

Multiple Oracle Algorithm For General-Sum Continuous Games

Tomáš Kroupa, Tomáš Votroubek

Artificial Intelligence Center, Faculty of Electrical Engineering, Czech Technical University in Prague
{tomas.kroupa,votroto1}@fel.cvut.cz

Abstract

Continuous games have compact strategy sets and continuous utility functions. Such games can have a highly complicated structure of Nash equilibria. Algorithms and numerical methods for the equilibrium computation are known only for particular classes of continuous games such as two-person polynomial games or games with pure equilibria. This contribution focuses on the computation and approximation of a mixed strategy equilibrium for the whole class of multi-player general-sum continuous games. We extend vastly the scope of applicability of the double oracle algorithm, which was initially designed and proved to converge only for two-person zero-sum games. Specifically, we propose an iterative strategy generation technique, which splits the original problem into the master problem with only a finite subset of strategies being considered, and the subproblem in which an oracle finds the best response of each player. This simple method is guaranteed to recover an approximate equilibrium in finitely many iterations. Further, we argue that the Wasserstein distance (the earth mover's distance) is the right metric on the space of mixed strategies for our purposes. Our main result is the convergence of this algorithm in the Wasserstein distance to an equilibrium of the original continuous game. The numerical experiments show the performance of our method on several examples of games appearing in the literature.

Introduction

A strategic n -person game is called continuous if the action space of each player is a closed and bounded subset of Euclidean space and all utility functions are continuous. Continuous games have equilibria in mixed strategies by Glicksberg's generalization of the Nash's theorem (Glicksberg 1952), but those equilibria are usually very hard to characterize and compute. Nevertheless, many real-world scenarios and application domains have a continuum of actions expressing the amount of time, resources, location in space (Kamra et al. 2018, 2019), or parameters of classifiers (Yasodharan and Loiseau 2019). Equilibria of some large imperfect information games can be found by an infinite approximation of the original game (Ganzfried and Sandholm 2010).

We point out the main difficulties in the analysis and development of algorithms for continuous games.

- The equilibrium can be any tuple of mixed strategies with infinite supports (Karlin 1959) or almost any tuple of finitely-supported mixed strategies (Rehbeck 2018).
- Bounds on the size of supports of equilibrium strategies are known only for particular classes of continuous games (Stein, Ozdaglar, and Parrilo 2008).
- Some important games have only mixed equilibria; for example, certain variants of Colonel Blotto games (Golman and Page 2009).
- Finding a mixed strategy equilibrium involves locating its support, which lies inside a continuum of points.

To the best of our knowledge, algorithms or numerical methods exist only for very special classes of continuous games. In particular, two-person zero-sum polynomial games can be solved by the sum-of-squares optimization based on the sequence of semidefinite relaxations of the original problem (Parrilo 2006; Laraki and Lasserre 2012). The book (Başar and Olsder 1999) contains a detailed analysis of equilibria for some families of games with a particular shape of utility functions (games of timing, bell-shaped kernels, etc.) One of the principal learning methods for finite games, fictitious play (Robinson 1951; Brown 1951), was recently extended to continuous action spaces and applied to Blotto games (Ganzfried 2021). The dynamics of fictitious play were analyzed only under further restrictive assumptions in the continuous setting; see (Hofbauer and Sorin 2006; Perkins and Leslie 2014). No-regret learning studied in (Mertikopoulos and Zhou 2019) can be applied to finding pure equilibria or to mixed strategy learning in finite games. In a similar setting, Chasnov et al. (2020) provide convergence guarantees to a neighborhood of a stable Nash equilibrium for gradient-based learning algorithms.

The double oracle algorithm of (McMahan, Gordon, and Blum 2003) was extended from finite games and proved to converge for all two-person zero-sum continuous games (Adam et al. 2021). The algorithm is relatively straightforward — it is based on the iterative solution of finite subgames and the subsequent extension of the current strategy sets with best response strategies. Despite its simplicity, this method was successfully adapted to large extensive-form games (Bošanský et al. 2014), certain Bayesian games (Li and Wellman 2021), and real-world security domains with complex policy spaces (Xu et al. 2021a).

In this contribution, we extend the double oracle algorithm beyond two-person zero-sum continuous games. Our main result, Theorem 1, guarantees that Algorithm 1 converges to an equilibrium for any general-sum n -player continuous game. Moreover, this convergence is naturally captured by the Wasserstein distance on the space of mixed strategies. We demonstrate the computational performance of our method on selected examples of games appearing in the literature.

Basic Notions

This section summarizes basic notions and results related to continuous games and their mixed equilibria; see (Karlin 1959; Stein, Ozdaglar, and Parrilo 2008) for further details.

Continuous Games

The player set is $N = \{1, \dots, n\}$. Each player $i \in N$ selects a pure strategy x_i from a nonempty compact set $X_i \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{d_i}$, where d_i is a positive integer. Put

$$\mathbf{X} = X_1 \times \dots \times X_n.$$

A pure strategy profile is an n -tuple $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_n) \in \mathbf{X}$. We assume that each utility function

$$u_i: \mathbf{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$$

is continuous. A *continuous game* is the tuple

$$\mathcal{G} = \langle N, (X_i)_{i \in N}, (u_i)_{i \in N} \rangle.$$

We say that \mathcal{G} is *finite* if each X_i is finite.

Consider nonempty compact subsets $Y_i \subseteq X_i$ for $i \in N$. When each u_i is restricted to $Y_1 \times \dots \times Y_n$, the continuous game $\langle N, (Y_i)_{i \in N}, (u_i)_{i \in N} \rangle$ is called the *subgame* of \mathcal{G} .

