
A General Framework for Optimizing and Learning Nash Equilibrium

Di Zhang*

Wei Gu†

Qing Jin‡

Abstract

One key in real-life Nash equilibrium applications is to calibrate players' cost functions. To leverage the approximation ability of neural networks, we proposed a general framework for optimizing and learning Nash equilibrium using neural networks to estimate players' cost functions. Depending on the availability of data, we propose two approaches (a) the two-stage approach: we need the data pair of players' strategy and relevant function value to first learn the players' cost functions by monotonic neural networks or graph neural networks, and then solve the Nash equilibrium with the learned neural networks; (b) the joint approach: we use the data of partial true observation of the equilibrium and contextual information (e.g., weather) to optimize and learn Nash equilibrium simultaneously. The problem is formulated as an optimization problem with equilibrium constraints and solved using a modified Backpropagation Algorithm. The proposed methods are validated in numerical experiments.

1 Introduction

The concept of Nash equilibrium, introduced by John Nash [Nash Jr, 1950, Nash et al., 1950], has found widespread application in various domains, including transportation systems [Fisk, 1984], financial markets [Lin et al., 2024], and healthcare operations [Faretta et al., 2022]. This fundamental game-theoretic concept can be formally defined as follows: Consider a non-cooperative game with N players, where each player $i \in 1, 2, \dots, N$ selects a strategy x_i from their feasible strategy set $K_i \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{n_i}$ to minimize their cost function $\theta_i(x_i, x_{-i})$. Here, x_{-i} denotes the collective strategies of all players except player i . The Nash equilibrium can be formulated as a system of N coupled optimization problems:

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \min \quad \theta_i(x_i, x_{-i}) \\ s.t. \quad x_i \in K_i \end{array} \right\}_{i=1}^N \quad (1)$$

A Nash equilibrium is reached when no player can unilaterally deviate from their current strategy to achieve a lower cost, given the strategies of all other players. Mathematically, a strategy profile $x^* = (x_1^*, \dots, x_N^*)$ constitutes a Nash equilibrium if and only if:

$$\theta_i(x_i^*, x_{-i}^*) \leq \theta_i(x_i, x_{-i}^*), \quad \forall x_i \in K_i, \quad \forall i \in 1, 2, \dots, N \quad (2)$$

This condition encapsulates the essence of strategic stability in non-cooperative games, where each player's strategy is optimal given the strategies of all other players.

*Department of Industrial and System Engineering, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA (dzhang22@usc.edu)

†Department of Industrial and System Engineering, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA (weig@usc.edu)

‡Department of Industrial and System Engineering, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA (qingjin@usc.edu)

In practical applications of Nash equilibrium, the cost functions $\theta_i(x_i, x_{-i})$ are often subject to uncertainties arising from incomplete information, environmental variability, and unpredictable future events. To address these stochastic elements, researchers have increasingly employed sophisticated stochastic programming techniques [Xu and Sen, 2023, 2024, Zhang and Sen, 2024a,b]. These methods provide a robust framework for modeling and solving optimization problems under uncertainty, allowing for more realistic representations of complex decision-making scenarios.

The development of advanced computational infrastructure, such as the Computational Operations Research Exchange (cORe) [Deng et al., 2019], has significantly enhanced the implementation and dissemination of these stochastic methods across various domains. This cyber-infrastructure facilitates the integration of advanced algorithms, data management, and collaborative research, thereby accelerating progress in the field of stochastic optimization.

While stochastic programming offers powerful tools for modeling uncertainty in Nash equilibrium problems, it is important to note its limitations. Traditional approaches often rely on predefined probability distributions and scenario generation techniques, which may not fully capture the intricate complexities and interdependencies present in real-world cost functions. This constraint highlights the need for more flexible and adaptive methodologies capable of representing and solving increasingly complex Nash equilibrium problems under uncertainty.

