INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL FOR INNOVATIVE RESEARCH IN MULTIDISCIPLINARY FIELD
ISSN(O): 2455-0620 [Impact Factor: 9.47]
Monthly, Peer-Reviewed, Refereed, Indexed Journal with IC Value : 86.87
Volume - 10, Issue - 12, December - 2024

DOIs:10.2015/IJIRMF/202412016 --:-- Research Paper / Article / Review

The theory of Games and Economic behaviour using Nash Equilibrium

[1]Shivani Vishnoi and [2]Dr S. K. Malhotra

[1]Research schollar Govt Dr Shyama Prasad Mukharjee Science and Commerce College, Bhopal MP India
[2]Professor Govt Dr Shyama Prasad Mukharjee Science and Commerce College, Bhopal MP India
Email – [1]shivanivishnoi48@gmail.com

Abstract: *This paper explores the fundamental concepts of game theory, with a particular focus on Nash Equilibrium and its applications in economic behavior. We examine the historical development of game theory, from its inception to its current status as a crucial tool in economic analysis. The paper delves into the mathematical foundations of Nash Equilibrium, its various forms, and its implications for strategic decision-making in diverse economic scenarios. Through a series of case studies and theoretical analyses, we demonstrate the wide-ranging applicability of Nash Equilibrium in fields such as industrial organization, international trade, and behavioral economics. Additionally, we discuss the limitations of Nash Equilibrium and recent advancements in game theory that address these constraints. The paper concludes by considering the future directions of game theory research and its potential to further our understanding of complex economic interactions.*

Key Words: *Game theory; Nash Equilibrium; economic behavior; strategic decision-making; industrial organization; international trade; behavioral economics.*

1. INTRODUCTION:

Game theory, a branch of mathematics that studies strategic decision-making, has profoundly impacted our understanding of economic behavior and interactions. At the heart of this field lies the concept of Nash Equilibrium, named after the brilliant mathematician John Forbes Nash Jr. This equilibrium concept has become a cornerstone in analyzing strategic situations where the outcome depends on the choices of multiple actors.

The theory of games and economic behavior, as we know it today, emerged from the groundbreaking work of John von Neumann and Oskar Morgenstern in their 1944 book "Theory of Games and Economic Behavior" [1]. However, it was Nash's contribution in the early 1950s that revolutionized the field and provided a solution concept applicable to a wide range of non-cooperative games [2].

This paper aims to provide a comprehensive exploration of the theory of games and economic behavior, with a particular emphasis on Nash Equilibrium. We will examine its theoretical foundations, practical applications, and implications for various economic scenarios. By doing so, we hope to demonstrate the power and versatility of game theory as a tool for understanding complex economic interactions and decision-making processes.

The structure of this paper is as follows: Section 2 provides a historical overview of game theory and the development of Nash Equilibrium. Section 3 delves into the mathematical foundations of Nash Equilibrium, including its formal definition and properties. Section 4 explores the applications of Nash Equilibrium in various economic contexts, such as industrial organization, international trade, and behavioral economics. Section 5 discusses the limitations of Nash Equilibrium and recent advancements in game theory. Finally, Section 6 concludes the paper by considering future directions for research in this field.

Through this comprehensive analysis, we aim to contribute to the ongoing discourse on the role of game theory in economic analysis and highlight the enduring relevance of Nash Equilibrium in understanding strategic interactions in the modern economy.

2. HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT OF GAME THEORY AND NASH EQUILIBRIUM

2.1 Early Foundations of Game Theory

The roots of game theory can be traced back to the early 20th century, with notable contributions from mathematicians such as Émile Borel and John von Neumann. Borel's work on strategic games in the 1920s laid the groundwork for future developments in the field [3]. However, it was von Neumann's minimax theorem, published in 1928, that is often considered the first major breakthrough in game theory [4].

2.2 Von Neumann and Morgenstern's Seminal Work

The publication of "Theory of Games and Economic Behavior" by John von Neumann and Oskar Morgenstern in 1944 marked a watershed moment in the development of game theory [1]. This seminal work provided a comprehensive mathematical framework for analyzing strategic interactions in economics and other social sciences. Von Neumann and Morgenstern introduced key concepts such as utility theory, cooperative games, and the extensive form of games, which remain fundamental to the field today.

