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Abstract

In a framework where mergers are mutually excluding, I show that firms pursue anti-competitive rather than (alternative) pro-competitive mergers. Potential outsiders to anti-competitive mergers refrain from pursuing pro-competitive mergers if the positive externalities from anti-competitive mergers are strong enough. Potential outsiders to pro-competitive mergers pursue anti-competitive mergers (thereby preempting pro-competitive mergers) if the negative externalities from the pro-competitive mergers are strong enough. Potential participants in anti-competitive mergers are cheap to buy due to the risk of becoming outsiders to pro-competitive mergers. Firms may even pursue an unprofitable and anti-competitive merger when alternative mergers are profitable and pro-competitive.
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1 Introduction

Today, competitive forces drive a merger wave of historical proportions. The total global value of mergers and acquisitions (M&As) exceeded 3.4 trillion US dollars in 1999 (The Economist, 2000). While many of the M&As in the current wave appear to be motivated by a legitimate response to fast changing business conditions such as global competition, deregulation, and over capacity, a larger share than in the recent past seems to involve direct competitors (Pitofsky, Chairman of the FTC, 1997). As a result, one may legitimately fear that many of the recent mergers have increased firms’ market power and thereby have reduced consumers’ welfare.

This concern has been the main motivation for ruling some horizontal mergers illegal. For example, the European Commission recently blocked the merger between the two Swedish truck manufacturers Volvo and Scania on the ground that the merger would nearly eliminate all competition in the Scandinavian market while reducing it significantly in Ireland and the United Kingdom (European Commission, 2000a). Interestingly, the prohibition of this merger also induced Volvo to acquire Renault Véhicules Industriels (RVI).\textsuperscript{1} Unlike the attempted merger between Volvo and Scania, the latter merger was not blocked by the Commission (European Commission, 2000b). According to the Commission, this merger would not increase market concentration significantly in any geographical market and consequently should not hurt the consumers. One may even hypothesize that the Volvo-RVI merger will benefit the consumers; if a merger does not reduce competition and its only impact is to save on costs, some of the associated benefits should spill over to the consumers.

\textsuperscript{1}Similarly, Volkswagen purchased a large minority stake in Scania. However, this purchase was not investigated by the Commission, since it was not classified as a merger.
These events raise the concern that mergers harming consumers, that is anti-competitive mergers, may preempt pro-competitive mergers benefitting them. The main finding of this paper is that this concern is legitimate. While the market sometimes select the most desirable merger from the consumers’ point of view, the subsequent analysis highlights several mechanisms that lead firms to pursue anti- rather than pro-competitive mergers.

The starting point of this analysis is a robust finding in the theoretical literature on mergers, that the “competitive” nature of mergers is linked to their impact on the profitability of outsiders (competitors). While anti-competitive mergers typically benefit outsiders, the opposite is true for pro-competitive mergers. In turn, the signs and magnitudes of these external effects on outsiders favor anti- rather than pro-competitive mergers.

To be more precise, external effects have a direct influence on the firms’ merger decisions which, depending on their sign, materializes into different incentives for potential outsiders. First, consider anti-competitive mergers. Potential outsiders to such mergers refrain from pursuing pro-competitive mergers if the positive external effect from the anti-competitive merger is large enough. This lack of incentives for merging is referred to as the “inducement mechanism.” Second, consider pro-competitive mergers with negative external effects. Potential outsiders to such mergers pursue anti-competitive mergers to preempt the pro-competitive merger that would hurt them. This incentive for merging is referred to as the “preemption mechanism.”

Furthermore, external effects also have an indirect influence on firms’

\[\text{Intuitively, the merging firms in an anti-competitive merger restrict their output relative to their combined pre-merger output in order to increase the equilibrium price. As a result, the external effect of the merger is positive, since the outsider benefits from the higher price without bearing the cost of reducing its own output (Salant, Switzer and Reynolds, 1983; Perry and Porter, 1985; Farrell and Shapiro, 1990). Throughout the paper, I use the sign of the external effects accordingly in order to identify whether a merger is anti- or pro-competitive.}\]
merger decisions. Since firms’ pre-merger values incorporate the risk of becoming an outsider, potential outsiders to anti-competitive mergers with positive external effects have high pre-merger values. As a result, such firms tend to be expensive to buy. Conversely, potential outsiders to pro-competitive mergers tend to be cheap to buy. In turn, other firms, including firms that are potential participants in pro-competitive mergers, tend to find it profitable to buy potential outsiders to pro-competitive mergers. Thereby, they preempt the pro-competitive merger and instead induce an anti-competitive one. This incentive for buying firms that lose as outsiders is referred to as the “valuation mechanism.”

To illustrate these mechanisms, I extend the model in Fridolfsson and Stennek (1999) to asymmetric firms. Unlike other models of endogenous merger formation, this model predicts how the merging firms split the surplus. In the present context, such a prediction is crucial. Indeed, firms pursue anti- rather than pro-competitive mergers, since the split of the surplus in the former type of merger is more favorable to bidding firms. Thus, I am able to identify the valuation mechanism precisely because the merging firms split the surplus endogenously.

Previous merger analysis, starting with Stigler (1950), has mainly focused on the question whether the process of merger formation leads to the most desirable level of concentration. In contrast, the present paper asks the question whether the process of merger formation induces the most desirable merger for a given level of concentration. This issue was first addressed in a full-fledged model of endogenous merger formation by Horn and Persson (1996). They propose a cooperative model of endogenous merger forma-
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4A number of other papers treat related questions. Barros (1998) studies whether the
tion which captures the inducement and preemption mechanisms. However their model does not predict endogenously the split of the surplus among the merging firms and is therefore not suitable for identifying the valuation mechanism. Moreover, they do not explicitly analyze cases where mergers are pro-competitive.

The paper is organized as follows. Section 2 introduces the model. To focus on the competitive nature of mergers, Section 3 considers cases where the profitability of mergers (the internal effects of mergers) is small relative to their external effects. As a result, merger incentives are determined to a large extent by the external effects of mergers. If one merger is anti-competitive (has a positive external effect) while an alternative merger is pro-competitive (has a negative external effect), the firms tend to pursue the former merger. Furthermore, the market may fail to select the most desirable merger, also when all mergers benefit the consumers (are pro-competitive). Section 4 briefly discusses cases when internal effects are larger than external effects. Section 5 shows that the signs and magnitudes of external effects may be crucial to predict the likelihood of specific mergers even though profitability considerations clearly favor specific mergers. Indeed, firms may pursue an unprofitable and anti-competitive merger, even though other mergers are profitable and pro-competitive. The welfare effects may also be perverse; firms may pursue an unprofitable merger that reduces both the consumers’ and producers’ surpluses, even though an alternative and profitable merger increases both these surpluses. The Concluding Remarks discuss some prospects to test the prediction that more anti-competitive mergers preempt less anti-competitive ones as well as policy implications of this finding.

2 The Model

Time is infinite and continuous but divided into short periods of length $\Delta$. Each period is divided into two phases. In the first phase, there is an acquisition game where nature, with equal probability, selects a firm as bidder.\(^5\) The selected firm chooses whether or not to bid, the identity of the target firm and the size of the bid. A firm receiving a bid can only accept or reject it; if it rejects, it can give a (counter) offer in some future period when selected by nature. It is assumed that no time elapses during the acquisition game, although it is described as a sequential game.

I consider an industry which initially consists of three firms: two identical firms, labelled $x_1$ and $x_2$, and one other firm, labelled $y$. Mergers to monopoly are not allowed, i.e. it is implicitly assumed that mergers for monopoly are blocked by competition authorities. Consequently, firms can submit bids for one other firm at a time only.

In the second phase, there is a market game. Rather than specifying an explicit oligopoly model, I take the profit levels of each firm in each market structure as exogenous. In the triopoly, a firm $x_i$ earns profit flow $\pi_x (3)$ and firm $y$ earns profit flow $\pi_y (3)$. After the $xx$-merger, that is the merger between firms $x_1$ and $x_2$, the merged firm earns profit flow $\pi_{xx} (2)$, and the outsider (i.e. firm $y$) earns $\pi_y (2)$. Similarly, after a $xy$-merger, that is a merger between say firm $x_i$ and firm $y$, the merged firm earns profit flow $\pi_{xy} (2)$, and the outsider (i.e. firm $x_j$) earns $\pi_x (2)$.

A firm’s strategy describes the firm’s behavior in the acquisition game: whether to bid (if selected by nature), the identity of the target firm, how

\(^5\)This specification differs from the one in Fridolfsson and Stennek (1999). They assume that all firms can bid in the same period but that only one bid is transmitted (each with equal probability) if more than one firm bid in the same period. I adopt the specification where a bidder in each period is selected randomly by nature, since it is simpler.
much to bid, and a reservation price at which to accept an offer. The strategy specifies the behavior for all periods, and for all possible histories. I restrict attention to Markov strategies and to symmetric equilibria. In the present context, symmetry means that firm $y$ treats firms $x_1$ and $x_2$ identically, and that firms $x_1$ and $x_2$ behave identically. With a slight abuse of notation, let the subscripts $yx$, $xx$ and $xy$ denote the events that firm $y$ submits a bid to firm $x_1$ or $x_2$, firm $x_i$ submits a bid to firm $x_j$ and firm $x_i$ submits a bid to firm $y$ respectively. Firm $y$’s strategy consists of the triple $(p_{yx}, b_{yx}, a_y)$, where $p_{yx} \in [0, 1/2]$ denotes the probability that firm $y$ bids for a specific firm $x_i$ in a given period, $b_{yx}$ denotes the size of this bid and $a_y$ denotes the lowest bid that firm $y$ accepts. Firm $x_i$’s strategy consists of the quintuple $(p_{xx}, b_{xx}, p_{xy}, b_{xy}, a_x)$, where $(p_{xx}, p_{xy}) \in \{(p_{xx}, p_{xy}) : p_{xx} + p_{xy} \in [0, 1]\}, p_{xx} (p_{xy})$ denotes the probability that firm $x_i$ bids for firm $x_j$ ($y$) in a given period, $b_{xx} (b_{xy})$ denotes the size of this bid and $a_x$ denotes the lowest bid that firm $x_i$ accepts. For simplicity, I also restrict attention to sharp bids, that is bids accepted in equilibrium. Formally, it implies that $b_{xy} \geq a_y$ and $b_{xx}, b_{yx} \geq a_x$.\footnote{This is assumed without loss of generality, since a firm making a non-sharp bid can achieve the same outcome by not bidding.}

