

Platform Competition with Multihoming on Both Sides: Subsidize or Not?

— ONLINE APPENDIX —

Yannis Bakos* Hanna Halaburda†

This version: February 26, 2020

In this appendix, we show that assuming $A_x = B_x$ and $A_y = B_y$ simplifies exposition of the benchmark cases without any loss to the our results.

1 General Model Set-up and Benchmarks

We consider a setting with two types of potential participants (sides), X and Y , which are spatially differentiated and uniformly distributed; specifically $x \sim U[0, 1]$ for side X and $y \sim U[0, Y]$ for side Y . We allow Y to be smaller, greater or equal to 1. There is two-sided Hotelling competition between the two platforms, A and B that are located at the ends of these segments, with A at 0 in both sides and B respectively at 1 and Y . The platforms charge participation fees p_i , $i = A, B$ on side X and r_i on side Y , and incur zero marginal cost in serving additional users.

A user located at x on side X (respectively y on Y) receives utility from joining platform $i = A, B$:

$$\begin{aligned} u(x; A) &= A_x + \alpha y_A - p_A - zx, \\ u(x; B) &= B_x + \alpha(Y - y_B) - p_B - z(1 - x), \\ u(y; A) &= A_y + \beta x_A - r_A - qy, \\ u(y; B) &= B_y + \beta(1 - x_B) - r_B - q(Y - y), \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

*Stern School of Business, New York University; email: bakos@stern.nyu.edu.

†Stern School of Business, New York University; email: hhalaburda@gmail.com.

where for platform A a mass of y_A agents participate on side Y and a mass x_A agents participate on side X , while for platform B a mass of $1 - x_B$ agents participate on side X and a mass of $Y - y_B$ agents participate on side Y ; α and β is the “network effect” of the other side on side X and Y respectively; A_x, B_x and A_y, B_y are the stand-alone values users on side X and Y obtain from joining the respective platform; and z and q are the respective “transportation cost,” i.e., the loss of utility due to preference mis-match or set-up costs. We assume that $qz > \alpha\beta$, i.e., that network effects are weaker than transportation costs, which is a typical assumption in models of competition with network effects on Hotelling line, as these models focus on the effects of differentiation.

1.1 Single-homing benchmark

We begin by analyzing as a benchmark the case with full coverage and single-homing, as is typical in most of the literature on platform competition. Imposing single-homing, under full coverage, the platforms share the market according to $x_A = x_B = \tilde{x}$ s.t. $u(\tilde{x}; A) = u(\tilde{x}; B)$ and $y_A = y_B = \tilde{y}$ s.t., $u(\tilde{y}; A) = u(\tilde{y}; B)$; i.e.,

$$\tilde{x} = \frac{z + A_x - B_x + 2\alpha\tilde{y} - \alpha Y - p_A + p_B}{2z},$$

$$\tilde{y} = \frac{qY + A_y - B_y + 2\beta\tilde{x} - \beta - r_A + r_B}{2q}.$$

First, solving for \tilde{x} and \tilde{y} for given prices yields

$$\tilde{x} = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{q(A_x - B_x) + \alpha(A_y - B_y) - q(p_A - p_B) - \alpha(r_A - r_B)}{2(zq - \alpha\beta)},$$

$$\tilde{y} = \frac{Y}{2} + \frac{\beta(A_x - B_x) + z(A_y - B_y) - \beta(p_A - p_B) - z(r_A - r_B)}{2(zq - \alpha\beta)}.$$

Platform A is choosing p_A and r_A to maximize its profit, $\Pi_A = p_A\tilde{x} + r_A\tilde{y}$. The FOCs wrt p_A and r_A yield

$$zq - \alpha\beta + q(A_x - B_x) + \alpha(A_y - B_y) + qp_B + \alpha r_B - 2qp_A - r_A(\alpha + \beta) = 0,$$

$$Y(zq - \alpha\beta) + \beta(A_x - B_x) + z(A_y - B_y) + \beta p_B + z r_B - (\alpha + \beta)p_A - 2z r_A = 0.$$

