

Pricing in Ride-sharing Markets : Effects of network competition and autonomous vehicles

Diptangshu Sen^a and Arnob Ghosh^b

Abstract—Autonomous vehicles will be an integral part of ride-sharing services in the future. This setting is different from traditional ride-sharing marketplaces because of the absence of the supply side (drivers). However, it has far-reaching consequences because in addition to pricing, players now have to make decisions on how to distribute fleets across network locations and re-balance vehicles in order to serve future demand. In this paper, we explore a duopoly setting in the ride-sharing marketplace where the players have fully autonomous fleets. Each ride-service provider (rsp)’s prices depends on the prices and the supply of the other player. We formulate their decision-making problems using a game-theoretic setup where each player seeks to find the optimal prices and supplies at each node while considering the decisions of the other player. This leads to a scenario where the players’ optimization problems are coupled and it is challenging to solve for the equilibrium. We characterize the types of demand functions (e.g.: linear) for which this game admits an exact potential function and can be solved efficiently. For other types of demand functions, we propose an iterative heuristic to compute the equilibrium. We conclude by providing numerical insights into how different kinds of equilibria would play out in the market when the players are asymmetric or when there are regulations in place.

I. INTRODUCTION

A. Motivation

When Uber started operations in San Francisco in 2010, a new era of mobility-on-demand systems was ushered in. Mobility-on-demand systems are classic examples of the ‘sharing economy’ where multiple users share access to a scarce resource (e.g. a vehicle) and the sharing is facilitated by an intermediate platform (like Uber). Since 2010, the ride-sharing market has taken off rapidly and is expected to grow to 97.3mn users in the US alone by 2027 [Statista(2023)]. The traditional ride-sharing marketplace is two-sided and the ride-service provider(rsp) can control both supply and demand sides by using the price signal. However, competition makes the decision-making process challenging as it pushes passenger fares down and driver wages up and reduces the margin for the players.

With significant technological advances over the last few years, autonomous vehicles are the next big step in the ride-sharing marketplace. Lyft has already introduced autonomous fleets in Las Vegas, Miami and more recently in Austin, Texas [NYT(2022)], [Statesman(2022)]. Uber also has similar plans by the end of 2022 [Bloomberg(2022)]. While such futuristic developments are exciting, they alter

the dynamic of the marketplace entirely. The supply side of the marketplace is now non-existent and platforms are required to maintain their own autonomous fleets. A fixed supply also means that apart from pricing, there are other important considerations to be made, like what should be the optimal fleet size and how to dispatch and re-balance¹ vehicles optimally. In this paper, our goal is to study the following :

- 1) How can players with autonomous vehicles make decisions about how to price, dispatch and re-balance effectively ?
- 2) How will the above decisions be affected when there is competition in the marketplace ?
- 3) What kind of effects would imposing regulations (like parking costs, congestion taxes) have on the players ?

In particular, we consider a *duopoly setting* where only two platforms are involved in the marketplace. The duopoly setting is of particular interest because many major ridesharing markets around the world have evolved into duopolies like Uber-Lyft in the US [Global-News(2019)], Uber-Ola in India [Business-Wire(2020)].

B. Literature Review

In recent years, the ride-hailing marketplace has been an area of active research. The pricing problem is a consistent theme in the existing literature and two notable papers which explore this are [Banerjee et al.(2015)] and [Bimpikis et al.(2019)]. [Banerjee et al.(2015)] uses a queuing theory framework for matching passengers with rides. They show that while static pricing policies provide better profits for the platform compared to any state-dependent dynamic pricing policies, dynamic policies are in fact, much more robust to noisy parameter data (like passenger arrival rates). Compared to [Banerjee et al.(2015)] which explores the temporal variations of pricing, [Bimpikis et al.(2019)] pursues a different route. It shows that spatial price discrimination is the optimal choice if demand across the network is unbalanced (unbalanced demand means that different nodes in the network have significantly different levels of demand). There has also been other work which has explored pricing for ride-sharing platforms using tools like reinforcement learning [Haliem et al.(2021)]. However, this line of work is with respect to a single platform (which operates in a traditional two-sided marketplace) and does not consider competition.

¹The rsp may dispatch empty vehicles from one location to another to serve demand there. This is known as ‘re-balancing.’

^a Diptangshu Sen is a graduate student at Georgia Tech School of Industrial & Systems Engineering. dsen30@gatech.edu

^b Arnob Ghosh is currently affiliated with the NSF-AI Edge Institute at the Ohio State University. ghosh.244@osu.edu

More recently, researchers have looked at the scenario where autonomous vehicles are involved. As explained earlier, there are three primary decision problems for the platform : 1) how to pick the optimal fleet size to be maintained 2) how to price passengers and finally, 3) how to dispatch and re-balance empty vehicles to meet demand. There is literature where researchers try to tackle one or more of these problems together. [Wollenstein-Betech et al.(2020)] proposes how to solve the pricing and the re-balancing problem efficiently while [Braverman et al.(2019)] looks at the empty vehicle re-balancing problem specifically. Finally, [Wollenstein-Betech et al.(2021)] develops a unified framework to solve all three decision problems at the same time, albeit in steady state. Note that all these aforementioned works do not consider competition with other platforms.

There has also been some work that looks at competition in ride-sharing platforms. [Nikzad(2017)] explores how competition on the supply side of the marketplace can effect driver wages and passenger welfare. In terms of context, the works which are closest to ours are [Turan and Alizadeh(2021)] and [Ghosh and Berry(2022)]. [Turan and Alizadeh(2021)] looks at price competition in a duopoly setting with two platforms which own fully autonomous fleets. However, it assumes that the platforms have identical operation costs which leads to a symmetric equilibrium (i.e., identical prices for both players for each source-destination pair). Additionally, their model imposes no constraints on fleet size for either player. Our work addresses this issue specifically because fleet size limits how much demand can be served and hence affects prices directly. Also, firms may differ significantly in terms of fleet sizes and this can lead to asymmetric equilibria which we have considered in our paper, but it has not been taken into account elsewhere. The asymmetric case is interesting because externalities like regulations can affect asymmetric firms differently. [Ghosh and Berry(2022)] also investigates the competition between two ride-sharing platforms with autonomous fleets. It solves a multi-horizon problem where each player tries to optimize prices and take vehicle re-balancing decisions. The paper shows that under certain assumptions on competitor behavior and a specific type of demand function, the problem admits a generalized Nash equilibrium via a potential game. However, in our paper, we show that the potential game approach cannot be extended to all demand functions. For the particular non-linear form we use, we propose an iterative heuristic to compute the equilibrium. We also investigate the impact of various forms of regulation which guides us on how to impose regulations effectively in such settings. We summarize the main contributions of our paper below.

