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#### Abstract

It is show $n$ how the generating functionalm ethod ofD $e D$ om inicis can be used to solve the dynam ics of the originalversion of the m inority gam e $(\mathbb{M} G)$ ，in which agents observe real as opposed to fake $m$ arket histories．H ere one again nds exact closed equations for correlation and response functions，but now these are de ned in term s of tw o connected e ective non $M$ arkovian stochastic processes：a single e ective agent equation sim ilar to that of the＇fake＇history models，and a second e ective equation for the overallm arket bid itself（the latter is absent in＇ake＇history models）． The result is an exact theory，from which one can calculate from rst principles both the persistent observables in the M G and the distribution of history frequencies．


PACS num bers： $02.50 \mathrm{Le}, 8723 \mathrm{Ge}, 05.70 \mathrm{Ln}, 64.60 \mathrm{Ht}$
E－m ail：tcoolen＠mth．kcl．ac．uk

## 1．Introduction

M inority $G$ am es（MG）［i－1］are simple and transparent models which were designed to increase our understanding of the com plex collective processes which result from inductive decision making by interacting agents in simpli ed markets＇．They are $m$ athem aticalim plem entations of the so－called E lFarolbar problem 琉．M any versions of the M G have by now been studied in the literature，see e．g．the recent textbook［⿴囗玉 $]$ for an overview．They di er in the type ofm icroscopic dynam ics used（e．g．batch versus on－line，stochastic versus determ inistic），in the de nition of the inform ation provided to the agents（real－valued versus discrete，true versus fake $m$ arket histories）and the agents＇decision $m$ aking strategies，and also in the speci c recipe used for converting the observed extemal inform ation into a trading action（inner products versus look－up tables）．M odels w ith＇fake＇$m$ arket histories（proposed rst in＇［［1］［ ］），where at each point in time all agents are given random rather than realm arket data upon which to base their decisions，have the advantage ofbeing $M$ arkovian and were therefore the rst to be studied and solved in the theoreticalphysics literature using techniques from equilibrium


A fter $[\underline{-1}]$ had revealed the sim ilarity betw een the behaviour of the volatility in the standard M G m odels w ith real versus fake $m$ arket histories，it was show $n$ via num erical
$\operatorname{sim} u l a t i o n s$ that this statem ent did not extend to $m$ any variations of the $M G$, such as gam es w ith di erent strategy valuation update rules'[] $\overline{1} \overline{1} \overline{1}]$ or $w$ th populations where agents do not allobserve history strings of the sam e length [i-1 $\overline{-1}]$. Furtherm ore, even in the standard M G one does nd profound di erences in the history frequency distributions (although there these di erences do not im pact on observables such as the volatility or the fraction of frozen' agents). A partly phenom enological attem pt at analyzing quantitatively the e ects of true history in the M G was presented in '[1] $\overline{1} \bar{\Gamma}]$, and followed by a sim ulation study [ī̄] of bid periodicities induced by having real histories. A fter these tw o papers virtually all theorists restricted them selves to the exclusive analysis of M G versions w th fake histories, sim ply because there is no proper theory yet for M G versions w ith realhistories, in spite of the fact that these are the $m$ ore realistic types.

There would thus seem to bem erit in a $m$ athem aticalprocedure which w ould allow for the derivation of exact dynam ical solutions for M G s w ith real m arket histories. The ob jective of this paper is to develop and apply such a procedure. M odels w ith real $m$ arket histories are strongly non M arkovian, so analytical approaches based on pseudoequilibrium approxim ations (which require the existence of a m icroscopic Lyapunov function) are ruled out. In contrast, the generating functionalanalysis (G FA) m ethod of [ī̄], which has an excellent track record in solving the dynam ics ofM arkovian M G s, w ill tum out to work also in the case ofnon $-M$ arkovian $m$ odels. There are tw o com plications in developing a G FA for M G s w ith real histories. Firstly, having real histories im plies that no batch' version of the dynam ics can be de ned (since batch models by de nition involve averaging by hand over all possible histories). Thus one has to retum to the original on-line de nitions. Secondly, the tem poral regularization method "[i] upon which one norm ally relies in carrying out a G FA of on-line M G versions is no longer helpful. This regularization is based on the introduction of random durations of the individual on-line iteration steps of the process, which disnupts the tim ing of all retarded $m$ icroscopic forces and thereby leads to extrem ely $m$ essy equationsiz. Thus, one has to develop the G FA directly in term s of the un-regularized $m$ icrosoopic law $s$.
$T$ his paper is divided into two distinct parts, sim ilar to the $m$ ore traditional G FA studies of M G sw th fake $m$ arket histories. The rst part deals w th the derivation of closed $m$ acroscopic law s from which to solve the canonical dynam ic order param eters for the standard (on-line) M G w ith true $m$ arket history. These $w$ ill tum out to be form ulated in term $s$ of two e ective equations (rather than a single equation, as for models with fake histories) : one for an e ective agent, and one for an e ective overall $m$ arket bid. These equations are fiully exact. The second part of the paper is devoted to constructing solutions for these e ective processes. In particular, this paper focuses on the usualpersistent observables of the M G and on the distribution of history frequencies, which are calculated in the form of an expansion ofw hich the rst few term s are derived in explicit form. The nal results nd excellent con $m$ ation in num erical sim ulations. $z N$ ote that in $m$ odels $w$ ith fake histories there are no retarded $m$ icroscopic foroes, so that there this particular problem could not occur.

## 2. De nitions

### 2.1. G eneralized M inority G am e with both valuation and overall bid perturbations

In the standard M G one im agines having N agents, labeled by $\mathrm{i}=1$;:::; N . At each
 to the $m$ arket. The (re-scaled) cum ulative $m$ arket bid at stage ' is de ned as

$$
\begin{equation*}
A(V)=p \bar{N}_{i=1}^{X^{N}} b_{i}(\Upsilon)+A_{e}\left({ }^{\prime}\right) \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

An extemal contribution $A_{e}(`)$ has been added, representing e.g. the actions ofm arket regulators, which will enable us to identify speci c response functions later. P ro $t$ is assum ed to be $m$ ade by those agents $w$ ho nd them selves subsequently in the $m$ inority group, ie. when A (`) > 0 by those agents i with \(b_{i}\left({ }^{( }\right)<0\), and when \(A(`)<0\) by those w th $\mathrm{b}_{\mathrm{i}}\left({ }^{( }\right)>0$. Each agent $i$ determ ines his bid $\mathrm{b}_{i}\left({ }^{( }\right)$at each step ' on the basis of publicly available inform ation, which the agents believe to represent historic $m$ arket data, here given by the vector ( $\quad$; $\mathrm{A} ; \mathrm{Z}) 2 \mathrm{f} 1 ; 1 \mathrm{~g}^{\mathrm{M}}$ :

The numbers fZ ('; ) g, w ith $=1$;:::; M , are zero-average $G$ aussian random variables, which represent a 'rake' altemative to the truem arket data. $M$ is the num ber of iteration steps in the past for which $m$ arket inform ation is $m$ ade available. W e de ne $=2_{2}^{n}=\mathrm{N}$, and take to rem ain nite asN! 1 . Theparam eter $2[0 ; 1]$ allow s us to interpolate betw een the cases of strictly true $(=0)$ and strictly fake $(=1) \mathrm{m}$ arket histories. W e distinguish between two classes of 'ake history' variables:
$W$ e note that $(\underline{\overline{4}})$ does not correspond to a pattem being shifted in tim e, contrary to what one expects of a string representing the tim e series of the overall bid, so that the agents in a realm arket could easily detect that they are being fooled. H ence (3్) seem s a m ore natural description of fake history. A though fake, it is at least consistently so.

Each agent has $S$ trading strategies, which we labelby $a=1 ;::: ;$ S . E ach strategy a of each trader i consists of a com plete list $R^{\text {ia }}$ of $2^{M}$ recom $m$ ended trading decisions $f R{ }^{\text {ia }} \mathrm{g} 2 \mathrm{f} 1 ; 1 \mathrm{~g}$, covering all $2^{4}$ possible values of the extemal inform ation vector. $W$ e draw allentries $f R{ }^{\text {ia }} \mathrm{g}$ random ly and independently before the start of the gam $\mathrm{e}, \mathrm{w}$ th equal probabilities for 1 . U pon observing history string ( $\quad$; $A ; Z$ ) at stage `, given a trader's active strategy at that stage is \(\mathrm{a}_{\mathrm{i}}(`)\), the agent $w$ ill follow the instruction of
 strategies $\mathrm{a}_{\mathrm{i}}(`)$, all agents keep tradk of valuations $\mathrm{p}_{\mathrm{ia}}(`)$, which $m$ easure how often and
to what extent each strategy a would have led to a m inority decision if it had been used from the start of the gam e onw ards. T hese valuations are updated continually, via

$$
\begin{equation*}
p_{i a}(`+1)=p_{i a}(`) \quad \frac{p^{\sim}}{\bar{N}} A(`) R_{(` ; A ; z)}^{\text {ia }} \tag{5}
\end{equation*}
$$

T he factor ~ represents a leaming rate. If the active strategy $a_{i}$ ( $'$ ) of trader i at stage ' is de ned as the one $w$ ith the highest valuation $\mathrm{Pa}_{\mathrm{a}}$ ( $)$ at that point, and upon w riting $\mathrm{F} \quad[\because \mathrm{A} ; \mathrm{Z}]=\mathrm{P} \overline{\mathrm{N}} \quad ;\left({ }^{\prime} ; \mathrm{A} ; \mathrm{Z}\right)$, our process becom es

$$
\begin{align*}
& \mathrm{p}_{\mathrm{ia}}\left({ }^{\prime}+1\right)=\mathrm{p}_{\mathrm{ia}}\left({ }^{\prime}\right) \quad \underset{\mathrm{P}}{\tilde{\mathrm{P}}-\mathrm{A}()^{\mathrm{X}} \quad \mathrm{R}^{\mathrm{ia}} \mathrm{~F} \quad\left[{ }^{\prime} ; A ; Z\right]} \tag{6}
\end{align*}
$$

$$
\begin{align*}
& \mathrm{a}_{\mathrm{i}}\left({ }^{\prime}\right) \quad=\arg \max _{\mathrm{a} 2 \mathrm{f} 1 ;:: ; ; \mathrm{Sg}} \mathrm{fp}_{\mathrm{ia}}\left({ }^{\prime}\right) \mathrm{g} \tag{7}
\end{align*}
$$

W e note that $(\mathrm{N})^{1} \quad 1=(\mathrm{N}){ }^{\mathrm{P}} \quad \mathrm{F}^{2}[\mathrm{r} ; \mathrm{A} ; \mathrm{Z}]=1$. The standard $\mathrm{M} G$ is recovered for ! 0 (i.e. true market data only), whereas the rake history' M G as


H enceforth we w ill restrict ourselves to the sim plest case $S=2$, where each agent has only two strategies, so a $2 \mathrm{fl} ; 2 \mathrm{~g}$, since the choige $m$ ade for $S$ has been shown to have only a quantitative e ect on the behaviour of the M G.O ur equations can now be simpli ed in the standard way upon introducing the new variables

$$
\begin{align*}
& \left.q_{i}(\Upsilon)=\frac{1}{2}\left[p_{i 1}(`) \quad \mathrm{p}_{2}( \urcorner\right)\right]  \tag{9}\\
& \left.\left.!^{i}=\frac{1}{2} \mathbb{R}^{\mathrm{i} 1}+R^{\mathrm{i} 2}\right] ; \quad \quad i=\frac{1}{2} \mathbb{R}^{i 1} \quad R^{\mathrm{i} 2}\right] \tag{10}
\end{align*}
$$

and $=N \quad N^{1=2^{P}}$ i ${ }^{i}$. The bid of agent $i$ at step 'is now seen to follow from

$$
\begin{align*}
R^{\mathrm{ia}_{i}(`)} & \left.\left.\left.=\frac{1}{2} \mathbb{R}^{\mathrm{i} 1} \quad \mathrm{R}^{\mathrm{i} 2}\right]+\frac{1}{2} \operatorname{sgn}\left[q_{i}( \urcorner\right)\right] \mathbb{R}^{\mathrm{i} 1}+R^{\mathrm{i} 2}\right] \\
& \left.=!^{i}+\operatorname{sgn}\left[q_{i}( \urcorner\right)\right]^{i} \tag{11}
\end{align*}
$$

