

A parametric representation of totally mixed Nash equilibria

Gabriela Jeronimo^{*†} Daniel Perrucci^{*†}

Departamento de Matemática, Facultad de Ciencias Exactas y Naturales,
Universidad de Buenos Aires, Ciudad Universitaria, 1428 Buenos Aires, Argentina
CONICET - Argentina

and

Juan Sabia^{*}

Departamento de Ciencias Exactas, Ciclo Básico Común, and
Departamento de Matemática, Facultad de Ciencias Exactas y Naturales,
Universidad de Buenos Aires, Ciudad Universitaria, 1428 Buenos Aires, Argentina
CONICET - Argentina

Abstract

We compute a parametric description of the totally mixed Nash equilibria of a generic game in normal form with pre-fixed structure. Using this representation, we show conditions under which a game has the maximum possible number of this kind of equilibria. Then, we present a symbolic procedure that allows us to describe and estimate the number of isolated totally mixed Nash equilibria of an arbitrary game. Under certain assumptions, the algorithm computes the exact number of these equilibria.

1 Introduction

Noncooperative game theory is used to model and analyze strategic interaction situations. Among its most outstanding applications, we can mention the fundamental role this theory has played in economics (see, for example, the classical reference book [31]). Moreover, game theory has also been applied to politics, sociology and psychology, and to biology and evolution as well.

One of the main concepts in this theory is a *Nash equilibrium*, which consists in a situation in which no player can increase his payoff by unilaterally changing his strategy. Since within this theory the players cannot communicate in order to decide a simultaneous

^{*}Partially supported by the following Argentinian research grants: UBACyT X112 (2004-2007) and CONICET PIP 5852/05.

[†]Partially supported by the Argentinian research grant UBACyT X847 (2006-2009).

change of strategies, in a Nash equilibrium the game stabilizes. In [22], it is proved that any noncooperative game in normal form has at least one Nash equilibrium. However, the proof is not constructive and does not give any information about the existence of more than one Nash equilibrium. The question posed is how to compute algorithmically Nash equilibria and to determine the number of them in a given game.

Nash equilibria of noncooperative games in normal form can be regarded as real solutions to systems of polynomial equations and inequalities (see, for instance, [29, Chapter 6]). In the case of two players, each equilibrium is the solution of a linear system of equations, and therefore, equilibria may be found exactly by using simplex type algorithms (see, for instance, [15]); however, there is no polynomial time algorithm solving the problem (see [32]). In the general case of a game with more than two players, the polynomials appearing are multilinear. To solve the problem of finding *one* equilibrium, some numerical methods have been applied successfully (for example, some methods derived from Scarf's algorithm, [26]). Nevertheless, sometimes it is not sufficient to compute only one equilibrium because, depending on the problem to be solved, not all the equilibria of a game are equally interesting and the methods developed to compute only one equilibrium do not allow us to decide beforehand whether it fulfills some additional properties or to compare different equilibria.

A comparative study of different known methods for the computation of all the Nash equilibria of a game may be found in [7]. In [12], a new algorithm solving this problem for generic games by means of homotopy methods is presented, but no complexity bounds are shown. In addition, the application of symbolic algorithms solving systems of equations and inequalities over the real numbers is being studied in this context, motivated by the characterization of the set of all the Nash equilibria of a game as a semi-algebraic set (an example of this fact is the application of quantifier elimination algorithms over the real numbers to compute approximated equilibria in [16]; see also the survey [17]). However, up to now, no significative result had been obtained concerning the adaptation of these algorithms in order to profit from the particular properties of the algebraic systems arising in game theory.

In this paper, we study *totally mixed Nash equilibria*, that is to say, Nash equilibria in which every player allocates a positive probability to each of his available strategies. Note that a procedure to compute these equilibria can be used as a subroutine to compute all Nash equilibria of the game by recursing over all possible subsets of used strategies. We present a *symbolic* method to find a parametric description of the set of totally mixed Nash equilibria of a generic game with a pre-fixed structure. This method is based on a symbolic procedure for the computation of *multihomogeneous* resultants with complexity polynomial in the degree and the number of variables of the resultant ([13]). Using the description previously obtained, we show conditions (given by polynomial inequalities on the payoff values) under which a game with the given pre-fixed structure will have the maximum number of such equilibria. The next step is to give a similar parametric description for *particular* games. First, we solve this problem under some genericity assumptions implying, in particular, that the number of totally mixed Nash equilibria of the game is finite, and we show how to compute this number. Then, we consider the general case, in which we give a parametric description of a finite set of points including all the isolated (in the complex space) totally mixed Nash equilibria of the game, which enables us to bound

the number of these isolated equilibria. All our algorithms have a complexity polynomial in the number of pure strategies of each player, and the number of totally mixed Nash equilibria of a generic game with the given structure.

This paper is organized in the following way:

In Section 2, we introduce some basic notions on game theory, the description of the algorithmic model we are going to use and a mathematical formulation for the totally mixed Nash equilibria of a game in normal form as the set of solutions of a system of multihomogeneous polynomial equations. In Section 3, the algorithmic description of the totally mixed Nash equilibria of a generic game is given, and it is used to find conditions under which a game has the maximum number of these equilibria. In Section 4 we deal with the totally mixed Nash equilibria of particular games. Finally, the last section is devoted to proving some results about the algorithmic computation of multihomogeneous resultants and upper bounds for their degrees which are used throughout the paper.

2 Preliminaries

2.1 Definitions and Notation

2.1.1 Basic facts

Throughout this paper \mathbb{Q} denotes the field of rational numbers, \mathbb{N} denotes the set of positive integers and $\mathbb{N}_0 := \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$.

If K is a field, we denote an algebraic closure of K by \overline{K} . The ring of polynomials in the variables x_1, \dots, x_n with coefficients in K is denoted by $K[x_1, \dots, x_n]$. For a polynomial $f \in K[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ we write $\deg f$ to refer to the total degree of f and $\deg_{x_i} f$ to refer to the degree of f in the variable x_i .

For $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and an algebraically closed field k , we denote by $\mathbb{A}^n(k)$ and $\mathbb{P}^n(k)$ (or simply by \mathbb{A}^n or \mathbb{P}^n if the base field is clear from the context) the n -dimensional affine space and projective space over k respectively, equipped with their Zariski topologies.

We adopt the usual notions of dimension and degree of an algebraic variety V , which will be denoted by $\dim V$ and $\deg V$ respectively. See for instance [27] and [9] for the definitions of these notions.

2.1.2 Game theory

In this section we present some basic game theory concepts. For a more detailed account on the subject we refer the reader to any standard game theory text such as [24].

We consider non-cooperative games in *normal form*; that is to say, games in which there is only one time step at which all the players move simultaneously without communicating among themselves. We will assume that there are r players in the game having $n_1 + 1, \dots, n_r + 1$ distinct available pure strategies respectively ($n_1, \dots, n_r \in \mathbb{N}$).

For $i = 1, \dots, r$:

- $c^{(i)} := (c_{j_1 \dots j_r}^{(i)})_{0 \leq j_k \leq n_k}$ is the given *payoff matrix* of player i , where $c_{j_1 \dots j_r}^{(i)}$ is the *payoff* to player i if, for every $1 \leq k \leq r$, player k chooses the strategy j_k .

- $X_i := (x_{i0}, x_{i1}, \dots, x_{in_i})$ is a vector representing a *mixed strategy* of the i th player, which is a probability distribution on his set of pure strategies (that is to say, x_{ij} is the probability that the i th player allocates to his j th pure strategy).

With these notations, for every $1 \leq i \leq r$, the payoff to player i if the mixed strategies X_1, \dots, X_r are played is:

$$\pi_i(X_1, \dots, X_r) := \sum_{0 \leq j_1 \leq n_1} \cdots \sum_{0 \leq j_r \leq n_r} c_{j_1 \dots j_r}^{(i)} x_{1j_1} \cdots x_{rj_r}.$$

A *Nash equilibrium* is a vector of mixed strategies such that no player can increase his payoff by changing unilaterally to another strategy while the other players keep their strategies fixed; that is to say, a vector of mixed strategies X_1, \dots, X_r satisfying

$$\pi_i(X_1, \dots, X_{i-1}, X_i, X_{i+1}, \dots, X_r) \geq \pi_i(X_1, \dots, X_{i-1}, X'_i, X_{i+1}, \dots, X_r) \quad \forall 1 \leq i \leq r$$

for every mixed strategy X'_i . A *totally mixed Nash equilibrium* is a Nash equilibrium in which each pure strategy is assigned a positive probability, that is, one that satisfies $x_{ij} > 0$ for every $1 \leq i \leq r$, $0 \leq j \leq n_i$.

2.2 Data structure, algorithms and complexity

The algorithms we consider in this paper are described by arithmetic networks over the base field \mathbb{Q} (see [33]). An arithmetic network is represented by means of a directed acyclic graph. The external nodes of the graph correspond to the input and output of the algorithm. Each of the internal nodes of the graph is associated with either an arithmetic operation in \mathbb{Q} or a comparison between two elements in \mathbb{Q} followed by a selection of another node. These are the only operations allowed in our algorithms.

We assume that the cost of each operation in the algorithm is 1 and so, we define the *complexity* of the algorithm as the number of internal nodes of its associated graph.

The objects our algorithms deal with are polynomials with coefficients in \mathbb{Q} . We represent each of them by means of one of the following data structures:

- *Dense form*, that is, as the array of all its coefficients (including zeroes) in a pre-fixed order of all monomials of degree at most d , where d is an upper bound for the degree of the polynomial. The size of this representation equals the number of monomials of degree at most d .
- *Sparse encoding*, that is, as an array of the coefficients corresponding to monomials in a fixed set, provided that we know in advance that the coefficient of any other monomial of the polynomial must be zero. The size in this case is the cardinal of the fixed set of monomials.
- *Straight-line programs*, which are arithmetic circuits (i.e. networks without branches). Roughly speaking, a straight-line program (or slp, for short) over \mathbb{Q} encoding a polynomial $f \in \mathbb{Q}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ is a program which enables us to evaluate the polynomial f at any given point in \mathbb{Q}^n . Each of the instructions in this program is an addition, subtraction or multiplication between two pre-calculated elements in $\mathbb{Q}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$,

or an addition or multiplication by a scalar. The number of instructions in the program is called the *length* of the slp. For a precise definition of straight-line programs we refer to [5, Definition 4.2] (see also [11]).

2.3 Polynomial equations for totally mixed Nash equilibria

Now, we show that the totally mixed Nash equilibria of an r -person game in normal form can be regarded as real solutions to a polynomial equation system (see [29, Sec. 6.3]).

Let us observe that, if the payoff matrix of player i is $c^{(i)}$ ($1 \leq i \leq r$), given mixed strategies X_1, \dots, X_r , the payoff to player i is

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_i(X_1, \dots, X_r) &= \sum_{j_1, \dots, j_r} c_{j_1 \dots j_r}^{(i)} x_{1j_1} \dots x_{rj_r} \\ &= \sum_{0 \leq j_i \leq n_i} x_{ij_i} \sum_{j_1, \dots, j_{i-1}, j_{i+1}, \dots, j_r} c_{j_1 \dots j_r}^{(i)} x_{1j_1} \dots x_{i-1j_{i-1}} x_{i+1j_{i+1}} \dots x_{rj_r} \\ &= \sum_{0 \leq j_i \leq n_i} x_{ij_i} \pi_i(X_1, \dots, X_{i-1}, e_{j_i}^{(i)}, X_{i+1}, \dots, X_r) \end{aligned}$$

where $e_j^{(i)}$ is the $(j+1)$ th vector of the canonical basis of \mathbb{R}^{n_i+1} .

Now, if (X_1, \dots, X_r) is a totally mixed Nash equilibrium, we have that $x_{ij} > 0$ for every i, j . Then, in order that $\pi_i(X_1, \dots, X_{i-1}, \cdot, X_{i+1}, \dots, X_r)$ attains a maximum at $X_i = (x_{i0}, \dots, x_{in_i})$ (among all the different probability distributions), a necessary and sufficient condition is that

$$\pi_i(X_1, \dots, X_{i-1}, e_{j_i}^{(i)}, X_{i+1}, \dots, X_r) = \pi_i(X_1, \dots, X_{i-1}, e_0^{(i)}, X_{i+1}, \dots, X_r) \quad \forall 1 \leq j_i \leq n_i. \quad (1)$$

In fact, assuming that this condition does not hold for some $1 \leq i \leq r$, let j_{\max} and j_{\min} denote the indices of pure strategies leading to maximum and minimum payoffs to player i respectively. Then, taking $\varepsilon > 0$ with $\varepsilon < \min\{x_{ij_{\min}}, 1 - x_{ij_{\max}}\}$ and changing to the (totally) mixed strategy $X'_i := X_i + \varepsilon(e_{j_{\max}}^{(i)} - e_{j_{\min}}^{(i)})$ the i th player can increase his payoff by

$$\varepsilon(\pi_i(X_1, \dots, X_{i-1}, e_{j_{\max}}^{(i)}, X_{i+1}, \dots, X_r) - \pi_i(X_1, \dots, X_{i-1}, e_{j_{\min}}^{(i)}, X_{i+1}, \dots, X_r)) > 0,$$

contradicting the fact that the vector is a totally mixed Nash equilibrium for the game.

Conversely, for a vector of totally mixed strategies (X_1, \dots, X_r) such that all the identities (1) hold for every $1 \leq i \leq r$, we have that $\pi_i(X_1, \dots, X'_i, \dots, X_r) = \pi_i(X_1, \dots, X_i, \dots, X_r)$ for every mixed strategy X'_i and so, player i ($1 \leq i \leq r$) cannot increase his payoff by unilaterally changing his strategy, which implies that (X_1, \dots, X_r) is a Nash equilibrium for the game.

