

# How Bad Can An Election Game of Two or More Parties Be?\*

Chuang-Chieh Lin<sup>1</sup>, Chi-Jen Lu<sup>2</sup>, and Po-An Chen<sup>3\*\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Department of Computer Science and Information Engineering, Tamkang University  
No. 151, Yingzhuan Rd., Tamsui Dist., New Taipei City 25137, Taiwan

josephcclin@gms.tku.edu.tw

<sup>2</sup> Institute of Information Science, Academia Sinica  
128 Academia Road, Section 2, Nankang, Taipei 11529, Taiwan

cjlu@iis.sinica.edu.tw

<sup>3</sup> Institute of Information Management, National Yang-Ming Chiao-Tung University  
1001 University Rd, Hsinchu City 300, Taiwan

poanchen@nctu.edu.tw

**Abstract.** We extend our previous work on two-party election competition [Lin, Lu & Chen 2021] to the setting of three or more parties. An election campaign among two or more parties is viewed as a game of two or more players. Each of them has its own candidates as the pure strategies to play. People, as voters, comprise supporters for each party, and a candidate brings utility for the supporters of each party. Each player nominates exactly one of its candidates to compete against the other party's. *A candidate is assumed to win the election with higher odds if it brings more utility for all the people.* The payoff of each player is the expected utility that its supporters get. The game is *egoistic* if every candidate benefits its party's supporters more than any candidate from the competing party does. In this work, we first argue that the election game always has a pure-strategy Nash equilibrium when the winner is chosen by the hardmax function, while there exist game instances in the three-party election game such that no pure-strategy Nash equilibrium exists even if the game is egoistic. Next, we propose two sufficient conditions for the egoistic election game to have a pure-strategy Nash equilibrium. Based on these conditions, we propose a fixed-parameter tractable algorithm to compute a pure-strategy Nash equilibrium of the egoistic election game. Finally, perhaps surprisingly, we show that the price of anarchy of the egoistic election game is upper bounded by the number of parties. Our findings suggest that the election becomes unpredictable when more than two parties are involved and, moreover, the social welfare deteriorates with the number of participating parties in terms of possibly increasing price of anarchy. This work alternatively explains why the two-party system is prevalent in democratic countries.

**Keywords:** Election game; Nash equilibrium; Price of anarchy; Egoism; Monotone function

## 1 Introduction

Modern democracy runs on political parties and elections prevail in democratic countries. In an election campaign, political parties compete with each other and exhaust their effort to attract voters' ballots, which can be regarded as the aggregation of voters' belief or preferences. They compete by nominating their "best" candidates in elections and try to appeal mainly to their supporters. At first sight, it seems to be difficult to foresee the result of an election especially when voters are strategic and different voting procedures and allocation rules could lead to totally different results. Duverger's law suggests plurality voting is in favor of the two-party system [19]. Also, Delli [13] explained why a two-party system emerges under plurality voting and other voting procedures permitting truncated ballots. These motivated the investigation of the efficiency of a two-party system in our previous work [31], in which we bypassed the above mentioned issues in a micro

\* This work is supported by the Taiwan Ministry of Science and Technology under grant no. NSTC 110-2222-E-032-002-MY2 and NSTC 111-2410-H-A49-022-MY2.

\*\* Corresponding author

scale, and considered a macro-model instead by formalizing the political competition between two parties as a non-cooperative two-player game. We call it the *two-party election game*.

In the two-party election game, each party is regarded as a player who treats its candidates as pure strategies and its payoff is the expected utility for its supporters. The randomness in the expectation comes from the uncertainty of winning or losing in the game. The odds of winning an election for a candidate nominated by a party over another candidate nominated by the competing party are assumed to be related to two factors—the total benefits that she brings to the whole society, including the supporters and non-supporters, and those that its competitor brings. Usually, a candidate nominated by a party responds and caters more to the needs and inclination of its party’s supporters and less to those of the supporters of the other party. Naturally, a candidate then brings different utility to the supporters and to the non-supporters. We expect a candidate to win with higher probability if she brings more total utility to the whole society. We focused on pure strategies in the election game for the reason that, compared with *mixed strategies* that are represented as a probability distribution over a subset of available actions, pure strategies are arguably more realistic for players to play in practical world.

Suppose that the winning probability of a candidate against the opponent is calculated using either a linear function or the softmax function, where the former is linear in the difference between the total utility brought by the two competing candidates and the latter is the ratio of one exponential normalized total utility to the sum of both. Based upon the game setting as above, we proved in our previous work [31] that a pure-strategy Nash equilibrium (PNE) always exists in the two-party election game under a mild condition—*egoism*, which states that any candidate benefits its party’s supporters more than any candidate from the competing party does. The existence of equilibria can bring positive implications. For decades, the Nash equilibrium has been known as a kind of solution concept which provides a more predictable outcome of a non-cooperative game modeling behaviors of strategic players. Although a Nash equilibrium always exists in a finite game when mixed strategies are considered [34, 35], PNE is not guaranteed to exist [37]. We applied the price of anarchy [27] as the inefficiency measure of an equilibrium and proved that the price of anarchy is constantly bounded. This shows in some sense that game between two parties in candidate nomination for an election benefits the people with a social welfare at most constantly far from the optimum. Existence guarantee of pure-strategy Nash equilibria and bounded price of anarchy for the egoistic two-party election game suggest that a two-party system is “good” from these perspectives. On the other hand, however, when the egoistic property is not satisfied, the game might not have any PNE and the price of anarchy can be unbounded, hence, the game can be extremely inefficient.

## 1.1 Our Contributions

In this work, we generalize our previous work in [31] to deal with  $m \geq 2$  parties. We would like to know *how good or bad a system of two or more parties can be*. As we have shown that, without the egoism guarantee, the two-party election game may have no PNE and it can be extremely inefficient in terms of the unbounded price of anarchy, in this work we focus on the egoistic election game for two or more parties. Briefly, we call such a generalized game the *egoistic election game*, and aim at investigating the following questions:

1. Does the egoistic election game using the softmax function to calculate the winning probability of a candidate against its opponents always have a PNE, even for three or more parties? Does the function for computing such a winning probability matter?
2. What is the computational complexity of computing a PNE of the egoistic election game when two or more parties are involved in general?
3. What is the price of anarchy of the egoistic election game of two or more parties? Is it still constantly bounded?

*Our results with respect to the above questions are summarized in the following:*

1. We give examples to confirm that a PNE does not always exist in the egoistic election game of three or more parties even using the softmax function to calculate the winning probability of a candidate.

Furthermore, there exist instances in which no PNE exists even if it satisfies a stronger notion of egoism. Moreover, we propose two sufficient conditions for the egoistic election game to have a PNE.

2. We conjecture that to compute a PNE of the egoistic election game is NP-hard in the general form representation. Based on two sufficient conditions, we identify two natural parameters, the *nominating depth* and *number of chaotic parties*, of the egoistic election game, and propose a fixed-parameter tractable algorithm to compute a PNE of the game if it exists. Namely, a PNE of the egoistic election game can be computed in time polynomial in the number of parties and number of candidates in each party if the two proposed parameters are as small as constants.
3. Perhaps surprisingly, we prove that the price of anarchy of the egoistic election game is upper bounded by the number of competing parties  $m$  when the odds of winning the election for a party is calculated by any *monotone* function, which includes the hardmax function, the natural function and the softmax function, etc. This upper bound is arguably tight, as we show that it is tight for the hardmax function. This, to a certain degree, suggests that the social welfare deteriorates when there are more competing parties participating in the election campaign. Our work provides an explanation alternative to Duverger’s law that why the two-party system is prevalent in democratic countries. As shown in [31] and this work as well, the price of anarchy of the egoistic election game is lower bounded by 2 for the two-party election game using either the hardmax function or the softmax function to compute the winning probability of a candidate, our results in this study imply that the price of anarchy bound for the egoistic two-party election game is tight.
4. We also remark that coalition of party players with the strongly egoism guarantee, in which a composite-like candidate for a coalition is considered, makes the game collapse on the non-cooperative egoistic election game setting. This observation reveals that if the election game is cooperative and strongly egoistic, it will be efficient in the sense of decreasing price of anarchy.

*Organization of this paper.* We briefly survey related work in Sect. 1.2. Preliminaries are given in Sect. 2. In Sect. 3, we investigate the egoistic election game through examples to show that the hardmax function for winning probability computation leads the game to always have a PNE, while there exist instances of three parties in which there is no PNE when the natural function or the softmax function is adopted. In Sect. 4, we propose two sufficient conditions for the egoistic election game to have a PNE. Then, we propose a fixed-parameter tractable algorithm to compute a PNE of the egoistic election game in the general form representation. In Sect. 6, we show the upper bounds on the price of anarchy of the egoistic election game. Coalition of party players with the strongly egoism guarantee is also discussed therein. Concluding remarks and future work will be given and discussed in Sect. 7.

## 1.2 Related work

*On Duverger’s law.* Duverger’s law that suggests plurality voting in favor of the two-party system [19]. There have been studies that formalize Duverger’s law. It can be explained either by the strategic behavior of the voters [13, 20, 21, 33, 39] or that of the candidates [8, 9, 38, 43]. The latter considers models where two selected candidates face a third candidate as a potential threat. Dellis [13] explained (with mild assumptions on voters’ preferences) why a two-party system emerges under plurality voting and other voting procedures permitting truncated ballots. Nevertheless, why the two candidates are selected is not discussed.

*On spatial theory of voting.* Most of the works on equilibria of a political competition are mainly based on *Spatial Theory of Voting* [16, 25, 32, 38, 43], which can be traced back to [25]. In such settings, there are two parties and voters with single-peaked preferences over a unidimensional metric space. Each party chooses a kind of “policy” that is as close as possible to voters’ preferences. When the policy space is unidimensional, the Spatial Theory of Voting states that the parties’ strategies would be determined by the median voter’s preference. However, pure-strategy Nash equilibria may not exist for policies over a multi-dimensional space [18].

*On the Hotelling-Downs model.* Hotelling-Downs model [25] originally considers the problem that two strategic ice cream vendors along a stretch of beach try to attract as many customers as possible by placing themselves. This framework can be extended to the setting that two parties nominate their candidates on a political spectrum. The model has variations involving *multiple* agents with *restricted options*, and this is in line with the competition of multiple parties with a few nominees as possible candidates. For the variation of Hotelling-Downs model as such, Harrenstein et al. [24] show that computing a Nash equilibrium is NP-complete in general but can be done in linear time when there are only two competing parties. Sabato et al. [41] consider *real candidacy games*, in which competing agents select intervals on the real line and then the outcome of the competition follows a given social choice rule. They establish conditions for existence of a Nash equilibrium, yet the computation complexity is not discussed.