Historically, cost functions in Nash equilibrium problems have often been manually estimated from empirical studies based on historical data (e.g., [Manual, 1964]). However, this approach may lack accuracy and flexibility in accommodating real-time conditions. To address these limitations, we propose approximating the cost function $\theta_i(x_i, x_{-i})$ using neural networks rather than traditional empirical functions. Neural networks, a cornerstone of artificial intelligence and machine learning, have demonstrated remarkable efficacy in approximating complex functions across diverse domains, include but not limited to machine learning [Du et al., 2024], image processing [Dan et al., 2024a,b], anomaly detection [Chung et al., 2024], and natural language understanding [Alshemali and Kalita, 2020]. Leveraging the generality and capability of neural networks, we present two novel approaches for optimizing and learning Nash equilibrium. The main contributions of this study are as follows:

- We introduce a learn-then-optimize approach and a learn-and-optimize approach for the simultaneous optimization and learning of Nash equilibrium.
- In the learn-then-optimize approach, we develop a method to construct monotonic neural networks and a mix-of-experts architecture to build graph neural networks for learning the cost function. Subsequently, we solve the Nash equilibrium using these learned neural network representations.
- For the learn-and-optimize approach, we explore an end-to-end learning algorithm that directly learns the Nash equilibrium from data, bypassing the need for explicit cost function estimation.

These approaches represent a significant advancement in the field, offering more adaptive and data-driven methods for solving Nash equilibrium problems in complex, real-world scenarios.

The remainder of this study is organized as follows. In Section 2, we provide the mathematical formulation for Nash equilibrium. Section 3 presents the general frameworks for the two approaches, followed by Section 4, where the solution algorithms are developed. In Section 5, we validate the proposed models and algorithms in numerical experiments. Section 6 concludes this study and points out future directions.

2 Mathematical Formulation of Nash equilibrium

We start by presenting a tractable reformulation of the Nash equilibrium (1). The following proposition establishes the equivalence between a Nash equilibrium and the solution to a set of inequalities named variational inequality (VI; e.g., [Facchinei and Pang, 2003]).

Definition 1. (VI problem). Given a set $K \subseteq R^n$ and a function $F : K \rightarrow R^n$, the variational inequality, denoted as $VI(K, F)$, is to find a vector $x^* \in K$ such that

$$(x - x^*)^T F(x^*) \geq 0, \quad \forall x \in K$$

Proposition 1. (Equivalence between Nash equilibrium and VI). Let the feasible set of player i 's strategy $K_i \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{n_i}$ be convex and closed. Suppose that with other players' strategy x_{-i} fixed, player i 's cost function $\theta_i(x_i, x_{-i})$ is convex and continuous differentiable in x_i . Then the set of all players' strategy $\mathbf{x} \triangleq \{x_i\}_{i=1}^N$ is a Nash equilibrium if and only if it solves VI(\mathbf{K}, \mathbf{F}), where $\mathbf{K} \triangleq \prod_{i=1}^N K_i$ and $\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}) \triangleq \{\nabla_{x_i} \theta_i(\mathbf{x})\}_{i=1}^N$. In other words, the definition of Nash equilibrium in Eq. (1) is equivalent to the VI problem (3) below:

$$(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}^*)^T \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}^*) \geq 0, \quad \forall \mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{K} \quad (3)$$

Remark 1. The proposition above provides the ‘‘vanilla’’ version of the equivalence between Nash equilibrium and VI. For more advanced versions please refer to [Facchinei and Pang, 2003].

Remark 2. Since we have reformulated the Nash equilibrium (1) as a VI (3), we can directly estimate the function $\mathbf{F}(\cdot)$ in (3) instead of the function $\{\theta_i(\cdot)\}_{i=1}^N$ in (1) using neural networks. In the following section, we will discuss how to design neural networks to estimate the function $\{\theta_i(\cdot)\}_{i=1}^N$.

3 The Overall Modeling Framework

With the VI formulation of Nash equilibrium in Section 2, we are now ready to introduce the overall modeling framework for optimizing and learning Nash equilibrium. Based on the availability of data, we propose two approaches: a two-stage approach in Section 3.1 that first learns the players' functions using neural networks and then optimizes the Nash equilibrium with the learned neural networks, and a joint approach in Section 3.2 that simultaneously learns the players' functions and optimizes the Nash equilibrium.

