

B. ONLINE APPENDIX

B.1. Proofs of Pooling Calculations. Given a pooling bid b_p^n , let the random variables L^n , G^n , and $X^n = L^n + G^n$ denote the number of losers, number of winners (or the number of objects left for the bidders that submit a bid equal to b_p^n), and number of bidders that submit a bid equal to b_p^n , respectively. Let $\bar{L}^n = \mathbb{E}[L^n | P^n = b_p^n, v]$, $\bar{G}^n = \mathbb{E}[G^n | P^n = b_p^n, v]$ and $\bar{X}^n = \bar{L}^n + \bar{G}^n$. Given these definitions, $\Pr[b_p^n \text{ lose} | P^n = b_p^n, v] = \mathbb{E}[L^n / X^n | P^n = b_p^n, v]$ and $\Pr[b_p^n \text{ win} | P^n = b_p^n, v] = \mathbb{E}[G^n / X^n | P^n = b_p^n, v]$. For any type θ that submits the pooling bid, $\Pr(L^n = i | Y_s^n(k_s + 1) = \theta, v) = bi(i; n - 1 - k_s, \frac{F_s^n([\underline{\theta}_p^n, \theta] | v)}{1 - F_s^n(\theta | v)})$ and $\Pr(X^n = i | Y_s^n(k_s + 1) = \theta, v) = bi(i; n - 1 - k_s, \frac{F_s^n([\theta, \theta_p^n] | v)}{F_s^n(\theta | v)})$. Therefore, $\mathbb{E}[L^n | Y_s^n(k_s + 1) = \theta, v] = n \frac{F_s^n([\underline{\theta}_p^n, \theta] | v)}{1 - F_s^n(\theta | v)} (1 - \kappa_s - \frac{1}{n})$, $\mathbb{E}[X^n | Y_s^n(k_s + 1) = \theta, v] = n \kappa_s \frac{F_s^n([\theta, \theta_p^n] | v)}{F_s^n(\theta | v)}$, $\bar{L}^n = \int_{\underline{\theta}_p^n}^{\theta_p^n} n \frac{F_s^n([\underline{\theta}_p^n, \theta] | v)}{1 - F_s^n(\theta | v)} (1 - \kappa_s - 1/n) \Pr(Y_s^n(k_s + 1) = \theta | v) d\theta$ and $\bar{X}^n = \int_{\underline{\theta}_p^n}^{\theta_p^n} n \kappa_s \frac{F_s^n([\theta, \theta_p^n] | v)}{F_s^n(\theta | v)} \Pr(Y_s^n(k_s + 1) = \theta | v) d\theta$.

We prove a somewhat stronger version of Lemma A.2 in Lemma B.1 below.

Lemma B.1. *If $\lim \Pr(P^n \geq b_p^n | v = 0)$, then*

$$\lim \Pr(b_p^n \text{ lose} | P^n = b_p^n, V = v) / \frac{\bar{F}_s^n(\underline{\theta}_p^n | v)(1 - \bar{F}_s^n(\underline{\theta}_p^n | v))}{n F_s^n([\underline{\theta}_p^n, \theta_p^n] | v)(\kappa_s - \bar{F}_s^n(\underline{\theta}_p^n | v))} = 1.$$

Suppose $\lim \Pr(P^n = b_p^n | v) > 0$.

- i. If $\lim F_s^n([\underline{\theta}_p^n, \theta_p^n] | v) > 0$, then*

$$\lim \Pr(b_p^n \text{ win} | P^n = b_p^n, v) = \lim \frac{\kappa_s - \bar{F}_s^n(\underline{\theta}_p^n | v)}{F_s^n([\underline{\theta}_p^n, \theta_p^n] | v)}.$$
- ii. If $\sqrt{n} |F_s^n(\theta^n(v) | v) - F_s^n(\underline{\theta}_p^n | v)| \rightarrow \infty$, then*

$$\lim \frac{F_s^n([\underline{\theta}_p^n, \theta_p^n] | v)}{F_s^n([\underline{\theta}_p^n, \theta^n(v)] | v)} \Pr(b_p^n \text{ lose} | P^n = b_p^n, v) \in (0, \infty);$$
- iii. If $\sqrt{n} |F_s^n(\theta^n(v) | v) - F_s^n(\underline{\theta}_p^n | v)| < \infty$, then*

$$\lim \sqrt{n} F_s^n([\underline{\theta}_p^n, \theta_p^n] | v) \Pr(b_p^n \text{ lose} | P^n = b_p^n, v) \in (0, \infty);$$
- iv. If $\sqrt{n} |F_s^n(\theta^n(v) | v) - F_s^n(\theta_p^n | v)| \rightarrow \infty$, then*

$$\lim \frac{F_s^n([\underline{\theta}_p^n, \theta_p^n] | v)}{F_s^n([\theta^n(v), \theta_p^n] | v)} \Pr(b_p^n \text{ win} | P^n = b_p^n, v) \in (0, \infty);$$
- v. If $\sqrt{n} |F_s^n(\theta^n(v) | v) - F_s^n(\theta_p^n | v)| < \infty$, then*

$$\lim \sqrt{n} F_s^n([\underline{\theta}_p^n, \theta_p^n] | v) \Pr(b_p^n \text{ win} | P^n = b_p^n, v) \in (0, \infty).$$

Proof of item i in Lemma B.1. Suppose that $Y_s^n(k_s + 1) = \theta^n$, $\theta^n \in [\underline{\theta}_p^n, \theta_p^n]$ and $\bar{F}_s^n(\theta^n | v) \in (\kappa_s - \epsilon_1, \kappa_s + \epsilon_1)$. There are k_s bidders with signals above θ^n and the

distribution of G^n is binomial, hence $\bar{G}_n = \frac{k_s(\bar{F}^n(\theta|v) - \bar{F}_s^n(\theta_p^n|v))}{\bar{F}^n(\theta|v)}$. Also, $\Pr(G^n < (1 - \delta)\bar{G}_n | Y_s^n(k_s + 1) = \theta^n, v) \leq e^{-\frac{\delta^2}{2}\bar{G}_n}$ for any $\delta \in (0, 1)$ by the Chernoff's inequality.¹⁸ Similarly, $\bar{L}_n = \frac{(n-1-k_s)(\bar{F}_s^n(\theta_p^n|v) - \bar{F}_s^n(\theta^n|v))}{1 - \bar{F}_s^n(\theta^n|v)} + 1$ because there are $n-1-k_s$ bidders with signals below θ^n and the distribution of L^n is binomial and $\Pr(L^n < (1 - \delta)\bar{L}_n | Y_s^n(k_s + 1) = \theta, v) \leq e^{-\frac{\delta^2}{2}\bar{L}_n}$. The random variable X^n and L^n are independent conditional on $Y_s^n(k_s + 1) = \theta^n$. Moreover, $\Pr(b_p^n \text{ win} | Y_s^n(k_s + 1) = \theta^n, v) = \mathbb{E}[G^n / (L^n + G^n) | Y_s^n(k_s + 1) = \theta^n, v]$. The function $G^n / (L^n + G^n)$ is concave in G^n and convex in L^n . Therefore, using Jensen's inequality and then the Chernoff bound we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{G^n}{G^n + \bar{L}_n} | Y_s^n(k_s + 1) = \theta^n, v\right] &\leq Q_n \leq \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{\bar{G}_n}{\bar{G}_n + L_n} | Y_s^n(k_s + 1) = \theta^n, v\right] \\ \frac{(1 - \delta)\bar{G}_n}{\bar{G}_n(1 - \delta) + \bar{L}_n} (1 - e^{-\frac{\delta^2}{2}\bar{G}_n}) &\leq Q_n \leq \frac{\bar{G}_n}{\bar{G}_n + (1 - \delta)\bar{L}_n} + e^{-\frac{\delta^2}{2}\bar{L}_n}. \end{aligned}$$