*Other work modelling an election as a game.* Ding and Lin [14] considered open list proportional representation as the election mechanism which has been used in Europe elections for parliament seats. Each voter is given a set of lists to vote and exactly one list will be cast. The mechanism proceeds in two rounds to compute the winners. They formulate the election of exactly two parties as a two player zero-sum game and show that the game always has a PNE while it is NP-hard to compute it. The hardness comes from deciding the best way to for the lists for each party such that the outcome as the number of seats a party can win is maximized. The setting in Laslier’s work [29, 30] is close to our work. Two parties are considered as two players each of which provides a finite set of alternatives for the voters. Yet, a party’s strategy is viewed as a “mixed one” instead, that is, a non-spatial alternative is identified by a fraction of the voters. With standard analysis the mixed-strategy Nash equilibrium is guaranteed to exist. Compared with our work, the winning probabilities, the expected utility of each party as well as the price of anarchy are not considered in [29, 30].

*On distortion of voting rules.* Procaccia and Rosenschein [40] introduced the notion “distortion” which resembles the price of anarchy, while the latter is used in games of strategic players. The distortion measures the inefficiency when a social choice rule (e.g., voting) is applied. Generally, voters with cardinal preferences [10, 40]) or metric preferences [3, 4, 12]) are considered herein. As an embedding on a voter’s ballot is allowed, Caragiannis and Procaccia [10] discussed the distortion of social choice when each voter’s ballot receives an embedding, which maps the preference to the output ballot. Cheng et al. [12] focused on the distribution of voters as well as the candidates of parties and they justified that the expected distortion is small when the candidates are drawn from the same distribution as the voters.

*On dynamics of a competition.* A political competition can be considered as a simultaneous one-shot game, similar to what we consider in this work, though it can also be viewed as a dynamic process in multiple rounds. In [26], each time a player competes by investing some of its budget or resource in a component battle to collect a value if she wins. Players fight in multiple battles, and their budgets are consumed over time. In a two-player zero-sum version of such games, a strategic player needs to make adequate sequential actions to win the contest against dynamic competition over time [11].

**Discussion of our work.** Most of the literature on the voting theory and the game of elections focuses on the voters’ behavior on a *micro-level* and outcomes by various election rules, which proceed with either one or multiple rounds and aim to bring one or multiple winners. Voters can be strategic and have different preferences for the candidates. Their behaviors can be even affected by the other voters (e.g., see [5, 6]) and also dependent on the social choice rule, such as the design of ballots, rounds of selection, and the allocation rule, etc. In this work, we bypass the above involved factors in an election and focus on a *macro-level* analysis instead. By introducing uncertainty in the competition between candidates participating in the competition, the payoff as the expected utility for the supporters of a party can also be regarded as the sum of fractional social welfare one party’s supporters can get from all the competing candidates. Moreover, we consider the winning probability computed by a monotone function, which is arguably natural in the sense that a party can attract more voters when it nominates a candidate who benefits the voters more. Through several monotone winning probability functions as illustrating examples for the nonexistence of PNE, eventually we

show that the price of anarchy is upper bounded by the number of parties. It deserves to be noted that our price of anarchy bound holds for *any* monotone function computing the winning probability. Our work provides an alternative perspective and a simpler evidence on the inefficiency of multiple parties competition, which complements previous relevant work.

## 2 Preliminaries

For an integer  $k > 0$ , let  $[k]$  denote the set  $\{1, 2, \dots, k\}$ . We assume that the society consists of voters, and each voter is a supporter of one of the  $m \geq 2$  parties  $\mathcal{P}_1, \mathcal{P}_2, \dots, \mathcal{P}_m$ . These  $m$  parties compete in an election campaign. Each party  $\mathcal{P}_i$ , having  $n_i \geq 2$  candidates  $x_{i,1}, x_{i,2}, \dots, x_{i,n_i}$  for each  $i \in [m]$ , has to designate one candidate to participate in the election campaign. Let  $n = \max_{i \in [m]} n_i$  denote the maximum number of candidates in a party. Let  $u_j(x_{i,s})$  denote the *utility* that party  $\mathcal{P}_j$ 's supporters can get when candidate  $x_{i,s}$  is elected, for  $i, j \in [m], s \in [n_i]$ . For each  $i \in [m]$  and  $s \in [n_i]$ , we denote by  $u(x_{i,s}) := \sum_{j \in [m]} u_j(x_{i,s})$  as the *social utility* candidate  $x_{i,s}$  can bring to all the voters. Assume that the social utility is nonnegative and bounded, specifically, we assume  $u(x_{i,s}) \in [0, \beta]$  for some real  $\beta \geq 1$ , for each  $i \in [m], s \in [n_i]$ . Assume that candidates in each party are sorted according to the utility for its party's supporters. Namely, we assume that  $u_i(x_{i,1}) \geq u_i(x_{i,2}) \geq \dots \geq u_i(x_{i,n_i})$  for each  $i \in [m]$ .

The election campaign is viewed as a game of  $m$  players such that each party corresponds to a player, called a *party player*. With a slight abuse of notation,  $\mathcal{P}_i$  also denotes the party player with respect to party  $\mathcal{P}_i$ . Each party player  $\mathcal{P}_i$ ,  $i \in [m]$ , has  $n_i$  *pure strategies*, each of which is a candidate selected to participate in the election campaign. We consider an assumption as a desired property that *a party wins the election with higher odds if it selects a candidate with higher social utility*. We call it the *monotone property*. Moreover, the odds of winning then depend on the social utility brought by the candidates. Suppose that  $\mathcal{P}_i$  designates candidates  $x_{i,s_i}$  for  $i \in [m]$  and let  $\mathbf{s} = (x_{1,s_1}, x_{2,s_2}, \dots, x_{m,s_m})$  (or simply  $(s_1, s_2, \dots, s_m)$  when it is clear from the context) be the *profile* of the designated candidates of all the party players. As defined and discussed in [31], we concretely formulate the winning odds,  $p_{i,\mathbf{s}}$ , which exemplifies the probability  $\mathcal{P}_i$  of winning the election campaign and preserves the monotone property, as follows<sup>4</sup>. Note that the monotone property guarantees that  $p_{i,\mathbf{s}'} \geq p_{i,\mathbf{s}}$  for  $\mathbf{s}' = (s_1, s_2, \dots, s'_i, \dots, s_m)$  whenever  $u(x_{i,s'_i}) \geq u(x_{i,s_i})$  (i.e., party player  $i$  unilaterally deviates its strategy to  $x_{i,s'_i}$  which brings larger social utility).

- The hardmax function:

$$p_{i,\mathbf{s}} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } i = \arg \max_{j \in [m]} u(x_{j,s_j}) \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

- The hardmax function simply allocates all probability mass to the candidate of maximum social utility with ties broken arbitrarily.
- The softmax function [28, 42]:

$$p_{i,\mathbf{s}} := \frac{e^{u(x_{i,s_i})/\beta}}{\sum_{j \in [m]} e^{u(x_{j,s_j})/\beta}}.$$

- The softmax function is extensively used in machine learning to normalize the output into a probability distribution. It is formulated as the ratio of one exponential normalized social utility to the sum of both. Clearly, it is *nonlinear* in the social utility  $u(x_{i,s_i})$  and produces a probability strictly in  $(0, 1)$ .
- The natural function [7, 17, 44]:

$$p_{i,\mathbf{s}} := \frac{u(x_{i,s_i})}{\sum_{j \in [m]} u(x_{j,s_j})}.$$

<sup>4</sup> In [31], the linear model based on the dueling bandit setting [1] is applied for the election game of exactly two party players. As it is designed for pairwise comparison, we do not consider it for general  $m \geq 2$  in this work.

- We treat the probability  $p_{i,s}$  as ratio of the social utility brought by a candidate to the sum of the social utility brought by all candidates.<sup>5</sup> The natural function is *linear* in the social utility  $u(x_{i,s_i})$  and produces a probability in  $[0, 1]$

We call the functions calculating the winning probability of a candidate against the others *WP functions*. The WP functions fulfilling the monotone property are called *monotone WP functions*. The hardmax function is monotone since raising the social utility never makes a party player lose. In addition, by Lemma 1 we know that the softmax and natural functions are monotone WP functions. Throughout this paper, we consider monotone WP functions unless otherwise specified.

**Lemma 1.** *Let  $r, s > 0$  be two positive real numbers such that  $r < s$ . Then, for any  $d > 0$ ,  $r/s < (r + d)/(s + d)$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $r, s > 0$  be two positive real numbers such that  $r < s$ . Then  $r/s - (r + d)/(s + d) = d(r - s)/(s^2 + sd)$ . Clearly,  $r/s - (r + d)/(s + d) < 0$  if  $r < s$ .  $\square$

The payoff of party player  $\mathcal{P}_i$  given the profile  $\mathbf{s}$  is denoted by  $r_{i,s}$ , which is the *expected utility* that party  $\mathcal{P}_i$ 's supporters obtain in  $\mathbf{s}$ . Namely,

$$r_i(\mathbf{s}) = \sum_{j \in [m]} p_{j,s} u_i(x_{j,s_j}),$$

which can be computed in  $O(m)$  time for each  $i$ . We define the *social welfare* of the profile  $\mathbf{s}$  as  $SW(\mathbf{s}) = \sum_{i \in [m]} r_i(\mathbf{s})$ . We say that a profile  $\mathbf{s}$  is a *pure-strategy Nash equilibrium* (PNE) if  $r_i(s'_i, \mathbf{s}_{-i}) \leq r_i(\mathbf{s})$  for any  $s'_i$ , where  $\mathbf{s}_{-i}$  denotes the profile without party player  $\mathcal{P}_i$ 's strategy. That is, in  $\mathbf{s}$ , none of the party players has the incentive to deviate from its current strategy. The (*pure*) *price of anarchy* (PoA) of the game  $\mathcal{G}$  is defined as

$$\text{PoA}(\mathcal{G}) = \frac{SW(\mathbf{s}^*)}{SW(\hat{\mathbf{s}})} = \frac{\sum_{j \in [m]} r_j(\mathbf{s}^*)}{\sum_{j \in [m]} r_j(\hat{\mathbf{s}})},$$

where  $\mathbf{s}^* = \arg \max_{\mathbf{s} \in \prod_{i \in [m]} [n_i]} SW(\mathbf{s})$  is the *optimal profile*, which has the best (i.e., highest) social welfare among all possible profiles, and  $\hat{\mathbf{s}} = \arg \min_{\mathbf{s} \in \prod_{i \in [m]} [n_i], \mathbf{s} \text{ is a PNE}} SW(\mathbf{s})$  is the PNE with the worst (i.e., lowest) social welfare. Note that an egoistic election game may not necessarily have a PNE so an upper bound on the PoA is defined over only games with PNE, i.e.,  $\max_{\mathcal{G} \text{ has a PNE}} \text{PoA}(\mathcal{G})$ , accordingly.

