

Entry and Regulation – Evidence from Health Care Professions *

Catherine Schaumans

K.U.Leuven

Frank Verboven

K.U.Leuven and C.E.P.R.

January 2006

Abstract

The health care professions have been subject to substantial entry and conduct regulation. Most notably, pharmacies frequently receive high regulated markups over wholesale costs, and are protected from additional competition through geographic entry restrictions. We develop an entry model to study the direct impact of the regulations on the pharmacies, and the indirect impact on the physicians who provide related services. We study the case of Belgium, which is representative for many other European countries with geographic entry restrictions. We find that the entry decisions of pharmacies and physicians are strategic complements. Furthermore, the entry restrictions have directly reduced the number of pharmacies by more than 50%, and indirectly reduced the number of physicians by about 7%. A policy analysis shows that a removal of the entry restrictions, combined with a large reduction in the regulated markups (by between 10–18%, down from the current 28%) would lead to a large shift in rents to consumers, without reducing the geographic coverage of pharmacies throughout the country. These findings show that the public interest motivation for the current regime has no empirical support. Our findings are also relevant in light of the renewed attention by competition authorities to liberalize professional regulation.

Keywords: Entry, regulation, professional services.

JEL-codes: I11, K21, L10, L43.

* *Acknowledgments:* We thank Jan Boone, Hans Degryse, David Genesove, Erik Schokkaert, Patrick Van Cayseele, Joel Waldfogel and seminar participants at various places for helpful comments. We gratefully acknowledge financial support by the Flemish Science Foundation (FWO, Research Grant no. G.0089.04) and a K.U.Leuven Onderzoekstoelage (OT).

Contact: Department of Economics, K.U.Leuven, Naamsestraat 69, B-3000 Leuven, Belgium.
catherine.schaumans@econ.kuleuven.be; frank.verboven@econ.kuleuven.be.

1 Introduction

Professional or occupational regulation has been a widespread phenomenon in many countries. It consists of a variety of measures affecting entry, such as minimum standards of competency and geographic entry restrictions, and additional measures stipulating conduct, e.g. price and advertising. While the U.S. courts started to more consistently apply their antitrust laws to professional services after a Supreme Court Decision in 1975 (Wise (2000)), important exceptions remain. For example, in the taxicab market many cities still fix fares and restrict entry through tradable medallions (Viscusi et al. (2005)). In Europe, the tolerance towards the anti-competitive effects of professional regulation has continued, as illustrated by the practices of accountants, engineers, lawyers, pharmacies and notaries. Only very recently, the European Commission has shown an interest in making the practices in line with competition policy rules.¹ The economic debate on the desirability of professional regulation is still ongoing. Proponents have emphasized the presence of various kinds of market failures, but critical assessors have pointed out that many of the regulations essentially serve to protect the professions' private interests. Perhaps one point of consensus is that the effects of entry and conduct regulation should be assessed simultaneously.

The health care professions in Europe provide an interesting case to study these effects. Physicians and pharmacies supply essential services to patients, and their activities have been heavily regulated. Both professions are subject to strict conduct regulation, with regulated fees or markups and bans on most types of advertising. In addition, the number of pharmacies is restricted on a geographic basis in many countries. These regulations have been commonly motivated to be in the public interest because of market failures in the provision of health care services. In particular, the high fixed markups to pharmacies and their geographic entry restrictions have been defended to ensure a minimum availability of supply in the less profitable regions, without inducing excessive entry elsewhere. The private interest view challenges these motivations, arguing that the regulations are anti-competitive and have no beneficial effects to other parties. In a detailed report, the U.K.'s Office of Fair Trading (2003) concluded that free entry by pharmacies in the U.K. would benefit consumers. The O.E.C.D. (2000) obtained similar conclusions based on the experiences in a larger set of countries, but also emphasized that a holistic view be taken. For example, simply introducing free entry of pharmacies without any accompanying measures would likely create (or strengthen) excessive entry because of the currently high regulated markups.

¹This interest is evident from Paterson et al.'s (2003) extensive report for the European Commission, describing the state of professional regulation in Europe. This report subsequently led to an official Communication, COM (2004) 83, showing the Commission's commitment to liberalize the professions.

In this paper, we look at the health care professions to shed new light on the effects of entry and conduct regulation. To evaluate the public interest motivation of the current regime, we develop an econometric model of entry by two types of professions: pharmacies and physicians (defined as general practitioners). Extending previous entry models of Bresnahan and Reiss (1991) and Mazzeo (2002), the model accounts for two key features that are specific to this market. First, entry is not free as geographic entry restrictions apply to pharmacies. Second, both professions are strategically interdependent: their entry decisions may be either strategic complements or strategic substitutes. The entry model can be used to draw inferences about competitive interaction, both within and between the professions. In addition, it allows us to assess to which extent the entry restrictions have limited the number of firms, either directly (pharmacies) or indirectly (physicians).

We apply the model to a data set for Belgium, which is representative for many other countries with geographic entry restrictions. The data contain information on the number of pharmacies and physicians per market (town), and the corresponding demographic characteristics in 2001. Regarding competitive interaction, we find that entry into one profession has a positive effect on the profitability of entry into the other profession, i.e. the entry decisions by firms of different professions are strategic complements. Furthermore, entry does not lead to intensified (non-price) competition among firms of the same profession. Regarding the geographic entry restrictions, we find that they have substantially limited the number of firms. A simple removal of all geographic entry restrictions without any accompanying measures would more than double the number of pharmacies, and also indirectly increase the number of physicians by about 7% (due to the strategic complementarities). If a full removal of the entry restrictions would be combined with an absolute reduction in the pharmacies' regulated gross markups by between 10–18% (down from the current 28%), the total number of pharmacies in the country would remain constant and the local geographic coverage (i.e. the number of markets with at least one pharmacy) would essentially remain the same. In sum, we find that a new regime with free entry and reduced markups can lead to a large shift in rents to consumers (tax payers) without the risk of reducing the availability of supply.² This strongly indicates that the current regime of restricted entry and high regulated markups protects the private interests of pharmacies rather than the public interest.

There is a small related empirical literature on free entry and social inefficiency. Berry and Waldfogel (1999) show how free entry of radio stations can be inefficient in an imperfectly competitive market. Hsieh and Moretti (2003) look at real estate agents, and document the

²We also draw conclusions on a partial removal of the entry restrictions. This may be a politically more realistic policy option that better respects the large sunk investments to obtain the licenses as incurred by the pharmacies.

inefficiency of free entry in a market with fixed regulated markups.³ In contrast to these studies, we concentrate on a case of restricted entry. In principle, given that markups are regulated at a distortionary high level, it may be socially desirable to introduce a second distortion and restrict entry. However, our analysis shows how a *combined* policy of loosening the entry restrictions and lowering the markups may improve welfare. On the one hand, it does not reduce local geographic coverage throughout the country, and on the other hand, it leads to large shifts in rents from pharmacies to consumers. In the concluding section, we come back to the question whether these shifts in rents are beneficial.

Our analysis also relates to the U.S. literature on occupational licensing. This is a weaker form of professional regulation, with less extreme entry restrictions in the form of minimum standards of competency; see Kleiner’s (2000) overview. The evidence on the effects of such entry restrictions has been mixed. Some studies find that professional licensing may raise prices or earnings in specific cases, e.g. Kleiner and Kudrle (2000) for dentists, and Kleiner (2000) and Pagliero (2004) for lawyers, thus supporting the private interest view.⁴ Other studies however find evidence in favor of the public interest view. Most notably, Law and Kim (2004) undertook a comprehensive historical study on the introduction of educational licensing during the late nineteenth and early twentieth century in the U.S. They find that professional licensing has not effectively restricted entry into professions in general (and in the one exception where it did, there was no effect on earnings). In contrast with this literature, we look at the effects of more stringent entry regulations, i.e. geographic entry restrictions, and we show how this can be studied naturally within an empirical model of entry. At least in this case, we find unambiguous support that the geographic entry restrictions are not in the public interest. Hence, our results point out that professional regulation beyond pure occupational licensing should be considered with extreme care.

The paper is organized as follows. Section 2 discusses the markets of pharmacies and physicians, with the entry and conduct regulations, and introduces the data set. Section 3 presents the econometric entry model and section 4 discusses the empirical results. Section 5 discusses the implications for policy reform and section 6 concludes.

³For a theoretical analysis of the conditions under which free entry may be socially inefficient, see for example Mankiw and Whinston (1986).

⁴A variant of the private interest view on regulation is that it serves the regulators’ interest (rather than the industry’s). Djankov, La Porta, Lopez-de-Silanes, and Shleifer (2002) find evidence from a comparison between 85 countries that entry restrictions mainly benefit politicians and bureaucrats.

2 The markets of pharmacies and physicians

Health care markets are subject to extensive regulation in most countries. The regulations have often been motivated by efficiency considerations; Dranove and Satterwaite (2000) provide an overview of the various market failures associated with the supply of basic health care services. In addition, equity concerns and private interests have often been invoked to explain the government interventions. In this section we provide a selective overview of the health care markets in which the pharmacies and physicians operate in Belgium. We focus on those elements that motivate our econometric model. We begin with a discussion of the entry process, including the presence of geographic entry restrictions on the pharmacies as imposed by the Belgian government. We next discuss the general economic and regulatory factors influencing the nature of competitive interaction within and between the two professions. Finally, we provide descriptive statistics of our collected data set, documenting some of the discussion and introducing our subsequent econometric analysis.

2.1 Entry and geographic restrictions

Both pharmacies and physicians need to satisfy minimum educational standards. Otherwise, their services are not covered by the health insurance companies, and a different professional title must be used. Physicians, which we define as general practitioners (as opposed to specialists), need to obtain a university degree in medical sciences. Until recently, every high school graduate was eligible to start this degree. Since 1998, there is an introductory examination at the start of the first year in one region of the country (Flanders) to restrict the number of incoming students. However, this potential entry restriction is irrelevant for our empirical analysis, which covers the year 2001 (i.e. before the 1998 incoming students graduated). In practice, only a minority of the students (about 25%) with a medical degree choose to become a physician (in the sense of a general practitioner). Other employment opportunities are to become a specialist, an occupational health officer, an expert for the health insurer, etc. For practical purposes it is thus reasonable to think of a fairly large pool of individuals satisfying the minimum educational standards required to become a physician. There are no essential further restrictions to setting up a physician's practice.⁵ In particular, a physician can choose to locate an establishment anywhere in Belgium. According to the WIV, the majority of physicians (about 78%) currently operate as a single-person establishment.

