Abstract. This paper studies convex stochastic dynamic team problems with finite and infinite time horizons under decentralized information structures. First, we introduce two notions called exchangeable teams and symmetric information structures. We show that in convex exchangeable team problems an optimal policy exhibits a symmetry structure. We give a characterization for such symmetrically optimal teams for a general class of convex dynamic team problems under mild conditional independence conditions. In addition, through concentration of measure arguments, we establish the convergence of optimal policies for teams with $N$ decision makers to the corresponding optimal policies for symmetric mean-field teams with infinitely many decision makers. As a by-product, we present an existence result for convex mean-field teams, where the main contribution of our paper is with respect to the information structure in the system when compared with the related results in the literature that have either assumed a classical information structure or a static information structure. We also apply these results to the important special case of LQG team problems, where while for partially nested LQG team problems with finite time horizons it is known that the optimal policies are linear, for infinite horizon problems the linearity of optimal policies has not been established in full generality. We also study average cost finite and infinite horizon dynamic team problems with a symmetric partially nested information structure and obtain globally optimal solutions where we establish linearity of optimal policies. Moreover, we also study average cost infinite horizon LQG dynamic teams under sparsity and delay constraints.
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1. Introduction and literature review. Team problems consist of a collection of decision makers or agents acting together to optimize a common cost function, but not necessarily sharing all the available information. The term stochastic teams refers to the class of team problems where there exist randomness in the initial states, observations, cost realizations, or the evolution of the dynamics. At each time stage, each agent only has partial access to the global information which is defined by the information structure (IS) of the problem [43]. If there is a pre-defined order in which the decision makers act then the team is called a sequential team. For sequential teams, if each agent’s information depends only on primitive random variables, the team is static. If at least one agent’s information is affected by an action of another agent, the team is said to be dynamic. Information structures can be further categorized as classical, partially nested, and non-classical. An IS is classical if the information of decision maker $i$ (DM$_i$) contains all of the information available to DM$_k$ for $k < i$. An IS is partially nested, if whenever the action of DM$_k$, for some $k < i$, affects the information of DM$_i$, then the information of DM$_i$ contains the information of DM$_k$. An IS which is not partially nested is non-classical. A detailed review is presented in [48].

Obtaining structural results in team problems is important towards establishing both existence and computational/approximation methods for optimal policies. In this paper, we define the notion of exchangeable teams and symmetric information structures, and we show that, for convex exchangeable dynamic teams with finite horizons, optimal policies exhibit a symmetry structure (Theorem 2.7). For any number of DMs, this symmetry structure is more relaxed when compared with the symmetry results developed earlier, e.g. in [35, 36] which focused on problems under a static information structure, and is applicable for dynamic teams which may not admit a static reduction, as long as convexity in policies holds for the team problem.

There have been many studies involving decentralized stochastic control with infinitely many decision makers. In particular, when the coupling among the decision makers is only through some aggregate/average effect, such problems can be viewed within the umbrella...
of mean-field games [26, 19], which were introduced as a limit model for non-cooperative symmetric \( N \)-player differential games with mean-field interaction as \( N \to \infty \). The solution concept in game theory is often Nash equilibrium, and often under various characterizations of it in dynamic Bayesian setups. In the context of decentralized stochastic control or teams, these would correspond to person-by-person optimal solutions, and hence not necessarily globally optimal solutions.

Nonetheless, on the existence as well as uniqueness and non-uniqueness results on equilibria, there have been several studies for mean-field games [26, 5, 13, 28, 20]. There have also been several studies for mean-field games where the limits of sequences of Nash equilibria have been investigated as the number of decision makers \( N \to \infty \) (see e.g., [14, 23, 6, 26, 4]). We refer interested readers to [12, 10] for a literature review and a detailed summary of some recent results on mean-field games.

Some notable relevant studies from the mean-field literature are the following: In [14], through a concentration of measures argument, it has been shown that sequences of \( \epsilon_N \)-local (for each player) Nash equilibria for \( N \) player games converge to a solution for the mean-field game under exchangeability of the initial states and weak convergence of normalized occupational measures to a deterministic measure [14, Theorem 5.1]. In [21], assumptions on equilibrium policies of the large population mean-field symmetric stochastic differential games have been presented to allow the convergence of asymmetric approximate Nash equilibria to a weak solution of the mean-field game [21, Theorem 2.6].

However, in these studies the information structures are restricted to the following models: In [14] the information structure is assumed to be static since strategies of each player are assumed to be adapted to the filtration generated by his/her initial states and Wiener process (also called distributed open-loop controllers in the mean-field games’ literature [21, 13, 12]) (see Remark 2 for details of this discussion). Convergence of Nash equilibria induced by closed-loop controllers to a weak semi-Markov mean-field equilibrium has been established in [23] for finite horizon mean-field game problems, where the classical information structure (i.e., what would be a centralized problem in the team theoretic setup) has been considered. For infinite horizon problems, in [11], an example of ergodic differential games with mean-field coupling has been constructed such that limits of sequences of expected costs induced by symmetric Nash-equilibrium of \( N \)-player games capture expected costs induced by many more Nash-equilibrium policies including a mean-field equilibrium and social optima. In [23], the classical information structure (a centralized problem) has been considered, where in [11] it has been assumed that players have access to all the history of states of all players but not controls (we note that in the team problem setup through using a classical result of Blackwell [8] in the case where each DM knows all the history of states of all DMs, optimal policies can be realized as one in the centralized problem where just the global state is a sufficient statistic). Moreover, under relaxed regularity conditions on dynamics and the cost function, a limit theory has been established for controlled McKean-Vlasov dynamics [22] under the classical information structure, where through a similar analysis as in [14, 21], it has been shown that the empirical measure of pairs of states and \( \epsilon_N \)-open-loop optimal controls converges weakly as \( N \to \infty \) to limit points in the set of pairs of states and optimal controls of the McKean-Vlasov problem.

The above highlight the intricacies due to the information structure aspects: different from the aforementioned studies above, we consider information structures that are not necessarily static or classical. Also, in this paper we work with global optimality and not only mean-field equilibria and we show the existence of a globally optimal policy for mean-field team problems. On the other hand, in our paper since we work under the convexity assumption, the information structure does not allow for mean-field coupling in the dynamics. We also note that in prior work, [35], we studied static teams where under convexity and more restrictive symmetry conditions, global optimality of a limit policy of a sequence of \( N \)-DM optimal policies has been established.

In the context of stochastic teams with countably infinite number of decision makers, the
and global team optimality is significant since a perturbation of finitely many policies fails to
devalue the value of the expected cost, thus person by person optimality is a weak condition
for such a setup, and hence the results presented in the aforementioned papers may be in-
conclusive regarding global optimality of the limit equilibrium. For teams and social optima
control problems, the analysis has primarily focused on the LQG model where the centralized
performance has been shown to be achieved asymptotically by decentralized controllers (see
e.g., [18, 2, 3]).

We also obtain existence results on optimal policies for the setups considered. Compared
to the results on the existence of a globally optimal policy in team problems where (finite)
$N$-DM teams have been considered [47, 15, 49, 34], we study convex team problems
with countably infinite number of decision makers.

Parts of our results in this paper correspond to Linear Quadratic Gaussian (LQG) teams.
In [16], it has been shown that for teams with finite number of DMs, dynamic teams with
a partially nested information structure can be reduced to a static one ([16, 45]) where Rad-
ner’s theorem concludes global optimality of linear policies for LQG team problems [31].
However, for average cost infinite horizon, partially nested, LQG dynamic team problems
so far there has been no universal result establishing that a globally optimal policy is linear,
time-invariant, and stabilizing, and this has been often imposed apriori: In [33], the problem
of designing a linear, time-invariant, stabilizing, state feedback optimal policy for decen-
tralized $H_2$-optimization problems, which satisfy the quadratically invariance property, has
been addressed by reparametrizing the problem as a convex problem (via Youla parametriza-
tion). In [32], it has been shown that for sequential team problems involving linear systems,
quadratic invariance and the partially nested property are equivalent. For a class of partially
ordered (POSET) systems, state space techniques have been utilized to obtain optimal, linear,
time-invariant, state feedback controllers for $H_2$-optimization problems with sparsity con-
straints [40]. A similar result has been established in [41] where linearity and time invariance
have been imposed apriori. In [27], $H_2$-optimization output feedback problems with two-
players have been considered and optimality results have been established when the optimal
policies are restricted to linear, time invariant, stabilizing policies. However, the results in
[27, 33, 40, 41] are inconclusive regarding global optimality. Our contribution here is to con-
sider average cost infinite horizon dynamic team problems without restricting the set of poli-
cies to those that are linear, time-invariant, and stabilizing unlike the results in [27, 33, 40, 41].

We note again that the optimality of linear policies for infinite horizon LQG problems is open
in its generality and we provide positive results for a class of such problems.

Average cost, infinite horizon, team problems with the one step delay sharing pattern
have not been fully addressed in the literature, despite the presence of results where finite-
ness of the state space and actions and additional technical assumptions on the information
structure and the cost function have been imposed [1]. In [24], under the assumption that
initial states and disturbances are independent, the state feedback optimal policy has been
obtained for finite horizon LQG team problems with a partially nested information structure
admitting delay and sparsity constraints [24]. This approach assumes full state feedback with
independent initial states and disturbances. The result has been extended to average cost infin-
ite horizon LQG problems where under some technical assumptions, the convergence of the
solution to the solution of the corresponding algebraic Riccati equations [24] has been shown;
however, global optimality of the limit solution has not been established. In this paper, we
establish global optimality.

Contributions. In view of the discussion above, our paper makes the following contribu-
tions.

(i) We define the notion of exchangeable teams and symmetric information structures,
and we show that, for convex exchangeable dynamic teams with finite horizons,
optimal policies exhibit a symmetry structure (Theorem 2.7). For any number of
DMs, this symmetry structure is more relaxed when compared with the symmetry
results developed in [35, 36] and is applicable for dynamic teams which may not admit a static reduction, as long as convexity in policies holds for the team problem.

(ii) For convex mean-field teams with a symmetric information structure, through concentration of measure arguments, we establish the convergence of optimal polices for mean-field teams with $N$ decision makers to the corresponding optimal policies for mean-field teams (see Theorem 3.2).

(iii) We establish an existence result for the class of convex mean-field teams with a symmetric information structure (see Theorem 3.3) for finite horizon problems, where, as noted in the literature review, related results assumed more restrictive information structures which are either static or classical.

(iv) We also apply our results to LQG dynamic teams for finite horizon problems (see Section 4). For LQG dynamic teams with a symmetric partially nested information pattern, we obtain an optimal policy for finite horizon problems (see Section 4.1). We also apply convex mean-field results to LQG mean-field teams with a symmetric partially nested information structure (see Section 4.1) and obtain a globally optimal policy. Building on the result above, we also obtain a globally optimal policy for average cost team problems with a symmetric partially nested. For LQG dynamic teams with the one step delayed information structure, we show that under observability and controllability conditions, a globally optimal policy for the average cost infinite horizon problems can be obtained as the pointwise limit of the sequence of optimal policies for finite horizon problems as $T \to \infty$. Hence, we establish linearity of a global optimal policy (see Theorem 4.13).

The organization of the paper is as follows: we study convex exchangeable dynamic teams with finite horizons in Section 2, and we study mean-field teams in Section 3. We obtain globally optimal solutions for finite horizon problems with a symmetric partially nested information structure and LQG mean-field teams in Section 4.1, and we discuss average cost LQG team problems with a symmetric information structure and with the one step delayed sharing pattern and sparsity in Section 4.2.1 and Section 4.2.2, respectively.

1.1. Preliminaries. We first introduce preliminaries following the presentation in [49], in particular, we introduce the characterizations laid out by Witsenhausen, through his Intrinsic Model [43]. Consider sequential systems and assume the action and measurement spaces are standard Borel spaces, that is, Borel subsets of complete, separable and metric spaces. The Intrinsic Model for sequential teams is defined as follows.

- There exists a collection of measurable spaces $\{(\Omega, \mathcal{F}), (\mathcal{U}^i, \mathcal{U}^i), (\mathcal{Y}^i, \mathcal{Y}^i), i \in \mathcal{N}\}$, specifying the system’s distinguishable events, and control and measurement spaces. In this model (described in discrete time), any action applied at any given time is regarded as applied by an individual decision maker (DM), who acts only once. The pair $(\Omega, \mathcal{F})$ is a measurable space (on which an underlying probability measure may be defined). The pair $(\mathcal{U}^i, \mathcal{U}^i)$ denotes the measurable space from which the action, $u^i$, of DM $i$ is selected. The pair $(\mathcal{Y}^i, \mathcal{Y}^i)$ denotes the measurable observation/measurement space.

