

On Discrete-Time Approximations to Infinite Horizon Differential Games*

Javier de Frutos[†] Victor Gatón[‡] Julia Novo[§]

December 7, 2021

Abstract

In this paper we study a discrete-time semidiscretization of an infinite time horizon noncooperative N -player differential game. We prove that as the discretization time step approaches zero the discrete-time value function approximate the value function of the differential game. Furthermore, the discrete-time Nash equilibrium is an ϵ -Nash equilibrium for the continuous-time differential game.

1 Introduction

The theory of noncooperative differential games [3], [7], [14], [4], has become an indispensable tool in the applications to model problems in which the strategic interaction between several agents (or players) evolve over time. Among the several, non equivalent, concepts of equilibria in differential games that can be used to analyze a given model problem, we are concerned with Markovian Nash equilibria or state feedback Nash equilibria [4]. We remark that feedback Nash equilibria have the property of being subgame perfect (strongly time consistent), see [4]. Subgame perfectness is a property of prime importance in the applications that is not shared by other concepts of equilibrium as open-loop Nash equilibrium. It is worth noting that in optimal control problems the optimal path can be represented by strategies either in open-loop form or in feedback form. On the contrary, when several decision-makers compete, each one faces an optimal control problem that depends on the actions of the rest of the players. Now, different information structures are not longer equivalent and, in particular, open-loop Nash equilibria are not subgame perfect [7], [4].

To look for a Markovian Nash equilibria each player has to solve an optimal control problem in which the strategies of his or her opponents are fixed. This leads

*Research supported by Spanish MCI under grants PID2019-104141GB-I00 (AEI) (AEI/FEDER, UE) and VA169P20 (Junta de Castilla y Leon, ES) co-financed by FEDER funds (EU).

[†]Instituto de Investigación en Matemáticas (IMUVA), Universidad de Valladolid, Spain. (frutos@mac.uva.es)

[‡]Instituto de Investigación en Matemáticas (IMUVA), Universidad de Valladolid, Spain. (vgaton@mac.uva.es)

[§]Departamento de Matemáticas, Universidad Autónoma de Madrid, Spain. (julia.novo@uam.es)

to a system of N coupled Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman equations, $N > 1$ being the number of players. The highly non linear character of Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman equations together with the dimensionality of the problem makes that, except for some specific models with particular structure (linear-state or linear-quadratic models, for example), an analytic approach is not possible. Then, we have to resort to numerical methods. In the one player case (optimal control), the numerical solution of Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman has received considerable attention in the literature, see, among many others, the papers [9],[8], [6], [1], [13], [5].

The objective of this paper is to show that an equilibrium of a differential game can be approximated by means of a semi-lagrangian discretization in time of the problem. Semi-lagrangian methods are well known numerical methods for optimal control problems, see for example [2], [8], [9]. Essentially, the method consists of a combination of a time discretization of the dynamics with an approximation of the same order to the objective. This kind of methods have the nice property that once the discretization has been built up, the approximation scheme can be viewed as a discrete-time version of the continuous model. The approximation is constructed solving the Bellman equation for the discrete-time model. The approach has been previously used, in the context of differential games, in [10], [12].

In this paper we adapt the results on [2] about the convergence of the discrete-time value function to the continuous-time value function to the case of noncooperative N player differential games. We use these results to prove that if the time step in the discretization is small, the discrete-time Nash equilibrium is an ϵ -Nash of the differential game.

The rest of the paper is as follows. Section 2 is devoted to state the problem and some preliminaries including the notation to be used in the rest. In Section 3 we present the results of our analysis. Some concluding remarks and possible extensions are presented in Section 4.

2 Model problem and preliminaries

We consider a N -player differential game with infinite time horizon. Player i 's objective, $i = 1, \dots, N$, is to maximize with respect his or her own control u_i ,

$$W_i(u_i, u_{-i}, x_0) := \int_0^\infty f_i(x, u_i, u_{-i}) e^{-\rho t} dt, \quad (1)$$

subject to:

$$\dot{x} = g(x, u_i, u_{-i}), \quad x(0) = x_0. \quad (2)$$

Functions $f_i : \mathbb{V} \times \mathbb{U}_1 \cdots \times \mathbb{U}_N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $i = 1, \dots, N$, and $g : \mathbb{V} \times \mathbb{U}_1 \cdots \times \mathbb{U}_N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ are given functions with $\mathbb{V} \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ and $\mathbb{U}_i \subset \mathbb{R}^m$, $i = 1, \dots, N$. ρ is a positive constant. Here and in the rest of the paper, we are using, as it is usual, the notation u_{-i} to denote

$$u_{-i} = [u_1, \dots, u_{i-1}, u_{i+1}, \dots, u_N].$$

With this notation, the evaluation of a given real function H of N variables in a pair (u_i, u_{-i}) is by convention

$$H(u_i, u_{-i}) = H(u_1, \dots, u_i, \dots, u_N).$$

In this paper, we consider autonomous problems in infinite horizon and we are interested in stationary Markovian strategies, [3], [7].

Definition 1 Let \mathcal{U}_i a set of measurable functions ϕ_i defined in \mathbb{V} with values in $\mathbb{U}_i \subset \mathbb{R}^m$. The set $\mathcal{U} = \mathcal{U}_1 \times \cdots \times \mathcal{U}_N$ is the set of admissible strategies if for every $(\phi_1, \dots, \phi_N) \in \mathcal{U}$ the state equation (2) with $u_i = \phi_i(x(t))$, $i = 1, \dots, N$, has, for every $x_0 \in \mathbb{V}$, a unique absolutely continuous solution $x(t) \in \mathbb{V}$ defined for all $t \geq 0$.

Let us note that, with this definition of admissible strategies, if $(\phi_1, \dots, \phi_N) \in \mathcal{U}$ and $(\psi_1, \dots, \psi_N) \in \mathcal{U}$ are two N -tuples of admissible strategies, the strategy $(\psi_i, \phi_{-i}) \in \mathcal{U}$ is also an admissible strategy.

The relevant concept we are interested in is the concept of Nash equilibrium.

Definition 2 A N -tuple of admissible stationary strategies $(\phi_1, \dots, \phi_N) \in \mathcal{U}$ is a Markovian Nash Equilibrium (MNE) if for every $x \in \mathbb{V}$

$$W_i(\phi_i, \phi_{-i}, x) \geq W_i(\psi_i, \phi_{-i}, x), \quad i = 1, \dots, N, \quad (3)$$

for all $(\psi_1, \dots, \psi_N) \in \mathcal{U}$.

Given a MNE (ϕ_1, \dots, ϕ_N) the value function for player i is the function

$$V_i(x) = W_i(\phi_i, \phi_{-i}, x), \quad x \in \mathbb{V}.$$

The following verification theorem can be found in [7, Theorem 4.1]

Theorem 1 Let $(\phi_1, \dots, \phi_N) \in \mathcal{U}$ a N -tuple of admissible stationary strategies. Assume that there exist continuously differentiable functions $V_i : \mathbb{V} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $i = 1, \dots, N$, such that the Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman equations

$$\rho V_i(x) = \max_{u_i \in \mathbb{U}_i} \{f_i(x, u_i, \phi_{-i}) + \nabla V_i(x)^T g(x, u_i, \phi_{-i})\}, \quad i = 1, \dots, N, \quad (4)$$

are satisfied for all $x \in \mathbb{V}$. Assume also that either V_i is bounded or V_i is bounded below and the transversality condition

$$\limsup_{T \rightarrow \infty} e^{-\rho T} V_i(x(T)) \leq 0, \quad (5)$$

where $x(t)$ is the solution of (2) with $u_i = \phi_i(x(t))$, $i = 1, \dots, N$, is satisfied. If $\phi_i(x)$ is a maximizer of the right hand side of (4) for all $i = 1, \dots, N$ and $x \in \mathbb{V}$, then (ϕ_1, \dots, ϕ_N) is a Markovian Nash Equilibrium (in the sense of catching up optimality). Moreover, the function V_i is the value function for player i , $i = 1, \dots, N$.

We remark that (4) is a non-linear partial differential equation whose solution requires of some numerical approximation, except for some particular cases as linear-state or linear-quadratic problems, for example. In the case of optimal control problems (only one player) one well developed approach is to combine a time discretization of (2) with a discretization of the same order of (1), see [2], [9], [8], for example. For differential games (more than one interacting player) this approach has been used in [10], [12]. We consider now the most simple time-discrete version of the problem (1)-(2). We consider a discretization of the functional (1) by means

of the rectangle rule combined with a forward Euler discretization of the dynamics (2).

