

Inferring the prior in routing games using public signalling

Jasper Verbree, *Student Member, IEEE*, Ashish Cherukuri *Member, IEEE*

arXiv:2109.05895v1 [math.OC] 13 Sep 2021

Abstract—This paper considers Bayesian persuasion for routing games where information about the uncertain state of the network is provided by a traffic information system (TIS) using public signals. In this setup, the TIS commits to a signalling scheme and participants form a posterior belief about the state of the network based on prior beliefs and received signal. They subsequently select routes minimizing their individual expected travel time under their posterior beliefs, giving rise to a Wardrop equilibrium. We investigate how the TIS can infer the prior beliefs held by the participants by designing suitable signalling schemes, and observing the equilibrium flows under different signals. We show that under mild conditions a signalling scheme that allows for exact inference of the prior exists. We then provide an iterative algorithm that finds such a scheme in a finite number of steps. Finally, we show how in the simplified 2-road, 2-state case such a scheme can be constructed without the need for a sequential procedure. Several examples illustrate our results.

Index Terms—Bayesian persuasion; Inferring prior; Network routing game; Public signalling.

I. INTRODUCTION

RECENT years have seen increased utilization of *traffic information systems* (TISs) such as Google maps and Waze by users of traffic networks. While TISs can cause unprecedented congestions and pose various challenges for traffic management [1], they also carry with them the opportunity of *information design*, where information about the current state of the traffic is strategically revealed in order to minimize congestion. For instance, in some cases the travel time of all participants is reduced when information about certain routes is not shared with them [2].

A fitting framework for studying the effects of information on decision making is *Bayesian persuasion* [3]. As applied to the routing context, in this framework the network is assumed to be in one of several possible states, each representing for instance the presence or absence of road congestion, accidents, or weather events. The participants are assumed to have a prior belief about the probability of each state occurring. The TIS releases information about the state using a set of messages or signals and in this way influences the posterior belief formed by the participants. Subsequently, participants select routes that minimize the expected travel cost in a selfish manner under the posterior belief, i.e., they route according

to a *Wardrop equilibrium*. In the above explained framework, the TIS can influence the flow by carefully designing the map between states to messages, also known as the signalling scheme. The effects of such a design naturally depend on the prior of the participants. However, the TIS may not know this prior in advance, presenting a problem for the implementation of this method. For instance, when aiming to minimize the total travel time of all participants, any error in the estimation of the prior by the TIS can result in decreased performance.

The aim of this paper is to address this problem by studying how the prior of a population influences the Wardrop equilibrium, and how information about the prior can be inferred from observing the equilibrium flows under a signalling scheme.

Literature review: The Bayesian persuasion framework [3] for information design is adapted to the network routing setup in several recent works. In [4] the potential of information design to reduce travel times is show-cased for two common examples, in [5] the cost-performance of incentive-compatible signalling schemes are studied in comparison to socially optimal solutions, and in [6], [7] the relative performance of different strategies of information design, such as public and private signalling, are obtained. Instead of assuming that all users participate in persuasion, the works [8], [9] determine optimal information provision for heterogeneous population, where a part of the users do not “trust” the TIS. Recent works also investigate the possible pitfalls of information provision by TISs. For example, [10], [11] explore inefficiencies caused by competing TISs; [2] highlights how knowing more routes can cause more congestion, revealing informational Braess’s paradox; and [12] demonstrates oscillating traffic behaviour when information about travel-times is available in real time.

The viewpoint adapted in our paper of learning private preferences, such as the prior, about users in a routing setup is similar in spirit to [13] and [14]. In the former, the problem of estimating the learning rate of the population that employs a mirror descent algorithm to adapt route choices is considered, and in the latter, learning of the cost functions of the roads is studied. In a broader context, [15] investigates incentive design for set of noncooperative agents by learning the cost functions that govern their decisions. Our work is partly related to learning in routing games, where a lot of focus is on learning from the perspective of participants, see [16], [17] and references therein. The work [18] looks at a Bayesian framework and explores how participants learn about the state of the network in a repeated play. It is worth noting that none of the works look at the problem of learning preferences or

J. Verbree and A. Cherukuri are with the ENgineering and TEchnology institute Groningen (ENTEG), University of Groningen, {j.verbree, a.k.cherukuri}@rug.nl.

biases inherently present in decisions of users in the context of information design.

Finally, we note that a popular alternative to information design for influencing flows in a traffic network is *incentive design*. For routing games, this area focuses on how tolls and subsidies can be used to influence the behavior of traffic participants, see [19] and references therein.

Setup and contributions: We study non-atomic routing games over a network with a single origin and destination connected by parallel roads. The network can exist in one of a finite number of possible states and each road is associated with an affine cost function that differs per state of the network. Traffic participants rely on a traffic information system (TIS) to supply information about the current state of the system. The TIS commits in advance to a signalling scheme which is known to the participants and which determines the probability with which the TIS sends a particular signal to all participants when a state is realized. This framework is commonly known as *public signalling* as everyone gets the same signal. On receiving a signal, users form a Bayesian posterior belief about the state of the network using the prior belief and the signalling scheme employed by the TIS. Subsequently, the flow induced by user decisions is the Wardrop equilibrium with respect to the expected costs under the posterior. The aim of this paper is to investigate how and when the TIS can infer exactly the prior by observing the equilibrium flows under different signals. In Section II we motivate the advantage of knowing the prior with an example showing that an error in the estimate of the prior can lead to an increase in social cost. The main contributions of this paper are:

- (i) We show that the set of posterior beliefs resulting in identical Wardrop equilibria is compact and convex.
- (ii) Using a constructive proof, we show that under mild conditions there always exists a signalling scheme employing as many signals as there are states that will allow the TIS to exactly determine the prior.
- (iii) We give an iterative procedure, terminating in a finite number of steps, that finds a signalling scheme allowing the TIS to determine the prior. The procedure uses the observation of equilibrium flow in each iteration.
- (iv) For the simplified case with two states and two roads, we show how a scheme suitable for determining the prior can be designed without the need for an iterative procedure.

We provide examples throughout the paper to better illustrate the technical exposition.

Organization: The routing model and the motivating example are presented in Section II. The existence and design of a signalling scheme that can infer the prior exactly are studied in Section III. The special case of 2-road 2-state network is investigated in Section IV. And finally, conclusions are summarized in Section V.

Notation: We use the notation $[n] := \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$. For a vector $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, the i -th component is denoted as x_i , and the Euclidean 2-norm is written as $\|x\|$. Given a $\lambda > 0$, we define $\Delta_\lambda^n := \{x \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n \mid \sum_{i \in [n]} x_i = \lambda\}$. For a matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$ the (i, j) -th element is denoted as A_{ij} . The space of $n \times m$ column stochastic matrices is written as $\text{CS}(n, m) = \{A \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{n \times m} \mid \sum_{i \in [n]} A_{ij} = 1 \text{ for all } j \in [m]\}$.

II. MODEL AND PROBLEM STATEMENT

Consider a network consisting of a set $\mathcal{R} := [n]$ of n parallel roads connecting a source to a destination. For notational convenience and without loss of generality, we assume that a unit amount of traffic needs to be routed from the source to the destination. The amount of traffic that uses the road $i \in [n]$ is denoted as $f_i \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ and is referred to as the *flow on road i* . Taken together, the flows on all different roads give rise to a vector $f \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n$ which is called the *flow*. The set of feasible flows is then given by

$$\mathcal{H} := \left\{ f \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n \mid \sum_{i \in [n]} f_i = 1 \right\}. \quad (1)$$

At any instant, the network can be in one of a finite number of states. This can model, for instance, the presence or absence of an accident on a road, or varying weather conditions. The set of states is denoted by $\Theta := \{\theta_1, \dots, \theta_m\}$. In any state $\theta_k \in \Theta$ each road $i \in [n]$ has a cost function $C_i^{\theta_k} : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, $f_i \rightarrow C_i^{\theta_k}(f_i)$ associated to it, which is given by

$$C_i^{\theta_k}(f_i) := \alpha_i^k f_i + \beta_i^k, \quad (2)$$

for some known constants $\alpha_i^k \in \mathbb{R}_{> 0}$ and $\beta_i^k \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$.

We consider a Bayesian setting, where the users of the network are assumed to have a *prior* belief $q \in \Delta_1^m$ regarding the probability distribution of the state in which the network operates at any instant. That is, q_k is the probability with which the users believe the network will be in state θ_k , given that they have received no additional information. For $p \in \mathbb{R}^m$, the *weighted cost* under p of traversing a road $i \in [n]$ is given by

$$C_i^p(f_i) := \sum_{k \in [m]} p_k C_i^{\theta_k}(f_i).$$

When $p \in \Delta_1^m$, i.e., when p is a probability distribution, we call this the *expected cost* under p . For notational convenience, we define the following:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{C} &:= \{C_i^{\theta_k}\}_{i \in [n], k \in [m]}, \\ C_i(f_i) &:= (C_i^{\theta_1}(f_i), \dots, C_i^{\theta_m}(f_i))^T, \\ C^p(f) &:= (C_1^p(f_1), \dots, C_n^p(f_n))^T. \end{aligned}$$

Here \mathcal{C} denotes the set of all cost functions, C_i is the vector of the cost functions associated to road i per state, and C^p is the vector of weighted costs under p per road.

For a given a probability distribution p over the states Θ , we assume that the users aim to minimize their own expected cost of traveling, where the expectation is taken with respect to the distribution p . To formalize the flow resulting from such rational decision-making of users, we define the following notion of Wardrop equilibrium:

Definition II.1. (*p*-WE): Given a set of roads \mathcal{R} , states Θ , cost functions \mathcal{C} and a probability distribution $p \in \Delta_1^m$, the flow f^p is said to be a *p*-based Wardrop equilibrium (*p*-WE) if $f^p \in \mathcal{H}$ and for all $i \in \mathcal{R}$ such that $f_i^p > 0$ we have

$$C_i^p(f_i^p) \leq C_j^p(f_j^p) \quad \text{for all } j \in \mathcal{R}. \quad (3)$$

We will sometimes refer to the *p*-WE f^p as the flow, or the WE, induced by the distribution p . The intuition behind

this notion of Wardrop equilibrium is that when the flow is in p -WE, a single driver cannot decrease her expected cost by changing her routing decision. For \mathcal{H} given by (1) and cost functions of the form (2) with $\alpha_i^k > 0$, the p -WE is unique [20, Theorem 2.3.3]. When no additional information regarding the state of the network is available to the users, the flow is assumed to depend on the prior q , and is given by the q -WE, denoted as f^q .