Next, I define the continuation values after a merger, at the date of a merger, and before a merger. After the $xy$- ($xx$-) merger has occurred, the values of the merged firm $xy$ ($xx$) and the outsider $x$ ($y$) are given by

$$W_i (2) = \frac{\pi_i (2)}{r},$$

for $i \in \{xy, x, xx, y\}$, where $r$ is the common discount rate, and $\pi_i (2) / r$ is the discounted value of all future profits. At the points in time when firm $y$ buys firm $x_i$ (event $yx$), firm $x_i$ buys firm $x_j$ (event $xx$) and firm $x_i$ buys
firm $y$ (event $xy$), the values of the buying and the selling firms are given by

$$V_i^{\text{buy}} = W_i (2) - b_i,$$

$$V_i^{\text{sell}} = b_i,$$

for $i \in \{yx, xx, xy\}$. Also, at the time of a merger, the value of the outsider is given by

$$V_i^{\text{out}} = W_i (2),$$

for $i \in \{y, x\}$. Finally, firm $y$’s pre-merger value, that is its expected value in the triopoly, is given by

$$W_y (3) = \frac{\pi_y (3)}{r} (1 - e^{-r\Delta}) + e^{-r\Delta} \left[ \frac{2}{3} p_{yx} V_{yx}^{\text{buy}} + \frac{2}{3} p_{xy} V_{xy}^{\text{sell}} + \frac{2}{3} p_{xx} V_{x}^{\text{out}} + \left( 1 - \frac{2}{3} (p_{yx} + p_{xy} + p_{xx}) \right) W_y (3) \right].$$

The first term is the value generated by firm $y$ in the current period. The second term is the discounted expected value of all future profits, that is the values for firm $y$ of being a buyer, seller, outsider and triopolist in the next period, multiplied by the respective probabilities of becoming a buyer, seller, outsider and triopolist. For example, the probability for firm $y$ of being a buyer in the next period is $\frac{2}{3} p_{yx}$, since firm $y$ is selected by nature with probability $\frac{1}{3}$ and then buys each $x$-firm with probability $p_{yx}$. Moreover, given the probabilities for firm $y$ of being a buyer, a seller and an outsider in the next period, the probability of remaining in the triopoly is $1 - \frac{2}{3} (p_{yx} + p_{xy} + p_{xx})$. In particular, note that firm $y$’s pre-merger value incorporates the risk of becoming an outsider in the next period, that is $\frac{2}{3} p_{xx} V_y^{\text{out}}$. Similarly, a firm
\( x_i \)'s pre-merger value, that is its expected value in the triopoly, is given by

\[
W_x(3) = \frac{\pi_x(3)}{r} (1 - e^{-r\Delta}) + e^{-r\Delta} \left[ \frac{1}{3} \left( p_{xx} V_{xx}^{buy} + p_{xy} V_{xy}^{buy} \right) + \frac{1}{3} \left( p_{xx} V_{xx}^{sell} + p_{yx} V_{yx}^{sell} \right) + \frac{1}{3} (p_{xy} + p_{yx}) V_{out}^{x} + \left( 1 - \frac{2}{3} (p_{yx} + p_{xy} + p_{xx}) \right) W_x(3) \right].
\]

(6)

Three types of equilibrium conditions complete the model. First, by subgame perfection, an offer is accepted if, and only if, the bid is at least as high as the value of the firm, that is, for \( i \in \{x, y\} \),

\[
a_i = W_i(3). \tag{7}
\]

Second, for the bidders to maximize their value, it is necessary that

\[
b_{xy} = a_y = W_y(3),
\]

\[
b_{xx} = b_{yx} = a_x = W_x(3). \tag{8}
\]

The third type of equilibrium condition is that firms, when selected by nature, submit a bid if, and only if, it is profitable to do so. Once firm \( y \) is selected by nature, it can either choose to buy a \( x \)-firm which is worth \( V_{yx}^{buy} \), or choose to remain in the triopoly which is worth \( W_y(3) \). Hence, by subgame perfection it is necessary that

\[
\begin{cases}
    p_{yx} = 0 & \text{only if } V_{yx}^{buy} \leq W_y(3), \\
    p_{yx} = \frac{1}{2} & \text{only if } V_{yx}^{buy} \geq W_y(3), \\
    p_{yx} \in (0, \frac{1}{2}) & \text{only if } V_{yx}^{buy} = W_y(3). \tag{9}
\end{cases}
\]

Similarly, firm \( x_i \) can choose between remaining triopolist and buying firm
or firm \( y \). Hence, by subgame perfection it is necessary that

\[
\begin{align*}
(p_{xx}, p_{xy}) &= (0, 0) & \text{only if } V_{xx}^{buy} V_{xy}^{buy} \leq W_x (3) \\
(p_{xx}, p_{xy}) &= (1, 0) & \text{only if } V_{xx}^{buy} \geq V_{xy}^{buy}, W_x (3) \\
(p_{xx}, p_{xy}) &= (0, 1) & \text{only if } V_{xy}^{buy} \geq V_{xx}^{buy}, W_x (3) \\
(p_{xx}, p_{xy}) &\in \{(0, 1)^2 : p_{xx} + p_{xy} = 1\} & \text{only if } V_{xx}^{buy} = V_{xy}^{buy} \geq W_x (3) \\
p_{xx} &\in (0, 1), p_{xy} = 0 & \text{only if } V_{xy}^{buy} = W_x (3) \geq V_{xy}^{buy} \\
p_{xx} = 0, p_{xy} \in (0, 1) & \text{only if } V_{xy}^{buy} = W_x (3) \geq V_{xx}^{buy} \\
(p_{xx}, p_{xy}) &\in \{(0, 1)^2 : p_{xx} + p_{xy} \in (0, 1)\} & \text{only if } V_{xx}^{buy} = V_{xy}^{buy} = W_x (3) .
\end{align*}
\]

Combining firm \( y \)'s three types of equilibrium conditions in (9) with the \( x \)-firms' seven types of equilibrium conditions in (10) yields potentially 21 types of symmetric Markov perfect equilibria. These different types of equilibria are partitioned into three different categories: no-merger equilibria (NME), immediate-merger equilibria (IME) and delayed-merger equilibria (DME).

In a NME, no firm submits bids, that is \( p_{yx} = 0 \) and \( (p_{xx}, p_{xy}) = (0, 0) \).

In an IME, at least one firm submits a bid with certainty. For example, \( p_{yx} = \frac{1}{2} \) and \( (p_{xx}, p_{xy}) = (0, 1) \) constitutes an IME. In total, there are 13 types of IME.\footnote{In some IME, a merger occurs after a few periods. For example, consider the IME where \( p_{yx} = 0 \) and \( (p_{xx}, p_{xy}) = (1, 0) \). If firm \( y \) is selected as bidder in the first period, then the \( xx \)-merger is delayed until firm \( x_1 \) or \( x_2 \) is selected as bidder. However, the \( xx \)-merger occurs almost immediately as the length of the periods become very short and, as \( \Delta \to 0 \), the delay tends to 0.}

In a DME, no firm bids with certainty and at least one firm bids with strictly positive probability. For example, \( p_{yx} \in (0, \frac{1}{2}) \) and \( (p_{xx}, p_{xy}) = (0, 0) \) constitutes a DME. In total, there are 7 types of DME.

Let the internal effects of the \( xy \)- and the \( xx \)-merger, that is the prof-
Itability of these mergers, be denoted

\[ I_{xy} \equiv \frac{1}{r} [\pi_{xy}(2) - \pi_x(3) - \pi_y(3)] , \quad (11a) \]

\[ I_{xx} \equiv \frac{1}{r} [\pi_{xx}(2) - 2\pi_x(3)] . \quad (11b) \]

Also, let the the external effects of the \( xy \)- and the \( xx \)-merger, that is the net gain compared to remaining in the triopoly of becoming an outsider to these mergers, be denoted

\[ E_{xy} \equiv \frac{1}{r} [\pi_x(2) - \pi_x(3)] , \quad (12a) \]

\[ E_{xx} \equiv \frac{1}{r} [\pi_y(2) - \pi_y(3)] . \quad (12b) \]

Lemma 1 in the Appendix characterizes the conditions under which the different types of equilibria exist as \( \Delta \to 0 \). In particular, there exists at least one type of equilibrium for all profit configurations. Henceforth, I restrict attention to equilibria that exist under generic profit configurations.\(^8\)

Moreover, if an equilibrium is said to exist, it is meant to exist generically. The following types of equilibria exist.

**NME:** \( p_{yx} = 0 \) and \( (p_{xx}, p_{xy}) = (0, 0) \),

**IME\(_{xx}\):** \( p_{yx} = 0 \) and \( (p_{xx}, p_{xy}) = (1, 0) \),

**IME\(_{xy,yx}\):** \( p_{yx} = \frac{1}{2} \) and \( (p_{xx}, p_{xy}) = (0, 1) \),

**IME\(_{xx,xy,yx}\):** \( p_{yx} = \frac{1}{2} \) and \( (p_{xx}, p_{xy}) = (1, 0) \),

**IME\(_{xx,xy};yx\):** \( p_{yx} = \frac{1}{2} \) and \( (p_{xx}, p_{xy}) \in \{ (0, 1)^2 : p_{xx} + p_{xy} = 1 \} \),

**DME\(_{xy,yx}\):** \( p_{yx} \in (0, \frac{1}{2}) \) and \( p_{xx} = 0, p_{xy} \in (0, 1) \),

**DME\(_{xx,xy,yx}\):** \( p_{yx} \in (0, \frac{1}{2}) \) and \( (p_{xx}, p_{xy}) \in \{ (0, 1)^2 : p_{xx} + p_{xy} \in (0, 1) \} \).

In the \( IME_{xx} \), the \( xx \)-merger occurs with certainty since firm \( y \) does not bid while the \( x \)-firms bid on each other with certainty. Similarly, in the \( IME_{xy,yx} \).

\(^8\)Non-generic profit configurations are such that \( I_{xx} = 0, I_{xy} = E_{xy} \) and so on.
a \(xy\)-merger occurs with certainty while in contrast both types of mergers occur with positive probabilities in the \(IME_{xx,yy}\) and the \(IME_{xx,xy,yx}\). In the \(DME_{xy,yy}\), the \(xy\)-merger, even though it is delayed, occurs with certainty as in the \(IME_{xy,yy}\). Similarly, one may relate the \(DME_{xx,xy,yx}\) to the \(IME_{xx,xy,yx}\).\(^9\)

In the remainder of the paper, I discuss the properties of the above equilibrium structure. In particular, I am concerned with the impact of external effects on the type of merger that the firms select in equilibrium. For instance, do the firms always select the most profitable merger (with the highest internal effect) or do the external effects of mergers matter as well? In fact, the conditions under which a specific merger may occur depend in a subtle way on the signs and magnitudes of both internal (\(I_{xx}\) and \(I_{yx}\)) and external (\(E_{xx}\) and \(E_{yx}\)) effects. To focus on the role of external effects, Section 3 considers cases where they are larger than internal effects. In turn, Section 4 discusses to which extent the insights found in Section 3 carry over to cases where internal effects are larger than external effects. Section 5 considers a case where internal effects clearly favor one type of merger, namely when one type of merger is profitable while the other is unprofitable.

3 Large External Effects

In this section, my focus is on markets where external effects are important for the process of merger formation. To be more precise, I consider profit configurations such that external effects are large in absolute terms relative to internal effects, that is \(|E_{xx}|, |E_{xy}| > \max \{|I_{xx}, I_{xy}|\} \) where \(I_{xx}, I_{xy} > 0\).\(^{10}\)

\(^9\)Actually, other equilibria exist as well (see Lemma 1 in the Appendix). However, disregarding these equilibria (which is done in order to simplify the exposition below) equilibria, does not affect any result.

