

AXIOMATIC EQUILIBRIUM SELECTION: THE CASE OF GENERIC EXTENSIVE-FORM GAMES

SRIHARI GOVINDAN AND ROBERT WILSON

ABSTRACT. A solution concept that is a refinement of Nash equilibria selects for each finite game a nonempty collection of closed and connected subsets of Nash equilibria as solutions. We impose three axioms for such solution concepts. The axiom of backward induction requires each solution to contain a quasi-perfect equilibrium. Two invariance axioms posit that solutions of a game are the same as those of a game obtained by the addition of strategically irrelevant strategies and players. Stability [20, 21] satisfies these axioms; and any solution concept that satisfies them must, for generic extensive-form games, select from among its stable outcomes. A strengthening of the two invariance axioms provides an analogous axiomatization of components of equilibria with a nonzero index.

1. INTRODUCTION

Kohlberg and Mertens ([15], henceforth KM) argued that refinements of Nash equilibria should derive from axioms adapted from single-person decision theory, and they listed properties that the axioms should imply. The solution concept they defined, stability, satisfied most but not all of their properties. Mertens ([20, 21]) showed that his reformulated definition of stability satisfied these properties, and more. Neither of these papers provided an axiomatic approach (KM did “not feel ready for such an [axiomatic] approach”). In Govindan and Wilson ([12], henceforth GW) we provided a first step in implementing KM’s program, in generic two-player games. In this paper we take another step by allowing for any finite number of players. Specifically, we show that, in generic N -player games, axioms capturing backward induction and invariance of solutions to the addition of irrelevant strategies or players characterize *stable outcomes*; and stronger versions of the invariance axioms characterize *essential outcomes*.¹

A solution concept for finite games that refines the set of Nash equilibria selects for each finite normal-form game a collection of subsets of Nash equilibria, called solutions. As KM showed, solutions must be subsets if one wants to ensure that every game has a solution

We are grateful to Paulo Barelli for his help with this project. We would also like to thank Lucas Pahl and Carlos Pimienta for their comments.

¹As explained in our discussion of the invariance axioms, such a strengthening reveals a shortcoming of essentiality in comparison to stability.

where players play undominated strategies. As in GW, we define solutions to be nonempty collections of closed and connected subsets of Nash equilibria. Connectedness forces a solution to lie within a single component of the Nash equilibria and, thus, is necessary for a selection among equilibrium outcomes and payoffs. Asking for solutions to be closed subsets, while a purely topological property, seems to be a mild technical requirement, which, actually, is not needed for our results concerning outcomes.

We impose three axioms for a solution concept. The first axiom, Axiom B, captures the logic of backward induction: every solution of the normal form of an extensive-form game should contain a mixed strategy profile that is equivalent to a quasi-perfect equilibrium of the extensive form.

The other two axioms concern the property of invariance for solution concepts. We apply the principle that a subset of equilibria selected by a refinement should inherit the invariance properties of Nash equilibria. We invoke two invariance properties. Each is an instance of the general decision-theoretic requirement that there are no framing effects (Tversky and Kahneman [33]); that is, equilibria are not affected by embedding the given game in a larger one that does not alter the original players' strategies and payoffs.² For each of these invariance properties, we invoke an axiom requiring that each player's preference ranking over his actions is unaffected by the embedding.

The first invariance axiom (Axiom D*) considers the addition of weakly dominated strategies that are strategically irrelevant—see Definition 4.4—and requires the solutions of a game be the same as those of a game obtained by adding such strategies. The second invariance axiom (Axiom I*) considers the addition of players whose strategies are strategically irrelevant—see Definition 5.2—and requires a similar invariance of solutions.

Stable sets as defined by Mertens [20, 21] satisfies all three axioms. Our main result, Theorem 6.1, concerns the implications of the axioms for an extensive-form game with perfect recall and generic payoffs. Such games have finitely many equilibrium outcomes, i.e. probability distributions over the terminal nodes induced by the equilibria. The fact that solutions must be connected implies that there is a unique equilibrium outcome associated with each solution. Theorem 6.1 shows that if a solution concept satisfies our axioms, then every solution induces a stable outcome, i.e. an outcome associated with a stable set.

How does Theorem 6.1 compare with the result in GW? That paper, too, imposed three axioms: Axiom B, a weaker version of Axiom I*, and Admissibility, which requires each solution to consist only of undominated strategy profiles. Their result, however, is a little

²Framing effects refers to the empirical phenomenon that some people react differently to the same information depending on how it is presented.

stronger: any solution concept that satisfies those three axioms must select from among the stable sets. If we eliminate the admissibility axiom from their list, then we get Theorem 6.1 for two-player games. In terms of solutions themselves, as opposed to the outcomes they induce, the best we can say is that every solution of a solution concept that satisfies the three axioms of this paper must contain a stable set. Alternatively, if we impose a minimality axiom, that solutions are as “small” as possible, then for any generic game we must get a selection of its stable sets.³

One could insist on a stronger invariance principle by considering embeddings where the best-reply correspondence is preserved on the restriction of the larger game to the original game and allowing it to be arbitrary otherwise—whereas, by contrast, our original invariance principle would ask for the best-reply correspondences of the two games to be related globally over the strategy spaces. Such an expansive notion (see Definitions 4.2 and 5.5) results in stronger versions of the invariance axioms, called Axioms D and I. Replacing Axioms D* and I* with these axioms produces an analogous characterization of essentiality, which is the solution concept that selects components of equilibria with nonzero indices—see Theorem 6.3.

A common feature that both essentiality and stability share is that they insist on an algebraic-topological version of robustness—essentiality in (co)homology—which is much stronger than the usual ϵ - δ version. None of the axioms calls on a perturbation in its requirement;⁴ and yet the combination of the axioms imply this strong robustness property. The proofs of our two main theorems, of course, lay out the logic behind this implication. Here, we offer a heuristic explanation. As Mertens [21] points out in his concluding remarks in Section 7, essentiality allows us to solve many fixed point problems, the existence of a backward induction equilibrium being an exemplar of such a problem. Our finding, both in GW and here, is that more than just being exemplary, backward induction gives us the canonical problem to solve. The invariance axioms generate a whole family of such problems (one for each larger game we obtain) that is so rich that its solution represents a sufficient condition for essentiality.

The main point of divergence between essentiality and stability is the difference in their domains of perturbations. Essentiality admits all possible payoff perturbations of the game, while stability allows strategy perturbations, which correspond to a much smaller class of payoff perturbations. Comparisons of their respective invariance axioms allows us to recast this technical difference between the concepts in a decision-theoretic framework. Intuitively

³In the two-player case, admissibility can be replaced with minimality to produce the same result.

⁴One could demur that quasi-perfection is defined using a sequence of perturbations of strategies, but there is an equivalent LPS-based definition of it—cf. Section 3 for more on this point.

speaking, when we enlarge a game G to a larger game \bar{G} with more strategies or players, stability requires the solutions of the two games to be the same when there is a one-to-one correspondence between the beliefs—both on- and off-the-equilibrium-path—and the preference orderings of actions of the original players in the two games, whereas essentiality does not insist on this relation “away” from the face of the strategy space of \bar{G} that corresponds to the original game G .

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 lays out the notation that we use and also the definitions of the key concepts. Sections 3 through 5 describe the axioms. Section 6 states the two main results of the paper, for stability and essentiality. These results are proved in Sections 9 and 11, respectively. Sections 7 and 8 do the required preparatory work for Section 9: the former gives a characterization of consistent beliefs for extensive-form games, which is used in the latter to give a characterization of stability for generic extensive-form games. Section 10 provides a similar characterization of essentiality for generic games, which is used in Section 11. Finally, Section 12 offers a few concluding remarks concerning the question of where we go from here.

2. FINITE GAMES

We denote a finite N -player game in normal form as follows. The set of players is $\mathcal{N} = \{1, \dots, N\}$. For each player n , his set of pure strategies is a finite set S_n . The payoff function is $G : S \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^N$, where $S = \prod_n S_n$. We refer to such a game simply by its payoff function G . We use Σ_n to denote the set of n 's mixed strategies, and $\Sigma = \prod_n \Sigma_n$.

We denote by Γ the game tree of a game in extensive form with perfect recall. For each player n , H_n is the collection of his information sets. For each n and $h_n \in H_n$, $A_n(h_n)$ is the set of actions available at h_n . Assume that the actions are all labeled differently across all n , h_n . For each a_n , let $h_n(a_n)$ be the information set such that $a_n \in A_n(h_n)$, and let $A_n = \cup_{h_n} A_n(h_n)$ and $A = \cup_n A_n$. The payoff function is $u : Z \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^N$, where Z is the set of terminal nodes of Γ . $\Gamma(u)$ refers to the extensive-form game with payoff function u . We say that u is in “generic” position if it lies outside a lower-dimensional semialgebraic subset of $\mathbb{R}^{N \times Z}$.⁵

A pure strategy for player n in an extensive-form game Γ is a function that assigns to each $h_n \in H_n$ an action $a_n \in A_n(h_n)$. We again use G to represent the normal form of the extensive-form game $\Gamma(u)$ with pure strategies S_n for each n . A behavioral strategy for

⁵In proving our main results, we invoke genericity in several intermediary steps, and each time the set where the property of genericity holds is different; however, as there are only finitely many such instances, it is clear that everything in this paper holds for games in an open set whose complement is a closed, lower-dimensional semialgebraic set.

n is a function that assigns to each $h_n \in H_n$ a probability distribution over $A_n(h_n)$. Let B_n be the set of n 's behavioral strategies, and $B = \prod_n B_n$. A mixed strategy induces a payoff-equivalent behavioral strategy, and vice versa by Kuhn's Theorem [17].

A third representation of strategies—which has the dimensional advantage of behavioral strategies over mixed strategies, and the property of linearity of payoffs, as mixed strategies do—invokes the concept of enabling strategies (cf. Govindan and Wilson, [9]) which we now describe. Say that $a_n \in A_n$ is a last action of player n if it is the last action for n on some path from the root of the tree to a terminal node. Let L_n be the set of last actions of player n . For each $a_n \in L_n$, let $S_n(a_n)$ be the set of pure strategies of n that choose all actions leading up to, and including, a_n . Then there is a linear map $\pi_n : \Sigma_n \rightarrow [0, 1]^{L_n}$ given by $\pi_{n,a_n}(\sigma_n) = \sum_{s_n \in S_n(a_n)} \sigma_{n,s_n}$ for all $a_n \in L_n$. $P_n = \pi_n(\Sigma_n)$ is the set of n 's enabling strategies, and $P = \prod_n P_n$. Each P_n , and thus P , is a compact and convex polyhedron. For each n and z , let $a_n(z)$ be last action of n on the path to z , in case n has at least one action on this path; and for $p_n \in P_n$, we use $p_n(a_n(z))$ to denote the probability of $a_n(z)$ under p_n , with the convention that $p_n(a_n(z)) = 1$ if n has no action on this path. Use $p_0(z)$ to denote the product of the probabilities of Nature's choices on the path to z , letting this probability be 1 if no such choice exists. Given p , for each n and z , let $p_{-n}(z) = p_0(z) \prod_{m \neq n} p_m(a_m(z))$. The game $\Gamma(u)$ can be defined in strategic form over P with player n 's payoff from a profile p being $\sum_{z \in Z} p_{-n}(z) p_n(a_n(z)) u(z)$ —see Pahl [27].

We now provide the definitions of three refinements of Nash equilibria that are important in this paper. The first is the concept of quasi-perfect equilibria, due to van Damme [34], that is invoked in our Backward Induction Axiom. The other two concepts, which we characterize axiomatically, are essentiality and stability.

Given a completely mixed behavioral strategy profile b_{-n} of n 's opponents and an information set h_n of n , say that an action a_n at h_n is optimal against b_{-n} if at h_n there exists a continuation strategy that chooses action a_n at h_n and is optimal against b_{-n} .

Definition 2.1. A behavioral strategy profile b is a *quasi-perfect equilibrium* of a game $\Gamma(u)$ if there exists a sequence b^k of completely mixed behavioral strategies converging to b such that for each n and h_n , b_n assigns positive probability only to actions in $A_n(h_n)$ that are optimal against b_{-n}^k for all k .

Given a game G and a component Σ^* of Nash equilibria of G , we can assign an index, denoted $\text{Ind}(\Sigma^*)$, which is a measure of its robustness to perturbations—see Gul et al. [13] or Ritzberger [30]. This index is essentially independent of the map used in its definition

(DeMichelis and Germano [4]). In fixed point theory there is an equivalence between robustness of fixed points and nonzero index (O’Neill [26]). Govindan and Wilson [10] show that this is “almost” the case with games: if we allow for the addition of duplicate strategies and then consider the perturbations of those as well, we obtain the concept of uniform hyperstability, which is equivalent to nonzero index.⁶ In order not to add terminology, we simply use the term essentiality rather than uniform hyperstability.

Definition 2.2. A component of equilibria is *essential* if its index is nonzero.

KM argued that stability of a subset of equilibria requires every nearby game generated by small strategy perturbations to have a nearby equilibrium. (That is, the subset must be ‘truly perfect’.) Mertens [20, 21] strengthened this to apply to deformations of the graph of the equilibrium correspondence. His definition was motivated by the fact that the formulation in KM did not satisfy all the criteria that they listed and that to obtain those properties, the solution concept had to satisfy a strong fixed point property—see, for example, the proof of the backward induction property of stability in Section 3 of Mertens [20].

Mertens defined many variants of stability by the choice of the coefficient module in the cohomology theory used. The one we axiomatize is called 0-stability, which uses Čech cohomology with coefficients in the field \mathbb{Q} of rational numbers.⁷ Given a normal form game G , for each $0 < \varepsilon \leq 1$, let T_ε be the set of all vectors $\delta\tau$, with $0 \leq \delta \leq \varepsilon$ and $\tau \in \Sigma$, and let ∂T_ε be its boundary. For each $\delta\tau \in T_1$, we have a perturbed game $G(\delta\tau)$ where each player n is constrained to choosing $\sigma_n \in \Sigma_n$ such that $\sigma_n \geq \delta\tau_n$. Let E be the graph of equilibria over T_1 , i.e. the set of $(\eta, \sigma) \in T_1 \times \Sigma$ such that σ is an equilibrium of the perturbed game $G(\eta)$. Let $\text{proj} : E \rightarrow T_1$ be the natural projection. For each $X \subseteq E$ and $\varepsilon > 0$, let $(X_\varepsilon, \partial X_\varepsilon) = \text{proj}^{-1}(T_\varepsilon, \partial T_\varepsilon) \cap X$ and for $\varepsilon = 0$, let $X_0 = \text{proj}^{-1}(0) \cap X$. In the following definition \check{H} refers to Čech cohomology with rational coefficients.

Definition 2.3. $\Sigma^* \subseteq \Sigma$ is a *stable set* if there exists $X \subseteq E$ such that:

- (1) $\Sigma^* = \{ \sigma \mid (0, \sigma) \in X \}$;
- (2) *connexity*: for each neighborhood V of X_0 in X , there is a connected component of $V \setminus \partial X_1$ whose closure is a neighborhood of X_0 in X .

⁶Pahl and Pimienta [28] prove an exact equivalence for generic two-person games in extensive form; that is, a component has a nonzero index iff it is hyperstable in the sense of KM. It should be possible to extend the result to generic N -player games in extensive form using a characterization of essentiality along the lines of that given in Section 10. But, we conjecture that the equivalence would not extend to all finite games and thus that there is a “gap” between these two robustness ideas in game theory.

⁷ p -stability, where p is a prime number, is defined using the field \mathbb{Z}_p of integers modulo p . For each such p , p -stability satisfies the axioms as well and for generic games yields a selection of 0-stable sets.

(3) essentiality: $\text{proj}^* : \check{H}^*(T_\varepsilon, \partial T_\varepsilon) \rightarrow \check{H}^*(X_\varepsilon, \partial X_\varepsilon)$ is nonzero for some $\varepsilon > 0$.

A weaker form of the essentiality condition in the definition of stability is the following: the projection map from X_ε to T_ε is surjective for some $\varepsilon > 0$. A stable set in the sense of KM is a minimal set of equilibria Σ^* that satisfies condition (1) and the weaker form of essentiality.⁸ Unfortunately, asking merely for surjectivity of the projection map means that KM stable sets fail many of the properties that are desirable—for e.g., they need not contain a backward induction equilibrium.

The axiomatic approach to refinements, as envisaged by KM, aims to select from the Nash equilibria of a game, using a set of axioms of rationality. From this viewpoint, we have the following definition for a solution concept.

Definition 2.4. A *solution concept* φ is a correspondence that assigns to each finite game G a nonempty collection $\varphi(G)$ of closed and connected subsets of the Nash equilibria of G , called *solutions*.

Our focus in this paper is on two solution concepts. The first is called essentiality, which assigns to each game G its essential components of equilibria; and the second is called stability, which assigns to each game G its stable sets. The next three sections describe the axioms we impose on a solution concept φ .

3. BACKWARD INDUCTION

The Backward Induction Axiom states that a solution should contain a “backward induction” equilibrium. As KM argue, the concept of a sequential equilibrium captures backward induction rationality in games with imperfect information and is thus the right notion of a backward induction equilibrium. Ideally, we would like to state the axiom using sequential equilibria. Unfortunately, our method of proof requires us to use instead quasi-perfect equilibria in the axiom. We hope that future work will show that sequential equilibria suffice.

Axiom 3.1. [Axiom B] *If G is the normal form of an extensive form game Γ with perfect recall, then every solution contains a strategy profile that is equivalent to a quasi-perfect equilibrium of Γ .*

A quasi-perfect equilibrium yields a sequential equilibrium for which, following each information set, a player’s strategy is admissible in the continuation. When payoffs are generic,

⁸Typically, KM-stable sets are not connected, because of the minimality requirement. By contrast, in Mertens’s definition, the connexity requirement serves the purpose of making stable sets as minimal as possible.

all sequential equilibria are quasi-perfect (see [14, 29]). Thus in this case the role of Axiom B is to ensure that a solution's outcome is consistent with sequential rationality.

Axiom B is the only axiom that explicitly considers perturbations: a quasi-perfect equilibrium must be a best-reply to a sequence of behavioral strategies converging to it—cf. Definition 2.1. However, as we explained in GW, there is an equivalent characterization of quasi-perfection using lexicographic probability systems (LPSs)—cf. Govindan and Klumpp [6]. Moreover, there are now explicit bounds to the number of levels in the LPS—cf. Callejas et al. [3]. Thus, even this axiom is free from statements involving perturbations of either the payoffs or the strategy sets.

Trembling hand perfect equilibria (Selten [31]), which are the perfect equilibria of the agent normal form of a game, represent another strengthening of sequential equilibria and as such could be used in the formulation of Axiom B. Such an axiom would be substantially different from our axiom. Indeed, Mertens [24] constructs an example where the set of trembling hand perfect equilibria consists entirely of profiles that are equivalent to weakly dominated strategies and is disjoint from the set of quasi-perfect equilibria. This example implies that stability would not satisfy a reformulated Axiom B that uses trembling hand perfection. However, essentiality satisfies either version of Axiom B and Theorem 6.3 goes through if we use trembling hand perfection.

4. ADDITION OF DOMINATED STRATEGIES

The Axiom of Iterated Dominance figures prominently in the list of desiderata drawn up by KM for stable sets. The axiom states that a stable set of a game G contains a stable set of any game G' obtained by the deletion of (weakly) dominated strategies. KM consider, but eventually drop, a dual requirement on the addition of a dominated strategy. Their reasoning is that such an axiom would be inconsistent with admissibility, as the following example, which is taken from KM, demonstrates. In the two-player game:

$$\left(\begin{array}{cc} 3, 2 & 2, 2 \end{array} \right)$$

every strategy profile is reasonable as a solution. But when we add a strictly dominated strategy:

$$\left(\begin{array}{cc} 3, 2 & 2, 2 \\ 1, 1 & 1, 0 \end{array} \right)$$

only the (Top, Left) equilibrium is admissible.

We propose two counterarguments that form the bases for two versions of a relational axiom concerning the addition of dominated strategies. (1) One could drop the axiom of admissibility. (2) Alternatively, one could restrict the class of games obtained by the


addition of dominated strategies. We elaborate on these ideas sequentially, after we consider the more general problem of the relationship between the solutions of any two games where one is obtained from the other by adding strategies. Studying the problem at this abstract level will hopefully persuade the reader of the reasonableness of our axiom about dominated strategies and also of how it naturally leads to the formulation of the invariance axiom in the next section, where we add players to the game.

Consider the following question. Suppose we have two games (N, S, G) and (N, \bar{S}, \bar{G}) with $S \subsetneq \bar{S}$ and the restriction of the payoff function \bar{G} to S is G ; under what conditions could we require axiomatically that the two games have the same solutions? If for each n , the strategies in $\bar{S}_n \setminus S_n$ are duplicates of mixed strategies in Σ_n , then the axiom of invariance, as postulated by KM, says that the games should have the same solution—see also Mertens [25] for a discussion of ordinality in games. But what if the additional strategies are not duplicates? Since we are dealing with the question of selecting from Nash equilibria, for us to answer this question, we must at least insist on property P1 below.

Property P1: *The two games G and \bar{G} have the same set of Nash equilibria.*


Using the techniques of Govindan et al. [7], we can construct games G and \bar{G} with the same set of equilibria, but where the indices of some of the equilibria are changed. Thus, if we want to pick equilibria with a positive index then such a solution concept would violate an axiom that relied on Property P1 alone. A more concrete example that we now describe also points to a need for something stronger than P1. The game G with the extensive form in Figure 1 has two components of equilibria, with outcomes $(3, 6)$ and $(4, 3)$, respectively. Only the first outcome survives the iterative elimination of dominated strategies and hence has index $+1$; the second outcome has index 0 .

Figure 1



Now add a move for Player 1 to obtain the game \bar{G} in Figure 2.

Figure 2



This game has two components as well, with the same outcomes. But now $(4, 3)$ is the outcome that survives iterative elimination of dominated strategies and thus has index $+1$ and $(3, 6)$ has index zero. Of course, even though the equilibrium payoffs of the two games are the same, the game \bar{G} has a strictly larger set of equilibria and, therefore, does not provide conclusive proof that essentiality would require an axiom based on more than P1. But, the example is suggestive of the imperative of asking for a stronger link between G and \bar{G} .

A stronger connection between G and \bar{G} than P1 exists when the following additional property holds .

Property P2: *The restriction of the best-reply correspondence of \bar{G} to Σ is the best-reply correspondence of G .*

P2 is satisfied when, for instance, all the strategies that are added are strictly dominated (in which case, P1 holds as well). A weaker assumption than P2 would be

Property P3: *The best-reply correspondence of G is a selection of the restriction of the best-reply correspondence of \bar{G} to Σ .*

P3 holds when, for example, the added strategies are weakly dominated (but now P3 is independent of P1). *Prima facie*, it seems reasonable to impose an axiom that says that when P1 and P3 hold, G and \bar{G} have the same solutions. Essentiality does satisfy such an axiom. Rather than imposing that axiom directly, we choose to impose a weaker one, asking for P1 to hold when we have added weakly dominated strategies. To state the axiom, we state formally what it means to add a dominated strategy.

Definition 4.1. A game (N, \bar{S}, \bar{G}) is obtained from (N, S, G) by the addition of (weakly) dominated strategies if:

- (1) $S \subsetneq \bar{S}$, and for each n , the strategies in $\bar{S}_n \setminus S_n$ are (weakly) dominated;

(2) the restriction of \bar{G} to S is G .

To restate what we observed earlier, if \bar{G} is obtained from G by the addition of strictly dominated strategies, both P2 and P1 hold. When some of the added strategies are only weakly dominated P3 holds, but P1 might not: it is possible that \bar{G} has a strictly bigger set of Nash equilibria. For each solution of G one could insist that there be a solution of \bar{G} that contains it (the reverse direction of the one proposed by KM). We do not know the implications of this axiom. For example, we do not know if essentiality satisfies it, or if it is even consistent with existence. However, when the addition of weakly dominated strategies does not expand the set of Nash equilibria, i.e. when P1 holds, the picture is clearer and our Axiom D imposes this restriction.

Definition 4.2. (N, \bar{S}, \bar{G}) is obtained from (N, S, G) by the addition of weakly irrelevant dominated strategies if:

- (1) \bar{G} is obtained from G by the addition of weakly dominated strategies;
- (2) \bar{G} and G have the same set of Nash equilibria.

Condition 1 of Definition 4.2 implies P3, and its condition 2 is P1. With this definition of weakly irrelevant strategies, we have the following axiom.

Axiom 4.3. [Axiom D] $\varphi(G) = \varphi(\bar{G})$ whenever \bar{G} is obtained from G by the addition of weakly irrelevant dominated strategies.

As we show in Appendix A, essentiality satisfies Axiom D. Of course, as the example of KM discussed at the beginning of this section shows, Axiom D comes at the expense of admissibility. Our own view is that admissibility is the more important of the two axioms as an expression of rationality, and therefore we are not entirely satisfied with Axiom D. There are other grounds to be skeptical of this axiom. Suppose \bar{G} is obtained from G by the addition of strictly dominated strategies. The restriction of the best-reply correspondence of \bar{G} to Σ is the best-reply correspondence of G . But what is the behavior of the correspondence on $\bar{\Sigma} \setminus \Sigma$? This set contains the set of all completely-mixed strategy profiles, which generate the consistent beliefs when \bar{G} has nontrivial extensive form. Absent a way to relate such profiles in \bar{G} with profiles in G , there is no meaningful way to compare beliefs in the two games. Applications have taught us that identification of the “rational” outcomes among all Nash outcomes in games quite often turns on the beliefs supporting these outcomes. In not allowing us to create a correspondence between beliefs in equivalent games, Axiom D relies on an equivalence relation among games that is too “coarse.” This inability to relate beliefs

between the two games is the game-theoretic cost of working with the much richer set of payoff perturbations.

The second approach to getting around the problem identified by KM is motivated by the criticism made in the last paragraph. What is required is a refinement of the notion of equivalent games we have defined combining P1 and P3 that would make beliefs across equivalent games comparable, thus making preference rankings over strategies in S_n comparable. One way to do this is to ask for a continuous map $f_n : \bar{\Sigma}_n \rightarrow \Sigma_n$ for each n that, from the perspective of players $m \neq n$, means that whenever n plays $\bar{\sigma}_n \in \bar{\Sigma}_n$, it is as if he is playing $\sigma_n = f_n(\bar{\sigma}_n)$ in G . Obviously, the restriction of f_n to Σ_n must be the identity. Given such mappings f_m for n 's opponents m , there is a mapping between n 's beliefs in \bar{G} and G . We also then need that his preference rankings are the same in the two games. Expressed in payoff terms we get property P4:

Property P4: For each n , there is a continuous map $f_n : \bar{\Sigma}_n \rightarrow \Sigma_n$ such that: (a) the restriction of f_n to Σ_n is the identity; (b) for $\sigma_n, \tau_n \in \Sigma_n$ and $\bar{\sigma}_{-n}, \bar{\tau}_{-n} \in \bar{\Sigma}_{-n}$, $\bar{G}_n(\sigma_n, \bar{\sigma}_{-n}) \geq \bar{G}_n(\tau_n, \bar{\sigma}_{-n})$ iff $G_n(\sigma_n, f_{-n}(\bar{\sigma}_{-n})) \geq G_n(\tau_n, f_{-n}(\bar{\sigma}_{-n}))$.

Clearly, if G and \bar{G} satisfy Property P4, and if each f_n is linear, then there exists a game \bar{G}' obtained from \bar{G} by an affine transformation of payoffs such that Property P4 holds for the pair (G, \bar{G}') and such that condition (b) can be sharpened to: $\bar{G}'_n(\sigma_n, \bar{\sigma}_{-n}) = G_n(\sigma_n, f_{-n}(\bar{\sigma}_{-n}))$ for all $\sigma_n \in \Sigma_n$ and $\bar{\sigma}_{-n} \in \bar{\Sigma}_{-n}$.

The linearity of f is an implication of P4 holding universally. Specifically, suppose we have continuous maps (f_n) that satisfy condition (a) of Property P4 and such that for each payoff function G there is a \bar{G} for which condition (b) of Property P4 holds as well.⁹ It is easy to show that then the f_n 's must be linear in σ_n . Thus, if the maps f_n are to serve "globally" on the space of games (with strategy sets $\bar{\Sigma}$ and Σ) as a way to generate equivalence classes, then we get linearity as a consequence.

To highlight what P4 entails consider the example from KM discussed at the beginning of the section. Suppose we have the following payoffs when we add a dominated strategy for player 1:

$$\begin{pmatrix} 3, 2 & 2, 2 \\ 1, 2 & 1, 2 \end{pmatrix}$$

From player 2's perspective, the newly added strategy is just a duplicate of 1's strategy in the original game; his payoffs have been duplicated; and all beliefs that can be generated in the

⁹If there exists a \bar{G} , then there exists one that is obtained from G by the addition of weakly dominated strategies.

new game can be generated in the original game (and vice versa). It is reasonable to insist that the two games have the same set of solutions.¹⁰

One way to get around KM's objection, then, is to ask that G and \bar{G} have the same solutions when \bar{G} is obtained from G by the addition of weakly dominated strategies and P4 holds with the maps f_n being linear. However, we want to weaken two aspects of P4. First, we could allow f_n be a function of $\bar{\sigma}$ and not just $\bar{\sigma}_n$; second we could insist on condition (b) of P4 holding not globally, but in a neighborhood of Σ in $\bar{\Sigma}$, since this set is what is relevant for beliefs at the equilibria (which, given P1, are in Σ). Thus, we have:

Property P5: *There exists a neighborhood \bar{U} of Σ in $\bar{\Sigma}$ and a multilinear map $f : \bar{\Sigma} \rightarrow \Sigma$ such that:*

- (a) *the restriction of f to Σ is the identity;*
- (b) *for each n , $\bar{\sigma} \in \bar{U}$, $\sigma_n, \tau_n \in \Sigma_n$, $\bar{G}_n(\sigma_n, \bar{\sigma}_{-n}) \geq \bar{G}_n(\tau_n, \bar{\sigma}_{-n})$ iff $G_n(\sigma_n, f_{-n}(\bar{\sigma}_n)) \geq G_n(\tau_n, f_{-n}(\bar{\sigma}_n))$.*

The map f creates a “dictionary” that identifies for each $\bar{\sigma} \in \bar{\Sigma}$ an equivalent profile in G .¹¹ It allows us to map beliefs in \bar{G} to those in G and to compare the preference orderings over a player's strategies against equivalent beliefs. Obviously, given the assumption of independence of the players' actions, a player n 's beliefs over the action of his opponents is independent of his choice. Given that we are allowing for f_m to depend on $\bar{\sigma}_n$ for $m \neq n$, the inclusion of $\bar{\sigma}_n$ in the profile $\bar{\sigma}$ in Condition (b) of P5 makes sure that this dependence of f_n on $\bar{\sigma}_n$ is decision-theoretically irrelevant. Unless the payoffs of the games G and \bar{G} are pathological, condition (b) of Property P5, therefore, would amount to saying that m 's choice is payoff irrelevant to n if f_m depends on σ_n .

Property P5 allows us to strengthen the requirements for obtaining a game \bar{G} from G by the addition of irrelevant strategies in the following definition.

Definition 4.4. (N, \bar{S}, \bar{G}) is obtained from (N, S, G) by the addition of strongly irrelevant dominated strategies if:

- (1) \bar{G} is obtained from G by the addition of weakly irrelevant dominated strategies;

¹⁰Section 4, p. 710 of Mertens [21] makes this argument: if we duplicate a strategy for a player and then subtract a constant from it just for this player, to make it strictly dominated, the resulting game should have the same solutions as the original game. De Stefano Grigis [5] also considers the addition of strictly dominated strategies in his KM-stability style refinement called G-stable sets.

