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Abstract. In Algorithmic Game Theory (AGT), designing efficient algorithms to compute Nash equilibria poses considerable challenges. We make progress in the field and shed new light on the intersection between Algorithmic Game Theory and Integer Programming. We introduce ZERO Regrets, a general cutting plane algorithm to compute, enumerate, and select Pure Nash Equilibria (PNEs) in Integer Programming Games, a class of simultaneous and non-cooperative games. We present a theoretical foundation for our algorithmic reasoning and provide a polyhedral characterization of the convex hull of the Pure Nash Equilibria. We introduce the concept of equilibrium inequality, and devise an equilibrium separation oracle to separate non-equilibrium strategies from PNEs. We test ZERO Regrets on two paradigmatic classes of games: the Knapsack Game and the Network Formation Game, a well-studied game in AGT. Our algorithm successfully solves relevant instances of both games and shows promising applications for equilibria selection.

1 Introduction

The concept of Nash equilibrium [22, 23] revolutionized the understanding of the strategic behavior. In many decision-making settings, a selfish agent seeks to optimize its objective function (subject to some constraints) and often interacts with other selfish agents influencing its decisions. The Nash equilibria are stable solutions, meaning that no single agent has an incentive to profitably defect from them. However, the quality of equilibria – in terms of a given welfare measure (typically the sum of all agents’ payoffs) – often does not match the quality of the social optimum, i.e., the best possible solution for the collectivity. In general, the social optimum is not a stable solution and therefore does not emerge naturally from the agents’ interactions. Nevertheless, in numerous contexts, a central authority may suggest solutions to the agents. On the one hand, if the authority proposes a collective solution to the agents, it should ensure there are little to no incentives to refuse it. On the other hand, the authority should propose a solution sufficiently close – in terms of quality – to the social optimum. The best trade-off between these two objectives is the best Nash equilibrium, i.e., a solution that optimizes a welfare measure among the equilibria. Often, the main focus is on selecting a Pure Nash Equilibrium (PNE), a stable solution where each agent selects one alternative with unit probability (in contrast to a
Mixed Strategy Equilibrium, where agents randomize over the set of its feasible alternatives. Algorithmic Game Theory (AGT) [24] studies the intertwining between game theory and algorithms. AGT attracted significant attention from the computer science and optimization community in the last two decades. Several recent works [10, 18, 20] considered Integer Programming Games (IPGs), namely games where the agents solve (parametrized) integer programs. In this work, we study a class of simultaneous and non-cooperative IPGs among \( n \) players (agents) as in Definition 1, where every player has \( m \) integer variables.

**Definition 1 (IPG).** Each player \( i = 1, 2, \ldots, n \) solves (1), where \( u^i(x^i, x^{-i}) \) – given \( x^{-i} \) – is a linear function in \( x^i \) with integer coefficients, \( A^i \in \mathbb{Z}^{r \times m} \), \( b^i \in \mathbb{Z}^r \).

\[
\max_{x^i} \{ u^i(x^i, x^{-i}) : x^i \in X^i \}, \quad X^i := \{ A^i x^i \leq b^i, x^i \in \mathbb{Z}^m \} \tag{1}
\]

As standard game theory notation, let \( x^i \) denote the vector of variables of player \( i \), and let the operator \((-)^{-1}\) be \((-)\) except \( i \). The vector \( x^{-i} = (x^1, \ldots, x^{i-1}, x^{i+1}, \ldots, x^n) \) represents the variables of \( i \)'s opponents (all players but \( i \)), and the set of linear constraints \( A^i x^i \leq b^i \) defines the feasible region \( X^i \) of \( i \). In IPGs, the strategic interaction takes place in the players’ objective functions, and not within their feasible regions. Specifically, players choose their strategy simultaneously, and each player \( i \)'s utility \( u^i(x^i, x^{-i}) \) is a linear function in \( x^i \) and parametrized in \( i \)'s opponents variables \( x^{-i} \). Without loss of generality, the entries \( A^i \) and \( b^i \) and the coefficients of \( u^i(x^i, x^{-i}) \) are integers. Besides, we assume (i.) players have complete information about the structure of the game, i.e., each player knows the other players’ optimization problems via their feasible regions and objectives, (ii.) each player is rational, namely it always selects the best possible strategy given the information available on its opponents, and (iii.) common knowledge of rationality, namely each player knows its opponents are rational, and there is complete information. Clearly, if \( n = 1 \), the game collapses to a single linear integer program. However, for \( n > 1 \), the problem is an IPG [10, 20]. In this work, we focus on optimizing over the set of Pure Nash Equilibria (PNEs) for the IPG defined above and characterize the polyhedral structure of the set containing the PNEs.

**Literature.** Not all Nash equilibria are created equal. Three paradigmatic questions in AGT are often: (i.) Does at least one PNE exist? (ii.) How good (or how bad) is a PNE compared to the social optimum? (iii.) If more than one equilibrium exists, can one select the best PNE according to a given measure of quality? The answers to such questions – even from an algorithmic perspective – often require a cumbersome effort. Establishing that a PNE does not exist may turn to be a difficult task [16]. Nash proved that there is always an equilibrium in finite games (i.e., with a finite number of strategies), yet it may be a Mixed Strategy Equilibrium. In IPGs where the set of players’ strategies is large, deciding if a PNE exists is generally \( \Sigma_2^p \)-hard in the polynomial hierarchy complexity [9]. To measure the quality of equilibria, [21] introduced the concept of Price
of Anarchy (PoA), the ratio between the welfare value of the worst-possible equilibrium and the welfare value of the social optimum. Similarly, [2, 14] introduced the Price of Stability (PoS), the ratio between the welfare value of the best-possible equilibrium and the social optimum’s one. Such definitions hold when agents minimize a cost, e.g., the costs of routing packets in a network. Otherwise, when agents maximize their benefits, we exchange numerator and denominator in the PoA (and the PoS). In the AGT literature, many works focus on providing theoretical bounds for the PoS and the PoA, often by exploiting the game’s structural properties [1, 2, 11, 24, 27]. Furthermore, equilibria selection indirectly exposes the issue of equilibria enumeration, and from a practical perspective, little is known about enumeration and selection of PNEs. Even in some 2-player games (i.e., normal-form [4, 26] and bimatrix [3]) there are considerable computational challenges in designing efficient algorithms for these tasks.

In the context of IPGs, [8, 10] propose algorithms to compute an equilibrium, not necessarily a PNE, without focusing on the selection aspect. Recently, [15] introduced an enumerative procedure (based on [10]), yet, [15] provide results for very small instances (i.e., $n = 2$ with $m = 4$ in the Knapsack game).