2.3 Nash's Breakthrough and the Concept of Equilibrium

John Forbes Nash Jr.'s contributions in the early 1950s revolutionized game theory and expanded its applicability to a wide range of economic scenarios. Nash's key insight was the concept of an equilibrium point in non-cooperative games, which later became known as Nash Equilibrium [2]. This equilibrium concept provided a solution to games where players make decisions independently, without cooperation or communication.

Nash's doctoral dissertation, "Non-Cooperative Games," published in 1951, introduced the formal definition of Nash Equilibrium and proved its existence for a broad class of games [5]. This work not only extended the scope of game theory beyond zero-sum games but also provided a powerful tool for analyzing strategic interactions in various economic contexts.

2.4 Refinements and Extensions of Nash Equilibrium

Following Nash's groundbreaking work, numerous researchers contributed to the refinement and extension of the Nash Equilibrium concept. Some notable developments include:

1. Selten's subgame perfect equilibrium (1965), which addressed the issue of credible threats in dynamic games [6].
2. Harsanyi's Bayesian Nash Equilibrium (1967-1968), which extended Nash's concept to games with incomplete information [7].
3. Reinhard Selten, John Harsanyi, and John Nash's joint Nobel Prize in Economics (1994), which recognized their seminal contributions to game theory [8].

These refinements and extensions have greatly enhanced the applicability of Nash Equilibrium to real-world economic situations and continue to influence research in game theory and economics.

2.5 The Impact of Game Theory on Economic Thought

The development of game theory, and particularly Nash Equilibrium, has had a profound impact on economic thought and analysis. It has provided economists with a powerful framework for modeling strategic interactions and has influenced various subfields of economics, including:

1. Industrial Organization: Analyzing firm behavior and market structures.
2. International Trade: Understanding trade negotiations and economic policies.
3. Labor Economics: Modeling bargaining processes and wage determination.
4. Public Economics: Examining the provision of public goods and the design of tax systems.
5. Behavioral Economics: Incorporating psychological insights into economic decision-making models.

The historical development of game theory and Nash Equilibrium has not only revolutionized economic analysis but has also found applications in diverse fields such as political science, evolutionary biology, and computer science. This rich history sets the stage for our deeper exploration of the mathematical foundations and applications of Nash Equilibrium in the following sections.

3. MATHEMATICAL FOUNDATIONS OF NASH EQUILIBRIUM

3.1 Formal Definition of Nash Equilibrium

Nash Equilibrium is a fundamental concept in game theory that describes a stable state in a strategic interaction where no player can unilaterally improve their outcome by changing their strategy, given the strategies of other players. To formally define Nash Equilibrium, we need to introduce some basic notation and concepts.

Let $G = (N, S, u)$ be a game in strategic form, where:

- $N = \{1, 2, ..., n\}$ is the set of players
- $S = S_1 \times S_2 \times ... \times S_n$ is the set of strategy profiles, where S_i is the set of strategies available to player i
- $u = (u_1, u_2, ..., u_n)$ is the set of payoff functions, where $u_i : S \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is the payoff function for player i

A strategy profile $s^* = (s_1^*, s_2^*, ..., s_n^*) \in S$ is a Nash Equilibrium if, for all players $i \in N$ and all strategies $s_i \in S_i$:

$$u_i(s_1^*, ..., s_i^*, ..., s_n^*) \geq u_i(s_1^*, ..., s_i, ..., s_n^*)$$

This definition states that in a Nash Equilibrium, no player can increase their payoff by unilaterally deviating from their equilibrium strategy, given that all other players maintain their equilibrium strategies.

3.2 Properties of Nash Equilibrium

Nash Equilibrium possesses several important properties that contribute to its significance in game theory and economic analysis:

1. Existence: Nash proved that every finite game (i.e., games with a finite number of players and strategies) has at least one Nash Equilibrium, either in pure or mixed strategies [5].
2. Multiplicity: A game may have multiple Nash Equilibria, which can lead to coordination problems and equilibrium selection issues.
3. Pareto inefficiency: Nash Equilibria are not necessarily Pareto efficient, meaning that there might be other strategy profiles that yield higher payoffs for all players.
4. Self-enforcing: Once reached, a Nash Equilibrium is self-enforcing, as no player has an incentive to unilaterally deviate from their equilibrium strategy.
5. Prediction: Nash Equilibrium serves as a prediction of the outcome of a game, assuming all players are rational and have common knowledge of the game structure and payoffs.