A *mixed strategy* of player i is a Borel probability measure p over X_i . The *support* of p is the compact set

$$\text{spt } p = \bigcap \{K \subseteq X \mid K \text{ compact, } p(K) = 1\}.$$

In the paper, we construct only the mixed strategies with finite supports. The support of Dirac measure δ_x is the singleton $\text{spt } \delta_x = \{x\}$, where $x \in X_i$. In general, when the support $\text{spt } p$ of a mixed strategy p is finite, it means that $p(x) > 0$ for all $x \in \text{spt } p$ and $\sum_{x \in \text{spt } p} p(x) = 1$. For clarity, we emphasize that a finitely-supported mixed strategy p of player i should be interpreted as the function $p: X_i \rightarrow [0, 1]$ vanishing outside $\text{spt } p$, and not as a vector of probabilities with a fixed dimension. Only the former viewpoint enables us to take into account the distances between any pair of pure strategies in X_i , which is crucial for defining a distance between mixed strategies whose supports are arbitrary subsets of X_i .

The convex set of all mixed strategies of player i is denoted by M_i . Define

$$\mathbf{M} = M_1 \times \dots \times M_n.$$

For a mixed strategy profile $\mathbf{p} = (p_1, \dots, p_n) \in \mathbf{M}$, the expected utility of player i is

$$U_i(\mathbf{p}) = \int_{\mathbf{X}} u_i \, d(p_1 \times \dots \times p_n), \quad (1)$$

where $p_1 \times \dots \times p_n$ is the product probability measure. Let

$$\mathbf{U}(\mathbf{p}) = (U_1(\mathbf{p}), \dots, U_n(\mathbf{p})). \quad (2)$$

The definition (1) yields a function

$$U_i: \mathbf{M} \rightarrow \mathbb{R},$$

which can be effectively evaluated only in special cases. In particular, suppose that each $\text{spt } p_i$ is finite; then

$$U_i(\mathbf{p}) = \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \times_{k \in N} \text{spt } p_k} u_i(\mathbf{x}) \prod_{k \in N} p_k(x_k).$$

For each $i \in N$, let

$$\mathbf{M}_{-i} = \times_{k \in N, k \neq i} M_k.$$

A profile of mixed strategies from \mathbf{M}_{-i} is denoted by

$$\mathbf{p}_{-i} = (p_1, \dots, p_{i-1}, p_{i+1}, \dots, p_n).$$

If player i uses a pure strategy $x \in X_i$ and the rest of the players play $\mathbf{p}_{-i} \in \mathbf{M}_{-i}$, we write $U_k(x, \mathbf{p}_{-i})$ in place of $U_k(\delta_x, \mathbf{p}_{-i})$ to denote the expected utility of player $k \in N$. For any $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{X}$ and $\mathbf{p} \in \mathbf{M}$, define

$$\mathbf{U}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{p}) = (U_1(x_1, \mathbf{p}_{-1}), \dots, U_n(x_n, \mathbf{p}_{-n})). \quad (3)$$

Nash Equilibria

A mixed strategy profile $\mathbf{p}^* = (p_1^*, \dots, p_n^*) \in \mathbf{M}$ is a (*Nash equilibrium*) in a continuous game \mathcal{G} if, for every $i \in N$ and all $p_i \in M_i$, the inequality $U_i(p_i, \mathbf{p}_{-i}^*) \leq U_i(\mathbf{p}^*)$ holds. Glicksberg's theorem (Glicksberg 1952) says that any continuous game \mathcal{G} has an equilibrium. The following useful characterization is a consequence of Proposition 2: A profile \mathbf{p}^* is an equilibrium if, and only if, $U_i(x_i, \mathbf{p}_{-i}^*) \leq U_i(\mathbf{p}^*)$, for each $i \in N$ and every $x_i \in X_i$.

Let $\epsilon \geq 0$. An ϵ -*equilibrium* is a mixed strategy profile $\mathbf{p}^* \in \mathbf{M}$ such that, for all $i \in N$ and every $x_i \in X_i$,

$$U_i(x_i, \mathbf{p}_{-i}^*) - U_i(\mathbf{p}^*) \leq \epsilon.$$

The last inequality implies that $U_i(p_i, \mathbf{p}_{-i}^*) - U_i(\mathbf{p}^*) \leq \epsilon$ for all $p_i \in M_i$. Using the notation (2)–(3) and letting $\epsilon = (\epsilon, \dots, \epsilon)$, a mixed strategy profile $\mathbf{p}^* \in \mathbf{M}$ is an ϵ -equilibrium if, and only if, for all $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{X}$,

$$\mathbf{U}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{p}^*) - \mathbf{U}(\mathbf{p}^*) \leq \epsilon.$$

Every inequality between vectors is interpreted pointwise.

Convergence of Mixed Strategies

We consider an arbitrary metric ρ_i on the compact strategy space $X_i \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{m_i}$ of each player $i \in N$. This enables us to quantify a distance between pure strategies $x, y \in X_i$ by the number $\rho_i(x, y) \geq 0$. Consequently, we can define the Wasserstein distance d_W on M_i , which is compatible with the metric of the underlying strategy space X_i in the sense that $d_W(\delta_x, \delta_y) = \rho_i(x, y)$, for all $x, y \in X_i$. The distance preservation from X_i to M_i is a very natural property, since the space of pure strategies X_i is embedded in M_i via the Dirac measure correspondence $x \mapsto \delta_x$.

The Wasserstein Distance

This metric originated from optimal transport theory; see (Villani 2009). It is nowadays highly instrumental in computer vision (Rubner, Tomasi, and Guibas 2000), machine learning (Frogner et al. 2015; Xu et al. 2021b), signal processing (Kolouri et al. 2017), and many other areas. The *Wasserstein distance* of mixed strategies $p, q \in M_i$ is

$$d_W(p, q) := \inf_{\mu} \int_{X_i^2} \rho_i(x, y) d\mu(x, y), \quad (4)$$

where the infimum is over all Borel probability measures μ on X_i^2 whose marginals are p and q :

$$\mu(A \times X_i) = p(A) \quad \text{and} \quad \mu(X_i \times A) = q(A),$$

for all Borel subsets $A \subseteq X_i$.