C. Contributions

- 1) We propose a non-linear demand model to capture the dynamics of a ride-sharing marketplace. Although the existing literature looks mostly at linear demand functions, it is indeed a restrictive assumption because in real life, demand functions are estimated using data and are hardly ever linear.

- 2) Our modeling choice makes the problem more challenging because it no longer admits a potential function (which is one of the key solution concepts in network games). So we develop a general iteration algorithm to compute the equilibrium which applies to any general demand function. However, we cannot provide formal convergence guarantees on the algorithm at this time.
- 3) We empirically investigate the properties of the equilibrium in a variety of settings like asymmetric competition. Among other things, we also show that network effects play a significant role in governing how ride-service providers with fully autonomous fleets would operate when price regulations are imposed on them. This helps us to generate some insights on how to effectively design regulations.

II. MODELING

A. Network

We consider a simple two-node network which is represented by the complete directed graph $G = (\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{A})$ (Refer Fig. 1). Clearly, $\mathcal{N} = \{1, 2\}$ and $\mathcal{A} = \{e_{11}, e_{12}, e_{21}, e_{22}\}$. We also assume that transit times along all arcs are the same. Note that our analysis goes through unchanged for any larger network (with $|\mathcal{N}| > 2$) and different arc transit times. The primary reason for considering a small version of the network is to visualize and interpret the network effects more meaningfully.




Fig. 1. Network Structure

B. Players & Interactions

There are two ride-service providers (rsps) A and B who operate in the marketplace (i.e., a duopoly setting). Each rsp has a fixed number of vehicles in its fleet, however the number may be different across the rsps (asymmetric players). Vehicles are used in one of three ways : either they serve passengers or they are routed empty ('re-balancing') to places of high expected demand or they stand idle at one of the nodes. We assume that a vehicle can only serve one passenger in a trip. Each rsp earns revenue by serving demand. They also incur costs for operating the fleet (fuel costs/ congestion taxes) or for keeping vehicles idle (parking costs). Therefore, the rsp has to decide how to set prices and use vehicles judiciously so that they can maximize their profits. Market competition makes the pricing decision more convoluted because players ² now have to take into

²We will use the terms ride-service providers, players and rsp's interchangeably.

consideration prices set by the other player. We will capture the effect of one player's prices on the other using the *demand function* which we explain subsequently. The players are assumed to be rational and selfish, so we model their interaction as a *simultaneous, non-cooperative game*.

C. Demand Function

The demand function outputs the fraction of the market share acquired by a rsp, given its own price and the price of the competitor. Let $f(p_A, p_B)$ represent the demand function for player A which depends on the prices of both players A and B , given by p_A and p_B respectively (similarly, player B 's demand function would be given by $f(p_B, p_A)$). We assume that all prices are normalized by P and hence are in the interval $[0, 1]$. P can be thought of as the price of an alternative commuting option, so no price in the network should exceed P , otherwise passengers will avail the outside option. In order to qualify as a candidate demand function, it is necessary that $f(\cdot)$ have the following desirable properties :

- $0 \leq f(p_A, p_B) \leq 1$: It is not possible to capture a market share which is negative or greater than 1.
- $f(p_A, p_B) + f(p_B, p_A) \leq 1$: This follows from the fact that the total market share captured by both players cannot exceed 1.
- $p_A = p_B \implies f(p_A, p_B) = f(p_B, p_A)$: This means that if both players set equal prices, they should capture identical market shares. It also reflects an inherent assumption in our model that no passenger has specific preferences for a particular ride-service provider. Also, note $f(0, 0) = \frac{1}{2}$.
- $f(p, p)$ is non-increasing in p : This captures the price sensitivity of passengers. Even if both players A and B set the same price p , as p increases, less and less people would be availing a ride as it exceeds their willingness-to-pay threshold.
- $p_A > p_B \implies f(p_A, p_B) \leq f(p_B, p_A)$: If player A sets a higher price than B , then A cannot capture a strictly larger market share than B .
- $p_A > p'_A \implies f(p_A, p_B) \leq f(p'_A, p_B)$: This means that with player B 's price fixed, if player A increases its price, then its market share will reduce. If $f(\cdot)$ is differentiable with respect to p_A , this condition is equivalent to $\frac{\partial f}{\partial p_A} \leq 0$
- $p_B < p'_B \implies f(p_A, p_B) \geq f(p_A, p'_B)$: If the competitor B increases its price, then player A 's market share should increase for the same price p_A . If $f(\cdot)$ is differentiable with respect to p_B , it is equivalent to $\frac{\partial f}{\partial p_B} \geq 0$
- $f(1, p_B) = 0$: If player A sets $p_A = 1$ (the highest possible price), then its market share goes to *zero*, irrespective of p_B . Alternatively, $p_A = 1$ represents a scenario where player A does not compete in the market and B has a monopoly.
- $f(0, 1) = 1$: If player A has a monopoly, then it can capture the whole market by setting $p_A = 0$. This is again intuitive.

In recent ride-sharing literature, [Ghosh and Berry(2022)] uses a specific piecewise linear form. It can be easily verified that it satisfies all the aforementioned properties. However in reality, demand functions are difficult to find out exactly and are often non-linear. We hope that the framework described above, provides a starting point to search for candidate non-linear demand functions in a structured way. For the purpose of this paper, we will use the following non-linear form given by :

$$f(p_A, p_B) = \frac{1}{2}(1 - p_A)(1 + p_B) \quad \forall 0 \leq p_A, p_B \leq 1 \quad (1)$$

D. RSP's Optimization Problem

Each ride-service provider seeks to maximize its profit. Profit for a rsp is expressed as the difference between total revenues earned and operation costs incurred. Revenues are earned from serving demand in the network. Operation costs can be classified into two components :

- *Re-balancing costs* : The rsp has the option to route empty vehicles to other locations where demand is higher. Thus, re-balancing costs may represent fuel costs for the empty cars plying on the network. However sometimes, re-balancing vehicles can also cause a nuisance by contributing to higher congestion. To prevent such behavior, the central planner may impose penalties on empty routing vehicles. All such penalties are included in this cost.
- *Parking costs* : If demand is low, the rsp will be forced to keep some of its fleet idle. Sometimes, the rsp might also have an incentive to keep vehicles idling deliberately to create an artificial lack of supply in the market and jack up the price. If the rsp chooses to keep vehicles parked at any node, it has to pay parking costs. For example, during certain periods of the day, the central planner may choose to impose high parking fees at specific locations to specifically decentivize idling behavior.

