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Abstract

Static stability in an economic model means negative incentives for deviation from equilibrium strategies, which we expect to assure a return to equilibrium, i.e., dynamic stability, as long as agents respond to incentives. There have been many attempts to prove this link, especially in evolutionary game theory, yielding both negative and positive results. This paper offers a universal and intuitive approach to this link. We prove static stability assures dynamic stability as long as agents’ decisions of switching strategies are rationalizable by revealing costs and constraints behind distortions from exact optimization. This idea guides us to track the remaining expected maximal payoff gain from switches, after deducting the costs and to be maximized subject to the constraints, as a disequilibrium index, namely, a Lyapunov function. While our analysis here is confined to myopic evolutionary dynamics in population games, our approach is applicable to more complex situations. (148 words)
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1 Introduction

Equilibrium stability has been a classic and fundamental issue in economic theory. Theorists have been trying to connect static and dynamic stability. In game theory, static stability essentially means self-defeating negative externality (Hofbauer and Sandholm, 2009, henceforth H & S): if agents take different strategies from their equilibrium strategies, this deviation lowers their relative payoffs. This is conceptualized as a regular ESS in Taylor and Jonker (1978) and extends to the notion of a stable game by H & S. It is intuitively natural to expect negative externality to bring players back to equilibrium, i.e., dynamic stability of equilibrium, as long as agents’ choices of strategies are guided by incentives. To prepare the ground for this assertion, we need to explicitly formulate a process of strategy adjustment. An evolutionary dynamic describes the transition of the strategy distribution in a population of agents who occasionally revise strategies according to a certain decision rule (revision protocol), such as exact optimization (best response dynamic), better reply (pairwise payoff comparison and excess payoffs), imitation, etc. For these canonical dynamics specifically, connection between static and dynamic stability has been studied, yielding both positive and negative results. We have not found a general behavioral principle on agents decision rules behind those results, as detailed below. One may wonder economic insights of those results beyond mathematical specifications and also doubt robustness of the results to perturbation and misspecification of a model.¹ On the other hand, recent development in computational approach to economic/game-theoretic models guides us to the study of dynamic stability as a foundation to computational analysis and engineering applications.²

This paper proposes a new approach to connecting static and dynamic stability in games through a single economically natural principle. There have been several attempts by assuming payoff monotonicity (Friedman 1991; H & S) but they resulted in negative counterexamples; see Section 6.3. While previous studies that tried to fix payoff monotonicity by adding a mathematical assumption, we start from abandon-

¹For example, see Iryo (2019); Guo et al. (2018) for controversy on robustness of equilibrium stability in congestion games in transportation applications under various dynamics. Hicks (1939, Additional Note C) shows a classical skepticism against purely mathematical study of dynamic stability, especially of Samuelson (1941); see Section 7.
²See Izquierdo et al. (2019b,a) for applications of evolutionary dynamics to agent-based simulations and Marden and Shamma (2015) for applications to distributional controls. In Section 7, we will argue implications on tâtonnement processes in market equilibrium models; despite its classical history in economic theory, it calls attention of computer scientists; see Cheung et al. (2019).
ing it and search for something else. In this paper, we rationalize revision protocols in canonical evolutionary dynamics by revealing implicit costs and constraints that defer agents from exact optimization (Section 2.2). This cost-benefit rationalizability is commonly held by canonical evolutionary dynamics (best response, pairwise payoff comparison, and excess payoff) that are known to yield positive results to connect static and dynamic stability, while other dynamics (imitative) that result in negative results indeed lack this property.\(^3\) We prove that cost-benefit rationalizability is indeed sufficient to derive dynamic stability from static stability. The mechanics behind the proof is also intuitive and economically natural: we rigorously define net gains of strategy revisions by taking those implicit costs and constraints into account of payoff improvements from the revisions and then calculate the ex-ante aggregate net gain. We show that the ex-ante aggregate net gain decreases over time under self-defeating externality, so it serves as a Lyapunov function (Theorem 3)). This intuitively natural idea suggests a possibility of extensions of our approach to more complex and common problems in economics, as we explore in Section 7.

Our approach—the assumption of cost-benefit rationalizability and the proof by net gains—is tight for connection of static and dynamic stability in the sense that breaking it indeed results in disconnection, as we discuss in Section 6. First of all, known counterexamples do not satisfy cost-benefit rationalizability. Imitative dynamics are known not to guarantee dynamic stability. This can be explained by net gains. Second, gross gains, or payoff increases from switches without incorporating switching costs and availability constraints, do not work; the aggregate gross gain may not monotonically decrease even under static stability and thus cannot serve as a Lyapunov function.

We should note that our approach stems from integration of three recent perspectives on evolutionary dynamics and bounded rationality. The first is what we could call modularism: we separate an evolutionary dynamic from a game and identify properties of the dynamic alone, which is clearly presented by Fox and Shamma (2013). The second is what we could call structuralism in evolutionary dynamics. Sandholm (2010b) can be regarded as a manifesto to reconstruct an evolutionary dynamic rigorously from a decision rule of individual agents. The last is rationalization of boundedly rational decision making, commonly practiced in behavioral decision theory. The present paper suggests this common—but new in evolutionary

\(^3\)One might simply call it rationalizability. The modifier “cost-benefit” is added to distinguish it from rationalizability of a strategy as Pearce (1984); Bernheim (1984).
game theory-approach is useful to study equilibrium stability and strategy adjustment processes, just like in other areas of economics. This can be done only after focusing on an evolutionary dynamic from the modularic viewpoint and then reconstructing it from a decision rule following the structural view.

The basic set-up is presented in Section 2 and the notions of static and dynamic stability are summarized in Section 3. Section 4 shows the main conclusion of the paper, i.e., the link between static and dynamic stability through the net gain. Section 5 collects extensions beyond the basic set-up. In Section 6, we consider other would-be approaches and discuss why they do not work. Section 7 provides a quick summary of our approach and its implications. The proofs and details of side issues are given in Appendix.

2 Basic set-up

We first set up a game and an evolutionary dynamic separately. Before going to details, let’s start from clarifying our goal and road map. A (population) game $F : x \mapsto \pi$ is ultimately a functional relationship that determines payoff vector $\pi$ from strategy distribution $x$; it represents an economic environment. An evolutionary dynamic $V : (x, \pi) \mapsto \dot{x}$ is mathematically a dynamic system that determines the transition of strategy distribution $\dot{x} = V(x)[\pi]$ given the current state of $x$ and $\pi$; this describes how agents adjust their choices to payoffs.\footnote{When we argue evolutionary dynamic $V$, we regard $\pi$ as a parameter for agents’ dynamic and thus put it in square brackets, separated from $x$.} Combining $F$ and $V$, we can close a loop and obtain an autonomous dynamic system $V^F : x \mapsto \dot{x}$ as $V^F(x) := V(x)[F(x)]$ that determines $\dot{x}$ from $x$; we call it a combined dynamic. Static stability, i.e., self-defeating negative externality is a property of game $F$. In contrast, dynamic stability, i.e., asymptotic stability of a Nash equilibrium, is of autonomous combined dynamic $V^F$. Our goal is to find a general economic principle behind $V$ to link static stability of $F$ and dynamic stability of $V^F$. Therefore, separation of $V$ and $F$ is crucial for our study.

2.1 Population game $F$

We consider a finite-action population game played in the society of continuously many homogeneous agents, as in Sandholm (2010b, Ch.2). The society consists of
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Figure 1: Static stability is a property of the game $F$ alone. To close the loop, we need evolutionary dynamics $V$ and combine $V$ and $F$ into $V^F$. Dynamic stability is a property of $V^F$.

a unit mass of agents. In this basic set-up, they are homogeneous in the sense that they have the same action set and the same payoff function.

More specifically, each agent chooses an action $a$ from set $A := \{1, \ldots, A\}$. Denote by $x_a \in [0,1]$ the mass of action-$a$ players in the society. The social state is represented by column vector $x := (x_1, \ldots, x_A)$ in $\Delta^A$.\(^5\) The tangent space of $\Delta^A$ is $\mathbb{R}^0$. The payoff of each action is a function of the social state; in social state $x \in \Delta^A$, $F_a(x) \in \mathbb{R}$ is the payoff from action $a \in A$. Define payoff function $F : \Delta^A \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^A$ by $F(x) := (F_a(x))_{a \in A}$ for each $x \in \Delta^A$. Throughout this paper, we assume that $F$ is continuously differentiable. Let $F*(x) := \max_{a \in A} F_a(x)$. A population game is characterized by $(A,F)$, or shortly by $F$.

As usual, a Nash equilibrium is a state where (almost) every agent takes an optimal action. Formally, social state $x^* \in \Delta^A$ is a Nash equilibrium if $F_a(x^*) = F*(x^*)$ whenever $x^*_a > 0$, or equivalently

$$\forall x \in \Delta^A \quad (x - x^*) \cdot F(x^*) \leq 0$$

Denote by $\text{NE}(F)$ the set of Nash equilibria in population game $F$.

The simplest example of a population game is random matching in a symmetric

\(^5\)The vector in a bold font like $v$ is a column vector, while the one with an arrow over the letter like $\vec{v}$ is a row vector. We omit the transpose when we write a column vector on the text. $1$ is a column vector $(1,1,\ldots,1)$. Note that $1 \cdot z = \sum_{i=1}^n z_i$ for an arbitrary column vector $z = (z_i)_{i=1}^n \in \mathbb{R}^n$. For a finite set $A = \{1,\ldots,A\}$, we define $\Delta^A$ as $\Delta^A := \{x = (x_a)_{a \in A} \in [0,1]^A \mid 1 \cdot x = 1\}$, i.e., the set of all probability distributions on $A$, and $\mathbb{R}^A_0 := \{z \in \mathbb{R}^A \mid 1 \cdot z = 0\}$. Let $\mathbb{R}_+: = [0,\infty)$ and $\mathbb{R}_{++} := (0,\infty)$. 
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two-player normal-form game with a payoff matrix $\mathbf{II}$; the population game is given by $F(x) = \mathbf{II}x$. NE($F$) coincides with the set of symmetric Nash equilibria of $\mathbf{II}$.

### 2.2 Evolutionary dynamic V

#### Cost-benefit rationalizable dynamics

Here we construct an evolutionary dynamic to formulate transition of the social state over continuous time horizon. In the dynamic, each agent occasionally receives an opportunity to revise the action, following the Poisson process with arrival rate 1. There is a wide variety of evolutionary dynamics stemmed from a variety of revision protocols (decision rules). Here we reduce them to a unifying framework based on optimization, while keeping flexibility of the framework to recover the variety.\(^6\)

Let’s set up an optimization-based framework of revision protocols. Upon receipt of a revision opportunity, a revising agent compares payoffs from the current action and from other available actions. Given current action $a$, all other actions may not be always available: available action set $A'_a$ is a subset of $A \setminus \{a\}$. Besides, if the revising agent chooses to switch an action, the agent needs to pay switching cost $q \in \mathbb{R}_+$. The switching cost does not depend on which of available actions to switch to. Observing payoff vector $\pi \in \mathbb{R}^A$, the agent chooses the action that yields the greatest net payoff:

$$\max \left\{ \pi_a, \max_{b \in A'_a} \pi_b - q \right\} \quad (2)$$

Let $\pi_*(A'_a) := \max_{b \in A'_a} \pi_b$ be the greatest (gross) payoff among available actions $A'_a$, and $b_*[\pi](A'_a) := \arg\max_{b \in A'_a} \pi_b$ be the set of the optimal actions among them, while $\pi_* := \max_{b \in A} \pi_b$ denotes the greatest payoff among all the actions $A$ and $b_*[\pi] := \arg\max_{b \in A} \pi_b$ the set of the optimal actions. Note that $x \in \text{NE}(F)$ is equivalent to $x \in \Delta^A(b_*[F(x)])$.\(^7\)

We allow both available action set $A'_a$ and switching cost $q$ to be randomly assigned after the receipt of the revision opportunity. Available action set $A'_a$ is drawn

---

\(^6\)On stochastic adaptive learning in finite normal-form games, Funai (2018) proposes a framework to unify various learning models such as stochastic fictitious play, experience-weighted attraction learning, etc.; then, he investigates how convergence to a quantal response equilibrium depends on these learning parameters in several classes of games.

