

Optimal Pricing Schemes in the Presence of Social Learning and Costly Reporting

Xi Weng*, Kaiwei Zhang†

November 23, 2022

Abstract

A monopoly platform sells either a risky product (with unknown utility) or a safe product (with known utility) to agents who sequentially arrive and learn the utility of the risky product by the reporting of previous agents. It is costly for agents to report utility; hence the platform has to design both the prices and the reporting bonus to motivate the agents to explore and generate new information. We characterize the optimal bonus and pricing schemes offered by the profit-maximizing platform. It turns out that the optimal scheme falls into one of four types: Full Coverage, Partial Coverage, Immediate Revelation, and Non-Bonus. In a model of exponential bandit, we find that there is a dynamical switch of the types along the learning trajectory. Although learning stops efficiently, information is revealed too slowly compared with the planner's optimal solution.

Keywords: Social Learning; Costly Reporting; Dynamic Pricing.

JEL. D83. C02. C61. C73.

*Guanghua School of Management, Peking University; wengxi125@gsm.pku.edu.cn.

†Guanghua School of Management, Peking University; ypzkw@pku.edu.cn.

1 ~~Intro~~

One of the most common features of online peer-to-peer market places is that the platform frequently does little up-front screening or certification and instead tries to maintain quality by using reputation and feedback mechanisms ([EFL16]). In particular, for the organization of online experience product markets such as houses on Airbnb or drivers on Uber, it crucially requires more consumers' reviews to relieve information asymmetry. Though the internet has made it feasible and common for everyone to leave some feedback after purchasing and experiencing, there is insufficient review supply in the real economy. According to some social surveys about online reviews, nearly 53 % of all internet users worldwide don't provide any reviews about a product, company, or service within a month¹; and only 5%-10% of consumers are used to writing reviews online².

Meanwhile, it is a common practice on online markets to utilize dynamic pricing and review bonus to motivate the consumers to purchase the experience product and leave feedback. For example, dynamic pricing is common in experience goods markets, such as video games and lead to an increase in both revenue and margins in the pilot categories³. Many online platforms such as Taobao also offer bonus for consumers' reviews. In the literature, however, dynamic pricing (see, e.g., [BV96],[BV00], [BV06],[Wen15], and [HW20]) and review bonus (see, e.g., [Li10] and [TZ⁺16]) are analyzed separately. It remains unexplored how a profit-maximizing monopolist determine the dynamic price and review bonus together; and how the optimal bonus scheme and dynamic pricing interact with each other.

In this paper, we study a mechanism design problem faced by a long-lived monopoly platform who sells either a risky product (with unknown utility) or a safe product (with known utility) to a sequence of short-lived risk-neutral consumers. Consumers receive a private signal about the utility of the risky product after purchasing, and incur a reporting cost to give his feedback interpreting as publishing the signal. So a consumer will give a feedback only when he receives a review bonus exceeding his cost, which is also the consumer's private information and known to the consumer before making the purchasing decision. Once a feedback is given, both the platform and the successors will see his private signal; hence there is incomplete social learning in the sense that the common belief about the utility of the risky product is updated according to the published private signals.

In this framework, we investigate how the monopolist commits to different prices of the two products and review bonuses over time to maximize its expected profits. It turns out that the bonus and pricing decisions are not independent and strategically interact with each other, due to following two reasons. First of all, when making the pricing decisions, the monopolist aims to guide the consumers to make the appropriate purchasing decisions. Due to the incompleteness of social learning, the bonus scheme has to be adjusted accordingly. If the monopolist wants to facilitate the learning about the risky product, the bonus should be set very high to guarantee that a lot of private signals are published and vice versa. Second, the bonus scheme also affects the pricing scheme because the bonus received from giving a feedback is also part of the payoff from purchasing the risky product. Therefore, if the

¹<https://www.oberlo.com/blog/online-review-statistics>

²<https://websitebuilder.org/blog/online-review-statistics/>

³<https://www.chartboost.com/blog/how-to-make-dynamic-pricing-work-for-free-to-play-mobile-games/>;
<https://www.mckinsey.com/business-functions/marketing-and-sales/how-we-help-clients/dynamic-pricing>

review bonus is set very high, the monopolist does not need to lower the price of the risky product too much to motivate the purchase of this product.

We first consider a perfect learning model where the unknown utility of the risky product is perfectly observed after the purchase of this product. In this case, the monopolist faces a trade-off between the value and the cost of information: once knowing the utility of the risky product, he can better guide the consumers to make the appropriate purchasing decisions, but the probability of successfully getting information depends on the bonus he sets. Intuitively, there are two obviously feasible strategies: the monopolist can either set the highest bonus to get the information as soon as possible (Immediate Revelation) if the information is of enough value; or never motivate feedback at all (Non-Bonus) if he thinks the information is of no value. Besides these two extreme strategies, we find that the monopolist may also use a recursive bonus structure, where the optimal bonus decreases over time as the number of remaining consumers decreases and hence the information becomes less valuable. When using this recursive bonus strategy, the monopolist still needs to decide how to guide the purchase the products. Optimally, he may stick to selling the risky product until someone reports its utility (i.e., Full Coverage) or allow the purchase of the safe product as well (i.e., Partial Coverage). When the expected utility from the risky product is sufficiently high but not too high to support Immediate Revelation, the monopolist will prefer Full Coverage over Partial Coverage.

We then extend the basic model to allow imperfect learning via the exponential bandit model ([KRC05], [Wen15]). In a bad state, the risky product generates zero utility for sure, while in a good state, the risky product generates a positive utility with a random arrival time following an exponential distribution. We characterize the monopolist's optimal pricing and bonus schemes as a function with respect to the belief about the good state. Our previous intuition still holds that the platform uses the optimal schemes to guide consumers to purchase the appropriate products and to reveal information in either moderate or extreme ways. The social learning trajectory in the exponential bandit model is such that the common belief about the good state either remains unchanged if the current agent does not purchase the risky product or make a report, falls because of a revelation of zero utility, or rises directly to 1 after a revelation of positive utility. Consistent with our findings in the basic model, with the decreasing of the common belief, the monopolist will optimally switch from Immediate Revelation to Full Coverage and then to Partial Coverage and Non-Bonus. Interestingly, we find that the optimal bonus is monotonically decreasing with respect to the belief, since the marginal value of one more experiment becomes lower when the monopolist believes that the state is more likely to be good. In this situation, although the monopolist expects a very quick revelation of the positive utility, which will immediately make the common belief jump to 1 and lead to even higher profits, he is also satisfied with the current high profits by selling the risky product, and do not want to bear the loss of bonus and the possible decrease of belief. As a result, a higher common belief leads to a lower optimal bonus.

We conduct welfare analysis in the imperfect learning case, where we assume a social planner who can commit to an allocation rule and reporting rule, based on the common belief and agents' reporting cost. We prove that social planner will act like the monopolist, and the optimal strategy is again one of the possible optimal strategies used by the monopolist. A surprising result is that unlike traditional literature, there is no inefficient earlier termination of social learning, since the monopolist can always take advantage of Partial Coverage by

setting a low enough bonus to encourage partial agents to reveal the information cheaply. Though stop at the same belief, we find that the social planner may still lead a more efficient experiment than the monopolist, in the sense that the social planner will encourage reporting with higher probability due to lower cost of experiments. The comparative static analysis shows that a higher learning speed will lead to more experimentation of the risky product, and hence lower switching belief from Full Coverage to Partial Coverage. A higher utility from the safe product or a higher discount rate may lead to inefficiently earlier termination of the learning process.

2 Literature

The literature on informational cascades that originated with the work of [Ban92] and [BHW92] is probably the closest to the model presented here. In these herding models, agents may directly follow actions ahead of him without referring to his own signal, which makes public information swamps private information and stops being updated. [BOOV06] and [BOOV08] study the monopoly pricing problems in herding situations. Our problem is different from their work because in our model, agents are not endowed with his own signal. With this assumption, [KMP14] considers a social planner who can reveal information strategically to agents, in order to persuade agents to optimally do experiments. They assume the planner can take advantage of information asymmetry to exert Bayesian Persuasion, hence the possibility of exploitation makes up to the experiment of agents' experiment. However, like e-commerce platforms, consumers' reviews are public to both the seller and the buyers, which makes Bayesian Persuasion infeasible. To our knowledge there is no relevant study, hence we try to fill this gap.

Agents in our model must choose from two arms like in a bandit problem setting originated with the work of [Rot74]. Unlike the single agent learning problem there, we assume there are agents involved sequentially, along the lines with works of [BH99]. In multi-agent setting with public information, the positive externality often rises free-rider problems, and social learning is always terminated insufficiently ([BV96],[BV00], [BV06],[HW20]). [Wen15] consider the dynamic pricing with individual learning, where every agent may have his own type to effect his action, though of no value to learn by others. Different to his work, our paper considers the social learning part, where agents care about the common utility of the risky arm.

The literature of review motivation is also highly related to our work. Though it's without no doubt that online reviews help consumers to decrease the uncertainty of purchasing some certain goods, we can see that current review provision is lacking. Some works are about dealing with missing reviews and ratings (see [YFW06] and [HZKC16]), while some more related works focus on motivating more reviews from consumers (see [Li10] and [TZ⁺16]). The idea of motivating reviews may be originated from the work of [ARZ99], where reporting cost is endogenously generated because of externality of information. When facing reporting cost, [KM12] find that full participation may not be optimal and if full participation is compulsory, every one's truthful revelation may be not a Nash Equilibrium. [ORS20] find that agents' threshold strategy limits the probability of revelation even when there are a large number of agents. But when transferring is plausible, agents' behavior may make their

payoff attach first best. In our work, we use the monetary encouragement to cover agents’ reporting cost in order to complete social learning.

Multiple studies have shown that monetary incentives are effective at encouraging wanted behavior online. For example, experimental studies show that financial incentives are effective in motivating consumers to write reviews on online consuming platforms ([FGHP15], [CL15], [KanKG18]). It is important to note that financial incentives offered in most such studies have generally been quite small, like \$ 1 or 2, or 0.5 RMB ([CL15]), \$ 0.04 in Amazon Mechanical Turk or 10 RMB in a Chinese online cloth retailing platform ([BHBG18]). Empiric works also show that paying for reviews do not effect consumers’ purchasing behavior or the demand curve faced by the seller ([CL15]), and the feedback motivated by financial incentives are often upward biased since consumers feel “bribed” ([CL15]).

3 Baseline Perfect Learning

In this section, we set up the baseline model in which learning is perfect, i.e. once a consumer reports the utility of the risky arm, it is the exact value. There is a monopoly platform selling two products $i = 1, 2$ (called as arm 1 and arm 2 henceforth) to a sequence of risk neutral agents. The production cost of each arm is normalized to zero. The platform’s objective is to maximize its total profit while the agents are maximizing expected utility by choosing one of these two arms. Each agent receives the same utility from arm i denoted as R_i . We assume that the value of R_2 is common knowledge while the value of R_1 is unknown both to the platform and to the agents. As in previous literature, arm 2 is called “safe arm” and arm 1 is “risky arm”. Moreover, it is common knowledge that R_1 follows a certain distribution $G(\cdot)$. For our further analysis, we only need to know the values of $\mathbb{E}R_1$ and $\mathbb{E}\max\{R_1, R_2\}$ with $\mathbb{E}R_1 < \mathbb{E}\max\{R_1, R_2\} < \infty$.

A leading example fitting our model very well is the proprietary platform operated by Amazon or JD.com. For the brands sold on such a platform, the platform can either directly determine the price or indirectly affect the price by offering customers coupons or discounts. Moreover, the safe arm corresponds to the well-established big brand for which the customers are quite certain about quality while the risky arm corresponds to the new brand for which both the platform and the customers are uncertain about quality.

Following the social learning literature (see, e.g., Kremer et al., 2014), we assume that there are $T \leq \infty$ agents indexed by the integer t . Agents know their positions and take actions in an exogenous order: agent t can make purchasing a decision in period t only. In our baseline model of perfect learning, an agent can perfectly know the value of R_1 after choosing arm 1, and then decides whether to report R_1 to the platform. Reporting is costly, and each agent has a private reporting cost c_i distributed in a common support interval $[0, \bar{c}]$. We assume the distribution function $H(\cdot)$ is strictly increasing and has a smooth density function $h(\cdot)$. Moreover, we impose the following technical assumptions on the density function h :

Ass. 1. *The density function $h(\cdot)$ satisfies: $\lim_{x \rightarrow 0^+} h(x) > 0$, and $\lim_{x \rightarrow c^-} h(x) > 0$.*⁴

⁴A more general assumption for part 2 in Assumption 3.1 is that there exist some order p such that

Technically speaking, these assumptions on the limits are needed because we have to calculate the limit value when x converges to the boundary (in Appendix A.2), and it always holds unless $h(x)$ is constant in a neighborhood of \bar{c} . In economic language, we know the first part of Assumption 3.2 restricts the marginal effect of increasing the size of bonus at the lower bound. The second part of also restricts the marginal effect of increasing the size of bonus at the upper bound, since it can be understood as a more general assumption than $\lim_{x \rightarrow \bar{c}^-} h(x) > 0$. For example, if $\lim_{x \rightarrow \bar{c}^-} h(x) = 0$, form L Hospital's Rule $\lambda(\bar{c}) = M + \bar{c} + \lim_{x \rightarrow \bar{c}^-} \frac{H(x) - H^2(x)}{h(x)} = M + \bar{c} - \lim_{x \rightarrow \bar{c}^-} \frac{h(x)}{h'(x)}$ so if $\lim_{x \rightarrow \bar{c}^-} h'(x) = 0$ we can still get the same result by using $\lim_{x \rightarrow \bar{c}^-} h''(x) > 0$ or so on. All we need is that the limit $\lim_{x \rightarrow \bar{c}^-} \frac{h(x)}{h'(x)}$ is convergent to zero.

Define $\beta(x) = x + \frac{H(x)}{h(x)}$ as the virtue value defined in the mechanism design literature. We impose the standard assumption on $\beta(x)$.

Ass. 2. $\beta(x)$ is monotonically increasing.

In our problem, the platform commits to a sequence of bonuses $\{b_1, b_2, \dots, b_T\}$ and a sequence of prices $\{p_{i1}, \dots, p_{iT}\}$ before the game starts, where p_{it} is the price of arm i for the t -th agent, and b_t is the bonus paid to agent t if agent t reveals R_1 and none of the agents before t report to the platform (in perfect learning setting, once R_1 is revealed, the platform will no longer need reports). We assume that once making a report, the agent will always report the true utility. This assumption is reasonable as there is no incentive for lying since each agent is short-lived in our model. Each agent has a reservation value of zero. So it is straightforward to set $p_{2t} = R_2$. And once R_1 is revealed to the platform, the platform will always sell the arm with higher value and get $\mathbb{E} \max\{R_1, R_2\}$. The platform's problem is to determine p_{1t} and b_t before R_1 is revealed.

4 ~~Economic~~ Analysis

This section is organized as follows. In Section 4.1 we try to do some preliminary analysis for the optimal bonus scheming problem where some definitions are declared, and the key conclusion is that the possible optimal strategy is one of the following strategies: Non Bonus, Immediate Revelation, Recursive Partial Coverage and Recursive Full Coverage. In section 4.2 we discussed the optimal solutions under these different strategies (mainly for RPC and RFC) in both a finite setting and an infinite setting. Though the process of solving the finite case and infinite case is different, results shows a highly similarity. In section 4.3 we try to do some explanations for some economics insights.

$\lim_{x \rightarrow \bar{c}^-} h^{(p)}(x) \neq 0$ if $\lim_{x \rightarrow \bar{c}^-} h^{(k)}(x) = 0, \forall k < p$. Here if $\lim_{x \rightarrow \bar{c}^-} h(x) = 0$, form L Hospital's Rule $\lambda(\bar{c}) = M + \bar{c} + \lim_{x \rightarrow \bar{c}^-} \frac{H(x) - H^2(x)}{h(x)} = M + \bar{c} - \lim_{x \rightarrow \bar{c}^-} \frac{h(x)}{h'(x)}$ so if $\lim_{x \rightarrow \bar{c}^-} h'(x) = 0$ we can still get the same result by using $\lim_{x \rightarrow \bar{c}^-} h''(x) > 0$ or so on. All we need is that the limit $\lim_{x \rightarrow \bar{c}^-} \frac{h(x)}{h'(x)}$ is convergent to zero hence as long as there exist some order p such that $\lim_{x \rightarrow \bar{c}^-} h^{(p)}(x) \neq 0$ if $\lim_{x \rightarrow \bar{c}^-} h^{(k)}(x) = 0, \forall k < p$, which always exists unless $h(x)$ is constant in a neighborhood of \bar{c} .

4.1 ~~Phy~~Any

Define $t_0 \equiv \min\{t|\text{agent } t \text{ reports } R_1\}$. Then firstly the monopolist can make $t_0 \geq T$ by setting $b_t \equiv 0$, and sell safe arm or risky arm respectively by setting $p_1 = \mathbb{E}R_1, p_2 = R_2 - \epsilon$ or $p_1 = \mathbb{E}R_1, p_2 = R_2 + \epsilon$. In this case all the agents purchase the corresponding arm but no information revelation are achieved. We call these two corner solutions as “Safe Arm” strategy and “Non Bonus” strategy respectively. The monopolist can also make $t_0 = 1$ by setting either $b_{t_0} = \bar{c}$ and $p_{1,t_0} = \mathbb{E}R_1$ or $b_{t_0} > \bar{c}$ and $p_{1,t_0} = \mathbb{E}R_1 + b_{t_0} - \bar{c}$. In this case the first agent will purchase arm 1 and report R_1 for sure. Hence we denote this strategy as “Immediate Revelation”.