Contributions. In this work, we shed new light on the intersection between AGT and integer programming. We propose a new theoretical and algorithmic framework to efficiently compute, enumerate, and select PNEs for the IPGs in Definition 1. We summarize our contributions as follows:

(i.) From a theoretical perspective, we provide a polyhedral characterization of the convex hull of the PNEs. We adapt the concept of valid inequality, closure, and separation oracle to the domain of Nash equilibria. Specifically, we introduce the concept of equilibrium inequality to guide the exploration of the set of PNEs. With this respect, we provide a general class of equilibrium inequalities and prove – through the concept of equilibrium closure – they are sufficient to define the convex hull of the PNEs.

(ii.) From a practical perspective, we design a cutting plane algorithm – ZERO Regrets – that computes the best PNE for a given welfare measure. This algorithm is flexible and can potentially enumerate all the PNEs and also compute approximate PNEs. The algorithm exploits an equilibrium separation oracle, namely a procedure separating non-equilibrium strategies from PNEs through the class of inequalities we introduce.

(iii.) We test our algorithmic framework on two paradigmatic classes of games from the realm of IPGs and AGT. First, the Knapsack Game, an IPG where each player solves a knapsack problem. For this problem, we also provide theoretical results on the hardness of establishing the existence of PNEs. Second, the class of Network Formation Games, a well-known and intensely investigated problem in AGT, where players build a network over a graph via a cost-sharing mechanism. ZERO Regrets proves to be highly efficient in practice and successfully selects PNEs on relevant instances of both games.
2 Definitions

We assume the reader is familiar with basic concepts of polyhedral theory and integer programming [13]. We introduce further notation and definitions related to an IPG instance $G$, where we omit explicit references to $G$ when not necessary. Let $X^i$ be the set of feasible strategies (or the feasible set) of player $i$, and let any strategy $\bar{x}^i \in X^i$ be a (pure) strategy for $i$. Any $\bar{x} = (\bar{x}^1, \ldots, \bar{x}^n)$ – with $\bar{x}^i \in X^i$ for any $i$ – is a strategy profile. Let vector $x^{-i} = (x^1, \ldots, x^{i-1}, x^{i+1}, \ldots, x^n)$ denote the vector of the opponents’ (pure) strategies of player $i$. The payoff for $i$ under the profile $\bar{x}$ is $u_i(\bar{x}^i, \bar{x}^{-i})$. Further, we define $S(\bar{x}) = \sum_{i=1}^n u_i(\bar{x}^i, \bar{x}^{-i})$ as the social welfare corresponding to a given strategy profile $\bar{x}$.

Equilibria and Prices. A strategy $\bar{x}^i$ is a best-response strategy for player $i$ given its opponents’ strategies $\bar{x}^{-i}$ if $u_i(\bar{x}^i, \bar{x}^{-i}) \geq u_i(\hat{x}^i, \bar{x}^{-i})$ for any $\hat{x}^i \in X^i$; equivalently, $i$ cannot deviate to any $\hat{x}^i$ from $\bar{x}^i$. The difference $u_i(\bar{x}^i, \bar{x}^{-i}) - u_i(\hat{x}^i, \bar{x}^{-i})$ is called the regret of strategy $\hat{x}^i$ under $\bar{x}^{-i}$. Let $\text{BR}(i, \bar{x}^{-i}) = \{x^i : u_i(x^i, \bar{x}^{-i}) \geq u_i(\hat{x}^i, \bar{x}^{-i}) \forall \hat{x}^i \in X^i, u_i(\bar{x}^i, \bar{x}^{-i}) < \infty\}$ be the set of best-responses for $i$ under $\bar{x}^{-i}$. A strategy profile $\bar{x}$ is a PNE if, for any player $i$ and any strategy $\bar{x}^i \in X^i$, then $u_i(\bar{x}^i, \bar{x}^{-i}) \geq u_i(\hat{x}^i, \bar{x}^{-i})$, i.e. any $\bar{x}^i$ is a best-response to $\bar{x}^{-i}$ (all regrets are 0). Equivalently, in a PNE no player $i$ can unilaterally improve its payoff by deviating from its strategy $\bar{x}^i$. We define the optimal social welfare as $\text{OSW} = \max_{x^1, \ldots, x^n} \{S(x) : x^i \in X^i \forall i = 1, 2, \ldots, n\}$. Given $G$, we denote as $\mathcal{N}_G = \{x = (x^1, \ldots, x^n) : x \text{ is a PNE for } G\}$ the set of its PNEs. Also, let $\mathcal{N}_G := \{x^i : (x^i, x^{-i}) \in \mathcal{N}_G\}$ – with $\mathcal{N}_G \subseteq X^i$ – be the set of equilibrium strategies for $i$, namely the strategies of $i$ appearing in at least a PNE. If $\mathcal{N}_G$ is not empty, let: (i.) $\hat{x} \in \mathcal{N}_G$ be so that $S(\hat{x}) \leq S(\bar{x})$ for any $\bar{x} \in \mathcal{N}_G$ (i.e., the PNE with the worst welfare), and (ii.) $\bar{x} \in \mathcal{N}_G$ be so that $S(\bar{x}) \geq S(\hat{x})$ for any $\hat{x} \in \mathcal{N}_G$ (i.e., the PNE with the best welfare). The PoA of $G$ is $\frac{\text{OSW}}{\text{POA}}$, and the PoS is $\frac{\text{OSW}}{\text{POS}}$.

Polyhedral Theory. For a set $S$, let $\text{conv}(S)$ be its convex hull. Let $P$ be a polyhedron: $\text{ext}(P)$, $\text{rec}(P)$, $\text{int}(P)$, is the set of its extreme points, cone of recession directions, and interior, respectively. Let $P \subset \mathbb{R}^p$ be a polyhedron and $\hat{x} \notin P$ a point in $\mathbb{R}^p$: a cut is a valid inequality $\pi^\top x \leq \pi_0$ for $P$ violated by $\hat{x}$, i.e., $\pi^\top \hat{x} > \pi_0$ and $\pi^\top x \leq \pi_0$ for any $x \in P$. Given a point $\hat{x}$ and a polyhedron $P$, we define the separation problem as the task of determining that either (i.) $\hat{x} \in P$, or (ii.) $\hat{x} \notin P$ and returning a cut $\pi^\top x \leq \pi_0$ for $P$ and $\hat{x}$. For each player $i$, the set $\text{conv}(X^i)$ is the perfect formulation of $X^i$, namely an integral polyhedron whose extreme vertices are in $X^i$. Note that, since $u_i(x^i, x^{-i})$ is linear in $x^i$ for any given $x^{-i}$, the set of player $i$’s best-responses is $\text{ext}(\text{conv}(X^i))$.