⁵There are some requirements of secondary importance. First, the Medical Committee needs to certify the medical degree and the applicant has to enroll with the medical association, the so-called "Order of Physicians". Second, it is necessary to register at the National Institute of Health Insurance (RIZIV), so that the medical consultation services to consumers can be covered by the health insurance companies.

In recent years, there has been a development to form associations of several physicians, but these are considerably less developed than in other countries.

Pharmacies also need to satisfy minimum educational standards.⁶ A university degree in pharmaceutical sciences provides the right to independently prepare and sell drugs in an existing establishment. However, in contrast to the physicians' case, this degree is not sufficient to entitle one to set up a new establishment. Since 1974, there exists an establishment act, imposing geographic entry restrictions on the number of pharmacies. Many other European countries have adopted similar acts. The most comparable population-based establishment acts exist in Finland, France and Portugal; other countries with geographic entry restrictions include Spain, Italy and the U.K.⁷ The act stipulates that there should be no more than one pharmacy per 2,000 inhabitants in small municipalities (with fewer than 7,500 inhabitants); no more than one pharmacy per 2,500 inhabitants in intermediate municipalities (with a number of inhabitants between 7,500 and 30,000); and no more than one pharmacy per 3,000 inhabitants in the larger municipalities. For example, in a municipality with 6,000 inhabitants, there can be no more than one pharmacy per 2,000 inhabitants, implying that there can be at most 3 pharmacies. The act provides slightly more lenient, i.e. lower threshold population levels if the physical distance between a new candidate pharmacy and any incumbent is sufficient large. Because of the establishment act, people with a university degree in pharmaceutical studies have only two ways to start an independent pharmacy: either apply for a new establishment at a location where the entry restrictions are not yet binding, or buy an existing pharmacy from an incumbent. The latter is the more common event; it is often a transaction between an incumbent who has reached retirement age and a candidate pharmacist who has obtained several years of experience in the same or in another pharmacy.⁸

2.2 Competitive interaction

We first discuss the geographic dimension, showing that competitive interaction essentially takes place at the local level. Next, we discuss the relevant institutional factors determining the (local) competitive interaction within each of the professions and between the two professions.

⁶For a more detailed discussion on the regulation of pharmacies in Belgium, we refer to Philipsen (2003).

⁷The UK has geographic entry restrictions due to the presence of NHS dispensing contracts.

⁸The average number of pharmacists (with a university degree) working in a pharmacy is 1.5. Hence, as in the physicians' case, most pharmacies operate as single-person establishments.

Competitive interaction at the geographic level

Consistent with earlier health care studies, it is reasonable to define the relevant geographic markets at the town level. The population within each town is typically concentrated around the center, with the exception of the densely populated urban areas, which we will exclude from our sample. As will be discussed below, both physicians and pharmacies cannot engage in advertising or other active promotional selling activities, so that it is reasonable to expect that the patients' choices are largely guided by local information. Survey evidence indicates that the majority of patients do indeed not travel outside their town to visit a physician. In the Netherlands, a country with similar demographic characteristics as Belgium, 85% of the patients travel less than 5 kilometers, which usually falls within the geographic boundaries of the town. Furthermore, 94% of the Belgian patients have a single fixed physician, which is conceivably located close to the patient's home. For the pharmacies, a recent study by the OFT (2003) finds that only 6% of the patients visit their pharmacy while commuting to work, further confirming the local nature of competitive interaction.

Competitive interaction within each of the two professions

Physicians provide medical consultations on a fee-for-service basis. A fixed price is negotiated between the government and the health insurer. Physicians are free to charge a higher price, but the social insurance companies do not reimburse patients for the extra price. In practice, only 15% of the physicians have not signed the fixed price agreement. Self-regulation traditionally prevented physicians from competing through advertising, though in recent years and under pressure of the European Commission there has been an increased tolerance towards informative advertising. While price and advertising competition have traditionally been quite limited, physicians have a broad range of other instruments to compete for patients: availability (consultation hours, waiting times and possibility to make appointment), quality and time spent on medical consultations (which can show a large variation among physicians), and willingness to provide medical prescriptions and sick-days.

Pharmacies have the exclusive right to sell drugs. In contrast to most other countries, this exclusivity applies to both prescribed drugs and over-the-counter (OTC) drugs. The prices of drugs are fixed by the Ministry of Economic Affairs, after negotiations with the pharmaceutical companies and the pharmacies' association. The pharmacies obtain a fixed margin of 31% of the drug price, up to a ceiling of 7.44€ per package; this implies an effective margin of 28% (de Bruyn (1994)). Consequently, for most products there is essentially no price competition.⁹ Advertising has until recently also been prevented due to self-regulation

⁹There is, however, some price competition for the pharmacists' own preparations and for some other general care products (such as cosmetics). But since these constitute a small fraction of overall sales, the

by the pharmacies' association, but there are various potential non-price instruments: availability (opening hours), quality of service and advice, and the supply of an assortment of general care products.

To summarize, competition among physicians and among pharmacies has until recently been limited with respect to price and advertising instruments, but they have a variety of other instruments at their disposal to compete for patients.

Competitive interaction between the two professions

The two professions' core services are potentially strong complements: physicians provide medical consultations and prescribe drugs, while pharmacies are responsible for selling the drugs. As a result, the nearby presence of one profession could strongly benefit the other profession (since geographic proximity matters, as we discussed above). The degree of complementarity is however not perfect and it may actually be asymmetric: not all consultations end with a prescription, and several drugs can be sold by pharmacies without a prescription. If patients would often visit the physician without a subsequent visit to the pharmacy (because no drug was prescribed), then the presence of a pharmacy would only have a small impact on the physicians' profit. Hence, pharmacies would only be weak complements to physicians. Similarly, if patients would often visit a pharmacy without a preceding visit to the physician (because the drug requires no prescription or was prescribed by a specialist), then physicians would only be weak complements to pharmacies. The degree of complementarity is therefore an empirical question. The above study by the OFT (2003) suggests there is a strong complementary link between both professions: up to 47% of U.K. patients go to the pharmacy immediately after having visited their physician.

While the professions' core services are complementary, they regularly operate on each other domain, so that they may also be viewed as providing substitute services. This has led to many conflicts between pharmacies and physicians.¹⁰ In addition to providing medical advice, physicians frequently offer free drugs to their patients, obtained from the pharmaceutical companies as a way to promote their products. The pharmacies do not oppose to such drug promotions *per se*, but they claim that the distribution should remain the exclusive right of the pharmacies. Conversely, pharmacies also provide services that are in the physicians' domain. They offer an increasing amount of independent medical advice to patients when selling their drugs. This development has actually been actively promoted by the European Commission: in the near future, pharmacies will be partly rewarded on a fee-

overall extent of price competition is limited, just as in the physicians' case.

¹⁰An interesting discussion of the conflicts arising from competition between physicians and pharmacies is provided in an article of the Belgian newspaper *De Standaard* (08/06/2004), with the self-explanatory translated title "Why physicians want to sell drugs, and pharmacies want to provide medical consultations."

for-service basis, rather than as a percentage of their sales, giving them additional incentives to provide medical advice; they will also obtain the right to substitute the prescribed drugs by equivalent but less expensive generic alternatives.

In sum, while the professions' core services are complementary, they often operate on each others' domain, so that they may also be viewed as providing substitute services. Our empirical framework will investigate in detail the question as to whether and to which extent the professions provide complementary or substitute services.

The above discussion has largely focused on the demand-side factors influencing the extent of competitive interaction. In principle, competitive interaction may also stem from supply side factors. For example, pharmacies and physicians may generate knowledge spillovers and learning effects, which can affect both their variable and fixed costs. The health care literature we have surveyed has however not put emphasis on these sources of competitive interaction, so we will interpret our empirical findings below as largely stemming from demand-side sources.

2.3 Overview of the data

An overview of the data documents part of the above discussion, and introduces our subsequent econometric analysis. The data set contains information on 1 136 markets in 2001, defined at the town-level motivated by our earlier discussion of the relevant geographic markets. To reduce potential problems with overlapping markets, we do not include urban towns, which are defined by a population density of more than 800 per km² or a population of more than 15 000. This reduces our sample of towns to 847.¹¹ We have information on the number of active pharmacies and physicians per market.¹² We combine this with information on the demographic characteristics of each market.¹³

Table 1 presents counts of the observed market configurations, which we will model in our econometric analysis. For example, there are 142 markets with no pharmacies or physicians, and 58 markets with one pharmacy and two physicians. There are also several market configurations that never occur, e.g. three physicians and more than three pharmacies. More generally, the table shows that there is a quite strong correlation between the number of

¹¹We also did our empirical analysis based on the full sample of 1,136 towns, and obtained similar conclusions.

¹²This information is from RIZIV (the National Institute of Health Insurance). In accordance with RIZIV, a physician is defined as a general practitioner who has more than 49 patients and has annually more than 199 consultations, of which more than 0.9% are house visits.

¹³The demographic characteristics were provided by the NIS (National Institute of Statistics), Ecodata (Federal Government Agency for Economics), and the RSZ (the National Institute of Social Security)

pharmacies and physicians; the correlation coefficient is 0.85. This strong correlation may be due to common observed and unobserved factors influencing the profitability of pharmacies and physicians. However, our discussion above suggested that the correlation may also be due to the fact that both professions provide complementary services. Our econometric analysis is able to distinguish between these alternative possibilities.

The final row shows the percentage of all markets (broken down by the number of pharmacies), in which the geographic entry restriction imposed on the pharmacies is binding, in the sense that no additional pharmacies are allowed to enter by the establishment act. This will be important in our empirical analysis. The entry restrictions are binding for 82.3% of all the markets. Binding entry restrictions occur the least frequently in markets with two established pharmacies, but even here the percentage is quite large (74.7%). Note that when entry restrictions are binding, establishment act may sometimes be violated. This is due to historical factors, since many pharmacies were set up in anticipation of the act, and these pharmacies were not forced to shut down at the moment the act was introduced.¹⁴ However, the excess number of pharmacies is generally small in these cases, and it is in any case not relevant for our econometric framework below.

table 1

Table 2 provides summary statistics on the demographic variables, which may affect the profitability of both professions. We include information on population size, the percentage of young people (under the age of 18), the percentage of elderly (over the age of 65), the percentage of foreigners, the unemployment rate, mean income, and a dummy variable to account for structural differences between the region of Flanders and Wallonia.

table 2

3 The entry model

Our entry model fits in the recent empirical entry literature, as initiated by Bresnahan and Reiss (1990, 1991) and Berry (1992). This literature models entry as a strategic game, and aims to draw inferences about unobserved payoffs – a latent variable – from the equilibrium relationship between the observed market structure and market characteristics, such as market size. Our own model is a static one, in the spirit of Mazzeo (2001); for dynamic entry models see Pakes, Ostrovsky and Berry (2005) and their review of other recent work.