The above $S=2$ formulation is easily generalized to include decision noise: one sim ply replaces sgn $\left[q_{i}(`)\right]!\quad\left[q_{i}(`) ; z_{i}(`)\right]$, in which the $f z_{j}(`) g$ are independent and zero average random num bers, described by a sym $m$ etric and unit-variance distribution $P(z)$. The function $[q ; z]$ is taken to be non-decreasing in $q$ for any $z$, and param etrized by a controlparam eter $T \quad 0$ such that $[q ; z] 2 \mathrm{f} 1 ; 1 g$, w th $\lim !0 \quad[q ; z]=\operatorname{sgn}[q]$ and $\lim _{T!1} d z P(z)[q ; z]=0$. Typical exam ples are additive and multiplicative noise de nitions, described by $[q ; z]=\operatorname{sgn}[q+T z]$ and $[q ; z]=\operatorname{sgn}[q] \operatorname{sgn}[1+\mathrm{Tz}]$, respectively. The param eter $T \mathrm{~m}$ easures the degree ofrandom ness in the agents' decision $m$ aking, $w$ th $T=0$ bringing us back to $a_{i}(`)=\arg m a x_{a} f p_{i a}(`) g$, and $w$ ith purely random strategy selection for $\mathrm{T}=1$.

Upon translating our $m$ icroscopic law $\left(\underline{(1)}, \bar{彳}_{1} \bar{T}_{1}\right)$ into the language of the valuation
 new dynam ical variables $f_{i}(`) g$, so that perturbations of valuations (again for the
purpose of de ning response fiunctions later) can be im plem ented sim ply by replacing $q_{i}(`)!q_{i}(`)+{ }_{i}(`)$ w th $i(`) 2 R$. Thus we arrive at the follow ing closed equations, de ning our generalized $S=2 \mathrm{M}$ G process:

$$
\begin{align*}
& q_{i}(`+1)=q_{i}(`)+{ }_{i}(`) \quad \tilde{N^{\prime}}={ }^{X}{ }^{i} F \quad[` A ; Z] A(`) \tag{12}
\end{align*}
$$

$$
\begin{align*}
& \text { F } \quad[; A ; Z]=\frac{\mathrm{P}}{\mathrm{~N}} \quad ;(; \mathrm{A} ; \mathrm{Z}) \tag{13}
\end{align*}
$$

The values of $f A\left({ }^{\prime}\right) ; Z(`) g$ for ${ }^{\prime} \quad 0$ and of the $q(0) p l a y$ the role of initialconditions.
The key di erences at the $m$ athem atical level between MG models with fake history and those w ith true history as de ned above, are in the dependence of the $m$ icroscopic law son the past via the history string fA ( 1 );:::;A (` M )g occurring in \((` A ; Z) 2 f 1 ; 1 g^{M}\), in com bination $w$ th the presence and role of the zero-average G aussian random variables $\mathrm{fZ}\left({ }^{\prime} ;\right.$ ) $g$.

### 2.2. M athem atical consequences of having real history

In allgenerating functionalanalyses ofM G swhich have been published so far, the choioe $=1$ elim inated w ith one stroke of the pen the dependence of the process on the history fA (` 1);:::;A (` M ) g. The variables fZ (';1);:::;Z (';M )g could subsequently be replaced sim ply by integer numbers , labeling each of the $2^{M}=p=N$ possible pseudo-histories' that could have been drawn at any given tim e step '. Here this is no longer possible. The variables fZ ('; ) g now play the role of random disturbances of the true $m$ anket history as perceived by the agents, and there is no reason why all possible histories should occur (let alone w th equal frequencies) or why som e entries fZ ('; )g (e.g. those $w$ th $s m$ all values of , which corrupt the $m$ ost recent past in the history string) could not be m ore im portant than others. The problem has becom e qualitatively di erent. O ne can thus anticipate variousm athem atical consequences for the generating functional analysis of introducing history into the M G. An early appreciation of these $w$ ill help us to proceed w ith the calculation $m$ ore e ciently.

Firstly, we will have to analyze the original on-line version of the M G; the batch version can no longer exist by de nition, since it involves averaging by hand over all possible histories' at each iteration step. H ow ever, the tem poral regularization $m$ ethod of [ī] on introducing Poissonnian distributed real-valued random durations for the individual
 The reason for this is the problem which prom pted the authors of $[1 \overline{1} 01]$ to add the extemalperturbations $i$ (') to the regularized on-line process rather than to the original
equations: whereas in a $M$ arkov chain the introduction of random durations for the individualiteration steps only im plies a harm less uncertainty in w here we are on the tim e axis, in a system w ith retarded interactions one would generate very $m$ essy equations. W e m ust therefore proceed w ith our process as it is, w ithout tem poral regularization (although we will be able to recover the previous theory in the lim it ! 1, as it should). It will in fact tum out that the more direct application of the generating functional $m$ ethod presented in this paper brings the bene $t$ of greater transparency. For instance, the continuity assum ptions underlying our use of saddle-point argum ents in path integrals becom em uch m ore clear than they were in [1] $\overline{1}]$. A $s$ alw ays we continue to concentrate on the evaluation and disorder averaging of the generating functional

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left.Z[\quad]=h e^{i^{\mathrm{P}}} \quad{ }^{\mathrm{P}}>0_{i} \quad i(\Upsilon)\left[q_{i}(\Upsilon) z_{i}( \urcorner\right)\right] i \tag{16}
\end{equation*}
$$

 random ness is here caused by the decision noise fz (') $g$ and the fake history variables fZ ( $;$ ) g. A though ( $(\overline{1} \overline{-} \overline{-})$ looks like the corresponding expressions for batch M G s, here we have to allow for ' $=O(\mathbb{N})$. Studying the un-regularized process also im plies that one has to bem ore carefulw ith nite size corrections. This has consequences in w orking out the disorder average of the generating functional: in previous M G versions one needed only the rst two moments of the distribution of the strategy look-up table entries. Here, although one must still expect only the rst two moments to play a role in the
nal theory, the need to keep track initially of the nite size correction term s im plies that our equations sim plify considerably if, instead ofbinary strategy entries, we choose the variables $f R^{i a} g$ to be zero-average and unit-variance $G$ aussian variables.

It w ill tum out that in our analysis of (1-1/) an im portant role w illbe played by the follow ing quantity:

$$
\begin{align*}
\bar{W}\left[{ }^{\prime}{ }^{0} ; A ; Z\right] & =\frac{1}{N}^{X} F\left[{ }^{\prime} ; A ; Z\right]\left[{ }^{0} ; A ; Z\right] \\
& =\left({ }^{0} ; A ; Z\right) ;\left({ }^{(0)} ; A ; Z\right) \tag{17}
\end{align*}
$$

This ob ject is a function of the paths fA $g$ and $f Z g$, and indicates whether or not the histories as perceived by the agents at tim es ' and ${ }^{10}$ are identical (irrespective of the extent to which these histories' are true). Its statistics are trivial in the absence of history, but will here generally contain inform ation regarding the recurrence of overall bid trajectories. For reasons of economy we will form ulate our theory in term $s$ of
 unnecessary future repetition, since it $w$ ill allow for $m$ ost of the theory to be applied also to M G m odels w ith inner product rather than look-up table de nitons for the

3. The disorder averaged generating functional

### 3.1. Evaluation of the disorder average

$R$ ather than rst writing the $m$ icroscopic process in probabilistic form, as in $\left.{ }_{[ }^{[1]-1} 10\right]$, we w ill express the generating functional ( $1 \overline{-1}$ ) as an integral over all possible joint paths of the state vector $q$ and of the overall bid A, and insert appropriate -distributions to enforce the $m$ icroscopic dynam ical equations ( $\overline{1} \overline{\underline{2}} \overline{1} \overline{1} \overline{1} \overline{1})$, i.e.
(since our microscopic laws are of an iterative and causal form, they have unique solutions). To com pactify our equationswew illuse the short-hand $s_{i}\left({ }^{\prime}\right)=\left[q_{i}(`) ; z_{i}(`)\right]$. W e can now w rite the disorder average $\overline{Z[\text { ] of (1̄@) as follow s: }}$

The brackets $h:: i_{f z ; z}$ denote averaging over the $G$ aussian decision noise and the pseudofn em ory variables, and we have used the abbreviations ( $\underline{1}_{-1}^{0}$ ) . T he short-hand $D u=(2)^{\frac{1}{2}} e^{\frac{1}{2} u^{2}}$ and the previously introduced quantity $\bar{W}[:::]$ in $\left(\underline{1} \overline{1}_{1}\right)$ allow us to w rite the disorder average (over the independently distributed zero-average and unitvariance $\mathrm{R}^{\text {ia }}$ ) in the last line of ( $\overline{1} \bar{i}$ í $)$ as
 $N \quad{ }^{1}{ }^{\mathrm{P}}{ }_{i} S_{i}\left({ }^{\prime}\right){\theta_{i}\left({ }^{0}\right)}^{0}$, and $C\left({ }^{\prime} ;{ }^{0}\right)=N \quad{ }^{\mathrm{P}}{ }_{i} S_{i}\left({ }^{\prime}\right) S_{i}\left({ }^{0}\right)$, by inserting appropriate integrals
 (sim ilarly for other two-tim e observables) and $D A=Q_{>0}\left[d A(v)={ }^{\mathrm{P}} 2\right.$ ] (sim ilarly for $\hat{A})$. Initial conditions for the $q_{i}(0)$ are assum ed to be of the factorized form $p_{0}(q)={ }^{2}{ }_{i} p_{0}\left(q_{i}(0)\right)$. In anticipation of issues to arise in subsequent stages of our analysis, especially those related to the scaling w ith N of the number of individual Iterations of the process, we w ill also de ne the largest iteration step in the generating
functional as $\mathrm{max}_{\mathrm{m}}^{\mathrm{A}} \underset{\mathrm{Z}}{71}$ this allow s us to write $\overline{\mathrm{Z}[]_{\mathrm{P}}}$ in the form
w ith

$$
\begin{align*}
& =\frac{1}{N}^{\mathrm{X}}{ }_{i} \quad{ }^{*} Z^{2}{ }_{4}^{2}{ }_{=0}^{\text {Yax }} \frac{\left.\mathrm{dq}( \urcorner) \mathrm{dq}()^{3}\right)^{3}}{2} \mathrm{p}_{0}(\mathrm{q}(0)) \tag{22}
\end{align*}
$$

and w ith

$$
\begin{align*}
& \left.M \quad\left[{ }^{\prime}{ }^{0} ; A ; A \hat{A}\right]=\sim^{2} A(`) L\left({ }^{\prime} ;{ }^{0}\right) A\left({ }^{0}\right) \quad \sim \hat{A}(`) K\left({ }^{\prime} ;{ }^{0}\right) A\left({ }^{0}\right)+\hat{A}\left({ }^{0}\right) K\left({ }^{0} ;{ }^{0}\right) A(`)\right] \\
& +\hat{A}(`)\left[1+C\left({ }^{\prime}{ }^{0}\right)\right] \hat{A}\left({ }^{0}\right) \tag{24}
\end{align*}
$$

The $O\left(\begin{array}{l}2 \\ m a x\end{array} \log N\right)$ corrections in $(\underline{2} \underline{Q})$ are constants, which re ect the scaling with $N$ used in de ning the conjugate order param eters.

