against  $\xi^{-i}$  any information set  $(h, b)$  such that  $X(h) = x_0$  and  $b \in \underline{B}_{\alpha, q}^i(T(h))$ .*

Several definitions are needed to state the next result. For all  $x \geq 0$ , let  $\underline{v}(x)$  be the value of the single-agent game with initial stock  $x$ .<sup>102</sup> Given  $t \geq 0$  and  $k \geq x \geq \lambda\mu$ , let  $\hat{v}_t(x, k)$  be the time- $t$  value of an agent  $i$  with  $k_t^i = k$ , assuming that she does not disclose at time  $t$ , that  $x_t = x > x_0$ , and that her opponents do not disclose for the remainder of the game. Let  $V$  be the space of 1-Lipschitz continuous, increasing and convex maps  $v : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , let  $V_0$  be the set of  $v \in V$  such that  $v = \underline{v}$  on  $[\lambda\mu n, \infty)$  and  $v - \underline{v}$  is decreasing, and let  $\mathcal{V}_0$  be the set of maps  $v : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow V_0$  that are continuous in the supremum metric.

Let  $A^c$  be the quotient space of Borel measurable  $a : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow [0, 1]$  by the equivalence relation identifying  $a$  and  $\hat{a}$  if and only if  $\int_0^t a_s ds = \int_0^t \hat{a}_s ds$  for all  $t > 0$ . Given  $\delta \in [0, \infty]$  and  $a \in A^c$ , let  $H(a, \delta)$  be the CDF of the random time  $\pi$  of the first increment obtained by an agent who exerts effort  $a_s$  at any time  $s < \delta$ , and no effort after  $\delta$  (with ‘ $\pi = \infty$ ’ if no increment arises).<sup>103</sup> Given  $\alpha \in \mathcal{S}$  and  $q \in \mathcal{Q}$ , suppose that the opponents of agent  $i$  play some  $\xi \in \Xi_{\alpha, q}$ . Note that, if no disclosure occurred by some time  $t$ , assuming that agent  $i$  does not disclose after time  $t$ , the joint distribution of  $(\tau, \kappa)$ , where  $t + \tau$  is the

102. That is, assuming that  $n = 1$ ,  $\underline{v}$  is the unique solution to (9) in the set  $B_{\bar{w}}$ , defined Appendix D.

103. That is,  $[H(a, \delta)](\pi) := 1 - e^{-\lambda \int_0^{\pi \wedge \delta} a_s ds}$  for all  $\pi \in \mathbb{R}_+$ .



time of the first disclosure by any opponent of agent  $i$  after time  $t$ , and  $\kappa$  is the value disclosed (with ‘ $\tau = \infty$ ’ and  $\kappa = 0$  if no opponent ever discloses), is pinned down by  $t$ ,  $\alpha$ , and  $q$ . Label it  $J(t, \alpha, q)$ .

**Lemma 5.** *Suppose that  $x_0 < \lambda\mu$ . Given  $\alpha \in \mathcal{S}$ ,  $q \in \mathcal{Q}_0$ , and  $v \in \mathcal{V}_0$ , the following are equivalent:*

- (a) *For any  $\xi \in \Xi_{\alpha, q}$ ,  $i$ , and information set  $(h, b)$  for agent  $i$  such that  $X(h) = x_0$  and  $b \in \underline{B}_{\alpha, q}^i(T(h))$ ,  $\xi^i$  is a best response against  $\xi^{-i}$  at  $(h, b)$  and yields agent  $i$  continuation payoff  $v_t(k_t^i)$ .*
- (b) *For each  $t \geq 0$  and  $k \geq x_0$ ,*

$$v_t(k) := \sup_{\substack{\delta \in [0, \infty] \\ a \in A^c}} \mathbb{E} \left[ x_0 \int_0^{\tilde{T}} e^{-s} (1 - a_s) ds + e^{-\tilde{T}} (\mathbb{1}_{\tilde{\tau}=\tilde{T}} \hat{v}_{t+\tilde{T}}(\tilde{\kappa}, k \vee \tilde{\kappa}) + \mathbb{1}_{\tilde{\pi}=\tilde{T}} v_{t+\tilde{T}}(k + \tilde{z}) + \mathbb{1}_{\tilde{T}=\delta} \underline{v}(k)) \right] \quad (60)$$

where  $(\tilde{\pi}, (\tilde{\tau}, \tilde{\kappa}), \tilde{z}) \sim H(a, \delta) \times J(t, \alpha, q) \times F$  and  $\tilde{T} := \tilde{\pi} \wedge \tilde{\tau} \wedge \delta$ . Moreover, the objective in (60) is maximised by  $\delta \in [0, \infty]$  and  $a \in A^c$  given by

$$\delta := \min \{s \geq 0 : k \geq q(t + s)\} \cup \{\infty\} \quad \& \quad a : s \mapsto \alpha_{t+s}(k). \quad (61)$$

I omit the proof of Lemma 5. The Bellman equation (60) may be understood as follows. At any time  $t$  prior to the first disclosure, an agent  $i$  with private stock  $k_t^i = k$  picks a delay  $\delta$  after which, if she obtained no increment and none of her opponents disclosed, she discloses fully (where  $\delta = \infty$  if agent  $i$  does not disclose in this situation), and a schedule  $a$  describing her effort until either she obtains an increment, or an opponent discloses, or time  $t + \delta$  is reached.<sup>104</sup> Agent  $i$ ’s value after she discloses fully is  $\underline{v}(k)$  as, following such a disclosure, her opponents do not disclose for the remainder of the game. Moreover, given a realisation  $(\tau, \kappa)$  of  $(\tilde{\tau}, \tilde{\kappa})$ , agent  $i$ ’s value after an opponent discloses  $\kappa$  at time  $t + \tau$  is  $\hat{v}_{t+\tau}(\kappa, k \vee \kappa)$ .

In light of Lemma 5, to prove Proposition 5, it suffices to exhibit  $\alpha \in \mathcal{S}$ ,  $q \in \mathcal{Q}_0$ , and  $v \in \mathcal{V}_0$  such that (b) holds. I end this section by deriving a strengthening of (b) (Lemma 6), expressed in a language that allows to formulate a discrete-time approximation of (60) for any time length  $\Delta > 0$ . Several definitions are necessary. Given  $\Delta > 0$ , for all  $a \in [0, 1]$ , define the CDF  $F^{\Delta, a}$  with support within  $\mathbb{R}_+$  by

$$F^{\Delta, a}(z) := (1 - e^{-a\Delta\lambda})F(z) + e^{-a\Delta\lambda} \quad \text{for all } z \geq 0.$$

104. In (60), we neglect the constraint that agent  $i$  cannot disclose prior to obtaining the first increment. This is without loss as any  $q \in \mathcal{Q}_0$  is bounded below by  $\lambda\mu > x_0$  so that, from (61),  $\delta = \infty$  if  $k = x_0$ .

Let  $\underline{v}_\Delta : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be the unique element of  $V$  solving the Bellman equation

$$\underline{v}_\Delta(x) = \max_{a \in [0,1]} x(1 - e^{-\Delta})(1 - a) + e^{-\Delta} \mathbb{E}_{F^{\Delta,a}}[\underline{v}_\Delta(x + \tilde{z})], \quad (62)$$

and let  $\underline{v}_0 := \underline{v}$ .<sup>105</sup> Also let  $\mathcal{V}$  be the set of Borel measurable  $v : \mathbb{R}_+^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  such that  $v_t \in V$  for all  $t \geq 0$ , and

$$Y' := [0, \infty] \times A^c \quad \& \quad \Theta_0 := \mathbb{R}_+^3 \times \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{Q} \times \mathcal{V}$$

with typical elements  $y := (\delta, a)$  and  $\theta := (\Delta, t, k, \alpha, q, v)$ , respectively. Let  $I : Y' \times \Theta_0 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be given by

$$I(y, \theta) := \mathbb{E} \left\{ x_0 \int_0^{\tilde{T}} e^{-s} (1 - a_s) ds + e^{-\tilde{T}} [\mathbf{1}_{\tilde{\tau} > \tilde{\pi} \leq \delta} v_{t+\tilde{T}}(k + \tilde{z}) + (1 - \mathbf{1}_{\tilde{\tau} > \tilde{\pi} \leq \delta}) \underline{v}_\Delta((k + \mathbf{1}_{\tilde{\pi} = \tilde{T}} \tilde{z}) \vee \mathbf{1}_{\tilde{\tau} = \tilde{T}} \tilde{\kappa})] \right\}$$

where  $y := (\delta, a)$ ,  $\theta := (\Delta, t, k, \alpha, q, v)$ ,  $\tilde{T} := \tilde{\tau} \wedge \tilde{\pi} \wedge \delta$ ,

$$(\tilde{\tau}, \tilde{\pi}) := \begin{cases} (\Delta \lceil \tilde{\tau}_0 / \Delta \rceil, \Delta \lceil \tilde{\pi}_0 / \Delta \rceil) & \text{if } \Delta > 0 \\ (\tilde{\tau}_0, \tilde{\pi}_0) & \text{if } \Delta = 0, \end{cases} \quad (63)$$

and  $(\tilde{\pi}_0, (\tilde{\tau}_0, \tilde{\kappa}), \tilde{z}) \sim H(a, \delta) \times J(t, \alpha, q) \times F$ . Given  $\Delta > 0$ , let  $T_\Delta := \{0, \Delta, 2\Delta, \dots\}$ ,  $\bar{T}_\Delta := T_\Delta \cup \{\infty\}$ ,  $A_\Delta^c$  be the set of  $a \in A^c$  that are constant over  $[(m-1)\Delta, m\Delta)$  for all  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ . Also let  $T_0 := \mathbb{R}_+$ ,  $\bar{T}_0 := [0, \infty]$ , and  $A_0^c := A$ . Define  $I^* : \Theta_0 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  by

$$I^*(\theta) := \sup_{\bar{T}_\Delta \times A_\Delta^c} I(\cdot, \theta)$$

for any  $\theta := (\Delta, t, k, \alpha, q, v)$ .

**Lemma 6.** *Let  $\alpha \in \mathcal{S}$ ,  $q \in \mathcal{Q}_0$ , and  $v \in \mathcal{V}_0$  be such that, for all  $t \geq 0$  and  $k \geq x_0$ ,*

$$v_t(k) = I^*(\theta) = I((\delta, a), \theta) \quad \text{where } \delta \text{ and } a \text{ are given by (61),} \quad (64)$$

---

105. We may view  $\underline{v}_\Delta$  as a discrete-time approximation of the map  $\underline{v}$  for time length  $\Delta > 0$ . In particular,  $\underline{v}_\Delta \rightarrow \underline{v}$  uniformly as  $\Delta \rightarrow 0$ . To see why note that, given any  $x \geq 0$ ,  $\underline{v}(x)$  is the value of the single-agent problem with initial stock  $x \geq 0$ . By standard dynamic-programming arguments,  $\underline{v}_\Delta$  is the value of the single-agent problem with three differences: (a) the time discount factor  $t \mapsto e^{-t}$  is replaced by  $t \mapsto e^{-\Delta \lceil t/\Delta \rceil}$ , (b) effort is constrained to be constant within the time interval  $[(m-1)\Delta, m\Delta)$  for any  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ , and (c) for any  $t \geq 0$ , increments occurring at time  $t$  are ‘delayed’ to time  $\Delta \lceil t/\Delta \rceil$ . Clearly, the value of the latter problem approximates that of the former as  $\Delta$  vanishes, and thus  $\underline{v}_\Delta \rightarrow \underline{v}$  pointwise. Uniform convergence follows since, clearly, there exists  $\hat{x} > 0$  such that  $\underline{v}_\Delta(x) = \underline{v}(x) = x$  for all  $x \geq \hat{x}$  and  $\Delta > 0$  sufficiently small. By standard dynamic-programming arguments, to prove that  $\underline{v}_\Delta$  lies in  $V$ , it suffices to show that (62) admits a solution in  $V$ . This follows easily from Tarki’s fixed-point theorem, since  $V$  is a complete lattice with respect to the point-wise order. Because  $\underline{v}_\Delta \rightarrow \underline{v}$ ,  $\underline{v} \in V$  as well.

holds with  $\theta := (0, t, k, \alpha, q, v)$ . Then, any  $\xi \in \Xi_{\alpha, q}$  is a Bayes-Nash equilibrium.