We conclude that the totally mixed Nash equilibria of the game are those vectors (X_1, \dots, X_r) with $X_i := (x_{i0}, \dots, x_{in_i})$ for every $1 \leq i \leq r$ satisfying:

- (a) $x_{ij} > 0$ for $i = 1, \dots, r$ and $j = 0, \dots, n_i$,
- (b) $\sum_{0 \leq j \leq n_i} x_{ij} = 1$ for $i = 1, \dots, r$,

- (c) $\sum_{J_{-i}} a_{J_{-i}}^{(ik)} x_{1j_1} \dots x_{i-1j_{i-1}} x_{i+1j_{i+1}} \dots x_{rj_r} = 0$ for $i = 1, \dots, r$ and $k = 1, \dots, n_i$, where the sum runs over all $J_{-i} := j_1 \dots j_{i-1} j_{i+1} \dots j_r$ with $0 \leq j_t \leq n_t$ for every $t \neq i$ and $a_{J_{-i}}^{(ik)} := c_{j_1 \dots j_{i-1} k j_{i+1} \dots j_r}^{(i)} - c_{j_1 \dots j_{i-1} 0 j_{i+1} \dots j_r}^{(i)}$.

Let us observe that (c) is a system of $n := n_1 + \dots + n_r$ multihomogeneous polynomial equations in the r groups of variables X_1, \dots, X_r with $n_1 + 1, \dots, n_r + 1$ variables respectively (with degrees 1 or 0 with respect to each group) and, therefore, it defines a (possibly empty) projective variety in $\mathbb{P}^{n_1}(\mathbb{C}) \times \dots \times \mathbb{P}^{n_r}(\mathbb{C})$. The complex solutions to the polynomial equation system (c) will be called *quasi-equilibria* of the game (see [7]), and those solutions not lying in any of the infinite hyperplanes $\{x_{i0} = 0\}$ ($1 \leq i \leq r$) will be called *affine quasi-equilibria* of the game.

Every quasi-equilibrium $\xi := (\xi_1, \dots, \xi_r) \in \mathbb{P}^{n_1}(\mathbb{C}) \times \dots \times \mathbb{P}^{n_r}(\mathbb{C})$ determines at most one totally mixed Nash equilibrium of the game: for every $1 \leq i \leq r$, let $s_{\xi_i} := \sum_{0 \leq j \leq n_i} \xi_{ij}$ be the sum of the coordinates of ξ_i . If $s_{\xi_i} \neq 0$ for every $1 \leq i \leq r$, the unique associated representation of ξ whose coordinates satisfy condition (b) is $(\xi_1/s_{\xi_1}, \dots, \xi_r/s_{\xi_r})$, and it will be a totally mixed Nash equilibrium if and only if all its coordinates are positive real numbers.

2.4 On the number of solutions to a multihomogeneous system

Let $r \in \mathbb{N}$ be a positive integer. Fix positive integers n_1, \dots, n_r and consider r groups of variables $X_j := (x_{j0}, \dots, x_{jn_j})$, $j = 1, \dots, r$. We say that the polynomial $F \in K[X_1, \dots, X_r]$ is *multihomogeneous* of *multi-degree* $v := (v_1, \dots, v_r)$, where v_1, \dots, v_r are non-negative integers, if F is homogeneous of degree v_j in the group of variables X_j for every $1 \leq j \leq r$.

Set $n := \sum_{j=1}^r n_j$. The classical Multihomogeneous Bézout Theorem, which follows from the intersection theory for divisors (see for instance [27, Chapter 4]), states that the set of common zeroes (over an algebraically closed field) in the projective variety $\mathbb{P}^{n_1} \times \dots \times \mathbb{P}^{n_r}$ of n generic multihomogeneous polynomials F_1, \dots, F_n with multi-degrees $\nu_i := (\nu_{i1}, \dots, \nu_{ir})$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$ is a zero-dimensional variety with

$$\text{Bez}_{n_1, \dots, n_r}(\nu_1; \dots; \nu_n) := \sum_{(j_1, \dots, j_n) \in \mathfrak{J}} \left(\prod_{i=1}^n \nu_{ij_i} \right) \quad (2)$$

points, where $\mathfrak{J} := \{(j_1, \dots, j_n) / \#\{k : j_k = i\} = n_i \ \forall 1 \leq i \leq r\}$. For an alternative proof of this result using deformation techniques, we refer the reader to [21], [19] and [10]. Note that this can be seen as a particular case of Bernstein's theorem on the number of common roots of sparse systems [3].

The quantity $\text{Bez}_{n_1, \dots, n_r}(\nu_1; \dots; \nu_n)$ is called the *Bézout number* of the generic multihomogeneous polynomial system. If k_1, \dots, k_t are positive integers with $\sum_{i=1}^t k_i = n$, we will use the notation $\text{Bez}_{n_1, \dots, n_r}(\nu_1, k_1; \dots; \nu_t, k_t)$ for the Bézout number of a multihomogeneous system with k_i polynomials of multi-degree ν_i for every $1 \leq i \leq t$.

The equations arising in our particular setting for the computation of totally mixed Nash equilibria of a game are multilinear (see Section 2.3). Moreover, for a game with r players with $n_1 + 1, \dots, n_r + 1$ pure strategies respectively, we have a system of $n =$

$\sum_{j=1}^r n_j$ polynomial equations consisting of exactly n_i polynomials of multi-degrees equal to $d_i := (1, \dots, 1, 0, 1, \dots, 1) \in (\mathbb{N}_0)^r$ (where the 0 lies in the i th coordinate of d_i) for every $1 \leq i \leq r$. Then, according to the previous formula, a system coming from a generic game with the given structure will have

$$\delta := \sum_{(j_{11}, \dots, j_{1n_1}, \dots, j_{r1}, \dots, j_{rn_r}) \in \mathfrak{J}} \left(\prod_{i=1}^r \prod_{k=1}^{n_i} d_{ij_{ik}} \right) \quad (3)$$

solutions in $\mathbb{P}^{n_1} \times \dots \times \mathbb{P}^{n_r}$, where $\mathfrak{J} := \{(j_{11}, \dots, j_{1n_1}, \dots, j_{r1}, \dots, j_{rn_r}) / \#\{j_{hk} : j_{hk} = i\} = n_i \forall 1 \leq i \leq r\}$. In fact, for a “generic” game, this will be the number of totally mixed Nash equilibria (see [18]).

We are going to deal with the case in which $\delta > 0$. This inequality can be determined by considering the set of exponents appearing with non-zero coefficients in each of the polynomials in the system (see [23, Chapter IV, Proposition 2.3]) and in our particular case, it is equivalent to the fact that $n_j \leq \sum_{1 \leq k \leq r, k \neq j} n_k = n - n_j$ for every $1 \leq j \leq r$. From now on, we will assume that these inequalities hold.

Taking into account that $d_{ii} = 0$ for every $1 \leq i \leq r$, the only n -tuples contributing to the sum (3) are those where $j_{ik} \neq i$ for every $1 \leq k \leq n_i$, and for each of them, the corresponding term of the sum equals 1. Therefore, δ equals the cardinality of the set

$$\mathfrak{J}_0 = \{(j_{11}, \dots, j_{rn_r}) / j_{ik} \neq i \forall 1 \leq k \leq n_i \text{ and } \#\{j_{hk} / j_{hk} = i\} = n_i \forall 1 \leq i \leq r\}. \quad (4)$$

2.5 Geometric resolutions

A way of representing zero-dimensional affine varieties which is widely used in computer algebra nowadays is a *geometric resolution*. This notion was first introduced in the works of Kronecker and König in the last years of the XIXth century [14]. Roughly speaking, it consists in a parametric description of the variety in which the parameter values range over the set of roots of a univariate polynomial. Now, we give the precise definition we are going to use.

Let $V = \{\xi^{(1)}, \dots, \xi^{(\delta)}\} \subset \mathbb{A}^n$ be a zero-dimensional variety defined by polynomials in $K[x_1, \dots, x_n]$. Given a *separating* linear form $\ell = u_1 x_1 + \dots + u_n x_n \in K[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ for V (that is, a linear form ℓ such that $\ell(\xi^{(i)}) \neq \ell(\xi^{(k)})$ if $i \neq k$), the following polynomials completely characterize the variety V :

- the *minimal polynomial* $p := \prod_{1 \leq i \leq \delta} (T - \ell(\xi^{(i)})) \in K[T]$ of ℓ over the variety V (where T is a new variable),
- polynomials $w_1, \dots, w_n \in K[T]$ with $\deg w_j < \delta$ for every $1 \leq j \leq n$ satisfying

$$V = \left\{ \left(\frac{w_1}{p'}(\eta), \dots, \frac{w_n}{p'}(\eta) \right) \in \overline{K}^n / \eta \in \overline{K}, p(\eta) = 0 \right\}.$$

The family of univariate polynomials $p, w_1, \dots, w_n \in K[T]$ is called the *geometric resolution* of V (associated with the linear form ℓ).

In our particular setting of totally mixed Nash equilibria computation, we will not only deal with zero-dimensional varieties in an affine space, but we will also consider zero-dimensional subvarieties of $\mathbb{P}^{n_1} \times \dots \times \mathbb{P}^{n_r}$.

Write $\xi := (\xi_1, \dots, \xi_r) \in \mathbb{P}^{n_1} \times \dots \times \mathbb{P}^{n_r}$ with $\xi_i := (\xi_{i0} : \dots : \xi_{in_i})$ ($1 \leq i \leq r$) to denote a point in the projective variety $\mathbb{P}^{n_1} \times \dots \times \mathbb{P}^{n_r}$. Assume that $V \subset \mathbb{P}^{n_1} \times \dots \times \mathbb{P}^{n_r}$ is a zero-dimensional variety defined by multihomogeneous polynomials in $K[X_1, \dots, X_r]$ such that $\xi_{i0} \neq 0$ ($1 \leq i \leq r$) holds for every point $\xi \in V$. Then, we may associate with V the following zero-dimensional variety in \mathbb{A}^n , where $n := n_1 + \dots + n_r$:

$$\{(\xi'_1, \dots, \xi'_r) \in \mathbb{A}^n / \xi'_i = (\xi_{i1}/\xi_{i0}, \dots, \xi_{in_i}/\xi_{i0}) \forall 1 \leq i \leq r, \xi \in V\}.$$

A geometric resolution $p, w_{11}, \dots, w_{1n_1}, \dots, w_{r1}, \dots, w_{rn_r} \in K[T]$ of this zero-dimensional variety will also be called a *geometric resolution* of $V \subset \mathbb{P}^{n_1} \times \dots \times \mathbb{P}^{n_r}$. In this case, the geometric resolution of V provides the following description of the variety:

$$V = \{((p'(\eta) : w_{11}(\eta) : \dots : w_{1n_1}(\eta)), \dots, (p'(\eta) : w_{r1}(\eta) : \dots : w_{rn_r}(\eta))) / \eta \in \overline{K}, p(\eta) = 0\}.$$

3 On the totally mixed Nash equilibria of a generic game

This section is devoted to the study of totally mixed Nash equilibria of generic games. In order to do this, we will begin by treating the payoff values as parameters and computing a geometric resolution of the set of quasi-equilibria of the associated generic game. This geometric resolution will provide a rational formula of the parameters which, for generic values of them, represents the totally mixed Nash equilibria of the game.

Then, we will obtain a finite number of generic conditions ensuring that a specific game has the maximum possible number of totally mixed Nash equilibria. Under these conditions, the Nash equilibria of the game can be described by the geometric resolution obtained by substituting the given payoffs for the parameters in our generic formulas.

3.1 The set of quasi-equilibria of a generic game

Here we are going to compute a geometric resolution of the set of quasi-equilibria of a generic game with r players with $n_1 + 1, \dots, n_r + 1$ pure strategies respectively, where $n_i \in \mathbb{N}$ for every $1 \leq i \leq r$.

For $1 \leq i \leq r$, $1 \leq k \leq n_i$, let $A^{(ik)} := (A_{j_1 \dots j_{i-1} j_{i+1} \dots j_r}^{(ik)})_{0 \leq j_t \leq n_t}$ be a set of new indeterminates and

$$F_k^{(i)} := \sum_{J_{-i}} A_{J_{-i}}^{(ik)} x_{1j_1} \dots x_{i-1j_{i-1}} x_{i+1j_{i+1}} \dots x_{rj_r}, \quad (5)$$

where the sum runs over all $J_{-i} := j_1 \dots j_{i-1} j_{i+1} \dots j_r$ with $0 \leq j_t \leq n_t$ for every $t \neq i$; that is, $F_k^{(i)}$ is a generic multihomogeneous polynomial of multi-degree $d_i := (1, \dots, 1, 0, 1, \dots, 1) \in (\mathbb{N}_0)^r$ (where 0 is in the i -th coordinate).

Note that, if $(C_{j_1 \dots j_r}^{(i)})_{1 \leq i \leq r, 0 \leq j_t \leq n_t}$ are new variables that are regarded as parameters representing the generic payoffs of the game, from the polynomials introduced in (5), we can obtain the polynomials defining the quasi-equilibria of the generic game by substituting

$$A_{J_{-i}}^{(ik)} := C_{j_1 \dots j_{i-1} k j_{i+1} \dots j_r}^{(i)} - C_{j_1 \dots j_{i-1} 0 j_{i+1} \dots j_r}^{(i)} \quad (6)$$

for every $1 \leq i \leq r$, $1 \leq k \leq n_i$ and each $J_{-i} = j_1 \dots j_{i-1} j_{i+1} \dots j_r$ with $0 \leq j_t \leq n_t$ for every $t \neq i$. Thus, we are going to compute a geometric resolution of the solution set of the generic polynomial system $F_k^{(i)} = 0$, $1 \leq i \leq r$, $1 \leq k \leq n_i$, and then, we will make the substitution (6) in the result to get the desired geometric resolution of the quasi-equilibria of the generic game.