3.3 Pure and Mixed Strategy Nash Equilibria

Nash Equilibria can be categorized into two types:

1. Pure Strategy Nash Equilibrium: Each player chooses a single strategy with certainty.
2. Mixed Strategy Nash Equilibrium: Players randomize over their available strategies according to a probability distribution.

Formally, a mixed strategy for player i is a probability distribution σ_i over the set of pure strategies S_i. The set of all mixed strategies for player i is denoted by Σ_i. A mixed strategy profile $\sigma^* = (\sigma_1^*, \sigma_2^*, ..., \sigma_n^*)$ is a Nash Equilibrium if, for all players $i \in N$ and all mixed strategies $\sigma_i \in \Sigma_i$:

$$E\sigma^*[u_i(s)] \geq E(\sigma_i, \sigma^*_{-i})[u_i(s)]$$

where $E\sigma^*[u_i(s)]$ denotes the expected payoff for player i under the mixed strategy profile σ^*, and $(\sigma_i, \sigma^*_{-i})$ represents the strategy profile where player i plays σ_i while all other players maintain their equilibrium strategies.

3.4 Computing Nash Equilibria

Finding Nash Equilibria in complex games can be computationally challenging. Several methods have been developed to compute Nash Equilibria:

1. Best Response Dynamics: Iteratively updating each player's strategy to their best response to the current strategies of other players.
2. Lemke-Howson Algorithm: An algorithm for finding Nash Equilibria in two-player games [9].
3. Support Enumeration Method: Enumerating all possible supports (sets of pure strategies played with positive probability) to find mixed strategy equilibria [10].
4. Homotopy Methods: Continuous deformation of the game to find equilibria [11].
5. Approximation Algorithms: Methods for finding approximate Nash Equilibria when exact computation is infeasible [12].

The complexity of computing Nash Equilibria has been a subject of extensive research, with important results showing that finding a Nash Equilibrium is PPAD-complete, indicating that it is unlikely to have a polynomial-time algorithm for general games [13].

3.5 Refinements of Nash Equilibrium

To address some limitations of the basic Nash Equilibrium concept, various refinements have been proposed:

1. Subgame Perfect Equilibrium: Requires Nash Equilibrium in every subgame of an extensive form game [6].
2. Perfect Bayesian Equilibrium: Extends subgame perfection to games with incomplete information [14].
3. Trembling Hand Perfect Equilibrium: Requires stability against small perturbations in players' strategies [15].
4. Proper Equilibrium: A refinement of trembling hand perfection that imposes additional restrictions on the perturbations [16].
5. Sequential Equilibrium: Combines consistent beliefs with sequential rationality in extensive form games [17].

These refinements aim to eliminate implausible equilibria and provide more accurate predictions of strategic behavior in various game-theoretic scenarios. The mathematical foundations of Nash Equilibrium provide a rigorous framework for analyzing strategic interactions in economics and other fields. In the following sections, we will explore how these theoretical concepts are applied to real-world economic situations and discuss their implications for understanding complex economic behaviors.

4. APPLICATIONS OF NASH EQUILIBRIUM IN ECONOMIC CONTEXTS

Nash Equilibrium has found widespread applications in various economic contexts, providing valuable insights into strategic decision-making and market outcomes. This section explores some key areas where Nash Equilibrium has been particularly influential.

4.1 Industrial Organization

In industrial organization, Nash Equilibrium is extensively used to analyze firm behavior, market structures, and competitive strategies.

4.1.1 Cournot Competition

The Cournot model of oligopoly, developed by Antoine Augustin Cournot in 1838, predates Nash's work but can be analyzed using Nash Equilibrium [18]. In this model, firms compete by choosing output quantities simultaneously. The Nash Equilibrium in a Cournot game represents a stable state where each firm's output decision is optimal given the output decisions of its competitors.

