UDC: 005.53:005.21]:519.83
Professional paper

UNDERSTANDING THE NASH EQUILIBRIUM: ITS THEORY, METHODS, AND APPLICATIONS IN STRATEGIC DECISION-MAKING

Edona A. D.[1], Edin D.[2], Alit I.[3], Miranda XH.[4]

[1*] *Mr.Sc. in Mathematics, Independent Researcher, North Macedonia*
[2] *Mr.Sc. in Mathematics, Independent Researcher, North Macedonia*
[3] *Department of Mathematics, Faculty of FNSM, North Macedonia*
[4] *Department of Mathematics, Faculty of FNSM, North Macedonia*
[*]*Corresponding Author: e-mail: e.ajeti233156@unite.edu.mk*

Abstract

This paper provides a comprehensive study of Nash Equilibrium, a fundamental concept in game theory that models strategic interactions among rational decision-makers. We begin by establishing the theoretical foundations of strategic games and the formal definition of Nash Equilibrium, then proceed to analytical techniques for identifying equilibria under both pure and mixed strategy settings. The Prisoner's Dilemma is presented as a canonical example, illustrating how rational individual decisions can lead to collectively suboptimal outcomes. The study further explores a range of methods for equilibrium identification, including dominance analysis, best-response dynamics, and computational tools such as the Lemke–Howson algorithm. Applications are examined across various fields, including economics, where firms adjust their strategies in competitive markets; political science, where electoral campaigns and international relations are modeled; behavioral sciences, where concepts such as trust and cooperation are evaluated; and artificial intelligence, where autonomous agents operate within shared environments. Additionally, this research highlights the limitations of Nash Equilibrium, particularly its assumptions of rationality, complete information, and static interactions. These challenges highlight the importance of exercising caution when applying equilibrium concepts in real-world scenarios. Through theoretical exposition, illustrative examples, and practical case studies, the paper aims to deepen understanding of how strategic decisions are formed and interpreted. By situating Nash Equilibrium in diverse contexts, this work affirms its enduring relevance while acknowledging the complexity of modeling human and institutional behavior in strategic settings.

Keywords: Nash Equilibrium, Game Theory, Strategic Interaction, Dominance, Payoff Matrix.

1. Introduction

Game theory is all about understanding how people (or even companies, countries, or animals) make decisions when they know their choices depend on what others do. It is a way of thinking that takes us beyond simple cause and effect, diving into the complex world of strategy, competition, and cooperation. Whether we realize it or not, game theory is everywhere — from the way businesses set prices to the tactics we use in negotiations and even the way animals compete for resources in the wild.

The story of game theory begins with John von Neumann, a brilliant mathematician who, in 1928, laid the groundwork with his study of two-player zero-sum games — situations where one player's gain is another's loss. But game theory didn't stop there. In 1944, von Neumann teamed up with economist Oskar Morgenstern to publish *Theory of Games and Economic Behavior* (von Neumann & Morgenstern, 1944). This book transformed what was once a niche area of mathematics into a powerful tool for understanding competitive behavior in economics and beyond.

But the real game changer came in 1950 when John Nash, a young mathematician, introduced a concept that would forever reshape game theory: Nash Equilibrium. Imagine a situation where no one can do better by changing their strategy — as long as everyone else sticks with theirs.

That’s Nash Equilibrium in a nutshell. It’s not just about winning or losing; it’s about finding a balance where everyone is making the best choice they can, given what everyone else is doing (Nash, 1951). Nash’s idea expanded game theory beyond zero-sum scenarios, making it useful in a world full of complex, non-zero-sum interactions.

What makes Nash Equilibrium so powerful is how widely it applies. Economists use it to understand how markets work and how companies compete (Fudenberg & Tirole, 1991; Myerson, 1991). Political scientists use it to analyze elections, international negotiations, and alliances (Osborne, 2004). Even psychologists use it to explore how people make decisions in social situations. The beauty of Nash Equilibrium is that it offers a way to think about any situation where multiple decision-makers — whether they are individuals, companies, or countries — are trying to figure out the best move (Shoham & Leyton-Brown, 2009).

In this paper, we will take a journey through the world of Nash Equilibrium, starting with the basics of game theory itself. We will then dig deeper into the concept of Nash Equilibrium, exploring what it means, how it works, and why it matters. We will look at both pure strategies, where players make clear, consistent choices, and mixed strategies, where they might choose randomly. Along the way, we will see how Nash Equilibrium can be calculated and applied, complete with practical examples that bring the theory to life (Osborne, 2004; Fudenberg & Tirole, 1991).

