
TRACTABLE GENERAL EQUILIBRIUM

Denizalp Goktas

Cornell Tech

dg776@cornell.edu

Amy Greenwald

Brown University

amy_greenwald@brown.edu

Abstract

We study Walrasian economies (or general equilibrium models) and their solution concept, the Walrasian equilibrium. A key challenge in this domain is identifying price-adjustment processes that converge to equilibrium. One such process, tâtonnement, is an auction-like algorithm first proposed in 1874 by Léon Walras. While continuous-time variants of tâtonnement are known to converge to equilibrium in economies satisfying the Weak Axiom of Revealed Preferences (WARP), the process fails to converge in a pathological Walrasian economy known as the Scarf economy. To address these issues, we analyze Walrasian economies using variational inequalities (VIs), an optimization framework. We introduce the class of mirror extragradient algorithms, which, under suitable Lipschitz-continuity-like assumptions, converge to a solution of any VI satisfying the Minty condition in polynomial time. We show that the set of Walrasian equilibria of any balanced economy—which includes among others Arrow-Debreu economies—corresponds to the solution set of an associated VI that satisfies the Minty condition but is generally discontinuous. Applying the mirror extragradient algorithm to this VI we obtain a class of tâtonnement-like processes, which we call the mirror extratâtonnement process. While our VI formulation is generally discontinuous, it is Lipschitz-continuous in variationally stable Walrasian economies with bounded elasticity—including those satisfying WARP and the Scarf economy—thus establishing the polynomial-time convergence of mirror extratâtonnement in these economies. We validate our approach through experiments on large Arrow-Debreu economies with Cobb-Douglas, Leontief, and CES consumers, as well as the Scarf economy, demonstrating fast convergence in all cases without failure. Our results suggest that the lack of polynomial-time computability results for general Arrow-Debreu economies is largely a theoretical issue stemming from discontinuities rather than fundamental computational intractability. This provides one resolution to the challenge set by Herbert Scarf’s fifty-year-old agenda on applied general equilibrium—namely, providing “a general method for the explicit numerical solution of the neoclassical model.”

1 Introduction

Walrasian economies (or general equilibrium models), first studied by French economist Léon Walras in 1874, are a broad mathematical framework for modeling any economic system governed by supply and demand (Walras, 1896). A Walrasian economy consists of a finite set of commodities, characterized by an excess demand function that maps values for commodities, called *prices*, to positive (resp. negative) quantities of each commodity demanded (resp. supplied) in excess. Walras proposed a steady-state solution of his economy, namely a Walrasian (or competitive) equilibrium, represented by a collection of per-commodity prices which is *feasible*, i.e., there is no excess demand for any commodity, and for which *Walras’ law* holds, i.e., the value of the excess demand is equal to 0.

Walras did not establish conditions ensuring the existence of an equilibrium, leaving the question unresolved until the 1950s (Arrow and Debreu, 1954), but argued, albeit without conclusive evidence, that his economy would settle at a Walrasian equilibrium via a *price-adjustment process* (i.e., any process that generates a sequence of prices based on prior prices and associated excess demands), known as *tâtonnement*, which mimics the behavior of the *law of supply and demand*, updating prices at a rate equal to the excess demand (Walras, 1896; Uzawa, 1960; Arrow and Hurwicz, 1958). To motivate the relevance of *tâtonnement* to real-world economies, Walras argued that *tâtonnement* is a *natural price-adjustment process*, in the sense that if each commodity is owned by a different seller, then each seller can update the price of its commodity without coordinating with other sellers, using only information about the excess demand of its commodity, hence making it plausible that *tâtonnement* could explain the movement of prices in real-world economies where sellers again do not coordinate with one another.

Nearly half a century after Walras' initial foray into general equilibrium analysis, a group of academics brought together by the Cowles Commission in 1939 reinitiated a study of Walras' economic model with the purpose of bringing rigorous mathematics to the analysis of markets. One of the earliest and most important outputs of this collaborative effort was the introduction of a broad and well-justified class of Walrasian economies known as *competitive economies* (Arrow and Debreu, 1954), for which the existence of Walrasian equilibrium was established by a novel application of fixed point theorems to economics. With the question of existence thus resolved, the field subsequently turned its focus to investigating questions on the *stability* of Walrasian equilibrium i.e., which price-adjustment processes can settle at a Walrasian equilibrium and under what assumptions? (Uzawa, 1960; Balasko, 1975; Arrow and Hurwicz, 1958; Cole and Fleischer, 2008; Cheung et al., 2018; 2013; Jain et al., 2005; Codenotti et al., 2005; 2006; Chen and Teng, 2009).

Most relevant work on stability has been concerned with the convergence properties of *tâtonnement*. Beyond Walras' justification for *tâtonnement*'s relevance to real-world economies, research on *tâtonnement* in the post-world war II economics literature is motivated by the fact that it can be understood as a plausible explanation of how prices move in real-world markets (Gillen et al., 2020). Hence, if one could prove that *tâtonnement* is a *universal price-adjustment process* (i.e., a price-adjustment process that converges to a Walrasian equilibrium in all competitive economies), then perhaps it would be justifiable to claim real-world economies would also eventually settle at a Walrasian equilibrium.

In 1958, Arrow and Hurwicz (1958) established the convergence of a continuous-time variant of *tâtonnement* in Walrasian economies with an excess demand function satisfying the weak axiom of revealed preferences (WARP) (Afriat, 1967), which among others, includes Walrasian economies satisfying the GS condition (Arrow et al., 1959; Arrow and Hurwicz, 1960). This result was complemented by Nikaidô and Uzawa's (Nikaidô and Uzawa, 1960) result

on the convergence of a discrete-time variant of *tâtonnement* in Walrasian economies satisfying WARP—albeit without any non-asymptotic convergence guarantees. These initial results sparked hopes that *tâtonnement* could be a universal price-adjustment process.

Furthermore, as there in general exists no closed-form formulas for Walrasian equilibria, these results ignited further interest in discovering algorithms to compute a Walrasian equilibrium, as *tâtonnement* could be implemented on a computer to obtain numerical approximations of Walrasian equilibria in Walrasian economies. Indeed, these early results on the stability of *tâtonnement* inspired a new line of work on *applied general equilibrium* (Scarf, 1967b;a; Scarf and Hansen, 1973; Scarf, 1982) initiated by Herbert Scarf (Arrow and Kehoe, 1994), whose goal was to establish “a general method for the explicit numerical solution of the neoclassical [Walrasian economy] model” (Scarf and Hansen, 1973). The motivation behind this research agenda was a desire to predict the impact of economic policy on an economy by estimating the parameters of a parametric Walrasian economy from empirical data, and then running a comparative static analysis to compare the numerical solution of the Walrasian economy before and after the implementation of the policy.

Unfortunately, soon after initiating this research agenda, Scarf dashed all hopes that *tâtonnement* could be a universal price-adjustment process by showing that the sequence of prices generated by a continuous-time variant of *tâtonnement* can cycle ad infinitum around the Walrasian equilibrium of his eponymous competitive economy, with only three commodities and an excess demand function generated by three consumers with Leontief preferences, i.e., *the Scarf economy* (Scarf, 1960). Even more discouragingly, when applied to the Scarf economy, the prices generated by discrete-time variants of *tâtonnement* spiral away from the Walrasian equilibrium, moving further and further away from equilibrium.

Scarf’s negative result seems to have discouraged further research by economists on the stability of Walrasian equilibrium (Fisher, 1975). Despite research on this question coming to a near halt, one positive outcome was achieved, on the convergence of a non-*tâtonnement* update rule known as *Smale’s process* (Herings, 1997; Kamiya, 1990; van der Laan et al., 1987; Smale, 1976), which updates prices at the rate of the product of the excess demand and the inverse of its Jacobian, to a Walrasian equilibrium in competitive economies which have an excess demand that has a non-singular Jacobian, including Scarf economies. Unfortunately, this convergence result for Smale’s process comes with two caveats: 1) Smale’s process is not a “natural” price-adjustment process, as it updates the price of each commodity using information about not only the excess demand of the commodity but also the derivative of the excess demand function with respect to each commodity in the economy, 2) convergence of discrete time-variants of Smale’s process

require the excess demand to satisfy the law of supply and demand, which even Walrasian economies that satisfy the GS or WARP conditions do not satisfy.

Nearly half a century after these seminal analyses of competitive economies, research on the stability and efficient computation of Walrasian equilibrium is once again coming to the fore, motivated by applications of algorithms to compute Walrasian equilibrium in dynamic stochastic general equilibrium models in macroeconomics (Geanakoplos, 1990; Sargent and Ljungqvist, 2000; Taylor and Woodford, 1999; Fernández-Villaverde, 2023), and the use of algorithms such as *tâtonnement* to solve models of transactions on cryptocurrency blockchains (Leonardos et al., 2021; Liu et al., 2022; Reijsbergen et al., 2021) and load balancing over networks (Jain et al., 2013). In contrast to the prior literature on the stability of *tâtonnement*, which was primarily concerned with proving asymptotic convergence of price-adjustment processes to a Walrasian equilibrium, this line of work is also concerned with obtaining non-asymptotic convergence rates, and hence computing approximate Walrasian equilibria in polynomial time.

The first result on this question is due to Codenotti et al. (2005), who introduced a discrete-time version of *tâtonnement*, and showed that in exchange economies that satisfy *weak gross substitutes (WGS)* (i.e., the excess demand of any commodity *weakly* increases if the price of any other commodity increases, fixing all other prices), the *tâtonnement* process converges to an approximate Walrasian equilibrium in a number of steps which is polynomial in the inverse of the approximation factor and size of the problem. Unfortunately, soon after this positive result appeared, Papadimitriou and Yannakakis (2010) showed that it is impossible for a price-adjustment process based on the excess demand function to converge in polynomial time to a Walrasian equilibrium in general, ruling out the possibility of Smale’s process (and many others), justifying the notion of Walrasian equilibrium in all competitive economies. Nevertheless, further study of the convergence of price-adjustment processes such as *tâtonnement* under stronger assumptions, or in simpler models than full-blown Arrow-Debreu competitive economies, continues, as these processes are being deployed in practice (Jain et al., 2013; Leonardos et al., 2021; Liu et al., 2022; Reijsbergen et al., 2021).¹

1.1 A Tractable Variational Inequality Framework for Walrasian Economies

To address the challenge brought forward by the impossibility result of Papadimitriou and Yannakakis (2010), we provide a characterization of Walrasian equilibrium using the variational inequality (VI) optimization framework. To this end, we first introduce the class of *mirror extragradient algorithms* and prove the polynomial-time convergence of this method for VIs that satisfy a computational tractability condition known as the Minty condition (Minty, 1967),

¹We refer the reader to Appendix A for additional related works on algorithms for Walrasian Economies and VIs.

and a generalization of Lipschitz-continuity known as Bregman-continuity. A Bregman-continuous (or relatively continuous (Lu, 2019)) function is one for which the change in the Euclidean distance of the function between any two points is proportional to Bregman divergence between those two points.

With these tools in place, we then demonstrate that the set of Walrasian equilibria of *balanced economies*—those Walrasian economies with an excess demand that is homogeneous of degree 0, and satisfy weak Walras’s (i.e., the value of the excess demand is less than or equal to 0 at any price)—a class of Walrasian economies which among others includes Arrow and Debreu’s competitive economies (Arrow and Debreu, 1954), is equal to the set of strong solutions of a VI that satisfies the Minty condition. With this characterization in hand, we apply the mirror extragradient algorithm to solving this VI, which gives rise to a novel natural price-adjustment process we call *mirror extratâtonnement*.

An important property of the VI we introduce is that its search space for prices is *not* restricted to the unit simplex as it is traditionally the case for competitive economies, but rather to the unit box. This fact offers us insight into understanding how we can overcome Papadimitriou and Yannakakis’s impossibility result on the exponential-time convergence of price-adjustment processes in general Walrasian economies. Papadimitriou and Yannakakis’s definition of a price-adjustment process restricts prices generated by the process to lie within the unit simplex; however, when the search space of the VI we introduce is restricted in this way, the VI fails to satisfy the Minty condition, and is thus computationally intractable. This suggests that relaxing the requirement that prices lie within the unit simplex can overcome the challenge of the exponential-time convergence of price-adjustment processes in Walrasian economies, and allow for the efficient computation of Walrasian equilibrium, at least in practice.

The reader might wonder what we mean by “in practice”. As it turns out the VI characterization we provide is in general discontinuous at one point in its search space, namely when the prices for all commodities are 0. As such, because it is not possible to ensure the Lipschitz-continuity or Bregman-continuity of the excess demand on the unit box in general, it is not possible to obtain polynomial-time convergence of our mirror extragradient to solve our VI without further assumptions. Nevertheless, as we discuss in the sequel, we observe the fast convergence of mirror *extratâtonnement* process in a large class of competitive economies, including very large instances with Leontief consumers, for which the computation of a Walrasian equilibrium is known to be PPAD-complete (Codonotti et al., 2006; Deng and Du, 2008). This suggests the need for a novel assumption that would explain the convergence of process to a Walrasian equilibrium in practice. To this end, we introduce the pathwise Bregman-continuity assumption, a condition that requires the excess demand to be Bregman-continuous along the sequence of prices generated by the

mirror *extratâtonnement* process, which we show is sufficient to guarantee the polynomial-time convergence of our process.

While the pathwise Bregman-continuity assumption provides intuition on the fast convergence of the mirror *extratâtonnement* processes in practice, it is hard to verify this assumption theoretically. Thus, we subsequently restrict our search space for prices to the unit simplex, and restrict our attention to competitive economies that are variationally stable on the unit simplex (i.e., those economies for which the associated VI satisfies the Minty condition) and have a *bounded elasticity of excess demand* (i.e., the percentage change in the excess demand for a percentage change in prices is bounded across all price changes). We demonstrate that under these additional assumptions, the VI is guaranteed to satisfy the Minty condition, and show that for such economies the excess demand is Bregman-continuous, thus providing the first polynomial-time convergence result for a price adjustment processes in this class of Walrasian economies, which among others includes competitive economies that satisfy WGS, and more generally, WARP.

1.2 Technical Contributions

Variational Inequalities Our first major contribution is introducing the class of mirror extragradient algorithms, a generalization of Korpelevich’s extragradient method (Korpelevich, 1976) for solving VIs. We establish best-iterate convergence of the class of mirror extragradient algorithms to a ε -strong solution of VIs that satisfy the Minty condition and are Bregman-continuous in $O(1/\varepsilon^2)$ evaluations of the optimality operator of the VI (Theorem 3.1). Our result generalizes the results and proof techniques of Huang and Zhang (2023) for the extragradient method, and extends the convergence results of Zhang and Dai (2023) for the unconstrained mirror extragradient method to constrained domains. In addition, to provide further justification for the convergence of the mirror *extratâtonnement* process in balanced economies, we establish suitable conditions for the local convergence of the mirror extragradient algorithm to an ε -strong solution of any Bregman-continuous VI that does *not* satisfy the Minty condition—to the best of our knowledge, the first result of its kind (Theorem 3.2).

Walrasian Economies While a characterization of the set of Walrasian equilibria of any Walrasian economy as the solution set of an associated complementarity problem (i.e., a VI where the constraint set is the positive orthant) seems to have already been known (Dafermos, 1990), for balanced economies, we provide the first computationally tractable characterization of Walrasian equilibria as the set of strong solutions of a VI that satisfies the Minty condition and whose constraint set is given by the unit box. We then apply the mirror extragradient method to obtain a novel natural

price-adjustment process we call the mirror *extratâtonnement* process (Algorithm 2), and prove its convergence in all balanced economies that satisfy pathwise Bregman-continuity (Corollary 1).

We then restrict our attention to a novel class of competitive economies, namely those which are variationally stable on the unit simplex, and establish the polynomial-time convergence of the mirror *extratâtonnement* process in all such economies assuming bounded elasticity of excess demand (Theorem 4.6). Our convergence result also provides the first polynomial-time convergence result for price-adjustment processes in the class of economies that satisfy WARP, and generalizes the well-known *tâtonnement* convergence result in competitive economies with bounded elasticity of excess demand that satisfy WGS (Codonotti et al., 2005).

We then apply the mirror *extratâtonnement* process to the Scarf economy, and prove its polynomial-time convergence to the unique Walrasian equilibrium of the economy (Corollary 2). As such, the mirror *extratâtonnement* process is the first discrete-time *natural* price adjustment process to converge in the Scarf economy.

Finally, we run a series of experiments on a variety of competitive economies where we verify that the pathwise Bregman-continuity assumption holds, and demonstrate that our algorithm converges to a Walrasian equilibrium at the rate predicted by our theory. Importantly, our experiments include examples of randomly initialized very large competitive economies (~ 500 consumers and ~ 500 commodities) which are known to be PPAD-complete (e.g., Leontief economies), for which we show that our algorithm computes a Walrasian equilibrium fast without failure in all cases.

2 Preliminaries

Notation. We use caligraphic uppercase letters to denote sets (e.g., \mathcal{X}), bold uppercase letters to denote matrices (e.g., \mathbf{X}), bold lowercase letters to denote vectors (e.g., \mathbf{p}), lowercase letters to denote scalar quantities (e.g., x). We denote the i th row vector of a matrix (e.g., \mathbf{X}) by the corresponding bold lowercase letter with subscript i (e.g., \mathbf{x}_i). Similarly, we denote the j th entry of a vector (e.g., \mathbf{p} or \mathbf{x}_i) by the corresponding lowercase letter with subscript j (e.g., p_j or x_{ij}). We denote functions by a letter determined by the value of the function, e.g., f if the mapping is scalar valued, \mathbf{f} if the mapping is vector valued, and \mathcal{F} if the mapping is set valued (i.e., \mathcal{F} is a correspondence). We denote the set $\{1, \dots, n\}$ by $[n]$, the set of natural numbers by \mathbb{N} , and the set of real numbers by \mathbb{R} . We denote the positive and strictly positive elements of a set using a $+$ or $++$ subscript, respectively, e.g., \mathbb{R}_+ and \mathbb{R}_{++} .

For any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we denote the n -dimensional vector of zeros and ones by $\mathbf{0}_n$ and $\mathbf{1}_n$, respectively, and the i^{th} basis vector in \mathbb{R}^n by \mathbf{j}_i . We let $\Delta_n = \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}_+^n \mid \sum_{i=1}^n x_i = 1\}$ denote the unit simplex in \mathbb{R}^n . Unless otherwise noted, we

denote the 2-norm $\|\cdot\| \doteq \|\cdot\|_2$. Finally, we denote the Euclidean projection operator onto a set C by Π_C , i.e., $\Pi_C(\mathbf{x}) \doteq \arg \min_{\mathbf{y} \in C} \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|^2$. Given a metric space (\mathcal{M}, d) and $\varepsilon \geq 0$, we write $\mathcal{B}_\varepsilon(x) = \{x' \in \mathcal{M} \mid d(x, x') \leq \varepsilon\}$ to denote the closed ε -ball centered at $x \in \mathcal{M}$. The multiplication of a scalar and a set is defined as the Minkowski product, i.e., for all $a \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^m$, we define $a\mathcal{X} \doteq \{a\mathbf{x} \mid \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}\}$.

Functions. Given a Euclidean vector space $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$, we define its dual space \mathcal{X}^* as the set of all linear maps $\mathbf{f} : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$. Let $(\mathcal{X}, \|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{X}})$, $(\mathcal{Y}, \|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{Y}})$ be normed spaces. Consider a function $\mathbf{f} : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$. \mathbf{f} is *continuous* if for all sequences $\{x^{(n)}\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ s.t. $x^{(n)} \rightarrow x \in \mathcal{X}$, we have $f(x^{(n)}) \rightarrow f(x)$. Given $\ell \geq 0$, \mathbf{f} is said to be ℓ -*Lipschitz-continuous* on $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{X}$ iff $\forall \mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2 \in \mathcal{A}$, $\|f(\mathbf{x}_1) - f(\mathbf{x}_2)\|_{\mathcal{Y}} \leq \ell \|\mathbf{x}_1 - \mathbf{x}_2\|_{\mathcal{X}}$. Consider a function $f : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. f is *convex* iff for all $\lambda \in [0, 1]$ and $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}' \in \mathcal{X}$, $f(\lambda\mathbf{x} + (1 - \lambda)\mathbf{x}') \leq \lambda f(\mathbf{x}) + (1 - \lambda)f(\mathbf{x}')$. Given $\mu \geq 0$, f is μ -*strongly-convex*, iff $\mathbf{x} \mapsto f(\mathbf{x}) - \mu/2\|\mathbf{x}\|^2$ is convex.

Correspondences. Let $(\mathcal{X}, \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle)$ be an inner product space. Consider a correspondence $\mathcal{R} : \mathcal{X} \rightrightarrows \mathcal{X}^*$. \mathcal{R} is said to be *upper hemicontinuous* if for any sequence $\{(x^{(n)}, y^{(n)})\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}_+} \subset \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X}^*$ such that $(x^{(n)}, y^{(n)}) \rightarrow (x, y)$ and $y^{(n)} \in \mathcal{R}(x^{(n)})$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}_+$, it also holds that $y \in \mathcal{R}(x)$. A correspondence \mathcal{R} is *continuous* if for any sequence $\{x^{(n)}\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}_+} \subset \mathcal{X}$ such that $x^{(n)} \rightarrow x$, we have $\mathcal{R}(x^{(n)}) \rightarrow \mathcal{R}(x)$. A correspondence is said to be *closed-valued* (resp. *compact-valued* / *convex-valued* / *singleton-valued*) iff for all $x \in \mathcal{X}$, $\mathcal{R}(x)$ is closed (resp. compact / convex / a singleton). \mathcal{R} is *monotone* iff for all $x, x' \in \mathcal{X}$, and $y \in \mathcal{R}(x), y' \in \mathcal{R}(x')$, $\langle y' - y, x' - x \rangle \geq 0$. \mathcal{R} is *pseudomonotone* iff for all $x, x' \in \mathcal{X}$, and $y \in \mathcal{R}(x), y' \in \mathcal{R}(x')$, $\langle y', x' - x \rangle \geq 0 \implies \langle y, x - x' \rangle \geq 0$. \mathcal{R} is *quasimonotone* iff for all $x, x' \in \mathcal{X}$, and $y \in \mathcal{R}(x), y' \in \mathcal{R}(x')$, $\langle y', x' - x \rangle > 0 \implies \langle y, x - x' \rangle \geq 0$. We note the following relationship between these notions of monotonicity: $\text{monotone} \implies \text{pseudomonotone} \implies \text{quasimonotone}$.

Bregman divergence Given a set \mathcal{X} and a *kernel function* $h : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, the *Bregman divergence* $\delta_h : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ associated with h is defined as: $\delta_h(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \doteq h(\mathbf{x}) - h(\mathbf{y}) - \langle \nabla h(\mathbf{y}), \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y} \rangle$.

When h is convex, for all $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{X}$, the Bregman divergence is positive, i.e., $\delta_h(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \geq 0$. Further, if h is strictly convex, then $\delta_h(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = 0$ iff $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{y}$. In addition, if h is μ -strongly convex, then for all $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{X}$, we have $\delta_h(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \geq \frac{\mu}{2} \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|^2$. When the kernel function is chosen s.t. $h(\mathbf{x}) \doteq \frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{x}\|^2$, the Bregman divergence corresponds to the Euclidean square distance, i.e., $\delta_h(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \doteq \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|^2$

Given a modulus of continuity $\lambda \geq 0$, and a kernel function h , a function $\mathbf{f} : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$ is said to be (λ, h) -Bregman-continuous (or relatively continuous (Lu, 2019)) on $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{X}$ iff for all $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{A}$, $\frac{1}{2}\|\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}) - \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{y})\|^2 \leq \lambda^2 \delta_h(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$.

3 Variational Inequalities

Consider an inner product space $(\mathcal{U}, \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle)$. A (generalized²) variational inequality (VI), denoted $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{F})$, consists of a constraint set $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathcal{U}$ and an optimality operator $\mathcal{F} : \mathcal{U} \rightrightarrows \mathcal{U}^*$. For notational convenience, for any $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}$, we denote any arbitrary element of $\mathcal{F}(\mathbf{x})$ by $\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x})$, and denote the variational inequality by $(\mathcal{X}, \mathbf{f})$ if \mathcal{F} is singleton-valued.

3.1 Solution Concepts and Properties

The canonical solution concept for VIs is the strong (or Stampacchia (Lions and Stampacchia, 1967)) solution. In practice, it is not possible to compute an exact strong solution to a VI $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{F})$, and as such we have to resort to approximate solutions which we call the ε -strong solution. Given an approximation parameter $\varepsilon \geq 0$, a ε -strong (or Stampacchia) solution of the VI $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{F})$ is a $\mathbf{x}^* \in \mathcal{X}$ s.t. for all $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}$, there exists $\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}^*) \in \mathcal{F}(\mathbf{x}^*)$, $\langle \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}^*), \mathbf{x}^* - \mathbf{x} \rangle \leq \varepsilon$. A 0-strong solution is simply called a strong solution. We denote the set of ε -strong (resp. the set of strong) solutions a VI $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{F})$ by $\mathcal{SVI}_\varepsilon(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{F})$ (resp. $\mathcal{SVI}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{F})$).

Strong solutions can be shown to exist in a broad of class known as continuous. A continuous VI is a VI $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{F})$ s.t. \mathcal{X} is non-empty, compact, and convex, and \mathcal{F} is upper hemicontinuous, non-empty-, compact-, and convex-valued. The proof of existence of a strong solution in continuous VIs relies on a fixed-point argument applied to a mapping whose fixed points correspond to strong solutions of the VI, whose fixed points can in turn be shown to exist by the Glicksberg-Kakutani fixed point theorem. We refer the reader to Theorem 2.2.1 of Facchinei and Pang (2003) for a reference.

An alternative but related solution to a VI is the weak (or Minty) solution (Minty, 1967), for which similarly, we can define an approximate variant for computational purposes. Given a VI $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{F})$ and an approximation parameter $\varepsilon \geq 0$, a ε -weak (or Minty) solution is a $\mathbf{x}^* \in \mathcal{X}$ s.t. for all $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}$, $\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}) \in \mathcal{F}(\mathbf{x})$: $\langle \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}), \mathbf{x}^* - \mathbf{x} \rangle \leq \varepsilon$. A 0-weak solution to the VI is simply called a weak solution. We denote the set of ε -weak (resp. the set of weak) solutions a VI $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{F})$ by $\mathcal{MVI}_\varepsilon(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{F})$ (resp. $\mathcal{MVI}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{F})$).

²When \mathcal{F} is singleton-valued a generalized variational inequality is simply called a variational inequality. As our computational results will be limited to generalized variational inequalities where \mathcal{F} is singleton-valued, for simplicity, we will refer to generalized variational inequalities simply as variational inequalities.

In continuous VIs, the set of weak solutions is a subset of set of strong solutions, i.e., the MVI is a refinement of the SVI. However, we note that a weak solution is in general not guaranteed to exist in continuous VIs. Additionally, if we assume that the optimality operator \mathcal{F} is monotone, then the set of strong and weak solutions are equal. Surprisingly, a ε -weak-solution is not guaranteed to be a ε -strong solution. However, if \mathcal{F} is assumed to be monotone then any ε -strong solution is also a ε -weak solution but not vice versa.

The following additional properties of VIs will be relevant in the sequel, and will define important properties of the set of strong and weak solutions of VIs. A VI $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{F})$ is $\{ \text{monotone}, \text{pseudomonotone}, \text{quasimonotone} \}$ iff the optimality operator \mathcal{F} is $\{ \text{monotone}, \text{pseudomonotone}, \text{quasimonotone} \}$. Another common more property for the analysis of VIs is known as the Minty condition. A VI $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{F})$ satisfies the *Minty condition* iff the set of weak solutions is non-empty, i.e., $\text{MVI}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{F}) \neq \emptyset$. With these definitions in order, we summarize the following known properties of the solution sets of VIs.

Remark 1 [Solution Set Properties].

Let $\varepsilon \geq 0$, then the following implications hold:

- $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{F})$ is continuous $\implies \text{SVI}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{F}) \neq \emptyset$ (Theorem 2.2.1 of [Facchinei and Pang \(2003\)](#))
- $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{F})$ is continuous $\implies \text{MVI}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{F}) \subseteq \text{SVI}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{F})$
- $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{F})$ is monotone $\implies \text{SVI}_\varepsilon(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{F}) \subseteq \text{MVI}_\varepsilon(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{F})$
- $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{F})$ is pseudomonotone $\implies \text{SVI}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{F}) \subseteq \text{MVI}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{F})$
- $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{F})$ is quasimonotone with \mathcal{X} non-empty, and compact $\implies \text{MVI}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{F}) \neq \emptyset$ (Lemma 3.1 of [He, 2017](#))
- Suppose $\text{SVI}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{F}) \neq \emptyset$, then: monotone \implies pseudomonotone \implies Minty's condition

3.2 First-Order Methods

We now turn our attention to the computation of solutions to variational inequalities. In what follows, for simplicity, we will restrict ourselves to VIs $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{F})$ in which \mathcal{F} is singleton-valued, which we will for simplicity denote as $(\mathcal{X}, \mathbf{f})$. In future work, the algorithms and results provided in this chapter could be extended to the more general non-singleton-valued VI setting. We will in this paper consider first-order methods for computing strong solutions of VIs. We will hereafter restrict ourselves to singleton-valued optimality operators $\mathcal{F}(\mathbf{x}) \doteq \{\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x})\}$. Given a VI $(\mathcal{X}, \mathbf{f})$,

and an initial iterate $\mathbf{x}^{(0)} \in \mathcal{X}$, a *first-order method* $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ consists of an update function which generates the sequence of iterates $\{\mathbf{x}^{(t)}\}_t$ given for all $t = 0, 1, \dots$ by: $\mathbf{x}^{(t+1)} \doteq \boldsymbol{\mu}(\bigcup_{i=0}^t(\mathbf{x}^{(i)}, \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}^{(i)})))$.

When $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ depends solely on the last item in the sequence, we simply write $\mathbf{x}^{(t+1)} = \boldsymbol{\mu}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}, \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}))$. As is standard in the literature (see, for instance, [Cai et al. \(2022\)](#)), given a VI $(\mathcal{X}, \mathbf{f})$, the computational complexity measures in this paper will take the number of evaluations of the optimality operator \mathbf{f} as the unit of account. A common assumption for obtain polynomial-time computation for strong solutions of VIs, is Lipschitz-continuity. Given a modulus of continuity $\lambda \geq 0$, a λ -Lipschitz-continuous VI is a VI $(\mathcal{X}, \mathbf{f})$ s.t. \mathcal{X} is non-empty, compact, and convex, and \mathbf{f} is λ -Lipschitz continuous.