- There is a measurement constraint to establish the connection between the observation variables and the system’s distinguishable events. The $\mathcal{Y}^i$-valued observation variables are given by $y^i = h^i(\omega, u^{[1:i-1]}_k)$, where $u^{[1,i-1]}_k = \{u^k, k \leq i-1\}$, $h^i$s are measurable functions and $u^k$s denote the action of DM $k$. Hence, $y^i$ induces $\sigma(y^i)$ over $\Omega \times \prod_{k=1}^{i-1} \mathcal{U}^k$.

- The set of admissible control laws $\gamma = \{\gamma^i\}_{i \in \mathcal{N}}$, also called designs or policies, are measurable control functions, so that $u^i = \gamma^i(y^i)$. Let $\Gamma^i$ denote the set of all admissible policies for DM $i$ and let $\Gamma = \prod_{i \in \mathcal{N}} \Gamma^i$.

- There is a probability measure $\mathbb{P}$ on $(\Omega, \mathcal{F})$ describing the probability space on which the system is defined.

Under the intrinsic model, every DM acts separately. However, depending on the information
structure, it may be convenient to consider a collection of DMs as a single DM acting at different time instances. In fact, in classical stochastic control, this is the standard approach.

**Notation.** \( \mathbb{R} \) and \( \mathbb{N} \) denote the set of real numbers and natural numbers, respectively. We denote trace of a matrix \( A \) as \( Tr(A) \). We denote that a random vector \( X \) is independent of a random vector \( Y \) by \( X \perp Y \). We denote \( A^T \) as the transpose of a matrix \( A \) and \( A^{(T)} \) to show the dependence of a matrix \( A \) to \( T \in \mathbb{N} \).

2. Finite horizon convex dynamic team problems with a symmetric information structure. In this section, we characterize symmetry in dynamic team problems. According to the discussion above, by considering a collection of DMs as a single DM \((i = 1, \ldots, N)\) acting at different time instances \((t = 0, \ldots, T - 1)\), we redefine the team problem with \((NT)\)-DMs as a team with \(N\)-DMs:

(i) Let the observation spaces and action spaces be standard Borel spaces and be identical for each DM \((i = 1, \ldots, N)\) with \( Y_i = Y = \prod_{k=0}^{T-1} \mathcal{Y}_k, U_i = \mathcal{U} = \prod_{k=0}^{T-1} \mathcal{U}_k \), respectively. The sets of all admissible policies are denoted by \( \Gamma_i = \prod_{t=1}^{T-1} \Gamma_t \). For each DM \((i)\) the dependence of a matrix \( \bar{p} \) on the set \( \mathcal{Y}_t \) and \( \mathcal{U}_t \) is denoted by \( \bar{p}_{ij} \) and \( \bar{p}_{ij}^{\gamma^t} \) for some Borel measurable cost function \( \gamma^t \). The symmetric information structure can also be interpreted as a graph, in which the edges represent the dependency notation in the information of nodes, and \( \gamma^t \) denotes all the uncertainty associated with DMs including his/her initial states, \( \gamma^t \) taking values in the space \( \Omega \). For \( i = 1, \ldots, N \), \( y_t^i := h_t^i(\xi^{1:N}_t, u_{0:t-1}^i, u_{0:t-1}) \) represents the observation of DM at time \( t \) (\( h_t^i \) is Borel measurable) and \( \xi^{1:N}_t := (\xi^{1}, \ldots, \xi^{t-1}, \xi^{t+1}, \ldots, \xi^{N}) \) and \( u_{0:t-1} := (u_{0:t-1}^1, \ldots, u_{0:t-1}^N) \).

(ii) Let \( \omega := (\xi^{1:N}) := (\xi^{1}, \ldots, \xi^{N}) \) where \( \xi^{i} \) denotes all the uncertainty associated with DM \( i \).

(iii) Let the expected cost function be defined as \( J_T(\xi^{1:N}) = \mathbb{E}_{\xi^{1:N}}[c(\xi^{1:N}, \omega^{1:N})] \), for some Borel measurable cost function \( c : \Omega^N \times \prod_{k=0}^{T-1} \mathcal{U} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+ \), where \( \omega^{1:N} = (\omega^{1}, \ldots, \omega^{N}) \) and \( \omega_t^i = \gamma^t_{0:t-1} \) for \( i = 1, \ldots, N \).

Now, we define the symmetric information structure (note that symmetric information structures can be classical, partially nested, or non-classical).

**Definition 2.1.** Let the information of DM \( i \) acting at time \( t \) be described as \( I^t_i := \{y_t^i\} \). The information structure of a sequential \( N \)-DM team problem is symmetric if

(i) \( y_t^i = h_t(\xi^{1:N}, \xi^{t-1}, u_{0:t-1}^i, u_{0:t-1}) \) where \( h_t \) is identical for all \( i = 1, \ldots, N \).

We note that the above definition can be generalized to be applicable for teams with countably infinite DMs and infinite horizon problems.

The symmetric information structure can also be interpreted and defined as a graph, which has often been the common method to describe information structures in the control theory, relating DMs and their information through directed edges. Consider \( \mathcal{G}(V, \mu) \) as a directed graph with \( V = \{1, \ldots, NT\} \) nodes and where \( \mu \subset V \times V \) determines the directed edges between nodes; this represents the dependency notation in the information of nodes, i.e., \((i, j)\) denotes a directed edge from \( i \) to \( j \), \( i \rightarrow j \), it means \( u^t \) affects \( y^t \) through the relation \( y^t = h^t(\omega, u^{[1:t-1]}_i) \) defined in the intrinsic model (see Section 1.1). We denote by \( \downarrow j \) as the set of nodes \( i \) such that \( i \rightarrow j \) (ancestors), and \( \uparrow j = \{ \downarrow j \} \cup \{j\} \). Similarly, we can define descendants by \( \uparrow j \). We can define a collection of DMs as a single DM \((i = 1, \ldots, N)\) acting at different time instances \((t = 0, \ldots, T - 1)\) on a graph with a symmetric information structure (two examples are shown in Fig. 2.1, and Fig. 2.2). Assume

(i) there exists a node \( \{i\} \) (root node) that represents initial states of DMs and \( \omega_0 = (x_0^i, \ldots, x_0^N) \). Each sub-graph represents a single DM acting at time instances \( t = 0, \ldots, T - 1 \), and there exists a finite number of sub-graphs \( G_p(\hat{V}, \hat{\mu}) \) such that \( \bigcup_{p=1}^{N} G_p \cup \{i\} = G \), where \( G_p \) are isomorphic (see e.g., [42]) for all \( p = 1, \ldots, N \), i.e., for every node with directed edges in each sub-graph there exists a unique node with identical directed edges in the corresponding sub-graphs, where \( \hat{V} = \{0, \ldots, T - 1\} \), and \( G_0^p \) refers to a node \( k \) in \( G_p \), for all \( p = 1, \ldots, N \) and \( k = 0, \ldots, T - 1 \).

(ii) sharing of the information is symmetric across sub-graphs, i.e., for \( p, s = 1, \ldots, N \), and \( k, j = 0, \ldots, T - 1 \), and for every edge from a node \( G_p^k \) to a node \( G_j^l \), there exists an edge
from a node $G^k_p$ to nodes $G^j_{p−p}$, where $G^j_{p−p}$ denotes $(G^j_1, \ldots, G^j_{p−1}, G^j_{p+1}, \ldots, G^j_N)$, and also there exist edges from nodes $G^k_{p−p}$ to a node $G^j_p$.

We present an exchangeability hypothesis on the cost function. First, we recall the definition of an exchangeable finite set of random variables.

**Definition 2.2.** Random variables (vectors) $x^1, x^2, \ldots, x^N$ defined on a common probability space are exchangeable if any permutation, $\sigma$, of the set $\{1, \ldots, N\}$ does not change the joint probability measures of random variables (vectors), i.e., $\mathbb{P}(dx^1, dx^2, \ldots, dx^N) = \mathbb{P}(dx^{\sigma 1}, dx^{\sigma 2}, \ldots, dx^{\sigma N})$.

**Assumption 2.1.** Assume for any permutation $\sigma \in \Sigma$ of the set $\{1, \ldots, N\}$, where $\Sigma$ is the set of all possible permutations, we have $\mathbb{P}$-almost surely,

$$c((x^{\sigma})_1^{1:N}, (d^{\sigma})_1^{1:N}) = c((x^1)_1^{1:N}, (d^1)_1^{1:N}).$$

Here, we recall some definitions and results from [49, Section 3.3] on convexity of static and dynamic team problems required to follow the result in this paper.

**Definition 2.3.** [49, Section 3.3] An $N$-DM team problem (static or dynamic) is convex in policies if for any two team policies $\gamma_0^{0:N}$ and $\gamma_0^{0:N}$ in the set $\{\gamma^{0:N}_0 \in \Gamma : J(\gamma^{0:N}_0) < \infty\}$, and for any $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, we have

$$J_T(\alpha\gamma^{0:N}_0 + (1-\alpha)\gamma^{0:N}_0) \leq \alpha J_T(\gamma^{0:N}_0) + (1-\alpha) J_T(\gamma^{0:N}_0).$$

The above definition can also be applied to infinite-horizon and/or teams with countably infinite number of DMs. We recall sufficient conditions for convexity of static and dynamic team problems following [49, Section 3.3].

**Theorem 2.4.** [49, Section 3.3] Consider a sequential team problems, and assume action spaces are convex, and $J(\gamma) < \infty$ for all $\gamma \in \Gamma$ (or alternatively, restrict the set to those leading to the finite cost). Then

(i) for static team problems, convexity of the cost function in actions, $\mathbb{P}$-almost sure convexity in $u_1^{1:N}$ of $c((\cdot^{1:N}, u_1^{1:N})$, is sufficient for convexity of the team problem in policies,

(ii) for dynamic team problems with a static reduction, convexity of the team problem in policies is equivalent to the convexity of its static reduction.

(iii) in particular, for partially nested dynamic teams with a static reduction (more generally, for stochastically partially nested team problems [49, Section 3.3]) if the statically reduced cost function is convex in actions then the team problem is convex on $\Gamma$.

The conditions above, however, are only sufficient conditions [49, Example 1]. We note however that as a Corollary for (ii) above, for the LQG setup, under partial nestedness, convexity in policies hold as a consequence of Radners theorem; we will study this case in Section 4. On the other hand, not all LQG problems are convex; the celebrated counterexample of Witsenhausen [44] demonstrates that under non-classical information structures, even LQG problems may not be convex and optimal policies may not be linear.

![Fig. 2.1: A tree structure of a symmetric dynamic team.](image)
2.1. Optimality of symmetric policies for convex dynamic teams with a symmetric information structure. In the following, we define notions of exchangeable and symmetrically optimal teams analogous to [35, 36] for dynamic teams.

**Definition 2.5.** (Exchangeable teams)

An $N$-DM team is exchangeable if the value of the expected cost function is invariant under every permutation of policies of DMs, i.e., $J_T(\gamma_1^T, \gamma_2^T, \ldots, \gamma_N^T) = J_T((\gamma_j^T)^1, \ldots, (\gamma_j^T)^N)$.

**Definition 2.6.** (Symmetrically optimal teams)

A team is symmetrically optimal, if for every given policy $\gamma_t^T = (\gamma_1^T, \ldots, \gamma_N^T)$, there exists an identically symmetric policy (i.e., each DM has the same policy, $\tilde{\gamma}_t^T = (\tilde{\gamma}_1^T, \ldots, \tilde{\gamma}_N^T)$, and $\tilde{\gamma}_i^T = \tilde{\gamma}_j^T$ for all $i, j = 1, \ldots, N$) which performs at least as good as the given policy.

**Remark 1.** The concepts of exchangeable and symmetrically optimal dynamic teams in this paper are generalizations of those for static teams in [35, 36]. However, here, the value of the cost function may not be invariant under exchanging $\gamma_k^t$ with $\gamma_j^k$ for $k \neq t$, $k, t = 0, \ldots, T - 1$, and for $i, j = 1, \ldots, N$.

Here, we give a characterization for exchangeable and symmetrically optimal dynamic teams.

**Theorem 2.7.** Consider a team problem with a symmetric information structure (see Definition 2.1) under Assumption 2.1. If

(a) action spaces are convex for each DM,
(b) $(\zeta_1^1, \ldots, \zeta_N^1)$ are exchangeable,
(c) for all policies $\gamma \in \Gamma$,

\[
\prod_{t=0}^{T-1} P \left( dy_t^{1:N} | \zeta_1^{1:N}, y_{\downarrow t}^{1:N}, \gamma_{\downarrow t}^{1:N} (y_{\downarrow t}^{1:N}) \right) = \prod_{t=0}^{T-1} \prod_{i=1}^{N} P \left( dy_t^{i} | \zeta_i^{i}, y_{\downarrow t}^{i}, \gamma_{\downarrow t}^{i} (y_{\downarrow t}^{i}) \right),
\]

where $\downarrow \downarrow (1 : N)$ denotes $(\downarrow \downarrow 1, \ldots, \downarrow \downarrow N)$ and $y_{\downarrow t}^{i}$ corresponds to the observations of DM$i$’s (including DM$i$ itself) at time instances $p$ where the action of DM$j$’s at time $p$ affects the observation of DM$i$ at time $t$ ($\gamma_{\downarrow t}^{1:N} (y_{\downarrow t}^{1:N})$) can be defined similarly),

(i) then, the team problem is exchangeable.

