### When can price discrimination benefit consumers?

Nima Haghpanah (Penn State)

with Maryam Farboodi (MIT Sloan) and Ali Shourideh (CMU)

June 28, 2024

1 / 1

 $QQ$ 

メロトメ 御 トメ 君 トメ 君 トッ 君 し







Pigou: "Yes! (with linear demands)" Is price discrimination bad? (for CS, TS, ...)



メロトメ 御 メメ ミドメ 差 トー 差  $299$ 3 / 1





イロト イ押ト イミト イミト É つへへ  $3/1$ 



イロト イ押ト イミト イミト ă つへへ  $3/1$ 



When is "more price discrimination" bad?



When is "more price discrimination" bad?



When is "more price discrimination" bad?

When it is  $\Rightarrow$  seller's data usage must be banned When it isn't  $\Rightarrow$  scope for appropriate regulation

# **Results**

A characterization of when more price discrimination is bad.

- $\blacktriangleright$  A separability condition
	- ▶ All demands must be decomposable into at most two demands
- $\blacktriangleright$  Satisfied by linear demands
	- ▶ Linear demand  $\Rightarrow$  more price discrimination is bad
	- ▶ Pigou's idea generalizes

# Model

A family of demand curves  $\mathcal{D} = \{D(p, \theta)\}_{\theta \in \Theta}$ , a distribution  $\mu \in \Delta(\Theta)$ .

 $\blacktriangleright$  Each downward sloping with concave revenue function.

A segmentation: a distribution  $f \in \Delta(\Delta(\Theta))$  over "markets"  $\nu \in \Delta(\Theta)$ .

**►** s.t.  $E_f[\nu] = \mu$ .

**►** Seller chooses a profit-maximizing price for every market  $\nu \in f$ .

"Information is always bad" (IAB) if for every two segmentations  $f, f'$ 

if f is a garbling of  $f'$  ( $f'$  finer than  $f$ )

 $\Rightarrow$  f gives a higher ( $\alpha$ -weighted) surplus  $V^\alpha = \alpha \mathcal{C}\mathcal{S} + (1-\alpha)\mathcal{R}.$ 



# Bergeman, Brooks, Morris 2015

A family of demand curves  $\mathcal{D} = \{D(p, \theta)\}_{\theta \in \Theta}$ , a distribution  $\mu \in \Delta(\Theta)$ .

A segmentation: a distribution  $f \in \Delta(\Delta(\Theta))$  over "markets"  $\nu \in \Delta(\Theta)$ .

**►** s.t.  $E_f[\nu] = \mu$ .

▶

**►** Seller chooses a profit-maximizing price for every market  $\nu \in f$ .



# Bergeman, Brooks, Morris 2015

A family of demand curves  $\mathcal{D} = \{D(p, \theta)\}_{\theta \in \Theta}$ , a distribution  $\mu \in \Delta(\Theta)$ .

▶ Each representing a single unit-demand consumer.

A segmentation: a distribution  $f \in \Delta(\Delta(\Theta))$  over "markets"  $\nu \in \Delta(\Theta)$ .

**►** s.t.  $E_f[\nu] = \mu$ .

**►** Seller chooses a profit-maximizing price for every market  $\nu \in f$ .



# Bergeman, Brooks, Morris 2015

A family of demand curves  $\mathcal{D} = \{D(p, \theta)\}_{\theta \in \Theta}$ , a distribution  $\mu \in \Delta(\Theta)$ .

▶ Each representing a single unit-demand consumer.

A segmentation: a distribution  $f \in \Delta(\Delta(\Theta))$  over "markets"  $\nu \in \Delta(\Theta)$ .

**►** s.t.  $E_f[\nu] = \mu$ .

**►** Seller chooses a profit-maximizing price for every market  $\nu \in f$ .



Observation: If IAB holds for D, then

▶  $D(p^*(\theta'), \theta) > 0, \forall \theta, \theta'.$ 

Observation: If IAB holds for  $D$ , then

▶  $D(p^*(\theta'), \theta) > 0, \forall \theta, \theta'.$ 

Similar to BBM'15, Pram'21.

