

A COUNTEREXAMPLE TO CONJECTURE “CATCH 22” WITH 3 PLAYERS,
AND 5 OUTCOMES: 2 TERMINAL AND 3 CYCLIC

Bogdan Butyrin

National Research University Higher School of Economics (HSE), Moscow, Russia
butirin.bogdan@yandex.ru

Vladimir Gurvich

National Research University Higher School of Economics (HSE), Moscow, Russia
vgurvich@hse.ru, vladimir.gurvich@gmail.com

Anton Lutsenko

National Research University Higher School of Economics (HSE), Moscow, Russia
ailutsenko@edu.hse.ru

Mariya Naumova

Rutgers Business School, Rutgers University, Piscataway, NJ, United States
mnaumova@business.rutgers.edu

Maxim Peskin

National Research University Higher School of Economics (HSE), Moscow, Russia
mpeskin_1@edu.hse.ru

Abstract: We construct a finite deterministic graphical (DG) game without Nash equilibria in pure stationary strategies. This game has 3 players $I = \{1, 2, 3\}$ and 5 outcomes: 2 terminal a_1 and a_2 and 3 cyclic. Furthermore, for 2 players a terminal outcome is the best: a_1 for player 3 and a_2 for player 1. Hence, the rank vector r is at most $(1, 2, 1)$. Here r_i is the number of terminal outcomes that are worse than some cyclic outcome for the player $i \in I$. This is a counterexample to conjecture “Catch 22” from the paper “On Nash-solvability of finite n -person DG games, Catch 22” (2021) <https://arxiv.org/abs/2111.06278>, according to which, at least 2 entries of r are at least 2 for any NE-free game. However, Catch 22 remains still open for the games with a unique cyclic outcome, not to mention a weaker (and more important) conjecture claiming that an n -person finite DG game has a Nash equilibrium (in pure stationary strategies) when $r = (0^n)$, that is, all n entries of r are 0; in other words, when the following condition holds:

(C_0) any terminal outcome is better than every cyclic one for each player.

A game is play-once if each player controls a unique position. It is known that any play-once game satisfying (C_0) has a Nash equilibrium. We give a new and very short proof of this statement. Yet, not only conjunction but already disjunction of the above two conditions may be sufficient for Nash-solvability. This is still open.

Keywords: n -person deterministic graphical games, Nash equilibrium, pure stationary strategy, digraph, directed cycle, strongly connected component.

1. Introduction; main conjectures and examples

Our main example is given in graphical and normal forms in Figures 1 and 2, respectively. Here we briefly describe its main properties postponing basic definitions, which will be given later in Introduction. Figure 1 represents a finite deterministic graphical game of 3 players, $I = \{1, 2, 3\}$, controlling positions $V_1 = \{s_1, u_1, v_1\}$; $V_2 = \{u_2, v_2\}$ and $V_3 = \{u_3, v_3\}$, respectively.

We restrict ourselves to finite games with perfect information and without moves of chance, and the players to their pure stationary strategies. In our example, player 1 has $3 \times 2 \times 2 = 12$ strategies, while players 2 and 3 have $2 \times 2 = 4$ strategies, each. This game in the normal form is defined by the table $X = X_1 \times X_2 \times X_3$ of size $12 \times 4 \times 4$, the game form mappings $g : X \rightarrow \Omega$, and a triple of preference relations $\succ = (\succ_1, \succ_2, \succ_3)$ over Ω , where $\Omega = \{a_1, a_2, c_1, c_2, c_3\}$ is the set of outcomes. It consists of 5 strongly connected components (SCCs) of the directed graph (digraph) $G = (V, E)$ of the game. Two of them are the terminals: a_1 and a_2 , while 3 are cycles: c_1, c_2 , and c_3 ; see Figure 1. Note that there is one more SCC in G , it consists of the initial position s_1 . Such an SCC, which is not terminal and does not contain a directed cycle, is called *transient*; no outcome is assigned to it.

A digraph $G = (V, E)$ is partitioned into SCCs. This partition is unique and can be constructed in time linear in its size of G , that is, $(|V| + |E|)$. This partition has many important properties and applications; see, for example, [38] and [37] for details. By contracting each SCC of G to a single vertex (and deleting every edge that belongs to an SCC) one obtains an acyclic digraph G^* . One more application, to the DG games, was suggested in [19]. The main result of this paper is the Nash-solvability (in pure stationary strategies) of the (finite) 2-person ($n = 2$) DG games. It follows from the general result on Nash-solvability of tight game forms [14, 16]; see also [23, 24, 26]. For the zero-sum case, the saddle-point-solvability was proven even earlier [12], see also [13].

However, this result cannot be extended to $n > 2$. The first example of an NE-free 4-person DG game was constructed in [27]; see also [17]. Then a much simpler 3-person NE-free DG game was given in [8, Figure 3]. It has 4 outcomes: 3 terminal and a unique cycle. Furthermore, its digraph G has two transient SCCs, which are not associated with outcomes. Moreover, this game is “almost play-once”: players 1 and 3 control a unique position each, only player 2 controls two positions.