\(^{10}\)The assumption that \(I_{xy}, I_{xx} > 0\) imply that the firms have incentives to merge.
This assumption has not only the advantage to highlight the role of external effects on the endogenous formation of mergers. It has also the advantage to put into focus the impact of mergers on consumers’ welfare. Indeed, based on findings in the theoretical literature on mergers, one may use the signs of mergers’ external effects to identify whether they are anti- or pro-competitive, that is whether they harm or benefit the consumers.\textsuperscript{11} Throughout the paper, I assume the following.

**Assumption 1** A merger is anti- [pro-] competitive if its external effect is positive [negative].

Assumption 1 holds in many oligopoly models. For example, if goods are perfect substitutes and firms compete in quantities, then Assumption 1 holds under standard assumptions about the demand and cost functions (Farrell and Shapiro, 1990). Intuitively, the merging firms in an anti-competitive merger restrict their output relative to their combined pre-merger output in order to increase the equilibrium price. As a result, the external effect of the merger is positive, since the outsider benefits from the higher price without bearing the cost of reducing its own output. Similarly, Assumption 1 is usually true if goods are differentiated and the firms compete in prices.\textsuperscript{12}

### 3.1 Anti- versus Pro-competitive Mergers

This subsection focuses attention on profit configurations such that one type of merger has a positive external effect while the other type has a negative effect.

\textsuperscript{11}A leading example of an anti- (pro-) competitive merger is that it increases (decreases) the prices of final goods. Other examples include mergers that reduce (increase) the variety or the quality of final goods.

\textsuperscript{12}To see this, consider an anti-competitive merger. Following such a merger, the merging firms increase their prices. As a result, the outsider is better off, since he responds by increasing his own prices and still gains market shares.
one. Note that such a configuration of external effects can be consistent with both types of mergers being profitable. While the type of merger with a positive external effect may be profitable due to fixed cost savings, the other type of merger may also be profitable and have a negative external effect due to marginal cost savings.

Given that Assumption 1 holds, a natural question is whether the firms pursue anti- rather than pro-competitive mergers. While in general no definite answer can be given to this question, the following analysis highlights several mechanisms by which firms tend to do so.

The discussion below makes frequent use of Figure 1 that illustrates the conditions under which the different equilibria exist in the case where $I_{xx} = I_{xy} = \varepsilon > 0$ and $\varepsilon$ is close to 0 (to focus on the external effects). The horizontal and vertical axes in Figure 1 indicate the external effects of the $xy$- and the $xx$-merger respectively. An $IME_{xx}$ exists in the areas marked with $IME_{xx}$ and so on. Note that there are profit configurations with multiple equilibria.

In the north-west and south-east quadrants of Figure 1, one type of merger is anti-competitive while the other is pro-competitive. These quadrants are
characterized by different types of equilibria and are therefore treated sequentially, starting with the north-west quadrant in Figure 1.

**Proposition 1** Consider profit configurations such that the $xx$-merger is anti-competitive [$E_{xx} > 0$] while the $xy$-merger is pro-competitive [$E_{xy} < 0$] and assume that mergers are profitable [$I_{xx}, I_{xy} > 0$]. If external effects are large in absolute terms relative to internal effects [$|E_{xx}|, |E_{xy}| > \max \{I_{xx}, I_{xy}\}$], the IM$E_{xx}$ is unique or exists simultaneously with the IM$E_{xx,xy}$ so that the anti-competitive $xx$-merger occurs with a lower bound probability of $2/3$.

All proofs are relegated to the Appendix.

Provided that the IM$E_{xx}$ is selected when the IM$E_{xx,xy}$ also exists, the anti-competitive $xx$-merger occurs with certainty in the whole north-west quadrant of Figure 1.\textsuperscript{13} Since the $xx$-merger is profitable, the $x$-firms have incentives to merge. In turn, the positive external effect $E_{xx}$ ensures that firm $y$ has no incentive to block the $xx$-merger. Hence, firm $y$ refrains from pursuing the pro-competitive $xy$-merger in order to induce the anti-competitive $xx$-merger that benefits him even more. This lack of incentive for merging constitutes an example of the inducement mechanism. Note also that firm $y$’s pre-merger value is high reflecting that firm $y$, in the IM$E_{xx}$, becomes an outsider with certainty. As a result, the $x$-firms bid on each other rather than on firm $y$, since each $x$-firm is cheaper to buy. This incentive for buying other firms than a potential outsider to an anti-competitive merger constitutes an example of the valuation mechanism.

\textsuperscript{13}If instead the IM$E_{xx,xy}$ is selected when it exists, the pro-competitive $xy$-merger occurs with positive probability. Nevertheless, the anti-competitive $xx$-merger occurs in this case with higher probability, namely with the lower bound probability of $2/3$. Of course, this lower bound is precisely $2/3$, since the firms are exogenously selected as bidders with equal probabilities.
Unlike the positive external effect $E_{xx}$, the negative one $E_{xy}$ plays no role in sustaining the $IME_{xx}$. Nevertheless, it has an important role in ruling out equilibria in which the pro-competitive $xy$-merger occurs with certainty. For example, suppose the $IME_{xy,yx}$ is an equilibrium so that the $xy$-merger occurs with certainty. In such an equilibrium, each $x$-firm becomes an outsider with positive probability. In turn, each $x$-firm’s pre-merger value is low (since $E_{xy} < 0$), reflecting the risk of becoming an outsider. As a result, each $x$-firm is better off buying the other $x$-firm rather than firm $y$ which contradicts that the $IME_{xy,yx}$ constitutes an equilibrium. This out of equilibrium incentive for buying a potential outsider to a pro-competitive merger constitutes a second example of the valuation mechanism.

Finally, note that the above discussion illustrates the crucial role of an endogenous split of the surplus for the process of merger formation, and more generally for the process of forming coalitions. In particular, it contrasts with Bloch’s (1995, 1996) model of coalition formation where the split of the surplus within a coalition is assumed to be exogenous. Proposition 1 shows that such an assumption may be troublesome. Indeed, one could easily construct an exogenous split of the surplus in each merger such that there exists an equilibrium in which the pro-competitive $xy$-merger occurs with certainty.

Next, consider the south-east quadrant in Figure 1.

**Proposition 2** Consider profit configurations such that the $xy$-merger is anti-competitive [$E_{xy} > 0$] while the $xx$-merger is pro-competitive [$E_{xx} < 0$] and assume that $I_{xy} > \frac{I_{xx}}{2} > 0$. If external effects are large in absolute terms relative to internal effects $|E_{xx}|, |E_{xy}| > \max \{I_{xx}, I_{xy}\}$, the $DME_{xy,yx}$ is unique so that the anti-competitive $xy$-merger occurs with certainty in the long run.
Once more, the negative external effect, in this case $E_{xx}$, rules out equilibria such as the $IME_{xx}$ where the pro-competitive $xx$-merger occurs with certainty. In such an equilibrium, firm $y$ becomes an outsider with certainty which hurts him, since $E_{xx} < 0$. In turn, firm $y$ has an incentive to block the $xx$-merger by buying one of the $x$-firms, which contradicts the assumption that the $IME_{xx}$ constitutes an equilibrium. Hence, firm $y$ pursues the anti-competitive $xy$-merger in order to preempt the pro-competitive $xx$-merger that would hurt him. This out of equilibrium incentive constitutes an example of the preemption mechanism. Note also that the valuation mechanism plays a role in ruling out the $IME_{xx}$. Indeed, firm $y$’s pre-merger value is low in such an equilibrium, since it becomes an outsider with certainty. As a result, each $x$-firm is better off buying firm $y$ rather than the other $x$-firm which again contradicts the assumption that the $IME_{xx}$ constitutes an equilibrium.

At this point, the distinction between the preemption and the valuation mechanisms should be clarified. In the above out of equilibrium example, firm $y$’s motive for merging is to preempt the pro-competitive $xx$-merger, that is firm $y$’s decision is driven by the preemption mechanism. However, to preempt this merger, firm $y$ cannot choose between different types of mergers, since firm $y$ only can participate in the anti-competitive $xy$-merger. In contrast, the $x$-firms can choose between the two different types of mergers. Moreover, these firms pursue the anti-competitive merger precisely because firm $y$ is cheaper to buy, that is their decision is driven by the valuation mechanism.

While the preemption and valuation mechanism hinder the pro-competitive merger to occur, the inducement mechanism delays rather than favors the anti-competitive $xy$-merger. Indeed, the $DME_{xy,yx}$ is unique in the south-
east quadrant of Figure 1. In such an equilibrium, the $x$-firms gain from merging, since $I_{xy} > 0$. However, these firms are even better off as outsiders, since $E_{xy} > I_{xy}$. As a result, the $x$-firms delay their merger proposals, and consequently forego valuable profits, since they hope other firms will merge instead - much like a war of attrition. Moreover, the larger the positive external effect $E_{xy}$, the larger the incentives to become an outsider. As a result, the expected delay (until the anti-competitive $xy$-merger occurs) increases with the positive external effect $E_{xy}$. Hence, the inducement mechanism creates a holdup problem for the firms in the sense that a profitable merger does not occur immediately (see also Fridolfsson and Stennek, 2000a).

Finally, it remains to discuss the condition $I_{xy} > \frac{L_x}{2} > 0$. In cases where $\frac{L_x}{2} > I_{xy} > 0$ is fulfilled (and external effects are large in absolute terms relative to internal effects), the $DME_{xx,xy,yx}$ is unique if $E_{xy} > 0$ and $E_{xx} < 0$. In such an equilibrium the $xy$-merger occurs with strictly positive probability in the long run. However, it also turns out to be impossible to establish a lower bound probability for the anti-competitive $xy$-merger to occur that is strictly larger than 0 for all pairs of external effects. That is the reason why Proposition 2 is stated in terms of the condition $I_{xy} > \frac{L_x}{2} > 0$ only.

\footnote{The reason for the ambiguous impact of positive external effects is simple. In the north-west quadrant of Figure 1 (Proposition 1), only firm $y$ gains by becoming an outsider while the $x$-firms loose as outsiders. As a result, there is no conflict of interests between the firms regarding which merger should form. In contrast, in the south-east quadrant of Figure 1 (Proposition 2), both $x$-firms are better off as outsiders than as insiders due to the positive external effect $E_{xy}$. As a result, a conflict of interests appears between firms $x_1$ and $x_2$ regarding which $xy$-merger should form. In turn, each $x$-firm, by delaying its merger proposal, tries to induce the merger in which it does not participate.}
3.2 Least versus Most Pro-competitive Mergers

Up to this point, I have only considered cases where one type of merger is anti-competitive while the other is pro-competitive. The reason is that twofold. First, when both types of mergers are anti-competitive (the positive quadrant in Figure 1) there are multiple equilibria. In fact, both the $xx$- and the $xy$-merger may occur with certainty depending on which equilibrium is selected. Intuitively, there is a conflict of interests between all firms regarding which merger should form and this conflict materializes into multiple equilibria. Unfortunately, I am not aware of any method of equilibrium selection that can be applied straightforwardly to the present problem. Therefore, I abstain from making any prediction in this region. Second, it is not straightforward to identify which type of merger is the most anti- or pro-competitive when external effects have the same sign. However, the following assumption is motivated in many contexts.

**Assumption 2** If both types of mergers are anti- [pro-] competitive, then the type of merger with the largest positive [negative] external effect is the most anti- [pro-] competitive.

