

# Robust Equilibria in General Competing Mechanism Games

Seungjin Han\*

McMaster University

September 27, 2021

## Abstract

This paper proposes a general competing mechanism game of incomplete information where a mechanism allows its designer to send a message to himself at the same time agents send messages. This paper introduces a notion of robust equilibrium. If each agent's payoff function is separable with respect to principals' actions, they lead to the full characterization of equilibrium allocations in terms of incentive compatible direct mechanisms without reference to the set of arbitrary mechanisms allowed in the game. Szentes' Critique (Szentes (2010)) on the standard competing mechanism game of complete information is also valid in a model with incomplete information.

## 1 Introduction

The Revelation Principle does not hold when multiple principals compete in the market (Epstein and Peters (1999), McAfee (1992)). When a principal (e.g., a seller) designs a mechanism, he is aware that agents (e.g., buyers) have not only private information on their payoff types but also market information on mechanisms offered by competing principals, their beliefs on the terms of trade determined in those mechanisms, etc. Therefore, it is generally not enough to ask agents to report their payoff types only.

The literature on competing mechanisms or contractible contracts has explored the big idea that principals can use mechanisms or contractible contracts that involve commitments

---

\*I thank Siyang Xiong, two anonymous referees and an associated editor for their comments and suggestions. I thankfully acknowledge financial support from the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada. Address: Department of Economics, McMaster University, 1280 Main Street West, Hamilton, ON, CANADA. Email: hansj@mcmaster.ca.

to punish a competing principal's deviation. Punishment can take place when agents' messages reveal a competing principal's deviation (Epstein and Peters (1999), Yamashita (2010), Xiong (2013)), or it is prescribed in a contractible contract, directly conditional on a deviator's publicly observable contract (Szentes (2015)). This makes it possible for principals to sustain various collusive outcomes.

Epstein and Peters (1999) propose a class of universal mechanisms that allow agents to describe competing principals' mechanisms. However, the message spaces in these universal mechanisms that agents use in describing competing principals' mechanisms are quite complex due to the infinite regress problem: my mechanism depends on the competitor's mechanism, his mechanism depends on mine, and so on ad infinitum. A major contribution by Yamashita (2010) is that any equilibrium allocations can be understood as if a principal offers a recommendation mechanism that delegates a choice of his incentive compatible direct mechanism to agents. The incentive compatible direct mechanism chosen by a majority of agents is implemented. Recommendation mechanisms can be thought of as an extension of menus proposed for common agency (Martimort and Stole (2002), Page and Monterio (2003), and Peters (2001)).

On the other hand, Szentes (2015) studies a bilateral contracting game as in Han (2006), but augmented by contractible contracts (Peters and Szentes (2012)) in which a principal's ordinary contract is directly conditional on a deviator's ordinary contract described by the Gödel language.

## 1.1 Motivation

The characterization of the equilibrium allocations in the current literature is however tied to the very set of arbitrary mechanisms allowed for each principal in the game. Therefore, the greatest lower bound of a principal's equilibrium payoff is not expressed in terms of incentive compatible direct mechanisms.

Further, Szentes (2010) points out a restrictive feature in Yamashita (2010). Mechanisms adopted in Yamashita (2010) delegate a choice of an action to agents in the sense that agents' messages fully determine an action in a mechanism. This is the restriction imposed on mechanisms in the standard competing mechanism game in the literature. However, a principal may offer a *set-valued mechanism* in which a set of actions is first determined by agents' messages and the principal subsequently chooses an action that he wants from the set.

Szentes shows that if such mechanisms are allowed, the greatest lower bound of a principal's (pure-strategy) equilibrium payoff in the competing mechanism game of *complete*

*information* can be expressed as his minmax value over actions regardless of the complexity of mechanisms allowed in the game. The reason is that a principal can deviate to a mechanism that leaves the whole set of actions for him regardless of agents' messages. The deviating principal can then choose an action that maximizes his payoff given his belief on non-deviators' actions. Therefore, a principal's payoff cannot be lower than his minmax value over actions in the case of the complete information. In the standard competing mechanism game, a principal is forced to offer a mechanism that takes away his freedom of choosing an action at a later stage of the game, inducing his maxmin value over actions as a principal's equilibrium payoff. Szentes (2010) argues that this is hard to justify on economic grounds.

This paper proposes a general competing mechanism game of *incomplete information* where a principal's general mechanism allows him to send a message to himself at the same time agents send messages and these messages altogether determine an action. A principal does not observe other principals' mechanisms when he sends a message to himself. A principal's mechanism that assigns a set of actions conditional on agents' messages (Szentes (2010)) is strategically equivalent to a general mechanism. Therefore, the set of mechanisms in Szentes (2010) can be nested into the set of general mechanisms.

In a model with a single principal, the Revelation Principle holds for both set-valued mechanisms in Szentes (2010) and general mechanisms in this paper: For any equilibrium given any set valued mechanism or any general mechanism, there exists an incentive compatible direct mechanism where agents' messages uniquely determine the principal's action and the equilibrium allocation is preserved by a truth-telling equilibrium. Therefore, in a model with a single principal, the mechanism design with set-valued mechanisms in Szentes (2010) or general mechanisms in this paper is no different from the mechanism design with the single-valued mechanisms. Szentes shows that such an equivalence breaks down in a model of complete information with multiple principals.

## 1.2 Main Results

This paper shows that such an equivalence also breaks down in a model of incomplete information with multiple principals. Further, this paper identifies the payoff environment and the notion of equilibrium under which the incentive compatibility alone characterizes the set of equilibrium allocations both when principals can use general mechanisms and when principals are restricted to use standard mechanisms.<sup>1</sup>

In a perfect Bayesian equilibrium (PBE) (Yamashita (2010)), an equilibrium allocation

---

<sup>1</sup>This provides the clear comparison of equilibrium allocations between general competing mechanism games and standard competing mechanism games, although I believe the breakdown can be shown with the notion of perfect Bayesian equilibrium and no restriction on the payoff environment

is induced by agents' equilibrium strategies of communicating with all principals, including a deviating principal, that are worst for the deviating principal. In a strongly robust PBE (Epstein and Peters (1999), Han (2007)), an equilibrium allocation is induced by agents' equilibrium strategies of communicating with all principals that are best for the deviating principal.

A PBE or strongly PBE are the two extreme polar cases in terms of a principal's belief on what kind of communication strategies he can persuade agents to play upon his deviation: In a strongly PBE, a deviating principal is optimistic that he believes he can persuade them to choose the equilibrium strategies of communicating with all principals that are best for him, whereas, in a PBE, he is pessimistic that he believes that the non-deviating principals can persuade them to choose the equilibrium strategies of communicating with all principals that are worst.

In a robust PBE, a principal believes that he can persuade agents to follow only what kind of strategies of communicating with *himself* upon his deviation, taking agents' communication with non-deviating principals as given. Given such limited persuasion, non-deviating principals believe they can partially persuade agents, that is, to follow what kind of strategies of communicating with themselves. The notion of robust PBE is based on the view that agents may not fully serve the deviating principal's interest only or the non-deviating principals' interest only. In a robust PBE, agents partially serve both the deviating principal and the non-deviating principals. Since agents are common agents for all principals, it seems reasonable for agents to (partially) serve both of them.

If a principal's payoff does not depend on the other principals' actions, the notion of robust PBE coincides with that of strongly robust PBE. If a principal's payoff does not depend on his own action, the notion of robust PBE coincides with that of PBE. Generally when a principal's payoff depends on both his action and the other principals' actions, robust PBE is weaker than strongly robust PBE but stronger than PBE.

If an agent's payoff function is separable with respect to principals' actions, the set of robust PBE allocations in a general competing mechanism game is fully characterized in terms of the greatest lower bound of a principal's robust PBE payoff, which is his *minmax* value over incentive compatible direct mechanisms. Let us explain the key idea. If each agent's payoff function is separable with respect to principals' actions, we can define an individually Bayesian incentive compatible (BIC) direct mechanism for each principal  $j$ . Then, a BIC profile of principals' direct mechanisms is a profile of principals' individually BIC direct mechanisms. In a general competing mechanism game, principal  $j$  can offer a mechanism where the message space for himself is the set that includes all of his individually BIC direct mechanisms  $\Pi_j^B$  and the message space for each agent is her type space. In

this mechanism, principal  $j$  chooses his BIC direct mechanism  $\pi_j$  from  $\Pi_j^B$  and agents send type messages to  $j$  at the same time and subsequently  $\pi_j$  determines  $j$ 's action conditional on agents' messages. The notion of robust PBE makes it possible for  $j$  to implement any BIC direct mechanism  $\pi_j$  from  $\Pi_j^B$ . Given  $j$ 's belief on BIC direct mechanisms induced by non-deviators' mechanisms, principal  $j$  can then choose his BIC direct mechanism  $\pi_j$  from  $\Pi_j^B$  that maximizes his payoff. Therefore, principal  $j$ 's payoff in a robust PBE of a general competing mechanism game cannot be lower than his minmax values over individually BIC direct mechanisms.

This paper then shows that any profile of individually BIC direct mechanisms that generates a payoff for each principal no less than his minmax value can be supported in a robust PBE where each principal  $j$  offers a deviator-reporting mechanism which asks agents to report only the identity of a deviating principal along with their payoff types. If a majority of agents report  $j$ , then deviator-reporting mechanisms assign individually BIC direct mechanisms that lead to  $j$ 's minmax value: Otherwise, they assign individually BIC direct mechanisms that are supposed to be implemented in an equilibrium.

For a robust PBE, the standard competing mechanism game is restrictive in the sense that it takes the freedom of choosing any BIC direct mechanism away from a principal at the same time agents send messages to him given his mechanism. In the standard competing mechanism game, a deviating principal's payoff can be as low as his *maxmin* value. The reason is that agents' communication with the deviator alone induces a BIC direct mechanism from the deviator's mechanism and non-deviators can choose their BIC direct mechanisms conditional on agents' reports on the deviator's BIC direct mechanism that they induce from the deviator's mechanism.

When random mechanisms are allowed as in our paper and there are only two principals, the restrictive feature of the standard competing mechanism game is not a problem because each principal's minmax value over individually BIC direct mechanisms is equal to his maxmin value. However, the equivalence between the minmax and maxmin values are not extended to the case with three or more principals. Therefore, Szentes' critique on the standard competing mechanism game of complete information is also valid in a model of incomplete information.

### 1.3 Related literature

While this paper imposes the separability on the agent's payoff function, it allows for interdependent values of payoff types, an agent's payoff depends on actions chosen by all principals, and there are no restrictions on the principal's payoff function. In my companion paper (Han

(2021)), I considered a particular environment where (i) an agent can choose only one principal for trading and her payoff depends on only the action of the principal she chooses and her type (i.e. private value) and (ii) payoff functions for all players are linear and there are also no externalities on the principal side. Han (2021) focuses on the specific (but tractable) competition model where a principal’s general contract chooses his dominant-strategy incentive compatible direct mechanism as a function of messages sent by all agents before they choose their trading principals; each agent subsequently sends her true type to the principal she chooses.<sup>2</sup> The focus in Han (2021) is to characterize the equilibrium allocations conditional on truthful type reporting to the trading principal in the specific competition model, show the validity of Szentes’ critique based on such equilibria, and provide comparative statics on equilibrium profits and prices in applications.