Platform B is choosing p_B and r_B to maximize its profit, $\Pi_B = p_B(1 - \tilde{x}) + r_B(Y - \tilde{y})$. The

FOCs wrt p_B and r_B yield

$$zq - \alpha\beta - q(A_x - B_x) - \alpha(A_y - B_y) + qp_A + \alpha r_A - 2qp_B - r_B(\alpha + \beta) = 0,$$

$$Y(zq - \alpha\beta) - \beta(A_x - B_x) - z(A_y - B_y) + \beta p_A + z r_A - (\alpha + \beta)p_B - 2zr_B = 0.$$

Using these FOC to solve for the equilibrium, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{x}^S &= \frac{1}{2} + \frac{3q(A_x - B_x) + (\alpha + 2\beta)(A_y - B_y)}{18(zq - \alpha\beta) - 4(\alpha - \beta)^2}, \\ \tilde{y}^S &= \frac{Y}{2} + \frac{(2\alpha + \beta)(A_x - B_x) + 3z(A_y - B_y)}{18(zq - \alpha\beta) - 4(\alpha - \beta)^2}, \\ p_A^S &= z - Y\beta + \frac{(A_x - B_x)(3qz - \beta(2\alpha + \beta)) + (A_y - B_y)z(\alpha - \beta)}{9(zq - \alpha\beta) - 2(\alpha - \beta)^2}, \\ r_A^S &= qY - \alpha + \frac{(A_y - B_y)(3qz - \alpha(\alpha + 2\beta)) - q(A_x - B_x)(\alpha - \beta)}{9(zq - \alpha\beta) - 2(\alpha - \beta)^2}, \\ p_B^S &= z - Y\beta - \frac{(A_x - B_x)(3qz - \beta(2\alpha + \beta)) + (A_y - B_y)z(\alpha - \beta)}{9(zq - \alpha\beta) - 2(\alpha - \beta)^2}, \\ r_B^S &= qY - \alpha - \frac{(A_y - B_y)(3qz - \alpha(\alpha + 2\beta)) - q(A_x - B_x)(\alpha - \beta)}{9(zq - \alpha\beta) - 2(\alpha - \beta)^2}.\end{aligned}$$

For this equilibrium to exist, we need to have the utilities of marginal users, \tilde{x}^S and \tilde{y}^S to be positive, and profits of the platforms Π_A^S and Π_B^S to be positive as well.

We get $u(\tilde{x}^*, A) = u(\tilde{x}^*, B) = \frac{1}{2}(A_x + B_x + Y(\alpha + 2\beta) - 3z)$ and $u(\tilde{y}^*, A) = u(\tilde{y}^*, B) = \frac{1}{2}(A_y + B_y + 2\alpha + \beta - 3qY)$. They are positive when

$$A_x + B_x > 3z - Y(\alpha + 2\beta) \quad \text{and} \quad A_y + B_y > 3qY - (2\alpha + \beta).$$

Note that the requirement that stand alone values are positive for the equilibrium is a general property of the Hotelling model, with or without network effects.

1.2 Multihoming on one side

We now examine the second benchmark, with single homing imposed on side X , multihoming allowed on side Y , and full coverage of both sides. As before, \tilde{x} is characterized by $u(\tilde{x}, A) = u(\tilde{x}, B)$. A user on side Y who multihomes, i.e., joins both platforms, obtains

utility $u(y; A\&B) = A_x + B_x + \beta - r_A - r_B - qY = u(y; A) + u(y; B)$. It is preferable for user y to join both platforms when $u(y; A) > 0$ and $u(y; B) > 0$. Therefore, all users $y < y_A$ join platform A , where y_A is characterized by $u(y_A; A) = 0$. All users $y > y_B$ join platform B , where y_B is characterized by $u(y_B; B) = 0$. Users $y \in (y_B, y_A)$ multihome.

