

Game Transformations that preserve Nash Equilibrium sets and/or Best Response sets

Emanuel Tewolde

Imperial College London, October 2021

Abstract

In the literature on simultaneous non-cooperative games, it is well-known that a positive affine (linear) transformation (PAT) of the utility payoffs do not change the best response sets and the Nash equilibrium set. PATs have been successfully used to expand the classes of 2-player games for which we can compute a Nash equilibrium in polynomial time.

We investigate which game transformations other than PATs also possess one of the following properties: (i) The game transformation shall not change the Nash equilibrium set when being applied on an arbitrary game. (ii) The game transformation shall not change the best response sets when being applied on an arbitrary game.

First, we prove that property (i) implies property (ii). Over a series of further results, we derive that game transformations with property (ii) must be positive affine. Therefore, we obtained two new and equivalent characterisations with game theoretic meaning for what it means to be a positive affine transformation.

All our results in particular hold for the 2-player case of bimatrix games.

1 Introduction

Game theory is the study of strategic interactions between agents (e.g. people, organizations, firms or machines), also called players. We focus on multiplayer games in which each player chooses a strategy from a finite strategy set. The players choose their strategy simultaneously and they do not have the ability to cooperate or communicate.

Central concepts in non-cooperative simultaneous games are the best response strategy and the Nash equilibrium. Given what strategies the opponent players chose, a best response strategy for a player maximizes the utility of that same player. Thus, the player would be content with their choice of a best response strategy (in this non-cooperative setting). A Nash equilibrium is defined as the game state in which each player chose a best response against the strategies of the respective opponent players. Nash equilibria are considered as the perhaps most important solution concept to non-cooperative simultaneous games. It was named after John Forbes Nash Jr. who showed non-constructively that there always exists a Nash equilibrium if each player is allowed to randomize their choice over their strategy space.

Naturally, succeeding research got interested in algorithms that can compute one or all Nash equilibria of a game. The complexity of computing a Nash equilibrium is stated to be one of the most important concrete open question on the boundary of \mathbf{P} [Pap01; KS12]. The earliest results towards an answer date back to von Neumann [Neu28] and Dantzig [Dan51; Adl13] who studied 2-player games (also referred to as bimatrix games). They showed that solving a zero-sum¹ bimatrix game is equivalent to the problem of solving a linear program, which can be done in polynomial (=“efficient”) time. The work in [DGP06; CD05; CD06] showed that computing a Nash equilibrium for an arbitrary bimatrix game is inherently hard². Consequently, the same statement holds for any N -player game where $N \geq 2$. Succeeding work has been interested in finding further subclasses of bimatrix games,

¹Defined by the property that whenever player 1 gains utility, player 2 loses the same amount of utility.

²Assuming $\mathbf{FP} \neq \mathbf{PPAD}$. This complexity conjecture is similar to, but not quite as strong as, the famous conjecture $\mathbf{P} \neq \mathbf{NP}$.

beyond the zero-sum games, for which we can compute a Nash equilibrium in efficient time.

Given an input game, a useful tool can be to transform it to a game that is easier to solve and work on the transformed game instead. One transformation often used for bimatrix games are the positive affine (linear) transformations (PATs). Such a transformation scales the utility gains of each player and/or adds constants, one for each strategy choice of the opponent player. A well-known property of PATs is that they do not change the best response sets of the input game. Therefore, they do not change the Nash equilibrium set of the input game either (see [Hey19b, Lemma 2.1], [MSZ13, Theorem 5.35] or [BO98, Proposition 3.1]). In consequence, positive affine transformations of zero-sum bimatrix games possess the same nice Nash equilibrium properties as zero-sum games do.

An early example for such an application of PATs can be found in von Neumann’s and Morgenstern’s book [NMR44, Section 27.1] where they studied zero-sum games whose utilities were translated by player-specific constants. Since then, many other authors have directly or indirectly studied bimatrix games that are a positive affine transform of a zero-sum [NMR44; Aum61; ADP09; BO98; IM80; MV78; KS12; HG19].

The same PAT-method has also been used by Heyman [Hey19a] to expand on the class of rank-1 games³. Prior to that, Adsul et al. [Ads+11; Ads+21] showed that a Nash equilibrium of rank-1 games can be computed in polynomial time.

The research question of this paper is to investigate whether there are game transformations other than PATs which possess the property that they do not change the Nash equilibrium set and/or do not change the best response sets. If so, we could give analogous expansions on the classes of efficiently solvable bimatrix games, just as in the research cited above.

Since our results for bimatrix games naturally generalized to N -player games ($N \geq 2$), we decided to directly present this paper in the multiplayer setup.

Our Contributions:

First, we introduce PATs and game transformations for N -player games ($N \geq 2$). Then, we study game transformations that *preserve* (i.e. do not change) the Nash equilibrium set when applied to an arbitrary multiplayer game. Proposition 11 shows that such game transformations must not change the best response sets when applied to an arbitrary multiplayer game. This makes our results also relevant to the study of learning processes in games, e.g. best response dynamics. We proceed to prove over a series of results that such best response preserving game transformations must be a positive affine transformations (PATs). Since PATs also preserve Nash equilibrium sets, we have found two new equivalent definitions to PATs (see Theorem 17 and Corollary 18). These characterizations also express the unique role of PATs when it comes to game transformations.

In particular, our results imply for future research: If we want a method that, given an input game G , lists a family of games with the same Nash equilibrium set or best response sets as the game G , then we can either use PATs or we necessarily have to exploit some properties that are specific to the game G at hand.

Related Work:

Hammond [Ham05] studied games that may have different numerical utility functions but the same underlying cardinal preference relations. Then, the possible choices of numerical utility functions can only differ up to a positive affine transformation. Appendix A gives the required background from expected utility theory to understand Hammond’s statements and it discusses how our work goes further than that. In essence, our question on preserving Nash equilibrium sets and best response sets are need another treatment since they are different in nature to the question of preference representations. Morris and Ui [MU04] characterize whether two given input games are best-response equivalent (or better-response equivalent or von Neumann-Morgenstern equivalent, both of which are even stricter properties) in the situation where both games satisfy specific generic properties. Instead of a method to determine whether two input games are similar, this paper investigates transformations to generate

³A bimatrix game, represented as $(A, B) \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n} \times \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$, is called rank-1 if the matrix rank of $A + B$ is 1.

a family of similar games, given one input game. This is in part because it was Du [Du08] showed that it is **co-NP**-hard to decide whether two input games have the same Nash equilibrium set.

2 Preliminaries

For $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we denote $[n] := \{1, \dots, n\}$. Any vector $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is a column vector and its transpose is denoted by x^T . The entries of $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ will be x_1, \dots, x_n . Inequalities like $x \geq 0$ abbreviate the statement $\forall i \in [n] : x_i \geq 0$. For $i \in [n]$, we will use $e_i \in \mathbb{R}^n$ to denote the i -th standard basis vector (with a 1 in its i -th entry and 0's anywhere else). Furthermore, we will denote the vector with all ones as $\mathbb{1} \in \mathbb{R}^n$, where the dimension n will be clear from the context.

Multiplayer Games

A multiplayer game $G = (N, \{S^i\}_{i \in [N]}, \{u_i\}_{i \in [N]})$ specifies

1. the amount of players $N \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 2}$
2. a set of strategies S^i for each player i such that $m_i := |S^i| \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 2}$ and
3. a utility function $u_i : S^1 \times \dots \times S^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ for each player i .

We refer to the strategies of S^i as the *pure* strategies. They are denoted as the standard basis vectors $S^i = \{e_1, \dots, e_{m_i}\} \subset \mathbb{R}^{m_i}$. In a multiplayer game, each player i simultaneously chooses a pure strategy $e_{k_i} \in S^i$. Player i then gains utility $u_i(e_{k_1}, \dots, e_{k_N})$. The goal of each player is to maximize their utility. Cooperation or communication between the players is prohibited. Often times, we also use the term payoff instead of utility.

A utility function u_i can be summarized by a N -dimensional array

$$\left\{ u_i(e_{k_1}, \dots, e_{k_N}) \right\}_{k_1, \dots, k_N=1}^{m_1, \dots, m_N}$$

that captures all scenario outcomes for player i .

As typical in game theory, we allow the players to randomize/mix over their pure strategies⁴. Then, player i 's strategy space extends to the probability vectors over S^i , i.e.

$$\Delta(S^i) := \left\{ s^i = \sum_{k=1}^{m_i} s_k^i e_k \in \mathbb{R}^{m_i} \mid s^i \geq 0 \text{ and } \mathbb{1}^T s^i = 1 \right\} .$$

A probability vector $s^i = (s_1^i, \dots, s_{m_i}^i) \in \Delta(S^i)$ is referred to as a mixed strategy.