Assumption 2 has weaker theoretical support than Assumption 1. Nevertheless, it is easy to construct examples by means of simple oligopoly models that validate this assumption. For example, consider an homogeneous good Cournot oligopoly where firms have constant marginal costs, where demand is linear and where both types of mergers are pro-competitive due to large marginal cost savings. Then the merger inducing the largest marginal cost savings is the most pro-competitive, that is benefits the consumers the most. Moreover, this merger has the largest negative external effect, as long as the
outsider is not driven out of the market.\footnote{One may construct examples where Assumption 2 does not hold if the negative external effect of one type of merger drives the outsider out of the market. To see this, note that the triopoly profits of the firm becoming an outsider constitutes an upper bound on the negative external effect. Hence, if these profits are small, then the negative external effect must also be small, even though the merger induced marginal cost savings may be large.}

**Proposition 3** Consider pro-competitive mergers \([E_{xx}, E_{xy} < 0]\) and assume that mergers are profitable \([I_{xx}, I_{xy} > 0]\). If Assumption 2 holds and if external effects are large in absolute terms relative to internal effects \([|E_{xx}|, |E_{xy}| > \max \{I_{xx}, I_{xy}\}]\), the IME\(_{xx,yx}\) or the IME\(_{xx,xy,yx}\) is unique and the least pro-competitive merger occurs with a lower bound probability approximately equal to 0.16.

Proposition 3 focuses on the negative quadrant in Figure 1. In this area, the preemption mechanism provides all the firms with incentives to pursue a merger in order to avoid becoming an outsider. It is not mainly this mechanism, however, that induces the firms to pursue the least pro-competitive merger. Indeed, firm \(y\) has an incentive to pursue the \(xy\)-merger irrespective of whether it is the most or the least pro-competitive one. Rather it is the valuation mechanism. To see this, consider the behavior of the \(x\)-firms who can choose between the two different types of mergers. Since firms’ pre-merger values incorporate the risk of becoming outsiders, these firms tend to buy the firm that is potential outsider to the most pro-competitive merger with the largest negative external effect. Thereby they preempt this merger and induce the least pro-competitive merger.

To be more precise, consider the simplest case, namely the area in Figure 1 where the IME\(_{xx,yx}\) is unique. In this area, the \(x\)-firms lose more as outsiders than firm \(y\) does (since \(E_{xy} < E_{xx} < 0\)) and therefore their pre-merger value is low. In turn, the \(x\)-firms bid on each other with certainty and
therefore the $xx$-merger, that is the least pro-competitive merger, occurs with high probability, namely $2/3$. In the area where the $IME_{xx,xy,yx}$ is unique, each $x$-firm bids on both other firms with positive probabilities. However, they bid with highest probability on the firm that is a potential outsider to the most pro-competitive merger (if $I_{xx} = I_{xy}$). In fact, the $x$-firms bid on firm $y$ almost with certainty as $E_{xy} \rightarrow 0$. As a result, the preemption and the valuation mechanisms complement each other so that the least pro-competitive merger, in this case the $xy$-merger, occurs almost with certainty.

4 Large Internal Effects

The present section discusses briefly cases where internal effects may be large relative to external effects, keeping the assumption that mergers are profitable. In connection to the previous analysis, a natural question is whether profitability considerations reinforce the tendency for firms to pursue anti-rather than pro-competitive mergers. The answer to this question is ambiguous. This is not surprising, however; for assume that one merger is pro-competitive while the other is not, that the former merger is sufficiently profitable; then the firms tend to pursue the pro-competitive merger. Conversely, if the anti-competitive merger is sufficiently profitable, the firms tend to pursue the anti-competitive merger. While recognizing that firms, in many markets, pursue the most desirable merger, the paper proceeds by identifying further instances in which the opposite is true.

To test the robustness of Propositions 1, 2 and 3 with respect to large internal effects, consider profit configurations such that $I_{xy} > \frac{L_{xy}}{2} > 0$. If external effects are equal to 0, the $IME_{xx,yx}$ or the $IME_{xx,xy,yx}$ is unique. Hence, although some merger occurs with certainty, no specific type of merger
occurs with certainty. In this sense, the condition \( I_{xy} > \frac{I_{xx}}{2} > 0 \) implies that profitability considerations do not favor too much one type of merger over the other. In turn, if external effects differ from 0 and from each other, their impacts on firms’ merger decisions are similar to the ones discussed in Section 3.

To be more precise, consider Figure 2 that illustrates in the \((E_{xy}, E_{xx})\)-plane the conditions under which the different equilibria exist when \( I_{xy} > \frac{I_{xx}}{2} > 0 \). The solid lines represent the horizontal and vertical axes and an equilibrium area is delimited by the dashed lines.

First, consider the north-west and south-east quadrants of Figure 2 where one type of merger is anti-competitive, while the other is pro-competitive. Since the \(IME_{xx,xy} \) or the \(IME_{xx,xy,yx} \) is unique in these areas if the positive external effect is sufficiently small relative to the internal effect, the anti-competitive type of merger occurs with strictly positive probability in such

\[ E_{xx} = I_{xy} - \frac{I_{xx}}{2} + \frac{2}{3} E_{xy} \]

\[ E_{xy} = I_{xy} - \frac{I_{xx}}{2} \]

\[ E_{xy} = I_{xy} - \frac{I_{xx}}{2} \]

Figure 2: \( I_{xy} > \frac{I_{xx}}{2} > 0 \).

Interestingly, this observation implies that the firms may fail to pursue the most profitable merger even in the absence of external effects.

Note that Figure 1 is obtained by letting the internal effects tend to 0 in Figure 2.
cases. Furthermore, there are profit configurations in the south-east quadrant of Figure 2 where the $IME_{xy,yx}$ is unique. Unlike the case when internal effects are small, the anti-competitive $xy$-merger may thus occur, not only with certainty, but also immediately.\textsuperscript{18} In these cases, large internal effects thus strengthen Propositions 1 and 2.

Next, consider the negative quadrant in Figure 2 where both types of mergers are pro-competitive. Since the $IME_{xx,yx}$ or the $IME_{xx,xy,yx}$ is unique in the negative quadrant of Figure 2 also when external effects are small in absolute terms, both types of mergers occur with strictly positive probability in this quadrant. In this sense, also Proposition 3 is robust to large internal effects. Finally, note that equilibria are unique in the positive quadrant of Figure 2 if at least one external effect is sufficiently large relative to the internal effects. Therefore, one may conclude that also more anti-competitive mergers in some cases preempt less anti-competitive ones (in particular, if Assumption 2 holds).

The conclusion of this discussion is thus that external effects being large relative to internal effects is a sufficient, but not a necessary condition, for the results in the previous section to hold.

## 5 The Preemptive Merger Hypothesis

The present section relaxes the assumption that all mergers are profitable. In particular I will focus attention on cases where the $xy$-merger is unprofitable ($I_{xy} < 0$) while the $xx$-merger is profitable ($I_{xx} > 0$). Clearly, this assumption favors the $xx$-merger. Nevertheless, I will show that the signs and magnitudes of the external effects may be crucial in order to determine which merger will

\textsuperscript{18}Also, the expected delay associated with the $DME_{xy,yx}$ decreases as $I_{xy}$ increases.
Figure 3: $I_{xx} > 0$ and $\frac{I_{xx}}{2} > I_{xy}$.

To be more precise, consider Figure 3 that illustrates in the $(E_{xy}, E_{xx})$-plane the conditions under which the different equilibria exist when $I_{xx} > 0$ and $\frac{I_{xx}}{2} > I_{xy}$ (actually, Figure 3 is drawn such that $I_{xx} > 0$ and $I_{xy} < 0$). The solid lines represent the horizontal and vertical axes and an equilibrium area is delimited by the dashed lines.

Not surprisingly, the $xx$-merger occurs with certainty for many profit configurations. More interestingly, however, note that the $xx$-merger does not occur with certainty if $E_{xx} < I_{xy} - \frac{I_{xy}}{2}$. Hence:

**Proposition 4** Assume that the $xx$-merger is profitable and pro-competitive [$I_{xx} > 0$ and $E_{xx} < 0$] while the $xy$-merger is unprofitable and anti-competitive [$I_{xy} < 0$ and $E_{xy} > 0$]. Then the unprofitable and anti-competitive $xy$-merger
occurs with strictly positive probability if $E_{xx} < I_{xy} - \frac{I_{xx}}{2}$.¹⁹

The condition $E_{xx} < I_{xy} - \frac{I_{xx}}{2}$ guarantees that equilibria such as the $IME_{xx}$ where the profitable $xx$-merger occurs with certainty, do not exist. In such an equilibrium, the $x$-firms split the surplus equally. In turn, if firm $y$ buys one of the $x$-firms (which contradicts that the $IME_{xx}$ is an equilibrium), it must compensate the selling $x$-firm for its foregone share of the surplus in the $xx$-merger, that is $\frac{I_{xx}}{2}$. Thereby, firm $y$ loses $I_{xy} - \frac{I_{xx}}{2}$ relative to the status quo. But such a behavior constitutes a best reply if firm $y$ is even worse off as an outsider, that is $E_{xx} < I_{xy} - \frac{I_{xx}}{2}$. Hence, firm $y$‘s decision is driven by the preemption mechanism discussed previously. Note also that the valuation mechanism plays a role in ruling out the $IME_{xx}$, since firm $y$ becomes an outsider with certainty in such an equilibrium. As a result, the $x$-firms are better off pursuing the unprofitable $xy$-merger rather than the profitable $xx$-merger, since firm $y$‘s pre-merger value is very low. Finally, note that firm $y$ bears more than the whole cost associated with the $xy$-merger. Otherwise, it could not be a best-reply for the $x$-firms to bid on firm $y$ with positive probability, as they do in the $IME_{xx,xy,yx}$ and the $DME_{xx,xy,yx}$.²⁰

The preemptive motive for unprofitable mergers has already been studied by Fridolfsson and Stennek (1999). They show in a setting with three symmetric firms that unprofitable mergers may occur in equilibrium, if being an outsider is even more disadvantageous. The value added of the present paper is thus to extend their analysis to asymmetric firms. Thereby, Proposition 4

¹⁹It can be shown that the unprofitable $xy$-merger may be very likely. For instance, the probability with which the unprofitable $xy$-merger occurs, tends to 1 as $E_{xy} \to \frac{I_{xx}}{2}$ (given that $E_{xx} < I_{xy} - \frac{I_{xx}}{2}$). Note also that there are profit configurations such that an unprofitable and anti-competitive $xx$-merger occurs with strictly positive probability even though the $xy$-merger is profitable and pro-competitive.