In common agency (i.e., multiple principals and a single agent), Han (2012), Peters (2003, 2007), and Attar et al. (2008) identify the restrictions on the players’ preference ordering with which there is no loss of generality for principals to focus on take-it-or-leave-it offers or incentive-compatible direct mechanisms. The “no externalities” condition imposed in Peters (2003, 2007) focused on games where an agent’s payoff type does not affect her preference ordering and it does not allow that a principal’s utility depends on competing principals’ actions. A separability on the agent’s preference ordering is imposed in Attar et al. (2008) for common agency but we impose none of the following restrictions: (i) the no indifference condition in Attar et al. (2008) that an agent is never indifferent between any pair of actions from any principals<sup>3</sup>, (ii) the “no externalities” condition imposed on principals’ preference ordering in Peters (2003, 2007), (iii) the monotonicity condition in Han (2012). In contrast to these papers, we formulate the notion of robust equilibrium such that it is sufficient to impose only the separability on agents’ preference ordering for the characterization of the set of all robust equilibrium allocations in terms of BIC direct mechanisms in general competing mechanism games with multiple principals and multiple agents.

It is worthwhile to mention that mechanism design approaches considered in Szentes (2010) and this paper are different from contracting with limited commitment considered by Bester and Strausz (2000, 2010) and Dorval and Skreta (2018) in a model with a single principal. In Bester and Strausz (2000, 2010), a principal cannot specify the set of the actions that he can choose conditional on agents’ messages. Because of that, the standard Revelation

---

<sup>2</sup>Extending the DIC-BIC equivalence in Gershkov, et al. (2013), Han (2021) shows that when all the other principals offer such general contracts, a principal has no incentive to deviate to any arbitrary general contract in the sense that there exists a continuation equilibrium that punishes a principal upon his deviation to an arbitrary general contract.

<sup>3</sup>We believe that for common agency as in Attar, et al. (2008), only the separability condition is needed for the Revelation Principle for robust equilibrium formulated in our paper without the no indifference condition.

Principle does not hold even with a single principal (Bester and Stausz (2000)). What the principal can design is rather a communication device that generates a publicly observable output message  $s$  conditional on an agent's private input message  $m$  (Bester and Strausz (2010)). While the principal designs a communication device, he observes only the output message  $s$  and this output message does not restrict the set of actions that the principal can choose. Given the posterior belief conditional on the output message  $s$ , the principal chooses his action. Dorval and Skreta (2018) applies the limited commitment approach to a model with an agent's persistent type in multiple periods: The principal's action choice in the current period is independent of an agent's output messages observed from previous communication devices.

On the other hand, the class of mechanisms considered in Szentes (2010) and in this paper still allows a principal to commit to a mechanism that specifies the set of a principal's actions as a function of agents' messages sent to him.<sup>4</sup> As pointed out in footnote 6, when there is only one principal in a model, the standard Revelation Principle holds for the class of mechanisms considered in Szentes (2010) and my paper. Therefore, for a model with a single principal, the class of mechanisms considered in Szentes (2010) and this paper generates the same set of equilibrium allocations that are generated by the class of standard mechanisms in which agents' messages uniquely determines a principal's action. Szentes (2010) shows that's not the case in a model of complete information with multiple principals by showing that a principal can raise the greatest lower bound of his equilibrium payoff by using the class of mechanisms in which agents' messages only determines the set of actions from which a principal can choose his action. We show that this result can be extended to a model of incomplete information with multiple principals.

## 2 General Competing Mechanisms

Throughout the paper, we assume that a set is a compact metric space. When a measurable structure is necessary, the corresponding Borel  $\sigma$  algebra is used. For a set  $Z$ ,  $\Delta(Z)$  denotes the set of Borel probability distributions on  $X$ . For any mapping  $L$  from  $S$  into  $Q$ ,  $L(S)$  denotes the image set of  $L$ .

There are  $J$  principals and  $I$  agents. Let  $\mathcal{J} = \{1, \dots, J\}$  be the collection of principals and  $\mathcal{I} = \{1, \dots, I\}$  the the collection of agents with  $J \geq 2$  and  $I \geq 3$ . Agent  $i$ 's payoff type

---

<sup>4</sup>These approaches assume the full commitment. A principal may want to offer a more general mechanism than a standard (single-valued) mechanism even if he can offer any standard mechanism. In fact, the set of standard mechanisms is a strict subset of the set of general mechanisms. On the other hand, the literature on contract design with limited commitment assumes that a principal can offer neither a general mechanism nor a standard mechanism.

is denoted by  $x_i \in X_i$ . Let  $x = (x_1, \dots, x_I) \in X = X_1 \times \dots \times X_I$  denote a profile of types, which is drawn from a probability distribution  $F \in \Delta(X)$ . Each principal  $j$  takes his action  $a_j \in A_j$ . Let  $a = (a_1, \dots, a_I) \in A = A_1 \times \dots \times A_I$  denote a profile of actions. For all  $a \in A$  and all  $x \in X$ , principal  $j$ 's payoff is  $v_j(a, x)$  and agent  $i$ 's payoff is  $u_i(a, x)$ .

Competing mechanisms brings an extreme form of multidimensionality. Not only may each principal  $j$ 's action  $a_j$  be multidimensional, the number of principals adds multidimensionality to the profile of actions  $a = (a_1, \dots, a_I)$ . We assume that each agent's payoff function is separable with respect to principals' actions. For all  $a \in A$  and all  $x \in X$ , agent  $i$ 's payoff takes the form of

$$u_i(a, x) = \sum_{k=1}^J u_{ik}(a_k, x). \quad (1)$$

Notably, (1) allows a quasilinear representation of an agent's preference relation. For example, let  $a_j = (y_j, t_j)$ , where  $y_j$  is a non-monetary (multidimensional) component of principal  $j$ 's action and  $t_j = (t_{0j}, t_{1j}, \dots, t_{Ij})$  is a profile of monetary transfers with  $t_{0j}$  for principal  $j$  himself and  $t_{ij}$  for agent  $i$  for all  $i \in \mathcal{I}$ . Then, (1) allows us to express agent  $i$ 's payoff as  $u_i(a, x) = \sum_{k=1}^J h_{ik}(y_k, x) + T_i$  with  $T_i = \sum_{k=1}^J t_{ik} + m_i$  for agent  $i$ 's initial amount of money  $m_i \in \mathbb{R}_+$ .

While (1) imposes the separability on the agent's payoff function, it is quite general in terms of the nature of actions, how principals' actions affect a player's payoff, and how a player's payoff depends on all agents' types. The equivalence between dominant-strategy implementation and Bayesian implementation in Gershkov, et al. (2013) is based on the restrictions that (i) agents' payoff functions are linear, (ii) each agent's type has only *private value*, and (iii) a principal's action is  $a = (n, m)$ , where an alternative  $n$  belongs to a discrete and finite set  $\{1, \dots, N\}$  and  $m$  is a vector of monetary transfers, one for each agent. Given that the agent's payoff environment in my paper allows for *interdependent values* and generality of a principal's action, working with dominant strategy incentive compatible direct mechanisms for the characterization of equilibrium allocations loses its generality even with linear payoff functions and monetary transfers.<sup>5</sup>

Each agent's preference relation satisfies the von Neumann-Morgenstern expected utility property. For a profile of random actions  $(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_J) \in \Delta(A_1) \times \dots \times \Delta(A_J)$  and a profile

---

<sup>5</sup>One may consider ex-post incentive compatible direct mechanisms for the case of interdependent types. However they are generally not equivalent to Bayesian incentive compatible direct mechanisms as shown in Gershkov, et al (2013).



of types  $x \in X$ , expected payoffs for agent  $i$  and principal  $j$  are

$$U_i(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_J, x) := \int_{A_1} \cdots \int_{A_J} u_i(a_1, \dots, a_J, x) d\alpha_J \times \cdots \times d\alpha_1,$$

$$V_j(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_J, x) := \int_{A_1} \cdots \int_{A_J} v_j(a_1, \dots, a_J, x) d\alpha_J \times \cdots \times d\alpha_1.$$

For each  $i \in \mathcal{I}$ , (1) allows us to express  $U_i(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_J, x)$  as

$$U_i(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_J, x) = \sum_{k=1}^J U_{ik}(\alpha_k, x), \quad (2)$$

where  $U_{ik}(\alpha_k, x) := \int_{A_k} u_{ik}(a_k, x) d\alpha_k$ . Note that  $U_i$  and  $V_j$  are both linear in each  $\Delta(A_j)$  for all  $j \in \mathcal{J}$ .

A major departure from the literature on competing mechanisms is to allow a principal to send a message to himself given his mechanism. Specifically, each principal  $j$  can offer a *general mechanism* that determines his action contingent on agents' messages and his own message. Let  $M_{ij}$  be the set of messages available for agent  $i \in \mathcal{I}$ . Let  $M_{0j}$  be the set of messages available for principal  $j$  himself. Let  $M_j = \times_{k=0}^I M_{kj}$ . A mechanism is then a measurable mapping

$$\gamma_j : M_j \rightarrow \Delta(A_j).$$

Let  $\Gamma_j$  be the set of mechanisms available for principal  $j$ . Let  $\Gamma = \Gamma_1 \times \cdots \times \Gamma_J$ . Note that we allow for *random mechanisms*.

The class of mechanisms proposed in this paper is more general than a standard mechanism that specifies a principal's action contingent on agents' messages only. In terms of our formulation, a standard mechanism is the same as a mechanism  $\gamma_j : M_j \rightarrow \Delta(A_j)$  such that for all  $m_{0j}, m'_{0j} \in M_{0j}$  and all  $(m_{1j}, \dots, m_{Ij}) \in \times_{k \neq 0} M_{kj}$ ,

$$\gamma_j(m_{0j}, m_{1j}, \dots, m_{Ij}) = \gamma_j(m'_{0j}, m_{1j}, \dots, m_{Ij}). \quad (3)$$

Let  $\bar{\Gamma}_j$  be the set of mechanisms satisfying (3) for each  $j \in \mathcal{J}$ . Clearly  $\bar{\Gamma}_j$  is a strict subset of  $\Gamma_j$ . Standard competing mechanism games (e.g., Epstein and Peters (1999), Han (2006), Yamashita (2010) among many) allow principal  $j$  to offer only a mechanism in  $\bar{\Gamma}_j$ . For notational simplicity, we drop the message set  $M_{0j}$  for any mechanism in  $\bar{\Gamma}_j$  and denote a mechanism in  $\bar{\Gamma}_j$  by a measurable mapping from  $M_{1j} \times \cdots \times M_{Ij}$  into  $\Delta(A_j)$ .