A strategy profile in a game G is a tuple of mixed strategies

$$s = (s^1, \dots, s^N) \in \Delta(S^1) \times \dots \times \Delta(S^N) =: \prod_{i=1}^N \Delta(S^i)$$

specifying what mixed strategies each player chose. We sometimes also call it a scenario. The utility gain of player i for the strategy profile s is defined to be their utility gain in expectation

$$u_i(s) := \sum_{k_1=1}^{m_1} \dots \sum_{k_N=1}^{m_N} s_{k_1}^1 \cdot \dots \cdot s_{k_N}^N \cdot u_i(e_{k_1}, \dots, e_{k_N})$$

when each player i randomizes their pure strategies according to s^i .

Example 1. A very active field of study in game theory are multiplayer games with $N = 2$, better known as bimatrix games because they can be represented by a payoff bimatrix $(A, B) \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n} \times \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$. In our multiplayer notation, a bimatrix game (A, B) would be represented by $N = 2$, $S^1 = \{e_1, \dots, e_m\}$ and $S^2 = \{e_1, \dots, e_n\}$ as well as by utility functions $u_1(e_i, e_j) := A_{ij}$ and $u_2(e_i, e_j) := B_{ij}$ where $i \in [m]$, $j \in [n]$.

⁴That is because often times, a pure strategy is easily exploitable by the opponent players, e.g. in Rock-Paper-Scissors.

For N -player games, we will often use $s^{-i} := (s^1, \dots, s^{i-1}, s^{i+1}, \dots, s^N)$ as an abbreviation. Then, player i 's payoff is simply referred to as $u_i(s^i, s^{-i}) := u_i(s)$ which stresses how player i can only influence their own strategy when it comes to their payoff. Thus, player i can only play optimal given what strategies the other players have chosen. Those optimal plays are called best responses. The best response set of player i to the strategy profile s^{-i} of the opponents is denoted as

$$BR_{u_i}(s^{-i}) := \operatorname{argmax}_{t^i \in \Delta(S^i)} \left\{ u_i(t^i, s^{-i}) \right\} .$$

If we only want to consider the best responses that are pure strategies, then we use

$$PBR_{u_i}(s^{-i}) := BR_{u_i}(s^{-i}) \cap \{e_1, \dots, e_{m_i}\} .$$

How do best responses and pure best responses relate? Given $s^{-i} \in \prod_{j \neq i} \Delta(S^j)$, the payoff of player i from playing t^i will be the convex combination

$$\begin{aligned} u_i(t^i, s^{-i}) &= \sum_{k_1=1}^{m_1} t_{k_1}^i \cdot \sum_{k_2=1}^{m_2} \dots \sum_{k_{i-1}=1}^{m_{i-1}} \sum_{k_{i+1}=1}^{m_{i+1}} \dots \sum_{k_N=1}^{m_N} s_{k_1}^1 \cdot \dots \cdot s_{k_{i-1}}^{i-1} \cdot s_{k_{i+1}}^{i+1} \cdot \dots \cdot s_{k_N}^N \cdot u_i(e_{k_1}, \dots, e_{k_N}) \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^{m_i} t_k^i \cdot u_i(e_k, s^{-i}) . \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

Suppose t^i is a best response to s^{-i} , i.e. it maximizes u_i given s^{-i} . Then by considering the convex combination above, t^i is such a maximizer if and only if t^i only randomizes over those pure strategies e_k that maximize u_i themselves (given s^{-i}). We conclude:

Lemma 2. *Take a game $G = (N, \{S^j\}_{j \in [N]}, \{u_j\}_{j \in [N]})$, fix player i and the strategy profile $s^{-i} \in \prod_{j \neq i} \Delta(S^j)$ of the opponents. Then we have for $t^i = (t_1^i, \dots, t_{m_i}^i) \in \Delta(S^i)$:*

$$t^i \in BR_{u_i}(s^{-i}) \iff \forall k \in [m_i] : t_k^i = 0 \text{ or } e_k \in PBR_{u_i}(s^{-i}) . \quad (2)$$

Proof. Follows from (1). □

Corollary 3. *Let S be some finite strategy set and $BR_{u_i}(s^{-i}), BR_{u'_i}(s'^{-i}) \in \Delta(S)$ for some given $u_i, u'_i, s^{-i}, s'^{-i}$. Then, we have equality $BR_{u_i}(s^{-i}) = BR_{u'_i}(s'^{-i})$ if and only if the two sets contain the same pure best responses.*

Proof. “ \Rightarrow ”: Take pure strategy $e_k \in S$. Then $e_k \in BR_{u_i}(s^{-i}) \iff e_k \in BR_{u'_i}(s'^{-i})$.

“ \Leftarrow ”: By Lemma 2, we have

$$\begin{aligned} t^i \in BR_{u_i}(s^{-i}) &\iff \forall k \in [m_i] : t_k^i = 0 \text{ or } e_k \in PBR_{u_i}(s^{-i}) \\ &\iff \forall k \in [m_i] : t_k^i = 0 \text{ or } e_k \in PBR_{u'_i}(s'^{-i}) \iff t^i \in BR_{u'_i}(s'^{-i}) . \end{aligned}$$

□

The most popular equilibrium concept in non-cooperative games is the Nash equilibrium:

Definition 4. *Take a game $G = (N, \{S^i\}_{i \in [N]}, \{u_i\}_{i \in [N]})$ and fix a strategy profile*

$s = (s^1, \dots, s^N) \in \prod_{i=1}^N \Delta(S^i)$. *Then we say that s is a Nash equilibrium of the game G if for all players $i \in [N]$ we have $s^i \in BR_{u_i}(s^{-i})$.*

So in a Nash equilibrium, each player played the best strategy they had, given what the opponents played. Therefore, no player regrets their decision making in hindsight. Any multiplayer game G admits at least one Nash equilibrium in mixed strategies (see [Nas50]).

Positive Affine Transformations

When do we consider two games G and G' to be the same? If we are only interested in Nash equilibria, then [Ads+21] and [Hey19b] use the following notion:

Definition 5. *Two games $G = (N, \{S^i\}_{i \in [N]}, \{u_i\}_{i \in [N]})$ and $G' = (N', \{(S')^i\}_{i \in [N]}, \{u'_i\}_{i \in [N]})$ are called strategically equivalent if we have $N = N'$, $\forall i \in [N]: S^i = (S')^i$ and that G has the same set of Nash equilibria as G' .*

Other researchers have used the term *strategic equivalence* for different (typically stricter) concepts. We refer to [Hey19b, Section 2.2.2] for a review on that. Our definition allows us to compute the Nash equilibria of G by computing them for G' instead. Interestingly enough, [Aum61; MV78; KS12; Hey19b] showed that allowing such detours can significantly expand the class of games for which we have efficient computations of Nash equilibria.

From now on, we fix the amount of players N and the strategy sets S^1, \dots, S^N for all upcoming multiplayer games.

Hence, we only have to specify utility functions $u_i : S^1 \times \dots \times S^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ for each player $i \in [N]$ when we want to fix a multiplayer game.

By Du [Du08], the problem of deciding whether two games share a common Nash equilibrium is **NP**-hard. Moreover, the author deduces that it is **co-NP**-hard to decide whether two games are strategically equivalent (which he calls strongly similar). So instead of checking whether two games are strategically equivalent, we will use transformations on some given input game G to generate a family of games from which we already know that they will be strategically equivalent to G . One possible way of doing so is through a positive affine transformation (PAT), sometimes also called a positive linear transformation. The following lemma is a well-known result for the case of 2-player games:

Lemma 6. *Let (A, B) be a $m \times n$ bimatrix game and take arbitrary $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ and $a \in \mathbb{R}^n, b \in \mathbb{R}^m$. Define*

$$A' = \alpha A + \mathbb{1}_m a^T, \quad B' = \beta B + b \mathbb{1}_n^T \quad .$$

Then game (A', B') is strategically equivalent to game (A, B) .

The intuition behind this lemma is as follows: Player 1 wants to maximize their utility given the strategy that player 2 chose. A positive rescaling of u_1 will change the utility gains but will not change strategy set of best responses. The same holds if we added utility gains/losses to u_1 dependent on the strategy choice s^2 of the opponent. This intuition, translated into the notation of bimatrix games, then yields that the transformation $A \rightarrow A + \mathbb{1}_m a^T$ does not affect the best response sets of player 1. Symmetrically for player 2 and the transformation $B \rightarrow B + b \mathbb{1}_n^T$. Hence, the Nash equilibrium set also stays the same when transitioning to (A', B') .

Let us first generalize PATs to multiplayer games and then make the intuition above rigorous.

Definition 7. *A positive affine transformation (PAT) specifies for each player i a scaling parameter $\alpha^i \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ and translation constants*

$$C^i := \left(c_{k_1, \dots, k_{i-1}, k_{i+1}, \dots, k_N}^i \right)_{k_1, \dots, k_{i-1}, k_{i+1}, \dots, k_N=1}^{m_1, \dots, m_{i-1}, m_{i+1}, \dots, m_N} \quad ,$$

that is, one translation constant for each choice of pure strategies from the opponents.