3.1 A two-stage approach: first learn then optimize

Suppose that we have the data of the pair $\{(\hat{\mathbf{x}}^m, \hat{\mathbf{F}}^m(\hat{\mathbf{x}}^m))\}_{m=1}^M$ in Eq. (3), namely players' strategy and relevant function value, then we propose a two-stage approach:

- First stage: Learn the function $\mathbf{F}(\cdot)$ in Eq. (3) from the data of the pair $\{(\hat{\mathbf{x}}^m, \hat{\mathbf{F}}^m(\hat{\mathbf{x}}^m))\}_{m=1}^M$. Denote $\mathbf{F}_\lambda(\cdot)$ as the neural network with parameters λ to approximate the function $\mathbf{F}(\cdot)$, then the problem to learn the function $\mathbf{F}(\cdot)$ in this stage can be formulated as to minimize the loss function in training a neural network as follows:

$$\min_{\lambda} \sum_{m=1}^M \ell[\mathbf{F}_\lambda^m(\hat{\mathbf{x}}^m), \hat{\mathbf{F}}^m(\hat{\mathbf{x}}^m)] \quad (4)$$

where $\ell(\cdot)$ represents the loss function for training the neural network.

- Second stage: With the functions of the players, $\mathbf{F}_\lambda(\cdot)$, learned in the first stage, we solve the equivalent VI problem of the Nash equilibrium using the functions approximated by neural networks. The formulation of this stage can be written as below:

$$(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}^*)^T \mathbf{F}_\lambda(\mathbf{x}^*) \geq 0, \quad \forall \mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{K} \quad (5)$$

The key to this two-step approach is to design the neural network $\mathbf{F}_\lambda(\cdot)$ in the first stage appropriately so that the Nash equilibrium (5) in the second stage is solvable. How to design the neural networks properly will be introduced in Section 4.1.

3.2 A joint approach: learn and optimize simultaneously

Suppose that we only have the partial true observation of the Nash equilibrium $\{\hat{\mathbf{x}}^m\}_{m=1}^M$ and contextual information (e.g., weather) $\{\mathbf{d}^m\}_{m=1}^M$, then we develop a joint approach to learn the function $\mathbf{F}(\cdot)$ in Eq. (3) and optimize the Nash equilibrium simultaneously. Let $\mathbf{d} \triangleq \{\mathbf{d}^m\}_{m=1}^M$. Denote $\mathbf{F}_\lambda(\cdot)$ as the neural network approximation for function $\mathbf{F}(\cdot)$, \mathbf{x}^* as the solution of the VI($\mathbf{K}, \mathbf{F}_\lambda$), $\ell(\mathbf{x}^*, \hat{\mathbf{x}}^m)$ as the loss function between the computed Nash equilibrium solution \mathbf{x}^* and the observed true Nash equilibrium data $\hat{\mathbf{x}}^m$. Then the joint approach can be formulated as an optimization problem below.

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\lambda} \quad & \mathbf{L} \triangleq \sum_{m=1}^M \ell(\mathbf{x}^*, \hat{\mathbf{x}}^m) \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & (\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}^*)^T \mathbf{F}_{\lambda}(\mathbf{x}^*, \mathbf{d}) \geq 0, \quad \forall \mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{K} \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

In Eq. (6) above, the objective is to minimize the total loss between the computed Nash equilibrium solution and the observed true Nash equilibrium data. This objective is the same as that in traditional machine learning. The main difference with traditional machine learning is that Eq. (6) includes constraints. In particular, the constraints in Eq. (6) are formulated as a VI problem, namely, the solution of Eq. (6) needs to satisfy Nash equilibrium conditions.

4 Solution Algorithms

In this section, we develop the solution algorithms for the proposed general framework to optimize and learn Nash equilibrium in Section 3. In Section 4.1, we introduce how to solve the two-stage approach that first learns the players' functions and then optimizes the Nash equilibrium using the learned functions. Section 4.2 presents the algorithm for solving the joint approach that simultaneously learns the players' functions and optimizes the Nash equilibrium.

4.1 Algorithm for the two-stage approach

In this section, we discuss two approaches for constructing neural networks so that the approximation of cost functions is accurate and the Nash equilibrium is solvable. The neural networks could be either monotonic, or capture the interaction between the players by a graph structure. The design of the monotonic neural network and the graph neural network are presented in Sections 4.1.1 and 4.1.2, respectively. Section 4.1.3 introduces how to solve the Nash equilibrium with the learned neural networks.

