

Static MFG.

- Static games means they has no time component.

(i) Limit Theorems:

Def: Action space A is cpt metric

i) Strategy profile is vector $(a_1, \dots, a_n) \in A^n$.

$$\dots a_n) \in A^n.$$

ii) Objective func. of player i in n -player game is $J_i^n : A^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$.

Rank: Player i 's goal is to choose a_i to maximize J_i^n .

iii) Nash equilibrium for n -player is $(a_1, \dots, a_n) \in A^n$. St.

$$J_i^n(a_1, \dots, a_n) \geq J_i^n(a_1, \dots, \tilde{a}_i, a_{i+1}, \dots, a_n)$$

$\forall i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$

if for given $\varepsilon \geq 0$. we have:

$$\hat{J}_i(a_1, \dots, a_n) \geq \hat{J}_i(a_1, \dots, \tilde{a}_i, a_{i+1}, \dots, a_n) - \varepsilon.$$

then we call it ε -Nash equi.

Rmk: Nash equi means each player i is choosing a_i opt. given the other players.

iv) Payoff function $F: A \times P(A) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}'$.

set $\hat{J}_i(a_1, \dots, a_n) \stackrel{\Delta}{=} f(a_i, \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n \delta_{a_j})$

Rmk: The structure is symmetric

i^{th} is only a label. So the name of this game is called anonymous.

Next, we assume $F: A \times P(A) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}'$ is joint conti. w.r.t. (A, W, J)

① Thm. If for each n , given $\Sigma_n \geq 0$.

and Σ_n -push equi. ($\hat{a}_1^n, \dots, \hat{a}_n^n$).

st. $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \Sigma_n = 0$. Denote $\hat{\mu}^n = \sum_{i=1}^n \delta_{\hat{a}_i^n}/n$.

Then: i) (μ_n) is tight in $\mathcal{P}(A)$

ii) For weak limit μ . $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(A)$

$$F(a, \mu) = \sup_{b \in A} F(b, \mu) = 1.$$

Pf: Note A is cpt metric.

$\Rightarrow (\mu_n)$ is pre-cpt \Rightarrow tight.

$$\text{Set } \mu_n^{(i)}(b) := \frac{1}{n} (\delta_b + \sum_{k \neq i} \delta_{a_k^n})$$

Note we have: $\forall i, \forall b \in A$.

$$F(\hat{a}_i^n, \mu_n) \geq F(b, \mu_n^{(i)}) - \Sigma_n.$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \xrightarrow{\text{Avege}} \int_A F(a, \mu_n) \mu_n(da) \geq \frac{1}{n} \sum_i^n F(b, \mu_n^{(i)}) \\ & \quad \downarrow n \rightarrow \infty \quad - \Sigma_n. \end{aligned}$$

$\int_A F(a, \mu) \mu(da)$. by joint cpt;

Combine with the following:

$$W_i \in M_n, M_i(b) \stackrel{i}{\leq} \bar{\pi} = \sum_{k \neq i} \delta(a_k^*, a_k^*) + \delta(a_i^*, b) \stackrel{A \text{ CP}^+}{=} L(a_i^*, b)/n \leq c/n.$$

$$\Rightarrow \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \max_{b \in A} \max_i |F(a_i, M_i(b)) - F(a_i, M_n)| \stackrel{\text{Lip.}}{=} 0$$

S_1 : Set $n_k \rightarrow 0$. we have:

$$\int_A F(a, m') dM(a) \geq F(b, m), \quad \forall b \in A.$$

$$\text{I.e. } \int_A F(a, m') d\mu(a) \geq \sup_b F(b, m)$$

Rmk: Existence of (Σ -) Nash eqn.

may not hold in pure strategy

But it's possible when working

with mixed strategy.

Def: $m \in P(A)$ is called MFE (mean

field equilibrium) if $m \in \text{ext}(F(a,$

$$m)) = \sup_b F(b, m) = 1.$$

Rmk: The Thm shows the limit points of Nash eqn. must be MFE.