¹¹We have imposed the assumption of multilinearity in P5. Like with P4, it is a consequence of P5 holding over a “large” domain of games. Given a continuous function f , suppose for all G in a linear subspace of the space of games over S generated by a game form, there is a \bar{G} for which P5 holds, then we could replace f with a multilinear function g for which P5 holds as well.

(2) there exists a neighborhood \bar{U} of Σ in $\bar{\Sigma}$ and a multilinear function $f : \bar{\Sigma} \rightarrow \Sigma$ such that:

- (a) the restriction of f to Σ is the identity;
- (b) for each n , $\bar{\sigma} \in \bar{U}$, $\sigma_n, \tau_n \in \Sigma_n$, $\bar{G}_n(\sigma_n, \bar{\sigma}_{-n}) \geq \bar{G}_n(\tau_n, \bar{\sigma}_{-n})$ iff $G_n(\sigma_n, f_{-n}(\bar{\sigma}_n)) \geq G_n(\tau_n, f_{-n}(\bar{\sigma}_n))$.

Suppose \bar{G} is obtained from G by the addition of dominated strategies. What is the effect of Condition 2(b) of Definition 4.4? We provide some examples by way of an answer. As might be expected, there is a substantial difference between two-player games and N -player games with $N > 2$. Therefore, we treat them separately.

Example 4.5. Suppose we fix a two person game tree Γ and consider the space of all games G with this tree. Let \bar{S} be obtained from S by the addition of strategies. Given a multilinear function $f : \bar{\Sigma} \rightarrow \Sigma$ suppose for each G there is a \bar{G} for which P5 holds. Then, n 's strategy is payoff relevant to m and P5 holds only when $f_m(\bar{s}_m, \sigma_n)$ is independent σ_n ; it could still depend on $\bar{s}_n \notin S_n$, but that is payoff irrelevant. Thus from n 's perspective each $\bar{s}_m \notin S_m$ corresponds to a duplicate in G .


For example, consider the game \bar{G}

$$\begin{pmatrix} 4, 2 & 0, 0 & 4, 1 \\ 0, 0 & 2, 4 & 0, 1 \\ 1, 2 & 1, 0 & 0, 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

The last strategy of each player is dominated by a mixture of the other two; a player's payoff if he plays an undominated strategy against the dominated strategy of the other is what he gets if the other player were to play his first strategy. The payoffs when both play a dominated strategy are irrelevant. If we let G be the game obtained by the deletion of the last row, then \bar{G} obtains from G by the addition of an irrelevant dominated strategy. \square

Example 4.6. By way of an example with more than two players, view the Beer-Quiche game as a three-player game G (as in Figure 3, where Weak, Strong and Receiver are players 1, 2, and 3, respectively).

Figure 3



Define a game \bar{G} is as follows. The strategy sets of Strong and Receiver are as in G . Weak has his two strategies as before but also a third strategy, denoted s_w^0 . This strategy corresponds to the uniform mixture over Quiche and Beer. \bar{G} in extensive form is played as follows (see Figure 4). First Weak chooses whether to play s_w^0 or not; if he plays s_w^0 , then the mixed strategy σ_w^* executed. If he chooses not to, then the moves of the game G occur. Specifically, Nature chooses Weak and Strong to play with probability .1 and .9 respectively. When chosen, Strong and Weak decide whether to play Beer or Quiche. Player two then moves, having only observed Beer or Quiche. Figure 4 describes the game; it has as its root the node where Weak decides whether to play s_w^0 .


There is a multilinear map f such that \bar{G} is obtained from G by the addition of strongly irrelevant strategies. The map is specified by the following values at a pure strategy profile \bar{s} . $f_n(\bar{s}) = \bar{s}_n$ if n is the receiver or if $\bar{s}_W \neq s_w^0$. Otherwise it is the uniform mixture over beer and quiche.

The example highlights a couple of aspects of Property P5. First, in this example, unlike with P4, condition (b) of P5 cannot be reduced to a statement of the form: $\bar{G}_n(\sigma_n, \bar{\sigma}_{-n}) = G_n(\sigma_n, f_{-n}(\bar{\sigma}))$. Second, observe that the preference orderings are preserved as long as Weak does not play his dominated strategy; in other words, the neighborhood \bar{U} of Σ is a strict subset of $\bar{\Sigma}$. \square

The definition of strongly irrelevant dominated strategies now gives us the following variant of Axiom D, called Axiom D*. As the set of embeddings is smaller, Axiom D* is weaker than Axiom D.

Axiom 4.7. [Axiom D*] $\varphi(G) = \varphi(\bar{G})$ whenever \bar{G} is obtained from G by the addition of strongly irrelevant dominated strategies.

Figure 4



Example 4.8. As a precursor to how Axiom D* and Axiom B are useful in eliminating outcomes that are not stable, let us return to Example 4.6, and in particular to consider the following extensive-form of the game \bar{G} . Players Strong and Weak simultaneously decide first. For Weak, first he decides whether to play Quiche or not. If he decides not to play Quiche, then he decides between s_w^0 and Beer. Strong just decides between Beer and Quiche. The Receiver then moves, having just seen the signal of Beer or Quiche. Quiche is not a sequential equilibrium outcome in the game \bar{G} when ε is sufficiently small. Indeed, consider any equilibrium supporting Quiche. At the node where Weak decides between Beer and s_w^0 , the latter is strictly better for all small ε . Then from 2's perspective, it is as if when he sees Beer, he believes it is strong with a high probability and he would retreat, thus upsetting the equilibrium.

In this example, Strong's strategy is payoff-irrelevant to Weak, since they do not move in succession in G . For an arbitrary extensive-form game, however, we would not be able to

use this feature. What works is an addition not just of dominated strategies, but also of players, as considered in the next section about our final axiom.¹² \square

5. INVARIANCE

An invariance axiom says that the solutions of a game G are the projections of the solutions of a game \tilde{G} that “embeds” it. In KM, embedding just meant the addition of duplicate strategies. In GW we allowed for both the addition of duplicate strategies and other players whose choices were payoff irrelevant to the original players. Here, we are going to take an even more expansive notion of an embedding. As with the addition of dominated strategies, there are going to be two versions of an embedding that nest one another, yielding two axioms.

We first recall the definition of an embedding in GW and then give the modified version.

Definition 5.1. A game $\tilde{G} : \bar{\Sigma} \equiv \bar{\Sigma}_{\mathcal{N}} \times \bar{\Sigma}_O \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{N} \cup O}$, where $\bar{\Sigma}_{\mathcal{N}} = \prod_{n \in \mathcal{N}} \bar{\Sigma}_n$, and multilinear maps $f_n : \bar{\Sigma}_n \times \bar{\Sigma}_O \rightarrow \Sigma_n$, $n \in \mathcal{N}$, embed a game $G : \Sigma \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{N}}$ if:

- (1) for each n and $\bar{\sigma}_O \in \bar{\Sigma}_O$, the map $f_n(\cdot, \bar{\sigma}_O) : \bar{\Sigma}_n \rightarrow \Sigma_n$ is surjective;
- (2) $\tilde{G} = G \circ f$, where $f = \prod_n f_n$.

As a matter of terminology, we call the players in \mathcal{N} , the “insiders,” and those in O , the “outsiders.” As a matter of notation, for any profile $\bar{\sigma}_{\mathcal{N}}$ of the insiders, there is an induced game among the outsiders, denoted $\tilde{G}_O^{\bar{\sigma}_{\mathcal{N}}}$. While the payoffs of the outsiders could depend on the strategies of the insiders—and thus $\tilde{G}_O^{\bar{\sigma}_{\mathcal{N}}}$ is a nontrivial function of $\bar{\sigma}_{\mathcal{N}}$ —the properties of f in the definition of an embedding ensure that the insiders’ strategic interaction is not affected by the outsiders. To see this, it is best to consider an equivalent definition of the function f . Proposition 3.2 of GW shows Property (1) of Definition 5.1 holds iff there is a bijection i_n between a subset \bar{S}_n^* of \bar{S}_n and S_n such that for each n and $\bar{s}_n \in \bar{S}_n^*$, we have $f_n(\bar{s}_n, \cdot) = i_n(\bar{s}_n)$. That is, there is a subset of pure strategies whose payoff implications for the insiders are not distorted by the actions of the outsiders, while the strategies in $\bar{S}_n \setminus \bar{S}_n^*$ are mapped to mixed strategies in a way that possibly depends on the choice of the outsiders. The payoff evaluations in \tilde{G} are the same as in G using f to identify equivalent profiles. Thus, the outsiders are strategically irrelevant for the insiders. It is as if the insiders are “upstream” players and the outsiders, “downstream.”

¹²The definition of G-stability in De Stefano Grigis [5] requires the use of both the addition of strictly dominated strategies and irrelevant players in order to get a player-splitting property: in games like signaling games where different agents of a player do not move in succession the solutions of the normal and agent normal form of the game are the same.

If \bar{G} embeds G via the map f , then the Invariance Axiom in GW requires that the solutions of G are the f -images of the solutions of \bar{G} . We want to strengthen the axiom by allowing for a larger class of games to embed a given game G . The idea we use draws on the procedure we used in dealing with the addition of dominated strategies. Suppose \bar{G} embeds G via a map f in the sense of Definition 5.1. Now take a game \tilde{G} obtained from \bar{G} by adding strategies only for the outsiders. We use $\tilde{\Sigma}$ to denote the strategy space of \tilde{G} —for each n , $\tilde{\Sigma}_n = \bar{\Sigma}_n$. Suppose, too, that there is an extension of each f_n to a multilinear map \tilde{f}_n over $\tilde{\Sigma}_n \times \tilde{\Sigma}_O$.¹³ When could we consider the newly added strategies irrelevant? That is, when is it reasonable to insist that the \tilde{f} -images of solutions of \tilde{G} are the same as the f -images of the solutions of \bar{G} ? Obviously \bar{G} and \tilde{G} must satisfy Property P1, i.e. they must have the same set of Nash equilibria. But, if this property has to hold for some extension \tilde{G} for any arbitrary specification of payoffs for G , then, as any profile in Σ could arise as an equilibrium for the upstream players, Property P1 must hold in a stronger sense:

Property P6: For each $\bar{\sigma}_N \in \bar{\Sigma}_N$, the games $\bar{G}_O^{\bar{\sigma}_N}$ and $\tilde{G}_O^{\bar{\sigma}_N}$ have the same set of Nash equilibria.

If we want a counterpart of Axiom D^* , then a version of Property P5 is necessary as well:

Property P7: There exists a neighborhood \tilde{U} of $\bar{\Sigma}$ in $\tilde{\Sigma}$, and for each n , a multilinear map $\tilde{f}_n : \tilde{\Sigma}_n \times \tilde{\Sigma}_O \rightarrow \Sigma_n$ such that for each n :

- (a) the restriction of \tilde{f}_n to $\bar{\Sigma}_n \times \bar{\Sigma}_O$ is f_n ;
- (b) for each $\tau_n \in \tilde{\Sigma}_n$, $\tilde{\sigma} \in \tilde{U}$, $\tilde{G}_n(\tilde{\sigma}) \geq \tilde{G}_n(\tau_n, \tilde{\sigma}_{-n})$ iff $G_n(\tilde{f}(\tilde{\sigma})) \geq G_n(\tilde{f}(\tau_n, \tilde{\sigma}_{-n}))$.

We combine Definition 5.1 with Properties P6 and P7 to allow for a richer class of embeddings. Rather than first embedding G via f in a game \bar{G} in the sense of Definition 5.1 and then extending \bar{G} to a game \tilde{G} , we will directly state the properties for embedding G in a game \tilde{G} with the “subgame” \bar{G} being defined implicitly.

Definition 5.2. A game $\tilde{G} : \tilde{\Sigma}_N \times \tilde{\Sigma}_O \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{N \cup O}$, where $\tilde{\Sigma}_N = \prod_{n \in N} \tilde{\Sigma}_n$, and multilinear maps $f_n : \tilde{\Sigma}_n \times \tilde{\Sigma}_O \rightarrow \Sigma_n$, $n \in N$, strongly embed a game $G : \Sigma \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^N$ if:

- (1) there is a face $\bar{\Sigma}_O$ of $\tilde{\Sigma}_O$ such that for each $\tilde{\sigma}_N \in \tilde{\Sigma}_N$, the set of Nash equilibria of the induced game $\bar{G}_O^{\tilde{\sigma}_N}$ among the outsiders O is contained in $\bar{\Sigma}_O$;
- (2) for each n , $\tilde{\sigma}_O \in \bar{\Sigma}_O$, $f_n(\cdot, \tilde{\sigma}_O)$ is surjective;
- (3) there exists a neighborhood \tilde{U} of $\tilde{\Sigma}_N \times \bar{\Sigma}_O$ in $\tilde{\Sigma}_N \times \tilde{\Sigma}_O$ such that for each $\tau_n \in \tilde{\Sigma}_n$, $\tilde{\sigma} \in \tilde{U}$, $\tilde{G}_n(\tilde{\sigma}) \geq \tilde{G}_n(\tau_n, \tilde{\sigma}_{-n})$ iff $G_n(f(\tilde{\sigma})) \geq G_n(f(\tau_n, \tilde{\sigma}_{-n}))$.

¹³Multilinearity in this setting, like in Section 4, is also a consequence of continuity and a requirement that the property hold universally over the domain of games being considered.

Example 5.3. We now give an example of a strong embedding. Let G be the beer-quiche game of Example 4.6. Suppose now that G_O is a completely independent game played by two players o_1 and o_2 whose payoffs are as follows:

$$\begin{pmatrix} 2, 2 & 2, 2 \\ 3, 0 & 0, 1 \\ 0, 2 & 3, 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

The game G_O has a unique equilibrium outcome $(2, 2)$. Suppose that when player o_1 plays his second strategy, Middle, then in the game G , Strong loses agency, in that regardless what he chooses, Beer is what the receiver observes. Similarly, if o_1 chooses Bottom, then Weak's choice is overridden and Beer is chosen. It seems a reasonable requirement of a solution concept φ that the solutions of the game \bar{G} involving both games G and G_O are just the products of the solutions of the two games. \square

With this definition of embedding, have the following invariance axiom.¹⁴

Axiom 5.4. [Axiom I*] *The φ -solutions of a game G are the f -images of the φ -solutions of any game \tilde{G} that strongly embeds it via a map f .*

As we did in the previous section, if we ask for Condition (3) of Definition 5.2 to hold only for profiles in $\bar{\Sigma}$, then we get a larger class of embeddings.

Definition 5.5. A game $\tilde{G} : \tilde{\Sigma}_{\mathcal{N}} \times \tilde{\Sigma}_O \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{N} \cup O}$, where $\tilde{\Sigma}_{\mathcal{N}} = \prod_{n \in \mathcal{N}} \tilde{\Sigma}_n$, and a multilinear maps $f_n : \tilde{\Sigma}_n \times \tilde{\Sigma}_O \rightarrow \Sigma_n$, $n \in \mathcal{N}$, weakly embed a game $G : \Sigma \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{N}}$ if:

- (1) there is a face $\bar{\Sigma}_O$ of $\tilde{\Sigma}_O$ such that for each $\tilde{\sigma}_{\mathcal{N}} \in \tilde{\Sigma}_{\mathcal{N}}$, the set of Nash equilibria of the induced game $\bar{G}_O^{\tilde{\sigma}_{\mathcal{N}}}$ among the outsiders O is contained in $\bar{\Sigma}_O$;
- (2) for each n , $\tilde{\sigma}_O \in \bar{\Sigma}_O$, $f_n(\cdot, \tilde{\sigma}_O)$ is surjective;
- (3) for each $\tau_n \in \tilde{\Sigma}_n$, $\tilde{\sigma}_{\mathcal{N}}$, $\tilde{\sigma}_O \in \bar{\Sigma}_O$, $\tilde{G}_n(\tilde{\sigma}) \geq \tilde{G}_n(\tilde{\tau}_n, \tilde{\sigma}_{-n})$ iff $G_n(f(\tilde{\sigma})) \geq G_n(f(\tilde{\tau}_n, \tilde{\sigma}_{-n}))$.

Weak embeddings allow us to formulate a stronger axiom of invariance. As with Axiom D, a big problem with Axiom I is that it does not allow us to compare off-equilibrium-path beliefs in the games \tilde{G} and G .

Axiom 5.6. [Axiom I] *The φ -solutions of a game G are the f -images of the φ -solutions of any game \tilde{G} that weakly embeds it via a map f .*

¹⁴One could create a *portmanteau* axiom that combines Axioms I* and D* to allow addition of players and strategies simultaneously. But that seems too heavy-handed for our purposes: even a stronger version of the axiom about adding strategies that dispenses with the requirement of dominance is already too much. Such a strengthening might be needed to extend the axiomatization to games with nongeneric payoffs.

6. THE MAIN RESULTS

For generic u , $\Gamma(u)$ has finitely many outcomes. Since solutions are connected sets, to each solution there corresponds a unique outcome. Thus, in this case, we can talk of the outcomes selected by a solution concept. The outcomes associated with the solutions selected by stability (resp. essentiality) for a generic game are called stable (resp. essential) outcomes. We are now ready to state the main theorems of the paper. We start with stability.

Theorem 6.1. *Stability satisfies Axioms B, D^* , and I^* . Any solution concept that satisfies these axioms must, for each generic game $\Gamma(u)$, select from among its stable outcomes.*

Theorem 6.1 differs from the corresponding theorem in GW for two-player games both in terms of the assumptions and the conclusion. GW also impose Axiom B but they invoke a weaker version of Axiom I^* —the definition of an embedding is as in Definition 5.1—and they impose admissibility rather than Axiom D^* . The result in GW is that the solutions themselves, rather than just their outcomes, of a solution concept satisfying their axioms must be selections from among the stable sets. In our case, if we want a statement involving the solutions, it would be of the following form: every solution of a generic game $\Gamma(u)$ assigned by a solution concept satisfying Axioms B, D^* and I^* must contain a stable set. If we impose a minimality axiom—that solutions are as small as possible—then we get a parallel result for the N -player case.¹⁵

The main reason that GW are able to get a stronger result is that for two-player games, a solution concept satisfying Axiom B and their invariance axiom must choose as solutions sets that contain a component of admissible equilibria. Admissibility and connectedness then imply that solutions have to be components of admissible equilibria; add to this the facts that stable sets in such games are also components of admissible equilibria and, as here, solutions must contain stable sets, we get the stronger result for two-player games.

In two-player games, but not in games with more players, an equilibrium is admissible iff it is perfect. But it does not appear that this is the source of the distinction between the results in the two cases: even if we strengthen admissibility to requiring perfection, it is not clear that stable sets for generic u have to be connected components of perfect equilibria. If we do not want to impose minimality, then perhaps we need to view a (perfect) equilibrium as a lexicographic equilibrium [1, 6] and require connectedness of such solutions.¹⁶

¹⁵In GW, admissibility could be replaced with minimality as well.

¹⁶This fix brings with it mathematical issues: do we allow for only LPSs with finitely many levels? infinite levels? what is the appropriate topology for such sets? Conditional probability systems, CPSs, are better behaved than LPSs, as they form a ball [18], but while they are useful for this paper, they seem inadequate for the general case.

Example 6.2. We illustrate the main idea in proving Theorem 6.1 using an example. Theorem 6.3 is proved analogously, but using payoff perturbations instead of strategy perturbations.

Consider the Beer-Quiche game of Example 4.6. The Quiche outcome is not stable as it relies on the receiver assigning more probability to weak rather than strong if he sees Beer, yet Beer is never a best reply to the equilibrium outcome. Backward induction does not help by itself since all beliefs are consistent. As we saw in Example 4.8, we could eliminate this outcome with just Axioms B and D^* . Here we will use Axiom I^* as well and give a different construction.

Take the game G_O developed in Example 5.3. It is useful to represent G_O as an outside option game where the outside option gives $(2, 2)$ and otherwise there is a 2×2 subgame. In the unique belief supporting the outcome as a sequential equilibrium, player o_2 assigns probability $2/3$ to M and probability $1/3$ to B .

As in Example 5.3 embed G in the game \tilde{G} using G_O : the choice of M (resp. B) triggers Beer for Strong (resp. Weak). Consider the game \bar{G} obtained from \tilde{G} by adding a dominated strategy for Weak as in Example 4.8 but now the dominated strategy immediately overrides o_1 's choice (but not Strong's choice) and implements Bottom.

We claim that there is no sequential equilibrium of \bar{G} that induces Quiche. Indeed, observe first that in any such equilibrium, o_2 's beliefs must assign probability $2/3$ to M . There are two sources of the belief: the direct choices of o_1 or the choice induced by Weak playing his dominated strategy. Either way, this implies that the Receiver of G assigns a strictly greater probability to Strong than Weak, upsetting the equilibrium.

We need a combination of both the dominated action for Weak and the effect of the unused actions of o_1 for this proof to work. Even if we did not have one of these two features, the receiver could assign more weight to Weak because there is nothing disciplining the relative trembles of Strong and Weak. \square

Essential outcomes are examples of nontrivial selections from stable outcomes in Theorem 6.1. Axiomatically, they are characterized by using Axioms D and I in place of D^* and I^* , respectively, as our second theorem shows.

Theorem 6.3. *Essentiality satisfies Axioms B, D, and I. Any solution concept that satisfies Axioms B, D, and I must, for each generic game $\Gamma(u)$, select from among its essential outcomes.*

Theorem 6.3 can be strengthened to show that the solutions themselves have to be essential sets, and minimality can replace connectedness in the theorem.¹⁷ The proof of Theorem 6.3 follows the same road map as that of Theorem 6.1. The main difference between them arises from the different characterizations of the two concepts—compare Propositions 8.1 and 10.3.

7. THE STRUCTURE OF CONSISTENT BELIEFS

We can use enabling strategies to encode beliefs and optimal continuation strategies at information sets. For n, h_n , let $L_n(h_n)$ be the set of last actions following h_n and let $Z(h_n)$ be the set of terminal nodes following h_n . Let $P_n(h_n)$ be the projection of P_n to $[0, 1]^{L_n(h_n)}$. Let $\Sigma_n(h_n)$ be the set of mixed strategies of n that choose all the actions leading to h_n with probability one. Recall that $\pi_n : \Sigma_n \rightarrow P_n$ is the map sending mixed strategies to enabling strategies. The projection $P_n^1(h_n)$ to $[0, 1]^{L_n(h_n)}$ of $\pi_n(\Sigma_n(h_n))$ is the maximal face of $P_n(h_n)$ that does not contain zero. (If $\Sigma_n \neq \Sigma_n(h_n)$, then $P_n^1(h_n)$ is a proper face of $P_n(h_n)$.)

Suppose p is a profile such that $p_{-n}(z) > 0$ for some $z \in Z(h_n)$. Then the optimal continuation from h_n for player n depends on maximizing $\sum_{z \in Z(h_n)} p_{-n}(z) p_n^1(z) u_n(z)$ by choosing $p_n^1 \in P_n^1(h_n)$. What matters for optimal behavior is the distribution over $Z(h_n)$ that is induced by p_{-n} . By going to limits of completely mixed strategies we get consistent beliefs encoded in these distributions. We study the structure of these beliefs below.

Let \mathcal{L} be the set of all ordered pairs (a_m, a_n) with $a_m \in L_m, a_n \in L_n$ for some m, n , (with possibly $m = n$ as well). For each n , let \mathcal{Z}_{-n} be the set of all pairs (z_0, z_1) that belong to $Z(h_n)$ for some h_n , and write \mathcal{Z} for $\bigcup_n \mathcal{Z}_{-n}$. Each p in the relative interior P^0 of P induces for each $(a_m, a_n) \in \mathcal{L}$ a conditional probability

$$\lambda(a_m, a_n) \equiv \frac{p_m(a_m)}{p_m(a_m) + p_n(a_n)},$$

and for each n and $(z_0, z_1) \in \mathcal{Z}_{-n}$

$$\lambda_{-n}(z_0, z_1) \equiv \frac{p_{-n}(z_0)}{p_{-n}(z_0) + p_{-n}(z_1)}.$$

Let \mathbb{P}^0 be the set of all pairs $(p, \lambda) \in P^0 \times [0, 1]^{\mathcal{L} \cup \mathcal{Z}}$ where λ is the vector of conditional probabilities derived from p . Let \mathbb{P} be the closure of \mathbb{P}^0 . Denote by $\partial\mathbb{P}$ the set $\mathbb{P} \setminus \mathbb{P}^0$. Let $\text{proj} : (\mathbb{P}, \partial\mathbb{P}) \rightarrow (P, \partial P)$ be the natural projection. Since \mathbb{P}^0 is homeomorphic to P^0 under proj , and $(\mathbb{P}, \partial\mathbb{P})$ is a semialgebraic pair, $(\mathbb{P}, \partial\mathbb{P})$ is an orientable d -pseudomanifold

¹⁷A relationship between connectedness and minimality exists in fixed point theory: sets that are minimal w.r.t to robustness of perturbations of the fixed-point map are connected components of fixed points with nonzero index.

with boundary, where d is the dimension of P . But that does not imply that $\partial\mathbb{P}$ is also a pseudomanifold, a weaker version of which property we need and which we now prove.¹⁸

For each triple $R = (R^0, R^1, R^2)$ that partitions $\mathcal{L} \cup \mathcal{Z}$, let $\mathbb{P}(R)$ be the set of $(p, \lambda) \in \partial\mathbb{P}$ such that $\lambda(\cdot)$ belongs to $(0, 1)$ on R^0 , is one on R^1 and zero on R^2 . Obviously the collection of the sets $\mathbb{P}(R)$ that are nonempty partition $\partial\mathbb{P}$. Moreover for each subset $\mathbb{P}(R)$ of $\partial\mathbb{P}$ there is a face of ∂P whose interior contains $\text{proj}(\mathbb{P}(R))$. The following lemma describes the structure of these sets.

Proposition 7.1. *Each $\mathbb{P}(R)$ is a boundaryless manifold and belongs to the closure of one that is a $(d - 1)$ -dimensional manifold; moreover, if $\mathbb{P}(R)$ is $(d - 2)$ -dimensional, it belongs to the closure of exactly two such manifolds.*

Proof. We will first study, for a fixed $p \in \partial P$, the structure of the set of λ such that $(p, \lambda) \in \mathbb{P}$. Let A^0 be the set of all last actions across all players that are used with zero probability under p . As p belongs to ∂P , it cannot be completely mixed, and therefore A^0 is nonempty. Given $\theta \in \mathbb{R}_{++}^{A^0}$, for each n and $a_n \in L_n$, let $\tilde{p}_n(a_n; \theta)$ equal $p_n(a_n)$ if $p_n(a_n) > 0$; otherwise let it equal $\theta_n(a_n)$. We define $\tilde{p}_{-n}(z; \theta)$ similarly, using \tilde{p}_m rather than p_m for each $m \neq n$. Let $\tilde{\lambda}(\theta)$ be the likelihood ratios defined as follows. For any pair $(a_m, a_n) \in \mathcal{L}$:

$$\tilde{\lambda}(a_m, a_n; \theta) = \frac{\tilde{p}_m(a_m; \theta)}{\tilde{p}_n(a_n; \theta)}$$

and for each n and $(z_0, z_1) \in \mathcal{Z}_{-n}$:

$$\tilde{\lambda}_{-n}(z_0, z_1; \theta) = \frac{\tilde{p}_{-n}(z_0; \theta)}{\tilde{p}_{-n}(z_1; \theta)}$$

From $\tilde{\lambda}$ we can compute $\lambda(a_m, a_n; \theta)$ as usual: $\lambda(a_m, a_n; \theta) = \tilde{\lambda}(a_m, a_n; \theta)(1 + \tilde{\lambda}(a_m, a_n; \theta))^{-1}$ and similarly for $\lambda_{-n}(z_0, z_1; \theta)$.

We claim that (p, λ) belongs to \mathbb{P} iff there exists a sequence $\theta \rightarrow 0$ such that $\lambda(\cdot; \theta) \rightarrow \lambda$. Indeed, to prove the necessity of the condition, suppose (p, λ) belongs to \mathbb{P} . There exists a sequence (p^k, λ^k) converging to (p, λ) with $p^k \in P^0$ for all k . For each k and $a^0 \in A^0$, let $\theta_{a^0}^k = p_{a^0}^k$. Clearly $\theta^k \rightarrow 0$. Using p along with θ^k to generate sequences $\tilde{p}_n(\cdot; \theta^k)$ and $\tilde{p}_{-n}(\cdot; \theta^k)$ for each n , we see that the corresponding sequence $\lambda(\cdot; \theta^k)$ converges to λ . To prove sufficiency, given a sequence $\theta^k \rightarrow 0$ generating a convergent sequence of beliefs $\lambda(\cdot, \cdot; \theta^k) \rightarrow \lambda$, define for each k a completely mixed behavioral strategy profile b^k using

¹⁸What our analysis here shows is that each connected component of $\partial\mathbb{P}$ is a $(d - 1)$ -pseudomanifold. It is not difficult to show that $\partial\mathbb{P}$ is connected and hence, itself, a pseudomanifold. McLennan [18, 19] shows that if the beliefs encode all likelihood ratios, not just for last actions, then $\partial\mathbb{P}$ is a sphere; it is not clear if this property is true for $\partial\mathbb{P}$ as currently defined.

the likelihood ratios $\lambda(\cdot, \theta^k)$. The sequence of b^k 's induces a corresponding sequence p^k of enabling strategies, which converges to p . The beliefs associated with p^k are $\lambda(\cdot, \theta^k)$, which completes the proof of the claim.

To compute the set of $(p, \lambda) \in \partial\mathbb{P}$ for this given p , we therefore need to study the limits of the sequences $\tilde{\lambda}(\cdot, \cdot; \theta^k)$ as $\theta^k \rightarrow 0$. Taking the log of $\tilde{\lambda}(\cdot, \cdot; \theta)$ in the formula defining it, and using a change of variable $\vartheta_{a^0} \equiv \ln(\theta_{a^0})$ for each $a^0 \in A^0$, we get that the log-likelihood ratios are affine in the variable ϑ . Call this function $L^p(\vartheta)$. L^p is an affine function from \mathbb{R}^{A^0} to $\mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{L} \cup \mathcal{Z}}$. For each ϑ , it assigns to each (a_m, a_n) (resp. each n and (z_0, z_1) in \mathcal{Z}_{-n}) a log-likelihood ratio $L^p_{a_m, a_n}(\vartheta)$ (resp. $L^p_{-n, z_0, z_1}(\vartheta)$).

Let $E^p \equiv L^p(\mathbb{R}^{A^0})$ and let $[-\infty, \infty]^{\mathcal{L} \cup \mathcal{Z}}$ be obtained by the two-point compactification $[-\infty, \infty]$ of each factor. Let \bar{E}^p be the closure of E^p in $[-\infty, \infty]^{\mathcal{L} \cup \mathcal{Z}}$. Let \bar{E}_∞^p be the set of $\eta \in \bar{E}^p$ that are limits of sequences $L^p(\vartheta^k)$ with $\vartheta_a^k \rightarrow -\infty$ for each $a \in A^0$. \bar{E}_∞^p is homeomorphic to the set of $(p, \lambda) \in \partial\mathbb{P}$.

Let $\bar{\Theta}(A^0)$ be the unit simplex in \mathbb{R}^{A^0} , i.e. the set of $\vartheta \in \mathbb{R}_+^{A^0}$ such that $\sum_{a^0} \vartheta_{a^0} = 1$, and let $\Theta(A^0)$ be its relative interior. Denote by \bar{L}^p the linear function on \mathbb{R}^{A^0} that is the derivative of the affine function L^p . For a triplet $R \equiv (R^0, R^1, R^2)$ that is a partition of $\mathcal{L} \cup \mathcal{Z}$ into three nonempty subsets, let $\Theta(R; A^0)$ be the set of $\vartheta \in \Theta(A^0)$ such that $\bar{L}_r^p(\vartheta)$ is resp., zero, negative, and positive, depending on whether r belongs, resp., to R^0 , R^1 and R^2 . Obviously the sets $\Theta(R; A^0)$ obtained by considering all possible triples R partition $\Theta(A^0)$.