*Remark.* We regard a party, which consists of its supporters, as a collective concept. A candidate is nominated by the supporters of the party to compete in an election campaign. Supporters of a party can benefit not only from the candidate nominated for them but also from that from the competing party. Since the winning candidate serves for the whole society, that is, for *all* the voters, we consider the payoff of the party as the expected utility the supporters can get to well formulate the payoff whenever the party wins or loses.

We will use the following properties throughout this paper.

**Definition 1.** *We call the election game egoistic if  $u_i(x_{i,s_i}) > u_i(x_{j,s_j})$  for all  $i \in [m], s_i \in [n_i], s_j \in [n_j]$ .*

*Remark.* This property guarantees that *any candidate benefits its supporters more than those from the other competing parties*. Such a property is natural and reasonable. Indeed, as a party is a collective concept which consists of its supporters, a candidate of the party is expected to be more favorable than that of a competing party for the supporters. However, it is not always the case in real world. For example, a smaller party that has fewer supporters and less resource is difficult to compete with a larger party, so a candidate of the larger party is possibly more beneficial to the supporters of the smaller party than that of a smaller party.

Below we define a stronger version of egoism.

**Definition 2.** *We say that the election game is strongly egoistic if  $u_i(x_{i,s_i}) > \sum_{j \in [m] \setminus \{i\}} \max_{s_j \in [n_j]} u_i(x_{j,s_j})$  for all  $i \in [m], s_i \in [n_i]$ .*

<sup>5</sup> We assume that  $\sum_{j \in [m]} u(x_{j,s_j}) > 0$  for the natural function.



*Remark.* The strongly egoistic property states that any candidate benefits its supporters more than all the other candidates nominated from the competing parties jointly do.

**Definition 3.** Given a profile  $\mathbf{s}$ , for  $i \in [m]$ , we say that strategy  $x_{i,s_i}$  weakly surpasses  $x_{i,s'_i}$  if  $s_i < s'_i$  (i.e.,  $u_i(x_{i,s_i}) \geq u_i(x_{i,s'_i})$ ) and  $u(x_{i,s_i}) \geq u(x_{i,s'_i})$ . We say that strategy  $x_{i,s_i}$  surpasses  $x_{i,s'_i}$  if  $x_{i,s_i}$  weakly surpasses  $x_{i,s'_i}$  and either  $p_{i,\mathbf{s}} > p_{i,(s'_i, \mathbf{s}_{-i})}$  or  $u_i(x_{i,s_i}) > u_i(x_{i,s'_i})$ .

By Definition 3, a candidate surpasses another one in the same party if it brings more (resp., no less) utility to the supporters and has no lower (resp., higher) winning probability.

*Remark.* By the monotone property, we have  $p_{i,(s_i, \mathbf{s}_{-i})} \geq p_{i,(s'_i, \mathbf{s}_{-i})}$  if and only if  $u(x_{i,s_i}) \geq u(x_{i,s'_i})$ .

### 3 Hardness and Counterexamples

We first note that when the hardmax function is adopted as the monotone WP function, the egoistic election game always has a PNE. With ties broken arbitrarily, the maximum of a finite set of numbers always exists and hence the candidate  $x_{i^*, s_{i^*}^*}$ , where  $i^* := \arg \max_{i \in [m]} u(x_{i,s_i})$  with respect to the profile  $\mathbf{s}$ , wins with probability 1 by definition of hardmax. Therefore, consider the candidate  $(i^*, s_{i^*}^*) := \arg \max_{i \in [m], s_i \in [n_i]} u(x_{i,s_i})$  with the maximum social utility and let  $I = \{s \in [n_{i^*}] : u(x_{i^*,s}) \geq u(x_{j,s_j}) \text{ for all } j \in [m] \setminus \{i^*\}, s_j \in [n_j]\}$  collect all the candidates in party  $i^*$  which bring more social utility than any one in the other parties. Clearly,  $I$  is not empty since  $s_{i^*}^* \in I$ . Next, choose the minimum index  $s_{i^*}^{**}$  in  $I$ , which brings the maximum utility for party  $i^*$ 's supporters, then we have that any profile  $\mathbf{s}$  with party player  $i^*$  choosing  $s_{i^*}^{**}$  is a PNE. Indeed, any other party player  $\mathcal{P}_j$  for  $j \neq i^*$  has no incentive to deviate its strategy because the payoff can never be better off. As for party player  $i^*$ , by the egoistic property we know that it gets less utility from the other party than that from its own candidates whenever it loses, so choosing  $s_{i^*}^{**}$  guarantees his maximum possible reward. However, such a PNE in this case is not necessarily the optimal profile. For example, consider the instance in Table 1. The social welfare of the PNE is 50, though that of the optimal profile is 100, which is twice higher.

In our previous work [31], we have shown that the egoistic two-party election game always has a PNE if a linear function or the softmax function is adopted as the monotone WP function<sup>6</sup>. Naturally, one might be curious about whether the egoistic property is sufficient for such an election game of *three or more parties* to possess a PNE. Unfortunately, through program simulations we can find game instances as counterexamples, which imply that the egoistic election game of three or more parties does not always have a PNE (see Table 2 and 3). Even for a strongly egoistic election game, such a counterexample still exists (see Table 4 and 5). This somehow provides a possible hint that the result of an election campaign between more than two parties may be more unpredictable than that between only two parties.

As an egoistic election game does not always possess a PNE, it is natural to investigate the hardness of deciding whether an egoistic election game of  $m \geq 2$  party players has a PNE. As pointed out by Àlvarez et al. [2], the computational complexity for such an equilibrium-finding problem can be much different with respect to the degrees of succinctness of the input representation. It also deserves to note that in Sect. 4 of [23], Gottlob et al. indicate that to determine if a game in the standard normal form<sup>7</sup> has a PNE can be solved in logarithmic space, and hence in polynomial time, though such a representation of a game instance is very space consuming. Instead, we consider the *general form* representation [2], which succinctly represents a game instance in a tuple of players, their action sets and a deterministic Turing machine, such that the payoffs are not required to be given explicitly. Note that to compute a PNE of a game under the general form representation is NP-hard [2]. We conjecture that to determine if the election game has a PNE, for general  $m \geq 2$  parties, is NP-complete, even it satisfies the egoistic property. Specifically, the input of the game can be represented by a tuple  $(X_1, X_2, \dots, X_m, f_G)$ , such that for each  $i \in [m]$ ,  $X_i$  consists of a vector

<sup>6</sup> Though it is not the case for the natural function.

<sup>7</sup> A game is in the standard normal form if the payoffs of players can be explicitly represented by a single table or matrix.

$u_1(x_{1,i})$	$u_2(x_{1,i})$	$u_3(x_{1,i})$	$u_1(x_{2,i})$	$u_2(x_{2,i})$	$u_3(x_{2,i})$	$u_1(x_{3,i})$	$u_2(x_{3,i})$	$u_3(x_{3,i})$
50	0	0	15	31	0	10	10	24
49	29	22	16	30	0	10	10	23

  

$r_{1,(1,1,1)}$	$r_{2,(1,1,1)}$	$r_{3,(1,1,1)}$	$r_{1,(1,1,2)}$	$r_{2,(1,1,2)}$	$r_{3,(1,1,2)}$	$r_{1,(1,2,1)}$	$r_{2,(1,2,1)}$	$r_{3,(1,2,1)}$
50	0	0	50	0	0	50	0	0
50	0	0	50	0	0	50	0	0

  

$r_{1,(2,1,1)}$	$r_{2,(2,1,1)}$	$r_{3,(2,1,1)}$	$r_{1,(2,1,2)}$	$r_{2,(2,1,2)}$	$r_{3,(2,1,2)}$	$r_{1,(2,2,1)}$	$r_{2,(2,2,1)}$	$r_{3,(2,2,1)}$
49	29	22	49	29	22	49	29	22
49	29	22	49	29	22	49	29	22

**Table 1.** An egoistic election game instance of three parties that always has a PNE ( $\beta = 100, n_i = 2$  for  $i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ ). The hardmax function is used as the monotone WP function. For example, here  $u_{x_{1,2}} = 49 + 29 + 22 = 100$ ,  $u_{x_{2,2}} = 16 + 30 + 0 = 46$ , and  $u_{x_{3,2}} = 10 + 10 + 23 = 43$ , so for profile  $(2, 2, 2)$  the winner is  $x_{1,2}$  and the rewards of the three party players are 49, 29 and 22 respectively, which result in social welfare  $49 + 29 + 22 = 100$ . By checking all the four profiles we know the optimal profile has social welfare 100. It is easy to see that profiles  $(1, 1, 1)$ ,  $(1, 1, 2)$ ,  $(1, 2, 1)$  and  $(1, 2, 2)$  are all PNE, however, each of them has the social welfare 50, which is only half of that of the optimal profile.

$u_1(x_{1,i})$	$u_2(x_{1,i})$	$u_3(x_{1,i})$	$u_1(x_{2,i})$	$u_2(x_{2,i})$	$u_3(x_{2,i})$	$u_1(x_{3,i})$	$u_2(x_{3,i})$	$u_3(x_{3,i})$
50	9	3	22	42	15	36	1	44
44	22	30	19	40	32	33	18	42

  

$r_{1,(1,1,1)}$	$r_{2,(1,1,1)}$	$r_{3,(1,1,1)}$	$r_{1,(1,1,2)}$	$r_{2,(1,1,2)}$	$r_{3,(1,1,2)}$	$r_{1,(1,2,1)}$	$r_{2,(1,2,1)}$	$r_{3,(1,2,1)}$
34.93	17.82	22.23	33.10	18.29	28.47	32.11	23.87	28.471
33.10	18.29	28.47	32.11	23.87	28.471	32.11	23.87	28.471

  

$r_{1,(2,1,1)}$	$r_{2,(2,1,1)}$	$r_{3,(2,1,1)}$	$r_{1,(2,1,2)}$	$r_{2,(2,1,2)}$	$r_{3,(2,1,2)}$	$r_{1,(2,2,1)}$	$r_{2,(2,2,1)}$	$r_{3,(2,2,1)}$
34.68	21.53	29.80	33.09	21.76	34.91	32.22	26.52	34.64
33.09	21.76	34.91	32.22	26.52	34.64	32.22	26.52	34.64