Note that, under the assumptions on \mathcal{C} and \mathcal{H} , a flow f^p is a p -WE if and only if it is the solution of a *variational inequality* (VI) problem. For a given map F and set \mathcal{K} the associated VI problem $\text{VI}(F, \mathcal{K})$ is to find $f^* \in \mathcal{K}$ satisfying

$$(f - f^*)^\top F(f^*) \geq 0 \quad \text{for all } f \in \mathcal{K}. \quad (4)$$

Following [21], f^p is the unique solution of $\text{VI}(C^p, \mathcal{H})$.

The last part of the model is a traffic information system (TIS), that observes the state θ_k of the network at any instant, and subsequently supplies information about this state to the drivers. The TIS has a set of signals $\mathcal{S} := \{\zeta^1, \dots, \zeta^s\}$ from which it chooses one to send to the users at any instant of the game. Before the traffic is routed, the TIS commits to a signalling scheme $\Phi : \Theta \mapsto \Delta_1^s$. Each state θ_k is mapped by Φ to a probability vector $\Phi(\theta_k) := \phi^{\theta_k} \in \Delta_1^s$. After observing state θ_k , the TIS randomly draws a signal from \mathcal{S} to send to the participants, where the probability of sending signal ζ^v is given by the v -th element of ϕ^{θ_k} . In our setting all participants receive the same signal, which is known as *public signalling*. Note that the signalling scheme Φ can be represented as a $s \times m$ column stochastic matrix; that is, $\Phi \in \text{CS}(s, m)$, with the (v, k) -th entry, denoted ϕ_k^v , giving the probability of sending signal ζ^v after observing state θ_k . We will adhere to this matrix representation of Φ throughout the paper.


After receiving a signal ζ^v , the users update their belief about the state of the network by forming a *posterior* \tilde{q} using Bayes' rule:

$$\tilde{q}_k = \mathbb{P}[\theta_k | \zeta^v] = \frac{\mathbb{P}[\zeta^v | \theta_k] q_k}{\sum_{\ell \in [m]} \mathbb{P}[\zeta^v | \theta_\ell] q_\ell} = \frac{\phi_k^v q_k}{\sum_{\ell \in [m]} \phi_\ell^v q_\ell}, \quad (5)$$

for all $k \in [s]$, where $\mathbb{P}[\theta_k | \zeta^v]$ is the probability of the network being in state θ_k having received the signal ζ^v and $\mathbb{P}[\zeta^v | \theta_k]$ is the probability of sending signal ζ^v after observing state θ_k . The resulting flow is then assumed to be the \tilde{q} -based Wardrop equilibrium. Throughout this paper we will use q to denote the prior, q^{ζ^v} to denote the posterior with respect to the signal ζ^v , and use \tilde{q} when the signal is clear from the context. The associated WE flows will be denoted as f^q , f^{ζ^v} , and $f^{\tilde{q}}$ respectively. We will use the notation f^{θ_k} for the p^{θ_k} -based WE, where the distribution p^{θ_k} is defined by $p_k^{\theta_k} = 1$. That is, this is the traditional WE with the cost functions given by $\{C_i^{\theta_k}\}_{i \in \mathcal{R}}$. Note that when $q_k = 0$ for some $k \in [m]$, despite the TIS observing state θ_k , it is possible that \tilde{q}_ℓ is ill-defined for some $\ell \in [m]$ as it may involve division by zero. In order to avoid this issue, we assume that $q_k > 0$ for all $k \in [m]$.

A. Main idea and motivating example

The setup we have introduced here is an adaptation of the Bayesian persuasion framework, as introduced in [3], to



(a) The example network. (b) Cost for TIS with and without exact knowledge of q .

Fig. 1: An illustration (see Example II.2) of how wrongly estimating the prior q can affect the ability of the TIS to reduce the long-term average social cost.

routing games. This model has received growing attention in recent years, often focused on the analysis and derivation of signalling schemes that maximize social welfare [4], [8], [22]. A common assumption in this context is that the prior belief of the population is known to the TIS, see e.g., [8], [10]. However, it is realistic to see the prior as an empirical estimate of the true distribution of the states formed by the users, based on observations made in previous instances of the game. The TIS can observe the state directly in each instance, and can therefore form a relatively accurate estimate of the true distribution as a result. Drivers can only observe the travel time on the roads they traverse, and may also have preferences that introduce biases into their estimate. As a result, the prior of the population may differ from the true distribution and in that case it will not be known beforehand by the TIS. In this paper we aim to show how a TIS can gain information about the prior by observing equilibrium flows. Before moving on to the results we briefly discuss a motivating example showing how for a TIS that aims to design a signalling scheme to minimize social cost, a mismatch between the prior of the population and the estimate of that prior made by that TIS can lead to an increase in social cost.

Example II.2. (Motivating example): Consider a network with two nodes, the origin v_o and destination v_d , and two parallel roads going from v_o to v_d as depicted in Figure 1a. The network can be in two states, and the cost functions of the roads in these states are

$$\begin{aligned} C_1^{\theta_1}(f_1) &= C_1^{\theta_2}(f_1) = 2f_1 + \frac{1}{2}, \\ C_2^{\theta_1}(f_2) &= 0, \text{ and } C_2^{\theta_2}(f_2) = 1. \end{aligned}$$

Since $C_2^{\theta_1}$ and $C_2^{\theta_2}$ are constant functions, strictly speaking these do not belong to the class of functions defined in (2). However, slightly increasing α_2^1 and α_2^2 will remedy this without qualitatively changing the results. We have not done it here to preserve the simplicity of the example. The probability distribution of states θ_1 and θ_2 is given by $p^{\text{true}} = (p_1^{\text{true}}, p_2^{\text{true}})$, where θ_1 occurs with probability $p_1^{\text{true}} = 0.5$ and θ_2 occurs with probability $p_2^{\text{true}} = 1 - p_1^{\text{true}}$. The distribution p^{true} is assumed to be known to the TIS. The goal of the TIS is to

minimize the long-term average social cost, which is a function of the signalling scheme. For a general network, given the prior belief q , the state θ_k and a message ζ^v , the incurred social cost is given by

$$J_q^{\text{stage}}(\zeta^v, \theta_k) := \sum_{i \in [n]} f_i^{\zeta^v} C_i^{\theta_k}(f_i^{\zeta^v}),$$

where f^{ζ^v} is the WE under the posterior q^{ζ^v} . Note that the dependence on q is through the term f^{ζ^v} , which depends on the posterior formed after receiving the signal ζ^v , which in turn depends on q . The long-term average cost will be the sum of $J_q^{\text{stage}}(\zeta^v, \theta_k)$ over all possible combinations of signals ζ^v and states θ_k , weighted by the probability p_k^{true} that θ_k occurs, and the probability ϕ_k^v of signal ζ^v being send when θ_k occurs. This will therefore depend on the number of signals that the scheme employs. However, in [22, Proposition 3] it is shown that a public signalling scheme $\Phi \in \text{CS}(s, m)$ needs no more than m signals to achieve the optimum and therefore we set $s = m$. Summarizing this, the long-term average cost that the TIS tries to minimize is given by

$$J_q(\Phi) := \sum_{k \in [m]} \sum_{v \in [m]} p_k^{\text{true}} \phi_k^v \sum_{i \in [n]} f_i^{\zeta^v} C_i^{\theta_k}(f_i^{\zeta^v}).$$

When the TIS knows the prior belief q , it aims to find a scheme Φ that minimizes $J_q(\Phi)$. When the TIS does not know this prior belief, it assumes it to be same as the the probability distribution of states p^{true} , and therefore employs a signalling scheme Φ that minimizes $J_{p^{\text{true}}}(\Phi)$. Whenever $q \neq p^{\text{true}}$, designing a signalling scheme using the estimate $\hat{q} = p^{\text{true}}$ can increase the social cost. This we show in Figure 1b. The blue line shows the long-term average cost of the game when the TIS uses the estimate of the prior as $\hat{q} = p^{\text{true}}$ and employs a signalling scheme that minimizes $J_{p^{\text{true}}}$. The horizontal axis in the plot depicts the prior held by the users and since we only consider two states, it is completely specified by the first component q_1 of the two-dimensional vector q . The dashed orange line shows the cost achieved when the TIS uses the exact knowledge of q and employs an optimal signalling scheme minimizing J_q . We see that the TIS with full knowledge performs better, with the difference becoming more pronounced as q moves further away from p^{true} . •

The above example highlights the need for the TIS to accurately know the prior in order to find the optimal scheme minimizing social cost. Motivated by this fact, the following section discusses how observations of Wardrop equilibria, and knowledge of the signalling scheme Φ can be used by the TIS to infer the prior q . Section IV refines our results for the particular class of cases having two roads and two states.

III. INFERRING THE PRIOR: GENERAL CASE

In this section we study how observations of Wardrop equilibria can be used to obtain information about the prior. Section III-A investigates the relationship between a distribution and the associated WE. In Section III-B we use the gained insights to show that under very mild conditions, there always exists a signalling scheme allowing for the identification of the prior.

After this, in Section III-C we give a procedure for sequentially updating a given signalling scheme in order to find a scheme allowing for the identification of the prior. At the end of Section III-C we provide an illustrative example.