3.2.1 Mirror Gradient Algorithm

The canonical class of first-order methods for VIs is the class of *mirror gradient algorithms* ([Nemirovskij and Yudin, 1983](#)) which are parameterized by a kernel function $h : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ which induces a Bregman divergence $\delta_h : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ that defines the update function $\boldsymbol{\mu}^{\text{MG}}$ of the algorithm as $\boldsymbol{\mu}^{\text{MG}}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{y})) \doteq \arg \min_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} \left\{ \langle \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{y}), \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y} \rangle + \frac{1}{2\eta} \delta_h(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \right\}$. When the kernel function is chosen s.t. $h(\mathbf{x}) \doteq \frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{x}\|^2$, the mirror gradient method $\boldsymbol{\mu}^{\text{MG}}$ reduces to the well-known *projected gradient* method $\boldsymbol{\mu}^{\text{PG}}$ ([Cauchy et al., 1847](#)), i.e., $\boldsymbol{\mu}^{\text{PG}}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{y})) \doteq \Pi_{\mathcal{X}}[\mathbf{y} - \eta \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{y})]$.

Unfortunately, while the average of the iterates of the mirror gradient method can be shown to converge to a strong solution asymptotically for monotone and Lipschitz-continuous VIs, it is in general only possible to prove polynomial-time computation of a ε -weak solution in such VIs which does not necessarily imply convergence to a ε -strong solution (see, for instance, Proposition 8 and Appendix D of [Liu et al. \(2021\)](#)). More importantly, in general the sequence of iterates generated by the mirror gradient method is not guaranteed to converge, as shown by Example 1 in Appendix B.

3.2.2 Global Convergence of the Mirror Extragradient Algorithm

As the iterates of the mirror gradient method do not asymptotically converge to a strong or weak solution, and it is not possible to obtain polynomial-time computation of a ε -strong solution by averaging the iterates, we now introduce a novel class of first order methods, namely the class of *mirror extragradient algorithms* (Algorithm 1) which similar to the class of mirror gradient methods are parameterized by a kernel function $h : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ that induces a Bregman divergence $\delta_h : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defining the update function $\boldsymbol{\mu}^{\text{MEG}}$ of the algorithm which can be written in terms of $\boldsymbol{\mu}^{\text{MG}}$ as follows: $\boldsymbol{\mu}^{\text{MEG}}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{y})) \doteq \boldsymbol{\mu}^{\text{MG}}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{f}(\boldsymbol{\mu}^{\text{MG}}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{y}))))$.

The mirror extragradient algorithm (Algorithm 1) generalizes the well-known extragradient algorithm which is known to asymptotically converge to a strong solution (Popov, 1980), and allows for the polynomial-time computation of a ε -strong solution (Nemirovski, 2004; Golowich et al., 2020b; Cai et al., 2022). In particular, when the kernel function for the mirror extragradient method is chosen s.t. $h(\mathbf{x}) \doteq \frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{x}\|^2$, the mirror gradient method reduces to the extragradient method.

A seminal result by Nemirovski (2004)

shows that the average of the iterates output by the extragradient algorithm

are a ε -strong solution for any mono-

tone VI with a Lipschitz-continuous op-

timality operator when the algorithm is

run for $\tau \in O(1/\varepsilon)$ time-steps. Addi-

tionally, Golowich et al. (2020b); Cai

et al. (2022) show that in the same set-

ting, best iterate convergence to a ε -

strong solution in $O(1/\varepsilon^2)$ operations. More recently, Huang and Zhang (2023) have extended the same polynomial-time

computation result to VIs which satisfy the weaker Minty condition rather than monotonicity assumption. We extend

at present this result to mirror extragradient algorithm with the following theorem. We introduce the result in its full

generality as we will subsequently be applying this general result in Section 4. The following result states that a

ε -strong solution of any VI $(\mathcal{X}, \mathbf{f})$ which satisfies the Minty condition given that the VI $(\mathcal{X}, \mathbf{f})$ is *pathwise Bregman*

continuous over the outputs of the mirror extragradient method $\{\mathbf{x}^{(t+0.5)}, \mathbf{x}^{(t)}\}_t$, i.e., there exists $\lambda \geq 0$, s.t. for

all $t \in [\tau]$, $\frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)}) - \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}^{(k)})\|^2 \leq \lambda^2 \delta_h(\mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)}, \mathbf{x}^{(k)})$. As we will show in Section 4, this weaker pathwise

Bregman-continuity condition can be useful in the analysis of price-adjustment processes, and has been in the past

used in the analysis of price-adjustment processes (see, for instance, Cheung et al. (2013)). We include all omitted

results and proofs in Appendix C.

Theorem 3.1 [Mirror Extragradient Method Convergence].

Let $(\mathcal{X}, \mathbf{f})$ be a VI satisfying the Minty condition with \mathcal{X} non-empty, compact, and convex; and h a 1-strongly-convex

and κ -Lipschitz-smooth kernel function. Consider the mirror extragradient algorithm (Algorithm 1) run with the VI

$(\mathcal{X}, \mathbf{f})$, the kernel function h , a step size $\eta > 0$, a time horizon $\tau \in \mathbb{N}$, and outputs $\{\mathbf{x}^{(t+0.5)}, \mathbf{x}^{(t+1)}\}_t$. Suppose that

Algorithm 1 Mirror Extragradient Algorithm

Input: $\mathcal{X}, \mathbf{f}, h, \tau, \eta, \mathbf{x}^{(0)}$

Output: $\{\mathbf{x}^{(t+0.5)}, \mathbf{x}^{(t+1)}\}_t$

1: **for** $t = 1, \dots, \tau$ **do**

2: $\mathbf{x}^{(t+0.5)} \leftarrow \arg \min_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} \left\{ \langle \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}), \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}^{(t)} \rangle + \frac{1}{2\eta} \delta_h(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}^{(t)}) \right\}$

3: $\mathbf{x}^{(t+1)} \leftarrow \arg \min_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} \left\{ \langle \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}^{(t+0.5)}), \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}^{(t)} \rangle + \frac{1}{2\eta} \delta_h(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}^{(t)}) \right\}$

4: **end for**

5: **return** $\{\mathbf{x}^{(t+0.5)}, \mathbf{x}^{(t+1)}\}_t$

there exists $\lambda \in (0, \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}\eta}]$, s.t. $\frac{1}{2}\|\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)}) - \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}^{(k)})\|^2 \leq \lambda^2 \delta_h(\mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)}, \mathbf{x}^{(k)})$. Then, the following bound holds: $\min_{k=0, \dots, \tau} \max_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} \langle \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)}), \mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)} - \mathbf{x} \rangle \leq \frac{2(1+\kappa)\text{diam}(\mathcal{X})}{\eta} \frac{\sqrt{\delta_h(\mathbf{x}^*, \mathbf{x}^{(0)})}}{\sqrt{\tau}}$ where $\mathbf{x}^* \in \mathcal{MVI}(\mathcal{X}, \mathbf{f})$ is a weak solution of the VI $(\mathcal{X}, \mathbf{f})$.

In addition, let $\mathbf{x}_{\text{best}}^{(\tau)} \in \arg \min_{\mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)}; k=0, \dots, \tau} \delta_h(\mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)}, \mathbf{x}^{(k)})$, then, for some choice of time horizon $\tau \in O(\frac{\kappa^2 \text{diam}(\mathcal{X})^2 \delta_h(\mathbf{x}^*, \mathbf{x}^{(0)})}{\eta^2 \varepsilon^2})$, $\mathbf{x}_{\text{best}}^{(\tau)}$ is a ε -strong solution of $(\mathcal{X}, \mathbf{f})$, and $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{x}^{(t+0.5)} = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{x}^{(t)} \in \mathcal{SVI}(\mathcal{X}, \mathbf{f})$ is a strong solution of the VI $(\mathcal{X}, \mathbf{f})$.³

3.2.3 Local Convergence of the Mirror Extragradient Algorithm

Unfortunately, beyond VIs for which the Minty condition holds, it seems implausible to devise a first-order method that converges to strong solutions. To see this, we refer the reader to Example 2 in Appendix B. This is perhaps not surprising, since the computation of a ε -strong solution for Lipschitz-continuous VIs is in general a PPAD-complete problem (Kapron and Samieefar, 2024). Nevertheless, it is still of interest to investigate under what conditions can one guarantee the local convergence of the mirror extragradient algorithm to a strong solution. As we will show, we can guarantee local convergence by assuming the algorithm is initialized close enough to a *local* weak (or Minty) solution Aussel and Chaipunya (2024). Given a VI $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{F})$, and a *locality parameter* $\delta \geq 0$, a δ -*local weak solution* of the VI is a $\mathbf{x}^* \in \mathcal{X}$ that satisfies for all $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X} \cap \mathcal{B}_\delta(\mathbf{x}^*)$, $\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}) \in \mathcal{F}(\mathbf{x})$, $\langle \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}), \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}^* \rangle \leq 0$. We denote the set of δ -local weak solutions of a VI $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{F})$ by $\mathcal{LMVI}^\delta(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{F})$. With this definition in place, we now present our local convergence result for the mirror extragradient algorithm. As we will not be directly applying this result, for simplicity we present it under the assumption of Lipschitz-continuity, and then turn our attention to our Walrasian economies application.

Theorem 3.2 [Mirror Extragradient Method Local Convergence].

Let $(\mathcal{X}, \mathbf{f})$ be a λ -Lipschitz-continuous VI, h a 1-strongly-convex and κ -Lipschitz-smooth kernel function, and let $\eta \in (0, \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}\lambda}]$. Suppose that $\|\mathbf{f}\|_\infty \leq \ell < \infty$, and that for some $\mathbf{x}^* \in \mathcal{LMVI}^\delta(\mathcal{X}, \mathbf{f})$ δ -local weak solution, the initial iterate $\mathbf{x}^{(0)} \in \mathcal{X}$ is chosen so that $\sqrt{2\delta_h(\mathbf{x}^*, \mathbf{x}^{(0)})} \leq \delta - \eta\ell$.

Consider the mirror extragradient algorithm (Algorithm 1) run with the VI $(\mathcal{X}, \mathbf{f})$, the kernel function h , the step size η , initial iterate $\mathbf{x}^{(0)}$, an arbitrary time horizon $\tau \in \mathbb{N}$, and outputs $\{\mathbf{x}^{(t+0.5)}, \mathbf{x}^{(t+1)}\}_t$. Then, we have:

$$\min_{k=0, \dots, \tau} \max_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} \langle \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)}), \mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)} - \mathbf{x} \rangle \leq \frac{\sqrt{2}(1+\kappa)\text{diam}(\mathcal{X})}{\eta} \frac{\delta}{\sqrt{\tau}}$$

³First, note that the assumption that h is 1-strongly-convex is without loss of generality since any μ -strongly-convex kernel h' can be converted to a 1-strongly-convex kernel $\frac{1}{\mu}h'$. Second, while we present our convergence result using the pathwise Bregman-continuity assumption for generality, we note that the pathwise Bregman-continuity assumption is guaranteed to hold whenever \mathbf{f} is Bregman-continuous. Further, since if h is 1-strongly-convex, Lipschitz-continuity of \mathbf{f} implies its Bregman continuity, hence, a direct corollary of our result is that the mirror extragradient algorithm can compute a ε -strong solution in $O(1/\varepsilon^2)$ evaluation of \mathbf{f} for Lipschitz-continuous VIs which satisfy the Minty condition.

In addition, let $\mathbf{x}_{\text{best}}^{(\tau)} \in \arg \min_{\mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)}; k=0, \dots, \tau} \delta_h(\mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)}, \mathbf{x}^{(k)})$. Then, for some choice of $\tau \in O(1/\varepsilon^2)$, $\mathbf{x}_{\text{best}}^{(\tau)}$ is a ε -strong solution of $(\mathcal{X}, \mathbf{f})$.

4 Walrasian economies

An *Walrasian economy* (m, \mathcal{Z}) consists of $m \in \mathbb{N}$ commodities⁴, with any quantity of any given commodity being exchangeable for a quantity of another. The exchange process is governed by a system of valuation called *prices* modeled as a vector $\mathbf{p} \in \mathbb{R}_+^m$ s.t. $p_j \geq 0$ is the price of commodity $j \in [m]$.⁵ Prices $\mathbf{p} \in \mathbb{R}_+^m$ allow the *sale* of $x \in \mathbb{R}_+$ units of any commodity $j \in [m]$ in exchange for the *purchase* of $\frac{x p_j}{p_k}$ units of any other commodity $k \in [m]$.

For any price, the economy determines quantities of each commodity which can be bought and sold, with all admissible exchanges being summarized by an *excess demand correspondence* $\mathcal{Z} : \mathbb{R}_+^m \rightrightarrows \mathbb{R}^m$ which for any prices $\mathbf{p} \in \mathbb{R}_+^m$ outputs a *set of excess demands* $\mathcal{Z}(\mathbf{p}) \subseteq \mathbb{R}^m$ with each excess demand denoted $\mathbf{z}(\mathbf{p}) \in \mathcal{Z}(\mathbf{p})$. For any price $\mathbf{p} \in \mathbb{R}_+^m$ and excess demands $\mathbf{z}(\mathbf{p}) \in \mathcal{Z}(\mathbf{p})$, $z_j(\mathbf{p}) \geq 0$ denotes the number of units of commodity $j \in [m]$ *demanded in excess* (i.e., more units of it are bought than sold) $j \in [m]$, while $z_j(\mathbf{p}) < 0$ denotes the number of units of commodity $j \in [m]$ *supplied in excess* (i.e., more units of it are sold than bought). If \mathcal{Z} is singleton-valued, then we will for convenience represent \mathcal{Z} as a function and denote it z .

A price vector $\mathbf{p} \in \mathbb{R}_+^m$ is said to be *feasible* if there exists a $\mathbf{z}(\mathbf{p}) \in \mathcal{Z}(\mathbf{p})$ s.t. for all commodity $j \in [m]$, $z_j(\mathbf{p}) \leq 0$. Similarly, a price vector $\mathbf{p} \in \mathbb{R}_+^m$ is said to satisfy *Walras' law* if there exists a $\mathbf{z}(\mathbf{p}) \in \mathcal{Z}(\mathbf{p})$ s.t. $\mathbf{p} \cdot \mathbf{z}(\mathbf{p}) = 0$. The canonical solution concept for Walrasian equilibria is the approximate Walrasian equilibrium (Walras, 1896).

Given an approximation parameter $\varepsilon \geq 0$, a price vector $\mathbf{p}^* \in [0, 1]^m$ is said to be a ε -*Walrasian* (or ε -*competitive*) *equilibrium* of a Walrasian economy (m, \mathcal{Z}) if there exists an excess demand $\mathbf{z}(\mathbf{p}^*) \in \mathcal{Z}(\mathbf{p}^*)$ s.t. we have: (ε -*Feasibility*) for all commodities $j \in [m]$, $z_j(\mathbf{p}^*) \leq \varepsilon$; and (ε -*Walras' law*) $-\varepsilon \leq \mathbf{p}^* \cdot \mathbf{z}(\mathbf{p}^*) \leq \varepsilon$. We denote the set of ε -Walrasian equilibria of any Walrasian economy (m, \mathcal{Z}) by $\mathcal{WE}_\varepsilon(m, \mathcal{Z})$. A 0-Walrasian equilibrium is simply called a *Walrasian equilibrium*, in which case we denote the set of Walrasian equilibria $\mathcal{WE}(m, \mathcal{Z})$.

⁴The ‘‘commodity’’ terminology is used here in the tradition of Arrow and Debreu (1954), and refers to any raw, intermediate, & final commodities, labor & services.

⁵An observant reader might notice that in real-world economies the prices of certain commodities can be negative (e.g., prices of oil when storage of excess oil is not possible), and might raise the concern that the model does not account for the possibility negative prices. However, in these cases the price of the commodity is ‘‘negative’’ only colloquially speaking, and rather the price of an associated commodity is positive. For instance, when the price of oil is negative, companies are no more selling oil, rather they are buying a service: the storage of oil. As such, we include ‘‘negative pricing’’ in the real-world by adding the commodities with ‘‘negative prices’’ as additional commodities into the economy (e.g., including both oil and the sale of oil as commodities).

4.1 Walrasian Economies and Variational Inequalities

With definitions in order, we now present the fundamental relationship there exists between Walrasian economies and VIs. The following theorem due to [Dafermos \(1990\)](#), is to the best of our knowledge the first result exposing the connection between VIs and Walrasian equilibria, and states that the problem of computing a Walrasian equilibrium is equivalent to the problem of computing a strong solution of a VI whose set of constraints is given by the positive orthant (a class of VIs known as *complementarity problems* ([Cottle and Dantzig, 1968](#))). For completeness, we include its proof, as well as all other omitted results and proofs of this section in [Appendix D](#).

Theorem 4.1 [Walrasian economies as Complementarity Problems].

The set of Walrasian equilibria of any Walrasian economy (m, \mathcal{Z}) is equal to the set of strong solutions of the VI $(\mathbb{R}_+^m, -\mathcal{Z})$, i.e., $\mathcal{WE}(m, \mathcal{Z}) = \mathcal{SVI}(\mathbb{R}_+^m, -\mathcal{Z})$.

While [Theorem 4.1](#) is useful to approach any Walrasian equilibrium computation problem as a strong solution computation problem, as the domain of prices is unbounded, i.e., \mathbb{R}_+^m , to obtain existence and computational results, we have to restrict the class of Walrasian economies we study. To this end, we introduce two important classes of Walrasian economies. The first of these classes are balanced economies.

A *balanced economy* is a Walrasian economy (m, \mathcal{Z}) whose excess demand correspondence satisfies (Homogeneity of degree 0) for all $\lambda > 0$, $\mathcal{Z}(\lambda \mathbf{p}) = \mathcal{Z}(\mathbf{p})$; and (Weak Walras' law) for all $\mathbf{p} \in \mathbb{R}_+^m$ and $\mathbf{z}(\mathbf{p}) \in \mathcal{Z}(\mathbf{p})$, $\mathbf{p} \cdot \mathbf{z}(\mathbf{p}) \leq 0$. Intuitively, homogeneity requires that prices have a meaning only relative to other prices, and have no absolute meaning of their own; weak Walras' law requires budget-balance to hold. While homogeneity of degree 0 is a standard assumption, weak Walras' law is significantly weaker than standard assumptions previously considered in the literature (see, for instance [Arrow and Hurwicz \(1958\)](#) and [Debreu \(1974\)](#)), and are satisfied by Arrow-Debreu economies ([Arrow and Debreu, 1954](#)).

We now provide a novel characterization of Walrasian equilibrium prices in balanced economies as a VI over $[0, 1]^m$ rather than \mathbb{R}_+^m which will allow us to obtain polynomial-time algorithms for the computation of Walrasian equilibrium, as the computational guarantees of our algorithms for VIs depend on the diameter of the constraint space of the VIs.

Theorem 4.2 [Balanced economies as VIs].

For any balanced economy (m, \mathcal{Z}) , the set of Walrasian equilibria is equal to the strictly positive cone generated by the strong solutions of the continuous VI $([0, 1]^m, -\mathcal{Z})$, i.e., $\mathcal{WE}(m, \mathcal{Z}) = \bigcup_{\lambda \geq 1} \lambda \mathcal{SVI}([0, 1]^m, -\mathcal{Z})$.

In the sequel, we will make use of the following lemma which states that for any balanced economy (m, \mathcal{Z}) , any approximate strong solution of the VI $([0, 1]^m, -\mathcal{Z})$ is an approximate Walrasian equilibrium of (m, \mathcal{Z}) .

Lemma 1 [ε -strong solution $\implies \varepsilon$ -Walrasian equilibrium].

For any balanced economy (m, \mathcal{Z}) , any ε -strong solution of the VI $([0, 1]^m, -\mathcal{Z})$ is a ε -Walrasian equilibrium of (m, \mathcal{Z}) .

We now turn our attention to prove the existence of Walrasian equilibrium. In balanced economies, under the assumption that the excess demand correspondence \mathcal{Z} is upper hemicontinuous, non-empty-, compact-, and convex-valued, it is possible to prove the existence of a Walrasian equilibrium $\mathbf{p}^* \in [0, 1]^m$ as a corollary of the existence of strong solutions in continuous VIs (Theorem 2.2.1 of [Facchinei and Pang \(2003\)](#)). Unfortunately, this Walrasian equilibrium can be trivial, i.e., $\mathbf{p}^* = \mathbf{0}_m$, and to prove the existence of a non-trivial Walrasian equilibrium, we have to restrict our attention to a canonical subset of balanced Walrasian economies studied in the literature which we call competitive economies ([Debreu, 1974](#); [Sonnenschein, 1972](#)).

A *competitive economy* is a balanced economy (m, \mathcal{Z}) whose excess demand correspondence satisfies (Non-Satiation) for all $\mathbf{p} \in \mathbb{R}_+^m$, and $\mathbf{z}(\mathbf{p}) \in \mathcal{Z}(\mathbf{p})$, $\mathbf{z}(\mathbf{p}) \leq \mathbf{0}_m \implies \mathbf{p} \cdot \mathbf{z}(\mathbf{p}) = 0$. Intuitively the additional non-satiation condition requires that whenever all goods are supplied in excess, it must be that the economy cannot spend any more money on purchasing commodities (i.e., the value of the excess demand is 0). In competitive economies, an alternative VI characterization of Walrasian equilibrium holds over the constraint space Δ_m rather than $[0, 1]^m$, which is more suitable for proving existence. The canonical example of a competitive economy is the *Arrow-Debreu competitive economy* ([Arrow and Debreu, 1954](#)) (see, Lemma 10, Appendix E).

Theorem 4.3 [Competitive economies as VIs].

For any competitive economy (m, \mathcal{Z}) , the set of Walrasian equilibria is equal to the strictly positive cone generated by the strong solutions of the continuous VI $(\Delta_m, -\mathcal{Z})$, i.e., $\mathcal{WE}(m, \mathcal{Z}) = \bigcup_{\lambda > 0} \lambda \mathcal{SVI}(\Delta_m, -\mathcal{Z})$.

To prove existence, it will be necessary to make assumptions on the continuity of the excess demand, which necessitates the definition of continuous economies. A *continuous economy* is a Walrasian economy (m, \mathcal{Z}) whose excess demand correspondence \mathcal{Z} is upper hemicontinuous on Δ_m , non-empty-, compact-, and convex-valued. We note that in the following definition we assume upper hemicontinuity only on Δ_m , since in competitive, and more generally balanced, economies it is too restrictive to assume that the excess demand \mathcal{Z} is upper hemicontinuous on \mathbb{R}_+^m since any

correspondence which is homogeneous of degree 0 and continuous in the entirety of its domain is constant.⁶ Intuitively, continuous economies are those economies in which changes in the proportions of prices lead to well-behaved changes in excess demands.

With the above theorem in hand, we can leverage the fact that a strong solution is guaranteed in continuous VIs to establish the existence of a Walrasian equilibrium in continuous competitive economies. We note that any Arrow-Debreu competitive economy is a continuous economy, as we show in Lemma 10 (Appendix E). As such, the following result provides an alternative proof of existence of a Walrasian equilibrium in Arrow-Debreu competitive economies.

Theorem 4.4 [Existence of Walrasian Equilibrium].

The set of Walrasian equilibria of any continuous competitive economy (m, \mathcal{Z}) is non-empty, i.e., $\mathcal{WE}(m, \mathcal{Z}) \neq \emptyset$.

With our characterization of Walrasian equilibria as strong solutions of VIs complete, we now turn our attention to solving the VIs we have introduced.

4.2 Price Adjustment Processes for Walrasian Equilibrium

We will for the rest of this chapter, assume that the excess demand correspondence is singleton-valued unless otherwise noted. We will consider (first-order) price-adjustment processes, as first defined by Papadimitriou and Yannakakis (2010). Given a Walrasian economy (m, \mathcal{Z}) , and an initial iterate $\mathbf{p}^{(0)} \in \mathbb{R}_+^m$, a (first-order) price adjustment process π consists of an update function which generates the sequence of iterates $\{\mathbf{p}^{(t)}\}_t$ given for all $t = 0, 1, \dots$ by $\mathbf{x}^{(t+1)} \doteq \pi(\bigcup_{i=0}^t(\mathbf{p}^{(i)}, \mathbf{z}(\mathbf{p}^{(i)})))$. As is standard in the literature (see, for instance, Papadimitriou and Yannakakis (2010)) the computational complexity measures in this paper will take the number of evaluations of the excess demand \mathbf{z} as the unit of account.

The most common class of algorithms to compute a Walrasian equilibrium are first-order price adjustment processes simply called *price adjustment processes* (Papadimitriou and Yannakakis, 2010). Given a Walrasian economy (m, \mathbf{z}) , and an initial price vector $\mathbf{p}^{(0)} \in \mathbb{R}_+^m$, a *price adjustment process* π consists of an update function $\pi :$

⁶In more stylized applications such as Arrow-Debreu competitive economies (Arrow and Debreu, 1954), the excess demand correspondence is sometimes defined so as to be guaranteed to be continuous only on the interior of the unit simplex, i.e., $\text{int}(\Delta_m) = \Delta_m$, as the excess demand for a good can be infinite if the price of any goods is 0. However, this issue in these stylized models only arises from a modeling choice which allows the demand of commodities to be possibly greater than the total amount of the commodity that can be ever supplied. However, it is indeed possible to restrict the excess demand to be bounded by the total amount of the commodity that can be ever supplied without modifying the Walrasian equilibria of the economy. This is indeed the approach that Arrow and Debreu (1954) take in Section 3 of their paper for proving their seminal Walrasian equilibrium existence result. In Lemma 10 (Appendix E) we prove that any Arrow-Debreu competitive economy can be represented as a continuous competitive economy with a bounded excess demand. This restriction is also realistic from an economic perspective since it is not possible for the economy to consume more of a commodity than there can exist, and resources in the real-world are indeed scarce. Indeed, otherwise there would be no use for the economic sciences: the science of resource allocation under scarcity.

$\bigcup_{\tau \geq 1} (\mathbb{R}_+^m \times \mathbb{R}^m) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+^m$ which generates the sequence of prices $\{\mathbf{p}^{(t)}\}_t$ given for all $t = 0, 1, \dots$ by: $\mathbf{p}^{(t+1)} \doteq \boldsymbol{\pi} \left(\bigcup_{k=0}^t (\mathbf{p}^{(k)}, \mathbf{z}(\mathbf{p}^{(k)})) \right)$

An important class of price-adjustment processes are natural price-adjustment processes. Intuitively, these are price-adjustment processes where the price of each commodity is updated using only information about the past prices of the commodity and its excess demand. This class of processes are natural in the sense that the price of each commodity is updated with information relevant to it, and as such if each commodity is sold by one fictional seller, then each seller can update the price of its good without having to coordinate with other seller. Given a Walrasian economy (m, \mathbf{z}) , and an initial price vector $\mathbf{p}^{(0)} \in \mathbb{R}_+^m$, a price adjustment process $\boldsymbol{\pi}$ is said to be *natural* if for all commodities, the price adjustment process can be written as $\boldsymbol{\pi} \doteq (\pi_1, \dots, \pi_m)$ where for all commodities $j \in [m]$, $\pi_j : \bigcup_{\tau \geq 1} (\mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+^m$ s.t. for all $t = 0, 1, \dots$ we have: $p_j^{(t+1)} \doteq \pi_j \left(\bigcup_{k=0}^t (p_j^{(k)}, z_j(\mathbf{p}^{(k)})) \right)$. The canonical type of natural price adjustment processes are *tâtonnement processes* (Walras, 1896; Arrow and Hurwicz, 1958), i.e., natural price-adjustment process $\boldsymbol{\pi} \doteq (\pi_1, \dots, \pi_m)$ s.t. for all $j \in [m]$ and $t \in \mathbb{N}_{++}$ there exists a function $g : \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ that satisfies: $\pi_j \left(\bigcup_{k=0}^t (p_j^{(k)}, z_j(\mathbf{p}^{(k)})) \right) \doteq g(p_j^{(t)}, z_j(\mathbf{p}^{(t)}))$.⁷

Now notice that the mirror gradient method applied to the VI $(\mathbb{R}_+^m, -\mathcal{Z})$ defines a family of *tâtonnement* processes parametrized by the kernel function h which we call the mirror *tâtonnement* process.⁸ Unfortunately, as demonstrated by Scarf (1960) using his eponymous Walrasian economy with 3 commodities an excess demand generated by Leontief consumers, continuous time-variants of *tâtonnement* processes cycle ad infinitum around the unique Walrasian equilibrium of the Scarf economy. For discrete-time variants of *tâtonnement*, as we show in Appendix G, the behavior of price trajectories is even more undesirable as they spiral away from the Walrasian equilibrium getting further and further. Interestingly, as we show next the VI $([0, 1], \mathbf{z}^{\text{scarf}})$, satisfies the Minty condition, which suggests that we should be able to compute a Walrasian equilibrium in Scarf economies by applying the mirror extragradient algorithm to this VI, which as we have shown earlier can be guaranteed to converge in polynomial-time under suitable continuity assumptions.

⁷Traditionally, g is further restricted to be sign preserving, i.e., $\forall p \in \mathbb{R}_+, z \in \mathbb{R}, \text{sign}(g(p, z)) = \text{sign}(z)$, as with this restriction in place a *tâtonnement* process can be seen a mathematical model of the law supply and demand which stipulates that the price of any commodity in the economy which is demanded (resp. supplied) in excess will rise (resp. decrease) Walras (1896); Arrow and Hurwicz (1958).

⁸A similar observation was previously made by Cheung et al. (2013) for a smaller class of Walrasian economies known as convex potential markets.