The remaining important part of a DG game is the payoff $u : I \times \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, where $u(i, \omega)$ is the profit of player $i \in I$ in case outcome $\omega \in \Omega$ is realized in the game. Studying NE, it is both correct and convenient to replace payoffs by preferences. For each player $i \in I = \{1, \dots, n\}$, we introduce a linear order \succ_i over Ω . Notation $\omega' \succ_i \omega''$ means that i prefers ω' to ω'' . In particular, we assume that there are no ties. It can be done without any loss of generality (wlog). Indeed, making ties

can create an NE, but cannot destroy it; see the definition of Subsection 2.3. In particular, an NE-free DG game with payoff u remains NE-free after any sufficiently small perturbation of u . Thus, one can replace a payoff u by a close tie-free payoff u' and then, in its turn, replace u' by the corresponding n -dimensional preference profile $\succ = \{\succ_i \mid i \in I\}$, keeping the transformed game NE-free all way.

Note also that merging arbitrarily the outcomes is an operation that respects NE-existence; see for example, [14, 16]. In this paper, merging all cyclic outcomes into a unique one, will play an important role.

In [6], among other results, it was shown that a play-once DG game has an NE if the following additional condition hold:

CND(C_0): every terminal outcome is better than any cyclic one for each player.

A very simple proof of this statement will be given in Subsection 3.2.

Clearly, CND(C_0) holds if and only if the rank n -vector r is (0^n) , that is, all n entries of r equal 0.

However, it seems that conjunction of the above two conditions: the play-once one and (C_0) is too strong. Can it be replaced by disjunction? No counterexample is known, yet.

In [8, Section 6], it was shown that if an NE-free DG game satisfying CND(C_0) exists, then there is also a DG game that has a unique NE-outcome, which is cyclic. This conclusion holds even if the original game has terminal outcomes and only one cyclic one. This looks like a paradox in view of (C_0).

Although CND(C_0) looks “relaxable”, all attempts to construct an NE-free example satisfying (C_0) fail yet. The following conjecture was suggested in [20]:

CNJ(C_0): A DG game has an NE whenever CND(C_0) holds.

Let us merge all cyclic outcomes in one. Then, CND(C_0) (resp. CNJ(C_0)) is replaced by a stronger condition CND(C'_0) (resp., by a weaker conjecture CNJ(C'_0)).

Since attempts to disprove the weaker CNJ(C'_0) fail too, we try to weaken it further. Given the preference \succ_i of a player $i \in I$, let r_i be the number of terminal outcomes for which there exists a better, for player i , cyclic outcome. Thus every preference profile $\succ = \{\succ_i \mid i \in I\}$ uniquely defines the rank n -vector $r = (r_i \mid i \in I)$. For example, for the DG game from [8] we have $r = (2, 0, 2)$. For many other NE-free DG games their rank vector has at least 2 entries equal to at least 2, each.

In [20], the corresponding condition and conjecture were denoted by CND(C_{22}) and CNJ(C_{22}), respectively. Furthermore, after merging all cyclic outcomes in one, we obtain CND(C'_{22}) and CNJ(C'_{22}). CNJ(C'_{22}), which is stronger than CNJ(C_{22}), holds for NE-free DG games from [27, 8] and in many other cases, as our computer analysis shows. Partial results were obtained in [26].

Our main example disproves CNJ(C_{22}) but not CNJ(C'_{22}). Indeed, consider the preference profile, given in Figure 1. There are 3 cyclic and only 2 terminal outcomes. Furthermore, one of them is the best outcome, for 2 players. In other words, $r = (1, 2, 1)$ However, an NE appears after merging c_1, c_2 , and c_3 .

To summarize, $\text{CNJ}(C_{22})$ is disproved, but $\text{CNJ}(C'_{22})$ still stays, along with $\text{CNJ}(C_0)$ and $\text{CNJ}(C'_0)$.

A digraph is called symmetric if (u, v) is its directed edge whenever (v, u) is (unless u is a terminal or v is an initial position).

In [5, Theorem 2], it was shown that every n -person DG game on a symmetric digraph is Nash-solvable; see also Theorem 3.

We assume, yet, that all cycles of any fixed SCC form the same outcome. Another option is to wave this assumption and consider each cycle as a separate outcome. Then, Nash-solvability becomes a rare phenomenon already for the 2-person zero-sum games. Consider, for example, the digraph with two vertices s, v controlled by players 1 and 2, respectively, and 2 pairs of directed edges: two from s to v and two from v to s ; its normal form is the 2×2 matrix game whose entries are four distinct outcomes; see [9, Figure 1 (1)]. Thus, no saddle point exists if player 1 prefers the main diagonal to the side one, while player 2 prefers vice versa.

A criterion of Nash-solvability for such two-person DG games on symmetric digraphs is given by [9, Theorem 1, Corollaries 1 and 2].

2. Main concepts and definitions

2.1. Strongly connected components of directed graphs

Let $G = (V, E)$ be a directed graph (digraph). It may have parallel edges, directed oppositely or similarly, and loops, at most one at each vertex. Digraph G is called *strongly connected* if for any $v, v' \in V$ there is a directed path from v to v' (and, hence, from v' to v , as well). By definition, the union of two strongly connected digraphs is strongly connected if and only if they have a common vertex. A vertex-inclusion-maximal strongly connected induced subgraph of G is called its *strongly connected component* (SCC). Obviously, any digraph $G = (V, E)$ admits a unique decomposition into SCCs: $G^j = G[V^j] = (V^j, E^j)$ for $j \in J$, where J is a set of indices and $V = \cup_{j \in J} V^j$ is a partition of V , that is, $V^j \cap V^{j'} = \emptyset$ whenever $j \neq j'$ for a pair $j, j' \in J$. This partition can be determined in time linear in the size of G (that is, in $(|V| + |E|)$) and has numerous applications; see [38] and also [37] for more details. One more application, to positional games, was suggested in [19].