- ▶ Suppose  $D(p^*(\theta'), \theta) = 0$ .
- ► Consider  $f \ni \mu$  that puts almost all mass on  $\theta'$ , some mass on  $\theta$ .
- $\blacktriangleright$   $\theta$  will be "excluded" in  $\mu$ .
- $\triangleright$  Separating some  $\theta$  consumers is an improvement.

Observation: If IAB holds for  $D$ , then

▶  $D(p^*(\theta'), \theta) > 0, \forall \theta, \theta'.$ 

Similar to BBM'15, Pram'21.

- ▶ Suppose  $D(p^*(\theta'), \theta) = 0$ .
- ► Consider  $f \ni \mu$  that puts almost all mass on  $\theta'$ , some mass on  $\theta$ .
- $\blacktriangleright$   $\theta$  will be "excluded" in  $\mu$ .
- $\triangleright$  Separating some  $\theta$  consumers is an improvement.

Observation: If IAB holds for D, then

▶  $D(p^*(\theta'), \theta) > 0, \forall \theta, \theta'$ . No-exclusion.

Similar to BBM'15, Pram'21.

- ▶ Suppose  $D(p^*(\theta'), \theta) = 0$ .
- ► Consider  $f \ni \mu$  that puts almost all mass on  $\theta'$ , some mass on  $\theta$ .
- $\blacktriangleright$   $\theta$  will be "excluded" in  $\mu$ .
- $\triangleright$  Separating some  $\theta$  consumers is an improvement.

### **1** IAB holds for a family of demand curves  $\{D(p, \theta)\}_\theta$  if and only if (A) there is no exclusion and

- **1** IAB holds for a family of demand curves  $\{D(p, \theta)\}\theta$  if and only if
	- (A) there is no exclusion and
	- (B) there exist two functions  $f_1, f_2 > 0$  and two demand curves  $D_1, D_2$  such that
		- (i)  $D(p, \theta) = f_1(\theta)D_1(p) + f_2(\theta)D_2(p)$  for all  $\theta$  and
		- (ii) IAB holds for  $\{D_1, D_2\}$

**1** IAB holds for a family of demand curves  $\{D(p, \theta)\}\theta$  if and only if

- (A) there is no exclusion and
- (B) there exist two functions  $f_1, f_2 > 0$  and two demand curves  $D_1, D_2$  such that

(i) 
$$
D(p, \theta) = f_1(\theta)D_1(p) + f_2(\theta)D_2(p)
$$
 for all  $\theta$  and

- (ii) IAB holds for  $\{D_1, D_2\}$
- $\bullet$  IAB holds for  $\{D_1, D_2\}$ , with  $p_1^* \leq p_2^*$  (WLOG) if and only if

$$
V_2(\rho)-V_1(\rho)+\frac{-\frac{R_1'(\rho)}{R_2'(\rho)}V_2'+V_1'}{-\frac{R_1'(\rho)}{R_2'(\rho)}R_2''+R_1''}(R_1'(\rho)-R_2'(\rho))}
$$

is decreasing on  $(p_1^*, p_2^*)$ .

**1** IAB holds for a family of demand curves  $\{D(p, \theta)\}\theta$  if and only if

- (A) there is no exclusion and
- (B) there exist two functions  $f_1, f_2 > 0$  and two demand curves  $D_1, D_2$  such that

(i) 
$$
D(p, \theta) = f_1(\theta)D_1(p) + f_2(\theta)D_2(p)
$$
 for all  $\theta$  and

