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Abstract. This paper studies generalized Nash equilibrium problems that are given by rational functions. Rational expressions for Lagrange multipliers and feasible extensions of KKT points are introduced to compute generalized Nash equilibria (GNEs). We give a hierarchy of rational optimization problems to solve rational generalized Nash equilibrium problems. The existence and computation of feasible extensions are studied. The Moment-SOS relaxations are applied to solve the rational optimization problems. Under some general assumptions, we show that the proposed hierarchy can compute a GNE if it exists or detect its nonexistence. Numerical experiments are given to show the efficiency of the proposed method.

1. Introduction

The generalized Nash equilibrium problem (GNEP) is a kind of games to find strategies for a group of players such that each player’s objective cannot be further optimized, for given strategies of other players. Suppose there are $N$ players and the $i$th player’s strategy is the real vector $x_i \in \mathbb{R}^{n_i}$. We write that

$x_i := (x_{i,1}, \ldots, x_{i,n_i}), \quad x := (x_1, \ldots, x_N)$.

Let $n := n_1 + \cdots + n_N$. When the $i$th player’s strategy $x_i$ is focused, we also write that $x = (x_i, x_{-i})$, where

$x_{-i} := (x_1, \ldots, x_{i-1}, x_{i+1}, \ldots, x_N)$.

A strategy tuple $u := (u_1, \ldots, u_N)$ is said to be a generalized Nash equilibrium (GNE) if each $u_i$ is the optimizer for the $i$th player’s optimization

$$F_i(u_{-i}) := \left\{ \min_{x_i \in \mathbb{R}^{n_i}} \ f_i(x_i, u_{-i}) \right\} \quad \text{s.t.} \quad x_i \in X_i(u_{-i}).$$

In the above, the $X_i(u_{-i})$ is the feasible set and $f_i(x_i, u_{-i})$ is the $i$th player’s objective. They are parameterized by $u_{-i} = (u_1, \ldots, u_{i-1}, u_{i+1}, \ldots, u_N)$. Each player’s optimization is parameterized by strategies of other players. We denote by $S$ the set of all GNEs and denote by $S_i(u_{-i})$ the set of minimizers for the optimization $F_i(u_{-i})$. The entire feasible strategy set is

$X := \{(x_1, \ldots, x_N) | x_i \in X_i(x_{-i}), i = 1, \ldots, N\}$.

A strategy tuple $x = (x_1, \ldots, x_N)$ is said to be feasible if each $x_i \in X_i(x_{-i})$. 
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This paper studies rational generalized Nash equilibrium problems (rGNEPs), i.e., all the objectives and constraining functions are rational functions in $x$. We assume the $i$th player’s feasible set is given as

$$(1.3) \quad X_i(x_{-i}) = \begin{cases} x_i \in \mathbb{R}^n_i & g_{i,j}(x_i, x_{-i}) = 0 (j \in I_0^{(i)}), \\ g_{i,j}(x_i, x_{-i}) \geq 0 (j \in I_1^{(i)}), \\ g_{i,j}(x_i, x_{-i}) > 0 (j \in I_2^{(i)}) \end{cases},$$

where $I_0^{(i)}, I_1^{(i)}, I_2^{(i)}$ are respectively the labelling sets (possibly empty) for equality, weak inequality and strict inequality constraints. For the rational function to be well defined, we assume all denominators are positive in the feasible set. If this is not the case, we can add strict inequality constraints for denominators. Rational functions frequently appear in GNEPs. When functions are polynomials, the GNEPs are studied in the recent work [37, 39, 40]. For convenience, rational functions are also called rational polynomials throughout the paper.

A special case of GNEPs is the Nash Equilibrium Problems (NEPs): each feasible set $X_i(x_{-i})$ is independent of $x_{-i}$. When NEPs are defined by polynomials, a method is given in [39] to solve them. For GNEPs given by convex polynomials, it is studied how to solve them in the recent work [40]. The Karush-Kuhn-Tucker (KKT) conditions are useful for solving GNEPs and NEPs. We refer to [7, 10, 11, 13, 48] for related work.

One may reformulate rGNEPs equivalently as polynomial GNEPs by introducing new variables or change the description of the feasible set. However, doing so may lose some useful properties. For instance, the convexity may be lost if we use polynomial reformulations. The following is such an example.

**Example 1.1.** Consider the 2-player rational GNEP

$$\min_{x_1 \in \mathbb{R}^2} \quad \frac{2(x_{1,1})^2+(x_{1,2})^2+x_{1,1}x_{1,2}e^T x_2}{x_{1,1}} \quad \min_{x_2 \in \mathbb{R}^2} \quad \frac{2(x_{2,1})^2+(x_{2,2})^2-x_{2,1}x_{2,2}e^T x_1}{x_{2,1}}$$

s.t. $x_{1,1} - \frac{x_{2,1}}{x_{1,1}} \geq 0,$  
$s_{1,1} > 0, \ x_{1,2} > 0,$  
$s_{2,1} - 1 \geq 0, \ x_{2,2} - 1 \geq 0.$

In the above, $e = [1 1]^T$. In the domain $(x_1, x_2) > 0$, each player’s optimization is convex in its strategy variable. We can equivalently express this GNEP as polynomial optimization

$$\min_{x_1 \in \mathbb{R}^3} \quad x_{1,1}(2(x_{1,1})^2+(x_{1,2})^2+x_{1,1}x_{1,2}e^T x_2) \quad \min_{x_2 \in \mathbb{R}^3} \quad x_{2,3}(2(x_{2,1})^2+(x_{2,2})^2-x_{2,1}x_{2,2}e^T x_1)$$

s.t. $x_{1,1}x_{1,2} - x_{2,1} \geq 0,$  
$s_{1,1} > 0, \ x_{1,2} > 0,$  
$s_{2,1} - 1 \geq 0, \ x_{2,2} - 1 \geq 0,$  
$x_{1,1}x_{1,3} = 1, \ x_{2,1}x_{2,3} = 1.$

where $e = [1 1 0]^T$. However, the above two optimization problems are not convex.

The GNEPs were originally introduced to model economic problems. They are now widely used in various fields, such as transportation, telecommunications, and machine learning. We refer to [1, 5, 6, 22, 28, 42] for recent applications of GNEPs. It is typically difficult to solve GNEPs. The major challenge is due to interactions among different players’ strategies on the objectives and feasible sets. The set of GNEs may be nonconvex, even for convex NEPs (see [39]). Convex GNEPs can be reformulated as variational inequality (VI) or quasi-variational inequality (QVI) problems [9, 29, 41]. A semidefinite relaxation method for convex GNEPs...
of polynomials is given in [10]. The penalty functions are used to solve GNEPs in [2][12]. An Augmented-Lagrangian method is given in [21]. The Nikaido-Isoda function related methods are given in [8, 47]. Newton type methods are given in [10,48]. An interior point method is given in [7]. The Gauss-Seidel type methods are studied in [14,37]. The Lemke’s method is used to solve affine GNEPs [44]. An ADMM-type method for solving GNEPs in Hilbert spaces is given in [4]. We refer to [11, 13, 16] for surveys on GNEPs.

Contributions. This paper focuses on generalized Nash equilibrium problems that are given by rational functions. In particular, when the functions are nonconvex, there is relatively few work for solving GNEPs. We propose a new approach for solving rational GNEPs. The optimization problems are not assumed to be convex. Our new approach is based on a hierarchy of rational optimization problems. Our major contributions are:

• First, we introduce rational expressions for Lagrange multipliers of each player’s optimization. These expressions can be used to give new constraints for GNEs.
• Second, we introduce the new concept of feasible extensions for some KKT points. More specifically, for a KKT point that is not a GNE, we extend it to the image of a rational function, such that the image is feasible on the KKT set. The feasible extension can be used to preclude KKT points that are not GNEs. For nonconvex rational GNEPs, the usage of rational feasible extensions is important for computing a GNE (if it exists) or for detecting its nonexistence.
• Third, the Moment-SOS relaxations are used to solve rational optimization problems that are obtained from using Lagrange multiplier expressions and feasible extensions of some KKT points. Unlike polynomial optimization, a rational optimization problem may have strict inequalities. We study properties of Moment-SOS relaxations for solving them.

The paper is organized as follows. Some preliminaries for moment and polynomial optimization are given in Section 2. A hierarchy of rational optimization problems for solving the GNEP is proposed in Section 3. Feasible extensions of KKT points are studied in Section 4. We show how to solve rational optimization problems in Section 5. Some numerical experiments are given in Section 6. Some conclusions and discussions are given in Section 7.

2. Preliminaries

Notation The symbol \( \mathbb{N} \) denotes the set of nonnegative integers. The symbol \( \mathbb{R} \) denotes the set of real numbers. For a positive integer \( k \), denote the set \( [k] := \{1, \ldots, k\} \). For a real number \( t \), \( \lceil t \rceil \) denotes the smallest integer not smaller than \( t \). We use \( e_i \) to denote the vector such that the \( i \)th entry is 1 and all others are zeros, use \( e \) to denote the vector of all ones. For a vector \( u \) in the Euclidean space, its Euclidean norm is denoted as \( \|u\| \). By writing \( A \succeq 0 \) (resp., \( A \succ 0 \)), we mean that the matrix \( A \) is symmetric positive semidefinite (resp., positive definite). Let \( \mathbb{R}[x] \) denote the ring of real polynomials in \( x \) and \( \mathbb{R}[x]_d \) denotes the set of polynomials with degrees not bigger than \( d \). For the \( i \)th player’s strategy vector \( x_i \), the notation \( \mathbb{R}[x_i] \) and \( \mathbb{R}[x_i]_d \) are defined similarly. For a polynomial \( p \in \mathbb{R}[x] \), we write \( p = 0 \) to mean that \( p \) is the identically zero polynomial, and \( p \neq 0 \) means that \( p \) is not
identically zero. The total degree of \( p \) is denoted by \( \deg(p) \) and its partial degree on \( x_i \) is denoted by \( \deg_{x_i}(p) \). For a function \( f(x) \), the notation \( \nabla_x f := (\frac{\partial f}{\partial x_i})_{i \in [n]} \) denotes its gradient respect to \( x_i \). For a set \( X \), we use \( cl(X) \) to denote its closure in the Euclidean topology. A property is said to hold \textit{generically} if it holds for all points in the space of input data except a set of Lebesgue measure zero.

Let \( z = (z_1, \ldots, z_l) \) stand for the vector \( x \) or \( x_i \). For a power \( \alpha := (\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_l) \in \mathbb{N}^l \), we denote that \( z^\alpha := z_1^{\alpha_1} \cdots z_l^{\alpha_l} \) and \( |\alpha| := \alpha_1 + \cdots + \alpha_l \). For a degree \( d \geq 0 \), denote the power set \( \mathbb{N}_d^l := \{ \alpha \in \mathbb{N}^l : |\alpha| \leq d \} \). We use \( [z]_d \) to denote the vector of all monomials in \( z \) whose degrees are at most \( d \), ordered in the graded alphabetical ordering, i.e., \( [z]_d := [1, z_1, \ldots, z_l, z_1^2, \ldots, z_l^d]^T \).

### 2.1. Ideals and quadratic modules

For a polynomial \( p \in \mathbb{R}[x] \) and subsets \( I, J \subseteq \mathbb{R}[x] \), define the product and Minkowski sum

\[
p \cdot I := \{ pq : q \in I \}, \quad I + J := \{ a + b : a \in I, b \in J \}.
\]

The subset \( I \) is an ideal if \( p \cdot I \subseteq I \) for all \( p \in \mathbb{R}[x] \) and \( I + I \subseteq I \). The ideal generated by a polynomial tuple \( h = (h_1, \ldots, h_m) \) is \( \text{Ideal}[h] := h_1 \cdot \mathbb{R}[x] + \cdots + h_m \cdot \mathbb{R}[x] \).