Let $V_T \subseteq V$ denote the set of all the terminals of G , that is, $v \in V_T$ if and only if there is no edge from v . Any such vertex forms a maximal SCC, that is, $\{v\} = V^j$ for some $j \in J$. Denote by J^T the corresponding subset of J . For convenience, let us add a loop e_v to each $v \in V_T$ that does not have one yet. All loops in V_T , old and new, will be called terminal loops and all $v \in V_T$ will be still called terminals.

The concepts of a directed path and a directed cycle (dicycle) are defined standardly [37, 38]. An edge is a directed path of length 1; a loop is a dicycle of length 1, a dicycle of length 2 is a pair of parallel oppositely directed edges, a dicycle of length $|V|$ is called *Hamiltonian*. A digraph without dicycles is called *acyclic*.

Let J_0 denote the subset of J such that V^j is a single vertex with no loop in it. Obviously, G^j contains a dicycle unless $j \in J_0$. By our convention, $J_T \cap J_0 = \emptyset$.

For each $j \in J$, let us contract G^j into a single vertex v^j . Then, all the edges of E^j (in particular, loops) disappear and we obtain an *acyclic* digraph $G^* = (V^*, E^*)$. It can be constructed in time linear in $|V| + |E|$.

2.2. Modeling graphical games by digraphs

Given an arbitrary digraph $G = (V, E)$, we interpret it as a *positional structure* in which V and E are positions and moves, respectively. Furthermore, let us fix a partition $D : V = V_1 \cup \dots \cup V_n \cup V_T$ in which V_i are the sets of positions controlled by the players $i \in I = \{1, \dots, n\}$, while V_T is the set of all terminals.

The considered model is restricted to the games with perfect information and without moves of chance. Also, we restrict all players $i \in I$ to their pure stationary strategies X_i . Such a strategy $x_i \in X_i$ assigns a move $(v, v') \in E$ to every $v \in V_i$. Given an initial position $v_0 \in V \setminus V_T$, each *strategy profile* $x = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$ uniquely defines a walk in G that begins in v_0 and in each position follows the move chosen by the corresponding strategy. We denote this walk by $p(x)$ and call it a *play* generated by x . Since all strategies of x are stationary, play $p(x)$ forms a “lasso”, that is, it consists of an initial directed path, which can be empty, and a dicycle repeated infinitely.

For every $j \in J \setminus J_0$, let us identify all lassos whose dicycles belong to G_j and treat them as a single outcome c_j of the game. Then, $\Omega = \{c_j \mid j \in J \setminus J_0\}$ is the set of outcomes.

An outcome is called *terminal* if the corresponding SCC G^j generates a terminal vertex of G^* . Note that all terminals of G are the terminals of G^* , but there may exist others. Any SCC such that each move from it does not leave it, also forms a terminal of the considered game. Furthermore, components G^j for $j \in J_0$ are called *transient*. Each one consists of a single vertex and does not form an outcome. Each remaining SCC, not terminal and not transient, will be called *inner*. Clearly, each one has a cycle, which may be a loop, and it forms an outcome, which will be called *inner* too.

Thus, given a digraph $G = (V, E)$ and partition D , we obtain mapping $g : X \rightarrow \Omega$, where $X = X_1 \times \dots \times X_n$ is the set of strategy profiles, also called *situations*. In general, such a mapping g is called a *game form*.

Pair (G, D) defines a *DG game structure* and $g = g(G, D)$ its *normal form*.

Given an n -person game form $g : X \rightarrow \Omega$, introduce a payoff $u : I \times \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. The value $u(i, \omega)$ is interpreted as the profit of the player $i \in I = \{1, \dots, n\}$ in case the outcome $\omega \in \Omega$ is realized. Pair (g, u) is called the *game in normal form*.

The DG games were introduced by Washburn [40] in 1990 and since then are frequent in the literature; see, for example, [2, 3, 4, 6, 9, 10, 11, 27]. Only 2-person zero-sum DG games were considered in [40] but the extension to the n -person case is obvious.

2.3. Nash equilibrium (NE)

Given the game (g, u) defined by a game form $g : X \rightarrow \Omega$ and payoff $u : I \times \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, a situation $x = (x_1, \dots, x_n) \in X_1 \times \dots \times X_n = X$ is called a *NE* if for each player $i \in I$ inequality $u(i, g(x)) \geq u(i, g(x'))$ holds for every situation $x' \in X$ that may differ from x only in entry i , that is, equality $x_j = x'_j$ holds for all $j \neq i$. In other words, no player $i \in I$ can improve the result $u(i, g(x))$ replacing the strategy x_i by x'_i provided all other players keep their strategies unchanged. This concept was introduced by John Nash [34, 35]. He proved that any matrix game has a NE in mixed strategies. Here we study Nash-solvability in pure strategies; see, for example, [1-9,12-33,36,40].

A game form g is called *Nash-solvable* if for an arbitrary payoff u , the corresponding game (g, u) has an NE.

Since tie-breaking can only destroy NE, but cannot create one, studying Nash-solvability, we can assume wlog that payoff u has no ties and then replace u by a preference $\succ = (\succ_1, \dots, \succ_n)$ assuming that $\omega \succ_i \omega'$ if and only if $u(i, \omega) > u(i, \omega')$ for any $\omega, \omega' \in \Omega$.