4.2.1 Mirror Extrâtonnement Process in Balanced Economies

To characterize the class of Walrasian economies for which a Walrasian equilibrium can be computed by using the VI characterizations, we now introduce the class of variationally stable economies. A Walrasian economy (m, \mathcal{Z}) , is said to be *variationally stable* on $\mathcal{P} \subseteq \mathbb{R}_+^m$ iff there exists $\mathbf{p}^* \in \mathcal{P}$ s.t. for all prices $\mathbf{p} \in \mathcal{P}$, $\mathbf{z}(\mathbf{p}) \in \mathcal{Z}(\mathbf{p})$: $\langle \mathbf{z}(\mathbf{p}), \mathbf{p}^* - \mathbf{p} \rangle \geq 0$. Intuitively, a Walrasian economy (m, \mathcal{Z}) is variationally stable on \mathcal{P} iff the VI $(\mathcal{P}, -\mathcal{Z})$ satisfies the Minty condition.⁹

A surprising and important result which is described by the following lemma is that the VI $([0, 1]^m, -\mathcal{Z})$ associated with any balanced economy (m, \mathcal{Z}) satisfies the Minty condition, i.e., any balanced economy is variationally stable on $[0, 1]^m$.

Lemma 2 [Balanced Economies are Variationally Stable on the Unit Box].

Any balanced economy (m, \mathcal{Z}) is variationally stable on $[0, 1]^m$, in particular letting $\mathbf{p}^* \doteq \mathbf{0}_m$, for all prices $\mathbf{p} \in [0, 1]^m$ and $\mathbf{z}(\mathbf{p}) \in \mathcal{Z}(\mathbf{p})$, we have $\langle \mathbf{z}(\mathbf{p}), \mathbf{p}^* - \mathbf{p} \rangle \geq 0$.

Algorithm 2 Mirror Extratâtonnement Process

Input: $m, \mathbf{z}, \tau, \eta, h, \mathcal{P}, \mathbf{p}^{(0)}$

Output: $\{\mathbf{p}^{(t)}\}_{t \in [\tau]}$

- 1: **for** $t = 1, \dots, \tau$ **do**
 - 2: $\mathbf{p}^{(t+0.5)} \leftarrow \arg \min_{\mathbf{p} \in \mathcal{P}} \left\{ \langle \mathbf{z}(\mathbf{p}^{(t)}), \mathbf{p}^{(t)} - \mathbf{p} \rangle + \frac{1}{2\eta} \delta_h(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{p}^{(t)}) \right\}$
 - 3: $\mathbf{p}^{(t+1)} \leftarrow \arg \min_{\mathbf{p} \in \mathcal{P}} \left\{ \langle \mathbf{z}(\mathbf{p}^{(t+0.5)}), \mathbf{p}^{(t)} - \mathbf{p} \rangle + \frac{1}{2\eta} \delta_h(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{p}^{(t)}) \right\}$
 - 4: **end for** **return** $\{\mathbf{p}^{(t+0.5)}\}_{t \in [\tau]}$
-

The above lemma is a highly surprising and important as it suggests that for balanced economies, which among others includes Arrow-Debreu competitive economies, under suitable continuity assumptions, first-order methods for the VI $([0, 1]^m, -\mathcal{Z})$ are guaranteed to converge to a strong solution. Hence,

with Lemma 2 in hand, we now turn our attention to solving the VI $([0, 1]^m, -\mathcal{Z})$ —or in our case rather the VI $([0, 1]^m, -\mathbf{z})$ since we assume for our algorithms that the excess demand is singleton-valued—and hence a Walrasian equilibrium with the mirror extragradient method. Solving the VI $([0, 1]^m, -\mathbf{z})$ with the mirror extragradient method,

⁹To understand the variational stability condition, consider a fictional auctioneer who buys the commodities sold in the economy and sells them back at prices $\mathbf{p} \in \mathbb{R}_+^m$. The profit of the auctioneer for his transaction is given by $\langle \mathbf{z}(\mathbf{p}), \mathbf{p} \rangle$. Now suppose that the auctioneer were to change the prices at which it bought and sold its commodities to prices $\mathbf{p}^* \in \mathbb{R}_+^m$, while fixing the quantities of goods sold and bought to those that he has observed (i.e., the excess demand $\mathbf{z}(\mathbf{p})$), then the auctioneer's profit improvement in "hindsight" would be given by $\langle \mathbf{z}(\mathbf{p}), \mathbf{p}^* \rangle - \langle \mathbf{z}(\mathbf{p}), \mathbf{p} \rangle = \langle \mathbf{z}(\mathbf{p}), \mathbf{p}^* - \mathbf{p} \rangle$. Then, variational stability condition requires the existence of a price vector $\mathbf{p}^* \in \mathcal{P}$, which in hindsight looks to the auctioneer like a more profitable price vector than any original price vector $\mathbf{p} \in \mathbb{R}_+^m$ it chose.

gives rise to a family of price adjustment processes parameterized by the kernel function h which we will call the *mirror extratâtonnement process* (Algorithm 2).

Remark 2 [Mirror *Extratâtonnement* is a Natural Price-Adjustment Process].

For the choice of a price space $\mathcal{P} \doteq [0, 1]^m$, and any choice of kernel function s.t. $h(\mathbf{p}) \doteq \sum_{j \in [m]} h_j(p_j)$ for some $\{h_j : \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}\}_{j \in [m]}$, the mirror *extratâtonnement* updates can be written for all commodities $j \in [m]$ and $t \in \mathbb{N}$ as: $p_j^{(t+0.5)} \leftarrow \arg \min_{p_j \in [0, 1]} \{z_j(\mathbf{p}^{(t)})(p_j^{(t)} - p_j) + \frac{1}{2\eta} \delta_{h_j}(p_j, p_j^{(t)})\}$, $p_j^{(t+1)} \leftarrow \arg \min_{p_j \in [0, 1]} \{z_j(\mathbf{p}^{(t+0.5)})(p_j^{(t)} - p_j) + \frac{1}{2\eta} \delta_{h_j}(p_j, p_j^{(t)})\}$. Now, multiplying the indices of the sequence of price iterates by 2, the mirror *extratâtonnement* process (Algorithm 2) can be interpreted as a natural price adjustment process which on odd time-steps applies a *tâtonnement* update on the current time-step's prices, and on even time-step applies a *tâtonnement* update on the *previous* time-step's prices. As such, the mirror *extratâtonnement* process is natural price adjustment process.

With the mirror *extratâtonnement* process, and Lemma 2 in hand, we can apply Theorem 3.1 to prove the convergence of the mirror *extratâtonnement* process (Algorithm 2).

Theorem 4.5 [Convergence of Mirror *Extratâtonnement*].

Let (m, \mathbf{z}) be a balanced economy. Consider the mirror *extratâtonnement* process run on (m, \mathbf{z}) , with a 1-strongly-convex and κ -Lipschitz-smooth kernel function h , any time horizon $t \in \mathbb{N}$, any step size $\eta > 0$, a price space $\mathcal{P} \doteq [0, 1]^m$, and any initial price vector $\mathbf{p}^{(0)} \in [0, 1]^m$, and let $\{\mathbf{p}^{(t)}, \mathbf{p}^{(t+0.5)}\}_t$ be the sequence of prices generated. Suppose that there exists $\lambda \in (0, \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\eta}}]$, s.t. $\frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{z}(\mathbf{p}^{(k+0.5)}) - \mathbf{z}(\mathbf{p}^{(k)})\|^2 \leq \lambda^2 \delta_h(\mathbf{p}^{(k+0.5)}, \mathbf{p}^{(k)})$.

Let $\mathbf{p}_{\text{best}}^{(\tau)} \in \arg \min_{\mathbf{p}^{(k+0.5)} : k=0, \dots, \tau} \delta_h(\mathbf{p}^{(k+0.5)}, \mathbf{p}^{(k)})$, then for some time horizon $\tau \in O(\frac{\kappa^2 m^2 \delta_h(\mathbf{0}_m, \mathbf{p}^{(0)})}{\eta^2 \varepsilon^2})$, $\mathbf{p}_{\text{best}}^{(\tau)}$ is a ε -Walrasian equilibrium. Further, we have that $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{p}^{(t+0.5)} = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{p}^{(t)} = \mathbf{p}^*$ is a Walrasian equilibrium.

The convergence guarantee provided by the above theorem is highly general, and does not require Lipschitz-continuity of the excess demand \mathbf{z} . Rather, the above theorem requires pathwise Bregman-continuity over price trajectories of the *extratâtonnement* process. This broad statement is purposeful as it is in general not possible to guarantee the Lipschitz-continuity of the excess demand at $\mathbf{p} = \mathbf{0}_m$ in balanced economies. Indeed, the only balanced economies with a Lipschitz-continuous excess demand function are those economies with a constant excess demand function.¹⁰ Nevertheless, while Lipschitz-continuity over $[0, 1]^m$ is too restrictive, Lipschitz continuity over paths of the mirror

¹⁰To see this, suppose that \mathbf{z} is λ -Lipschitz-continuous on $[0, 1]^m$, then by homogeneity of degree 0, we have for all $\alpha > 0$ and $\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q} \in [0, 1]^m$, $\|\mathbf{z}(\mathbf{p}) - \mathbf{z}(\mathbf{q})\| = \|\mathbf{z}(\alpha \mathbf{p}) - \mathbf{z}(\alpha \mathbf{q})\| \leq \lambda \alpha \|\mathbf{p} - \mathbf{q}\|$. Hence, taking $\alpha \rightarrow 0$, we have for all $\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q} \in [0, 1]^m$, $\mathbf{z}(\mathbf{q}) = \mathbf{z}(\mathbf{p})$.

extratâtonnement process (i.e., $\|z(\mathbf{p}^{(k+0.5)}) - z(\mathbf{p}^{(k)})\| \leq \lambda \|\mathbf{p}^{(k+0.5)} - \mathbf{p}^{(k)}\|$) seems to be a mild assumption that holds in a large class of Walrasian economies as we show in our experiments in Section 5.

While we leave the question open for future work, it seems likely that for choices of kernel functions h s.t. the associated Bregman divergence δ_h is not homogeneous of degree $\alpha > 0$ (i.e., for all $\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{R}_+^m$, $\alpha, \lambda > 0$ $\delta_h(\lambda \mathbf{p}, \lambda \mathbf{q}) \neq \lambda^\alpha \delta_h(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q})$), the following class of Walrasian economies seems to be likely to contain a large number of Walrasian economies. Given a modulus of continuity $\lambda \geq 0$, and a kernel function $h : \mathcal{P} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, a (λ, h) -Bregman-continuous economy on $\mathcal{P} \subseteq \mathbb{R}_+^m$ is a Walrasian economy (m, z) whose excess demand z (λ, h) -Bregman-continuous on \mathcal{P} .¹¹ With the definition in hand, we note the following corollary of Theorem 4.5.

Corollary 1 [Convergence of Mirror *Extratâtonnement* under Bregman Continuity].

Let (m, z) be a balanced economy which is (λ, h) -Bregman-continuous on $[0, 1]^m$. Consider the mirror *extratâtonnement* process run on (m, z) , with a 1-strongly-convex and κ -Lipschitz-smooth kernel function h , any time horizon $t \in \mathbb{N}$, any step size $\eta \in (0, \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\lambda}}]$, a price space $\mathcal{P} \doteq [0, 1]^m$, and any initial price vector $\mathbf{p}^{(0)} \in [0, 1]^m$, and let $\{\mathbf{p}^{(t)}, \mathbf{p}^{(t+0.5)}\}_t$ be the sequence of prices generated.

Let $\mathbf{p}_{\text{best}}^{(\tau)} \in \arg \min_{\mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)}: k=0, \dots, \tau} \delta_h(\mathbf{p}^{(k+0.5)}, \mathbf{p}^{(k)})$, then for some time horizon $\tau \in O(\frac{\kappa^2 m^2 \delta_h(\mathbf{0}_m, \mathbf{p}^{(0)})}{\eta^2 \varepsilon^2})$, $\mathbf{p}_{\text{best}}^{(\tau)}$ is a ε -Walrasian equilibrium. Further, we have that $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{p}^{(t+0.5)} = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{p}^{(t)} = \mathbf{p}^*$ is a Walrasian equilibrium.

While these convergences result are useful, it is not clear what types of excess demand functions satisfy Bregman-continuity. As a result, to characterize the Bregman-continuity properties of Walrasian economies we introduce the following economic parameters based on elasticity which have been extensively used in the analysis of algorithms for the computation of Walrasian equilibrium (see, for instance, Cole and Fleischer (2008)). Given any function $\mathbf{f} : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$, we define the *elasticity* $\epsilon_{f_j, p_k} : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ of output f_j w.r.t. input x_k between any two points $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ as the percentage change in f_j for a one percent change from x_k to y_k , i.e., $\epsilon_{f_j, x_k}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \doteq \frac{f_j(\mathbf{y}) - f_j(\mathbf{x})}{f_j(\mathbf{x})} \frac{x_k}{y_k - x_k}$. Given $\bar{\epsilon} \geq 0$, a $\bar{\epsilon}$ -elastic economy $(m, \mathbf{d}, \mathbf{s})$ is a Walrasian economy (m, z) which consists of an *aggregate demand function* $\mathbf{d} : \mathbb{R}_+^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+^m$ and *aggregate supply function* $\mathbf{s} : \mathbb{R}_+^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+^m$ s.t. we have $z(\mathbf{p}) \doteq \mathbf{d}(\mathbf{p}) - \mathbf{s}(\mathbf{p})$, and the following two

¹¹Bregman continuous functions have been introduced in recent years in the optimization literature and have been shown to contain a large number of important function classes which are not continuous (see, for instance, Lu (2019)). Note that when the kernel function h is chosen to be $h(\mathbf{p}) \doteq \frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{p}\|^2$, λ -Bregman-continuity reduces to λ -Lipschitz continuity. Further, the literature on algorithmic general equilibrium theory has considered variants of Bregman continuity to prove the polynomial-time convergence of the mirror tâtonnement process to Walrasian equilibria in restricted classes of Walrasian economies (see, for instance Cheung et al. (2013) and Cheung et al. (2018)). As such, Bregman continuity seems a natural assumption to prove the convergence of algorithms to a Walrasian equilibrium.

bounds hold:

$$\max_{\substack{\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{R}_+^m \\ j, k \in [m]}} |\epsilon_{d_j, p_k}(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q})| \leq \bar{\epsilon}, \quad \max_{\substack{\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{R}_+^m \\ j, k \in [m]}} |\epsilon_{s_j, p_k}(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q})| \leq \bar{\epsilon}$$

The following lemma provides intuition on conditions which ensures that a $\bar{\epsilon}$ -economy satisfy Bregman-continuity.

Lemma 3 [Bregman Continuity Bound for elastic economies].

Let $(m, \mathbf{d}, \mathbf{s})$ be an $\bar{\epsilon}$ -elastic economy, then for any 1-strongly-convex kernel function $h : \mathbb{R}_+^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, the following bound holds: $\frac{1}{2} \|z(\mathbf{q}) - z(\mathbf{p})\|^2 \leq \left(\frac{\epsilon(\|\mathbf{d}(\mathbf{p})\| + \|\mathbf{s}(\mathbf{p})\|)}{\|\mathbf{p}\|_\infty} \right)^2 \delta_h(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{p})$

Lemma 3 suggests that boundedness of the excess demand and a lower bound on the prices is sufficient to ensure the Bregman-continuity of the excess demand. Boundedness of the excess demand can be ensured in large class of Walrasian economies including Arrow-Debreu competitive economies (see, Lemma 10 in Appendix E). While it is not possible to ensure that prices are bounded from below when running the mirror extratâtonnement process with the price space $\mathcal{P} \doteq [0, 1]^m$, if we choose as a price space Δ_m , we can then obtain a Bregman continuity bound from the above lemma. Unfortunately, however balanced economies are not necessarily variationally stable on Δ_m , and as such to obtain a stronger convergence result, we have to restrict our attention to competitive economies which are variationally stable on Δ_m .¹² Unfortunately, as the price space $\mathcal{P} = \Delta_m$ does not include the zero vector $\mathbf{0}_m$ which ensures that balanced economies are variationally stable, the restriction of the price space to Δ_m effectively “destabilizes” the economy and makes computation of a Walrasian equilibrium intractable. As a result, to overcome this challenge we have to restrict the class of competitive economies to the class of competitive economies which are variationally stable on Δ_m .

To use Lemma 3 we have to ensure that the excess demand of the economy is bounded, which is a mild assumption which can be ensured to hold in all Arrow-Debreu competitive economies by bounding the consumption space of all consumers for any commodity by the maximum aggregate supply of each commodity. Formally, given $\bar{z} \geq 0$, a \bar{z} -bounded economy $(m, \mathbf{d}, \mathbf{s})$ is a Walrasian economy (m, \mathcal{Z}) which consists of an aggregate demand function $\mathbf{d} : \mathbb{R}_+^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+^m$ and an aggregate supply function $\mathbf{s} : \mathbb{R}_+^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+^m$ s.t. we have $z(\mathbf{p}) \doteq \mathbf{d}(\mathbf{p}) - \mathbf{s}(\mathbf{p})$ and the following bounds hold: $\|\mathbf{d}\|_\infty \leq \bar{z}$, $\|\mathbf{s}\|_\infty \leq \bar{z}$. In Lemma 10 (Appendix E), we prove that any Arrow-Debreu competitive economy (Arrow and Debreu, 1954) can be represented as a bounded continuous competitive economy, as such,

¹²In Appendix F, we discuss some important classes of Walrasian economies which are variationally stable on Δ_m . The class of Walrasian economies which are variationally stable on Δ_m include amongst others Walrasian economies whose excess demand satisfies the weak axiom of revealed preferences (WARP) (Definition 5, Appendix F), the weak gross substitutes (WGS) condition (Definition 4, Appendix F), and the law of supply and demand (Definition 3, Appendix F).

we note that this assumption is very mild. With this definition in place, we can now apply Lemma 3 to derive the polynomial-time convergence of the mirror extratâtonnement process as a direct corollary of Theorem 4.5.¹³

Theorem 4.6 [Mirror Extratâtonnement Convergence on the Unit Simplex].

Let (m, \mathbf{d}, s) be a $\bar{\epsilon}$ -elastic and \bar{z} -bounded balanced economy which is variationally stable on Δ_m , and let $\mathbf{p}^* \in \mathcal{WE}(m, \mathbf{d}, s)$ be any of its Walrasian equilibria. Consider the mirror *extratâtonnement* process run on (m, \mathbf{z}) , with a 1-strongly-convex and κ -Lipschitz-smooth kernel function h , any time horizon $t \in \mathbb{N}$, any step size $\eta \in (0, \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2m\epsilon\bar{z}}}]$, a price space $\mathcal{P} \doteq \Delta_m$, and any initial price vector $\mathbf{p}^{(0)} \in \Delta_m$, and let $\{\mathbf{p}^{(t)}, \mathbf{p}^{(t+0.5)}\}_t$ be the sequence of prices generated. The following convergence bound holds: $\min_{k=0, \dots, \tau} \max_{\mathbf{p} \in \Delta} \langle \mathbf{z}(\mathbf{p}^{(k+0.5)}), \mathbf{p} - \mathbf{p}^{(k+0.5)} \rangle \leq \frac{2\sqrt{2}(1+\kappa)}{\eta} \frac{\sqrt{\max_{\mathbf{p} \in \Delta} \delta_h(\mathbf{p}^*, \mathbf{p}^{(0)})}}{\sqrt{\tau}}$. Further, we have that $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{p}^{(t+0.5)} = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{p}^{(t)} = \mathbf{p}^*$ is a Walrasian equilibrium.

4.2.2 Mirror Extratâtonnement in Scarf Economies

One of the earliest negative and most discouraging results in the literature on price-adjustment processes is an example of a Walrasian economy provided by Herbert Scarf in which continuous-time tâtonnement is known to cycle around the Walrasian equilibrium of the economy, while discrete-time variants are known to spiral away from the equilibrium for any initial non-equilibrium price vector (Scarf, 1960). Formally, a *Scarf economy* $\mathbf{z}^{\text{scarf}}$ is a Walrasian economy $(3, \mathbf{z}^{\text{scarf}})$ with 3 goods for which the excess demand is singleton-valued and given by the function: $\mathbf{z}^{\text{scarf}}(\mathbf{p}) \doteq \left(\frac{p_1}{p_1+p_2} + \frac{p_3}{p_1+p_3} - 1, \frac{p_1}{p_1+p_2} + \frac{p_2}{p_2+p_3} - 1, \frac{p_2}{p_2+p_3} + \frac{p_3}{p_1+p_3} - 1 \right)$. As we show in Lemma 9 (Appendix D), the Scarf economy is variationally stable on any non-empty price space $\mathcal{P} \subseteq \mathbb{R}_+^3$, and Bregman-continuous on any price space bounded away from 0. With this in mind, we thus obtain the following corollary of Corollary 1.

Corollary 2 [Convergence of Mirror *Extratâtonnement* in Scarf Economies].

Let $\underline{p} \in (0, 1)$. Consider the mirror *extratâtonnement* process run on the Scarf economy $\mathbf{z}^{\text{scarf}}$, with a 1-strongly-convex and κ -Lipschitz-smooth kernel function h , any time horizon $t \in \mathbb{N}$, any step size $\eta \in (0, \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\lambda}}]$, a price space $\mathcal{P} \doteq [\underline{p}, 1]^3$, and any initial price vector $\mathbf{p}^{(0)} \in \mathcal{P}$, and let $\{\mathbf{p}^{(t)}, \mathbf{p}^{(t+0.5)}\}_t$ be the sequence of prices generated. Then, we have that $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{p}^{(t+0.5)} = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{p}^{(t)} = \mathbf{p}^*$ is a Walrasian equilibrium.

5 Experiments

In this section, we first apply the *tâtonnement* and mirror *extratâtonnement* process with kernel function $h(\mathbf{p}) \doteq \|\mathbf{p}\|^2$, first to solve the Scarf economy with the goal of illustrating the differing convergence behavior between the two

¹³Going beyond variationally stable competitive economies on Δ_m , the local convergence behavior of mirror *extratâtonnement* can similarly be obtained by applying Theorem 3.2, and replacing the assumption that the competitive economy is variationally stable with the assumption that the initial price iterate starts close enough to a price vector which is local weak solution of the VI $(\Delta_m, -\mathbf{z})$.

price-adjustment processes. We then apply the mirror *extratâtonnement* process with kernel function $h(\mathbf{p}) \doteq \|\mathbf{p}\|^2$ to solve a number of Arrow-Debreu exchange economies (Arrow and Debreu, 1954) with the goal of demonstrating that our pathwise Bregman-continuity assumption holds, and that the mirror *extratâtonnement* process can efficiently solve very large Walrasian economies in practice.

We record in the first 2 leftmost

plots of Figure 1 the movement

of prices in the Scarf economy

for the *tâtonnement* and mirror *ex-*

tratâtonnement processes respec-

tively. As is well-established, the

sequence of prices generated by

tâtonnement, despite starting very

close to the equilibrium prices

$(1/3, 1/3, 1/3)$ spiral away from the

prices, converging to the $(0, 0, 1)$

price vector which is not a Wal-

rasian equilibrium. In contrast,

the prices generated by the mirror

extratâtonnement process spiral

inwards towards the equilibrium price despite starting far way from the equilibrium prices. An intuitive explanation of

this behavior is as follows, the continuous-time variant of *tâtonnement* is known to cycle around the equilibrium prices

(Scarf, 1960). Now, one way to intepret the discrete-time *tâtonnement* (resp. mirror *extratâtonnement*) process is as an

explicit (resp. implicit) discretization (Butcher, 2008) of the continuous-time *tâtonnement* dynamics. A well-known

fact is that explicit (resp. implicit) discretization methods are unstable (resp. stable) when the continuous-time

dynamics cycle, thus explaining the observed behavior.

An Arrow-Debreu exchange economy $(n, m, \mathcal{X}, \mathbf{e}, \mathbf{u})$ consists of $m \in \mathbb{N}$ commodities, $n \in \mathbb{N}$ consumers each $i \in [n]$

with a consumption space \mathcal{X}_i , an endowment of commodities $\mathbf{e}_i \in \mathbb{R}_+^m$, and a utility function $u_i : \mathcal{X}_i \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. An

Table 1: Summary of Setups for Arrow-Debreu Exchange Economy Experiments

| Exp No. | Num. Comm. | Num. Linear Cons. | Num. Cobb -Doug. Cons. | Num. CES $\rho \in (0, 1)$ Cons. | Num. CES $\rho < 0$ Cons. | Num. Leont. Cons. |
|------------|---------------|-------------------------|---------------------------------|---|------------------------------------|-------------------------|
| 1 | 500 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 600 |
| 2 | 500 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 600 | 0 |
| 3 | 500 | 0 | 0 | 600 | 0 | 0 |
| 4 | 500 | 0 | 600 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5 | 500 | 600 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 6 | 1000 | 200 | 200 | 200 | 200 | 200 |
| 7 | 1000 | 0 | 200 | 200 | 200 | 200 |

Arrow-Debreu exchange economy $(n, m, \mathcal{X}, e, \mathbf{u})$ can be represented as a bounded continuous competitive economy

$$(m, \mathcal{Z}) \text{ where the excess demand correspondence is given as: } \mathcal{Z}(\mathbf{p}) \doteq \sum_{i \in [n]} \arg \max_{\mathbf{x}_i \in \mathcal{X}_i: \mathbf{x}_i \cdot \mathbf{p} \leq e_i \cdot \mathbf{p}} u_i(\mathbf{x}_i) - \sum_{i \in [n]} e_i. \quad 14$$




Figure 1: Phase Portraits of *Tâtonnement*, and *Extratâtonnement* for the Scarf Economy, and Results of Experiments 1-7.

We consider the following utility function classes to run our experiments: 1. linear: $u_i(\mathbf{x}_i) = \sum_{j \in [m]} v_{ij} x_{ij}$; 2. Cobb-Douglas: $u_i(\mathbf{x}_i) = \prod_{j \in [m]} x_{ij}^{v_{ij}}$; 3. Leontief: $u_i(\mathbf{x}_i) = \min_{j \in [m]} \{x_{ij}/v_{ij}\}$; and 4. CES: $u_i(\mathbf{x}_i) = \sqrt[\rho_i]{\sum_{j \in [m]} v_{ij} x_{ij}^{\rho_i}}$ with each utility function parameterized by a vector of valuations $\mathbf{v}_i \in \mathbb{R}_+^n$, where each v_{ij} quantifies the value of commodity j to consumer i . We summarize the experiments we run in Table 1. The parameters of each economy are initialized randomly according to the uniform random distribution.¹⁵ We record the results of our experiments in Figure 1, describing for what value of $\varepsilon \geq 0$, are the prices generated throughout the algorithm a ε -Walrasian equilibrium.

¹⁴We refer the reader to Appendix E on additional background and definitions on Arrow-Debreu exchange economies.

¹⁵For reproducibility purposes, we include our code ready to run on <https://anonymous.4open.science/r/extratatonnement-E024/README.md>, and include all details of our experimental setup in Appendix G.

We observe that in all our experiments except in experiments 5 and 6—which include Linear consumers and are as such not covered by our theory as the excess demand for the economies is not singleton-valued—the mirror *extratâtonnement* process converges to a Walrasian equilibrium. In all experiments, we verify and confirm that pathwise Bregman-continuity holds, thus justifying our assumption. Finally, while our experiments obey our theory which suggests a best-iterate convergence to a ε -Walrasian equilibrium in $1/\varepsilon^2$ time-steps, we observe that a last-iterate convergence occurs only for experiments 5, corresponding to the case of Cobb-Douglas consumers, for which even *tâtonnement* is known to converge in last-iterates. This suggests that achieve convergence in last iterates might not be possible with the mirror *extratâtonnement* process.

6 Conclusion

Our work introduces the mirror extragradient algorithm as a powerful computational tool for solving variational inequalities, extending existing results to constrained domains and establishing polynomial-time convergence under suitable conditions. By leveraging this framework, we provide the first computationally tractable characterization of Walrasian equilibria in balanced economies and introduce the mirror *extratâtonnement* process, which converges efficiently even in challenging cases like the Scarf economy. Our theoretical insights and empirical validation suggest that computational intractability in general equilibrium is largely a consequence of discontinuities rather than fundamental hardness, offering a new perspective on Scarf’s long-standing challenge in applied general equilibrium theory.

References

- Sydney N Afriat. The construction of utility functions from expenditure data. *International economic review*, 8(1): 67–77, 1967. (Cited on pages 2 and 68.)
- Gabriel Andrade, Rafael Frongillo, Sharadha Srinivasan, and Elliot Gorokhovskiy. Graphical economies with resale. *Proceedings of the 22nd ACM Conference on Economics and Computation*, Jul 2021. doi: 10.1145/3465456.3467628. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1145/3465456.3467628>. (Cited on page 39.)
- Kazeem Olalekan Aremu, Muhammed Ibrahim Mona, and Muhammad Ibrahim. A modified self-adaptive inertial tseng algorithm for solving a quasimonotone variational inequality and fixed point problems in real hilbert space. *The Journal of Analysis*, pages 1–22, 2024. (Cited on page 40.)
- Kenneth Arrow and Gerard Debreu. Existence of an equilibrium for a competitive economy. *Econometrica: Journal of the Econometric Society*, pages 265–290, 1954. (Cited on pages 2, 5, 14, 15, 16, 17, 22, 24, 64, and 65.)
- Kenneth J. Arrow and Leonid Hurwicz. On the stability of the competitive equilibrium, i. *Econometrica*, 26(4): 522–552, 1958. ISSN 00129682, 14680262. URL <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1907515>. (Cited on pages 2, 15, 18, 39, and 68.)
- Kenneth J Arrow and Leonid Hurwicz. Competitive stability under weak gross substitutability: The " euclidean distance" approach. *International Economic Review*, 1(1):38–49, 1960. (Cited on page 2.)
- Kenneth J. Arrow and Timothy J. Kehoe. Distinguished fellow: Herbert scarf’s contributions to economics. *The Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 8(4):161–181, 1994. ISSN 08953309. URL <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2138344>. (Cited on page 3.)
- Kenneth J. Arrow, Leonid Hurwicz, and Hirofumi Uzawa. *Studies in Linear and Non-Linear Programming*, volume 2 of *Stanford Mathematical Studies in the Social Sciences*. Stanford University Press, Redwood City, California, 1958. (Cited on page 39.)
- Kenneth J Arrow, Henry D Block, and Leonid Hurwicz. On the stability of the competitive equilibrium, ii. *Econometrica: Journal of the Econometric Society*, pages 82–109, 1959. (Cited on pages 2 and 68.)
- Alfred Auslender and Marc Teboulle. Interior projection-like methods for monotone variational inequalities. *Mathematical programming*, 104(1):39–68, 2005. (Cited on page 40.)