3 Equilibrium Inequalities

Cutting plane methods are attractive tools for integer programs, both from a theoretical and applied perspective. The essential idea is to iteratively refine a relaxation of the original problem by cutting off fractional solutions via valid
inequalities for the integer hull (the convex hull of integer solutions). Nevertheless, in an IPG where the solution paradigm is the Nash equilibrium, we argue there exist stronger families of cuts, yet, not necessarily valid for each player’s integer hull (conv(\(X^i\))). In fact, for any player \(i\), some of its best-responses in \(\text{ext}(\text{conv}(X^i))\) may never appear in a PNE, since no equilibrium strategies of \(i\)’s opponents induce \(i\) to play such best-responses. Here we introduce a general class of inequalities to characterize the polyhedral structure of \(\mathcal{N}\). Such inequalities play a pivotal role in the cutting plane algorithm of Section 4.

**Dominance and Rationality.** We ground our reasoning in the concepts of rationality and dominance [5, 25]. Given two strategies \(\bar{x}^i \in \mathcal{X}^i\) and \(\hat{x}^i \in \mathcal{X}^i\) for \(i\), \(\bar{x}^i\) is strictly dominated by \(\hat{x}\) if, for any choice of opponents strategies \(x^{-i}\), then \(u^i(\hat{x}, x^{-i}) > u^i(\bar{x}, x^{-i})\). Then, a rational player will never play dominated strategies. This also implies no \(i\) would play any strategy in \(\text{int}(\text{conv}(X^i))\). Since dominated strategies – by definition – are never best-responses, they will never be part of any PNE. In Example 1, the set \(\mathcal{X}^2\) is made of 3 strategies \((x_1^2, x_2^2) = (0, 0), (1, 0), (0, 1)\). Yet, \((x_1^2, x_2^2) = (0, 0)\) is dominated by \((x_1^2, x_2^2) = (0, 1)\), and the latter is dominated by \((x_1^3, x_2^3) = (1, 0)\). However, when considering player \(1\), we need the assumption of common knowledge of rationality to conclude which strategy it will play. Player 1 needs to know that player 2 would never play \(x_2^1 = 1\) to declare \((x_1^1, x_2^1) = (0, 1)\) being dominated by \((x_1^1, x_2^1) = (1, 0)\). When searching for a PNE in this example, it follows that \(\mathcal{N}^1 = \{(x_1^1, x_2^1) = (1, 0)\}\) and \(\mathcal{N}^2 = \{(x_1^2, x_2^2) = (1, 0)\}\). This inductive (and iterative) process produces tighter sets of strategies, and never excludes any PNE from the game [28, Ch.4].

**Example 1.** Consider the IPG where player 1 solves \(\max_{x^1} \{6x_1^1 + x_2^1 - 4x_1^1 x_2^1 + 3x_2^1 x_2^2 : 3x_1^1 + 2x_2^1 \leq 4, x^1 \in \{0,1\}^2\}\), and player 2 solves \(\max_{x^2} \{4x_1^2 + 2x_2^1 - x_1^2 x_1^1 - x_2^2 x_2^2 : 3x_1^1 + 2x_2^1 \leq 4, x^2 \in \{0,1\}^2\}\). The only PNE is \((\bar{x}_1^1, \bar{x}_2^1) = (1, 0), (\bar{x}_1^2, \bar{x}_2^2) = (1, 0)\) with a welfare of \(S(\bar{x}) = 5, u^1(\bar{x}_1^1, \bar{x}_2^2) = 2, u^2(\bar{x}_1^2, \bar{x}_2^1) = 3\).

In the same fashion of IEDS, we propose a family of inequalities that cuts off – from each player’s feasible set – the strategies that never appear in a PNE. Thus, from an IPG instance \(G\), we aim to derive an instance \(G’\) where \(\mathcal{N}’\) replaces each player’s feasible set \(\mathcal{X}^i\). Note that, even if some \(\mathcal{X}^i\) is infinite, all \(\mathcal{N}’\) are finite, as there are finitely many PNEs in \(\mathcal{N}\) if the latter is not empty.

**Proposition 1.** Given an IPG instance with \(\mathcal{N} \neq 0\). Then, \(\mathcal{N}\) is a finite set.

**Proof.** Assume \(\mathcal{N}\) is infinite. Then, at least a player \(i\) has an infinite set \(\mathcal{X}^i\), thus \(\text{conv}(\mathcal{X}^i)\) has a recession cone and \(i\) has infinitely many best-responses to some of its opponents’ strategies. Since PNEs are infinite, there should exist a PNE \(\bar{x}\) so that \(\bar{x}^i \in \text{conv}(\mathcal{X}^i)\) lies on an extreme ray of \(\text{rec}(\text{conv}(\mathcal{X}^i))\). However, then \(i\) can always deviate given \(\bar{x}^{-i}\), implying \(\bar{x}^i\) cannot be a best-response. Then, no best response of \(i\) lies on an extreme ray, and the number of best-responses is finite, implying \(\mathcal{N}\) is finite. \(\square\)
3.1 A Lifted Space

Given the social welfare \( S(x) \), we aim to find the PNE maximizing it, namely we aim to perform equilibria selection. In this context, the first urgent question is in what space should we work in. Since PNEs are defined by mutually optimal strategies, a natural choice is to consider a space of all players' variables \( x \). In our framework, we assume the existence of a higher-dimensional (lifted) space where we linearize the non-linear terms in any \( u^i(\cdot) \) via auxiliary variables \( z \) and corresponding constraints. Although our scheme holds for an arbitrary \( f(x) : \sum_{i=1}^n X^i \to \mathbb{R} \) we can linearize to \( f(x,z) \), we focus on \( S(x) \) and \( S(x, z) \). In (2) we describe this lifted space, where \( \mathcal{L} \) is the set of linear constraints necessary to linearize the non-linear terms and includes integer requirements and bounds on the \( z \) variables. Any vector \( x^1, \ldots, x^n, z \) in (2) corresponds to a unique strategy profile \( x = (x^1, \ldots, x^n) \), since \( x \) induces \( z \). \( \mathcal{K} \) is then a set defined by linear constraints and integer requirements, and thus it is reasonable to deal with \( \text{conv}(\mathcal{K}) \) and some of its projections. For brevity, let \( \text{proj}_x(\text{conv}(\mathcal{K})) = \{x = (x^1, \ldots, x^n) : \exists z \text{ s.t. } (x^1, \ldots, x^n, z) \in \text{conv}(\mathcal{K})\} \), and let \( u^i(x^i, x^{-i}) \) include the \( z \) variables when working in the space of \( \text{conv}(\mathcal{K}) \).

\[
\mathcal{K} = \{(x^1, \ldots, x^n, z) \in \mathcal{L}, x^i \in X^i \text{ for any } i = 1, \ldots, n\}
\]

Equilibrium Inequalities. The integer points in \( \text{proj}_x(\text{conv}(\mathcal{K})) \) encompass all the game’s strategy profiles. However, we need to focus on the polyhedron \( \mathcal{E} = \{(x^1, \ldots, x^n, z) \in \text{conv}(\mathcal{K}) : (x^1, \ldots, x^n) \in \text{conv}(\mathcal{N})\} \), since projecting out \( z \) yields the convex hull of PNE profiles \( \text{conv}(\mathcal{N}) \). Note that, by definition, \( \mathcal{E} \) is a polyhedron (since the definition of \( \mathcal{L} \), and \( \text{proj}_x(\mathcal{E}) = \text{conv}(\mathcal{N}') \). The role of \( \mathcal{E} \) is similar to the one of a perfect formulation for an integer program.