¹⁴In some cases a violation of the entry restrictions may be due to an exception clause in the act, which allows an additional entry under certain circumstances (population and distance of existing pharmacies).

Mazzeo distinguishes between two types of substitute firms, and he models the total number of firms of each type as the (unique) equilibrium outcome of a strategic free entry game. We extend the static entry literature in two respects. First, we account for the fact that entry may not be free, i.e. there may be binding entry restrictions for one of the two types of firms. Second, we allow for the possibility that the entry decisions of firms of different types are either strategic complements or strategic substitutes, since neither possibility can be ruled out *a priori* in our case.¹⁵

3.1 Payoffs

There are two types of firms, $i = 1, 2$, with a large pool of firms for each type. In our application, firms of type 1 are pharmacies, and firms of type 2 are physicians. Each firm decides whether or not to enter the market. The entry decisions can be summarized by the total number of firms of each type entering the market, as denoted by the random variable n_i . Equilibrium realizations of this random variable are denoted by \bar{n}_i . Firms of type 1 are subject to an entry restriction $n_1 \leq \bar{n}_1$, i.e. in each market there cannot be more than \bar{n}_1 firms. This is determined by population criteria, as discussed in section 2. If $n_1 < \bar{n}_1$, the entry restriction is not binding in equilibrium; if $n_1 = \bar{n}_1$ the entry restriction is binding.

Firms of the same type are identical, i.e. they have the same payoff functions. If a firm of either type does not enter, its payoffs are zero. If a firm of type i enters, its payoffs depend on the total number of entering firms of both types, as given by:

$$\pi_i^*(n_1, n_2) = \pi_i(n_1, n_2) - \epsilon_i \quad (1)$$

where $\pi_i(n_1, n_2)$ is the deterministic component of payoffs, and ϵ_i is a random component, unobserved to the econometrician. The precise relationship between the payoffs and the number of firms of each type reflects the nature of competitive interaction. Our main assumption is that entry decisions by firms of the same type are strategic substitutes, i.e. when one firm decides to enter, the payoffs from entry by another firm of the same type decreases. This amounts to assuming that payoffs are decreasing in the number of firms of the same type.

¹⁵Previous work has not considered the possibility that entry is restricted. As far as we know, it has also not considered the possibility of strategic complements within an equilibrium entry model. One interesting paper is Cohen and Mazzeo (2005), who investigate whether branch investments are strategic complements based on an alternative approach. In their setting the branching decision is a discrete variable that may take more than two values. This substantially increases the dimension of the problem, making it computationally difficult to develop the equilibrium conditions for the number of branches. As an alternative, they therefore specify reaction functions for the branching decisions (accounting for endogeneity of the rivals' choices).

Assumption 1. (Entry decisions by firms of the same type are strategic substitutes)

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_1(n_1 + 1, n_2) &\geq \pi_1(n_1, n_2) \\ \pi_2(n_1, n_2 + 1) &\geq \pi_2(n_1, n_2) \end{aligned}$$

This assumption is consistent with the previous empirical entry literature, and is central to characterize the Nash equilibrium outcomes below.

Regarding firms of different types, we do not make *a priori* assumptions as to whether their entry decisions are strategic substitutes, strategic complements, or independent. Our background discussion on competitive interaction in section 2 made it clear that this is ultimately an empirical question in the case of pharmacies and physicians. Mazzeo (2001) and subsequent entry contributions have considered the case in which the entry decisions by firms of different types are strategic substitutes, implying that payoffs are not only decreasing in the number of firms of the own type, but also in the number of firms of the other type (though to a lesser extent). Since the alternative case of strategic complements has not been studied before, and since this is also what we will find empirically, we concentrate the exposition in the text on this case. In the Appendix, we describe the case in which the entry decisions by firms of different types are strategic substitutes.¹⁶

The case in which entry decisions by firms of different types are strategic complements or independent may be summarized as follows.

Assumption 2. (Entry decisions by firms of different types are strategic complements or independent)

$$\begin{aligned} \text{(a)} \quad \pi_1(n_1, n_2) &\leq \pi_1(n_1, n_2 + 1) \\ \pi_2(n_1, n_2) &\leq \pi_2(n_1 + 1, n_2) \\ \text{(b)} \quad \pi_1(n_1 + 1, n_2 + 1) &\geq \pi_1(n_1, n_2) \\ \pi_2(n_1 + 1, n_2 + 1) &\geq \pi_2(n_1, n_2) \end{aligned}$$

Assumption 2 (a) states that payoffs are either increasing or independent of the number of firms of the other type, so that the entry decisions by firms of different types are (weak) strategic complements. Assumption 2 (b) says that the extent of strategic complementarity between firms of different types is weaker than the extent of strategic substitutability between firms of the same type. Hence, payoffs decrease when there is an additional firm of both the own type and the other type.¹⁷

¹⁶It is also possible that the entry decisions by firms of different types are sometimes strategic complements, and sometimes strategic substitutes. We do not consider these mixed possibilities.

¹⁷Strictly speaking, we only require one of the pair of inequalities in Assumption 2 (b) to be strict.

Based on these assumptions, we can now derive the equilibrium number of firms and the implied likelihood function to be taken to the data. In the empirical analysis, we will verify whether these assumptions are indeed satisfied at the obtained parameter estimates and confront this with the alternative case in which entry decisions by firms of different types are strategic substitutes.

3.2 Equilibrium with nonbinding entry restrictions

When entry restrictions are not binding, i.e. $\alpha_1 = -1$, each firm freely decides whether or not to enter, given the entry decisions of the other firms. As is well-known, there are many pure-strategy Nash equilibria in this entry game. Bresnahan and Reiss (1990) resolve this problem in two alternative ways. First, they aggregate the non-unique Nash equilibrium outcomes to obtain an econometric model for the total number of firms entering in a Nash equilibrium. In their application in which all firms are substitutes, this yields a unique prediction for the total number of entering firms. Second, they put additional structure to the entry game and assume that firms move sequentially. This alternative approach yields a unique subgame perfect Nash equilibrium at the disaggregate firm level. Mazzeo (2001) can be viewed as a combination of both approaches: he specifies a model for the total number of firms per type entering in a Nash equilibrium, and then refines the Nash equilibrium to obtain a unique prediction for the total number of firms per type.¹⁸ We take a related approach here.

The market configuration (n_1, n_2) is a Nash equilibrium outcome if and only if the random component of profits $\pi = (\pi_1, \pi_2)$ satisfies the following conditions:

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_1(n_1 + 1, n_2) &\leq \pi_1(n_1, n_2) \\ \pi_2(n_1, n_2 + 1) &\leq \pi_2(n_1, n_2) \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

When (2) is satisfied, n_1 firms of type 1, and n_2 of type 2 find it profitable to enter, and no additional firm of either type has an incentive to enter; hence (n_1, n_2) is indeed a Nash equilibrium outcome. Assumption 1 guarantees that there are realizations of π for which (2) holds, so that the market configuration (n_1, n_2) is observed with positive probability.

However, (n_1, n_2) may show multiplicity with other Nash equilibrium outcomes for some realizations of π . This is illustrated in Figure 1. The bold lines delineate the areas of π for which the market configurations $(1, 2)$ and $(2, 3)$ are the Nash equilibrium outcomes. The shaded rectangle is the area of overlap, where both market configurations are Nash equilibrium outcomes. Note that the area of multiplicity would disappear if firms are independent,

¹⁸There have also been alternative approaches to the multiplicity of equilibria in static entry games. Seim (2005) introduces incomplete information to the entry game to obtain uniqueness. Ciliberto and Tamer (2004) draw inference from a class of models rather than refining the equilibrium to obtain a unique prediction.

i.e. if the conditions in Assumption 2(a) hold with equality, so that $\pi_1(2, 2) = \pi_1(2, 3)$ and $\pi_2(1, 3) = \pi_2(2, 3)$. As the extent of complementarity increases, the area of multiplicity increases. Figure 2 shows an extreme case of strong complementarity. In this case, the entire area of θ for which $(1, 2)$ is a Nash equilibrium outcome is a subset of the area of

We assume that firms make their entry decisions sequentially, i.e. after observing all previous entry decisions, and impose the subgame perfect Nash equilibrium refinement.¹⁹ With complementary entry decisions, it is not necessary to make specific assumptions regarding the exact ordering of entry moves. This additional structure makes it possible to assign a unique subgame perfect equilibrium outcome to every realization of θ . Suppose θ is such that both (n_1, n_2) and $(n_1 + 1, n_2 + 1)$ are Nash equilibrium outcomes (with θ a positive or negative integer). The outcome with the fewest number of firms cannot be subgame perfect, since there would then always be an additional firm of one type with an incentive to enter, in anticipation of triggering further entry by a firm of the other type as well. Hence, when there are multiple Nash equilibrium outcomes, the one with the largest number of firms is the unique subgame perfect equilibrium. Making use of our earlier characterization of the multiplicity of Nash equilibrium outcomes, it immediately follows that (n_1, n_2) will be a subgame perfect Nash equilibrium outcome if and only if (i) θ satisfies conditions (2) and (ii) θ does not satisfy conditions (3). This can be illustrated on Figure 1. The market configuration (n_1, n_2) is a subgame perfect Nash equilibrium outcome if and only if θ falls in the relevant area bounded by the bold lines, minus the shaded area in the lower left corner.