Each ride-service provider has to make the following decisions :

- How to price rides for every arc in the network ? The rsp wants to earn higher revenues, so it may be tempted to set high prices but there is a trade-off because high prices mean that lower number of passengers would be willing to ride and there is the risk of losing out demand to the competitor. Pricing is also important for matching supply with demand. Since the supply is limited, pricing too low would mean that demand exceeds supply and many passengers who want to avail a ride, do not get matched with a vehicle. By pricing appropriately, the rsp can ensure that every passenger who can afford the price, has a ride available for her.
- Given a fixed fleet size, how to distribute the supply optimally across the network nodes ? Intuitively, it is more profitable to allocate larger supplies to nodes with high expected demand. In case some part of the fleet is not in use and will be kept idle (low demand regime),

it may be more favorable for the rsp to place those vehicles at a location which has lower parking costs.

- How to re-balance empty vehicles throughout the network effectively ? When rides carry passengers from one location to another, it leads to accumulation of vehicles at the destination node. If demand along the reverse direction is scarce, the rsp has to re-route some of these empty vehicles to meet demand in other locations because supply is limited.

1) *Assumptions:* We make the following assumption :

- We treat vehicles like divisible commodities. This enables us to model them as continuous variables and retain the convexity of the solution space (ideally, they should be modelled as integer variables because number of passengers or vehicle supply cannot be fractional). It is well-known that mixed-integer models are difficult to solve and solution methods often do not scale well.

2) *Notation Key:* In this segment, we introduce the notation for our formulation. Unless otherwise specified, this notation applies for the rest of the paper. (Refer Table I)

Notation	Description
m_A, m_B	Total fleet sizes of players A and B respectively
m_A^i, m_B^i	steady state supply of vehicles at node $i \in \mathcal{N}$
p_c^{ij}	transit cost per trip along arc $e_{ij} \in \mathcal{A}$
p_e^i	parking cost per vehicle at a node $i \in \mathcal{N}$
p_A^{ij}, p_B^{ij}	ride fare along arc $e_{ij} \in \mathcal{A}$
x_A^{ij}, x_B^{ij}	steady state rate of serving demand along $e_{ij} \in \mathcal{A}$
r_A^{ij}, r_B^{ij}	steady state rate of re-balancing along $e_{ij} \in \mathcal{A}$
D^{ij}	steady state rate of demand generation along $e_{ij} \in \mathcal{A}$

TABLE I
NOTATION SUMMARY

3) *Formulation:* We now introduce our formulation for player A 's optimization problem. Player B 's optimization problem will be similar, so we will omit it here for the sake of avoiding repetition.

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{p_A^{ij}, r_A^{ij}, m_A^i} \quad & \sum_{e_{ij} \in \mathcal{A}} (p_A^{ij} - p_c^{ij}) x_A^{ij} - \sum_{e_{ij} \in \mathcal{A}} p_c^{ij} r_A^{ij} \\ & - \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}} p_e^i \left(m_A^i - \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}} (x_A^{ij} + r_A^{ij}) \right) \quad s.t. \\ & x_A^{ij} = D^{ij} \cdot f(p_A^{ij}, p_B^{ij}) \quad \forall e_{ij} \in \mathcal{A} \quad (2a) \\ & \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}} (x_A^{ij} + r_A^{ij}) \leq m_A^i \quad \forall i \in \mathcal{N} \quad (2b) \\ & \sum_{\substack{j \in \mathcal{N} \\ j \neq i}} (x_A^{ij} + r_A^{ij}) = \sum_{\substack{j \in \mathcal{N} \\ j \neq i}} (x_A^{ji} + r_A^{ji}) \quad \forall i \in \mathcal{N} \quad (2c) \\ & \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}} m_A^i = m_A \quad (2d) \\ & 0 \leq p_A^{ij} \leq 1 \quad \forall e_{ij} \in \mathcal{A} \quad (2e) \\ & 0 \leq r_A^{ij} \quad \forall e_{ij} \in \mathcal{A} \quad (2f) \\ & 0 \leq m_A^i \quad \forall i \in \mathcal{N} \quad (2g) \end{aligned}$$

As described earlier, player A seeks to maximize its profit (Revenue - rebalancing costs - parking costs). The first

constraint is the demand constraint (note that we can omit this constraint by substituting x_A^{ij} 's throughout, however it makes the problem non-linear in p_A^{ij}). The second constraint is a supply constraint at every node because the total outflow rate of vehicles from node $i \in \mathcal{N}$ cannot exceed the supply rate of vehicles at the node. The third constraint is a flow balance constraint at each node. This is needed because at the steady state, total inflow rate must equal to the total outflow rate from any given node. Observe that we deliberately omit flows along the self-loops (edges e_{ii}) because it cancels out on both sides of the equation. The next constraint implies that the total supply across the network must add up to the fleet size of the rsp. Finally, we have the bounds on the prices and the non-negativity constraints on re-balancing flows. Since prices are normalized, they cannot exceed 1.

Observation 1: When player B 's prices are known and we consider the form of the demand function in Eq.1, player A 's optimization problem admits a unique solution (and vice-versa).

Proof: This is easy to verify. When we use the demand function form in Eq. 1, the objective function is concave in p_A^{ij} (quadratic in p_A^{ij} with negative leading co-efficient), r_A^{ij} and m_A^i . Also, the feasible set is convex and compact. Maximizing a concave function over a convex compact set always leads us to a unique solution. ■

Observation 2: All prices on the network will be greater than or equal to $\frac{1}{2}$.

