- 1. we looked at capacity limits in Bertrand
- 2. related goods §3.3.3 and Bertrand

math tedious and parameters don't contribute to intuition

key is that can take reaction curve approach:

if firm 1 raised p₁ **then** firm 2 will raise p₂ as well

therefore the reaction curve will have a positive slope

hence they will intersect at some p > MC

hence presence of substitutes mutes competition

- 3. Herfindahl: variation on our profit margin calculation:
 - $(p c_{avg})/p = H / \epsilon$ where we look at the weighted average of costs to think about profit margins
 - \Rightarrow H is sum of squares of shares. measure of market concentration.

HHI (Herfindahl-Hirschman Index as alternate jargon)

widely used, value ranges from 1.0 (monopoly) 0.5 (symmetric duopoly) and so on.

larger firms sway value more than do (many) smaller firms.

one firm with a 90% market share with 10 rivals with 1% each gives H = 0.811

one firm with a 90% market share and 1 rivals with 10% gives H = 0.82

4. n-opoly

 $p = a - b(q + nq^*)$ so looks like our duopoly

 $c = MR = a - 2bq - bnq^* \Rightarrow firm level \Rightarrow q^* = (a-c)/2b - nq^*/2$

so $q^* = (a-c)/b(n+1)$ and industry $Q^* = nq^* = n(a-c)/b(n+1)$

and $p^* = a - n(a-c)/(n+1)$ and $p^* - c = (a - c) - n(a-c)/(n+1) = (a-c)/(n+1)$

thus firm $\pi^* = (p^*-c)q^* = (a-c)^2/(n+1)^2b$

we need this result to analyze horizontal mergers

note that $n \to \infty \Rightarrow p \to perfect$ competition level with $\pi \to 0$. it would be most uncomfortable if our model didn't suggest that an industry with a large number of firms looks almost like perfect competition!