(ii) Furthermore, if the team problem is convex in policies (see Theorem 2.4), then the team is symmetrically optimal.
Proof. We first show that for any permutation \( \sigma \in \Sigma \) of policies
\( J_T((\sigma_1)^N, \ldots, (\sigma_N)^N) = J_T((\sigma_1)^N, \ldots, (\sigma_N)^N) \), i.e., the team is exchangeable. We have,

\[
J_T \left( (\sigma_1), \ldots, (\sigma_N) \right)
\]

(2.3)

\[
= \int c \left( (\zeta_1^{1:N}, (\zeta_2^{1:N}(y_1^{1,1})), \ldots, (\zeta_N^{1:N}(y_1^{1,N})) \right) P(d\zeta_1^{1:N}) \prod_{t=0}^{T-1} \prod_{i=1}^{N} P \left( dy_i^{1:t} | \zeta_{i\downarrow t}^{1}, y_{i\downarrow t}^{1:t}, (\gamma_{i\downarrow t}^{1:t})^{1:t} \right)
\]

(2.4)

\[
= \int c \left( (\zeta_1), \ldots, (\zeta_N^{1:N}(y_1^{1,N})) \right) P(d\zeta_1^{1:N}) \prod_{t=0}^{T-1} \prod_{i=1}^{N} P \left( dy_i^{1:t} | (\zeta_1), (\gamma_{i\downarrow t}^{1:t})^{1:t}, (y_1^{1:t})^{1:t} \right)
\]

(2.5)

\[
= J_T((\gamma_1), \ldots, (\gamma_2))
\]

where (2.3) follows from Assumption (c). Equality (2.4) follows from exchanging \( y_i^{1}, \zeta_i^{1} \) with \( (y_1^{1}, \zeta_1^{1}) \) by relabeling them, respectively. Since the information structure is symmetric, (2.1) and Assumption (b) imply (2.5). Hence, the team is exchangeable. Let \( \tilde{\gamma}_{T}^{*} \) be a team optimal policy. Consider \( \tilde{\gamma}_{T}^{*} \) as a convex combination of all possible permutations of policies by averaging them. Since action spaces are convex, \( \tilde{\gamma}_{T}^{*} \) is a control policy. Following from convexity of the cost function in policies, we have for \( \sum_{\sigma \in \Sigma} \alpha_{\sigma} = 1 \), and \( \alpha_{\sigma} \in (0, 1) \),

\[
J_T(\tilde{\gamma}_{T}^{*}) := J_T(\sum_{\sigma \in \Sigma} \alpha_{\sigma} \tilde{\gamma}_{T}^{\sigma}) \leq \sum_{\sigma \in \Sigma} \alpha_{\sigma} J_T(\tilde{\gamma}_{T}^{\sigma}) = J_T(\gamma_{T}^{*})
\]

where the inequality follows from the hypothesis that the team problem is convex on \( \Gamma \) and the last equality follows from exchangeability of the team problem. This implies that \( \tilde{\gamma}_{T}^{*} \) is team optimal and the dynamic team is symmetrically optimal.

Examples will be given in Section 4.1 where Theorem 2.7 can be applied. Here, we present the result for the class of problems that admit a static reduction (see [48, Section 3.7], [49, Section 1.2], [17, 45]).

**Lemma 2.8.** Consider a dynamic team problem with a symmetric partially nested information structure (see Definition 2.1) which admits a static reduction. Under Assumption 2.1, and Assumptions (a), (b), (c) of Theorem 2.7, if the cost function is jointly convex on \( \mathcal{U}_{1}^{1}, \ldots, \mathcal{U}_{N}^{N} \), \( \mathbb{P} \)-almost surely, then the team is symmetrically optimal.

We note that here by symmetry we mean symmetry across the decision makers.

**Proof.** The proof follows from Theorem 2.4(iii) and Theorem 2.7 since the team is convex on \( \Gamma \).

It follows that if a static reduction of an exchangeable, symmetrically optimal, dynamic team exists, then it is exchangeable and symmetrically optimal.

3. **Convex mean-field teams with a symmetric information structure.** In the following, we establish global optimality results for convex mean-field teams with a symmetric information structure (that are not necessarily partially nested).
**Problem** ($\mathcal{P}_{T}^{N,\text{MF}}$): Consider the expected cost function for $N$-DM teams defined as

$$J_{T}^{N}(\gamma_{T}) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \mathbb{E}^{\gamma_{T}}_{t}[c(x_{t}^{i}, u_{t}^{i}, \frac{1}{N} \sum_{p=1}^{N} u_{t}^{p}, \frac{1}{N} \sum_{p=1}^{N} x_{t}^{p}])],$$

where $\gamma_{T}^{i} = (x_{0}^{i}, u_{0}^{i}, \omega_{0}^{i})$, and the cost function satisfies the following assumption.

**Assumption 3.1.** The cost function, $c : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{U} \times \mathcal{U} \times \mathcal{X} \to \mathbb{R}_{+}$, is continuous in all its arguments, where $\mathcal{X}$, $\mathcal{U}$ denote the state space and action space of DMs at all time instances.

**Problem** ($\mathcal{P}_{T}^{\infty,\text{MF}}$): Consider the expected cost for mean-field teams as

$$J_{T}^{\infty}(\gamma_{T}) = \lim_{N \to \infty} J_{T}^{N}(\gamma_{T}),$$

where $J_{T}^{N}(\cdot)$ is defined in (3.1), $\gamma_{T}^{i} = \gamma_{0:T-1}^{i}$ for $i \in \mathbb{N}$, and $\gamma_{T} = \{\gamma_{T}^{i}\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$. Let

$$x_{t+1}^{i} = f_{t}(x_{t}^{i}, u_{t}^{i}, w_{t}^{i}),$$

$$y_{t}^{i} = h_{t}(x_{0:t}^{i}, u_{0:t}^{i}, v_{0:t}^{i}),$$

where functions $f_{t}$ and $h_{t}$ are measurable functions. The information structure for DM $i$ at time $t$ is $I_{t}^{i} = \{y_{t}^{i}\}$ for $i \in \mathbb{N}$ and $t = 0, \ldots, T-1$, and $\gamma_{t}^{i} := (u_{t}^{i}, v_{t}^{i})$ (with $\omega_{0}^{i} := (x_{0}^{i}, u_{0}^{i}, v_{0}^{i})$) denotes uncertainty corresponding to dynamics and observations at time $t$ for DM $i$ which are exogenous random vectors in the standard Borel space

**Assumption 3.2.** Functions $f_{t}$ and $h_{t}$ are continuous in the state and actions.

### 3.1. Mean-field optimal policies as limits of optimal $N$-DM teams.

**Assumption 3.3.** Assume

(i) $\omega_{0}^{i} := \{x_{0}^{i}\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ are exchangeable zero mean random vectors with an identical distribution (not necessarily independent),

(ii) for $t = 0, \ldots, T-1$, $\{u_{t}^{i}\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ are i.i.d. zero mean random vectors, and for $i \in \mathbb{N}$, $\{w_{t}^{i}\}_{t=0}^{T-1}$ are mutually independent, and independent of $\omega_{0}^{i}$. For $t = 0, \ldots, T-1$, $\{v_{t}^{i}\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ are i.i.d. zero mean random vectors, and for $i \in \mathbb{N}$, $\{v_{t}^{i}\}_{t=0}^{T-1}$ are mutually independent, and independent of $\omega_{0}^{i}$ and $w_{t}^{i}$s for $i \in \mathbb{N}$ and $t = 0, \ldots, T-1$.

**Lemma 3.1.** Consider a team defined as ($\mathcal{P}_{T}^{N,\text{MF}}$) (see (3.1)) with a symmetric information structure. Assume the problem is convex in policies. Let the action space be compact and convex for each decision makers. Under Assumption 3.1, Assumption 3.2, and Assumption 3.3 for $i = 1, \ldots, N$, the team is symmetrically optimal.

**Proof.** The proof follows from Theorem 2.7.

**Theorem 3.2.** Consider a team defined as ($\mathcal{P}_{T}^{\infty,\text{MF}}$) (see (3.2)) with ($\mathcal{P}_{T}^{N,\text{MF}}$) having a symmetric information structure for every $N$. Assume for every $N$ the team is convex in policies. Let the action space be compact and convex for each DM. Under Assumption 3.1, Assumption 3.2, and Assumption 3.3, if there exists a sequence of optimal policies for ($\mathcal{P}_{T}^{N,\text{MF}}$), $\{\gamma_{T}^{*,N}\}_{N}$, which converges (for every DM due to the symmetry) pointwise to $\gamma_{T}^{*,\infty}$ as $N \to \infty$, then $\gamma_{T}^{*,\infty}$ (which is identically symmetric) is an optimal policy for ($\mathcal{P}_{T}^{\infty,\text{MF}}$).

**Proof.** Following from Lemma 3.1, one can consider a sequence of $N$-DM teams which are symmetrically optimal that defines ($\mathcal{P}_{T}^{N,\text{MF}}$) and whose limit is identified with ($\mathcal{P}_{T}^{\infty,\text{MF}}$). Define

$$Q_{N}^{\infty}(B) := \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \delta_{\beta_{N}^{i}}(B)$$

where $\beta_{N}^{i} := (\gamma_{T}^{*,N}(x_{t}^{i}), y_{t}^{i}, \zeta_{t}^{i})$.  


\[
\hat{Q}_N^\omega(B) := \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \delta_{y^i,\zeta^i}(B) \text{ where } \delta_{y,\zeta}(\cdot) \text{ denotes Dirac measure for any random vector } Y, \text{ and } B \in \mathcal{Z} := U \times Y \times S, U := (\prod_{k=0}^{T-1} \mathcal{U}), Y := (\prod_{k=0}^{T-1} \mathcal{Y}), S := (\prod_{k=0}^{T-1} \mathcal{S}) = (\prod_{k=0}^{T-1} \mathcal{W} \times \gamma), y^i = (y^i_0, \ldots, y^i_{T-1}) \text{ for all } i \in \mathbb{N}, \text{ and } \zeta^i := (\zeta^i_0, \ldots, \zeta^i_{T-1}).
\]

where \(\delta_{y,\zeta}(\cdot)\) denotes Dirac measure for any random vector \(Y\), and \(B \in \mathcal{Z} := U \times Y \times S\), \(U := (\prod_{k=0}^{T-1} \mathcal{U})\), \(Y := (\prod_{k=0}^{T-1} \mathcal{Y})\), \(S := (\prod_{k=0}^{T-1} \mathcal{S}) = (\prod_{k=0}^{T-1} \mathcal{W} \times \gamma)\), \(y^i = (y^i_0, \ldots, y^i_{T-1})\) for all \(i \in \mathbb{N}\), and \(\zeta^i := (\zeta^i_0, \ldots, \zeta^i_{T-1})\).

In the following, first, we show that \(Q_N^\omega\) converges \(P\)-almost surely to \(Q^\omega\) in \(w-s\) topology (coarsest topology on \(P(\mathcal{U} \times \mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{S})\)) \((P(\cdot)\) denotes the set of probability measures) under which \(\int f(u, y, \zeta)Q_N^\omega(du, dy, d\zeta) : \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{U} \times \mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{S}) \to \mathbb{R}\) is continuous for every measurable and bounded \(f\) which is continuous in \(u\) and \(y\) but need not to be continuous in \(\zeta\) (see e.g., [38] and [47, Theorem 5.6]), then we show

\[
\lim_{N \to \infty} \sup_{\omega} J_N^\omega(\hat{z}_{o^N}^\omega, \hat{z}_{n^N}^\omega) = J_\infty(\hat{z}_{o^\infty}^\omega, \hat{z}_{n^\infty}^\omega),
\]

where \(\hat{z}_{o^N}^\omega := (\hat{z}_{o^N}^1, \hat{z}_{o^N}^2, \ldots, \hat{z}_{o^N}^N)\), and \(\hat{z}_{o^\infty}^\omega := (\hat{z}_{o^\infty}^1, \hat{z}_{o^\infty}^2, \ldots)\).