- Didier Aussel and Parin Chaipunya. Variational and quasi-variational inequalities under local reproducibility: solution concept and applications. *Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications*, 203(2):1531–1563, 2024. (Cited on pages 13 and 47.)
- Yves Balasko. Some results on uniqueness and on stability of equilibrium in general equilibrium theory. *Journal of Mathematical Economics*, 2(2):95–118, 1975. (Cited on page 2.)
- Aharon Ben-Tal, Laurent El Ghaoui, and Arkadi Nemirovski. *Robust optimization*, volume 28. Princeton university press, 2009. (Cited on page 39.)
- Claude Berge. *Topological Spaces: including a treatment of multi-valued functions, vector spaces, and convexity*. Courier Corporation, 1997. (Cited on page 67.)
- Mathieu Blondel, Quentin Berthet, Marco Cuturi, Roy Frostig, Stephan Hoyer, Felipe Llinares-López, Fabian Pedregosa, and Jean-Philippe Vert. Efficient and modular implicit differentiation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2105.15183*, 2021. (Cited on page 70.)
- Stephen Boyd, Stephen P Boyd, and Lieven Vandenberghe. *Convex optimization*. Cambridge university press, 2004. (Cited on page 38.)
- James Bradbury, Roy Frostig, Peter Hawkins, Matthew James Johnson, Chris Leary, Dougal Maclaurin, George Necula, Adam Paszke, Jake VanderPlas, Skye Wanderman-Milne, and Qiao Zhang. JAX: composable transformations of Python+NumPy programs, 2018. URL <http://github.com/google/jax>. (Cited on page 70.)
- William C Brainard, Herbert E Scarf, et al. *How to compute equilibrium prices in 1891*. Citeseer, 2000. (Cited on page 37.)
- Simina Brânzei, Nikhil Devanur, and Yuval Rabani. Proportional dynamics in exchange economies. In *Proceedings of the 22nd ACM Conference on Economics and Computation*, pages 180–201, 2021. (Cited on page 38.)
- Haim Brezis and Haim Brezis. *Functional analysis, Sobolev spaces and partial differential equations*, volume 2. Springer, 2011. (Cited on page 39.)
- Haim Brezis and Moïse Sibony. Méthodes d’approximation et d’itération pour les opérateurs monotones. In *Numerical Analysis of Partial Differential Equations*, pages 407–439. Springer, 2011. (Cited on page 39.)
- Felix E Browder. Nonlinear monotone operators and convex sets in banach spaces. *Bulletin of the American Mathematical Society*, 71(5):780–785, 1965. (Cited on page 39.)

- J. C. Butcher. *Numerical Methods for Ordinary Differential Equations*. John Wiley & Sons, 2nd edition, 2008. ISBN 9780470753751. (Cited on page 24.)
- Yang Cai, Argyris Oikonomou, and Weiqiang Zheng. Tight last-iterate convergence of the extragradient method for constrained monotone variational inequalities. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2204.09228*, 2022. (Cited on pages 11, 12, 39, and 40.)
- Augustin Cauchy et al. Méthode générale pour la résolution des systemes d'équations simultanées. *Comp. Rend. Sci. Paris*, 25(1847):536–538, 1847. (Cited on pages 11 and 39.)
- Augustin-Louis Cauchy. *Cours d'Analyse de l'École Royale Polytechnique*. Debure, Paris, 1821. In French. Contains the first formal appearance of what is now the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality. (Cited on page 43.)
- Yair Censor, Aviv Gibali, and Simeon Reich. Strong convergence of subgradient extragradient methods for the variational inequality problem in hilbert space. *Optimization Methods and Software*, 26(4-5):827–845, 2011. (Cited on page 40.)
- Xi Chen and Shang-Hua Teng. Spending is not easier than trading: on the computational equivalence of Fisher and Arrow-Debreu equilibria. In *International Symposium on Algorithms and Computation*, pages 647–656. Springer, 2009. (Cited on page 2.)
- Yun Kuen Cheung and Richard Cole. Amortized analysis of asynchronous price dynamics. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1806.10952*, 2018. (Cited on page 38.)
- Yun Kuen Cheung, Richard Cole, and Ashish Rastogi. Tatonnement in ongoing markets of complementary goods. In *Proceedings of the 13th ACM Conference on Electronic Commerce*, pages 337–354, 2012. (Cited on pages 37 and 38.)
- Yun Kuen Cheung, Richard Cole, and Nikhil Devanur. Tatonnement beyond gross substitutes? gradient descent to the rescue. In *Proceedings of the Forty-Fifth Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*, STOC '13, page 191–200, New York, NY, USA, 2013. Association for Computing Machinery. ISBN 9781450320290. doi: 10.1145/2488608.2488633. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/2488608.2488633>. (Cited on pages 2, 12, 18, 21, 37, and 38.)
- Yun Kuen Cheung, Richard Cole, and Yixin Tao. Dynamics of distributed updating in Fisher markets. In *Proceedings of the 2018 ACM Conference on Economics and Computation*, pages 351–368, 2018. (Cited on pages 2, 21, and 38.)

- Yun Kuen Cheung, Martin Hoefer, and Paresh Nakhe. Tracing equilibrium in dynamic markets via distributed adaptation. In *Proceedings of the 18th International Conference on Autonomous Agents and MultiAgent Systems*, pages 1225–1233, 2019. (Cited on page 38.)
- Bruno Codenotti, Benton McCune, and Kasturi Varadarajan. Market equilibrium via the excess demand function. In *Proceedings of the thirty-seventh annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing*, pages 74–83, 2005. (Cited on pages 2, 4, and 7.)
- Bruno Codenotti, Amin Saberi, Kasturi Varadarajan, and Yinyu Ye. Leontief economies encode nonzero sum two-player games. In *SODA*, volume 6, pages 659–667, 2006. (Cited on pages 2 and 5.)
- Richard Cole and Lisa Fleischer. Fast-converging tatonnement algorithms for one-time and ongoing market problems. In *Proceedings of the fortieth annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing*, pages 315–324, 2008. (Cited on pages 2, 21, 37, and 38.)
- Richard Cole, Lisa Fleischer, and Ashish Rastogi. Discrete price updates yield fast convergence in ongoing markets with finite warehouses, 2010. (Cited on page 37.)
- Richard W. Cottle and George B. Dantzig. Complementary pivot theory of mathematical programming. *Linear Algebra and Its Applications*, 1(1):103–125, 1968. (Cited on page 15.)
- Stella Dafermos. Exchange price equilibria and variational inequalities. *Mathematical Programming*, 46(1):391–402, 1990. (Cited on pages 6 and 15.)
- Gerard Debreu. Excess demand functions. *Journal of mathematical economics*, 1(1):15–21, 1974. (Cited on pages 15 and 16.)
- Gerard Debreu et al. Representation of a preference ordering by a numerical function. *Decision processes*, 3:159–165, 1954. (Cited on page 64.)
- Xiaotie Deng and Ye Du. The computation of approximate competitive equilibrium is ppad-hard. *Information Processing Letters*, 108(6):369–373, 2008. (Cited on page 5.)
- N. R. Devanur, C. H. Papadimitriou, A. Saberi, and V. V. Vazirani. Market equilibrium via a primal-dual-type algorithm. In *The 43rd Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, 2002. Proceedings.*, pages 389–395, 2002. doi: 10.1109/SFCS.2002.1181963. (Cited on page 37.)
- Nikhil R Devanur, Christos H Papadimitriou, Amin Saberi, and Vijay V Vazirani. Market equilibrium via a primal–dual algorithm for a convex program. *Journal of the ACM (JACM)*, 55(5):1–18, 2008. (Cited on pages 37 and 38.)

- Jelena Diakonikolas. Halpern iteration for near-optimal and parameter-free monotone inclusion and strong solutions to variational inequalities. In *Conference on Learning Theory*, pages 1428–1451. PMLR, 2020. (Cited on pages 39 and 40.)
- Vu Tien Dung, Pham Ky Anh, and Duong Viet Thong. Convergence of two-step inertial tseng’s extragradient methods for quasimonotone variational inequality problem. *Communications in Nonlinear Science and Numerical Simulation*, page 108110, 2024. (Cited on page 40.)
- Edmund Eisenberg. Aggregation of utility functions. *Management Science*, 7(4):337–350, 1961. (Cited on page 37.)
- Francisco Facchinei and Jong-Shi Pang. *Finite-dimensional variational inequalities and complementarity problems*. Springer, 2003. (Cited on pages 9, 10, 16, 39, and 58.)
- Jesús Fernández-Villaverde. *Computational Methods for Macroeconomics*. University of Pennsylvania, 2023. URL <https://www.sas.upenn.edu/~jesusfv/teaching.html>. Lecture notes for one-year course on computational methods for economists. (Cited on page 4.)
- Franklin M Fisher. The stability of general equilibrium: Results and problems. 1976), *Essays in Economic Analysis: Proceedings of the Association of University Teachers of Economics Sheffield*, pages 3–29, 1975. (Cited on page 3.)
- Yuan Gao and Christian Kroer. First-order methods for large-scale market equilibrium computation. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33:21738–21750, 2020. (Cited on page 38.)
- Jugal Garg and Ravi Kannan. Markets with production: A polynomial time algorithm and a reduction to pure exchange. In *Proceedings of the Sixteenth ACM Conference on Economics and Computation*, pages 733–749, 2015. (Cited on page 65.)
- John Geanakoplos. An introduction to general equilibrium with incomplete asset markets. *Journal of mathematical economics*, 19(1-2):1–38, 1990. (Cited on page 4.)
- Gauthier Gidel, Hugo Berard, Gaetan Vignoud, Pascal Vincent, and Simon Lacoste-Julien. A variational inequality perspective on generative adversarial networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1802.10551*, 2018. (Cited on page 40.)
- Benjamin J Gillen, Masayoshi Hirota, Ming Hsu, Charles R Plott, and Brian W Rogers. Divergence and convergence in scarf cycle environments: experiments and predictability in the dynamics of general equilibrium systems. *Economic Theory*, pages 1–52, 2020. (Cited on pages 2 and 37.)
- Noah Golowich, Sarath Pattathil, and Constantinos Daskalakis. Tight last-iterate convergence rates for no-regret learning in multi-player games. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 33:20766–20778, 2020a. (Cited on page 40.)

- Noah Golowich, Sarath Pattathil, Constantinos Daskalakis, and Asuman E. Ozdaglar. Last iterate is slower than averaged iterate in smooth convex-concave saddle point problems. *CoRR*, abs/2002.00057, 2020b. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2002.00057>. (Cited on page 12.)
- Ian Goodfellow, Jean Pouget-Abadie, Mehdi Mirza, Bing Xu, David Warde-Farley, Sherjil Ozair, Aaron Courville, and Yoshua Bengio. Generative adversarial nets. In Z. Ghahramani, M. Welling, C. Cortes, N. Lawrence, and K.Q. Weinberger, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 27. Curran Associates, Inc., 2014. URL <https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper/2014/file/5ca3e9b122f61f8f06494c97b1afccf3-Paper.pdf>. (Cited on page 39.)
- Eduard Gorbunov, Nicolas Loizou, and Gauthier Gidel. Extragradient method: $O(1/k)$ last-iterate convergence for monotone variational inequalities and connections with cocoercivity. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 366–402. PMLR, 2022a. (Cited on page 40.)
- Eduard Gorbunov, Adrien Taylor, and Gauthier Gidel. Last-iterate convergence of optimistic gradient method for monotone variational inequalities. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 35:21858–21870, 2022b. (Cited on page 40.)
- Giuseppe Grioli. Proprietà variazionali nella meccanica dei continui. nota i. *Atti della Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei. Classe di Scienze Fisiche, Matematiche e Naturali. Rendiconti*, 54(5):755–760, 1973. (Cited on page 39.)
- Charles R. Harris, K. Jarrod Millman, Stéfan J van der Walt, Ralf Gommers, Pauli Virtanen, David Cournapeau, Eric Wieser, Julian Taylor, Sebastian Berg, Nathaniel J. Smith, Robert Kern, Matti Picus, Stephan Hoyer, Marten H. van Kerkwijk, Matthew Brett, Allan Haldane, Jaime Fernandez del Rio, Mark Wiebe, Pearu Peterson, Pierre Gérard-Marchant, Kevin Sheppard, Tyler Reddy, Warren Weckesser, Hameer Abbasi, Christoph Gohlke, and Travis E. Oliphant. Array programming with NumPy. *Nature*, 585:357–362, 2020. doi: 10.1038/s41586-020-2649-2. (Cited on page 70.)
- Philip Hartman and Guido Stampacchia. On some non-linear elliptic differential-functional equations. 1966. (Cited on page 39.)
- Bingsheng He, Shengjie Xu, and Xiaoming Yuan. On convergence of the arrow–hurwicz method for saddle point problems. *Journal of Mathematical Imaging and Vision*, 64(6):662–671, 2022. (Cited on pages 39 and 40.)
- Yiran He. Solvability of the minty variational inequality. *Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications*, 174:686–692, 2017. (Cited on pages 10, 68, and 69.)

- P Jean-Jacques Herings. A globally and universally stable price adjustment process. *Journal of Mathematical Economics*, 27(2):163–193, 1997. (Cited on page 3.)
- Kevin Huang and Shuzhong Zhang. An approximation-based regularized extra-gradient method for monotone variational inequalities. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.04440*, 2022. (Cited on page 39.)
- Kevin Huang and Shuzhong Zhang. Beyond monotone variational inequalities: Solution methods and iteration complexities. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.04153*, 2023. (Cited on pages 6 and 12.)
- J. D. Hunter. Matplotlib: A 2d graphics environment. *Computing in Science and Engineering*, 9(3):90–95, 2007. doi: 10.1109/MCSE.2007.55. (Cited on page 70.)
- Kamal Jain, Vijay V Vazirani, and Yinyu Ye. Market equilibria for homothetic, quasi-concave utilities and economies of scale in production. In *SODA*, volume 5, pages 63–71, 2005. (Cited on pages 2 and 37.)
- Shweta Jain, Narayanaswamy Balakrishnan, Yadati Narahari, Saiful A Hussain, and Nyuk Yoong Voo. Constrained tâtonnement for fast and incentive compatible distributed demand management in smart grids. In *Proceedings of the fourth international conference on Future energy systems*, pages 125–136, 2013. (Cited on page 4.)
- Sham M Kakade, Michael Kearns, and Luis E Ortiz. Graphical economics. In *COLT*, pages 17–32. Springer, 2004. (Cited on page 38.)
- Kazuya Kamiya. A globally stable price adjustment process. *Econometrica: Journal of the Econometric Society*, pages 1481–1485, 1990. (Cited on page 3.)
- Bruce M Kapron and Koosha Samieefar. The computational complexity of variational inequalities and applications in game theory. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2411.04392*, 2024. (Cited on page 13.)
- Galina M Korpelevich. The extragradient method for finding saddle points and other problems. *Matecon*, 12:747–756, 1976. (Cited on pages 6 and 39.)
- Stefanos Leonardos, Barnabé Monnot, Daniël Reijnsbergen, Efstratios Skoulakis, and Georgios Piliouras. Dynamical analysis of the eip-1559 ethereum fee market. In *Proceedings of the 3rd ACM Conference on Advances in Financial Technologies*, pages 114–126, 2021. (Cited on page 4.)
- Tianyi Lin and Michael I. Jordan. Perseus: A simple high-order regularization method for variational inequalities. *ArXiv*, abs/2205.03202, 2022. URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:248562799>. (Cited on page 40.)

- Jacques-Louis Lions and Guido Stampacchia. Variational inequalities. *Communications on pure and applied mathematics*, 20(3):493–519, 1967. (Cited on pages 9 and 39.)
- Mingrui Liu, Hassan Rafique, Qihang Lin, and Tianbao Yang. First-order convergence theory for weakly-convex-weakly-concave min-max problems. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 22(1):7651–7684, 2021. (Cited on pages 11 and 40.)
- Yulin Liu, Yuxuan Lu, Kartik Nayak, Fan Zhang, Luyao Zhang, and Yinhong Zhao. Empirical analysis of eip-1559: Transaction fees, waiting time, and consensus security. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2201.05574*, 2022. (Cited on page 4.)
- Nicolas Loizou, Hugo Berard, Gauthier Gidel, Ioannis Mitliagkas, and Simon Lacoste-Julien. Stochastic gradient descent-ascent and consensus optimization for smooth games: Convergence analysis under expected co-coercivity. *CoRR*, abs/2107.00052, 2021. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2107.00052>. (Cited on page 40.)
- Haihao Lu. “relative continuity” for non-lipschitz nonsmooth convex optimization using stochastic (or deterministic) mirror descent. *INFORMS Journal on Optimization*, 1(4):288–303, 2019. (Cited on pages 5, 9, and 21.)
- George J Minty. On the generalization of a direct method of the calculus of variations. 1967. (Cited on pages 4 and 9.)
- Arkadi Nemirovski. Prox-method with rate of convergence $o(1/t)$ for variational inequalities with lipschitz continuous monotone operators and smooth convex-concave saddle point problems. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 15(1):229–251, 2004. (Cited on pages 12 and 40.)
- Arkadij Semenovic Nemirovskij and David Borisovich Yudin. Problem complexity and method efficiency in optimization. 1983. (Cited on page 11.)
- Yurii Nesterov. Introductory lectures on convex programming volume i: Basic course. *Lecture notes*, 3(4):5, 1998. (Cited on page 39.)
- Hukukane Nikaidô and Hirofumi Uzawa. Stability and non-negativity in a walrasian tatonnement process. *International Economic Review*, 1(1):50–59, 1960. (Cited on page 2.)
- Noam Nisan and Tim Roughgarden. *Algorithmic Game Theory*. Cambridge University Press, 2007. doi: 10.1017/CBO9780511800481. (Cited on page 37.)
- Austine Efut Ofem, Akindele Adebayo Mebawondu, Godwin Chidi Ugwunnadi, Huseyin Isik, and Ojen Kumar Narain. A modified subgradient extragradient algorithm-type for solving quasimonotone variational inequality problems with applications. *Journal of Inequalities and Applications*, 2023(1):73, 2023. (Cited on page 40.)

- Christos H Papadimitriou and Mihalis Yannakakis. An impossibility theorem for price-adjustment mechanisms. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 107(5):1854–1859, 2010. (Cited on pages 4, 5, and 17.)
- Leonid Denisovich Popov. A modification of the arrow-hurwitz method of search for saddle points. *Mat. Zametki*, 28(5):777–784, 1980. (Cited on pages 12 and 39.)
- Daniël Reijsbergen, Shyam Sridhar, Barnabé Monnot, Stefanos Leonardos, Stratis Skoulakis, and Georgios Piliouras. Transaction fees on a honeymoon: Ethereum’s eip-1559 one month later. In *2021 IEEE International Conference on Blockchain (Blockchain)*, pages 196–204. IEEE, 2021. (Cited on page 4.)
- Thomas J Sargent and Lars Ljungqvist. Recursive macroeconomic theory. *Massachusetts Institute of Technology*, 2000. (Cited on page 4.)
- Herbert Scarf. Some examples of global instability of the competitive equilibrium. *International Economic Review*, 1(3):157–172, 1960. ISSN 00206598, 14682354. URL <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2556215>. (Cited on pages 3, 18, 23, and 24.)
- Herbert Scarf. The approximation of fixed points of a continuous mapping. *SIAM Journal on Applied Mathematics*, 15(5):1328–1343, 1967a. (Cited on page 3.)
- Herbert E Scarf. On the computation of equilibrium prices. 1967b. (Cited on page 3.)
- Herbert E Scarf. The computation of equilibrium prices: an exposition. *Handbook of mathematical economics*, 2: 1007–1061, 1982. (Cited on page 3.)
- Herbert E Scarf and Terje Boye Hansen. The computation of economic equilibria. *A Cowles Foundation Monograph*, 1973. (Cited on page 3.)
- Hermann Amandus Schwarz. Über einige abhängigkeiten zwischen den werteigen einer function und deren ableitungen. *Journal für die reine und angewandte Mathematik*, 98:159–181, 1884. In German. Expands the inequality in the context of integrals and inner product spaces. (Cited on page 43.)
- Steve Smale. A convergent process of price adjustment and global newton methods. *Journal of Mathematical Economics*, 3(2):107–120, 1976. (Cited on page 3.)
- Mikhail V Solodov and Benar F Svaiter. A hybrid approximate extragradient–proximal point algorithm using the enlargement of a maximal monotone operator. *Set-Valued Analysis*, 7(4):323–345, 1999. (Cited on page 40.)
- Hugo Sonnenschein. Market excess demand functions. *Econometrica: Journal of the Econometric Society*, pages 549–563, 1972. (Cited on page 16.)

- John B Taylor and Michael Woodford. *Handbook of macroeconomics*, volume 1. Elsevier, 1999. (Cited on page 4.)
- Duong Viet Thong, Dang Van Hieu, and Themistocles M Rassias. Self adaptive inertial subgradient extragradient algorithms for solving pseudomonotone variational inequality problems. *Optimization Letters*, 14(1):115–144, 2020. (Cited on page 40.)
- Hirofumi Uzawa. Walras' tatonnement in the theory of exchange. *The Review of Economic Studies*, 27(3):182–194, 1960. (Cited on page 2.)
- Victor Amarachi Uzor, Timilehin Opeyemi Alakoya, Oluwatosin Temitope Mewomo, and Aviv Gibali. Solving quasimonotone and non-monotone variational inequalities. *Mathematical Methods of Operations Research*, 98(3): 461–498, 2023. (Cited on page 40.)
- Gerard van der Laan, AJJ Talman, et al. A convergent price adjustment process. *Economics Letters*, 23(2):119–123, 1987. (Cited on page 3.)
- Guido Van Rossum and Fred L Drake Jr. *Python tutorial*. Centrum voor Wiskunde en Informatica Amsterdam, The Netherlands, 1995. (Cited on page 70.)
- Leon Walras. *Elements de l'economie politique pure, ou, Theorie de la richesse sociale*. F. Rouge, 1896. (Cited on pages 1, 2, 14, and 18.)
- WY Wang and BB Ma. Extragradient type projection algorithm for solving quasimonotone variational inequalities. *Optimization*, 73(8):2639–2655, 2024. (Cited on page 40.)
- Fang Wu and Li Zhang. Proportional response dynamics leads to market equilibrium. In *Proceedings of the Thirty-Ninth Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing, STOC '07*, page 354–363, New York, NY, USA, 2007. Association for Computing Machinery. ISBN 9781595936318. doi: 10.1145/1250790.1250844. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/1250790.1250844>. (Cited on page 38.)
- Hui Zhang and Yu-Hong Dai. Mirror frameworks for relatively lipschitz and monotone-like variational inequalities. *Journal of the Operations Research Society of China*, pages 1–31, 2023. (Cited on page 6.)
- Li Zhang. Proportional response dynamics in the Fisher market. *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 412(24):2691–2698, May 2011. ISSN 0304-3975. doi: 10.1016/j.tcs.2010.06.021. URL <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tcs.2010.06.021>. (Cited on page 38.)

A Related Works

Algorithms for Walrasian Economies A detailed inquiry into the computational properties of market equilibria was initiated by [Devanur et al. \(2008\)](#), who studied a special case of the Arrow-Debreu competitive economy known as the *Fisher market* ([Brainard et al., 2000](#)). This model, for which Irving Fisher computed equilibrium prices using a hydraulic machine in the 1890s, is essentially the Arrow-Debreu model of a competitive economy, but there are no firms, and buyers are endowed with only one type of commodity—hereafter good¹⁶—an artificial currency ([Brainard et al., 2000](#); [Nisan and Roughgarden, 2007](#)). [Devanur et al. \(2002\)](#) exploited a connection first made by [Eisenberg \(1961\)](#) between the *Eisenberg-Gale program* and Walrasian equilibrium to solve Fisher markets assuming buyers with linear utility functions, thereby providing a (centralized) polynomial-time algorithm for equilibrium computation in these markets ([Devanur et al., 2002](#); [Devanur et al., 2008](#)). Their work was built upon by [Jain et al. \(2005\)](#), who extended the Eisenberg-Gale program to all Fisher markets in which buyers have *continuous, quasi-concave, and homogeneous* utility functions, and proved that the equilibrium of Fisher markets with such buyers can be computed in polynomial time by interior point methods.

Concurrent with this line of work on computing Walrasian equilibrium using centralized methods, a line of work on devising and proving convergence guarantees for price-adjustment processes (i.e., iterative algorithms that update prices according to a predetermined update rule) developed. This literature has focused on devising *natural* price-adjustment processes, like *tâtonnement*, which might explain or imitate the movement of prices in real-world markets. In addition to imitating the law of supply and demand, *tâtonnement* has been observed to replicate the movement of prices in lab experiments, where participants are given endowments and asked to trade with one another ([Gillen et al., 2020](#)). Perhaps more importantly, the main premise of research on the stability of Walrasian equilibrium in computer science is that for Walrasian equilibrium to be justified, not only should it be backed by a natural price-adjustment process as economists have long argued, but it should also be computationally efficient ([Nisan and Roughgarden, 2007](#)).

Another line of work considers price-adjustment processes in variants of Fisher markets. [Cole and Fleischer \(2008\)](#) analyzed *tâtonnement* in a real-world-like model satisfying WGS called the ongoing market model. In this model, *tâtonnement* once-again converges in polynomial-time ([Cole and Fleischer, 2008](#); [Cole et al., 2010](#)), and it has the advantage that it can be seen as an abstraction for market processes. [Cole and Fleischer](#)'s results were later extended by [Cheung et al. \(2012\)](#) to ongoing markets with *weak gross complements*, i.e., the excess demand of any commodity

¹⁶In the context of Fisher markets, commodities are typically referred to as goods ([Cheung et al., 2013](#)), as Fisher markets are often analyzed for a single time period only. More generally, in Arrow-Debreu markets, where commodities vary by time, location, or state of the world, "an apple today" may be different than "an apple tomorrow". For consistency with the literature, we refer to commodities as goods.

weakly increases if the price of any other commodity weakly decreases, fixing all other prices, and ongoing markets with a mix of WGC and WGS commodities. The ongoing market model these two papers study contains as a special case the Fisher market; however [Cole and Fleischer \(2008\)](#) assume bounded own-price elasticity of Marshallian demand, and bounded income elasticity of Marshallian demand, while [Cheung et al. \(2012\)](#) assume, in addition to [Cole and Fleischer](#)'s assumptions, bounded adversarial market elasticity, which can be seen as a variant of bounded cross-price elasticity of Marshallian demand, from below. With these assumptions, these results cover Fisher markets with a small range of the well-known CES utilities, including CES Fisher markets with $\rho \in [0, 1)$ and WGC Fisher markets with $\rho \in (-1, 0]$.

[Cheung et al. \(2013\)](#) built on this work by establishing the convergence of *tâtonnement* in polynomial time in nested CES Fisher markets, excluding the limiting cases of linear and Leontief markets, but nonetheless extending polynomial-time convergence guarantees for *tâtonnement* to Leontief Fisher markets as well. More recently, [Cheung and Cole \(2018\)](#) showed that [Cheung et al.](#)'s [2013] result extends to an asynchronous version of *tâtonnement*, in which good prices are updated during different time periods. In a similar vein, [Cheung et al. \(2019\)](#) analyzed *tâtonnement* in online Fisher markets, determining that *tâtonnement* tracks Walrasian equilibrium prices closely provided the market changes slowly.

Another price-adjustment process that has been shown to converge to market equilibria in Fisher markets is *proportional response dynamics*, first introduced by [Wu and Zhang \(2007\)](#) for linear utilities; then expanded upon and shown to converge by [Zhang, 2011](#)) for all CES utilities; and very recently shown to converge in Arrow-Debreu exchange economies with linear and CES ($\rho \in [0, 1)$) utilities by [Brânzei et al.](#). The study of the proportional response process was proven fundamental when [Cheung et al.](#) noticed its relationship to gradient descent. This discovery opened up a new realm of possibilities in analyzing the convergence of market equilibrium processes. For example, it allowed [Cheung et al. \(2018\)](#) to generalize the convergence results of proportional response dynamics to Fisher markets for buyers with mixed CES utilities. This same idea was applied by [Cheung et al. \(2013\)](#) to prove the convergence of *tâtonnement* in Leontief Fisher markets, using the equivalence between mirror descent ([Boyd et al., 2004](#)) on the dual of the Eisenberg-Gale program and *tâtonnement*, first observed by [Devanur et al. \(2008\)](#). More recently, [Gao and Kroer \(2020\)](#) developed methods to solve the Eisenberg-Gale convex program in the case of linear, quasi-linear, and Leontief Fisher markets.

An alternative to the (global) competitive economy model, in which an agent's trading partners are unconstrained, is the [Kakade et al. \(2004\)](#) model of a graphical economies. This model features local markets, in which each agent

can set its own prices for purchase only by neighboring agents, and likewise can purchase only from neighboring agents. Auction-like price-adjustment processes have been shown to converge in variants of this model assuming WGS (Andrade et al., 2021).

Algorithms for Variational Inequalities Variational inequalities (Facchinei and Pang, 2003) are a mathematical modeling framework whose study dates back to the early 1960s (Lions and Stampacchia, 1967; Hartman and Stampacchia, 1966; Browder, 1965; Grioli, 1973; Brezis and Sibony, 2011). Their utility lies in their very broad mathematical formulation which allows one to solve other mathematical modeling problems using the tools of functional analysis. They have found a great number of applications to problems in engineering and finance (Facchinei and Pang, 2003) over the years, and have seen an increased interest due to their novel applications in machine learning, to problems ranging from the training of generative adversarial neural networks (Goodfellow et al., 2014) to robust optimization (Ben-Tal et al., 2009).

Historically, the goal of the literature on solution methods for VIs has been to devise algorithms which are asymptotically guaranteed to converge to a strong or weak solution (Brezis and Brezis, 2011). An overwhelming majority of these works have focused on first-order methods for computing solutions of VIs, with higher order methods having been considered only in recent years (see, for instance, He et al. (2022); Huang and Zhang (2022)) While a strong solution of a VI is guaranteed to exist in continuous VIs, most results on the computational complexity of strong solutions, concerns the class of monotone VIs (see, for instance Cai et al. (2022)) with a few works focusing on VIs that satisfy the Minty condition (see, for instance, Diakonikolas (2020)).