- (ii) IAB holds for  $\{D_1, D_2\}$
- $\bullet$  IAB holds for  $\{D_1, D_2\}$ , with  $p_1^* \leq p_2^*$  (WLOG) if and only if

$$
V_2(\rho)-V_1(\rho)+\frac{-\frac{R_1'(\rho)}{R_2'(\rho)}V_2'+V_1'}{-\frac{R_1'(\rho)}{R_2'(\rho)}R_2''+R_1''}(R_1'(\rho)-R_2'(\rho))}
$$

is decreasing on  $(p_1^*, p_2^*)$ .

$$
V_i(p) = V_i^{\alpha}(p) = \alpha CS_i(p) + (1 - \alpha)R_i(p).
$$

The second condition: interpretation

$$
V_2(\rho) - V_1(\rho) + \frac{-\frac{R_1'(\rho)}{R_2'(\rho)} V_2' + V_1'}{-\frac{R_1'(\rho)}{R_2'(\rho)}R_2'' + R_1''}(R_1'(\rho) - R_2'(\rho))
$$

### The second condition: interpretation

$$
V_2(\rho) - V_1(\rho) + \frac{-\frac{R_1'(\rho)}{R_2'(\rho)} V_2' + V_1'}{-\frac{R_1'(\rho)}{R_2'(\rho)}R_2'' + R_1''}(R_1'(\rho) - R_2'(\rho))
$$

′

Let  $\mu_2$  = measure of demand 2. Increase  $\mu_2$  slightly

$$
\text{effect} = \Delta(p) := \underbrace{V_2(p) - V_1(p)}_{\text{composition effect}} + \underbrace{E[V_i'(p)]p'(\mu_2)}_{\text{price change effect}}
$$

### The second condition: interpretation

$$
V_2(\rho)-V_1(\rho)+\frac{-\frac{R_1'(\rho)}{R_2'(\rho)}V_2'+V_1'}{-\frac{R_1'(\rho)}{R_2'(\rho)}R_2''+R_1''}(R_1'(\rho)-R_2'(\rho))
$$

Let  $\mu_2$  = measure of demand 2. Increase  $\mu_2$  slightly

$$
\text{effect} = \Delta(p) := \underbrace{V_2(p) - V_1(p)}_{\text{composition effect}} + \underbrace{E[V_i'(p)]p'(\mu_2)}_{\text{price change effect}}
$$

If decreasing, then splitting  $\mu_2$  to  $\frac{1}{2}(\mu_2+\epsilon)$  and  $\frac{1}{2}(\mu_2-\epsilon)$  decreases value

### Proposition

Consider  $\mathcal{D} = \{a(D + b) \mid a \in [a, \bar{a}] \ge 0, b \in [\underline{b}, \bar{b}] \le 0\}$ 

$$
\begin{array}{ccccccccc}\n\leftarrow & & & & & & \\
\leftarrow & & & & & & \\
\left
$$

### Proposition

Consider  $\mathcal{D} = \{a(D + b) \mid a \in [a, \bar{a}] \ge 0, b \in [b, \bar{b}] \le 0\}$  and  $\alpha = 0.5$ .

$$
\begin{array}{ccccccccc}\n\leftarrow & & & & & & \\
\leftarrow & & & & & & & \\
\leftarrow & & & & & &
$$

The second condition: examples  $V^{0.5} = 0.5 CS + 0.5R$ : total surplus.

#### Proposition

Consider  $\mathcal{D} = \{a(D + b) \mid a \in [a, \bar{a}] \ge 0, b \in [b, \bar{b}] \le 0\}$  and  $\alpha = 0.5$ .

9 / 1

 $V^{0.5} = 0.5 CS + 0.5R$ : total surplus. Let  $f(p) = -D'(p)$  be the density of values. Let  $p_1 : R'(p_1) + \underline{b} = 0, p_2 : R'(p_2) + \bar{b} = 0.$ 

### Proposition

Consider  $\mathcal{D} = \{a(D + b) \mid a \in [a, \bar{a}] \ge 0, b \in [b, \bar{b}] \le 0\}$  and  $\alpha = 0.5$ .