For each triplet R for which $\Theta(R; A^0)$ is nonempty, let $E^p(R)$ be the set $L_{R^0}(\mathbb{R}^{A^0}) \times \{\infty\}^{R^1} \times \{-\infty\}^{R^2}$. We claim that the sets $E^p(R)$ partition \bar{E}_∞^p . The sets $E^p(R)$ are obviously disjoint. Thus to prove the claim we have to show that \bar{E}_∞^p is the union of these sets. First take η in \bar{E}_∞^p . There is a unique R such that η_r is resp., finite, $+\infty$, and $-\infty$ depending on whether r belongs, resp., to R^0 , R^1 , and R^2 . Obviously there is a ϑ such that $L_{R^0}(\vartheta)$ is the projection of η to R^0 and thus η belongs to $E^p(R)$. Going the other way, given $\eta \in E^p(R)$ for some R , there exists ϑ such that $\eta_{R^0} = L_{R^0}^p(\vartheta)$. Let ϑ' be a point in $\Theta(R)$. Obviously η is the limit of $L^p(\vartheta + \alpha\vartheta')$ as $\alpha \rightarrow -\infty$. Thus, \bar{E}_∞^p contains the union of the sets $E^p(R)$ and our claim is proved.

To analyze the structure of the sets $E^p(R)$, we first analyze their duals $\Theta(R; A^0)$. For each R , letting $d^0(R; A^0)$ be the dimension of $L_{R^0}^p(A^0)$, we see that $\Theta(R; A^0)$ is a linear manifold of dimension $|A^0| - 1 - d^0(R; A^0)$. The closure $\bar{\Theta}(R; A^0)$ of each $\Theta(R; A^0)$ in $\bar{\Theta}(A^0)$ is a polytope and the relative interior of each face of it that does not belong to the boundary of $\bar{\Theta}(A^0)$ is a set of the form $\Theta(R'; A^0)$. We claim that $\bar{\Theta}(R; A^0)$ has at least one vertex in $\Theta(A^0)$ (which then corresponds to some $\Theta(R'; A^0)$). Indeed, to show this, choose R' such

that $\Theta(R'; A^0)$ is a face of $\Theta(R; A^0)$ with the smallest possible dimension among faces that are not contained in the boundary of $\bar{\Theta}(A^0)$. We claim that $\Theta(R'; A^0)$ is a singleton. Otherwise, there is a line segment in $\bar{\Theta}(R', \Theta)$ and a pair (a_m^0, a_n^0) of last actions (possibly of the same player) such that $\vartheta_{a_m^0} - \vartheta_{a_n^0} = \bar{L}_{a_m, a_n}^p(\vartheta)$ is positive at one end point of the line segment and negative at the other, which is impossible by the definition of the set $\Theta(R'; A^0)$. Thus $\bar{\Theta}(R; A^0)$ has a vertex in $\Theta(A^0)$. If $\Theta(R; A^0)$ is 1-dimensional and has a vertex ϑ^0 in $\bar{\Theta}(A^0) \setminus \Theta(A^0)$, then ϑ^0 is a singleton set $\Theta(\hat{R}; \hat{A}^0)$ in $\Theta(\hat{A}^0)$ for some \hat{R} and $\hat{A}^0 \subsetneq A^0$.

The properties of $\Theta(R; A^0)$ described above yield the following properties for the sets $E^p(R)$. Each set $E^p(R)$ is a linear manifold of dimension $d^0(R; A^0)$. And its closure is a union of manifolds of the form $E^p(R')$ where R' is such that $\bar{\Theta}(R'; A^0)$ contains $\Theta(R; A^0)$ in its closure. Every $E^p(R)$ belongs to the closure of a manifold of dimension $|A^0| - 1$. If $d^0(R; A^0) = |A^0| - 2$, then it belongs to the closure of either one or two such manifolds $E^p(R')$ of dimension $|A^0| - 1$, depending on whether the set $\Theta(R; A^0)$ has one or two end points in $\Theta(A^0)$. When the set $\Theta(R; A^0)$ has one end point ϑ^0 in $\bar{\Theta}(A^0) \setminus \Theta(A^0)$, there exists \hat{R} and $\hat{A}^0 \subsetneq A^0$ such that ϑ^0 is the set $\Theta(\hat{R}, \hat{A}^0)$. It is easily checked that for each $\eta \in E^p(R)$, there then exists a sequence $p^k \rightarrow p$ with $p_{a_n}^k > 0$ iff $a_n \notin \hat{A}^0$, and a corresponding sequence of η^k (in the $(|\hat{A}^0| - 1)$ -dimensional manifold) $E^{p^k}(\hat{R})$ converging to η . All the qualitative results about the structure of the set of points (p, λ) for a fixed p that we have described hold uniformly across all profiles with the same support as p .

We are now ready to prove the stated properties of the sets $\mathbb{P}(R)$. Take $\mathbb{P}(R)$ in $\partial\mathbb{P}$. There exists a unique proper face P^1 of P whose interior $P^{1,0}$ contains $\text{proj}(\mathbb{P}(R))$. Let A^0 be the set of unused actions in P^1 . $\mathbb{P}(R)$ is then $\cup_{p \in P^{1,0}} \mathbb{P}(R, p)$, where for each p , $\mathbb{P}(R, p) = \text{proj}^{-1}(p) \cap \mathbb{P}(R)$, and it is homeomorphic to $\cup_{p \in P^{1,0}} (\{p\} \times E^p(R))$ and thus manifold of dimension $d^0(R; A^0) + \dim(P^1)$. As $d^0(R; A^0) \leq |A^0| - 1$ and $\dim(P^1) = d - |A^0|$, $\dim(\mathbb{P}(R)) \leq d - 1$. If $d^0(R; A^0) = |A^0| - 1$, then $\dim(\mathbb{P}(R)) = d - 1$. If $\dim(\mathbb{P}(R)) < d - 1$, then it belongs to the closure of a manifold $\mathbb{P}(R')$ of dimension $d - 1$ as the polytope $\bar{\Theta}(R, A^0)$ has a vertex in $\Theta(A^0)$ that is of the form $\Theta(R'; A^0)$. If $\mathbb{P}(R)$ has dimension $d - 2$, then it either belongs to the closure of two such manifolds whose projection to P is $P^{1,0}$, or if it belongs to the closure of just one such manifold and then it belongs to the closure of one projecting to a face P^2 that is either a face of P^1 or has P^1 as a face. \square

8. A CHARACTERIZATION OF STABILITY

Given $(q, \lambda) \in \mathbb{P}$, we have for each n and information set h_n , a well-defined belief over the continuation strategy of n 's opponents. Indeed, since we have all the conditional probabilities $\lambda(z_0, z_1)$ as (z_0, z_1) range over pairs of terminal nodes in $Z(h_n)$, we can compute a ‘‘probability

distribution" $q_{-n}(z; \lambda, h_n)$ over all terminal nodes z in $Z(h_n)$. $p_n^1 \in P_n^1(h_n)$ is optimal against (q, λ) at h_n if it maximizes $\sum_{z \in Z(h_n)} \tilde{p}_n^1(z) q_{-n}(z; \lambda, h_n) u_n(z)$ subject to $\tilde{p}_n^1 \in P_n^1(h_n)$. We say that an action $a_n \in L_n$ is optimal against (q, λ) in $\Gamma(u)$ if for each h_n that precedes a_n (including the information set where a_n is available) there is an optimal continuation strategy $p_n^1 \in P_n^1(h_n)$ for which $p_n^1(a_n) = 1$. When q_{-n} is a completely-mixed strategy profile, the requirement that a_n is optimal is simply a restatement of the requirement that there exists $s_n \in S_n(a_n)$ that is a best reply to q_{-n} . We say that p is a best reply to (q, λ) if each a_n in the support of p_n (i.e. $p_n(a_n) > 0$) is optimal against (q, λ) .

For each game $\Gamma(u)$, let $\mathcal{Q}(u)$ be the closure of the set of $(p, (p^*, \lambda)) \in (P \setminus \partial P) \times \mathbb{P}$ such that: (1) p^* is a best reply to (p^*, λ) in the game $\Gamma(u)$; (2) for every a_m and a_n , we have $\lambda(a_m, a_n) \geq \frac{p_m(a_m)}{p_m(a_m) + p_n(a_n)}$ if a_n is not a best reply to (p, λ) in $\Gamma(u)$. Let $\partial\mathcal{Q}(u)$ be the set of $(p, (p^*, \lambda)) \in \mathcal{Q}(u)$ such that $p \in \partial P$. We write $(\mathcal{Q}, \partial\mathcal{Q})$ for $(\mathcal{Q}(u), \partial\mathcal{Q}(u))$ when the game u is implicitly given.

Proposition 8.1. *If u is generic, there exists a finite partition $(\mathcal{Q}^1, \partial\mathcal{Q}^1), \dots, (\mathcal{Q}^k, \partial\mathcal{Q}^k)$ of $(\mathcal{Q}, \partial\mathcal{Q})$ such that:*

- (1) for each i , $(\mathcal{Q}^i, \partial\mathcal{Q}^i)$ is a d -pseudomanifold;
- (2) Σ^* is a stable set of $\Gamma(u)$ iff there exists i such that:
 - (a) $\pi(\Sigma^*) = \{q \in P \mid \exists (p, (q, \lambda)) \in \mathcal{Q}^i\}$;
 - (b) $\text{proj} : (\mathcal{Q}^i, \partial\mathcal{Q}^i) \rightarrow (P, \partial P)$ is essential.

We prove Proposition 8.1 via a sequence of lemmas. For each $u \in \mathbb{R}^{NZ}$, let $E(u)$ be the closure of the set of $(\varepsilon, p, (q, \lambda)) \in (0, 1) \times (P \setminus \partial P) \times \mathbb{P}$ such that for all n and $a_n \in L_n$, $q_{n, a_n} \geq \varepsilon p_{n, a_n}$, with an equality if a_n is not a best reply to q . For simplicity, we write E for $E(u)$ when the utility function we are talking about is understood. For each $0 < \eta \leq 1$ (resp. $0 \leq \eta \leq 1$) and each subset X of E , let $X_{[0, \eta]}$ (resp. X_η) be the set of $(\varepsilon, p, (q, \lambda))$ in X such that $\varepsilon \leq \eta$ (resp. $\varepsilon = \eta$) and let $\partial X_{[0, \eta]}$ (resp. ∂X_η) be the set of $(\varepsilon, p, (q, \lambda))$ in $X_{[0, \eta]}$ (resp. X_η) such that $(\varepsilon, p) \in \partial([0, \eta] \times P)$ (resp. $p \in \partial P$).

Lemma 8.2. *If u is generic, there exist $0 < \eta_0 < 1$ and a partition of $(E_{[0, \eta_0]}, \partial E_{[0, \eta_0]})$ into finitely many pairs $(X_{[0, \eta_0]}^i, \partial X_{[0, \eta_0]}^i)$, $i = 1, \dots, k$ such that for all i and $0 < \eta \leq \eta_0$:*

- (1) $(X_{[0, \eta]}^i, \partial X_{[0, \eta]}^i)$ is a $(d+1)$ -pseudomanifold and $(X_\eta^i, \partial X_\eta^i)$ is a d -pseudomanifold;
- (2) $\text{proj} : (X_{[0, \eta]}^i, \partial X_{[0, \eta]}^i) \rightarrow ([0, \eta] \times P, \partial([0, \eta] \times P))$ is essential in cohomology iff $\text{proj} : (X_\eta^i, \partial X_\eta^i) \rightarrow (P, \partial P)$ is essential in cohomology.

Proof. Lemma E.3 of [11] shows the existence of η_1 and subsets X^1, \dots, X^k of E such that: $\cup_i (X_{[0, \eta_1]}^i, \partial X_{[0, \eta_1]}^i) = (E_{[0, \eta_1]}, \partial E_{[0, \eta_1]})$; and for $i \neq j$, $(X_{[0, \eta_1]}^i \cap X_{[0, \eta_1]}^j) \subseteq \partial E_1$. We need to

show that, in addition, these sets are disjoint.¹⁹ Furthermore, the paragraph following the proof of Lemma E.3 (loc. cit.) shows that for $0 < \eta \leq \eta_1$, each $X_{[0,\eta]}^i$ is a d -homology manifold and, hence, a pseudomanifold as well, which proves Property (1) for these sets.

We now show that there exists $0 < \eta_0 \leq \eta_1$ such that for all i and $0 < \eta \leq \eta_0$, X_η^i is a pseudomanifold and that property (2) holds. To show point (1) for the sets X_η^i for small $\eta > 0$, we argue as follows. For each i , let $\phi^i : X_{[0,\eta_1]}^i \rightarrow [0,\eta_1]$ be the map that sends $(\varepsilon, (p, (q, \lambda)))$ to ε . By the Generic Local Triviality Theorem (Theorem 9.3 of [2]) there exists $0 < \eta_0 \leq \eta_1$, and for each i , a semialgebraic pair $(F^i, \partial F^i)$, and a homeomorphism $h^i : (0, \eta_0] \times (F^i, \partial F^i) \rightarrow (X_{[0,\eta_0]}^i \setminus X_0^i, \partial X_{[0,\eta_0]}^i \setminus \partial X_0^i)$ such that $\phi^i \circ h^i(\eta, f^i) = \eta$ for each $(\eta, f^i) \in F^i$. Looking ahead to our proof of point (2), the function ϕ^i can be chosen in such a way that for each face P_0 of P , there is a subset F_0^i of F^i such that $h^i((0, \eta_0] \times F_0^i) = \text{proj}^{-1}((0, \eta_0] \times P_0) \cap X_{[0,\eta_0]}^i$. As $X_{[0,\eta_0]}^i$ is a $(d+1)$ -homology manifold, $[0, \eta_0] \times F^i$ is a $(d+1)$ -homology manifold as well. Hence, F^i is a d -homology manifold and $(F^i, \partial F^i)$ is a d -pseudomanifold. $(X_\eta, \partial X_\eta)$ is homeomorphic to $(F^i, \partial F^i)$ by the restriction of h^i to $\{\eta\} \times (F^i, \partial F^i)$, which completes the proof of point (1).

To prove point (2), now fix i and $0 < \eta \leq \eta_0$. Let \bar{P}_η be the quotient space of $[0, \eta] \times P$ obtained by collapsing $\{0\} \times P$ to a point 0_P and let $\partial \bar{P}_\eta$ be the image of the boundary under this quotient map. Likewise let $\bar{X}_{[0,\eta]}^i$ be the quotient space obtained by collapsing X_0^i to a point 0_{X^i} and denote by $\bar{X}_{[0,\eta]}^i$ its boundary. Let $\bar{\text{proj}}$ be the projection from $\bar{X}_{[0,\eta]}^i$ to \bar{P}_η . The essentiality of proj for an $(X_{[0,\eta^i]}^i, \partial X_{[0,\eta]}^i)$ is equivalent to that of $\bar{\text{proj}}$ for the corresponding set $(\bar{X}_{[0,\eta]}^i, \partial \bar{X}_{[0,\eta]}^i)$.

The map $H_\eta^i : (0, \eta] \times X_\eta^i \rightarrow \bar{X}_{[0,\eta]}^i \setminus 0_{X^i}$ that sends $(\varepsilon, (\eta, p, (q, \lambda)))$ to $h^i(\varepsilon, (h^i)^{-1}(\eta, p, (q, \lambda)))$ is a homeomorphism that extends to a map to their closures. Hence H^i induces an isomorphism of the cohomology groups. Define $\tilde{\text{proj}} : [0, \eta] \times X_\eta^i$ to \bar{P}_η by $\tilde{\text{proj}} = \bar{\text{proj}} \circ H^i$. Then $\bar{\text{proj}}$ is essential iff $\tilde{\text{proj}}$ is and thus $\text{proj} : (X_{[0,\eta]}^i, \partial X_{[0,\eta]}^i) \rightarrow ([0, \eta] \times P, \partial([0, \eta] \times P))$ is essential iff $\tilde{\text{proj}}$ is. Let $\hat{\text{proj}} : [0, \eta] \times X_\eta^j \rightarrow \bar{P}_\eta$ be the map given by $\hat{\text{proj}}(\varepsilon, (\eta, p, (q, \lambda))) = (\varepsilon\eta, P)$ if $\varepsilon > 0$ and 0_P otherwise. Since for each face P^0 of P , there exists F_0^i of F^i such that $h^i((0, \eta_1] \times F_0^i) = \text{proj}^{-1}((0, \eta_1] \times P_0) \cap X_{[0,\eta_1]}^i$, $\hat{\text{proj}}$ is linearly homotopic to $\tilde{\text{proj}}$. Hence the latter map is essential iff the former is. Thus $\text{proj} : (X_{[0,\eta]}^i, \partial X_{[0,\eta]}^i) \rightarrow ([0, \eta] \times P, \partial([0, \eta] \times P))$ is essential iff $\hat{\text{proj}}$ is. Obviously $\hat{\text{proj}}$ is essential iff $\text{proj} : (X_\eta^i, \partial X_\eta^i) \rightarrow (P, \partial P)$ is essential, which proves point (2) of the lemma.

¹⁹In [11] the set E consisted of tuples (ε, p, q) without the induced beliefs, hence this stronger property does not hold in their setup.

To complete the proof, there remains to show that the sets $X_{[0,\eta_0]}^i$ are disjoint. As we saw earlier, the sets $X_{[0,\eta_0]}^i \setminus \partial X_{[0,\eta_0]}^i$ are disjoint. Take then $(\eta, p, (q, \lambda)) \in \partial X_{[0,\eta_0]}^i$ for some i . If it belongs to $X_{[0,\eta_0]}^j$ for some $j \neq i$, then we can find curves $(\eta^i(t), p^i(t), (q^i(t), \lambda^i(t)))$ and $(\eta^j(t), p^j(t), (q^j(t), \lambda^j(t)))$, $t \in [0, 1]$, that lie in $X_{[0,\eta_0]}^i$ and $X_{[0,\eta_0]}^j$, respectively and such that: (a) their values at $t = 0$ equals $(\eta, p, (q, \lambda))$; (b) $p^i(t), p^j(t) \notin \partial E_1$ for all t ; (c) $\eta^i(t) = \eta_j^i(t)$ for all t . For $\alpha \in [0, 1]$, let $p(t; \alpha)$ (resp. $q(t; \alpha)$) be the point in P that is closest to $((p_{a_n}^i(t))^{(1-\alpha)}(p_{a_n}^j(t))^\alpha)_{a_n \in A}$ (resp. $((q_{a_n}^i(t))^{(1-\alpha)}(q_{a_n}^j(t))^\alpha)_{a_n \in A}$) among all p' for which p'_{a_n} equals $(p_{a_n}^i(t))^{(1-\alpha)}(p_{a_n}^j(t))^\alpha$ (resp. $(q_{a_n}^i(t))^{(1-\alpha)}(q_{a_n}^j(t))^\alpha$) for each n, a_n such that $q_{a_n} = \eta p_{n, a_n}$. For small $t > 0$, $p(t; \alpha)$ and $q(t; \alpha)$ are well-defined for all $\alpha \in [0, 1]$. Moreover, the limit as $t \rightarrow 0$ of the sequence $(\eta(t), p(t; \alpha), (q(t; \alpha), \lambda(t; \alpha)))$ is $(\eta, p, (q, \lambda))$ for all α . For each α and small t , there is now a small perturbation of payoffs to $u(t; \alpha)$ that puts this point in $E(u(t; \alpha))$. Moreover $u(t; \alpha)$ can be chosen continuously in (t, α) . In [11] Lemma E.3 was proved using a generic local triviality argument: in a neighborhood U of u , there exist fiber $(F, \partial F)$ and a homeomorphism $h : U \times (F, \partial F) \rightarrow (E(U), \partial E(U))$ such that $\text{proj} \circ h$ is the projection onto the first factor, and the fiber $(F, \partial F)$ is the union of the fibers (F^1, \dots, F^k) . Therefore, for small t and all α , $(\eta(t; \alpha), p(t; \alpha), (q(t; \alpha), \lambda(t; \alpha)))$ belongs to the same component of $(F, \partial F)$, which contradicts the assumption that the two curves are in two different sets. \square

For each $i = 1, \dots, k$, let \mathcal{Q}^i be the set of $(p, (q, \lambda))$ such that $(0, p, (q, \lambda)) \in X_0^i$ and let $\partial \mathcal{Q}^i$ the subset of \mathcal{Q}^i consisting of points $(p, (q, \lambda))$ such that $p \in \partial P$. Since the sets $(X_{[0,\eta_0]}^1, \partial X_{[0,\eta_0]}^1), \dots, (X_{[0,\eta_0]}^k, \partial X_{[0,\eta_0]}^k)$ partition $E_{[0,\eta]}$, by Lemma 8.2 the \mathcal{Q}^i 's are connected sets that are pairwise disjoint.

Lemma 8.3. *If u is generic, then $(\mathcal{Q}, \partial \mathcal{Q}) = \cup_{i=1}^k (\mathcal{Q}^i, \partial \mathcal{Q}^i)$ and for each i , $(\mathcal{Q}^i, \partial \mathcal{Q}^i)$ is a d -pseudomanifold with boundary.*

Proof. Let $\mathcal{Q}^*(u)$ be the set of $(p, (q, \lambda)) \in (P \setminus \partial P) \times (\mathbb{P} \setminus \partial \mathbb{P})$ such that, for every pair (a_m, a_n) , if a_n is not a best reply to (q, λ) in $\Gamma(u)$ then $\lambda(a_m, a_n) \geq \frac{p_m(a_m)}{p_m(a_m) + p_n(a_n)}$. Let $\mathcal{Q}_0(u)$ be the closure of the set of points $(p, (q, \lambda)) \in (P \setminus \partial P) \times \mathbb{P}$ such that there is a sequence $(p^k, (q^k, \lambda^k))$ in $\mathcal{Q}^*(u)$ converging to it against which q is a best reply. We claim that $\mathcal{Q}_0(u)$ is the set of $(p, (q, \lambda))$ such that $(0, p, (q, \lambda))$ belongs to $E_0(u)$. To show that $\mathcal{Q}_0(u)$ is a subset of $E_0(u)$, it is sufficient to show that $(p, (q, \lambda)) \in \mathcal{Q}_0(u)$ with $p \notin \partial P$ belongs to $E_0(u)$, as $\mathcal{Q}_0(u)$ is the closure of such points and $E_0(u)$ is closed. Take such a point $(p, (q, \lambda))$. If $q \in P \setminus \partial P$, then q is a best reply to itself, i.e. a completely mixed equilibrium. Therefore, $(\varepsilon, p, (q, \lambda))$ belongs to E_ε for all small ε and hence $(0, p, (q, \lambda))$ belongs to $E_0(u)$. Suppose

$q \in \partial P$. Then $q \neq p$ and for all large k , $q^k \neq p^k$. For each such k , as q^k and p^k are in $P \setminus \partial P$, there exists a unique $\varepsilon^k \in (0, 1)$ such that $\frac{1}{1-\varepsilon^k}(q^k - \varepsilon^k p^k)$ belongs to ∂P . Then $(\varepsilon^k, p^k, (q^k, \lambda^k))$ belongs to $E(u)$. As q^k converges to q , $\varepsilon^k \rightarrow 0$. Thus we have shown that $\mathcal{Q}_0(u)$ contains only points $(p, (q, \lambda))$ such that $(0, p, (q, \lambda))$ belongs to $E_0(u)$. To prove the reverse inclusion, if $(\varepsilon^k, p^k, (q^k, \lambda^k))$ is a sequence in $E(u)$ converging to $(0, p, (q, \lambda))$ with $p \in \mathbb{P} \setminus \partial \mathbb{P}$, then obviously q is a best reply to (q^k, λ^k) as q^k puts ε weight on suboptimal last actions. Therefore, $(p, (q, \lambda)) \in \mathcal{Q}_0(u)$, implying as well that every point in $E_0(u)$ is also in $\mathcal{Q}_0(u)$, as both sets are closed.

Obviously, $\mathcal{Q}_0(u)$ is contained in $\mathcal{Q}(u)$. Thus, to complete the proof, there remains to show the reverse inclusion and that $\mathcal{Q}(u)$ is a finite union of pseudomanifolds. As we saw earlier, $\partial \mathbb{P}$ is expressible as the union of manifolds $\mathbb{P}(R)$, where the triples $R = (R^0, R^1, R^2)$ partition $\mathcal{L} \cup \mathcal{Z}$. For $R = (\mathcal{L} \cup \mathcal{Z}, \emptyset, \emptyset)$, we have the manifold $\mathbb{P}(R) \equiv \mathbb{P} \setminus \partial \mathbb{P}$. Thus \mathbb{P} is a finite disjoint union of semialgebraic manifolds, $\mathbb{P}(R)$, where R ranges over all triples that either partition $\mathcal{L} \cup \mathcal{Z}$ or is the triple with $R^0 = \mathcal{L} \cup \mathcal{Z}$. Every manifold belongs to the relative interior of a face of P , and letting $d(R)$ be the dimension of $\mathbb{P}(R)$, we have that if $d(R) < d(R')$, $\mathbb{P}(R)$ is either contained in the closure of $\mathbb{P}(R')$ or disjoint from it. Observe that this decomposition of \mathbb{P} depends only on the game tree Γ and not on the payoffs.

Fix a manifold $\mathbb{P}(R)$; and fix a face P^j of P such that if $\mathbb{P}(R) \neq \mathbb{P} \setminus \partial \mathbb{P}$, then the face that contains $\mathbb{P}(R)$ in its interior is a subset of P^j . Let $\mathcal{M}(P^j, \mathbb{P}(R))$ be the set of $(u, (p^*, \lambda)) \in \mathbb{R}^{NZ} \times \mathbb{P}(R)$ such that the strategies in P^j are the best replies to (p^*, λ) . Clearly, $\mathcal{M}(P^j, \mathbb{P}(R))$ is a semialgebraic manifold of dimension $NZ + d(R) - \dim(P^j)$. Suppose $(u, (p^*, \lambda)) \in \mathcal{M}(P^j, \mathbb{P}(R))$ and $\mathbb{P}(R')$ contains $\mathbb{P}(R)$ in its closure with $\mathbb{P}(R')$ also belonging to the face P^j if it does not equal $\mathbb{P} \setminus \partial \mathbb{P}$. If we have a sequence (p^k, λ^k) converging to (p^*, λ) such that (p^k, λ^k) belongs to $\mathbb{P}(R')$ for all k , then, as in [16] we can construct a sequence $u^k \rightarrow u$ such that $(u^k, (p^k, \lambda^k))$ belongs to $\mathcal{M}(P^j, \mathbb{P}(R'))$ for all k . Thus, $\mathcal{M}(P^j, \mathbb{P}(R))$ belongs to the closure of $\mathcal{M}(P^j, \mathbb{P}(R'))$ if $\mathbb{P}(R)$ belongs to the closure of $\mathbb{P}(R')$. Similarly, if $P^{j'}$ is a face of P^j that also contains $\mathbb{P}(R)$, then $\mathcal{M}(P^{j'}, \mathbb{P}(R))$ contains $\mathcal{M}(P^j, \mathbb{P}(R))$ in its closure.

For each $u \in \mathbb{R}^{NZ}$, if we let $M(P^j, \mathbb{P}(R), u)$ be the set of (p^*, λ) such that $(u, (p^*, \lambda)) \in \mathcal{M}(P^j, \mathbb{P}(R))$, then by Generic Local Triviality (loc. cit.) for all u outside of a closed semialgebraic subset $U(P^j, \mathbb{P}(R))$, $M(P^j, \mathbb{P}(R), u)$ is a semi-algebraic manifold of dimension $d(R) - \dim(P^j)$, and the sets $M(P^j, \mathbb{P}(R), u)$ and $M(P^j, \mathbb{P}(R), u')$ are homeomorphic for u and u' belonging to the same connected component of $\mathbb{R}^{NZ} \setminus U(P^j, \mathbb{P}(R))$. If u does not belong to $U(P^j, \mathbb{P}(R))$ for any pair $(P^j, \mathbb{P}(R))$, then: (1) each $M(P^j, \mathbb{P}(R), u)$ is a manifold of dimension $d(R) - \dim(P^j)$; (2) if $M(P^j, \mathbb{P}(R), u)$ is nonempty for some $(P^j, \mathbb{P}(R))$, then

for each $\mathbb{P}(R')$ (respectively $P^{j'}$) whose closure contains $\mathbb{P}(R)$ (resp. that is a face of P^j) the closure of $M(P^j, \mathbb{P}(R'), u)$ (resp. $M(P^{j'}, \mathbb{P}(R), u)$) contains $M(P^j, \mathbb{P}(R), u)$.

Fix a manifold $\mathbb{P}(R)$; a nonempty face P^j of P ; let \tilde{P}^j be any (possibly empty) face of P^j . Let $\mathcal{Q}(P^j, \mathbb{P}(R), \tilde{P}^j, u)$ be the set of $(p, (p^*, \lambda)) \in (P \setminus \partial P) \times \mathbb{P}(R)$ such that: (1) $(p^*, \lambda) \in M(P^j, \mathbb{P}(R), u)$; (2) if a_n is not a best reply, then $\lambda(a_m, a_n) > \frac{p_m(a_m)}{p_m(a_m) + p_n(a_n)}$ iff a_m is a best reply and has zero probability on the face \tilde{P}^j . Obviously, $\mathcal{Q}(P^j, \mathbb{P}(R), \tilde{P}^j, u)$ is nonempty only if \tilde{P}^j is not a face of the face of P that contains $\mathbb{P}(R)$ in its relative interior.

$\mathcal{Q}(u)$ is the closure of the union of the sets $\mathcal{Q}(P^j, \mathbb{P}(R), \tilde{P}^j, u)$ as we range over all triples $(P^j, \mathbb{P}(R), \tilde{P}^j)$ with $\mathbb{P}(R) \neq P \setminus \partial P$. By Property (2) of the last paragraph, if u does not belong to $U(P^j, \mathbb{P}(R))$ for any $(P^j, \mathbb{P}(R))$, then if $(p, (p^*, \lambda))$ belongs to $\mathcal{Q}(P^j, \mathbb{P}(R), \tilde{P}^j, u)$ with $\mathbb{P}(R) \neq P \setminus \partial P$, there is a sequence $(p^k(q^k, \lambda))$ converging to it that belongs to $\mathcal{Q}^*(u)$. Hence $\mathcal{Q}(u)$ is contained in $\mathcal{Q}_0(u)$. To finish the proof we have to show that $\mathcal{Q}(u)$ is a pseudomanifold, for which it is sufficient to show that each of the sets $\mathcal{Q}(P^j, \mathbb{P}(R), \tilde{P}^j, u)$ belongs to the closure of one with dimension d ; and that if the dimension of one is $d - 1$ it belongs to the closure of exactly two such d -manifolds.