Mechanisms in  $\Gamma$  or  $\bar{\Gamma}$  are quite general in terms of the degree and nature of communication that they allow. For example, they are sufficiently general that there exists an

embedding  $\eta_j$  from the set of individually BIC direct mechanisms for principal  $j$  defined in Section 3 into  $\bar{\Gamma}_j$ .  $\bar{\Gamma}$  is also large enough to include mechanisms homeomorphic to deviator-reporting mechanisms and deviator's DM (direct mechanism) reporting mechanisms defined in Sections 4 and 5.

For a contract in Szentes (2010), there exists a strategically equivalent mechanism in  $\Gamma_j$ . Principal  $j$ 's contract proposed by Szentes (2010) is a measurable mapping  $h_j : M_{1j} \times \cdots \times M_{Ij} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\Delta(A_j))$  in our environment, where  $\mathcal{P}(\Delta(A_j))$  is the set of all subsets of  $\Delta(A_j)$ . In this contract, a profile of agents' messages  $(m_{1j}, \dots, m_{Ij})$  first determines  $h_j(m_{1j}, \dots, m_{Ij})$ , a subset of  $\Delta(A_j)$ , from which principal  $j$  subsequently chooses his action. For such a contract, we can construct a strategically equivalent mechanism  $\gamma_j : M_j \rightarrow \Delta(A_j)$ . Let  $m_{0j}$  be a measurable mapping from  $h_j(M_{1j} \times \cdots \times M_{Ij})$  (i.e., the image set of  $h_j$ ) into  $\Delta(A_j)$  with the property that for all  $h_j(m_{1j}, \dots, m_{Ij}) \in h_j(M_{1j} \times \cdots \times M_{Ij})$ ,  $m_{0j}(h_j(m_{1j}, \dots, m_{Ij})) \in h_j(m_{1j}, \dots, m_{Ij})$ . Let  $M_{0j}$  be the set of all such measurable mappings. Let us define a mechanism  $\gamma_j : M_j \rightarrow \Delta(A_j)$  such that for a general contract  $h_j$  and all  $(m_{0j}, m_{1j}, \dots, m_{Ij}) \in M_j$

$$\gamma_j(m_{0j}, m_{1j}, \dots, m_{Ij}) = m_{0j}(h_j(m_{1j}, \dots, m_{Ij})).$$

In a contract  $h_j$ , agents' messages determine a subset of actions and then principal  $j$  chooses an action from the subset. In the corresponding mechanism  $\gamma_j$ , principal  $j$  reports his contingency plan  $m_{0j}$  to himself, at the same time agents send messages to him, as to what action to choose as a function of the subset of actions determined by agents' messages. Therefore, the set of contracts in Szentes (2010) can be nested into  $\Gamma$ .

A general competing mechanism game with  $\Gamma$  starts when principals simultaneously offer their mechanisms from  $\Gamma$ . Given a profile of mechanisms  $\gamma = (\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_J)$ , each agent sends a message to every principal and every principal sends a message only to himself at the same time. When principals and agents send messages, each principal  $j$ 's mechanism is only observed by agents but not by the other principals. According to each principal  $j$ 's mechanism  $\gamma_j$ , a profile of messages  $m_j = (m_{0j}, m_{1j}, \dots, m_{Ij})$  determines his random action as  $\gamma_j(m_j) \in \Delta(A_j)$ . Finally, payoffs are realized.

One may consider an alternative game where a principal inputs his message after observing the other principals' mechanisms. In terms of characterizing equilibrium allocations, it does not matter whether or not the other principals' mechanisms are observable by a principal when he inputs his message in his mechanism given three or more agents. The reason is that the message spaces can be sufficiently general that (i) agents are able to describe the other principals' mechanisms with their messages and (ii) a principal can input a message in his mechanism that describes a contingency plan with respect to all possible messages that

agents could send, as explained earlier.

### 3 Notion of Equilibrium

We consider a pure-strategy equilibrium, as in Yamashita (2010), in the sense that principals use pure strategies for their mechanism choices. In this paper, mixed communication strategies are however allowed to such an extent that the existence of an equilibrium can be addressed, whereas Yamashita (2010) considers only pure communication strategies.

Let  $c_{ij} : \Gamma \times X_i \rightarrow \Delta(M_{ij})$  denote agent  $i$ 's mixed strategy of communicating with principal  $j$ . Let  $c_{0j} : \Gamma_j \rightarrow \Delta(M_{0j})$  be principal  $j$ 's mixed strategy of communicating with himself. For all  $\gamma \in \Gamma$  and all  $x \in X$ , let

$$\begin{aligned} &g_j(\gamma_j, c_{0j}(\gamma_j), c_{1j}(\gamma, x_1), \dots, c_{Ij}(\gamma, x_I)) \\ &:= \int_{M_{0j}} \int_{M_{1j}} \dots \int_{M_{Ij}} \gamma_j(m_{0j}, m_{1j}, \dots, m_{Ij}) dc_{0j}(\gamma_j) dc_{1j}(\gamma, x_1) \dots dc_{Ij}(\gamma, x_I). \end{aligned}$$

Given  $\gamma = (\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_J) \in \Gamma$ ,  $g_j(\gamma_j, c_{0j}(\gamma_j), c_{1j}(\gamma, x_1), \dots, c_{Ij}(\gamma, x_I)) \in \Delta(A_j)$  is the probability distribution over  $A_j$  conditional on  $x = (x_1, \dots, x_I)$  that is induced by (i) the strategies of communicating with principal  $j$ ,  $c_j(\gamma) = (c_{0j}(\gamma_j), c_{1j}(\gamma, \cdot), \dots, c_{Ij}(\gamma, \cdot))$  and (ii) principal  $j$ 's mechanism  $\gamma_j$ . Then,

$$g_j(\gamma_j, c_{0j}(\gamma_j), c_{1j}(\gamma, \cdot), \dots, c_{Ij}(\gamma, \cdot)) \tag{4}$$

is a mapping from  $X \rightarrow \Delta(A_j)$ , which is a *direct mechanism* induced by the communication strategies  $c_j(\gamma)$  and principal  $j$ 's mechanism  $\gamma_j$ .<sup>6</sup>

For  $\gamma \in \Gamma$ , agent  $i$ 's (ex-ante) expected payoff is expressed as becomes

$$\mathbb{E}_x [U_i(g_1(\gamma_1, c_1(\gamma, x)), \dots, g_J(\gamma_J, c_J(\gamma, x)), x)] = \sum_{k=1}^J \mathbb{E}_x [U_{ik}(g_k(\gamma_k, c_k(\gamma, x)), x)],$$

---

<sup>6</sup>Suppose that there is only one principal in a model. Given a mechanism  $\gamma_1$  offered by principal 1 (i.e., single principal), a profile of continuation-equilibrium communication strategies  $c_1(\gamma_1)$  induces a Bayesian incentive compatible direct mechanism  $g_1$  according to (4) in which only agents send type messages and the principal does not send a message to himself. Therefore, the standard Revelation Principle holds. This implies that in a model of a single principal, the class of mechanisms considered in Szentes (2010) and my paper is no different from the class of standard mechanisms in terms of the set of equilibrium allocations that it generates.

where for all  $k \in \mathcal{J}$ ,

$$\mathbb{E}_x [U_{ik}(g_k(\gamma_k, c_k(\gamma, x)), x)] := \int_X U_{ik}(g_k(\gamma_k, c_k(\gamma, x)), x) dF.$$

For  $\gamma \in \Gamma$ , principal  $j$ 's (ex-ante) expected payoff is expressed as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_x [V_j(g_1(\gamma_1, c_1(\gamma, x)), \dots, g_J(\gamma_J, c_J(\gamma, x)), x)] \\ := \int_X V_j(g_1(\gamma_1, c_1(\gamma, x)), \dots, g_J(\gamma_J, c_J(\gamma, x)), x) dF. \end{aligned}$$

**Definition 1** For all  $\gamma \in \Gamma$ ,  $c(\gamma) = (c_1(\gamma), \dots, c_J(\gamma))$  is said to be a continuation equilibrium given  $\gamma$  if

(i) for all  $i \in \mathcal{I}$  and all her communication strategies  $(c'_{i1}(\gamma, \cdot), \dots, c'_{iJ}(\gamma, \cdot))$

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=1}^J \mathbb{E}_x [U_{ik}(g_k(\gamma_k, c_{0k}(\gamma_k), c_{1k}(\gamma, x_1), \dots, c_{Ik}(\gamma, x_I)), x)] \geq \\ \sum_{k=1}^J \mathbb{E}_x [U_{ik}(g_k(\gamma_k, c_{0k}(\gamma_k), c'_{ik}(\gamma, x_i), c_{-ik}(\gamma, x_{-i})), x)], \end{aligned}$$

where  $c_{-ik}(\gamma, x_{-i}) = (c_{\ell k}(\gamma, x_{-\ell}))_{\ell \neq i}$  and

(ii) for all  $j \in \mathcal{J}$  and all his communication strategies  $c'_{0j}(\gamma)$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_x [V_j(g_j(\gamma_j, c_j(\gamma, x)), g_{-j}(\gamma_{-j}, c_{-j}(\gamma, x)), x)] \geq \\ \mathbb{E}_x [V_j(g_j(\gamma_j, c'_{0j}(\gamma), c_{-0,j}(\gamma, x)), g_{-j}(\gamma_{-j}, c_{-j}(\gamma, x)), x)], \quad (5) \end{aligned}$$

where  $c_{-0,j}(\gamma, x) = (c_{ij}(\gamma, x_i))_{i \in \mathcal{I}}$  and  $g_{-j}(\gamma_{-j}, c_{-j}(\gamma, x)) = (g_k(\gamma_k, c_k(\gamma, x)))_{k \neq j}$ .

Definition 1 is based on ex-ante expected payoffs. Condition (i) in Definition 1 can be equivalently formulated with agents' interim expected payoffs as follows: For all  $i \in \mathcal{I}$ , a.e.  $x_i \in X_i$  and all  $(\mu_{i1}, \dots, \mu_{iJ}) \in \Delta(M_{i1}) \times \dots \times \Delta(M_{iJ})$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=1}^J \mathbb{E}_{x_{-i}} [U_{ik}(g_k(\gamma_k, c_{0k}(\gamma_k), c_{1k}(\gamma, x_1), \dots, c_{Ik}(\gamma, x_I)), x_{-i}, x_i) | x_i] \geq \\ \sum_{k=1}^J \mathbb{E}_{x_{-i}} [U_{ik}(g_k(\gamma_k, c_{0k}(\gamma_k), \mu_{ik}, c_{-ik}(\gamma, x_{-i})), x_{-i}, x_i) | x_i], \quad (6) \end{aligned}$$

where  $\mathbb{E}_{x_{-i}}[\cdot|x_i]$  is the expectation operator based on the probability distribution over  $X_{-i}$  conditional on  $x_i \in X_i$ . We use agents' interim expected payoffs when we define a continuation equilibrium in the standard competing mechanism game in Section 5. Let  $\mathcal{C}(\gamma)$  be the set of all continuation equilibria given  $\gamma$ .

