
Empirical Game-Theoretic Analysis for Mean Field Games

Yongzhao Wang
University of Michigan
wangyzh@umich.edu

Michael P. Wellman
University of Michigan
wellman@umich.edu

Abstract

We present a simulation-based approach for solution of mean field games (MFGs), using the framework of *empirical game-theoretical analysis* (EGTA). Our method employs a version of the double oracle, iteratively adding strategies based on best response to the equilibrium of the *empirical MFG* among strategies considered so far. We present *Fictitious Play* (FP) and *Replicator Dynamics* as two subroutines for computing the empirical game equilibrium. Each subroutine is implemented with a query-based method rather than maintaining an explicit payoff matrix as in typical EGTA methods due to a representation issue we highlight for MFGs. We prove that a Nash equilibrium (NE) exists in the empirical MFG and show the convergence of iterative EGTA to NE of the full MFG with either subroutine. We test the performance of iterative EGTA in various games and show that it outperforms directly applying FP to MFGs in terms of iterations of strategy introduction.

1 Introduction

Mean field games (MFGs) [Lasry and Lions, 2007; Huang *et al.*, 2006] model strategic interactions among a conceptually infinite number of players. Aggregate player behavior is summarized by a distribution over states of the population, which constitutes the *mean field*. The MFG framework reduces analysis to the characterization of the optimal behavior of a single representative player in its interactions with the full population, as represented by the mean field. By considering the limit case of populations with mean-field structure, this framework can support game-theoretic analysis that would be intractable for a standard corresponding model of a game among a large but finite number of players. One common interpretation of MFG models is as an approximation of an actually finite many-player game.

The complexity of analytic solution of MFGs grows with the state space, necessitating numerical approaches for all but the simplest problems. Several such algorithms for MFGs have recently been proposed [Perrin *et al.*, 2020; Perolat *et al.*, 2021; Perrin *et al.*, 2021b]. As befits the game nature of MFGs, some of these employ standard online game-solving algorithms, such as fictitious play (FP) [Robinson, 1951; Brown, 1951].

The methodology of *empirical game-theoretic analysis* (EGTA) [Tuyls *et al.*, 2020; Wellman, 2006] represents a general approach for building and reasoning about game models based on simulation. EGTA works by estimating game models over restricted strategy sets, typically identified through a heuristic process as being strategically salient for analysis. The estimated game models are called *empirical games*. An iterative form of EGTA is presented by Lanctot *et al.* [2017] as the *Policy Space Response Oracle* (PSRO) algorithm, where at each iteration, new strategies are generated through reinforcement learning (RL). There is a considerable prior literature that demonstrates the effectiveness of PSRO and variants in a range of applications [Wang *et al.*, 2019; Wright *et al.*, 2019; Czarnecki *et al.*, 2020].

We introduce an iterative framework for numerically solving MFGs with EGTA. Our method extends the double oracle method [McMahan *et al.*, 2003] to MFGs, iteratively adding strategies based on best response to the equilibrium of the *empirical MFG* among strategies considered so far. We propose FP and replicator dynamics (RD) as two subroutines for computing a Nash equilibrium (NE) of the empirical MFG and demonstrate that both subroutines are effective for the empirical game analysis. Each subroutine is implemented with a query-based method, in which we query the utilities of different strategies through simulations as needed rather than maintaining an explicit payoff matrix as in typical EGTA methods. This tweak is caused by the non-linearity of the MFG utility function in the population distribution, which we highlight for MFGs. We test our iterative EGTA framework in MFGs with various configurations and demonstrate the improved learning performance of EGTA over directly applying FP [Perrin *et al.*, 2020] to MFGs.

The theoretical results of this work are twofold. First, we prove the existence of NE in an empirical MFG with a restricted strategy space under a mild assumption, assuming the MFG is fully symmetric. Second, we prove that the iterative EGTA converges to NE of the full game if the best response target is NE across iterations and an exact best-response oracle is available.

Finally, we provide a discussion on the limitations of EGTA on MFGs, emphasizing the trade-off in computational cost between analyzing the current empirical game and exploring new strategies. Moreover, we suggest one research direction for improving the stability of MFG solutions in finite games by generating strategies via EGTA in MFGs and re-evaluating the generated strategies in finite games. The motivation is to utilize the MFG model to quickly generate strategically important strategies, which cannot be cheaply accessible through the finite game, and then calibrate the empirical game model in the finite game for improved accuracy.

Contributions of this study include:

1. We propose an iterative EGTA framework for MFGs with FP and RD as two practical subroutines for the empirical game analysis. We demonstrate the effectiveness of EGTA in various MFGs.
2. We prove the existence of NE in an empirical MFG among a restricted set of strategies under a mild assumption and prove the convergence of the iterative EGTA to NE of the full MFG.
3. We provide a detailed discussion on the limitations of EGTA on MFGs as well as the future research directions.

2 Related Work: Learning Mean Field Games

There is a large prior literature on learning solutions of MFGs. Here we list few that are closely related to our approach. Elie *et al.* [2020] first studied the convergence of approximate discrete-time FP in MFGs. Perrin *et al.* [2020] further proved the convergence rate of continuous-time FP in MFGs and extended the study to MFGs with common noise. Moreover, FP for MFGs with finite time horizons was demonstrated effective in their work. Perolat *et al.* [2021] criticized that FP is not scalable to MFGs with large state spaces and proposed Online Mirror Descent (OMD) as a solution. They empirically showed that OMD converges significantly faster than FP in MFGs with a large number of states. In the aforementioned algorithms, a fixed initial distribution of the population is required. Perrin *et al.* [2021a] argued that a fixed initial distribution restricts the practical applications of MFGs since a real initial distribution could be different from the one used for training. They proposed a learning algorithm to learn a *Master Policy*, which takes the distribution of population as input and thus taking the initial distribution into consideration. They demonstrated the ability of generalization of the learned master policy.