4.1.1 Monotonic neural network

Many existing algorithms for solving VI require the monotone property of the function $\mathbf{F}(\cdot)$ (e.g., [Facchinei and Pang, 2003]). Let $K \in \mathbb{R}^n$, we say that a multivariate function $f : K \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is partially monotonically increasing with respect to x_i if

$$f(x_1, \dots, x_i^0, \dots, x_n) \leq f(x_1, \dots, x_i^1, \dots, x_n), \quad \forall x_i^0 \leq x_i^1.$$

A simple way to construct a monotonic neural network is to constrain signs on its weights. Unfortunately, this construction does not work with popular non-saturated activation functions as it can only approximate convex functions. We consider an approach to maintain the monotone property for neural networks. The main steps are listed below. The pseudo-code for constructing a monotonic neural network is summarized in Algorithm 1. Theoretical guarantee for the prediction accuracy is established in Proposition 2.

- Design constrained linear layer. Let $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$, given an $(m \times n)$ -dimensional matrix W , we define the operation $|\cdot|_t$ assigning an $(m \times n)$ -dimensional matrix $|W|_t$ to W element-wise as follows:

$$(|W|_t)_{i,j} = \begin{cases} |w_{i,j}| & \text{if } \frac{\partial f(\mathbf{x})_i}{\partial x_j} \geq 0, \quad \forall i \in \{1, 2, \dots, m\} \\ -|w_{i,j}| & \text{if } \frac{\partial f(\mathbf{x})_i}{\partial x_j} \leq 0, \quad \forall i \in \{1, 2, \dots, m\} \\ w_{i,j} & \text{o.w.} \end{cases}$$

Let the linear coefficient $\mathbf{W} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$, the bias $\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{R}^m$ and the output $\mathbf{h} \in \mathbb{R}^m$. The constrained linear layer is constructed as

$$\mathbf{h} = |\mathbf{W}^T|_t \cdot \mathbf{x} + \mathbf{b}.$$

- Build combined activation function. Let \bar{A} denote the set of all zero-centered, monotonically increasing, convex, lower-bounded functions. We will build three functions

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\rho} &\in \bar{A} \\ \hat{\rho}(x) &= \bar{\rho}(-x) \\ \tilde{\rho}(x) &= \begin{cases} \bar{\rho}(x+1) - \bar{\rho}(1) & \text{if } x < 0 \\ \hat{\rho}(x-1) + \bar{\rho}(1) & \text{o.w.} \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

Let $s = (\bar{s}, \hat{s}, \tilde{s})$ such that $\bar{s} + \hat{s} + \tilde{s} = m$. Then the output of the combined activation function $\rho^s : \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$ is defined element-wise as follows:

$$\rho^s(h)_j = \begin{cases} \bar{\rho}(h_j) & \text{if } j < \bar{s} \\ \hat{\rho}(h_j) & \text{if } \bar{s} < j < \bar{s} + \hat{s} \\ \tilde{\rho}(h_j) & \text{o.w.} \end{cases} \quad (7)$$

- Construct monotone constrained fully connected layer. Let $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^m$ be the output, then the monotone constrained fully connected layer is

$$\mathbf{y} = \rho^s(|\mathbf{W}^T|_t \cdot \mathbf{x} + \mathbf{b}).$$

Algorithm 1: Construct Monotonic Neural Network

Initialization: $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{K}$, $\bar{\rho} \in \bar{A}$, $\mathbf{W} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$, and $\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{R}^m$.

Step 1: Set $\mathbf{h} = |\mathbf{W}^T|_t \cdot \mathbf{x} + \mathbf{b}$.

Step 2: Construct $\rho^s(\mathbf{h})$ based on Eq. (7).

Step 3: Set $\mathbf{y} = \rho^s(|\mathbf{W}^T|_t \cdot \mathbf{x} + \mathbf{b})$.

Step 4: Output \mathbf{y} .