By the end of this exploration, you will not only understand what Nash Equilibrium is but also see how it can help make sense of the strategic decisions we encounter in everyday life — from the choices we make in business and politics to the way we navigate personal interactions. Nash Equilibrium is more than just a mathematical concept; it’s a lens through which we can better understand the world (Shoham & Leyton-Brown, 2009).

2. Theoretical background

A strategic game is a mathematical model of interaction between multiple decision-makers. In such settings, the participants are referred to as players. Each player has a set of possible actions to choose from, and the result of their decision depends not only on their own choice but also on the choices of others. This means the outcome for each player is determined by the combination of strategies chosen by all players involved (**Osborne, 2004; Fudenberg & Tirole, 1991**).

In a strategic game, players have preferences over the full profile of actions—meaning, they evaluate outcomes based on the set of choices made by everyone. These preferences can be described in various ways, such as through utility functions or by ranking the desirability of different outcomes (**Myerson, 1991**).

Formally, a strategic game with ordinal preferences consists of:

- A set of players: $N = \{1, 2, \ldots, n\}$, where n is the total number of players.
- For each player, a set of available actions: S_i, representing the strategy set for player i.
- For each player, a preference ordering over the set of possible action profiles.

If players’ preferences can be represented by utility functions, we denote them as:

$$u_i : S_1 \times S_2 \times \ldots \times S_n \rightarrow \mathbb{R},$$

where each player prefers outcomes that result in a higher utility value according to their own function u_i (**Shoham & Leyton-Brown, 2009**).

Many real-world scenarios can be modeled as strategic games. For example, players could be firms, with strategies such as pricing decisions, and their preferences could reflect profits. Alternatively, players might be political candidates choosing campaign spending strategies, with preferences linked to their probability of winning. Even animals competing over resources can be modeled as players, where strategies might represent timing of actions, and preferences relate to survival or dominance (**Osborne, 2004**).

As in individual rational choice theory, it is often helpful to define preferences via utility functions. However, it's important to note that these functions represent ordinal rankings only. For example, if a player has utilities of 1, 2, and 10 for different action profiles, the only conclusion we can draw is that the player prefers the third option over the second and the second over the first—the actual numbers have no inherent meaning beyond the order (**Myerson, 1991**).

In this model, time is not explicitly included. Each player selects their action once, and choices are made simultaneously—meaning that when a player chooses an action, they do not know the others' choices. For this reason, such games are often referred to as simultaneous-move games (**Osborne, 2004**). Nevertheless, a strategy can involve conditional rules that account for future scenarios. For instance, one could define a strategy like: "If stock X falls below $10, buy 100 shares; otherwise, do nothing." This is why actions are often referred to as strategies. Still, the lack of time dynamics in the model means that players are assumed to commit to their strategies fully from the outset, without the opportunity to revise their plans mid-game.

2.1. An example of Prisoner's Dilemma: A classic illustration of a strategic game and the concept of Nash Equilibrium is the Prisoner's Dilemma (Osborne, 2004; Fudenberg & Tirole, 1991). In this scenario, two suspects are held in separate cells and are given the option to either confess or remain silent. The outcome for each suspect depends on the combination of their decisions.

- If both remain silent, they each receive a relatively light sentence.
- If one confesses while the other remains silent, the confessor is released while the other receives a heavy sentence.
- If both confess, they each receive a moderate sentence.

This interaction can be represented with the following payoff matrix, where the values indicate years in prison for each prisoner:

Prisoner B / Prisoner A	Confess	Silent
Confess	(1,1)	(0,20)
Silent	(20,0)	(5,5)

- (5, 5): Both remain silent—each gets 5 years.
- (0, 20): A confesses, B stays silent—A is freed, B gets 20 years.
- (20, 0): A stays silent, B confesses—A gets 20 years, B is freed.
- (1, 1): Both confess—each gets 1 year.

From the perspective of each player, confessing always results in a better or equal outcome, regardless of the other player's choice. This confesses the dominant strategy for both. As a result, both players choose to confess, even though they would have been better off if they had both remained silent. The Nash Equilibrium here is the outcome where both players confess—an outcome that is rational from an individual perspective, but suboptimal from a collective one (Osborne, 2004; Fudenberg & Tirole, 1991)..

This example is central to understanding how rational choices can lead to inefficient group outcomes, particularly in situations where trust or cooperation is limited. The Prisoner's Dilemma provides a foundation for analyzing broader strategic interactions in economics, politics, and other fields (Shoham & Leyton-Brown, 2009).