\(^7\)Consider an $A$-dimensional real space, each of whose coordinate is labeled with either one element of $A = \{1, \ldots, A\}$. For a set $S \subseteq A$, we denote by $\Delta^A(S)$ the set of probability vectors whose support is contained in $S$: i.e., $\Delta^A(S) := \{x \in \mathbb{R}_+^A \mid \sum_{k \in S} x_k = 1 \text{ and } x_l = 0 \text{ for any } l \in A \setminus S\}$. 
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from probability distribution $\mathbb{P}_{A\setminus \{a\}}$ over $2^{A\setminus \{a\}}$, the power set of $A \setminus \{a\}$. Switching cost $q$ is drawn from probability distribution $\mathbb{P}_Q$ over $\mathbb{R}_+$; let $Q_-(q) = \mathbb{P}_Q((-\infty, q))$ and $Q(q) = \mathbb{P}_Q((-\infty, q])$. We assume $\mathbb{P}_Q$ has no singular continuous part.\(^8\) Let $Q(q) := [Q_-(q), Q(q)] \subset [0, 1]$. Note that, if $\mathbb{P}_Q$ is continuous at $q$, i.e., $Q_-(q) = Q(q)$, then $Q(q)$ reduces to a singleton $\{Q(q)\}$. While we distinguish $Q$ from $q$ for mathematical completeness in case $\mathbb{P}_Q$ is not continuous, readers do not have to be bothered when reading the main text; when it matters anyhow, it is cautioned explicitly. We also assume that $A'_a$ and $q$ are independent of each other, the agent’s current action, and the social state, and that $\mathbb{P}_{A\setminus \{a\}}$ and $\mathbb{P}_Q$ are also invariant over time.

The revising agent chooses to switch to either one action in $b_*[\pi](A'_a)$ if $\pi_*(A'_a) - q$ is greater than $\pi_a$, i.e., the gross gain from the switch $\pi_a(A'_a) := \pi_*(A'_a) - \pi_a$ is greater than switching cost $q$. The agent chooses to maintain the current action $a$ as the status quo if $\pi_a(A'_a) < q$; these choices are indifferent if $\pi_a(A'_a) = q$. Hence, the probability of choosing a switch is in the range $Q(\pi_a(A'_a))$; we do not impose any tie-breaking rule, as seen from (3). We interpret $\pi_*(A'_a) - q$ as the net gain.

Given that a revising agent was taking action $a$ until this revision opportunity, the probability distribution of possible changes in her action upon the revision opportunity takes a form of a probability vector such that\(^9\)

$$\sum_{A'_a \subset A \setminus \{a\}} \mathbb{P}_{A\setminus \{a\}}(A'_a) Q_a(A'_a) \{y_a(A'_a) - e_a\} \in \mathbb{R}_+^A.$$ 

Here, $Q_a(A'_a) \in Q(\pi_a(A'_a))$ is a probability of switching to a new strategy, conditional on the receipt of a revision opportunity and the draw of $A'_a$; we call it a conditional switching rate. Besides, $y_a(A'_a) \in \Delta^A(b_*[\pi](A'_a))$ is a probability vector that assigns a positive probability only to optimal available actions, i.e., actions in $b_*[\pi](A'_a)$. If $b_*[\pi](A'_a)$ is not a singleton, $y_a(A'_a)$ cannot be determined uniquely. Because of the multiplicities of possible $Q_a(A'_a)$ and $y_a(A'_a)$, we formulate the dynamic as a set-valued differential equation (differential inclusion). Denote the set of vectors in the above form by

$$V_a[\pi] := \sum_{A'_a \subset A \setminus \{a\}} \mathbb{P}_{A\setminus \{a\}}(A'_a) Q(\pi_a(A'_a)) \{\Delta^A(b_*[\pi](A'_a)) - e_a\}.$$ 

\(^8\)That is, $\mathbb{P}_Q$ is a convex combination of an absolute continuous measure and a discrete measure.

\(^9\)Here $e_a = (e_{ab})_{b \in A} \in \Delta^A$ is a unit vector such that $e_{aa} = 1$ and $e_{ab} = 0$ for all $b \neq a$. This represents a population state where every agent takes action $a$. 
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Aggregating $V_a[\pi]$ over the whole population, the transition of the social state is represented by vector $\dot{x} \in \mathbb{R}^A_0$ in the set $V(x)[\pi] = \sum_{a \in A} x_a V_a[\pi]$: i.e,

$$\dot{x} \in V(x)[\pi] \iff \forall a \in A \exists z_a \in V_a[\pi] \text{ s.t. } \dot{x} = \sum_{a \in A} x_a z_a.$$  \hspace{1cm} (3)

This mapping $V : \Delta^A \times \mathbb{R}^A \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^A_0$ is an evolutionary dynamic.

**Assumptions**

Our formulation itself imposes some restrictions. One significant restriction is that the distribution of available action sets $P_A$ does not depend on the social state $x$. This excludes imitative dynamics such as the replicator dynamic. Actually, it is known that dynamic stability under imitative dynamics cannot be assured by static stability; see Section 6.2. We make this restriction explicit as follows.

**Assumption A0.** For any $a \in A$, $P_Aa$ is independent of $x$.

About the distribution $P_Q$ of switching costs, we first assume the following.

**Assumption Q1.** i) $Q(q) = 0$ if $q < 0$ and ii) $Q(q) > 0$ if $q > 0$.  \hspace{1cm} (11)

The assumption guarantees that i) switching cost is nonnegative almost surely and ii) an agent chooses to switch her action with some positive probability whenever there is an available action strictly better than the current action.

The following assumptions are essential, despite its notational complication, to make myopic evolutionary dynamics economically natural and to obtain a reasonable relationship between payoffs and the notion of gains.

**Assumption A1-i).** For any $a \in A$ and any $b \in A \setminus \{a\}$, $P_Aa(\{A'_a \subset A \setminus \{a\} \mid b \in A'_a\}) > 0$.

**Assumption A1-ii).** For any $a, b \in A$ and any $A_{ab} \subset A \setminus \{a, b\}$, $P_Aa(\{A'_a \subset A \setminus \{a\} \mid A'_a \cap A_{ab} \neq \emptyset\}) = P_Ab(\{A'_b \subset A \setminus \{b\} \mid A'_b \cap A_{ab} \neq \emptyset\})$.

---

10 In a vector space $Z$, with a set $S \subset Z$, an element $c \in Z$ and a scalar $k \in \mathbb{R}$, we define set $k(S + c) := \{k(z + c) \in Z \mid z \in S\}$; with a scalar set $K \subset \mathbb{R}$, set $KS$ is defined as $KS := \{kz \in Z \mid k \in K, z \in S\}$. For sets $S_1, S_2 \subset Z$, we define set $S_1 + S_2 := \{z_1 + z_2 \in Z \mid z_1 \in S_1 \text{ and } z_2 \in S_2\}$.

11 This assumption is equivalent to i) $Q_-(q) = 0$ if $q \leq 0$ and ii) $Q_-(q) > 0$ if $q > 0$. 11
Assumption A1-i) requires any action $b$ to be available with some positive probability; i.e., there exists $A'_a$ such that $b \in A'_a$ and $P_{Aa}(A'_a) > 0$. Assumptions Q1 and A1-i) together imply that there must be a positive probability to switch to the current best response actions. This guarantees stationarity of a Nash equilibrium. Assumption A1-ii) imposes invariance of availability of actions other than the current action. Specifically, we compare the distribution of available actions $P_{Aa}$ when the status-quo (current) action is $a$ and the one $P_{Ab}$ when it is $b$. Fix an arbitrary subset $A'_{ab}$ of actions other than $a$ and $b$. The assumption requires $P_{Aa}$ and $P_{Ab}$ to assign the same probability on the event that at least one of the actions in $A'_{ab}$ becomes available.\(^{12}\)

Assumption A1-ii) implies that, the better action an agent chooses, the smaller room of payoff improvement remains for the next revision opportunity; this is one of important properties of the gain, to be stated in Theorem 2. If this assumption is not satisfied, the current action affects mobility to a further better action.\(^{13}\) Then, economic intuition would suggest a revising agent to consider not only the payoff directly earned from a new action but also opportunity costs of changing mobility in the next revision opportunity. In this paper, we focus on myopic evolutionary dynamics where agents respond simply to the current payoffs and we are trying to find economically natural driving force behind them; to accomplish our goal, we exclude a situation where myopic decision is not well suited with economic intuition.

We say an evolutionary dynamic is cost-benefit rationalizable if it is constructed as (3) from an optimization-based revision protocol (2) with $P_Q$ satisfying Assumption Q1 and $\{P_{Aa}\}_{a \in A}$ satisfying Assumptions A0, A1-i) and A1-ii). A variety of evolutionary dynamics is found to be cost-benefit rationalizable. The basic formulation in this section captures not only the standard best response dynamic (BRD; Gilboa and Matsui (1991); Hofbauer (1995)) but also tempered BRDs (Zusai, 2018) and pairwise comparison dynamics (Smith, 1984); see Figure 2. It also opens new evolutionary dynamics, such as ordinal better-reply dynamics, where switching rates depend on the ordinal payoff ranking.\(^{14}\) Our approach covers excess payoff dynamics

\(^{12}\)One may wonder why we look at a set $A'_{ab}$, not an action, and the event that at least one of the actions, not all the actions, in the set is available. A change of the invariance condition in either of these two aspects breaks the monotone relationship between gains and payoffs; see Appendix A1.1.

\(^{13}\)See (10) in the proof of Lemma 1 in Appendix A2.

\(^{14}\)See Figure 2 for $P_{Aa}$ to rationalize this dynamic. In $P_{Aa}$ for this dynamic, each action becomes available with an equal probability, independently of availability of other actions. The constant $c$ is for normalization so that the sum of $P_{Aa}(A'_a)$ over all non-empty $A'_a \subset A \setminus \{a\}$ equals to 1. I owe
Figure 2: Major dynamics captured under the basic framework. A box containing another box suggests that the class of dynamics represented in a larger box includes the dynamics in a smaller box. In each box, a revision protocol is described in the upper part and the pair of $P_{Aa}$ and $Q$ to rationalize it is presented in the lower; $a$ denotes the action that a revising agent has been taking until a receipt of a revision opportunity and $\pi$ is the payoff vector at this moment of time.

and smooth BRDs with a little modification of the formulation, particularly in the definition of a status-quo strategy for an agent, as discussed in Section 5.1.

finding this $P_{Aa}$ implies ordinal better-reply to Bill Sandholm.
2.3 Combined dynamic $V^F$

Now we have set up both game $F : x \mapsto \pi$ and evolutionary dynamic $V : (x, \pi) \mapsto \dot{x}$. Combining them, we obtain an autonomous dynamic system $V^F : x \mapsto \dot{x}$ to completely describe the transition of social state $x$ as

$$\dot{x} \in V(x)[F(x)] =: V^F(x).$$

We call $V^F$ the **combined dynamic**. Typically, evolutionary game theorists investigate mathematical properties of $V^F$ to study dynamic stability.

Our construction of an optimization-based revision protocol implies that a Nash equilibrium is a stationary state. Assumptions Q1 and A1-i) guarantee that a revising agent can always switch to an optimal action with some positive probability; so, a stationary state must be also a Nash equilibrium. As a result, we have equivalence between stationarity and Nash equilibrium, i.e., $0 \in V^F(x) \iff x \in \text{NE}(F)$.\(^\text{15}\)

3 Static and dynamic stability

3.1 Static stability of $F$

Without explicitly formulating how $x$ adjust to $\pi$, conventional economists would believe that the economy should return to an equilibrium as long as there is negative correlation between deviations in action distribution $\Delta x \in R_A^d$ and the resulting changes in payoff vector $\Delta \pi$. With a linear approximation of the latter by $\Delta \pi \approx DF(x)\Delta x$, the negative correlation is expressed as\(^\text{16}\)

$$\Delta x \cdot DF(x)\Delta x \leq 0 \quad \text{for any } \Delta x \in R_A^d. \quad (4)$$

The condition states that, on average over all actions, actions that have excessively greater shares than in the equilibrium should not yield greater payoffs than in the equilibrium, and actions with smaller shares should yield greater profits, which H & S call *self-defeating externality*. Economists expect incentive-driven economic

---

\(^\text{15}\)The formal proof for this can be easily obtained in a similar way to Zusai (2018, Theorem 1).

\(^\text{16}\)For differentiable function $f = (f_i)_{i=1}^m : R^n \to R^m$ with input variable $z = (z_j)_{j=1}^n$, we denote the Jacobian of $f$ by $Df$ or $df/dz$; $\partial f_i/\partial z_j$ locates on the $i$-th row and the $j$-th column of $df/dz$. 

agents to switch from the former group of actions to the latter and thus the society to return to the equilibrium.\footnote{Milchtaich (2019) attempts to exactly define a static stability concept that is universally applicable to different settings (finite player games, population games, etc.).}

This is, of course, nothing but negative semidefiniteness of $DF$. Note that this imposes a condition only on $F$, but not on $V^F$. So, we can regard it as \textit{static stability}.