²⁰Hence, assuming an exogenous split of the surplus could once more be troublesome. In particular, if both merging firms in the unprofitable merger were exogenously assigned to bear a share of the cost associated with the merger, then the unprofitable merger would not occur.
shows that the preemptive motive may be so strong that unprofitable mergers occur even though other mergers are profitable. In addition, the present analysis strengthens their results by showing that some equilibria entailing unprofitable mergers are unique. In Fridolfsson and Stennek (1999), unprofitable mergers only occur when all mergers are unprofitable (due to symmetry). In that case a NME exist as well. In contrast a NME does not exist in Figure 3, since the $xx$-merger is profitable.\footnote{Note also in Figure 3 that one merger being anti-competitive while the other is pro-competitive, is not a necessary condition for an unprofitable merger to occur with positive probability. Indeed, the $IME_{xx,xx}$ and the $IME_{xx,xy,xy}$ also exist (and are unique) if $E_{xx},E_{xy} < 0$ (that is, both mergers are pro-competitive), $E_{xx} < I_{xy} - \frac{I_{xx}}{2}$ and $I_{xx} > 0$.}

Proposition 4 deserves a few more remarks. First, restricting attention to symmetric Markov perfect equilibria is not crucial for that result. While asymmetric equilibria may exist for the profit configurations indicated in Proposition 4, they must entail that the unprofitable merger occurs with positive probability. Indeed, the condition $E_{xx} < I_{xy} - \frac{I_{xx}}{2}$ reflects that equilibria such that the profitable $xx$-merger occurs with certainty, do not exist even if the analysis is extended to asymmetric equilibria.

Second, one can easily generate examples by means of simple oligopoly models such that one type of merger is anti-competitive and unprofitable while the other is pro-competitive and profitable. For instance, it is well known that anti-competitive mergers often are unprofitable (Salant, Switzer and Reynolds, 1983; Perry and Porter, 1985). Moreover, substantial average cost savings are necessary for a merger to reduce the equilibrium price (Farrell and Shapiro, 1990). Thereby, pro-competitive mergers tend to be profitable.

Third, preemptive mergers may be relevant for vertical mergers which aim at raising the rivals’ costs. A downstream firm may buy a supplier to foreclose other downstream firms’ access to the input market (Ordover, Saloner and Salop, 1990). Note that the reason for such a merger is closely
related to its negative externality on the competitor. The present analysis suggests that downstream firms may buy the supplier even if vertical integration is inefficient in itself, and even if the gains from foreclosure are dominated by reduced internal efficiency. The reason is that the relevant alternative is that a rival integrates with the supplier. Hence, by allowing for bidding-competition, this work extends and strengthens the previous analysis of foreclosure.

Fourth, the welfare effects of mergers may be quite perverse. To see this, note that the change in the producers’ surplus relative to the initial market structure is given by \( \Delta PS_{xx} = I_{xx} + E_{xx} \) and \( \Delta PS_{xy} = I_{xy} + E_{xy} \) for the \( xx \)- and the \( xy \)-merger respectively. The two dotted lines in Figure 3 separate the areas where \( \Delta PS_{xx} > 0 \) (\( \Delta PS_{xy} > 0 \)) and \( \Delta PS_{xx} < 0 \) (\( \Delta PS_{xy} < 0 \)). In particular, consider the area to the left of the vertical dotted line (so that \( \Delta PS_{xy} < 0 \)) and above the horizontal dotted line (so that \( \Delta PS_{xx} > 0 \)). In this area there are profit configurations such that the \( xx \)-merger is profitable (\( I_{xx} > 0 \)) and pro-competitive (\( E_{xx} < 0 \)) while the \( xy \)-merger is unprofitable (\( I_{xy} < 0 \)) and anti-competitive (\( E_{xy} > 0 \)). Hence, in this area, the profitable \( xx \)-merger increases both the producers’ and the consumers’ surpluses relative to the initial market structure. In contrast, the unprofitable \( xy \)-merger reduces both these surpluses. Nevertheless, the \( xy \)-merger occurs with strictly positive probability if \( E_{xx} < I_{xy} - \frac{I_{xx}}{2} \).\(^{22}\)

\(^{22}\)In such cases the profitable and pro-competitive \( xx \)-merger occurs with highest probability. Nevertheless, the unprofitable and anti-competitive \( xy \)-merger occurs with a lower bound probability of \( \frac{1}{3} \).
6 Concluding Remarks

In a framework where mergers are mutually excluding, I find that firms pursue an anti-competitive merger when alternative mergers are pro-competitive. This result is driven by three distinct mechanisms related to the signs and magnitudes of mergers’ external effects.

Some indirect evidence, such as the challenged Volvo-Scania merger discussed in the Introduction, indicate that the issue addressed in this paper, is not merely a theoretical concern. Unfortunately, it is difficult to find direct evidence, since preempted mergers, by definition, are not observed. However, some further empirical investigations could be pursued. Most obviously, further indirect evidence could be collected by investigating more systematically whether the prohibition of horizontal mergers have triggered other mergers. Less obviously, the event-study methodology could potentially be used to identify whether preemption is an important motive behind mergers. If the stock market is efficient, in the sense that share prices reflect firms’ true values, then share prices should reflect, not only the possibility of becoming an insider, but also the risk of becoming an outsider. Expressed differently, share prices may, prior to the merger, incorporate information on different mergers, including information related to mergers that never occur. This is precisely the case in $IME_{xz,yz}$ and $IME_{xz,xy,yz}$ where all firms may become insiders and outsiders. In such equilibria, the testable prediction is that the combined stock market value of the merging firms increases when a merger is announced, while the share prices of the outsider decrease at that time.

\footnote{Fridolfsson and Stennek (1999) discuss further indirect evidence indicating that preemption is an important motive behind many mergers. In particular, they show that preemption may be an explanation for the empirical puzzle that unprofitable mergers occur, and that the combined stock market value of the merging firms nevertheless is increased.}
The finding that the relevant alternative to a merger may be another merger rather than the original market structure, have some policy implications. Current policies mainly evaluate the impact of mergers relative to the original market structure. Propositions 1, 2 and 4 imply that such a policy may underestimate the benefits of blocking anti-competitive mergers. Proposition 3 implies that even blocking pro-competitive mergers may benefit the consumers.

An immediate implication of these findings is that competition authorities should try to assess the relevant alternative to a proposed merger. Unfortunately, the implementation of such an ambitious policy is likely to be problematic. Indeed, the authority would have to assess, not only the consequences of the proposed merger, but also the impact of mergers that have not been proposed, both regarding their profitability and their impact on competitors’ as well as on consumers’ welfare. Clearly, such a policy requires that antitrust authorities have access to a substantial amount of information. In particular, implementing such a policy requires more information than the implementation of current policies.

One may even argue that assessing the consequences of proposed mergers is less difficult than assessing the consequences of potential ones. For example, the participating firms in potential mergers (that have not been proposed) may be reluctant to reveal relevant information. Fridolfsson (2000) suggests that, in such cases, it may be optimal to delegate a welfare standard to competition authorities which assigns a larger weight to the consumers’ than to the producers’ surplus.
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A Appendix

A.1 Equilibrium Structure

Lemma 1 Consider the set of symmetric Markov perfect equilibria as $\Delta \to 0$. Such an equilibrium exists for all profit configurations. The following equilibria exist.

1. A NME exists if, and only if, $I_{xx} \leq 0$ and $I_{xy} \leq 0$.

2. An IMEX exists if, and only if, $I_{xx} \geq 0$ and $E_{xx} \geq I_{xy} - \frac{L_{xx}}{2}$.

3. An IMEX exists if, and only if, $E_{xy} \leq I_{xy}$ and $E_{xy} \geq \frac{L_{xx}}{2}$.

4. An IMEX exists if, and only if, $E_{xx} \leq I_{xy} - \frac{L_{xx}}{2} + \frac{1}{5} \left( \frac{L_{xx}}{2} - E_{xy} \right)$ and $E_{xx} \geq I_{xy} - \frac{L_{xx}}{2} - \frac{2}{5} \left( \frac{L_{xx}}{2} - E_{xy} \right)$.

5. An IMEX exists if, and only if, $E_{xy} < \frac{L_{xx}}{2}$ and $E_{xx} < I_{xy} - \frac{L_{xx}}{2} - \frac{2}{5} \left( \frac{L_{xx}}{2} - E_{xy} \right)$.

6. An IME such that $p_{yx} \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$ and $(p_{xx}, p_{xy}) = (1, 0)$ exists if, and only if, $E_{xx} < I_{xy} - \frac{L_{xx}}{2} + \frac{1}{5} \left( \frac{L_{xx}}{2} - E_{xy} \right)$ and $E_{xx} > I_{xy} - \frac{L_{xx}}{2}$. 

7. A DME \( x,y,z \) as well as DME such that (i) \( p_{yz} \in (0, \frac{1}{2}) \) and \( (p_{xx}, p_{xy}) = (0, 0) \), and (ii) \( p_{yx} = 0, p_{xx} = 0 \) and \( p_{xy} \in (0, 1) \) exist if, and only if, \( I_{xy} \geq \frac{I_{xx}}{2} \) and \( \Psi_x = \frac{I_{xy}}{E_{xy} - I_{xy}} > 0 \).

8. A DME \( x,x,y,z \) as well as DME such that (i) \( p_{yx} \leq 0 \), \( p_{xx} = 0 \) and \( p_{xy} = 0 \) exist if, and only if, \( \Theta_y \equiv \frac{I_{xy} - \frac{I_{xx}}{2}}{E_{xx} - (I_{xy} - \frac{I_{xx}}{2})} > 0 \) and \( \Theta_x \equiv \frac{I_{xy}}{E_{xy} - I_{xy}} > 0 \).

All other types of equilibria exist only for non-generic profit configurations.\(^{24}\)

**Proof:** The following proof restricts attention to the type of equilibria that exist generically. To analyze the equilibria that only exist for non-generic profit configurations is time consuming, but not difficult.

The proof starts by rewriting the definitions of \( V_{yx}^{buy} \), \( V_{xx}^{buy} \), \( V_{xy}^{buy} \), \( W_y(3) \) and \( W_x(3) \). By equations (2) and (8), we have:

\[
\begin{align*}
V_{yx}^{buy} &= W_{xy}(2) - W_x(3) \quad (13a) \\
V_{xx}^{buy} &= W_{xx}(2) - W_x(3) \quad (13b) \\
V_{xy}^{buy} &= W_{xy}(2) - W_y(3) \quad (13c)
\end{align*}
\]

Let \( \delta = e^{-rA} \) and rearrange (5) in the following way.

\[
(1 - \delta) \left( W_y(3) - \frac{\pi_s(3)}{r} \right) = \frac{26}{3} \left[ p_{yx} \left( V_{yx}^{buy} - W_y(3) \right) + p_{xy} \left( V_{xy}^{sell} - W_y(3) \right) + p_{xx} \left( V_{yy}^{out} - W_y(3) \right) \right].
\]

By equations (3) and (8), we have \( V_{xy}^{out} = W_x(3) \). Eliminate \( V_{xy}^{sell} \). Use equations (4) and (13a) to eliminate \( V_{xy}^{out} \) and \( V_{yx}^{buy} \).

\[
(1 - \delta) \left( W_y(3) - \frac{\pi_s(3)}{r} \right) = \frac{26}{3} \left[ p_{yx} \left( W_y(2) - W_x(3) - W_y(3) \right) + p_{xx} \left( W_y(2) - W_y(3) \right) \right]. \tag{14}
\]

\(^{24}\)Non-generic parameter configurations are such that \( \frac{I_{xx}}{2} = E_{xy}, I_{xy} = 0 \) and so on.
Rearrange (6) in a similar way. Use equations (3) and (8) to eliminate $V_{x x}^{s e l l}$ and $V_{y x}^{s e l l}$. Use equations (4), (13b) and (13c) to eliminate $V_{x}^{o u t}$, $V_{x x}^{b u y}$ and $V_{x y}^{b u y}$.

\[
(1 - \delta) \left( W_x (3) - \frac{\pi_x (3)}{r} \right) = \frac{\delta}{3} [p_{xy} (W_{xy} (2) - W_y (3) - W_x (3))
+ p_{xx} (W_{xx} (2) - 2W_x (3))
+ (p_{xy} + p_{yx}) (W_x (2) - W_x (3))].
\]

Next, I derive the conditions under which each type of equilibrium exists. The proof ends by showing that an equilibrium exists for all profit configurations.