**Definition 2**  $(\gamma^*, c^*)$  is a pure-strategy perfect Bayesian equilibrium (henceforth simply PBE) of a general competing mechanism game with  $\Gamma$  if (i)  $c^*(\gamma) \in \mathcal{C}(\gamma)$  for all  $\gamma \in \Gamma$  and (ii) for all  $j \in \mathcal{J}$  and all  $\gamma_j \in \Gamma_j$ ,

$$\mathbb{E}_x [V_j (g_j (\gamma_j^*, c_j^*(\gamma^*, x)), g_{-j} (\gamma_{-j}^*, c_{-j}^*(\gamma^*, x)), x)] \geq \mathbb{E}_x [V_j (g_j (\gamma_j, c_j^*(\gamma_j, \gamma_{-j}^*, x)), g_{-j} (\gamma_{-j}^*, c_{-j}^*(\gamma_j, \gamma_{-j}^*, x)), x)]. \quad (7)$$

Yamashita (2010) and Xiong (2013) employ the notions of sequential equilibrium and subgame perfect Nash equilibrium respectively with finite types, whereas Szentes (2015) employs the notion of perfect Bayesian equilibrium in the model of contractible contracts. All these notions, including one defined in Definition 2 above, are in fact identical except for the extent to which mixed strategies are allowed. A common requirement of these equilibrium notions is that principals have no incentive to deviate as long as there exists a continuation equilibrium upon deviation where the deviating principal cannot gain. Condition (ii) in the definition of a PBE is equivalent to the following condition: For all  $j$  and all  $\gamma_j \in \Gamma_j$

$$\mathbb{E}_x [V_j (g_j (\gamma_j^*, c_j^*(\gamma^*, x)), g_{-j} (\gamma_{-j}^*, c_{-j}^*(\gamma^*, x)), x)] \geq \inf_{[c_j(\gamma_j, \gamma_{-j}^*), c_{-j}(\gamma_j, \gamma_{-j}^*)] \in \mathcal{C}(\gamma_j, \gamma_{-j}^*)} \mathbb{E}_x [V_j (g_j (\gamma_j, c_j(\gamma_j, \gamma_{-j}^*, x)), g_{-j} (\gamma_{-j}^*, c_{-j}(\gamma_j, \gamma_{-j}^*, x)), x)] \quad (8)$$

Accordingly, the greatest lower bound of a principal's PBE payoff is based on continuation-equilibrium strategies that are *worst* for him upon his deviation whenever there are multiple continuation equilibria.

A strongly robust equilibrium (Epstein and Peters (1999) and Han (2007)) is an alternative notion of equilibrium. In our general competing mechanism game, strongly robust PBE can be defined as follows.

**Definition 3**  $(\gamma^*, c^*)$  is a strongly robust PBE of a general competing mechanism game with  $\Gamma$  if (i) it is a PBE and (ii) for all  $j \in \mathcal{J}$ , all  $\gamma_j \in \Gamma_j$ , and all  $[c_j(\gamma_j, \gamma_{-j}^*), c_{-j}(\gamma_j, \gamma_{-j}^*)] \in \mathcal{C}_j(\gamma_j, \gamma_{-j}^*)$ ,

$$\mathbb{E}_x [V_j (g_j (\gamma_j^*, c_j^*(\gamma^*, x)), g_{-j} (\gamma_{-j}^*, c_{-j}^*(\gamma^*, x)), x)] \geq \mathbb{E}_x [V_j (g_j (\gamma_j, c_j(\gamma_j, \gamma_{-j}^*, x)), g_{-j} (\gamma_{-j}^*, c_{-j}(\gamma_j, \gamma_{-j}^*, x)), x)]. \quad (9)$$

Condition (ii) in Definition 3 is equivalent to the following condition: For all  $j$  and all  $\gamma_j \in \Gamma_j$

$$\mathbb{E}_x [V_j (g_j (\gamma_j^*, c_j^*(\gamma^*, x)), g_{-j} (\gamma_{-j}^*, c_{-j}^*(\gamma^*, x)), x)] \geq \sup_{[c_j(\gamma_j, \gamma_{-j}^*), c_{-j}(\gamma_j, \gamma_{-j}^*)] \in \mathcal{C}(\gamma_j, \gamma_{-j}^*)} \mathbb{E}_x [V_j (g_j (\gamma_j, c_j(\gamma_j, \gamma_{-j}^*, x)), g_{-j} (\gamma_{-j}^*, c_{-j}(\gamma_j, \gamma_{-j}^*, x)), x)] \quad (10)$$

A principal's equilibrium payoff in a strongly robust PBE is compared to his payoff based on continuation equilibrium strategies of communicating with all principals that are *best* for him upon his deviation to any mechanism. The literature has not identified the set of strongly robust PBE allocations nor the greatest lower bound of each principal's strongly robust PBE payoff even in terms of mechanisms allowed in the game.

I propose a new notion of equilibrium. For all  $\gamma \in \Gamma$ , let  $\mathcal{C}_{-j}(\gamma)$  be the projection of  $\mathcal{C}(\gamma)$  onto the space of strategies of communicating with principals except for  $j$ . For all  $\gamma \in \Gamma$ , all  $c_{-j}(\gamma) \in \mathcal{C}_{-j}(\gamma)$ , let us define the set of strategies of communicating with principal  $j$  as follows

$$\mathcal{C}_j(\gamma | c_{-j}(\gamma)) := \{c_j(\gamma) : (c_j(\gamma), c_{-j}(\gamma)) \in \mathcal{C}(\gamma)\}.$$

**Definition 4**  $(\gamma^*, c^*)$  is a robust PBE of a general competing mechanism game with  $\Gamma$  if

(i)  $c^*(\gamma) \in \mathcal{C}(\gamma)$  for all  $\gamma \in \Gamma$  and

(ii) for all  $j \in \mathcal{J}$ , all  $\gamma_j \in \Gamma_j$ , and all  $c_j(\gamma_j, \gamma_{-j}^*) \in \mathcal{C}_j(\gamma_j, \gamma_{-j}^* | c_{-j}^*(\gamma_j, \gamma_{-j}^*))$ ,

$$\mathbb{E}_x [V_j (g_j (\gamma_j^*, c_j^*(\gamma^*, x)), g_{-j} (\gamma_{-j}^*, c_{-j}^*(\gamma^*, x)), x)] \geq \mathbb{E}_x [V_j (g_j (\gamma_j, c_j(\gamma_j, \gamma_{-j}^*, x)), g_{-j} (\gamma_{-j}^*, c_{-j}(\gamma_j, \gamma_{-j}^*, x)), x)]. \quad (11)$$

Suppose that principal  $j$  deviates to  $\gamma_j$ . The robustness of a PBE  $(\gamma^*, c^*)$  examines whether or not there exist profitable continuation-equilibrium strategies  $c_j(\gamma_j, \gamma_{-j}^*)$  of communicating with principal  $j$ , *given* the continuation-equilibrium strategies  $c_{-j}^*(\gamma_j, \gamma_{-j}^*)$  of communicating with non-deviating principals, which is specified in the PBE  $(\gamma^*, c^*)$ . Robust PBE is weaker than strongly robust PBE but stronger than PBE. Condition (ii) for a robust PBE is equivalent to the following condition: For all  $j$  and all  $\gamma_j \in \Gamma_j$

$$\mathbb{E}_x [V_j (g_j (\gamma_j^*, c_j^*(\gamma^*, x)), g_{-j} (\gamma_{-j}^*, c_{-j}^*(\gamma^*, x)), x)] \geq \inf_{c_{-j}(\gamma_j, \gamma_{-j}^*) \in \mathcal{C}_{-j}(\gamma_j, \gamma_{-j}^*)} \sup_{c_j(\gamma_j, \gamma_{-j}^*) \in \mathcal{C}_j(\gamma_j, \gamma_{-j}^* | c_{-j}^*(\gamma_j, \gamma_{-j}^*))} \mathbb{E}_x [V_j (g_j (\gamma_j, c_j(\gamma_j, \gamma_{-j}^*, x)), g_{-j} (\gamma_{-j}^*, c_{-j}(\gamma_j, \gamma_{-j}^*, x)), x)] \quad (12)$$

A PBE or strongly PBE are the two extreme polar cases in terms of a principal's belief on what kind of communication strategies he can persuade agents to play upon his deviation. In a PBE, a principal is pessimistic in that he believes agents would choose a profile of continuation equilibrium strategies of communicating with all principals that are worst for him upon his deviation: He believes that he could not convince them to choose communication strategies that are better for him. On the other hand, in a strongly robust PBE, a principal is optimistic in that he believes agents would choose a profile of continuation equilibrium strategies of communicating with all principals that are best for him upon his deviation: Non-deviating principals believe they could not convince them to choose communication strategies that punishes the deviating principal more severely.

In a robust PBE, a principal believes that he can persuade agents to follow only what kind of strategies of communicating with *himself* upon his deviation, taking agents' communication with non-deviating principals as given. Given such limited persuasion, non-deviating principals believe they can partially persuade agents, that is, to follow what kind of strategies of communicating with themselves. The notion of robust PBE is based on the view that agents may not fully serve the deviating principal's interest only or the non-deviating principals' interest only, in contrast to and a PBE and a strongly robust PBE. In a robust PBE, agents partially serve both the deviating principal and the non-deviating principals. Since agents are common agents for all principals, it seems reasonable for agents to (partially) serve both of them.

If a principal's payoff does not depend on the other principals' actions, the notion of robust PBE coincides with that of strongly robust PBE. However, a principal's payoff often depends on the other principals' actions in practice: For example, a country's preference ranking on its own trade policies depends on the other countries trade policies; a policy maker's preference ranking over fiscal policies depends on not only central banker's monetary policy; a seller's profit associated with introducing a line of differentiated products depends on what types of differentiated products competing sellers launch in the market. If a principal's payoff does not depend on his own action, the notion of robust PBE coincides with that of PBE. Generally, when a principal's payoff depend both his own action and the other principals' actions, the notion of robust PBE is weaker than that of strongly robust PBE but stronger than that of PBE.

I characterize the set of robust PBE allocations and show that the greatest lower bound of each principals' robust PBE payoff in the general competing mechanism game is greater than that in the standard competing mechanism game. The same thing can be shown for the notion of PBE. One advantage of the notion of robust PBE is that the incentive compatibility alone is sufficient to characterize the set of robust equilibrium allocations given

the separability of agents' utility functions. This point is explained in details in Section 5.

## 4 Robust Equilibrium Characterization

Now we fully characterize the set of robust PBE allocations in the general competing mechanism game. The greatest lower bound of each principal's robust PBE payoff is his minmax value over the set of all BIC direct mechanisms.