Recall also that merging outcomes of a game form respects its Nash-solvability.

3. Partial results

3.1. Nash-solvability of n -person DG games for $n = 2$ and $n > 2$

Theorem 1. ([19]) *Every 2-person DG game has an NE.*

This result is derived from a general criterion of Nash-solvability of 2-person game forms [14, 16]. The zero-sum case was considered even earlier by Edmonds and Fulkerson [12]; see also [13]. In [16] it was shown that the zero-sum- and Nash-solvability are equivalent properties of a 2-person game form g . Furthermore, both are equivalent with the tightness of g . Tightness of the DG game forms was shown in [6] for the special case, when all inner cyclic outcomes are merged, and verified in general in [19]. However, tightness is not related (neither necessary, nor sufficient) to Nash-solvability of n -person game forms with $n > 2$ [16]. Moreover, an n -person DG game is tight for all n , yet, may be not Nash-solvable when $n > 2$; see [27] for $n = 3$ and [8] for $n = 4$.

NE-free DG games are sparse. We can add some extra conditions and enforce Nash-solvability. For example, it holds for all n in case of symmetric digraphs [5].

Extra conditions $\text{CND}(C_0)$, $\text{CND}(C'_0)$, $\text{CND}(C_{22})$, $\text{CND}(C'_{22})$ and the corresponding conjectures on Nash-solvability, $\text{CNJ}(C_0)$, $\text{CNJ}(C'_0)$, $\text{CNJ}(C_{22})$, $\text{CNJ}(C'_{22})$, were considered in [20]. Here we disprove $\text{CNJ}(C_{22})$, while 3 others remain open.

3.2. Play-once n -person DG games and condition $\text{CND}(C_0)$

The following two conditions are sufficient for the existence of a NE.

Proposition 1. *An n -person DG game has an NE if (i) it is play-once and (ii) $CND(C_0)$ holds.*

This statement follows from the results of [6]. Here we give a simple direct proof. Let us note, however, that not only conjunction but, perhaps, already disjunction of (i) and (ii) is sufficient for Nash-solvability. At least, we have no counterexample.

So conjecture $CNJ(C_{22})$ is disproved, but to conjectures $CNJ(C_0)$, $CNJ(C'_0)$ and $CNJ(C'_{22})$ we can add one more.

Conjecture 1. *A play-once n -person DG game is Nash-solvable.*

Although a NE exists whenever conditions (i) and (ii) holds, yet, improvement cycles can exist too; see [2, Figure 5 and Section 2] for definitions and more details.

Proof of Proposition. Note first that each (finite) digraph G has a terminal SCC, since its SCC digraph G^* is finite and acyclic.

Assume for contradiction that a DG game $\mathcal{G} = (G, D, \succ)$ is NE-free but satisfies (i) and (ii). Moreover, assume that it is a minimal such game. Wlog, assume that every vertex (and arc) of G is reachable from the initial position s . Indeed, one can simply delete from G the vertices not reachable from s , thus, reducing G .

Deleting bad terminal moves. Suppose there are two terminal moves v, t and v, t' . Wlog we assume that v is controlled by a player $i \in I$ and that $t \succ_i t'$. Then, one can delete arc (v, t') and, obviously, no NE appears. Thus, we can assume that in every position v there exists at most one terminal move. Furthermore, clearly, there is at least one non-terminal move in v . More generally, \mathcal{G} has no forced move. Indeed, in contradiction with minimality of G , one can contract such a move keeping the normal normal form of the game and, in particular, the set of its Nash equilibria.

Choose a shortest terminal play p and fix the following situation: on p follow p , out of p choose a non-terminal move. By (i) and (ii), this is a NE situation. \square

Remark 1. Recall that each finite DG game has a terminal and a terminal play. Indeed, the game may have no terminal positions but it always has a terminal SCC, since its SCC graph is finite and acyclic. In the original graph, one can contract a terminal SCC replacing it by a single vertex (or by a loop).

Example 1. *Let \mathcal{G} consists of the following moves (s, v) , (s, t) , (v, t') , (v, t'') . Furthermore, s is an initial position, while t', t'' , and t are terminal. The terminal payoffs are $(2, 3)$ in t , $(3, 2)$ in t' , and $(1, 1)$ in t'' . It is easy to verify that this game has two NE. The standard “backward induction” NE: $x' = \{(s, v), (v, t')\}$ resulting in $(3, 2)$ and the blackmail NE: $x'' = \{(s, t), (v, t'')\}$ resulting in $(2, 3)$. Player 2 threatens by move (v, t'') , which is the worst for both, thus, pushing player 1 to move to t which is better for 2 than t' . Consider two terminal moves (v, t') and (v, t'') of player 2. The first is better than the second. Delete the bad move (v, t'') from the digraph. By doing so, we destroy the second NE. Only the first NE remains.*

4. Main example

The following example disproves $\text{CNJ}(C_{22})$. However, 3 weaker conjectures, $\text{CNJ}(C'_{22})$, $\text{CNJ}(C_0)$ and $\text{CNJ}(C'_0)$ remain open.