Let $h > 0$ be a positive parameter and let $t_n = nh$, be the discrete times defined for all positive integers n . We denote by β_h the discrete discount factor defined by $\beta_h = 1 - \rho h$. We consider the discrete-time infinite horizon game in which player i aims to maximize

$$W_{i,h}(\mathbf{u}_i, \mathbf{u}_{-i}, x_0) := h \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \beta_h^n f_i(x_n, u_{i,n}, u_{-i,n}), \quad (6)$$

subject to

$$x_{n+1} = x_n + hg(x_n, u_{i,n}, u_{-i,n}), \quad (7)$$

where

$$\mathbf{u}_j = \{u_{j,0}, u_{j,1}, \dots\}, \quad u_{j,n} \in \mathbb{U}_j, \quad n \geq 0, \quad j = 1, \dots, N.$$

and $x_0 \in \mathbb{V}$ is a given initial state.

We are interested in stationary Markovian Strategies, see [14], [15] for a study of the discrete-time case. We assume, for simplicity, that for every $x_0 \in \mathbb{V}$ and $(\psi_1, \dots, \psi_N) \in \mathcal{U}$, the recursion (7) with $u_{j,n} = \psi_j(x_n)$, $j = 1, \dots, N$, $n \geq 0$, is well defined and $x_n \in \mathbb{V}$ for all $n \geq 0$. In other words, we assume that \mathcal{U} is also the set of admissible strategies of the discrete-time game (6), (7). For $(\psi_1, \dots, \psi_N) \in \mathcal{U}$, we will use the notation $W_{i,h}(\psi_i, \psi_{-i}, x_0) = W_{i,h}(\mathbf{u}_i, \mathbf{u}_{-i}, x_0)$ with $u_{j,n} = \psi_j(x_n)$, $j = 1, \dots, N$, $n \geq 0$ and x_n defined by (7).

The definitions of Markovian Nash Equilibrium and player i value function are similar to that of the continuous-time dynamic game.

Definition 3 *A N -tuple of admissible stationary strategies $(\phi_1^h, \dots, \phi_N^h) \in \mathcal{U}$ is a Markovian Nash Equilibrium (MNE) for the discrete-time game (6)-(7) if for every $x \in \mathbb{V}$*

$$W_{i,h}(\phi_i^h, \phi_{-i}^h, x) \geq W_{i,h}(\psi_i, \phi_{-i}^h, x), \quad i = 1, \dots, N. \quad (8)$$

for all $(\psi_1, \dots, \psi_N) \in \mathcal{U}$.

Given a MNE for the discrete-time game $(\phi_1^h, \dots, \phi_N^h)$ the value function for player i is the function

$$V_{i,h}(x) = W_{i,h}(\phi_i^h, \phi_{-i}^h, x), \quad x \in \mathbb{V}.$$

The following is a verification theorem similar to (1), see [15], [14].

Theorem 2 *Let $(\phi_1^h, \dots, \phi_N^h) \in \mathcal{U}$ a N -tuple of admissible stationary strategies. Assume that there exist continuous functions $V_{i,h} : \mathbb{V} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $i = 1, \dots, N$, such that the Bellman equations*

$$V_{i,h}(x) = \max_{u_i \in \mathbb{U}_i} \left\{ f_i(x, u_i, \phi_{-i}^h) + \beta_h V_{i,h}(x + hg(x, u_i, \phi_{-i}^h)) \right\}, \quad i = 1, \dots, N, \quad (9)$$

are satisfied for all $x \in \mathbb{V}$. Assume also that either $V_{i,h}$ is bounded or $V_{i,h}$ is bounded below and the transversality condition

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \beta_h^n V_{i,h}(x_n) \leq 0, \quad (10)$$

where $\{x_n\}_{n=0}^\infty$ is the solution of (7) with $u_{i,n} = \phi_i^h(x_n)$, $i = 1, \dots, N$, is satisfied. If $\phi_i^h(x)$ is a maximizer of the right hand side of (9) for all $i = 1, \dots, N$ and $x \in \mathbb{V}$, then $(\phi_1^h, \dots, \phi_N^h)$ is a Markovian Nash Equilibrium for the discrete game. Moreover, the function $V_{i,h}$ is the value function for player i , $i = 1, \dots, N$.