Solving for \tilde{x} , y_A and y_B for given prices yields

$$\tilde{x} = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{q(A_x - B_x) + \alpha(A_y - B_y)}{2(zq - \alpha\beta)} - \frac{q(p_{AM} - p_{BM}) + \alpha(r_{AM} - r_{BM})}{2(zq - \alpha\beta)},$$

$$y_A = \frac{(A_x - B_x)q\beta + (A_y - B_y)\alpha\beta + (zq - \alpha\beta)(2A_y + \beta) - \beta q(p_{AM} - p_{BM}) - (2qz - \alpha\beta)r_{AM} + \alpha\beta r_{BM}}{2q(zq - \alpha\beta)},$$

$$y_B = Y - \frac{(B_x - A_x)q\beta + (B_y - A_y)\alpha\beta + (zq - \alpha\beta)(2B_y + \beta) + \beta q(p_{AM} - p_{BM}) + \alpha\beta r_{AM} - (2qz - \alpha\beta)r_{BM}}{2q(zq - \alpha\beta)}.$$

Note that formula for \tilde{x} is the same as in the case of single-homing on both sides.

In equilibrium, we obtain

$$\tilde{x}^M = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{2q(A_x - B_x) + (\alpha + \beta)(A_y - B_y)}{2(6(qz - \alpha\beta) - (\alpha - \beta)^2)},$$

$$y_A^M = \frac{2A_y + \alpha + \beta}{4q} + \frac{(\alpha - \beta)(2q(A_x - B_x) + (\alpha + \beta)(A_y - B_y))}{4q(6(qz - \alpha\beta) - (\alpha - \beta)^2)},$$

$$y_B^M = Y - \frac{2B_y + \alpha + \beta}{4q} - \frac{(\alpha - \beta)(2q(A_x - B_x) + (\alpha + \beta)(A_y - B_y))}{4q(6(qz - \alpha\beta) - (\alpha - \beta)^2)},$$

$$p_A^M = \frac{4(qz - \alpha\beta) + \beta(\alpha - \beta) - \beta(A_y + B_y)}{4q} + \frac{q(4(qz - \alpha\beta) + \beta(\alpha - \beta))(A_x - B_x) + (\alpha(qz - \alpha\beta) + qz(\alpha - \beta))(A_y - B_y)}{2q(6(qz - \alpha\beta) - (\alpha - \beta)^2)},$$

$$p_B^M = \frac{4(qz - \alpha\beta) + \beta(\alpha - \beta) - \beta(A_y + B_y)}{4q} - \frac{q(4(qz - \alpha\beta) + \beta(\alpha - \beta))(A_x - B_x) + (\alpha(qz - \alpha\beta) + qz(\alpha - \beta))(A_y - B_y)}{2q(6(qz - \alpha\beta) - (\alpha - \beta)^2)},$$

$$r_A^M = \frac{2A_y - \alpha + \beta}{4} - \frac{(\alpha - \beta)(2q(A_x - B_x) + (\alpha + \beta)(A_y - B_y))}{4(6(qz - \alpha\beta) - (\alpha - \beta)^2)},$$

$$r_B^M = \frac{2B_y - \alpha + \beta}{4} + \frac{(\alpha - \beta)(2q(A_x - B_x) + (\alpha + \beta)(A_y - B_y))}{4(6(qz - \alpha\beta) - (\alpha - \beta)^2)}.$$

Such equilibrium exists if the platforms make positive profits and the marginal users obtain positive utility. Marginal users obtain positive utility when $A_y + B_y + \alpha + \beta > 2qY$ and $(\alpha + \beta)(A_y + B_y) + 2q(A_x + B_x) > 6(qz - \alpha\beta) - (\alpha - \beta)^2$.

2 Allowing for multihoming on both sides

We now allow for multihoming on both sides of a platform, i.e., $x_A > x_B$ and $y_A > y_B$. In such a case, multihoming agents on side X and Y obtain respective utility

$$\begin{aligned} u(x; A\&B) &= A_x + B_x + \alpha Y - p_A - p_B - z, \\ u(y; A\&B) &= A_y + B_y + \beta - r_A - r_B - q. \end{aligned}$$

An agent multihomes when multihoming yields higher utility than joining only platform A , only platform B , or not joining either of the platforms.