\textbf{(Step 1):} In this step, we show that \(\hat{Q}_N^\omega\) converges \(P\)-almost surely to \(Q^\omega\) in \(w-s\) topology. For every \(\omega_0 = (x_0, \ldots, x_N)\), we have for every continuous and bounded function \(g\) in actions and observations, by the strong law of large numbers,

\[
(3.6) \quad \mathbb{P} \left( \{ \omega \in \Omega \mid \lim_{N \to \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N g(\hat{z}_{o^N}^i(y^i), y^i, \zeta^i) - g(\hat{z}_{o^\infty}^\omega(y^i), y^i, \zeta^i) = 0 \} \mid \omega_0 \right) = 1,
\]

where \(3.6\) follows from the definition of empirical measures and the fact that \(\zeta^i\) are i.i.d., conditioned on \(\omega_0\), \(y^i\) are i.i.d. random vectors, and every DM applies an identical policy (this follows from symmetry of the information structure and Lemma 3.1 since every DM applies the identical policy \(\gamma_{o}^\omega\), and functions \(f\) and \(h\) are identical for each DM), and since \(g\) is continuous and bounded in actions and observations, by the dominated convergence theorem,

\[
(3.7) \quad \lim_{N \to \infty} \mathbb{E} \left( g(\hat{z}_{o^N}^\omega(y^i), y^i, \zeta^i) - g(\hat{z}_{o^\infty}^\omega(y^i), y^i, \zeta^i) \right) = 0.
\]

Hence, we have, \(\mathbb{P} \left( \{ \omega \in \Omega \mid \lim_{N \to \infty} \left| \int gdQ_N^\omega - \int gd\hat{Q}_N^\omega \right| = 0 \} \right) = 1\). Now, we show that, \(\{ \hat{Q}_N^\omega \}_N\) converges \(P\)-almost surely weakly to \(Q^\omega\). Let

\[
L(\hat{z}_{o^N}^\omega, \hat{z}_{n^N}^\omega, \hat{z}_{n^\infty}^\omega) := g(\hat{z}_{o^N}^\omega(y^i), y^i, \zeta^i) - \mathbb{E}(g(\hat{z}_{o^\infty}^\omega(y^i), y^i, \zeta^i)).
\]

Since conditioned on \(\omega_0\), \((\hat{z}_{o^N}^\omega(y^i), y^i, \zeta^i)\) are i.i.d. random vectors by the strong law of large numbers, we have for every \(\omega_0\),

\[
\mathbb{P} \left( \{ \omega \in \Omega \mid \lim_{N \to \infty} \left| \int gdQ_N^\omega - \int gd\hat{Q}_N^\omega \right| = 0 \} \mid \omega_0 \right) = 1,
\]

hence, \(\mathbb{P} \left( \{ \omega \in \Omega \mid \lim_{N \to \infty} \left| \int gdQ_N^\omega - \int gd\hat{Q}_N^\omega \right| = 0 \} \right) = 1\). Hence, for a set of \(P\)-measure one, for every \(g\) continuous and bounded in actions and observations (and measurable and bounded in uncertainty and initial states)

\[
\lim_{N \to \infty} \left| \int gdQ_N^\omega - \int gd\hat{Q}_N^\omega \right| \leq \lim_{N \to \infty} \left| \int gdQ_N^\omega - \int gd\hat{Q}_N^\omega \right| + \left| \int gd\hat{Q}_N^\omega - \int gdQ^\omega \right| = 0,
\]

and \(Q_N^\omega\) converges \(P\)-almost surely weakly to \(Q^\omega\). We note that the convergence is weakly, but since \(\zeta^i\)s are exogenous with a fixed marginal, the convergence is also in the \(w-s\) topology.
(Step 2): Following from Assumption 3.2, we have

\[
x_i^t = f_t - 1(f_t - 2(\ldots f_0(x_0^t, u_0^t), u_{t-1}), u_{t-1}),
\]

\[
y_i^t = h_t(f_0(x_0^t, \zeta_0^t, u_0^t), \ldots, f_t - 1(x_0^t, \zeta_t^t, u_{t-1}^t), u_{t-1}^t, u_{0:t-1}^t) = \tilde{h}_t(x_0^t, \zeta_t^t, u_{0:t-1}^t),
\]

where \(\tilde{f}_{t-1}\) and \(\tilde{h}_t\) are continuous in actions, and since the cost function is continuous in its argument, we have

\[
\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \frac{1}{T-i} \left(\sum_{p=1}^{N} u_{p}^t \sum_{p=1}^{N} x_{p}^t\right)
\]

\[
= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \sum_{t=1}^{T-1} \left[ e \left( x_{i}^t, u_{i}^t, f_{i}^t, u_{i}^t, x_{i}^t\right) \right]
\]

\[
\geq \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \sum_{t=1}^{T-1} \left[ e \left( x_{i}^t, u_{i}^t, f_{i}^t, u_{i}^t, x_{i}^t\right) \right]
\]

where (3.8) is true for some \(P\)-almost sure, \(\tilde{c}\) non-negative and continuous in its last three arguments, and a function \(\Lambda\) continuous in \(\tilde{X}\). Hence, by induction and by rewriting observations as a functions of policies of the past DMs \((\gamma_{i}^{T,N}(y_{i}^t))\) if \(\gamma_{i}^{T,N}\) converges to \(\gamma_{i}^{T,\infty}\), then the induced cost by \(\gamma_{i}^{T,N}\) also converges to the cost induced by \(\gamma_{i}^{T,\infty}\) \(P\)-almost surely.

(Step 3): We have

\[
\lim_{N \to \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \sum_{t=1}^{T-1} E \left[ e \left( x_{i}^t, u_{i}^t, f_{i}^t, u_{i}^t, x_{i}^t\right) \right]
\]

\[
= \lim_{N \to \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \sum_{t=1}^{T-1} E \left[ e \left( x_{i}^t, u_{i}^t, f_{i}^t, u_{i}^t, x_{i}^t\right) \right]
\]

\[
\geq \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \sum_{t=1}^{T-1} \left[ e \left( x_{i}^t, u_{i}^t, f_{i}^t, u_{i}^t, x_{i}^t\right) \right]
\]

where (3.9) is true from (Step 2). Inequality (3.10) follows from the definition of \(Q_{N}\) and by replacing limsup by liminf, and (3.11) follows from Fatou’s lemma. In the following, we justify (3.12). Since \(Q_{N}\) converges \(P\)-almost surely weakly to \(Q\), we have \(Q_{N}\) converges \(P\)-almost surely weakly to \(Q\), hence the compactness of \(U\) implies \(P\)-almost surely

\[
\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \gamma_{i}^{T,N}(y_{i}^t) \xrightarrow{N \to \infty} \int_{U} uQ_{N}(du \times Y \times S), \int_{Y \times S} \Lambda Q_{N}(U \times dy \times d\zeta)
\]

\[
\geq \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \gamma_{i}^{T,N}(y_{i}^t) \xrightarrow{N \to \infty} \int_{U} uQ_{\infty}(du \times Y \times S), \int_{Y \times S} \Lambda Q_{\infty}(U \times dy \times d\zeta)
\]

where \(\omega, \zeta, u\) are i.i.d., hence, using the law of iterated expectations and the law of large numbers, we can show that \(P\)-almost surely

\[
\int_{Y \times S} \Lambda Q_{\infty}(U \times dy \times d\zeta) \xrightarrow{N \to \infty} \int_{Y \times S} \Lambda Q_{\infty}(U \times dy \times d\zeta).
\]
Since the cost function is $\mathbb{P}$-almost sure continuous in its last three arguments, $\mathbb{P}$-almost surely

$$
\lim_{N \to \infty} \tilde{c} \left( \omega_0, \zeta, u, \int_{Y} uQ_N^m(du \times Y \times S), \int_{Y \times S} \lambda Q_N^o(U \times dy \times d\zeta) \right)
= \tilde{c} \left( \omega_0, \zeta, u, \int_{U} uQ^m(du \times Y \times S), \int_{Y \times S} \lambda Q^o(U \times dy \times d\zeta) \right).
$$

Define a non-negative bounded sequence

$$
G_N^M := \min \{ M, \tilde{c} \left( \omega_0, \zeta, u, \int_{U} uQ_N^m(du \times Y \times S), \int_{Y \times S} \lambda Q_N^o(U \times dy \times d\zeta) \right) \},
$$

where the sequence $\{G_N^M\}_M$ converges as $M \to \infty$ to

$$
G_N := \tilde{c} \left( \omega_0, \zeta, u, \int_{U} uQ_N^m(du \times Y \times S), \int_{Y \times S} \lambda Q_N^o(U \times dy \times d\zeta) \right),
$$

then we have $\mathbb{P}$-almost surely

$$
\lim_{N \to \infty} \lim_{M \to \infty} \int_{Z} \tilde{c} \left( \omega_0, \zeta, u, \int_{U} uQ_N^m(du \times Y \times S), \int_{Y \times S} \lambda Q_N^o(U \times dy \times d\zeta) \right) Q_N^o(du, dy, d\zeta)
= \lim_{M \to \infty} \lim_{N \to \infty} \int_{Z} G_N M Q_N^o(du, dy, d\zeta)
\geq \lim_{M \to \infty} \int_{Z} G_M Q^o(du, dy, d\zeta)
= \int_{Z} \tilde{c} \left( \omega_0, \zeta, u, \int_{U} uQ^m(du \times Y \times S), \int_{Y \times S} \lambda Q^o(U \times dy \times d\zeta) \right) Q^o(du, dy, d\zeta),
$$

where the inequality follows from the definition of $G_N^M$ and the second equality is true using [39, Theorem 3.5] or [25, Theorem 3.1] since $G_N^M$ is bounded (hence is uniformly $Q_N^o$-integrable) and continuously converges to $G^M$, and the monotone convergence theorem implies the last equality. Hence, (3.12) holds which implies $\limsup_{N \to \infty} J_T^N(\tilde{\gamma}^{*, N}_T) = J_T^N(\tilde{\gamma}^{*, \infty}_T)$, and this completes the proof following from [35, Theorem 5]. Here, for completeness we present the proof which is similar to the analysis of the proof [35, Theorem 5] for dynamic teams,

$$
\inf_{2T} J_T^\infty(\gamma_T) \leq \limsup_{N \to \infty} J_T^N(\tilde{\gamma}^{*, N}_T)
= \limsup_{N \to \infty} J_T^N(\tilde{\gamma}^{*,N}_T) = \limsup_{N \to \infty} \inf_{2T} J_T^N(\tilde{\gamma}^{*,N}_T)
\leq \inf_{2T} \limsup_{N \to \infty} J_T^N(\tilde{\gamma}_T) = \inf_{2T} J_T^\infty(\gamma_T),
$$

(3.14)

where (3.14) is true since the restriction $\gamma_T$ to $N$ first components is $\tilde{\gamma}^{*,N}_T$. This implies that $\tilde{\gamma}^{*, \infty}_T$ is globally optimal.
Remark 2. On the connection between finitely many DMs and infinitely many DMs, we note that a closely related work on mean-field games by Fischer [14] where the information structure is assumed to be static since the strategy of each player is assumed to be adapted to the filtration generated by his/her initial states and Wiener process (also called in the mean-field games literature, somewhat non-standard in the control literature, as open-loop distributed controllers [21],[13, pages 72-76]). This means that the information of each DM is not affected by any of the actions of the other DMs. For dynamic teams, there are two difficulties: (i) obtaining variational equations is challenging since fixing policies of DMs and perturbing only one DM’s policies, perturbs the observation of other DMs and hence the controls \( u^{-1}_{t} = (\gamma_{1}^{i}(y_{1}^{i}), \ldots, \gamma_{i-1}^{i}(y_{i-1}^{i}), \gamma_{i+1}^{i}(y_{i+1}^{i}), \ldots, \gamma_{N}^{i}(y_{N}^{i})) \), (ii) solutions of variational equations which give person-by-person optimal policies are inconclusive for global optimality due to the lack of convexity in general since convexity of the cost function in \((u_{1}, \ldots, u_{N})\) does not necessarily imply the convexity of the team problem in policies, hence person-by-person optimality does not necessarily imply global optimality (for sufficient conditions for convexity in policies see Theorem 2.4).

Remark 3. We also note additional related works by Lacker [22, 23] where either convergence of open-loop controllers, or convergence of Nash equilibria induced by closed-loop controllers (where controls are measurable path-dependent functions of states, \(u_{t}^{i} = \phi(t, X_{0:t}^{i})\), where \(X_{0:t}^{i} = (X_{0:t}^{0}, \ldots, X_{0:t}^{N})\) and \(\phi\) is a measurable function) or Markovian controllers \((u_{t}^{i} = \phi(t, X_{t}^{i})\), where \(X_{t} = (X_{t}^{0}, \ldots, X_{t}^{N})\) have been considered. In [23], the information structure is classical (hence, a centralized problem since players have access to all the information available).

