

The Theory of Intervention Games for Resource Sharing in Wireless Communications

BY JAEOK PARK AND MIHAELA VAN DER SCHAAR

The authors are with Electrical Engineering Department, University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA), 420 Westwood Plaza, Los Angeles, CA 90095-1594, USA. e-mail: {jaeok, mihaela}@ee.ucla.edu.

Abstract

This paper develops a game-theoretic framework for the design and analysis of a new class of incentive schemes called intervention schemes. We formulate intervention games, propose a solution concept of intervention equilibrium, and prove its existence in a finite intervention game. We apply our framework to resource sharing scenarios in wireless communications, whose non-cooperative outcomes without intervention yield suboptimal performance. We derive analytical results and analyze illustrative examples in the cases of imperfect and perfect monitoring. In the case of imperfect monitoring, intervention schemes can improve the suboptimal performance of non-cooperative equilibrium when the intervention device has a sufficiently accurate monitoring technology, although it is impossible to achieve the best feasible performance. In the case of perfect monitoring, the best feasible performance can be obtained with an intervention scheme when the intervention device has a sufficiently strong intervention capability.

Keywords: Game theory, incentives, intervention, network policing, resource sharing, wireless communications.

1 Introduction

When self-interested users share resources non-cooperatively, it is common that the resources are utilized suboptimally from a global point of view [Hardin], [Dubey]. Hence, overcoming the suboptimal performance of non-cooperative outcomes poses an important challenge for resource management. The aforementioned phenomenon is widely observed in wireless communications, where users compete for radio resources interfering with each other. For the sake of discussion, consider the following abstract scenario of resource sharing in wireless communications. First, users determine their resource usage levels, which in turn determine the service quality they receive. In general, as the overall usage level increases, the service quality is reduced due to interference or congestion. The payoff of a user is determined by its own usage level as well as the service quality. In such a scenario, users tend to

choose a higher usage level than socially optimal one. That is, it is in the self-interest of users to choose a high usage level, although reducing their usage levels simultaneously would benefit all of them. In game theory, such a conflict between private and social interests is modeled as the prisoner's dilemma game. In the literature, it has been shown that various wireless communication scenarios exhibit a prisoner's dilemma phenomenon, including packet forwarding [hubaux], distributed spectrum allocation [laufer], and medium access control (CSMA/CA [Cagalj] and slotted Aloha [ma]).

Incentive schemes are needed to improve upon the suboptimal performance of non-cooperative equilibrium and achieve a better performance. In this paper, we propose a class of incentive schemes based on the idea of intervention [jpark]. Implementing an intervention scheme requires an intervention device that is able to monitor the actions of users and to affect their resource usage. A resource manager first chooses an intervention rule used by the intervention device, and then users choose their actions knowing the intervention rule chosen by the manager. After observing a signal about the actions of users, the intervention device chooses its action according to the intervention rule. The manager chooses an intervention rule to maximize his payoff, anticipating the rational behavior of users given the intervention rule. The payoff of the manager can be considered as a measure of the system performance, which can incorporate various efficiency and fairness criteria. We formulate the interaction between users and a manager as an intervention game and propose a solution concept called intervention equilibrium. Intervention equilibrium predicts the outcome of an intervention game in terms of an intervention rule chosen by the manager and an operating point chosen by users.

Intervention can be classified into two types, called type 1 and type 2, depending on how the intervention device acts in the system relative to users. In type-1 intervention, the intervention device acts in a symmetric way as users do while having with an ability to monitor the actions of other users. An example of type-1 intervention can be found in [jpark], which considers a random access network where an intervention device interferes with other users by transmitting its packets after observing the transmission probabilities of users. In type-2 intervention, the intervention device acts as a gatekeeper that can control resource usage by users. An example of type-2 intervention can be found in [garg], which analyzes scheduling mechanisms where a scheduler (intervention device) assigns different priorities to traffic flows depending on their input rates. The two types of intervention can be applied to the aforementioned resource sharing scenario, as schematically shown in Fig. 1. In the course of discussion in this paper, we use two examples of intervention schemes in resource sharing. In Section 3.2, we analyze an example of type-2 intervention, where the service quality is determined randomly given the usage levels of users. The intervention device observes the service quality and then determines the probability of intervention, which degrades the quality provided to the users. In Section 4.2, we discuss an example of type-1 intervention, where the service quality is

determined deterministically as a function of the total usage level. The intervention device observes the usage levels of users and then chooses its own usage level, thereby affecting the quality received by users.

The goal of intervention schemes to improve the suboptimal performance of non-cooperative equilibrium and to achieve a better performance is illustrated in Fig. 2 with two users and system performance defined by the average payoff of the two users. Our analysis is aimed at answering the following two questions.

1. When can we construct an intervention scheme that improves the suboptimal performance of non-cooperative equilibrium?
2. When can we construct an intervention scheme that achieves the best feasible performance?

Our analysis suggests that the answers to these questions depend on the ability of the intervention device:

- Ability to monitor the actions of users (i.e., monitoring technology),
- Ability to affect the payoffs of users through its actions (i.e., intervention capability).

The discussion on the example in Section 3.2 shows that an intervention scheme can improve the performance of non-cooperative equilibrium when the monitoring technology is sufficiently accurate. This result is reinforced by the analytical results and the example in Section 4, which considers the case of perfect monitoring. The analytical result in Section 3.1 shows that intervention schemes cannot achieve the best feasible performance when the monitoring technology is noisy. On the other hand, the analytical results and the example in Section 4 show that intervention schemes can achieve the best feasible performance when monitoring is perfect and the intervention device has a sufficiently strong intervention capability. When signals are noisy, the manager can provide incentives by triggering a punishment following signals that are more likely to occur when users deviate. When these signals occur with positive probability even when users do not deviate, punishment happens from time to time on the equilibrium path, which results in a performance loss. On the contrary, when signals are perfectly accurate, punishment through intervention can be used only as a threat, which is never used on the equilibrium path. Thus, in the case of perfect monitoring, the manager can achieve a desired operating point without incurring a performance loss.

We briefly discuss the advantages of using intervention schemes over other forms of incentive schemes, pricing schemes [basar] and incentive schemes based on repeated game strategies [La]. Intervention affects the payoffs of users by directly influencing their resource usage, whereas pricing does so by using an outside instrument, money. Thus, intervention schemes can be implemented more robustly in that users cannot avoid intervention as long as they use resources. In order to achieve a desired outcome through an incentive scheme, the manager needs to know the impact of the incentive

device on the payoffs of users. Since intervention affects the payoffs of users through physical quantities associated with resource usage (e.g., throughput, delay), which are easily measurable, this information is easier to obtain when the manager uses an intervention scheme than a pricing scheme. Implementing an incentive scheme based on a repeated game strategy requires long-term relationship among interacting users, which may not exist especially in mobile wireless networks. Intervention schemes do not require long-term relationship among users, which makes them applicable to systems with a dynamically changing user population.

The hierarchical structure in the interaction between the manager and users has been modeled as a Stackelberg game in [ma], [korilis], and [yisu2]. In these works, the manager takes an action before users do, whereas in intervention schemes, the manager specifies a complete contingent plan for actions to be taken given the observed actions of users. This adaptivity of intervention schemes is especially helpful when the manager does not have a selfish motive. By creating interference with users only when a deviation is observed or when a signal that is suggestive of a deviation is realized, the manager can achieve a desired operating point while incurring no or little performance loss.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we formulate intervention games, develop a solution concept of intervention equilibrium, and show its existence in a finite intervention game. In Sections 3 and 4, we derive analytical results and discuss illustrative examples in the cases of imperfect and perfect monitoring, respectively. In Section 5, we conclude.

2 Intervention Games and Intervention Equilibrium

We consider a system (e.g., wireless network) where N users and an intervention device interact. The set of the users is denoted by $\mathcal{N} = \{1, \dots, N\}$. The action space of user i is denoted by A_i , and a pure action for user i is denoted by $a_i \in A_i$, for all $i \in \mathcal{N}$. A pure action profile is represented by a vector $a = (a_1, \dots, a_N) \in A \triangleq \prod_{i \in \mathcal{N}} A_i$. A mixed action for user i is a probability distribution over A_i and is denoted by $\alpha_i \in \Delta(A_i)$, where $\Delta(A_i)$ is the set of all probability distributions over A_i . A mixed action profile is represented by a vector $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_N) \in \prod_{i \in \mathcal{N}} \Delta(A_i)$. A mixed action profile of the users other than user i is written as $\alpha_{-i} = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{i-1}, \alpha_{i+1}, \dots, \alpha_N)$ so that α can be expressed as $\alpha = (\alpha_i, \alpha_{-i})$. Once a pure action profile of the users is determined, a signal is realized from the set of all possible signals, denoted Y , and is observed by the intervention device. The probability distribution of signals for a given pure action profile is denoted by $\rho: A \rightarrow \Delta(Y)$. If Y is finite, the probability that a signal $y \in Y$ is realized given a pure action profile $a \in A$ is denoted by $\rho(y|a)$. After observing the realized signal, the intervention device takes its action. We use a_0 , α_0 , and A_0 to denote a pure action, a mixed action, and the set of pure actions for the intervention device, respectively.