For a degree \( d \), the \( d \)th truncation of \( \text{Ideal}[h] \) is

\[
\text{Ideal}[h]_d := h_1 \cdot \mathbb{R}[x]_{d - \deg(h_1)} + \cdots + h_m \cdot \mathbb{R}[x]_{d - \deg(h_m)}.
\]

A polynomial \( \sigma \in \mathbb{R}[x] \) is said to be a sum-of-squares (SOS) if \( \sigma = p_1^2 + \cdots + p_k^2 \) for some \( p_i \in \mathbb{R}[x] \). We use \( \Sigma[x] \) to denote the set of all SOS polynomials in \( x \) and denote the truncation \( \Sigma[x]_d := \Sigma[x] \cap \mathbb{R}[x]_d \). The quadratic module of a polynomial tuple \( g = (g_1, \ldots, g_m) \) is \( \text{Qmod}[g] := \Sigma[x] + g_1 \cdot \Sigma[x] + \cdots + g_m \cdot \Sigma[x] \). Similarly, the degree-\( d \) truncation of \( \text{Qmod}[g] \) is

\[
\text{Qmod}[g]_d := \Sigma[x]_d + g_1 \cdot \Sigma[x]_{d - \deg(g_1)} + \cdots + g_m \cdot \Sigma[x]_{d - \deg(g_m)}.
\]

The polynomial tuples \( h, g \) determine the basic closed semi-algebraic set

\[
(2.1) \quad T := \{ x \in \mathbb{R}^n : h_i(x) = 0 \ (i \in [m_1]), g_j(x) \geq 0 \ (j \in [m_2]) \}.
\]

Clearly, every polynomial in \( \text{Ideal}[h] + \text{Qmod}[g] \) is nonnegative on the set \( T \). We denote by \( \mathcal{P}(T) \) the set of polynomials nonnegative on \( T \) and denote the truncation \( \mathcal{P}_d(T) := \mathcal{P}(T) \cap \mathbb{R}[x]_d \). Clearly, \( \text{Ideal}[h] + \text{Qmod}[g] \subseteq \mathcal{P}(T) \). The sets \( \mathcal{P}(T) \), \( \mathcal{P}_d(T) \) are convex cones, and \( \mathcal{P}_d(T) \) is the dual cone of the moment cone

\[
\mathcal{R}_d(T) := \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^M \lambda_i [u_i]_d : u_i \in T, \lambda_i \geq 0, M \in \mathbb{N} \right\}.
\]

When \( T \) is compact, the cone \( \mathcal{R}_d(T) \) is closed and it equals the dual cone of \( \mathcal{P}_d(T) \).

The set \( \text{Ideal}[h] + \text{Qmod}[g] \) is said to be archimedean if there exists \( p \in \text{Ideal}[h] + \text{Qmod}[g] \) such that the inequality \( p(x) \geq 0 \) defines a compact set. If \( \text{Ideal}[h] + \text{Qmod}[g] \) is archimedean, then \( T \) is compact. Conversely, if \( T \) is compact, say, \( T \) is contained in the ball \( ||x||^2 \leq R \), then \( \text{Ideal}[h] + \text{Qmod}[g, R - ||x||^2] \) is archimedean. When \( \text{Ideal}[h] + \text{Qmod}[g] \) is archimedean, if a polynomial \( p > 0 \) on \( T \), then \( p \in \text{Ideal}[h] + \text{Qmod}[g] \). This conclusion is referenced as Putinar’s Positivstellensatz [43].
2.2. Localizing and moment matrices. For an integer \( k \geq 0 \), a real vector \( y = (y_{\alpha})_{\alpha \in \mathbb{N}_k} \) is said to be a \textit{truncated multi-sequence} (tms) of degree \( 2k \). For a polynomial \( f = \sum_{\alpha \in \mathbb{N}_k} f_{\alpha} x^\alpha \), define the operation

\[
\langle f, y \rangle := \sum_{\alpha \in \mathbb{N}_k} f_{\alpha} y_{\alpha}.
\]

The operation \( \langle f, y \rangle \) is bilinear in \( f \) and \( y \). For a polynomial \( q \in \mathbb{R}[x]_{2k} \) (\( t \leq k \)) and a degree \( s \leq t - \lfloor \deg(q)/2 \rfloor \), the \( t \)th order localizing matrix of \( q \) for \( y \) is the symmetric matrix \( L_q^{(t)}[y] \) such that (the \( \text{vec}(a) \) denotes the coefficient vector of \( a \))

\[
\langle q a^2, y \rangle = \text{vec}(a)^T (L_q^{(t)}[y]) \text{vec}(a)
\]

for all \( a \in \mathbb{R}[x] \). When \( q = 1 \) (the constant one polynomial), the localizing matrix \( L_q^{(t)}[y] \) becomes the \( t \)th order moment matrix \( M_t[y] := L_1^{(t)}[y] \).

Localizing and moment matrices can be used to approximate the moment cone \( \mathcal{R}_d(T) \) by semidefinite programming relaxations. They are useful for solving polynomial and tensor optimization \[13, 23, 32, 36\]. We refer to \[25, 27\] for general introduction to polynomial optimization and moment problems.

2.3. Lagrange multiplier expressions. We review optimality conditions for non-linear optimization (see \[3\]). Frequently used constraint qualifications are the linear independence constraint qualification (LICQ) and the Mangasarian-Fromovitz constraint qualification (MFCQ). For KKT conditions, the strict inequality constraints can be ignored. For convenience of description, we write that \( \mathcal{I}_0^{(i)} \cup \mathcal{I}_1^{(i)} = \{1, \ldots, m_i\} \) and \( g_i = (g_{i,1}, \ldots, g_{i,m_i}) \). Under certain constraint qualifications, if \( x_i \) is a minimizer of \( F_i(x_{-i}) \), then there exists a Lagrange multiplier vector \( \lambda_i := (\lambda_{i,1}, \ldots, \lambda_{i,m_i}) \) such that

\[
\nabla_x f_i(x) - \sum_{j=1}^{m_i} \lambda_{i,j} \nabla_x g_{i,j}(x) = 0,
\]

\[
\lambda_{i,j} \perp g_{i,j}(x), \lambda_{i,j} \geq 0, g_{i,j}(x) \geq 0 (j \in \mathcal{I}_1^{(i)}).
\]

In the above, \( \lambda_{i,j} \perp g_{i,j}(x) \) means that \( \lambda_{i,j} \) is perpendicular to \( g_{i,j}(x) \). The system (2.4) gives the first order KKT conditions for \( F_i(x_{-i}) \). Such \((x_i, \lambda_i)\) is called a critical pair. Under the constraint qualifications, every GNE satisfies (2.4).

As in (2.4), each critical pair \((x_i, \lambda_i)\) of the optimization \( F_i(x_{-i}) \) satisfies

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
\nabla_x g_{i,1}(x) & \nabla_x g_{i,2}(x) & \ldots & \nabla_x g_{i,m_i}(x)
\end{bmatrix}
\begin{bmatrix}
\lambda_{i,1} \\
\lambda_{i,2} \\
\vdots \\
\lambda_{i,m_i}
\end{bmatrix}
= \begin{bmatrix}
\nabla_x f_i(x) \\
0 \\
\vdots \\
0
\end{bmatrix}
\]

If there exist a matrix polynomial \( T_i(x) \) and a nonzero scalar polynomial \( q_i(x) \) such that \( T_i(x)G_i(x) = q_i(x) \cdot I_{m_i} \), then (2.5) implies that \( q_i(x)\lambda_i = T_i(x)\tilde{f}_i(x) \). This gives the \textit{rational} Lagrange multiplier expression (LME):

\[
\lambda_i(x) := T_i(x)\tilde{f}_i(x)/q_i(x).
\]

At a point \( u \), if \( q_i(u) = 0 \), then \( T_i(u)\tilde{f}_i(u) = 0 \). The rational expression (2.6) always exists if each \( g_{i,j} \) is not constantly zero. There often exist different options for \( T_i(x) \) and \( q_i(x) \). For convenience of computation, we prefer those \( T_i(x) \) and \( q_i(x) \) with
low degrees. It is worthy to note that once the degrees are given, the equation $T_i(x)G_i(x) = q_i(x) \cdot I_m$ is linear in the coefficients of $T_i(x)$ and $q_i(x)$. We refer to [34] for Lagrange multiplier expressions.

3. A HIERARCHY OF OPTIMIZATION PROBLEMS

In this section, we propose a new approach for solving rational GNEPs. It requires to solve a hierarchy of rational optimization problems. They are obtained from Lagrange multiplier expressions and feasible extensions of KKT points that are not GNEs. Under some general assumptions, we prove that this hierarchy either returns a GNE or detects its nonexistence.

As shown in Subsection 2.3, one can express Lagrange multipliers as rational functions on the KKT set. Recall the set $X$ as in (1.2). For the $i$th player’s optimization $F_i(x_{-i})$, we suppose that there is a tuple $\tau_i = (\tau_{i,j})_{j \in I_0^{(i)} \cup I_1^{(i)}}$ of rational functions in $x$, with denominators positive on $X$, such that

$$\lambda_{i,j} = \tau_{i,j}(x), \quad j \in I_0^{(i)} \cup I_1^{(i)},$$

for each critical pair $(x_i, \lambda_i)$ of $F_i(x_{-i})$. Note that the Lagrange multipliers are zero for strict inequality constraints. The existence of the LME (3.1) can be implied by (2.6). They give the KKT set

$$\mathcal{K} := \left\{ x \in X \left| \nabla_x f_i = \sum_{j \in I_0^{(i)} \cup I_1^{(i)}} \tau_{i,j}(x) \nabla_x g_{i,j}(x), \quad i \in [N], \quad \tau_{i,j}(x) g_{i,j}(x) = 0, \quad \tau_{i,j}(x) \geq 0, \quad j \in I_1^{(i)} \right\}.$$

Not every point $u = (u_1, \ldots, u_N) \in \mathcal{K}$ is a GNE. How do we preclude non-GNEs in $\mathcal{K}$? We consider the case that $u$ is not a GNE. Then there exist $i \in [N]$ and a point $v_i \in X_i(u_{-i})$ such that

$$f_i(v_i, u_{-i}) - f_i(u_i, u_{-i}) < 0.$$

However, if $x := (x_1, \ldots, x_N)$ is a GNE and $v_i$ is also feasible for $F_i(x_{-i})$, i.e., $v_i \in X_i(x_{-i})$, then $x$ must satisfy the inequality

$$f_i(v_i, x_{-i}) - f_i(x_i, x_{-i}) \geq 0.$$

That is, every GNE $x$ satisfies the constraint (3.3) if $v_i \in X_i(x_{-i})$. This is used to solve NEPs in [39]. Unlike NEPs, the feasible set of $X_i(x_{-i})$ depends on $x_{-i}$. As a result, a point $v_i \in X_i(u_{-i})$ may not be feasible for $F_i(x_{-i})$, i.e., $v_i \not\in X_i(x_{-i})$, for a GNE $x$. For such a case, the inequality (3.3) may not hold for any GNEs. The following is such an example.