Consider a duopoly where the inverse demand function is $P = a - b(q_1 + q_2)$, and firms have constant marginal costs c. The profit function for firm i is:

$$\pi_i(q_1, q_2) = (a - b(q_1 + q_2) - c)q_i$$

The Nash Equilibrium quantities can be derived by solving the system of best response functions:

$$q_1^* = q_2^* = (a - c) / (3b)$$

This equilibrium yields insights into market outcomes, such as prices, quantities, and profits, under imperfect competition.

4.1.2 Bertrand Competition

The Bertrand model of price competition provides another application of Nash Equilibrium in industrial organization [19]. In this model, firms compete by setting prices simultaneously. The Nash Equilibrium in a Bertrand game with homogeneous products and identical marginal costs results in marginal cost pricing, known as the "Bertrand paradox." For differentiated products, the Nash Equilibrium in prices can be more complex and yield positive profits for firms. This framework has been extensively used to analyze pricing strategies in various industries.

4.1.3 Entry Deterrence and Limit Pricing

Nash Equilibrium concepts have been applied to analyze strategic entry deterrence in markets. The limit pricing model, developed by Milgrom and Roberts (1982), uses a refined Nash Equilibrium concept (sequential equilibrium) to examine how incumbent firms may use pricing strategies to deter potential entrants [20].

4.2 International Trade and Economic Policy

Nash Equilibrium has significant applications in analyzing international trade policies and negotiations.

4.2.1 Tariff Games
In international trade, countries often engage in strategic interactions when setting trade policies. Nash Equilibrium can be used to analyze the outcomes of these interactions. For example, consider a simple tariff game between two countries:

Country 2 → Country 1 ↓	Low Tariff	High Tariff
Low Tariff	(10, 10)	(5, 12)
High Tariff	(12, 5)	(7, 7)

In this game, (High Tariff, High Tariff) is a Nash Equilibrium, illustrating the potential for suboptimal outcomes in international trade negotiations.

4.2.2 Currency Wars
Nash Equilibrium concepts have been applied to analyze strategic currency devaluations, often referred to as "currency wars" [21]. These models help explain how countries may engage in competitive devaluations, potentially leading to suboptimal global outcomes.

4.3 Auction Theory
Nash Equilibrium plays a crucial role in auction theory, providing insights into bidding strategies and auction design.

4.3.1 First-Price Sealed-Bid Auctions
In a first-price sealed-bid auction, bidders simultaneously submit bids, and the highest bidder wins, paying their bid. The Nash Equilibrium bidding strategy in this auction format involves shading one's bid below one's true valuation to balance the probability of winning against the payoff when winning [22].

4.3.2 Second-Price Sealed-Bid Auctions (Vickrey Auctions)
In a second-price sealed-bid auction, the highest bidder wins but pays the second-highest bid. In this format, bidding one's true valuation is a weakly dominant strategy and thus a Nash Equilibrium [23]. This result has important implications for auction design and mechanism design more broadly.

4.4 Labor Economics
Nash Equilibrium concepts have been instrumental in modeling various aspects of labor markets and employment relationships.

4.4.1 Wage Bargaining
The Nash bargaining solution, an extension of Nash Equilibrium to cooperative games, has been widely applied to model wage negotiations between employers and employees or unions [24]. This approach helps explain wage determination and the distribution of surplus between firms and workers.
Consider a simple wage bargaining model where a firm and a worker negotiate over a surplus of size S. The Nash bargaining solution maximizes the product of their utilities:

$$\max (w - w_0)^\alpha * (\pi - \pi_0)^{(1-\alpha)}$$

where w is the wage, π is the firm's profit, w_0 and π_0 are the disagreement points, and α represents the worker's bargaining power. This framework has been extended to analyze various labor market phenomena, including the impact of minimum wages and unemployment benefits on wage negotiations.

4.4.2 Efficiency Wage Theory
Efficiency wage models, which posit that firms may pay wages above the market-clearing level to incentivize worker productivity, can be analyzed using Nash Equilibrium concepts [25]. These models help explain wage rigidity and involuntary unemployment in labor markets.

