

Integer Programming Games

Other titles in Foundations and Trends® in Optimization

Multi-agent Online Optimization

Deming Yuan, Alexandre Proutiere and Guodong Shi

ISBN: 978-1-63828-482-6

An Invitation to Deep Reinforcement Learning

Bernhard Jaeger and Andreas Geiger

ISBN: 978-1-63828-440-6

*Constrained Reinforcement Learning with Average Reward Objective:
Model-Based and Model-Free Algorithms*

Vaneet Aggarwal, Washim Uddin Mondal and Qinbo Bai

ISBN: 978-1-63828-396-6

*Stochastic Optimization Methods for Policy Evaluation in Reinforcement
Learning*

Yi Zhou and Shaocong Ma

ISBN: 978-1-63828-370-6

Numerical Methods for Convex Multistage Stochastic Optimization

Guanghai Lan and Alexander Shapiro

ISBN: 978-1-63828-350-8

A Tutorial on Hadamard Semidifferentials

Kenneth Lange

ISBN: 978-1-63828-348-5

Integer Programming Games

Margarida Carvalho

Université de Montréal
carvalho@iro.umontreal.ca

Gabriele Dragotto

Princeton University
gabriele@dragotto.net

Andrea Lodi

Cornell Tech and Technion - IIT
andrea.lodi@cornell.edu

Sriram Sankaranarayanan

Indian Institute of Management Ahmedabad
srirams@iima.ac.in

now

the essence of knowledge

Boston — Delft

Foundations and Trends[®] in Optimization

Published, sold and distributed by:

now Publishers Inc.
PO Box 1024
Hanover, MA 02339
United States
Tel. +1-781-985-4510
www.nowpublishers.com
sales@nowpublishers.com

Outside North America:

now Publishers Inc.
PO Box 179
2600 AD Delft
The Netherlands
Tel. +31-6-51115274

The preferred citation for this publication is

M. Carvalho *et al.*. *Integer Programming Games*. Foundations and Trends[®] in Optimization, vol. 7, no. 4, pp. 264–391, 2025.

ISBN: 978-1-63828-517-5
© 2025 M. Carvalho *et al.*

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior written permission of the publishers.

Photocopying. In the USA: This journal is registered at the Copyright Clearance Center, Inc., 222 Rosewood Drive, Danvers, MA 01923. Authorization to photocopy items for internal or personal use, or the internal or personal use of specific clients, is granted by now Publishers Inc for users registered with the Copyright Clearance Center (CCC). The 'services' for users can be found on the internet at: www.copyright.com

For those organizations that have been granted a photocopy license, a separate system of payment has been arranged. Authorization does not extend to other kinds of copying, such as that for general distribution, for advertising or promotional purposes, for creating new collective works, or for resale. In the rest of the world: Permission to photocopy must be obtained from the copyright owner. Please apply to now Publishers Inc., PO Box 1024, Hanover, MA 02339, USA; Tel. +1 781 871 0245; www.nowpublishers.com; sales@nowpublishers.com

now Publishers Inc. has an exclusive license to publish this material worldwide. Permission to use this content must be obtained from the copyright license holder. Please apply to now Publishers, PO Box 179, 2600 AD Delft, The Netherlands, www.nowpublishers.com; e-mail: sales@nowpublishers.com