**Example 3.1.** Consider the 2-player GNEP

$${\min_{x_1 \in \mathbb{R}^2}} \quad (x_1,1 - x_1,2)x_2,1,2 x_2,2 - x_1^T x_1$$

$$\text{s.t.} \quad 1 - e^T x \geq 0, \quad x_1 \geq 0,$$

$${\min_{x_2 \in \mathbb{R}^2}} \quad 3(x_2,1 - x_1,1)^2 + 2(x_2,2 - x_1,2)^2$$

$$\text{s.t.} \quad 2 - e^T x \geq 0, \quad x_2 \geq 0.$$

It has only two GNEs $x^* = (x_1^*, x_2^*)$:

$$x_1^* = x_2^* = (0.5, 0) \quad \text{and} \quad x_1^* = x_2^* = (0, 0.5).$$

Consider the point $u = (u_1, u_2) \in \mathcal{K}$, with $u_1 = u_2 = (0, 0)$. The $u_1$ is not a minimizer of $F_1(u_2)$, so $u$ is not a GNE. The optimizers of $F_1(u_2)$ are $v_1 = (1, 0)$ and $(0, 1)$. One can check that for either GNE $x^*$, it holds that

$$v_1 \not\in X_1(x_2^*), \quad f_1(v_1, x_2^*) - f_1(x_1^*, x_2^*) = -0.75 < 0.$$
The inequality (3.3) does not hold for any GNE.

The above example shows that the constraint (3.3) may not hold for any GNE. However, if there is a function $p_i$ in $x$ such that
\begin{equation}
(3.4)
  v_i = p_i(u), \quad p_i(x) \in X_i(x_{-i}) \quad \text{for all } x \in K,
\end{equation}
then the following inequality
\begin{equation}
(3.5)
  f_i(p_i(x), x_{-i}) - f_i(x_i, x_{-i}) \geq 0
\end{equation}
separates GNEs and non-GNEs. This is because $f_i(x_i, x_{-i}) \leq f_i(p_i(x), x_{-i})$ for every GNE $x$, since $p_i(x) \in X_i(x_{-i})$. This motivates us to make the following assumption.

Assumption 3.2. For a given triple $(u, i, v_i)$, with $u \in K$, $i \in [N]$ and $v_i \in S_i(u_{-i})$, there exists a vector function $p_i$ in $x := (x_1, \ldots, x_N)$ such that (3.4) holds.

The function $p_i$ satisfying (3.4) is called a feasible extension of $v_i$ at the point $u$. This kind of functions are useful for solving bilevel optimization [38]. In Section 4, we will discuss the existence and computation of such $p_i$.

3.1. An algorithm for solving GNEPs. Based on LMEs and feasible extensions, we propose the following algorithm for solving GNEPs.

Algorithm 3.3. For the given GNEP of (1.1), do the following:

Step 0 Find the Lagrange multiplier expressions as in (3.1). Let $U := K$ and $k := 0$. Choose a generic positive definite matrix $\Theta$ of length $n + 1$.

Step 1 Solve the following optimization (note $[x]_1 = [1 \quad x^T]^T$)
\begin{equation}
(3.6)
\begin{cases}
\min [x]_1^T \Theta [x]_1 \\
\text{s.t. } x \in U.
\end{cases}
\end{equation}
If (3.6) is infeasible, output that either (1.1) has no GNEs or there is no GNE in the set $K$. Otherwise, solve it for a minimizer $u := (u_1, \ldots, u_N)$, if it exists.

Step 2 For each $i = 1, \ldots, N$, solve the following optimization
\begin{equation}
(3.7)
\begin{cases}
\delta_i := \min f_i(x_i, u_{-i}) - f_i(u_i, u_{-i}) \\
\text{s.t. } x_i \in X_i(u_{-i})
\end{cases}
\end{equation}
for a minimizer $v_i$. Denote the label set
\begin{equation}
(3.8)
\mathcal{N} := \{ i \in [N] : \delta_i < 0 \}.
\end{equation}
If $\mathcal{N} = \emptyset$, then $u$ is a GNE and stop; otherwise, go to Step 3.

Step 3 For every above triple $(u, i, v_i)$ with $i \in \mathcal{N}$, find a rational feasible extension $p_i$ satisfying (3.4). Then update the set $\mathcal{U}$ as
\begin{equation}
(3.9)
\mathcal{U} := \mathcal{U} \cap \{ f_i(p_i(x), x_{-i}) - f_i(x_i, x_{-i}) \geq 0, i \in \mathcal{N} \}.
\end{equation}
Then, let $k := k + 1$ and go to Step 1.

In Step 0, we can let $\Theta := R^T R$ for a randomly generated square matrix $R$. Then the function $[x]_1^T \Theta [x]_1$ is generically coercive and strictly convex in $x$. The optimization (3.6) may have constraints given by rational polynomials or it may have strict inequality constraints. The optimization (3.7) may have both rational objective and rational constraints. They can be solved by Moment-SOS relaxations. We discuss how to solve them in Section 5.
If a GNE is a KKT point, i.e., it belongs to the set $\mathcal{K}$ as in \((3.2)\), then it belongs to the set $\mathcal{W}$ in every loop. In other words, the update of $\mathcal{W}$ in Algorithm 3.3 does not preclude any GNEs. The set $\mathcal{W}$ stays nonempty if there is a GNE lying in $\mathcal{K}$.

### 3.2. Convergence analysis

We now study the convergence of Algorithm 3.3.

First, an interesting case is the convex rational GNEP. A GNEP is said to be convex if every player’s optimization problem is convex: for each fixed $x_{-i}$, the objective $f_i(x_i,x_{-i})$ is convex in $x_i$, the inequality constraining functions in \((1.3)\) are concave in $x_i$ and all equality constraining functions are linear in $x_i$. Interestingly, the concavity of constraining functions can be weakened to the convexity of feasible sets under certain assumptions. As in \([24]\), for given $x_{-i}$, the feasible set $X_i(x_{-i})$ is said to be nondegenerate if the gradient $\nabla_{x_i}g_{i,j}(x) \neq 0$ for every $j \in I_0^{(i)} \cup I_1^{(i)}$. The set $X_i(x_{-i})$ is said to satisfy the Slater’s condition if it contains a point that makes all inequalities strictly hold.

**Theorem 3.4.** Assume the Lagrange multipliers are expressed as in \((3.1)\). Suppose that each objective $f_i$ is convex in $x_i$, each $g_{i,j}$ is linear in $x_i$ for $j \in I_0^{(i)}$, and each strategy set $X_i(x_{-i})$ is convex, nondegenerate and satisfies the Slater’s condition. Then, Algorithm 3.3 terminates at the initial loop $k = 0$, and it either returns a GNE or detects nonexistence of GNEs.

**Proof.** Under the given assumptions, a feasible point is a minimizer of the optimization $F_i(x_{-i})$ if and only if it is a KKT point. This is shown in \([24]\). Equivalently, a point is a GNE if and only if it belongs to the set $\mathcal{K}$. If there is a GNE, Algorithm 3.3 can get one in Step 2 for the initial loop $k = 0$, and then it terminates. If there is no GNE, the KKT point set $\mathcal{K}$ is empty, then Algorithm 3.3 terminates in Step 1 for the initial loop. $\square$

Second, we prove that Algorithm 3.3 terminates within finitely many loops under a finiteness assumption on critical points. It is known that a general polynomial optimization problem has finitely many KKT points (see \([35]\)). Recall that $\mathcal{S}$ denotes the set of all GNEs. When the complement $K \setminus \mathcal{S}$ is a finite set, Algorithm 3.3 must terminate within finitely many loops.

**Theorem 3.5.** Assume the Lagrange multipliers are expressed as in \((3.1)\). Suppose Assumption 3.2 holds for every triple $(u,i,v_i)$ produced by Algorithm 3.3. If the complement set $K \setminus \mathcal{S}$ is finite, then Algorithm 3.3 must terminate within finitely many loops, and it either returns a GNE or detects its nonexistence.

**Proof.** When $K \setminus \mathcal{S}$ is finite, the algorithm terminates in the initial loop $k = 0$. When $K \setminus \mathcal{S}$ is finite, then Algorithm 3.3 must terminate within finitely many loops, and it either returns a GNE or detects its nonexistence. $\square$

The set $\mathcal{W}$ is updated with the newly added constraint

$$f_i(p_i(x),x_{-i}) - f(x_i,x_{-i}) \geq 0.$$ 

The point $u$ does not belong to $\mathcal{W}$ for all future loops. The cardinality of the set $K \setminus \mathcal{W}$ decreases at least by one, after each loop. Note that $\mathcal{W} \subseteq K$. Therefore, if $K \setminus \mathcal{S}$ is a finite set, then Algorithm 3.3 must terminate within finitely many loops.

Next, suppose Algorithm 3.3 terminates with a minimizer $u$ in Step 2. Then $\delta_i \geq 0$ for all $i$, so every $u_i$ is a minimizer of $F_i(u_{-i})$, i.e., $u$ is a GNE. $\square$
The KKT point set is finite for general polynomial optimization problems. For some special problems, it may be infinite. When the complement set $\mathcal{K}\setminus\mathcal{S}$ is infinite, Algorithm 3.3 may not be guaranteed to terminate within finitely many loops. However, we can prove its asymptotic convergence under certain assumptions. For each $i = 1, \ldots, N$, we define the $i$th player’s value function

$$\nu_i(x_{-i}) := \inf_{x_i \in X_i(x_{-i})} f_i(x_i, x_{-i}).$$

The function $\nu_i(x_{-i})$ is continuous under certain conditions, e.g., under the restricted inf-compactness (RIC) condition (see [17, Definition 3.13]). A sequence of functions $\{\phi_i(x)\}$ is said to be uniformly continuous at a point $x^*$ if for each $\epsilon > 0$, there exists $\tau > 0$ such that $\|\phi_i(x) - \phi_i(x^*)\| < \epsilon$ for all $k$ and for all $x$ with $\|x - x^*\| < \tau$. The following is the asymptotic convergence result.

**Theorem 3.6.** For the GNEP (1.1), suppose Lagrange multipliers can be expressed as in (3.11) and Assumption 3.2 holds for every triple $(u, i, v_i)$ produced by Algorithm 3.3. In the $k$th loop, let $u^{(k)}$, $v_i^{(k)}$ be the minimizers of (3.6), (3.7) respectively and let $p_i^{(k)}$ be the feasible extension in Step 3. Suppose $u^* := (u_1^*, \ldots, u_N^*)$ is an accumulation point of the sequence $\{u^{(k)}\}_{k=1}^\infty$. If for each $i = 1, \ldots, N$,

i) the strict inequality $g_{i,j}(u^*) > 0$ holds for all $j \in I^i_2$,

ii) the value function $\nu_i(x_{-i})$ is continuous at $u^*_{-i}$, and

iii) the sequence of feasible extensions $\{p_i^{(k)}\}_{k=1}^\infty$ is uniformly continuous at $u^*$, then $u^*$ is a GNE for (1.1).