where $Q_n = \Pr(b_p^n \text{ win} | Y_s^n(k_s + 1) = \theta^n, v)$. Our assumption $\lim F_s^n([\underline{\theta}_p^n, \theta_p^n] | v) > 0$ implies either $\bar{G}_n \rightarrow \infty$ or $\bar{L}_n \rightarrow \infty$ or both. Taking the limits and noting that δ is arbitrary we obtain $\lim \Pr(b_p^n \text{ win} | Y_s^n(k_s + 1) = \theta^n, v) = \lim \frac{\bar{G}_n}{\bar{G}_n + \bar{L}_n}$. Since $\bar{F}_s^n(\theta^n|v) \in (\kappa_s - \epsilon_1, \kappa_s + \epsilon_1)$ by assumption, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \lim \frac{\kappa_s \frac{(\kappa_s - \epsilon_1 - \bar{F}_s^n(\theta_p^n|v))}{\kappa_s + \epsilon_1}}{\kappa_s \frac{(\kappa_s + \epsilon_1 - \bar{F}_s^n(\theta_p^n|v))}{\kappa_s - \epsilon_1} + (1 - \kappa_s) \frac{\bar{F}_s^n(\theta_p^n|v) - \kappa_s + \epsilon_1}{1 - \kappa_s - \epsilon_1}} &\leq \lim Q_n \leq \\ \lim \frac{\kappa_s \frac{(\kappa_s + \epsilon_1 - \bar{F}_s^n(\theta_p^n|v))}{\kappa_s - \epsilon_1}}{\kappa_s \frac{(\kappa_s - \epsilon_1 - \bar{F}_s^n(\theta_p^n|v))}{\kappa_s + \epsilon_1} + (1 - \kappa_s) \frac{\bar{F}_s^n(\theta_p^n|v) - \kappa_s - \epsilon_1}{1 - \kappa_s + \epsilon_1}} &. \end{aligned}$$

But $\lim \Pr(\bar{F}_s^n(Y_s^n(k_s + 1) | v) \in (\kappa_s - \epsilon_1, \kappa_s + \epsilon_1) | v) = 1$ for every $\epsilon_1 > 0$ by the LLN. Hence,

$$\lim \Pr(\bar{F}_s^n(Y_s^n(k_s + 1) | v) \in (\kappa_s - \epsilon_1, \kappa_s + \epsilon_1) | Y_s^n(k_s + 1) \in [\underline{\theta}_p^n, \theta_p^n], v) = 1.$$

¹⁸See [Janson et al. \(2011, Theorem 2.1\)](#).

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
\lim \frac{\kappa_s \frac{(\kappa_s - \epsilon_1 - \bar{F}_s^n(\theta_p^n|v))}{\kappa_s + \epsilon_1}}{\kappa_s \frac{(\kappa_s + \epsilon_1 - \bar{F}_s^n(\theta_p^n|v))}{\kappa_s - \epsilon_1} + (1 - \kappa_s) \frac{\bar{F}_s^n(\theta_p^n|v) - \kappa_s + \epsilon_1}{1 - \kappa_s - \epsilon_1}} &\leq \\
\lim \Pr(b_p^n \text{ wins} | Y_s^n(k_s + 1) \in [\theta_p^n, \theta_p^n], v) & \\
&\leq \lim \frac{\kappa_s \frac{(\kappa_s + \epsilon_1 - \bar{F}_s^n(\theta_p^n|v))}{\kappa_s - \epsilon_1}}{\kappa_s \frac{(\kappa_s - \epsilon_1 - \bar{F}_s^n(\theta_p^n|v))}{\kappa_s + \epsilon_1} + (1 - \kappa_s) \frac{\bar{F}_s^n(\theta_p^n|v) - \kappa_s - \epsilon_1}{1 - \kappa_s + \epsilon_1}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Since this is true for each $\epsilon_1 > 0$, taking $\epsilon_1 \rightarrow 0$ shows $\lim \Pr(b_p^n \text{ wins} | P^n = b_p^n, v) = \lim \frac{\kappa_s - \bar{F}_s^n(\theta_p^n|v)}{F_s^n([\theta_p^n, \theta_p^n]|v)}$. \square

Proof of items ii-v in Lemma B.1. Further below we argue that the expected number of losers at the pooling bid satisfies $0 < \liminf \frac{\bar{L}^n}{\sqrt{n}} \leq \limsup \frac{\bar{L}^n}{\sqrt{n}} < \infty$ if $\lim \sqrt{n} |F_s^n(\theta^n(v)|v) - F_s^n(\theta_p^n|v)| < \infty$, and satisfies $0 < \liminf \frac{\bar{L}^n}{n F_s^n([\theta_p^n, \theta^n(v)]|v)} \leq \limsup \frac{\bar{L}^n}{n F_s^n([\theta_p^n, \theta^n(v)]|v)} \leq 1$ if $\lim \sqrt{n} |F_s^n(\theta^n(v)|v) - F_s^n(\theta_p^n|v)| \rightarrow \infty$.

We will prove items *ii* and *iii* using these bounds for \bar{L}^n items *iv* and *v* follow from an identical argument. We begin by proving the lower bounds in items *ii* and *iii*. Note that $\Pr(L^n \geq \bar{L}^n - 1 | P^n = b_p^n, v) \geq 1/2$.¹⁹

$$\begin{aligned}
\Pr(b_p^n \text{ lose} | P^n = b_p^n, v) &\geq \\
\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{L^n}{X} | L^n \geq \bar{L}^n - 1, P^n = b_p^n, v \right] \Pr(L^n \geq \bar{L}^n - 1 | P^n = b_p^n, v) & \\
&\geq \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\bar{L}^n - 1}{X} | L^n \geq \bar{L}^n - 1, P^n = b_p^n, v \right] \frac{1}{2} \\
&\geq \frac{(\bar{L}^n - 1)/2}{\mathbb{E}[X^n | L^n \geq \bar{L}^n - 1, P^n = b_p^n, v]} \text{ (by Jensen's Ineq.)}
\end{aligned}$$