3 Discrete-time approximation analysis

In the rest of this paper we will assume that functions g , and f_i , $i = 1, \dots, N$, are continuous and satisfy the following assumptions:

H1 There exists a constant L_g such that for all $(x, u_1, \dots, u_N), (y, v_1, \dots, v_N)$ in $\mathbb{V} \times \mathbb{U}_1 \cdots \times \mathbb{U}_N$

$$|g(x, u_1, \dots, u_N) - g(y, v_1, \dots, v_N)| \leq L_g(|x - y| + \sum_{j=1}^N |u_j - v_j|).$$

H2 There exist constants L_i , $i = 1, \dots, N$, such that for all $(x, u_1, \dots, u_N), (y, v_1, \dots, v_N)$ in $\mathbb{V} \times \mathbb{U}_1 \cdots \times \mathbb{U}_N$ and $i = 1, \dots, N$,

$$|f_i(x, u_1, \dots, u_N) - f_i(y, v_1, \dots, v_N)| \leq L_i(|x - y| + \sum_{j=1}^N |u_j - v_j|).$$

H3 There exists a constant M such that for all (x, u_1, \dots, u_N) in $\mathbb{V} \times \mathbb{U}_1 \cdots \times \mathbb{U}_N$

$$|f_i(x, u_1, \dots, u_N)| \leq M.$$

The following proposition is a consistency result that extends [2, Chapter 6, Lemma 1.2] to the case of a number of players $N > 1$. We include the proof for the reader's convenience.

Proposition 1 *Let $(\phi_1, \dots, \phi_N) \in \mathcal{U}$ an arbitrary N -tuple of admissible strategies. Let us assume that there exists a constant $L_s > 0$ with*

$$|\phi_i(x_1) - \phi_i(x_2)| \leq L_s |x_1 - x_2|, \quad i = 1, \dots, N. \quad (11)$$

Let us assume that hypotheses H_1 , H_2 and H_3 are satisfied. Then

$$\lim_{h \rightarrow 0} |W_{i,h}(\phi_i, \phi_{-i}, x) - W_i(\phi_i, \phi_{-i}, x)| = 0, \quad i = 1, \dots, N.$$

Proof The first part of the proof uses a well known argument from the theory of the numerical solution of ordinary differential equations, see [2, Chapter 6, Lemma 1.2].

Let $(\phi_1, \dots, \phi_N) \in \mathcal{U}$ be a fixed N -tuple of admissible strategies. Let $y(t)$ be the solution of (2) with $y(0) = x$, and y_n , $n = 0, 1, \dots$ the solution of (7) with $y_0 = x$. Let us define the piecewise constant function

$$\tilde{y}(t) = y_n, \quad t \in [t_n, t_{n+1}), \quad n \geq 0,$$

with $t_n = nh$, $n = 0, 1, \dots$

Let us note that $\phi_i(\tilde{y}(t))$ is a piecewise constant strategy with $\phi_i(\tilde{y}(t)) = \phi_i(y_n)$ for $t \in [t_n, t_{n+1})$.

It is easy to see that \tilde{y} can be expressed as

$$\tilde{y}(t) = x + \int_0^{t_n} g(\tilde{y}(s), \phi_i(\tilde{y}(s)), \phi_{-i}(\tilde{y}(s))) \mathfrak{s}, \quad \forall t \in [t_n, t_{n+1}).$$

Using that $y(t)$ satisfies

$$y(t) = x + \int_0^t g(y(s), \phi_i(y(s)), \phi_{-i}(y(s))) \mathfrak{s}, \quad \forall t \geq 0,$$

we have that, for $t \in [t_n, t_{n+1})$,

$$\begin{aligned} y(t) - \tilde{y}(t) &= \int_0^{t_n} g(y(s), \phi_i(y(s)), \phi_{-i}(y(s))) - g(\tilde{y}(s), \phi_i(\tilde{y}(s)), \phi_{-i}(\tilde{y}(s))) \mathfrak{s} \\ &\quad + \int_{t_n}^t g(y(s), \phi_i(y(s)), \phi_{-i}(y(s))) \mathfrak{s}. \end{aligned}$$

We use now hypothesis H1, (11) and the fact that H1 implies that there exists a constant $K \geq 0$ with

$$|g(y, u_i, u_{-i})| \leq K(1 + |y|), \quad (12)$$

to get

$$|y(t) - \tilde{y}(t)| \leq L \int_0^t |y(s) - \tilde{y}(s)| ds + K \int_{[t/h]h}^t (1 + |y(s)|) \mathfrak{s},$$

where $L = L_g(1 + NL_s)$.