Since the intervention device chooses its action after observing the signal, a strategy for it can be represented by a mapping $f: Y \rightarrow \Delta(A_0)$, which is called an *intervention rule*. The set of all possible intervention rules is denoted by \mathcal{F} . If A_0 is finite, the probability that the intervention device takes an action a_0 when a signal y is realized is denoted by $f(a_0|y)$. There is a system manager who determines the intervention rule used by the intervention device. We assume that the manager can commit to an intervention rule, for example, by using a protocol embedded in the intervention device. The payoff of user $i \in \mathcal{N}$ is determined by its own action, the realized signal, and the action of the intervention device. Thus, we denote the payoff function of user i by $u_i: A_0 \times A_i \times Y \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. The payoff of the manager depends on the actions of the intervention device and the users and the realized signal, and the payoff function of the manager is denoted by $u_0: A_0 \times A \times Y \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$.¹ We call the pair (Y, ρ) the *monitoring technology* of the intervention device, and A_0 its *intervention capability*. The ability of the intervention device to influence the system outcome is represented by these two elements.

The game played by the manager and the users is formulated as an *intervention game*, which is summarized by the data

$$\Gamma = \langle \mathcal{N}_0, (A_i)_{i \in \mathcal{N}_0}, (u_i)_{i \in \mathcal{N}_0}, (Y, \rho) \rangle,$$

where $\mathcal{N}_0 \triangleq \mathcal{N} \cup \{0\}$. The sequence of events in an intervention game can be listed as follows.

1. The manager chooses an intervention rule $f \in \mathcal{F}$.
2. The users choose their actions $\alpha \in \prod_{i \in \mathcal{N}} \Delta(A_i)$ simultaneously, knowing the intervention rule f chosen by the manager.
3. A pure action profile a is realized following the probability distribution α , and a signal $y \in Y$ is realized following the probability distribution $\rho(a)$.
4. The intervention device chooses its action $a_0 \in A_0$ following the probability distribution $f(y)$.

Ex ante payoffs can be computed by taking expectations over signals and pure actions. The ex ante payoff function of user i is denoted by a function $v_i: \mathcal{F} \times \prod_{i \in \mathcal{N}} \Delta(A_i) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, while that of the manager is denoted by $v_0: \mathcal{F} \times \prod_{i \in \mathcal{N}} \Delta(A_i) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. We say that an intervention game is *finite* if \mathcal{N}_0 , A_i , for $i \in \mathcal{N}_0$, and Y are all finite. In a finite intervention game, ex ante payoffs can be computed as

$$v_i(f, \alpha) = \sum_{a \in A} \sum_{y \in Y} \sum_{a_0 \in A_0} u_i(a_0, a_i, y) f(a_0|y) \rho(y|a) \alpha(a),$$

1. Alternatively, we can have u_i and u_0 as functions of (a_0, a) and have y as an exogenous signal on a that the intervention device obtains. Our analysis applies to this alternative formulation as well.

for $i \in \mathcal{N}$, where $\alpha(a)$ is the probability that a is played under α , and

$$v_0(f, \alpha) = \sum_{a \in A} \sum_{y \in Y} \sum_{a_0 \in A_0} u_0(a_0, a, y) f(a_0|y) \rho(y|a) \alpha(a).$$

Once the manager chooses an intervention rule f , the users play a simultaneous game, whose normal form representation is given by

$$\Gamma_f = \langle \mathcal{N}, (A_i)_{i \in \mathcal{N}}, (v_i(f, \cdot))_{i \in \mathcal{N}} \rangle.$$

We predict actions chosen by the users given an intervention rule f by applying the solution concept of Nash equilibrium [fudenberg] to the induced game Γ_f .

Definition 1. An intervention rule $f \in \mathcal{F}$ sustains an action profile $\alpha^* \in \prod_{i \in \mathcal{N}} \Delta(A_i)$ if α^* is a Nash equilibrium of the game Γ_f , i.e.,

$$v_i(f, \alpha_i^*, \alpha_{-i}^*) \geq v_i(f, \alpha_i, \alpha_{-i}^*) \quad \text{for all } \alpha_i \in \Delta(A_i), \text{ for all } i \in \mathcal{N}.$$

An action profile α^* is sustainable if there exists an intervention rule f that sustains α^* .

Let $\mathcal{E}(f) \subseteq \prod_{i \in \mathcal{N}} \Delta(A_i)$ be the set of action profiles sustained by f . We say that a pair (f, α) is attainable if $\alpha \in \mathcal{E}(f)$. The manager's problem is to find an attainable pair that maximizes his ex ante payoff among all attainable pairs, which leads to the following solution concept for intervention games.

Definition 2. $(f^*, \alpha^*) \in \mathcal{F} \times \prod_{i \in \mathcal{N}} \Delta(A_i)$ is an intervention equilibrium if $\alpha^* \in \mathcal{E}(f^*)$ and

$$v_0(f^*, \alpha^*) \geq v_0(f, \alpha) \quad \text{for all } (f, \alpha) \text{ such that } \alpha \in \mathcal{E}(f).$$

$f^* \in \mathcal{F}$ is an optimal intervention rule if there exists an action profile $\alpha^* \in \prod_{i \in \mathcal{N}} \Delta(A_i)$ such that (f^*, α^*) is an intervention equilibrium.

An intervention equilibrium solves the following optimization problem:

$$\max_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \max_{\alpha \in \mathcal{E}(f)} v_0(f, \alpha).$$

An intervention equilibrium can be considered as a subgame perfect equilibrium (or Stackelberg equilibrium), with an implicit assumption that the manager can induce the users to choose the best Nash equilibrium for him in case of multiple Nash equilibria. Our interpretation is that if the manager specifies an intervention equilibrium (f^*, α^*) to the users then α^* becomes a self-enforcing operating point for them. In other words, the manager can make α^* a focal point [fudenberg] of the game Γ_{f^*} by recommending it to the users.

We can represent an *intervention scheme* formally by $\{(Y, \rho), A_0, f\}$. In this paper, we focus on the problem of finding an optimal intervention rule given the monitoring technology and intervention capability of the intervention device. However, our design problem can be generalized so that the design choice includes (Y, ρ) and A_0 . Let $v_0^*((Y, \rho), A_0)$ be the optimal value of the problem (2) given (Y, ρ) and A_0 . Also, let $C((Y, \rho), A_0)$ be the cost of implementing an intervention device with (Y, ρ) and A_0 . Then an optimal intervention scheme can be considered as a solution to $\max v_0^*((Y, \rho), A_0) - C((Y, \rho), A_0)$.

Below we show the existence of an intervention equilibrium.

Proposition 3. *Every finite intervention game has an intervention equilibrium.*

We prove Proposition 3 using the following two lemmas.

Lemma 4. *The correspondence $\mathcal{E}: \mathcal{F} \rightrightarrows \prod_{i \in \mathcal{N}} \Delta(A_i)$ is nonempty, compact-valued, and upper hemi-continuous.*

[IEEEproof]

We can show that, for any $f \in \mathcal{F}$, the set $\mathcal{E}(f)$ is nonempty by applying Nash Theorem [nash] to Γ_f . Since $\prod_{i \in \mathcal{N}} \Delta(A_i)$ is bounded, it suffices to show that \mathcal{E} has a closed graph to prove that \mathcal{E} is compact-valued and upper hemi-continuous (u.h.c.) (see Theorem 3.4 of [stokey]). Choose a sequence $\{(f^n, \alpha^n)\}$ with $(f^n, \alpha^n) \rightarrow (f, \alpha)$ and $\alpha^n \in \mathcal{E}(f^n)$ for all n . Suppose that $\alpha \notin \mathcal{E}(f)$. Then there exists $i \in \mathcal{N}$ such that α_i is not a best response to α_{-i} in Γ_f . Then there exist $\epsilon > 0$ and α'_i such that $v_i(f, \alpha'_i, \alpha_{-i}) > v_i(f, \alpha_i, \alpha_{-i}) + 3\epsilon$. Since v_i is continuous and $(f^n, \alpha^n) \rightarrow (f, \alpha)$, for sufficiently large n we have

$$v_i(f^n, \alpha'_i, \alpha_{-i}^n) > v_i(f, \alpha'_i, \alpha_{-i}) - \epsilon > v_i(f, \alpha_i, \alpha_{-i}) + 2\epsilon > v_i(f^n, \alpha_i^n, \alpha_{-i}^n) + \epsilon,$$

which contradicts $\alpha^n \in \mathcal{E}(f^n)$.

Define a function $\check{v}_0: \mathcal{F} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by $\check{v}_0(f) = \max_{\alpha \in \mathcal{E}(f)} v_0(f, \alpha)$. For each f , $\mathcal{E}(f)$ is nonempty and compact by Lemma 4 and $v_0(f, \cdot)$ is continuous. Hence, the function \check{v}_0 is well-defined.

