PRICE OF ANARCHY IN STOCHASTIC ATOMIC CONGESTION GAMES WITH AFFINE COSTS
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ABSTRACT. We consider an atomic congestion game with stochastic demand in which each player participates in the game with probability \( p \), and incurs no cost with probability \( 1 - p \). We assume that \( p \) is common knowledge among all players and that players are independent. For congestion games with affine costs, we provide an analytic expression for the price of anarchy as a function of \( p \), which is monotonically increasing and converges to the well-known bound of \( 5/2 \) as \( p \to 1 \). On the other extreme, for \( p \leq 1/4 \) the bound is constant and equal to \( 4/3 \) independently of the game structure and the number of players. We show that these bounds are tight and are attained on routing games with purely linear costs. Additionally, we also obtain tight bounds for the price of stability for all values of \( p \).

1. Introduction

The effects of selfishness in congestion games have been studied extensively in the past twenty years. Initially, the focus was on the simplest case of complete information routing games where either the network was very simple—Koutsoupias and Papadimitriou (1999)—or the demand was infinitely divisible—Roughgarden and Tardos (2002). The impact of selfishness is typically evaluated through worst-case bounds for the price of anarchy (PoA), parameterized by input parameters. Different papers made different calls about what aspect to highlight, hence which parametrization to choose. In Roughgarden and Tardos (2002), it is proved that the PoA for nonatomic congestion games with affine costs is at most \( 4/3 \). In time, research addressed more nuanced situations including having players control a positive fraction of the demand or removing the restriction that players choose a single route. After several extensions to more general settings, Roughgarden (2015a) showed that bounds on the PoA also extend to other solution concepts such as the mixed Nash equilibrium, the correlated equilibrium and the coarse correlated equilibrium.

More recently, there has been ample interest in understanding the stochastic aspects of the game, both on the supply and demand sides. The interest comes from the need to understand how the uncertainty of latencies—manifested through bad weather or accidents in road traffic applications, or jitter and failures in telecommunication applications—and the uncertainty of traffic patterns—what origins, destinations and amount of demand materialize in practice—affect the strategies and behaviour of agents playing the game. In this work, we go back to the selfish routing model with atomic players put forward by
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Rosenthal (1973). Inspired by that, we study congestion games but adding uncertainty to the demand side. Suppose one is planning a trip from home to work for the tomorrow morning commute. From routinely making that trip, one probably knows the possible routes and one might also have an idea of the potential number of drivers that may be on the road during an average morning. However, how many actual drivers will be there? It is likely that there is some deviation from the expected number, and that variability may imply that it is best for one to anticipate and plan the best route accordingly. As it is common in the literature, we assume that route planning happens before getting any signal of the realized congestion in the morning. This situation can be modeled as a game of incomplete information.

For simplicity, we shall assume that each driver will be present independently at random with a certain probability \( p \), which we consider homogeneous across players. With probability \( 1 - p \), the player will stay at home and not take the trip. Concretely, the number of participating players in the game is represented by a binomial random variable with probability \( p \) and total number of players \( n \). We assume that \( p \) and \( n \) are common knowledge among all players, but the realization of the random variable is unknown to the players.

The model boils down to an atomic congestion game in which there is uncertainty about the number of players involved. The question we pose is how players should strategize in this setting. In answering this question, we explore the impact caused by both the individual optimization of routes and the uncertainty in who shows up. Even though the game we consider is a game of incomplete information, we show how the game can be transformed into a deterministic one by appropriately adapting the cost functions. This allows us to analyze it as a (regular) complete information game. For these transformed cost functions, we derive tight bounds for the PoA by using the \((\lambda, \mu)\)-smoothness framework first explored by Harks and Végh (2007) and thoroughly studied by Roughgarden (2015a).

Our contribution. There are two key features of our analysis that make it different from previous studies with similar motivations. First, we consider that the social-planner solution—the yardstick that all the PoA papers have used to evaluate the efficiency of equilibria—is exposed to the same uncertainty. The routes that are assigned to players have to be set before knowing whether the player is actually present or not. For the players that show up, the corresponding routes are used; for the others, the routes are discarded. This sets the bar for a fairer comparison since in both situations we have similar uncertainty. Second, Roughgarden (2015b) showed that PoA bounds for smooth games also apply to Bayesian extensions of the game as long as types are drawn independently. His goal is to find bounds that are independent of the distribution over types, which means that taking a worst-case approach in terms of the Bayesian game reduces to the case of \( p = 1 \), and does not provide additional information for the case of stochastic players. Instead, we study a weaker definition of smoothness and we parameterize our bounds explicitly with respect to \( p \). When \( p \) is close to zero one would expect that the PoA is close to 1, whereas when \( p \) is close to one we would expect that the PoA reduces to the deterministic case. Through our model, we can show how the actual curve behaves between those extremes and whether the intuition above materializes.

We assume that cost functions are affine and obtain the following results. In Theorem 4.1, we establish (tight) upper bounds for the PoA. We show that the PoA is non-decreasing in \( p \) and has two kinks. In fact, we show that the range of \( p \in [0, 1] \) can be divided into three regions: \( 0 < p \leq \bar{p}_0, \bar{p}_0 < p < \bar{p}_1 \) and \( \bar{p}_1 \leq p \leq 1 \), where \( \bar{p}_0 = 1/4 \).
and \( p_1 \sim 0.3774 \) is the real root of \( 8p^3 + 4p^2 = 1 \). In the lower range, the PoA is at most \( 4/3 \), which is equal to the PoA for nonatomic congestion games with affine costs. In the middle range, the PoA is at most

\[
\frac{1 + p + \sqrt{p(2 + p)}}{1 - p + \sqrt{p(2 + p)}},
\]

and in the upper range, the PoA is at most

\[
1 + p + \frac{p^2}{1 + p}.
\]

For \( p = 1 \) we get back the 5/2 bound known for deterministic atomic congestion games, whereas for all \( p < 1 \) we have a smaller bound. Note the (perhaps unexpected) fact that for \( p \leq 1/4 \) we get the significantly smaller and constant bound of 4/3, and that this holds independently of the structure of the congestion game and for any number of players.

We show that all the bounds mentioned above are tight. In fact, these bounds are attained (asymptotically) by means of standard routing congestion games and with purely linear costs. Example 4.1 shows that the bound is asymptotically tight for \( p \) in the lower range by considering a sequence of bypass networks. Notice that even though cost functions are linear, due to the randomness in demand, the adjusted cost functions have an intercept term implying that the PoA equals to 4/3, which is the PoA for nonatomic congestion games with affine costs, and not 1 as one could expect from nonatomic congestion games with purely linear costs. Example 4.2 shows that the PoA is asymptotically tight for values of \( p \) in the middle range by considering a sequence of roundabout networks. Finally, Example 4.3 shows that the PoA is tight for values of \( p \) in the upper range by considering a simple variant of the game defined by Awerbuch et al. (2013).