Proof: Observe that $p_A^{ij} \geq p_c^{ij}$ always. This is because setting a price lower than p_c^{ij} would lead to negative revenues from serving demand on e_{ij} and is not favorable to the rsp. $p_A^{ij} = 1$ is equivalent to player A not competing on e_{ij} at all, so this case is not very interesting. (Also, when $p_A^{ij} = 1$, the observation is trivially correct.) So, we now look at cases when $p_c^{ij} \leq p_A^{ij} < 1$. Using the KKT-conditions on Problem 2, we can show that :

$$p_A^{ij} = \frac{1}{2}(1 + Q^{ij})$$

where Q^{ij} is the Lagrange multiplier associated with the non-negativity constraint $r_A^{ij} \geq 0$. Since $Q^{ij} \geq 0$, this implies $p_A^{ij} \geq \frac{1}{2}$. Equality holds when $Q^{ij} = 0$, that is whenever $r_A^{ij} > 0$ (using complementary slackness). For a detailed analysis of the KKT-conditions, please refer to the Appendix. ■

III. COMPUTING EQUILIBRIA

From player A 's optimization problem in Eq. 2, it is clear that A cannot solve for the optimal decisions without considering the prices set by player B . Similarly, player B 's decisions are also dependent on prices set by A . Thus, their optimization problems are coupled. In this setting, we define an *equilibrium* as the combination of decisions $(\{p_A^{ij}\}, \{r_A^{ij}\}, \{m_A^i\}, \{p_B^{ij}\}, \{r_B^{ij}\}, \{m_B^i\})$ from where neither player A nor player B has the incentive to deviate unilaterally. We assume a complete information setup where both players have knowledge of the other player's fleet sizes. The characterization of equilibria for the incomplete information

setup is an interesting future direction and is out of the scope of this paper.

A. Potential functions

Potential functions are extremely useful tools to compute equilibria of multi-player games. They involve finding a global potential function $\Phi(\cdot)$ which tracks the change in payoffs whenever any player unilaterally changes their strategy. It has been established that the local optima of the potential function correspond to the pure Nash equilibria of the underlying game. [Ghosh and Berry(2022)] has already shown that there exists an exact potential game corresponding to a 2-player duopoly setting in the ride-sharing marketplace with fully autonomous vehicles, for a specific choice of demand function. Our aim is to investigate if and when the potential game approach can be applied more generally.

Observation 3: For the non-linear demand function defined in Eq. 1, this game does not have an exact potential function.

Proof: The proof is by contradiction. Details can be found in the Appendix section of the paper. ■

Now, we have already seen an example where if the structure considered in [Ghosh and Berry(2022)] is not satisfied, we may not have a potential function. Naturally, this leads to the question : Under what conditions on the demand function $f(\cdot)$ can the game admit a potential function ? We take a small step towards answering this question which leads to the following result.

Theorem 1: When the demand function $f(p_A, p_B)$ is of the form $f(p_A, p_B) = g(p_A) + h(p_B)$, the game does have an exact potential function if and only if $h(p_B)$ is a linear function in p_B (that is, $h(p_B) = Cp_B$ for some $C > 0, C \in \mathbb{R}$).

Proof: The detailed proof can be found in the Appendix. ■

Remark : It is easy to see that the demand function used in [Ghosh and Berry(2022)] is a special case of the functional form in Theorem 1 where $g(p_A)$ is linear in p_A . Hence, it must admit an exact potential function.

B. Heuristic for Finding Equilibrium

In this segment, we propose a heuristic algorithm to compute the equilibrium of the game when the demand function is of the non-linear form in Eq. 1. Unfortunately, we are unable to provide formal convergence guarantees on the algorithm at this time. However, empirically, the heuristic is found to converge quickly to the equilibrium.

We introduce some more notation here. Define OPT_A and OPT_B to be the optimization problems of players A and B respectively. $\mathcal{BR}(OPT_A | p_B)$ represents the best response price of player A to the price set by player B and vice-versa. Note that finding the best response price given the other player's price just involves solving a convex optimization problem and hence, can be done very efficiently using any standard convex-opt solver. The algorithm we propose, is as follows :

Algorithm 1 Iteratively Computing the Equilibrium

Require: initializing price vector $p_B^{(0)}$

Require: tolerance level $\varepsilon > 0$

$$p_A^{(0)} \leftarrow \mathcal{BR}(OPT_A | p_B^{(0)})$$

$$p_B^{(1)} \leftarrow \mathcal{BR}(OPT_B | p_A^{(0)})$$

$$p_A^{(1)} \leftarrow \mathcal{BR}(OPT_A | p_B^{(1)})$$

while $\|p_A^{(k)} - p_A^{(k-1)}\|_\infty > \varepsilon$ or $\|p_B^{(k)} - p_B^{(k-1)}\|_\infty > \varepsilon$ **do**

$$p_B^{(k+1)} \leftarrow \mathcal{BR}(OPT_B | p_A^{(k)})$$

$$p_A^{(k+1)} \leftarrow \mathcal{BR}(OPT_A | p_B^{(k+1)})$$

$$k \leftarrow k + 1$$

end while

C. Empirical Observations

In this segment, we highlight the performance of the heuristic empirically. We also provide insights as to why providing formal convergence in this setting is difficult.

- 1) When we fix the initializing price vector $p_B^{(0)}$, the iteration algorithm (if it converges) will always produce a *unique equilibrium*. This follows directly from Observation 1.
- 2) The algorithm was empirically found to converge to the same equilibrium, irrespective of the starting point.
- 3) The algorithm was empirically found to converge quickly to the equilibrium, usually within 5 iterations for $\varepsilon = 0.01$.

Remark : It is important to highlight the main challenges to providing formal convergence guarantees. We can think of $\mathcal{BR}(OPT_A | p_B)$ as a function $\Theta(p_B)$ and similarly $\mathcal{BR}(OPT_B | p_A)$ as a function $\zeta(p_A)$. Then from the iteration algorithm, we have $p_A^{(k)} = \Theta(p_B^{(k)})$ and $p_B^{(k)} = \zeta(p_A^{(k-1)})$ which implies $p_A^{(k)} = \Theta \circ \zeta(p_A^{(k-1)})$. Therefore, proving convergence of the algorithm is equivalent to showing that the function composition $\Theta \circ \zeta$ has a fixed point and by symmetry, $\zeta \circ \Theta$ also has a fixed point. However, that requires us to show that $\zeta(\cdot)$ and $\theta(\cdot)$ are continuous mappings which is difficult in this setting. For general demand functions, it might also be difficult to guarantee uniqueness of the solution at every iteration because the feasible set may not be convex (because of non-linear equality constraints).

IV. NUMERICAL EXPERIMENTS

In this section, we will explore the properties of the equilibrium in a variety of settings using numerical experiments. We will start by describing the simulation setup for the experiments.