The canonical algorithm to solve VIs is the projected gradient method (Cauchy et al., 1847; Nesterov, 1998) (also known under the names of the Subgradient method, Gradient Descent Ascent Method or Arrow-Hurwicz-Uzawa method (Arrow and Hurwicz, 1958; Arrow et al., 1958)). While asymptotic convergence of the projected gradient method to a solution can be shown for a subset of monotone VIs known as strongly monotone VIs¹⁷, in general monotone VIs, only ergodic asymptotic convergence (i.e., asymptotic convergence of the averaged iterates) to a strong solution can be guaranteed. The earliest known algorithm with asymptotic convergence guarantees to a solution of a monotone VI, is the extragradient method, attributed to Korpelevich (1976). Following this earlier success, Popov (1980) introduced a closely related algorithm called the optimistic gradient method which he also showed to converge to a solution. These initial extragradient and optimistic gradient algorithms would eventually become much more

¹⁷Recall that for monotone VIs, the set of strong and weak solutions are equal, as such here “solution” refers to both strong and weak solutions.

sophisticated with a large body of work appearing on asymptotic convergence guarantees for variants of these earlier methods (e.g., (Solodov and Svaiter, 1999)). of the optimality operator

More recently, the literature has turned its attention to algorithms with non-asymptotic guarantees, and in particular to ones that are guaranteed to compute a ε -strong or ε -weak solution of a VI in polynomial-time, i.e., in a number of evaluations of the optimality operator \mathcal{F} which is polynomial in the inverse of the approximation parameter $1/\varepsilon$, the dimensionality n of the constraint set, and other relevant assumption specific parameters such as an upper bound on all of the values of the optimality operator. One of the earliest results in this direction was given by Nemirovski (2004), who introduced the conceptual mirror-Prox Method, an elegant generalization of the extragradient Method, and established that ε -strong and ε -weak solutions can be computed in $O(1/\varepsilon)$ operations by averaging the iterates of the algorithm under the assumption that the the VI is monotone, and the optimality operator is Lipschitz-continuous. Nemirovski’s work was subsequently followed by a large body of work on more sophisticated algorithms (e.g., (Auslender and Teboulle, 2005; Diakonikolas, 2020)) for monotone VIs, and better computational results for the projection method (Gidel et al., 2018), the extragradient method (Gorbunov et al., 2022a; Golowich et al., 2020a; Cai et al., 2022) and the optimistic gradient method (Gorbunov et al., 2022b).

More recently, a number of works have considered first-order methods to compute a strong solution (e.g., Loizou et al. (2021); He et al. (2022); Diakonikolas (2020)) in VIs or a stationary point of the VI¹⁸ (e.g., Liu et al. (2021)) that satisfy the Minty condition. The first-order methods considered by this more recent line of work on non-monotone variational inequalities include the extragradient method (e.g., (Wang and Ma, 2024; Ofem et al., 2023)), Tseng’s method (e.g., (Censor et al., 2011; Thong et al., 2020; Uzor et al., 2023; Dung et al., 2024; Aremu et al., 2024)), and the optimistic gradient method (e.g., (Lin and Jordan, 2022)) and its variants.

B Omitted Examples from Section 3

Example 1 [Non-Convergence of Gradient Method].

Consider the VI $(\mathcal{X}, \mathbf{f})$ with $\mathcal{X} \doteq \mathbb{R}^2$ and $\mathbf{f}(x, y) = (-y, x)$. For this VI, we have $\text{SVI}(\mathcal{X}, \mathbf{f}) = \text{MVI}(\mathcal{X}, \mathbf{f}) = \{(0, 0)\}$. Suppose that $(\mathbf{x}^{(0)}, \mathbf{y}^{(0)}) \neq (0, 0)$, then for any $\eta > 0$ the iterates generated by the gradient method are given by:

$$(x^{(t)}, y^{(t)}) \doteq \left(x^{(0)} - \eta \sum_{k=1}^t y^{(k-1)}, y^{(0)} + \eta \sum_{k=1}^t x^{(k-1)} \right) \quad \forall t \in \mathbb{N}_{++} \quad (1)$$

¹⁸A (ε, δ) stationary point of a VI $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{F})$ is a point $\mathbf{x}^* \in \mathcal{X}$ s.t. for some $\delta \geq 0$ there exists $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{B}_\delta(\mathbf{x}^*)$ and \mathbf{x} is a ε -strong solution. Convergence to this weaker solution concept is necessary for VIs in which \mathcal{F} is not singleton-valued for technical reasons, and any future work that seeks to generalize the results in this section should adopt this weaker definition to prove their convergence results.

and as such are unbounded, i.e., $\|(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}, \mathbf{y}^{(t)})\| \rightarrow \infty$.

Example 2 [Non-convergence in the absence of the Minty condition].

Consider the VI $(\mathcal{X}, \mathbf{f})$ where $\mathcal{X} \doteq \mathbb{R}$ and $\mathbf{f}(x) \doteq 1 - x^2$. The set of strong solutions of VI is given by $\text{SVI}(\mathcal{X}, \mathbf{f}) = \{-1, 1\}$. Notice that for any any $x > 1$, $\mathbf{f}(x) < 0$. As such, for the mirror (extra)gradient method, for any choice of step size $\eta > 0$, if the initial iterate is initialized s.t. $x^{(0)} > 1$, then $x^{(t)} \rightarrow \infty$.

C Omitted Proofs for Section 3

Before we start our analysis of the mirror extragradient method (Algorithm 1), we first prove the following technical lemma on Bregman divergences.

Lemma 4 [Bregman Triangle Lemma].

Consider the Bregman divergence $\delta_h : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ associated with a differentiable kernel function $h : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. Let $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{X}$, we then have:

$$\delta_h(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}) + \delta_h(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{x}) - \delta_h(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z}) = \langle \nabla h(\mathbf{x}) - \nabla h(\mathbf{z}), \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y} \rangle. \quad (2)$$

Proof of Lemma 4. For all $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{X}$, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} & \delta_h(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}) + \delta_h(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{x}) - \delta_h(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z}) \\ &= [h(\mathbf{x}) - h(\mathbf{z}) - \langle \nabla h(\mathbf{z}), \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{z} \rangle] + [h(\mathbf{y}) - h(\mathbf{x}) - \langle \nabla h(\mathbf{x}), \mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x} \rangle] - [h(\mathbf{y}) - h(\mathbf{z}) - \langle \nabla h(\mathbf{z}), \mathbf{y} - \mathbf{z} \rangle] \\ &= -\langle \nabla h(\mathbf{z}), \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{z} \rangle - \langle \nabla h(\mathbf{x}), \mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x} \rangle + \langle \nabla h(\mathbf{z}), \mathbf{y} - \mathbf{z} \rangle \\ &= \langle \nabla h(\mathbf{z}) - \nabla h(\mathbf{x}), \mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x} \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

□

C.1 Global Convergence of the Mirror Extragradient Algorithm

With the above technical lemma in hand, we are now ready to prove a progress lemma for the mirror extragradient method, which describes how the algorithm progresses from one iteration to another. Note that under the Minty condition, the following lemma implies convergence to a weak solution since setting $\mathbf{x} \doteq \mathbf{x}^* \in \text{MVI}(\mathcal{X}, \mathbf{f})$, we obtain $\delta_h(\mathbf{x}^*, \mathbf{x}^{(k)}) > \delta_h(\mathbf{x}^*, \mathbf{x}^{(k+1)})$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ (i.e., the distance to the weak solution \mathbf{x}^* is strictly decreasing). In addition, note that under the assumptions of the lemma, the VI $(\mathcal{X}, \mathbf{f})$ is continuous, hence also implying convergence to a strong solution since any weak solution is also a strong solution in continuous VIs.

Lemma 5 [Mirror Extragradient Progress].

Consider the mirror extragradient algorithm (Algorithm 1), run with a VI $(\mathcal{X}, \mathbf{f})$ where \mathcal{X} is non-empty, compact, and convex, and a 1-strongly-convex kernel function h , a step size $\eta > 0$, a time horizon $\tau \in \mathbb{N}$, and outputs $\{\mathbf{x}^{(t+0.5)}, \mathbf{x}^{(t+1)}\}_t$. Suppose that there exists $\lambda \geq 0$, s.t. $\frac{1}{2}\|\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)}) - \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}^{(k)})\|^2 \leq \lambda^2 \delta_h(\mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)}, \mathbf{x}^{(k)})$. Then, for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}$, the following inequality holds for its outputs $\{\mathbf{x}^{(t+0.5)}, \mathbf{x}^{(t+1)}\}_t$:

$$\delta_h(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}^{(k)}) - \delta_h(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}^{(k+1)}) \geq \eta \langle \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)}), \mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)} - \mathbf{x} \rangle + (1 - (\eta\lambda)^2) \delta_h(\mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)}, \mathbf{x}^{(k)}) \quad (3)$$

Proof of Lemma 5. By the first order optimality conditions of $\mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)}$, we have for all $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}$:

$$\langle \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}^{(k)}) + \frac{1}{\eta} \langle \nabla h(\mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)}) - \nabla h(\mathbf{x}^{(k)}), \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)} \rangle \geq 0.$$

Substituting $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{x}^{(k+1)}$ above, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}^{(k)}), \mathbf{x}^{(k+1)} - \mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)} \rangle &\geq \frac{1}{\eta} \langle \nabla h(\mathbf{x}^{(k)}) - \nabla h(\mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)}), \mathbf{x}^{(k+1)} - \mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)} \rangle \\ &= \frac{1}{\eta} \left(\delta_h(\mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)}, \mathbf{x}^{(k)}) + \delta_h(\mathbf{x}^{(k+1)}, \mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)}) - \delta_h(\mathbf{x}^{(k+1)}, \mathbf{x}^{(k)}) \right). \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

where the last line was obtained by Lemma 4.

On the other hand, by the optimality condition at $\mathbf{x}^{(k+1)}$, we have for all $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}$:

$$\langle \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)}), \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}^{(k+1)} \rangle + \frac{1}{\eta} \langle \nabla h(\mathbf{x}^{(k+1)}) - \nabla h(\mathbf{x}^{(k)}), \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}^{(k+1)} \rangle \geq 0 .$$

Hence, for all $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}$:

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)}), \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}^{(k+1)} \rangle &\geq \frac{1}{\eta} \langle \nabla h(\mathbf{x}^{(k)}) - \nabla h(\mathbf{x}^{(k+1)}), \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}^{(k+1)} \rangle \\ &= \frac{1}{\eta} \left(\delta_h(\mathbf{x}^{(k+1)}, \mathbf{x}^{(k)}) + \delta_h(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}^{(k+1)}) - \delta_h(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}^{(k)}) \right) . \end{aligned}$$

where the last line was once again obtained by Lemma 4.

Continuing with the above inequality, for any given $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}$, we have:

$$\frac{1}{\eta} \left(\delta_h(\mathbf{x}^{(k+1)}, \mathbf{x}^{(k)}) + \delta_h(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}^{(k+1)}) - \delta_h(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}^{(k)}) \right) \quad (5)$$

$$\leq \langle \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)}), \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}^{(k+1)} \rangle \quad (6)$$

$$= \langle \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)}), \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)} \rangle + \langle \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)}), \mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)} - \mathbf{x}^{(k+1)} \rangle \quad (7)$$

$$= \langle \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)}), \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)} \rangle + \langle \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)}) - \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}^{(k)}), \mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)} - \mathbf{x}^{(k+1)} \rangle \\ + \langle \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}^{(k)}), \mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)} - \mathbf{x}^{(k+1)} \rangle \quad (8)$$

$$\leq \langle \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)}), \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)} \rangle + \|\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)}) - \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}^{(k)})\| \cdot \|\mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)} - \mathbf{x}^{(k+1)}\| \\ + \langle \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}^{(k)}), \mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)} - \mathbf{x}^{(k+1)} \rangle \quad (9)$$

where the final line follows by the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality (Cauchy, 1821; Schwarz, 1884).

Recall that by the arithmetic mean-geometric mean inequality, $\forall x, y \in \mathbb{R}_+$, $\frac{x+y}{2} \geq \sqrt{xy}$. Hence, applying the inequality with $x = \eta \|\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)}) - \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}^{(k)})\|^2$ and $y = 1/\eta \|\mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)} - \mathbf{x}^{(k+1)}\|^2$

$$\frac{1}{\eta} \left(\delta_h(\mathbf{x}^{(k+1)}, \mathbf{x}^{(k)}) + \delta_h(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}^{(k+1)}) - \delta_h(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}^{(k)}) \right) \quad (10)$$

$$\leq \langle \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)}), \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)} \rangle + \frac{\eta \|\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)}) - \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}^{(k)})\|^2}{2} \\ + \frac{\|\mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)} - \mathbf{x}^{(k+1)}\|^2}{2\eta} + \langle \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}^{(k)}), \mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)} - \mathbf{x}^{(k+1)} \rangle \quad (11)$$

$$\leq \langle \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)}), \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)} \rangle + \eta \lambda^2 \delta_h(\mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)}, \mathbf{x}^{(k)}) \\ + \frac{\|\mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)} - \mathbf{x}^{(k+1)}\|^2}{2\eta} + \langle \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}^{(k)}), \mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)} - \mathbf{x}^{(k+1)} \rangle \quad (12)$$

where the last line was obtained by the assumption that there exists $\lambda \geq 0$, s.t. $\frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)}) - \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}^{(k)})\|^2 \leq \lambda^2 \delta_h(\mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)}, \mathbf{x}^{(k)})$.

Additionally, note that by strong convexity of h , we have $\forall \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{X}$, $\delta_h(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \geq 1/2 \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|^2$. Hence, continuing we have:

$$\frac{1}{\eta} \left(\delta_h(\mathbf{x}^{(k+1)}, \mathbf{x}^{(k)}) + \delta_h(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}^{(k+1)}) - \delta_h(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}^{(k)}) \right) \quad (13)$$

$$\leq \langle \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)}), \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)} \rangle + \eta \lambda^2 \delta_h(\mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)}, \mathbf{x}^{(k)}) \\ + \frac{\delta_h(\mathbf{x}^{(k+1)}, \mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)})}{\eta} + \langle \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}^{(k)}), \mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)} - \mathbf{x}^{(k+1)} \rangle. \quad (14)$$

Plugging Equation (4) into the above, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{\eta} \left(\delta_h(\mathbf{x}^{(k+1)}, \mathbf{x}^{(k)}) + \delta_h(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}^{(k+1)}) - \delta_h(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}^{(k)}) \right) \\
& \leq \langle \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)}), \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)} \rangle + \eta \lambda^2 \delta_h(\mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)}, \mathbf{x}^{(k)}) \\
& \quad + \frac{\delta_h(\mathbf{x}^{(k+1)}, \mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)})}{\eta} - \frac{1}{\eta} \left(\delta_h(\mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)}, \mathbf{x}^{(k)}) + \delta_h(\mathbf{x}^{(k+1)}, \mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)}) - \delta_h(\mathbf{x}^{(k+1)}, \mathbf{x}^{(k)}) \right) \\
& \leq \langle \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)}), \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)} \rangle + \left(\eta \lambda^2 - \frac{1}{\eta} \right) \delta_h(\mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)}, \mathbf{x}^{(k)}) + \frac{1}{\eta} \delta_h(\mathbf{x}^{(k+1)}, \mathbf{x}^{(k)})
\end{aligned}$$

Canceling out terms, we simplify the above inequality into:

$$\frac{1}{\eta} \left(\delta_h(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}^{(k+1)}) - \delta_h(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}^{(k)}) \right) \leq \langle \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)}), \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)} \rangle + \left(\eta \lambda^2 - \frac{1}{\eta} \right) \delta_h(\mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)}, \mathbf{x}^{(k)}) \quad (15)$$

Multiplying both sides by $-\eta < 0$, we obtain the lemma statement. \square

While the above lemma implies asymptotic convergence to a strong solution, to show polynomial-time computation of a ε -strong solution, we have to bound the progress of the intermediate iterates $\delta_h(\mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)}, \mathbf{x}^{(k)})$ as a function of the time horizon algorithm. In the proof of the following theorem we show that we can bound this quantity, assuming that the kernel function is in addition κ -Lipschitz-smooth.

Theorem 3.1 [Mirror Extragradient Method Convergence].

Let $(\mathcal{X}, \mathbf{f})$ be a VI satisfying the Minty condition with \mathcal{X} non-empty, compact, and convex; and h a 1-strongly-convex and κ -Lipschitz-smooth kernel function. Consider the mirror extragradient algorithm (Algorithm 1) run with the VI $(\mathcal{X}, \mathbf{f})$, the kernel function h , a step size $\eta > 0$, a time horizon $\tau \in \mathbb{N}$, and outputs $\{\mathbf{x}^{(t+0.5)}, \mathbf{x}^{(t+1)}\}_t$. Suppose that there exists $\lambda \in (0, \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\eta}}]$, s.t. $\frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)}) - \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}^{(k)})\|^2 \leq \lambda^2 \delta_h(\mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)}, \mathbf{x}^{(k)})$. Then, the following bound holds: $\min_{k=0, \dots, \tau} \max_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} \langle \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)}), \mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)} - \mathbf{x} \rangle \leq \frac{2(1+\kappa)\text{diam}(\mathcal{X}) \sqrt{\delta_h(\mathbf{x}^*, \mathbf{x}^{(0)})}}{\eta \sqrt{\tau}}$ where $\mathbf{x}^* \in \mathcal{MVI}(\mathcal{X}, \mathbf{f})$ is a weak solution of the VI $(\mathcal{X}, \mathbf{f})$.

In addition, let $\mathbf{x}_{\text{best}}^{(\tau)} \in \arg \min_{\mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)}: k=0, \dots, \tau} \delta_h(\mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)}, \mathbf{x}^{(k)})$, then, for some choice of time horizon $\tau \in O\left(\frac{\kappa^2 \text{diam}(\mathcal{X})^2 \delta_h(\mathbf{x}^*, \mathbf{x}^{(0)})}{\eta^2 \varepsilon^2}\right)$, $\mathbf{x}_{\text{best}}^{(\tau)}$ is a ε -strong solution of $(\mathcal{X}, \mathbf{f})$, and $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{x}^{(t+0.5)} = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{x}^{(t)} \in \mathcal{SVI}(\mathcal{X}, \mathbf{f})$ is a strong solution of the VI $(\mathcal{X}, \mathbf{f})$.¹⁹

¹⁹First, note that the assumption that h is 1-strongly-convex is without loss of generality since any μ -strongly-convex kernel h' can be converted to a 1-strongly-convex kernel $\frac{1}{\mu}h'$. Second, while we present our convergence result using the pathwise Bregman-continuity assumption for generality, we note that the pathwise Bregman-continuity assumption is guaranteed to hold whenever \mathbf{f} is Bregman-continuous. Further, since if h is 1-strongly-convex, Lipschitz-continuity of \mathbf{f} implies its Bregman continuity, hence, a direct corollary of our result is that the mirror extragradient algorithm can compute a ε -strong solution in $O(1/\varepsilon^2)$ evaluation of \mathbf{f} for Lipschitz-continuous VIs which satisfy the Minty condition.

Proof of Theorem 3.1. Taking Lemma 5 with $\mathbf{x} \doteq \mathbf{x}^* \in \mathcal{MVI}(\mathcal{X}, \mathbf{f})$, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_h(\mathbf{x}^*, \mathbf{x}^{(k)}) - \delta_h(\mathbf{x}^*, \mathbf{x}^{(k+1)}) &\geq \underbrace{\eta \langle \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)}), \mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)} - \mathbf{x}^* \rangle}_{\geq 0} + (1 - (\eta\lambda)^2) \delta_h(\mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)}, \mathbf{x}^{(k)}) \\ &\geq (1 - (\eta\lambda)^2) \delta_h(\mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)}, \mathbf{x}^{(k)}) \end{aligned}$$

Multiplying both sides by $(1 - (\eta\lambda)^2)^{-1} > 0$, we have:

$$\delta_h(\mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)}, \mathbf{x}^{(k)}) \leq \frac{1}{1 - (\eta\lambda)^2} \left(\delta_h(\mathbf{x}^*, \mathbf{x}^{(k)}) - \delta_h(\mathbf{x}^*, \mathbf{x}^{(k+1)}) \right) \quad (16)$$

Summing up for $k = 0, \dots, \tau$:

$$\sum_{k=0}^{\tau} \delta_h(\mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)}, \mathbf{x}^{(k)}) \leq \frac{1}{1 - (\eta\lambda)^2} \sum_{k=0}^{\tau} \left(\delta_h(\mathbf{x}^*, \mathbf{x}^{(k)}) - \delta_h(\mathbf{x}^*, \mathbf{x}^{(k+1)}) \right) \quad (17)$$

$$\leq \frac{1}{1 - (\eta\lambda)^2} \left(\delta_h(\mathbf{x}^*, \mathbf{x}^{(0)}) - \delta_h(\mathbf{x}^*, \mathbf{x}^{(\tau+1)}) \right) \quad (18)$$

$$\leq \frac{1}{1 - (\eta\lambda)^2} \delta_h(\mathbf{x}^*, \mathbf{x}^{(0)}) \quad (19)$$

Dividing both sides by τ , we have:

$$\frac{1}{\tau} \sum_{k=0}^{\tau} \delta_h(\mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)}, \mathbf{x}^{(k)}) \leq \frac{1}{\tau(1 - (\eta\lambda)^2)} \left(\delta_h(\mathbf{x}^*, \mathbf{x}^{(0)}) \right) \quad (20)$$

$$\min_{k=0, \dots, \tau} \delta_h(\mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)}, \mathbf{x}^{(k)}) \leq \frac{1}{\tau(1 - (\eta\lambda)^2)} \left(\delta_h(\mathbf{x}^*, \mathbf{x}^{(0)}) \right) \quad (21)$$

We can transform this convergence into a convergence in terms of the primal gap function. Now, recall by the first order optimality conditions of $\mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)}$, we have for all $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}$:

$$\langle \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}^{(k)}), \mathbf{x} \rangle + \frac{1}{\eta} \langle \nabla h(\mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)}) - \nabla h(\mathbf{x}^{(k)}), \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)} \rangle \geq 0.$$

Re-organizing, for all $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}$, and $k \in \mathbb{N}$ we have:

$$\langle \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}^{(k)}), \mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)} - \mathbf{x} \rangle \leq \frac{1}{\eta} \left\| \nabla h(\mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)}) - \nabla h(\mathbf{x}^{(k)}) \right\| \left\| \mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)} - \mathbf{x} \right\| \quad (22)$$

$$\leq \frac{\text{diam}(\mathcal{X})}{\eta} \left\| \nabla h(\mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)}) - \nabla h(\mathbf{x}^{(k)}) \right\| \quad (23)$$

$$\leq \frac{\text{diam}(\mathcal{X})\kappa}{\eta} \left\| \mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)} - \mathbf{x}^{(k)} \right\| \quad (24)$$

where the last line follow from h being κ -Lipschitz-smooth.

Now, with the above inequality in hand, notice that for all $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)}), \mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)} - \mathbf{x} \rangle &= \langle \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}^{(k)}), \mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)} - \mathbf{x} \rangle + \langle \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)}) - \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}^{(k)}), \mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)} - \mathbf{x} \rangle \\ &\leq \frac{\text{diam}(\mathcal{X})\kappa}{\eta} \|\mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)} - \mathbf{x}^{(k)}\| + \|\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)}) - \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}^{(k)})\| \cdot \|\mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)} - \mathbf{x}\| \\ &\leq \frac{\text{diam}(\mathcal{X})\kappa}{\eta} \|\mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)} - \mathbf{x}^{(k)}\| + \lambda \sqrt{2\delta_h(\mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)}, \mathbf{x}^{(k)})} \cdot \|\mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)} - \mathbf{x}\| \\ &\leq \text{diam}(\mathcal{X}) \left(\frac{\kappa}{\eta} + \lambda \right) \sqrt{2\delta_h(\mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)}, \mathbf{x}^{(k)})} \end{aligned}$$

where the penultimate line was obtained by the assumption that there exists $\lambda \geq 0$, s.t. $\frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)}) - \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}^{(k)})\|^2 \leq \lambda^2 \delta_h(\mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)}, \mathbf{x}^{(k)})$, and the last line from the strong convexity of h , which means that we have $\forall \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{X}$, $\delta_h(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \geq 1/2 \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|^2$.

Now, let $k^* \in \arg \min_{k=0, \dots, \tau} \delta_h(\mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)}, \mathbf{x}^{(k)})$, we then have for all $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}$:

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}^{(k^*+0.5)}), \mathbf{x}^{(k^*+0.5)} - \mathbf{x} \rangle &\leq \text{diam}(\mathcal{X}) \left(\frac{\kappa}{\eta} + \lambda \right) \sqrt{2\delta_h(\mathbf{x}^{(k^*+0.5)}, \mathbf{x}^{(k^*)})} \\ &= \text{diam}(\mathcal{X}) \left(\frac{\kappa}{\eta} + \lambda \right) \sqrt{2 \min_{k=0, \dots, \tau} \delta_h(\mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)}, \mathbf{x}^{(k)})} \end{aligned}$$

Now, plugging Equation (21) in the above, we have for all $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}$:

$$\langle \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}^{(k^*+0.5)}), \mathbf{x}^{(k^*+0.5)} - \mathbf{x} \rangle \leq \frac{\sqrt{2} \text{diam}(\mathcal{X}) \left(\frac{\kappa}{\eta} + \lambda \right) \sqrt{\delta_h(\mathbf{x}^*, \mathbf{x}^{(0)})}}{\sqrt{1 - (\eta\lambda)^2} \sqrt{\tau}}$$

Now, by the assumption that $\eta \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}\lambda} \leq \frac{1}{\lambda}$, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}^{(k^*+0.5)}), \mathbf{x}^{(k^*+0.5)} - \mathbf{x} \rangle &\leq \frac{\sqrt{2} \text{diam}(\mathcal{X}) \left(\frac{\kappa}{\eta} + \frac{1}{\eta} \right) \sqrt{\delta_h(\mathbf{x}^*, \mathbf{x}^{(0)})}}{\sqrt{1 - (\eta\lambda)^2} \sqrt{\tau}} \\ &= \frac{(1 + \kappa) \sqrt{2} \text{diam}(\mathcal{X}) \sqrt{\delta_h(\mathbf{x}^*, \mathbf{x}^{(0)})}}{\eta \sqrt{1 - (\eta\lambda)^2} \sqrt{\tau}} \\ &= \frac{(1 + \kappa) \sqrt{2} \text{diam}(\mathcal{X}) \sqrt{\delta_h(\mathbf{x}^*, \mathbf{x}^{(0)})}}{\eta \sqrt{1 - (1/\sqrt{2})^2} \sqrt{\tau}} \\ &= \frac{2(1 + \kappa) \text{diam}(\mathcal{X}) \sqrt{\delta_h(\mathbf{x}^*, \mathbf{x}^{(0)})}}{\eta \sqrt{\tau}} \\ &= \frac{2(1 + \kappa) \text{diam}(\mathcal{X}) \sqrt{\delta_h(\mathbf{x}^*, \mathbf{x}^{(0)})}}{\eta \sqrt{\tau}} \end{aligned}$$

That is, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{k=0, \dots, \tau} \max_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} \langle \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)}), \mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)} - \mathbf{x} \rangle &\leq \max_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} \langle \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}^{(k^*+0.5)}), \mathbf{x}^{(k^*+0.5)} - \mathbf{x} \rangle \\ &\leq \frac{2(1 + \kappa) \text{diam}(\mathcal{X}) \sqrt{\delta_h(\mathbf{x}^*, \mathbf{x}^{(0)})}}{\eta \sqrt{\tau}} \end{aligned}$$

In addition, for any $\varepsilon \geq 0$, letting $\frac{2(1+\kappa)\text{diam}(\mathcal{X})}{\eta} \frac{\sqrt{\delta_h(\mathbf{x}^*, \mathbf{x}^{(0)})}}{\sqrt{\tau}} \leq \varepsilon$, and solving for τ , we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{2(1+\kappa)\text{diam}(\mathcal{X})}{\eta} \frac{\sqrt{\delta_h(\mathbf{x}^*, \mathbf{x}^{(0)})}}{\sqrt{\tau}} &\leq \varepsilon \\ \frac{4(1+\kappa)^2\text{diam}(\mathcal{X})^2}{\eta^2} \frac{\delta_h(\mathbf{x}^*, \mathbf{x}^{(0)})}{\varepsilon^2} &\leq \tau \end{aligned}$$

That is, $\mathbf{x}_{\text{best}}^{(\tau)} \in \arg \min_{\mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)}: k=0, \dots, \tau} \delta_h(\mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)}, \mathbf{x}^{(k)})$ is a ε -strong solution after $\frac{4(1+\kappa)^2\text{diam}(\mathcal{X})^2}{\eta^2} \frac{\delta_h(\mathbf{x}^*, \mathbf{x}^{(0)})}{\varepsilon^2}$ iterations of the mirror extragradient algorithm.

Finally, notice that we have $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \max_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} \langle \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)}), \mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)} - \mathbf{x} \rangle = \lim_{\tau \rightarrow \infty} \min_{k=0, \dots, \tau} \max_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} \langle \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)}), \mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)} - \mathbf{x} \rangle = 0$ and $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \delta_h(\mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)}, \mathbf{x}^{(k)}) = \lim_{\tau \rightarrow \infty} \min_{k=0, \dots, \tau} \delta_h(\mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)}, \mathbf{x}^{(k)}) = 0$. Hence, $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{x}^{(t+0.5)} = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{x}^{(t)} = \mathbf{x}^{**}$ is a strong solution of the VI $(\mathcal{X}, \mathbf{f})$. \square

C.2 Local Convergence of the Mirror Extragradient Algorithm

To understand how a local weak solution can provide us with local convergence, recall by Lemma 5 the iterates of the mirror extragradient algorithm satisfy the following for all $t \in \mathbb{N}$:

$$\delta_h(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}^{(k)}) - \delta_h(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}^{(k+1)}) \geq \eta \langle \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)}), \mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)} - \mathbf{x} \rangle + (1 - (\eta\lambda)^2) \delta_h(\mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)}, \mathbf{x}^{(k)})$$

Suppose that the kernel function h is strictly convex, and that the algorithm has not yet converged, i.e., $\mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)} \neq \mathbf{x}^{(k)}$, then $\delta_h(\mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)}, \mathbf{x}^{(k)}) > 0$, and we can drop the term. Re-organizing the expressions, we then have:

$$\delta_h(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}^{(k)}) > \delta_h(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}^{(k+1)}) + \eta \langle \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)}), \mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)} - \mathbf{x} \rangle$$

Now, notice that if we can ensure that for all $k \in \mathbb{N}_+$, there exists a $\mathbf{x}^* \in \mathcal{SVI}(\mathcal{X}, \mathbf{f})$ s.t. $\langle \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)}), \mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)} - \mathbf{x}^* \rangle \geq 0$, then we have: $\delta_h(\mathbf{x}^*, \mathbf{x}^{(k)}) \geq \delta_h(\mathbf{x}^*, \mathbf{x}^{(k+1)})$, implying that $\mathbf{x}^{(k)} \rightarrow \mathbf{x}^*$ converges to a strong solution. Since we cannot assume the existence of a weak solution (i.e., the Minty condition), the next best way to ensure that there $\mathbf{x}^* \in \mathcal{SVI}(\mathcal{X}, \mathbf{f})$ s.t. $\langle \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)}), \mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)} - \mathbf{x}^* \rangle \geq 0$, is to initialize the algorithm with an initial iterate $\mathbf{x}^{(0)} \in \mathcal{X}$ which is $O(\delta)$ -close to a δ -local weak solution $\mathbf{x}^* \in \mathcal{LMVI}^\delta(\mathcal{X}, \mathbf{f})$ ²⁰ for some $\delta \geq 0$, and ensure that all subsequent intermediary iterates $\{\mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)}\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}_+}$ remain δ -close to \mathbf{x}^* .

