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Abstract

Interactive proofs are a fundamental theoretical concept that has become increasingly widely used as a framework to design efficient computation-outsourcing protocols. However, in all existing interactive-proof systems with multiple provers, the provers’ interests either perfectly align (as in multi-prover interactive proofs) or directly conflict (as in refereed games). Neither of these extremes truly capture the strategic nature of service providers in outsourcing applications. How to design and analyze non-cooperative interactive proofs is an important open problem.

In this paper, we introduce a multi-prover interactive-proof model in which the provers are rational and non-cooperative—each prover acts individually so as to maximize his own utility in the resulting game. In contrast to refereed games, no prover is required to be honest.

To model interactive protocols with non-cooperative provers, we first define a new solution concept for extensive-form games with imperfect information, strong sequential equilibrium. Our technical results focus on protocols that provide strong utility gap guarantees, which are analogous to soundness gap in classic interactive proofs. At a high level, a utility gap of $u$ means that the protocol is robust against provers that may not care about a utility loss of $1/u$.

We fully characterize the complexity of our proof system under different utility gap guarantees. For example, we show that with a polynomial utility gap, the power of our proof system is exactly $\mathsf{P}^{\mathsf{NEXP}}$. Our results imply that non-cooperative provers can be used to handle adaptive oracle queries (unlike the cooperative rational provers studied previously), which makes them more powerful whenever adaptive queries do not reduce to non-adaptive queries.
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1 Introduction

In an interactive proof (IP) \cite{2, 34} (or a multi-prover interactive proof (MIP) \cite{9}), a probabilistic polynomial verifier interacts with one (or more powerful provers respectively), to determine whether a proposition is true—in particular, whether the input \( x \) belongs to a specific language \( L \). Interactive proofs are extremely powerful because they are sound against arbitrary, even malicious provers. If the proposition is true then the verifier accepts with probability 1, while if the proposition is false then no strategy of the provers can make the verifier accept with probability greater than \( 1/3 \).

Classical results on IPs have led us to better understand complexity classes through characterizations such as \( \text{IP} = \text{PSPACE} \) \cite{48, 56} and \( \text{MIP} = \text{NEXP} \) \cite{7, 27, 31}, and later led to the important area of probabilistically checkable proofs; see e.g. \cite{1–3, 39, 57}. More recently, the study of IPs has resulted in extremely efficient (e.g., near linear or even logarithmic time) protocols for delegation of computation \cite{10, 12, 16, 18, 22, 24, 35, 38, 42, 43, 52}. Such super-efficient IPs have brought theory closer to practice, resulting in “nearly-practical” systems \cite{11, 15, 50, 53–55, 58, 59, 61, 63}.

Indeed, interactive proofs are not only a fundamental theoretical concept but an indispensable framework to design efficient computation-outsourcing protocols.

Incentives in multi-prover interactive games. All interactive-proof systems with multiple provers have an implicit incentive structure: the provers have a utility that they are trying to maximize. In classical multi-prover interactive proofs \cite{9}, the provers are totally cooperative with each other and their utility is equal to the probability that the verifier accepts the statement \( x \in L \). On the other hand, in refereed games \cite{19, 26, 28, 30}, the provers compete with one another in a zero-sum game. The utility of each prover in a refereed game is the probability that the verifier accepts their claim \( x \in L \) or \( x \notin L \) respectively (thus at least one prover must be honest).

Several computation-outsourcing protocols that make use of either MIP or refereed games have been designed \cite{11, 15, 17, 44}. However, neither of these models truly captures the strategic nature of service providers in outsourcing applications. How do we design multi-prover interactive proof systems where the provers are neither completely cooperative nor completely conflicting?

In this paper, we use a mechanism design approach to introduce a new proof system where the provers are non-cooperative—that is, each prover acts to maximize his own expected utility. Unlike refereed games, no prover is required to be honest. The utility of non-cooperative provers may no longer directly correspond to the verifier’s acceptance probability (as in MIP and refereed games).

To assign meaningful incentives, we draw on the work on rational proofs \cite{4, 21}, in which the provers’ utility is a monetary payment given at the end of the protocol. In rational proofs, the provers are cooperative and rational—that is, they work together to maximize their total expected payment received from the verifier. Since the provers cooperate, rational proofs are not too different from MIP—the total payment is analogous to the verifier’s acceptance probability \footnote{The class of languages decideable by multiple rational provers \( \text{MRIP} \) is still larger than \( \text{MIP} \) because of different soundness and completeness requirements, and the fact that MRIP protocols allow provers to prove \( x \notin L \) \cite{21}.}

We borrow the notion of payments as utilities in our new model from rational proofs with the difference that instead of a total payment, each prover receives an individual expected payment. While this leads to a well-defined utility structure, there are still significant challenges in designing the overall model of a non-cooperative proof system and in understanding its full power.

In particular, we need to (a) select a meaningful equilibrium concept for the specific game structure of interactive proofs, (b) design protocols where the verifier learns the correct answer under such an equilibrium, and finally (c) bound the exact power of such equilibria-based proofs. In this work, we address these challenges.
1.1 Contributions and Results

In this paper, we introduce a new interactive-proof model, *non-cooperative rational interactive proofs (ncRIP)* that generalizes multi-prover rational proofs to non-cooperative provers.

**Finding the Right Solution Concept.** As an interactive protocol proceeds in rounds, it results in an extensive-form game. As in MIP, the provers cannot communicate with each other once the protocol begins; thus the game has imperfect information. In ncRIP, the provers have perfect recall.

We describe the main obstacles to finding an appropriate solution concept. First, the solution concept should not be susceptible to empty threats. This rules out Nash and maximum Nash as they cannot handle empty threats. Second, the solution concept should have an elegant way to handle provers’ beliefs at unreachable information sets. In particular, we want to avoid artificial consistency requirements on the beliefs of the players at these information sets, like those of sequential equilibrium (SE).

Finally, the solution concept must handle equilibrium selection.

**Strong Sequential Equilibrium.** Taking the above constraints into account, we define a new solution concept to help analyze ncRIP: *strong sequential equilibrium* (SSE). SSE is a refinement of SE which, unlike SE, may not always exist. Thus, it is up to the mechanism designer to ensure that their protocol does have an SSE. We believe that SSE is of independent interest as a solution concept for designing extensive-form mechanisms (e.g. [25, 33, 60]). In Appendix B, we prove important properties of SSE that are used in this work and may prove useful in future studies.

To resolve the problem of equilibrium selection, we define a maximum variant of SSE and apply it recursively to a larger class of “subgames.” Informally, in a rational proof with non-cooperative provers, whenever the strategy profile used by the provers is a recursive-maximum SSE (rmSSE), it leads the verifier to the correct answer. The ncRIP framework is formally defined in Section 2.

**Utility Gap for Non-Cooperative Provers.** Utility gap is a fundamental concept for rational proofs [5, 21, 36] which is analogous to soundness gap in interactive proofs. It measures how robust a protocol is against the provers’ possible deviations from the desired strategy.

This notion is straightforward to define for cooperative rational protocols—they have a utility gap of $u$ if the total expected payment decreases by $1/u$ whenever the provers report the wrong answer. In non-cooperative protocols, however, it is not a priori clear how to define such a payment loss or to choose which prover should incur the loss. A payment loss solely imposed on the total payment may not prevent some provers from deviating, and a loss solely imposed on the provers’ final payments may not prevent them from deviating within subgames.

We define a meaningful notion of utility gap for ncRIP that captures how the provers reason in the resulting extensive-form game, and is naturally incorporated into the framework of rmSSEs.

**Tight Characterizations of ncRIP Classes.** We construct ncRIP protocols with constant, polynomial, and exponential utility gaps for powerful (and tight) complexity classes, demonstrating the strength of our solution concept. Our protocols are simple and intuitive (in fact requiring few changes from their cooperative counterparts), and are thus easy to explain and implement. However, proving their correctness requires significant effort to analyze the provers’ incentives and to show that the protocol meets the strong solution-concept and utility-gap requirements.

---

2In Remark 14, we demonstrate an empty threat incurred under Nash equilibrium. Another possible approach to ncRIP using maximum Nash is to simulate an MRIP protocol [21] using non-cooperative provers, and split the final payment evenly among them. While such an approach may not suffer from empty threats, it forces non-cooperative provers to act cooperatively and fails to lead us to a more meaningful and general non-cooperative model.

3To quote Kreps, one of the inventors of SE, “rather a lot of bodies are buried in this definition” [46, 49].

4Similar to subgame-perfect equilibrium, the recursive aspect is to ensure that provers play their best response at each subform, an extension of subgame for imperfect-information games.
Given our ncRIP protocols, a natural question to ask is whether we are “overfitting” the solution concept so as to give the verifier unrealistic or unlimited power in leveraging the provers’ rationality. We show that this is not the case by proving tight upper-bounds for all three ncRIP classes.

Proving tight upper bounds on the classes is the most technically challenging part of the paper. For example, while an NEXP oracle can guess a strategy profile and verify if it is an SSE, it cannot itself verify recursive-maximum SSEs. Furthermore, the polynomial randomness of the verifier can induce an exponential-sized game tree. The key lemma that helps us overcome these challenges is the pruning lemma (Lemma 16). At a high level, it shows how we can prune the nature moves of the verifier in the resulting game tree, while preserving the rmSSE and utility gap guarantees.

Our results are stated in Figure 1, where we use $O(1)$-ncRIP, poly$(n)$-ncRIP and exp$(n)$-ncRIP to denote ncRIP classes with constant, polynomial and exponential utility gaps respectively. The notations are analogous for MRIP (the cooperative variant). We characterize ncRIP classes via oracle Turing machines. In particular, $P^{\text{NEXP}[O(1)]}$ is the class of languages decided by a polynomial-time Turing machine that makes $O(1)$ queries to an NEXP oracle, and $\text{EXP}^{\text{poly}-\text{NEXP}}$ is the class decided by an exponential-time Turing machine with polynomial-length queries to an NEXP oracle. (Unlike the non-adaptive variant, this class is not known to be equivalent to $\text{EXP}^{\text{NP}}$).

We denote Turing machines with non-adaptive access to an oracle by using $\parallel$ in the subscript: for example, $P^{\text{NEXP}} \parallel$. Note that this is sometimes denoted $P^{\text{NEXP}}$ in the literature.

| Theorem 1. $O(1)$-ncRIP = $P^{\text{NEXP}[O(1)]}$ | Corollary 4. $O(1)$-ncRIP = $O(1)$-MRIP |
| Theorem 2. poly$(n)$-ncRIP = $P^{\text{NEXP}}$ | Corollary 5. poly$(n)$-ncRIP $\supseteq$ poly$(n)$-MRIP |
| Theorem 3. exp$(n)$-ncRIP = $\text{EXP}^{\text{poly}-\text{NEXP}}$ | Corollary 6. exp$(n)$-ncRIP = exp$(n)$-MRIP |

Figure 1: Summary of our results.

**Power of Non-Cooperative vs. Cooperative and Competitive Provers.** Interestingly, in the case of constant and exponential utility gap, the power of ncRIP and MRIP coincides. This can be explained by the power of adaptive versus non-adaptive queries in oracle Turing machines.

Indeed, our results reveal the main difference between non-cooperative and cooperative provers: the former can be used to handle adaptive oracle queries, the latter cannot (see [20, 21]). Intuitively, this makes sense—cooperative provers may collude across adaptive queries, answering some incorrectly to gain on future queries. On the other hand, ncRIP protocols allow us to dissociate the provers handling oracle queries from the others. Thus, whenever adaptive queries to the oracle reduce to non-adaptive queries, the two classes coincide.

Our results also show that non-cooperative provers are more powerful than competing provers—the power of refereed games with imperfect information and perfect recall is equal to $\text{EXP}$ [26].

**MRIP vs. ncRIP protocols.** The ncRIP protocols presented in this paper (e.g., Figure 3) are largely the same as the corresponding MRIP protocols [21]—this is somewhat unsurprising as both are tailored tightly to a circuit representation of the classes in Figure 1.

However, the techniques used in the analysis are substantially different. The proofs in this paper require careful analysis of the information sets, and subtleties of identifying when they form proper “subgames”[5]. On the other hand, ncRIP protocols and proofs are in some places much more intuitive—for example, they let us avoid the difficult and somewhat artificial payment scaling between rounds, often required in RIP and MRIP [11, 21, 36].

---

[5] For example, proving correctness of the ncRIP protocol for NEXP requires “opening the box” of the MIP protocol (see the proof of Lemma 12).
2 Non-Cooperative Rational Interactive Proofs

In this section we introduce the model for ncRIP.

**Notation.** We review the model and notation for ncRIP protocols; this is largely the same as [21]. We review the relevant concepts of extensive-form games in the context of ncRIP in Section A.

Let $L$ be a language and $x$ be a string whose membership in $L$ is to be decided, where $n = |x|$. An interactive protocol is a pair $(V, \vec{P})$, where $V$ is the *verifier*, $\vec{P} = (P_1, \ldots, P_{p(n)})$ is the vector of *provers* and $p(n)$ a polynomial in $n$—that is, we allow polynomially many provers. The verifier runs in polynomial time and flips private coins. Each $P_i$ is computationally unbounded. The verifier and provers are given the input $x$. The verifier can communicate with each prover privately, but no two provers can communicate with each other once the protocol begins.

In a *round*, either each prover sends a message to $V$, or $V$ sends a message to each prover, and these two cases alternate. The length of each message $\ell(x)$, and the number of rounds $k(n)$ are both polynomial in $n$. Let $r$ be the random string used by $V$. Let $\vec{m}$ be the final transcript of the protocol ($\vec{m}$ is a random variable depending on $r$). At the end of the communication, based on $x$, $r$, and $\vec{m}$, the verifier computes an *answer bit* $c \in \{0, 1\}$ for the membership of $x$ in $L$, and a payment vector $\vec{R} = (R_1, R_2, \ldots, R_{k(n)})$, where $R_i$ is the payment given to $P_i$ and $R_i \in [-1, 1]$, and the total $\sum_{i=1}^{p(n)} R_i \in [-1, 1]$ as well. The protocol and the payment function $\vec{R}$ are public knowledge.