The dependence of d_W on the metric ρ_i is tacitly understood. The function d_W is a metric on M_i . Since X_i is compact, it is necessarily a set of bounded diameter

$$\text{diam } X_i := \sup\{\rho_i(x, y) \mid x, y \in X_i\}.$$

This implies that the convergence in (M_i, d_W) coincides with the weak convergence (Panaretos and Zemel 2020, Corollary 2.2.2). Specifically, let (p^j) be a sequence in M_i . Then the following are equivalent:

- The sequence (p^j) converges to p in (M_i, d_W) .
- The sequence (p^j) *weakly converges* to p , that is, for every continuous function $f: X_i \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$,

$$\lim_j \int_{X_i} f dp^j = \int_{X_i} f dp.$$

The metric space (M_i, d_W) is compact by (Panaretos and Zemel 2020, Proposition 2.2.3). This implies that \mathbf{M} is compact in a product metric as well. Therefore, any sequence (\mathbf{p}^j) in \mathbf{M} has an accumulation point. In other words:

Proposition 1. *Any sequence of mixed strategy profiles (\mathbf{p}^j) in \mathbf{M} contains a weakly convergent subsequence.*

The function U_i is continuous on \mathbf{M} by (1) and the definition of weak convergence. This implies that if (\mathbf{p}^j) weakly converges to \mathbf{p} in \mathbf{M} , then the corresponding values of expected utility goes to $U_i(\mathbf{p})$,

$$\lim_j U_i(\mathbf{p}^j) = U_i(\mathbf{p}).$$

By compactness of M_i and continuity of U_i , all maxima and maximizers in the paper exist. In particular, the optimal value of utility function in response to the mixed strategies of other players is attained for some pure strategy.

Proposition 2. *For each $i \in N$ and any $\mathbf{p}_{-i} \in \mathbf{M}_{-i}$, there exists $x_i \in X_i$ such that*

$$\max_{p \in M_i} U_i(p, \mathbf{p}_{-i}) = \max_{x \in X_i} U_i(x, \mathbf{p}_{-i}) = U_i(x_i, \mathbf{p}_{-i}).$$

In general, computing $d_W(p, q)$ for any pair of mixed strategies $p, q \in M_i$ is a difficult infinite-dimensional optimization problem. The existing numerical methods for this problem are reviewed in (Peyré and Cuturi 2019). In our setting it suffices to evaluate $d_W(p, q)$ only for mixed strategies

with finite supports. In particular, it follows immediately from the definition (4) that

$$d_W(p, \delta_y) = \sum_{x \in \text{spt } p} \rho_i(x, y) p(x),$$

for every finitely-supported mixed strategy $p \in M_i$ and any $y \in X_i$. If both p and q have finite supports, then computing (4) becomes the linear programming problem with variables $\mu(x, y)$ indexed by $(x, y) \in \text{spt } p \times \text{spt } q$. The objective function to be minimized is

$$\sum_{x \in \text{spt } p} \sum_{y \in \text{spt } q} \rho_i(x, y) \mu(x, y) \quad (5)$$

and the constraints are

$$\begin{aligned} \mu(x, y) &\geq 0, \quad (x, y) \in \text{spt } p \times \text{spt } q, \\ \sum_{x \in \text{spt } p} \sum_{y \in \text{spt } q} \mu(x, y) &= 1, \\ \sum_{y \in \text{spt } q} \mu(x, y) &= p(x), \quad x \in \text{spt } p \\ \sum_{x \in \text{spt } p} \mu(x, y) &= q(y), \quad y \in \text{spt } q. \end{aligned}$$

The Total Variation Distance

This concept of distance on M_i does not depend on the geometry of the underlying space of pure strategies (X_i, ρ_i) . The *total variation distance* between a pair of mixed strategies $p, q \in M_i$ of player i is

$$d_{TV}(p, q) := \sup_A |p(A) - q(A)|,$$

where the supremum is over all Borel subsets $A \subseteq X_i$. When both mixed strategies p and q have finite supports, we have

$$d_{TV}(p, q) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_x |p(x) - q(x)|,$$

where the sum is over $\text{spt } p \cup \text{spt } q$. In this case, the Wasserstein metric and the total variation distance satisfy the following relation (Gibbs and Su 2002):

$$d_{\min} \cdot d_{TV}(p, q) \leq d_W(p, q) \leq d_{\max} \cdot d_{TV}(p, q), \quad (6)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} d_{\min} &:= \min\{\rho_i(x, y) \mid x, y \in \text{spt } p \cup \text{spt } q, x \neq y\}, \\ d_{\max} &:= \max\{\rho_i(x, y) \mid x, y \in \text{spt } p \cup \text{spt } q\}. \end{aligned}$$

If (p^j) converges to p in the total variation distance, then (p^j) converges weakly, but the converse fails. For example, if a sequence (x^j) converges to $x \in X_i$ and $x^j \neq x$ for all j , then the corresponding sequence of Dirac measures converges weakly in M_i , as $d_W(\delta_{x^j}, \delta_x) = \rho_i(x^j, x) \rightarrow 0$. By contrast, it fails to converge in the total variation distance, since $d_{TV}(\delta_{x^j}, \delta_x) = 1$ for all j .