**Definition 1** (Static stability). Consider a population game $F: \Delta^A \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^A$. If $DF(x)$ satisfies the negative semidefiniteness condition (4) at any $x \in \Delta^A$, we say that the game satisfies \textit{static stability} globally. If there is a neighborhood of an isolated Nash equilibrium $x^* \in \Delta^A$ such that (4) is satisfied at any $x$ in the neighborhood, then we say that the game satisfies static stability locally around $x^*$.

We do \textit{not} assert the above static stability is a newly invented notion.\footnote{We say a Nash equilibrium $x^*$ is \textit{isolated} if there is no other Nash equilibrium in a neighborhood of $x^*$. We may extend local static and dynamic stability to a set of connected Nash equilibria.} Rather, it summarizes the existing concepts of static stability in game theory. Global static stability of $F$ is indeed equivalent to $F$ being a \textit{stable game} (H & S, Theorem 2.1). Static stability is locally satisfied at an interior ESS; a boundary (regular) ESS satisfies a weaker version of static stability, as we argue in Section 5.2.

**Remark.** Note that our static stability is equivalent to monotonicity in comparative statics. To see it, consider an exogenous change in payoffs $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^A$ in addition to the original payoff function $F^0$ so the payoff function $F: \Lambda^A \times \mathbb{R}^A \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^A$ is now given by $F(x; \theta) := F^0(x) + \theta$. Assume the existence of an interior equilibrium $x^*_0$ in the original game $F^0$; it satisfies $\hat{F}(x^*_0; 0) = 0$ where the relative payoff vector $\hat{F}(x; \theta) \in \mathbb{R}^A$ is defined as $\hat{F}_a(x; \theta) = F_a(x; \theta) - F(x; \theta) \cdot x$ for each $a \in A$. This implies that, around $(\theta, x) = (0, x^*_0)$, there is $x^*(\theta)$ for each $\theta$ such that $\hat{F}(x^*(\theta); \theta) = 0$ with differentiable mapping $x^*$ from $\theta$ to $x^*(\theta)$. Differentiation of this equation yields

$$\Delta x^* \cdot DF^0(x^*_0) \Delta x^* + \Delta x^* \cdot \Delta \theta = 0.$$  

Therefore, static stability (4) is equivalent to positive correlation (monotonicity) between exogenous changes in payoff vector $\Delta \theta$ and changes in equilibrium state $\Delta x^*$,
i.e., $\Delta x^* \cdot \Delta \theta \geq 0$; strictness of the former is equivalent to that of the latter. In particular, strict monotonicity implies that an exogenous increase in the payoff of action $a$, ceteris paribus, causes an increase in the equilibrium share of the action.

### 3.2 Dynamic stability of $V^F$

Dynamic stability of an equilibrium in an autonomous dynamic system simply means asymptotic stability, i.e., convergence of a solution path to the equilibrium from an arbitrary initial state—in the entire space for global stability and in some neighborhood for local stability. In mathematical study of dynamical systems, a Lyapunov function is a common tool to prove asymptotic stability. A Lyapunov function is a disequilibrium index that decreases over time until a dynamic reaches a limit state. In this paper, we use the following version of the Lyapunov stability theorem for a differential inclusion.

**Theorem 1** (Lyapunov stability theorem; Zusai 2020b). Let $X^*$ be a non-empty closed set in compact metric space $X$ with tangent space $TX$, and $X'$ be a neighborhood of $X^*$. Suppose that continuous function $W : X \to \mathbb{R}$ and lower semicontinuous function $\tilde{W} : X \to \mathbb{R}$ satisfy (a) $W(x) \geq 0$ and $\tilde{W}(x) \leq 0$ for all $x \in X'$ and (b) $\text{cl}(X' \cap W^{-1}(0)) = X' \cap \tilde{W}^{-1}(0) = X^*$. In addition, assume that $W$ is Lipschitz continuous in $x \in X'$. i) If differential inclusion $V : X \to TX$ satisfies

$$\frac{d}{dx} W(x) \leq \tilde{W}(x) \quad \text{for any } x \in V(x)$$

whenever $W$ is differentiable at $x \in X'$, then $X^*$ is asymptotically stable under $V$. ii) If $X'$ is forward invariant, i.e., every Carathéodory solution path $\{x_t\}$ starting from $X'$ at time $0$ remains in $X'$ for all moments of time $t \in [0, \infty)$, then $X'$ is a basin of attraction to $X^*$.

We call $W$ a Lyapunov function and $\tilde{W}$ a decaying rate function. Note that we allow for multiplicity of transition vectors, while requiring functions $W$ and $\tilde{W}$ to be well defined (the uniqueness of the values) as functions of state variable $x$, independently of the choice of transition vector $x$ from $V(x)$.

---

20See Sandholm (2010b, §7.A) for formal definitions of dynamic stability concepts, such as asymptotic stability, Lyapunov stability and attracting, especially for a differential inclusion.

21See Smirnov (2001, Theorem 8.2) for a standard version that applies to convergence to a single state. Zusai (2018, Theorem 8.2) requires (5) to hold on every solution path, which essentially means that $X'$ is forward invariant. Zusai (2020b) relaxes it by constructing a forward invariant subset from $X'$. 

---
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3.3 \( \delta \)-passivity of \( V \) as a mathematical bridge

In this paper, we try to identify commonality over different evolutionary dynamics \( V \) that yields dynamic stability of \( V^F \) when combined with static stability of \( V^F \). Based on the modularic view of game dynamics, Fox and Shamma (2013) define \( \delta \)-passivity as a mathematical property of an evolutionary dynamic \( V \).\(^{22}\)

**Definition 2** (\( \delta \)-passivity, extended from Fox and Shamma, 2013). Evolutionary dynamic \( V : \Delta^A \times \mathbb{R}^A \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_0^A \) is \( \delta \)-**passive**, if there exists a pre-Lyapunov function \( L : \Delta^A \times \mathbb{R}^A \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+ \) and a pre-decaying rate function \( \tilde{L} : \Delta^A \times \mathbb{R}^A \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_- \) s.t., at any \( x \in \Delta^A \) and \( \pi \in \mathbb{R}^A \),

\[
\frac{\partial L}{\partial x}(x)[\pi]x + \frac{\partial L}{\partial \pi}(x)[\pi] \dot{\pi} \leq \tilde{L}(x)[\pi] + x \cdot \dot{\pi} \quad \text{for any } \pi \in \mathbb{R}^A \text{ and } x \in V(x)[\pi].
\]

In a game \( F \), payoff vector \( \pi \) is always determined from the current population state \( x \). Thus, the pre-Lyapunov function \( L \) reduces to a function of \( x \) given by \( L^F(x) := L(x)[F(x)] \); similarly, \( \tilde{L}^F(x) := \tilde{L}(x)[F(x)] \). If the game \( F \) satisfies static stability at \( x \), \( \delta \)-passivity of \( V \) implies that \( L^F : \Delta^A \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+ \) satisfies (5) and thus as a Lyapunov function for dynamic \( V^F \), with \( \tilde{L}^F : \Delta^A \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_- \) as a decaying rate function.

\( \delta \)-passivity identifies a **mathematical** property that should be satisfied for an evolutionary dynamic \( V \), **separately from a game \( F \)**, in order to derive dynamic stability of \( V^F \) from static stability of \( F \). However, it does not tell how to **find** a pre-Lyapunov function and also it is not clear what \( \delta \)-passivity means in an economic context.

4 Main results

Now our goal is to find a pre-Lyapunov function based on economic intuition. Thanks to revelation of costs and constraints by our notion of cost-benefit rationalizability, we can use the net gain as an exact measure to assess when an agent chooses to switch the strategy and **when not**. Furthermore, as an agent always exploits the maximal net gain among all the **available** actions, the expected net gain cannot increase by a switch in cost-benefit rationalizable dynamics. Below we make this idea

\(^{22}\) Since our version of the Lyapunov stability theorem requires the explicit specification of a lower semicontinuous function \( \tilde{W} \) as a decaying rate function to cover a differential inclusion, the definition of \( \delta \)-passivity differs from Fox and Shamma (2013) by including \( \tilde{L} \) in the RHS of the defining equation.
concrete and construct a pre-Lyapunov function from net gains.

4.1 Individual ex-ante net gains

Defining net gain from revisions

Imagine an agent who receives a revision opportunity and draws available strategy set \( A'_a \) and switching cost \( q \) from their distributions \( P_{A_a} \) and \( P_Q \). If the agent switches an action, the agent should choose the best available action in \( A'_a \); the net gain from this switch is \( \bar{\pi} a^*(A'_a) - q \). Before the realization of \( A'_a \) and \( q \), the individual ex-ante (first-order) net gain for an action-\( a \) player is defined as

\[
g^a[\pi] := \sum_{A'_a \subset A \setminus \{a\}} P_{A_a}(A'_a) E_Q[\bar{\pi} a^*(A'_a) - q]^+. \tag{6}
\]

This represents the remaining room to improve a payoff for a player who currently takes action \( a \). The net gain \( \bar{\pi} a^*(A'_a) - q \) from a switch is counted into the expected value \( E_Q[\bar{\pi} a^*(A'_a) - q]^+ \) if and only if the agent chooses a switch, i.e., the net gain is positive.\(^{24}\) Let \( g^*_a[\pi] := (g^a[\pi])_{a \in A} \in \mathbb{R}^A \).

**Lemma 1.** Consider a cost-benefit rationalizable dynamic \( V \). Then, the ex-ante first-order gain function \( g^*_a : \mathbb{R}^A \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^A \) satisfies the following properties.

\begin{enumerate}
  \item \( g^a[\pi] \geq 0 \) for any \( a \in A \) and \( \pi \in \mathbb{R}^A \). \( g^a[\pi] = 0 \) if and only if \( a \in b^*_a[\pi]. \)
  \item Consider arbitrary two actions \( a, b \in A \); assume \( \pi_a \leq \pi_b \). Then, \( g^b[\pi] \leq g^a[\pi] \).
  \item The inequality is strict if \( \pi_a < \pi_b \).
  \item For each \( a \in A \), function \( g^a : \mathbb{R}^A \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \) is Lipschitz continuous and thus differentiable almost everywhere in \( \mathbb{R}^A \). If it is differentiable at \( \pi \in \mathbb{R}^A \),

\[
\frac{\partial g^a[\pi]}{\partial \pi} \Delta \pi = z_a \cdot \Delta \pi \quad \text{for any } \Delta \pi \in \mathbb{R}^A, z_a \in V_a[\pi]. \]
\end{enumerate}
About g0, it is immediate from the definition (6) to confirm i) and the “if” part of ii). The “only-if” part relies on Assumption A1-i), which implies that any strategy must be available with some positive probability.

Property g1 states that the better the status-quo (current) action is, the less the ex-ante gain is. For this property, we observe from (6) that the status-quo action a may affect the ex-ante net gain through two factors. The most obvious is through the status-quo payoff $-\pi_a$ in calculation of the realized net gain $\bar{\pi}_a(A'_a) - q$. The less obvious is through the availability of other actions in calculation of probability $P_{A_a}(A'_a)$. Assumption A1-ii) eliminates this secondary factor; recall the discussion about mobility in Section 2.2. Hence, the only first factor matters, which leads us to g1. Note that, by property g1, when an agent chooses the best among available actions, i.e., $g_{a*}[\pi](A'_a) := \min_{b \in A'_a} g_{b*}[\pi]$. To understand property g2, imagine a change in payoff vector by $\Delta \pi$. Then, the net gain $\bar{\pi}_a(A'_a) - q$ changes by $\Delta \pi_*(A'_a) - \Delta \pi_a$ regardless of $q$. The resulting change in $g_{a*}[\pi]$ is linearly approximated as

$$\frac{\partial g_{a*}}{\partial \pi}[\pi] \Delta \pi = \sum_{A'_a \subseteq A \backslash \{a\}} P_{A_a}(A'_a) Q(\bar{\pi}_a(A'_a)) \cdot (\Delta \pi_*(A'_a) - \Delta \pi_a).$$

This is the expected sum of a change in the net gain $\Delta \pi_*(A'_a) - \Delta \pi_a$, weighted with the probability $P_{A_a}(A'_a) Q(\bar{\pi}_a(A'_a))$ that a switch from $a$ is chosen, given available action set $A'_a$; this weighted sum is simply $z_a \cdot \Delta \pi$. Note that this does not depend on a choice of transition vector $z_a$ from $V_a[\pi]$. It is crucial for property g2 that zero net gain sets a threshold between switching to a new action and keeping the current action. This makes a contrast with a gross gain, as we argue in Section 6.1.

