Regular Potential Games

Brian Swenson^a, Ryan Murray^b, Soummya Kar^a

^aDepartment of Electrical and Computer Engineering, Carnegie Mellon University,

 $Pitts burgh, \ PA \ (brianswe@andrew.cmu.edu, \ soummyak@andrew.cmu.edu)$

^bDepartment of Mathematics, Pennsylvania State University, State College, PA (rwm22@psu.edu)

Abstract

A fundamental problem with the Nash equilibrium concept is the existence of certain "structurally deficient" equilibria that (i) lack fundamental robustness properties, and (ii) are difficult to analyze. The notion of a "regular" Nash equilibrium was introduced by Harsanyi. Such equilibria are isolated, highly robust, and relatively simple to analyze. A game is said to be regular if all equilibria in the game are regular. In this paper it is shown that almost all potential games are regular. That is, except for a closed subset with Lebesgue measure zero, all potential games are regular. As an immediate consequence of this, the paper also proves an oddness result for potential games: in almost all potential games, the number of Nash equilibrium strategies is finite and odd. Specialized results are given for weighted potential games, exact potential games, and games with identical payoffs. Applications of the results to game-theoretic learning are discussed.

Keywords: Game theory, Regular equilibrium, Potential games, Multi-agent systems

1. Introduction

While the notion of Nash equilibrium (NE) is a universally accepted solution concept for games, several shortcomings have been noted over the years. A principal criticism (in addition to non-uniqueness) is that some Nash equilibrium strategies may be undesirable or unreasonable due to a lack of basic robustness properties. As a consequence, many equilibrium refinement concepts have been proposed [1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7], each attempting to single out subsets of Nash equilibrium strategies that satisfy some desirable criteria.

Preprint submitted to Games and Economic Behavior

November 6, 2019

One of the most stringent refinement concepts, originally proposed by Harsanyi [3], is that a NE strategy be "regular." In the words of van Damme [4], "regular Nash equilibria possess all the robustness properties that one can reasonably expect equilibria to possess." Such equilibria are quasi-strict [3, 4], perfect [1], proper [2], strongly stable [6], essential [5], and isolated [4].¹

If all equilibria of a game are regular, then the number of NE strategies in the game has been shown to be finite and, curiously, odd [3, 8]. Regular equilibria have also been studied in the context of games of incomplete information, where, as part of Harsanyi's celebrated purification theorem [9, 10, 11], they have been shown to be approachable.

A game is said to be regular if all equilibria in the game are regular. Harsanyi [3] showed that almost all² games are regular, and hence, in almost all games, all equilibria possess all the robustness properties we might reasonably hope for.

While this result is a powerful when targeted at general N-player games, there are many important classes of games that have Lebesgue measure zero within the space of all games [12]. Harsanyi's result tells us nothing about equilibrium properties within such special classes of games. This is the case, for example, in the important class of multi-agent games known as *potential games* [13].

A game is said to be a *potential game* if there exists some underlying function (generally referred to as the *potential function*) that all players implicitly seek to optimize. Potential games have many applications in economics and engineering [14, 13], and are particularly useful in the study of multi-agent systems, e.g., [15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25].

There are several types of potential games—in order of decreasing generality, these include weighted potential games, exact potential games, and games with identical payoffs [13, 26].³ Letting WPG, EPG, and GIP denote the set of each of these types of potential games respectively, and letting G

 $^{^{1}}$ See [4] for an in depth discussion of each of these concepts and their interrelationships.

²Following Harsanyi [3], when we say almost all games satisfy some condition we mean the set of games where the condition fails to hold is a closed set with Lebesgue measure zero. See Section 2.2 for more details.

³More general sets of potential games include ordinal potential games [13] and best response potential games [27]. In this paper we will focus on weighted potential games and subsets thereof.

denote the set of all games, we have the following relationship:⁴

$GIP \subset EPG \subset WPG \subset G$,

where each subset is a low-dimensional (measure-zero) subset within any of its supersets. Harsanyi's regularity result provides no information on the abundance (or dearth) of regular equilibria within these subclasses of games. Hence, when restricting attention to potential games, as is often done in the study of multi-agent systems, we are deprived of any generic results on the regularity, robustness, or finiteness of the equilibrium set.

We say that a property holds for almost all games in a given class if the subset of games in the class where the property fails to holds is a closed set with Lebesgue measure zero (with the dimension of the Lebesgue measure corresponding to the dimension of the given class of games—see Section 2.2 for more details).

The main result of this paper is the following theorem.

Theorem 1.

(i) Almost all weighted potential games are regular.
(ii) Almost all exact potential games are regular.
(iii) Almost all games with identical payoffs are regular.

We note that this result implies that for almost all games in each of these classes, all equilibria are quasi-strict, perfect, proper, strongly stable, essential, and isolated. Using Harsanyi's oddness theorem (see [3], Theorem 1), we see that in any regular game, the number of NE strategies is finite and odd. Hence, the following result is an immediate consequence of Theorem 1.

Theorem 2. In almost all weighted potential games, almost all exact potential games, and almost all games with identical payoffs, the number of NE strategies is finite and odd.

Regularity may be seen as serving two purposes. First, it ensures that the equilibrium set possesses the desirable structural properties noted above

⁴More precisely, any finite game of a fixed size (i.e., with a fixed number of players and actions) is uniquely represented as a vector in Euclidean space denoting the payoff received by each player for each pure strategy. The set G of all possible games of a given size is equal to \mathbb{R}^m for some appropriate $m \in \mathbb{N}$ (see, e.g., [28] Section 12.1), and each class of potential games is a lower-dimensional subset of \mathbb{R}^m . See Section 2.2 for more details.

(e.g., equilibria are isolated, robust, and finite in number). Second, it simplifies the analysis of the game near equilibrium points—the important features of players' utility functions near an equilibrium can be understood by looking only at first- and second-order terms in the associated Taylor series expansion. In this sense, the role of regular equilibria in games is analogous to the role that non-degenerate critical points play in the study of real-valued functions.⁵ This amenable analytic structure can greatly facilitate the study of (for example) game-theoretic learning processes [29] or approachability in games with incomplete information [10].

As an application of these results to learning theory, in the paper [29] we consider the problem of studying continuous best-response dynamics (BR dynamics) [30, 31, 32] in potential games. BR dynamics are fundamental to learning theory—they model various forms of learning in games and underlie many popular game-theoretic learning algorithms including the canonical fictitious play (FP) algorithm [33]. While it is known that BR dynamics converge to the set of NE in potential games, the result is less than satisfactory. BR dynamics can converge to mixed-strategy (saddle-point) Nash equilibria and solutions of BR dynamics may be non-unique. Furthermore, little is understood about transient properties such as the rate of convergence of BR dynamics in potential games. (In fact, due to the non-uniqueness of solutions in potential games, it has been shown that it is impossible to establish convergence rate estimates for BR dynamics that hold at all points [34].)

In [29] we study how regular potential games can be used to address these issues. In particular, it is shown that in any regular potential game, BR dynamics converge generically to pure NE, solutions of BR dynamics are generically unique, and the rate of convergence of BR dynamics is generically exponential. Combined with the results of the present paper, this allows us to show that BR dynamics are "well behaved" in almost all potential games.

Furthermore, in [26] Monderer and Shapley study the convergence of the

⁵A critical point x^* of a function $f : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$ is said to be non-degenerate if the Hessian of f at x^* is non-singular. When a critical point is non-degenerate, one can understand the important local properties of f using only the gradient and Hessian of f. If a critical point is *degenerate* then heavy algebraic machinery may be required to understand the local properties of f. With regard to games, if x^* is an interior equilibrium point of a potential game with potential function U, then x^* is regular if and only if x^* is a non-degenerate critical point of x^* . For non-interior equilibrium points the story is more involved, but the main idea is the same.

closely related FP algorithm in potential games and show convergence to the set of NE. In particular, they show that it is possible for FP to converge to completely mixed NE in potential games, which can be highly problematic for a number of reasons [35, 36, 29]. However, they conjecture that such behavior is exceptional; that is, they conjecture that in generic two-player potential games FP always converges to pure NE (see [26], Section 2).⁶ Regular potential games are well suited to studying this conjecture. Theorem 1 of the present paper combined with Theorem 1 of [29] shows that for the continuous-time version of FP [34, 38] (which is equivalent to BR dynamics after a time change [34]), this conjecture holds generically for potential games of arbitrary size; that is, in any regular potential game (and hence almost all potential games) continuous-time FP dynamics converge to pure NE from almost all initial conditions.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 1.1 we outline our strategy for proving Theorem 1. Section 2 sets up notation. Section 3 introduces the notion of a regular equilibrium. Section 4 elucidates the structure of regular equilibria in potential games and presents two simple conditions that will allow us to verify if an equilibrium of a potential game is regular. Section 5 proves that almost all games with identical payoffs are regular (Proposition 3). Section 6 proves that almost all exact and weighted potential games are regular (Proposition 31).

1.1. Proof Strategy

Our first step in proving Theorem 1 will be to prove the following proposition.

Proposition 3. Almost all games with identical payoffs are regular.

This proposition accomplishes a majority of the work required to prove Theorem 1. Once Proposition 3 is proved, the proof of parts (i)–(ii) of Theorem 1 (which consider exact and weighted potential games) reduces to a simple matter of identifying equivalence relationships between these classes of games and identical-payoff games. This is accomplished in Section 6 after proving Proposition 3 (see Proposition 31). Propositions 3 and 31 (along with Proposition 11) prove Theorem 1.

⁶Since their reasoning relies on the improvement principle [37], which does not hold in games with more than two players, they limit their conjecture to two-player games.

Accordingly, the majority of the paper is focused on proving Proposition 3. Our strategy for proving Proposition 3 is as follows. An equilibrium in an identical-payoffs game (or, more generally, in any potential game) can be shown to be regular if and only if the derivatives of the potential function satisfy two simple non-degeneracy conditions (see Section 3 and Lemma 22). The first condition deals with the gradient of the potential function—we refer to it as the *first-order non-degeneracy condition*. The second condition deals with the Hessian of the potential function—we refer to it as the *first-order non-degeneracy condition*. We say a potential game is first-order (second-order) non-degeneracy condition.

We will prove Proposition 3 by showing that almost all games with identical payoffs are both first- and second-order non-degenerate. We proceed in two steps. First, we will prove that almost all games with identical payoffs are second-order non-degenerate (see Section 5.1 and Proposition 24). We follow roughly the approach of [3, 39], setting up an appropriate mapping into the space of N-player games with identical payoffs of a fixed size, and proving that all second-order degenerate games are contained in the set of critical values of the map. The result then follows from Sard's Theorem [40]. We note, however, that the mapping used by Harsanyi [3] for general games fails to give any useful information when restricted to games with identical payoffs (see Remark 29). Consequently, our construction differs substantially from Harsanyi's in terms of the mapping used and some of the fundamental technical tools used. Most significantly, we require a strong characterization of the rank of the linear mapping that relates equilibrium points of a game and the game utility structure (see (23) and Proposition 25). This characterization relies on (relatively) recent results on the signsolvability of matrices [41], not available to Harsanyi. The case of identical-payoff games (and, more generally, potential games) also differs from the general case in that it is not possible to construct a single mapping à la Harsanyi [3] whose critical values set contains all degenerate games. Instead, we only utilize Sard's theorem locally in the space of games and then use a covering argument to obtain the global result for all identical-payoff games.

As our second step in proving Proposition 3, we show that almost all games with identical payoffs are *first-order* non-degenerate (see Section 5.2 and Proposition 30). In order to show this, we use our aforementioned characterization of the rank of the linear mapping (see (23) and discussion above) to construct a Lipschitz mapping from a set with low Hausdorff dimension

into the space of games with identical payoffs, such that the range of the map contains all first-order degenerate games. The result then follows from the fact that the graph of a Lipschitz mapping cannot have a higher Hausdorff dimension than its domain ([42], Section 2.4.2).

2. Preliminaries

2.1. Notation

Throughout the paper we will consider finite normal-form games, defined as follows.

Definition 4. A game (in normal form) is given by a tuple

$$\Gamma := (N, (Y_i, u_i)_{i=1,\dots,N}),$$

where $N \in \{2, 3, ...\}$ denotes the number of players, $Y_i := \{y_i^1, ..., y_i^{K_i}\}$ denotes the set of pure strategies (or actions) available to player *i*, with cardinality $K_i := |Y_i|$, and $u_i : \prod_{j=1}^N Y_j \to \mathbb{R}$ denotes the utility function of player *i*.

Given some game Γ , let $Y := \prod_{i=1}^{N} Y_i$ denote the set of joint pure strategies available to players, and let

$$K := K_1 \times \dots \times K_N \tag{1}$$

denote the number of joint pure strategies. When defining spaces of games (e.g., as in Section 2.2) we will find it convenient to view $u_i = (u_i(y)_{y \in Y})$ as a vector in \mathbb{R}^K ; we will clearly indicate when using this abuse of notation.

For a finite set S, let $\Delta(S)$ denote the set of probability distributions over S. For $i = 1, \ldots, N$, let $\Delta_i := \Delta(Y_i)$ denote the set of *mixed-strategies* available to player i. Let $\Delta := \prod_{i=1}^{N} \Delta_i$ denote the set of joint mixed strategies. Note that it is implicitly assumed that players' mixed strategies are independent; i.e., players do not coordinate. Let $\Delta_{-i} := \prod_{j \in \{1,\ldots,N\} \setminus \{i\}} \Delta_j$. When convenient, given a mixed strategy $\sigma = (\sigma_1, \ldots, \sigma_N) \in \Delta$, we use the notation σ_{-i} to denote the tuple $(\sigma_j)_{j \neq i}$

Given a mixed strategy $\sigma \in \Delta$, the expected utility of player *i* is given by

$$U_i(\sigma_1,\ldots,\sigma_N) = \sum_{y \in Y} u_i(y)\sigma_1(y_1)\cdots\sigma_N(y_N).$$
(2)

For $\sigma_{-i} \in \Delta_{-i}$, the best response of player *i* is given by the set-valued map $BR_i : \Delta_{-i} \rightrightarrows \Delta_i$,

$$BR_i(\sigma_{-i}) := \arg \max_{\sigma_i \in \Delta_i} U_i(\sigma_i, \sigma_{-i}),$$

where we use the symbol \Rightarrow to indicate a set-valued map. For $\sigma \in \Delta$ the joint best response is given by the set-valued map BR : $\Delta \Rightarrow \Delta$,

$$BR(\sigma) := BR_1(\sigma_{-1}) \times \cdots \times BR_N(\sigma_{-N}).$$

A strategy $\sigma \in \Delta$ is said to be a Nash equilibrium (NE) if $\sigma \in BR(\sigma)$. For convenience, we sometimes refer to a Nash equilibrium simply as an equilibrium.