② Thm. Uniqueness

If F satisfies the monotonicity condition

$$\int_A (F(a, m_1) - F(a, m_2)) (m_1 - m_2) d\alpha < 0.$$

for $\forall m_1, m_2 \in P(A)$. Then: There's at most one MFE.

Rmk: It's not enough that:

$a \mapsto F(a, m)$ has unique max

point for each m . Since:

$(\delta_{\hat{a}^*(m)})_{m \in P(A)}$ ✓. where $(\hat{a}^*(m))$

is set of maximizer for m .

Pf: If m_1, m_2 are both MFE.

$i, j = 1, 2$

$$\Rightarrow \int_A F(a, m_i) m_j d\alpha - \int_A F(a, m_j) m_i d\alpha \geq 0.$$

$$\text{So: } \int_A (F(a, m_1) - F(a, m_2)) (m_2 - m_1) d\alpha > 0.$$

③ Thm (Converse of Limit Thm)

If $m \in P(A)$ is a MFE. Then:

$\exists c \Sigma_n \geq 0$. and seq of strategy

profiles $(x_k)_{k \geq 1} \subset A$. s.t. (x_1, \dots, x_n)

Σ_n -nash eqns. for n -player and

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_i^{\hat{n}} \delta_{x_i} = m. \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \Sigma_n = 0.$$

Pf: $x_k \stackrel{i.i.d}{\sim} m$. A -valued r.v.'s.

defined on $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$.

Set $\mu_n := \frac{1}{n} \sum_i^{\hat{n}} \delta_{x_k}$. and

$$m_n^{(i)}(\alpha) := \frac{1}{n} (\delta_\alpha + \sum_{k=1}^n \delta_{x_k}).$$

Note $\mu_n \xrightarrow{w} m$. a.s. Next.

prove: $\Sigma_n = \max_{i \in \hat{n}} (\sup_{a \in A} F(a, \mu_n^{(i)}(\alpha)) - F(x_i, \mu_n)) \rightarrow 0$. a.s.

$$\text{Set } \tilde{\Sigma}_n := \max_{i \in \hat{n}} (\sup_{a \in A} F(a, \mu_n) - F(x_i, \mu_n))$$

Note by uniform cont. of $F(a, \cdot)$. (A cpt.)

we have $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} |\Sigma_n - \tilde{\Sigma}_n| = 0$. a.s.

Again $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} |\tilde{\Sigma}_n - \max_{i \leq n} (\sup_{a \in A} F(a, m_i) - F(x_i, m_i))| = 0$.

Since x_i support on M . \Rightarrow "0". a.s.

Rmk: If we require: $\forall n. \Sigma_n = 0$. then

the theorem won't hold.

e.g. $A = [0, 1]$. $F(a, m) := a \int_{[0, 1]} x m(dx)$

$$\Rightarrow MFE = \delta_0, \delta_1$$

The only Nash equi. is:

$$(a_1, \dots, a_n). \quad \forall k. \quad a_k = 1.$$

But $(0, 0 \dots 0)$ is $\frac{1}{n}$ -Nash

equi. $\rightarrow (0, 0 \dots 0 \dots)$.

④ Then (Existence)

There always exists a MFE.

Pf: Lemma: If K is convex cpt. subset
(Kakutani) of locally cpt. t.v.s. and

$\Gamma: K \rightarrow 2^K$. (set-valued). s.t.

i) $\Gamma(x)$ is nonempty, convex. $\forall x$.

ii) Graph $\text{Gr}(\Gamma) = \{(x, y) \in K \times K \mid y \in \Gamma(x)\}$ is closed.

Then: There exists a fix point.

i.e. $x \in \Gamma(x)$

Set: $T: \mathcal{P}(A) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(A)$. defined by

$$\begin{aligned} T(\eta) &:= \{m \in \mathcal{P}(A) \mid m \sim n \in A \mid F(n, m) \\ &= \sup_{b \in A} F(b, m) = 1\}. \end{aligned}$$

Next, we check the conditions of Lm.

i) $\mathcal{P}(A)$ is cpt. convex. of $M(A)$. the space of signed measures.

