

Bayes correlated equilibria, no-regret dynamics in Bayesian games, and the price of anarchy

Kaito Fujii

National Institute of Informatics

FUJIIK@NII.AC.JP

Editors: Nika Haghtalab and Ankur Moitra

This paper investigates equilibrium computation and the price of anarchy for Bayesian games, which are the fundamental models of games with incomplete information proposed by [Harsanyi \(1967, 1968a,b\)](#). In normal-form games with complete information, it is known that efficiently computable no-regret dynamics converge to correlated equilibria ([Foster and Vohra, 1997](#); [Hart and Mas-Colell, 2000](#); [Blum and Mansour, 2007](#)), and the price of anarchy for correlated equilibria can be bounded for a broad class of games called smooth games ([Roughgarden, 2015](#)). However, as surveyed by [Forges \(1993\)](#), there are various non-equivalent extensions of correlated equilibria, which are collectively called *Bayes correlated equilibria*. For example, *communication equilibria* are naturally realized by introducing a mediator who can bidirectionally communicate with players ([Myerson, 1982](#); [Forges, 1986](#)). Other extensions include *strategic-form correlated equilibria* (SFCEs) and *agent-normal-form correlated equilibria* (ANFCEs), which are defined as correlated equilibria of complete-information interpretations of Bayesian games called the strategic form and agent normal form, respectively.

In this paper, we present *the intersection of communication equilibria and ANFCEs* as an equilibrium concept that is efficiently computable and has PoA bounds for various games. Our contributions are summarized as follows.

- This paper proposes a variant of swap regret, which we call *untruthful swap regret*. If each player minimizes it in repeated play of Bayesian games, the empirical distribution of these dynamics is guaranteed to converge to this intersection class.
- We propose an efficient algorithm for minimizing the untruthful swap regret with regret upper bound $O(\sqrt{T} \max\{\log |\Theta_i|, |A_i| \log |A_i|\})$, where T is the number of rounds, $|\Theta_i|$ is the number of types, and $|A_i|$ is the number of actions.
- We show that this upper bound is tight in terms of the number of types by providing a problem instance for which no algorithm can achieve untruthful swap regret better than $\Omega(\sqrt{T \log |\Theta_i|})$.
- For smooth games and mechanisms, we extend existing lower bounds on the price of anarchy based on the smoothness arguments from Bayes–Nash equilibria to equilibria obtained by the proposed dynamics.¹

Acknowledgements

This work was supported by JSPS KAKENHI Grant Number 22K17857.

1. Extended abstract. Full version appears as [[arXiv:2304.05005](#)].

References

- Avrim Blum and Yishay Mansour. From external to internal regret. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 8:1307–1324, 2007.
- Françoise Forges. An approach to communication equilibria. *Econometrica*, pages 1375–1385, 1986.
- Françoise Forges. Five legitimate definitions of correlated equilibrium in games with incomplete information. *Theory and Decision*, 35:277–310, 1993.
- Dean P Foster and Rakesh V Vohra. Calibrated learning and correlated equilibrium. *Games and Economic Behavior*, 21(1-2):40–55, 1997.
- John C. Harsanyi. Games with incomplete information played by “Bayesian” players, I–III part I. The basic model. *Management Science*, 14(3):159–182, 1967.
- John C. Harsanyi. Games with incomplete information played by “Bayesian” players part II. Bayesian equilibrium points. *Management Science*, 14(5):320–334, 1968a.
- John C. Harsanyi. Games with incomplete information played by ‘Bayesian’ players, part III. The basic probability distribution of the game. *Management Science*, 14(7):486–502, 1968b.
- Sergiu Hart and Andreu Mas-Colell. A simple adaptive procedure leading to correlated equilibrium. *Econometrica*, 68(5):1127–1150, 2000.
- Roger B Myerson. Optimal coordination mechanisms in generalized principal–agent problems. *Journal of Mathematical Economics*, 10(1):67–81, 1982.
- Tim Roughgarden. Intrinsic robustness of the price of anarchy. *Journal of the ACM*, 62(5):32:1–32:42, 2015.