We will start by briefly introducing the intuition behind the ideas presented in this section. Consider the case where the TIS provides no information to the users and so, the resulting flow is f^q as players base their routing choices on the prior.¹ From Definition II.1 we know that f^q satisfies (3) where p is replaced by q . Specifically, if there exist two roads i and j , $i \neq j$ such that $f_i^q > 0$ and $f_j^q > 0$, then we have $C_i^q(f_i^q) = C_j^q(f_j^q)$, that is,

$$(C_i(f_i^q) - C_j(f_j^q))^{\top} q = 0, \quad (6)$$

where we recall that $C_i(f_i^q) := (C_i^{\theta_1}(f_i^q), \dots, C_i^{\theta_m}(f_i^q))^{\top}$ for any $i \in \mathcal{R}$. Thus, we arrive at an equality constraint which q necessarily satisfies. The number of linearly independent equality constraints on q that we can derive in this way is upper bounded by $n_q - 1$, where n_q is the number of roads i for which $f_i^q > 0$. In addition to these, we also have the constraint $\sum_{k \in [m]} q_k = 1$, which is linearly independent from constraints of the form given in (6).² Thus, we find at most n_q independent equality constraints on q . We may find less, when there are dependencies between the constraints, while in order to uniquely determine q , we need m such constraints. If the flow f^q does not allow us to determine q uniquely, we can use a public signalling scheme Φ to induce different posteriors. These posteriors will lead to different equilibrium flows resulting in different constraints on q . If for a signal ζ^v the resulting posterior \tilde{q} induces a flow $f^{\tilde{q}}$ with $f_i^{\tilde{q}} > 0$, $f_j^{\tilde{q}} > 0$ for some $i \neq j \in [n]$ then this flow must satisfy

$$(C_i(f_i^{\tilde{q}}) - C_j(f_j^{\tilde{q}}))^{\top} \tilde{q} = 0.$$

Using (5) we can write this equivalently as

$$\sum_{k \in [m]} \phi_k^v (C_i^{\theta_k}(f_i^{\tilde{q}}) - C_j^{\theta_k}(f_j^{\tilde{q}})) q_k = 0, \quad (7)$$

where the denominator has been dropped, since it the same for each term in the summation. As was true for the prior, when more than two roads have non-zero flow, more than one equality constraint of this form may be obtained from observing $f^{\tilde{q}}$. Note that when $C_i^{\theta_k}(f_i^{\tilde{q}}) - C_j^{\theta_k}(f_j^{\tilde{q}}) = 0$ for all k , the constraint in (7) does not impose any restrictions on q . We will call a constraint of the form (7) *informative* when it does impose restrictions on q . For a signalling scheme Φ we denote the set of all priors satisfying all obtained equality constraints from all signals as

$$\mathcal{Q}_{\Phi} = \{q \in \Delta_1^m \mid \forall v \in [s], \quad i, j \in [n] \text{ such that } f_i^{\zeta^v} > 0, \\ \sum_{k \in [m]} \phi_k^v (C_i^{\theta_k}(f_i^{\tilde{q}}) - C_j^{\theta_k}(f_j^{\tilde{q}})) q_k = 0, \quad \tilde{q} = q^{\zeta^v}, \}.$$

¹The same situation can be achieved by using a signalling scheme which supplies no information, for instance by setting $\phi_k^v = \frac{1}{s}$ for all v, k .

²An intuitive way to see this is as follows. For any q that satisfies a constraint of the form (6), it is clear that cq will satisfy the same constraint for any $c \in \mathbb{R}$. This is clearly not the case for the constraint $\sum_{k \in [m]} q_k = 1$

We give the following definition:

Definition III.1. (*q-identifying signalling scheme*): Given a set of roads \mathcal{R} , states Θ , cost functions \mathcal{C} , and a prior $q \in \Delta_1^m$, a signalling scheme $\Phi \in \text{CS}(s, m)$ is called *q-identifying* if the set $\mathcal{Q}_\Phi = \{q\}$.

The main focus of this paper is addressing the question ‘‘How can we design Φ so as to ensure that it is *q-identifying*?’’ Before we can discuss this however, we will first investigate the relation between the distribution p and the flow f^p .

A. Probability distribution and equilibrium

Our results build upon the upcoming lemma and the proposition that follows. The lemma shows that in our setting f^p depends in a continuous manner on p .

Lemma III.2. (*Continuity of p-WE*): Let \mathcal{R} , Θ , and \mathcal{C} be given. For every $\epsilon > 0$, there exists a $\delta > 0$ such that for any two distributions $\rho, \varphi \in \Delta_1^m$, we have

$$\|\rho - \varphi\| < \delta \Rightarrow \|f^\rho - f^\varphi\| < \epsilon.$$

In other words, the *p-WE* f^p depends in a continuous manner on the distribution p .

Proof. The result is a consequence of Corollary 5.5.12 in [20]. To see this, note that, as previously mentioned, the *p-WE* can be equivalently defined as the solution of a variational inequality (VI) defined by the expected cost C^p and the set \mathcal{H} . For a variational inequality problem $\text{VI}(F, \mathcal{K})$ defined by a continuous map F and a compact set \mathcal{K} , the cited result from [20] states that for any $\epsilon > 0$ there exists a $\delta > 0$ such that for any map G satisfying $\|G(x) - F(x)\| < \delta(1 + \|x\|)$ for all $x \in \mathcal{K}$, the solution set of $\text{VI}(G, \mathcal{K})$ is ϵ close to that of $\text{VI}(F, \mathcal{K})$. In our case, C_p is a continuous map, varying p can be seen as a perturbation to the cost C^p which satisfies the given condition, and the set \mathcal{H} is compact. Thus, continuity follows from the cited Corollary in [20]. ■

In the next result we show that when two different distributions induce the same WE, then any convex combination of these distributions will result in the same WE.


Proposition III.3. (*Distribution set corresponding to a p-WE is convex*): Let \mathcal{R} , Θ , and \mathcal{C} be given and let $\tilde{f} \in \Delta_1^n$. The set of distributions p such that $f^p = \tilde{f}$ is compact and convex.

Proof. For any distribution $p \in \Delta_1^m$ we have $f^p = \tilde{f}$ if and only if (3) is satisfied; i.e., if and only if the following holds:


$$\begin{aligned} C_i^p(\tilde{f}_i) &= C_j^p(\tilde{f}_j) \quad \text{for all } i, j \text{ such that } \tilde{f}_i, \tilde{f}_j > 0, \\ C_i^p(\tilde{f}_i) &\leq C_j^p(\tilde{f}_j) \quad \text{for all } i, j \text{ such that } \tilde{f}_i > 0, \tilde{f}_j = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

Let the matrix-valued map $C^{\text{mat}} : \Delta_1^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{n \times m}$ be defined as

$$C^{\text{mat}}(f) := \begin{pmatrix} C_1^{\theta_1}(f_1) & C_1^{\theta_2}(f_1) & \dots & C_1^{\theta_m}(f_1) \\ C_2^{\theta_1}(f_2) & C_2^{\theta_2}(f_2) & \dots & C_2^{\theta_m}(f_2) \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ C_n^{\theta_1}(f_n) & C_n^{\theta_2}(f_n) & \dots & C_n^{\theta_m}(f_n) \end{pmatrix}.$$



(a) A graph showing the relationship between the *p-WE* and the distribution p for a 2-road, 2-state scenario.



(b) A graph showing the relationship between the *p-WE* and the distribution p for a 4-road, 2-state scenario.

Fig. 2: Plots illustrating the regions of constant *p-WE* for cases discussed in Example III.4.

Then, $C^p(\tilde{f}) = C^{\text{mat}}(\tilde{f})p$ and so (8) can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned} (C_i^{\text{mat}}(\tilde{f}) - C_j^{\text{mat}}(\tilde{f}))p &= 0 \quad \forall i, j \text{ with } \tilde{f}_i, \tilde{f}_j > 0, \\ (C_i^{\text{mat}}(\tilde{f}) - C_j^{\text{mat}}(\tilde{f}))p &\leq 0 \quad \forall i, j \text{ with } \tilde{f}_i > 0, \tilde{f}_j = 0, \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

where $C_i^{\text{mat}}(\tilde{f})$ denotes the *i*-th row of $C^{\text{mat}}(\tilde{f})$. Since \tilde{f} is fixed, $C^{\text{mat}}(\tilde{f})$ is fixed, and we see that (9) imposes a number of affine equality and inequality constraints on p . In addition we have that Δ_1^m is a compact and convex set. Therefore the intersection between Δ_1^m and the set of distributions satisfying (9) is compact and convex, and it follows that the set of all $p \in \Delta_1^m$ such that $f^p = \tilde{f}$ is compact and convex. ■

We illustrate the implications of Proposition III.3 using the following examples.

Example III.4. (*Demonstration of Proposition III.3*): Consider a 2-road, 2-state network, with cost functions given by

$$\begin{aligned} C_1^{\theta_1}(f_2) &= 0.8f_2 + 0.7, & C_1^{\theta_2}(f_2) &= 0.1f_2 + 0.2, \\ C_2^{\theta_1}(f_1) &= 0.3f_1 + 0.2, & C_2^{\theta_2}(f_1) &= 0.5f_1 + 0.5. \end{aligned}$$

Figure 2a shows the relationship between the *p-WE* and the distribution p . Note that since there are only two states $p_2 = 1 - p_1$. Therefore a distribution p is defined completely by p_1 . The figure shows that the *p-WE* remains constant with

respect to p_1 in two convex regions, namely when $p_1 \leq 0.133$ and when $p_1 \geq 0.8$. In addition the p -WE for one of these regions is $f^p = f^{\theta_1} = (1, 0)^\top$ and in the other region we have $f^p = f^{\theta_2} = (0, 1)^\top$. This last property always holds for a 2-road, 2-state case, which is shown in Section IV.

Next we consider a 4-road, 2-state network, with the following cost functions:

$$\begin{aligned} C_1^{\theta_1}(f_1) &= f_1 + 1, & C_1^{\theta_2}(f_1) &= 0.4f_1 + 4, \\ C_2^{\theta_1}(f_2) &= 0.5f_2 + 1.7, & C_2^{\theta_2}(f_2) &= 0.5f_2 + 1.7, \\ C_3^{\theta_1}(f_3) &= 0.4f_3 + 1.8, & C_3^{\theta_2}(f_3) &= 0.4f_3 + 1.8, \\ C_4^{\theta_1}(f_4) &= 0.4f_4 + 3.5, & C_4^{\theta_2}(f_4) &= 0.6f_4 + 1. \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

Figure 2b shows the dependency between the distribution and the WE. We see that the situation has changed compared to the 2-road, 2-state case. Here we find a region in which the p -WE remains constant while not being equal to f^{θ_1} or f^{θ_2} or having all flows on one road. We do see that the sets of distributions in which the p -WE remains constant are convex, which is in line with Proposition III.3.