2. Related literature

The idea of systematically measuring the inefficiency of equilibria started with Koutsoupias and Papadimitriou (1999, 2009); Papadimitriou (2001) who defined the PoA as the ratio of the social cost of the worst equilibrium over the optimum social cost. The idea has been extensively applied to various classes of games, in particular to congestion games in general and to routing games in particular.

Bounds for the PoA are substantially different for atomic and nonatomic congestion games. In nonatomic games the equilibrium concept is due to Wardrop (1952), and its properties have been thoroughly studied, among others, by Beckmann et al. (1956). Bounds for the PoA in these games can be found in Roughgarden (2003, 2005); Roughgarden and Tardos (2002, 2004) and Correa et al. (2004, 2008). These papers provide tight bounds for the PoA when the cost functions are restricted to specific classes—such as polynomials—and show that the bounds depend only on the cost functions but not on the topology of the network. We refer the reader to Correa and Stier-Moses (2011); Roughgarden (2007); Roughgarden and Tardos (2007) for surveys of these results. On the other hand, atomic congestion games, and in particular atomic routing games, were studied by Rosenthal (1973). The PoA for these games is examined in Awerbuch et al. (2013), Christodoulou and Koutsoupias (2005) and Suri et al. (2007) for the case of weighted and unweighted atomic players. Aland et al. (2011) provided exact bounds for the PoA when costs are polynomial functions. As an extension of the previously cited results, Roughgarden (2015a) studied a property, called \((\lambda, \mu)\)-smoothness, that allows to easily find bounds for the PoA. The bounds obtained by this technique hold not only for pure equilibria, but also for mixed,
correlated, and coarse-correlated equilibria. Our results are obtained through an adaptation of the $(\lambda, \mu)$-smoothness idea.

Several papers have examined the behavior of the PoA as a function of some parameter of the model. Correa et al. (2008) provided an expression to compute the PoA as a function of the maximum congestion level in the network. Relatedly, Colini-Baldeschi et al. (2017, 2019) studied the asymptotic behavior of the PoA in light and heavy traffic regimes, and showed that under weak conditions efficiency is achieved in both limit cases. Similar results for congestion games in heavy traffic have been obtained in Wu et al. (2017, 2018), using a slightly different technique.

Lately, there has been an increased interest in understanding the stochastic aspects of the game, both on the supply and demand sides by, for instance, introducing some risk posture in the model (see, e.g., Lianeas et al., 2019; Nikolova and Stier-Moses, 2014; Ordóñez and Stier-Moses, 2010). Also, while most results concern the PoA and its bounds for games with complete information, attention has recently turned to incomplete information games. Gairing et al. (2008) studied the PoA for congestion games on a network with capacitated parallel edges, where players are of different types—the type of each agent being the traffic that she moves—and types are private information. Wang et al. (2014) considered nonatomic routing games with random demand and examine the behavior of the PoA as a function of the demand distribution. Roughgarden (2015b) showed that whenever player types are independent, the PoA bounds for complete information games extend to Bayesian Nash equilibria of the incomplete information game. In particular, for congestion games with affine costs, the bound of $5/2$ holds also for games of incomplete information. The definition of smoothness in that framework is stronger than the definition we use and therefore has stronger implications, as the quality of Bayesian Nash equilibria is compared to an adaptive definition of optimum. However, because Roughgarden’s bounds are more robust, they are not as sharp as ours. Recently, Correa et al. (2019) proved a similar result for smooth games with stochastic demand and arbitrary correlations in playing probability, but their bounds are not tight for a fixed $p \in (0, 1)$.

Our model can also be seen as a special case of the perception-parametrized affine congestion games studied by Kleer and Schäfer (2019). These games feature two parameters $\rho$ and $\sigma$ which affect respectively the cost perceived by the players and the cost considered by the central planner. Our model corresponds to the case where $\rho = \sigma = p$. Focusing on the results which apply to this case, we observe that their Theorem 2 establishes the same bound for all $p \in \left[\frac{1}{2}, 1\right]$. Our results improve both the upper and lower bounds for PoA. Indeed, on the one hand we show that their upper bound is valid and tight on the larger interval $p \in [\bar{p}, 1]$, and on the other hand we also obtain tight bounds outside this interval. Kleer and Schäfer (2019) also investigated the price of stability (PoS). Their Theorem 5 characterizes the PoS for all $p \in \left[\frac{1}{4}, 1\right]$ showing that $\text{PoS}(p) \leq 1 + \sqrt{p/(2 + p)}$. Naturally, this upper bound on PoS is strictly smaller than our two upper bounds for PoA in the corresponding range $p \in \left[\frac{1}{4}, 1\right]$. On the other hand, for $p \in [0, \frac{1}{4}]$ our Example 4.1 has a unique equilibrium and thus gives a larger lower bound of $4/3$, which combined with our upper bound on PoA shows that in fact this is sharp with $\text{PoA}(p) = \text{PoS}(p) = 4/3$ in this range. Our result thus complements theirs and completes the characterization of the PoS.

Let us finally mention some other papers that investigate the PoA in stochastic models. For instance, Stidham (2014) studied the efficiency of some classical queueing models on various networks, whereas Hassin et al. (2018) examined a queueing model with heterogeneous agents and studied how the PoA varies with the intensity function.
3. Congestion games with stochastic demand

3.1. Atomic congestion games. Consider a finite set of players $\mathcal{N} = \{1, \ldots, n\}$ and a finite set of resources $E$. The set of feasible strategies for player $i$ is $S_i \subset 2^E$ and we denote $S := \times_{i \in \mathcal{N}} S_i$. For each $s \in S$ and each $e \in E$, call

$$n_e(s) = |\{j \in \mathcal{N} \mid e \in s_j\}|$$

the number of players who use resource $e$ when the strategy profile is $s \in S$. Let $c_e : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{R}_+$ be a weakly increasing function such that $c_e(n_e(s))$ is the cost experienced by each player who uses resource $e$ and there are $n_e(s)$ of them. Given a strategy profile $s \in S$ the cost of player $i$ is given by

$$C_i(s) = \sum_{e \in S_i} c_e(n_e(s)). \quad (3.1)$$

The above quantities define an atomic congestion game (ACG) $\Gamma = (\mathcal{N}, E, (S_i)_{i \in \mathcal{N}}, (c_e)_{e \in E})$. This class of game was introduced in Rosenthal (1973).

The strategy profile $\hat{s}$ is a pure Nash equilibrium (PNE) if for all $i \in \mathcal{N}$ and $s_i \in S_i$ we have

$$C_i(\hat{s}) \leq C_i(s_i, \hat{s}_{-i}).$$

We call $\mathcal{E}(\Gamma)$ the set of PNEs of $\Gamma$. The set $\mathcal{E}(\Gamma)$ is non-empty since $\Gamma$ is a potential game (see Monderer and Shapley, 1996; Rosenthal, 1973).