The positive affine transformation of a game $G = \{u_i\}_{i \in [N]}$ through $\{\alpha^i, C^i\}_{i \in [N]}$ is defined to be the game $G' = \{u'_i\}_{i \in [N]}$ with an unchanged amount of players, with unchanged strategy sets and where for all $i \in [N]$, $k_1 \in [m_1], \dots, k_N \in [m_N]$:

$$u'_i(e_{k_1}, \dots, e_{k_N}) := \alpha_i \cdot u_i(e_{k_1}, \dots, e_{k_N}) + c_{k_1, \dots, k_{i-1}, k_{i+1}, \dots, k_N}^i \quad . \quad (3)$$

We could not find multiplayer PATs defined in the literature, thus we came up with the generalization above. First, note that these multiplayer PATs indeed generalize the 2-player PATs from Lemma 6 by setting $\alpha := \alpha^1, \beta := \alpha^2$ and $a := (c_1^1, \dots, c_{m_2}^1)^T, b := (c_1^2, \dots, c_{m_1}^2)^T$. Then if $\{u_1, u_2\} \leftrightarrow (A, B)$ is a two-player game, we indeed have the equality of both transformation definitions

$$\begin{aligned} \left(u'_1(e_i, e_j)\right)_{ij} &= \left(\alpha_1 \cdot u_1(e_i, e_j) + c_j^1\right)_{ij} = \alpha A + \mathbb{1}_m a^T \quad \text{and} \\ \left(u'_2(e_i, e_j)\right)_{ij} &= \left(\alpha_2 \cdot u_2(e_i, e_j) + c_i^2\right)_{ij} = \beta B + b \mathbb{1}_n^T. \end{aligned}$$

Secondly, these PATs indeed preserve the best response sets and therefore also the Nash equilibrium set. The proof is an appropriate generalization of the proof of Lemma 6.

Lemma 8. *Take a PAT $\{\alpha^i, C^i\}_{i \in [N]}$ and any game $G = \{u_i\}_{i \in [N]}$. Then, the corresponding transformed game $G' = \{u'_i\}_{i \in [N]}$ is strategically equivalent to G .*

Proof. We first show that the best response sets are preserved after an application of the PAT. Take a game $\{u_j\}_{j \in [N]}$, fix a player i and a strategy profile s^{-i} of the opponents. Then, we have

$$\begin{aligned} BR_{u'_i}(s^{-i}) &= \operatorname{argmax}_{t^i \in \Delta(S^i)} \left\{ u'_i(t^i, s^{-i}) \right\} \\ &= \operatorname{argmax}_{t^i \in \Delta(S^i)} \left\{ \sum_{k_1=1}^{m_1} \dots \sum_{k_N=1}^{m_N} s_{k_1}^1 \cdot \dots \cdot t_{k_i}^i \cdot \dots \cdot s_{k_N}^N \cdot u'_i(e_{k_1}, \dots, e_{k_N}) \right\} \\ &\stackrel{(3)}{=} \operatorname{argmax}_{t^i \in \Delta(S^i)} \left\{ \sum_{k_1=1}^{m_1} \dots \sum_{k_N=1}^{m_N} s_{k_1}^1 \cdot \dots \cdot t_{k_i}^i \cdot \dots \cdot s_{k_N}^N \cdot \left(\alpha^i \cdot u_i(e_{k_1}, \dots, e_{k_N}) + c_{k_1, \dots, k_{i-1}, k_{i+1}, \dots, k_N} \right) \right\} \\ &\stackrel{(*)}{=} \operatorname{argmax}_{t^i \in \Delta(S^i)} \left\{ \alpha^i \cdot \sum_{k_1=1}^{m_1} \dots \sum_{k_N=1}^{m_N} s_{k_1}^1 \cdot \dots \cdot t_{k_i}^i \cdot \dots \cdot s_{k_N}^N \cdot u_i(e_{k_1}, \dots, e_{k_N}) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \sum_{k_1=1}^{m_1} \dots \sum_{k_{i-1}=1}^{m_{i-1}} \sum_{k_{i+1}=1}^{m_{i+1}} \dots \sum_{k_N=1}^{m_N} s_{k_1}^1 \cdot \dots \cdot s_{k_{i-1}}^{i-1} \cdot s_{k_{i+1}}^{i+1} \cdot \dots \cdot s_{k_N}^N \cdot c_{k_1, \dots, k_{i-1}, k_{i+1}, \dots, k_N} \right\} \\ &\stackrel{(\dagger)}{=} \operatorname{argmax}_{t^i \in \Delta(S^i)} \left\{ \sum_{k_1=1}^{m_1} \dots \sum_{k_N=1}^{m_N} s_{k_1}^1 \cdot \dots \cdot t_{k_i}^i \cdot \dots \cdot s_{k_N}^N \cdot u_i(e_{k_1}, \dots, e_{k_N}) \right\} \\ &= \operatorname{argmax}_{t^i \in \Delta(S^i)} \left\{ u_i(t^i, s^{-i}) \right\} = BR_{u_i}(s^{-i}) \end{aligned}$$

We obtained $(*)$ by moving the sum $\sum_{k_i=1}^{m_i}$ to the right and all of the factors independent of k_i to the left of $\sum_{k_i=1}^{m_i}$. Then since the translation $c_{k_1, \dots, k_{i-1}, k_{i+1}, \dots, k_N}$ is independent of k_i , we can drop the vanishing factor $\sum_{k_i=1}^{m_i} t_i = 1$. We got line (\dagger) because the argmax operator is not affected by constants

in t_i or by a rescaling with a positive factor α_i .

Therefore, the definition of a Nash equilibrium implies: A strategy profile s is a Nash equilibrium for the positive affine transformed game $\{u'_j\}_{j \in [N]}$ if and only if it was one for the original game $\{u_j\}_{j \in [N]}$. This yields strategic equivalence. \square

3 Maps that preserve Nash Equilibrium Sets and/or Best Response Sets

As mentioned before, positive affine transformations have been applied successfully to expand the classes of games for which we have efficient solvers. A key property that makes PATs suitable for such an extension is that they preserve Nash equilibrium sets. We want to investigate the question whether there are game transformations other than PATs with the same property. If so, we could use them to

even further increase the classes of efficiently solvable games⁵. To our surprise, we could not find our research question addressed anywhere in the literature.

To be specific, we want to study game transformations $H = \{H^i\}_{i \in [N]}$ where each H^i further specifies a collection of functions

$$H^i := \left\{ h_{k_1, \dots, k_N}^i : \mathbb{R} \longrightarrow \mathbb{R} \right\}_{k_1, \dots, k_N=1}^{m_1, \dots, m_N} ,$$

that is, one function for each pure strategy profile $(e_{k_1}, \dots, e_{k_N}) \in \prod_{i=1}^N S^i$.

A game transformation H can then be applied to a game $G = \{u_i\}_{i \in [N]}$ to obtain the transformed game $H(G)$. Game $H(G) = \{H^i(u_i)\}_{i \in [N]}$ has the same amount of players and the same strategy sets, but for each player $i \in [N]$, the utility function becomes

$$\begin{aligned} H^i(u_i) : S^1 \times \dots \times S^N &\longrightarrow \mathbb{R} \\ (e_{k_1}, \dots, e_{k_N}) &\longmapsto h_{k_1, \dots, k_N}^i(u_i(e_{k_1}, \dots, e_{k_N})) \end{aligned} .$$

Thus, the game transformation H maps input $\{u_i\}_{i \in [N]}$ player-wise and scenario-wise to the new utility outcomes. The extension of $H^i(u_i)$ to mixed strategy profiles $s \in \prod_{i=1}^N \Delta(S^i)$ is as before by taking the expected utility

$$H^i(u_i)(s) := \sum_{k_1=1}^{m_1} \dots \sum_{k_N=1}^{m_N} s_{k_1}^1 \cdot \dots \cdot s_{k_N}^N \cdot h_{k_1, \dots, k_N}^i(u_i(e_{k_1}, \dots, e_{k_N})) \quad . \quad (4)$$

We will often use $h_{k_i, k_{-i}}^i$ to refer to h_{k_1, \dots, k_N}^i .