---

26 $\Delta \pi_*(A'_a)$ is the change in the payoff from the best action $b*[\pi](A'_a)$, i.e., $\Delta \pi_*(A'_a) = \Delta \pi_b$ of an action $b \in b*[\pi](A'_a)$. The derivative $\partial g_{a*}/\partial \pi$ is well defined (when $g_{a*}$ is differentiable) regardless of multiplicity of the best actions, thanks to Dankin’s envelop theorem; see the proof of property g2 in Appendix A2.

27 To obtain this equation mathematically, notice that the derivative of $E_Q[\hat{\pi} - q]_+ = \int_{q=0}^{\hat{\pi}} (\hat{\pi} - q) dP_Q(q)$ with respect to $\pi$ is $\int_{q=0}^{\hat{\pi}} 1 \cdot dP_Q(q) = P_Q(q \leq \hat{\pi}) = Q(\hat{\pi})$.

28 When $g_{a*}$ is differentiable at $\pi$, then $P_Q$ must be continuous at $\bar{\pi}_a(A'_a)$ of all $A'_a \subseteq A \backslash \{a\}$ for all $a \in A$.  
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The second-order net gains

We need the ex-ante net gain not only to be an exact determinant of a switch but also to diminish by the switch. To show it, we should identify its change caused by a switch. Specifically, we define the individual ex-ante second-order net gain for an action-$a$ player as

\[
h_a^* [\pi] := \sum_{A'_a \subset A \setminus \{a\}} P_{A_a} (A'_a) Q (\bar{\pi}_a^* (A'_a)) (g^{**}[\pi] (A'_a) - g_a^* [\pi]). \tag{8}
\]

The term \(P_{A_a} (A'_a) Q (\bar{\pi}_a^* (A'_a))\) is the (greatest) probability\(^2^9\) that, upon the receipt of the first revision opportunity, the agent receives available action set \(A'_a\) and chooses to switch from the current action \(a\). If \(Q (\bar{\pi}_a^* (A'_a)) > 0\), i.e., an agent chooses switching from \(a\) with a positive probability, then it must be the case that \(\pi^* (A'_a) \geq \pi_a\). Property g1 implies that this switch changes the agent’s first-order net gain from \(g_a^* [\pi]\) to \(g^{**}[\pi] (A'_a)\). Hence \(h_a^* [\pi]\) is the expected change in the first-order gain upon the first revision opportunity, as stated in property gh below.

Since \(g^{**}[\pi] (A'_a) \leq g_a^* [\pi]\), property h1-i) is implied by the above formula.

Further, if \(a\) is not optimal, then there must be a better action, which must be available with some positive probability by Assumption A1-i). The above argument suggests that \(h_a^* [\pi] < 0\) in such a case. The contrapositive is property h1-ii).

**Lemma 2.** Assume that the individual ex-ante gain function \(g^* : \mathbb{R}^A \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^A\) satisfies property g1.\(^3^0\) Then, the individual ex-ante second-order gain function \(h^* = (h_a^*)_{a \in A} : \mathbb{R}^A \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^A\) satisfies the following properties.

**h.** \(h_a^*\) is lower semicontinuous. i) \(h_a^* [\pi] \leq 0\) for any \(a \in A\) and \(\pi \in \mathbb{R}^A\). ii) \(h_a^* [\pi] = 0\) if and only if \(a \in b^* [\pi]\).

**gh.** For any \(a \in A\) and \(\pi \in \mathbb{R}^A\), if \(g_a^*\) is differentiable at \(\pi\), we have

\[
h_a^* [\pi] = z_a \cdot g^* [\pi] \quad \text{for any } z_a \in V_a [\pi].
\]

If it is not differentiable, we have \(h_a^* [\pi] \geq z_a \cdot g^* [\pi]\) instead.

\(^2^9\)If \(P_Q\) is not continuous, \(Q (\bar{\pi}_a^* (A'_a))\) is only the greatest possible probability of switch as the switching probability can be any value in the range \(Q (\bar{\pi}_a^* (A'_a))\). Yet, we keep this definition to define \(h_a^*\) as a (single-valued) function of \(\pi\). So \(h_a^*\) is lower semicontinuous thanks to upper semicontinuity of cumulative distribution function \(Q\).

\(^3^0\)No other assumptions or properties are needed. Once property g1 is satisfied, any assumption is not needed.
4.2 Aggregate net gain

To analyze the dynamic of \( x \), we aggregate the individual ex-ante first-order and second-order gains over the whole population. We define the aggregate first/second-order gain functions \( G, H : \Delta^A \times \mathbb{R}^A \to \mathbb{R} \) as

\[
G(x)[\pi] := x \cdot g_\pi \quad \text{and} \quad H(x)[\pi] := x \cdot h_\pi.
\]

Note that \( G \) and \( H \) are linear in \( x \) because Assumption A0 assures invariance of \( g_\pi \) and \( h_\pi \) under transition of \( x \) when \( \pi \) is fixed.

**Theorem 2** (Properties of gains under cost-benefit rationalizable dynamics). Consider a cost-benefit rationalizable dynamic \( V \). Then, the aggregate first-order and second-order gain functions \( G, H : \Delta^A \times \mathbb{R}^A \to \mathbb{R} \) satisfy the following properties.

**G.** \( G \) is Lipschitz continuous and thus differentiable almost everywhere. Besides, i) \( G(x)[\pi] \geq 0 \) for any \( x \in \Delta^A, \pi \in \mathbb{R}^A \); and, ii) \( G(x)[\pi] = 0 \) if and only if \( x \in \Delta^A(b_\pi[\pi]) \).

**H.** \( H \) is lower semicontinuous. Besides, i) \( H(x)[\pi] \leq 0 \) for any \( x \in \Delta^A, \pi \in \mathbb{R}^A \); and, ii) \( H(x)[\pi] = 0 \) if and only if \( x \in \Delta^A(b_\pi[\pi]) \).

**GH.** Whenever \( G \) is differentiable at \((x, \pi) \in \Delta^A \times \mathbb{R}^A \), we have\(^{31}\)

\[
i) \frac{\partial G}{\partial x}(x)[\pi]\Delta x = H(x)[\pi] \quad \text{ii) } \frac{\partial G}{\partial \pi}(x)[\pi]\Delta \pi = \Delta x \cdot \Delta \pi
\]

for any \( \Delta x \in V(x)[\pi], \Delta \pi \in \mathbb{R}^A \).

Part i) in each of properties G and H confirms that the aggregate net gain \( G \) is always non-negative and the aggregate second-order net gain \( H \) is always non-positive. Part ii) states that they are both zero if and only if (almost) all agents are taking the optimal strategies given the current payoff vector. If the payoff vector never changes from \( \pi^0 \), i.e., \( F(x) \equiv \pi^0 \) for any \( x \), property GH-i) alone implies \( \dot{G}(x)[\pi^0] = \frac{\partial G}{\partial x}(x)[\pi^0]x = H(x)[\pi^0] \). With property H, this suggests that the aggregate net gain must diminish toward zero under any cost-benefit rationalizable dynamics. Without strategic dependency of the payoffs on state \( x \), this simply suggests that economic agents gradually but steadily exploit opportunities to make greater payoffs and they eventually reach optimal choices given the constant payoff vector.

\(^{31}\)Note that Assumption A0 is needed only for property GH in this theorem (not even for gh).
This sounds economically natural. GH-i) assures it for cost-benefit rational dynamics here. On the other hand, some canonical evolutionary dynamics like imitative dynamics do not converge even in such a situation, as we will discuss in Section 6.2.

When we think of a “game”, the payoff vector changes with state $x$. Thanks to properties GH-i) and ii), a cost-benefit rationalizable dynamic satisfies $\delta$-passivity (Definition 2) with function $G$ as a pre-Lyapunov function and $H$ as a pre-decaying rate function:

$$
\frac{\partial G}{\partial x}(x)[\pi] \Delta x + \frac{\partial G}{\partial \pi}(x)[\pi] \Delta \pi = H(x)[\pi] + \Delta x \cdot \Delta \pi \quad \text{for any } \Delta x \in V(x)[\pi], \Delta \pi \in \mathbb{R}^A.
$$

**Corollary 1.** Any cost-benefit rationalizable dynamic is $\delta$-passive.

### 4.3 From static stability to dynamic stability

Now we embed population game $F$ into evolutionary dynamic $V$ in order to examine dynamic stability of the combined dynamic $V^F$. Let $G^F(x) := G(x)[F(x)]$ and $H^F(x) := H(x)[F(x)]$. Combined with static stability of $F$, $\delta$-passivity of $V$ implies that $G^F$ works as a Lyapunov function with $H^F$ as a decaying rate function to prove asymptotic stability of the equilibrium set.

**Theorem 3** (Dynamic stability from static stability through net gains). Consider an evolutionary dynamic $V$ that generates the aggregate ex-ante first/second-order gain functions $G, H$ satisfying properties $G, H, \text{and } GH$ in Theorem 2. Then, static stability of equilibrium in $F$ (i.e., negative semidefiniteness of $DF$) implies dynamic stability under $V^F$. The aggregate net gain $G^F$ monotonically decreases toward zero. Specifically, the following holds.

i) Global static stability of $F$ implies global asymptotic stability of $\text{NE}(F)$ under the combined dynamic $V^F$.

ii) In an arbitrary population game $F$, let $x^* \in \Delta^A$ be an isolated Nash equilibrium. (a) Local static stability of $F$ at $x^*$ implies (local) asymptotic stability of $x^*$ under the combined dynamic $V^F$. (b) Consider a case that $DF(x^*)$ is not negative semidefinite. If there is indeed a transition vector $z \in V^F(x^*)$ such that $z \cdot DF(x^*)z > 0$, then $x^*$ is not Lyapunov stable.

Recall that negative semidefiniteness of $DF$ represents static stability of a game and characterizes a stable game and an interior ESS, as argued in Section 3. Further,
if $DF(x^*)$ is positive definite at an interior isolated Nash equilibrium $x^*$, then there must be multiple best responses and thus there must be a non-stationary transition vector; so the equilibrium is unstable.\footnote{Since $x^*$ is in the interior of $\Delta^A$, there are multiple best response actions to $F(x^*)$. $\Delta^A(b_s | \pi)$ is not a singleton, especially containing not only $x^*$. Under Assumptions Q1 and A1-i), it implies $V^F(x^*) \setminus \{0\} \neq \emptyset$. By part ii-b) of Theorem 3, the positive definiteness and this fact imply that $x^*$ is not Lyapunov stable.} So, this theorem reduces to the following corollary.

**Corollary 2** (Equilibrium stability under cost-benefit rationalizable dynamics). Under any cost-benefit rationalizable dynamics, the set of Nash equilibria in a stable game is globally asymptotically stable and an interior ESS is (locally) asymptotically stable. An interior isolated Nash equilibrium $x^*$ cannot be Lyapunov stable under any cost-benefit rationalizable dynamics, if $DF(x^*)$ is positive definite.

As we argued, $\delta$-passivity is a mathematical ground to establish dynamic stability of stable games. By generalizing the self-defeating externality of a (static) game $F : x \mapsto \pi$ to $\delta$-anti-passivity of a dynamic payoff generating system $\{x_t\}_{t \in \mathbb{R}_+} \mapsto \{\pi_t\}_{t \in \mathbb{R}_+}$, Fox and Shamma (2013) extend dynamic stability of a stable game under $\delta$-passive evolutionary dynamics to a setting where agents base their decisions on some variables that summarize past payoffs. Thanks to Corollary 1, we can apply it to cost-benefit rationalizable dynamics.

5 Extensions beyond the basic set-up

5.1 Rationalizability and gains in other major dynamics

The “generality” of our approach lies in the idea itself—to be summarized in Section 7; the analysis based on the “basic set-up” is made to convince readers of mathematical validity of our approach and to present a concrete way to construct the gain functions and prove crucial properties, as well as to set a boundary with what are excluded from our approach, to be argued in Section 6.

The essence of our approach is that static stability is proven to be a sufficient condition for dynamic stability as long as we can justify the dynamic in a cost-benefit rationalizable way, i.e., based on optimization by revealing additional costs or constraints that prevent agents from exact optimization. This is indeed what has
been done for smoothed best response dynamics, where agents follow a kind of quantal response rules such as logit choice rules. According to Hofbauer and Sandholm (2002), there are two ways to make it cost-benefit rationalizable. First, each agent is considered as facing heterogeneous payoff perturbations while the agent chooses the exact optimal choice given the perturbed payoff vector. The perturbed BRD emerges as the aggregation of such heterogeneous exact BRD. We discuss heterogeneous dynamics in Section 5.3 as an extension of the basic model to games with finitely many distinctive populations. Second, an agent chooses mixed strategy $y \in \Delta^A$ and there is a control cost $V(y)$ to prevent the agent from taking a pure strategy. The control cost perturbs the agent’s optimal strategy. We can interpret the known Lyapunov function for perturbed BRDs in Hofbauer and Sandholm (2007, Theorem 3.1) as the aggregate net gain function after counting the control costs and we can confirm easily that it satisfies properties G, H and GH.