**Proof.** Up to selection of a subsequence, we can generally assume that $u^{(k)} \to u^*$ as $k \to \infty$. The condition i) implies that $u^* \in X$ and $u_i^* \in X_i(u^*_{-i})$ for every $i$. We need to show that each $u_i^*$ is a minimizer for the optimization $F_i(u^*_{-i})$. By the definition of $\nu_i$ as in (3.10), this is equivalent to showing that

$$\nu_i(u^*_{-i}) - f_i(u^*) \geq 0, \quad i = 1, \ldots, N.$$  

For convenience of notation, let $p_i^{(k)} = x_i$ for each $i \not\in N$, in the $k$th loop. Since $u^{(k)}$ is feasible for (3.3) in all previous loops, we have that

$$f_i(p_i^{(k)}(u^{(k)}), u^*_{-i}) - f_i(u^{(k)}) \geq 0, \quad \text{for all } k' \leq k.$$

As $k \to \infty$, the above implies that

$$f_i(p_i^{(k)}(u^*), u^*_{-i}) - f_i(u^*) \geq 0, \quad \text{for all } k'.$$

Then, for every $i$ and for every $k \in \mathbb{N},$

$$\nu_i(u^*_{-i}) - f_i(u^*)$$

$$\geq (\nu_i(u^*_{-i}) - f_i(p_i^{(k)}(u^*), u^*_{-i})) + (f_i(p_i^{(k)}(u^*), u^*_{-i}) - f_i(u^*))$$

$$\geq \nu_i(u^*_{-i}) - f_i(p_i^{(k)}(u^*), u^*_{-i}).$$

Note that $\nu_i(u^{(k)}_{-i}) = f_i(p_i^{(k)}(u^{(k)}), u^*_{-i})$ for all $k$. Under the continuity assumption of $\nu_i$ at $u^*_{-i}$, the convergence $u^{(k)} \to u^*$ implies that

$$\nu_i(u^*_{-i}) = \lim_{k \to \infty} \nu_i(u^{(k)}_{-i}) = \lim_{k \to \infty} f_i(p_i^{(k)}(u^{(k)}), u^{(k)}_{-i}).$$
Because \( \{p_i^{(k)}\}_{k=1}^{\infty} \) is uniformly continuous at \( u^* \), for every fixed \( \epsilon > 0 \), there exists \( \tau > 0 \) such that for all \( k \) big enough, we have
\[
\|u^* - u^{(k)}\| \leq \tau, \quad \|p_i^{(k)}(u^*) - p_i^{(k)}(u^{(k)})\| < \epsilon.
\]
Since \( f_i \) is rational and the denominator is positive on \( X \), we have
\[
f_i(p_i^{(k)}(u^*), u_i^{*}) - f_i(p_i^{(k)}(u^{(k)}), u_i^{*}) \to 0 \quad \text{as} \quad k \to \infty.
\]
In view of the inequality (3.12), we can conclude that \( \nu_i(u_i^{*}) - f_i(u^*) \geq 0 \). This shows that \( u^* \) is a GNE.

We would like to remark that Theorems 3.4 and 3.5 only give sufficient conditions for Algorithm 3.3 to terminate within finitely many loops. But these conditions are not necessary. In fact, in all our numerical experiments, Algorithm 3.3 always terminated successfully within a few loops.

4. FEASIBLE EXTENSIONS OF KKT POINTS

In this section, we discuss the existence and computation of feasible extensions \( p_i \) required as in Assumption 3.2. They are important for solving GNEPs.

4.1. Some common cases. The feasible extensions in Assumption 3.2 can be explicitly given for some common cases of optimization problems. Suppose the triple \((u, i, v)\) is given.

Box constraints Suppose the feasible set of \( F_i(x_{-i}) \) is
\[
a(x_{-i}) \leq A(x_{-i})x_i \leq b(x_{-i}),
\]
where \( a, b \in \mathbb{R}[x_{-i}]^m, A \in \mathbb{R}[x_{-i}]^{m_i \times m} \). Suppose \( A(x_{-i}) \) has full row rank for all \( x \in X \) and there is a matrix polynomial \( B_0(x_{-i}) \) such that
\[
B(x_{-i}) := \begin{bmatrix} A(x_{-i})^T & B_0(x_{-i}) \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}[x_{-i}]^{n_i \times n_i}
\]
is nonsingular for all \( x \in X \). Let \( \mu := (\mu_1, \ldots, \mu_{n_i}) \) be the vector such that
\[
(b_j(u_{-i}) - a_j(u_{-i})) \cdot \mu_j = (b(u_{-i}) - B(u_{-i})^T v_i)_j.
\]
For the case \( a_j(u_{-i}) = b_j(u_{-i}) \), we just let \( \mu_j = 0 \). Since \( v_i \in X_i(u_{-i}) \), it is clear that each \( \mu_j \in [0, 1] \). Then we choose \( p_i \) as
\[
p_i = B(x_{-i})^{-T} \hat{p}_i,
\]
where \( \hat{p}_i = (\hat{p}_{i,1}, \ldots, \hat{p}_{i,n_i}) \) is defined by
\[
\hat{p}_{i,j}(x) := \mu_j a_j(x_{-i}) + (1 - \mu_j) b_j(x_{-i}).
\]
One can check that \( p_i(u) = v_i \) and \( p_i(x) \in X_i(x_{-i}) \) for all \( x \in \mathcal{K} \subseteq X \).

Simplex constraints Suppose the feasible set \( X_i(x_{-i}) \) is given as
\[
d(x_{-i})^T x_i \leq b(x_{-i}), \quad c_j(x_{-i})x_{i,j} \geq a_j(x_{-i}), \quad j \in [n_i].
\]
In the above, \( b \in \mathbb{R}[x_{-i}], a = (a_1, \ldots, a_{n_i}), c = (c_1, \ldots, c_{n_i}) \) and \( d \) are vectors of polynomials in \( x_{-i} \). Assume \( c(x_{-i}), d(x_{-i}) > 0 \) for all \( x = (x_i, x_{-i}) \in X \). For convenience, use \( \odot \) to denote the entrywise product, i.e.,
\[
(c^{-1} \odot a)(x_{-i}) := (c^{-1}_1(x_{-i})a_1(x_{-i}), \ldots, c^{-1}_{n_i}(x_{-i})a_{n_i}(x_{-i}))^T.
\]
Let \( \mu := (\mu_1, \ldots, \mu_{n_i}) \) be vector such that
\[
((b - d^T c^{-1} \odot a)(u_{-i})) \cdot \mu_j = v_{i,j} - (c^{-1}_j a_j)(u_{-i}).
\]
Proof. 

Theorem 4.1. \( u \in K \) is a polynomial vector function in \( K \) the general case that the KKT set extensions in Assumption 3.2 can be shown under some assumptions. We consider 4.2.

Ball constraints Suppose \( X_i(x_i) \) is given as
\[
\sum_{j=1}^{n_i} (a_j(x_i)x_{i,j} - c_j(x_i))^2 \leq (R(x_i))^2,
\]
where \( R \in \mathbb{R}[x_{-i}] \), and \( a = (a_1, \ldots, a_{n_i}) \), \( c = (c_1, \ldots, c_{n_i}) \) are vectors of rational functions in \( x_{-i} \). Assume \( a_j(x_i) \neq 0 \) on \( X \). Let \( \mu \) be such that
\[
||a(u_{-i}) \odot v_i - c(u_{-i})|| = \mu |R(u_{-i})|, \quad 0 \leq \mu \leq 1.
\]
Then choose scalars \((s_1, \ldots, s_{n_i})\) such that
\[
||a(u_{-i}) \odot v_i - c(u_{-i})|| \cdot s_j = a_j(u_{-i})v_{i,j} - c_j(u_{-i}).
\]
For the case ||\(a(u_{-i}) \odot v_i - c(u_{-i})|| = 0\), just let \( s_j = 1/\sqrt{n_i} \). Then we can choose \( p_i := (p_{i,1}, \ldots, p_{i,n_i}) \) as
\[
p_{i,j}(x) := (c_j(x_i) + s_j \cdot R(x_i)) / a_j(x_i).
\]
One can verify that \( p_i(u) = v_i \) and \( p_i(x) \in X_i(x_i) \) for all \( x \in K \subseteq X \).

4.2. The existence of feasible extensions. The existence of rational feasible extensions in Assumption 3.2 can be shown under some assumptions. We consider the general case that the KKT set \( K \) as in 3.2 is finite. A polynomial feasible extension \( p_i \) exists when \( K \) is finite.

**Theorem 4.1.** Assume \( K \) is a finite set. Then, for every triple \((u, i, v_i)\) with \( u \in K, i \in [N] \) and \( v_i \in X_i(u_{-i}) \), there exist a feasible extension \( p_i \) satisfying Assumption 3.2. Moreover, such \( p_i \) can be chosen as a polynomial vector function.

**Proof.** Since the set \( K \) is finite, by polynomial interpolation, there must exist a real polynomial vector function \( p_i \) such that
\[
p_i(u) = v_i, \quad p_i(z) = z_i \quad \text{for all } \quad z := (\ldots, z_N) \in K \setminus \{u\}.
\]
Note that \( K \subseteq X \). For every \( x = (x_1, \ldots, x_N) \in K \setminus \{u\} \), we have \( p_i(x) = x_i \in X_i(x_{-i}) \). The polynomial function \( p_i \) satisfies Assumption 3.2.

When the set \( K \) is known, we can get a polynomial feasible extension \( p_i \) as in Theorem 4.1 by polynomial interpolation. The following is such an example.

**Example 4.2.** Consider Example 4.1. There are four KKT points:
\[
u_1^{(1)} = u_2^{(1)} = (0, 0), \quad u_1^{(2)} = u_2^{(2)} = \left(\frac{\sqrt{17} - 3}{4}, \frac{5 - \sqrt{17}}{4}\right),
\]
\[
u_1^{(3)} = u_2^{(3)} = (1/2, 0), \quad u_1^{(4)} = u_2^{(4)} = (0, 1/2).
\]
The \((u, 1)^{(1)} = (u_1^{(1)}, u_2^{(1)})\) and \((u, 2)^{(2)} = (u_2^{(2)}, u_2^{(2)})\) are not GNEs. For \((u, 1)^{(1)}\), there is a minimizer for \( F_1(u_1^{(1)}) \), which are \((1, 0)\) and \((0, 1)\). The feasible extension \( p_1 \) of \((1, 0)\) at \((u, 1)^{(1)}\) is \((1 - x_{1,1} - x_{1,2} - x_{2,2}, x_{2,2})\), and the feasible extension \( p_1 \) of \((0, 1)\) at \((u, 1)^{(1)}\) is \((x_{1,1}, 1 - x_{2,1} - x_{2,2} - x_{1,1})\). At \((u, 2)^{(2)}\), the minimizer of \( F_1(u_2^{(2)}) \) is \((0, 3/4)\), and the feasible extension \( p_1 \) is
\[
\left(x_{2,1}(x_{2,1} - \frac{\sqrt{17} - 3}{4})(x_{2,1} + \frac{3 + \sqrt{17}}{2(5 - \sqrt{17})}) - \frac{1}{2}(x_{2,2} - \frac{1}{2})(x_{2,2} - \frac{3 + \sqrt{17}}{4})(x_{2,2} + \frac{1}{2}(x_{2,2} - \frac{3 + \sqrt{17}}{4}(x_{2,2} + \frac{4}{5 - \sqrt{17}})).
\]
When the set $K$ is not finite, Assumption 3.2 may still hold for some GNEPs. For instance, consider that there are no equality constraints, i.e., $I_0^{(i)} = \emptyset$. Suppose $K$ is compact and there exists a continuous map $\rho : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ such that $\rho(u) = v_i$ and $g_{i,j}(\rho(x), x_{-i}) > 0$ for all $x \in K$ and for all $j \in I_1^{(i)} \cup I_2^{(i)}$. For every $\epsilon > 0$, one can approximate $\rho$ by a polynomial $p_i$ such that $\|p_i - \rho\| < \epsilon$ on $K$. Therefore, for $\epsilon$ sufficiently small, $g_{i,j}(p_i(x), x_{-i}) > 0$ on $x \in K$. Such polynomial function $p_i$ is a feasible extension of $v_i$ at $u$.

4.3. Computation of feasible extensions. We discuss how to compute the rational feasible extension $p_i$ satisfying Assumption 3.2. For the set $K$ as in (3.2), let $E_0$ denote the set of its equality constraining polynomials and let $E_1$ denote the set of its (both weak and strict) inequality ones. Consider the set

$$K_1 := \left\{ x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid g(x) = 0 (g \in E_0), \quad g(x) \geq 0 (g \in E_1) \right\}.$$ 

The set $K$ may not be closed but $K_1$ is, and the closure of $K$ is contained in $K_1$. For a polynomial $p(x)$, if $p(x) \in X_i(x_{-i})$ for all $x \in K_1$, then we also have $p(x) \in X_i(x_{-i})$ for all $K$. Therefore, it is sufficient to get $p_i$ satisfying Assumption 3.2 with $K$ replaced by $K_1$.