Proposition 2. (Universal approximation) Any multivariate continuous monotone function on a compact subset of \mathbb{R}^m can be approximated with a monotone-constrained neural network of at most m layers using ρ^s as the activation function.

4.1.2 Graph neural network

Graph neural networks have emerged as a powerful tool for tackling various problems in structured data domains. These networks leverage the inherent graph structure of many datasets, where data points and their relationships can be naturally represented as graphs. The design of the graph neural network is shown in Fig. 1. The proposed graph neural network distinguishes itself from a standard graph convolutional network by incorporating a mix-of-experts architecture, which allows for dynamic weight gating in the network, thresholding the contributions for three experts (tackling different types of nodes). This results in a model that can adapt more flexibly to complex data patterns, i.e., the node type, attribute, and adjacent matrix of the network. This enhances prediction accuracy across the flow graph structures.




Figure 1. The structure of the proposed graph neural network.

The proposed mix-of-experts neural network type model consists of two main components: the expert blocks and the mix-of-experts graph neural network module. Each expert block is a simple

neural network module that processes input features through a graph convolutional network layer followed by a linear transformation and non-linear activation functions. It aims to capture node-specific patterns in the data. The mix-of-experts graph neural network module integrates three expert blocks and applies a gating mechanism to dynamically weigh the contributions of each expert to the final prediction. This allows the model to adaptively leverage different experts based on the input features.

Algorithm 2: Extragradient Algorithm

Initialization: $\mathbf{x}^0 \in \mathbf{K}$ and $\tau > 0$.

Step 0: Set $k = 0$.

Step 1: If \mathbf{x}^k solves the VI($\mathbf{K}, \mathbf{F}_\lambda$), stop.

Step 2: Compute

$$\mathbf{x}^{k+1/2} = \Pi_{\mathbf{K}}(\mathbf{x}^k - \tau \mathbf{F}_\lambda(\mathbf{x}^k)),$$

$$\mathbf{x}^{k+1} = \Pi_{\mathbf{K}}(\mathbf{x}^k - \tau \mathbf{F}_\lambda(\mathbf{x}^{k+1/2}));$$

set $k \leftarrow k + 1$ and go to Step 1.

4.1.3 Solving the Nash equilibrium

With the neural network approximation $\mathbf{F}_\lambda(\cdot)$ learned in the previous sections, the second-stage problem is a VI problem in Eq. (5). With the monotonicity of $\mathbf{F}_\lambda(\cdot)$ guaranteed in Section 4.1.1, any algorithm for solving the monotone VI can be used to solve Eq. (5).

In this section, we use the extragradient algorithm to solve the VI problem in Eq. (5), which is based on a projection operator. The pseudo-code of the extragradient algorithm is in Algorithm 2.

Definition 2. (*Projection operator*). The projection operator $\Pi_{\mathbf{K}}$ with respect to the Euclidean norm is defined as

$$\Pi_{\mathbf{K}}(\mathbf{x}) = \operatorname{argmin}_{\mathbf{x}^* \in \mathbf{K}} \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}^*\|.$$

4.2 Algorithm for the joint approach

In order to solve the joint approach in Eq. (6), we propose a modified Backpropagation Algorithm. Similar to the traditional Backpropagation Algorithm, our modified Backpropagation Algorithm includes forward and backward passes. The main difference includes: (a) In the forward pass, we need to solve the Nash equilibrium; (b) In the backward pass, when we update the gradient using the chain rule, the calculation of the first term $\frac{\partial \mathbf{L}}{\partial \mathbf{x}}$ is the same as that in a normal neural network, while the calculation of the second term $\frac{\partial \mathbf{L}}{\partial \lambda}$ relies on implicit function theorem. The pseudo-code of the modified Backpropagation Algorithm is in Algorithm 3.

