

Belief-invariant Equilibria in Games with Incomplete Information

Vincenzo Auletta*, Diodato Ferraioli†, Ashutosh Rai‡,
Giannicola Scarpa§, Andreas Winter¶

January 5, 2022

Abstract

Drawing on ideas from game theory and quantum physics, we investigate nonlocal correlations from the point of view of equilibria in games of incomplete information. These equilibria can be classified in decreasing power as general *communication equilibria*, *belief-invariant equilibria* and *correlated equilibria*, all of which contain the familiar *Nash equilibria*.

The notion of belief-invariant equilibrium has appeared in game theory before (in the 1990s). However, the class of *non-signalling correlations* associated to belief-invariance arose naturally already in the 1980s in the foundations of quantum mechanics: Indeed, since quantum theory is consistent with relativistic causality, quantum mechanical correlations are non-signalling.

In the present work, we explain and unify these two origins of the idea and study the above classes of equilibria, and furthermore *quantum correlated equilibria*, using tools from quantum information but the language of game theory. We present a general framework of belief-invariant communication equilibria, which contains correlated equilibria and quantum correlated equilibria as special cases. Our framework also contains the theory of Bell inequalities and their violation due to non-locality, which is a question of intense interest in the foundations of quantum mechanics, and was indeed the original motivation for the above-mentioned studies.

We then use our framework to show new results related to the *social welfare* of games. Namely, we exhibit a game where belief-invariance is socially better than any correlated equilibrium, and a game where all non-belief-invariant communication equilibria have a suboptimal social welfare. We also show that optimal social welfare can in certain cases be achieved by quantum mechanical correlations, which do not need an informed mediator to be implemented, and go beyond the classical “sunspot” or shared randomness approach. Furthermore, we illustrate potential practical applications related to *privacy*. For instance, situations where competing companies can benefit from a correlated strategy that does not expose their trade secrets, or *network congestion games* where privacy-preserving advice reduces the congestion.

Along the way, we highlight open questions about the interplay between quantum information, cryptography, and game theory.

*Dipartimento di Ingegneria dell’Informazione ed Elettrica e Matematica applicata (DIEM), Università degli Studi di Salerno, Italy. Email: auletta@unisa.it

†Dipartimento di Ingegneria dell’Informazione ed Elettrica e Matematica applicata (DIEM), Università degli Studi di Salerno, Italy. Email: dferraioli@unisa.it

‡Faculty of Computing, University of Latvia. Email: ashutosh.raai@lu.lv

§Facultad de Ciencias Matemáticas, Universidad Complutense de Madrid, Spain. Email: gscarpa@ucm.es

¶ICREA and Departament de Física: Grup d’Informació Quàntica, Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, Spain. Email: andreas.winter@uab.cat

1 Introduction

The notion of equilibrium of a strategic game and the mathematical formulation of rational behaviour in situations of conflict are among the most fruitful ideas in the history of economics, and duly became a cornerstone of any modern discussion on the subject.

The topic was initiated by the classic treatment of von Neumann and Morgenstern [vNM44], where it was realized that in the realm of mixed strategy there is always a minimax equilibrium for zero-sum games. Another milestone was the definition of *Nash equilibrium* [Nas50] and Nash’s proof that in mixed strategies there always exists one. These pioneering results were followed by a multitude of further investigations into other concepts of equilibrium and their properties, including the question of how the players, knowing the game, can find one [Aum74, For93, LH64, DGP09, CDT09]. Motivated, among other things, by the realization that Nash equilibria sometimes can be “bad” both individually and collectively for the players, a major direction in game theory is the question of how to induce players, or help them, to a more beneficial equilibrium [FT91, Mye91, NRTV07]. One important idea is that giving the players *advice*, in the form of a random variable, can change the landscape of equilibria. This generalizes the concept of Nash equilibrium to *correlated equilibria* [Aum74].

The present paper is about advice in the setting of *games of incomplete information*. As it turns out, this is a subject of considerable complexity, since the kind of correlation that can serve as advice to the players can be far more general than in the case of complete information. In games of incomplete information, or *Bayesian games*, each player has a *type* which is not perfectly known to, but only estimated by, the other players. Depending on what the game models, a type can be many things. For example, it can represent a characteristic of the player (strong, weak, rich, poor, etc.) or a secret objective of the player (interest in one particular outcome). For this class of games, a relevant solution concept is the *communication equilibrium* [For82]. Here, the players privately communicate their type to a mediator, who implements a correlation and gives each player advice for a convenient action. It is reasonable to assume that players are comfortable with revealing their private information to a trusted mediator if this gives them an advantage. However, there are situations where it might be crucial for players never to reveal any private information to the other players (e.g., trade secrets). In game theory, this concept has been noted before when discussing correlations. In [For93, For06] it is called “conditional independence property” or “belief-invariance”, while in [LRS10] it is called “non-communicating garbling”. In both cases, however, this property is used to make the analysis of the equilibria more convenient, and is not highlighted as interesting in its own right.

From a completely different angle, belief-invariance has been a topic of research in physics (motivated by questions in the foundations of quantum mechanics [PR94, Tsi80, BLM⁺05, MAG06]) and theoretical computer science (motivated by multi-prover interactive proof systems [KRR14] and parallel repetition of games [BFS14, FRV16, LW15]), under the name of *non-signalling correlations*. In these investigations, belief-invariance is relevant because it describes the largest class of correlations that obey relativistic causality.

Here, we bring together the strands of thought coming from these two backgrounds. On the one hand, this results in a more general and much richer picture of non-locality as a resource and, on the other hand, allows us to import findings from the physics of non-locality and non-signalling to game theory. The interdisciplinarity leaves us with the problem of choosing the language in which to formulate our results, as we might end up not reaching anyone from either side of the discipline divide. We have chosen to use a language familiar to game theorists, but hopefully not too far from the one used in physics and computer science.

We define and study the class of *belief-invariant communication equilibria* and compare it

with the classes of communication equilibria and correlated equilibria. We discuss, always in the language of game theory, relevant examples from physics [CHSH69, GHSZ90, BL13, PKL⁺15] and we introduce new ones. We finally show that there is a subclass of the belief-invariant correlations that will give rise to the interesting concept of “fully private correlations”: not only the correlation does not reveal the type of a player to other players, but also parts do not need to reveal their type to a mediator. However, in order to achieve efficient equilibrium outcomes that would be impossible to achieve without an informed mediator, one needs to rely on quantum effects. For this reason, in a stand-alone section, we give a brief introduction to some basic linear algebraic notions behind quantum mechanics and we consider a class of correlations that arises from observing a shared quantum mechanical state. We will prove that there are games for which the resulting equilibria are better than the ones that may be achieved without quantum effects. Note that we need games of incomplete information to exhibit this quantum advantage: Zhang [Zha12] proved that in games of full information, there can be no quantum advantage.

We organize the paper as follows. Section 2 defines the objects we are working on: first games of incomplete information and then various classes of correlations. Section 3 uses these concepts to define the classes of equilibria we study. In Section 4 we discuss some meaningful examples where belief-invariance helps reaching a better social outcome. In Section 5, we will discuss some practical applications of our new definitions. No quantum physics is involved in the sections above; only in Section 6 we broaden the discussion to include the quantum case, and we will present it in a way that makes it fit into the framework we have developed up to that point. Finally, we will discuss some open problems in the conclusions section.

2 Preliminaries

In this section we define the basic concepts we need to discuss our classes of equilibria. First we will define games of incomplete information and their strategies. Later, we will define the notion of correlation and the classes of probability distributions we need.

2.1 Games with incomplete information

There are several slightly different notations for games of incomplete information. We will follow the one of Forges [For06] because of the closeness with our topic. We find it convenient to work with games in *strategic form* because of the similarity with the approach in quantum information to so-called *non-local games*. In a game in strategic form, in a single round, all players make their moves simultaneously, and receive their respective payoffs. It is worth mentioning that games of incomplete information, as presented here, are also called *Bayesian games* (because there is a fixed prior distribution on the types), and can be analyzed in a probability theory setting.

A *game with incomplete information* G is defined by the following objects:

- A finite set of *players* N , of size n , usually $N = [n]$;
- A finite set of *type profiles* $T := T_1 \times \dots \times T_n$;
- A finite set of *action profiles* $A := A_1 \times \dots \times A_n$;
- A prior probability distribution $P(t)$ on the types $t \in T$;
- For each player $i \in N$, a *payoff function* $v_i: T \times A \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$.

In a game of incomplete information, the behaviour of the players is modelled as follows. A *strategy* g_i for the player i is a map from the information that i knows to an action $a_i \in A_i$. In the absence of any correlation or external advice, players can apply pure strategies or mixed ones. A *pure strategy* for player i is a map $g_i: T_i \rightarrow A_i$, meaning that players select an action based only on their type. A *mixed strategy* for player i is a probability distribution over pure ones, i.e. the function $g_i: T_i \rightarrow A_i$ becomes a random variable. If we want to make its distribution explicit, we introduce the independent local random variables λ_i with probability $\Lambda_i(\lambda_i)$. and we set $g_i = g_{i,\lambda_i} = g_i(\cdot, \lambda_i)$. This random function describes a conditional probability distribution on A_i given T_i , denoted by slight abuse of notation as $g_i(a_i | t_i)$.

The game goes as follows. The types $\mathbf{t} = (t_1, \dots, t_n)$ are sampled according to P . Each player i learns his type t_i , uses his strategy g_i to select an action $a_i \in A_i$, and is awarded according to his payoff function v_i (which in general depends also on the other players' actions and types). Hence, the expected utility of player i is:

$$\langle v_i \rangle = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{g}} v_i(\mathbf{t}, g_1(t_1), \dots, g_n(t_n)) = \sum_{\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{a}} P(\mathbf{t}) v_i(\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{a}) \prod_{i=1}^n g_i(a_i | t_i), \quad (1)$$

where $\mathbf{g} = (g_1, \dots, g_n)$ and $\mathbf{a} = (a_1, \dots, a_n)$. Observe that if P is a point mass on a fixed type t_0 , $P(t_0) = 1$, we recover the usual games of complete information.

A game is called *full coordination game* if all the payoff functions are equal, i.e., all players are interested in the same outcome. On the other hand, if the payoff functions are distinct, we talk about a *game of conflicting interests*.

A *solution* for a game is a family of strategies $\mathbf{g} = (g_1, \dots, g_n)$, one for each player. Players are modelled as being *selfish* and *rational*, meaning that fixing the other players' strategies, each player chooses the strategy that maximizes his own expected payoff, by using the resources he has access to. A solution is then said to be an *equilibrium* (more precisely a *Nash equilibrium*) if no player has an incentive to change the adopted strategy. In the basic, uncorrelated, case, this means that

$$\langle v_i \rangle = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{g}_{-i}} v_i(\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{t}) g_i(t_i)) \geq \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{t}} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{g}_{-i}} v_i(\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{g}_{-i}(\mathbf{t}_{-i}) \chi_i(t_i)), \quad (2)$$

for all i and $\chi_i \in A_i^{T_i}$. This can be expressed more concisely as saying that for all i , t_i and a_i ,

$$\sum_{\mathbf{t}_{-i}, \boldsymbol{\lambda}} P(\mathbf{t}) \Lambda(\boldsymbol{\lambda}) v_i(\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{g}_{-i}(\mathbf{t}_{-i}, \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{-i}) g_i(t_i, \lambda_i)) \geq \sum_{\mathbf{t}_{-i}, \boldsymbol{\lambda}} P(\mathbf{t}) \Lambda(\boldsymbol{\lambda}) v_i(\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{g}_{-i}(\mathbf{t}_{-i}, \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{-i}) a_i), \quad (3)$$

where $\boldsymbol{\lambda} = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n)$, and, by independence of λ_i , $\Lambda(\boldsymbol{\lambda}) = \prod_{i=1}^n \Lambda_i(\lambda_i)$.

Note also that a game of incomplete information can be modelled as a game of complete information where the players' strategies are $A_i^{T_i} = \{g_i: T_i \rightarrow A_i\}$, i.e., all possible functions from T_i to A_i . Then, by Nash's theorem [Nas50], every game of incomplete information has an equilibrium. In fact, as is familiar from games of complete information, usually – except in the simplest situations – we have to expect several Nash equilibria to exist, with different payoff profiles $(\langle v_i \rangle : i \in N)$.

The expected *social welfare* $\mathbf{SW}(\mathbf{g})$ of a solution \mathbf{g} is the sum of the expected payoffs of all players, $\mathbf{SW}(\mathbf{g}) = \sum_i \langle v_i \rangle$, and often used as a measure of the quality of an equilibrium. More generally, we may consider some other function $v(\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{a})$ of the types and actions (e.g., the max of the expected payoffs of all players is the measure that is commonly adopted in the job scheduling setting [AT01]), and look at the *social payoff* $\mathbf{SP0}$ defined as follows:

$$\mathbf{SP0}(\mathbf{g}) = \langle v \rangle = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{g}} v(\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{t})).$$

Example: CHSH game [CHSH69]. We now give an example of game of incomplete information. The game is a classic example from quantum information, that later was also independently found in game theory (cf. [For06, LRS10]). We will refer to this game several times in the paper. The game is called **CHSH** after the authors of [CHSH69], Clauser, Horne, Shimony and Holt.

It is a two-player game, with respective types and actions of players (t_1, t_2) and (a_1, a_2) . Both players' types and actions are single bits, taking values from the set $\{0, 1\}$. The distribution P on the types (t_1, t_2) is uniform, i.e. probability $\frac{1}{4}$ is assigned to each of the four possibilities. The game is a full coordination game, i.e., the payoff functions v_1, v_2 are equal and the players want to achieve a common goal. The payoffs are as in Figure 1. In other words, the two players

	0	1		0	1
0	1,1	0,0	0	0,0	1,1
1	0,0	1,1	1	1,1	0,0
	$t_1 \cdot t_2 = 0$			$t_1 \cdot t_2 = 1$	

Figure 1: The CHSH game

prefer to correlate if at least one of them has the first type (which happens with probability $\frac{3}{4}$), and to anti-correlate if they both have the second type (with probability $\frac{1}{4}$).

A simple pure strategy for each player in the CHSH game is the constant function mapping to 0. Since the distribution P is uniform, such joint action by players give an expected payoff of $\frac{3}{4}$. It is not hard to see that this cannot be improved with other pure or mixed, or correlated strategies. Later we will see that, in presence of external devices, other equilibria exist that reach the optimal expected payoff of 1.

2.2 Correlations: joint conditional probability distributions

Looking at eq. (1), we see that for a well-defined expected payoff, we only need a joint distribution of $\mathbf{t} = (t_1, \dots, t_n)$ and $\mathbf{a} = (a_1, \dots, a_n)$. In fact, since the marginal distribution $P(\mathbf{t})$ of the types is fixed, we only require a conditional distribution of \mathbf{a} given \mathbf{t} .

This motivates us to consider, as a resource in gameplay, a general *correlation*, i.e. a joint conditional probability distribution

$$Q(s_1, \dots, s_n \mid r_1, \dots, r_n)$$

of *inputs* r_i and *outputs* s_i for player i . We may abbreviate the notation as $Q(\mathbf{s} \mid \mathbf{r})$ for tuples $\mathbf{r} = (r_1, \dots, r_n) \in R = \times_i R_i$ and $\mathbf{s} = (s_1, \dots, s_n) \in S = \times_i S_i$, where R_i and S_i are the input and output alphabets of player i , respectively.