Consider now the social cost (SC)

$$C(s) = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}} C_i(s) = \sum_{e \in E} n_e(s) c_e(n_e(s)). \quad (3.2)$$

A strategy profile $s^*$ minimizing this aggregate cost is called a social optimum (SO) and $C(s^*)$ is called the socially optimum cost (SOC).

Given an ACG $\Gamma$, the price of anarchy (PoA) and price of stability (PoS) are defined as

$$\text{PoA}(\Gamma) = \max_{s \in \mathcal{E}(\Gamma)} \frac{C(s)}{C(s^*)}, \quad \text{and} \quad \text{PoS}(\Gamma) = \min_{s \in \mathcal{E}(\Gamma)} \frac{C(s)}{C(s^*)},$$

where $s^*$ is a SO.

A very useful tool to bound the PoA in a class of games is the concept of $(\lambda, \mu)$-smoothness.

**Definition 3.1.** A game $\Gamma$ is said to be $(\lambda, \mu)$-smooth if, for all strategy profiles $s, s'$, we have

$$\sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}} C_i(s'_i, s_{-i}) \leq \lambda \cdot C(s') + \mu \cdot C(s). \quad (3.3)$$

**Lemma 3.2 (Roughgarden (2015a)).** *If the game $\Gamma$ is $(\lambda, \mu)$-smooth with $\lambda > 0$ and $\mu < 1$, then*

$$\text{PoA}(\Gamma) \leq \frac{\lambda}{1 - \mu}. \quad (3.4)$$

3.2. Stochastic demand. We consider an atomic congestion game with stochastic demand (ACGSD) in which each player $i \in \mathcal{N}$ participates in the game with probability $p$, and is inactive—hence incurring no costs—with probability $1 - p$. As most prior work, each player $i$ chooses her strategy $s_i$ before knowing Nature’s draw.\(^1\) The random variable $X_i \sim \text{Bernoulli}(p)$ indicates whether player $i$ is active. The variables $(X_i)_{i \in \mathcal{N}}$ are assumed to be independent. We denote $f^P$ the resulting ACGSD.

\(^1\)Since players could update their priors after starting the trip and switch to other routes, (Marcotte et al., 2004; Miller-Hooks, 2001; Nguyen and Pallottino, 1988) consider a richer set of strategies called hyperpaths.
In a Bayesian Nash equilibrium (BNE), each player minimizes her expected cost with respect to her beliefs about the presence of other players. In the current setting, the expected cost $c^p_e : N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ for a player using resource $e$ is given by

$$c^p_e(x) = p \cdot E(c_e(1 + X)),$$

where $X \sim \text{Binomial}(x-1, p)$ and $x$ is the number of players—active and inactive—who choose to use that resource. Hence, for a given strategy profile $s = (s_i)_{i \in N}$ the total expected cost for a player $i \in N$ is now

$$C_i^p(s) = \sum_{e \in i} c^p_e(n_e(s)).$$

and $\hat{s}$ is a BNE if for all $i \in N$ and $s \in S_i$ we have

$$C_i^p(s) \leq C_i^p(\hat{s}, \hat{s}_{-i}).$$

It follows that a ACGSD $\Gamma^p$ is equivalent to a standard ACG $\Gamma(p)$ in which the costs $c_e(\cdot)$ are replaced by $c^p_e(\cdot)$. This immediately implies that a BNE always exists.

The social expected cost (SEC) is now

$$C^p(s) = \sum_{i \in N} C_i^p(s) = \sum_{e \in E} n_e(s) c^p_e(n_e(s)) = E \left( \sum_{e \in E} N_e(s) \cdot c_e(n_e(s)) \right),$$

where $N_e(s) \sim \text{Binomial}(n_e(s), p)$ and the last equality follows from the law of total expectation, by writing $N_e(s) = \sum_{i \in S_i} X_i$ and conditioning on $X_i$.

Call $\mathcal{G}^p$ the class of all ACGSDs $\Gamma^p$ having affine costs

$$c_e(x) = a_e \cdot x + b_e, \quad \text{with } a_e, b_e \geq 0, \forall e \in E.$$

We are interested in the best possible bounds for the PoA and PoS over this class. To this end, we define

$$\text{PoA}(p) := \sup_{\Gamma^p \in \mathcal{G}^p} \text{PoA}(\Gamma^p), \quad \text{and} \quad \text{PoS}(p) := \sup_{\Gamma^p \in \mathcal{G}^p} \text{PoS}(\Gamma^p).$$

4. Price of Anarchy for congestion games with stochastic demand and affine costs

For the rest of this paper we focus on atomic ACGSDs having affine costs. We will prove $(\lambda, \mu)$-smoothness bounds that yield tight bounds for the PoA over the class $\mathcal{G}^p$.

4.1. Upper bounds. The following is the main result of our work. It provides an upper bound on the PoA for ACGSDs with affine costs. Define $\hat{p}_0$ and $\hat{p}_1$ as follows:

$$\hat{p}_0 = 1/4, \quad \hat{p}_1 \sim 0.3774 \text{ is the real root of } 8p^3 + 4p^2 = 1. \quad (4.1)$$

**Theorem 4.1.** Let $\hat{p}_0, \hat{p}_1$ be defined as in Eq. (4.1). Then every ACGSD $\Gamma^p$ is $(\lambda, \mu)$-smooth, with

$$(\lambda, \mu) = \begin{cases} 
(1, 1/4) & \text{if } 0 < p \leq \hat{p}_0, \\
\left(\frac{1 + p + \sqrt{p(2 + p)}}{2}, \frac{1 + p - \sqrt{p(2 + p)}}{2}\right) & \text{if } \hat{p}_0 \leq p \leq \hat{p}_1, \\
\left(\frac{1 + 2p + 2p^2}{1 + 2p}, \frac{p}{1 + 2p}\right) & \text{if } \hat{p}_1 \leq p \leq 1.
\end{cases} \quad (4.2)$$
Figure 1. The three curves correspond to the expressions in Eq. (4.3) and the upper envelope gives the bound for the PoA hence,

$$\text{PoA}(p) \leq \begin{cases} 
\frac{4}{3} & \text{if } 0 < p \leq \bar{p}_0, \\
\frac{1 + p + \sqrt{p(2 + p)}}{1 - p + \sqrt{p(2 + p)}} & \text{if } \bar{p}_0 \leq p \leq \bar{p}_1, \\
1 + p + \frac{p^2}{1 + p} & \text{if } \bar{p}_1 \leq p \leq 1.
\end{cases} \quad (4.3)$$

Fig. 1 shows the graph of the bounds in Eq. (4.3). The idea of the proof of Theorem 4.1 is the following. First we show that, under some conditions, for fixed $p$, all games $\Gamma^p \in \mathcal{G}^p$ are $(\lambda, \mu)$-smooth. Then we optimize over the parameters $\lambda$ and $\mu$ and we show that the optimal $(\lambda, \mu)$ take different values in three regions of the interval $[0, 1]$. Using then Lemma 4.2, we find upper bounds for the PoA. The following lemma is a slight variation of the technical lemma in Aland et al. (2011); Christodoulou and Koutsoupias (2005) that takes into account the role of the probability $p$.