In this paper we will consider the following notions of a potential game (cf. [13, 26]).

Definition 5 (Weighted Potential Game). We say that Γ is a weighted potential game if there exists a function $u: Y \to \mathbb{R}$ and a vector of positive weights $(w_i)_{i=1}^N \in \mathbb{R}^N$ such that

$$u_i(y'_i, y_{-i}) - u_i(y''_i, y_{-i}) = w_i \big(u(y'_i, y_{-i}) - u(y''_i, y_{-i}) \big)$$
(3)

for all $y_{-i} \in Y_{-i}$ and $y'_i, y''_i \in Y_i$, for all $i = 1, \ldots, N$.

Definition 6 (Exact Potential Game). We say that Γ is an exact potential game if Γ is a weighted potential game with corresponding weights satisfying $w_i = 1$ for all $i = 1, \ldots, N$.

Definition 7 (Game with Identical Payoffs). We say that Γ is a game with identical payoffs (or an identical-payoffs game) if there exists a function $u: Y \to \mathbb{R}$ such that $u_i(y) = u(y)$ for all $y \in Y$ and all $i, j \in \{1, \ldots, N\}$.

Note that any identical-payoffs game is an exact potential game, and any exact potential game is a weighted potential game. When we refer simply to a "potential game" we mean a weighted potential game, which includes the other classes of games as special cases.

In a potential game there exists a *potential function* $u: Y \to \mathbb{R}$ to which all players utility functions are aligned. We note that, as with the utility function u_i , at times we will find it convenient to view $u = (u(y)_{u \in Y})$ as a vector in \mathbb{R}^{K} ; we will clearly indicate when using this abuse of notation. Let $U: \Delta \to \mathbb{R}$ be the multilinear extension of u defined by

$$U(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_N) = \sum_{y \in Y} u(y)\sigma_1(y_1) \cdots \sigma(y_N).$$
(4)

The function U may be seen as giving the expected value of u under the mixed strategy $\sigma = (\sigma_1, \ldots, \sigma_N)$. We refer to U as the *potential function* and to u as the *pure form of the potential function*.

Using the definitions of U_i and U it is straightforward to verify that

$$BR_i(\sigma_{-i}) := \arg\max_{\sigma_i \in \Delta_i} U_i(\sigma_i, \sigma_{-i}) = \arg\max_{\sigma_i \in \Delta_i} U(\sigma_i, \sigma_{-i}).$$
(5)

That is, any potential game is best-response equivalent in mixed strategies to a game with identical payoffs. Thus, in order to compute the best response set in a potential game we only require knowledge of the potential function U, not necessarily the individual utility functions $(U_i)_{i=1,\dots,N}$.

By way of notation, given a pure strategy $y_i \in Y_i$ and a mixed strategy $\sigma_{-i} \in \Delta_{-i}$, we will write $U(y_i, \sigma_{-i})$ to indicate the value of U when player i uses a mixed strategy placing all weight on the y_i and the remaining players use the strategy $\sigma_{-i} \in \Delta_{-i}$.

Given a $\sigma_i \in \Delta_i$, let σ_i^k denote value of the k-th entry in σ_i , so that $\sigma_i = (\sigma_i^k)_{k=1}^{K_i}$. Since the potential function is linear in each σ_i , if we fix any $i = 1, \ldots, N$ we may express it as

$$U(\sigma) = \sum_{k=1}^{K_i} \sigma_i^k U(y_i^k, \sigma_{-i}).$$
(6)

In order to study learning dynamics without being (directly) encumbered by the hyperplane constraint inherent in Δ_i we define

$$X_i := \{ x_i \in \mathbb{R}^{K_i - 1} : 0 \le x_i^k \le 1 \text{ for } k = 1, \dots, K_i - 1, \text{ and } \sum_{k=1}^{K_i - 1} x_i^k \le 1 \},\$$

where we use the convention that x_i^k denotes the k-th entry in x_i so that $x_i = (x_i^k)_{k=1}^{K_i-1}$.

Given $x_i \in X_i$ define the bijective mapping $T_i : X_i \to \Delta_i$ as $T_i(x_i) = \sigma_i$ for the unique $\sigma_i \in \Delta_i$ such that $\sigma_i^k = x_i^{k-1}$ for $k = 2, \ldots, K_i$ and $\sigma_i^1 =$ $1 - \sum_{k=1}^{K_i-1} x_i^k$. For $k = 1, \ldots, K_i$ let T_i^k be the k-th component map of T_i so that $T_i = (T_i^k)_{i=1}^{K_i}$.

Let $X := X_1 \times \cdots \times X_N$ and let $T : X \to \Delta$ be the bijection given by $T = T_1 \times \cdots \times T_N$. In an abuse of terminology, we sometimes refer to X as the *mixed-strategy space* of Γ . When convenient, given an $x \in X$ we use the notation x_{-i} to denote the tuple $(x_j)_{j \neq i}$. Letting $X_{-i} := \prod_{j \neq i} X_j$, we define $T_{-i} : X_{-i} \to \Delta_{-i}$ as $T_{-i} := (T_j)_{j \neq i}$.

Throughout the paper we will often find it convenient to work in X rather than Δ . In order to keep the notation as simple as possible we overload the definitions of some symbols when the meaning can be clearly derived from the context. In particular, let $BR_i : X_{-i} \rightrightarrows X_i$ be defined by $BR_i(x_{-i}) := \{x_i \in$ $X_i : BR_i(\sigma_{-i}) = \sigma_i, \ \sigma_i \in \Delta_i, \ \sigma_{-i} \in \Delta_{-i}, \ \sigma_i = T_i(x_i), \ \sigma_{-i} = T_{-i}(x_{-i})\}$. Similarly, given an $x \in X$ we abuse notation and write U(x) instead of U(T(x)).

Given a pure strategy $y_i \in Y_i$, we will write $U(y_i, x_{-i})$ to indicate the value of U when player i uses a mixed strategy placing all weight on the y_i and the remaining players use the strategy $x_{-i} \in X_{-i}$. Similarly, we will say $y_i^k \in BR_i(x_{-i})$ if there exists an $x_i \in BR_i(x_{-i})$ such that $T_i(x_i)$ places weight one on y_i^k .

Applying the definition of T_i to (6) we see that U(x) may also be expressed as

$$U(x) = \sum_{k=1}^{K_i - 1} x_i^k U(y_i^{k+1}, x_{-i}) + \left(1 - \sum_{k=1}^{K_i - 1} x_i^k\right) U(y_i^1, x_{-i}).$$
(7)

for any $i = 1, \ldots, N$.

We use the following nomenclature to refer to strategies in X.

Definition 8. (i) A strategy $x \in X$ is said to be pure if T(x) places all its mass on a single action tuple $y \in Y$.

(ii) A strategy $x \in X$ is said to be completely mixed if x is in the interior of X.

(iii) In all other cases, a strategy $x \in X$ is said to be incompletely mixed.

Other notation as used throughout the paper is as follows.

• $\mathbb{N} := \{1, 2, \ldots\}.$

• The mapping sgn : $\mathbb{R}^{n \times m} \to \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$ is given by

$$(\operatorname{sgn}(\mathbf{A}))_{i,j} := \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } a_{i,j} > 0 \\ -1 & \text{if } a_{i,j} < 0 \\ 0 & \text{if } a_{i,j} = 0 \end{cases}$$

- Given two matrices **A** and **B** of the same dimension, **A** \circ **B** denotes the Hadamard product (i.e., the entrywise product) of **A** and **B**.
- Suppose $m, n, p \in \mathbb{N}$, $F_i : \mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$, for $i = 1, \ldots, p$. Suppose further that $F : \mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}^p$ is given by $F(w, z) = (F_i(w, z))_{i=1,\ldots,p}$. Then the operator D_w gives the Jacobian of F with respect to the components of $w = (w_k)_{k=1,\ldots,m}$; that is

$$D_w F(w,z) = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\partial F_1(w,z)}{\partial w_1} \cdots \frac{\partial F_1(w,z)}{\partial w_m} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \frac{\partial F_p(w,z)}{\partial w_1} \cdots \frac{\partial F_p(w,z)}{\partial w_m} \end{pmatrix}.$$

- A^c denotes the complement of a set A, and \mathring{A} denotes the interior of A, and cl A denotes the closure of A.
- The support of a function $f : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}$ is given by $\operatorname{spt}(f) := \{x \in \Omega : f(x) \neq 0\}.$
- Given a function f, $\mathcal{D}(f)$ refers to the domain of f and $\mathcal{R}(f)$ to the range of f.
- \mathcal{L}^n , $n \in \{1, 2, ...\}$ refers to the *n*-dimensional Lebesgue measure.

2.2. Almost All Games

We say that a game Γ has size $(N, (K_i)_{i=1}^N)$ if Γ is an N-player game, $N \in \{2, 3, \ldots\}$, and the size of the action space of each player satisfies $|Y_i| = K_i \in \{2, 3, \ldots\}$, $i = 1, \ldots, N$. Let K be as defined in (1) so that K gives the number of pure strategies in a game of size $(N, (K_i)_{i=1}^N)$.

A game of size $(N, (K_i)_{i=1}^N)$ is uniquely represented by the vector $u := (u_i(y))_{y \in Y, i=1,...,N} \in \mathbb{R}^{NK}$ which specifies the utility received by each player for each pure strategy $y \in Y$. We will frequently refer to u as the vector of *utility coefficients*.

Following Harsanyi [3], we define the notion of almost all games as follows.

Definition 9 (Almost All Games).

(i) We say that almost all games of size $(N, (K_i)_{i=1}^N)$ satisfy a given property if the subset of games in \mathbb{R}^{NK} where the property fails to hold is a closed subset of \mathbb{R}^{NK} with \mathcal{L}^{NK} -measure zero.

(ii) We say that almost all games satisfy a given property if, for arbitrary game size $(N, (K_i)_{i=1}^N)$, almost all games of size $(N, (K_i)_{i=1}^N)$ satisfy the property.

For convenience, we decompose the vector of utility coefficients $u \in \mathbb{R}^{NK}$ as $u = (u_i)_{i=1}^N$, where $u_i \in \mathbb{R}^K$ gives the pure strategy utility received by player *i* for each pure strategy $y \in Y$. The set of weighted potential games is given by

$$\mathcal{W} := \left\{ (u_i)_{i=1}^N \in \mathbb{R}^{NK} : (3) \text{ holds for some } u \in \mathbb{R}^K \text{ and some } (w_i)_{i=1}^N, \\ w_i > 0, i = 1, \dots, N \right\}.$$

the set of exact potential games is given by

$$\mathcal{P} := \big\{ (u_i)_{i=1}^N \in \mathbb{R}^{NK} : (3) \text{ holds for some } u \in \mathbb{R}^K \text{ with } (w_i)_{i=1}^N = \mathbf{1} \big\},\$$

where **1** denotes the vector of all ones. An identical-payoffs game is uniquely represented as a vector $u \in \mathbb{R}^{K}$ denoting the payoff (identical for all players) received for each action $y \in Y$. We represent the set of games with identical payoffs as

$$\mathcal{I} := \mathbb{R}^K. \tag{8}$$

We note, of course, that the set of games with identical payoffs can also be viewed as a K-dimensional subspace in \mathbb{R}^{NK} . The set \mathcal{P} is a linear subspace of \mathbb{R}^{NK} defined by a finite number of equality constraints as prescribed in (3) and Definition 6. Let K_w and K_p denote the dimension of \mathcal{W} and \mathcal{P} respectively, so that \mathcal{P} is isomorphic to \mathbb{R}^{K_p} and \mathcal{W} is isomorphic to a set in \mathbb{R}^{K_w} .

Definition 10 (Almost All Potential Games).

(i) We say that a property holds for almost all weighted potential games, almost all exact potential games, or almost all games with identical payoffs of size $(N, (K_i)_{i=1}^N)$, if the subset of games where the property fails to holds is a closed subset of W, \mathcal{P} or \mathcal{I} (respectively) with \mathcal{L}^{K_w} -measure zero, \mathcal{L}^{K_p} measure zero, or \mathcal{L}^K -measure zero (respectively).

(ii) We say that a property holds for almost all games of a given class if, for

arbitrary game size $(N, (K_i)_{i=1}^N)$, the property holds for almost all games of size $(N, (K_i)_{i=1}^N)$ in the class.

It was shown by Harsanyi [3, 4] that the set of irregular games (discussed in the next section) of size $(N, (K_i)_{i=1}^N)$ is a closed subset in the space of all games of size $(N, (K_i)_{i=1}^N)$. This result readily extends to potential games. In particular, since the sets of exact potential games and identical payoff games are closed subspaces in \mathbb{R}^{KN} , it immediately follows that the set of irregular games in each of these classes is a closed set with respect to the given class of games. Furthermore, the set of irregular weighted potential games can be viewed as an intersection of sets that are closed with respect to \mathcal{W} and is itself closed with respect to \mathcal{W} . We thus get the following proposition.

Proposition 11 (Closedness in Regular Games).

(i) The set of irregular weighted potential games is closed with respect to \mathcal{W} . (ii) The set of irregular exact potential games is closed with respect to \mathcal{P} . (iii) The set of irregular games with identical payoffs is closed with respect to \mathcal{I} .

For practical purposes this means that in order to verify that almost all potential games of a given class are regular (per Definition 10), we need only verify that the subset of irregular games has appropriately dimensioned Lebesgue measure zero.

3. Regular Equilibria

The notion of a regular equilibrium was originally introduced by Harsanyi [3]. Subsequently, these equilibria were studied by van Damme [43, 4], who introduced a slightly modified definition of a regular equilibrium that is generally standard today. Informally, an equilibrium is said to be regular if the Jacobian of a certain differentiable mapping is non-singular. This standard definition of regularity is introduced below. In the following section we will focus our attention to potential games where we will see that, in potential games, the notion of a regular equilibrium takes on a more intuitive meaning.

We will now formally define the notion of a regular equilibrium as given in [43, 4]. Let the game size $(N, (K_i)_{i=1}^N)$ be fixed. We begin by defining the carrier set of an element $x \in X$, a natural modification of a support set to the present context. For $x_i \in X_i$ let

$$\operatorname{carr}_i(x_i) := \operatorname{spt}(T_i(x_i)) \subseteq Y_i;$$

i.e., $\operatorname{carr}_i(x_i)$ is the set of pure strategies in Y_i that receive positive weight under the (conventional) mixed strategy $T_i(x_i) \in \Delta_i$. For $x = (x_1, \ldots, x_N) \in$ X let $\operatorname{carr}(x) := \operatorname{carr}_1(x_1) \cup \cdots \cup \operatorname{carr}_N(x_N)$.

