

PERSUASION WITH AMBIGUOUS RECEIVER PREFERENCES

EITAN SAPIRO-GHEILER

MIT

DECEMBER 7, 2021

ABSTRACT. I describe a Bayesian persuasion problem where Receiver has a private type representing a cutoff for choosing Sender's preferred action, and Sender has maxmin preferences over all Receiver type distributions with known mean and bounds. This problem can be represented as a zero-sum game where Sender chooses a distribution of posterior mean beliefs that is a mean-preserving contraction of the prior over states, and an adversarial Nature chooses a Receiver type distribution with the known mean; the player with the higher realization from their chosen distribution wins. I formalize the connection between maxmin persuasion and similar games used to model political spending, all-pay auctions, and competitive persuasion. In both a standard binary-state setting and a new continuous-state setting, Sender optimally linearizes the prior distribution over states to create a distribution of posterior means that is uniform on a known interval with an atom at the lower bound of its support.

JEL Classification: D81, D82, D83

Keywords: Bayesian persuasion, maxmin utility, mean-preserving contraction

Email: eitans@mit.edu

I thank Drew Fudenberg, Stephen Morris, Frank Schillbach, Dmitry Taubinsky, participants in MIT 14.192, and especially Alexander Wolitzky for helpful discussions and comments. This material is based upon work supported by the National Science Foundation Graduate Research Fellowship under Grant No. 1745302.

1. INTRODUCTION

Consider a politician who is proposing a new welfare program. She must decide how to disclose information about its expected cost, but does not know how much spending voters will support. All voters have the same ex-ante beliefs about the program's cost, but some will only approve if, after hearing the politician's speech, they expect the cost to be low, while others are willing to support even a large government outlay. Rather than imposing a prior distribution over people's preferences, the politician wishes to be robust to the worst-case distribution she may face given a known cost threshold for the average voter. In this setting, what disclosure rule maximizes the share of voters who approve of the welfare program after taking into account the politician's message? How do the optimal rule and the politician's utility differ from the case where the politician faces a known distribution of citizen preferences?

I address and generalize those questions through a model of Bayesian persuasion ([Kamenica and Gentzkow, 2011](#)), where a Sender commits to a message distribution in each state of the world and a Receiver uses Bayesian updating to form a posterior belief about the state based on the message structure. To represent Receiver's preferences, I use private types denoting the cutoff above which Receiver chooses Sender's preferred action. Sender knows the mean and support of Receiver types, and has maxmin preferences ([Gilboa and Schmeidler, 1989](#)) over all Receiver type distributions satisfying those constraints. Regardless of the true state of the world, Sender maximizes the probability of inducing the favorable action. This model captures situations where all Receiver types process information in the same way, but may have different preferences over outcomes. In addition to the political spending example described above, a model of this style also applies to a variety of other situations, such as disclosing information about product quality (if potential customers share a prior belief about quality, but may be more or less picky about when they buy) or screening job candidates (if all firms have a common prior about candidate quality and see the same resumé, but have different thresholds for hiring).

This persuasion model can be reinterpreted as a zero-sum game between Sender and an adversarial Nature. Following the Bayesian persuasion literature, I can allow Sender to directly choose any distribution of posterior mean beliefs about the state that is a mean-preserving contraction of the prior. Then, Nature chooses a Receiver type distribution with the appropriate mean and domain; this choice is equivalent to choosing a mean-preserving contraction of a Receiver type distribution with support $\{0, 1\}$. The player with the higher realization from their chosen distribution wins the game. Such *mean-preserving contraction games* (henceforth MPC games), albeit with simultaneous moves, have been studied in prior literature outside of the persuasion context (for example by [Myerson 1993](#)), as well as being used to represent competition between many Senders persuading a single Receiver (as in [Boleslavsky and Cotton 2015](#)). Many of those works emphasize the role of uniform distributions, which induce indifference among many possible strategies for the opposing players. Adapting these results to my setting, I show that in a binary-state setting where the probability of the high state is weakly less than $1/2$, Sender’s unique optimal posterior distribution places an atom at 0 and is uniform on an interval $[0, c]$ for $c \leq 1$. In doing so, I formalize the connection between maxmin persuasion and MPC games and show that the sequential timing of the maxmin persuasion game does not affect Sender’s optimal distribution but the tie-breaking rule (the probability with which a posterior mean q convinces a Receiver type $r = q$) sometimes does. I also use a geometric approach based on the concavification argument of [Kamenica and Gentzkow \(2011\)](#) to show that when the state of the world is continuous and unimodal, a similar distribution—uniform on $[a, b] \subset (0, 1)$ with an atom at a —is one of many optimal distributions for Sender. The continuous-state setting is a novel specification of both the MPC game and the maxmin persuasion problem.

2. RELATED LITERATURE

This work builds on the Bayesian persuasion problem of [Kamenica and Gentzkow \(2011\)](#), and adopts a similar approach to existing work in robust mechanism design.

In addition, my model resembles a class of games I call MPC games, which include a continuous version of the Colonel Blotto game as well as competitive Bayesian persuasion by multiple Senders. I discuss the first two topics here and postpone discussion of the third to Section 3.3, after presenting the formal model.

In the baseline Bayesian persuasion model of [Kamenica and Gentzkow \(2011\)](#), Receiver has no private information. Subsequent literature in this area is surveyed in detail by [Kamenica \(2019\)](#) and [Bergemann and Morris \(2019\)](#), so I focus on the two works most directly related to the model I propose, [Kolotilin et al. \(2017\)](#) and [Hu and Weng \(2021\)](#).¹ The former has an interval state space, Receiver types that enter payoffs linearly, and a binary action, as in my model; however, it endows Sender with a prior distribution over Receiver types. If that prior distribution is log-concave, then the optimal distribution for Sender can be generated by upper censorship; the resulting distribution of posterior means is essentially a truncated version of the prior where states in some interval $[\alpha, 1]$ are replaced with an atom at $\beta \in (\alpha, 1)$. In the continuous-state version of my model, linearizing the prior rather than censoring high states helps Sender avoid facing a tailored Receiver type distribution in response. To make sure this strategy respects Bayes-plausibility, Sender may use a truncated uniform distribution with interior support.

The model of [Hu and Weng \(2021\)](#) is most similar to the one considered here: it is a binary-action model where Sender has maxmin preferences over Receiver types and maximizes the probability of inducing the favorable action. However, Receiver types represent an ambiguous posterior about a binary state of the world rather than a payoff-relevant characteristic which does not directly interact with beliefs about the state. This model captures substantively different applications—e.g., voters with common ideology who privately read outside news sources before listening to a politician’s

¹Other works use maxmin preferences in Bayesian persuasion settings, but are much more distinct. In [Kosterina \(2021\)](#), possible Receiver type distributions are distortions of a “reference distribution;” in [Dworczak and Pavan \(2020\)](#), there is full ambiguity about Receiver’s posterior belief; and in [Laclau and Renou \(2017\)](#) and [Beauchêne et al. \(2019\)](#), Receiver has maxmin preferences.

speech, rather than the equally-informed voters with different ideological positions in my model. Working with belief-independent Receiver types also means that I am able to characterize Receiver’s posterior distribution and thus provide a sharp testable prediction—all posteriors in a known interior interval are equally likely. Methodologically, because my formulation features a simpler interaction between Receiver’s type and Sender’s signal, I am able to extend my approach and characterization of Sender’s optimal policy to a continuous-state case.

A literature in robust mechanism design has also used moment conditions alongside maxmin preferences. [Wolitzky \(2016\)](#) considers a bilateral trade model where each agent has a valuation in $[0, 1]$ and knows only the mean of the other agent’s type distribution. In that model, agents’ worst-case beliefs have binary support. Here, it is similarly possible to define a binary-support worst-case Receiver type distribution, but Sender’s desire to induce indifference between many such distributions means the optimal posterior distribution has interval support. In [Carrasco et al. \(2019\)](#), a principal with maxmin preferences offers a surplus-maximizing contract to a privately informed agent. Similar to my model, the agent’s type distribution has known mean and support $[0, 1]$. As in [Hu and Weng \(2021\)](#) and my work, the optimal mechanism for the principal induces a payoff that is piecewise linear in the agent’s type. Finally, [Carrasco et al. \(2018\)](#) considers a setting where a seller with maxmin preferences faces an unknown distribution of buyer valuations. The seller knows the first $N - 1$ moments of the valuation distribution and an upper bound on the N th moment. Similar to the concavification argument of [Kamenica and Gentzkow \(2011\)](#), optimal transfers are given by the non-negative monotonic hull of a degree- N polynomial.

3. MODEL

3.1. Setup and Preferences. There is one Sender (she) and one Receiver (he).² Both players share a common prior belief $F \in \Delta([0, 1])$ about the state of the world

²The presence of one Receiver with an unknown type may also be interpreted as a population of Receivers, each with a known type, with which Sender communicates publicly.

$\omega \in [0, 1]$, with $\mathbb{E}_F[\omega] = \pi \in (0, 1)$. Only Receiver knows his private type $r \in [0, 1]$, but the mean Receiver type $r^* \in (0, 1)$ is common knowledge. Sender considers potential Receiver type distributions T in the set

$$\mathcal{T} = \left\{ \text{cdf } T \text{ over } [0, 1] \mid \int r dT(r) = r^* \right\}.$$

I restrict Sender to the standard Bayesian persuasion tool of committing ex-ante to a Blackwell experiment, i.e., a state-dependent signal distribution, and in particular do not allow her to elicit Receiver's type in order to capture the public-communication interpretation of this model. After Sender communicates, Receiver chooses a binary action $a \in \{0, 1\}$ whose utility depends on the state and on Receiver's type:

$$u_R(a, \omega, r) = a(\omega - r).$$

Thus when Receiver believes $\mathbb{E}[\omega \mid \text{Sender's message}] > r$, he strictly prefers $a = 1$, and when the opposite inequality holds he strictly prefers $a = 0$.³ The explicit functional form used here is for ease of exposition only. Whenever Receiver's utility is a linear function of the state, his action depends only on the mean of his posterior belief about the state, and my results still hold (under an appropriate re-normalization of the interval of Receiver types).

Sender's goal is to maximize the probability of inducing the high action $a = 1$ independent of the true state ω and true Receiver type r :

$$u_S(a, \omega, r) = a.$$

3.2. The Maxmin Persuasion Problem. Since Receiver's choice of action depends only on the mean q of the posterior belief distribution, I can follow Blackwell (1953) and directly consider Sender choosing a distribution of posterior means G such that G is a mean-preserving contraction of the prior distribution F . The set of feasible

³Receiver's choice when indifferent will not affect equilibrium outcomes, but will affect Sender's equilibrium strategy. I discuss this tie-breaking issue in Section 4.1.

distributions of posterior means is therefore

$$\mathcal{G} = \left\{ \text{cdf } G \text{ over } [0, 1] \left| \int_0^x G(q) dq \leq \int_0^x F(q) dq \forall x \in [0, 1] \right. \right. \\ \left. \left. \text{and } \int_0^1 G(q) dq = \int_0^1 F(q) dq \right\}.$$

I follow the literature in referring to this constraint as Bayes-plausibility. Note that when $\text{supp}(F) = \{0, 1\}$, a case which I refer to as *binary support*, any posterior distribution that satisfies the equality at $x = 1$ satisfies the inequality for all $x \in [0, 1)$.

Using this formulation and Receiver's preferences, I rewrite Sender's utility as

$$u_S(q, r) = \mathbf{1}(q > r),$$

where I assume that an indifferent Receiver chooses Sender's less-preferred action, $a = 0$. Sender's full optimization problem is therefore

$$\max_{G \in \mathcal{G}} \left\{ \min_{T \in \mathcal{T}} \int \int \mathbf{1}(q > r) dG(q) dT(r) \right\}. \quad (1)$$

I state the optimization problem using max and min, rather than sup and inf. The tie-breaking rule for indifferent Receivers ensures that the max and min are well-defined, but they may not be for other tie-breaking rules, as I discuss in Section 4.1. Regardless of tie-breaking, the main difference from standard Bayesian persuasion with private information is the presence of an endogenously-determined Receiver type distribution.

3.3. MPC Games. I characterize the solution to the maxmin persuasion problem by reframing Sender's maxmin preferences as a zero-sum game, in which Sender designs a distribution of posterior means and then Nature adversarially designs a type distribution. More generally, my persuasion model can be viewed as a special case of a more general game which I call an *MPC game*. In this game, players $1, \dots, N$ simultaneously⁴ choose distributions G_1, \dots, G_N that are mean-preserving contractions

⁴Simultaneous choice is a feature of most prior literature on games of this kind; I will show in Section 4.1 that my solution is a saddle point and so the switch from sequential to simultaneous moves does not affect the result.

of corresponding distributions F_1, \dots, F_N . A realization x_i is drawn from each distribution G_i to produce a vector of realizations $x = (x_1, \dots, x_N)$. A prize allocation rule $A(x) : \mathbb{R}^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^N$ determines each player's payoff as a function of the realizations. One simple prize allocation rule is to assign the player with the highest realization a payoff of 1 and all other players a payoff of 0; such a rule fits my model, where Sender gets a payoff of 1 if and only if the realized posterior exceeds the realized Receiver type. Various choices of F_i have been paired with this prize allocation rule in prior literature. In particular, as noted in the previous section, if a cdf F_i over a positive interval $[0, c]$ or over \mathbb{R}_+ has binary support, then any G_i with the same domain and mean as F_i is a mean-preserving contraction of F_i . MPC games where the F_i have binary support and domain \mathbb{R}_+ have been used to describe campaign spending or distribution of revenues by politicians (Myerson, 1993; Che and Gale, 1998; Sahuguet and Persico, 2006). Changing the domain to a finite interval $[0, c]$ has been used to model all-pay auctions with complete information (Baye et al., 1996; Hart, 2015). Further specifying the domain as $[0, 1]$ and potentially allowing F_i to have non-binary support can represent competition between different Senders attempting to persuade a single Receiver (Boleslavsky and Cotton, 2015; Hwang et al., 2019; Au and Kawai, 2020). However, this work is the first to explicitly use the connection between MPC games and persuasion by a single Sender with maxmin preferences.