Algorithm 1

Input: Continuous game $\mathcal{G} = \langle N, (X_i)_{i \in N}, (u_i)_{i \in N} \rangle$, nonempty finite subsets $X_i^1 \subseteq X_i$ ($i \in N$), and $\epsilon \geq 0$

- 1: $j := 0$
- 2: **repeat**
- 3: $j := j + 1$
- 4: Find an equilibrium \mathbf{p}^j of $\langle N, (X_i^j)_{i \in N}, (u_i)_{i \in N} \rangle$
- 5: **for** $i \in N$ **do**
- 6: Find some $x_i^{j+1} \in \beta_i(\mathbf{p}_{-i}^j)$
- 7: $X_i^{j+1} := X_i^j \cup \{x_i^{j+1}\}$
- 8: **end for**
- 9: **until** $\mathbf{U}(\mathbf{x}^{j+1}, \mathbf{p}^j) - \mathbf{U}(\mathbf{p}^j) \leq \epsilon$

Output: ϵ -equilibrium \mathbf{p}^j of game \mathcal{G}

Main Results

We propose Algorithm 1 as an iterative strategy-generation technique for (approximately) solving any continuous game $\mathcal{G} = \langle N, (X_i)_{i \in N}, (u_i)_{i \in N} \rangle$. We recall that the *best response set* of player $i \in N$ with respect to a mixed strategy profile $\mathbf{p}_{-i} \in \mathbf{P}_{-i}$ is the set

$$\beta_i(\mathbf{p}_{-i}) = \operatorname{argmax}_{x \in X_i} U_i(x, \mathbf{p}_{-i}).$$

The set $\beta_i(\mathbf{p}_{-i})$ is always nonempty by Proposition 2. We assume that every player uses an oracle to recover at least one best response strategy.

Algorithm 1 proceeds as follows. In every iteration j , finite strategy sets X_i^j are constructed for each player $i \in N$ and the corresponding finite subgame of \mathcal{G} is solved. Let \mathbf{p}^j be its equilibrium. Then, an arbitrary best response strategy x_i^{j+1} with respect to \mathbf{p}_{-i}^j is added to each strategy set X_i^j . Those steps are repeated until

$$U_i(x_i^{j+1}, \mathbf{p}_{-i}^j) - U_i(\mathbf{p}^j) \leq \epsilon \quad \text{for each } i \in N. \quad (7)$$

First we discuss basic properties of the algorithm. At each step j , we have the inequality

$$\mathbf{U}(\mathbf{x}^{j+1}, \mathbf{p}^j) \geq \mathbf{U}(\mathbf{p}^j). \quad (8)$$

Indeed, for each player $i \in N$,

$$\begin{aligned} U_i(x_i^{j+1}, \mathbf{p}_{-i}^j) &= \max_{x \in X_i^j} U_i(x, \mathbf{p}_{-i}^j) \\ &\geq \max_{x \in X_i^j} U_i(x, \mathbf{p}_{-i}^j) = U_i(\mathbf{p}^j). \end{aligned}$$

We note that the stopping condition of the double oracle algorithm for two-person zero-sum continuous games (Adam et al. 2021) is necessarily different from (7). Namely the former condition, which is tailored to the zero-sum games, is

$$U_1(x_1^{j+1}, p_2^j) - U_1(x_2^{j+1}, p_1^j) \leq \epsilon. \quad (9)$$

When \mathcal{G} is a two-player zero-sum continuous game, it follows immediately from (8) that (9) implies (7).

We prove correctness of Algorithm 1 — the eventual output \mathbf{p}^j is an ϵ -equilibrium of the original game \mathcal{G} .

Lemma 1. *If Algorithm 1 terminates at step j , then \mathbf{p}^j is an ϵ -equilibrium of \mathcal{G} .*

Proof. Let $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{X}$. The difference $\mathbf{U}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{p}^j) - \mathbf{U}(\mathbf{p}^j)$ can be written as

$$\mathbf{U}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{p}^j) - \mathbf{U}(\mathbf{x}^{j+1}, \mathbf{p}^j) + \mathbf{U}(\mathbf{x}^{j+1}, \mathbf{p}^j) - \mathbf{U}(\mathbf{p}^j).$$

Then $\mathbf{U}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{p}^j) - \mathbf{U}(\mathbf{x}^{j+1}, \mathbf{p}^j) \leq \mathbf{0}$, since \mathbf{x}^{j+1} is the profile of best response strategies. Consequently,

$$\mathbf{U}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{p}^j) - \mathbf{U}(\mathbf{p}^j) \leq \mathbf{U}(\mathbf{x}^{j+1}, \mathbf{p}^j) - \mathbf{U}(\mathbf{p}^j) \leq \epsilon,$$

where the last inequality is just the terminating condition (7). Therefore, \mathbf{p}^j is an ϵ -equilibrium of \mathcal{G} . \square

If the set $\mathbf{X}^j = X_1^j \times \dots \times X_n^j$ cannot be further inflated, Algorithm 1 terminates.

Lemma 2. *Assume that $\mathbf{X}^j = \mathbf{X}^{j+1}$ at step j of Algorithm 1. Then $\mathbf{U}(\mathbf{x}^{j+1}, \mathbf{p}^j) = \mathbf{U}(\mathbf{p}^j)$.*

Proof. The condition $\mathbf{X}^j = \mathbf{X}^{j+1}$ implies $\mathbf{x}^{j+1} \in \mathbf{X}^j$. Then

$$U_i(x_i^{j+1}, \mathbf{p}_{-i}^j) = \max_{x \in X_i^j} U_i(x, \mathbf{p}_{-i}^j) = U_i(\mathbf{p}^j),$$

for each $i \in N$. \square

The following proposition extends the analogous result for two-person zero-sum finite games from (McMahan, Gordon, and Blum 2003).