*Proof.* In light of Lemma 5, it suffices to show that (b) holds. Fix  $t \geq 0$  and  $k \geq x_0$ , let  $\theta := (0, t, k, \alpha, q, v)$ , and label  $I_0(\delta, a)$  the objective on the right-hand side of (60) for any  $\delta \in [0, \delta]$  and  $a \in A^c$ . Then, it suffices to show that  $I_0(\delta, a) \leq I((\delta, a), \theta)$  for any  $\delta \in [0, \delta]$  and  $a \in A^c$ , where equality holds for  $\delta$  and  $a$  given by (61). Fix  $\delta$  and  $a$  and suppose without loss that  $\delta > 0$ . It suffices to show that, given  $(\tilde{\kappa}, \tilde{\tau}) \sim J(t, \alpha, q)$ , a.s.,  $\hat{v}_{t+\tilde{\tau}}(\tilde{\kappa}, k \vee \tilde{\kappa}) \leq \underline{v}(k \vee \tilde{\kappa})$ , and that equality holds if  $\delta$  and  $a$  are given by (61). For the former note that, a.s.,  $\tilde{\kappa} \geq q(\tilde{\tau}) \geq \lambda\mu$  so that  $\hat{v}_{t+\tilde{\tau}}(\tilde{\kappa}, k \vee \tilde{\kappa}) \leq k \vee \tilde{\kappa} = \underline{v}(k \vee \tilde{\kappa})$ . For the latter, note that  $\tilde{\kappa} \geq k$  a.s. if  $\delta > 0$  is given by (61), so that  $\hat{v}_{t+\tilde{\tau}}(\tilde{\kappa}, k \vee \tilde{\kappa}) = k \vee \tilde{\kappa}$ .  $\square$

## I.1 Approximate Bellman equation

In this section, I define a discrete-time, finite-horizon approximation of the Bellman equation ‘ $v_t(k) = I^*(\theta)$ ’ (Lemma 6), and show that it admits a solution with the desired property (61) for any time length  $\Delta > 0$  and horizon  $M \in \mathbb{N}$  (Lemma 8 below). As part of the analysis, I establish bounds for the disclosure cutoff  $q$  that is part of the solution, and show that they converge to the desired values as the approximation becomes more accurate (Lemma 7 below).

I begin with several definitions. Recall from Appendix I the definitions of  $\mathcal{S}$ ,  $\mathcal{Q}$ ,  $V$ ,  $J$ ,  $F^{\Delta, a}$  and  $\underline{v}_\Delta$ . Let  $S$  be the set of increasing  $\alpha : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow [0, 1]$  and, given  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ , let

$$Y := \{0, 1\} \times [0, 1] \quad \& \quad \Theta_m := \mathbb{R}_+ \times S^m \times \mathbb{R}_+^m \times V$$

with typical elements  $y := (\delta, a)$  and  $\theta := (k, \alpha, q, v)$ , respectively. Let  $I_{\Delta, m} : Y \times \Theta_m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be given by

$$I_{\Delta, m}(y, \theta) = \begin{cases} \underline{v}_\Delta(k) & \text{if } \delta = 0 \\ x_0(1 - e^{-\Delta})(1 - a) \\ \quad + e^{-\Delta} \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{1}_{\tilde{\tau} \leq \Delta} \underline{v}_\Delta(\tilde{\kappa} \vee (k + \tilde{z})) + \mathbf{1}_{\tilde{\tau} > \Delta} v(k + \tilde{z})] & \text{if } \delta = 1 \end{cases}$$

where  $y := (\delta, a)$ ,  $\theta := (k, \alpha, q, v)$ ,  $(\tilde{z}, (\tilde{\tau}, \tilde{\kappa})) \sim F^{\Delta, a} \times J((m-1)\Delta, \hat{\alpha}, \hat{q})$ , and  $\hat{\alpha} \in \mathcal{S}$  and  $\hat{q} \in \mathcal{Q}$  are such that  $\hat{\alpha}_t = \alpha_l$  and  $\hat{q}_t = q_l$  for all  $l \in \{1, \dots, m\}$  and  $t \in [(l-1)\Delta, l\Delta]$ . Also let  $I_{\Delta, m}^* : \Theta_m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be given by

$$I_{\Delta, m}^*(\theta) := \max_Y I_{\Delta, m}(\cdot, \theta).$$

I define bounds  $q_\Delta^+$  and  $q_\Delta^-$  for the disclosure cutoff  $q$  for each  $\Delta > 0$ , and show that they converge to the desired values as  $\Delta$  vanishes (Lemma 7 below). Given  $\Delta > 0$ , let

$q_\Delta^-$  be the largest  $x \geq 0$  such that the objective in (62) is maximised by  $a = 1$ ,<sup>106</sup> and

$$q_\Delta^+ := \sup \left\{ k \in \mathbb{R}_+ : \arg \max_{a \in [0,1]} I_{\Delta,m}((1, a), (k, \alpha, q, v)) \geq k \geq \max q \text{ for some } m \in \mathbb{N}, \right. \\ \left. \alpha \in S^m, q \in \mathbb{R}_+^m \text{ and } v \in V, \text{ such that } v(l) = l \text{ for all } l \geq k \right\}.$$

**Lemma 7.**  $q_\Delta^- \leq q_\Delta^+ < \infty$  for all  $\Delta > 0$ ,  $\liminf_{\Delta \rightarrow 0} q_\Delta^- \geq \lambda\mu$  and  $\limsup_{\Delta \rightarrow 0} q_\Delta^+ \leq n\lambda\mu$ .

Lemma 7 is proved in Curello (2021). Next, I restate (64) in a language that allows to formulate a finite-horizon approximation for any given time length  $\Delta > 0$  (Remark 1 below). Given  $\Delta > 0$ , let  $Q_\Delta := [q_\Delta^-, q_\Delta^+]$ , and  $V_\Delta$  be the set of  $v \in V$  such that  $v - \underline{v}_\Delta$  is decreasing and  $v(k) = \underline{v}_\Delta(k)$  for  $k \geq q_\Delta^+$ . Let  $\mathcal{Q}_\Delta$  be the set of  $q \in \mathcal{Q}$  that have image in  $Q_\Delta$  and are constant on  $[(m-1)\Delta, m\Delta]$  for all  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ . Similarly, let  $\mathcal{S}_\Delta$  ( $\mathcal{V}_\Delta$ ) be the set of  $\alpha \in \mathcal{S}$  ( $v \in \mathcal{V}$ ) such that, for all  $k \geq 0$ ,  $t \mapsto \alpha_t(k)$  ( $t \mapsto v_t(k)$ ) is constant over  $[(m-1)\Delta, m\Delta]$  for all  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ .

*Remark 1.* Let  $\Delta > 0$  and  $(\alpha_m, q_m, v_m)_{m \in \mathbb{N}} \subset S \times Q_\Delta \times V_\Delta$  be such that, for all  $m \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $k \geq x_0$ ,

$$v_m(k) = I_{\Delta,m}^*(k, \theta_m) = I_{\Delta,m}(\mathbf{1}_{k < q_m}, \alpha_m), \theta_m \quad (65)$$

where  $\theta_m := (k, (\alpha_l)_{l=1}^m, (q_l)_{l=1}^m, v_{m+1})$ . Define  $(\hat{\alpha}, \hat{q}, \hat{v}) \in \mathcal{S}_\Delta \times \mathcal{Q}_\Delta \times \mathcal{V}_\Delta$  by

$$(\hat{\alpha}_t, \hat{q}_t, \hat{v}_t) = (\alpha_m, q_m, v_m) \quad \text{for all } m \in \mathbb{N} \text{ and } t \in [(m-1)\Delta, m\Delta]. \quad (66)$$

Then (64) holds with  $v = \hat{v}$  and  $\theta := (\Delta, t, k, \hat{\alpha}, \hat{q}, \hat{v})$  for any  $t \in T_\Delta$  and  $k \geq x_0$ .

Remark 1 is proved in Curello (2021). I end this section by showing that there are (well-behaved) sequences of arbitrary length in  $S \times Q_\Delta \times V_\Delta$  that satisfy (65) (Lemma 8 below). Recall the definition of  $G_t(\alpha, q)$  from Appendix I. Note that  $G_t(\alpha, q) = G_t(\hat{\alpha}, \hat{q})$  for any  $\hat{\alpha} \in \mathcal{S}$ , and  $\hat{q} \in \mathcal{Q}$  such that  $\alpha = \hat{\alpha}$  and  $q = \hat{q}$  on  $[0, t)$ . Given  $\Delta > 0$ ,  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $\alpha \in S^m$ , and  $q \in \mathbb{R}_+^m$ , define

$$G^{\Delta,m}(\alpha, q) := G_{m\Delta}(\hat{\alpha}, \hat{q}) \quad (67)$$

where  $\hat{\alpha} \in \mathcal{S}$  and  $\hat{q} \in \mathcal{Q}$  are given by  $\hat{\alpha}_t = \alpha_l$  and  $\hat{q}_t = q_l$  for all  $l \in \{1, \dots, m\}$  and  $t \in [(l-1)\Delta, l\Delta)$ .

**Lemma 8.** *There are  $\Delta_0 > 0$  and  $\gamma : (0, \infty) \rightarrow (0, \infty)$  such that, for any  $\Delta \in (0, \Delta_0)$  and  $M \in \mathbb{N}$ , there are  $\alpha \in S^M$ ,  $q \in Q_\Delta^M$ , and  $v \in V_\Delta^{M+1}$  such that, given any  $m = 1, \dots, M$ , (65) holds for all  $k \geq x_0$  and, moreover,*

$$\sup |v_{m+1} - v_m| \vee |g_m - g_{m-1}| \leq \gamma(m\Delta)\Delta, \quad (68)$$

---

106. The objective in (62) is maximised by  $a = 1$  for  $x = 0$ , so that  $q_\Delta^-$  is well-defined. Moreover, it is easy to show that  $a = 0$  is the unique maximiser of (62) for  $x > \Delta\lambda\mu/(e^\Delta - 1)$ , so that  $q_\Delta^-$  is finite.

where  $g_m := G^{\Delta, m}((\alpha_l)_{l=1}^m, (q_l)_{l=1}^m)$  for each  $m = 1, \dots, M$ , and  $g_0$  is degenerate at  $x_0$ .

Lemma 8 is proved in Appendix I.3.