Note that $\mathbb{E}[X^n | L^n \geq \bar{L}^n - 1, P^n = b_p^n, v] \Pr(L^n \geq \bar{L}^n - 1, P^n = b_p^n, v) \leq \mathbf{E}[X^n | v] = n F_s^n([\theta_p^n, \theta_p^n] | v)$. Therefore,

$$\Pr(b_p^n \text{ lose} | P^n = b_p^n, v) \geq \frac{(\bar{L}^n - 1)}{n F_s^n([\theta_p^n, \theta_p^n] | v)} \frac{\Pr(L^n \geq \bar{L}^n - 1 | P^n = b_p^n, v) \Pr(P^n = b_p^n | v)}{2}$$

¹⁹Conditional on $Y_s^n(k_s + 1) = \theta \in [\theta_p^n, \theta_p^n]$ and $V = v$, the number of losers L^n is a binomial random variable. The median of the binomial differs from the mean by at most one. Therefore, $\Pr(L^n \geq \mathbf{E}[L^n | Y_s^n(k_s + 1) = \theta, v] - 1 | Y_s^n(k_s + 1) = \theta, v) \geq 1/2$. In turn, this implies that $\Pr(L^n \geq \bar{L}^n - 1 | P^n = b_p^n, v) \geq 1/2$.

and $\Pr(b_p^n \text{ lose} | P^n = b_p^n, v) nF_s^n([\underline{\theta}_p^n, \theta_p^n] | v) \geq (\bar{L}^n - 1) \frac{\Pr(P^n = b_p^n | v)}{4}$. Taking limits and substituting $0 < \liminf \frac{\bar{L}^n - 1}{\sqrt{n}} < \limsup \frac{\bar{L}^n - 1}{\sqrt{n}} < \infty$ if $\lim \sqrt{n} |F_s^n(\theta^n(v) | v) - F_s^n(\underline{\theta}_p^n | v)| < \infty$; and

$$0 < \liminf \frac{\bar{L}^n - 1}{nF_s^n([\underline{\theta}_p^n, \theta_p^n] | v)} \leq \limsup \frac{\bar{L}^n - 1}{nF_s^n([\underline{\theta}_p^n, \theta_p^n] | v)} \leq 1$$

if $\lim \sqrt{n} |F_s^n(\theta^n(v) | v) - F_s^n(\underline{\theta}_p^n | v)| \rightarrow \infty$ delivers the lower bounds in items *ii* and *iii*.

We now establish the upper bounds in items *ii* and *iii*. If $\lim \sqrt{n} F_s^n([\underline{\theta}_p^n, \theta_p^n] | v) \in (0, \infty)$, then $\lim \sqrt{n} |F_s^n(\theta^n(v) | V = v) - F_s^n(\underline{\theta}_p^n | V = v)| < \infty$ (because $\lim \Pr(P^n = b_p^n | V = v) > 0$) and the upper bound in item *ii* is trivially satisfied. Suppose $\lim \sqrt{n} F_s^n([\underline{\theta}_p^n, \theta_p^n] | v) = \infty$. Pick $\delta \in (0, 1)$ and let $\bar{Y}^n = nF_s^n([\underline{\theta}_p^n, \theta_p^n] | v)$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr[b_p^n \text{ lose} | P^n = b_p^n, v] &\leq \\ &\frac{\mathbb{E}[L^n | X^n > (1 - \delta)\bar{Y}^n, P^n = b_p^n, v] \Pr(X^n > (1 - \delta)\bar{Y}^n | P^n = b_p^n, v)}{(1 - \delta)\bar{Y}^n} \\ &\quad + \Pr(X^n \leq \bar{Y}^n(1 - \delta) | P^n = b_p^n, v). \end{aligned}$$

However, $\mathbb{E}[L^n | X^n > (1 - \delta)\bar{Y}^n, P^n = b_p^n, v] \Pr(X^n > (1 - \delta)\bar{Y}^n | P^n = b_p^n, v) \leq \bar{L}^n$. Therefore,

$$\frac{\Pr[b_p^n \text{ lose} | P^n = b_p^n, v] \bar{Y}^n}{\bar{L}^n} \leq \frac{1}{1 - \delta} + \frac{\bar{Y}^n}{\bar{L}^n} \Pr(X^n \leq \bar{Y}^n(1 - \delta) | P^n = b_p^n, v)$$

Chernoff's inequality implies that $\lim \Pr(X^n \leq (1 - \delta)\bar{Y}^n | v) < \exp(-\frac{\delta^2 \bar{Y}^n}{3})$ and hence $\Pr(X^n \leq \bar{Y}^n(1 - \delta) | P^n = b_p^n, v) \leq \frac{\exp(-\frac{\delta^2 \bar{Y}^n}{3})}{\Pr(P^n = b_p^n | v)}$. Therefore,

$$\lim \frac{\Pr[b_p^n \text{ lose} | P^n = b_p^n, v] \bar{Y}^n}{\bar{L}^n} \leq \frac{1}{1 - \delta}.$$

Substituting for the number of losers \bar{L}^n now delivers the upper bounds in items *i* and *ii*.

We now show that $0 < \liminf \frac{\bar{L}^n}{\sqrt{n}} \leq \limsup \frac{\bar{L}^n}{\sqrt{n}} < \infty$ if $\lim \sqrt{n} |F_s^n(\theta^n(v) | v) - F_s^n(\underline{\theta}_p^n | v)| < \infty$, and $0 < \liminf \frac{\bar{L}^n}{nF_s^n([\underline{\theta}_p^n, \theta_p^n] | v)} \leq \limsup \frac{\bar{L}^n}{nF_s^n([\underline{\theta}_p^n, \theta_p^n] | v)} \leq 1$ if $\lim \sqrt{n} |F_s^n(\theta^n(v) | v) - F_s^n(\underline{\theta}_p^n | v)| \rightarrow \infty$.

Pick any $\theta^n \in [\underline{\theta}_p^n, \theta_p^n]$ and let $a(\theta^n) := \bar{F}_s^n(\theta^n(v) | v) - \bar{F}_s^n(\theta^n | v) = \kappa_s -$

$\bar{F}_s^n(\theta^n|v)$. Recall that $\Pr(L^n = i|Y_s^n(k_s + 1) = \theta^n, v) = bi(i; n - 1 - k_s, p^n)$ and $\mathbb{E}[L^n|Y_s^n(k_s + 1) = \theta^n, v] = np(a(\theta^n))(1 - \kappa_s - \frac{1}{n})$ where

$$p(a(\theta^n)) = \frac{\bar{F}_s^n(\theta_p^n|v) - \kappa_s + a(\theta^n)}{1 - \kappa_s + a(\theta^n)}.$$

Calculating the number of losers we find

$$\bar{L}^n = - \left(1 - \kappa_s - \frac{1}{n}\right) \int_{\underline{a}^n}^{\bar{a}^n} np(a) d\Lambda(a)$$

where $\underline{a}^n = a(\underline{\theta}_p^n)$, $\bar{a}^n = a(\bar{\theta}_p^n)$, and

$$\Lambda(a) := \Pr(F_s^n(Y_s^n(k_s + 1)|v) - \kappa_s \geq a | P^n = b_p^n, v).$$