Cost-benefit rationalizability of excess payoff dynamics may not be obvious. In those dynamics, an agent’s switching rate to a new action is an increasing function of excess payoff, i.e., the relative payoff of the action compared with the average payoff in the population $\pi \cdot x$. To rationalize it, we regard the population’s average strategy, i.e., $x$, as the mixed-strategy status quo for a revising agent: if an agent chooses the status quo to avoid the payment of a switching cost, the new action is chosen randomly according to the current action distribution $x \in \Delta^A$ in the population; a revising agent can be interpreted as a newborn agent, replacing an old agent. Then, the relative payoff determines the switching rate. See Appendix A3.1 for details and the construction of the gain function.

5.2 Local stability on the boundary

While our local static stability condition sounds natural when we imagine an interior Nash equilibrium, it may sound a bit too strong for a strict equilibrium on the boundary or, more weakly, a quasi-strict equilibrium $x^*$, where all unsupported actions $U := \{u \in A \mid x_u^* = 0\}$ are strictly worse than supported actions $S := \{s \in A \mid x_s^* > 0\}$. Economic intuition suggests that any small mutations to those worse actions in $U$ should extinguish; even if those mutations may increase payoffs of actions in $U$, the strict payoff domination of $S$ over $U$ remains locally. Thus, we can relax the local static stability condition by requiring negative semidefinite-ness $\Delta x \cdot DF(x)\Delta x \leq 0$ only for deviations that keep the supported actions, i.e.,
\[ \Delta x \in \mathbb{R}^A_{<0} := \left\{ z \in \mathbb{R}^A_0 \mid [z_u = 0 \text{ for any } u \in U] \right\} \]  

This is indeed a weaker version of a regular ESS (Taylor and Jonker, 1978; Friedman, 1991; Sandholm, 2010a), which has been studied in the literature on dynamic stability of an ESS. Zusai (2020a) defines a weak regular ESS and prove its local stability under cost-benefit rationalizable dynamics.\(^{33}\) Since it is crucial for a boundary equilibrium how close the current state is to the boundary, the current mass of players of actions in \( U \) is added to the aggregate net gain function \( G \) in order to obtain the Lyapunov function for a regular ESS, as suggested by Sandholm (2010a). an additional term is added to account closeness to the boundary.

### 5.3 Heterogeneity

The model and all the propositions can be extended to a multi-population game in which (finitely many) different populations may have different payoff functions and/or different revision protocols, as long as each population’s revision protocol is cost-benefit rationalizable.\(^{34}\) We obtain the pre-Lyapunov function for a multi-population game just by adding up the net gain functions over all the populations; similarly, the decay rate function is obtained straightforwardly from summation of the corresponding functions over the populations.\(^{35}\) It is easy to see properties \( G, H \) and \( GH \) are preserved by summation; see Appendix A3.2

### 6 Discussion: why not other ways?

#### 6.1 Why not using the gross gain for a Lyapunov function?

For the net gain, we need to “reveal” the switching cost \( q \). One may think it artificial and wonder why we need it. Why can’t we simply look at gross gains? Under a cost-


\(^{34}\)Zusai (2019) allows the number of types to be continuously many and provides the measure-theoretic definition of heterogeneous evolutionary dynamic, while clarifying regularity conditions for the unique existence of a solution path and proving dynamic stability of equilibria in potential games (but not those in stable games).

\(^{35}\)It can be cost-benefit rationalizable in the basic framework in this paper or in some modified ways as argued in Section 5.1. In particular, we can consider a hybrid dynamic where an agent may keep the current choice of an action as a status quo or may be replaced with a new agent. Further, even if a population’s dynamic is not cost-benefit rationalizable, we can include it as long as we can somehow find functions \( G \) and \( H \) that satisfy properties \( G, H \) and \( GH \) for this dynamic.
benefit rationalizable dynamic, when an action-\(a\) player receives a revision opportunity, the agent draws available action set \(A'_a\) with probability \(P_{A_a}(A'_a)\), chooses to switch the action (at most) with probability \(Q(\bar{\pi}_a^*(A'_a))\) and yields the gross gain \(\bar{\pi}_a^*(A'_a)\).

Imagine a change in payoff vector by \(\Delta \pi\). This causes a change in the conditional switching rate \(Q(\bar{\pi}_a^*(A'_a))\) by \(Q'(\bar{\pi}_a^*(A'_a))\Delta \bar{\pi}_a^*(A'_a)\). This reflects the changes in switching decisions for agents who are on the margin between choosing to switch and not. By changing from no switch to switch, each one of such marginal agents adds the individual gross gain \(\bar{\pi}_a^*(A'_a)\) to the aggregate gross gain \(\Gamma\). Notice that \(\bar{\pi}_a^*(A'_a)\) may be significantly (not marginally) positive even for those marginal agents, since the gross gain is not an exact determinant for switching decision unlike the net gain.

While \(Q\) accounts for \(\dot{x}\), \(Q'\) accounts for the change in \(\dot{x}\), i.e, \(\ddot{x}\). Thus, the direction of the change in the aggregate gross gain cannot be determined without knowing a higher-order time derivative \(\dot{x}\), which depends on specifications of dynamics such as \(Q'\) beyond cost-benefit rationalizability. See Example 3 in Appendix A4.

6.2 Why not covering imitative dynamics?

To fit imitative dynamics into our framework, we could define the probability that action \(b\) is available, i.e., \(P_{A_b}(\{A'_a \mid b \in A'_a\})\) as the probability that a \(b\)-player is sampled from the society. But the essence of such imitative dynamics is that the sampling probability depends on the current actual distribution of actions in the society. Then, Assumption A0 does not hold, which invalidates property GH.

Imitation refuels net gains. Imagine a deviation from an equilibrium and look at an action that has a greater share than in the equilibrium. While static stability yields a negative economic feedback to this action through lowering payoffs, imitation rather generates a positive non-economic feedback to this strategy as this strategy is more likely to be sampled. This refuels the ex-ante net gain; see Appendix A4.2.

For major imitative dynamics such as the replicator and projection dynamics, only Lyapunov stability (a deviation from an equilibrium does not cause farther escape from the equilibrium) is obtained for stable games in general.\(^{36}\) For asymptotic stability (convergence to an equilibrium), strict static stability of the game is needed.

Requirement of strictness of stable games might appear to be a subtle, minor difference. However, we should notice that it excludes a game with a constant payoff vector $F(x) \equiv \pi^0$ at any $x \in \Delta^A$. We naturally expect economic agents to switch to the best actions, which do not change over time in this situation. The population should converge to a Nash equilibrium, as long as agents’ choices are driven by incentives. This is assured for our dynamics, as argued after Theorem 2. In contrast, it is known that imitative dynamics result in a cyclic trajectory, staying away from the equilibrium.\footnote{This is generally proven for null stable games (including zero-sum games), where Equation (4) always holds with equality; see Sandholm (2010b, Sec. 9.1).}

6.3 Why not assuming payoff monotonicity?

The preceding literature on evolutionary dynamics attempted to capture consistency of evolutionary dynamics with incentives by imposing payoff monotonicity, i.e., positive relationship between a change in the share of each action and the relative payoff of the action and then found counterexamples on the link between static and dynamic stability. H & S (Example 6.1) argue that payoff monotonicity alone does not guarantee equilibrium stability in a stable game; a similar counterexample is also reported by Friedman (1991, Counterexample 2).\footnote{More broadly, the replicator dynamic is payoff monotone in the growth rate but fails to guarantee convergence to an equilibrium under (null) stable games, as argued in Section 6.2.} To fix this, H & S propose to add another assumption, i.e., integrability of a switching rate function (with focusing on excess payoff dynamics).\footnote{Let $Z[\pi] \in \Delta^A$ be the probability distribution over new actions to which an agent switches upon the receipt of a revision opportunity; in excess payoff dynamics, it depends on excess payoff vector $\pi$ such that $\tilde{\pi}_a = \pi_a - (\pi \cdot x)$, but not on the agent’s current action. Integrability means the existence of a continuously differentiable (“revision potential”) function $\rho : \mathbb{R}^A \to \mathbb{R}$ such that $d\rho / d\tilde{\pi} \equiv Z$.} However, it is hard to find an economically intuitive meaning of the integrability.\footnote{Sandholm (2014) admits this point (p.96) and tries to find an economic meaning of the integrability assumption. For this, he focuses on a class of excess payoff dynamics in a single-player decision model where the payoff vector changes randomly, and introduces signals to tell improvements of future performances; then, integrability means no correlation between switching decisions and those signals. While this is interesting, the introduction of signals may be artificial.} Besides, the integrability is not derived from the idea of payoff monotonicity alone.
7 Conclusion remarks

In this paper, we present a unifying and economically intuitive approach to link static and dynamic stability based on cost-benefit rationalizability behind agents’ updates of choices. The approach is summarized as follows:

1. Reconstruct an individual agent’s decision rule (revision protocol) based on optimization; distortions from exact optimization should be rationalized by revealing hidden costs and constraints.

2. Then, define a net gain as the payoff improvement after deducting those additional costs. Calculate the ex-ante net gain as the greatest available net gain subject to the revealed additional constraint. Aggregate it over all the agents.

3. When static stability is granted, the aggregate ex-ante net gain should decrease to zero and thus it should work as a Lyapunov function to prove dynamic stability.

Our general approach not only provides a general proof of dynamic stability with mathematically universal and economically intuitive logic but also extends it to the heterogeneous setting where different agents follow different decision rules or have different payoff functions.

Our notion of cost-benefit rationalizability is new in evolutionary game theory, but prevalent in any other areas of economics. The optimization principle of “rational choice” is so powerful to reveal the underlying preference, which in turn allows us to empirically test rationality (e.g. Kitamura and Stoye 2018). In estimation of discrete choice models, econometricians attempt to explain empirical data with random utility models Anderson et al., 1992. In game experiments, quantal response equilibrium (McKelvey and Palfrey, 1995) has been dominant in solution concepts; the quantal response is regarded as optimization under idiosyncratic payoff perturbation. In recent development of decision theory, theorists try to rationally axiomatize behavioral distortions (e.g. Natenzon 2019). Those economists admit distortions from exact optimization but try to understand each of those distortions by revealing hidden costs, constraints and structures in decision making, and have proven usefulness of the rational-choice approach by deriving rich implications and presenting good matches with empirical data. Our approach shares this spirit and proves use-
fulness in dynamic modeling by solving a fundamental problem of finding a link between static and dynamic stability.\footnote{Recall that out static stability can be understood as monotonicity in comparative statics. So, our finding here can be regarded as a general proof of the classic correspondence principle in Samuelson (1941) for economic dynamics based on (possibly, bounded) rational choices.}

Looking back at past, one might recall tâtonnement processes in general equilibrium analysis as an ancestor of evolutionary dynamics. It seems that, despite massive accumulation of studies on tâtonnement especially in 1950–60s (Arrow and Hurwicz, 1958), they did not find a single universal and intuitive principle behind a variety of tâtonnement processes.\footnote{Mas-Colell et al. (1995, p.621) states “one of the difficulties in this area [tâtonnement stability] is the plethora of plausible disequilibrium models. Although there is a single way to be in equilibrium, there are many different ways to be in disequilibrium.” See Kirman (2006, p.262) for a critical survey of the literature on tâtonnement stability.} A Lyapunov function was used to prove dynamic stability (Uzawa, 1960; Negishi, 1962) but its economic meaning did not call economists’ interests. The tâtonnement dynamic specifies ad hoc representation of a price adjustment process in a market by means of a differential equation. Game theorists would explicitly formulate the market mechanism as a game such as double auction and then regard price formation as an outcome of the game by rational players. Our study suggests that, if the tâtonnement process is constructed as an evolutionary dynamic in such a market game, cost-benefit rationalizability of agents would generally guarantee dynamic stability with the aggregate gain as an economically interpretable Lyapunov function.

At present, one of emerging applications of evolutionary dynamics is an analytical foundation of agent-based simulations and distributional controls. Such computational models run on a discrete time horizon and involve more or less of random perturbations. Our approach is applicable to discrete-time dynamics. First, according to Roth and Sandholm (2013), our rational-choice framework of a strategy revision process allows us to use continuous-time large-population dynamics as deterministic mean approximation of stochastic discrete dynamics. Further, thanks to Ellison et al. (2016), we can use our Lyapunov function to assure a bounded convergence time in such a discrete dynamic.