Fix $P^j, \mathbb{P}(R), \tilde{P}^j$. As we saw, $M(P^j, \mathbb{P}(R), u)$ is $(d(R) - \dim(P^j))$ -dimensional. For each $(p^*, \lambda) \in M(P^j, \mathbb{P}(R), u)$, the set of p such $(p, (p^*, \lambda))$ belongs to $\mathcal{Q}(P^j, \mathbb{P}(R), \tilde{P}^j, u)$ is a manifold of dimension $\dim(P^j) - \dim(\tilde{P}^j)$, with the convention that $\dim(\tilde{P}^j)$ is -1 (resp. 0) if \tilde{P}^j is an empty set and $\dim(P^j) < d$ (resp. $\dim(P^j) = d$). Thus, $\mathcal{Q}(P^j, \mathbb{P}(R), \tilde{P}^j, u)$ is a manifold of dimension $d(R) - \dim(\tilde{P}^j)$. If $d(R) = d$, or $d(R) = d - 1$ and \tilde{P}^j is empty, then dimension of $\mathcal{Q}(P^j, \mathbb{P}(R), \tilde{P}^j) = d$ and we are done. If $d(R) < d - 1$ or \tilde{P}^j is nonempty, there is a $(d - 1)$ -dimensional manifold $\mathbb{P}(\hat{R})$ that is contained in the interior of the same face, call it \hat{P}^j , that contains $\mathbb{P}(R)$ and that has $\mathbb{P}(R)$ in its closure. $\mathcal{Q}(P^j, \mathbb{P}(R), \tilde{P}^j)$ is then contained in the closure of the d -dimensional manifold $\mathcal{Q}(\hat{P}^j, \mathbb{P}(\hat{R}), \emptyset)$. Finally, if $d(R) - \dim(\tilde{P}^j)$ is $(d - 1)$ -dimensional, to show that it belongs to the closure of two d -manifolds, observe first that, then, either $d(R) = d - 1$ and \tilde{P}^j is a singleton or $d(R) = d - 2$ and \tilde{P}^j is empty. As we saw, there is a $\mathbb{P}(\hat{R})$ in the same face \hat{P}^j that contains $\mathcal{Q}(P^j, \mathbb{P}(R), \tilde{P}^j)$ in its closure. If \tilde{P}^j is a singleton, there is also a $(d - 1)$ -dimensional $\mathbb{P}(\check{R})$ in the face \check{P}^j spanned by \hat{P}^j and \tilde{P}^j such that $\mathcal{Q}(P^j, \mathbb{P}(R), \tilde{P}^j)$ is in the closure of $\mathcal{Q}(\check{P}^j, \mathbb{P}(\check{R}), \emptyset)$; if \tilde{P}^j is empty, then there is another $(d - 1)$ -dimensional manifold $\mathbb{P}(\check{R})$ in the relative interior of a face \hat{P}^j that has $\mathbb{P}(R)$ as a face, and then $\mathcal{Q}(P^j, \mathbb{P}(R), \tilde{P}^j)$ is in the closure of $\mathcal{Q}(\check{P}^j, \mathbb{P}(\check{R}), \emptyset)$, which completes the proof. \square

Lemma 8.4. *For each i and all small $0 < \eta \leq \eta_0$, $\text{proj} : (X_\eta^i, \partial X_\eta^i) \rightarrow (P, \partial P)$ is essential iff $\text{proj} : (\mathcal{Q}^i, \partial \mathcal{Q}^i) \rightarrow (P, \partial P)$ is.*

Proof. For $0 < \eta \leq 1$, and $\varepsilon = 0, \eta$, letting $i_\varepsilon : (\{\varepsilon\} \times P, \{\varepsilon\} \times \partial P) \rightarrow ([0, \eta] \times P, [0, \eta] \times \partial P)$, we have an isomorphism $i_{\varepsilon, d} : H_d(\{\varepsilon\} \times P, \{\varepsilon\} \times \partial P) \approx H_d([0, \eta] \times P, [0, \eta] \times \partial P) \approx \mathbb{Z}$ in dimension d . With respect to the set X^i , let $\bar{\partial}X_{[0, \eta]}^i$ be the set of $(\varepsilon, p, (q, \lambda)) \in X_{[0, \eta]}^i$ such that $p \in \partial P$, and for $\varepsilon = 0, \eta$, let $i_\varepsilon : (X_\varepsilon^i, \partial X_\varepsilon^i) \rightarrow (X_{[0, \eta]}^i, \bar{\partial}X_{[0, \eta]}^i)$ be the inclusion map. Then $i_{0, d}(H_d(X_0^i, \partial X_0^i)) = i_{1, d}(H_d(X_\eta^i, \partial X_\eta^i)) \approx \mathbb{Z}$ as well.²⁰ Therefore, $\text{proj} : (X_0, \partial X_0) \rightarrow (P, \partial P)$ is essential in homology iff $\text{proj} : (X_\eta, \partial X_\eta) \rightarrow (P, \partial P)$. Finally, the essentiality of projection in homology is equivalent to the essentiality of projection in cohomology. \square

We are ready to assemble the lemmas to prove Proposition 8.1. It follows from Lemma E.3 of [11] that a subset Σ^* is stable iff there exists X^i such that: (1) $\pi(\Sigma^*)$ is the set of p^* for which there exists a point $(0, p, (p^*, \lambda)) \in X_0^i$; and (2) the projection from $(X_{[0, \eta]}^i, \partial X_{[0, \eta]}^i) \rightarrow ([0, \eta] \times P, \partial([0, \eta] \times \partial P))$ is essential in cohomology. By Lemma 8.3, condition (1) here is the same as the requirement that $\pi(\Sigma^*)$ be the set of q such that $(p, (q, \lambda)) \in \mathcal{Q}^i$. By Lemma 8.2, condition (2) is the same as the requirement that the projection $\text{proj} : (X_\eta^i, \partial X_\eta^i) \rightarrow (P, \partial P)$ be essential. By Lemma 8.4, this requirement is the same as asking for $\text{proj} : (\mathcal{Q}^i, \partial \mathcal{Q}^i) \rightarrow (P, \partial P)$ to be essential.

9. PROOF OF THEOREM 6.1

Theorem 6, Section 3, of Mertens [20] shows that a stable set contains a proper equilibrium. A proper equilibrium is equivalent to a quasi-perfect equilibrium in the extensive-form representation of the game. Therefore, stability satisfies Axiom B. In the appendix we show that stability satisfies Axioms D^* and I^* . Here we prove the second statement of Theorem 6.1, which is that any solution concept satisfying Axioms B, D^* , and I^* must select from among its stable outcomes when the game is generic.

Fix now a generic game $\Gamma(u)$ and a component Σ^* of its equilibria. Let P^* be the corresponding set of enabling strategies. Suppose Σ^* does not contain a stable set. Fix a solution concept φ that satisfies Axiom D^* and I^* and that picks a solution contained in Σ^* . We show in a sequence of steps that φ fails Axiom B.

Step 1—Fixed-Point Preliminaries. Denote by $(\mathcal{Q}^*, \partial \mathcal{Q}^*)$ the union of the manifolds $(\mathcal{Q}^j, \partial \mathcal{Q}^j)$ such that for each $(p, (q, \lambda)) \in \mathcal{Q}^j$, $q \in P^*$. Since Σ^* does not contain a stable set, the projection map $\text{proj} : (\mathcal{Q}^*, \partial \mathcal{Q}^*) \rightarrow (P, \partial P)$ is inessential in cohomology. By the Theorem in Section 4 of Mertens [21] it is inessential in homotopy. Therefore, by Lemma

²⁰It is not difficult to show that these maps are isomorphisms as well.

A.2 of Govindan and Wilson [11] there exists a map $f : \mathcal{Q}^* \rightarrow P$ that does not have a point of coincidence with $\text{proj} : \mathcal{Q}^* \rightarrow P$. We can assume that f maps \mathcal{Q}^* into $P \setminus \partial P$: indeed, for a small $\varepsilon > 0$ and $p^0 \in P \setminus \partial P$, the map $(1 - \varepsilon)f + \varepsilon p^0$ does not have a point of coincidence with proj if f does not, and its image is contained in the interior of P . We exploit the function f to first construct a strong embedding of $\Gamma(u)$ and then add some dominated strategies such that the resulting game has no quasi-perfect equilibrium that projects to an equilibrium in P^* .

Observe that for any $(p, (q, \lambda)) \in P \times \mathbb{P}$, the vector λ of conditional probabilities already has all the information required to compute q , i.e. the projection from $P \times \mathbb{P}$ to $\mathcal{P} \equiv P \times [0, 1]^{\mathcal{L} \cup \mathcal{Z}}$ is a homeomorphism onto its image $\hat{\mathcal{P}} \subsetneq \mathcal{P}$. Therefore, we can view \mathcal{Q}^* as a subset of \mathcal{P} and f as being defined from this set to P . For any point $(p, \lambda) \in \hat{\mathcal{P}}$, we use $q(\lambda)$ to denote the enabling strategy defined by λ .

The map f can be extended to the whole of \mathcal{P} such that, letting proj still be the natural projection onto P : there is no point of coincidence between f and proj in a neighborhood U of \mathcal{Q}^* ; and f maps \mathcal{P} into $P \setminus \partial P$. In particular, there exist $U \subset \mathcal{P}$ and $\delta > 0$ such that: (1) U contains the 2δ -neighborhood of \mathcal{Q}^* ; (2) $\|f(p, (q, \lambda)), p'\|_\infty > 2\delta$ for all $(p, (q, \lambda)) \in \mathcal{P}$ and $p' \in \partial P$; (3) $\|f(p, \lambda), p\|_\infty > 2\delta$ for all $(p, \lambda) \in U$.

For each $\varepsilon > 0$, let \mathcal{Q}^ε be the set of $(p, \lambda) \in P \times \hat{\mathcal{P}}$ such that: (1) $q(\lambda) \in P^*$ and it is a best reply to $(q(\lambda), \lambda)$; (2) if a_n is not an ε -best reply to $(q(\lambda), \lambda)$ then for each a_m , $\lambda(a_m, a_n) \geq \frac{p_m(a_m)}{p_m(a_m) + p_n(a_n)}$. There exists $\varepsilon > 0$ small enough such that \mathcal{Q}^ε is contained in the δ -neighborhood of \mathcal{Q}^* .

Step 2—Triangulations. Take a simplicial triangulation $\mathcal{K}(P)$ of P such that the diameter of each simplex is less than δ . \mathcal{P} is a product space $P \times [0, 1]^{\mathcal{L} \cup \mathcal{Z}}$ and therefore we can take a multisimplicial triangulation $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{P})$ of \mathcal{P} such that the diameter of each multisimplex is less than δ and such that there is a multisimplicial approximation $g : \mathcal{P} \rightarrow P$ to f when \mathcal{P} is the space of $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{P})$ and the range is the space of $\mathcal{K}(P)$ (see Appendix B of Govindan and Wilson [10]). Then, for every $(p, \lambda) \in \mathcal{P}$, $g(p, \lambda)$ belongs to a simplex that does not intersect ∂P ; and for no (p, λ) in a multisimplex that intersects \mathcal{Q}^ε does there exist a simplex K of \mathcal{K} that contains both $g(p, \lambda)$ and p . Let $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{P})$ be a polyhedral subdivision of $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{P})$. Let $\gamma : \mathcal{P} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ be a piecewise-linear convex function that is linear precisely on the polyhedra of $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{P})$ —see Appendix B of [10] for details on how to construct such a function. With these preliminaries out of the way, we are ready to construct an embedding of Γ .

Step 3—A Family of Embeddings. We construct a family of strong embeddings of G . The procedure involves first adding a signaling game Γ^o that is completely independent of Γ and which has a unique equilibrium component.

In the signaling game Γ^o , there are N types for the sender, indexed $o_n, n \in \mathcal{N}$, and there is a receiver, called o_{N+1} . The distribution over the types of the sender is uniform. The sender has two signals, h and l . The game ends if signal h is sent, with the sender, independent of his type, and the receiver receiving a payoff of N (the receiver's payoff here is irrelevant). After observing a signal of l , the receiver has N possible responses, indexed r_1, \dots, r_N . If the receiver chooses r_n , then: (1) type o_n receives a payoff of 0 from l while all types receive a payoff of $N + 1$ from l ; (2) the receiver receives a payoff of 1 if l was sent by type o_n and receives 0 otherwise. We will view Γ^o as an $(N + 1)$ -person game, with player set O : each type of the sender is treated as a separate player, i.e. we will use the agent normal form of the game.

Γ^o has a unique equilibrium component, where all types of player 1 pool in sending h . Every equilibrium is sequential, but the beliefs at the receiver's information set following a message of l is unique across all the equilibria, and it assigns equal probability to all types.

We construct a family of games $\tilde{G}(p)$, indexed by $p \in P$, that are derived from the product game $\Gamma \times \Gamma^o$ in two steps. Fix $p \in P$ and consider first the following game $\tilde{G}^1(p)$. The senders o_n move first, then the players in \mathcal{N} play their game G in normal form, and finally the receiver moves. Each player n is told if player o_n has chosen h or not. If o_n chose h , then n has access to all his strategies and chooses a pure strategy $s_n \in S_n$; otherwise, the mixed strategy equivalent to the enabling strategy p_n is automatically implemented. Finally, the receiver moves if one of the senders has chosen l . The game $\tilde{G}^1(p)$ strongly embeds G for each $p \in P$. By Axiom I^* , there is a solution of $\tilde{G}^1(p)$ that projects to a subset of Σ^* .

Step 4—Adding Weakly Dominated Strategies. Now we modify $\tilde{G}^1(p)$ to obtain the game $\tilde{G}(p)$ as follows. Each player n chooses a strategy $s_n \in S_n$ in two stages. In the first stage, he makes a provisional choice of a strategy s_n . In the second stage, following the choice of an s_n , he gets an opportunity to revise his choice. If he does not want to revise his strategy, then s_n is implemented. If he wants to change his choice, he gets an opportunity to choose one of a finite set of strategies labeled (t_n, h_n) , where $t_n \in S_n$ and h_n is an information set enabled by t_n . Choosing (t_n, h_n) has the following consequences. (1) It gives n the same payoff as choosing t_n except that it is reduced by ε at nodes following h_n (where ε is the positive number chosen at the end of Step 1); (2) from the perspective of players $m \neq n$, the strategy (t_n, h_n) implements p_n ; (3) player o_n 's choice of h in the signaling game Γ^o is nullified and l is chosen instead.

If $p \notin \partial P$, then we claim that the set of Nash equilibria of $\tilde{G}(p)$ is the same as that of $\Gamma \times \Gamma^o$. Indeed, if some player n plays some (t, h_n) with positive probability in an equilibrium $\tilde{\sigma}$ of $\tilde{G}(p)$, then for each m who does not play a (t, h_m) with positive probability, the corresponding receiver o_m must play l with positive probability, implying that every information set of Γ that is enabled by (t, h_n) is reached with positive probability and (t, h_n) would be an inferior reply. Thus, in no equilibrium of $\tilde{G}(p)$ does a player $n \in \mathcal{N}$ use a dominated strategy (t_n, h_n) . By Axiom D^* , therefore, the solutions of G are the projections of the solutions of $\tilde{G}(p)$ for each $p \notin \partial P$.

Step 5—Adding More Players. Over the next three steps, we construct a game \bar{G} by adding a set \bar{O} of players to $\mathcal{N} \cup O$, which is the set of players in the game $G \times G^0$. \bar{O} consists of the following players: three players, denoted \bar{o}_0, \bar{o}_1 , and \bar{o}_2 ; for each $(a_n, a_m) \in \mathcal{L}$, a player \bar{o}_{a_n, a_m} ; and for each $(n, z_1, z_2) \in \mathcal{Z}$, a player \bar{o}_{n, z_1, z_2} .

The pure strategy sets of the players in \bar{O} are defined by making use of the triangulations constructed in Step 2 and are as follows. Outsider \bar{o}_0 chooses a full-dimensional polyhedron $T(\mathcal{P})$ of $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{P})$. \bar{o}_1 and \bar{o}_2 choose a vertex of \mathcal{K} , which is a triangulation of P . The other outsiders choose a vertex of the triangulation of their copy $[0, 1]$ (in the multisimplicial triangulation $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{P})$) corresponding to the coordinate (which is either (a_m, a_n) or (n, z_1, z_2)). For each outsider \bar{o} , we use $\bar{S}_{\bar{o}}$ and $\bar{\Sigma}_{\bar{o}}$ to denote his pure and mixed strategy sets, respectively.

Step 6—Timing of the Moves. For each outsider \bar{o}_i , $i = 1, 2$, a pure strategy $\bar{s}_{\bar{o}_i}$ corresponds to a point $\phi_{\bar{o}_i}(\bar{s}_{\bar{o}_i}) \equiv p \in P$ with $\phi_{\bar{o}_i, n} \in P_n$ being the coordinates of A_n . Hence there exists a unique affine extension of this function to $\bar{\Sigma}_{\bar{o}_i}$, denoted still by $\phi_{\bar{o}_i}$. Likewise, for each i of the form (a_m, a_n) or (n, z_1, z_2) , there is an affine function $\phi_i : \bar{\Sigma}_{\bar{o}_i} \rightarrow [0, 1]$. We use $\phi_{-\bar{o}_2}$ to denote the collection all these functions other than $\phi_{\bar{o}_2}$ and view $\phi_{-\bar{o}_2}$ as a function from $\Sigma_{\bar{O}}$, the mixed strategy space of the players in \bar{O} , to \mathcal{P} .

The timing of the game in the extensive form $\bar{\Gamma}$ of \bar{G} is as follows. Players in \bar{O} play simultaneously and ahead of the other players. The players $\mathcal{N} \cup O$ then play their game unaware of the choices of the players in \bar{O} and their strategy sets are as in the game $\tilde{G}(p)$ (for any p). The choice of outsider \bar{o}_1 determines which of the games $\tilde{G}(p)$ is actually played by the players in $\mathcal{N} \cup O$, i.e. if he chooses a pure strategy $\bar{s}_{\bar{o}_1}$ then the game played is $\tilde{G}(\phi_{\bar{o}_1}(\bar{s}_{\bar{o}_1}))$.

Step 7—Payoffs of the Outsiders. Let \bar{S} be the set of pure strategy profiles of \bar{G} and let $\bar{\Sigma}$ be the set of mixed strategy profiles. For each n , each profile \bar{s} induces a point $q_n \equiv \psi_n(\bar{s})$ as follows: $q_n = \phi_{\bar{o}_1, n}(\bar{s}_{\bar{o}_1})$ if $o_n = l$ or $\bar{s}_n = (t_n, h_n)$ for some (t_n, h_n) ; otherwise it equals $\pi_n(\bar{s}_n)$, the enabling strategy equivalent to \bar{s}_n . Likewise, each profile \bar{s} also induces a strategy

$s_{o_n} = \psi_{o_n}(\bar{s})$ of player o_n : $s_{o_n} = l$ if $\bar{s}_{o_n} = l$ or $\bar{s}_n = (t_n, h_n)$ for some (t_n, h_n) ; otherwise it is h . The maps ψ_n and ψ_{o_n} extend multilinearly to the whole of $\bar{\Sigma}$.

We now describe the payoffs of the outsiders. o_0 's payoff function depends on the choices of players in $\bar{O} \setminus \{\bar{o}_2\}$. Fix a full-dimensional polyhedron T of $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{P})$. Recall from Step 2 that we have a piecewise-linear function $\gamma : \mathcal{P} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ that is linear precisely on the polyhedra of $\mathcal{T}(P)$. The restriction of γ to T is therefore linear, and it has a unique extension γ_T to the whole of \mathcal{P} . Given a strategy profile \bar{s} for the outsiders where $\bar{s}_{\bar{o}_0}$ is T , o_0 's payoff from choosing T is $\gamma_T(\phi_{-\bar{o}_2})$.

Player \bar{o}_1 's payoff depends on his choice and that of player \bar{o}_2 . If he chooses a vertex v and \bar{o}_2 chooses w , then his payoff is one if $v = w$ and zero otherwise. Thus, \bar{o}_1 wants to mimic \bar{o}_2 .

Player \bar{o}_{a_m, a_n} 's payoffs depend on the relative probabilities of these last actions for the original players. Given a profile \bar{s} , then letting $\lambda = \phi_{\bar{o}_{a_m, a_n}}(\bar{s}_{\bar{o}_{a_m, a_n}})$, $q_m = \phi_m(\bar{s})$, and $q_n = \psi_n(\bar{s})$, \bar{o}_{a_m, a_n} 's payoff is $2\lambda_m q_m(a_m) + 2(1 - \lambda_m)q_n(a_n) - (\lambda^2 + (1 - \lambda)^2)(q_m(a_n) + q_n(a_n))$. Player \bar{o}_{n, z_1, z_2} 's payoffs are defined exactly like those of \bar{o}_{a_m, a_n} , but using instead of q_m and q_n , the probabilities $q_{-n}(z_1)$ and $q_{-n}(z_2)$.

Finally player \bar{o}_2 's payoff depends on all the other outsiders. Suppose \bar{o}_2 chooses a vertex w . If \bar{o}_0 chooses a polyhedron T , there exists a multisimplex L that contains T . Let $u_2(\cdot, w, T)$ be the function on the vertex set of L that assigns one to a vertex v if w is the image of v under g and zero otherwise. $u_2(\cdot, w, T)$ extends uniquely to a multilinear function on the whole of \mathcal{P} . Given a profile \bar{s} , if $\bar{s}_{\bar{o}_0}$ is a polyhedron T of o_0 , the payoff to w is $u_2(\phi_{-\bar{o}_2}(\bar{s}), w, T)$.

Step 8—The Relationship between \mathbf{G} and $\bar{\mathbf{G}}$. The game, call it \hat{G} , obtained from \bar{G} by deleting the dominated strategies (t_n, h_n) of each player n strongly embeds Γ as well as the signaling game Γ^0 . By Axiom I^* , there is a solution of \hat{G} that projects to a subset of Σ^* and to a subset the unique equilibrium component of Γ^0 . In the game \bar{G} , Player o_2 's pure strategies that are best replies to a profile are all vertices of simplices that are contained in $P \setminus \partial P$. Hence, in any equilibrium $\bar{\sigma}$, $\phi_{\bar{o}_2}(\bar{\sigma}_{\bar{o}_2}) \in P \setminus \partial P$. As o_1 mimics o_2 , $\bar{p} \equiv \phi_{\bar{o}_1}(\bar{\sigma}_{\bar{o}_1}) \in P \setminus \partial P$ as well. As we saw in Step 4, the game $\tilde{G}(\bar{p})$ does not have an equilibrium where an insider plays a dominated strategy. Therefore, by Axiom D^* , the solutions of \bar{G} project to solutions of \hat{G} .

Step 9—Failure of Axiom B. Since the solution concept φ picks a subset of Σ^* as a solution of G , and since it satisfies Axioms D^* and I^* , there is a solution $\bar{\Sigma}^*$ of \bar{G} that projects to a subset of Σ^* . To complete the proof of Theorem 6.1, we will show that $\bar{\Sigma}^*$ does not contain a profile that is equivalent to a quasi-perfect equilibrium of $\bar{\Gamma}$. Suppose to

the contrary that there is a backward induction equilibrium in $\bar{\Sigma}^*$. Then there is a quasi-perfect equilibrium \bar{b} in behavioral strategies of \bar{G} such that letting $\bar{\sigma}$ be the equivalent mixed strategy profile, we have that $\psi_{\mathcal{N}}(\bar{\sigma}) \in P^*$. Let $\bar{\sigma}^\eta$ be a sequence of η -quasi perfect equilibria converging to $\bar{\sigma}$. For each η , let $q^\eta = \psi_{\mathcal{N}}(\bar{\sigma}^\eta)$, $p^\eta = \phi_{\bar{o}_1}(\bar{\sigma}_{\bar{o}_1}^\eta)$, and $\tilde{\sigma}_O^\eta = \psi_O(\bar{\sigma}^\eta)$. Also, for each n and η , we can express $\bar{\sigma}_n$ as a convex combination $(1 - \zeta^\eta)(\tilde{\sigma}^\eta) + \zeta^\eta \bar{\tau}_n^\eta$ where $\tilde{\sigma}^\eta$ has as its support the original strategy set S_n and $\bar{\tau}_n^\eta$ has as its support the strategies (t_n, h_n) . For each n , then, q_n^η is of the form $(1 - \tilde{\sigma}_{o_n}^\eta(l))\tilde{q}_n^\eta + \tilde{\sigma}_{o_n}^\eta(l)p_n^\eta$, where $\tilde{q}_n = \pi_n(\tilde{\sigma}_n^\eta)$. Let q and p be the limits of q^η and p^η , resp. Let λ^η be the conditional probabilities induced by q^η and, if necessary by going to a subsequence, let λ be its limit.

If a strategy s_n of player n is not ε -optimal against $\bar{\sigma}^\eta$, then at the stage where he is considering playing s_n or one of the dominated strategies (t_n, h_n) , he would assign zero probability to s_n under \bar{b} . Therefore, for each n and each action a_n that is not ε -optimal against λ , $\lim_{\eta \rightarrow 0} \frac{\tilde{q}_n^\eta(a_n)}{\tilde{\sigma}_{o_n}^\eta(l)} = 0$. For each pair m, n , $\tilde{\sigma}_{o_m}^\eta(l) = \tilde{\sigma}_{o_n}^\eta(l)$ all along the sequence, since otherwise one of the responses, say r_n , is not optimal against $\bar{\sigma}^\eta$, implying that l is a better response for o_n than h , which is impossible. Putting these two facts together, for each m, n and action a_n that is not optimal,

$$\lim_{\eta \rightarrow 0} \frac{(1 - \tilde{\sigma}_{o_m}^\eta(l))\tilde{q}_m^\eta + \tilde{\sigma}_{o_m}^\eta(l)p_m^\eta}{(1 - \tilde{\sigma}_{o_n}^\eta(l))\tilde{q}_n^\eta + \tilde{\sigma}_{o_n}^\eta(l)p_n^\eta} \geq \lim_{\eta \rightarrow 0} \frac{\tilde{\sigma}_{o_m}^\eta(l)p_m^\eta}{(1 - \tilde{\sigma}_{o_n}^\eta(l))\tilde{q}_n^\eta + \tilde{\sigma}_{o_n}^\eta(l)p_n^\eta} = \frac{p_m(a_m)}{p_n(a_n)},$$

showing that $(p, (q, \lambda)) \in \mathcal{Q}^\varepsilon$.

For each (a_m, a_n) , letting $\bar{\lambda}(a_m, a_n) = \phi_{\bar{o}_{a_m, a_n}}(\bar{\sigma}_{\bar{o}_{a_m, a_n}})$, the payoff structure implies that $\bar{\lambda}(a_m, a_n)$ is within δ of $\lambda(a_m, a_n)$. A similar conclusion holds for the players \bar{o}_{n, z_1, z_2} . Thus $(p, \bar{\lambda})$ belong to U . The support of \bar{o}_0 's strategy $\bar{s}_{\bar{o}_0}$ is a subset of the polyhedra containing $(p, \bar{\lambda})$. Therefore, the support of o_2 's strategy is contained in the set of vertices that are in the support of $g(p, \bar{\lambda})$ in the triangulation $\mathcal{K}(P)$. We now have that o_1 would mimic o_2 , implying that p belongs to the simplex of vertices in the support of o_2 's strategy. Consequently, $g(p, \bar{\lambda})$ and p belong to a simplex, which is impossible. Therefore, $\bar{\Sigma}^*$ does not contain a backward induction equilibrium. Thus φ fails Axiom B, implying that Σ^* does not contain a φ -solution of G .

10. A CHARACTERIZATION OF ESSENTIALITY

In this section we provide a characterization of essentiality, which is then used in the next section to prove Theorem 6.3. The ideas in these two sections mirror those in the last three sections but are adapted to deal with payoff—rather than strategy—perturbations. Also, we work with behavioral—rather than enabling—strategies.

Conceptually, our characterization is similar to the one that Pahl and Pimienta [28] obtain for the two-player case. In a generic extensive-form game, the index of a component can be computed as the product of the indices of two fixed-point problems: one for the pruned game obtained by deleting all paths that are not in the support of the outcome; and another that captures off-the-equilibrium-path behavior of the best-reply correspondence. The index under the first problem is always ± 1 ; thus, the essentiality of the component depends on the second problem. In the two-person case, unlike here, Pahl and Pimienta are able to decompose this latter problem into two subproblems—called “excluded games”—analyzing the strategic interaction that occurs after just one of the two players deviates.

Let $\Gamma(u)$ be an extensive form game. Let $\text{BR}^\Gamma : B \rightarrow B$ be the best-reply correspondence of $\Gamma(u)$ in behavioral strategies. BR^Γ is a contractible-valued correspondence with nonempty, compact and convex values. Therefore, one can assign an index $\text{Ind}(B^*)$ to each component of equilibria in behavioral strategies. Let G be the normal form of $\Gamma(u)$. We know that we have an index for each component Σ^* of equilibria in mixed strategies. The following proposition shows that there is a 1-1 correspondence between the components of equilibria in these two representations and that their indices agree.²¹ As a matter of notation, for each component Σ^* of equilibria of G , let $B(\Sigma^*)$ be the set of behavioral strategy profiles that are equivalent to some profile in Σ^* .

Proposition 10.1. *The components of equilibria in behavioral strategies of the extensive form are of the form $B(\Sigma^*)$ where Σ^* is a component of equilibria of G . Furthermore, $\text{Ind}(\Sigma^*) = \text{Ind}(B(\Sigma^*))$ for each component Σ^* of equilibria of G .*

Proof. The components of equilibria in enabling strategies are in a 1-1 correspondence with the components of equilibria of the normal form and their indices coincide under this identification—cf. Proposition 3.10 in [27]. Thus it is sufficient to show the claim replacing mixed strategies with enabling strategies in its statement.

For each component P^* of equilibria in enabling strategies, let $B(P^*)$ be the set of behavioral strategy profiles that are equivalent to it. Let $\phi : B \rightarrow P$ be the map that sends behavioral strategies to equivalent enabling strategies. Then for each component B^* of equilibria of $\Gamma(u)$, $\phi(B^*)$ is a connected set of equilibria and is contained in a component P^* of equilibria. Obviously, $B(P^*)$ contains B^* . To prove the first statement, then, it is sufficient to show that $B(P^*)$ is connected for a component P^* . For each $\varepsilon > 0$, let U^ε be the ε -neighborhood of P^* . There is a homeomorphism map $\psi : P \setminus \partial P \rightarrow B \setminus \partial P$ that sends p to

²¹This result is certainly part of the folklore of the subject, but we are recording it here since we need it and have not seen it in print.

an equivalent profile $\psi(p)$ of behavioral strategies. For each ε , the closure B^ε of $\psi(U^\varepsilon \setminus \partial P)$ is a connected set that contains $B(P^*)$. Since $B(P^*)$ is $\lim_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} B^\varepsilon$, it is connected.