Proposition 3. *If \mathcal{G} is a finite game and $\epsilon = 0$, then Algorithm 1 recovers an equilibrium of \mathcal{G} in finitely-many steps.*

Proof. Let \mathcal{G} be finite and $\epsilon = 0$. Since each X_i is finite, there exists an iteration j in which $\mathbf{X}^{j+1} = \mathbf{X}^j$. Then the terminating condition of Algorithm 1 is satisfied with $\epsilon = 0$ (Lemma 2) and \mathbf{p}^j is an equilibrium of \mathcal{G} (Lemma 1). \square

This is our main result.

Theorem 1. *Let \mathcal{G} be a continuous game.*

1. *Let $\epsilon = 0$. If Algorithm 1 stops at step j , then \mathbf{p}^j is an equilibrium of \mathcal{G} . Otherwise any accumulation point of the sequence $\mathbf{p}^1, \mathbf{p}^2, \dots$ is an equilibrium of \mathcal{G} .*
2. *If $\epsilon > 0$, then Algorithm 1 stops at some step j and \mathbf{p}^j is an ϵ -equilibrium of \mathcal{G} .*

Proof. Item 1. Let $\epsilon = 0$. If Algorithm 1 terminates at step j , then Lemma 1 implies that \mathbf{p}^j is an equilibrium of \mathcal{G} . In the opposite case, the algorithm generates a sequence of mixed strategy profiles $\mathbf{p}^1, \mathbf{p}^2, \dots$. Consider any weakly convergent subsequence of this sequence — at least one such subsequence exists by Proposition 1. Without loss of generality, such a subsequence will be denoted by the same indices as the original sequence. Therefore, for each player $i \in N$, there exists some $p_i^* \in M_i$, such that the sequence p_i^1, p_i^2, \dots weakly converges to p_i^* . We need to show that $\mathbf{p}^* = (p_1^*, \dots, p_n^*) \in \mathbf{M}$ is an equilibrium of \mathcal{G} .

Let $i \in N$. Define

$$Y_i := \bigcup_{j=1}^{\infty} X_i^j.$$

First, assume that $x \in Y_i$. Then there exists j_0 with $x \in X_i^j$ for each $j \geq j_0$. Hence the inequality $U_i(\mathbf{p}^j) \geq U_i(x, \mathbf{p}_{-i}^j)$, for each $j \geq j_0$, since \mathbf{p}^j is an equilibrium of the corresponding finite subgame. Therefore

$$U_i(\mathbf{p}^*) = \lim_j U_i(\mathbf{p}^j) \geq \lim_j U_i(x, \mathbf{p}_{-i}^j) = U_i(x, \mathbf{p}_{-i}^*).$$

Further, we obtain by continuity of U_i ,

$$U_i(\mathbf{p}^*) \geq U_i(x, \mathbf{p}_{-i}^*) \quad \text{for all } x \in \text{cl}(Y_i). \quad (10)$$

Now, consider an arbitrary $x \in X_i \setminus \text{cl}(Y_i)$. The definition of x_i^{j+1} yields $U_i(x_i^{j+1}, \mathbf{p}_{-i}^j) \geq U_i(x, \mathbf{p}_{-i}^j)$ for each j . This implies, by continuity,

$$\lim_j U_i(x_i^{j+1}, \mathbf{p}_{-i}^*) \geq \lim_j U_i(x, \mathbf{p}_{-i}^j) = U_i(x, \mathbf{p}_{-i}^*). \quad (11)$$

Since $x_i^{j+1} \in X_i^{j+1}$, compactness of X_i provides a convergent subsequence (denoted by the same indices) such that $x' := \lim_j x_i^j \in \text{cl}(Y_i)$. Then (10) gives

$$U_i(\mathbf{p}^*) \geq U_i(x', \mathbf{p}_{-i}^*) = \lim_j U_i(x_i^{j+1}, \mathbf{p}_{-i}^*). \quad (12)$$

Combining (11) and (12) shows that $U_i(\mathbf{p}^*) \geq U_i(x, \mathbf{p}_{-i}^*)$.

Item 2. Let $\epsilon > 0$. If Algorithm 1 terminates at step j , then Lemma 1 implies that \mathbf{p}^j is an ϵ -equilibrium of \mathcal{G} . Otherwise Algorithm 1 produces a sequence $\mathbf{p}^1, \mathbf{p}^2, \dots$ and we can repeat the analysis as in Item 1 for convergent subsequences of (\mathbf{p}^j) and (\mathbf{x}^j) , which are denoted by the same indices. Define

$$x' := \lim_j x_i^j.$$

Then

$$U_i(\mathbf{p}^*) \geq U_i(x', \mathbf{p}_{-i}^*) = \lim_j U_i(x_i^{j+1}, \mathbf{p}_{-i}^j). \quad (13)$$

At every step j we have $U_i(x_i^{j+1}, \mathbf{p}_{-i}^j) \geq U_i(\mathbf{p}^j)$ for each $i \in N$ by (8). Hence

$$\lim_j U_i(x_i^{j+1}, \mathbf{p}_{-i}^j) \geq U_i(\mathbf{p}^*). \quad (14)$$

Putting together (13) with (14), we get

$$\lim_j (U_i(x_i^{j+1}, \mathbf{p}_{-i}^j) - U_i(\mathbf{p}^j)) = 0 \quad (15)$$

for each $i \in N$. This equality means that Algorithm 1 stops at some step j and \mathbf{p}^j is an ϵ -equilibrium by Lemma 1. \square

Algorithm 1 generates the sequence of equilibria $\mathbf{p}^1, \mathbf{p}^2, \dots$ in increasingly larger subgames of \mathcal{G} . The sequence itself may fail to converge weakly in \mathbf{M} even for a two-person zero-sum continuous game — see (Adam et al. 2021, Example 1). In fact, Theorem 1 guarantees only convergence to an accumulation point. We recall that this is a typical feature of some globally convergent methods not only in infinite-dimensional spaces (Hinze et al. 2008, Theorem 2.2), but also in Euclidean spaces. For example, a gradient method generates the sequence such that only its accumulation points are guaranteed to be stationary points; see (Bertsekas 2016, Proposition 1.2.1) for details. One necessary condition for the weak convergence of $\mathbf{p}^1, \mathbf{p}^2, \dots$ is easy to formulate using the stopping condition of Algorithm 1.