4.5 Public Economics
Nash Equilibrium has important applications in public economics, particularly in the analysis of public goods provision and mechanism design for optimal taxation.

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL FOR INNOVATIVE RESEARCH IN MULTIDISCIPLINARY FIELD
ISSN(O): 2455-0620 [Impact Factor: 9.47]
Monthly, Peer-Reviewed, Refereed, Indexed Journal with IC Value : 86.87
Volume - 10, Issue - 12, December - 2024

4.5.1 Voluntary Provision of Public Goods

The private provision of public goods often leads to a free-rider problem, which can be analyzed using Nash Equilibrium. Consider a simple model where n individuals can contribute to a public good. Each individual i chooses a contribution g_i to maximize their utility:

$U_i = \ln(y_i - g_i) + \ln(G)$

where y_i is individual i's income, and $G = \Sigma g_i$ is the total provision of the public good. The Nash Equilibrium in this game typically results in underprovision of the public good relative to the social optimum [26].

4.5.2 Mechanism Design for Optimal Taxation

Nash Equilibrium concepts are crucial in the design of optimal tax mechanisms. For example, in models of income tax design with asymmetric information, the government must design a tax schedule that induces individuals to truthfully reveal their private information about their abilities. The resulting equilibrium must satisfy incentive compatibility constraints, which are derived from Nash Equilibrium conditions [27].

4.6 Behavioral Economics

While traditional game theory assumes fully rational actors, behavioral economics incorporates psychological insights into economic models. Nash Equilibrium concepts have been adapted and extended to accommodate these behavioral considerations.

4.6.1 Quantal Response Equilibrium

The Quantal Response Equilibrium (QRE) is a generalization of Nash Equilibrium that allows for bounded rationality [28]. In QRE, players' choices are modeled as probabilistic, with higher-utility strategies being chosen more frequently, but not with certainty. This approach often provides a better fit to observed behavior in experimental games.

4.6.2 Level-k Thinking

Level-k models of strategic thinking assume that players have different levels of sophistication in their reasoning about others' strategies [29]. These models can explain deviations from Nash Equilibrium predictions in various games and have been particularly useful in analyzing behavior in beauty contest games and other strategic interactions.

5. LIMITATIONS AND RECENT ADVANCEMENTS IN GAME THEORY

While Nash Equilibrium has proven to be a powerful tool for analyzing strategic interactions, it has certain limitations that have motivated further research and advancements in game theory.

5.1 Limitations of Nash Equilibrium

5.1.1 Multiple Equilibria

Many games have multiple Nash Equilibria, which can make it difficult to predict which outcome will occur. This multiplicity can lead to coordination problems and raises questions about equilibrium selection.

5.1.2 Mixed Strategy Equilibria

While mixed strategy Nash Equilibria provide a theoretical solution to many games, they can be challenging to interpret and observe in practice. The assumption that players randomize their strategies according to specific probabilities may not always align with real-world decision-making processes.

5.1.3 Common Knowledge Assumptions

Nash Equilibrium relies on strong assumptions about players' rationality and their beliefs about others' rationality. These common knowledge assumptions may not hold in many real-world situations, particularly when dealing with bounded rationality or incomplete information.

5.1.4 Dynamic Considerations

Standard Nash Equilibrium analysis is primarily static and may not capture important dynamic aspects of strategic interactions, such as learning, adaptation, and evolution of strategies over time.

5.2 Recent Advancements and Extensions

To address these limitations and expand the applicability of game theory, researchers have developed various extensions and new approaches:

5.2.1 Evolutionary Game Theory

Evolutionary game theory extends the Nash Equilibrium concept to dynamic settings where strategies evolve over time through processes of natural selection or social learning [30]. This approach has been particularly useful in analyzing the emergence and stability of cooperative behaviors in biological and social systems.

5.2.2 Global Games

Global games, introduced by Carlsson and van Damme (1993), provide a framework for analyzing games with incomplete information about the payoff structure [31]. This approach helps resolve some issues related to multiple equilibria and has found applications in analyzing financial crises and coordination problems.