Each prover $P_i$’s strategy at round $j$ maps the transcript seen at the beginning of round $j$ to the message he sends in that round. Let $s_i = (s_{i1}, \ldots, s_{ik(n)})$ be the *strategy* of prover $P_i$, and $s = (s_1, \ldots, s_{k(n)})$ be the strategy profile of the provers. Given input $x$, and strategy profile $s$, let $\mu_k(x, s, (V, \vec{P}))$ denote the expected payment of prover $P_k$ in the protocol $(V, \vec{P})$ based on randomness $r$, input $x$ and $s$; if $(V, \vec{P})$ is clear from context, this is shortened to $\mu_k(x, s)$.

At a high level, the provers choose their strategy individually to maximize their own payment; we formalize the solution concept in Section 2.1. The protocol should be such that the provers are incentivized to reach an equilibrium that leads $V$ to the correct answer bit $c$. The protocol forms an *extensive-form game with imperfect information*; see Appendix A for more details.

### 2.1 Strong Sequential Equilibrium

We now introduce a new solution concept, which is a refinement of sequential equilibrium.

**Sequential Equilibrium (SE).** Sequential equilibrium considers a strategy profile $s$ together with a *belief system* $\mu$, where $\mu$ specifies, for each information set $I$, the probability assigned to each history in $I$. SE imposes a *consistency condition* on $s$ and $\mu$: $s$ and $\mu$ are *consistent* if there exists a sequence $(s^t, \mu^t)_{t=1}^\infty$ that converges to $(s, \mu)$, such that each $s^t$ is a profile of completely mixed behavioral strategies and each $\mu^t$ is the belief system derived from $s^t$ using Bayes’ rule. The pair $(s, \mu)$ is a SE if $s$ and $\mu$ are consistent and conditioned on any information set $I_i$ being reached by a player $i$, player $i$’s strategy is a best response to the others’ given $i$’s beliefs at $I_i$ (specified by $\mu$).

We introduce a refinement of SE that avoids the somewhat artificial consistency condition of SE, which involves computing limits of sequences to argue about players’ beliefs at unreachable information sets (reached with probability 0 under the equilibrium strategy $s$).

**Strong Sequential Equilibrium (SSE).** A strong sequential equilibrium is identical to SE for reachable information sets. At any unreachable information set $I$, SSE requires that the acting player’s strategy be a best response to the others, for *any beliefs* he may hold at $I$.

---

6 Negative payments are used to reflect that the provers are being punished. They can be shifted and scaled to lie in $[0, 1]$. Similarly, we may allow $V$’s total budget to be a larger constant for simplicity as it can be scaled down.
**Definition 7.** (Strong Sequential Equilibrium) A strategy profile $s$ is a strong sequential equilibrium if for every player $i$ and information set $I_i$ of $i$:

- **If $I$ is reachable under $s$:** conditioned on $I_i$ being reached, player $i$’s strategy $s_i$ is a best response to $s_{-i}$, given $i$’s beliefs at $I_i$ being derived from $s$ using Bayes’ rule.
- **If $I$ is not reachable under $s$:** conditioned on $I_i$ being reached, player $i$’s strategy $s_i$ is a best response to $s_{-i}$, given any beliefs of $i$ at $I_i$.

Strong sequential equilibrium strengthens SE so that a player’s beliefs at unreachable information sets are irrelevant in justifying his equilibrium strategy. Unlike SE, not every extensive-form game with perfect recall has an SSE. However, in the context of mechanism design, SSE allows for the design of stronger mechanisms.\(^7\) Although we introduce SSE to analyze ncRIP protocols, we believe it is of independent interest as a solution concept for mechanisms based on extensive-form games. In Section B we give an equivalent definition of SSE and several useful structural results.

### 2.2 Solution Concept for ncRIP: Recursive-Maximum SSE

To deal with equilibrium selection, we define maximum SSE. A strategy profile $s$ is a maximum SSE if it is an SSE and for any player $i$ and SSE $s'$, $u_i(s) \geq u_i(s')$. However, maximum SSE alone is not enough to resolve equilibrium-selection problems in extensive-form games, as the maximality is only imposed at the root. Instead, we impose the maximality condition at every subgame.\(^8\)

A subgame is a subtree that can be singled out from the game tree and treated as a separate well-defined game. As an extensive-form game with imperfect information may have very few proper subgames, we use the extended notion of subgames, subforms, defined by Kreps and Wilson\(^9\) to ensure that the solution concept “has enough bite.”

**Subforms.** For any information set $I$, let $H_I$ be the forest rooted at $I$, that is, $H_I = \cup_{h' \in I} \{h : (h', h) \in H\}$, where $H$ is the set of all valid histories in the game. For a history $h \in H$, let $I(h)$ be the unique information set containing $h$. Let $F_I$ be the set of all information sets following $I$, that is, $F_I = \{I(h', h) : h' \in I, (h', h) \in H\}$. As $h$ can be the empty history $\phi$, we have $I \in F_I$.

**Definition 8.** (Subform \(^{47}\)) For any information set $I$, $H_I$ is a subform rooted at $I$ if for every $I' \in F_I$ and every $h \in I$, $\exists h' \in I$ and $\exists h \in H_I$ such that $h = (h', h)$.

Roughly speaking, a subform $H_I$ completely contains all the information sets following $I$, so there is no information asymmetry between the players acting within $H_I$. A subform $H_I$ and a probability distribution $\mu_I$ on $I$ together form a well-defined game, where the players’ expected utilities under $s$ are based on $\mu_I$ and the Nature moves in $H_I$.

A subform $H_I$ is reachable under $s$ if $I$ is reachable under $s$. Given a strategy profile $s$, let $s_I$ be the strategy profile induced by $s$ in the subform $H_I$. The height of a subform $H_I$ is the length of the longest path in the game following the information set $I$.

**Recursive-Maximum SSE.** To deal with equilibrium selection in ncRIP protocols, we enforce the solution concept to hold recursively on every subform, as in subgame-perfect equilibrium.

---

\(^7\)This is reminiscent of dominant-strategy equilibrium, and the difference between analyzing general games and designing specific mechanisms. Not every game has a dominant-strategy equilibrium, and it cannot be used to analyze general games. However, if the designer can design a mechanism with a dominant-strategy equilibrium, he obtains a strong guarantee on the behavior of the players.

\(^8\)This is analogous to the backward induction in subgame-perfect equilibrium. As the correctness of ncRIP protocols only hold at max SSE, the provers must play their max SSE strategy when restricted to subforms as well.

\(^9\)We would like to thank an anonymous reviewer for pointing us towards this citation.
Definition 9 ( Recursive-Maximum Strong Sequential Equilibrium). A strategy profile $s$ is a recursive-maximum strong sequential equilibrium (or rmSSE) if $s$ is a SSE and

- for every subform $H_I$ of height 1:
  - if $I$ is reachable under $s$: $s_I$ is a maximum SSE on $H_I$ with respect to $\mu_I$ (deduced from $s$ using Bayes' rule),
  - if $I$ is unreachable under $s$: $s_I$ is a maximum SSE on $H_I$ with respect to any distribution $\mu_I$,

- for every subform $H_I$ subgame of height $> 1$:
  - if $I$ is reachable under $s$: $s_I$ is maximum among all SSEs on $H_I$ that are rmSSEs in all subforms following $I$ (with respect to $\mu_I$ deduced from $s$ using Bayes' rule),
  - if $I$ is unreachable under $s$: $s_I$ is maximum among all SSEs on $H_I$ that are rmSSEs in all subforms following $I$ (with respect to any distribution $\mu_I$).

We are ready to define rational proofs with non-cooperative provers.

Definition 10. For any language $L$, an interactive protocol $(V, \vec{P})$ is a non-cooperative rational interactive proof (ncRIP) protocol for $L$ if, for any $x \in \{0,1\}^*$, there exists a strategy profile $s$ of the provers that is a recursive-maximum SSE in the resulting extensive-form game, and under any recursive-maximum SSE, the answer bit $c$ output by the verifier is correct (i.e., $c = 1$ iff $x \in L$) with probability 1, where the probability is taken over the verifier’s randomness.

2.3 Utility Gap in ncRIP Protocols

The notion of rmSSE provides a strong guarantee that rational non-cooperative provers will act as prescribed by the protocol and lead the verifier to the correct answer. However, this is only true in the classic game-theoretic sense where the players are perfectly rational and “sensitive” to arbitrarily small utility losses. In reality, some provers may not care about small payment losses. Such provers could still deviate to lead the verifier to the wrong answer. To make ncRIP protocols robust against such “insensitive” provers, we define the notion of utility gap.

Informally, a utility gap of $u$ means that if a strategy profile $s$ leads the verifier to the wrong answer, there must exist a subform, such that some provers must lose at least a $1/u$ amount in their final individual payments (compared to the strategy where they do their best in that subform). As a consequence, these provers will not deviate to $s$, as long as they care about $1/u$ payment losses.

Utility gap is analogous to soundness gap—the difference between completeness and soundness—in interactive proofs. If an IP protocol has a large soundness gap, then the probability that malicious provers can make the verifier accept when $x \notin L$ is low. Similarly, if an ncRIP protocol has a large utility gap, then even provers who are not perfectly rational and are insensitive to small losses will not have an incentive to deviate and lead the verifier to the wrong answer.

Definition 11. Let $(V, \vec{P})$ be an ncRIP protocol for a language $L$ and $s^*$ be a recursive-maximum SSE in the resulting game. The protocol $(V, \vec{P})$ has an $\alpha(n)$-utility gap or $\alpha(n)$-gap, if for any strategy profile $s'$ under which the answer bit $c'$ is wrong, there exists a subform $H_I$ reachable under $s'$, and a prover $P_j$ acting in $H_I$ who has deviated from $s^*$ such that

$$u_j(x, (s'_{-j}, s'_j), (V, \vec{P})) - u_j(x, (s'_{-j}, s'_j), (V, \vec{P})) > 1/\alpha(n),$$

where $s'_{-j}$ denotes the strategy profile $s'$ outside subform $H_I$, that is, $s'_{-j} = s' \setminus s'_j$. 

The class of languages that have an ncRIP protocol with constant, polynomial and exponential utility gap, are denoted by $O(1)$-ncRIP, $\text{poly}(n)$-ncRIP, and $\text{exp}(n)$-ncRIP respectively.\textsuperscript{10} Note that these terms refer to $\alpha(n)$, so exponential gives the weakest gap guarantees.

\textsuperscript{10}These classes are formally defined by taking the union over languages with $\alpha(n)$ utility gap, for every $\alpha(n)$ that is constant, polynomial and exponential in $n$ respectively.
3 Lower Bounds: ncRIP Protocols with Utility Gap

In this section, we give an \(O(1)\)-utility gap ncRIP protocol for the class \(NEXP\) and use it to give an \(O(\alpha(n))\)-utility gap ncRIP protocol for the class \(P^{NEXP[\alpha(n)]}\). Setting \(\alpha(n)\) to be a constant or polynomial in \(n\) gives us \(P^{NEXP[O(1)]} \subseteq O(1)\)-ncRIP and \(P^{NEXP} \subseteq \text{poly}(n)\)-ncRIP respectively.

Then, we show how to simulate any cooperative multi-prover rational interactive proof (MRIP) using an ncRIP protocol with exponential utility gap. Since \(\text{EXP}^{NP} \subseteq \text{MRIP}\), and \(\text{EXP}^{NP} = \text{Exp}^{\text{poly} - \text{NEXP}}\), this proves that \(\text{Exp}^{\text{poly} - \text{NEXP}} \subseteq \exp(n)\)-ncRIP.

Here we argue correctness of our protocols at a high level; see Section C for full proofs.

**Constant-gap ncRIP protocol for \(NEXP\).** The ncRIP protocol for any language in \(NEXP\) is in Figure 2. While the protocol is simple and uses the 2-prover 1-round MIP for \(NEXP\) as a blackbox, in the analysis we have to open up the blackbox. In particular, if \(P_1\) sends \(c = 0\) in round 1 all the information sets of \(P_1\) and \(P_2\) in round 3 become unreachable. To show that a strong sequential equilibrium exists, we need to show that the provers have a best response at these unreachable sets, which is argued based on the messages exchanged in the MIP protocol.

This protocol is a good example to highlight the differences between ncRIP and MRIP protocols—the ncRIP protocol appears almost identical to the MRIP protocol for \(NEXP\). However, the analyses are significantly different—the correctness of the MRIP protocol follows almost immediately from that of the blackbox MIP protocol, while in the case of ncRIP we have to prove that the protocol meets all the conditions of recursive-maximum SSE.

**Lemma 12.** Any language \(L \in \text{NEXP}\) has a 2-prover 3-round 6/5-gap ncRIP protocol.

---

For any input \(x\) and language \(L \in \text{NEXP}\), the protocol \((V, P_1, P_2)\) for \(L\) is:

1. \(P_1\) sends a bit \(c\) to \(V\). \(V\) outputs \(c\) at the end of the protocol.
2. If \(c = 0\), then the protocol ends and the payments are \(R_1 = R_2 = 1/2\).
3. Otherwise, \(V\) runs the classic 2-prover 1-round MIP protocol for \(NEXP\) with \(P_1\) and \(P_2\) to prove if \(x \in L\). If the MIP protocol accepts then \(R_1 = 1, R_2 = 1\); else, \(R_1 = -1, R_2 = -1\).

**Figure 2:** A simple \(O(1)\)-utility gap ncRIP protocol for \(NEXP\).

---

**O(\(\alpha(n)\))-gap ncRIP protocol for \(P^{NEXP[\alpha(n)]}\).** Next, we give an ncRIP protocol with \(O(\alpha(n))\)-utility gap for the class \(P^{NEXP[\alpha(n)]}\), where \(\alpha(n)\) is a function of \(n\) which (1) only takes positive integral values, (2) is upper-bounded by a polynomial in \(n\), and (3) is polynomial-time computable.\(^{12}\)

**Lemma 13.** Any language \(L \in P^{NEXP[\alpha(n)]}\) has a 3-prover 5-round \(6/(5\alpha(n))\)-gap ncRIP protocol.

The ncRIP protocol for any \(L \in P^{NEXP[\alpha(n)]}\) is in Figure 3. It is fairly intuitive—\(V\) simulates the polynomial-time Turing machine directly, and uses the ncRIP protocol for \(NEXP\) for the queries.