To see this, let us first define incentive compatible direct mechanisms. Let us denote principal  $j$ 's direct mechanism by  $\pi_j : X \rightarrow \Delta(A_j)$ . A profile of direct mechanisms  $\pi = (\pi_1, \dots, \pi_J)$  is *Bayesian incentive compatible* (BIC) if for all  $i \in \mathcal{I}$ , a.e.  $x_i \in X_i$ , and all  $x_{i1}, \dots, x_{iJ} \in X_i$

$$\mathbb{E}_{x_{-i}} [U_i(\pi_1(x), \dots, \pi_J(x), x_{-i}, x_i) | x_i] \geq \mathbb{E}_{x_{-i}} [U_i(\pi_1(x_{i1}, x_{-i}), \dots, \pi_J(x_{iJ}, x_{-i}), x_{-i}, x_i) | x_i]. \quad (13)$$

Let  $\Pi^B$  be the set of all BIC profiles of direct mechanisms.

Principal  $j$ 's direct mechanism is *individually BIC* if for all  $i \in \mathcal{I}$ , a.e.  $x_i \in X_i$ , and  $x_{ij} \in X_i$ ,

$$\mathbb{E}_{x_{-i}} [U_{ij}(\pi_j(x_i, x_{-i}), x_{-i}, x_i) | x_i] \geq \mathbb{E}_{x_{-i}} [U_{ij}(\pi_j(x_{ij}, x_{-i}), x_{-i}, x_i) | x_i]. \quad (14)$$

Let  $\Pi_j^B$  be the set of all individually BIC direct mechanisms for principal  $j$ .

**Lemma 1**  $\Pi^B = \Pi_1^B \times \dots \times \Pi_J^B$ .

**Proof.** Consider any BIC profile of direct mechanisms  $\pi = (\pi_1, \dots, \pi_J) \in \Pi^B$ . Because  $\pi$  is BIC as a whole, we have that for all  $j \in \mathcal{J}$ , all  $i \in \mathcal{I}$ , a.e.  $x_i \in X_i$ , and all  $x_{ij} \in X_i$ ,

$$\sum_{k=1}^J \mathbb{E}_{x_{-i}} [U_{ik}(\pi_k(x), x_{-i}, x_i) | x_i] \geq \mathbb{E}_{x_{-i}} [U_{ij}(\pi_j(x_{ij}, x_i), x_{-i}, x_i) | x_i] + \sum_{k \neq j} \mathbb{E}_{x_{-i}} [U_{ik}(\pi_k(x), x_{-i}, x_i) | x_i],$$

The inequality above implies that for all  $i \in \mathcal{I}$ , a.e.  $x_i \in X_i$ , and all  $x_{ij} \in X_i$ ,

$$\mathbb{E}_{x_{-i}} [U_{ij}(\pi_j(x_i, x_{-i}), x_{-i}, x_i) | x_i] \geq \mathbb{E}_{x_{-i}} [U_{ij}(\pi_j(x_{ij}, x_{-i}), x_{-i}, x_i) | x_i].$$



This means that  $\pi_j$  is individually BIC and hence  $\pi_j \in \Pi_j^B$  for all  $j \in \mathcal{J}$ . Therefore,  $\pi = (\pi_1, \dots, \pi_J) \in \Pi_1^B \times \dots \times \Pi_J^B$ .

It is straightforward to show that any profile of individually BIC direct mechanisms  $\pi = (\pi_1, \dots, \pi_J) \in \Pi_1^B \times \dots \times \Pi_J^B$  is also a BIC profile of direct mechanisms, i.e.,  $\pi = (\pi_1, \dots, \pi_J) \in \Pi^B$ . ■

Lemma 1 shows that the set of BIC profiles of direct mechanisms is the Cartesian product of individually BIC direct mechanisms. This is due to the separability of the agent's payoff function with respect to principals' actions.

$\Pi_j^B$  is a compact convex set. It is straightforward to show that  $\Pi_j^B$  is a convex set because  $\lambda\pi_j + (1 - \lambda)\pi'_j$  is also BIC for all  $\pi_j, \pi'_j \in \Pi_j^B$  and all  $\lambda \in [0, 1]$ . I provide the proof of the compactness of  $\Pi_j^B$  below.

**Proposition 1**  $\Pi_j^B$  is compact for all  $j \in \mathcal{J}$ .

**Proof.** Let  $\Pi_j$  be the set of all possible (measurable) mappings  $\pi_j : X \rightarrow \Delta(A_j)$ . Let us take the uniform metric  $d_\infty(\pi_j, \pi'_j)$  for all  $\pi_j, \pi'_j \in \Pi_j$  such that

$$d_\infty(\pi_j, \pi'_j) = \sup \{d(\pi_j(x), \pi'_j(x)) : x \in X\},$$

where  $d(\pi_j(x), \pi'_j(x))$  is the Lévy–Prokhorov metric (Prokhorov (1956)). Because the Lévy–Prokhorov metric is a metric on probability measures and it is always no greater than 1, we have that  $d_\infty(\pi_j, \pi'_j) \leq 1$  for all  $\pi_j, \pi'_j \in \Pi_j$ . Therefore,  $\Pi_j$  is bounded. Because  $\Pi_j^B \subset \Pi_j$ ,  $\Pi_j^B$  is bounded for all  $j \in \mathcal{J}$ .

$\Pi_j^B$  is closed if and only if every convergent sequence  $\{\pi_j^k\}$  in  $\Pi_j^B$  has its limit  $\pi_j^*$  in  $\Pi_j^B$ . On contrary, suppose that there exists a convergent sequence  $\{\pi_j^k\}$  in  $\Pi_j^B$  with  $\pi_j^* \notin \Pi_j^B$ , that is for some  $i \in \mathcal{I}$  and some  $D_i \subset X_i$  with positive measure,  $\pi_j^*$  violates (14) for all  $x_i \in D_i$ . Because  $\{\pi_j^k\}$  converges to  $\pi_j^*$ , there exists  $K$  such that  $\pi_j^k$  also violates (14) for all  $x_i \in D_i$  and all  $k \geq K$ . This contradicts that  $\{\pi_j^k\}$  is in  $\Pi_j^B$ . Therefore,  $\Pi_j^B$  is closed for all  $j \in \mathcal{J}$ . ■

The key for the closedness of  $\Pi_j^B$  is that the incentive compatibility in (14) is defined with weak inequality. For  $\pi = (\pi_1, \dots, \pi_J) \in \Pi^B$ , principal  $j$ 's expected payoff is

$$\mathbb{E}_x [V_j(\pi_1(x), \dots, \pi_J(x), x)] = \int_X V_j(\pi_1(x), \dots, \pi_J(x), x) dF. \quad (15)$$

Since (15) is linear in each  $\Pi_j^B$  and each  $\Pi_j^B$  is compact, we can then apply Berge's Maximum Theorem (Aliprantis and Border (1999)) to show that  $\min_{\pi_{-j} \in \Pi_{-j}^B} \max_{\pi_j \in \Pi_j^B} \mathbb{E}_x [V_j(\pi_j(x), \pi_{-j}(x), x)]$  is well defined.

Recall that given  $\gamma \in \Gamma$ , a profile of communication strategies  $c(\gamma)$  induces a direct mechanism for each principal  $j \in \mathcal{J}$ ,

$$g_j(\gamma_j, c_{0j}(\gamma_k), c_{1j}(\gamma, \cdot), \dots, c_{Ij}(\gamma, \cdot)).$$

Lemma 2 below shows that the continuation-equilibrium strategies of communicating with a principal always induce an individually BIC direct mechanism from his mechanism.

**Lemma 2** *Given any  $\gamma \in \Gamma$  and any  $c(\gamma) \in \mathcal{C}(\gamma)$ ,*

$$g_j(\gamma_j, c_{0j}(\gamma_j), c_{1j}(\gamma, \cdot), \dots, c_{Ij}(\gamma, \cdot)) \in \Pi_j^B \text{ for all } j \in \mathcal{J}$$

**Proof.** Fix a profile of mechanisms  $\gamma \in \Gamma$  and a continuation equilibrium  $c(\gamma) \in \mathcal{C}(\gamma)$ . Suppose that  $g_j(\gamma_j, c_{0j}(\gamma_j), c_{1j}(\gamma, \cdot), \dots, c_{Ij}(\gamma, \cdot))$  is not individually BIC. That means that for some  $j$ , some  $i$ , some  $B_i \subset X_i$  with  $F(B_i, X_{-i}) > 0$ , and all  $x_i \in B_i$ , there exists  $x'_i \neq x_i$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{x_{-i}} [U_{ij}(g_j(\gamma_j, c_{0j}(\gamma_j), c_{-ij}(\gamma, x_{-i}), c_{ij}(\gamma, x'_i)), x_{-i}, x_i) | x_i] > \\ \mathbb{E}_{x_{-i}} [U_{ij}(g_j(\gamma_j, c_{0j}(\gamma_j), c_{-ij}(\gamma, x_{-i}), c_{ij}(\gamma, x_i)), x_{-i}, x_i) | x_i]. \end{aligned}$$

This contradicts that  $c_{ij}(\gamma, \cdot)$  is agent  $i$ 's continuation-equilibrium strategy of communicating with principal  $j$  given  $\gamma$ . Therefore,  $g_j(\gamma_j, c_{0j}(\gamma_j), c_{1j}(\gamma, \cdot), \dots, c_{Ij}(\gamma, \cdot))$  must be individually BIC for all  $j \in \mathcal{J}$ . ■

Let  $\Pi_R^*$  be the set of all robust PBE allocations of a general competing mechanism game with  $\Gamma$ :

$$\Pi_R^* := \{(g_k(\gamma_k^*, c_{0k}^*(\gamma_k^*), c_{1k}^*(\gamma^*, \cdot), \dots, c_{Ik}^*(\gamma^*, \cdot)))_{k \in \mathcal{J}} \in \Pi^B : (\gamma^*, c^*) \text{ is a robust PBE.}\}.$$

Our main result is that  $\Pi_R^*$  is characterized by only BIC direct mechanisms without reference to  $\Gamma$ . For all  $j \in \mathcal{J}$ , let

$$\underline{V}_j = \min_{\pi_{-j} \in \Pi_{-j}^B} \max_{\pi_j \in \Pi_j^B} \mathbb{E}_x [V_j(\pi_j(x), \pi_{-j}(x), x)]. \quad (16)$$

**Theorem 1** *The set of robust PBE allocations of a general competing mechanism game with  $\Gamma$  is*

$$\Pi_R^* = \{\pi \in \Pi^B : \mathbb{E}_x [V_j(\pi(x), x)] \geq \underline{V}_j \text{ for all } j \in \mathcal{J}\}. \quad (17)$$

**Proof.** We first show that any robust PBE allocation must generate a payoff no less than  $\underline{V}_j$  for all  $j \in \mathcal{J}$ . Fix a robust PBE  $(\gamma^*, c^*)$ . On contrary, suppose that for some  $j \in \mathcal{J}$

$$\mathbb{E}_x [V_j (g_j (\gamma_j^*, c_j^*(\gamma^*, x)), g_{-j} (\gamma_{-j}^*, c_{-j}^*(\gamma^*, x)), x)] < \underline{V}_j. \quad (18)$$

Suppose that principal  $j$  unilaterally deviates to  $\gamma'_j : M_j \rightarrow \Delta(A_j)$  such that, with a slight abuse of notation, (i)  $M_{0j} = \Pi_j^B$ , (ii)  $M_{ij} = X_i$  for all  $i \in \mathcal{I}$ , (iii) for all  $\pi_j \in M_{0j}$  and all  $x_{ij} \in X_i$  for all  $i \in \mathcal{I}$ ,

$$\gamma'_j (\pi_j, x_{1j}, \dots, x_{Ij}) = \pi_j (x_{1j}, \dots, x_{Ij}). \quad (19)$$

This is a general mechanism where principal  $j$  chooses his direct mechanism from  $\Pi_j^B$  and agents send their type messages at the same time.<sup>7</sup>

Now we can construct continuation-equilibrium strategies of communicating with principal  $j$  that provides a higher payoff for principal  $j$  than his PBE payoff, *given* continuation-equilibrium strategies  $c_{-j}^*(\gamma'_j, \gamma_{-j}^*)$  of communicating with non-deviating principals. For this, we first show that we can keep continuation-equilibrium strategies  $c_{-j}^*(\gamma'_j, \gamma_{-j}^*)$  of communicating with non-deviating principals regardless of continuation-equilibrium strategies of communicating with principal  $j$ .