**Table 2.** An egoistic election game instance of three parties that has no PNE. The natural function to compute winning probabilities is adopted ( $\beta = 100, n_i = 2$  for  $i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ ). Here, for example,  $u_{x_{1,1}} = 50 + 9 + 3 = 62$ ,  $u_{x_{2,1}} = 22 + 42 + 15 = 79$ ,  $u_{x_{3,1}} = 36 + 1 + 44 = 81$ . Then we have  $p_{1,(1,1,1)} = 62/(62 + 79 + 81) \approx 0.2793$ ,  $p_{2,(1,1,1)} = 79/(62 + 79 + 81) \approx 0.3559$ ,  $p_{3,(1,1,1)} \approx 0.3649$ . So  $r_{1,1,1} = 50 \cdot p_{1,(1,1,1)} + 22 \cdot p_{2,(1,1,1)} + 36 \cdot p_{3,(1,1,1)} \approx 34.93$ . All the eight profiles are not PNE. For example, consider profile  $(1, 1, 1)$ . Party player  $\mathcal{P}_2$  has the incentive to change its strategy to  $x_{2,2}$  from  $x_{2,1}$  because  $r_{2,(1,2,1)} = 18.29 > 17.82 = r_{2,(1,1,1)}$ . This example is clearly egoistic because  $u_1(x_{1,2}) = 44 > \max\{u_1(x_{2,1}), u_1(x_{3,1})\} = 36$ ,  $u_2(x_{2,2}) = 40 > \max\{u_2(x_{1,2}), u_2(x_{3,2})\} = 22$  and  $u_3(x_{3,2}) = 42 > \max\{u_3(x_{1,2}), u_3(x_{2,2})\} = 32$ .

of  $m$  real values each of which corresponds to the utility for the corresponding supporters of each party, and  $f_{\mathcal{G}}$  is the function that computes the payoff for each party player. Clearly, the input size is not a tabular of size  $\prod_{i \in m} n_i = \Omega(2^m)$ , but is  $O(nm^2)$  instead. Indeed, as we can still generate a payoff matrix of the election game to have its standard normal form, however, not all of the entries are uncorrelated so such a game representation results in redundancy.

## 4 Two Sufficient Conditions for PNE Existence in the Egoistic Election Game

The following theorem provides two sufficient conditions for the egoistic election game to have a pure-strategy Nash equilibrium when a monotone WP function is adopted. Roughly speaking, if every party player has a dominant strategy as nominating their first candidate, which weakly surpasses all the other ones in their own candidate sets, then clearly the profile is a PNE. Moreover, if  $m - 1$  of the party players have such dominant strategies, the rest party player can simply take a best response with respect to the profile except itself.

**Theorem 1.** (a) *If for all  $i \in [m]$ , strategy  $x_{i,1}$  weakly surpasses (surpasses, resp.) each  $x_{i,j}$  for  $j \in [n_i] \setminus \{1\}$  of party player  $\mathcal{P}_i$ , then  $(x_{1,1}, x_{2,1}, \dots, x_{m,1})$  is a PNE (the unique PNE, resp.) of the egoistic election game.*



$u_1(x_{1,i})$	$u_2(x_{1,i})$	$u_3(x_{1,i})$	$u_1(x_{2,i})$	$u_2(x_{2,i})$	$u_3(x_{2,i})$	$u_1(x_{3,i})$	$u_2(x_{3,i})$	$u_3(x_{3,i})$
29	4	21	23	59	7	8	32	54
27	43	3	3	57	38	20	13	53

$r_{1,(1,1,1)}$	$r_{2,(1,1,1)}$	$r_{3,(1,1,1)}$	$r_{1,(1,1,2)}$	$r_{2,(1,1,2)}$	$r_{3,(1,1,2)}$	$\approx$	18.81	34.64	28.51	23.49	27.82	27.38
$r_{1,(1,2,1)}$	$r_{2,(1,2,1)}$	$r_{3,(1,2,1)}$	$r_{1,(1,2,2)}$	$r_{2,(1,2,2)}$	$r_{3,(1,2,2)}$	$\approx$	11.27	34.67	39.70	15.57	28.09	38.93
$r_{1,(2,1,1)}$	$r_{2,(2,1,1)}$	$r_{3,(2,1,1)}$	$r_{1,(2,1,2)}$	$r_{2,(2,1,2)}$	$r_{3,(2,1,2)}$	$\approx$	18.74	44.53	22.84	23.18	38.35	21.61
$r_{1,(2,2,1)}$	$r_{2,(2,2,1)}$	$r_{3,(2,2,1)}$	$r_{1,(2,2,2)}$	$r_{2,(2,2,2)}$	$r_{3,(2,2,2)}$	$\approx$	11.58	44.25	33.66	15.67	38.27	32.77

**Table 3.** An egoistic election game instance of three parties that has no PNE. The softmax function to compute winning probabilities is adopted ( $\beta = 100, n_i = 2$  for  $i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ ). Here, for example,  $u_{x_{1,1}} = 29 + 4 + 21 = 54$ ,  $u_{x_{2,1}} = 23 + 59 + 7 = 89$ ,  $u_{x_{3,1}} = 8 + 32 + 54 = 94$ . Then we have  $p_{1,(1,1,1)} = e^{54/100} / (e^{54/100} + e^{89/100} + e^{94/100}) \approx 0.2557$ ,  $p_{2,(1,1,1)} = e^{89/100} / (e^{54/100} + e^{89/100} + e^{94/100}) \approx 0.3629$ ,  $p_{3,(1,1,1)} \approx 0.3814$ . So  $r_{1,1,1} = 29 \cdot p_{1,(1,1,1)} + 23 \cdot p_{2,(1,1,1)} + 8 \cdot p_{3,(1,1,1)} \approx 18.81$ . All the eight profiles are not PNE. For example, consider profile  $(1, 1, 1)$ . Party player  $\mathcal{P}_2$  has the incentive to change its strategy to  $x_{2,2}$  from  $x_{2,1}$  because  $r_{2,(1,2,1)} = 34.67 > 34.64 = r_{2,(1,1,1)}$ . This example is egoistic because  $u_1(x_{1,2}) = 27 > \max\{u_1(x_{2,1}), u_1(x_{3,2})\} = 23$ ,  $u_2(x_{2,2}) = 57 > \max\{u_2(x_{1,2}), u_2(x_{3,1})\} = 43$  and  $u_3(x_{3,2}) = 53 > \max\{u_3(x_{1,1}), u_3(x_{2,2})\} = 38$ .

$u_1(x_{1,i})$	$u_2(x_{1,i})$	$u_3(x_{1,i})$	$u_1(x_{2,i})$	$u_2(x_{2,i})$	$u_3(x_{2,i})$	$u_1(x_{3,i})$	$u_2(x_{3,i})$	$u_3(x_{3,i})$
67	10	9	11	45	9	2	25	53
66	9	11	1	43	27	41	6	49

$r_{1,(1,1,1)}$	$r_{2,(1,1,1)}$	$r_{3,(1,1,1)}$	$r_{1,(1,1,2)}$	$r_{2,(1,1,2)}$	$r_{3,(1,1,2)}$	$\approx$	28.73	25.04	24.24	42.16	17.66	24.55
$r_{1,(1,2,1)}$	$r_{2,(1,2,1)}$	$r_{3,(1,2,1)}$	$r_{1,(1,2,2)}$	$r_{2,(1,2,2)}$	$r_{3,(1,2,2)}$	$\approx$	25.29	24.95	29.24	38.61	17.74	29.23
$r_{1,(2,1,1)}$	$r_{2,(2,1,1)}$	$r_{3,(2,1,1)}$	$r_{1,(2,1,2)}$	$r_{2,(2,1,2)}$	$r_{3,(2,1,2)}$	$\approx$	28.36	24.67	24.98	41.81	17.31	25.24
$r_{1,(2,2,1)}$	$r_{2,(2,2,1)}$	$r_{3,(2,2,1)}$	$r_{1,(2,2,2)}$	$r_{2,(2,2,2)}$	$r_{3,(2,2,2)}$	$\approx$	24.92	24.59	29.97	38.27	17.40	29.91

**Table 4.** A strongly egoistic election game instance of three parties that has no PNE. The natural winning probability function is adopted ( $\beta = 100, n_i = 2$  for  $i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ ). Similar to Table 2 we can compute the rewards of each party player in each profile. This example is strongly egoistic since  $u_1(x_{1,2}) = 66 > u_1(x_{2,1}) + u_1(x_{3,2}) = 52$ ,  $u_2(x_{2,2}) = 43 > u_2(x_{1,1}) + u_2(x_{3,1}) = 35$  and  $u_3(x_{3,2}) = 49 > u_3(x_{1,2}) + u_3(x_{2,2}) = 38$ .

(b) If there exists  $\mathcal{I} \subset [m]$ ,  $|\mathcal{I}| = m-1$ , such that for all  $i \in \mathcal{I}$ ,  $x_{i,1}$  weakly surpasses each  $x_{i,j}$  for  $j \in [n_i] \setminus \{1\}$  of party player  $\mathcal{P}_i$ , then  $((x_{i,1})_{i \in \mathcal{I}}, x_{j,s_j^\#})$  is a PNE for  $j \notin \mathcal{I}$  and  $s_j^\# = \arg \max_{\ell \in [n_j]} r_j((x_{i,1})_{i \in \mathcal{I}}, x_{j,\ell})$ .

*Proof.* For the first case, let us consider an arbitrary  $i \in [m]$  and an arbitrary  $t \in [n_i] \setminus \{1\}$ . Denote by  $\mathbf{s}$  the profile  $(x_{1,1}, x_{2,1}, \dots, x_{m,1})$ . Since strategy  $x_{i,1}$  weakly surpasses  $x_{i,t}$ , we have  $p_{i,\mathbf{s}} \geq p_{i,(t,\mathbf{s}_{-i})}$  and then  $\sum_{j \in [m] \setminus \{i\}} p_{j,\mathbf{s}} \leq \sum_{j \in [m] \setminus \{i\}} p_{j,(t,\mathbf{s}_{-i})}$ . Hence,

$$\begin{aligned}
r_{i,\mathbf{s}} - r_{i,(t,\mathbf{s}_{-i})} &= \sum_{j \in [m]} p_{j,\mathbf{s}} u_i(x_{j,1}) - \left( \sum_{j \in [m] \setminus \{i\}} p_{j,(t,\mathbf{s}_{-i})} u_i(x_{j,1}) + p_{i,(t,\mathbf{s}_{-i})} u_i(x_{i,t}) \right) \\
&= \sum_{j \in [m] \setminus \{i\}} u_i(x_{j,t}) (p_{j,\mathbf{s}} - p_{j,(t,\mathbf{s}_{-i})}) + (p_{i,\mathbf{s}} u_i(x_{i,1}) - p_{i,(t,\mathbf{s}_{-i})} u_i(x_{i,t})) \\
&\geq \sum_{j \in [m] \setminus \{i\}} u_i(x_{i,t}) (p_{j,\mathbf{s}} - p_{j,(t,\mathbf{s}_{-i})}) + u_i(x_{i,t}) (p_{i,\mathbf{s}} - p_{i,(t,\mathbf{s}_{-i})}) \\
&= u_i(x_{i,t}) \left( \sum_{j \in [m] \setminus \{i\}} p_{j,\mathbf{s}} - p_{j,(t,\mathbf{s}_{-i})} + (p_{i,\mathbf{s}} - p_{i,(t,\mathbf{s}_{-i})}) \right) \\
&= u_i(x_{i,t}) \left( \sum_{j \in [m]} p_{j,\mathbf{s}} - \sum_{j \in [m]} p_{j,(t,\mathbf{s}_{-i})} \right) = 0,
\end{aligned}$$