## I.2 Proof of Proposition 5

In this section, I show that the approximate solution to the Bellman equation constructed in Lemma 8 lies in a suitably compact space (Remarks 2 and 3 and Lemma 9), and that the functional underlying the Bellman equation is continuous in the limit as the approximation becomes more accurate (Lemma 10). I end with the proof of Proposition 5.

Recall the definitions of  $\mathcal{S}$ ,  $\mathcal{Q}$ ,  $\mathcal{Q}_0$ ,  $V$ ,  $\mathcal{V}_0$ , and  $T_\Delta$  from Appendix I, and of  $\mathcal{Q}_\Delta$  and  $\mathcal{V}_\Delta$  from Appendix I.1. Endow  $\mathcal{S}$  with the topology such that  $\alpha^m \rightarrow \alpha$  if and only if  $\int_0^t \alpha_s^m(k) ds \rightarrow \int_0^t \alpha_s(k) ds$  for all  $t, k \geq 0$ .

*Remark 2.*  $\mathcal{S}$  is sequentially compact.<sup>107</sup>

Endow  $\mathcal{Q}$  with the topology such that  $q^m \rightarrow q$  if and only if  $\inf_{[t', t'']} q^m \rightarrow \inf_{[t', t'']} q$  for all but countably many  $t' < t''$ . The next result is proved in Curello (2021).

**Lemma 9.** *Let  $(\Delta^m)_{m \in \mathbb{N}} \subset (0, \infty)$  converge to 0, and  $(q^m)_{m \in \mathbb{N}} \in \prod_{m \in \mathbb{N}} \mathcal{Q}_{\Delta^m}$ . There exists  $q \in \mathcal{Q}_0$  such that  $q^m \rightarrow q$  in  $\mathcal{Q}$  along a subsequence. Moreover, for any  $t \geq 0$ ,  $k \geq x_0$  and  $q \in \mathcal{Q}_0$  such that  $q^m \rightarrow q$  in  $\mathcal{Q}$ , there are  $(t^m)_{m \in \mathbb{N}} \in \prod_{m \in \mathbb{N}} T_{\Delta^m}$  and  $(k_m)_{m \in \mathbb{N}} \subset [x_0, \infty)$  such that  $t^m \rightarrow t$ ,  $k_m \rightarrow k$ , and  $\delta_m \rightarrow \delta$  where  $\delta$  is given by (61) and*

$$\delta_m := \min\{s \geq 0 : k_m \geq q^m(t^m + s)\} \cup \{\infty\} \quad \text{for each } m \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (69)$$

Endow  $V$  with the the supremum metric, and  $\mathcal{V}$  with the topology such that  $v^m \rightarrow v$  if and only if  $v^m$  converges uniformly to  $v$  on  $[0, t]$  for all  $t > 0$ .

*Remark 3.* Let  $(0, \infty) \supset (\Delta^m)_{m \in \mathbb{N}} \rightarrow 0$  and  $(v^m)_{m \in \mathbb{N}} \in \prod_{m \in \mathbb{N}} \mathcal{V}_{\Delta^m}$  be such that, for all  $t > 0$ , there is  $\gamma > 0$  such that, for all  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $v^m$  is  $\gamma$ -Lipschitz on  $T_{\Delta^m} \cap [0, t]$  in the supremum metric. Then, there is  $v \in \mathcal{V}_0$  such that  $v^m \rightarrow v$  along a subsequence.<sup>108</sup>

Recall the definitions of  $Y'$  and  $\Theta_0$  from Appendix I, and of  $\mathcal{S}_\Delta$  and  $G_t(\alpha, q)$  from Appendix I.1. Let

$$\Theta := \left( \bigcup_{\Delta > 0} \{\Delta\} \times T_\Delta \times \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathcal{S}_\Delta \times \mathcal{Q}_\Delta \times \mathcal{V}_\Delta \right) \cup (\{0\} \times \mathbb{R}_+^2 \times \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{Q}_0 \times \mathcal{V}_0).$$

107. This follows from (a multi-dimensional version of) Helly's selection theorem (for example, Theorem 2 in Brunk, Ewing, and Utz (1956)), together with a diagonalisation argument. This is because, for any  $\alpha \in \mathcal{S}$ , the map  $(s, k) \mapsto \int_0^s \alpha_r(k) dr$  is increasing and bounded by  $t$  on  $[0, t] \times \mathbb{R}_+$ , for each  $t > 0$ .

108. To see why, define for each  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $\phi^m : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow T_{\Delta^m}$  by  $\phi^m(t) := \Delta^m \lfloor t/\Delta^m \rfloor$ , and  $\hat{v}^m : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow V$  by  $\hat{v}_t^m := [1 - t + \phi^m(t)]v_{\phi^m(t)}^m + [t - \phi^m(t)]v_{\phi^m(t) + \Delta^m}^m$ . Given  $t > 0$ , let  $\gamma$  satisfy the hypothesis of Remark 3 and note that, for all  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $\hat{v}^m$  is  $\gamma$ -Lipschitz on  $[0, t]$ . Then, since  $V$  is compact, by the Arzela-Ascoli theorem,  $(\hat{v}^m)_{m \in \mathbb{N}}$  admits a subsequence that converges uniformly on  $[0, t]$  to some  $v : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow V$ . Clearly,  $v$  can be chosen to lie in  $\mathcal{V}_0$ . Moreover, for all  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $\sup_{s \in [0, t]} |v^m - \hat{v}^m| \leq \gamma \Delta^m$  since  $v^m \in \mathcal{V}_{\Delta^m}$ , and thus  $v^m \rightarrow v$  uniformly on  $[0, t]$  by the triangle inequality, since  $\Delta^m \rightarrow 0$ . By a diagonalisation argument, we may choose  $v \in \mathcal{V}_0$  such that convergence is uniform over  $[0, t]$  for all  $t > 0$ .

and note that  $\Theta \subset \Theta_0$ . Endow  $\Theta_0$  with the product topology and  $\Theta$  with the topology such that  $\theta^m := (\Delta^m, t^m, k^m, \alpha^m, q^m, v^m)$  converges to  $\theta := (\Delta, t, k, \alpha, q, v)$  if and only if either  $\theta_m = \theta$  for  $m$  large enough, or  $\Delta = 0$  and  $\theta_m \rightarrow \theta$  in  $\Theta_0$ . Endow  $Y'$  with the product topology, and recall that  $A$  is endowed with the topology such that  $a \rightarrow \hat{a}$  if and only if  $\int_0^t a_s ds \rightarrow \int_0^t \hat{a}_s ds$  for all  $t > 0$ .<sup>109</sup> The next result is proved in Curello (2021).

**Lemma 10.** *Let  $(\theta_m)_{m \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \Theta$  converge to some  $\theta \in \Theta$ . Suppose that, for all  $s > 0$ , there is  $\gamma > 0$  such that, for all  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $r \mapsto G_r(\alpha^m, q^m)$  and  $v^m$  are  $\gamma$ -Lipschitz on  $[0, s] \cap T_{\Delta^m}$  in the supremum metric, where  $\theta_m := (\Delta^m, t^m, k_m, \alpha^m, q^m, v^m)$ . Then  $I^*(\theta_m) \rightarrow I^*(\theta)$  and, for any  $(y_m)_{m \in \mathbb{N}} \subset Y'$  converging to  $y \in Y'$ ,  $I(y_m, \theta_m) \rightarrow I(y, \theta)$ .*

*Proof of Proposition 5.* From Lemma 6 (Appendix I), it suffices to construct  $\alpha \in \mathcal{S}$ ,  $q \in \mathcal{Q}_0$  and  $v \in \mathcal{V}_0$  such that, for all  $t \geq 0$  and  $k \geq x_0$ , (64) holds with  $\theta := (0, t, k, \alpha, q, v)$ . To construct  $\alpha$ ,  $q$  and  $v$ , fix  $\gamma$  and  $\Delta_0$  satisfying the conditions of Lemma 8 (Appendix I.1).

*Claim 6.* For all  $\Delta \in (0, \Delta_0)$ , there are  $\hat{\alpha} \in \mathcal{S}_\Delta$ ,  $\hat{q} \in \mathcal{Q}_\Delta$ , and  $\hat{v} \in \mathcal{V}_\Delta$  such that

- (a) (64) holds with  $v = \hat{v}$  and  $\theta = (\Delta, t, k, \hat{\alpha}, \hat{q}, \hat{v})$  for all  $t \in T_\Delta$  and  $k \geq x_0$ , and
- (b)  $s \mapsto G_s(\hat{\alpha}, \hat{q})$  and  $\hat{v}$  are  $\gamma(t)$ -Lipschitz on  $[0, t] \cap T_\Delta$  in the supremum metric, for all  $t > 0$ .

*Proof.* Fix  $\Delta$  and, for all  $M \in \mathbb{N}$ , let  $\alpha^M \in S^M$ ,  $q^M \in Q_\Delta^M$ , and  $v^M \in V_\Delta^{M+1}$  satisfy the conditions of Lemma 8. Since  $S$ ,  $Q_\Delta$ , and  $V_\Delta$  are compact,<sup>110</sup> a diagonalisation argument yields a sequence  $(\alpha_m, q_m, v_m)_{m \in \mathbb{N}} \subset S \times Q_\Delta \times V_\Delta$  and a map  $r : \mathbb{N}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$  such that, given any  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $r(m, l) \geq m$  for all  $l \in \mathbb{N}$  and

$$(\alpha_m, q_m, v_m) = \lim_l (\alpha_m^{r(m,l)}, q_m^{r(m,l)}, v_m^{r(m,l)}).$$

Moreover it is clear that, for each  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $I_{\Delta, m}^*$  and  $I_{\Delta, m}$  are continuous, and that  $G_m^\Delta$  and  $G_{m+1}^\Delta$  are continuous in the supremum metric. Then, (65) and (68) hold for each  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ .<sup>111</sup> Let  $\hat{\alpha} \in \mathcal{S}_\Delta$ ,  $\hat{q} \in \mathcal{Q}_\Delta$  and  $\hat{v} \in \mathcal{V}_\Delta$  be given by (66). Then (a) is immediate from Remark 1 (Appendix I.1), and (b) holds since (68) holds for all  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ .  $\square$

109. The set  $A$  was defined in Appendix C, and its definition is repeated in Appendix I.

110. This follows from Helly's selection theorem for  $S$ , and from the Arzela-Ascoli theorem for  $V_\Delta$ .

111. In particular, writing  $\bar{\alpha}^m := (\alpha_i)_{i=1}^m$ ,  $\bar{q}^m := (q_i)_{i=1}^m$ ,  $\bar{\alpha}_l^m := (\alpha_i^{r(i,l)})_{i=1}^m$  and  $\bar{q}_l^m := (q_i^{r(i,l)})_{i=1}^m$ ,

$$I_{\Delta, m}((\mathbf{1}_{k < q_m}, \alpha_m), (k, \bar{\alpha}^m, \bar{q}^m, v_{m+1})) = \lim_l I_{\Delta, m} \left( \left( \mathbf{1}_{k < q_m^{r(m,l)}}, \alpha_m^{r(m,l)} \right), \left( k, \bar{\alpha}_l^m, \bar{q}_l^m, v_{m+1}^{r(m+1,l)} \right) \right)$$

even if  $(\mathbf{1}_{k < q_m^{r(m,l)}})_{l \in \mathbb{N}}$  does not converge to  $\mathbf{1}_{k < q_m}$ , since in this case  $k = q_m$  and

$$\begin{aligned} I_{\Delta, m}((\mathbf{1}_{k < q_m}, \alpha_m), (k, \bar{\alpha}^m, \bar{q}^m, v_{m+1})) &= \lim_{k' \downarrow k} I_{\Delta, m}((\mathbf{1}_{k' < q_m}, \alpha_m), (k', \bar{\alpha}^m, \bar{q}^m, v_{m+1})) \\ &= \lim_{k' \downarrow k} I_{\Delta, m}^*(k', \bar{\alpha}^m, \bar{q}^m, v_{m+1}) = I_{\Delta, m}^*(k, \bar{\alpha}^m, \bar{q}^m, v_{m+1}) = \lim_l I_{\Delta, m}^* \left( k, \bar{\alpha}_l^m, \bar{q}_l^m, v_{m+1}^{r(m+1,l)} \right) \\ &= \lim_l I_{\Delta, m} \left( \left( \mathbf{1}_{k < q_m^{r(m,l)}}, \alpha_m^{r(m,l)} \right), \left( k, \bar{\alpha}_l^m, \bar{q}_l^m, v_{m+1}^{r(m+1,l)} \right) \right). \end{aligned}$$