Although it is perhaps not directly apparent from Proposition III.3, a consequence of that result is that for any distribution which is not in a convex set where the p -WE remains constant, the associated p -WE is unique to that distribution. When such a flow is observed, we can derive the unique distribution which induced it. If a p -WE is observed that can be induced by multiple distributions, we can at best limit the distribution that induced the flow lies to a set. Thus regions of Δ_1^m where the p -WE remains constant are less helpful in identifying q , and should be avoided if possible, when attempting to design a q -identifying signalling scheme. •

B. Existence of a sufficient signalling scheme

Here we discuss the existence of signalling schemes that allow the TIS to identify q . Our strategy involves first showing existence for the simplified case where $\Theta = \{\theta_1, \theta_2\}$. We later use this result for the more general case $\Theta = \{\theta_1, \dots, \theta_m\}$, $m \in \mathbb{N}$ by designing our signalling scheme Φ in such a way that the resulting posteriors only assign positive probability to exactly two states. In the case $\Theta = \{\theta_1, \theta_2\}$, since we already have the equality $q_1 + q_2 = 1$, we only need to find one other equality constraint on q to identify it uniquely. In order to find it, it is necessary to induce a posterior which results in a positive flow on at least two roads. Note however, that this condition is not sufficient, since, as mentioned before, an equality constraint is not necessarily informative. For instance, consider a case where for the signal ζ^v and roads $i, j \in [n]$ with positive flow $f_i, f_j > 0$ we have

$$\phi_1^v(C_i^{\theta_1}(f_i^{\tilde{q}}) - C_j^{\theta_1}(f_j^{\tilde{q}})) = \phi_2^v(C_i^{\theta_2}(f_i^{\tilde{q}}) - C_j^{\theta_2}(f_j^{\tilde{q}})) = 0.$$

Then (7) is satisfied for any q and even though $f_i, f_j > 0$, this fact does not result in an informative equality constraint on q . In order to avoid such scenarios, we define the *informative flow set* \mathcal{F}_{inf} , or *informative set* for short, as

$$\mathcal{F}_{\text{inf}} := \{f \in \Delta_1^n \setminus \{f^{\theta_2}\} \mid \exists i \in [n] \text{ such that } f_i^{\theta_1} > f_i > 0\}. \quad (11)$$

The set \mathcal{F}_{inf} is the set of all flows $f \in \Delta_1^n$ such that there is at least one road $i \in [n]$ with positive flow $f_i > 0$ strictly

less than $f_i^{\theta_1}$, where we excluded the flow f^{θ_2} . Since we have $\sum_{j \in \mathcal{R}} f_j = 1 = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{R}} f_j^{\theta_1}$ and $f_j, f_j^{\theta_1} \geq 0$ for all $j \in [n]$ it follows that for any $f \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{inf}}$ there must also exist a road j such that $f_j > f_j^{\theta_1}$. It is this property of flows in \mathcal{F}_{inf} , together with the fact that the cost functions in \mathcal{C} are strictly increasing that will allow us to prove that if a posterior \tilde{q} results in a flow $f^{\tilde{q}} \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{inf}}$, then we obtain an informative constraint on q . This will be proven in Proposition III.7 at the end of this section.

Remark III.5. (Sufficiency of \mathcal{F}_{inf}): It is important to note here that it not necessary for a flow $f^{\tilde{q}}$ to lie in \mathcal{F}_{inf} in order to supply an informative equality constraint on q . For the 4-road, 2-state network in Example III.4 we highlighted the regions where $f^p \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{inf}}$ in Figure 3. Any flow f^p that can only be induced by a unique distribution p will, when observed, necessarily give informative constraints on p . However, we see that the region where $f^p \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{inf}}$ does not cover all distributions for which f^p is unique with respect to p . The set \mathcal{F}_{inf} will however be of special import in the coming results because under mild assumptions, we can identify conditions that allow the flow induced by a signal to be contained in \mathcal{F}_{inf} . •




Fig. 3: Plot illustrating the regions of constant p -WE for the 4-road, 2-state case in Example III.4. Note that at $p_1 = 1$ (resp. $p_1 = 0$) we have $f^p = f^{\theta_1}$ (resp. $f^p = f^{\theta_2}$). The shaded region of the graph shows the set of distributions for which $f^p \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{inf}}$, with \mathcal{F}_{inf} defined as in (11).

The next result considers the case $\Theta = \{\theta_1, \theta_2\}$, and shows the existence of a convex set of distributions p with nonempty relative interior that results in flows $f^p \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{inf}}$. This will be useful for the general case with more than two states, since we can design a signalling scheme in such a way that each signal induces a posterior assigning positive probability to only two states, allowing us to use this result for the 2-state case.

Lemma III.6. (Distributions leading to \mathcal{F}_{inf}): Let \mathcal{R} , Θ , and \mathcal{C} be given, where $\Theta = \{\theta_1, \theta_2\}$ and let $f^{\theta_1} \neq f^{\theta_2}$. Then, there exist probability distributions $\rho \neq \varphi$ such that for any $p_\lambda = \lambda\rho + (1 - \lambda)\varphi$, $\lambda \in (0, 1)$, and $p_\mu = \mu p^{\theta_1} + (1 - \mu)\rho$, $\mu \in [0, 1]$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} f^{p_\lambda} &\in \mathcal{F}_{\text{inf}}, \\ f^{p_\mu} &= f^{\theta_1}, \end{aligned}$$

where \mathcal{F}_{inf} is given in (11).

Proof. We first note that a distribution $p \in \Delta_1^2$ is completely defined by the value p_1 . Using this, p^{θ_1} is defined by $p_1^{\theta_1} = 1$, and we recall that f^{θ_1} is the corresponding p^{θ_1} -WE. Likewise p^{θ_2} is defined by $p_1^{\theta_2} = 0$ and f^{θ_2} is the corresponding p^{θ_2} -WE. The first step is to find the distribution ρ .

From Proposition III.3 we know that the set $\{p \in \Delta_1^2 \mid f^p = f^{\theta_1}\}$ is compact and convex. Since $f^{\theta_2} \neq f^{\theta_1}$ this implies that there exist a value $c > 0$ such that for any $p \in \Delta_1^2$, $p_1 \geq c$ implies $f^p = f^{\theta_1}$ and $p_1 < c$ implies $f^p \neq f^{\theta_1}$. We set $\rho = (c, 1 - c)$. This already shows $f^{\mu\rho} = f^{\theta_1}$ for all $\mu \in [0, 1]$.

Now we show that there exist a value $\varphi_1 < \rho_1$ such that for any distribution $p = (p_1, 1 - p_1)$ with $p_1 \in (\varphi_1, \rho_1)$ we have $f^p \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{inf}}$. To do so, we define the function $H(p) := \|f^{\theta_1} - f^p\|$. From Lemma III.2 we know that f^p changes continuously with respect to p . It follows that H is a continuous function. Consequently we have that for any $\epsilon > 0$ there exists a $\delta > 0$ such that $\|\rho - p\| < \delta$ implies $\|H(\rho) - H(p)\| < \epsilon$. Note that since $f^\rho = f^{\theta_1}$ we have $H(\rho) = 0$, so $\|H(\rho) - H(p)\| < \epsilon$ simplifies to $\|H(p)\| < \epsilon$. Next we will show that there exists $\epsilon_1 > 0$ such that when $f^p \notin \mathcal{F}_{\text{inf}} \cup \{f^{\theta_1}\}$, then $H(p) \geq \epsilon_1$.

Let $c_1 := \min\{(f_i^{\theta_1})^{1/2} \mid f_i^{\theta_1} > 0, i \in [n]\}$. Consider a p and corresponding flow f^p such that $f^p \notin \{f^{\theta_1}, f^{\theta_2}\}$. Since $f^p \in \Delta_1^n$, it follows that there exists an $i \in [n]$ such that $f_i^p < f_i^{\theta_1}$. In addition, if $f^p \notin \mathcal{F}_{\text{inf}}$, then $f_i^p = 0$ by definition. Consequently, $H(p) > c_1$. We write $c_2 := H((0, 1)) = \|f^{\theta_1} - f^{\theta_2}\| > 0$, where the strict inequality holds since $f^{\theta_1} \neq f^{\theta_2}$. Thus we have

$$f^p \notin \mathcal{F}_{\text{inf}} \cup \{f^{\theta_1}\} \Rightarrow H(p) \geq c_1 \geq \min(c_1, c_2) > 0. \quad (12)$$

Setting $\epsilon_1 = \min(c_1, c_2)$ we have $H(p) \geq \epsilon_1$ whenever $f^p \notin \mathcal{F}_{\text{inf}} \cup \{f^{\theta_1}\}$. By the continuity of H there exists a $\delta > 0$ such that $\|\rho - p\| < \delta$ implies $\|H(p)\| < \epsilon_1$. Now set $\varphi = (\varphi_1, 1 - \varphi_1)$ with $\varphi_1 := (\frac{\delta}{2})^{1/2}$. For any distribution $p_1 \in (\varphi_1, \rho_1)$, we have $\|p - \rho\| < \delta$ and so $H(p) < \epsilon_1$. Consequently, $f^p \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{inf}} \cup \{f^{\theta_1}\}$. Since $p_1 < \rho_1$, $f^p \neq f^{\theta_1}$ and so $f^p \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{inf}}$. This completes the proof. ■

Figure 3 can help us gain some intuition about the implications of Lemma III.6. Under the given assumptions, the result proves the existence of a set of distributions for which the induced flow is equal to f^{θ_1} , which in Figure 3 we see is the singleton set $\{(0, 1)\}$. The result then shows that at a distance of zero from this set, there is a convex set of distributions for which the induced flow is in \mathcal{F}_{inf} . In Figure 3 this would be all distributions inducing a flow in the rightmost shaded region.

We next present the main result of this section. In it we make use of Lemma III.6 to design a signalling scheme for which all but one of the signals gives an equality constraint on the prior, showing that there always exists a signalling scheme using m messages that is q -identifying.

Proposition III.7. (Existence of q -identifying signalling scheme): *Let \mathcal{R} , Θ , \mathcal{C} and q be given, and assume that $f^{\theta_1} \neq f^{\theta_2}$.³ Then, there exists a signalling scheme $\Phi \in \text{CS}(m, m)$ of m messages that is q -identifying.*

³By relabeling the states we can see that this assumption is equivalent to assuming that there are at least two states $\theta_k, \theta_\ell \in \Theta$ such that $f^{\theta_k} \neq f^{\theta_\ell}$.

Proof. Our proof will be constructive. Recall the matrix notation of the signalling scheme, that is, $\Phi = (\phi_k^v)_{v,k \in [m]}$, where ϕ_k^v is the (v, k) -th entry of the matrix and denotes the probability of sending signal ζ^v under the state θ_k . We will proceed row-by-row starting from the second row of Φ .

Step 1: Constructing the second row: Set $\phi_k^2 = 0$ for all $k \in [m] \setminus \{1, 2\}$. Using (5) we obtain the posterior distribution under the message ζ^2 as

$$q_1^{\zeta^2} = \frac{\phi_1^2 q_1}{\phi_1^2 q_1 + \phi_2^2 q_2}, \quad q_2^{\zeta^2} = \frac{\phi_2^2 q_2}{\phi_1^2 q_1 + \phi_2^2 q_2}, \quad (13)$$

$$q_k^{\zeta^2} = 0, \quad \text{for all } k \in [m] \setminus \{1, 2\}.$$

Since q_1 and q_2 are non-zero by assumption, one can tune ϕ_1^2 and ϕ_2^2 to induce any posterior $\tilde{q} = q^{\zeta^2}$ satisfying $0 < q_1^{\zeta^2} < 1$ and $q_1^{\zeta^2} = 1 - q_2^{\zeta^2}$. By construction we then have $\phi_1^2, \phi_2^2 > 0$. In the following, we will outline the procedure for tuning these parameters such that the flow induced by signal ζ^2 results in an informative equality constraint for the prior q .

