

## Supplemental Material

**Proof of Proposition 1:** Let  $p^* = p^*(\lambda, \delta, \psi)$  be the value of  $p$  that solves the free entry condition (1). By definition,  $\pi^*(\theta', p) = 0$ . This implies that the partial derivative of the left-hand side of (1) with respect to  $p$  is positive (since profits are increasing in market price). Moreover, straightforward derivation shows that the left-hand side of (1) is increasing in  $\delta$  and decreasing in  $\lambda$ , whereas the right-hand side is increasing in  $\psi$ . Together, this implies that  $p^*$  is increasing in  $\psi$  and  $\lambda$ , and decreasing in  $\delta$ .

Straightforward derivation of (2) shows that  $\partial r / \partial \lambda > 0$  and  $\partial r / \partial x > 0$ . Moreover,  $\partial r / \partial x \rightarrow 0$  as  $\lambda \rightarrow 0$ . Since  $\pi^*(\theta, p)$  is increasing in  $p$ , both  $\theta'$  and  $x(p)$  are decreasing in  $p$ .

Now consider an increase in  $\psi$ . From (1) and the discussion above, we conclude this results in an increase in  $p$ , which in turn results in a decrease in  $x$ , which in turn results in a decrease in  $r$ .

Consider now an increase in  $\lambda$ . In this case, I must consider both the direct effect of a change in  $\lambda$  as well as the effect through changes in  $x$ . The direct effect on  $r$ , given by  $\partial r / \partial \lambda$ , is positive. However, from (1), an increase in  $\lambda$  leads to an increase in  $p$ , which in turn leads to a decrease in  $x$ , which in turn leads to a decrease in  $r$ , an effect of opposite sign to the previous one. I next show that when  $\lambda = 0$  or  $\lambda = 1$  then the indirect effect is zero, resulting in a total effect that is positive. Specifically,

$$\frac{dr}{d\lambda} = \frac{\partial r}{\partial \lambda} + \frac{\partial r}{\partial x} \frac{dx}{d\lambda} = \frac{1-x}{(1-x(1-\lambda))^2} + \frac{\lambda(1-\lambda)}{(1-x(1-\lambda))^2} \frac{dx}{d\lambda}$$

The first term is positive for all values of  $\lambda$ . Since  $dx/d\lambda$  is finite, the second term is zero for  $\lambda = 0$  or  $\lambda = 1$ . ■

**Proof of Proposition 2:** Define

$$E^+(z) \equiv E(\theta \mid \theta > z) = \frac{\int_z^\infty \theta dF(\theta)}{\int_z^\infty dF(\theta)}$$

Straightforward derivation reveals that  $E^+(z)$  is increasing. Average productivity is then given by

$$\bar{\theta} = \frac{n}{m} E^+(0) + \frac{m-n}{m} E^+(\theta')$$

It follows that

$$\frac{d\bar{\theta}}{d\psi} = \left( \frac{m-n}{m} \right) \left( \frac{dE^+(\theta')}{d\psi} \right) + \left( \frac{d\frac{n}{m}}{d\psi} \right) (E^+(\theta') - E^+(0))$$

By the same argument as in the proof of Proposition 1, (2) implies that, if  $\lambda = 0$  or  $\lambda = 1$ , then  $dr/d\psi = 0$ . This and the fact that  $r$  is continuously differentiable in  $\lambda$  implies that, for  $\lambda$  close to 0 or close to 1

$$\frac{d\bar{\theta}}{d\psi} \approx \frac{m-n}{m} \left( \frac{dE^+(\theta')}{d\psi} \right) \quad (3)$$

As shown in the proof of Proposition 1,  $p$  is increasing in  $\psi$  and  $\theta'$  is decreasing in  $p$ . It follows that  $\theta'$  is decreasing in  $\psi$ , and so the right-hand side of (3) is negative.

A similar argument holds for variation in  $\lambda$ . ■