C om pared to the M arkovian (fake history) M G versions, we note that and take their conventional form $s$, and that all the com plications induced by having true $m$ arket history are concentrated in the function $[\mathrm{C} ; \mathrm{K} ; \mathrm{L}]$, which is now de ned in term s of a stochastic process for the overall bid A (') rather than being an explicit function of the order param eters (which had been the situation in all fake history versions of the gam e), and in the rem aining task to im plem ent an appropriate scaling w ith N of the tim e scale $m$ ax. W e can now also see the advantage in our earlier decision to de ne G aussian rather than binary look-up table entries. W ith the $N$-scaling of $m$ ax still pending, instead of $\left(\overline{1}_{1} \overline{9}_{1}\right)$, in the binary case we would have found
$G$ enerating functional analysis of $M$ inority $G$ am es $w$ ith realm arket histories


In this expression we see that, for ' m ax $=O(\mathbb{N}$ ), the di erent choiges of strategy look-up table entry distribution will give the sam e results only for those paths fA; Z g where the frequency of occurrence each of the $2^{M}$ possible histories is of order $O\left(\mathbb{N}^{1}\right)$. In the latter case the function $\mathrm{F} \quad[$ ';A;Z] scales e ectively inside sum $m$ ations over ' as $\mathrm{F} \quad[\because \mathrm{A} ; \mathrm{Z}]=\mathrm{O}\left(\mathbb{N}{ }^{\frac{1}{2}}\right)$, and we retum to $\left(\overline{1} \overline{\underline{1}} \overline{\mathrm{I}}_{1}\right)$. Thus, for non-G aussian distributions of the $f R^{\text {ia }} g$ at this stage of the G FA one either has to carry on $w$ ith the $m$ ore com plicated expression $(\overline{2} \bar{Z})$, which cannot be expressed in term $s$ of the order param eters fC ; $\mathrm{K} ; \mathrm{Lg}$, or one has to $m$ ake further assum ptions on the overall bid statistics, which (although tuming out to be correct) require validation a posteriori.

### 3.2. C anonical tim e scaling

For the on-line M G w ith random extemal inform ation (ie. w ith $=1$ ) it is known that the relevant time scale is $\mathrm{m}_{\mathrm{m}}=\mathrm{O}=(\mathbb{N})$. R ather than imposing the tim e scale ${ }_{\mathrm{m}} \mathrm{max}^{\prime}=\mathrm{O}(\mathbb{N})$ by hand, it is satisfactory to see that one can also extract this canonical


 $\hat{C}=\hat{K}=\hat{L}=0$. This leads to a trivial e ective single spin problem, which just describes a frozen state. This $m$ akes perfect sense in view of our de nitions 1 individual updates of the variables $q_{i}$ are of order $N^{\frac{1}{2}}$, so nothing can change on tim e-scales corresponding to only a nite num ber of titeration steps. T hus our present equations autom atically lead us to the choige ${ }_{\mathrm{m} \text { ax }}=O\left(\mathrm{l}_{\mathrm{N}}\right)$, where $\lim _{\mathrm{N}}!\mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{N}}=0$; the function will indeed scale di erently as soon $\mathrm{as} \mathrm{max}_{\mathrm{m}}$ is allowed to diverge with N. W e thus de ne max $=t_{m a x}={ }_{N}$, where $0 \quad t_{\text {max }}<1 \quad\left(\right.$ oforder $\left.N^{0}\right)$ and with $\lim _{N} 1_{1} N_{N}=0$. In order to obtain well-de ned lim its at the end in our con jugate order param eters according to $(\hat{C} ; \hat{K} ; \hat{L})!N^{2}(\hat{C} ; \hat{K} ; \hat{L})$. Furthem ore, for the perturbation elds $f_{i} ; i g$ to retain statistical signi cance they also will have to be re-scaled in the fam iliar manner, according to ( $\left.i_{i} i_{i}\right)!N^{1}\left(\sim_{i} ;{ }_{i}\right)$ (sim ilar to [1̄0̄1]). T he integrations over order param eters and con jugate order param eters in $(\underline{2} \underline{0}$ ) w ill now becom e path integrals for N ! 1 x .

It $w$ ill be convenient to introduce the follow ing e ective m easure:
$\mathrm{x} T$ his is the point, therefore, where the inevitable continuity assum ptions regarding our $m$ acroscopic dynam ic observables enter. In the present derivation these take a $m$ ore transparent form than in [1d], where they were hidden inside the details of the tem poral regularization.
 re-scaling of the con jugate order param eters, these three fiunctions acquire the follow ing form ( m odulo irrelevant constants):
with

It is clear that and now have proper $N$ ! 1 lim its. The canonical choice of ${ }_{N}$ is subsequently determ ined by the $m$ athem atical condition that $\lim _{N}!1 \quad[C ; K ; L] 0$, but nite. It follow s that '(20) is again dom inated by its physical saddle-point, and we are nearly back in fam iliar territory.

### 3.3. The saddle point equations

In order to elm inate the elds $f_{i}(`)$; $i(`) g$, and thereby sim plify our equations, we next extract the physicalm eaning ofour order param eters from the generating functionalby taking appropriate derivatives with respect to these elds. This gives

$$
\begin{align*}
& 0 \quad=\lim _{\mathrm{N}!1_{1}} \frac{1}{\mathrm{~N}}_{\mathrm{X}}^{\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{i}}\left({ }^{( }\right) @_{i}\left({ }^{0}\right)}=\mathrm{@}^{2} 1=\mathrm{q}\left({ }^{( }\right) \hat{q}\left({ }^{( }\right) \mathrm{i}_{\text {? }} \tag{33}
\end{align*}
$$

Thus at the physical saddle-point of $(\overline{2} \overline{0})$ we have the usual relations $L\left({ }^{\prime} ;{ }^{\circ}\right)=0$ and $K\left(' ;{ }^{10}\right)=$ iG $\left({ }^{\prime} ;{ }^{10}\right)$, where $G$ denotes the single-site response function. Upon varying $f \hat{C} ; \hat{K} ; \hat{L} g$ in $(\underline{2} \underline{\underline{q}})$ we reproduce self-consistently the by now standard equations

$$
\begin{align*}
& G\left(\because ;^{00}\right)=\text { ih }[q(9) ; z(9)] \hat{q}\left({ }^{(9)} i_{\text {? }}\right.  \tag{36}\\
& L\left(\because ;{ }^{0}\right)=h \hat{q}\left({ }^{\circ}\right) \hat{Q}\left({ }^{0}\right) i_{?}=0
\end{align*}
$$

W e tum to variation of the order param eters $\mathrm{fC} ; \mathrm{K} ; \mathrm{Lg}$ in + (as only depends on the conjugate order param eters). In working out derivatives of we observe that the conjugate bids e ectively act as di erential operators, ie $e \hat{A}(s)!\quad i \varrho=@ A_{e}(s) . T h i s$
gives us our rem aining three saddle point equations:

At the physical saddle-point, we m ay use $L=0$ and the sym m etry of $\bar{W}[:::]$ to sim plify the function $M\left[{ }^{\prime} ;{ }^{\wedge} ; A ; \hat{A}\right]$ which occurs in the m easure $(\overline{3} \overline{1} \overline{1})$ to

$$
\begin{equation*}
M\left[{ }^{\prime} ;{ }^{0} ; A ; \hat{A}\right]=\hat{A}(`)\left[1+C\left({ }^{\prime} ;{ }^{0}\right)\right] \hat{A}\left({ }^{0}\right) \quad 2 i \not 2 \hat{A}(`) G\left(`^{\prime}{ }^{0}\right) A\left({ }^{0}\right) \tag{41}
\end{equation*}
$$

The generating elds $\mathrm{f}_{\mathrm{i}}^{\sim}(`) g$ are now no longer needed and can be rem oved. The perturbations $\sim_{i}$ are still useful for calculating the response function $G$, but can be
 dependence. A lso the functions $f$; ; $g$ have at this stage becom e obsolete. We m ay de ne a new timet $=i_{N}=O\left(N^{0}\right)$, which willbe real-valued as $N$ ! 1 , and we may take the lim it N! 1 in the de nitions of our observables. T he latter can subsequently be written in term $s$ of the new real-valued tim e argum ents, $C$ ( ${ }^{\prime}{ }^{10}$ )! $C$ ( $t$; $t^{0}$ ) (and sim ilar for the other kemels).

## 4. The resulting theory

### 4.1. Sim pli cation of saddle-point equations

W e m ay now sum $m$ arize our saddle-point equations for $\mathrm{fC} ; \mathrm{Gg}$ in the usual com pact way, in term s of an e ective single agent process:

$$
\begin{equation*}
C\left(t ; t^{0}\right)=h \operatorname{sgn}[q(t)] \operatorname{sgn}\left[q\left(t^{0}\right)\right] i_{?} \quad G\left(t ; t^{0}\right)=\quad i h \operatorname{sgn}[q(t)]\left({ }^{0}(l) i_{?}\right. \tag{42}
\end{equation*}
$$

w ith a m easure which is de ned in term $s$ of path integrals, as in [1] [10] (and with time integrals running from $t=0$ to $t=t_{\text {max }}$ ):

$$
\begin{align*}
& M[f q ; \hat{q} ; z g]=p_{0}(q(0)) R^{e^{R}} d t q(t)\left[\frac{d}{d t} q(t) \quad(t) \quad{ }^{R} d t^{0} \hat{K}\left(t^{0} ; t\right) \quad\left[q\left(t^{0}\right) ; z\left(t^{0}\right)\right]\right]  \tag{43}\\
& e^{\left.i{ }^{R} \operatorname{dtdt}^{0} \hat{\tilde{H}}\left(t, t^{0}\right) q(t) \hat{q}\left(t^{0}\right)+\hat{C}\left(t, t^{0}\right) \quad[q(t) ; z(t)] \quad\left[q\left(t^{0}\right) ; z\left(t^{0}\right)\right]\right]} \tag{44}
\end{align*}
$$

 rem em bering that the lefthand sides as yet still involve the integer tim e labels ( $\mathrm{s} ; \mathrm{s}^{0}$ ), rather than the continuous times. Now the scaling chosen for ${ }_{\mathrm{N}}$ w ith N which we adopt w ill.be crucial. W e observe that all com plications are contained in the evaluation,
for large $N$ and for any given realization of the fake $m$ arket inform ation path $f Z g$, of ob jects of the follow ing general form (w ith all operators evaluated at the saddle-point) :

$$
\begin{equation*}
h Q[f A g] i_{f A \nsucceq g}=D^{Z} A D \hat{A} W\left[A ; \hat{A}-\_\right] Q[f A g] \tag{45}
\end{equation*}
$$

W e can con $m$, by repeating the steps taken in evaluating the disorder-averaged generating functional $\overline{\mathrm{Z}[\mathrm{]}}$ but now for calculating averages of arbitrary functions of the overallm arket bid path fA $g$, that the physical interpretation of the m easure ( $\overline{4} \overline{\bar{T}_{1}}$ ) is

$$
\begin{equation*}
\lim _{\mathrm{N}!1} \overline{\mathrm{hQ}[\mathrm{fA} g] \mathrm{i}}=\mathrm{hQ}[£ A g] i_{\mathrm{fA} \mathrm{Zg}}{ }_{\mathrm{fZ} g} \tag{46}
\end{equation*}
$$