Observe that when considering the signal ζ^2 , we have simplified the situation by removing the influence from all but the first two states on the posterior (by setting $\phi_k^2 = 0$ for $k = 3, 4, \dots$). That is, we have effectively reduced the analysis to a two state case, as analyzed in Lemma III.6. Consequently we can appeal to Lemma III.6 to conclude that there exists a posterior \tilde{q} , with $\tilde{q}_1 \in (0, 1)$, $\tilde{q}_2 = 1 - \tilde{q}_1$ and $\tilde{q}_k = 0$ for all $k = [m] \setminus \{1, 2\}$, such that $f^{\tilde{q}} \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{inf}}$, where \mathcal{F}_{inf} is given in (11). We fix ϕ_1^2 and ϕ_2^2 such that the posterior q^{ζ^2} is equal to such a posterior \tilde{q} . In that case, by definition of \mathcal{F}_{inf} , there exists a road i satisfying $0 < f_i^{\tilde{q}} < f_i^{\theta_1}$. Since $f^{\tilde{q}} \in \Delta_1^n$ it follows that there must be another road j satisfying $f_j^{\tilde{q}} > f_j^{\theta_1}$. Since $f^{\tilde{q}}$ is the \tilde{q} -WE flow and $f_i^{\tilde{q}}, f_j^{\tilde{q}} > 0$, we have from (3),

$$(C_i(f_i^{\tilde{q}}) - C_j(f_j^{\tilde{q}}))^T \tilde{q} = 0.$$

From (13) it follows that this is equivalent to

$$\begin{pmatrix} \phi_1^2 (C_i^{\theta_1}(f_i^{\tilde{q}}) - C_j^{\theta_1}(f_j^{\tilde{q}})) \\ \phi_2^2 (C_i^{\theta_2}(f_i^{\tilde{q}}) - C_j^{\theta_2}(f_j^{\tilde{q}})) \end{pmatrix}^T \begin{pmatrix} q_1 \\ q_2 \end{pmatrix} = 0, \quad (14)$$

where the denominator has been dropped, as it is the same in all terms. Next we show that

$$\begin{pmatrix} \phi_1^2 (C_i^{\theta_1}(f_i^{\tilde{q}}) - C_j^{\theta_1}(f_j^{\tilde{q}})) \\ \phi_2^2 (C_i^{\theta_2}(f_i^{\tilde{q}}) - C_j^{\theta_2}(f_j^{\tilde{q}})) \end{pmatrix} \neq \mathbf{0}, \quad (15)$$

which then implies that the constraint in (14) is an informative equality constraint on q . To obtain (15), note that since $f_i^{\theta_1} > 0$, by (3) we have

$$C_i^{\theta_1}(f_i^{\theta_1}) - C_j^{\theta_1}(f_j^{\theta_1}) \leq 0. \quad (16)$$

Since the functions $C_i^{\theta_k}$ are strictly increasing, we have

$$C_i^{\theta_1}(f_i^{\tilde{q}}) < C_i^{\theta_1}(f_i^{\theta_1}), \quad C_j^{\theta_1}(f_j^{\tilde{q}}) > C_j^{\theta_1}(f_j^{\theta_1}).$$

From (16) and the above, we then have

$$C_i^{\theta_1}(f_i^{\tilde{q}}) - C_j^{\theta_1}(f_j^{\tilde{q}}) < 0. \quad (17)$$

Since ϕ_1^2 and ϕ_2^2 are non-zero by construction it follows that (15) holds.

Step 2: Constructing rows 2 through m : For row $k \notin \{1, 2\}$, there exists a state θ_l with $l < k$ such that $f^{\theta_k} \neq f^{\theta_l}$. By setting $\phi_{k'}^k = 0$ for all $k' \notin \{k, l\}$ we can, similar to before, induce any posterior $\tilde{q} = q^{\zeta^k}$ such that $\tilde{q}_k = 1 - \tilde{q}_l$. We can then repeat the previous arguments to show that by tuning ϕ_k^k and ϕ_l^k we can obtain an informative equality constraint on q of the form

$$\begin{pmatrix} \phi_l^k (C_i^{\theta_l}(f_i^{\tilde{q}}) - C_j^{\theta_l}(f_j^{\tilde{q}})) \\ \phi_k^k (C_i^{\theta_k}(f_i^{\tilde{q}}) - C_j^{\theta_k}(f_j^{\tilde{q}})) \end{pmatrix}^\top \begin{pmatrix} q_l \\ q_k \end{pmatrix} = 0.$$

This equality constraint is necessarily linearly independent from the other equality constraints obtained in this manner. This can be seen by noting that the constraint generated by row k involves q_k , while the set of constraints generated by the rows $k' < k$ do not involve q_k by construction. Thus, in this manner we obtain $m - 1$ linear independent equality constraints q .

Step 3: Constructing the first row: Once we have constructed the rows 2 through m of the matrix Φ , we select the elements of the first row to ensure that each column of Φ sums to one. This is always possible, and a short procedure to do this is described in Algorithm 2.

Finally, note that with the $m - 1$ linearly independent equality constraints and the additional independent constraint $\mathbb{1}^\top q = 1$ derived from the condition that $q \in \Delta_1^m$ lies in the simplex, we obtain m constraints that uniquely identify q . ■

Remark III.8. In the proof of Proposition III.7 we make use of a specific kind of signalling scheme in which each signal except the first has a positive chance of being send only in two states, and the first signal is used to ensure that the signalling scheme satisfies all the required constraints. Mathematically, the signalling scheme belongs to the set

$$\mathcal{F}_{\text{sig}} := \{ \Phi \in \text{CS}(m, m) \mid \forall v \in [m] \setminus \{1\}, \exists k_v < v \text{ such that } f^{\theta_v} \neq f^{\theta_{k_v}}, \text{ and } \phi_v^v = 0 \Leftrightarrow k \notin \{v, k_v\} \}. \quad (18)$$

Such a scheme is used because for each signal, as mentioned, the situation is effectively reduced to a two state case, allowing for simpler analysis. Such a scheme is however, limited in that it can derive at most one equality constraint from a signal. If a signal can be send in more than two states, and the resulting equilibrium has flow on more than two roads, more information may be gained from one signal. Analysis however becomes more difficult, since it is not clear if and how the result of Lemma III.6 can be generalized to a case involving more than two states. •

C. Designing the signalling scheme

With existence of a q -identifying signalling scheme guaranteed under mild conditions, the next step would be to give guidelines for how such a scheme can be designed. For this purpose we provide Algorithm 1, which using observations of the flow under various signals, updates a signalling scheme until it is q -identifying. The algorithm uses signalling schemes in the set (18), and requires the assumption of Proposition III.7 that the WE corresponding to states θ_1 and θ_2 are different.

[Informal description of Algorithm 1]: The procedure starts with an initial $\Phi(0)$ of the form (18), such that for each signal $k \in [m] \setminus \{1\}$ exactly two elements in the k -th row of $\Phi(0)$ are non-zero. One of these elements is ϕ_k^k and the other is denoted $\phi_{\ell(k)}^k$ (cf. Line 1). At each iteration N , and for each row $k \in \mathcal{I}$, we check whether the flow f^{ζ^k} observed under the signalling scheme $\Phi(N)$ when sending signal ζ^k results in an equality constraint on q (cf. Line 7). If it does, then row k of $\Phi(N)$ is not updated in the for-loop and the ratio between ϕ_k^k and $\phi_{\ell(k)}^k$ remains the same for all subsequent iterations (cf. Lines 8 and 4). If not, then we consider two cases. In the first case, the flow $f^{\zeta^k} = f^{\theta_k}$ and the values ϕ_k^k and $\phi_{\ell(k)}^k$ are updated so as to increase the ratio $\phi_{\ell(k)}^k / \phi_k^k$ in signalling scheme $\Phi(N+1)$. In this way, the posterior induced by signal k in the next iteration will assign less probability to state θ_k . This increase in ratio is achieved in Lines 10 through 14. In the second case, $f^{\zeta^k} \neq f^{\theta_k}$ and we decrease the ratio $\phi_{\ell(k)}^k / \phi_k^k$ in Line 17. After modifying rows in the for-loop, the signalling scheme $\Phi(N+1)$ is updated in Line 20 so as to ensure that each column sums to unity while the ratios $\phi_{\ell(k)}^k / \phi_k^k$ are preserved. This is done using Algorithm 2.

The above explained procedure not only identifies the right signalling scheme, but can also determine the prior, since the set of linear inequality constraints obtained together with the observed flows define it uniquely. The following result establishes the correctness of Algorithm 1.

Proposition III.9. (Convergence of Algorithm 1): *Let \mathcal{R} , Θ , \mathcal{C} and q be given, and assume that $f^{\theta_1} \neq f^{\theta_2}$. Then, Algorithm 1 terminates in a finite number of iterations, denoted N_f , and the resulting signalling scheme $\Phi(N_f)$ is q -identifying.*

Proof. For a signal $k \in [m] \setminus \{1\}$, we look at the properties of f^{ζ^k} , $\text{low}_k(N)$, $\text{up}_k(N)$ and $r_k(N) := \frac{\phi_{\ell(k)}^k}{\phi_k^k}$ as the algorithm iterates. We first show that $\text{low}_k(N) \leq \text{up}_k(N)$ for all N , which holds by definition for the initial iterate. We suppress the argument N in the following few statements for the sake of convenience. Observe that the signalling scheme maintains the same sparsity pattern, of the form (18), in all iterations. That is, $\phi_i^k = 0$ for all $i \notin \{\ell(k), k\}$ and all iterations. This effectively reduces the analysis to that of a two-state situation, meaning that the posterior under signal ζ^k , denoted $\tilde{q} = q^{\zeta^k}$, satisfies $\tilde{q}_i = 0$ for all $i \notin \{\ell(k), k\}$ and any choice of $\phi_{\ell(k)}^k$, ϕ_k^k . From Lemma III.6 there exist constants $a_k \in (0, 1]$ and $c_k \in (0, 1)$ with $a_k > c_k$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{q}_k \geq a_k &\Rightarrow f^{\tilde{q}} = f^{\theta_k}, \\ a_k > \tilde{q}_k > c_k &\Rightarrow f^{\tilde{q}} \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{inf}}. \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

From (5), we have

$$\tilde{q}_k = \frac{\phi_k^k q_k}{\phi_k^k q_k + \phi_{\ell(k)}^k q_{\ell(k)}} = \frac{q_k}{q_k + \frac{\phi_{\ell(k)}^k}{\phi_k^k} q_{\ell(k)}}.$$

⁴Here we use θ_k and $\theta_{\ell(k)}$ instead of θ_1 and θ_2 respectively in the definition of \mathcal{F}_{inf} in (11).