**Lemma 4.2.** Let $\lambda > 0$ and $\mu < 1$ be such that

$$k(1 + mp) \leq \lambda k(1 - p + pk) + \mu m(1 - p + pm) \quad \forall k, m \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (4.4)$$

Then every ACGSD $\Gamma^p \in \mathcal{G}^p$ is $(\lambda, \mu)$-smooth.

**Proof.** We first observe that Eq. (4.4) implies that $\lambda \geq 1$ (by considering $k = 1$ and $m = 0$), $\mu \geq 0$ (by considering $k = 0$ and $m = 1$), and for all $k, m \in \mathbb{N}$

$$k c^p_E(m + 1) = kp[a_c(1 + mp) + b_c]$$

$$\leq p[\lambda k a_c(1 - p + pk) + \mu m a_c(1 - p + pm) + kb_c]$$

$$\leq \lambda k c^p_E(k) + \mu m c^p_E(m), \quad (4.5)$$

$$\leq k c^p_E(m + 1)$$

This completes the proof.
where the first inequality follows from Eq. (4.4). For all \( s, s' \in S \)
\[
\sum_{i \in N} \sum_{e \in \mathcal{E}_i} c^e_i(n_e(s', s_{-i})) \leq \sum_{i \in N} \sum_{e \in \mathcal{E}_i} c^e_i(n_e(s) + 1)
\]
\[
= \sum_{e \in E} n_e(s') \cdot c^e_i(n_e(s) + 1)
\]
\[
\leq \sum_{e \in E} \lambda \cdot n_e(s') \cdot c^e_i(n_e(s')) + \mu \cdot n_e(s) \cdot c^e_i(n_e(s))
\]
\[
= \lambda \cdot C^e(s') + \mu \cdot C^e(s),
\]
where the second inequality follows from Eq. (4.5) with \( k = n_e(s') \) and \( m = n_e(s) \).

The optimization of Eq. (4.4) over \( \lambda \) and \( \mu \) is similar to what has been done by Aland et al. (2011) and Roughgarden (2015a) for deterministic congestion games. For \( k = 0 \) the condition in Eq. (4.4) is trivially satisfied as long as \( \mu \geq 0 \), so it suffices to consider \( k \geq 1 \). Hereafter we let \( q = 1 - p \) and we denote \( \mathcal{P} \) the set of all pairs \((k, m) \in \mathbb{N}^2 \) with \( k \geq 1 \). Then the smallest possible \( \lambda \) is
\[
\lambda = \sup_{(k, m) \in \mathcal{P}} \frac{k(1 + pm) - \mu m(q + pm)}{k(q + pk)}
\]
\[
= \sup_{(k, m) \in \mathcal{P}} \mu \left[ \frac{k(1 + pm) - m(q + pm)}{k(q + pk)} \right] + (1 - \mu) \frac{1 + pm}{q + pk}
\]
and the best bound on the PoA that we can get is
\[
\text{PoA}(p) \leq B(p) := \inf_{\lambda, \mu \geq 0} \frac{\lambda}{1 - \mu} = \inf_{\mu \in [0,1]} \sup_{(k, m) \in \mathcal{P}} \mu \left[ \frac{k(1 + pm) - m(q + pm)}{k(q + pk)} \right] + \frac{1 + pm}{q + pk}.
\]
Denoting
\[
y = \frac{\mu}{1 - \mu} \in [0, \infty)
\]
and introducing the functions
\[
\varphi_p^{k,m}(y) = y \left[ \frac{k(1 + pm) - m(q + pm)}{k(q + pk)} \right] + \frac{1 + pm}{q + pk}, \tag{4.7}
\]
\[
\varphi_p(y) = \sup_{(k, m) \in \mathcal{P}} \varphi_p^{k,m}(y), \tag{4.8}
\]
the optimal bound is
\[
B(p) = \inf_{y \geq 0} \varphi_p(y). \tag{4.9}
\]
If this infimum is attained at a certain \( y_p \) then we get \( B(p) = \varphi_p(y_p) \) together with the corresponding optimal parameters
\[
\mu = \frac{y_p}{1 + y_p} \quad \text{and} \quad \lambda = (1 - \mu)B(p) = \frac{\varphi_p(y_p)}{1 + y_p}.
\]
Our next lemma gathers some basic facts about the function \( \varphi_p : [0, \infty) \to \mathbb{R} \) and shows in particular that its infimum is attained.

**Lemma 4.3.** The function \( \varphi_p(\cdot) \) has the following properties:

1. \( \varphi_p(\cdot) \) is convex.
2. \( \varphi_p(0) = \infty \) and \( \varphi_p(y) < \infty \) for all \( y > 0 \).
3. \( \varphi_p(y) \to \infty \) for \( y \to \infty \).
4. The minimum of \( \varphi_p(\cdot) \) is attained at a point \( y_p > 0 \).
Proof. (1) This property is obvious since $\varphi_p(\cdot)$ is a supremum of affine functions.

(2) For $y = 0$ we may take $k = 1$ and $m \to \infty$ to get $\varphi_p(0) \geq \varphi_p^{1,m}(0) = 1 + pm \to \infty$. Now, consider the case $y > 0$ and rewrite the expression of $\varphi_p(\cdot)$ as

$$
\varphi_p(y) = \sup_{k \geq 1} \frac{1}{k(q + pk)} \left[ (y + 1)k + \sup_{m \geq 0} ((y + 1)pk - yq)m - ypm^2 \right].
$$

Relaxing the inner supremum and considering the maximum with $m \in \mathbb{R}$ we get

$$
\varphi_p(y) \leq \sup_{k \geq 1} \frac{1}{k(q + pk)} \left[ (y + 1)k + \frac{(y + 1)pk - yq}{4yp} \right].
$$

The expression within square brackets is a quadratic $ak^2 + bk + c$ so the conclusion follows by noting that all three expressions

$$
\frac{k^2}{k(q + pk)}, \frac{k}{k(q + pk)}, \frac{1}{k(q + pk)}
$$

are bounded for $k \geq 1$.

(3) This follows directly from $\varphi_p(y) \geq \varphi_p^{1,1}(y) = yp + 1 + p$.