Then given $1 < t_0 < T$, there are still two possible strategies. Agents t_0 will purchase the risky arm for sure. But which arm will agents before t_0 purchase? Notice that when R_1 is unknown, agent t has to choose between arm 1 and arm 2 given $\{p_{1t}, p_{2t}, b_t\}$. It is straightforward to see that there exist possibly two cutoffs $0 \leq \tilde{r}'_t \leq \tilde{r}_t \leq \bar{c}$ such that agent t will choose arm 1 if $c_t \leq \tilde{r}_t$ and report R_1 if $c_t \leq \tilde{r}'_t$. Obviously, if $0 < \tilde{r}'_t \leq \tilde{r}_t < \bar{c}$, \tilde{r}'_t and \tilde{r}_t should satisfy the following equations:

$$\mathbb{E}R_1 - p_{1t} + \max\{b_t - \tilde{r}_t, 0\} = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad b_t - \tilde{r}'_t = 0. \quad (1)$$

There are two cases from Equation 1. In the first case, $b_t - \tilde{r}_t \leq 0$ and hence p_{1t} is set to be $\mathbb{E}R_1$. In this case, agent t will always use arm 1 when R_1 is unknown but only report R_1 if $c_t \leq b_t$. In the second case, $b_t - \tilde{r}_t > 0$ and hence p_{1t} is set to be $\mathbb{E}R_1 + b_t - \tilde{r}_t$. In this case, agent t will not always use arm 1 when R_1 is unknown but will always report R_1 whenever use it. In the first case, $t_0 = \min\{t|b_t \geq c_t\}$. Before t_0 , the platform sells arm 1 at price $\mathbb{E}R_1$ but does not pay any bonus. At t_0 , the platform gets $p_{1t} - b_t = \mathbb{E}R_1 - b_{t_0}$. So the goal of the platform is to maximize:

$$\mathbb{E}[(1 + r + \dots + r^{t_0-1})R_1 + (r^{t_0} + r^{t_0+1} + \dots + r^{T-1}) \max\{R_1, R_2\} - r^{t_0-1}b_{t_0}]. \quad (2)$$

In the second case, similarly we have $t_0 = \min\{t|\mathbb{E}R_1 + b_t - p_{1t} \geq c_t\}$. Before t_0 , the platform sells arm 2 at price R_2 and at t_0 , the platform gets $p_{1t} - b_t = \mathbb{E}R_1 - b_{t_0}$. So the maximization problem of the platform is:

$$\mathbb{E}[(1 + r + \dots + r^{t_0-2})R_2 + r^{t_0-1}R_1 + (r^{t_0} + r^{t_0+1} + \dots + r^{T-1}) \max\{R_1, R_2\} - r^{t_0-1}b_{t_0}]. \quad (3)$$

Hence before the information of R_1 is revealed (t_0), the monopolist can either sell risky arm for every agent, or sell safe arm but set a bonus to motivate someone to explore the risky arm (In our Appendix A we proved that mixing these two strategies will never be optimal). We denote these two strategies as “Full Coverage” and “Partial Coverage” strategy respectively. By saying “selling the certain arm” we mean the monopolist can guide all the agents to purchase the risky arm by pricing ϵ lower for the corresponding arm.

t_0 is a description of equilibrium output instead of the equilibrium strategy. After t_0 the game is trivial since the monopolist will sell the arm with the highest utility. The following definitions are only for strategies that may be equilibrium strategies:

~~Def~~4.1.

1. The platform uses “Non Bonus” Strategy (NB) if the platform sets $b_t \leq 0, \forall t \leq T$ and keeps selling the risky arm for all $t \leq T$.
2. The platform uses “Safe Arm” Strategy (SA) if the platform sets $b_t \leq 0, \forall t \leq T$ and keeps selling the safe arm for all $t \leq T$.
3. The platform uses “Full Coverage” Strategy (FC) if the platform sets $b_1 \in (0, \bar{c})$ and keeps selling the risky arm before t_0 .
4. The platform uses “Partial Coverage” Strategy (PC) if the platform sets $b_1 \in (0, \bar{c})$ and keeps selling the safe arm before t_0 .
5. The platform uses “Immediate Revelation” Strategy (IR) if the platform sets $b_1 \geq \bar{c}$.

There are two points to note. Firstly we should explain the difference between FC and PC. Under Full Coverage Strategy, the platform always sells arm 1 before R_1 is revealed but the value of R_1 may not be reported. Under Partial Coverage Strategy, the platform sells both arm 1 and arm 2 before R_1 is revealed, and the value of R_1 is always revealed after an agent purchases arm 1. Though in definition we call a selling strategy Partial Coverage whenever the platform sells the safe arm at least once, we prove in Appendix that it’s not optimal for the platform to mix between these two arms: in the equilibrium path, the seller either keeps selling risky arm until one consumer reports, or he keeps selling safe arm until one consumer purchases the risky arm and reports its utility.

Secondly it’s natural to treat NB as corner solutions of FC when $b_t \equiv 0$, and treat SA as corner solutions of PC when $b_t \equiv 0$. Here we tell them apart to make things clear. Using the NB strategy means that the platform believes that the expected utility of the risky arm is high enough that it does not need to reveal information to further increase the pricing, while using the SA strategy means that the platform believes that the risky arm is not comparable to the safe arm, and the information is not worth revealing since it’s too costly. IR can also be treated as a corner solution of both FC and PC by setting $b_1 = \bar{c}$. And using IR means the platform values this information a lot and wants to reveal it as soon as possible even with a very high cost.

For the subsequent analysis, we declare some notations here:

$$\begin{aligned}
M &= \mathbb{E} \max\{R_1, R_2\} - \mathbb{E}R_1 \\
N &= M + \frac{\mathbb{E}R_1 - R_2}{r} \\
\beta(x) &= \frac{H(x)}{h(x)} + x, x \in [0, \bar{c}] \\
\psi(x) &= \begin{cases} \beta(x) + M - \frac{H^2(x)}{h(x)} & \text{if } x \in [0, \bar{c}] \\ x + M & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \\
\psi_N(x) &= \begin{cases} \beta(x) + N - \frac{H^2(x)}{h(x)} & \text{if } x \in [0, \bar{c}] \\ x + N & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\Psi(x) = \left(1 - \frac{1}{r}\right)\beta(x) + M - \frac{H^2(x)}{h(x)}$$

$$\Psi_N(x) = \left(1 - \frac{1}{r}\right)\beta(x) + N - \frac{H^2(x)}{h(x)}$$

Finally we denote $\Gamma(x) = \beta^{-1}(r\psi(x))$ and $\Gamma_N(x) = \beta^{-1}(r\psi_N(x))$ for the recursive equation of bonus, and we let b^*, b_N^* stand for the fixed point of $\Gamma(\cdot), \Gamma_N(\cdot)$ respectively. We can get some immediate mathematical results based on Assumption 3.1 and 3.2 (these facts are stated and proven in Appendix A):

1. there exists b^* if $M < \left(\frac{1}{r} - 1\right)\bar{c} + \frac{1}{rh(\bar{c})}$ ⁵.
2. if b^* exists, it's unique and positive.
3. $b_{p+1} < b_p < b^*$ given $0 < b_{p+1} < b^*$ ⁶.

Similar results about b_N^* can be found in Appendix Fact A.6 and A.7.

According to our definition 4.1 there are five possible optimal strategies in the equilibrium. In order to focus our analysis on the parts relevant to FC and PC, we ignore the possibility of IR in the main text. The content of this part is placed in the appendix B.3. In other words, in the following analysis we consider four different strategies: FC and PC, and their corresponding corner solutions NB and SA. The following assumption requires a large enough \bar{c} in order to rule out the case when Immediate Revelation is optimal.

A4.1. $\Psi(\bar{c}) < 0$

4.2 Optimal Different Cases

In section 4.2, we consider the cases of finite cases (i.e. $T < \infty$) and infinite cases (i.e. $T = \infty$) simultaneously. Though strictly speaking the proof process is different, our results show a highly similarity of solutions under different strategies or different cases. We leave the details of finite partial coverage part to Appendix A and infinite part to Appendix B.

4.2.1 Full Coverage

In the full coverage case, holding price for arm 2 R_2 , the optimal price of arm 1 is always $\mathbb{E}R_1 - \epsilon$ before R_1 is fully revealed to guide consumers to purchase arm 1. So we only need to characterize the optimal bonus scheme. The following lemma is the first step of fully characterizing the optimal solution to maximization problem generated by equation (2):

⁵If this condition is not satisfied, the iteration relationships in Lemma 4.3 shows for any b_{p+1} we should set $b_p > \bar{c}$, hence an direct conclusion is that the Immediate Revelation is always optimal when $M > \left(\frac{1}{r} - 1\right)\bar{c} + \frac{1}{rh(\bar{c})}$. To avoid too much discussion on this trivial case, we can define $b^* = \infty$ for consistency in this case, since it doesn't matter in Proposition 4.4.

⁶more detailed discussion can be found in Appendix Fact A.2

Lm 4.2. *Suppose that there exists $1 \leq p < T$ such that the corresponding optimal bonus scheme satisfies $b_p < \bar{c}$. Then we have the following recursive relationship for any $1 \leq T \leq +\infty$:*

$$\frac{\beta(b_p)}{r} = \psi(b_{p+1}), \quad (4)$$

where $M = \mathbb{E}max\{R_1, R_2\} - \mathbb{E}R_1$ and $\psi(\cdot)$ as denoted ahead.

Lemma 4.2 actually describes the necessary condition of a recursive (interior) bonus scheme when using Full Coverage strategy. In the proof process we can find that the results shown in Lemma 4.2 does not depend on $T < \infty$ or not. The monotonicity of above functions guarantees the existence and uniqueness of the solution b_p given b_{p+1} . It also guarantees the existence and uniqueness of the fixed point, b^* , which is the root of $\Psi(x)$. Actually equation (4) defines an iteration constructed by monotone increasing function:

$$b_p = \Gamma(b_{p+1}) \equiv \beta^{-1}\left(r * \left[\beta(b_{p+1}) + M - \frac{H^2(b_{p+1})}{h(b_{p+1})}\right]\right)$$

Moreover, lemma 4.2 implies that the optimal interior bonus for agent p only depends on agent $p + 1$'s bonus plan in the backward induction sense. Therefore, the platform's optimal bonus scheme is time consistent, i.e., if the platform designs the optimal bonus scheme at period p , the optimal solution should be the same as the initial commitment solution.

Here we characterize the optimal bonus scheme where $T < \infty$. The recursive relationship given in Lemma 4.2 allows us to use a backward induction procedure to calculate the optimal bonus scheme. First of all, it is easy to see that $b_T = 0$ since the platform no longer care about the knowledge of R_1 when no agent is left. Then, Equation (4) allows us to solve the optimal bonus scheme b_t backwardly. Assumption 4.1 allows us to rule out the corner solution when $b_t > \bar{c}$, and the following proposition describes the optimal FC strategy.

Pr 4.3. *If $T = 1$, the optimal full coverage strategy is to set $b_1 = 0$ (NB)
For $\forall T \geq 2$, construct the sequence $\{d_t\}$ as follows:*

1. *if $T < \infty$, let $d_t = \Gamma^{(T-t)}(0)$ for $1 \leq t \leq T$.*
2. *if $T = \infty$, let $d_t = b^*$ for $1 \leq t \leq T$ (b^* is the fixed point of function $\Gamma(\cdot)$ as declared in section 4.1).*

Under our Assumption 3.1, Assumption 3.2 and Assumption 4.1, the optimal full coverage strategy is to set: $(b_1, b_2, \dots, b_T) = (d_1, d_2, \dots, d_T)$, if $0 < d_1 < \bar{c}$ (FC)

Proposition 4.3 shows the algorithm of optimal bonus structure in finite case. Sequence $\{d_t\}$ reveals the recurrence structure of the bonus scheme (recursive FC). If $T \geq 2$, d_1 is positive for sure since d_1 is the result of $T - 1$ times of increasing iteration starting from 0, hence we do not need to concern whether $d_1 \leq 0$ in this case. In other words, information about R_1 is always worth exploring as long as there is left agents. Or equivalently, NB is always dominated by the optimal FC when $T \geq 2$.

Results in infinite case are also presented in Proposition 4.3. Different from finite case, we can not exert backward induction, hence we have to perform the induction from the

beginning by using $b_{p+1} = \Gamma^{-1}(b_p)$ given in Lemma 4.2. The existence and the uniqueness of b_p given b_{p-1} can be inherited from Equation (4). A constant bonus scheme is intuitive given the fact that the platform faces the same designing condition and the same stage game where ever the game starts. Still, we know the fixed point here is positive and unique, which means the intuition before still holds.

4.2.2 Partial Coverage Strategy

If the platform chooses partial coverage strategy, he sells the safe item before R_1 is revealed. In other words, the platform will optimally set $p_2 = R_2$, $p_1 = \mathbb{E}R_1 + \epsilon$, hence for agents whose $c_t > b_t$, he purchases R_1 get surplus $-\epsilon < 0$ hence he will choose R_2 . But for agents $c_t < b_t$, he will still choose R_1 and get surplus $\mathbb{E}R_1 + b_t - c_t - p_1$. We should notice that $p_1 - b_t$ will always be shown as a part, hence we can set any $p_1 > \mathbb{E}R_1$ and make b_t an upward translation with equal distance. Hence in the following analysis we just set $p_1 = \mathbb{E}R_1 + \epsilon$ and let $\epsilon \rightarrow 0^+$. The mathematical structure is similar to Full Coverage case, and Lemma A.1 (omitted here) is similar to Lemma 4.3 which describes the recursive structure of possible optimal strategies.

Prop 4.4. For $\forall T \geq 1$, construct the sequence $\{d_t\}$ as follows:

1. let d_T to be the root of equation $\beta(d_T) = \mathbb{E}R_1 - R_2$
2. if $T < \infty$, let $d_t = \Gamma_N^{(T-t)}(d_T)$ for $1 \leq t \leq T$.
3. if $T = \infty$, let $d_t = b_N^*$ for $1 \leq t \leq T$ (b_N^* is the fixed point of function $\Gamma_N(\cdot)$ as declared in section 4.1).

Under our Assumption 3.1, Assumption 3.2 and Assumption 4.1, the optimal full coverage strategy is to set:

1. $(b_{N1}, b_{N2}, \dots, b_{NT}) = (d_1, d_2, \dots, d_T)$, if $0 \leq d_1 < \bar{c}$ (PC).
2. $(b_{N1} = 0, b_{N2} = 0, b_{N3} = 0, \dots, b_{NT} = 0)$ if $d_1 < 0$ (SA).

The bonus scheme is almost the same despite that the platform may have a negative d_1 in the iteration sequence. The reason is that the starting point of the iteration, d_T may be negative, unlike in Full Coverage Strategy where $d_T = 0$ for sure. This phenomena is a key difference in PC and FC. Intuitively, a negative d_1 shows that the platform acts as if it's "punishing" consumers who purchase arm 1, though it's not realistic since consumers can always purchase arm 1 and leaves no feedback to avoid this negative bonus. However, it seems that this is the best the platform can do in order to de-motivate consumers from buying arm 1. Actually, it's equivalent to set $(0, 0, 0, \dots, 0)$ and set $p_1 = \mathbb{E}R_1 + \epsilon$ and $p_2 = R_2$ to guide consumers to purchase arm 2. A straightforward explanation is, in this case, the platform do not want any consumers to purchase from arm 1. Though knowing the exact value of R_1 is beneficial, it may not be worthwhile to let one consumer to exploit arm 1, meaning the platform has to bear the expected loss $R_1 - \mathbb{E}R_1$ to do so. In other words, recursive Partial Coverage (PC) may degenerate into Safe Arm (SA) in this case.

As for the infinite case, a certain problem occurs. It's possible that the fixed point in PC, b_N^* , may be negative. Actually, b_N^* is the root of the following equation:

$$\left(\frac{1}{r} - 1\right)\left[\frac{H(x)}{h(x)} + x\right] + \frac{H^2(x)}{h(x)} = N, \quad (5)$$

Obviously, the left hand side of Equation 5 is monotonically increasing with respect to x , hence it values from 0 to $(\frac{1}{r} - 1)\left[\frac{1}{h(\bar{c})} + \bar{c}\right] + \frac{1}{h(\bar{c})}$. Hence when $N < 0$, using the interior expression of $H(\cdot)$ results in a negative b_N^* . Hence we say in this case we have $b_N^* < 0$, by which we mean Equation 5 has no reasonable solution in interval $[0, \bar{c}]$ since $N < 0$.

4.3 Optimal Bonus Scheme

To find out the optimal bonus scheme, we calculate the payoffs first. We have the following lemma, whose illustration is in figure 1. ⁷

Lemma 4.5. For $\forall 0 \leq T \leq \infty$ if b_1 and b_{N_1} both lie in $[0, \bar{c}]$, then:

$$\pi_L = \begin{cases} \mathbb{E} \max\{R_1, R_2\} \frac{1 - r^T}{1 - r} - \psi(b_1) & \text{if } L = \text{Full Coverage} \\ \mathbb{E} \max\{R_1, R_2\} \frac{1 - r^T}{1 - r} - \psi(b_{N_1}) & \text{if } L = \text{Partial Coverage} \\ R_2 \frac{1 - r^T}{1 - r} & \text{if } L = \text{Safe Arm} \\ \mathbb{E} R_1 \frac{1 - r^T}{1 - r} & \text{if } L = \text{Non Bonus} \end{cases}$$

We use figure 1 as a numerical illustration. In this case $T = 3$, $\bar{c} = 1.1$, $r = 0.95$, $\mathbb{E}R_1 = 2$, R_2 ranges from 1.1 to 3.1 hence the max possible M values around 1.16. $\Psi(\bar{c}) \leq -0.166 < 0$ hence Assumption 4.1 is always satisfied. The illustration shows FC tends to NB when R_2 is low enough, and PC tends to SA when R_2 is high enough. In other words, there exists cutoffs of R_2 such that SA dominates PC when $R_2 > \hat{R}_2$, and PC dominates FC when $R_2 > \bar{R}_2$. Given the explicit expression of our Proposition 4.4, we know $\bar{R}_2 = \mathbb{E}R_1$ at which FC=PC and SA=NB. \hat{R}_2 is the cutoff when $b_{N_1} = 0$ where FC=SA. Moreover we have $\hat{R}_2 > \bar{R}_2$ given $T \geq 2$ for sure since $R_2 = \bar{R}_2$ leads to $b_{NT} = 0$ and therefore a positive b_{N_1} .

Proposition 4.6. If $T \geq 2$, under Assumption 3.1, 3.2 and 4.1, there exists two cutoffs of R_2 : $0 < \bar{R}_2 < \hat{R}_2$ such that

The optimal selling strategy is FC if $0 < R_2 < \bar{R}_2$
The optimal selling strategy is PC if $\bar{R}_2 < R_2 < \hat{R}_2$
The optimal selling strategy is SA if $\hat{R}_2 < R_2$

If $T = 1$, under Assumption 3.1, 3.2 and 4.1, there exists one cutoff of R_2 : $0 < \bar{R}_2$ such that

The optimal selling strategy is NB if $0 < R_2 < \bar{R}_2$
The optimal selling strategy is SA if $\bar{R}_2 < R_2$

⁷In figure 1, B3 and B4 we use hR_2 for \hat{R}_2 , uR_2 for \underline{R}_2 , bR_2 for \bar{R}_2 and tR_2 for \tilde{R}_2 mentioned in Proposition 4.7 respectively.




Figure 1: utility- R_2 under three strategies when $T = 3, \bar{c} = 1.1, r = 0.95, \mathbb{E}R_1 = 2$

4.3.1 PC vs FC

We should point out the key difference between FC and PC strategy and we take the finite case as an example. The starting point of backward induction may be different. In FC case, arm 1 is always purchased no matter whether the bonus is taken, hence by backward induction the starting point is always setting $b_T = 0$. But in PC case, if the bonus is not taken, arm 2 will be purchased. Hence when R_2 is extremely small the platform would have motivation to set some bonus for agents to purchase arm 1 even when he is the only one agent left and information of R_1 is of no value. Otherwise when R_2 is extremely large, the platform may prefer not to motivate agents to purchase arm 1 by setting zero bonus, and that's the reason why Safe Arm strategy appears. We use following figure 1 to describe these two insights.

A surprising conclusion is that, in both strategies the t_0 has the same expectation value. The reason is that though it seems that in Partial Coverage Strategy we define $t_0 = \min\{t | c_t < r_t + \mathbb{E}R_1 - p_1\}$, but in equilibrium the platform will increase the bonus for the agent to compensate the utility loss $p_1 - \mathbb{E}R_1$ for agents hence no matter how large p_1 is, it will be return back in form of bonus. Hence in our equilibrium analysis we directly fix $p_1 = \mathbb{E}R_1$. Fix $\mathbb{E}R_1$ and let R_2 increase rapidly, from figure 1 we can see there are two important thresholds for R_2 .