Remark 4. In Lemma 3.1 and Theorem 3.2, we considered a non-classical information structure for teams defined as \((\mathcal{P}_{T}^{MF})\) (see (3.2)) with a convex expected cost in policies. For teams defined as \((\mathcal{P}_{T}^{MF})\) (see (3.2)) with a symmetric partially information structure which admits static reduction, the above result holds and similar to the proof of Theorem 3.2, it can be proven under the assumption that the cost functions is convex in actions (since convexity of the cost function in actions is a sufficient condition for convexity of the expected cost function in policies for this class of problems [49, Theorem 3.7]).

Remark 5. Analogous to [35, Theorem 9], we can relax the hypothesis that action spaces are compact; by assuming that
\[
(\text{A1}) \quad \sup_{N \geq 1} \mathbb{E}(\gamma_{t}^{e,N}(y_{t}^{1}) - \gamma_{t}^{e,\infty}(y_{t}^{1}))^{1+\delta} < \infty \quad \text{for some} \quad \delta > 0,
\]

since the above uniform integrability justifies exchanging the limit and the expectation required to establish the convergence in (3.13). This result is particularly important for LQG models (we use this remark in Section 4).

3.2. An existence theorem on globally optimal policies for dynamic mean-field team problems with a symmetric information structure. An implication of Theorem 3.2 is the following existence result on globally optimal policies for mean-field problems. In particular, we will establish the existence of a converging sequence, in an appropriate sense, for a sequence of optimal policies for finite teams with an increasing number of DMs. For the following theorem, we do not establish the pointwise convergence; but by Theorem 3.2, if a sequence of optimal policies for \((\mathcal{P}_{T}^{N, MF})\), \(\{\gamma_{t}^{e,N}\}_{N}\), converges pointwise, a global optimal policy exists. To this end, we allow decision makers for \((\mathcal{P}_{T}^{MF})\) to apply randomized policies. In fact, for each decision maker (DM) for \(i \in \mathbb{N}\), a probability measure \(P \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X} \times \prod_{t=0}^{T-1}(\mathcal{W} \times \mathcal{Y}) \times \prod_{t=0}^{T-1}(\mathcal{U} \times \mathcal{Y}))\) is a strategic measure induced by a randomized policy if and only if for every \(t = 0, \ldots, T-1\),
\[
\int g(x_{0:t}^{i}, y_{0:t}^{i}, u_{0:t}^{i}) P(dx_{0:t}^{i}, dy_{0:t}^{i}, du_{0:t}^{i})
\]
for some stochastic kernel \( \Pi_k \) on \( \mathbb{U} \) given \( \mathbb{Y} \), for all continuous and bounded \( g \), where \( p_k \) is the transition kernel characterizing the observations of \( \text{DM}^i \) at time \( t \),

\[
p_k(y_t^i \mid x_s^i, \zeta_t^i, u_t^i) := P \left( (h_t(x_t^i, u_t^i, v_t^i)) \in [x_s^i, \zeta_t^i, u_t^i] \right),
\]

and \( \mu^i \) is a fixed probability measure on initial states and disturbances. This equivalency follows from the fact that continuous and bounded functions form a separating class [7, page 12] and [46, Theorem 2.2] (for a detailed discussion on sets of strategic measures for decentralized control, see [46, Section 2]).

First, we present an absolute continuity assumption on observations of \( \text{DMs} \).

**ASSUMPTION 3.4.** For every \( \text{DM}^i \), and for every \( t = 0, \ldots, T - 1 \), there exists a function \( \psi_t^i : \mathbb{Y} \times \mathbb{X} \times \prod_{k=0}^{t-1} \mathbb{W} / \mathbb{Y} \times \prod_{k=0}^{t-1} \mathbb{U} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+ \) and a probability measure \( \nu_t^i \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{Y}) \) such that the following absolute continuity condition holds

\[
p_t^i(dy_t^i \mid x_t^i, \zeta_t^i, u_t^i, l_t^i) = \psi_t^i(y_t^i, x_t^i, \zeta_t^i, u_t^i, l_t^i) \nu_t^i(dy_t^i).
\]

This assumption lets us obtain an independent measurements reduction (see [47, Section 2.2]). For example, assume actions spaces, observations spaces, disturbances spaces, and initial states spaces are Euclidean spaces of appropriate dimensions and assume \( \nu_t^i \) for all \( i \in \mathbb{N} \) and \( t = 0, \ldots, T - 1 \), is i.i.d with a probability measure admitting a density function so that the observation of each \( \text{DM}^i \) at time \( t \) is \( y_t^i = h_t(x_t^i, u_t^i) + v_t^i \), where \( h_t \) is continuous in its arguments, then Assumption 3.4 holds [15, Lemma 5.1].

**THEOREM 3.3.** Consider a team defined as \( (\mathcal{P}^i_{T, \text{MF}}) \) (see (3.2)) with \( (\mathcal{P}^N_{T, \text{MF}}) \) having a symmetric information structure for every \( N \). Assume for every \( N \) the team is convex in policies, and action spaces are convex. Assume further that, \( \mathbb{U} := \prod_{t=0}^{T-1} \mathbb{W} / \mathbb{Y} \cup \mathbb{U}_t K_t \) for a countable collection of compact sets \( K_t \) (i.e., \( \mathbb{U} \) is \( \sigma \)-compact) and without any loss, the control laws can be restricted to those with \( \mathbb{E}(\phi_h)(u^i) \leq K \) for some finite \( K \), where \( \phi_h : \mathbb{U} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+ \) is lower semi-continuous and satisfies \( \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \inf_{u^i \notin K_t} \phi_h(u^i) = \infty \). Under Assumption 3.2 and Assumption 3.3 if either

(i) Assumption 3.4 holds (with no further assumptions on the information structure of each \( \text{DM}^i \) for \( i \in \mathbb{N} \) through time \( t = 0, \ldots, T - 1 \)), or

(ii) For each \( \text{DM}^i \) for \( i \in \mathbb{N} \) through time \( t = 0, \ldots, T - 1 \), there exists a static reduction with the classical information structure (i.e., under the reduction, the information structure is expanding such that \( \sigma(y_t^i) \subset \sigma(y_{t+1}^i) \) for \( t = 0, \ldots, T - 1 \)),

then there exists an optimal policy for \( (\mathcal{P}^i_{T, \text{MF}}) \).

Since the space of strategic measures that are deterministic are not closed under weak convergence (e.g., as an implication of [49, Theorem 2.7]), we allow for randomization in the policies and therefore the optimal limit policy is not necessarily deterministic according to the above result; however, it is identical for each \( \text{DM} \).

**Proof.** We will develop a strategic measures approach by considering the probability measures on the product space induced by admissible team policies. In particular, we will show that for every optimal finite-time policy sequence, there exists a subsequence which converges to an optimal strategic measure for the mean-field limit under an appropriate topology defined by the product topology where each coordinate is endowed with the weak convergence (i.e., that induced by the Prohorov metric). We first show that for each finite team
problem, optimal policies are deterministic and symmetric and we will consider the strategic measures induced by such policies as our sequence to be studied. Then, we show that there exists a subsequence of optimal policies of \( N \)-DMs converges to an optimal policy of \( \mathcal{P}_{T}^{\infty,M,F} \). However, we need to ensure that the limit is admissible and satisfies the required measurability/conditional independence constraints. We define

\[
Q_{n}^{\omega}(B) := \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \delta_{\beta_{n}}^{\omega}(B) \quad \text{where} \quad \beta_{n}^{\omega} := (\gamma_{n}^{\omega,N}(y^{i}), y^{i}, \zeta^{i}),
\]

where \( \delta_{\beta}^{\omega}(\cdot) \) denotes Dirac measure for any random vector \( Y \), and \( B \in \mathcal{Z} \). In (Step 2) and (Step 3), we show that the set of strategic measures is weakly compact for each DM and also there exists a subsequence \( \{Q_{n}^{\omega}\}_{n} \) (where \( n \in \mathbb{I} \) is the index set of a convergent subsequence) converges \( \mathbb{P} \)-almost surely in \( w\)-s topology. Then, we show that an induced policy by the limit of a subsequence of empirical measures is globally optimal.

**Step 1**: Under Assumption 3.1, Assumption 3.2 and Assumption 3.3, and following from condition (i) using [47, Theorem 5.2], or condition (ii) using [47, Theorem 5.6], there exists a deterministic optimal policy for each finite team problem. Action spaces are convex and the team problem is convex in policies and following from the hypothesis that \( y \)'s are i.i.d. random variables given \( \omega_{0} \), and the result of Lemma 3.1, one can consider a sequence of \( N \)-DM teams which are symmetrically optimal that defines \( \mathcal{P}_{T}^{N,M,F} \) and whose limit is identified with \( \mathcal{P}_{T}^{\infty,M,F} \). Hence, for each finite team problem, we consider the strategic measures induced by symmetric optimal policies.

**Step 2**: In the following, we show that for some converging subsequence \( \{Q_{n}^{\omega}\}_{n\in\mathbb{I}} \) converges \( \mathbb{P} \)-almost surely to \( Q^{\omega} \) in \( w\)-s topology, that is, for a set of \( \mathbb{P} \)-measure one, for every continuous and bounded function \( g \) in actions and observations and bounded and measurable in uncertainty,

\[
\lim_{n \to \infty} \left| \int gdQ_{n}^{\omega} - \int gdQ^{\omega} \right| = 0,
\]

where \( n \in \mathbb{I} \) is the index set of a convergent subsequence. We use the fact that conditioned on \( \omega_{0}, (\gamma_{n}^{\omega,N}(y^{i}), y^{i}, \zeta^{i}) \) are i.i.d. random vectors (this follows from symmetry of the information structure and Lemma 3.1 since every DM applies the identical policy \( \gamma_{n}^{\omega,N} \)) and also since the space of control policies is relatively compact under weak convergence for each DM (see e.g., [47, proof of Theorem 4.7]).

To this end, first, we represent the policy spaces with probability measures \( P \in \mathcal{P}(Y \times U) \) for each DM [49, 9] satisfying (3.15), then we show that these set of probability measures are relatively compact, hence, \( Q_{n}^{\omega} \) is induced by these strategic measures is also relatively compact. Since actions of DMs do not affect the observations of others, the policy spaces are decoupled from the actions of other decision makers, and following from the hypothesis on \( \phi_{i} \) and the fact that \( \nu \to \int \nu(dx)g(x) \) is lower semi-continuous for a continuous function \( g \) [47, proof of Theorem 4.7], the marginals on \( U \) will be relatively compact under weak convergence. If the marginals are relatively compact, then the collection of all measures with these relatively compact marginals are also relatively compact (see e.g., [46, Proof of Theorem 2.4]) and hence the control policy space is relatively compact. Following from the information structure and Lemma 3.1 since every DM applies an identical policy, for every observation, there is a different action where marginals of the product space of observations and actions on the countably infinite product of these actions are relatively compact under weak convergence, hence this implies that there exists a subsequence of strategic measures \( \tilde{P}_{n} \in \mathcal{P}(\prod_{i,j}Y \times U) \) (as a product of strategic measures for each DM) converges \( \mathbb{P} \)-almost sure weakly to the limit \( \tilde{P} \).

Furthermore, following from the information structure and Lemma 3.1 since every DM applies an identical policy, conditioned on \( \omega_{0} \), observations of DMs are i.i.d., and disturbances
are also i.i.d., hence, there exists a subsequence of empirical measures \( \{ Q_n^{w^*} \} \) (defined in the product space of actions, observations, and disturbances) converges \( \mathbb{P} \)-almost surely to \( Q^w \) in \( w \)-s topology (the convergence is weakly, but since \( \zeta \)'s are exogenous with a fixed marginal, the convergence is also in the \( w \)-s topology).

**Step 3:** In this step, we show that each coordinate of the space of policies (space of polices for each DM) is closed under the weak convergence topology. This implies that the space of policies is closed under product topology and since using (Step 1) and Tychonoff's theorem, the countably infinite product space is also compact under the product topology, we can conclude that the space of control actions is compact under the product topology where each coordinate is weakly compact.

Assume \( \Phi_n \) is a strategic measure for DM's induced by a randomized policy converging weakly to \( \Phi \). We need to show that conditions (i) or (ii) leads to closedness of the set of strategic measures (see (3.15)) induced by \( \Phi_n \). If Assumption 3.4 holds, then by lower semi-continuity property of \( \phi_i \), and following from the discussion in the proof of [47, Theorem 5.2], each coordinate of policy spaces corresponds to DM \( i \) at time \( t \) is closed under the weak convergence topology. Also, if condition (ii) holds, then [47, Theorem 5.6] leads to the same conclusion. Hence, each coordinate of space of policies (corresponds to DM \( i \)) is closed under the weak convergence topology (since each coordinate of the space of policies is finite product of space of policies for each DM at time instances \( t = 0, \ldots, T - 1 \)). Hence, following from (Step 2), there exists a subsequence \( \{ \Phi_n^w \} \) converges \( \mathbb{P} \)-almost surely weakly to \( Q^w \) where \( Q^w \) is induced by a randomized policy in the set of strategic measures satisfying (3.15) and the limit policy is admissible and satisfies the required measurability/conditional independence constraints.