A. Simulation Setup

We fix the total supply on the network to be $\mathcal{S} = 1000$ for all our experiments. We use a parameter m to determine the total demand \mathcal{D} across the network according to the relation $\mathcal{D} = m\mathcal{S}$. For example, $m = 0.5$ indicates that $\mathcal{D} = 500$ and it is a low-demand regime. $m = 1$ indicates that total demand and supply are exactly matched while $m > 1$ indicates high demand regimes. The distribution of demand across the

different arcs is controlled by another parameter α (explained in detail in Section IV-B). We also have a parameter β which determines what fraction of total supply \mathcal{S} is owned by which player. Player A has a fleet of size $\beta\mathcal{S}$ while player B has a fleet of size $(1-\beta)\mathcal{S}$. $\beta = 0.5$ indicates that both players are symmetric while $\beta < 0.5$ indicates that B is the larger player in the market (vice-versa for $\beta > 0.5$).

Parameter	Range	Description
\mathcal{S}	1000	Total Supply on network
\mathcal{D}	Depends on m	Total Demand on network
m	0.5–2.0	Demand multiplier wrt \mathcal{S}
β	0.2–0.5	Fraction of \mathcal{S} owned by A
α	0.0–1.0	Demand distribution parameter

TABLE II
SIMULATION PARAMETERS

B. Demand Patterns

We consider the following demand patterns in our experiments:

- 1) *Pattern 1* : Here, the demand is equally split between the two nodes. We use control parameter α to choose the demand distribution across the self-looping arc and the arc that goes across to the other node. α is varied in the range $[0.5, 1]$. $\alpha = 0.5$ represents a perfectly balanced network while $\alpha = 1$ represents the scenario where all demand is concentrated on arcs which end in node 1. Let \mathcal{D} represent the total demand across the network. Then the demand distribution can be represented by matrix D where D_{ij} is the demand on arc e_{ij} :

$$D = \begin{bmatrix} 0.5\alpha\mathcal{D} & 0.5(1-\alpha)\mathcal{D} \\ 0.5\alpha\mathcal{D} & 0.5(1-\alpha)\mathcal{D} \end{bmatrix}$$

- 2) *Pattern 2* : This demand pattern is used to model scenarios where demand originates out of a single node increasingly with increase in α . At $\alpha = 0.5$, the demand is perfectly balanced, but at $\alpha = 1$, all demand originates out of node 1 and is equally split between arcs e_{11} and e_{12} . The demand matrix D is as follows :

$$D = \begin{bmatrix} 0.5\alpha\mathcal{D} & 0.5\alpha\mathcal{D} \\ 0.5(1-\alpha)\mathcal{D} & 0.5(1-\alpha)\mathcal{D} \end{bmatrix}$$

- 3) *Pattern 3* : This demand pattern captures two extreme scenarios. When $\alpha = 0$, demand is localized only along the cross-arcs e_{12} and e_{21} . When $\alpha = 1$, all demand is split equally between the two self-looping arcs and represents a setting where there is no network effect at all. The demand matrix D is given by :

$$D = \begin{bmatrix} 0.5\alpha\mathcal{D} & 0.5(1-\alpha)\mathcal{D} \\ 0.5(1-\alpha)\mathcal{D} & 0.5\alpha\mathcal{D} \end{bmatrix}$$

C. Monopoly Setting

We can use our model to simulate monopoly scenarios in the ride-sharing marketplace. This can be done by simply setting the price vector of one of the players equal to $\mathbb{1}$. By property 8 of the demand function, it ensures that the market share of this player goes to *zero*, irrespective of the price




Fig. 2. Demand Patterns 1 (left) and 3 (right)

point of the other player. This is very convenient because it allows us to compare the properties of the monopoly market with the competitive market using the same model.

D. Duopoly Setting

1) *Symmetric Players*: For this setting, we have $\beta = 0.5$, so each player has a fleet size of 500 autonomous vehicles. We study the effects of the demand multiplier m and the demand distribution parameter α on player profits.

- *Nature of the equilibrium* : When the players are symmetric, we end up with a *symmetric equilibrium*. This observation is intuitive and in line with the findings of [Turan and Alizadeh(2021)] and [Ghosh and Berry(2022)].
- *Effect of m* : As the multiplier m increases, player profits are found to increase across all demand patterns. This can be attributed to higher price points and higher utilization of vehicles as m increases. Intuitively, for small values of m (like $m = 0.5$), the demand is much smaller compared to supply, so the players cannot operate at full capacity which leads to costs either in terms of re-balancing or parking costs. Additionally, the smaller demand forces the players to lower their prices because higher prices will alienate most of the passengers. However, in the high demand regime ($m = 2$), players have the flexibility to set high prices and still capture a sizeable portion of the market. Also, their fleets are operating close to full capacity which leads to higher revenues and lower incurred costs.
- *Effect of α* : For demand patterns 1 and 2, as we increase α from $\frac{1}{2}$ gradually to 1, the demand across the network becomes **unbalanced**. This leads to lowering of player profits. This observation is aligned with the findings of [Bimpikis et al.(2019)]. One possible reason for this finding is that as demand gets more unbalanced, the operating inefficiencies for the players increase. For example, let us consider the case with $\alpha = 1$ for pattern 2. All the demand is restricted to arcs e_{11} and e_{12} . So, many vehicles which serve customers along e_{11} are forced to re-route empty back to node 1 (Refer Fig. 3). Re-balancing incurs costs and reduces the profits. However, in demand pattern 3, player profits remain unchanged with variation in α . This is because there is no need for re-balancing (the demand in the cross-arcs

match exactly). So, the player just has to choose the steady state supply at each node optimally.




Fig. 3. Demand Pattern 1 under $m = 2$. As α increases from 0.5 to 1, demand gets restricted to e_{11} and e_{12} . r_{21} increases rapidly leading to decline in profits.

2) *Asymmetric Players*: For this setting, we will look at values of $\beta < 0.5$, so player A is smaller than player B. Note that we do not consider $\beta > 0.5$ because it is identical to the $(1 - \beta)$ scenario (where the identities of players are reversed).

- *Big player, Big profits* : We find that as we decrease β from 0.5 (asymmetry increases), player B's profits increase. The increase in profit is much more significant in the higher demand regime ($m = 2$) compared to the low demand regime ($m = 0.5$). This outcome is expected because at high demand, owning a larger fleet provides player B with a large competitive advantage over player A. With increase in asymmetry, the market approaches a monopoly market for player B. It is well-known that monopoly markets are inefficient, so intuitively it appears that the total size of the market served would decrease with decrease in β . However, surprisingly, that does not seem to be the case. Player B's market share definitely increases when it has a larger fleet at its disposal, but the total market served remains unchanged with changes in β .
- *Forced market exits* : Asymmetry creates other adverse effects. In the high demand regime, the player with the smaller fleet might be forced out of certain markets in order to compete in other markets. This gives rise to 'localized monopolies' where the larger player has unilateral control. This leads to high prices and is not favorable for the passengers. We provide an example below (Refer Fig. 4)




Fig. 4. Setting with $\alpha = 1$ and $\beta = 0.2$ for demand pattern 1. (a) $m = 0.5$, (b) $m = 1.0$, (c) $m = 2.0$. Player A forced out on e_{21} for $m = 2.0$.