Lemma 5. *The function \check{v}_0 is upper semi-continuous.*

[IEEEproof]

Let $E(f) = \{\alpha \in \mathcal{E}(f): v_0(f, \alpha) = \check{v}_0(f)\}$. Note that $E(f)$ is nonempty for all f . Fix f , and let $\{f^n\}$ be any sequence converging to f . Choose $\alpha^n \in E(f^n)$, for all n . Let $v_0^s = \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \check{v}_0(f^n)$. Then there exists a subsequence $\{f^{n_k}\}$ such that $v_0^s = \lim v_0(f^{n_k}, \alpha^{n_k})$. Since $\alpha^n \in \mathcal{E}(f^n)$ and \mathcal{E} is u.h.c., there exists a convergent subsequence of $\{\alpha^{n_k}\}$, called $\{\alpha^j\}$, whose limit point α is in $\mathcal{E}(f)$. Hence, $v_0^s = \lim v_0(f^j, \alpha^j) = v_0(f, \alpha) \leq \check{v}_0(f)$ since $\alpha \in \mathcal{E}(f)$.

Note that the space of intervention rules, \mathcal{F} , is equivalent to $(\Delta(A_0))^{|Y|}$, which is compact. Therefore, a solution to $\max_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \tilde{v}_0(f)$ exists, which establishes the existence of an intervention equilibrium.

There can be multiple intervention equilibria, all of which yield the same payoff for the manager. We can propose different selection criteria for the manager to choose an intervention equilibrium out of multiple ones. For example, the discussion on affine intervention rules in Section 4.1 is motivated by the robustness of performance to mistakes by the users.

3 Performance with Intervention under Imperfect Monitoring

3.1 Analytical Results

In this section, we maintain the following assumption.

Assumption 6. *There exists an action for the intervention device $\tilde{a}_0 \in A_0$ that satisfies*

$$u_0(\tilde{a}_0, a, y) > u_0(a_0, a, y) \quad \text{for all } a_0 \neq \tilde{a}_0,$$

for all $a \in A$ and $y \in Y$.

Define an intervention rule \tilde{f} by $\tilde{f}(y) = \tilde{a}_0$ for all y . \tilde{a}_0 is the action of the intervention device that is most preferred by the manager regardless of the action profile of the users and the signal, and \tilde{f} is the intervention rule that prescribes \tilde{a}_0 regardless of the realized signal.

Let $\bar{v}_0 = \sup_{(f, \alpha)} v_0(f, \alpha)$, $v_0^* = \sup_f \sup_{\alpha \in \mathcal{E}(f)} v_0(f, \alpha)$, and $\tilde{v}_0 = \sup_{\alpha \in \mathcal{E}(\tilde{f})} v_0(\tilde{f}, \alpha)$. \bar{v}_0 is the best performance that the manager can obtain when the users are not subject to the incentive constraints (e.g., the actions of the users can be completely controlled by the manager). v_0^* is the best performance when the manager takes into account the incentives of the users by requiring that the action profile should be sustained by the intervention rule. Lastly, \tilde{v}_0 is the best performance when the manager does not engage in active intervention. It is straightforward to see that $\tilde{v}_0 \leq v_0^* \leq \bar{v}_0$. The following proposition provides a sufficient condition on the intervention game for a gap between \bar{v}_0 and v_0^* to exist.

Proposition 7. *Suppose that the intervention game is finite, ρ has full support (i.e., $\rho(y|a) > 0$ for all y and a), and there is no α such that $\alpha \in \mathcal{E}(\tilde{f})$ and $v_0(\tilde{f}, \alpha) = \bar{v}_0$. Then $v_0^* < \bar{v}_0$.*

⟨IEEEproof|

Suppose that the conclusion does not hold, i.e., $v_0^* = \bar{v}_0$. Since the intervention game is finite, v_0^* is attained by Proposition 4. Thus, there exists (f, α) such that $\alpha \in \mathcal{E}(f)$ and $v_0(f, \alpha) = \bar{v}_0$. Note that $\bar{v}_0 = v_0(f, \alpha) \leq v_0(\tilde{f}, \alpha) \leq \bar{v}_0$. Hence, $v_0(f, \alpha) = v_0(\tilde{f}, \alpha)$. Since ρ has full support, we have $f(y) = \tilde{f}(y)$ for all y . This contradicts the hypothesis that there is no α such that $\alpha \in \mathcal{E}(\tilde{f})$ and $v_0(\tilde{f}, \alpha) = \bar{v}_0$.

When the intervention game is finite, \bar{v}_0 is attained since v_0 is continuous and $(\mathcal{F} \times \prod_{i \in \mathcal{N}} \Delta(A_i))$ is compact. Since $v_0(\tilde{f}, \alpha) \geq v_0(f, \alpha)$ for all α , for all f , we have $\bar{v}_0 = \sup_{\alpha} v_0(\tilde{f}, \alpha)$. In fact, when the intervention game is finite and ρ has full support, \tilde{f} is the only intervention rule that can attain the best feasible performance, \bar{v}_0 . When \tilde{f} sustains no action profile that attains \bar{v}_0 , the manager needs to trigger a punishment following some signals in order to provide appropriate incentives for the users to follow an action profile that attains \bar{v}_0 . However, since ρ has full support, the punishment results in a performance loss, which prevents the manager from achieving \bar{v}_0 .

3.2 Illustrative Example (Type-2 Intervention)

We consider a wireless network where two users interfere with each other. Each user has two pure actions, a_L and a_H , which represent low and high resource usage levels, respectively, and satisfy $0 < a_L < a_H$. The service quality is determined randomly given an action profile, and there are two possible quality levels, \bar{y} and \underline{y} , with $0 < \underline{y} < \bar{y}$. The service quality is realized following the distribution

$$\rho(\bar{y}|a) = \begin{cases} p, & \text{if } a = (a_L, a_L), \\ q, & \text{if } a = (a_H, a_L) \text{ or } (a_L, a_H), \\ r, & \text{if } a = (a_H, a_H), \end{cases}$$

where $0 < r < q < p < 1$. The intervention device in this example acts as a gatekeeper (i.e., type-2 intervention) after observing the service quality, having two pure actions: intervene (\hat{a}_0) and not intervene (\tilde{a}_0).² When the intervention device does not intervene, a user receives a payoff given by the product of the quality level and its own usage level, i.e., $u_i(\tilde{a}_0, a_i, y) = y a_i$ for all a_i and y , for $i = 1, 2$. When the intervention device does intervene, the service stops completely and a user receives zero payoff regardless of its usage level, i.e., $u_i(\hat{a}_0, a_i, y) = 0$ for all a_i and y , for $i = 1, 2$. The payoff of the manager is set as the average payoff of the users, i.e., $u_0(a_0, a, y) = [u_1(a_0, a_1, y) + u_2(a_0, a_2, y)]/2$. Note that denoting the action of not intervening by \tilde{a}_0 is consistent with Assumption 6. A communication scenario that fits into this example is presented in Fig. 4.

² We consider the simplest case of two users, two pure actions for each agent, and two signals for analytical tractability, although the example can be easily extended to a more general case. The incentive to choose the high usage level is the strongest with two users, which allows us to highlight the role of intervention schemes. Also, considering two pure actions and two signals is sufficient to generate interesting results without involving too many analytical complications.

Since there are two pure actions for the intervention device, we can represent $\mathcal{F} = [0, 1]$ and use $f(y)$ as the probability of not intervening given the signal y .³ The ex ante payoff function of user i for pure action profiles is given by

$$v_i(f, a) = [\rho(\bar{y}|a) f(\bar{y}) \bar{y} + (1 - \rho(\bar{y}|a)) f(\underline{y}) \underline{y}] a_i.$$

The payoff matrix of the game $\Gamma_{\bar{f}}$, i.e., when the intervention device does not intervene at all, is displayed in Table 1, where we define $y_k = k\bar{y} + (1 - k)\underline{y}$, for $k = p, q, r$. We assume that the game $\Gamma_{\bar{f}}$ is the prisoner's dilemma game, i.e., $y_q a_H > y_p a_L > y_r a_H > y_q a_L$ and $2 y_p a_L > y_q (a_H + a_L)$. Then without any intervention, it is the dominant strategy of each user to choose the high usage level, which results in the inefficient Nash equilibrium. The manager aims to improve upon the inefficiency of the Nash equilibrium by providing appropriate incentives through intervention.⁴ We restrict attention to symmetric action profile, assuming that the manager desires to sustain a symmetric action profile.

| | a_L | a_H |
|-------|--------------------|--------------------|
| a_L | $y_p a_L, y_p a_L$ | $y_q a_L, y_q a_H$ |
| a_H | $y_q a_H, y_q a_L$ | $y_r a_H, y_r a_H$ |

Table 1. Payoff matrix of the game $\Gamma_{\bar{f}}$ in the illustrative example of Section 3.2.