**Step 4:** Now, we show that the expected cost function under the induced policy of \( Q^w \) is less than or equal to the expected cost achieved by \( \limsup_{n \to \infty} J_T^n (\hat{Z}^*, n) \). Following from a similar argument of (Step 2) of the proof of Theorem 3.2, (3.8) holds for some \( \hat{c} \) continuous in its last three arguments. We have

\[
\int_{\Omega} \int_{\mathcal{Z}} \hat{c} \left( \omega_0, \zeta, u, \int_{\mathcal{U}} u Q^w(du \times \mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{S}), \int_{\mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{S}} \Lambda Q^w(\mathcal{U} \times dy \times d\zeta) \right) Q^w(du, dy, d\zeta) \mathbb{P}(d\omega) \\
= \lim_{M \to \infty} \lim_{N \to \infty} \lim_{n \to \infty} \int_{\Omega} \int_{\mathcal{Z}} \min \{ M, \hat{c} \left( \omega_0, \zeta, u, \int_{\mathcal{U}} u Q_n^w(du \times \mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{S}), \int_{\mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{S}} \Lambda Q_n^w(\mathcal{U} \times dy \times d\zeta) \right) \} \\
\times Q_n^w(du, dy, d\zeta) \mathbb{P}(d\omega) \\
(3.17)
\]

\[
\leq \lim_{N \to \infty} \limsup_{M \to \infty} \lim_{n \to \infty} \int_{\Omega} \int_{\mathcal{Z}} \min \{ M, \hat{c} \left( \omega_0, \zeta, u, \int_{\mathcal{U}} u Q_N^w(du \times \mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{S}), \int_{\mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{S}} \Lambda Q_N^w(\mathcal{U} \times dy \times d\zeta) \right) \} \\
\times Q_n^w(du, dy, d\zeta) \mathbb{P}(d\omega) \\
(3.19)
\]

\[
\leq \lim_{N \to \infty} \limsup_{M \to \infty} \lim_{n \to \infty} \int_{\Omega} \int_{\mathcal{Z}} \min \{ M, \hat{c} \left( \omega_0, \zeta, u, \int_{\mathcal{U}} u Q_N^w(du \times \mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{S}), \int_{\mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{S}} \Lambda Q_N^w(\mathcal{U} \times dy \times d\zeta) \right) \} \\
\times Q_N^w(du, dy, d\zeta) \mathbb{P}(d\omega) \\
(3.20)
\]

\[
\leq \limsup_{N \to \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} E_{\omega} Z_{i,t}^{n+1} \left[ c(x_t^i, u_t^i, \frac{1}{N} \sum_{p=1}^{N} u_t^p, \frac{1}{N} \sum_{p=1}^{N} x_t^p) \right] \\
(3.21)
\]
where (3.17) follows from the monotone convergence theorem. Since \( \{Q_n^w\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \) converges \( \mathbb{P} \)-almost surely weakly to \( Q^w \), we have \( \int u Q_n^w(du \times Y \times S) \rightarrow \int u Q^w(du \times Y \times S) \) \( \mathbb{P} \)-almost surely. Hence, (3.18) follows from [39, Theorem 3.5] since

\[
\min \{ M, \tilde{c} \left( \omega_0, \zeta, u, \int u Q_n^w(du \times Y \times S), \int_{Y \times S} \Lambda Q_n^w(U \times dy \times d\zeta) \right) \}
\]

is bounded and non-negative, and continuously converges in \( u \) \( \mathbb{P} \)-almost surely, i.e., \( \mathbb{P} \)-almost surely

\[
\lim_{n \to \infty} \min \{ M, \tilde{c} \left( \omega_0, \zeta, u, \int u Q_n^w(du \times Y \times S), \int_{Y \times S} \Lambda Q_n^w(U \times dy \times d\zeta) \right) \}
\]

\[
= \min \{ M, \tilde{c} \left( \omega_0, \zeta, u, \int u Q_n^w(du \times Y \times S), \int_{Y \times S} \Lambda Q_n^w(U \times dy \times d\zeta) \right) \},
\]

where \( u_n \to u \) as \( n \to \infty \). That is because, thanks to the symmetry, conditioned on \( \omega_0 \), \( y^i \) are i.i.d. random vectors, the space of policies is compact under the product topology (with the weak convergence topology for each coordinate (for each DM)), and the cost function is continuous. Equality (3.19) follows from the dominated convergence theorem, and (3.20) is true since limsup is the greatest convergent subsequence limit for a bounded sequence. Finally, (3.21) follows from the definition of empirical measures and since \( \mathbb{P} \)-almost surely

\[
\min \{ M, \tilde{c} \left( \omega_0, \zeta, u, \int u Q_n^w(du \times Y \times S), \int_{Y \times S} \Lambda Q_n^w(U \times dy \times d\zeta) \right) \}
\]

\[
\leq \tilde{c} \left( \omega_0, \zeta, u, \int u Q_n^w(du \times Y \times S), \int_{Y \times S} \Lambda Q_n^w(U \times dy \times d\zeta) \right).
\]

Hence, the proof is completed. \( \square \)

**Remark 6.** For the existence result, to show that the set of strategic measures induced by independent randomized policies for each DM through time \( t = 0, \ldots, T - 1 \) (see (3.15)) is closed under the weak convergence topology, we utilized the result of [47, Section 5.2] which are more general than those in [15, 49]. We note that the extension of the existence results in [47, Section 5.2] to our setup is not obvious since the conclusion of (Step 4) can not be made rigorously without considering the technical steps involving infinite dimensions and limit arguments.

### 4. Symmetric LQG dynamic teams

In the section, we consider LQG setup where the results of Section 2 and Section 3 can be applied. Also, we consider infinite horizon problems. In the following subsection, we consider the LQG setup where Theorem 2.7 can be utilized.

#### 4.1. Symmetric partially nested LQG dynamic teams on a graph

In the following, we consider decentralized problems where Theorem 2.7 can be utilized and the optimal policy can be obtained. First, we formulate LQG problems with a symmetric partially nested information pattern. Consider the following dynamics. Let \( i = 1, 2 \), and

\[
x_{i+1} = Ax_i + Bu_i + w_i,
\]

where \( \mathbb{E}(x_0^i(x_0^i)^T) \neq 0 \).

**Problem** (\( P_T \)): Consider the expected cost function

\[
J_T (\gamma_1, \gamma_2) = \mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{t=0}^{T-2} \sum_{i=1}^{T-2} (x_t^i)^T Q x_t^i + (u_t^i)^T R u_t^i + (u_t^i)^T \hat{R} u_t^i + (\hat{u}_t^i)^T \hat{R} \hat{u}_t^i) \right],
\]

where \( \gamma_{T-i} = (\gamma_{0:T-1}) \) for \( i = 1, 2 \), and \( R, \hat{R} > 0 \) and \( Q \geq 0 \). Assume the information for each decision maker is \( I_t = \{y_{1:t}, y_{2:t}\} \), where \( y_t^i = H_t \zeta_t + \sum_{j=0}^{t-1} D_{ij} u_j, \zeta_t = (x_0^i, w_{0:T-1}^i) \).
In the following, we show that the above dynamic teams are symmetrically optimal under sufficient conditions on the observations and initial states.

**Corollary 4.1.** For a fixed $T$, consider a finite horizon team problem defined above as $(\mathcal{P}_T)$ (see (4.2)). If $x_0^1$ and $x_0^2$ are exchangeable zero mean Gaussian random vectors and $w_i$ are i.i.d. Gaussian random vectors for $i = 1, 2$, and independent for all $t = 0, \ldots, T - 1$ and also independent of initial states, then the dynamic team is symmetrically optimal.

**Proof.** Since the dynamic team is LQG with partially nested information structure, static reduction exists and the cost is convex in policies under a static reduction [16] and Theorem 2.4(iii). Assumption 2.1 is satisfied following from (4.2). In the following, we show assumptions of Theorem 2.7 hold. Follows from the hypothesis that disturbances are independent random vectors and also independent of initial states, and the assumption that $x_0^1$ and $x_0^2$ are exchangeable and the hypothesis that $w_i$ are i.i.d., we have Assumption (b) holds. Assumption (c) holds following from Assumption 2.7 and since given $\omega_0$, $(y_{0:T-1})$, is mutually independent of $(\eta_{0:T-1})$. Hence, Theorem 2.7 completes the proof. \hfill \Box

Here, we consider a class of LQG dynamic teams with symmetrically nested information structure. The information structure satisfying a tree structure where we utilize Corollary 4.1 and we obtain an explicit recursion for the optimal policy. Define the problem as follows:

**Problem $(\mathcal{P}_{\text{tree}})_T$:** Consider a finite horizon expected cost (4.2) with the information of each DM is defined as $I^*_t = \{x^1_{[0:t]}, u^1_{[0:t-1]}\}$.

**Theorem 4.2.** For a fixed $T$, consider a finite horizon team problem defined as $(\mathcal{P}_{\text{tree}})_T$ (see (4.2)). If $(x_0^1, x_0^2)$ are exchangeable with an identical zero mean Gaussian distribution and $w_i$ are i.i.d. zero mean Gaussian random vectors for $i = 1, 2$ and independent for all $t = 0, \ldots, T - 1$ and independent of initial states, then

\begin{align*}
    u^{1*}(T)_{t} &= K^1_{t}(T)x_t^1 + L^1_{t}(T)\mathbb{E}(x^2_t|x_0^1), \\
    u^{2*}(T)_{t} &= K^2_{t}(T)x_t^2 + L^2_{t}(T)\mathbb{E}(x^1_t|x_0^2),
\end{align*}

where

\begin{align*}
    K^1_{t}(T) &= -(R + B^T P^1_{t+1} B)^{-1} B^T P^1_{t+1} A, \\
    P^1_{t}(T) &= -A^T P^{1T}_{t+1} B^T (R + B^T P^1_{t+1} B)^{-1} B^T P^1_{t+1} A + Q + A^T P^1_{t+1} A, \\
    L^1_{t}(T) &= -(R + B^T P^1_{t+1} B)^{-1} \tilde{R} K^1_{t}(T) G^1_{t} + \tilde{R} L^1_{t}(T) \Sigma \\
    + \sum_{s=t+1}^{T-1} B^T (A^T)^{s-t-1} P^1_{s+1} B L^1_{s}(T), \\
    G^1_{t}(T) &= \prod_{s=0}^{t-1} (A + B R^1_{s}) + \sum_{s=1}^{t-1} \prod_{j=s}^{t-1} (A + B R^1_{j}) B L^1_{s-1}(T) \Sigma,
\end{align*}

where $\Sigma = \mathbb{E}(x^1_0(x^2_0)^T)(\mathbb{E}(x^2_0(x^2_0)^T))^{-1} P^0_T = 0, C^1_0 = I$. Moreover, the optimal cost is as follows:

\begin{equation}
    J_T(\pi^*_T) = \frac{1}{T} \left[ \mathbb{E}(x^1_0)^T P^1_0 x^1_0 \right] + \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \mathbb{E}(w^1_t)^T P^1_t w^1_t \\
    + \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \mathbb{E}(\{(x^2_t)^T|x^1_0\})^T (L^1_t)^T B^T P^1_{t+1} B L^1_t (T) \mathbb{E}(x^1_0|x^1_0) \\
    + \sum_{t=1}^{T-1} \mathbb{E}(\{(x^2_0)^T(A^T)^t P^1_{t+1} B L^1_t (T) \mathbb{E}(x^1_0|x^1_0))
\end{equation}
Proof. Following from [16] and Radner’s theorem [31], person-by-person optimality implies global optimality due to the uniqueness of the person-by-person optimal policy. That is because the information structure is partially nested, and LQG dynamic teams can be reduced to a static one using Ho-Chu’s static reduction [16]. Hence, we only need to show that (4.3) and (4.4) are person-by-person optimal. In the following, we show that for the first decision maker $J(\gamma_{1,2}^*, \gamma_{1,2}^*) \leq J((\gamma_{1,2}^*, \gamma_{1,2}^*), (\gamma_{1,2}^*, \gamma_{1,2}^*))$ for all $\beta \in \Gamma^i$. This implies that $J(\gamma_{1,2}^*, \gamma_{1,2}^*)$ is person-by-person optimal according to Corollary 4.1 since the dynamic team is symmetrically optimal (by exchanging policies $(\gamma_{1,2}^* \gamma_{1,2}^*)$ with $\gamma_{1,2}^*$, which implies $J(\gamma_{1,2}^*, \gamma_{1,2}^*) \leq J((\gamma_{1,2}^*, \gamma_{1,2}^*), (\gamma_{1,2}^*, \gamma_{1,2}^*))$ for all $\beta \in \Gamma^i$, this implies that $(\gamma_{1,2}^*, \gamma_{1,2}^*)$ is the fixed point of the equation). The proof is completed by induction. Due to space constraints, we have removed the calculation. \[\square\]

Remark 7. The optimal policies (4.3) and (4.4) contain two parts which can be interpreted as follows: the first part, $k_{i}^{\pi}(T)x_{i}^{T}$, is equivalent to the optimal policy of the branch (DM) by ignoring the other branch in the optimization problem (in this case, this is equivalent to the centralized policies since the information structure of each branch (DM) is centralized). The second part corresponds to the correlation term between branches (DMs).