For example, in economics, firms may face similar situations when setting prices in competitive markets. The Nash Equilibrium helps predict how each firm might act, knowing that the others are also optimizing their strategies (Myerson, 1991). Similarly, governments use game theory to design auctions and other mechanisms where participants' strategies affect collective outcomes (Osborne, 2004). Overall, the concept of Nash Equilibrium helps explain how individually rational decisions can sometimes lead to results that are not ideal for the group as a whole—a phenomenon commonly referred to as the "tragedy of the commons" (Hardin, 1968; Shoham & Leyton-Brown, 2009), where the lack of coordination leads to the overuse or depletion of shared resources.

2.2. Formal definition of Nash Equilibrium: A Nash Equilibrium is a strategy profile in which no player can improve their payoff by unilaterally changing their strategy, assuming other players' strategies remain unchanged.
Formally, for a game with players $i = 1,2,\dots,n$, and strategy sets S_i for each player, a strategy profile $(s_1^*, s_2^*, \dots, s_n^*,)$ is a Nash Equilibrium if, for every player i, and for any alternative strategy $s_i \in S_i$:

$$u_i(s_i^*, s_{-i}^*) \geq u_i(s_i, s_{-i}^*)$$

where s_{-i}^* denotes the strategies of all players other than player i, and u_i is the payoff function of player i. This condition ensures that no player has an incentive to deviate from their equilibrium strategy (Osborne, 2004; Fudenberg & Tirole, 1991; Myerson, 1991).

3. Methods for Finding Nash Equilibrium

Nash Equilibrium represents a situation in which no player can benefit by changing their strategy alone, assuming others stick to theirs. Several methods are commonly used to identify such equilibria:

3.1. Dominance of Strategies: A strategy dominates another if it always yields a better or equal outcome.
Strict dominance: Always strictly better.
Weak dominance: At least as good, and better in some cases.
Eliminating dominated strategies—either directly or iteratively—helps simplify the game and identify possible equilibria.

3.2. Mixed Strategies and Payoff Matrices: When no pure strategy equilibrium exists, players may use mixed strategies, assigning probabilities to their choices. Using payoff matrices, we can analyze outcomes and calculate expected payoffs to identify equilibria in probabilistic terms.

3.3. Best Response: A best response is a player's optimal choice, given the other players' strategies. A Nash Equilibrium is where all players are choosing best responses simultaneously.

3.4. Computational Methods: For complex games, algorithms like the Lemke–Howson method, linear programming, and simulation tools are used to compute equilibria, especially in large-scale or applied scenarios.

4. Applications of Nash Equilibrium

Nash Equilibrium has wide-ranging applications across disciplines where strategic interaction plays a role. Below are some key areas:

4.1. Economics and Business: In markets with competing firms, the Nash Equilibrium helps explain pricing, production, and marketing strategies. For example, in oligopolies, companies often adjust their prices based on the expected behavior of competitors, leading to predictable equilibrium outcomes.

Example 4.1. ***Pepsi and Coca-Cola Pricing Game***

Pepsi and Coca-Cola are two competing firms deciding whether to set a High Price or a Low Price for their products. Their profits (in millions) based on pricing decisions are shown below:

	Coca-Cola: High	Coca-Cola: Low
Pepsi: High	(10,10)	(4,12)
Pepsi: Low	(12,4)	(6,6)

- If both choose **High**, they earn high profits: (10,10).
- If one lowers the price, it gains more profit while the other loses: (12,4) or (4,12).
- If both choose **Low**, they reduce profits: (6,6).

The **Nash Equilibrium** is **(Low, Low)** — neither firm can improve by changing strategy alone. However, it's not the best collective outcome. This reflects real pricing competition, where fear of losing market share leads to price wars, even when cooperation would be more profitable.

4.2. Political Science: It is used to model elections, voting behavior, and international relations. Political parties may choose policies based on what they believe others will do, while nations may form treaties or engage in conflict.

Example 4.2. ***Electoral Strategy***

Imagine two political parties competing in a national election: the Green Party and the Liberty Party. Each must decide whether to focus their campaign on urban or rural areas. The voter base and effectiveness of their messages differ across regions.

	Liberty: Urban Focus	Liberty: Rural Focus
Green: Urban Focus	(4,4)	(5,3)
Green: Rural Focus	(3,5)	(2,2)

If both focus on urban areas, they split the votes evenly. If one party focuses on rural areas while the other stays urban, the rural-focused party wins over an untapped electorate. If both focus on rural regions, they dilute their effectiveness.

Here, **(Urban, Urban)** is a Nash Equilibrium: neither party gains by changing strategy unilaterally. This model demonstrates how Nash Equilibrium can help political analysts predict campaign behavior and design strategies based on the anticipated actions of rivals.

4.3. Behavioral and Social Sciences: In psychology and sociology, Nash Equilibrium is used to study how individuals make decisions in social settings, including cooperation, trust, and negotiation. It explains why people may not always act in a collectively optimal way.

