Abstract

In this talk we give a brief introduction into the theory of index and degree of Nash-equilibria. After explaining the general concepts in a rather informal way, we will, by means of certain examples, show how Nash-equilibria components of arbitrary index (or degree) can be constructed. We will then discuss certain properties of these components and the question, whether the index (or degree) of a component can be used to capture certain refinement criteria.
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1) Introduction and Motivation

• The number of Nash-equilibria in a non-degenerated game is odd (Lemke-Howson algorithm)
  → index as “orientation”

• Kohlberg-Mertens Structure theorem: The space of games is homotopic to the graph of the NE-correspondence
  → “degree” of the projection map

• The NE of a game are the fixed points of certain mappings, mapping the strategy space into itself
  → index as the “local degree” of the displacement map

• Can index and degree capture certain aspects of NE?
  → stability, refinement
2) Degree and Index for components of NE

- **KM-structure Theorem:**
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  Definition: \( \deg (C) = \) local degree of projection map at the component

  \[ \to \text{number of cycles around the original game traversed by the image of a cycle in the graph around the component} \]

  \[ \to \text{sum of the degrees of the Nash-equilibria of some non-degenerated game close to the original game that are close to the component.} \]

- **Index of a component**

  Fix a game \( G \). Let \( \Sigma \) be the strategy space. Consider some mapping \( F: \Sigma \to \Sigma \) whose fixed points coincide with the set of Nash-equilibria.

  Definition: \( \text{Ind}(C) = \) local degree of the displacement map \( F-id \)
The definition of index by Shapley (1974)

- Motivated by the Lemke-Howson algorithm for non-degenerate games

→ “orientation” of Nash-equilibria

- Example:

A =

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>10</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B =

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>10</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Definition: \( I(\sigma) = - \text{sign} \det \)

A’ and B’ are the payoff matrixes consisting of those rows and columns of A and B that are played with positive probability.
3) Properties of Index and Degree

- Index and degree are the same (also for Shapley in the non-degenerate case) (Govindan and Wilson, 1997; DeMichelis and Germano, 1998)

- The sum of indices of NE-components of a game is +1.

- Pure strategy equilibria have index +1

- The index of an equilibrium component is invariant under adding redundant strategies as new strategies (Govindan and Wilson, 1997).

  => non-zero index components are essential and hyperessential

Example:

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
0,0 & 0,0 & 0,0 \\
0,0 & 0,0 & 0,0 \\
0,0 & 0,0 & 0,0 \\
\end{array}
\hspace{1cm}
\begin{array}{ccc}
a_{11},b_{11} & a_{12},b_{12} & a_{13},b_{13} \\
a_{21},b_{21} & a_{22},b_{22} & a_{23},b_{23} \\
a_{31},b_{31} & a_{32},b_{32} & a_{33},b_{33} \\
\end{array}
\]
4) Construction of components with arbitrary index

- Construction of Components with arbitrary high positive and negative index via outside option games.

Idea:

- Overall index is +1
- Pure strategy equilibria have index +1
- Cutting off equilibria with outside options creates indizes of desired size
The Game has 4 equilibrium components: The 3 index +1 pure strategy equilibria and the outside option equilibrium component, in which player I plays $Out$.

=> The component has index $-2$.

This method allows us to construct arbitrarily high negative index components.
The game has two equilibrium components: 
\[ (0.5, 0.5, 0, 0); (0.5, 0.5, 0) \] and the outside option equilibrium component. The first equilibrium has index \(-1\).

=> The component has index +2.

This method allows us to construct arbitrarily high positive index equilibrium components.
The outside option equilibrium component has index 0. The component is not essential.

Remark: It was conjectured by Govindan and Wilson (1997) that index 0 equilibrium components cannot be essential. This conjecture turned out to be false (Hauk and Hurkens, 1999).
5) Some Results and Open Questions

- The construction methods from above can be used to show that q-stable sets violate the weak symmetry axiom as defined by Govindan (2001) (Govindan, von Stengel, von Schemde, 2002; von Schemde, 2002).

- Index 0 components can be essential (Hauk and Hurkens, 1999).

  Question: Can index 0 components be hyperstable

  Conjecture: No!

- What other properties of NE might be captured by the index?