Suppose the triple $(u, i, v_j)$ is given. First, choose a priori degree $l$ and choose a denominator $h$, such that $h > 0$ on $K$ (e.g., one can often choose $h = 1$). Then, we consider the following feasibility problem in $(q, \mu)$

$$q := (q_1, \ldots, q_n) \in \mathbb{R}[x]_{2l}, \quad \mu := (\mu_j)_{j \in I_1^{(i)} \cup I_2^{(i)}},$$

$$\begin{align*}
g(u) &= h(u)v_i, \quad h \cdot g_{i,j}(q, x_{-i}) = 0 (j \in I_1^{(i)}), \\
\mu_j &\geq 0 (j \in I_1^{(i)}), \quad \mu_j > 0 (j \in I_2^{(i)}) \\
h \cdot g_{i,j}(q, x_{-i}) - \mu_j &\in \text{Ideal}[E_0]_{2l} + \text{Qmod}[E_1]_{2l}.
\end{align*}$$

When all constraining polynomials $g_{i,j}$ are linear in $x_i$, the system 4.3 is convex in $(q, \mu)$, and it ensures that $p_i := q/h$ is a rational feasible extension satisfying Assumption 3.2. For such a case, a feasible pair $(q, \mu)$ for (4.4) can be obtained by solving a linear conic optimization problem.

Example 4.3. Consider the following 2-player GNEP:

$$\begin{align*}
\min_{x_1 \in \mathbb{R}^2} & \quad \frac{(x_{2,1} + x_{2,2} - 2x_{1,1}(x_{1,1})^2 + 2x_{1,2}^2)}{x_{2,1}^2 + x_{2,2}}, \\
s.t. & \quad 2x_{1,1}x_{2,1} - x_{1,2}x_{2,2} \geq 0, \\
& \quad x_{2,1}x_{2,2} - x_{1,1}x_{2,1} \geq 0, \\
& \quad 2x_{2,1}x_{2,2} - 1 \geq 0, \\
& \quad 2 - x_{1,2}x_{2,2} \geq 0;
\end{align*}$$

$$\begin{align*}
\min_{x_2 \in \mathbb{R}^2} & \quad \frac{x_{2,1}^2 - (x_{2,2})^2}{x_{2,1}^2 + x_{2,2}}, \\
s.t. & \quad 2x_{2,1}x_{2,2} - 1 \geq 0, \\
& \quad 1 - x_{2,2} \geq 0, \\
& \quad 2 - x_{2,1} \geq 0, \\
& \quad x_{2,1} \geq 0.
\end{align*}$$

Consider the triple $(u_1, v_1)$ for $u = (u_1, u_2)$ with

$$u_1 = (0.5, 0.5), \quad u_2 = (0.5, 1), \quad v_1 = (1, 0.5).$$

For $l = 2$ and $h = x_{2,1}x_{2,2}$, a feasible $q$ given by (4.4) is $(x_{2,1}, x_{2,2})/2$. Let $p_1 = \frac{1}{2x_{2,1}x_{2,2}}(x_{2,2}, x_{2,1})$. Then we have each $h \cdot g_{i,j}(p_1, x_2) \in \text{Ideal}[E_0]_{2l} + \text{Qmod}[E_1]_{2l}$:

$$\begin{align*}
h \cdot g_{1,1}(p_1, x_2) &= 0.25 + 0.25(2x_{2,1}x_{2,2} - 1), \\
h \cdot g_{1,2}(p_1, x_2) &= (x_{2,1}x_{2,2} - 0.5)^2 + 0.25(2x_{2,1}x_{2,2} - 1), \\
h \cdot g_{1,3}(p_1, x_2) &= 0, \quad h \cdot g_{1,4}(p_1, x_2) = 0.75 + 0.75(2x_{2,1}x_{2,2} - 1).
\end{align*}$$
For the triple \((u, i, v)\), when some constraining polynomials \(g_{i,j}\) are nonlinear in \(x_i\), the system \((4.4)\) may not be convex in \((q, \mu)\). For such cases, it is not clear how to obtain feasible extensions in a computationally efficient way. The existence of such \(p_i\) is guaranteed when \(K\) is a finite set. This is shown in Theorem 4.1. When \(K\) is fully known, we can get the \(p_i\) by polynomial interpolation. For other cases, it is not clear for us how to compute such \(p_i\) efficiently.

5. Rational optimization problems

This section discusses how to solve the rational optimization problems appearing in Algorithm 3.3.

5.1. Rational polynomial optimization. A general rational polynomial optimization problem is

\[
\begin{align*}
\min \quad & A(x) := \frac{a_1(x)}{a_2(x)} \\
\text{s.t.} \quad & x \in K,
\end{align*}
\]

where \(a_1, a_2 \in \mathbb{R}[x]\) and \(K \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n\) is a semialgebraic set. We assume the denominator \(a_2(x) > 0\) on \(K\), otherwise one can minimize \(A(x)\) over two subsets \(K \cap \{a_2(x) > 0\}\) and \(K \cap \{-a_2(x) > 0\}\) separately. Moment-SOS relaxations can be applied to solve \((5.1)\). We refer to [19, 20, 30] for related work.

The rational optimization problems in Algorithm 3.3 may have strict inequalities. So we consider the case that \(K\) is given as

\[
\begin{align*}
K = \left\{ x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid p(x) = 0 \ (p \in \Psi_0), \\
q(x) \geq 0 \ (q \in \Psi_1), \\
q(x) > 0 \ (q \in \Psi_2) \right\},
\end{align*}
\]

where \(\Psi_0, \Psi_1\) and \(\Psi_2\) are finite sets of constraining polynomials in \(x\). Since \(a_2(x) > 0\) on \(K\), we have \(A(x) \geq \gamma\) on \(K\) if and only if \(a_1(x) - \gamma a_2(x) \geq 0\) on \(K\), or equivalently, \(a_1 - \gamma a_2 \in \mathcal{P}_d(K)\), for the degree

\[
d := \max \{\deg(a_1), \deg(a_2)\}.
\]

The rational optimization \((5.1)\) is then equivalent to

\[
\begin{align*}
\gamma^* := \max \gamma \quad & \text{s.t.} \quad a_1(x) - \gamma a_2(x) \in \mathcal{P}_d(K),
\end{align*}
\]

Denote the weak inequality set

\[
K_1 := \left\{ x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid p(x) = 0 \ (p \in \Psi_0), \\
q(x) \geq 0 \ (q \in \Psi_1 \cup \Psi_2) \right\}.
\]

Note that \(K_1\) is closed and \(\text{cl}(K) \subseteq K_1\). We consider the moment optimization problem

\[
\begin{align*}
\min \quad & \langle a_1, w \rangle \\
\text{s.t.} \quad & \langle a_2, w \rangle = 1, \ w \in \mathcal{B}_d(K_1).
\end{align*}
\]

It is a moment reformulation for the optimization

\[
\begin{align*}
\min \quad & A^* := \min \ A(x) \\
\text{s.t.} \quad & x \in K_1.
\end{align*}
\]

Note that \((5.6)\) is a relaxation of \((5.1)\). It is worthy to observe that if a minimizer of \((5.6)\) lies in the set \(K\), then it is also a minimizer of \((5.1)\).
We apply Moment-SOS relaxations to solve (5.5). Let
\begin{equation}
(5.7)
d_0 := \max \{ [d/2], \lceil \deg(g)/2 \rceil \ (g \in \Psi_0 \cup \Psi_1 \cup \Psi_2) \}.
\end{equation}
For an integer \( k \geq d_0 \), the \( k \)th order SOS relaxation for (5.3) is
\begin{equation}
(5.8)
\gamma^{(k)} := \max \gamma \quad \text{s.t.} \quad a_1 - \gamma a_2 \in \text{Ideal}[\Psi_0]_{2k} + \text{Qmod}[\Psi_1 \cup \Psi_2]_{2k}.
\end{equation}
The dual optimization of (5.8) is the \( k \)th order moment relaxation
\begin{equation}
(5.9)
a^{(k)} := \min \langle a_1, y \rangle \quad \text{s.t.} \quad L^{(k)}_p[y] \geq 0 \ (p \in \Psi_0), \ L^{(k)}_q[y] \geq 0 \ (q \in \Psi_1 \cup \Psi_2),
\end{equation}
\[ \langle a_2, y \rangle = 1, \ M_k[y] \geq 0, \ y \in \mathbb{R}^{n_{2k}}. \]
Since (5.9) is a relaxation of (5.3), if (5.9) is infeasible, then (5.1) is also infeasible.
The following is the Moment-SOS algorithm for solving (5.1). It can be conveniently implemented with the software GloptPoly3 [19].

**Algorithm 5.1.** For the rational optimization (5.1), let \( k := d_0 \).

1. **Step 1** Solve the \( k \)th order moment relaxation (5.9). If it is infeasible, then (5.1) has no feasible points and stop. Otherwise, solve it for the optimal value \( a^{(k)} \) and a minimizer \( y^* \), if they exist. Let \( t := d_0 \) and go to Step 2.

2. **Step 2** Check whether or not there is an order \( t \in [d_0, k] \) such that
\begin{equation}
(5.10)
r := \text{rank} \ M_t[y^*] = \text{rank} \ M_{t-d_0}[y^*].
\end{equation}

3. **Step 3** If (5.10) fails, let \( k := k + 1 \) and go to Step 1; if (5.10) holds, find points \( z_1, \ldots, z_r \in K_1 \) and scalars \( \mu_1, \ldots, \mu_r > 0 \) such that
\begin{equation}
(5.11)
y^*[z_i] = \mu_1[z_i]_2 + \cdots + \mu_r[z_r]_2.
\end{equation}

4. **Step 4** Output each \( z_i \in K \) with \( a_2(z_i) > 0 \) as a minimizer of (5.1).

In Step 2, the rank condition (5.10) is called flat truncation. It is sufficient and almost necessary for checking convergence of the Moment-SOS hierarchy (see [31]). Once (5.10) is met, the moment relaxation (5.9) is tight for solving (5.3), and the decomposition (5.11) can be computed by the Schur decomposition [18]. This is also implemented in the software GloptPoly3 [19]. When \( \text{Ideal}[\Psi_0] + \text{Qmod}[\Psi_1 \cup \Psi_2] \) is archimedean, one can show that \( a^{(k)} \rightarrow a^* \) as \( k \rightarrow \infty \) (see [33]). The following is the justification for the conclusion in Step 4.

**Theorem 5.2.** Assume \( a_2 \geq 0 \) on \( K_1 \). Suppose \( y^* \) is a minimizer of (5.9) and it satisfies (5.10) for some order \( t \in [d_0, k] \). Then, each \( z_i \) in (5.11), such that \( a_2(z_i) > 0 \) and \( z_i \in K \), is a minimizer of (5.1).