Our main result is the following:

Theorem 1 *Let notations be as in Section 2. There is an algorithm which computes a geometric resolution of the set of quasi-equilibria of a generic game with r players having $n_1 + 1, \dots, n_r + 1$ pure strategies respectively, within complexity $O(D^2(D + n_1 \dots n_r \delta \log(D)r^2 n^4(n^3 + rN)))$, where*

$$\begin{aligned} D &:= \sum_{0 \leq i \leq r} n_i \text{Bez}_{n_1, \dots, n_r}(d_0, n_0; d_1, n_1; \dots; d_i, n_i - 1; \dots; d_r, n_r) \quad (n_0 := 1, d_0 := (1, \dots, 1)), \\ \delta &:= \text{Bez}_{n_1, \dots, n_r}(d_1, n_1; \dots; d_r, n_r), \\ n &:= \sum_{1 \leq i \leq r} n_i, \\ N &:= n + 1 + \sum_{1 \leq i \leq r} n_i(n_1 + 1) \dots (n_{i-1} + 1)(n_{i+1} + 1) \dots (n_r + 1). \end{aligned}$$

The algorithm obtains polynomials $P(T)$, $W_{ij}(T) \in \mathbb{Q}[C_{j_1 \dots j_r}^{(i)}][T]$ with $\deg_T P = \delta$, $\deg_T W_{ij} < \delta$ and degrees bounded by D in the parameters $C_{j_1 \dots j_r}^{(i)}$, which are encoded by straight-line programs of length $O(D^2(D + n_1 \dots n_r \delta \log(D)r^2 n^4(n^3 + rN)))$.

Proof. The geometric resolution of the system $F_k^{(i)} = 0$, $1 \leq i \leq r$, $1 \leq k \leq n_i$, will be obtained by means of multihomogeneous resultant computations. More precisely, we are going to obtain the geometric resolution associated to a linear form ℓ which separates the points of the generic system by computing the resultant of our system and a generic linear form. The minimal polynomial of ℓ and the polynomials W_{ij} will be obtained by specializing the resultant and some of its partial derivatives in the coefficients of ℓ .

We introduce a set of new indeterminates $A^{(0)} := (A_0^{(0)}, A_{ij}^{(0)} : 1 \leq i \leq r, 1 \leq j \leq n_i)$ which stand for the coefficients of a generic affine linear form $A_0^{(0)} + \sum_{\substack{1 \leq i \leq r \\ 1 \leq j \leq n_i}} A_{ij}^{(0)} x_{ij}$ in the $n = n_1 + \dots + n_r$ variables x_{ij} ($1 \leq i \leq r, 1 \leq j \leq n_i$), and we consider the multilinear polynomial

$$F_0 := A_0^{(0)} x_{10} \dots x_{r0} + \sum_{\substack{1 \leq i \leq r \\ 1 \leq j \leq n_i}} A_{ij}^{(0)} x_{10} \dots x_{i-1,0} x_{ij} x_{i+1,0} \dots x_{r0},$$

which is obtained by homogenizing the generic affine linear form with respect to each group of variables X_1, \dots, X_r .

The first step of the algorithm consists in the computation of the polynomial resultant $\mathcal{R} = \text{Res}(F_0, F_1^{(1)}, \dots, F_{n_1}^{(1)}, \dots, F_1^{(r)}, \dots, F_{n_r}^{(r)})$. According to [20, Theorem 1], this resultant coincides with the specialization of the resultant of a system of multihomogeneous polynomials of respective multi-degrees $d_0 = (1, \dots, 1)$, $d_j^{(1)} = (0, 1, \dots, 1)$ for $1 \leq j \leq$

$n_1, \dots, d_j^{(r)} = (1, \dots, 1, 0)$ for $1 \leq j \leq n_r$, in which all the coefficients of the polynomial of multi-degree d_0 corresponding to monomials not appearing in F_0 are substituted for 0. Thus, in order to obtain the polynomial \mathcal{R} we apply an adapted version of the algorithm underlying the proof of [13, Theorem 5] (see Subsection 5.1). With our previous notation, the complexity of this algorithm is of order $O(D^2(D + n_1 \dots n_r \delta \log(D)r^2 n^4(n^3 + rN)))$ and it computes a straight-line program for \mathcal{R} whose length is of the same order.

Then, a standard procedure enables us to compute a geometric resolution of the zero-dimensional variety defined by the system $F_k^{(i)} = 0$ ($1 \leq i \leq r, 1 \leq k \leq n_i$) from the polynomial \mathcal{R} : the polynomials giving the parametrization of the points in the variety are obtained from the partial derivatives

$$\mathcal{R}_0 := \frac{\partial \mathcal{R}}{\partial A_0^{(0)}} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{R}_{ij} := \frac{\partial \mathcal{R}}{\partial A_{ij}^{(0)}} \quad (1 \leq i \leq r, 1 \leq j \leq n_i),$$

which we compute from the straight-line program representing \mathcal{R} within the same complexity order as in the first step. These partial derivatives are encoded by straight-line programs of length of the same order as for the straight-line program encoding \mathcal{R} (see [5]). Note that $\deg_{A_0^{(0)}} \mathcal{R}_{ij} < \delta$ for every $1 \leq i \leq r, 1 \leq j \leq n_i$.

Let $L := \sum_{\substack{1 \leq i \leq r \\ 1 \leq j \leq n_i}} L_{ij} x_{ij}$ be a generic linear form in the variables x_{ij} , where L_{ij} are new variables, and let T be another new variable. Consider the polynomial $P_L \in \mathbb{Q}[A^{(ik)}, L_{ij}][T]$ obtained by specializing

$$A_0^{(0)} \mapsto T, \quad A_{ij}^{(0)} \mapsto -L_{ij} \quad (1 \leq i \leq r, 1 \leq j \leq n_i) \quad (7)$$

in \mathcal{R} . Since the resultant \mathcal{R} is in the ideal $(F_0, F_k^{(i)} : 1 \leq k \leq r, 1 \leq i \leq n_k)$, then substituting L for T in P_L , we obtain a polynomial \mathcal{P} which is in the ideal $(F_k^{(i)} : 1 \leq k \leq r, 1 \leq i \leq n_k)$. Taking into account that $\deg_T(P_L) = \delta$, which is the number of solutions of the system $F_k^{(i)} = 0$, it follows that P_L is a multiple by a nonzero factor in $\mathbb{Q}[A^{(ik)}]$ of the minimal polynomial of L . On the other hand, taking the partial derivative of \mathcal{P} with respect to the variable L_{ij} , we get

$$\frac{\partial \mathcal{P}}{\partial L_{ij}} = -\frac{\partial \mathcal{R}}{\partial A_{ij}^{(0)}}(L, -L_{ij}, A^{(ik)}) + \frac{\partial \mathcal{R}}{\partial A_0^{(0)}}(L, -L_{ij}, A^{(ik)})x_{ij} \in (F_k^{(i)} : 1 \leq k \leq r, 1 \leq i \leq n_k).$$

We conclude that making the substitution (7) in \mathcal{R}_0 and \mathcal{R}_{ij} ($1 \leq i \leq r, 1 \leq j \leq n_i$) we obtain polynomials which complete the geometric resolution of the variety defined by $F_k^{(i)} = 0$ with respect to the generic linear form $L := \sum_{\substack{1 \leq i \leq r \\ 1 \leq j \leq n_i}} L_{ij} x_{ij}$.

Finally, in order to obtain a geometric resolution for the zero set of the generic system, we choose a separating linear form and we substitute its coefficients for the parameters L_{ij} . As the multihomogeneous system $F_k^{(i)} = 0$ is generic, it has no zeroes in the hyperplanes $x_{i0} = 0$ ($1 \leq i \leq r$) and we can consider its zeroes as affine points by setting $x_{i0} = 1$ ($1 \leq i \leq r$). Let us show that the linear form $\ell := \sum_{1 \leq i \leq r} x_{i1}$ separates these affine points. To this end, it is enough to show the existence of a choice of coefficients such that the induced polynomial system has the maximum number of affine roots and that ℓ

separates those roots. To see this, choose coefficient vectors for the polynomials $F_k^{(i)}$ so as to obtain a specific system $f_k^{(i)}$ with the maximum number of affine solutions, and take a linear form $l \in \mathbb{Q}[x_{ij}; 1 \leq i \leq r, 1 \leq j \leq n_i]$ separating the common affine roots of the polynomials $f_k^{(i)}$. Now, making a linear change of variables in each group X_i ($1 \leq i \leq r$), the linear form l maps to ℓ and the specific system considered leads to a polynomial system of the same structure in the new variables, which is the particular system we were looking for.

Hence, the algorithm proceeds to specialize

$$A_0^{(0)} \mapsto T, A_{i1}^{(0)} \mapsto -1 \ (1 \leq i \leq r), A_{ij}^{(0)} \mapsto 0 \ (1 \leq i \leq r, 2 \leq j \leq n_i)$$

in the polynomials \mathcal{R} , \mathcal{R}_0 and \mathcal{R}_{ij} ($1 \leq i \leq r, 1 \leq j \leq n_i$) to obtain new polynomials giving the geometric resolution of the set of common zeros of the polynomials $F_k^{(i)}$ in $\mathbb{P}^{n_1} \times \dots \times \mathbb{P}^{n_r}$.

If $(C_{j_1 \dots j_r}^{(i)})_{1 \leq i \leq r, 0 \leq j_t \leq n_t}$ are the parameters representing the generic payoffs of a game with the given structure, in order to obtain the geometric resolution of the set of its quasi-equilibria it suffices to substitute $C_{j_1 \dots j_{i-1} k j_{i+1} \dots j_r}^{(i)} - C_{j_1 \dots j_{i-1} 0 j_{i+1} \dots j_r}^{(i)}$ for the coefficient $A_{J_{-i}}^{(ik)}$ for every $1 \leq i \leq r, 1 \leq k \leq n_i$ and each $J_{-i} = j_1 \dots j_{i-1} j_{i+1} \dots j_r$ with $0 \leq j_t \leq n_t$ for every $t \neq i$. In this way, the algorithm obtains polynomials $P(T)$, $\partial P / \partial T(T)$ and $W_{ij}(T)$ in $\mathbb{Q}[C_{j_1 \dots j_r}^{(i)}][T]$ such that the set of quasi-equilibria of the generic game in $\mathbb{P}^{n_1} \times \dots \times \mathbb{P}^{n_r}$ is represented as follows:

$$\left\{ \left(\left(\frac{\partial P}{\partial T}(t) : W_{11}(t) : \dots : W_{1n_1}(t) \right), \dots, \left(\frac{\partial P}{\partial T}(t) : W_{r1}(t) : \dots : W_{rn_r}(t) \right) \right) / t \in \overline{\mathbb{K}}, P(t) = 0 \right\}, \quad (8)$$

where $\mathbb{K} := \mathbb{Q}(C_{j_1 \dots j_r}^{(i)})$. The polynomials P , $\partial P / \partial T$ and W_{ij} are encoded by straight-line programs of length $O(D^2(D + n_1 \dots n_r \delta \log(D) r^2 n^4 (n^3 + rN)))$ over \mathbb{Q} , which is also the order of complexity of the whole computation. The upper bounds $\deg_T P \leq \delta$ and $\deg_T W_{ij} < \delta$ follow from the stated upper bounds for the degrees of \mathcal{R} and \mathcal{R}_{ij} in the variable $A_0^{(0)}$. \square

3.2 Games with the maximum number of totally mixed Nash equilibria

The existence of games with the maximum possible number of totally mixed Nash equilibria, namely the multihomogeneous Bézout number δ of the associated polynomial equation system, was proved in [18]. However, no characterization of those games has been provided. In this subsection, we will obtain a finite family of polynomial conditions (inequalities over the reals) ensuring that a given game satisfying those conditions has δ totally mixed Nash equilibria. We keep our previous assumptions and notation.

Let $P(T)$ and $W_{ij}(T)$ ($1 \leq i \leq r, 1 \leq j \leq n_i$) in $\mathbb{Q}[C_{j_1 \dots j_r}^{(i)}][T]$ be polynomials, as in Theorem 1, which give a geometric resolution of the set of quasi-equilibria (see (8)) of a game with r players with $n_1 + 1, \dots, n_r + 1$ strategies and generic payoffs $(C_{j_1 \dots j_r}^{(i)})_{1 \leq i \leq r, 0 \leq j_t \leq n_t}$.

Consider a specific choice of payoff values $c := (c_{j_1 \dots j_r}^{(i)})_{1 \leq i \leq r, 0 \leq j_t \leq n_t}$ over \mathbb{R} and assume that the polynomials $P(c)(T)$ and $W_{ij}(c)(T)$ obtained from $P(T)$ and $W_{ij}(T)$ by specializing the parameters at c provide a geometric resolution of the set of quasi-equilibria

of the game with the given payoffs. Then, the arguments in the last paragraph of subsection 2.3 imply that the totally mixed Nash equilibria of the game are those points $(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_r) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1+1} \times \dots \times \mathbb{R}^{n_r+1}$ of the form

$$\xi_i = \left(\frac{P'(c)(t)}{S_i(c)(t)}, \frac{W_{i1}(c)(t)}{S_i(c)(t)}, \dots, \frac{W_{in_i}(c)(t)}{S_i(c)(t)} \right) \quad (1 \leq i \leq r),$$

where $P' := \partial P / \partial T$ and $S_i := P' + \sum_{1 \leq j \leq n_i} W_{ij}$, having all their coordinates real and positive; that is, with t belonging to

$$\{t \in \mathbb{R} : P(c)(t) = 0, P'(c)(t) > 0, W_{ij}(c)(t) > 0 \forall 1 \leq i \leq r, 1 \leq j \leq n_i\}$$

or

$$\{t \in \mathbb{R} : P(c)(t) = 0, P'(c)(t) < 0, W_{ij}(c)(t) < 0 \forall 1 \leq i \leq r, 1 \leq j \leq n_i\}.$$

Equivalently, t must belong to the intersection

$$\bigcap_{1 \leq i \leq r, 1 \leq j \leq n_i} \{t \in \mathbb{R} : P(c)(t) = 0, (P'(c)W_{ij}(c))(t) > 0\}. \quad (9)$$

Thus, our polynomial conditions on the payoff vector c which imply that the associated game has δ totally mixed Nash equilibria will state, on the one hand, that the generic geometric resolution can be specialized into c leading to a geometric resolution of the set of quasi-equilibria of the game with the given payoffs and, on the other hand, that the cardinality of the set introduced in (9) equals δ .