The digraph $G = (V, E)$ is given in Figure 1. It has 3 distinct cyclic outcomes c_1, c_2, c_3 and only 2 terminals a_1, a_2 . The preferences of the players are also given Figure 1. We see that a_1 and a_2 are top outcomes of players 3 and 1, respectively and, thus, the rank vector is $r = (1, 2, 1)$ and condition $\text{CND}(C_{22})$ fails. Nevertheless, we will show that the game is NE-free, in contradiction with $\text{CNJ}(C_{22})$.




Figure 1: Graphical form

Three players $I = \{1, 2, 3\}$ control positions (s_1, u_1, v_1) , (u_2, v_2) , (u_3, v_3) , respectively, and have $|X_1| = 3 \times 2 \times 2 = 12$ and $|X_2| = |X_3| = 2 \times 2 = 4$ strategies. The initial position is s_1 . To specify a strategy of a player i we fix how (s)he moves in each position. The normal form is given in Figure 2. For every situation $x \in X$ we provide the outcome $\omega(x) \in \Omega = \{a_1, a_2, c_1, c_2, c_3\}$ with the superscripts showing each player i who can improve x by replacing x_i with x'_i such that $\omega(x') \succ_i g(x)$. In some situations there are more than one superscript, yet, for each situation there exists at least one. This exactly means that the obtained game is NE-free. Yet, condition $\text{CND}(C_{22})$ of the conjecture $\text{CNJ}(C_{22})$ fail.

However, if we merge cyclic outcomes c_1, c_2, c_3 then an NE will appear. Thus, a weaker conjecture $\text{CNJ}(C'_{22})$ is not disproved, as well as conjectures $\text{CNJ}(C_0)$ and $\text{CNJ}(C'_0)$, since the corresponding conditions $\text{CND}(C_0)$ and $\text{CND}(C'_0)$ do not hold.

Preferences $\prec_1, \prec_2, \prec_3$:

player 1: $c_1 \prec_1 a_1 \prec_1 c_2 \prec_1 c_3 \prec_1 a_2$

player 2: $a_2 \prec_2 c_1 \prec_2 c_2 \prec_2 a_1 \prec_2 c_3$

player 3: $c_3 \prec_3 c_1 \prec_3 a_2 \prec_3 c_2 \prec_3 a_1$

3-d player: $(v_2 \rightarrow v_1, w_2 \rightarrow w_1)$

1st player	2nd player			
	$(u_2 \rightarrow u_1, v_2 \rightarrow v_3)$	$(u_2 \rightarrow u_1, v_2 \rightarrow a_1)$	$(u_2 \rightarrow u_3, v_2 \rightarrow v_3)$	$(u_2 \rightarrow u_3, v_2 \rightarrow a_1)$
$(s \rightarrow u_2, u_1 \rightarrow u_2, v_1 \rightarrow v_2)$	$c_1^{1,2}$	$c_1^{1,2}$	c_2^1	c_2^3
$(s \rightarrow u_2, u_1 \rightarrow u_2, v_1 \rightarrow w_1)$	$c_1^{1,2}$	$c_1^{1,2}$	c_3^3	$a_2^{1,2}$
$(s \rightarrow u_2, u_1 \rightarrow v_1, v_1 \rightarrow v_2)$	c_2^1	c_2^3	c_2^1	c_2^3
$(s \rightarrow u_2, u_1 \rightarrow v_1, v_1 \rightarrow w_1)$	c_3^3	$a_2^{1,2}$	c_3^3	$a_2^{1,2}$
$(s \rightarrow v_1, u_1 \rightarrow u_2, v_1 \rightarrow v_2)$	c_2^1	c_2^3	c_2^1	c_2^3
$(s \rightarrow v_1, u_1 \rightarrow u_2, v_1 \rightarrow w_1)$	c_3^3	$a_2^{1,2}$	c_3^3	$a_2^{1,2}$
$(s \rightarrow v_1, u_1 \rightarrow v_1, v_1 \rightarrow v_2)$	c_2^1	c_2^3	c_2^1	c_2^3
$(s \rightarrow v_1, u_1 \rightarrow v_1, v_1 \rightarrow w_1)$	c_3^3	$a_2^{1,2}$	c_3^3	$a_2^{1,2}$
$(s \rightarrow w_1, u_1 \rightarrow u_2, v_1 \rightarrow v_2)$	c_3^3	$a_2^{1,2}$	c_3^3	$a_2^{1,2}$
$(s \rightarrow w_1, u_1 \rightarrow u_2, v_1 \rightarrow w_1)$	c_3^3	$a_2^{1,2}$	c_3^3	$a_2^{1,2}$
$(s \rightarrow w_1, u_1 \rightarrow v_1, v_1 \rightarrow v_2)$	c_3^3	$a_2^{1,2}$	c_3^3	$a_2^{1,2}$
$(s \rightarrow w_1, u_1 \rightarrow v_1, v_1 \rightarrow w_1)$	c_3^3	$a_2^{1,2}$	c_3^3	$a_2^{1,2}$