Fix a sequence  $(\Delta^m)_{m \in \mathbb{N}} \subset (0, \Delta_0)$  that converges to 0. For all  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ , let  $\alpha^m \in \mathcal{S}_{\Delta^m}$ ,  $q^m \in \mathcal{Q}_{\Delta^m}$  and  $v^m \in \mathcal{V}_{\Delta^m}$  satisfy the conditions of Claim 6 with  $\Delta := \Delta^m$ . From Remark 2, by considering a subsequence of  $(\Delta^m)_{m \in \mathbb{N}}$ , we may assume without loss of generality that  $\alpha^m \rightarrow \alpha$  in  $\mathcal{S}$  for some  $\alpha \in \mathcal{S}$ . Moreover, from Lemma 9, by considering a further subsequence we may also assume that,  $q^m \rightarrow q$  in  $\mathcal{Q}$  for some  $q \in \mathcal{Q}_0$ . Finally, for all  $m \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $t > 0$ , the variation of  $v^m$  on  $[0, t]$  is bounded by  $(t + \Delta_0)\gamma(t + \Delta_0)$  as, from (b),  $v^m$  is  $\gamma(t + \Delta_0)$ -Lipschitz on  $[0, t + \Delta_0] \cap T_{\Delta^m}$ . Then, from Remark 3, by considering a further subsequence, we may assume without loss of generality that  $v^m \rightarrow v$  in  $\mathcal{V}$  for some  $v \in \mathcal{V}_0$ .

It remains to prove that (64) holds with  $\theta := (0, t, k, \alpha, q, v)$  for all  $t \geq 0$  and  $k \geq x_0$ . Fix  $t$  and  $k$ , and let  $a$  and  $\delta$  be given by (61). By Lemma 9, there exists sequences  $(t^m)_{m \in \mathbb{N}} \in \prod_{m \in \mathbb{N}} T_{\Delta^m}$  and  $(k_m)_{m \in \mathbb{N}} \subset [x_0, \infty)$  such that  $t^m \rightarrow t$ ,  $k_m \rightarrow k$ , and  $\delta_m \rightarrow \delta$ , where  $(\delta_m)_{m \in \mathbb{N}}$  is given by (69). Let  $a^m : s \mapsto \alpha_{t^m+s}^m(k_m)$  and  $\theta_m := (\Delta^m, t^m, k_m, \alpha^m, q^m, v^m)$  for all  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ . Then, from Claim 6,

$$v_{t^m}^m(k_m) = I^*(\theta_m) = I((\delta_m, a^m), \theta_m) \quad \text{for all } m \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Note that  $v_{t^m}^m(k) \rightarrow v_t(k)$ . Moreover,  $\theta_m \rightarrow \theta$  in  $\Theta$  and  $a^m \rightarrow a$  in  $A^c$ ,<sup>112</sup> so that  $(a^m, \delta_m) \rightarrow (a, \delta)$  in  $Y'$ . Then, (64) follows from (b) and Lemma 10.  $\square$

### I.3 Proof of Lemma 8

Endow  $S$  with the topology of pointwise convergence. I begin with a remark, proved in Curello (2021).

*Remark 4.* Given  $\Delta > 0$  and  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ ,

$$(\alpha, q, v) \mapsto \left( k \mapsto \max \arg \max_{a \in [0,1]} I_{\Delta, m}((1, a), (k, \alpha, q, v)) \right)$$

is a well-defined and continuous map  $S^m \times Q_{\Delta}^m \times V_{\Delta} \rightarrow S$ , and

$$(\alpha, q, v) \mapsto (k \mapsto I_{\Delta, m}^*(k, \alpha, q, v))$$

is a well-defined and continuous map  $S^m \times Q_{\Delta}^m \times V_{\Delta} \rightarrow V_{\Delta}$ .

*Proof of Lemma 8.* From Lemma 7, we can choose  $\Delta_0 > 0$  such that

$$\bar{q} := \frac{e^{\Delta_0} - 1}{\Delta_0} \times \sup \{ q_{\Delta}^+ : \Delta \in (0, \Delta_0) \} \cup \{1, \lambda\mu\} < \infty.$$

---

112. It suffices to show that  $\int_0^s a_r^m dr \rightarrow \int_0^s a_r dr$  for all  $s > 0$ . Fix  $s$  and note that  $\int_0^s a_r^m dr = \int_0^s \alpha_{t^m+r}^m(k) dr = \int_0^{t^m+s} \alpha_r^m(k) dr - \int_0^{t^m} \alpha_r^m(k) dr$ . Similarly,  $\int_0^s a_r dr = \int_0^{t+s} \alpha_r(k) dr - \int_0^t \alpha_r(k) dr$ . Then,  $\int_0^s a_r^m dr \rightarrow \int_0^s a_r dr$  since  $\int_0^{t^m+s} \alpha_r^m(k) dr \rightarrow \int_0^{t+s} \alpha_r(k) dr$  and  $\int_0^{t^m} \alpha_r^m(k) dr \rightarrow \int_0^t \alpha_r(k) dr$ , as  $t^m \rightarrow t$ ,  $\alpha^m$  and  $\alpha$  take values in  $[0, 1]$ , and  $\alpha^m \rightarrow \alpha$  in  $\mathcal{S}$ .



To define  $\gamma$ , note that there exists  $\epsilon > \lambda$  such that, for all  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $\Delta \in (0, \Delta_0)$ ,  $a \in [0, 1]$ ,  $k \leq q_\Delta^+$ ,  $\alpha \in S^m$ ,  $q \in Q_\Delta^m$ , and  $v \in V_\Delta$ ,

$$\left| \int_{q_m}^{\infty} \text{Id} g_{m-1}^{n-1}(l) + g_{m-1}^{n-1}(q_m)v(k) - I_{\Delta, m}((1, a), (k, \alpha, q, v)) \right| < \epsilon \Delta$$

where, recall,  $g_0$  is degenerate with value  $x_0$ , and  $g_{m-1} := G^{\Delta, m-1}((\alpha_l)_{l=1}^{m-1}, (q_l)_{l=1}^{m-1})$  for  $m > 1$ . Moreover, as  $F$  is Lipschitz, there is an increasing map  $\gamma_0 : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow [1, \infty)$  such that  $G_t(\alpha, q)$  is  $\gamma_0(t)$ -Lipschitz on  $[x_0, \infty)$  for all  $\alpha \in \mathcal{S}$ ,  $q \in \mathcal{Q}$ , and  $t \geq 0$ . Define  $\gamma : (0, \infty) \rightarrow (0, \infty)$  by

$$\gamma(t) := 3\epsilon n \bar{q} \gamma_0(t).$$

Fix  $\Delta \in (0, \Delta_0)$  and  $M \in \mathbb{N}$ . To construct  $\alpha \in S^M$ ,  $q \in Q_\Delta^M$ , and  $v \in V_\Delta^{M+1}$ , let  $w : S^M \times Q_\Delta^M \rightarrow V_\Delta^{M+1}$  be given by  $w_{M+1}(\alpha, q) := \underline{v}_\Delta$ , and

$$[w_m(\alpha, q)](k) := I_{\Delta, m}^*(k, \alpha^m, q^m, w_{m+1}(\alpha, q))$$

for each  $m \in \{1, \dots, M\}$ , where  $\alpha^m = (\alpha_l)_{l=1}^m$  and  $q^m := (q_l)_{l=1}^m$ . Note that  $w_{M+1}$  has image in  $V_\Delta$ , and it is constant. Then Remark 4, coupled with an induction argument, implies that  $w$  is well-defined and continuous. Define the map  $\phi : S^M \times Q_\Delta^M \times V_\Delta^{M+1} \rightarrow S^M \times Q_\Delta^M \times V_\Delta^{M+1}$  by

$$\phi(\alpha, q, v) := \left( \left( k \mapsto \max \arg \max_{a \in [0, 1]} I_{\Delta, m}((1, a), (\alpha^m, q^m, w_{m+1}(\alpha, q))) \right)_{m=1}^M, \right. \\ \left. ([w_m(\alpha, q)](q_m))_{m=1}^M, w(\alpha, q) \right).$$

Since  $w$  is continuous and  $V$  is endowed with the topology of uniform convergence,  $\phi$  is well-defined and continuous by Remark 4. Then  $\phi$  admits a fixed point  $(\alpha, q, v)$  by Brouwer's fixed-point theorem, as  $S$  is compact by Helly's selection theorem, and  $V_\Delta$  is compact by the Arzela-Ascoli theorem.

Fix  $m \in \{1, \dots, M\}$ . To prove (65) note that, by definition of  $\phi$ , it suffices to prove that  $v_m(k) \leq (\geq) \underline{v}_\Delta(k)$  for all  $k \geq (\leq) q_m$ . This holds since  $v_m(q_m) = q_m \leq \underline{v}_\Delta(q_m)$ , and  $v_m - \underline{v}_\Delta$  is positive and decreasing (as  $v_m \in V_\Delta$ ).

It remains to prove (68). Let  $g^* := g_{m-1}^{n-1}$ .

*Claim 7.*  $1 - g^*(q_m) \leq 2\Delta \epsilon n \gamma_0(m\Delta)$ .