$u_1(x_{1,i})$	$u_2(x_{1,i})$	$u_3(x_{1,i})$	$u_1(x_{2,i})$	$u_2(x_{2,i})$	$u_3(x_{2,i})$	$u_1(x_{3,i})$	$u_2(x_{3,i})$	$u_3(x_{3,i})$
33	42	0	0	93	4	20	6	54
30	30	29	3	89	1	0	44	50

  

$r_{1,(1,1,1)}$	$r_{2,(1,1,1)}$	$r_{3,(1,1,1)}$	$r_{1,(1,1,2)}$	$r_{2,(1,1,2)}$	$r_{3,(1,1,2)}$	$\approx$	16.38	49.80	18.73	9.55	61.09	18.94
$r_{1,(1,2,1)}$	$r_{2,(1,2,1)}$	$r_{3,(1,2,1)}$	$r_{1,(1,2,2)}$	$r_{2,(1,2,2)}$	$r_{3,(1,2,2)}$	$\approx$	17.74	47.67	17.84	10.74	59.23	18.10
$r_{1,(2,1,1)}$	$r_{2,(2,1,1)}$	$r_{3,(2,1,1)}$	$r_{1,(2,1,2)}$	$r_{2,(2,1,2)}$	$r_{3,(2,1,2)}$	$\approx$	16.11	45.45	27.59	9.57	56.47	27.40
$r_{1,(2,2,1)}$	$r_{2,(2,2,1)}$	$r_{3,(2,2,1)}$	$r_{1,(2,2,2)}$	$r_{2,(2,2,2)}$	$r_{3,(2,2,2)}$	$\approx$	17.40	43.36	26.87	10.71	54.62	26.71

**Table 5.** A strongly egoistic election game instance of three parties that has no PNE. The softmax winning probability function is adopted ( $\beta = 100, n_i = 2$  for  $i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ ). Similar to Table 3, we can derive the rewards of each party player in each profile. This example is strongly egoistic since  $u_1(x_{1,2}) = 30 > u_1(x_{2,2}) + u_1(x_{3,1}) = 23$ ,  $u_2(x_{2,2}) = 89 > u_2(x_{1,1}) + u_2(x_{3,2}) = 86$  and  $u_3(x_{3,2}) = 50 > u_3(x_{1,2}) + u_3(x_{2,1}) = 33$ .

where the inequality follows from the egoistic property and the assumption that strategy  $x_{i,1}$  weakly surpasses  $x_{i,t}$ , and last equality holds since  $\sum_{j \in [m]} p_{j,s} = \sum_{j \in [m]} p_{j,(t,s-i)} = 1$  by the law of total probability. Thus, party player  $i$  has no incentive to deviate from its current strategy. Note that the uniqueness of the PNE comes when the inequality becomes “greater-than”. This happens as strategy  $x_{i,1}$  surpasses  $x_{i,t}$ .

For the second case, by the same arguments for the first case, we know that for  $i \in \mathcal{I}$ , party player  $i$  has no incentive to deviate from its current strategy. Let  $j \in [m] \setminus \mathcal{I}$  be the only one party player not in  $\mathcal{I}$ . As  $s_j^\#$  is the best response when the other strategies of parties in  $\mathcal{I}$  are fixed, party player  $j$  has no incentive to deviate from its current strategy. Therefore, the theorem is proved.  $\square$

For example, consider  $m = 2$  (i.e., only two parties exist in the society). Namely, if strategy  $x_{1,1}$  of party  $\mathcal{P}_1$  (weakly) surpasses each  $x_{1,t}$  for  $2 \leq t \leq n_1$  and strategy  $x_{2,1}$  of party  $\mathcal{P}_2$  (weakly) surpasses each  $x_{2,t'}$  for  $2 \leq t' \leq n_2$ , then  $(x_{1,1}, x_{2,1})$  is a (weakly) dominant-strategy solution.

## 5 A Fixed-Parameter Algorithm for Finding a Pure-Strategy Nash Equilibrium of the Egoistic Election Game

In the following we provide the formal definitions of a parameterized problem and a fixed-parameter tractability to make our discussions self-contained.

**Definition 4** ([15, 22, 36]). A parameterized problem is a language  $\mathcal{L} \subseteq \Sigma^* \times \Sigma^*$ , where  $\Sigma$  is a finite alphabet. The second component is called the parameter(s) of the problem.

**Definition 5** ([15, 22, 36]). A parameterized problem  $L$  is fixed-parameter tractable (FPT) if, for all  $(x, k) \in \mathcal{L}$ , whether  $(x, k) \in \mathcal{L}$  can be determined in  $f(k) \cdot n^{O(1)}$  time, where  $f$  is a computable function that depends only on  $k$ .

Below we give a useful lemma which states that a profile with a player’s strategy surpassed by other one of it is never a PNE. With a slight abuse of notation, we abbreviate the profile  $(x_{1,s_1}, x_{2,s_2}, \dots, x_{m,s_m})$  by  $\mathbf{s} = (s_1, s_2, \dots, s_m)$ .

**Lemma 2.** If  $s_i$  is surpassed by some  $s'_i \in [n_i] \setminus \{s_i\}$ , then  $(s_i, (\tilde{s}_j)_{j \in [m] \setminus \{i\}})$  is not a PNE for any  $(\tilde{s}_j)_{j \in [m] \setminus \{i\}}$ .

*Proof.* Let  $\mathbf{s}_{-i} = (\tilde{s}_j)_{j \in [m] \setminus \{i\}}$  be any profile except party player  $\mathcal{P}_i$ ’s strategy. If  $s_i$  is surpassed by  $s'_i$ , then we have  $s'_i < s_i$ , and either:

- (a)  $u(x_{i,s'_i}) > u(x_{i,s_i})$  and  $u_i(x_{i,s'_i}) \geq u_i(x_{i,s_i})$ , or
- (b)  $u(x_{i,s'_i}) \geq u(x_{i,s_i})$  and  $u_i(x_{i,s'_i}) > u_i(x_{i,s_i})$ .

We prove case (a) as follows. Case (b) can be similarly proved.

We have  $u_i(x_{i,s'_i}) \geq u_i(x_{i,s_i})$  from the assumption in (a). Also, by the monotone property of the WP functions, we have  $p_{i,(s'_i, \mathbf{s}_{-i})} \geq p_{i,(s_i, \mathbf{s}_{-i})}$  and  $\sum_{j \in [m] \setminus \{i\}} p_{j,(s'_i, \mathbf{s}_{-i})} \leq \sum_{j \in [m] \setminus \{i\}} p_{j,(s_i, \mathbf{s}_{-i})}$  since  $u(x_{i,s'_i}) > u(x_{i,s_i})$ . Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}
r_i(s_i, \mathbf{s}_{-i}) - r_i(s'_i, \mathbf{s}_{-i}) &= \left( p_{i,(s_i, \mathbf{s}_{-i})} u_i(x_{i,s_i}) + \sum_{j \in [m] \setminus \{i\}} p_{j,(s_i, \mathbf{s}_{-i})} u_i(x_{j,\tilde{s}_j}) \right) \\
&\quad - \left( p_{i,(s'_i, \mathbf{s}_{-i})} u_i(x_{i,s'_i}) + \sum_{j \in [m] \setminus \{i\}} p_{j,(s'_i, \mathbf{s}_{-i})} u_i(x_{j,\tilde{s}_j}) \right) \\
&= \left( \sum_{j \in [m] \setminus \{i\}} (p_{j,(s_i, \mathbf{s}_{-i})} - p_{j,(s'_i, \mathbf{s}_{-i})}) u_i(x_{j,\tilde{s}_j}) \right) + (p_{i,(s_i, \mathbf{s}_{-i})} u_i(x_{i,s_i}) - (p_{i,(s'_i, \mathbf{s}_{-i})} u_i(x_{i,s'_i}))) \\
&< u_i(x_{i,s_i}) \left( \sum_{j \in [m] \setminus \{i\}} (p_{j,(s_i, \mathbf{s}_{-i})} - p_{j,(s'_i, \mathbf{s}_{-i})}) \right) + (p_{i,(s_i, \mathbf{s}_{-i})} u_i(x_{i,s_i}) - (p_{i,(s'_i, \mathbf{s}_{-i})} u_i(x_{i,s'_i}))) \\
&= u_i(x_{i,s_i}) (p_{i,(s'_i, \mathbf{s}_{-i})} - p_{i,(s_i, \mathbf{s}_{-i})}) + (p_{i,(s_i, \mathbf{s}_{-i})} u_i(x_{i,s_i}) - p_{i,(s'_i, \mathbf{s}_{-i})} u_i(x_{i,s'_i})) \\
&\leq (p_{i,(s'_i, \mathbf{s}_{-i})} - p_{i,(s_i, \mathbf{s}_{-i})}) (u_i(x_{i,s_i}) - u_i(x_{i,s'_i})) = 0,
\end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality follows from the egoistic property. Thus,  $(s_i, \mathbf{s}_{-i})$  is not a PNE.  $\square$

Inspired by Theorem 1 and Lemma 2, we are able to devise an efficient algorithm to find out a PNE of the egoistic election game whenever it exists, with respect to two parameters: number of *chaotic parties* and *nominating depth*, which are introduced as follows. As we have assumed, candidates in each party are sorted according to the utility for its supporters. That is,  $u_i(x_{i,1}) \geq u_i(x_{i,2}) \geq \dots \geq u_i(x_{i,n_i})$  for each  $i \in [m]$ . Let  $d_i$  be the index of the candidate that surpasses all candidates  $x_{i,d_i+1}, \dots, x_{i,n_i}$  or is set to  $n_i$  if  $x_{i,n_i}$  is not surpassed by any candidates of  $\mathcal{P}_i$ . Formally, let  $\max\text{Prob}_i := \arg \max_{s \in [n_i]} u_i(x_{i,s})$ , then  $d_i = \max\{\arg \max_{s \in \max\text{Prob}_i} u_i(x_{i,s})\}$ . From Theorem 1 we know that  $x_{i,d_i}$  is a dominant strategy for the “sub-game instance” in which  $\mathcal{P}_i$ ’s strategy set is reduced to  $\{x_{i,s}\}_{s \in \{d_i, d_i+1, \dots, n_i\}}$ . We then collect the set  $\mathcal{D} = \{i \mid i \in [m], d_i = 1\}$ . As for each  $i \in \mathcal{D}$ , party player  $\mathcal{P}_i$  must choose the first candidate  $x_{i,1}$ . Thus, we can reduce the game instance to  $(\tilde{X}_i)_{i \in [m] \setminus \mathcal{D}}$ , where  $\tilde{X}_i = \{x_{i,s}\}_{s \in [d_i]}$ . We call  $d := \max_{i \in [m]} d_i$  the *nominating depth* of the election game. We call a party  $\mathcal{P}_i$  *chaotic* if  $d_i > 1$  and denote by  $k$  the number of chaotic parties. Then, we propose Algorithm FPT-ELECTION-PNE to compute a PNE of the egoistic election game. The complexity of the algorithm is  $O(nm^2 + kd^{k+1}m)$ . Thus, to compute a PNE for such a game is *fixed-parameter tractable* with respect to the two parameters  $d$  and  $k$ . The results are proved and concluded in Theorem 2.