**Proof of point 1:** A NME is characterized by $p_{yx} = 0$ and $(p_{xx}, p_{xy}) = (0, 0)$. By equation (14), we have $W_y (3) = \pi_y (3) / r$. By equation (15), we have $W_x (3) = \pi_x (3) / r$.

First, consider firm $y$’s equilibrium condition in (9). By equation (13a), we have $W_{xy} (2) \leq W_y (3) + W_x (3)$. Eliminate $W_y (3)$ and $W_x (3)$ by using their equilibrium values. Use (1) to eliminate $W_{xy} (2)$. Rearrange the inequality so as to use definition (11a). Then it simplifies to $I_{xy} \leq 0$.

Second, consider the $x$-firms’ equilibrium conditions in (10). By equations (13b) and (13c), we have $W_{xx} (2) \leq 2W_x (3)$ and $W_{xy} (2) \leq W_y (3) + W_x (3)$. Eliminate $W_y (3)$ and $W_x (3)$ by using their equilibrium values. Use (1) to eliminate $W_{xx} (2)$ and $W_{xy} (2)$. Rearrange the inequalities so as to use definitions (11b) and (11a). Then they simplify to $I_{xx} \leq 0$ and $I_{xy} \leq 0$ respectively.

**Proof of point 2:** An IME$_{xx}$ is characterized by $p_{yx} = 0$ and $(p_{xx}, p_{xy}) = (1, 0)$. Use these values to simplify equations (14) and (15). Solve for $W_y (3)$ in (14) and for $W_x (3)$ in (15). Rearrange the solutions in the following way.

\[
W_y (3) = \frac{\pi_y (3)}{r} + \frac{2\delta}{3 - \delta} \left[ W_y (2) - \frac{\pi_y (3)}{r} \right] = \frac{\pi_y (3)}{r} + \frac{2\delta}{3 - \delta} I_{xx},
W_x (3) = \frac{\pi_x (3)}{r} + \frac{2\delta}{3 - \delta} \frac{1}{2} \left[ W_{xx} (2) - 2 \frac{\pi_x (3)}{r} \right] = \frac{\pi_x (3)}{r} + \frac{2\delta}{3 - \delta} I_{xx}^{2}.
\]

The second equality in the solution for $W_y (3)$ [for $W_x (3)$] follows from the definitions in (1) and (12b) [in (1) and (11b)].
First, consider firm $y$’s equilibrium condition in (9). By equation (13a), we have $W_{xy}(2) \leq W_y(3) + W_x(3)$. Eliminate $W_y(3)$ and $W_x(3)$ by using their equilibrium values as $\delta \to 1$ ($\Delta \to 0$). Use (1) to eliminate $W_{xy}(2)$. Rearrange the inequality so as to use definition (11a). Then it simplifies to $E_{xy} \geq I_{xy} - \frac{I_{yx}}{2}$.

Second, consider the $x$-firms’ equilibrium conditions in (10). By equations (13b) and (13c), we have $W_{xx}(2) \geq 2W_x(3)$ and $W_{xx}(2) - W_x(3) \geq W_{xy}(2) - W_y(3)$. Eliminate $W_x(3)$ in the first inequality by using its equilibrium value (where $\delta < 1$). Use (1) to eliminate $W_{xx}(2)$. Rearrange the inequality so as to use definition (11b). Then it simplifies to $I_{xx} \geq 0$. Next, eliminate $W_y(3)$ and $W_x(3)$ in the second inequality by using their equilibrium values as $\delta \to 1$ ($\Delta \to 0$). Use (1) to eliminate $W_{xx}(2)$ and $W_{xy}(2)$. Rearrange the inequality so as to use definitions (11a) and (11b). Then it simplifies to $E_{xx} \geq I_{xy} - \frac{I_{yx}}{2}$.

Proof of point 3: An $IME_{xy,yx}$ is characterized by $p_{yx} = \frac{1}{2}$ and $(p_{xx}, p_{xy}) = (0, 1)$. Use these values to simplify equations (14) and (15). Then one gets a system of two equations with two unknowns: $W_y(3)$ and $W_x(3)$. Solve this system. Use (1) to eliminate $W_{xy}(2)$ and $W_x(2)$ in the resulting solutions. Rearrange so as to use definitions (11a) and (12a).

\[
\begin{align*}
W_y(3) &= \frac{\pi_y(3)}{r} + \frac{\delta}{6 - 5\delta} \left[(2 - \delta) I_{xy} - \delta E_{xy}\right], \\
W_x(3) &= \frac{\pi_x(3)}{r} + \frac{\delta}{6 - 5\delta} \left[2(1 - \delta) I_{xy} + (3 - 2\delta) E_{xy}\right].
\end{align*}
\]

First, consider firm $y$’s equilibrium condition in (9). By equation (13a), we have $W_{xy}(2) \geq W_y(3) + W_x(3)$. Eliminate $W_y(3)$ and $W_x(3)$ by using their equilibrium values (where $\delta < 1$). Use (1) to eliminate $W_{xy}(2)$. Rearrange the inequality so as to use definition (11a). Then it simplifies to $E_{xy} \leq (2 - \delta) I_{xy}$. Let $\delta \to 1$ ($\Delta \to 0$) to get $E_{xy} \leq I_{xy}$.

Second, consider the $x$-firms’ equilibrium conditions in (10). By equations
(13b) and (13c), we have \( W_y (2) \geq W_y (3) + W_x (3) \) and \( W_y (2) - W_y (3) \geq W_x (2) - W_x (3) \). We already know that the first inequality simplifies to \( E_{xy} \leq I_{xy} \) as \( \delta \to 1 \). Eliminate \( W_y (3) \) and \( W_x (3) \) in the second inequality by using their equilibrium values as \( \delta \to 1 \) (\( \Delta \to 0 \)). Use (1) to eliminate \( W_y (2) \) and \( W_x (2) \). Rearrange the inequality so as to use definitions (11a) and (11b). Then it simplifies to \( E_{xy} \geq \frac{I_{xy}}{2} \).

**Proof of point 4:** An IME \( E_{xx,yx} \) is characterized by \( p_{yx} = \frac{1}{2} \) and \( (p_{xx}, p_{xy}) = (1, 0) \). Use these values to simplify (14) and (15). Then one gets a system of two equations with two unknowns: \( W_y (3) \) and \( W_x (3) \). Let \( \delta \to 1 \) (\( \Delta \to 0 \)) in both equations. The LHS in both equations then equals to 0, since \( W_y (3) \) and \( W_x (3) \) are bounded. Solve the resulting system of equations. Use (1) to eliminate \( W_y (2) \), \( W_x (2) \), \( W_x (3) \) and \( W_y (3) \). Rearrange so as to use definitions, (11a), (11b), (12a) and (12b).

\[
W_y (3) = \frac{\pi_y (3)}{r} + \frac{1}{3} \left[ I_{xy} - \left( \frac{4}{5} \frac{I_{xy}}{2} + \frac{1}{5} E_{xy} \right) \right] + \frac{2}{3} E_{xx},
\]
\[
W_x (3) = \frac{\pi_x (3)}{r} + \frac{4}{5} \frac{1}{2} E_{xy} + \frac{1}{5} E_{xy}.
\]

First, consider firm \( y \)'s equilibrium condition in (9). By equation (13a), we have \( W_{xy} (2) \geq W_y (3) + W_x (3) \). Eliminate \( W_y (3) \) and \( W_x (3) \) by using their equilibrium values. Use (1) to eliminate \( W_{xy} (2) \). Rearrange the inequality so as to use definition (11a). Then it simplifies to \( E_{xx} \leq I_{xy} - \frac{I_{xx}}{2} + \frac{1}{5} \left( \frac{I_{xx}}{2} - E_{xy} \right) \).

Second, consider the \( x \)-firms' equilibrium conditions in (10). By equations (13b) and (13c), we have \( W_{xx} (2) \geq 2W_x (3) \) and \( W_{xx} (2) - W_x (3) \geq W_y (2) - W_y (3) \). Eliminate \( W_x (3) \) in the first inequality by using its equilibrium value. Use (1) to eliminate \( W_{xx} (2) \). Rearrange the inequality so as to use definition (11b). Then it simplifies to \( E_{xy} \leq \frac{I_{xy}}{2} \). Next, eliminate \( W_y (3) \) and \( W_x (3) \) in the second inequality by using their equilibrium values. Use (1) to eliminate \( W_{xy} (2) \) and \( W_{xx} (2) \). Rearrange the inequality so as to use definition (11a) and (11b). Then it simplifies to \( E_{xx} \geq I_{xy} - \frac{I_{xx}}{2} - \frac{2}{5} \left( \frac{I_{xx}}{2} - E_{xy} \right) \).
Finally, note that $E_{xy} \leq \frac{I_{xx}}{2}$ is fulfilled if the two other conditions are fulfilled.

**Proof of point 5:** An $IME_{xx,xy,yx}$ is characterized by $p_{yx} = \frac{1}{2}$ and $(p_{xx}, p_{xy}) \in \{(0, 1)^2 : p_{xx} + p_{xy} = 1\}$. Eliminate $p_{yx}$ in equations (14) and (15) as well as $p_{xy}$, using the fact that $p_{xy} = 1 - p_{xx}$. Then one gets a system of two equations with two unknowns: $W_y (3)$ and $W_x (3)$. Let $\delta \to 1$ ($\Delta \to 0$) in both equations. The LHS in both equations then equals to 0, since $W_y (3)$ and $W_x (3)$ are bounded. Solve the resulting system of equations. Use (1) to eliminate $W_{xy} (2)$, $W_{xx} (2)$, $W_x (2)$ and $W_y (2)$. Rearrange so as to use definitions, (11a), (11b), (12a) and (12b).

First, consider the equality $V^{buy}_{xx} = V^{buy}_{xy}$, that is one of the $x$-firms’ equilibrium conditions in (10). By equations (13b) and (13c), we have $W_{xx} (2) - W_x (3) = W_{xy} (2) - W_y (3)$. Eliminate $W_x (3)$ and $W_y (3)$ by using their equilibrium values. Use (1) to eliminate $W_{xx} (2)$ and $W_{xy} (2)$. Rearrange the equality so as to use definitions (11a) and (11b). Finally, rearrange in the following way.

$$f (p_{xx}) \equiv \frac{3 (1 - 2p_{xx})}{p_{xx} (7 - 2p_{xx})} = \frac{I_{xy} - I_{xx} + E_{xy} - E_{xx}}{I_{xx} - E_{xy}}. \quad (16)$$

Equation (16) defines $p_{xx}$ implicitly as a function of the exogenous variables in the RHS of (16), since $f' (p_{xx}) < 0 \forall p_{xx} \in (0, 1)$.

