

**Algorithmic Game Theory**  
Autumn 2021  
Exercise Set 2

These exercises are **non-graded**. Please submit your solutions via [moodle](#), in order to get **feedbacks**, before the beginning of next lecture (**October 5, 10:00 am**). If you cannot use moodle, please send solutions by **email** to [agt-course@lists.inf.ethz.ch](mailto:agt-course@lists.inf.ethz.ch).

**Exercise 1:** (3 Points)

Fair cost sharing games are congestion games with delay functions of the form

$$d_r(x) = c_r/x$$

where  $c_r$  is a positive constant. (In these games,  $c_r$  represents the cost for building resource  $r$ , and this cost is shared equally among the players using this resource.)

- (a) Show that fair cost sharing games with  $n$  players are  $(n, 0)$ -smooth.
- (b) For every  $n$ , give an example of a fair cost sharing game with  $n$  players whose price of anarchy for pure Nash equilibria (*POA*) is at least  $n$ .

**Exercise 2:** (3 Points)

An  $\epsilon$ -Nash equilibrium is a state  $s \in S$  such that

$$c_i(s)(1 - \epsilon) \leq c_i(s'_i, s_{-i})$$

for all players  $i$  and for all  $s'_i \in S_i$ . Prove that in congestion games with affine delay functions the cost of any  $\epsilon$ -Nash equilibrium is at most  $\frac{5}{2-3\epsilon}$  times the optimal social cost. (The social cost is the sum of all players' costs.)

**Exercise 3:** (3 Points)

In this exercise we consider *load balancing games*: There are  $m$  machines of identical speeds. Player  $i$  is in charge of one job of weight  $w_i > 0$ . Every player may choose a machine to process this job; his strategy set is therefore  $\{1, \dots, m\}$ . Player  $i$ 's cost in state  $s$  is given as

$$c_i(s) = \text{load}_{s_i}(s) := \sum_{i': s_{i'} = s_i} w_{i'} .$$

(Note that this is the load of the machine chosen by  $i$ , including  $w_i$ .)

Prove that every pure Nash equilibrium is a local minimum for the function  $f$  given by the sum of the *squares of the machine loads*:

$$f(s) = \sum_{\ell=1}^m (\text{load}_{\ell}(s))^2 .$$

Explain how this implies that a pure Nash equilibrium exists. Does  $f$  satisfy the definition of potential game given in the lecture (Lecture 1)?