Thus ( path' fA $g$ ofglobalbids, for a given realization of the fake history path fZ $g$. To evaluate (4픈) we introduce two path-dependent $m$ atrioes $G[A ; Z]$ and $D[A ; Z]$, w ith entries

$$
\begin{align*}
& G[A ; Z]\left({ }^{\prime}{ }^{10}\right)=\bar{W}\left[{ }^{0} ;{ }^{0} ; A ; Z\right] G\left(\because ;{ }^{0}\right)  \tag{47}\\
& D[A ; Z]\left(` ;{ }^{0}\right)=\bar{W}\left[{ }^{0} ;{ }^{0} ; A ; Z\right]\left[1+C\left({ }^{0} ;{ }^{\circ}\right)\right] \tag{48}
\end{align*}
$$

 identical to that observed at stage ${ }^{\circ}$, and zero otherw ise, and sim ilarly for the relation betw een $D[A ; Z]\left(\because ;{ }^{\circ}\right)$ and $1+C\left(\imath ;{ }^{\circ}\right)$. W e now use auxiliary integration variables $f$. $g$ to linearize the term in the exponent of ( $\overline{4} \overline{5})$ whidh is quadratic in $\hat{A}$, and use causality of the response function $G$ where appropriate:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& =\mathrm{Zh}^{\mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{m}}^{Z^{K}}={ }_{N}} \mathrm{dA}\left(\text { ' }^{i} \mathrm{Q}\right. \text { [fA g] }
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { f } \begin{array}{c}
\mathrm{A} ; \mathrm{Zg} \\
\text { g }
\end{array}
\end{aligned}
$$

 dependent covariance $h, ~{ }^{0} i_{f} \nexists ; Z g=\frac{1}{2} D[A ; Z]\left({ }^{\prime} ;{ }^{\circ}\right)$. W e conclude from our expression for hQ [fA $g] i_{f A}{ }_{\mathrm{fz}}$ g that the conditionaldisorder-averaged probability density P [fA gjif g] for nding a bid path fA $g$, given a realization $f Z g$ of the pseudo-history, is given by
 f $74 ; \mathrm{Zg}$
 $(\underline{4}-\overline{9})$ is norm alized, since both , and $G[A ; Z]\left({ }^{\prime} ;{ }^{10}\right)$ involve only entries of the paths fA; Z g w ith tim es k< '.
 We immediately nd that $\hat{C}=0$. To sim plify com parison $w$ th the theory of [1] $]$ (corresponding to $=1$ ), we willm ake a nalchange in notation and put

$$
\begin{equation*}
\hat{K}\left(\imath^{\prime}{ }^{0}\right)=R\left({ }^{Q} ;{ }^{\Upsilon}\right) \quad \hat{L}\left(\because ;{ }^{0}\right)=\frac{1}{2} i\left(\because ;{ }^{0}\right) \tag{50}
\end{equation*}
$$

This allow sus, w th $p=N$ and in anticipation of our expected tim e scaling ${ }_{N}=\sim=2 p$ (know $n$ from the analysis in [1̄] $]$ of the $M$ arkovian $\lim$ it $=1$ ), to w rite the rem aining equations ( $\overline{3} \overline{9}, \overline{4} 0 \overline{0})$ in the sim ple form
$W$ e see that $R$ de nes a response function associated $w$ ith extemalbid perturbation, and hence obeys causality: $R\left({ }^{\prime} ;{ }^{0}\right)=0$ for ${ }^{10}>$. This, in tum, enables us to sim plify equations ( $\overline{4} \overline{2}$ ) for fC; Gg and the $m$ easure $h:: i_{\text {? }}$ to a form identical to that found in [1]Ō] for the M arkovian ('ake history') on-line M G:

$$
\begin{align*}
& C\left(t ; t^{0}\right)=h[q(t) ; z(t)]\left[q(t) ; z\left(t^{0}\right)\right] i_{?}  \tag{53}\\
& G\left(t ; t^{0}\right)=\frac{\sim}{\sim}(t) h[q(t) ; z(t)] i_{\text {? }} . \tag{54}
\end{align*}
$$

$$
\begin{align*}
& M \text { [fq; zg] }=p_{0}(q(0)) \text { fdqg } e^{\frac{1}{2} d^{R} d t d t^{0} \quad\left(t, t^{0}\right) q(t) \&\left(t^{0}\right)}  \tag{55}\\
& e_{\dot{i}^{i}}^{R} d t q(t)\left[\frac{d}{d t} q(t) \quad \sim(t)+\quad{ }^{R} d t^{0} R\left(t, t^{0}\right) \quad\left[q\left(t^{0}\right) ; z\left(t^{0}\right)\right]\right] \tag{56}
\end{align*}
$$

### 4.2. Sum $m$ ary and interpretation

W e recognize that ( $\overline{5} \overline{\underline{G}})$ describes the usual e ective singletrader equation $w$ ith a retarded self-interaction and zero-average Gaussian noise (t) w ith covariances $h(t)(l) i=\left(t ; t^{0}\right)$ :

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{d}{d t} q(t)=\sim(t) \quad{ }_{0}^{\mathrm{t}} d t^{0} R\left(t ; t^{0}\right) \quad\left[q\left(t^{0}\right)\right]+{ }^{p-\quad(t)} \tag{57}
\end{equation*}
$$

W e have used the fact, as in [1] $\overline{1}]$, that the discontinuity of the correlation function for equal tim es, i.e. $C(t ; t)=1, w i l l$ in the continuous tim e lim it be irrelevant. This im plies that we m ay carry out the averages over the decision noise and are left only w ith expressions involving $[q]={ }^{R} d z P(z)[q ; z]$, and that ( $w$ ith the exclusion of $t=t^{0}$, where one has $C(t ; t)=1)$ the order param eter equations $(\overline{5} \overline{3}, 1, \overline{5} \overline{4})$ sim plify to

$$
\begin{equation*}
C\left(t ; t^{0}\right)=h[q(t)]\left[q\left(t^{0}\right)\right] i_{?} \quad G\left(t ; t^{0}\right)=\frac{\sim}{\sim}(t) h \quad[q(t)] i_{?} \tag{58}
\end{equation*}
$$

O ur rem aining problem is to solve the order param eters fR; 9 from $(5152)$. To do so we m ust select the canonical tim e scale ${ }_{\mathrm{N}}$ such that the N ! 1 lim it in (
is both non-trivial (ie. n su ciently small) and well-de ned (i.e. n not too sm all). For the special value $=1$ we know '[1-1 ${ }_{1}$ ] that ${ }_{\mathrm{N}}=\sim=2 \mathrm{p}$. A though here we have follow ed a di erent route tow ards a continuous tim e description, we show in "Appendix 'Ā.' that indeed $n=\sim=2 p$, by working out our present equations in detail for the fake history lim it ! 1. G iven this canonical tim e scaling and given the de nition


$$
\begin{align*}
& R\left(t ; t^{0}\right)=\lim _{N!0} \overline{A_{e}\left(t^{0}\right)}  \tag{59}\\
& { }^{\mathrm{DD}} \text { A (`) } \\
& \text { EE } \\
& \left(t ; t^{0}\right)=\sim \lim _{\mathrm{N}!} \frac{1}{\mathrm{~N}}^{\mathrm{DD}} \mathrm{~A}(\mathrm{Y}) \mathrm{A}\left({ }^{0}\right) \tag{60}
\end{align*}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \mathrm{EE} \\
& \text { ( } \left.{ }^{\prime} \text { A ; Z ) ; ( }{ }^{0} ; \mathrm{A} ; \mathrm{Z}\right) \quad \mathrm{fA} ; \mathrm{Z} \mathrm{~g} \quad=\mathrm{t}={ }_{\mathrm{N}} \quad ;^{\mathrm{N}=}=\mathrm{t}^{0}={ }_{\mathrm{N}}
\end{aligned}
$$

w th $=\mathrm{A}_{\mathrm{e}}(\Upsilon)={ }_{\mathrm{N}}{ }^{1} \mathrm{C}=@ \mathrm{~A}(\Upsilon)$. H ere hh: : : $\mathrm{i}_{\mathrm{A}} ; \mathrm{z}$ refers to an average over the stochastic process ( $(\overline{-} \overline{-})$ ) for the overallbids $f A g$ and over the pseudo-history $f Z \mathrm{~g}$. The bid evolution process can be written in $m$ ore explicit form as
$w$ th the zero-average $G$ aussian random elds $f g$, characterized by

$$
\begin{equation*}
\text { h , } \quad \circ i_{f} ; A ; Z g=\frac{1}{2}\left[1+C\left({ }^{(1)}{ }^{\circ}\right)\right] \quad(\because A ; Z) ; \quad\left({ }^{0} ; A ; Z\right) \tag{62}
\end{equation*}
$$

Equation ( $\left.\overline{6}_{6} \overline{1} \overline{1}^{\prime}\right)$ is to be interpreted as follow s. For every realization fZ g of the fake history path' one iterates $(\underline{6} \overline{1} \overline{1})$ to $n d$ successive bid values upon generating the zeroaverage G aussian random variables , with statistics $(\overline{6} \overline{2})$ ) (which depend, in tum, on the recent bid realizations). The result is averaged over the fake history paths $f Z \mathrm{~g}$.

Let us now sum $m$ arize the structure of the present theory describing the M G w ith truem arket history in the $\lim$ it $N$ ! 1 , by indicating the sim ilarities and the di erences with the previous theory describing the on-line M G w ithout m arket history:
sim ilarities betw een the theory of real and fake history M G s:
The MG with real history is described again by the e ective single agent equation ( $5 \mathbf{5} \mathbf{D}_{1} \overline{1}$ ), from which the usual order dynam ical order param eters fC; Gg

The scaling with N of the characteristic tim es in the M G w ith history is identical to that of the M G w thout history, if we avoid highly biased global bid initializations (where the M G w ith history acts faster by a factor $\overline{\mathrm{N}}$ ).
di erences betw een the theory of real and fake history M G s:
Real and fake history M Gsdi er in the retarded self-interaction kemel R and the noise covariance kemel of the single agent equation. W ithout history, $f R$; $g$ were found as explicit functions of $f C$; $G . W$ ith history they are to be solved from an e ective equation '( 6 ( $\overline{1}$ ) for the evolving globalbid.
the e ective globalbid process:
The e ective global bid processi-( $\overline{\text { ( }}$ ( ) is itself independent of the stochastic e ective single trader process $!(\overline{5} \overline{7})$. The two are linked only via the (time dependent) order param eters occurring in their de nitions.
At each stage in the processi- ( $\overline{1} 1$ ), the bid A ( 9 ) is coupled directly only to bids in the past at tim es ${ }^{10} w$ th identical realization of the $M$ boit history string. In addition, only those e ective globalbid noise variables , are correlated which correspond to tim es ' $w$ th identical realizations of the $M$ bit history string.
The di erences between the two Yake history' de nitionsi- ${ }^{3}=14$ ) (i.e. consistent versus inconsistent) are seen to be lim ited to the details of the averaging process $\mathrm{h}:: \mathrm{i}_{\mathrm{fz} \mathrm{g}}$.
 in the fake history lim it ! 1. This exercise serves two purposes. Firstly, it con m s that the canonical tim e scale of our process is indeed given by ${ }_{\mathrm{n}}=\sim=2 \mathrm{p}$ ( m odulo an irrelevant multiplicative constant). M ore im portantly, being the sim plest instance of our presently studied class of M G m odels, it provides useful intuition on how we m ight proceed to nd solutions of our e ective processesi' ( $\left.\overline{5} \mathbf{j}_{7}^{-}, \overline{1} 1\right)$ in the general case.