(4) This is a consequence of (1), (2), (3). \hfill \Box

We now show that when $p$ is sufficiently large the minimum of $\varphi_p(\cdot)$ is attained at a point $y_p$ for which the supremum in Eq. (4.8) is reached with $k = 1$ and simultaneously for $m = 1$ and $m = 2$, that is,

$$
\varphi_p(y_p) = \varphi_p^{1,1}(y_p) = \varphi_p^{1,2}(y_p).
$$

For smaller values of $p$ the supremum in Eq. (4.8) for $y = y_p$ is still reached at $k = 1$ with either $m = 1$ or $m = 0$, but also for $k$ and $m$ tending to $\infty$. In order to state this more precisely we introduce the limit function

$$
\varphi_\infty(y) = \lim_{k \to \infty} \sup_{m \geq 0} \varphi_p^{k,m}(y).
$$

Our next lemma shows that this limit is well defined and does not depend on $p$. Note that this function is also a minorant of $\varphi_p(y)$.

**Lemma 4.4.** For all $y > 0$ we have

$$
\varphi_\infty(y) = \frac{(y + 1)^2}{4y}.
$$

Moreover,

$$
\varphi'_\infty(y) = \frac{y^2 - 1}{4y^2} < 0
$$

for all $y \in (0, 1)$.

Proof. Fix $y > 0$ and $p \in (0, 1]$. The maximum of $\varphi_p^{k,m}(y)$ for $m \in \mathbb{N}$ is attained at the integer $\hat{m}$ that is closest to the unconstrained (real) maximizer

$$
\hat{m} = \frac{(y + 1)pk - yq}{2py}.
$$

\hfill (4.11)
For $k$ large we have $\hat{m} \geq 0$ and we may find $f \in (-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]$ such that $\hat{m} = \bar{m} + f$. Then,

$$\sup_{m \in \mathbb{N}} ((y + 1)pk - yq)m - ypm^2 = yp(2\hat{m} - \bar{m})\bar{m} = yp(\bar{m} + f)(\bar{m} - f) = yp(\bar{m}^2 - f^2) = \frac{((y + 1)pk - yq)^2}{4yp} - ypf^2,$$

from which it follows that

$$\varphi_\infty(y) = \lim_{k \to \infty} \frac{(y + 1)k + \frac{1}{4yp}((y + 1)pk - yq)^2 - ypf^2}{k(q + pk)} = \frac{(y + 1)^2}{4y}. \quad \Box$$

In the sequel we will find the exact expression for the optimal solution $y_p$ for all $p \in [0, 1]$. To this end, consider the solutions of the equations

- $\varphi_p^{(0)}(y) = \varphi_\infty(y)$ \iff $y = y_{0,p} := \frac{1}{3}$
- $\varphi_p^{(1)}(y) = \varphi_\infty(y)$ \iff $y = y_{1,p} := \frac{1}{1 + 2p + 2\sqrt{p(2 + p)}}$
- $\varphi_p^{(2)}(y) = \varphi_p^{(1)}(y)$ \iff $y = y_{2,p} := \frac{p}{1 + p}$

Note that these three solutions belong to $(0, 1)$. Let also $p_0 = 1/4$ be the point at which $y_{0,p} = y_{1,p}$, and $\bar{p}_1 \approx 0.3774$ the unique real root of $8p^3 + 4p^2 = 1$ which is the point where $y_{1,p} = y_{2,p}$.

**Proposition 4.5.** The minimum of $\varphi_p(\cdot)$ is attained at $y_p = y_{0,p}$ if and only if $p \in (0, p_0]$. 

**Proof.** We claim that

$$\varphi_p(y_{0,p}) = \varphi_p^{(0)}(y_{0,p}) = \varphi_\infty(y_{0,p}) \tag{4.12}$$

iff $p \leq p_0$.

Since both $\varphi_p^{(0)}(\cdot)$ and $\varphi_\infty(\cdot)$ are minorants of $\varphi_p(\cdot)$, their slopes $(\varphi_p^{(0)})'(y_{0,p}) = 1$ and $\varphi_\infty'(y_{0,p}) = -2$ are subgradients of $\varphi_p(\cdot)$ at $y_{0,p}$. Hence $0 \in [-2, 1] \subseteq \partial \varphi_p(y_{0,p})$ and $y_{0,p}$ is indeed a minimizer.

We now establish the claim in Eq. (4.12), that is,

$$y_{0,p} \left[ \frac{k(1 + pm) - m(1 - p + pm)}{k(1 - p + pk)} \right] + \frac{1 + pm}{1 - p + pk} \leq \frac{(1 + y_{0,p})^2}{4y_{0,p}} \quad \forall (k, m) \in \mathcal{P} \tag{4.13}$$

iff $p \leq p_0$.

Substituting $y_{0,p} = 1/3$, this can be written equivalently as

$$0 \leq \rho(2k - m - 1)^2 + m(1 - 3p) - p \quad \forall (k, m) \in \mathcal{P}.$$

This holds trivially for $m = 0$ so we just consider $m \geq 1$. Now, for $k = m = 1$ this requires $p \leq 1/4$. Conversely, if $p \leq 1/4$ we have $1 - 3p > 0$ and therefore $m(1 - 3p)$ increases with $m$ so that

$$\rho(2k - m - 1)^2 + m(1 - 3p) - p \geq m(1 - 3p) - p \geq 1 - 4p \geq 0. \quad \Box$$

**Proposition 4.6.** The minimum of $\varphi_p(\cdot)$ is attained at $y_p = y_{1,p}$ if and only if $p \in [\bar{p}_0, \bar{p}_1]$. 
Proof. We claim that if \( p \in [\bar{p}_0, \bar{p}_1] \) we have
\[
\varphi_p(y_{1,p}) = \varphi_{1,1}^{-1}(y_{1,p}) = \varphi_{1,0}(y_{1,p}),
\] (4.14)
so that \( \varphi_{1,1}^{-1}(y_{1,p}) = p \) and \( \alpha = \varphi_{1,0}(y_{1,p}) \) are subgradients of \( \varphi_p(\cdot) \) at \( y_{1,p} \). Now, since \( y_{1,p} < 1 \), by Lemma 4.4, we have \( \alpha < 0 \) so that \( 0 \in [\alpha, p] \subseteq \partial \varphi_p(y_{1,p}) \) and therefore \( y_{1,p} \) is a minimizer.

We prove Eq. (4.14), that is,
\[
y_{1,p} \left[ \frac{k(1 + pm) - m(1 - p + pm)}{k(1 - p + pk)} \right] + \frac{1 + pm}{1 - p + pk} \leq \frac{(1 + y_{1,p})^2}{4y_{1,p}} \forall (k, m) \in \mathcal{P},
\] (4.15)
iff \( p \in [\bar{p}_0, \bar{p}_1] \).