Let $w_0(\alpha) = \sup_f \{v_0(f, \alpha) : \alpha \in \mathcal{E}(f)\}$. That is, $w_0(\alpha)$ is the maximum payoff that the manager can obtain while sustaining a given action profile α . Since we focus on symmetric action profiles and there are two pure actions for each user, let $\alpha \in [0, 1]$ denote the probability of each user playing a_L . Then we can show that $w_0(0) = y_r a_H$ and, for $\alpha \in (0, 1]$,

$$w_0(\alpha) = \begin{cases} \frac{\{(q - r) + \alpha[(p - q) - (q - r)]\} a_H a_L}{[(1 - r) a_H - (1 - q) a_L] + \alpha[(p a_L - q a_H) - (q a_L - r a_H)]} \bar{y}, & \text{if } \alpha[(p a_L - q a_H) - (q a_L - r a_H)] + (q a_L - r a_H) \geq 0, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

3. An alternative interpretation is that the intervention device can degrade the service quality, with $f(y) y$ representing the quality level after intervention. When the users and the manager are expected-utility maximizers, the two interpretations yield the same payoff functions.

4. In this paper, we focus on the role of intervention schemes to improve the prospect of cooperation by applying intervention to prisoner's dilemma situations. Intervention schemes can also be used to help users achieve coordination by eliminating the multiplicity of Nash equilibria in coordination games such as the battle of the sexes and the stag hunt [fudenberg]. For example, in the stag-hunt game, an intervention scheme may induce players to choose the payoff dominant (but not risk dominant) "all stag" equilibrium by intervening in the hare hunt.

The intervention rule that attains $w_0(0)$ is given by \tilde{f} (i.e., no intervention), while the intervention rule that attains $w_0(\alpha)$, for $\alpha \in (0, 1]$, is given by

$$f(\bar{y}) = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad f(y) = \frac{(q a_L - r a_H) + \alpha [(p a_L - q a_H) - (q a_L - r a_H)]}{[(1-r) a_H - (1-q) a_L] + \alpha [(p a_L - q a_H) - (q a_L - r a_H)]} \frac{\bar{y}}{y}.$$

if $\alpha(p a_L - q a_H) + (1-\alpha)(q a_L - r a_H) \geq 0$, and by $f(\bar{y}) = f(y) = 0$ otherwise. We can think of $\alpha(p a_L - q a_H) + (1-\alpha)(q a_L - r a_H)$ as a measure of the sensitivity of signals between the two pure actions when the other user plays α . When signals are sufficiently sensitive at α , an intervention rule can sustain α with a positive payoff by degrading the low quality only. On the contrary, when signals are not sensitive, destroying all the payoffs is the only method to sustain α , which yields zero payoff for the users. Note that, when $p a_L - q a_H < 0$ and $q a_L - r a_H > 0$, the pure action profile (a_L, a_L) cannot be sustained with a positive payoff while a completely mixed action profile can be. In this case, signals are more sensitive to the action of a user when the other user plays a_H . Hence, by inducing the users to play a_H with positive probability, the manager can make the signal a more informative indicator of a deviation. This allows the possibility that an intervention rule improves the performance of non-cooperative equilibrium by sustaining a completely mixed action profile even when the social optimum (a_L, a_L) cannot be sustained non-trivially. A similar discussion about the advantage of using mixed actions can be found in [kandori] in the context of the repeated prisoner's dilemma game.

In this example, we have $\tilde{v}_0 = w_0(0) = y_r a_H$, $\bar{v}_0 = y_p a_L$, and $v_0^* = \max_{\alpha \in [0,1]} w_0(\alpha)$. We summarize the results about the performance with intervention, v_0^* , in the following proposition.

Proposition 8. (i) Suppose that (a) $p a_L - q a_H < 0$ and $q a_L - r a_H < 0$, or (b) $p a_L - q a_H < q a_L - r a_H$ and $(p-q)(1-r) - (q-r)(1-q) \leq 0$. Then $v_0^* = \tilde{v}_0$.
(ii) Suppose that (c) $p a_L - q a_H \geq q a_L - r a_H \geq 0$, (d) $p a_L - q a_H \geq 0 > q a_L - r a_H$, or (e) $0 \leq p a_L - q a_H < q a_L - r a_H$ and $(p-q)(1-r) - (q-r)(1-q) > 0$. Then $v_0^* = \max\{\tilde{v}_0, w_0(1)\}$.
(iii) Suppose that (f) $p a_L - q a_H < 0 \leq q a_L - r a_H$ and $(p-q)(1-r) - (q-r)(1-q) > 0$. Then $v_0^* = \max\{\tilde{v}_0, w_0(\bar{\alpha})\}$, where

$$\bar{\alpha} = \frac{q a_L - r a_H}{(q a_L - r a_H) - (p a_L - q a_H)}.$$

⟨IEEEproof|
 See Appendix 6.⟩

Fig. 3 shows that each of the three cases of $v_0^* = \tilde{v}_0$, $v_0^* = w_0(\bar{\alpha})$, and $v_0^* = w_0(1)$ can arise depending on the parameter values. To obtain the results, we set $a_L = 1$, $a_H = 1.19$, $\bar{y} = 5$, $\underline{y} = 1$, $q = 0.8$, and $r = 0.65$ while varying $p = 0.9, 0.94, 0.96$. We can see that, as p increases, the performance with intervention improves, getting closer to its upper bound \tilde{v}_0 . In fact, when $v_0^* = w_0(1)$, we have

$$\tilde{v}_0 - v_0^* = \frac{(1-p)a_L(y_q a_H - y_p a_L)}{(1-q)a_H - (1-p)a_L} > 0,$$

which is consistent with Proposition 7. The gap between v_0^* and \tilde{v}_0 vanishes as p approaches 1, while it increases with the deviation gain $(y_q a_H - y_p a_L)$. This result is intuitive because punishment rarely occurs when p is close to 1, and a stronger punishment is needed as the deviation gain is larger.

We can consider pricing schemes applied to this example, by having the manager charge different payments depending on the realized service quality. In order to find a pricing scheme that sustains a certain action profile, the manager needs to know how payments affect the payoffs of the users (i.e., the function $u_i(a_0, a_i, y)$, where a_0 is now interpreted as the charged payment). Suppose, for example, that the users care about data rates. With an intervention scheme, which influences data rates directly, it is easy to find out the relationship between a_0 and u_i . In contrast, with a pricing scheme, finding out the relationship requires the manager to know how the users value payments relative to data rates. This information is difficult to obtain since the users' valuations are subjective and thus not easily measurable. This discussion points out the informational advantage of intervention over pricing.

4 Performance with Intervention under Perfect Monitoring

4.1 Analytical Results

In this section, we consider the case where the intervention device can observe the pure action profile without errors (i.e., perfect monitoring), as stated formally in the following assumption.

Assumption 9. $Y = A$, and only signal a can arise in the distribution $\rho(a)$ for all $a \in A$.

With Assumption 9, the ex post payoff functions can be written as $u_i: A_0 \times A \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, for all $i \in \mathcal{N}_0$. We also maintain the following assumption in this section.

Assumption 10. *There exist two actions for the intervention device \underline{a}_0 , $\bar{a}_0 \in A_0$ that satisfy for all $i \in \mathcal{N}_0$,*

$$u_i(\underline{a}_0, a) \geq u_i(a_0, a) \geq u_i(\bar{a}_0, a) \quad \text{for all } a_0 \in A_0, \text{ for all } a \in A.$$

\underline{a}_0 and \bar{a}_0 can be interpreted as the most and least preferred actions of the intervention device, respectively. For any $a \in A$, the users and the manager receive the highest (resp. lowest) payoff when the intervention device takes the most (resp. least) preferred intervention action. Assumption 10 allows the intervention device to reward or punish all the users at the same time. The action \underline{a}_0 plays a similar role to that of \tilde{a}_0 in Assumption 6 in that the manager prefers to use \underline{a}_0 for a given action profile and that both can be interpreted as the action with which the intervention device does not intervene at all.

In this section, we restrict attention to pure actions (both for the users and for the intervention device) while allowing the action spaces to be continuous spaces. Thus, an intervention rule is represented by a mapping $f: A \rightarrow A_0$, while user i chooses a pure action $a_i \in A_i$ given an intervention rule. Then the ex ante payoff function is given by $v_i(f, a) = u_i(f(a), a)$, for all $i \in \mathcal{N}_0$. We define a class of intervention rules.

Definition 11. $f_{\tilde{a}}: A \rightarrow A_0$ is an extreme intervention rule with target action profile $\tilde{a} \in A$ if

$$f_{\tilde{a}}(a) = \begin{cases} \underline{a}_0 & \text{if } a = \tilde{a}, \\ \bar{a}_0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

With an extreme intervention rule, the intervention device chooses the most preferred action when the users follow the target action profile while choosing the least preferred action when they deviate. Hence, an extreme intervention rule provides the strongest incentive for sustaining a given target action profile. Let $\mathcal{E}(\mathcal{F}) = \cup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \mathcal{E}(f)$. That is, $\mathcal{E}(\mathcal{F})$ is the set of sustainable action profiles.