Note that we do not assume any restriction on these correlations, apart from the obvious requirements of probability distributions:

$$\sum_{\mathbf{s}} Q(\mathbf{s} \mid \mathbf{r}) = 1 \quad \forall \mathbf{r}.$$

Given a set R of inputs and a set S of outputs we denote as $\text{ALL}(S \mid R)$, the set of all possible correlations on these sets.

By imposing additional restrictions we can single out other meaningful subclasses of correlations, that we will use later to define different kinds of equilibrium.

Belief-invariant (aka non-signalling) correlations. A joint conditional probability distribution Q is *belief-invariant* (also called *non-signalling*) if the distribution of the output variable

s_i given r_i does not give any information about r_j , with $j \neq i$. This class is easily seen to be strictly contained in the general class of correlations. Indeed, the belief-invariant condition is clearly violated in a correlation where s_i could be just equal to r_j , i.e., $\Pr\{s_i = r_j\} = 1$.

The names belief-invariant and non-signalling can be understood in the following way. Suppose we have n parties, with the i -th party having access only to r_i, s_i . Then the observation of r_i, s_i does not reveal anything more about the other parties' r_j variables than r_i alone. Therefore if the parties had a estimation (belief) of what could be the others' variables, this is not changed by the observation of the outputs of the correlation Q .

Formally, for a set $I \subset N$, let $R_I = \times_{i \in I} R_i$ and $S_I = \times_{i \in I} S_i$. Then, we say that a correlation $Q(\mathbf{s} \mid \mathbf{r})$ is belief-invariant [KRR14] for all subsets $I \subset N$ and $J = N \setminus I$,

$$\sum_{\mathbf{s}_J \in S_J} Q(\mathbf{s}_I, \mathbf{s}_J \mid \mathbf{r}_I, \mathbf{r}_J) = \sum_{\mathbf{s}_J \in S_J} Q(\mathbf{s}_I, \mathbf{s}_J \mid \mathbf{r}_I, \mathbf{r}'_J) \quad \forall \mathbf{s}_I \in S_I, \mathbf{r}_I \in R_I, \mathbf{r}_J, \mathbf{r}'_J \in R_J. \quad (4)$$

Given a set R of inputs and a set S of outputs we denote as $\text{BINV}(S \mid R)$, the set of all belief-invariant correlations on these sets.

We remark that this class of correlations has various equivalent definitions (see, for example, [MAG06]), but we prefer the one given above since it makes it clear that any subset of parties, even when getting together, cannot learn anything more about the other subset's input variables than what they would know from the joint distribution of their $\{R_i\}_{i \in I}$ alone.

Local correlations. A joint conditional probability distribution Q is called *local* if it can be simulated locally by each party i , by observing (their part of) a random variable $\gamma = (\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_n)$ (with distribution $V(\gamma)$) independent of \mathbf{r} , and doing local operations depending only on r_i and γ_i . More formally, a correlation $Q(\mathbf{s} \mid \mathbf{r})$ is local if there exist a random variable γ and distributions $L_i(s_i \mid r_i \gamma_i)$ such that

$$Q(\mathbf{s} \mid \mathbf{r}) = \sum_{\gamma} V(\gamma) L_1(s_1 \mid r_1 \gamma_1) \cdots L_n(s_n \mid r_n \gamma_n). \quad (5)$$

Any local distribution is also belief-invariant, because the condition (4) is respected. However, the opposite is not true, meaning that the inclusion is strict. An example of non-local belief-invariant distribution is given below in (10).

As above, given a set R of inputs and a set S of outputs we denote as $\text{LOC}(S \mid R)$, the set of all local correlations on these sets. We remark that the sets $\text{ALL}(S \mid R)$, $\text{BINV}(S \mid R)$ and $\text{LOC}(S \mid R)$ are all closed convex sets.

3 Equilibria with communication and correlation resources

Consider a game $G = (N, T, A, P, \{v_i\})$ as defined in Section 2.1. A solution with communication for G studies the behaviour of players who have access to a *correlation device* that depends on inputs communicated by them during the game. The most common operational interpretation of this setting is that a *trusted mediator*, who has private communication channels with all the players, collects from each player i the input r_i , samples \mathbf{s} according to $Q(\mathbf{s} \mid \mathbf{r})$ and sends to each i the output s_i .

Formally, we add to the strategies of the players the use of a *correlation* $Q(\mathbf{s} \mid \mathbf{r})$, where $\mathbf{r} = (r_1, \dots, r_n) \in R$ is a tuple of *inputs* and $\mathbf{s} = (s_1, \dots, s_n) \in S$ is a tuple of *outputs*. In this setting, a *pure strategy* for each player i is a pair of functions, $f_i: T_i \rightarrow R_i$ and $g_i: T_i \times S_i \rightarrow A_i$; and a mixed strategy is a pair of jointly distributed random functions $(f_i, g_i) \in R_i^{T_i} \times A_i^{T_i \times S_i}$.

As done above, the latter can be given explicitly by specifying a local random variable λ_i for each player i with distribution $\Lambda_i(\lambda_i)$, and letting $f_i = f_{i,\lambda_i} = f_i(\cdot, \lambda_i)$, $g_i = g_{i,\lambda_i} = g_i(\cdot, \lambda_i)$. The joint distribution of $\boldsymbol{\lambda} = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n)$ is a product distribution, $\Lambda(\boldsymbol{\lambda}) = \prod_{i=1}^n \Lambda_i(\lambda_i)$, reflecting the fact that the n pairs $\{(f_i, g_i) : i = 1, \dots, n\}$ are independent.

The game now goes as follows. The types $\mathbf{t} = (t_1, \dots, t_n)$ are sampled according to P . Each player i learns his type t_i , and sends the input $r_i = f_i(t_i)$ to the correlation device. He then gets the correlation output s_i and plays the action $a_i = g_i(t_i, s_i)$. This makes all of \mathbf{t} , \mathbf{r} , \mathbf{f} , \mathbf{g} and \mathbf{a} jointly distributed random variables. The expected payoff of player i is:

$$\begin{aligned} \langle v_i \rangle &= \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{f}, \mathbf{g}, Q} v_i(\mathbf{t}, g_1(t_1, s_1), \dots, g_n(t_n, s_n)) \\ &= \sum_{\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{s}, \boldsymbol{\lambda}} P(\mathbf{t}) \Lambda(\boldsymbol{\lambda}) Q(\mathbf{s} \mid f_1(t_1, \lambda_1), \dots, f_n(t_n, \lambda_n)) v_i(\mathbf{t}, g_1(t_1, s_1, \lambda_1), \dots, g_n(t_n, s_n, \lambda_n)). \end{aligned}$$

We now give the definitions of some classes of equilibria, introduced by Forges [For82], that are meaningful in this setting with communication: communication equilibria, belief-invariant communication equilibria and correlated equilibria. A new class, namely quantum equilibria, will be defined later in Section 6. Communication and correlated equilibria were explicitly discussed in previous work, notably [Aum74, For82, For93, For06]. The intermediate class of belief-invariant (and the quantum variant of Section 6) was previously discussed only indirectly in some works, for example [For93, LRS10, PKL⁺15].

3.1 Communication equilibrium

The most general class we consider here is the class of *communication equilibria*. Here, we assume that the correlation device can implement a correlation Q that is *unrestricted*. We will obtain later two meaningful subclasses by restricting the class of available correlations.

In order to formally define a solution for a game we need to describe not only the correlation Q implemented by the correlation device, but also the strategies, i.e., the functions $\{f_i\}$ and $\{g_i\}$, and the private randomness used by the players. To this aim, given an n -tuple $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$, we use the standard abbreviation \mathbf{x}_{-i} to denote the $(n-1)$ -tuple $(x_1, \dots, x_{i-1}, x_{i+1}, \dots, x_n)$, i.e., \mathbf{x} with the i -th entry removed. Similarly, if $\mathbf{f} = (f_1, \dots, f_n)$ is a family of functions in which each f_i is a function of an argument x_i , we denote $\mathbf{f}_{-i} = (f_1, \dots, f_{i-1}, f_{i+1}, \dots, f_n)$ the family with the i -th member removed, and by $\mathbf{f}_{-i}(\mathbf{x}_{-i})$ the tuple of values $f_1(x_1), \dots, f_{i-1}(x_{i-1}), f_{i+1}(x_{i+1}), \dots, f_n(x_n)$.

Definition 1 (Communication equilibrium). *A solution $(\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{g}, Q)$ is a communication equilibrium of a game G if for each player i and for all random functions $\varphi_i : T_i \rightarrow R_i$ and $\chi_i : S_i \rightarrow A_i$,*

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{\mathbf{t}, \boldsymbol{\lambda}, \mathbf{s}} P(\mathbf{t}) \Lambda(\boldsymbol{\lambda}) Q(\mathbf{s} \mid f_i(t_i, \lambda_i) \mathbf{f}_{-i}(\mathbf{t}_{-i}, \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{-i})) v_i(t, g_i(t_i, s_i, \lambda_i) \mathbf{g}_{-i}(\mathbf{t}_{-i}, \mathbf{s}_{-i}, \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{-i})) \\ &\geq \sum_{\mathbf{t}, \boldsymbol{\lambda}, \mathbf{s}} P(\mathbf{t}) \Lambda(\boldsymbol{\lambda}) Q(\mathbf{s} \mid \varphi_i(t_i, \lambda_i) \mathbf{f}_{-i}(\mathbf{t}_{-i}, \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{-i})) v_i(t, \chi_i(t_i, s_i, \lambda_i) \mathbf{g}_{-i}(\mathbf{t}_{-i}, \mathbf{s}_{-i}, \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{-i})). \end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

This definition captures the idea of having no incentive to deviate unilaterally, but it may seem a formidable task to verify the conditions it imposes. Note that it is w.l.o.g. to assume that in the above definition φ_i and χ_i are deterministic, i.e., not depending on λ_i . Hence, it easily follows that we do not have to go over all functions φ_i , but it is sufficient to go over all its possible outputs r_i , as stated by the next proposition.

Proposition 2. A solution $(\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{g}, Q)$ is a communication equilibrium of a game G if for all i , t_i , r_i and functions $\chi_i \in A_i^{T_i \times S_i}$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{\mathbf{t}_{-i}, \boldsymbol{\lambda}, \mathbf{s}} P(\mathbf{t}) \Lambda(\boldsymbol{\lambda}) Q(\mathbf{s} \mid \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{t}, \boldsymbol{\lambda}) v_i(\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{s}, \boldsymbol{\lambda}))) \\ & \geq \sum_{\mathbf{t}_{-i}, \boldsymbol{\lambda}, \mathbf{s}} P(\mathbf{t}) \Lambda(\boldsymbol{\lambda}) Q(\mathbf{s} \mid r_i \mathbf{f}_{-i}(\mathbf{t}_{-i}, \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{-i})) v_i(\mathbf{t}, \chi_i(t_i, s_i) \mathbf{g}_{-i}(\mathbf{t}_{-i}, \mathbf{s}_{-i}, \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{-i})). \end{aligned}$$

□

The canonical form. Definition 1 is useful for understanding the subclasses of equilibria we define later. However, it is possible to express the communication equilibria in a simpler *canonical form*, where players communicate their types (not a function of the type) to the correlation device, and the latter returns the actions they have to take (not only an information from which players compute their action). The intuition is that the mediator, who implements the correlation $Q(\mathbf{s} \mid \mathbf{r})$ also takes care of the computation of the functions $r_i = f_i(t_i)$ and $a_i = g_i(t_i, s_i)$. Starting from a general communication solution $(\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{g}, Q)$, we construct a new solution where we have a correlation $\hat{Q}(\mathbf{a} \mid \mathbf{t})$ in which inputs are types, outputs are actions, and which works as follows:

$$\hat{Q}(\mathbf{a} \mid \mathbf{t}) = \sum_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}} \Lambda(\boldsymbol{\lambda}) \sum_{\mathbf{s}: \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{s}, \boldsymbol{\lambda}) = \mathbf{a}} Q(\mathbf{s} \mid \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{t}, \boldsymbol{\lambda})). \quad (7)$$

It is clear that the expected payoffs for this solution when the players truthfully reveal their type and take the suggested action (that is, when their strategy corresponds to identity functions id both for inputs and outputs) are the same as those of the original solution:

$$\langle v_i \rangle = \sum_{\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{a}} P(\mathbf{t}) \hat{Q}(\mathbf{a} \mid \mathbf{t}) v_i(\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{a}).$$

Furthermore, we have the following important proposition.

Proposition 3. If $(\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{g}, Q)$ is a communication equilibrium, then the associated canonical strategy $(\text{id}, \text{id}, \hat{Q})$ is a communication equilibrium with the same expected payoffs. In words, no player has an incentive to communicate a false type, or to take an action different from the one suggested.

Proof. Since $(\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{g}, Q)$ is an equilibrium, no player has an incentive in communicating a false type or in taking an action different from the one that has been suggested. If in \hat{Q} there is a player i who can increase his expected payoff by deviating from the suggested action on a type t_i , then the same deviation would increase the expected payoff of player i in $(\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{g}, Q)$ for t_i . This contradicts the assumption that $(\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{g}, Q)$ is an equilibrium. It follows that $(\text{id}, \text{id}, \hat{Q})$ is an equilibrium as well. Because it preserves the conditional distribution of actions given types of $(\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{g}, Q)$, it also preserves the expected payoffs. □

Notice that there are (infinitely) many equilibria $(\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{g}, Q)$ that lead to the same canonical equilibrium \hat{Q} . In fact, (7) and Proposition 3 imply an equivalence relation on solutions. Also notice that each equivalence class of a communication equilibrium contains exactly one canonical equilibrium, which we call *the canonical representative*.

Note also that, since the communicated information comprises only types and actions, these are the only two deviations that a player can take. Therefore, we can simplify the notion of communication equilibrium as follows.

Definition 4 (Canonical communication equilibrium). A solution $(\text{id}, \text{id}, Q)$ is a canonical communication equilibrium if there exists an equilibrium $(\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{g}, Q')$ in its equivalence class, i.e. if the former is the canonical representative of the latter, $Q = \widehat{Q}'$.

Equivalently, in light of the above proposition, $(\text{id}, \text{id}, Q)$ is a canonical communication equilibrium if for all i , t_i , r_i and $\alpha_i \in A_i^{A_i}$ a function from A_i to itself,

$$\sum_{\mathbf{t}_{-i}, \mathbf{a}_{-i}} P(\mathbf{t})Q(\mathbf{a} \mid \mathbf{t})v_i(\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{a}) \geq \sum_{\mathbf{t}_{-i}, \mathbf{a}_{-i}} P(\mathbf{t})Q(\mathbf{a} \mid r_i \mathbf{t}_{-i})v_i(\mathbf{t}, \alpha_i(a_i) \mathbf{a}_{-i}). \quad (8)$$

The above observations imply that as far as communication equilibria are concerned, we may without loss of generality restrict our attention to their canonical representatives. Then, for given game G , we denote as $\text{Comm}(G)$ the set of canonical communication equilibria for G . The next proposition shows that, for every game, this is a convex set.

Proposition 5. If $(\text{id}, \text{id}, Q_1)$ and $(\text{id}, \text{id}, Q_2)$ are canonical communication equilibria for the same game G , then so is $(\text{id}, \text{id}, Q)$, with $Q = pQ_1 + (1-p)Q_2$, for $0 \leq p \leq 1$.