The analysis of the protocol illustrates the robustness of the solution concept. In particular, the \(NEXP\) queries start the non-trivial subforms in the game, and which of them are reachable under any strategy profile \(s\) is determined solely by \(P_1'\) strategy. To avoid suboptimal equilibria and the problem of empty threats, recursive-maximality must hold at both reachable and unreachable subforms. Otherwise, \(P_1\) cannot unilaterally deviate out of a bad strategy where he is lying on

---

\(^{11}\)It is also possible to give a scoring-rule based ncRIP protocol for \(NEXP\), similar to MRIP.\(^{21}\) However, such a protocol has an exponential utility gap and is subsumed by our simulation of MRIP in Figure 3.

\(^{12}\)For Theorem 1 and Theorem 2, \(\alpha(n)\) need only be a constant or polynomial in \(n\). However, Lemma 13 holds for all \(\alpha(n)\)'s that are polynomial-time computable (given \(1^n\)) and polynomially bounded, such as \(\log n, \sqrt{n}\), etc.
an NEXP gate to a strategy giving the correct answers (and thus making a previously unreachable NEXP query reachable), if \( P_2 \) and \( P_3 \) are giving wrong answers at those NEXP queries.

The utility-gap analysis of the protocol in Figure 3 shows that even though \( V \) can only check the NEXP queries that \( P_1 \) wants \( V \) to see, the protocol is designed to ensure that deviating provers in some reachable subform suffer an \( O(1/\alpha(n)) \) loss in their overall expected payment.

For any input \( x \) of length \( n \), the protocol \((V, \bar{P})\) works as follows.
1. \( P_1 \) sends \((c, c_1, \ldots, c_{\alpha(n)}) \in \{0, 1\}^{\alpha(n)+1} \) to \( V \). \( V \) outputs \( c \) at the end of the protocol.
2. \( V \) simulates \( M \) on \( x \) using the bits \( c_1, \ldots, c_{\alpha(n)} \) as answers to NEXP queries \( \phi_1, \ldots, \phi_{\alpha(n)} \) generated by \( M \) respectively. If \( M \) accepts and \( c = 0 \) or \( M \) rejects and \( c = 1 \), then the protocol ends and \( R_1 = -1, R_2 = R_3 = 0 \).
3. \( V \) picks a random index \( i' \) from \( \{1, \ldots, \alpha(n)\} \) and sends \((i', \phi_{i'})\) to \( P_2 \) and \( P_3 \).
4. \( V \) runs the 2-prover 3-round \( O(1)\)-gap ncRIP protocol for NEXP (Figure 2) with \( P_2 \) and \( P_3 \) on \( \phi_i \). \( P_2 \) and \( P_3 \) get payments \( R_2 \) and \( R_3 \) based on the protocol. Let \( c_{i'}^* \) be the answer bit in the NEXP protocol. If \( c_{i'}^* \neq c_{i'} \), then \( R_1 = 0 \); otherwise \( R_1 = 1 \).

Figure 3: An \( O(\alpha(n))\)-utility gap ncRIP protocol for \( P^{\text{NEXP}[\alpha(n)]} \).

Remark 14. The ncRIP protocol in Figure 3 is a good example to demonstrate the problem of empty threats that can occur under Nash and maximum Nash equilibrium. In this protocol, \( P_2 \) and \( P_3 \) obtain a higher expected payment if the NEXP instance they are queried is not satisfiable. Thus, they can blackmail \( P_1 \)—if he does not give answers that lead them to a satisfiable instance, they will lie about the answer to the NEXP instance in step 4 which would result in \( P_1 \) being punished. This is an empty threat (as it is not a rational move for \( P_2 \) and \( P_3 \)), however it leads to an unnatural Nash equilibrium. Similarly, there does exist a maximum Nash equilibrium for this protocol.

Simulating any MRIP protocol using a ncRIP Protocol. We show how to simulate a general MRIP protocol \((V, \bar{P})\) with \( p(n) \) provers and \( k(n) \) rounds using a 2-prover 3-round ncRIP protocol \((V', P_1', P_2')\) with exponential-utility gap. (The protocol \((V', P_1', P_2')\) is in Figure 2 in Section C).

Essentially, \( V' \) gives all the randomness of \( V \) to \( P_1' \) and asks for the entire transcript and uses \( P_2' \) to commit to a single prover’s message, and cross-checks their answers. However, we don’t want \( P_1' \) who has access to all the randomness to dictate what information sets of \( P_2' \) are reachable. Because the ncRIP protocol need only have an exponential utility gap, \( V' \) asks one prover a totally random question (independent of \( P_1' \)), and with exponentially small probability this random message is exactly the message \( V' \) intended to check. This protocol shows why exponential gap guarantees do not lead to meaningful protocols—a verifier that asks random questions can still extract honest behavior from rational provers through the exponentially small changes in expected payments.

4 Upper Bounds: ncRIP Protocols with Utility Gap

In this section, we prove matching upper bounds on the classes of ncRIP protocols with constant, polynomial and exponential utility gaps. We focus on the upper bound for \( O(1)\)-ncRIP and \( \text{poly}(n)\)-ncRIP, in which a polynomial-time Turing machine needs to simulate the protocol with a constant and polynomial number of queries to an NEXP oracle respectively.

To simulate an ncRIP protocol, we need to find a strategy profile “close enough” to the recursive-maximum SSE so that the answer bit is still correct, that is, it is sufficient to find any strategy profile that satisfies the utility gap guarantee. We formalize this restatement of Definition 11 below.
Observation 15. Given input $x$ and an $\alpha(n)$-utility gap ncRIP protocol $(V, \bar{P})$, let $s$ be a strategy profile such that for all subforms $H_I$ (reachable under $s$), and for all provers $P_j$ acting in $H_I$:

$$u_j(x, r, (V, \bar{P}), (s_{-I}, s_I^*)) - u_j(x, r, (V, \bar{P}), (s_{-I}, s_I)) < \frac{1}{\alpha(n)},$$

where $s^*$ is a recursive-maximum SSE. Then, the answer bit $c$ under $s$ must be correct.

There are several challenges involved in finding a strategy profile satisfying Observation 15. First, the size of the game tree of any ncRIP protocol—small gap notwithstanding—can be exponential in $n$. Even if the polynomial-time Turing machine considers a single strategy profile $s$ at a time, since $V$ can flip polynomially many coins, the part of the tree “in play”—the number of decision nodes reached with nonzero probability under $s$—can still be exponential in $n$.

The second and related problem is that while the NEXP oracle can guess and verify an SSE, it cannot help the Turing machine directly with maximum SSEs. In particular, the polynomial-time machine must go bottom-up in the game tree and find an SSE that is recursively maximal on all its reachable subgames (which can again be exponential in $n$).

Finally, the polynomial-time machine needs to search through the exponentially large strategy-profile space in an efficient way to find one which leads to the correct answer.

We now prove a fundamental lemma about ncRIP protocols with utility gap that lets us get around the first two challenges mentioned above.

**Pruning Nature moves in ncRIP protocols.** A verifier’s coin flips in an ncRIP protocol represent Nature moves in the resulting game. A Nature move that imposes nonzero probabilities over exponentially many outcomes can cause the game tree under play to be exponential in size.

We prune the Nature moves of a verifier so that a polynomial-time Turing machine simulating an $\alpha(n)$ utility gap protocol can traverse the game tree reachable under any given $s$.

**Lemma 16 (Pruning Lemma).** Let $L \in \alpha(n)$-ncRIP and let $(V, \bar{P})$ be an ncRIP protocol for $L$ with $\alpha(n)$ utility gap and $p(n)$ provers. Given an input $x$ and a strategy $s$, the protocol $(V, \bar{P})$ can be transformed in exponential time to a new protocol, say $(V', \bar{P}')$, where

- the probability distributions imposed by the nature moves of $V'$ on $x$ have $O(\alpha(n))$ support,
- if $s$ is a recursive-maximum SSE of $(V, \bar{P})$, then $s$ induces a recursive-maximum SSE in $(V', \bar{P}')$, 
- $|u_j(x, s, (V, \bar{P})) - u_j(x, s, (V', \bar{P}'))| < 1/(4\alpha(n))$ for all $j \in \{1, \ldots, p(n)\}$, and
- if the answer bit under $s$ is wrong, then there exists a subform $H_I$ in the game $(V', \bar{P})$ (reachable under $s$) and a prover $P_j$ acting at $H_I$, such that $P_j$ loses a $1/(2\alpha(n))$ amount in his expected payment compared to a strategy profile where $s_I$ (induced by $s$ on $H_I$) is replaced by $s_I^*$ (the recursive-maximum SSE on $H_I$), keeping the strategy profile outside $H_I$, $s_{-I}$, fixed.

We prove Lemma 16 in several parts. First, we show how to transform any nature move of $V$ that imposes a nonzero probability distribution on exponentially many outcomes into a probability distribution with $O(\alpha(n))$ support, given an input $x$ and a strategy $s$ of the provers.

Let $(V, \bar{P})$ use $p(n)$ provers and let the running time of $V$ be $n^k$ for some constant $k$. There can be at most $2^{n^k}$ different payments that $V$ can generate for a particular prover given the input $x$. Given $x$ and $s$, fix a prover index $j \in \{1, p(n)\}$. Let $R_1, R_2, \ldots, R_m$ be the payments generated by $V$ on $s$ for $P_j$. Let $V$’s randomness assign probability distribution $\mu = (p_1, p_2, \ldots, p_m)$ to $R_1, R_2, \ldots, R_m$ respectively. Then, the expected payment of $P_j$ under $s$, $u_j(x, s, (V, \bar{P})) = \sum_{i=1}^{m} p_i R_i$.

Recall that $u_j(x, s, (V, \bar{P})) \in [-1, 1]$ for all $1 \leq j \leq p(n)$. For each prover $P_j$, divide the interval $[-1, 1]$ into $4\alpha(n)$ intervals, each of length $1/(2\alpha(n))$. In other words, prover $P_j$’s $i$th interval is $[i/2\alpha(n), (i+1)/2\alpha(n))$, for each $i \in \{-2\alpha(n), \ldots, 2\alpha(n) - 1\}$.

\[To include 1 as a possible payment, interval $2\alpha(n) - 1$ should be closed on both sides; we ignore this for simplicity.
We round the possible payments for $P_i$ to a representative of the interval they belong. Specifically, we map each payment $R_i$ to $r_j$ as described in Equation (1). There are potentially exponentially many different payments $R_i$, and only polynomially many different payments $r_j$, so several $R_i$ must map to the same $r_j$. Let $T_j = \{ i : R_i \text{ maps to } r_j \}$. Let $T = \bigcup_j \{ T_j \}$. Thus the total number of distinct $r_j$’s is $8\alpha(n)$, $|T| = O(\alpha(n))$. Let $S : \{1, \ldots, m\} \rightarrow T$, such that $S(i) = T_j$ iff $i \in T_j$.

For each $T_j \in T$, let $f(T_j)$ denote a unique index in the set $T_j$. Without loss of generality, let $f(T_j)$ be the lowest index in $T_j$. We define a new probability distribution $\mu' = (p'_1, \ldots, p'_h)$ over the payments $R_1, \ldots, R_h$ respectively given by Equation (2). In particular, for every $T_j \in T$, assign $R_{f(T_j)}$ probability $\sum_{k \in T_j} p_k$ and for every other index $\ell \in T_j, \ell \neq f(T_j)$, assign $R_{\ell}$ probability 0.

Define $V'$ as a polynomial-time verifier that simulates all deterministic computation of $V$ and for a fixed input $x$, it imposes a probability distribution $\mu'$ with $O(\alpha(n))$ support for any probability distribution $\mu$ imposed by $V$. For other inputs, $V'$ simulates $V$ without any modification.

Note that given input $x$, a strategy profile $s$ and the protocol $(V, \vec{P})$, transforming the distribution $\mu$ to $\mu'$ takes time linear in the size of the game tree, and thus exponential in $n$. (This means that an NEXP oracle, given $x$, can guess a particular $s$ and perform the transformation.)

Next, we show that if the strategy profile $s$ is a recursive-maximum SSE of $(V, \vec{P})$, then $s$ restricted to the pruned game tree of $(V', \vec{P})$ imposes a recursive-maximum SSE on $(V', \vec{P})$ as well.

**Claim 17.** Any recursive-maximum SSE $s$ in the game tree of protocol $(V, \vec{P})$ induces a recursive-maximum SSE in the game tree of protocol $(V', \vec{P})$.

**Proof.** By contradiction, suppose $s$ is not an SSE of $(V', \vec{P})$. Then there exists an information set $I = \{ h_1, \ldots, h_m \}$, such that, conditioned on reaching $I$, the prover acting at $I$ can improve his expected payment by deviating (given his belief $u'_I$ at $I$ if $I$ is reachable under $s$ and for any belief he may hold at $I$ if $I$ is unreachable under $s$).

We split into two cases: $I$ is either reachable or unreachable under $s$.