Note that each of the sets appearing in the intersection defined in (9) is described by means of one equality and one inequality of univariate polynomials over \mathbb{R} . In order to estimate the cardinality of one of these sets, we will apply the following well-known result due to Hermite (see, for example, [1, Theorem 4.13]):

Proposition 2 *Let $p, q \in \mathbb{R}[T]$ be polynomials and assume that p is square-free. Let $\mathcal{S}_q : \mathbb{R}[T]/(p) \times \mathbb{R}[T]/(p) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be the symmetric bilinear map defined by $\mathcal{S}_q(f, g) = \text{Trace}(M_{fqg})$, where for every $H \in \mathbb{R}[T]$, $M_H : \mathbb{R}[T]/(p) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}[T]/(p)$ denotes the linear map $M_H(f) = H \cdot f$. Then*

$$\text{Signature}(\mathcal{S}_q) = \#\{\eta \in \mathbb{R} / p(\eta) = 0, q(\eta) > 0\} - \#\{\eta \in \mathbb{R} / p(\eta) = 0, q(\eta) < 0\}.$$

The main result of this section is the following:

Theorem 3 *Under the previous assumptions and notations, there is a family of $n\delta + 1$ polynomials $S_0, S_{ij}^{(h)}, 1 \leq i \leq r, 1 \leq j \leq n_i$ and $1 \leq h \leq \delta$, in $\mathbb{Q}[C_{j_1 \dots j_r}^{(i)}]_{1 \leq i \leq r, 0 \leq j_t \leq n_t} \setminus \{0\}$ with total degrees bounded by $4\delta^2 D$, such that for every vector $c := (c_{j_1 \dots j_r}^{(i)})_{1 \leq i \leq r, 0 \leq j_t \leq n_t}$ with real coordinates satisfying the conditions*

$$S_0(c) \neq 0, S_{ij}^{(h)}(c) > 0 \quad (1 \leq i \leq r, 1 \leq j \leq n_i, 1 \leq h \leq \delta),$$

the game with r players with $n_1 + 1, \dots, n_r + 1$ pure strategies and payoff values given by c has δ totally mixed Nash equilibria.

The polynomials S_0 and $S_{ij}^{(h)}$ can be obtained algorithmically within complexity $O(\delta^2(n\delta^2 + L))$ from a straight-line program of length L encoding polynomials P, W_{ij} as in Theorem 1. The algorithm computes straight-line programs of length $O(\delta^2(\delta^2 + L))$ which encode these polynomials.

For every $1 \leq i \leq r, 1 \leq k \leq n_i$, let $G_k^{(i)} \in \mathbb{Q}[C_{j_1 \dots j_r}^{(i)}][X_1, \dots, X_r]$ be the polynomial obtained after $F_k^{(i)}$ (see (5)) by means of the substitution stated in (6). The system $G_k^{(i)} = 0$ ($1 \leq i \leq r, 1 \leq k \leq n_i$) defines the quasi-equilibria of a generic game with r players and $n_1 + 1, \dots, n_r + 1$ pure strategies respectively.

Let $P(T)$ and $W_{ij}(T)$ ($1 \leq i \leq r, 1 \leq j \leq n_i$) in $\mathbb{Q}[C_{j_1 \dots j_r}^{(i)}][T]$ be polynomials as in Theorem 1 which give a geometric resolution of the set of common zeros of $G_k^{(i)}$ over an algebraic closure of $\mathbb{K} := \mathbb{Q}(C_{j_1 \dots j_r}^{(i)})$.

Denote P' the derivative of the polynomial P with respect to its main variable T . Let us consider the resultant

$$S_0 := \text{Res}_{\delta, \delta-1}(P(T), P'(T)) \in \mathbb{Q}[C_{j_1 \dots j_r}^{(i)}]$$

of $P(T)$ and $P'(T)$ regarded as polynomials in the single variable T with coefficients in $\mathbb{Q}[C_{j_1 \dots j_r}^{(i)}]$, where the subindices indicate the degrees in the variable T of P and P' respectively.

Let us observe that, for every real vector $c = (c_{j_1 \dots j_r}^{(i)})_{1 \leq i \leq r, 0 \leq j_t \leq n_t}$ with $S_0(c) \neq 0$, the polynomial $P(c)(T)$ obtained by specializing all the coefficients of $P(T)$ at c is a non-zero square-free polynomial of degree δ . Furthermore, the solution set of the system $G_k^{(i)}(c) = 0$, $1 \leq i \leq r, 1 \leq k \leq n_i$, is a zero-dimensional sub-variety of $\mathbb{P}^{n_1} \times \dots \times \mathbb{P}^{n_r}$ with δ distinct points and the polynomials $P(c)(T), W_{ij}(c)(T)$ ($1 \leq i \leq r, 1 \leq j \leq n_i$) give a geometric resolution of this variety.

Therefore, if the condition $S_0(c) \neq 0$ holds, taking into account that $\deg_T(P(c)(T)) = \delta$, the arguments at the beginning of this subsection imply that the game with payoff vector c will have δ distinct totally mixed Nash equilibria if and only if every root t of $P(c)$ is real and satisfies $(P'(c)W_{ij}(c))(t) > 0$ for every $1 \leq i \leq r, 1 \leq j \leq n_i$ (see (9)). This additional condition can be restated as

$$\#\{t \in \mathbb{R} : P(c)(t) = 0, (P'W_{ij}(c))(t) > 0\} = \delta \quad \forall 1 \leq i \leq r, 1 \leq j \leq n_i.$$

Since $\deg_T P = \delta$, this last condition is equivalent to

$$\text{Signature}(\mathcal{S}_{P'W_{ij}(c)}) = \delta \quad \forall 1 \leq i \leq r, 1 \leq j \leq n_i. \quad (10)$$

Note that for any fixed pair of indices i, j , being $\mathcal{S}_{P'W_{ij}(c)}$ a bilinear form defined over a vector space of dimension δ , the equality $\text{Signature}(\mathcal{S}_{P'W_{ij}(c)}) = \delta$ holds if and only if all the eigenvalues of the matrix of $\mathcal{S}_{P'W_{ij}(c)}$ in an arbitrary basis of the space are positive, which is in turn equivalent to the fact that the coefficient sequence of the characteristic polynomial of this matrix, whose roots are all real, has δ sign changes. The conditions stating these sign changes will be the inequalities ensuring that the game has the maximum number of totally mixed Nash equilibria.

Now, we will obtain the polynomials $S_{ij}^{(h)}$ giving the inequalities in the statement of the theorem by considering the bilinear forms $\mathcal{S}_{P'W_{ij}}$ for generic payoffs and performing all our computations over the parameter field $\mathbb{K} = \mathbb{Q}(C_{j_1 \dots j_r}^{(i)})$, that is, we will consider the bilinear form $\mathcal{S}_{P'W_{ij}} : \mathbb{K}[T]/(P) \times \mathbb{K}[T]/(P) \rightarrow \mathbb{K}$. Let $\mathcal{M}^{(ij)} \in \mathbb{K}^{\delta \times \delta}$ be the matrix of $\mathcal{S}_{P'W_{ij}}$ in the basis $\mathcal{B} := \{1, T, \dots, T^{\delta-1}\}$. Note that, for every real vector $c = (c_{j_1 \dots j_r}^{(i)})_{1 \leq i \leq r, 0 \leq j_t \leq n_t}$ with $S_0(c) \neq 0$, the coefficient of T^δ of the polynomial $P(c)(T)$ is not zero. Then, the matrix of the bilinear form $\mathcal{S}_{P'W_{ij}(c)}$ can be computed by specializing $\mathcal{M}^{(ij)}$ at c .

Actually, to deal with polynomials instead of rational functions of the parameters, we will not compute the matrices $\mathcal{M}^{(ij)}$ of the bilinear forms $\mathcal{S}_{P'W_{ij}}$ but (scalar) multiples of them with polynomial entries. In what follows, we will first show how to obtain these matrices. Then, we will compute the coefficients of their characteristic polynomials, and we will estimate their degrees and the overall complexity for their computation.

Before proceeding, we are going to make some remarks about the denominator-free computation of traces of multiplication maps in $\mathbb{K}[T]/(P)$. It is easy to see that for all $H \in \mathbb{K}[T]$, we have $M_H = H(M_T)$; that is, every multiplication map is a polynomial function of the multiplication map $M_T : \mathbb{K}[T]/(P) \rightarrow \mathbb{K}[T]/(P)$, whose matrix in the basis $\mathcal{B} := \{1, T, \dots, T^{\delta-1}\}$ can be read off from P . In fact, if we write $P = \sum_{k=0}^{\delta} p_k T^k$, with $p_k \in \mathbb{Q}[C_{j_1 \dots j_r}^{(i)}]_{1 \leq i \leq r, 0 \leq j_t \leq n_t}$, the matrix of M_T in the basis \mathcal{B} is

$$\begin{pmatrix} 0 & \dots & \dots & 0 & -\frac{p_0}{p_\delta} \\ 1 & 0 & \dots & \dots & -\frac{p_1}{p_\delta} \\ 0 & \ddots & \ddots & \dots & \vdots \\ \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & 0 & \vdots \\ 0 & \dots & 0 & 1 & -\frac{p_{\delta-1}}{p_\delta} \end{pmatrix}.$$

In order not to deal with denominators in our computations in the case when $H \in \mathbb{Q}[C_{j_1 \dots j_r}^{(i)}][T]$, we will consider the multiplication map $M_{p_\delta T}$, whose matrix in the basis \mathcal{B} is

$$\mathcal{M} := \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \dots & \dots & 0 & -p_0 \\ p_\delta & 0 & \dots & \dots & -p_1 \\ 0 & \ddots & \ddots & \dots & \vdots \\ \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & 0 & \vdots \\ 0 & \dots & 0 & p_\delta & -p_{\delta-1} \end{pmatrix}.$$

If $H = \sum_{h=0}^d b_h T^h$ with $b_h \in \mathbb{Q}[C_{j_1 \dots j_r}^{(i)}]$, we have that $\text{Trace}(M_H) = \sum_{h=0}^d b_h \text{Trace}((M_T)^h)$ and, therefore, we can obtain a multiple of $\text{Trace}(M_H)$ working over the polynomial ring $\mathbb{Q}[C_{j_1 \dots j_r}^{(i)}]$ due to the following identity which holds for every $K \geq d$:

$$p_\delta^K \text{Trace}(M_H) = \sum_{h=0}^d p_\delta^{K-h} b_h \text{Trace}((M_{p_\delta T})^h). \quad (11)$$

Taking into account the previous remark, we are able to obtain a multiple of the matrix $\mathcal{M}^{(ij)}$ by a sufficiently big power of the leading coefficient p_δ with all its entries in $\mathbb{Q}[C_{j_1 \dots j_r}^{(i)}]$

by working over this polynomial ring: for every $1 \leq \alpha, \beta \leq \delta$, we have that

$$(\mathcal{M}^{(ij)})_{\alpha,\beta} = \text{Trace}(M_{T^{\alpha-1}P'W_{ij}T^{\beta-1}}) \quad (12)$$

and then, as $\deg_T(P') < \delta$ and $\deg_T(W_{ij}) < \delta$, the upper bound $\deg(T^{\alpha-1}P'W_{ij}T^{\beta-1}) \leq 4\delta - 4$ holds. We conclude that the matrix $p_\delta^{4\delta-4}\mathcal{M}^{(ij)}$ has all its entries in the polynomial ring $\mathbb{Q}[C_{j_1 \dots j_r}^{(i)}]$. Moreover, as we are multiplying the matrix $\mathcal{M}^{(ij)}$ by an *even* power of p_δ , for every payoff vector c with $S_0(c) \neq 0$, the identity

$$\text{Signature}(\mathcal{M}^{(ij)}(c)) = \text{Signature}(p_\delta(c)^{4\delta-4}\mathcal{M}^{(ij)}(c))$$

holds (note that $S_0(c) \neq 0$ implies $p_\delta(c) \neq 0$).

Therefore, our algorithm will compute the matrices $p_\delta^{4\delta-4}\mathcal{M}^{(ij)}$ and then, their characteristic polynomials $\mathcal{X}_{ij} = T^\delta + \sum_{h=1}^{\delta} (-1)^h S_{ij}^{(h)} T^{\delta-h} \in \mathbb{Q}[C_{j_1 \dots j_r}^{(i)}][T]$ for every $1 \leq i \leq r$, $1 \leq j \leq n_i$. Our previous arguments imply that for a payoff vector c with $S_0(c) \neq 0$, condition (10) is equivalent to

$$S_{ij}^{(h)}(c) > 0 \quad \forall 1 \leq i \leq r, 1 \leq j \leq n_i, 1 \leq h \leq \delta.$$

Now we detail the successive steps of the algorithm, we estimate its complexity and the length of a straight-line program encoding the output polynomials $S_{ij}^{(h)}$, and we give an upper bound for the degrees of these polynomials.

The entries of the matrices $p_\delta^{4\delta-4}\mathcal{M}^{(ij)}$ are obtained according to identities (12) and (11).