4. THE BINARY-STATE SETTING

In this section, I fully characterize Sender's optimal distribution when the prior F has binary support, so that a distribution of posterior means is the same as a posterior distribution (I use the latter expression for simplicity). This case is equivalent to a 2-player MPC game where F_1 equals F , with domain $[0, 1]$, binary support, and mean π ; F_2 , which represents Nature's mean constraint, has domain $[0, \infty)$, binary support, and mean r^* .⁵ The solution to the maxmin persuasion problem of Equation (1), as well as Sender's optimal posterior distribution under slight variations of my model, then

⁵This equivalence also holds when F does not have binary support. However, I do not use it in characterizing Sender's optimal distribution with a continuous-support prior in Section 5.

follows from extending earlier results about MPC games. In particular, Proposition 1 shows that when the prior π is weakly less than $1/2$, Sender uniquely selects an upper-truncated uniform distribution with an atom at $q = 0$. Under favorable tie-breaking—where an indifferent Receiver chooses $a = 1$ rather than $a = 0$ —Corollary 1 shows that Sender may modify this solution by also placing an atom at $q = 1$.

4.1. Maxmin Persuasion as an MPC Game. Equivalence of the maxmin persuasion problem in Equation (1) and the MPC game specified above rests on two results. The first (Lemma 1 in Appendix A) is that Nash equilibrium strategies for Sender in the MPC game are equivalent to optimal posterior distributions in the sequential-move game implied by Sender’s maxmin preferences. This result follows from Sion’s minimax theorem (Sion, 1958), which shows that Sender’s maxmin and minmax utilities are equal, and therefore equal to the utility from the MPC game.

The second result is that tie-breaking against Sender is equivalent to allowing the Receiver type distribution to be unbounded above.⁶ With favorable tie-breaking, Sender persuades a Receiver with type $r < 1$ by generating a posterior $q_r^0 = r$; with unfavorable tie-breaking, she must generate $q_r^\varepsilon = r + \varepsilon$ for arbitrary $\varepsilon > 0$. As $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, the effect on the Bayes-plausibility constraint from replacing each q_r^0 with q_r^ε vanishes, allowing a Sender facing unfavorable tie-breaking to match her utility with favorable tie-breaking. However, this argument breaks down when examining Receiver type $r = 1$, since Sender cannot generate a posterior $q_1^\varepsilon > 1$. With favorable tie-breaking, the maximal posterior convinces the maximal Receiver type; with unfavorable tie-breaking, it fails to do so. In the persuasion problem, posteriors greater than 1 cannot exist, so the choice of tie-breaking rule necessarily affects Sender’s payoff from strategies involving an atom at $q = 1$. However, in the corresponding MPC game, tie-breaking can be made moot by adjusting one player’s upper bound. Allowing Sender, but not Nature, to choose distributions containing realizations greater than 1 means

⁶A similar relationship is discussed in the context of all-pay auctions by Szech (2015).

that under unfavorable tie-breaking, Sender can attain her utility from favorable tie-breaking in the limit by adding ε to every realization (including $q = 1$) and taking $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. Similarly, allowing Nature, but not Sender, to choose distributions containing realizations greater than 1 means that, even with favorable tie-breaking for Sender, Nature can keep Sender’s utility to the same level as with unfavorable tie-breaking. This argument also applies to cases where tie-breaking partially favors one player by giving them a higher payoff than the other player, but not the full payoff they would attain from a strictly greater realization. Thus it is without loss to always consider even tie-breaking (which selects a winner randomly when the realizations are equal) and remove the upper bound for the favored player, if one exists.

Since in my setting, Nature moves second, I focus on the formulation where tie-breaking is against Sender. This choice ensures that for each posterior distribution, the minimizing Receiver type distribution is well-defined, rather than requiring the use of an infimum over ε -adjustments. In this binary-state setting, I can leverage prior work on MPC games to characterize Sender’s optimal posterior distribution with favorable tie-breaking or even tie-breaking as well. Corollary 1 in Section 4.3 and Corollary 2 in Appendix A, respectively, show that those results differ only in the potential presence of an atom at posterior $q = 1$.

4.2. Optimal Posterior Distributions. Having established equivalence between the maxmin persuasion problem and an appropriate MPC game, the solution to the maxmin persuasion problem closely resembles Theorem 4 of Hart (2015), which provides a Nash equilibrium of that MPC game. I extend that result by providing an alternative proof which shows uniqueness of Sender’s optimal distribution when the prior mean π is weakly less than $1/2$, as well as necessary and sufficient conditions on any maxmin-optimal posterior distribution when $\pi > 1/2$. To fix notation, let δ_x be the Dirac distribution with all mass at $q = x$ and $U[x, y]$ be the uniform distribution over the interval $[x, y]$. Then the following describes Sender’s optimal posterior distribution:

Proposition 1. *Let $\text{supp}(F) = \{0, 1\}$ and let ties be broken against Sender.*

If $\pi > 1/2$, then a posterior distribution G^ is optimal for Sender if and only if $\mathbb{E}_{G^*}[\omega] = \pi$ and $G^*(x) \leq x \forall x \in [0, 1]$.*

If $\pi \leq 1/2$, then Sender's unique optimal posterior distribution G^ is as follows:*

- *If $r^* \leq \pi \leq 1/2$,*

$$G^*(q) = U[0, 2\pi].$$

- *If $\pi \leq r^* \leq 1/2$,*

$$G^*(q) = \left(1 - \frac{\pi}{r^*}\right) \delta_0 + \frac{\pi}{r^*} U[0, 2r^*].$$

- *If $\pi \leq 1/2 \leq r^*$,*

$$G^*(q) = (1 - 2\pi) \delta_0 + 2\pi U[0, 1].$$

Proof. See Appendix A. □

Because Nature can choose a binary support distribution where Receiver type $r = 0$ is always persuaded and Receiver type $r = 1$ is never persuaded, Sender's payoff cannot exceed $1 - r^*$. Whenever Sender chooses a posterior distribution with a convex cdf, this Receiver type distribution is indeed optimal for Nature, and Sender attains her maximum payoff. Since the uniform distribution $U[0, 1]$ has the highest mean among distributions with convex cdfs, this choice is feasible for Sender if and only if $\pi \geq 1/2$ (and multiple such distributions are feasible when $\pi > 1/2$). When $\pi < 1/2$, Sender chooses a distribution that is as close to uniform as possible given her Bayes-plausibility constraint. This choice requires her to place an atom at $q = 0$, truncate the support of the distribution below $q = 1$, or both. Which of these modifications is used depends on the relationship between π , r^* , and $1/2$, which determines the relative ability of Sender and Nature to generate high realizations from their respective distributions.

Hart (2015) does not establish uniqueness of this Nash equilibrium of the MPC game. A related work, Amir (2017), shows through explicit calculations of players' utilities under various distributions that Sender's Nash equilibrium strategy is unique when $\pi \leq 1/2$ (Theorems 4 and 5 in that work) but gives only a partial characterization of optimal strategies for Sender when $\pi > 1/2$ (Theorem 10 in that work). In the maxmin persuasion setting with tie-breaking against Sender, I am able to avoid issues with limits of ε -approximating distributions and close that gap: Lemma 3 in Appendix A gives a necessary and sufficient condition for Sender's optimal distribution when $\pi > 1/2$. Additionally, in Lemma 7 of Appendix A, I provide a novel geometric proof of Sender's optimal posterior distribution for the case $\pi \leq 1/2$, including its uniqueness, which does not use results on MPC games and instead leverages the concavification approach of Kamenica and Gentzkow (2011). This proof informs my approach in the continuous-state setting.

4.3. Varying the Tie-Breaking Rule. A dramatic feature of Proposition 1 is that replacing the maxmin criterion by any prior belief over Receiver types with mean r^* would result in weakly higher utility for Sender. In fact, any prior belief with mean r^* that does not first-order stochastically dominate $U[0, 1]$ results in strictly higher utility. This result is in part driven by Nature's ability to tailor a worst-case Receiver type distribution to Sender's particular disclosure strategy, but is also affected by the ability to generate a Receiver type who is unconvinced even when the state is surely $\omega = 1$. By re-interpreting the tie-breaking rule in terms of the domain of the distributions each player can choose, I can obtain Sender's optimal posterior distribution under favorable tie-breaking, and show exactly when the choice of tie-breaking rule is influential:

Corollary 1 (Adapted from Theorem 4 of Hart 2015). *Let $\text{supp}(F) = \{0, 1\}$ and let ties be broken in favor of Sender.*

One optimal posterior distribution for Sender's is as follows:

- If $r^* \leq \pi \leq 1/2$,

$$G^*(q) = U[0, 2\pi].$$

- If $\pi \leq r^* \leq 1/2$,

$$G^*(q) = \left(1 - \frac{\pi}{r^*}\right) \delta_0 + \frac{\pi}{r^*} U[0, 2r^*].$$

- If $1/2 < r^*$,

$$G^*(q) = (1 - \pi) \delta_0 + \pi \delta_1.$$

- If $r^* \leq 1/2 < \pi$,

$$G^*(q) = (2 - 2\pi) U[0, 1] + (2\pi - 1) \delta_1.$$

Proof. See Appendix A. □

In this case, Sender sometimes takes advantage of the tie-breaking rule and places an atom at posterior $q = 1$, exploiting Nature's inability to generate a skeptical Receiver type for that posterior belief. This choice allows Sender to obtain a utility higher than $1 - r^*$, since even if the Receiver type is $r = 1$, they are now persuaded whenever posterior $q = 1$ is realized. However, creating this atom tightens the Bayes-plausibility constraint, so if neither Sender nor Nature's constraint is slack enough to allow frequent realizations of 1, Sender uses the same approach as with unfavorable tie-breaking. Thus when the probability of the high state and the mean Receiver type are both small, Sender's maxmin utility remains strictly below her utility with even the most unfavorable prior belief about Receiver types, regardless of whether tie-breaking is favorable or not.

5. THE CONTINUOUS-STATE SETTING

While the solution when F has binary support is especially sharp, that restriction may not always be plausible. In this section, I consider the maxmin persuasion problem of Equation (1) when F is a continuously differentiable and unimodal cdf over $[0, 1]$ with $F(0) = 0$. Specifically, I assume that, for some mode $m \in [0, 1]$, the density f is

strictly increasing on $[0, m)$ and strictly decreasing on $(m, 1]$. For technical reasons, I also assume that $f'(0) < 1 - 2\pi$. Before presenting my main results, which show that a double-truncated uniform distribution of posterior means is optimal for Sender when r^* is either sufficiently small (Proposition 2) or sufficiently large (Proposition 3), I first discuss two simple cases with a full-support prior and relate my model to other MPC games in the literature.

5.1. Other Continuous Priors. Moving to the continuous-state setting alters the specification of the MPC game by changing Sender’s constraint. As described in Section 3.2, Sender’s chosen distribution must be a mean-preserving contraction of the prior F . In this continuous-state setting, Sender can no longer choose any cdf G_1 with domain $[0, 1]$ and mean π . Instead, the chosen cdf must additionally satisfy the *integral constraint*

$$\int_0^x G_1(q) dq \leq \int_0^x F(q) dq \forall x \in [0, 1].$$

In particular, given my assumption that $F(0) = 0$, this constraint prevents Sender from choosing a distribution with an atom at posterior mean $q = 0$ and thus renders the solution in Proposition 1 infeasible.

Despite this new constraint, a special case of the model is easy to solve using the intuitions of the previous section. Nature is still able to choose the binary support distribution which generates only Receiver types $r = 0$ and $r = 1$, so Sender’s utility is still upper-bounded by $1 - r^*$. Thus for any F that first-order stochastically dominates the uniform distribution $U[0, 1]$ —so that $F(q) \leq q \forall q \in [0, 1]$ —it is easy to see that full disclosure is optimal, since it ensures that $G_1 = F$ and Sender’s utility attains the upper bound. This condition generalizes the case where F is unimodal as described above with $m = 1$.