4.4. Artificial Intelligence and Technology: Game-theoretic models are used in AI for decision-making in multi-agent systems, robotics, and machine learning. For example, autonomous vehicles or software agents can use Nash strategies to interact efficiently in shared environments.

5. Limitations of Nash Equilibrium

While Nash Equilibrium is a powerful concept, it also has limitations that affect its applicability in real-world strategic decision-making. Some of the main issues are outlined below:

- ***Assumption of Rationality***

Nash Equilibrium assumes that all players are fully rational and always make decisions that maximize their own utility. In reality, individuals may act irrationally due to cognitive biases, emotions, or a lack of experience.

- ***Complete Information Requirement***

The standard model assumes that players know the game structure, available strategies, and payoffs of all participants. However, in many real-world scenarios, information is incomplete or uncertain, which limits the predictive power of the equilibrium.

- ***Multiple Equilibria***

Some games have more than one Nash Equilibrium, making it difficult to predict which outcome will occur. This raises questions about coordination and equilibrium selection.

- ***Inefficiency of Outcomes***

Nash Equilibrium does not always lead to socially optimal or efficient outcomes. For example, in the Prisoner's Dilemma, the equilibrium results in both players defecting, even though mutual cooperation would be better for both.

- ***Static Framework***

The classic model is static and assumes that players make decisions simultaneously and only once. It does not account for learning, adaptation, or repeated interactions, which are common in real-world strategic environments.

Conclusions

Nash Equilibrium remains a foundational framework in the analysis of strategic decision-making, offering powerful insights into the behavior of rational agents across a variety of domains. From the illustrative simplicity of the Prisoner's Dilemma to the sophisticated interplay of strategies in economic competition or political elections, the concept has proven its analytical strength in both theoretical and applied contexts. Methods for identifying equilibria—ranging from strategy dominance to computational modeling—provide researchers and practitioners with essential tools for predicting and interpreting behavior in multi-agent environments.

However, despite its elegance, the Nash Equilibrium is not without limitations. Its reliance on strong assumptions, such as complete information and perfect rationality, can reduce its realism in practical applications. The presence of multiple equilibria and the potential for inefficient outcomes further complicate its predictive utility. As a static model, it also falls short in capturing the dynamics of learning, adaptation, and repeated interaction that characterize many real-world strategic situations.

Nonetheless, the equilibrium concept continues to evolve, particularly through extensions in evolutionary game theory, learning models, and behavioral economics. As this study has shown, Nash Equilibrium serves not only as a powerful analytical tool but also as a foundation for deeper exploration into the complexities of strategic interaction. Its role in economics, politics, behavioral sciences, and technology affirms its importance in understanding both cooperative and competitive behavior in human and artificial systems.

References

[1] An, B., & Kolokoltsov, V. N. (2021). Evolutionary game theory and its applications to behavioral sciences and AI. *Journal of Mathematical Economics*, 92, 102488. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jmateco.2020.102488

[2] Basu, K., & Weibull, J. W. (2020). Game theory and economic behavior: Recent developments and applications. *Annual Review of Economics*, 12, 1–30. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-economics-081919-050442

[3] Dutta, B., & Ray, D. (2019). Nash equilibrium with limited information: Recent advances and applications. *Journal of Economic Theory*, 181, 104779. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jet.2019.104779

[4] Fudenberg, D., & Tirole, J. (1991). *Game theory*. MIT Press.

[5] Fudenberg, D., & Tirole, J. (2019). *Game theory* (Advanced edition). MIT Press.

[6] Hardin, G. (1968). The tragedy of the commons. *Science*, 162(3859), 1243–1248. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.162.3859.1243

[7] Nash, J. F. (1951). Non-cooperative games. *Annals of Mathematics*, 54(2), 286–295. https://doi.org/10.2307/1969529

[8] Myerson, R. B. (1991). *Game theory: Analysis of conflict*. Harvard University Press.

[9] Osborne, M. J. (2004). *An introduction to game theory*. Oxford University Press.

[10] Roughgarden, T. (2020). *Twenty lectures on algorithmic game theory*. Cambridge University Press.

[11] Shoham, Y., & Leyton-Brown, K. (2009). *Multiagent systems: Algorithmic, game-theoretic, and logical foundations*. Cambridge University Press.

[12] Shoham, Y., & Leyton-Brown, K. (2020). *Multiagent systems: Algorithmic, game-theoretic, and logical foundations* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.

[13] Tirole, J. (1988). *The theory of industrial organization*. MIT Press.

[14] Von Neumann, J., & Morgenstern, O. (1944). *Theory of games and economic behavior*. Princeton University Press.