**Theorem 2.** *Given an election game instance  $\mathcal{G}$  of  $m \geq 2$  parties each of which has at most  $n$  candidates. Suppose that  $\mathcal{G}$  has at most  $k$  chaotic parties and the nominating depth of  $\mathcal{G}$  is bounded by  $d$ , then to compute a PNE of  $\mathcal{G}$  can be done in  $O(nm^2 + kd^{k+1}m)$  time if it exists.*

*Proof.* It costs  $O(nm^2)$  time to compute  $d$  and  $d_i$  for all  $i$ , and the set  $\mathcal{D}$  can be then obtained. Since playing strategy 1 (i.e., nominating the first candidate) for parties  $i \in \mathcal{D}$  is the dominant strategy, we only need to consider party players in  $[m] \setminus \mathcal{D}$ . Since for each  $i \in [m] \setminus \mathcal{D}$ , each strategy in  $\{x_{i,d_i+1}, \dots, x_{i,n_i}\}$  is surpassed by  $x_{i,d_i}$  (considering the subgame with respect to  $(x_{i,d_i+1}, \dots, x_{i,n_i})_{i \in [m]}$ ), by Lemma 2 we know that we only need to consider strategies  $\{x_{i,1}, \dots, x_{i,d_i}\}$  for such party player  $i$ . Thus, the number of entries of the implicit payoff matrix that we need to check whether it is a PNE is  $\prod_{i \in [m] \setminus \mathcal{D}} d_i = O(d^k)$ , where  $k = |[m] \setminus \mathcal{D}|$ . For each of these entries, it takes  $O(m)$  time to compute the winning probabilities as well as the payoffs of the party players in  $[m] \setminus \mathcal{S}$ . In addition, checking whether each of such entries can be done in at most  $k(d-1)$  steps. Therefore, the theorem is proved.  $\square$

---

**Algorithm** FPT-ELECTION-PNE

---

**Input:** an election game instance  $\mathcal{G} = (X_1, X_2, \dots, X_m, f_{\mathcal{G}})$ .

- 1: For each  $i$ , compute  $\max\text{Prob}_i = \arg \max_{s \in [n_i]} u(x_{i,s})$ .
  - 2: For each  $i$ , compute  $d_i = \max\{\arg \max_{s \in \max\text{Prob}_i} u_i(x_{i,s})\}$ .
  - 3: Collect  $\mathcal{D} = \{i \mid i \in [m], d_i = 1\}$  and assign  $x_{i,1}$  to party player  $\mathcal{P}_i$  for  $i \in \mathcal{D}$ ,
  - 4: Reduce the game instance to  $(\tilde{X}_i)_{i \in [m] \setminus \mathcal{D}}$ , where  $\tilde{X}_i = \{x_{i,s}\}_{s \in [d_i]}$ ,  $i \in [m] \setminus \mathcal{D}$ .
  - 5: **for** each entry  $\mathbf{s} \in \prod_{i \in \mathcal{D}} \{x_{i,1}\} \times \prod_{j \in [m] \setminus \mathcal{D}} \tilde{X}_j$  **do**
  - 6:   Compute the payoff  $r_i(\mathbf{s})$  for each  $i$ .
  - 7:   **if**  $\mathbf{s}$  corresponds to a PNE/\* check if any unilateral deviation is possible \*/ **then**
  - 8:     /\* for each  $j \in [m] \setminus \mathcal{D}$ , check if  $r_j(\mathbf{s}) \geq r_j(s'_j, \mathbf{s}_{-j})$  for all  $s'_j \in \tilde{X}_j$  \*/
  - 9:     return  $\mathbf{s}$
  - 10:   **end if**
  - 11: **end for**
  - 12: Output “NO”
- 

*Remark.* As candidates in each party are sorted by the utility for the supporters of their own party, the nominating depth  $d$  equals the maximum possible number of candidates that we suffice to consider. On the other hand, a party is chaotic if it does not have a candidate as a dominant strategy, and hence a “searching” for the state involving chaotic parties is required. If the number  $k$  of chaotic parties is small, it leads to limited exponential explosion. In practical, a party usually has very limited number of potential candidates to choose for an election campaign, so we believe the two parameters are small and hence the fixed-parameter algorithm is efficient in practical.

## 6 Price of Anarchy for Egoistic Election Games

Below, Proposition 1 relates a PNE to an optimal profile on social welfare. Note that a PNE may be a profile that is suboptimal in the social welfare in the election game.

**Proposition 1.** *Let  $\mathbf{s} = (s_i)_{i \in [m]}$  be a PNE and  $\mathbf{s}^* = (s_i^*)_{i \in [m]}$  be the optimal profile. Then,  $\sum_{i \in [m]} u(s_i) \geq \max_{i \in [m]} u(s_i^*)$ .*

*Proof.* We assume that  $\mathbf{s} \neq \mathbf{s}^*$  since otherwise the proposition trivially holds. By Lemma 2, we know that for each  $i \in [m]$ , strategy  $s_i$  is not surpassed by  $s_i^*$  since  $\mathbf{s}$  is a PNE. Therefore, it suffices to consider the following cases.

- (a) If  $s_i \leq s_i^*$  for all  $i \in [m]$ , then for each  $j \in [m]$ ,  $\sum_{i \in [m]} u(s_i) \geq \sum_{i \in [m]} u_i(s_i) \geq \sum_{i \in [m]} u_i(s_j^*) = u(s_j^*)$ , where the second inequality follows from the egoistic property. Hence, we have  $\sum_{i \in [m]} u(s_i) \geq \max_{i \in [m]} u(s_i^*)$ .
- (b) If  $u(s_i^*) \leq u(s_i)$  for all  $i \in [m]$ , then obviously we have  $\sum_{i \in [m]} u(s_i) \geq \sum_{i \in [m]} u(s_i^*) \geq \max_{i \in [m]} u(s_i^*)$ .
- (c) Suppose that there exists a subset  $W \subset [m]$  such that  $s_i \leq s_i^*$  for all  $i \in W$  and  $u(s_j^*) \leq u(s_j)$  for each  $j \in \overline{W} := [m] \setminus W$ . For  $j \in W$ , we have  $\sum_{i \in [m]} u(s_i) \geq \sum_{i \in [m]} u_i(s_i) \geq \sum_{i \in [m]} u_i(s_j^*) = u(s_j^*)$ . For  $j \in \overline{W}$ , we have  $\sum_{i \in [m]} u(s_i) = \sum_{i \in [m] \setminus \{j\}} u(s_i) + u(s_j) \geq u(s_j^*)$ . Hence,  $\sum_{i \in [m]} u(s_i) \geq \max_{i \in [m]} u(s_i^*)$ .  $\square$

### 6.1 Adopting the Natural Function

In Sect. 3, we have seen counterexamples that a PNE does not always exist in the egoistic election game given the natural function as the WP function. Nevertheless, we can still ask how good or bad its PoA can be once a PNE of the game instance exists. In the following, we show that its PoA is upper bounded by  $m$  when the natural function is adopted as the WP function.

**Theorem 3.** *Suppose that the natural function is adopted as the monotone WP function. Then the egoistic election game has the PoA upper bounded by the number of parties  $m$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $\mathbf{s} = (s_i)_{i \in [m]}$  be a PNE and  $\mathbf{s}^* = (s_i^*)_{i \in [m]}$  be the optimal profile. Note that  $SW(\mathbf{s}^*) = \sum_{i \in [m]} p_{i^*, \mathbf{s}^*} u(s_i^*) \leq \max_{i \in [m]} u(s_i^*)$ . By the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we derive that  $\sum_{i \in [m]} u(s_i)^2 \geq (\sum_{i \in [m]} u(s_i))^2 / m$ . Then, we have

$$SW(\mathbf{s}) = \sum_{i \in [m]} \frac{u(s_i)}{\sum_{j \in [m]} u(s_j)} \cdot u(s_i) = \frac{\sum_{i \in [m]} u(s_i)^2}{\sum_{j \in [m]} u(s_j)} \geq \frac{1}{m} \cdot \sum_{i \in [m]} u(s_i).$$

Together, by Proposition 1 that  $\sum_{i \in [m]} u(s_i) \geq \max_{i \in [m]} u(s_i^*)$ , we obtain that  $SW(\mathbf{s}) \geq SW(\mathbf{s}^*)/m$ . Thus, the PoA is upper bounded by  $m$ .  $\square$

## 6.2 Adopting the Monotone Function in General

We have seen analysis that the egoistic election game given the natural function as the monotone WP function has PoA upper bounded by  $m$ . In fact, by carefully lower bounding the social welfare of a profile, we can show that the bound holds for the game adopting any monotone WP function.