When F is concave but not uniform, it must be that F lies strictly above $U[0, 1]$ on $(0, 1)$ and therefore that $\pi < 1/2$. Additionally, the uniform distribution $U[0, 2\pi]$, which was uniquely optimal when $r^* \leq \pi \leq 1/2$ in the binary-state setting of Proposition 1, satisfies the integral constraint. To see why, note that the shape of F ensures

that $U[0, 2\pi]$ lies strictly below F on $(0, c)$ for some $c < 1$; therefore the integral constraint is satisfied with equality at $x = 0$ and strict inequality for $x \in (0, c]$. The difference between the left- and right-hand sides of the constraint strictly decreases for $x \in (c, 1)$, but only reaches 0 at $x = 1$: thus the weak inequality is preserved on the entire interval $[0, 1]$.⁷ The binary-state maxmin persuasion problem is a relaxed version of the continuous-state maxmin persuasion problem, so an optimal solution for Sender in the former that is feasible in the latter must also be optimal there. Thus, if $r^* \leq \pi$ and F is concave but not uniform (generalizing the case of unimodal F with $m = 0$), then $G^* = U[0, 2\pi]$ is the unique optimal distribution for Sender.

In the maxmin setting, the mean constraint Nature faces represents information Sender possesses which allows her to consider only a particular set of possible Receiver type distributions. Thus it is reasonable for Nature to face only a mean constraint and choose a mean-preserving contraction of a binary support distribution, while Sender faces the integral constraint and chooses a mean-preserving contraction of the continuous prior over states. However, in the case of competitive persuasion, where both parties are persuading Receiver about a common state, it is natural to require all players to choose mean-preserving contractions of the same continuous prior. This case is studied in [Hwang et al. \(2019\)](#), which shows that the optimal distribution of posterior means divides the prior support into finitely many intervals and alternates between matching the prior and generating a linear mean-preserving contraction on each interval. Nature’s weaker constraint in my setting rules out this result.

5.2. Optimal Distributions with Small r^* . To provide sufficient conditions for a double-truncated uniform distribution (henceforth DTU) to be optimal for Sender, I first establish some notation. A DTU can be viewed as having three parameters: the lower truncation length, the size of the atom at the end of that lower truncation,

⁷This geometric approach to the integral constraint will be key in proving Proposition 2, which modifies this “small r^* ” result to apply to unimodal distributions.

and the upper truncation length.⁸ Because the DTU's mean must be π , one of these three parameters is uniquely determined as a function of the other two; I can then transform the remaining two parameters to characterize each DTU by the slope β of the uniform portion and the intercept y implied by extending the uniform portion to intersect the y -axis, writing it as G_y^β .

For each value of y , there is an optimal choice of β , $\beta(y)$, that delivers Sender's highest utility among DTUs with intercept y (Lemma 8 in Appendix B); I refer to the DTU $G_y^{\beta(y)}$ as y -optimal. As a final piece of notation, let $q_i(y, \beta)$ be the smallest nonzero point of intersection between the DTU G_y^β and the prior F (which must exist, since $G_y^\beta(1) = F(1) = 1$). The following proposition describes Sender's choice for small r^* :

Proposition 2. *Let $r^* \in (0, q_i(0, \beta(0))]$. Then the 0-optimal DTU, $G_0^{\beta(0)}$, attains Sender's highest possible utility. Further, any other distribution H that attains Sender's highest possible utility must have the same concavification as $G_0^{\beta(0)}$.*

Proof. See Appendix B. □

Regardless of the support of the prior F , Sender's utility is not determined directly by her chosen distribution, but rather by its concavification (see Lemma 2 in Appendix A for a formal proof). In the binary-state setting, Sender's optimal distribution was equal to its concavification everywhere on $[0, 1]$, and any other distribution with the same concavification would have a different mean. Thus uniqueness of the optimal distribution and uniqueness of the concavified optimal distribution were equivalent. In the continuous-state setting, this equivalence no longer holds, since a DTU differs from its concavification on the lower truncation interval, allowing other distributions to have the same concavification and the same mean. Thus uniqueness of the concavification is the strongest result that can be obtained when using DTUs.

⁸Keeping in mind that, following [Kamenica and Gentzkow \(2011\)](#), Nature may maximize its utility by concavifying Sender's chosen distribution, I restrict attention to distributions with an atom at the end of the lower truncation but no atom at the beginning of the upper truncation.




FIGURE 1. Two DTUs with intercept 0 and varying slopes (orange) and their relationship to the prior F (blue). The guidelines show where the function v , which represents the difference between the integral of F and that of the corresponding DTU, switches from increasing to decreasing or vice-versa.

The importance of the intersection $q_i(0, \beta(0))$ comes from a simplification of the integral constraint (Lemma 10 in Appendix B). To gain an intuition for this lemma, note that the concavification of a DTU may have a kink at the end of the lower truncation region, since the concavification passes through the origin while the DTU may have a strictly positive intercept. However, DTUs with intercept $y = 0$ do not have kinked concavifications, and thus Sender's 0-optimal DTU is given by making β as low as possible (to minimize Nature's utility) while still satisfying the integral constraint. Given the shape of F , a DTU G_0^β will have 0 interior intersections with F , if its slope is steep enough to lie everywhere above F ; 1 such intersection, if its slope is such that it is exactly tangent to F ; or 2 such intersections, if its slope is shallower than that of the tangent.⁹ Writing the integral constraint as a function of x ,

$$v(x) = \int_0^x F(q) dq - \int_0^x G_0^\beta(q) dq,$$

⁹Slight variations of these cases may occur and are dealt with in the proofs of Appendix B, but can be ignored to simplify the intuition.

the intersections of F and G_0^β can be used to infer whether v is increasing or decreasing on particular intervals. Figure 1 shows an example of this approach. Combined with the observation that $v(0) = v(1) = 0$, this behavior allows me to show that if G_0^β has two interior intersections with F , then it satisfies the integral constraint if and only if $v(q_i(0, \beta)) \geq 0$. Thus $\beta(0)$ is given implicitly by the equation $v(q_i(0, \beta(0))) = 0$. The shape of F ensures that $q_i(0, \beta(0)) > 0$, and therefore the interval in Proposition 2 is always nonempty. In fact, for some distributions (like the truncated normal) it may even be a superset of the interval $[0, \pi]$, which will be important in Proposition 3.

The remainder of the proof uses the fact that the integral constraint binds only at $q \in \{0, q_i(0, \beta(0)), 1\}$ for $G_0^{\beta(0)}$ and adapts the strategy used in my alternative proof of Proposition 1. First, I show that any DTU which delivers higher utility for Sender than $G_0^{\beta(0)}$ cannot be Bayes-plausible. I then approximate an arbitrary optimal distribution H by a DTU, using the concavification of H to ensure that this DTU upper-bounds H everywhere above the lower truncation. If H delivers Sender strictly higher utility than $G_0^{\beta(0)}$, the approximating DTU must do so as well; therefore it cannot be Bayes-plausible, and neither is H itself. If H delivers Sender the same utility as $G_0^{\beta(0)}$, then the approximating DTU is precisely $G_0^{\beta(0)}$ and the concavification of H equals that of $G_0^{\beta(0)}$. The last step relies crucially on the fact that the slope of $G_0^{\beta(0)}$ is the same as that of its concavification in the lower truncation region. For a DTU with intercept $y > 0$, this property will no longer hold, and as a result the concavified optimal distribution will no longer be unique.

5.3. Optimal Distributions with Large r^* . When $r^* > q_i(0, \beta(0))$, characterizing both the optimal DTU and optimal distributions more generally becomes more difficult. In fact, an optimal distribution may not exist, though Sender's supremum utility over a sequence of distributions converging to optimality is always well-defined. Despite these challenges, I can still show that for sufficiently large values of r^* , DTUs are not dominated by other distributions:

Proposition 3. *Let $r^* \in [\pi, 1)$. Then no distribution of posterior means gives Sender strictly higher utility than all DTUs.*

Proof. See Appendix B. □

This proof is similar in approach to that of Proposition 2. When $r^* \geq \pi$, the slope of the concavified DTU in the lower truncation region, and in particular the potential kink at the upper endpoint of that region, do not affect the value of the concavified DTU at r^* . Thus, as in Proposition 2, Sender’s y -optimal DTU for each y is given by minimizing the slope β subject to the Bayes-plausibility constraint. Unlike in that proposition, I cannot directly characterize which choice of intercept is optimal. In fact, since the set $[0, 1)$ of possible intercept choices is not compact, it may be that the optimal choice is $y = 1$ and Sender’s highest utility is attained only in the limit. However, I can still use the fact that each y -optimal DTU has minimal slope among DTUs with intercept y to extend the bounding argument of Proposition 2. This approach rules out as infeasible any distributions that delivers strictly higher utility than all DTUs, and again leaves open the possibility of non-DTU distributions that attain Sender’s highest possible utility. In the next section, I explore those possible distributions in more detail, and show why the “unique concavification” portion of Proposition 2 no longer holds with large r^* .

5.4. Non-Uniform Optimal Distributions. The result of Proposition 2 provides an appealing reason for focusing on DTUs as opposed to other maxmin-optimal posterior distributions: outside of the lower-truncation region, the optimal DTU is precisely equal to the unique optimal concavification. However, in the large- r^* case of Proposition 3, the optimal concavification is no longer unique. To see why, assume an optimal DTU with $y > 0$ exists. Its concavification passes through the origin rather than the point $(0, y)$, so it has a kink at $q = \ell$. This kink can be used to alter the DTU without affecting Sender’s utility. In particular, consider a distribution that places slightly positive mass in the interval $[\ell - \varepsilon, \ell)$, has a smaller atom than the DTU at $q = \ell$, and places slightly less mass than the DTU in the interval $(\ell, \ell + \varepsilon]$.




FIGURE 2. A potential deviation (green) from a DTU (blue); where the concavification of either distribution differs from the cdf, it is shown by dashed lines. The second panel focuses on the region where the concavified deviation has a double kink (at both guidelines) as opposed to the concavified DTU’s single kink (only at the first guideline).

This distribution, shown in Figure 2, changes slope at ℓ and $\ell + \varepsilon$, but is equal to the DTU for $q \notin (\ell - \varepsilon, \ell + \varepsilon)$. Whenever $r^* \geq \ell + \varepsilon$, and in particular when $r^* \geq \pi$ (the case in Proposition 3) the deviation delivers the same utility for Sender.

This deviation also sheds light on the difficulty of characterizing the optimal distribution of posterior means when $r^* \in (q_1(\ell_0^*, 0), \pi)$. In the binary-state setting, there is no need for a lower-truncation region and thus the optimal distribution equals its concavification. With a continuous state, lower truncation represents an extreme response to the integral constraint, and can be varied slightly because that constraint need not bind anywhere except a finite (and possibly empty) set of interior points. The deviation in Figure 2 gives Sender a greater utility than the corresponding DTU for $r^* \in (0, \ell + \varepsilon)$, and is feasible so long as the integral constraint does not bind in that interval. This example suggests that a new approach is needed to characterize the optimal distribution of posterior means for intermediate r^* and to place greater structure on optimal distributions in the absence of a uniqueness result either for optimal distributions or their concavifications.

6. CONCLUSION

Bayesian persuasion provides a tractable model of communication that can be extended to include rich uncertainty about the Receiver who is the target of persuasion. This work contributes to a growing literature that also introduces ambiguity by posing a maxmin persuasion problem, where the Sender seeks to be robust to any possible prior belief about Receiver types with a known mean. In a binary-state setting, I show a connection to mean-preserving contraction (MPC) games, where competing players choose mean-preserving contractions of probability distributions to obtain the highest realization, and fully characterize Sender’s optimal distribution. As in many other MPC games, when her constraint is strong enough Sender chooses a uniform distribution mixed with atoms at the lowest and highest posterior beliefs. These results highlight the importance of the tie-breaking assumption in persuasion problems and emphasize the strength of the maxmin criterion, which delivers strictly lower utility for Sender than any prior belief over Receiver types when the probability of the high state is less than $1/2$. I then use a geometric approach to show, in a novel continuous-state setting, that uniform distributions with an atom at the lower bound of their support are in many cases still optimal. Unlike in the binary-state setting, these distributions now have support in the interior of $[0, 1]$, and Sender’s optimal distribution is no longer unique. However, the intuition of linearizing the prior belief over states in order to make Nature indifferent between many worst-case Receiver type distributions is preserved.

REFERENCES

- AMIR, N. (2017): “Uniqueness of optimal strategies in Captain Lotto games,” *International Journal of Game Theory*, 47, 55–101.
- AU, P. H. AND K. KAWAI (2020): “Competitive information disclosure by multiple senders,” *Games and Economic Behavior*, 119, 56–78.

- BAYE, M. R., D. KOVENOCK, AND C. G. DE VRIES (1996): “The All-Pay Auction with Complete Information,” *Economic Theory*, 8, 291–305.
- BEAUCHÊNE, D., J. LI, AND M. LI (2019): “Ambiguous Persuasion,” *Journal of Economic Theory*, 179, 312–365.
- BELL, R. M. AND T. M. COVER (1980): “Competitive Optimality of Logarithmic Investment,” *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 5, 161–166.
- BERGEMANN, D. AND S. MORRIS (2019): “Information Design: A Unified Perspective,” *Journal of Economic Literature*, 57, 44–95.
- BLACKWELL, D. (1953): “Equivalent Comparisons of Experiments,” *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, 24, 265–272.
- BOLESLAVSKY, R. AND C. COTTON (2015): “Grading Standards and Education Quality,” *American Economics Journal: Microeconomics*, 7, 248–279.
- CARRASCO, V., V. F. LUZ, N. KOS, M. MESSNER, P. MONTEIRO, AND H. MOREIRA (2018): “Optimal selling mechanisms under moment conditions,” *Journal of Economic Theory*, 177, 245–279.
- CARRASCO, V., V. F. LUZ, P. MONTEIRO, AND H. MOREIRA (2019): “Robust mechanisms: the curvature case,” *Economic Theory*, 68, 203–222.
- CHE, Y.-K. AND I. L. GALE (1998): “Caps on Political Lobbying,” *The American Economic Review*, 88, 643–651.
- DWORCZAK, P. AND A. PAVAN (2020): “Preparing for the Worst But Hoping for the Best: Robust (Bayesian) Persuasion,” Working Paper.
- GILBOA, I. AND D. SCHMEIDLER (1989): “Maxmin expected utility with non-unique prior,” *Journal of Mathematical Economics*, 18, 141–153.
- HART, S. (2008): “Discrete Colonel Blotto and General Lotto games,” *International Journal of Game Theory*, 36, 441–460.