Proof. Consider the following correlation, with $\mathbf{a} = (a_1, \dots, a_n) \in A$, $\mathbf{b} = (b_1, \dots, b_n) \in \{0, 1\}^n$ and $\mathbf{t} = (t_1, \dots, t_n) \in T$:

$$Q'(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b} \mid \mathbf{t}) = \begin{cases} pQ_1(\mathbf{a} \mid \mathbf{t}) & \text{if } b_1 = b_2 = \dots = b_n = 0, \\ (1-p)Q_2(\mathbf{a} \mid \mathbf{t}) & \text{if } b_1 = b_2 = \dots = b_n = 1, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

That is, Q' chooses with probability p and $1-p$ to provide Q_1 and Q_2 , respectively, and informs the players of its choice along with the recommended actions \mathbf{a} . Thus it is clear from the fact that $(\text{id}, \text{id}, Q_1)$ and $(\text{id}, \text{id}, Q_2)$ are equilibria, that $(\text{id}, \text{id}, Q')$ (where players do not output the b_i variables) is an equilibrium, too. The proof is concluded by observing that $Q = \widehat{Q}'$ is the canonical representative of Q' . \square

An example. Consider again the CHSH game described above. A communication equilibrium for the CHSH game consists in players revealing their type to the mediator, receiving information about which game are they playing (i.e., information about the type of the other player), and which action they are suggested to play in that game, and following the advice of the mediator. Formally, consider inputs $(r_1, r_2) \in T$ and outputs (s_1, s_2) where $s_i \in A_i \times \{0, 1\}$. Moreover, consider a correlation Q such that $Q(00, 00 \mid r_1 \cdot r_2 = 0) = 1$ and $Q(01, 11 \mid r_1 \cdot r_2 = 1) = 1$. Then, the solution (id, s_1, Q) , where s_1 is the function that returns the first bit of the advice s received by the player, is a communication equilibrium, since all players have expected payoff 1 and no action can be taken in order to increase this payoff.

Note also that this equilibrium is not canonical, since the mediator is not just suggesting an action, but more complex advices are given. Anyway, it is immediate to transform above equilibrium in a canonical one, by requiring the mediator to return only the action players are suggested to take.

3.2 Belief-invariant equilibrium

We obtain the subclass of belief-invariant equilibria by requiring that the correlation used in the equilibrium is in the class of belief-invariant correlations.

Definition 6 (Belief-invariant equilibrium). A solution $(\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{g}, Q)$ is called belief-invariant if Q is a belief-invariant correlation. If $(\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{g}, Q)$ is a communication equilibrium, we call it a belief-invariant (communication) equilibrium.

A solution $(\text{id}, \text{id}, Q)$ is a canonical belief-invariant equilibrium if there is a belief-invariant equilibrium $(\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{g}, Q')$ in its equivalence class, i.e., with $Q = \widehat{Q}'$.

The relation between belief-invariant equilibria and their canonical version is clarified in the following proposition, whose proof is evident and, hence, omitted.

Proposition 7. *If $(\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{g}, Q)$ is a belief-invariant equilibrium and \widehat{Q} its canonical representative, then $(\text{id}, \text{id}, \widehat{Q})$ is also a belief-invariant equilibrium, with the same payoffs as the original equilibrium.* \square

In a caveat to the above proposition, we stress that the equivalence class of a canonical belief-invariant equilibrium $(\text{id}, \text{id}, Q)$ may contain also solutions involving non-belief-invariant correlations. Indeed, the correlating device could provide players with information about other players even if this information is useless with respect to the choice of the strategy to play. Below we discuss an example showing how this can occur.

Finally, observe that the canonical belief-invariant equilibria of a given game G , denoted $\text{B.I.}(G)$, form a convex set, like the canonical communication equilibria:

Proposition 8. *If $(\text{id}, \text{id}, Q_1)$ and $(\text{id}, \text{id}, Q_2)$ are canonical belief-invariant equilibria for the same game, then so is $(\text{id}, \text{id}, Q)$, with $Q = pQ_1 + (1 - p)Q_2$ for $0 \leq p \leq 1$.*

Proof. Just notice that Q' as defined in the proof of Proposition 5 is belief-invariant. \square

An example. Consider again the CHSH game described above. Recall the canonical communication equilibrium Q previously described, i.e. $Q(00 \mid t_1 \cdot t_2 = 0) = 1$ and $Q(01 \mid t_1 \cdot t_2 = 1) = 1$. It is easy to see that this equilibrium is not belief-invariant. Indeed, whenever the second player receives advice 1, his belief about the type of the first player changes, since he knows for sure that it is 1.

Still, there is a canonical belief-invariant equilibrium. Consider, indeed, the following correlation Q' : $Q'(00 \mid t_1 \cdot t_2 = 0) = Q'(11 \mid t_1 \cdot t_2 = 0) = 1/2$ and $Q'(01 \mid t_1 \cdot t_2 = 1) = Q'(10 \mid t_1 \cdot t_2 = 1) = 1/2$. Note that each player receives a payoff of 1 and, thus, there is no way for them to improve their utility. Anyway, each player receives advice a with probability $1/2$ regardless of the other player's type. Hence, this correlation does not allow players to gain any information about other players.

We note that there are multiple equilibria that belong to the equivalence class whose canonical representative is Q' . In some of these equilibria the advice received by players can contain information that does not serve to the player for computing the action, but still reveal information about the other player's type. Consider for example the following correlation: $Q(00, 00 \mid r_1 \cdot r_2 = 0) = Q(10, 10 \mid r_1 \cdot r_2 = 0) = 1/2$ and $Q(01, 11 \mid r_1 \cdot r_2 = 1) = Q(11, 01 \mid r_1 \cdot r_2 = 1) = 1/2$, in which the advice not only suggests the action that the player should take, but also reveal which game the players are actually playing, and thus, which is the type of the other player.

3.3 Correlated equilibrium

We obtain the subclass of correlated equilibria by requiring that the correlation used at the equilibrium is essentially a shared random variable.

Definition 9 (Correlated equilibrium). *A solution $(\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{g}, Q)$ is called correlated if the output distribution of Q is independent of the input: $Q(\mathbf{s} \mid \mathbf{r}) = Q(\mathbf{s})$ for all \mathbf{r} and \mathbf{s} . If it is a communication equilibrium, we speak of a correlated (communication) equilibrium.*

Similarly to the belief-invariant case, we transfer the property of being correlated to the canonical representative \widehat{Q} , and we call a canonical correlation Q a canonical correlated equilibrium if there is any correlated equilibrium $(\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{g}, Q')$ in its equivalence class, i.e., $Q = \widehat{Q}'$.

The set of canonical correlated equilibria of the game G is denoted $\text{Corr}(G)$.

Our definition is equivalent to the one of Forges (see [For82] and [For93, page 8]), who describes the correlated equilibrium as a collection $(Q(\mathbf{s}), g_1, \dots, g_n)$, where Q is a distribution of suggestions independent of the types, and each $g_i: T_i \times S_i \rightarrow A_i$ is a function that player i uses to determine their action. Indeed, note that the functions f_i in a correlated solution serve no purpose, since the input $r_i = f_i(t_i)$ to Q is irrelevant, and only the sampled output s_i and its correlation with \mathbf{s}_{-i} matter. Hence, from now on we will denote a correlated solution/equilibrium simply as (\mathbf{g}, Q) , with a probability distribution Q on S .

This also allows us to exhibit a simplified equilibrium criterion.

Proposition 10. *A tuple (\mathbf{g}, Q) is a correlated equilibrium if and only if for all i , t_i , s_i and a_i ,*

$$\sum_{\mathbf{t}_{-i}, \mathbf{s}_{-i}} P(\mathbf{t})Q(\mathbf{s})v_i(\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{s})) \geq \sum_{\mathbf{t}_{-i}, \mathbf{s}_{-i}} P(\mathbf{t})Q(\mathbf{s})v_i(\mathbf{t}, a_i \mathbf{g}_{-i}(\mathbf{t}_{-i}, \mathbf{s}_{-i})).$$

□

Remark 11. If (\mathbf{g}, Q) is a correlated equilibrium, then its canonical correlation \hat{Q} is local in the sense of (5). Be aware, however, that we do not know if $(\mathbf{id}, \mathbf{id}, \hat{Q})$ is a correlated equilibrium, because it may not have the required property that $\hat{Q}(\mathbf{a} \mid \mathbf{t})$ is independent of \mathbf{t} (in contrast to Proposition 7 in the belief-invariant case).

Worse, even if $(\mathbf{id}, \mathbf{id}, Q)$ is a communication equilibrium such that Q is a local correlation, it is not clear whether this implies that \hat{Q} is a canonical correlated equilibrium in the sense of Definition 9. To show this, one would have to find a correlated equilibrium (\mathbf{g}, Q') such that $Q = \hat{Q}'$ is its canonical representative. The difficulty stems from the fact that while Q can be simulated by giving a suitable shared randomness $\Gamma = (\Gamma_1, \dots, \Gamma_n)$ to cooperating players, see eq. (5), to competing players it might give an advantage over the others having access to Γ directly rather than only Q .

To have a usable handle on correlated equilibria, we propose the following definition, which allows us to identify the correlated solutions to a game of incomplete information with the correlated strategies of the associated game of complete information.

Definition 12. *We say that a correlated solution (equilibrium) (\mathbf{g}, Q) is in standard form if for all i , the advice space equals the set of functions from types to actions, $S_i = A_i^{T_i}$, and if the function g_i consists of evaluating the first argument (a function) on the second argument:*

$$\begin{aligned} g_i: T_i \times A_i^{T_i} &\longrightarrow A_i, \\ (t_i, \sigma_i) &\longmapsto \sigma_i(t_i). \end{aligned}$$

Clearly, such a solution is given entirely by the distribution Q on $A_1^{T_1} \times \dots \times A_n^{T_n}$, which we will thus use as a shorthand for a correlated solution in standard form.

The following proposition shows that the correlated equilibria in games with incomplete information, or more specifically their standard form, are precisely the correlated equilibria in the associated game of complete information that has the strategy space $S_i = A_i^{T_i}$ for player i . The proof is evident and, hence, omitted.

Proposition 13. *If (\mathbf{g}, Q) is a correlated equilibrium, then we can obtain a correlated equilibrium \tilde{Q} in standard form that is in the same equivalence class, as follows:*

$$\tilde{Q}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}) := \Pr_Q\{\forall i \ g_i(\cdot, s_i) = \sigma_i\}.$$

Thus, a canonical equilibrium Q is a correlated equilibrium if and only if there exists a correlated equilibrium in standard form in its equivalence class. □

Remark 14. Note that we can also define Nash equilibria in this formalism. Nash equilibria are precisely the correlated equilibria (\mathbf{g}, Q) with a product distribution $Q(\mathbf{s}) = Q_1(s_1) \cdots Q_n(s_n)$.

Note that it is straightforward to see that if (\mathbf{g}, Q) is a Nash equilibrium, then the canonical representative is also a product distribution, i.e., $\hat{Q} = \hat{Q}_1 \times \cdots \times \hat{Q}_n$, and in fact a Nash equilibrium. Conversely, if $Q(\mathbf{a} | \mathbf{t})$ is a canonical communication equilibrium that factorizes, i.e., $Q(\mathbf{a} | \mathbf{t}) = Q_1(a_1 | t_1) \cdots Q_n(a_n | t_n)$, then there is a Nash equilibrium in its equivalence class with the same payoffs. This is obtained by writing each of the local transition probabilities $Q_i(a_i | t_i)$ as probabilistic mixtures of functions in $A_i^{T_i}$.

Thus, in the spirit of previous definitions, we can speak of a *canonical Nash equilibrium* as a factorizing canonical communication equilibrium $Q(\mathbf{a} | \mathbf{t})$. We will denote the set of canonical Nash equilibria of a game G as $\text{Nash}(G)$.

As expected, and as it should be, the set of correlated equilibria is convex:

Proposition 15. *If $(\mathbf{g}^{(1)}, Q_1)$ and $(\mathbf{g}^{(2)}, Q_2)$ are correlated equilibria for the same game, with Q_j a distribution on $S^{(j)}$ and $0 \leq p \leq 1$, then so is (\mathbf{g}, Q) with*

$$Q(\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{b}) := \begin{cases} pQ_1(\mathbf{s}) & \text{if } b_1 = \dots = b_n = 0, \mathbf{s} \in S^{(1)}, \\ (1-p)Q_2(\mathbf{s}) & \text{if } b_1 = \dots = b_n = 1, \mathbf{s} \in S^{(2)}, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise;} \end{cases}$$

$$g_i(s_i, b_i) := g^{(b_i+1)}(s_i).$$

Proof. The proof follows from the insight that (\mathbf{g}, Q) gives each player the information which of the two solutions $(\mathbf{g}^{(1)}, Q_1)$ and $(\mathbf{g}^{(2)}, Q_2)$ was implemented, so any benefit from deviating from the advice for player i would imply an advantage for the player in one of $(\mathbf{g}^{(1)}, Q_1)$ or $(\mathbf{g}^{(2)}, Q_2)$, contradicting the assumption that they are equilibria. \square

An example. Consider again the CHSH game defined above. It is easy to check that the belief-invariant equilibrium described above is not correlated. Indeed, a shared random variable is not sufficient to understand which game players are actually playing and to understand if they need to coordinate or to anti-coordinate.

An example of correlated equilibrium for this game is (id, Q) with $Q(00) = Q(11) = 1/2$. Here, the action of each player does not depend on the other player's type. Anyway, it is still convenient for the player to follow the suggestion, since they will receive payoff 1 with probability 3/4 and there is no alternative action that allows them to receive this payoff with larger probability. Observe that this equilibrium is not a Nash equilibrium, since it requires shared randomness and cannot be factorized. A Nash equilibrium with the same payoff is (id, Q) with $Q(00) = 1$.

3.4 General properties of the equilibrium classes

The main goal of this work is to highlight the relations between the different concepts of equilibria we have introduced so far. In particular, in Section 4, we will compare the performance of these equilibria with respect to social welfare maximization. Here, we begin by pointing out common and distinguishing features of the classes.

We have observed that there are correlated equilibria that are not Nash, belief-invariant equilibria that are not correlated, and communication equilibria that are not belief-invariant. Since communication, belief-invariant and correlated equilibria have convexity properties, we

can arrange the canonical versions of these equilibria into nested sets within the set of canonical correlations $Q(\mathbf{a} \mid \mathbf{t})$:

$$\text{Nash}(G) \subset \text{conv}(\text{Nash}(G)) \subset \text{Corr}(G) \subset \text{B.I.}(G) \subset \text{Comm}(G), \quad (9)$$

where $\text{conv}(\text{Nash}(G))$ denotes the convex hull of the set of Nash equilibria for G .

Actually, this inclusion can be easily derived from the similar structure existing between the different classes of correlation resources behind these equilibrium concepts.

Indeed, by our previous observations, $\text{Corr}(G)$ is always a convex subset of the local correlations $\text{LOC}(A \mid T)$, $\text{B.I.}(G)$ is a convex subset of the non-signalling correlations $\text{BINV}(A \mid T)$, and all are contained in the set of all correlations $\text{ALL}(A \mid T)$. The inclusion structure between these classes is known (see, e.g., [MAG06]) for full-coordination games¹.

We go on to discuss some further issue arising with these definitions.