Let $C = C_1 \cup \cdots \cup C_N$, where for each $i = 1, \ldots, N$, C_i is a nonempty subset of Y_i . We say that C is the carrier for $x = (x_1, \ldots, x_N) \in X$ if $C_i = \operatorname{carr}_i(x_i)$ for $i = 1, \ldots, N$ (or equivalently, if $C = \operatorname{carr}(x)$).

As discussed in Section 2.2, a game is uniquely defined by a vector $u \in \mathbb{R}^{NK}$ (which we refer to as the utility coefficient vector) specifying the purestrategy utility received by each player. The vector u uniquely defines the expected utility U_i for each player i.

Given a strategy $x \in X$ and vector of utility coefficients $u \in \mathbb{R}^{NK}$, let

$$\tilde{F}_{i}^{k}(x,u) := T_{i}^{1}(x_{i})x_{i}^{k}[U_{i}(y_{i}^{k+1}, x_{-i}) - U_{i}(y_{i}^{1}, x_{-i})]$$
(9)

for $i = 1, ..., N, k = 1, ..., K_i - 1$, and let

$$\tilde{F}(x,u) := \left(\tilde{F}_i^k(x,u)\right)_{\substack{i=1,\dots,N\\k=1,\dots,K_i-1}}.$$
(10)

Definition 12 (Regular Equilibrium). Let $x^* \in X$ be an equilibrium of a game with utility coefficient vector u. Assume the action set Y_i of each player is reordered so that $y_i^1 \in \operatorname{carr}_i(x_i^*)$. The equilibrium x^* is said to be regular if the Jacobian of $\tilde{F}(x^*, u)$, given by $D_x \tilde{F}(x^*, u)$, is non-singular.

Remark 13. We note that if x^* is regular, then the Jacobian of $\tilde{F}(x^*, u)$ can be shown to be nonsingular under any reordering of Y_i in which the reference action satisfies $y_i^1 \in \operatorname{carr}_i(x_i^*)$ for all $i = 1, \ldots, N$ (see [43], Theorem 3.8). This justifies the use of an arbitrary reference action $y_i^1 \in \operatorname{carr}_i(x_i^*)$ in the above definition.

Remark 14. The notion of a regular equilibrium is traditionally defined by considering strategies in the space Δ rather than X [4]. Using the definition of \tilde{F}_i^k and the properties of the determinant of a matrix, one may confirm that the definition of regularity given in Definition 12 coincides with the traditional definition in [4]. For completeness, a proof of the equivalency of Definition 12 with the traditional definition of regularity is included in Appendix A.

4. Regular Equilibria in Potential Games

In general games, the definition of a regular equilibrium relies on the invertibility of the Jacobian of a particular map. In potential games, regular equilibria have a more natural interpretation. Roughly speaking, in a potential game, an equilibrium is regular if it is a non-degenerate critical point of the potential function. To be more precise, if an equilibrium x^* lies in the *interior* of the strategy space X then x^* is a regular equilibrium if and only if x^* is a non-degenerate critical point of the potential function U (i.e., the Hessian of U is invertible at x^*). If, on the other hand, x^* lies on the boundary of X, then the situation is slightly more delicate—one must also account for behavior of the gradient of U at x^* .

In this section we will formalize this by introducing a pair of simple conditions on the potential function that are equivalent to regularity within the class of potential games. The first condition (referred to as the *first-order condition*) concerns the gradient of the potential function; the second condition (referred to as the *second-order condition*) concerns the Hessian of the potential function.

In order to simplify the presentation, we begin by considering only games with identical payoffs. In Sections 4.1–4.2 we define the notions of first and second-order degeneracy in these games. In Section 4.3 we will see that, in a game with identical payoffs, an equilibrium is regular if and only if it satisfies these non-degeneracy conditions (see Lemma 22). In Section 4.4 we generalize this characterization to potential games.

The conditions given in this section operate directly on the potential function U, have an intuitive meaning, and (in our view) are simpler to work with than Definition 12. Thus, we will generally prefer to work with these conditions rather than Definition 12 through the remainder of the paper.

4.1. First-Order Degeneracy

Let $C = C_1 \cup \cdots \cup C_N$, $C_i \subset Y_i \forall i = 1, \ldots, N$ be some carrier set. Let $\gamma_i := |C_i|$ and assume that the strategy set Y_i is reordered so that $\{y_i^1, \ldots, y_i^{\gamma_i}\} = C_i$. Under this ordering, the first $\gamma_i - 1$ components of any strategy x_i with $\operatorname{carr}_i(x_i) = C_i$ are free (not constrained to zero by C_i) and the remaining components of x_i are constrained to zero. That is $(x_i^k)_{k=1}^{\gamma_i-1}$ is free under C_i and $(x_i^k)_{k=\gamma_i}^{K_i} = 0$. The set of strategies $\{x \in X : \operatorname{carr}(x) = C\}$ is precisely the interior of the face of X given by

$$\Omega_C := \{ x \in X : x_i^k = 0, \ k = \gamma_i, \dots, K_i - 1, \ i = 1, \dots, N \}.$$
(11)

Definition 15 (First-Order Degenerate Equilibrium). Suppose Γ is a game with identical payoffs. Suppose $x^* \in X$ is an equilibrium of Γ with carrier C.

We say that x^* is a first-order degenerate equilibrium if there exists a pair $(i, k), i = 1, ..., N, k = \gamma_i, ..., K_i - 1$ such that

$$\frac{\partial U(x^*)}{\partial x_i^k} = 0 \tag{12}$$

and we say x^* is first-order non-degenerate otherwise.

Definition 16 (First-order Degenerate Game). We say a game is first-order degenerate if it has an equilibrium that is first-order degenerate, and we say the game is first-order non-degenerate otherwise.

Example 17. The 2 × 2 identical-payoffs game with payoff matrix $M = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 1 & -1 \end{pmatrix}$ has a first-order degenerate equilibrium at the strategy in which the row player plays his second action with probability 1 and the column player mixes between both his actions with equal probability.

Remark 18. Using the multi-linearity of U, it is straightforward to verify that an equilibrium x^* with carrier C is first order non-degenerate if and only if, for every player i, the set of pure-strategy best responses to x^*_{-i} coincides with C_i . We note that, using this later definition, Harsanyi [3] referred to first-order non-degenerate equilibria as quasi-strong equilibria. We prefer to use the term first-order non-degenerate in order to emphasize that we are concerned with the gradient of the potential function and to keep the nomenclature consistent with the notion of second-order non-degeneracy, introduced next.

4.2. Second-Order Degeneracy

Let Γ be a game with identical payoffs. Let C be some carrier set. Let $\tilde{N} := |\{i = 1, \ldots, N : \gamma_i \geq 2\}|$, and assume that the player set is ordered so that $\gamma_i \geq 2$ for $i = 1, \ldots, \tilde{N}$. Under this ordering, for strategies with $\operatorname{carr}(x) = C$, the first \tilde{N} players use mixed strategies and the remaining players use pure strategies. Assume that $\tilde{N} \geq 1$ so that any x with carrier C is a mixed (not pure) strategy.

Let the Hessian of U taken with respect to C be given by

$$\tilde{\mathbf{H}}(x) := \left(\frac{\partial^2 U(x)}{\partial x_i^k \partial x_j^\ell}\right)_{\substack{i,j=1,\dots,\tilde{N},\\k=1,\dots,\gamma_i-1,\\\ell=1,\dots,\gamma_j-1}}.$$
(13)

Note that this definition of the Hessian restricts attention to the components of x that are free (i.e., unconstrained) under C. That is, $\tilde{\mathbf{H}}(x)$ taken with respect to C is the Hessian of $U|_{\Omega_C}$ at x.

Definition 19 (Second-Order Degenerate Equilibrium). Let Γ be a game with identical payoffs. We say an equilibrium $x^* \in X$ is second-order degenerate if the Hessian $\tilde{\mathbf{H}}(x^*)$ taken with respect to $\operatorname{carr}(x^*)$ is singular, and we say x^* is second-order non-degenerate otherwise.

Definition 20 (Second-Order Degenerate Game). We say a game is secondorder degenerate if it has an equilibrium that is second-order degenerate, and we say the game is second-order non-degenerate otherwise.

Remark 21. Note that both forms of degeneracy are concerned with the interaction of the utility function (or more generally, the potential function see Section 4.4) and the "face" of the strategy space containing the equilibrium x^* . If x^* touches one or more constraints, then first-order non-degeneracy ensures that the gradient of the potential function is nonzero normal to the face $\Omega_{\operatorname{carr}(x^*)}$, defined in (11). Second-order non-degeneracy ensures that, restricting U to the face $\Omega_{\operatorname{carr}(x^*)}$, the Hessian of $U|_{\Omega_{\operatorname{carr}(x^*)}}$ is non-singular. If x^* is contained within the interior of X, then the first-order condition becomes moot and the second-order condition reduces to the standard definition of a non-degenerate critical point.

4.3. Regular Equilibria in Games with Identical Payoffs

The following lemma shows that the first and second-order non-degeneracy conditions defined above are equivalent to regularity.

Lemma 22. Let Γ be a game with identical payoffs. Then,

(i) If an equilibrium x^* is first-order non-degenerate, then it is second-order non-degenerate if and only if it is regular.

(ii) If an equilibrium x^* is regular, then it is first-order non-degenerate.

In particular, an equilibrium x^* is regular if and only if it is both first and second-order non-degenerate.

The proof of this lemma follows readily from the definitions of regularity and first and second-order degeneracy. A proof of the lemma can be found in Appendix B.

4.4. Regular Equilibria in Potential Games

We now generalize the characterization of regular equilibria from identicalpayoff games to potential games.

Given a potential game with potential function U, we define the "associated identical-payoffs game" to be the identical-payoffs game in which the utility of each player is given by $U_i = U$. The following lemma establishes the fundamental relationship between general (weighted) potential games and identical-payoff games.

Lemma 23. Suppose Γ is a potential game with potential function U. An equilibrium x^* of Γ is regular if and only if x^* is a regular equilibrium of the associated identical-payoffs game.

We remark that since Γ and the associated identical payoffs game are best-response equivalent in mixed strategies (see (5)), their equilibrium sets coincide. Thus, when applying the above lemma one need not verify that x^* is an equilibrium in the associated game. We now prove the lemma.

Proof. Let $u \in \mathbb{R}^{NK}$ be the utility coefficient vector representing the game Γ and let $\bar{u} \in \mathbb{R}^{NK}$ be the utility coefficient vector representing the identical payoffs game where all player use the potential function as their utility.

Differentiating (7), using Definition 5 and the definitions of expected utility and potential (2) and (6) we see that for any $i, j \in \{1, \ldots, N\}$, $k \in \{1, \ldots, K_i - 1\}, \ell \in \{1, \ldots, K_j - 1\}$ we have $\frac{\partial U_i(x)}{\partial x_i^k \partial x_j^\ell} = w_i \frac{\partial U(x)}{\partial x_i^k \partial x_j^\ell}$. Hence, for each $i = 1, \ldots, N, k = 1, \ldots, K_i$, the (i, k)-th row of $D_x \tilde{F}(x, u)$ is equal to the (i, k)-th row of $D_x \tilde{F}(x, \bar{u})$ times the constant $w_i > 0$. By elementary properties of the determinant, this implies that det $D_x \tilde{F}(x, u) = 0 \iff$ $\det D_x \tilde{F}(x, \bar{u}) = 0$. By Definition 12 this implies the desired result. \Box

The practical implication of this result (combined with Lemma 22) is that if x^* is an equilibrium of a potential game Γ with potential function U, then x^* is a regular equilibrium of Γ if and only if x^* satisfies the first and secondorder non-degeneracy conditions for the associated identical payoffs game. In particular, if x^* lies in the interior of X, then x^* is a regular equilibrium of Γ if and only if it is a non-degenerate critical point of U (i.e., satisfies the second-order non-degeneracy condition). If x^* is on the boundary of X, then we must also account for the first-order non-degeneracy condition.

5. Regularity in Games with Identical Payoffs

In this section we prove that almost all games with identical payoffs are regular; i.e., we prove Proposition 3.

Our strategy for proving the proposition is as follows. First, we note that by Proposition 11 we see that the set identical-payoff games that are irregular is a closed subset of \mathcal{I} . Thus, it is sufficient to prove that the set of irregular identical-payoff games has \mathcal{L}^{K} -measure zero. Given this fact, we will prove Proposition 3 in two steps. We begin by showing that almost all games with identical payoffs are second-order non-degenerate (Section 5.1 and Proposition 24). Subsequently we show that almost all games with identical payoffs are first-order non-degenerate (Section 5.2 and Proposition 30). Since a game is regular if and only if it is first and second-order nondegenerate (Lemma 22) Propositions 24 and 30 together prove Proposition 3.

5.1. Second-Order Degenerate Games

Throughout the section, we will assume the number of players N and number of actions K_i , i = 1, ..., N is fixed, and let K be as defined in (1) (cf. (8)). The goal of this subsection is to prove the following proposition.

Proposition 24. The set of identical-payoff games which are second-order degenerate has \mathcal{L}^{K} -measure zero.

We will prove the proposition using Sard's theorem. Our construction roughly follows that of [3]. We begin by introducing some pertinent notation and preliminary results.

Note that the set of joint pure strategies Y may be expressed as an ordered set $Y = \{y^1, \ldots, y^K\}$ where each $y^{\tau} \in Y$, is an N-tuple of strategies, $\tau \in \{1, \ldots, K\}$. We will assume a particular ordering for this set after Proposition 25.

In an identical-payoffs game there exists a single function $u : Y \to \mathbb{R}$ such that $u_i = u$ for all i = 1, ..., N. If we consider the vector of utility coefficients $u = (u(y))_{y \in Y} \in \mathbb{R}^K$ as a variable, then by (4), U is linear in u.⁷ At this point we will express U in a more convenient form.

⁷The potential function U is, of course, a function of both x and u. However, since we will only exploit the dependence on u in this section, we generally stick to the standard game-theoretic convention of writing U as a function of x only [44].

Let $\tau = 1, \ldots, K$, $i = 1, \ldots, N$ and $x_i \in X_i$. We define $q_i^{\tau} : X_i \to [0, 1]$ by

$$q_i^{\tau}(x_i) := T_i^k(x_i) \tag{14}$$

where k corresponds to the action played by player i in the tuple y^{τ} , i.e, $(y^{\tau})_i = y_i^k$, and where $T_i^k(x_i)$ is the k-th component of $T_i(x_i)$. In an abuse of notation, given a pure strategy $y_i^k \in Y_i$, we let $q_i^{\tau}(y_i^k) = 1$ if $(y^{\tau})_i = y_i^k$ and $q_i^{\tau}(y_i^k) = 0$ otherwise.

Given a fixed vector of utility coefficients $u \in \mathbb{R}^{K}$, the utility function $U: X \to \mathbb{R}$ may be expressed as (see (4) and (14))

$$U(x) = \sum_{\tau=1}^{K} u^{\tau} \left[\prod_{i=1}^{N} q_i^{\tau}(x_i) \right].$$
 (15)

Note that this form makes it clear that U is linear in u.