Foundations and Trends[®] in Optimization

Volume 7, Issue 4, 2025

Editorial Board

Editors-in-Chief

Garud Iyengar
Columbia University

Editors

Dimitris Bertsimas
Massachusetts Institute of Technology

John R. Birge
The University of Chicago

Robert E. Bixby
Rice University

Emmanuel Candes
Stanford University

David Donoho
Stanford University

Laurent El Ghaoui
University of California, Berkeley

Donald Goldfarb
Columbia University

Michael I. Jordan
University of California, Berkeley

Zhi-Quan (Tom) Luo
University of Minnesota, Twin Cities

George L. Nemhauser
Georgia Institute of Technology

Arkadi Nemirovski
Georgia Institute of Technology

Yurii Nesterov
HSE University

Jorge Nocedal
Northwestern University

Pablo A. Parrilo
Massachusetts Institute of Technology

Boris T. Polyak
Institute for Control Science, Moscow

Tamás Terlaky
Lehigh University

Michael J. Todd
Cornell University

Kim-Chuan Toh
National University of Singapore

John N. Tsitsiklis
Massachusetts Institute of Technology

Lieven Vandenbergh
University of California, Los Angeles

Robert J. Vanderbei
Princeton University

Stephen J. Wright
University of Wisconsin

Editorial Scope

Foundations and Trends[®] in Optimization publishes survey and tutorial articles in the following topics:

- algorithm design, analysis, and implementation (especially, on modern computing platforms)
- models and modeling systems, new optimization formulations for practical problems
- applications of optimization in machine learning, statistics, and data analysis, signal and image processing, computational economics and finance, engineering design, scheduling and resource allocation, and other areas

Information for Librarians

Foundations and Trends[®] in Optimization, 2025, Volume 7, 4 issues. ISSN paper version 2167-3888. ISSN online version 2167-3918. Also available as a combined paper and online subscription.


Contents

Preface	3
1 Definitions and Preliminaries	5
1.1 Types of Games	5
1.2 Equilibria	9
2 Simultaneous Games - Analysis	12
2.1 Basic Properties of Equilibria	12
2.2 Convex Games	20
2.3 Best-response Dynamics	23
2.4 Complexity Results	30
3 Simultaneous Games - Algorithms	41
3.1 Solving Complementarity Problems and Convex Games	41
3.2 Solving Finite Games	47
3.3 Solving ILPSGs	55
4 Bilevel Programming - Analysis	67
4.1 Properties of Bilevel Programs	68
4.2 Representability of Bilevel Programs	81
4.3 Special Families of Bilevel Games	84
4.4 Complexity Results	87


5 Bilevel Programming - Algorithms	94
5.1 Exact Algorithms	94
5.2 Fixed-parameter Tractable Algorithms	112
5.3 Approximation Algorithms	115
List of Algorithms	120
References	121

Integer Programming Games

Margarida Carvalho¹, Gabriele Dragotto², Andrea Lodi³ and Sriram Sankaranarayanan⁴

¹*Université de Montréal, Canada; carvalho@iro.umontreal.ca* 

²*Princeton University, USA; gabriele@dragotto.net* 

³*Cornell Tech, USA and Technion - Israel Institute of Technology, Israel; andrea.lodi@cornell.edu* 

⁴*Indian Institute of Management Ahmedabad, India; srirams@iima.ac.in* 

ABSTRACT

We provide a comprehensive survey of Integer Programming Games (IPGs), focusing on both simultaneous games and bilevel programs. These games are characterized by integral constraints within the players' strategy sets. We start from the fundamental definitions of these games and various solution concepts associated with them, and derive the properties of the games and the solution concepts. For each of the two types of games – simultaneous and bilevel – we have one section dedicated to the analysis of the games and another section dedicated to the development and analyses of algorithms to solve them. The analyses sections present results on the computational complexity of the general game as well as various other restricted versions. These sections also discuss the structural properties of the games and the equilibrium concepts associated with them. The algorithm sections, in contrast, present some of the state-of-the-art algorithms developed to solve these games, either exactly, approximately or fast under fixed-parameter assumptions.

Margarida Carvalho, Gabriele Dragotto, Andrea Lodi and Sriram Sankaranarayanan (2025), “Integer Programming Games”, Foundations and Trends® in Optimization: Vol. 7, No. 4, pp 264–391. DOI: 10.1561/24000000040.

©2025 M. Carvalho *et al.*

These sections also contain proofs of the correctness of these algorithms and an assessment of their theoretical run times in the worst-case scenario.

Preface

Game theory has been a powerful tool to model the strategic interaction between multiple players when their objectives are in conflict. The domain has a long history in the economics literature, where this has been used to model the behavior of firms. One of the foundational results in this area is the existence of Nash equilibria in finite games, which was proved by Nash in the 1950s. Since then, a variety of games have been studied in the literature, including games where players make moves sequentially, games with uncertainty in payoffs, games with asymmetry in information between players, and so on.