In the following, we generalize the result of Theorem 4.2 to $N$-DM LQG dynamic teams. Assume that the dynamics for $i = 1, 2, \ldots, N$ are defined as (4.1), where $\mathbb{E}(x_{0}^{T}(x_{0}^{T})) \neq 0$ for $i, j = 1, 2, \ldots, N$.

**Problem (P_{N}^{T, \text{tree}}):** Consider the expected cost function as

$$J_{1}^{N}(\gamma_{1}^{N, T}) = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \mathbb{E}x_{i}^{T}(x_{i}^{T})Qx_{i}^{T} + (u_{i}^{T})^{T}Ru_{i}^{T} + \sum_{j=1, j \neq i}^{N} (u_{i}^{T})^{T}R_{i,j}u_{j}^{T},$$

where $\gamma_{i}^{T} = \gamma_{0:T-1}^{i}$ for $i = 1, \ldots, N$ and $R, \tilde{R} \geq 0$ and $Q \succeq 0$. Let $I_{i}^{t} = \{x_{i}^{t+1}, u_{i}^{t+1} \}$. \[\square\]

**Corollary 4.3.** For a fixed $T$ and $N$, consider a finite horizon MM problem defined as $(P_{N}^{T, \text{tree}})$ (see (4.1)). If $(x_{0}^{1:N})$ are exchangeable with an identical zero mean Gaussian distribution, and $w_{i}'s$ for $i = 1, \ldots, N$ are i.i.d. zero mean Gaussian random vectors, independent for $t = 0, \ldots, T-1$, and independent of initial states, then

$$u_{i}^{T}(x_{0}, \gamma_{0:T-1}^{i}) = K_{i}^{T}(x_{0}, \gamma_{0:T-1}^{i})x_{0}^{T} + L_{i}^{T}(x_{0}, \gamma_{0:T-1}^{i}) \sum_{j=1, j \neq i}^{N} \mathbb{E}(x_{i}^{T}|x_{0}^{T}),$$

where $K_{T}^{i}$ and $L_{T}^{i}$ satisfy (4.5) and (4.6), and $L_{T}^{i}(x_{0}, \gamma_{0:T-1}^{i})$ is a function of $K_{0:T}^{i}$.

**Proof.** The proof is similar to the one of Theorem 4.2.

In the following, we relax the assumption on the distribution of initial states and disturbances. Here, $x_{0}'s$ are not necessarily exchangeable and $w_{i}'s$ do not necessarily have the same distribution. We also consider LQ (not necessarily Gaussian) problems. To this end, we first define the notion of a strategy-by-strategy optimal policy which will be used in Corollary 4.5.

**Definition 4.4.** (Strategy-by-strategy optimal policy) A policy $(\gamma_{1}^{1:N}) = (\gamma_{0:T-1}^{1}, \ldots, \gamma_{0:T-1}^{N})$ is strategy-by-strategy optimal if the following inequalities hold: for all $i = 1, \ldots, N$, and for all $\beta \in \Gamma^i$,

$$J(\gamma_{1}^{1:N}) \leq J(\gamma_{1}^{1:N}, \beta, \gamma_{i}^{i+1:T}).$$

**Remark 8.** Strategy-by-strategy optimality allows for joint perturbation in policies of DMs in a given precedence graph $\gamma^{1}$ but person-by-person optimality (under the intrinsic model) only allows perturbation for a single DM’s policy $\gamma^{i}$. 
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COROLLARY 4.5. For a fixed $T$, consider a finite horizon team problem defined as $(\mathcal{P}^{\text{tree}}_T)$ (see (4.2)), if $x^0_t$ and $x^0_0$ have an identical zero mean Gaussian distribution and $\{w_t\}_s$ are independent random vectors for $i = 1, 2$ and $t = 0, \ldots, T - 1$ (not necessarily Gaussian and identical for $i = 1, 2$ and for all $t = 0, \ldots, T - 1$), then (4.3) and (4.4) are team optimal.

Proof. Following from [16] and Radner’s theorem [31], the optimal policy and person-by-person optimal policy are unique, hence the strategy-by-strategy optimal policy is also unique. Hence, the set of person-by-person optimal policies, the set of strategy-by-strategy policies, and the set of global optimal policies are coincide. We only need to show that (4.3) and (4.4) are strategy-by-strategy optimal and this implies globally optimality thanks to the uniqueness of such policies for this problem. Since $x^0_1$ and $x^0_2$ are not exchangeable, the team may not be exchangeable, hence one can not justify symmetry using Corollary 4.1; however, we show that by fixing policies of a DM and minimizing the cost for the other one, the optimal policy for each decision maker is identical for $t = 0, \ldots, T - 1$, and this implies that the team is symmetrically optimal thanks to the uniqueness of the strategy-by-strategy optimal policy for this problem. We can use dynamic programming to show (4.9) holds for (4.3) and (4.4), and this completes the proof.

REMARK 9. The above result can be extended to the case where $w^1_t$ and $w^2_t$ are exchangeable for all $t = 0, \ldots, T - 1$ (not necessarily independent), and $\{w^s_t\}_s$ are independent zero mean Gaussian random vectors and independent of initial states (i.e., $(w^1_t, w^2_t), \mathbb{I}(w^1_t, w^2_1)$ for $t \neq k$, and $(w^1_t, w^2_t), \mathbb{I}(x^0_0, x^0_1)$ for all $t = 0, \ldots, T - 1$), then

$$u^{1*}_{t}(T) = K^{(T)}_t x^1_t + L^{(T)}_t \mathbb{E}(x^2_0|x^1_0) + \sum_{p=0}^{t-1} h^{p,(T)}_t \mathbb{E}(w^2_p|x^1_p),$$

$$u^{2*}_{t}(T) = K^{(T)}_t x^2_t + L^{(T)}_t \mathbb{E}(x^1_0|x^2_0) + \sum_{p=0}^{t-1} h^{p,(T)}_t \mathbb{E}(w^1_p|x^2_p),$$

where $K^{(T)}_t$ and $L^{(T)}_t$ satisfy (4.5), and (4.7), respectively.

Following from Corollary 4.5, we present the Certainty equivalency property for symmetric LQG teams on a tree.

THEOREM 4.6. For a fixed $T$, consider a finite horizon team problem defined as $(\mathcal{P}^{\text{tree}}_T)$ (see (4.2)). If $x^0_1$ and $x^0_2$ are exchangeable with an identical zero mean Gaussian distribution and $w^s_t$ are mean zero i.i.d. random vectors for $i = 1, 2$ and for all $t = 0, \ldots, T - 1$ and independent of initial states, then the team problem is certainty equivalent, i.e., the optimal controller’s gains $K^{(T)}_t$ and $L^{(T)}_t$ are independent of the distributions of disturbances $w^s_t$.

Proof. The proof similar to that of Corollary 4.3.

In the following, we develop a structural result to the case where the information structure of each decision maker over time satisfies a structure which is identical for all DMs and is partially nested. An example of such a graph structure has been depicted in Fig. 2.

THEOREM 4.7. For a fixed $T$ and $N$, consider a finite horizon team problem defined as $(\mathcal{P}^{\text{tree}}_T)$ (see (4.1)). If $x^0_1$ and $x^0_2$ are exchangeable with an identical zero mean Gaussian distribution and $w^s_t$ for $i = 1, 2$ are i.i.d. zero mean Gaussian random vectors, independent for all $t = 0, \ldots, T - 1$ and independent of initial states, then

$$u^{1*}_{t}(T),(N) = K^{(T)}_t y^t_t + L^{(T),(N)}_t \sum_{j=1,j \neq i}^N \mathbb{E}(y^j_0|y^t_0),$$

where $K^{(T)}_t$ are obtained by considering only one DM and ignoring other DMs.
Proof. The proof is similar to that of Theorem 4.2, using the results in [16] and Corollary 4.1.

Remark 10. A related work is [30], where structural results for optimal policy have been obtained for finite horizon LQG problems on graphs. In our analysis above, the structural result for the optimal policy is obtained without assuming that decision makers who have no common ancestors and no common descendants have either uncorrelated noise or are decoupled through the cost function. Instead, exchangeable partially nested LQG teams with correlated initial states and disturbances are considered. Moreover, here, the graph structures may not be trees in general, as opposed to [30], where a multi-tree structure has been imposed on a graph.

In the following, we present results for LQG teams with a mean-field coupling through the cost function. First, using Corollary 4.3, we obtain globally optimal policies for $N$-DM teams with a mean-field coupling with correlated initial states and disturbances. However, we note that in our model, the mean-field coupling is only in the cost function and not in the dynamics. Next, as an implication of Theorem 3.2, we show the convergence of optimal policies for LQG $N$-DM mean-field teams on a tree to the corresponding optimal policy of mean-field teams.

Problem $(P_{T,1,LQG}^{N,MF})$: Consider the expected cost function for LQG mean-field teams as

\begin{equation}
J_T^N(\gamma_{\tau}) = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \mathbb{E} x_{i}^{t+1} N \left( (x_{i}^{t})^T Q x_{i}^{t} + (u_{i}^{t})^T R u_{i}^{t} \right)
+ \frac{1}{N-1} \sum_{j=1,j \neq i}^{N} (u_{j}^{t})^T \tilde{R} u_{j}^{t} + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1,j \neq i}^{N} (x_{j}^{t})^T \tilde{Q} x_{j}^{t} + (x_{i}^{t})^T \hat{Q} x_{i}^{t},
\end{equation}

where $R, \tilde{R} > 0$ and $Q, \hat{Q} \succeq 0$.

Problem $(P_{T,1,LQG}^{\infty,MF})$: Consider the expected cost function for LQG mean-field teams as

\begin{equation}
J_T^\infty(\gamma_{\tau}) = \lim_{N \to \infty} J_T^N(\gamma_{\tau}).
\end{equation}

Let $I_t^i = \{x_{[0:t],i}^i, u_{[0:t-1],i}^i\}$ for $i \in \mathbb{N}$, and dynamics be as (4.1).

Corollary 4.8. For a fixed $T$ and $N$, consider a finite horizon team problem defined as $(P_{T,1,LQG}^{N,MF})$ (see (4.10)). If $(x_{i}^j)_{i=N}^{1}$ are exchangeable zero mean Gaussian random vectors with an identical distribution, and $w_{i}^j$ are i.i.d. zero mean Gaussian random vectors for $i = 1, \ldots, N$, independent for $t = 0, \ldots, T-1$, and independent of initial states, then

\begin{equation}
u_{i}^{T,*(T),i} = K_i^{T}(x_{i}^0) + \frac{L_i^{(N),T}}{N-1} \sum_{j=1,j \neq i}^{N} \mathbb{E}(x_{j}^0|x_{i}^0),
\end{equation}

where $K_{i}^{(T)}$ and $P_{i}^{(T)}$ satisfy (4.5) and (4.6), and $L_{i}^{(N),T}$ is a function of $K_{i}^{(T)}$.

Proof. The proof is similar to the one in Theorem 4.2.

Corollary 4.9. For a fixed $T$, consider a finite horizon team problem defined as $(P_{T,1,LQG}^{\infty,MF})$ (see (4.11)). Assume $(x_{i}^0)_{i=N}^{1}$ are exchangeable zero mean Gaussian random vectors with an identical distribution, and $w_{i}^j$ are i.i.d. zero mean Gaussian random vectors for $i \in \mathbb{N}$, independent for $t = 0, \ldots, T-1$, and independent of initial states. If $L_i^{(N),T}$ (see (4.12)) converges pointwise as $N \to \infty$ to $L_i^{(\infty),T}$, then

\begin{equation}
u_{i}^{T,*(T),i} = K_i^{(T)}(x_{i}^0) + L_i^{(\infty),T} \sum_{j=1,j \neq i}^{N} \mathbb{E}(x_{j}^0|x_{i}^0),
\end{equation}

where $K_{i}^{(T)}$ and $P_{i}^{(T)}$ satisfy (4.5) and (4.6), and $\Sigma = \mathbb{E}(x_{i}^0(x_{i}^0)^T)$, $(\mathbb{E}(x_{i}^0(x_{i}^0)^T))^{-1}$.
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Proof. Invoking Theorem 3.2 and Corollary 4.8; using Remark 5 completes the proof. □

4.2. Average cost infinite horizons problems for partially nested dynamic teams. In the following, we consider average cost problems with symmetric partially nested information structure as well as LQG dynamic teams with the one step delay sharing pattern and sparsity constraints. We note that the optimality of linear policies for infinite horizon LQG problems is open in its generality. In this subsection, we provide positive results for a class of such problems.