Second, consider the inequality $V^{buy}_{xy} \geq W_x (3)$, that is the $x$-firms’ other equilibrium condition in (10). By equation (13c), we have $W_{xy} (2) \geq W_x (3) + W_y (3)$. Eliminate $W_x (3)$ and $W_y (3)$ by using their equilibrium values. Use
(1) to eliminate $W_{xy}(2)$. Rearrange so as to use definition (11a). The inequality then simplifies to

$$-6 \left( \frac{I_{xx}}{2} - E_{xy} \right) \leq (3 + 2p_{xx}) (I_{xy} - I_{xx} + E_{xy} - E_{xx}).$$

Assume that $\frac{I_{xx}}{2} > E_{xy}$ and rearrange the inequality in the following way.

$$-\frac{6}{3 + 2p_{xx}} \leq \frac{I_{xy} - I_{xx} + E_{xy} - E_{xx}}{\frac{I_{xx}}{2} - E_{xy}}.$$

By equation (16), the RHS equals $f'(p_{xx})$. Simplify to get

$$3 + 10p_{xx} - 8p_{xx}^2 \geq 0,$$

which is true for all $p_{xx} \in (0, 1)$. Conversely, the inequality $V_{xy}^{buy} \geq W_x(3)$ simplifies to $3 + 10p_{xx} - 8p_{xx}^2 \leq 0$ if $\frac{I_{xx}}{2} < E_{xy}$, which is not true for any $p_{xx} \in (0, 1)$. Hence, if $V_{xy}^{buy} = V_{xy}^{buy}$, then $V_{xy}^{buy} \geq W_x(3)$ if, and only if, $E_{xy} < \frac{I_{xx}}{2}$.

Third, note by (13a), that firm $y$’s equilibrium condition in (9) is equivalent to $W_{xy}(2) \geq W_x(3) + W_y(3)$, that is the inequality treated above.

Finally, note that $\lim_{p_{xx} \to 0} f(p_{xx}) = +\infty$ and $f'(p_{xx}) < 0 \forall p_{xx} \in (0, 1)$.

Since $p_{xx} \in (0, 1)$, equation (16) has a unique solution if, and only if,

$$\frac{I_{xy} - I_{xx} + E_{xy} - E_{xx}}{\frac{I_{xx}}{2} - E_{xy}} > f(1) = -\frac{3}{5}.$$

Since $\frac{I_{xx}}{2} > E_{xy}$, this inequality simplifies to $E_{xx} < I_{xy} - \frac{I_{xx}}{2} - \frac{3}{5} \left( \frac{I_{xx}}{2} - E_{xy} \right)$.

**Proof of point 6:** In this equilibrium, $p_{yx} \in (0, \frac{1}{2}) \text{ and } (p_{xx}, p_{xy}) = (1, 0)$. Eliminate $p_{xx}$ and $p_{xy}$ in equations (14) and (15). Let $\delta \to 1$ ($\Delta \to 0$) in both equations. Since $W_y(3)$ and $W_x(3)$ are bounded, the two equations simplify to

$$0 = p_{yx} [W_{xy}(2) - W_y(3) - W_x(3)] + W_y(2) - W_y(3) \quad (17)$$

$$0 = W_{xx}(2) - 2W_x(3) + p_{yx} [W_x(2) - W_x(3)] \quad (18)$$

First, consider firm $y$’s equilibrium condition in (9). By equation (13a), we have $W_{xy}(2) = W_y(3) + W_x(3)$. This equation and equation (17) constitute
a system of two equations with two unknowns: \( W_y (3) \) and \( W_x (3) \). Solve this system. Use (1) to eliminate \( W_y (2) \) [\( W_{xy} (2) \)] in the solution for \( W_y (3) \) [\( W_x (3) \)]. Rearrange so as to use definitions (11a) and (12b). The solutions are then \( W_y (3) = \frac{\pi_y (3)}{r} + E_{xx} \) and \( W_x (3) = \frac{\pi_x (3)}{r} + I_{xy} - E_{xx} \).

Second, consider the \( x \)-firms’ equilibrium conditions in (10). By equations (13b) and (13c), we have \( W_{xx} (2) \geq 2W_x (3) \) and \( W_{xx} (2) - W_x (3) \geq W_y (2) - W_y (3) \). Eliminate \( W_x (3) \) in the first inequality by using its equilibrium value. Use (1) to eliminate \( W_{xx} (2) \). Rearrange so as to use definition (11a). The inequality then simplifies to \( E_{xx} \geq I_{xy} - \frac{I_{xx}}{2} \). Similarly, the second inequality also simplifies to \( E_{xx} \geq I_{xy} - \frac{I_{xx}}{2} \).

Finally, it is required that \( p_{yx} \in (0, \frac{1}{2}) \). To obtain an expression for \( p_{yx} \), insert the equilibrium values of \( W_y (3) \) and \( W_x (3) \) into (18). Use (1) to eliminate \( W_{xx} (2) \) and \( W_x (2) \). Rearrange so as to use definitions (11b) and (12a). Solving for \( p_{yx} \) yields that \( p_{yx} = \frac{2E_{xx} - (I_{xy} - I_{xx}/2)}{I_{xy} - (E_{xy} + E_{xx})} \). Hence, it is required that \( \frac{1}{2} > 2 \frac{E_{xx} - (I_{xy} - I_{xx}/2)}{I_{xy} - (E_{xy} + E_{xx})} > 0 \). Since \( E_{xx} \geq I_{xy} - \frac{I_{xx}}{2} \), these two inequalities imply that \( I_{xy} > E_{xy} + E_{xx} \) and \( E_{xx} > I_{xy} - \frac{I_{xx}}{2} \) and \( E_{xx} < I_{xy} - \frac{I_{xx}}{2} + \frac{1}{5} \left( \frac{I_{xx}}{2} - E_{xy} \right) \). The two latter inequalities imply that the former one is fulfilled.

**Proof of point 7:** I only prove the conditions under which a \( DME_{xy,yx} \) exists. Following the same steps as below, it is straightforward to prove that the two other \( DME \) exist under the same conditions as the \( DME_{xy,yx} \).

A \( DME_{xy,yx} \) is characterized by \( p_{yx} \in (0, \frac{1}{2}) \) and \( p_{xx} = 0, p_{xy} \in (0, 1) \).

Consider firm \( y \)'s equilibrium condition in (9). By equation (13a), we have \( W_{xy} (2) = W_y (3) + W_x (3) \). This equation and equation (14) constitute a system of two equations with two unknowns: \( W_y (3) \) and \( W_x (3) \). Solve this system, using the fact that \( p_{xx} = 0 \). The solutions are \( W_y (3) = \frac{\pi_y (3)}{r} \) and \( W_x (3) = W_{xy} (2) - \frac{\pi_x (3)}{r} = \frac{\pi_x (3)}{r} + I_{xy} \) (the second equality follows from the
definitions (1) and (11a)).

Next, eliminate $W_x (3)$ in the LHS in (15) by using its equilibrium value. The LHS then equals $I_{xy}$. The RHS in (15) equals $1 - \frac{1}{3} \pm \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 - \delta}} (p_{xy} + p_{yx}) (W_x (2) - W_x (3))$, since $p_{xx} = 0$ and $W_{xy} (2) = W_y (3) + W_x (3)$. Note that $W_x (2) - W_x (3) = E_{xy} - I_{xy}$ (which follows from the equilibrium value of $W_x (3)$ and the definitions in (1) and (12a)). Hence:

$$p_{xy} + p_{yx} = \frac{3}{\delta} \frac{I_{xy}}{E_{xy} - I_{xy}} = \frac{3}{\delta} \frac{1}{\Psi_x}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (19)

Since $p_{xy} + p_{yx} > 0$, it is necessary that $\Psi_x > 0$. As $\delta \to 1 (\Delta \to 0)$, the RHS tends to 0 so that there exists probabilities $p_{xy}$ and $p_{yx}$ satisfying the above equality (in fact there exists a continuum of such probabilities). Thus, the condition $\Psi_x > 0$ is also sufficient in order to satisfy the above equality.

Finally, consider the $x$-firms’ equilibrium conditions in (10). By equations (13b) and (13c), we have $W_{xy} (2) = W_y (3) + W_x (3)$ and $W_{xy} (2) - W_y (3) = W_{xx} (2) - W_x (3)$. We already know that the equality is fulfilled. Use (1) to eliminate $W_{xy} (2)$ and $W_{xx} (2)$ in the inequality. Eliminate $W_y (3)$ and $W_x (3)$ by using their equilibrium values. Rearrange so as to use definitions (11a) and (11b). The inequality then simplifies to $I_{xy} \geq \frac{I_{xx}}{2}$.

**Proof of point 8:** I only prove the conditions under which a $DME_{xx,xy,yx}$ exists. Following the same steps as below, it is straightforward to prove that the two other $DME$ exist under the same conditions as the $DME_{xx,xy,yx}$.

A $DME_{xx,xy,yx}$ is characterized by $(p_{xx}, p_{xy}) \in \{(0, 1) : p_{xx} + p_{xy} \in (0, 1)\}$ and $p_{yx} \in (0, 1/2)$.

Consider the $x$-firms’ equilibrium condition in (10). By equations (13b) and (13c), we have $W_{xy} (2) = W_y (3) + W_x (3)$ and $W_{xx} (2) - W_x (3) = W_{xy} (2) - W_y (3)$. Use these equations to solve for $W_y (3)$ and $W_x (3)$. The solutions are $W_y (3) = W_{xy} (2) - \frac{W_{xx}(2)}{2} = \frac{p_{xx}(3)}{r} + I_{xy} - \frac{I_{xx}}{2}$ and $W_x (3) = \dots$
$$\frac{W_{xy}(2)}{2} = \frac{\pi_x(3)}{2} + \frac{I_{xx}}{2}$$ (the second equality in the first [second] solution follows from the definitions in (1), (11a) and (11b) [(1) and (11b)].)

Next, eliminate $W_y(3)$ in the LHS in (14) by using its equilibrium value. The LHS then equals $I_{xy} - \frac{I_{xx}}{2}$. The RHS in (14) equals $\frac{2}{3} \frac{\delta}{1-\delta} p_{xx} (W_y(2) - W_y(3))$, since $W_{xy}(2) = W_y(3) + W_x(3)$. Note that $W_y(2) - W_y(3) = E_{xx} - (I_{xy} - \frac{I_{xx}}{2})$ (which follows from the equilibrium value of $W_y(3)$ and the definitions in (1) and (12b)). Hence:

$$p_{xx} = \frac{31 - \delta}{2} \frac{I_{xy} - \frac{I_{xx}}{2}}{E_{xx} - (I_{xy} - \frac{I_{xx}}{2})} = 3 \frac{1 - \delta}{\delta} \Theta_y.$$ Since $p_{xx} > 0$, it is necessary that $\Theta_y > 0$. As $\delta \to 1 (\Delta \to 0)$, the RHS tends to 0 so that there exists a probability $p_{xx}$ satisfying the above equality. Thus, the condition $\Theta_y > 0$ is also sufficient in order to satisfy the above equality. Similarly, by simplifying equation (15), it is straightforward to show that there exists probabilities $p_{xy}$ and $p_{yx}$ satisfying equation (15) if, and only if, $\Theta_x = \frac{I_{xx}/2}{E_{xy} - I_{xx}/2} > 0$.