Example 9. A positive affine transformation $\{\alpha^i, C^i\}_{i \in [N]}$ makes a game transformation $H = \{H^i\}_{i \in [N]}$ in the above sense through

$$\begin{aligned} h_{k_1, \dots, k_N}^i : \mathbb{R} &\longrightarrow \mathbb{R}, \\ z &\longmapsto \alpha^i \cdot z + C_{k_1, \dots, k_{i-1}, k_{i+1}, \dots, k_N}^i \end{aligned} .$$

Definition 10. Let $H = \{H^i\}_{i \in [N]}$ be a game transformation. Then we say:

1. H universally preserves Nash equilibrium sets if for all games $G = \{u_i\}_{i \in [N]}$, the transformed game $H(G) = \{H^i(u_i)\}_{i \in [N]}$ has the same Nash equilibrium set as the original game G .
2. transformation H^i , $i \in [N]$, universally preserves best responses if for all utility functions $u_i : S^1 \times \dots \times S^N \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and for all strategy profiles s^{-i} of the opponents:

$$BR_{H^i(u_i)}(s^{-i}) = \operatorname{argmax}_{t^i \in \Delta(S^i)} \left\{ H^i(u_i)(t^i, s^{-i}) \right\} = \operatorname{argmax}_{t^i \in \Delta(S^i)} \left\{ u_i(t^i, s^{-i}) \right\} = BR_{u_i}(s^{-i})$$

3. transformation H^i , $i \in [N]$, only depends on the strategy choice of the opponents if for all pure strategy choice $k_{-i} := (k_1, \dots, k_{i-1}, k_{i+1}, \dots, k_N)$ of the opponents, we have the map identities

$$h_{1, k_{-i}}^i = \dots = h_{m_i, k_{-i}}^i : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \quad .$$

Therefore, Lemma 8 showed that PATs universally preserve Nash equilibrium sets and universally preserve best responses. By the definition of Nash equilibria, if for all players i , transformation H^i universally preserves best responses, then $H = \{H^i\}_{i \in [N]}$ universally preserves Nash equilibrium sets.

The main result of this thesis will be:

⁵The game transformations would additionally need to satisfy: Given an input game, we can efficiently identify a transform of it for which we have an efficient Nash equilibrium computation. However, this additional property will be irrelevant for us because we will show that PATs are the only transformations with our desired properties.

Theorem. Let $H = \{H^i\}_{i \in [N]}$ be a game transformation. Then:

H universally preserves Nash equilibrium sets (i)

\iff for each player i , transformation H^i universally preserves best responses (ii)

$\iff H$ is a positive affine transformation as defined in Definition 7. (iii)

Therefore, we have two equivalent characterizations to what it means for a game transformation to be positive affine transformation. Both characterizations have a direct game theoretic interpretation. For the two-player setting, the theorem breaks down to:

Corollary. PATs make up all the game transformations that we can apply to any bimatrix game and be sure that the Nash equilibrium set and/or the best response sets stayed the same.

As a consequence, there are no other transformation types with which we can replicate the work of [Hey19b] in which classes of efficiently solvable games were expanded on through the use of PATs. Further consequences of the theorem and corollary will be discussed on Page 14. The remaining section will show the directions (i) \implies (ii) \implies (iii) in the theorem.

The key property that enables us to derive the main theorem is that the considered game transformation $H = \{H^i\}_{i \in [N]}$ needs to be universally applicable, no matter the game $G = \{u_i\}_{i \in [N]}$ we have at hand. As an intermediate step, we will show that such game transformations have to preserve the best response sets.

Proposition 11. If the game transformation $H = \{H^i\}_{i \in [N]}$ universally preserves Nash equilibrium sets, then for each player i , the transformation H^i

1. only depends on the strategy choice of the opponents and
2. universally preserves best responses.

Proof. Take game transformation $H = \{H^i\}_{i \in [N]}$ that universally preserves Nash equilibrium sets and fix some player i .

First conclusion:

Fix the pure strategy choice $s^{-i} := (e_{k_1}, \dots, e_{k_{i-1}}, e_{k_{i+1}}, \dots, e_{k_N})$ of the opponent players and let $z \in \mathbb{R}$. Consider the game $G = \{u_j\}_{j \in [N]}$ with constant utility functions $u_j \equiv z$ for all $j \in [N]$. Then, the

Nash equilibrium set will be the whole strategy space $\prod_{j=1}^N \Delta(S^j)$. By assumption on H , the trans-

formed game $H(G)$ also has the full strategy space as its set of Nash equilibria. In particular, each of the strategy profiles $(s^i = e_1, s^{-i}), \dots, (s^i = e_{m_i}, s^{-i})$ are Nash equilibria of the transformed game $H(G)$. Hence, for all $2 \leq l \leq m_i$:

$$\begin{aligned}
h_{1, k_{-i}}^i(z) &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} h_{k_1, \dots, k_{i-1}, 1, k_{i+1}, \dots, k_N}^i(z) \\
&\stackrel{u_i \equiv z}{=} h_{k_1, \dots, k_{i-1}, 1, k_{i+1}, \dots, k_N}^i(u_i(e_{k_1}, \dots, e_{k_{i-1}}, e_1, e_{k_{i+1}}, \dots, e_{k_N})) \\
&\stackrel{(4)}{=} H^i(u_i)(e_1, s^{-i}) \\
&\stackrel{\text{Nash-Eq}}{=} \max_{t^i \in \Delta(S^i)} \left\{ H^i(u_i)(t^i, s^{-i}) \right\} \\
&\stackrel{\text{Nash-Eq}}{=} H^i(u_i)(e_l, s^{-l}) \\
&\stackrel{(4)}{=} h_{k_1, \dots, k_{i-1}, l, k_{i+1}, \dots, k_N}^i(u_i(e_{k_1}, \dots, e_{k_{i-1}}, e_l, e_{k_{i+1}}, \dots, e_{k_N})) \\
&= h_{k_1, \dots, k_{i-1}, l, k_{i+1}, \dots, k_N}^i(z) = h_{l, k_{-i}}^i(z) \quad .
\end{aligned}$$

Since z and l were chosen arbitrarily, we get $h_{1, k_{-i}}^i = \dots = h_{m_i, k_{-i}}^i$.

Second conclusion:

Fix player i 's utility function u_i and the strategy profile s^{-i} of the opponents. Then by Corollary 3, it suffices to identify the pure strategies in the best response sets $BR_{u_i}(s^{-i})$ and $BR_{H^i(u_i)}(s^{-i})$.

Take game $G = \{u_j\}_{j \in [N]}$ with u_i as prefixed and with $u_j \equiv 0$ for players $j \neq i$. Then the best responses of players $j \neq i$ are their whole strategy space S^j . By assumption on the game transformation H , we get for a pure strategy $e_l \in S^i$:

$$\begin{aligned}
e_l &\in BR_{u_i}(s^{-i}) \\
&\iff (e_l, s^{-i}) \text{ is a Nash equilibrium for the game } G \\
&\iff (e_l, s^{-i}) \text{ is a Nash equilibrium for the game } H(G) \\
&\stackrel{\text{def}}{\iff} e_l \in BR_{H^i(u_i)}(s^{-i}) \text{ and} \\
&\quad \forall j \neq i : s^j \in BR_{H^j(u_j)}(s^1, \dots, s^{j-1}, s^{j+1}, \dots, s^{i-1}, e_l, s^{i+1}, \dots, s^N) \\
&\stackrel{(*)}{\iff} e_l \in BR_{H^i(u_i)}(s^{-i})
\end{aligned}$$

Let us explain (*). Recall the definition for a strategy s^j , $j \neq i$, to be a best response to the strategies $(s^1, \dots, s^{j-1}, s^{j+1}, \dots, s^{i-1}, s^i := e_l, s^{i+1}, \dots, s^N)$ of the opponents:

$$s^j \in \operatorname{argmax}_{t^j \in \Delta(S^j)} \left\{ \sum_{k_1=1}^{m_1} \dots \sum_{k_N=1}^{m_N} s_{k_1}^1 \cdot \dots \cdot t_{k_j}^j \cdot \dots \cdot s_{k_N}^N \cdot h_{k_1, \dots, k_N}^j(u_j(e_{k_1}, \dots, e_{k_N})) \right\} .$$

Now rearrange the term in the argmax to obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{k_1=1}^{m_1} \dots \sum_{k_N=1}^{m_N} s_{k_1}^1 \cdot \dots \cdot t_{k_j}^j \cdot \dots \cdot s_{k_N}^N \cdot h_{k_1, \dots, k_N}^j(u_j(e_{k_1}, \dots, e_{k_N})) \\
&\stackrel{u_j \equiv 0}{=} \sum_{k_1=1}^{m_1} \dots \sum_{k_{j-1}=1}^{m_{j-1}} \sum_{k_{j+1}=1}^{m_{j+1}} \dots \sum_{k_N=1}^{m_N} \left(s_{k_1}^1 \cdot \dots \cdot s_{k_{j-1}}^{j-1} \cdot s_{k_{j+1}}^{j+1} \cdot \dots \cdot s_{k_N}^N \cdot \sum_{k_j=1}^{m_j} t_{k_j}^j \cdot h_{k_1, \dots, k_N}^j(0) \right) \\
&\stackrel{(\dagger)}{=} \sum_{k_1=1}^{m_1} \dots \sum_{k_{j-1}=1}^{m_{j-1}} \sum_{k_{j+1}=1}^{m_{j+1}} \dots \sum_{k_N=1}^{m_N} s_{k_1}^1 \cdot \dots \cdot s_{k_{j-1}}^{j-1} \cdot s_{k_{j+1}}^{j+1} \cdot \dots \cdot s_{k_N}^N \cdot h_{k_1, \dots, k_{j-1}, 1, k_{j+1}, \dots, k_N}^j(0)
\end{aligned}$$

where (\dagger) follows from the first conclusion of this proposition. So the term in the argmax is constant in t^j and thus, any strategy of player j is a best response to $(s^1, \dots, s^{j-1}, s^{j+1}, \dots, s^{i-1}, e_l, s^{i+1}, \dots, s^N)$. Hence, equivalence (*) follows by removing/adding the redundant condition on s^j to be a best response.