To ensure this, we have to first bound the distance between the intermediary $\{\mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)}\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}_+}$ and terminal $\{\mathbf{x}^{(k)}\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}_+}$ iterates. The following lemma provides us with such a bound.

²⁰Note that a local weak solution is guaranteed to be strong solution by Proposition 3.1 of [Aussel and Chaipunya \(2024\)](#).

Lemma 6 [Distance bound on intermediate iterates].

Let $(\mathcal{X}, \mathbf{f})$ be a λ -Lipschitz-continuous VI satisfying the Minty condition, and h a 1-strongly-convex and κ -Lipschitz-smooth kernel function. Consider the mirror extragradient algorithm (Algorithm 1) run with the VI $(\mathcal{X}, \mathbf{f})$, the kernel function h , any step size $\eta \geq 0$, for any time horizon $\tau \in \mathbb{N}$, and outputs $\{\mathbf{x}^{(t+0.5)}, \mathbf{x}^{(t+1)}\}_t$. We then have:

$$\left\| \mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)} - \mathbf{x}^{(k)} \right\| \leq \eta \ell \quad (25)$$

where $\ell \doteq \max_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} \|\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x})\|$.

Proof of Lemma 6. Note that for all $k \in \mathbb{N}_+$, by the first order optimality conditions of $\mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)}$, we have for all $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}$:

$$\langle \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}^{(k)}) + \frac{1}{\eta} \langle \nabla h(\mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)}) - \nabla h(\mathbf{x}^{(k)}), \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)} \rangle \geq 0.$$

Substituting $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{x}^{(k)}$ above, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}^{(k)}), \mathbf{x}^{(k)} - \mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)} \rangle &\geq \frac{1}{\eta} \langle \nabla h(\mathbf{x}^{(k)}) - \nabla h(\mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)}), \mathbf{x}^{(k)} - \mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)} \rangle \\ &= \frac{1}{\eta} \left(\delta_h(\mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)}, \mathbf{x}^{(k)}) + \delta_h(\mathbf{x}^{(k)}, \mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)}) \right). \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

where the last line was obtained by Lemma 4.

Re-organizing:

$$\delta_h(\mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)}, \mathbf{x}^{(k)}) \leq \eta \langle \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}^{(k)}), \mathbf{x}^{(k)} - \mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)} \rangle - \delta_h(\mathbf{x}^{(k)}, \mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)}). \quad (27)$$

$$\leq \eta \langle \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}^{(k)}), \mathbf{x}^{(k)} - \mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)} \rangle - 1/2 \left\| \mathbf{x}^{(k)} - \mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)} \right\|^2 \quad (28)$$

$$\leq \eta \left\| \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}^{(k)}) \right\| \left\| \mathbf{x}^{(k)} - \mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)} \right\| - 1/2 \left\| \mathbf{x}^{(k)} - \mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)} \right\|^2 \quad (29)$$

$$\leq \eta \ell \left\| \mathbf{x}^{(k)} - \mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)} \right\| - 1/2 \left\| \mathbf{x}^{(k)} - \mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)} \right\|^2 \quad (30)$$

Since for all $z \in \mathbb{R}$, $ab \in \mathbb{R}_+$, we have $az - bz^2 \leq a^2/4b$:

$$\delta_h(\mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)}, \mathbf{x}^{(k)}) \leq \frac{\eta^2 \ell^2}{2} \quad (31)$$

Additionally, note that by strong convexity of h , we have $\forall \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{X}$, $\delta_h(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \geq 1/2 \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|^2$ or equivalently $\sqrt{2\delta_h(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})} \geq \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|$. Hence, continuing:

$$\left\| \mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)} - \mathbf{x}^{(k)} \right\| \leq \sqrt{2\delta_h(\mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)}, \mathbf{x}^{(k)})} \leq \eta \ell \quad (32)$$

□

With the above Lemma in hand, we can show that if the initial iterate starts close enough to some local weak solution, then the intermediate iterates will remain within this δ -ball for the remainder of the algorithm for an appropriate choice of step size.

Lemma 7 [Mirror Extragradient Iterates Remain Local].

Let $(\mathcal{X}, \mathbf{f})$ be a λ -Lipschitz-continuous VI satisfying the Minty condition, and h a 1-strongly-convex kernel function. Define $\ell \doteq \max_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} \|\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x})\|$. Suppose that for some $\mathbf{x}^* \in \mathcal{LMVI}^\delta(\mathcal{X}, \mathbf{f})$ δ -local weak solution, the initial iterate $\mathbf{x}^{(0)} \in \mathcal{X}$ is chosen so that $\sqrt{2\delta_h(\mathbf{x}^*, \mathbf{x}^{(0)})} \leq \delta - \eta\ell$. Consider the mirror extragradient algorithm (Algorithm 1) run with the VI $(\mathcal{X}, \mathbf{f})$, the kernel function h , a step size $\eta \geq 0$, initial iterate $\mathbf{x}^{(0)}$, some time horizon $\tau \in \mathbb{N}$, and outputs $\{\mathbf{x}^{(t+0.5)}, \mathbf{x}^{(t+1)}\}_t$. Then, for all $t \in [\tau]$, we have

$$\delta_h(\mathbf{x}^*, \mathbf{x}^{(t)}) \leq 1/2(\delta - \eta\ell)^2 \quad \text{and} \quad \|\mathbf{x}^{(t+0.5)} - \mathbf{x}^*\| \leq \delta .$$

Proof of Lemma 7. We will prove the claim by induction on $t \in \mathbb{N}_+$.

Base case: $t = 0$

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{x}^{(0.5)} - \mathbf{x}^*\| &= \|\mathbf{x}^{(0.5)} - \mathbf{x}^{(0)} + \mathbf{x}^{(0)} - \mathbf{x}^*\| \\ &\leq \|\mathbf{x}^{(0.5)} - \mathbf{x}^{(0)}\| + \|\mathbf{x}^{(0)} - \mathbf{x}^*\| \\ &\leq \|\mathbf{x}^{(0.5)} - \mathbf{x}^{(0)}\| + \sqrt{2\delta_h(\mathbf{x}^*, \mathbf{x}^{(0)})} \\ &\leq \eta\ell + (\delta - \eta\ell) && \text{(Lemma 6)} \\ &\leq \delta \end{aligned}$$

Inductive step: Suppose that for all $t = 0, \dots, \tau$, $\|\mathbf{x}^{(t+0.5)} - \mathbf{x}^*\| \leq \delta$ and $\sqrt{2\delta_h(\mathbf{x}^*, \mathbf{x}^{(t)})} \leq \delta - \eta\ell$ (or equivalently, $\delta_h(\mathbf{x}^*, \mathbf{x}^{(t)}) \leq 1/2(\delta - \eta\ell)^2$). We will show that $\|\mathbf{x}^{(\tau+1.5)} - \mathbf{x}^*\| \leq \delta$ and $\delta_h(\mathbf{x}^*, \mathbf{x}^{(\tau+1)}) \leq 1/2(\delta - \eta\ell)^2$.

By Lemma 5, we have:

$$\delta_h(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}^{(\tau)}) - \delta_h(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}^{(\tau+1)}) \geq \eta \langle \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}^{(\tau+0.5)}), \mathbf{x}^{(\tau+0.5)} - \mathbf{x} \rangle + (1 - (\eta\lambda)^2) \delta_h(\mathbf{x}^{(\tau+0.5)}, \mathbf{x}^{(\tau)}) \quad (33)$$

Substituting in $\mathbf{x} \doteq \mathbf{x}^* \in \mathcal{LMVI}^\delta(\mathcal{X}, \mathbf{f})$, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_h(\mathbf{x}^*, \mathbf{x}^{(\tau)}) - \delta_h(\mathbf{x}^*, \mathbf{x}^{(\tau+1)}) &\geq \underbrace{\eta \langle \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}^{(\tau+0.5)}), \mathbf{x}^{(\tau+0.5)} - \mathbf{x}^* \rangle}_{\geq 0} + (1 - (\eta\lambda)^2) \underbrace{\delta_h(\mathbf{x}^{(\tau+0.5)}, \mathbf{x}^{(\tau)})}_{\geq 0} \\ &\geq 0 \end{aligned}$$

Re-organizing, and using the inductive assumption that $\delta_h(\mathbf{x}^*, \mathbf{x}^{(\tau)}) \leq 1/2(\delta - \eta\ell)^2$ we have:

$$1/2(\delta - \eta\ell)^2 \geq \delta_h(\mathbf{x}^*, \mathbf{x}^{(\tau)}) \geq \delta_h(\mathbf{x}^*, \mathbf{x}^{(\tau+1)}) \quad (34)$$

Now, notice that we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{x}^{(\tau+0.5)} - \mathbf{x}^*\| &= \|\mathbf{x}^{(\tau+0.5)} - \mathbf{x}^{(\tau)} + \mathbf{x}^{(\tau)} - \mathbf{x}^*\| \\ &\leq \|\mathbf{x}^{(\tau+0.5)} - \mathbf{x}^{(\tau)}\| + \|\mathbf{x}^{(\tau)} - \mathbf{x}^*\| \\ &\leq \|\mathbf{x}^{(\tau+0.5)} - \mathbf{x}^{(\tau)}\| + \sqrt{2\delta_h(\mathbf{x}^*, \mathbf{x}^{(\tau)})} \\ &\leq \eta\ell + (\delta - \eta\ell) \quad (\text{Lemma 6}) \\ &\leq \delta \end{aligned}$$

□

With the above lemma in hand, modifying the proof of Theorem 3.1 slightly, we can show local convergence to a strong solution when the initial iterate of the algorithm is initialized close enough to a local solution.

Theorem 3.2 [Mirror Extragradient Method Local Convergence].

Let $(\mathcal{X}, \mathbf{f})$ be a λ -Lipschitz-continuous VI, h a 1-strongly-convex and κ -Lipschitz-smooth kernel function, and let $\eta \in \left(0, \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\lambda}}\right]$. Suppose that $\|\mathbf{f}\|_\infty \leq \ell < \infty$, and that for some $\mathbf{x}^* \in \mathcal{LMVI}^\delta(\mathcal{X}, \mathbf{f})$ δ -local weak solution, the initial iterate $\mathbf{x}^{(0)} \in \mathcal{X}$ is chosen so that $\sqrt{2\delta_h(\mathbf{x}^*, \mathbf{x}^{(0)})} \leq \delta - \eta\ell$.

Consider the mirror extragradient algorithm (Algorithm 1) run with the VI $(\mathcal{X}, \mathbf{f})$, the kernel function h , the step size η , initial iterate $\mathbf{x}^{(0)}$, an arbitrary time horizon $\tau \in \mathbb{N}$, and outputs $\{\mathbf{x}^{(t+0.5)}, \mathbf{x}^{(t+1)}\}_t$. Then, we have:

$$\min_{k=0, \dots, \tau} \max_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} \langle \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)}), \mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)} - \mathbf{x} \rangle \leq \frac{\sqrt{2}(1+\kappa)\text{diam}(\mathcal{X})}{\eta} \frac{\delta}{\sqrt{\tau}}$$

In addition, let $\mathbf{x}_{\text{best}}^{(\tau)} \in \arg \min_{\mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)}; k=0, \dots, \tau} \delta_h(\mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)}, \mathbf{x}^{(k)})$. Then, for some choice of $\tau \in O(1/\varepsilon^2)$, $\mathbf{x}_{\text{best}}^{(\tau)}$ is a ε -strong solution of $(\mathcal{X}, \mathbf{f})$.

Proof of Theorem 3.2. Taking Lemma 5 with $\mathbf{x} \doteq \mathbf{x}^*$, where \mathbf{x}^* is given as in the Theorem statement, then by Lemma 7 we have for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$:

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_h(\mathbf{x}^*, \mathbf{x}^{(k)}) - \delta_h(\mathbf{x}^*, \mathbf{x}^{(k+1)}) &\geq \eta \underbrace{\langle \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)}), \mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)} - \mathbf{x}^* \rangle}_{\geq 0} + (1 - (\eta\lambda)^2) \delta_h(\mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)}, \mathbf{x}^{(k)}) \\ &\geq (1 - (\eta\lambda)^2) \delta_h(\mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)}, \mathbf{x}^{(k)}) \end{aligned}$$

Multiplying both sides by $(1 - (\eta\lambda)^2)^{-1} > 0$, we have:

$$\delta_h(\mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)}, \mathbf{x}^{(k)}) \leq \frac{1}{1 - (\eta\lambda)^2} \left(\delta_h(\mathbf{x}^*, \mathbf{x}^{(k)}) - \delta_h(\mathbf{x}^*, \mathbf{x}^{(k+1)}) \right) \quad (35)$$

Summing up for $k = 0, \dots, \tau$:

$$\sum_{k=0}^{\tau} \delta_h(\mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)}, \mathbf{x}^{(k)}) \leq \frac{1}{1 - (\eta\lambda)^2} \sum_{k=0}^{\tau} \left(\delta_h(\mathbf{x}^*, \mathbf{x}^{(k)}) - \delta_h(\mathbf{x}^*, \mathbf{x}^{(k+1)}) \right) \quad (36)$$

$$\leq \frac{1}{1 - (\eta\lambda)^2} \left(\delta_h(\mathbf{x}^*, \mathbf{x}^{(0)}) - \delta_h(\mathbf{x}^*, \mathbf{x}^{(\tau+1)}) \right) \quad (37)$$

$$\leq \frac{1}{1 - (\eta\lambda)^2} \delta_h(\mathbf{x}^*, \mathbf{x}^{(0)}) \quad (38)$$

Dividing both sides by τ , we have:

$$\frac{1}{\tau} \sum_{k=0}^{\tau} \delta_h(\mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)}, \mathbf{x}^{(k)}) \leq \frac{1}{\tau(1 - (\eta\lambda)^2)} \left(\delta_h(\mathbf{x}^*, \mathbf{x}^{(0)}) \right) \quad (39)$$

$$\min_{k=0, \dots, \tau} \delta_h(\mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)}, \mathbf{x}^{(k)}) \leq \frac{1}{\tau(1 - (\eta\lambda)^2)} \left(\delta_h(\mathbf{x}^*, \mathbf{x}^{(0)}) \right) \quad (40)$$

We can transform this convergence into a convergence in terms of the primal gap function. Now, recall by the first order optimality conditions of $\mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)}$, we have for all $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}$:

$$\langle \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}^{(k)}), \mathbf{x} \rangle + \frac{1}{\eta} \langle \nabla h(\mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)}) - \nabla h(\mathbf{x}^{(k)}), \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)} \rangle \geq 0.$$

Re-organizing, for all $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}$, and $k \in \mathbb{N}$ we have:

$$\langle \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}^{(k)}), \mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)} - \mathbf{x} \rangle \leq \frac{1}{\eta} \left\| \nabla h(\mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)}) - \nabla h(\mathbf{x}^{(k)}) \right\| \left\| \mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)} - \mathbf{x} \right\| \quad (41)$$

$$\leq \frac{\text{diam}(\mathcal{X})}{\eta} \left\| \nabla h(\mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)}) - \nabla h(\mathbf{x}^{(k)}) \right\| \quad (42)$$

$$\leq \frac{\text{diam}(\mathcal{X})\kappa}{\eta} \left\| \mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)} - \mathbf{x}^{(k)} \right\| \quad (43)$$

where the last line follow from h being κ -Lipschitz-smooth.

Now, with the above inequality in hand, notice that for all $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)}), \mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)} - \mathbf{x} \rangle &= \langle \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}^{(k)}), \mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)} - \mathbf{x} \rangle + \langle \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)}) - \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}^{(k)}), \mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)} - \mathbf{x} \rangle \\ &\leq \frac{\text{diam}(\mathcal{X})\kappa}{\eta} \left\| \mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)} - \mathbf{x}^{(k)} \right\| + \left\| \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)}) - \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}^{(k)}) \right\| \cdot \left\| \mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)} - \mathbf{x} \right\| \\ &\leq \frac{\text{diam}(\mathcal{X})\kappa}{\eta} \left\| \mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)} - \mathbf{x}^{(k)} \right\| + \lambda \left\| \mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)} - \mathbf{x}^{(k)} \right\| \cdot \left\| \mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)} - \mathbf{x} \right\| \\ &\leq \text{diam}(\mathcal{X}) \left(\frac{\kappa}{\eta} + \lambda \right) \left\| \mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)} - \mathbf{x}^{(k)} \right\| \end{aligned}$$

where the penultimate line follows from the λ -Lipschitz-continuity of \mathbf{f} , and the strong convexity of h , which means that we have $\forall \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{X}$, $\delta_h(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \geq 1/2 \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|^2$.

Now, let $k^* \in \arg \min_{k=0, \dots, \tau} \|\mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)} - \mathbf{x}^{(k)}\|$, we then have:

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}^{(k^*+0.5)}), \mathbf{x}^{(k^*+0.5)} - \mathbf{x} \rangle &\leq \text{diam}(\mathcal{X}) \left(\frac{\kappa}{\eta} + \lambda \right) \|\mathbf{x}^{(k^*+0.5)} - \mathbf{x}^{(k^*)}\| \\ &= \text{diam}(\mathcal{X}) \left(\frac{\kappa}{\eta} + \lambda \right) \min_{k=0, \dots, \tau} \|\mathbf{x}^{(k^*+0.5)} - \mathbf{x}^{(k^*)}\| \\ &\leq \text{diam}(\mathcal{X}) \left(\frac{\kappa}{\eta} + \lambda \right) \min_{k=0, \dots, \tau} \sqrt{2\delta_h(\mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)}, \mathbf{x}^{(k)})} \end{aligned}$$

where the last line follows from

Now, plugging Equation (40) in the above, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}^{(k^*+0.5)}), \mathbf{x}^{(k^*+0.5)} - \mathbf{x} \rangle &\leq \text{diam}(\mathcal{X}) \left(\frac{\kappa}{\eta} + \lambda \right) \min_{k=0, \dots, \tau} \sqrt{2\delta_h(\mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)}, \mathbf{x}^{(k)})} \\ &\leq \sqrt{2} \text{diam}(\mathcal{X}) \left(\frac{\kappa}{\eta} + \lambda \right) \sqrt{\min_{k=0, \dots, \tau} \delta_h(\mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)}, \mathbf{x}^{(k)})} \\ &\leq \frac{\sqrt{2} \text{diam}(\mathcal{X}) \left(\frac{\kappa}{\eta} + \lambda \right) \sqrt{\delta_h(\mathbf{x}^*, \mathbf{x}^{(0)})}}{\sqrt{1 - (\eta\lambda)^2} \sqrt{\tau}} \end{aligned}$$

Now, by the assumption that $\eta \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}\lambda} \leq \frac{1}{\lambda}$, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}^{(k^*+0.5)}), \mathbf{x}^{(k^*+0.5)} - \mathbf{x} \rangle &\leq \frac{\sqrt{2} \text{diam}(\mathcal{X}) \left(\frac{\kappa}{\eta} + \frac{1}{\eta} \right) \sqrt{\delta_h(\mathbf{x}^*, \mathbf{x}^{(0)})}}{\sqrt{1 - (\eta\lambda)^2} \sqrt{\tau}} \\ &= \frac{(1 + \kappa) \sqrt{2} \text{diam}(\mathcal{X}) \sqrt{\delta_h(\mathbf{x}^*, \mathbf{x}^{(0)})}}{\eta \sqrt{1 - (\eta\lambda)^2} \sqrt{\tau}} \\ &= \frac{(1 + \kappa) \sqrt{2} \text{diam}(\mathcal{X}) \sqrt{\delta_h(\mathbf{x}^*, \mathbf{x}^{(0)})}}{\eta \sqrt{1 - (1/\sqrt{2})^2} \sqrt{\tau}} \\ &= \frac{2(1 + \kappa) \text{diam}(\mathcal{X}) \sqrt{\delta_h(\mathbf{x}^*, \mathbf{x}^{(0)})}}{\eta \sqrt{\tau}} \\ &= \frac{\sqrt{2}(1 + \kappa) \text{diam}(\mathcal{X}) \delta}{\eta \sqrt{\tau}} \end{aligned}$$

where the last line follows from the assumption that $\sqrt{2\delta_h(\mathbf{x}^*, \mathbf{x}^{(0)})} \leq \delta - \eta\ell$ which implies $\sqrt{\delta_h(\mathbf{x}^*, \mathbf{x}^{(0)})} \leq \frac{\delta}{\sqrt{2}}$.

That is, we have:

$$\max_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} \langle \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)}), \mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)} - \mathbf{x} \rangle \leq \langle \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}^{(k^*+0.5)}), \mathbf{x}^{(k^*+0.5)} - \mathbf{x} \rangle \leq \frac{\sqrt{2}(1 + \kappa) \text{diam}(\mathcal{X}) \delta}{\eta \sqrt{\tau}}$$

In addition, for any $\varepsilon \geq 0$, letting $\frac{\sqrt{2}(1+\kappa)\text{diam}(\mathcal{X})}{\eta} \frac{\delta}{\sqrt{\tau}} \leq \varepsilon$, and solving for τ , we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\sqrt{2}(1+\kappa)\text{diam}(\mathcal{X})}{\eta} \frac{\delta}{\sqrt{\tau}} &\leq \varepsilon \\ \frac{2(1+\kappa)^2\text{diam}(\mathcal{X})^2}{\eta^2} \frac{\delta^2}{\varepsilon^2} &\leq \tau \end{aligned}$$

That is, $\mathbf{x}_{\text{best}}^{(\tau)} \in \arg \min_{\mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)}: k=0, \dots, \tau} \|\mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)} - \mathbf{x}^{(k)}\|$ is a ε -strong solution after $\frac{2(1+\kappa)^2\text{diam}(\mathcal{X})^2}{\eta^2} \frac{\delta}{\varepsilon^2}$ iterations of the mirror extragradient algorithm. \square

D Omitted Proofs for Section 4

D.1 Walrasian Economies and Variational Inequalities

Theorem 4.1 [Walrasian economies as Complementarity Problems].

The set of Walrasian equilibria of any Walrasian economy (m, \mathcal{Z}) is equal to the set of strong solutions of the VI $(\mathbb{R}_+^m, -\mathcal{Z})$, i.e., $\mathcal{WE}(m, \mathcal{Z}) = \mathcal{SVI}(\mathbb{R}_+^m, -\mathcal{Z})$.

Proof of Theorem 4.1. (\implies) Let $\mathbf{p}^* \in \mathcal{WE}(m, \mathcal{Z})$ be a Walrasian equilibrium. Then, for some $\mathbf{z}(\mathbf{p}^*) \in \mathcal{Z}(\mathbf{p}^*)$, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \mathbf{z}(\mathbf{p}^*), \mathbf{p} - \mathbf{p}^* \rangle & \quad \forall \mathbf{p} \in \mathbb{R}_+^m \\ &= \langle \mathbf{z}(\mathbf{p}^*), \mathbf{p} \rangle - \underbrace{\langle \mathbf{z}(\mathbf{p}^*), \mathbf{p}^* \rangle}_{=0} \quad \forall \mathbf{p} \in \mathbb{R}_+^m \\ &= \underbrace{\langle \mathbf{z}(\mathbf{p}^*), \mathbf{p} \rangle}_{\leq 0} \quad \forall \mathbf{p} \in \mathbb{R}_+^m \\ &\leq 0 \end{aligned}$$

where the last line follows from the feasibility of $\mathbf{z}(\mathbf{p}^*)$, i.e., $\mathbf{z}(\mathbf{p}^*) \leq 0$, and the positivity of \mathbf{p} .

(\impliedby) Let $\mathbf{p}^* \in \mathcal{SVI}(\mathbb{R}_+^m, -\mathcal{Z})$. Then, for some $\mathbf{z}(\mathbf{p}^*) \in \mathcal{Z}(\mathbf{p}^*)$, we have:

$$0 \geq \langle \mathbf{z}(\mathbf{p}^*), \mathbf{p} - \mathbf{p}^* \rangle \quad \forall \mathbf{p} \in \mathbb{R}_+^m$$

Substituting $\mathbf{p} \doteq \mathbf{p}^* + \mathbf{j}_j$, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\geq \langle \mathbf{z}(\mathbf{p}^*), \mathbf{p}^* + \mathbf{j}_j - \mathbf{p}^* \rangle \\ &= \langle \mathbf{z}(\mathbf{p}^*), \mathbf{j}_j \rangle \\ &\geq z_j(\mathbf{p}^*) \quad \forall j \in [m] \end{aligned}$$

That is, \mathbf{p}^* is feasible.

Similarly, substituting in $\mathbf{p} \doteq \mathbf{0}$ and $\mathbf{p} \doteq 2\mathbf{p}^*$, we have:

$$0 \leq \langle \mathbf{z}(\mathbf{p}^*), \mathbf{p}^* \rangle$$

and

$$0 \geq \langle \mathbf{z}(\mathbf{p}^*), \mathbf{p}^* \rangle \quad (44)$$

That is, \mathbf{p}^* satisfies weak Walras' law. Hence, \mathbf{p}^* is a Walrasian equilibrium. \square

Theorem 4.2 [Balanced economies as VIs].

For any balanced economy (m, \mathcal{Z}) , the set of Walrasian equilibria is equal to the strictly positive cone generated by the strong solutions of the continuous VI $([0, 1]^m, -\mathcal{Z})$, i.e., $\mathcal{WE}(m, \mathcal{Z}) = \bigcup_{\lambda \geq 1} \lambda \mathcal{SVI}([0, 1]^m, -\mathcal{Z})$.

Proof of Theorem 4.2. (\implies) Let $\mathbf{p}^* \in \mathcal{WE}(m, \mathcal{Z})$ be a Walrasian equilibrium. Let $\alpha \doteq \frac{1}{\max\{1, \|\mathbf{p}^*\|_\infty\}}$. Then, we have $\alpha\mathbf{p}^* \in [0, 1]^m$. Further, for some $\mathbf{z}(\alpha\mathbf{p}^*) \in \mathcal{Z}(\alpha\mathbf{p}^*)$, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} & \langle -\mathbf{z}(\alpha\mathbf{p}^*), \alpha\mathbf{p}^* - \mathbf{p} \rangle && \forall \mathbf{p} \in [0, 1]^m \\ & = \langle \mathbf{z}(\mathbf{p}^*), \mathbf{p} - \alpha\mathbf{p}^* \rangle && \forall \mathbf{p} \in [0, 1]^m \quad (\text{Homogeneity of } \mathbf{z}) \\ & = \langle \mathbf{z}(\mathbf{p}^*), \mathbf{p} \rangle - \underbrace{\alpha \langle \mathbf{z}(\mathbf{p}^*), \mathbf{p}^* \rangle}_{=0} && \forall \mathbf{p} \in [0, 1]^m \\ & = \langle \mathbf{z}(\mathbf{p}^*), \mathbf{p} \rangle && \forall \mathbf{p} \in [0, 1]^m \\ & \leq 0 \end{aligned}$$

where the penultimate line follows from Walras' law holding at a Walrasian equilibrium, and the last line follows from the feasibility of $\mathbf{z}(\mathbf{p}^*)$, i.e., $\mathbf{z}(\mathbf{p}^*) \leq \mathbf{0}$, and the positivity of \mathbf{p} . Hence, $\alpha\mathbf{p}^*$ is a strong solution of the VI $([0, 1]^m, -\mathcal{Z})$, which means that $\mathbf{p}^* \in \frac{1}{\alpha} \mathcal{SVI}([0, 1]^m, -\mathcal{Z})$.

Now, notice that by homogeneity of the excess demand in balanced economies since for all $\lambda > 0$, $\mathcal{Z}(\lambda\mathbf{p}^*) = \mathcal{Z}(\mathbf{p}^*)$, if \mathbf{p}^* is a Walrasian equilibrium, then so is $\lambda\mathbf{p}^*$. Hence, α takes values in $(0, 1]$, implying $\frac{1}{\alpha} \in [1, \infty)$, and as such we must have $\mathcal{WE}(m, \mathcal{Z}) \subseteq \bigcup_{\lambda \geq 1} \lambda \mathcal{SVI}([0, 1]^m, -\mathcal{Z})$.