Utility of an agent joining A without having joined the other platform is given by $u(x; A)$ as in (1). Therefore, the agent indifferent between joining platform A only and not joining any platform at all, \bar{x}_A , is characterized by $u(\bar{x}_A; A) = 0$, i.e.,

$$\bar{x}_A = \frac{A_x + \alpha y_A - p_A}{z}. \quad (2)$$

I.e., \bar{x}_A would be the market captured by platform A if it was the only platform.

Similarly, given only the choice of platform B or no platform, all users $x > \bar{x}_B$ would prefer to join B , while $x < \bar{x}_B$ would not join, where

$$\bar{x}_B = 1 - \frac{B_x + \alpha(Y - y_B) - p_B}{z}.$$

However, user x 's utility from joining A in addition to B is given by

$$u(x; A|B) = u(x; A\&B) - u(x; B). \quad (3)$$

If there is multihoming on side Y , this incremental utility $u(x; A|B)$ is smaller than $u(x; A)$. Thus, platform A 's market coverage on side X is \hat{x}_A , characterized by $u(\hat{x}_A; A|B) = 0$ which is equivalent to $u(\hat{x}_A; A\&B) = u(\hat{x}_A; B)$. I.e.,

$$\hat{x}_A = \frac{A_x + \alpha y_B - p_A}{z}. \quad (4)$$

Since $y_A > y_B$, then $\hat{x}_A < \bar{x}_A$.

Partial multihoming on both sides occurs in equilibrium when $0 < \hat{x}_B < \hat{x}_A < 1$ and

$0 < \hat{y}_B < \hat{y}_A < 1$, where

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{x}_A &= \frac{A_x + \alpha \hat{y}_B - p_A}{z}, \\
\hat{x}_B &= 1 - \frac{B_x + \alpha(Y - \hat{y}_A) - p_B}{z}, \\
\hat{y}_A &= \frac{A_y + \beta \hat{x}_B - r_A}{q}, \\
\hat{y}_B &= Y - \frac{B_y + \beta(1 - \hat{x}_A) - r_B}{q}.
\end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

After solving platforms' profit-maximizing problems, the pure strategy equilibrium with partial multihoming on both sides is characterized by

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{x}_A^{MM} &= \frac{q[(2qz - \alpha\beta)(A_x + \alpha Y) - \alpha z(B_y + \beta)]}{(qz - \alpha\beta)(4qz - \alpha\beta)}, \\
\hat{y}_A^{MM} &= \frac{z[(2qz - \alpha\beta)(A_y + \beta) - \beta q(B_x + Y\alpha)]}{(qz - \alpha\beta)(4qz - \alpha\beta)}, \\
\hat{x}_B^{MM} &= \frac{(2qz - \alpha\beta)^2 - (2qz - \alpha\beta)q(B_x + Y\alpha) + \alpha qz A_y}{(qz - \alpha\beta)(4qz - \alpha\beta)}, \\
\hat{y}_B^{MM} &= \frac{Y(2qz - \alpha\beta)^2 - (2qz - \alpha\beta)z(B_y + \beta) + \beta qz A_x}{(qz - \alpha\beta)(4qz - \alpha\beta)}.
\end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

And

$$\begin{aligned}
p_A^{MM} &= \frac{(2qz - \alpha\beta)(A_x + Y\alpha) - \alpha z(B_y + \beta)}{4qz - \alpha\beta}, \\
r_A^{MM} &= \frac{(2qz - \alpha\beta)(A_y + \beta) - \beta q(B_x + Y\alpha)}{4qz - \alpha\beta}, \\
p_B^{MM} &= \frac{(2qz - \alpha\beta)(B_x + Y\alpha) - \alpha z(A_y + \beta)}{4qz - \alpha\beta}, \\
r_B^{MM} &= \frac{(2qz - \alpha\beta)(B_y + \beta) - \beta q(A_x + Y\alpha)}{4qz - \alpha\beta}.
\end{aligned}$$