Note that principal  $j$ 's deviation to  $\gamma'_j$  is not observable by non-deviating principals so that they do not change their messages to themselves, i.e.,  $c_{0k}(\gamma_k^*) = c_{0k}^*(\gamma_k^*)$  for all  $k \neq j$ . Now consider agents' communication with every principal  $k \neq j$ . Because  $c^*(\gamma'_j, \gamma_{-j}^*)$  is a continuation equilibrium, we have that for all  $k \neq j$ , all  $i \in \mathcal{I}$ , a.e.  $x_i \in X_i$  and all  $\mu_{ik} \in \Delta(M_{ik})$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{x_{-i}} [U_{ik} (g_k (\gamma_k^*, c_{0k}^*(\gamma_k^*), c_{1k}^*(\gamma'_j, \gamma_{-j}^*, x_1), \dots, c_{Ik}^*(\gamma'_j, \gamma_{-j}^*, x_I)), x_{-i}, x_i) | x_i] \geq \\ \mathbb{E}_{x_{-i}} [U_{ik} (g_k (\gamma_k^*, c_{0k}^*(\gamma_k^*), \mu_{ik}, c_{-ik}^*(\gamma'_j, \gamma_{-j}^*, x_{-i})), x_{-i}, x_i) | x_i]. \end{aligned}$$

This implies that we can also keep each agent  $i$ 's strategy  $c_{ik}^*(\gamma'_j, \gamma_{-j}^*, \cdot)$  of communicating with each non-deviating principal  $k$  for continuation-equilibrium strategies of communicating with principal  $j$  at  $(\gamma'_j, \gamma_{-j}^*)$ . Therefore, we fix

$$c_{-j}^*(\gamma'_j, \gamma_{-j}^*). \quad (20)$$

for continuation-equilibrium strategies of communicating with non-deviating principals re-

---

<sup>7</sup>A precise formulation of such a mechanism  $\gamma'_j : M_j \rightarrow A_j$  can be given as follows.  $M_{ij}$  is homeomorphic to  $X_i$ , there exists a homeomorphism  $\xi_{ij} : X_i \rightarrow M_{ij}$  and  $M_{0j}$  is homeomorphic to  $\eta_j(\Pi_j^B)$ , that is, there exists an homeomorphism  $\varrho_{0j} : \eta_j(\Pi_j^B) \rightarrow M_{0j}$ , where  $\eta_j$  is an embedding  $\eta_j : \Pi_j^B \rightarrow \bar{\Gamma}_j$ .

regardless of continuation-equilibrium strategies of communicating with principal  $j$ .

Now consider how to construct continuation-equilibrium strategies of communicating with principal  $j$  that are best for principal  $j$  upon his deviation to  $\gamma'_j$ . Note that  $g_k(\gamma_k^*, c_k^*(\gamma'_j, \gamma_{-j}^*, \cdot))$  is individually BIC for all  $k \neq j$  by Lemma 2. Then, with a slight abuse of notation, let principal  $j$  choose a degenerate probability distribution  $c_{0j}(\gamma'_j) \in M_{0j} = \Pi_j^B$  satisfying

$$c_{0j}(\gamma'_j) \in \arg \max_{\pi_j \in \Pi_j^B} \mathbb{E}_x [V_j(\pi_j(x), g_{-j}(\gamma_{-j}^*, c_{-j}^*(\gamma'_j, \gamma_{-j}^*, x)), x)], \quad (21)$$

and let each agent choose a non-degenerate probability distribution that chooses her true type with probability one and send it to principal  $j$ , i.e., for all  $i \in \mathcal{I}$  and a.e.  $x_i \in X_i$

$$c_{ij}(\gamma'_j, \gamma_{-j}^*, x_i) = x_i. \quad (22)$$

Principal  $j$  takes  $g_k(\gamma_k^*, c_k^*(\gamma'_j, \gamma_{-j}^*, \cdot))$  for all  $k \neq j$  as given. Given agents' truthful type reporting to him,  $c_{0j}(\gamma'_j)$  satisfying (21) is clearly principal  $j$ 's optimal choice of a direct mechanism in  $M_{0j} = \Pi_j^B$ . Given principal  $j$ 's choice of a BIC direct mechanism  $\pi_j = c_{0j}(\gamma'_j)$ , truthful type reporting (i.e., (22)) is also optimal for every agent  $i$  of a.e.  $x_i \in X_i$ . Therefore, (20), (21) and (22) constitute a *continuation equilibrium* at  $(\gamma'_j, \gamma_{-j}^*)$ .

Because  $g_{-j}(\gamma_{-j}^*, c_{-j}^*(\gamma'_j, \gamma_{-j}^*, \cdot)) \in \Pi_{-j}^B$ , principal  $j$ 's payoff in this continuation equilibrium upon deviation to  $\gamma'_j$  is no less than  $\underline{V}_j$ :

$$\max_{\pi_j \in \Pi_j^B} \mathbb{E}_x [V_j(\pi_j(x), g_{-j}(\gamma_{-j}^*, c_{-j}^*(\gamma'_j, \gamma_{-j}^*, x)), x)] \geq \underline{V}_j \quad (23)$$

(18) and (23) show that

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{\pi_j \in \Pi_j^B} \mathbb{E}_x [V_j(\pi_j(x), g_{-j}(\gamma_{-j}^*, c_{-j}^*(\gamma'_j, \gamma_{-j}^*, x)), x)] > \\ \mathbb{E}_x [V_j(g_j(\gamma_j^*, c_j^*(\gamma^*, x)), g_{-j}(\gamma_{-j}^*, c_{-j}^*(\gamma^*, x)), x)] \end{aligned}$$

and hence principal  $j$ 's payoff in this continuation equilibrium is greater than his equilibrium payoff. Because this continuation equilibrium upon deviation to  $\gamma'_j$  is constructed with (20), (11) in the definition of a robust PBE is violated. Therefore, any robust PBE allocation must be in the set on the right hand side of (17)

To complete the proof, we need to show how to construct a robust PBE to support an allocation in the set on the right hand side of (17). Consider an allocation  $\pi^* = (\pi_1^*, \dots, \pi_J^*)$  in the set on the right hand side of (17). For each  $k \in \mathcal{J}$ , we consider the following *deviator-reporting mechanism*  $\gamma_k^\star : M_{1k} \times \dots \times M_{Ik} \rightarrow \Delta(A_k)$ , where, with a slight abuse of notation,

$M_{ik} = \{1, \dots, J\} \times X_i$  (precisely,  $M_{ik}$  is homeomorphic to  $\{1, \dots, J\} \times X_i$ , that is there exists a homeomorphism  $\vartheta_{ik} : \{1, \dots, J\} \times X_i \rightarrow M_{ik}$ ). Note that a deviator-reporting mechanism is a standard mechanism in  $\bar{\Gamma}_k$  where the principal does not send a message to himself. In this deviator-reporting mechanism, each agent sends a message on who the deviator is, if any, and her type. If more than a half of agents report  $j \neq k$  as the deviator, principal  $k$  assigns a BIC direct mechanism  $\pi_k^j$  that punishes principal  $k$ . Otherwise, he assigns  $\pi_k^*$ . We choose the following BIC direct mechanism for  $\pi_k^j$ . For all  $j \in \mathcal{J}$ , then  $\pi_k^j$  is principal  $k$ 's BIC direct mechanism in  $\pi_{-j}^j$  satisfying

$$\pi_{-j}^j = (\pi_k^j)_{k \neq j} \in \arg \min_{\pi_{-j} \in \Pi_{-j}^B} \left[ \max_{\pi_j \in \Pi_j^B} \mathbb{E}_x [V_j(\pi_j(x), \pi_{-j}(x), x)] \right]. \quad (24)$$

(24) implies that

$$\mathbb{E}_x [V_j(\pi^*(x), x)] \geq \max_{\pi_j \in \Pi_j^B} \mathbb{E}_x [V_j(\pi_j(x), \pi_{-j}^j(x), x)] = \underline{V}_j \quad (25)$$

because  $\pi^* = (\pi_1^*, \dots, \pi_J^*)$  in the set on the right hand side of (17).

Principal  $k$ 's deviator-reporting mechanism is constructed as follows. For all  $((\ell_{1k}, x_{1k}), \dots, (\ell_{Ik}, x_{Ik})) \in \times_{i \in \mathcal{I}} M_{ik}$ ,

$$\gamma_k^\star((\ell_{1k}, x_{1k}), \dots, (\ell_{Ik}, x_{Ik})) = \begin{cases} \pi_k^j(x_{1k}, \dots, x_{Ik}) & \text{if } \#\{\ell_{ik} = j \text{ for } j \neq k\} > I/2 \\ \pi_k^*(x_{1k}, \dots, x_{Ik}) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (26)$$

Every principal  $k$  offers the mechanism  $\gamma_k^\star$  specified in (26). Suppose that no principal deviates. Then, each agent  $i$  of a.e.  $x_i \in X_i$  truthfully reports  $x_i$  to every principal  $k$  along with the message  $\ell_{ik} = k$ . Then  $\gamma_k^\star$  implements  $\pi_k^*(x_1, \dots, x_I)$ . Since there are three or more agents, any single agent  $i$ 's deviation from  $\ell_{ik} = k$  does not prevent principal  $k$  from implementing  $\pi_k^*(x_1, \dots, x_I)$ . Because  $\pi_k^*$  is individually BIC, such communication behavior constitutes a continuation equilibrium and each principal  $k$  receives the payoff of  $\mathbb{E}_x [V_k(\pi^*(x), x)]$ .

