

4: An Exponential-Time Algorithm

Wednesday, 24 August 2022

10:33 AM

Computing Equilibria in General Bimatrix Games.

Let (R, C) be a general bimatrix game, $R, C \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$.
Thus row player has m pure strategies, column player has n pure strategies, and $x \in \Delta_m$, $y \in \Delta_n$ are mixed strategies.
We use e_i to denote the column vector $[0 \dots 0 \underset{i}{1} 0 \dots 0]^T$.

We will now give an exponential-time algorithm for computing equilibria in bimatrix games.

Recall: given $x \in \Delta_m$, $\text{supp}(x) = \{i: x_i > 0\}$

Similarly for $y \in \Delta_n$.

Fix $S_R \subseteq [m]$, $S_C \subseteq [n]$ as subsets of pure strategies for the players. Consider the following LP:

$$\begin{array}{ll} P(S_R, S_C): & \max \quad 0 \\ \text{s.t.} & x \in \Delta_m \\ & y \in \Delta_n \\ & \left. \begin{array}{l} \forall i \notin S_R, \quad x_i = 0 \\ \forall j \notin S_C, \quad y_j = 0 \end{array} \right\} \quad A \\ & \left. \begin{array}{l} \forall i \in S_R, i' \in [m], \quad (Ry)_i \geq (Ry)_{i'} \\ \forall j \in S_C, j' \in [n], \quad (Cx)_j \geq (Cx)_{j'} \end{array} \right\} \quad B \end{array}$$

- So: (A) x is supported on S_R , y on S_C
(B) S_R is a subset of best-responses to y
 S_C is a subset of best-responses to x

Theorem: (i) If (x^*, y^*) is a feasible soln to $P(S_R, S_C)$, then (x^*, y^*) is a NE of the game.

(ii) If (x^*, y^*) is a NE, let $S_R^* = \text{supp}(x^*)$, $S_C^* = \text{supp}(y^*)$.
 (x^*, y^*) is a feasible soln. to $P(S_R^*, S_C^*)$.

Proof of (i): easy.

Note: (i) Every LP w/ rational coefficients has a rational soln.
Hence, if utilities R, C are rational, the game has a rational equilibrium.

(ii) Let (x_1^*, y^*) , (x_2^*, y^*) be two equilibria of (R, C) .
Then $\forall 0 \leq \lambda \leq 1$, $(\lambda x_1^* + (1-\lambda)x_2^*, y^*)$ is also an equilibrium.

(Q) Prove (ii) yourself.

Proof of Theorem (i):

Claim 1: (x^*, y^*) is a NE iff
 $x^{*T} R y^* \geq e_i^T R y^* \quad \forall i \in [m]$
 $y^{*T} C x^* \geq e_j^T C x^* \quad \forall j \in [n]$

Proof: Easy.

Corollary: (x^*, y^*) is a NE iff
 $\text{supp}(x^*) \subseteq \arg \max_{i \in [m]} (R y^*)_i$

$$\& \text{supp}(y^*) \subseteq \arg \max_{j \in [n]} (C x^*)_j$$

Proof of Theorem: By the constraints:

$$\text{supp}(x^*) \stackrel{A}{\subseteq} S_R \stackrel{B}{\subseteq} \arg \max_{i \in [m]} (R y^*)_i$$

$$\text{supp}(y^*) \stackrel{A}{\subseteq} S_C \stackrel{B}{\subseteq} \arg \max_{j \in [n]} (C x^*)_j$$

Hence, (x^*, y^*) is a NE by the corollary.

By Nash's Theorem, we know \exists a NE, hence $\exists S_R, S_C$ for which $P(S_R, S_C)$ is feasible.

Algorithm enumerated over all possible $S_R \subseteq [m]$, $S_C \subseteq [n]$, solves $P(S_R, S_C)$ to check if feasible, takes time

$$\text{poly}(m, n, |R|, |C|) \cdot 2^{m+n}$$