As optimizing a linear function over a perfect formulation results in an integer optimum, optimizing a linear function \( S(x, z) \) over \( \mathcal{E} \) results in a PNE. We define \( \mathcal{E} \) as the perfect equilibrium formulation for \( G \). Also, the equivalent of the relative primal gap in integer programming is the PoS, namely the ratio between the optimal value of \( f(x, z) \) over \( \text{conv}(\mathcal{K}) \) and \( \mathcal{E} \). All considered, we establish the concept of equilibrium inequality, a valid inequality for \( \mathcal{E} \).

**Definition 2 (Equilibrium Inequality).** Consider an IPG instance \( G \). An inequality is an equilibrium inequality for \( G \) if it is a valid inequality for \( \mathcal{E} \).

**A Class of Equilibrium Inequalities.** We introduce a generic class of equilibrium inequalities linear in the space of \( \text{conv}(\mathcal{K}) \). Consider any strategy \( \tilde{x}^i \in X^i \) for \( i \): for any \( i \)'s opponents' strategy \( x^{-i} \), \( u^i(\tilde{x}^i, x^{-i}) \) provides a lower bound on \( i \)'s payoff since \( \tilde{x}^i \in X^i \) (i.e., is a feasible point). Then, \( u^i(\tilde{x}^i, x^{-i}) \leq u^i(x^i, x^{-i}) \) holds for every player \( i \). We introduce such inequalities in Proposition 2.

**Proposition 2.** Consider an IPG instance \( G \). For any player \( i \) and \( \tilde{x}^i \in X^i \), the inequality \( u^i(\tilde{x}^i, x^{-i}) \leq u^i(x^i, x^{-i}) \) is an equilibrium inequality.

**Proof.** If a \( (\tilde{x}, \tilde{z}) \in \mathcal{E} \), then \( \tilde{x} \in \mathcal{N} \). Assume \( (\tilde{x}, \tilde{z}) \) violates the inequality associated with at least a player \( i \), then, \( u^i(\tilde{x}^i, x^{-i}) > u^i(\tilde{x}^i, \tilde{x}^{-i}) \). Therefore, \( i \) can profitably deviate from \( \tilde{x}^i \) to \( \tilde{x}^i \) under \( \tilde{x}^{-i} \), which contradicts \( (\tilde{x}, \tilde{z}) \in \mathcal{E} \). \( \square \)
A fundamental issue is whether the inequalities of Proposition 2 are sufficient to define the set \( \mathcal{E} \). By modulating the concept of closure introduced by Chvátal [12], we prove this is indeed the case. We define the equilibrium closure as the points in \( \text{conv}(\mathcal{K}) \) satisfying the equilibrium inequalities of Proposition 2.

**Theorem 1.** Consider an IPG instance \( G \) where \( |N| \neq 0 \). Let the equilibrium closure of \( \text{conv}(\mathcal{K}) \) given the set of equilibrium inequalities in Proposition 2 be

\[
P^e := \left\{(x, z) \in \text{conv}(\mathcal{K}) \mid u^i(\hat{x}, x^{-1}) \leq u^i(x^i, x^{-1}) \forall x^i \in \text{ext}(\text{conv}(\mathcal{X}^i)), i = 1, \ldots, n \right\}
\]

Then, (i.) \( P^e \) is a rational polyhedron, (ii.) \( P^e = \mathcal{E} \), (iii.) \( \text{int}(\mathcal{E}) \) contains no points \((\hat{x}, \hat{z}) : \hat{x} \in \mathbb{Z}^nm\).

**Proof.** Proof of (i.) The set \( \{(x, z) \in \text{conv}(\mathcal{K}) : x^i \in \text{ext}(\text{conv}(\mathcal{X}^i))\} \) is finite, \( \text{conv}(\mathcal{K}) \) is a rational polyhedron, and any equilibrium inequality has integer coefficients. It follows that \( P^e \) is a rational polyhedron. Proof of (ii.) The inequalities defining \( P^e \) are equilibrium inequalities, then any \((\hat{x}, \hat{z}) \in \mathcal{E} \) belongs to \( P^e \), implying \( \mathcal{E} \subseteq P^e \). We exclude the strict inclusion by showing any \((\tilde{x}, \tilde{z}) \notin \mathcal{E} \) is not in \( P^e \). If \((\tilde{x}, \tilde{z}) \notin \mathcal{E} \), then \( \tilde{x} \) is not a PNE. Thus, there exists a player \( i \) that can profitably deviate from \( \hat{x}^i \) to a \( \tilde{x}^i \in BR(i, \hat{x}^{-1}) \). We get that \( u^i(\hat{x}^i, \hat{x}^{-1}) > u^i(\tilde{x}^i, \tilde{x}^{-1}) \), implying that the corresponding inequality in \( P^e \) with \( \hat{x}^i = \tilde{x}^i \) is violated. Hence, \((\tilde{x}, \tilde{z})\) does not belong to \( P^e \), and \( \mathcal{E} = P^e \).

Proof of (iii.) Assume there exists a \((\tilde{x}, \tilde{z}) \in \text{int}(\mathcal{E})\) so that \( \tilde{x} \in \mathbb{Z}^nm \). Then, \( \tilde{x} \in \mathcal{N} \) by (ii.). However, since \( \tilde{x} \in \text{int}(\mathcal{E}) \), then no equilibrium inequality is tight, contradicting the fact \( \tilde{x} \) is a PNE. \( \square \)