Suppose that principal  $j$  deviates to a general mechanism  $\gamma_j : M_j \rightarrow \Delta(A_j)$ . Then, each agent  $i$  of a.e.  $x_i \in X_i$  truthfully reports  $x_i$  to every principal  $k \neq j$  along with the message  $\ell_{ik} = j$ . Then,  $\gamma_k^\star$  implements  $\pi_k^j(x_1, \dots, x_I)$ . Because  $\pi_k^j$  is individually BIC, we can fix such communication behavior for a continuation equilibrium upon principal  $j$ 's deviation to  $\gamma_j$ . Let  $(c_{0j}(\gamma_j), c_{1j}(\gamma_j, \gamma_{-j}^\star, \cdot), \dots, c_{Ij}(\gamma_j, \gamma_{-j}^\star, \cdot))$  be arbitrary continuation-equilibrium

strategies of communicating with principal  $j$  upon  $j$ 's deviation to  $\gamma_j$ . Then, it is clear that

$$g_j \left( \gamma_j, c_{0j}(\gamma_j), c_{1j}(\gamma_j, \gamma_{-j}^\star, \cdot), \dots, c_{Ij}(\gamma_j, \gamma_{-j}^\star, \cdot) \right) \in \Pi_j^B. \quad (27)$$

Because of (27), we have that

$$\max_{\pi_j \in \Pi_j^B} \mathbb{E}_x [V_j(\pi_j(x), \pi_{-j}^j(x), x)] \geq \mathbb{E}_x \left[ V_j \left( g_j \left( \gamma_j, c_j(\gamma_j, \gamma_{-j}^\star, x) \right), \pi_{-j}^j(x), x \right) \right] \quad (28)$$

where  $c_j(\gamma_j, \gamma_{-j}^\star, x) = (c_{0j}(\gamma_j), c_{1j}(\gamma_j, \gamma_{-j}^\star, x_1), \dots, c_{Ij}(\gamma_j, \gamma_{-j}^\star, x_I))$ . Note that the expression on the right hand side of (28) is principal  $j$ 's payoff in a continuation equilibrium upon deviation to  $\gamma_j$ . Combining (25) and (28) yields

$$\mathbb{E}_x [V_j(\pi^*(x), x)] \geq \mathbb{E}_x \left[ V_j \left( g_j \left( \gamma_j, c_j(\gamma_j, \gamma_{-j}^\star, x) \right), \pi_{-j}^j(x), x \right) \right], \quad (29)$$

which shows that principal  $j$  cannot gain upon deviation to  $\gamma_j$ . (29) implies that  $\pi^* = (\pi_1^*, \dots, \pi_j^*)$  is supported as a robust PBE allocation because the first argument  $g_j \left( \gamma_j, c_j(\gamma_j, \gamma_{-j}^\star, x) \right)$  on the right-hand side of (29) is derived with any continuation-equilibrium strategies of communicating with principal  $j$ ,  $\left( c_{0j}(\gamma_j), c_{1j}(\gamma_j, \gamma_{-j}^\star, \cdot), \dots, c_{Ij}(\gamma_j, \gamma_{-j}^\star, \cdot) \right)$ , given agents' truth telling to non-deviating principals. ■

The proof of Theorem 1 first establishes that a principal's payoff in a robust PBE  $(\gamma^*, c^*)$  cannot be lower than his minmax value over BIC direct mechanisms. Given continuation-equilibrium strategies  $c_{-j}^*$  of communicating with non-deviating principals, principal  $j$  can deviate to a general mechanism  $\gamma'_j$  where he can choose any BIC direct mechanism from  $\Pi_j^B$  and agents send their type messages to principal  $j$  at the same time. Given the robustness of PBE, principal  $j$  can implement the BIC direct mechanism from  $\Pi_j^B$  that maximizes his payoff, taking  $g_{-j}(\gamma_{-j}^*, c_{-j}^*(\gamma'_j, \gamma_{-j}^*, \cdot)) \in \Pi_{-j}^B$  as given. This directly implies that principal  $j$ 's robust PBE payoff cannot be lower than his minmax value over BIC direct mechanisms.

The proof of Theorem 1 is completed by constructing the deviator-reporting mechanism to show how to support any profile of BIC direct mechanisms that provides every principal a payoff no less than his minmax value over BIC direct mechanisms as a robust PBE allocation.

The existence of a robust PBE with deviator-reporting mechanisms can be addressed. First consider a continuation equilibrium upon principal  $j$ 's deviation to a general mechanism  $\gamma_j$ . If principal  $j$  deviates, the truth-telling continuation equilibrium that implements  $\pi_{-j}^j$  is also well established and exists when it comes to communicating with non-deviating principals.

One may wonder if there is a (mixed-strategy) continuation equilibrium

$$\left( c_{0j}(\gamma_j), c_{1j}(\gamma_j, \gamma_{-j}^\star, \cdot), \dots, c_{Ij}(\gamma_j, \gamma_{-j}^\star, \cdot) \right)$$

exists for communicating with deviating principal  $j$  upon his deviation to a general mechanism  $\gamma_j$ . When agents and principal  $j$  send messages to principal  $j$  given his mechanism  $\gamma_j$ , they take  $\pi_{-j}^j$  as given. For all  $(m_{0j}, m_{1j}, \dots, m_{Ij}) \in M_j$  and all  $x \in X$ , principal  $j$ 's payoff for the subgame defined by  $\gamma_j$  follows

$$\mathcal{V}_j(m_{0j}, m_{1j}, \dots, m_{Ij}, x) := V_j(\gamma_j(m_{0j}, m_{1j}, \dots, m_{Ij}), \pi_{-j}^j(x), x). \quad (30)$$

Because the agent's payoff function is separable with respect to principals' actions, the agent's relevant payoff for the subgame defined by  $\gamma_j$  is

$$\mathcal{U}_{ij}(m_{0j}, m_{1j}, \dots, m_{Ij}, x) := U_{ij}(\gamma_j(m_{0j}, m_{1j}, \dots, m_{Ij}), x). \quad (31)$$

If  $\mathcal{V}_j$  and  $\mathcal{U}_{ij}$  and the information structure satisfy the sufficient conditions for the existence of a Bayesian equilibrium with continuous actions identified in the literature (Balder (1988), Hellman and Levy (2017), Milgrom and Weber (1985), etc.), then a continuation equilibrium for the subgame defined by  $\gamma_j$  exists.<sup>8</sup>

Because any (mixed) continuation-equilibrium strategies

$$\left( c_{0j}(\gamma_j), c_{1j}(\gamma_j, \gamma_{-j}^\star, \cdot), \dots, c_{Ij}(\gamma_j, \gamma_{-j}^\star, \cdot) \right)$$

upon deviation to any mechanism  $\gamma_j$  induces a BIC direct mechanism

$$g_j \left( \gamma_j, c_{0j}(\gamma_j), c_{1j}(\gamma_j, \gamma_{-j}^\star, \cdot), \dots, c_{Ij}(\gamma_j, \gamma_{-j}^\star, \cdot) \right) \in \Pi_j^B,$$

the notion of robustness makes it possible for principal  $j$  to focus on any BIC direct mechanism in  $\Pi_j^B$  for his deviation. Because the notion of robustness is imposed only on the continuation equilibrium of communicating with a deviating principal, it also allows the other principals to induce any BIC direct mechanisms in  $\Pi_{-j}^B$  to punish principal  $j$  upon his deviation. The existence of a robust PBE of a general competing mechanism game with  $\Gamma$

---

<sup>8</sup>For example,  $\mathcal{V}_j$  and  $\mathcal{U}_{ij}$  are uniformly continuous and the information structure is absolutely continuous (Milgrom and Weber (1985)), then a (mixed-strategy) continuation equilibrium exists. However, the existence of a (mixed-strategy) continuation equilibrium for communicating with principal  $j$  upon his deviation should come naturally. When principal  $j$  deviates, he will certainly deviate to a mechanism that guarantees the existence of a (mixed-strategy) continuation equilibrium for communicating with him.

can be then assured if  $\Pi_R^* = \{\pi \in \Pi^B : \mathbb{E}_x [V_j(\pi(x), x)] \geq \underline{V}_j \text{ for all } j \in \mathcal{J}\}$  is non-empty.<sup>9</sup> Given the definition of  $\underline{V}_j$ ,  $\Pi_R^*$  is clearly non-empty.

## 5 Discussion

For a robust equilibrium, the standard competing mechanism game is restrictive in the sense that it takes the freedom of choosing any BIC direct mechanism away from a principal at the same time agents send messages to him given his mechanism. In the standard competing mechanism game, a deviating principal's payoff can be as low as his maxmin value over BIC direct mechanisms:

$$\max_{\pi_j \in \Pi_j^B} \min_{\pi_{-j} \in \Pi_{-j}^B} \mathbb{E}_x [V_j(\pi_j(x), \pi_{-j}(x), x)]$$

The reason is that agents' communication with the deviator alone induces a BIC direct mechanism from the deviator's mechanism and non-deviators can choose their BIC direct mechanisms conditional on agents' reports on the deviator's BIC direct mechanism that they induce from the deviator's mechanism.

When random mechanisms are allowed as in our paper and there are only two principals, the restrictive feature of the standard competing mechanism game is not a problem. To see this, we use Sion's minimax theorem.

**Theorem 2 (Sion's minimax theorem (1958))** *Let  $Y$  and  $Z$  be convex, compact spaces. If the real-valued function  $f$  on  $Y \times Z$  is quasi-concave and upper semi-continuous in  $Y$  and quasi-convex and lower semi-continuous in  $Z$ ,*

$$\inf_{y \in Y} \sup_{z \in Z} f(y, z) = \sup_{z \in Z} \inf_{y \in Y} f(y, z).$$

For the case of  $J = 2$ , it is easily shown that

$$\min_{\pi_{-j} \in \Pi_{-j}^B} \max_{\pi_j \in \Pi_j^B} \mathbb{E}_x [V_j(\pi_j(x), \pi_{-j}(x), x)] = \max_{\pi_j \in \Pi_j^B} \min_{\pi_{-j} \in \Pi_{-j}^B} \mathbb{E}_x [V_j(\pi_j(x), \pi_{-j}(x), x)] \quad (32)$$

---

<sup>9</sup>One way to check the non-emptiness is to check the existence of a pure-strategy PBE of a competing mechanism game with  $\Pi^B$  where each principal  $j$  offers an individually BIC direct mechanism. Since each  $\Pi_j^B$  is non-empty compact convex and  $\mathbb{E}_x [V_j(\pi(x), x)]$  is linear in each  $\Pi_j^B$ , a pure-strategy PBE based on truth telling exists (Glicksberg 1952, Fudenberg and Tirole 1991). A pure-strategy PBE allocation  $\pi$  of a competing mechanism game with  $\Pi^B$  certainly belongs to  $\Pi_R^*$ .

Without the separability of the agent's payoff function, the existence of a robust PBE is more difficult. The reason is that the BIC property of the profile of direct mechanisms  $\pi_{-j}$  in principal  $j$ 's payoff function in (30) depends on the mechanism  $\gamma_j$  chosen by principal  $j$ . It is not clear how to examine if the set of all profiles of BIC direct mechanisms that the other principals can implement conditional on each  $\gamma_j$  is compact and convex.