3-d player: $(v_2 \rightarrow v_1, w_2 \rightarrow a_2)$

1st player	2nd player			
	$(u_2 \rightarrow u_1, w_1 \rightarrow w_2)$	$(u_2 \rightarrow u_1, w_1 \rightarrow a_1)$	$(u_2 \rightarrow v_2, w_1 \rightarrow w_2)$	$(u_2 \rightarrow v_2, w_1 \rightarrow a_1)$
$(s \rightarrow u_2, u_1 \rightarrow u_2, v_1 \rightarrow v_2)$	$c_1^{1,2}$	$c_1^{1,2}$	c_2^1	c_2^3
$(s \rightarrow u_2, u_1 \rightarrow u_2, v_1 \rightarrow w_1)$	$c_1^{1,2}$	$c_1^{1,2}$	a_1^2	a_2^1
$(s \rightarrow u_2, u_1 \rightarrow v_1, v_1 \rightarrow v_2)$	c_2^1	c_2^3	c_2^1	c_2^3
$(s \rightarrow u_2, u_1 \rightarrow v_1, v_1 \rightarrow w_1)$	a_1^2	a_2^1	a_1^2	a_2^1
$(s \rightarrow v_1, u_1 \rightarrow u_2, v_1 \rightarrow v_2)$	c_2^1	c_2^3	c_2^1	c_2^3
$(s \rightarrow v_1, u_1 \rightarrow u_2, v_1 \rightarrow w_1)$	a_1^2	a_2^1	a_1^2	a_2^1
$(s \rightarrow v_1, u_1 \rightarrow v_1, v_1 \rightarrow v_2)$	c_2^1	c_2^3	c_2^1	c_2^3
$(s \rightarrow v_1, u_1 \rightarrow v_1, v_1 \rightarrow w_1)$	a_1^2	a_2^1	a_1^2	a_2^1
$(s \rightarrow w_1, u_1 \rightarrow u_2, v_1 \rightarrow v_2)$	a_1^2	a_2^1	a_1^2	a_2^1
$(s \rightarrow w_1, u_1 \rightarrow u_2, v_1 \rightarrow w_1)$	a_1^2	a_2^1	a_1^2	a_2^1
$(s \rightarrow w_1, u_1 \rightarrow v_1, v_1 \rightarrow v_2)$	a_1^2	a_2^1	a_1^2	a_2^1
$(s \rightarrow w_1, u_1 \rightarrow v_1, v_1 \rightarrow w_1)$	a_1^2	a_2^1	a_1^2	a_2^1

3-d player: $(v_2 \rightarrow w_2, w_2 \rightarrow w_1)$

1st player	2nd player			
	$(u_2 \rightarrow u_1, w_1 \rightarrow w_2)$	$(u_2 \rightarrow u_1, w_1 \rightarrow a_1)$	$(u_2 \rightarrow v_2, w_1 \rightarrow w_2)$	$(u_2 \rightarrow v_2, w_1 \rightarrow a_1)$
$(s \rightarrow u_2, u_1 \rightarrow u_2, v_1 \rightarrow v_2)$	$c_1^{1,2}$	$c_1^{1,2}$	c_3^3	a_2^2
$(s \rightarrow u_2, u_1 \rightarrow u_2, v_1 \rightarrow w_1)$	$c_1^{1,2}$	$c_1^{1,2}$	c_3^3	a_2^2
$(s \rightarrow u_2, u_1 \rightarrow v_1, v_1 \rightarrow v_2)$	c_3^3	a_2^2	c_3^3	a_2^2
$(s \rightarrow u_2, u_1 \rightarrow v_1, v_1 \rightarrow w_1)$	c_3^3	a_2^2	c_3^3	a_2^2
$(s \rightarrow v_1, u_1 \rightarrow u_2, v_1 \rightarrow v_2)$	c_3^3	a_2^2	c_3^3	a_2^2
$(s \rightarrow v_1, u_1 \rightarrow u_2, v_1 \rightarrow w_1)$	c_3^3	a_2^2	c_3^3	a_2^2
$(s \rightarrow v_1, u_1 \rightarrow v_1, v_1 \rightarrow v_2)$	c_3^3	a_2^2	c_3^3	a_2^2
$(s \rightarrow v_1, u_1 \rightarrow v_1, v_1 \rightarrow w_1)$	c_3^3	a_2^2	c_3^3	a_2^2
$(s \rightarrow w_1, u_1 \rightarrow u_2, v_1 \rightarrow v_2)$	c_3^3	a_2^2	c_3^3	a_2^2
$(s \rightarrow w_1, u_1 \rightarrow u_2, v_1 \rightarrow w_1)$	c_3^3	a_2^2	c_3^3	a_2^2
$(s \rightarrow w_1, u_1 \rightarrow v_1, v_1 \rightarrow v_2)$	c_3^3	a_2^2	c_3^3	a_2^2
$(s \rightarrow w_1, u_1 \rightarrow v_1, v_1 \rightarrow w_1)$	c_3^3	a_2^2	c_3^3	a_2^2