5.2.3 Algorithmic Game Theory

The intersection of game theory and computer science has led to the development of algorithmic game theory, which focuses on computational aspects of game-theoretic solutions and their applications in designing mechanisms for online markets, auctions, and resource allocation problems [32].

5.2.4 Behavioral Game Theory

Behavioral game theory incorporates psychological insights and experimental evidence to develop more realistic models of strategic decision-making [33]. This field has led to new solution concepts, such as the aforementioned Quantal Response Equilibrium and Level-k thinking models.

5.2.5 Robust Game Theory

Robust game theory addresses uncertainties in game formulations by considering sets of possible games rather than a single, precisely specified game [34]. This approach provides equilibrium concepts that are less sensitive to modeling assumptions and parameter uncertainties.

5.2.6 Mean Field Games

Mean field game theory, developed by Lasry and Lions (2007), provides a framework for analyzing strategic decision-making in large populations [35]. This approach has found applications in various fields, including economics, finance, and engineering.

6. CONCLUSION

The theory of games and economic behavior, centered around the concept of Nash Equilibrium, has profoundly impacted our understanding of strategic interactions in economics and beyond. From its origins in the mid-20th century to its current status as a fundamental tool in economic analysis, game theory has continuously evolved to address new challenges and incorporate insights from various disciplines.

Nash Equilibrium, with its elegant mathematical formulation and wide-ranging applications, remains a cornerstone of game-theoretic analysis. Its applications in industrial organization, international trade, auction theory, labor economics, and public economics have provided valuable insights into complex economic phenomena and informed policy decisions.

However, the limitations of Nash Equilibrium have also spurred significant advancements in game theory. The development of refinements and extensions, such as evolutionary game theory, global games, and behavioral game theory, has expanded the field's ability to analyze real-world strategic interactions more accurately.

Looking to the future, several promising directions for research in game theory and its applications to economic behavior emerge:

1. Integration of machine learning and artificial intelligence with game theory to model and predict strategic behavior in complex, data-rich environments.
2. Further development of behavioral game theory to incorporate insights from neuroscience and cognitive psychology, leading to more realistic models of decision-making.
3. Application of game-theoretic concepts to emerging fields such as cryptocurrencies, blockchain technology, and decentralized finance (DeFi).

4. Exploration of game-theoretic approaches to addressing global challenges, such as climate change mitigation and pandemic response coordination.
5. Advancement of computational methods for solving and analyzing games with large state spaces or complex information structures.
6. Development of game-theoretic models that incorporate social preferences, fairness considerations, and other non-standard motivations to better explain observed economic behaviors.

As we continue to grapple with increasingly complex economic and social challenges, the theory of games and economic behavior, grounded in the foundational concept of Nash Equilibrium, will undoubtedly play a crucial role in shaping our understanding and informing our decisions. The ongoing dialogue between theoretical advancements, empirical observations, and practical applications promises to yield further insights into the nature of strategic interactions and their implications for economic behavior.

REFERENCES:

1. Von Neumann, J., & Morgenstern, O. (1944). Theory of Games and Economic Behavior. *Princeton University Press.*
2. Nash, J. F. (1950). Equilibrium points in n-person games. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 36(1), 48-49.*
3. Borel, É. (1921). La théorie du jeu et les équations intégrales à noyau symétrique. *Comptes Rendus de l'Académie des Sciences, 173(1304-1308), 58.*
4. Von Neumann, J. (1928). Zur Theorie der Gesellschaftsspiele. *Mathematische Annalen, 100(1), 295-320.*
5. Nash, J. (1951). Non-cooperative games. *Annals of Mathematics, 54(2), 286-295*.
6. Selten, R. (1965). Spieltheoretische Behandlung eines Oligopolmodells mit Nachfrageträgheit. *Zeitschrift für die gesamte Staatswissenschaft, 121(2), 301-324.*
7. Harsanyi, J. C. (1967-1968). Games with incomplete information played by "Bayesian" players, I-III. *Management Science, 14(3, 5, 7), 159-182, 320-334, 486-502.*
8. Royal Swedish Academy of Sciences. (1994). The Sveriges Riksbank Prize in Economic Sciences in Memory of Alfred Nobel 1994. *https://www.nobelprize.org/prizes/economic-sciences/1994/summary/*
9. Lemke, C. E., & Howson, Jr, J. T. (1964). Equilibrium points of bimatrix games. *Journal of the Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, 12(2), 413-423.*
10. Porter, R. W., Nudelman, E., & Shoham, Y. (2008). Simple search methods for finding a Nash equilibrium. *Games and Economic Behavior, 63(2), 642-662.*
11. Herings, P. J. J., & Peeters, R. (2010). Homotopy methods to compute equilibria in game theory. *Economic Theory, 42(1), 119-156.*
12. Lipton, R. J., Markakis, E., & Mehta, A. (2003). Playing large games using simple strategies. *Proceedings of the 4th ACM Conference on Electronic Commerce, 36-41.*
13. Daskalakis, C., Goldberg, P. W., & Papadimitriou, C. H. (2009). The complexity of computing a Nash equilibrium. *SIAM Journal on Computing, 39(1), 195-259.*
14. Kreps, D. M., & Wilson, R. (1982). Sequential equilibria. *Econometrica, 50(4), 863-894.*
15. Selten, R. (1975). Reexamination of the perfectness concept for equilibrium points in extensive games. *International Journal of Game Theory, 4(1), 25-55.*
16. Myerson, R. B. (1978). Refinements of the Nash equilibrium concept. International *Journal of Game Theory, 7(2), 73-80.*
17. Kreps, D. M., & Wilson, R. (1982). Sequential equilibria. *Econometrica, 50(4), 863-894.*
18. Cournot, A. A. (1838). Recherches sur les principes mathématiques de la théorie des richesses. *L. Hachette.*
19. Bertrand, J. (1883). Book review of théorie mathématique de la richesse sociale and of recherches sur les principes mathématiques de la théorie des richesses. *Journal de Savants, 67, 499-508.*
20. Milgrom, P., & Roberts, J. (1982). Limit pricing and entry under incomplete information: An equilibrium analysis. *Econometrica, 50(2), 443-459.*
21. Corsetti, G., Pesenti, P., & Roubini, N. (2000). Competitive devaluations: toward a welfare-based approach. *Journal of International Economics, 51(1), 217-241.*
22. Krishna, V. (2009). Auction Theory (2nd ed.). *Academic Press.*
23. Vickrey, W. (1961). Counterspeculation, auctions, and competitive sealed tenders. *The Journal of Finance, 16(1), 8-37.*

24. Rubinstein, A. (1982). Perfect equilibrium in a bargaining model. *Econometrica, 50(1), 97-109.*
25. Shapiro, C., & Stiglitz, J. E. (1984). Equilibrium unemployment as a worker discipline device. *The American Economic Review, 74(3), 433-444.*
26. Bergstrom, T., Blume, L., & Varian, H. (1986). On the private provision of public goods. *Journal of Public Economics, 29(1), 25-49.*
27. Mirrlees, J. A. (1971). An exploration in the theory of optimum income taxation. *The Review of Economic Studies, 38(2), 175-208.*
28. McKelvey, R. D., & Palfrey, T. R. (1995). Quantal response equilibria for normal form games. *Games and Economic Behavior, 10(1), 6-38.*
29. Nagel, R. (1995). Unraveling in guessing games: An experimental study. *The American Economic Review, 85(5), 1313-1326.*
30. Smith, J. M., & Price, G. R. (1973). The logic of animal conflict. *Nature, 246(5427), 15-18.*
31. Carlsson, H., & van Damme, E. (1993). Global games and equilibrium selection. *Econometrica, 61(5), 989-1018*.
32. Nisan, N., Roughgarden, T., Tardos, E., & Vazirani, V. V. (Eds.). (2007). Algorithmic Game Theory. *Cambridge University Press*.
33. Camerer, C. F. (2003). Behavioral Game Theory: *Experiments in Strategic Interaction. Princeton University Press.*
34. Aghassi, M., & Bertsimas, D. (2006). Robust game theory. *Mathematical Programming, 107(1), 231-273.*
35. Lasry, J. M., & Lions, P. L. (2007). Mean field games. *Japanese Journal of Mathematics, 2(1), 229-260.*