In the traditional sense, a handful of strategies are considered, with the payoffs described for every combination of strategies picked by the followers. Many standard references [37, 51, for example] provide a comprehensive overview of such games and the solution concepts associated with them. This is where mathematical programming games, in particular, integer programming games, take a different approach. We do not restrict ourselves to a handful of strategies or even set of strategies that can be *nicely described* (for example, an interval). Instead, we allow each player's set of actions to be described by a set of constraints – for example, as mixed-integer points in a polyhedron. They warrant attention in many applications, where strategic decision makers are *actually* solving optimization problems to identify their decisions, and their payoffs are also determined by the actions of other similar

strategic players. Thus, it becomes important to identify various types of equilibria in these games, and to develop algorithms to compute them.

This survey focuses on optimization-based approaches to study such games and the solution concepts associated with them. In particular, the focus is towards two classes of games – simultaneous games and bilevel programs. For each of these families of games, which has developed a rich literature over the past decade, we provide a set of analytical results, which helps the reader better understand the structure of the problem. These results, where possible, are also interspersed with a collection of examples that assist in understanding the concepts better. We also comment, where possible, on the computational complexity of determining various solution concepts in these games. Following such analysis, we also provide a set of algorithms that have been developed to solve these games, and provide a theoretical analysis of their performance.

We also note that we have been selective about certain algorithms, (i) based on their simplicity and (ii) with a motivation to capture a large variety of ideas, rather than a complete deep dive on a single family of algorithms. We believe that a more advanced reader can use this survey as a stepping stone to dive deeper into the literature on this topic.

Finally, we note that some topics, which could fall under the broad ambit of games are not considered in this survey. We have not provided any result in the context of cooperative games. We have also not analyzed multi-level games, or even bilevel games where there are more than one “leader” or more than one “follower.” We have not considered games with any uncertainty or asymmetric information between players. The survey focuses exclusively on deterministic games with complete information. We have also not considered special families of simultaneous or bilevel games. For example, bilevel knapsack games define a very active area of research, but we do not provide much attention to such special cases, and restrict ourselves to the general setting.

With that, we believe that this survey will help the reader understand the landscape of integer programming games, and provide a stepping stone for further research in this area.

Margarida, Gabriele, Andrea and Sriram
December 31, 2024

References

- [1] C. Audet, P. Hansen, B. Jaumard, and G. Savard, “Links between linear bilevel and mixed 0–1 programming problems,” *Journal of optimization theory and applications*, vol. 93, 1997, pp. 273–300.
- [2] R. J. Aumann, “Subjectivity and correlation in randomized strategies,” *Journal of mathematical Economics*, vol. 1, no. 1, 1974, pp. 67–96.
- [3] E. Balas, “Intersection cuts—a new type of cutting planes for integer programming,” *Operations Research*, vol. 19, no. 1, 1971, pp. 19–39. DOI: [10.1287/opre.19.1.19](https://doi.org/10.1287/opre.19.1.19).
- [4] A. Basu, C. T. Ryan, and S. Sankaranarayanan, “Mixed-integer bilevel representability,” *Mathematical Programming*, vol. 185, no. 1–2, 2019, pp. 163–197. DOI: [10.1007/s10107-019-01424-w](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10107-019-01424-w).
- [5] W. F. Bialas and M. H. Karwan, “Two-level linear programming,” *Management science*, vol. 30, no. 8, 1984, pp. 1004–1020.
- [6] C. Buchheim, “Bilevel linear optimization belongs to np and admits polynomial-size kkt-based reformulations,” *Operations Research Letters*, vol. 51, no. 6, 2023, pp. 618–622. DOI: [10.1016/j.orl.2023.10.006](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.orl.2023.10.006).
- [7] Q. M. Bui, M. Carvalho, and J. Neto, “Asymmetry in the complexity of the multi-commodity network pricing problem,” *Mathematical Programming*, 2024, pp. 1–37.