The first one is $\tilde{R}_2 = \mathbb{E}R_1$ or 2.0 in figure 1. At this point $\mathbb{E}R_1 = R_2, M = N$, and $b_T = 0$ in RPC case. When $R_2 < \mathbb{E}R_1$, we know if the platform insists on using RPC we have $\beta(b_T) = \mathbb{E}R_1 - R_2 > 0$, which means the platform would still like to use a positive bonus to encourage the last agent to purchase arm 1 even there is only one agent left. Hence it's obviously dominated by RFC, a more direct way to guide agents purchase arm 1. Hence $\forall R_2 \in [0, \mathbb{E}R_1]$, the platform should use Full Coverage Strategy. When $R_2 > \mathbb{E}R_1$, in both strategies reporting agent get $\mathbb{E}R_1$ and yields the same profit. But agents who arrives before t_0 and does not report will get R_2 in Partial Coverage instead of $\mathbb{E}R_1$ in Full Coverage. Hence when $R_2 > \mathbb{E}R_1$ the platform should use Partial Coverage Strategy.

The second one is \hat{R}_2 which makes $N = 0$ or 3.26 in figure 1. At this point $N = 0$ and $b_N^* = 0$. When $R_2 > \hat{R}_2$, $N < 0$ hence the interior solution sequence $\{b_t\}$ can never be positive (see figure 5 and 4. more details can be found in Appendix A.2). Hence the total

bonus structure is equivalent to $(0, 0, \dots, 0)$, meaning the RPC completely degenerates into a zero bonus structure. When $\tilde{R}_2 < R_2 < \hat{R}_2$, though b_T is negative, the interior solution sequence $\{b_t\}$ may finally get positive since $b_N^* > 0$ (see figure 5), meaning that when there are still enough agents left the platform should use a positive bonus to encourage reporting, otherwise it will set a zero (negative is equivalent to zero) bonus to prevent loss of $R_2 - \mathbb{E}R_1$ caused by reporting.




Figure 2: $b_T < 0$ and $N < 0$




Figure 3: $b_T < 0$ and $N > 0$

Here we should notice that if RM could be optimal, we need $\underline{R}_2 > \bar{R}_2$ (see figure B4). Otherwise it's always dominated by RPC or RFC (see figure 1). A larger T, r , smaller \bar{c} may provide more support for IRM to be optimal according to above insights. A numeric example is provided in our Appendix A.4 where $T = 2$.

4.3.2 Finite

The platform's optimal selling strategy and bonus method in infinite case are also contained in the corresponding propositions or lemmas (4.3-4.7), though simply taking the limit is not strict though it yields the right answer and it's more straightforward. Hence in the Appendix A we focus on the proof of finite cases, and all the proof in infinite cases are placed in Appendix B since they are based on a different solving process.

Mathematically speaking, the only difference between finite case and infinite case is the discrimination condition of corner solution. In finite case, we construct sequence $\{d_t\}$ and use $d_1 = \Gamma^{(T-1)}(0)$ to compare with \bar{c} for corner solution. In infinite case, we use d^* , which is the fixed point of the iteration equation and can be understood as $d^* = \Gamma^{(\infty)}(0)$. When $T = \infty$, our insights before may be better understood because the discrimination conditions can be expressed explicitly. For example, $RPC \prec IRM \Leftrightarrow b_M^* < \bar{c} \Leftrightarrow \Psi(b^*) < \Psi(\bar{c}) \Leftrightarrow (1 - r\bar{c}) + \frac{1}{\lim_{x \rightarrow \bar{c}} h(x)} > rM \Leftrightarrow R_2 < \underline{R}_2(uR_2)$. Hence a larger M (a larger R_2), a larger r , a larger $h(\bar{c})$ and a smaller \bar{c} will all provide more incentive to use RM. A larger $h(\bar{c})$ means the bonus has enough marginal effect at \bar{c} . We provide a numerical illustration in figure




Figure 4: utility- R_2 when $T = \infty$




Figure 5: bonus- R_2 when $T = \infty$

5 IftLag

In this section, we consider a situation where each agent cannot perfectly learn R_1 . We use the exponential bandit to model this imperfect learning (see, e.g., Keller, Rady, and Cripps (2005), Weng (2015)).

5.1 MStUp

As in the previous model, we assume that R_2 is a safe product with known utility s and R_1 is a risky product modeled as an exponential bandit arm.

When purchasing R_1 , it can generate either a lump-sum value z or zero utility. There are two states of the world, good or bad. When the state is good, the arrival rate of realizing value z follows $EXP(\lambda)$ distribution. When the state is bad, R_1 always leads to zero utility. We further consider the discount factor is r and the form is exponential form, i.e. a payoff v arriving after time t generates utility $re^{-rt}v$ at time 0, where we normalize all utility with r .

As before, there are four possible strategies: two iteration strategies Full Coverage, Partial Coverage and two extreme strategies, None Bonus and Immediate Revelation. None Bonus here stands for the case that platform is unwilling to do more experiments to reveal the true utility of the risky arm, hence it's understood as selling safe arm for sure. And as before, Non Bonus can be treated as a special case of Partial Coverage when setting $R = \lambda z \alpha + b - p_1 = 0$. Here we treat Non Bonus as a separate strategy rather than a corner solution of Partial Coverage to emphasize its importance. As for the Immediate Revelation, we should expect it's nothing but setting an upper truncation of our value function when α is large enough, since it should be an extreme case for Full Coverage when belief is high enough. Of course when \bar{c} is large enough, using Immediate Revelation is too expensive to be the optimal strategy. Hence in the text, for simplicity we make assumption 5.1 in order to ignore the possibility of Immediate Revelation, and leave the more general cases with possibility of Immediate Revelation to Appendix D. Assumption 5.1 requires a large enough \bar{c} , and intuitively, the monopolist will have less motivation to use Immediate Revelation when \bar{c} is larger. The Assumption 5.1 is a sufficient but not necessary condition of our claim "Immediate Revelation is never the optimal strategy" we make assumptions in this form for a explicit mathematical expression. The equivalent condition is discussed in Appendix D.

Ass. 1. $\bar{c} > \left(\frac{\lambda}{r} + 1\right)(g - s)$

Using Immediate Revelation requires a relatively high enough belief than the cost \bar{c} . In other words, given moderate starting beliefs, ignoring Immediate Revelation does not affect our insights get in this section. In the main text, we provide a numerical example satisfies Assumption 5.1 (where we assume $\lambda = 0.2, z = 7, r = 0.2$ and $H(x) = x$ hence $\bar{c} = 1$), and in the Appendix D we also provide another numerical example where we still assume $H(x) = x$ hence $\bar{c} = 1$, but let $\lambda = 0.2, z = 7, r = 0.1$. In the latter case Immediate Revelation is possible to be the optimal solution. A more direct illustration can be found in comparison between Figure 7 (in the text) Figure D2 (in the Appendix D). Moreover, we want our analysis to be meaningful, i.e. the bandit problem is non trivial. If the platform has already known the state is good and keeps selling R_1 , the total utility will be:

$$\tilde{V} = \int_0^\Delta r e^{-rt} (\lambda e^{-\lambda t}) z dt + e^{-r\Delta} \tilde{V} \quad (6)$$

Let $\Delta \rightarrow 0$ we can get $\tilde{V} = \lambda z$, and we denote

$$g \equiv \lambda z$$

Similarly, keeping selling R_2 leads to payoff $\tilde{U} = s$. We make a key assumption here to guarantee our discussion is meaningful:

Ass. 2. $\lambda z > s > 0$

5.1.1 Platform

In imperfect learning setting, the state variables of the platform is his belief (which is also the common belief that holds for consumers) of the possibility that the state is good. At time t with belief $\alpha \circ \theta_G + (1 - \alpha) \circ \theta_B$ the platform can choose one possible strategy L from the set { Non Bonus, Full Coverage and Partial Coverage } which affects his value function by affecting immediate payoff (which item will be sold) and can set a bonus b which influences the value function by affecting the probability of belief updating. Hence his value function $\Pi(\cdot)$ follows the dynamic process:

$$\Pi(\alpha) = \max_{L,b} \pi_{1,L}(\Delta) + P_L(b) e^{-r\Delta} \gamma(\alpha, \Delta) \Pi(\alpha') + P_L(b) e^{-r\Delta} (1 - \gamma(\alpha, \Delta)) \tilde{V} + (1 - P(b)) e^{-r\Delta} \Pi(\alpha) \quad (7)$$

where

$$\gamma(\alpha, \Delta) = 1 - \alpha(1 - e^{-\lambda\Delta})$$

stands for the probability that in time period Δ the current agent reports a zero utility and then leads to belief updating to α' , and $1 - \gamma(\alpha)$ stands for the probability that the agent reports a utility z which makes the common belief jump to 1 immediately. $P(b)$ stands for the probability of motivating the current agent to report successfully. By denoting $R = \lambda\alpha z - p_1 + b_t$ as the net surplus of reporting under Partial Coverage, we can characterize $P(b)$ like

$$P_L(b) = \begin{cases} H(b) & \text{if } L = \text{Full Coverage} \\ H(R) & \text{if } L = \text{Partial Coverage} \\ 0 & \text{if } L = \text{Non Bonus} \end{cases}$$

$\pi_1(\Delta)$ stands for the expectation of immediate net profit within period Δ , which is then of the form

$$\pi_{1,L}(\Delta) = \begin{cases} \int_0^\Delta re^{-rt}[\lambda e^{-\lambda t}\alpha z - H(b)b]dt & \text{if } L = \text{Full Coverage} \\ \int_0^\Delta re^{-rt}[H(R)(p_1 - b) + (1 - H(R))s]dt & \text{if } L = \text{Partial Coverage} \\ \int_0^\Delta re^{-rt}sdt = s(1 - e^{-r\Delta}) & \text{if } L = \text{Non Bonus} \end{cases}$$

let $\Delta \rightarrow 0$ we can get:

$$\lim_{\Delta \rightarrow 0} \frac{\pi_{1,L}(\Delta)}{\Delta} = \begin{cases} \alpha zr\lambda - H(b)br & \text{if } L = \text{Full Coverage} \\ [H(R)(p_1 - b) + (1 - H(R))s]r & \text{if } L = \text{Partial Coverage} \\ rs & \text{if } L = \text{Non Bonus} \end{cases}$$

Combining with Bayesian updating rule

$$\alpha' = \frac{\alpha e^{-\lambda\Delta}}{\alpha e^{-\lambda\Delta} + 1 - \alpha}$$

and Taylor expansion (for more details, see Appendix C), we can get $\Pi(b)$ actually follows the ordinary differential equation:

$$[r + P_L(b)\alpha\lambda]\Pi(\alpha) = \lim_{\Delta \rightarrow 0} \frac{\pi_{1,L}(\Delta)}{\Delta} + P_L(b)(\alpha^2 - \alpha)\lambda\Pi'(\alpha) + P_L(b)\alpha\lambda^2z \quad (8)$$

In the left of this section, we characterize the optimal pricing and bonus scheme for the monopolist at first. To do so we first derive the value function of monopolist who can not use Partial Coverage (i.e. Full Coverage only) or monopolist who can not use Full Coverage (i.e. Partial Coverage only) respectively, and combine these two results to get the optimal switching condition to describe the value function of a monopolist. Then we characterize the optimal pricing and bonus scheme for a social planner for welfare analysis who cannot do Partial Coverage in our model setting.

5.1.2 “Naïve Monoplist”

The monopolist can optimally choose one of three possible strategies in Full Coverage, Partial Coverage and Non Bonus based on the common belief, and it's quite intuitive that when the belief is high enough (for example, when it's the good state for sure), the platform is willing to choose Full Coverage, and when it's low (for example, when it's the bad state for sure), Non Bonus would be optimal. An immediate question is whether the platform may choose Partial Coverage as a transition between Full Coverage and Non Bonus when the belief is decreasing, or switch from Full Coverage to Non Bonus directly. The only way to answer this question is to compare the cutoff switching belief of switching from Full Coverage to Non Bonus and the cutoff switching belief of switching from Partial Coverage to Non Bonus. Hence, we should characterize the optimal strategy of “Non optimal switching Monoplist”

or “Naive Monopolist”, by which we mean the monopolist can only use part of the strategies and switch among them.

Firstly we consider “Full Coverage Only” monopolist (i.e. the platform can only use Full Coverage or Non bonus). We denote $V(\alpha)$ as the value function of using Full Coverage and plug parameters using Full Coverage into equation (12), combining with Bayes’ Rule we can get (proof in Appendix)

$$[r + H(b_t)\lambda\alpha]V(\alpha) = \max_b \alpha z \lambda [r + H(b_t)\lambda] - rH(b_t)b_t + H(b_t)(\alpha^2 - \alpha)\lambda V'(\alpha) \quad (\text{FC-ODE})$$

If we only consider the possibility that the monopoly can stop doing Full Coverage experiments and switch to the safe arm for constant value, then the optimal stopping problem is when to switch from $V(\cdot)$ to \tilde{U} . The following lemma describes the strategy under this setting:

Lm 5.1. *If the monopolist can only use “Full Coverage Strategy”, then he would set prices $p_1 = \alpha z \lambda - \epsilon$ and $p_2 = R_2$, and would set bonus b_t for agent t to report the utility of the risky arm. Agents would try the risky arm when $\alpha > \underline{\alpha}_1$ and safe arm otherwise. Denote \underline{b}_1 as the reporting cut-off at belief $\underline{\alpha}_1$, then $b_t(\alpha), V(\alpha)$ and $\underline{\alpha}_1, \underline{b}_1$ fit the following relationships:*

1. *First order condition:*

$$r\beta(b) = \alpha z \lambda^2 + (\alpha^2 - \alpha)\lambda V'(\alpha) - \alpha \lambda V(\alpha)$$

2. *Bellman equation:*

$$V(\alpha) = \alpha z \lambda + \frac{H^2(b)}{h(b)}$$

3. *Optimal Stopping:*

$$\begin{cases} r\beta(\underline{b}_1) = \underline{\alpha}_1 \lambda (z \lambda - s) \\ s = \underline{\alpha}_1 z \lambda + \frac{H^2(\underline{b}_1)}{h(\underline{b}_1)} \end{cases}$$

4. *Optimal bonus scheme $b(\alpha)$ is monotonically decreasing with respect to α .*

It’s helpful to do some analysis for Lemma 5.1 before starting to consider the “Partial Coverage Only” monopolist. As we assumed in Assumption 3.2, we know $\beta(b) = \frac{H(b)}{h(b)} + b$ is monotone increasing hence the uniqueness of the solution $b^*(\alpha)$ can be guaranteed. Another important fact is that the monopolist is less willing to motivate agents’ learning when belief is higher. Intuitively, there are two powers affecting bonus setting. When the belief is high, the monopolist may think it’s more possible to jump to 1 and hence get higher profit, which provides high incentive to set high bonus. However, in this case, the belief may be needless to test and yield a quite well profit, hence provides low incentive to set high bonus. Our result shows the latter power overcomes the first one.

Moreover, obviously we know:

$$s > \underline{\alpha}_1 z \lambda$$

which means the full coverage only monopolist would like to encourage agents to test the risky arm even when it yields lower expected utility than safe arm. But keep in mind that in this section we consider the case when the monopolist can only use the Full Coverage Strategy to sell the risky arm, and he can only switch to selling safe arm when belief is low, this helps to build the primary insights. However, the monopolist can also use “Partial Coverage Strategy” to sell the risky arm, hence when belief is low, the monopolist may not only switch to selling the safe arm, but also switch to use “Partial Coverage Strategy” to sell risky arm. We characterize the “Partial Coverage Strategy” by assuming the monopolist can only use “Partial Coverage Strategy” to sell the risky arm in section 5.2, and we then discuss the optimal switching in section 5.3.

Last but not least, we should emphasize the possibility of zero bonus under Full Coverage. From interior solution got from part 1 in Lemma 5.1, Full Coverage will generate zero bonus when

$$\alpha z \lambda^2 + (\alpha^2 - \alpha) \lambda V'(\alpha) - \alpha \lambda V(\alpha) \leq 0$$

Combined with part 2 in Lemma 5.1, it's equivalent (in the interior solution part) to

$$\alpha > \alpha_{FC}^* \tag{9}$$

where α_{FC}^* is the solution of $V(\alpha) = \alpha z \lambda$. In our numerical examples mentioned later, when $r = 0.1$, $\alpha_{FC}^* \approx 0.79$ and 0.75 when $r = 0.2$ (illustration can be found in Figure 8 and D2). If in the case mentioned in the main text where Immediate Revelation is ignored, equation 9 shows that the monopolist would like to set $b \equiv 0$ for $\forall \alpha \in (\alpha_{FC}^*, 1)$. In other words, if the temporary common belief $\alpha_t \in (\alpha_{FC}^*, 1)$, the monopolist will sell risky arm to each agent and won't motivate them to report the utility. As a result, the common belief would never change since no social signals are generated in this case. As mentioned before (Lemma 5.1), the monopolist would set lower bonus when common belief is higher, given the common belief $\alpha < \alpha_{FC}^*$. In this period, the monopolist is motivating agents to do more experiments). Otherwise when $\alpha \in (\alpha_{FC}^*, 1)$, the monopolist would not set any belief though it's possible that some agents come and report a positive utility and push the common belief directly to 1, since he can sell the risky arm and take advantage of the pretty high common belief.

A main take away here is that when common belief is high enough (i.e. $\alpha > \alpha_{FC}^*$ which is a sufficient condition for the monopolist to sell risky arm), the monopolist faces a trade-off between the following two extreme strategies: doing experiments at extremely high speed (i.e. using Immediate Revelation) or motivating no experiments to keep the high belief (i.e. using Full Coverage while set $b = 0$). The reason why we need not to care about recursive Full Coverage (i.e. Full Coverage with a positive bonus) is that given in Lemma 5.1, where we find at very high speed it is dominated by setting $b = 0$ within the right field of α_{FC}^* . However when the belief is higher, *exploration* may leads to higher profits because the probability of pushing common belief to 1 may be high enough to cover the exploration cost. Hence when \bar{c} is small enough, we can find Immediate Revelation will be the optimal strategy. In this case Assumption 5.1 fails, and we place more detailed discussions in Appendix D.