2') $S = \{a \in A \mid F(a, \mu) = \sup_A F(a, \mu)\} \neq \emptyset$.

Since F is conti.

$\Rightarrow T^c(\mu) \neq \emptyset$. for $\forall \mu \in P(A)$.

And $T^c(\mu)$ is convex is trivial.

3') $Gr(T) = \bigcap_{b \in A} K_b$, where we have

$$K_b := \{c(M, m) \in P(A) \mid \int F(c, m) d\mu \stackrel{\textcircled{2}}{\geq} F(c, b), \forall b \in A\}.$$

prove K_b is close by limit point argument. follows from F is conti.

(2) Multiple Types of Agents:

Next, we introduce more general case

Def: Type space T is polish

i) Payoff func. $F: T \times A \times P(A)$

$$T \times A \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^I.$$

And the objective function is :

$$J_i^*(a_1, \dots, a_n) = F(t_i, a_i, \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n \delta(a_j, a_k))$$

ii) Let $C: J \rightarrow 2^A$. Set-value map.

called constraint map. Denote

graph of C by $\text{Gr}(C) := \{(t,$

$a) \in J \times A : a \in C(t)\}$.

iii) Σ -Nash equi. associated with

(t_1, \dots, t_n) is $(a_1, \dots, a_n) \in A^{D^n}$. s.t.

$\forall i. a_i \in C(t_i)$ and $\forall b \in C(t_i)$. :

$$J_i^*(a_1, \dots, a_n) \geq J_i^*(a_1, \dots, b, a_{i+1}, \dots)$$

Thm. (Berge's)

If F and C satisfy the followings:

i) F is joint conti on $\text{Gr}(C) \times \mathcal{P}(\text{Gr}(C))$.

ii) $\forall t \in J. C(t) \neq \emptyset$. iii) $\text{Gr}(C)$ is clos.

iv) C is uniform conti. i.e. if $t_k \rightarrow t$ in J .

and $a \in C(t)$. $\Rightarrow \exists (k_j). a_j \in C(t_{k_j}) \rightarrow a$.

Then: $C^*(t, m) = \{a \in C(t) \mid F(a, t, m)$

$= \sup_{b \in C(t)} F(t, b, m)\}$ is closed and

$F^*(t, m) = \sup_{b \in C(t)} F(t, b, m)$ is joint conti.

Pf: $C^*(t, m) = \bigcap_{b \in C(t)} \{F(t, a, m) \geq F(t, b, m)\}$

And conti. follows from $C(t)$ is

pre-opt and joint conti. of F .

Gr. Under the assumptions above, if

given $(\hat{t}_1, \dots, \hat{t}_n) \in \mathcal{T}^{\otimes n}$. En-Nash

equi. $(\hat{a}_1^n, \dots, \hat{a}_n^n) \in A^{\otimes n}$ for the cor

-responding game. St. $\epsilon_n \rightarrow 0$. And

$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n \delta_{\hat{t}_k^n} = \lambda \in P(\mathcal{T})$. Then:

$\mu_n := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n \delta_{(t_k^n, \hat{a}_k^n)}$ is tight and

& weak limit point $\mu \in P(\mathcal{T} \times A)$

satisfies $\mu\{t, a\} \in \mathcal{T} \times A \mid F(t, a) = F^*(t, a)\} = 1$

Pf: Note A is cpt. Set $M = \overline{\bigcup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} A_k}$

and $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n \delta_{x_k^n}(N) \geq 1 - \varepsilon$.

Since it's tight. Then let

$P = N \otimes M$ is the set to prove:

$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n \delta_{(x_k^n, \bar{x}_k^n)}$ is tight.

The latter is regard as before

cor. Refine MFE as Thm above.

There's always a MFE.

Pf: By Berge's Thm, argue as

before.

Ex. (Congestion game)

$G = (V, \bar{E})$. finite directed graph

Set $J = V \times V$. set of source-dest
-ination pair. And set A is set
of Hamilton paths of G .