Necessity of an informed mediator. The correlated equilibrium class does not need an informed mediator to be implemented, since it is based on local correlations and the shared random variables are independent of the types. For some cases the players can also get rid of the mediator completely, and base their strategy on the observation of a single independent shared random variable, such as meteorological data. This however suggests that all players receive the same information as advice. There are examples of correlated equilibria where this is not given and indeed not possible, such as the game of Chicken [RC66]. Different schemes to get rid of a mediator based on communication between players have been studied in [For88].

In contrast, in the case of belief-invariant and communication equilibria, the players seem to need a trusted mediator to implement the correlation. We say “seem” because strong experimental evidence from physics suggests that it is possible to go beyond the local correlations without a mediator by using quantum effects. However quantum mechanics cannot cover the whole class of belief-invariant correlations. The correlation (10) given below is not achievable in quantum mechanics without a mediator (as proven in [Tsi80]). Therefore, unless quantum mechanics is falsified in the future and replaced by another theory, a mediator is needed to implement the complete belief-invariant class. The quantum mechanical class will be discussed later in Section 6.

Privacy of the players. Clearly, in order to implement a correlated equilibrium, nobody else other than player i needs to learn the type t_i . The belief-invariant class allows for more correlations at the expense that a trusted mediator might learn something about the types. The use of a belief-invariant correlation guarantees however that the mediator will be the only one learning the types and no player j will learn t_i . It is not always possible to respect this requirement in the more general class of communication equilibria.

Note that our concept of privacy in correlated and belief-invariant equilibria is much stronger than the well-known concept of differential privacy [PR13]. Indeed, we say that an equilibrium is private in an information-theoretic sense and assume that each player cannot obtain any new information about the other players while playing the game; differential privacy, instead, assumes only that each player cannot obtain more than epsilon information, for small and positive epsilon. Moreover, differential privacy usually guarantees privacy only when the number of players is large, while our privacy concept applies to any number of players.

¹In quantum physics and computer science, these games are known as non-local games. While they may seem uninteresting because of the lack of competition, they are a wonderful way of reasoning about the classes of correlations. The objective of a non-local game, in our parlance here, is to find an optimal equilibrium with respect to a certain payoff function $v(\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{a})$ common to all players, which simply boils down to optimizing $\langle v \rangle = \sum_{\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{a}} P(\mathbf{t}) Q(\mathbf{a} \mid \mathbf{t}) v(\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{a})$ over all canonical solutions Q from a given class.

Situations in which communication or correlation are useless. If our game G is really one of complete information in the sense that the types of the players are deterministically prescribed, i.e., $P(\mathbf{t}_0) = 1$ for some $\mathbf{t}_0 \in T$, then any communication equilibrium is equivalent to a correlated equilibrium. More precisely, for the canonical form Q of the communication equilibrium, $Q_0 := Q(\cdot \mid \mathbf{t}_0)$ as a probability distribution on $A = A_1 \times \cdots \times A_n$ is a correlated equilibrium, which has the same expected payoffs,

$$\langle v_i \rangle = \sum_{\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{a}} P(\mathbf{t}) Q(\mathbf{a} \mid \mathbf{t}) v_i(\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{a}) = \sum_{\mathbf{a}} Q(\mathbf{a} \mid \mathbf{t}_0) v_i(\mathbf{t}_0, \mathbf{a}) = \sum_{\mathbf{a}} Q_0(\mathbf{a}) v_i(\mathbf{t}_0, \mathbf{a}),$$

and similarly for any social payoffs. This reproduces the result of Zhang [Zha12], that quantum (and indeed *any*) correlation doesn't change the landscape of equilibria in games of complete information beyond correlated equilibria.

Secondly, we can identify a simple class of games where the presence of no additional correlation changes the set of equilibrium payoffs; we call them (two-player) *constant sum games*, and they are characterized by the property that

$$v_1(t_1 t_2, a_1 a_2) + v_2(t_1 t_2, a_1 a_2) = s(t_1 t_2),$$

i.e., the sum of the two players' individual payoffs depends only on the type. This implies that regardless of the solution employed,

$$\langle v_1 \rangle + \langle v_2 \rangle = \sum_{t_1 t_2} P(t_1 t_2) s(t_1 t_2) =: \langle s \rangle.$$

Thus, the game is an instance of a zero-sum game according to the theory of von Neumann and Morgenstern [vNM44] (we can make the sum of payoffs explicitly equal to zero by subtracting $s(t_1 t_2)$ from $v_1(t_1 t_2, a_1 a_2)$, but we refrain from doing so not to overload notation).

This means that there exists a (mixed) strategy $Q_i^{\text{vNM}}(a_i \mid t_i)$ for player i , which guarantees him a payoff v_i^{vNM} regardless of what the other player does, and $v_1^{\text{vNM}} + v_2^{\text{vNM}} = \langle s \rangle$. In particular, if we consider any communication equilibrium of the game, then the first player's payoff cannot increase if the second player were to use his von-Neumann-Morgenstern strategy (ignoring the advice) that guarantees him a payoff of at least v_2^{vNM} . Thus,

$$\langle v_1 \rangle \leq \langle s \rangle - v_2^{\text{vNM}} = v_1^{\text{vNM}},$$

and symmetrically

$$\langle v_2 \rangle \leq \langle s \rangle - v_1^{\text{vNM}} = v_2^{\text{vNM}}.$$

This explains the absence of quantum advantage in the conflict-of-interest games considered in [BL13], as they are all of the above constant-sum type.

Computational complexity The equilibrium concept and its variations discussed so far are useful to understand the behaviour of the players. A fundamental question (see for example [PR08]) is how one could calculate such an equilibrium or even just verify that a given set of strategies is an equilibrium, or on the other hand find an equilibrium that optimizes some other parameter, such as a social payoff. Not that much is known for the class of equilibria we just discussed. Below we mention the results we are aware of, and we leave as an interesting open problem to complete the picture. Note that, except where otherwise specified, the computational complexity will be with respect to the size of the n -player game specification, that consists of a

list of probabilities $P(\mathbf{t})$, for $\mathbf{t} \in T$, and a list of the payoff function values $v_i(\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{a})$, one for each player $i = 1, \dots, n$, each $\mathbf{t} \in T$, and each $\mathbf{a} \in A$.²

Nash equilibria of complete information games are hard to find: in fact, it is known that the problem is PPAD-hard even for two-player games [DGP09, CDT09]. Since games of incomplete information contain complete-information games as a special case, they are at least as hard. On the other hand, from Proposition 2, it turns out that it is possible to check in polynomial time whether a solution $(\mathbf{id}, \mathbf{id}, Q)$ in canonical form is a Nash equilibrium whenever the number of actions available to players is bounded.

Correlated equilibria of complete information games can be found in time that is polynomial in the size of the game specification through linear programming [HS89]. Recall that a game of incomplete information can be modelled as a game of complete information where the players' strategies are $A_i^{T_i} = \{g_i: T_i \rightarrow A_i\}$, i.e., all possible functions from T_i to A_i . However, this not only disregards the special nature of the payoff functions that depend only on input-output pairs of the strategy, but exponentially increases the size of the game specification. Thus, the above result does not extend, and thus we do not know whether it is possible to find correlated equilibria in polynomial time. This result extends also to games of incomplete information.

Still, optimal correlated equilibria of incomplete information games are hard to find (they belong to the complexity class of NP-hard problems) even for full coordination games, with respect to the size of the game specification. This can be proven by embedding notoriously hard problems (like the chromatic number of a graph) into cooperative games (see, for example, the game used in [CMN⁺07]).

Belief-invariant equilibria of full coordination games of incomplete information can be instead found in time that is polynomial in the size of game description via linear programming. This is because the set of non-signalling correlations is defined by polynomially many non-negative variables subject to polynomially many linear inequalities. (See, for example, the LP in [BFS14, page 8].) We do not know yet if this extends to conflict of interest games, and this is one of the major open problems in the present theory. Our intuition is that the belief-invariant equilibria of games of incomplete information are the “right” analogue of correlated equilibria of games of complete information; from this perspective one might speculate that belief-invariant equilibria can be found efficiently, such as [HS89].

4 Impact of correlation on social welfare

In this section we show that no-signalling correlation can have a positive impact on the social welfare of a game. Specifically, there are games in which a belief-invariant equilibrium can achieve a social welfare that is better than every correlated equilibria. The CHSH game discussed above gives us a clear example of this fact: indeed, we showed there is a belief-invariant equilibrium that achieves an expected social welfare of 2, whereas it is not hard to see that no correlated equilibrium is better than the one described above, whose social welfare is $3/2$.

However, the CHSH game is a two-player full coordination game, and one can wonder whether such a result holds even we consider games with conflict of interests and/or with more than two player. Pappa et al. [PKL⁺15] give a partial answer to this question, by showing that above result holds for a two-player conflict-of-interest variant of the CHSH game. Below, we report

²Note that the size of the game specification is exponential in the number of players. For this reason, many computational complexity results have been given only for games that are succinctly representable, that is games that can be fully specified by a number of parameters that is polynomial in the number of players, types and actions.

this result for completeness. Moreover, we extend their result by presenting a n -player game with conflict of interests in which a belief-invariant equilibrium exists that is better than any correlated equilibrium. Interestingly, our game is a variant of the GHZ game, a game motivated from quantum mechanics [GHSZ90].

Since the class of belief-invariant equilibria strictly contains the class of correlated equilibria, it may be expected that the former contains equilibria that are better than the ones in the latter class. It is instead surprising that a correlated equilibrium can perform better than any other equilibrium in the class, even unrestricted ones. However, we next show that this may be the case. In other word, we prove that locality is not only a desirable requirement, but it is sometimes necessary in order to achieve high social welfare. Note that, recently a general form of Pappa et al. game has been studied where authors have shown quantum advantage in the context of social welfare [RMG⁺16].

4.1 Belief-invariant equilibria can outperform correlated equilibria

4.1.1 Two-player games with conflict of interests

A modified version of CHSH has been used in [PKL⁺15] to obtain a two-player game with conflict of interests in which there is a belief-invariant equilibrium that achieves a better expected social welfare than any correlated equilibrium. We report it here for completeness.

In this game, the players are still interested in coordinating or anti-coordinating as in CHSH, but now each player prefers a specific outcome, as follows:

	0	1		0	1
0	$1, \frac{1}{2}$	0,0	0	0,0	$\frac{3}{4}, \frac{3}{4}$
1	0,0	$\frac{1}{2}, 1$	1	$\frac{3}{4}, \frac{3}{4}$	0,0
	$t_1 \cdot t_2 = 0$			$t_1 \cdot t_2 = 1$	

Figure 2: The game of Pappa et al. [PKL⁺15]

The pure strategies (0,0) and (1,1) lead to two equilibria with unfair expected payoffs, in a battle-of-sexes flavour.³ No player has incentive to deviate from constant actions (0,0), but the first player has $\frac{3}{4}$ expected payoff, while the other player has $\frac{3}{8}$. For the second equilibrium, constant (1,1), we have the same unfairness, this time in favor of the second player.

The situation can be improved with the notions of communication equilibria we discussed in Section 3. With a correlated equilibrium we have a solution similar to battle-of-sexes: with one bit shared randomness one can select either the first or the second pure equilibrium uniformly. This makes the situation fair, with an expected payoff of $\frac{9}{16}$. There are also an unfair correlated equilibria where the two players get payoff of $\frac{11}{16}$ and $\frac{7}{16}$, respectively. However, the following belief-invariant correlation guarantees to both players a fair and optimal expected payoff of $\frac{3}{4}$.

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{If } t_1 \cdot t_2 = 0 \text{ then } \quad Q(0,0 | t) &= Q(1,1 | t) = \frac{1}{2}, \\
\text{if } t_1 \cdot t_2 = 1 \text{ then } \quad Q(0,1 | t) &= Q(1,0 | t) = \frac{1}{2}.
\end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

This is belief-invariant because the marginal of each player is a uniformly random bit whatever the other player's type is. Notice that this correlation solves perfectly the common objective of

³Battle of Sexes is a classic game theory example. It is used in many textbooks, for example [FT91, NRTV07].

CHSH, i.e., coordinating if $t_1 \cdot t_2 = 0$ and anti-coordinating otherwise. Also, in the case $t_1 \cdot t_2 = 0$ it behaves like a correlated equilibrium in the battle-of-sexes game, by selecting one of the two pure strategies $(1, 1)$ or $(0, 0)$ uniformly.

As said above, this correlation is used in [For06, page 335], and it is well-known in the physics community as the PR-box [PR94]. It is also known that this belief-invariant correlation cannot be implemented as a local one [Tsi80].

4.1.2 n -player games with conflict of interests

We now introduce a game based on an example in physics known as *the GHZ state* for three parties [GHSZ90]. (The result can be generalized to n parties, we chose $n = 3$ for simplicity.)

We have three players, each one with two possible types (which we label type 0 and 1) and two possible actions (action 0 and 1). The possible type triples (t_1, t_2, t_3) are taken from the set $\{(0, 0, 1), (0, 1, 0), (1, 0, 0), (1, 1, 1)\}$ with probability

$$p(0, 0, 1) = p(0, 1, 0) = p(1, 0, 0) = \frac{1}{6}, \quad p(1, 1, 1) = \frac{1}{2}.$$

Let $\tau = t_1 \cdot t_2 \cdot t_3$. We have $\Pr(\tau = 1) = \Pr(\tau = 0) = \frac{1}{2}$. The payoff are as follows:

	0	1				
0	<table border="1" style="display: inline-table;"><tr><td>$\varepsilon, \varepsilon, \varepsilon$</td><td>$0, 0, 0$</td></tr></table>	$\varepsilon, \varepsilon, \varepsilon$	$0, 0, 0$	<table border="1" style="display: inline-table;"><tr><td>$0, 0, 0$</td><td>$1, \varepsilon, 1$</td></tr></table>	$0, 0, 0$	$1, \varepsilon, 1$
$\varepsilon, \varepsilon, \varepsilon$	$0, 0, 0$					
$0, 0, 0$	$1, \varepsilon, 1$					
1	<table border="1" style="display: inline-table;"><tr><td>$0, 0, 0$</td><td>$\varepsilon, 1, 1$</td></tr></table>	$0, 0, 0$	$\varepsilon, 1, 1$	<table border="1" style="display: inline-table;"><tr><td>$1, 1, \varepsilon$</td><td>$0, 0, 0$</td></tr></table>	$1, 1, \varepsilon$	$0, 0, 0$
$0, 0, 0$	$\varepsilon, 1, 1$					
$1, 1, \varepsilon$	$0, 0, 0$					
	0	1				

(a) $\tau = 0$

	0	1				
0	<table border="1" style="display: inline-table;"><tr><td>$0, 0, 0$</td><td>$1, 1, \varepsilon$</td></tr></table>	$0, 0, 0$	$1, 1, \varepsilon$	<table border="1" style="display: inline-table;"><tr><td>$\varepsilon, 1, 1$</td><td>$0, 0, 0$</td></tr></table>	$\varepsilon, 1, 1$	$0, 0, 0$
$0, 0, 0$	$1, 1, \varepsilon$					
$\varepsilon, 1, 1$	$0, 0, 0$					
1	<table border="1" style="display: inline-table;"><tr><td>$1, \varepsilon, 1$</td><td>$0, 0, 0$</td></tr></table>	$1, \varepsilon, 1$	$0, 0, 0$	<table border="1" style="display: inline-table;"><tr><td>$0, 0, 0$</td><td>$\varepsilon, \varepsilon, \varepsilon$</td></tr></table>	$0, 0, 0$	$\varepsilon, \varepsilon, \varepsilon$
$1, \varepsilon, 1$	$0, 0, 0$					
$0, 0, 0$	$\varepsilon, \varepsilon, \varepsilon$					
	0	1				

(b) $\tau = 1$

Figure 3: A modified GHZ game. The subgame (a) is played when $\tau = 0$ and subgame (b) when $\tau = 1$. In both cases the strategy player 1 identify the table (0 for right table, 1 for the left table), the strategy of player 2 chooses the row (0 for the top row, 1 for the bottom row), and the strategy of player 3 chooses the column (0 for left column, 1 for right column). Within a cell, the first value is the payoff of player 1, the second value is the payoff of player 2 and the last payoff is for player 3.