## 4 The Cutting Plane Algorithm and its Oracle

If an oracle gives us the equilibrium formulation \( \mathcal{E} \), then any solution to the linear program \( \max_{x, z} \{ f(x, z) : (x, z) \in \mathcal{E} \} \) is a PNE for \( G \) for any linear function \( f(x, z) \) (thus for \( S(x, z) \)). However, there are two major issues. First, since \( \mathcal{E} \subseteq \text{conv}(\mathcal{K}) \), and \( \text{conv}(\mathcal{K}) \) is an integer hull described by a possibly large number of inequalities. Second, even if an oracle provides us with \( \text{conv}(\mathcal{K}) \), retrieving \( \mathcal{E} \) through Theorem 1 may also require a large number of inequalities. In practice, we actually do not need \( \mathcal{E} \) nor \( \text{conv}(\mathcal{K}) \): a more reasonable goal is to get a polyhedron containing \( \text{conv}(\mathcal{K}) \) over which we can optimize \( f(x, z) \) efficiently (i.e., solving a linear program) and obtain an integer solution that is also a PNE. The first challenge is to obtain an integer solution: yet, we could deploy known families of integer programming cutting planes (they are also equilibrium inequalities as they are valid for \( \mathcal{E} \) and branching schemes. Equivalently, we exploit a (blackbox) Mixed-Integer Programming solver to solve \( \max_{x^1, \ldots, x^n, z} \{ f(x, z) : (x, z) \in K \} \). Once the maximizer is integer, if it is also a PNE we are done. Otherwise, the second challenge is to cut off such maximizer – since it is not a PNE – by separating at least an equilibrium inequality from Proposition 2.
Algorithm 1: Equilibrium Separation Oracle

Data: An IPG instance $G$, a point $(\bar{x}, \bar{z})$, and a set of cuts $\phi = \emptyset$. 
Result: Either: (i.) yes if $(\bar{x}, \bar{z}) \in \mathcal{E}$, or (ii.) no and $\phi$.

1. for $i \leftarrow 1$ to $n$ do 
2. \hspace{1em} $\hat{x}^i \leftarrow \max\{u^i(x^i, \bar{x}^{-i}) : A^i x^i \leq b^i, x^i \in \mathbb{Z}^m\}$; 
3. \hspace{1em} if $u^i(\hat{x}^i, \bar{x}^{-i}) > u^i(\bar{x}^i, \bar{x}^{-i})$ then 
4. \hspace{2em} Add $u^i(\hat{x}^i, x^{-i}) \leq u^i(x^i, x^{-i})$ to $\phi$; 
5. if $|\phi| = 0$ then return yes ; 
6. else return no and $\phi$;

Equilibrium Separation Oracle. Given an integer point $(\bar{x}, \bar{z}) \in \text{conv}(\mathcal{K})$ (i.e., the point returned by the Mixed-Integer Programming solver), the central question is to determine if $\bar{x} \in \mathcal{N}$ (equivalently, $(\bar{x}, \bar{z}) \in \mathcal{E}$), and, if not, to derive an equilibrium inequality to cut off $(\bar{x}, \bar{z})$. If we use the inequalities from Proposition 2, the process terminates in a finite number of iterations, since the result of Theorem 1. In the spirit of [17, 19], we define a separation oracle for the equilibrium inequalities in Proposition 2 and $\mathcal{E}$. The equilibrium separation oracle solves the equilibrium separation problem of Definition 3.

Definition 3 (Equilibrium Separation Problem). Consider an IPG instance $G$. Given a point $(\bar{x}, \bar{z})$, the equilibrium separation problem is the task of determining that either: (i.) $(\bar{x}, \bar{z}) \in \mathcal{E}$, or (ii.) $(\bar{x}, \bar{z}) \notin \mathcal{E}$ and return an equilibrium inequality violated by $(\bar{x}, \bar{z})$.

Algorithm 1 presents our separation oracle for the inequalities of Proposition 2. Given $(\bar{x}, \bar{z})$ and an empty set of linear inequalities $\phi$, the algorithm outputs either yes if $(\bar{x}, \bar{z}) \in \mathcal{E}$, or no and adds in $\phi$ some inequalities violated by $(\bar{x}, \bar{z})$. The algorithm separates at most one inequality for any player $i$. Note that $\hat{x}^i$ should be a best-response to be in a PNE. Then, we solve $\max\{u^i(x^i, \bar{x}^{-i}) : A^i x^i \leq b^i, x^i \in \mathbb{Z}^m\}$, where $\hat{x}^i$ is one of its maximizers. If $u^i(\hat{x}^i, \bar{x}^{-i}) = u^i(\bar{x}^i, \bar{x}^{-i})$, then $\hat{x}^i$ is also a best-response. However, if $u^i(\hat{x}^i, \bar{x}^{-i}) > u^i(\bar{x}^i, \bar{x}^{-i})$, the algorithm adds to $\phi$ an equilibrium inequality $u^i(\hat{x}^i, x^{-i}) \leq u^i(x^i, x^{-i})$ violated by $(\bar{x}, \bar{z})$. After considering all players, if $|\phi| = 0$, then $\bar{x}$ is by definition a PNE and the answer is yes. Otherwise, the algorithm returns no and $\phi \neq \emptyset$, i.e., at least an equilibrium inequality cutting off $(\bar{x}, \bar{z})$.

ZERO Regrets. We present our cutting plane algorithm ZERO Regrets in Algorithm 2. The inputs are an instance $G$, and $S(x)$, while the output is either the PNE $\bar{x}$ maximizing $S(x)$, or a certificate that no PNE exists. Let $\Phi$ be a set of equilibrium inequalities, and $Q = \max_{x_1, \ldots, x_n, z} \{ S(x, z) : (x, z) \in \mathcal{K}, (x, z) \in \Phi \}$. We assume $Q$ is feasible and bounded (otherwise, there would be no point in getting a PNE with an arbitrarily bad welfare). At each iteration, we compute an optimal solution $(\bar{x}, \bar{z})$ of $Q$. Then, the equilibrium separation oracle (Algorithm 1) evaluates such solution: if the oracle returns yes, then $\bar{x} = \bar{x}$ is the PNE maximizing $S(x)$ in $G$. Otherwise, the oracle returns a set $\phi$ of equilibrium inequalities cutting off $(\bar{x}, \bar{z})$, and the algorithm adds $\phi$ to $\Phi$. Therefore,
Algorithm 2: ZERO Regrets

Data: An IPG instance $G$, and a function $f(x)$. 
Result: Either: (i.) the PNE $\hat{x}$ maximizing $f(x)$, or (ii.) no PNE 

1. $\Phi = \{0 \leq 1\}$, and $Q = \max_{x_1, \ldots, x_n, z} \{f(x, z) : (x, z) \in K, (x, z) \in \Phi\}$; 
2. While true do 
3. if $Q$ is infeasible then return no PNE; 
4. $(\bar{x}, \bar{z}) = \arg \max Q; \phi = \emptyset$; 
5. if EquilibriumSeparationOracle$(G, (\bar{x}, \bar{z}), \phi)$ is yes then 
6. return $\hat{x} = \bar{x}$; 
7. else add $\phi$ to $\Phi$; 

the process restarts by solving $Q$ with the additional set of constraints. If at any iteration $Q$ becomes infeasible, then $G$ has no PNE. Theorem 1 implies both correctness and finite termination of Algorithm 2.