3-d player: $(v_2 \rightarrow w_2, w_2 \rightarrow a_2)$

1st player	2nd player			
	$(u_2 \rightarrow u_1, w_1 \rightarrow w_2)$	$(u_2 \rightarrow u_1, w_1 \rightarrow a_1)$	$(u_2 \rightarrow v_2, w_1 \rightarrow w_2)$	$(u_2 \rightarrow v_2, w_1 \rightarrow a_1)$
$(s \rightarrow u_2, u_1 \rightarrow u_2, v_1 \rightarrow v_2)$	c_1^1	c_1^1	$a_1^{2,3}$	$a_1^{2,3}$
$(s \rightarrow u_2, u_1 \rightarrow u_2, v_1 \rightarrow w_1)$	c_1^1	c_1^1	a_1^2	$a_1^{2,3}$
$(s \rightarrow u_2, u_1 \rightarrow v_1, v_1 \rightarrow v_2)$	a_1^3	a_1^3	a_1^3	a_1^3
$(s \rightarrow u_2, u_1 \rightarrow v_1, v_1 \rightarrow w_1)$	a_1^2	a_2^1	a_1^2	$a_1^{2,3}$
$(s \rightarrow v_1, u_1 \rightarrow u_2, v_1 \rightarrow v_2)$	a_1^3	a_1^3	a_1^3	a_1^3
$(s \rightarrow v_1, u_1 \rightarrow u_2, v_1 \rightarrow w_1)$	a_1^2	a_2^1	a_1^2	a_1^2
$(s \rightarrow v_1, u_1 \rightarrow v_1, v_1 \rightarrow v_2)$	a_1^3	a_1^3	a_1^3	a_1^3
$(s \rightarrow v_1, u_1 \rightarrow v_1, v_1 \rightarrow w_1)$	a_1^2	a_2^1	a_1^2	a_1^2
$(s \rightarrow w_1, u_1 \rightarrow u_2, v_1 \rightarrow v_2)$	a_1^2	a_2^1	a_1^2	a_1^2
$(s \rightarrow w_1, u_1 \rightarrow u_2, v_1 \rightarrow w_1)$	a_1^2	a_2^1	a_1^2	a_1^2
$(s \rightarrow w_1, u_1 \rightarrow v_1, v_1 \rightarrow v_2)$	a_1^2	a_2^1	a_1^2	a_1^2
$(s \rightarrow w_1, u_1 \rightarrow v_1, v_1 \rightarrow w_1)$	a_1^2	a_2^1	a_1^2	a_1^2

Figure 2: Normal form

5. NE-free DG n -person games and satisfiability

Constructing NE-free n -person DG games requires a computer. The problem is reduced to satisfiability and solved by a SAT-solver. The CNF corresponding to a DG game is "bipolar": part of its clauses are positive, no negated variables, while the remaining clauses are negative, all variables are negated.

Introduce $\frac{1}{2}nk(k-1)$ variables $y_{\omega,\omega'}^i$, for all $i \in I = \{1, \dots, n\}$ and distinct pairs $\omega, \omega' \in \Omega$; here $k = |\Omega|$. We set $y_{\omega,\omega'}^i = 1$ when $\omega \succ_i \omega'$ and, respectively, $y_{\omega,\omega'}^i = 0$ when $\omega' \succ_i \omega$. Thus, $y_{\omega,\omega'}^i = \bar{y}_{\omega',\omega}^i$ holds by definition. Consider CNF $C_- = \bigwedge (\bar{y}_{\omega,\omega'}^i \vee \bar{y}_{\omega',\omega''}^i \vee \bar{y}_{\omega'',\omega}^i)$, where conjunction is taken over all players $i \in I$ and all pairwise distinct triplets $\omega, \omega', \omega'' \in \Omega$. All variables of C_- are negated. It is not difficult to see that C_- is satisfied if and only if it corresponds to an acyclic preference of player i over Ω . Indeed, 2-dicycles obviously are not possible, since $y_{\omega,\omega'}^i = \bar{y}_{\omega',\omega}^i$. Furthermore, it is well-known that any tournament that has a dicycle, has a 3-dicycle; see, for example, [39]. Finally, it is not difficult to assign a positive CNF C_+ to a game such that the game is NE-free if and only if CNF $C_i \wedge C_+$ is satisfiable. Although it is exponential in the size of digraph G , but its structure is clear. Then, by the above construction, an NE-free preference \succ for the considered DG n -person game structure corresponds to a satisfying assignments of the CNF $C_- \wedge C_+$. Using a powerful SAT-solver we can analyze many games and find NE-free ones among them.

Acknowledgement

The paper was prepared within the framework of the HSE University Basic Research Program.

References

- [1] H. Ackermann, H. Röglin, and B. Vöcking, Pure Nash equilibria in player-specific and weighted congestion games, *Theoretical Computer Science, Internet and Network Economics* 410 (17) (2009) 1552–1563.
- [2] D. Anderson, V. Gurvich, and T. Hansen, On acyclicity of games with cycles, *Discrete Applied Math.* 158:10 (2010) 1049–1063.
- [3] D. Andersson, K. Hansen, P. Miltersen, and T. Sorensen, Deterministic graphical games, revisited, *J. Logic and Computation* 22:2 (2012) 165–178; Preliminary version in *Fourth Conference on Computability in Europe (CiE-08)*, *Lecture Notes in Computer Science* 5028 (2008) 1–10.
- [4] E. Boros, K. Elbassioni, V. Gurvich, and K. Makino, On Nash equilibria and improvement cycles in pure positional strategies for Chess-like and Backgammon-like n -person games, *Discrete Math.* 312:4 (2012) 772–788.