In a recent work simultaneous with and independent of our own, Muller *et al.* [2021] adapted PSRO to MFGs and analyzed convergence properties with various solution concepts. Both theirs and ours developed an iterative EGTA/PSRO framework for MFGs, highlighting the issue that the utility function for MFGs is not generally linear in the distribution. Theoretically, both works prove the existence of NE in the empirical game with restricted strategy set and the convergence of iterative EGTA/PSRO to NE. What is unique to their work is that they investigate the modifications for PSRO to converge to (coarse) correlated equilibria ((C)CE) in MFGs as well as the theoretical counterparts. Our contribution focuses on practical techniques (e.g., FP and RD) for the empirical game analysis and experimental comparison to other learning methods.

3 Preliminaries

We study MFGs with a temporal structure, where representative players interact with populations over a shared state space X , action space A and time horizon T . A *multi-population mean field game* (MP-MFG) in normal form is given by $\mathcal{G} = ([N_p], (S_i), (u_i))$. $[N_p] = \{1, \dots, N_p\}$ is a set of N_p populations indexed by i . Each population corresponds to a conceptually infinite and interchangeable set of players playing a particular role in the game. S_i denotes the set of strategies of population i and u_i denotes the utility function. State space X , action space A and time horizon T are encoded in the definitions of a strategy $s_i \in S_i$ and the utility function u_i as described below.

A strategy of the representative player of population i at time t , $s_{i,t}$, maps from state space X to the space of action distributions $\Delta(A)$, where Δ represents the probability simplex over a set. The overall strategy $s_i = (s_{i,t})_{t \in [0, T-1]} \in S_i$ is a sequence of strategies from time 0 through horizon T .

The behavior of each population is summarized by a mean field, defined as distributions over an underlying state space X of the game environment. Denote distributions of all populations over time horizon T as $\mu = \{\mu_1, \dots, \mu_{N_p}\}$, where $\mu_i = (\mu_{i,t})_{t \in [0, T]} \in \Delta(X)^{T+1}$.

Utility functions $u_i : S_i \times \Delta(X)^{N_p \times (T+1)} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ define the payoff to a representative player of population $i \in [N_p]$ playing its strategy against the distributions of all populations μ (i.e., mean fields).

A mixed strategy σ_i is a probability distribution over strategies in S_i , with $\sigma_i(s_i)$ denoting the probability the representative player of population i plays strategy s_i . Let σ be the profile of strategies across populations (i.e., $\sigma = (\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_{N_p})$).

The representative player of population i 's *best response* to population distributions μ is any strategy yielding maximum payoff for the player, holding the distributions μ constant:

$$br_i(\mu) = \operatorname{argmax}_{\sigma_i \in \Delta(S_i)} u_i(\sigma_i, \mu).$$

Let $br(\mu) = \prod_{i \in [N_p]} br_i(\mu)$ be the overall best-response correspondence for populations' distributions μ . Here \prod is the Cartesian product. A Nash equilibrium for a MFG is a profile σ^* such that $\sigma^* \in br(\mu^*)$, where μ^* is induced by σ^* .

A distribution μ_i is said to be induced by σ_i , denoted as $\mu_i^{\sigma_i}$, following the *Forward Equation*, that is, given initial distribution $\mu_{i,0}$, for $t \in [0, T-1]$ and all $x'_i \in X$,

$$\mu_{i,t+1}^{\sigma_i}(x'_i) = \sum_{x_i, a_i \in X, A} \mu_{i,t}^{\sigma_i}(x_i) \sigma_{i,t}(a_i | x_i) p(x'_i | x_i, a_i), \quad (1)$$

where $p : X \times A \rightarrow \Delta X$ is the transition function.

The representative player of population i 's *regret* in profile σ given distributions μ in game \mathcal{G} is given by

$$\rho_i^{\mathcal{G}}(\sigma_i, \mu) = \max_{s_i \in S_i} u_i(s_i, \mu) - u_i(\sigma_i, \mu).$$

Regret captures the maximum the representative player of population i can gain in expectation by unilaterally deviating from its mixed strategy in σ to an alternative strategy in S_i , given distributions μ . A NE strategy profile has zero regret for each representative player. A profile is said to be an ϵ -Nash equilibrium (ϵ -NE) if no representative player can gain more than ϵ by unilateral deviation. The regret of a strategy profile σ is defined as the sum over representative players' regrets:

$$\rho^{\mathcal{G}}(\sigma, \mu) = \sum_{i \in [N_p]} \rho_i^{\mathcal{G}}(\sigma_i, \mu).$$

An *empirical MFG* $\mathcal{G}_{S \downarrow \Lambda}$ is an approximation of the true game \mathcal{G} , in which populations choose from a restricted strategy set $\Lambda_i \subseteq S_i$, and payoffs are estimated through simulation. That is, $\mathcal{G}_{S \downarrow \Lambda} = ([N_p], (\Lambda_i), (\hat{u}_i))$, where \hat{u} is a projection of u onto the restricted strategy space Λ .

4 Iterative EGTA for MFGs

4.1 Framework

In finite games, an iterative approach for computing NE is presented by the well-known Double Oracle (DO) algorithm [McMahan *et al.*, 2003], which alternates between analysis of a current empirical game and adding strategies that best respond to a current equilibrium. We extend DO to MFGs and provide a game-solving algorithm for MP-MFG in Algorithm 1.