Proposition 4. *If the sequence $\mathbf{p}^1, \mathbf{p}^2, \dots$ generated by Algorithm 1 converges weakly to an equilibrium \mathbf{p} , then*

$$\lim_j (U_i(x_i^{j+1}, \mathbf{p}_{-i}^j) - U_i(\mathbf{p}^j)) = 0, \quad i \in N.$$

Proof. Using (8) and the triangle inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} U_i(x_i^{j+1}, \mathbf{p}_{-i}^j) - U_i(\mathbf{p}^j) &= |U_i(x_i^{j+1}, \mathbf{p}_{-i}^j) - U_i(\mathbf{p}^j)| \\ &\leq |U_i(x_i^{j+1}, \mathbf{p}_{-i}^j) - U_i(\mathbf{p})| + |U_i(\mathbf{p}) - U_i(\mathbf{p}^j)|. \end{aligned}$$

As $j \rightarrow \infty$, the first summand goes to zero by (15) and the second by the assumption. Hence the conclusion. \square

In our numerical experiments we compute the difference

$$U_i(x_i^{j+1}, \mathbf{p}_{-i}^j) - U_i(\mathbf{p}^j) \quad (16)$$

at each step j and check if the differences are diminishing with j increasing. This provides a simple heuristics to detect the quality of approximation and convergence. Another option is to calculate the Wasserstein distance

$$d_W(\mathbf{p}^j, \mathbf{p}^{j+1}), \quad (17)$$

which can be done with a linear program (5) or approximately using the bounds (6). If the sequence $\mathbf{p}^1, \mathbf{p}^2, \dots$ converges weakly, then $d_W(\mathbf{p}^j, \mathbf{p}^{j+1}) \rightarrow 0$. We include the values (17) in the results of some numerical experiments and observe that they are decreasing to zero quickly. It can be shown that neither (16) nor (17) are monotone sequences. The lack of monotonicity is apparent from the graphs of our experiments; see Figure 1, for example.

Algorithm 1 is a meta-algorithm, which depends on the selection of (i) the specific method for finding an equilibrium of finite games (the master problem) and (ii) the optimization method for computing the best response (the subproblem). We detail this setup for each example in the next section. The choice of concrete computational methods should reflect the properties of a given continuous game, since the performance of methods for solving the master problem and subproblem can make huge difference in the overall performance and precision of Algorithm 1. For example:

- Polymatrix games are solvable in polynomial time (Cai et al. 2016) as opposed to general-sum finite games (Daskalakis, Goldberg, and Papadimitriou 2009).
- For special classes of utility functions, the best response computation can be based on global solvers.

Numerical Experiments

In this section, we demonstrate the versatility of our method by solving various games from the literature. Each example shows the progress of the convergence-criterion value (16) (which we term “instability”) over the course of ten iterations. For all univariate examples, we also plot the Wasserstein distance (17) between mixed strategies from consecutive iterations. All experiments were initialized with random unit vectors. In example games with polynomial utility functions, the best response oracles employ methods of global polynomial optimization (Lasserre 2015). In other cases we use local solvers, which nevertheless perform sufficiently well.

We used a laptop running Linux 5.13 on Intel Core i5-7200U CPU with 8 GiB of system memory to perform our experiments. Our implementation uses Julia 1.6, JuMP (Dunning, Huchette, and Lubin 2017), and Mosek. We also used the solver Ipopt (Wächter and Biegler 2006) when we did not have an explicit best response formulation. The Julia source codes will be attached to this paper.

Example 1 (Zero-sum polynomial game (Parrilo 2006)). Consider a two-player zero-sum game with strategy sets $[-1, 1]$ and with the utility function of the first player

$$u(x, y) = 2xy^2 - x^2 - y$$

on $[-1, 1]^2$. As the generated subgames are zero-sum, we can use linear programming to find their equilibria. The global method for optimizing polynomials described by Parrilo (2006) is an appropriate best response oracle in this case. After 10 iterations, our method finds pure strategies

$$x \approx 0.4; y \approx 0.63$$

resulting in payoffs $(-0.47, 0.47)$. An oracle based on a hierarchy of semidefinite relaxations (as implemented in SumOfSquares (Weisser et al. 2019)) can be used instead to handle games with semialgebraic strategy sets.




Figure 1: Convergence in Example 1

Example 2 (General-sum two-player polynomial game (Stein, Ozdaglar, and Parrilo 2008)). The strategy set of each player is $[-1, 1]$. Given utility functions

$$\begin{aligned} u_1(x, y) &= -3x^2y^2 - 2x^3 + 3y^3 + 2xy - x \\ u_2(x, y) &= 2x^2y^2 + x^2y - 4y^3 - x^2 + 4y \end{aligned}$$

over $[-1, 1]^2$, our method finds mixed strategies

$$\begin{aligned} x &\approx \begin{cases} 0.11 & 44.19\% \\ -1.0 & 55.81\% \end{cases} \\ y &\approx 0.72 \end{aligned}$$

resulting in payoffs $(1.13, 1.81)$. We use the PATH solver (Ferris and Munson 2000) for linear complementarity problems to find equilibria in the generated subgames.