Integrating by parts and substituting $p(\underline{a}^n) = 0$, $\Lambda(\bar{a}^n) = 0$, and

$$p'(a) = \frac{(1 - \bar{F}_s^n(\theta_p^n|v))}{(1 - \kappa_s + a)^2} = \frac{1 - \kappa_s + \underline{a}^n}{(1 - \kappa_s + a)^2}$$

delivers $\bar{L}^n/n = (1 - \kappa_s - \frac{1}{n})(1 - \kappa_s + \underline{a}^n) \int_{\underline{a}^n}^{\bar{a}^n} \frac{\Lambda(a)}{(1 - \kappa_s + a)^2} da$. Hence,

$$C^n \int_{\underline{a}^n}^{\bar{a}^n} \Lambda(a) da \leq \bar{L}^n/n \leq \frac{1 - \kappa_s}{1 - \kappa_s + \underline{a}^n} \int_{\underline{a}^n}^{\bar{a}^n} \Lambda(a) da \leq \int_{\underline{a}^n}^{\bar{a}^n} \Lambda(a) da.$$

where $C^n = \frac{(1 - \kappa_s)(1 - \kappa_s + \underline{a}^n)}{(1 - \kappa_s + \bar{a}^n)^2}$.

Pick any $\epsilon > 0$ and let a_*^n be such that $\Pr(F_s^n(Y_s^n(k_s + 1)|v) - \kappa_s \geq a^n | P^n = b_p^n, v) = 1 - \epsilon$. The central limit theorem implies that $\lim \sqrt{n}a_*^n \in (0, \infty)$. Moreover, $\lim \sqrt{n}(a^n - \underline{a}^n) > 0$ because $\Pr(F_s^n(Y_s^n(k_s + 1)|v) - \kappa_s \leq a^n | P^n = b_p^n, v) = \epsilon$ for each n . Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\underline{a}^n}^{a_*^n} \Lambda(a) da &\leq \int_{\underline{a}^n}^{\bar{a}^n} \Lambda(a) da \leq \max\{-\underline{a}^n, 0\} + \int_0^{\bar{a}^n} \Lambda(a) da \\ \int_{\underline{a}^n}^{a_*^n} (1 - \epsilon) da &\leq \int_{\underline{a}^n}^{\bar{a}^n} \Lambda(a) da \leq \max\{-\underline{a}^n, 0\} + \frac{\int_0^{\bar{a}^n} e^{-\frac{a^2 n}{2}} d\theta}{\Pr(P^n = b_p^n|v)} \\ (1 - \epsilon)(a_*^n - \underline{a}^n) &\leq \int_{\underline{a}^n}^{\bar{a}^n} \Lambda(a) da = \max\{-\underline{a}^n, 0\} + \frac{\sqrt{2}erf(\sqrt{n}\bar{a})}{\Pr(P^n = b_p^n|v)\sqrt{\pi n}} \\ &\leq \max\{-\underline{a}^n, 0\} + \frac{1}{\Pr(P^n = b_p^n|v)\sqrt{2\pi n}} \end{aligned}$$

where $\text{erf}(x) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi}} \int_0^x e^{-t^2} dt \in [0, 1/2]$ is the error function.

Note $-\underline{a}^n = F_s^n(\theta^n(v)|V=v) - F_s^n(\underline{\theta}_p^n|V=v)$. Suppose that $-\lim \sqrt{n}\underline{a}^n < \infty$. If $-\lim \sqrt{n}\underline{a}^n = \delta_1 < \infty$, then $\lim \sqrt{n}(a_*^n - \underline{a}^n) = \delta \in (0, \infty)$. The fact that $\frac{\bar{L}^n}{\sqrt{n}} \in \left(\sqrt{n}C^n \int_{\underline{a}^n}^{\bar{a}^n} \Lambda(a)da, \sqrt{n} \int_{\underline{a}^n}^{\bar{a}^n} \Lambda(a)da \right)$ and the bounds for $\int_{\underline{a}^n}^{\bar{a}^n} \Lambda(a)da$ together imply that

$$\begin{aligned} C^n \left((1 - \epsilon) \sqrt{n}(a_*^n - \underline{a}^n) \right) &\leq \frac{\bar{L}^n}{\sqrt{n}} \\ &\leq \max\{\sqrt{n}\underline{a}^n, 0\} + \frac{1}{\Pr(P^n = b_p^n|v) \sqrt{2\pi}} \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} 0 < (1 - \epsilon) C \delta \leq \liminf \frac{\bar{L}^n}{\sqrt{n}} &\leq \limsup \frac{\bar{L}^n}{\sqrt{n}} \leq \\ &\max\{\delta_1, 0\} + \frac{1}{\Pr(P^n = b_p^n|v) \sqrt{2\pi}} < \infty, \end{aligned}$$

where $C = \liminf C^n$.

If $-\lim \sqrt{n}\underline{a}^n = \infty$, then $L^n \in \left(n\sqrt{n}C^n \int_{\underline{a}^n}^{\bar{a}^n} \Lambda(a)da, n \int_{\underline{a}^n}^{\bar{a}^n} \Lambda(a)da \right)$ and the bounds for $\int_{\underline{a}^n}^{\bar{a}^n} \Lambda(a)da$ together imply that

$$\begin{aligned} C^n \left(\frac{(1 - \epsilon) n (a_*^n - \underline{a}^n)}{-n\underline{a}^n} \right) &\leq \frac{\bar{L}^n}{-n\underline{a}^n} \leq 1 - \frac{1}{\Pr(P^n = b_p^n|v) \underline{a}^n \sqrt{2\pi n}} \\ \lim C^n \left((1 - \epsilon) \left(\frac{\sqrt{n}a_*^n}{-n\underline{a}^n} + 1 \right) \right) &\leq \liminf \frac{\bar{L}^n}{-n\underline{a}^n} \leq \limsup \frac{\bar{L}^n}{-n\underline{a}^n} \leq 1 \\ 0 < C(1 - \epsilon) &\leq \liminf \frac{\bar{L}^n}{-n\underline{a}^n} \leq \limsup \frac{\bar{L}^n}{-n\underline{a}^n} \leq 1. \end{aligned}$$

□

Proof of the calculation for the case where $\lim \Pr(P^n \geq b_p^n|v) = 0$ in Lemma B.1. As before, let X^n denote the random variable which is equal to the number of bidders in the interval $[\underline{\theta}_p^n, \theta_p^n]$. Redefine L^n to denote the random variable which is equal to the number of losers with signals that exceed $\underline{\theta}_p^n$. Note that $\mathbb{E}[L^n | Y_s^n(k+1) \geq \underline{\theta}_p^n, V=v] = \mathbb{E}[L^n | L^n \geq 1, V=v]$. Pick a $\delta > 0$, and let $d^n = (1 - \delta)k_s \frac{F_s^n([\underline{\theta}_p^n, \theta_p^n]|v)}{\bar{F}_s^n(\underline{\theta}_p^n|v)}$ and observe that $\lim \frac{d^n}{\sqrt{n}} > 0$. We will show

$$\lim \frac{\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{L^n}{X^n} | L^n \in [1, d^n], V=0 \right]}{\frac{\bar{F}_s^n(\underline{\theta}_p^n|V=v)(1 - \bar{F}_s(\underline{\theta}_p|V=v))}{nF_s^n([\underline{\theta}_p^n, \theta_p^n]|V=v)(\kappa_s - \bar{F}_s(\underline{\theta}_p|V=v))}} = 1$$

and

$$\lim \frac{\Pr(b_p^n \text{ loses} | P^n = b_p^n, V = v)}{\mathbb{E}\left[\frac{L^n}{X^n} | L^n \in [1, d^n], V = 0\right]} = 1.$$