It is easy to prove (see [2, Chapter 3, Theorem 5.5]) that, thanks to (12)

$$|y(t)| \leq (|x| + \sqrt{2Kt})e^{Kt}, \quad t > 0. \quad (13)$$

And then

$$|y(t) - \tilde{y}(t)| \leq L \int_0^t |y(s) - \tilde{y}(s)| ds + Kh \left(1 + (|x| + \sqrt{2Kt})e^{Kt}\right).$$

Hence, by Gronwall's Lemma

$$|y(t) - \tilde{y}(t)| \leq Kh \left(1 + (|x| + \sqrt{2Kt})e^{Kt}\right) e^{Lt}. \quad (14)$$

Let J be a positive integer. Let us write

$$\begin{aligned} W_{i,h}(\phi_i, \phi_{-i}, x) &= h \sum_{n=0}^{J-1} \beta_h^n f_i(y_n, \phi_i(y_n), \phi_{-i}(y_n)) + h \sum_{n=J}^{\infty} \beta_h^n f_i(y_n, \phi_i(y_n), \phi_{-i}(y_n)) \\ &= \int_0^{t_J} \beta_h^{[t/h]h} f_i(\tilde{y}(s), \phi_i(\tilde{y}(s)), \phi_{-i}(\tilde{y}(s))) \mathfrak{s} \\ &\quad + h \sum_{n=J}^{\infty} \beta_h^n f_i(y_n, \phi_i(y_n), \phi_{-i}(y_n)). \end{aligned}$$

So that

$$\begin{aligned}
W_{i,h}(\phi_i, \phi_{-i}, x) - W_i(\phi_i, \phi_{-i}, x) = & \\
& \int_0^{t_J} e^{-\rho s} (f_i(\tilde{y}(s), \phi_i(\tilde{y}(s)), \phi_{-i}(\tilde{y}(s))) - f_i(y(s), \phi_i(y(s)), \phi_{-i}(y(s)))) \mathfrak{s} \\
& + \int_0^{t_J} (\beta_h^{\lfloor s/h \rfloor} - e^{-\rho s}) f_i(\tilde{y}(s), \phi_i(\tilde{y}(s)), \phi_{-i}(\tilde{y}(s))) \mathfrak{s} \\
& + h \sum_{n=J}^{\infty} \beta_h^n f_i(y_n, \phi_i(y_n), \phi_{-i}(y_n)) \\
& + \int_{t_J}^{\infty} e^{-\rho s} f_i(y(s), \phi_i(y(s)), \phi_{-i}(y(s))) \mathfrak{s}
\end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

We bound separately each of the four terms. Using now H2, (11) and (14), we have

$$\left| \int_0^{t_J} e^{-\rho t} (f_i(\tilde{y}(s), \phi_i(\tilde{y}(s)), \phi_{-i}(\tilde{y}(s))) - f_i(y(s), \phi_i(y(s)), \phi_{-i}(y(s)))) \mathfrak{s} \right| \leq Ch,$$

with $C = K(L_i + NL_s) \int_0^{t_J} (1 + (|x| + \sqrt{2Ks})e^{Ks})e^{Ls}e^{-\rho s} \mathfrak{s}$. The second term can be estimated using H3 and the mean value theorem as follows

$$\begin{aligned}
\left| \int_0^{t_J} (\beta_h^{\lfloor t/h \rfloor} - e^{\rho t}) f_i(\tilde{y}(s), \phi_i(\tilde{y}(s)), \phi_{-i}(\tilde{y}(s))) \mathfrak{s} \right| & \leq Mt_J \max_{0 \leq t \leq t_J} |\beta_h^{\lfloor t/h \rfloor} - e^{\rho t}| \\
& \leq Mt_J((\theta_h - 1)t_J + \theta_h h),
\end{aligned}$$