Some Remarks. We conclude with some further considerations on ZERO Regrets. First, it is sufficient to add just one equilibrium inequality in $\phi$ to cut off a given solution $(\bar{x}, \bar{z})$. However, we expect a good trade-off between $|\phi| = 1$ and $|\phi| = n$ may speed up the convergence of the algorithm. Second, we can modify Algorithm 2 to enumerate all PNEs in $\mathcal{N}$ as follows. In line 6, instead of terminating and returning $\hat{x}$, we memorize $\hat{x}$ and add an (invalid) inequality cutting off $(\bar{x}, \bar{z})$ from $\mathcal{E}$. Since all $x$ are integers, such inequality can be, for instance, a classical hamming distance from $\bar{x}$. The algorithm will eventually cut off any PNE until $Q$ becomes infeasible. Third, ZERO Regrets can compute approximate PNEs, i.e., when each player can deviate at most by a small $\epsilon$ with respect to a best-response ([24]). Approximate PNEs may be a reasonable compromise in games where no PNE exists. W.l.o.g, if $\epsilon$ is integer, we can adapt Algorithm 1 to separate $\epsilon$-equilibrium inequalities $u^i(\hat{x}^i, x^{-i}) - \epsilon \leq u^i(x^i, x^{-i})$, without affecting the correctness of Algorithm 2 (yet returning an $\epsilon$-equilibrium).

5 Knapsack and Network Formation Games

We evaluate ZERO Regrets for the task of selecting equilibria with maximum welfare on two well-known classes of games. Specifically, we consider the Knapsack Game [7, 8, 10] – for which we also provide further theoretical results – and the Network Formation Game [1, 11].

5.1 Knapsack Game

The Knapsack Game ($KPG$) is an IPG among $n$ players, where each $i$ solves the following binary knapsack problem with $m$ items.

$$\max_{x^i} \left\{ \sum_{j=1}^{m} p_j^i x_j^i + \sum_{k=1,k \neq i}^{n} \sum_{j=1}^{m} C_{k,j}^i x_j^i x_k^i : m \sum_{j=1}^{m} w_j^i x_j^i \leq b^i, x_j^i \in \{0, 1\}^m \right\}$$ (3)
As in the classical knapsack problem, we assume that the profits \( p_i^j \), weights \( w_i^j \) and capacities \( b_i \) are in \( \mathbb{Z}^+ \). The selection of an item \( j \) by a player \( i \neq k \) impacts either negatively or positively the item profit for player \( i \) through integer coefficients \( C_{i,k,j}^i \). Clearly, given the strategies of the other players \( x^{−i} \), computing a corresponding best-response for player \( i \) is \( \mathcal{NP} \)-hard. [7] introduced the game with \( n = 2 \) and \( p_i^j = 0 \ \forall j = 1, \ldots, m, i = 1, 2 \). [8, 10] consider a more general game variant (\( p_i^j \) and \( w_i^j \) in \( \mathbb{Z} \)) and provided algorithms to compute mixed-strategy Nash equilibria, yet the focus was not on PNE nor on equilibria selection. We can straightforwardly apply our algorithmic framework to the KPG in (3), since we can linearize the bilinear products \( x_i^j x_k^j \) (for any \( i, k, j \)) with \( O(mn^2) \) auxiliary variables and additional constraints. We claim the KPG can be extremely difficult to solve even with two players: in Theorem 2, we prove that deciding if a KPG instance has a PNE— even with \( n = 2 \) — is \( \Sigma_2^p \)-complete in the polynomial hierarchy complexity, matching the result of [10] for general IPGs. Also, we show that when at least one PNE exists, the PoS and PoA can be arbitrarily bad.

**Theorem 2.** Deciding if a KPG instance has a PNE is a \( \Sigma_2^p \)-complete problem.

We perform a reduction from the DeNegre Bilevel Knapsack Problem (BKP) below, which is \( \Sigma_2^p \)-complete [6].

**Definition 4 (BKP).** Given two \( m \)-dimensional non-negative vectors \( a \) and \( b \) and two non-negative integers \( A \) and \( B \), the BKP asks whether there exists a binary vector \( x - \) with \( \sum_{j=1}^m a_j x_j \leq A \) — satisfying \( \sum_{j=1}^m b_j y_j (1 - x_j) \leq B - 1 \) for any binary vector \( y \) such that \( \sum_{j=1}^m b_j y_j \leq B \).

**Proof.** Given a BKP instance, we construct a KPG instance with 2 players as follows. We consider \( m + 1 \) items and associate the elements of vectors \( x \) and \( y \) with the first \( m \) elements of vectors \( x^1 \) and \( x^2 \), respectively. Player 1 solves the following problem:

\[
\begin{align*}
\max_{x^1} & \quad \sum_{j=1}^m b_j x_j^1 x_j^2 + x_{m+1}^1 x_{m+1}^2 \\
\text{s.t.} & \quad \sum_{j=1}^m a_j x_j^1 \leq A, \\
& \quad x_j^1 \in \{0, 1\} \quad j = 1, \ldots, m + 1
\end{align*}
\]

Whereas player 2 solves the following problem:

\[
\begin{align*}
\max_{x^2} & \quad (B - 1) x_{m+1}^2 + \sum_{j=1}^m b_j x_j^2 - \sum_{j=1}^m b_j x_j^2 x_j^1 \\
\text{s.t.} & \quad \sum_{j=1}^m b_j x_j^2 + B x_{m+1}^2 \leq B, \\
& \quad x_j^2 \in \{0, 1\} \quad j = 1, \ldots, m + 1
\end{align*}
\]
We need to show that a BKP instance has a solution if and only if the corresponding KPG instance has a PNE.

**BKP has a solution.** We assume the BKP instance has a solution $\pi$. We prove that the strategies $\hat{x}^1 = (\pi, 1)$, $\hat{x}^2 = (\vec{0}, 1)$ (with $\vec{0}$ being a $m$-dimensional vector of zeros) is a PNE. First of all, both the strategies $\hat{x}^1$ and $\hat{x}^2$ are feasible by construction. Given $\hat{x}^2$, player 1 attains the maximum profit of 1 by playing strategy $\hat{x}^1$. The strategy $\hat{x}^2$ yields a profit of $B - 1$ for player 2 when player 1 plays $\hat{x}^1$. Player 2 cannot profitably deviate by setting $x_{m+1}^2 = 0$. This follows from the fact that the BKP instance has a solution $\pi$ and, given that $\hat{x}_j^1 = \pi_j$ for $j = 1, \ldots, m$, the following inequality must hold.

$$\sum_{j=1}^m b_j x_j^2 - \sum_{j=1}^m b_j \pi_j \leq B - 1$$

Thus, the pair of strategies $(\hat{x}^1, \hat{x}^2)$ is also a PNE for the KPG instance.