E. Regulations

In this segment, we will explore how different forms of regulation affect the dynamics of the marketplace. We will specifically look at *two* types of price regulation :

- 1) *Parking costs at nodes*
- 2) *Penalties on re-balancing vehicles*

Also, note that we will study regulations only in the high demand regime ($m = 2$). This is intentional because regulations generally would not be imposed in the low demand regime, so there is no motivation to study those scenarios.

- *Regulations affect players' profits disparately* : We find that when players are highly asymmetric (small β) and demand is unbalanced, regulations affect the larger player's profits much more than the smaller player. Since the regulations are in the form of high parking costs or penalties for re-balancing vehicles, they have negligible effect on the smaller player because it has no re-balancing or parked vehicles (its entire fleet is serving demand). However, regulations do not necessarily lead to passenger welfare because prices increase and number of rides completed, decreases.

Example : Consider demand pattern 2 with $\alpha = 1$. This means that there is high demand originating in node 1. The intuition here is that players would try to capture the high demand at node 1 by re-routing empty vehicles from node 2 to node 1 or keep a large supply at node 1. So, one possible form of regulation could be to increase parking costs at node 1 and penalize empty vehicles on e_{21} . We simulate the scenario with and without regulation. Take $\beta = 0.2$.

- *Network effects of regulation* : One consistent pattern that we observe in our numerical experiments is that

Metrics	e_{11}	e_{12}	e_{21}	e_{22}
#Rides completed (A)	200	0	-	-
#Rides completed (B)	200	200	-	-
Prices (A)	0.77	1.00	-	-
Prices (B)	0.77	0.8	-	-

TABLE III

RESULTS WITHOUT REGULATIONS IN PLACE, PLAYER A'S PROFIT = 134
AND PLAYER B'S PROFIT = 254.

Metrics	e_{11}	e_{12}	e_{21}	e_{22}
#Rides completed (A)	200	0	-	-
#Rides completed (B)	200	150	-	-
Prices (A)	0.77	1.00	-	-
Prices (B)	0.77	0.85	-	-

TABLE IV

RESULTS WITH REGULATIONS IN PLACE, PLAYER A'S PROFIT = 134 AND
PLAYER B'S PROFIT = 157. PRICES INCREASE AND # RIDES COMPLETED
DECREASES.

the larger player does not use all its fleet to serve customers even when the total demand across the network is high. This means that a lot of passengers go unserved which is clearly not a favorable outcome for social welfare. In this segment, we investigate if regulations can be used appropriately to compel the larger player to serve more demand instead of parking/re-balancing vehicles deliberately. Since we operate in the high demand regime ($m = 2$), price regulations have negligible effect on the smaller player.

Let us consider the following setup : Demand Pattern 1 with $\alpha = 0.75$. Take $\beta = 0.2$ which indicates that the players are highly asymmetric and player B's fleet is 4 times the size of player A's fleet. We re-define p_c^{ij} slightly to include a regulatory component :

$$p_c^{ij} = p_b^{ij} + v^{ij}$$

where p_b^{ij} represents the transit cost on the edge (that applies to all vehicles) while v^{ij} is a penalty that applies only to re-balancing vehicles on e_{ij} . For now, we set $p_b^{ij} = 0.1$ for all $e_{ij} \in \mathcal{A}$. When there is no regulation, $v^{ij} = 0 \forall e_{ij}$. We report our solutions in the form of a table. Variables/parameters which are arc-dependent are reported as 2×2 matrices while node-dependent quantities are reported as vectors of size 2×1 .

Scenario 1 (No regulation) : Observe that player B has

Variables/Parameters	Values
Parking cost (p_e)	[0;0]
Penalty for re-balancing (v)	[[0,0];[0,0]]
Supply (m_B)	[495;305]
Prices (p_B)	[[0.71,0.5];[0.73,0.55]]
Rides (x_B)	[[200,111];[200,105]]
Rebalancing (r_B)	[[0,89];[0,0]]

TABLE V

a large number of vehicles (95) idling at node 1. Total

supply at node 1 is 495, out of which $200 + 111 = 311$ serve passengers while 89 are routed to node 2 for re-balancing. All the supply at node 2 is used to serve demand. *The most intuitive regulation here is to impose parking costs at node 1.*

Scenario 2 : We have now increased the parking

Variables/Parameters	Values
Parking cost (p_e)	[0.5;0]
Penalty for re-balancing (v)	[[0,0];[0,0]]
Supply (m_B)	[400;400]
Prices (p_B)	[[0.71,0.5];[0.73,0.55]]
Rides (x_B)	[[200,111];[200,105]]
Rebalancing (r_B)	[[0,89];[0,0]]

TABLE VI

cost at node 1 to 0.5. As we can see, it has no impact on player B whatsoever in terms of prices or passengers served. Player B only adjusts the supply in such a way that the idling vehicles from earlier are now parked at node 2. This also highlights that *localized regulations may not always produce the desired effect.*

Scenario 3 : We now impose an additional regulation in terms of parking costs at node 2. This does force player B to use some of the extra supply for serving demand along e_{22} (rides served increases from 105 to 116). However, this is not a good outcome because the number of rebalancing vehicles on the network has increased significantly. The intuition here is that the rsp finds it more favorable to route the extra supply on the network (because there are no penalties currently) than actually serve demand.

Variables/Parameters	Values
Parking cost (p_e)	[0.5;0.5]
Penalty for re-balancing (v)	[[0,0];[0,0]]
Supply (m_B)	[463;337]
Prices (p_B)	[[0.71,0.5];[0.73,0.5]]
Rides (x_B)	[[200,111];[200,116]]
Rebalancing (r_B)	[[43,109];[21,0]]

TABLE VII

The key takeaways from this discussion are as follows :

- 1) Regulations do not affect all players in the same way. They affect the larger player in the market significantly more than the smaller player.
- 2) Localized regulations often may not have the desired outcome. This is primarily due to network effects. Since the rsp has control over its whole supply, it can circumvent local price regulations by diverting supplies in the most cost-effective way possible.
- 3) This also gives us some insights into how we can design effective regulations for ride-sharing marketplaces with autonomous vehicles. The regulations need to be coordinated over the entire network to achieve the best possible outcome.