with $\theta_h = -\log(1 - \rho h)/(\rho h)$. Note that $\theta_h \rightarrow 1$ as $h \rightarrow 0$. Third and four terms in (15) are bounded using hypothesis H3. We have

$$h \left| \sum_{n=J}^{\infty} \beta_h^n f_i(y_n, \phi_i(y_n), \phi_{-i}(y_n)) \right| \leq M \frac{\beta_h^J}{1 - \beta_h} h$$

and

$$\left| \int_{t_J}^{\infty} e^{-\rho t} f_i(y(s), \phi_i(y(s)), \phi_{-i}(y(s))) \mathfrak{s} \right| \leq \frac{M}{\rho} e^{-\rho t_J}.$$

The proof finishes observing that each of the four terms can be made arbitrary small taking J big enough and h small enough. \square

The following proposition is a refinement of the Proposition 1 requiring stronger hypotheses on the problem data [2, Chapter 3, Theorem 5.5].

Proposition 2 *Let $(\phi_1, \dots, \phi_N) \in \mathcal{U}$ an arbitrary N -tuple of admissible strategies and let $x \in \mathbb{V}$. Let assume that hypotheses H1, H2 and H3 and (11) hold. Let us assume that either $\rho > L$, with $L = L_g(1 + NL_s)$ and g bounded or $\rho > L + K$ with K the constant in (12). Then, there exists a positive constant C and $h_0 > 0$ such that for all $h \leq h_0$*

$$|W_{i,h}(\phi_i, \phi_{-i}, x) - W_i(\phi_i, \phi_{-i}, x)| \leq Ch.$$

Proof In the proof we will use the same notation as in Proposition 1.

We start by writing

$$\begin{aligned} \left| W_{i,h}(\phi_i, \phi_{-i}, x) - W_i(\phi_i, \phi_{-i}, x) \right| \leq \\ \int_0^\infty |f_i(y(t), \phi_i(y(t)), \phi_{-i}(y(t))) - f_i(\tilde{y}(t), \phi_i(\tilde{y}(t)), \phi_{-i}(\tilde{y}(t)))| e^{-\rho t} \mathfrak{s}, \\ + \int_0^\infty |f_i(\tilde{y}(t), \phi_i(\tilde{y}(t)), \phi_{-i}(\tilde{y}(t)))| |e^{-\rho t} - e^{-\rho \theta_h [t/h] h}| \mathfrak{t}, \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

where $\theta_h = -\log(1-\rho h)/(\rho h)$. Then, using H2, (11) and (14) we have, if $\rho > K+L$,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^\infty |f_i(y(t), \phi_i(y(t)), \phi_{-i}(y(t))) - f_i(\tilde{y}(t), \phi_i(\tilde{y}(t)), \phi_{-i}(\tilde{y}(t)))| e^{-\rho t} \mathfrak{t} \leq \\ K(L_i + NL_s) \int_0^\infty \left(1 + (|x| + \sqrt{2Kt})e^{Kt}\right) e^{(L-\rho)t} \mathfrak{t} \leq Ch, \end{aligned}$$

for some constant $C > 0$.

The second term in (16) can be estimated using hypothesis H3 and the mean value theorem

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^\infty |f_i(\tilde{y}(t), \phi_i(\tilde{y}(t)), \phi_{-i}(\tilde{y}(t)))| |e^{-\rho t} - e^{-\rho \theta_h [t/h] h}| \mathfrak{t} \leq \\ M\rho \int_0^\infty \max \left\{ e^{-\rho t}, e^{-\rho \theta_h [t/h] h} \right\} |t - \theta [t/h] h| \mathfrak{t}. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, using that $\theta_h > 1$ and $|t - [t/h]h| \leq h$ we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^\infty |f_i(\tilde{y}(t), \phi_i(\tilde{y}(t)), \phi_{-i}(\tilde{y}(t)))| |e^{-\rho t} - e^{-\rho \theta_h [t/h] h}| \mathfrak{t} \leq \\ M\rho e^{\theta \rho h} \int_0^\infty e^{-\rho t} ((\theta_h - 1)t + \theta_h h) \mathfrak{t} \end{aligned}$$

and since $\theta_h - 1 = \mathcal{O}(h)$ as $h \rightarrow 0$, we conclude

$$\int_0^\infty |f_i(\tilde{y}(t), \phi_i(\tilde{y}(t)), \phi_{-i}(\tilde{y}(t)))| |e^{-\rho t} - e^{-\rho \theta_h [t/h] h}| \mathfrak{t} \leq Ch,$$

for some constant $C > 0$.