(\Leftarrow) Let $\mathbf{p}^* \in \mathcal{SVI}([0, 1]^m, -\mathcal{Z})$ and $\lambda \geq 1$. Then, for some $\mathbf{z}(\mathbf{p}^*) \in \mathcal{Z}(\mathbf{p}^*)$, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
 0 &\geq \langle -\mathbf{z}(\mathbf{p}^*), \mathbf{p}^* - \mathbf{p} \rangle && \forall \mathbf{p} \in [0, 1]^m \\
 &= \langle \mathbf{z}(\mathbf{p}^*), \mathbf{p} - \mathbf{p}^* \rangle && \forall \mathbf{p} \in [0, 1]^m \\
 &= \langle \mathbf{z}(\mathbf{p}^*), \mathbf{p} \rangle - \langle \mathbf{z}(\mathbf{p}^*), \mathbf{p}^* \rangle && \forall \mathbf{p} \in [0, 1]^m
 \end{aligned} \tag{45}$$

Plugging $\mathbf{p} = \mathbf{0}_m$ in Equation (45), we then have:

$$\begin{aligned}
 0 &\geq \underbrace{\langle \mathbf{z}(\mathbf{p}^*), \mathbf{0}_m \rangle}_{=0} - \langle \mathbf{z}(\mathbf{p}^*), \mathbf{p}^* \rangle \\
 0 &\geq -\langle \mathbf{z}(\mathbf{p}^*), \mathbf{p}^* \rangle \\
 0 &\leq \langle \mathbf{z}(\mathbf{p}^*), \mathbf{p}^* \rangle \\
 0 &\leq \langle \mathbf{z}(\lambda \mathbf{p}^*), \mathbf{p}^* \rangle && \text{(Homogeneity of } \mathbf{z} \text{)} \\
 0 &\leq \langle \mathbf{z}(\lambda \mathbf{p}^*), \lambda \mathbf{p}^* \rangle
 \end{aligned}$$

Further, since (m, \mathcal{Z}) is balanced, we have $\lambda \mathbf{p}^* \cdot \mathbf{z}(\lambda \mathbf{p}^*) = \mathbf{p}^* \cdot \mathbf{z}(\mathbf{p}^*) \leq 0$, hence, combining it with the above inequality, we must have $\lambda \mathbf{p}^* \cdot \mathbf{z}(\lambda \mathbf{p}^*) = 0$, meaning that $\lambda \mathbf{p}^*$ satisfies Walras' law.

In addition, continuing from Equation (45) again, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
 0 &\geq \langle \mathbf{z}(\mathbf{p}^*), \mathbf{p} \rangle - \underbrace{\langle \mathbf{z}(\mathbf{p}^*), \mathbf{p}^* \rangle}_{\leq 0} \\
 &\geq \langle \mathbf{z}(\mathbf{p}^*), \mathbf{p} \rangle && \forall \mathbf{p} \in [0, 1]^m
 \end{aligned} \tag{46}$$

$$\geq \langle \mathbf{z}(\lambda \mathbf{p}^*), \mathbf{p} \rangle \quad \forall \mathbf{p} \in [0, 1]^m \tag{47}$$

where the penultimate line follows from the fact that balanced economies satisfy weak Walras' law, and the last line from homogeneity of degree 0 of the excess demand.

Now, plugging $\mathbf{p} = \mathbf{j}_j$ for all $j \in [m]$ in Equation (47), we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
 0 &\geq \langle \mathbf{z}(\lambda \mathbf{p}^*), \mathbf{j}_j \rangle && \forall j \in [m] \\
 &\geq z_j(\lambda \mathbf{p}^*) && \forall j \in [m] .
 \end{aligned}$$

That is, $\lambda \mathbf{p}^*$ is feasible. Putting it all together, $\lambda \mathbf{p}^*$ must be a Walrasian equilibrium. As such we must have

$$\bigcup_{\lambda \geq 1} \lambda \mathcal{SVI}([0, 1]^m, -\mathcal{Z}) \subseteq \mathcal{WE}(m, \mathcal{Z}) \quad \square$$

Lemma 1 [ε -strong solution $\implies \varepsilon$ -Walrasian equilibrium].

For any balanced economy (m, \mathcal{Z}) , any ε -strong solution of the VI $([0, 1]^m, -\mathcal{Z})$ is a ε -Walrasian equilibrium of (m, \mathcal{Z}) .

Proof of Lemma 1. For any $\varepsilon \geq 0$, let $\mathbf{p}^* \in \mathcal{SVI}_\varepsilon([0, 1]^m, -\mathcal{Z})$. Then, for some $\mathbf{z}(\mathbf{p}^*) \in \mathcal{Z}(\mathbf{p}^*)$, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon &\geq \langle -\mathbf{z}(\mathbf{p}^*), \mathbf{p}^* - \mathbf{p} \rangle && \forall \mathbf{p} \in [0, 1]^m \\ &= \langle \mathbf{z}(\mathbf{p}^*), \mathbf{p} - \mathbf{p}^* \rangle && \forall \mathbf{p} \in [0, 1]^m \\ &= \langle \mathbf{z}(\mathbf{p}^*), \mathbf{p} \rangle - \langle \mathbf{z}(\mathbf{p}^*), \mathbf{p}^* \rangle && \forall \mathbf{p} \in [0, 1]^m \end{aligned} \quad (48)$$

Plugging $\mathbf{p} = \mathbf{0}_m$ in Equation (45), we then have:

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon &\geq \underbrace{\langle \mathbf{z}(\mathbf{p}^*), \mathbf{0}_m \rangle}_{=0} - \langle \mathbf{z}(\mathbf{p}^*), \mathbf{p}^* \rangle \\ \varepsilon &\geq -\langle \mathbf{z}(\mathbf{p}^*), \mathbf{p}^* \rangle \\ -\varepsilon &\leq \langle \mathbf{z}(\mathbf{p}^*), \mathbf{p}^* \rangle \end{aligned}$$

Further, since (m, \mathcal{Z}) is balanced, we have $\mathbf{p}^* \cdot \mathbf{z}(\mathbf{p}^*) \leq 0 \leq \varepsilon$, hence, combining it with the above inequality, we must have that \mathbf{p}^* satisfies ε -Walras' law.

In addition, continuing from Equation (48) again, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon &\geq \langle \mathbf{z}(\mathbf{p}^*), \mathbf{p} \rangle - \underbrace{\langle \mathbf{z}(\mathbf{p}^*), \mathbf{p}^* \rangle}_{\leq 0} \\ &\geq \langle \mathbf{z}(\mathbf{p}^*), \mathbf{p} \rangle && \forall \mathbf{p} \in [0, 1]^m \end{aligned} \quad (49)$$

where the last line follows from the fact that balanced economies satisfy weak Walras' law.

Now, plugging $\mathbf{p} = \mathbf{j}_j$ for all $j \in [m]$ in Equation (49), we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon &\geq \langle \mathbf{z}(\mathbf{p}^*), \mathbf{j}_j \rangle && \forall j \in [m] \\ &\geq z_j(\mathbf{p}^*) && \forall j \in [m] . \end{aligned}$$

That is, \mathbf{p}^* is ε -feasible. Putting it all together, \mathbf{p}^* must be a ε -Walrasian equilibrium. □

Theorem 4.3 [Competitive economies as VIs].

For any competitive economy (m, \mathcal{Z}) , the set of Walrasian equilibria is equal to the strictly positive cone generated by the strong solutions of the continuous VI $(\Delta_m, -\mathcal{Z})$, i.e., $\mathcal{WE}(m, \mathcal{Z}) = \bigcup_{\lambda > 0} \lambda \mathcal{SVI}(\Delta_m, -\mathcal{Z})$.

Proof of Theorem 4.3. (\implies) Let $\mathbf{p}^* \in \mathcal{WE}(m, \mathcal{Z})$ be a Walrasian equilibrium. Let $\alpha \doteq \frac{1}{\|\mathbf{p}^*\|_1}$. Then, we have $\alpha\mathbf{p}^* \in \Delta_m$. Further, for some $\mathbf{z}(\alpha\mathbf{p}^*) \in \mathcal{Z}(\alpha\mathbf{p}^*)$, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \langle -\mathbf{z}(\alpha\mathbf{p}^*), \alpha\mathbf{p}^* - \mathbf{p} \rangle && \forall \mathbf{p} \in \Delta_m \\
 & = \langle \mathbf{z}(\mathbf{p}^*), \mathbf{p} - \alpha\mathbf{p}^* \rangle && \forall \mathbf{p} \in \Delta_m \quad (\text{Homogeneity of } \mathbf{z}) \\
 & = \langle \mathbf{z}(\mathbf{p}^*), \mathbf{p} \rangle - \underbrace{\alpha \langle \mathbf{z}(\mathbf{p}^*), \mathbf{p}^* \rangle}_{=0} && \forall \mathbf{p} \in \Delta_m \\
 & = \langle \mathbf{z}(\mathbf{p}^*), \mathbf{p} \rangle && \forall \mathbf{p} \in \Delta_m \\
 & \leq 0
 \end{aligned}$$

where the penultimate line follows from Walras' law holding at a Walrasian equilibrium, and the last line follows from the feasibility of $\mathbf{z}(\mathbf{p}^*)$, i.e., $\mathbf{z}(\mathbf{p}^*) \leq \mathbf{0}$, and the positivity of \mathbf{p} . Hence, $\alpha\mathbf{p}^*$ is a strong solution of the VI $(\Delta_m, -\mathcal{Z})$, which means that $\mathbf{p}^* \in \frac{1}{\alpha} \mathcal{SVI}(\Delta_m, -\mathcal{Z})$.

Now, notice that by homogeneity of the excess demand in competitive economies since for all $\lambda > 0$, $\mathcal{Z}(\lambda\mathbf{p}^*) = \mathcal{Z}(\mathbf{p}^*)$, if \mathbf{p}^* is a Walrasian equilibrium, then so is $\lambda\mathbf{p}^*$. Hence, α takes values in $(0, \infty)$, implying $\frac{1}{\alpha} \in [1, \infty)$, and as such we must have $\mathcal{WE}(m, \mathcal{Z}) \subseteq \bigcup_{\lambda > 0} \lambda \mathcal{SVI}(\Delta_m, -\mathcal{Z})$.

(\impliedby) Let $\mathbf{p}^* \in \mathcal{SVI}(\Delta_m, -\mathcal{Z})$ and $\lambda > 1$. Then, for some $\mathbf{z}(\mathbf{p}^*) \in \mathcal{Z}(\mathbf{p}^*)$, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
 0 & \geq \langle -\mathbf{z}(\mathbf{p}^*), \mathbf{p}^* - \mathbf{p} \rangle && \forall \mathbf{p} \in \Delta_m \\
 & = \langle \mathbf{z}(\mathbf{p}^*), \mathbf{p} - \mathbf{p}^* \rangle && \forall \mathbf{p} \in \Delta_m \\
 & = \langle \mathbf{z}(\mathbf{p}^*), \mathbf{p} \rangle - \underbrace{\langle \mathbf{z}(\mathbf{p}^*), \mathbf{p}^* \rangle}_{\leq 0} \\
 & \geq \langle \mathbf{z}(\mathbf{p}^*), \mathbf{p} \rangle && \forall \mathbf{p} \in \Delta_m \\
 & \geq \langle \mathbf{z}(\lambda\mathbf{p}^*), \mathbf{p} \rangle && \forall \mathbf{p} \in \Delta_m
 \end{aligned}$$

where the penultimate line follows from the fact that competitive economies satisfy weak Walras' law, and the last line from homogeneity of degree 0 of the excess demand.

Now, plugging $\mathbf{p} = \mathbf{j}_j$ for all $j \in [m]$ in the above, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
 0 & \geq \langle \mathbf{z}(\lambda\mathbf{p}^*), \mathbf{j}_j \rangle && \forall j \in [m] \\
 & \geq z_j(\lambda\mathbf{p}^*) && \forall j \in [m] .
 \end{aligned}$$

That is, $\lambda \mathbf{p}^*$ is feasible. Now by non-satiation, since $\mathbf{z}(\lambda \mathbf{p}^*) \leq \mathbf{0}_m$, we must have $\lambda \mathbf{p}^* \cdot \mathbf{z}(\lambda \mathbf{p}^*) \geq 0$. As by weak Walras' law $\lambda \mathbf{p}^* \cdot \mathbf{z}(\lambda \mathbf{p}^*) \leq 0$, we must have $\lambda \mathbf{p}^* \cdot \mathbf{z}(\lambda \mathbf{p}^*) = 0$, meaning that $\lambda \mathbf{p}^*$ satisfies Walras' law. Putting it all together, $\lambda \mathbf{p}^*$ must be a Walrasian equilibrium. As such we must have $\bigcup_{\lambda > 0} \lambda \text{SVI}(\Delta_m, -\mathcal{Z}) \subseteq \mathcal{WE}(m, \mathcal{Z})$ \square

Theorem 4.4 [Existence of Walrasian Equilibrium].

The set of Walrasian equilibria of any continuous competitive economy (m, \mathcal{Z}) is non-empty, i.e., $\mathcal{WE}(m, \mathcal{Z}) \neq \emptyset$.

Proof of Theorem 4.4. By Theorem 4.3, we know that the set of strong solutions $\text{SVI}(\Delta_m, -\mathcal{Z})$ of the VI $(\Delta_m, -\mathcal{Z})$ is a subset of the set of Walrasian equilibria (m, \mathcal{Z}) .

Now, notice that for a continuous Walrasian economy $(\Delta_m, -\mathcal{Z})$ is a continuous VI. Hence, by (Theorem 2.2.1 of [Facchinei and Pang \(2003\)](#)) a strong solution to $(\Delta_m, -\mathcal{Z})$ is guaranteed to exist, which in turn implies the existence of a Walrasian equilibrium in continuous competitive Walrasian economies. \square

D.2 Results for Balanced Economies

Lemma 2 [Balanced Economies are Variationally Stable on the Unit Box].

Any balanced economy (m, \mathcal{Z}) is variationally stable on $[0, 1]^m$, in particular letting $\mathbf{p}^* \doteq \mathbf{0}_m$, for all prices $\mathbf{p} \in [0, 1]^m$ and $\mathbf{z}(\mathbf{p}) \in \mathcal{Z}(\mathbf{p})$, we have $\langle \mathbf{z}(\mathbf{p}), \mathbf{p}^* - \mathbf{p} \rangle \geq 0$.

Proof of Lemma 2. Let (m, \mathcal{Z}) be a balanced economy, then setting $\mathbf{p}^* \doteq \mathbf{0}_m$, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \mathbf{z}(\mathbf{p}), \mathbf{p}^* - \mathbf{p} \rangle &= \langle \mathbf{z}(\mathbf{p}), \mathbf{0}_m - \mathbf{p} \rangle \\ &= \underbrace{\langle \mathbf{z}(\mathbf{p}), \mathbf{0}_m \rangle}_{=0} - \langle \mathbf{z}(\mathbf{p}), \mathbf{p} \rangle \\ &= - \underbrace{\langle \mathbf{z}(\mathbf{p}), \mathbf{p} \rangle}_{\leq 0} \\ &\geq 0 \end{aligned}$$

where the last line follow from the weak Walras' law assumption holding in balanced economies, i.e., for all prices $\mathbf{p} \in [0, 1]^m$, $\langle \mathbf{z}(\mathbf{p}), \mathbf{p} \rangle \leq 0$, which implies $-\langle \mathbf{z}(\mathbf{p}), \mathbf{p} \rangle \geq 0$. \square

Theorem 4.5 [Convergence of Mirror Extratâtonnement].

Let (m, \mathcal{Z}) be a balanced economy. Consider the mirror *extratâtonnement* process run on (m, \mathcal{Z}) , with a 1-strongly-convex and κ -Lipschitz-smooth kernel function h , any time horizon $t \in \mathbb{N}$, any step size $\eta > 0$, a price space

$\mathcal{P} \doteq [0, 1]^m$, and any initial price vector $\mathbf{p}^{(0)} \in [0, 1]^m$, and let $\{\mathbf{p}^{(t)}, \mathbf{p}^{(t+0.5)}\}_t$ be the sequence of prices generated. Suppose that there exists $\lambda \in (0, \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\eta}}]$, s.t. $\frac{1}{2}\|\mathbf{z}(\mathbf{p}^{(k+0.5)}) - \mathbf{z}(\mathbf{p}^{(k)})\|^2 \leq \lambda^2 \delta_h(\mathbf{p}^{(k+0.5)}, \mathbf{p}^{(k)})$.

Let $\mathbf{p}_{\text{best}}^{(\tau)} \in \arg \min_{\mathbf{x}^{(k+0.5)}: k=0, \dots, \tau} \delta_h(\mathbf{p}^{(k+0.5)}, \mathbf{p}^{(k)})$, then for some time horizon $\tau \in O(\frac{\kappa^2 m^2 \delta_h(\mathbf{0}_m, \mathbf{p}^{(0)})}{\eta^2 \epsilon^2})$, $\mathbf{p}_{\text{best}}^{(\tau)}$ is a ϵ -Walrasian equilibrium. Further, we have that $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{p}^{(t+0.5)} = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{p}^{(t)} = \mathbf{p}^*$ is a Walrasian equilibrium.

Proof of Theorem 4.5. Since (m, \mathbf{z}) is a balanced economy, by Lemma 2, (m, \mathbf{z}) is variationally stable on $[0, 1]^m$, and hence the VI $([0, 1]^m, -\mathcal{Z})$ satisfies the Minty condition. Hence, as the mirror *extratâtonnement* process is simply the mirror extragradient method run on the VI $([0, 1]^m, -\mathcal{Z})$, the assumptions of Theorem 3.1 are satisfied, and we obtain the result. □

Lemma 3 [Bregman Continuity Bound for elastic economies].

Let $(m, \mathbf{d}, \mathbf{s})$ be an $\bar{\epsilon}$ -elastic economy, then for any 1-strongly-convex kernel function $h : \mathbb{R}_+^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, the following bound holds: $\frac{1}{2}\|\mathbf{z}(\mathbf{q}) - \mathbf{z}(\mathbf{p})\|^2 \leq \left(\frac{\epsilon(\|\mathbf{d}(\mathbf{p})\| + \|\mathbf{s}(\mathbf{p})\|)}{\|\mathbf{p}\|_\infty}\right)^2 \delta_h(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{p})$

Proof of Lemma 3. By the assumption of the theorem, we have for all $\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q} \in \Delta_m$, $j, k \in [m]$:

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \frac{d_j(\mathbf{q}) - d_j(\mathbf{p})}{d_j(\mathbf{p})} \frac{p_k}{q_k - p_k} \right| &\leq \epsilon \\ \frac{|d_j(\mathbf{q}) - d_j(\mathbf{p})|}{|d_j(\mathbf{p})|} \frac{|p_k|}{q_k - p_k} &\leq \epsilon \\ |d_j(\mathbf{q}) - d_j(\mathbf{p})| &\leq \frac{\epsilon |d_j(\mathbf{p})|}{p_k} |q_k - p_k| \\ |d_j(\mathbf{q}) - d_j(\mathbf{p})|^2 &\leq \frac{\epsilon^2 |d_j(\mathbf{p})|^2}{(p_k)^2} |q_k - p_k|^2 \end{aligned}$$

Summing up over $j \in [m]$, we have for all $k \in [m]$:

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{d}(\mathbf{q}) - \mathbf{d}(\mathbf{p})\|^2 &\leq \frac{\epsilon^2 \|\mathbf{d}(\mathbf{p})\|^2}{(p_k)^2} |q_k - p_k|^2 \\ &\leq \frac{\epsilon^2 \|\mathbf{d}(\mathbf{p})\|^2}{(p_k)^2} \|\mathbf{q} - \mathbf{p}\|^2 \end{aligned}$$

Since h is 1-strongly-convex, $\forall \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{X}$, $\delta_h(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \geq 1/2\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|^2$, hence, we have:

$$\|\mathbf{d}(\mathbf{q}) - \mathbf{d}(\mathbf{p})\|^2 \leq \frac{2\epsilon^2 \|\mathbf{d}(\mathbf{p})\|^2}{(p_k)^2} \delta_h(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{p})$$

Taking the square root of both sides and the taking a minimum over $k \in [m]$, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{d}(\mathbf{q}) - \mathbf{d}(\mathbf{p})\| &\leq \min_{k \in [m]} \frac{\epsilon \|\mathbf{d}(\mathbf{p})\|}{p_k} \sqrt{2\delta_h(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{p})} \\ &= \frac{\epsilon \|\mathbf{d}(\mathbf{p})\|}{\max_{k \in [m]} p_k} \sqrt{2\delta_h(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{p})} \\ &= \frac{\epsilon \|\mathbf{d}(\mathbf{p})\|}{\|\mathbf{p}\|_\infty} \sqrt{2\delta_h(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{p})} \end{aligned}$$

By a similar argument, note that we also have:

$$\|\mathbf{s}(\mathbf{q}) - \mathbf{s}(\mathbf{p})\| \leq \frac{\epsilon \|\mathbf{s}(\mathbf{p})\|}{\|\mathbf{p}\|_\infty} \sqrt{2\delta_h(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{p})}$$

Combining the two above bounds, we then have:

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{z}(\mathbf{q}) - \mathbf{z}(\mathbf{p})\| &= \|\mathbf{d}(\mathbf{q}) - \mathbf{s}(\mathbf{q}) - \mathbf{d}(\mathbf{p}) + \mathbf{s}(\mathbf{p})\| \\ &\leq \|\mathbf{d}(\mathbf{q}) - \mathbf{d}(\mathbf{p})\| + \|\mathbf{s}(\mathbf{q}) - \mathbf{s}(\mathbf{p})\| \\ &\leq \frac{\epsilon \|\mathbf{d}(\mathbf{p})\|}{\|\mathbf{p}\|_\infty} \sqrt{2\delta_h(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{p})} + \frac{\epsilon \|\mathbf{s}(\mathbf{p})\|}{\|\mathbf{p}\|_\infty} \sqrt{2\delta_h(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{p})} \\ &\leq \frac{\epsilon (\|\mathbf{d}(\mathbf{p})\| + \|\mathbf{s}(\mathbf{p})\|)}{\|\mathbf{p}\|_\infty} \sqrt{2\delta_h(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{p})} \end{aligned}$$

Squaring both sides and re-organizing expressions, we then have:

$$\frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{z}(\mathbf{q}) - \mathbf{z}(\mathbf{p})\|^2 \leq \left(\frac{\epsilon (\|\mathbf{d}(\mathbf{p})\| + \|\mathbf{s}(\mathbf{p})\|)}{\|\mathbf{p}\|_\infty} \right)^2 \delta_h(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{p})$$

□

D.3 Results for Variationally Stable Economies

Theorem 4.6 [Mirror Extratâtonnement Convergence on the Unit Simplex].

Let $(m, \mathbf{d}, \mathbf{s})$ be a $\bar{\epsilon}$ -elastic and \bar{z} -bounded balanced economy which is variationally stable on Δ_m , and let $\mathbf{p}^* \in \mathcal{WE}(m, \mathbf{d}, \mathbf{s})$ be any of its Walrasian equilibria. Consider the mirror *extratâtonnement* process run on (m, \mathbf{z}) , with a 1-strongly-convex and κ -Lipschitz-smooth kernel function h , any time horizon $t \in \mathbb{N}$, any step size $\eta \in (0, \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2m\epsilon\bar{z}}}]$, a price space $\mathcal{P} \doteq \Delta_m$, and any initial price vector $\mathbf{p}^{(0)} \in \Delta_m$, and let $\{\mathbf{p}^{(t)}, \mathbf{p}^{(t+0.5)}\}_t$ be the sequence of prices generated. The following convergence bound holds: $\min_{k=0, \dots, \tau} \max_{\mathbf{p} \in \Delta} \langle \mathbf{z}(\mathbf{p}^{(k+0.5)}), \mathbf{p} - \mathbf{p}^{(k+0.5)} \rangle \leq \frac{2\sqrt{2}(1+\kappa)}{\eta} \frac{\sqrt{\max_{\mathbf{p} \in \Delta} \delta_h(\mathbf{p}^*, \mathbf{p}^{(0)})}}{\sqrt{\tau}}$. Further, we have that $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{p}^{(t+0.5)} = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{p}^{(t)} = \mathbf{p}^*$ is a Walrasian equilibrium.

Proof of Theorem 4.6. Since (m, \mathbf{z}) is variationally stable on Δ_m , the VI $(\Delta_m, -\mathcal{Z})$ satisfies the Minty condition. In addition, since by the assumption of the theorem the economy is $\bar{\epsilon}$ -elastic and \bar{z} -bounded, by Lemma 3, \mathbf{z} is

$(2m\epsilon\bar{z})$ -Bregman-continuous on Δ_m . That is, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 \frac{1}{2}\|z(\mathbf{q}) - z(\mathbf{p})\|^2 &\leq \left(\frac{\epsilon(\|\mathbf{d}(\mathbf{p})\| + \|\mathbf{s}(\mathbf{p})\|)}{\|\mathbf{p}\|_\infty} \right)^2 \delta_h(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{p}) \\
 &\leq \max_{\mathbf{p} \in \Delta_m} \left(\frac{\epsilon(\|\mathbf{d}(\mathbf{p})\| + \|\mathbf{s}(\mathbf{p})\|)}{\|\mathbf{p}\|_\infty} \right)^2 \delta_h(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{p}) \\
 &\leq \left(\frac{\epsilon(\|\mathbf{d}\|_\infty + \|\mathbf{s}\|_\infty)}{\min_{\mathbf{p} \in \Delta_m} \|\mathbf{p}\|_\infty} \right)^2 \delta_h(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{p}) \\
 &\leq \left(\frac{2\epsilon\bar{z}}{\frac{1}{m}} \right)^2 \delta_h(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{p}) \\
 &\leq (2m\epsilon\bar{z})^2 \delta_h(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{p}) .
 \end{aligned}$$

That is,

Suppose that under the assumptions of the theorem the mirror generates the sequence of prices $\{\mathbf{p}^{(t)}, \mathbf{p}^{(t+0.5)}\}_t$. Let $\mathbf{p}_{\text{best}}^{(\tau)} \in \arg \min_{\mathbf{p}^{(k+0.5)}: k=0, \dots, \tau} \delta_h(\mathbf{p}^{(k+0.5)}, \mathbf{p}^{(k)})$. As the mirror *extratâtonnement* process is simply the mirror extragradient method run on the VI $(\Delta_m, -\mathcal{Z})$, and the assumptions of Theorem 3.1 are satisfied and hence we have the following bound:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \min_{k=0, \dots, \tau} \max_{\mathbf{p} \in \Delta} \langle -z(\mathbf{p}^{(k+0.5)}), \mathbf{p}^{(k+0.5)} - \mathbf{p} \rangle &\leq \frac{2(1 + \kappa) \text{diam}(\Delta_m)}{\eta} \frac{\sqrt{\max_{\mathbf{p} \in \Delta} \delta_h(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{p}^{(0)})}}{\sqrt{\tau}} \\
 \min_{k=0, \dots, \tau} \max_{\mathbf{p} \in \Delta} \langle z(\mathbf{p}^{(k+0.5)}), \mathbf{p} - \mathbf{p}^{(k+0.5)} \rangle &\leq \frac{2\sqrt{2}(1 + \kappa)}{\eta} \frac{\sqrt{\max_{\mathbf{p} \in \Delta} \delta_h(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{p}^{(0)})}}{\sqrt{\tau}}
 \end{aligned}$$

Further, $\lim_t \mathbf{p}^{(t)} = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{p}^{t+0.5} = \mathbf{p}^*$ is a Walrasian equilibrium.

□

D.4 The Scarf Economy

The following lemma states that any Scarf economy is a balanced economy.

Lemma 8 [Scarf Economies are Balanced].

The Scarf economy is a balanced economy which satisfies Walras' law, i.e., for all $\mathbf{p} \in \mathbb{R}_+^m$, $\mathbf{p} \cdot \mathbf{z}^{\text{scarf}}(\mathbf{p}) = 0$. Further, the set of Walrasian equilibrium of the Scarf economy $\mathbf{z}^{\text{scarf}}$ is given by $\mathcal{WE}(\mathbf{z}^{\text{scarf}}) \doteq \{\lambda \mathbf{1}_3 \mid \lambda > 0\}$.

Proof. First, notice that the scarf economy is homogeneous of degree 0. That is, for all $\lambda \geq 0$, we have:

$$\mathbf{z}^{\text{scarf}}(\lambda \mathbf{p}) \doteq \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\lambda p_1}{\lambda p_1 + \lambda p_2} + \frac{\lambda p_3}{\lambda p_1 + \lambda p_3} - 1 \\ \frac{\lambda p_1}{\lambda p_1 + \lambda p_2} + \frac{\lambda p_2}{\lambda p_2 + \lambda p_3} - 1 \\ \frac{\lambda p_2}{\lambda p_2 + \lambda p_3} + \frac{\lambda p_3}{\lambda p_1 + \lambda p_3} - 1 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{p_1}{p_1 + p_2} + \frac{p_3}{p_1 + p_3} - 1 \\ \frac{p_1}{p_1 + p_2} + \frac{p_2}{p_2 + p_3} - 1 \\ \frac{p_2}{p_2 + p_3} + \frac{p_3}{p_1 + p_3} - 1 \end{pmatrix} = \mathbf{z}^{\text{scarf}}(\mathbf{p})$$

Second, for all $\mathbf{p} \in \mathbb{R}^m$, notice we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{p} \cdot \mathbf{z}^{\text{scarf}}(\mathbf{p}) &= \frac{p_1^2}{p_1 + p_2} + \frac{p_1 p_3}{p_1 + p_3} - p_1 + \frac{p_1 p_2}{p_1 + p_2} + \frac{p_2^2}{p_2 + p_3} - p_2 + \frac{p_2 p_3}{p_2 + p_3} + \frac{p_3^2}{p_1 + p_3} - p_3 \\ &= \frac{p_1^2 + p_1 p_2}{p_1 + p_2} + \frac{p_2^2 + p_2 p_3}{p_2 + p_3} + \frac{p_3^2 + p_1 p_3}{p_1 + p_3} - p_1 - p_2 - p_3 \\ &= \frac{p_1(p_1 + p_2)}{p_1 + p_2} + \frac{p_2(p_2 + p_3)}{p_2 + p_3} + \frac{p_3(p_3 + p_1)}{p_1 + p_3} - p_1 - p_2 - p_3 \\ &= 0 \end{aligned}$$

Finally, observe that for $\mathbf{p}^* = \mathbf{1}_m$, we have $\mathbf{z}^{\text{scarf}}(\mathbf{p}^*) = \mathbf{0}_m$, and, we have $\mathbf{p}^* \cdot \mathbf{z}^{\text{scarf}}(\mathbf{p}^*)$. Notice that this equilibrium is unique up to positive scaling since if the price of any commodity is changed from \mathbf{p}^* , then the excess demand for another commodity is guaranteed to decrease while the excess demand of some other commodity increases. \square

Lemma 9 [Variational stability and Bregman-continuity of the Scarf Economy].

Any Scarf economy $\mathbf{z}^{\text{scarf}}$ is variationally stable on any non-empty price space $\mathcal{P} \subseteq \mathbb{R}_+^3$. Further, for any $\underline{p} \in (0, 1/3)$ and any 1-strongly-convex kernel function $h : \mathbb{R}_+^3 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, the Scarf economy $\mathbf{z}^{\text{scarf}}$ is variationally stable and $(3/\underline{p}^2, h)$ -Bregman-continuous on $[\underline{p}, 1]^3$.