- [8] A. Caprara, M. Carvalho, A. Lodi, and G. J. Woeginger, “A study on the computational complexity of the bilevel knapsack problem,” en, *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, vol. 24, no. 2, 2014, pp. 823–838. DOI: [10.1137/130906593](https://doi.org/10.1137/130906593).
- [9] A. Caprara, M. Carvalho, A. Lodi, and G. J. Woeginger, “Bilevel Knapsack with interdiction constraints,” *INFORMS Journal on Computing*, vol. 28, no. 2, 2016, pp. 319–333. DOI: [10.1287/ijoc.2015.0676](https://doi.org/10.1287/ijoc.2015.0676).
- [10] M. Carvalho, “A note on the complexity of integer programming games,” 2019. DOI: [10.48550/ARXIV.1907.11338](https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.1907.11338).
- [11] M. Carvalho, G. Dragotto, F. Feijoo, A. Lodi, and S. Sankaranarayanan, “When Nash meets Stackelberg,” *Management Science*, 2023. DOI: [10.1287/mnsc.2022.03418](https://doi.org/10.1287/mnsc.2022.03418).
- [12] M. Carvalho, G. Dragotto, A. Lodi, and S. Sankaranarayanan, “The Cut and Play algorithm: Computing Nash equilibria via outer approximations,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2111.05726*, 2023.
- [13] M. Carvalho, A. Lodi, and J. P. Pedroso, “Computing equilibria for integer programming games,” en, *European Journal of Operational Research*, 2022. DOI: [10.1016/j.ejor.2022.03.048](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejor.2022.03.048). (accessed on 04/27/2022).
- [14] L. Chen, X. Wu, and G. Zhang, “Approximation algorithms for interdiction problem with packing constraints,” 2022. DOI: [10.48550/ARXIV.2204.11106](https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.2204.11106).
- [15] L. Chen and G. Zhang, “Approximation algorithms for a bi-level knapsack problem,” *Theoretical Computer Science*, vol. 497, 2013, pp. 1–12. DOI: [10.1016/j.tcs.2012.08.008](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tcs.2012.08.008).
- [16] X. Chen, X. Deng, and S.-H. Teng, “Settling the complexity of computing two-player nash equilibria,” *Journal of the ACM*, vol. 56, no. 3, 2009, pp. 1–57. DOI: [10.1145/1516512.1516516](https://doi.org/10.1145/1516512.1516516).
- [17] S.-J. Chung, “Np-completeness of the linear complementarity problem,” *Journal of optimization theory and applications*, vol. 60, 1989, pp. 393–399.
- [18] M. Conforti, G. Cornuéjols, and G. Zambelli, *Integer Programming*, ser. Graduate Texts in Mathematics. Springer International Publishing, 2014. DOI: [10.1007/978-3-319-11008-0](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-11008-0).