By construction, if $I$ is reachable under $s$ in $(V', \vec{P})$, then $I$ must also be reachable under $s$ in $(V, \vec{P})$. Let $\mu'_I = (p'_1, \ldots, p'_m)$, where $p'_i$ is the probability assigned to $h_i$ and the support of $\mu'_I$ is $O(\alpha(n))$. Let $R_1, \ldots, R_m$ be the payments that the player acting on $I$ gets under $s$ conditioned on reaching $h_1, \ldots, h_m$ respectively. Similarly, let $R'_1, \ldots, R'_m$ be the payments conditioned on reaching $h_1, \ldots, h_m$ respectively under the strategy to which the player at $I$ deviates from $s$. Then, $\sum_{i=1}^m p'_i R'_i > \sum_{i=1}^m p'_i R_i$. Let $\mu_I = (p_1, \ldots, p_m)$ be the beliefs on $I$ under $s$ in $(V, \vec{P})$. We use the relationship between the distributions $\mu'_I$ and $\mu_I$, to show that such a deviation in $(V', \vec{P})$ would imply a deviation in $(V, \vec{P})$. In particular, mapping $\mu'_I$ back to $\mu_I$, using Equation (2) we get:

$$\sum_{i=1}^m \left( \sum_{k \in S(i)} p_k \right) R'_i > \sum_{i=1}^m \left( \sum_{k \in S(i)} p_k \right) R_i$$

$$\sum_{i=1}^m \left( \sum_{k \in S(i)} p_k \right) \cdot \min_{k \in S(i)} R'_k > \sum_{i=1}^m \left( \sum_{k \in S(i)} p_k \right) \cdot \max_{k \in S(i)} R_k$$

(3)
\[ \sum_{i=1}^{m} \left( \mathbb{I}_{i=f(S(i))} \cdot \sum_{k \in S(i)} p_k R'_k \right) > \sum_{i=1}^{m} \left( \mathbb{I}_{i=f(S(i))} \cdot \sum_{k \in S(i)} p_k R_k \right) \]

Inequality 3 holds because \( R'_f(S(i)) > R_f(S(i)) \), and so the two payments lie in different intervals in the mapping (Equation 1). Thus the minimum payment in the interval of \( R'_f(S(i)) \) will be greater that the maximum payment in the interval of \( R_f(S(i)) \). Finally, Inequality 4 contradicts the fact that \( s \) was an SSE in \((V, \bar{P})\), achieving a contradiction for the case of reachable information sets.

For unreachable information sets the argument is easy. If \( I \) is unreachable under \( s \) in \((V, \bar{P})\), then \( I \) must be unreachable under \( s \) in \((V, \bar{P})\). If the action of prover acting at \( I \) is not his best response in \((V', \bar{P'})\) for some history \( h \in I \) then, it contradicts the fact that \( s \) is an SSE of \((V, \bar{P})\).

Now, suppose \( s \) is not a recursive-maximum SSE of \((V', \bar{P})\). Then there exists a subgame \( H_I \) of height \( k \) such that \( s \) is recursive-maximum on all subgames following \( H_I \) of height \(< k \) but not maximum at \( H_I \) (among SSE’s that are recursively-maximum at all subforms following \( H_I \)). Let \( s^* \) be recursive-maximum on \( H_I \), then the expected payment of at least one prover \( P_j \) is better under \( s^* \), while everyone else does just as well (given the beliefs at \( I \) derived using Bayes’ rule if \( I \) is reachable under \( s \) or given any beliefs if \( I \) is unreachable under \( s \)). Writing out the expression of expected payment of \( P_j \) conditioned on reaching \( H_I \) and “unfolding” the probability distribution back to the original game, we get a contradiction that \( s \) could not have been a recursive-maximum SSE of the original game, as the same strategy \( s^* \) would give \( P_j \) a better expected payment at \( H_I \) while doing just as well for other provers. The proof is similar as before and we omit the details. \( \square \)

We now show that for a given \( s \), the expected payments of the provers under \((V, \bar{P})\) and under \((V', \bar{P'})\) are not too far off. In particular, we prove the following claim.

**Claim 18.** For all \( j \in \{1, \ldots, p(n)\} \), \( |u_j(x, s, (V, \bar{P})) - u_j(x, s, (V', \bar{P}'))| < 1/(4\alpha(n)) \).

**Proof.** Given input \( x \) and strategy profile \( s \), fix a prover \( P_j \). Let \( V \) generate payments \( R_1, R_2, \ldots, R_m \) under \( s \) for \( P_j \), and assign the probability distribution \( \mu = (p_1, p_2, \ldots, p_m) \) on \( R_1, R_2, \ldots, R_m \) respectively. Using Equations 1 and 2 we compare \( P_j \)'s expected payment:

\[
|u_j(s, x, (V, \bar{P})) - u_j(s, x, (V', \bar{P}'))| = \left| \sum_{i=1}^{m} p_i R_i - \sum_{T_j \in T} \left( \sum_{k \in T_j} p_k \right) R_{f(T_j)} \right| \\
= \sum_{T_j \in T} \sum_{k \in T_j} p_k \left( |R_{f(T_j)} - R_i| \right) < \sum_{T_j \in T} \sum_{k \in T_j} p_k \left( \frac{1}{4\alpha(n)} \right) = \left( \sum_{i=1}^{m} p_i \right) \frac{1}{4\alpha(n)} = \frac{1}{4\alpha(n)} \]  

To complete the proof of Lemma 16 we show that \((V', \bar{P'})\) preservers utility gap guarantees.

**Claim 19.** Given input \( x \), if the answer bit under \( s \) is wrong, then there exists a subform \( H_I \) reachable under \( s \) in \((V', \bar{P'})\) and \( P_j \) acting at \( H_I \), such that \( P_j \)'s expected payment under \( s \) is \( \frac{1}{2\alpha(n)} \) less than his expected payment under \((s_{-I}, s_I^*)\), where \( s_I^* \) is a recursive-maximum SSE on \( H_I \).

**Proof.** Consider a strategy profile \( s^* \) that is a recursive-maximum SSE in the game tree of \((V, \bar{P})\). Since \( s \) gives the wrong answer bit, from the \( \alpha(n) \)-utility gap guarantee of \((V, \bar{P})\) and Definition 14 there exists a subform \( H_I \) reachable under \( s \), such that a prover \( P_j \) acting in \( H_I \) loses \( 1/\alpha(n) \) in his expected payment under \( s \) compared to the strategy profile \((s_{-I}, s_I^*)\). That is,
\[ u_j(x, (s_{-1}, s^*_j), (V, \bar{P})) - u_j(x, (s_{-1}, s_{I}), (V, \bar{P})) > \frac{1}{\alpha(n)}. \]  

(5)

Using Claim 17, \( s^* \) also induces a recursive-maximum SSE in the game tree of \((V', \bar{P})\). And since \( H_I \) is reachable under \( s \) in \((V, \bar{P})\), it is reachable under \( s \) in \((V', \bar{P})\) as well. We show that:

\[ u_j(x, (s_{-1}, s^*_I), (V', \bar{P})) - u_j(x, (s_{-1}, s_{I}), (V', \bar{P})) > \frac{1}{2\alpha(n)}. \]  

(6)

Using Claim 18, prover \( P_j \)'s expected payments in the two protocols under \( s \) and \( s^* \) follow:

\[ |u_j(x, (s_{-1}, s^*_I), (V, \bar{P})) - u_j(x, (s_{-1}, s^*_I), (V', \bar{P}))| < \frac{1}{4\alpha(n)} \]  

(7)

\[ |u_j(x, (s_{-1}, s_{I}), (V, \bar{P})) - u_j(x, (s_{-1}, s_{I}), (V', \bar{P}))| < \frac{1}{4\alpha(n)} \]  

(8)

There are four cases depending on the sign of the left hand side of Inequalities (7) and (8). We show that Claim 19 holds for one of the cases and omit the details of the others, which are similar.

Suppose the left hand side of both inequalities is positive, that is, \( u_j(x, (s_{-1}, s^*_I), (V, \bar{P})) > u_j(x, (s_{-1}, s^*_I), (V', \bar{P})) \), and \( u_j(x, (s_{-1}, s_{I}), (V, \bar{P})) > u_j(x, (s_{-1}, s_{I}), (V', \bar{P})) \). Then,

\[
\begin{align*}
& u_j(x, (s_{-1}, s^*_I), (V', \bar{P})) - u_j(x, (s_{-1}, s_{I}), (V', \bar{P})) \\
& > \left( u_j(x, (s_{-1}, s^*_I), (V, \bar{P})) - \frac{1}{4\alpha(n)} \right) - u_j(s^*_I, x, (V', \bar{P})) \\
& > \left( u_j(x, (s_{-1}, s_{I}), (V, \bar{P})) + \frac{1}{\alpha(n)} \right) - \frac{1}{4\alpha(n)} - u_j(x, (s_{-1}, s_{I}), (V', \bar{P})) > \frac{3}{4\alpha(n)}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\text{\square}
\]

**Searching through strategy-profile space efficiently.** Using Lemma 16, given an input \( x \) and an \( \alpha(n) \)-utility gap \( \text{ncRIP} \) protocol \((V, \bar{P})\), when \( \alpha(n) \) is constant or polynomial, a polynomial-time oracle Turing machine can use its \( \text{NEXP} \) oracle to guess a certain strategy profile \( s \), prune the Nature moves of \( V \), and report the resulting \( O(\alpha(n)) \)-support distribution bit-by-bit. Thus, it is able to simulate the new distribution to figure out which decision nodes are reachable under \( s \).

The next question then is, how should the polynomial-time Turing machine navigate the potential strategy-profile space in polynomial-time to find the strategy profile that satisfies Observation 15 (and thus gives the correct answer bit)? To do this, we invoke a recurring idea: divide each prover’s expected payment interval \([-1, 1]\), evenly into \( 8\alpha(n) \) subintervals of length \( 1/(4\alpha(n)) \), and consider subinterval profiles (a tuple of subintervals, one for each prover) to cut down on the search space.

**Claim 20.** Given an input \( x \) and a \( \text{ncRIP} \) protocol \((V, \bar{P})\) with \( \alpha(n) \)-utility gap, consider a subinterval profile \((L_1, \ldots, L_{p(n)})\), where each \( L_i = [k/(4\alpha), (k + 1)/(4\alpha + 1)] \) denotes a subinterval of prover \( P_i \) in \([-1, 1]\), for some \( k \in \{-2\alpha(n), \ldots, 2\alpha(n) - 1\} \). If any SSE \( s \) that has an expected payment profile \( \bar{u}(x, s) \) such that \( u_i(x, s) \in L_i \) for all \( 1 \leq i \leq p(n) \), and \( s \) does not satisfy Observation 15 then the expected payment profile \( \bar{u}^*(x, s) \) under a recursive-maximum SSE \( s^* \) cannot lie in the same subinterval profile, that is, there exists a prover index \( j \) such that \( u_j(x, s^*) \notin L_j \).

**Proof.** Since \( s \) does not satisfy Observation 15 there exists a reachable subform \( H_I \) and prover \( P_j \) acting on \( H_I \) such that the following holds. Without loss of generality, let \( \mu_j(s, x) \in L_k \).

\[ u_j(x, (s_{-1}, s^*_j), (V, \bar{P})) - u_j(x, (s_{-1}, s_{I}), (V, \bar{P})) > \frac{1}{\alpha(n)} \]

\[ u_j(x, s^*, (V, \bar{P})) > \frac{1}{\alpha(n)} + \frac{k}{4\alpha(n)} \implies u_j(x, s^*, (V, \bar{P})) \notin L_k \]

\[
\text{\square}
\]
Using Claim\textsuperscript{[20]} if the polynomial-time Turing machine is able to test any SSE $s$ with $\tilde{u}(x,s)$ in a subinterval profile, for all subinterval profiles, it is guaranteed to find one that satisfies Observation\textsuperscript{[15]} This is because a recursive-maximum SSE of an ncRIP protocol is guaranteed to exist and its expected payment profile must belong to some subinterval profile.

However, as there are $O(\alpha(n))$ subintervals for each of the $p(n)$ provers, there are $O(\alpha(n)p(n))$ total subinterval profiles and a polynomial-time machine cannot test SSEs for each of them.

To reduce the search space further, we show that it is sufficient to consider subintervals of the total expected-payment interval and test an SSE $s$ for each of them. To test if an SSE $s$ satisfies Observation\textsuperscript{[15]} we go bottom-up in the game tree reachable under $s$ to find the maximum SSE for all subforms (always exists in an ncRIP protocol).

Recall that a maximum SSE is an SSE where for any player $i$ and SSE $s'$, $u_i(s) \geq u_i(s')$. We can find such an SSE by querying about total expected-payment intervals only using the next lemma.

**Lemma 21.** If a maximum SSE exists then a strategy profile $s$ is a maximum SSE if and only if $s$ is an SSE and $s$ maximizes the sum of utilities of all players among all SSEs.

Using Lemma\textsuperscript{[21]} we can divide the total expected payment range $[-1, 1]$ into $\alpha(n)/4$-sized subintervals, and query whether a strategy profile has a total expected payment in a given interval\textsuperscript{[14]}

We are now ready to prove the upper bounds on the power of our ncRIP classes.

**Constant Utility Gap.** Using Lemma\textsuperscript{[16]} and Lemma\textsuperscript{[21]} simulating a constant-gap protocol using a $\mathsf{P^{NEXP[O(1)]}}$ machine $M$ is easy. In particular, there are at most $O(1)$ subforms that are reachable under any strategy profile $s$, and the total expected payment of the provers conditioned on reaching these subforms will be in one of the $O(1)$ subintervals. Thus, there are $O(1)$ combinations of total expected payments on all subforms (including the whole game). $M$ queries its $\mathsf{NEXP}$ oracle whether there exists an SSE that achieves that combination of total expected payments on those subforms, for all combinations. Then, $M$ finds the maximum among all of the combinations that got a “yes”. Such a maximum is guaranteed to exist for an ncRIP protocol and finally $M$ queries the oracle for the answer bit of the corresponding SSE by giving the maximum profile of total expected payments over the subgames.

**Lemma 22.** $\mathsf{O(1)-ncRIP} \subseteq \mathsf{P^{NEXP[O(1)]}}$.

The polynomial-time oracle Turing machine in Lemma\textsuperscript{[22]} can issue all its queries non-adaptively That is, $\alpha(n)$-ncRIP $\subseteq \mathsf{P^{NEXP[O(1)]}}$. Furthermore in Section\textsuperscript{[3]} we show that $\mathsf{O(1)-ncRIP} \subseteq \mathsf{P^{NEXP[O(1)]}}$. Indeed, the two classes are equal: $\mathsf{P^{NEXP[O(1)]}} = \mathsf{P^{NEXP[O(1)]}}$.

Since $\mathsf{O(1)-MRIP} = \mathsf{P^{NEXP[O(1)]}}$\textsuperscript{[20][21]}, this shows that cooperative provers are as powerful as non-cooperative provers under constant utility-gap guarantees, and we obtain Corollary\textsuperscript{[4]}

**Polynomial Utility Gap.** To simulate a polynomial-utility gap ncRIP protocol $(V,P)$, using a $\mathsf{P^{NEXP}}$ machine $M$, we put to use all the structure we have established in this section. We note that the simple strategy of querying all possible payment combinations as in Lemma\textsuperscript{[22]} does not work (there are total $O(\alpha(n)^{\alpha(n)})$ combinations).