First, from a straight-line program of length L encoding the polynomials P and W_{ij} ($1 \leq i \leq r, 1 \leq j \leq n_i$), we obtain a straight-line program of length $O(\delta^2 L)$ for the coefficients of P in the variable T and a straight-line program of length $O(\delta^2(L+n))$ for the coefficients of all the polynomials $P'W_{ij}$ ($1 \leq i \leq r, 1 \leq j \leq n_i$) in the variable T within complexity $O(\delta^2(L+n))$ (see [5, Lema 21.25]).

Then, using the coefficients of P , the matrix $\mathcal{M} \in \mathbb{Q}[C_{j_1 \dots j_r}^{(i)}]^{\delta \times \delta}$ of the multiplication map $M_{p_\delta T}$ is constructed and the powers \mathcal{M}^h for $h = 0, \dots, 4\delta - 4$ are computed. Note that every matrix in $\mathbb{Q}[C_{j_1 \dots j_r}^{(i)}]^{\delta \times \delta}$ can be multiplied by \mathcal{M} with $\mathcal{O}(\delta^2)$ additions and multiplications in $\mathbb{Q}[C_{j_1 \dots j_r}^{(i)}]$ and so, the powers \mathcal{M}^h for $h \leq 4\delta - 4$ of this matrix can be computed within $O(\delta^3)$ polynomial additions and multiplications. Thus, we obtain straight-line programs of length $O(\delta^2(\delta+L))$ for the entries of the matrices \mathcal{M}^h ($0 \leq h \leq 4\delta - 4$) within complexity $O(\delta^3)$.

Therefore, a straight-line program of length $O(\delta^2(\delta+L))$ computing $\text{Trace}((M_{p_\delta T})^h)$, for every $0 \leq h \leq 4\delta - 4$ is obtained with $O(\delta^2)$ additional operations.

Now, fix i, j with $1 \leq i \leq r$ and $1 \leq j \leq n_i$. Let $P'W_{ij} = \sum_{h=0}^{2\delta-2} b_h^{(ij)} T^h$ be the expansion of $P'W_{ij}$ in the variable T with coefficients in $\mathbb{Q}[C_{j_1 \dots j_r}^{(i)}]$. Recall that in the first step of the algorithm we have obtained a straight-line program of length $O(\delta^2(L+n))$ for the polynomials $b_h^{(ij)}$. For every α, β with $1 \leq \alpha, \beta \leq \delta$, we obtain a straight-line program for $(p_\delta^{4\delta-4}\mathcal{M}^{(ij)})_{\alpha,\beta}$ by means of the formula:

$$p_\delta^{4\delta-4} \text{Trace}(M_{T^{\alpha-1}P'W_{ij}T^{\beta-1}}) = \sum_{h=\alpha+\beta-2}^{2\delta+\alpha+\beta-4} p_\delta^{4\delta-4-h} b_{h-\alpha-\beta+2}^{(ij)} \text{Trace}(M_{(p_\delta T)^h})$$

within additional complexity $O(\delta)$. The length of this straight-line program is $O(\delta^2(\delta + L + n))$.

The complexity of the computation of the entries of all the matrices $p_\delta^{4\delta-4}\mathcal{M}^{(ij)}$ from the coefficients $b_h^{(ij)}$ and the traces $\text{Trace}((M_{p_\delta T})^h)$ is $O(n\delta^2)$.

Finally, we apply the division-free algorithm described in [2] in order to compute the coefficients of the characteristic polynomial \mathcal{X}_{ij} of each of these matrices. For every $1 \leq i \leq r, 1 \leq j \leq n_i$, the algorithm produces straight-line programs of length $O(\delta^2(\delta^2 + L + n))$ encoding these coefficients within complexity $O(\delta^4)$.

The overall complexity of the algorithm is $O(\delta^2(n\delta^2 + L))$.

Let us observe that the entries of the matrices $p_\delta^{4\delta-4}\mathcal{M}^{(ij)}$ are polynomials in $\mathbb{Q}[C_{j_1 \dots j_r}^{(i)}]$ of total degrees bounded by $4\delta D$ and so, the polynomials $S_{ij}^{(h)}$ obtained by the described procedure, which are the (signed) coefficients of the characteristic polynomials \mathcal{X}_{ij} , have total degrees bounded by $4\delta^2 D$. \square

Note that, with the same notation as in the previous theorem, for a generic game with the given structure (namely, any game whose payoff vector c satisfies $S_0(c) \neq 0$) the conditions $S_{ij}^{(h)}(c) > 0$ are *equivalent* to the fact that the considered game has the maximum possible number of totally mixed Nash equilibria.

4 The set of totally mixed Nash equilibria of an arbitrary game

When dealing with a particular game with specific payoff values, the geometric resolution of the set of quasi-equilibria of a generic game with the same structure might not be useful in order to describe the quasi-equilibria of the given game. For instance, the minimal polynomial $P(T)$ or its derivative $\frac{\partial P}{\partial T}(T)$ computed by the algorithm shown in Theorem 1 could vanish identically when specialized at the considered payoff values. This section is aimed at adapting the procedures previously developed in order to handle these particular situations.

First, we show an algorithm computing a geometric resolution of the set of affine quasi-equilibria of the game provided that it has a zero-dimensional set of quasi-equilibria. In a second step, this algorithm is extended to find all *isolated* affine quasi-equilibria of an arbitrary game.

Once a finite set of affine quasi-equilibria of a game including the isolated ones is computed, we apply standard algorithms of semialgebraic geometry to estimate the number of isolated totally mixed Nash equilibria of the game.

4.1 Games with a zero-dimensional set of quasi-equilibria

As in the previous sections, we consider an r -person non-cooperative game in normal form in which the players have $n_1 + 1, \dots, n_r + 1$ distinct available pure strategies each. Let $c^{(i)} := (c_{j_1, \dots, j_r}^{(i)})_{0 \leq j_k \leq n_k}$ denote the payoff matrix to player i for every $1 \leq i \leq r$.

Then, the polynomial equations defining the Nash equilibria of the game (see Section 2.3) can be obtained by specializing the coefficients of each of the generic multilinear

polynomials $F_k^{(i)}$ introduced in (5) in the vector $a^{(ik)} := (a_{j_1 \dots j_{i-1} j_{i+1} \dots j_r}^{(ik)})_{0 \leq j_t \leq n_t}$ defined from the payoffs of the game as follows $a_{j_1 \dots j_{i-1} j_{i+1} \dots j_r}^{(ik)} := c_{j_1 \dots j_{i-1} k j_{i+1} \dots j_r}^{(i)} - c_{j_1 \dots j_{i-1} 0 j_{i+1} \dots j_r}^{(i)}$. Thus, if $a := (a^{(ik)})_{1 \leq i \leq r, 1 \leq k \leq n_i}$, the set of quasi-equilibria of the game is the algebraic variety

$$V_a := \{\xi := (\xi_1, \dots, \xi_r) \in \mathbb{P}^{n_1} \times \dots \times \mathbb{P}^{n_r} / F_k^{(i)}(a, \xi) = 0 \forall 1 \leq i \leq r, 1 \leq k \leq n_i\}.$$

In this section we consider the case when V_a is zero-dimensional. In order to decide whether this is the case for given payoff values, we study the non vanishing of an adequate multihomogeneous resultant. More precisely, we consider a generic polynomial of multi-degree $d_0 := (1, \dots, 1)$ in the groups of variables X_1, \dots, X_r ,

$$F_0 = \sum_{\substack{1 \leq i \leq r \\ 0 \leq j_i \leq n_i}} A_{j_1 \dots j_r}^{(0)} x_{1j_1} \dots x_{rj_r}$$

and the resultant $R := \text{Res}(F_0, F_1^{(1)}, \dots, F_{n_1}^{(1)}, \dots, F_1^{(r)}, \dots, F_{n_r}^{(r)})$. Let $R_a(A_{j_1 \dots j_r}^{(0)})$ be the polynomial obtained by substituting the coordinates of $a = (a^{(ik)})_{1 \leq i \leq r, 1 \leq k \leq n_i}$ for the variables $A^{(ik)}$ in the polynomial R . Then:

Remark 4 *The algebraic variety V_a is either zero-dimensional or empty if and only if the polynomial R_a is not identically zero.*

Proof. If V_a is empty, the result is straightforward. If V_a is zero-dimensional, there exists a multilinear polynomial $f_0 \in \mathbb{Q}[X_1, \dots, X_r]$ which does not vanish at any of the (finitely many) points of V_a and therefore, R_a does not vanish at the coefficients of f_0 .

On the other hand, if the projective variety V_a has positive dimension, any multilinear polynomial f_0 has zeros in V_a . Therefore, R_a is identically zero. \square

Now we will show how to decide whether R_a is identically zero algorithmically and we will estimate the complexity of this procedure.

First, we compute the multihomogeneous resultant R by means of the algorithm described in [13] adapted according to Subsection 5.1 below. Thus, a straight-line program of length $\mathcal{L} := O(D^2(D + n_1 \dots n_r \delta \log(D) r^2 n^4 (n^3 + rN)))$ encoding R is obtained within complexity of the same order as \mathcal{L} . The specialization $A^{(ik)} := a^{(ik)}$ which leads us to the polynomial R_a does not modify this complexity order.

Since R_a is a multivariate polynomial in $\prod_{1 \leq i \leq r} (n_i + 1)$ variables encoded by a straight-line program, we do not know its coefficients; moreover, the complexity to compute them is exponential. Therefore, in order to decide whether it is the zero polynomial or not, we will make a suitable specialization so that solving this problem amounts to solving the same problem in the univariate setting.

More precisely, we specialize the variable coefficients $A_{j_1 \dots j_r}^{(0)}$ into successive powers of a new variable t , that is,

$$A_{j_1 \dots j_r}^{(0)} = t^{j_1 + (n_1 + 1)j_2 + (n_1 + 1)(n_2 + 1)j_3 + \dots + (\prod_{j=0}^{r-1} (n_j + 1))j_r}. \quad (13)$$

Making this specialization in F_0 , we obtain a new polynomial $f_0 \in \mathbb{Q}[t][X_1, \dots, X_r]$. Let us show that if V_a consists of finitely many points, there is a polynomial $f_0(t_0)$ with coefficients of this type (namely, successive powers of the same scalar t_0) which does not vanish at any point of V_a .

For every $\xi := (\xi_1, \dots, \xi_r) \in \mathbb{P}^{n_1} \times \dots \times \mathbb{P}^{n_r}$, we have

$$f_0(\xi)(t) = \sum_{j_1 \dots j_r} \xi_{1j_1} \dots \xi_{rj_r} t^{j_1 + (n_1+1)j_2 + (n_1+1)(n_2+1)j_3 + \dots + (\prod_{j=0}^{r-1} (n_j+1))j_r} \in \mathbb{C}[t],$$

which is a non-zero polynomial, due to the fact that there exists at least one choice of j_1, \dots, j_r for which the product $\xi_{1j_1} \dots \xi_{rj_r}$ is not 0. Now, if V_a is a finite set, we may consider the polynomial $\Delta(t) := \prod_{\xi \in V_a} f_0(\xi)(t)$. Note that $\Delta \in \mathbb{C}[t]$ is a non-zero polynomial and, therefore, there exists $t_0 \in \mathbb{Q}$ with $\Delta(t_0) \neq 0$. Due to the definition of Δ , the polynomial $f_0(t_0) \in \mathbb{Q}[X_1, \dots, X_r]$ does not vanish at any point of V_a . This implies that the resultant of $f_0(t_0), F_k^{(i)}(a^{(ik)})$ ($1 \leq i \leq r, 1 \leq k \leq n_i$) is not zero, that is, the polynomial $R_{a,t} \in \mathbb{Q}[t]$ obtained by specializing R_a following (13) does not vanish at t_0 . We conclude that $R_{a,t}$ is not the zero polynomial.

Therefore, in order to decide whether $R_a \in \mathbb{Q}[A_{j_1 \dots j_r}^{(0)}]$ is zero or not, it suffices to decide whether the associated polynomial $R_{a,t} \in \mathbb{Q}[t]$ is zero or not. Taking into account that $\deg(R_{a,t}) \leq (\prod_{1 \leq i \leq r} (n_i + 1) - 1)\delta$, it follows that this task can be achieved by evaluating $R_{a,t}$ at $(\prod_{1 \leq i \leq r} (n_i + 1))\delta$ distinct values of t , which is done by substituting the powers of these values for the variables $A_{j_1 \dots j_r}^{(0)}$ according to (13) in the straight-line program for R_a .

The overall complexity of this procedure is $\left((\prod_{1 \leq i \leq r} (n_i + 1)) + \mathcal{L} \right) (\prod_{1 \leq i \leq r} (n_i + 1))\delta = O(D^2(n_1 \dots n_r)^2 \delta (D + n_1 \dots n_r \delta \log(D) r^2 n^4 (n^3 + rN)))$.

Assume now that the set of quasi-equilibria of the given game is finite, that is, the polynomial R_a is not identically zero.

Proposition 5 *Following the previous assumptions and notation, there is an algorithm which computes a geometric resolution of the set of affine quasi-equilibria of a game with r players having $n_1 + 1, \dots, n_r + 1$ pure strategies respectively within complexity $O(\delta^8 D^2 (D + n_1 \dots n_r \delta \log(D) r^2 n^5 (n^3 + rN)))$ provided that the associated set of quasi-equilibria V_a is zero-dimensional.*

Proof. We will obtain the desired geometric resolution from the specialized resultant R_a . In order to do this, we first show that this specialized resultant factorizes as follows:

$$R_a = C_a \prod_{\xi \in V_a} F_0(\xi)^{m_\xi}, \quad \text{with } C_a \in \mathbb{Q}, \quad m_\xi \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Set $\mathcal{F}_a := \prod_{\xi \in V_a} F_0(\xi) \in \mathbb{Q}[A^{(0)}]$. For a given coefficient vector $a^{(0)}$, we have that $\mathcal{F}_a(a^{(0)}) = 0$ if and only if there is a point $\xi \in V_a$ such that $F_0(a^{(0)}, \xi) = 0$; that is, if and only if $F_0(a^{(0)}), F_1^{(1)}(a^{(11)}), \dots, F_{n_r}^{(r)}(a^{(rn_r)})$ have a common root in $\mathbb{P}^{n_1} \times \dots \times \mathbb{P}^{n_r}$. But this last condition is equivalent to the fact that the resultant $\text{Res}(F_0, F_1^{(1)}, \dots, F_{n_r}^{(r)})$ vanishes at $a^{(0)}, a^{(11)}, \dots, a^{(rn_r)}$ or, equivalently, that $R_a(a^{(0)}) = 0$. We conclude that the

polynomials \mathcal{F}_a and R_a have the same zero set and so, they have the same irreducible factors, which proves our assertion.