In Algorithm 1, for each population i , the representative player is initialized with a strategy $s_{i,0}$ and an initial distribution $\mu_{i,0}$. At each iteration τ , an equilibrium σ^e of the current empirical game is computed by a subroutine (e.g., FP or RD) and then distributions μ^e are induced by σ^e through the forward equation. Then for each population i , the representative player computes an exact/approximate best response strategy $s_{i,\tau}$ to the distribution μ^e and adds it to the corresponding strategy set in the empirical game. This process repeats until no beneficial deviation strategy could be found or certain stopping criterion is satisfied.

Algorithm 1 Iterative EGTA for MP-MPG

Input: an initial strategy $s_{i,0}$ and an initial distribution $\mu_{i,0}$ for all population $i \in [N_p]$.

- 1: **for** $\tau \in \{1, \dots, \mathcal{T}\}$ **do**
- 2: Compute (σ^e, μ^e) of the current empirical game by a subroutine
- 3: **for** $i \in \{1, \dots, N_p\}$ **do**
- 4: Compute a best response strategy $s_{i,\tau}$ to the empirical equilibrium distribution μ^e
- 5: Add $s_{i,\tau}$ to the strategy set of population i : $\Lambda_i \leftarrow \Lambda_i \cup s_{i,\tau}$
- 6: **end for**
- 7: **end for**
- 8: **Return** (σ^e, μ^e)

4.2 Analyzing an Empirical MFG

In EGTA, analyzing an intermediate empirical game is crucial for generating effective strategies.¹ Despite a MFG model reduces the analysis to the study of interactions between two parties (i.e., a representative player and the population), computing a NE of an empirical MFG is more than constructing an explicit payoff matrix and then applying a game-solver for two parties as in finite games. Proposition 1 shows that MFGs with a restricted strategy set can only be solved with an explicit payoff matrix under certain restrictive conditions.

Consider a empirical MFG with an explicit payoff matrix representation shown in Table 1. In the empirical game, there are 4 strategies $\Lambda = \{s_0, s_1, s_2, s_3\}$ in the restricted strategy set. Since the game is fully symmetric, the population would act following distributions $\mu = \{\mu_0, \mu_1, \mu_2, \mu_3\}$ induced by corresponding strategies in Λ . In the payoff matrix, the value in entry (j, k) , where $j, k \in \{0, 1, 2, 3\}$, is $u(s_j, \mu_k)$, the utility of the representative player playing s_j against the distributions μ_k induced by s_k .

	s_0	s_1	s_2	s_3
s_0	$u(s_0, \mu_0)$	$u(s_0, \mu_1)$	$u(s_0, \mu_2)$	$u(s_0, \mu_3)$
s_1	$u(s_1, \mu_0)$	$u(s_1, \mu_1)$	$u(s_1, \mu_2)$	$u(s_1, \mu_3)$
s_2	$u(s_2, \mu_0)$	$u(s_2, \mu_1)$	$u(s_2, \mu_2)$	$u(s_2, \mu_3)$
s_3	$u(s_3, \mu_0)$	$u(s_3, \mu_1)$	$u(s_3, \mu_2)$	$u(s_3, \mu_3)$

Table 1: Single-population payoff matrix.

Proposition 1. *The NE of the aforementioned payoff matrix will not generally be a NE of the empirical mean field game unless the utility function is linear in μ .*

¹For discussion simplicity, we assume that players are fully symmetric (i.e., $N_p = 1$) in this section. So the population index i is dropped when the context is clear. The analysis can be easily extended to MP-MFGs.

Proof. Assume σ is a NE computed from the payoff matrix. According to the definition of NE, we have

$$\sum_{j \in [\Lambda]} \sum_{k \in [\Lambda]} \sigma(s_j) \sigma(s_k) u(s_j, \mu_k) \geq \sum_{k \in [\Lambda]} \sigma(s_k) u(s', \mu_k), \forall s' \in \Lambda. \quad (2)$$

According to the definition of NE σ^* in MFG, we have

$$\sum_{j \in [\Lambda]} \sigma^*(s_j) u(s_j, \mu^{\sigma^*}) \geq u(s', \mu^{\sigma^*}), \forall s' \in \Lambda \quad (3)$$

where μ^{σ^*} is induced by σ^* .

By comparing inequalities 2 and 3, to make the NE σ a MFG NE σ^* , the following condition should hold

$$\sum_{k \in [\Lambda]} \sigma(s_k) u(s_j, \mu_k) = u(s_j, \mu^{\sigma}), \forall s_j \in \Lambda$$

indicating the requirement of linearity in μ at least at the equilibrium point. □

Since the utility function in MFGs will not generally be linear in μ , analysis of an empirical game based on an explicit payoff matrix is impractical. Instead, we rely on query-based methods. We propose FP and RD as two subroutines for solving empirical games and query utility information through simulation as needed.

4.2.1 FP for Empirical MFGs

FP for MFGs has been studied by Elie *et al.* [2020] and Perrin *et al.* [2020]. We adapt it to analyzing an empirical game with a restricted set of strategies. In Algorithm 2, we demonstrate how to apply FP to an empirical game. Specifically, starting from the uniform strategy $\bar{\sigma}$ over the strategies in the restricted strategy set and its induced distribution $\bar{\mu}$, at each iteration $j \in [1, J]$, the representative player of a population i computes a best response strategy $s_{i,j} \in \Lambda_i$ against populations $\bar{\mu}$. The probability in the mixed strategy of playing $s_{i,j}$ is updated by the frequency of $s_{i,j}$ appearing as a best response, that is, the count of being a best response $n_{s_{i,j}}$ divided by the total count up to the j^{th} iteration. Mathematically, for all $i \in [N_p]$ and $k \in [\Lambda_i]$, the count of $s_{i,k}$ being a best response $n_{s_{i,k}}$ is incremented by 1 if $s_{i,k}$ is the best response at the current iteration (i.e., $s_{i,k} = s_{i,j}$) and remains the same otherwise.