Dividing by \( y_{1,p} \) and letting
\[
z = \frac{1 + y_{1,p}}{2y_{1,p}} = 1 + p + \sqrt{2 + p},
\]
this becomes
\[
\left[ \frac{k(1 + pm) - m(1 - p + pm)}{k(1 - p + pk)} \right] + \frac{1 + pm}{1 - p + pk} (2z - 1) \leq z^2.
\]
Multiplying by \( k(1 - p + pk) \) and factorizing, this can be rewritten as
\[
0 \leq p \left( z^2 - \frac{(1 - p)z - 2}{2p} \right)^2 + ((1 - p)z - 1 - p)m - \frac{(1 - p)z - 2}{4p}.
\] (4.16)
so that, denoting \( Q_p(k, m) \) this last expression, Eq. (4.16) is equivalent to \( Q_p(k, m) \geq 0 \) for all \( (k, m) \in \mathcal{P} \). We observe that
\[
Q_p(1, 0) \geq 0 \iff z \geq 2 \iff p \geq \bar{p}_0
\] (4.17)
\[
Q_p(1, 2) \geq 0 \iff 8p^3 + 4p^2 - 1 \leq 0 \iff p \leq \bar{p}_1
\] (4.18)
so that \( p \in [\bar{p}_0, \bar{p}_1] \) is a necessary condition for Eq. (4.15). We now show that it is also sufficient.

Case 1. \( m = 0 \): The inequality \( Q_p(k, 0) \geq 0 \) is equivalent to \( z(1 - p + pk) \geq 2 \) so that the most stringent condition is for \( k = 1 \), which holds for all \( p \geq \bar{p}_0 \) as already noted in Eq. (4.17).

Case 2. \( m = 1 \): From the very definition of \( y_{1,p} \) we have that Eq. (4.15) holds with equality for \( (k, m) = (1, 1) \), so that \( Q_p(1, 1) = 0 \). Since \( Q_p(k, 1) \) is quadratic in \( k \), in order to have \( Q_p(k, 1) \geq 0 \) for all \( k \geq 1 \), it suffices to check that \( Q_p(2, 1) \geq 0 \). The latter can be factored as
\[
Q_p(2, 1) = 2(1 + p)z(z - 2) + 1,
\]
so that, substituting \( z \) and simplifying, the resulting inequality becomes
\[
4p(1 + p)\sqrt{2 + p} + 4p^3 + 8p^2 + 2p - 1 \geq 0.
\]
The conclusion follows since this expression increases with \( p \) and the inequality holds for \( p = 1/4 \).

Case 3. \( m = 2 \): As noted in Eq. (4.17) we have \( Q_p(1, 2) \geq 0 \) for all \( p \leq \bar{p}_1 \). On the other hand, since \( z > 1 \) we have that \( Q_p(k, 2) \) increases for \( k \geq 2 \), so that it suffices to show that \( Q_p(2, 2) \geq 0 \). Now, \( Q_p(2, 2) \) can be factored as
\[
Q_p(2, 2) = 2(1 + p)(z - 1)^2 - 4pz
\]
and substituting \( z \) we get

\[
Q_p(2, 2) = 4p^2(1 + p + \sqrt{p(2 + p)}) \geq 0.
\]

**Case 4.** \( m \geq 3 \): Let \( \alpha = (1 - p)z - 1 - p \) be the slope of the linear term in \( Q_p(k, m) \). Neglecting the quadratic part we have

\[
Q_p(k, m) \geq \alpha m - \frac{((1 - p)z - 2)^2}{4p}
\]

and therefore it suffices to show that the latter linear expression is non-negative. We claim that for all \( p \) and therefore it suffices to show that the latter linear expression is non-negative. We claim that for all \( p \leq \rho_1 \) we have \( \alpha \geq 0 \). Indeed, substituting \( z \) we get

\[
\alpha = (1 - p)\sqrt{p(2 + p)} - p(1 + p),
\]

so that \( \alpha \geq 0 \) if and only if \( (1 - p)^2(2 + p) \geq p(1 + p)^2 \) which simplifies as \( p^2 + 2p \leq 1 \) and holds for \( p \leq \sqrt{2} - 1 \), and in particular for \( p \leq \rho_1 \). Thus the right hand side in Eq. (4.19) increases with \( m \), so it remains to show that it is non-negative for \( m = 3 \). The latter amounts to

\[
3 \alpha \geq \frac{((1 - p)z - 2)^2}{4p},
\]

which is equivalent to

\[
2(6p + 1 + p^2)(1 - p)\sqrt{p(2 + p)} \geq 1 + 2p + 11p^2 + 12p^3 + 2p^4
\]

and can be seen to hold for all \( p \in [\rho_0, \rho_1] \). \( \square \)

**Proposition 4.7.** The minimum of \( \phi_p(\cdot) \) is attained at \( y_p = y_{z, p} \) if and only if \( p \in [\rho_1, 1] \).

**Proof.** For \( y = y_{z, p} \) and \( k = 1 \) the unconstrained maximizer Eq. (4.11) is \( \hat{m} = 3/2 \) so that \( \sup_{m \geq 0} \phi_p^{1, m}(y_{z, p}) \) is attained at \( m = 1 \) and \( m = 2 \). The slopes of the corresponding terms are

\[
(\phi_p^{1, m})'(y) = \begin{cases} 
\rho & \text{if } m = 1, \\
-1 & \text{if } m = 2.
\end{cases}
\]

If the outer supremum \( \sup_{k \geq 1} \) is attained for \( k = 1 \) it follows that \( 0 \in [-1, p] \subseteq \partial \phi_p(y_{z, p}) \) and therefore \( y_{z, p} \) is a minimizer. Considering the expression Eq. (4.10) and substituting the value of \( y_{z, p} \), it follows that \( \sup_{k \geq 1} \) is attained at \( k = 1 \) if and only if

\[
(1 + 2p)k + \sup_{m \in \mathbb{N}} ((1 + 2p)k - q)pm - p^2m^2 \leq [(1 + p)^2 + p^2]k(q + pk) \quad \forall k \geq 2. \tag{4.20}
\]

We claim that this holds if and only if \( p \in [\rho_1, 1] \). To this end we note that for all \( k \geq 1 \) the unconstrained maximum of the quadratic is attained at

\[
\bar{m} = \frac{(1 + 2p)k - q}{2p} > 1.
\]

Proceeding as in the proof of Lemma 4.4 we may find an integer \( \bar{m} \geq 1 \) and \( f \in (-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}] \) such that \( \bar{m} = \overline{m} + f \), hence, the supremum for \( m \in \mathbb{N} \) is attained at \( \overline{m} \) and

\[
\sup_{m \in \mathbb{N}} ((1 + 2p)k - q)pm - p^2m^2 = p^2(\overline{m}^2 - f^2) = \frac{1}{4}((1 + 2p)k - q)^2 - p^2f^2. \tag{4.21}
\]