To prove the second statement, take a component P^* of equilibria. Take a neighborhood U of P^* that is disjoint from the other components. Let V be the closure of $\psi(U \setminus \partial P)$, where ψ is as in the previous paragraph. V is a neighborhood of $B(\Sigma^*)$ that is disjoint from the other components. Fix $\varepsilon > 0$ and let B^ε be the set of $b \in B$ such that for each n , $a_n, b_{n,a_n} \geq \varepsilon$. Let P^ε be the set of enabling strategies p such that $\psi(p) \in B^\varepsilon$. P^ε is then a polyhedron. Use $\text{BR}^{P^\varepsilon}$ (resp. $\text{BR}^{\Gamma, \varepsilon}$) to denote the best-reply correspondence with this restricted strategy space. If ε is small, the index of P^* (resp. $B(\Sigma^*)$) can be computed as the index of $\text{BR}^{P^\varepsilon}$ (resp. $\text{BR}^{\Gamma, \varepsilon}$) over U (resp. V). The result now follows as ψ is homeomorphism that commutes with the best reply correspondences. \square

There is a convex-valued selection of BR^Γ that is useful for this section. For each b and each information set h_n of n that is reachable by b_{-n} (if n chooses all actions leading to h_n), as beliefs are well-defined there, say that an action $a_n \in A_n(h_n)$ is optimal if there is a continuation strategy at h_n that is optimal given his beliefs at h_n and in which he chooses a_n . Then $\text{BR}(b)$ assigns to each information set the set of mixtures over optimal actions against b_{-n} . The fixed points of BR are a subset of the set of Nash equilibria.²²

Let B^* be a component of equilibria in behavioral strategies of a game $\Gamma(u)$ and denote its index by $\text{Ind}(B^*)$. We assume that u is generic so that every equilibrium in B^* induces the same outcome, and hence the equilibrium payoff of each player n , call it v_n^* , is unique. For each n , let H_n^+ be the set of information sets of player n that are reached with positive probability under the equilibria of B^* . For each n , the mixture at each information set in H_n^+ is constant across all equilibria in B^* . Let A_n^+ (resp. A_n^0) be the set of actions a_n that belong to some $h_n \in H_n^+$ and that are chosen with positive (resp. zero) probability by the equilibria of B^* . For each n , let H_n^1 be the set of $h_n \notin H_n^+$ such that at each $h'_n \in H_n^+$ that precedes it, n 's action that leads to h_n is in A_n^+ —thus, the information sets in H_n^1 are excluded under B^* by n 's opponents. For each $a_n^0 \in A_n^0$, let $H_n(a_n^0)$ be the collection of information sets that succeed a_n^0 and let $H_n^0 = \cup_{a_n^0 \in A_n^0} H_n(a_n^0)$. The information sets in H_n^0 are reached only if

²²This selection is almost the one that gives us perfect Bayesian equilibria. If, in addition, we ask for optimality at singleton information sets that are excluded by the opponents, one would perfect Bayesian equilibria. An equivalent way to formulate the stronger requirement of perfect Bayesian rationality is to ask for optimality at information sets where the beliefs are constant across all consistent beliefs associated with the strategy profile.

n chooses a nonequilibrium action a_n^0 . Let $H_n^- = H_n^0 \cup H_n^1$. Obviously, the sets H_n^+, H_n^0, H_n^1 partition H_n .²³

Every $b_n \in B_n$ can be written uniquely as a triple (b_n^+, b_n^0, b_n^1) where b_n^+ is the restriction of b_n to information sets in H_n^+ , and for $i = 0, 1$, b_n^i is the restriction of b_n to H_n^i ; alternatively, we also write b_n as (b_n^+, b_n^-) where $b_n^- = (b_n^0, b_n^1)$. For each n , let B_n^+ be the set of b_n^+ whose support is contained in A_n^+ , and let $B^+ = \prod_n B_n^+$. Observe that the projection of B^* to B^+ is a singleton, denoted $b^{*,+}$, with n 's component being $b_n^{*,+}$.

For $i = 0, 1$, let B_n^i be the restriction of B to the information sets in H_n^i . $B_n^- \equiv B_n^0 \times B_n^1$. Also, for $i = 0, 1$, let $B^i = \prod_n B_n^i$, and $B^- = B^0 \times B^1$. Let the projection of B^* to B^- be denoted $B^{*,-}$. $B^{*,-}$ is of the form $B^0 \times B^{*,1}$. If the payoffs are generic, then $B^{*,1}$ is a full-dimensional subset of B^1 consisting of strategies that deter deviation by players: indeed, the set is defined by a set of polynomial inequalities, and generically it is the closure of the set of profiles that satisfy the inequalities strictly. Denote by $\partial B^{*,-}$ the boundary of $B^{*,-}$ in B^- : $\partial B^{*,-} = B^0 \times \partial B^{*,1}$, where $\partial B^{*,1}$ is the boundary of $B^{*,1}$ in B^1 .

Fix a closed neighborhood $U^{*,+}$ of $b^{*,+}$ in B^+ such that: (1) for each $b^+ \in U^{*,+}$, the support is A^+ ; (2) for every other equilibrium component, if the equilibrium outcome has the same support as that for B^* , then its projection to B^+ is outside $U^{*,+}$ or coincides with that of B^* .²⁴ Given $b^+ \in U^{*,+}$, computing the optimal action in the set $A_n^+ \cap A_n(h_n)$ for each $h_n \in H_n^+$ involves only the information about b^+ . Therefore, we have a well-defined best-reply correspondence $\text{BR}^{*,+} : U^{*,+} \rightarrow B^+$, which can be viewed as the best-reply correspondence of the pruned game obtained by deleting all paths that are not in the support of the equilibrium distribution associated with B^* . If u is generic, then $b^{*,+}$ is the unique fixed point of $\text{BR}^{*,+}$ in $U^{*,+}$ and its index, denoted $\text{Ind}(b^{*,+})$, is ± 1 —indeed, viewed as an equilibrium of the pruned game tree, it is a regular equilibrium. If H_n^1 is empty for each n , then either H_n^0 is empty for each n and B^* is an isolated equilibrium or $B^* = \{b^{*,+}\} \times B^0$ and either way $\text{Ind}(B^*) = \pm 1$. This case is uninteresting for the purposes of Theorem 6.3. Therefore, we will assume that H_n^1 is nonempty for some n , and thus $B^{*,1}$ is a nonempty set.

Fix now a closed neighborhood $U^{*,-}$ of $B^{*,-}$ in B^- such that $U^{*,+} \times U^{*,-}$ is disjoint from all other components of equilibria of $\Gamma(u)$. Our objective now is to define consistent beliefs at information sets in H^- for profiles of the form (b^*, b^-) with $b^- \in U^{*,-}$. (The beliefs at information sets in H^+ are given by the equilibrium strategies.) Let $A^0 = \cup_n A_n^0$ and let

²³For simplicity in notation, this section and the next are written as if for each n , all three collections, H_n^+ , H_n^0 , and H_n^1 , and hence all objects defined using them, are nonempty. If one of them, especially something that shows up as a factor in a product space, is empty, it is to be simply ignored.

²⁴For generic two-player games, no two components can induce the same equilibrium distribution. But, with more than two-players, that property seems unlikely to be true, though we do not know of an example.

Δ be the set of all probability distributions over A^0 . Given $(b^0, b^1, \delta) \in U^{*, -} \times \Delta$ and ε a small positive number, consider the strategy profile $b^{\varepsilon, \delta} \in B$ defined as follows. For each $n, h_n \in H_n^+$, we perturb the strategy $b_n^{*, +}$ so that each $a_n^0 \in A_n(h_n) \cap A_n^0$ is played with probability $\varepsilon \delta_{a_n^0}$ and with probability $(1 - \sum_{a_n^0 \in A_n(h_n)} \varepsilon \delta_{a_n^0})$, the mixture $b_n^{*, +}(h_n)$ is played; at all other information sets, players randomize according to (b^0, b^1) . For each small ε , $b^{\varepsilon, \delta}$ induces, for each n , beliefs at all information sets in $H_n^0 \cup H_n^1$ that are reachable by $b_{-n}^{\varepsilon, \delta}$ (even if n 's strategy excludes them). Letting ε goes to zero, we get a limiting vector of beliefs $\mu_n^{b_{-n}^{\delta}}$ over all such information sets in H_n^- . Note that, $\mu_n^{b_{-n}^{\delta}}$ need not specify beliefs at all information sets in H_n^- , only those that are enabled by $b_{-n}^{\varepsilon, \delta}$ for $\varepsilon > 0$. We use $\mu^{b^-, \delta}$ to denote the vector of beliefs of all players at the profile (b^-, δ) .

For $(b^-, \delta) \in B^{*, -} \times \Delta$, let $H_n^0(b^-, \delta)$ be the information sets in H_n^0 where player n 's beliefs $\mu_n^{b_{-n}^{\delta}}$ are well-defined and assign zero probability to any node that is reached by some opponent m choosing a non-equilibrium action a_m^0 ; likewise let $H_n^1(b^-, \delta)$ be the information sets in H_n^1 where the beliefs are well-defined and assign zero probability to nodes that are reached only when two or more of his opponents deviate to a non-equilibrium action. At an information set in $H_n^i(b^-, \delta)$, $i = 0, 1$, the beliefs are continuous in (b^-, δ) . To see this, suppose $h_n \in H_n^0(b^-, \delta)$, then the information set is reachable by (b_{-n}^*, b_{-n}^1) (if n were to choose all his actions leading to it) and $\mu^{b^-, \delta}$ assigns positive probability only to nodes that are reached thus; clearly the beliefs are continuous at (b^-, δ) ; a similar argument works to show continuity at information sets in $H_n^1(b^-, \delta)$.

We will say that a mixture at an information set $h_n \in H_n^0 \cup H_n^1$ is optimal against (b^-, δ) either if $h_n \notin H^0(b^-, \delta) \cup H^1(b^-, \delta)$ or if it is optimal against the induced strategy-belief pair (b^-, μ^δ) . We now have a best-reply correspondence $\text{BR}^{*, -} : B^{*, -} \times \Delta \rightarrow B^-$ that is *well-behaved*, in the sense that it is an upper semicontinuous correspondence with nonempty, compact, and convex values.

We define a correspondence $\text{BR}^{*, \Delta} : U^{*, -} \rightarrow \Delta$ by viewing $\delta \in \Delta$ as being a choice variable of an outsider O_Δ . His payoff if he chooses a_n^0 is $G_\Delta(a_n^0) \equiv G_n(\tilde{b}_n(a_n^0, b_n^-), b_{-n}^{*, +}, b_{-n}^-) - v_n^*$, where $\tilde{b}_n(a_n^0, b_n^-)$ is the following strategy: at the information set $h_n(a_n^0)$, it plays a_n^0 and at all other information sets in H_n^+ it plays according to $b_n^{*, +}$; at information sets in H_n^- , it plays according to b_n^- . Thus, his best-reply correspondence is: $\text{BR}^{*, \Delta}(b^-) = \text{argmax}_{\delta} \sum_{n, a_n^0} \tilde{\delta}_{n, a_n^0} [G_n(\tilde{b}_n(a_n^0, b_n^-), b_{-n}^{*, +}, b_{-n}^-) - v_n^*]$

This correspondence, too, is well-behaved. We would now like to compute the index of the fixed points of the product correspondence $\text{BR}^{*, -} \times \text{BR}^{*, \Delta}$. Since the domain is, possibly, a strict subset of the range, the first property we have to establish is that the correspondence

does not have a fixed point on the boundary of the domain, which is set out in the following lemma.

Lemma 10.2. *If u is generic, $BR^{*, -} \times BR^{*, \Delta}$ does not have a fixed point on $\partial B^{*, -} \times \Delta$.*

Proof. Suppose $(b^-, \delta) \in \partial B^{*, -} \times \Delta$ is a fixed point of $BR^{*, -} \times B^{*, \Delta}$. For each n , let \hat{A}_n^0 be the set of $a_n^0 \in A_n^0$ such that $\tilde{b}(a_n^0, b^-)$ yields v_n^* against $(b_{-n}^{*, +}, b_{-n}^-)$, where \tilde{b}_n is as defined for the payoffs of O_Δ . Let $\hat{A}^0 = \cup_n \hat{A}_n^0$. Since b^- belongs to the boundary of $B^{*, -}$, \hat{A}^0 is nonempty. Clearly, the support of δ is contained in \hat{A}^0 .

For each n , let \hat{H}_n^0 be the information sets in $H_n^0(b^-, \delta)$ that follow some $a_n^0 \in \hat{A}_n^0$ and are reached by b_n^0 . The beliefs and the continuation payoffs at information sets in \hat{H}_n^0 are multilinear in $(b_{-n}^{*, +}, b_{-n}^-)$. Likewise let \hat{H}_n^1 be the information sets in $H_n^1(b^-, \delta)$. The beliefs and continuation payoffs at information sets in \hat{H}_n^1 are multilinear in $(b_{-n}^{*, +}, b_{-n}^-, \delta)$. Let $\hat{H}^- = \cup_n (\hat{H}_n^0 \cup \hat{H}_n^1)$ and let \hat{A}^- be the set of actions at the information sets in \hat{H}^- that are in the support of b^- .

Consider the following set of equations in the variables $(u, \hat{b}^+, \hat{b}^-, \hat{\delta})$ where the support of \hat{b}^+ is A^+ , the support of \hat{b}^- is \hat{A}^- , and support of δ is \hat{A}^0 : (1) \hat{b}^+ is an equilibrium of the game $\Gamma(u)$ where actions other than A^+ are eliminated; (2) the actions in \hat{A}^- are all optimal given (b^0, b^1, δ) ; (3) the action \hat{a}_n^0 yields the same payoff as any other $a_n^+ \in A_n(h_n(a_n^0))$. The solutions to the first two set of equations is a set of dimension $|NZ| + |\hat{A}^0| - 1$. However, we also have to satisfy the equations in (3), and thus the set of solutions has dimension $|NZ| - 1$. For generic u , then, there is no solution $(u, \hat{b}^+, \hat{b}^-, \hat{\delta})$ to the set of equations. The result now follows since (u, b^+, b^-, δ) must satisfy the equations for the fixed point (b^-, δ) . \square

Thanks to the lemma, $BR^{*, -} \times BR^{*, \Delta}$ has a well-defined fixed point index for the set of fixed of points in $B^{*, -} \times \Delta$. We denote this index by $\text{Ind}(B^{*, -})$. Also, if necessary by replacing $U^{*, -}$ with a smaller closed neighborhood, we can assume that $BR^{*, -} \times BR^{*, \Delta}$ has no fixed points in $(U^{*, -} \setminus B^{*, -}) \times \Delta$.

Putting together all three correspondences we have defined, we have a correspondence $BR^* : U^{*, +} \times U^{*, -} \times \Delta \rightarrow B^+ \times B^- \times \Delta$. BR^* now has a well-defined index, which is $\text{Ind}(b^{*, +}) \times \text{Ind}(B^{*, -})$. The following proposition is our characterization of the index of components.

Proposition 10.3. $\text{Ind}(B^*) = \text{Ind}(b^{*, +}) \times \text{Ind}(B^{*, -})$.

Proof. For each $\delta \in \Delta$ and $\varepsilon \in [0, 1)$, consider the following perturbed game $\bar{\Gamma}^{\varepsilon, \delta}$. For each player n and each information set $h_n \in H_n^+$ where there is at least one $a_n^0 \in A_n^0$, player n

first decides which of the actions a_n^0 there to play; and if he decides against playing any of them, then Nature chooses with probability $\varepsilon\delta_{a_n^0}$ to automatically implement a_n^0 for each a_n^0 there and with the complementary probability allows n to choose one of his actions a_n^+ there. Even if Nature implements an a_n^0 player n still has to choose an action at each of the succeeding information sets. n 's opponents are unable to distinguish between whether n choose a_n^0 or Nature did. We represent a strategy of player n as a vector $(b_n^+, b_n^0, b_n^1, \eta_n, \hat{b}_n^0)$ where: b_n^0 represent the choices after nature chooses an a_n^0 and \hat{b}_n^0 represents choices after n himself chooses an a_n^0 ; b^1 represents n 's choices at information sets in H_n^1 ; η_n is a vector in $\mathbb{R}^{A_n^0}$ with $\eta_{a_n^0}$ being the probability with which n (and not Nature) chooses $a_n^0 \in A_n^0$ at the stage where n decides which of the actions in $A_n^0 \cap A_n(h_n)$, if any, to play.

Let $\bar{G}^{\varepsilon, \delta}$ be the normal form of the game $\bar{\Gamma}^{\varepsilon, \delta}$. $\bar{G}^{\varepsilon, \delta}$ is obtained from G by the addition of duplicate strategies (created by the sequential nature of choosing actions by first deciding on nonequilibrium actions). Hence the index of each component of equilibria of $\bar{G}^{\varepsilon, \delta}$ is the same as its equivalent component in G . Let \bar{B}^* be the component of equilibria of $\bar{\Gamma}^{\varepsilon, \delta}$ that is equivalent to B^* , that is \bar{B}^* is set of all $(b^{*,+}, b^0, b^1, 0, \hat{b}^0)$ with $b^0, \hat{b}^0 \in B^0$ and $b^1 \in B^{*,1}$. We then have that $\text{Ind}(\bar{B}^*) = \text{Ind}(B)$.

Let $\bar{\text{BR}}^{\varepsilon, \delta}$ be the selection of the best-reply correspondence of $\bar{G}^{\varepsilon, \delta}$ we defined at the beginning of the section. Players optimize at all information sets that are not excluded by their opponents; but, also ask for each player n to optimize at information sets following Nature's choice of a_n^0 (even if $\delta_{a_n^0} = 0$). There is now a neighborhood \bar{U} of \bar{B}^* such that for all small $\varepsilon > 0$ and any $\delta \in \Delta$, there are no fixed points of $\bar{\text{BR}}^{\varepsilon, \delta}$ on the boundary of \bar{U} and the index of $\bar{\text{BR}}^{\varepsilon, \delta}$ over \bar{U} is $\text{Ind}(B^*)$. For such small $\varepsilon > 0$, consider now the correspondence $\bar{\text{BR}}^\varepsilon \times \text{Id}$ on $U \times \Delta$ where $(\bar{\text{BR}}^\varepsilon \times \text{Id})(\cdot, \delta) = \bar{\text{BR}}^{\varepsilon, \delta}(\cdot) \times \{\delta\}$. The index of this correspondence over the set $\bar{U} \times \Delta$ is also $\text{Ind}(B^*)$. Furthermore, the index remains unchanged if we change Id to any well-behaved correspondence: indeed, for the linear homotopy between Id and this new correspondence, there are no fixed points in the boundary of \bar{U} and hence the index remains constant along the homotopy. In particular, the index remains unchanged if we replace Id with the correspondence $\bar{\text{BR}}^{\varepsilon, \Delta}$ defined as follows: $\bar{\text{BR}}^{\varepsilon, \Delta}(b^+, b^0, b^1, \eta, \hat{b}^0, \delta) = \text{BR}^{*, \Delta}(b^0, b^1)$.

Suppose now that for each small $\varepsilon > 0$ we have the following property: given a fixed point $(b^+, b^0, b^1, \eta, \hat{b}^0, \delta)$ in $\bar{U}^* \times \Delta$ of $\bar{\text{BR}}^\varepsilon \times \bar{\text{BR}}^{\varepsilon, \Delta}$, for each n , each $a_n^0 \in A_n^0$ is an inferior action in the game $\bar{\Gamma}^{\varepsilon, \delta}$ against $(b^+, b^0, b^1, \eta, \hat{b}^0)$. Then, the index of $\bar{\text{BR}}^\varepsilon \times \bar{\text{BR}}^{\varepsilon, \Delta}$ over $\bar{U}^* \times \Delta$ can be computed using the pruned tree $\hat{\Gamma}^{\varepsilon, \delta}$ where the actions a_n^0 and everything that follows them are deleted. Let $\hat{\text{BR}}^\varepsilon \times \hat{\text{BR}}^{\varepsilon, \Delta}$ be the best-reply correspondence with the pruned tree.

Observe that each neighborhood of the graph of $\text{BR}^* \times \text{BR}^{*, -} \times \text{BR}^{*, \Delta}$ over $U^{*, +} \times U^{*, -} \times \Delta$ contains the graph of $\hat{\text{BR}}^\varepsilon \times \hat{\text{BR}}^{\varepsilon, \Delta}$ over $U^{*, +} \times U^{*, -} \times \Delta$ for all small ε . Therefore, the result follows.

There remains to show that for small $\varepsilon > 0$, in any fixed point $\bar{b} \in \bar{U}^*$, the actions a_n^0 are not optimal. To do that, take a sequence of fixed points $(b^{+, \varepsilon}, b^{0, \varepsilon}, b^{1, \varepsilon}, \eta^\varepsilon, \hat{b}^{0, \varepsilon}, \delta^\varepsilon)$ of $\bar{\text{BR}}^\varepsilon \times \bar{\text{BR}}^{\varepsilon, \Delta}$ such that, letting \tilde{b}^ε be the equivalent behavioral strategy profile in Γ , \tilde{b}^ε converges to some $\tilde{b} \in B^*$. Then \tilde{b} is of the form $(b^{*, +}, \tilde{b}^-)$. Define $\tilde{\delta}_{a_n^0}^\varepsilon = \sum_{a_m^0} \tilde{b}^\varepsilon(a_m^0)^{-1} \tilde{b}^\varepsilon(a_n^0)$ and let $\tilde{\delta}$ be its limit. Clearly $(b^{*, +}, \tilde{b}^0, \tilde{b}^1, \tilde{\delta})$ is a fixed point of $\text{BR}^{*, +} \times \text{BR}^{*, -} \times \text{BR}^{*, \Delta}$, implying that $(\tilde{b}^0, \tilde{b}^1)$ belongs to the interior of $B^{*, -}$. In other words, for small ε , the actions a_n^0 are suboptimal as was to be shown. \square

We will now provide an implication—an equivalence, actually, though we do not prove the other direction—of index zero in Proposition 10.4 that is used in the next section. For all sufficiently small ζ , if we replace $\text{BR}^{*, -} \times \text{BR}^{*, \Delta}$ by ζ -best reply correspondences, i.e. where the probability of an action that is not ζ -optimal is no more than ζ , still there is no fixed point in $\partial B^{*, -} \times \Delta$. Fix such a ζ . Let $B^{*, \zeta, -}$ be the set of $(b^0, b^1) \in B^{*, -}$ such that $b^0(a_n) \geq \zeta$ for all $a_n \in A_n(h_n)$ for some $h_n \in H_n^0$. Similarly, let Δ^ζ be the set of $\delta \in \Delta$ such that $\delta_{a_n^0} \geq \zeta$ for all a_n^0 . Let $\text{BR}^{*, \zeta, -}$ and $\text{BR}^{*, \zeta, \Delta}$ be the best reply correspondences when the choice sets are restricted to be $B^{*, \zeta, -}$ and Δ^ζ respectively. There are no fixed points in $\partial B^{*, -} \times \Delta$ and the fixed point index is still the same.

For each $(b^-, \delta) \in B^{*, \zeta, -} \times \Delta^\zeta$ such that b^1 is completely mixed as well, and $\varepsilon > 0$, the beliefs $\mu^{\varepsilon, b^-, \delta}$ are well-defined at all information sets in H^- . Let \mathbb{B}^* be the set of (b^-, μ, δ) that are limits of $(b^\varepsilon, \mu^{\varepsilon, b^-, \delta}, \delta^\varepsilon)$ as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$.²⁵ $\partial \mathbb{B}^{*, -}$ refers to the points $(b^-, \mu, \delta) \in \mathbb{B}^*$ with $b^- \in \partial B^{*, -}$.

There is now a well-defined best-reply correspondence from $\mathbb{B}^* \rightarrow B^- \times \Delta$ where at each information set h_n in H_n^- , player n optimizes relative to the beliefs there and subject to choosing each action with probability at least ζ if $h_n \in H_n^0$, and the best-reply for the factor Δ^ζ is as before. We use \mathbb{BR}^* to denote this correspondence. Given a vector $g \in \mathbb{R}^{A \setminus A^+}$, $\Gamma(u) \oplus \gamma$ denotes the game where the payoffs to an action $a_n \notin A^+ \cup A^0$ at an information set $h_n \in H_n^-$ is augmented by a bonus g_{a_n} ; and for the outsider controlling choices in Δ , the payoffs to a_n^0 are augmented by $g_{a_n^0}$. We use \mathbb{BR}_g^* to denote the best-reply correspondence when the payoffs have been augmented using g . The proof of the following proposition follows the logic of Govindan, Laraki and Pahl [7].

²⁵ \mathbb{B}^* , or rather just its first two factors, is the projection to the information sets in H^- of pairs of strategy profiles and consistent beliefs where an equilibrium in $\{b^{*, +}\} \times B^{*, \zeta, -}$ is played.

Proposition 10.4. *If $\text{Ind}(B^*) = 0$, then there exists a function $g : \mathbb{B}^* \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{A \setminus A^+}$ such that:*

- (1) *g is zero in a neighborhood of $\partial \mathbb{B}^*$ in \mathbb{B}^* ;*
- (2) *$(b^-, \delta) \notin \mathbb{B} \mathbb{R}_{g(b^-, \mu, \delta)}^*(b^-, \mu, \delta)$ for any $(b^-, \mu, \delta) \in \mathbb{B}^*$.*

Proof. Suppose the index of B^* is zero. Then, by Proposition 10.3, $\text{Ind}(B^{*, -}) = 0$. We define a map $f^* : B^{*, \zeta, -} \times \Delta^\zeta \rightarrow B^{\zeta, -} \times \Delta^\zeta$, which is a version of the Nash map. For each (b^-, δ) and n , recall that $H_n^1(b^-, \delta)$ is the set of information sets where there is some node that is reached when exactly one of n 's opponents m chooses an a_m^0 . For each $h_n \in H_n^1(b^-, \delta)$, and a node that is reached if only one player m deviated to some a_m^0 , we can define the probability of reaching this node by the product of the probabilities of all actions leading up to it, with $\delta_{a_m^0}$ used for action a_m^0 ; we define the probability $P(h_n | b^-, \delta)$ as the sum of these probabilities over such nodes. f^* assigns the following $\tilde{b}(h_n)$ at h_n : for each action $a_n \in A_n(h_n)$,

$$\tilde{b}_{a_n}(h_n) \propto b_{a_n}(h_n) + P(h_n | b^-, \delta) \max[G_n(a_n, b^-) - G_n(b(h_n), b^-), 0]$$

where $G_n(a_n, b^-)$ is the best payoff achievable given beliefs μ conditional of being at h_n and playing a_n ; and similarly for $G_n(b(h_n), b^-)$.

An information set in $H_n^0(b^-, \delta)$ has at least one node that is reached without any opponent playing an action in A^0 . For an information set h_n in $H_n^0(b^-, \delta)$, let $P_n(b^-, \delta)$ be the probability of reaching this information set if n chooses all the actions leading up to it. f^* assigns the following strategy $\tilde{b}(h_n)$ at h_n :

$$\tilde{b}_{a_n}(h_n) - \zeta \propto \frac{b_{a_n}(h_n) - \zeta}{1 - |A_n(h_n)|\zeta} + P(h_n | b^-, \delta) \max[G_n(\hat{b}_n(a_n), b^-, \mu) - G_n(b(h_n), b^-, \mu), 0]$$

where $\hat{b}_n(a_n)$ is the strategy that plays actions $a'_n \neq a_n$ in $A_n(h_n)$ with probability ζ and plays a_n with the remaining probability; $G_n(\hat{b}_n(a_n), b^-)$ is the best payoff achievable conditional of being at h_n and playing $\hat{b}_n(a_n)$; and $G_n(b(h_n), b^-)$ is defined similarly. At all other information sets $h_n \in H_n^-$, f^* is the identity.

For the δ -coordinate, we use the Nash map:

$$\tilde{\delta}_{a_n^0} - \zeta \propto \frac{\delta_{a_n^0} - \zeta}{1 - |A^0|\zeta} + \max[G_\Delta(\hat{\delta}(a_n^0)) - G_\Delta(\delta), 0],$$

where $\hat{\delta}(a_n^0)$ plays a_n^0 with probability $1 - (|A^0| - 1)\zeta$ and every other a_m^0 with probability ζ .

The fixed points of f^* are the same as those of $\text{BR}^{*, \zeta, -} \times \text{BR}^{*, \zeta, \Delta}$ and there is a linear homotopy between f^* and $\text{BR}^{*, \zeta, -} \times \text{BR}^{*, \zeta, \Delta}$ that preserves the set of fixed points. Hence the index of f^* over $B^{*, -} \times \Delta$ is zero as well. By the Hopf Extension Theorem (Corollary 8.1.18 in [32]), there now exists a map $f : B^{*, \zeta, -} \times \Delta^\zeta \rightarrow B^{\zeta, -} \times \Delta^\zeta$ that coincides with

f^* in a neighborhood V of $\partial B^{*,\zeta,-} \times \Delta^\zeta$ and that has no fixed points. In particular, if b^- belongs to the boundary of $B^{*,\zeta,-}$ and $\delta = f_\Delta(b^-, \delta)$, then $f_{h_n}(b^-, \delta) \neq b_{h_n}^-$ for some n and $h_n \in H_n^0(b^-, \delta) \cup H_n^1(b^-, \delta)$.

Define $\mathbb{F} : \mathbb{B}^* \rightarrow B^{\zeta,-} \times \Delta^\zeta$ by $\mathbb{F}(b^-, \mu, \delta) = f(b^-, \delta)$. Then \mathbb{F} does not have a point of coincidence with the projection map from \mathbb{B}^* to $B^{\zeta,-} \times \Delta^\zeta$. For each $h_n \in H_n^-$, let $X^0(h_n)$ be the set of (b^-, μ, δ) such that $\mathbb{F}_{h_n}(b^-, \mu, \delta) = b^-(h_n)$ and let $X^1(h_n)$ be its complement. For each $(b^-, \mu, \delta) \in X^1(h_n)$, letting $\tilde{b}(h_n)$ be the h_n -coordinates under \mathbb{F} , we have that $\tilde{b}_n \neq b_n$. For such a point, take the ray from b_n through \tilde{b}_n . There is a unique point of intersection, call it $r^0(b^-, \delta, h_n)$, between this ray and the boundary of the minimal face of the projection of $B^{\zeta,-}$ to $\Delta(A_n(h_n))$ containing the interval between $b_n(h_n)$ and $\tilde{b}_n(h_n)$ in the affine generated by this face. Let $X_{a_n}^1$ be closure of the set of points in $X^1(h_n)$ such that $r_{a_n}^0(\cdot) \geq r_{a_n}^0(\cdot)$ for all $a_n' \in A_n(h_n)$. We construct the sets $X^0(\Delta)$, $X^1(\Delta)$, and $X_{a_n^0}^1$ similarly.

Let $\beta_{h_n}^1 : \mathbb{B}^* \rightarrow [0, 1]$ be a function that is zero on $X^0(h_n)$ and strictly positive elsewhere. For each a_n , let $\beta_{a_n}^2 : \mathbb{B}^* \rightarrow [0, 1]$ be a function that is one on $X_{a_n}^1$ and strictly smaller than one elsewhere. Let $\beta_{h_n}^3$ be a function that is zero on a neighborhood $U \subsetneq V$ of $\partial \mathbb{B}^*$ and one outside V . The functions β_Δ^1 , $\beta_{a_n^0}^2$, and β_Δ^3 are defined similarly. We define $g_{a_n}(b^-, \mu, \delta)$ recursively backwards for the collection of information sets in H_n^- .

$$g_{a_n}(b^-, \mu, \delta) = \beta_{h_n}^3(b^-, \mu, \delta) \beta_{a_n}^2(b^-, \mu, \delta) [v_n(b^-, \mu, h_n) - G_n(a_n, b^-, \mu, \delta) + \beta_{h_n}^1(b^-, \mu, \delta)]$$

where $v_n(b^-, \mu, h_n)$ is the best payoff at h_n against (b^-, μ, δ) conditional on reaching h_n and given that bonuses have already been defined for succeeding information sets. $g_{a_n^0}$ is defined similarly for each $a_n^0 \in A^0$. The function g has the requisite properties. \square

11. PROOF OF THEOREM 6.3

Essential components exist and are closed and connected sets of equilibria. Moreover, each contains a stable set, which contains a proper equilibrium; hence essentiality satisfies Axiom B. In the appendix, we show that essentiality satisfies Axioms D and I. To complete the proof, fix a solution concept φ satisfying Axioms D and I. Fix also a generic extensive form game $\Gamma(u)$ and a component Σ^* of its equilibria with index zero. Suppose φ picks a subset of Σ^* as a solution. We show that φ must fail Axiom B.