*Proof.* Assume without loss of generality that  $g_{m-1}(q_m) < 1$ . Note that  $g_{m-1}$  is  $\gamma_0((m-1)\Delta)$ -Lipschitz and, therefore,  $\gamma_0(m\Delta)$ -Lipschitz on  $[x_0, \infty)$ , as  $\gamma_0$  is increasing. Then  $g^*$  is  $n\gamma_0(m\Delta)$ -Lipschitz on  $[x_0, \infty)$  so that  $g^*$  conditioned on the event  $(q_m, \infty)$  FOSD-



dominates the uniform distribution over  $[q_m, q_m + 1/(n\gamma_0(m\Delta))]$ . Hence

$$q_m + \frac{1}{2n\gamma_0(m\Delta)} \leq \frac{\int_{q_m}^{\infty} l dg^*}{1 - g^*(q_m)} \Leftrightarrow 1 - g^*(q_m) \leq 2n\gamma_0(m\Delta) \int_{q_m}^{\infty} l - q_m dg^*.$$

Then,  $1 - g^*(q_m) \leq 2\Delta\epsilon n\gamma_0(m\Delta)$  since

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{q_m}^{\infty} l - q_m dg^* &\leq \int_{q_m}^{\infty} l - q_m dg^* + g^*(q_m)[v_{m+1}(q_m) - q_m] \\ &\leq \int_{q_m}^{\infty} l dg^* + g^*(q_m)v_{m+1}(q_m) - I_{\Delta,m}((1, \alpha_m), (q_m, \alpha^m, q^m, v_{m+1})) \leq \epsilon\Delta \end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality holds since  $v_{m+1}(q_m) \geq q_m$  (as  $v_{m+1} \in V_{\Delta}$ ), and the second since  $q_m = v_m(q_m) = I_{\Delta,m}^*(q_m, \alpha^m, q^m, v_{m+1}) \geq I_{\Delta,m}((1, \alpha_m), (q_m, \alpha^m, q^m, v_{m+1}))$ .  $\square$

To prove that  $\sup |v_{m+1} - v_m| \leq \gamma(m\Delta)\Delta$ , let  $k_0 := \min\{k \geq 0 : v_m = \underline{v}_{\Delta} \text{ over } [k, \infty)\}$  and note that  $k_0 \leq q_m$ . Since  $v_{m+1} - \underline{v}_{\Delta}$  is positive and decreasing,  $v_{m+1} - v_m$  is positive and decreasing on  $[k_0, \infty)$ . Hence, we may assume without loss of generality that  $k_0 > 0$  and restrict attention to  $k \in [0, k_0)$ , so that

$$\begin{aligned} |v_{m+1}(k) - v_m(k)| &\leq \left| \int_{q_m}^{\infty} v_{m+1}(k) - l dg^*(l) \right| \\ &\quad + \left| \int_{q_m}^{\infty} l dg^*(l) + g^*(q_m)v_{m+1}(k) - I_{\Delta,m}((1, \alpha_m), (k, \alpha^m, q^m, v_{m+1})) \right| \\ &\leq 2\epsilon n\gamma_0(m\Delta)\Delta \times \bar{q} + \epsilon\Delta \leq \gamma(m\Delta)\Delta \end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality follows from Claim 7 since  $|v_{m+1}(k) - l| \leq \bar{q}$  for all  $l \geq q_m$  in the support of  $g^*$ , as  $g^*(\bar{q}) = 1$  and  $k \leq v_{m+1}(k) \leq v_{m+1}(\bar{q}) = \underline{v}_{\Delta}(\bar{q}) = \bar{q}$ .

It remains to prove  $\sup |g_m - g_{m-1}| \leq \gamma(m\Delta)\Delta$ . To this end note that, for  $k > q_m$ ,  $g_m(k) = 1$  so that

$$|g_m(k) - g_{m-1}(k)| \leq 1 - g^*(q_m) \leq 2\Delta\epsilon n\gamma_0(m\Delta) \leq \gamma(m\Delta)\Delta$$

where the second inequality follows from Claim 7. Now fix  $k \in [x_0, q_m]$ . If agent  $i$  plays  $\xi^i$  for some  $\xi \in R(\hat{\alpha}, \hat{q})$  where  $\hat{\alpha} \in \mathcal{S}$  and  $\hat{q} \in \mathcal{Q}$  are such that  $\hat{\alpha}_t = \alpha_t$  and  $\hat{q}_t = q_t$  for all  $t \in [(l-1)\Delta, l\Delta)$  and  $l = 1, \dots, m$ , and her opponents never disclose then, for any  $l \geq x_0$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr\left(\tilde{k}_{(m-1)\Delta}^i \leq l \ \&\ \tilde{x}_{(m-1)\Delta} = x_0\right) &\geq \Pr\left(\tilde{k}_{m\Delta}^i \leq l \ \&\ \tilde{x}_{m\Delta} = x_0\right) \\ &\geq \Pr\left(\tilde{k}_{(m-1)\Delta}^i \leq l \ \&\ q_m \ \&\ \tilde{x}_{(m-1)\Delta} = x_0\right) e^{-\Delta\lambda}. \end{aligned}$$

Suppose that  $g_m(k) \geq g_{m-1}(k)$ . Note that

$$\begin{aligned} g_m(k) &= \Pr\left(\tilde{k}_{m\Delta}^i \leq k \mid \tilde{x}_{m\Delta} = x_0\right) \\ &\leq \frac{\Pr\left(\tilde{k}_{(m-1)\Delta}^i \leq k \ \& \ \tilde{x}_{(m-1)\Delta} = x_0\right)}{\Pr\left(\tilde{k}_{(m-1)\Delta}^i \leq q_m \ \& \ \tilde{x}_{(m-1)\Delta} = x_0\right)} e^{\Delta\lambda} = \frac{g_{m-1}(k)}{g_{m-1}(q_m)} e^{\Delta\lambda} \end{aligned}$$

so that, since  $k \leq q_m$ ,

$$g_m(k) - g_{m-1}(k) \leq e^{\lambda\Delta} - g_{m-1}(q_m) \leq e^{\lambda\Delta} - 1 + 2\Delta\epsilon n\gamma_0(m\Delta) \leq \gamma(m\Delta)\Delta$$

where the second inequality follows from Claim 7. Finally, suppose that  $g_m(k) < g_{m-1}(k)$ . Note that, since  $k \leq q_m$ ,

$$g_m(k) \geq \frac{\Pr\left(\tilde{k}_{(m-1)\Delta}^i \leq k \wedge q_m \ \& \ \tilde{x}_{(m-1)\Delta} = x_0\right)}{\Pr(\tilde{x}_{(m-1)\Delta} = x_0)} e^{-\Delta\lambda} = g_{m-1}(k) e^{-\Delta\lambda}$$

so that  $g_{m-1}(k) - g_m(k) \leq 1 - e^{-\Delta\lambda} \leq \Delta\lambda \leq \gamma(m\Delta)\Delta$ .  $\square$

## J Proof of Proposition 3

The argument relies on several intermediary results, proved at the end of this section.

*Claim 8.* Suppose that  $v_d(x_0) \geq \lambda\mu > x_0$ , and let  $\alpha^c$  and  $v^c$  satisfy the conditions of Theorem 4. Then, given  $t \geq 0$  such that  $\{s \in [t, t + \epsilon) : \alpha_s^c(x_0) < 1\}$  is non-null for all  $\epsilon > 0$ ,  $v_t^c(x_0) \geq v_d(x_0)$ .

For any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , write  $v_f^n$  and  $v_d^n$  for the values of  $v_f$  and  $v_d$  in the  $n$ -agent case. Let

$$\theta := \mathbb{E}_F[x_0 + \tilde{z} \mid x_0 + \tilde{z} \geq \lambda\mu].$$

**Lemma 11.** *Suppose that (1) and (30) hold, and that  $x_0 < \lambda\mu$ . Then there are  $\epsilon > 0$  and  $N \in \mathbb{N}$  such that, for all  $n \geq N$   $v_d^n(x_0) \geq \lambda\mu$  and*

$$e^\epsilon v_f^n(x_0) \leq v_d^n(x_0) \wedge \theta. \tag{70}$$

Fix  $x_0 < \lambda\mu$ . Given  $\xi_c$  satisfying the conditions of Theorem 4 for  $x_0$  and some  $\alpha^c$  and  $q$ , for any  $\epsilon > 0$  and  $t > 0$ , let  $\pi^{t,\epsilon}(\xi_c)$  be the probability that, conditional on no disclosure within  $[0, t)$  when  $\xi_c$  is played, a disclosure occurs within  $[t, t + \epsilon)$ . Similarly, let  $\pi^{0,\epsilon}(\xi_c)$

be the probability that a disclosure occurs within  $[0, \epsilon)$  when  $\xi_c$  is played. Define

$$\begin{aligned} r(\xi_c) &:= \sup\{0\} \cup \{t > 0 : \alpha_s^c(x_0) = 1 \text{ for a.e. } s \in [0, t]\} \\ s^\epsilon(\xi_c) &:= \sup\{0\} \cup \{t > 0 : \pi^{s,\epsilon}(\xi_c) \geq 1 - \epsilon \text{ for all } s \in [0, t]\} \quad \text{for all } \epsilon > 0. \end{aligned}$$

*Claim 9.* For all  $w \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $\epsilon > 0$ , there is  $N \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $v_{s^\epsilon(\xi_c)}^c(x_0) \geq w$  for any  $n \geq N$  and  $\xi_c, v^c$  satisfying the conditions of Theorem 4 for  $n$  agents as well as  $r(\xi_c) > s^\epsilon(\xi_c) < \infty$ .

*Claim 10.* For all  $\delta > 0$ , there exists  $\epsilon > 0$  such that, for any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $\xi_c$  satisfying the conditions of Theorem 4 for  $n$  agents and such that  $0 < r(\xi_c) \leq \epsilon$ , conditional on the first disclosure occurring within  $[0, r(\xi_c)]$  when  $\xi_c$  is played, its expected value is at least  $\theta - \delta$ .

*Proof of Proposition 3.* If  $x_0 \geq \lambda\mu$  then  $v_f^n(x_0) = x_0 \leq v^c(x_0)$  for any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $v^c$  that satisfies the conditions of Theorem 4 for  $n$  agents, where the inequality holds since any agent can obtain an ex-ante payoff of at least  $x_0$  by exerting no effort. Hence, suppose that  $x_0 < \lambda\mu$ . From Lemma 11, there are  $N' \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $\bar{\epsilon} > 0$  such that, for all  $n \geq N'$ ,  $v_d^n(x_0) \geq \lambda\mu$  and (70) holds with  $\epsilon = \bar{\epsilon}$ . Fix  $\delta' \in (0, \theta(1 - e^{-\bar{\epsilon}}))$  and choose  $\hat{\epsilon} \in (0, \bar{\epsilon})$  sufficiently small to ensure that Claim 10 holds with  $\epsilon = \hat{\epsilon}$  and  $\delta = \delta'$ , and

$$e^{\bar{\epsilon} - \hat{\epsilon}}(1 - \hat{\epsilon})(\theta - \delta') \geq \theta. \quad (71)$$

Finally, let  $N \geq N'$  satisfy the conditions of Claim 9 with  $w = \theta$  and  $\epsilon = \hat{\epsilon}$ .