The construction of evolutionary dynamics in this paper does not require an agent to have ad hoc knowledge of the payoff structure or even the current payoffs of all feasible choices or to observe other agents’ choices. This parsimony in agents’ information may be useful for design of distributional controls over decen-
tralized systems with a large number of feasible choices, such as implementation of optimal network formation and traffic flows.

While our analysis is confined here to a normal-form game, the author believes that there is a broad range of future applications of our approach to proving equilibrium stability beyond this simple setting; see Sawa and Zusai (2019) for an example of our approach to the BRD with a nested choice structure in multitasking environments. Typically in sequential-move, repeated or coalitional games, one may define a version of static stability that is tailored to each specific situation in order to refine the equilibrium concept.\footnote{See Garcia and van Veelen (2016); Fujiwara-Greve and Okuno-Fujiwara (2009, 2016) for examples in repeated games. Models of preference evolution normally take the “indirect evolution approach”: see Dekel et al. (2007); Alger and Weibull (2013). See Demuynck et al. (2019) for an example of a general definition of static coalitional stability based on myopic adjustments.} Equilibrium refinement with those versions of static stability imposes a condition on the payoff function (the game) alone, while the adjustment process is discussed only casually. One may hope to justify the ad-hoc refinement by establishing dynamic stability. This paper suggests to formally define such a dynamic from the casual idea about the underlying adjustment process and track down changes in the remaining net gain under the dynamic; then dynamic stability should be obtained.

Formulation of expectation/belief plays a crucial role in many of interesting economic problems such as Bayesian learning under incomplete information and intertemporal choices as in macroeconomic models.\footnote{Perfect foresight dynamics (Matsui and Matsuyama, 1995) and rationalizable foresight dynamics (Matsui and Oyama, 2006) are exceptions, though they would correspond to $V_F$ in our notation and thus need separation for clearer and more general analysis, as we argue below.} The modularist’s view suggests that we may keep using the conventional modeling of evolutionary dynamics by regarding $\pi$ as expected present values or some predictors of future payoffs that are updated based on the current payoffs, as argued at the end of Section 4.\footnote{Leslie et al. (2018) consider a best response dynamic in a stochastic zero-sum game, where agents take the best response based on such a predictor that is adjusted in response to the current payoff, and prove equilibrium stability.} As suggested by Fox and Shamma (2013), we may further separate the belief update process from an evolutionary dynamic and a game. From this modularist’s viewpoint, our next goal is to find a property of this process that contributes to dynamic stability when combined with static stability of a game and cost-benefit rationalizability of an evolutionary dynamic.
A1 Appendix to Section 2

A1.1 The role of Assumption A1-ii)

From the proof of Lemma 1 in Appendix A2, we can see that the role of Assumption A1-ii) is to obtain equation (10) for property g1. Assumption A1-ii) implies that, given the preference ordering of actions based on the current payoff vector, for any $i \in \mathbb{N}$, the probability that (at least one of) the $i$-th best actions is available does not vary whether the current action is $a$ or $b$, as long as the $i$-th action is better than both $a$ and $b$. This is what (10) means. So, if $a$ is worse than $b$, an agent who is currently taking $a$ is more likely to switch than one currently taking $b$ because the former action $a$ has more actions (including $b$) that are better than $a$ itself and thus the agent should switch to. Besides, if the former agent and the latter switch to the same action, the former improves the payoff more than the latter, as in (9). Combining these two facts, the ex-ante gain by a switch from $a$ should be greater than that from $b$. Therefore, the ordering of actions by the ex-ante gains is obtained by simply reversing the ordering by the current payoffs, as stated in property g1.\footnote{The switching cost does not matter to this and thus the monotone relationship as in property g1 is obtained as well for the gross gain.}

Assumption A1-ii) may look a bit complicated. First, it checks the symmetry for each set $A_{ab} \subset A \setminus \{a, b\}$, not for each action $c \in A \setminus \{a, b\}$. Second, it checks the probability of the event that at least one action in the set is available, not simply that the whole set is available. The first point assures invariance of correlations in availability between any actions other than $a$ and $b$. The second point is made because we do not impose a condition on a set that contains either $a$ or $b$—a set containing $a$ cannot be assigned to a positive probability in $P_{A_a}$ when $a$ is the status quo. One might think of somewhat simpler conditions that look similar to Assumption A1-ii):

i) $P_{A_a}(\{A'_a \mid c \in A'_a\}) = P_{A_b}(\{A'_b \mid c \in A'_b\})$ for any $a, b \in A$ and $c \in A \setminus \{a, b\}$. That is, the probability that arbitrary action $c$ is available should not depend on the status quo, as long as strategy $c$ is not the status quo.

ii) $P_{A_a}(A_{ab}) = P_{A_b}(A_{ab})$ for any $a, b \in A$ and $A_{ab} \subset A \setminus \{a, b\}$. That is, for any subset that excludes both $a$ and $b$, the probability that the available strategy set coincides exactly with this subset does not depend on which of the excluded two actions is the status quo.
However, neither of these two simpler conditions cannot assure (10). Each of the following cases satisfies one of the above two conditions but not Assumption A1-ii); as a result, (10) does not hold. When checking the violation of (10), payoff vector $\pi$ is assumed to yield the payoff ordering such that $\pi_e > \pi_d > \pi_c > \pi_b > \pi_a$.

i) Assume that, when $a$ is the status quo, then the available strategy set is $\{b\}$ with probability 0.4, $\{c,d\}$ with 0.3 and $\{e\}$ with 0.3. When $b$ is the status quo, then the available strategy set is $\{a\}$ with probability 0.4, $\{c\}$ with 0.3 and $\{d,e\}$ with 0.3. Condition i) is satisfied, since each of the three actions $c,d$ and $e$ is available with probability 0.3, whether the status quo is $a$ or $b$. However, Assumption A1-ii) is not satisfied since at least $d$ or $e$ is available with probability $P_{Aa}(\{A'_a \cap \{d,e\} \neq \emptyset\}) = P_{Aa}(\{c,d\}) + P_{Aa}(\{e\}) = 0.6$ when $a$ is the status quo, while this probability is $P_{Ab}(\{A'_b \cap \{d,e\} \neq \emptyset\}) = P_{Ab}(\{d,e\}) = 0.3$ when $b$ is the status quo.

Note that, if the second best $d$ is available, the first best $e$ is not available when $a$ is the status quo; when $b$ is the status quo, $e$ is also available. As a result, the probability that the second best $d$ is the best available strategy is $p^2_{Aa} = 0.3$ when $a$ is the status quo, while it is $p^2_{Ab} = 0$ when $b$ is the status quo. Thus, (10) does not hold. This is because condition i) allows correlation of availabilities of distinct two strategies to vary with the status quo.

ii) Assume that, when $a$ is the status quo, then the available strategy set is $\{b\}$ with probability 0.8, $\{b,c,d\}$ with 0.1, and $\{b,e\}$ with 0.1. When $b$ is the status quo, then the available strategy set is $\{a\}$ with probability 0.8, $\{a,c\}$ with 0.1, and $\{a,d,e\}$ with 0.1. Condition ii) is trivially satisfied, since no subset that excludes both $a$ and $b$ is available with any positive probability when either $a$ or $b$ is the status quo. (Note that condition i) is also satisfied.) However, Assumption A1-ii) is not satisfied, since at least $d$ or $e$ is available with probability 0.2 when $a$ is the status quo; this probability is 0.1 when $b$ is the status quo.

Similarly to the example for condition i), $P_{Aa}$ and $P_{Ab}$ have different correlations between availabilities of the first best action $e$ and the second best action $d$; this results in $p^2_{Aa} = 0.1 \neq 0 = p^2_{Ab}$. 
A2  Appendix to Section 4

Proof of Lemma 1. g0. i) is immediate from the definition of $\bar{g}_a \ast$. Note that the term $\mathbb{E}_Q[\bar{\pi}_a \ast(A'_a) - q]_+$ reflects the fact that a revising agent switches to a different new action only if $\pi_\ast(A'_a) \geq \pi_a + q$; so does this non-negativity of $\bar{g}_a \ast$.

For the “only-if” part of ii), first assume $a \in b \ast[\pi]$. Then, $\pi_a \geq \pi_\ast(A'_a) \geq \pi_\ast(A'_a) - q$ for any $A'_a \subset A \setminus \{a\}$, as long as $q \geq 0$. This implies $[\bar{\pi}_a \ast(A'_a) - q]_+ = 0$ almost surely by Assumption Q1-i). Thus, $\bar{g}_a \ast[\pi] = 0$.

For the “if” part of ii), we prove its contrapositive by assuming the existence of $b \in A$ such that $\pi_b > \pi_a$ and then deriving $\bar{g}_a \ast[\pi] > 0$. Assumption A1-i) assures the existence of $A'_a \subset A \setminus \{a\}$ such that $\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{A}_a}(A'_a) > 0$ and $b \in A'_a$. For this set $A'_a$, we have $\pi_\ast(A'_a) \geq \pi_b > \pi_a$. Then, by Assumption Q1, it is guaranteed that $Q(\bar{\pi}_a \ast(A'_a)) > 0$ and thus $\mathbb{E}_Q[\bar{\pi}_a \ast(A'_a) - q]_+ > 0$. Hence, we have $\bar{g}_a \ast[\pi] > 0$.

g1. Make a partition of $A$ according to $\pi$, say $A_1, A_2, \ldots$ such as

$$[a, a' \in A_i \Leftrightarrow \pi_a = \pi_{a'}] \quad \text{and} \quad [a \in A_i \text{ and } a' \in A_i \text{ with } i < i' \Leftrightarrow \pi_a > \pi_{a'}].$$

Let $\pi_i$ be the payoff obtained from actions in set $A_i$: i.e., $\pi_i$ is defined as $\pi_a$ with any $a \in A_i$. In other words, $A_i$ is the set of actions that yield the $i$-th greatest payoff $\pi_i$ among $\{\pi_a \mid a \in A\}$.

Define $p^i_{\mathcal{A}_a}$ by

$$p^i_{\mathcal{A}_a} := \mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{A}_a}(\{A'_a \subset A \setminus \{a\} \mid A'_a \cap A_i \neq \emptyset \text{ and } A'_a \cap A_j = \emptyset \text{ for any } j < i\}) \quad \text{for each } i.$$  

Given current action $a$, the maximal available payoff after the revision is $\pi_i$ with probability $p^i_{\mathcal{A}_a}$. For the set $A'_a$ in the above definition of $p^i_{\mathcal{A}_a}$, we have $\pi_\ast(A'_a) = \pi_i$. Assumption A1-i) implies $p^1_{\mathcal{A}_a} > 0$.

Denote by $I(a)$ the index of the partition that $a$ belongs to: i.e., $a \in A_{I(a)}$. Notice that

$$\bar{g}_a \ast[\pi] = \sum_{i=1}^{I(a)-1} p^i_{\mathcal{A}_a} \mathbb{E}_Q[\pi_i - \pi_a - q]_+. $$

If $\pi_a \leq \pi_b$, then $I(a) \geq I(b)$ as well as

$$\mathbb{E}_Q[\pi_i - \pi_a - q]_+ \geq \mathbb{E}_Q[\pi_i - \pi_b - q]_+ \text{ for any } i. \quad (9)$$
Fix \( I < I(b) \) arbitrarily. Since \( a, b \notin \bigcup_{i=1}^{I} A_i \) as \( I < I(b) \leq I(a) \), we obtain
\[
\sum_{i=1}^{I} p_{Aa}^i = \mathbb{P}_a \left( \{ A'_a \mid A'_a \cap (\bigcup_{i=1}^{I} A_i) \neq \emptyset \} \right) = \mathbb{P}_b \left( \{ A'_b \mid A'_b \cap (\bigcup_{i=1}^{I} A_i) \neq \emptyset \} \right) = \sum_{i=1}^{I} p_{Ab}^i
\]
for all \( I < I(b) \) by applying Assumption A1-ii) to \( A_{ab} = \bigcup_{i=1}^{I} A_i \). Hence, we have
\[
p_{Aa}^i = p_{Ab}^i \quad \text{for any } i < I(b).
\]
Combining this with (9), we obtain part i):
\[
g_{a^*} [\pi] = \sum_{i=1}^{I(b)-1} p_{Aa}^i \mathbb{E}_Q [\pi_i - \pi_a - q]_+ + \sum_{i=I(b)}^{I(a)-1} p_{Aa}^i \mathbb{E}_Q [\pi_i - \pi_a - q]_+ \\
\geq g_{b^*} [\pi] = \sum_{i=1}^{I(b)-1} p_{Ab}^i \mathbb{E}_Q [\pi_i - \pi_b - q]_+.
\]
Further, if \( \pi_a < \pi_b \), then \( I(a) > I(b) \). As \( \pi_a < \pi_b \leq \pi_1 \), Assumption Q1 implies \( Q(\pi_1 - \pi_a) > 0 \) and thus \( \mathbb{E}_Q [\pi_1 - \pi_a - q]_+ > \mathbb{E}_Q [\pi_1 - \pi_b - q]_+ \). With the fact \( p_{Aa}^i > 0 \), it guarantees \( g_{a^*} [\pi] > g_{b^*} [\pi] \), i.e., part ii) of property g1.