## 5. The role of history statistics

W e continue with our analysis of the fiull M G w ith history, and next show that all the e ects induced by having realm arket history can be concentrated in the statistics of the $M$ boit $m$ em ory strings of $(\overline{1} \overline{5})$. M ore speci cally, the core ob jects in the theory will tum out to be the follow ing functions, which m easure the joint probability to nd identicalhistories in thee ective globalbid process '( $\overline{6} \overline{7})$ at $k$ speci ed tim es $f_{1}$; : : : ; ${ }_{k} \mathrm{k}$, relative to the probability $p^{k}$ for this to happen in the case of random ly drawn fake histories and non-identical tim es:

$$
\begin{equation*}
k\left(\Upsilon_{1} ;::: ; \grave{k}_{k}\right)=\mathrm{p}^{\mathrm{k} 1^{\mathrm{X}}} \mathrm{~m}_{\mathrm{i}=1}^{\mathrm{Y}^{\mathrm{k}}} \quad ;\left({ }_{i} ; A ; Z\right) \dot{\mathrm{i}}_{\mathrm{fA} ; Z g} \tag{63}
\end{equation*}
$$

$W^{2}$ e have abbreviated ${ }^{P}={ }^{P} \quad 2 f 1 ; 1 g^{M}$, w ith $2^{M}=p=N$. For any value of $k$ one recovers in the random history $\lim$ it and for non-identicaltim es $\lim !l_{\mathrm{p}}(:::)=1$. For

(i.e. when allow ing for real histories) and $k>1$ the functions

### 5.1. Reduction of the kemels $f R$; $g$

W e will follow as much as possible the steps which we took in 'AMpendix in in order to

and we form ally invert the operator on the lefthand side, using $\mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{N}}=\sim=2 \mathrm{p}$ :

$$
\begin{align*}
& \mathrm{h}_{Y^{r}} \quad\left({ }_{i} A ; Z\right) ; \quad\left({ }_{i} ; A ; Z\right) \quad\left[A_{e}\left(Y_{r}\right)+\quad{ }_{r}\right]  \tag{64}\\
& i=1
\end{align*}
$$

Expression ( $\overline{6} \overline{4} \overline{1})$ is itself not yet a solution of ( $\overline{6} \overline{1} \overline{1})$, since the bids fA ( s ) g also occur inside
 and consider only in nitesim alextemalbid perturbations $A_{e}$, so that we need not worry about indirect e ects on $A(`)$ of these perturbations via the history strings ( $\mathrm{s} ; \mathrm{A} ; \mathrm{Z}$ ):

$$
\begin{align*}
& r+1\left({ }_{0} ;::: \boldsymbol{r}_{r}{ }_{r}\right) \quad{ }_{0}=\frac{t}{N} ;_{r}=\frac{t^{0}}{N} \tag{65}
\end{align*}
$$

Sim ilarly we can insert $(\overline{6} \overline{4})$ into $(\overline{6} \overline{0} \overline{1})$, again with $A_{e}$ ! 0 , and nd

$$
\begin{aligned}
& { }_{1}^{0}:::{ }_{r}^{0} \\
& \text { hYr in } Y^{K^{0}} \text { i } \mathrm{EE} \stackrel{9}{=}
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{align*}
& { }_{1}^{0}:::{ }_{r}^{0} \\
& r+r^{0}+2\left({ }_{0} ;::: ;{ }_{r} ;{ }_{0}^{0} ;::: ;_{r^{0}}^{0}\right) \quad{ }_{0}=\frac{t}{\mathrm{~N}} ;{ }_{0}^{0}=\frac{t^{0}}{\mathrm{~N}} \tag{66}
\end{align*}
$$

 a factor $N$ to generate an integral, w hereas pairw ise identicaltim es in ( $\overline{6} \bar{\sigma} \bar{G})$ leave a bare' factor N but w illalso cause $\mathrm{r}+\mathrm{r}^{0}+2$ (:: :) to gain a factor $p=\sim=2_{\mathrm{N}}$ in com pensation.

Since the single agent process ( $\left.\overline{5} \overline{7} \overline{1}_{1}\right)$ is linked to the globalbid process ( $\left.\overline{6} \overline{1} \overline{1}\right)$ only via the kemels fR ; $\quad$, we conclude from ( $\overline{6} \overline{\bar{j}}, \overline{6} \bar{\sigma})$ (which are still fully exact) that the e ects of having true $m$ arket history are concentrated solely in the resulting history statistics as described by the functions $(\underline{\bar{\sigma}} \overline{3})$. . M ore speci cally, there is no need for us to solve the globalbid process (

### 5.2. T im e-translation invariant stationary states

In fully ergodic and tim e-translation invariant states without anom alous response, we could in Yake history' M G versions nd exact closed equations for persistent order param eters $w$ thout having to solve for the kemels $f C ; G g$ in full, and locate phase transitions exactly. T his suggests that the sam em ay be true for $M G s w$ ith true history. $T$ hus we $m$ ake the standard tim e-translation invariance (TTI) ansatz for the kemels in ( $\overline{5}_{1} \overline{1}_{1}$ ) and for the correlation-and response functions:

$$
\left.\begin{array}{lll}
C\left(t ; t^{0}\right) & =C(t & l
\end{array}\right) \quad G\left(t ; t^{0}\right)=G(t \quad l)
$$

w th $={ }_{0}^{\mathrm{R}_{1}} \mathrm{dt} R(\mathrm{t})$ nite. It tums out that several relations betw een persistent observables in TTI stationary states of the present non M arkovian M G process, if such states again exist, can be established on the basis of ( $\overline{5} \overline{7}_{1}$ ) alone. Upon follow ing established notation conventions and abbreviating time averages as $\overline{\mathrm{f}}=$


$$
\begin{equation*}
\overline{\mathrm{dq}=\mathrm{dt}}=\bar{\sim} \quad{ }_{\mathrm{R}} \quad-\mathrm{P}_{+}- \tag{67}
\end{equation*}
$$

with ${ }_{R}={ }_{R_{1}}^{0} d t R(t)$. We may now de ne the fam iliar e ective agent trajectories corresponding to $d k l e$ versus frozen agents as those $w$ th either $d q=d t=0$ or $d q=d t$, respectively. For frozen agents, consistency dem ands that sgn [ ] = sgn [dq=dt]. It then follow s from ( $\left.\overline{6} \overline{-1} \bar{i}_{1}\right)$ that the (at least for ${ }_{R}>0$ com plem entary and $m$ utually exchusive) conditions for having a ' dkle' or a 'frozen' solution can be w ritten as follow s:

$$
\begin{align*}
& \text { ckle: } \bar{j}+{ }^{\mathrm{P}}-_{j} \quad \text { R }[1] ; \quad-=\frac{\bar{\sim}_{+} \mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{j}}-}{\mathrm{R}}  \tag{68}\\
& \text { frozen : } \bar{j}+{ }^{\mathrm{P}}-_{j>} \quad \text { R }[1] ; \quad-=[1]: \operatorname{sgn} \frac{\mathrm{h}^{\bar{\sim}}+\mathrm{P}--i}{R} \tag{69}
\end{align*}
$$

W hich solution of $(\overline{6} \overline{-1})$ ) and $(\overline{6} \overline{9})$ wew ill nd depends on the realization of the noise term - , which is a frozen $G$ aussian variable $w$ th zero expectation value and with variance

$$
\begin{equation*}
S_{0}^{2}=h^{-2} i_{?}=\lim _{!1} \frac{1}{2}_{0}^{\mathrm{z}} \operatorname{dtdt}^{0} \quad\left(t ; \ell^{0}\right)=(1) \tag{70}
\end{equation*}
$$

W em ay now proceed as in 'AApendix' tow ards the calculation of the persistent order param eters , and $c_{r}$ where denotes the fraction of frozen agents in the stationary state, where $={ }_{0}^{R_{1}} d t G(t)$, and $w$ ith

$$
\begin{equation*}
c=\lim _{t!1} C(t)=\lim _{!1} \frac{1}{2}_{0}^{z} d_{0} d d t^{0} h[q(t)]\left[q\left(t^{0}\right)\right] i_{?}=h^{-2} i_{?} \tag{71}
\end{equation*}
$$

U pon introducing the short-hand $u=P-{ }_{R} \quad[1]=S_{0}{ }^{\mathrm{P}} \overline{2}$, and upon using the conditions and relations $\left(\overline{6} \bar{\sigma}_{1}, \bar{\sigma} \bar{\sigma}_{9}\right)$, we nd in the lim it $^{\sim}$ ! 0 of vanishing extemal elds:

$$
\begin{align*}
& =1 \quad \operatorname{Erf}[u] \tag{72}
\end{align*}
$$

$G$ enerating functional analysis of $M$ inority $G$ am es $w$ ith realm arket histories

$$
\begin{align*}
& +h_{R} \quad[1] \quad \underset{j}{i} \sum^{i}-2 \text { ) } \\
& ={ }^{2}[1]^{n} 1 \quad \operatorname{Erf}[u]+\frac{1}{2 u^{2}} \operatorname{Erf}[u] \quad \frac{1}{u^{P}}=e^{u^{2}}  \tag{73}\\
& =\frac{Z}{S_{0}^{P}-\frac{d}{2}} e^{\frac{1}{2}-2=S_{0}^{2}} \frac{Q^{-}}{@(-)} \\
& =\operatorname{Erf}[\mathrm{u}]={ }_{\mathrm{R}} \tag{74}
\end{align*}
$$

Hence, in order to nd the TTIstationary solution $f$; $; ~ g$ and the phase transition point (de ned by ! 1 ), we only need to extract expressions for ${ }_{R}$ and $S_{0}$ from the stochastic overall bid process ( $\overline{6} \overline{1} 1 \mathbf{1})$. U sing ( $\overline{6} \overline{5}, \mathbf{\prime}, \bar{\sigma} \overline{6})$, the latter can be w ritten as

$$
\begin{aligned}
& { }_{R}={ }_{0}^{Z_{1}} d t R(t)
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{align*}
& { }^{X} \quad G\left(\begin{array}{ll}
0 & 0 \\
0 & 1
\end{array}\right)::: G\left(\begin{array}{ll}
0 & \\
r & 1
\end{array}\right)\left[1+C\left(\begin{array}{ll}
r_{r} & { }_{r}^{0}
\end{array}\right)\right]
\end{align*}
$$

### 5.3. T T I states w ith short history correlation tim es

C aloulating the history statistics kemels ( $\overline{6} \overline{\overline{3}})$ ) from the globalbid process $(\overline{6} \overline{1} 1 \overline{1})$ is hard, but in those cases where the history correlation tim $e L_{h}$ ( $m$ easured in individual iterations ソ) in the process is m uch sm aller than $N$, we can $m$ ake progress in our analysis of T T I stationary states. $W$ e de ne the asym ptotic frequency ( $\mathrm{A} ; \mathrm{Z}$ ) at which history string occurs in a given realization $\mathrm{fA} ; \mathrm{Z}$ g of our process ( $\overline{6} \overline{1} \overline{1}$ ) as

$$
\begin{equation*}
(A ; Z)=\lim _{L!1} \frac{1}{\mathrm{~L}} \mathrm{X}_{\imath=1}^{\mathrm{L}} \quad ; \quad(; A ; Z) \tag{77}
\end{equation*}
$$

Obviously ${ }^{P} \quad(A ; Z)=1$. For $=1$ (no history) we would have $=p^{1}$ for all
. We may also de ne the distribution o (f) of these asym ptotic history frequencies
( $A ; Z$ ), relative to the benchm ark homem ory' values $p^{1}$, and averaged over the globalbid process ( $\overline{6} \overline{1} 1 \mathbf{1})$ in the in nite system size (i.e. continuous tim e) lim it:

O ur de nitions guarantee that ${ }_{0}^{\mathrm{R}_{1}}$ df $\mathrm{f} \%(\mathrm{f})=1$ for any . For $=1$ we simply recover $\%(f)=\left[\begin{array}{ll}\mathrm{f} & 1\end{array}\right]$, i.e. all histories occur equally frequently. W e have not yet show n that


Figu re 1. Typical exam ples of history frequency distributions (7d) as m easured in sim ulations of the on-line M G w ithout decision noise but with fullhistory (i.e. $=0$ ), after equilibration. H ere $N=8193$. Left: $=0: 125$ (in the non-ergodic regim e of the M G , below c). Right: $=2: 0$ (in the ergodic regim e, above c).
the lim it in ( $\overline{\text { In }} \overline{-1})$ exists, i.e. that the history frequencies do indeed generally scale as
$(A ; Z)=O\left(N{ }^{1}\right)$. N um erical sim ulations, how ever, con $m$ quite convincingly that this ansatz is indeed correct (see e.g. Figure'i-1').