Proposition 1 *For range of parameters described by conditions (i)-(vi) below, there exists a pure strategy equilibrium with partial multihoming on both sides.*

$$(i) \quad zq(4zq + A_y\alpha) > q(Y\alpha + B_x)(2qz - \alpha\beta) + \alpha\beta(4qz - \alpha\beta)$$

$$(ii) \quad q(A_x + Y\alpha)(2qz - \alpha\beta) < (qz - \alpha\beta)(4qz - \alpha\beta) + \alpha qz(B_y + \beta)$$

$$(iii) \quad zq(4zq + A_y\alpha + B_y\alpha + \alpha\beta) < q(2qz - \alpha\beta)(A_x + B_x + 2Y\alpha) + \alpha\beta(4qz - \alpha\beta)$$

$$(iv) \quad Y(2qz - \alpha\beta)^2 + qz\beta A_x > z(B_y + \beta)(2qz - \alpha\beta)$$

$$(v) \quad z(A_y + \beta)(2qz - \alpha\beta) < (qz - \alpha\beta)(4qz - \alpha\beta) + \beta zq(B_x + Y\alpha)$$

$$(vi) \quad Y(2qz - \alpha\beta)^2 + \beta zq(A_x + B_x + Y\alpha) < z(2qz - \alpha\beta)(A_y + B_y + 2\beta)$$

Proof. Suppose parameters satisfy conditions (i)-(vi). It is straightforward to provide examples illustrating that the region of parameters satisfying these conditions is non-empty. Then \hat{x}_A^{MM} , \hat{x}_B^{MM} , \hat{y}_A^{MM} and \hat{y}_B^{MM} calculated according to (6) are such that $0 < \hat{x}_B^{MM} < \hat{x}_A^{MM} < 1$ and $0 < \hat{y}_B^{MM} < \hat{y}_A^{MM} < 1$. Conditions $\hat{x}_B^{MM} < \hat{x}_A^{MM}$ and $\hat{y}_B^{MM} < \hat{y}_A^{MM}$ indicate multihoming on both sides. And since all four thresholds are strictly between 0 and 1, the multihoming is partial. Moreover, multihoming brings positive utility on each side, i.e.,

$$\alpha z(A_y + B_y) + 2qz(A_x + B_x) > \alpha\beta(z - \alpha Y) + 4z(qz - \alpha\beta),$$

$$\beta q(A_x + B_x) + 2qz(A_y + B_y) > \alpha\beta(qY - \beta) + 4qY(qz - \alpha\beta).$$

The final condition for existence of the equilibrium, platforms' positive profits, are assured by the result that the prices are non-negative. ■

Proposition 2 *In an equilibrium with partial multihoming on both sides, there are no subsidies, i.e., p_A^{MM} , r_A^{MM} , p_B^{MM} and r_B^{MM} are strictly positive.*

Proof. Consider parameters for which conditions (i)-(vi) above are satisfied. Since the conditions imply $0 < \hat{x}_B^{MM} < \hat{x}_A^{MM} < 1$ and $0 < \hat{y}_B^{MM} < \hat{y}_A^{MM} < 1$, they must also imply $\hat{x}_A^{MM} > 0$, $\hat{x}_B^{MM} < 1$, $\hat{y}_A^{MM} > 0$ and $\hat{y}_B^{MM} < 1$. Direct algebraic manipulations reveal that $\hat{x}_A^{MM} > 0 \iff p_A^{MM} > 0$, $\hat{y}_A^{MM} > 0 \iff r_A^{MM}$, $\hat{x}_B^{MM} < 1 \iff p_B^{MM} > 0$, and $\hat{y}_B^{MM} < 1 \iff r_B^{MM} > 0$. ■

With these result, we achieve the goal of this appendix: showing that the assumption $A_x = B_x$ and $A_y = B_y$ simplifies exposition of the benchmark cases without any loss to the our results.