Step 1. $\lim \frac{\mathbb{E}[L^n | L^n \in [1, d^n], v]}{a^n} = 1$, where $a^n = \frac{\kappa_s(1 - \bar{F}_s^n(\theta_p^n | V=v))}{\kappa_s - \bar{F}_s^n(\theta_p^n | V=v)}$. Note

$$\lim \mathbb{E}[L^n | L^n \in [1, d^n], v] = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{d^n} i bi(k_s + i, n; p^n)}{\sum_{i=1}^{d^n} bi(k_s + i, n; p^n)}$$

where $p^n = \bar{F}_s^n(\theta_p^n | v)$. Observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{bi(k+i, n; p^n)}{bi(k+i, n; \kappa_s)} bi(k+i, n; \kappa_s) &= \\ bi(k+i, n; \kappa_s) \left(\frac{p^n}{\kappa_s}\right)^{k_s} \left(\frac{1-p^n}{1-\kappa_s}\right)^{n-k_s} \left(\frac{p^n(1-\kappa_s)}{\kappa_s(1-p^n)}\right)^i. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore

$$\mathbb{E}[L^n | L^n \in [1, d^n], v] = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{d^n} ir(n)^i bi(k_s + i, n; \kappa_s)}{\sum_{i=1}^{d^n} r(n)^i bi(k_s + i, n; \kappa_s)},$$

where $r(n) = \frac{p^n(1-\kappa_s)}{\kappa_s(1-p^n)} < 1$. Pick any $J < d^n$. For each $i < J$,

$$(1 - \epsilon^n) \phi\left(\frac{J}{\sqrt{n(1-\kappa_s)\kappa_s}}\right) \leq \sqrt{n(1-\kappa_s)\kappa_s} bi(k+i, n; \kappa_s) \leq (1 + \epsilon^n) \phi(0)$$

by the local limit theorem (Proposition A.1). Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} (1 - \epsilon^n) \frac{\phi\left(\frac{J}{\sqrt{n}}\right) \sum_{i=1}^J ir(n)^i}{\phi(0) \sum_{i=1}^{d^n} r(n)^i} &\leq \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{d^n} ir^i \sqrt{n} bi(k+i, n; \kappa_s)}{\sum_{i=1}^{d^n} r^i \sqrt{n} bi(k+i, n; \kappa_s)} \leq \\ &\frac{\phi(0) \sum_{i=1}^{d^n} ir(n)^i}{\phi\left(\frac{J}{\sqrt{n}}\right) \sum_{i=1}^J r(n)^i} (1 + \epsilon^n). \end{aligned}$$

Evaluating the geometric series we find

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\phi\left(\frac{J}{\sqrt{n}}\right)(1-\epsilon^n)}{\phi(0)\left(1-r(n)^{d^n}\right)}\left(\frac{1-r(n)^J}{1-r(n)}-Jr(n)^J\right) &\leq Q \leq \\ &\frac{\phi(0)(1+\epsilon^n)}{\phi\left(\frac{J}{\sqrt{n}}\right)\left(1-r(n)^J\right)}\left(\frac{1-r(n)^{d^n}}{1-r(n)}-d^n r(n)^{d^n}\right) \\ \frac{\phi\left(\frac{J}{\sqrt{n}}\right)(1-\epsilon^n)}{\phi(0)\left(1-r(n)^{d^n}\right)}\left(\frac{1-r(n)^J}{1-r(n)}-Jr(n)^J\right) &\leq Q \leq \frac{\phi(0)(1+\epsilon^n)}{\phi\left(\frac{J}{\sqrt{n}}\right)\left(1-r(n)^J\right)} \end{aligned}$$

where $Q = \mathbb{E}[L^n | L^n \in [1, d^n], v]$.

Case 1. $\bar{F}(\theta_p | v) < \kappa_s$. In this case, $\lim r(n) = r < 1$. Picking $J = n^{1/4} < d^n$ and taking the limit as $n \rightarrow \infty$ we find $\lim \mathbb{E}[L^n | L^n \in [1, d^n], v_i] = \frac{1}{1-r} = \frac{\kappa_s(1-\bar{F}_s(\theta_p | V=v))}{\kappa_s - \bar{F}_s(\theta_p | V=v)} = \lim a^n$.

Case 2. $\bar{F}_s(\theta_p | v_i) = \kappa_s$. In this case $r(n) < 1$ for all n sufficiently large but $\lim r(n) = 1$. Note that $\lim \frac{1-r(n)}{1/a^n} = 1$. For any constant m , $ma^n < d^n$ for sufficiently large n because $d^n/a^n \rightarrow \infty$. Substituting $1/a^n$ for $1-r(n)$ and setting $J = ma^n$ for any arbitrary m we find

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\phi(ma^n/\sqrt{n})}{\phi(0)} \frac{a^n \left(1 - (1 - 1/a^n)^{ma^n}\right) - ma^n (1 - 1/a^n)^{ma^n}}{1 - (1 - 1/a^n)^{d^n}} \frac{1 - \epsilon^n}{a^n} &\leq X \\ &\leq \frac{\phi(0)}{\phi(ma^n/\sqrt{n})} a^n \frac{1 + \epsilon^n}{a^n} \\ \frac{\phi(ma^n/\sqrt{n})}{\phi(0)} \frac{\left(1 - (1 - 1/a^n)^{ma^n}\right) - m(1 - 1/a^n)^{ma^n}}{1 - (1 - 1/a^n)^{d^n}} (1 - \epsilon^n) &\leq X \\ &\leq \frac{\phi(0)}{\phi(ma^n/\sqrt{n})} (1 + \epsilon^n) \end{aligned}$$

where $X = \frac{\mathbb{E}[L^n | L^n \in [1, d^n], v_i]}{a^n}$. Taking the limit as $n \rightarrow \infty$ and noting that $a^n \rightarrow \infty$, $a^n/\sqrt{n} \rightarrow 0$ and $d^n/a^n \rightarrow \infty$ we obtain $(1 - 1/a^n)^{ma^n} \rightarrow \exp(-m)$, $\phi(ma^n/\sqrt{n}) \rightarrow \phi(0)$, and $(1 - 1/a^n)^{d^n} \rightarrow 0$. Therefore

$$1 - \exp(-m) - \exp(-m)m \leq \lim \mathbb{E}[L^n | L^n \in [1, d^n], v_i] / a^n \leq 1.$$

As m is arbitrary, taking the limit as $m \rightarrow \infty$ we find $\mathbb{E}[L^n | L^n \in [1, d^n], v_1] / a^n \rightarrow 1$.