Lemma 12. *If $a^* \in \mathcal{E}(\mathcal{F})$, then $a^* \in \mathcal{E}(f_{a^*})$.*

⟨IEEEproof

Suppose that $a^* \in \mathcal{E}(\mathcal{F})$. Then there exists an intervention rule f such that $v_i(f, a^*) \geq v_i(f, a_i, a_{-i}^*)$ for all $a_i \in A_i$, for all $i \in \mathcal{N}$. Then we obtain $v_i(f_{a^*}, a^*) = u_i(\underline{a}_0, a^*) \geq u_i(f(a^*), a^*) \geq u_i(f(a_i, a_{-i}^*), a_i, a_{-i}^*) \geq u_i(\bar{a}_0, a_i, a_{-i}^*) = v_i(f_{a^*}, a_i, a_{-i}^*)$ for all $a_i \neq a_i^*$, for all $i \in \mathcal{N}$, where the first and the third inequalities follow from (10).⟩

Let $\mathcal{E}^* = \{a \in A : a \in \mathcal{E}(f_a)\}$. The following results are the consequences of Lemma 12.

Proposition 13. (i) $\mathcal{E}(\mathcal{F}) = \mathcal{E}^*$.

(ii) If (f^*, a^*) is an intervention equilibrium, then (f_{a^*}, a^*) is also an intervention equilibrium.

⟨IEEEproof⟩

(i) Let $a^* \in \mathcal{E}^*$. Then $a^* \in \mathcal{E}(f_{a^*}) \subset \mathcal{E}(\mathcal{F})$. Hence, $\mathcal{E}^* \subset \mathcal{E}(\mathcal{F})$. The other inclusion $\mathcal{E}(\mathcal{F}) \subset \mathcal{E}^*$ follows from Lemma 12.

(ii) Suppose that (f^*, a^*) is an intervention equilibrium. Then by Definition 2, $a^* \in \mathcal{E}(f^*)$ and $v_0(f^*, a^*) \geq v_0(f, a)$ for all $(f, a) \in \mathcal{F} \times A$ such that $a \in \mathcal{E}(f)$. Since $a^* \in \mathcal{E}(\mathcal{F})$, $a^* \in \mathcal{E}(f_{a^*})$ by Lemma 12. Hence, $v_0(f^*, a^*) \geq v_0(f_{a^*}, a^*)$. On the other hand, since $f_{a^*}(a^*) = \underline{a}_0$, we have $v_0(f^*, a^*) \leq v_0(f_{a^*}, a^*)$ by (10). Therefore, $v_0(f^*, a^*) = v_0(f_{a^*}, a^*)$, and thus $v_0(f_{a^*}, a^*) \geq v_0(f, a)$ for all $(f, a) \in \mathcal{F} \times A$ such that $a \in \mathcal{E}(f)$. This proves that (f_{a^*}, a^*) is an intervention equilibrium.⟩

Proposition 13 shows that it is without loss of generality to restrict attention to pairs of the form (f_a, a) when we ask whether a given action profile is sustainable and whether there exists an intervention equilibrium. The role of extreme intervention rules is analogous to that of grim trigger strategies in repeated games with perfect monitoring. To generate the set of equilibrium payoffs, it suffices to consider grim trigger strategies that trigger the most severe punishment in case of a deviation. Under Assumption 10, the least preferred intervention action \underline{a}_0 plays a similar role to that of mutual minmaxing [mailath] in that it provides the strongest threat to deter a deviation.

Proposition 14. (f_{a^*}, a^*) is an intervention equilibrium if and only if $a^* \in \mathcal{E}^*$ and $u_0(\underline{a}_0, a^*) \geq u_0(\underline{a}_0, a)$ for all $a \in \mathcal{E}^*$.

⟨IEEEproof⟩

Suppose that (f_{a^*}, a^*) is an intervention equilibrium. Then $a^* \in \mathcal{E}(f_{a^*})$, and thus $a^* \in \mathcal{E}^*$. Also, $v_0(f_{a^*}, a^*) \geq v_0(f, a)$ for all (f, a) such that $a \in \mathcal{E}(f)$. Choose any $a \in \mathcal{E}^*$. Then $a \in \mathcal{E}(f_a)$, and thus $u_0(\underline{a}_0, a^*) = v_0(f_{a^*}, a^*) \geq v_0(f_a, a) = u_0(\underline{a}_0, a)$.

Suppose that $a^* \in \mathcal{E}^*$ and $u_0(\underline{a}_0, a^*) \geq u_0(\underline{a}_0, a)$ for all $a \in \mathcal{E}^*$. To prove that (f_{a^*}, a^*) is an intervention equilibrium, we need to show that (i) $a^* \in \mathcal{E}(f_{a^*})$, and (ii) $v_0(f_{a^*}, a^*) \geq v_0(f, a)$ for all (f, a) such that $a \in \mathcal{E}(f)$. (i) follows from $a^* \in \mathcal{E}^*$. To prove (ii), choose any (f, a) such that $a \in \mathcal{E}(f)$. By Lemma 12, we have $a \in \mathcal{E}^*$. Then $v_0(f_{a^*}, a^*) = u_0(\underline{a}_0, a^*) \geq u_0(\underline{a}_0, a) \geq v_0(f, a)$, where the first inequality follows from $a \in \mathcal{E}^*$.⟩

Proposition 14 shows that the pair (f_a, a) constitutes an intervention equilibrium if a solves

$$\max_{a \in \mathcal{E}^*} u_0(\underline{a}_0, a).$$

The next proposition provides a sufficient condition under which an intervention equilibrium exists.

Proposition 15. *Suppose that A_i is a bounded set in Euclidean space, for all $i \in \mathcal{N}$, and that $u_i(a_0, a)$ is continuous in a , for $a_0 = \underline{a}_0, \bar{a}_0$, for all $i \in \mathcal{N}_0$. Then there exists an intervention equilibrium.*

[IEEEproof]

By Proposition 13(ii) and Proposition 14, an intervention equilibrium exists if and only if there exists a solution to the problem (14). Since $u_0(\underline{a}_0, a)$ is continuous in a , the result follows if we show that the constraint set \mathcal{E}^* is compact. Since $\mathcal{E}^* \subset A$ and A is bounded, \mathcal{E}^* is also bounded. To show that \mathcal{E}^* is closed, choose a sequence $\{a^n\}$ with $a^n \rightarrow a^*$ and $a^n \in \mathcal{E}^*$ for all n . Choose any $i \in \mathcal{N}$ and $a'_i \in A_i$. Since $a^n \in \mathcal{E}(f_{a^n})$, we have $u_i(\underline{a}_0, a^n) \geq u_i(\bar{a}_0, a'_i, a^n_{-i})$. Since $u_i(a_0, a)$ is continuous in a for $a_0 = \underline{a}_0, \bar{a}_0$, we obtain $u_i(\underline{a}_0, a^*) \geq u_i(\bar{a}_0, a'_i, a^*_{-i})$ by taking limits. This proves $a^* \in \mathcal{E}(f_{a^*})$ and thus $a^* \in \mathcal{E}^*$.

When we find an action profile that constitutes an intervention equilibrium by solving the problem (14), we can hold the action of the intervention device at $a_0 = \underline{a}_0$ because any sustainable action can be sustained while the intervention device takes \underline{a}_0 on the equilibrium path. Let a^o be a solution to the problem $\max_{a \in A} u_0(\underline{a}_0, a)$, which exists when $u_0(\underline{a}_0, a)$ is continuous in a and A is compact. Then we have $\bar{v}_0 = u_0(\underline{a}_0, a^o)$. The following result can be obtained as a corollary of Proposition 14.

Corollary 16. *If $a^o \in \arg \max_{a \in A} u_0(\underline{a}_0, a)$ and $u_i(\underline{a}_0, a^o) \geq u_i(\bar{a}_0, a_i, a^o_{-i})$ for all $a_i \in A_i$, for all $i \in \mathcal{N}$, then $v_0^* = \bar{v}_0$.*

Corollary 16 shows that, with perfect monitoring, the manager can achieve the best feasible performance by using an intervention scheme when the intervention capability is sufficiently strong. When the punishment provided by the action \bar{a}_0 is sufficiently severe, any deviation from a target action profile can be deterred. Also, there is no performance loss in sustaining a target action profile because the punishment exists only as a threat, not happening on the equilibrium path. This contrasts with the imperfect monitoring case (see Proposition 7), where providing incentives necessarily incurs a performance loss.

Extreme intervention rules are useful to characterize sustainable action profiles and intervention equilibria. However, they may not be desirable in practice. For example, when a user chooses an action different from the target action by mistake (i.e., trembling hands), an extreme intervention rule triggers the most severe punishment, resulting in a large performance loss. Thus, it is of interest to investigate intervention rules that use weaker punishments than extreme intervention rules do. To obtain concrete results, we assume that $A_i = [\underline{a}_i, \bar{a}_i] \subset \mathbb{R}$ with $\underline{a}_i < \bar{a}_i$ for all $i \in \mathcal{N}_0$ in the remainder of this section. Below we define another class of intervention rules.