Now, let $C = C_1 \cup \cdots \cup C_N$ be some carrier set. The analysis through the remainder of the section will rely on this carrier set being fixed, and many of the subsequent terms are implicitly dependent on the choice of C. In keeping with our prior convention we let $\gamma_i := |C_i|$, and let $\tilde{N} := |\{i \in \{1, \ldots, N\} : \gamma_i \geq 2\}|$.

Any x_i with carrier C_i has precisely $\gamma_i - 1$ free components (i.e., not constrained to zero by C_i). The joint strategy $x = (x_1, \ldots, x_N)$ is a vector with

$$\gamma := \sum_{i=1}^{N} (\gamma_i - 1)$$

free components.

By (7) we have that

$$\frac{\partial U(x)}{\partial x_i^k} = U(y_i^{k+1}, x_{-i}) - U(y_i^1, x_{-i}) =: F_i^k(x, u)$$
(16)

for $i = 1, ..., \tilde{N}, \ k = 1, ..., \gamma_i - 1$. Let

$$F(x,u) := \left(F_i^k(x,u)\right)_{\substack{i=1,\dots,\tilde{N}\\k=1,\dots,\gamma_i-1}}.$$
(17)

Given an $x \in X$, it is at times useful to decompose it as $x = (x_p, x_m)$, where $x_m = (x_i^k)_{i=1,\dots,\tilde{N}, k=1,\dots,\gamma_i-1}$ and x_p contains the remaining components of x. (The subscript of x_m is indicative of "mixed strategy components" of x and

 x_p indicative of "pure strategy components" of x.) In this decomposition, x_m is a $\gamma\text{-dimensional vector containing the free components of <math display="inline">x.$ Taking the Jacobian of F in terms of the components of x_m we find that

$$D_{x_m} F(x_p, x_m, u) = \tilde{\mathbf{H}}(x), \tag{18}$$

where $D_{x_m} F(x_p, x_m, u) = \left(\frac{\partial F}{\partial x_i^{\ell}}\right)_{\substack{i=1,\dots,\tilde{N},\\\ell=1,\dots,\gamma_i-1}}$. Let x^* be a mixed equilibrium with carrier C. Differentiating (7) we see that at the equilibrium x^* we have $\frac{\partial U(x^*)}{\partial x_i^k} = 0$ for $i = 1, \dots, \tilde{N}, k =$ $1, \ldots, \gamma_i - 1$ (see Lemma 35 in appendix), or equivalently,

$$F_i^k(x^*, u) = U(y_i^{k+1}, x_{-i}^*) - U(y_i^1, x_{-i}^*) = 0$$
(19)

for $i = 1, \ldots, \tilde{N}, k = 1, \ldots, \gamma_i - 1$. Using (15) in the above we get

$$F_i^k(x^*, u) = \sum_{\tau=1}^K u^\tau \left[\left(q_i^\tau(y_i^{k+1}) - q_i^\tau(y_i^1) \right) \prod_{j \neq i} q_j^\tau(x_j^*) \right] = 0.$$
(20)

It will be convenient to be able to relate the ordering of Y with the ordering of $(F_i^k)_{i=1,\dots,\tilde{N}, k=1,\dots,\gamma_i-1}$. For this purpose, given $i = 1, \dots, \tilde{N}$, $k = 1, \dots, \gamma_i - 1$, let

$$s^*(i,k) := \begin{cases} k & \text{for } i = 1, \\ \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} (\gamma_j - 1) + k & \text{for } i \ge 2. \end{cases}$$

Define $i^* : \{1, \ldots, \gamma\} \to \{1, \ldots, \tilde{N}\}$ and $k^* : \{1, \ldots, \gamma\} \to \{1, \ldots, \max_i \{\gamma_i - \gamma_i\} \to \{1, \ldots, \gamma_i\}$ 1}} to be the inverse of s^* ; that is

$$s^*(i^*(s), k^*(s)) = s \tag{21}$$

for all $s = 1, \ldots, \gamma$.

Given an $x \in X$, let $\mathbf{A}(x) = (a_{s,\tau}(x))_{\substack{s=1,\ldots,\gamma,\\\tau=1,\ldots,K}} \in \mathbb{R}^{\gamma \times K}$ be defined as the matrix with entries

$$a_{s,\tau}(x) := \left(q_{i^*(s)}^{\tau}(y_i^{k^*(s)+1}) - q_{i^*(s)}^{\tau}(y_i^1)\right) \prod_{j \neq i^*(s)} q_j^{\tau}(x_j),$$
(22)

Using this notation, (20) is equivalently expressed as

$$\mathbf{A}(x^*)u = 0. \tag{23}$$

The following proposition establishes the solvability of (23). We note that, in order to prove Proposition 24 (the main result of this section), it is sufficient to consider only x such that $\operatorname{carr}(x) = C$ in the following proposition. However, later, when studying first order degenerate games in Section 5.2, we will consider the notion of an "extended carrier set" (see (34)), and we will need to characterize the rank of $\mathbf{A}(x)$ for x with $\operatorname{carr}(x) \subset C$.

Proposition 25. For any x such that $carr(x) \subseteq C$, the matrix $\mathbf{A}(x)$ has full row rank.

Before proving this proposition we introduce some notation that will permit us to study the structure of $\mathbf{A}(x)$.

We begin by establishing a particular ordering of elements in Y. Let

$$\tilde{K} := \prod_{i=1}^{N} \gamma_i.$$

For $\tau = 1, \ldots, \tilde{K}$, let $\alpha_{\tau} = (\alpha_{\tau}^1, \ldots, \alpha_{\tau}^{\tilde{N}})$ be a multi-index associated with the τ -th action tuple in Y, meaning that

$$y^{\tau} = (y_1^{\alpha_{\tau}^1}, \dots, y_{\tilde{N}}^{\alpha_{\tau}^{\tilde{N}}}, y_{\tilde{N}+1}^1, \dots, y_N^1),$$

where y_i^1 , for $i = \tilde{N} + 1, \ldots, N$, is, by construction, the pure strategy used by player *i* at any strategy *x* with carrier *C*. Let *Y* be reordered so that for every $\tau = 1, \ldots, \tilde{K}$, $i = 1, \ldots, \tilde{N}$ we have $1 \leq \alpha_{\tau}^i \leq \gamma_i$. This ensures that the first \tilde{K} strategies in *Y* contain all strategy combinations of the elements of C_1, \ldots, C_N , and that for any multi-index $\alpha = (\alpha^1, \ldots, \alpha^{\tilde{N}}), 1 \leq \alpha^i \leq \gamma_i$, there exists a unique $1 \leq \tau \leq \tilde{K}$ such that $y^{\tau} = (y_1^{\alpha_1}, \ldots, y_{\tilde{N}}^{\alpha_{\tilde{N}}}, y_{\tilde{N}+1}^1, \ldots, y_N^1)$.

By definition (14) and the ordering we assumed for Y we have that

$$q_i^{\tau}(y_i^k) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } k = \alpha_{\tau}^i \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$
(24)

For $1 \leq s \leq \gamma$ and $1 \leq \tau \leq \tilde{K}$, let

$$r_{s,\tau} := q_i^{\tau}(y_i^{k+1}) - q_i^{\tau}(y_i^1) \quad \text{and} \quad p_{s,\tau}(x) := \prod_{j \neq i} q_j^{\tau}(x_j), \tag{25}$$

where $i = i^*(s)$ and $k = k^*(s)$ (see (21)), and note that $a_{s,\tau}(x) = r_{s,\tau}p_{s,\tau}(x)$ (see (22)). We may write $\mathbf{A}(x) = \mathbf{R} \circ \mathbf{P}(x)$, where \circ is the Hadamard product, and \mathbf{R} and $\mathbf{P}(x)$ have entries $r_{s,\tau}$ and $p_{s,\tau}(x)$ respectively.

Partition $\mathbf{A}(x)$, \mathbf{R} and $\mathbf{P}(x)$ as $\mathbf{A}(x) = [\mathbf{A}_1(x) \ \mathbf{A}_2(x)]$, $\mathbf{R} = [\mathbf{R}_1 \ \mathbf{R}_2]$, and $\mathbf{P}(x) = [\mathbf{P}_1(x) \ \mathbf{P}_2(x)]$, where $\mathbf{A}_1(x)$, \mathbf{R}_1 , $\mathbf{P}_1(x) \in \mathbb{R}^{\gamma \times \tilde{K}}$ and $\mathbf{A}_2(x)$, \mathbf{R}_2 , $\mathbf{P}_2(x) \in \mathbb{R}^{\gamma \times (K - \tilde{K})}$, so we may write

 $\mathbf{A}(x) = [\mathbf{A}_1(x) \ \mathbf{A}_2(x)], \text{ with, } \mathbf{A}_1(x) = \mathbf{R}_1 \circ \mathbf{P}_1(x) \text{ and } \mathbf{A}_2(x) = \mathbf{R}_2 \circ \mathbf{P}_2(x).$

In order to show that $\mathbf{A}(x)$ has full row rank, it is sufficient to prove that $\mathbf{A}_1(x)$ has full row rank—this is the approach we will take in proving the proposition.

We address this by studying the sign pattern of $A_1(x)$. Properties of sign pattern matrices (i.e., matrices with entries in $\{-1, 0, 1\}$) have been well-studied [45, 41]. We recall the following definition from [45],

Definition 26. A sign pattern matrix $\mathbf{L} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ with $n \ge m$ is said to be an *L*-matrix if for every matrix \mathbf{M} with $\operatorname{sgn}(\mathbf{M}) = \operatorname{sgn}(\mathbf{L})$, the matrix \mathbf{M} has full row rank.

The following lemma characterizes L-matrices [45, 41].

Lemma 27. Let $\mathbf{L} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ be a sign pattern matrix with $n \ge m$. Then \mathbf{L} is an *L*-matrix if and only if for every diagonal sign pattern matrix $\mathbf{D} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$, $\mathbf{D} \ne 0$ there is a nonzero column of \mathbf{DL} in which each nonzero entry has the same sign.

In light of Definition 26, Proposition 25 is equivalent to the following lemma.

Lemma 28. For any x such that $\operatorname{carr}(x) \subseteq C$, the matrix $\mathbf{A}_1(x) = (\mathbf{R}_1 \circ \operatorname{sgn}(\mathbf{P}_1(x)))$ is an L-matrix.

The proof of this lemma relies on showing that $(\mathbf{R}_1 \circ \operatorname{sgn}(\mathbf{P}_1(x)))$ satisfies the *L*-matrix characterization given in Lemma 27. While this lemma is critical to the proof of Proposition 3, the proof of the lemma requires one to check several special cases and can be somewhat tedious. Readers may which to skip the proof this lemma on a first read through.

Before proving Lemma 28 we introduce some definitions that will be useful in the proof. Given a diagonal matrix $\mathbf{D} \in \mathbb{R}^{\ell \times \ell}$, $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$, let diag (**D**) be the vector in \mathbb{R}^{ℓ} containing the diagonal elements of **D**.

Given a diagonal sign pattern matrix $\mathbf{D} \in \mathbb{R}^{\ell \times \ell}$, $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$, define $\operatorname{idx}(\mathbf{D})$ as follows. If diag (**D**) does not contain any ones, then let $\operatorname{idx}(\mathbf{D}) = 1$. Otherwise, let $\operatorname{idx}(\mathbf{D})$ be one more than the first index in diag (**D**) containing a 1.⁸⁹

Given a diagonal matrix $\mathbf{D} \in \mathbb{R}^{\gamma \times \gamma}$, let $\mathbf{D}_i \in \mathbb{R}^{(\gamma_i - 1) \times (\gamma_i - 1)}$, $i = 1, \dots, \tilde{N}$ be the (unique) diagonal matrices satisfying

diag
$$(\mathbf{D}) = (\operatorname{diag}(\mathbf{D}_1), \ldots, \operatorname{diag}(\mathbf{D}_N)).$$

We now prove Lemma 28.

Proof. Let x be a strategy satisfying $\operatorname{carr}(x) \subseteq C$. In order to show that $(\mathbf{R}_1 \circ \operatorname{sgn}(\mathbf{P}_1(x)))$ is an L-matrix, it is sufficient (by Lemma 27) to show that and for any diagonal sign pattern matrix $\mathbf{D} \neq 0$, there exists a column of $\mathbf{D}(\mathbf{R}_1 \circ \operatorname{sgn}(\mathbf{P}_1(x)))$ which is nonzero and in which every nonzero entry has the same sign. With this in mind, we begin by giving a characterization of the columns of \mathbf{R}_1 .

Suppose that $i = 1, ..., \tilde{N}$ and $k = 1, ..., \gamma_i - 1$ are fixed. Note the following:

- (i) Suppose $\tau \in \{1, \ldots, \tilde{K}\}$ is such that $\alpha_{\tau}^{i} = k + 1$, where α_{τ}^{i} is the *i*-th index of the multi-index α_{τ} . Since α_{τ} is used to define the ordering of actions in Y, we have $q_{i}^{\tau}(y_{i}^{k+1}) = 1$ and $q_{i}^{\tau}(y_{i}^{1}) = 0$ (see (24) and preceding discussion). Hence, $q_{i}^{\tau}(y_{i}^{k+1}) q_{i}^{\tau}(y_{i}^{1}) = 1$.
- (ii) Suppose $\tau \in \{1, ..., \tilde{K}\}$ is such that $\alpha_{\tau}^{i} = 1$. Then $q_{i}^{\tau}(y_{i}^{k+1}) = 0$, and $q_{i}^{\tau}(y_{i}^{1}) = 1$. Hence, $q_{i}^{\tau}(y_{i}^{k+1}) q_{i}^{\tau}(y_{i}^{1}) = -1$.
- (iii) For all other $\tau \in \{1, \ldots, \tilde{K}\}$ we have $q_i^{\tau}(y_i^{k+1}) = 0$, and $q_i^{\tau}(y_i^1) = 0$, and hence $q_i^{\tau}(y_i^{k+1}) q_i^{\tau}(y_i^1) = 0$.

⁸Assume indexing starts with one, not zero. For example, if the first time a 1 appears in diag (**D**) is at index 2, then $idx(\mathbf{D}) = 3$.

⁹The awkward offset in this definition is needed in order to handle the indexing offset inherent in the mapping $T_i: X_i \to \Delta_i, i = 1, ..., N$.