We present a high-level structure of the proof here; see Section\textsuperscript{C} for the full proof.

For each of the $O(\alpha(n))$ subintervals of the interval $[-1, 1]$ that correspond to an SSE, $M$ does a recursive search to find an exact total expected payment $u(x,s)$ that is generated by an SSE. In particular, $M$ queries the $\mathsf{NEXP}$ oracle: *Does there exist an SSE with total expected payment in the first half of the $i$th interval?* then recurses on the first half if the answer is yes, else recurses on the

\textsuperscript{14}We maintain a constant total budget for $V$; the payments in our protocols can be scaled so that total is in $[-1, 1]$. 


second half. Thus, in polynomial time and with polynomial queries, $M$ can find an exact $u(x, s)$ for an SSE $s$ in the subinterval using the power of its adaptive queries.

Next, $M$ simulates the protocol $(V, \bar{P})$ with the help of the oracle, under the SSE $s$ for a given subinterval. The Lemma 16 is crucial for $M$ to simulate the verifier’s moves, because $V$ in general can induce exponential-size distributions. $M$ traverses the tree reachable under $s$ “top-down” using the oracle to learn the pruned distributions and provers’ moves. Finally, $M$ goes “bottom-up” to test whether $s$ satisfies Observation 15 on all its reachable subgames.

**Lemma 23.** $\text{poly}(n)\text{-ncRIP} \subseteq \text{P}^\text{NEXP}$.

**Exponential Utility Gap.** Finally, we prove a tight upper bound on the class of ncRIP protocols with exponential utility gaps. The proof follows immediately from that of Lemma 23. In fact, it is simpler as the exponential-time Turing machine is powerful enough to (a) simulate $V$’s Nature moves directly, and (b) test all possible payment profiles. Thus in this proof we do not need Lemma 16 or the notion of subintervals.

**Lemma 24.** $\text{ncRIP} \subseteq \text{EXP}^{\text{poly} - \text{NEXP}}$.

Since $\text{EXP}^{\text{poly} - \text{NEXP}} \subseteq \text{EXP}^{\text{poly} - \text{NEXP}} = \text{EXP}^{\text{NP}} = \text{EXP}^{\text{NP}} \subseteq \text{MRIP}$ [21], Lemma 24 shows that $\text{exp}(n)\text{-ncRIP} \subseteq \text{exp}(n)\text{-MRIP}$ and using Lemma 31, we get that in general the two classes coincide. In other words, non-cooperative rational proofs are as powerful as cooperative multi-prover rational proofs under exponential utility gap and we obtain Corollary 6.

5 **Additional Related Work**

**Rational Proofs.** Azar and Micali [4] introduce rational interactive proofs (RIP) and used scoring rules to construct simple and efficient (single-prover) RIP protocols. In a follow-up work [5], they extended this work to design super-efficient rational proofs that have sublinear verification and computation complexity. Guo et al. present rational arguments for a computationally bounded prover and a sublinear verifier in [36], and construct rational arguments for all languages in $\text{P}$ [37]. More recently, Campanelli and Rosario [14] study sequentially composable rational proofs and Zhang and Blanton [64] design protocols to outsource matrix multiplications to a rational cloud.

Chen et al. [21] introduce multi-prover rational interactive proofs (MRIP) in which multiple provers cooperate to maximize their total payment. They show that the class equals $\text{EXP}^{\text{NP}}$ under exponential utility gap, $\text{P}^{\text{NEXP}}$ under polynomial utility gap. In the full version [20], they show that MRIP under constant utility gap is equal to $\text{P}^{\text{NEXP}/O(1)}$.

**Game-Theoretic Characterization of Complexity Classes.** Game-theoretic characterization of complexity classes has been largely studied in the form of refereed games [19, 20, 28, 30, 35, 51]. Chandra and Stockmeyer [19] show that any language in $\text{PSPACE}$ is refereeable by a game of perfect information. Feige and Kilian [20] show that the class of imperfect information, perfect recall refereed games is exactly $\text{EXP}$. Feigenbaum, Koller and Shor [30] show that if provers are allowed to have imperfect recall (essentially acting as oracles), refereed games can simulate $\text{EXP}^{\text{NP}}$.

**Query Complexity and Related Complexity Classes.** The query complexity of oracle Turing machines has been widely studied in the literature [8, 13, 62]. In this paper, we give game-theoretic characterizations of the classes $\text{P}^{\text{NEXP}/O(1)}$, $\text{P}^{\text{NEXP}}$, and $\text{EXP}^{\text{poly} - \text{NEXP}}$. 
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A Extensive-Form Games with Imperfect Information and ncRIP

We describe a rational proof protocol with non-cooperative provers as an extensive-form game, where the game tree is naturally induced by the possible coin flips and messages of the verifiers, as well as the possible messages of the provers. For details on extensive-form games, we refer the readers to the textbook by Osborne and Rubinstein [49].

In a protocol \((V, \vec{P})\) with input \(x\), the set of provers \(\vec{P} = (P_1, \ldots, P_{t(n)})\) are the players and the verifier \(V\)’s random coin flips are treated as the moves of Nature. The history \(h = (a^1, a^2, \ldots, a^K)\) corresponding to a decision node is the sequence of actions taken by Nature and the players along the path from the root to the decision node. The set of valid histories (including \(\phi\), the empty history corresponding to the root) is denoted by \(H\). A history \(h\) is terminal if it corresponds to a leaf in the game tree, and non-terminal otherwise. Let \(Z(h)\) denote the player whose turn it is to act following a non-terminal history \(h\)—note that even though in an ncRIP protocol more than one prover may send a message to the verifier in a round, without loss of generality we can increase the number of rounds such that only a single prover acts in each round. Let \(A(h)\) denote the set of actions available to the acting player at a non-terminal history \(h\): that is, \(A(h) = \{a : (h, a) \in H\}\). If \(Z(h)\) is Nature, then \(A(h)\) is the set of possible coin flips and messages of the verifier following \(h\); otherwise \(A(h)\) is the set of possible messages that \(Z(h)\) may send to the verifier. For each terminal history \(h\), the utility of a player \(i\) following \(h\), \(u_i(h)\), is the payment \(R_i\) computed by the verifier given \(x\) and \(h\).

Since the verifier’s coins are private and a prover does not see the messages exchanged between the verifier and the other provers, an ncRIP protocol represents an extensive-form game of imperfect information. An information set \(I_i\) of a player \(P_i\) is a subset of all possible histories \(h\) with \(Z(h) = P_i\), and represents all the information that the player knows when acting in one of the decision nodes in \(I_i\). That is, when a decision node in \(I_i\) is reached, \(P_i\) knows that \(I_i\) has been reached but does not know exactly which node he is at. Naturally, \(A(h) = A(h')\) for all \(h, h' \in I_i\) —that is, the set of actions available to player \(i\) at every decision node in a particular information set is the same. Let \(A(I_i)\) denote the set of available actions at an information set \(I_i\). The set of all information sets of \(P_i\) forms a partition of the set \(\{h \in H : Z(h) = P_i\}\), and let \(\mathcal{I}_i\) to denote this partition, referred to as the information partition of \(P_i\). In terms of the protocol, \(\mathcal{I}_i\) is in a one-to-one correspondence with the set of possible message sequences \((m_{i1}, \ldots, m_{ij})\) seen by \(P_i\), where \(j \in \{1, \ldots, p(n)\}\) and \(P_i\) is acting in round \(j\).

A pure strategy \(s_i\) of a player \(P_i\) in an extensive-form game is a function that assigns an action in \(A(I_i)\) to each information set \(I_i \in \mathcal{I}_i\). A behavioral strategy \(\beta_i\) of \(P_i\) is a collection \((\beta_i(I_i))_{I_i \in \mathcal{I}_i}\) of independent probability measures, where \(\beta_i(I_i)\) is a probability measure over the action set \(A(I_i)\). A behavioral strategy \(\beta_i\) is completely mixed if each \(\beta_i(I_i)\) assigns a positive probability to every action in \(A(I_i)\). In ncRIP protocols, since the provers are deterministic, we only consider pure strategies of the players. However, the solution concept introduced in this paper applies to behavioral strategies as well. A player \(i\)’s utility under a strategy profile \(s\), \(u_i(s)\), is his expected utility over the distribution of histories induced by \(s\) and the verifier’s randomness.

The provers are computationally unbounded and never “forget” anything and thus the corresponding extensive-form game has perfect recall. That is, for any two histories \(h\) and \(h'\) in the same information set \(I_i\) of a player \(P_i\), \(h\) and \(h'\) pass the same sequence of information sets to player \(P_i\). Furthermore, for any information set in this sequence, player \(P_i\) took the same action in \(h\) and \(h'\). This holds in any ncRIP protocol since all histories of prover \(P_i\) in the same information set \(I_i\) at round \(j\) correspond to the sequence of messages \((m_{i1}, \ldots, m_{ij})\) seen by \(P_i\) up to round \(j\).
B Properties of Strong Sequential Equilibrium

In this section, we prove several important properties of strong sequential equilibrium, which make it a good candidate solution concept in designing extensive-form mechanisms.

Strong Sequential Equilibrium Admits a Sequential Equilibrium. We first show that, given a strategy profile \( s \) that is a strong sequential equilibrium (thus does not rely on a belief system), we can construct a belief system \( \mu \) such that the pair \((s, \mu)\) forms a sequential equilibrium.

Lemma 25. For any strategy profile \( s \) that is a strong sequential equilibrium, there exists a belief system \( \mu \) such that \((s, \mu)\) is a sequential equilibrium.

Proof. The sequential-rationality requirement will follow easily from the definition of SSE. To prove that \( s \) admits a sequential equilibrium, the key is to pair it with a consistent belief system; see Section 2 for definition. Indeed, we construct a belief system \( \mu \) and show that, there exists a sequence of pairs \((s^\varepsilon, \mu^\varepsilon)\) \(_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \) which converges to \((s, \mu)\), as \( \varepsilon \) goes to 0, where each \( s^\varepsilon \) is a profile of completely mixed behavioral strategies and each \( \mu^\varepsilon \) is the belief system derived from \( s^\varepsilon \) using Bayes’ rule.

Recall that a strategy profile \( s \) defines a probability distribution over the actions available to a player at an information set where he acts. That is, for each information set \( I_i \) of a player \( i \), \( s_i(I_i) \) is a probability distribution over \( A(I_i) \), the set of actions available to player \( i \) at \( I_i \). In particular, if \( A(I_i) = \{a_1, \ldots, a_k\} \), then \( s_i(I_i) = (p_i(a_1), \ldots, p_i(a_k)) \) where \( p_i(a_k) \) is the probability that player \( i \) chooses action \( a_k \) at \( I_i \). Let \( A^+(I_i) \) and \( A^0(I_i) \) be the set of actions at information set \( I_i \) which player \( i \) chooses with positive probability and zero probability respectively; that is, \( A^+(I_i) = \{a_k \in A(I_i) | p_i(a_k) > 0\} \) and \( A^0(I_i) = A(I_i) \setminus A^+(I_i) \). For any \( \varepsilon \in (0, 1) \), we define \( s_i^\varepsilon \) for player \( i \) at information set \( I_i \) as follows: if \( A^0(I_i) = \emptyset \) then \( s_i^\varepsilon(I_i) = s_i(I_i) \); otherwise,

\[
s_i^\varepsilon(I_i)(a_k) = \begin{cases} (1 - \varepsilon) \cdot p_i(a_k) & \text{for each } a_k \in A^+(I_i); \\ \frac{\varepsilon}{|A^0(I_i)|} & \text{for each } a_k \in A^0(I_i). \end{cases}
\]

By construction, \( s_i^\varepsilon(I_i) \) is a valid probability distribution over \( I_i \) and is completely mixed, that is, assigns a positive probability to every action in \( I_i \). Indeed, because \( \sum_{k=1}^K p_i(a_k) = \sum_{a_k \in A^+(I_i)} p_i(a_k) = 1 \), when \( A^0(I_i) \neq \emptyset \) we have \( \sum_{a_k \in A(I_i)} s_i^\varepsilon(I_i)(a_k) = \sum_{a_k \in A^+(I_i)} (1 - \varepsilon) p_i(a_k) + \varepsilon = 1 \). It is easy to see that \( s_i^\varepsilon \) converges to \( s_i \) when \( \varepsilon \rightarrow 0 \).

Given the strategy profile \( s^\varepsilon \), to define \( \mu^\varepsilon \), the belief system of a player \( i \), consider an arbitrary information set \( I_i \) where player \( i \) acts. The probability that a particular history \( h = (a_1, \ldots, a^K) \in I_i \) occurs can be derived from \( s^\varepsilon \) as follows. For any history \( h' = (a_1, \ldots, a^w) \) with \( 0 \leq w \leq K - 1 \), recall that \( Z(h') \) is the player acting following history \( h' \). For any action \( a \in A(h') \), let \( s_{Z(h')}^\varepsilon(h')(a) \) denote the probability assigned by \( s_{Z(h')}^\varepsilon \) to action \( a \) at history \( h' \) (i.e., at the information set containing \( h' \)). We have

\[
\Pr \{h \text{ occurs under } s^\varepsilon\} = \prod_{w=0}^{K-1} s_{Z(a^1, \ldots, a^w)}(a^1, \ldots, a^w)(a^{w+1}) = c_h \varepsilon^{e_h} (1 - \varepsilon)^{f_h},
\]

where \( c_h, e_h \) and \( f_h \) are positive constants depending on \( s \) and \( h \), but not on \( \varepsilon \). In particular, letting \( S^0 \) be the set of actions \( a^{w+1} \) in \( h \) that are assigned zero probability by \( s_{Z(h')} \) at history \( h' = (a^1, \ldots, a^w) \), we have \( e_h = |S^0| \). \( f_h \) is the number of actions \( a^{w+1} \) in \( h \) such that \( a^{w+1} \) is not in \( S^0 \) but \( s_{Z(h')} \) is not completely mixed at \( h' \) either. Finally,

\[
c_h = \prod_{0 \leq w \leq K-1} s_{Z(a^1, \ldots, a^w)}(a^1, \ldots, a^w)(a^{w+1}) \cdot \prod_{0 \leq w \leq K-1} \frac{1}{|A^0(a^1, \ldots, a^w)|},
\]
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where the second term is defined to be 1 if \( S^0 = \emptyset \). Note that \( \Pr \{ h \text{ occurs under } s^r \} > 0 \) for every \( h \in I_i \).