Secondly, we consider Partial Coverage Only Monopolist setting. In this case for agents with reporting cost c , if $R \equiv \lambda \alpha z + b - p_1 > c$ this agents will use arm 1 and report for sure no matter how large actual R_1 is. Hence the value function $U(\alpha)$ must fit the following

ordinary differential equation:

$$[r + H(R)\alpha\lambda]U(\alpha) = [H(R)(\lambda\alpha z - R) + (1 - H(R))s]r + H(R)(\alpha^2 - \alpha)\lambda U'(\alpha) + H(R)\alpha\lambda^2 z \quad (\text{PC-ODE})$$

And the following lemma characterize the solution of optimal stopping problem of switching from $U(\cdot)$ to \tilde{U}

Lm5.2. *If the monopolist can only use “Partial Coverage Strategy”, then he would set prices $p_1 = \alpha z \lambda$ and p_2 , and would set bonus b_t for agent t to report the utility of the risky arm. It's equivalent to set $R = \lambda z \alpha + b_t - p_t$. Agents would try the safe arm when $\alpha > \underline{\alpha}_1$ unless his own reporting cost $c_t < \lambda \alpha z + b_t - p_1$ when he would try the risky arm and report the utility. Denote \underline{b}_2 as the reporting cut-off at belief $\underline{\alpha}_2$, then $b_t(\alpha), U(\alpha)$ and $\underline{\alpha}_2, \underline{R}_2$ fit the following relationships:*

1. *First order condition:*

$$r\beta(R) = \lambda\alpha z r - rs + \alpha z \lambda^2 + (\alpha^2 - \alpha)\lambda U'(\alpha) - \lambda\alpha U(\alpha)$$

2. *Bellman equation:*

$$U(\alpha) = s + \frac{H^2(R)}{h(R)}$$

3. *Optimal Stopping:*

$$\begin{cases} \underline{R}_2 = 0 \\ \underline{\alpha}_2 = \frac{sr}{\lambda(g - s + zr)} \end{cases}$$

4. *$R(\alpha)$ is monotonically increasing with respect to α .*

Lemma 5.1 and 5.2 describes the value function of the Naive Monopolist. A quick illustration is in 6⁸ (to emphasis $V(\alpha)$ got here is not the optimal strategy of the sophisticated monopolist, we call it “original”). A similar version considering Immediate Revelation can be found in Figure D1 in Appendix D. These numerical illustrations are based on our numerical example mentioned when we are trying to introduce Assumption 5.1.

⁸Here we use hollow circles for α_{FC} and α_{PC} since they are the cutoffs of naive monopolist. As comparison we use star marks for smooth pasting cutoffs in Figure 7.




Figure 6: Value Functions of the Naive Monoplist

Moreover, a noticeable fact is that in Partial Coverage the net bonus R is monotonically increasing with respect to α , unlike Full Coverage. A more detailed discussion about this fact is illustrated in the Figure 8, where we translate the bonus scheme of the monopolist into a mechanism designed based on the current belief and the reporting cost.

5.2 Optimal Monoplist

In this section we consider whether the monopolist should switch from Full Coverage into Partial Coverage, or directly into Non Bonus when the belief is decreasing. As claimed before, comparing the cutoff beliefs got from analysis of “Naive Monoplists” is helpful. Obviously from all the calculation above we know

$$rs = \underline{\alpha}_1 [rg + H(\underline{b}_1)\lambda(g - s)] - rH(\underline{b}_1)\underline{b}_1 = \underline{\alpha}_2 (\lambda zr + \lambda(g - s))$$

which is to say

$$\underline{\alpha}_1 > \underline{\alpha}_2$$

This fact shows that, mathematically, $\underline{\alpha}_1$, the cutoff belief between full coverage strategy and selling safe arm, is higher than $\underline{\alpha}_2$, the cutoff belief between partial coverage strategy and selling safe arm. It’s straight-forward since Full Coverage sells more risky arm than Partial Coverage, hence when α is quite low, Partial Coverage generates more profits. With the same logic, Full Coverage will exceed Partial Coverage when α is high enough. Combined with convexity, we know $V(\alpha)$ and $U(\alpha)$ is single-crossing in non trivial part.

As shown in figure 6, the monopolist may use Full Coverage when α is high, use Partial Coverage when α is moderate and sell safe arm when α is lower but higher than the cutoff of switching into Non Bonus. In other words, the optimal switching condition may be changed, since the monopolist may switch from Full Coverage to Partial Coverage, instead of the safe arm considered in section 5.1, which switching belief we denote as $\underline{\alpha}_3$. Mathematically speaking, our original ODE still holds, and only the boundary condition (related to unknown $\underline{\alpha}_3$) needs to be changed as:

$$V(\underline{\alpha}_3) = U(\underline{\alpha}_3), V'(\underline{\alpha}_3) = U'(\underline{\alpha}_3) \quad (10)$$

where $U(\alpha)$ has been pinned down by boundary problem claimed in Lemma 5.2. Moreover, the fact that $\underline{\alpha}_1 > \underline{\alpha}_2 > 0$ also guarantees that the monopolist will always switch from Full Coverage to Partial Coverage, and from Partial Coverage to selling safe arm. It's not optimal to switch from Full Coverage directly to selling safe arm. Mathematical reason is that value function $V(\alpha)$ and $U(\alpha)$ will always be single crossing above value of safe arm, and an intuitive explanation may be that Partial Coverage here can be understood as a mixed strategy of using Full Coverage and selling safe arm. A numerical illustration can be found in figure D4, where it looks as if we try to connect $V(\alpha)$ and $U(\alpha)$ smoothly when the first optimal switching occurs. More over we can prove:

$$\underline{\alpha}_3 = \frac{s}{z\lambda}$$

where the right hand side is nothing but the cut-off of the myopic monopolist (i.e. the monopolist who can only consider the present profit instead of the value function including discounted future profits). Base on Lemma 5.1, 5.2 and equation 10, we use the following proposition to state the optimal strategy of the monopolist completely. The proof of $\underline{\alpha}_3 = \frac{s}{z\lambda}$ can be found in Appendix C.

Prop 5.3. *There exists cutoffs $0 < \underline{\alpha}_2 < \underline{\alpha}_3 < 1$, and the monopolist uses Full Coverage strategy when $\alpha > \underline{\alpha}_3$, uses Partial Coverage strategy when $\underline{\alpha}_3 > \alpha > \underline{\alpha}_2$, and sells safe arm when $\alpha < \underline{\alpha}_2$. The optimal pricing scheme with and corresponding bonus scheme is as claimed in Lemma 5.1 and 5.2, and the optimal switching in $\underline{\alpha}_3 = \frac{s}{z\lambda}$ fits $V(\underline{\alpha}_3) = U(\underline{\alpha}_3)$, $V'(\underline{\alpha}_3) = U'(\underline{\alpha}_3)$.*

To illustrate our results, a numeric example is provided whose details can be found in Appendix C. Figure 7 is a numeric result based on the same parameters in Figure 6. The horizontal axis stands for α and the vertical axis stands for the value function $V(\alpha)$ or $U(\alpha)$. Since $U(\alpha)$ has no explicit expression, I use (8-order) power series approximation for it, which is shown as the black dotted line. From the figure we know the fitting works well. We can also see $\underline{\alpha}_3 = \frac{s}{z\lambda} = \frac{5}{7} \approx 0.71$ (the smooth pasting point between Full Coverage and Partial Coverage) shown as a vertical red dotted line, and $\underline{\alpha}_2 = \frac{sr}{\lambda(g-s+zr)} = \frac{5}{9} \approx 0.556$ (the smooth pasting point between Partial Coverage and Safe Arm) shown as a vertical blue dotted line, in this situation. The red dot-line line is original $V(\alpha)$ which is generated by the Naive Monopolist but necessary to be shown.

Moreover, we should notice that the optimal switching belief between FC and PC is $\underline{\alpha}_3 = \frac{s}{z\lambda}$, which is the exact belief when the one shot payoff of selling the risky arm, $\alpha z \lambda$ is equal to the one shot payoff of selling the safe arm s . According to our bullet points 4 in lemma 5.1 and 5.2, we know the optimal reporting bonus should be monotonically decreasing with respect to α under FC but increasing under PC. This is to say, at the switching belief $\underline{\alpha}_3$, the reporting bonus attaches the local maximum. Intuitively, the value of information attaches the maximum when the belief is at its vaguest state. An illustration is at Fig 8, where for the social planner the bonus is highest when $\alpha \approx 0.71$.




Figure 7: Optimal Switching Monopolist

5.3 Welfare

5.3.1 Social planner's utility

We consider such a setting, where a social planner, based on current common belief α and reporting cost \tilde{c} announced by the current agent, commits an allocation rule $p(\alpha, \cdot)$, a transfer rule $t(\alpha, \cdot)$ (negative for agents' net gain) and a reporting rule $q(\alpha, \cdot)$. Then the current agent with true cost c_i arrives and reports his own reporting cost \tilde{c}_i , and the social planner will act using α and \tilde{c}_i . Allocation rule stands for the probability of delivering the risky arm to the current agent, and probability $1 - p(\alpha, \cdot)$ to get the safe arm. The agent will be charged a transfer $t(\alpha, \tilde{c}_i)$ no matter which arm is purchased. Then conditional on getting the risky arm, the agent has probability $q(\alpha, \tilde{c})$ to be obliged to report the true utility and $1 - q(\alpha, \tilde{c})$ to do nothing. Then for the agent with true cost c_i , reporting \tilde{c} leads to utility

$$U(c, \tilde{c}, \alpha) = -t(\alpha, \tilde{c}) + p(\alpha, \tilde{c})[\alpha z \lambda - q(\alpha, \tilde{c})c] + (1 - p(\alpha, \tilde{c}))s$$

and IC constraint hence requires

$$c \in \operatorname{argmax}_{\tilde{c}} U(c, \tilde{c}, \alpha)$$

For the social planner, in period Δ , if the current agent reports \tilde{c} (we use c to replace \tilde{c} since in equilibrium we have truthfully reporting), his immediate gain from total social surplus, should be

$$\tilde{\pi}_1(\Delta, c) = \int_0^\Delta r e^{-rt} p(\alpha, \tilde{c}) [\lambda e^{-\lambda t} \alpha z - q(\alpha, \tilde{c})c] + r e^{-rt} (1 - p(\alpha, \tilde{c})) s dt \quad (11)$$

Then we define the value function, which is based on α only and stands for the expected total utility when holding belief α . According to our definition of $\tilde{\pi}(\Delta, c)$, we have (The formation details can be found in Appendix)

$$W(\alpha) = \mathbb{E}_c(\pi(\alpha, c)) = \int_c \pi(\alpha, c) dH(c)$$

Then we apply the operator $\int_c \cdot dH(c)$ for equation (11), (i.e. take the expectation with respect to c) for both sides, we can execute the limit calculation by using L'Hospital's Rule. We can get:

$$[r + \lambda\alpha\mathbb{E}(pq)]W(\alpha) = r\lambda\alpha z\mathbb{E}(p) + [1 - \mathbb{E}(p)]sr - r\mathbb{E}(pqc) + \lambda^2 z\alpha\mathbb{E}(pq) + (\alpha^2 - \alpha)\lambda W'(\alpha)\mathbb{E}(pq)$$

The following lemma describes the optimal strategy for the social planner.

Lemma 5.4. *There exists optimal mechanism (p, q, t) to guarantee that every agent will truthfully report their cost. There exists cutoff $\underline{\alpha}_5$ and $\underline{\alpha}_6$ for the common belief, and cutoff $C_1(\alpha)$ and $C_2(\alpha)$ for agents' cost, such that the social planner would set $p = q = 0$ (i.e. using Safe Arm) if $\alpha < \underline{\alpha}_5$, set $q = 1$ for sure and $p = 1$ if $c < C_1(\alpha)$ (i.e. using Partial Coverage), and set $p = 1$ for sure and $q = 1$ if $c < C_2(\alpha)$ (i.e. using Full Coverage) if $\underline{\alpha}_6 < \alpha < 1$.*

Above Lemma shows that social planner's decision is also based on the same optimal switching. Here the social planner actually has three possible combinations of (p, q) , which stands for just the same three strategies as the monopolist. Like before, the social planner is more likely to use Full Coverage when the common belief is high, use Non Bonus when belief is low, and use Partial Coverage as a transition when belief is moderate. More specifically, when $\alpha > \underline{\alpha}_6$, $p = 1$ for sure, which means the social planner will always ask the agent to try the risky arm and report if the current agent is with a low enough c such that $q = 1$, which is like using Full Coverage. Otherwise when $\underline{\alpha}_5 < \alpha < \underline{\alpha}_6$, p is possible to be zero when c is large. The social planner will only ask agents with low enough costs to test the risky arm, hence it's equivalent to Partial Coverage. What's still important here is that the once the social planner ask an agent to test the risky arm, the agent will be obliged to report. Mathematically speaking, when $\underline{\alpha}_5 < \alpha < \underline{\alpha}_6$ and $p = 1$, we require $B(\alpha) - rc + \lambda z\alpha r - sr > 0$ given $\lambda z\alpha r - sr < 0$, which guarantees $B(\alpha) - rc > 0$ hence $q = 1$. In a more intuitive way, these agents whose reporting cost is small enough to let $p = 1$ for them are asked to use risky arm to explore rather than exploit the risky arm since myopically safe arm is better. When $\alpha < \underline{\alpha}_5$ (which is equivalent to $B(\alpha) - rc + \lambda z\alpha r - sr < 0$), the social planner will set $p = 0$ for sure, which means the information aggregation is terminated, and the social planner sets Non Bonus and keeps using safe arm.

To be more direct, we can characterize the optimal strategy and value function iteration in non trivial case (i.e. when $\alpha > \underline{\alpha}_5$). Denote $B(\alpha) \equiv \alpha\lambda^2 z + (\alpha^2 - \alpha)\lambda W'(\alpha) - \lambda\alpha W(\alpha)$, then For $\alpha > \underline{\alpha}_5$, the social planner would set p, q accordingly, and his value function $W(\cdot)$ fits the following law of motion:

- (Partial Coverage) for $\underline{\alpha}_5 < \alpha < \underline{\alpha}_6$,

$$\begin{cases} p = 1 \text{ if } c < C_1(\alpha) \equiv \frac{B(\alpha) + \lambda z\alpha r - sr}{r} \\ q = 1 \ \forall \alpha, c \\ rW(\alpha) - rs = \int_{0 < c < \frac{B(\alpha) + \lambda z\alpha r - sr}{r}} \lambda z\alpha r - sr + B(\alpha) - rc dH(c) \\ W(\underline{\alpha}_5) = s, W'(\underline{\alpha}_5) = 0 \end{cases}$$

- (Full Coverage) for $\underline{\alpha}_6 < \alpha < 1$,

$$\begin{cases} p = 1 \quad \forall \alpha, c \\ q = 1 \text{ if } c < C_2(\alpha) \equiv \frac{B(\alpha)}{r} \\ rW(\alpha) = \lambda z \alpha r + \int_{0 < c < \frac{B(\alpha)}{r}} B(\alpha) - rcdH(c) \\ W(\alpha) \text{ smooth at } \frac{s}{\lambda z} \end{cases}$$

5.3.2 ~~Critical belief~~

We measure the efficiency of the learning process led by the monopolist in two ways. Firstly, will the monopolist stop experiments at a higher belief? And secondly, will the monopolist attach the termination sooner than the social planner? The following lemma answers the first question:

Prop. 5.5. *The social planner will switch from Full Coverage to Partial Coverage, and switch from Partial Coverage and Non Bonus at the same belief as the monopolist (i.e. $\underline{\alpha}_5 = \underline{\alpha}_2$, and $\underline{\alpha}_6 = \underline{\alpha}_3$). Moreover, at any belief, the social planner will do experiments with higher probability.*

Two messages are shown in this proposition. The first one is that the switching cutoff belief is irrelevant with the decision maker. To be more specific:

1. The social planner will switch to Partial Coverage at the same belief cutoff as the monopolist. At the cutoff belief, the decision maker should feel indifferent myopically between safe arm and risky arm, since the reporting probability is continuous at this cutoff.
2. The social planner will stop at the same belief cutoff as the monopolist. Though surprising at the first sight, actually the switching condition guarantees this equivalence. $\underline{\alpha}_2$ actually stands for the switching belief between Partial Coverage and Non Bonus, at which in the long run the decision maker feels indifferent between doing more experiment or not. One more experiment is of no value when the common belief is low enough, and it's irrelevant with the cost of experiment. Intuitively speaking, because of the existence of Partial Coverage, if the information is valuable for the social planner, it's also valuable for the monopolist since the monopolist can always set a low enough bonus and use Partial Coverage, and keep waiting until agents with low enough cost arrive, try the risky arm and report.

The second message is that the monopolist's willingness to do experiments is less than the social planner, hence every stage there is lower probability to report. Since the social planner bears less cost than the monopolist ($\mathbb{E}(c|c < b) < b$), a quick thought should be that the social planner will encourage agents with higher reporting cost to report than the monopolist. In other words, the learning speed of the social planner should be higher. The following analysis supports this intuition, and "learning speed" actually means reporting

probability in our model. We should realize that here social planner can naturally do better since he can design the reporting probability on α, c while the monopolist can only set it on α . For example, the monopolist gets probability $H(b(\alpha))$ or $H(R(\alpha))$ to update (lower) their belief, while the social planner has probability $p(\alpha, c) = 1 - H(B(\alpha) - rc + \lambda z \alpha r - sr)$ to get update. Even before reporting true c , the expected probability would be $\mathbb{E}(p)$, which is higher than $H(b(\alpha))$ under the same α .

In order to show our results more intuitively, we characterize the equivalent mechanism (p, q) of the monopolist. Take the partial coverage case as an example, the following setting can lead the (ex ante) equivalent learning process as monopolist's partial coverage

$$p(\alpha, c) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{where } R(\alpha) - c > 0 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

and

$$q(\alpha, c) \equiv 1$$

where as declared in Lemma 5.2, $R(\alpha)$ is the solution of equation

$$r\beta(R) = \lambda\alpha zr - rs + \alpha z\lambda^2 + (\alpha^2 - \alpha)\lambda U'(\alpha) - \lambda\alpha U(\alpha)$$

Hence at the stopping belief $\underline{\alpha}_2$, we should have $p(\underline{\alpha}_2, c) = 0, \forall c$, hence $R(\alpha) = 0$ which leads to the restriction of value function:

$$0 = \lambda\underline{\alpha}_2 zr - rs + \underline{\alpha}_2 z\lambda^2 + (\underline{\alpha}_2^2 - \underline{\alpha}_2)\lambda U'(\underline{\alpha}_2) - \lambda\underline{\alpha}_2 U(\underline{\alpha}_2)$$

which is just the same as the value function of social planner when $\alpha < \frac{s}{z\lambda}$.

Similarly, using Full Coverage is equivalent to set

$$p(\alpha, c) \equiv 1$$

and

$$q(\alpha, c) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{where } b(\alpha) - c > 0 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

According to our definition, $b(\alpha)$ is the solution of equation

$$r\beta(b) = \alpha z\lambda^2 + (\alpha^2 - \alpha)\lambda V'(\alpha) - \alpha\lambda V(\alpha)$$

Simply comparing (p, q) combination between the mechanism under the monopolist and the social planner we can find the social planner will do experiments in a higher probability hence attaches the termination in a higher speed. A further illustration is in Figure 8. Both using Full Coverage, when the current agent's reporting cost c is lower than the red solid line, the social planner is willing to set $p = q = 1$, while the monopolist is only willing to set $p = q = 1$ when c is lower than the red dotted line. We can find the monopolist will have lower probability to do experiments than the social planner. Similarly, blue lines stands for the Partial Coverage, and our observations still hold.