Algorithm 3: Modified Backpropagation Algorithm

Forward Pass:

Step 1: Use Algorithm 2 to compute the Nash equilibrium \mathbf{x}^* :

$$(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}^*)^T \mathbf{F}_\lambda(\mathbf{x}^*, \mathbf{d}) \geq 0, \quad \forall \mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{K}$$

Step 2: Calculate the loss between \mathbf{x}^* and data:

$$\mathbf{L} \triangleq \sum_{i=1}^M \ell(\mathbf{x}^*, \hat{\mathbf{x}}^m)$$

Backward Pass: Update the gradient

$$\frac{\partial \mathbf{L}}{\partial \lambda} \triangleq \frac{\partial \mathbf{L}}{\partial \mathbf{x}} \frac{\partial \mathbf{x}}{\partial \lambda}$$

5 Numerical Experiments

In this section, we validate the proposed models and algorithms in numerical experiments. Section 5.1 introduces the setting of our experiments. The results of the two-stage approach are presented in Section 5.2. The results of the joint approach are shown in Section 5.3.

5.1 Setting of the congestion game

As a special case of Nash equilibrium, the congestion game has been studied for over fifty years [Wardrop, 1952, Sheffi, 1985]. The basic setting of the congestion game is as follows. Suppose there is a network with a set of nodes \mathcal{N} and a set of arcs \mathcal{A} . Travelers in this network want to travel from origins in a set $\mathcal{O} \subseteq \mathcal{N}$ to destinations in a set $\mathcal{D} \subseteq \mathcal{N}$. Denote \mathcal{W} as the set of origin-destination (OD) pairs, namely $\mathcal{W} \subseteq \mathcal{O} \times \mathcal{D}$. There is a set of path \mathcal{P}_w connecting each OD pair $w \in \mathcal{W}$. Travelers' total demand for each OD pair $w \in \mathcal{W}$ is denoted as d_w . Let $c_a(\cdot)$ and $C_p(\cdot)$ be the cost function for each arc $a \in \mathcal{A}$ and each path $p \in \mathcal{P}_w$, respectively. In the literature, the arc cost function is the BPR function [Manual, 1964] as in Eq. (8), which is a polynomial function.

$$c_a(\bullet) = t_a \times \left(1 + b \left[\frac{\bullet}{\alpha_a} \right]^4 \right), \quad \forall a \in \mathcal{A} \quad (8)$$

Notate $\delta_{a,p}$ as the indicator function to represent whether a path $p \in \mathcal{P}_w$ includes an arc $a \in \mathcal{A}$ or not. If a path $p \in \mathcal{P}_w$ includes an arc $a \in \mathcal{A}$, then $\delta_{a,p} = 1$; $\delta_{a,p} = 0$ otherwise. Assume that the arc costs are additive, the path cost function of a traveler using path $p \in \mathcal{P}_w$ can be calculated as the summation of the costs of all arcs along the path as in Eq. (9) below.

$$C_p(\bullet) = \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} [c_a(\bullet) \times \delta_{a,p}], \quad \forall p \in \mathcal{P}_w, \forall w \in \mathcal{W} \quad (9)$$

The network we used in the experiments is the Braess Network, as in Fig. 2, which contains four nodes and five arcs. All travelers want to go from the origin node to the destination node. In a Nash equilibrium state, no traveler can reduce the travel time by unilaterally switching the path.




Figure 2. The Braess network.

5.2 Results of the two-stage approach

In this section, we present the result of the two-stage approach using the solution algorithm proposed in Section 4.1. The accuracy of the monotonic neural network and the graph neural network for approximating the arc cost function (8) is demonstrated in Sections 5.2.1 and 5.2.2, respectively. With the trained neural networks, in Section 5.2.3, we solve the congestion game and present the equilibrium solution.




Figure 3. Predicted travel times and true travel times under different traffic flow conditions using the monotonic neural networks.

5.2.1 Results of the monotonic neural network

We use Algorithm 1 to construct the monotonic neural network to approximate the travel time functions for all arcs in the Braess network. Each of the five arcs is approximated using one monotonic neural network. When the feature range in the dataset is narrow, we apply data standardization solely to the training dataset. Additionally, we record the minimum and maximum values of the features from the training dataset. This enables us to standardize the test dataset while preventing data leakage. The comparison between predicted travel times from the monotonic neural networks and the true travel time values under different traffic flow conditions are summarized in Fig. 3. Results show that our proposed design of the monotonic neural network can guarantee monotonicity. Moreover, the proposed monotonic neural network provides accurate predictions for travel times under various traffic flow conditions, i.e., the prediction errors are within 10^{-5} .