Step 1—Fixed Point Preliminaries. Let B^* be the set of behavioral strategies that are equivalent to mixed strategies in Σ^* . Let $g : \mathbb{B}^* \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{A \setminus A^+}$ be a function given by Proposition 10.4. The ambient space of \mathbb{B}^* is the set \mathbb{B} of all (b, μ, δ) where $(b, \delta) \in B^{\zeta,-} \times \Delta^\zeta$ and μ specifies a probability distribution for each h_n over the nodes in it. The correspondence $\mathbb{B}\mathbb{R}^*$ extends to a correspondence $\mathbb{B}\mathbb{R}$ over \mathbb{B} in the obvious way, as does the perturbed

correspondence $\mathbb{B}\mathbb{R}_g^*$ for any bonus vector g . We can extend the function g to the whole of \mathbb{B} , but denoting it still g . There exists $\eta_0 > 0$ such that if (b^-, μ, δ) is within η_0 of some $(\tilde{b}^-, \tilde{\mu}, \tilde{\delta})$ in \mathbb{B}^* , and g is within η_0 of $g(\tilde{b}^-, \tilde{\mu}, \tilde{\delta})$ then $(b^-, \mu, \delta) \notin \mathbb{B}\mathbb{R}_g(b^-, \mu, \delta)$. There now exists $0 < \eta < \eta_0$ such that: (1) if (b^-, μ, δ) and $(\tilde{b}^-, \tilde{\mu}, \tilde{\delta})$ are within η of one another, then their g values are within η_0 of one another; (2) g is zero in the 2η -neighborhood of $\partial\mathbb{B}^*$ in \mathbb{B} .

Step 2—Triangulations. \mathbb{B} is a product of simplices: there is a simplex $\Delta^\zeta(A_n(h_n))$ of distributions over actions at h_n for each $h_n \in H^0$, where the probability of each action is at least ζ ; there is a simplex $\Delta(A_n(h_n))$ of distributions over actions at $h_n \in H_n^1$; there is a simplex $\Delta(h_n)$ of distributions over the nodes x of h_n for each $h_n \in H_n^-$; and there is the simplex Δ^ζ of distributions over A^0 . We can take a triangulation of each of these simplices such that the diameter of each simplex of the triangulation is less than η .

For each $h_n \in H_n^-$, let $\mathcal{X}^0(h_n)$ be the polyhedral complex generated by the triangulation of the simplex of actions at h_n . Likewise, let $\mathcal{X}^1(h_n)$ and $\mathcal{X}(\Delta)$ denote the polyhedral complexes of $\Delta(h_n)$ and Δ^ζ . Let $\tilde{S}_{h_n}^0$ (resp. $\tilde{S}_{h_n}^1$ and \tilde{S}_Δ) be the set of full-dimensional polyhedra of $\mathcal{X}^0(h_n)$ (resp. $\mathcal{X}^1(h_n)$ and $\mathcal{X}(\Delta)$). Let $\tilde{\gamma}_{h_n}^0$ (resp. $\tilde{\gamma}_{h_n}^1$ and $\tilde{\gamma}_\Delta$) be a piecewise-linear convex function that is linear precisely on the polyhedra of $\mathcal{X}^0(h_n)$ (resp. $\mathcal{X}^1(h_n)$) and $\mathcal{X}(\Delta)$.

Step 3—Adding Players. As in Step 3 of the proof of Theorem 6.1, we introduce a signaling game Γ^o that is independent of Γ . The only difference between the two games is that the one there had N senders, while here the game has $|A^0|$ senders, one per $a_n^0 \in A^0$. In the unique equilibrium outcome, all senders send the message h , and the unique belief at the information set of the receiver following a message of l assigns equal weight to all senders. We use $S_{a_n^0}^o$ to denote the message space of sender a_n^0 and S^o to denote the profile of pure strategies of the players in Γ^o .

We now add the following set of outsiders as well. For each n and each information set $h_n \in H_n^-$, there are three outsiders, \hat{o}_{h_n} , $\tilde{o}_{h_n}^0$, and $\tilde{o}_{h_n}^1$; and there are two other outsiders \hat{o}_0 and \tilde{o}_0 . The pure strategy sets of these outsiders are as follows. Outsider \hat{o}_{h_n} choose a vertex of $\Delta^\zeta(A_n(h_n))$ (resp. $\Delta(A_n(h_n))$) if $h_n \in H_n^0$ (resp. H_n^1). Outsider \hat{o}_0 chooses a vertex of Δ^ζ . The pure strategy set of outsider $\tilde{o}_{h_n}^i$, for $i = 0, 1$ (resp. \tilde{o}_0) is the set $\tilde{S}^i(h_n)$ (resp. \tilde{S}_Δ) of the full-dimensional polyhedra of $\mathcal{X}^i(h_n)$ (resp. $\mathcal{X}(\Delta)$). The space of profiles of these choices is denoted (\hat{S}^o, \tilde{S}^o) .

Step 4—A Game Tree $\hat{\Gamma}$. We now describe a game tree $\hat{\Gamma}$ involving players in \mathcal{N} and the outsiders introduced in Step 3. First, all the senders a_n^0 , and the other outsiders \hat{o}, \tilde{o} move. Each player n gets to observe the messages sent by the receivers a_n^0 . Then the extensive

form game Γ is played by the players in \mathcal{N} . And finally the receiver of the signaling game Γ^o responds to the senders' messages.

The game Γ is played with a slight modification. If all senders a_n^0 chose h , then each player n first chooses which actions to take at information sets in H_n^+ . Specifically, he decides which of the following type of strategy to use: a choice $s_n^+ : H_n^+ \rightarrow A_n$ such that $s_n^+(h_n) \in A_n(h_n)$ for all $h_n \in H_n^+$. If he decides to use one of them, then those choices are automatically implemented and he has to choose at the other information sets. If one of the senders a_n^0 sends l , then n has a strategy, to be described below, that is automatically implemented for him. A pure strategy for n is thus naturally decomposed into (s_n^+, s_n^0, s_n^1) .

Fix a pure strategy profile $(s^o, \hat{s}^o, \tilde{s}^o)$ for the outsiders and a profile s for the original players. If none of the outsiders sends the message l , then the original game is played by the insiders and the game ends (since the receiver does not have a choice after h). If, say, a subset \hat{A}_n^0 of senders a_n^0 use l , then the following strategy is implemented for n and without his opponents knowing about it: at all information sets in H_n^+ , other than the information sets h_n with $A_n(h_n) \cap \hat{A}_n^0 \neq \emptyset$, the equilibrium mixture b_n^+ is implemented; at h_n with an action a_n^0 in \hat{A}_n^0 , with probability δ_{n,a_n^0} a_n^0 is chosen, where $\delta_{a_n^0}$ is the probability of a_n^0 under the choice \hat{s}_o of \hat{o}_0 , and with the remaining probability, the equilibrium mixture is implemented; at information sets h_n in H_n^- , player \hat{o}_{h_n} 's choice is implemented.

Step 5—The Payoffs in $\hat{\Gamma}(u)$. The payoffs of the players are as follows. For each $h_n \in H_n^-$, pick a point $\tilde{b}_{h_n}(\tilde{s}_{h_n}^o)$ in the polyhedron $\tilde{s}_{h_n}^o$; similarly pick a point $\tilde{\mu}(h_n) \in \tilde{s}_{h_n}^1$ and $\tilde{\delta}(\tilde{s}_0) \in \tilde{s}_0$. $(\tilde{b}^-(\tilde{s}^o), \tilde{\mu}(\tilde{s}^o), \tilde{\delta}(\tilde{s}^o))$ denotes the point corresponding to the profile \tilde{s}^o . At nodes following choices of h by all senders, the payoffs are as in Γ for \mathcal{N} . When a_n^0 chooses l , then the payoffs for each information set $h_m^- \in H_m^-$ for each m and nodes at h_m^- that follow the choice of a_n^0 , the payoff of action $a_m \in A_m(h_n)$ are augmented by $g_{a_m}(\tilde{b}^-(\tilde{s}^o), \tilde{\mu}(\tilde{s}^o), \tilde{\delta}(\tilde{s}^o))$. The payoffs of \hat{o}_{h_n} coincide with the payoffs of n , when outsider a_n^0 chooses l and he gets to choose at h_n .

The payoff to player \hat{o}_0 is as follows. If he chooses a vertex \hat{s}_0 which corresponds to a mixture δ in Δ^ζ , for each $a_n^0 \in A^0$ and for each terminal node that follows just sender a_n^0 sending the message l , his payoffs are the payoffs of player n but with a bonus $g_{\hat{s}_0}$ instead of n 's bonus. At all other nodes, his payoffs are zero.

There remains to describe the payoffs of the outsiders \tilde{o} . For outsider \tilde{o}_0 , he wants to mimic the choice of \hat{o}_0 . The restriction of the function $\tilde{\gamma}_\Delta$ to a full-dimensional polyhedron $\tilde{s}_{\tilde{o}_0}$ is affine. It has a unique affine extension $\hat{G}_{\tilde{s}_{\tilde{o}_0}}$ to the whole of Δ^ζ . This function represents the payoff to the pure strategy \tilde{s}_0 that is the full-dimensional polyhedron.

For each polyhedron \tilde{s}_{h_n} of $\mathcal{X}^1(h_n)$, $\gamma_{h_n}^1$ defines a linear function $\hat{G}_{\tilde{s}_{h_n}}^1$ over the polyhedron which extends to one over $\Delta(h_n)$. Now extend it to the convex hull of $\Delta(h_n)$ and 0 by setting it to be zero on 0. For each n , there is a map $\hat{\psi}_n : \Sigma_n \times \Sigma^o \times \hat{\Sigma}^o \rightarrow \Sigma_n$ that is just the projection if no receiver a_n^0 plays l with positive probability, and it is independent of n 's choice otherwise. If $\sigma_n = \psi_n(s_n, s^o, \hat{s}^o)$, then for each information set $h_n \in H_n^-$, we have a vector $(\sigma_n(a_n))_{a_n \in A_n(h_n)}$ with $\sigma_n(a_n) = \sum_{s_n \in S_n(a_n)} \sigma_{n, s_n}$ being the unconditional probability of playing a_n . The payoff against (s, s^o, \hat{s}^o) for \tilde{s}_{h_n} is $\hat{G}_{\tilde{s}_{h_n}}^o((\sigma_n(a_n))_{a_n \in A_n(h_n)})$. Thus, \tilde{o}_{h_n} wants to mimic the implied unconditional probabilities of the actions at h_n .

Payoffs of $\tilde{o}_{h_n}^1$ are defined as mimicking the beliefs at information set h_n . For each polyhedron \tilde{s}_{h_n} of $\mathcal{X}^1(h_n)$, $\gamma_{h_n}^1$ defines a linear function $\tilde{G}_{h_n}^1$ over the polyhedron which extends to one over $\Delta(h_n)$. Now extend it to the convex hull of $\Delta(h_n)$ and 0 by setting it to be zero on 0. For each strategy profile $(s, s^o, \hat{s}^o, \tilde{s}^o)$ if $\sigma = \psi(s, s^o, \hat{s}^o)$, then for each node x of h_n there is a well-defined probability of reaching x , giving us a vector of these probabilities. \tilde{o}_{h_n} 's payoff from $\tilde{s}_{h_n}^1$ is the value of $\tilde{G}_{h_n}^1$ at this vector of probabilities.

Step 6—The Relationship between Γ and $\hat{\Gamma}$. $\hat{\Gamma}$ weakly embeds Γ via the mappings $\hat{\psi}_n$. Indeed, players can implement their strategies in Γ if the senders choose h . A fixed strategy is implemented for n if one of his sender counterparts plays l . The payoffs of the insiders are as in the original game Γ unless some receiver sends l . The equilibria of $\hat{\Gamma}$ involve only the message h from the receivers. Thus, $\hat{\Gamma}$ embeds Γ . By Axiom I, the φ -solutions of Γ are the projections of the φ -solutions of $\hat{\Gamma}$.

Step 7—Adding Dominated Strategies. We now modify the game $\hat{\Gamma}$ by adding a set of dominated strategies for the players in \mathcal{N} . For each n and a choice s_n^+ at the first stage, if n chooses an s_n^+ for which $s_n^+(h_n) \in A_n^0$ for some h_n , then we create a choice problem where we add as many dominated strategies as there are a_n^0 's in the choices made by s_n^+ . Specifically, for each $a_n^0 \in s_n^+(H_n^+)$, we create a dominated strategy \hat{a}_n^0 , and n has to sequentially reject all these choices \hat{a}_n^0 , one in each round, before executing s_n^+ . Choosing a dominated action \hat{a}_n^0 immediately triggers the message l for the sender a_n^0 and the strategy that is implemented for n is the same as well. Only n 's payoffs in the continuation at $h_n(a_n^0)$ following choices in A_n^+ are reduced by $0 < \alpha \leq \zeta$ to make it dominated in the continuation game, where α is chosen such that if the action a_n^0 is α -optimal against an equilibrium in $b \in B^*$, then b^- is within η of $\partial B^{*, -}$. Call this modified game $\bar{\Gamma}$.

Let \bar{S}_n be the set of pure strategies of n in $\bar{\Gamma}$. There is a mapping $\bar{\psi}_n : \bar{\Sigma}_n \times \Sigma^o \times \hat{\Sigma}^o \rightarrow \Sigma_n$ that coincides with $\hat{\psi}_n$ if n does not choose a dominated strategy \hat{a}_n^0 and when he does, it maps the profile to the corresponding mixture. Likewise, for each sender a_n^0 in the signaling

game, there is a mapping $\bar{\psi}_{a_n^0} : \bar{\Sigma}_n \times \Sigma_{a_n^0}^0 \rightarrow \Sigma_{a_n^0}^0$ that is just the projection if n does not choose one of the dominated actions \hat{a}_n^0 and is just l otherwise. As in Step 4 of the proof of Theorem 6.1, it is easy to show that the equilibria of the game $\bar{\Gamma}$ are the same as that of $\hat{\Gamma}$. Hence, by Axiom D, the φ -solutions of the two game are the same.

Step 8—Failure of Axiom B. Since φ satisfies Axioms D and I, there is a φ -solution $\bar{\Sigma}^*$ of the normal form \bar{G} of $\bar{\Gamma}(u)$ such that $\bar{\psi}(\bar{\Sigma}^*) \subseteq \Sigma^*$. To prove the result, we now show that $\bar{\Sigma}^*$ does not contain a mixed strategy profile that is equivalent to a quasi-perfect equilibrium of $\bar{\Gamma}(u)$. Suppose otherwise. Then the game $\bar{\Gamma}(u)$ has a sequence of ε -quasi-perfect equilibria \bar{b}^ε such that, for $\varepsilon > 0$, letting $\bar{\sigma}^\varepsilon$ be an equivalent mixed-strategy profile, σ^ε be $\bar{\psi}(\bar{\sigma}^\varepsilon)$, and $b^\varepsilon \in B$ a profile in Γ equivalent to σ^ε , b^ε converges to some $b^* = (b^{*,+}, b^{*,-}) \in B^*$. Let μ^ε be the beliefs induced by b^ε at information sets in H^- and let μ^* be its limit. Likewise, let $\delta^\varepsilon = \bar{\sigma}_\delta^\varepsilon$ and let δ^* be its limit.

For each \tilde{o}_{h_n} a pure strategy $\tilde{s}_{h_n}^o$ corresponds to a mixture $\tilde{b}(\tilde{s}_{h_n}^o)$. Hence in the sequence of ε -quasi-perfect equilibria, his strategy $\tilde{\sigma}_{\tilde{o}_{h_n}}^\varepsilon$ corresponds to a point $\tilde{b}^\varepsilon \in \Delta(h_n)$. Similarly, we have a distribution $\tilde{\mu}^\varepsilon$ for player $\tilde{o}_{h_n}^1$ and $\tilde{\delta}^\varepsilon$ for \tilde{o}_0 , with limits $\tilde{b}^*, \tilde{\mu}^*, \tilde{\delta}^*$. By the structure of the payoffs of these players, for each $h_n \in H_n^-$, $\tilde{b}^\varepsilon(h_n)$ and $\tilde{\mu}^\varepsilon(h_n)$ are within η of $b^*(h_n)$ and $\mu^*(h_n)$ respectively, and similarly $\tilde{\delta}^*$ is within η of δ^* . Obviously, $(b^{*,+}, \mu^*, \delta^*) \in \mathbb{BR}_{g(b^{*,+}, \mu^*, \delta^*)}$ by the structure of the payoffs in $\bar{\Gamma}$.

We claim now that in \bar{b} , no player n chooses an s_n^+ with an a_n^0 in its range, either initially or in any of the successive rounds. Obviously under \bar{b} , no player chooses an s_n^+ with an a_n^0 in its range, as it would induce a non-equilibrium outcome. Suppose now that conditional on choosing such an s_n^+ , he does reconfirm it (i.e. with probability one he opts out rather than reconfirm such a choice). Then there is an (s_n^+, s_n^0, s_n^1) that is α -optimal against b^* . This implies that $b^{*,+}$ is in the η -neighborhood of $\partial B^{*,+}$. As $\tilde{b}(h_n)$ is within η of $b(h_n)$ and g is zero in the 2η -neighborhood of $\partial B^{*,+}$, the bonus vector g is then zero. For each ε , let $\hat{\delta}^\varepsilon \in \Delta$ be such that $\hat{\delta}_{a_n^0}^\varepsilon \propto b_{a_n^0}^\varepsilon$ and let $\hat{\delta}$ be its limit. Now $(b^{*,+}, \hat{\delta})$ is a ζ -best reply to itself in Γ , which is impossible. Hence, each n avoids reconfirming s_n^+ with a_n^0 in its range.

Under \bar{b}^ε , let $\bar{b}_{o_{a_n^0}}^\varepsilon$ be the probability that sender a_n^0 sends the message l ; this probability is the sum of two probabilities: (1) the probability that a_n^0 voluntarily sends the message l ; (2) the probability that l is triggered by n 's use of a dominated choice \hat{a}_n^0 . From the receiver's perspective, then quasi-perfection requires that $\bar{b}_{o_{a_n^0}}^\varepsilon = \bar{b}_{o_{a_m^0}}^\varepsilon$ for all a_n^0, a_m^0 . Therefore,

$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{\bar{b}_{a_n^0}^\varepsilon}{\bar{b}_{a_m^0}^\varepsilon} = \frac{\delta_{a_n^0}^*}{\delta_{a_m^0}^*}$ for each $(a_n^0, a_m^0) \in A^0$. Hence, $(b^{*,+}, \mu^*, \delta^*)$ belongs to \mathbb{B}^* .

We now have that $(\tilde{b}^{*,-}, \tilde{\mu}^*, \tilde{\delta}^*)$ is within η of $(b^{*,-}, \mu^*, \delta^*)$, which belongs to \mathbb{B}^* , and $(b^{*,-}, \mu^*, \delta^*) \in \mathbb{BR}_{g(\tilde{b}^{*,-}, \tilde{\mu}^*, \tilde{\delta}^*)}$, which is impossible. Hence $\bar{\Gamma}$ does not have a quasi-perfect equilibrium projecting to B^* .

12. SOME REMARKS ON THE NON-GENERIC CASE

The essentiality condition in Definition 2.3 on the projection map $\text{proj} : X_\varepsilon \rightarrow T_\varepsilon$ implies a strong fixed-point property: every continuous function $f : X_\varepsilon \rightarrow T_\varepsilon$ has a point of coincidence with the proj , i.e. there exists $(\eta, \sigma) \in X_\varepsilon$ such that $\text{proj}(\eta, \sigma) = f(\eta, \sigma)$.²⁶ When X_ε and T_ε have the same dimension, the essentiality condition is equivalent to the fixed-point property—see the Theorem of Section 4.E of [21] and Lemma A.4 of [11]. For a generic game $\Gamma(u)$, our characterization of stability in Proposition A.2 shows that for a transformation of X and T , we do indeed have sets of the same dimension. Thus, if an outcome is not stable, we can construct a fixed-point problem without a solution. Axioms B, D^* , and I^* turn the fixed-point problem into a game-theoretically meaningful one.

When the given game is nongeneric (even in the space of the extensive-form games) then X_ε typically has a different dimension compared to T_ε . Stability asks that X_ε contain a subset of the same dimension as T_ε and for which the restriction of the projection is essential—see, again, the Theorem of Section 4.E of [21]. As yet, we do not understand axiomatically the need for this dimensionality requirement. In [11], we pursued a refinement, called metastability, based directly on the fixed point property of the projection, which in a sense drops the dimensionality requirement from the definition of stability. Metastable sets satisfy a lot of the same properties as stable sets, and they coincide with stable sets for generic extensive-form games. But, importantly, metastability satisfies only weaker forms of the small worlds axiom and the decomposition property, which are subsumed by Axiom I^* —see Theorems 4.4 and 4.5 of [11]. Perhaps, metastability and Axiom I^* imply stability. If that were to be true, then there is hope of using the axioms here—and maybe other axioms?—to extend the result to all games.²⁷

The fact that our axiomatization of stability here is only in terms of outcomes, and not the solutions themselves, is another problem for the general case. We could impose a minimality axiom to deal with it, as we could here. Any such result would not be completely satisfactory, since the only rationale for a minimality axiom is that it would whittle down solutions. Another approach, which we footnoted in the paper, is to view an equilibrium not just as

²⁶This fixed-point property is a generalization of the fixed-point property of spaces, which obtains when $X_\varepsilon = T_\varepsilon$ and proj is the identity map.

²⁷We are not wedded to the concept of stability—it might be that something stronger than metastability and weaker than stability is the right concept.

a profile but as an LPS. While this approach is intuitively appealing, it seems beset with technical problems.

With regard to the parallel axiomatization of essentiality, the picture is a little clearer. While we did make use of the genericity assumption in our characterization of essentiality in Proposition 10.3, the definition of essentiality directly involves a fixed point property—see Theorem 5.2 of [26]—and there are no issues relating to the dimensionality of the objects. Alternate characterizations of essentiality would show what additional axioms one might need, and they would pave the way for an extension of the result to all games.

APPENDIX A. VERIFYING AXIOMS D AND D^*

In this appendix, we verify that essentiality and stability satisfy Axioms D and D^* , respectively.

Proposition A.1. *Essentiality satisfies Axiom D.*

Proof. Let \bar{G} be a game obtained from a game G by the addition weakly irrelevant dominated strategies. The two games have the same set of components of equilibria. It suffices to show that the index of each component is the same in each game. Let f and \bar{f} be the best-reply correspondences of G and \bar{G} . Let $\tilde{f} : \bar{\Sigma} \rightarrow \bar{\Sigma}$ be the correspondence that assigns to each $\bar{\sigma}$ the set of $\sigma \in \Sigma$ that are best replies against it in \bar{G} . \tilde{f} is an upper semicontinuous correspondence with nonempty, compact, and convex values. It is linearly homotopic to \bar{f} and the set of fixed points along the homotopy is constant. Hence, by the homotopy axiom for index, the fixed-point index of each component of equilibria under the correspondence \tilde{f} is the same as the index of the component in the game \bar{G} . Since \tilde{f} maps into Σ , the index of each component of equilibria under \tilde{f} can be computed as the index under the restriction of \tilde{f} to Σ , which is in fact f . \square

We now show that stability satisfies Axiom D^* . The proof uses two definitions of stability that are equivalent to the original definition proposed in Mertens—see Theorems 4 and 10 of Govindan and Mertens [8]. First we need some notation. For a game G , let BR be the graph of the best-reply correspondence, i.e.

$$\text{BR} = \{ (\sigma, \tau) \in \Sigma \times \Sigma \mid \tau \text{ is a best reply to } \sigma \text{ in } G \},$$

and let Δ be the diagonal of $\Sigma \times \Sigma$, i.e.

$$\Delta = \{ (\sigma, \sigma) \in \Sigma \times \Sigma \}.$$

For $0 \leq \varepsilon \leq 1$, let

$$\text{BR}_\varepsilon = \{ (\sigma, \tau) \in \text{BR} \mid \sigma \geq (1 - \varepsilon)\tau \},$$

and when $\varepsilon > 0$,

$$\partial\text{BR}_\varepsilon = \{ (\sigma, \tau) \in \text{BR}_\varepsilon \mid \sigma_{n,s_n} = (1 - \varepsilon)\tau_{n,s_n} \text{ for some } n, s_n \}.$$

For $\varepsilon > 0$, we say that a strategy profile σ is an ε -perfect equilibrium if it is completely mixed and assigns no more than ε probability to the set of non-best replies, i.e. σ belongs to $\text{proj}(\text{BR}_\varepsilon) \setminus \partial\Sigma$, where proj is the projection BR onto the first factor.

Let A be the affine space generated by Σ and let $\partial A = A \setminus (\Sigma \setminus \partial\Sigma)$. For $(X_\varepsilon, \partial X_\varepsilon) \subseteq (\text{BR}_\varepsilon, \partial\text{BR}_\varepsilon)$ and $K \geq \varepsilon^{-1}$, we define a map $\varphi_K : (X_\varepsilon, \partial X_\varepsilon) \rightarrow (A, \partial A)$ by $\varphi_K(\sigma, \tau) = \tau + K(\sigma - \tau)$. If $K = \varepsilon^{-1}$, the image of φ_K is contained in Σ , but not necessarily otherwise. Observe, too, that the maps φ_K are (linearly) homotopic to one another.

Proposition A.2. *Let Σ^* be a subset of Σ . The following statements are equivalent:*

- (1) Σ^* is a stable set of G ;
- (2) There exists $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ and for each $0 < \varepsilon \leq \varepsilon_0$ a closed semi-algebraic set $X_\varepsilon \subseteq \text{BR}_\varepsilon$ such that:
 - (a) $X_\varepsilon \setminus \partial X_\varepsilon$ is connected and dense in X_ε , where $\partial X_\varepsilon = X_\varepsilon \cap \partial\text{BR}_\varepsilon$;
 - (b) $\varphi_{\varepsilon^{-1}} : (X_\varepsilon, \partial X_\varepsilon) \rightarrow (\Sigma, \partial\Sigma)$ is essential in Čech cohomology with rational coefficients.
 - (c) $\varepsilon' \leq \varepsilon$ implies $X_{\varepsilon'} \subseteq X_\varepsilon$;
 - (d) $\bigcap_{\varepsilon > 0} X_\varepsilon = \{ (\sigma, \sigma) \mid \sigma \in \Sigma^* \}$.
- (3) There exists a sequence Σ^k of closures of ε_k -perfect equilibria that converges to Σ^* in the Hausdorff topology as $\varepsilon_k \rightarrow 0$ and such that:
 - (a) $\Sigma^k \setminus \partial\Sigma$ is connected and dense in Σ^k ;
 - (b) $\varphi_K : (\text{proj}^{-1}(\Sigma^k), \text{proj}^{-1}(\Sigma^k) \cap \partial\text{BR}_{\varepsilon_k}) \rightarrow (A, \partial A)$ is essential for some $K \geq \varepsilon_k$

Proposition A.3. *Stability satisfies Axiom D^* .*

Let \bar{G} be obtained from G by the addition of strongly irrelevant dominated strategies. Let $f : \bar{\Sigma} \rightarrow \Sigma$ be a map satisfying Condition 2 of Definition 4.4. We show Proposition B.2 using two claims. In what follows $\bar{\text{BR}}$ refers to the graph of the best-reply correspondence of \bar{G} .

Claim A.4. *Every stable set of \bar{G} is stable in G as well.*

Proof. Let Σ^* be a stable set of \bar{G} . There exists ε_0 and semi-algebraic sets $\bar{X}_\varepsilon \subseteq \bar{\text{BR}}_\varepsilon$ for $0 < \varepsilon \leq \varepsilon_0$ satisfying the conditions of Statement 2 of Proposition A.2. For each $0 < \varepsilon \leq \varepsilon_0$, let $\bar{\Sigma}^\varepsilon$ be the set of σ such that $(\sigma, \sigma) \in \bar{X}_\varepsilon$. We will show that there exists a stable set Σ^ε of G with $\Sigma^* \subseteq \Sigma^\varepsilon \subseteq \bar{\Sigma}^\varepsilon$. Since $\bigcap_{0 < \varepsilon \leq \varepsilon_0} \bar{\Sigma}^\varepsilon = \Sigma^*$, the compactness property of stable sets implies the stability of Σ^* in G .

Fix $0 < \varepsilon \leq \varepsilon_0$ such that $\bar{\sigma} \in \bar{U}$ for each $(\bar{\sigma}, \tau) \in X_\varepsilon$, where \bar{U} is the neighborhood given by Condition 2 of Definition 4.4. For each $(\bar{\sigma}, \tau) \in \bar{X}_\varepsilon$, $(f(\bar{\sigma}), \tau) \in \text{BR}$. Let \hat{X} be the set of $(\bar{\sigma}, \tau) \in \bar{X}_\varepsilon$ such that $\bar{\sigma} \notin \partial\bar{\Sigma} \setminus (\Sigma \setminus \partial\Sigma)$. Define $\alpha : \hat{X} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ by $\alpha(\bar{\sigma}, \tau) = \min\{\delta \in [0, 1] \mid (f(\bar{\sigma}), \tau) \in \text{BR}_\delta\}$. α is clearly a continuous function. Let W be the closure of the set of $(\delta, f(\bar{\sigma}), \tau)$ such that $(\bar{\sigma}, \tau) \in \hat{X}$ and $\delta \geq \alpha(\bar{\sigma}, \tau)$. Observe that if $(\delta, \sigma, \tau) \in W$, then $(\delta', \sigma, \tau) \in W$ for all $\delta' > \delta$; also if $(\sigma, \tau) \in \bar{X}_\delta$ for $\delta \leq \varepsilon$, then $(\delta, \sigma, \tau) \in W$. Let ∂W be the set of $(\delta, \sigma, \tau) \in W$ such that $\sigma \in \partial\Sigma$. $f(\bar{\sigma}) \notin \partial\Sigma$ if $\bar{\sigma} \notin \partial\bar{\Sigma} \setminus (\Sigma \setminus \partial\Sigma)$; therefore, $W \setminus \partial W$ is dense in W .

Let $\gamma : W \rightarrow [0, 1]$ be the projection onto the first factor: $\gamma(\delta, \sigma, \tau) = \delta$. As W is semi-algebraic, by the Generic Local Triviality theorem (cf. Theorem 9.3.2 in [2]) there exist: (a) $0 < \delta_0 \leq 1$; (b) a semi-algebraic pair $(F, \partial F)$; (c) a homeomorphism $h : (0, \delta_0] \times (F, \partial F) \rightarrow ((\gamma^{-1}((0, \delta_0])), (\gamma^{-1}((0, \delta_0]) \cap \partial W))$ such that $\gamma \circ h$ is the projection onto the first factor. $W \setminus \partial W$ being dense in W , we have that $F \setminus \partial F$ is dense in F . There now exist finitely many pairs $(F^k, \partial F^k) \subseteq (F, \partial F)$ such that: the sets $F^k \setminus \partial F^k$ are the connected components of $F \setminus \partial F$; $F^k \setminus \partial F^k$ is dense in F^k for each k ; $\cup_k (F^k, \partial F^k) = (F, \partial F)$. For each k let $(W^k, \partial W^k) = h((0, \delta_0] \times (F^k, \partial F^k))$. As with W , if $(\delta, \sigma, \tau) \in W^k$ for some k , then $(\delta', \sigma, \tau) \in W^k$ for all $\delta < \delta' \leq \delta_0$; and if $(\sigma, \tau) \in \hat{X} \cap \bar{X}_\delta$ for $\delta \leq \delta_0$, then (δ, σ, τ) belongs to W^k .

There exists $0 < \varepsilon_1 < \min(\varepsilon, \delta_0)$ such that $\alpha(\cdot) \leq \delta_0$ on the (connected set) $\hat{X} \cap \bar{X}_{\varepsilon_1}$. Hence there exists a unique k , say $k = 1$, such that $(\alpha(\bar{\sigma}, \tau), f(\bar{\sigma}), \tau) \in W^k \setminus \partial W^k$ for all $(\bar{\sigma}, \tau) \in \hat{X} \cap X_{\varepsilon_1}$.