Finally, consider firm y’s equilibrium condition in (9). By equation (13a), we have $W_{xy}(2) = W_y(3) + W_x(3)$, which we know is fulfilled.

**Existence:** To complete the proof, it remains to show that at least one type of equilibrium exists for all profit configurations.

Consider the case in Figure 3, that is profit configurations such that $E_{xx} > 0$ and $\frac{I_{xx}}{2} > I_{xy}$. Next, I show that there exists an equilibrium for all pairs $(E_{xx}, E_{xy})$ given that the above conditions on $I_{xx}$ and $I_{xy}$ are fulfilled. First, assume that $E_{xx} > I_{xy} - \frac{I_{xx}}{2}$. By point 2, there exists an $IME_{xx}$, since $I_{xx} > 0$. Second, assume that $E_{xx} < I_{xy} - \frac{I_{xx}}{2}$ and $E_{xy} > \frac{I_{xx}}{2}$ By point 8, there exists a $DME_{xx,xy,yx}$, since $I_{xy} - \frac{I_{xx}}{2} < 0$ and $I_{xx} > 0$. Third, assume that $E_{xx} < I_{xy} - \frac{I_{xx}}{2}$ and $E_{xy} < \frac{I_{xx}}{2}$. By point 5, there exists an $IME_{xx,xy,yx}$ if $E_{xx} < I_{xy} - \frac{I_{xx}}{2} - \frac{2}{3} (\frac{I_{xx}}{2} - E_{xy})$. If instead $E_{xx} > I_{xy} - \frac{I_{xx}}{2} - \frac{2}{3} (\frac{I_{xx}}{2} - E_{xy})$, there exists an $IME_{xx,yx}$. Indeed, this latter inequality constitutes one of the
two conditions for an IME$_{xx,yx}$ to exist (see point 4). Moreover, the second condition for such an equilibrium to exist is $E_{xx} < I_{xy} - \frac{I_{xy}}{2} + \frac{1}{2} (\frac{I_{xy}}{2} - E_{xy})$. This condition is fulfilled if $E_{xx} < I_{xy} - \frac{I_{xy}}{2}$ and $E_{xy} < \frac{I_{xy}}{2}$.

To check existence for all possible profit configurations, repeat similar arguments for the following three cases: (i) $I_{xy} > \frac{I_{xy}}{2} > 0$ (that is, the case in Figure 2), (ii) $I_{xy} > 0$ and $I_{xx} < 0$ and (iii) $I_{xx}, I_{xy} < 0$. QED.

A.2 Proofs of Propositions:

All proofs below build upon the equilibrium structure derived in Lemma 1.

A.2.1 Proof of Proposition 1:

By Lemma 1, Figures 2 and 3 illustrate the conditions under which each equilibrium exists when $I_{xy} \geq \frac{I_{xy}}{2} \geq 0$ and $\frac{I_{xy}}{2} \geq I_{xy} \geq 0$ respectively. First, assume that $I_{xy} \geq \frac{I_{xy}}{2} \geq 0$. Then $E_{xx} > I_{xy} - \frac{I_{xy}}{2}$, since $I_{xy}, I_{xx} > 0, E_{xx} > 0$ and $|E_{xx}| > I_{xy}$. Moreover, $E_{xy} < 0 < \frac{I_{xy}}{2}$. By Figure 2, the IME$_{xx}$ is then unique or exists simultaneously with the IME$_{xx,yx}$. Consequently, the xx-merger occurs with probability 1 (in the IME$_{xx}$) or 2/3 (in the IME$_{xx,yx}$). Second, assume that $\frac{I_{xy}}{2} \geq I_{xy} \geq 0$. Then $E_{xx} > I_{xy} - \frac{I_{xy}}{2}$, since $E_{xx} > 0 \geq I_{xy} - \frac{I_{xy}}{2}$. The same conclusion as in the first case follows from Figure 3. QED.

A.2.2 Proof of Proposition 2:

By Lemma 1, Figure 2 illustrates the conditions under which each equilibrium exists when $I_{xy} \geq \frac{I_{xy}}{2} \geq 0$. Since $E_{xx} < 0$ and $I_{xy} > \frac{I_{xy}}{2}$, we have that $E_{xx} < I_{xy} - \frac{I_{xy}}{2}$. Moreover, $E_{xy} > I_{xy}$, since $E_{xy} > 0$ and $|E_{xy}| > I_{xy}$. By Figure 2, the DME$_{xy,yx}$ is then unique.
It remains to show that the $xy$-merger occurs with probability 1 in the long run. Note that there are $t/\Delta$ time periods between time 0 and time $t$. In a $DME_{xy,yx}$, the triopoly remains until time $t$ with probability \(\left(1 - \frac{1}{2} \frac{e^{-\gamma t}}{e^{\gamma t}} \Psi_x\right)^{t/\Delta}\) where the second inequality follows from (19) and the fact that $\delta = e^{-r\Delta}$. Let $q_0(\Delta) = 1 - \frac{1}{2} \frac{e^{-\gamma t}}{e^{\gamma t}} \Psi_x$ and define the cumulative distribution function indicating the probability that a merger has not occurred before time $t$, as

\[G_0(t) = \lim_{\Delta \to 0} [q_0(\Delta)]^{t/\Delta}.
\]

Since the logarithm is continuous

\[\ln G_0(t) = t \lim_{\Delta \to 0} \frac{\ln q_0(\Delta)}{\Delta}.
\]

Note that $\lim_{\Delta \to 0} q_0(\Delta) = 1$. Hence, $\lim_{\Delta \to 0} \frac{\ln q_0(\Delta)}{\Delta} = \ln q_0' = -\frac{2r t}{\Psi x}$. By l’Hopital’s rule: $\lim_{\Delta \to 0} \frac{\ln q_0(\Delta)}{\Delta} = \lim_{\Delta \to 0} \frac{q_0'(\Delta)}{q_0(\Delta)} = \lim_{\Delta \to 0} q_0'(\Delta)$. Hence:

\[\ln G_0(t) = t \lim_{\Delta \to 0} q_0'(\Delta) = -2rt\Psi_x.
\]

Thus, $G_0(t) = e^{-2rt\Psi_x}$. Define the probability that a $xy$-merger has occurred at time $t$ as $G(t) = 1 - e^{-2rt\Psi_x}$. $\lim_{t \to \infty} G(t) = 1$ for all $\Psi_x > 0$. QED.

**A.2.3 Proof of Proposition 3:**

By Lemma 1, Figures 2 and 3 illustrate the conditions under which each equilibrium exists when $I_{xy} \geq \frac{l_{xy}}{2} \geq 0$ and $\frac{l_{xx}}{2} \geq I_{xy} \geq 0$ respectively. First, assume that $I_{xy} \geq \frac{l_{xy}}{2} \geq 0$. By Figure 2, the $IME_{xx,yx}$ or the $IME_{xx,xy,yx}$ is unique if $E_{xy}, E_{xx} < 0$. Second assume that $\frac{l_{xx}}{2} \geq I_{xy} \geq 0$. Then $E_{xx} < I_{xy} - \frac{l_{xx}}{2}$, since $I_{xy}, I_{xx} > 0$, $E_{xx} < 0$ and $|E_{xx}| > I_{xx}$. By Figure 3, the $IME_{xx,yx}$ or the $IME_{xx,xy,yx}$ is then unique if $E_{xy}, E_{xx} < 0$.

It remains to prove the lower bound probability. Consider first the simple case when the $IME_{xx,yx}$ is unique. In such an equilibrium, the $xy$- (xx-).
merger occurs with probability 1/3 (2/3). Hence, the least pro-competitive merger must occur with a lower bound probability of 1/3.

Next, consider the more difficult case when the $IME_{xx,xy,yx}$ is unique. In such an equilibrium, the $xy$-merger occurs with a lower bound probability of 1/3 while the $xx$-merger may occur with an arbitrarily small probability. It thus remains to determine the lower bound probability for the $xx$-merger to occur in the cases when it is the least pro-competitive, that is when $0 > E_{xx} > E_{xy}$ (by Assumption 2). This amounts to find a lower bound for $p_{xx}$ which is defined implicitly by equation (16). Since $f'(p_{xx}) < 0$ and $\lim_{p_{xx} \to 0} f(p_{xx}) = 0$, the lower bound of $p_{xx}$ is found by solving the following maximization problem.

$$\max_{\{I_{xx}, I_{xy}, E_{xx}, E_{xy}\}} \frac{I_{xy} - I_{xx} + E_{xy} - E_{xx}}{\frac{I_{xx}}{2} - E_{xy}},$$

subject to $E_{xy} - E_{xx} \leq 0$, $I_{xx}, I_{xy} \geq 0$ and $E_{xy}, E_{xx} \leq -\max\{I_{xx}, I_{xy}\}$. By noting that the existence of an $IME_{xx,xy,yx}$ requires that $\frac{I_{xx}}{2} > E_{xy}$, it is straightforward to solve the above maximization problem. The solutions are given by $\{(I_{xx}, I_{xy}, E_{xx}, E_{xy}) : I_{xx} = 0$ and $E_{xx}, E_{xy} = -I_{xy}\}$. The maximized expression equals 1 at its maximum. Replacing the RHS in (16) by 1 and solving the resulting equation yields that $p_{xx} = \frac{13}{4} - \frac{1}{3}\sqrt{145}$. Moreover, the $xx$-merger occurs with probability $\frac{2}{3}p_{xx}$. By continuity, it follows that the $xx$-merger occurs with a lower bound probability of $\frac{2}{3}(\frac{13}{4} - \frac{1}{3}\sqrt{145}) \simeq 0.16$.

QED.

A.2.4 Proof of Proposition 4:

By Lemma 1, Figure 3 illustrates the conditions under which each type of equilibrium exists when $I_{xx} > 0$ and $I_{xy} < 0$. First, consider profit configurations such that $E_{xx} < I_{xy} - \frac{I_{xx}}{2}$ and $E_{xy} < \frac{I_{xx}}{2}$. By Figure 3, either
the $IME_{xx,xy}$ or the $IME_{xx,xy,yx}$ is then unique. Hence, the $xy$-merger then occurs immediately with strictly positive probability. Second, consider profit configurations such that $E_{xx} < I_{xy} - \frac{L_{xx}}{2}$ and $E_{xy} > \frac{L_{xy}}{2}$. By Figure 3, the $DME_{xx,xy,yx}$ is then unique. In the proof of Proposition 2, it was shown that in a $DME_{xy,yx}$, the probability that a $xy$-merger has occurred at time $t$ is $1 - e^{-2rt\Psi_x}$. Similarly, it can be shown that in a $DME_{xx,xy,yx}$, the probability that some merger has occurred at time $t$ is $1 - e^{-rt(2\Theta_x + \Theta_y)}$. Since, $\lim_{t \to \infty} 1 - e^{-rt(2\Theta_x + \Theta_y)} = 1$, it follows that some merger occurs with probability 1 in the long run. Moreover, it is easy to show that, conditional on the event that some merger has occurred, the probability that a $xy$-merger has occurred is $\frac{2\Theta_y}{2\Theta_x + \Theta_y} > 0$. QED.