——— (2015): “Allocation games with caps: from Captain Lotto to all-pay auctions,” *International Journal of Game Theory*, 45, 37–61.

HU, J. AND X. WENG (2021): “Robust Persuasion of a Privately Informed Receiver,” *Economic Theory*, 72, 909–953.

HWANG, I., K. KIM, AND R. BOLES LAVSKY (2019): “Competitive Advertising and Pricing,”

<https://docs.google.com/viewer?a=v&pid=sites&srcid=ZGVmYXVsdGRvbWVpbnxpcnVod2FuZ3xn>

KAMENICA, E. (2019): “Bayesian Persuasion and Information Design,” *Annual Review of Economics*, 11, 249–272.

KAMENICA, E. AND M. GENTZKOW (2011): “Bayesian Persuasion,” *American Economic Review*, 101, 2590–2615.

KLEINER, A., B. MOLDOVANU, AND P. STRACK (2021): “Extreme Points and Majorization: Economic Applications,” *Econometrica*, 89, 1557–1593.

KOLOTILIN, A., T. MYLOVANOV, A. ZAPECHELNYUK, AND M. LI (2017): “Persuasion of a Privately Informed Receiver,” *Econometrica*, 85, 1949–1964.

KOSTERINA, S. (2021): “Persuasion with Unknown Beliefs,” *Theoretical Economics*, forthcoming.

LACLAU, M. AND L. RENO (2017): “Public Persuasion,” Working Paper.

MYERSON, R. B. (1993): “Incentives to Cultivate Favored Minorities Under Alternative Electoral Systems,” *The American Political Science Review*, 87, 856–869.

SAHUGUET, N. AND N. PERSICO (2006): “Campaign spending regulation in a model of redistributive politics,” *Economic Theory*, 28, 95–124.

SION, M. (1958): “On general minimax theorems,” *Pacific Journal of Mathematics*, 8, 171–176.

SZECH, N. (2015): “Tie-breaks and bid-caps in all-pay auctions,” *Games and Economic Behavior*, 92, 138–149.

WOLITZKY, A. (2016): “Mechanism design with maxmin agents: Theory and an application to bilateral trade,” *Theoretical Economics*, 11, 971–1004.

APPENDIX A: OMITTED PROOFS FOR SECTION 4

A1: Maxmin Persuasion and MPC Games. I first show that any Nash equilibrium strategy for Sender in the MPC game described in Section 4 solves the maxmin persuasion problem of Equation (1):

Lemma 1. *Consider the MPC game with tie-breaking against Sender, where Sender's choice set is defined as*

$$\mathcal{G}_1 = \{cdf G_1 \text{ over } [0, 1] \mid G_1 \text{ is an MPC of } F\},$$

and Nature's choice set is defined as

$$\mathcal{G}_2 = \{cdf G_2 \text{ over } [0, 1] \mid G_2 \text{ is an MPC of } (1 - r^*)\delta_0 + r^*\delta_1\}.$$

$G^* \in \mathcal{G}_1$ is a Nash equilibrium strategy for Sender if and only if G^* solves the maxmin persuasion problem of Equation (1).

Proof. I first show that Sender's utility from the maxmin persuasion problem is the same as from an analogous minmax problem. By Proposition 1 of Kleiner et al. (2021), both \mathcal{G}_1 and \mathcal{G}_2 are compact and convex. The functional of Equation (1) is linear in both distributions, so it is continuous in both variables, quasi-convex in G_1 , and quasi-concave in G_2 . Therefore, by Sion's minimax theorem (Sion, 1958), interchanging the order of the supremum and infimum in the maxmin persuasion problem does not alter Sender's utility. It is then clear that Sender's utility with simultaneous moves in the MPC game must be equal to her utility in the maxmin persuasion problem.

If G^* is a Nash equilibrium strategy in the MPC game for Sender, then the Nash equilibrium payoff for Sender results from taking Nature's best response to G^* . Since Nature's payoff is the opposite of Sender's, that payoff is therefore Sender's minimum utility from G^* . Thus a Nash equilibrium distribution for Sender has the same payoff in the MPC game and the maxmin persuasion problem, and that utility is precisely

equal to Sender’s maximum utility in the maxmin persuasion problem, so G^* solves the maxmin persuasion problem by definition.

Let G^* solve the maxmin persuasion problem. Because \mathcal{G}_2 is compact, the set of distributions that minimize Sender’s payoff from G^* is nonempty. Since the maxmin and minmax utilities for Sender are equal, there must be at least one distribution in that set—call it T^* —such that G^* maximizes Sender’s utility in response to T^* . Thus in the MPC game G^* is a best response by Sender to T^* . Of course, since Nature’s payoff in the MPC game is the opposite of Sender’s and T^* minimizes Sender’s utility from choosing G^* , T^* is by definition a best response to G^* . Thus the two distributions are mutual best responses and G^* is a Nash equilibrium strategy in the MPC game for Sender. \square

This equivalence does not rely on the support of the prior F in the maxmin persuasion problem, and thus suggests that results from other maxmin persuasion models may be applied to solve richer MPC games.

A2: Characterizing Sender’s Optimal Distribution. In Section 4.1, I argue that instead of using tie-breaking against Sender, I can use even tie-breaking and remove the upper bound on Nature’s distributions, so that the choice set becomes

$$\mathcal{G}_2 = \{\text{cdf } G_2 \text{ over } \mathbb{R}_+ \mid G_2 \text{ is an MPC of } (1 - r^*) \delta_0 + r^* \delta_1\}.$$

Combining this change with Lemma 1 means that a Nash equilibrium of the MPC game in Hart (2015), which the author calls a “Captain Lotto game,” provides a solution to the maxmin persuasion problem of Equation (1). Thus Theorem 4 of that work now gives an optimal posterior distribution for Sender, where Sender in my model is Player B in that theorem. Theorems 4 and 5 of Amir (2017) show that the Nash equilibrium strategy for Player B in the Captain Lotto game is unique when $\pi \leq 1/2$, and therefore so is Sender’s optimal posterior distribution. To complete the proof of Proposition 1, I augment the sufficient condition for Nash equilibrium when

$\pi > 1/2$ in Theorem 10 of Amir (2017) with a necessary condition for optimality of Sender’s chosen posterior distribution.

I begin by showing that Sender’s utility can be expressed as a function of \bar{G} , the concavification of G :

Lemma 2. *Consider the maxmin persuasion problem of Equation (1) and let $\bar{G} : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ be the concavification of G , i.e., the infimum over the set of concave functions $H : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ satisfying*

$$H(q) \geq G(q) \forall q \in [0, 1].$$

Then the following equality holds:

$$\min_{T \in \mathcal{T}} \int \int \mathbf{1}(q > r) dG(q) dT(r) = 1 - \bar{H}(r^*).$$

Proof. Manipulating the bounds of integration to rewrite Sender’s objective function from Equation (1) gives

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{[0,1]} \left(\int_{[0,1]} \mathbf{1}(q > r) dG(q) \right) dT(r) &= \int_{[0,1]} \left(\int_{[r,1]} 1 dG(q) \right) dT(r) \\ &= \int_{[0,1]} (1 - G(r)) dT(r). \end{aligned}$$

Then the minimization portion of the problem can be written as

$$\max_{T \in \Delta([0,1])} \int G(r) dT(r) \quad \text{s.t.} \quad \int r dT(r) = r^*,$$

where I have dropped the constant, rewritten the min as a max, and explicitly included the mean restriction to highlight the similarity to a Bayesian persuasion problem. In this case, the Receiver type r fills the role of “posterior belief,” Nature’s utility from a realized Receiver type is $G(r)$, and the “prior” is the distribution with support $\{0, 1\}$ and mean r^* . This final point follows from the observation in Section 3 that when the prior distribution has binary support, the Bayes-plausibility constraint is the same as a mean restriction. Thus by Corollary 2 of Kamenica and Gentzkow (2011), Nature’s

utility is given by \bar{G} , the concavification of G over the interval $[0, 1]$, evaluated at the prior mean r^* . Flipping the sign again, Sender's utility is $1 - \bar{G}(r^*)$. \square

My necessary and sufficient condition when $\pi > 1/2$ is an immediate consequence of this result:

Lemma 3. *Let $\pi > 1/2$. Then a posterior distribution G_1 is optimal for Sender if and only if $\mathbb{E}_{G_1}[\omega] = \pi$ and $G_1(q) \leq q \forall q \in [0, 1]$. More than one distribution satisfying this condition exists.*

Proof. As established in Section 3, the only constraint on a feasible distribution G_1 for Sender is that $\mathbb{E}[G_1] = \pi$; I show that the second constraint is both necessary and sufficient for optimality.

Assume $G_1(q) \leq q \forall q \in [0, 1]$. Then the function $U(q) = q$ upper-bounds G_1 and is concave. Since U is the pointwise-smallest concave function on $[0, 1]$ passing through the point $(1, 1)$, it must therefore be the concavification of G_1 , and Sender's utility from G_1 is $1 - U(r^*) = 1 - r^*$. Because Nature may always choose a Receiver type distribution T with $\text{supp}(T) = \{0, 1\}$, Sender's utility from any posterior distribution is no more than $1 - r^*$ (the probability that Receiver type $r = 0$ is drawn from T). Thus G_1 attains the upper bound and is optimal for Sender. There are at least two such distributions for any $\pi > 1/2$. The first is given by solving $\pi = n/(n + 1)$ for n and setting $G_1(q) = q^n$. The second is given by

$$G_1(q) = \begin{cases} 0 & q \in [0, 2\pi - 1), \\ (q + 1 - 2\pi)/(2 - 2\pi) & q \in (2\pi - 1, 1]. \end{cases}$$

Therefore an optimal distribution always exists and is non-unique.

Now assume G_1 is optimal for Sender; then, since we have just shown an optimal distribution exists, it must be that $1 - \bar{G}_1(r^*) = 1 - r^*$. But the only weakly positive concave function H on $[0, 1]$ satisfying $H(1) = 1$ and $H(r^*) = r^*$ is $U(q) = q$. Any distinct concave function must have slope greater than 1 at r^* —any less and it would

fail to pass through the point $(1, 1)$ —and must therefore have $H(0) < 0$. Therefore $\bar{G}_1 = U$, and therefore $G_1(q) \leq q \forall q \in [0, 1]$. \square

This lemma completes the proof of Proposition 1. However, the theorems I reference rely on lengthy computations of Sender’s utility under different strategy profiles. In the next section, I provide a clearer geometric proof that does not rely on MPC games and instead highlights the usefulness of concavification.

A3: An Alternative Proof of Proposition 1. The concavification result of Lemma 2 means that Sender’s utility from any posterior distribution H is a convex function of r^* . It can therefore be lower-bounded by a line tangent to that function through the fixed r^* in the maxmin persuasion problem. The key step of my alternative proof of Proposition 1 is to show that if H gives Sender a higher utility than the optimal distribution G^* , then that tangent line implicitly defines a cdf whose mean is greater than π . Because the tangent line lies below the function $1 - H$, it must therefore be that H itself has a mean greater than π , and thus H is not a Bayes-plausible posterior distribution.