For each $0 < \delta \leq \varepsilon_1$, let X_δ be the set of (σ, τ) such that $(\delta, \sigma, \tau) \in W^1$. Let Σ^ε be the set of σ such that $(\sigma, \sigma) \in \cap_{0 < \delta \leq \varepsilon_1} X_\delta$. We will show that Σ^ε contains Σ^* and that it is a stable set, i.e. that the sets X_δ satisfy the properties of Proposition A.2. To show that Σ^* is contained in Σ^ε , take $\sigma \in \Sigma^*$. There exists a sequence $(\delta^k, \bar{\sigma}^k, \tau^k)$ converging to $(0, \sigma, \sigma)$ such that $(\bar{\sigma}^k, \tau^k) \in \bar{X}_{\delta^k} \setminus \partial\bar{X}_{\delta^k}$ for each k . Therefore, for each $0 < \delta \leq \varepsilon_1$, $(\delta, f(\bar{\sigma}^k), \tau^k) \in W^1$ for large k , giving us that $(\delta, \sigma, \sigma) \in X_\delta$, which shows that σ belongs to Σ^ε .

The set Σ^ε was constructed to satisfy property (d) of Statement 2 of Proposition A.2. We have to verify the other three properties. The X_δ 's are a nested sequence of sets in BR since $(\delta, \sigma, \tau) \in W^1$ implies $(\delta', \sigma, \tau) \in W^1$ for all $\delta \leq \delta' \leq \varepsilon_1$. The connectedness property follows from the fact that $F^1 \setminus \partial F^1$ is connected and dense in F^1 and $(F^1, \partial F^1)$ is homeomorphic to $(X_\delta, \partial X_\delta)$. As for essentiality, for each $0 < \delta \leq \varepsilon_1$, the essentiality of $\bar{\varphi}_{\delta^{-1}} : (\bar{X}_\delta, \partial\bar{X}_\delta) \rightarrow (\bar{\Sigma}, \partial\bar{\Sigma})$ implies the essentiality of its restriction to the inverse image, call it $(\hat{X}_\delta, \partial\hat{X}_\delta)$, of $(\Sigma, \partial\Sigma)$ (see the Theorem in Mertens [23]). The pair $(\hat{X}_\delta, \partial\hat{X}_\delta)$, viewed

now as being subset of $(\text{BR}_\delta, \partial\text{BR}_\delta)$ is contained in $(X_\delta, \partial X_\delta)$. Therefore, the map $\varphi_{\delta^{-1}}$ from $(X_\delta, \partial X_\delta)$ to $(\Sigma, \partial\Sigma)$ is essential, and the proof of the claim is complete. \square

We need a preliminary lemma before our second claim. The map $f : \bar{\Sigma} \rightarrow \Sigma$ has a unique multiaffine extension to a map from \bar{A} to A , where \bar{A} is the affine space generated by $\bar{\Sigma}$. We still use f to denote this extension. For each $0 \leq \delta \leq 1$, let \bar{A}^δ be the set of $\bar{\sigma}$ in \bar{A} such that: (1) for each n , $\bar{\sigma}_{n, \bar{s}_n} \geq 0$ for all $\bar{s}_n \notin S_n$, and $\sum_{\bar{s}_n \notin S_n} \bar{\sigma}_{n, \bar{s}_n} \leq \delta$; (2) $f(\bar{\sigma}) \in \Sigma$. Let $\bar{\Sigma}^\delta = \bar{A}^\delta \cap \bar{\Sigma}$. For $\delta > 0$, let ∂A^δ (resp. $\partial \Sigma^\delta$) be the relative boundary of \bar{A}^δ (resp. $\bar{\Sigma}^\delta$) in \bar{A} . Obviously \bar{A}^δ is a compact subset of \bar{A} for all δ , and when $\delta = 0$, it is just the set Σ viewed as a subset of \bar{A} .

Let d be the difference in the dimensions of $\bar{\Sigma}$ and Σ . Recall from Appendix IV.2 of [21] that a d -ball bundle is a triple $((E, \partial E), (B, \partial B), p)$ where $(E, \partial E)$ and $(B, \partial B)$ are compact pairs, $p : E \rightarrow B$ is a continuous map with $p^{-1}(\partial B) \subseteq \partial E$ and with the following property: for each $x \in B \setminus \partial B$, there is a neighborhood U of x in $B \setminus \partial B$ and a homeomorphism $h : U \times ([0, 1]^d, \partial([0, 1]^d)) \rightarrow (p^{-1}(U), p^{-1}(U) \cap \partial E)$ such that $p \circ h$ is the projection onto the first factor.

Lemma A.5. *For each sufficiently small $\delta > 0$, $((\bar{A}^\delta, \partial \bar{A}^\delta), (\Sigma, \partial \Sigma), f)$ is a d -ball bundle.*

Proof. Let N_1 be the nonempty subset of players n for whom $\bar{S}_n \neq S_n$. Define $\gamma : \bar{A}^1 \rightarrow \Sigma \times [0, \delta]^d$ by $g(\bar{\sigma}) = (f(\bar{\sigma}), (\bar{\sigma}_{\bar{s}_n})_{n \in N_1, \bar{s}_n \notin S_n})$. It is easily checked using the formula for f that the derivative of γ is nonsingular at each point in \bar{A}^0 . Hence for small δ , γ is a homeomorphism of \bar{A}^δ to its image, which in turn is easily seen to be homeomorphic to $\Sigma \times [0, \delta]$. \square

Claim A.6. *Every stable set of G is stable in \bar{G} as well.*

Proof. Let Σ^* be a stable set of G . There exists $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ and for every $0 < \varepsilon \leq \varepsilon_0$ a set X_ε satisfying the properties of Statement 2 of Proposition A.2. Take a sequence ε_i of positive numbers converging to zero. For each i , Σ^i be the projection of X_{ε_i} to Σ . Each Σ^i is semialgebraic with $\Sigma^i \setminus \partial \Sigma$ connected and dense in it. The sequence Σ^i is nested and converges to Σ^* . For each i , there exists $\delta_i > 0$ such that if $\bar{\sigma} \in \bar{\Sigma}^{\delta_i} \setminus \partial \bar{\Sigma}$, and $(f(\bar{\sigma}), \tau) \in \Sigma^i$, then $\bar{\sigma}$ is a $2\varepsilon_i$ -perfect equilibrium of \bar{G} . We can choose the sequence δ_i to be monotonically decreasing and converging to zero. $f^{-1}(\Sigma^i \setminus \partial \Sigma) \cap (\bar{\Sigma}^{\delta_i} \setminus \partial \bar{\Sigma}^{\delta_i})$ has finitely many connected components, exactly one of which contains $\Sigma^i \setminus \partial \Sigma$ in its closure. Call the closure of this component $\bar{\Sigma}^i$.

We now verify that the sequence of sets $\bar{\Sigma}^i$ satisfy the conditions of Statement 3 of Proposition A.2. For each i , $\bar{\Sigma}^i \setminus \partial \bar{\Sigma}$ is a connected set of $2\varepsilon_i$ -perfect equilibria and is dense in

$\bar{\Sigma}^i$. The sets $\bar{\Sigma}^i$ are nested and converge to Σ^* . Hence, to prove that Σ^* is stable in \bar{G} , it is sufficient to show that each $\bar{\Sigma}^i$ satisfies Condition 3(b) of Proposition A.2 for large i .

Fix i large enough such that δ_i is small enough for Lemma A.5 to hold. Let $\hat{\Sigma}^i$ be the set of $\bar{\sigma}$ in \bar{A}^{δ_i} such that $f(\bar{\sigma}) \in \Sigma^i$. Let \hat{X}^i be the set of $(\bar{\sigma}, \tau) \in \hat{\Sigma}^i \times \Sigma$ such that $(f(\bar{\sigma}), \tau) \in X_{\varepsilon_i}$. Let $\partial\hat{X}^i$ be the union of $f^{-1}(\partial X_{\varepsilon_i})$ and the set of points $(\bar{\sigma}, \tau)$ for which $\bar{\sigma} \in \partial\bar{\Sigma}^{\delta_i}$. Then $((\hat{X}^i, \partial\hat{X}^i), (X_{\varepsilon_i}, \partial X_{\varepsilon_i}), \bar{f})$ is d -ball bundle, where $\bar{f} : \hat{X}^i \rightarrow X_{\varepsilon_i}$ is the map that sends $(\bar{\sigma}, \tau)$ to $(f(\bar{\sigma}), \tau)$. Fix $K \geq 2\varepsilon_i^{-1}$. The claim is now proved if we show that $\bar{\varphi}_K : (\hat{X}^i, \partial\hat{X}^i) \rightarrow (\bar{A}, \partial\bar{A})$ is essential.

By a retraction of a point x to a compact convex set C , we mean that we map x to the point $y \in C$ that minimizes the ℓ_2 -distance between x and points in C . Let $r : A \rightarrow \Sigma$ be the retraction of A to Σ and define $\bar{r} : \bar{A} \rightarrow \bar{\Sigma}$ similarly. Let $\tilde{f} : \bar{\Sigma} \rightarrow \Sigma$ be the retraction of $\bar{\Sigma}$ to Σ . (As usual, we view Σ as a subset of $\bar{\Sigma}$.) $((\bar{\Sigma}, \partial\bar{\Sigma}), (\Sigma, \partial\Sigma), \tilde{f})$ is a d -ball bundle. In fact, there exists a function $\tilde{h} : \Sigma \times [0, \delta]^d \rightarrow \bar{\Sigma}$ such that $\tilde{f} \circ \tilde{h}$ is the projection onto the first factor and \tilde{h} maps $(\Sigma \setminus \partial\Sigma) \times ([0, \delta]^d, \partial([0, 1]^d))$ homeomorphically onto $(\bar{\Sigma} \setminus \partial\bar{\Sigma}, \partial\bar{\Sigma} \setminus \partial\Sigma)$.

Define $\tilde{\varphi}^i : (\hat{X}^i, \partial\hat{X}^i) \rightarrow (\bar{\Sigma}, \partial\bar{\Sigma})$ by $\tilde{\varphi}^i(\bar{\sigma}, \tau) = \tilde{h}(r \circ \varphi_K(f(\bar{\sigma}), \tau), (\bar{\sigma}_{n, \bar{s}_n})_{n \in N, \bar{s}_n \notin S_n})$, where $K \geq \varepsilon_i^{-1}$ is such that $\varphi_K(f(\bar{\sigma}), \tau) \notin (\Sigma \setminus \partial\Sigma)$ if $\bar{\sigma} \in \partial\hat{X}^i$. Then $r \circ \varphi_K \circ \bar{f} = \tilde{f} \circ \tilde{\varphi}^i$. Since φ_{ε_i} is essential, φ_K and, therefore, $r \circ \varphi_K$ are essential. Hence, by the Thom Isomorphism Theorem (cf. the Theorem of Appendix IV.3 in [21]), $\tilde{\varphi}^i$ is essential.

To finish the proof, we show that $\bar{\varphi}_K$ and $\tilde{\varphi}^i$ are homotopic as maps between pairs. The two maps agree on the set of points of the form $(\sigma, \tau) \in \bar{X}$; therefore, if we construct a homeomorphism $\bar{\psi}$ between $\bar{\Sigma}$ and a convex set $\tilde{\Sigma}$ such that $\partial\bar{\Sigma} \setminus (\Sigma \setminus \partial\Sigma)$ is mapped to a convex set, then there a linear homotopy between $\bar{\psi} \circ \bar{r} \circ \bar{\varphi}_K$ and $\bar{\psi} \circ \tilde{\varphi}^i$. Thus, $\bar{\varphi}_K$ and $\tilde{\varphi}^i$ are homotopic, which gives us that $\bar{\varphi}_K$ is essential as well. \square

APPENDIX B. VERIFYING AXIOMS I AND I^*

In this appendix, we prove that essentiality and stability satisfy Axioms I and I^* , respectively. We start with Axiom I.

Proposition B.1. *Essentiality satisfies Axiom I.*

Proof. Let \tilde{G} weakly embed G via the map $f : \tilde{\Sigma}_{\mathcal{N}} \times \tilde{\Sigma}_O \rightarrow \Sigma$. Let $\tilde{\Sigma}^*$ be an essential component of \tilde{G} and let $\Sigma^* = f(\tilde{\Sigma}^*)$. Σ^* is obviously a connected set of equilibria. Let $\hat{\Sigma}^*$ be the component of equilibria of G that contains Σ^* . We will show that $\Sigma^* = \hat{\Sigma}^*$ and that

its index is nonzero. We use BR and $\hat{\text{BR}}$ to denote the best-reply correspondences in G and \tilde{G} , resp.

Let $r_O : \tilde{\Sigma}_O \rightarrow \bar{\Sigma}_O$ be a retraction and let $r : \tilde{\Sigma}_N \times \tilde{\Sigma}_O \rightarrow \tilde{\Sigma}_N \times \bar{\Sigma}_O$ be the map $r(\tilde{\sigma}_N, \tilde{\sigma}_O) = (\tilde{\sigma}_N, r_O(\tilde{\sigma}_O))$. Choose a closed neighborhood \bar{U} of $\tilde{\Sigma}^*$ in $\tilde{\Sigma}_N \times \bar{\Sigma}_O$ that is disjoint from the other components of equilibria of \tilde{G} . Let $\tilde{U} = r^{-1}(\bar{U})$. For each n , there is a linear injection $i_n : \Sigma_n \rightarrow \tilde{\Sigma}_n$ such that for each $\bar{\sigma}_O \in \bar{\Sigma}_O$, $f(i_n(\sigma_n), \bar{\sigma}_O) = \sigma_n$ for all σ_n . Define $\hat{\text{BR}}_N : \tilde{U} \rightarrow \tilde{\Sigma}$ by $\hat{\text{BR}} = i \circ \text{BR} \circ f \circ r$, where $i = (i_n)_n$. Let $\hat{\text{BR}} = \hat{\text{BR}}_N \times \hat{\text{BR}}_O$. The f -projection of the set of fixed points of $\hat{\text{BR}}$ is contained in Σ^* . $\hat{\text{BR}}$ is homotopic to $\tilde{\text{BR}}$ under a linear homotopy with no fixed points on the boundary of \tilde{U} . Hence the index of \tilde{U} under $\hat{\text{BR}}$ is the same as that under $\tilde{\text{BR}}$, and in particular nonzero.

Suppose either that $\Sigma^* \neq \hat{\Sigma}^*$ or the index of $\hat{\Sigma}^*$ is zero. Choose a closed neighborhood $\bar{V} \subseteq \bar{U}$ of $\tilde{\Sigma}^*$ in $\tilde{\Sigma}_N \times \bar{\Sigma}_O$ such that its f -projection to Σ does not contain $\hat{\Sigma}^*$ if $\Sigma^* \neq \hat{\Sigma}^*$. Let $\tilde{V} = r^{-1}(\bar{V})$. For each $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists a function $g : \Sigma \rightarrow \Sigma$ such that: (1) the graph of g is within ε of the graph of BR ; (2) g has no fixed points in $f(\tilde{V})$. Define $\hat{g}_N : \tilde{V} \rightarrow \tilde{\Sigma}_N$ by $\hat{g}_N = i \circ g \circ f \circ r$ and $\hat{g} = \hat{g}_N \times \hat{\text{BR}}_O$. Then \hat{g} is within ε of the graph of $\hat{\text{BR}}$ and has no fixed points in \tilde{V} , which is impossible since the index of $\hat{\text{BR}}$ is nonzero. Hence $\tilde{\Sigma}^* = \Sigma^*$ and its index is nonzero.

To prove the other direction, take an essential component Σ^* of G , whose index is, say, $c \neq 0$. Let U be a closed neighborhood of Σ^* that is disjoint from the other components of equilibria of G . $\text{BR} \times \text{Id} : U \times \tilde{\Sigma}_O \rightarrow \Sigma \times \Sigma_O$ has index c as well, where Id is the identity map. The index does not change if we replace Id with $\hat{\text{BR}}_O$ given by $\hat{\text{BR}}_O(\sigma, \bar{\sigma}_O) = \hat{\text{BR}}_O(i(\sigma), \bar{\sigma})$ or if we replace Σ with $i(\Sigma)$. Thus, for the correspondence $\bar{\text{BR}} : i(\Sigma) \times \tilde{\Sigma}_O \rightarrow i(\Sigma) \times \tilde{\Sigma}_O$ given by $\bar{\text{BR}}(i(\sigma), \tilde{\sigma}_O) = i(\text{BR}(\sigma)) \times \hat{\text{BR}}_O(i(\sigma), \tilde{\sigma}_O)$ the index over $i(U) \times \tilde{\Sigma}_O$ is still c .

Let \tilde{U} be the set of $\tilde{\sigma} \in \tilde{\Sigma}_N \times \tilde{\Sigma}_O$ such that $f(\tilde{\sigma}_N, \tilde{\sigma}_O) \in U$, and let $\tilde{U} = r^{-1}(\bar{U})$, where r is the retraction defined earlier in the proof. Let $\hat{\text{BR}}_N = i \circ \text{BR} \circ f \circ r$ and $\hat{\text{BR}} = \hat{\text{BR}}_N \times \hat{\text{BR}}_O$. The restriction of $\hat{\text{BR}}_N$ to $\tilde{U} \cap (i(\Sigma) \times \tilde{\Sigma}_O)$ is $\bar{\text{BR}}$ and hence its index is c . As $\hat{\text{BR}}$ maps into $(i(\Sigma) \times \tilde{\Sigma}_O)$, the index of $\hat{\text{BR}}$ over \tilde{U} is also c . As $\tilde{\text{BR}}$ is linearly homotopic to $\hat{\text{BR}}$ over \tilde{u} , its index, too, is c . In particular, there is at least one essential component $\tilde{\Sigma}^*$ whose f -image is contained in Σ^* . The same proof as above shows that $f(\tilde{\Sigma}^*)$ must in fact be Σ^* . \square

Proposition B.2. *Stability satisfies Axiom I*.*

Let \tilde{G} embed G strongly via the map f . As with Axiom D^* , we prove Proposition B.2 via two claims. The claim uses alternate characterizations of stability that obtain when we use other spaces of perturbations. In Definition 2.3, we used the space $T = \{\delta\tau \mid 0 \leq \delta \leq 1, \tau \in$

Σ } as the space of perturbations. We could equivalently have used $[0, 1] \times \Sigma$ as the space of perturbations, i.e. vectors $(\delta, \tau) \in [0, 1] \times \Sigma$ rather than vectors $\delta\tau$; or $[0, 1]^{\mathcal{N}} \times \Sigma$, where each player n has a different probability of tremble; or vectors $(\delta_n \tau_n)_{n \in \mathcal{N}}$ with $\delta_n \in [0, 1]$ and $\tau_n \in \Sigma_n$ for each n . Each of these perturbations defines a perturbed game in one of two ways. Take a vector $\delta\tau$ in T , for example: either we change the payoffs to a profile σ as we did in our definition to that from $(1 - \delta)\sigma + \delta\tau$ or we could restrict the strategy space $\Sigma(\delta\tau)$ to vectors σ such that $\sigma_{n,s_n} \geq \delta\tau_{n,s_n}$ for all $n \in \mathcal{N}$ and $s_n \in S_n$. The latter is what we call a perturbed equilibrium of the game $G(\delta\tau)$. A definition of stability based on any of these spaces of perturbations is equivalent that based on any other in this class of perturbations—see Corollary 6 of Section 5 of [21].

In our case, with outsiders, we can add to the variants of the set of perturbations (using the same logic as in the above case). We could use perturbations $((\delta_n \tilde{\tau}_n)_n, \delta_o \tilde{\tau}_o)$ or where the outsiders have a common tremble probability and the insiders a player-specific one. Finally, we also use the following tremble probabilities: for a fixed $0 < \beta < 1$, trembles $\hat{P}_\varepsilon^\beta$, which is the set of $((\delta_n \tau_n)_n, \delta_o \tau_o)$ satisfy the condition $\delta_o^\beta = \min_n \delta_n \leq \varepsilon$. For the last set of trembles, if there is a subset $\hat{X}_\varepsilon^\beta$ of the graph over $\hat{P}_\varepsilon^\beta$ that satisfies the condition of the essentiality, then there is $\tilde{X}_\varepsilon \supset \hat{X}_\varepsilon^\beta$ of the graph over equilibria over the set \tilde{P}_ε of perturbations $((\delta_n \tau_n)_n, \delta_o \tau_o)$ with $\delta_n \leq \varepsilon$ and $\delta_o \leq \varepsilon$ that satisfies the conditions for stability as well.

The proofs of the claims also use the concept of p -essentiality from Mertens [23]. A map $f : X \rightarrow Y$ between compact spaces is p -essential if for every compact pair $(Z, \partial Z)$, and map $g : Z \rightarrow Y$, letting Q be the fibered product $\{(x, z) \in X \times Z \mid f(x) = g(z)\}$ of f and g , and $q : (Q, \partial Q) \rightarrow (Z, \partial Z)$ the projection, with $\partial Q = q^{-1}(\partial Z)$, $\check{H}^*(q)$ is one-to-one. An important property of p -essentiality is that a composition of p -essential maps is p -essential.

In our context, typically Y is a simplex of perturbations P , while X is a subset of the graph of equilibria and f the projection map. When $\text{proj} : (X, \partial X) \rightarrow (P, \partial P)$ is essential in cohomology, then it is p -essential. p -essentiality also gives us that if R is a simplex contained in P , then the essentiality of proj from X to P implies the essentiality of the restriction of the projection to the inverse image of $(R, \partial R)$ as well.

Claim B.3. *Let $\tilde{\Sigma}^*$ be a stable set of \tilde{G} . Then $\Sigma^* \equiv f(\tilde{\Sigma}^*)$ is stable in G .*

Proof. Let $\tilde{T} = [0, 1]^{\mathcal{N}} \times [0, 1] \times \tilde{\Sigma}_{\mathcal{N}} \times \Sigma_o$. For each $(\tilde{\varepsilon}_{\mathcal{N}}, \tilde{\varepsilon}_o, \tilde{\tau}_{\mathcal{N}}, \tilde{\tau}_o)$ in \tilde{T} , there is a perturbed game where the strategy sets are the same as in \tilde{G} but where the payoffs to a profile $(\tilde{\sigma}, \tilde{\sigma}_o)$ are the payoffs in \tilde{G} to the profile $((1 - \tilde{\varepsilon}_n)\tilde{\sigma}_n + \tilde{\varepsilon}_n \tilde{\tau}_n)_n, (1 - \tilde{\varepsilon}_o)\tilde{\sigma}_o + \tilde{\varepsilon}_o \tilde{\tau}_o)$. Let $\tilde{E} \subseteq \tilde{T} \times \tilde{\Sigma}_{\mathcal{N}} \times \tilde{\Sigma}_o$ be closure of the graph of the equilibria of perturbed games $(\tilde{\varepsilon}_{\mathcal{N}}, \varepsilon_o, \tilde{\tau}_{\mathcal{N}}, \tilde{\tau}_o) \in \tilde{T} \setminus \partial \tilde{T}$, and let $\text{proj} : \tilde{E} \rightarrow \tilde{T}$ be the natural projection.

For each $\varepsilon \geq 0$, let \tilde{T}_ε be the set of $(\tilde{\delta}_N, \tilde{\delta}_O, \tilde{\tau}_N, \tilde{\tau}_O) \in \tilde{T}$ such that $\delta_n \leq \varepsilon$ for each n , and $\delta_{O \leq \varepsilon}$; for $\varepsilon > 0$, let $\partial\tilde{T}_\varepsilon$ be the boundary of \tilde{T}_ε . For each subset \tilde{Y} of \tilde{E} and $\varepsilon > 0$, let $(\tilde{Y}_\varepsilon, \partial\tilde{Y}_\varepsilon) = \tilde{\text{proj}}^{-1}(\tilde{T}_\varepsilon, \partial\tilde{T}_\varepsilon) \cap \tilde{Y}$ and let $\tilde{Y}_0 = \text{proj}^{-1}(\tilde{T}_0) \cap \tilde{Y}$.

Since $\tilde{\Sigma}^*$ is stable, there exists a subset \tilde{Y} of \tilde{E} such that: (1) $\tilde{\Sigma}^*$ is the set of $(\tilde{\sigma}_N, \tilde{\sigma}_O)$ such that \tilde{Y}_0 is the set of $(0, 0, \tau_N, \tau_O, \tilde{\sigma}_N, \tilde{\sigma}_O) \in \tilde{Y}$ for some (τ_N, τ_O) ; (2) for each neighborhood \tilde{V} of \tilde{Y}_0 in \tilde{Y} , there is a component of $\tilde{V} \setminus \partial\tilde{Y}_1$ whose closure is a neighborhood of \tilde{Y}_0 in \tilde{Y} ; (3) the projection from $(\tilde{Y}_\varepsilon, \partial\tilde{Y}_\varepsilon)$ to $(\tilde{T}_\varepsilon, \partial\tilde{T}_\varepsilon)$ is essential in Čech cohomology with coefficients in \mathbb{Z}_p for some (and then all smaller) $\varepsilon > 0$. We can assume, if necessary by replacing \tilde{Y} with a subset \tilde{Y}_ε for a sufficiently small ε that for $(\tilde{\delta}_N, \tilde{\delta}_O, \tilde{\sigma}_N, \tilde{\sigma}_O, \tilde{\sigma}_N, \tilde{\sigma}_O)$ in \tilde{Y} , $((1 - \delta_n)\sigma_n + \delta_n\tau_n)_n, (1 - \tilde{\delta}_O), \tilde{\sigma}_O + \delta_O\tilde{\tau}_O)$ belongs to \tilde{U} , the neighborhood of $\tilde{\Sigma}_N \times \tilde{\Sigma}_O$ given in Definition 5.2.

Let P be the set of $(\varepsilon_n\tau_n)_{n \in N}$ such that $0 \leq \varepsilon_n \leq 1$ and $\tau_n \in \Sigma_n$ for each n . Each $\eta \in P$ defines a perturbed game where the set of strategies is $\Sigma(\eta)$. Let E be the equilibrium graph over P . Define a map $\varphi : \tilde{Y} \rightarrow E$ as follows. $\varphi(\varepsilon_N, \varepsilon_O, \tilde{\tau}_N, \tilde{\tau}_O, \tilde{\sigma}_N, \tilde{\sigma}_O) = (\eta, \sigma)$ where, letting $\hat{\sigma}_O = (1 - \varepsilon_O)\tilde{\sigma}_O + \varepsilon_O\tilde{\tau}_O$, for each n : (1) $\eta_n = \varepsilon_n f_n(\tilde{\tau}_n, \hat{\sigma}_O) + (1 - \varepsilon_n) \sum_{\tilde{s}_O \notin \tilde{\Sigma}_O} \hat{\sigma}_O(\tilde{s}_O) f_n(\tilde{\sigma}_n, \tilde{s}_O)$; (2) $\sigma_n = f_n((1 - \varepsilon_n)\tilde{\sigma}_n + \varepsilon_n\tilde{\tau}_n, \hat{\sigma}_O)$. It is easily checked that φ is a well-defined map into E . Let $X = \varphi(\tilde{Y})$. Σ^* is the set of σ such that $(0, \sigma) \in X_0$. Also, the connexity property holds for X . We merely have to show that the projection from X to P is essential for some positive ε .

For each $\varepsilon \geq 0$, let \tilde{P}_ε be the set of $(\tilde{\delta}_N, \tilde{\delta}_O, \tilde{\tau}_N, \tilde{\tau}_O) \in \tilde{T}_1$ such that $\tilde{\delta}_O \leq \min_n \tilde{\delta}_n$ and $\max_n \delta_n \leq \varepsilon$; for $\varepsilon > 0$, let $\partial\tilde{P}_\varepsilon$ be the boundary of \tilde{P}_ε . Let $(\tilde{X}_\varepsilon, \partial\tilde{X}_\varepsilon) = \tilde{Y}_\varepsilon \cap (\tilde{\text{proj}}^{-1}(\tilde{P}_\varepsilon, \partial\tilde{P}_\varepsilon))$. As \tilde{P}_ε is a simplex contained in T_ε and the projection from \tilde{Y}_ε to \tilde{T}_ε is essential for all small $\varepsilon > 0$, the projection from $(\tilde{X}_\varepsilon, \partial\tilde{X}_\varepsilon)$ to $(\tilde{P}_\varepsilon, \partial\tilde{P}_\varepsilon)$ is essential for all such ε .

Define a function $h : \tilde{P}_\varepsilon \rightarrow \prod_n \mathbb{R}^{S_n}$ by: $h(\delta_N, \delta_O, \tilde{\tau}_N, \tilde{\tau}_O) = \eta$ where, letting $\hat{\tau}_O^*$ be the uniform profile of the outsiders, for each n , $\eta_n = \delta_n f_n(\tilde{\tau}_n, \hat{\tau}_O^*) + \delta_O \sum_{\tilde{s}_O \notin \tilde{\Sigma}_O} \hat{\tau}_O^*(\tilde{s}_O) f_n(\tilde{\sigma}_n, \tilde{\tau}_O^*)$. Let $\hat{P}_\varepsilon = h^{-1}(P_\varepsilon)$. \hat{P}_ε is a full-dimensional subset of \tilde{P}_ε for small ε , and the map $h : \hat{P}_\varepsilon \rightarrow P_\varepsilon$ is p -essential. Observe that for $\eta = h(\delta_N, \delta_O, \tilde{\tau}_N, \tilde{\tau}_O)$ if $\sum_{s_n} \eta_{n,s_n} = \varepsilon$ for some n , then necessarily $\delta_n \geq .5\varepsilon$. Construct a continuous function $t : [0, \varepsilon] \rightarrow [0, 2]$ such that $t(\delta) = 1$ if $\delta \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{4}$; $t(\delta) = \frac{\varepsilon}{\delta}$ if $\delta \geq \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$; and t is linear on $[\frac{\varepsilon}{4}, \frac{\varepsilon}{2}]$. Modify the map h to a map \hat{h} with $\hat{h}_n(\cdot) = t(\sum_{n,s_n} h_{n,s_n}(\cdot)) h_n(\cdot)$. Clearly the map \hat{h} is also p -essential.

Obviously, the projection from $\hat{X} \equiv \tilde{\text{proj}}^{-1}(\hat{P}_\varepsilon) \cap \tilde{X}_\varepsilon$ to \hat{P}_ε , and thus its composition with \hat{h} , is also p -essential. Hence $\hat{h} \circ \tilde{\text{proj}} : (\hat{X}, \partial\hat{X}) \rightarrow (P_\varepsilon, \partial P_\varepsilon)$ is essential where $\partial\hat{X}$ is the inverse of ∂P_ε under $\hat{h} \circ \tilde{\text{proj}}$. When comparing $\hat{h} \circ \tilde{\text{proj}}$ with the map $\text{proj} \circ \varphi$ as maps from \hat{X} to

P_1 , we see that for $\eta = \hat{h} \circ \text{proj}(\delta_N, \delta_O, \tilde{\tau}_N, \tilde{\tau}_O) \in \partial P_\varepsilon$: (1) if η belongs to ∂P_1 (i.e. $\eta_{n,s_n} = 0$ for some n, s_n), then under $\text{proj} \circ \varphi$, the same property holds; (2) if $\sum_{s_n} \eta_{n,s_n} = \varepsilon$, then the corresponding sum under the image of $\text{proj} \circ \varphi$ is at least $\frac{\varepsilon}{2}$. Therefore, by retracting $\text{proj} \circ \varphi$ from P_1 to P_ε , we see that they are linearly homotopic as maps from $(\hat{X}, \partial \hat{X})$ to $(P_\varepsilon, \partial P_\varepsilon)$. Therefore, $\text{proj} \circ \varphi$ is essential, implying that proj is an essential map. Thus we have shown that Σ^* is stable. \square

We need the following lemma to prove the claim in the other direction. It is similar in spirit to Lemma A.5 and, especially, Lemma C.2 of GW; therefore, its proof is omitted. For $\delta > 0$, let $\tilde{\Sigma}_O^\delta$ be the set of $\tilde{\sigma}_O \in \tilde{\Sigma}_O$ such that for each outsider the probability under $\tilde{\sigma}_O$ of a pure strategy that does not belong to his factor of $\tilde{\Sigma}_O$ is no more than δ . Let $d = \dim(\tilde{\Sigma}_N) - \dim(\Sigma)$ and $(B, \partial B) = ([0, 1]^d, \partial[0, 1]^d)$, with the convention that B is a singleton set and $\partial B = \emptyset$, if $d = 0$.