- [19] V. Conitzer and T. Sandholm, “New complexity results about nash equilibria,” *Games and Economic Behavior*, vol. 63, no. 2, 2008, pp. 621–641.
- [20] W. Cook, A. M. Gerards, A. Schrijver, and É. Tardos, “Sensitivity theorems in integer linear programming,” *Mathematical Programming*, vol. 34, 1986, pp. 251–264. DOI: [10.1007/BF01582230](https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01582230).
- [21] R. Cottle, J.-S. Pang, and R. E. Stone, *The linear complementarity problem*, SIAM ed., [Classics ed.], ser. Classics in applied mathematics 60. Philadelphia: Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, 2009.
- [22] T. Crönert and S. Minner, “Equilibrium identification and selection in finite games,” en, *Operations Research*, vol. 72, no. 2, 2022, pp. 816–831. DOI: [10.1287/opre.2022.2413](https://doi.org/10.1287/opre.2022.2413).
- [23] C. Daskalakis, P. W. Goldberg, and C. H. Papadimitriou, “The complexity of computing a nash equilibrium,” *SIAM Journal on Computing*, vol. 39, no. 1, 2009, pp. 195–259.
- [24] C. Daskalakis, P. W. Goldberg, and C. H. Papadimitriou, “The complexity of computing a Nash equilibrium,” en, *Communications of the ACM*, vol. 52, no. 2, 2009, pp. 89–97. DOI: [10.1145/1461928.1461951](https://doi.org/10.1145/1461928.1461951).
- [25] S. Dempe and K. Richter, “Bilevel programming with knapsack constraints,” Ph.D. dissertation, TU Bergakademie, Fakultät für Mathematik und Informatik, 2000.
- [26] S. DeNegre, “Interdiction and discrete bilevel linear programming,” English, Ph.D. dissertation, Lehigh University, 2011, p. 184. URL: <https://www.proquest.com/docview/872083062/691B4CDD4A6C4E15PQ>.
- [27] S. P. Dirkse and M. C. Ferris, “The PATH solver: a nonmonotone stabilization scheme for mixed complementarity problems,” en, *Optimization Methods and Software*, vol. 5, no. 2, 1995, pp. 123–156. (accessed on 03/19/2021).
- [28] C. E. J. Eggermont and G. J. Woeginger, “Motion planning with pulley, rope, and baskets,” *Theory of Computing Systems*, vol. 53, no. 4, 2013, pp. 569–582. DOI: [10.1007/s00224-013-9445-4](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00224-013-9445-4).

- [29] F. Eisenbrand and G. Shmonin, “Parametric integer programming in fixed dimension,” *Mathematics of Operations Research*, vol. 33, no. 4, 2008, pp. 839–850. DOI: [10.1287/moor.1080.0320](https://doi.org/10.1287/moor.1080.0320).
- [30] F. Eisenbrand and R. Weismantel, “Proximity results and faster algorithms for integer programming using the steinitz lemma,” in *Proceedings of the Twenty-Ninth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms*, Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics (SIAM), pp. 808–816, 2018.
- [31] F. Facchinei and J.-S. Pang, *Finite-Dimensional Variational Inequalities and Complementarity Problems*, en, ser. Springer Series in Operations Research and Financial Engineering. Springer New York, 2004. DOI: [10.1007/b97543](https://doi.org/10.1007/b97543).
- [32] M. Fischetti, I. Ljubić, M. Monaci, and M. Sinnl, “A new general-purpose algorithm for mixed-integer bilevel linear programs,” *Operations Research*, vol. 65, no. 6, 2017, pp. 1615–1637. DOI: [10.1287/opre.2017.1650](https://doi.org/10.1287/opre.2017.1650).
- [33] M. Fischetti, I. Ljubić, M. Monaci, and M. Sinnl, “On the use of intersection cuts for bilevel optimization,” *Mathematical Programming*, vol. 172, no. 1–2, 2017, pp. 77–103. DOI: [10.1007/s10107-017-1189-5](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10107-017-1189-5).
- [34] M. Fischetti, M. Monaci, and M. Sinnl, “A dynamic reformulation heuristic for generalized interdiction problems,” *European Journal of Operational Research*, vol. 267, no. 1, 2018, pp. 40–51. DOI: [10.1016/j.ejor.2017.11.043](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejor.2017.11.043).
- [35] S. A. Gabriel, R. García-Bertrand, P. Sahakij, and A. J. Conejo, “A practical approach to approximate bilinear functions in mathematical programming problems by using schur’s decomposition and sos type 2 variables,” *Journal of the Operational Research Society*, vol. 57, no. 8, 2006, pp. 995–1004. DOI: [10.1057/palgrave.jors.2602052](https://doi.org/10.1057/palgrave.jors.2602052).
- [36] S. Ghadimi and M. Wang, “Approximation methods for bilevel programming,” 2018. DOI: [10.48550/ARXIV.1802.02246](https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.1802.02246).
- [37] R. Gibbons, *Game Theory for Applied Economists*. Princeton University Press, 1992.