Step 2. We show $\Pr(L^n > d^n | L^n \geq 1, v) \leq A \exp(-d^n/a^n) \rightarrow 0$ and $\Pr[Y^n(k+1) > \theta_p^n | Y^n(k+1)] > \underline{\theta}_p^n, v \leq A \exp(-d^n/a^n) \rightarrow 0$ where A is an arbitrary positive constant.

Following the procedure from the previous step, we find

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr(L^n > d^n | L^n \geq 1, v) &= \frac{\sum_{i=d^n}^{n-k} bi(k+i, n; \kappa)}{\sum_{i=1}^{n-k} bi(k+i, n; \kappa)} \\ &= \frac{r^{d^n} (1 - \epsilon_1^n) \left(a^n + \frac{(1-1/a^n)^n}{a^n} - (1 - 1/a^n)^n \right)}{(1 - \epsilon_2^n) \left(a^n + \frac{(1-1/a^n)^n}{a^n} - (1 - 1/a^n)^n \right)} \leq \\ &A \exp(-d^n/a^n) \end{aligned}$$

where last inequality is a consequence of the fact that $(1 - 1/a^n)^{d^n}$ is of the order of $\exp(-d^n/a^n)$. Also, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr[Y^n(k+1) > \theta_p^n | Y^n(k+1) > \underline{\theta}_p^n, v] &= \\ \Pr(L^n \in [1, d^n] | L^n > 1, v) \Pr(X^n < L^n | L^n \in [1, d^n], L^n > 1, v) \\ &+ \Pr(L^n > d^n | L^n > 1, v) \Pr(X^n < L^n | L^n > d^n, L^n > 1, v). \end{aligned}$$

Consequently

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr[Y^n(k+1) > \theta_p^n | Y^n(k+1) > \underline{\theta}_p^n, v] &\leq \Pr(L^n > d^n | L^n > 1, v) + \\ &\Pr(X^n < L^n | L^n \in [1, d^n], L^n > 1, v) \\ &\leq \frac{\sum_{i=d^n}^{n-k} bi(k+i, n; \kappa)}{\sum_{i=1}^{n-k} bi(k+i, n; \kappa)} + \exp(-\delta^2 d^n/2) \\ &\leq A \exp(-d^n/a^n) + \exp(-\delta^2 d^n/2) \leq A \exp(-d^n/a^n) \end{aligned}$$

where in the last inequality we use the fact that $A \exp(-d^n/a^n) \geq \exp(-\delta^2 d^n/2)$ and redefine the constant A without changing the order of the term.

Step 3. We now show

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\bar{F}_s^n(\theta_p^n | v)}{(1 + \delta) F^n([\underline{\theta}_p^n, \theta_p^n] | v)} \frac{\mathbb{E}[L^n | L^n \in [1, d^n], v]}{k_s} &\leq \Pr(b^p \text{ loses} | L^n \geq 1, v) \leq \\ &\frac{\bar{F}_s^n(\theta_p^n | v)}{(1 - \delta) F^n([\underline{\theta}_p^n, \theta_p^n] | v)} \frac{\mathbb{E}[L^n | L^n \in [1, d^n], v]}{k_s} + A \exp(-d^n/a^n) \end{aligned}$$

We first give a lower bound for the probability of losing:

$$\Pr(b^p \text{ loses} | L^n \geq 1, v) \geq \mathbb{E} \left[\min \left[\frac{L^n}{X^n}, 1 \right] | L^n \in [1, d^n], v \right] \Pr(L^n \in [1, d^n] | L^n \geq 1, v)$$

Note that $\Pr(L^n \in [1, d^n] | L^n \geq 1, v) \rightarrow 1$, thus

$$\Pr(b^p \text{ loses} | L^n \geq 1, v) \geq \mathbb{E} \left[\min \left[\frac{L^n}{X^n}, 1 \right] | L^n \in [1, d^n], v \right] (1 - \delta_1)$$

where δ_1 is an arbitrarily small constant. The facts that $\min [L^n/X^n, 1]$ is a concave function of X^n and Jensen's inequality together imply that

$$\mathbb{E} [\min [L^n/X^n, 1] | L^n \in [1, d^n], v] \geq \mathbb{E} \left[\min \left[\frac{L^n}{\mathbb{E}[X^n | L^n, v]}, 1 \right] | L^n \in [1, d^n], v \right].$$

By definition $\mathbb{E}[X^n | L^n, v_i] > d^n$, therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[\min \left[\frac{L^n}{\mathbb{E}[X^n | L^n, v_i]}, 1 \right] | L^n \in [1, d^n], v \right] &= \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{L^n}{\mathbb{E}[X^n | L^n, v_i]} | L^n \in [1, d^n], v \right] = \\ &= \frac{\overline{F}_s^n(\underline{\theta}_p^n | v)}{F_s^n([\underline{\theta}_p^n, \theta_p^n] | v)} \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{L^n}{L^n + k_s} | L^n \in [1, d^n], v \right] \end{aligned}$$

Noticing that $\frac{L^n}{L^n + k}$ is a concave function of L and applying Jensen's inequality implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} [\min [L^n/X^n, 1] | L^n \in [1, d^n], v] &\geq \frac{\overline{F}_s^n(\underline{\theta}_p^n | v)}{F_s^n([\underline{\theta}_p^n, \theta_p^n] | v)} \frac{\frac{\mathbb{E}[L^n | L^n \in [1, d^n], v]}{k_s}}{\frac{\mathbb{E}[L^n | L^n \in [1, d^n], v]}{k_s} + 1} \\ &\geq \frac{\overline{F}_s^n(\underline{\theta}_p^n | v)}{F_s^n([\underline{\theta}_p^n, \theta_p^n] | v)} \frac{\frac{\mathbb{E}[L^n | L^n \in [1, d^n], v]}{k_s}}{1 + \delta_2} \end{aligned}$$

where $\delta_2 := \mathbb{E}[L^n | L^n \in [1, d^n], v] / k$ is an arbitrary positive constant. Note that $\mathbb{E}[L^n | L^n \in [1, d^n], v] / k \rightarrow 0$, therefore we can choose δ_2 arbitrarily small for large n . Therefore,

$$\Pr(b^p \text{ loses} | L^n \geq 1, v) \geq (1 - \delta) \frac{\overline{F}_s^n(\underline{\theta}_p^n | v)}{F_s^n([\underline{\theta}_p^n, \theta_p^n] | v) k_s} \mathbb{E}[L^n | L^n \in [1, d^n], v]$$

where $1 - \delta = \min \{1/(1 + \delta_2), 1 - \delta_1\}$.