The probability that the information set \( I_i \) is reached under \( s^r \) is \( P(I_i) = \sum_{h \in I_i} \Pr \{ h \text{ occurs under } s^r \} = \sum_{h \in I_i} c_h e^{e_h} (1 - \varepsilon)^{f_h} > 0 \). Then \( P(I_i) \) can be written as a polynomial in \( \varepsilon \), that is, \( P(I_i) = b_0 + b_1 \varepsilon + b_2 \varepsilon^2 + \ldots + b_r \varepsilon^r \), where the coefficients \( b_0, \ldots, b_r \) may be zero, positive or negative. Following Bayes’ rule, for any history \( h \in I_i \),

\[
\mu_i^\varepsilon(I_i)(h) = \frac{c_h e^{e_h} (1 - \varepsilon)^{f_h}}{b_0 + b_1 \varepsilon + b_2 \varepsilon^2 + \ldots + b_r \varepsilon^r} > 0.
\]

To define the belief system \( \mu \), let \( d \) be the minimum degree of \( \varepsilon \) in \( P(I_i) \) such that \( b_d \neq 0 \). As the minimum degree of \( \varepsilon \) in each term \( c_h e^{e_h} (1 - \varepsilon)^{f_h} \) is \( e_h \) with coefficient \( c_h > 0 \), we have \( d = \min_{h \in I_i} e_h \) and \( b_d = \sum_{h \in I_i, e_h = d} c_h > 0 \). For any \( h \in I_i \), we define \( \mu_i(I_i)(h) = c_h/b_d(> 0) \) if \( e_h = d \), and \( \mu_i(I_i)(h) = 0 \) if \( e_h > d \). It is easy to see that \( \mu_i(I_i) \) is a probability distribution over \( I_i \). Moreover, \( \lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} \mu_i^\varepsilon(I_i)(h) = c_h/b_d \) when \( e_h = d \), and \( \lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} \mu_i^\varepsilon(I_i)(h) = 0 \) when \( e_h > d \). Thus, \( \lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} \mu_i^\varepsilon(I_i)(h) = \mu_i(I_i)(h) \) for any player \( i \), information set \( I_i \) of \( i \) and history \( h \in I_i \), and \( \mu^\varepsilon \) converges to \( \mu \) as \( \varepsilon \to 0 \). Since \( s^r \) converges to \( s \) as we have seen, \( s \) and \( \mu \) are consistent.

For sequential rationality, the only thing we need to show is that, at a reachable information set, the belief specified by \( \mu \) is derived from \( s \) using Bayes’ rule. To do so, consider an arbitrary player \( i \) and an information set \( I_i \) of \( i \) that is reachable by \( s \). By definition, there exists \( h \in I_i \) such that \( e_h = 0 \), thus \( d = 0 \) for \( P(I_i) \) and \( b_0 = \sum_{h \in I_i, e_h = 0} c_h \). Therefore \( \mu_i(I_i) \) is indeed the probability distribution derived from \( s \) using Bayes’ rule. Sequential rationality of \( s \) (with respect to \( \mu \)) then follows from the definition of SSE. Thus \( (s, \mu) \) is a sequential equilibrium. 

**Alternative Definition of Strong Sequential Equilibrium.** The notion of strong sequential equilibrium, as stated in Definition 21, requires that at any unreachable information set, regardless of the belief the acting player holds at that set, his action should be a best response to that belief and the other players’ strategies. We now give an equivalent definition of strong sequential equilibrium, which says that a player’s strategy at an unreachable information set should be optimal following every history in that information set. This definition is more convenient when proving that a strategy profile is an SSE.

**Definition 26.** A strategy profile \( s \) is a strong sequential equilibrium if for every player \( i \) and information set \( I_i \) of \( i \), we have:

- **At reachable information sets** \( I_i \): conditional on \( I_i \) being reached, player \( i \)’s strategy \( s_i \) is a best response to \( s_{-i} \), given \( i \)’s beliefs at \( I_i \) being derived from \( s \) using Bayes’ rule.
- **At unreachable information sets** \( I_i \): for every history \( h \in I_i \), conditional on \( I_i \) being reached, player \( i \)’s strategy \( s_i \) is a best response to \( s_{-i} \), given \( i \)’s belief that he is at \( h \) with probability 1.

We now prove the equivalence of the two definitions of SSE in the following lemma. W.l.o.g., \( s \) is a profile of pure strategies.

**Lemma 27.** For any strategy profile \( s \), any player \( i \) and information set \( I_i \) of \( i \) that is not reached with positive probability under \( s \), conditional on \( I_i \) being reached, \( s_i \) is a best response to \( s_{-i} \) with respect to all possible beliefs that player \( i \) may hold at \( I_i \) if and only if for every history \( h \in I_i \), \( s_i \) is a best response to \( s_{-i} \) given \( i \)’s belief that he is at \( h \) with probability 1.

**Proof.** The “only if” part is immediate, because for any history \( h \in I_i \), “at \( h \) with probability 1 (and any other history with probability 0)” is a specific belief that \( i \) may hold at \( I_i \).
The “if” part is also easy to show. Suppose that $s_i$ is a best response to $s_{-i}$ conditional on every history $h \in I_i$ (i.e., at $h$ with probability 1). To show that $s_i$ is a best response to $s_{-i}$ conditional on all possible beliefs player $i$ may hold at information set $I_i$, arbitrarily fix a belief $\mu_i(I_i)$ over $I_i$ and a strategy $s'_i$. Let $I_i = \{h_1, h_2, \ldots, h_m\}$ and $\mu_i(I_i) = (\mu_i(I_i)(h_1), \mu_i(I_i)(h_2), \ldots, \mu_i(I_i)(h_m))$, where $\mu_i(I_i)(h_k)$ is the probability with which player $i$ believes that history $h_k$ occurs conditional on $I_i$ being reached. Then, player $i$’s expected utilities under $s_i$ and $s'_i$ respectively, conditioned on $I_i$, $\mu_i(I_i)$ and $s_{-i}$, are

$$u_i(s_i, s_{-i} | \mu_i(I_i)) = \sum_{k=1}^{m} \mu_i(I_i)(h_k) \cdot u_i(s_i, s_{-i} | h_k)$$

and

$$u_i(s'_i, s_{-i} | \mu_i(I_i)) = \sum_{k=1}^{m} \mu_i(I_i)(h_k) \cdot u_i(s'_i, s_{-i} | h_k),$$

where $u_i(s_i, s_{-i} | h_k)$ is player $i$’s utility under $(s_i, s_{-i})$, conditioned on history $h_k$ being reached at $I_i$. Since $s_i$ is a best response to $s_{-i}$ at every $h_k \in I_i$, we have $u_i(s_i, s_{-i} | h_k) \geq u_i(s'_i, s_{-i} | h_k)$ $\forall k \in \{1, \ldots, m\}$. Thus $u_i(s_i, s_{-i} | \mu_i(I_i)) \geq u_i(s'_i, s_{-i} | \mu_i(I_i))$ and the “if” part holds.

**Corollary 28.** Definition [7] and Definition [20] of strong sequential equilibrium are equivalent.

**One-Shot Deviation for Strong Sequential Equilibrium.** Informally, the one-shot deviation principle says that a player cannot change his action at a single information set (without changing the rest of his strategy) and improve his expected reward.

In the context of sequential equilibrium, it is well known that given a consistent belief system $\mu$, $(s, \mu)$ is a sequential equilibrium if and only if the one-shot deviation principle holds, that is, no player $i$ has an information set $I_i$ at which a change in $s_i(I_i)$—holding the remaining of $s_i$ fixed—increases his expected utility conditional on reaching $I_i$ [11],[49].

Since strong sequential equilibrium does not require artificial notion of beliefs for unreachable information sets, we define a stronger notion of one-shot deviation at those information sets— for every decision node (i.e., history) in an unreachable information set of player $i$, there does not exist a one-shot deviation at that node which improves player $i$’s utility conditional on that node being reached. Note that at reachable information sets, both the definition and proof of the one-shot deviation condition for SSE are exactly the same as in SE [41].

**Lemma 29 (One-Shot Deviation for Strong Sequential Equilibrium).** For any strategy profile $s$, $s$ is a strong sequential equilibrium if and only if it satisfies the following one-shot deviation principle: For every player $i$ and every information set $I_i$ of $i$,

- If $I_i$ is reachable under $s$: there does not exist a change in $s_i(I_i)$ (holding the rest of $s_i$ fixed) that increases player $i$’s expected utility conditional on reaching $I_i$, given his belief at $I_i$ derived using Bayes’ rule.

- If $I_i$ is unreachable under $s$: for every history $h \in I_i$, there does not exist a change in $s_i(I_i)$ (holding the rest of $s_i$ fixed) that increases player $i$’s expected utility conditional on reaching $h$.

**Proof.** The “only if” part follows immediately from Definition [20] and the fact that a one-shot deviation results in a different strategy for the deviating player. We now prove the “if” part, that is, if $s$ satisfies the one-shot deviation principle then it is a strong sequential equilibrium.

**Reachable information sets.** First of all, similar to the proof of Lemma [25], we can construct a belief system $\mu$ such that $s$ and $\mu$ are consistent. Indeed, the construction of $\mu$ only depends on the actions taken by $s$ and does not depend on the utilities induced by $s$ at all. Since $s$ satisfies the one-shot deviation principle at every reachable information set and at every history in each unreachable information set, it is not hard to see that $s$ satisfies the one-shot deviation principle with respect to $\mu$. Thus $(s, \mu)$ is a sequential equilibrium. Accordingly, for any player $i$ and information set $I_i$
of i that is reachable by s, s_i is a best response to s_{-i} conditional on \( \mu_i(I_i) \) (which is derived from s using Bayes’ rule at \( I_i \)), as desired by the definition of SSE.

**Unreachable information sets.** Next, we use backward induction to show that, for any player i, information set \( I_i \) of i that is unreachable by s, and history \( h \in I_i \), \( s_i \) is a best response to \( s_{-i} \) conditional on reaching \( h \). To begin with, if \( h \) is of height 1 then this immediately holds: indeed, the strategy induced by \( s_i \) following \( h \) is exactly the action \( s_i(I_i) \), thus the one-shot deviation principle implies that \( s_i \) is a best response to \( s_{-i} \) at \( h \).

Now, arbitrarily fix a player i, information set \( I_i \) of i unreachable by s, and a history \( h \in I_i \) of height larger than 1. By induction, assume that for any information set \( I'_i \) of i unreachable by s, and history \( h' \in I'_i \) of height smaller than that of \( h \), \( s_i \) is a best response to \( s_{-i} \) at \( h' \). For the sake of contradiction, suppose player i can deviate to strategy \( s'_i \) and increase his utility conditional on reaching \( h \), that is,

\[
u_i(s'_i, s_{-i}|h) > u_i(s_i, s_{-i}|h).
\]

If \( s'_i(I_i) = s_i(I_i) \), consider the first history \( h' \) following \( h \) where player i acts and \( s'_i \) differs from \( s_i \). As \( h \) is unreachable by s, \( h' \) is unreachable by s as well. However, the height of \( h' \) is smaller than that of \( h \) and \( u_i(s'_i, s_{-i}|h') = u_i(s'_i, s_{-i}|h) > u_i(s_i, s_{-i}|h) = u_i(s_i, s_{-i}|h') \), contradicting the inductive hypothesis. Thus we have

\[
s'_i(I_i) \neq s_i(I_i).
\]

If \( s'_i \) is the same as \( s_i \) at all the histories following \( (h, s'_i(I_i)) \) where player i acts, then the one-shot deviation principle is violated. Accordingly, there must exist a history following \( (h, s'_i(I_i)) \), where player i acts and \( s'_i \) differ from \( s_i \). Letting \( h' \) be the first such history, we have that the height of \( h' \) is smaller than that of \( h \). Since \( h' \) is unreachable by s, by the inductive hypothesis we have that \( s_i \) is a best response to \( s_{-i} \) at \( h' \). Thus \( u_i(s_i, s_{-i}|h') \geq u_i(s'_i, s_{-i}|h') \). As \( u_i(s'_i, s_{-i}|h') = u_i(s'_i, s_{-i}|h) > u_i(s_i, s_{-i}|h) \), we have

\[
u_i(s_i, s_{-i}|h') > u_i(s_i, s_{-i}|h).
\]

Let strategy \( s''_i \) be such that, it follows \( s_i \) till history \( h \), then follows action \( s'_i(I_i) \), then follows \( s'_i \) (and \( s_i \) as well, because they are the same after \( (h, s'_i(I_i)) \) and before \( h' \)) till history \( h' \), and then follows \( s_i \) for the rest. Note that \( s''_i \) can be obtained from \( s_i \) by a one-shot deviation from \( s_i(I_i) \) to \( s'_i(I_i) \). However,

\[
u_i(s''_i, s_{-i}|h) = u_i(s''_i, s_{-i}|h') = u_i(s_i, s_{-i}|h') > u_i(s_i, s_{-i}|h),
\]

contradicting the one-shot deviation principle. Therefore \( s_i \) is a best response to \( s_{-i} \) conditional on reaching \( h \), as desired.

Combining everything together, by Definition 26 s is an SSE and Lemma 29 holds.

**Verifying Strong Sequential Equilibrium.** Given an extensive-form game with arbitrary number of players, it is possible to decide whether a pair \((s, \mu)\) is a sequential equilibrium in time polynomial in the size of the game tree 32.

However, if only a strategy profile \( s \) is given, then it is NP-hard to decide whether \( s \) is part of an SE (that is, whether there exists a belief system \( \mu \) such that \((s, \mu)\) is an SE) 40. As strong sequential equilibrium does not rely on belief systems, we prove the following.