- [38] I. Gilboa and E. Zemel, “Nash and correlated equilibria: Some complexity considerations,” *Games and Economic Behavior*, vol. 1, no. 1, 1989, pp. 80–93. DOI: [10.1016/0899-8256\(89\)90006-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/0899-8256(89)90006-7).
- [39] Gurobi Optimization, LLC, *Gurobi Optimizer Reference Manual*, 2023. URL: <https://www.gurobi.com>.
- [40] P. Hansen, B. Jaumard, and G. Savard, “New branch-and-bound rules for linear bilevel programming,” *SIAM Journal on scientific and Statistical Computing*, vol. 13, no. 5, 1992, pp. 1194–1217.
- [41] R. Jeroslow, “The polynomial hierarchy and a simple model for competitive analysis,” *Mathematical Programming*, vol. 32, 1985, pp. 146–164.
- [42] S. Kakutani, “A generalization of brouwer’s fixed point theorem,” *Duke Mathematical Journal*, vol. 8, no. 3, 1941, pp. 457–459.
- [43] T. Kleinert and M. Schmidt, “Why there is no need to use a big-M in linear bilevel optimization: a computational study of two ready-to-use approaches,” en, *Computational Management Science*, vol. 20, no. 1, 2023, p. 3.
- [44] M. Köppe, M. Queyranne, and C. T. Ryan, “Parametric integer programming algorithm for bilevel mixed integer programs,” *Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications*, vol. 146, no. 1, 2010, pp. 137–150. DOI: [10.1007/s10957-010-9668-3](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10957-010-9668-3).
- [45] M. Labbé, P. Marcotte, and G. Savard, “A bilevel model of taxation and its application to optimal highway pricing,” *Management science*, vol. 44, no. 12-part-1, 1998, pp. 1608–1622.
- [46] C. E. Lemke and J. T. Howson Jr., “Equilibrium Points of Bimatrix Games,” en, *Journal of the Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics*, vol. 12, no. 2, 1964, pp. 413–423. DOI: [10.1137/0112033](https://doi.org/10.1137/0112033). (accessed on 10/21/2019).
- [47] C. E. Lemke, “Some pivot schemes for the linear complementarity problem,” *Complementarity and Fixed Point Problems*, 1978, pp. 15–35.
- [48] H. W. Lenstra, “Integer programming with a fixed number of variables,” *Mathematics of Operations Research*, vol. 8, no. 4, 1983, pp. 538–548. DOI: [10.1287/moor.8.4.538](https://doi.org/10.1287/moor.8.4.538).

- [49] L. Lozano and J. C. Smith, “A value-function-based exact approach for the bilevel mixed-integer programming problem,” *Operations Research*, vol. 65, no. 3, 2017, pp. 768–786. DOI: [10.1287/opre.2017.1589](https://doi.org/10.1287/opre.2017.1589).
- [50] R. Mansi, C. Alves, J. M. Valério de Carvalho, and S. Hanafi, “An exact algorithm for bilevel 0-1 knapsack problems,” *Mathematical Problems in Engineering*, vol. 2012, 2012, pp. 1–23. DOI: [10.1155/2012/504713](https://doi.org/10.1155/2012/504713).
- [51] M. Maschler, S. Zamir, and E. Solan, *Game theory*. Cambridge University Press, 2020.
- [52] G. P. McCormick, “Computability of global solutions to factorable nonconvex programs: Part i — convex underestimating problems,” *Mathematical Programming*, vol. 10, no. 1, 1976, pp. 147–175. DOI: [10.1007/bf01580665](https://doi.org/10.1007/bf01580665).
- [53] D. Monderer and L. S. Shapley, “Potential games,” *Games and economic behavior*, vol. 14, no. 1, 1996, pp. 124–143.
- [54] J. F. Nash, “Equilibrium Points in n-Person Games,” en, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, vol. 36, no. 1, 1950, pp. 48–49.
- [55] J. F. Nash, “Non-Cooperative Games,” en, *The Annals of Mathematics*, vol. 54, no. 2, 1951, p. 286. DOI: [10.2307/1969529](https://doi.org/10.2307/1969529). (accessed on 12/16/2020).
- [56] N. Nisan, T. Roughgarden, E. Tardos, and V. V. Vazirani, “Algorithmic game theory,” *Book available for free online*, 2007. URL: <https://www.cs.cmu.edu/~sandholm/cs15-892F13/algorithmic-game-theory.pdf>.
- [57] J. Nocedal and S. J. Wright, *Numerical optimization*. Springer, 1999.
- [58] R. Porter, E. Nudelman, and Y. Shoham, “Simple search methods for finding a Nash equilibrium,” en, *Games and Economic Behavior*, vol. 63, no. 2, 2008, pp. 642–662. DOI: [10.1016/j.geb.2006.03.015](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geb.2006.03.015). (accessed on 08/11/2020).
- [59] X. Qiu and W. Kern, “Improved approximation algorithms for a bilevel knapsack problem,” *Theoretical Computer Science*, vol. 595, 2015, pp. 120–129. DOI: [10.1016/j.tcs.2015.06.027](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tcs.2015.06.027).