**g2.** First of all, let \( b(A'_a) \in A'_a \) be a choice of a (not necessarily optimal) action for non-empty available action set \( A'_a \subset A \setminus \{ a \} \); we could call \( b : 2^A \setminus \{ a \} \to A \setminus \{ a \} \) a policy function for a revising agent to make a choice after observing (non-empty) available action set. Let \( \mathfrak{B} \) be the set of all such policy functions; notice that it is a finite set as long as \( A \) is a finite set. Define the ex-ante gain from policy \( b, g_{ab} \), by
\[
g_{ab} [\pi] := \sum_{A'_a \subset A \setminus \{ a \}} \mathbb{P}_{Aa} (A'_a) \mathbb{E}_Q [\pi_{b(A'_a)} - \pi_a - q]_+.
\]
If an agent follows the randomly constrained optimization protocol (2), \( b(A'_a) \) should be chosen from \( b^* (A'_a) \) in each possible realization of \( A'_a \); thus,
\[
g_{a^*} [\pi] = \max_{b \in \mathfrak{B}} g_{ab} [\pi].
\]
Specifically, the maximum is attained by a policy \( b^* \in \mathfrak{B} \) such that \( b^* (A'_a) \in b^* (A'_a) \subset A'_a \).

With \( b \) fixed arbitrarily in \( \mathfrak{B} \), function \( g_{ab} \) is Lipschitz continuous and thus differ-
entiable almost everywhere. It is differentiable at \( \pi \) if and only if \( \mathbb{P}_Q \) is continuous at \( \pi_{b(A'_a)} - \pi_a \) of all \( a \in A \) and all \( A'_a \subset A \setminus \{a\} \) with \( \mathbb{P}_{A_a}(A'_a) > 0 \). Then, the derivative is

\[
\frac{\partial g_{ab}}{\partial \pi_b} [\pi] = \begin{cases} 
- \sum_{A'_a \subset A \setminus \{a\}} \mathbb{P}_{A_a}(A'_a) Q(\pi_{b(A'_a)} - \pi_a) \in [-1, 0] & \text{if } b = a, \\
\sum_{A'_a \subset A \setminus \{a\}} \mathbb{P}_{A_a}(A'_a) Q(\pi_{b(A'_a)} - \pi_a) \in [0, 1] & \text{otherwise}
\end{cases}
\]

for each action \( b \in A \). Therefore,

\[
\frac{\partial g_{ab}}{\partial \pi} [\pi] \Delta \pi = \sum_{A'_a \subset A \setminus \{a\}} \mathbb{P}_{A_a}(A'_a) Q(\pi_{b(A'_a)} - \pi_a)(\Delta \pi_{b(A'_a)} - \Delta \pi_a) \quad \text{for any } \Delta \pi \in \mathbb{R}^A.
\]

As \( g_{ab} \) is Lipschitz continuous on \( \mathbb{R}^A \), the maximal value function \( g_{a*} \) is also Lipschitz continuous and thus differentiable almost everywhere in \( \mathbb{R}^A \) by a version of Danskin’s envelop theorem in H & S, Theorem A.4. By applying the above equation to \( b = b_* \) and noticing \( \pi_{b_*(A'_a)} = \pi_*(A'_a) \), we obtain

\[
\frac{d g_{a*}}{d \pi} [\pi] \Delta \pi = \sum_{A'_a \subset A \setminus \{a\}} \mathbb{P}_{A_a}(A'_a) Q(\pi_{b_*(A'_a)})(\Delta \pi_{b_*(A'_a)} - \Delta \pi_a) \quad \text{for any } \Delta \pi \in \mathbb{R}^A.
\]

Note that \( g_{a*} \) is differentiable at \( \pi \) if and only if \( \mathbb{P}_Q \) is continuous at \( \pi_{b_*(A'_a)} \) for all \( a \in A \) and all \( A'_a \subset A \setminus \{a\} \) with \( \mathbb{P}_{A_a}(A'_a) > 0 \). In this case, any \( z_a \in V_a(x)[\pi] \) satisfies

\[
z_a \cdot \Delta \pi = \sum_{A'_a \subset A \setminus \{a\}} \mathbb{P}_{A_a}(A'_a) Q(\pi_{b_*(A'_a)})(\Delta \pi_{A'_a} - e_a) \cdot \Delta \pi.
\]

with some \( y_a(A'_a) \in \Delta(A_(b_*[\pi])(A'_a)) \). We have \( y_a(A'_a) \cdot \Delta \pi = \Delta \pi_*(A'_a) \) and \( e_a \cdot \Delta \pi = \Delta \pi_a \). Combining these, we obtain (7). \( \square \)

Proof of Lemma 2. \( h \). Part i) is immediate from property g1-i). For part ii), first consider action \( a \) such that \( a \in b_*[\pi] \). Then, any other action \( b \in A \) yields \( \pi_b \leq \pi_a \); by property g1-i) again, it is equivalent to \( g_{b_*[\pi]} \geq g_{a_*[\pi]} \); thus, \( g_{a_*[\pi]}(A'_a) = \min_{b \in A'_a} g_{b_*[\pi]} \geq g_{a_*[\pi]} \). By (8), it implies \( h_{a_*[\pi]} \) cannot be strictly negative. By part i) of this property \( h \), it follows that \( h_{a_*[\pi]} = 0 \). For the opposite, assume \( h_{a_*[\pi]} < 0 \). Again, we can see from (8) that it implies the existence of \( A'_a \) such that \( \mathbb{P}_{A_a}(A'_a) > 0, Q(\pi_{a_*(A'_a)}) > 0 \) and \( g_{a_*[\pi]}(A'_a) - g_{a_*[\pi]} < 0 \). By property g1-ii),
the last condition implies \( \pi_*(A'_a) > \pi_a \); there exists an action in \( A'_a \subset A \setminus \{a\} \) that is better than \( a \). Therefore, \( a \notin b_\pi[\pi] \). Finally, since \( Q \) is upper semicontinuous and \( \bar{\pi}_a(\pi) := \pi_*(A'_a) - \pi_a \) is a continuous function of \( \pi \), the composite \( Q(\bar{\pi}_a(\pi)) \) is upper semicontinuous in \( \pi \). Since \( g^{**}[\pi](A'_a) - g^{**}[\pi] \) is continuous and non-positive, this implies lower semicontinuity of \( h_{a^*} \).

**gh.** First of all, notice that differentiability of \( g_{a^*}[\pi] \) at \( \pi \) implies continuity of \( P_Q \) at \( \bar{\pi}_a(A'_a) \) for all \( a \in A \) and all \( A'_a \subset A \setminus \{a\} \) with \( \mathbb{P}_{Aa}(A'_a) > 0 \). Any actions in \( b_\pi[\pi](A'_a) \) yield the greatest payoff \( \pi_*(A'_a) \) among all the available actions in \( A'_a \); property g1 implies that they yield the smallest first-order gain \( g^{**}[\pi](A'_a) \) among them. Thus, any mixture of those actions \( y_a(A'_a) \in \Delta^A(b_\pi[\pi](A'_a)) \) satisfies

\[
y_a(A'_a) \cdot g_\pi[\pi] = g^{**}[\pi](A'_a).
\]

By the fact \( e_a \cdot g_\pi[\pi] = g_{a^*}[\pi] \) and the assumption \( z_a \in V_a[\pi] \), we find from (8) that this implies the equation in property gh.

**Proof of Theorem 2.** G. i) is immediately obtained from property g0-i) and the fact \( x \in \mathbb{R}^A \). For ii), notice that \( x \in \Delta^A(b_\pi[\pi]) \) is equivalent to \( x_a > 0 \Rightarrow a \in b_\pi[\pi] \); and, by property g0-i), \( G(x)[\pi] = 0 \) is equivalent to \( x_a > 0 \Rightarrow g_{a^*}[\pi] = 0 \). The equivalence between \( a \in b_\pi[\pi] \) and \( g_{a^*}[\pi] = 0 \) has been established in property g0-ii). Thus, combining these, we obtain property G-ii).

**H.** Each of the two parts can be readily verified from property h, similarly to the proof of property G.

**GH.** Suppose that \( G \) is differentiable at \( (x, \pi) \). i) Since \( \Delta x \in V(x)[\pi] = \sum_{a \in A} x_a V_a[\pi] \) by (3), there exists \( (z_a)_{a \in A} \) such that \( \Delta x = \sum_{a \in A} x_a z_a \) and \( z_a \in V_a[\pi] \) for each \( a \). By property gh, we have

\[
\Delta x \cdot g_\pi[\pi] = \sum_{a \in A} x_a z_a \cdot g_\pi[\pi] = \sum_{a \in A} x_a h_a[\pi] = H(x)[\pi].
\]

By Assumption A0, \( g_\pi[\pi] \) is constant to \( x \); thus, \( G(x)[\pi] = g_\pi[\pi] \cdot x \) is linear in \( x \) with coefficient \( g_\pi[\pi] \), when \( \pi \) is fixed. Thus, \( \partial G / \partial x \equiv g_\pi[\pi] \). Plugging this into the above equation, we obtain part i) of property GH.

ii) As \( G(x)[\pi] = x \cdot g_\pi[\pi] \), property g2 implies

\[
\frac{\partial G}{\partial \pi}(x)[\pi] \Delta \pi = \sum_{a \in A} x_a \frac{\partial g_{a^*}}{\partial \pi}[\pi] \Delta \pi = \sum_{a \in A} x_a z_a \cdot \Delta \pi
\]
for any \( z_a \in V_a[\pi] \). Since \( \Delta x \in V[\pi](x) = \sum_{a \in A} x_a V_a[\pi] \) by (3), this implies part ii) of property GH.

**Proof of Theorem 3.** We use function \( G \) as a Lyapunov function \( W \) in Theorem 1 and function \( H \) as a decay rate function \( \tilde{W} \). Thanks to continuous differentiability (and thus Lipschitz continuity) of \( F \), Lipschitz continuity of \( G \) and lower semicontinuity of \( H \) are succeeded to those of \( G^F \) and \( H^F \), respectively. Properties G-i) and H-i) guarantee condition (a) in the theorem. By properties G-ii) and H-ii), condition (b) is satisfied with the limit set being \( X^* = \text{NE}(F) \).

By the chain rule and then property GH, we have

\[
\frac{d}{dt} G^F(x_t) = \frac{\partial G}{\partial x}(x_t)[F(x_t)]x_t + \frac{\partial G}{\partial \pi}(x_t)[F(x_t)] \frac{dF}{dx}(x_t)x_t \\
= \dot{x}_t \cdot \frac{dF}{dx}(x_t)x_t + H^F(x_t) \tag{11}
\]

for any \( x_t \in V^F(x_t) \) and \( x_t \in \Delta^A \). If \( DF \) is negative semidefinite at \( x_t \), (11) implies

\[
\frac{d}{dt} G^F(x_t) \leq H^F(x_t) \leq 0 \quad \text{for any } \dot{x}_t \in V^F(x).
\]

Thus we obtain (5) without making restriction on the initial state \( x_0 \); so it holds globally and thus the basin of attraction is \( \Delta^A \). This proves part i). By the same token, we can verify the local stability as in part ii-a) by setting \( X' \) to a neighborhood of \( x^* \) in which \( x^* \) is the only Nash equilibrium and \( DF \) is negative semidefinite.