**Lemma 30.** Given an extensive-form game and a strategy profile \( s \) of the players, deciding whether \( s \) is a SSE of the game can be done in time polynomial in the size of the game tree.
\textbf{Proof.} First of all, we can traverse the game tree in polynomial time, mark each information set whether it is reachable by \( s \) or not, and compute, for each player \( i \) and each reachable information set \( I_i \) of \( s \), the belief \( \mu_i(I_i) \) derived from \( s \) using Bayes’ rule. Next, we apply the one-shot deviation principle following Lemma 29.

To do so, we start from the bottom level of the tree and proceed up. For every player \( i \) and every information set \( I_i \) of \( s \), if \( I_i \) is unreachable under \( s \), then we go through each \( h \in I_i \) and each \( a \in A(I_i) \), and check if changing \( s_i(I_i) \) to \( a \) improves \( i \)’s utility conditional on reaching \( h \). If so then \( s \) is not an SSE. If \( I_i \) is reachable under \( s \), then we go through every \( a \in A(I_i) \), and check if changing \( s_i(I_i) \) to \( a \) improves \( i \)’s expected utility conditional on \( I_i \) and \( \mu_i(I_i) \). If so then again \( s \) is not an SSE. If all the checks above pass, then \( s \) is an SSE.

Since this procedure goes through each decision node of the game tree at most once, and since it takes polynomial time to compute player \( i \)’s strategy of committing to a polynomial \( P \) and \( i \)’s best response at any information set \( I_i \) of the MIP protocol. Under any such recursive-maximum SSE, we show that \( \mu_i(I_i) \) is a recursive-maximum SSE of the game tree corresponding to the protocol \(( V, P_1, P_2) \) and under any recursive-maximum SSE, the answer bit is a tuple of queries \(( V, P_1, P_2) \) that matches \( i \)’s strategy of committing to a polynomial \( P_1 \) and \( P_2 \). To exhibit a strategy that is a best response for \( P_1 \) and \( P_2 \) on their information sets at step \( k \), we look at the messages the verifier sends to each prover in the classic MIP protocol. In the MIP protocol, the verifier sends \( P_1 \) a tuple of message pairs \( \vec{m}_1 = ((q_1, x_1), \ldots, (q_m, x_m)) \) where \( m \) is a polynomial in \( n \) and \( V \) sends \( P_2 \) a tuple of random messages \( \vec{m}_2 = (y_1, \ldots, y_m) \). \( P_1 \) sends back a polynomial \( P(t) \) and \( P_2 \) sends back the value of the polynomial \( P(t) \) for \( t \) satisfying \( q_j + tx_j = y_j \). The verifier rejects if their answers are inconsistent.

To analyze the SSE strategy, without loss of generality, suppose \( P_1 \) moves last in the MIP protocol. Any information set \( I_1 \) of \( P_1 \) at step \( k \) is characterized by the message \( \vec{m}_1 \) he receives. The decision nodes in \( I_1 \) correspond to each possible message \( \vec{m}_2 \) that \( P_2 \) could have received.

Because the \( V \) gives the largest payment when the MIP protocol accepts, given \( P_2 \)’s strategy, if any information set \( I_1 \) of \( P_1 \) is reached under \( s \) then \( P_1 \)’s best response at \( I_1 \) is to maximize the acceptance-probability of the MIP protocol given his beliefs on \( I_1 \). Similarly, given \( P_2 \)’s strategy, if any information set \( I_1 \) of \( P_1 \) is unreachable under \( s \) then \( P_1 \)’s best response at \( I_1 \) is the following: given \( \vec{m}_1 = ((q_1, x_1), \ldots, (q_m, x_m)) \), respond with a polynomial \( P(t) \) such that \( P(t) \)’s value at all \( t \) coincides with \( P_2 \)'s reply on all \( y_j \) where \( q_j + tx_j = y_j \).

Given \( P_1 \)’s strategy of committing to a polynomial \( P(t) \) that matches \( P_2 \) on all values of \( t \), \( P_2 \)' best response at any information set \( I_2 \) (reachable or unreachable under \( s \)) at step \( k \) at every decision node in \( I_2 \) is to answer the tuple of queries \(( y_1, \ldots, y_m) \) so as to maximize the acceptance probability of the MIP protocol. The verifier’s move at step \( k \) is the root of a non-trivial subform. Conditioned on step \( k \) being reached, any maximum SSE at this subform corresponds to a strategy profile \( s \) that is an SSE, which when restricted to this subform, maximizes the acceptance probability of the MIP protocol. Under any such recursive-maximum SSE, we show that \( P_1 \)’s best response at step \( k \) is to send the correct answer bit.

Suppose \( x \in L \). If \( P_1 \) sends \( c = 0 \), then \( R_1 = 1/2 \) with probability 1. On the other hand, if
Suppose $x \notin L$. If $P_1$ reports $c = 0$, then $R_1 = 1/2$ with probability 1. On the other hand if $P_1$ reports $c = 1$, then by the soundness condition of the MIP protocol, the maximum acceptance probability is 1/3 leading to $R_1 = 1$. The protocol rejects with probability at least 2/3 leading to $R_1 = -1$. Thus, $P_1$’s expected payment for misreporting the answer bit is at most $R_1 = -1/3$. Thus for $x \notin L$, $s$ is a recursive-maximum SSE iff $P_1$ sends $c = 0$.

Thus, under $s$ which is a recursive-maximum SSE, $c = 1$ if and only if $x \in L$.

Furthermore, the payment incurred by the provers when the answer bit sent in the first round is incorrect is at least $5/6$ for both provers and thus the protocol has constant utility gap. □

**Proof of Lemma 13.** Consider any language $L \in \text{pNEXP}^{\alpha(n)}$. Let $M$ be a polynomial-time Turing machine deciding $L$, with access to an oracle $O$ for an NEXP language.

The ncRIP protocol for $L$ is given in Figure 3. Let $s_1, s_2, s_3$ denote the strategy used by $P_1$, $P_2$ and $P_3$ for the protocol in Figure 3, and $s = (s_1, s_2, s_3)$. First, note that regardless of $s_2$ and $s_3$, $P_1$’s best response at step 1 is to send the bits $c, c_1, \ldots, c_\alpha(n)$ such that the verification in step 2 goes through. In particular, if $s_1$ is such that the output of $M$ on input $x$, using $c_1, \ldots, c_\alpha(n)$ as answers to NEXP queries $\phi_1, \ldots, \phi_\alpha(n)$ is consistent with $c$, then $P_1$ gets $R_1 \geq 0$. Meanwhile, if the verification in step 2 fails then $R = -1$. Thus, under any SSE $s$, the answer bits $c_1, \ldots, c_\alpha(n)$ sent by $P_1$ must be consistent with the computation of $M$ on $x$ and the final the answer bit $c$, regardless of $s_2$ and $s_3$.

We now argue using backward induction. Each random index $i'$ chosen by $V$ in step 1 together with $\phi_{i'}$ starts a subform. In particular, since $P_2$ and $P_3$ both know $(i', \phi_{i'})$, all their information sets starting from step 3 are completely disjoint from information sets reached under a different index and NEXP query. By Lemma 12, there exists a recursive-maximum SSE $s$ on each such subform simulating an NEXP query, and under any recursive-maximum SSE, $s_2$ and $s_3$ are such that $c_{i'}^*$ is the correct answer to the NEXP query.

Moving up the tree, the next subform is induced by $V$’s nature move at step 3 assigning a probability to each subsequent subform. Since under any recursive-maximum SSE, the expected payments of $P_2$ and $P_3$ (conditioned on reaching these subforms) are maximized, the overall expected payments under $V$’s nature move at step 3 is also maximized.

We move up a further level in the tree to the root. We show that $P_1$’s best response at step 1 is to send the correct answer bits, given that under any recursive-maximum SSE $s$:

- $P_2$ and $P_3$ answer each NEXP query $\phi_{i'}$ determined by $s_1$ and index $i'$ correctly, and
- the verification in step 2 goes through (i.e. $P$ does not set $R_1 = -1$) under $s_1$.

Suppose $s_1$ is such that there exists an NEXP query where $P_1$ lies. Let $k$ be the first NEXP query index such that $c_k$ is not the correct answer to query $\phi_k$, where $1 \leq k \leq \alpha(n)$. In particular, the instance $\phi_k$ is evaluated correctly (by running $M$ on $x$ using the correct answers to previous queries: $c_1, \ldots, c_{k-1}$) but the answer $c_k$ is not evaluated correctly based on $\phi_k$. Then with probability $1/\alpha(n)$, $V$ picks $k$ in step 3 and crosschecks the $c_k$ with $c_k^*$, in which case the verification fails and $R_1 = 0$.

Thus, $P_1$’s expected payment is at most $1 - 1/\alpha(n)$. If $P_1$ answers all NEXP queries correctly, since the verification in step 2 goes through, $P_1$ gets $R_1 = 1$ with probability 1. Thus, $c, c_1, \ldots, c_\alpha(n)$ are correct under any recursive-maximum SSE $s$, and $c = 0$ if and only if $x \in L$.

Now, we show that protocol $(V, \tilde{P})$ has $O(\alpha(n))$ utility gap. Let $s^*$ be a recursive-maximum SSE of the game resulting from $(V, \tilde{P})$. Suppose $s'$ is such that the answer bit $c'$ under $s'$ is incorrect. We go “bottom-up” in the game tree and exhibit a subform $H_I$ (reachable under $s'$) such that some prover acting in that subform loses $O(1/\alpha(n))$ compared to the strategy where $s_I^*$ is played on $H_I$, keeping the rest of the strategy fixed.
First, consider all the NEXP queries at step 4 that start subforms. Suppose there exists a query \( \phi_k \) committed under \( s'_1 \), for \( 1 \leq k \leq \alpha(n) \), such that \( c_k^* \) is the wrong answer to \( \phi_k \). By Lemma 12, both \( P_2 \) and \( P_3 \) lose a constant amount (5/6 in particular) from their expected payment (conditioned on reaching this subform) compared to the recursive-maximum SSE strategy profile \( s^*_{\phi_k} \) which reports the correct answer to \( \phi_k \). Since \( V \) chooses \( \phi_k \) with probability \( 1/\alpha(n) \), \( P_2 \) and \( P_3 \) can gain \( O(1/\alpha(n)) \) in their overall expected payment by deviating to strategy profile \( s^*_{\phi_k} \), at the subform corresponding to \( (k, \phi_k) \) keeping \( s'_{\phi_k} \) fixed. Specifically,

\[
\mu_i \left( x, r, (s'_{\phi_k}, s^*_{\phi_k}), (V, \vec{P}) \right) - \mu_i \left( x, r, (s'_{\phi_k}, s^*_{\phi_k}), (V, \vec{P}) \right) > \frac{1}{\alpha(n)} \left( \frac{5}{6} \right), \quad \text{for } i \in \{2, 3\}.
\]

Finally, suppose \( P_2 \) and \( P_3 \) answer all NEXP queries (reachable under \( s' \)) correctly. Then, \( P_1 \) loses at least \( 1/\alpha(n) \) at the subform at the root—the entire game. Since the answer bit \( c' \) under \( s' \) is incorrect, either step 2 fails or \( P_1 \) lies on some NEXP query. In the first case, \( P_1 \) gets \(-1\) with probability 1 compared to an expected payment of 1 under \( s^* \). In the second case, \( P_1 \) gets caught in step 4 with probability \( 1/\alpha(n) \), and gets an expected payment of at most \( 1 - 1/\alpha(n) \), losing at least \( 1/\alpha(n) \) compared to \( s^* \).

Thus, the protocol \( (V, \vec{P}) \) is an ncRIP protocol for \( \text{P}^{\text{NEXP}[O(\alpha(n))]} \) and has \( O(\alpha(n)) \) utility gap.

**Proof of Lemma 31.** Let \( (V, \vec{P}) \) be an MRIP protocol with \( p(n) \) provers and \( k(n) \) rounds for a language \( L \). Without loss of generality, each message in the protocol is of length \( \ell(n) \) for any input of length \( n \), where \( \ell(n) \) is a polynomial in \( n \). We shift and rescale the payment function of \( V \), so that the payment is always in \([0, 1]\), and the expected payment is strictly greater than \( 0 \) under the provers’ best strategy profile.

We simulate \( (V, \vec{P'}) \) using an ncRIP protocol \( (V', (P'_1, P'_2)) \), given in Figure 4.

**Lemma 31.** Any MRIP protocol can be simulated using a 2-prover 3-round ncRIP protocol with \( O(1/2^{n^k}) \)-utility gap, for some constant \( k \), where \( n \) is the length of the input.

---

Figure 4: Simulating any MRIP using an ncRIP protocol with exponential utility gap.

Let \( s'_1 \) and \( s'_2 \) denote the strategy of the provers \( P'_1 \) and \( P'_2 \) respectively and \( s' = (s'_1, s'_2) \). Since \( P'_2 \) is queried only once and about a single message in Step 3, any strategy \( s'_2 \) of \( P'_2 \) de facto commits to a strategy profile for the provers in \( (V, \vec{P}) \).
We analyze the game tree of the protocol $(V', \vec{P'})$ bottom-up.

The last move is by $P'_1$ sending the entire transcript $m$ at step 1. Any information set $I'_1$ of $P'_1$ is characterized by the randomness $r$ received by $P'_1$ in step 1 and all information sets are reachable under any $s'$. The decision nodes in $I'_2$ correspond to different strings $m_{ij}$ that $P'_2$ could have been asked in step 2. Given $s'_2$, the best response of $P'_1$ at any information set $I'_1$, for any beliefs at $I'_1$, is to match the transcript committed by $P'_2$ and make the verification in step 7 go through. Suppose there exists a prover index $i$ and round $j$ such that the message $m_{ij}$ in $m$ that is inconsistent with the corresponding message $m_{ij}'$ committed under $s'_2$. With probability $\frac{1}{2(\alpha - 1)(n)}$, the random string $m_{ij}$ generated by $V'$ in Step 1 is equal to $(m_{i1}, \ldots, m_{i(j-1)})$, otherwise the protocol ends with $R'_1 = 0$. With probability at least $\frac{1}{p(n)k(n)}$, $V'$ chooses $(i, j)$ in step 2 and queries $P'_2$ for $m_{ij}$ and $R'_1 = -1$. If $(i, j)$ is not chosen then $R'_1 = 0$. Thus, $P'_1$ expected payment at $I'_1$ is at most

$$\sum_{i \leq p(n), 1 \leq j \leq k(n)} 1 - \left( \mathbb{I}_{m_{ij} \neq m_{ij}'} \cdot (-1) + \mathbb{I}_{m_{ij} = m_{ij}'} \cdot 0 \right) < 0.$$

On the other hand, matching $s'_2$ on all messages leads to an expected payment of 0 at $I'_1$ for $P'_1$.