Thus, the players jointly lose the game (have all payoff 0) whenever $\tau \neq a_1 + a_2 + a_3 \pmod{2}$. In the non-losing cases, the players whose action is equal to τ receive payoff ε (a positive number very close to 0), while the others receive payoff 1.

Therefore this game, in the spirit of [PKL⁺15], features both coordination and conflicting interests. The players are jointly interested in minimizing the probability of having payoff 0, while each player individually dislikes to be the one implementing the action τ in the winning cases.

In the best correlated equilibrium (in terms of expected payoff for each player), the mediator suggests to each player i the function

$$\sigma_i = 1 - t_i \pmod{2}.$$

This always wins in the case $\tau = 0$ and loses in the case $\tau = 1$. It gives to each player expected payoff $\frac{2+\varepsilon}{6}$.

The best communication equilibrium is as follows. The mediator learns the types, and if $\tau = 0$ he suggests actions $(0, 1, 1), (1, 0, 1), (1, 1, 0)$ uniformly at random, while if $\tau = 1$ he suggests actions $(0, 0, 1), (0, 1, 0), (1, 0, 0)$ uniformly at random. This gives to each player expected payoff $\frac{2+\varepsilon}{3}$.

This communication equilibrium is not belief-invariant, because the marginals for the players' actions are not the same in case $\tau = 0$ and $\tau = 1$. For example, if a player has type 1 and receives advice for action 0, then his belief will change, assigning more probability to the case $\tau = 1$.

Thus, in any belief-invariant equilibria, the mediator must make sure that, for all the possible triples of types, the marginal distributions of all players are the same. Since the payoff of player i is maximized when the action $a_i \neq \tau$, the expected social welfare for a belief-invariant equilibrium is maximized by considering a distribution Q such that the i -th marginal gives $\Pr_{Q,\mathbf{t}}(a_i = 1 \mid t_i) = \Pr_{Q,\mathbf{t}}(a_i = 0 \mid t_i) = \frac{1}{2}$, whatever the type t_i is. This is implemented by the following distribution Q :

If $\mathbf{t} \in \{(0, 0, 1), (0, 1, 0), (1, 0, 0)\}$ then

$$Q(0, 0, 0 \mid \mathbf{t}) = Q(0, 1, 1 \mid \mathbf{t}) = Q(1, 0, 1 \mid \mathbf{t}) = Q(1, 1, 0 \mid \mathbf{t}) = \frac{1}{4}, \quad (11)$$

if $\mathbf{t} = (1, 1, 1)$ then

$$Q(0, 0, 1 \mid \mathbf{t}) = Q(0, 1, 0 \mid \mathbf{t}) = Q(1, 0, 0 \mid \mathbf{t}) = Q(1, 1, 1 \mid \mathbf{t}) = \frac{1}{4}.$$

It is easy to see that this is a belief-invariant equilibrium, since any deviating player would decrease his own expected payoff by deviating (it makes everyone lose in at least a value of τ).

One can check that in this equilibrium each player receives a payoff of $\frac{1+\varepsilon}{2}$ that is better than the expected payoff of the best correlated equilibrium. There are biased communication equilibria produced through an unrestricted, non-private, correlation. Such an equilibrium can have a player's expected payoff as large as 1.

4.2 Belief-invariant equilibria can outperform non-belief-invariant ones

Consider the following two-player game of incomplete information: the two players with types $t_1, t_2 \in \{0, 1\}$. Each player has also two available actions, also named 0 and 1. The payoffs are as follows:

		0	1			0	1
0		$1-\varepsilon, 1-\varepsilon$	$2, 0$	0		$0, 0$	$1, 1$
1		$0, 2$	$2-\varepsilon, 2-\varepsilon$	1		$1, 1$	$0, 0$
		$t_1 \cdot t_2 = 0$				$t_1 \cdot t_2 = 1$	

Figure 4: A game in which belief-invariant equilibria outperform non-belief-invariant ones

Thus, if $t_1 \cdot t_2 = 0$, then payoffs resemble the ones of the Prisoners' Dilemma,⁴ so that it is a dominant strategy for each player to take action 0. If instead $t_1 \cdot t_2 = 1$ then players are playing a full coordination game in which they prefer to take different actions. We assume that each type profile (t_1, t_2) has the same probability $\frac{1}{4}$ of being generated.

Let us consider a distribution Q of the form $Q(\mathbf{a} \mid \mathbf{t})$. We will show that for any such distribution, if $(\text{id}, \text{id}, Q)$ is an equilibrium and maximizes the social welfare among all the

⁴The Prisoners' Dilemma is another classic example in game theory. It is found in many textbooks, for example [FT91, NRTV07].

equilibria, then it is a correlated equilibrium, and hence it is belief-invariant. Note that there is no loss of generality in considering only canonical equilibria. Indeed, as stated above, if a non-canonical communication equilibrium $(\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{g}, Q')$ exists with a better social welfare, then its canonical representative $(\mathbf{id}, \mathbf{id}, \widehat{Q}')$ is still an equilibrium and has the same social welfare as $(\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{g}, Q')$.

We start by stating conditions for $(\mathbf{id}, \mathbf{id}, Q)$ being an equilibrium that maximizes the social welfare. A first simple observation is the following: If $Q(1, a_2 \mid 0, t_2) > 0$, then $(\mathbf{id}, \mathbf{id}, Q)$ is not in equilibrium. Indeed, when $t_1 = 0$, then player 1 knows with probability 1 that $t_1 \cdot t_2 = 0$, and thus it is a dominant strategy to take action 0. By symmetry, the same observation holds by inverting the roles of players. Hence, in order to have a canonical equilibrium we must have that Q is as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} Q(0, 0 \mid 0, 0) &= 1; \quad Q(0, 0 \mid 0, 1) = 1 - p; \quad Q(0, 1 \mid 0, 1) = p; \\ Q(0, 0 \mid 1, 0) &= 1 - q; \quad Q(1, 0 \mid 1, 0) = q; \\ Q(0, 0 \mid 1, 1) &= p_{00}; \quad Q(0, 1 \mid 1, 1) = p_{01}; \quad Q(1, 0 \mid 1, 1) = p_{10}; \quad Q(1, 1 \mid 1, 1) = p_{11}. \end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

Next lemma states conditions on these values in order for Q being an equilibrium.

Lemma 16. *$(\mathbf{id}, \mathbf{id}, Q)$ is an equilibrium if and only if the following conditions are satisfied:*

$$p_{10} - p_{11} \geq (1 - \varepsilon)q \tag{13}$$

$$p_{01} - p_{11} \geq (1 - \varepsilon)p \tag{14}$$

$$p_{00} - p_{01} \leq (1 - \varepsilon)(1 - q) \tag{15}$$

$$p_{00} - p_{10} \leq (1 - \varepsilon)(1 - p) \tag{16}$$

$$(p_{01} + p_{10}) - (p_{00} + p_{11}) \geq (1 - \varepsilon)(2q - 1) \tag{17}$$

$$(p_{01} + p_{10}) - (p_{00} + p_{11}) \geq (1 - \varepsilon)(2p - 1). \tag{18}$$

Proof. By Proposition 2, $(\mathbf{id}, \mathbf{id}, Q)$ is an equilibrium if and only if for every $i \in \{1, 2\}$, $t_i \in \{0, 1\}$, $b_i \in \{0, 1\}$ and any function $\chi_i \in A_i^{T_i \times A_i}$

$$\langle v_i \mid t_i \rangle := \sum_{\mathbf{t}_{-i}, \mathbf{a}} P(\mathbf{t}_{-i} t_i) Q(\mathbf{a} \mid \mathbf{t}_{-i} t_i) v_i(\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{a}_{-i} a_i) \geq \sum_{\mathbf{t}_{-i}, \mathbf{a}} P(\mathbf{t}_{-i} t_i) Q(\mathbf{a} \mid \mathbf{t}_{-i} b_i) v_i(\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{a}_{-i} \chi_i(t_i, a_i)). \tag{19}$$

As observed above, when $t_i = 0$, (19) easily holds since, whichever the advice is, it is a dominant strategy for player i to take action 0. Hence, we only need to verify that (19) holds when $t_i = 1$. To this aim, observe that there are only four possible functions $\chi_i(1, \cdot)$: the identity function that sets $\chi_i(1, a_i) = a_i$, the two constant functions that set $\chi_i(1, a_i) = 0$ and $\chi_i(1, a_i) = 1$ for every a_i , respectively, and the negation function that sets $\chi_i(1, a_i) = 1 - a_i$.

Thus, if $i = 1$ and $b_i = t_i = 1$, then we require that

$$\begin{aligned} \langle v_1 \mid 1 \rangle &\geq \sum_{t_2, \mathbf{a}} P(1, t_2) Q(\mathbf{a} \mid 1, t_2) v_1(\mathbf{t}, 0a_2) = \frac{1 - \varepsilon + p_{01} + p_{11}}{2} \\ \langle v_1 \mid 1 \rangle &\geq \sum_{t_2, \mathbf{a}} P(1, t_2) Q(\mathbf{a} \mid 1, t_2) v_1(\mathbf{t}, 1a_2) = \frac{p_{10} + p_{00}}{2} \\ \langle v_1 \mid 1 \rangle &\geq \sum_{t_2, \mathbf{a}} P(1, t_2) Q(\mathbf{a} \mid 1, t_2) v_1(\mathbf{t}, (1 - a_1)a_2) = \frac{(1 - \varepsilon)q + p_{00} + p_{11}}{2}. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, if $i = 1$ and $0 = b_i \neq t_i = 1$, then we require that

$$\begin{aligned}\langle v_1 | 1 \rangle &\geq \sum_{t_2, \mathbf{a}} P(1, t_2) Q(\mathbf{a} | 0, t_2) v_i(\mathbf{t}, a_1 a_2) = \frac{1 - \varepsilon + p_{01} + p_{11}}{2} \\ \langle v_1 | 1 \rangle &\geq \sum_{t_2, \mathbf{a}} P(1, t_2) Q(\mathbf{a} | 0, t_2) v_i(\mathbf{t}, 0 a_2) = \frac{1 - \varepsilon + p_{01} + p_{11}}{2} \\ \langle v_1 | 1 \rangle &\geq \sum_{t_2, \mathbf{a}} P(1, t_2) Q(\mathbf{a} | 0, t_2) v_i(\mathbf{t}, 1 a_2) = \frac{p_{10} + p_{00}}{2} \\ \langle v_1 | 1 \rangle &\geq \sum_{t_2, \mathbf{a}} P(1, t_2) Q(\mathbf{a} | 0, t_2) v_i(\mathbf{t}, (1 - a_1) a_2) = \frac{p_{10} + p_{00}}{2}.\end{aligned}$$

Since $\langle v_1 | 1 \rangle = \frac{(1-\varepsilon)(1-q)+p_{01}+p_{10}}{2}$, it follows that all these inequalities hold if and only if conditions (13),(15),(17) are satisfied.

By repeating the same argument, we can observe that all the inequalities regarding to the second player hold if and only if conditions (14),(16),(18) are satisfied. \square

Let us now consider the correlation Q^* that sets $p = q = p_{01} = p_{10} = 1/2$ and $p_{00} = p_{11} = 0$. It is immediate to check that conditions (13-18) are satisfied, and, hence, $(\text{id}, \text{id}, Q^*)$ is an equilibrium.

Note also that, if $t_i = 0$, then the player i is suggested to take action 0, regardless of the other player's type, whereas, if $t_i = 1$, the player i uses a shared random variable to decide which action they have to take. Thus, the solution $(\text{id}, \text{id}, Q^*)$ is equivalent to $(\mathbf{g}, \widetilde{Q}^*)$, where $\widetilde{Q}^*(\mathbf{a} | \mathbf{t}) = \widetilde{Q}^*(\mathbf{a})$ for each \mathbf{a} , and, in particular, sets $\widetilde{Q}^*(00) = \widetilde{Q}^*(11) = 0$ and $\widetilde{Q}^*(01) = \widetilde{Q}^*(10) = 1/2$, and $\gamma = (g_1, g_2)$, with $g_i \in A_i^{T_i \times A_i}$ that sets $g_i(0, a_i) = 0$ and $g_i(1, a_i) = a_i$ for each $a_i \in A_i$. In other words, $(\text{id}, \text{id}, Q^*)$ is a correlated equilibrium.

Finally, it is easy to check that the expected payoff that each player receives at this equilibrium is $1 - \varepsilon/2$. Thus the expected social welfare of the correlated equilibrium $(\text{id}, \text{id}, Q^*)$ is $2 - \varepsilon$.

We next state the main result of this section, namely that for this game any communication equilibrium achieving an expected social welfare that is at least $2 - \varepsilon$ must be correlated.

Theorem 17. *Any canonical communication equilibrium $(\text{id}, \text{id}, Q)$ with expected social welfare at least $2 - \varepsilon$ is correlated.*

Proof. Let Q be as in (12). As observed above, any canonical communication equilibrium $(\text{id}, \text{id}, Q)$ must be distributed as Q and must satisfy conditions (13-18).

The expected social welfare of a solution $(\text{id}, \text{id}, Q)$ is

$$\begin{aligned}\text{SW}(\text{id}, \text{id}, Q) &= \frac{1}{4} [2(1 - \varepsilon) + (2(1 - \varepsilon)(1 - p) + 2p) + (2(1 - \varepsilon)(1 - q) + 2q) + 2(p_{01} + p_{10})] \\ &= \frac{1}{2} [3 - \varepsilon[3 - p - q] + (p_{01} + p_{10})].\end{aligned}$$

Thus, the expected social welfare of $(\text{id}, \text{id}, Q)$ is at least $2 - \varepsilon$ only if

$$p_{00} + p_{11} = 1 - p_{01} - p_{10} \leq (p + q - 1)\varepsilon.$$

However, since $p_{00} + p_{11} \geq 0$, we have that

$$p + q \geq 1. \tag{20}$$

Moreover, since $p \leq 1$, we also have that

$$p_{11} \leq p_{00} + p_{11} \leq (p + q - 1)\varepsilon \leq q\varepsilon,$$

and, similarly, $p_{11} \leq p\varepsilon$.

Then, for a canonical communication equilibrium $(\text{id}, \text{id}, Q)$ with social welfare at least $2 - \varepsilon$, we have, from (13), that $p_{10} \geq (1 - \varepsilon)q + p_{11} \geq q$, and, from (14), that $p_{01} \geq p$. Thus, $p + q \leq p_{01} + p_{10} \leq 1$. Hence and from (20) we can then conclude that $q = 1 - p$, $p_{10} = q$ and $p_{01} = p$.