Towards establishing this result, consider *upper-truncated uniform posterior distributions* (henceforth UTUs), a class of posterior distributions which place mass $x \geq 0$ on posterior $q = 0$, equal mass on all posteriors $q \in (0, r_h]$ for some $r_h \leq 1$, and no mass on posteriors $q \in (r_h, 1]$. I can use Bayes-plausibility to solve for the unique value of r_h corresponding to a given x , so that a UTU is fully characterized by x :

$$\begin{aligned} \pi &= \int q dG_x(q) = \int 1 - G_x(q) dq = \frac{(1-x)r_h(x)}{2} \\ \Leftrightarrow r_h(x) &= \frac{2\pi}{1-x}, \end{aligned}$$

Since r_h is uniquely determined by x , I denote a UTU by G_x . The following lemma shows that a single choice of x is optimal among all UTUs and can be written as a closed-form function of r^* :

Lemma 4. *Let $\pi \leq 1/2$. Then if $r^* \leq \pi$, Sender's unique optimal UTU is G_0 ; if $\pi \leq r^* \leq 1/2$, it is $G_{1-\pi/r^*}$; and if $1/2 \leq r^*$ it is $G_{1-2\pi}$.*

Proof. By construction, any UTU G_x is concave and is therefore equal to its concavification \bar{G}_x . By Lemma 2, the utility from a UTU G_x is therefore

$$1 - \bar{G}_x(r^*) = 1 - G_x(r^*) = \left\{ (1-x) - r^* \frac{(1-x)^2}{2\pi} \right\}_+.$$

The first-order condition in x for the expression in brackets is

$$-1 + r^* \frac{1-x}{\pi} = 0 \Leftrightarrow x_{\text{FOC}} = 1 - \frac{\pi}{r^*}.$$

The bracketed expression is increasing in x when $x < x_{\text{FOC}}$ and decreasing in x when $x > x_{\text{FOC}}$. Since $x \in [0, 1-2\pi]$, if $r^* < \pi$ the constrained optimal solution is $x^* = 0$ and if $r^* > 1/2$ the constrained optimal solution is $x^* = 1-2\pi$; otherwise the optimum is the interior solution $x^* = x_{\text{FOC}} = 1 - \pi/r^*$. \square

I now prove two lemmas describing the relationship between the UTU $G_{1-2\pi}$ and the function $1 - \bar{H}$ derived from an arbitrary posterior distribution H . The first establishes that if, for some posterior distribution H , the function $1 - H$ falls below $1 - G_{1-2\pi}$ at some mean Receiver type q , Sender's utility from H remains below her utility from $G_{1-2\pi}$ for all higher Receiver types:

Lemma 5. *Let H be a cdf on $[0, 1]$. Then if there is $q \in [0, 1)$ such that*

$$1 - H(q) < 1 - G_{1-2\pi}(q),$$

then it is also the case that

$$1 - \bar{H}(q') < 1 - G_{1-2\pi}(q') \forall q' \in [q, 1).$$

Proof. The proof is by contradiction. Assume there is q such that

$$1 - \bar{H}(q) \leq 1 - H(q) < 1 - G_{1-2\pi}(q),$$

but that there is $q' \in [q, 1)$ such that

$$1 - \bar{H}(q') \geq 1 - G_{1-2\pi}(q').$$

Since $1 - \bar{H}(q) < 1 - G_{1-2\pi}(q)$ but $1 - \bar{H}(q') \geq 1 - G_{1-2\pi}(q')$, it must be that there is $q_1 \in [q, q']$ where the slope of $1 - \bar{H}$ is strictly greater than that of $1 - G_{1-2\pi}$. But because H and $G_{1-2\pi}$ are cdfs and $1 - \bar{H}$ is weakly positive,

$$1 - \bar{H}(1) = 0 = 1 - H(1) = 1 - G_{1-2\pi}(1),$$

so there must be $q_2 \in [q', 1]$ where the slope of $1 - \bar{H}$ is weakly less than that of $1 - G_{1-2\pi}$. Then $q_1 \leq q_2$ but the slope of $1 - \bar{H}$ at q_1 is strictly greater than at q_2 , violating convexity of $1 - \bar{H}$, and thus concavity of \bar{H} . \square

The next lemma describes features of $1 - \bar{H}$ when the posterior distribution H weakly improves on Sender's utility from $G_{1-2\pi}$:

Lemma 6. *If $H \neq G_{1-2\pi}$ is a cdf such that*

$$1 - \bar{H}(r^*) \geq 1 - G_{1-2\pi}(r^*) \text{ and } \int q dH(q) = \pi,$$

then the slope¹⁰ of $1 - \bar{H}$ at r^ is strictly less than the slope of $1 - G_{1-2\pi}$ at r^* .*

Proof. I first show that there is $q_d \in (r^*, 1]$ such that

$$1 - \bar{H}(q_d) \leq 1 - H(q_d) < 1 - G_{1-2\pi}(q_d).$$

Note that for H to be distinct from $G_{1-2\pi}$, there must be some posterior $q_d \in [0, 1]$ where $1 - H(q_d) \neq 1 - G_{1-2\pi}(q_d)$. It cannot be the case that

$$1 - H(q) \geq 1 - G_{1-2\pi}(q) \forall q \in [0, 1] \text{ and } 1 - H(q_d) > 1 - G_{1-2\pi}(q_d).$$

¹⁰Because $1 - \bar{H}$ is convex, it is continuous on $(0, 1)$ and its left and right derivatives are always well-defined. The function $1 - G$ for any UTU G is also continuous with well-defined left and right derivatives. When referring to the slope or to a tangent line I consider the right derivative.

If that is the case, then because H is a cdf, it is right-continuous, and therefore fixing $\varepsilon > 0$ there is $\delta(\varepsilon) > 0$ such that

$$1 - H(q') > 1 - H(q_d) - \varepsilon \forall q' \in [q_d, q_d + \delta(\varepsilon)].$$

Since the slope of $1 - G_{1-2\pi}$ is no greater than 0, setting $\varepsilon \in (0, G_{1-2\pi}(q_d) - H(q_d))$ ensures that

$$1 - H(q') > 1 - G_{1-2\pi}(q_d) \geq 1 - G_{1-2\pi}(q') \forall q' \in [q_d, q_d + \delta(\varepsilon)].$$

Therefore there is a non-degenerate interval where $1 - H > 1 - G_{1-2\pi}$, and by assumption $1 - H \geq 1 - G_{1-2\pi}$ everywhere on $[0, 1]$, so integrating the inequality gives a violation of Bayes-plausibility:

$$\int q dH(q) = \int 1 - H(q) dq > \int 1 - G_{1-2\pi}(q) dq = \int q dG_{1-2\pi}(q) = \pi.$$

Thus by contradiction there must be $q_d \in [0, 1]$ such that

$$1 - \bar{H}(q_d) \leq 1 - H(q_d) < 1 - G_{1-2\pi}(q_d).$$

By Lemma 5, since $1 - \bar{H}(r^*) \geq 1 - G_{1-2\pi}(r^*)$, there is no $q \in [0, r^*)$ where $1 - H(q) < 1 - G_{1-2\pi}(q)$. Thus it must be that

$$1 - H(q) \geq 1 - G_{1-2\pi}(q) \forall q \in [0, r^*],$$

and therefore $q_d \in (r^*, 1]$.

The claim now follows by the argument in Lemma 5. Since $1 - \bar{H}(r^*) \geq 1 - G_{1-2\pi}(r^*)$ and $1 - \bar{H}(q_d) < 1 - G_{1-2\pi}(q_d)$, there is $q' \in [r^*, q_d]$ where the slope of $1 - \bar{H}$ is strictly less than that of $1 - G_{1-2\pi}$. But since \bar{H} is concave, $1 - \bar{H}$ is convex and its slope cannot increase as q decreases; the slope of $1 - \bar{H}$ at r^* must therefore be strictly less than that of $1 - G_{1-2\pi}$ at r^* . \square

The implication is vacuous for $r^* \leq 1/2$, where there are no posterior distributions that meet the conditions; however, even in that case the result is central to a proof by contradiction.

With these three lemmas in hand, I now provide an alternative proof of the case $\pi \leq 1/2$ in Proposition 1:

Lemma 7. *If $\pi \leq 1/2$, Sender's unique optimal posterior distribution is as follows:*

- If $r^* \leq \pi \leq 1/2$,

$$G^*(q) = U[0, 2\pi].$$

- If $\pi \leq r^* \leq 1/2$,

$$G^*(q) = \left(1 - \frac{\pi}{r^*}\right) \delta_0 + \frac{\pi}{r^*} U[0, 2r^*].$$

- If $\pi \leq 1/2 \leq r^*$,

$$G^*(q) = (1 - 2\pi) \delta_0 + 2\pi U[0, 1].$$

Proof. The proof is by contradiction. Let H be a proposed alternative posterior distribution that delivers weakly greater utility for Sender than G^* . By Lemma 2 (to define the utility from each posterior distribution) and Lemma 4 (since G^* is a UTU, it must be uniquely optimal among UTUs), it is the case that

$$1 - \bar{H}(r^*) \geq \bar{G}^*(r^*) = 1 - G^*(r^*) \geq 1 - G_{1-2\pi}(r^*).$$

Consider the line L that is tangent to $1 - \bar{H}$ at r^* .¹¹ Because \bar{H} is convex and weakly positive (recall that the line $\ell(q) = 0$ is convex and lower-bounds $1 - H$), it is lower-bounded by $L_+(q) = \max\{L(q), 0\}$. Furthermore, by Lemma 6, the slope of L is less than that of $1 - G_{1-2\pi}$, so it must be that

$$1 \geq 1 - H(0) \geq 1 - \bar{H}(0) \geq L_+(0) > 1 - G_{1-2\pi}(0) = 2\pi.$$

For any $x \in [0, 1 - 2\pi]$, there is a corresponding UTU G_x with $G_x(0) = x$. Since $1 - L_+(0) \in [0, 1 - 2\pi]$, there an UTU—call it G_{x_H} —with $1 - G_{x_H}(0) = 1 - x_H = L_+(0)$.

¹¹Recall that if r^* is a kink point of $1 - \bar{H}$, I use the right derivative of $1 - \bar{H}$ to define the slope.

If $G_{x_H} \neq G^*$, then because G^* is uniquely optimal among UTUs, it must be that

$$L_+(r^*) = 1 - \bar{H}(r^*) \geq 1 - \bar{G}^*(r^*) > \bar{G}_{x_H}(r^*) = 1 - G_{x_H}(r^*).$$

Then, because L and $1 - G_{x_H}$ intersect at $q = 0$ but L is greater than $1 - G_{x_H}$ at $q = r^*$, it must be that the slope of L is strictly greater than the slope of the strictly downward-sloping portion of $1 - G_{x_H}$; therefore in fact

$$L_+(q) \geq 1 - G_{x_H}(q) \forall q \in [0, 1] \quad \text{and} \quad L_+(q') > 1 - G_{x_H}(q') \forall q' \in (0, r^*].$$

Integrating the expression and using the fact that L_+ lower-bounds $1 - \bar{H}$, which in turn lower-bounds $1 - H$, it is the case that

$$\begin{aligned} \int q dH(q) &= \int 1 - H(q) dq \geq \int 1 - \bar{H}(q) dq \geq \int L_+(q) dq \\ &> \int 1 - G_{x_H}(q) dq = \int q dG_{x_H}(q) = \pi. \end{aligned}$$

The first and penultimate equalities are both from integration by parts, and the final equality is because all UTUs (including G_{x_H}) are Bayes-plausible by construction. Therefore H violates Bayes-plausibility and is not a valid alternative distribution.

Even when $G_{x_H} = G^*$, it is still the case that, whenever

$$L_+(r^*) = 1 - \bar{H}(r^*) > 1 - \bar{G}^*(r^*) = 1 - G^*(r^*),$$

the slope of L is greater than the slope of the strictly downward-sloping portion of $1 - G^*$. In this case, $L_+(q) > 1 - G^*(q) \forall q \in (0, r^*]$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \int q dH(q) &= \int 1 - H(q) dq \geq \int 1 - \bar{H}(q) dq \geq \int L_+(q) dq \\ &> \int 1 - G^*(q) dq = \int q dG^*(q) = \pi, \end{aligned}$$

just as before. Thus H again violates Bayes-plausibility.

If instead $G_{x_H} = G^*$ but now $L_+(r^*) = 1 - G^*(r^*)$, it must be the case that L and the strictly downward-sloping portion of $1 - G$ have the same slope, so in fact

$$L_+(q) = 1 - G^*(q) \forall q \in [0, 1].$$

Then then there are two possible cases. The first is trivial:

$$1 - H(q) = L_+(q) = 1 - G^*(q) \forall q \in [0, 1],$$

so that H is not a deviation at all. In the second, there must be some $q \in [0, 1]$ so that $1 - H(q) > L_+(q)$; recall that L_+ lower-bounds $1 - H$, and thus the direction of the inequality is known. Because H is a cdf, it is right-continuous, and therefore fixing $\varepsilon > 0$ there is $\delta(\varepsilon) > 0$ such that

$$1 - H(q') > 1 - H(q) - \varepsilon \forall q' \in [q, q + \delta(\varepsilon)].$$

Since the slope of L_+ is no greater than 0, setting $\varepsilon \in (0, 1 - H(q) - L_+(q))$ ensures that

$$1 - H(q') > L_+(q) \geq L_+(q') \forall q' \in [q, q + \delta(\varepsilon)].$$

Therefore there is a non-degenerate interval where $1 - H > L_+$, and $1 - H \geq L_+$ everywhere on $[0, 1]$, so integrating the inequality gives

$$\int q dH(q) = \int 1 - H(q) dq > \int L_+(q) dq = \int 1 - G^* dq = \int q dG^*(q) = \pi,$$

as desired. Having covered both the case $G_{x_H} \neq G^*$ and the case $G_{x_H} = G^*$, I have shown that in all cases H violates Bayes-plausibility and therefore, by contradiction, G^* is uniquely optimal. \square

The full proof of Proposition 1 without reference to MPC games is therefore obtained by combining Lemmas 3 and 7.

A4: Proofs of Results with Alternative Tie-Breaking. To prove Corollary 1, I make use of the MPC game representation of the maxmin persuasion problem. The result then follows directly from Player A's equilibrium strategy in Theorem 4 of Hart (2015), where I replace the use of ε -approximating distributions, which are not needed in my setting, with the exact upper bound of 1 on posterior beliefs. Since this alternate tie-breaking rule is not the focus of the section, I do not provide a full characterization of other possible optimal posterior distributions, which in any case would not affect the comparison to Sender's utility under various prior distributions

as discussed in Section 4.3. As Amir (2017) shows, attempting a full characterization through the connection to MPC games becomes complex.