Proof of Lemma 9. Part 1: Variational stability on Δ_m .

We claim that for $\mathbf{p}^* = (1/3, 1/3, 1/3)$, the Scarf economy is variationally stable on Δ_m , i.e., we have for all prices $\mathbf{p} \in \Delta_3$ and all $\mathbf{z}(\mathbf{p}) \in \mathcal{Z}(\mathbf{p})$, we have $\langle \mathbf{z}^{\text{scarf}}(\mathbf{p}), \mathbf{p}^* - \mathbf{p} \rangle \geq 0$.

First, notice that expanding the expression $\langle \mathbf{z}^{\text{scarf}}(\mathbf{p}), \mathbf{p}^* - \mathbf{p} \rangle$ we have for all $\mathbf{p} \in \mathcal{P}$:

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \mathbf{z}^{\text{scarf}}(\mathbf{p}), \mathbf{p}^* - \mathbf{p} \rangle &= \langle \mathbf{z}^{\text{scarf}}(\mathbf{p}), \mathbf{p}^* \rangle - \underbrace{\langle \mathbf{z}^{\text{scarf}}(\mathbf{p}), \mathbf{p} \rangle}_{=0} \\ &= \langle \mathbf{z}^{\text{scarf}}(\mathbf{p}), \mathbf{p}^* \rangle \\ &= 2 \frac{p_1}{p_1 + p_2} + 2 \frac{p_2}{p_2 + p_3} + 2 \frac{p_3}{p_1 + p_3} - \underbrace{1/3 - 1/3 - 1/3}_{=-1} \\ &= 2 \frac{p_1}{p_1 + p_2} + 2 \frac{p_2}{p_2 + p_3} + 2 \frac{p_3}{p_1 + p_3} - 1 \end{aligned}$$

We proceed by proof by cases.

Case 1 $p_1 \geq p_2$.

$$\begin{aligned}
 \langle z^{\text{scarf}}(\mathbf{p}), \mathbf{p}^* - \mathbf{p} \rangle &= 2 \frac{p_1}{p_1 + p_2} + 2 \underbrace{\frac{p_2}{p_2 + p_3}}_{\geq 0} + 2 \underbrace{\frac{p_3}{p_1 + p_3}}_{\geq 0} - 1 \\
 &\geq 2 \frac{p_1}{p_1 + \underbrace{p_2}_{\leq p_1}} - 1 \\
 &\geq 2 \frac{p_1}{p_1 + p_1} - 1 \\
 &= 1 - 1 \\
 &= 0
 \end{aligned}$$

Case 2 $p_1 < p_2$.

$$\begin{aligned}
 \langle z^{\text{scarf}}(\mathbf{p}), \mathbf{p}^* - \mathbf{p} \rangle &= 2 \underbrace{\frac{p_1}{p_1 + p_2}}_{\geq 0} + 2 \frac{p_2}{p_2 + p_3} + 2 \frac{p_3}{p_1 + p_3} - 1 \\
 &= 2 \frac{p_2}{p_2 + p_3} + 2 \frac{p_3}{\underbrace{p_1 + p_3}_{< p_2}} - 1 \\
 &= 2 \frac{p_2}{p_2 + p_3} + 2 \frac{p_3}{p_2 + p_3} - 1 \\
 &= 2 \frac{p_2 + p_3}{p_2 + p_3} - 1 \\
 &= 2 - 1 \\
 &\geq 0
 \end{aligned}$$

Hence, we must have: $\langle z^{\text{scarf}}(\mathbf{p}), \mathbf{p}^* - \mathbf{p} \rangle \geq 0$, and the Scarf economy is variationally stable on Δ_m .

Part 2: Variational stability and Bregman-continuity on $[\underline{p}, 1]^3$. First, for variational stability on $[\underline{p}, 1]$, observe that the proof provided in part 1 applies directly by replacing Δ_m by $[\underline{p}, 1]$.

Second, notice that the excess demand is differentiable with its Jacobian matrix given by:

$$\nabla z(\mathbf{p}) = \begin{bmatrix} -\frac{p_1}{(p_1+p_2)^2} - \frac{p_3}{(p_1+p_3)^2} & -\frac{p_1}{(p_1+p_2)^2} & -\frac{p_3}{(p_1+p_3)^2} \\ -\frac{p_1}{(p_1+p_2)^2} & -\frac{p_1}{(p_1+p_2)^2} - \frac{p_3}{(p_2+p_3)^2} & -\frac{p_2}{(p_2+p_3)^2} \\ -\frac{p_3}{(p_1+p_3)^2} & -\frac{p_3}{(p_2+p_3)^2} & -\frac{p_2}{(p_2+p_3)^2} - \frac{p_3}{(p_1+p_3)^2} \end{bmatrix}$$

Thus, the Jacobian consists of entries of the form of $f(x, y) \doteq \frac{x}{(x+y)^2}$. For $x, y \in [\underline{p}, 1]$, we then have $|f(x, y)| \leq \frac{1}{4\underline{p}^2}$. This means that the absolute value of the off diagonal entries of $\nabla \mathbf{z}(\mathbf{p})$ are bounded by $\frac{1}{4\underline{p}^2}$, while the diagonal entries are bounded by $\frac{1}{2\underline{p}^2}$. Hence, for all $\mathbf{p} \in [\underline{p}, 1]^3$, we have $\|\nabla \mathbf{z}(\mathbf{p})\|_1 \leq \frac{3}{2\underline{p}^2} + \frac{6}{4\underline{p}^2} = \frac{3}{\underline{p}^2}$. Then, by the mean value theorem, $\mathbf{z}^{\text{scarf}}$ is $\frac{3}{\underline{p}^2}$ -Lipschitz-continuous on $[\underline{p}, 1]^3$, i.e., for all $\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q} \in [\underline{p}, 1]^3$, $\|\mathbf{z}(\mathbf{p}) - \mathbf{z}(\mathbf{q})\| \leq \frac{3}{\underline{p}^2} \|\mathbf{q} - \mathbf{p}\|$. Now, by the assumptions of the theorem, since h is 1-strongly-convex, we have for all $\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{R}_+^3$, $\frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{p} - \mathbf{q}\|^2 \leq \delta_h(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q})$. Hence, this implies that for all for all $\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q} \in [\underline{p}, 1]^3$,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{z}(\mathbf{p}) - \mathbf{z}(\mathbf{q})\|^2 &\leq \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{3}{\underline{p}^2} \right)^2 \|\mathbf{p} - \mathbf{q}\|^2 \\ &\leq \left(\frac{3}{\underline{p}^2} \right)^2 \delta_h(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q}) \end{aligned}$$

□

E Arrow-Debreu Competitive Economies as Competitive Walrasian Economies

An *Arrow-Debreu economy* $(n, m, \mathcal{X}, \mathbf{e}, \mathbf{u})$, denoted $(\mathcal{X}, \mathbf{e}, \mathbf{u})$ when clear from context, comprises a finite set of $m \in \mathbb{N}_+$ divisible *commodities* and $n \in \mathbb{N}_+$ *consumers*. Each consumer $i \in [n]$ is characterized by a *set of consumptions* $\mathcal{X}_i \subseteq \mathbb{R}^m$, an *endowment* of commodities $\mathbf{e}_i = (e_{i1}, \dots, e_{im}) \in \mathbb{R}^m$, and a *utility function* $u_i : \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ which for any *consumption* $\mathbf{x}_i \in \mathcal{X}_i$ describes the utility $u_i(\mathbf{x}_i)$ consumer i derives.²¹ We define any collection of per-consumer consumptions $\mathbf{x} \doteq (\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n) \in \mathcal{X}$ a *consumption profile*, where $\mathcal{X} \doteq \times_{i \in [n]} \mathcal{X}_i$ is the *set of consumption profiles*, and any collection of per-consumer endowments an *endowment profile* $\mathbf{e} \doteq (\mathbf{e}_1, \dots, \mathbf{e}_n) \in \mathbb{R}^{nm}$.

Remark 3.

For ease of exposition, without loss of generality, we restrict ourselves to Arrow-Debreu exchange economies and opt to not present Arrow-Debreu competitive economies (see [Arrow and Debreu \(1954\)](#)) which in addition to consumers also contain firms. Nevertheless, our focus on Arrow-Debreu exchange economies is without loss of generality since any firm can be represented as a consumer in an Arrow-Debreu exchange economy by adding an additional commodity into the economy which represents ownership of the firm, setting the consumption space of the new consumer to be equal to the production space of the firm, and its utility function so that it seeks to maximize its consumption of the commodity associated with the firm's ownership. The commodity associated with ownership of the firm should further appear in the endowments of consumers that are supposed to have a contractual claim over the profits of the firms. A

²¹In line with the literature (see, for instance, [Debreu et al., 1954](#)), the value of this utility function should not be interpreted to have any meaning, and the utility function u_i should be understood to represent a preference relation \succeq_i on the space of consumptions \mathcal{X}_i so that for any two consumptions $\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{x}'_i \in \mathcal{X}_i$, $u_i(\mathbf{x}_i) \geq u_i(\mathbf{x}'_i) \implies \mathbf{x}_i \succeq_i \mathbf{x}'_i$.

similar, albeit much more complicated reduction than described here was proposed earlier by [Garg and Kannan \(2015\)](#) which refer the reader to for additional details.

Definition 1.

A *Arrow-Debreu equilibrium* $(\mathbf{x}^*, \mathbf{p}^*)$ is a tuple comprising consumptions $\mathbf{x}^* \in \mathbb{R}_+^{n \times n}$ and prices $\mathbf{p}^* \in \Delta_m$ s.t.

1. (Utility maximization) all consumers $i \in [n]$, maximize their utility constrained by the value of their endowment:

$$\text{ment: } \max_{\mathbf{x}_i \in \mathcal{X}_i: \mathbf{x}_i \cdot \mathbf{p}^* \leq \mathbf{e}_i \cdot \mathbf{p}^*} u_i(\mathbf{x}_i) \leq u_i(\mathbf{x}_i^*);$$
2. (Feasibility) the consumptions are feasible, i.e., $\sum_{i \in [n]} \mathbf{x}_i^* \leq \sum_{i \in [n]} \mathbf{e}_i$
3. (Walras' law) the value of the demand and the supply are equal, i.e., $\mathbf{p}^* \cdot \left(\sum_{i \in [n]} \mathbf{x}_i^* - \sum_{i \in [n]} \mathbf{e}_i \right) = 0$

Assumption 1.

Any Arrow-Debreu economy $(\mathcal{X}, \mathbf{e}, \mathbf{u})$ satisfies the following conditions for all consumers $i \in [n]$:

1. (Closed consumption set) \mathcal{X}_i is non-empty, bounded from below, closed, and convex
2. (Feasible budget set) There exists a consumption that is strictly less than the consumer's endowment, i.e., for all $i \in [n]$, $\exists \mathbf{x}_i \in \mathcal{X}_i, \quad \mathbf{x}_i < \mathbf{e}_i$
3. (Continuity) u_i is continuous
4. (Quasiconcavity) u_i is quasi-concave, i.e., for all $\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{x}'_i \in \mathbb{R}^m, \lambda \in (0, 1), \quad u_i(\lambda \mathbf{x}_i + (1 - \lambda) \mathbf{x}'_i) \geq \min \{u_i(\mathbf{x}_i), u_i(\mathbf{x}'_i)\},$
5. (Non-satiation) u_i is non-satiated, i.e., $\forall \mathbf{x}_i \in \mathcal{X}_i$, there exists $\mathbf{x}'_i \in \mathcal{X}_i$ s.t. $u_i(\mathbf{x}'_i) > u_i(\mathbf{x}_i)$

Definition 2 [Walrasian Arrow-Debreu Competitive Economy].

Given an Arrow-Debreu economy $(n, m, \mathcal{X}, \mathbf{e}, \mathbf{u})$, the *Walrasian Arrow-Debreu competitive economy* (m, \mathcal{Z}) is a Walrasian economy with the excess demand correspondence given as:

$$\mathcal{Z}(\mathbf{p}) = \sum_{i \in [n]} \left[\arg \max_{\mathbf{x}_i \in \mathcal{X}'_i: \mathbf{x}_i \cdot \mathbf{p} \leq \mathbf{e}_i \cdot \mathbf{p}} u_i(\mathbf{x}_i) \right] - \sum_{i \in [n]} \mathbf{e}_i,$$

where $\mathcal{X}'_i \doteq \left\{ \mathbf{x}_i \mid \sum_{k \in [n]} \mathbf{x}_k \leq \sum_{k \in [n]} \mathbf{e}_k, \forall k \in [n], \mathbf{x}_k \in \mathcal{X}_k \right\}$.

From the proof of Theorem 1 of [Arrow and Debreu \(1954\)](#), we can infer that any Walrasian equilibrium $\mathbf{p}^* \in \Delta_m$ of the Walrasian Arrow-Debreu competitive economy (m, \mathcal{Z}) is an Arrow-Debreu equilibrium price of $(n, m, \mathcal{X}, \mathbf{e}, \mathbf{u})$. Further, as shown in the following lemma, it is straightforward to verify that the Walrasian economy (m, \mathcal{Z}) , as the name suggests, gives rise to a Walrasian Arrow-Debreu economy.

Lemma 10 [Arrow-Debreu Economies are Walrasian competitive Economies].

Consider the Walrasian Arrow-Debreu competitive economy (m, \mathcal{Z}) associated with the Arrow-Debreu economy $(n, m, \mathcal{X}, e, \mathbf{u})$. Then, \mathcal{Z} satisfies the following:

1. (Homogeneity of degree 0) For all $\lambda > 0$, $\mathcal{Z}(\lambda \mathbf{p}) = \mathcal{Z}(\mathbf{p})$
2. (Weak Walras' law) For all $\mathbf{p} \in \mathbb{R}_+^m$ and $\mathbf{z}(\mathbf{p}) \in \mathcal{Z}(\mathbf{p})$, $\mathbf{p} \cdot \mathbf{z}(\mathbf{p}) \leq 0$
3. (Non-Satiation) for all $\mathbf{p} \in \mathbb{R}_+^m$, and $\mathbf{z}(\mathbf{p}) \in \mathcal{Z}(\mathbf{p})$, $\mathbf{z}(\mathbf{p}) \leq \mathbf{0}_m \implies \mathbf{p} \cdot \mathbf{z}(\mathbf{p}) = 0$
4. (Continuity) The excess demand correspondence \mathcal{Z} is upper hemicontinuous on Δ_m , non-empty-, compact-, and convex-valued.
5. (Boundedness) For all $\mathbf{p} \in \mathbb{R}_+^m$, and $\mathbf{z}(\mathbf{p}) \in \mathcal{Z}(\mathbf{p})$, $\|\mathbf{z}(\mathbf{p})\|_\infty < \infty$

That is, the Walrasian Arrow-Debreu competitive economy (m, \mathcal{Z}) associated with the Arrow-Debreu economy $(n, m, \mathcal{X}, e, \mathbf{u})$, is a continuous competitive economy which is bounded.

Proof of Lemma 10. Homogeneity. For all $\lambda > 0$, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{Z}(\lambda \mathbf{p}) &= \sum_{i \in [n]} \left[\arg \max_{\mathbf{x}_i \in \mathcal{X}'_i: \mathbf{x}_i \cdot (\lambda \mathbf{p}) \leq e_i \cdot (\lambda \mathbf{p})} u_i(\mathbf{x}_i) \right] - \sum_{i \in [n]} \mathbf{e}_i \\ &= \sum_{i \in [n]} \left[\arg \max_{\mathbf{x}_i \in \mathcal{X}'_i: \lambda \mathbf{x}_i \cdot \mathbf{p} \leq \lambda e_i \cdot \mathbf{p}} u_i(\mathbf{x}_i) \right] - \sum_{i \in [n]} \mathbf{e}_i \\ &= \sum_{i \in [n]} \left[\arg \max_{\mathbf{x}_i \in \mathcal{X}'_i: \mathbf{x}_i \cdot \mathbf{p} \leq e_i \cdot \mathbf{p}} u_i(\mathbf{x}_i) \right] - \sum_{i \in [n]} \mathbf{e}_i = \mathcal{Z}(\mathbf{p}) \end{aligned}$$

Walras' law. Fix any $\mathbf{p} \in \mathbb{R}_+^m$, and let for all consumers $i \in [n]$, $\mathbf{x}_i^* \in \arg \max_{\mathbf{x}_i \in \mathcal{X}'_i: \mathbf{x}_i \cdot \mathbf{p} \leq e_i \cdot \mathbf{p}} u_i(\mathbf{x}_i)$. Then, we have:

$$\mathbf{x}_i^* \cdot \mathbf{p} \leq e_i \cdot \mathbf{p}$$

Summing up across all consumers, and re-organizing, we have:

$$\mathbf{p} \cdot \left(\sum_{i \in [n]} \mathbf{x}_i^* - \sum_{i \in [n]} \mathbf{e}_i \right) \leq 0$$

Hence, we have for all $\mathbf{p} \in \mathbb{R}_+^m$ and $\mathbf{z}(\mathbf{p}) \in \mathcal{Z}(\mathbf{p})$, $\mathbf{p} \cdot \mathbf{z}(\mathbf{p}) \leq 0$.

Non-Satiation Fix any $\mathbf{p} \in \Delta_m$, and let for all consumers $i \in [n]$, $\mathbf{x}_i^* \in \arg \max_{\mathbf{x}_i \in \mathcal{X}'_i: \mathbf{x}_i \cdot \mathbf{p} \leq e_i \cdot \mathbf{p}} u_i(\mathbf{x}_i)$. Suppose by contradiction that $\mathbf{z}(\mathbf{p}) \leq \mathbf{0}_m$ but there exists some consumer $i \in [n]$ s.t.:

$$\mathbf{x}_i^* \cdot \mathbf{p} < e_i \cdot \mathbf{p}$$

Now, by non-satiation, there exists $\mathbf{x}'_i \in \mathcal{X}_i$ s.t. $u_i(\mathbf{x}'_i) > u_i(\mathbf{x}_i^*)$. As a result, there must also exist $\lambda \in (0, 1)$ s.t. for the consumption $\mathbf{x}_i^\dagger \doteq \lambda \mathbf{x}'_i + (1 - \lambda)\mathbf{x}_i^*$, we have:

1. $\mathbf{x}_i^\dagger \in \mathcal{X}'_i$ since $\mathbf{x}_i^* \in \text{int}(\mathcal{X}'_i)$;
2. $u_i(\mathbf{x}_i^\dagger) > u_i(\mathbf{x}_i^*)$ since u_i is quasiconcave;
3. $\mathbf{x}_i^\dagger \cdot \mathbf{p} \leq \mathbf{e}_i \cdot \mathbf{p}$ since the function $\mathbf{x}_i \mapsto \mathbf{x}_i \cdot \mathbf{p}$ is continuous.

However, this is a contradiction since $\mathbf{x}_i^* \in \arg \max_{\mathbf{x}_i \in \mathcal{X}'_i: \mathbf{x}_i \cdot \mathbf{p} \leq \mathbf{e}_i \cdot \mathbf{p}} u_i(\mathbf{x}_i)$.

Hence, for all consumers $i \in [n]$ we must have:

$$\mathbf{x}_i^* \cdot \mathbf{p} = \mathbf{e}_i^* \cdot \mathbf{p} \quad (50)$$

Summing the above across $i \in [n]$, and re-organizing the expression, we have for all $\mathbf{z}(\mathbf{p}) \in \mathcal{Z}(\mathbf{p})$:

$$0 = \mathbf{p}^* \cdot \left(\sum_{i \in [n]} \mathbf{x}_i^* - \sum_{i \in [n]} \mathbf{e}_i \right) = \mathbf{p}^* \cdot \mathbf{z}(\mathbf{p})$$

Continuity.

Since \mathcal{X}' is non-empty, compact, and convex, and for all consumers $i \in [n]$, u_i is continuous and quasiconcave, and $\exists \mathbf{x}_i \in \mathcal{X}_i, \mathbf{x}_i < \mathbf{e}_i$ the assumptions of Berge's maximum theorem (Berge, 1997) hold, and the excess demand \mathcal{Z} is upper hemicontinuous, non-empty, compact, and convex-valued over Δ_m .

Boundedness Since for all consumers $i \in [n]$, \mathcal{X}_i is bounded from below, \mathcal{X}'_i must be bounded as it is bounded from above by $\sum_{i \in [n]} \mathbf{e}_i$. Hence, for all consumers $i \in [n]$, \mathcal{X}'_i is compact. Hence, we must have for all $\mathbf{p} \in \mathbb{R}_+^m$, and $\mathbf{z}(\mathbf{p}) \in \mathcal{Z}(\mathbf{p})$, $\|\mathbf{z}(\mathbf{p})\|_\infty < \text{diam}(\mathcal{X}'_i)$. \square

F Classes of Variationally Stable Economies on Δ_m

We now discuss some important classes of Walrasian economies which are variationally stable on Δ_m . The most basic class of Walrasian economies which are variationally stable on Δ_m are those which satisfy the law of supply and demand. Intuitively, these Walrasian economies are those for which the excess demand is downward sloping.

Definition 3 [Law of supply and demand economies].

Given a Walrasian economy (m, \mathcal{Z}) , an excess demand correspondence is said to satisfy the *law of supply and demand*

iff

$$\langle z(\mathbf{q}) - z(\mathbf{p}), \mathbf{q} - \mathbf{p} \rangle \leq 0 \quad \text{for all } z(\mathbf{p}) \in \mathcal{Z}(\mathbf{p}), z(\mathbf{q}) \in \mathcal{Z}(\mathbf{q}) \quad (51)$$

We note that the excess demand of a Walrasian economies satisfies the law of supply and demand iff $-\mathcal{Z}$ is monotone. This implies that $-\mathcal{Z}$ is quasimonotone, and hence for any non-empty and compact price space $\mathcal{P} \subseteq \mathbb{R}_+^m$ the VI $(\mathcal{P}, -\mathcal{Z})$ satisfies the Minty condition (see Lemma 3.1 of He (2017)), meaning that any Walrasian economy which satisfies the law of supply and demand is variationally stable on \mathcal{P} .

Another important class of Walrasian economies which are variationally stable on Δ_m is the class of Walrasian economies which satisfy the weak gross substitutes condition. Intuitively, these are Walrasian economies for which the excess demand for a given good only increases when the price of some other good increases. While we omit the proof as it is involved, we note that any continuous balanced weak gross substitutes Walrasian economy (m, \mathcal{Z}) which satisfies Walras' law, i.e., (for all $\mathbf{p} \in \mathbb{R}_+^m, z(\mathbf{p}) \in \mathcal{Z}(\mathbf{p}), \mathbf{p} \cdot z(\mathbf{p})$) is a subset of the class of variationally stable economies on $\mathcal{P} \subseteq \mathbb{R}_+^m$ for any non-empty and compact price space \mathcal{P} (see, for instance lemma 5 of Arrow et al. (1959)).

Definition 4 [Weak Gross Substitutes economies].

Given a Walrasian economy (m, \mathcal{Z}) , an excess demand correspondence is said to satisfy the *weak gross substitutes condition* iff for all $\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{R}_+^m$ s.t. for some $k \in [m], q_k > p_k$ and for all $j \neq k, q_j = p_j$, we have:

$$z_j(\mathbf{q}) \geq z_j(\mathbf{p}) \quad \text{for all } z(\mathbf{p}) \in \mathcal{Z}(\mathbf{p}), z(\mathbf{q}) \in \mathcal{Z}(\mathbf{q}) \quad (52)$$

Going further, we can show that any Walrasian economy which satisfies the well-known weak axiom of revealed preferences Afriat (1967); Arrow and Hurwicz (1958), is variationally stable on Δ_m (and more generally on any non-empty and compact price space $\mathcal{P} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^m$). To this end, let us first define the weak axiom of revealed preferences for balanced economies.

Definition 5 [WARP excess demand].

Given a Walrasian economy (m, \mathcal{Z}) , an excess demand correspondence is said to satisfy the *weak axiom of revealed preferences (WARP)* iff for all $z(\mathbf{p}) \in \mathcal{Z}(\mathbf{p}), z(\mathbf{q}) \in \mathcal{Z}(\mathbf{q})$:

$$\langle z(\mathbf{q}), \mathbf{p} \rangle \leq \langle z(\mathbf{q}), \mathbf{q} \rangle \text{ and } z(\mathbf{p}) \neq z(\mathbf{q}) \implies \langle z(\mathbf{p}), \mathbf{q} \rangle > \langle z(\mathbf{p}), \mathbf{p} \rangle$$

Remark 4.

This definition of (WARP) is adapted to arbitrary Walrasian economies and as such is a generalization of the usual

definition for economies which satisfy Walras' law (i.e., for all $\mathbf{p} \in \mathbb{R}_+^m$, $\mathbf{p} \cdot \mathbf{z}(\mathbf{p})$), which requires that \mathcal{Z} is singleton-valued, and $\langle \mathbf{z}(\mathbf{q}), \mathbf{p} \rangle \leq 0$ and $\mathbf{z}(\mathbf{p}) \neq \mathbf{z}(\mathbf{q}) \implies \langle \mathbf{z}(\mathbf{p}), \mathbf{q} \rangle > 0$ (i.e., for all $\mathbf{p} \in \mathbb{R}_+^m$, $\mathbf{p} \cdot \mathbf{z}(\mathbf{p})$).

As we show next, WARP implies that $-\mathcal{Z}$ is pseudomonotone in balanced economies.²²

Lemma 11 [WARP \implies pseudomonotone].

If the excess demand correspondence \mathcal{Z} of a Walrasian economy (m, \mathcal{Z}) satisfies WARP, then $-\mathcal{Z}$ is pseudomonotone.

Proof. Suppose that \mathcal{Z} satisfies WARP, and that $\langle -\mathbf{z}(\mathbf{q}), \mathbf{q} - \mathbf{p} \rangle = \langle \mathbf{z}(\mathbf{q}), \mathbf{p} - \mathbf{q} \rangle \leq 0$, then we have $\langle -\mathbf{z}(\mathbf{p}), \mathbf{q} - \mathbf{p} \rangle = \langle \mathbf{z}(\mathbf{p}), \mathbf{p} - \mathbf{q} \rangle$

If $\mathbf{z}(\mathbf{p}) \neq \mathbf{z}(\mathbf{q})$, then, by WARP, we have $\langle \mathbf{z}(\mathbf{p}), \mathbf{p} - \mathbf{q} \rangle < 0$.

Otherwise, if $\mathbf{z}(\mathbf{p}) = \mathbf{z}(\mathbf{q})$, then we have:

$$\langle \mathbf{z}(\mathbf{p}), \mathbf{p} - \mathbf{q} \rangle = \langle \mathbf{z}(\mathbf{q}), \mathbf{p} - \mathbf{q} \rangle \leq 0$$

That is, if \mathcal{Z} satisfies WARP, we have:

$$\langle -\mathbf{z}(\mathbf{q}), \mathbf{q} - \mathbf{p} \rangle \leq 0 \implies \langle -\mathbf{z}(\mathbf{p}), \mathbf{q} - \mathbf{p} \rangle \leq 0$$

Hence, $-\mathcal{Z}$ is pseudomonotone. □

An important consequence of Lemma 11 is that since $-\mathcal{Z}$ is pseudomonotone, for any non-empty and compact price space $\mathcal{P} \subseteq \mathbb{R}_+^m$ the VI $(\mathcal{P}, -\mathcal{Z})$ satisfies the Minty condition (see Lemma 3.1 of He (2017)). As such, we have the following corollary of Lemma 11.

Corollary 3 [WARP \implies Minty's condition].

Any Walrasian economy which satisfies WARP is variationally stable on any non-empty and compact price space $\mathcal{P} \subseteq \mathbb{R}_+^m$.

G Experiment Details

Computational Resources Our experiments were run on MacOS machine with 8GB RAM and an Apple M1 chip, and took about 10 minutes to run. Only CPU resources were used.

²²To be more precise, we note that an excess demand function \mathcal{Z} satisfies WARP iff $-\mathcal{Z}$ is strictly pseudomonotone. However, as this result will not be used we present the more general result.

Programming Languages, Packages, and Licensing We ran our experiments in Python 3.7 (Van Rossum and Drake Jr, 1995), using NumPy (Harris et al., 2020), Jax (Bradbury et al., 2018), and JaxOPT (Blondel et al., 2021). All figures were graphed using Matplotlib (Hunter, 2007).

Python software and documentation are licensed under the PSF License Agreement. Numpy is distributed under a liberal BSD license. Pandas is distributed under a new BSD license. Matplotlib only uses BSD compatible code, and its license is based on the PSF license.

Experimental Setup Details Each economy is initialized using a random seed to ensure reproducibility. Each consumer is assigned an initial endowment, drawn from a uniform distribution: $e' \sim \text{Unif}(10^{-6}, 1)$, $\forall i \in [n], j \in [m]$. For numerical stability, we restrict the total economy-wide aggregate supply of each commodity to remain fixed at 10^{23} , to this end we normalize the endowments of consumers for all $j \in [m], i \in [n]$ to obtain their final endowment:

$$e_{ij} \doteq \frac{10e'_{ij}}{\sum_{i \in [n]} e'_{ij}}.$$

Each consumer's valuation of each commodity is drawn from a uniform distribution, i.e., for all $j \in [m], i \in [n]$:

$$v_{ij} \sim \text{Unif}(0, 1).$$

For any CES consumer $i \in [n]$, the elasticity of substitution parameter ρ_i , is drawn as follows from the uniform distribution for substitutes and complements consumers respectively:

$$\rho_i^{\text{substitutes}} \sim \text{Unif}(0.6, 0.9) \qquad \rho_i^{\text{complements}} \sim \text{Unif}(-1000, -1)$$

The initial price vector $p^{(0)}$ for the algorithms is drawn from a uniform distribution s.t. for all $j \in [m]$:

$$p_j^{(0)} \sim \text{Unif}(1, 10).$$

We note that while we initialize the prices between 1 and 10 for numerical stability, this choice is without loss of generality since the excess demand is homogeneous of degree 0.

To summarize. Given a random seed, the initialization process consists of: 1) Sampling endowments from a uniform distribution and normalizing them to ensure total supply constraints; 2) sampling valuations from a uniform distribution; 3) sampling substitution parameters for CES consumers, 4) generating an initial price vector.

²³This is without loss of generality since commodities are divisible.