$$n_{s_{i,k}} = \begin{cases} n_{s_{i,k}} + 1 & s_{i,k} = s_{i,j} \\ n_{s_{i,k}} & s_{i,k} \neq s_{i,j} \end{cases}$$

Then we update the probability of every strategy in the mixed strategy by

$$\bar{\sigma}_i(s_{i,k}) = \frac{n_{s_{i,k}}}{|\Lambda_i| + \sum_{k \in [\Lambda_i]} n_{s_{i,k}}}, \forall s_i \in \Lambda_i, i \in [N_p]. \quad (4)$$

Algorithm 2 Fictitious Play as a Subroutine

Input: an empirical game. An initial averaged strategy $\bar{\sigma}_i$ over strategies in the restricted set $\Lambda_i = (s_{i,1}, \dots, s_{i,\tau})$ of population $i, \forall i \in [N_p]$ and distributions $\bar{\mu}$ that are induced by $\bar{\sigma}$.

- 1: **for** $j \in \{1, \dots, J\}$ **do**
 - 2: **for** $i \in \{1, \dots, N_p\}$ **do**
 - 3: Compute a best response strategy $s_{i,j} \in \Lambda_i$ against $\bar{\mu}$
 - 4: $n_{s_{i,j}} \leftarrow n_{s_{i,j}} + 1$
 - 5: **end for**
 - 6: **for** $i \in \{1, \dots, N_p\}$ **do**
 - 7: Update $\bar{\sigma}_i$ according to Equation 4 and induce $\bar{\mu}_i$
 - 8: **end for**
 - 9: **end for**
 - 10: **Return** $(\bar{\sigma}, \bar{\mu})$
-

To induce a corresponding distribution $\bar{\mu}_i$, we first build a weighted average strategy that is equivalent to the mixed strategy $\bar{\sigma}_i$. Specifically, consider a mixed strategy $\sigma \in \Delta(\Lambda)$ defined on the empirical game with a restricted strategy set Λ . An equivalent strategy $\bar{\sigma}$ is defined as, for each population i ,

$$\bar{\sigma}_{i,t}(a | x) = \frac{\sum_{k=1}^{|\Lambda_i|} \sigma_i(s_{i,k,t}) \mu_t^{s_{i,k,t}}(x) s_{i,k,t}(a | x)}{\sum_{k=1}^{|\Lambda_i|} \sigma_i(s_{i,k,t}) \mu_t^{s_{i,k,t}}(x)}, \forall t \in [0, T - 1],$$

where $s_{i,k,t}$ is the k^{th} strategy of population i at time step t . Then the induced distribution is computed through Equation 3 or estimated through various approaches (e.g., empirical density estimation [Perrin *et al.*, 2020] or generative models [Perrin *et al.*, 2021b]).

The empirical game analysis stops until certain stopping criterion is satisfied (e.g., reaching a fixed number of iterations or the difference between the averaged strategies in two consecutive iterations is tiny). FP has been proved for convergence to NE in MFGs with a single population [Elie *et al.*, 2020; Perrin *et al.*, 2020]. However, FP will not generally converge to a NE (or even a CE) in MFGs with multiple populations.

4.2.2 RD for Empirical MFGs

Replicator dynamics describes an evolving trajectory of mixed profiles and is commonly employed as a heuristic equilibrium search algorithm in finite games [Taylor and Jonker, 1978; Smith and Price, 1973]. In Algorithm 3, we adapt RD to our MFG model and propose it as a practical subroutine for empirical game analysis. Similar to RD in finite games, at each iteration the update of a strategy’s probability in population i is in proportion to the deviation payoff of that strategy from the average fitness, weighted by its probability from the previous iteration and a learning rate. Theoretically, RD has not been proved for convergence as FP. However, we show that RD exhibits empirical convergence with an even more stable learning manner than FP in our experiments.

Algorithm 3 Replicator Dynamics as a Subroutine

Input: an empirical game. An initial averaged strategy $\bar{\sigma}_i$ over strategies in the restricted set $\Lambda_i = (s_{i,1}, \dots, s_{i,\tau})$ of population $i, \forall i \in [N_p]$ and $\bar{\mu}$ is induced by $\bar{\sigma}$. A learning rate dt .

- 1: **for** Iteration $j \in \{1, \dots, J\}$ **do**
- 2: **for** $i \in \{1, \dots, N_p\}$ **do**
- 3: Compute the average fitness $F_i = u_i(\bar{\sigma}_i, \bar{\mu})$
- 4: **for** $s_i \in \Lambda_i$ **do**
- 5: Evaluate $u_i(s_i, \bar{\mu})$
- 6: Update $\bar{\sigma}'_i(s_i) = \bar{\sigma}_i(s_i) + dt * \bar{\sigma}_i(s_i)[u_i(s_i, \bar{\mu}) - F_i]$
- 7: **end for**
- 8: **end for**
- 9: $\bar{\sigma} = \bar{\sigma}'$
- 10: Induce new distribution $\bar{\mu}$ using updated $\bar{\sigma}$.
- 11: **end for**
- 12: **Return** $(\bar{\sigma}, \bar{\mu})$

4.3 Best Response Calculation

In Algorithm 1, one key step is to compute a best-response strategy against distributions μ . For games with a moderate size of the state and action spaces, best responses can be computed through tabular reinforcement learning (RL) or backward dynamic programming. For example, a strategy can be represented by a Q-value table (i.e., a tabular strategy) and Q-learning for MFGs can be applied.² However, the scalability of the tabular approach is problematic.