Figure 4. Training loss and prediction error for the graph neural network.

5.2.2 Results of the graph neural network

We show the results of the mix-of-experts graph convolutional network proposed in Section 4.1.2. There are three types of arcs in the Braess network, namely (a) arc 1 and 4, (b) arc 2 and 3, and (c) arc 5. Therefore, we introduce three experts in the mix-of-experts model. Each expert is in charge of one type of arc. The overall training loss and prediction error of the graph neural network are summarized in Fig. 4, while the comparison between the predicted travel times and the true




Figure 5. Prediction v.s. ground truth for three types of arcs using the graph neural network.

travel times for each type of arc is shown in Fig. 5. Results reveal that our proposed graph neural network provides accurate prediction for the travel times in the Braess network. In particular, the mean squared errors for the results in Fig. 4 and Fig. 5 are within 10^{-7} .

5.2.3 Results of the congestion game

With the monotonic neural network approximation learned from the first stage, we then use the extragradient algorithm to solve the congestion game. The Nash equilibrium solution for flows on each arc is shown in Fig. 6. We observe an interesting phenomenon in this network. As listed in Table 1, if we remove arc 5 in the Braess network, the travel time and vehicle miles traveled will decrease by 19.2% and 18.2%, respectively. This validates the Braess’s paradox: road construction in a transportation network could make congestion even worse.




Figure 6. Flows on each arc under a Nash equilibrium state in the Braess network.

Table 1. The Braess’s paradox.

	The Braess Network	The Braess Network without Arc 5
Travel Time	4.36	3.52
Vehicle Hours Travelled	0.22	0.18

5.3 Results of the joint approach

We again use the Braess network in Fig. 2, and the travel time function (8) for each arc now includes contextual information (e.g., weather) d :

$$c_a(\bullet; d) = t_a \times \left(1 + b \left[\frac{\bullet}{\alpha(d)_a} \right]^4 \right) \tag{10}$$

where $t_a = (1, 2, \sqrt{2}, \sqrt{3}, 1)$, and $\alpha(d) \triangleq \tilde{\alpha} \odot (1 + P_{[-\varepsilon, \varepsilon]}(wd))$ for $\varepsilon = 0.4$ and $\tilde{\alpha} = (0.4, 0.8, 0.8, 0.6, 0.3)$. The clamp operator $P_{[-\varepsilon, \varepsilon]}(\cdot)$ clamp the value to the range $[-\varepsilon, \varepsilon]$. We sample the vector w uniformly from $[-10, 0)$ and d uniformly from $(0, 0.25]$. The vector d represents the raining amount, and the vector w is negative in the sense that a larger raining amount decreases the capacity of each arc. After obtaining the travel time data, we solve the Nash equilibrium problem (3) to derive the equilibrium data \hat{x} for each data pair as training data.

The neural network structure we use to approximate the travel time function is described in Fig. 7. We train the algorithm using 700 epochs, and the training loss through time is shown in Fig. 8. We can observe from the figure that the training loss is as small as 10^{-5} at the end of the training epochs. On the test set, the loss is also as small as 10^{-5} .




Figure 7. Design of the neural network for the joint approach.




Figure 8. Training loss for the joint approach.

To visualize the Nash equilibrium state on both sunny and rainy days, we test two cases with $d = 0.05$ and 0.2 . To obtain the true equilibrium travel flow, we use function (10) to calculate the travel time and then solve the Nash equilibrium (3). We set d as input and leverage the iteration algorithm to derive the predicted traffic flows under the Nash equilibrium condition. The capacity and utilization (i.e., the ratio of traffic flow over capacity) of each arc are presented in Fig. 9. We can observe from the figure that, on a rainy day, when the capacity of Arc 3 and Arc 4 becomes smaller, the utilization of those arcs will be larger. This also causes an increase in utilization on Arc 5. On both rainy and sunny days, the predicted value is close to the true value, with prediction errors less than 10^{-5} .




Figure 9. Comparison of the predicted flow and true flow values for the joint approach under different weather conditions.