If $L_{h}$ is the history correlation tim e in the process ( $(\overline{6} \overline{1})$ ), then nite sam ples of history occurrence frequencies can be expected to approach the asym ptotic value (

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{1}{2 L}_{0=V^{\prime}}^{\dot{X}^{L}} \quad ;\left({ }^{(0 ; A ; Z)}=(A ; Z)^{h} 1+O\left(\left(L_{h}=L\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\right)^{i}\right. \tag{79}
\end{equation*}
$$

 where only time strings $f_{1} ;:::: ;{ }_{k} g$ w ith mutual tem poral separations of order $O(\mathbb{N})$ will survive the lim it ${ }_{\mathrm{N}}$ ! 0 , we m ay choose e.g. $\mathrm{L}={ }^{\mathrm{P}} \overline{\mathrm{L}_{\mathrm{h}} \mathrm{N}}$ and e ectively replace

$$
\begin{equation*}
{ }_{r+1}\left(1_{1} ;::: ;_{r} ; 0\right)!p^{r^{X}} \quad\left[1+O\left(\bar{L}_{h}=N\right)\right]{ }^{r+1} \tag{80}
\end{equation*}
$$

This results in

$$
\begin{align*}
& { }_{R}=\lim _{p!1} \frac{1}{\mathrm{p}} \mathrm{x}_{\mathrm{x}}^{\mathrm{x}} \mathrm{X}_{0} \quad \mathrm{f} p \quad\left[1+\mathrm{O}\left(\overline{\mathrm{~L}_{\mathrm{h}}=\mathrm{L}}\right)\right]^{\mathrm{r}+1} \\
& =\lim _{p!1} \frac{1}{\mathrm{p}} \frac{\mathrm{p} \quad\left[1+\mathrm{O}\left(\overline{\mathrm{q}} \overline{\mathrm{~L}_{\mathrm{h}}=\mathrm{N}}\right)\right]}{1+\mathrm{p}\left[1+\mathrm{O}\left(\overline{L_{h}=N}\right)\right]}=\mathrm{Z}_{1} d f \%(f) \frac{\mathrm{f}}{1+\mathrm{f}} \tag{81}
\end{align*}
$$

(provided indeed $\lim _{\mathrm{N}}!1 \mathrm{~L}_{\mathrm{h}}=\mathrm{N}=0$ ). The sam e sim pli cation to an expression involving only the distribution \% (f) can be achieved in (ī̄̄), but there we have to be m ore careful in dealing w th the occurrences of sim ilar or identical tim es in the argum ent of ( $\left.\overline{6} \overline{3} \overline{3}_{1}\right)$. W e rst rew rite '

$$
\text { for all i2 f0;:::;rg : }{ }_{i}={ }_{j=i}^{X^{r}} S_{j}
$$

This gives, using $\lim _{s!1} G(s)=0$ (i.e. restricting ourselves to ergodic states $w$ ith norm al response):

Each time summation is compensated either by a factor ${ }_{\mathrm{N}}$ (giving an integral), or lim ited in range by $L$ and com pensated by an associated factor $L{ }^{1}$, so that any pairing' where two (or more) tim es are close to each other (relative to the correlation time $\mathrm{L}_{\mathrm{h}}$ ) will not survive the combined lim its ${ }_{\mathrm{N}}!0$ and $\mathrm{L}!1$. Thuswemay again put

$$
\begin{equation*}
{ }_{x+r^{0}+2}(::::::)^{r+r^{0}+1} X \quad\left[1+O\left(\bar{L}_{h}=N\right)\right]^{r+r^{0}+2} \tag{82}
\end{equation*}
$$

and nd, with C (1) = c:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& S_{0}^{2}=(1+c) \lim _{p!1} \frac{1}{p} \sum_{r ; r^{0}}^{x} \quad\left(\quad r^{x+r^{0}} p \quad\left[1+O\left(\bar{L}_{h}=N\right)\right]\right]^{r+r^{0}+2}
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{align*}
& =(1+c)^{Z_{1}}{ }_{0} \mathrm{df} \% \text { (f) } \frac{\mathrm{f}^{2}}{(1+\mathrm{f})^{2}} \tag{83}
\end{align*}
$$

Since only ${ }_{R}$ and $S_{0}$ are needed to solve our e ective single agent process in TTI stationary states, we see that upon $m$ aking the ansatz of short history correlation tim es $L_{h} \quad N$ the e ects of history on the persistent order param eters in the M G are fully concentrated in the distribution \% ( $£$ ) of history frequencies, as de ned by '( $\overline{7} \bar{p})$. O nce $\%$ ( $f$ ) has been extracted from the process ( $\left(\underline{6} \bar{j}_{-1}\right)$, the T T I order param eters are given by the solution of the follow ing set of equations:

$$
\begin{align*}
& \left.u=\frac{\left[1{\underset{p}{p}}_{p}^{S_{R}}\right.}{S_{0}} \quad=\frac{1}{R} \quad=1 \quad \operatorname{Erffu}\right]  \tag{84}\\
& c={ }^{2}[1]^{n} 1 \quad \operatorname{Erf}[u]+\frac{1}{2 u^{2}} \operatorname{Erf}[u] \quad \frac{1}{u^{p}}=e^{u^{2}}  \tag{85}\\
& \mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{R}}^{\mathrm{Z}} \mathrm{O}_{0} \mathrm{df} \%(\mathrm{f}) \frac{\mathrm{f}}{1+\mathrm{f}}  \tag{86}\\
& S_{0}^{2}=(1+C){ }_{0}^{Z} \text { df \% (f) } \frac{f^{2}}{(1+f)^{2}} \tag{87}
\end{align*}
$$

For $=1$ (the fake history lim it) we have $\%(f)=\left[\begin{array}{ll}f & 1] \text {, leading to } \\ R\end{array}=(1+\quad)^{1}\right.$ and $\left.S_{0}=\mathrm{P} \frac{1+\mathrm{C}}{1+1+}\right)$, and the above equations are seen to reduce to the corresponding ones in $[100]$ O- 1 , as they should.

## 6. C alculating the history statistics

Upon making the ansatz of short history correlation times in the MG, we have show $n$ that nding closed equations for persistent T T I order param eters boils down to
 rem aining program $m$ e of analysis is: (i) nding an expression for \% (f), (ii) expressing this distribution in term $s$ of the persistent order param eters $\mathrm{fC}_{;} ;$; $_{\mathrm{R}} ; \mathrm{S}_{0} \mathrm{~g}_{\text {, }}$ and (iii) con m ing retrospectively the consistency of assum ing short history correlation tim es.

### 6.1. The m om ents of \% (f)

The distribution ( $\overline{7} \bar{q})$ is generated by the non $M$ arkovian process ( $(\bar{\sigma} \overline{1} \overline{1})$, which we cannot hope to solve directly. H ow ever, we can get aw ay w th a self-consistent calculation which does not require solving ( $\overline{6} \overline{1} 1)$ in full $W$ e focus on the $m$ om ents $k$ of the distribution \%, from which the latter can alw ays be recovered (if the integrals below exist):

$$
\begin{align*}
k & =z_{1} d f \%(f) f^{k}  \tag{88}\\
\%(f) & =z^{0} \frac{d!}{2} e^{\mathrm{i}!f} \mathrm{f}_{\mathrm{k}}^{\mathrm{x}} \frac{\mathrm{k}}{\mathrm{k}!}(\mathrm{i}!)^{k} \tag{89}
\end{align*}
$$

Obviously $0=1=1$, for any , which follows directly from de nition absence of history (i.e. $=1$ ) we have $\%(f)=\left[\begin{array}{ll}f & 1\end{array}\right]$, so that ${ }_{k}=1$ for all $k \quad 0$. W e will rely on the sum over $m$ om ents in ( $\overline{8} \overline{9}$ ) converging on scales of $k$ which are independent of N . This is equivalent to saying that the lim it ( does not restrict us further. By com bining the de nitions obtain a m ore explicit but still relatively sim ple expression for the $m$ om ents ${ }_{k}$ :

$$
\begin{aligned}
& { }_{k}=\frac{1}{p}^{x} \quad \ln [\mathrm{p} \quad(A ; Z)]^{k} \ddot{i}_{\mathrm{fA} ; Z g}
\end{aligned}
$$



$$
\begin{align*}
& \text { and }{ }^{n}{ }_{2}(1 ; A ; Z)={ }_{2}\left({ }_{2} ; A ; Z\right)=:::={ }_{2}\left({ }_{k} ; A ; Z\right)^{\circ} \\
& \vdots \tag{91}
\end{align*}
$$

k A sim ilar conchusion w as reached also in [][], but on the basis ofseveralapproxim ations. Furtherm ore, in contrast to the present GFA approach, in [1- [] ] there w as no w ay to calculate $\%$ (f) from the theory.

Let us de ne the short-hand

$$
\begin{equation*}
\operatorname{Same} e(i)={ }^{n}{ }_{i}\left(r_{1} ; A ; Z\right)={ }_{i}\left(r_{2} ; A ; Z\right)=:::={ }_{i}\left(r_{k} ; A ; Z\right)^{0} \tag{92}
\end{equation*}
$$

which states that the i-th com ponent of the history string takes the sam e value at the
 (9̄그) can be w ritten as
:

$$
\begin{align*}
& \text { P rob }\left[\begin{array}{ll}
S \text { am e }(\mathbb{M} & 1) j S a m e(\mathbb{M})] \\
\text { P rob }[S \text { am e }(\mathbb{M})]
\end{array}\right.
\end{align*}
$$

Since we need not consider values of $k$ which scale $w$ ith $N$ or $L$, the contributions to
 a time ${ }_{r}$ and those at another time 'rowill vanish in the lim it $L!1$. Since we also know that we are in a T T I state, 边 follow s that the conditionalprobabilities in ( $\overline{9} \overline{3}_{1}^{-1}$ ) w ill


$$
\text { Prob } \left.\left.[S \text { am e(r) jS ame(r }+1)^{\wedge}::^{:^{\wedge}} \operatorname{Sam} e(\mathbb{M})\right]!\quad P_{[k M} r\right]
$$

where $P_{[k j n]}$ denotes the probability to nd for random ly drawn and in nitely separated
 identity holds for the indiges fi+ $1 ;::: ; i+m g\left(w\right.$ ith $P_{[k j 0]}$ giving this probability in the absence of conditions). This allow s us to w rite ( $\overline{9} 0 \overline{1})$ as

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left.\left.k_{k}=p^{k} P_{[k \neq M} \quad 1\right] P_{[k \not M} \quad 2\right] ~::: P_{[k j]}: P_{[k j 0]} \tag{94}
\end{equation*}
$$

A s a simple test one $m$ ay verify ( $\overline{9} \overline{4})$ for the trivial case $=1$ (fake history only). H ere conditioning on the past is irrelevant, so $P_{[k j n]}=P_{[k j 0]}=2^{1} k$ for all $m$, which indeed gives us $\mathrm{k}_{\mathrm{k}}=\mathrm{p}^{\mathrm{k}}{ }^{1} 2^{(1 \mathrm{k}) \mathrm{M}}=1$ (as it should). In the continuous time im it N ! 1 (equivalently: for $M!1$, since $2^{M}=N$ ) we thus nd the as yet exact form ula

$$
\begin{equation*}
\lim _{M!1} \log \left({ }_{k}\right)=\lim _{M!1}^{M_{X} 1_{r=0}^{1}} \log 2^{k}{ }^{1} P_{[k j r]}^{i} \tag{95}
\end{equation*}
$$