Figure 8: Mechanisms Comparison

In other words, there is inefficiency of the experiment process led by the monopolist since the learning speed is lower, and because of lower learning speed, the social surplus is also lower under the monopolist setting (see figure 9). It's straight forward that social planner has higher value function than the monopolist since the total cost is c_i for the social planner but $b > c_i$ or $R > c_i$ for the monopolist. However, this is not the pivotal reason why the social planner is efficient. We can calculate the social surplus under our monopolist setting to show the social surplus is also lower than the social planner to illustrate that it's the learning speed which makes the social planner more efficient. To do so, we modify the immediate surplus as

$$\lim_{\Delta \rightarrow 0} \frac{\pi_{1,L}(\Delta, c)}{\Delta} = \begin{cases} \alpha z r \lambda - H(b) c r & \text{if } L = \text{Full Coverage} \\ [H(R)(\lambda z \alpha - c) + (1 - H(R))s] r & \text{if } L = \text{Partial Coverage} \\ r s & \text{if } L = \text{Non Bonus} \end{cases}$$

and use first order conditions in lemma 5.1 and 5.2, and original boundary conditions we get the following iteration relationships for value function $\Gamma(\alpha, c)$ conditional on current reporting cost c and common belief α :

$$[r + P_L(b)\alpha\lambda]\Gamma(\alpha, c) = \lim_{\Delta \rightarrow 0} \frac{\pi_{1,L}(\Delta, c)}{\Delta} + P_L(b)(\alpha^2 - \alpha)\lambda\Gamma_\alpha(\alpha, c) + P_L(b)\alpha\lambda^2 z \quad (12)$$

and let

$$\Lambda(\alpha) = \mathbb{E}_\alpha[\Gamma(\alpha, c)|c < b(\alpha)] \text{ in Full Coverage}$$

or

$$\Lambda(\alpha) = \mathbb{E}_\alpha[\Gamma(\alpha, c)|c < R(\alpha)] \text{ in Partial Coverage}$$

to stand for the value function of the social surplus under monopolist setting, then combine with FOC gotten before we can get the following rule of motion for $\Lambda(\alpha)$. Let $\underline{\alpha}_3 = \frac{s}{z\lambda}$ and

$\underline{\alpha}_2 = \frac{sr}{\lambda(g-s+sr)}$, then for $\underline{\alpha}_2 < \alpha < \underline{\alpha}_3$ we have

$$\begin{cases} r\beta(R) = \lambda\alpha zr - rs + \alpha z\lambda^2 + (\alpha^2 - \alpha)\lambda\Lambda'(\alpha) - \lambda\alpha\Lambda(\alpha) \\ \Lambda(\alpha) = -H(R)\mathbb{E}(c|c < R) + s + H(R)\beta(R) \\ \Lambda(\underline{\alpha}_2) = s \end{cases}$$

and for $\underline{\alpha}_3 < \alpha < 1$ we have

$$\begin{cases} r\beta(b) = \alpha z\lambda^2 + (\alpha^2 - \alpha)\lambda\Lambda'(\alpha) - \lambda\alpha\Lambda(\alpha) \\ \Lambda(\alpha) = -H(b)\mathbb{E}(c|c < b) + \alpha z\lambda + H(b)\beta(b) \\ \Lambda(\alpha) \text{ is smooth at } \underline{\alpha}_3 \end{cases}$$




Figure 9: Social Welfare Comparison

It's quite straight forward to see that $\Lambda(\alpha) > \Pi(\alpha)$ since they two share the same first order condition but the right hand side of the second line of $\Lambda(\alpha)$ is larger than the right hand side of the Bellman Equation for $\Pi(\alpha)$. What's important is that $\Lambda(\alpha) < W(\alpha)$, as we mentioned before, the whole society suffer from lower learning speed caused by the monopolist. As a comparison, for any $V \in (W, \Pi, \Lambda)$, we can rewrite iteration equation as

$$V - \alpha z\lambda = \kappa_V(b)$$

where b is given by the common FOC:

$$r\beta(b) = \alpha z\lambda^2 + (\alpha^2 - \alpha)\lambda V'(\alpha) - \lambda\alpha V(\alpha)$$

and

$$\kappa_V(b) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2}(\beta(b))^2 & \text{if } V = W \\ H(b)\beta(b) - H(b)\mathbb{E}(c|c < b) & \text{if } V = \Lambda \\ H(b)\beta(b) - H(b)b & \text{if } V = \Pi \end{cases}$$

A natural question is whether we always have $\kappa_W > \kappa_\Lambda$. Actually $\kappa_W - \kappa_\Lambda = \frac{1}{2}(\beta(b))^2 - H(b)\beta(b) + H(b)\mathbb{E}(c|c < b) > \beta(b)[\frac{1}{2}\beta(b) - H(b)]$. And let $J(b) = \frac{1}{2}\beta(b) - H(b)$, then $J(0) = 0$ and

$$J'(b) = \frac{-H(b)h'(b)}{h^2(b)}$$

$h'(b) < 0$ guarantees $J(b) > 0$ for all $b > 0$, hence $\kappa_W > \kappa_\Lambda$ for sure.

5.4 Comparative Statics

We do comparative statics here with respect to λ , the arriving rate of utility when the state is good, z , the random utility when the state is good, r , the discount factor of the decision maker, and s , the common utility of safe arm. A direct idea is value functions should be monotonically decreasing with respect to the discount rate r . An illustration (take social surplus as an example) should be like Figure 10:




Figure 10: Comparative Statics for r

Then we focus on comparative statics about the switching believes.

Lemma 5.6. $\underline{\alpha}_2, \underline{\alpha}_3, \underline{\alpha}_4$ are monotonically decreasing with respect to λ and z , and monotonically increasing with respect to s .

Parameters' affection to α_2 and α_4 , the belief of the termination of experiment of monopolist and social planner, shows a simple logic that the monopolist and the social planner may be more patient to do experiments when doing experiment is attractive. Higher z increases the utility of risky arm directly, hence make it more attractive. Partially speaking, λ plays the same role with z , since it stands for the possibility of getting z . Moreover, λ not only

stands for the utility of taking the risky arm but also stands for the speed of getting perfect information when the state is good. It may takes less time for the belief to jump to 1 when λ is higher, hence doing experiments is more attractive. In other words, a high learning speed will lead to more efficient learning. s stands for the utility of safe arm, hence s being higher is actually equivalent to lower λ and z . The intuition is that a better status quo utility may demotivate innovation. α_3 is the switching belief of using Full Coverage and Partial coverage, hence it will decrease and support Full Coverage more when parameters make the risky arm more attractive.

Lm5.7. $\underline{\alpha}_2, \underline{\alpha}_4$ are monotonically increasing with respect to r , and $\underline{\alpha}_3$ is irrelevant with r .

r here stands for the patience of the decision maker, hence more efficient experiment will be allowed when he is more patient. The decision whether to switch from Full Coverage to Partial Coverage seems like a myopic decision since $\underline{\alpha}_3$ is not affected by r : the monopolist stops selling risky arm and starts to sell safe arm when risky arm makes less profit. However, it's actually not the case. As we have mentioned before, Partial Coverage has the same learning speed with Full Coverage. Switching to Partial Coverage will not slow down the speed of learning the state, hence r will not affect the switching belief here.

6 Conclusion

The seller can always set Non-Bonus or Immediate Revelation in extreme cases. Besides, there are two possible selling strategies: Full Coverage Strategy and Partial Coverage Strategy. In Full Coverage Strategy, the platform keeps selling the risky arm and combine it with a bonus scheme of recursive structure. In Partial Coverage Strategy the platform set $p_{2t} \equiv s$. He can set an arbitrary p_{1t} because at time t with belief α_t he has to choose optimal $R_t(\alpha_t)$ and set bonus $b_t = p_{1t} + R_t(\alpha_t) - \lambda\alpha_t z$. In this case agents purchasing arm 1 is a stochastic process but once agent t chooses to buy arm 1 he will report for sure, unlike in the Full Coverage where agents reporting R_1 is a stochastic process instead. The linkage of pricing scheme and bonus scheme actually reflects how the seller can take advantage of leading the social experiment. The monopolist may switch from Full Coverage to Partial Coverage optimally, and when the belief is low enough, he may stop doing experiments and setting Non-Bonus. Since the monopolist can always take advantage of Partial Coverage by setting a low enough bonus to encourage partial agents to reveal the information cheaply, the monopolist can bear the same experiment extent as the First Best. However, to save costs, the monopolist will attach the termination of experiments at a lower speed.

References

- [ARZ99] Christopher Avery, Paul Resnick, and Richard Zeckhauser. The market for evaluations. *American economic review*, 89(3):564–584, 1999.
- [Ban92] Abhijit V Banerjee. A simple model of herd behavior. *The quarterly journal of economics*, 107(3):797–817, 1992.

- [BH99] Patrick Bolton and Christopher Harris. Strategic experimentation. *Econometrica*, 67(2):349–374, 1999.
- [BHBG18] Gordon Burtch, Yili Hong, Ravi Bapna, and Vidas Griskevicius. Stimulating online reviews by combining financial incentives and social norms. *Management Science*, 64(5):2065–2082, 2018.
- [BHW92] Sushil Bikhchandani, David Hirshleifer, and Ivo Welch. A theory of fads, fashion, custom, and cultural change as informational cascades. *Journal of political Economy*, 100(5):992–1026, 1992.
- [BOOV06] Subir Bose, Gerhard Orosel, Marco Ottaviani, and Lise Vesterlund. Dynamic monopoly pricing and herding. *The RAND Journal of Economics*, 37(4):910–928, 2006.
- [BOOV08] Subir Bose, Gerhard Orosel, Marco Ottaviani, and Lise Vesterlund. Monopoly pricing in the binary herding model. *Economic Theory*, 37(2):203–241, 2008.
- [BV96] Dirk Bergemann and Juuso Välimäki. Learning and strategic pricing. *Econometrica: Journal of the Econometric Society*, pages 1125–1149, 1996.
- [BV00] Dirk Bergemann and Juuso Välimäki. Experimentation in markets. *The Review of Economic Studies*, 67(2):213–234, 2000.
- [BV06] Dirk Bergemann and Juuso Välimäki. Dynamic pricing of new experience goods. *Journal of Political Economy*, 114(4):713–743, 2006.
- [CL15] Luis Cabral and Lingfang Li. A dollar for your thoughts: Feedback-conditional rebates on ebay. *Management Science*, 61(9):2052–2063, 2015.
- [EFL16] Liran Einav, Chiara Farronato, and Jonathan Levin. Peer-to-peer markets. *Annual review of economics*, 8:615–635, 2016.
- [FGHP15] Andrey Fradkin, Elena Grewal, Dave Holtz, and Matthew Pearson. Bias and reciprocity in online reviews: Evidence from field experiments on airbnb. *EC*, 15:15–19, 2015.
- [HW20] Andrei Hagiu and Julian Wright. Data-enabled learning, network effects and competitive advantage. In *working paper*. 2020.
- [HZKC16] Xiangnan He, Hanwang Zhang, Min-Yen Kan, and Tat-Seng Chua. Fast matrix factorization for online recommendation with implicit feedback. In *Proceedings of the 39th International ACM SIGIR conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval*, pages 549–558, 2016.
- [KanKG18] Warut Khern-am nuai, Karthik Kannan, and Hossein Ghasemkhani. Extrinsic versus intrinsic rewards for contributing reviews in an online platform. *Information Systems Research*, 29(4):871–892, 2018.

- [KM12] Vijay Krishna and John Morgan. Voluntary voting: Costs and benefits. *Journal of Economic Theory*, 147(6):2083–2123, 2012.
- [KMP14] Ilan Kremer, Yishay Mansour, and Motty Perry. Implementing the “wisdom of the crowd”. *Journal of Political Economy*, 122(5):988–1012, 2014.
- [KRC05] Godfrey Keller, Sven Rady, and Martin Cripps. Strategic experimentation with exponential bandits. *Econometrica*, 83(1):39–68, 2005.
- [Li10] Lingfang Li. Reputation, trust, and rebates: How online auction markets can improve their feedback mechanisms. *Journal of Economics & Management Strategy*, 19(2):303–331, 2010.
- [ORS20] Martin J Osborne, Jeffrey S Rosenthal, and Colin Stewart. Information aggregation with costly reporting. *The Economic Journal*, 130(625):208–232, 2020.
- [Rot74] Michael Rothschild. A two-armed bandit theory of market pricing. *Journal of Economic Theory*, 9(2):185–202, 1974.
- [TZ⁺16] Steven Tadelis, Xiaolan Zhou, et al. Buying reputation as a signal of quality: Evidence from an online marketplace. Technical report, National Bureau of Economic Research, 2016.
- [Wen15] Xi Weng. Dynamic pricing in the presence of individual learning. *Journal of Economic Theory*, 155:262–299, 2015.
- [YFW06] Yuanping Ying, Fred Feinberg, and Michel Wedel. Leveraging missing ratings to improve online recommendation systems. *Journal of marketing research*, 43(3):355–365, 2006.

A Appendix

A.1 Full Coverage

A.1.1 Lemma 4.3

Proof. If the platform uses full coverage strategy the goal is:

$$\begin{aligned} & \max_{b_t} \mathbb{E}[R_1(1 + r + \dots + r^{t_0-1}) + \max\{R_1, R_2\}(r^{t_0} + \dots + r^{T-1}) - \text{cost}] \\ & \Leftrightarrow \max_{b_t} \mathbb{E}R_1 \frac{r^{t_0} - 1}{r - 1} + \mathbb{E}\max\{R_1, R_2\} r^{t_0} \frac{r^{T-t_0} - 1}{r - 1} - \mathbb{E}\text{cost} \end{aligned}$$

where $t_0 = \min\{t | H(b_t) > c_t\}$.

Hence we know for each agent he has probability $S_i = H(b_i)$ to report his utility. We let $a_i = S_i \prod_{j=1}^{i-1} (1 - S_j)$ for the probability that agent t reports. $\mathbb{E}\text{cost} = \sum_{i=1}^T b_i r^{i-1} a_i$. Hence above problem is equivalent to:

$$\min_{b_t} \sum_{i=1}^T r^i a_i [M + \frac{r-1}{r} b_i]$$

$\forall p$, we have:

$$\sum_{i=1}^T r^i a_i [M + \frac{r-1}{r} b_i] = \sum_{i=1}^{p-1} r^i a_i [M + \frac{r-1}{r} b_i] + \prod_{j=1}^{p-1} (1 - S_j) [S_p r^p (M + \frac{r-1}{r} b_p) + (1 - S_p) L_p]$$

, where

$$L_p = \sum_{i=p+1}^T r^i [M + \frac{r-1}{r} b_i] S_i \prod_{k=p+1}^{i-1} (1 - S_j)$$

F.O.C requires the following equation must hold for the optimal bonus structure (L_p is irrelevant with b_p):

$$h(b_p) r^p (M + \frac{r-1}{r} b_p) + H(b_p) r^p \frac{r-1}{r} - h(b_p) L_p = 0$$

which can be simplified:

$$\frac{r-1}{r} \beta(b_p) + M = \frac{L_p}{r^p}$$

Moreover, from the definition of L_p , we know:

$$\begin{aligned} L_p &= \sum_{i=p+1}^T r^i [M + \frac{r-1}{r} b_i] S_i \prod_{k=p+1}^{i-1} (1 - S_j) \\ &= (1 - S_{p+1}) \sum_{i=p+2}^T r^i [M + \frac{r-1}{r} b_i] S_i \prod_{k=p+2}^{i-1} (1 - S_j) + r^{p+1} [M + \frac{r-1}{r} b_{p+1}] S_{p+1} \\ &= (1 - S_{p+1}) L_{p+1} + r^{p+1} [M + \frac{r-1}{r} b_{p+1}] S_{p+1} \end{aligned}$$

Combining the above two equations we can finish the proof of Lemma 4.3. \square

A.1.2 P4.4

Proof. We use the following facts to finish our proof.

FactA.1. $b_{T-1} < b^*$ given $b_T = 0$.

Proof. Firstly we should notice that $\beta(x) - \frac{H^2(x)}{h(x)}$ is monotone increasing since its first order derivation is $\frac{[1-H(x)][2h^2(x)-H(x)h'(x)]}{h^2(x)} > 0$ (from Assumption 3.2) for any $x \in [0, \bar{c}]$. Otherwise, it will degenerate into the form x . Then we know: $\frac{\beta(b_{T-1})}{r} = M + \beta(0) - \frac{H^2(0)}{h(0)} = M = \frac{H^2(b^*)}{h(b^*)} + (\frac{1}{r} - 1)\beta(b^*) < \beta(b^*) + (\frac{1}{r} - 1)\beta(b^*) = \frac{\beta(b^*)}{r}$, hence $b_{T-1} = \Gamma(0) < b^*$ \square

FactA.2. $b_{p+1} < b_p < b^*$ given $0 < b_{p+1} < b^*$.

Proof. $\beta(b_p) - \beta(b_{p+1}) = r[M - \frac{H^2(b_{p+1})}{h(b_{p+1})} + \beta(b_{p+1})] - \beta(b_{p+1}) > r[M - \frac{H^2(b^*)}{h(b^*)} + \beta(b^*)] - \beta(b^*) = 0$ hence $b_p > b_{p+1}$.

On the other hand $\frac{\beta(b_p)}{r} = M - \frac{H^2(b_{p+1})}{h(b_{p+1})} + \beta(b_{p+1}) < M - \frac{H^2(b^*)}{h(b^*)} + \beta(b^*) = \frac{\beta(b^*)}{r}$ hence $b_p < b^*$ \square

Given our fact A.2 we know $b^* > b_1 > b_2 > \dots > b_{t-1} > b_T = 0$. Then if $b_1 < \bar{c}$, we know the optimal bonus structure is $(b_1, b_2, \dots, b_{T-1}, b_T)$, where $b_i = \Gamma^{T-i}(0)$. We then ask what if $\exists p$ such that $b_p > \bar{c} > b_{p+1}$. We should first notice that the necessary of which is $b^* > \bar{c} \Leftrightarrow \Psi(b^*) < \Psi(\bar{c})$. We take the this equation as given in the left of our proof:

$$rM > (r-1)\bar{c} + \frac{1}{h(\bar{c})}, \quad (13)$$

FactA.3. Given Equation (13), for any $\{b_i\}$ and $x > 0$, setting $b_p = x > 0$ and $b_{p-1} = 0$ is always (strictly) dominated by setting $b_p = 0$, $b_{p-1} = x$ and remaining others.

Proof. $u(r_1, \dots, r_p - 1, x, 0, r_{p+2}, \dots) - u(r_1, \dots, r_p - 1, 0, x, r_{p+2}, \dots) = r^{p-1} \prod_{j=1}^{p-1} (1 - H(r_j))H(x)[Mr - x(1-r)] \geq r^{p-1} \prod_{j=1}^{p-1} (1 - H(r_j))H(x)[Mr - \bar{c}(1-r)] \geq 0$ \square

Given fact 3, we know it's impossible to set $b_{p-1} = 0$ before any positive b_p . Hence we have to set $b_{p-1} = \bar{c}$ when corner solution is necessary. The next problem is given $b_p = \bar{c}$, what should b_{p-1} be. Based on the fact that the recurrence relationship is monotone increasing we know the interior solution is even larger than \bar{c} hence corner solution is again needed, combine with Fact 3' we know the only possible solution is to use \bar{c} . With the same logic we should set $b_{p-2} = \dots = b_1 = \bar{c}$, then we can get our lemma, which is a key step in forming the optimal structure.

Lm A.4. Given Equation(13), the bonus structures where $\exists p, s.t. b_p = \bar{c}$, is always dominated by setting $b_1 = \bar{c}$.

Lemma A.5 and Lemma 4.3 are enough to prove our proposition 4.4. \square

A.2 Partial Coverage Case

Lemma 5. *Suppose that there exists $1 \leq p < T$ such that the corresponding optimal bonus scheme satisfies $0 < b_p < \bar{c}$. Then we have the following recursive relationship:*

$$\frac{\beta(b_p)}{r} = \psi_N(b_{p+1}), \quad (14)$$

where $N = M + \frac{\mathbb{E}R_1 - R_2}{r}$ and $M = \mathbb{E} \max\{R_1, R_2\} - \mathbb{E}R_1$ and $\psi_N(\cdot)$ as denoted ahead.