Note that for any strategy profile  $\mathbf{s}$ , we have

$$SW(\mathbf{s}) = \sum_{i \in [m]} p_{i, \mathbf{s}} \cdot u(s_i) \leq \max_{i \in [m]} u(s_i) \quad (1)$$

and

$$SW(\mathbf{s}) = \sum_{i \in [m]} p_{i, \mathbf{s}} \cdot u(s_i) \geq \frac{1}{m} \cdot \sum_{i \in [m]} u(s_i) \quad (2)$$

which hold for any monotone WP function. Inequality (2) can be justified as follows. W.l.o.g., let us assume that  $u(s_1) \geq u(s_2) \geq \dots \geq u(s_m)$  (by relabeling after they are sorted). As the winning probability function is monotone, it is clear that  $p_{1, \mathbf{s}} \geq p_{2, \mathbf{s}} \geq \dots \geq p_{m, \mathbf{s}}$ . Let  $k \in [m]$  be the index such that  $p_{k, \mathbf{s}} \geq 1/m$  and  $p_{k+1, \mathbf{s}} < 1/m$  and  $k = m$  if  $p_{i, \mathbf{s}} = 1/m$  for all  $i \in [m]$ . Note that such an index  $k$  must exist otherwise  $\sum_{i \in [m]} p_{i, \mathbf{s}} < 1$  which contradicts the law of total probability. It is clear that Inequality (2) holds when  $k = m$ . For the case  $k < m$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} SW(\mathbf{s}) &= \sum_{i \in [m]} p_{i, \mathbf{s}} \cdot u(s_i) = \sum_{i=1}^k \left( p_{i, \mathbf{s}} - \frac{1}{m} \right) u(s_i) + \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^k u(s_i) + \sum_{i=k+1}^m \left( p_{i, \mathbf{s}} - \frac{1}{m} \right) u(s_i) + \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=k+1}^m u(s_i) \\ &\geq \sum_{i=1}^k \left( p_{i, \mathbf{s}} - \frac{1}{m} \right) u(s_k) + \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^k u(s_i) + \sum_{i=k+1}^m \left( p_{i, \mathbf{s}} - \frac{1}{m} \right) u(s_k) + \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=k+1}^m u(s_i) \\ &= \left( \sum_{i=1}^m p_{i, \mathbf{s}} - 1 \right) u(s_k) + \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m u(s_i) \\ &= \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m u(s_i). \end{aligned}$$

Hence the inequality (2) is valid.

Now, we are ready for Theorem 4 and its proof.

**Theorem 4.** *The PoA of the egoistic election game using any monotone WP function is upper bounded by  $m$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $\mathbf{s} = (s_i)_{i \in [m]}$  be a PNE and  $\mathbf{s}^* = (s_i^*)_{i \in [m]}$  be the optimal profile. Let  $\ell = \arg \max_{i \in [m]} u(s_i^*)$  be the index of the party players with the maximum social utility with respect to  $\mathbf{s}^*$ . Recall that  $m \cdot SW(\mathbf{s}) \geq \sum_{i \in [m]} u(s_i)$ . Our goal is to prove Inequality (3):

$$\sum_{i \in [m]} u(s_i) \geq u(s_\ell^*). \quad (3)$$

By Lemma 2 we know that each  $i \in [m]$ , strategy  $s_i$  is not surpassed by  $s_i^*$  since  $\mathbf{s}$  is a PNE. Therefore, it suffices to consider the following cases.

- (a) For all  $i \in [m]$ ,  $s_i \leq s_i^*$ . In this case, Inequality (3) holds since
  - (i)  $u_\ell(s_\ell) \geq u_\ell(s_\ell^*)$ ,
  - (ii)  $u_j(s_j) \geq u_j(s_\ell^*)$  for each  $j \in [m]$ .
- (b) For all  $i \in [m]$ ,  $u(s_i^*) \leq u(s_i)$ . In this case, we have  $\sum_{i \in [m]} u(s_i) - u(s_\ell^*) \geq \sum_{i \in [m] \setminus \{\ell\}} u(s_i) \geq 0$ . Hence, Inequality (3) holds.
- (c) Suppose that there exists a subset  $W \subset [m]$  such that  $s_i \leq s_i^*$  for all  $i \in W$  and  $u(s_\ell^*) \leq u(s_j)$  for each  $j \in \overline{W} := [m] \setminus W$ .
  - (i) Assume that  $\ell \in W$ . By the arguments similar to (a), Inequality (3) follows from  $u_\ell(s_\ell) \geq u_\ell(s_\ell^*)$  (by the assumption that  $\ell \in W$  and the egoistic property), and  $u_j(s_j) \geq u_j(s_\ell^*)$  for each  $j \in [m] \setminus \{\ell\}$  (by the egoistic property).
  - (ii) Assume that  $\ell \in \overline{W}$ . By the arguments similar to (b), we have

$$\sum_{i \in [m]} u(s_i) - u(s_\ell^*) \geq \sum_{i \in \overline{W}} u(s_i) - u(s_\ell^*) \geq \sum_{i \in \overline{W} \setminus \{\ell\}} u(s_i) \geq 0.$$

Together with Inequality (2) and (1), we derive that  $SW(\mathbf{s}) \geq SW(\mathbf{s}^*)/m$ . Therefore, we conclude that the PoA is upper bounded by  $m$ .  $\square$

*Remark.* In [31], the lower bound on the PoA of the egoistic two-party election game using the softmax WP function is 2. Here we further point out that the PoA upper bound is tight when the hardmax WP function is applied. Consider the game instance shown in Table 6. We can see that the PoA of the game approaches  $m$ . Through these examples we know that our PoA bound is tight for  $m = 2$  using either the hardmax or the softmax function as the WP function, and is also tight for general  $m \geq 2$  when the hardmax WP function is applied.

$u_1(x_{1,i})$	$u_2(x_{1,i})$	$\cdots$	$u_m(x_{1,i})$	$u_1(x_{2,i})$	$u_2(x_{2,i})$	$\cdots$	$u_m(x_{2,i})$	$\cdots$	$u_1(x_{m,i})$	$u_2(x_{m,i})$	$\cdots$	$u_m(x_{m,i})$
$\frac{\beta}{m} + 3\epsilon$	0	$\cdots$	0	0	$\frac{\beta}{m} + 2\epsilon$	$\cdots$	0	$\cdots$	0	0	$\cdots$	$\frac{\beta}{m} + 2\epsilon$
$\frac{\beta}{m}$	$\frac{\beta}{m}$	$\cdots$	$\frac{\beta}{m}$	0	$\frac{\beta}{m} + \epsilon$	$\cdots$	0	$\cdots$	0	0	$\cdots$	$\frac{\beta}{m} + \epsilon$

**Table 6.** An egoistic election game instance of  $m \geq 2$  parties that always has a PNE ( $\beta > 0, n_i = 2$  for  $i \in \{1, 2\}$ ,  $0 < \epsilon \ll 1$ ). The hardmax function is used as the monotone WP function. Profile  $(1, 1, \dots, 1)$  is a PNE, and it has the social welfare  $\beta/m + 3\epsilon$ , which approaches  $1/m$  of that of the optimal profile,  $\beta$ , when  $\epsilon$  is close to 0.

### 6.3 Coalition with Strongly Egoism Guarantee

In the rest of this section, we consider a scenario that party players can unite as coalitions and utility can share between the members in a coalition, and furthermore, we assume that the election game is strongly egoistic. We call such a game *the strongly egoistic cooperative election game* (SE-CE game). We will show that the SE-CE game collapses on the original non-cooperative egoistic election game.



For the SE-CE game, suppose that we have  $m'$  coalitions  $\mathcal{C}_1, \mathcal{C}_2, \dots, \mathcal{C}_{m'}$  of the  $m$  party players, such that  $m' \leq m$ , each coalition  $\mathcal{C}_i$  is composed of  $n'_i$  party players and  $\mathcal{C}_i \cap \mathcal{C}_j = \emptyset$  for each  $i, j \in [m'], i \neq j$ . That is, for each  $i \in [m']$ ,  $\mathcal{C}_i = \{\mathcal{P}_{i_1}, \mathcal{P}_{i_2}, \dots, \mathcal{P}_{i_{h_i}}\}$  is composed of  $h_i$  *member parties*. Let  $X_{i_j}$  denote the set of candidates of party  $\mathcal{P}_{i_j}$  (i.e.,  $X_{i_j} = \{x_{i_j,1}, x_{i_j,2}, \dots, x_{i_j,n_{i_j}}\}$ ). For a coalition  $\mathcal{C}_i$  of parties, we regard  $\mathcal{C}_i$  as a player and consider the *coalition candidate*  $z_i$  as a pure strategy of  $\mathcal{C}_i$ , where  $z_i \in X_{i_1} \times X_{i_2} \times \dots \times X_{i_{h_i}}$  is a composition of  $h_i$  candidates each of which comes from the corresponding member party of  $\mathcal{C}_i$ . Clearly, there are  $\prod_{j \in [h_i]} n_{i_j} = O(n^{h_i})$  pure strategies of coalition  $\mathcal{C}_i$ .

For each  $j \in [m']$ , denote by  $\tilde{u}_j(z_i)$  the utility of a coalition candidate  $z_i$  of  $\mathcal{C}_i = \{\mathcal{P}_{i_1}, \mathcal{P}_{i_2}, \dots, \mathcal{P}_{i_{h_i}}\}$  for coalition  $\mathcal{C}_j$ , which is the sum of utility brought by  $z_i$  for the supporters of parties in coalition  $\mathcal{C}_j$ . Namely, for any coalition candidate  $z_i$  of  $\mathcal{C}_i$ , we define  $\tilde{u}_j(z_i) = \sum_{\mathcal{P}_{j_\ell} \in \mathcal{C}_j} \sum_{t \in [h_i]} u_{j_\ell}(z_i(t))$ , where  $z_i(t)$  corresponds to the candidate in  $X_{i_t}$ . The social utility of  $z_i$  is then  $\sum_{t \in [h_i]} u(z_i(t))$ . By the assumption that the SE-CE game is strongly egoistic, we argue that it collapses on the egoistic election game when each coalition is viewed as a party player in the election game. Indeed, consider any coalition  $\mathcal{C}_j \neq \mathcal{C}_i$ , for any coalition candidate  $z_i = (x_{i_1, s_{i_1}}, x_{i_2, s_{i_2}}, \dots, x_{i_{h_i}, s_{i_{h_i}}})$  of  $\mathcal{C}_i$  and any coalition candidate  $z_j = (x_{j_1, s_{j_1}}, x_{j_2, s_{j_2}}, \dots, x_{j_{h_j}, s_{j_{h_j}}})$  of  $\mathcal{C}_j$ , we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{u}_i(z_i) &= \sum_{\mathcal{P}_{i_\ell} \in \mathcal{C}_i} \sum_{t \in [h_i]} u_{i_\ell}(z_i(t)) = \sum_{t \in [h_i]} \sum_{\mathcal{P}_{i_\ell} \in \mathcal{C}_i} u_{i_\ell}(x_{i_t, s_{i_t}}) = \sum_{t \in [h_i]} \left( u_{i_t}(x_{i_t, s_{i_t}}) + \sum_{\mathcal{P}_{i_\ell} \in \mathcal{C}_i, \ell \neq t} u_{i_\ell}(x_{i_t, s_{i_t}}) \right) \\ &> \sum_{t \in [h_i]} \left( \sum_{\mathcal{P}_{j_{\ell'}} \in \mathcal{C}_j} u_{i_t}(x_{j_{\ell'}, s_{j_{\ell'}}}) + \sum_{\mathcal{P}_{i_\ell} \in \mathcal{C}_i, \ell \neq t} u_{i_\ell}(x_{i_t, s_{i_t}}) \right) \\ &\geq \sum_{t \in [h_i]} \sum_{\mathcal{P}_{j_{\ell'}} \in \mathcal{C}_j} u_{i_t}(x_{j_{\ell'}, s_{j_{\ell'}}}) \\ &= \sum_{\mathcal{P}_{i_\ell} \in \mathcal{C}_i} \sum_{t \in [h_j]} u_{i_\ell}(z_j(t)) \\ &= \tilde{u}_i(z_j), \end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality follows from the strongly egoistic property and the last two equalities follow by the definition of the social utility of coalition.