For games with large state and action spaces, Deep RL has been employed in prior work to find an approximate best-response strategy. To handle the time-heterogeneity of optimal strategies in

²For detailed algorithms such as Q-learning and backward induction, please refer to the Appendix by Perrin *et al.* [2020].

MFGs, one possible approach is to encode the time information as part of the input to the function approximator in deep RL, aiming to learn the temporal structure of the optimal strategy, without keeping one optimal strategy for each time step.

5 Convergence to NE

We analyze the theoretical properties of iterative EGTA for MFGs from two aspects: the existence of NE in mean field empirical games and the convergence of iterative ETGA to NE of the full game. Theoretical results for the existence of NE in general MFGs have been widely studied in prior work. For discrete-time MFGs with finite state and action spaces, Gomes *et al.* [2010] proved the existence of NE in general case and Doncel *et al.* [2019] further extended the existence results to scenarios where transition function also depends on the population. For an empirical game model, since it restricts the set of strategies available to players, it is necessary to re-examine the existence result for NE. We assume that players are fully symmetric (i.e., a single population) and prove that the NE exists in an empirical game under one mild assumption.

Assumption 1. *The utility function $u(s, \mu)$ is continuous in the distribution μ .*

Theorem 1. *Under Assumption 1, for games with finite state and action spaces, there exists a Nash equilibrium in the empirical game.*

Proof Sketch. We extend the proof of existence of NE in MFGs by Gomes *et al.* [2010] to the empirical game with a restricted set of strategies³. To prove the existence of a NE in the empirical game with restricted strategy sets Λ , we apply the Kakutani’s fixed point theorem [Kakutani, 1941] and need to show

1. The restricted strategy space $\Delta(\Lambda)$ is non-empty, closed and bounded (compactness by Heine-Borel Theorem [Borel, 1895]) and a convex subset of certain Euclidean space.
2. The best response correspondence br is a set-valued function such that br has a closed graph and $br(\cdot)$ is non-empty and convex.

We provide a detailed proof in the Appendix A and only show a proof sketch here. The first condition holds due to the basic properties of the strategy simplex. For the second condition, for each strategy $\sigma \in \Delta(\Lambda)$, the overall best-response correspondence $br(\sigma)$ can be proved non-empty and convex and the graph $Gr(br) := \{(\sigma, br(\sigma)) : \sigma \in \Delta(\Lambda), br(\sigma) \in \Delta(\Lambda)\}$ can be proved closed by the upper-hemicontinuity of br and the continuity assumptions, then according to Kakutani’s fixed point theorem [Kakutani, 1941], a NE exists in an empirical game. \square

According to Theorem 1, an empirical NE exists and hence it can be obtained through some theoretically proven equilibrium search subroutines (e.g., FP). The remaining problem is whether iterative EGTA converges to the NE of the full game.

Theorem 2. *For games with finite state and action spaces, suppose the empirical NE is the best response target at each iteration of iterative EGTA and an exact best response oracle is available, then the empirical NE converges to the NE of the full game.*

Proof. Suppose σ^* is an empirical NE associated with a population distribution μ^* such that

$$\max_{s \in \Lambda} u(s, \mu^*) - u(\sigma^*, \mu^*) = 0$$

Suppose there is no beneficial deviation can be found at certain iteration, indicating

$$\max_{s \in S} u(s, \mu^*) - u(\sigma^*, \mu^*) = 0$$

Then σ^* is a NE of the full game. Since the strategy space is finite, σ^* is always reachable with the worst case where all strategies are included in the empirical game. \square

³Gomes *et al.* [2010]’s proof first fixed a state and generalized the result from the single state to the global. This could be problematic for a restricted strategy set since not all actions are available for different states.

6 Experimental Results

We evaluate our algorithms using environments provided in the open-source game computation library OpenSpiel [Lanctot *et al.*, 2019].

6.1 The 1-D Beach Bar

We consider a simplified version of Santa Fe bar problem [Arthur, 1994; Farago *et al.*, 2002] and adopt the model by Perrin *et al.* [2020]. Specifically, a beach bar problem for a single-population MFG is a Markov Decision Process (MDP) with $|X|$ states on a one-dimensional torus ($X = 0, \dots, |X| - 1$). Without loss of generality, we designate a bar to the state 0. Positions of players are initialized according to a uniform distribution. Players can keep still ($a_t = 0$) or move left ($a_t = -1$) or right ($a_t = 1$) at time step t on the torus to get as close as possible to the bar, while avoiding the crowded areas. The transition function is given by:

$$x_{t+1} = x_t + a_t + \epsilon_t$$

where a_t is an action of the representative player at time t and ϵ_t represents the randomness of the environment. The immediate reward function is given by:

$$r(x_t, a_t, \mu_t) = \tilde{r}(x_t) - \frac{|a_t|}{|X|} - \log(\mu_t(x_t))$$

where $\tilde{r}(x_t)$ measures the closeness to the bar from state x_t , $-\frac{|a_t|}{|X|}$ is the running cost and $-\log(\mu_t(x_t))$ represents the aversion of players to the crowded areas.

We test the performance of iterative EGTA in the 1-D beach bar problem with various configurations, which are determined by the Cartesian product of $|X| \in \{10, 50, 100\}$ and $T \in \{10, 20, 30\}$, denoted by 1-D($|X|$, T). In Figure 1a-1i, we plot the regret curves of iterative EGTA (with FP and RD as subroutines respectively) against directly applying FP to MFGs [Perrin *et al.*, 2020], where x-axis being the EGTA iterations. Since the game size supports exact best response calculation and exact strategy evaluation given a fixed initialization and parameters of the randomness of the environment, the regret curves can be exactly computed and hence no error bar is reported in the plots.