For $1 \leq \tau \leq \tilde{K}$, let $\mathbf{r}_{\tau} \in \mathbb{R}^{\gamma}$ be the τ -th column of \mathbf{R}_1 . Partition this column as

$$\mathbf{r}_{ au} = egin{pmatrix} \mathbf{r}_{ au}^1 \ dots \ \mathbf{r}_{ au}^{ ilde{N}} \end{pmatrix}.$$

where $\mathbf{r}_{\tau}^{i} \in \mathbb{R}^{\gamma_{i}-1}$. From (25) we see that

$$\mathbf{r}_{\tau}^{i} = \begin{pmatrix} q_{i}^{\tau}(y_{i}^{2}) - q_{i}^{\tau}(y_{i}^{1}) \\ \vdots \\ q_{i}^{\tau}(y_{i}^{\gamma_{i}}) - q_{i}^{\tau}(y_{i}^{1}) \end{pmatrix}.$$

Given the observations (i)–(iii) above we see that for each i we have

$$\mathbf{r}_{\tau}^{i} = \begin{cases} -\mathbf{1} & \text{if } \alpha_{\tau}^{i} = 1\\ e_{\alpha_{\tau}^{i}-1} & \text{if } 2 \le \alpha_{\tau}^{i} \le \gamma_{i}, \end{cases}$$
(26)

where the symbol $e_{\alpha_{\tau}^{i}-1}$ refers to the $(\alpha_{\tau}^{i}-1)$ -th canonical vector in $\mathbb{R}^{\gamma_{i}-1}$ and $\mathbf{1} \in \mathbb{R}^{\gamma_{i}-1}$ is the vector of all ones.

We now characterize the columns of $sgn(\mathbf{P}_1(x))$. For $i = 1, ..., \tilde{N}$ we define

$$\operatorname{idx}_i(x) := \{k \in \{1, \dots, \gamma_i\} : T_i^k(x_i) > 0\}.$$

Since carr(x) = C, the ordering we assumed for Y_i implies that $T_i^k(x) = 0$ for $k \ge \gamma_i + 1$. By the definition of T_i , it is not possible to have $T_i^k(x_i) = 0$ for all $k = 1, \ldots, K_i$ and hence $\operatorname{idx}_i(x) \ne \emptyset$.

Let \mathbf{p}_{τ} be the τ -th column of $\mathbf{P}_1(x)$ and let

$$\tilde{\mathbf{p}}_{\tau} := \operatorname{sgn}(\mathbf{p}_{\tau})$$

be the τ -th column of $\operatorname{sgn}(\mathbf{P}_1(x))$.¹⁰ Suppose that $\tau \in \{1, \ldots, \tilde{K}\}$ is such that for the multi-index α_{τ} we have $\alpha_{\tau}^i \in \operatorname{idx}_i(x)$ for all $i = 1, \ldots, \tilde{N}$. Then for each $s = 1, \ldots, \gamma$ the (s, τ) -th entry of $\mathbf{P}_1(x)$ is strictly positive (see (14) and (25)), and hence \mathbf{p}_{τ} is positive and $\tilde{\mathbf{p}}_{\tau} = \mathbf{1}$.

 $^{^{10}\}mathrm{For}$ convenience in notation, we suppress the argument x when writing the columns of these matrices.

Partition the columns \mathbf{p}_{τ} and $\tilde{\mathbf{p}}_{\tau}$ as

$$\mathbf{p}_{\tau} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{p}_{\tau}^{1} \\ \vdots \\ \mathbf{p}_{\tau}^{\tilde{N}} \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{\mathbf{p}}_{\tau} = \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{\mathbf{p}}_{\tau}^{1} \\ \vdots \\ \tilde{\mathbf{p}}_{\tau}^{\tilde{N}} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (27)$$

where $\mathbf{p}_{\tau}^{i}, \tilde{\mathbf{p}}_{\tau}^{i} \in \mathbb{R}^{\gamma_{i}-1}$. Suppose that τ is such that for the multi-index α_{τ} we have $\alpha_{\tau}^{i} \notin \operatorname{idx}_{i}(x)$ for exactly one subindex $i \in \{1, \ldots, \tilde{N}\}$. Then \mathbf{p}_{τ}^{i} is positive (see (25)) and \mathbf{p}_{τ}^{j} is zero for any $j \neq i$. Hence, $\tilde{\mathbf{p}}_{\tau}^{i} = \mathbf{1}$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{p}}_{\tau}^{j} = 0$ for any $j \neq i$.

Now, let $\mathbf{D} \in \mathbb{R}^{\gamma \times \gamma}$ be an non-zero diagonal sign pattern matrix. We will show that there is a nonzero column of $\mathbf{D}(\mathbf{R}_1 \circ \operatorname{sgn}(\mathbf{P}_1(x)))$ in which each nonzero entry is a 1.

We now consider two possible cases for the structure of **D** and show that in each case there is a nonzero column of $\mathbf{D}(\mathbf{R}_1 \circ \operatorname{sgn}(\mathbf{P}_1(x)))$ in which every nonzero entry is 1.

Case 1: Suppose that for all $i \in \{1, ..., \tilde{N}\}$ such that $idx(\mathbf{D}_i) \notin idx_i(x)$ we have diag $(\mathbf{D}_i) = 0$. Choose τ such that

$$\begin{cases} \alpha_{\tau}^{i} = \operatorname{idx}(\mathbf{D}_{i}) & \text{if } \operatorname{idx}(\mathbf{D}_{i}) \in \operatorname{idx}_{i}(x), \\ \alpha_{\tau}^{i} \in \operatorname{idx}_{i}(x) & \text{if } \operatorname{idx}(\mathbf{D}_{i}) \notin \operatorname{idx}_{i}(x). \end{cases}$$

Note that $\alpha_{\tau}^{i} \in \operatorname{idx}_{i}(x)$ for all $i = 1, \ldots, \tilde{N}$, and hence $\tilde{\mathbf{p}}_{\tau} = \mathbf{1}$ (see discussion preceding (27)). The τ -th column of $\mathbf{D}(\mathbf{R}_{1} \circ \operatorname{sgn}(\mathbf{P}_{1}(x)))$ is given by

$$\mathbf{D}(\mathbf{r}_{\tau} \circ \tilde{\mathbf{p}}_{\tau}) = \operatorname{diag}\left(\mathbf{D}\right) \circ \mathbf{r}_{\tau} = \left(\operatorname{diag}\left(\mathbf{D}_{i}\right) \circ \mathbf{r}_{\tau}^{i}\right)_{i=1}^{N}.$$
 (28)

For any *i* such that $\operatorname{idx}(\mathbf{D}_i) \notin \operatorname{idx}_i(x)$ we have, by assumption, diag $(\mathbf{D}_i) = 0$ and hence diag $(\mathbf{D}_i) \circ \mathbf{r}_{\tau}^i = 0$. Moreover, note that in this case we have $\operatorname{idx}(\mathbf{D}_i) = 1$ since, by the definition of $\operatorname{idx}(\cdot)$, diag $(\mathbf{D}_i) = 0$ implies $\operatorname{idx}(\mathbf{D}_i) = 1$.

Suppose now that *i* is such that $idx(\mathbf{D}_i) \in idx_i(x)$. For $i = 1, \ldots, \tilde{N}$, if $\alpha_{\tau}^i = 1$ then $\mathbf{r}_{\tau}^i = -\mathbf{1}$ (by (26)) and diag (\mathbf{D}_i) contains no ones (this is the definition of $idx(\mathbf{D}_i) = 1$). In fact, diag (\mathbf{D}_i) contains only entries with value of 0 or -1. Hence, diag (\mathbf{D}_i) $\circ \mathbf{r}_{\tau}^i = -diag (\mathbf{D}_i)$, which is a nonnegative vector.

If $2 \leq \alpha_{\tau}^{i} \leq \gamma_{i}$ then $\mathbf{r}_{\tau}^{i} = e_{\alpha_{\tau}^{i}-1}$ (by (26)). Recalling the definition of $idx(\cdot)$, by our choice of $\alpha_{\tau}^{i} = idx(\mathbf{D}_{i})$, the $(\alpha_{\tau}^{i}-1)$ -th entry of diag (\mathbf{D}_{i}) is 1.

Hence, diag $(\mathbf{D}_i) \circ \mathbf{r}_{\tau}^i = e_{\alpha_{\tau}^i - 1}$. In particular, this implies that if $\alpha_{\tau}^i \neq 1$ then diag $(\mathbf{D}_i) \circ r_{\tau}^i$ is not identically zero and every nonzero entry of diag $(\mathbf{D}_i) \circ r_{\tau}^i$ is 1.

In summary, for $i = 1, ..., \tilde{N}$, we have diag $(\mathbf{D}_i) \circ \mathbf{r}_{\tau}^i \geq 0$, with equality only when $\operatorname{idx}(\mathbf{D}_i) = 1$ and $\mathbf{D}_i = 0$. Hence, by (28), the τ -th column of $\mathbf{D}(\mathbf{R}_1 \circ \operatorname{sgn}(\mathbf{P}_1(x)))$ satisfies $\mathbf{D}(\mathbf{r}_{\tau} \circ \tilde{\mathbf{p}}_{\tau}) \geq 0$, with equality only when $\operatorname{idx}(\mathbf{D}_i) = 1$ and $\mathbf{D}_i = 0$ for all *i*. But, by assumption $\mathbf{D} \neq 0$, so $\mathbf{D}(\mathbf{r}_{\tau} \circ \tilde{\mathbf{p}}_{\tau}) \neq 0$.

Case 2: Suppose that for some $i \in \{1, \ldots, N\}$ we have $idx(\mathbf{D}_i) \notin idx_i(x)$ and $diag(\mathbf{D}_i) \neq 0$. Let $\tau \in \{1, \ldots, \tilde{K}\}$ be chosen such that $\alpha_{\tau}^i = idx(\mathbf{D}_i)$ for exactly one such $i \in \{1, \ldots, \tilde{N}\}$ and for all other $j \neq i$ we have $\alpha_{\tau}^i \in idx_j$ (this is always possible since $idx_j \neq \emptyset$). Then we have

$$\tilde{\mathbf{p}}_{\tau}^{i} = \mathbf{1}, \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{\mathbf{p}}_{\tau}^{j} = 0, \text{ for all } j \neq i$$

(see discussion following (27)).

As shown in Case 1, if $\alpha_{\tau}^{i} = 1$, then $\mathbf{D}_{i} \leq 0$ and $r_{\tau}^{i} = -1$ which implies that diag $(\mathbf{D}_{i}) \circ \mathbf{r}_{\tau}^{i} \geq 0$. Moreover, since $\tilde{\mathbf{p}}_{\tau}^{i} = \mathbf{1}$ and since, by assumption diag $(\mathbf{D}_{i}) \neq 0$ we have diag $(\mathbf{D}_{i}) \circ \mathbf{r}_{\tau}^{i} \circ \tilde{\mathbf{p}}_{\tau}^{i} \neq 0$ and every nonzero entry is 1.

If $2 \leq \alpha_{\tau}^{i} \leq \gamma_{i}$, then, again using the same reasoning as in Case 1, we see that diag $(\mathbf{D}_{i}) \circ \mathbf{r}_{\tau}^{i} = e_{\alpha_{\tau}^{i}-1}$. Since $\tilde{\mathbf{p}}_{\tau}^{i} = \mathbf{1}$ we get that diag $(\mathbf{D}_{i}) \circ \mathbf{r}_{\tau}^{i} \circ \mathbf{p}_{\tau}^{i} = e_{\alpha_{\tau}^{i}-1}$.

For $j \neq i$ we have $\tilde{\mathbf{p}}_{\tau}^{j} = 0$, which implies diag $(\mathbf{D}_{j}) \circ \mathbf{r}_{\tau}^{j} \circ \tilde{\mathbf{p}}_{\tau}^{j} = 0$.

All together, this implies that the τ -th column of $\mathbf{D}(\mathbf{R}_1 \circ \operatorname{sgn}(\mathbf{P}_1(x)))$, given by $(\operatorname{diag}(\mathbf{D}_j) \circ \mathbf{r}_{\tau}^j \circ \tilde{\mathbf{p}}_{\tau}^j)_{j=1}^{\tilde{N}}$, is nonzero and every nonzero entry is equal to 1.

Since this holds for arbitrary diagonal sign matrix $\mathbf{D} \neq 0$, Lemma 27 implies that $(\mathbf{R}_1 \circ \operatorname{sgn}(\mathbf{P}_1(x)))$ is an *L*-matrix. Since this holds for any x satisfying $\operatorname{carr}(x) \subseteq C$, we see that the desired result holds.

Given the carrier C there are $\binom{K}{\gamma}$ possible combinations (of length γ) of the columns of $\mathbf{A}(x)$. For each $r = 1, \ldots, \binom{K}{\gamma}$, let $\mathbf{A}_r(x) \in \mathbb{R}^{\gamma \times \gamma}$ denote a square matrix formed by taking one unique combination of the columns of $\mathbf{A}(x)$. For $r = 1, \ldots, \binom{K}{\gamma}$, let

$$S_r := \{ x \in X : \operatorname{carr}(x) = C, \operatorname{det} \mathbf{A}_r(x) \neq 0 \}$$

By Proposition 25, no strategy $x \in X$ with $\operatorname{carr}(x) = C$ may simultaneously be in all S_r^c . Note also that each S_r is open relative to the set

 $\{x \in X : \operatorname{carr}(x) = C\} = \mathring{\Omega}_C$ (see (11)). Thus, we may construct a countable family of open balls $(B_\ell)_{\ell \ge 1}, B_\ell \subset \Omega_C$ that satisfy:

(i) $\bigcup_{\ell \ge 1} B_\ell = \{x \in X : \operatorname{carr}(x) = C\}$

(ii) For each $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists an $r_{\ell} \in \{1, \ldots, \binom{K}{\gamma}\}$ such that $B_{\ell} \subseteq S_{r_{\ell}}$ (i.e., $\mathbf{A}_{r_{\ell}}(x)$ is invertible for all $x \in B_{\ell}$).

Fix $\ell \in \{1, 2, \ldots\}$. After reordering, $\mathbf{A}(x)$ may be partitioned as $\mathbf{A}(x) = [\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{r_{\ell}}(x) \ \mathbf{A}_{r_{\ell}}(x)]$, where $\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{r_{\ell}}(x)$ is a matrix formed by the columns of $\mathbf{A}(x)$ not used to form $\mathbf{A}_{r_{\ell}}(x)$. Let the strategy set Y be reordered in the same way as the columns $\mathbf{A}(x)$.¹¹ Given a vector of utility coefficients $u \in \mathbb{R}^{K}$, let it be partitioned as $u = (u_1, u_2)$, where $u_1 = (u^1, \ldots, u^{K-\gamma})$ and $u_2 = (u^{K-\gamma+1}, \ldots, u^K)$. Define $\tilde{\rho}_{\ell} : B_{\ell} \times \mathbb{R}^{K-\gamma} \to \mathbb{R}^{\gamma}$ by

$$\tilde{\rho}_{\ell}(x, u_1) := -\mathbf{A}_{r_{\ell}}(x)^{-1} \tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{r_{\ell}}(x) u_1, \qquad (29)$$

If $x^* \in B_{\ell}$ is an equilibrium for some identical-payoffs game with utility coefficient vector u, then by (23) we have $\mathbf{A}(x^*)u = 0$. Since $\mathbf{A}_{r_{\ell}}(x^*)$ is invertible, this is equivalent to $u_2 = -\mathbf{A}_{r_{\ell}}(x^*)^{-1}\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{r_{\ell}}(x^*)u_1$. Hence, if $x^* \in B_{\ell}$ is an equilibrium of some identical-payoffs game with utility coefficient vector $u = (u_1, u_2)$, the function $\tilde{\rho}_{\ell}$ permits us to recover u_2 given u_1 and x^* .