Replacing this expression into Eq. (4.20) and after simplification the condition becomes

\[
0 \leq [8p^3 + 4p^2 - 1]k^2 + [2 - 2p - 4p^2 - 8p^3]k + 4p^2f^2 - (1 - p)^2 \quad \forall k \geq 2. \tag{4.22}
\]
It follows that a necessary condition is $8p^3 + 4p^2 - 1 \geq 0$ which amounts to $p \geq \bar{p}_1$. It remains to show that once $p \geq \bar{p}_1$ the inequality Eq. (4.22) holds automatically. Consider first the case $k \geq 3$. Ignore the non-negative term $4p^2 \widetilde{f}^2$ and denote


For $p \geq \bar{p}_1$ this is quadratic and convex in $x$ and we have

$$Q'(3) = 40p^3 + 20p^2 - 2p - 4 \geq 0 \quad \forall \ p \geq \bar{p}_1.$$  

Hence $Q(x)$ is increasing for $x \in [3, \infty)$ and then Eq. (4.22) holds for all $k \geq 3$ since

$$Q(k) \geq Q(3) = 48p^3 + 23p^2 - 4p - 4 \geq 0 \quad \forall \ p \geq \bar{p}_1.$$  

For $k = 2$ it is not always the case that $Q(2) \geq 0$ so we must consider also the role of the fractional residual $4p^2 \widetilde{f}^2$. The inequality to be proved is

$$2(1 + 2p) + \sup_{m \in \mathbb{N}} (1 + 5p)pm - p^2m^2 \leq [(1 + p)^2 + p^2]2(1 + p).$$  

The supremum for $m \in \mathbb{N}$ is attained at the integer closest to

$$\hat{m} = \frac{1 + 5p}{2p} = 2 + \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2p},$$  

which can be either $m = 3$ or $m = 4$ depending whether $p$ is larger or smaller than $\frac{1}{2}$. Now, for these values of $m$ the inequalities to be checked are

\begin{align*}
2(1 + 2p) + (1 + 5p)3p - 9p^2 & \leq [(1 + p)^2 + p^2]2(1 + p) \\
2(1 + 2p) + (1 + 5p)4p - 16p^2 & \leq [(1 + p)^2 + p^2]2(1 + p)
\end{align*}

which reduce respectively to

\begin{align*}
0 & \leq 4p^3 + 2p^2 - p \\
0 & \leq 4p^3 + 4p^2 - 2p
\end{align*}

and are easily seen to hold for all $p \in [\bar{p}_1, 1]$.

\[\square\]

With all the previous ingredients the proof of our main result is straightforward.

**Proof of Theorem 4.1.** Substituting the expressions for the optimal solution $y_p$ obtained in Propositions 4.5–4.7 we get the optimal bound $B(p) = \varphi_p(y_p)$ which gives Eq. (4.3), as well as the optimal parameters

$$\mu = \frac{y_p}{1 + y_p} \quad \text{and} \quad \lambda = \frac{\varphi_p(y_p)}{1 + y_p},$$  

which are shown in Eq. (4.2).

\[\square\]

4.2. **Lower bounds.** The following three examples show that the upper bounds in Theorem 4.1 are tight, and are in fact attained (at least asymptotically) by network routing games with linear latency functions.

**Example 4.1.** Let $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and consider a routing game with $n = 2k$ players on the bypass network $B_k$ shown in Fig. 2. Players $i = 1, \ldots, k$ have two strategies, $s_i$ and $\bar{s}_i$, to travel from origin $o_i$ to destination $d_i$. Strategy $s_i$ consists of an exclusive direct link $e_i$ with cost $c_i(x) = x$, while the bypass strategy $\bar{s}_i$ uses a faster shared link $\bar{e}$ with cost

$$\bar{c}(x) = \frac{1}{1 + 2kp} \cdot x.$$  

connected to $o_i$ and $d_i$ by zero cost links (dashed). The remaining players $i = k + 1, \ldots, 2k$ have a common origin $\tilde{o}$ and destination $\tilde{d}$ with a unique strategy $\tilde{s}_i$ using the shared link $\tilde{e}$.

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=0.5\textwidth]{network.png}
\caption{The bypass network $B_2$. Dashed links have zero cost.}
\end{figure}

We claim that for each player $i = 1, \ldots, k$ the bypass $\tilde{s}_i$ is a strictly dominant strategy. Indeed, in every strategy profile there are at most $2k$ players on $\tilde{e}$, and thus for all $s'_{-i} \in S_{-i},$

\[ c_i(\tilde{s}_i, s'_{-i}) \leq p \cdot \frac{1}{1 + 2kp} \cdot (1 + (2k - 1)p) < p = c_i(s_i, s'_{-i}). \]

Hence in the unique Nash equilibrium all players use $\tilde{s}_i$, whereas in the optimal profile $s^*$ players $i = 1, \ldots, k$ use their exclusive route $s_i' = s_i$ and players $i = k + 1, \ldots, 2k$ use their only available strategy $s_i' = \tilde{s}_i$. This yields the lower bound

\[ \text{PoA}(p) \geq \text{PoS}(p) \geq \frac{C(\tilde{s})}{C(s^*)} = \frac{2kp \cdot \frac{1}{1 + 2kp} \cdot (1 + (2k - 1)p)}{kp \cdot \frac{1}{1 + 2kp} \cdot (1 + (k - 1)p) + kp} = \frac{4kp + 2 - 2p}{3kp + 2 - p}, \]

which increases towards $4/3$ as $k$ grows to $\infty$. In particular, it follows that for $p \in [0, \frac{1}{4}]$ we have in fact $\text{PoA}(p) = \text{PoS}(p) = 4/3$.

**Example 4.2.** Consider a pair of integers $m > k \geq 1$ and set $n = m + k$. We build a graph $G_{k,m}$ consisting of a roundabout with $n$ arcs of the form $(a_i, b_i)$ with linear costs $h_i(x) = ax$, where

\[ a = \frac{p}{m(1 - p + pm) - k(1 + pm)}, \]

connected by zero cost links $(b_i, a_{i+1})$ (modulo $n$). Additionally there are $n$ exit arcs $(b_i, c_i)$ with costs $g_i(x) = x$. Fig. 3 illustrates the roundabout network $G_{2,4}$.

Consider players $i = 1, \ldots, n$ with origin nodes $a_i$, which have only 2 outgoing links connecting to the roundabout at the nodes $a_i$ and $a_{i+k}$, respectively, and destination nodes $d_i$, which can be reached only from the exit nodes $c_{i+k-1}$ and $c_{i+k+m-1}$ (again modulo $n$). Hence player $i$ has only two non-dominated strategies, which consist in entering the roundabout at one of the two available entrance nodes and then proceed clockwise to the closest exit leading to $d_i$: the short route $s_i' = \{h_i, \ldots, h_{i+k-1}, g_{i+k-1}\}$, which uses $k$ resources of type $h_i$ and only one $g_j$, and the long route $s_i = \{h_{i+k}, \ldots, h_{i+k+m-1}, g_{i+k+m-1}\}$, which uses $m$ resources $h_j$ and one $g_j$. 