Algorithm 1: Determine q -identifying Signalling Scheme

Initialize: An index set $\mathcal{I} = \{2, 3, \dots, m\}$, counter $N = 0$, lower and upper bounds $\text{low}_k(0) = 0$, $\text{up}_k(0) = \infty$ for all $k \in \mathcal{I}$, a signalling scheme $\Phi(0) \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{sig}}$ using (18)

- 1 For all $k \in \mathcal{I}$ set $\ell(k) \neq k$ such that $\phi_{\ell(k)}^k(0) \neq 0$
- 2 Compute f^{θ_k} for all $k \in [m]$ by solving VI($C^{\theta_k}, \mathcal{H}$)
- 3 **while** $\mathcal{I} \neq \emptyset$ **do**
- 4 Set $\phi_i^j(N+1) \leftarrow \phi_i^j(N)$ for all $i \in [m]$ and $j \in [m] \setminus \mathcal{I}$
- 5 **for** $k \in \mathcal{I}$ **do**
- 6 Obtain f^{ζ^k} under scheme $\Phi(N)$ and signal ζ^k
- 7 **if** $\exists i, j \in [n]$ such that $f_i^{\zeta^k} > 0$, $f_j^{\zeta^k} > 0$ and $C_i^{\theta_k}(f_i^{\zeta^k}) - C_j^{\theta_k}(f_j^{\zeta^k}) \neq 0$ **then**
- 8 | Set $\mathcal{I} \leftarrow \mathcal{I} \setminus \{k\}$
- 9 **else if** $f^{\zeta^k} = f^{\theta_k}$ **then**
- 10 | Set $\text{low}_k(N+1) \leftarrow \frac{\phi_{\ell(k)}^k(N)}{\phi_k^k(N)}$,
- | $\text{up}_k(N+1) \leftarrow \text{up}_k(N)$, and
- | $\phi_k^k(N+1) \leftarrow \phi_k^k(N)$
- 11 | **if** $\text{up}_k(N+1) = \infty$ **then**
- 12 | Set $\phi_{\ell(k)}^k(N+1) \leftarrow 2\phi_{\ell(k)}^k(N)$
- 13 | **else**
- 14 | Set $\phi_{\ell(k)}^k(N+1) \leftarrow$
- | $\frac{1}{2}(\text{low}_k(N+1) + \text{up}_k(N+1))\phi_k^k(N)$
- 15 | **end**
- 16 **else**
- 17 | Set $\text{up}_k(N+1) \leftarrow \frac{\phi_{\ell(k)}^k(N)}{\phi_k^k(N)}$,
- | $\text{low}_k(N+1) \leftarrow \text{low}_k(N)$, and
- | $\phi_k^k(N+1) \leftarrow \phi_k^k(N)$
- | $\phi_{\ell(k)}^k(N+1) \leftarrow$
- | $\frac{1}{2}(\text{low}_k(N+1) + \text{up}_k(N+1))\phi_k^k(N)$
- 18 **end**
- 19 **end**
- 20 Set $\Phi(N+1) \leftarrow \text{MSS}(\Phi(N+1))$
- 21 Set $N \leftarrow N+1$
- 22 **end**

Note that the influence of Φ on \tilde{q}_k is completely determined by the ratio $r_k = \frac{\phi_{\ell(k)}^k}{\phi_k^k}$ and that \tilde{q}_k is monotonically decreasing in r_k with $\lim_{r_k \rightarrow 0} \tilde{q}_k = 0$ and $\lim_{r_k \rightarrow 1} \tilde{q}_k = 1$. Thus, given (19), and the relationship between \tilde{q}_k and r_k , we deduce that there exist constants $b_k \geq 0$ and $d_k > b_k$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} r_k \leq b_k &\Rightarrow f^{\tilde{q}} = f^{\theta_k}, \\ d_k > r_k > b_k &\Rightarrow f^{\tilde{q}} \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{inf}}. \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

With this in mind, we now analyze the evolution of low_k and up_k . Note that low_k is only changed in line 10 of the algorithm. Here we set $\text{low}_k(N) = r_k(N)$ whenever $f^{\tilde{q}} = f^{\theta_k}$ and thus from (20), $\text{low}_k(N) \leq b_k$ for all N . Similarly, $\text{up}_k(N) = r_k(N)$ whenever $f^{\tilde{q}} \neq f^{\theta_k}$ and

Algorithm 2: MSS: Make Signalling Scheme

Input: A signalling scheme $\Phi \in \text{CS}(m, m)$ such that for all $k \in [m] \setminus \{1\}$ there exist $\ell < k$ satisfying $\phi_i^k \neq 0 \Leftrightarrow i \in \{\ell, k\}$ and $f^{\theta_k} \neq f^{\theta_\ell}$

- 1 Set $a = \max_{i \in [m]} \sum_{j \in [m] \setminus \{1\}} \phi_i^j$.
- 2 Set $\Phi \leftarrow \frac{1}{a}\Phi$
- 3 **for** $k \in [m]$ **do**
- 4 | Set $\phi_k^1 \leftarrow 1 - \sum_{j \in [m] \setminus \{1\}} \phi_k^j$
- 5 **end**

no equality constraint is obtained. As shown in the proof of Proposition III.7, whenever $f^{\tilde{q}} \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{inf}}$ we obtain an informative equality constraint. From (20) we then conclude that $\text{up}_k(N) \geq d_k$. We now have $\text{low}_k(N) < \text{up}_k(N)$ for all N . In fact, we have $(b_k, d_k) \subseteq (\text{low}_k(N), \text{up}_k(N))$ for all N . We also note that since $d_k > b_k$ we have $d_k > 0$ and $b_k < \infty$.

Now we look at the evolution of $r_k(N)$. We will show that $r_k(N) \in (b_k, d_k)$ for some finite N and at that iteration, we obtain an informative equality constraint corresponding to signal k . This in turn shows termination of the algorithm in finite number of iterations. Consider three cases: (a) $d_k = \infty$; (b) $b_k = 0$ and $d_k < \infty$; and (c) otherwise. In case (a), at any N , we have either $r_k(N) \in (b_k, d_k)$ and we find an informative equality constraint, or $r_k(N) \leq b_k$, implying $f^{\tilde{q}} = f^{\theta_k}$. In the latter case, $r_k(N+1) = 2r_k(N)$. Thus, there exists some \bar{N} such that $r_k(\bar{N}) > b_k$, implying $r_k(\bar{N}) \in (b_k, d_k)$. Similarly, in case (b), we have either $r_k(N) \in (b_k, d_k)$ or $r_k(N) \geq d_k$. In the latter case, $r_k(N)$ is halved for the next iteration and so in finite number of steps r_k reaches (b_k, d_k) . In case (c), the arguments for case (a) and (b) can be repeated to show that there exists \bar{N} such that $\text{low}_k(\bar{N}) > 0$ and $\text{up}_k(\bar{N}) < \infty$. Looking at the algorithm, we see that the quantity $\text{up}_k(N) - \text{low}_k(N)$ is halved in every subsequent iteration $N \geq \bar{N}$. Since $r_k(N)$ always belongs to the interval $(\text{low}_k(N), \text{up}_k(N))$, it then reaches the set (b_k, d_k) in a finite number of iterations yielding an informative equality constraint. Following these facts, we conclude that an informative equality constraint is found in finite number of iterations for each signal which completes the proof. ■

Remark III.10. (Practical considerations of implementing Algorithm 1): To implement Algorithm 1 in real-life, note that the TIS can only send certain signals at any time, as the probability of a signal is fixed by the probability of state occurring and the current signalling scheme. Therefore, in practice, the TIS cannot send all signals in an ordered manner at each iteration of the algorithm and then update Φ . Instead, it would be best to update a row of Φ after each instance of a game when the used signal does not induce a useful equality constraint. We have presented the algorithm in its current form, rather than the practically implementable one, to simplify the exposition of the main idea of the scheme. •

Example III.11. (Application of Algorithm 1 in 4-road 2-state case): To shed light on the conclusions of Proposition III.7 and the workings of Algorithm 1, we revisit the 4-road, 2-state case in Example III.4. Setting $q = (0.5, 0.5)^\top$, and using

the initial signalling scheme

$$\Phi(0) = \begin{pmatrix} 0.5 & 0.5 \\ 0.5 & 0.5 \end{pmatrix},$$

we go through the steps of Algorithm 1 to find a q -identifying signalling scheme. From (10) we derive $f^{\theta_1} = (0.8, 0.2, 0, 0)^\top$ and $f^{\theta_2} = (0, 0, 0, 1)^\top$. Using $\Phi(0)$ as a signalling scheme, (5) gives us $q^{\zeta^2} = \tilde{q} = (0.5, 0.5)^\top$. We can then use the functions $C_i^{\tilde{q}}(f)$ and (3) to find that $f^{\tilde{q}} = (0, \frac{5}{9}, \frac{4}{9}, 0)^\top$ is the flow observed after sending signal ζ^2 . Even though there is positive flow on two roads, the resulting constraint is not informative, since $C_2^{\theta_2}(\frac{5}{9}) - C_3^{\theta_2}(\frac{4}{9}) = 0$. In Figure 2b this can also be observed by noting that $\tilde{q} = (0.5, 0.5)^\top$ is in a region of distributions where the flow remains constant. We do have $f^{\tilde{q}} \neq f^{\theta_2}$ which means that we will update $\Phi(0)$ according to Line 17. Setting the values as prescribed there, we get $\phi_1^2(1) = 0.25$, $\phi_2^2(1) = 0.5$. In Line 20 we then update the first row to ensure that all columns of $\Phi(1)$ sum to one, and thus we arrive at

$$\Phi(1) = \begin{pmatrix} 0.75 & 0.5 \\ 0.25 & 0.5 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Using the new signalling scheme we find $q^{\zeta^2} = \tilde{q} = (\frac{1}{3}, \frac{2}{3})^\top$, resulting in $f^{\tilde{q}} = (0, \frac{32}{68}, \frac{23}{68}, \frac{13}{68})^\top$. Substituting $\phi_1^2(1)$, $\phi_2^2(1)$ and $f^{\tilde{q}}$ into (14), where we set $i = 2$, $j = 4$, we get

$$\begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{4}(\frac{32}{68} \cdot \frac{1}{2} + 1.7 - \frac{2}{5} \frac{13}{68} - 3.5) \\ \frac{1}{2}(\frac{32}{68} \cdot \frac{1}{2} + 1.7 - \frac{3}{5} \frac{13}{68} - 1) \end{pmatrix}^\top q = 0.$$

Solving this we find $q_1 = q_2$. Taken together with $q_1 + q_2 = 1$ this implies $q = (0.5, 0.5)^\top$. Thus, the q -identifying scheme exists and is obtained in one iteration of the algorithm. •

IV. INFERRING THE PRIOR: THE 2-ROAD, 2-STATE CASE

The previous section provided an iterative algorithm to arrive at a signalling scheme that is q -identifying. The method required observing, in each iteration, the equilibrium flow under various signals. While having access to such observations of flows is restrictive in practice, for a general setup, it is impossible to determine a q -identifying signalling scheme without them. However, this can be achieved for the particular case of 2-road, 2-state networks. This section lays out this idea in the main result, Proposition IV.4. The following result is the first step; it shows that if two distributions $\rho \neq \varphi$ induce the same WE, then under such an equilibrium, the entire flow is on only one road. It also shows that in this case the WE is equal to either f^{θ_1} or f^{θ_2} .