Therefore in any communication equilibrium $(\text{id}, \text{id}, Q)$ that achieves welfare at least $2 - \varepsilon$, the distribution Q is as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} Q((0, 0) \mid (0, 0)) &= 1; \\ Q((0, 0) \mid (0, 1)) &= Q((1, 0) \mid (1, 0)) = Q((1, 0) \mid (1, 1)) = 1 - p; \\ Q((0, 1) \mid (0, 1)) &= Q((0, 0) \mid (1, 0)) = Q((0, 1) \mid (1, 1)) = p; \end{aligned}$$

whereas all the remaining probabilities are 0.

That is, if $t_i = 0$, then the player i is suggested to take action 0, and, if $t_i = 1$, then the player i uses a shared random binary variable with distribution $(p, 1 - p)$ to decide which action they have to take. Thus, as above, we can rewrite the equilibrium $(\text{id}, \text{id}, Q)$ as (\mathbf{g}, \tilde{Q}) , where $\tilde{Q}(\mathbf{a} \mid \mathbf{t}) = \tilde{Q}(\mathbf{a})$ for each \mathbf{a} , and, in particular, sets $\tilde{Q}(00) = \tilde{Q}(11) = 0$, $\tilde{Q}^*(01) = p$ and $\tilde{Q}^*(10) = 1 - p$, and $\gamma = (g_1, g_2)$, with $g_i \in A_i^{T_i \times A_i}$ that sets $g_i(0, a_i) = 0$ and $g_i(1, a_i) = a_i$ for each $a_i \in A_i$. In conclusion, $(\text{id}, \text{id}, Q^*)$ is a correlated equilibrium. \square

We remark that a communication equilibrium that is not correlated exists in this game. Consider, indeed, the correlation Q' that sets $p = q = 0$, $p_{01} = p_{10} = 1/2$ and $p_{00} = p_{11} = 0$. We have that $(\text{id}, \text{id}, Q')$ is an equilibrium since it satisfies (13-18). However, if the type of player 1 is 1, then she is suggested to take action 0 with a larger probability when $t_2 = 0$ than when $t_2 = 1$. Thus, $(\text{id}, \text{id}, Q')$ is not belief-invariant, and, as a consequence it is not correlated. However, as proved above, $(\text{id}, \text{id}, Q')$ has an expected social welfare of $2 - \frac{3}{2}\varepsilon$ that is lower than the social welfare of $(\text{id}, \text{id}, Q^*)$.

5 Potential applications

In the previous sections we introduced the concepts of correlated and belief-invariant equilibria, and briefly highlighted some of their properties, mainly with respect to privacy, computational complexity and social welfare maximization. We saw that very little is known about these equilibria, and thus these equilibrium concepts can stimulate theoretical research along these and other directions.

However, our interest in these equilibrium concepts is not only of theoretical nature. Indeed, it turns out that privacy and high social welfare are desirable properties in many real world settings. For these setting, implementing a good correlated or a good belief-invariant equilibrium can help the players to reach better equilibria guaranteeing information-theoretic privacy. We list below three examples of real-world settings in which the concepts of correlated and belief-invariant equilibria can be relevant.

Trade secrets in markets. Suppose two or more companies are in competition for a share of the market (e.g., Coke and Pepsi, or Microsoft and Apple). Each company is trying to introduce a new product, and the features of the products are trade secrets. They have an incentive to cooperate in order to minimize the production costs but, at the same time, they

have an incentive *not* to cooperate, as the negotiation might expose their secrets. In such a setting, if there were a trusted third party able to implement a correlated or a belief-invariant equilibrium, this would not longer be an issue.

Note that this simple example can be generalized to every setting in which players' payoff are affected by the ability of "guessing the other players' types".

Advertising. A typical setting in which the ability of guessing the other players' type is of huge importance is advertising (see, for example, [CLPR15]). In such a setting an advertiser has a product to advertise, whose absolute quality is unknown to the potential users. The advertiser can adopt different advertising strategies (e.g., viral advertising, commercials, newspaper ads, web ads), whose success depends on the features of the subject to which the advertisement is aimed. On the other side, users would like to receive ads only for high-quality products, therefore they do not like to reveal their interests.

Hence, as above, it would be useful both for advertiser and for users to correlate their actions, so that the advertisers would be able to make more successful advertising campaign and the users could receive more ads for high-quality products than for low-quality ones. However, because of the privacy issues discussed above, this correlation may be effectively implemented only if there is a trusted mediator that is able to find a good correlated or belief-invariant equilibrium.

Network congestion. Another example in which correlated and belief-invariant equilibria may be useful is for network congestion. Suppose that the routes taken by people driving during rush hours were correlated in some way. (An example could be a GPS device or smartphone application, on which people select their starting and destination points and receive a suggested route.) Can this correlation reduce the congestion of the network? As we show next, not only this is possible, but this correlation can also be implemented privately, so that the suggestion does not reveal the sources or the destinations of other players. Note that this may be required in order to avoid privacy leakages.

Specifically, we show an application of belief-invariant equilibria in *network congestion games* (*aka selfish routing*). Here, a network is modelled as a labelled graph G , defined by a set V of vertices, a set of edges $E \subset V \times V$ and for each $(u, v) \in E$ a cost function $c_{uv}: \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. A network congestion game goes as follows. Each player is associated with a source and a target node and they have to decide the route to take. The strategy set for a player contains all possible paths from source to target, and the utility for a player is *minus* the sum of the cost functions in the edges of the chosen path. The edges get "congested" as a function of the number of players using them, i.e., if x players choose edge (u, v) , then each of them faces cost $c_{uv}(x)$.

We consider an "incomplete information" version of network congestion games, where the source-targets are decided by the players' types. Then, by tweaking the CHSH game we can exhibit an instance of selfish routing that demonstrate that belief-invariant equilibria can help reducing the social cost. Our example is illustrated in Figure 5.

The game goes as follows: there are two players, with binary types selected uniformly at random. The source-target pairs are chosen as follows:

- if $t_i = 0$ then Player i starts at vertex s_0 and wants to reach t ,
- if $t_i = 1$ then Player i starts at vertex s_1 and wants to reach t .

The strategies can be summarized in two meaningful choices: from his source point, a player can decide to go UP towards the vertex u or DOWN towards the vertex d and from there take final step towards t .

Figure 5: A network congestion game based on CHSH. The edge labels are the cost functions of the edges, where x is the number of players using that edge.

		UP	DOWN			UP	DOWN
	UP	$\frac{3}{2}, \frac{3}{2}$	2,2		UP	$\frac{5}{2}, \frac{5}{2}$	$\frac{3}{2}, \frac{3}{2}$
	DOWN	2,2	$\frac{3}{2}, \frac{3}{2}$		DOWN	$\frac{3}{2}, \frac{3}{2}$	$\frac{5}{2}, \frac{5}{2}$
		$t_1 \cdot t_2 = 0$				$t_1 \cdot t_2 = 1$	

Figure 6: Cost matrix for the network congestion CHSH game

The cost table is in Figure 6. It is clear from the table that the situation is similar to Figure 1. Players with pure strategies can reach an equilibrium by choosing (UP, UP) or (DOWN, DOWN) regardless of their types, and have an expected cost of $\frac{3}{4} \cdot \frac{3}{2} + \frac{1}{4} \cdot 2 = \frac{13}{8}$. A belief-invariant correlation as in (10) gives an equilibrium with expected cost of $\frac{3}{2}$.

Note that one can introduce conflict of interest into the game above by modifying the network in Figure 5 as follows:

Figure 7: A network congestion game based on CHSH. The edge labels are the cost functions of the edges, where x is the number of players using that edge.

In this graph, whatever the types are, always assign Player 1 to target t' and Player 2 to target t'' . Now the first player will prefer the strategy UP and the second player will prefer the strategy DOWN, in a situation similar to the game in Figure 2.

6 Quantum equilibria

In this section we define the class of quantum correlated solutions and equilibria of games, which is a physically motivated subclass of belief-invariant solutions and equilibria. This class is interesting because it allows us to go beyond the local correlations without the need of an informed trusted mediator. Rather, like the correlated equilibria, it only requires the (still trusted) distribution of a prior shared resource: a quantum state. To make use of it, the players need the capability to store this quantum information, and to make measurements on it at will, according to their type. The measurement result then informs their action.

6.1 Quantum formalism

In the interest of being self-contained, we briefly present the mathematical formalism necessary to introduce and discuss quantum correlated equilibria. (For more details, see [NC00, Wil13].)

Mathematically, a *state* is given by a *density operator* ρ acting on a complex Hilbert space \mathcal{H} , which means that ρ is positive semidefinite, $\rho \geq 0$, and has unit trace, $\text{Tr}(\rho) = 1$. Every density operator can occur as the state of a system.

A *measurement* on the quantum system with Hilbert space \mathcal{H} is given by a *resolution of the identity*, or *positive operator valued measure (POVM)*, which is a collection $(M_s : s \in S)$ of positive semidefinite matrices $M_s \geq 0$, one for each possible outcome $s \in S$ of the measurement, acting on \mathcal{H}_i and such that $\sum_s M_s = \mathbb{1}$. Every resolution of the identity can be realized in a quantum mechanical experiment.

States and measurements are the way quantum theory encodes the observable features of physical systems. The fundamental formula is *Born's rule*, which determines the probability of observing an outcome:

$$\Pr\{s \mid \rho\} = \text{Tr } \rho M_s. \quad (21)$$

The above-mentioned rules for states and measurements make sure that these numbers are always nonnegative, and add up to 1 for each state and each measurement. This formalism includes classical probability theory, by restricting to diagonal states ρ and measurement operators M_s (in some fixed, “computational” orthonormal basis $\{|x\rangle\}$):

$$\begin{aligned} \rho &= \sum_x r_x |x\rangle\langle x|, \\ M_s &= \sum_x \mu_s(x) |x\rangle\langle x|, \end{aligned}$$

where $|x\rangle\langle x|$ denotes the projector onto the line $\mathbb{C}|x\rangle$. In this case, the conditions for a state are equivalent to $r_x \geq 0$ and $\sum_x r_x = 1$, i.e., $(r_x)_x$ is a probability vector; the conditions for a measurement reduce to $\sum_s \mu_s(x) = 1$ for all x , i.e., $[\mu_s(x)]_{s,x}$ is a stochastic matrix.

Note that for simplicity, we assume the discrete setting here: the Hilbert spaces are all finite dimensional and the measurements have discrete sets of outcomes.

In our multi-player games, we associate a Hilbert space \mathcal{H}_i to each player’s quantum system, while their joint quantum system is described by the tensor product Hilbert space $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathcal{H}_n$. If each player has a measurement $M^i = (M_{s_i}^i : s_i \in S_i)$ acting on \mathcal{H}_i , we associate to them a joint measurement $M^1 \otimes \cdots \otimes M^n = (M_{\mathbf{s}} : \mathbf{s} = (s_1, \dots, s_n) \in S)$ acting on \mathcal{H} :

$$M_{(s_1, \dots, s_n)} = M_{s_1}^1 \otimes \cdots \otimes M_{s_n}^n.$$

Then, for a state ρ acting on the composite Hilbert space \mathcal{H} ,

$$\Pr\{\mathbf{s} = (s_1, \dots, s_n) \mid \rho\} = \text{Tr } \rho (M_{s_1}^1 \otimes \cdots \otimes M_{s_n}^n).$$

To make the link with the correlations discussed in the previous sections, consider the situation that every player i has access to several measurements M^{r_i} , $r_i \in R_i$, for simplicity all with outcomes in a set S_i , which however could be specific to the player. Now, given a state ρ and the measurements M^{r_i} , the probability of outputs s_1, \dots, s_n given the players’ inputs r_1, \dots, r_n is

$$Q(s_1, \dots, s_n \mid r_1, \dots, r_n) = \text{Tr } \rho (M_{s_1}^{r_1} \otimes \cdots \otimes M_{s_n}^{r_n}). \quad (22)$$

This is evidently a correlation, and the correlations that can be written in the above form, with a suitable state and suitable measurements, are called *quantum correlations*, their set denoted $\mathcal{Q}(S \mid R)$. (See, for example, the definition in the survey [Pal15].)

Fact 18 (Belief-invariance of quantum correlations). *The correlation Q obtained as in eq. (22) is always belief-invariant.*

Proof. Let I and $J = N \setminus I$ be a partition of N . Recall that for all j and $r_j \in R_j$ we have $\sum_{s_j} M_{s_j}^{r_j} = \mathbb{1}$. Thus, for all $s_I \in S_I$, $r_I \in R_I$, $r_J, r'_J \in R_J$,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{s_J \in S_J} q(s_I, s_J \mid r_I, r_J) &= \sum_{s_J \in S_J} \text{Tr } \rho \left(\bigotimes_{i \in I} M_{s_i}^{r_i} \otimes \bigotimes_{j \in J} M_{s_j}^{r_j} \right) \\ &= \text{Tr } \rho \left(\bigotimes_{i \in I} M_{s_i}^{r_i} \otimes \bigotimes_{j \in J} \mathbb{1} \right) \\ &= \sum_{s_J \in S_J} \text{Tr } \rho \left(\bigotimes_{i \in I} M_{s_i}^{r_i} \otimes \bigotimes_{j \in J} M_{s_j}^{r'_j} \right) \\ &= \sum_{s_J \in S_J} q(s_I, s_J \mid r_I, r'_J), \end{aligned}$$

and we are done. □

Remark 19. Any local correlation Q ,

$$Q(\mathbf{s} \mid \mathbf{r}) = \sum_{\gamma} V(\gamma) L_1(s_1 \mid r_1 \gamma_1) \cdots L_n(s_n \mid r_n \gamma_n),$$

can be obtained in the form (22), with a suitable state and measurement. Namely,

$$\rho = \sum_{\gamma} V(\gamma) |\gamma_1\rangle\langle\gamma_1| \otimes \cdots \otimes |\gamma_n\rangle\langle\gamma_n|,$$

and

$$M_{s_i}^{r_i} = \sum_{\gamma_i} L_i(s_i \mid r_i \gamma_i) |\gamma_i\rangle\langle\gamma_i|.$$

Thus we have,

$$\text{LOC}(S \mid R) \subset \text{Q}(S \mid R) \subset \text{BINV}(S \mid R).$$

Bell [Bel64] and Tsileron [Tsi80] prove that the above inclusions are strict.

6.2 Quantum solutions and quantum correlated equilibria

We are now ready to give the definition of a quantum correlated equilibrium. To start, a *quantum solution* for a game consists of local measurements $M^{t_i} = (M_{a_i}^{t_i} : a_i \in A_i)$ for player i , $t_i \in T_i$, on a suitable local Hilbert space \mathcal{H}_i , and a state ρ on $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathcal{H}_n$. This defines a correlation in canonical form,

$$Q(\mathbf{a} \mid \mathbf{t}) = \text{Tr } \rho(M_{a_1}^{t_1} \otimes \cdots \otimes M_{a_n}^{t_n}), \quad (23)$$

and hence expected payoffs for the players,

$$\langle v_i \rangle = \sum_{\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{a}} P(\mathbf{t}) \text{Tr } \rho(M_{a_1}^{t_1} \otimes \cdots \otimes M_{a_n}^{t_n}) v_i(\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{a}).$$

In strategic form, the “quantum correlated” canonical game goes as follows. A mediator, who does not know the players’ types, has a correlation device that produces the state ρ . The players trust the mediator in using such device correctly. He sends to each player i the corresponding part of the state in the space \mathcal{H}_i . He also suggests the measurements $\{M^{t_i} : t_i \in T_i\}$ to use as a strategy. Note that there is no need for the players to reveal their types to the mediator, just as in the case of correlated solutions.