Given that $P'_1$ best response is to make the verifier in step 7 go through for every randomness $r$, we analyze $P'_2$ move at step 2. Any information set $I'_2$ of $P'_2$ is characterized by the random string $m_{ij}$ received by $P'_2$ in step 2 and all information sets are reachable under any $s'$. The decision nodes in $I'_1$ correspond to different random strings $r$ that $P'_1$ could have been asked in step 2. The best response of $P'_2$ at any information set $I'_1$, for any beliefs at $I'_1$, is to commit to the correct strategy profile $s$ of the provers $\vec{P}$. Suppose $P'_2$ commits to a strategy profile $s'$ such that the answer bit under $s'$ is wrong. With probability $\frac{1}{p(n)k(n)}$, the random string $m_{ij}$ generated by $V'$ in Step 2 matches $(m_{i1}, \ldots, m_{i(j-1)})$, otherwise the protocol ends with $R'_2 = 0$. If it matches, then $P'_2$ expected payment is determined by the expected payment that $s$ gets in $(V, \vec{P})$ given $x$ and randomness $n$, which is strictly less than the expected payment under the strategy profile $s$ which commits to the correct answer bit (by correctness of the original MRIP protocol). That is,

$$\sum_{1 \leq j \leq k(n)} \frac{1}{k(n)} \cdot \frac{1}{2(j-1)} \cdot \sum_{1 \leq j \leq k(n)} \frac{1}{k(n)} \cdot \mathbb{1}_{(V, \vec{P})}(x, \vec{P}) < \sum_{1 \leq j \leq k(n)} \frac{1}{k(n)} \cdot \frac{1}{2(j-1)} \cdot \mathbb{1}_{(V, \vec{P})}(x, s').$$

Thus, given that $s'_1$ matches $s'_2$ for every randomness $r$, the best response by $P'_2$ is to commit to a strategy profile $s'_2 = s$ that maximizes the total expected payment of the original protocol $(V, \vec{P})$ and thus has the correct answer bit.

There are no non-trivial subform in the game. Any maximum SSE is a recursive-maximum SSE, under which both $P'_1$ and $P'_2$ maximize their expected payments—$P'_1$ matches $P'_2$ on all messages and $P'_2$ commits to the correct strategy profile $s$. Thus, the protocol $(V, \vec{P})$ is correct.

Proof of Lemma 22: Given any $L \in \alpha(n)$-ncRIP, let $(V, \vec{P})$ be the MRIP protocol with $\alpha(n)$ utility gap for $L$, where $\alpha(n)$ is a constant.

Given an input $x$ of length $n$, consider the following deterministic polynomial-time oracle Turing machine $M$ with access to an oracle $O$ for an $\text{NEXP}$ language. Similar to the proof of Lemma 28, $M$ divides $[-1, 1]$ into 8$\alpha(n)$ intervals, each of length $1/4\alpha(n)$. In other words, the $i$th interval is $[i/4\alpha(n), (i+1)/4\alpha(n)]$ for each $i \in \{-4\alpha(n), \ldots, 4\alpha(n) - 1\}$.

Using Lemma 16 under a given input $x$ and strategy profile $s$, there are at most $8\alpha(n)$ subforms are reached under any $s$ in the modified game. Total expected payment of provers acting within

\[15\] To include 1 as a possible reward, interval $4\alpha(n) - 1$ should be closed on both sides; we ignore this for simplicity.
any subform (conditioned on reaching the subform) must lie in any one of the $8\alpha(n)$ intervals in $[-1, 1]$. Thus overall, there are $O(\alpha(n)^3(n))$ combinations of total expected payments over subforms, which is still $O(1)$. Let $(u, u_1, \ldots, u_k)$ be a tuple of total expected payments, where $k = 8\alpha(n)$, the maximum number of subforms reachable under any $s$, and $u$ represents the total expected payment of the whole game, whereas $u_j$ represents total expected payment of the provers acting in subform $I_j$ (conditioned on reaching $I_j$).

For each combination $(u, u_1, \ldots, u_k)$, $M$ queries $O$: does there exist a strategy profile that is an SSE and the sum of expected payments of all provers $u(x, s)$ is in the $i$th interval? In polynomial time and polynomial queries, $M$ finds the combination that achieves maximum expected payment for all subforms. Such a combination is guaranteed to exist because $(V, \tilde{P})$ is an ncRIP protocol, and a recursive-maximum SSE of the game exists and maximizes expected payment on all subforms. □

Proof of Lemma 29. Given any $L \in \text{poly}(n)$-ncRIP, let $(V, \tilde{P})$ be the MRIP protocol with $\alpha(n)$ utility gap for $L$, where $\alpha(n) = n^k$ for some constant $k$.

Given an input $x$ of length $n$, consider the following deterministic polynomial-time oracle Turing machine $M$ with access to an oracle $O$ for an NEXP language. $M$ divides $[-1, 1]$ into $8\alpha(n)$ intervals, each of length $1/4\alpha(n)$. In other words, the $i$th interval is $[i/4\alpha(n), (i+1)/4\alpha(n)]$ for each $i \in \{-4\alpha(n), \ldots, 4\alpha(n) - 1\}$.

For each interval $[i/4\alpha(n), (i+1)/4\alpha(n)]$, $M$ makes the following queries to $O$: does there exist a strategy profile $s$ that is an SSE and the sum of expected payments of all provers $u(x, s)$ is in the $i$th interval? Let $L$ denote the set of intervals for which the answer to the query is “yes”.

For each interval $[\ell/4\alpha(n), (\ell+1)/4\alpha(n)] \in L$, $M$ queries $O$: does there exist a strategy profile $s$ that is an SSE and the sum of expected payments of all provers $u(x, s)$ is in the first half of the $\ell$th interval? If the answer is “yes”, then $M$ recurses on the first half, else $M$ recurses on the second half of the interval. In polynomial time and polynomial queries, $M$ can find the exact total expected payment $u(x, s, (V, \tilde{P}))$ in the interval that is generated by an SSE. $M$ asks further queries to figure out the exact payment profile under such an SSE. For $k \in \{1, \ldots, p(n)\}$, where $p(n)$ is the total number of provers in $(V, \tilde{P})$, and for each $j \in \{1, \ldots, n^k\}$, where $n^k$ is the running time of $V$ (k is a constant), $M$ asks the following queries adaptively: under an SSE where $\sum_{i=1}^{p(n)} u_i(x, s) = u(x, s)$, what is the $j$th bit in the expected payment $\mu_k(x, s)$ of prover $P_k$, given and the first $j-1$ bits of $\mu_k(x, s)$ and $\mu_1(x, s), \ldots, \mu_{k-1}(x, s)$. In $O(n^k p(n))$ queries, $M$ can figure out the exact payment profile $\tilde{u}(x, s) = (\mu_1(x, s) \ldots, \mu_k(x, s))$ under an SSE $s$, such that the total expected payment is in the $\ell$th interval.

$M$ now verifies whether the SSE corresponding to the payment profile $\tilde{u}(x, s)$ satisfies the condition of Observation 15. $M$ proceeds in two phases: first, $M$ wants to go “top-down” figuring out what part of the game tree is being played under $s$ on input $x$, using the oracle to simulate the provers and the verifier. Then, it goes “bottom-up” in the tree being played under $s$, to check whether all subforms are “$(1/\alpha(n))$-close” to the recursive-maximum at that subform.

Top-down phase. Let $k(n)$ be the total number of rounds in $(V, \tilde{P})$. Note that $k(n)$ is polynomial in $n$. Let $m_{ij}$ denote the message sent by prover $P_j$ at round $j$. Then, for each round $j$ and each prover $i$ where $1 \leq j \leq k(n)$ and $1 \leq k \leq p(n)$, $M$ first asks the oracle to give the “pruned” $O(\alpha(n))$ support distribution imposed by the Nature move of $V$ at round $j$ bit by bit as follows: “under an SSE where the expected payment profile is $\tilde{u}(x, s)$, what is the $r$th bit of the distribution imposed by $V'$ using $V$ and Lemma 16?” This requires a polynomial number of bits (and therefore queries)

\[16\] To include 1 as a possible reward, interval $4\alpha(n) - 1$ should be closed on both sides; we ignore this for simplicity.
because the distribution is polynomial sized. The pruned distribution preserves the recursive-maximum SSE and changes the utility gap by only a factor 2 (this factor does not affect the proof as our intervals are scaled down to handle it). Given this distribution, $M$ simulates $V$ on the support of the distribution to figure out the messages that $V$ sends to the provers in round $j$. In particular, $M$ does not have access to random bits, so instead it simulates every action of $V$ in the support. To simulate the provers at round $j$, $M$ similarly queries $O$ bit by bit: “under an SSE where the expected payment profile is $\tilde{u}(x,s)$, what is the $r$th bit of the message sent by $P_k$”. Thus, after simulating the moves of $V$ and $P$ under $s$, $M$ has sketched out the $O(\alpha(n))$ size part of the game tree being played under $s$ corresponding to $\tilde{u}(x,s)$.

**Bottom-up phase.** Given the $O(\alpha(n))$ nodes of the game tree under play, $M$ can mark out the subforms reachable under $s$ (corresponding to $\tilde{u}(x,s)$). Going from last level up, for each subform $H_I$ reachable under $s$, $M$ uses the oracle to figure out which payment interval the expected payments of the maximum SSE on $H_I$ lie in (given the expected maximum SSE payments on the reachable subforms verified so far), until it finds a subform that violates the condition of Observation 15.

In particular, for each subform $H_I$ of height $k$, let $\tilde{u}(x,s,I')$ denote the tuple of total expected payments under $s$ on all subforms $H_I$ of height $< k$ following $I$ (conditioned on reaching $I$) verified so far. $M$ divides the interval $[-1,1]$ into $8\alpha(n)$ intervals of size $\alpha(n)/4$ as before and for each interval queries the oracle $O$: does there exist a strategy profile $s_I$ on subgame $H_I$ that is an SSE and the sum of expected payments of all provers $u(x,s,I)$ is in the $x$th interval, and gets a total expected payments on subforms $H_I$ of height $< k$ following $I$ equal to $\tilde{u}(x,s,I')$.

Then, $M$ finds the maximum interval $[i/4\alpha(n), (i+1)/4\alpha(n))$ among the intervals for which the oracle says yes. By Lemma 21 the maximum SSE $s_I^{\text{max}}$ at $H_I$ also lies in the $i$th interval. Using the probability $p_I$ assigned by $H_I$ ($M$ knows the distribution imposed by all “pruned” Nature moves), $M$ checks whether the total expected payment of maximum SSE $s_I^{\text{max}}$ is in the same interval as the sum of expected payments of provers in $Z_I$ under $s$. If it is not, then $s$ fails the test and $M$ continues to the next interval in $L$. Otherwise, $M$ continues to the next reachable subform.

If $s$ passes the test for all subforms (including at the root), then by Observation 15 the answer bit under $s$ is correct. $M$’s final query to $O$ is: “under an SSE where the expected payment profile is $\tilde{u}(x,s)$, what is the answer bit $c$? If $c = 1$, then $M$ accepts $x$, otherwise $M$ rejects $x$.

$M$ is guaranteed to find a payment profile $\tilde{u}(x,s)$ (and thus a strategy profile $s$) that passes the test. Since $(V,\bar{P})$ is an ncRIP protocol for $L$, there exists a recursive-maximum SSE $s^*$ in some interval in $L$. By Observation 15 if a strategy profile $s'$ fails the test, the recursive-maximum SSE cannot get a total expected payment in the same interval as $s'$. Thus, we can rule out intervals by checking any SSE with total expected payment in that interval. Since a recursive-maximum SSE $s^*$ exists, $M$ must eventually find an interval, where the corresponding SSE passes the test.

To complete the proof, we note that (a) $M$ runs in polynomial time, (b) each query to the oracle is polynomial, and, (c) the oracle queries can be answered in non-deterministic exponential time.

First, (a) holds because each top-down and bottom-up phase is executed $O(\alpha(n))$ times and each of the phases take polynomial time. In the top-down phase, $M$ simulates the protocol on strategy $s$ using the oracle while restricting the verifier’s Nature moves to be of $O(\alpha(n))$ support. Thus this phase takes polynomial time. For the bottom-up phase, $M$ finds maximum SSEs at each reachable subforms under $s$. Since there are at most $O(\alpha(n))$ subforms and at most $O(\alpha(n))$ interval queries for each subform, the bottom-up phase takes time polynomial in $n$.

$M$ does not need to send the total expected payments of the subforms at lower levels (that have already been verified). Instead, $M$ can just send the total expected payment $u(x,s)$ at the root and ask $O$ to guess $s$ as well. While an $\text{NEXP}$ oracle cannot find maximum SSEs, it can guess two complete strategy profiles and compare their expected payments. This observation is crucial in extending this proof to exponential utility gap.
Second, (b) holds each oracle query involves a total expected payment \( \tilde{u}(x, s) \) or an interval of size \( \alpha(n)/2 \), both of which can be generated by \( V \) and hence are polynomial in \( n \).

To prove (c), it is sufficient to show that an \( \text{NEXP} \) machine can guess a strategy profile and verify if it is an SSE and if it gets expected payments in a certain interval. Since the transcript of any ncRIP protocol is polynomial in \( n \), a strategy profile \( s \) of the provers can be represented in exponential bits, and thus \( O \) can guess such an \( s \). Now given \( s \) and the protocol \((V, \vec{P})\), by Lemma 30, it is possible to verify whether \( s \) is an SSE of the game in time linear in the size of the game tree, and thus exponential in \( n \). Furthermore, it can compute the expected payments of the provers under \( s \) in exponential time as well, which is sufficient to answer all the queries made by \( M \).