From Figure 1a-1i, we observe that the performance of iterative EGTA dominates FP in all instances. Moreover, as the instance becomes complex (i.e., with more states and longer horizon), the performance gap between iterative EGTA and FP becomes more apparent. For the subroutine selection, we observe that RD in some cases exhibits a more stable learning manner (e.g., Fig 1f) than FP while in most cases their performances are almost indistinguishable. We provide more discussions on the subroutine selection in Appendix C.

6.2 The 2-D Beach Bar

We test the performance of iterative EGTA in the 2-D beach bar problem with fixed $|X| = 100$ and different time horizon $T \in \{10, 20, 30\}$, denoted by 2-D($|X|$, T). Compared to the 1-D beach bar problem, the 2-D beach bar problem includes extra actions (i.e., up, down, left, right, stay) yielding a more complex environment. From Figure 1j-1l, we observe the same phenomenon as in the 1-D problem, that is, iterative EGTA dominates FP and as the game instance becomes larger, the advantage of iterative EGTA becomes apparent.

6.3 Multi-population Chasing

For MP-MFGs, we test the performance of iterative EGTA in a 3-population chasing problem [Perolat *et al.*, 2021] and observe that iterative EGTA also exhibits faster convergence than FP in the 3-population MFG. We report the environment definition and our experimental results in Appendix B.

7 Conclusion

The primary goal of this study is to demonstrate how EGTA can be applied to MFGs. We emphasize the non-linearity issue in EGTA for MFGs, that is, the utility function of a MFG will not generally be




Figure 1: Experimental results of 1-D and 2-D beach bar problems.

linear in the distribution of the population. To handle this issue, we apply FP and RD in a query-based manner for the empirical game analysis. We further propose an iterative EGTA framework for computing NE in MFGs and prove the convergence of iterative EGTA. We test the performance of iterative EGTA in various games and show its superior performance against FP. Finally, in Appendix D, we discuss the limitations of applying iterative EGTA to MFGs as well as the future research directions.

References

- W. Brian Arthur. Inductive reasoning and bounded rationality. *American Economic Review*, 84(2):406–411, 1994.
- Claude Berge. *Topological Spaces: including a treatment of multi-valued functions, vector spaces, and convexity*. Courier Corporation, 1997.
- Émile Borel. Sur quelques points de la théorie des fonctions. In *Annales scientifiques de l'École normale supérieure*, volume 12, pages 9–55, 1895.
- George W Brown. Iterative solution of games by fictitious play. *Activity Analysis of Production and Allocation*, 13(1):374–376, 1951.
- Wojciech Marian Czarnecki, Gauthier Gidel, Brendan Tracey, Karl Tuyls, Shayegan Omidshafiei, David Balduzzi, and Max Jaderberg. Real world games look like spinning tops. *34th Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2020.
- Josu Doncel, Nicolas Gast, and Bruno Gaujal. Discrete mean field games: Existence of equilibria and convergence. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1909.01209*, 2019.
- Romuald Elie, Julien Perolat, Mathieu Laurière, Matthieu Geist, and Olivier Pietquin. On the convergence of model free learning in mean field games. In *34th AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, pages 7143–7150, 2020.
- Julie Farago, Amy Greenwald, and Keith Hall. Fair and efficient solutions to the santa fe bar problem. In *Grace Hopper Celebration of Women in Computing*. Citeseer, 2002.
- Ian Gemp, Rahul Savani, Marc Lanctot, Yoram Bachrach, Thomas Anthony, Richard Everett, Andrea Tacchetti, Tom Eccles, and János Kramár. Sample-based approximation of nash in large many-player games via gradient descent. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2106.01285*, 2021.
- Diogo A Gomes, Joana Mohr, and Rafael Rigao Souza. Discrete time, finite state space mean field games. *Journal de Mathématiques Pures et Appliquées*, 93(3):308–328, 2010.
- Minyi Huang, Roland P Malhamé, Peter E Caines, et al. Large population stochastic dynamic games: Closed-loop McKean-Vlasov systems and the Nash certainty equivalence principle. *Communications in Information & Systems*, 6(3):221–252, 2006.
- Shizuo Kakutani. A generalization of Brouwer’s fixed point theorem. *Duke Mathematical Journal*, 8(3):457–459, 1941.
- Marc Lanctot, Vinicius Zambaldi, Audrūnas Gruslys, Angeliki Lazaridou, Karl Tuyls, Julien Pérolat, David Silver, and Thore Graepel. A unified game-theoretic approach to multiagent reinforcement learning. In *31st Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 4190–4203, 2017.
- Marc Lanctot, Edward Lockhart, Jean-Baptiste Lespiau, Vinicius Zambaldi, Satyaki Upadhyay, Julien Pérolat, Sriram Srinivasan, Finbarr Timbers, Karl Tuyls, Shayegan Omidshafiei, et al. Openspiel: A framework for reinforcement learning in games. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1908.09453*, 2019.
- Jean-Michel Lasry and Pierre-Louis Lions. Mean field games. *Japanese Journal of Mathematics*, 2(1):229–260, 2007.
- H. Brendan McMahan, Geoffrey J. Gordon, and Avrim Blum. Planning in the presence of cost functions controlled by an adversary. In *20th International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 536–543, 2003.
- Paul Muller, Mark Rowland, Romuald Elie, Georgios Piliouras, Julien Perolat, Mathieu Lauriere, Raphael Marinier, Olivier Pietquin, and Karl Tuyls. Learning equilibria in mean-field games: Introducing mean-field psro, 2021.
- Julien Perolat, Sarah Perrin, Romuald Elie, Mathieu Laurière, Georgios Piliouras, Matthieu Geist, Karl Tuyls, and Olivier Pietquin. Scaling up mean field games with online mirror descent. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2103.00623*, 2021.