Assuming that θ has a bivariate density $f(\cdot)$, it is now possible to derive the probability that the market configuration (n_1, n_2) will be observed as the unique subgame perfect equilibrium outcome when entry restrictions are not binding:

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr(n_1 = n_1, n_2 = n_2) &= \int_{\pi_1(n_1+1, n_2)}^{\pi_1(n_1, n_2)} \int_{\pi_2(n_1, n_2+1)}^{\pi_2(n_1, n_2)} f(n_1, n_2) d n_1 d n_2 \\ &\quad - \int_{\pi_1(n_1+1, n_2)}^{\pi_1(n_1+1, n_2+1)} \int_{\pi_2(n_1, n_2+1)}^{\pi_2(n_1+1, n_2+1)} f(n_1, n_2) d n_1 d n_2 \equiv \Pr(n_1, n_2) \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

3.3 Equilibrium with binding entry restrictions

When the entry restrictions are binding, $n_1 = \bar{n}_1$, the analysis needs to be modified. Essentially, there are some firms of type 1 (pharmacies in our application) that have an incentive to enter but are not able to do so because of the restriction. This has the following immediate

¹⁹This approach is in the spirit of Mazzeo (2002), but adapted to the circumstances of our application to health care professions. Mazzeo assumes that firms can choose their type at or after entering. We instead assume that there is a given pool of entrants of each type. At that point, firms can only make entry decisions and can no longer choose to change their type. This yields somewhat different conditions for selecting the unique subgame perfect equilibrium outcome.

implication. From the market configuration (n_1, n_2) it is no longer possible to infer that entry by $n_1 + 1$ firms would be unprofitable. Hence, with binding entry restrictions the market configuration (n_1, n_2) is a Nash equilibrium outcome if and only if θ satisfies the following conditions:

$$\begin{aligned} \theta_1 &\leq \theta_1(n_1, n_2) \\ \theta_2(n_1, n_2 + 1) &\leq \theta_2(n_1, n_2) \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

For firms of type 2 these conditions are still the same as in (2). For firms of type 1 they are different, since it is no longer possible to infer a lower bound on profits from observing (n_1, n_2) . This actually simplifies the problem of multiple Nash equilibrium outcomes. With nonbinding entry restrictions, we showed that (n_1, n_2) may only show multiplicity with Nash equilibrium outcomes of the form $(n_1 + k, n_2 + k)$, with k either a positive or a negative integer. When the entry restrictions are binding, it is immediately obvious that there can no longer be such multiplicity for positive integers k . Hence, (n_1, n_2) can only have multiplicity with equilibria of the form $(n_1 + k, n_2 + k)$, for negative integers k . However, similar to the case of nonbinding entry restrictions, the equilibrium with the fewer number of firms cannot be selected as the subgame perfect Nash equilibrium. Hence, with binding entry restrictions on firms of type 1, the market configuration (n_1, n_2) is the unique subgame perfect Nash equilibrium if and only if θ satisfies (5).

The probability of observing the market configuration (n_1, n_2) as the subgame perfect Nash equilibrium when entry restrictions are binding, i.e. when $\theta_1 = \theta_1^*$, is therefore:

$$\Pr(\theta_1 = \theta_1^*, \theta_2 = \theta_2) = \int_{-\infty}^{\pi_1(\bar{n}_1, n_2)} \int_{\pi_2(\bar{n}_1, n_2 + 1)}^{\pi_2(\bar{n}_1, n_2)} \theta(n_1, n_2) d\theta_1 d\theta_2 \equiv \theta^-(n_1, n_2) \quad (6)$$

3.4 Econometric specification

We can now specify the likelihood function for our sample of observations on market configurations and the corresponding market characteristics. We suppress a market subscript indexing the unit of observation. In both the case of nonbinding and binding entry restrictions, there is a unique subgame perfect equilibrium outcome for every possible realization of θ . Hence, the probabilities of observing a market configuration, as derived by (4) and (6), can be sensibly used to construct the likelihood function. Defining a dummy variable $\theta = 1$ if $\theta_1 = \theta_1^*$ and $\theta = 0$ otherwise, the contribution to the likelihood function of a representative observed market configuration is:

$$C = \theta(n_1, n_2) + \theta^-(n_1, n_2)(1 - \theta) \quad (7)$$

where the probability terms are defined above by (4) and (6). We use the subscript in C to emphasize that the likelihood contributions entering the likelihood function have been derived under the assumption that the entry decisions of firms of different types are strategic complements. In the Appendix, we consider the alternative possibility of strategic substitutes, and derive the corresponding likelihood contributions, π_S . We will estimate both alternative models, and subsequently verify whether the assumptions are met at the obtained parameter estimates.

Specify the density $\phi(\cdot)$ as the bivariate normal density, with a parameter ρ measuring the correlation between ϵ_1 and ϵ_2 . There are some interesting special cases of this model. First, if firms of different types are independent, the second term in (4) vanishes, so that the model reduces to a bivariate ordered probit model with censoring, where the censoring refers to observations where the entry restrictions are binding. Second, if in addition the entry restriction is not binding for any observation, the model reduces to a uncensored bivariate ordered probit model. Third, if the correlation parameter $\rho = 0$, we end up with two traditional ordered probit models, one for each type, as estimated by Bresnahan and Reiss (1991) and several subsequent contributions. In the empirical analysis, we will also present the results from the first two special cases and compare it with the general model.

It remains to specify the payoff function entering the likelihood function through the probabilities (4) and (6). There are two economic interpretations of the payoffs $\pi_i^*(\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2)$, both with the required property that a firm would enter if and only if $\pi_i^*(\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2) \geq 0$. In a direct interpretation payoffs are simply profits, i.e. variable profits minus fixed costs. We adopt an appealing alternative interpretation here, similar to Genesove (2001). Define a firm's profits as $\Pi_i^*(\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2) = \epsilon_i(\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2) \exp(-\epsilon_i) - \epsilon_i(\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2)$, where $\epsilon_i(\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2)$ is variable profits, $\epsilon_i(\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2)$ is fixed costs, and ϵ_i is a multiplicative error term capturing unobserved variable profits or fixed costs. Firms enter if and only if $\Pi_i^*(\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2) \geq 0$, or equivalently if and only if

$$\pi_i^*(\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2) = \ln(\epsilon_i(\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2) / \epsilon_i(\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2)) - \epsilon_i \geq 0 \quad (8)$$

Hence, we can interpret a firm's payoffs $\pi_i^*(\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2)$ as the log of the variable profits to fixed costs ratio. Consider the following linear specification, in which all variables have the interpretation of affecting the log of the variable profits to fixed costs ratio:

$$\pi_i^*(\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2) = \alpha_i \ln(\epsilon) + \beta_i - \frac{j}{i} + \frac{k}{i} - \epsilon_i \quad (9)$$

The variable ϵ is market size, measured by the number of consumers (population), ϵ is a vector of other observed market characteristics, such as average income, percentage of elderly, and α_i and β_i are the corresponding type-specific parameters. The parameters $\frac{j}{i}$

and γ_i^k are fixed effects for type k when there are, respectively, j_i firms of the own type and k_i firms of the other type.

The fixed effects γ_i^j are similar to the “cut-values” in simple ordered probit models, and measure the effect of j_i firms of the own type on payoffs. The fixed effects γ_i^k measure the effect of k_i firms of the other type on payoffs, and reflect the extent of complementarity between the entry decisions of different types. One may reasonably expect the complementarity effect to be stronger when there are few firms of the own type. We incorporate this by dividing γ_i^k by the number of firms of the own type j_i . A more general approach would be to specify a full set of fixed effects γ_i^{jk} for every market configuration, instead of the additive specification $\gamma_i^j + \gamma_i^k$. This more general specification would however require a too large number of parameters to be estimated.

As is common in discrete choice models, the scale of the payoffs is not identified. To proceed with estimation, we restrict the standard deviation of ϵ_i , η_i , to be equal to one. This restriction is irrelevant for our empirical analysis in section 4. In section 5, however, we need to identify the scale of the payoffs, so we will then put additional structure on the payoffs.

Apart from the scaling issue, the fixed effects γ_i^j and γ_i^k are not all identified. Let J be the maximum number of firms observed in any market of the own type, and K the maximum number of firms of the other type. The fixed effect parameters entering the model then are $\gamma_i^0, \dots, \gamma_i^{J+1}$ and $\gamma_i^0, \dots, \gamma_i^{K+1}$. To identify the model, set $\gamma_i^0 = -\infty$, $\gamma_i^{J+1} = \infty$, $\gamma_i^1 = 0$, $\gamma_i^0 = 0$, and $\gamma_i^{K+1} = \gamma_i^K$ for each i .²⁰ Assumptions 1 and 2 imply that the model is internally consistent if the estimated fixed effects γ_i^j and γ_i^k entering (9) satisfy the following conditions for all i , j , and k :

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_i^{j+1} &\geq \gamma_i^j \\ \gamma_i^{k+1} &\geq \gamma_i^k \\ \gamma_i^{j+1} - \gamma_i^{k+1} &\geq (\gamma_i^j - \gamma_i^k) + 1 \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

Since we normalized $\gamma_i^1 = 0$ and $\gamma_i^0 = 0$, it also follows that the fixed effects γ_i^j and γ_i^k should all be positive. The first row of inequalities in (10) simply says that an additional firm of the own type decreases the ratio of variable profits over fixed costs.²¹ The second row says that

²⁰With these normalization assumptions, a constant term β_i^0 in the vector β_i is identified. Alternatively, one can normalize this constant term to zero, and estimate α_i^1 .

²¹This is similar to the requirement of the cut-points in traditional ordered probit models. In our case, the condition $\alpha_i^{j+1} > \alpha_i^j$ is a sufficient but not a necessary condition for Assumption 1 to be satisfied. The necessary and sufficient condition is slightly weaker, i.e. $\alpha_i^{j+1} > \alpha_i^j - \gamma_i^k / ((j+1))$. We presented the sufficient condition, since it is easier to interpret in the empirical analysis, and since they were always met anyway.

an additional firm of the other type increases the ratio of variable profits over fixed costs. Finally, the third row says that an additional firm of both types reduces the ratio of variable profits over fixed costs. In the empirical analysis, we will verify whether these conditions are satisfied. If they are, the estimates are consistent with the initial assumptions.

Finally, following Bresnahan and Reiss (1991) we define entry thresholds and entry threshold ratios. We elaborate on these in some more detail, since their interpretation needs additional care in our framework. The entry threshold $\frac{j,k}{i}$ is the market size at which the i -th firm would just be willing to enter, when there are j firms of the other type, i.e. the market size such that the deterministic component of payoffs given by (9) is equal to zero. The per-firm entry threshold ratio is defined as $\frac{j+1,k}{i} = \left(\frac{j+1,k}{i} - \left(\frac{j,k}{i} + 1 \right) \right) \left(\frac{j,k}{i} \right)$, which can be written as:

$$\frac{j+1,k}{i} = \exp \left(\frac{\frac{j+1}{i} - \frac{j}{i}}{i} \right) \left(\frac{1}{i+1} \right) \exp \left(\frac{\frac{k}{i}}{\left(\frac{j}{i} + 1 \right) i} \right) \quad (11)$$

An entry threshold ratio greater than 1 means that the per-firm entry threshold has to increase to support an additional firm. In our framework, this can occur for two reasons. First, as in Bresnahan and Reiss, additional entry may lead to lower margins and hence more intense competition. This “competitive entry” effect is captured by the first two terms in (11). Second, additional entry means that the beneficial effect from complementarity with the other-type firms has to be shared with one more firm. This is captured by the third term in (11). Note that when no other-type firms are present ($j = 0$), then the third term vanishes (since $\frac{0}{i} = 0$), so that the entry threshold ratios then have a clean competitive entry interpretation as in Bresnahan and Reiss. In our empirical analysis, the entry threshold ratios will be useful in two respects. First, they provide a natural starting point for imposing restrictions on the number of fixed effects $\frac{j}{i}$ to be estimated. Second, they are of independent interest in interpreting the empirical results, in particular the estimated fixed effects $\frac{j}{i}$ and $\frac{k}{i}$.