V. CONCLUSION

In this paper, we use game theory to study the networked competition of two players in the ride-sharing marketplace where the players have fully autonomous fleets. We propose a non-linear demand function that captures the effect of one player's price on the other. Unlike linear demand functions in literature, we show that the non-linear form does not admit a potential function, so it is technically challenging to solve. We propose an iterative algorithm to compute the equilibrium of the game for any general form of the demand function. We use our model to empirically study properties of the equilibrium under a variety of settings like asymmetric competition and price regulations and develop insights that can help regulators design informed policies for these markets.

VI. FUTURE SCOPE

There are several interesting avenues of future work. One immediate extension is to investigate the equilibrium of this game under incomplete information settings. It may also be worthwhile to explore if it is possible to provide formal convergence guarantees or find necessary conditions for the convergence of our iteration algorithm. In our work, we highlight why it is important to coordinate regulations across the network. Designing effective price regulations that take network effects into account, could be another interesting direction of work.

VII. ACKNOWLEDGMENT

We thank Dr. Parinaz Naghizadeh at the Ohio State University for her insightful inputs at different stages of the work.

REFERENCES

- [Banerjee et al.(2015)] Siddhartha Banerjee, Carlos Riquelme, and Ramesh Johari. 2015. Pricing in ride-share platforms: A queueing-theoretic approach. *Available at SSRN 2568258* (2015).
- [Bimpikis et al.(2019)] Kostas Bimpikis, Ozan Candogan, and Daniela Saban. 2019. Spatial pricing in ride-sharing networks. *Operations Research* 67, 3 (2019), 744–769.
- [Bloomberg(2022)] Bloomberg. 2022. Uber Revives Self-Driving Taxi Dreams, Plans to Start This Year.
- [Braverman et al.(2019)] Anton Braverman, Jim G Dai, Xin Liu, and Lei Ying. 2019. Empty-car routing in ridesharing systems. *Operations Research* 67, 5 (2019), 1437–1452.
- [Business-Wire(2020)] Business-Wire. 2020. Online Taxi Services Market in India.
- [Ghosh and Berry(2022)] Arnob Ghosh and Randall Berry. 2022. Competition among ride service providers with autonomous vehicles. In *2022 20th International Symposium on Modeling and Optimization in Mobile, Ad hoc, and Wireless Networks (WiOpt)*. IEEE, 209–216.
- [Global-News(2019)] Global-News. 2019. Uber, Lyft's huge capital have created duopoly in rideshare market.
- [Haliem et al.(2021)] Marina Haliem, Ganapathy Mani, Vaneet Aggarwal, and Bharat Bhargava. 2021. A distributed model-free ride-sharing approach for joint matching, pricing, and dispatching using deep reinforcement learning. *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems* 22, 12 (2021), 7931–7942.
- [Nikzad(2017)] Afshin Nikzad. 2017. Thickness and competition in ride-sharing markets. *Available at SSRN 3065672* (2017).
- [NYT(2022)] NYT. 2022. Lyft Unveils Self-Driving Car Service in Las Vegas (With Caveats).
- [Statesman(2022)] Statesman. 2022. You can now take a driverless Lyft in Austin. Here's what you need to know.

[Statista(2023)] Statista. 2023.

- [Turan and Alizadeh(2021)] Berkay Turan and Mahnoosh Alizadeh. 2021. Competition in electric autonomous mobility on demand systems. *IEEE Transactions on Control of Network Systems* (2021).
- [Wollenstein-Betech et al.(2020)] Salomón Wollenstein-Betech, Ioannis Ch Paschalidis, and Christos G Cassandras. 2020. Joint pricing and rebalancing of autonomous mobility-on-demand systems. In *2020 59th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*. IEEE, 2573–2578.
- [Wollenstein-Betech et al.(2021)] Salomón Wollenstein-Betech, Ioannis Ch Paschalidis, and Christos G Cassandras. 2021. Optimal operations management of mobility-on-demand systems. *Frontiers in Sustainable Cities* 3 (2021), 681096.

APPENDIX

A. Analysis of Observation 2

Consider player A 's optimization problem in 2. Since x_A^{ij} are functions of p_A^{ij} , we will substitute x_A^{ij} 's throughout the problem. Additionally, define $C_{ij} = \frac{1}{2}D^{ij}(1 + p_B^{ij})$. Since we are solving player A 's optimization problem given the prices of player B , we treat C_{ij} as constants. Now, we will convert this constrained optimization problem into an unconstrained one by constructing the Lagrangian (\mathcal{L}). Let us define the Lagrangian multipliers associated with some of the constraints we need :

- K_i for (2b)
- L_{ij} and H_{ij} for the lower and upper bounds in (2e)
- Q_{ij} for (2f)

Therefore, we have the following first order KKT condition :

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial p_A^{11}} &= C_{11}(-1 + 2p_A^{11} - p_c^{11} + p_e^1 - K_1) - L_{11} + H_{11} = 0 \\ \implies -1 + 2p_A^{11} - p_c^{11} + p_e^1 - K_1 &= 0 \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

Note that we have already argued about why L_{11} and H_{11} can be zero (from complementary slackness). Also, $C_{ij} \neq 0$. We can obtain a similar condition involving r_A^{11} :

$$\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial r_A^{11}} = p_c^{11} - p_e^1 + K_1 - Q_{11} = 0 \quad (4)$$

Combining Eqs. 3 and 4, we get $p_A^{11} = \frac{1}{2}(1 + Q_{11})$. We can derive similarly for all other p_A^{ij} 's.

B. Proof of Observation 3

Proof: We will prove this by contradiction. Suppose, there exists a potential function Φ for this game. Let $U_A(\cdot)$ and $U_B(\cdot)$ represent the objectives of players A and B respectively. Then the following must hold :

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial \Phi}{\partial p_A^{ij}} &= \frac{\partial U_A}{\partial p_A^{ij}} = \frac{1}{2}D^{ij}(1 + p_B^{ij}) \left(1 - 2p_A^{ij} + p_c^{ij} - p_e^i\right) \\ \frac{\partial \Phi}{\partial p_B^{ij}} &= \frac{\partial U_B}{\partial p_B^{ij}} = \frac{1}{2}D^{ij}(1 + p_A^{ij}) \left(1 - 2p_B^{ij} + p_c^{ij} - p_e^i\right) \\ \frac{\partial \Phi}{\partial r_A^{ij}} &= \frac{\partial U_A}{\partial r_A^{ij}} = p_e^i - p_c^{ij} = \frac{\partial U_B}{\partial r_B^{ij}} = \frac{\partial \Phi}{\partial r_B^{ij}} \\ \frac{\partial \Phi}{\partial m_A^i} &= \frac{\partial U_A}{\partial m_A^i} = -p_e^i = \frac{\partial U_B}{\partial m_B^i} = \frac{\partial \Phi}{\partial m_B^i} \end{aligned}$$

It is easy to see that r_A^{ij} , r_B^{ij} , m_A^i and m_B^i will appear in $\Phi(\cdot)$ as linear terms. Now, we will try to reconstruct the rest of $\Phi(\cdot)$ from the conditions above.

