

# 1 Best Response Dynamics

While the current outcome is not a Pure Nash equilibrium (PNE), we can pick an arbitrary player  $i$  and an arbitrary beneficial deviation  $s'_i$  for player  $i$  and move to outcome  $(s'_i, \mathbf{s}_{-i})$ .

Recall that the definition of a potential game is one where there exists a function  $\Phi : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  where  $\mathcal{S}$  is the finite set of strategies with

$$\Phi(s'_i, s_{-i}) - \Phi(s_i, s_{-i}) = c_i(s'_i, s_{-i}) - c_i(s_i, s_{-i})$$

**Proposition 1.1.** In a finite potential game from any arbitrary outcome, best-response dynamics converge to a PNE.

*Proof.* In a best-response dynamics approach, every iteration has  $\Phi(\mathbf{s}^{t+1}) < \Phi(\mathbf{s}^t)$ , i.e. the potential decreases. Unless the  $\mathbf{s}^t$  is a PNE, our  $\Phi$  is lower bounded by  $\min_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \Phi(s)$  and hence the process must terminate.  $\square$

**Definition 1.2** ( $\epsilon$ -Pure Nash Equilibrium). For  $\epsilon \in [0, 1]$ , and outcome  $\mathbf{s}$  is an  $\epsilon$ -pure NE if for every agent  $i$  and deviations  $s'_i \in S_i$

$$c_i(s'_i, s_{-i}) \geq (1 - \epsilon)c_i(s_i, s_{-i})$$

An *epsilon*-best response dynamics is one which permits moves when there is significant improvements (substantial lowering of cost or increasing of utility) which is an important factor to for a state to converge to near optimal equilibrium. While a current outcome  $\mathbf{s}$  is not an  $\epsilon$ -PNE, we pick an arbitrary player  $i$  that has an  $\epsilon$ -move, i.e. a deviation to  $s'_i$ :

$$c_i(s'_i, s_{-i}) < (1 - \epsilon)c_i(\mathbf{s})$$

**Theorem 1.3** (Fast convergence of  $\epsilon$ -Best Response Dynamics). Consider an atomic selfish routing game where:

1. All players have the same source  $s$  and destination  $t$  vertex.
2. Cost function satisfy the “ $\alpha$ -bound jump condition”

$$c_e(x) \leq c_e(x + 1) \leq \alpha \cdot c_e(x)$$

for all edges  $e$ .

3. The MaxGain variant of  $\epsilon$ -BR dynamics is used: in every iteration, amongst all players with an  $\epsilon$ -move available, the player who can obtain the biggest absolute cost decrease gets to move.

Then an  $\epsilon$ -PNE is reached in at most

$$\frac{k \cdot \alpha}{\epsilon} \log \frac{\Phi(\mathbf{s}^0)}{\Phi_{min}}$$

iterations, where  $k$  is the number of agents,  $\mathbf{s}^0$  is the initial state of the system.

**Lemma 1.4.** For  $x \in (0, 1)$

$$(1 - x)^{1/x} \leq (e^{-x})^{1/x} = e^{-1}$$

**Theorem 1.5.** Consider a  $(\lambda, \mu)$ -cost minimization game with a positive potential function  $\Phi$  such that  $\Phi(\mathbf{s}) \leq \text{cost}(\mathbf{s})$  for every outcome  $\mathbf{s}$ . Let  $\mathbf{s}^0, \mathbf{s}^1, \dots, \mathbf{s}^T$  be a sequence generated by MaxGain best response dynamics,  $\mathbf{s}^*$  a minimum cost outcome and  $1 > \gamma > 0$  is a parameter, Then for all but

$$\frac{k}{\gamma(1 - \mu)} \log \frac{\Phi(\mathbf{s}^0)}{\Phi_{\min}} \quad (1)$$

outcomes  $\mathbf{s}^t$  satisfy

$$\text{cost}(\mathbf{s}^t) \leq \left( \frac{\lambda}{(1 - \mu)(1 - \gamma)} \right) \cdot \text{cost}(\mathbf{s}^*) \quad (2)$$

*Proof.*

$$\begin{aligned} \text{cost}(\mathbf{s}^t) &\leq \sum_i c_i(\mathbf{s}^t) \\ &= \sum_i [c_i(s_i^*, s_{-i}^t) + \delta_i(\mathbf{s}^t)], \quad \delta_i(\mathbf{s}^t) = c_i(\mathbf{s}^t) - c_i(s_i^*, s_{-i}^t) \\ &\leq \lambda \cdot \text{cost}(\mathbf{s}^*) + \mu \cdot \text{cost}(\mathbf{s}^t) + \sum_i \delta_i(\mathbf{s}^t) \\ \text{cost}(\mathbf{s}^t) &\leq \frac{\lambda}{1 - \mu} \cdot \text{cost}(\mathbf{s}^*) + \frac{1}{1 - \mu} \cdot \sum_i \delta_i(\mathbf{s}^t) \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

we shall let  $\Delta(\mathbf{s}^t) = \sum_i \delta_i(\mathbf{s}^t)$  in the remaining parts of the proof. We shall now define a state  $\mathbf{s}^t$  to be bad if it does not satisfy (2) and by (3), when  $\mathbf{s}^t$  is bad we get

$$\Delta(\mathbf{s}^t) \geq \gamma(1 - \mu) \cdot \text{cost}(\mathbf{s}^t)$$

By the MaxGain definition and the inequality relating the potential function and cost,

$$\max_i \delta_i(\mathbf{s}^t) \geq \frac{\Delta(\mathbf{s}^t)}{k} \geq \frac{\gamma(1 - \mu)}{k} \cdot \text{cost}(\mathbf{s}^t) \geq \frac{\gamma(1 - \mu)}{k} \cdot \Phi(\mathbf{s}^t)$$

and we get what we desire as

$$\Phi(\mathbf{s}^t) - \Phi(s_i^*, s_{-i}^t) = c_i(\mathbf{s}^t) - c_i(s_i^*, s_{-i}^t) = \delta_i(\mathbf{s}^t)$$

and hence

$$\left( 1 - \frac{\gamma(1 - \mu)}{k} \right) \Phi(\mathbf{s}^t) \geq \Phi(\mathbf{s}^{t+1}) \quad (4)$$

whenever  $\mathbf{s}^t$  is a bad state. The equation in (4) says that for every MaxGain best response dynamics, if the state is bad, the new state  $\mathbf{s}^{t+1}$  is smaller than the previous state  $\mathbf{s}^t$  by a factor of  $1 - \frac{\gamma(1 - \mu)}{k}$ . By Lemma 1.4, the potential decreases by a factor of  $e$  for every  $\frac{k}{\gamma(1 - \mu)}$  bad states encountered. Thus solving

$$e^{-n} \Phi(\mathbf{s}^0) \geq \Phi_{\min}$$

shows (1). □