We now provide an upper bound for the probability of losing:

$$\begin{aligned}
\Pr(b^p \text{ loses} | L^n \geq 1, v) &\leq \\
&\mathbb{E}[\min[L^n/X^n, 1] | L^n \in [1, d^n], v] + \Pr(L^n > d^n | L^n \geq 1, v) \leq \\
&\frac{\bar{F}_s^n(\theta_p^n | v)}{(1 - \delta)F_s^n([\theta_p^n, \theta_p^n] | v)} \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{L^n}{L^n + k_s} | L^n \in [1, d^n], v\right] + \\
&\Pr(L^n > d^n | L^n \geq 1, v) + \exp(-\delta^2 d^n / 3) \leq \\
&\frac{\bar{F}_s^n(\theta_p^n | v)}{(1 - \delta)F_s^n([\theta_p^n, \theta_p^n] | v)} \frac{\mathbb{E}[L^n | L^n \in [1, d^n], v]}{k_s} + A \exp(-d^n/a^n) + \exp(-\delta^2 d^n / 3) \leq \\
&\frac{\bar{F}_s^n(\theta_p^n | v)}{(1 - \delta)F_s^n([\theta_p^n, \theta_p^n] | v)} \frac{\mathbb{E}[L^n | L^n \in [1, d^n], v]}{k_s} + A \exp(-d^n/a^n).
\end{aligned}$$

the first inequality follows because $\mathbb{E}[X^n | L^n = i \in [1, d^n], v] = (k_s + i) \frac{F_s^n([\theta_p^n, \theta_p^n] | v)}{\bar{F}_s^n(\theta_p^n | v)}$ is less than $(1 - \delta)(k_s + i) \frac{F_s^n([\theta_p^n, \theta_p^n] | v)}{\bar{F}_s^n(\theta_p^n | v)}$ with probability $\exp(-\delta^2 d^n / 3)$ by Chernoff's inequality and the second follows because we showed that $\Pr(L^n > d^n | L^n \geq 1, v) \leq A \exp(-d^n/a^n)$ in step 2. To obtain the last inequality we use the fact $A \exp(-d^n/a^n) > \exp(-\delta^2 d^n / 3)$ and redefine the constant A without changing the order of the term. The lemma now follows as $\frac{d^n}{a^n} \exp(-d^n/a^n) \rightarrow 0$ because $d^n/a^n \rightarrow \infty$ and because the constants δ are arbitrary. \square

Lemma B.2. *Fix a sequence of bidding equilibria \mathbf{H} and suppose that $\lim \sqrt{n} |\bar{F}_s^n(\theta_s^n(1) | V = v) - \bar{F}_s^n(\theta_s^n(0) | V = v)| \rightarrow \infty$. If there is pooling by pivotal types, then $\lim \Pr(P^n \leq b_p^n | V = 1) = 1$ and $\lim \Pr(P^n < b_p^n | V = 0) = 0$.*

Proof. Pooling by pivotal types implies that $\lim \Pr(P^n = b_p^n | V = v) > 0$ for $v = 0, 1$. Suppose $\lim \Pr(P^n < b_p^n | V = 0) > 0$ then $\lim \sqrt{n} (F_s^n(\theta_s^n(0) | 0) - F_s^n(\theta_p^n | 0)) \in (-\infty, \infty)$. Moreover, $\lim \Pr(P^n = b_p^n | V = 1) > 0$ and $\lim \sqrt{n} |\bar{F}_s^n(\theta_s^n(1) | V = 1) - \bar{F}_s^n(\theta_s^n(0) | V = 1)| \rightarrow \infty$ together imply $\lim \sqrt{n} (F_s^n(\theta_s^n(1) | 1) - F_s^n(\theta_p^n | 1)) = \infty$. Along any sequence where the limit in the equation below exists, Lemma A.2 implies that there is a constant C such that

$$\lim \frac{\Pr(b^n \text{ lose} | P^n = b_p^n, V = 0)}{\Pr(b^n \text{ lose} | P^n = b_p^n, V = 1)} \leq \frac{1}{\eta} \lim \frac{C}{\sqrt{n} (F_s^n(\theta_s^n(1) | 1) - F_s^n(\theta_p^n | 1))} = 0$$

showing that pooling is not possible. Therefore, if there is pooling by pivotal types, then $\lim \Pr(P^n < b_p^n | V = 0) = 0$.

Suppose $\lim \Pr(P^n \leq b_p^n | V = 1) < 1$. Then

$$\lim \sqrt{n} (F_s^n(\theta_p^n | 1) - F_s^n(\theta_s^n(1) | 1)) \in (-\infty, \infty).$$

Moreover, $\lim \Pr(P^n = b_p^n | V = 0) > 0$ and $\lim \sqrt{n} |\bar{F}_s^n(\theta_s^n(1) | V = 1) - \bar{F}_s^n(\theta_s^n(0) | V = 1)| \rightarrow \infty$ together imply $\lim \sqrt{n} (F_s^n(\theta_p^n | 0) - F_s^n(\theta_s^n(0) | 0)) = \infty$. Using Lemma A.2 we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \lim \frac{\Pr(b^n \text{ win} | P^n = b_p^n, V = 1)}{\Pr(b^n \text{ win} | P^n = b_p^n, V = 0)} &\leq \\ C \lim \frac{F_s^n([\theta_p^n, \theta_p^n] | 0)}{F_s^n([\theta_p^n, \theta_p^n] | 1)} \frac{\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}}{(F_s^n(\theta_p^n | 0) - F_s^n(\theta_s^n(0) | 0))} &= 0 \end{aligned}$$

again showing that pooling is not possible. Therefore, if there is pooling by pivotal types, then $\lim \Pr(P^n \leq b_p^n | V = 1) = 1$. \square

B.2. Proof of Step 2 of Proposition A.1

Proof. Pick $\theta' \in [1/3, 2/3]$, $\theta'' \in [2/3, 1]$ and let $\tilde{\theta} = (\theta', \theta'')$. Suppose that $\theta \in [0, \theta') \cup (2/3, \theta'']$ select market s and all others select market r . The expected payoff of a type $\theta \in \mathcal{E}(1)$ who submits a bid equal to $b = 1$ in market s or in market r is given by $u_{\tilde{\theta}}(s | \mathcal{E}(1)) = G_s(1/3 | 1) + \int_{1/3}^{\theta'} (1 - b_s^n(\theta)) dG_s(\theta | 1)$ and $u_{\tilde{\theta}}(r | \mathcal{E}(1)) = G_r(\theta' | 1)(1 - c) + \int_{\theta'}^{2/3} (1 - b_r^n(\theta)) dG_r(\theta | 1)$ where $G_m(\theta | v) = \Pr(Y_m^{n-1}(k_m) \leq \theta | V = v)$.²⁰ The expected payoff of type $1/3$ (hence the payoff for any $\theta \in \mathcal{E}(1/2)$) that submits a bid equal to $b = b_s^n(1/3)$ in market s and the expected payoff of type θ' that submits a bid equal to $b = b_r^n(\theta')$ in market r are given by $u_{\tilde{\theta}}(s | \mathcal{E}(1/2)) = G_s(1/3 | 1)/2$ and $u_{\tilde{\theta}}(r | \mathcal{E}(1/2)) = G_r(\theta' | 1)(1 - c)/2 - G_r(\theta' | 0)c/2$. Notice that $\Pr(Y_s^{n-1}(k_s) \leq \theta | V = 1)$ and $\Pr(Y_s^{n-1}(k_s) \leq \theta | V = 0)$ are binomial distributions with parameters $\bar{F}_s([\theta, 2/3] | 1) + \bar{F}_s([2/3, \theta''] | 1)$ and $\bar{F}_s([\theta, 2/3] | 0)$. Therefore, the functions $\mathbb{E}[V | Y_m^{n-1}(k_m) = \theta]$, $G_m(\theta | v)$, and $dG_m(\theta | v)$ are continuous in θ' and θ'' .