4 Empirical analysis

Our empirical analysis proceeds in two steps. First, we compare the model in which the entry decisions of the different types are strategic complements to the model in which they are strategic substitutes; we find that only the first gives internally consistent parameter estimates. Second, we discuss the parameter estimates of this model in more detail and compare it to special cases, i.e. the bivariate ordered probit model in which different types are independent, with and without censoring for binding entry restrictions.

4.1 Strategic complements or substitutes?

Our first entry model, in which the entry decisions by firms of different types are strategic complements, is given by (7). The second model, in which they are strategic substitutes, is derived in the Appendix. We estimate both models, and verify whether the parameter estimates are internally consistent, i.e. satisfy the implied restrictions (as given by (10) in the case of strategic complements).

We begin with the first model, the case of strategic complements. There may be up to 11 pharmacies and up to 21

4.2 Parameter estimates

Table 3 presents the parameter estimates from three different models. The specification in the first column is an uncensored bivariate probit model. This model assumes that different types are independent (no complementarity, so all $\beta_i^k = 0$), and that there are no binding entry restrictions. This model still allows the unobserved factors influencing the pharmacies' and physicians' payoffs to be correlated (). The specification in the second column is a censored bivariate probit model. It still assumes that different types are independent, but it accounts for the fact that entry restrictions on pharmacies are binding in some of the markets. The specification in the third column is our general entry model, allowing the entry decisions by the different types to be strategic complements and accounting for binding entry restrictions.

A comparison between the first and the second model clearly demonstrates the importance of accounting for the presence of geographic entry restrictions on pharmacies. Several of the parameters change to a substantial extent. A Hausman test confirms that the parameters differ significantly across the two estimators (test-statistic of 531.9). Hence, the consistent model which accounts for the entry restrictions should be preferred. Furthermore, a comparison between the second and the third specification shows that there are significant strategic complementarities between the entry decisions of different types (likelihood ratio test-statistic of 41.78). It is interesting to point out that the correlation parameter ρ is lower in the third specification than in the second. Intuitively, the second specification suggests there is a (small) positive correlation between the unobserved market characteristics affecting the pharmacies' and physicians' payoffs, but this correlation drops once one accounts for the presence of strategic complementarity. We now discuss the parameter estimates of the general entry model in more detail.

table 3

Market size, as measured by population, is the most important market characteristic affecting the pharmacies' and physicians' payoffs. This is consistent with the results from previous entry models, such as Bresnahan and Reiss (1991). In line with expectations, the population's age distribution has an important impact on payoffs. More specifically, the percentage of elderly in a market has a positive and significant effect on both professions' payoffs; the effect is stronger for the pharmacies. The other market characteristics only have a significant effect on the payoffs of one of the two professions. The percentage of foreigners has a negative effect on payoffs, but the effect is significant only in the case of physicians. Physicians do not obtain significantly different payoffs in markets with higher unemployment, whereas pharmacies tend to obtain significantly higher payoffs in such markets, consistent

with other studies showing that the unemployed tend to consume more drugs. Income per capita positively and significantly affects the physicians' payoffs. Finally, there are some regional differences: payoffs to physicians are significantly lower in the region of Flanders than in the other two regions (Brussels and Wallonia). This may be due to either different medical consumption habits or to better alternative employment opportunities in the region of Flanders.

As discussed in the previous section, the entry fixed effects β_i^j and β_i^k all satisfy the conditions given by (10) to have an internally consistent model. More specifically, the own-type effects β_i^j are all positive and show an increasing pattern, as required by the first condition in (10).²⁴ This implies that additional entry by firms of the same type lowers payoffs. The same pattern occurs for the other-type effects β_i^k , satisfying the second condition in (10). This means that additional entry by firms of different types raises payoffs (strategic complementarity). Finally, one can verify that the third condition in (10) is satisfied for all observed market configurations. Intuitively, this means that the extent of complementarity between firms of different types is lower than the extent of substitutability between firms of the same type.

Note that the complementarities implied by other-type effects β_i^k appear to be asymmetric: pharmacies tend to yield larger benefits to physicians than vice versa. As discussed in section 2, such an asymmetry in complementarities could not be ruled out *a priori*. It can be interpreted as follows. On the one hand, a visit to the physician may rather likely result in a prescription and in a subsequent visit to the pharmacy. Hence, physicians tend to benefit strongly from the nearby presence of pharmacies. On the other hand, a visit to the pharmacy may often occur without a preceding visit to the physician (because of over-the-counter drugs, or drugs prescribed by specialists), hence a pharmacy is less dependent on the nearby presence of physicians.

To better interpret the magnitude of the complementarities implied by the other-type effects β_i^k , consider the change in market size required to support k firms when one moves from j to $j+1$ firms of the other type. This can be measured by the ratio $\frac{\beta_i^{j,k+1}}{\beta_i^{j,k}} = \exp(-(\beta_i^{k+1} - \beta_i^k) / \beta_i^j)$. The estimates imply that the market size required to support one pharmacy when a physician is present is only 58% of the required market size when no physician is present (standard error of 14%). Conversely, the market size required to support one physician is not significantly lower in the presence than in the absence of a pharmacy (ratio of 93% with a standard error of 8%). However, the market size required to support one physician in the presence of two pharmacies is only 45% of the required market size in the presence of one pharmacy (standard error of 10%).

²⁴Recall that α_i^1 and γ_i^0 are normalized to zero.

Further insights in the magnitude of the own-type fixed effects γ_i^j can be obtained from the per-firm entry thresholds, as shown in Table 4. They are given by (11) and measure the extent to which the per-firm market size has to increase to support an additional firm of the same type. As discussed above, because there are two types in the model their interpretation is more complicated in our framework than in Bresnahan and Reiss'. If no other-type firm is present ($\gamma = 0$), the entry threshold ratios can still be interpreted as measures of the effect of additional entry on competition. But in the presence of other types, they also capture the extent to which the beneficial effect from complementarity has to be shared with an additional firm.

We therefore concentrate our discussion of Table 4 on the entry threshold ratios in the first column ($\gamma = 0$), which have the standard interpretation of capturing the competitive effects from entry. The numbers show that these entry threshold ratios are generally insignificantly different from 1, for both pharmacies and physicians. To illustrate, the entry threshold ratio for two pharmacies is 1.07 (standard error 0.14), which is insignificantly different from 1: the per-firm market size to support a duopoly of pharmacies is thus insignificantly different from the market size required to support a monopoly pharmacy. The general conclusion from the first column is that additional entry does not appear to imply intensified competition.²⁵ In section 2, we already discussed that neither pharmacies nor physicians can use price or advertising to compete. Our estimates thus imply that both professions do also not appear to use the other non-price instruments (such as quality of service) in response to additional entry. Some caution is however warranted. In general, the entry threshold ratios are only informative about the change in competition in response to entry, but not about the *level* of competition to start with. In principle, it could thus be possible that even monopoly pharmacies and physicians already behave competitively, because of the threat of new entry as in contestable markets. However, at least for the pharmacies, this possibility appears to be rather unlikely. As Table 1 showed, the entry restrictions stemming from the establishment act are binding in the majority of the markets, so that most monopoly pharmacies are effectively protected from the threat of new entry.

As a final point, we discuss the entry threshold ratios in the second and third column of Table 4, which refer to markets in which there are one or two firms of the other type. The ratios are all greater than in the first column, and usually greater than 1. This is due to our finding of significant complementarities: additional entry by a firm of the same type means that the beneficial effect from complementarity has to be shared with that additional firm.

²⁵One may compare the physicians' threshold ratios to those obtained by Bresnahan and Reiss. They find that the effect of a second entrant is strong (threshold ratio of about 2). But additional entrants no longer have significant effects as is the case here (threshold ratios about 1 from the third entrant onwards).

5 Policy reform towards pharmacies

According to the public interest view, high regulated markups have been combined with tight geographic entry restrictions to ensure a sufficient coverage of pharmacies in the less attractive areas, without triggering excessive entry elsewhere. To evaluate whether this view has empirical support, it is therefore necessary to assess the combined effects of both liberalizing entry and reducing the regulated markups.

Our counterfactual analysis essentially proceeds as follows. To account for entry liberalization, we adjust the maximum allowed number of firms \bar{n}_1 upwards by a factor $\Phi \geq 1$. To account for the reduced regulated markups, we adjust the estimated intercept β_0 downwards by an amount $-\beta_1 \ln(\Delta)$, where $\Delta \leq 1$ refers to a given relative reduction in the net markups. We then use the estimated model (the general entry model with strategic complements, last column of Table 3) to make new entry predictions under alternative levels of Φ and Δ . The reader who is not interested in the details of our approach can skip section 5.1, and immediately go to the discussion of the findings in section 5.2.

5.1 Approach

Entry liberalization is modeled by multiplying the maximum allowed number of firms \bar{n}_1 per market by a common factor $\Phi \geq 1$.²⁶ The expected number of type 1 firms (pharmacies) in a given market is then computed as:

$$E(n_1) = \sum_{n_1=1}^{\Phi \bar{n}_1 - 1} (n_1) \beta_1 + \beta_0 (\Phi^{-1}) \Phi^{-1}$$

where (n_1) and β_0 are the marginal probabilities, as obtained from summing the joint probabilities (4) and (6) over all n_2 . A similar expression holds for the expected number of type 2 firms (physicians). If $\Phi = 1$, we obtain the status quo predictions of the expected number of firms under the current regime. If Φ is arbitrarily large, we obtain the predictions when entry becomes completely free. Intermediate values of Φ give predictions for partial liberalization.