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial \Phi}{\partial p_A^{ij}} &= \frac{1}{2} D^{ij} (1 + p_B^{ij}) (1 - 2p_A^{ij} + p_c^{ij} - p_e^i) \\ \implies \Phi &= \sum_{i,j} \frac{1}{2} D^{ij} (1 + p_B^{ij}) \int_{p_A^{ij}} (1 - 2p_A^{ij} + p_c^{ij} - p_e^i) dp_A^{ij} \\ &+ \sum_{i,j} \Psi(p_B^{ij}) - \sum_i p_e^i (m_A^i + m_B^i) + \sum_{i,j} (p_e^i - p_c^{ij}) (r_A^{ij} + r_B^{ij}) \end{aligned}$$

Note that $\Psi(\cdot)$ is purely a function of p_B^{ij} , otherwise it would have contributed terms to $\frac{\partial \Phi}{\partial p_A^{ij}}$. This also gives us :

$$\frac{\partial \Phi}{\partial p_B^{ij}} = \frac{1}{2} D^{ij} (p_A^{ij} (1 + p_c^{ij} - p_e^i) - (p_A^{ij})^2) + \Psi'(p_B^{ij})$$

But, we know that $\frac{\partial \Phi}{\partial p_B^{ij}} = \frac{1}{2} D^{ij} (1 + p_A^{ij}) (1 - 2p_B^{ij} + p_c^{ij} - p_e^i)$. Therefore, we must have :

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2} D^{ij} (1 + p_A^{ij}) (1 - 2p_B^{ij} + p_c^{ij} - p_e^i) &= \\ \frac{1}{2} D^{ij} (p_A^{ij} (1 + p_c^{ij} - p_e^i) - (p_A^{ij})^2) &+ \Psi'(p_B^{ij}) \end{aligned}$$

This gives us an expression for $\Psi'(p_B^{ij})$. But it turns out to be a function of both p_A^{ij} and p_B^{ij} which is clearly a contradiction. This concludes the proof. ■

C. Proof of Theorem 3.1

Proof: In this proof, we will recycle the same techniques we used in the last proof. Since this is an if and only if statement, we need to prove both directions.

(\Leftarrow) We know that the demand function $f(p_A, p_B)$ is of the form $g(p_A) + h(p_B)$. Suppose, there exists an exact potential function admitted by this demand function. Let's call it Φ . Then, the following must hold :

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial \Phi}{\partial p_A^{ij}} &= D^{ij} (g(p_A^{ij}) + h(p_B^{ij}) + g'(p_A^{ij})(p_A^{ij} - p_c^{ij} + p_e^i)) \\ \frac{\partial \Phi}{\partial p_B^{ij}} &= D^{ij} (g(p_B^{ij}) + h(p_A^{ij}) + g'(p_B^{ij})(p_B^{ij} - p_c^{ij} + p_e^i)) \end{aligned}$$

The other partial derivatives $\frac{\partial \Phi}{\partial r_A^{ij}}$, $\frac{\partial \Phi}{\partial r_B^{ij}}$, $\frac{\partial \Phi}{\partial m_A^i}$ and $\frac{\partial \Phi}{\partial m_B^i}$ remain the same as in the earlier proof and we will reuse them directly. By reconstruction from the partial wrt p_A^{ij} , Φ should be of the following form :

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi &= \sum_{i,j} D^{ij} p_A^{ij} (g(p_A^{ij}) + h(p_B^{ij}) + p_e^i - p_c^{ij}) + \sum_{i,j} \Psi(p_B^{ij}) \\ &- \sum_i p_e^i (m_A^i + m_B^i) + \sum_{i,j} (p_e^i - p_c^{ij}) (r_A^{ij} + r_B^{ij}) \end{aligned}$$

This implies, $\frac{\partial \Phi}{\partial p_B^{ij}} = \Psi'(p_B^{ij}) + D^{ij} p_A^{ij} h'(p_B^{ij})$ which should be equal to $D^{ij} (g(p_B^{ij}) + h(p_A^{ij}) + g'(p_B^{ij})(p_B^{ij} - p_c^{ij} + p_e^i))$. Now,

since $\Psi'(p_B^{ij})$ is only a function of p_B^{ij} , the following must be true :

$$\begin{aligned} p_A^{ij} h'(p_B^{ij}) &= h(p_A^{ij}) \\ \implies \frac{h(p_A^{ij})}{p_A^{ij}} &= h'(p_B^{ij}) \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, $h(p)$ must be the *zero* function or $h(p) = Cp$. Since $h(p)$ represents the effect of the competitor's price on a player's demand, $h(p) = 0$ is unrealistic. Therefore, $h(p) = Cp$. Also, note from the properties of the demand function $f(p, q)$ that $\frac{\partial f}{\partial q} \geq 0$. This implies $C > 0$ (we have already ruled out the *zero* case).

(\implies) For this direction, we have to show that if there is a demand function $f(p_A, p_B) = g(p_A) + h(p_B)$ with $h(p_B) = Cp_B$ for some $C > 0$, then it admits a potential function. So, if we can come up with a valid potential function, we are done. We claim that the following is a potential function for the game for the above demand function :

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi &= \sum_{i,j} D^{ij} [p_A^{ij} g(p_A^{ij}) + p_B^{ij} g(p_B^{ij}) + (p_e^i - p_c^{ij}) (g(p_A^{ij}) + g(p_B^{ij}))] \\ &+ C \sum_{i,j} D^{ij} p_A^{ij} p_B^{ij} - \sum_i p_e^i (m_A^i + m_B^i) + \sum_{i,j} (p_e^i - p_c^{ij}) (r_A^{ij} + r_B^{ij}) \end{aligned}$$

It can be easily verified that the above is a potential function for this game. This concludes the proof. ■