- Sarah Perrin, Julien Pérolat, Mathieu Laurière, Matthieu Geist, Romuald Elie, and Olivier Pietquin. Fictitious play for mean field games: Continuous time analysis and applications. *NeurIPS 2020*, 2020.
- Sarah Perrin, Mathieu Laurière, Julien Pérolat, Romuald Élie, Matthieu Geist, and Olivier Pietquin. Generalization in mean field games by learning master policies. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2109.09717*, 2021.
- Sarah Perrin, Mathieu Laurière, Julien Pérolat, Matthieu Geist, Romuald Élie, and Olivier Pietquin. Mean field games flock! the reinforcement learning way. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2105.07933*, 2021.
- Julia Robinson. An iterative method of solving a game. *Annals of Mathematics*, pages 296–301, 1951.
- J Maynard Smith and George R Price. The logic of animal conflict. *Nature*, 246(5427):15–18, 1973.
- Peter D Taylor and Leo B Jonker. Evolutionary stable strategies and game dynamics. *Mathematical biosciences*, 40(1-2):145–156, 1978.
- Karl Tuyls, Julien Pérolat, Marc Lanctot, Edward Hughes, Richard Everett, Joel Z. Leibo, Csaba Szepesvári, and Thore Graepel. Bounds and dynamics for empirical game theoretic analysis. *Autonomous Agents and Multi-Agent Systems*, 34:7, 2020.
- Yufei Wang, Zheyuan Ryan Shi, Lantao Yu, Yi Wu, Rohit Singh, Lucas Joppa, and Fei Fang. Deep reinforcement learning for green security games with real-time information. In *33rd AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, pages 1401–1408, 2019.
- Michael P. Wellman. Methods for empirical game-theoretic analysis (extended abstract). In *Twenty-First National Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, pages 1552–1555, Boston, 2006.
- Mason Wright, Yongzhao Wang, and Michael P. Wellman. Iterated deep reinforcement learning in games: History-aware training for improved stability. In *EC*, pages 617–636, 2019.

A Convergence Analysis

Proof of Theorem 1. To prove the existence of a NE in the empirical game with strategy sets Λ using Kakutani's fixed point theorem [Kakutani, 1941], we need to show

1. The empirical strategy space $\Delta(\Lambda)$ is non-empty, closed and bounded (compactness by Heine-Borel Theorem [Borel, 1895]) and a convex subset of certain Euclidean space.
2. The best response correspondence br is a set-valued function such that br has a closed graph and $br(\cdot)$ is non-empty and convex.

Then according to Kakutani's fixed point theorem, a NE exists in an empirical game.

For the first condition, since Λ is non-empty, then $\Delta(\Lambda)$ is just the simplex of Λ so it is non-empty. For the compactness, we need to prove $\Delta(\Lambda)$ is closed and bounded. First note that $|\Lambda|$ is finite since there are finite number of strategies in the empirical game. Since $\Delta(\Lambda)$ is the intersection of the closed sets $\mathcal{R}_+^{|\Lambda|}$ and $\{\lambda \in \mathcal{R}^{|\Lambda|} : \sum_{j \in [|\Lambda|]} \lambda_j = 1\}$, $\Delta(\Lambda)$ is closed. Since $\Delta(\Lambda)$ is a subset of $[0, 1]^{|\Lambda|}$, it is bounded. Then $\Delta(\Lambda)$ is compact. For the convexity, consider any strategies s and s' , and coefficient $\lambda \in (0, 1)$, according to the definition of a simplex, $\lambda s + (1 - \lambda)s' \in \Delta(\Lambda)$. So $\Delta(\Lambda)$ is a convex set. We now complete the verification of the first condition.

For the second condition, given a strategy $\sigma \in \Delta(\Lambda)$, define a best-response correspondence to σ as

$$\begin{aligned} br(\sigma) &= \operatorname{argmax}_{s' \in \Lambda} u(s', \mu^\sigma) \\ &= \operatorname{argmax}_{\sigma' \in \Delta(\Lambda)} u(\sigma', \mu^\sigma) \\ &= \operatorname{argmax}_{\sigma' \in \Delta(\Lambda)} \sum_{s \in \Lambda} \sigma'(s) u(s, \mu^\sigma) \end{aligned}$$

Due to the compactness of $\Delta(\Lambda)$ and the continuity assumption of u , the best-response correspondence $br(\sigma)$ is non-empty. To show it is convex, consider two strategies $s_1, s_2 \in br(\sigma)$ associated with coefficients c_1 and c_2 such that $c_1, c_2 \geq 0$ and $c_1 + c_2 = 1$. Since all optima share the same utility

$$u(s_1, \mu^\sigma) = u(s_2, \mu^\sigma)$$

and the definition of the expected utility

$$u(c_1 s_1 + c_2 s_2, \mu^\sigma) = c_1 u(s_1, \mu^\sigma) + c_2 u(s_2, \mu^\sigma)$$

we have $c_1 s_1 + c_2 s_2 \in br(\sigma)$ and then $br(\sigma)$ is convex. Note that $br(\sigma)$ is a set-valued function since there could be multiple strategies maximizing the value function, which constitutes a power set of Λ .