We are interested in describing the set of *affine* quasi-equilibria of the game, that is, the variety $V_a^{\text{aff}} := \{\xi \in V_a : \xi_{i0} \neq 0 \forall 1 \leq i \leq r\}$. For this reason, we are going to compute the polynomial $R_a^{\text{aff}} := \prod_{\xi \in V_a^{\text{aff}}} F_0(\xi)^{m_\xi}$. Note that

$$R_a = C_a \prod_{\xi \in V_a - V_a^{\text{aff}}} F_0(\xi)^{m_\xi} \prod_{\xi \in V_a^{\text{aff}}} F_0(\xi)^{m_\xi}, \quad (14)$$

where $R_a^{\text{aff}} = \prod_{\xi \in V_a^{\text{aff}}} F_0(\xi)^{m_\xi}$ is monic in the variable $A_{0\dots 0}^{(0)}$ and $\prod_{\xi \in V_a - V_a^{\text{aff}}} F_0(\xi)^{m_\xi}$ does not depend on this variable. Then, $C_a \prod_{\xi \in V_a - V_a^{\text{aff}}} F_0(\xi)^{m_\xi}$ is the leading coefficient of R_a in the variable $A_{0\dots 0}^{(0)}$. Therefore, R_a^{aff} can be obtained from R_a by dividing it by this leading coefficient.

Let us consider the generic form $f_0 := A_{0\dots 0}^{(0)} x_{10} \dots x_{r0} + \sum_{\substack{1 \leq i \leq r \\ 1 \leq j \leq n_i}} A_{ij}^{(0)} x_{10} \dots x_{i-10} x_{ij} x_{i+10} \dots x_{r0}$.

After specializing R_a^{aff} as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} A_{0\dots 0}^{(0)} &\mapsto A_0^{(0)} \\ A_{0\dots 0j\dots 0}^{(0)} &\mapsto A_{ij}^{(0)} \quad \text{where the index } j \text{ is in the } i\text{th place } (1 \leq j \leq n_i) \\ A_{j_1\dots j_r}^{(0)} &\mapsto 0 \quad \text{otherwise} \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

we obtain the polynomial $\tilde{P}_a := \prod_{\xi \in V_a^{\text{aff}}} f_0(\xi)^{m_\xi}$. The geometric resolution of the variety V_a^{aff} can be obtained from the square-free part $P_a := \prod_{\xi \in V_a^{\text{aff}}} f_0(\xi)$ of \tilde{P}_a and the partial derivatives of P_a as shown in the proof of Theorem 1 and substituting the powers of a conveniently chosen scalar for the variables A_{ij} .

Now we estimate the complexity of the different steps of our algorithm.

Computation of R_a^{aff} : First, we compute the degree $d_a := \deg_{A_{0\dots 0}^{(0)}}(R_a)$. To do this, let $t_0 \in \mathbb{Q}$ be the element we have already obtained such that $R_{a,t}(t_0) \neq 0$. Let $R_a^{(t_0)} \in \mathbb{Q}[A_{0\dots 0}^{(0)}]$ be the (non-zero) polynomial obtained from R_a after specializing it as in (13) for every $(j_1, \dots, j_r) \neq (0, \dots, 0)$ setting $t = t_0$. Because of (14), $\deg(R_a^{(t_0)}) = d_a$. Then, in order to compute d_a , it suffices to compute the coefficients of $R_a^{(t_0)}$ up to degree δ (which is an a priori upper bound for d_a). The complexity of this computation is of order $O(\delta^2 \mathcal{L})$. Now we obtain an slp of length $O(\delta^2 \mathcal{L})$ for the coefficient of $(A_{0\dots 0}^{(0)})^{d_a}$ of R_a and we obtain R_a^{aff} by dividing R_a by this coefficient. As the divisor does not vanish when its variables are specialized in the successive powers of t_0 , this polynomial division can be done within complexity $O(\delta^4 \mathcal{L})$, and produces an slp of the same order ([28]).

Computation of the polynomial P_a : We obtain P_a as the quotient $\tilde{P}_a / \gcd(\tilde{P}_a, \frac{\partial \tilde{P}_a}{\partial A_0^{(0)}})$.

The specialization in (15) gives an slp for \tilde{P}_a without modifying the previous length.

To obtain the square-free part of \tilde{P}_a , we apply a well-known subresultant-based procedure for the computation of the gcd of two polynomials (see, for instance, [4]). We proceed as before by specializing all the variables in \tilde{P}_a , except for the main variable $A_0^{(0)}$ into the successive powers of a new variable t and deal with the polynomial we obtain in

$\mathbb{Q}[t][A_0^{(0)}]$. We will use the following notation: given $F \in \mathbb{Q}[A_0^{(0)}, A_{ij}^{(0)}]$, $F^{(t)}$ will denote the polynomial obtained from F by doing the previously mentioned specialization.

Let $G = \gcd(\tilde{P}_a, \frac{\partial \tilde{P}_a}{\partial A_0^{(0)}})$. As, for $\xi_1 \neq \xi_2$ we have that $f_0^{(t)}(\xi_1)$ y $f_0^{(t)}(\xi_2)$ are relatively prime irreducible polynomials in $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}[A_0^{(0)}, t]$, we have that

$$G^{(t)} = \prod_{\xi \in V_a^{\text{aff}}} f_0^{(t)}(\xi)^{m_\xi - 1} = \gcd(\tilde{P}_a^{(t)}, \frac{\partial \tilde{P}_a^{(t)}}{\partial A_0^{(0)}}).$$

Then, we can obtain $\tilde{d}_a := \deg(\gcd(\tilde{P}_a, \frac{\partial \tilde{P}_a}{\partial A_0^{(0)}}))$ using the polynomials $\tilde{P}_a^{(t)}$ and $\frac{\partial \tilde{P}_a^{(t)}}{\partial A_0^{(0)}}$. In order to compute the degree of the gcd of these polynomials, we look for their first non-zero subresultant. In each step, to decide whether the considered subresultant (which is a polynomial of degree at most $2\delta^2 n$ in $\mathbb{Q}[t]$) is zero or not, we evaluate the variable t in a sufficient number of elements of \mathbb{Q} . First, we obtain an slp of length $O(\delta^4 \mathcal{L} + n)$ for $\tilde{P}_a^{(t)}$ and then an slp of length $O(\delta^2(\delta^4 \mathcal{L} + n))$ for its coefficients in the variable $A_0^{(0)}$. For a specific evaluation of t the complexity of the computation of all the subresultants is $O(\delta^6 \mathcal{L} + \delta^2 n)$, and therefore, the whole complexity of this step is bounded by $O(\delta^8 \mathcal{L} n + \delta^4 n^2)$. We obtain $\tilde{G} = \text{sr}_a \cdot \gcd(\tilde{P}_a, \frac{\partial \tilde{P}_a}{\partial A_0^{(0)}})$ as the polynomial subresultant of index \tilde{d}_a , where sr_a is the main subresultant of index \tilde{d}_a , within complexity $O(\delta^6 \mathcal{L})$.

Finally, the polynomial P_a is obtained by dividing $\text{sr}_a \tilde{P}_a$ by \tilde{G} . Note that we already know a point τ where sr_a does not vanish (τ is the value obtained in the previous step when computing \tilde{d}_a). Then, if we consider the nonzero polynomial $\tilde{G}^{(t)}(A_0^{(0)}, \tau) \in \mathbb{Q}[A_0^{(0)}]$ of degree \tilde{d}_a , by evaluating it in at most $\tilde{d}_a + 1$ elements in \mathbb{Q} , we obtain $a_0^{(0)} \in \mathbb{Q}$ such that $\tilde{G}^{(t)}(a_0^{(0)}, \tau) \neq 0$. This enables us to compute the quotient P_a by applying the classical division avoiding algorithm in [28]. The complexity of this step is of order $O(\delta^8 \mathcal{L})$.

Observe that the linear form ℓ whose coefficients are $(-\tau^k)_{0 \leq k \leq n-1}$ is a separating linear form for V_a^{aff} . To compute the required geometric resolution associated with ℓ from the polynomial P_a we proceed as in the proof of Theorem 1: we specialize P_a and its partial derivatives at the coefficients of ℓ .

The overall complexity of the algorithm is $O(\delta^8 \mathcal{L} n + \delta^4 n^2) = O(\delta^8 D^2 (D + n_1 \dots n_r \delta \log(D) r^2 n^5 (n^3 + rN)))$. \square

Now, we are able to compute the number of totally mixed Nash equilibria of a game with zero-dimensional set of quasi-equilibria from the geometric resolution given by Proposition 5.

Let p and w_{ij} ($1 \leq i \leq r$, $1 \leq j \leq n_i$) be the polynomials giving the geometric resolution of V_a^{aff} . Then, the totally mixed Nash equilibria of the game are the points (ξ_1, \dots, ξ_r) with $\xi_i = (p'(t)/s_i(t), w_{i1}(t)/s_i(t), \dots, w_{ir}(t)/s_i(t))$, where $s_i = p' + \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} w_{ij}$ for $i = 1, \dots, r$, and t is a root of p , having all their coordinates real and positive.

Then, the number of totally mixed Nash equilibria of the game equals the cardinality of the union of the sets

$$\{t \in \mathbb{R} : p(t) = 0, p'(t) > 0, w_{ij}(t) > 0 \forall 1 \leq i \leq r, 1 \leq j \leq n_i\}$$

and

$$\{t \in \mathbb{R} : p(t) = 0, p'(t) < 0, w_{ij}(t) < 0 \forall 1 \leq i \leq r, 1 \leq j \leq n_i\}.$$

Once we have the polynomials p, p' and w_{ij} ($1 \leq i \leq r, 1 \leq j \leq n_i$) encoded in dense form, by using the algorithm in [6, Section 3.3], it is possible to compute this cardinality within complexity $O(n\delta^3)$.

Therefore we have:

Proposition 6 *Following the previous assumptions and notation, there is an algorithm which computes the number of totally mixed Nash equilibria of a game with r players having n_1+1, \dots, n_r+1 pure strategies respectively within complexity $O(\delta^8 D^2 (D+n_1 \dots n_r \delta \log(D) r^2 n^5 (n^3 + rN)))$ provided that the associated set of quasi-equilibria of the game is zero-dimensional.*

4.2 Computing the isolated affine quasi-equilibria of an arbitrary game

When we are dealing with an arbitrary game, it may happen that the set V_a of its quasi-equilibria has positive dimension and, therefore, the polynomial R_a introduced in the previous subsection is identically zero. In this case, we are going to use a procedure applied in [10] to obtain a non-zero multiple of the minimal polynomial of a generic linear form over the isolated points of the set V_a^{aff} of affine quasi-equilibria. For the sake of completeness, we are going to explain this procedure briefly.

We consider a *sufficiently generic* coefficient vector $b := (b^{(ik)})_{1 \leq i \leq r, 1 \leq k \leq n_i}$ such that $R_b \not\equiv 0$ (we remark that the vector b can be chosen at random or effectively constructed as the coefficient vector a system with δ many common roots). Then, if τ is a new variable, the polynomial $R_{a+\tau(b-a)}$ is non-zero. If $f_k^{(i)}$ denotes the polynomial obtained from $F_k^{(i)}$ by evaluating $x_{j0} = 1$ ($1 \leq j \leq r$), let $\tilde{f}_k^{(i)} := f_k^{(i)}(a^{(ik)} + \tau(b^{(ik)} - a^{(ik)}))$ ($1 \leq i \leq r, 1 \leq k \leq n_i$). Let $\tilde{P}_{a+\tau(b-a)}$ be the polynomial obtained from $R_{a+\tau(b-a)}$ by specializing it as in (15) and let $L := \sum_{i,j} A_{ij}^{(0)} x_{ij}$.

As $\tilde{P}_{a+\tau(b-a)}(\tau, A^{(0)})|_{\tau=0} \equiv 0$, there exists $\epsilon > 0$ such that $\tilde{P}_{a+\tau(b-a)} = \tau^\epsilon \tilde{P}$ for a polynomial $\tilde{P} \in \mathbb{Q}[\tau, A^{(0)}]$ with $\tilde{P}(\tau, A^{(0)})|_{\tau=0} \not\equiv 0$. Let $P := \tilde{P}|_{\tau=0, A_0^{(0)} = -T}$. We are going to show that this polynomial P is a multiple of the minimal polynomial of L over the set of isolated points of V_a^{aff} .

Since the polynomial R is a linear combination of $F_0, F_k^{(i)}$ ($1 \leq i \leq r, 1 \leq k \leq n_i$), we have that $\tilde{P}_{a+\tau(b-a)}|_{A_0^{(0)} = -L} = \tau^\epsilon \tilde{P}|_{A_0^{(0)} = -L} \in (\tilde{f}_k^{(i)} : 1 \leq i \leq r, 1 \leq k \leq n_i) \in \mathbb{Q}[\tau, x_{ij} : 1 \leq i \leq r, 1 \leq j \leq n_i]$.