Computing the effects of an absolute reduction in the pharmacies' regulated gross markups, currently set at 28%, generally requires information on the pharmacies' variable retail costs

²⁶Equivalently, this amounts to dividing the population threshold criteria set out in the establishment act by this factor Φ .

other than wholesale costs. To avoid this identification issue, we first predict the effects of a relative reduction in the net markups, i.e. the gross markups net of other variable retail costs. More precisely, we consider a drop in the net markups by a given factor Δ , where $0 \leq \Delta \leq 1$, i.e. a drop from μ to $\Delta \mu$. To proceed, we put additional structure on the pharmacies' payoffs $y_i(\mu_1, \mu_2)$, which we interpreted earlier in (8) as the log of the variable profits to fixed costs ratio. Assume that variable profits can be specified as:

$$y_i(\mu_1, \mu_2) = \alpha + \beta_1(\mu_1, \mu_2). \quad (12)$$

where $\beta_1(\mu_1, \mu_2)$ is revenues per consumer. This assumes that the net markups are constant and uniform across markets, and that the variable profits per consumer are independent of the number of consumers n . Both assumptions are reasonable for pharmacies.²⁷ Now specify $\ln(\beta_1(\mu_1, \mu_2) - \beta_1(\mu_1, \mu_2)) = \gamma_1 - \gamma_1^j + \gamma_1^k$, and substitute this and (12) in the payoffs $y_i(\mu_1, \mu_2)$ given by (8). We then essentially obtain our earlier specification (9), where the coefficient on $\ln(\cdot)$ is now restricted to 1, so that the standard deviation of β_1, γ_1 , becomes identified. In other words, based on this additional structure our earlier population coefficient β_1 can be reinterpreted as $1 - \gamma_1$, and our intercept γ_1^0 as $\left(\gamma_1^0 + \ln(\cdot)\right) - \gamma_1$, i.e. as containing the net markup μ . In sum, lowering the pharmacies' net markups from μ to $\Delta \mu$ amounts to uniformly adjusting the intercept γ_1^0 to $\gamma_1^0 + \beta_1 \ln(\Delta)$. The expected number of firms can then be computed as before.

To retrieve the absolute reduction in the regulated gross markup corresponding to the relative reduction in the net markup from μ to $\Delta \mu$, additional information on the variable retail costs other than the wholesale costs is required. A reasonable starting point is to assume that the other variable retail costs are zero, so that $\mu = 1$.²⁸ The absolute reduction in the gross regulated markups is then simply $(\Delta - 1)$, where $\mu = 28\%$. As a robustness check, we will also consider the possibility that there are other variable retail costs, i.e.

. It can be verified that the implied absolute gross markup reduction is then given by $((1 - \mu)(1 - \Delta \mu)) - (\Delta - 1)$. In this formula, we again have $\mu = 28\%$, and we set $\mu = 10\%$ = 18%, i.e. we assume that other variable retail costs amount to 10%.

²⁷Gross markups are regulated at a uniform rate and our empirical results showed no evidence of non-price competition. Furthermore, there are no scale economies in distribution to pharmacies, apart from the fixed costs of setting up a pharmacy.

²⁸The pharmacies' most important other retail costs are labor costs. It is not unreasonable to treat these as fixed, since time spent on servicing patients is essentially fixed during opening hours (in contrast to physicians who spend a variable amount of their time on servicing patients).

5.2 Findings

Table 5 summarizes the entry predictions under alternative regulatory policies towards entry and markups of pharmacies. The results are based on the estimates of the general model with strategic complements (third part of Table 3). We obtain similar results from the model without strategic complements (second part of Table 3 with $\frac{k}{i} = 0$), except that there are of course no indirect effects on the physicians in that case. Table 5 compares three entry regimes: the status quo entry regulation ($\Phi = 1$; panel A), “partial” entry deregulation where the maximum allowed number of pharmacies in each market is doubled ($\Phi = 2$; panel B), and a full free entry situation (Φ large; panel C). We also consider three possible net markups: no change in the markups ($\Delta = 1$; first column), and relative drops of 25% and 50% ($\Delta = 0.75$ and $\Delta = 0.5$; second and third columns). Note that if pharmacies have no other variable retail costs than wholesale costs, these relative net markup reductions amount to absolute reductions in the regulated gross markups by respectively 7% and 14% (down from the initial 28%). On the other hand, if the other variable retail costs are 10%, the net markup reductions correspond to absolute gross markup reductions of 4% and 7.9%.

The first column of Table 5 shows the predictions under the three entry regimes, assuming no changes in markups.²⁹ The total number of pharmacies is predicted to increase from 1454 to 2074 (or +43%) under partial entry deregulation, and to 3035 (or +109%) under full free entry. The current entry restrictions, which Table 1 documented to be binding in more than 80% of the markets, are thus also economically important. Furthermore, the first column shows that entry deregulation would also have indirect effects on the physicians. Their number would increase from 4201 to 4232 (or +1%) under partial entry deregulation, and to 4489 (or +7%) under full free entry. These effects stem from our earlier finding that the entry decisions of pharmacies and physicians are strategic complements. Finally, the first column shows how the geographic coverage of health care services changes after entry deregulation. For example, full free entry would drastically reduce the number of markets in which there is no pharmacy, from 250 to 104.

Policy makers have warned against too simple conclusions regarding the effects of liberalizing entry regulations. According to the public interest view the high regulated markups and tight entry restrictions ensure a sufficient coverage of pharmacies in the less attractive areas, without triggering excessive entry elsewhere. To evaluate this view, it is therefore important to look at the effects of simultaneously liberalizing entry and lowering markups. The second and the third columns of Table 5 show the results. If the net markups are

²⁹The model predicts the status quo outcomes reasonably well. For example, Table 1 showed that there are 246 (154) markets without any pharmacy (physician), whereas the model predicts that there are 250 (142) such markets.

multiplied by factors of 0.75 and 0.5 without liberalizing the entry restrictions (second and third columns of panel A), then the total number of pharmacies drops to respectively 1363 and 1191. The geographic coverage would also decrease. For example, the number of markets without any pharmacy would increase by 12% to 279 if the net markups were lowered by 50%. In contrast, panel B and panel C show that the number of pharmacies would no longer decrease if the markup reductions are accompanied by a sufficient liberalization of the entry restrictions. For example, the number of pharmacies increases from 1454 to 1836 if a 50% net markup reduction is combined with full free entry. Furthermore, geographic coverage is no source of concern under these combined policies: the total number of markets without any pharmacy always drops. Even if a net markup reduction of 50% is combined with partial entry deregulation, the number of markets without a pharmacy would drop from 250 to 241. The indirect effects on physicians are small but, if anything, the availability of physicians increases when entry liberalization is combined with a lowering of the markups.

table 5

This discussion strongly indicates that the public interest motivation for combining high markups and tight entry restrictions as a way to ensure geographic coverage has little empirical support. The government could in fact ensure a higher geographic coverage (in the sense of number of markets with at least one pharmacy) by simultaneously liberalizing entry and lowering markups. To explore this further, it would be interesting to know the optimal number of firms and the required policies to ensure this. A complete welfare analysis is not possible within our empirical framework, but we can address a related question that sheds partial light on this issue. We ask how the entry restrictions can be liberalized (through Φ) and the net markup can be reduced (through Δ) in such a way that the total number of pharmacies in the country remains constant at the current predicted level of 1454. We then also compute the associated reductions in the absolute gross markups and the number of markets without any pharmacy. By keeping the total number of pharmacies in the country constant, we maintain the current level of duplicated fixed costs, and look at the effects on the pharmacies' rents and local geographic coverage.

Table 6 shows the results from this policy experiment. The first and second columns show the combinations of entry restrictions and net markups such that the total number of pharmacies in the country remains constant at the predicted status quo level. To illustrate, raising the maximum allowed number of pharmacies by 75% ($\Phi = 1.75$) requires a drop in the net markups by a factor 0.508. In general, as the entry restrictions become more liberalized (higher Φ), the net markups should drop by more (lower Δ) to keep the total number of pharmacies in the country constant. With full free entry, we obtain the maximum

drop in net markups by a factor 0.376

pharmacies. If they are simply a transfer, liberalization would only have distributional effects. Two arguments may, however, be provided as to why the pharmacies' current rents may be socially wasteful. First, their rents are to the detriment of consumers as taxpayers. This will be inefficient to the extent that the required taxes create distortions elsewhere in the economy. Second, the rents themselves may have been dissipated in the form of wasteful investments. Along the lines of Posner's (1975) argument, pharmacies and their organization would need to engage in inefficient lobbying and related activities to maintain the rents.

We hope that our analysis will stimulate additional research, which is highly relevant from a policy perspective. In the U.S., efforts have been done to liberalize entry and conduct regulation, but exceptions such as the taxicab example remain. In Europe, policy makers have only recently opened the debate to reform the liberal professions, and to make their practices in line with competition policy. The European Commission recently published a large report by Paterson et al. (2003) documenting the country-specific regulations of several professions, such as accountants, engineers, lawyers, pharmacies, and notaries. As another example, the U.K.'s Office of Fair Trading (2003) published a report on reforming the pharmacies. Our analysis shows how these policy issues can be addressed by suitably adapting empirical models of free entry to account for entry restrictions and other relevant factors.

7 References

- Berry, S.T., "Estimation of a Model of Entry in the Airline Industry." *Econometrica*, Vol. 60 (1992), pp. 889-917.
- Berry, S.T. and Waldfogel, J., "Free Entry and Social Inefficiency in Radio Broadcasting." *RAND Journal of Economics*, Vol. 30 (1999), pp. 397-420.
- Bresnahan, T.F. and Reiss, P.C., "Entry in Monopoly Markets." *Review of Economic Studies*, Vol. 57 (1990), pp. 531-53.
- Bresnahan, T.F. and Reiss, P.C., "Empirical Models of Discrete Games." *Journal of Econometrics*, Vol. 48 (1991), pp. 57-81.
- Bresnahan, T.F. and Reiss, P.C., "Entry and Competition in Concentrated Markets." *Journal of Political Economy*, Vol. 99 (1991), pp. 977-1009.
- Ciliberto, F. and Tamer, E., "Market Structure and Equilibria in Airline Markets." *Working paper* (2004).