Lemma B.4. *There exists $\delta_o > 0$ and a semialgebraic function $h : \Sigma \times B \times \tilde{\Sigma}_O^{\delta_o} \rightarrow \tilde{\Sigma}$ such that for each $\tilde{\sigma}_O \in \tilde{\Sigma}_O^{\delta_o}$:*

- (1) $f \circ h(\sigma, b, \tilde{\sigma}_O) = \sigma$ for all $(\sigma, b) \in \Sigma \times B$;
- (2) for each $\sigma \in \Sigma \setminus \partial \Sigma$ and $\tilde{\sigma}_O$ such that $\sum_{\tilde{s}_{so} \notin \tilde{S}_O} \tilde{\sigma}_O < \min_{n,s_n} \sigma_{n,s_n}$, $h(\sigma, \cdot, \tilde{\sigma}_O)$ maps $B \setminus \partial B$ homeomorphically on to the set of $\tilde{\sigma}_N \in \tilde{\Sigma}_N \setminus \partial \tilde{\Sigma}_N$ such that $f(\tilde{\sigma}_N, \tilde{\sigma}_O) = \sigma$.

Let $C\Sigma$, $C\tilde{\Sigma}_N$, and $C\tilde{\Sigma}_O$ be, resp., the convex cones generated by Σ , $\tilde{\Sigma}_N$, and $\tilde{\Sigma}_O^{\delta_o}$. Then f extends to a multilinear function from $C\tilde{\Sigma}_N \times C\tilde{\Sigma}_O^{\delta_o}$ to $C\Sigma$ in the obvious way. h also extends to a map from $C\Sigma \times B \times (C\tilde{\Sigma}_O \setminus 0)$ to $C\tilde{\Sigma}_N$, denoted still h , using the formula: $h(\lambda\sigma, b, \tilde{\mu}\tilde{\sigma}_O) = \tilde{\mu}^{-1}\lambda h(\sigma, b, \tilde{\sigma}_O)$ for $\lambda \geq 0, \tilde{\mu} > 0$. $f \circ h$ is still the projection on the first factor. The map continues to be a homeomorphism between $B \setminus \partial B$ and its image for any fixed $\lambda, \tilde{\mu} > 0, \sigma \in \Sigma, \tilde{\sigma}_O \in \tilde{\Sigma}_O$, with $\sum_{\tilde{s}_{so} \notin \tilde{S}_O} \tilde{\sigma}_O < \min_{n,s_n} \sigma_{n,s_n}$.

Claim B.5. *Let Σ^* be a stable set of G . There exists a stable set $\tilde{\Sigma}^*$ of \tilde{G} such that $f(\tilde{\Sigma}^*) = \Sigma^*$.*

Proof. It is sufficient to prove the claim under the additional assumption that Σ^* is semi-algebraic, as the collection of stable sets is compact in Hausdorff topology and the subcollection of semi-algebraic stable sets is dense in it. The proof proceeds in steps.

Step 1. For each $0 < \varepsilon \leq 1$, let \tilde{P}_ε be the set of $((\tilde{\delta}_n \tilde{\tau}_n)_n, \tilde{\delta}_O \tilde{\tau}_O)$ such that $0 \leq \tilde{\delta}_n \leq \varepsilon$ for all n , $\tilde{\delta}_O \leq \varepsilon$, $\tilde{\tau}_N \in \tilde{\Sigma}_N$, and $\tilde{\tau}_O \in \tilde{\Sigma}_O$. Let $\partial \tilde{P}_\varepsilon$ be its topological boundary. Let \tilde{E} be the closure of the set of $(\tilde{\eta}_N, \tilde{\eta}_O, \tilde{\sigma}_N, \tilde{\sigma}_O) \in (\tilde{P}_1 \setminus \partial \tilde{P}_1) \times \tilde{\Sigma}_N \times \tilde{\Sigma}_O$ such that $(\tilde{\sigma}_N, \tilde{\sigma}_O)$ is an equilibrium of

the game where the strategy sets are $\tilde{\Sigma}_N(\eta_N) \times \tilde{\Sigma}_O(\eta_O)$. Let $\text{proj} : \tilde{E} \rightarrow \tilde{P}_1$ be the projection map.

Let \tilde{E}_0 be the set of points in \tilde{E} of the form $(0, 0, \tilde{\sigma}, \tilde{\sigma}_o)$. Let \tilde{E}_0^* be the set of points of the form $(0, 0, \tilde{\sigma}, \tilde{\sigma}_o)$ and with $f(\tilde{\sigma}) \in \Sigma^*$. We can take a semi-algebraic triangulation of \tilde{E} such that \tilde{E}_0^* is a full subcomplex. Let \tilde{X}^* be the union of the simplices of this triangulation that have a face in \tilde{E}_0^* . \tilde{X}^* is semi-algebraic. By Lemma 2 of [22], there exists $\tilde{\varepsilon}_o$ and a finite number of subsets \tilde{X}^k of \tilde{X}^* such that: (1) $\cup_k \tilde{X}^k = \tilde{X}^*$; (2) for all $0 < \varepsilon \leq \tilde{\varepsilon}_o$ and k , $\tilde{X}_\varepsilon^k \setminus \partial\tilde{X}_\varepsilon^k$ is connected and dense in \tilde{X}_ε^k , and $\tilde{X}_\varepsilon^k \cap \tilde{X}_\varepsilon^l \subseteq \partial\tilde{X}_\varepsilon^k$ for $l \neq k$. To prove our theorem, it is sufficient to show that for some k : (1) Σ^* is the set of profiles $f(\tilde{\sigma}_N, \tilde{\sigma}_o)$ such that $(0, 0, \tilde{\sigma}_N, \tilde{\sigma}_o) \in \tilde{X}^k$; (2) \tilde{X}^k satisfies the essentiality property.

Step 2. Define two functions $\gamma_1, \gamma_2 : \tilde{X}^* \rightarrow [0, 1]$ as follows. $\gamma_1(\eta_N, \delta_o \tau_o, \tilde{\sigma}_N, \tilde{\sigma}_o) = \delta_o$; $\gamma_2(\eta_N, \delta_o \tilde{\tau}_o, \tilde{\sigma}_N, \tilde{\sigma}_o) = \sum_{s_o \notin \tilde{S}_o} \tilde{\sigma}_o(s_o)$ is the probability that a profile not in \tilde{S}_O is chosen under $\tilde{\sigma}_o$. Then $\gamma_1^{-1}(0) \subseteq \gamma_2^{-1}(0)$, as for each $\tilde{\sigma}_N$, the equilibria of the game $\tilde{G}_o^{\tilde{\sigma}_N}$ is contained in $\tilde{\Sigma}_O$. By the Lojasiewicz Inequality—cf. Corollary 2.6.7 of [2]—there exist $0 < \tilde{\varepsilon}_1 \leq \tilde{\varepsilon}_o$, and $0 < \alpha < 1$ such that $\gamma_2 \leq \gamma_1^\alpha$ on $\tilde{X}_{\tilde{\varepsilon}_1}^*$.

Step 3. Fix now $0 < \beta < \alpha$ where α is given by Step 2. For each $0 < \varepsilon \leq \tilde{\varepsilon}_1$, where $\tilde{\varepsilon}_1$ is as in Step 2, let $\tilde{P}_\varepsilon^\beta$ be the set of $((\delta_n \tilde{\tau}_n)_n, \delta_o \tilde{\tau}_o) \in \tilde{P}_\varepsilon$ such that for all n , $\delta_o^\beta \leq \delta_n$, and let $\partial\tilde{P}_\varepsilon^\beta$ be its boundary. Let $(\tilde{X}_\varepsilon^{k,\beta}, \partial\tilde{X}_\varepsilon^{k,\beta}) = \tilde{X}_\varepsilon^k \cap \text{proj}^{-1}(\tilde{P}_\varepsilon^\beta, \partial\tilde{P}_\varepsilon^\beta)$ be the corresponding subset of \tilde{X}_ε^k for perturbations in $\tilde{P}_\varepsilon^\beta$. We prove in this step that for each k , the essentiality of the projection from \tilde{X}_ε^k to \tilde{P}_ε is equivalent to that of the projection from $\tilde{X}_\varepsilon^{k,\beta}$ to $\tilde{P}_{\varepsilon,\beta}$.

For a proof in one direction, observe that the essentiality of the projection from \tilde{X}_ε^k implies that it is p -essential, and thus the projection from $(\tilde{X}_\varepsilon^{k,\beta}, \partial\tilde{X}_\varepsilon^{k,\beta})$ to $(\tilde{P}_\varepsilon^\beta, \partial\tilde{P}_\varepsilon^\beta)$ is essential. Going the other way, the essentiality of the projection from $\tilde{X}_\varepsilon^{k,\beta}$ implies its p -essentiality and thus the essentiality of the projection from $\hat{X}_\varepsilon^{k,\beta}$ to $\hat{P}_\varepsilon^{k,\beta}$, where $\hat{P}_\varepsilon^{k,\beta}$ is the set of $((\delta_n \tilde{\tau}_n)_n, \delta_o \tilde{\tau}_o)$ such that $\delta_o = \min_n \delta_n^\beta$, and \hat{X}_ε^k is the inverse image in $\tilde{X}_\varepsilon^{k,\beta}$ of $\hat{P}_\varepsilon^{k,\beta}$ under the projection map. The set $\hat{P}_\varepsilon^{k,\beta}$ is another set of perturbations for stability, and essentiality with this set of perturbations is equivalent to that for the set $\tilde{P}_\varepsilon^{k,\beta}$ of perturbations. Thus, the essentiality of the projection from \tilde{X}_ε^k to \tilde{P}_ε is equivalent to that from $\tilde{X}_\varepsilon^{k,\beta}$ to $\tilde{P}_\varepsilon^\beta$.

Step 4. For each positive integer L and $\varepsilon > 0$, let $\tilde{P}_{\varepsilon,L}^\beta$ be the set of $(\delta \tilde{\tau}, \tilde{\delta}_o \tilde{\tau}_o) \in \tilde{P}_\varepsilon^\beta$ such that $\tilde{\tau}_{n,s_n} \geq L^{-1}$ for each n and s_n and let $\tilde{X}_{\varepsilon,L}^{k,\beta}$ be the corresponding subset of $\tilde{X}_\varepsilon^{k,\beta}$. If $L > |\tilde{S}_n|$, then $\tilde{P}_{\varepsilon,L}^\beta$ is a nonempty, full-dimensional subset of $\tilde{P}_\varepsilon^\beta$. For such large $L < L'$, the inclusion $(\tilde{P}_\varepsilon^\beta, \tilde{P}_\varepsilon^\beta \setminus (\tilde{P}_{\varepsilon,L'}^\beta \setminus \partial\tilde{P}_{\varepsilon,L'}^\beta)) \subset (\tilde{P}_\varepsilon^\beta, \tilde{P}_\varepsilon^\beta \setminus (\tilde{P}_{\varepsilon,L}^\beta \setminus \partial\tilde{P}_{\varepsilon,L}^\beta))$ induces an isomorphism of their

cohomology groups, and $(\tilde{P}_\varepsilon^\beta, \partial\tilde{P}_\varepsilon^\beta) = \cap_L(\tilde{P}_\varepsilon^\beta, \tilde{P}_\varepsilon^\beta \setminus (\tilde{P}_{\varepsilon,L}^\beta \setminus \partial\tilde{P}_{\varepsilon,L}^\beta))$. We have a similar situation with the sets $\tilde{X}_{\varepsilon,L}^{k,\beta}$. It is then clear that essentiality of the projection for $(\tilde{X}_\varepsilon^{k,\beta}, \partial\tilde{X}_\varepsilon^{k,\beta})$ to $(\tilde{P}_\varepsilon^\beta, \partial\tilde{P}_\varepsilon^\beta)$ is equivalent to the essentiality of the projection from $(\tilde{X}_{\varepsilon,L}^{k,\beta}, \partial\tilde{X}_{\varepsilon,L}^{k,\beta})$ to $(\tilde{P}_{\varepsilon,L}^\beta, \partial\tilde{P}_{\varepsilon,L}^\beta)$ for large L . For the rest of the proof, fix a large enough L so that this property holds.

Step 5. We use P to denote the space of perturbations $\eta \in \prod_n \mathbb{R}^{S_n}$ and consider perturbed games to be obtained by restricting strategy sets to be $\Sigma(\eta)$ for each perturbation vector η . E is the graph of perturbed equilibria over P . There exists a semi-algebraic set $X \subseteq E$ and $0 < \varepsilon_0 < 1$ such that: (1) $X_0 = \{0\} \times \Sigma^*$; (2) for each $0 < \varepsilon \leq \varepsilon_0$, $X_\varepsilon \setminus \partial X_\varepsilon$ is connected and dense in X_ε ; (3) the projection map $\text{proj} : (X_\varepsilon, \partial X_\varepsilon) \rightarrow (P_\varepsilon, \partial P_\varepsilon)$ is essential for all $0 < \varepsilon \leq \varepsilon_0$.

Step 6. Fix $0 < \varepsilon_1 \leq \varepsilon_0, \tilde{\varepsilon}_1, \delta_o$, where ε_0 is from Step 5, $\tilde{\varepsilon}_1$ is from Step 2, and δ_o is as in Lemma B.4. Then the projection from X_{ε_1} to P_{ε_1} is essential. Let $\tilde{P}_{o,\varepsilon}$ be the set of $\delta_o \tau_o$ such that $\delta_o \leq \varepsilon_1$. Let \hat{P}_{ε_1} be the set of $(\eta_N, b, \tilde{b}, \delta_o \tilde{\tau}_o) \in P_{\varepsilon_1} \times B \times B \times \tilde{P}_{o,\varepsilon}$ such that $\delta_o^\alpha \leq \min_n \eta_{n,s_n}$ for all n, s_n , where B is as in Lemma B.4. Let $\partial\hat{P}_{\varepsilon_1}$ be the set of points $(\eta_N, b, \tilde{b}, \delta_o \tilde{\tau}_o) \in \hat{P}_{\varepsilon_1}$ such that: (1) $(\eta_N, b) \in \partial(P_{\varepsilon_1,L} \times B)$; or (2) $\delta_o \tilde{\tau}_o \in \partial\tilde{P}_{o,\varepsilon_1}$; or (3) $\delta_o^\alpha = \eta_{n,s_n}$ for some n, s_n . Let \hat{X}_{ε_1} be the set of $((\eta_N, b, \tilde{b}, \delta_o \tilde{\tau}_o), \sigma) \in \hat{P}_{\varepsilon_1} \times \Sigma$ such that $(\eta_N, \sigma) \in X_\varepsilon$ and let $\hat{\text{proj}}$ be the projection map from \hat{X}_{ε_1} to \hat{P}_{ε_1} . Let $\partial\hat{X}_{\varepsilon_1}$ be the inverse image in \hat{X}_{ε_1} of $\partial\hat{P}_{\varepsilon_1}$ under $\hat{\text{proj}}$. The essentiality of proj from $(X_{\varepsilon_1}, \partial X_{\varepsilon_1})$ to $(P_{\varepsilon_1}, \partial P_{\varepsilon_1})$ implies that of $\hat{\text{proj}}$ from $(\hat{X}_{\varepsilon_1}, \partial\hat{X}_{\varepsilon_1})$ to $(\hat{P}_{\varepsilon_1}, \partial\hat{P}_{\varepsilon_1})$.

Step 7. Let $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}_o$ be the space of all the payoffs for the outsiders over the strategy space $\tilde{S}_N \times \tilde{S}_o$. For each $\hat{G} \in \tilde{\mathcal{G}}_o$, and $\tilde{\sigma}_N \in \tilde{\Sigma}_N$, we have a well-defined game $\hat{G}^{\tilde{\sigma}_N}$. Given \hat{G} , $\tilde{\sigma}_N \in \tilde{\Sigma}_N$, and $(\eta_N, b, \tilde{b}, \tilde{\eta}_o) \in \hat{P}_{\varepsilon_1}$, we define a perturbed game $\hat{G}^{\tilde{\sigma}_N}(\eta_o)$ as the game where the strategy space is the set $\tilde{\Sigma}_o(\eta_N, \eta_o)$ of profiles in $\tilde{\Sigma}_o(\eta_o)$ such that for each outsider o_i and \tilde{s}_{o_i} that is not in \tilde{S}_{o_i} , $\tilde{\sigma}_{o_i, \tilde{s}_{o_i}} \leq |\tilde{S}_o|^{-1} \eta_{n,s_n}^{\alpha-1}$ for all n, s_n .

Given $(\eta_N, b, \tilde{b}, \eta_o)$ and $(\sigma, \tilde{\sigma}_o)$ with $\sigma_N \geq \eta_N$ and $\tilde{\sigma}_o \in \tilde{\Sigma}_o(\eta_N, \eta_o)$, define $\hat{\sigma}_N(\eta_N, \tilde{b}, \sigma, \tilde{\sigma}_o) = h(\sigma_N - \eta_N, \tilde{b}, \hat{\sigma}_o)$ where $\hat{\sigma}_o$ is the projection of $\tilde{\sigma}_o$ to the coordinates of strategies in \tilde{S} ; and define $\tilde{\eta}(\eta_N, b, \tilde{b}, \sigma, \tilde{\sigma}_o)$ to be $h(\eta - \sum_{\tilde{s}_o \notin \tilde{S}_o} \tilde{\sigma}_{\tilde{s}_o} f(\tilde{s}_o, \hat{\sigma}_{s_o}), b, \tilde{\sigma}_o)$.

Let \mathcal{E} be the set of $((\eta_N, b, \tilde{b}, \delta_o \tilde{\tau}_o), \sigma, \hat{G}_o, \tilde{\sigma}_N, \tilde{\sigma}_o) \in \hat{P}_{\varepsilon_1} \times \Sigma \times \tilde{\mathcal{G}}_o \times \tilde{\Sigma}_N \times \tilde{\Sigma}_o$ such that: (1) $\tilde{\sigma}_o$ is an equilibrium, of $\hat{G}^{\tilde{\sigma}_N}(\eta_o)$; (2) $\tilde{\sigma}_N = \hat{\sigma}_N(\eta_N, \tilde{b}, \sigma, \tilde{\sigma}_o) + \tilde{\eta}_N(\eta_N, b, \tilde{b}, \sigma, \tilde{\sigma}_o)$. A variation of the KM structure theorem—see the Proposition in KM—shows that \mathcal{E} is homeomorphic to $\hat{P}_{\varepsilon_1} \times \Sigma \times \tilde{\mathcal{G}}_o$ and that the projection map \tilde{g} has degree one; thus \tilde{g} is p -essential.

Step 8. Let $g : \hat{X}_{\varepsilon_1} \rightarrow \hat{P}_{\varepsilon_1} \times \Sigma \times \mathcal{G}_o$ be given by $(\eta_N, b, \tilde{b}, \tilde{\eta}_o, \sigma) = (\eta_N, b, \tilde{b}, \tilde{\eta}_o, \sigma, \tilde{G})$. Let \hat{Y}_{ε_1} be the fibered product of \tilde{g} and g . Since \tilde{g} is p -essential, the projection proj^g from $(\hat{Y}_{\varepsilon_1}, \partial\hat{Y}_{\varepsilon_1})$ to $(\hat{X}_{\varepsilon_1}, \partial\hat{X}_{\varepsilon_1})$ is essential, where $\partial\hat{Y}_{\varepsilon_1}$ is the inverse image of $\partial X_{\varepsilon_1}$ under this projection. (In particular this projection is onto.) Therefore, for all $0 < \varepsilon \leq \varepsilon_1$, the projection proj^g from $(\hat{Y}_\varepsilon, \partial\hat{Y}_\varepsilon)$ to $(\hat{X}_\varepsilon, \partial\hat{X}_\varepsilon)$, and then $\hat{\text{proj}} \circ \text{proj}^g$ to $(\hat{P}_\varepsilon, \partial\hat{P}_\varepsilon)$, is essential as well.

Again applying Lemma 2 of [22], there exists $0 < \varepsilon \leq \varepsilon_1$ and a subset \hat{Z}_ε of \hat{Y}_ε such that for each $0 < \delta \leq \varepsilon$, the projection from \hat{Z}_δ to \hat{X}_δ is essential and \hat{Z}_ε satisfies the connectivity condition, i.e., for all $\delta \leq \varepsilon$, $\hat{Z}_\delta \setminus \partial\hat{Z}_\delta$ is connected and dense in \hat{Z}_δ .

Step 9. Now, define a map $H : \hat{Z}_\varepsilon$ to \tilde{E}_ε by: $H((\eta_N, b, \tilde{b}, \tilde{\eta}_o, \sigma, \tilde{\sigma}_N, \tilde{\sigma}_o)) = (\tilde{\eta}_N, \tilde{\eta}_o, \tilde{\sigma}_N, \tilde{\sigma}_o)$ with $\tilde{\eta}_N = \tilde{\eta}_N(\eta_N, b, \tilde{b}, \sigma, \tilde{\sigma}_o)$. Let $\hat{E}_\varepsilon = H(\hat{Z}_\varepsilon)$. H maps $(\hat{Z}_\varepsilon \setminus \partial\hat{Z}_\varepsilon)$ homeomorphically onto its image. As proj^g from \hat{Z}_ε to \hat{X}_ε is onto, we also have that Σ^* is the set of $f(\tilde{\sigma}_N, \tilde{\sigma}_o)$ such that $(0, 0, \tilde{\sigma}_N, \tilde{\sigma}_o) \in \hat{E}_\varepsilon$. Thus $\hat{E}_\delta \equiv H(\hat{Z}_\delta)$ is contained in \tilde{X}^* for all small δ . By the connectedness property of \hat{E}_δ , there exists a unique k , say $k = 1$, such that \tilde{X}^k contains \hat{E}_δ for all small $\delta > 0$. Obviously, $\Sigma^* = f(\tilde{\Sigma}^*)$, where $\tilde{X}_0^1 = \{(0, 0)\} \times \tilde{\Sigma}^*$. There remains to show that \tilde{X}^1 satisfies the essentiality condition for stability.

Step 10. Choose $\delta_1 > 0$ small such that \hat{E}_{δ_1} is contained in $\tilde{X}_{\varepsilon_1}^1$. Choose also $0 < \delta < \delta_1$ such that $\delta^\alpha \leq (1 - \delta^\alpha)\delta^\beta L$ and $\delta^{\frac{\alpha}{\beta}} \leq L^{-1}\delta$. We conclude the proof by showing that the projection from $\tilde{X}_{\delta, L}^{1, \beta}$ to $\tilde{P}_{\delta, L}^\beta$ is essential. Define $\psi : \hat{P}_{\delta_1} \rightarrow \tilde{P}_{\delta_1}$ by $\psi(\eta_N, b, \tilde{b}, \tilde{\eta}_o) = (\tilde{\eta}_N, \tilde{\eta}_o)$ where $\tilde{\eta}_N = \tilde{\eta}(\eta_N, b, \tilde{b}, \sigma^*, \tilde{\sigma}_o^*)$, with σ^* being the profile of uniform distributions and $\tilde{\sigma}_o^*$ a strategy profile with support \tilde{S}_o . Let $(Q_{\delta_1}, \partial Q_{\delta_1}) = \psi(\hat{P}_{\delta_1}, \partial\hat{P}_{\delta_1})$. ψ induces a homeomorphism between $\hat{P}_{\delta_1} \setminus \partial\hat{P}_{\delta_1}$ and its image $Q_{\delta_1} \setminus \partial Q_{\delta_1}$. Then, $\psi \circ \text{proj}^g \circ H^{-1}$ is an essential map from $(\hat{E}_{\delta_1}, \partial\hat{E}_{\delta_1})$ to $(Q_{\delta_1}, \partial Q_{\delta_1})$.

We now have that $\tilde{P}_{\delta, L}^\beta$ is contained in Q_{δ_1} by our choice of δ . Since Q_δ and $\tilde{P}_{\delta, L}^\beta$ are both simplices, the inclusion $(Q_{\delta_1}, \partial Q_{\delta_1}) \subseteq (Q_{\delta_1}, Q_{\delta_1} \setminus (P_{\delta, L}^\beta \setminus \partial P_{\delta, L}^\beta))$ induces an isomorphism of the cohomology groups. Thus, $\psi \circ \text{proj}^g \circ H^{-1}$ is essential as a map from $(\hat{E}_\delta, \partial\hat{E}_\delta) \rightarrow (Q_{\delta_1}, Q_{\delta_1} \setminus (P_{\delta, L}^\beta \setminus \partial P_{\delta, L}^\beta))$.

For $t \in [0, 1]$, and $(\eta_N, \eta_o, \tilde{\sigma}_{sn}, \tilde{\sigma}_{so}) \in \hat{E}_{\delta_1}$, define $F^t(\eta_N, \eta_o, \tilde{\sigma}_{sn}, \tilde{\sigma}_{so}) = (\tilde{\eta}_N^t, \eta_o)$ where $\tilde{\eta}_N^t = \tilde{\eta}(\eta_N, b, \tilde{b}, t\sigma + (1-t)\sigma^*, t\tilde{\sigma}_o + (1-t)\tilde{\sigma}_o^*)$. F^t defines a homotopy between $\psi \circ \hat{\text{proj}} \circ \text{proj}^g \circ H^{-1}$ and $\tilde{\text{proj}}$, which is the projection map from \tilde{X}_ε to \tilde{P}_ε . Hence, $\tilde{\text{proj}}$ is essential as a map from $(\hat{E}_{\delta_1}, \partial\hat{E}_{\delta_1})$ to $(Q_{\delta_1}, Q_{\delta_1} \setminus (P_{\delta, L}^\beta \setminus \partial P_{\delta, L}^\beta))$. This implies that the projection map from $X_{\delta, L}^\beta$ to $P_{\delta, L}^\beta$ is essential. \square

REFERENCES

- [1] Blume, L., A. Brandenburger, and E. Dekel (1991): “Lexicographic Probabilities and Equilibrium Refinements,” *Econometrica* 59, 81-98.
- [2] Bochnak, J., M. Coste, and M.-F. Roy (1998): *Real Algebraic Geometry*. Berlin: Springer Verlag.
- [3] Callejas, I., S. Govindan, and L. Pahl (2021): “A Finite Characterization of Perfect Equilibria,” *Mathematical Programming Series B*
- [4] DeMichelis, S. and F. Germano (2020): “On the Indices of Zeros of Nash Fields,” *Journal of Economic Theory*, 94, 192-217.
- [5] De Stefano Grigis, F. (2014): “Strategic Stability of Equilibria: The Missing Paragraph,” preprint.
- [6] Govindan, S., and T. Klumpp (2002): “Perfect Equilibrium and Lexicographic Beliefs,” *International Journal of Game Theory*, 31, 229-43.
- [7] Govindan, S., R. Laraki and L. Pahl (2023): “On Sustainable Equilibria” *Journal of Economic Theory*, 213, 105736.
- [8] Govindan, S., and J.-F. Mertens (2003): “An Equivalent Definition of Stable Equilibria,” *International Journal of Game Theory*, 32, 339-57.
- [9] Govindan, S., and R. Wilson (2002): “Structure theorem for game trees,” *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 102, 15706–11.
- [10] Govindan, S., and R. Wilson (2005): “Essential Equilibria,” *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 102, 15706–11.
- [11] Govindan, S., and R. Wilson (2008): “Metastable Equilibria,” *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 33, 787-820.
- [12] Govindan, S., and R. Wilson (2012): “Axiomatic Equilibrium Selection for Generic Two-Player Games,” *Econometrica*, 80, 1639-99.
- [13] Gül, F., D. Pearce, and E. Stacchetti (1993): “A Bound on the Proportion of Pure Strategy Equilibria in Generic Games,” *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 18, 548–52.
- [14] Hillas, J., T. Kao, and A. Schiff (2002): “A Semi-Algebraic Proof of The Generic Equivalence of Quasi-Perfect and Sequential Equilibria,” mimeo.
- [15] Kohlberg, E., J.-F. Mertens, (1986): “On the Strategic Stability of Equilibria,” *Econometrica*, 54, 5, 1003-7.
- [16] Kreps, D., and R. Wilson (1982): “Sequential Equilibria,” *Econometrica*, 50, 863-94.
- [17] Kuhn, H. (1953): “Extensive Form Games and The Problem of Information,” *Contributions to The Theory of Games, Vol. II*, ed. by H. Kuhn and A. Tucker. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, pp. 193-216. Reprinted in *Classics in Game Theory* ed. by H. Kuhn. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press (1997).
- [18] McLennan, A. (1989a): “The Space of Conditional Systems is a Ball,” *International Journal of Game Theory*, 18, 125-39.
- [19] McLennan, A. (1989b): “Consistent Conditional Systems in Noncooperative Game Theory,” *International Journal of Game Theory*, 18, 141-74.
- [20] Mertens, J.-F. (1989): “Stable Equilibria—A Reformulation, Part I: Definition and Basic Properties”, *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 14, 575-625.
- [21] Mertens, J.-F. (1991): “Stable Equilibria—A Reformulation, Part II: Discussion of The Definition and Further Results,” *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 16, 694-753.
- [22] Mertens, J.-F. (1992a): “The Small Worlds Axiom for Stable Equilibria,” *Games and Economic Behavior*, 4, 553-64

- [23] Mertens, J.-F. (1992b): “Essential Maps and Manifolds,” *Proceedings of The American Mathematical Society*, 115, 513-25.
- [24] Mertens, J.-F. (1995): “Two Examples of Strategic Equilibrium,” *Games and Economic Behavior*, 8, 378-88.
- [25] Mertens, J.-F. (2003): “Ordinality in non cooperative games”, *International Journal of Game Theory*, 32, 387-430.
- [26] O’Neill, B. (1953): “Essential sets and fixed points,” *American Journal of Mathematics*, 75, 497–509.
- [27] Pahl, L. (2023): “Polytope-form Games and Index/Degree theories for Extensive-form Games,” *Games and Economic Behavior*, 141, 444-71.
- [28] Pahl, L., and C. Pimienta (2024): “Robust Equilibria in Generic Extensive-Form Games,” mimeo.
- [29] Pimienta, C., and J. Shen (2014): “On The Equivalence Between (Quasi) Perfect and Sequential Equilibria,” *International Journal of Game Theory*, 43, 395-402.
- [30] Ritzberger, K. (1994): “The theory of normal form games from the differentiable viewpoint,” *International Journal of Game Theory*, 23, 207-36.
- [31] Selten, R. (1975): “Re-examination of the Perfectness Concept for Equilibrium Points in Extensive Games”, *International Journal of Game Theory*, 4, 25-55.
- [32] Spanier, E. H., (1966): *Algebraic Topology*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin.
- [33] Tversky, A., and D. Kahneman (1981): “The Framing of Decisions and The Psychology of Choice,” *Science*, 211, 453-58.
- [34] van Damme, E. (1984): “A Relation Between Perfect Equilibria in Extensive Form Games and Proper Equilibria in Normal Form Games,” *International Journal of Game Theory*, 13, 1-13.

DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMICS, UNIVERSITY OF ROCHESTER, NY 14627, USA.

Email address: `s.govindan@rochester.edu`

STANFORD BUSINESS SCHOOL, STANFORD, CA 94305, USA.

Email address: `rwilson@stanford.edu`