Now, taking into account that the number of variables τ, x_{ij} ($1 \leq i \leq r, 1 \leq j \leq n_i$) is greater than the number of generators of the ideal $(\tilde{f}_k^{(i)} : 1 \leq i \leq r, 1 \leq k \leq n_i)$, we deduce that each irreducible component of the variety V_τ defined by this ideal in \mathbb{A}^{n+1} has dimension at least 1. Then, for each isolated point ξ of V_a^{aff} , the point $(0, \xi) \in \mathbb{A}^{n+1}$ lies in an irreducible component C of V_τ such that $\tau \notin I(C)$. Therefore $\tilde{P}|_{A_0^{(0)} = -L} \in I(C)$ and $P|_{T=L}$ vanishes at ξ .

Now, we are going to show how to compute the polynomial P .

Let $\tilde{P}_{a+\tau(b-a)} = \sum_{j=0}^{\delta} p_j(\tau)(A_0^{(0)})^j$, where $p_j(\tau)$ are polynomials in $\mathbb{Q}[A_{ij}^{(0)}][\tau]$ such that $p_j(\tau) \not\equiv 0$ for some $0 \leq j \leq D$. Then $\epsilon := \max\{k : \tau^k \text{ divides } p_j \forall 0 \leq j \leq D\}$.

The procedure for the computation of P from a straight-line program encoding R runs as follows:

- (1) Obtain an slp for $\tilde{P}_{a+\tau(b-a)}$.
- (2) Obtain an slp encoding the coefficients $p_j(\tau)$ ($0 \leq j \leq \delta$).
- (3) For $j = 0, \dots, \delta$:
 - (3.a) Obtain an slp for the coefficients of $p_j(\tau) = \sum_{k=0}^D p_{jk} \tau^k$.
 - (3.b) Compute $\epsilon_j := \min\{k : p_{jk} \neq 0\}$.

Compute $\epsilon := \min\{\epsilon_j : 0 \leq j \leq \delta\}$.
- (4) Obtain an slp for $P = \sum_{j=0}^{\delta} (-1)^j p_{j\epsilon} T^j$ from the slp's encoding $p_{j\epsilon}$ ($0 \leq j \leq \delta$).

Now, we are going to estimate the complexity of this procedure. Let \mathcal{L} be the length of a straight-line program encoding R .

In step (1), we compute first $a + \tau(b - a)$ with $3N$ operations and then, we specialize the slp for R according to (15). We obtain an slp of length $3N + \mathcal{L}$ for $\tilde{P}_{a+\tau(b-a)}$. The interpolation in step (2) takes $O(\delta^2(N + \mathcal{L}))$ operations. The complexity of step (3.a) is of order $O(D^2\delta^2(N + \mathcal{L}))$. In order to determine whether each of the multivariate polynomials $p_{jk} \in \mathbb{Q}[A_{ij}^{(0)}]$ encoded by an slp is zero or not, we apply the probabilistic Zippel-Schwartz zero test (see [34]). The overall complexity of step (3) is $O(D^2\delta^3(N + \mathcal{L}))$. Step (4) does not modify the order of the complexity.

From the polynomial P we have computed we can obtain a geometric resolution for a finite set of points including the isolated points of V_a^{aff} in the same way we showed in the proof of Theorem 1, obtaining a description for the isolated affine quasi-equilibria of the game. Therefore, we have:

Theorem 7 *Let notations be as in Theorem 1. There is a probabilistic algorithm which computes, given a game with r players having $n_1 + 1, \dots, n_r + 1$ pure strategies respectively, a geometric resolution of a finite set of points including the isolated affine quasi-equilibria of the game within complexity $O(D^4\delta^3(D + n_1 \dots n_r \delta \log(D)r^2n^4(n^3 + rN)))$.*

Proceeding as in the previous section, from the geometric resolution given by this theorem, we are able to obtain an upper bound on the number of isolated (in the complex space) totally mixed Nash equilibria of the game within the same order of complexity as in the previous theorem.

5 Resultants in the multihomogeneous setting

5.1 Computing resultants

In this subsection we are going to show how the algorithm in [13] can be adapted in order to compute the multihomogeneous resultants we use. That procedure computes multihomogeneous resultants under the assumption that the coordinates of each multidegree are all positive and this is not the case in our situation.

First, we will prove that the multihomogeneous resultant we want to compute is a non-constant polynomial and then, we will show how to modify the Poisson formula on which the algorithm in [13] relies. All the computations required once the Poisson formula is recursively applied run in the same way as in [13].

In order to do this, we are going to use the theory in [30] and [20]. We can apply these results to our situation because the multihomogeneous resultant of a family of multihomogeneous polynomials G_0, \dots, G_n in r groups of variables $X_j = (x_{j0}, \dots, x_{jn_j})$, with $\sum_{j=1}^r n_j = n$, coincides with the sparse resultant of the dehomogenized polynomials g_0, \dots, g_n obtained by setting $x_{j0} = 1$ for every $1 \leq j \leq r$.

Let $\mathcal{A}_0, \dots, \mathcal{A}_n \subset \mathbb{Z}^n$ be finite sets and let g_0, \dots, g_n be polynomials with supports $\mathcal{A}_0, \dots, \mathcal{A}_n$ respectively.

For any subset $J \subseteq \{0, \dots, n\}$, let \mathcal{L}_J be the lattice generated by $\sum_{j \in J} \mathcal{A}_j$. Following [30], if $I \subset \{0, \dots, n\}$, the collection of supports $\{\mathcal{A}_i\}_{i \in I}$ is said to be *essential* if $\text{rank}(\mathcal{L}_I) = \#I - 1$ and $\text{rank}(\mathcal{L}_J) \geq \#J$ for each proper subset J of I .

If there is a unique subcollection $\{\mathcal{A}_i\}_{i \in I}$ which is essential, the resultant $\text{Res}(g_0, \dots, g_n)$ coincides with the resultant $\text{Res}(g_i; i \in I)$.

Note that if G is a multihomogeneous polynomial in r groups of $n_1 + 1, \dots, n_r + 1$ variables each with multidegree (ν_1, \dots, ν_r) , the set of exponent vectors of the dehomogenized polynomial g is $\Delta_{n_1, \nu_1} \times \dots \times \Delta_{n_r, \nu_r} \subset \mathbb{Z}^{n_1} \times \dots \times \mathbb{Z}^{n_r}$, where Δ_{n_i, ν_i} is ν_i times the unitary simplex in \mathbb{Z}^{n_i} for $i = 1, \dots, r$.

In our particular case, we will deal with families of multihomogeneous polynomials in r groups of $m_1 + 1, \dots, m_r + 1$ variables respectively and multidegrees $(1, \dots, 1)$ or $d_i = (1, \dots, 0, \dots, 1)$ (with 0 in the i th coordinate) for $i = 1, \dots, r$. If one of the polynomials in the family indexed by I has multidegree $(1, \dots, 1)$, then $\text{rank}(\mathcal{L}_I) = \sum_{i=1}^r m_i$, and the same holds if the family contains polynomials with multidegrees d_i and d_j with $i \neq j$. If all the polynomials in the family have multidegree d_i , then $\text{rank}(\mathcal{L}_I) = \sum_{j \neq i} m_j$.

The resultant will be computed recursively by applying Poisson's formula ([20, Lemma 13]). At each step, we will have to compute a multihomogeneous resultant in one of the following settings, where $m_1, \dots, m_r \in \mathbb{N}$ and $m := m_1 + \dots + m_r$:

- (I) $m + 1$ multihomogeneous polynomials in r groups of $m_1 + 1, \dots, m_r + 1$ variables: one polynomial with multidegree $(1, \dots, 1)$ and, for every $1 \leq i \leq r$, m_i polynomials with multidegrees $d_i := (1, \dots, 0, \dots, 1)$ with 0 in the coordinate i , under the assumption that $m_i \leq \sum_{j \neq i} m_j$ for every $1 \leq i \leq r$,
- (II) $m + 1$ multihomogeneous polynomials with multidegrees $(1, \dots, 1)$ in r groups of $m_1 + 1, \dots, m_r + 1$ variables each,
- (III) m multihomogeneous polynomials in r groups of variables with $m_1, m_2 + 1, \dots, m_r + 1$ variables each, with m_i polynomials of multidegree d_i for every $1 \leq i \leq r$, under the assumption that $m_i \leq \sum_{j \neq i} m_j$ for every $1 \leq i \leq r$.

Now we are going to start with the recursion.

The resultant $\mathcal{R} = \text{Res}(F_0, F_1^{(1)}, \dots, F_{n_1}^{(1)}, \dots, F_1^{(r)}, \dots, F_{n_r}^{(r)})$ we want to compute in the proof of Theorem 1 involves a family of multihomogeneous polynomials satisfying the conditions in (I) with $m_i := n_i$ and $m := n$. Note that, for a generic game to have a non-empty set of quasi-equilibria, the inequalities $m_i \leq \sum_{j \neq i} m_j$ for every $1 \leq i \leq r$ hold.

Let $G_0^{(0)}$ and $G_k^{(i)}$ ($1 \leq i \leq r$, $1 \leq k \leq m_i$) be a family of polynomials satisfying the conditions in (I) and let $\mathcal{I} := \{(0, 0)\} \cup \{(i, k) : 1 \leq i \leq r, 1 \leq k \leq m_i\}$.

First, note that $\text{rank}(\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{I}}) = m = \#\mathcal{I} - 1$. Let J be a proper subset of \mathcal{I} . If there exist $(i, k), (i', k')$ in J with $i \neq i'$, then $\text{rank}(\mathcal{L}_J) = m \geq \#J$ and the same holds if $(0, 0) \in J$. On the other hand, if $J \subset \{(i, k) : 1 \leq k \leq m_i\}$ for a fixed $i \neq 0$, then $\text{rank}(\mathcal{L}_J) = \sum_{j \neq i} m_j \geq m_i \geq \#J$. Therefore, the set of all supports is the unique essential subset. So, the resultant is not constant and the following identity holds:

$$\text{Res}(G_0^{(0)}, (G_k^{(i)})_{1 \leq i \leq r; 1 \leq k \leq m_i}) = \prod_{\xi \in V} g_0^{(0)}(\xi) \prod_{1 \leq j \leq r} \text{Res}(G_{kj}^{(i)})_{1 \leq i \leq r, 1 \leq k \leq m_i},$$

where $g_0^{(0)}$ is the dehomogenized polynomial obtained from $G_0^{(0)}$ by evaluating $x_{\ell m_\ell} = 1$ ($1 \leq \ell \leq r$), V is the set of common zeros in \mathbb{A}^m of the polynomials $g_k^{(i)}$ obtained in the same way from the $G_k^{(i)}$ ($1 \leq i \leq r, 1 \leq k \leq m_i$), and, for each $1 \leq j \leq r$, $G_{kj}^{(i)}$ is the polynomial obtained from $G_k^{(i)}$ by setting $x_{jm_j} = 0$.

(I.a) Note that if $m_i \geq 2$ for every $1 \leq i \leq r$, (up to renaming variables and polynomials) each of the resultants $\text{Res}(G_{kj}^{(i)})$ involves a family of polynomials satisfying the conditions in (III).

(I.b) Without loss of generality, assume now that $m_1 = 1$. Here, we can discard the first group of variables. Then, we have to compute the resultant of m polynomials in $r - 1$ groups of $m_2 + 1, \dots, m_r + 1$ variables each with m_i polynomials with multidegree $(1, \dots, 0, \dots, 1)$ where the zero is in the $(i - 1)$ th coordinate for $2 \leq i \leq r$ and one with multidegree $(1, \dots, 1)$.

If, for every $2 \leq i \leq r$, $m_i < \sum_{1 \leq j \leq r, j \neq i} m_j$, since $m_1 = 1$ we deduce that $m_i \leq \sum_{2 \leq j \leq r, j \neq i} m_j$ and so, the polynomial system obtained is of the form (I) but with one group of variables less than the original one.

On the other hand, if $m_i = 1 + \sum_{2 \leq j \leq r, j \neq i} m_j$ for some $2 \leq i \leq r$, we have that $m_j < m_i$ for every $j \neq i$. Therefore, the unique essential subset is $\{(i, k) : 1 \leq k \leq m_i\}$ and the resultant to be computed is the resultant of the corresponding family of m_i polynomials of multidegree $(1, \dots, 1)$ in $r - 2$ groups of $m_2 + 1, \dots, m_{i-1} + 1, m_{i+1} + 1, \dots, m_r + 1$ variables each, which is the situation in (II).

If the polynomials involved satisfy the conditions in (II), all the coordinates of their multidegrees are not zero and so, we can apply the algorithm in [13] for the computation of their resultant.

To analyze (III), let us consider first the case when $r = 2$. Here, the assumption on the numbers m_i implies that $m_1 = m_2 := M$.

(III.a) We consider the resultant of M polynomials with multidegrees $(0, 1)$ and M polynomials with multidegrees $(1, 0)$ in two groups of M and $M + 1$ variables respectively. Now the unique essential set is the corresponding to the first M polynomials and, therefore their resultant equals the determinant of the matrix of their coefficients.

Assume now that $r > 2$. Note that the equality $m_i = \sum_{j \neq i} m_j$ may be valid for at most one value i . If, on the contrary, $m_{i_1} = \sum_{j \neq i_1} m_j$ and $m_{i_2} = \sum_{j \neq i_2} m_j$ hold for $i_1 \neq i_2$, it follows that $\sum_{j \neq i_1, i_2} m_j = 0$, which implies $r = 2$. Let $G_k^{(i)}$ ($1 \leq i \leq r, 1 \leq k \leq m_i$) be a family of polynomials satisfying the conditions in (III).

(III.b) If $m_1 = 1$, we are under the same assumptions as in (I.b).