**Proposition 2.** *The SE-CE game with  $m'$  coalitions  $\mathcal{C}_1, \mathcal{C}_2, \dots, \mathcal{C}_{m'}$  for  $m' < m$  is the egoistic election game in which  $\mathcal{C}_i$  is a party player with utility  $\tilde{u}_j(z_i)$  for each coalition candidate  $z_i$  of  $\mathcal{C}_i$  and each  $i, j \in [m']$ .*

An implication of Proposition 2 is that the strongly egoistic election game becomes more efficient when it is “more cooperative” in terms of more coalitions of party players. This results in an egoistic election game with less party players and hence a less PoA bound is expected.

## 7 Concluding Remarks and Future Work

From the perspectives of PNE existence and the PoA, unlike the two-party case, we have learned that the election game is “bad” when more than two parties are involved in the sense that the PNE is no longer guaranteed to exist and the PoA can be in proportional to the number of competing parties. Our work provides an alternative explanation why the two-party system is prevalent in democratic countries.

We conjecture that to determine if the election game has a PNE is NP-complete, even for the egoistic election game. Nevertheless, two parameters of the election game, that is, the number of chaotic parties and the nominating depth, are extracted in this work and utilized to devise an efficient parameterized algorithm for computing a PNE of the egoistic election game. In addition, when we consider mixed-strategy Nash equilibrium of the egoistic election game, the support of each party player can also be identified by slightly modifying Algorithm FPT-ELECTION-PNE. We expect these two parameters to be of independent interest.

We have shown that the PoA of the egoistic election game is upper bounded by the number of parties  $m$ , and this also improves our previous bound in [31] using the softmax WP function for the two-party case. Our PoA bound is tight for the egoistic two-party election game using either the hardmax or the softmax function as the WP function, and is also right for general  $m \geq 2$  when the hardmax function is applied as the WP function. It will be interesting to know if the PoA bound is tight for all monotone WP functions and for general  $m \geq 2$ .

Coalition between the parties and thus strong equilibria can also be further considered. In Sect. 6.3 under the strongly egoism assumption, we regard a coalition as a unit which receives the whole payoff. Naturally, one might argue that not every member party player in a coalition is “equally happy”. We plan to consider individual strategic behaviors of each party player including the choice of parties for the coalition, and moreover, the payoff of each individual party player will be considered separately. Whether the PoA is getting higher or lower when coalition is allowed deserves further investigation.

## References

- [1] Ailon, N., Joachims, T., , Karnin, Z.: Reducing dueling bandits to cardinal bandit. In: Proceedings of the 31st International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML’14). pp. II–856–864 (2014)
- [2] Àlvarez, C., Gabarro, J., Serna, M.: Equilibria problems on games: Complexity versus succinctness. *Journal of Computer and System Sciences* **77**(6), 1172–1197 (2011)
- [3] Anshelevich, E., Bhardwaj, O., Postl, J.: Approximating optimal social choice under metric preferences. In: Proceedings of the 30th AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence (AAAI’15). pp. 777–783 (2015)
- [4] Anshelevich, E., Postl, J.: Randomized social choice functions under metric preferences. In: Proceedings of the 31st International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence (IJCAI’16). pp. 46–59 (2016)
- [5] Auletta, V., Ferraioli, D., Savarese, V.: Manipulating an election in social networks through edge addition. In: Alviano, M., Greco, G., Scarcello, F. (eds.) *Advances in Artificial Intelligence (AI\*IA 2019)*. pp. 495–510. Springer International Publishing, Cham (2019)
- [6] Bilò, V., Fanelli, A., Moscardelli, L.: Opinion formation games with dynamic social influences. *Theoretical Computer Science* **746**, 73–87 (2018). <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tcs.2018.06.025>
- [7] Bradley, R.A., Terry, M.E.: Rank analysis of incomplete block designs: I. the method of paired comparisons. *Biometrika* **39**(3/4), 324–345 (1954)
- [8] Callander, S.: Electoral competition in heterogeneous districts. *Journal of Political Economy* **113**(5), 1116–1145 (2005)
- [9] Callander, S., Wilson, C.: Turnout, polarization, and duverger’s law. *Journal of Politics* **69**(4), 1047–1056 (2007)
- [10] Caragiannis, I., Procaccia, A.D.: Voting almost maximizes social welfare despite limited communication. *Artificial Intelligence* **175**(9–10), 1655–1671 (2011)
- [11] Cheng, C.H., Chen, P.A., Hon, W.K.: Budget-constrained multi-battle contests: A new perspective and analysis. *Theoretical Computer Science* **271**, 16–26 (2018)
- [12] Cheng, Y., Dughmi, S., Kempe, D.: Of the people: voting is more effective with representative candidates. In: Proceedings of the 18th ACM conference on Economics and Computation (EC’17). pp. 305–322 (2017)
- [13] Dellis, A.: The two-party system under alternative voting procedures. *Social Choice and Welfare* **40**, 263–284 (2013)
- [14] Ding, N., Lin, F.: On computing optimal strategies in open list proportional representation: The two parties case. In: Proceedings of the 28th AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence (AAAI’14). pp. 1419–1425 (Jun 2014). <https://doi.org/10.1609/aaai.v28i1.8888>
- [15] Downey, R.G., Fellows, M.R.: *Fundamentals of Parameterized Complexity*. Springer, London (2013)
- [16] Downs, A.: *An Economic Theory of Democracy*. Harper and Row, New York (1957)
- [17] Du, Y., Wang, S., Huang, L.: Dueling bandits: From two-dueling to multi-dueling. In: Proceedings of the 19th International Conference on Autonomous Agents and MultiAgent Systems (AAMAS’20). pp. 348–356 (2020)

- [18] Duggan, J.: Candidate objectives and electoral equilibrium. In: Weingast, B., Wittman, D. (eds.) *The Oxford handbook of political economy*. Oxford University Press (2008)
- [19] Duverger, M.: *Political Parties: their organization and activity in the modern state*. Methuen & Co.; John Wiley & Sons London, New York (1954)
- [20] Feddersen, T.: A voting model implying duverger’s law and positive turnout. *American Journal of Political Science* **36**(4), 938–962 (1992)
- [21] Fey, M.: Stability and coordination in duverger’s law: a formal model of preelection polls and strategic voting. *American Journal of Political Science Review* **91**(1), 135–147 (1997)
- [22] Flum, J., Grohe, M.: *Parameterized Complexity Theory*. Springer, New York (2006)
- [23] Gottlob, G., Greco, G., Scarcello, F.: Pure Nash equilibria: hard and easy games. *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research* **24**(1), 357–406 (2005)
- [24] Harrenstein, P., Lisowski, G., Sridharan, R., Turrini, P.: A hotelling-downs framework for party nominees. In: *Proceedings of the 20th International Conference on Autonomous Agents and MultiAgent Systems (AAMAS’21)*. pp. 593–601. International Foundation for Autonomous Agents and Multiagent Systems, Richland, SC (2021)
- [25] Hotelling, H.: Stability in competition. *The Economic Journal* **39**(153), 41–57 (1929)
- [26] Konrad, K.A., Kovenock, D.: Multi-battle contests. *Games and Economic Behavior* **66**(1), 256–274 (2009)
- [27] Koutsoupias, E., Papadimitriou, C.: Worst-case equilibria. *Computer Science Review* **3**(2), 65–69 (2009)
- [28] Kuleshov, V., Precup, D.: Algorithms for the multi-armed bandit problem. *Journal of Machine Learning Research* pp. 1–48 (2000)
- [29] Laslier, J.F.: Aggregation of preferences with a variable set of alternatives. *Social Choice and Welfare* **17**, 269–282 (2000)
- [30] Laslier, J.F.: Interpretation of electoral mixed strategies. *Social Choice and Welfare* **17**, 283–292 (2000)
- [31] Lin, C.C., Lu, C.J., Chen, P.A.: How good is a two-party election game? *Theoretical Computer Science* **871**, 79–93 (2021)
- [32] López, M.D., Rodrigo, J., Lillo, I.: Two-party political competition: a geometric study of the Nash equilibrium in a weighted case. *Applied Mathematical Sciences* **1**(55), 2715–2725 (2007)
- [33] Myerson, R., Webber, R.: A theory of voting equilibria. *American Journal of Political Science Review* **87**(1), 102–114 (1993)
- [34] Nash, J.F.: Equilibrium points in  $n$ -person games. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **36**(1), 48–49 (1950)
- [35] Nash, J.F.: Noncooperative games. *Annals of Mathematics* **54**, 289–295 (1951)
- [36] Niedermeier, R.: *Invitation to Fixed-Parameter Algorithms*. Oxford University Press (2006)
- [37] Osborne, M., Rubinstein, A.: *A Course in Game Theory*. MIT Press (1994)
- [38] Palfrey, T.R.: Spatial equilibrium with entry. *The Review of Economic Studies* **51**(1), 139–156 (1984)
- [39] Palfrey, T.R.: A mathematical proof of duverger’s law. In: Weingast, B., Wittman, D. (eds.) *Models of strategic choice in politics*, pp. 69–91. University of Michigan Press, Ann Arbor (1989)
- [40] Procaccia, A.D., Rosenschein, J.S.: The distortion of cardinal preferences in voting. In: *Proceedings of the 10th International Workshop on Cooperative Information Agents (CIA’06)*. pp. 317–331 (2006)
- [41] Sabato, I., Obraztsova, S., Rabinovich, Z., Rosenschein, J.S.: Real candidacy games: A new model for strategic candidacy. In: *Proceedings of the 16th Conference on Autonomous Agents and MultiAgent Systems (AAMAS’17)*. pp. 867–875. International Foundation for Autonomous Agents and Multiagent Systems (2017)
- [42] Sutton, R.S., Barto, A.G.: *Reinforcement Learning: An Introduction*. Second Edition. MIT Press (2018)
- [43] Weber, S.: On hierarchical spatial competition. *Review of Economic Studies* **59**(2), 407–425 (1992)
- [44] Yue, Y., Broder, J., Kleinberg, R., Joachims, T.: The  $k$ -armed dueling bandits problem. *Journal of Computer and System Sciences* **78**(5), 1538–1556 (2012)