Figure 2: Convergence in Example 2

Example 3 (Torus game (Chasnov et al. 2020)). Each player's strategy space is the unit circle $S^1 = [-\pi, \pi]$ and the utility functions are

$$\begin{aligned} u_1(\theta_1, \theta_2) &= \alpha_1 \cos(\theta_1 - \phi_1) - \cos(\theta_1 - \theta_2) \\ u_2(\theta_1, \theta_2) &= \alpha_2 \cos(\theta_2 - \phi_2) - \cos(\theta_2 - \theta_1) \end{aligned}$$

where $\phi = (0, \pi/8)$ and $\alpha = (1, 1.5)$. Using Ipopt as a best response oracle, our method returns pure strategies

$$\theta_1 \approx 1.41; \theta_2 \approx -0.33$$

resulting in payoffs $(0.32, 1.29)$.




Figure 3: Convergence in Example 3

Example 4 (General Blotto (Golman and Page 2009)). Each strategy set in this two-player zero-sum game is the standard 4-dimensional simplex

$$\left\{ \mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_5) \in \mathbb{R}^5 \mid \sum_{i=1}^5 x_i = 1, x_i \geq 0 \right\}$$

and the utility function of the first player is

$$u(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = \sum_{j=1}^5 f(x_j - y_j)$$

where $f(x) = \text{sgn}(x) \cdot x^2$. Using linear programming to solve the master problem and Ipopt for the approximation of

best response, our method finds the pure strategies

$$\mathbf{x} \approx (0, 0, 0, 1, 0)$$

$$\mathbf{y} \approx (0, 1, 0, 0, 0)$$

resulting in payoffs $(0, 0)$. This is a pure strategy equilibrium by (Golman and Page 2009, Proposition 4).




Figure 4: Convergence in Example 4

Example 5 (Three-player zero-sum polynomial game). This example presents a continuous generalization of polynomial (separable network) games investigated in (Cai et al. 2016). Specifically, each of three players has the interval $[-1, 1]$ as the strategy set, all pairs of players are involved in bilateral general-sum games, and each player uses the same strategy across all such games. The sum of all utility functions must be zero. The pairwise utility functions on $[-1, 1]^2$ are

$$u_{1,2}(x_1, x_2) = -2x_1x_2^2 + 5x_1x_2 - x_2$$

$$u_{1,3}(x_1, x_3) = -2x_1^2 - 4x_1x_3 - 2x_3$$

$$u_{2,1}(x_2, x_1) = 2x_1x_2^2 - 2x_1^2 - 5x_1x_2 + x_2$$

$$u_{2,3}(x_2, x_3) = -2x_2x_3^2 - 2x_2^2 + 5x_2x_3$$

$$u_{3,1}(x_3, x_1) = 4x_1^2 + 4x_1x_3 + 2x_3$$

$$u_{3,2}(x_3, x_2) = 2x_2x_3^2 + 2x_2^2 - 5x_2x_3$$

We exploit the network structure of the game to find equilibria of the generated subgames by linear programming (Cai et al. 2016), while the polynomial (sum-of-squares) optimization serves as the best response oracle. Our method finds the mixed strategies

$$x_1 \approx -0.06$$

$$x_2 \approx \begin{cases} 0.35 & 70.8\% \\ 0.36 & 29.2\% \end{cases}$$

$$x_3 \approx \begin{cases} 1.0 & 72.11\% \\ -1.0 & 27.89\% \end{cases}$$

resulting in payoffs $(-1.23, 0.26, 0.97)$.

Conclusions

The idea of Algorithm 1 is to construct a sequence of finite subgames whose equilibria approximate the equilibria of original game in the appropriate sense. We remark that Fudenberg and Levine (1986) used a similar limiting approach based on smaller subgames, but their results are not directly comparable to ours.




Figure 5: Convergence in Example 5

We stress that Algorithm 1 is a very general method that converges for the whole class of continuous games. However, it is sensible to evaluate its scalability and speed of convergence only for particular families of games. The choice of best response oracle and the method for solving finite subgames should be optimal for such a class. A good case in point is the class of polynomial games.

Several examples from the literature show that our method converges fast when the dimension of strategy spaces is small, and the generated subgames are not large. In future research, we plan to extend the scope of our algorithm to games with more complicated strategy spaces such as Bayesian games.

References

- Adam, L.; Horčík, R.; Kasl, T.; and Kroupa, T. 2021. Double oracle algorithm for computing equilibria in continuous games. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 5070–5077.
- Başar, T.; and Olsder, G. 1999. *Dynamic Noncooperative Game Theory, 2nd Edition*. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics.
- Bertsekas, D. 2016. *Nonlinear programming*. Athena Scientific.
- Božanský, B.; Kiekintveld, C.; Lisý, V.; and Pěchouček, M. 2014. An exact double-oracle algorithm for zero-sum extensive-form games with imperfect information. *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research* 51: 829–866.
- Brown, G. W. 1951. Iterative Solution of Games by Fictitious Play. In *Activity analysis of production and allocation*, 374–376. John Wiley & Sons.
- Cai, Y.; Candogan, O.; Daskalakis, C.; and Papadimitriou, C. 2016. Zero-sum polymatrix games: A generalization of minmax. *Mathematics of Operations Research* 41(2): 648–655.
- Chasnov, B.; Ratliff, L.; Mazumdar, E.; and Burden, S. 2020. Convergence analysis of gradient-based learning in continuous games. In *Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence*, 935–944. PMLR.