All in all, we proved that the sets $BR_{u_i}(s^{-i})$ and $BR_{H^i(u_i)}(s^{-i})$ contain the same pure strategies. Corollary 3 therefore yields set equality. \square

In the last proposition, we used the first conclusion to prove the second one. Before we discuss the conclusions, let us first show the following Lemma.

Lemma 12. *Suppose transformation map H^i universally preserves best responses. Then it only depends on the strategy choice of the opponents.*

Proof. Let the pure strategy choice of the opponents be $k_{-i} := (k_1, \dots, k_{i-1}, k_{i+1}, \dots, k_N)$, i.e. $s^{-i} = (e_{k_1}, \dots, e_{k_{i-1}}, e_{k_{i+1}}, \dots, e_{k_N})$. Pick some $z \in \mathbb{R}$ and set $u_i \equiv z$. Then we can reformulate

$$\begin{aligned}
h_{1,k_{-i}}^i(z) &= \dots = h_{m_i,k_{-i}}^i(z) \\
&\iff \forall l \in [m_i] : h_{k_1,\dots,k_{i-1},l,k_{i+1},\dots,k_N}^i(z) = \max_{j \in [m_i]} h_{k_1,\dots,k_{i-1},j,k_{i+1},\dots,k_N}^i(z) \\
&\stackrel{y_i \equiv z}{\iff} \forall l \in [m_i] : h_{k_1,\dots,k_{i-1},l,k_{i+1},\dots,k_N}^i(u_i(e_{k_1}, \dots, e_{k_{i-1}}, e_l, e_{k_{i+1}}, \dots, e_{k_N})) \\
&\quad = \max_{j \in [m_i]} h_{k_1,\dots,k_{i-1},j,k_{i+1},\dots,k_N}^i(u_i(e_{k_1}, \dots, e_{k_{i-1}}, e_j, e_{k_{i+1}}, \dots, e_{k_N})) \\
&\iff \forall l \in [m_i] : \text{given } s^{-i}, \text{ response } e_l \text{ yields at least as much utility in } H^i(u_i) \\
&\quad \text{as any other pure strategy } e_j. \\
&\stackrel{\text{def}}{\iff} \forall l \in [m_i] : e_l \in BR_{H^i(u_i)}(s^{-i}) \\
&\stackrel{(*)}{\iff} \forall l \in [m_i] : e_l \in BR_{u_i}(s^{-i}) \\
&\stackrel{\text{def}}{\iff} \forall l \in [m_i] : u_i(e_{k_1}, \dots, e_{k_{i-1}}, e_l, e_{k_{i+1}}, \dots, e_{k_N}) \\
&\quad = \max_{j \in [m_i]} u_i(e_{k_1}, \dots, e_{k_{i-1}}, e_j, e_{k_{i+1}}, \dots, e_{k_N}) \\
&\stackrel{y_i \equiv z}{\iff} \forall l \in [m_i] : z = \max_{j \in [m_i]} z \quad .
\end{aligned}$$

In (*), we used our assumption on H^i .

The last line of the equivalence chain is certainly true. Because z was chosen arbitrarily, we therefore obtain $h_{1,k_{-i}}^i = \dots = h_{m_i,k_{-i}}^i$. \square

Thanks to Proposition 11, we can transition to investigating which transformation maps H^i universally preserve best responses for player i . So from now on, the results also become relevant for any game theory research that focuses on best response sets, e.g. best response dynamics.

Proposition 11 also implies that we can simplify our analysis of this section to only studying transformations H^1 that universally preserve best responses for player 1. By symmetry, any results for H^1 then hold for H^2, \dots, H^N as well. By Lemma 12, we can also drop the dependence of H^1 on k_1 and write

$$H^1 := \left\{ h_{k_2,\dots,k_N}^1 : \mathbb{R} \longrightarrow \mathbb{R} \right\}_{k_2,\dots,k_N=1}^{m_2,\dots,m_N} .$$

As help functions, we will introduce for k_2, \dots, k_N the maps

$$\begin{aligned}
\Delta h_{k_2,\dots,k_N}^1 &: \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} \longrightarrow \mathbb{R} \\
(z, w) &\longmapsto h_{k_2,\dots,k_N}^1(z) - h_{k_2,\dots,k_N}^1(w)
\end{aligned}$$

with two inputs to measure the distance between function values of h_{k_2,\dots,k_N}^1 . Then, the upcoming lemma relates these distance functions with each other. It will use variables l_2, \dots, l_N instead of k_1, \dots, k_N so that we won't get confused in the proof of the first conclusion in Lemma 14.

Lemma 13. *Suppose transformation map H^1 universally preserves best responses. Then $\forall r \in \{2, \dots, N\}$, $\forall l_r \in [m_r] \setminus \{1\}$, $\forall l_2 \in [m_2], \dots, \forall l_{r-1} \in [m_{r-1}], \forall l_{r+1} \in [m_{r+1}], \dots, \forall l_N \in [m_N]$ and $\forall z, z', w, w' \in \mathbb{R}$:*

$$z - w \geq z' - w' \iff \Delta h_{l_2,\dots,l_r,\dots,l_N}^1(z, w) \geq \Delta h_{l_2,\dots,1,\dots,l_N}^1(z', w')$$

Proof. Take a transformation map H^1 that universally preserves the best responses sets. Then by Lemma 12, its maps h_{k_1,k_2,\dots,k_N}^1 only depend on the strategy choice of the opponents. Let $r \in \{2, \dots, N\}$, $l_r \in [m_r] \setminus \{1\}$, $l_2 \in [m_2], \dots, l_{r-1} \in [m_{r-1}], l_{r+1} \in [m_{r+1}], \dots, l_N \in [m_N]$ and $z, z', w, w' \in \mathbb{R}$.

We can set $u_1(e_1, e_{l_2}, \dots, e_{l_r}, \dots, e_{l_N}) := z$ and $u_1(e_1, e_{l_2}, \dots, e_1, \dots, e_{l_N}) := w'$ because of $l_r \neq 1$. For all $j \in \{2, \dots, m_1\}$, we can set $u_1(e_j, e_{l_2}, \dots, e_{l_r}, \dots, e_{l_N}) := w$ and $u_1(e_j, e_{l_2}, \dots, e_1, \dots, e_{l_N}) := z'$ because of $l_r \neq 1$. The utility gains of u_1 from other scenarios can be set arbitrarily. Also, set $s^1 := e_1$ and let the strategy profile of the opponents be $s^{-1} := (e_{l_2}, \dots, \frac{1}{2}e_1 + \frac{1}{2}e_{l_r}, \dots, e_{l_N})$. Then:

$$z - w \geq z' - w'$$

$$\begin{aligned} \iff \forall j \in \{2, \dots, m_1\} : & u_1(e_1, e_{l_2}, \dots, e_{l_r}, \dots, e_{l_N}) - u_1(e_j, e_{l_2}, \dots, e_{l_r}, \dots, e_{l_N}) \\ & \geq u_1(e_j, e_{l_2}, \dots, e_1, \dots, e_{l_N}) - u_1(e_1, e_{l_2}, \dots, e_1, \dots, e_{l_N}) \end{aligned}$$

(Reorder and divide/multiply by 2 to get)

$$\begin{aligned} \iff \forall j \in \{2, \dots, m_1\} : & \frac{1}{2}u_1(e_1, e_{l_2}, \dots, e_{l_r}, \dots, e_{l_N}) + \frac{1}{2}u_1(e_1, e_{l_2}, \dots, e_1, \dots, e_{l_N}) \\ & \geq \frac{1}{2}u_1(e_j, e_{l_2}, \dots, e_1, \dots, e_{l_N}) + \frac{1}{2}u_1(e_j, e_{l_2}, \dots, e_{l_r}, \dots, e_{l_N}) \end{aligned}$$

$$\iff \forall j \in \{2, \dots, m_1\} : u_1(e_1, s^{-1}) \geq u_1(e_j, s^{-1})$$

$$\iff e_1 \in BR_{u_1}(s^{-1})$$

(Since H^1 is assumed to be universally best response preserving)

$$\iff e_1 \in BR_{H^1(u_1)}(s^{-1})$$

$$\iff \forall j \in \{2, \dots, m_1\} : H^1(u_1)(e_1, s^{-1}) \geq H^1(u_1)(e_j, s^{-1})$$

$$\iff \forall j \in \{2, \dots, m_1\} :$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{2}h_{1,l_2,\dots,1,\dots,l_N}^1(u_1(e_1, e_{l_2}, \dots, e_1, \dots, e_{l_N})) + \frac{1}{2}h_{1,l_2,\dots,l_r,\dots,l_N}^1(u_1(e_1, e_{l_2}, \dots, e_{l_r}, \dots, e_{l_N})) \\ & \geq \frac{1}{2}h_{j,l_2,\dots,1,\dots,l_N}^1(u_1(e_j, e_{l_2}, \dots, e_1, \dots, e_{l_N})) + \frac{1}{2}h_{j,l_2,\dots,l_r,\dots,l_N}^1(u_1(e_j, e_{l_2}, \dots, e_{l_r}, \dots, e_{l_N})) \end{aligned}$$