The definition of equilibrium is basically the same as before; we want to capture the idea that no player has an incentive to deviate from the advice unilaterally.

Definition 20 (Quantum correlated equilibrium). *A quantum solution $(M^{\mathbf{t}}, \rho)$ is a quantum correlated equilibrium, if and only if for all players i and any measurements $N^{t_i} = (N_{a_i}^{t_i} : a_i \in A_i)$,*

$$\begin{aligned} \langle v_i \rangle &= \sum_{\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{a}} P(\mathbf{t}) \operatorname{Tr} \rho(M_{a_1}^{t_1} \otimes \cdots \otimes M_{a_n}^{t_n}) v_i(\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{a}) \\ &\geq \sum_{\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{a}} P(\mathbf{t}) \operatorname{Tr} \rho(M_{a_1}^{t_1} \otimes \cdots \otimes M_{a_{i-1}}^{t_{i-1}} \otimes N_{a_i}^{t_i} \otimes M_{a_{i+1}}^{t_{i+1}} \otimes \cdots \otimes M_{a_n}^{t_n}) v_i(\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{a}). \end{aligned}$$

Under the same philosophy as in the sections on belief-invariant and correlated equilibria, we then call the canonical solution Q as in eq. (23) a canonical quantum correlated equilibrium, the set of which is denoted $\mathbf{Quantum}(G)$.

The following proposition simplifies the equilibrium condition by looking at one t_i at a time, in the spirit of Proposition 10. The proof is evident and, hence, omitted.

Proposition 21. *A quantum solution $(M^{\mathbf{t}}, \rho)$ is a quantum correlated equilibrium, if and only if for all players i , types t_i , and any measurement $N^{t_i} = (N_{a_i}^{t_i} : a_i \in A_i)$,*

$$\begin{aligned} \langle v_i \rangle &= \sum_{\mathbf{t}_{-i}, \mathbf{a}} P(\mathbf{t}) \operatorname{Tr} \rho(M_{a_1}^{t_1} \otimes \cdots \otimes M_{a_n}^{t_n}) v_i(\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{a}) \\ &\geq \sum_{\mathbf{t}_{-i}, \mathbf{a}} P(\mathbf{t}) \operatorname{Tr} \rho(M_{a_1}^{t_1} \otimes \cdots \otimes M_{a_{i-1}}^{t_{i-1}} \otimes N_{a_i}^{t_i} \otimes M_{a_{i+1}}^{t_{i+1}} \otimes \cdots \otimes M_{a_n}^{t_n}) v_i(\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{a}). \end{aligned}$$

□

Remark 22. Verifying that $(M^{\mathbf{t}}, \rho)$ is a quantum correlated equilibrium can be done via semidefinite programming. As argued in [PKL⁺15], and formalized in the above Proposition 21, one can fix the other players’ strategies and check that for each type t_i the optimal strategy of player i is M^{t_i} . Since this must be done for each type profile, the running time is polynomial in the size of the game description (or rather the description of the supposed equilibrium), but not of the game parameters.

It may seem as if we have left the formalism of communication and belief-invariant developed in the previous section, and of course that is necessarily the case since we want to talk about quantum correlations. It is however possible, although at a price, to present quantum solutions and quantum correlated equilibria in that general framework. Note that in Definition 20 above we have to consider any one player varying their measurement. Thus, define $R_i := M(\mathcal{H}_i, A_i)$ to be the set of all possible measurements on \mathcal{H}_i with outcomes in A_i ; this is of course an infinite set, in fact it has the structure of a manifold, but let us not worry about that. In this way, each $r_i \in R_i$ specifies precisely a measurement and each possible measurement is represented. Denote this (very big) correlation $\mathfrak{Q}(\mathbf{a} \mid \mathbf{r})$.

Proposition 23. *A quantum solution $(M^{\mathbf{r}}, \rho)$ is a quantum correlated equilibrium if and only if $(\mathbf{f}, \text{id}, \mathfrak{Q})$ is a (belief-invariant) communication equilibrium, where $f_i(t_i) = r_i := M^{t_i} \in R_i$ is defined uniquely by the requirement that r_i labels the measurement used in the quantum solution.*

Furthermore, the canonical forms coincide: $\hat{\mathfrak{Q}} = Q$.

Proof. By definition. □

The class of quantum correlated equilibria contains the correlated equilibria of Definition 9 as a special case:

Proposition 24. *Every correlated equilibrium is a quantum correlated equilibrium. Indeed, if (\mathbf{g}, Q) is a correlated equilibrium, and we define the state ρ and measurements $M^{t_i} = (M_{a_i}^{t_i} : a_i \in A_i)$ as in Remark 19:*

$$\rho = \sum_{\mathbf{s}} Q(\mathbf{s}) |s_1\rangle\langle s_1| \otimes \cdots \otimes |s_n\rangle\langle s_n|,$$

$$M_{a_i}^{t_i} = \sum_{s_i} \delta_{g_i(t_i, s_i), a_i} |s_i\rangle\langle s_i|,$$

where δ is the Kronecker delta function, then $(M^{\mathbf{r}}, \rho)$ is a quantum correlated equilibrium which has the same canonical representative \hat{Q} as (\mathbf{g}, Q) ; in particular they have the same payoffs.

Proof. The state ρ is a mixture of classical advice. For all i, t_i every measurement can also be simulated classically, and locally, with the use of private randomness. Since (\mathbf{g}, Q) is a correlated equilibrium, no deviation from the suggested measurement can be beneficial to any player. This shows that $(M^{\mathbf{r}}, \rho)$ is an equilibrium, and by (23) one can verify that its canonical is \hat{Q} . □

Discussion and historical background. From the definition and the observations made above, it follows that when comparing equilibrium classes at the level of their canonical representatives, quantum correlated equilibria are sandwiched between correlated and belief-invariant ones:

$$\text{Corr}(G) \subset \text{Quantum}(G) \subset \text{B.I.}(G).$$

There are games where the inclusions are strict. A famous one is the CHSH game, which we have used extensively as an example throughout this paper. This is a non-local game, therefore a full coordination Bayesian game. It follows from [CHSH69] that there is a quantum equilibrium which is not in $\text{Corr}(\text{CHSH})$, and [Tsi80] proved that the belief-invariant equilibrium given by (10) is not in $\text{Quantum}(\text{CHSH})$. Both results, though elementary mathematically, constituted breakthroughs in the foundations of quantum mechanics.

The study of quantum correlations appears in many works in physics and computer science (see, for example, the surveys [AMO08, Pal15] and the references therein). However, the connection with game theory has been made explicit only recently in [BL13], and the mayor step forward came when [PKL⁺15] figured out that there could be a quantum advantage even in the case of conflicting interest, *i.e.*, non full-coordination games. Below we show that their result can be extended to n players.

Remark 25 (About physical realization). Let us conclude this discussion with few words on privacy. The class of quantum correlations can be completely realized only with the use of quantum information processing. Such technology is developing rapidly and it is already available to experimental physicists, as reported in [PKL⁺15].

Physicists often imagine ideal devices called “non-signalling boxes” that implement all the class of belief-invariant correlations without revealing the types to a mediator. However, quantum mechanics is the best-known theory to describe our reality, and there is no known super-quantum theory that allows the existence of the non-signalling boxes. Therefore, to the best of our knowledge of nature, the quantum class is the best feasible way of obtaining correlations without revealing players’ types to a mediator.

6.3 Implementing the best belief-invariant equilibrium for GHZ with quantum correlations

Consider the game of Section 4.1.2. The correlation Q described in (11) can be implemented as a quantum correlated equilibrium, therefore it does not need an informed mediator. To see this, we will now exhibit one of the constructions of the quantum state and the measurements that produce the correlation.

Fix the computational basis to $|0\rangle = \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}$ and $|1\rangle = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}$ and consider the following abbreviation for the tensor product: $|xyz\rangle = |x\rangle \otimes |y\rangle \otimes |z\rangle$.

The state is then constructed as follows. Each player i holds a 2-dimensional quantum system with Hilbert space \mathcal{H}_i . Start from the following vector living in $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_1 \otimes \mathcal{H}_2 \otimes \mathcal{H}_3$

$$|\psi\rangle = \frac{1}{2}(|111\rangle - |001\rangle - |010\rangle - |100\rangle),$$

and obtain the corresponding state on \mathcal{H} :

$$\rho = |\psi\rangle\langle\psi|.$$

The measurement operators are the following. For each player i , we have

$$\left\{ M_0^0 = \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad M_1^0 = \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & -1 \\ -1 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \right\} \quad (\text{on input } 0),$$

$$\left\{ M_0^1 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad M_1^1 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \right\} \quad (\text{on input } 1).$$

It can be checked via eq.(22) that the above state and measurements produce the claimed correlation Q .

Proposition 26. *The considered quantum strategy is a quantum correlated equilibrium.*

Proof. To prove the claim, we fix the measurements of any two parties and then show that the third party by changing his measurements cannot increase his average payoff. Since the shared state is symmetric under the permutation of parties, it is sufficient to consider the case in which measurements of party-1 are variable and measurements of parties 2 and 3 are fixed to M_j^i , where $i, j \in \{0, 1\}$. Measurements of party-1 can be expressed as $X_0^0 + X_1^0 = I$ (on input 0), and $X_0^1 + X_1^1 = I$ (on input 1). The general operators defining these measurements are:

$$X_0^0 = \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} \alpha + a_3 & a_1 - ia_2 \\ a_1 + ia_2 & \alpha - a_3 \end{pmatrix},$$

where $(\alpha, \vec{a}) \in \mathbb{R}^4$, $\vec{a} = (a_1, a_2, a_3)$, and $\|\vec{a}\| \leq \alpha \leq 2 - \|\vec{a}\|$;

$$X_0^1 = \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} \beta + b_3 & b_1 - ib_2 \\ b_1 + ib_2 & \beta - b_3 \end{pmatrix},$$

where $(\beta, \vec{b}) \in \mathbb{R}^4$, $\vec{b} = (b_1, b_2, b_3)$, and $\|\vec{b}\| \leq \beta \leq 2 - \|\vec{b}\|$.

Note that the constraints on the parameters in the above equations implies that $\|\vec{a}\| \leq 1$ and $\|\vec{b}\| \leq 1$.

The expected value of the i -th party, $i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ is given by,

$$\langle v_i \rangle = \sum_{t,a} p(t) \cdot \text{Tr}\{\rho(M_{a_1}^{t_1} \otimes M_{a_2}^{t_2} \otimes M_{a_3}^{t_3})\} \cdot v_i(t, a). \quad (24)$$

On substituting the values for probability distribution of inputs, quantum probabilities, and utilities, in eq.(24), and simplifying, we obtain that:

$$\begin{aligned} \langle v_1 \rangle &= f_0 + f_1, \quad \text{where,} \\ f_0 &= \frac{1}{12} \{2 - (1 - \varepsilon)\alpha + (1 + \varepsilon)a_1\}, \\ f_1 &= \frac{1}{12} \{1 + 3\varepsilon + (1 - \varepsilon)\beta + 2(1 + \varepsilon)b_3\}. \end{aligned}$$

Now, using $0 \leq \varepsilon \leq 1$, and constraints on parameters (α, \vec{a}) and (β, \vec{b}) , it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} f_0 &= \frac{1}{12} \{2 - (1 - \varepsilon)\alpha + (1 + \varepsilon)a_1\} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{12} \{2 - (1 - \varepsilon)\|\vec{a}\| + (1 + \varepsilon)\|\vec{a}\|\} \\ &= \frac{1}{6} \{1 + \varepsilon\|\vec{a}\|\} \leq \frac{1}{6} \{1 + \varepsilon\}. \end{aligned}$$

The upper bound on f_0 is achieved for $\alpha = 1, \vec{a} = (1, 0, 0)$, therefore, $\max(f_0) = \frac{1}{6} \{1 + \varepsilon\}$. Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned} f_1 &= \frac{1}{12} \{1 + 3\varepsilon + (1 - \varepsilon)\beta + 2(1 + \varepsilon)b_3\} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{12} \left\{ 1 + 3\varepsilon + (1 - \varepsilon) \left(2 - \|\vec{b}\| \right) + 2(1 + \varepsilon)\|\vec{b}\| \right\} \\ &= \frac{1}{12} \left\{ 3 + \varepsilon + (1 + 3\varepsilon)\|\vec{b}\| \right\} \leq \frac{1}{3} \{1 + \varepsilon\}. \end{aligned}$$

The upper bound on f_1 is achieved for $\beta = 1, \vec{b} = (0, 0, 1)$, therefore, $\max(f_1) = \frac{1}{3} \{1 + \varepsilon\}$. Finally,

$$\max(\langle v_1 \rangle) = \max(f_0) + \max(f_1) = \frac{1 + \varepsilon}{6} + \frac{1 + \varepsilon}{3} = \frac{1 + \varepsilon}{2}. \quad (25)$$

Due to symmetry in the shared state, we get same results when varying the measurements of some other party by keeping remaining two parties measurements fixed, therefore, $\max(\langle v_i \rangle) = \frac{1 + \varepsilon}{2} \quad \forall i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$. This proves that the considered strategy is a quantum equilibrium. \square

We remark that a similar approach (modifying the game in [GHSZ90]) has been used independently in [SZY15] to obtain a 3-player quantum game with conflict of interest.

6.4 A game with conflict of interest where quantum correlations achieve optimal social welfare

We now introduce a variant of the three player game of Section 4.1.2, with a distribution of types: $p(0, 0, 1) = p(0, 1, 0) = p(1, 0, 0) = p(1, 1, 1) = 1/4$, and with the following payoff table (with $0 \leq \varepsilon \leq 1$ and $\delta = \frac{2 + \varepsilon}{3}$):

	0	1		0	1
0	δ, δ, δ	$0, 0, 0$	0	$0, 0, 0$	$1, \varepsilon, 1$
1	$0, 0, 0$	$\varepsilon, 1, 1$	1	$1, 1, \varepsilon$	$0, 0, 0$
	0			1	

(a) $\tau = 0$

	0	1		0	1
0	$0, 0, 0$	$1, 1, \varepsilon$	0	$\varepsilon, 1, 1$	$0, 0, 0$
1	$1, \varepsilon, 1$	$0, 0, 0$	1	$0, 0, 0$	δ, δ, δ
	0			1	

(b) $\tau = 1$

Figure 8: Another modified GHZ game. The figure is structured like Figure 3.

Clearly, players have conflict of interest in this modified GHZ game. This game has a very interesting connection with the 3-party Mermin inequality [Mer90]:

$$|\langle A_0 B_0 C_1 \rangle + \langle A_0 B_1 C_0 \rangle + \langle A_1 B_0 C_0 \rangle - \langle A_1 B_1 C_1 \rangle| \leq 2 \quad (26)$$

where, for $i, j, k \in \{0, 1\}$, the random variables A_i, B_j, C_k take value ± 1 .