Next, we claim that $Gr(br) := \{(\sigma, br(\sigma)) : \sigma \in \Delta(\Lambda), br(\sigma) \in \Delta(\Lambda)\}$ is a closed graph. By the Berge's maximum theorem [Berge, 1997] and the continuity assumption, the set-valued function br is upper-hemicontinuous. Since $br(\sigma)$ is closed for all $\sigma \in \Delta(\Lambda)$ and $\Delta(\Lambda)$ is a metrizable space, $Gr(br)$ is a closed graph. This completes the proof of the second condition. With condition 1 and 2, according to Kakutani's fixed point theorem, a NE exists in an empirical game. □

B Experimental Results for Multi-population MFGs

For MP-MFGs, we test the performance of iterative EGTA in a 3-population chasing problem [Perolat *et al.*, 2021], which closely relates to the game Hens-Foxes-Snakes, where hens, snakes and foxes are chasing cyclically. The reward structure of this game is shown in table B, denoted as R .

	Hens	Snakes	Foxes
Hens	(0, 0)	(-1, 1)	(1, -1)
Snakes	(1, -1)	(0, 0)	(-1, 1)
Foxes	(-1, 1)	(1, -1)	(0, 0)

The immediate reward function of population $i \in [N_p]$ is defined as

$$r_i(x, a, \mu) = -\log(\mu_i(x)) + \sum_{j \neq i} \mu_j(x) R(i, j)$$

In Figure 2, we observe that at the early stage of learning, both FP and iterative EGTA can learn the game quickly and improve the stability of strategies. Iterative EGTA keeps its momentum as learning proceeds while the learning curve of FP becomes flatter over time. We conjecture that the reason for the two learning curves of EGTA and FP close to each other is the best response target given by FP is not as effective as the one in the single-population setting since FP will not generally converge to NE in MP-MFGs.




Figure 2: Regret curves in multi-population chasing.

C Comparing RD with FP as a Subroutine

In our experiments, we observe that both RD and FP can successfully serve as tools for empirical game analysis. Although FP has been proved convergence in MFGs by Elie *et al.* [2020] and Perrin *et al.* [2020], we observe that RD also empirically converges to NE in our MFGs. For the subroutine selection, we prefer RD than FP since RD appears to be more stable than FP in some cases (e.g., Fig 1f and Fig 1k). We also find that while evaluating each intermediate empirical game, the regret curve of RD is more stable than FP. Specifically, we consider the empirical game at the final iteration of EGTA, which includes all strategically important strategies. We apply RD and FP separately to the NE of this empirical game and report the regret curves in Figure 3. We observe that given an empirical game, the performance of RD is more stable than that of FP and more importantly RD converges faster than FP. Therefore, we prefer RD to FP but both are highly effective for strategy generation.




Figure 3: RD vs FP.

D Limitations and Future Research Directions

D.1 Complexity of the Empirical Game Analysis

In our experiments, we measure the regret with respect to EGTA iterations and show superior performance of iterative EGTA against FP. However, in terms of running time, we notice that directly applying FP or OMD to the MFGs in OpenSpiel results in faster convergence since in EGTA the analysis of the empirical game (i.e., estimate the payoffs of mixed strategies, update the mixed strategies and compute the corresponding distributions) turns out to be computationally expensive. This is because without an explicit payoff matrix, the same strategy or similar strategies and distributions could be evaluated repeatedly. Besides, computing the induced distribution for every FP update also could be costly. In a word, we believe that the acceleration of the empirical game analysis is a crucial step for the application of iterative EGTA for MFGs, which is a potential research direction in the future.

In our plots, the reason for measuring the regret with respect to EGTA iterations is based on one assumption in EGTA, that is, it is common that the cost on best response calculation becomes dominant than the empirical game analysis in complex games especially when deep reinforcement learning is deployed. Based on this assumption, we prefer to build an effective game model with a minimal number of iterations and thus evaluating the performance with respect to the EGTA iterations. For the same reason, we did not plot the regret curves of OMD [Perolat *et al.*, 2021] with respect to PSRO iterations since we found that the definition of one iteration in OMD is different from that in PSRO, which could lead to improper comparison.

For MP-MFGs, as we observed in the multi-population chasing experiments, since FP will not generally converge to a NE in the multi-population setting, using FP for the empirical game analysis in EGTA may affect the learning performance. Therefore, selecting an effective best response target is also one future research direction.

D.2 Re-evaluating Strategies in Finite Games

A key motivation for using MFGs is that the MFG model dramatically simplifies game learning compared to directly solving the corresponding finite game. Meanwhile, the solution of a MFG approximates the NE of the finite game. Since the approximation induces some errors, one future research direction is how to reduce the error while applying the MFG solution to the finite game. It is apparent that the error depends on many factors (e.g., the number of players and the game size of a finite game).

A key distinction between EGTA and other learning dynamics is that the constructed empirical game model incorporates a set of strategies, which are considered strategically important to understand the game. The construction of the set of strategies is called the *strategy exploration* problem in EGTA, which aims to construct effective models with minimal iteration. The iterative EGTA can be viewed as an approach for strategy exploration in MFGs.

Based on this feature of EGTA, to reduce the approximation error of the MFG solution in the corresponding finite game, one potential approach is to conduct strategy exploration in the MFG while re-evaluating the generated strategies in the finite game. This takes the virtue of the MFG model for fast strategy exploration (i.e., quickly obtain strategically important strategies of a game) as well as improving the accuracy of the empirical game model for the finite game. This approach is also compatible with the factors that affect the approximation errors. For example, a MFG solution could behave much worse in a ten-player symmetric game than in a one-hundred-player symmetric game. In this case, re-evaluating the empirical game model in the ten-player game could improve the accuracy of the empirical game model and provide stable solutions. Note that the re-evaluation does not necessarily require evaluating all profiles in the empirical game by utilizing the symmetry and certain techniques [Gemp *et al.*, 2021]. Due to the potential benefits of this approach for solving a finite game, we propose this as a future research direction.