**Proof.** Under the rank condition (5.10), the decomposition (5.11) holds for some points \( z_1, \ldots, z_r \in K_1 \) (see [18, 31]). The constraint \( \langle a_2, y^* \rangle = 1 \) implies that
\[ 1 = \langle a_2, y^* \rangle = \mu_1 a_2(z_1) + \cdots + \mu_r a_2(z_r). \]
Since \( a_2 \geq 0 \) on \( K_1 \), we know all \( a_2(z_j) \geq 0 \). Let \( J_1 := \{ j : a_2(z_j) > 0 \} \) and \( J_2 := \{ j : a_2(z_j) = 0 \} \), then
\[ \langle a_1, y^* \rangle = \sum_{j \in J_1} \mu_j a_2(z_j) A(z_j) + \sum_{j \in J_2} \mu_j a_1(z_j). \]
Note that \( \sum_{j \in J} \nu_j a_2(z_j) = 1 \) and each \( [z_j]_{2k} \in R_{2k}(K_i) \). For all nonnegative scalars \( \nu_j \geq 0, j \in J_1 \cup J_2 \) such that \( \sum_{j \in J} \nu_j a_2(z_j) = 1 \), the tms
\[
z(\nu) := \nu_1[z_1]_{2k} + \cdots + \nu_r[z_r]_{2k}
\]
is a feasible point for the moment relaxation (5.9). Therefore, the optimality of \( y^* \) implies that \( A(z_j) = a^{(k)} \) for all \( j \in J_1 \). Since \( a^{(k)} \leq a^* \) and each \( z_j \in K_i \), we have \( A(z_j) \geq a^* \). Hence, \( A(z_j) = a^* \) for all \( j \in J_1 \). Note that (5.5) is a relaxation of (5.6). So each \( z_j (j \in J_1) \) is a minimizer of (5.6). Therefore, every \( z_i \in K_i \) satisfying \( a_2(z_i) > 0 \) is a minimizer of (5.1).

In the decomposition (5.11), it is possible that no \( z_i \) belongs to the set \( K_i \). This is because the feasible set \( K \) may not be closed, due to strict inequality constraints. For such a case, the optimal value of (5.1) may not be achieved. We refer to [19, 20, 30] for the work on solving rational optimization problems.

5.2. The optimization for all players. The rational optimization problem in Step 2 of Algorithm 3.3 is
\[
(5.12) \quad \min \theta(x) := [x]_T^T \Theta [x]_1 \quad \text{s.t. } x \in \mathcal{U},
\]
where \( \Theta \) is a generic positive definite matrix. The feasible set \( \mathcal{U} \) can be expressed as in the form (5.2), with polynomial equalities and weak/strict inequalities, for some polynomial sets \( \Psi_0, \Psi_1, \Psi_2 \). That is, (5.12) can be expressed in the form of (5.1), with denominators being 1. Denote the corresponding set
\[
(5.13) \quad \mathcal{U}_1 = \{ x \in \mathbb{R}^n | p(x) = 0 (p \in \Psi_0), q(x) \geq 0 (q \in \Psi_1 \cup \Psi_2) \}.
\]
Since \( \Theta \) is positive definite, the objective \( \theta \) is coercive and strictly convex. When \( \Theta \) is also generic, the function \( \theta \) has a unique minimizer \( u^* \) on the set \( \mathcal{U}_1 \) if it is nonempty. Suppose \( y^* \) is a minimizer of the \( k \)th order moment relaxation of (5.12). Then, in Algorithm 5.1 the rank condition (5.10) is reduced to
\[
\text{rank } M_t[y^*] = 1
\]
for some order \( t \in [d_0, k] \) and the decomposition (5.11) is equivalent to \( y^*[z]_{2t} = \mu_1[z_1]_{2t} \) for some \( z_1 \in \mathcal{U}_1 \). Algorithm 5.1 can be applied to solve (5.12). The following are some special properties of Moment-SOS relaxations for (5.12).

**Theorem 5.3.** Assume \( \Theta \) is a generic positive definite matrix.

i) If the set \( \mathcal{U}_1 \) is empty and \( \text{Ideal} [\Psi_0] + \text{Qmod} [\Psi_1 \cup \Psi_2] \) is archimedean, then the moment relaxation for (5.12) must be infeasible when the order \( k \) is big enough.

ii) Suppose \( \mathcal{U}_1 \neq \emptyset \) and \( \text{Ideal} [\Psi_0] + \text{Qmod} [\Psi_1 \cup \Psi_2] \) is archimedean. Let \( u^{(k)} := (y^{(k)}_1, \ldots, y^{(k)}_n) \), where \( y^{(k)} \) is the minimizer of the \( k \)th order moment relaxation of (5.12). Then \( u^{(k)} \) converges to the unique minimizer of \( \theta \) on \( \mathcal{U}_1 \).

iii) Suppose the real zero set of \( \Psi_0 \) is finite. If \( \mathcal{U}_1 \neq \emptyset \), then we must have \( \text{rank } M_t[y^*] = 1 \) for some \( t \in [d_0, k] \), when \( k \) is sufficiently large.

**Proof.** i) When \( \mathcal{U}_1 = \emptyset \), the constant \(-1\) can be viewed as a positive polynomial on \( \mathcal{U}_1 \). Since \( \text{Ideal} [\Psi_0] + \text{Qmod} [\Psi_1 \cup \Psi_2] \) is archimedean, we have \(-1 \in \text{Ideal} [\Psi_0]_{2k} + \text{Qmod} [\Psi_1 \cup \Psi_2]_{2k} \) for \( k \) big enough, by Putinar’s Positivstellensatz. For such \( k \),
the corresponding SOS relaxation \((5.8)\) is unbounded from above, and hence the corresponding moment relaxation must be infeasible.

ii) When \(\Psi \neq \emptyset\), the objective \(\theta\) has a unique minimizer \(u^*\) on \(\Psi\). The convergence of \(u^{(k)}\) is implied by [31] Theorem 3.3 (also see [45]).

iii) When the real zero set of \(\Psi_0\) is finite and \(\Psi \neq \emptyset\), the conclusion can be implied by [20] Proposition 4.6 (also see [24]).

\[\]  

**5.3. Checking Generalized Nash Equilibria.** Once we get a minimizer \(u\) of \((5.12)\), we need to check if it is a GNE or not. For each \(i = 1, \ldots, N\), we need to solve the rational optimization problem

\[
\delta_i := \min_{x_i \in X_i(u_{-i})} f_i(x_i, u_{-i}) - f_i(u_i, u_{-i})
\]

where \(f_i, X_i(u_{-i})\) are given in \((1.1)\). Assume the KKT conditions hold and the Lagrange multiplies can be expressed as in \((3.1)\). Therefore, \((5.14)\) is equivalent to

\[
\begin{array}{l}
\min \ f_i(x_i, u_{-i}) - f_i(u_i, u_{-i}) \\
\text{s.t.} \quad x_i \in X_i(u_{-i}),
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{l}
\nabla_x f_i(x_i, u_{-i}) = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{I}_j} \tau_{i,j}(x_i, u_{-i}) \nabla_x g_{i,j}(x_i, u_{-i}), \\
\tau_{i,j}(x_i, u_{-i}) g_{i,j}(x_i, u_{-i}) = 0, \quad \tau_{i,j}(x_i, u_{-i}) \geq 0, \quad (j \in \mathcal{I}_j), \\
x_i \in X_i(u_{-i}).
\end{array}
\]

We can equivalently express the feasible set of \((5.15)\) in the form

\[
Y_i(u_{-i}) = \left\{ x_i \in \mathbb{R}^{n_i} \mid \begin{array}{l}
p(x_i) = 0 \quad (p \in \Psi_{i,0}), \\
q(x_i) \geq 0 \quad (q \in \Psi_{i,1}), \\
q(x_i) > 0 \quad (q \in \Psi_{i,2})
\end{array} \right\}
\]

for three sets \(\Psi_{i,0}, \Psi_{i,1}, \Psi_{i,2}\) of polynomials in \(x_i\). As in the Subsection 5.1 we can apply a similar version of Algorithm [5.1] to solve the rational optimization problem \((5.16)\). Similar conclusions like in Theorem 5.3 hold for the corresponding Moment-SOS relaxations. A difference is that all rational functions for \((5.14)\) are only in the variable \(x_i\) instead of \(x\). It may have several different minimizers, so the rank in \((5.10)\) may be bigger than one. Generally, the optimization \((5.15)\) is easier to solve than \((5.12)\).

\[\]

**6. Numerical Experiments**

This section gives numerical experiments for Algorithm [5.9] to solve GNEPs. The rational optimization problems are solved by Moment-SOS relaxations, which are implemented with the software GloptiPoly3 [19]. The semidefinite programs for the Moment-SOS relaxations are solved by SeDuMi [46]. The computation is implemented in MATLAB R2018a, in a Laptop with CPU 8th Generation Intel(R) Core(TM) i5-8250U and RAM 16 GB. For neatness of the paper, only four decimal digits are displayed for computational results. The accuracy for a point \(u\) to be a GNE is measured by the quantity

\[
\delta := \min \{\delta_1, \ldots, \delta_N\}
\]

where \(\delta_i\) is the optimal value of \((5.7)\). The point \(u\) is a GNE if and only if \(\delta = 0\). Due to numerical issues, \(u\) can be viewed as a GNE if \(\delta\) is nearly zero (e.g., \(\delta \geq -10^{-6}\)). For clearness of presentation, we do not list the constraining functions \(g_{i,j}\) explicitly. Instead, they are ordered row by row, from top to bottom; in each row, they are
ordered from left to right. If there is an inequality like \( a(x) \leq b(x) \), then the corresponding constraining function is \( b(x) - a(x) \).

To implement Algorithm 3.3, we need rational LMEs. This is reviewed in Subsection 2.3. More details can be found in [34]. For some standard constraints (e.g., box, simplex or balls), we can have LMEs explicitly given as follows.

i) Consider the box constraints \( a(x_{-i}) \leq x_i \leq b(x_{-i}) \), where \( a = (a_1, \ldots, a_n) \), \( b = (b_1, \ldots, b_n) \). The LME is, for \( j = 1, \ldots, n \),

\[
\lambda_{i,j-1} = \frac{b_j(x_{-i}) - x_{i,j}}{b_j(x_{-i}) - a_j(x_{-i})} \frac{\partial f_i}{\partial x_{i,j}}, \quad \lambda_{i,j} = \frac{x_{i,j} - a_j(x_{-i})}{b_j(x_{-i}) - a_j(x_{-i})} \frac{\partial f_i}{\partial x_{i,j}}.
\]

ii) Consider the simplex constraints \( u(x_{-i}) \geq e^T x_i, x_i \geq l(x_{-i}) \), where \( l \) is a vector function in \( x_{-i} \). The LME is \( \lambda_i = (\lambda_{i,1}, \ldots, \lambda_{i,n}) \) with

\[
\lambda_{i,1} = -\frac{(x_i - l)^T \nabla x_i f_i}{u(x_{-i}) - e^T l(x_{-i})}, \quad \hat{\lambda}_i = \nabla x_i f_i + \lambda_{i,1} \cdot e.
\]

iii) Consider the ball type constraint \( r(x_{-i}) \leq \|x_i - c\|^2 \leq R(x_{-i}) \), where \( c = (c_1, \ldots, c_n) \) is a constant vector. The LME is

\[
\lambda_i = \begin{pmatrix}
\frac{r(x_{-i})}{2(x_i - c_1)(R(x_{-i}) - r(x_{-i}))} \frac{\partial f_i}{\partial x_{i,1}} - \frac{(x_i - l)^T \nabla x_i f_i}{u(x_{-i}) - e^T l(x_{-i})} & \\
\frac{r(x_{-i})}{2(x_i - c_1)(R(x_{-i}) - r(x_{-i}))} \frac{\partial f_i}{\partial x_{i,1}} - \frac{(x_i - c_1)^T \nabla x_i f_i}{R(x_{-i}) - r(x_{-i})}
\end{pmatrix}.
\]

For the special case that \( r(x_{-i}) = 0 \), the LME is reduced to

\[
\lambda_i = (c - x_i)^T \nabla x_i f_i / (2R(x_{-i})).
\]

6.1 Some explicit examples. First we give some explicit examples.

**Example 6.1.** (i) Consider the GNEP in \([1,4]\). The LME for the first player is

\[
\lambda_1 = \begin{pmatrix}
\frac{x_{1,2}^T \nabla x_1 f_1}{2x_{1,2}} \\
0
\end{pmatrix}, \quad \lambda_2 = (0,0), \quad \delta = -3.44 \cdot 10^{-8}.
\]

It took around 8.36 seconds.