- Daskalakis, C.; Goldberg, P. W.; and Papadimitriou, C. H. 2009. The complexity of computing a Nash equilibrium. *SIAM Journal on Computing* 39(1): 195–259.
- Dunning, I.; Huchette, J.; and Lubin, M. 2017. JuMP: A Modeling Language for Mathematical Optimization. *SIAM Review* 59(2): 295–320. doi:10.1137/15M1020575.
- Ferris, M. C.; and Munson, T. S. 2000. Complementarity problems in GAMS and the PATH solver. *Journal of Economic Dynamics and Control* 24(2): 165–188.
- Frogner, C.; Zhang, C.; Mobahi, H.; Araya-Polo, M.; and Poggio, T. 2015. Learning with a Wasserstein loss. In *Proc. of NIPS 2015*.
- Fudenberg, D.; and Levine, D. 1986. Limit games and limit equilibria. *Journal of Economic Theory* 38(2): 261–279.
- Ganzfried, S. 2021. Algorithm for Computing Approximate Nash Equilibrium in Continuous Games with Application to Continuous Blotto. *Games* 12(2): 47.
- Ganzfried, S.; and Sandholm, T. 2010. Computing Equilibria by Incorporating Qualitative Models. In *Proc. of AAMAS 2010*.
- Gibbs, A. L.; and Su, F. E. 2002. On choosing and bounding probability metrics. *International statistical review* 70(3): 419–435.
- Glicksberg, I. L. 1952. A Further Generalization of the Kakutani Fixed Point Theorem, With Application to Nash Equilibrium Points. *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society* 3: 170–174.
- Golman, R.; and Page, S. E. 2009. General Blotto: games of allocative strategic mismatch. *Public Choice* 138(3–4): 279–299.
- Hinze, M.; Pinnau, R.; Ulbrich, M.; and Ulbrich, S. 2008. *Optimization with PDE constraints*, volume 23. Springer Science & Business Media.
- Hofbauer, J.; and Sorin, S. 2006. Best Response Dynamics for Continuous Zero-sum Games. *Discrete and Continuous Dynamical Systems—Series B* 6(1): 215.
- Kamra, N.; Gupta, U.; Fang, F.; Liu, Y.; and Tambe, M. 2018. Policy Learning for Continuous Space Security Games Using Neural Networks. In *Thirty-Second AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 1103–1112.
- Kamra, N.; Gupta, U.; Wang, K.; Fang, F.; Liu, Y.; and Tambe, M. 2019. DeepFP for Finding Nash Equilibrium in Continuous Action Spaces. In *International Conference on Decision and Game Theory for Security*, 238–258. Springer.
- Karlin, S. 1959. *Mathematical Methods and Theory in Games, Programming and Economics. Vol. 2: The Theory of Infinite Games*. Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.
- Kolouri, S.; Park, S. R.; Thorpe, M.; Slepcev, D.; and Rohde, G. K. 2017. Optimal mass transport: Signal processing and machine-learning applications. *IEEE signal processing magazine* 34(4): 43–59.
- Laraki, R.; and Lasserre, J. B. 2012. Semidefinite Programming for Min–max Problems and Games. *Mathematical programming* 131(1–2): 305–332.
- Lasserre, J. B. 2015. *An introduction to polynomial and semi-algebraic optimization*, volume 52. Cambridge University Press.
- Li, Z.; and Wellman, M. P. 2021. Evolution Strategies for Approximate Solution of Bayesian Games. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 35, 5531–5540.
- McMahan, H. B.; Gordon, G. J.; and Blum, A. 2003. Planning in the Presence of Cost Functions Controlled by an Adversary. In *Proceedings of the 20th International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML-03)*, 536–543.
- Mertikopoulos, P.; and Zhou, Z. 2019. Learning in games with continuous action sets and unknown payoff functions. *Mathematical Programming* 173(1): 465–507.
- Panaretos, V. M.; and Zemel, Y. 2020. *An invitation to statistics in Wasserstein space*. Springer Nature.
- Parrilo, P. 2006. Polynomial Games and Sum of Squares Optimization. In *Decision and Control, 2006 45th IEEE Conference on*, 2855–2860.
- Perkins, S.; and Leslie, D. S. 2014. Stochastic Fictitious Play With Continuous Action Sets. *Journal of Economic Theory* 152: 179–213.
- Peyré, G.; and Cuturi, M. 2019. Computational optimal transport: With applications to data science. *Foundations and Trends® in Machine Learning* 11(5–6): 355–607.
- Rehbeck, J. 2018. Note on Unique Nash Equilibrium in Continuous Games. *Games and Economic Behavior* 110: 216–225.
- Robinson, J. 1951. An Iterative Method of Solving a Game. *Annals of Mathematics* (54): 296–301.
- Rubner, Y.; Tomasi, C.; and Guibas, L. J. 2000. The earth mover’s distance as a metric for image retrieval. *International Journal of Computer Vision* 40(2): 99–121.
- Stein, N. D.; Ozdaglar, A.; and Parrilo, P. A. 2008. Separable and Low-rank Continuous Games. *International Journal of Game Theory* 37(4): 475–504.
- Villani, C. 2009. *Optimal transport: old and new*, volume 338. Springer.
- Wächter, A.; and Biegler, L. T. 2006. On the implementation of an interior-point filter line-search algorithm for large-scale nonlinear programming. *Mathematical Programming* 106(1): 25–57. ISSN 1436-4646. doi:10.1007/s10107-004-0559-y. URL <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10107-004-0559-y>.
- Weisser, T.; Legat, B.; Coey, C.; Kapelevich, L.; and Vielma, J. P. 2019. Polynomial and Moment Optimization in Julia and JuMP. In *JuliaCon*. URL <https://pretalx.com/juliacon2019/talk/QZBKAU/>.
- Xu, L.; Perrault, A.; Fang, F.; Chen, H.; and Tambe, M. 2021a. Robust Reinforcement Learning Under Minimax Regret for Green Security. In *To appear in Proceedings of UAI Conference*.
- Xu, M.; Zhou, Z.; Lu, G.; Tang, J.; Zhang, W.; and Yu, Y. 2021b. Towards Generalized Implementation of Wasserstein

Distance in GANs. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 35, 10514–10522.

Yasodharan, S.; and Loiseau, P. 2019. Nonzero-sum Adversarial Hypothesis Testing Games. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 7310–7320.