4.2.1. Average cost infinite horizon problems for symmetric partially nested LQG dynamic teams on a tree. Now, consider infinite horizon team problems and we use the result in Section 4.1.

Problem (P\textsuperscript{tree}\textsuperscript{∞}): Consider the following expected cost function

\begin{equation}
J(\gamma^{1:2}) = \limsup_{T \to \infty} E(x_{0:T}^{2}, x_{0:T-1}^{2})[c(x_{0:T-1}^{1:2}, u_{0:T-1}^{1:2})],
\end{equation}

where the cost function is defined as (4.2) and \(I^i_t = \{x_{[t:t]}, u_{[0:t-1]}^i\}\).

First, we introduce a lemma essential for Theorem 4.11.

Lemma 4.10. Consider the sequence \(\{a^i_T\}_{i=1}^\infty\). Assume \(\lim_{T \to \infty} a^i_T = a\) for \(i = 0, \ldots, T - 1\). If for every fixed \(T \in \mathbb{N}\), \(a^i_T = a^{l+1}_{T+1}\) for all \(l = 0, \ldots, T - 1\), then

\[\lim_{T \to \infty} \frac{1}{T} \sum_{i=1}^T a^i_T = a,\]

where the second equality follows from the assumption that \(a^i_T = a^{l+1}_{T+1}\) and the last equality follows from the Cesàro mean argument. □

Theorem 4.11. Consider average cost infinite horizon team problems defined as \((P^{tree}_{\infty})\) (see (4.13)). Assume \((A, B)\) are stabilizable and \((A, Q, \Sigma)\) are detectable. Assume \(x_0^i\) and \(x_2^i\) are exchangeable with an identical zero mean Gaussian distribution and \(w_t^i\)s are i.i.d. zero mean Gaussian random variables for \(i = 1, 2\) and for all \(t = 0, \ldots, T - 1\) and independent of initial states. If \(L_t^i(\infty)\) converges pointwise to \(L_t^i(\infty)\) as \(T \to \infty\), then the pointwise limit of the sequence of optimal policies for \((P^{tree}_{\infty})\) is team optimal for \((P^{tree}_{\infty})\) and stabilizes the closed-loop system,

\begin{align*}
    u_t^{1*,(\infty)} &= Kx_t^1 + L_t(\infty)E(x_0^2|x_0^1), \\
    u_t^{2*,(\infty)} &= Kx_t^2 + L_t(\infty)E(x_0^2|x_0^2),
\end{align*}

where \(K, P, L_t(\infty)\) and \(G_t(\infty)\) are the pointwise limit of the ones for \((P^{tree}_{T})\) as \(T \to \infty\).

Proof. We show \(\limsup_{T \to \infty} J_T(\gamma^\ast_T) = J(\gamma^\ast_\infty)\) and invoke [35, Theorem 5] or [29, Theorem 1] to complete the proof. From (4.8), we have

\begin{align*}
    \lim_{T \to \infty} J_T(\gamma^\ast_T) &- J_T(\gamma^\ast_T) \\
    &= \lim_{T \to \infty} \frac{2}{T} E((x_0^1)^T (P_0^T - P)x_0^1) + \frac{2}{T} \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} E((u_t^1)^T (P_t^T - P)u_t^1),
\end{align*}

(4.14)
where (4.14) is zero since $P_0^{(T)}$ converges to $P$, and using Lemma 4.10 since $P_{t+1}^{(T)} = P_t^{(T)}$. Expression (4.16) converges to zero since $L_t^{(T)}$ (see (4.7)) converges pointwise to $L_t^{(\infty)}$ as $T \to \infty$, we have $\sum_{s=t}^{\infty} B^T (A^T)^{s-t} PBL_s^{(\infty)} < \infty$, and this implies that $\lim_{s \to \infty} L_s^{(\infty)} = 0$. Hence, we have for every $\epsilon > 0$, there exists $N > T$ such that for every $t > N$, $\|Tr[L_t^{(T)} (L_t^{(\infty)})^T]\| < \epsilon$. We define $L_t^{(T)} = 0$ for $t > T$. Expression (4.15) is equal to zero following from Lemma 4.10 and the fact that $\|Tr[L_t^{(\infty)} (L_t^{(\infty)})^T]\| < \epsilon$ for every $t > N$. Hence, equality (4.17) is true and global optimality follows from [35, Theorem 5]. The closed loop system is stable since we have, $\limsup_{t \to \infty} \mathbb{E}(\|x_t^1\|^2) < \infty$ following from the fact that $\|A + BK\| < 1$ (all the eigenvalues of $A + BK$ are inside of the unit circle), and $\|L_t^{(\infty)}\| < M$. 

\section*{4.2.2. Average cost team problems with one step delayed sharing pattern and sparsity constraints.} In [24], the problem of finding a steady state solution for state feedback average cost LQG team problems with a delay and sparsity has been considered. Under the independence of disturbances assumption, convergence of the solution to the stabilizing solutions for finite horizon of the corresponding algebraic Riccati equation has been shown [24]; however, global optimality of the limit solution has not been established. We establish global optimality of the limit solution. Consider the following dynamics for $i = 1, \ldots, N$,

$$
x_{t+1}^i = \sum_{j} A_{ij}^1 x_t^j + B_{ij}^1 u_t^j + \omega_t^i,
$$

where for a fixed $i = 1, \ldots, N$, $A_{ij}^1$ and $B_{ij}^1$ are zero if sum of the delays along the directed path from $j$ to $i$ with the shortest path, $D_{ij}$, is more than one, i.e., $D_{ij} > 1$. Assume $x_0^j$ and $\omega_t^i$ are mutually independent Gaussian random vectors for all $i = 1, \ldots, N$ and $\omega_t^i$ are independent for $t = 0, \ldots, T - 1$ with covariance matrix $\Sigma_{\omega}^i$. The information structure is defined as $I_t^i = \{x_k^j | j = 1, \ldots, N, \text{and } k = 0, \ldots, t - D_{ij}\}$. This along with the assumption on the dynamics of the system implies that the information structure is partially nested. Since the disturbances and initial states are mutually independent, the information structure can be decomposed into the independent sets [24]. To this end, an information graph, $\hat{G}(M,F)$, has been defined for a graph [24]. In the following, we follow the notation in [24]. Define $s_k^j$ as a set of all nodes reachable from node $j$ within $k$ steps. Define $\mathcal{M} := \{s_k^j | j = 1, \ldots, N \text{ and } k \geq 0\}$ and $\mathcal{F} := \{(s_k^j, s_{k+1}^j) | j = 1, \ldots, N \text{ and } k \geq 0\}$. The following theorem is from [24], and gives an optimal policy for finite horizon problems. Assume that the delay of sharing between each decision maker is not greater than one. Assume there are no directed cycles with a total delay of zero.
Consider the LQG team problem with
\[
J_T(\mathcal{X}_r) := \frac{1}{T} \mathbb{E} \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \left[ x_t^T u_t^T \right] \left[ \begin{array}{c} Q \\ S \\ R \end{array} \right] \left[ \begin{array}{c} x_t \\ u_t \end{array} \right],
\]
where \( R > 0, Q \geq 0, \) and \( \frac{Q}{S^T R} \geq 0, \) \( u_t = (u_t^1, \ldots, u_t^N) \). Then, the optimal controller is \( u^*_t = \sum_{r \geq 1} I^{(i),r} P^*_t \zeta^*_t \), where \( r \in \mathcal{M}, I^{(i),r} \) is the identity matrix partition according to \( \{i\} \) and \( r \), and
\[
\begin{align*}
K^*_t &= -(R^{rr} + (B^{sr})^T X_{t+1}^s B^{sr})^{-1} (S^{rr} + (A^{sr})^T X_{t+1}^s B^{sr}), \\
X^*_t &= Q^{rr} + (A^{sr})^T X_{t+1}^s A^{sr} - (K^*_t)^T (R^{rr} + (B^{sr})^T X_{t+1}^s B^{sr}) K^*_t,
\end{align*}
\]
with \( X^*_t = Q^{rr} \), and \( \zeta^*_{t+1} = \sum_{r \rightarrow s} (A^{sr} + B^{sr} K^*_t) \zeta^*_t \), \( \sum_{\omega \rightarrow s} I^{s,(i)} \omega \), with \( \zeta^*_0 = \sum_{\omega \rightarrow s} I^{s,(i)} \omega \), where \( s \in \mathcal{M} \) is the unique node such that there is an edge between \( r \) and \( s \), i.e., \( r \rightarrow s \). Moreover, the optimal cost is obtained as
\[
J_T(\mathcal{X}_r) = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \sum_{\omega \rightarrow s} T \mathbb{E} \left[ x_0^T (x_0^T) \right] \left[ \begin{array}{c} Q \\ S \\ R \end{array} \right] \left[ \begin{array}{c} x_0 \\ u_0 \end{array} \right],
\]
and
\[
\sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \sum_{\omega \rightarrow s} T \mathbb{E} \left[ x_1^T (x_1^T) \right] \left[ \begin{array}{c} Q \\ S \\ R \end{array} \right] \left[ \begin{array}{c} x_1 \\ u_1 \end{array} \right],
\]
where \( (X^*_t)^{(i),(i)} \) denotes the sub-matrix \( (X^*_t)^{(i)} \) corresponds to the \( ij \)-th array.

In the following, we refine a related result in \cite{24}.

**Theorem 4.13.** Consider the LQG team problem with
\[
J(\mathcal{X}_r) := \lim_{T \to \infty} \mathbb{E} \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \left[ x_t^T u_t^T \right] \left[ \begin{array}{c} Q \\ S \\ R \end{array} \right] \left[ \begin{array}{c} x_t \\ u_t \end{array} \right],
\]
Assume for self loops \( s \to s \) in the information graph, \( (A^{ss}, B^{ss}) \) is stabilizable and \( \begin{bmatrix} A^{ss} & e^{i\theta} B^{ss} \\ C^{ss} & R^{ss} \end{bmatrix} \) has a full column rank for every \( \theta \in [0, 2\pi] \), where \( C^{ss} \) and \( D^{ss} \) are the matrix of the form \( \begin{bmatrix} Q^{ss} & S^{ss} \\ (S^{ss})^T & R^{ss} \end{bmatrix} \). Then, \( u^*_t = \sum_{r \geq 1} I^{(i),r} K^{r,(\infty)} \zeta^{r,(\infty)}_t \), where \( K^{r,(\infty)} = \lim_{T \to \infty} K^{r,(T)} \), \( X^{r,(\infty)} = \lim_{T \to \infty} X^{r,(T)} \) for all \( t \) and \( \zeta^{r,(\infty)}_t \) is obtained by replacing \( K^{r,(T)} \) with \( K^{r,(\infty)} \).

**Proof.** As \( T \to \infty \), we have \( X^{r,(\infty)} = \lim_{T \to \infty} X^{r,(T)} \) for (4.18) since the the recursion for \( s \to s \) corresponds to the classical Riccati equation and \( X^{r,(T)} \) is a continuous function of \( X^{s,(T)} \) \cite{24, Corollary 7}. We have,
\[
\lim_{T \to \infty} |J_T(\mathcal{X}^*_r) - J_T(\mathcal{X}^*_{r+1})| = \lim_{T \to \infty} \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \sum_{\omega \rightarrow s} T \mathbb{E} \left[ (X^{r,(T)}_t)^{(i),(i)} \zeta^{r,(\infty)}_t - (X^{r,(\infty)}_t)^{(i),(i)} \zeta^{r,(\infty)}_t \right] = 0,
\]
where (4.19) and Lemma 4.10 implies the last equality. This is because (4.18) implies that \( X^{r,(T+1)} = X^{r,(T)} \); hence, invoking \cite[Theorem 5]{35} implies global optimality of \( \mathcal{X}^*_r \). The stability argument follows from \cite{24, Corollary 7} and \cite{50}. \( \square \)
5. Conclusion. In this paper, we studied dynamic teams with symmetric information structure. We presented a characterization for symmetrically optimal teams for convex exchangeable team problems. For mean-field teams with symmetric information structure, we show the convergence of optimal policies for mean-field teams with $N$ decision makers to the corresponding optimal policy of mean-field teams. We obtained global optimal solutions for average cost finite and infinite horizon LQG dynamic team problems with symmetric partially nested information structure. Moreover, we obtained globally optimal policies for average cost infinite horizon state feedback problems for LQG dynamic teams with sparsity and delay constraints.
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