### 6.2. Reduction to history coincidence statistics

 that the value of the overallbid at any tim e ' is only correlated w th the bid value at tim e ${ }^{0}$ if the two tim es ( ${ }^{\prime} ;{ }^{0}$ ) have identicalhistory strings, i.e. if ( $\left.{ }^{\prime} ; A ; Z\right)=\left({ }^{0} ; A ; Z\right)$. \{ W e here use the fact that a com ponent i (';A;Z) of the history string observed by the agents at tim e ' is by construction (see de nition (1-5)) referring to the overallbid at tim e i. It follow s that the probability of nding a given value for $i(`$; ; Z ) depends via causality only on the bids at the


$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { h i }
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& =P \text { rob }\left[S a m e(1) j S a m e(2)^{\wedge}::^{\prime}:^{\wedge} S a m e(M)\right] \\
& \text { Prob [S am e(2) jS am e(3) ^ : : : ^ } \operatorname{Same(M)]}
\end{aligned}
$$

W e know that individual histories show up during the process w ith probabilities of order $\mathrm{N}{ }^{1}$. Since the likelihood of nding recurring histories during any number $r=0(\mathrm{M})$ of consecutive iterations of our process is thus vanishingly sm all (of order $\mathrm{O}(\mathrm{M}=\mathrm{N})$ ) such direct correlations are of no consequence in our calculation. The only relevant e ect of conditioning in the sense of the $\mathrm{P}_{\text {kjcl }}$ is via its biasing ofhistories in subsequent iterations. A though the probability of history recurrence during a time window of size $O(M)$ is vanishingly $s m a l l$, if tw o (short) instances of global bid trajectories are found to have identical realizations of som e of the bits of their history strings, they will nevertheless be $m$ ore likely than average to have an identical history realization in the next time step. This is the subtle statistical e ect which, together with the resulting biases in the bids which are subsequently found at tim es with speci chistories, gives rise to the relative history frequency distributions \% ( f ) as observed in e.g. F ig. . I '.
$T$ he statem ent that the conditioning in $\mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{k}_{\mathrm{jkj}}}$ acts only via the joint likelihood of nding speci chistories $f_{1} ;::: ; k^{\prime} g$ at the $k$ speci ed (and widely separated) times $\mathrm{f}_{1} ;:::{ }^{\prime}{ }_{k} \mathrm{~g}$, translates into

$$
\begin{align*}
& \text { 1;:: k } \tag{96}
\end{align*}
$$

Here P $\left.\mathbb{k j}{ }_{1} ;::: ;{ }_{k}\right]$ denotes the likelihood to $n d \quad(i ; A ; Z)=:::=(k ; A ; Z)$, if the history strings at those $k$ tim es equalf $1 ;::: ;{ }_{k} g$, and $P[1 ;::: ; ~ k j r]$ denotes the likelihood of nding those $k$ speci $c$ histories given that the bits of the $k$ history strings have been identicalover the rm ost recent iterations ${ }^{{ }^{+}}{ }^{+}$. The probability of nding speci c bid values A (') will in TTI states only depend on the history string associated w ith tim e '. G iven this history string, A (') is a G aussian variable (this follow s from the e ective bid process $\left.{ }_{( }^{\prime}(\overline{6} \overline{1})\right)$, w ith som e average $\bar{A}$ and a variance ${ }^{2}$ (which will in due course have to be calculated). U sing also the fact that the Z (';i) were de ned as zero average $G$ aussian variables, w th variance ${ }^{2}$, we obtain:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& +{ }_{2}^{Y^{k} h^{Z}} D Z^{Z} d A P_{j}^{(A)}\left[\begin{array}{llll}
i & \text { (1)A } & Z^{i}
\end{array}\right]
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{align*}
& 2 \text { 3 } \tag{97}
\end{align*}
$$

W e now w rite the sum over allcom binations ofhistories in ( $\overline{9} \overline{\bar{G}}$ ) in term sofa partitioning + H ere one will nd that consistent and inconsistent realizations of the history noise variables Z (';i) are to be treated di erently: in the case of consistent noise, one will always have i( '; A ; Z ) = i+ $1\left(\begin{array}{l} \\ +1 ; A ; Z) .\end{array}\right.$
in groups, where two M boit strings f $\mathrm{f}_{\mathrm{i}} \mathrm{j}$ g are in the sam e group if and only if they are identical. W e w rite ( $g_{1} ; g_{2} ;::$ : for the subset of all com binations $f 1 ;::$; k 9 w ith one group of size $g_{1}$, a second group of size $g_{2}$, and so oni '. C learly $g_{1}+g_{2}+:::=k$, for all possible subsets of our partitioning. T his allow s us to w rite

$$
\begin{align*}
& P_{[k j]}=\quad \mathrm{k} \quad k ; g_{1}+g_{2}+:: P\left[k \dot{g}_{1} ; g_{2} ;:::\right] P\left[g_{1} ; g_{2} ;::: j c\right]  \tag{98}\\
& \text { ( } \mathrm{g}_{1} ; \mathrm{g}_{2} ;:: \text { ) }
\end{align*}
$$

A coording to $\left(\overline{9} \bar{q}_{-1}\right)$, the distribution $\mathrm{P} \mathbb{k} \dot{g}_{1} ; g_{2} ;:: 0$ is of the relatively sim ple form

 of the relative history frequencies in the follow ing form :

It w ill be helpful to assess which values of $r$ in ( $(\underline{1} 0 \overline{0} \overline{\underline{Q}})$ can survive the lim it $M$ ! 1 . $W$ henever we have a value $r$ such that $M \quad r!1$ as $M!1$, the condition that the k history bits were identical over the most recent $r$ steps still leaves a large $\mathrm{O}\left(2^{\mathrm{M}} \quad{ }^{\mathrm{r}}\right.$ ) num ber of com patible history strings to be found at the probing tim es f ${ }_{1} ;::: ;{ }_{k}{ }^{\prime} g$, so


Since $k$ is nite and $(1 ; 1 ; 1 ;:::)=1$, the totalcontribution to $\log \left({ }_{k}\right)$ from those term $S$ where M r! 1 as M ! 1 is negligible, since for $1 \quad R \quad M$ we $m$ ay write

$$
\begin{align*}
& r=0 \quad\left(g_{1} ; g_{2} ;:::\right) \\
& =\mathrm{XX}_{\mathrm{r}=0}^{1} \log 1+\mathrm{O}\left(2^{\mathrm{h}}\right)^{\mathrm{h}}=O\left(2^{R} \mathrm{M}^{\mathrm{M}}\right) \tag{101}
\end{align*}
$$

H ence in $(\underline{1} \overline{1} \bar{O} \overline{0})$ we need only those term $s$ where $M \quad r$ is nite. These term $s$ represent contributions where virtually all past com ponents of the history strings at the tim es $\mathrm{f}_{1}{ }_{1}:$ :: : ; ${ }_{\mathrm{k}} \mathrm{g}$ were identical, which should indeed constrain the possible histories at the times $f_{1} ;::: ;{ }^{\prime} \mathrm{kg} \mathrm{m}$ ost, and indeed gives the largest history coincidence rates. W e consequently sw itch our conditioning label from the number r of previously identical com ponents to the num ber $M \quad r$ of unconstrained com ponents, and w rite
$\mathrm{P}\left[\mathrm{g}_{1} ; \mathrm{g}_{2} ;:: \mathbf{j} \mathrm{j}\right]=\mathrm{Q}\left[\mathrm{g}_{1} ; \mathrm{g}_{2} ;::: \mathrm{M} \quad \mathrm{M}\right]$
For example: (k) denotes the subset of all combinations fir:::; kg where $\mathrm{f}_{1}=:::=\mathrm{k}$, ( 2 ;1;1;:::) is the subset of all $f 1 ;::: ; \mathrm{kg}$ where precisely two history strings are identical, and allothers are distinct.
and nd $(\overline{1} 0 \mathrm{O} p)$ converting into the sim pler form

W e are left w th the task to calculate the likelinood $\mathrm{Q}\left[\mathrm{g}_{1} ; \mathrm{g}_{2} ;::: \mathfrak{j}\right]$ of nding at the k distinct tim es $f_{1} ;::: ;{ }_{k} g$ of our process the histories $f_{1} ;::: ;{ }_{k} g$ to be identical in
 identical during all but $r$ of the $m$ ost recent iterations.

At this stage we bene $t$ from having to consider only values of $r$ in '( $1-\overline{0} \overline{0})$ which are nite (com pared to M, which is sent to in nity). For each value r of the num ber of free' com ponents, there $w$ ill be only $2^{r}$ possible history strings available to be allocated to the $k$ tim es $f_{1} ;::: ;{ }_{k} g$. In principle one would have to worry about the probabilities to be assigned to each of the $2^{r}$ options. How ever, we know for the full $M$-com ponent history strings that their probabilities scale as $=f \mathrm{p}^{1} \mathrm{with} \mathrm{f}=\mathrm{O}(1)$, so the e ective probabilities of individual com ponents of $2 \mathrm{f} \quad 1$; 1 gm ust scale as

$$
i_{i}=O\left({ }^{1=M}\right)=O\left(\frac{1}{2} f^{1=M}\right)=\frac{1}{2}\left[1+O\left(M^{1}\right)\right]
$$

From this we deduce that for nite $r$ we $m$ ay take all $\frac{1}{2}$ allowed history strings to have equal probabilities. This tums the evaluation of $Q\left[g_{1} ; g_{2} ;::: j r\right]$ into a solvable com binatorial problem. Each of $k$ elem ents is given random ly one of $2^{r}$ colours (where each colour has probability $2^{\mathrm{r}}$ ), and Q [ $\left.\mathrm{g}_{1} ; \mathrm{g}_{2} ;::: \mathrm{j}_{\mathrm{r}}\right]$ represents the likelihood of nding identical colour sets of sizes $\left(g_{1} ; g_{2} ;:::\right)$. Let us abbreviate $R=2^{r}$, and write the $r$-th term in (

$$
\begin{equation*}
\lim _{M!1} \log \left({ }_{k}\right)=\underbrace{x}_{r 1} \log H_{r} \tag{103}
\end{equation*}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& H_{r}={ }^{X} \quad\left(g_{1} ; g_{2} ;:::\right) Q\left[g_{1} ; g_{2} ;::: j r\right] \\
& \text { ( } g_{1} ; g_{2} ;::: \text { ) }
\end{aligned}
$$

### 6.3. Expansion of sign-coincidence probabilities

Having sim pli ed the conditionaldistribution $Q\left[g ; g_{2} ;::: j r\right]$ ofhistory coincidences, we
 powers of the (random ) bid biases $\overline{\mathrm{A}}$ in which we retain only the leading term s , our
] O ne easily con ms that ourexpression for $\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{r}}$ is properly norm alized. U pon choosing ( $\mathrm{g}_{1} ; \mathrm{g}_{2} ;:::$ ) = 1 one can perform the sum $m$ ations iteratively, starting from $g_{R}$ and descending dow $n$ to $g_{1}$, which leads exactly to the factor $R^{k}$ to com bine $w$ ith the $R{ }^{k}$ present.
problem simpli es further to the point where we can obtain a fully explicit expression


$$
\begin{align*}
& \begin{array}{l}
(1 ; 1 ; 1 ;:::)=1 \\
\left(g_{i} ; g_{2} ;:::\right)=e^{\frac{1}{2}}{ }^{P}{ }_{j 1} g_{j}\left(g_{j} 1\right) \frac{1}{4}{ }^{2}{ }^{P}{ }_{j} g_{j}\left(g_{j} 1\right)\left(2 g_{j} 3\right)+0\left({ }^{3}\right)
\end{array}  \tag{105}\\
& =x \quad \operatorname{Erf}^{h} p \overline{2}^{\mathrm{q}} \frac{(1 \quad \overline{\mathrm{~A}}}{2^{2}+(1)^{2}}{ }^{i} \tag{106}
\end{align*}
$$