Definition 17. $f_{\tilde{a},c}: A \rightarrow A_0$ is a (truncated) affine intervention rule with target action profile $\tilde{a} \in A$ and intervention rate profile $c \in \mathbb{R}^N$ if

$$f_{\tilde{a},c}(a) = [c \cdot (a - \tilde{a}) + \underline{a}_0]_{\underline{a}_0}^{\bar{a}_0},$$

where $[x]_{\alpha}^{\beta} = \min \{ \max \{ x, \alpha \}, \beta \}$.

The following proposition constructs an affine intervention rule to sustain an interior target action profile in the differentiable payoff case.

Proposition 18. Let $a^* \in \mathcal{A}$ be an action profile such that $a_i^* \in (a_i, \bar{a}_i)$ for all $i \in \mathcal{N}$. Suppose that, for all $i \in \mathcal{N}$, u_i is twice continuously differentiable and $u_i(a_0, a^*)$ is strictly decreasing in a_0 on $[\underline{a}_0, \bar{a}_0]$. Let

$$c_i^* = - \frac{\partial u_i(\underline{a}_0, a^*) / \partial a_i}{\partial u_i(\underline{a}_0, a^*) / \partial a_0}$$

for all $i \in \mathcal{N}$.⁵ Suppose that

$$\frac{\partial^2 u_i}{\partial a_i^2}(\underline{a}_0, a_i, a_{-i}^*) \leq 0 \quad \text{for all } a_i \in (a_i, \bar{a}_i)$$

for all $i \in \mathcal{N}$ such that $c_i^* = 0$,

$$\frac{\partial^2 u_i}{\partial a_i^2}(\underline{a}_0, a_i, a_{-i}^*) \leq 0 \quad \text{for all } a_i \in (a_i, a_i^*),$$

$$\left((c_i^*)^2 \frac{\partial^2 u_i}{\partial a_0^2} + 2 c_i^* \frac{\partial^2 u_i}{\partial a_i \partial a_0} + \frac{\partial^2 u_i}{\partial a_i^2} \right) \Big|_{(a_0, a_i, a_{-i}) = (c_i^*(a_i - a_i^*) + \underline{a}_0, a_i, a_{-i}^*)} \leq 0$$

for all $a_i \in (a_i^*, \min \{ \bar{a}_i, a_i^* + (\bar{a}_0 - \underline{a}_0) / c_i^* \})$, and

$$\frac{\partial u_i}{\partial a_i}(\bar{a}_0, a_i, a_{-i}^*) \leq 0 \quad \text{for all } a_i \in (a_i^* + (\bar{a}_0 - \underline{a}_0) / c_i^*, \bar{a}_i)$$

for all $i \in \mathcal{N}$ such that $c_i^* > 0$, and

$$\frac{\partial u_i}{\partial a_i}(\bar{a}_0, a_i, a_{-i}^*) \geq 0 \quad \text{for all } a_i \in (a_i, a_i^* + (\bar{a}_0 - \underline{a}_0) / c_i^*),$$

$$\left((c_i^*)^2 \frac{\partial^2 u_i}{\partial a_0^2} + 2 c_i^* \frac{\partial^2 u_i}{\partial a_i \partial a_0} + \frac{\partial^2 u_i}{\partial a_i^2} \right) \Big|_{(a_0, a_i, a_{-i}) = (c_i^*(a_i - a_i^*) + \underline{a}_0, a_i, a_{-i}^*)} \leq 0$$

for all $a_i \in (\max \{ \bar{a}_i, a_i^* + (\bar{a}_0 - \underline{a}_0) / c_i^* \}, a_i^*)$, and

$$\frac{\partial^2 u_i}{\partial a_i^2}(\underline{a}_0, a_i, a_{-i}^*) \leq 0 \quad \text{for all } a_i \in (a_i^*, \bar{a}_i)$$

for all $i \in \mathcal{N}$ such that $c_i^* < 0$.⁶ Then f_{a^*, c^*} sustains a^* .

⁵. We define $\partial u_i(\underline{a}_0, a^*) / \partial a_0$ as the right partial derivative of u_i with respect to a_0 at (\underline{a}_0, a^*) .

⟨IEEEproof|
See Appendix 7.⟩

Note that $\partial u_i(a_0, a^*) / \partial a_0 < 0$ for all $i \in \mathcal{N}$ since $u_i(a_0, a^*)$ is strictly decreasing in a_0 . Thus, c_i^* , defined in (18), has the same sign as $\partial u_i(a_0, a^*) / \partial a_i$. With $A_0 = [a_0, \bar{a}_0]$, the action of the intervention device can be interpreted as the intervention level, and the users receive higher payoffs as the intervention level is smaller. The affine intervention rule f_{a^*, c^*} , constructed in Proposition 18, has the properties that the intervention device uses the minimum intervention level a_0 when the users choose the target action profile a^* , i.e., $f_{a^*, c^*}(a^*) = a_0$, and that the intervention level increases in the rate of $|c_i^*|$ as user i deviates to the direction in which its payoff increases at (a_0, a^*) . The expression of c_i^* in (18) has an intuitive explanation. Since c_i^* is proportional to $\partial u_i(a_0, a^*) / \partial a_i$ and inversely proportional to $-\partial u_i(a_0, a^*) / \partial a_0$, a user faces a higher intervention rate as its incentive to deviate from (a_0, a^*) is stronger and as a change in the intervention level has a smaller impact on its payoff. The intervention level does not react to the action of user i when $c_i^* = 0$, because user i chooses a_i^* in its self-interest even when the intervention level is fixed at a_0 , provided that the other users choose a_{-i}^* . Finally, we note that if (f^*, a^*) is an intervention equilibrium and $f_{a^*, c}$ sustains a^* for some c , then $(f_{a^*, c}, a^*)$ is also an intervention equilibrium, since $f_{a^*, c}(a^*) = a_0$.

4.2 Illustrative Example (Type-1 Intervention)

As an illustrative example, we consider another resource sharing scenario in a wireless network where two users and an intervention device interfere with each other. In this example, the intervention device engages in type-1 intervention, affecting the service quality through its usage level. The actions of the users and the intervention device are their usage levels, and the action spaces are given by $A_i = [0, \bar{a}_i]$ for $i = 0, 1, 2$. \bar{a}_i denotes the maximum usage level of user i . The service quality is determined by the total usage level, $a_0 + a_1 + a_2$, following the relationship

$$Q(a_0, a_1, a_2) = [q - b(a_0 + a_1 + a_2)]^+,$$

where $q, b > 0$ and $[x]^+ = \max\{x, 0\}$. The payoff of user $i \in \{1, 2\}$ is given by the product of the service quality and its own usage level,

$$u_i(a_0, a_1, a_2) = Q(a_0, a_1, a_2) a_i.$$

The payoff of the manager is given by the average payoff of the two users,

$$u_0(a_0, a_1, a_2) = [u_1(a_0, a_1, a_2) + u_2(a_0, a_1, a_2)] / 2.$$

6. We define $(\alpha, \beta) = \emptyset$ if $\alpha \geq \beta$.

In this example, we have $\bar{v}_0 = q^2/8b$, which is achieved when $a_0 = 0$ and $a_1 + a_2 = q/2b$, assuming that $\bar{a}_1 + \bar{a}_2 \geq q/2b$. The symmetric action profile that attains \bar{v}_0 is thus (a_l, a_l) , where $a_l \triangleq q/4b$. On the other hand, the best performance at the non-cooperative equilibrium without intervention (i.e., when a_0 is held fixed at 0) is given by $\bar{v}_0 = q^2/9b$, which is attained at (a_h, a_h) , where $a_h \triangleq q/3b$, assuming that $\bar{a}_i \geq a_h$, for $i = 1, 2$. Hence, the goal of the manager is to limit the usage levels of the users by using intervention as a potential threat.

Given the structure of the intervention game in this example, the intervention capability of the intervention device is represented by its maximum intervention level \bar{a}_0 . In the following proposition, we investigate the performance with intervention as we vary \bar{a}_0 .