Fix  $n \geq N$ , and  $\xi_c, v^c$  satisfying the conditions of Theorem 4 for  $n$  agents. It remains to show that  $v_0^c(x_0) \geq v_f^n(x_0)$ . Let  $t := r(\xi_c) \wedge s^{\hat{\epsilon}}(\xi_c)$ . Suppose first that  $t \leq \hat{\epsilon}$ . Then  $v_t^c(x_0) \geq v_d^n(x_0)$  if  $r(\xi_c) = t$  by Claim 8, and  $v_t^c(x_0) \geq \theta$  otherwise, by Claim 9. Thus,  $v_t^c(x_0) \geq v_d^n(x_0) \wedge \theta$  so that

$$v_0^c(x_0) \geq e^{-t}[\pi^{0,t}(\xi_c)(\theta - \delta') + [1 - \pi^{0,t}(\xi_c)]v_t^c(x_0)] \geq e^{-\hat{\epsilon}}[(\theta - \delta') \wedge v_d^n(x_0)] \geq v_f^n(x_0)$$

where the first inequality follows from Claim 10 (since, clearly,  $\pi^{0,0}(\xi_c) = 0$ ), and the last from (71) as well as (70) with  $\epsilon = \bar{\epsilon}$ , since  $\hat{\epsilon} \leq \bar{\epsilon}$ . Suppose finally that  $t > \hat{\epsilon}$  and note that

$$v_0^c(x_0) \geq e^{-\hat{\epsilon}}(1 - \hat{\epsilon})(\theta - \delta') \geq e^{-\bar{\epsilon}}\theta \geq v_f^n(x_0)$$

where the first inequality follows from Claim 10, the second from (71), and the last from (70) with  $\epsilon = \bar{\epsilon}$ .  $\square$

*Proof of Claim 8.* Since  $s \mapsto v_s^c(x_0)$  is continuous, it suffices to show that, for all  $\epsilon > 0$ , there is  $s \in [t, t + \epsilon)$  such that  $v_s^c(x_0) \geq v_d(x_0)$ . Fix  $\epsilon$ . Recall from the proof of Theorem 4 that  $v_t^c(x_0)$  satisfies (60), and that  $q$  and  $\alpha^c$  satisfy (61). Then (60) is maximised by

$\delta = \infty$ , since  $x_0 < \lambda\mu \leq q$ . Then,

$$\alpha_s^c(x_0) \in \arg \max_{a \in [0,1]} \{a\lambda\{\mathbb{E}_F[v_s^c(x_0 + \tilde{z})] - v_s^c(x_0)\} - ax_0\} \quad \text{for almost all } s > t,$$

by Lemma 4 with  $b(x) = x$ ,  $c(a, x) = ax$ ,  $\hat{w}(s) := \mathbb{E}_F[v_s^c(x_0 + \tilde{z})]$ ,  $\check{w}(s) := \mathbb{E}[\tilde{\kappa}|\tilde{\tau} - t = s]$ , and  $G$  being the CDF of  $t + \tilde{\tau}$ , where  $(\tilde{\tau}, \tilde{\kappa}) \sim J(t, \alpha^c, q)$ . Hence, for some  $s \in [t, t + \epsilon)$ ,

$$v_s^c(x_0) \geq \mathbb{E}_F[v_s^c(x_0 + \tilde{z})] - \frac{x_0}{\lambda} \geq \mathbb{E}_F[(x_0 + \tilde{z}) \vee v_s^c(x_0)] - \frac{x_0}{\lambda}$$

where the second inequality holds since, clearly,  $k \mapsto v_s^c(k)$  is increasing and  $v_s^c(k) \geq k$  for all  $k \geq x_0$ . Moreover,  $\alpha_d(x_0) > 0$  as  $x_0 < \lambda\mu$ , so that

$$v_d(x_0) \leq \mathbb{E}_F[(x_0 + \tilde{z}) \vee v_d(x_0)] - \frac{x_0}{\lambda}$$

by (28), since  $v_d(x) = x$  for  $x \geq \lambda\mu$  and  $v_d(x_0) \geq \lambda\mu$ . Then  $v_s^c(x_0) \geq v_d(x_0)$ .  $\square$

*Proof of Lemma 11.* Note that  $F(\lambda\mu - x_0) < 1$  by (30). For any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , write  $\alpha_f^n$ ,  $y_f^n$  and  $\alpha_d^n$  for the values of  $\alpha_f$ ,  $y_f$ , and  $\alpha_d$  in the  $n$ -agent case. Let  $\bar{v}_f : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be given by  $\bar{v}_f(x) := x + \int_{x \wedge \lambda\mu}^{\lambda\mu} \frac{M}{\lambda}$ , where  $M$  was defined in Section 4. By Corollary 3,  $v_f^n(x) = \bar{v}_f(x)$  for any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $x \geq y_f^n$ , and  $\alpha_f^n(x) \in (0, 1)$  for any  $x \in (y_f^n, \lambda\mu)$ . Then (17) yields

$$\bar{v}_f(x) = \mathbb{E}_F[\bar{v}_f(x + \tilde{z})] - \frac{x}{\lambda} \quad (72)$$

for any  $x \in (y_f^n, \lambda\mu)$ . Since  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} y_f^n = 0$  and  $\bar{v}_f$  is continuous, (72) holds for all  $0 \leq x \leq \lambda\mu$ .

I claim that  $\limsup_n v_f^n(x_0) = \bar{v}_f(x_0)$ . From above, this is immediate for  $x_0 > 0$ , hence suppose that  $x_0 = 0$ . Note that, for each  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $\alpha_f^n = 1$  over  $[0, y_f^n]$  and  $v_f^n = \bar{v}_f$  over  $[y_f^n, \infty)$  so that

$$v_f^n(0) = \mathbb{E} \left[ \left( \frac{\lambda n}{1 + \lambda n} \right)^{\tilde{m}} \bar{v}_f \left( \sum_{i=1}^{\tilde{m}} \tilde{z}_i \right) \right],$$

where  $(\tilde{z}_i)_{i=1}^{\infty} \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} F$  and  $\tilde{m} := \min\{m \in \mathbb{N} : \sum_{i=1}^m \tilde{z}_i \geq y_f^n\}$ . Since  $\lim_n y_f^n = 0$ , taking the limit as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  yields  $\limsup_n v_f^n(0) \leq \mathbb{E}_F[\bar{v}_f(\tilde{z})] = \bar{v}_f(0)$ .

I show that  $\bar{v}_f(x_0) < \theta$ . To this end, note that  $M$  is strictly decreasing by (1), so that  $\bar{v}_f$  is strictly convex over  $[0, \lambda\mu]$ . Then, there exists  $\hat{x} \in [x_0, \lambda\mu]$  such that  $\bar{v}_f$  is strictly decreasing over  $[x_0, \hat{x}]$  and strictly increasing over  $[\hat{x}, \infty)$ . Let  $\phi : y \mapsto \mathbb{E}_F[\bar{v}_f(x_0 + \tilde{z}) | x_0 + \tilde{z} \geq y]$  and note that, by (1),  $\phi$  is strictly increasing over  $[0, \hat{x}]$  since  $\phi(x_0) \geq \bar{v}_f(x_0)$  by (72). Moreover,  $\phi$  is strictly increasing over  $[\hat{x}, \lambda\mu]$  by (1), since  $\bar{v}_f$  is. Then  $\bar{v}_f(x_0) \leq \phi(x_0) < \phi(\lambda\mu) = \theta$ , as desired.

Since  $\limsup_n v_f^n(x_0) = \bar{v}_f(x_0)$ , it suffices to show that  $v_d^n(x_0) \geq \lambda\mu \vee \bar{v}_f(x_0)$  for  $n$  sufficiently large, and that  $\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} v_d^n(x_0) - \bar{v}_f(x_0) > 0$ .

By (28), for large enough  $n$ , either  $v_d^n(x_0) > (\bar{v}_f(x_0) \vee \lambda\mu) + 1$ , or  $\alpha_d^n(x_0) < 1$ . Hence, we may focus on the case  $\alpha_d^n(x_0) < 1$ . Then  $v_d(x_0) \geq \lambda\mu$ , for otherwise

$$x_0 \geq \lambda \mathbb{E}_F[(v_d^n(x_0 + \tilde{z}) - v_d^n(x_0)) \vee 0] > \lambda \mathbb{E}_F[(x_0 + \tilde{z} - \lambda\mu) \vee 0] \geq x_0,$$

where the first inequality follows from (28), the second holds since  $F(\lambda\mu - x_0) < 1$  and  $v_d(x) \geq x$  for all  $x$ , and the third is (30).

It remains to prove that  $v_d^n(x_0) - \bar{v}_f(x_0)$  is positive and bounded away from 0. Since  $v_d^n(x_0) \geq \lambda\mu$ , we may assume that  $\bar{v}_f(x_0) \geq \lambda\mu$ . Then

$$\mathbb{E}_F[\bar{v}_f(x_0 + \tilde{z})] < \mathbb{E}_F[\bar{v}_f(x_0 + \tilde{z}) \vee \bar{v}_f(x_0)]$$

by (1), since  $x_0 < \lambda\mu$  and  $\bar{v}_f$  is strictly convex over  $[x_0, \lambda\mu]$ . Moreover  $v_d^n(x_0) \geq \mathbb{E}_F[v_d^n(x_0 + \tilde{z}) \vee v_d^n(x_0)] + x_0/\lambda$  by (28), since  $\alpha_d^n(x_0) < 1$ . Then  $v_d^n(x_0) - \bar{v}_f(x_0)$  is positive and bounded away from 0 by (72).  $\square$

*Proof of Claim 9.* Note that, for all  $k \geq x_0$  and  $\delta > 0$ , there exists  $N' \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $w' \geq 0$  such that  $v_t^c(x_0) \geq v_t^c(k) - \delta$  for any  $n \geq N'$  and  $\xi_c, q, v^c$  satisfying the conditions of Theorem 4 for  $n$  agents, and any  $t \geq 0$  such that  $t < r(\xi_c)$  and  $\inf_{[t, t+\epsilon)} q \geq w'$ . Intuitively, if, conditional on no disclosure prior to time  $t$ , numerous agents exert full effort over the time interval  $[t, t + \epsilon)$  as long as no disclosure occurs, and the disclosure cutoff is large, the difference  $v_t^c(k) - v_t^c(x_0)$  is negligible because an agent whose private stock is  $k$  or less at time  $t$  believes that she will never disclose with high probability. Moreover, for any  $w'' \in \mathbb{R}$ , there exists  $N'' \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $\inf_{[t, t+\epsilon)} q \geq w''$  for any  $n \geq N''$  and  $\xi_c, q$  satisfying the conditions of Theorem 4 for  $n$  agents, and  $t \geq 0$  such that  $r(\xi_c) < t < s^\epsilon(\xi_c)$ . Intuitively, if, conditional on no disclosure up to time  $t$ , a large number  $n$  of agents exert full effort over the time interval  $[t, t + \epsilon)$  as long as no disclosure occurs, disclosure is likely to occur unless the disclosure cutoff is sufficiently high. Fix  $w$  and  $\epsilon$ . Let  $N'$  and  $w'$  satisfy the aforementioned conditions with  $k = w + 1$  and  $\delta = 1$ , and let  $N''$  satisfy the aforementioned conditions with  $w'' = w'$ . Let  $N := N' \vee N''$  and fix  $n \geq N$  and  $\xi_c, v^c$  satisfying the conditions of Theorem 4 for  $n$  agents as well as  $r(\xi_c) > s^\epsilon(\xi_c) < \infty$ . Since  $t \mapsto v_t^c(x_0)$  is continuous, it suffices to show that  $v_t^c(x_0) \geq w$  for all  $t \geq 0$  such that  $r(\xi_c) > t > s^\epsilon(\xi_c)$ . Fix  $t$  and note that  $v_t^c(x_0) \geq v_t^c(w + 1) - 1 \geq w$ , as desired.  $\square$

*Proof of Claim 10.* Suppose that  $n$  agents exert full effort perpetually and let  $\tau^n := \min\{t \geq 0 : \max_i k_t^i \geq \lambda\mu\} \cup \{\infty\}$ ,  $\tau_*^n := \min\{t \geq 0 : \max_i k_t^i \geq q(t)\} \cup \{\infty\}$ ,  $\iota_n := \arg \max_i k_{\tau^n}^i$  and  $\kappa^n := k_{\tau^n}^{\iota_n}$  (with  $\iota_n$  arbitrary and  $\kappa^n := 0$  if  $\tau^n = \infty$ ),<sup>113</sup> and  $\kappa_*^n =$

<sup>113</sup>. Note that  $\iota_n$  is well-defined since  $F$  is atomless.