(Use that H^1 does not depend on the strategy choice of player 1)

$$\stackrel{(*)}{\iff} h_{l_2,\dots,1,\dots,l_N}^1(w') + h_{l_2,\dots,l_r,\dots,l_N}^1(z) \geq h_{l_2,\dots,1,\dots,l_N}^1(z') + h_{l_2,\dots,l_r,\dots,l_N}^1(w)$$

$$\iff h_{l_2,\dots,l_r,\dots,l_N}^1(z) - h_{l_2,\dots,l_r,\dots,l_N}^1(w) \geq h_{l_2,\dots,1,\dots,l_N}^1(z') - h_{l_2,\dots,1,\dots,l_N}^1(w')$$

$$\iff \Delta h_{l_2,\dots,l_r,\dots,l_N}^1(z, w) \geq \Delta h_{l_2,\dots,1,\dots,l_N}^1(z', w')$$

□

It was key in the above proof that our transformation H^1 is applicable to any utility function u_1 . This allows us to match any inputs z, z', w, w' to an appropriate utility function u_1 . Only based on that, the previous and upcoming lemma are able to deduce global properties of H^1 .

Note that the maps $\Delta h_{k_2,\dots,k_N}^1$ are skew-symmetric, i.e.

$$\Delta h_{k_2,\dots,k_N}^1(z, w) = -\Delta h_{k_2,\dots,k_N}^1(w, z) \quad .$$

With that, the next lemma gives interpretable insights into the maps of H^1 :

Lemma 14. *Suppose transformation H^1 universally preserves best responses. Then:*

1. “The maps in H^1 equally distort distances”

$$\forall k_2 \in [m_2], \dots, k_N \in [m_N] : \Delta h_{k_2,\dots,k_N}^1 = \Delta h_{1,\dots,1}^1 \quad .$$

2. $\forall k_2 \in [m_2], \dots, k_N \in [m_N] : \text{map } h_{k_2,\dots,k_N}^1 \text{ is strictly increasing.}$

3. “Distances are distorted independent of the reference points”

$$\forall k_2 \in [m_2], \dots, k_N \in [m_N]:$$

$$\forall z, z', \lambda \in \mathbb{R} : \Delta h_{k_2,\dots,k_N}^1(z + \lambda, z) = \Delta h_{k_2,\dots,k_N}^1(z' + \lambda, z') \quad . \quad (5)$$

Proof. Take a transformation map H^1 that universally preserves the best responses sets. Then by Lemma 12, its maps h_{k_1,k_2,\dots,k_N}^1 only depend on the strategy choice of the opponents.

First conclusion:

Fix $k_2 \in [m_2], \dots, k_N \in [m_N]$. Recall that the elements $r \geq 2$ and l_2, \dots, l_N in Lemma 13 can be chosen arbitrarily⁶. So we can apply Lemma 13 on a trivially true statement to get for all $z, w \in \mathbb{R}$:

$$\begin{aligned} z - w &\geq z - w \\ \implies \forall r \in \{2, \dots, N\} : \Delta h_{k_2, \dots, k_{r-1}, k_r, 1, \dots, 1}^1(z, w) &\geq \Delta h_{k_2, \dots, k_{r-1}, 1, 1, \dots, 1}^1(z, w) \\ \implies \Delta h_{k_2, \dots, k_{N-1}, k_N}^1(z, w) &\geq \Delta h_{k_2, \dots, k_{N-1}, 1}^1(z, w) \geq \dots \geq \Delta h_{1, \dots, 1}^1(z, w) \quad . \end{aligned}$$

With skew-symmetry, we similarly obtain

$$\begin{aligned} w - z &\geq w - z \\ \implies \forall r \in \{2, \dots, N\} : \Delta h_{k_2, \dots, k_{r-1}, k_r, 1, \dots, 1}^1(w, z) &\geq \Delta h_{k_2, \dots, k_{r-1}, 1, 1, \dots, 1}^1(w, z) \\ \implies \Delta h_{k_2, \dots, k_{N-1}, k_N}^1(w, z) &\geq \Delta h_{k_2, \dots, k_{N-1}, 1}^1(w, z) \geq \dots \geq \Delta h_{1, \dots, 1}^1(w, z) \\ \xrightarrow{\cdot(-1)} \Delta h_{k_2, \dots, k_{N-1}, k_N}^1(z, w) &\leq \Delta h_{1, \dots, 1}^1(z, w) \quad . \end{aligned}$$

Putting both together, we have for all $z, w \in \mathbb{R}$:

$$\Delta h_{k_2, \dots, k_{N-1}, k_N}^1(z, w) = \Delta h_{1, \dots, 1}^1(z, w) \quad .$$

Second conclusion:

Let us first consider $h_{2,1,\dots,1}^1$. Take arbitrary $z, w \in \mathbb{R}$. Apply Lemma 13 in upcoming line (*) with $r = 2, l_2 = 2, l_3 = 1 = l_4 = \dots = l_N$ and $z' = w' \in \mathbb{R}$ to get

$$\begin{aligned} z \geq w &\iff z - w \geq 0 = z' - w' \\ &\stackrel{(*)}{\iff} \Delta h_{2,1,\dots,1}^1(z, w) \geq \Delta h_{1,1,\dots,1}^1(z', w') \stackrel{z'=w'}{=} 0 \\ &\iff h_{2,1,\dots,1}^1(z) \geq h_{2,1,\dots,1}^1(w) \quad . \end{aligned}$$

Since z and w were arbitrary, we also have for any $\bar{z}, \bar{w} \in \mathbb{R}$ that

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{z} > \bar{w} &\iff \bar{z} \geq \bar{w} \text{ and } \bar{w} \not\geq \bar{z} \\ &\stackrel{\text{by above}}{\iff} h_{2,1,\dots,1}^1(\bar{z}) \geq h_{2,1,\dots,1}^1(\bar{w}) \text{ and } h_{2,1,\dots,1}^1(\bar{w}) \not\geq h_{2,1,\dots,1}^1(\bar{z}) \\ &\iff h_{2,1,\dots,1}^1(\bar{z}) > h_{2,1,\dots,1}^1(\bar{w}) \quad . \end{aligned}$$

This shows that $h_{2,1,\dots,1}^1$ is strictly increasing.

For arbitrary k_2, \dots, k_N , we can then use the first conclusion to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{z} > \bar{w} &\iff h_{2,1,\dots,1}^1(\bar{z}) > h_{2,1,\dots,1}^1(\bar{w}) \\ &\iff \Delta h_{2,1,\dots,1}^1(\bar{z}, \bar{w}) > 0 \\ &\iff \Delta h_{k_2, \dots, k_N}^1(\bar{z}, \bar{w}) = \Delta h_{1,1,\dots,1}^1(\bar{z}, \bar{w}) = \Delta h_{2,1,\dots,1}^1(\bar{z}, \bar{w}) > 0 \\ &\iff h_{k_2, \dots, k_N}^1(\bar{z}) > h_{k_2, \dots, k_N}^1(\bar{w}) \quad . \end{aligned}$$

Thus h_{k_2, \dots, k_N}^1 is strictly increasing as well.

Third conclusion:

Let us show that $\Delta h_{1, \dots, 1}^1$ satisfies Property (5). Then by the first conclusion, all $\Delta h_{k_2, \dots, k_N}^1$ satisfy Property (5).

⁶We required $l_r \neq 1$ but this is irrelevant for our argument.