For part ii-b), consider a Carathéodory solution path \( \{x_t\}_{t \in \mathbb{R}_+} \) from \( x_0 = x^* \). Then, we have \( \dot{G}^F(x_0) = H^F(x^*) + x_0 \cdot DF(x^*) \dot{x}_0 \). The former term \( H^F(x^*) \) is zero by property H-ii), since \( x^* \) is a Nash equilibrium. The assumption for part ii-b) allows us to take \( x_0 \in V^F(x^*) \) that makes the latter term \( x_0 \cdot DF(x^*) \dot{x}_0 \) being positive. With \( G(x_0) \geq 0 \) (indeed zero by property G-ii)), this implies \( G^F(x_t) > 0 \) for any \( t \) in some interval of time \((0, T]\). Property G-ii) implies that \( x_t \) in this interval of time cannot be at a Nash equilibrium. Thus, it must be escaping from \( x^* \); this implies that \( x^* \) is not Lyapunov stable.

\[\square\]
A3 Appendix to Section 5

A3.1 Appendix to Section 5.1

Modified framework for excess payoff dynamics

To interpret excess payoff dynamics as cost-benefit rationalizable, we need just one modification of our framework: the status-quo strategy should be $x$ as a mixed strategy, i.e., the average strategy (action distribution) of agents in the population. We imagine a birth-death process over generations (Alós-Ferrer and Neustadt, 2010), rather than a revision process of immortal agents as in the basic framework.\footnote{Specifically, an agent’s death follows a Poisson process with arrival rate 1. At the same time as one’s death, a new agent is born. Unless a newborn agent chooses to pay $q$, the agent is assigned to a randomly chosen action, drawn from the population’s action distribution $x$.} Everything else is the same as the basic framework. If an agent chooses to switch an action, then the agent chooses a pure strategy of a particular available action and pays switching cost $q$. Available action set $A' \subset A$ is randomly drawn from probability distribution $P_A$ over the power set of $A$; switching cost $q$ follows probability distribution $P_Q$ over $\mathbb{R}_+$. A newborn agent compares the net payoffs from pure strategies of available actions with the expected payoff from the default mixed strategy $x$; then the newborn agent decides whether to adopt the default strategy $x$ or to pay cost $q$ and take a pure strategy of an available action.

On $P_Q$, we maintain Assumption Q1. On $P_A$, we modify Assumption A1-i) only to fit the notation:

**Assumption (A1-i)').** For any $b \in A$, there is a set $A' \subset A$ such that $P_A(A') > 0$ and $b \in A'$.

As Assumption A1-i), this assumption simply means any action is always available with some positive probability. Assumption A1-ii) does not make sense for this situation and thus we drop it.

The (gross) payoff gain from a switch to action $a$ is indeed the excess payoff of the action, i.e., $\hat{\pi}_a := \pi_a - \pi \cdot x$; let $\hat{\pi}_*(A') := \pi_*(A') - \pi \cdot x$. Thus, after drawing available action set $A'$, an agent’s conditional switching rate must belong to $Q(\hat{\pi}_*(A'))$. Thus, the transition of the social state follows

$$\dot{x} \in V(x)[\pi] = \sum_{A' \subset A} P_A(A') Q(\hat{\pi}_*(A')) \left( \Delta^A(b_*(A')[\pi] - x) \right).$$
We call an evolutionary dynamic a cost-benefit rationalizable birth-death dynamic if it is constructed in this way and satisfies Assumptions Q1 and A1-i). It includes excess payoff dynamics and also some new dynamics.

### Equilibrium stability

Now we can define an individual’s first-order gain $g^*_*(x)[\pi]$ as

$$g^*_*(x)[\pi] := \sum_{A' \subset A} P_A(A') E_Q[\hat{\pi}^*_*(A') - q]_+.$$  

Note that it depends on $x$ as well as $\pi$, but all the agents share the same gain regardless of their current actions. As a result, the second order gain is zero; were the payoff vector fixed constant, we could say that the ex-ante first-order gain after a revision would not depend on the choice of an action in the revision thus it does not change from that gain before the revision. With the total mass of agents equal to one, the aggregate first-order gain $G(x)[\pi]$ is now just equal to the individual first-order gain: $G(x)[\pi] = g^*_*(x)[\pi] \cdot 1$. Similar to Theorem 2, we can prove $G$ satisfies properties G and GH-ii).

While the aggregate second-order gain cannot be used as a decay rate function $H$, we find that the following function $H$ works as the decay rate function coupled with $G$ as a Lyapunov function to meet properties in Theorem 2. This function $H$ is
obtained from \( \partial G / \partial x \) to meet property GH-i).

\[
H[\pi](x) = - \left\{ \sum_{A' \subset A} P_A(A') Q(\hat{\pi}_*(A')) \right\} \left\{ \sum_{A' \subset A} P_A(A') Q(\hat{\pi}_*(A')) \hat{\pi}_*(A') \right\}.
\]

From this form, it is immediate to see that \( H \) satisfies property H as well. Therefore, the pair of these \( G \) and \( H \) assures \( \delta \)-passivity of cost-benefit rationalizable birth-death dynamics.

### A3.2 Appendix to Section 5.3

Set-up of a multi-population game.

The society consists of \( P \) populations; let \( m^p > 0 \) be the mass of population \( p \in P := \{1, \ldots, P\} \) and \( \sum_{p \in P} m^p = 1 \). Let \( A^p = \{1, \ldots, A^p\} \) be the action set for an agent in population \( p \). Denote \( A^P := \sum_p A^p \). We denote by \( x^p_a \) the mass of action-\( a \) agents in population \( p \); population \( p \)'s state \( x^p := (x^p_a)_{a \in A^p} \) belongs to \( \mathcal{X}^p := m^p \Delta A^p \). The state of the entire society is \( x^P := (x^p)_{p \in P} \). Denote by \( \mathcal{X}^P := \times_{p \in P} \mathcal{X}^p \) the set of all the feasible social states. Let \( F^p : \mathcal{X}^P \to \mathbb{R}^{A^p} \) be the payoff function for an agent in population \( p \). \( F^p(x^P) \) is the payoff vector for agents in population \( p \in P \) when the social state is \( x^P \). Let \( \pi^P \), given a collection of payoff vectors \( \pi^p \in \mathbb{R}^{A^p} \) over all the populations \( p \in P \). The definition of static stability (Definition 1) is extended to a multi-population setting by requiring \( F, x, \Delta x \) in condition (4) to be replaced with \( F^P, x^P, \Delta x^P \).

**Example 1** (Saddle games). It has been long to call game theorists’ attention to a multi-player game with a (C\(^2\)-class) saddle function \( \phi : \mathcal{X}^P \to \mathbb{R} \) that is concave in \( x^C := (x^p)_{p \in P^C} \) and convex in \( x^V := (x^p)_{p \in P^V} \).\(^{48}\) Here, the population set is partitioned to \( P^C \) and \( P^V \). The payoff function for population \( p \) is given by \( F^c \equiv \partial \phi / \partial x^c \) for each \( c \in P^C \) and \( F^v \equiv -\partial \phi / \partial x^v \) for each \( v \in P^V \). Then, \( F^P \) is a stable game and a Nash equilibrium \( x^P^* \) is a saddle point of \( \phi \).

**Example 2** (Anonymous games). In an **anonymous game**, all populations \( p \in P \) share the same action set \( A \) and each population’s payoff vector depends on \( x^P \)

\(^{48}\) Nora and Uno (2014) relate correlated equilibria in a saddle game to robust equilibria under incomplete information. The study of evolutionary dynamics in this class of games dates back to Kose (1956). Sorin and Hofbauer (2006) verify Nash stability in this class of games under the standard BRD, while they regard this game as a zero-sum game. A class of saddle games is broader than that of zero-sum games; see Nora and Uno (2014, Example 1).
only through the aggregate action distribution over the society \( \bar{x} := \sum_{q \in \mathcal{P}} x^q \in \Delta^A \).
Assume that payoff heterogeneity is additively separable: each \( p \)'s payoff function \( F^p \) is written as \( F^p(x^P) = F^0(\sum_{q \in \mathcal{P}} x^q) + \theta^p \), the sum of common payoff function \( F^0 : \Delta^A \to \mathbb{R}^A \) and constant payoff perturbation \( \theta^p \in \mathbb{R}^A \). If \( F^0 \) is a stable game in the homogeneous setting, then \( F^P \) is also a stable game.

**Evolutionary dynamics and gains**

Let \( V^p : \mathcal{X}^p \times \mathbb{R}^{A^p} \to \mathbb{R}^{A^p} \) be the evolutionary dynamic for population \( p \)'s state \( x^p \). We allow each population \( p \) to follow a different revision protocol but we assume that \( V^p \) depends only on \( x^p \) and \( \pi^p \).\(^{49}\) Then, the social dynamic of \( x^P \) is constructed simply as

\[
\dot{x}^P = (\dot{x}^p)_{p \in \mathcal{P}} \in V^P(x^P)[\pi^P] := \bigtimes_{p \in \mathcal{P}} V^p(x^p)[\pi^p].
\]

If each population’s evolutionary dynamic \( V^p \) has functions \( G^p, H^p : \mathcal{X}^p \times \mathbb{R}^{A^p} \to \mathbb{R} \), then we define functions \( G^P, H^P : \mathcal{X}^P \times \mathbb{R}^{A^P} \to \mathbb{R} \) for the entire society \( \mathcal{P} \) by \( G^P(x^P)[\pi^P] := \sum_{p \in \mathcal{P}} G^p(x^p)[\pi^p] \) and \( H^P(x^P)[\pi^P] := \sum_{p \in \mathcal{P}} H^p(x^p)[\pi^p] \). As these are simply sums, it is easy to confirm that properties \( G, H \) and \( GH \) of \( G^p \) and \( H^p \) are succeeded to those of \( G^P \) and \( H^P \).

The modulalist’s view is behind this straightforward extension. Choices in different populations affect evolution in other populations through playing a game \( F^P \) on the same field.\(^{50}\) However, the separation of an evolutionary dynamic \( V(x)[\pi] \) from a game \( \pi = F(x) \) allows us to put aside this indirect interdependence between populations.

**A4 Appendix to Section 6**

**A4.1 An example for Section 6.1 and Section 6.2**

The following example of a strictly stable game illustrates i) a case where the aggregate gross gain may not decrease over time even under a cost-benefit rationalizable

\(^{49}\)For non-observational dynamics, it only requires uncoupledness—independence of the dynamic from \( \pi^{-p} \). However, for observational dynamics, it requires an agent’s observations of others’ choices to be limited to the same population.

\(^{50}\)Note that, because of this, even an uncoupled nonobservational dynamic cannot guarantee convergence to Nash equilibria in general (Hart and Mas-Colell, 2003).
Figure 4: Convergence to the unique Nash equilibrium in a good RPS and changes in the aggregate gross and net gains under a pairwise comparison dynamic (Smith). In Figure 4b, the aggregate net gain $G$ is shown with a black thick curve and the aggregate gross gain $\Gamma$ with a red thin curve.

**d**ynamic and ii) another case where that the aggregate net gain may not decrease under an *imitative* dynamic.

*Example 3 (Rock-Paper-Scissors)*. Here we consider random matching in a “good” Rock-Paper-Scissors game (Sandholm, 2010b, Example 3.3.2), where a player gets payoff of 1 from a win, 0 from a draw and $-0.9$ from a loss. This game is strictly stable and thus the unique Nash equilibrium $x^* = (x^*_R, x^*_P, x^*_S) = (1/3, 1/3, 1/3)$ is globally asymptotically stable under cost-benefit rationalizable dynamics.

In Figure 4a, the Smith dynamic starts from $x = (0.9, 0.05, 0.05)$ and indeed converges to $x^*$. In Figure 4b, the aggregate net gain $G$ decreases over time while the aggregate gross gain $\Gamma$ has a decreasing trend but with perpetual fluctuations.

Figure 5 illustrates the evolution under the replicator dynamic. Both the aggregate net gain $G$ and the aggregate gross gain $\Gamma$ fluctuate. According to Taylor and Jonker (1978), function $W_{x^*}(x) = \sum_{a \in A}(1/3)(\ln x^*_a - \ln x_a)$ works as a Lyapunov function. Actually it decreases over time; the trajectory converges from $(0.9, 0.05, 0.05)$ to $x^*$. 
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Consider the replicator dynamic; it could fit into our notation by having $P_{Aa}(\{b\}) = x_b$. If we dare to apply our definition of the aggregate net gain, we obtain

$$G(x)[\pi] = \sum_{a \in A} x_a \sum_{b \in A} x_b E_Q[\pi_b - \pi_a - q]_+.$$

We can readily find that the time derivative of this aggregate gain function is

$$\dot{G}(x)[\pi] = \dot{x} \cdot \frac{\partial G}{\partial \pi} + H(x)[\pi] + \sum_{a \in A} x_a \sum_{b \in A} \dot{x}_b E_Q[\pi_b - \pi_a - q]_+.$$

The last term represents the effects of changes in $x$ through changes in the sampling probability $P_{Aa}(\{b\}) = x_b$ and thus appears peculiarly for imitative dynamics. Although $H$ is still negative, this term prevents $G$ from decreasing monotonically over time even in a stable game, as seen in Example 3.

Notice that $\dot{x}_b$ may be positive or negative, depending on the share of $b$ players.
(and thus the likelihood of having them sampled) and the relative payoff of $b$. If $b$ performs better than other strategies and also has a large share of players currently, this additional term should be positive while the other terms are negative. This refuels the aggregate ex-ante net gain; a greater share of action $b$ makes it more likely to sample action-$b$ players and thus to mimic it, which offsets a negative effect of the increase in the share by self-defeating externality.
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