Proof. Similar to proof of Lemma 4.3 in A.1.1 hence omitted. \square

A.2.1 Partial Coverage

Proof. If the platform uses partial coverage strategy the goal is:

$$\begin{aligned} & \max_{b_t} E[R_2(1 + r + \dots + r^{t_0-2}) + R_1 r^{t_0-1} I(t_0 \leq T) + \max\{R_1, R_2\}(r^{t_0} + \dots + r^{T-1}) - cost] \\ & \Leftrightarrow \max_{b_t} R_2 \frac{r^{t_0} - 1}{r - 1} + (R_1 - R_2)r^{t_0-1} + E \max\{R_1, R_2\} r^{t_0} \frac{r^{T-t_0} - 1}{r - 1} - Ecost \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

where $t_0 = \min\{t | H(b_t) > c_t\}$. $Ecost = \sum_{i=1}^T b_i r^{i-1} a_i$. Hence above problem is equivalent to:

$$\min_{b_t} \sum_{i=1}^T r^i a_i [N + \frac{r-1}{r} b_i] \quad (16)$$

With the proof Proposition 1, we can get the recursive relation for interior solution:

$$\frac{\beta(b_p)}{r} = \psi_N(b_{p+1}) \quad (17)$$

We should notice that unlike M is always positive, N may be negative. Another difference here is that the starting point, b_T , may not be zero. To see this, we consider the sub-game when only one agent T left. Setting $b_T = x$ provides utility $H(x)(R_1 - x) + (1 - H(x))R_2$, hence the optimal b_T satisfies F.O.C:

$$\beta(b_T) = ER_1 - R_2 \quad (18)$$

This result shows that when R_2 is very large, the optimal b_T may be negative, and the consumers would choose arm 2 to get utility 0 instead of a negative utility $-\epsilon$ by purchasing arm1 since he will never report to get a negative bonus and pay a reporting cost. If $b_T < 0$, from equation (17) we know the every point of the interior solution sequence is negative. Hence in this case, the bonus structure is equivalent to set $(0, 0, \dots, 0)$.

To describe the interior solution structure here in detail, we should notice the following facts:

Fact A.6. *The fixed point, b_N^* , shares the same signal with N , and the starting point, b_T , shares the same signal with $\mathbb{E}R_1 - R_2$. Hence $b_T > 0 \Rightarrow b_N^* > 0$.*




Figure A1: $b_T < 0$ and $N > 0$




Figure A2: $b_T < 0$ and $N < 0$

FactA.7. *If $N > 0$ and $b_T > 0$, we have $b_N^* > b_1 > b_2 > b_3 > \dots > b_{T-1} > b_T > 0$. If $N > 0$ and $b_T < 0$, we have $b_N^* > b_1 > b_2 > b_3 > \dots > b_{T-1} > 0 > b_T$. (An illustration is Figure A1) If $N < 0$, we have $0 > b_N^* > b_1 > b_2 > b_3 > \dots > b_{T-1} > b_T$. (An illustration is Figure A2)*

Proof. From the definition of b_N^* we know $(\frac{1}{r} - 1)\beta(b_N^*) + \frac{H^2(b_N^*)}{h(b_N^*)} = N = M + \frac{\mathbb{E}R_1 - R_2}{r}$, and $(\frac{1}{r} - 1)\beta(b_T) + \frac{H^2(b_T)}{h(b_T)} = (\mathbb{E}R_1 - R_2)(\frac{1}{r} - 1) + \frac{H^2(b_T)}{h(b_T)} = \frac{H^2(b_T)}{h(b_T)} + R_2 - \mathbb{E}R_1 + \frac{\mathbb{E}R_1 - R_2}{r}$. Since $b_T > 0$, we have $\beta(b_T) - \frac{H^2(b_T)}{h(b_T)} > \beta(0) - \frac{H^2(0)}{h(0)} = 0$, hence $\frac{H^2(b_T)}{h(b_T)} + R_2 - \mathbb{E}R_1 + \frac{\mathbb{E}R_1 - R_2}{r} < \frac{H(b_T)}{h(b_T)} + b_T + R_2 - \mathbb{E}R_1 + \frac{\mathbb{E}R_1 - R_2}{r} = 0 + \frac{\mathbb{E}R_1 - R_2}{r} < M + \frac{\mathbb{E}R_1 - R_2}{r} = N$, hence $b_T < b_N^*$. Then with the same logic above, this inequality can be iterated, hence we finish the proof of the first part here.

When $b_T < 0$, the direction of inequality changes. Actually above function is not defined when $b_T < 0$. However, with our basic definition, $\psi_N(x) = \beta(x) - \frac{H^2(x)}{h(x)} + N$, and when $x < 0$ it degenerates into simply N . Hence in the first step we have $\beta(b_{T-1}) = rN$, which will lead to a positive b_{T-1} . In this case, we have $(\frac{1}{r} - 1)\beta(b_N^*) + \frac{H^2(b_N^*)}{h(b_N^*)} = N = M + \frac{\mathbb{E}R_1 - R_2}{r}$, and $(\frac{1}{r} - 1)\beta(b_{T-1}) + \frac{H^2(b_{T-1})}{h(b_{T-1})} = rN(\frac{1}{r} - 1) + \frac{H^2(b_{T-1})}{h(b_{T-1})} = \frac{H^2(b_{T-1})}{h(b_{T-1})} + rN(\frac{1}{r} - 1)$. Since $b_{T-1} > 0$, we have $\beta(b_{T-1}) - \frac{H^2(b_{T-1})}{h(b_{T-1})} > \beta(0) - \frac{H^2(0)}{h(0)} = 0$, hence $\frac{H^2(b_{T-1})}{h(b_{T-1})} + rN(\frac{1}{r} - 1) < \frac{H(b_{T-1})}{h(b_{T-1})} + b_{T-1} + rN(\frac{1}{r} - 1) = 0 + N$, hence $b_{T-1} < b_N^*$.

Moreover, we should notice that when $x < 0$, $\beta(x)$ degenerates to $\beta(x) = x$ and $\psi_N(x)$ degenerates to $\psi_N(x) = x + N$. Hence given $N < 0$, $\beta(b_{T-1}) = \psi_N(b_T) = b_T + N < 0$ so $b_{T-1} < 0$. The same logic guarantees $b_i < 0, \forall i$. The fixed point satisfies $\frac{\beta(x)}{r} = \psi_N(x)$ or $\frac{x}{r} = x + N$, hence $b_N^* = \frac{rN}{1-r}$. $(1-r)(b_N^* - b_T) = rN - (R_1 - R_2)(1-r) = r(\text{Emax}\{R_1, R_2\} - R_2) > 0$. Hence we have $0 > b_N^* > b_1 > b_2 > b_3 > \dots > b_{T-1} > b_T$. \square

Lemma A.5 combined with Fact A.6-A.8 finishes proof of Proposition 4.5. A more complex and seemingly redundant proof is needed because of the possibility of a negative iteration start point. To sum up, unlike Full Coverage (only one contingency), when using Partial

Coverage Strategy, there may be three contingencies: (1) $b_T > 0, N > 0$; (2) $b_T < 0, N > 0$ and (3) $b_T < 0, N < 0$. In case (1) and (2). A negative bonus is equivalent to zero bonus since it provides no probability for agents to report. Moreover, if he chooses to purchase arm 1 without reporting, his utility is $ER_1 - p1 = -\epsilon$. If he chooses arm 2 and not to report, his utility should be $R_2 - p2 = 0$. Hence a zero bonus or a negative bonus is providing motivation for agents to use arm 2 instead of using arm 1 in Partial Coverage Strategy. \square

A.3 Profitability

A.3.1 Lemma 4.5 (final)

Proof. We denote η_p to be the total utility of bonus structure $(0, 0, \dots, 0, \Gamma^{(p)}(b_T), \Gamma^{(p-1)}(b_T), \dots, \Gamma^{(1)}(b_T), b_T)$. Hence obviously we have the following equation:

$$\begin{aligned} \eta_p &= R_1(1 + r + \dots r^{T-p-1}) - H(x)xr^{T-p-1} + H(x)Emax\{R_1, R_2\}(r^{T-p} + r^{T-p+1} + \dots r^{T-1}) \\ &\quad + [1 - H(x)][\eta_{p-1} - R_1(1 + r + \dots r^{T-p-1})] \\ &= H(x)R_1 \frac{r^{T-p} - 1}{r - 1} - H(x)xr^{T-p-1} + H(x)Emax\{R_1, R_2\}r^{T-p} \frac{r^p - 1}{r - 1} + (1 - H(x))\eta_{p-1} \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

We have known $x = \Gamma^{(p)}(b_T)$ maximizes η_p given η_{p-1} fixed. Hence F.O.C. must hold for $x = \Gamma^{(p)}(b_T)$, thus we can get the expression of η_{p-1} :

$$\eta_{p-1} = Emax\{R_1, R_2\} \frac{r^T - r^{T-p}}{r - 1} + R_1 \frac{r^{T-p} - 1}{r - 1} - r^{T-p} \psi(\Gamma^{(p-1)}(0)) \quad (20)$$

Hence $\eta_{T-1} = Emax\{R_1, R_2\} \frac{r^T - 1}{r - 1} - \psi(b_1)$.

Similarly, if the platform uses Partial Coverage Strategy, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \eta_p &= H(x)[R_2(1 + r + \dots r^{T-p-2}) + R_1r^{T-p-1} - xr^{T-p-1} \\ &\quad + Emax\{R_1, R_2\}(r^{T-p} + r^{T-p+1} + \dots r^{T-1})] + [1 - H(x)]\eta_{p-1} \\ &= H(x)[R_2 \frac{r^{T-p-1} - 1}{r - 1} + R_1r^{T-p-1} - xr^{T-p-1} + Emax\{R_1, R_2\} \frac{r^T - r^{T-k}}{r - 1}] + [1 - H(x)]\eta_{p-1} \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

From above analysis we know the platform chooses the optimal $x = \Gamma^{(p)}(0)$ to maximize η_p given η_{p-1} , hence the F.O.C must hold at $x = \Gamma^{(p)}(0)$:

$$\eta_{p-1} = -\beta(\Gamma^{(p)}(b_T))r^{T-p-1} + R_2 \frac{r^{T-p-1} - 1}{r - 1} + R_1r^{T-p-1} + Emax\{R_1, R_2\} \frac{r^T - r^{T-p}}{r - 1} \quad (22)$$

This equation should hold for $\forall 1 \leq p \leq T-1$, hence let $p = T-1$, $\eta_{T-2} = -\beta(\Gamma^{(T-1)}(b_T)) + R_1 + Emax\{R_1, R_2\} \frac{r^T - r}{r - 1}$. Plug this result in to the recursive equation (21) at $p = T-1$, we can get the final η_{T-1} :

$$\eta_{T-1} = Emax\{R_1, R_2\} \frac{r^T - 1}{r - 1} - \psi(b_{N_1}) \quad (23)$$

where $b_{N_1} = \Gamma_N^{(T-1)}(b_T)$.

Here is an example to show that this result is robust when sequence $\{b_t\}$ contains negative items (Actually the negative item also fits equation (21), when $b_p < 0$, $\eta_p = \eta_{p+1}$). For example, only $b_1 > 0$ and $b_2, b_3, \dots, b_T = ER_1 - R_2 < 0$. The recursive relation for $t \geq 2$ is $\frac{\beta(b_p)}{r} = \psi_N(b_{p+1}) \Rightarrow \frac{b_p}{r} = N + b_{p+1}$. Hence $b_t + \frac{rN}{r-1} = r^{T-t}(b_T + \frac{rN}{r-1})$. The above result shows $\eta_{T-2} = -\beta(\Gamma_N^{(T-1)}(b_T)) + R_1 + Emax\{R_1, R_2\} \frac{r^T - r}{r-1}$. Combine these two results together we can get $\eta_{T-2} = \frac{r^T - 1}{r-1} R_2$, which fits the direct calculation given structure $b_2, b_3, \dots, b_T = ER_1 - R_2 < 0$. \square

A.4 Nonsufficiency

We consider $R_1 \sim U[0, 4], c \sim U[0, 1], T = 2$. Hence $M = Emax\{R_1, R_2\} - ER_1 = \frac{R_2^2}{8}$. In RFC, given $b_2 = 0$, we know $\beta(b_1) = 2b_1 = r\psi_M(b_2) = rM$ so $b_1 = \frac{rM}{2} = \frac{rR_2^2}{16}$. The root of $b_1 = \bar{c} = 1$ is $\frac{4}{\sqrt{r}}$, which is just the \bar{R}_2 . In this case $\bar{R}_2 > \bar{c}$ hence IRM should not be optimal, but we can make it real by choosing a large T . In RPC, if $ER_1 - R_2 > 0, b_2 > 0$, $\beta(b_2) = 2b_2 = ER_1 - R_2$, hence $\beta(b_{1N}) = 2b_1 = \psi_N(b_2)$ which will lead to $b_{1N} = \frac{r}{2}[ER_1 - R_2 + N - \frac{(ER_1 - R_2)^2}{4}] = \frac{r}{2} + 1 - \frac{R_2}{2} - \frac{rR_2^2}{16}$. The root of $b_{1N} = \bar{c} = 1$ is our \underline{R}_2 . Hence $b_1 - b_{1N} = (R_2 - 2)(\frac{r}{8}R_2 + \frac{2+r}{4})$. We predict before that $\hat{R}_2 = ER_1$ and we can see it's true here.

$N = \frac{R_2^2}{8} - \frac{2-R_2}{r}$ hence the root of which is $\frac{4(1 \pm \sqrt{1-r})}{r}$. The smaller one, $\frac{4(1-\sqrt{1-r})}{r} < 4$ is \tilde{R}_2 as we analyzed before.

B Appendix: Infinite Case

B.1 Infinite Case

B.1.1 Proposition 4.4, part 2

Proof. We use the following facts to complete the proof of proposition 4.8.

FactB.1. *If $b_1 > b^*$, we have $b^* < b_1 < b_2 < \dots$ and $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} b_t = \infty$.*

Proof. If $b_p > b^*$, we know $\psi(b^*) = \frac{\beta(b^*)}{r} < \frac{\beta(b_p)}{r} = \psi(b_{p+1})$, hence $b_{p+1} > b^*$. Moreover, $\frac{\beta(b_p) - \beta(b_{p+1})}{r} = \Psi(b_{p+1}) < \Psi(b^*) = 0$, hence $b_p < b_{p+1}$. Hence the sequence $\{\frac{\beta(b_p) - \beta(b_{p+1})}{r}\}$ is monotone decreasing and negative, we know the sequence $\{b_p\}$ is monotone increasing and not convergent, so we must have $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} b_t = \infty$ \square

Similar to above Fact A.2, we can also get:

FactB.2. *If $b_1 < b^*$, we have $b^* > b_1 > b_2 > \dots$ and $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} b_t = -\infty$.*

Then in infinite case, if we set $b_1 > b^*$, we can get a sequence of interior solution $\{b_q\}$ from the recurrence relation and combine with Fact 1, this sequence will finally get above \bar{c} . With the same logic mentioned in the proof of Proposition 4.4, “if we use highest bonus, we use it as soon as possible”, we know this structure will be dominated by $(\bar{c}, 0, 0, \dots)$. Likewise, if we set $b_1 < b^*$, this structure will also be dominated by $(\bar{c}, 0, 0, \dots)$. When $b_1 = b^* < \bar{c}$, there comes another candidate of optimal bonus structure: (b^*, b^*, b^*, \dots) . We then compare these two strategies by computing their total utility respectively. (We use $E\max\{R_1, R_2\} \frac{1}{1-r}$ minus total utility to stand for total loss.)

Obviously $\pi_1 = U(\bar{c}, 0, 0, 0, \dots) = R_1 - \bar{c} + E\max\{R_1, R_2\}(r + r^2 + \dots) = R_1 - \bar{c} + E\max\{R_1, R_2\} \frac{r}{1-r}$. Hence $L_1 = E\max\{R_1, R_2\} \frac{1}{1-r} - \pi_1 = M + \bar{c}$. As for $\pi_2 = U(b^*, b^*, \dots)$, we know it must fit the following equation: $\pi_2 = R_1 - H(b^*)b^* + H(b^*)E\max\{R_1, R_2\} \frac{r}{1-r} + (1 - H(b^*))r\pi_2$, hence $L_2 = E\max\{R_1, R_2\} \frac{1}{1-r} - \pi_2 = \frac{M + H(b^*)b^*}{1 - r(1 - H(b^*))} \equiv \eta(b^*)$. As $H(\bar{c}) = 1$, we can rewrite $L_1 = \frac{M + H(\bar{c})\bar{c}}{1 - r(1 - H(\bar{c}))} = \eta(\bar{c})$. $\eta'(x) = \frac{rh(x)}{[1 - r(1 - H(x))]^2} [\frac{\beta(x)}{r} - \psi(x)]$. Hence b^* is the global minimum point without consideration of boundary conditions. We hence finish the proof of Proposition. \square

B.2 Total Utility

B.2.1 Proposition 4.5, part 2: finite

Proof. In the infinite case, we use $\tilde{\pi}_0, \tilde{\pi}_1, \tilde{\pi}_2$ and $\tilde{\pi}_3$ to stand for the total payoff of IR, FC, PC and NB respectively. If we take the limit of above result, we can get the limit version of Lemma 4.5 when $T < \infty$.

Take $\tilde{\pi}_1$ as an example: we have

$$\tilde{\pi}_1 = R_1 - H(b^*)b^* + H(b^*)\mathbb{E} \max\{R_1, R_2\} \frac{r}{1-r} + r(1 - H(b^*))\tilde{\pi}_1 \quad (24)$$

Moreover we know $\frac{\beta(b^*)}{r} = \psi(b^*)$ hence $\frac{H(b^*)}{h(b^*)} = \frac{M+(1-\frac{1}{r})b^*}{H(b^*)-(1-\frac{1}{r})}$. Plug this result in , we know $\psi(b^*) = \frac{M+H(b^*)b^*}{1-r[1-H(b^*)]}$. So both answers gives out the same amount of utility. \square

B.3 ~~IR~~

In this subsection we consider the case when Assumption 4.1 is not satisfied, i.e. there is possibility that d_1 or $d_{N,1}$ is higher than \bar{c} and hence the interior solution leads to the corner case. We should first notice that Assumption 4.1 requires a large enough \bar{c} to rule out IR, and it's actually equivalent to $b^* < \bar{c}$. A modified version of Proposition 4.3 and 4.4 should be as follows:

P4.3. For $\forall T \geq 2$, construct the sequence $\{d_t\}$ as follows:

1. if $T < \infty$, let $d_t = \Gamma^{(T-t)}(0)$ for $1 \leq t \leq T$.
2. if $T = \infty$, let $d_t = b^*$ for $1 \leq t \leq T$ (b^* is the fixed point of function $\Gamma(\cdot)$ as declared in section 4.1).