Fix $z, z', \lambda \in \mathbb{R}$. Then in the upcoming equivalence chain, use skew-symmetry in (*), the first conclusion in (†) and Lemma 13 in (★) for $r = 2, l_2 = 2, l_3 = 1 = l_4 = \dots = l_N$ to get

$$\begin{aligned}
& \Delta h_{1,\dots,1}^1(z + \lambda, z) = \Delta h_{1,\dots,1}^1(z' + \lambda, z') \\
& \stackrel{(*)}{\iff} \Delta h_{1,\dots,1}^1(z + \lambda, z) \geq \Delta h_{1,\dots,1}^1(z' + \lambda, z') \\
& \quad \text{and } \Delta h_{1,\dots,1}^1(z, z + \lambda) \geq \Delta h_{1,\dots,1}^1(z', z' + \lambda) \\
& \stackrel{(\dagger)}{\iff} \Delta h_{2,\dots,1}^1(z + \lambda, z) \geq \Delta h_{1,\dots,1}^1(z' + \lambda, z') \\
& \quad \text{and } \Delta h_{2,\dots,1}^1(z, z + \lambda) \geq \Delta h_{1,\dots,1}^1(z', z' + \lambda) \\
& \stackrel{(\star)}{\iff} z + \lambda - z \geq z' + \lambda - z' \quad \text{and} \quad z - (z + \lambda) \geq z' - (z' + \lambda) \quad .
\end{aligned}$$

The last line is certainly true and thus, the first line as well. Because $z, z', \lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ were arbitrary, map $h_{1,\dots,1}^1$ satisfies Property (5). \square

Lemma 14 gives us all we need to show that the PATs of Definition 7 are the only game transformations that universally preserve best responses. Intuitively speaking, the last conclusion of Lemma 14 says that the same distance λ in the domain space maps to the same amount of distance in the range space, no matter at which base point z we are. This brings us to the upcoming helping lemma which is closely related to the intuition above and a known result from analysis. A function $h : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is called linear if there exists $a \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $\forall z \in \mathbb{R} : h(z) = az$. A function $h : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is said to be additive if it satisfies

$$\forall x, y \in \mathbb{R} : \quad h(x + y) = h(x) + h(y) \quad .$$

Lemma 15. *Take a map $h : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ which is monotone and additive. Then h is linear.*

Proof. According to [Ree17], this was first shown by Darboux [Dar75] in 1875. Alternatively, [Pro] gives a proof in English. \square

How does the previous lemma relate to our findings in Lemma 14?

Corollary 16. *Let $h : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be monotone and satisfy for all $z, z', \lambda \in \mathbb{R}$:*

$$h(z + \lambda) - h(z) = h(z' + \lambda) - h(z') \quad . \quad (6)$$

Then h is affine linear, i.e. there exist $a, c \in \mathbb{R}$ such that for all $z \in \mathbb{R} : h(z) = az + c$.

Proof. Define $h'(z) := h(z) - h(0)$. Then h' is still monotone and, by our assumption on h , we have for all $x, y \in \mathbb{R}$

$$\begin{aligned}
h'(x + y) &= h(x + y) - h(0) = h(x + y) - h(y) + h(y) - h(0) \\
&= h(x) - h(0) + h(y) - h(0) = h'(x) + h'(y) \quad .
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we can apply Lemma 15 on h' to get $a \in \mathbb{R}$ such that for all $z \in \mathbb{R}$

$$h(z) = h(z) - h(0) + h(0) = h'(z) + h(0) = az + h(0) \quad .$$

Thus, set $c := h(0)$. \square

Finally, we can conclude with the main result:

Theorem 17. *Let $H = \{H^i\}_{i \in [N]}$ be a game transformation. Then:*

- H universally preserves Nash equilibrium sets (i)
- \iff for each player i , transformation H^i universally preserves best responses (ii)
- $\iff H$ is a positive affine transformation as defined in Definition 7. (iii)

Proof. (iii) \implies (i):
By Lemma 8.

(i) \implies (ii):
By Proposition 11.

(ii) \implies (iii):

Let us combine Corollary 16 with Lemma 14.

Take $k_2 \in [m_2], \dots, k_N \in [m_N]$. By the second and last conclusion of Lemma 14, map h_{k_2, \dots, k_N}^1 is monotone and satisfies the distance property (6). Hence, by Corollary 16, there exist parameters $a_{k_2, \dots, k_N}^1, c_{k_2, \dots, k_N}^1 \in \mathbb{R}$ such that for all $z \in \mathbb{R}$:

$$h_{k_2, \dots, k_N}^1(z) = a_{k_2, \dots, k_N}^1 \cdot z + c_{k_2, \dots, k_N}^1 \quad .$$

The first conclusion of Lemma 14 necessarily implies

$$\forall k_2 \in [m_2], \dots, k_N \in [m_N] : a_{k_2, \dots, k_N}^1 = a_{1, \dots, 1}^1 \quad .$$

So we only have to keep track of one scaling parameter for all maps in H^1 . Denote it with α^1 . Finally, $\alpha^1 > 0$ is necessarily implied by the second conclusion of Lemma 14. All in all, we have shown that H^1 is a positive affine transformation.

Previous to Lemma 14, we mentioned why the same result can be analogously derived for the other transformation maps H^2, \dots, H^N . The only difference is that for player i , we now have to index over $k_1 \in [m_1], \dots, k_{i-1} \in [m_{i-1}], k_{i+1} \in [m_{i+1}], \dots, k_N \in [m_N]$. \square

Finally, we explicitly state the result for two-player games:

Corollary 18. *PATs are the only game transformations that we can apply to any bimatrix game and be sure that the Nash equilibrium set and/or the best response sets stay the same.*

Corollary 18 and Theorem 17 stress how special PATs are with regards to Nash equilibrium sets and best responses. Therefore, they could be mentioned in standard literature or game theory lectures whenever positive affine (linear) transformations are introduced for the first time.

Our results in particular imply: If we want to use game transformations to list a family of games with the same Nash equilibrium set or best response sets as a given input game G , then we can either use PATs or we necessarily have to exploit some properties that are specific to the input game G .

4 Conclusion

First, we introduced game transformations and the positive affine transformations (PATs) for multi-player games. Next, we defined the properties (1) universally preserving Nash equilibrium sets and (2) universally preserving best responses. It is well-known that PATs universally preserve Nash equilibrium sets. We showed that for game transformations, universally preserving Nash equilibrium sets implies universally preserving best responses. Then, we derived further that if a game transformation universally preserves best responses then it is a positive affine transformation. Therefore, we gave two equivalent characterisations for a game transformation to be a PAT and both of them have a clear game theoretic interpretation.

Implications for future work:

The current literature is lacking in methods for creating strategic equivalent games to a given input game. Theorem 17 implies that such methods based on game transformations can only exist if we restricted the type of input games. In that case, a desirable type would be one that most games belong to. Furthermore, it would be ideal if given an input game, such a method also admits a polynomial time algorithm to identify a strategically equivalent game for which we can efficiently compute a Nash equilibrium (e.g. if it is zero-sum, strictly competitive, rank-1 etc.).

Acknowledgement

I sincerely thank Professor Sebastian van Strien for the valuable discussions and for his guidance throughout this project.

References

- [Adl13] Ilan Adler. “The equivalence of linear programs and zero-sum games”. English. In: *International Journal of Game Theory* 42.1 (2013), pp. 165–177. DOI: [10.1007/s00182-012-0328-8](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00182-012-0328-8).
- [ADP09] Ilan Adler, Constantinos Daskalakis, and Christos H. Papadimitriou. “A Note on Strictly Competitive Games”. In: *Internet and Network Economics*. Ed. by Stefano Leonardi. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2009, pp. 471–474. ISBN: 978-3-642-10841-9.
- [Ads+11] Bharat Adsul et al. “Rank-1 Bimatrix Games: A Homeomorphism and a Polynomial Time Algorithm”. In: *Proceedings of the Forty-Third Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*. STOC ’11. San Jose, California, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, 2011, pp. 195–204. ISBN: 9781450306911. DOI: [10.1145/1993636.1993664](https://doi.org/10.1145/1993636.1993664). URL: <https://doi.org/10.1145/1993636.1993664>.
- [Ads+21] Bharat Adsul et al. “Fast algorithms for rank-1 bimatrix games”. In: *Operations Research* 69.2 (2021), pp. 613–631.
- [Aum61] Robert J. Aumann. “Almost Strictly Competitive Games”. In: *Journal of The Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics* 9 (1961), pp. 544–550.
- [BO98] Tamer Başar and Geert Jan Olsder. *Dynamic Noncooperative Game Theory, 2nd Edition*. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, 1998. DOI: [10.1137/1.9781611971132](https://doi.org/10.1137/1.9781611971132). URL: <https://epubs.siam.org/doi/abs/10.1137/1.9781611971132>.
- [CD05] X. Chen and X. Deng. “3-NASH is PPAD-Complete”. In: *Electron. Colloquium Comput. Complex.* (2005).
- [CD06] Xi Chen and Xiaotie Deng. “Settling the Complexity of Two-Player Nash Equilibrium”. In: *2006 47th Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS’06)* (2006), pp. 261–272.
- [Dan51] George B Dantzig. “A proof of the equivalence of the programming problem and the game problem”. In: *Activity analysis of production and allocation* 13 (1951), pp. 330–338.
- [Dar75] Gaston Darboux. “Sur la composition des forces en statique”. fr. In: *Bulletin des Sciences Mathématiques et Astronomiques* 9 (1875), pp. 281–288. URL: http://www.numdam.org/item/BSMA_1875__9__281_1/.
- [DGP06] C. Daskalakis, P. Goldberg, and C. Papadimitriou. “The complexity of computing a Nash equilibrium”. In: *STOC ’06*. 2006.
- [Du08] Ye Du. “On the Complexity of Deciding Bimatrix Games Similarity”. In: *Theor. Comput. Sci.* 407.1–3 (Nov. 2008), pp. 583–586. ISSN: 0304-3975. DOI: [10.1016/j.tcs.2008.07.021](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tcs.2008.07.021). URL: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tcs.2008.07.021>.
- [Ham05] Peter J Hammond. “Utility invariance in non-cooperative games”. In: *Advances in public economics: utility, choice and welfare*. Springer, 2005, pp. 31–50.
- [Hey19a] Joseph L Heyman. “A manifold of polynomial time solvable bimatrix games”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:1904.04251* (2019).
- [HG19] Joseph L Heyman and Abhishek Gupta. “On the computation of strategically equivalent rank-0 games”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:1904.00450* (2019).
- [Hey19b] Joseph Lee Heyman. *On the Computation of Strategically Equivalent Games*. The Ohio State University, 2019.