Since  $\Pi_k^B$  is a compact convex set for all  $k \in \mathcal{J}$ , the properties of the domain of the functions in Sion's Minimax Theorem (1958) are satisfied. Since  $\mathbb{E}_x [V_j(\pi_j(x), \pi_{-j}(x), x)]$  is linear in each  $\Pi_k^B$  we can apply Sion's Minimax Theorem to establish (32).

In the case of  $J \geq 3$ , one cannot swap the max and min in (32). To see this reason, interpret  $\Pi_{-j}^B$  as the set of degenerate probability distributions that put probability one on a profile of individually BIC direct mechanisms for principals except for  $j$ . A convex combination between two such degenerate probability distributions creates correlation between two profiles of individually BIC direct mechanisms and such correlation is not feasible if we only focus on degenerate probability distributions that put probability one on a profile of individually BIC direct mechanisms. Therefore,  $\Pi_{-j}^B$  is not a convex set in terms of the probability measure space and hence one cannot apply Sion's Minimax Theorem (1958). Therefore, Szentes' critique is valid.

**Robust PBE vs. PBE** It can be also shown that Szentes' critique is valid for PBE as well. However, the set of PBE allocations cannot be characterized by incentive compatibility alone for PBE or robust PBE. To see this point, let  $\mathcal{C}_j^*(\pi_{-j}, \gamma_j)$  be the set of all continuation equilibrium strategies of communicating with principal  $j$  conditional on truth telling type reporting to the other principals given  $(\pi_{-j}, \gamma_j) \in \Pi_{-j}^B \times \Gamma_j$ . Using recommendation mechanisms for non-deviators' equilibrium mechanisms (Yamashita (2010)), I can show that the greatest lower bound of principal  $j$ 's PBE payoff is

$$\begin{aligned} \underline{V}_j^P &\equiv \min_{\pi_{-j} \in \Pi_{-j}^B} \max_{\gamma_j \in \Gamma_j} \min_{c_j(\pi_{-j}, \gamma_j) \in \mathcal{C}_j^*(\pi_{-j}, \gamma_j)} \mathbb{E}_x [V_j(\gamma_j(c_j(\pi_{-j}, \gamma_j, x)), \pi_{-j}(x), x)] \\ &= \min_{\pi_{-j} \in \Pi_{-j}^B} \max_{\pi_j \in \hat{\Pi}_j^B(\Gamma_j)} \mathbb{E}_x [V_j(\pi_j(x)), \pi_{-j}(x), x), \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\hat{\Pi}_j^B(\Gamma_j) \equiv \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \gamma_j(c_j(\pi_{-j}, \gamma_j, \cdot)) \in \Pi_j^B : \\ \text{(i) } \gamma_j \in \Gamma_j, \text{ (ii) } c_j(\pi_{-j}, \gamma_j) \in \mathcal{C}_j^*(\pi_{-j}, \gamma_j), \\ \text{(iii) } \mathbb{E}_x [V_j(\gamma_j(c_j(\pi_{-j}, \gamma_j, x)), \pi_{-j}(x), x)] \leq \\ \mathbb{E}_x [V_j(\gamma_j(c'_j(\pi_{-j}, \gamma_j, x)), \pi_{-j}(x), x)] \quad \forall c'_j(\pi_{-j}, \gamma_j) \in \mathcal{C}_j^*(\pi_{-j}, \gamma_j) \end{array} \right\}$$

It is clear that  $\hat{\Pi}_j^B(\Gamma_j) \subset \Pi_j^B$  but generally  $\hat{\Pi}_j^B(\Gamma_j)$  is not equal to  $\Pi_j^B$ . The reason is that given the other principals' BIC direct mechanisms  $\pi_{-j} \in \Pi_{-j}^B$ , some direct mechanisms in  $\Pi_j^B$  may not be induced by the worst continuation equilibrium regardless of his deviation to any mechanism in  $\Gamma_j$ .

Identifying the set of strongly robust equilibrium is challenging even in the standard competing mechanism game. It is not known how to characterize the greatest lower bound of each principal's strongly robust PBE payoff even in terms of mechanisms allowed in the game just like Yamashita (2010) does for the greatest lower bound of each principal's PBE equilibrium payoff.

Together with the separability assumption on agents' utility function, the notion of robust PBE allows us to focus on the incentive compatibility alone to identify the set of equilibrium allocations because  $\Pi_k^B$  is defined only with the incentive compatibility respectively for each  $k \in \mathcal{J}$ .

**Mixed strategies for principals** We have not considered mixed strategies for principals. This can be done easily. Consider the general competing mechanism game. When principal  $j$  deviates given that the other principals employ mixed strategies for their mechanism choice, he can deviate to a general mechanism where he asks agents not only about their types but also the BIC direct mechanisms  $\pi_{-j}$  induced from the other principals' mechanisms. Principal  $j$ 's message in this general mechanism is a mapping from  $\Pi_{-j}^B$  into  $\Pi_j^B$ , which specifies his choice of a BIC direct mechanism as a function of agents' reports on the other principals' BIC direct mechanisms. In this way, even in a mixed-strategy robust PBE, a deviating principal can always implement a BIC direct mechanism that maximizes his payoff conditional on BIC direct mechanisms induced by the other principals' mechanisms. Therefore, the greatest lower bound of principal  $j$ 's mixed-strategy robust PBE payoff is the same as the greatest lower bound of his pure-strategy robust PBE payoff, that is, his minmax value  $\underline{V}_j$  over BIC direct mechanisms. For all  $j$ , let

$$\Phi_j(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_J) := \int_{\Pi_1^B} \cdots \int_{\Pi_J^B} \mathbb{E}_x [V_j(\pi_1(x), \dots, \pi_J(x), x)] d\sigma_1 \cdots d\sigma_J,$$

where  $(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_J) \in \Delta(\Pi_1^B) \times \cdots \times \Delta(\Pi_J^B)$ . Then, the set of mixed-strategy robust PBE allocations of a general competing mechanism game with  $\Gamma$  is

$$\{(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_J) \in \Delta(\Pi_1^B) \times \cdots \times \Delta(\Pi_J^B) : \Phi_j(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_J) \geq \underline{V}_j \text{ for all } j \in \mathcal{J}\}.$$

## References

- [1] Aliprantis, C. D., and K. C. Border (1999), *Infinite Dimensional Analysis: A Hitchhiker's Guide*, 2nd Edition, Springer.

- [2] Attar, A., Majumdar, D., Oiaser, G., and N. Porteiro (2008), “Common Agency Games: Indifference and Separable Preferences,” *Mathematical Social Sciences*, 56, 75-95
- [3] Balder, E. J. (1988), “Generalized Equilibrium Results for Games with Incomplete Information,” *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 13(2), 265-276.
- [4] Bester, H. and R. Strausz (2000), “Imperfect Commitment and the Revelation Principle: the Multi-agent Case,” *Economics Letters*, 69(2), 165-171.
- [5] ————— (2007), “Contracting with Imperfect Commitment and Noisy Communication,” *Journal of Economic Theory*, 136(1), 236-259.
- [6] Dorval, L. and V. Skreta (2021), “Mechanism Design with Limited Commitment,” Papers 1811.03579, arXiv.org.
- [7] Epstein, L., and M. Peters (1999), “A Revelation Principle for Competing Mechanisms,” *Journal of Economic Theory*, 88 (1), 119–160.
- [8] Fudenberg, D. and J. Tirole (1991), “Game Theory,” Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- [9] Gershkov, A, J. K. Goeree, A. Kushnir, B. Moldovanu and X. Shi (2013), “On the Equivalence of Bayesian and Dominant Strategy Implementation,” *Econometrica*, 81(1), 197-220.
- [10] Glicksberg, I. L. (1952), “A Further Generalization of the Kakutani Fixed Point Theorem with Application to Nash Equilibrium Points,” *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 38, 170-174.
- [11] Han, S. (2006), “Menu Theorems for Bilateral Contracting,” *Journal of Economic Theory*, 131(1), 157-178.
- [12] ——— (2007), “Strongly Robust Equilibrium and Competing-Mechanism Games,” *Journal of Economic Theory*, 137, 610-626.
- [13] ——— (2012), “On Take It or Leave It Offers in Common Agency,” *Economics Letters*, 117, 777-781.
- [14] ——— (2021), “General Competing Mechanism Games with Strategy-Proof Punishment,” working paper, McMaster University.
- [15] Hellman, Z. and Y. J. Levy (2017), “Bayesian Games with a Continuum of States,” *Theoretical Economics*, 12(3), 1089-1120.
- [16] Martimort, D. and L. Stole (2002), “The Revelation and Delegation Principles in Common Agency Games,” *Econometrica* 70(4), 1659-73.
- [17] McAfee, P. (1993), “Mechanism Design by Competing Sellers,” *Econometrica*, 61(6), 1281-1312
- [18] Milgrom, P. R., and R. J. Weber (1985), “Distributional Strategies for Games with Incomplete Information,” *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 10(4), 619-632.

- [19] Page, F. H., and P. K. Monteiro (2003), “Three Principles of Competitive Nonlinear Pricing,” *Journal of Mathematical Economics*, 39(1-2), 63–109.
- [20] Pavan, A. and G. Calozlari (2010), “Truthful Revelation Mechanisms for Simultaneous Common Agency Games,” *American Economic Journal: Microeconomics* 2(2), 132-190.
- [21] Peters, M. (2001), “Common Agency and the Revelation Principle,” *Econometrica* 69(5), 1349-1372
- [22] Peters, M. (2003), “Negotiation and Take-it-or-leave-it in Common Agency,” *Journal of Economic Theory*, 111(1), 88-109
- [23] ——— (2007), “Errata - Negotiation and Take-it-or-leave-it in Common Agency,” *Journal of Economic Theory*, 135(1), 594-595
- [24] Peters, M., and B. Szentes (2012), “Definable and Contractible Contracts,” *Econometrica*, 80(1), 363-411
- [25] Prokhorov, Y. V. (1956), “Convergence of Random Processes and Limit Theorems in Probability Theory,” *Theory Probab. Appl.* , 1, 157–214 *Teor. Veroyatnost. i Primenen.*, 1:2, 177–238.
- [26] Sion, M. (1958), “On General Minimax Theorems,” *Pacific Journal of Mathematics*, 8(1), 171-176.
- [27] Szentes, B. (2010), “A note on ‘Mechanism games with multiple sellers and three or more buyers’ by T. Yamashita,” University College London, unpublished manuscript.
- [28] Szentes, B. (2015), “Contractible Contracts in Common Agency Problems,” *Review of Economic Studies*, 82(1), 391-422
- [29] Yamashita, T. (2010), “Mechanism games with multiple sellers and three or more buyers,” *Econometrica*, 78(2), 791-801.
- [30] Xiong, S. (2013), “A Folk Theorem for Contract Games with Multiple Principals and Agents,” working paper, Rice University