Conversely, suppose $x \in B_{\ell}$ and $u_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{K-\gamma}$ are arbitrary. If $u = (u_1, u_2)$ with $u_2 = \tilde{\rho}_{\ell}(x, u_1)$, then by the definition of $\tilde{\rho}_{\ell}$ we see that $\mathbf{A}(x)u = 0$. By the definition of $\mathbf{A}(x)$ (see (17)–(22)) this implies

$$F(x, u_1, \tilde{\rho}_\ell(x, u_1)) = 0, \quad \text{for all } x \in B_\ell.$$

Thus, taking a partial derivative with respect to x_i^k we get

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial x_i^k} F(x, u_1, \tilde{\rho}_\ell(x, u_1)) = 0, \qquad i = 1, \dots, \tilde{N}, \ k = 1, \dots, \gamma_i - 1.$$
(30)

Consider again the decomposition $x = (x_p, x_m)$. Using compact notation, (30) is restated as

$$D_{x_m} F(x_p, x_m, u_1, \tilde{\rho}_{\ell}(x_p, x_m, u_1)) = 0.$$
(31)

Suppose $x^* \in B_{\ell}$ is an equilibrium of a identical-payoffs game with utility coefficient vector u and carr $(x^*) = C$. Applying the chain rule in (31), using

¹¹Note that we previously assumed a specific ordering for Y. However, this was for the purpose of proving Proposition 25, which is unaffected by a reordering of Y at this point.

(18), and using the fact that $F(x, u) = \mathbf{A}(x)u = \tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{r_{\ell}}(x)u_1 + \mathbf{A}_{r_{\ell}}(x)u_2$, we find that at x^* there holds¹²

$$\widetilde{\mathbf{H}}(x^*) = -\mathbf{A}_{r_\ell}(x^*)\widetilde{\mathbf{J}}_{\rho_\ell}(x^*, u), \qquad (32)$$

where $\tilde{\mathbf{J}}_{\rho_{\ell}}(x, u) := D_{\tilde{x}_m} \tilde{\rho}_{\ell}(x_p, \tilde{x}_m, u) \big|_{\tilde{x}_m = x_m}$ is the Jacobian of $\tilde{\rho}_{\ell}$ taken with respect to x_m .

Since $\mathbf{A}_{r_{\ell}}(x)$ is invertible for all $x \in B_{\ell}$, this means that given any equilibrium $x^* \in B_{\ell}$, the Hessian $\tilde{\mathbf{H}}(x^*)$ is nonsingular if and only if the Jacobian $\tilde{\mathbf{J}}_{\rho_{\ell}}(x^*, u)$ is nonsingular.

For each $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$, define the function $\rho_{\ell} : B_{\ell} \times \mathbb{R}^{K-\gamma} \to \mathbb{R}^{K}$ by $\rho_{\ell}(x, u_{1}) := (u_{1}, \tilde{\rho}_{\ell}(x, u_{1}))$. The function ρ_{ℓ} is a trivial extension of $\tilde{\rho}_{\ell}$ that recovers the full vector of utility coefficients $u \in \mathbb{R}^{K}$ given $u_{1} \in \mathbb{R}^{K-\gamma}$ and an equilibrium $x^{*} \in B_{\ell}$.

Remark 29. In the case of general N-player games, as considered in [3, 4], Harsanyi (and van Damme) construct a mapping into \mathbb{R}^{NK} (denoted by the symbol ρ^{**} in [3]) which recovers the individual utility coefficients for each player, given a subset of $NK - \gamma$ utility coefficients and an equilibrium strateqy. In that case, the equality governing the relationship between strategies and utility coefficients is given by an equation analogous to (23) (see (49)in [3]) in which the matrix corresponding to $\mathbf{A}(x)$ in (23) has dimension $\gamma \times NK$. Effectively, Harsanyi's mapping ρ^{**} is constructed by choosing γ columns of the associated matrix $\mathbf{A}(x)$ that are linearly independent for all $x \in X$, and inverting this square submatrix as in (29). Sard's theorem then gives that the critical values set of this map has \mathcal{L}^{NK} -measure zero. In order to prove genericity results for identical-payoff games we must show that the set of irregular identical-payoff games has \mathcal{L}^{K} -measure zero. One can restrict Harsanyi's map to the set of identical-payoff games $\mathcal{I} = \mathbb{R}^{K}$. However, if Harsanyi's map is restricted to the set of identical-payoff games (which reduces the dimension of the input vector of utility coefficients from $NK - \gamma$ to $K-\gamma$), the mapping looses uniqueness for some values of x. Instead, one must construct a collection of (well-defined) mappings $(\rho_{\ell})_{\ell}$, each of which recovers the full vector of utility coefficients given a vector of $K - \gamma$ utility coefficients and an equilibrium strategy $x^* \in B_\ell \subset X$, where B_ℓ is some subset

¹²We note that $\tilde{\mathbf{H}}(x^*)$ is also dependent on u. However, we suppress the argument u since it is generally held constant in the context of the Hessian $\tilde{\mathbf{H}}$.

of X where the mapping ρ_{ℓ} is well defined. This is accomplished by showing that the matrix $\mathbf{A}(x)$ in (23) has full row rank and constructing each ρ_{ℓ} as an appropriate combination of the columns of $\mathbf{A}(x)$.

Note that the Jacobian of ρ_{ℓ} takes the form

$$\mathbf{J}_{\rho_{\ell}}(x,u) = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{I} \\ \mathbf{J}_{\tilde{\rho}_{\ell}} & \mathbf{M} \end{pmatrix},$$

for some matrix **M**. Clearly, det $\mathbf{J}_{\rho_{\ell}} = 0$ if and only if det $\tilde{\mathbf{J}}_{\rho_{\ell}} = 0$. Thus, by (32) we see that if $x^* \in B_{\ell}$ is an equilibrium of an identical-payoffs game with utility coefficient vector u, then

$$\det \mathbf{J}_{\rho_{\ell}}(x^*, u) = 0 \quad \Longleftrightarrow \quad \det \mathbf{\tilde{H}}(x^*) = 0.$$
(33)

We now prove Proposition 24.

Proof. Let C be a carrier set. Let $\mathcal{U}(C) \subseteq \mathbb{R}^K$ be the set of identical-payoff games having at least one degenerate equilibrium with carrier set C; that is,

 $\mathcal{U}(C) := \left\{ u \in \mathbb{R}^K : \exists \text{ degenerate equilibrium } x^* \in \{ x \in X : \operatorname{carr}(x) = C \} \right\}.$

For $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$, let $\mathcal{U}(C, \ell) \subseteq \mathbb{R}^K$ be the subset of identical-payoff games having at least one degenerate equilibrium $x^* \in B_\ell$, where B_ℓ is defined with respect to C; that is,

 $\mathcal{U}(C,\ell) := \left\{ u \in \mathbb{R}^K : \exists \text{ degenerate equilibrium } x^* \in B_\ell \right\}.$

By construction, we have $\bigcup_{\ell \ge 1} B_{\ell} = \{x \in X : \operatorname{carr}(x) = C\}$, and hence $\mathcal{U}(C) = \bigcup_{\ell > 1} \mathcal{U}(C, \ell)$.

We showed above that for any $(x, u) \in B_{\ell} \times \mathbb{R}^{K}$ such that x is an equilibrium of the identical-payoffs game with utility coefficients u, the Hessian $\tilde{\mathbf{H}}(x)$ (taken with respect to C) is invertible if and only if the Jacobian of $\rho_{\ell}(x, u)$ is invertible. Thus, the set $\mathcal{U}(C, \ell)$ is contained in the set of critical values of ρ_{ℓ} . By Sard's theorem, we get that $\mathcal{U}(C, \ell)$ is a set with \mathcal{L}^{K} -measure zero. Since $\mathcal{U}(C)$ is the countable union of sets of \mathcal{L}^{K} -measure zero, it is itself a set with \mathcal{L}^{K} -measure zero.

Let $\mathcal{U} \subset \mathbb{R}^K$ denote the subset of identical-payoff games with at least one degenerate equilibrium. The set \mathcal{U} may be expressed as the union $\mathcal{U} = \bigcup_C \mathcal{U}(C)$ taken over all possible support sets C. Since there are a finite number of support sets C, the set \mathcal{U} has \mathcal{L}^K -measure zero. \Box

5.2. First-Order Degenerate Games

The following proposition shows that, within the set of identical-payoff games, first-order degenerate games form a null set.

Proposition 30. The set of identical-payoff games which are first-order degenerate has \mathcal{L}^{K} -measure zero.

Proof. Fix some set $C = C_1 \cup \cdots \cup C_N$ where each C_i is a nonempty subset of Y_i . Let \widehat{C} be any *strict* subset of C. In the context of this proof let $\gamma_i := |C_i|$, let $\gamma := \sum_{i=1}^{N} (\gamma_i - 1)$, let $\widetilde{N} := |\{i = 1, \ldots, N : \gamma_i \ge 2\}|$, and assume Y_i is reordered so that $\{y_i^1, \ldots, y_i^{\gamma_i}\} = C_i$. Note that this ordering implies that for any x with $\operatorname{carr}(x) = C$ we have $y_i^1 \in \operatorname{carr}(x)$, $i = 1, \ldots, N$.

Given an equilibrium x^* let the *extended carrier* of x^* be defined as

ext carr
$$(x^*) := \operatorname{carr}(x^*) \cup \left(\bigcup_{i=1}^N \{ y_i^k \in Y_i : k = 2, \dots, K_i, \frac{\partial U(x^*)}{\partial x_i^{k-1}} = 0 \} \right).$$

(34)

Suppose that x^* is an equilibrium with *extended* carrier C. By Lemma 35 (see appendix) and the ordering we assumed for Y_i we have

$$F_i^k(x^*, u) = \frac{\partial U(x^*)}{\partial x_i^{k-1}} = 0, \qquad i = 1, \dots, \tilde{N}, \ k = 1, \dots, \gamma_i - 1, \tag{35}$$

where F_i^k is as defined in (16). Thus, if x^* is an equilibrium for some identicalpayoffs game with utility coefficient vector $u \in \mathbb{R}^K$, and ext carr $(x^*) = C$, then by the definition of $\mathbf{A}(x)$ (see (17)–(22)), (35) implies that $\mathbf{A}(x^*)u = 0$, or equivalently,

$$u \in \ker \mathbf{A}(x^*)$$

where the matrix $\mathbf{A}(x) \in \mathbb{R}^{\gamma \times K}$ is defined with respect to C, as in (22).

Let $\mathcal{U}(C, \widehat{C}) \subseteq \mathbb{R}^K$ be the set of identical-payoff games in which there exists an equilibrium x^* with $\operatorname{carr}(x^*) = \widehat{C}$ and $\operatorname{ext} \operatorname{carr}(x^*) = C$. Let

$$\widehat{X} := \{ x \in X : \operatorname{carr}(x) = \widehat{C} \}.$$

By the above we see that

$$\mathcal{U}(C,\widehat{C}) \subseteq \bigcup_{x \in \widehat{X}} \ker \mathbf{A}(x).$$
(36)

For each $x \in \widehat{X}$, let range $\mathbf{A}(x)^T$ denote the range space of $\mathbf{A}(x)^T$. Each entry of $\mathbf{A}(x)^T$ is a polynomial function in x and hence is Lipschitz continuous over the bounded set \widehat{X} . By Proposition 25 we have rank $\mathbf{A}(x)^T = \gamma$ for all $x \in \widehat{X}$. Thus, we may choose a set of γ basis vectors $\{\mathbf{b}_1(x), \ldots, \mathbf{b}_{\gamma}(x)\}$ spanning range $\mathbf{A}(x)^T$ such that each $\mathbf{b}_k(x) \in \mathbb{R}^K$, $k = 1, \ldots, \gamma$ is a Lipschitz continuous function in x. Moreover, we may choose a complementary set of $(K - \gamma)$ linearly independent vectors $\{\mathbf{b}_{\gamma+1}(x), \ldots, \mathbf{b}_K(x)\}$ forming a basis for the orthogonal complement (range $\mathbf{A}(x)^T)^{\perp}$, with each $\mathbf{b}_k(x) \in$ \mathbb{R}^K , $k = \gamma + 1, \ldots, K$ being a continuous function in x. Let $\mathbf{B}(x) :=$ $(\mathbf{b}_{\gamma+1}(x) \cdots \mathbf{b}_K(x)) \in \mathbb{R}^{K \times (K - \gamma)}$. Let $f : \widehat{X} \times \mathbb{R}^{K - \gamma} \to \mathbb{R}^K$ be given by $f(x, v) := \mathbf{B}(x)v$. Since $\mathbf{B}(x)$ is Lipschitz continuous in x and \widehat{X} is bounded, f is Lipschitz continuous. By the fundamental theorem of linear algebra, for each $x \in \widehat{X}$, ker $\mathbf{A}(x) = (\text{range } \mathbf{A}(x)^T)^{\perp} = \text{range } \mathbf{B}(x)$. Hence,

$$\bigcup_{x \in \widehat{X}} \ker \mathbf{A}(x) = f(\widehat{X} \times \mathbb{R}^{K-\gamma}).$$
(37)

Since $\widehat{C} \subseteq C$, the Hausdorff dimension of \widehat{X} is at most $(\gamma - 1)$ and the Hausdorff dimension of $\widehat{X} \times \mathbb{R}^{K-\gamma}$ is at most K - 1. Since f is Lipschitz continuous, this implies (see [42], Section 2.4) that the Hausdorff dimension of $f(\widehat{X} \times \mathbb{R}^{K-\gamma})$ is at most K-1, and in particular, that $f(\widehat{X} \times \mathbb{R}^{K-\gamma})$ has $\mathcal{L}^{K-\gamma}$ measure zero. By (36) and (37), this implies that $\mathcal{U}(C,\widehat{C})$ has $\mathcal{L}^{K-\gamma}$ -measure zero.