**KPG has a PNE.** Assume the KPG instance has a PNE $(\hat{x}^1, \hat{x}^2)$. In order to get a solution of the BKP instance, we distinguish two cases: (i.) $\hat{x}_{m+1}^2 = 1$ (ii.) $\hat{x}_{m+1}^2 = 0$.

**Case (i.)** If $\hat{x}_{m+1}^2 = 1$, then $\hat{x}_j^2 = 0$ for any $j = 1, \ldots, m$ due to the knapsack constraint of player 2. The corresponding payoff for player 2 is $B - 1$. Since $(\hat{x}^1, \hat{x}^2)$ is a PNE, player 2 cannot improve its payoff by deviating to any other strategy having $x_{m+1}^2 = 0$ when player 1 plays strategy $\hat{x}^1$. This implies that – for any assignment of variables $x_1^2, \ldots, x_m^2$ for player 2 – the following inequality holds.

$$\sum_{j=1}^m b_j x_j^2 - \sum_{j=1}^m b_j \hat{x}_j^2 \pi_j \leq B - 1$$

Hence, the vector $\pi$ with $\pi_j = \hat{x}_j^1$ ($j = 1, \ldots, m$) is a solution of the BKP instance.

**Case (ii.)** If $\hat{x}_{m+1}^2 = 0$, the choice of variables $\hat{x}_1^2, \ldots, \hat{x}_m^2$ for player 2 must guarantee a payoff of at least $B - 1$ with player 1 playing $\hat{x}^1$. Otherwise, this would contradict the equilibrium assumption on $(\hat{x}^1, \hat{x}^2)$ since the strategy of player 2 with $x_{m+1}^2 = 1$ yields a profit of $B - 1$ for any choice of $\hat{x}^1$. Notice that strategy $\hat{x}^1$ is a best-response for player 1 by construction of a PNE. Thus, there exists at least one item $j$ where $\hat{x}_j^1 = 1$, $\hat{x}_j^2 = 1$ and $b_j > 0$. Otherwise, the payoff of player 1 would be 0 and a profitable deviation would exist. Considering that each $b_j$ is a non-negative integer number, and that $\sum_{j=1}^m b_j \hat{x}_j^2 \leq B$ (due to the capacity constraint of player 2), we necessarily must have a payoff of exactly $B - 1$ for player 2. For any assignment of variables $x_1^2, \ldots, x_m^2$, the following must hold.

$$\sum_{j=1}^m b_j x_j^2 - \sum_{j=1}^m b_j \hat{x}_j^2 \pi_j \leq B - 1$$
Otherwise, we would get a contradiction on the equilibrium assumption. Analogously to the previous case, one can derive a solution vector $\pi$ for the $BKP$ instance by setting $\pi_j = x_j^0$ ($j = 1, \ldots, n$). This implies the PNE in the $KPG$ instance induces a solution to the corresponding $BKP$ instance.

**Proposition 3.** The PoA and the PoS in KPG can be arbitrarily bad.

**Proof.** Consider the following $KPG$ instance with $n = 2$: $i = 1$ solves $\max x_1 \{ Mx_1 + x_1^3 - (M - 2)x_1^2 - x_1^0 x_2^2 : 3x_1^2 + 2x_1^3 \leq 4, x_1 \in \{0, 1\}^2 \}$ where $M$ is an arbitrarily large value; $i = 2$ solves $\max x_2 \{ 4x_1^2 + x_2^3 - x_1^2 x_2^1 - x_2^0 x_2^2 : 3x_1^2 + 2x_1^3 \leq 4, x_2 \in \{0, 1\}^2 \}$. The only PNE is $(x_1^1, x_2^1, x_2^2) = (1, 0, 1, 0)$, with $u^1(x_1^1, x_2^2) = 2$, $u^2(x_2^2, x_1^1) = 3$, $S(x) = 5$. The maximum welfare $OSW = M + 1$ is given by $(x_1^1, x_2^2, x_2^2) = (1, 0, 0, 1)$, i.e. $OSW$ is arbitrarily large and there are no bounds on both the PoA and the PoS.

### 5.2 Network Formation Game

Network design games are paradigmatic problems in Algorithmic Game Theory [1, 11, 24]. We consider a Network Formation Game (NFG) where $n$ players are interested in building a network. Let $G(V, E)$ be a directed graph representing a network layout, where $V$, $E$ are the sets of vertices and edges, respectively. Each edge $(h, l) \in E$ has a construction cost $c_{hl} \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, and each player $i$ wants to connect an origin $s^i$ with a destination $t^i$ while minimizing its construction costs. A cost-sharing mechanism determines the cost of each edge $c^i_{hl}(x)$ for $i$ as a function of the number of players crossing $(h, l)$. A commonly adopted mechanism is the *Shapley cost-sharing mechanism*, where players using $(h, l)$ equally share its cost $c_{hl}$. The goal is to find a PNE (if any) minimizing the sum of construction costs for each player. Although the NFG with Shapley cost-sharing mechanism is a potential game (i.e., best-response dynamics always converge, and there is always a PNE), selecting the best PNE is often challenging. We model the NFG as an IPG as follows. For any player $i$ and edge $(h, l)$, let the binary variables $x^i_{hl}$ be 1 if $i$ uses the edge. We use classical flow constraints modeling a path between $s^i$ and $t^i$. For conciseness, we represent these constraints and binary requirements with a set $F^i$ for each $i$. Thus, each $i$ solves:

$$\min\left\{ \sum_{(h,l) \in E} \frac{c_{hl} x^i_{hl}}{\sum_{k=1}^{n} x^i_{hl}} : x^i \in F^i \right\}$$

For any $i$, the cost contribution of each edge $(h, l)$ to the objective is not linear in $x$, yet we can linearize it. For instance, consider a game with $n = 3$ and the objective of $i = 1$. Let the binary variable $z_{hl}^{1,...,k}$ be 1 if only players $j, \ldots, k$ select the edge $(h, l)$. Then, $x^1_{hl} = z_{hl}^1 + z_{hl}^{12} + z_{hl}^{13} + z_{hl}^{123}$, $x^2_{hl} = z_{hl}^2 + z_{hl}^{23} + z_{hl}^{23} + z_{hl}^{123}$, $x^3_{hl} = z_{hl}^3 + z_{hl}^{31} + z_{hl}^{32} + z_{hl}^{321}$. The term for edge $(h, l)$ in the objective of $i = 1$ is then $c_{hl} z_{hl}^1 + \frac{c_{hl}}{3}(z_{hl}^{12} + z_{hl}^{13}) + \frac{c_{hl}}{6} z_{hl}^{123}$. In our tests, we also model the general weighted NFG [1], where each $i$ has a weight $w^i$, and the cost share of each selected $(h, l)$ is $w^i c_{hl}$ divided by the weights of all other players using $(h, l)$. Specifically, we consider the 3-player weighted NFG, which may not admit a PNE.
6 Computational tests

We performed our tests on an Intel Xeon Gold 6142, with 128GB of RAM and with Gurobi 9.2 as blackbox solver for Algorithm 2, and to compute OSW. The time-limit for ZERO Regrets is 1800 seconds.