- [IM80] Karen Isaacson and C. Millham. “On a class of nash-solvable bimatrix games and some related nash subsets”. In: *Naval Research Logistics Quarterly* 27 (1980), pp. 407–412.
- [KS12] Spyros Kontogiannis and Paul Spirakis. “On mutual concavity and strategically-zero-sum bimatrix games”. In: *Theoretical Computer Science* 432 (2012), pp. 64–76. ISSN: 0304-3975. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tcs.2012.01.016>. URL: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0304397512000527>.
- [MWG95] Andreu Mas-Colell, Michael Whinston, and Jerry Green. *Microeconomic Theory*. Oxford University Press, 1995. URL: <https://EconPapers.repec.org/RePEc:oxp:obooks:9780195102680>.
- [MSZ13] Michael Maschler, Eilon Solan, and Shmuel Zamir. *Game Theory*. Cambridge University Press, 2013. DOI: [10.1017/CB09780511794216](https://doi.org/10.1017/CB09780511794216).
- [MU04] Stephen Morris and Takashi Ui. “Best response equivalence”. In: *Games and Economic Behavior* 49.2 (2004), pp. 260–287. ISSN: 0899-8256. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geb.2003.12.004>. URL: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0899825604000132>.
- [MV78] H. Moulin and J.P. Vial. “Strategically zero-sum games: The class of games whose completely mixed equilibria cannot be improved upon”. In: *International Journal of Game Theory* 7 (1978), pp. 201–221. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01769190>.
- [Nas50] John F. Nash. “Equilibrium points in n-person games”. In: *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 36.1 (1950), pp. 48–49. ISSN: 0027-8424. DOI: [10.1073/pnas.36.1.48](https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.36.1.48). URL: <https://www.pnas.org/content/36/1/48>.
- [Neu28] J. von Neumann. “Zur Theorie der Gesellschaftsspiele”. In: *Mathematische Annalen* 100 (1928), pp. 295–320. URL: <http://eudml.org/doc/159291>.
- [NMR44] John von Neumann, Oskar Morgenstern, and Ariel Rubinstein. *Theory of Games and Economic Behavior (60th Anniversary Commemorative Edition)*. Princeton University Press, 1944. ISBN: 9780691130613. URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt1r2gkx>.
- [Pap01] Christos H. Papadimitriou. “Algorithms, Games, and the Internet”. In: *Automata, Languages and Programming*. Ed. by Fernando Orejas, Paul G. Spirakis, and Jan van Leeuwen. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2001, pp. 1–3. ISBN: 978-3-540-48224-6.
- [Pro] ProofWiki. *Monotone Additive Function is Linear*. URL: [https://proofwiki.org/wiki/Monotone_Additive_Function_is_Linear#:~:text=Let%5C%20f%5C%3A%5C%E2%5C%86%5C%92R,f\(x\)%5C%3Dax](https://proofwiki.org/wiki/Monotone_Additive_Function_is_Linear#:~:text=Let%5C%20f%5C%3A%5C%E2%5C%86%5C%92R,f(x)%5C%3Dax). (accessed: 10.09.2021).
- [Ree17] Daniel Reem. “Remarks on the Cauchy functional equation and variations of it”. In: *Aequationes mathematicae* 91 (2017), pp. 237–264.

A Utility Theory in Game Theory

To understand what Hammond addresses in [Ham05] or how results from standard micro-economic literature (such as chapters 1,6 and 22 from [MWG95]) relate to our results, we should revise some expected utility theory. The following introduction is taken from Mas-Colell et al. [MWG95].

A decision maker can choose from a space C of N -many outcomes (where N finite). The preferences of the decision maker on these outcomes are represented by a preference relation \succeq on C . The preference relation is assumed to satisfy the completeness and transitivity axioms

$$\begin{aligned} \forall c, d \in C : & \quad c \succeq d \text{ or } c \preceq d \text{ (or both)} \\ \forall c, d, e \in C : & \quad c \succeq d \text{ and } d \succeq e \text{ implies } c \succeq e \quad . \end{aligned}$$

Now extend the choice space C to \mathcal{L} in which we allow for so-called lotteries over the outcomes. A lottery $L = (p_1, \dots, p_N) \in \mathcal{L}$ is a probability distribution over C . It indicates with which probability the decision maker chooses each outcome in C . Also extend the preference relation \succeq to the

space of lotteries \mathcal{L} in a way that satisfies a continuity and independence axiom (not relevant for the understanding of this section).

Definition.

1. A von Neumann-Morgenstern (NM) expected utility function is a map $U : \mathcal{L} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ that is determined by its values $U(e_i)$ on the outcomes $e_i \in C, i \in [N]$, and by

$$\forall L = (p_1, \dots, p_N) : U(L) = \sum_{i=1}^N p_i \cdot U(e_i) \quad .$$

2. Take a preference relation \succeq on \mathcal{L} that satisfies the four axioms. We say that \succeq is represented by a NM expected utility function U if

$$\forall L, L' \in \mathcal{L} : L \succeq L' \iff U(L) \geq U(L') \quad .$$

Then U translates the preference relation \succeq into comparisons of numerical values.

Let U be a NM expected utility function. Then U defines a preference relation \succeq on \mathcal{L} by

$$\forall L, L' \in \mathcal{L} : L \succeq L' : \iff U(L) \geq U(L') \quad .$$

In that case, preference relation \succeq satisfies the four axioms and is represented by U .

On the other hand, we have

Theorem (Expected Utility Theorem). *Let preference relation \succeq satisfy the four axioms on \mathcal{L} . Then \succeq can be represented by a NM expected utility function U . Moreover, the representing U is unique up to a positive affine transformation, that is, if U and U' are NM expected utility functions representing \succeq , then there exist $a, c \in \mathbb{R}$ such that for all $L \in \mathcal{L}$ we have $U'(L) = a \cdot U(L) + c$.*

Proof. See Proposition 6.B.2 and 6.B.3 from Mas-Colell et al. [MWG95]. □

Hence, the translation from a preference relation to comparing numerical values is only unique up to PATs.

How this relates to game theory and our work:

Take a game $G = (N, \{S^i\}_{i \in [N]}, \{u_i\}_{i \in [N]})$. Then, player i can choose a strategy from the mixed strategy space $\Delta(S^i)$. Each element in $\Delta(S^i)$ can be viewed as a lottery on the choice set $C := S^i$.

Moreover, their utility gain from strategy profile $s \in \prod_{i=1}^N \Delta(S^i)$ is

$$u_i(s^i, s^{-i}) = \sum_{k_i=1}^{m_i} s_{k_i}^i \cdot u_i(e_{k_i}, s^{-i}) \quad .$$

Therefore, $u_i(\cdot, s^{-i})$ has the form of a NM expected utility function. As mentioned before, any NM expected utility function defines a preference relation on the space of lotteries $\mathcal{L} = \Delta(S^i)$ that also satisfies the four axioms.

Section 6 of Hammond [Ham05] studied games which are not specified by numerical payoff functions $u_i : S^1 \times \dots \times S^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ for each player but which are specified by preference relations

$$\left\{ \succeq_{i, s^{-i}} \right\}_{i \in [N], s^{-i} \in \prod_{j \neq i} \Delta(S^j)} \quad ,$$

one for each player i and for each opponents strategy s^{-i} . This is why in Section 6.1, he allows for any numerical representation of the preference relations. By the Expected Utility Theorem, these numerical representations are unique up to PATs. He then proceeds to give definitions for already known classes of games and already known solution concepts, but in this language of preference relations.

So his work is about (1) expanding classes of games such that they are closed w.r.t. positive affine transformation and about (2) showing that the solution concepts are not affected by PATs. To summarize, Hammond only considers those game transformations that do not change the preference relations. Note: A game transformation that does not change the preference relations is in particular a game transformation that does not change the best responses (and hence neither the Nash equilibrium set). Therefore, our work started with two (a priori) considerably bigger classes of game transformations and proved that both classes collapsed to the PAT class.