- [5] E. Boros, P. G. Franciosa, V. Gurvich, and M. Vyalyi, Deterministic n -person shortest path and terminal games on symmetric digraphs have Nash equilibria in pure stationary strategies, arxiv.org/abs/2202.11554 (2022) 25 pp., *Int. J. Game Theory*, online since 10 October 2023 DOI10.1007/s00182-023-00875-y; SharedIt link: <https://rdcu.be/dof0K>.
- [6] E. Boros and V. Gurvich, On Nash solvability in pure stationary strategies of positional games with perfect information which may have cycles, *Mathematical Social Sciences* 46 (2003) 207–241.
- [7] E. Boros and V. Gurvich, Why Chess and Backgammon can be solved in pure positional uniformly optimal strategies, RUTCOR Research Report, RRR-21-2009, Rutgers University.
- [8] E. Boros, V. Gurvich, M. Milanic, V. Oudalov, and J. Vivic, A three-person deterministic graphical game without Nash equilibria, *Discrete Applied Math.* 243 (2018) 21–38.
- [9] E. Boros, V. Gurvich, K. Makino, and S. Wei, Nash-solvable two-person symmetric cycle game forms, *Discrete Applied Math.* 159:15 (2011) 1461–1487.
- [10] A. Condon, The complexity of stochastic games, *Information and Computation* 96 (1992) 203–224.
- [11] V. I. Danilov and A. I. Sotskov, Social Choice Mechanisms, in “Studies of Economic Design”, Springer, Berlin-Heidelberg, 2002.
- [12] J. Edmonds and D.R. Fulkerson, Bottleneck extrema, *J. Combin. Theory* 8:3 (1970) 299–306.
- [13] V. Gurvich, To theory of multi-step games, *USSR Comput. Math. and Math Phys.* 13:6 (1973) 143–161.
- [14] V. Gurvich, Solution of positional games in pure strategies, *USSR Comput. Math. and Math. Phys.* 15:2 (1975) 74–87.
- [15] V. Gurvich, A stochastic game with complete information and without equilibrium situations in pure stationary strategies, *Russian Math. Surveys* 43:2 (1988) 171–172.
- [16] V. Gurvich, Equilibrium in pure strategies, *Soviet Math. Dokl.* 38:3 (1989) 597–602.
- [17] V. Gurvich, A four-person chess-like game without Nash equilibria in pure stationary strategies, *Business Informatics* 1:31 (2015) 68–76.
- [18] V. Gurvich, Generalizing Gale’s theorem on backward induction and domination of strategies (2017) 16 pp. <http://arxiv.org/abs/1711.11353>.

- [19] V. Gurvich, Backward induction in presence of cycles, *Oxford Journal of Logic and Computation* 28:7 (2018) 1635–1646.
- [20] V. Gurvich, On Nash-solvability of finite n -person deterministic graphical games, *Catch 22* <https://arxiv.org/abs/2111.06278> (2021) 4 pp.
- [21] V. Gurvich, On Nash-solvability of finite n -person shortest path games, bi-shortest path conjecture, <http://arxiv.org/abs/2111.07177> (2021) 5 pp.
- [22] V. Gurvich and G. Koshevoy, Monotone bargaining is Nash-solvable, *Discrete Appl. Math.* 250 (2018) 1–15.
- [23] V. Gurvich and M. Naumova, Lexicographically maximal edges of dual hypergraphs and Nash-solvability of tight game forms, *Annals of Mathematics and Artificial Intelligence*, 92 (1) (2024) 49–57.
- [24] V. Gurvich and M. Naumova, On Nash-solvability of n -person graphical games under Markov’s and a-priori realizations, *Annals of Operations Research*, 336:3 (2024) 1905–1927.
- [25] V. Gurvich and M. Naumova, Computing lexicographically safe Nash equilibria in finite two-person games with tight game forms given by oracles, *Discr. Appl. Math.* 340:3 (2023) 53–68.
- [26] V. Gurvich and M. Naumova, On Nash-solvability of finite two-person tight vector game forms, <https://arxiv.org/abs/2204.10241> (2022) 17 pp.
- [27] V. Gurvich and V. Oudalov, A four-person chess-like game without Nash equilibria in pure stationary strategies <https://arxiv.org/abs/1411.0349> (2014) 17 pp.
- [28] C. A. Holt and A. E. Roth, The Nash equilibrium: A perspective. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 101 (2004) 3999–4002.
- [29] R. Holzman and N. Law-Yone, Strong equilibrium in congestion games, *Games and Economic Behavior*, 21 (1) (1997) 85–101.
- [30] N. S. Kukushkin, I. S. Men’shikov, O. R. Men’shikova, and V. V. Morozov, Resource allocation games, *Computational Mathematics and Modeling*, 1 (4) (1990) 433.
- [31] I. Milchtaich, Congestion models of competition, *The American Naturalist*, 147 (5) (1996) 760–783.
- [32] I. Milchtaich, Congestion games with player-specific payoff functions, *Games and Economic Behavior*, 13 (1) (1996) 111–124.
- [33] D. Monderer and L. S. Shapley, Potential games, *Games and Economic Behavior*, 14 (1) (1996) 124–143.

- [34] J. F. Nash Jr., Equilibrium points in n-person games, Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences 36:1 (1950) 48–49.
- [35] J. F. Nash Jr., Non-cooperative Games, Annals of Math. 54:2 (1951) 286–295.
- [36] R. W. Rosenthal, A class of games possessing pure-strategy Nash equilibria, International Journal of Game Theory, 2 (1973) 65–67.
- [37] M. Sharir, A strong-connectivity algorithm and its application in data flow analysis, Comput. Math. Appl. 7 (1981) 67–72.
- [38] R. E. Tarjan, Depth-first search and linear graph algorithms, SIAM J. Computing 1:2 (1972) 146–160.
- [39] A. Thomason, Paths and cycles in tournaments, Transactions of AMS 296:1 (1986) 167–180.
- [40] A. R. Washburn, Deterministic graphical games, J. Math. Analysis and Applications 153 (1990) 84–96.