Lemma IV.1. (Characterizing unique p -WE caused by distinct distributions): Let $\mathcal{R} = [2]$, $\Theta = \{\theta_1, \theta_2\}$, and \mathcal{C} be given and assume $f^{\theta_1} \neq f^{\theta_2}$. We have the following:

- 1) If there exist two distributions $\rho \neq \varphi$ such that $f^\rho = f^\varphi = \tilde{f}$, then $\tilde{f} \in \{(1, 0), (0, 1)\}$.
- 2) If there exists a distribution ρ such that $f^\rho \in \{(1, 0), (0, 1)\}$, then $f^\rho \in \{f^{\theta_1}, f^{\theta_2}\}$.

Proof. Part 1: Consider two probability distributions $\rho \neq \varphi$ with $f^\rho = f^\varphi = \tilde{f} = (\tilde{f}_1, \tilde{f}_2)$. For the sake of contradiction,

assume $\tilde{f}_1 > 0$, $\tilde{f}_2 > 0$. From the WE condition (3), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \rho^\top (C_1(\tilde{f}_1) - C_2(\tilde{f}_2)) &= 0, \\ \varphi^\top (C_1(\tilde{f}_1) - C_2(\tilde{f}_2)) &= 0. \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

From the above, the vector $p_\lambda = \lambda\rho + (1 - \lambda)\varphi$ satisfies

$$(p_\lambda)^\top (C_1(\tilde{f}_1) - C_2(\tilde{f}_2)) = 0.$$

for any $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$. That is, for any vector in the affine hull of $\{\rho, \varphi\}$, the corresponding WE is \tilde{f} . Since $\rho_1 \neq \varphi_1$ and $\rho, \varphi \in \Delta_1^2$, the distributions $(0, 1)$ and $(1, 0)$ are in the affine hull of $\{\rho, \varphi\}$. Thus, under (21), we have $f^{\theta_1} = f^{\theta_2} = \tilde{f}$, contradicting our assumption. This establishes part 1.

Part 2: Let ρ be such that $f^\rho = (1, 0)$. The proof is analogous for the case when $f^\rho = (0, 1)$. For any $\bar{\rho} \in \Delta_1^2$ consider the following inequality:

$$\bar{\rho}^\top (C_2(f_2^\rho) - C_1(f_1^\rho)) \geq 0. \quad (22)$$

The above is satisfied for $\bar{\rho} = \rho$ as f^ρ is the ρ -WE and the inequality then represents the WE condition (3). Expanding (22) using $f^\rho = (1, 0)$ and $\bar{\rho} = (\bar{\rho}_1, 1 - \bar{\rho}_1)$, we get

$$\bar{\rho}_1(\alpha_1^2 + \beta_1^2 + \beta_2^1 - \alpha_1^1 - \beta_1^1 - \beta_2^2) \geq \alpha_1^2 + \beta_1^2 - \beta_2^2. \quad (23)$$

Note that for the coefficient on the left-hand side we have

$$\alpha_1^2 + \beta_1^2 + \beta_2^1 - \alpha_1^1 - \beta_1^1 - \beta_2^2 \neq 0, \quad (24)$$

since otherwise (23) and hence, (22) is satisfied for all $\bar{\rho} \in \Delta_1^2$. This implies that $(1, 0)$ is a $\bar{\rho}$ -WE for all $\bar{\rho} \in \Delta_1^2$ which contradicts the fact that $f^{\theta_1} \neq f^{\theta_2}$. Moving on, using (24) we deduce that there exists a value $\tilde{\rho}_1$ such that (23) holds with equality when $\bar{\rho}_1$ is replaced with $\tilde{\rho}_1$. Moreover, for $\bar{\rho}_1 < \tilde{\rho}_1$, the inequality (23) holds strictly, and whenever $\bar{\rho}_1 > \tilde{\rho}_1$, the inequality (23) does not hold, or vice versa. Since (23) holds for $\bar{\rho}_1 = \rho_1 \in [0, 1]$ and it does not hold for either $\bar{\rho}_1 = 1$ or $\bar{\rho}_1 = 0$, it follows that $\tilde{\rho}_1 \in [0, 1]$. Collectively, these facts imply that the inequality (23) is satisfied for exactly one of the two cases, $\bar{\rho}_1 = 0$ or $\bar{\rho}_1 = 1$. Since (23) and (22) are equivalent, the flow $f^\rho = (1, 0)$ is a WE under either distribution $(0, 1)$ or $(1, 0)$. Equivalently, $f^\rho \in \{f^{\theta_1}, f^{\theta_2}\}$, which completes the proof. ■




Fig. 4: A graph showing the relationship between the p -WE and the distribution p for the 2-road, 2-state case in Example III.4. The vertical lines mark the values of p_1 where the flow switches from being constant to changing with respect to p_1 .

Figure 4 illustrates the consequences of Lemma IV.1 for the 2-road 2-state case in Example III.4. It highlights the three regions for p : when $p_1 \in [0, 1.333]$ we have $f^p = (1, 0)^\top$; for $p_1 \in [0.8, 1]$ the flow is $f^p = (0, 1)^\top$; and in between these two regions, when $p_1 \in (0.133, 0.8)$, the flow does not remain constant, and in fact we have $f^p \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{inf}}$. The following result combines Lemma IV.1 and III.6 and formalizes the observation made above for the example.

Corollary IV.2. (Characterizing p -WE): Let $\mathcal{R} = [2]$, $\Theta = \{\theta_1, \theta_2\}$, and \mathcal{C} be given and assume $f^{\theta_1} \neq f^{\theta_2}$. For $p \in \Delta_1^2$, if $p \notin \{p^{\theta_1}, p^{\theta_2}\}$, then either $f^p \in \{(1, 0), (0, 1)\}$ or $f^p \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{inf}}$.

Guided by this observation we are interested in identifying the set of distributions $f^p \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{inf}}$. The next result gives an explicit expression for this set in the general case.

Lemma IV.3. (Characterizing distributions leading to \mathcal{F}_{inf}): Let $\mathcal{R} = [2]$, $\Theta = \{\theta_1, \theta_2\}$, and \mathcal{C} be given and assume $f^{\theta_1} \neq f^{\theta_2}$. Suppose the following conditions hold:

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_1^2 + \beta_1^2 + \beta_2^1 - \alpha_1^1 - \beta_1^1 - \beta_2^2 &\neq 0, \\ \alpha_2^2 + \beta_1^1 + \beta_2^2 - \alpha_2^1 - \beta_1^2 - \beta_2^1 &\neq 0. \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

Let q_{low} and q_{up} be defined as

$$q_{\text{low}} = \max(0, a), \quad q_{\text{up}} = \min(1, b), \quad (26)$$

where, a and b satisfy $a \leq b$ and are defined as⁵

$$\begin{aligned} a &= \frac{\alpha_1^2 + \beta_1^2 - \beta_2^1}{\alpha_1^2 + \beta_1^2 + \beta_2^1 - \alpha_1^1 - \beta_1^1 - \beta_2^2}, \\ b &= \frac{\beta_2^2 + \alpha_2^2 - \beta_1^2}{\alpha_2^2 + \beta_1^1 + \beta_2^2 - \alpha_2^1 - \beta_1^2 - \beta_2^1}. \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

Then, for a distribution $p = (p_1, 1 - p_1) \in \Delta_1^2$, we have $f^p \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{inf}}$ if and only if $p_1 \in (q_{\text{low}}, q_{\text{up}})$.

Proof. Let $p = (p_1, 1 - p_1) \in \Delta_1^2$. First we will show that

$$f^p \notin \{(1, 0), (0, 1)\} \Leftrightarrow p_1 \in (a, b). \quad (28)$$

In order to do so, let $a_p = (a, 1 - a)$ and $b_p = (b, 1 - b)$. By definition of a and b given in (27), one can deduce that

$$a_p^\top (C_1(1) - C_2(0)) = 0, \quad (29a)$$

$$b_p^\top (C_1(0) - C_2(1)) = 0. \quad (29b)$$

Note that a and b are not necessarily in $[0, 1]$, and consequently a_p and b_p are not necessarily in Δ_1^2 . Despite this fact, we can repeat the arguments made in part 2 of the proof of Lemma IV.1. That is, taking into account the condition (25), the equality (29a), and the fact that $a \leq b$, we reach the conclusion that for any distribution $p = (p_1, 1 - p_1) \in \Delta_1^2$ we have $f^p = (1, 0)$ if and only if $p_1 \leq a$. Similarly, we have that $f^p = (0, 1)$ if and only if $p_1 \geq b$. These two statements combined yield (28). We can use (28), and the assumption $f^{\theta_1} \neq f^{\theta_2}$ to show that $a < 1$, $b > 0$ and $a < b$. To see how, note that $a \geq 1$ would imply $f^{\theta_1} = f^{\theta_2} = (1, 0)$, which contradicts $f^{\theta_1} \neq f^{\theta_2}$. Thus we have $a < 1$, and

⁵The assumption $a \leq b$ is without loss of generality, since it can always be enforced by a relabeling of roads, if necessary. Note that both a and b are well-defined by assumption (i.e. the denominators are non-zero).

using similar arguments we see that $b > 0$. When $a = b$ we have $a_p = b_p$. Since $0 < b = a < 1$ we see that in this case $a_p = (a, 1 - a) \in \Delta_1^2$ is a valid probability distribution. However, since $f^{a_p} = (1, 0)$ and $f^{b_p} = (0, 1)$ this contradicts the uniqueness of the p -WE, and therefore $a \neq b$ which shows that we have $a < b$. We note that the previous observations also imply $0 \leq q_{\text{low}} < q_{\text{up}} \leq 1$.