In game theoretical terminology, it can be thought that i, j, k are types of the three players and $A_i, B_j, C_k \in \{\pm 1\}$ correspond to the respective actions. The expected values of the product of the outcomes are:

$$\begin{aligned} \langle A_i B_j C_k \rangle &= \{P^{ijk}(+1, +1, +1) + P^{ijk}(+1, -1, -1) + P^{ijk}(-1, +1, -1) + P^{ijk}(-1, -1, +1)\} \\ &\quad - \{P^{ijk}(-1, -1, -1) + P^{ijk}(-1, +1, +1) + P^{ijk}(+1, -1, +1) + P^{ijk}(+1, +1, -1)\}. \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

We do the following relabelling of the actions: $-1 \mapsto 0$ and $+1 \mapsto 1$, and we get (by labelling the actions in the subscript):

$$\begin{aligned} \langle A_i B_j C_k \rangle &= \{P_{111}^{ijk} + P_{100}^{ijk} + P_{010}^{ijk} + P_{001}^{ijk}\} \\ &\quad - \{P_{000}^{ijk} + P_{011}^{ijk} + P_{101}^{ijk} + P_{110}^{ijk}\} \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

On substituting (28) in (26), using normalization condition for probabilities, and rearranging, we get,

$$\begin{aligned} &| \{1 - 2(P_{000}^{001} + P_{011}^{001} + P_{101}^{001} + P_{110}^{001})\} \\ &+ \{1 - 2(P_{000}^{010} + P_{011}^{010} + P_{101}^{010} + P_{110}^{010})\} \\ &+ \{1 - 2(P_{000}^{100} + P_{011}^{100} + P_{101}^{100} + P_{110}^{100})\} \\ &- \{2(P_{001}^{111} + P_{010}^{111} + P_{100}^{111} + P_{111}^{111}) - 1\} | \leq 2 \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

On simplifying we get:

$$1 \leq \mathbb{P} \leq 3 \quad (30)$$

where,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P} &= (P_{000}^{001} + P_{011}^{001} + P_{101}^{001} + P_{110}^{001}) \\ &+ (P_{000}^{010} + P_{011}^{010} + P_{101}^{010} + P_{110}^{010}) \\ &+ (P_{000}^{100} + P_{011}^{100} + P_{101}^{100} + P_{110}^{100}) \\ &+ (P_{001}^{111} + P_{010}^{111} + P_{100}^{111} + P_{111}^{111}). \end{aligned} \quad (31)$$

Let $\mathbb{M} = \langle A_0 B_0 C_1 \rangle + \langle A_0 B_1 C_0 \rangle + \langle A_1 B_0 C_0 \rangle - \langle A_1 B_1 C_1 \rangle$, then $\mathbb{M} = 4 - 2\mathbb{P}$. The bound we see on quantity \mathbb{M} is derived by considering all possible local correlations, therefore, nonlocal (quantum, no-signalling, or signalling) correlations can violate these bounds. However, \mathbb{M} also has algebraic bounds, $-4 \leq \mathbb{M} \leq 4$, which is respected by any type of correlation (or probability distribution). The algebraic restriction on \mathbb{M} implies that $0 \leq \mathbb{P} \leq 4$ for any type of correlation. One important feature of Mermin inequality is that its algebraic bounds can be achieved by quantum correlations. We will use this feature of the Mermin inequality to discover interesting properties in the game that we are considering here.

For the game of Figure 8, the sum of expected payoffs of the three players turns out to be:

$$\langle v_1 \rangle + \langle v_2 \rangle + \langle v_3 \rangle = \left(\frac{2 + \varepsilon}{4} \right) \mathbb{P}. \quad (32)$$

For any local strategy (correlated or uncorrelated)

$$\mathbb{P} \leq 3 \Leftrightarrow \langle v_1 \rangle + \langle v_2 \rangle + \langle v_3 \rangle \leq \frac{3}{4}(2 + \varepsilon). \quad (33)$$

For any possible strategies (quantum, belief-invariant or communicating):

$$\mathbb{P} \leq 4 \Leftrightarrow \langle v_1 \rangle + \langle v_2 \rangle + \langle v_3 \rangle \leq 2 + \varepsilon. \quad (34)$$

If the game is played with the same correlation (11) (which we implemented as a quantum strategy in Section 6.3), the expected payoff $\langle v_i \rangle = \frac{2+\varepsilon}{3} \forall i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$. Moreover, the strategy is a quantum equilibrium (the proof is very similar to the one of Proposition 26; only the objective function changes which is again easy to maximize).

Therefore, an interesting feature of the game of Figure 8 is that with the considered quantum protocol we obtain the optimal fair equilibrium, *i.e.*, no other quantum equilibrium, belief-invariant equilibrium, or even communication equilibrium can do better than this protocol in our second GHZ game. This is a new feature which was not revealed in the two party modified CHSH-game considered in [PKL⁺15] where optimal fair quantum correlated equilibrium was found, however, for the modified CHSH-game belief-invariant equilibrium, and communication equilibrium can do better than the optimal quantum fair equilibrium.

7 Conclusions and open problems

We have formally introduced the class of belief-invariant communication equilibria and its quantum mechanical version. Even if such classes appeared implicitly in previous work, a systematic study and an hunt for useful applications was not performed before. With this work we would like to open the way for collaboration between the quantum information and the game theory community, to address the numerous open problems. We conclude the paper with a list of the ones we could think of.

1. *Complete the complexity scenario.* In Section 3.4 we discuss some computational complexity facts. For example, verifying that a solution is an equilibrium is easy if the number of actions is bounded, while finding the optimal (quantum) correlated equilibrium is a hard task, given the connection with multi-prover interactive proofs. However, how difficult is to sample a quantum or a belief-invariant equilibrium? Are there classes of games where this is easy, like the succinct games of [PR08]?

2. *Get large separations and upper bound the largest possible separation.* Full coordination games are used to design Bell tests, experiments that quantify how different quantum mechanics is from classical physics. For this fundamental task, the quantity of interest is the separation between the largest expected payoff at a quantum and at a correlated equilibrium. The race for large separations was settled in [BRSdW12], where the authors exhibited a game that almost matches the upper bound proven in [JPPG⁺10]. In our context here, large separations would translate to economical or social convenience of implementing communication equilibria while respecting the privacy of the player. Are there conflict-of-interest games where the quantum correlated equilibrium leads to a much better social optimum than the correlated one? Is there an upper bound like the one of [JPPG⁺10]?
3. *Can any non-local game be converted in a conflict-of-interest game?* This is a question from [PKL⁺15]. The non-local games are the above-mentioned coordination games used in physics. It would be interesting if all these games also lead to cases in which a conflict-of-interest situation can be improved with quantum or belief-invariant correlations.
4. *Application to other relevant games.* This is a very natural question. Can belief-invariance be beneficial for scheduling problems, market dynamics, and any other topic of practical interest?
5. *Development of automatic belief-invariant advice on large network games.* We have shown in Section 5 that belief-invariance can be useful in network games. Can we design an automatic system that calculates and distributes belief-invariant advice to large-scale network, in order to reduce the congestion? This does not need to be optimal, and an approximation would already have great practical applications.

Acknowledgements

This work is partially supported by the European Commission (STREP “RAQUEL”), by the Spanish MINECO (grants FIS2013-40627-P and MTM2014-54240-P) with the support of FEDER funds, by the Generalitat de Catalunya CIRIT (project 2014-SGR-966), by the ERC (AdG “IRQUAT”), by the Comunidad de Madrid (project QUITEMAD+-CM, S2013/ICE-2801). This work was made possible through the support of grant #48322 from the John Templeton Foundation. The opinions expressed in this publication are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the John Templeton Foundation.

The authors thank Andris Ambainis, Dmitry Kravchenko, Giuseppe Persiano, Laura Santucci and Ronald de Wolf for useful discussions that improved the accessibility and the content of the paper. Furthermore, we acknowledge interesting conversations with Ignacio Villanueva, Carlos Palazuelos and David Pérez García on the open problem regarding large separations between quantum and classical advice in relation to the degree of competitiveness of the game.

References

- [AMO08] David Avis, Sonoko Moriyama, and Masaki Owari. From Bell inequalities to Tsirelson’s theorem: A survey. *arXiv preprint arXiv:0812.4887*, 2008.
- [AT01] Aaron Archer and Éva Tardos. Truthful mechanisms for one-parameter agents. In *42nd Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, FOCS 2001, 14-17 October 2001, Las Vegas, Nevada, USA*, pages 482–491, 2001.

- [Aum74] Robert J. Aumann. Subjectivity and correlation in randomized strategies. *Journal of mathematical Economics*, 1(1):67–96, 1974.
- [Bel64] John S. Bell. On the Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen paradox. *Physics*, 1(3):195–200, 1964.
- [BFS14] Harry Buhrman, Serge Fehr, and Christian Schaffner. On the parallel repetition of multi-player games: The no-signaling case. In *9th Conference on the Theory of Quantum Computation, Communication and Cryptography*, page 24, 2014.
- [BL13] Nicolas Brunner and Noah Linden. Connection between Bell nonlocality and Bayesian game theory. *Nature Communications*, 4, July 2013.
- [BLM⁺05] Jonathan Barrett, Noah Linden, Serge Massar, Stefano Pironio, Sandu Popescu, and David Roberts. Nonlocal correlations as an information-theoretic resource. *Physical Review A*, 71(2):022101, 2005.
- [BRSdW12] Harry Buhrman, Oded Regev, Giannicola Scarpa, and Ronald de Wolf. Near-optimal and explicit Bell inequality violations. *Theory of Computing*, 8(27):623–645, 2012.
- [CDT09] Xi Chen, Xiaotie Deng, and Shang-Hua Teng. Settling the complexity of computing two-player Nash equilibria. *J. ACM*, 56(3):14:1–14:57, May 2009.
- [CHSH69] John F. Clauser, Michael A. Horne, Abner Shimony, and Richard A. Holt. Proposed experiment to test local hidden-variable theories. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 23:880–884, Oct 1969.
- [CLPR15] Rachel Cummings, Katrina Ligett, Mallesh M. Pai, and Aaron Roth. The strange case of privacy in equilibrium models. *CoRR*, abs/1508.03080, 2015.
- [CMN⁺07] Peter J. Cameron, Ashley Montanaro, Michael W. Newman, Simone Severini, and Andreas Winter. On the quantum chromatic number of a graph. *Electron. J. Combin.*, 14(1), 2007.
- [DGP09] Constantinos Daskalakis, Paul W Goldberg, and Christos H. Papadimitriou. The complexity of computing a Nash equilibrium. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 39(1):195–259, 2009.
- [For82] Françoise Forges. A first study of correlated equilibria in repeated games with incomplete information. Core discussion paper 8218, Université Catholique de Louvain, 1982.
- [For88] Françoise Forges. Can sunspots replace a mediator? *Journal of Mathematical Economics*, 17(4):347–368, 1988.
- [For93] Françoise Forges. Five legitimate definitions of correlated equilibrium in games with incomplete information. *Theory and Decision*, 35(3):277–310, 1993.
- [For06] Françoise Forges. Correlated equilibrium in games with incomplete information revisited. Economics Papers from University Paris Dauphine 123456789/157, Paris Dauphine University, December 2006.

- [FRV16] Rotem Arnon Friedman, Renato Renner, and Thomas Vidick. Non-signaling parallel repetition using de Finetti reductions. *IEEE Trans. Information Theory*, 62(3):1440–1457, 2016.
- [FT91] D. Fudenberg and J. Tirole. *Game Theory*. MIT Press, 1991.
- [GHSZ90] Daniel M. Greenberger, Michael A. Horne, Abner Shimony, and Anton Zeilinger. Bell’s theorem without inequalities. *American Journal of Physics*, 58(12):1131–1143, 1990.
- [HS89] Sergiu Hart and David Schmeidler. Existence of correlated equilibria. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 14(1):18–25, 1989.
- [JPPG⁺10] Marius Junge, Carlos Palazuelos, David Pérez-García, Ignacio Villanueva, and Michael M. Wolf. Unbounded violations of bipartite Bell inequalities via operator space theory. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, 300(3):715–739, 2010.
- [KRR14] Yael Tauman Kalai, Ran Raz, and Ron D. Rothblum. How to delegate computations: The power of no-signaling proofs. In *Proceedings of the 46th Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing, STOC ’14*, pages 485–494, 2014.
- [LH64] Carlton E. Lemke and Joseph T. Howson. Equilibrium points of bimatrix games. *Journal of the Society for Industrial & Applied Mathematics*, 12(2):413–423, 1964.
- [LRS10] Ehud Lehrer, Dinah Rosenberg, and Eran Shmaya. Signaling and mediation in games with common interests. *Games and Economic Behavior*, 68(2):670–682, 2010.
- [LW15] Cécilia Lancien and Andreas Winter. Parallel repetition and concentration for (sub-) no-signalling games via a flexible constrained de Finetti reduction. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1506.07002*, 2015.
- [MAG06] Lluís Masanes, Antonio Acín, and Nicolas Gisin. General properties of nonsignaling theories. *Physical Review A*, 73(1):012112, 2006.
- [Mer90] N. David Mermin. Extreme quantum entanglement in a superposition of macroscopically distinct states. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 65:1838–1840, Oct 1990.
- [Mye91] Roger B. Myerson. *Game theory : analysis of conflict*. Harvard university press, 1997, Cambridge (Mass.), London, 1991.
- [Nas50] John F. Nash. Equilibrium points in n-person games. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 36(1):48–49, 1950.
- [NC00] Michael A. Nielsen and Isaac L Chuang. *Quantum computation and quantum information*. Cambridge university press, 2000.
- [NRTV07] Noam Nisan, Tim Roughgarden, Éva Tardos, and Vijay V. Vazirani. *Algorithmic Game Theory*. Cambridge University Press, New York, NY, USA, 2007.
- [Pal15] Carlos Palazuelos. Random constructions in Bell inequalities: A survey. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1502.02175*, 2015.
- [PKL⁺15] Anna Pappa, Niraj Kumar, Thomas Lawson, Miklos Santha, Shengyu Zhang, Eleni Diamanti, and Iordanis Kerenidis. Nonlocality and conflicting interest games. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 114:020401, Jan 2015.

- [PR94] Sandu Popescu and Daniel Rohrlich. Quantum nonlocality as an axiom. *Foundations of Physics*, 24(3):379–385, 1994.
- [PR08] Christos H. Papadimitriou and Tim Roughgarden. Computing correlated equilibria in multi-player games. *J. ACM*, 55(3):14:1–14:29, August 2008.
- [PR13] Mallesh M. Pai and Aaron Roth. Privacy and mechanism design. *ACM SIGecom Exchanges*, 12(1):8–29, 2013.
- [RC66] Anatol Rapoport and Albert M. Chammah. The game of chicken. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 10(3):10–28, 1966.
- [RMG⁺16] Arup Roy, Amit Mukherjee, Tamal Guha, Sibasish Ghosh, Some Sankar Bhattacharya, and Manik Banik. Nonlocal correlations: Fair and unfair strategies in Bayesian game. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1601.02349*, 2016.
- [SZY15] Haozhen Situ, Cai Zhang, and Fang Yu. Quantum advice enhances social optimality in three-party conflicting interest games. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1510.06918*, 2015.
- [Tsi80] Boris S. Tsirelson. Quantum generalizations of Bell’s inequality. *Lett. Math. Phys.*, 4(2):93–100, 1980.
- [vNM44] John von Neumann and Oskar Morgenstern. *Theory of Games and Economic Behavior*. Princeton University Press, 1944.
- [Wil13] Mark M. Wilde. *Quantum information theory*. Cambridge University Press, 2013. arXiv:1106.1445.
- [Zha12] Shengyu Zhang. Quantum strategic game theory. In *Proceedings of the 3rd Innovations in Theoretical Computer Science Conference, ITCS ’12*, pages 39–59, New York, NY, USA, 2012. ACM.