Knapsack Game. We generate KPG instances with \( n = 2, 3 \) and \( m = 25, 50, 75, 100 \). In any instance, for any \( i \), \( p_i \) and \( w_i \) are random integers uniformly distributed in \([1, 100]\). We consider three different distributions for the integer interaction coefficients \( C_{i,j}^k \). For any \( i \), they can be: a) equal and uniformly distributed in \([1, 100]\) b) random and uniformly distributed in \([1, 100]\) c) random and uniformly distributed in \([-100, 100]\). In any instance, for any \( i \), \( p_i \) and \( w_i \) are random integers uniformly distributed in \([1, 100]\) respectively. We consider three different distributions for the integer interaction coefficients \( C_{i,j}^k \). For any \( i \), they can be: a) equal and uniformly distributed in \([1, 100]\) b) random and uniformly distributed in \([1, 100]\) c) random and uniformly distributed in \([-100, 100]\). In any instance, for any \( i \), \( p_i \) and \( w_i \) are random integers uniformly distributed in \([1, 100]\).

Table 1, we present the results for the 72 instances. For any given number of players \( n \), items \( m \) and distribution of coefficients \( C_{i,j}^k \), we report the performance over 3 instances with different capacity distributions, in terms of average number of equilibrium inequalities added (\(#EI\)), average computational time (Time), average PoS (PoS) (when we find the best PNE), number of time-limit hits (Tl). The averages \#EI and Time consider also the instances where we hit the time-limit. ZERO Regrets solves almost all instances with \( n = 2 \), especially with distribution \( a \). Both running times and number of equilibrium inequalities are generally limited. The PoS is generally low, and increases with distribution \( c \) due to the complex interactions stemming from negative \( C_{i,j}^k \). We remind that a PoS close to 1 does not mean the instance is “easy”. On the contrary, a PoS \( \approx 1 \) highlights the existence of a high-quality PNE, with a welfare close to OSW. Thus, this result also provides further evidence on the need of selecting such PNE. With \( n = 3 \), ZERO Regrets performs well when \( m < 75 \), and solves larger instances with distribution \( a \). Previous works consider up to \( m = 40 \) items with \( n = 3 \), and rarely perform equilibria selection with more than \( m = 4 \) items.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>((n, m, d))</th>
<th>#EI</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>PoS</th>
<th>Tl</th>
<th>((n, m, d))</th>
<th>#EI</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>PoS</th>
<th>Tl</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(2, 25, a)</td>
<td>10.67</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(3, 25, a)</td>
<td>17.33</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2, 25, b)</td>
<td>15.67</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(3, 25, b)</td>
<td>29.67</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2, 25, c)</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(3, 25, c)</td>
<td>157.33</td>
<td>640.02</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2, 50, a)</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(3, 50, a)</td>
<td>67.00</td>
<td>115.06</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2, 50, b)</td>
<td>41.67</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(3, 50, b)</td>
<td>182.00</td>
<td>627.30</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2, 50, c)</td>
<td>112.00</td>
<td>30.75</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(3, 50, c)</td>
<td>193.67</td>
<td>1800.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2, 75, a)</td>
<td>45.33</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(3, 75, a)</td>
<td>156.33</td>
<td>1267.78</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2, 75, b)</td>
<td>146.33</td>
<td>94.03</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(3, 75, b)</td>
<td>297.33</td>
<td>1800.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2, 75, c)</td>
<td>242.67</td>
<td>636.72</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(3, 75, c)</td>
<td>179.00</td>
<td>1800.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2, 100, a)</td>
<td>37.00</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(3, 100, a)</td>
<td>156.33</td>
<td>1267.78</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2, 100, b)</td>
<td>188.00</td>
<td>234.44</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(3, 100, b)</td>
<td>297.33</td>
<td>1800.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2, 100, c)</td>
<td>293.00</td>
<td>1215.17</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(3, 100, c)</td>
<td>179.00</td>
<td>1800.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Results for KPG.

Network Formation Game. We consider the NFG with \( n = 3 \) on grid-based (directed) graphs \( G(V, E) \), where each \( i \) has to cross the grid from left to right
to reach its destinations. Compared to a standard grid graph, we randomly add some edges between adjacent layers to increase the number of paths. The instances are so that $|V| \in [50, 500]$, and the costs $c_{hl}$ for each edge $(h, l)$ are random integers uniformly distributed in $[20, 100]$. We consider three distributions of player’s weights: (i.) the Shapely-mechanism, with $w^1 = w^2 = w^3 = 1$, (ii.) $w^1 = 0.6$, $w^2 = 0.2$, and $w^3 = 0.2$, (iii.) $w^1 = 0.45$, $w^2 = 0.45$, and $w^3 = 0.1$. Table 2 reports the results, where we average over the distributions of the players’ weights. For each graph, the table reports the graph size ($|V|, |E|$), whereas the other columns have the same meaning of the ones of Table 1. Similarly to the KPG, we effectively solve all the instances but 3. Generally, the literature does not consider this problem from a practical perspective but provides theoretical bounds on the PoS and PoA. Nevertheless, we can compute high-quality PNEs even in large-size graphs (i.e., when $PoS \approx 1$), with a limited number of equilibrium inequalities and modest running times.

| $|V|, |E|$ | #EI | Time | PoS | TI | $|V|, |E|$ | #EI | Time | PoS | TI |
|----------|-----|------|-----|----|----------|-----|------|-----|----|
| (50, 99) | 5.00 | 0.07 | 1.12 | 0  | (300, 626) | 20.33 | 6.52 | 1.00 | 0  |
| (100, 206)| 9.00 | 0.13 | 1.00 | 0  | (350, 730) | 20.67 | 6.70 | 1.00 | 0  |
| (150, 308)| 9.67 | 0.47 | 1.04 | 0  | (400, 822) | 302.00 | 654.73 | 1.01 | 1  |
| (200, 416)| 18.67 | 1.85 | 1.00 | 0  | (450, 934) | 492.00 | 1200.43 | 1.01 | 2  |
| (250, 517)| 68.67 | 51.55 | 1.02 | 0  | (500, 1060) | 40.33 | 104.80 | 1.00 | 0  |

Table 2. Results for NFG.

We derive two essential conclusions from the results. First, by selecting high-quality PNEs with low PoS, we highlight the importance of efficient equilibria selection. Second, our theoretical and computational framework shows promising applications for equilibria selection in games.
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