Then $d_1 > 0$ if $T > 1$. Under our Assumption 3.1 and Assumption 3.2, the optimal full coverage strategy is to set:

1. $(b_1, b_2, \dots, b_T) = (d_1, d_2, \dots, d_T)$, if $0 < d_1 < \bar{c}$ (i.e. using recursive structure).
2. $(b_1 = \bar{c}, b_2 = 0, b_3 = 0, \dots, b_T = 0)$, if $d_1 > \bar{c}$ (i.e., using immediate revelation) .

P4.4. For $\forall T \geq 2$, construct the sequence $\{d_t\}$ as follows:

1. let d_T to be the root of equation $\beta(d_T) = \mathbb{E}R_1 - R_2$
2. if $T < \infty$, let $d_t = \Gamma_N^{(T-t)}(d_T)$ for $1 \leq t \leq T$.
3. if $T = \infty$, let $d_t = b_N^*$ for $1 \leq t \leq T$ (b_N^* is the fixed point of function $\Gamma_N(\cdot)$ as declared in section 4.1).

Under our Assumption 3.1, Assumption 3.2 and Assumption 4.1, the optimal full coverage strategy is to set:

1. $(b_{N1}, b_{N2}, \dots, b_{NT}) = (d_1, d_2, \dots, d_T)$, if $0 < d_1 < \bar{c}$ (i.e. using recursive structure).
2. $(b_{N1} = \bar{c}, b_{N2} = 0, b_{N3} = 0, \dots, b_{NT} = 0)$, if $d_1 > \bar{c}$ (i.e., using immediate revelation) .
3. $(b_{N1} = 0, b_{N2} = 0, b_{N3} = 0, \dots, b_{NT} = 0)$ if $d_1 < 0$ (i.e., setting non-bonus).

Then back to the optimal strategy, by setting IR the platform can get profit $\pi_L = \mathbb{E} \max\{R_1, R_2\} \frac{1-r^T}{1-r} - M - \bar{c}$ if $L = \text{Immediate Revelation}$

Combine this results with Lemma 4.5, we have a more complex comparative relationships like Proposition 4.6:

P4.5. The comparison relationships between these four possible optimal strategies are as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
PC \prec FC &\Leftrightarrow R_2 < \bar{R}_2 \\
FC \prec IR &\Leftrightarrow R_2 < \tilde{R}_2 \\
PC \prec IR &\Leftrightarrow R_2 > \tilde{R}'_2 \\
PC \prec SA &\Leftrightarrow R_2 > \hat{R}_2
\end{aligned}$$

We can still guarantee that $\bar{R}_2 < \hat{R}_2$ but it's not sure where the \tilde{R}_2 or \tilde{R}'_2 lies. In other words, IR may be or may not be the optimal solution. Besides what we saw in figure 1 that FC tends to NB when R_2 is small, we can see FC tends to IR when R_2 is large, and PC tends to IR when R_2 is small.

Then we try to reveal some intuition by comparing IR vs FC. Intuitively we know there are four incentives for the platform to use the highest bonus at the beginning (IRM) :

1. when T is large (many agents)
2. when $M = Emax\{R_1, R_2\} - ER_1$ is large (valuable information)
3. when \bar{c} is small (cheap process of information)
4. when r is large (future value matters)

Above are four straightforward conditions which help $b_1 > \bar{c}$ to hold, and our result fits these four insights well:

Firstly since $b_1 = \Gamma^{(T-1)}(0)$, whether b_1 exceeds a fixed value \bar{c} is actually a symbol of the size of T . We know the iteration of function Γ is increasing from our Fact 2. Moreover, it's convergent from our proof of Proposition 4.2. Hence when T is large enough, b_1 can get arbitrarily close to b^* , which will make it get over \bar{c} as long as $b^* > \bar{c}$. The platform hence should use the upper bound bonus, \bar{c} , to get the information immediately.

Points 2 and 3 are easy to understand. Holding everything else constant, a higher M will lead to a higher b_1 , hence makes $b_1 < \bar{c}$ less important to hold hence provides more incentives to use "Immediate revelation" strategy. A smaller \bar{c} directly makes $b_1 < \bar{c}$ less important to hold (see figure B4 and B3 where $T = 8, r = 0.95, \mathbb{E}R_1 = 2$ in both cases, a lower \bar{c} makes IRM possible to be optimal).




Figure B3: $\bar{c} = 0.4$




Figure B4: $\bar{c} = 1$

C Appendix C

C.1 Proposition 5.1 (First Order Condition)

The Bayesian updating rule is :

$$\alpha' = \frac{\alpha e^{-\lambda\Delta}}{\alpha e^{-\lambda\Delta} + 1 - \alpha}$$

Hence

$$\alpha' - \alpha = \frac{(\alpha^2 - \alpha)(1 - e^{-\lambda\Delta})}{\alpha e^{-\lambda\Delta} + 1 - \alpha}$$

. Combining with Taylor expanding expression $V(\alpha') = V(\alpha) + V'(\alpha)(\alpha' - \alpha)$ we can get

$$[r + H(b_t)\lambda\alpha]V(\alpha) = \max_b \alpha z \lambda [r + H(b_t)\lambda] - rH(b_t)b_t + H(b_t)(\alpha^2 - \alpha)\lambda V'(\alpha)$$

For interior solutions the following F.O.C holds:

$$h(b_t)\lambda\alpha V(\alpha) = \alpha z \lambda^2 h(b_t) - rH(b_t) - rh(b_t)b_t + h(b_t)(\alpha^2 - \alpha)\lambda V'(\alpha)$$

F.O.C can be written as:

$$r\beta(b) = r\left[\frac{H(b)}{h(b)} + b\right] = \alpha z \lambda^2 + (\alpha^2 - \alpha)\lambda V'(\alpha) - \alpha\lambda V(\alpha)$$

Moreover by plugging the F.O.C into the expression of $V(\alpha)$ we can get:

$$V(\alpha) = \alpha z \lambda + \frac{H^2(b^*)}{h(b^*)}$$

At stopping belief $\underline{\alpha}$ (we use $\underline{\alpha}_1$ to stand for the cutoff point here in order to make difference) we have $V(\underline{\alpha}_1) = \tilde{U}$. Moreover, we have smooth pasting condition $V'(\underline{\alpha}_1) = 0$. We denote \underline{b}_1 for optimal bonus when belief is $\underline{\alpha}_1$. Hence \underline{b}_1 maximizes $V(\alpha)$ at $\underline{\alpha}_1$, which guarantees first order condition must be hold:

$$r\beta(\underline{b}_1) = \underline{\alpha}_1 \lambda (z\lambda - s)$$

and :

$$s = \underline{\alpha}_1 z \lambda + \frac{H^2(\underline{b}_1)}{h(\underline{b}_1)}$$

As for the monotonicity of $b(\alpha)$, since

$$V(\alpha) - \alpha z \lambda = \frac{H^2(b)}{h(b)}$$

and right hand side of this equation is monotonically increasing with b , we only need to show the left hand side is monotonically decreasing with α . And let $V'(\alpha) - z\lambda = k$, we have

$$(\alpha^2 - \alpha)\lambda k = r\beta(b) + \alpha\lambda \frac{H^2(b)}{h(b)} > 0$$

hence we have $k < 0$ and complete our proof.

C.1.1 ~~Nonlinear~~

When assuming $H(x) = x$, we can get the following equations:

$$\begin{cases} 2rb = \alpha z \lambda^2 + (\alpha^2 - \alpha) \lambda V'(\alpha) - \alpha \lambda V(\alpha) \\ V(\alpha) = \alpha z \lambda + b^2 \end{cases}$$

We consider the problem when to stop at \tilde{U} first. Evaluate above equations at $\alpha = \underline{\alpha}_1$, we have

$$\begin{cases} 2r\underline{b}_1 = \underline{\alpha}_1 z \lambda^2 - \alpha \lambda s \\ s = \underline{\alpha}_1 z \lambda + \underline{b}_1^2 \end{cases}$$

Thus we have explicit form of solutions for $\underline{\alpha}_1$ and \underline{b}_1 : (\underline{b}_1 is well defined since we can always prove $s - \underline{\alpha}_1 z \lambda > 0$)

$$\begin{cases} \underline{\alpha}_1 = \frac{2r[-rz + \sqrt{z^2 + s(g-s)^2}]}{\lambda(g-s)^2} \\ \underline{b}_1 = \sqrt{s - \underline{\alpha}_1 z \lambda} \end{cases}$$

Moreover, together with above boundary conditions given above, the following ODE is a well defined boundary problem:

$$\begin{cases} V'(\alpha) = \frac{2r\sqrt{V(\alpha) - \alpha z \lambda} - \alpha z \lambda^2 + \alpha \lambda V(\alpha)}{\lambda(\alpha^2 - \alpha)} \equiv f(\alpha, V) \\ V(\underline{\alpha}_1) = s, \text{ where } \underline{\alpha}_1 = \frac{2r[-rz + \sqrt{z^2 + s(g-s)^2}]}{\lambda(g-s)^2} \end{cases}$$

Picard theory?

$$|f(\alpha, V_1) - f(\alpha, V_2)| = \frac{\alpha \lambda + \frac{2r}{M}}{\lambda(\alpha - \alpha^2)} |V_1 - V_2|$$

where $M = \sqrt{V_1 + \alpha z \lambda} + \sqrt{V_2 + \alpha z \lambda}$, $\alpha \in [\underline{\alpha}_1, 1)$ and $V \in [s, \lambda z]$, which guarantees $M \in [2\sqrt{s}, 2\sqrt{2\lambda z}]$. If we let $\alpha \leq 1 - \delta$, then the Lipschitz be satisfied by letting

$$L = \frac{\lambda(1 - \delta) + \frac{r}{\sqrt{s}}}{\lambda\delta(1 - \delta)}$$

hence Picard's theory guarantees that there exists one and the only one solution for above boundary problems, which is the basis of our usage of numerical solutions.

C.2 ~~PfLm5.2 (Paul CngOjM)~~

The value function here fits

$$[r + H(R)\alpha\lambda]U(\alpha) = [H(R)(\lambda\alpha z - R) + (1 - H(R))s]r + H(R)(\alpha^2 - \alpha)\lambda U'(\alpha) + H(R)\alpha\lambda^2 z$$

F.O.C respect to R holds:

$$h(R)\alpha\lambda U(\alpha) = [h(R)(\lambda\alpha z - R) - H(R) - h(R)s]r + h(R)(\alpha^2 - \alpha)\lambda U'(\alpha) + h(R)\alpha\lambda^2 z$$

which can be written as :

$$r\beta(R) = r\left[\frac{H(R)}{h(R)} + R\right] = \lambda\alpha zr - rs + \alpha z\lambda^2 + (\alpha^2 - \alpha)\lambda U'(\alpha) - \lambda\alpha U(\alpha)$$

By plugging the F.O.C into expression of $U(\alpha)$ we can get Bellman Equation:

$$U(\alpha) = s + \frac{H^2(R^*)}{h(R^*)}$$

Still, at stopping belief $\underline{\alpha}_2$ we have the following boundary condition:

$$U(\underline{\alpha}_2) = s, U'(\underline{\alpha}_2) = 0$$

b_2 and p_2 maximizes $U(\underline{\alpha}_2) \Leftrightarrow \underline{R}_2$ maximizes $U(\underline{\alpha}_2)$. Hence we have the following F.O.C at $\underline{\alpha}_2$:

$$r\beta(\underline{R}_2) = \lambda\underline{\alpha}_2 zr - rs + \underline{\alpha}_2 z\lambda^2 - \lambda\underline{\alpha}_2 s$$

and when $R = \underline{R}_2$ we know $U(\underline{\alpha}_2) = s$, hence we can get $H^2(\underline{R}) = 0$ which shows $\underline{R} = 0$. Moreover we assumed $\lim_{x \rightarrow 0^+} h(x) > 0$ so $\underline{\alpha}$ can be calculated:

$$\underline{\alpha}_2 = \frac{sr}{\lambda(g - s + zr)}$$

C.2.1 ~~Final step~~

$$\begin{cases} U'(\alpha) = \frac{2r\sqrt{U(\alpha)} - s + rs - \lambda z\alpha r - \alpha z\lambda^2 + \alpha\lambda U(\alpha)}{\lambda(\alpha^2 - \alpha)} \\ U(\underline{\alpha}_2) = s, \text{ where } \underline{\alpha}_2 = \frac{sr}{\lambda(g - s + zr)} \end{cases}$$

C.3 ~~Prop 5.3 (high)~~

To prove proposition 5.3 we only need to show that $\underline{\alpha}_3 = \frac{s}{z\lambda}$. Actually, based on our Lemma 5.1 and 5.2 for any valid α and corresponding optimal bonus b or R , we have:

$$r\beta(b) = \alpha z\lambda^2 + (\alpha^2 - \alpha)\lambda V'(\alpha) - \alpha\lambda V(\alpha)$$

$$V(\alpha) = \alpha z\lambda + \frac{H^2(b^*)}{h(b^*)}$$

and

$$r\beta(R) = \lambda\alpha zr - rs + \alpha z\lambda^2 + (\alpha^2 - \alpha)\lambda U'(\alpha) - \lambda\alpha U(\alpha)$$

$$U(\alpha) = s + \frac{H^2(R^*)}{h(R^*)}$$

Value these equations at $\underline{\alpha}_3$ and combined with our smooth pasting condition

$$U(\underline{\alpha}_3) = V(\underline{\alpha}_3), U'(\underline{\alpha}_3) = V'(\underline{\alpha}_3)$$

we have

$$s - \underline{\alpha}_3 z \lambda = \beta(\underline{b}_3) - \beta(\underline{R}_3) = \frac{H^2(\underline{b}_3)}{h(\underline{b}_3)} - \frac{H^2(\underline{R}_3)}{h(\underline{R}_3)}$$

Denote $Q(x) = \frac{H^2(x)}{h(x)} - \beta(x)$, we have (from our assumption 3.2, $2h^2(x) - H(x)h'(x) > 0$):

$$Q'(x) = \frac{2h^2(x) - H(x)h'(x)}{h(x)} [H(x) - 1] < 0$$

Hence we get $\underline{b}_3 = \underline{R}_3$, and $\underline{\alpha}_3 = \frac{s}{z\lambda}$.

C.4 Welfare

C.4.1 Full belief

For the social planner, in period Δ , if the current agent reports \tilde{c} (we use c to replace \tilde{c} since in equilibrium we have truthfully reporting), his immediate gain from total social surplus, should be

$$\tilde{\pi}_1(\Delta, c) = \int_0^\Delta r e^{-rt} p(\alpha, \tilde{c}) [\lambda e^{-\lambda t} \alpha z - q(\alpha, \tilde{c}) c] + r e^{-rt} (1 - p(\alpha, \tilde{c})) s dt$$

from which we can get

$$\lim_{\Delta \rightarrow 0} \frac{\tilde{\pi}_1(\Delta, c)}{\Delta} = r \lambda z \alpha p(\alpha, \tilde{c}) - p(\alpha, \tilde{c}) q(\alpha, \tilde{c}) cr + [1 - p(\alpha, \tilde{c})] sr$$

hence if current belief is α , within Δ , the social planner can get

$$\begin{aligned} \pi(\alpha, c) &= \max_{p, q, t} \tilde{\pi}_1(\alpha, \Delta) + p(\alpha, c) e^{-r\Delta} q(\alpha, c) \gamma(\alpha, \Delta) W(\alpha') \\ &+ p(\alpha, c) e^{-r\Delta} q(\alpha, c) [1 - \gamma(\alpha, \Delta)] \tilde{V} + \{p(\alpha, c) [1 - q(\alpha, c)] + 1 - p(\alpha, c)\} e^{-r\Delta} W(\alpha) \end{aligned}$$

Denote $\gamma(\alpha, \Delta) = 1 - \alpha(1 - e^{-\lambda\Delta})$ as the probability of getting a lower update for the belief, and $A = p(\alpha, c) q(\alpha, c) [1 - \gamma(\alpha, \Delta)]$. We can get

$$\pi(\alpha, c) = \tilde{\pi}_1(\Delta) + A e^{-r\Delta} z \lambda + (1 - A) e^{-r\Delta} W(\alpha) + p(\alpha, c) q(\alpha, c) e^{-r\Delta} (\alpha^2 - \alpha) (1 - e^{-\lambda\Delta}) W'(\alpha)$$

then

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{\Delta \rightarrow 0} \frac{\pi(\alpha, c) - e^{-r\Delta} W(\alpha) + A e^{-r\Delta} W(\alpha)}{\Delta} &= r \lambda z \alpha p(\alpha, c) + (1 - p(\alpha, c)) sr \\ &- p(\alpha, c) q(\alpha, c) cr + z \lambda^2 \alpha p(\alpha, c) q(\alpha, c) + p(\alpha, c) q(\alpha, c) (\alpha^2 - \alpha) \lambda W'(\alpha) \end{aligned}$$

Then we apply the operator $\int_c \cdot dH(c)$ (i.e. take the expectation with respect to c) for both sides, we can execute the limit calculation by using L'Hospital's Rule. We can get:

$$[r + \lambda \alpha \mathbb{E}(pq)] W(\alpha) = r \lambda z \alpha \mathbb{E}(p) + [1 - \mathbb{E}(p)] sr - r \mathbb{E}(pqc) + \lambda^2 z \alpha \mathbb{E}(pq) + (\alpha^2 - \alpha) \lambda W'(\alpha) \mathbb{E}(pq)$$

C.4.2 Solution

We should expect a pair of corner solution given the linear formation. To characterize the optimization solution, we first pin down the optimal $p(\alpha, \cdot)$. Put all terms to the right hand side, the terms contain q are (and we should maximize it)

$$\mathbb{E}(qp)B(\alpha) - r\mathbb{E}(qpc)$$

where $B(\alpha) \equiv \alpha\lambda^2z + (\alpha^2 - \alpha)\lambda W'(\alpha) - \lambda\alpha W(\alpha)$ is irrelevant to c .

$$\mathbb{E}(qp)B(\alpha) - r\mathbb{E}(qpc) = \int_c q(\alpha, c)[B(\alpha)p(\alpha, c) - rp(\alpha, c)c]dH(c)$$

Hence to maximize it we have to set

$$q(\alpha, c) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{where } B(\alpha) - rc \geq 0 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Hence in optimal solutions, we have

$$\mathbb{E}(qp)B(\alpha) - r\mathbb{E}(qpc) = \int_c p(\alpha, c) \max\{B(\alpha) - rc, 0\}dH(c) = \mathbb{E}[p(\alpha, c) \max\{B(\alpha) - rc, 0\}]$$

and the original equations requires optimal $p(\alpha, \cdot)$ to maximize

$$rW(\alpha) - sr = \max_p(\lambda z\alpha r - sr)\mathbb{E}(p) + \mathbb{E}[p(\alpha, c) \max\{B(\alpha) - rc, 0\}]$$

where the right hand side can be written as

$$(\lambda z\alpha r - sr)\mathbb{E}(p) + \int_c p(\alpha, c) \max\{B(\alpha) - rc, 0\}dH(c)$$

Hence if $\alpha > \frac{s}{\lambda z}$, optimal $p(\alpha, c)$ should be 1 for all c . Otherwise, it should be 1 where $\lambda z\alpha r - sr + B(\alpha) - rc > 0$. To conclude, the optimal allocation rule $p(\alpha, c)$ should take the form

$$p(\alpha, c) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{where } \max\{\lambda z\alpha r - sr, B(\alpha) - rc + \lambda z\alpha r - sr\} > 0 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Hence for $1 > \alpha > \frac{s}{\lambda z}$, we have

$$rW(\alpha) = \lambda z\alpha r + \int_{0 < c < \frac{B(\alpha)}{r}} B(\alpha) - rc dH(c)$$

and for $0 < \alpha < \frac{s}{\lambda z}$, we have

$$rW(\alpha) - rs = \int_{0 < c < \frac{B(\alpha) + \lambda z\alpha r - sr}{r}} \lambda z\alpha r - sr + B(\alpha) - rc dH(c)$$

Then we consider the optimal switching problem, the social planner will set $p = q = 0$ to sell safe arm at some cutoff belief $\underline{\alpha}_5 < \frac{s}{\lambda z}$, with $W(\underline{\alpha}_5) = s$ and $W'(\underline{\alpha}_5) = 0$. Hence according to our definition, we have $B(\underline{\alpha}_5) = \lambda^2 \underline{\alpha}_5 z - \lambda \underline{\alpha}_5 s$. As a conclusion, at $\underline{\alpha}_5$ we have

$$0 = \int_{0 < c < \frac{B(\underline{\alpha}_5) + \lambda z \alpha r - sr}{r}} \lambda z \alpha r - sr + B(\underline{\alpha}_5) - r c dH(c)$$

and a quick solution should be letting $B(\underline{\alpha}_5) + \lambda z \alpha r - sr = 0$ or in other words:

$$\underline{\alpha}_5 \lambda^2 z + (\underline{\alpha}_5^2 - \underline{\alpha}_5) \lambda W'(\underline{\alpha}_5) - \lambda \underline{\alpha}_5 W(\underline{\alpha}_5) + \lambda z \underline{\alpha}_5 r - sr = 0$$

and plug our smooth pasting conditions, we can get

$$\underline{\alpha}_5 = \frac{rs}{\lambda zr + \lambda^2 z - \lambda s} (= \underline{\alpha}_2)$$

which means the social planner will stop at the exact same belief as the partial coverage monopolist.