- Cohen, A. and Mazzeo, M., "Investment Strategies and Market Structure: An Empirical Analysis of Bank Branching Decisions." *Working Paper* (2005).
- de Bruyn, J.P.G.M., "De apotheek in België." *Pharmaceutisch Weekblad*, Vol. 129 (1994), pp. 608-611.
- Djankov, S., La Porta, R., Lopez-de-Silanes, F. and Shleifer, A., "The Regulation of Entry." *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, Vol. 67 (2002), pp. 1-37.
- Dranove, D. and Satterthwaite M.A., "The Industrial Organization of Health Care Markets." *Handbook of Health Economics* (2000), Edited by A. J. Culyer and J. P. Newhouse.
- Genesove, D., "Why Are There So Few (and Fewer and Fewer) Two-Newspaper Towns?" *Working Paper* (2001).
- Hsieh, C.-T. and Moretti, E., "Can Free Entry Be Socially Inefficient? Fixed Commissions and Social Waste in the Real Estate Industry.", *Journal of Political Economy*, Vol. 111 (2003), pp. 1076-1122.
- Kleiner, M.M., "Occupational Licensing." *The Journal of Economic Perspectives*, Vol. 14 (2000), pp. 189-202.
- Kleiner, M.M. and Kudrle, L., "Does Regulation Affect Economic Outcomes? The Case of Dentistry.", *Journal of Law and Economics*, Vol. 63 (2000), pp. 547-582.
- Law, M.T. and Kim, S., "Specialization and Regulation: the Rise of Professionals and the Emergence of Occupational Licensing Regulation." *Journal of Economic History*, forthcoming (2005).
- Mankiw, N.G. and Whinston, M.D., "Free Entry and Social Inefficiency." *RAND Journal of Economics*, Vol. 17 (1986), pp. 48-58.
- Mazzeo, M.J., "Product Choice and Oligopoly Market Structure." *RAND Journal of Economics*, Vol 33 (2002), pp. 221-242.
- Office of Fair Trading (OFT), "The control of entry regulations and retail pharmacy services in the UK." *Report Office of Fair Trading* (2003), OFT609.
- O.E.C.D., "Competition and Regulation Issues in the Pharmaceutical Industry." *OECD Economic Studies* (2000), DAF/CLP(2000)29.
- Pagliero, M., "What is the Objective of Professional Licensing? Evidence from the US Market for Lawyers." *London Business School Working Paper* (2004).

- Pakes, A., Ostrovsky, M. and Berry, S., “Simple Estimators for the Parameters of Discrete Dynamic Games.” *Working Paper* (2005).
- Paterson, I., Fink, M. and Ogus, A., “Economic impact of regulation in the field of liberal professions in different Member States.” *European Commission, Institute for Advances Studies of Vienna* (2003).
- Philipsen, N.J., “Regulation of and by Pharmacists in the Netherlands and Belgium: an Economic Approach.” *Dissertation*, Universiteit Maastricht (2003).
- Posner, R., “The Social Costs of Monopoly and Regulation.” *Journal of Political Economy*, Vol. 83 (1975), pp. 807-827.
- Seim, K., “An Empirical Model of Firm Entry with Endogenous Product-Type Choices.” *RAND Journal of Economics*, forthcoming (2005).
- Viscusi, W.K., Harrington, J. and Vernon, J., “Economics of Regulation and Antitrust.” *Cambridge: MIT Press* (2005), 927p.
- Wetenschappelijk Instituut Volksgezondheid (WIV), “Gezondheidsenquête, België 2001.” *Nationaal Instituut voor de Statistiek* (2002), IPH/EPI REPORTS Nr. 2002-22.
- Wise, M., “Competition and Regulatory Reforms.” *OECD Journal of Competition Law and Policy*, Vol. 3 (2001), pp. 60-109.

8 Appendix

This Appendix first characterizes the multiplicity of Nash equilibria outcomes when the entry decisions of firms of different types are strategic complements, and subsequently briefly presents the parallel case of strategic substitutes.

8.1 Characterization of multiplicity of Nash equilibria

If the entry decisions by firms of different types are strategic complements, i.e. Assumption 2(a) holds with strict inequality, then (α_1, α_2) may show multiplicity with other equilibrium outcomes of the general form $(\alpha_1 + \beta_1, \alpha_2 + \beta_2)$. The three Claims below show that the multiplicity can be characterized in a simple way if Assumptions 1 and 2 are satisfied. Taken together, these Claims imply that the areas of α for which (α_1, α_2) shows multiplicity with any other Nash equilibrium outcome are simply given by the areas of overlap with $(\alpha_1 + 1, \alpha_2 + 1)$ and $(\alpha_1 - 1, \alpha_2 - 1)$.

Define (x_1, x_2) as the set of (x_1, x_2) for which (x_1, x_2) is a Nash equilibrium outcome, as given by the conditions (2) in the text. Furthermore, define (x_1, x_2, x_1, x_2) as the set of (x_1, x_2) for which both (x_1, x_2) and $(x_1 + x_1, x_2 + x_2)$ are a Nash equilibrium, i.e. $(x_1, x_2, x_1, x_2) = (x_1, x_2) \cap (x_1 + x_1, x_2 + x_2)$, where x_1 and x_2 are positive or negative integers.

Claim 1. (x_1, x_2, x_1, x_2) is empty if $x_1 \neq x_2$. I.e., (x_1, x_2) may only show multiplicity with Nash equilibrium outcomes of the form $(x_1 + x_2, x_2 + x_2)$, where x_2 is a positive or a negative integer.

Proof: Suppose to the contrary that there are also equilibrium outcomes of the form $(x_1 + x_1, x_2 + x_2)$, where $x_1 \neq x_2$. There are several cases:

- (i) If $x_1 \geq 0$ and $x_2 \geq 0$, then $x_1 \leq x_1(x_1 + x_1, x_2 + x_2) \leq x_1(x_1 + x_1, x_2) \leq x_1(x_1 + 1, x_2)$, by the conditions for $(x_1 + x_1, x_2 + x_2)$ to be a Nash equilibrium, by Assumption 2(a) and by Assumption 1.
- (ii) If $x_1 \geq 0$ and $x_2 \geq 0$, and $x_1 < x_2$, then $x_1 \leq x_1(x_1 + x_1, x_2 + x_2) < x_1(x_1 + x_1 - x_2, x_2) \leq x_1(x_1 + 1, x_2)$, by the conditions for $(x_1 + x_1, x_2 + x_2)$ to be a Nash equilibrium, by Assumption 2(b), and by Assumption 1.
- (iii) If $x_1 \geq 0$ and $x_2 \geq 0$, and $x_1 > x_2$, then $x_2 \leq x_2(x_1 + x_1, x_2 + x_2) < x_2(x_1, x_2 + x_2 - x_1) \leq x_2(x_1, x_2 + 1)$, by the conditions for $(x_1 + x_1, x_2 + x_2)$ to be a Nash equilibrium, by Assumption 2(b), and by Assumption 1.
- (iv) If $x_1 \geq 0$ and $x_2 \geq 0$, then $x_2 \leq x_2(x_1 + x_1, x_2 + x_2) \leq x_2(x_1, x_2 + x_2) \leq x_2(x_1, x_2 + 1)$, by the condition for $(x_1 + x_1, x_2 + x_2)$ to be Nash, by Assumption 2(a) and by Assumption 1.
- (v) If $x_1 \geq 0$ and $x_2 \geq 0$, and $x_1 < x_2$, then $x_2(x_1, x_2) \leq x_2(x_1, x_2 + x_2 - x_1 + 1) < x_2(x_1 + x_1, x_2 + x_2 + 1) < x_2$, by Assumption 1, by Assumption 2(b), and by condition for $(x_1 + x_1, x_2 + x_2)$ to be Nash.
- (vi) If $x_1 \geq 0$ and $x_2 \geq 0$, and $x_1 > x_2$, then $x_1(x_1, x_2) \leq x_1(x_1 + x_1 - x_2 + 1, x_2) < x_1(x_1 + x_1 + 1, x_2 + x_2) < x_1$, by Assumption 1, by Assumption 2(b), and by the condition for $(x_1 + x_1, x_2 + x_2)$ to be Nash.

In all cases we have obtained a contradiction with the conditions (2) for (x_1, x_2) to be a Nash equilibrium outcome.

Claim 2. $(x_1, x_2, 1, 1)$ and $(x_1, x_2, -1, -1)$ are not empty. I.e., (x_1, x_2) shows multiplicity with $(x_1 + 1, x_2 + 1)$ and $(x_1 - 1, x_2 - 1)$.

Proof: The set $(n_1, n_2, 1, 1)$ is given by the conditions (3) in the text. Since we assume that Assumption 2(a) holds with strict inequality, this set is not empty. A similar reasoning applies to the set $(n_1, n_2, -1, -1)$.

Claim 3. $(n_1, n_2) \subset (n_1, n_2, 1, 1)$ if $n_1 \leq 1$, and $(n_1, n_2) \subset (n_1, n_2, -1, -1)$ if $n_2 \leq -1$. I.e., while (n_1, n_2) may also show multiplicity with $(n_1 + 1, n_2 + 1)$ for $n_1 \leq 1$ or $n_2 \leq -1$, the areas of multiplicity are a subset of those with $(n_1 + 1, n_2 + 1)$ and $(n_1 - 1, n_2 - 1)$.

Proof: The set (n_1, n_2) is given by:

$$\begin{aligned} n_1(n_1 + 1, n_2) &\leq n_1 \leq n_1(n_1 + 1, n_2 + 1) \\ n_2(n_1, n_2 + 1) &\leq n_2 \leq n_2(n_1 + 1, n_2 + 1) \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

which may or may not be empty. Since the left-hand-side in (13) is the same as in (3), and the right hand side in (13) is less than in (3) by Assumption 2(b), we have $(n_1, n_2) \subset (n_1, n_2, 1, 1)$ if $n_1 \leq 1$. A similar reasoning applies to show that the set $(n_1, n_2) \subset (n_1, n_2, -1, -1)$ if $n_2 \leq -1$.

8.2 Strategic substitutes

The case in which entry decisions by firms of different types are strategic substitutes may be summarized by the following assumption, replacing Assumption 2.

Assumption 2*. (Entry decisions by firms of different types are strategic substitutes or independent)

$$\begin{aligned} \text{(a)} \quad & n_1(n_1, n_2 + 1) \leq n_1(n_1, n_2) \\ & n_2(n_1 + 1, n_2) \leq n_2(n_1, n_2) \\ \text{(b)} \quad & n_1(n_1 + 1, n_2 - 1) \leq n_1(n_1, n_2) \\ & n_2(n_1 - 1, n_2 + 1) \leq n_2(n_1, n_2) \end{aligned}$$

Assumption 2*(a) says that payoffs are decreasing or independent of the number of firms of the other type, so that entry decisions by firms of different types are (weak) strategic substitutes. Assumption 2*(b) says that the extent of strategic substitutes between firms of different types is weaker than that between firms of the same type. Hence, payoffs decrease when there is one more firm of the same type and one less firm of the other type.