In the maxmin persuasion context, it seems natural to break ties either entirely in favor of or entirely against Sender. Those rules allow me to interpret a Receiver of type r either as the highest Receiver type who is convinced by posterior belief $q = r$ or the lowest Receiver type who is not convinced by that belief, respectively. However, if the MPC game is interpreted as competitive persuasion, as in Boleslavsky and Cotton (2015), then it also seems reasonable to consider breaking ties evenly, so as to favor neither player.¹² This choice is equivalent to requiring that both distributions have support in $[0, 1]$; in that case the optimal posterior distribution (derived without uniqueness in Hart 2015 and with uniqueness in Boleslavsky and Cotton 2015 and Amir 2017) is as follows:

Corollary 2 (Lemma 3 of Boleslavsky and Cotton 2015). *Let $\text{supp}(F) = \{0, 1\}$ and let ties be broken evenly.*

The unique optimal posterior distribution G^ for Sender's is as follows:*

- If $r^* \leq \pi \leq 1/2$,

$$G^*(q) = U[0, 2\pi].$$

- If $\pi \leq r^* \leq 1/2$,

$$G^*(q) = \left(1 - \frac{\pi}{r^*}\right) \delta_0 + \frac{\pi}{r^*} U[0, 2r^*].$$

- If $1/2 \leq \pi$ and $r^* \leq \pi$,

$$G^*(q) = \frac{1 - \pi}{\pi} U[0, 2 - 2\pi] + \frac{2\pi - 1}{\pi} \delta_1.$$

¹²When the players are persuading a Receiver about a common state of the world, as in Au and Kawai (2020), it is reasonable to also require $\pi = r^*$. In Boleslavsky and Cotton (2015), the players are schools convincing a Receiver about the binary ability of a student drawn from a school-specific distribution, so $\pi \neq r^*$ represents one school producing more high-type students on average.

- If $1/2 \leq r^*$ and $\pi \leq r^*$,

$$G^*(q) = \left(1 - \frac{\pi}{r^*}\right) \delta_0 + \frac{\pi}{r^*} \left(\frac{1-r^*}{r^*} U[0, 2-2r^*] + \frac{2r^*-1}{r^*} \delta_1 \right).$$

Proof. This result appears verbatim in [Boleslavsky and Cotton \(2015\)](#), with Sender as Player A when $r^* \leq \pi$ and Player B when $r^* \geq \pi$. \square

Finally, note for general interest that in the MPC game when both players' feasible distributions have domain \mathbb{R}_+ (and are mean-preserving contractions of binary support distributions), the unique solution is the same as the cases $r^* \leq \pi \leq 1/2$ and $\pi \leq r^* \leq 1/2$ of [Corollary 2](#), with the relationship between π and r^* determining which case applies. The solution when $\pi = r^*$, so that the constraints are symmetric, first appears in [Bell and Cover \(1980\)](#), and also appears in [Myerson \(1993\)](#). The solution for the asymmetric case first appears in [Sahuguet and Persico \(2006\)](#), and also appears in [Hart \(2008\)](#).

APPENDIX B: OMITTED PROOFS FOR SECTION 5

B1: Properties of DTUs. To begin, I describe DTUs in more detail. The uniform portion of the DTU (between the lower and upper truncations) has slope β , which I refer to as the slope of the DTU. The line $L(q) = \beta q + y$, which forms that uniform portion, intersects the vertical axis at y ; I refer to this value as the intercept of the DTU. To derive a relationship between β , y , and ℓ , I use the fact that Bayes-plausibility requires $\mathbb{E}_G[\omega] = \pi$. This condition immediately imposes the restriction that $\ell \in [0, \pi]$; using simple geometry to compute the integral of a DTU's cdf and set it equal to $1 - \pi$ shows that

$$\beta(\ell, y) = \frac{(\pi - y\ell) - \sqrt{(\pi - y\ell)^2 - \ell^2(1 - y)^2}}{\ell^2}.$$

This expression is continuously differentiable for $\ell \in (0, \pi]$ and $y \in [0, 1)$. Fixing ℓ , $\beta(\ell, y)$ is injective and decreasing in y . Fixing y , $\beta(\ell, y)$ is injective and increasing in ℓ , attaining a maximum of $\beta(\pi, y) = (1 - y)/\pi$. While $\beta(0, y)$ is not defined using the expression above, the limit from the right exists:

$$\lim_{\ell \rightarrow 0^+} \beta(\ell, y) = \lim_{\ell \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{(1 - y)^2}{(\pi - y\ell) + \sqrt{(\pi - y\ell)^2 - \ell^2(1 - y)^2}} = \frac{(1 - y)^2}{2\pi}.$$

I thus define $\beta(0, y) = (1 - y)^2/(2\pi)$ explicitly. For $y \in [0, 1 - 2\pi]$, $\beta(0, y)$ is the slope of the UTU with intercept y . When $y > 1 - 2\pi$, there is no corresponding UTU; instead, the lower bound of interest is $\beta(\ell, y) = 1 - y$, the slope that satisfies $G(1) = 1$.¹³ The assumption $y > 1 - 2\pi$ implies $1 - y \in ((1 - y)^2/(2\pi), (1 - y)/\pi)$, so the lower bound is attained at an interior $\ell \in (0, \pi)$; I call this value ℓ_y^{\min} . Because the function $\beta(\ell, y) - (1 - y)$ is continuously differentiable, the Implicit Function Theorem ensures that I can write ℓ_y^{\min} as a continuously differentiable function of y .

¹³This is the desired lower bound because any cdf H over $[0, 1]$ must satisfy $H = 1$, and I wish to use DTUs to upper-bound other feasible probability distributions.

The concavification of a DTU is easy to compute: so long as the slope of the line through $(0, 0)$ and $(\ell, \beta(\ell)\ell + y)$ is weakly less than $\beta(\ell, y)$, the concavification will be

$$\bar{G}_y^\ell(q) = \begin{cases} (\beta(\ell, y)\ell + y)/\ell & q \in [0, \ell), \\ G_y^\ell(q) & q \in [\ell, 1]. \end{cases}$$

That condition is simply

$$\frac{\beta(\ell, y)\ell + y}{\ell} = \beta(\ell, y) + \frac{y}{\ell} \geq \beta(\ell, y),$$

which always holds since $y \geq 0$ and $\ell \geq 0$. Thus the concavification of a DTU is composed of two upward-sloping line segments with a kink at ℓ and a constant line segment in the region of the upper truncation.

B2: y -Optimal DTUs. Given a value of the mean Receiver type r^* and a fixed intercept y , I show the existence of a well-defined and unique DTU that provides Sender's highest utility among all DTUs with an intercept of y . Since y is fixed, for this section I drop the dependence on y from all functions.

Lemma 8. *Given $r^* \in (0, 1)$ and $y \in [0, 1)$, there is a well-defined DTU G_y^* with lower truncation length ℓ_y^* that maximizes Sender's utility among all Bayes-plausible DTUs with intercept y .*

Proof. Let $V_y \subset [0, \pi]$ be the set of ℓ such that a DTU with lower truncation ℓ and intercept y is Bayes-plausible. I first show that V_y is closed; since it is clearly also bounded, V_y is therefore compact. To do so, I define the function

$$v(x, \ell) = \int_0^x F(q) dq - \int_0^x G_y^\ell(q) dq$$

for some DTU G_y^ℓ with intercept y and lower truncation ℓ . This function captures the value of the Bayes-plausibility integral constraint for G_y^ℓ at $x \in [0, 1]$. Clearly $v(0, \ell) = 0$, and $v(1, \ell) = 0$ because $\mathbb{E}_F[\omega] = \mathbb{E}_{G_y^\ell}[\omega] = \pi$.

At any x , the integral of G_y^ℓ on $[0, x]$ is continuous in ℓ . This result is obvious for $x \neq \ell$ (since $G_\ell(q)$ is continuous in ℓ at those points) and holds for $x = \ell$ because the

left and right limits as $x \rightarrow \ell$ are both 0. Therefore $v(x, \ell)$ is also continuous in ℓ for fixed x , since it depends on ℓ only through that integral. If G_y^ℓ is not Bayes-plausible, then (since it satisfies $\mathbb{E}_{G_y^\ell}[\omega] = \pi$ by construction) there must be some $x_{\text{neg}} \in (0, 1)$ for which $v(x_{\text{neg}}, \ell) < 0$. Because $v(x_{\text{neg}}, \ell)$ is continuous in ℓ , there is $\varepsilon > 0$ such that for any ℓ' in a ε -neighborhood of ℓ , $v(x_{\text{neg}}, \ell') < 0$. Therefore any $G_y^{\ell'}$ is not Bayes-plausible, so $U \subset [0, \pi]$, the set of ℓ where Bayes-plausibility fails, is open. Since $V_y = [0, \pi] \setminus U$, it must be that V is closed.

By Lemma 2, Sender's utility from a DTU is given by

$$u_S(r^*, \ell) = 1 - \begin{cases} (\beta(\ell) + y/\ell) r^* + y & \ell < r^*, \\ G_y^\ell(r^*) & \ell \geq r^*. \end{cases}$$

This function is continuous in ℓ on $[0, \pi]$. Since $\beta(\ell)$ is continuous in ℓ on $[0, \pi]$, each of the two piecewise portions of u_S are clearly continuous in ℓ ; it remains only to check the case $\ell = r^*$. But because the left and right limits as $\ell \rightarrow r^*$ exist (by continuity of each piecewise portion) and are equal (by construction of u_S), u_S is continuous at $\ell = r^*$ as well. Therefore the image of V under u_S must be compact, and thus contains a well-defined maximum, which is attained by some (possibly multiple) $\ell \in V$. \square

Unlike in the binary-state setting, it is not possible to solve analytically for G_y^* without specifying a functional form for F . However, appropriate sufficient conditions can ensure that G_y^* is both unique and slope-minimizing among Bayes-plausible DTUs with intercept y :

Lemma 9. *Fix $y \in [0, 1)$ and $r^* \in (0, 1)$. There is a unique and well-defined DTU G_y^{sm} that has minimal slope among all Bayes-plausible DTUs with intercept y . If $y = 0$ or $r^* \in [\pi, 1)$, then the y -optimal DTU G_y^* equals G_y^{sm}*

Proof. Fix $y \in (0, 1)$. By Lemma 11, the set V_y of values of ℓ such that G_y^ℓ is Bayes-plausible is closed, and the function $\beta(\ell, y)$ is continuous and monotonic in ℓ for fixed y , so there is a unique $\ell_{sm} \in V_y$ such that $\beta(\ell_{sm}, y) = \inf_{\ell \in V_y} \beta(\ell, y)$.

Now I show that either of the conditions provided in the lemma are sufficient for the slope-minimizing DTU to be optimal. First fix $y = 0$. Then $\beta(\ell) + y/\ell = \beta(\ell)$, so $u_S(r^*, \ell) = 1 - G(r^*)$; that is, there is no kink at ℓ in Sender's utility from DTUs with intercept 0. Thus Sender's utility from G_y^ℓ is strictly greater than her utility from $G_y^{\ell'}$ if and only if $\beta(\ell) < \beta(\ell')$. By Lemma 8, there exists a DTU G_0^* with lower truncation length ℓ_0^* that maximizes Sender's utility among all Bayes-plausible DTUs with intercept 0. No other Bayes-plausible DTU can have a strictly smaller slope, since then it would deliver a strictly higher utility. But no other Bayes-plausible DTU can have the same slope, $\beta(\ell_0^*)$, since there can be no $\ell' \neq \ell_0^*$ where $\beta(\ell) = \beta(\ell_0^*)$. Therefore all other Bayes-plausible DTUs have strictly larger slope, and so G_0^* satisfies both (1) and (2).

If instead $r^* \in [\pi, 1)$, then similarly $u_S(r^*, \ell) = 1 - G(r^*)$; since $\ell \in [0, \pi]$, r^* surely lies weakly above ℓ . The argument is then the same; a DTU is utility-maximizing if and only if it is slope-minimizing, Lemma 8 guarantees the existence of a utility-maximizing DTU, and the injectivity of the map from ℓ to $\beta(\ell)$ guarantees uniqueness. \square

B3: Simplifying the Integral Constraint. Let U_{r^*} be the set of utilities attained by any y -optimal DTU:

$$U_{r^*} = \{u_S(r^*, \ell, y) \mid G_\ell^y = G_y^* \text{ for some } y \in [0, 1)\},$$

where I restore the dependence on y in u_S , since y is no longer fixed. That set is a subset of $[0, 1]$, and is therefore bounded, so $\sup U_{r^*}$, Sender's supremum utility over all y -optimal DTUs (and thus over all DTUs) is well-defined and contained in the closure of U_{r^*} . Further restrictions on F and r^* provide sufficient conditions for U_{r^*} to be closed, and thus for the maximum to exist. In order to state these sufficient conditions, I first prove Lemma 10. In this proof, I again drop the dependence on y from all functions since y is fixed, but note important changes in the argument for different values of y .