Proposition 19. *Suppose that $\bar{a}_i \geq q/2b$, for $i = 1, 2$. Then (i) $v_0^* = \bar{v}_0$ if and only if $\bar{a}_0 = 0$, and (ii) $v_0^* = \bar{v}_0$ if and only if $\bar{a}_0 \geq (3\sqrt{2} - 4)q/4\sqrt{2}b$. Moreover, v_0^* is strictly increasing with \bar{a}_0 on $[0, (3\sqrt{2} - 4)q/4\sqrt{2}b]$.*

⟨IEEEproof

See Appendix 8.⟩

Since u_i is weakly decreasing in a_0 , the set \mathcal{E}^* is weakly increasing as the intervention capability \bar{a}_0 is larger. This implies that the performance with intervention v_0^* is weakly increasing with \bar{a}_0 . Proposition 19 shows that the performance with intervention improves as \bar{a}_0 increases, eventually reaching the best feasible performance. Fig. 5 plots the set $\mathcal{E}^* = \mathcal{E}(\mathcal{F})$ as a dark region for four different values of \bar{a}_0 with parameters $q = 12, b = 1$, and $\bar{a}_1 = \bar{a}_2 = 12$. We can see that \mathcal{E}^* expands as \bar{a}_0 increases. When $\bar{a}_0 = 0$, \mathcal{E}^* has only two elements, $(a_h, a_h) = (4, 4)$ and $(12, 12)$. When $\bar{a}_0 = 0.1$, there are more action profiles in \mathcal{E}^* . However, the symmetric social optimum $(a_l, a_l) = (3, 3)$ does not belong to \mathcal{E}^* , and Proposition 14 implies that the action profile (a_1, a_2) that minimizes $a_1 + a_2$ among those in \mathcal{E}^* constitutes an intervention equilibrium. When $\bar{a}_0 \geq (3\sqrt{2} - 4)q/4\sqrt{2}b \approx 0.51$, the action profiles in \mathcal{E}^* that satisfy $a_1 + a_2 = 2a_l = 6$ constitute an intervention equilibrium, as all of them yield the best feasible performance \bar{v}_0 . When $\bar{a}_0 \geq q/b = 12$, the punishment from \bar{a}_0 is strong enough to make any action profile sustainable, i.e., $\mathcal{E}^* = A$.

Applying Proposition 18, we can construct an affine intervention rule that sustains an action profile (a_1^*, a_2^*) such that $a_i^* \in (0, \bar{a}_i)$ for $i = 1, 2$ and $a_1^* + a_2^* < q/b$, provided that the maximum intervention level \bar{a}_0 is sufficiently large. With the payoff functions in (4.2), the expression of c_i^* in (18) is given by

$$c_i^*(a^*) = \frac{q}{b a_i^*} - \frac{a_{-i}^*}{a_i^*} - 2,$$

for $i = 1, 2$. For example, the affine intervention rule with target action profile (a_l, a_l) and intervention rate profile $c^*(a_l, a_l)$ is expressed as

$$f(a_1, a_2) = \left[a_1 + a_2 - \frac{q}{2b} \right]_0^{\bar{a}_0}.$$

Fig. 6 plots the payoff of user i against its action a_i , provided that the manager chooses the intervention rule in (19) and the other user chooses a_l . It also assumes that \bar{a}_0 is sufficiently large. Without intervention, the best response of user i to a_l is $3q/8b$, which shows the instability of the symmetric social optimum (a_l, a_l) . However, when the intervention rule (19) is used, the intervention device begins to intervene as user i increases its usage level from a_l . An increase in payoff due to the increased usage level is more than offset by a decrease in payoff due to the quality degradation from intervention. As a result, users do not gain by a unilateral deviation from (a_l, a_l) under the intervention rule (19).

5 Conclusion

In this paper, we have developed a game-theoretic framework for the design and analysis of intervention schemes, which are aimed to drive self-interested users towards a system objective. Our results suggest that we can construct an effective intervention scheme when an intervention device with an accurate monitoring technology and a strong intervention capability is available. In order to deal with the problem of designing an optimal intervention scheme, our framework should be extended to incorporate the cost of implementing a particular monitoring technology and an intervention capability. Another direction of extension is to consider a dynamic model of decision making under intervention, where users and intervention devices can use their past observations to adjust their behavior. Lastly, we can extend our framework to the one with incomplete information on the side of the manager or users.

[⟨appendices⟩](#)

6 Proof of Proposition 8

[⟨IEEEproof⟩](#)

First, note that $w_0(0) > \lim_{\alpha \rightarrow 0^+} w_0(\alpha)$. Suppose that $pa_L - qa_H < 0$ and $qa_L - ra_H < 0$. Then $w_0(\alpha) = 0$ for all $\alpha \in (0, 1]$, and thus $v_0^* = w_0(0) = \tilde{v}_0$.

Suppose that at least one of the two inequalities $pa_L - qa_H \geq 0$ and $qa_L - ra_H \geq 0$ holds. We consider three cases.

Case 1: $pa_L - qa_H = qa_L - ra_H$.

In this case, $\alpha[(pa_L - qa_H) - (qa_L - ra_H)] + (qa_L - ra_H) \geq 0$ is satisfied for all $\alpha \in (0, 1]$, and $w_0(\alpha)$ is increasing on $(0, 1]$. Thus, we obtain $v_0^* = \max\{w_0(0), w_0(1)\}$.

Case 2: $pa_L - qa_H > qa_L - ra_H$.

$\alpha[(pa_L - qa_H) - (qa_L - ra_H)] + (qa_L - ra_H) \geq 0$ if and only if

$$\alpha \geq \frac{-(qa_L - ra_H)}{(pa_L - qa_H) - (qa_L - ra_H)},$$

where the right-hand side of (6) is smaller than 1. Also, $p a_L - q a_H > q a_L - r a_H$ implies $p - q > q - r$. We can show that the sign of the first derivative of w_0 at $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ is equal to that of $(p - q)(1 - r) - (q - r)(1 - q)$, which is positive. Hence, we have $v_0^* = \max\{w_0(0), w_0(1)\}$.

Case 3: $p a_L - q a_H < q a_L - r a_H$.

$\alpha[(p a_L - q a_H) - (q a_L - r a_H)] + (q a_L - r a_H) \geq 0$ if and only if

$$\alpha \leq \frac{q a_L - r a_H}{(q a_L - r a_H) - (p a_L - q a_H)} \triangleq \bar{\alpha}.$$

Also, the sign of the first derivative of w_0 is equal to that of $(p - q)(1 - r) - (q - r)(1 - q)$.

Case 3-1: $0 \leq p a_L - q a_H < q a_L - r a_H$.

We have $\bar{\alpha} \geq 1$. Thus, w_0 is increasing on $(0, 1]$ if $(p - q)(1 - r) - (q - r)(1 - q) > 0$ and non-increasing if $(p - q)(1 - r) - (q - r)(1 - q) \leq 0$.

Case 3-2: $p a_L - q a_H < 0 \leq q a_L - r a_H$.

We have $\bar{\alpha} < 1$. Thus, w_0 is increasing on $(0, \bar{\alpha}]$ if $(p - q)(1 - r) - (q - r)(1 - q) > 0$ and non-increasing if $(p - q)(1 - r) - (q - r)(1 - q) \leq 0$.

7 Proof of Proposition 18

[IEEEproof]

To prove that f_{a^*, c^*} sustains a^* is equivalent to show that

$$a_i^* \in \arg \max_{a_i \in A_i} u_i(f_{a^*, c^*}(a_i, a_{-i}^*), a_i, a_{-i}^*)$$

for all $i \in \mathcal{N}$. Note that $f_{a^*, c^*}(a_i, a_{-i}^*) = [c_i^*(a_i - a_i^*) + a_0]_{a_0}^{\bar{a}_0}$. We consider three cases depending on the sign of c_i^* .

Case 1: $c_i^* = 0$.

By (18), we have $\partial u_i(a_0, a^*) / \partial a_i = 0$. Also, we have $f_{a^*, c^*}(a_i, a_{-i}^*) = a_0$ for all $a_i \in A_i$. Thus, the objective function in (7) reduces to $u_i(a_0, a_i, a_{-i}^*)$. The condition (5) implies that $u_i(a_0, a_i, a_{-i}^*)$ is a concave function with respect to a_i on A_i . Also, the first-order optimality condition is satisfied at $a_i = a_i^*$ since $\partial u_i(a_0, a^*) / \partial a_i = 0$. Therefore, a_i^* maximizes $u_i(a_0, a_i, a_{-i}^*)$ on A_i .

Case 2: $c_i^* > 0$.

Since $\partial u_i(a_0, a^*) / \partial a_0 < 0$, we have $\partial u_i(a_0, a^*) / \partial a_i > 0$ by (18). First, consider $a_i \in [a_i, a_i^*]$. In this region, $f_{a^*, c^*}(a_i, a_{-i}^*) = a_0$, and thus the objective function can be written as $u_i(a_0, a_i, a_{-i}^*)$. Since the condition (5) implies that $u_i(a_0, a_i, a_{-i}^*)$ is concave with respect to a_i on $[a_i, a_i^*]$, $u_i(a_0, a_i, a_{-i}^*)$ is strictly increasing in a_i on $[a_i, a_i^*]$.