- [60] S. M. Robinson, “Normal maps induced by linear transformations,” *Mathematics of Operations Research*, vol. 17, no. 3, 1992, pp. 691–714. DOI: [10.1287/moor.17.3.691](https://doi.org/10.1287/moor.17.3.691).
- [61] B. Rodrigues, M. Carvalho, and M. Anjos, *Unboundedness in bilevel optimization*, Optimization Online, 2024. URL: <https://optimization-online.org/?p=28405>.
- [62] J. B. Rosen, “Existence and uniqueness of equilibrium points for concave n-person games,” *Econometrica: Journal of the Econometric Society*, 1965, pp. 520–534.
- [63] R. W. Rosenthal, “A class of games possessing pure-strategy Nash equilibria,” en, *International Journal of Game Theory*, vol. 2, no. 1, 1973, pp. 65–67. DOI: [10.1007/BF01737559](https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01737559). (accessed on 11/14/2022).
- [64] S. Sankaranarayanan, “Best-response algorithms for integer convex quadratic simultaneous games,” *SSRN Electronic Journal*, 2024. DOI: [10.2139/ssrn.4827001](https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4827001).
- [65] S. Sankaranarayanan and V. S. Vatsalya, *Proximity-based approximation algorithms for integer bilevel programs*, 2024. URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2412.15940>.
- [66] S. Schwarze and O. Stein, “A branch-and-prune algorithm for discrete Nash equilibrium problems,” *Computational Optimization and Applications*, 2023, pp. 1–29.
- [67] S. Siddiqui and S. A. Gabriel, “An sos1-based approach for solving mpecs with a natural gas market application,” *Networks and Spatial Economics*, vol. 13, no. 2, 2012, pp. 205–227. DOI: [10.1007/s11067-012-9178-y](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11067-012-9178-y).
- [68] N. D. Stein, A. Ozdaglar, and P. A. Parrilo, “Separable and low-rank continuous games,” en, *International Journal of Game Theory*, vol. 37, no. 4, 2008, pp. 475–504. DOI: [10.1007/s00182-008-0129-2](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00182-008-0129-2). (accessed on 03/24/2021).
- [69] L. Vicente, G. Savard, and J. Júdice, “Discrete linear bilevel programming problem,” *Journal of optimization theory and applications*, vol. 89, 1996, pp. 597–614.
- [70] L. Wang and P. Xu, “The watermelon algorithm for the bilevel integer linear programming problem,” *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, vol. 27, no. 3, 2017, pp. 1403–1430. DOI: [10.1137/15m1051592](https://doi.org/10.1137/15m1051592).

- [71] M. Werman and D. Magagnosc, “The relationship between integer and real solutions of constrained convex programming,” *Mathematical Programming*, vol. 51, 1991, pp. 133–135. DOI: [10.1007/BF01586929](https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01586929).
- [72] B. Yu, J. E. Mitchell, and J.-S. Pang, “Solving linear programs with complementarity constraints using branch-and-cut,” en, *Mathematical Programming Computation*, vol. 11, no. 2, 2018, pp. 267–310. DOI: [10.1007/s12532-018-0149-2](https://doi.org/10.1007/s12532-018-0149-2). (accessed on 03/20/2021).