Lemma 10. *Let G_y^{sm} be the DTU with the minimal slope among all Bayes-plausible DTUs with intercept y , and let ℓ_y^{sm} be its lower truncation. If $y \in [0, 1 - 2\pi]$, then $q_1(\ell, y) = \min Q_y^\ell$ is well-defined and ℓ_y^{sm} satisfies*

$$\int_0^{q_1(\ell_y^{sm}, y)} F(q) dq = \int_0^{q_1(\ell_y^{sm}, y)} G_y^{sm}(q) dq$$

and

$$\int_0^x F(q) dq > \int_0^x G_y^{sm}(q) dq \quad \forall x \in (0, q_1(\ell_y^{sm}, y)) \cup (q_1(\ell_y^{sm}, y), 1).$$

If instead $y \in (1 - 2\pi, 1)$, then either the condition above is satisfied, or ℓ_y^{sm} equals the minimum lower truncation length ℓ_y^{min} .

Proof. By Lemma 9, there exists a unique minimal-slope Bayes-plausible DTU with intercept y .

Because of the shape of F , the equation $L(q) = F(q)$ has at most two solutions with $q \in (0, 1]$. In particular, if the slope of L is such that it lies completely above F in $(0, 1]$, then there are no solutions in that interval; if the slope of L is such that it is tangent to F , then there is one;¹⁴ and if the slope of L is less than that of the tangent to F through y , there are two.

Consider a DTU G_y^ℓ with slope $\beta(\ell)$. If $L(q) \geq F(q) \forall q \in (0, 1]$ —that is, L is either tangent to F at a point q_t or lies entirely above F —then this DTU satisfies Bayes-plausibility. The function $v(x, \ell)$, which gives the value of the Bayes-plausibility integral constraint for G_y^ℓ at some $x \in [0, 1]$, is weakly decreasing whenever $L(x) \geq F(x)$.¹⁵ Thus $v(x, \ell)$ is weakly decreasing for all $x \in (\ell, 1)$. Since $v(1) = 0$, it must therefore be that $v(x, \ell) \geq 0 \forall x \in (\ell, 1)$; of course $v(x, \ell) \geq 0 \forall x \in [0, \ell]$, so in fact $v(x, \ell) \geq 0$ everywhere in $[0, 1]$ and Bayes-plausibility is satisfied.

¹⁴There is at most one value of ℓ such that $\beta(\ell)q + y$ is tangent to F in $(0, 1]$.

¹⁵When $L(x) > 1$, $G_y^\ell(x) = 1$ rather than following $L(x)$, but since the line $y = 1$ is an upper bound on F as well, the upper truncation does not affect the behavior of $v(x, \ell)$.

If instead L intersects F twice in $(0, 1]$, then the argument is more subtle. In particular, let q_1 be the smallest $q \in (0, 1]$ such that $\beta(\ell)q + y = F(q)$, and let q_2 be the largest.¹⁶ By the Implicit Function Theorem, since the function $\beta(\ell)q + y - F(q)$ is continuously differentiable in all variables, I can write q_1 and q_2 as continuous functions of ℓ . Note that because of this definition, q_1 and q_2 are both well-defined (and satisfy $q_1 = q_2$) if $\beta(\ell)q + y$ is tangent to F , as well as for all smaller values of ℓ .

If $q_1(\ell) > \ell$, then $G_y^\ell(q) < F(q)$ for $q \in (0, \ell) \cup (q_1, q_2)$, but $G_y^\ell(q) > F(q)$ for $q \in [\ell, q_1) \cup (q_2, 1)$ (there is equality at $q \in \{0, q_1, q_2, 1\}$). Therefore if

$$v(q_1(\ell), \ell) = \int_0^{q_1(\ell)} F(q) dq - \int_0^{q_1(\ell)} G_y^\ell(q) dq \geq 0 \quad (2)$$

then $v(q) \geq 0 \forall q \in [0, 1]$ and Bayes-plausibility is satisfied. Given the relationship between G_y^ℓ and F , and what it implies about the increasing and decreasing behavior of $v(x, \ell)$, it is clear that

$$v(q_1(\ell), \ell) = \min_{q \in (0, 1)} v(q).$$

Therefore if a DTU violates Bayes-plausibility, it must be because $v(x, \ell) < 0$ for some $x \in (0, 1)$, which in turn implies that $v(q_1(\ell), \ell) < 0$. Thus Equation (2) is a necessary and sufficient condition for a DTU to be Bayes-plausible so long as $q_1(\ell)$ is well-defined. Furthermore, if the inequality is strict for some ℓ , then because $v(q_1(\ell), \ell)$ is continuous in ℓ , it is also strict for $\ell - \varepsilon$. Finally, if $q_2(\ell) = 1$, then either $y = 1 - 2\pi$ and $\ell = 0$, or $y \in (1 - 2\pi, 1)$ and $\ell = \ell_y^{\min}$. In the former case, I will show that any UTU intersects F twice, so it must be that $q_1(\ell) < 1$. Thus $v(x, \ell)$ is strictly increasing in (q_1, q_2) and is negative at $x = q_1$, so G_y^ℓ is not Bayes-plausible. In the latter case, if $\beta(\ell_y^{\min})q + y$ intersects F twice, then the same argument applies and G_y^ℓ is not Bayes-plausible. Thus if $q_1 \neq q_2$ for some Bayes-plausible DTU, it must be that $q_1 < q_2 < 1$.

If $q_1(\ell) \leq \ell$, then $G_\ell(q) < F(q) \forall q \in (0, q_1) \cup (q_1, q_2)$, with equality at q_1 only if $q_1(\ell) = \ell$. It is then clear that $v(x, \ell) > 0$ on $(0, q_2)$, and since $v(x, \ell)$ is strictly

¹⁶Clearly, given the shape of F , $F(q) > L(q)$ in the interval (q_1, q_2) .

decreasing on $(q_2, 1)$ with $v(1, \ell) = 0$, it must be that $v(q) > 0 \forall q \in (0, 1)$; thus G_ℓ satisfies Bayes-plausibility. However, as $\ell \rightarrow 0$, it cannot be that $q_1(\ell) \leq \ell$. To see why, assume that for some valid ℓ_i , L intersects F twice (so that q_1 and q_2 are distinct and well-defined). Then, for $\ell \in [0, \ell_i]$, the function $\beta(\ell)q + y$ will intersect F twice. If $y > 0$, then because $F(0) = 0$ there is $\varepsilon > 0$ so that $\beta(\ell)q + y$ lies strictly above F in $[0, \varepsilon)$ for any valid choice of ℓ ; thus $q_1(\ell) > \varepsilon$. If instead $y = 0$, then because $f(0) < 1 - 2\pi$, it must be that for any ℓ , there is $\varepsilon > 0$ small enough that $F(\varepsilon) < (1 - 2\pi)\varepsilon \leq \beta(\ell)\varepsilon$ by convexity of F . Thus it is again true that $q_1(\ell) > \varepsilon$. In either case, taking $\ell < \varepsilon$ ¹⁷ ensures that $\ell < q_1(\ell)$.

This result helps show that the cases where $q_1(\ell) \leq \ell$ tend not to generate the lowest Bayes-plausible slope. Note that whenever $q_1(\ell) \leq \ell$, it is true that $\beta(\ell)\ell + y \leq F(\ell)$; thus the latter is a necessary condition for the former. Since $\beta(\ell)\ell + y$ is continuous in ℓ , if there is some point where $\beta(\ell)\ell + y \leq F(\ell)$, then I can use the result above about small ℓ to apply the Intermediate Value Theorem and find a value of $\ell \in (0, \pi]$ where $\beta(\ell)\ell + y = F(\ell)$ but $\ell - \varepsilon < q_1(\ell - \varepsilon)$ for any $\varepsilon > 0$ sufficiently small. Furthermore, I can show that $G_y^{\ell - \varepsilon}$ is Bayes-plausible for ε sufficiently small. When $q_1(\ell) = \ell$, it must be that $v(q_1(\ell), \ell) > 0$ since $G_y^\ell(q) < F(q) \forall q \in (0, \ell)$. By continuity of $v(q_1(\ell), \ell)$ in ℓ , it must be that $v(q_1(\ell - \varepsilon), \ell - \varepsilon) > 0$ if ε is sufficiently small. Since $\ell - \varepsilon < q_1(\ell - \varepsilon)$, Equation (2) is a necessary and sufficient condition for Bayes-plausibility of $G_y^{\ell - \varepsilon}$, and therefore $G_y^{\ell - \varepsilon}$ is Bayes-plausible and has a smaller slope than G_y^ℓ .

Having established sufficient conditions for when Bayes-plausibility is satisfied, I can now use them to obtain a more precise characterization of ℓ_y^* . I begin with the case $y \in [0, 1 - 2\pi]$ and show that ℓ_y^* satisfies $v(q_1(\ell_y^*), \ell_y^*) = 0$. When $y \in [0, 1 - 2\pi]$, the lowest permissible slope for a DTU is $(1 - y)^2/(2\pi)$, the slope of the UTU with intercept y . Therefore the line $L(q) = q(1 - y)^2/(2\pi) + y$ must intersect F twice in $(0, 1]$. Otherwise the UTU given by $G(q) = \min\{L(q), 1\}$ would lie weakly above F on the interval $[0, 1]$ and strictly above F on some measurable subset of $[0, 1]$; thus

¹⁷Of course, this choice may not be valid for $y > 1 - 2\pi$, since the lower bound on the set of valid ℓ is strictly above $\ell = 0$; if so, I cannot rule out that $q_1(\ell) \leq \ell$ for the minimum permissible ℓ .

G could not have the same mean as F , contradicting the construction of all UTUs. Furthermore, the line $L(q) = q(1 - y)/\pi + y$ lies everywhere above F (by the same reasoning; this line corresponds to the maximum permissible slope for a DTU, and thus must lie above F for the mean of that DTU to equal the mean of F). Therefore by continuity of $\beta(\ell)$ in ℓ and continuity of f , there exists a value $\ell_t \in (0, \pi)$ where the line $L(q) = \beta(\ell)q + y$ is tangent to F . The point of tangency must be interior, as $\beta(\ell_t) \cdot 1 + y = 1$ only if $\ell_t = 0$, in which case the line $\beta(\ell_t)q + y$ forms part of a UTU and (as argued above) cannot be tangent to F . Therefore, for $\varepsilon > 0$ sufficiently small, $\ell_t - \varepsilon > 0$, the line $\beta(\ell_t - \varepsilon)q + y$ intersects F twice, and both intersections are bounded strictly below 1. As shown when discussing the case $q_1(\ell) \leq \ell$ above, the constraint in Equation (2) does not bind for $G_y^{\ell_t}$, so it does not bind for $G_y^{\ell_t - \varepsilon}$, and the latter DTU is therefore Bayes-plausible. Thus it must be that for the y -optimal DTU G_y^* , the line $\beta(\ell_y^*)q + y$ intersects F twice in $(0, 1)$. As shown earlier, given this double-intersection property and that $y \in [0, 1 - 2\pi]$, it cannot be that $q_1(\ell_y^*) \leq \ell_y^*$. Therefore the necessary and sufficient condition for Bayes-plausibility in Equation (2) applies, and implies that either $v(q_1(\ell_y^*), \ell_y^*) = 0$ or $v(q_1(\ell_y^*), \ell_y^*) > 0$. To show that the first property holds, consider the UTU corresponding to $\ell = 0$. It is not Bayes-plausible¹⁸ and intersects F twice, so it must be that $v(q_1(0), 0) < 0$. Because $v(q_1(\ell), \ell)$ is a continuous function of ℓ that takes both positive and negative values for $\ell \in [0, \pi]$, the Intermediate Value Theorem implies that there is a well-defined minimum value of ℓ , which I call ℓ_m , for which $v(q_1(\ell_m), \ell_m) = 0$. Since $v(q_1(\ell), \ell) < 0$ for any $\ell < \ell_m$, and I have shown that $v(q_1(\ell_y^*), \ell_y^*) \geq 0$, it must therefore be that $\ell_y^* = \ell_m$, and therefore that $v(q_1(\ell_y^*), \ell_y^*) = 0$.

Next, I show that if $y \in (1 - 2\pi, 1)$, then either $\ell_y^* = \ell_y^{\min}$ or $v(q_1(\ell_y^*), \ell_y^*) = 0$. Assume that $\beta(\ell_y^{\min})q + y$ intersects F twice; otherwise clearly $G_y^{\ell_y^{\min}}$ is Bayes-plausible and

¹⁸Any UTU with $y = 0$ has an atom at 0 while F does not. If $y = 0$, the restriction that $f(0) < 1/(2\pi)$ ensures that the UTU is not Bayes-plausible, since there is $\varepsilon > 0$ such that the UTU places more mass in the interval $[0, \varepsilon]$ than does F .