Figure 3. The roundabout network $G_{2,4}$. For clarity only the origin and destination for player $i = 1$ are shown. The corresponding strategies are $s^*_1 = \{h_1, h_2, g_2\}$ and $s_1 = \{h_3, h_4, h_5, g_6\}$. Dashed links have zero cost.

If all players choose the long route $s_i$ then each $h_j$ has a load of $m$ players and each $g_j$ a load of 1, so that every player experiences the same cost

$$p[m\alpha(1 - p + pm) + 1].$$

Shifting individually to the short route $s^*_i$ implies the cost

$$p[k\alpha(1 + pm) + 1 + p],$$

so that by the choice of $\alpha$ all players using $s_i$ is an equilibrium.

The social cost of this equilibrium is

$$C(s) = np[m\alpha(1 - p + pm) + 1].$$

Now, the feasible routing where all players use the short route $s^*_i$ gives an upper bound for the optimal social cost. In this case the loads are $k$ on each $h_j$ and again 1 on each $g_j$, so that

$$C(s^*) \leq np[k\alpha(1 - p + pk) + 1],$$

which yields the following lower bound for the PoA

$$\text{PoA}(p) \geq \frac{(1 + p)m(1 - p + pm) - k(1 + pm)}{pk(1 - p + pk) + m(1 - p + pm) - k(1 + pm)}. \quad (4.23)$$

Take $z = 1 + p + \sqrt{p(2 + p)}$ and $m = [zk]$ the integer part of $zk$. Then $m > k$ for $k$ large enough and in fact

$$\frac{m}{k} = \frac{[zk]}{k} \to z \quad \text{as} \quad k \to \infty.$$
With this choice of $m$ both the numerator and denominator in Eq. (4.23) grow quadratically with $k$, so that dividing by $k^2$ and letting $k \to \infty$ we get the asymptotic lower bound

$$\text{PoA}(p) \geq \frac{(1 + p)z^2 - z}{p + z^2 - z} = \frac{1 + p + \sqrt{p(2 + p)}}{1 - p + \sqrt{p(2 + p)}}. \tag{4.24}$$

Example 4.3. Consider the network congestion game of Fig. 4. The game contains 3 players, 6 costly resources $\{h_1, h_2, h_3, g_1, g_2, g_3\}$, and 15 connecting links (the dashed links). The cost functions are $c_e(x) = p \cdot x$ for $e \in \{h_1, h_2, h_3\}$ and $c_e(x) = x$ for $e \in \{g_1, g_2, g_3\}$, whereas the dashed links have zero cost. Ignoring the dashed links, each player $i$ has two pure strategies $\{h_i, g_i\}$ and $\{h_{i-1}, h_{i+1}, g_{i+1}\}$ (all indices are modulo 3).

A strategy profile $s$ is a BNE if $s_i = \{h_{i-1}, h_{i+1}, g_{i+1}\}$ for all $i \in \mathcal{N}$, since

$$2p(p + 1) + 1 \leq p(2p + 1) + (p + 1).$$

The corresponding expected total costs are

$$C(s) = 3(p^2 + 4p + 2p(1 - p) \cdot p) + 3p.$$  

Second, the strategy profile $s^*$ in which $s_i = \{h_i, g_i\}$ yields an expected total cost of

$$C(s^*) = 3(p^2 + p)$$

and therefore

$$\text{PoA}(p) \geq \frac{3p(1 + 2p + 2p^2)}{3p(1 + p)} = 1 + p + \frac{p^2}{1 + p}.$$  

We now switch to bounding the price of stability to complement the prior upper and lower bounds on the price of anarchy, and then conclude by putting these results in perspective in Section 6.
The behavior of the PoA and PoS for games in \( G^p \) is summarized by the following theorem (see Fig. 5).

**Theorem 5.1.** Consider the class \( G^p \) of ACGSDs. Then the following tight bounds for the PoS hold

\[
\text{PoA}(p) \leq \begin{cases} 
\frac{4}{3} & \text{if } 0 < p \leq 1/4, \\
\frac{p + \sqrt{p(2 + p)}}{\sqrt{p(2 + p)}} & \text{if } p \geq 1/4.
\end{cases} \tag{5.1}
\]

**Proof.** The proof will leverage on Kleer and Schäfer (2019, Theorem 5), who provide the tight bound in Eq. (5.1) for \( p \geq 1/4 \). Consider now the case \( p \leq 1/4 \). By Theorem 4.1 we have

\[
\text{PoS}(p) \leq \text{PoA}(p) \leq 4/3. \tag{5.2}
\]

The game in Example 4.1 has a unique equilibrium and PoS equal to 4/3. This proves the result. \(\square\)

### 6. Conclusion

Roughgarden (2015b) has shown that, when dealing with games of incomplete information, the bounds for the corresponding games of complete information are still valid. His framework for incomplete information games is very robust, but requires a smoothness definition that holds across different types (see Roughgarden, 2015b, Definition 3.1 and Remark 3.2). A result in the same spirit appears in Correa et al. (2019), where it is shown that the bound of 5/2 holds for the PoA of ACGSDs even if the events of players being active are not i.i.d. These authors consider a class of games and an information structure that makes these games of incomplete information; then they compute bounds for the PoA of games in this class over all possible probabilities that characterize the incomplete information. They show the remarkable result that the performance of the PoA does not decay in the presence of incomplete information. Our results are in a different spirit. We fix not only the class of games and the information structure, but also the
probability measure and examine the behavior of the PoA as this probability varies. In our case, where the probability is characterized by a single parameter \( p \), this is tantamount as studying the PoA as a univariate function of this parameter. The main results in this respect are

1. the monotonicity of the function \( \text{PoA}(p) \),
2. the presence of two kinks in this function,
3. the fact that the minimum of this function is \( 4/3 \), which is the bound for the PoA in nonatomic congestion games with affine costs.

Several natural questions remain open. For instance, it may be interesting to look at the case where players have different probabilities of being active, as considered by Correa et al. (2019). Notice that, if we look at a fixed vector of heterogeneous probabilities, then some interesting non-monotonicity phenomena appear, as the following example shows.

**Example 6.1.** First, consider Example 4.3 with \( p = 1 \) and compare the situation in which 3 players participate with probability 1, and 3 players participate with probability 0 to the situation in which all six players participate with probability 1/2. In expectation, the same number of players is participating. However, in the former case, the PoA is 5/2, whereas in the latter case we know by Theorem 4.1 that the PoA is at most 5/3.

Second, consider a two-link parallel network with \( c_{e_1}(x) = x \) and \( c_{e_2}(x) = 5/2 \), and compare the situation in which 2 players participate with probability 1, and 2 players participate with probability 0 to the situation in which all four players participate with probability 1/2. In the former case, for both players it is a dominant strategy to choose \( e_1 \), yielding a PoA of 8/7, whereas in the latter case the equilibrium in which all players choose \( e_1 \) yields a PoA of at least 5/4.
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