Let us assume now that function g is bounded and $\rho > L$. Let $M_g = \sup |g| < \infty$. We have immediately that

$$|y(t) - \tilde{y}(t)| \leq M_g h e^{Lt},$$

and then

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^\infty |f_i(y(t), \phi_i(y(t)), \phi_{-i}(y(t))) - f_i(\tilde{y}(t), \phi_i(\tilde{y}(t)), \phi_{-i}(\tilde{y}(t)))| e^{-\rho t} \mathfrak{s} \leq \\ L_i(1 + NL_s) M_g h \int_0^\infty e^{(L-\rho)t} \mathfrak{t} \leq Ch, \end{aligned}$$

for some positive constant $C > 0$ which finishes the proof. \square

The following theorem is the main objective of this paper. It states that a Markov Nash equilibrium of the discrete-time game is an approximate Nash equilibrium for the differential game in the sense that for $\epsilon > 0$ arbitrary it constitutes an ϵ -Nash equilibrium for h small enough.

Theorem 3 *Let $(\phi_1^h, \dots, \phi_N^h)$ a Markov Nash equilibrium of the discrete time game (6)-(7) that satisfies (11). Let us assume that hypotheses H1, H2 and H3 are satisfied. Let $\epsilon > 0$. There exists $h_0 > 0$ such that for $h \leq h_0$ and all $x \in \mathbb{V}$, if $(\psi_1, \dots, \psi_n) \in \mathcal{U}$ is a N -tuple of arbitrary admissible stationary strategies satisfying (11), then*

$$W_i(\phi_i^h, \phi_{-i}^h, x) \geq W_i(\psi_i, \phi_{-i}^h, x) - \epsilon, \quad i = 1, \dots, N.$$

Proof From Proposition 1 we known that given $\epsilon > 0$ there exists a constant h_0 such that for every $h \leq h_0$ and every N -tuple $(\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_N) \in \mathcal{U}$ satisfying (11)

$$|W_{i,h}(\varphi_i, \varphi_{-i}, x) - W_i(\varphi_i, \varphi_{-i}, x)| \leq \frac{\epsilon}{2}.$$

Using (8) we get

$$\begin{aligned} W_i(\phi_i^h, \phi_{-i}^h, x) &= (W_i(\phi_i^h, \phi_{-i}^h, x) - W_{i,h}(\phi_i^h, \phi_{-i}^h, x)) + W_{1,h}(\phi_i^h, \phi_{-i}^h, x) \\ &\geq (W_i(\phi_i^h, \phi_{-i}^h, x) - W_{1,h}(\phi_i^h, \phi_{-i}^h, x)) + W_{1,h}(\psi_i, \phi_{-i}^h, x) \\ &= W_i(\psi_i, \phi_{-i}^h, x) + (W_i(\phi_i^h, \phi_{-i}^h, x) - W_{1,h}(\phi_i^h, \phi_{-i}^h, x)) \\ &\quad + (W_{i,h}(\psi_i, \phi_{-i}^h, x) - W_i(\psi_i, \phi_{-i}^h, x)). \end{aligned}$$

Then, noting that all the bounds in the proof of Proposition 1 depend only on H1, H2, H3 and the constant L_s , we have that for h small enough

$$W_i(\phi_i^h, \phi_{-i}^h, x) \geq W_i(\psi_i, \phi_{-i}^h, x) - \epsilon.$$

□

Next theorem is a refinement of Theorem 3 with the more exigent hypotheses of Proposition 2.