$\ell_y^* = \ell_y^{\min}$. Assume also that the smallest ℓ for which $v(q_1(\ell), \ell) = 0$, which I label ℓ_y^0 ,¹⁹ satisfies $\ell_y^0 > \ell_y^{\min}$; otherwise clearly $G_y^{\ell_y^0}$ is both Bayes-plausible and slope-minimizing, so again $\ell_y^* = \ell_y^{\min}$. If $\ell_y^* \in (\ell_y^{\min}, \ell_y^0)$, then it must be that $\beta(\ell_y^*)q + y$ intersects F twice, because $\beta(\ell_y^0)q + y$ does. By the definition of ℓ_y^0 , $v(q_1(\ell_y^*), \ell_y^*) \neq 0$. Clearly that expression cannot be strictly positive, or by continuity there would be $\varepsilon > 0$ small enough so that $\ell_y^* - \varepsilon$ is both a valid choice of ℓ (i.e., greater than ℓ_y^{\min}) and generates a Bayes-plausible DTU. It must therefore be strictly negative, which means that $q_1(\ell_y^*) \leq \ell_y^*$; otherwise G_y^* would not be Bayes-plausible. But then the proof that $q_1(\ell) \leq \ell$ cannot occur for small ℓ implies that there is $\varepsilon > 0$ small enough so that $\ell_y^* - \varepsilon > \ell_y^{\min}$ and $G_y^{\ell_y^* - \varepsilon}$ is Bayes-plausible, which contradicts the slope-minimizing property of ℓ_y^* . Thus it cannot be true that $\ell_y^* \in (\ell_y^{\min}, \ell_y^0)$, so it must be that either $\ell_y^* = \ell_y^{\min}$ or $\ell_y^* = \ell_y^0$; the latter implies that $v(q_1(\ell_y^*), \ell_y^*) = 0$. \square

B4: Overall-Optimal DTUs. The simplified integral constraint in Lemma 10 can be used as a key step in deriving the continuity of ℓ_y^* in y , and thus in providing sufficient conditions for the existence of an overall-optimal DTU in Lemma 11. As an immediate corollary, though, it allows a characterization of the overall-optimal DTU when r^* is small:

Corollary 3. *Let ℓ_0^* be the length of the lower truncation for the 0-optimal double-truncated uniform distribution G_0^* , and let $q_1(\ell_0^*, 0)$ be the smallest $q \in (0, 1)$ that satisfies $\beta(\ell_0^*, 0)q = F(q)$.²⁰ If $r^* \leq q_1(\ell_0^*, 0)$, then G_0^* is uniquely optimal among all double-truncated uniform distributions.*

Proof. The proof is by contradiction, and resembles the proof of Proposition 1 in the binary-state setting. Fix r^* and assume some other DTU G does weakly better than G_0^* for Sender. It must therefore have a smaller slope than G_0^* : the intercept of G is larger than that of G_0^* , and G must intersect the horizontal line $y = 1$ at a larger

¹⁹If no such ℓ exists, I let $\ell_y^0 = \pi$.

²⁰The existence of $q_1(\ell_0^*, 0)$ is guaranteed by the proof of Lemma 10.

value of q than G_0^* or the concavification of G would be everywhere above that of G_0^* . Because of its larger slope, G_0^* upper-bounds G after r^* (where G lies weakly below G_0^*) and thus

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{r^*}^1 G(q) dq &< \int_{r^*}^1 G_0^*(q) dq \\ \Rightarrow \int_{q_1(\ell_0^*, 0)}^1 G(q) dq &< \int_{q_1(\ell_0^*, 0)}^1 G_0^*(q) dq \\ \Rightarrow \int_0^{q_1(\ell_0^*, 0)} G(q) dq &> \int_0^{q_1(\ell_0^*, 0)} G_0^*(q) dq = \int_0^{q_1(\ell_0^*, 0)} F(q) dq. \end{aligned}$$

The inequality in the first line is strict because $F(q_1(\ell_0^*, 0)) < 1$, so r^* is not in the upper-truncated region of G and there is some strict difference between G_0^* and G captured in the integral. The first implication follows from the bound on r^* . The inequality in the third line is because all DTUs have equal means, so

$$\begin{aligned} 1 - \pi &= \int_0^1 G(q) dq = \int_0^{q_1(\ell_0^*)} G(q) dq + \int_{q_1(\ell_0^*)}^1 G(q) dq \\ &= \int_0^1 G_0^*(q) dq = \int_0^{q_1(\ell_0^*)} G_0^*(q) dq + \int_{q_1(\ell_0^*)}^1 G_0^*(q) dq. \end{aligned}$$

The equality in the third line is by Lemma 10, since by Lemma 9 the DTU G_0^* has minimal slope among Bayes-plausible DTUs with intercept 0. \square

Using the characterization of Lemma 10, I now prove a sufficient condition on F for U_{r^*} , the set of utilities attained by y -optimal DTUs, to be compact, and thus for Sender to have a well-defined overall-optimal DTU:

Lemma 11. *Let $r^* \in [\pi, 1]$ and $f(1) > 0$. Then Sender's maximum utility over all double-truncated uniform distributions is well-defined, and is attained by a double-truncated uniform distribution G^* .*

Proof. I first show that ℓ_y^* is continuous in y at any $y \in [0, 1)$. Given the restriction on r^* , Sender's utility from a y -optimal DTU G_y^* is given by $1 - G_y^* = 1 - (\beta(\ell_y^*, y) r^* + y)$. Thus continuity of ℓ_y^* in y ensures that Sender's maximum utility over DTUs with

intercept y is continuous in y . I can then provide sufficient conditions for the intercept of a potential overall-optimal DTU to lie in a compact set. The continuity condition implies that U_{r^*} is compact, so that it contains its closure. Therefore there is some DTU that attains Sender's supremum utility over all DTUs.

To show continuity, I first work with $y \in [0, 1 - 2\pi)$, where the argument is most straightforward. Since in that range $v(q_1(\ell_y^*, y), \ell_y^*) = 0$ by Lemma 10, and the proof of that lemma shows that ℓ_y^* is the minimal ℓ where the property holds, I can apply the Implicit Function Theorem to write ℓ_y^* as a continuous function of y .

When $y \in (1 - 2\pi, 1)$, then Lemma 10 implies that either $v(q_1(\ell_y^*, y), \ell_y^*) = 0$ or $\ell_y^* = \ell_y^{\min}$. In particular, ℓ_y^* is either the minimum permissible ℓ or, if that choice does not deliver a Bayes-plausible DTU, the minimum ℓ satisfying $v(q_1(\ell, y), \ell) = 0$. Because both ℓ_y^{\min} and the minimal ℓ satisfying $v(q_1(\ell, y), \ell) = 0$ are continuous in y , the minimum over those two choices is also continuous in y . Thus ℓ_y^* is continuous in y for $y \in (1 - 2\pi, 1)$.

All that remains is to show that ℓ_y^* is continuous in y at $y = 1 - 2\pi$. The continuity of ℓ_y^{\min} in y ensures that the function

$$u(y) = \beta(\ell_y^{\min}) \ell_y^{\min} + y - F(\ell_y^{\min})$$

is also continuous in y . Because $u(y) > 0$ for any $y \in [0, 1 - 2\pi]$, as shown in the proof of why $q_1(\ell) > \ell$ for small enough ℓ , it must be that for $\delta > 0$ sufficiently small, $u(y') > 0$ for any $y' \in (1 - 2\pi, 1 - 2\pi + \delta)$. Since the line $\beta(0, 1 - 2\pi)q + (1 - 2\pi)$ intersects F twice in $(0, 1]$, it must therefore be that for $\delta > 0$ sufficiently small and $y' \in (1 - 2\pi, 1 - 2\pi + \delta)$, so do the lines $\beta(\ell_{y'}^{\min}, 1 - 2\pi)q + (1 - 2\pi)$, $\beta(\ell_{y'}^{\min}, y')q + (1 - 2\pi)$, and $\beta(\ell_{y'}^{\min}, y')q + y'$. Because the last intersects F twice in $(0, 1]$, and both intersections occur at values $q > \ell_{y'}^{\min}$, the proof of Lemma 10 shows that $v(q_1(\ell_{y'}^*, 0), \ell_{y'}^*) = 0$ and $\ell_{y'}^*$ is the minimal value of ℓ such that this property holds. Therefore, by the continuity of the minimal value of ℓ satisfying this equation, ℓ^* is continuous in y at $y = 1 - 2\pi$.

Having shown continuity of ℓ_y^* in y , I use the second part of the lemma statement to show that the set of possibly overall-optimal DTU intercepts is compact. Given that $f(1) > 0$, there must be $\bar{y} \in (0, 1)$ such that $1 - \bar{y} > f(1)$. Then for any intercept $y \geq \bar{y}$, the DTU with minimal permissible slope lies above F on $(0, 1)$, and is therefore Bayes-plausible. Since any DTU with intercept $y > \bar{y}$ surely lies above the slope-minimal DTU with intercept \bar{y} for all $q \in [\pi, 1]$, no DTU with intercept in $(\bar{y}, 1)$ can be optimal among all DTUs. Thus the intercept of the overall-optimal DTU lies in the compact set $[0, \bar{y}]$. \square

B5: Optimal Posterior Distributions. Having established properties of overall-optimal DTUs, I can now jointly prove the optimal distribution portions of Propositions 2 and 3:

Proof. Let H be a candidate optimal distribution of posterior means. I approximate \bar{H} , the concavification of H , by a tangent at r^* , which I call $L(q)$; let $L(0) = y_L \in [0, 1)$ be its intercept. Consider the y_L -optimal DTU $G_{y_L}^*$. In order for H to do at least as well for Sender as $G_{y_L}^*$, by Lemma 2 it must be that

$$1 - H(r^*) \geq 1 - \bar{H}(r^*) \geq 1 - G_{y_L}^*(r^*).$$

Thus L must have a weakly smaller slope than $G_{y_L}^*$, since otherwise $L(r^*) > G_{y_L}^*(r^*)$ and the above inequality is violated.

Recall that if $y_L \in [0, 1 - 2\pi]$, then for any slope $\beta \in ((1 - y_L)^2 / (2\pi), \beta(\ell_{y_L}^*))$ there is a DTU with that slope and intercept y_L . If instead $y_L \in (1 - 2\pi, 1)$, then for any slope $\beta \in [1 - y_L, \beta(\ell_{y_L}^*)]$ there is a DTU with that slope and intercept y_L . In the first case, the slope of L cannot lie below that interval or it would have a weakly smaller slope than the DTU with intercept y_L ; then the argument of Proposition 1 applies and H is not Bayes-plausible. In the second case, L must have a slope that is weakly greater than the lowest-slope DTU with intercept y_L , or it would fail to pass through $(1, 1)$, and therefore so would \bar{H} and H . Thus there is a DTU, G_L , with the same slope as L .

Let $r^* \in (0, q_1(\ell_0^*)]$. By Corollary 3, if $G_L \neq G_0^*$, then because $G_L(r^*) \leq G_0^*(r^*)$, G_L is not Bayes-plausible. If instead $r^* \in [\pi, 1)$ and G_L has a strictly smaller slope than G_{y_L} , then by Lemma 9, G_L is not Bayes-plausible.

In either case, given that G_L violates Bayes-plausibility, H must violate it as well. Because G_L upper-bounds \bar{H} beyond ℓ , it must be that

$$\int_q^1 H(t)dt \leq \int_q^1 \bar{H}(t)dt \leq \int_q^1 G_L(t)dt$$

for any $q \in [\ell, 1]$. Since G_L violates Bayes-plausibility, there is some $q_v \in [0, 1]$ where

$$\int_0^{q_v} G_L(t)dt > \int_0^{q_v} F(t)dt,$$

and since the left-hand side equals 0 for any $q \in [0, \ell)$, it must be that $q_v \in [\ell, 1]$.

Then because H and G_L have the same mean,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^1 H(t)dt &= \int_0^1 G_L(t)dt = 1 - \pi \\ \Rightarrow \int_0^{q_v} H(t)dt + \int_{q_v}^1 H(t)dt &= \int_0^{q_v} H(t)dt + \int_{q_v}^1 H(t)dt \\ \Rightarrow \int_0^{q_v} H(t)dt &\geq \int_0^{q_v} G_L(t)dt > \int_0^{q_v} F(t)dt, \end{aligned}$$

where the third line follows from the earlier upper bound on the integral of H . Therefore H violates Bayes-plausibility and is not a valid distribution.

If G_L has the same slope as $G_{y_L}^*$, then by construction H gives Sender the same utility as G_{y_L} . Thus if there is a DTU that delivers Sender a strictly higher utility than G_{y_L} , then clearly H is not optimal overall. If there is no such DTU, then G_{y_L} is optimal among all DTUs and H also attains Sender's maxmin utility. \square

Finally, I prove the unique concavification portion of Proposition 2:

Proof. By the proof for optimal distributions above, the slope of \bar{H} at r^* equals that of G_0^* . Because \bar{G}_0^* does not have a kink at ℓ_0^* , it upper-bounds H on the whole interval $[0, 1]$ instead of just on $[\ell, 1]$ as in that proof. If $H < G_0^*$ on any measurable

subset of $[r^*, 1]$ the proof of Corollary 3 shows that H violates the Bayes-plausibility integral constraint at $q_1(\ell_0^*, 0)$.

If $\ell_0^* \leq r^*$, it is therefore true that $\bar{H} = G_0^* = \bar{G}_0^*$ on $[r^*, 1]$. Furthermore, \bar{G}_0^* upper-bounds \bar{H} on $[0, r^*]$ and $\bar{G}_0^*(0) = \bar{H}(0) = 0$. Because \bar{G}_0^* is linear on $[0, r^*]$ (i.e., it has no kink at ℓ_0^*) there is no smaller concave function that takes the same values at $q = 0$ and $q = r^*$; thus $\bar{H} = \bar{G}_0^*$ on $[0, r^*]$ as well.

If instead $\ell_0^* > r^*$, then it is now the case that $\bar{H} = G_0^* = \bar{G}_0^*$ on $[\ell_0^*, 0]$, since that is the range where the latter equality holds. However, the upper-bounding relationship still holds on $[0, \ell_0^*]$, and thus the argument above still applies and $\bar{H} = \bar{G}_0^*$ on $[0, \ell_0^*]$. \square