Let $\mathcal{U} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{K}$ denote the set of all identical-payoff games containing a first-order degenerate equilibrium. Since we may represent this set as a finite union of \mathcal{L}^{K} -measure zero sets,

$$\mathcal{U} = \bigcup_{\substack{\emptyset \neq C_i \subseteq Y_i, i=1,\ldots,N\\C = C_1 \cup \cdots \cup C_N\\\widehat{C} \subseteq C}} \mathcal{U}(C, \widehat{C}),$$

the set \mathcal{U} also has \mathcal{L}^{K} -measure zero.

6. Regularity in Exact and Weighted Potential Games

The goal of this section is to prove generic regularity in exact and weighted potential games, as stated in the following proposition.

Proposition 31.

(i) Almost all weighted potential games are regular.

(ii) Almost all exact potential games are regular.

Exact and weighted potential games are closely related to games with identical payoffs. By identifying equivalence relationships between identical-payoff games and exact and weighted potential games, this result follows as a relatively simple consequence of Proposition 3.

Let the number of players $N \ge 2$ and action-space size $K_i \ge 2$, $i = 1, \ldots, N$ be arbitrary. Define

$$\tilde{\mathcal{I}} := \{ u \in \mathcal{I} : \mathbf{1}^T u = 0 \},\$$

where $\mathcal{I} = \mathbb{R}^{K}$ is the set of identical-payoff games as given in (8). The set $\tilde{\mathcal{I}}$ will provide a convenient means of partitioning the sets of exact and weighted potential games.

Note that an identical-payoffs game $u \in \tilde{\mathcal{I}}$ is regular if and only if $\tilde{u} = u + c\mathbf{1}$ is regular for every $c \in \mathbb{R}$. Note also that $\tilde{\mathcal{I}}$ is isomorphic to \mathbb{R}^{K-1} . (Henceforth we will treat $\tilde{\mathcal{I}}$ as $\tilde{\mathcal{I}} = \mathbb{R}^{K-1}$.) This, along with Proposition 3, implies the following lemma.

Lemma 32. The set of games in $\tilde{\mathcal{I}}$ that are irregular has \mathcal{L}^{K-1} -measure zero.

As defined in Section 2.2, let $\mathcal{P} \subset \mathbb{R}^{NK}$ denote the set of all exact potential games and let $\mathcal{W} \subset \mathbb{R}^{NK}$ denote the set of all weighted potential games (of size $(N, (K_i)_{i=1}^N)$). A element $v \in \mathcal{P}$ or $v \in \mathcal{W}$ is a vector in \mathbb{R}^{NK} which we decompose as $v = (v_i)_{i=1}^N$ where $v_i \in \mathbb{R}^K$ represent the pure-strategy utility of player *i*. For each $u \in \tilde{\mathcal{I}}$, define

$$\mathcal{P}_{u} := \left\{ v \in \mathbb{R}^{NK} : v_{i}(y_{i}, y_{-i}) - v_{i}(y'_{i}, y_{-i}) = u(y_{i}, y_{-i}) - u(y'_{i}, y_{-i}) \\ \forall i = 1, \dots, N, \ y_{i}, y'_{i} \in Y_{i}, \ y_{-i} \in Y_{-i} \right\};$$

to be the set of all potential games with potential function $u \in \tilde{\mathcal{I}}$. Using Definition 6 it is straightforward to verify that $\mathcal{P}_u \cap \mathcal{P}_{\tilde{u}} = \emptyset$ for every $u, \tilde{u} \in \tilde{\mathcal{I}}$, $u \neq \tilde{u}$ and $\bigcup_{u \in \tilde{\mathcal{I}}} \mathcal{P}_u = \mathcal{P}$. Thus $(\mathcal{P}_u)_{u \in \tilde{\mathcal{I}}}$ partitions \mathcal{P} . Likewise, define

$$\mathcal{W}_{u} := \left\{ v \in \mathbb{R}^{NK} : v_{i}(y_{i}, y_{-i}) - v_{i}(y'_{i}, y_{-i}) = w_{i}(u(y_{i}, y_{-i}) - u(y'_{i}, y_{-i})) \\ \forall i = 1, \dots, N, \ y_{i}, y'_{i} \in Y_{i}, \ y_{-i} \in Y_{-i}, \text{ and for some } w_{i} > 0 \right\}$$

to be set of all weighted potential games with potential function $u \in \mathcal{I}$. As in the case of exact potential games, we see that $(\mathcal{W}_u)_{u \in \tilde{\mathcal{I}}}$ partitions \mathcal{W} .

By Lemma 23 we get the following result.

Lemma 33.

(i) For each $u \in \tilde{\mathcal{I}}$ and each exact potential game $v \in \mathcal{P}_u$, v is regular if and only if u is regular. (ii) For each $u \in \tilde{\mathcal{I}}$ and each weighted potential game $w \in \mathcal{W}_u$, w is regular

(ii) For each $u \in \mathcal{I}$ and each weighted potential game $w \in W_u$, w is regular if and only if u is regular.

Recall that \mathcal{P} and \mathcal{W} are subspaces of \mathbb{R}^{NK} with dimensions K_p and K_w , respectively (see Section 2.2). Since $(\mathcal{P}_u)_{u\in\tilde{\mathcal{I}}}$ partitions \mathcal{P} , every exact potential game $v \in \mathcal{P}$ may be uniquely represented by a vector (u, z) where $u \in \tilde{\mathcal{I}} = \mathbb{R}^{K-1}$ and $z \in \mathbb{R}^{\tilde{K}_p}$, $\tilde{K}_p := K_p - K + 1$. Likewise, every weighted potential game $v \in \mathcal{W}$ may be uniquely represented by a vector (u, z) where $u \in \tilde{\mathcal{I}} = \mathbb{R}^{K-1}$ and $z \in \mathbb{R}^{\tilde{K}_w}$, $\tilde{K}_w := K_w - K + 1$.

Let $\operatorname{IR}_p \subset \mathcal{P}$ and $\operatorname{IR}_w \subset \mathcal{W}$ denote the subsets of the exact and weighted potential games (respectively) that are irregular. Recall that by Proposition 11, IR_p and IR_w are closed and hence measurable. Since $\mathcal{L}^{K-1}(\tilde{\mathcal{I}}) = 0$ we see that $\mathcal{L}^{K_p}(\operatorname{IR}_p) = \mathcal{L}^{K_p}(\tilde{\mathcal{I}} \times \mathbb{R}^{K_p-K+1}) = \mathcal{L}^{K-1}(\tilde{\mathcal{I}})\mathcal{L}^{K_p-K+1}(\mathbb{R}^{K_p-K+1}) = 0$. By similar reasoning we also see that $\mathcal{L}^{K_w}(\operatorname{IR}_w) = 0$. Since IR_p and IR_w are closed with respect to \mathcal{P} and \mathcal{W} (see Proposition 11), this proves Proposition 31.

Appendix A.

As noted in Remark 14, the notion of a regular equilibrium is traditionally defined by considering strategies in the space Δ rather than X. In this appendix we verify that the definition of a regular equilibrium given in Definition 12 is equivalent to the standard definition of a regular equilibrium given for strategies in Δ as in [4].

In an abuse of notation, given a strategy $\sigma \in \Delta$ and a vector $u \in \mathbb{R}^K$, let

$$\tilde{F}_i^k(\sigma, u) := \tilde{F}_i^k(T^{-1}(\sigma), u)$$
(A.1)

for i = 1, ..., N and $k = 1, ..., K_i - 1$, where $\tilde{F}_i^k(x, u)$ is as defined in (9). Furthermore, let

$$\tilde{F}_i^0(\sigma, u) := \left(\sum_{k=1}^{K_i} \sigma_i^k\right) - 1 \tag{A.2}$$

for $i = 1, \ldots, N$, and let

$$\tilde{F}(\sigma, u) := (\tilde{F}_i^k(\sigma, u))_{\substack{i=1,...,N,\\k=0,...,K_i-1}}.$$
(A.3)

An equilibrium $\sigma^* \in \Delta$ is traditionally said to be regular if the strategy set Y_i of each player $i = 1, \ldots, N$ is ordered so that $y_i^1 \in \operatorname{spt}(\sigma_i)$ and the Jacobian $D_{\sigma}\tilde{F}(\sigma^*, u)$ is non-singular [4].

To see that the definition of a regular equilibrium given in Definition 12 coincides with the traditional definition given in [4], suppose that $x^* \in X$ is an equilibrium of some game with utility coefficient vector u, and let $\sigma^* = T(x^*)$. The Jacobian $D_x \tilde{F}(x^*, u)$ may be formed from $D_\sigma \tilde{F}(\sigma^*, u)$ by removing the rows of $D_\sigma \tilde{F}(\sigma^*, u)$ corresponding to the coordinate maps \tilde{F}_i^0 , $i = 1, \ldots, N$ and removing the columns of $D_\sigma \tilde{F}(\sigma^*, u)$ in which the partial derivative is taken with respect to σ_i^1 , $i = 1, \ldots, N$.

Using (A.1)–(A.3), (9) may be equivalently expressed in terms of strategies $\sigma \in \Delta$ as

$$\tilde{F}_{i}^{k}(\sigma, u) := \sigma_{i}^{1} \sigma_{i}^{k+1} [U_{i}(y_{i}^{k+1}, \sigma_{-i}) - U_{i}(y_{i}^{1}, \sigma_{-i})]$$
(A.4)

for i = 1, ..., N, $k = 1, ..., K_i - 1$. Note that for i = 1, ..., N, and $k = 1, ..., K_i - 1$, at the equilibrium σ^* we have

$$\frac{\partial \tilde{F}_i^k(\sigma^*, u)}{\partial \sigma_i^1} = 0$$

This follows from (A.4) and the fact that for $k = 1, ..., K_i - 1$, either

$$\frac{\partial U_i(\sigma^*)}{\partial \sigma_i^{k+1}} = U_i(y_i^{k+1}, \sigma_{-i}^*) - U_i(y_i^1, \sigma_{-i}^*) = 0$$

or $\sigma_i^{*,k+1} = 0$. Note also that by (A.2) we have $\frac{\partial \tilde{F}_i^0(\sigma^*, u)}{\partial \sigma_i^1} = 1$ for $i = 1, \ldots, N$ and $\frac{\partial \tilde{F}_i^0(\sigma^*, u)}{\partial \sigma_j^1} = 0$ for $i, j = 1, \ldots, N, j \neq i$. This means that for each $i = 1, \ldots, N$, the column of $D_{\sigma} \tilde{F}(\sigma^*, u)$ in which the partial derivative is taken with respect to σ_i^1 is composed of all zeros except for a one in the row corresponding to \tilde{F}_i^0 . Thus, by the definition of the determinant (in terms of minors of the matrix), we see that removing the above mentioned rows and columns from $D_{\sigma} \tilde{F}(\sigma^*, u)$ does not change the value of the determinant of the resulting matrix. Consequently, $D_x \tilde{F}(x^*, u)$ is invertible if and only if $D_{\sigma} \tilde{F}(\sigma^*, u)$ is invertible, and the equilibrium $x^* \in X$ is regular as defined in Definition 12 if and only if σ^* is regular as defined in [4].

Appendix B.

This appendix gives the proof of Lemma 22 which shows that in potential games regularity is equivalent to first/second-order non-degeneracy. The following

definitions will be useful in the proof of the lemma. Given a carrier set $C = C_1 \cup \cdots \cup C_N$, let F_i^k and F be as defined in (16)–17. Note that for $i = 1, \ldots, N$, $k = 1, \ldots, \gamma_i - 1$ we have the relationship

$$\tilde{F}_i^k(x,u) = T_i(x_i)x_i^k F_i^k(x,u), \tag{B.1}$$

where \tilde{F}_i^k is as defined in (9). We now prove Lemma 22.

Proof. In order to simplify notation and minimize the overuse of superscripts, throughout the proof we will use the symbol \hat{x} rather than the usual x^* , when referring to an equilibrium. Without loss of generality, given an equilibrium $\hat{x} \in X$, assume that each player's action set Y_i is reordered so that $\operatorname{carr}_i(\hat{x}_i) = \{y_i^1, \ldots, y_i^{\gamma_i}\}$. Note that this comports with the ordering assumption implicit in the definitions of both first and second-order degeneracy (see Sections 4.1–4.2).

We begin by showing (ii). As noted in Remark 18, an equilibrium is first-order non-degenerate if and only if it is quasi-strong, as introduced by Harsanyi [3]. It was shown in [4] that any regular equilibrium is quasi-strong. Hence, (ii) holds.

We now prove (i). Assume henceforth that \hat{x} is a first-order non-degenerate equilibrium.

Our goal is to show that

$$D_x \tilde{F}(\hat{x}, u)$$
 is invertible $\iff \tilde{\mathbf{H}}(\hat{x})$ is invertible. (B.2)

Given an $x \in X$, it is useful to consider the decomposition $x = (x_p, x_m)$, where $x_m = (x_i^k)_{i=1,...,\tilde{N}, k=1,...,\tilde{\gamma}_i-1}$ and x_p contains the remaining components of x. (The subscript of x_m is indicative of "mixed strategy components" of x and x_p indicative of "pure strategy components" of x.) Noting that

$$D_{x_m}F(x_p, x_m, u) = \mathbf{H}(x),$$

where F is defined as in (17) with respect to the carrier $\operatorname{carr}(\hat{x})$, we see that (B.2) is equivalent to showing

$$D_x \tilde{F}(\hat{x}, u)$$
 is invertible $\iff D_{x_m} F(\hat{x}, u)$ is invertible.

With this end in mind, we will now consider the behavior of the component maps of \tilde{F} and F in two important cases.

Case 1: Suppose (i, k) is such that $k \in \{1, \ldots, \gamma_i - 1\}$. Note that in this case we have $\hat{x}_i^k > 0$. Differentiating (B.1) with respect to x_i^{ℓ} , $(j, \ell) \neq (i, k)$ we get

$$\frac{\partial \tilde{F}_i^k(\hat{x}, u)}{\partial x_j^\ell} = \left(\frac{\partial T_i^1(\hat{x}_i)}{\partial x_j^\ell}\right) \hat{x}_i^k F_i^k(\hat{x}, u) + T_i^1(\hat{x}_i) \hat{x}_i^k \frac{\partial F_i^k(\hat{x}, u)}{\partial x_j^\ell} \tag{B.3}$$

Since $k \in \{1, ..., \gamma_i - 1\}$, we have $F_i^k(\hat{x}, u) = 0$ and hence,

$$\frac{\partial F_i^k(\hat{x}, u)}{\partial x_j^\ell} = T_i^1(\hat{x}_i) \hat{x}_i^k \frac{\partial F_i^k(\hat{x}, u)}{\partial x_j^\ell} \tag{B.4}$$

for $(j, \ell) \neq (i, k)$.