Second, consider $a_i \in [a_i^*, \min\{\bar{a}_i, a_i^* + (\bar{a}_0 - a_0) / c_i^*\}]$. In this region, $f_{a^*, c^*}(a_i, a_{-i}^*) = c_i^*(a_i - a_i^*) + a_0$, and thus the objective function can be written as $u_i(c_i^*(a_i - a_i^*) + a_0, a_i, a_{-i}^*)$. The first derivative of $u_i(c_i^*(a_i - a_i^*) + a_0, a_i, a_{-i}^*)$ with respect to a_i is given by

$$\left(c_i^* \frac{\partial u_i}{\partial a_0} + \frac{\partial u_i}{\partial a_i} \right) \Big|_{(a_0, a_i, a_{-i}) = (c_i^*(a_i - a_i^*) + a_0, a_i, a_{-i}^*)},$$

while the second derivative is given by the left-hand side of (5). The first derivative is zero at $a_i = a_i^*$ by (18), while the second derivative is non-positive by (5). Hence, the first derivative is non-positive on $(a_i^*, \min\{\bar{a}_i, a_i^* + (\bar{a}_0 - \underline{a}_0)/c_i^*\})$, and thus $u_i(c_i^*(a_i - a_i^*) + \underline{a}_0, a_i, a_{-i}^*)$ is non-increasing in a_i on $[a_i^*, \min\{\bar{a}_i, a_i^* + (\bar{a}_0 - \underline{a}_0)/c_i^*\}]$.

Lastly, consider $a_i \in [a_i^* + (\bar{a}_0 - \underline{a}_0)/c_i^*, \bar{a}_i]$. In this region, $f_{a^*, c^*}(a_i, a_{-i}^*) = \bar{a}_0$, and thus the objective function can be written as $u_i(\bar{a}_0, a_i, a_{-i}^*)$. Since the first derivative of $u_i(\bar{a}_0, a_i, a_{-i}^*)$ with respect to a_i is non-positive on $(a_i^* + (\bar{a}_0 - \underline{a}_0)/c_i^*, \bar{a}_i)$ by (5), $u_i(\bar{a}_0, a_i, a_{-i}^*)$ is non-increasing in a_i on $[a_i^* + (\bar{a}_0 - \underline{a}_0)/c_i^*, \bar{a}_i]$.

Case 3: $c_i^* < 0$.

In this case, $\partial u_i(\underline{a}_0, a^*)/\partial a_i < 0$ and

$$f_{a^*, c^*}(a_i, a_{-i}^*) = \begin{cases} \bar{a}_0, & i f a_i \in [\underline{a}_i, a_i^* + (\bar{a}_0 - \underline{a}_0)/c_i^*], \\ c_i(a_i - a_i^*) + \underline{a}_0, & i f a_i \in [\max\{\bar{a}_i, a_i^* + (\bar{a}_0 - \underline{a}_0)/c_i^*\}, a_i^*], \\ \underline{a}_0, & i f a_i \in [a_i^*, \bar{a}_i]. \end{cases}$$

Following an analogous argument as in Case 2, we can show that the objective function is non-decreasing in a_i on $[\underline{a}_i, a_i^*]$ and strictly decreasing on $[a_i^*, \bar{a}_i]$, implying that $a_i = a_i^*$ maximizes the objective function on A_i .

Note that if the inequalities in (5), (5), and (5) are strict, we have $a_i = a_i^*$ as a unique maximizer for all $i \in \mathcal{N}$.

8 Proof of Proposition 19

(IEEEproof)

(i) Suppose that $\bar{a}_0 = 0$. Then the best response correspondence of user i is given by

$$b r_i(a_{-i}) = \begin{cases} \{\min\{(q - b a_{-i})/2b, \bar{a}_i\}\}, & i f a_{-i} < q/b, \\ [0, \bar{a}_i], & i f a_{-i} \geq q/b. \end{cases}$$

Among possible Nash equilibria, only (a_h, a_h) yields a positive payoff for the manager, which leads to $v_0^* = \bar{v}_0$. To show the converse, suppose that $\bar{a}_0 > 0$. We can show that $(a_h - \epsilon, a_h - \epsilon)$ is sustainable for sufficiently small $\epsilon > 0$, which yields $v_0^* > \bar{v}_0$.

(ii) We have $v_0^* = \bar{v}_0$ if and only if there exists a sustainable action profile (a_1, a_2) such that $a_1 + a_2 = q/2b$. Given $a_1 + a_2 = q/2b$, the incentive for user i to deviate is stronger as a_i is smaller. Hence, it suffices to check whether the symmetric action profile (a_l, a_l) is sustainable. By Lemma 12, (a_l, a_l) is sustainable if and only if

$$\max_{a_i \in [0, \bar{a}_i]} [q - b(a_0 + a_l + a_i)]^+ a_i \leq q^2/8b,$$

which is equivalent to $\bar{a}_0 \geq (3\sqrt{2} - 4)q/4\sqrt{2}b$.

Choose $\bar{a}_0, \bar{a}'_0 \in [0, (3\sqrt{2} - 4)q/4\sqrt{2}b]$ with $\bar{a}_0 < \bar{a}'_0$. Let v_0^* and $(v_0^*)'$ be the corresponding performances with intervention. Since $\bar{a}_0 < (3\sqrt{2} - 4)q/4\sqrt{2}b$, there exists an action profile (a_1, a_2) that attains v_0^* with \bar{a}_0 and satisfies $q/2b < a_1 + a_2 \leq 2q/3b$. We can show that $(a_1 - \epsilon, a_2 - \epsilon)$ can be sustained with \bar{a}'_0 for sufficiently small $\epsilon > 0$, which implies $(v_0^*)' > v_0^*$.

Bibliography

- [Hardin] G. Hardin, "The tragedy of the commons," *Science*, vol. 162, no. 3859, pp. 1243–1248, Dec. 1968.
- [Dubey] P. Dubey, "Inefficiency of Nash equilibria," *Math. Operations Research*, vol. 11, no. 1, pp. 1–8, Feb. 1986.
- [hubaux] M. Felegyhazi and J.-P. Hubaux, "Game theory in wireless networks: a tutorial," *EPFL Technical Report*, LCA-REPORT-2006-002, Feb. 2006.
- [laufer] A. Laufer and A. Leshem, "Distributed coordination of spectrum and the prisoner's dilemma," in *Proc. DySPAN*, 2005.
- [Cagalj] M. Čagalj, S. Ganeriwal, I. Aad, and J.-P. Hubaux, "On selfish behavior in CSMA/CA networks," in *Proc. INFOCOM*, Miami, FL, Mar. 2005.
- [ma] R. T. Ma, V. Misra, and D. Rubenstein, "An analysis of generalized slotted-Aloha protocols," *IEEE/ACM Trans. Netw.*, vol. 17, no. 3, pp. 936–949, Jun. 2009.
- [jpark] J. Park and M. van der Schaar, "Stackelberg contention games in multiuser networks," *EURASIP J. Advances Signal Process.*, vol. 2009, Article ID 305978, 15 pages, 2009.
- [garg] R. Garg, A. Kamra, and V. Khurana, "A game-theoretic approach towards congestion control in communication networks," *Comput. Commun. Review*, vol. 32, no. 3, pp. 47–61, Jul. 2002.
- [basar] T. Başar and R. Srikant, "A Stackelberg network game with a large number of followers," *J. Optimization Theory Applicat.*, vol. 115, no. 3, pp. 479–490, Dec. 2002.
- [La] R. J. La and V. Anantharam, "Optimal routing control: repeated game approach," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 47, no. 3, pp. 437–450, Mar. 2002.
- [korilis] Y. A. Korilis, A. A. Lazar, and A. Orda, "Achieving network optima using Stackelberg routing strategies," *IEEE/ACM Trans. Netw.*, vol. 5, no. 1, pp. 161–173, Feb. 1997.
- [yisu2] Y. Su and M. van der Schaar, "A new perspective on multi-user power control games in interference channels," *IEEE Trans. Wireless Commun.*, vol. 8, no. 6, pp. 2910–2919, Jun. 2009.
- [fudenberg] D. Fudenberg and J. Tirole, *Game Theory*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1991.
- [nash] J. F. Nash, "Equilibrium points in n-person games," *Proc. Nat. Academy Sci.*, vol. 36, no. 1, pp. 48–49, Jan. 1950.
- [stokey] N. L. Stokey and R. E. Lucas (with E. C. Prescott), *Recursive Methods in Economic Dynamics*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Univ. Press, 1989.
- [kandori] M. Kandori and I. Obara, "Efficiency in repeated games revisited: the role of private strategies," *Econometrica*, vol. 74, no. 2, pp. 499–519, Mar. 2006.
- [mailath] G. Mailath and L. Samuelson, *Repeated Games and Reputations: Long-run Relationships*. Oxford, U.K.: Oxford Univ. Press, 2006.




Figure 1. Two types of intervention in the resource sharing scenario.




Figure 2. Performance improvement through an intervention scheme.




Figure 3. The graph of the function $w_0(\alpha)$ defined in (1): (a) $v_0^* = \tilde{v}_0$ ($p = 0.9$), (b) $v_0^* = w_0(\bar{\alpha})$ ($p = 0.94$), and (c) $v_0^* = w_0(1)$ ($p = 0.96$). (The dotted lines display $\tilde{v}_0 = y_p a_L$.)




Figure 4. A communication scenario that fits into the example in Section 3.2.



Figure 5. Plot of \mathcal{E}^* as dark regions for the different values of \bar{a}_0 in the example of Section 4.2.




Figure 6. Plot of u_i against a_i when the manager chooses the affine intervention rule (19) and the other user chooses a_l .