$\max_i k_{\tilde{\tau}_*^n}^i$  (with  $\kappa_*^n := 0$  if  $\tau_*^n = \infty$ ). Note that, for all  $t > 0$  and  $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ ,

$$k \mapsto \Pr\left(\tilde{\kappa}_*^n > 0 \mid \left(\tilde{k}_t^j : j \neq i\right), \tilde{k}_t^i = k\right)$$

is increasing a.s. over  $\text{Supp}(\tilde{\kappa}^n) \setminus \{0\}$  so that, for any  $t > 0$ ,

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\tilde{\kappa}^n \mid \tilde{\tau}^n, \tilde{l}_n, \left(\tilde{k}_{\tilde{\tau}^n}^i : i \neq \tilde{l}_n\right), \tilde{\tau}_*^n \leq t\right] \stackrel{\text{a.s.}}{\geq} \mathbb{E}\left[\tilde{\kappa}^n \mid \tilde{\tau}^n, \tilde{l}_n, \left(\tilde{k}_{\tilde{\tau}^n}^i : i \neq \tilde{l}_n\right), \tilde{\tau}^n \leq t < \tilde{\tau}_*^n\right],$$

and thus  $\mathbb{E}[\tilde{\kappa}_*^n | \tilde{\tau}_*^n \leq t] \geq \mathbb{E}[\tilde{\kappa}^n | \tilde{\tau}^n \leq t < \tilde{\tau}_*^n]$ . Since  $\tilde{\kappa}_*^n \geq \tilde{\kappa}^n$  a.s. conditional on  $\tilde{\tau}_*^n < \infty$ , it follows that

$$\mathbb{E}[\tilde{\kappa}_*^n | \tilde{\tau}_*^n \leq t] \geq \mathbb{E}[\tilde{\kappa}^n | \tilde{\tau}_*^n \leq t] \geq \mathbb{E}[\tilde{\kappa}^n | \tilde{\tau}^n \leq t]. \quad (73)$$

Given  $t > 0$  and  $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ , let  $D_{i,t}^n$  be the event that agent  $i$  either obtained no increment within  $[0, t)$ , or obtained a single increment of size strictly less than  $\lambda\mu - x_0$ . Let  $E_t^n$  be the event that some agent  $i$  obtains her second increment at some time  $s \in (0, t]$  such that  $D_{j,s}^n$  holds for each  $j \neq i$ . Let  $G_t^n$  be the event that some agent  $i$  obtains her first increment at some time  $s \in (0, t]$  such that  $D_{j,s}^n$  holds for each  $j \neq i$ , and the increment has size  $\lambda\mu - x_0$  or more. Note that  $E_t^n$  and  $G_t^n$  are disjoint and that the event ' $\tau^n \leq t$ ' lies between  $G_t^n$  and  $E_t^n \cup G_t^n$ , so that

$$\Pr(G_t^n | \tilde{\tau}^n \leq t) \geq \frac{\Pr(G_t^n)}{\Pr(E_t^n) + \Pr(G_t^n)} = \left(\frac{\Pr(E_t^n)}{\Pr(G_t^n)} + 1\right)^{-1}.$$

Moreover  $\Pr(D_{i,t}^n) = \phi(t) := (1 + F(\lambda\mu - x_0)\lambda t)e^{-\lambda t}$  for each  $i$  and  $t$  and

$$\Pr(E_t^n) = n \int_0^t \phi(s)^{n-1} \lambda^2 s e^{-\lambda s} ds \quad \& \quad \Pr(G_t^n) = n[1 - F(\lambda\mu - x_0)] \int_0^t \phi(s)^{n-1} \lambda e^{-\lambda s} ds.$$

Note that the map

$$n \mapsto \frac{\int_0^t \phi(s)^{n-1} \lambda s \lambda^2 e^{-\lambda s} ds}{\int_0^t \phi(s)^{n-1} \lambda e^{-\lambda s} ds}$$

is decreasing, so that

$$[1 - F(\lambda\mu - x_0)] \frac{\Pr(E_t^n)}{\Pr(G_t^n)} \leq \frac{\int_0^t \lambda^2 s e^{-\lambda s} ds}{\int_0^t \lambda e^{-\lambda s} ds} = \frac{1 - e^{-\lambda t}(1 + \lambda t)}{1 - e^{-\lambda t}} \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } t \rightarrow 0.$$

Therefore, labelling  $H_t^n$  the event ' $\tau^n \leq t$ ',

$$\mathbb{E}[\tilde{\kappa}_*^n | \tilde{\tau}_*^n \leq t] = \Pr(G_t^n | \tilde{\tau}_*^n \leq t)\theta + [1 - \Pr(G_t^n | \tilde{\tau}_*^n \leq t)]\mathbb{E}[\tilde{\kappa}^n | H_t^n \setminus G_t^n] \rightarrow \theta$$

as  $t \rightarrow 0$  uniformly for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  since, clearly,  $\sup\{\mathbb{E}[\tilde{\kappa}^n | H_s^n \setminus G_s^n] : n \in \mathbb{N}, s < t\} < \infty$  given any  $t > 0$ . Then, given  $\delta > 0$ , there exists  $\epsilon > 0$  such that, for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $\xi_c$  satisfying the conditions of Theorem 4 for  $n$  agents as well as  $0 < r(\xi_c) \leq \epsilon$ ,

$\mathbb{E}[\tilde{\kappa}^n | \tilde{\tau}^n \leq r(\xi_c)] \geq \theta - \delta$ . Result follows from (73).  $\square$

## Supplemental appendices

### K Endogenous size of innovations

Suppose that each agent  $i$  obtains innovations at rate  $\lambda > 0$  and that, if she obtains an innovation at some time  $t$ , then its size is drawn from the distribution  $F_{a_t}^i$  where

$$F_a(z) := \rho a \mathbf{1}_{z \geq \zeta} + (1 - \rho a)(1 - e^{-\frac{z}{\epsilon}}) \quad \text{for all } a \in [0, 1],$$

for some  $\rho \in (0, 1]$  and  $\zeta > \epsilon > 0$ . That is, with probability  $\rho a_t^i$ , the innovation is substantial and has size  $\zeta$ ; otherwise, it is a small improvement, with size drawn from the exponential distribution with mean  $\epsilon$ . Thus, exerting higher effort increases the expected size of innovations, but does not alter their frequency. The fact that exerting no effort produces small improvements is justified if the cost of producing them is negligible.<sup>114</sup>

In this setting, if agents play a profile of Markov strategies  $\alpha := (\alpha^i)_{i=1}^n$ , the payoff to agent  $i$  is a function  $\bar{v}^i(x)$  of the current stock and satisfies

$$\bar{v}^i(x) = x(1 - \alpha^i(x)) + \lambda \sum_{j=1}^n \left\{ \mathbb{E}_{F_{\alpha^j(x)}} [v^i(x + \tilde{z})] - v^i(x) \right\}. \quad (8')$$

Therefore, the Bellman equation for maximal achievable welfare  $\bar{v}_*(x)$  is

$$v(x) = \max_{a \in [0, 1]} \left\{ x(1 - a) + \lambda n \left\{ \mathbb{E}_{F_a} [w(x + \tilde{z})] - w(x) \right\} \right\}. \quad (9')$$

and a strategy  $\alpha$  induces welfare  $\bar{v}_*(x)$  (when played by all agents) if and only if, for all  $x \geq x_0$ ,

$$\alpha(x) \in \arg \max_{a \in [0, 1]} \left\{ \lambda n \mathbb{E}_{F_a} [\bar{v}_*(x + \tilde{z})] - ax \right\}. \quad (10')$$

One can verify that it is efficient to cease exerting effort when the stock reaches  $\bar{x}_* := n\lambda\rho(\zeta - \epsilon)$ . Moreover, assuming that effort ceases after a substantial innovation (i.e. that  $\zeta \geq \bar{x}_*$ ),

$$\bar{v}_*(x) = \begin{cases} \frac{\lambda n \rho}{(1 + \lambda n \rho)^2} \left[ \epsilon \left( \frac{1}{\rho} - 1 \right) e^{\frac{1 + \lambda n \rho}{\epsilon(1 + \lambda n)}(x - \bar{x}_*)} \right. \\ \left. + (1 + \lambda n \rho)(x + \epsilon \lambda n) + \zeta + \epsilon \lambda n + \bar{x}_* \right] & \text{if } x \leq \bar{x}_* \\ x + \epsilon \lambda n & \text{if } x \geq \bar{x}_*, \end{cases} \quad (12')$$

---

114. This is because agents would always produce innovations even if they could choose to produce no innovation at no cost, both in the welfare benchmark and in equilibrium. Formally, efficient and equilibrium effort take values in  $[0, 1]$  even after expanding the domain of effort from  $[0, 1]$  to  $[-1, 1]$  and defining, for all  $a \in [-1, 0]$ ,  $c(a, x) := 0$  and  $F_a(z) := 1 - e^{-z/[\epsilon(a+1)]}$  (with  $F_0$  degenerate at 0).

and efficient effort  $\bar{\alpha}_*$  is ‘bang-bang’. That is,  $\bar{\alpha}_*(x) = 1$  for  $x < \bar{x}_*$ , and  $\bar{\alpha}_*(x) = 0$  for  $x > \bar{x}_*$ . In particular, Theorem 1 holds in this setting.

To compute symmetric equilibria in Markov strategies note that, from (8’), if the opponents of a given agent all play a strategy  $\alpha$ , the agent’s value function  $\hat{v}_\alpha$  solves

$$v(x) = \max_{a \in [0,1]} \{x(1-a) + \lambda \mathbb{E}_{F_a}[v(x+\tilde{z})]\} + \lambda(n-1) \left\{ \mathbb{E}_{F_{\alpha(x)}}[v(x+\tilde{z})] - v(x) \right\}. \quad (16')$$

Moreover,  $\alpha$  is a best response for the agent (at any history) if and only if, for all  $x \geq x_0$ ,

$$\alpha(x) \in \arg \max_{a \in [0,1]} \{ \lambda \mathbb{E}_{F_a}[\hat{v}_\alpha(x+\tilde{z})] - ax \}. \quad (17')$$

It is easy to show that, in any symmetric equilibrium in Markov strategies, effort ceases at  $\bar{x}_f := \lambda\rho(\zeta - \epsilon)$ . Assuming that effort ceases after a substantial innovation (i.e. that  $\zeta \geq \bar{x}_f$ ), the strategy

$$\bar{\alpha}_f(x) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } x \leq \bar{y}_f \\ \frac{\epsilon(1+\lambda n) + \bar{x}_f - x}{\lambda\rho(n-1)x} & \text{if } \bar{y}_f \leq x \leq \bar{x}_f \\ 0 & \text{if } x > \bar{x}_f, \end{cases}$$

where

$$\bar{y}_f = \frac{\epsilon(1+\lambda n) + \bar{x}_f}{1 + \lambda\rho(n-1)},$$

forms a symmetric equilibrium. Above  $\bar{y}_f$ , equilibrium payoffs are given by

$$\bar{v}_f(x) = \begin{cases} \zeta + \epsilon\lambda n + \left(1 - \frac{1}{\lambda\rho}\right)(x - \epsilon) & \text{if } \bar{y}_f \leq x \leq \bar{x}_f \\ x & \text{if } x > \bar{x}_f. \end{cases} \quad (20')$$

As illustrated in Figure 4, effort decreases as the stock grows, and continuation payoffs need not always increase. That is, innovations may be detrimental, as in the equilibrium  $\alpha_f$  of the baseline model (Section 4). More specifically,  $\bar{v}_f$  is monotone on  $[0, \bar{x}_f]$  if and only if  $\lambda\rho < 1$  and  $\bar{y}_f < \bar{x}_f$ , which is equivalent to

$$\frac{\zeta}{\epsilon} > 1 + \frac{1 + \lambda n}{\lambda^2 \rho^2 (n-1)}.$$

---

115. One can show via backward-induction arguments that no other pair of absolutely continuous  $\hat{v}_\alpha$  and  $\alpha$  satisfies both (16’) and (17’), so that  $\bar{\alpha}_f$  is the only ‘well-behaved’ symmetric equilibrium in Markov strategies.