²⁰If no types $\theta \in \mathcal{E}(1) \cup \mathcal{E}(1/2)$ bid in market s , then $\mathbb{E}[V | Y_s^{n-1}(k_s) = \theta]$ is not well defined. In this case any bid $b > 0$ is optimal for $\theta \in \mathcal{E}(1/2)$ (and similarly in market r). Although this situation never occurs in equilibrium, for completeness we assume that $\mathbb{E}[V | Y_m^{n-1}(k_m) = \theta] = 1/2$ in this case.

Let $\tilde{\theta} = (\theta', \theta'') \in [1/3, 2/3] \times [2/3, 1]$ and define

$$\Gamma_1(\tilde{\theta}) = \begin{cases} [\frac{1}{3}, \frac{2}{3}] & \text{if } u_{\tilde{\theta}}(s|\mathcal{E}(1/2)) = u_{\tilde{\theta}}(r|\mathcal{E}(1/2)) \\ \frac{2}{3} & \text{if } u_{\tilde{\theta}}(s|\mathcal{E}(1/2)) > u_{\tilde{\theta}}(r|\mathcal{E}(1/2)) \\ \frac{1}{3} & \text{if } u_{\tilde{\theta}}(s|\mathcal{E}(1/2)) < u_{\tilde{\theta}}(r|\mathcal{E}(1/2)) \end{cases}$$

and

$$\Gamma_2(\tilde{\theta}) = \begin{cases} [\frac{2}{3}, 1] & \text{if } u_{\tilde{\theta}}(r|\mathcal{E}(1)) = u_{\tilde{\theta}}(s|\mathcal{E}(1)) \\ 1 & \text{if } u_{\tilde{\theta}}(s|\mathcal{E}(1)) > u_{\tilde{\theta}}(r|\mathcal{E}(1)) \\ 2/3 & \text{if } u_{\tilde{\theta}}(s|\mathcal{E}(1)) < u_{\tilde{\theta}}(r|\mathcal{E}(1)). \end{cases}$$

The correspondence $\Gamma = \Gamma_1 \times \Gamma_2$ is UHC, convex valued, compact valued and therefore has a fixed point (θ_1, θ_2) and this fixed point is an equilibrium. The fixed point is an equilibrium because the correspondence Γ is defined so that all types $\theta \in \mathcal{E}(1/2)$ choose the market that gives them the highest payoff and if $\theta_1 \in (1/3, 2/3)$, then type θ_1 as well as all types $\theta \in \mathcal{E}(1/2)$ are indifferent between the two markets. The situation is similar for types $\theta \in \mathcal{E}(1)$ and all $\theta \in \mathcal{E}(0)$ choose market s by construction. Moreover, conditional on these choices, the bidding function $\mathbb{E}[V|Y_m^{n-1}(k_m) = \theta]$ is a bidding equilibrium in market m , and this bidding function delivers the payoffs used to construct the correspondence Γ . \square

B.3. An Equilibrium with Pooling by Pivotal Types Pooling by pivotal types is not possible in the illustrative example as shown in the paper. Below we construct an equilibrium where there is pooling by pivotal types by altering the signal structure in the illustrative example as follows:

$$f(\theta|V) = \begin{cases} 3(1 - g\frac{1-\pi}{\pi})(1 - V) & \text{for } \theta \in \mathcal{E}(0) := [0, 1/3] \\ 3(gV + (1 - V)g\frac{1-\pi}{\pi}) & \text{for } \theta \in \mathcal{E}(1/2) := [1/3, 2/3] \\ 3(1 - g)V & \text{for } \theta \in \mathcal{E}(1) := (2/3, 1] \end{cases}$$

where $\pi < c < 1/2$ and $g \in [0, 1]$. Types $\theta \in \mathcal{E}(1/2)$ are pessimistic, i.e., their belief is $\pi < 1/2$ as opposed to $1/2$ as in the illustrative example. The belief of types in $\mathcal{E}(0)$ and $\mathcal{E}(1)$ is equal to zero and one, respectively, as in the original illustrative example.

Example B.1. Suppose that $\kappa_s < g$ and $\kappa_r > 1 - g$. There exists an $\epsilon > 0$ such that, for all sufficiently large n , there is an equilibrium where all types $\theta \in \mathcal{E}(1)$ select market r and all types $\theta \in \mathcal{E}(1/2)$ bid $b_p = c + \epsilon$ in market s . In this

equilibrium, the price in markets s and r is equal to b_p and c , respectively, with probability converging to one.

Proof. Types $\theta \in \mathcal{E}(1/2)$ never opt for market r because $c > \pi$ and all types $\theta \in \mathcal{E}(0)$ submit a bid equal to zero in market s in any equilibrium. Pick $\epsilon < (1 - 2c)/2$. If all types $\theta \in \mathcal{E}(1/2)$ submit a pooling bid equal to b_p in market s , then their limit payoff at pooling is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr(V = 1|\theta) (1 - b_p) \lim \Pr(b_p \text{ win}|V = 1) - \Pr(V = 0|\theta) b_p \lim \Pr(b_p \text{ win}|V = 1) \\ = \pi \kappa_s (1 - 2c - 2\epsilon) / g > 0 \end{aligned}$$

because the probability of winning conditional on $P = b_p$ converges to κ_s/g and $\kappa_s\pi/g(1 - \pi)$, in states 1 and 0, respectively. Alternatively, if this type instead submits a bid greater than the pooling bid, then the type's limit payoff is $(1 - b_p)\pi - (1 - \pi)b_p = \pi - b_p < 0$ because she wins with probability converging to one. Therefore, at the limit, each $\theta \in \mathcal{E}(1/2)$ strictly prefers the pooling bid to any higher bid. Also, each $\theta \in \mathcal{E}(1/2)$ strictly prefers the pooling bid to any lower bid because $\kappa_s < g < g(1 - \pi)\pi$ implies that the probability of winning with a lower bid converges to zero. The fact that each $\theta \in \mathcal{E}(1/2)$ strictly prefers the pooling bid to any other bid at the limit implies that these types also prefer the pooling bid for sufficiently large n . Also, types $\theta \in \mathcal{E}(1)$ opt for market r because $b_p > c$. \square