6 Conclusion

In this study, we develop a general framework for optimizing and learning Nash equilibrium. Based on the availability of data, we propose two methods and validate both of them in numerical experiments:

- Given the data of the pair $\{(\hat{\mathbf{x}}^m, \hat{\mathbf{F}}^m(\hat{\mathbf{x}}^m))\}_{m=1}^M$ in Eq. (3), namely players' strategy and relevant function value, we propose a two-stage approach to first approximate players' cost functions using monotonic neural network or graph neural network, and then solve the Nash equilibrium using the learned neural networks.
- Given the data of partial true observation of the equilibrium $\{\hat{\mathbf{x}}^m\}_{m=1}^M$ and contextual information (e.g., weather) $\{\mathbf{d}^m\}_{m=1}^M$, we develop a joint approach to optimize and learn the Nash equilibrium simultaneously. A modified Backpropagation Algorithm is proposed to solve this problem.

References

- Basemah Alshemali and Jugal Kalita. Improving the reliability of deep neural networks in nlp: A review. *Knowledge-Based Systems*, 191:105210, 2020.
- Jihoon Chung, Bo Shen, and Zhenyu James Kong. Anomaly detection in additive manufacturing processes using supervised classification with imbalanced sensor data based on generative adversarial network. *Journal of Intelligent Manufacturing*, 35(5):2387–2406, 2024.
- Han-Cheng Dan, Bingjie Lu, and Mengyu Li. Evaluation of asphalt pavement texture using multiview stereo reconstruction based on deep learning. *Construction and Building Materials*, 412: 134837, 2024a.
- Han-Cheng Dan, Peng Yan, Jiawei Tan, Yinchao Zhou, and Bingjie Lu. Multiple distresses detection for asphalt pavement using improved you only look once algorithm based on convolutional neural network. *International Journal of Pavement Engineering*, 25(1):2308169, 2024b.
- Yunxiao Deng, Carl Kesselman, Suvrajeet Sen, and Jiajun Xu. Computational operations research exchange (core): A cyber-infrastructure for analytics. In *2019 Winter Simulation Conference (WSC)*, pages 3447–3456. IEEE, 2019.
- Yutao Du, Qin Li, Raghav Gnanasambandam, Mengnan Du, Haimin Wang, and Bo Shen. Neural operator for accelerating coronal magnetic field model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.12754*, 2024.
- Francisco Facchinei and Jong-Shi Pang. *Finite-dimensional variational inequalities and complementarity problems*. Springer, 2003.
- Georgia Fargetta, Antonino Maugeri, and Laura Scrimali. A stochastic nash equilibrium problem for medical supply competition. *Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications*, 193(1):354–380, 2022.
- CS Fisk. Game theory and transportation systems modelling. *Transportation Research Part B: Methodological*, 18(4-5):301–313, 1984.
- Mu Lin, Di Zhang, Ben Chen, and Hang Zheng. The economic analysis of the common pool method through the hara utility functions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.05194*, 2024.
- Traffic Assignment Manual. Urban planning division. *US Department of Commerce, Washington DC*, 1964.
- John F Nash et al. Non-cooperative games. 1950.
- John F Nash Jr. Equilibrium points in n-person games. *Proceedings of the national academy of sciences*, 36(1):48–49, 1950.
- Yosef Sheffi. *Urban transportation networks*, volume 6. Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ, 1985.
- John Glen Wardrop. Road paper. some theoretical aspects of road traffic research. *Proceedings of the institution of civil engineers*, 1(3):325–362, 1952.

- Jiajun Xu and Suvrajeet Sen. Compromise policy for multi-stage stochastic linear programming: Variance and bias reduction. *Computers & Operations Research*, 153:106132, 2023.
- Jiajun Xu and Suvrajeet Sen. Ensemble variance reduction methods for stochastic mixed-integer programming and their application to the stochastic facility location problem. *INFORMS Journal on Computing*, 36(2):587–599, 2024.
- Di Zhang and Suvrajeet Sen. A sampling-based progressive hedging algorithm for stochastic programming. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.20944*, 2024a.
- Di Zhang and Suvrajeet Sen. The stochastic conjugate subgradient algorithm for kernel support vector machines. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.21091*, 2024b.