Bearing (28) and the conclusion of Corollary IV.2 in mind, for $p \in \Delta_1^2$, $p_1 \in (a, b)$, we have $f^p \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{inf}}$ as long as $p \notin \{p^{\theta_1}, p^{\theta_2}\}$. This is true whenever $p_1 \notin \{0, 1\}$. Conversely, note that $p_1 \in \{0, 1\}$ implies $f^p \notin \mathcal{F}_{\text{inf}}$. Thus, we have that $f^p \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{inf}}$ if and only if $p_1 \in (a, b)$ and $p_1 \notin \{0, 1\}$ hold and, since we require $p \in \Delta_1^2$, we also have $p_1 \in [0, 1]$. Since $a < b$, and using the definition of q_{low} and q_{up} this is equivalent to saying $f^p \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{inf}}$ if and only if $p_1 \in (q_{\text{low}}, q_{\text{up}})$. ■

Revisiting the example in Figure 4, we get $a = 0.133$ and $b = 0.8$ from (27). We note that in general, these values can lie outside the interval $[0, 1]$. For instance, if $a < 0$ we arrive at a scenario where $f_1^p < 1$ for all $p \in \Delta_1^2$. Instead of dividing the distributions into three regions, we can then divide them into two regions and a single point, namely, a region where $f^p = (0, 1)^\top$, one where $f^p \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{inf}}$, and the point $p = p^{\theta_2}$. Such a scenario highlights the fact that conditions (25) in the above result do not need to hold. When one or both of the conditions are violated, this can be interpreted as a or b lying at $\pm\infty$, which does not change the result. Lemma IV.3 is nonetheless presented in this form to ease the exposition.

Next, using Lemma IV.3, and given some known minimum probability $c > 0$ that is assigned to each state under the prior q , the main result of this section gives conditions under which a signalling scheme is guaranteed to be q -identifying.

Proposition IV.4. (Designing signalling scheme): Let $\mathcal{R} = [2]$, $\Theta = \{\theta_1, \theta_2\}$, and \mathcal{C} be given and let the assumptions of Lemma IV.3 hold. In addition, assume $q_1, q_2 \geq c$. If the signalling scheme

$$\Phi = \begin{pmatrix} \phi_1^1 & \phi_1^2 \\ \phi_2^1 & \phi_2^2 \end{pmatrix} \in \text{CS}(2, 2)$$

satisfies

$$\frac{q_{\text{up}}}{1 - q_{\text{up}}} \frac{c}{1 - c} \phi_2^2 > \phi_1^2 > \frac{q_{\text{low}}}{1 - q_{\text{low}}} \frac{1 - c}{c} \phi_2^2, \quad (30)$$

where q_{up} and q_{low} are given in (26) and $q_{\text{up}} \frac{c}{1 - c} \phi_2^2 = \infty$ when $q_{\text{up}} = 1$, then Φ is q -identifying.

Proof. We write the posterior induced under the signal ζ^2 as $\tilde{q} = q^{\zeta^2}$. The aim of this proof is to show that when using a signalling scheme satisfying (30) we have $\tilde{q}_1 \in (q_{\text{low}}, q_{\text{up}})$, where q_{low} and q_{up} are defined in (26). We then appeal to Lemma IV.3 to conclude that $f^{\tilde{q}} \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{inf}}$. As argued in the proof of Proposition III.7, this will result in an informative equality constraint on q . This, along with $q_1 + q_2 = 1$, uniquely determines q and so, we conclude that Φ is q -identifying. As mentioned in the proof of Lemma IV.3 we have $0 \leq q_{\text{low}} < q_{\text{up}} \leq 1$. In other words, $(q_{\text{low}}, q_{\text{up}})$ is non-empty, and contained in $(0, 1)$.

To show that \tilde{q}_1 belongs to $(q_{\text{low}}, q_{\text{up}})$, we first prove that \tilde{q}_1 is a nondecreasing function of the first component of the

prior q_1 . To that end we use (5) and $q \in \Delta_1^2$ to write \tilde{q}_1 as a function of q_1 as follows:

$$\tilde{q}_1(q_1) = \frac{\phi_1^2 q_1}{\phi_1^2 q_1 + \phi_2^2 (1 - q_1)}.$$

Taking the derivative with respect to q_1 , we get

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial q_1} \tilde{q}_1(q_1) = \frac{\phi_1^2 \phi_2^2}{(\phi_1^2 q_1 + \phi_2^2 (1 - q_1))^2} \geq 0.$$

Using this monotonicity, and the assumption $q_1 \geq c$, we find

$$\tilde{q}_1 \geq \frac{\phi_1^2 c}{\phi_1^2 c + (1 - c)\phi_2^2}. \quad (31)$$

Thus it is sufficient to ensure $\frac{\phi_1^2 c}{\phi_1^2 c + (1 - c)\phi_2^2} > q_{\text{low}}$ to guarantee $\tilde{q}_1 > q_{\text{low}}$. The lower bound in (30) is obtained by rewriting (31). Using similar reasoning, $\tilde{q}_1 < q_{\text{up}}$ can be ensured by the upper bound in (30). This concludes the proof. ■

We conclude this section by using Proposition IV.4 to find a q -identifying signalling scheme for the example depicted in Figure 4, using $c = 0.2$. Substituting this value for c as well as $q_{\text{low}} = 0.133$ and $q_{\text{up}} = 0.8$ into (30) we get

$$\phi_2^2 > \phi_1^2 > 0.6154\phi_2^2.$$

To satisfy these inequalities we can for instance use

$$\Phi = \begin{pmatrix} 0.2 & 0 \\ 0.8 & 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

For any $q \in \Delta_1^2$ satisfying $q_1, q_2 > 0.2$, we now know that for the above signalling scheme $f^{\zeta^2} \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{inf}}$ and that we can therefore derive q by observing f^{ζ^2} .

V. CONCLUSIONS

In the context of routing games, we have investigated how a TIS can derive information about the prior beliefs of a population by observing the equilibrium flows induced by different public signals containing information about the state of the network. We have shown that under mild assumptions there always exist signalling schemes that will allow the TIS to fully learn the prior of the population. We have provided an algorithm for updating a given signalling scheme step by step in order to find a scheme sufficient for identifying the held beliefs. For the relatively simple two-road, two-state case and under some additional assumptions we have given conditions under which such a signalling scheme can be designed beforehand. We have used numerical examples to motivate our line of research and illustrate our results.

In the future, we aim to expand our results to more realistic scenarios, such as when only noisy observation of the WE are available, when private signalling schemes are used, when non-parallel networks are considered or edges have non-affine cost functions. Another interesting but challenging line of research is to investigate optimality of signalling schemes when balancing the objective of gaining information about the prior and minimizing the social cost.

REFERENCES

- [1] J. Macfarlane, "Your navigation app is making traffic unmanageable," *IEEE Spectrum*, pp. 22–27, 2019.
- [2] D. Acemoglu, A. Makhdomi, A. Malekian, and A. Ozdaglar, "Informational Braess' paradox: The effect of information on traffic congestion," *Operations Research*, vol. 66, no. 4, pp. 893–917, 2018.
- [3] E. Kamenica and M. Gentzkow, "Bayesian persuasion," *American Economic Review*, vol. 101, no. 6, pp. 2590–2615, 2011.
- [4] S. Das, E. Kamenica, and R. Mirka, "Reducing congestion through information design," in *Allerton Conference on Communications, Control and Computing*, pp. 1279–1284, 2017.
- [5] S. Vasserman, M. Feldman, and A. Hassidim, "Implementing the wisdom of Waze," in *International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, pp. 660–666, 2015.
- [6] O. Massicot and C. Langbort, "On the comparative performance of information provision policies in network routing games," in *Asilomar Conference on Signals, Systems, and Computers*, pp. 1434–1438, 2018.
- [7] H. Tavaafoghi and D. Teneketzis, "Strategic information provision in routing games," https://hamidtavaf.github.io/infodesign_routing.pdf, 2019.
- [8] Y. Zhu and K. Savla, "On the stability of optimal Bayesian persuasion strategy under a mistrust dynamics in routing games," in *Allerton Conference on Communications, Control and Computing*, pp. 92–99, 2018.
- [9] Y. Zhu and K. Savla, "A semidefinite approach to information design in non-atomic routing games," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2005.03000*, 2020.
- [10] M. Wu, S. Amin, and A. E. Ozdaglar, "Value of information in Bayesian routing games," *Operations Research*, vol. 69, no. 1, pp. 148–163, 2021.
- [11] H. Tavaafoghi, A. Shetty, K. Poolla, and P. Varaiya, "Strategic information platforms in transportation networks," in *Allerton Conference on Communications, Control and Computing*, pp. 816–823, IEEE, 2019.
- [12] G. Bianchin and F. Pasqualetti, "Routing apps may deteriorate stability in traffic networks: Oscillating congestions and robust information design," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2003.10018*, 2020.
- [13] K. Lam, W. Krichene, and A. Bayen, "On learning how players learn: estimation of learning dynamics in the routing game," in *ACM/IEEE International Conference on Cyber-Physical Systems*, pp. 1–10, 2016.
- [14] J. Thai and A. Bayen, "Learnability of edge cost functions in routing games," in *IEEE Conference on Decision and Control*, pp. 6422–6429, 2017.
- [15] L. J. Ratliff and T. Fiez, "Adaptive incentive design," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 66, no. 8, pp. 3871–3878, 2021.
- [16] S. Krichene, W. Krichene, R. Dong, and A. Bayen, "Convergence of heterogeneous distributed learning in stochastic routing games," in *Allerton Conference on Communications, Control and Computing*, pp. 480–487, 2015.
- [17] E. Meigs, F. Parise, and A. Ozdaglar, "Learning dynamics in stochastic routing games," in *Allerton Conference on Communications, Control and Computing*, pp. 259–266, 2017.
- [18] M. Wu and S. Amin, "Learning an unknown network state in routing games," *IFAC-PapersOnLine*, vol. 52, no. 20, pp. 345–350, 2019.
- [19] P. N. Brown and J. R. Marden, "Studies on robust social influence mechanisms: Incentives for efficient network routing in uncertain settings," *IEEE Control Systems Magazine*, vol. 37, no. 1, pp. 98–115, 2017.
- [20] F. Facchinei and J. S. Pang, *Finite Dimensional Variational Inequalities and Complementarity Problems, Volume 1*. Springer-Verlag, 2003.
- [21] M. J. Smith, "The existence, uniqueness and stability of traffic equilibria," *Transportation Research Part B: Methodological*, vol. 13, no. 4, pp. 295–304, 1979.
- [22] O. Massicot and C. Langbort, "Public signals and persuasion for road network congestion games under vagaries," *IFAC-PapersOnLine*, vol. 51, no. 34, pp. 124–130, 2019. IFAC Conference on Cyber-Physical and Human Systems 2018.