Moreover, unless  $\epsilon = 0$ , both  $\bar{\alpha}_f$  and  $\bar{v}_f$  jump down at  $x = \bar{x}_f$ .<sup>116</sup>




Figure 4: Effort (left) and payoffs (right) in the ‘well-behaved’ symmetric equilibrium in Markov strategies of the game with endogenous innovation sizes, as functions of the stock  $x_t$ . Parameter values are  $n = \zeta = 5$ ,  $\lambda = 10$ ,  $\rho = 0.05$ , and  $\epsilon = 0.01$ .

## L Separable payoffs

In this appendix, I argue that the main phenomena analysed in this paper do not arise if payoffs are separable. Specifically, if payoffs are separable then, in the equilibrium with forced disclosure, innovations are guaranteed to be beneficial *and* concealing them is not profitable.

Recall that continuation payoffs in the equilibrium with forced disclosure are  $v_f(x_t)$ , where  $x_t$  is the current stock (Theorem 2).

**Proposition 6.** *If the cost of effort does not increase with the stock, i.e.  $c(a, x) = c(a)$ , then  $v_f$  is increasing.*

*Proof.* Recall from the proofs of Theorems 2 and 5 that  $v_f$  is the unique fixed point of  $P_f$  in  $\widehat{V}$ , that  $P_f$  maps  $\widehat{V}$  to itself and is increasing, and that  $\widehat{V}$  is a complete lattice (with respect to the pointwise order). Let  $V'$  be the set of  $v \in \widehat{V}$  that are increasing. It suffices to show that  $P_f$  admits a fixed point in  $V'$ . Note that  $V'$  is a complete lattice. Then, since  $P_f$  is increasing on  $\widehat{V}$ , by Tarski’s fixed-point theorem, it suffices to show that  $P_f$  maps  $V'$  to itself. Fix  $v \in V'$ . Note that  $P_f v \in \widehat{V}$ , so that it remains to show that  $P_f v$  is increasing.

Since  $v$  is increasing and  $v - b$  is decreasing,  $v$  and, thus,  $L_f v$  are continuous. Then,  $p(L_f v(x), x)$  and, therefore,  $P_f v$ , are continuous. Moreover, from Step 3 of the proof of Theorem 5,  $p(x, L_f v(x))$  is decreasing in  $x$ . Let  $I_a := \{x \geq 0 : p(x, L_f v(x)) = a\}$  for

<sup>116</sup>. In the picture, the jumps in  $\bar{\alpha}_f$  and  $\bar{v}_f$  have approximate size 0.102 and 0.02, respectively.

$a \in \{0, 1\}$  and  $I := \mathbb{R}_+ \setminus (I_0 \cup I_1)$ . If  $p(x, L_f v(x)) = 0$  for some  $x \geq 0$ , then  $I_0$  is an interval, and  $P_f v = b$  over  $I_0$ , so that it is increasing on  $I_0$ . If  $p(x, L_f v(x)) \in (0, 1)$  for some  $x \geq 0$ , then  $I$  is also an interval. Moreover, for any  $x \in I$ ,

$$\lambda[L_f v(x) - P_f v(x)] = \lambda \frac{L_f v(x) - [b(x) - c(a, x)]}{1 + \lambda n a} = c'(a)$$

where  $a := p(x, L_f v(x))$ , the first equality follows by definition of  $P_f$ , and the second from (51). Then  $P_f v$  is then increasing on  $I$ , as  $v$  is increasing and  $p(x, L_f v(x))$  is decreasing in  $x$ . Finally, if  $p(x, L_f v(x)) = 1$  for some  $x \geq 0$ , then  $I_1$  is an interval, and

$$P_f v(x) = \frac{b(x) - c(1, x) + \lambda n L_f v(x)}{1 + \lambda n}$$

over  $I$ . Then,  $P_f v$  is increasing on  $I_1$  since  $b(x) - c(1, x)$  and  $v$  are increasing. Therefore,  $P_f v$  is decreasing since  $I_0, I_1$  and  $I$  partition  $\mathbb{R}_+$ , and  $P_f v$  is continuous.  $\square$

Given Lemma 2, Proposition 6 implies that, if payoffs are separable, then innovations are not detrimental.

In the remainder of this section, I show that agents have no incentive to conceal innovations in equilibrium if payoffs are separable.<sup>117</sup> The following dynamic-programming result, which I state without proof, gives a sufficient condition for concealment to be unprofitable. Recall that  $\alpha_f$  is the effort policy in the equilibrium with forced disclosure (Theorem 2). Let

$$\mathcal{F} := \left\{ \sum_{l=1}^m z_l : m \in \mathbb{N}, (z_l)_{l=1}^m \subset \text{Supp}(F) \right\} \cup \{0\}.$$

**Lemma 12.** *Suppose that  $\Delta(k, x) \leq 0$  for any  $k, x \geq 0$  such that  $\{k - x, x - x_0\} \subset \mathcal{F}$ , where*

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta(k, x) := & \max_{a \in [0, 1]} \{b(x) - c(a, x) + a\lambda\{\mathbb{E}_F[v_f(k + \tilde{z})] - v_f(k)\}\} \\ & + \alpha_f(x)\lambda(n - 1)\mathbb{E}_F\{\mathbf{1}_{x + \tilde{z} > k}[v_f(x + \tilde{z}) - v_f(k)]\} - v_f(k). \end{aligned} \quad (74)$$

*Then, the effort schedule  $\alpha_f$ , coupled with the ‘full-disclosure’ policy, induces a symmetric PBE of the game with concealment (for some profile of beliefs).*

Assuming that agents exert effort according to  $\alpha_f$  and disclose fully, and that some agent  $i$  obtains an innovation at time  $t$  raising her stock to  $k_t^i > x_t$ ,  $\Delta(k_t^i, x_t)$  has the same

---

<sup>117</sup> It is immediate that agents have no incentive to *discard* innovations in equilibrium, given that they are not detrimental. However, as noted at the end of Section 6.1, concealment is generally more beneficial than disposal. Therefore, it is a priori unclear that it is unprofitable in equilibrium.

sign as the net benefit of the deviation: ‘conceal fully, and exert optimal effort until the next innovation (by any agent), then disclose fully and revert to  $\alpha_f$  and full disclosure’.<sup>118</sup>

The next result shows that, if the cost of effort does not increase with the stock, then concealment is not profitable in equilibrium.

**Corollary 7.** *If the cost of effort does not increase with the stock, i.e.  $c(a, x) = c(a)$ , then the effort schedule  $\alpha_f$ , coupled with the ‘full-disclosure’ policy, induces a symmetric PBE of the game with concealment.*

*Proof.* Fix  $x_0 \geq 0$ . From Lemma 12, it suffices to show that  $\Delta(k, x) \leq 0$  for all  $k \geq x \geq x_0$ . Note that  $\Delta(x_0, x_0) = 0$  since  $v_f$  satisfies (16). Hence, it suffices to show that  $\Delta(k, x_0)$  is decreasing in  $k$  on  $[x_0, \infty)$ . From Proposition 6,  $v_f$  is increasing. Then, the second expectation in (74) is decreasing in  $k$ . Hence, it suffices to show that the map  $\phi : k \mapsto \mathbb{E}_F[v_f(k + \tilde{z})] - v_f(k)$  is decreasing. Define

$$I_1 := \{x \geq 0 : \alpha_f(x) = 1\}, \quad I := \{x \geq 0 : \alpha_f(x) \in (0, 1)\}, \quad I_0 := \{x \geq 0 : \alpha_f(x) = 0\}.$$

From Theorem 2,  $\alpha_f$  is continuous and decreasing, so that  $I_1$ ,  $I$  and  $I_0$  are (possibly empty) intervals. Since  $\phi$  is continuous, it suffices to show that it is decreasing on each of  $I_1$ ,  $I$  and  $I_0$ . On  $I_0$ ,  $v_f = b$ , so  $\phi$  is decreasing since  $b$  is concave. On  $I$ , (17) implies that  $\phi(k) = c(\alpha_f(k))$ . Then  $\phi$  is decreasing since  $\alpha_f$  is. On  $I_1$ ,

$$\phi(k) = \frac{\mathbb{E}_F[v_f(k + \tilde{z})] - b(k)}{1 + \lambda n}.$$

Then,  $\phi$  is decreasing on  $I_1$  from Claim 1, since  $v_f - b$  is decreasing (see Theorem 2).  $\square$

## M Innovations of fixed size

In this appendix, I show that the main phenomena studied in this paper do not occur if the size of innovations is deterministic. Namely, if innovations have fixed size, in the equilibrium of the game with forced disclosure, innovations are always beneficial and concealing them is unprofitable. The former follows immediately from Lemma 1, as innovations have fixed size precisely if  $F$  is degenerate.

**Corollary 8.** *If innovations have fixed size, then innovations are not detrimental.*

---

118. Due to the restriction on the agent’s disclosures imposed in Section 6.1, this deviation is not feasible. However, its (well-defined) payoff provides an upper-bound on the payoffs of feasible deviations. To gain an insight on the expression for  $\Delta(k_t^i, x_t)$ , suppose that agent  $i$  is indifferent between this and no deviation. Then, the payoff from deviating would equal the sum of the first two terms in (74). Namely, if agent  $i$  deviates and exerts optimal effort  $a$ , she obtains flow payoff  $b(x) - c(a, x)$  until a disclosure and, if she obtains an innovation of size  $z$  before her opponents disclosure, her continuation payoff increases by  $v_f(k + z) - v_f(k)$ ; if instead one of her opponents discloses an innovation of size  $z$ , agent  $i$  discloses  $k$  immediately after if and only if  $x + z < k$ .

The next result shows that, if the size of innovations is deterministic, then concealment is not profitable in equilibrium.

**Corollary 9.** *If innovations have fixed size, then the effort schedule  $\alpha_f$ , coupled with the ‘full-disclosure’ policy, induces a symmetric PBE of the game with concealment.*

*Proof.* Fix  $x_0 \geq 0$ . From Lemma 12, it suffices to show that  $\Delta(k, x) \leq 0$  for all  $k \geq x \geq x_0$  such that  $k := x + m\mu$  for some  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ . From Lemma 1,  $v(k) \geq v(x + \mu)$ . Then, as  $F$  is degenerate with value  $\mu$ ,

$$\Delta(k, x) = \max_{a \in [0,1]} b(x) - c(a, x) + a\lambda\{\mathbb{E}_F[v_f(k + \tilde{z})] - v_f(k)\} - v_f(k).$$

Hence,  $\Delta(k, x) \leq 0$  since  $v_f$  satisfies (16),  $\mathbb{E}_F[v_f(k + \tilde{z})] - v_f(k) \geq 0$  (Lemma 1), and  $b(x) - c(a, x)$  is increasing in  $x$ .  $\square$