An important part is to consider the monotonicity of C_1 with respect for $\alpha \in (\underline{\alpha}_5, \underline{\alpha}_2)$. First we should know that according to the definition, we have

$$rC_1 = \lambda z \alpha r - sr + B(\alpha)$$

And the Bellman Equation for $W(\alpha)$ in this interval should be like

$$rW(\alpha) - rs = \int_{0 < c < C_1} \lambda z \alpha r - sr + B(\alpha) - r c dH(c) = rC_1 H(C_1) - r \int_0^{C_1} c dH(c)$$

Take derivation with respect to α in both sides, in left hand side it's $\frac{dW(\alpha)}{d\alpha} > 0$ and for the right hand side we have

$$\frac{\partial RHS}{\partial \alpha} = \frac{\partial RHS}{\partial C_1} \frac{\partial C_1}{\partial \alpha}$$

and

$$\frac{\partial RHS}{\partial C_1} = H(C_1) > 0$$

hence we have

$$\frac{\partial C_1}{\partial \alpha} > 0$$

The left part of the mechanism design problem is to design $t(\alpha, c)$ carefully to guarantee that IC holds.

$$U(c, \tilde{c}, \alpha) = -t(\alpha, \tilde{c}) + p(\alpha, \tilde{c})[\alpha z \lambda - q(\alpha, \tilde{c})c] + (1 - p(\alpha, \tilde{c}))s$$

The following lemma shows that above social mechanism design is feasible using transfers:

LmC.1. *The following table 1 holds.*

condition1	condition2	$p(\alpha, c)$	$q(\alpha, c)$	$t(\alpha, c)$
$\alpha > \frac{s}{\lambda z}$	$0 < c < \frac{B(\alpha)}{r}$	1	1	$\bar{t}_3 = \alpha z \lambda - \frac{B(\alpha)}{r}$
$\alpha > \frac{s}{\lambda z}$	$\frac{B(\alpha)}{r} < c < \frac{B(\alpha) + \lambda z \alpha r - sr}{r}$	1	0	$\bar{t}_2 = \alpha z \lambda$
$\alpha > \frac{s}{\lambda z}$	$\frac{B(\alpha) + \lambda z \alpha r - sr}{r} < c < \bar{c}$	0	all	$\bar{t}_1 = s$
$\alpha < \frac{s}{\lambda z}$	$0 < c < \frac{B(\alpha) + \lambda z \alpha r - sr}{r}$	1	1	$\underline{t}_3 = \alpha z \lambda - \frac{B(\alpha) + \lambda z \alpha r - sr}{r}$
$\alpha < \frac{s}{\lambda z}$	$\frac{B(\alpha) + \lambda z \alpha r - sr}{r} < c < \bar{c}$	0	all	$\underline{t}_1 = s$

Table 1: Optimal mechanism of social planner

Proof. In our setting of $p(\alpha, c)$ and $q(\alpha, c)$, there are three possible combinations:

$$\begin{cases} p = 0 & , \text{ if } B(\alpha) - rc + \lambda z \alpha r - sr < 0 \\ p = 1, q = 0 & , \text{ if } B(\alpha) - rc + \lambda z \alpha r - sr > 0 \text{ and } B(\alpha) - rc < 0 \\ p = 1, q = 1 & , \text{ if } B(\alpha) - rc + \lambda z \alpha r - sr > 0 \text{ and } B(\alpha) - rc > 0 \end{cases}$$

which lead to three possible utility:

$$\begin{cases} u_1 = -t_1(\alpha, c) + s & , \text{ if } B(\alpha) - rc + \lambda z \alpha r - sr < 0 \\ u_2 = -t_2(\alpha, c) + \lambda z \alpha & , \text{ if } B(\alpha) - rc + \lambda z \alpha r - sr > 0 \text{ and } B(\alpha) - rc < 0 \\ u_3 = -t_3(\alpha, c) + \lambda z \alpha - c & , \text{ if } B(\alpha) - rc + \lambda z \alpha r - sr > 0 \text{ and } B(\alpha) - rc > 0 \end{cases}$$

Since the domain with respect to c is continuous and utility is linear with respect to the actual c , we must have $t(\alpha, c)$ is piecewise constant. which is to say:

$$\forall \alpha < \frac{s}{\lambda z}, t(\alpha, c) \begin{cases} \underline{t}_1(\alpha) & , \text{ if } c > \frac{B(\alpha) + \lambda z \alpha r - sr}{r} \\ \underline{t}_3(\alpha) & , \text{ if } c < \frac{B(\alpha) + \lambda z \alpha r - sr}{r} \end{cases}$$

and

$$\forall \alpha > \frac{s}{\lambda z}, t(\alpha, c) \begin{cases} \bar{t}_1(\alpha) & , \text{ if } c > \frac{B(\alpha) + \lambda z \alpha r - sr}{r} \\ \bar{t}_2(\alpha) & , \text{ if } \frac{B(\alpha)}{r} < c < \frac{B(\alpha) + \lambda z \alpha r - sr}{r} \\ \bar{t}_3(\alpha) & , \text{ if } c < \frac{B(\alpha)}{r} \end{cases}$$

Hence to let $u_3 \geq u_1$ holds for all α, c such that $\alpha < \frac{s}{\lambda z}$ and $c < \frac{B(\alpha) + \lambda z \alpha r - sr}{r}$, we got

$$\underline{t}_1 = s, \underline{t}_3 = \lambda z \alpha - \frac{B(\alpha) + sr - \lambda z \alpha r}{r}$$

which also guarantees that $u_1 \geq u_3$ when $\alpha < \frac{s}{\lambda z}$ and $c > \frac{B(\alpha) + \lambda z \alpha r - sr}{r}$. Similarly when $\alpha > \frac{s}{\lambda z}$, we have

$$\bar{t}_1 = s, \bar{t}_2 = \alpha, z, \lambda, \bar{t}_3 = \alpha z \lambda - \frac{B(\alpha)}{r}$$

□

C.5 Pffm5.6 adLm5.7 (containing λ)

For $\underline{\alpha}_2$ and $\underline{\alpha}_3$ we have :

$$\underline{\alpha}_2 = \frac{sr}{\lambda(\lambda z - s + zr)}$$

and

$$\underline{\alpha}_3 = \frac{s}{z\lambda}$$

hence they are both monotonically decreasing with respect to λ and z , and increasing with respect to s . $\underline{\alpha}_3$ has nothing to do with r but it's obvious that $\underline{\alpha}_2$ is monotonically increasing with respect to r . From the definition of $\underline{\alpha}_4$ we have

$$\begin{cases} \underline{\Omega}_4 H(\underline{\Omega}_4) + \int_0^{\underline{\Omega}_4} x dH(x) = \lambda \underline{\alpha}_4 \frac{\lambda z - R_2}{r} \\ s = \underline{\alpha}_4 z \lambda + \underline{\Omega}_4 H^2(\underline{\Omega}_4) \end{cases}$$

Take full derivation with respect to Ω, α and λ , then we can get

$$\frac{\partial \underline{\alpha}_4}{\partial \lambda} = \frac{-z \underline{\alpha}_4 - H(\underline{\Omega}_4) \underline{\alpha}_4 \frac{2\lambda z - s}{r}}{H(\underline{\Omega}_4) \frac{\lambda^2 z - \lambda s}{r} + \lambda z} < 0$$

$$\frac{\partial \underline{\alpha}_4}{\partial z} = \frac{-z \lambda - H(\underline{\Omega}_4) \underline{\alpha}_4 \frac{\lambda^2}{r}}{H(\underline{\Omega}_4) \frac{\lambda^2 z - \lambda s}{r} + \lambda z} < 0$$

$$\frac{\partial \underline{\alpha}_4}{\partial s} = \frac{1 + H(\underline{\Omega}_4) \underline{\alpha}_4 \frac{\lambda}{r}}{H(\underline{\Omega}_4) \frac{\lambda^2 z - \lambda s}{r} + \lambda z} > 0$$

and

$$\frac{\partial \underline{\alpha}_4}{\partial r} = \frac{H(\underline{\Omega}_4) \underline{\alpha}_4 \frac{\lambda^2 z - s \lambda}{r^2}}{H(\underline{\Omega}_4) \frac{\lambda^2 z - \lambda s}{r} + \lambda z} > 0$$

C.6 Ninesffthig

In this case we assume $c \sim U[0, 1]$. Therefore, let $Y(b) = -b^2 + b\lambda \underline{\alpha} \frac{\lambda z - s}{r}$ and $Y'(b) = -2b + \lambda \underline{\alpha} \frac{\lambda z - s}{r}$. So we can get $\underline{b} = \frac{-zr + \sqrt{z^2 r^2 + s(g-s)^2}}{g-s}$, and $\underline{\alpha}_1 = \frac{2r(-zr + \sqrt{z^2 r^2 + s(g-s)^2})}{\lambda(g-s)^2}$.

However, boundary problem for $U(\alpha)$ has no explicit expression solution even after we exert our uniform distribution assumption. We use power series approximation for numeric solution later. Moreover $\underline{b} < 1 \Leftrightarrow (1-s)(g-s) + 2zr > 0$. (Actually if we assume $c \sim U[0, w]$ then $\underline{b} < w$ for sure $\Leftrightarrow w(1 + \frac{2zr}{g-s}) > s$ hence given s, z, r, λ we can always find suitable w large enough to conduct the numeric example such that $\underline{b} < w$. So assuming $\underline{b} < 1$ loses no generality.) $\underline{\alpha} < 1 \Leftrightarrow \underline{b} < \frac{\lambda(g-s)}{2r} \Leftrightarrow s < g + (\frac{\lambda(g-s)}{2r})^2$ which always holds since $g > s$ from Assumption 5.1.

Then in this case we know $2b = \alpha z \lambda \frac{\lambda}{r} + (\alpha^2 - \alpha) \lambda V'(\alpha) - \lambda \alpha V(\alpha)$. $V(\alpha)$ must satisfies the following equation:

$$4rV(\alpha) = 4\alpha z \lambda + (\alpha z \lambda \frac{\lambda}{r} + (\alpha^2 - \alpha) \lambda V'(\alpha) - \lambda \alpha V(\alpha))^2 \quad (25)$$

On the other hand, we know $U(\alpha)$ is the solution to the boundary problem:

$$\begin{aligned}
4rU(\alpha) &= 4s + [\lambda\alpha z - s + \lambda\alpha(\frac{\lambda z}{r} - U(\alpha)) - \lambda\alpha(1 - \alpha)U'(\alpha)]^2 \\
U(\underline{\alpha}_1) &= \frac{s}{r} \\
U'(\underline{\alpha}_1) &= 0
\end{aligned} \tag{26}$$

C.6.1 ~~When~~

Still we illustrate our results using numerical assumption that $H(c)$ fits the uniform distribution. Let $D = \frac{B}{r} + \min\{0, \lambda z\alpha - s\}$, we can write the boundary problem as

$$rW(\alpha) - rs = \int_{0 < c < D} \lambda z\alpha r - sr + B(\alpha) - rcdH(c)$$

and $W(\underline{\alpha}_5) = s$ where $\underline{\alpha}_5 = \frac{rs}{\lambda zr + \lambda^2 z - \lambda s}$. With uniform distribution assumption, we have $rW(\alpha) - rs = (\lambda z\alpha r - sr + B(\alpha))D - r\frac{1}{2}D^2$. When $\alpha < \frac{s}{\lambda z}$ it's equivalent to

$$2(W(\alpha) - s) = [\frac{B(\alpha)}{r} + \lambda z\alpha - s]^2$$

hence the whole boundary problem can be written as:

$$\begin{cases} W'(\alpha) = \frac{\lambda\alpha W(\alpha) - \alpha\lambda^2 z - r(\lambda z\alpha - s) + r\sqrt{2(W(\alpha) - s)}}{(\alpha^2 - \alpha)\lambda} \\ W(\underline{\alpha}_5) = s \end{cases}$$

When $\alpha > \frac{s}{\lambda z}$ we have

$$\begin{cases} W'(\alpha) = \frac{\lambda\alpha W(\alpha) - \alpha\lambda^2 z + r\sqrt{2(W(\alpha) - \lambda z\alpha)}}{(\alpha^2 - \alpha)\lambda} \\ W(\alpha) \text{ is smooth at } \frac{s}{\lambda z} \end{cases}$$

We can also compare the learning speed in a more direct way. In numerical examples, the ex ante probability of getting reports is

$$\frac{\alpha z\lambda^2 + (\alpha^2 - \alpha)\lambda V'(\alpha) - \alpha\lambda V(\alpha)}{2r}$$

However in social planner's problem, $q(\alpha, c) = 1$ as long as $B(\alpha) > c$, which leads to probability of getting report attaches

$$\frac{\alpha z\lambda^2 + (\alpha^2 - \alpha)\lambda V'(\alpha) - \alpha\lambda V(\alpha)}{r}$$

We can also calculate $\kappa(b)$:

$$\kappa_V(b) = \begin{cases} 2b^2 & \text{if } V = W \\ \frac{3b^2}{2} & \text{if } V = \Lambda \\ b^2 & \text{if } V = \Pi \end{cases}$$

D Appendix 5.1

Assumption 5.1 is trying to simplify our analysis since in the text we want to focus on the Full Coverage and Partial Coverage. However, we can characterize the value function satisfied under Immediate Revelation.

$$(r + \alpha\lambda)\Pi_{IR}(\alpha) = (\alpha zr\lambda - r\bar{c}) + (\alpha^2 - \alpha)\lambda\Pi'_{IR}(\alpha) + \alpha\lambda^2z \quad (\text{IR-ODE})$$

An illustration of “Immediate Revelation Only” monopolist can be found in Figure 6’.




Figure D1: Non Optimal Switching Monopolist

Now we prove Assumption 5.1 is a sufficient but not necessary condition to ignore the existence of Immediate Revelation.

Proof. We consider the “Immediate Revelation Only” monopolist who can only switch from Immediate Revelation to Safe Arm. We assume the switching cutoff is α_{IR} , then similar as stated in section 5.2, the monopolist face a smooth pasting problem where there should exist cutoff belief α_{IR} such that

$$\Pi_{IR}(\alpha_{IR}) = \tilde{V}, \Pi'_{IR}(\alpha_{IR}) = 0$$

combined with equation (IR-ODE) we get

$$\alpha_{IR} = \frac{r(\bar{c} + s)}{\lambda(g - s) + rg}$$

□

Again, there should be a switching problem between Immediate Revelation and Full Coverage. We denote the switching point as $\underline{\alpha}_0$. Unlike before, we can not know for sure the optimal switching condition when using IR. We know $\alpha_{IR} > \alpha_{PC}$, but it's not sure whether $\alpha_{IR} > \alpha_{FC}$. Actually given $\min\{\alpha_{FC}, \alpha_{IR} > \alpha_{PC}\}$, we know both IR curve and the FC curve will optimally switch into PC instead of SA. Hence even $\alpha_{IR} > \alpha_{FC}$, there is still possibility that $\alpha_{IR}^{PC} > \alpha_{FC}^{PC}$ (switching goal is denoted here). Obviously the smaller the \bar{c} , the higher probability that IR performs better than FC. An illustration may be




Figure D2: Optimal Switching Monopolist: Without FC

Otherwise, we should let FC to smooth paste to PC, and let the IR to smooth paste to FC (or NB). If the cutoff happens before α_{FC}^* , the smooth pasting condition can be written as

$$\Pi_{IR}(\underline{\alpha}_0) = V(\underline{\alpha}_0), \Pi'_{IR}(\underline{\alpha}_0) = V'(\underline{\alpha}_0)$$

which gives the boundary condition of $\Pi(\cdot)$ here. An illustration of optimal switching including Immediate Revelation is in Figure XXX.

There is also probability that the cutoff happens after α_{FC}^* . In this case there is no smooth pasting condition, which means IR curve will meet NB curve in the form of intersect rather than tangent, since if we let $\Pi_{IR} = \alpha z \lambda$ we get

$$(\alpha^2 - \alpha)(z\lambda^2 - \lambda\Pi'(\alpha)) = -r\bar{c}$$

Hence we must have $\Pi'(\alpha) < \lambda z$. An illustration is that :




Figure D3: Optimal Switching Monopolist




Figure D4: Mechanism Comparison

It's quite counter-intuitive to find there is a discontinuity on $C(\alpha)$ in Monopolist setting in Figure D3. Mathematically, two reasons result in the jump from \bar{c} to 0. Firstly, in this monopolist setting when Assumption 5.1 is not satisfied, the monopolist will choose Immediate Revelation when $\alpha \rightarrow 1$ where accordingly $C(\alpha) = \bar{c}$. But when the monopolist is optimal switching from IM to FC, it happens at the highest possible belief of FC interval. According to our insights get in the main text, though the monopolist faces a trade-off to set a high bonus in FC, $C(\alpha)$ in FC should still be monotonically decreasing for belief after the two trade-off effects are summed up. Hence at the jump point $C(\alpha)$ will jump from 1 to 0, given it's larger than α_{FC}^* .

Moreover, for most times we can treat Assumption 5.1 as assuming a large enough \bar{c} . A simple and direct assumption is to assume $\bar{c} = \infty$, but it's hard to do the numerical illustration since it's hard to find a distribution function with infinite upper bound and 0 lower bound such that there exists explicit relationship between $\frac{H^2(\cdot)}{h(\cdot)}$ and $\beta(\cdot)$.