As in the case of strategic complements, the market configuration (n_1, n_2) is a Nash equilibrium outcome if (n_1, n_2) satisfies (2). Assumption 1 again guarantees that (n_1, n_2) is observed

with positive probability. Furthermore, there may again be multiple Nash equilibrium outcomes (when Assumption 2*(a)). Following a parallel reasoning to the case of strategic complements, the areas of multiplicity are simply given by the areas of multiplicity with the Nash equilibrium outcomes $(n_1 + 1, n_2 - 1)$ and $(n_1 - 1, n_2 + 1)$. For example, the area of multiplicity with $(n_1 + 1, n_2 - 1)$ is given by:

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_1(n_1 + 1, n_2) &\leq \pi_1 \leq \pi_1(n_1 + 1, n_2 - 1) \\ \pi_2(n_1 + 1, n_2) &\leq \pi_2 \leq \pi_2(n_1, n_2) \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

and similarly for $(n_1 - 1, n_2 + 1)$.

To obtain a unique equilibrium outcome, we again impose additional structure to the entry game. We assume that firms enter sequentially, i.e. conditional on observing all previous entry decisions, and impose the subgame perfect Nash equilibrium refinement. In contrast with the case of strategic complements, the specific ordering of entry matters. In our application, it is perhaps most natural to assume that type 1 firms (pharmacies) make their entry decisions before type 2 firms. In this case, an additional pharmacy will enter and thereby preempt entry of an additional physician, so that the market structure with the highest number of pharmacies will prevail. As a result, (n_1, n_2) will be a subgame perfect Nash equilibrium outcome if and only if (i) π_1 satisfies conditions (2) and (ii) does not satisfy conditions (14). Assuming that π has a bivariate density $\pi(\cdot)$, the probability that the market configuration (n_1, n_2) is observed as the unique subgame perfect equilibrium outcome is:

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr(n_1 = n_1, n_2 = n_2) &= \int_{\pi_1(n_1+1, n_2)}^{\pi_1(n_1, n_2)} \int_{\pi_2(n_1, n_2+1)}^{\pi_2(n_1, n_2)} \pi(n_1, n_2) d\pi_1 d\pi_2 \\ &\quad - \int_{\pi_1(n_1+1, n_2)}^{\pi_1(n_1+1, n_2-1)} \int_{\pi_2(n_1+1, n_2)}^{\pi_2(n_1, n_2)} \pi(n_1, n_2) d\pi_1 d\pi_2 \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

when entry restrictions are not binding. When entry restrictions are binding, one can follow the same reasoning as under strategic complements to obtain the same probability of observing (n_1, n_2) as the unique subgame perfect equilibrium outcome, given by (6).

Table 1. Observed market configurations*

		Number of pharmacies						Total
		0	1	2	3	4	5+	
Number of physicians	0	142	11	1	0	0	0	154
	1	62	36	2	0	0	0	100
	2	27	58	3	0	1	0	89
	3	6	38	16	3	0	0	63
	4	8	35	31	4	0	0	78
	5+	1	41	93	95	69	64	363
Total		246	219	146	102	70	64	847
restricted entry		199	179	109	85	61	64	697
% of total		80.9	81.7	74.7	83.3	87.1	100	82.3

* Source: RIZIV as discussed in the text.

Table 2. Summary statistics*

Variable	Description	mean	std. dev.
# pharmacies	Number of pharmacies	1.76	1.81
# physicians	Number of physicians	4.93	4.62
ln(population)	Logarithm of population	7.91	1.13
% young	Fraction of population, 17 years or younger	22.50	2.55
% old	Fraction of population, 65 years or older	16.11	2.79
% foreign	Fraction of population with foreign nationality	4.27	5.67
% unemployed	Unemployment rate	5.61	2.80
Flanders	Dummy variable, 1 for the region of Flanders	0.39	0.49
mean income	Mean income (in 10,000€)	2.47	0.40

* 847 observations (markets in 2001). Source: RIZIV, NIS, Ecodata, and the RSZ as discussed in text.

Table 3. Estimation results*

	Uncensored bivariate ordered probit		Censored bivariate ordered probit		General model with strategic complements	
Pharmacies' payoff equation						
constant	-19.05	(1.18)	-14.09	(3.40)	-13.54	(1.82)
ln(population)	2.49	(0.06)	1.95	(0.12)	1.43	(0.13)
% young	-0.31	(2.48)	0.73	(9.18)	0.22	(4.26)
% old	10.18	(2.43)	19.00	(5.20)	19.32	(3.54)
% foreign	-1.03	(0.94)	-0.94	(0.96)	-1.00	(1.08)
% unemployed	9.20	(2.22)	22.71	(4.85)	23.06	(4.40)
Flanders	-0.03	(0.14)	0.13	(0.34)	0.11	(0.25)
income	-0.43	(0.14)	-0.35	(0.18)	-0.32	(0.19)
$\frac{2}{1}$	2.26	(0.11)	1.50	(0.18)	1.09	(0.23)
$\frac{3}{1}$	3.64	(0.13)	2.56	(0.20)	1.94	(0.30)
$\frac{4}{1}$	4.83	(0.15)	3.14	(0.22)	2.37	(0.35)
$\frac{1}{1}$	—		—		0.78	(0.29)
Physicians' payoff equation						
constant	-19.41	(0.94)	-19.28	(1.12)	-17.42	(0.98)
ln(population)	2.54	(0.07)	2.53	(0.08)	2.27	(0.07)
% young	3.45	(2.08)	2.22	(2.25)	2.02	(2.15)
% old	6.85	(1.84)	6.81	(1.90)	5.98	(1.89)
% foreign	-3.61	(0.73)	-3.58	(0.69)	-3.43	(0.72)
% unemployed	2.30	(1.83)	2.29	(1.98)	0.67	(1.89)
Flanders	-0.65	(0.12)	-0.56	(0.13)	-0.58	(0.13)
income	0.32	(0.11)	0.32	(0.12)	0.37	(0.11)
$\frac{2}{2}$	1.30	(0.10)	1.32	(0.10)	1.23	(0.10)
$\frac{3}{2}$	2.34	(0.12)	2.36	(0.12)	2.27	(0.13)
$\frac{4}{2}$	2.99	(0.13)	3.09	(0.13)	2.91	(0.14)
$\frac{1}{2}$	—		—		0.16	(0.19)
$\frac{2}{2}$	—		—		2.01	(0.29)
$\frac{3}{2}$	—		—		3.89	(1.01)
$\frac{4}{2}$	—		—		5.99	(0.83)
	0.32	(0.03)	0.05	(0.07)	-0.15	(0.09)
Log Likelihood	-2,255.6		-1,761.5		-1,740.6	

* The number of observed markets is 847. Standard errors are in parentheses. The other estimated $\frac{j}{2}$ are not shown; constraints on the other $\frac{j}{1}$ and $\frac{k}{i}$ are discussed in the text.

Table 4. Own-type entry effects*

	$= 0$	$= 1$	$= 2$
Pharmacies' entry threshold ratios			
$\frac{2,k}{1}$	1.07 (0.14)	1.40 (0.17)	1.40 (0.17)
$\frac{3,k}{1}$	1.20 (0.11)	1.32 (0.12)	1.32 (0.12)
$\frac{4,k}{1}$	1.02 (0.08)	1.06 (0.08)	1.06 (0.08)
Physicians' entry threshold ratios			
$\frac{2,k}{2}$	0.86 (0.04)	0.89 (0.05)	1.34 (0.10)
$\frac{3,k}{2}$	1.05 (0.04)	1.07 (0.04)	1.22 (0.06)
$\frac{4,k}{2}$	0.99 (0.03)	1.00 (0.03)	1.07 (0.04)

* Entry threshold ratios are defined as $\frac{j+1,k}{i} = \left(\frac{j+1,k}{i} \right) \left(\frac{j,k}{i} + 1 \right)$, as given by (11) in the text. Standard errors are in parentheses.

Table 5. Summary entry predictions under alternative regulatory policies*

	net markup change		
	$\Delta = 1$	$\Delta = 0.75$	$\Delta = 0.5$
<i>Panel A - no change in entry restrictions ($\Phi = 1$)</i>			
number of pharmacies	1454	1363	1191
number of physicians	4201	4175	4125
number of markets without pharmacy	250	252	279
number of markets without physician	142	142	144
<i>Panel B - maximum number of pharmacies doubles ($\Phi = 2$)</i>			
number of pharmacies	2074	1840	1488
number of physicians	4232	4207	4152
number of markets without pharmacy	189	202	241
number of markets without physician	144	144	144
<i>Panel C - full free entry in pharmacy market (Φ is large)</i>			
number of pharmacies	3035	2493	1836
number of physicians	4489	4394	4261
number of markets without pharmacy	104	139	200
number of markets without physician	108	116	122

* $\Phi = 1$ refers to no change in entry restrictions, $\Phi = 2$ a doubling in the maximum number of allowed pharmacies, and Φ large to full free entry. Similarly, $\Delta = 1$ refers to no change in the net markups, $\Delta = 0.75$ to a drop in the net markups by 25% and $\Delta = 0.5$ to a drop in the net markups by 50%. All entry predictions are based on the parameter estimates of the general entry model with strategic complements, last column of Table 3.

**Table 6. Entry restrictions, markups and geographic coverage –
keeping the total number of pharmacies constant***

degree of entry restriction Φ	net markup drop by factor Δ	absolute gross markup drop		number of markets without pharmacy
		=	= - 10%	
1	1	0%	0%	250
1.25	0.719	-7.9%	-4.4%	244
1.5	0.576	-11.9%	-6.7%	249
1.75	0.508	-13.8%	-7.8%	248
2	0.481	-14.5%	-8.2%	244
2.25	0.441	-15.6%	-8.8%	257
2.5	0.427	-16.0%	-9.0%	254
large	0.376	-17.5%	-9.9%	252

* For each considered Φ (first column), the relative net markup drop Δ is computed (second column) such that the total number of pharmacies remains constant at the predicted status quo level of 1454 . The third and fourth column show the absolute gross markup drops corresponding to the relative net markup drop Δ , assuming that retail costs other than wholesale costs amount to respectively 0% (so that $\Delta = 1$) and 10% (so that $\Delta = 0.9$). The fifth column shows the corresponding number of markets without pharmacy.




Figure 1. Nash equilibria with strategic complements




Figure 2. Nash equilibria – strong strategic complementarities