Differentiating (B.1) with respect to x_i^k we get

$$\frac{\partial \tilde{F}_{i}^{k}(\hat{x}, u)}{\partial x_{i}^{k}} = -\hat{x}_{i}^{k} F_{i}^{k}(\hat{x}, u) + T_{i}^{1}(\hat{x}_{i}) F_{i}^{k}(\hat{x}, u) + \hat{x}_{i}^{k} T_{i}^{1}(\hat{x}_{i}) \frac{\partial F_{i}^{k}(\hat{x}, u)}{\partial x_{i}^{k}}$$
(B.5)

By our choice of (i, k) we have $F_i^k(\hat{x}, u) = 0$. Also note that $F_i^k(x, u)$ does not depend on x_i^k (see (16)), and hence $\frac{\partial F_i^k(\hat{x}, u)}{\partial x_i^k} = 0$. By (B.5), this implies that $\frac{\partial \tilde{F}_i^k(\hat{x}, u)}{\partial x_i^k} = 0$. But we just showed that $\frac{\partial F_i^k(\hat{x}, u)}{\partial x_i^k} = 0$, hence

$$\frac{\partial \tilde{F}_i^k(\hat{x}, u)}{\partial x_i^k} = \frac{\partial F_i^k(\hat{x}, u)}{\partial x_i^k} = 0.$$
(B.6)

Together, (B.4) and (B.6) imply that for each (i, k) such that $k = 1, \ldots, \gamma_i - 1$ we have $D_{x_m} \tilde{F}_i^k(\hat{x}, u) = T_i^1(\hat{x}_i) \hat{x}_i^k D_{x_m} F_i^k(\hat{x}, u)$, where $\hat{x}_i^k > 0$ and $T_i^1(\hat{x}_i) > 0$. This implies that

$$D_{x_m} \left(\tilde{F}_i^k(\hat{x}, u) \right)_{\substack{i=1,\dots,N\\k=1,\dots,\gamma_i-1}} \text{ is invertible } \iff D_{x_m} F(\hat{x}, u) \text{ is invertible.}$$
(B.7)

Case 2: Suppose (i, k) is such that $k \in \{\gamma_i, \ldots, K_i - 1\}$. Note that in this case we have $\hat{x}_i^k = 0$. Differentiating (9) with respect to x_j^ℓ , $(j, \ell) \neq (i, k)$ we get

$$\frac{\partial \tilde{F}_{i}^{k}(\hat{x}, u)}{\partial x_{j}^{\ell}} = T_{i}^{1}(\hat{x}_{i})\hat{x}_{i}^{k}\frac{\partial}{\partial x_{j}^{\ell}}[U(y_{i}^{k+1}, \hat{x}_{-i}) - U(y_{i}^{1}, \hat{x}_{-i})] = 0, \quad (B.8)$$

where the equality to zero holds since $\hat{x}_i^k = 0$. Note in particular that this implies that $D_{x_m} \tilde{F}_i^k(\hat{x}, u) = 0$.

If we differentiate (9) with respect to x_i^k and use the fact that $\hat{x}_i^k = 0$ we get

$$\frac{\partial \tilde{F}_i^k(\hat{x}, u)}{\partial x_i^k} = T_i^1(\hat{x}_i) [U(y_i^{k+1}, \hat{x}_{-i}) - U(y_i^1, \hat{x}_{-i})].$$

Since \hat{x} is a first-order non-degenerate equilibrium, $U(y_i^1, \hat{x}_{-i}) > U(y_i^{\ell+1}, \hat{x}_{-i})$ for all $\ell = \gamma_i, \ldots, K_i - 1$. Also, by our ordering of Y_i we have $T_i^1(\hat{x}_i) > 0$. Hence, $T_i^1(\hat{x}_i)[U(y_i^{k+1}, \hat{x}_{-i}) - U(y_i^1, \hat{x}_{-i})] < 0$. This, along with (B.8), implies that

$$D_{x_p}\left(\tilde{F}_i^k(\hat{x}, u)\right)_{\substack{i=1,\dots,N\\k=\gamma_i,\dots,K_i-1}}$$

is a diagonal matrix with non-zero diagonal.

We now consider the Jacobian $D_x F(\hat{x}, u)$. This may be expressed as

$$D_{x}\tilde{F}(\hat{x},m) = \begin{pmatrix} D_{x_{m}}\left(\tilde{F}_{i}^{k}(\hat{x},u)\right)_{\substack{i=1,\dots,N\\k=1,\dots,\gamma_{i}-1}} & D_{x_{p}}\left(\tilde{F}_{i}^{k}(\hat{x},u)\right)_{\substack{i=1,\dots,N\\k=\gamma_{i},\dots,K_{i}-1}} \\ D_{x_{m}}\left(\tilde{F}_{i}^{k}(\hat{x},u)\right)_{\substack{i=1,\dots,N\\k=\gamma_{i},\dots,K_{i}-1}} & D_{x_{p}}\left(\tilde{F}_{i}^{k}(\hat{x},u)\right)_{\substack{i=1,\dots,N\\k=\gamma_{i},\dots,K_{i}-1}} \end{pmatrix}$$

By the above discussion we see that this matrix has the form

$$D_x \tilde{F}(\hat{x}, m) = \begin{pmatrix} D_{x_m} \left(\tilde{F}_i^k(\hat{x}, u) \right)_{\substack{i=1, \dots, N \\ k=1, \dots, \gamma_i - 1}} & \mathbf{M} \\ 0 & \mathbf{D} \end{pmatrix},$$

where $\mathbf{M} \in \mathbb{R}^{\gamma \times (\kappa - \gamma)}$ and $\mathbf{D} \in \mathbb{R}^{(\kappa - \gamma) \times (\kappa - \gamma)}$ is an invertible diagonal matrix. Given this block form we see that $D_x \tilde{F}(\hat{x}, m)$ is invertible if and only if

$$D_{x_m}\left(\tilde{F}_i^k(\hat{x}, u)\right)_{\substack{i=1,\dots,N\\k=1,\dots,\gamma_i-1}}$$

is invertible. By (B.7) we then see that $D_x \tilde{F}(\hat{x}, u)$ is invertible if and only if $D_{x_m} F(\hat{x}, u)$ is invertible, which proves the desired result.

Appendix C.

Lemma 34. Let $x \in X$ and i = 1, ..., N. Assume Y_i is ordered so that $y_i^1 \in BR_i(x_{-i})$. Then: (i) For $k = 1, ..., K_i - 1$ we have $\frac{\partial U(x)}{\partial x_i^k} \leq 0$, and (ii) For $k = 1, ..., K_i - 1$, we have $y_i^{k+1} \in BR_i(x_{-i})$ if and only if $\frac{\partial U(x)}{\partial x_i^k} = 0$. In particular, combined with (i) this implies that $y_i^{k+1} \notin BR_i(x_{-i}) \iff \frac{\partial U(x)}{\partial x_i^k} < 0$.

Proof. (i) Differentiating (7) we find that $\frac{\partial U(x)}{\partial x_i^k} = U(y_i^{k+1}, x_{-i}) - U(y_i^1, x_{-i})$ (i) Since y_i^1 is a best response, we must have $U(y_i^1, x_{-i}) \ge U(y_i^{k+1}, x_{-i})$ for any $k = 1, \ldots, K_i - 1$. Hence $\frac{\partial U(x)}{\partial x_i^k} \le 0$. (ii) Follows readily from (7).

Lemma 35. Suppose x^* is an equilibrium and $y_i^k \in \operatorname{carr}(x^*)$, $k \ge 2$. Then $\frac{\partial U(x^*)}{\partial x_i^k} = 0$.

Proof. Since U is multilinear, y_i^k must be a pure-strategy best response to x_{-i}^* . The result then follows from Lemma 34.

References

References

- R. Selten, Reexamination of the perfectness concept for equilibrium points in extensive games, International Journal of Game Theory 4 (1) (1975) 25–55.
- [2] R. B. Myerson, Refinements of the Nash equilibrium concept, International Journal of Game Theory 7 (2) (1978) 73–80.
- [3] J. C. Harsanyi, Oddness of the number of equilibrium points: A new proof, International Journal of Game Theory 2 (1) (1973) 235–250.
- [4] E. Van Damme, Stability and perfection of Nash equilibria, Vol. 339, Springer, 1991.
- [5] W. Wen-Tsun, J. Jia-He, Essential equilibrium points of n-person noncooperative games, Sci Siniea 11 (10) (1962) 1307–1322.
- [6] M. Kojima, A. Okada, S. Shindoh, Strongly stable equilibrium points of n-person noncooperative games, Mathematics of Operations Research 10 (4) (1985) 650–663.
- [7] A. Okada, On stability of perfect equilibrium points, International Journal of Game Theory 10 (2) (1981) 67–73.
- [8] R. Wilson, Computing equilibria of *n*-person games, SIAM Journal on Applied Mathematics 21 (1) (1971) 80–87.
- [9] J. C. Harsanyi, Games with randomly disturbed payoffs: A new rationale for mixed-strategy equilibrium points, International Journal of Game Theory 2 (1) (1973) 1–23.
- [10] S. Govindan, P. J. Reny, A. J. Robson, A short proof of harsanyi's purification theorem, Games and Economic Behavior 45 (2) (2003) 369– 374.
- [11] S. Morris, "Purification" in The New Palgrave Dictionary of Economics, Vol. 6, Palgrave Macmillan Basingstoke, 2008.

- [12] F. Brandt, F. Fischer, On the hardness and existence of quasi-strict equilibria, in: International Symposium on Algorithmic Game Theory, Springer, 2008, pp. 291–302.
- [13] D. Monderer, L. Shapley, Potential games, Games and Economic Behavior 14 (1) (1996) 124–143.
- [14] J. R. Marden, G. Arslan, J. S. Shamma, Cooperative control and potential games, IEEE Transactions on Systems, Man, and Cybernetics, Part B (Cybernetics) 39 (6) (2009) 1393–1407.
- [15] G. Scutari, S. Barbarossa, D. P. Palomar, Potential games: A framework for vector power control problems with coupled constraints, in: Proceedings of the IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing, Vol. 4, IEEE, 2006, pp. 241–244.
- [16] Y. Xu, A. Anpalagan, Q. Wu, L. Shen, Z. Gao, J. Wang, Decisiontheoretic distributed channel selection for opportunistic spectrum access: Strategies, challenges and solutions, IEEE Communications Surveys & Tutorials 15 (4) (2013) 1689–1713.
- [17] M. Zhu, S. Martínez, Distributed coverage games for energy-aware mobile sensor networks, SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization 51 (1) (2013) 1–27.
- [18] C. Ding, B. Song, A. Morye, J. A. Farrell, A. K. Roy-Chowdhury, Collaborative sensing in a distributed PTZ camera network, IEEE Transactions on Image Processing 21 (7) (2012) 3282–3295.
- [19] N. Nie, C. Comaniciu, Adaptive channel allocation spectrum etiquette for cognitive radio networks, Mobile Networks and Applications 11 (6) (2006) 779–797.
- [20] X. Chu, H. Sethu, Cooperative topology control with adaptation for improved lifetime in wireless ad hoc networks, in: IEEE International Conference on Computer Communications, IEEE, 2012, pp. 262–270.
- [21] V. Srivastava, J. O. Neel, A. B. MacKenzie, R. Menon, L. A. DaSilva, J. E. Hicks, J. H. Reed, R. P. Gilles, Using game theory to analyze wireless ad hoc networks, IEEE Communications Surveys and Tutorials 7 (4) (2005) 46–56.

- [22] T. J. Lambert, M. A. Epelman, R. L. Smith, A fictitious play approach to large-scale optimization, Operations Research 53 (3) (2005) 477–489.
- [23] A. Garcia, D. Reaume, R. L. Smith, Fictitious play for finding system optimal routings in dynamic traffic networks, Transportation Research Part B: Methodological 34 (2) (2000) 147–156.
- [24] J. R. Marden, G. Arslan, J. S. Shamma, Connections between cooperative control and potential games, IEEE Transactions on Systems, Man and Cybernetics. Part B: Cybernetics 39 (2009) 1393–1407.
- [25] N. Li, J. R. Marden, Designing games for distributed optimization, IEEE Journal of Selected Topics in Signal Processing 7 (2) (2013) 230–242.
- [26] D. Monderer, L. S. Shapley, Fictitious play property for games with identical interests, Journal of Economic Theory 68 (1) (1996) 258–265.
- [27] M. Voorneveld, Best-response potential games, Economics Letters 66 (3) (2000) 289–295.
- [28] D. Fudenberg, D. K. Levine, The theory of learning in games, MIT press, 1998.
- [29] B. Swenson, R. Murray, S. Kar, On best-response dynamics in potential games, submitted for journal publication, online: https://arxiv.org/abs/1707.06465 (2017).
- [30] I. Gilboa, A. Matsui, Social stability and equilibrium, Econometrica: Journal of the Econometric Society 59 (3) (1991) 859–867.
- [31] J. Hofbauer, Stability for the best response dynamics, Tech. rep., Institut für Mathematik, Universität Wien, Strudlhofgasse 4, A-1090 Vienna, Austria (1995).
- [32] J. Hofbauer, K. Sigmund, Evolutionary game dynamics, Bulletin of the American Mathematical Society 40 (4) (2003) 479–519.
- [33] M. Benaïm, J. Hofbauer, S. Sorin, Stochastic approximations and differential inclusions, SIAM J. Control and Optim. 44 (1) (2005) 328–348.
- [34] C. Harris, On the rate of convergence of continuous-time fictitious play, Games and Economic Behavior 22 (2) (1998) 238–259.

- [35] J. S. Jordan, Three problems in learning mixed-strategy Nash equilibria, Games and Econ. Behav. 5 (3) (1993) 368–386.
- [36] D. Fudenberg, Learning mixed equilibria, Games and Econ. Behav. 5 (3) (1993) 320–367.
- [37] D. Monderer, A. Sela, Fictitious play and no-cycling conditions.
- [38] J. S. Shamma, G. Arslan, Unified convergence proofs of continuous-time fictitious play, IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control 49 (7) (2004) 1137–1141.
- [39] G. Debreu, Economies with a finite set of equilibria, Econometrica: Journal of the Econometric Society 38 (5) (1970) 387–392.
- [40] M. W. Hirsch, Differential topology, Springer, 1976.
- [41] V. Klee, R. Ladner, R. Manber, Signsolvability revisited, Linear Algebra and its Applications 59 (1984) 131–157.
- [42] L. C. Evans, R. F. Gariepy, Measure theory and fine properties of functions, revised Edition, Textbooks in Mathematics, CRC Press, Boca Raton, FL, 2015.
- [43] E. van Damme, Regular equilibrium points of *n*-person games in normal form (1981).
- [44] D. Fudenberg, J. Tirole, Game theory, MIT press, 1991.
- [45] R. A. Brualdi, K. L. Chavey, B. L. Shader, Rectangular L-matrices, Linear Algebra and its Applications 196 (1994) 37–61.