(ii) For the GNEP in \([1,4]\), if objective functions are changed to

\[
f_1(x) = \frac{(x_{1,2})^2 + x_{1,3} x_{1,2} (e^T x_2)}{x_{1,1}}, \quad f_2(x) = \frac{(x_{2,2})^2 - x_{2,1} x_{2,2} (e^T x_1)}{x_{2,1}},
\]

then there is no GNE. This is detected by Algorithm 3.3 at the initial loop \( k = 0 \). It took about 5.47 seconds.

(iii) Consider the GNEP in Example 6.1. We use the LMEs as in \([6,2]\) and the feasible extension as in \([4,72]\). By Algorithm 3.3 we got the GNE \( u = (u_1, u_2) \) at the loop \( k = 1 \) with

\[
u_1 = (0.0000, 0.5000), \quad u_2 = (0.0000, 0.5000), \quad \delta = -4.47 \cdot 10^{-8}.
\]

It took around 3.28 seconds.

(iv) Consider the GNEP in Example 6.1. For the first player’s optimization, we have the rational LMEs:

\[
\lambda_{1,1} = \frac{x_{2,2} - x_{1,1}}{x_{2,2} (x_{2,1} - x_{1,2})}, \quad \lambda_{1,2} = \frac{x_{1,2} x_{2,2} - 2x_{1,1} x_{2,2} x_{2,1}}{x_{1,2} x_{2,2} (x_{2,1} - x_{1,2})}, \quad \lambda_{1,3} = \frac{2 - x_{2,2} x_{2,1}}{\partial x_{1,2}} \partial x_{1,1} + \frac{x_{2,2} - x_{1,1}}{\partial x_{2,1}} \partial x_{1,1},
\]

\[
\lambda_{1,4} = \frac{1 - x_{2,2} x_{2,1}}{\partial x_{2,2}} \partial x_{1,1}.
\]
For the second player’s optimization, we have the rational LMEs:

\[ \lambda_{2,1} = \frac{1-x_2}{2x_1-1} \frac{\partial f_2}{\partial x_2}, \quad \lambda_{2,2} = \frac{1-2x_1}{2x_1-1} \cdot \frac{\partial f_2}{\partial x_2}, \]
\[ \lambda_{2,3} = \frac{1}{2}(\lambda_{2,1} - x_1 \frac{\partial f_2}{\partial x_2}), \quad \lambda_{2,4} = \frac{1}{2} \left((2-x_1) \cdot \frac{\partial f_2}{\partial x_2} + (1-4x_2)\lambda_{2,2}\right). \]

We apply the feasible extension as in Example 4.3 Algorithm 3.3 terminated at the loop \(k = 1\). We got the GNE \(u = (u_1, u_2)\) with

\[ u_1 = (1.0000, 0.5000), \quad u_2 = (0.5000, 1.0000), \quad \delta = -1.82 \cdot 10^{-8}. \]

It took around 22.73 seconds.

**Example 6.2.** Consider the 2-player GNEP with the optimization

\[
\begin{align*}
\min_{x_1 \in \mathbb{R}^3} & x_1^T (x_1 + x_2) + x_{1,1} - x_{1,2} - x_{1,3} \\
\text{s.t.} & x_{1,1}x_{1,2}x_{1,3} \leq 1 + (e^T x_2)^2, \\
\end{align*}
\]

For the first player’s optimization, we have the LME and the feasible extension

\[ \lambda_1 = - \frac{x_1^T \nabla x_1 f_1}{3 + (e^T x_2)^2}, \quad p_1(x) = \left(v_1, 1 + (e^T x_2)^2, v_1\right). \]

For the second player, we have the LME as in (6.3) and the feasible extension as in (6.3). Algorithm 3.3 terminated at the loop \(k = 0\). We got the GNE \(u = (u_1, u_2)\),

\[ u_1 = (0.3090, 0.8090, 0.8090), \quad u_2 = (-1.6180, -0.6180, -0.6180), \]

with the accuracy parameter \(\delta = -2.77 \cdot 10^{-8}\). It took around 5.16 seconds.

**Example 6.3.** Consider the 3-player GNEP

\[
\begin{align*}
F_1(x_2, x_3) : & \min_{x_1 \in \mathbb{R}^3} \|x_1 - \frac{1}{2}(x_2 + x_3)\|^2 \\
& \text{s.t.} \quad x_{1,1}x_{1,2} = 1 + x_1^2 x_3, \quad x_{1,1} \geq 0, \quad x_{1,2} \geq 0, \\
F_2(x_1, x_3) : & \min_{x_2 \in \mathbb{R}^2} \|x_2 - x_2\|^2 = (x_{1,2})^2, \\
& \text{s.t.} \quad x_1^2 x_3 + x_{1,1} \geq 0.1, \quad x_{1,2} \geq 0.1, \\
F_3(x_1, x_2) : & \min_{x_3 \in \mathbb{R}^2} e^T x_3 \leq x_1 x_2, \quad x_{3,1} \geq 0.1, \quad x_{3,2} \geq 0.1. \\
\end{align*}
\]

The LMEs for \(F_1(x_2, x_3)\) and \(F_2(x_1, x_3)\) are

\[ \lambda_{1,1} = \frac{x_1^T \nabla x_1 f_1}{2x_1 - 1}, \quad \lambda_{1,2} = \frac{\partial f_1}{\partial x_1} - x_{1,1}x_1, \quad \lambda_{1,3} = \frac{\partial f_1}{\partial x_1} - x_{1,1}x_1, \quad \lambda_{2} = \frac{-x_1^T \nabla x_1 f_2}{2(x_1)^2}. \]

We use the LME as in (6.2) for \(F_3(x_1, x_2)\). The first two players have the feasible extension

\[ p_1(x) = \left(v_{1,1}, 1 + x_2^2 x_3, v_{1,1}\right), \quad p_2(x) = \frac{u_{1,1} x_{1,2}}{u_{1,2} x_{1,1}}(v_{2,1}, v_{2,2}). \]

For the third player, the feasible extension is given in (4.2). Algorithm 3.3 terminated at the initial loop \(k = 0\). We got the GNE \(u = (u_1, u_2, u_3)\) with

\[ u_1 = (1.1401, 1.0461), \quad u_2 = (-0.1743, -0.9009), \quad u_3 = (0.1000, 0.4274) \]

and \(\delta = -6.19 \cdot 10^{-8}\). It took around 10.58 seconds.

It is interesting to note that if the third player’s objective is changed to

\[ x_3^T (x_1 + x_2 - e) + x_3^2 - x_3^2 \]
then there is no GNE. This is detected by Algorithm 3.3 at the loop $k = 1$. It took around 19.16 seconds.

We remark that Algorithm 3.3 can be generalized to compute more (or even all) GNEs. This can be done with the approach in [39]. Suppose a GNE $u$ is already known. Select a small scalar $\zeta > 0$ and solve the maximization problem

\[
\rho := \max_{x \in \mathcal{Y}} \{ x^T \Theta [x] \} \text{ s.t. } x^T \Theta [x] \leq [u]^T \Theta [u] + \zeta.
\]

If $\rho > [u]^T \Theta [u]$, then let $\zeta := \rho / 2$ and solve (6.5) again. Repeat this until $\zeta$ is small enough to make $\rho = [u]^T \Theta [u]$. When $u$ is an isolated KKT point and $\Theta$ is generic positive definite, such $\zeta$ always exists. This can be proved similarly to that in [39]. Once such $\zeta$ is found, we add the new inequality $[x]^T \Theta [x] \geq [u]^T \Theta [u] + \zeta$ to (4.3). Then Algorithm 3.3 can be applied to get a new GNE, if it exists. It is worthy to note that if the optimization (3.0) is infeasible with the newly added constraints, then there are no other GNEs. By repeating this process, we can get all GNEs if there are finitely many ones. We refer to [39] for more details. The following is an example for getting more GNEs.

**Example 6.4.** Consider the 2-player GNEP

\[
\begin{align*}
\min_{x_1 \in \mathbb{R}^2} & \quad \sum_{i=1}^2 (x_{1,i})^2 x_{2,i} + x_{1,1} x_{1,2} \\
\text{s.t.} & \quad (1 - e^T x_2)^2 \leq \|x_1\|^2 \leq 1,
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\min_{x_2 \in \mathbb{R}^2} & \quad \sum_{i=1}^2 (x_{2,i})^2 x_{1,i} x_{2,2} \\
\text{s.t.} & \quad (1 - e^T x_1)^2 \leq \|x_2\|^2 \leq 1.
\end{align*}
\]

We use the LMEs as in (6.3), and the feasible extensions as in (4.3) for both players. Following the above process, we got two GNEs $u = (u_1, u_2)$ with

\[
\begin{align*}
u_1 &= (0.9250, -0.3799), \quad u_2 = (0.9250, -0.3799), \quad \delta = -9.06 \cdot 10^{-8}, \text{ and} \\
\nu_1 &= (-0.2700, 0.9629), \quad u_2 = (-0.2700, 0.9629), \quad \delta = -2.67 \cdot 10^{-7}.
\end{align*}
\]

It took around 29.80 seconds to get both of them. Since each rational LME has a positive denominator on $X$, we computed all GNEs for this problem.

**6.2. Some examples in applications.** We give some examples arising from applications. The first one is an NEP with rational objectives.

**Example 6.5.** Consider the NEP for the electricity market problem [5][12]. Suppose there are $N$ generating companies. For each $i \in [N]$, the $i$th company possesses $n_i$ generating units, where the $j$th generating unit has $x_{i,j}$ power generation. Assume each $x_{i,j} \geq 0$ and is bounded by the maximum capacity $E_{i,j} \geq 0$. Denote $\varphi_i = (\varphi_{i,1}, \ldots, \varphi_{i,n_i})$, where each $\varphi_{i,j}$ is the cost of the generating unit $x_{i,j}$:

\[
\varphi_{i,j}(x) := a_{i,j} \cdot (x_{i,j})^3 - b_{i,j} \cdot (x_{i,j})^2 + c_{i,j} x_{i,j}.
\]

The electricity price is given by $\ell(x) := \frac{B}{x_{i,j}^2}$. The aim of each company is to maximize its profits. The $i$th player’s optimization problem is

\[
F_i(x_{-i}) : \quad \min_{x_i} e^T \varphi_i(x) - \ell(x) \cdot e^T x_i \\
\text{s.t.} \quad 0 \leq x_{i,j} \leq E_{i,j} (j \in [n_i]).
\]
The objectives are rational functions in strategies. The LME in (6.1) is applicable with box constraints. We choose the following parameters:

\[
\begin{align*}
N &= 3, & n_1 &= 1, & n_2 &= 2, & n_3 &= 3, & A &= 0.5, & B &= 20, \\
a_{1,1} &= 0.7, & a_{2,1} &= 0.75, & a_{2,2} &= 0.65, & a_{3,1} &= 0.66, & a_{3,2} &= 0.7, & a_{3,3} &= 0.8, \\
b_{1,1} &= 0.8, & b_{2,1} &= 0.75, & b_{2,2} &= 0.65, & b_{3,1} &= 0.66, & b_{3,2} &= 0.95, & b_{3,3} &= 0.5, \\
c_{1,1} &= 2, & c_{2,1} &= 1.25, & c_{2,2} &= 1, & c_{3,1} &= 2.25, & c_{3,2} &= 3, & c_{3,3} &= 3, \\
E_{1,1} &= 2, & E_{2,1} &= 2.5, & E_{2,2} &= 1.5, & E_{3,1} &= 1.2, & E_{3,2} &= 1.8, & E_{3,3} &= 1.6.
\end{align*}
\]

Algorithm 3.3 terminated at the loop \( k = 0 \). We got the GNE \( u = (u_1, u_2, u_3) \),

\[
\begin{align*}
u_1 &= 1.1432, & u_2 &= (1.0549, 1.1771), & u_3 &= (0.8917, 0.6439, 0.0000),
\end{align*}
\]

with \( \delta = -1.70 \cdot 10^{-8} \). It took about 7.98 seconds.