9 / 1

**A** 

 $V^{0.5} = 0.5 CS + 0.5R$ : total surplus. Let  $f(p) = -D'(p)$  be the density of values. Let  $p_1 : R'(p_1) + \underline{b} = 0, p_2 : R'(p_2) + \bar{b} = 0.$ 

### Proposition

Consider  $\mathcal{D} = \{a(D + b) \mid a \in [a, \bar{a}] \ge 0, b \in [b, \bar{b}] \le 0\}$  and  $\alpha = 0.5$ .  $\bullet$  IAB holds for  ${\cal D}$  if and only if  $\log p^2f(p)$  is concave over  $[p_1,p_2].$ 

 $V^{0.5} = 0.5 CS + 0.5R$ : total surplus. Let  $f(p) = -D'(p)$  be the density of values. Let  $p_1 : R'(p_1) + \underline{b} = 0, p_2 : R'(p_2) + \bar{b} = 0.$ 

### Proposition

Consider  $\mathcal{D} = \{a(D + b) \mid a \in [a, \bar{a}] \ge 0, b \in [b, \bar{b}] \le 0\}$  and  $\alpha = 0.5$ .

 $\bullet$  IAB holds for  ${\cal D}$  if and only if  $\log p^2f(p)$  is concave over  $[p_1,p_2].$ 

 $\bullet$   $\mathsf{IAG}$  holds for  $\mathcal D$  if and only if  $\mathsf{log}\, p^2f(p)$  is convex over  $[p_1,p_2].$ 

 $V^{0.5} = 0.5 CS + 0.5R$ : total surplus. Let  $f(p) = -D'(p)$  be the density of values. Let  $p_1 : R'(p_1) + \underline{b} = 0, p_2 : R'(p_2) + \bar{b} = 0.$ 

### Proposition

Consider 
$$
\mathcal{D} = \{a(D + b) \mid a \in [\underline{a}, \overline{a}] \ge 0, b \in [\underline{b}, \overline{b}] \le 0\}
$$
 and  $\alpha = 0.5$ .

• IAB holds for D if and only if 
$$
\log p^2 f(p)
$$
 is concave over  $[p_1, p_2]$ .

 $\bullet$   $\mathsf{IAG}$  holds for  $\mathcal D$  if and only if  $\mathsf{log}\, p^2f(p)$  is convex over  $[p_1,p_2].$ 

If f is log-concave 
$$
\Rightarrow \log p^2 f(p)
$$
 is concave.  
Uniform:  $f(p) = 1$  is log-concave.  
Edge case:  $f(p) = a_1 \frac{a_2^p}{p^2}$  both IAB and IAG!  
 $\triangleright$  D is a Gamma function.

# Conclusions

A characterization of when no-segmentation is optimal.

- $\blacktriangleright$  A strong separability condition
	- ▶ All demands must be decomposable into at most two demands
- $\blacktriangleright$  Satisfied by linear demands
	- ▶ Pigou's intuition generalizes
		- $▶$  Linear demand  $\Rightarrow$  no-segmentation is best among all segmentations

# Conclusions

A characterization of when no-segmentation is optimal.

- ▶ A strong separability condition
	- ▶ All demands must be decomposable into at most two demands
- $\blacktriangleright$  Satisfied by linear demands
	- ▶ Pigou's intuition generalizes
		- $▶$  Linear demand  $\Rightarrow$  no-segmentation is best among all segmentations

### Thanks!

### Related Literature

Segmented versus non-segmented, downward sloping demands:

▶ Pigou 1920; Robinson 1933; Varian 1985; Aguirre, Cowan, Vickers 2010

All segmentations, unit demands:

▶ Bergemann, Brooks, Morris 2014

Duality approaches in persuasion:

▶ Dworczak, Martini 2019; Kolotilin, Corrao, Wolitzky 2023; Smolin, Yamashita 2023; Dworczak, Kolotilin 2023