Theorem 4 *Let $(\phi_1^h, \dots, \phi_N^h)$ a Markov Nash equilibrium of the discrete time game (6)-(7) that satisfy (11). Let us assume that hypothesis H1, H2 and H3 are satisfied. Furthermore, let assume that either $\rho > L$, with $L = L_g(1 + NL_s)$ and g bounded or $\rho > L + K$ with K the constant in (12). There exists a positive $C > 0$ and $h_0 > 0$ such that for all $h \leq h_0$ and all $x \in \mathbb{V}$, if $(\psi_1, \dots, \psi_n) \in \mathcal{U}$ is a N -tuple of arbitrary admissible stationary strategies satisfying (11), then*

$$W_i(\phi_i^h, \phi_{-i}^h, x) \geq W_i(\psi_i, \phi_{-i}^h, x) - Ch, \quad i = 1, \dots, N.$$

Proof The proof is exactly the same as in Theorem 3 using now Proposition 2 instead of Proposition 1. □

4 Concluding remarks

In this paper we analyze a semilagrangian approach to numerically approximate Markovian Nash equilibria of differential games. We prove that markovian Nash equilibria of the discrete-time approximation are ϵ -Nash equilibria of the differential (continuous-time) game with ϵ arbitrarily small for h , the discretization time step, small enough. Under some restrictive hypotheses we prove that $\epsilon = \mathcal{O}(h)$. Although the hypotheses can be seen as too exigent, they often apply in the applications, particularly when a bounded domain, positively invariant for the flow of the dynamics, containing the region of interest can be identified, see [11] for an example. In the next version of this preprint we will present some numerical experiments and a refined analysis.

References

- [1] M. Akian, M., Gaubert, S. & Lakhoua, A., *The max-plus finite element method for solving deterministic optimal control problems: basic properties and convergence analysis*, SIAM J. Control Optim. 47, 2008, pp. 817–848.
- [2] Bardi, M. & Capuzzo-Dolcetta, I., *Optimal Control and Viscosity Solutions of Hamilton-Jacobi-Belmann Equations*. Springer Science+Business Media, LLC, New York, 1997.
- [3] Başar T. & Olsder G.J., *Dynamic noncooperative game theory*. SIAM, Philadelphia, (1999).
- [4] Başar T., Haurie A. & Zaccour, G., *Nonzero-Sum Differential Games*, in Handbook of Differential Games, Başar T. and Zaccour, G., eds., Springer, 2018.
- [5] Bokanowski, O., Garcke, J., Griebel, M. & Klompaker, I., *An adaptive sparse grid semi-Lagrangian scheme for first order Hamilton-Jacobi Bellman equations*, J. Sci. Comput. 55, 2013, pp. 575–605.
- [6] Carlini, E., Falcone, M. & Ferretti, R., *An efficient algorithm for Hamilton-Jacobi equations in high dimension*, Comput. and Visualization in Science, 7, 2004, pp. 15–29.
- [7] Dockner, E., Jørgensen, S. , Van Long, N. & Sorger, G. *Differential Games in Economics and management Science*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2000.
- [8] Falcone, M., *Numerical Solution of Dynamic Programming Equations*. Appendix A in M. Bardi & I. Capuzzo-Dolcetta. Optimal Control and Viscosity Solutions of Hamilton-Jacobi-Belmann Equations. Springer Science+Business Media, LLC, New York, 1997.
- [9] Falcone, M. & Ferreti, R., *Discrete time High-Order schemes for Viscosity Solutions of Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman Equations* Numerische Mathematik, 67, 1994, pp. 315–344
- [10] De Frutos J. & Martín-Herrán G., *Does flexibility facilitate sustainability of cooperation over time? A case study from environmental economics*. Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications 165, 2015, pp. 657–677.

- [11] De Frutos, J. & a Martín-Herrán, G., *Selection of a Markov perfect Nash equilibrium in a class of differential games*. Dynamic Games and Applications, 8, 2018, pp. 620–636,
- [12] De Frutos J., Martín-Herrán G., *Spatial effects and strategic behavior in a multi-regional transboundary pollution game*. Journal of Environmental Economics and Management 97, 2019, pp. 182–207.
- [13] Guo, B.Z. & Wu, T.T., *Approximation of optimal feedback control: a dynamic programming approach*, J. Global Optim. 46, 2010, pp. 395–422.
- [14] Haurie, A., Krawczyk, J.B. & Zaccour, G., *Games and dynamic games*. World Scientific, Singapore, 2012.
- [15] Krawczyk, J.B. & V. Petkov, *Multistage Games*, in Handbook of Dynamic Game Theory, T. Başar and G. Zaccour , eds., Springer Nature, 2018.