**Example 6.6.** Consider the GNEP for internet switching \([10, 22]\). Assume there are \( N \) users, and the maximum capacity of the buffer is \( B \). Let \( x_i \) denote the amount of \( i \)th user’s “packets” in the buffer, which has a positive lower bound \( L_i \). Suppose the buffer is managed with “drop-tail” policy: if the buffer is full, further packets will be lost and resent. Suppose \( \frac{e^T x}{B} \) is the transmission rate of the \( i \)th user, \( e^T x \) is the congestion level of the buffer, and \( 1 - \frac{e^T x}{B} \) measures the decrease in the utility of the \( i \)th user as the congestion level increases. The \( i \)th user’s optimization problem is

\[
\begin{align*}
(6.6) & \quad \min_{x_i \in \mathbb{R}^1} f_i(x) = -\frac{e^T x}{B} (1 - \frac{e^T x}{B}) \\
& \quad s.t. \quad x_i - L_i \geq 0, \quad B - e^T x \geq 0.
\end{align*}
\]

We apply the LME as in \([6, 2] \) and solve the GNEP for \( N = 10, \ldots, 14 \), with parameters \( B = 2.5 \) and \( L_i = 0.09 + 0.01i \) for each \( i \in [N] \). Algorithm 3.3 terminated at the initial loop \( k = 0 \) for each case. The numerical results are shown in Table 1.

In the table, \( u = (u_1, \ldots, u_N) \) and \( \delta \) denote respectively the GNE and the accuracy parameter, and “time” is the CPU time in seconds.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( N )</th>
<th>( u = (u_1, \ldots, u_N) )</th>
<th>( \delta )</th>
<th>time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>( u_i = 0.2250 ) (( i = 1, \ldots, 10 ))</td>
<td>( -1.05 \cdot 10^{-9} )</td>
<td>11.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>( u_i = 0.2066 ) (( i = 1, \ldots, 11 ))</td>
<td>( -4.75 \cdot 10^{-9} )</td>
<td>24.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>( u_i = \begin{cases} 0.1883 &amp; (i = 1, \ldots, 9) \ L_i &amp; (i = 10, \ldots, 12) \end{cases} )</td>
<td>( -1.93 \cdot 10^{-8} )</td>
<td>45.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>( u_i = \begin{cases} 0.1647 &amp; (i = 1, \ldots, 7) \ L_i &amp; (i = 8, \ldots, 13) \end{cases} )</td>
<td>( -4.83 \cdot 10^{-8} )</td>
<td>70.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>( u_i = \begin{cases} 0.1282 &amp; (i = 1, \ldots, 3) \ L_i &amp; (i = 4, \ldots, 14) \end{cases} )</td>
<td>( -1.02 \cdot 10^{-7} )</td>
<td>97.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**6.3. Comparison with other methods.** We compare our method (i.e., Algorithm 3.3) with some existing methods for solving GNEPs, such as the interior point method (IPM) based on the KKT system \([7]\), the Augmented-Lagrangian method (ALM) in \([21]\), and the Gauss-Seidel method (GSM) in \([37]\). All earlier examples are tested for comparison. For Example 6.3 we only compare for finding one GNE. For Example 6.6 we compare for \( N = 10 \).
For a computed tuple \( u := (u_1, \ldots, u_N) \), we use the quantity

\[
\kappa := \max \left\{ \max_{i \in [N], j \in \mathcal{I}_i} \{-g_{i,j}(u)\}, \max_{i \in [N], j \in \mathcal{I}_i} \{|g_{i,j}(u)|\} \right\}
\]

to measure the feasibility violation. Note that \( u \) is feasible if and only if \( \kappa \leq 0 \) and \( g_{i,j}(u) > 0 \) for every \( j \in \mathcal{I}_i \). For these methods, we use the following stopping criterion: for each generated iterate \( u \), if its feasibility violation \( \kappa < 10^{-6} \), then we compute the accuracy parameter \( \delta \) for verifying GNEs. If \( \delta > -10^{-6} \), then we stop the iteration.

For the above methods, the parameters are the same as in [7, 21, 37]. The full penalization is used for the Augmented-Lagrangian method, and a Levenberg-Marquardt type method (see [21 Algorithm 24]) is used to solve penalized sub-problems. For the Gauss-Seidel method, the normalization parameters are updated as (4.3) in [37], and the Moment-SOS relaxations are used to solve each player’s optimization problems. We let 1000 be the maximum number of iterations for all the above methods. For initial points, we use (1, 1, 1, 1) for Example 6.1(i-ii,iv), \((\sqrt{2}, \sqrt{2}, 1, 1, 1)\) for Example 6.3, \((0, 1, 0, 1)\) for Example 6.4, \(0.25 \cdot (1, \cdots, 1)\) for Example 6.6, and the zero vectors for other examples. If the maximum number of iterations is reached but the stopping criterion is not met, we still solve (5.7) to check if the latest iterating point is a GNE or not. For the ALM and IPM, the produced sequence is considered to converge if the last iterate satisfies the KKT conditions up to a small round-off error (say, \(10^{-6}\)). The numerical results are shown in Table 2. The “\( u \)” column lists the most recent update by each method, “time” gives the total CPU time (in seconds), and the “\( \max\{|\delta|, \kappa\} \)” measures the feasibility violation and the accuracy for being GNEs.

**Table 2. Comparison with some existing methods**

| Algorithm       | Example 6.1(i)    | time | \( \max\{|\delta|, \kappa\} \) |
|-----------------|-------------------|------|----------------------------------|
| ALM             | not convergent    |      |                                  |
| IPM             | (1.3561,0.7374,1.0000,1.0468) | 2.39 | 1.93 \( \cdot 10^{-7} \)          |
| GSM             | (1.3558,0.7376,1.0000,1.0466) | 3.47 | 2.60 \( \cdot 10^{-9} \)          |
| Alg. 3.3        | (1.3561,0.7374,1.0000,1.0468) | 8.36 | 3.44 \( \cdot 10^{-8} \)          |
| Example 6.1(ii) |                   |      |                                  |
| ALM             | not convergent    |      |                                  |
| IPM             | not convergent    |      |                                  |
| GSM             | not convergent    |      |                                  |
| Algorithm 3.3   | nonexistence of GNEs detected | 5.47 |                                   |
| Example 6.1(iii)|                   |      |                                  |
| ALM             | (0,0,0,0)         | 49.34| 1.00                             |
| IPM             | (0.2808,0.2192,0.2808,0.2192) | 12.98| 0.16                             |
| GSM             | (0.0000,0.5195,0.0000,0.5190) | 32.34| 8.21 \( \cdot 10^{-7} \)          |
| Alg. 3.3        | (0.0000,0.5000,0.0000,0.5000) | 3.28 | 4.47 \( \cdot 10^{-8} \)          |
| Example 6.1(iv) |                   |      |                                  |
| ALM             | not convergent    |      |                                  |
| IPM             | not convergent    |      |                                  |
| Example 6.2 | ALM | not convergent | IPM | not convergent | GSM | not convergent | Alg. 3.3 (1.0000,0.5000,0.5000,1.0000) | 22.73 | 1.82 · 10^{-8} |
| Example 6.3(i) | ALM | (0.3090, 0.8090, 0.8090, \(-1.6180, -0.6180, -0.6180\)) | 5.16 | 2.77 · 10^{-8} |
| Example 6.3(ii) | ALM | not convergent | IPM | not convergent | GSM | not convergent | Alg. 3.3 (0.7774, 1.3629, \(-0.2227, 1.7389, 0.2226, 0.1000\)) | 75.92 | 5.10 |
| Example 6.4 | ALM | not convergent | IPM | (0.2665, 0.3184, 0.2665, 0.3184) | 11.22 | 0.27 |
| Example 6.5 | ALM | (1.1652, 1.0601, 1.1822, 0.9952, 0.0577, 0.2332) | 94.36 | 0.10 |
| Example 6.6 | ALM | 0.2250 · (1, \cdots, 1) | 3.06 | 5.28 · 10^{-12} |
The comparisons are summarized as follows. The ALM failed to get a GNE for Examples 6.1(i), 6.1(ii), 6.2 and 6.3(ii), because the penalization subproblems cannot be solved accurately. For Examples 6.1(iii), 6.3(i) and 6.5, the ALM converges to a KKT point which is not a GNE. For Examples 6.1(iv) and 6.4, the ALM does not converge, because the maximum penalty parameter $10^{12}$ is reached while a GNE is not obtained. The IPM failed to get a GNE for Examples 6.2 and 6.3(ii), because the step length is too small to efficiently decrease the violation of KKT conditions. For Examples 6.1(iii) and 6.4 the IPM converges to a KKT point which is not a GNE. For Examples 6.1(ii), 6.1(iv) and 6.5, the IPM does not converge, because the Newton type directions usually do not satisfy the sufficient descent conditions. The GSM failed to find a GNE for Examples 6.1(ii), 6.2, 6.3(ii) and 6.4, because some sub-optimization problems cannot be solved successfully. Usually, this is the case when the subproblem is unbounded or infeasible. For Example 6.1(iii), the stopping criterion is not satisfied when the maximum iteration number is reached.

7. Conclusions and future work

This paper studies how to solve GNEPs given by rational functions. Lagrange multiplier expressions and feasible extensions are introduced to compute GNEs. We propose a hierarchy of rational optimization problems to solve GNEPs. This is given in Algorithm 3.3. The Moment-SOS relaxations are used to solve the appearing rational optimization problems. Under some general assumptions, we show that Algorithm 3.3 can get a GNE if it exists or detect its nonexistence.

There is interesting future work for solving rational GNEPs. An important question is how to find the feasible extension $p_i$ satisfying (3.4), required as in Assumption 3.2. When the set $K$ is finite, the existence of a polynomial vector function $p_i$ satisfying Assumption 3.2 is shown in Theorem 4.1. When each constraining function $g_{i,j}$ is linear in $x_i$, we propose a computational method for obtaining feasible extensions by solving the convex system (4.4). For other cases, the existence and computation of feasible extensions are mostly open. Another important question is how to find efficient expressions for Lagrange multipliers as in Subsection 2.3. It is also interesting to solve GNEPs when KKT conditions fail at GNEs.

Acknowledgement The first author is partially supported by the NSF grant DMS-2110780.

References


JIAWANG NIE, SUHAN ZHONG, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA SAN DIEGO, 9500 GILMAN DRIVE, LA JOLLA, CA, USA, 92093.

Email address: njw@math.ucsd.edu, suzhong@ucsd.edu

XINDONG TANG, DEPARTMENT OF APPLIED MATHEMATICS, THE HONG KONG POLYTECHNIC UNIVERSITY, HUNG HOM, KOWLOON, HONG KONG.

Email address: xindong.tang@polyu.edu.hk