(III.c) If $m_1 \geq 2$ and $m_i = \sum_{j \neq i} m_j$ for some $2 \leq i \leq r$, the set $\{(i, k) : 1 \leq k \leq m_i\}$ is essential. The assumption $r > 2$ implies that it is the unique essential subset. Then, the resultant we compute is that of m_i multilinear polynomials of multidegrees $(1, \dots, 1)$ in $r - 1$ groups of $m_1, m_2 + 1, \dots, m_{i-1} + 1, m_{i+1} + 1, \dots, m_r + 1$ variables respectively. Thus, we are in situation (II).

(III.d) If $m_1 \geq 2$ and $m_i < \sum_{j \neq i} m_j$ for every $2 \leq i \leq r$, we deduce that $m_i \leq m_1 - 1 + \sum_{j \neq 1, i} m_j$ for every $2 \leq i \leq r$. Therefore, the unique essential subset is the whole family of polynomials and applying Poisson's formula we obtain:

$$\text{Res}((G_k^{(i)})_{1 \leq i \leq r; 1 \leq k \leq m_i}) = \prod_{\xi \in V} g_1^{(1)}(\xi) \prod_{2 \leq l \leq r} \text{Res}((G_{kl}^{(1)})_{2 \leq k \leq m_1}; (G_{kl}^{(i)})_{2 \leq i \leq r, 1 \leq k \leq m_i}),$$

where $g_1^{(1)}$ is the dehomogenized of $G_1^{(1)}$ by setting $x_{jm_j} = 1$ for every $1 \leq j \leq r$, V is the set of common zeros in \mathbb{A}^{m-1} of the polynomials $g_k^{(1)}$ ($2 \leq k \leq m_1$), $g_k^{(i)}$ ($2 \leq i \leq r, 1 \leq k \leq m_i$) obtained in the same way from the homogeneous polynomials $G_k^{(i)}$, and $G_{kl}^{(i)}$ is the polynomial obtained from $G_k^{(i)}$ by setting $x_{lm_l} = 0$.

According to the previous formula, we will have to compute $r - 1$ multihomogeneous resultants of $m' = m - 1$ polynomials each:

For $l = 2, \dots, r$, setting $m' := m - 1$, $m'_1 := m_1 - 1$ and $m'_i := m_i$ for $i \neq 1$, the resultant to be computed involves m' polynomials in r groups of $m'_1 + 1, \dots, m'_{l-1} + 1, m'_l, m'_{l+1} + 1, \dots, m'_r + 1$ variables each with m'_i polynomials of multidegree d_i for every $1 \leq i \leq r$. We have $m'_1 \leq \sum_{j \neq 1} m'_j$ and, for $i \neq 1$, the condition $m_i < \sum_{j \neq i} m_j$ implies that $m'_i \leq \sum_{j \neq i} m'_j$; therefore, renaming variables and polynomials, we are again under the assumptions of (III).

5.2 A bound for the degree of the resultant

This section is devoted to proving an upper bound for the degree D of the resultant of multi-linear polynomials appearing in our previous computations in terms of the total number n of strategies available to the players and the number δ of totally mixed Nash equilibria of a generic game with the given structure.

As before, we assume $n = n_1 + \dots + n_r$ with $n_i \in \mathbb{N}$ for every $1 \leq i \leq r$. We consider the resultant \mathcal{R} of a family of $n + 1$ multi-linear polynomials in r groups of $n_1 + 1, \dots, n_r + 1$ variables each, consisting of a polynomial F_0 of multi-degree $d_0 := (1, \dots, 1)$ and, for every $1 \leq i \leq r$, a set of n_i polynomials $F_k^{(i)}$ ($1 \leq k \leq n_i$) of multi-degree $d_i := (1, \dots, 1, 0, 1, \dots, 1)$, where the 0 lies in the i th coordinate.

Throughout this section, we will denote

$$\delta_i := \text{Bez}_{n_1, \dots, n_r}(d_0, 1; d_1, n_1; \dots; d_i, n_i - 1; \dots; d_r, n_r), \quad i = 1, \dots, r,$$

the number of solutions to a generic polynomial system of the indicated multi-degrees. Recall that $\delta = \text{Bez}_{n_1, \dots, n_r}(d_1, n_1; \dots; d_r, n_r)$.

The resultant \mathcal{R} is a multihomogeneous polynomial in the coefficients of $F_0, F_k^{(i)}$ of degree δ in the coefficients of F_0 and δ_i in the coefficients of $F_k^{(i)}$ for every $1 \leq i \leq r, 1 \leq k \leq n_i$ (see, for instance, [25]). Therefore, the total degree of \mathcal{R} equals

$$D = \delta + \sum_{1 \leq i \leq r} n_i \delta_i. \quad (16)$$

The following result provides an upper bound for δ_i which will allow us to deduce an upper bound for D .

Proposition 8 *For every $1 \leq i \leq r$, we have $\delta_i \leq (n_i + 1)\delta$.*

Proof. Without loss of generality, we will prove the stated upper bound for $i = 1$.

First, note that the formula in the right hand side of identity (2) for the computation of the Bézout number of a multihomogeneous system of polynomial equations shows that this number is additive in each of the multi-degrees involved. Hence, as $\delta_1 = \text{Bez}_{n_1, \dots, n_r}(d_0, 1; d_1, n_1 - 1; d_2, n_2; \dots; d_r, n_r)$ with $d_0 = d_1 + e_1$, where $e_1 = (1, 0, \dots, 0)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_1 &= \text{Bez}_{n_1, \dots, n_r}(d_1, n_1; d_2, n_2; \dots; d_r, n_r) + \text{Bez}_{n_1, \dots, n_r}(e_1, 1; d_1, n_1 - 1; d_2, n_2; \dots; d_r, n_r) \\ &= \delta + \text{Bez}_{n_1, \dots, n_r}(e_1, 1; d_1, n_1 - 1; d_2, n_2; \dots; d_r, n_r). \end{aligned}$$

Now, identity (2) implies that $\text{Bez}_{n_1, \dots, n_r}(e_1, 1; d_1, n_1 - 1; d_2, n_2; \dots; d_r, n_r) = \#\mathfrak{J}_1$, where

$$\mathfrak{J}_1 = \{(j_{11}, \dots, j_{rn_r}) / j_{11} = 1, j_{ik} \neq i \forall (i, k) \neq (1, 1) \text{ and } \#\{j_{hk} / j_{hk} = i\} = n_i \forall 1 \leq i \leq r\}.$$

In order to finish the proof, we will show that $\#\mathfrak{J}_1 \leq n_1\delta$. Since δ equals the cardinality of the set \mathfrak{J}_0 introduced in (4), we will compare the cardinalities of both sets \mathfrak{J}_1 and \mathfrak{J}_0 . To this end, we define the following map from \mathfrak{J}_1 to \mathfrak{J}_0 : with a given n -tuple $j := (1, j_{12}, \dots, j_{1n_1}, \dots, j_{r1}, \dots, j_{rn_r}) \in \mathfrak{J}_1$ we associate the n -tuple $j' \in \mathfrak{J}_0$ which is obtained by exchanging the first coordinate of j (which equals 1) with the first one which is different from 1 and is located beyond the n_1 th coordinate. Note that a necessary condition for two distinct n -tuples in \mathfrak{J}_1 to lead to the same n -tuple in \mathfrak{J}_0 by means of this assignment is that they coincide in all of their coordinates except for two of them located among the n_1 coordinates $n_1 + 1, \dots, 2n_1$. Moreover, the vector consisting of these n_1 coordinates must be of the form $(1, \dots, 1, j_{hk}, \dots)$ for both of them (possibly with no 1 at the beginning) and so, they can only differ in the length of the string of 1's in this vector, which ranges between 0 and $n_1 - 1$. We conclude that each element of \mathfrak{J}_0 is the image of at most n_1 elements of \mathfrak{J}_1 . It follows that $\#\mathfrak{J}_1 \leq n_1\#\mathfrak{J}_0$.

Therefore, we have that $\delta_1 \leq \delta + n_1\delta = (n_1 + 1)\delta$. \square

Using the previous result along with identity (16) for the degree D of the resultant, we conclude:

Corollary 9 *With the previous assumptions and notations,*

$$D \leq \left(1 + \sum_{1 \leq i \leq r} n_i(n_i + 1)\right) \delta \leq n^2 \delta.$$

Remark 10 *The bound stated in Corollary 9 shows that all the algorithms presented in this paper are polynomial in the number of strategies n_1, \dots, n_r of the r players, and the generic number δ of totally mixed Nash equilibria of a game with the considered structure.*

References

- [1] S. Basu, R. Pollack, M.-F. Roy, Algorithms in real algebraic geometry, Springer Verlag, Berlin, 2003.
- [2] S. J. Berkowitz, On computing the determinant in small parallel time using a small number of processors, Inform. Process. Lett. 18 (1984) No. 3, 147–150.
- [3] D. N. Bernstein, The number of roots of a system of equations, Functional Anal. Appl. 9 (1975) No. 3, 183–185.
- [4] W. Brown, J. Traub, On Euclid’s algorithm and the theory of subresultants, J. Assoc. Comput. Mach. 18 (1971) 505–514.
- [5] P. Bürgisser, M. Clausen, M.A. Shokrollahi, Algebraic complexity theory. With the collaboration of Thomas Lickteig, Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften, 315, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1997.
- [6] J. Canny, Improved Algorithms for Sign Determination and Existential Quantifier Elimination, Comput. J. 36 (1993) No. 5, 409–418.
- [7] R. Datta, Algebraic methods in game theory, Ph.D. Thesis, University of California at Berkeley, 2003.
- [8] I.M. Gelfand, M.M. Kapranov, A.V. Zelevinsky, Discriminants, resultants, and multidimensional determinants, Birkhäuser, Boston, 1994.
- [9] J. Heintz, Definability and fast quantifier elimination in algebraically closed fields, Theoret. Comput. Sci. 24 (1983) 239–277.
- [10] J. Heintz, G. Jeronimo, J. Sabia, P. Solernó, Intersection theory and deformation algorithms: the multi-homogeneous case, manuscript, 2005.
- [11] J. Heintz, C.-P. Schnorr, Testing polynomials which are easy to compute, Monographie 30 de l’Enseignement Mathématique (1982) 237–254.
- [12] P. Herings, R. Peeters, A globally convergent algorithm to compute all Nash equilibria for n person games, Ann. Oper. Res. 137 (2005) 349–368.

- [13] G. Jeronimo, J. Sabia, Computing multihomogeneous resultants using straight-line programs, to appear in *J. Symbolic Comput.* (2006).
- [14] L. Kronecker, Grundzüge einer arithmetischen Theorie der algebraischen Größen, *J. Reine Angew. Math.* 92 (1882) 1–122.
- [15] C.E. Lemke, J.T. Howson, Jr., Equilibrium points of bimatrix games, *J. Soc. Indust. Appl. Math.* 12 (1964) 413–423.
- [16] R. Lipton, E. Markakis, Nash equilibria via polynomial equations, in: *Proc. of the 6th Latin American Symposium on Theoretical Informatics, Lecture Notes in Comput. Sci.* 2976, 2004, 413–422.
- [17] R.D. McKelvey, A. McLennan, Computation of equilibria in finite games, *Handbook of Computational Economics*, Vol. 1 (1996) 87–142.
- [18] R. McKelvey, A. McLennan, The maximal number of regular totally mixed Nash equilibria, *J. Econom. Theory* 72 (1997) No. 2, 411–425.
- [19] A. McLennan, The maximum number of real roots of a multihomogeneous system of polynomial equations, *Beiträge Algebra Geom.* 40 (1999) No. 2, 343–350.
- [20] M. Minimair, Sparse resultant under vanishing coefficients, *J. Algebraic Combin.* 18 (2003) No. 1, 53–73.
- [21] A. Morgan, A. Sommese, C. Wampler, A product-decomposition bound for Bézout numbers. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.* 32 (1995), No. 4, 1308–1325.
- [22] J.F. Nash, Non-cooperative games, *Ann. of Math. (2)* 54 (1951) 286–295.
- [23] M. Oka, Non-degenerate complete intersection singularity, *Actualités Mathématiques*, Hermann, Paris, 1997.
- [24] M.J. Osborne, A. Rubinstein, *A Course In Game Theory*, MIT Press, Cambridge MA, 1994.
- [25] P. Pedersen, B. Sturmfels, Product formulas for resultants and Chow forms, *Math. Z.* 214 (1993) 377–396.
- [26] H. Scarf, The approximation of fixed points of a continuous mapping, *SIAM J. Appl. Math.* 15 (1967) 1328–1343.
- [27] I. Shafarevich, *Basic algebraic geometry*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1974.
- [28] V. Strassen, Vermeidung von Divisionen, *J. Reine Angew. Math.* 264 (1973) 184–202.
- [29] B. Sturmfels, Solving systems of polynomial equations, *CBMS Regional Conference Series in Mathematics*, 97. Published for the Conference Board of the Mathematical Sciences, Washington, DC, by the American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2002.

- [30] B. Sturmfels, On the Newton polytope of the resultant, *J. Algebraic Combin.* 3 (1994) No. 2, 207–236.
- [31] J. von Neumann, O. Morgenstern, *Theory of Games and Economic Behaviour*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 1944.
- [32] B. von Stengel, Computing equilibria for two person games, Aumann, R.J., Hart, S., eds., *Handbook of Game Theory with Economic Applications* 3 (2002) 1723–1759.
- [33] J. von zur Gathen, Parallel arithmetic computations: a survey, in: *Proc. 12th FOCS*, Bratislava, *Lecture Notes in Comput. Sci.* 33, 1986, 93–112.
- [34] R. Zippel, Probabilistic algorithms for sparse polynomials, in: *Symbolic and algebraic computation (EUROSAM '79, Internat. Sympos., Marseille, 1979)*, *Lecture Notes in Comput. Sci.* 72, 1979, 216-226.