The results ( $\overline{1} 0 \overline{0} \bar{j}, 1 \overline{1} 0 \bar{\sigma} \bar{\sigma})$ im ply that, rather than know ing the full probability distribution P $\left[g_{1} ; g_{2} ;:: j r\right]$ in $(\underline{1} \overline{0} \overline{0} \overline{-1})$, we only need the (conditional) statistics of a m odest number
 orders, and using ${ }^{\mathrm{P}}{ }_{j} \mathrm{~g}_{\mathrm{j}}=\mathrm{k}$ (which is alw ays true inside ( $\left.\overline{1} \overline{0} \overline{\mathrm{O}} \overline{\mathrm{L}}^{\prime}\right)$ ) produces

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \left(g_{1} ; g_{2} ;:::\right)^{1}+\frac{1}{2}{ }_{j-1}^{h} g_{j}^{2}{ }^{i} \\
& +\frac{1}{4}{ }^{2}{ }^{\mathrm{h}} \frac{1}{2}{ }_{\mathrm{ij1}}^{\mathrm{X}} \mathrm{~g}_{\mathrm{i}}^{2} \mathrm{~g}_{\mathrm{j}}^{2} \quad{ }_{2}^{\mathrm{X}}{ }_{\mathrm{j} 1} \mathrm{~g}_{j}^{3} \quad(\mathrm{k} \quad 5)_{\mathrm{j} 1}^{\mathrm{X}} \mathrm{~g}_{j}^{2}+\frac{1}{2} \mathrm{k}^{2} \quad 3 \mathrm{k}^{\mathrm{i}}+\mathrm{O}\left({ }^{3}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

Since the combinatorial averaging process of ( $\overline{1} 0 \overline{0} \overline{4})$ in this particular representation involves a m easure which is invariant under perm utations of the numbers $f g_{1} ; g_{2} ;:: g$, the average of $(\overline{1} 0 \overline{0} \overline{-})$ ) is identical to that of the follow ing sim pler function ( $w$ ith $R=2^{r}$ ):

$$
\begin{align*}
& \text { e }\left(g_{1} ; g_{2} ;:::\right)=1+\frac{1}{2} \quad\left(R g_{1}^{2} \quad k\right)  \tag{109}\\
& +\frac{1}{8}{ }^{2} R g_{1}^{4}+R\left(\begin{array}{ll}
R & 1
\end{array}\right) q^{2} g_{2}^{2} \quad 4 R g^{3} \quad 2(k \quad 5) R q_{g}^{2}+k^{2} \quad 6 k^{i}+O\left({ }^{3}\right)
\end{align*}
$$

Instead of having to use full com binatorial m easure ( $(\underline{1} 0 \overline{0} \mathbf{4})$, we can therefore extract all the relevant inform ation from the (joint) m arginaldistribution for the pair ( $g_{1} ; g_{2}$ ) only.

w ith

Those com binatorial factors $\mathrm{G}_{\mathrm{a} ; \mathrm{b}}^{\mathrm{k} ; \mathrm{R}}$ which we need in order to evaluate ( $(\overline{1} \overline{1} \overline{1} \overline{\mathrm{O}})$ are calculated in $\bar{A}{ }^{\text {Appendix }}{ }^{-1}$ '. They are found to be

$$
G_{2 ; 0}^{k ; R}=\frac{k}{R}+\frac{k(k \quad 1)}{R^{2}}
$$



Figure 2. Test of the predicted history frequency distributions (11]) (left picture, based on expansion of the $m$ om ents $k$ up to rst order in the $w i d t h, k=$ $e^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathrm{k}\left(\mathrm{k}^{1)}\right.$ ) and (1101) (right picture, based on expansion up to second order, $k=$
 $\operatorname{sim}$ ulations for $=2: 0$ and $N=8193$. In both cases the second $m$ om ent which param etrizes (1-1 ${ }^{-1}$ ) and (118) was taken from the data: 2 1:380.

$$
\begin{align*}
& G_{3 ; 0}^{k ; R}=\frac{k}{R}+\frac{3 k(k \quad 1)}{R^{2}}+\frac{k(k \quad 1)(k \quad 2)}{R^{3}} \\
& G_{4 ; 0}^{k ; R}=\frac{k}{R}+\frac{7 k(k \quad 1)}{R^{2}}+\frac{6 k(k \quad 1)(k \quad 2}{R^{3}}+\frac{k(k \quad 1)(k \quad 2)(k \quad 3)}{R^{4}}  \tag{7}\\
& G_{2 ; 2}^{k ; R}=\frac{k(k \quad 1)}{R^{2}}+\frac{2 k(k \quad 1)(k \quad 2)}{R^{3}}+\frac{k(k \quad 1)(k \quad 2)(k \quad 3)}{R^{4}}
\end{align*}
$$

Insertion of these factors into ( $(\underline{1} 1 \overline{1} 0)$, followed by restoration of the shorthand $R=2^{r}$, gives us the fully explicit expression

$$
H_{r}=1+\frac{1}{2} k\left(\begin{array}{llll}
k & 1
\end{array}\right) 2^{r}+\frac{1}{8}{ }^{2} k\left(\begin{array}{lll}
k & 1
\end{array}\right)\left(\begin{array}{ll}
k & 2
\end{array}\right)\left(\begin{array}{ll}
k & 3 \tag{112}
\end{array}\right) 4^{r}+O\left({ }^{3}\right)
$$

W e can now write explicit form ulae for the $m$ om ents of the relative history frequencies, and hence also for the distribution \% ( $£$ ) itself, in the form an expansion in a param eter
which controls the width of this distribution.

### 6.4. Resulting prediction for \% (f)

 us nally to the desired expression for the $m$ om ents ${ }_{k}$ :

$$
\lim _{M!1} \log (k)=\frac{1}{2} k\left(\begin{array}{lll}
k & 1 \tag{113}
\end{array}\right) \frac{1}{12}{ }^{2} k(k \quad 1)(2 k \quad 3)+O\left({ }^{3}\right)
$$

W e see that this general form ula obeys $0=1=1$, as it should, and that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\lim _{m!1} 2=e^{\frac{1}{6}{ }^{2}+0\left({ }^{3}\right)} \tag{114}
\end{equation*}
$$

Insertion into our earlier expression ( $\overline{8} \overline{\mathrm{~g}})$ for $\%(\mathrm{f})$ leads in the $\lim$ it M 1 to a form ula in which, at least up the relevant orders in , the insertion of a G aussian integral allow s
us to carry out the sum $m$ ation over $m$ om ents explicitly:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \left.\left.\%(f)=\frac{\mathrm{Z}}{2} \frac{\mathrm{~d}!}{2} \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}!\mathrm{f}^{\mathrm{X}}} \mathrm{k}_{0} \frac{(\mathrm{i}!)^{k}}{\mathrm{k}!} \mathrm{e}^{\frac{1}{2} \mathrm{k}(\mathrm{k}} 1\right)\right)^{\frac{1}{12}}{ }^{2} \mathrm{k}(\mathrm{k} \quad 1)(2 \mathrm{k} \quad 3)+0\left({ }^{3}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

W emay use ( $\left.\overline{1} \overline{1} \overline{1} \bar{q}^{\prime}\right)$ to express in term sof 2 , tuming our expansion of the $m$ om ents $k$ into an expansion in powers of $\log \left({ }_{2}\right)$. D epending on whether we wish to take our expansion only to order O $(\log (2))$, or also to $O\left(\log ^{2}(2)\right)$, we obtain

$$
\begin{align*}
& \text { to } O(\log (2)): \quad \%(f)=\frac{e^{\frac{1}{2} z^{2}(f)}}{f 2 \log \left({ }_{2}\right)}  \tag{116}\\
& z(f)=\frac{\log (f)+\frac{1}{2} \log (2)}{\log (2)} \tag{117}
\end{align*}
$$

$$
\begin{align*}
& z(f)=\frac{\log (f)+\frac{1}{2}\left[\log (2)+\frac{2}{3} \log ^{2}(2)\right]}{\log (2)+\log ^{2}\left(2_{2}\right)} \tag{119}
\end{align*}
$$

The tw o statem ents ( $(\overline{1} \overline{1} \overline{\bar{G}})$ and $(\overline{1} \overline{1} \overline{1} \overline{8})$ are indeed found to constitute increasingly accurate predictions for the actual distribution of the relative history frequencies, see e.g. Fig. :2.1. W e have thus been able to explain the origin and the characteristics of the observed history frequency statistics. H ow ever, both form ulae are expansions for sm all. Should (1]īq) be applied to values of which are not $s m$ all, one has to be carefulin dealing $w$ ith large values of $f$, where \% (f) could becom e negative (this would have been prevented by the higher orders in ). The im plication is that in the $G$ aussian integral ( $m$ ust in practice either introduce a cut-0 $\quad z=O\left({ }^{1=6}\right)$, or exponentiate the factor $\left[1+\frac{1}{6} \log \left({ }_{2}\right)\left(3 z(f) \quad z^{3}(f)\right)\right]$.

### 6.5. The width of \% (f)

W hat rem ains in order to round o our analysis of the distribution of relative history frequencies is to calculate the width param eter in '(1] $1 \mathbf{1}=1)$ self-consistently from our equations. A coording to our theory, is given by ( $(\overline{1} \overline{0} \overline{-} \overline{-})$, ie. by

$$
\begin{equation*}
=\operatorname{Erf}^{\mathrm{h}} p \overline{2}^{\mathrm{q}} \frac{(1 \quad \overline{\mathrm{~A}}}{2^{2}+\left(1 \mathrm{y}^{2}\right.}{ }^{i} \tag{120}
\end{equation*}
$$

The quantities $\bar{A}$ and ${ }^{2}=\overline{\bar{A}^{2}} \quad \overline{\mathrm{~A}}$ describe the statistics of those bids which correspond to tim es with a prescribed history string . W e know from ( $(\overline{6} \overline{4})$ ) that these are $G$ aussian variables, which im plies that $\bar{A}$ and ${ }^{2}$ are allwe need to know. Since we
restrict ourselves to non－anom alous $T$ T I states，we can w rite both as long－tim e averages：

$$
\begin{align*}
& \overline{\mathrm{A}}=\quad 1 \lim _{\mathrm{L}!1} \mathrm{~L}^{1}{ }^{\mathrm{X}^{\mathrm{L}}} \quad ; \quad(\because \mathrm{A} ; \mathrm{Z})^{\mathrm{A}(`)} \tag{121}
\end{align*}
$$

W e can work out the average $\bar{A}$ ，using（ $\overline{6} \overline{4} \overline{1})$ and tim e－translation invariance，and subsequently de ne the new time variables $s=i_{i} \quad i+1$（for $i<r$ ）and $S_{r}={ }_{r}$ （so that ${ }_{j}=s_{j}+s_{j+1}+:::+s_{r}$ ）．This results in

G iven our ansatz of short history correlation tim es，in the sense of（7̄⿹勹巳一 $)$ ，and given
$=P{ }_{>0} G(`)<1$（so G（｀）must decay su ciently fast），we nd this expression sim plifying to

In a sim ilarm anner we nd

$$
\begin{aligned}
& { }_{1}^{0}:::_{r}^{10}
\end{aligned}
$$

$G$ enerating functional analysis of $M$ inority $G$ am es $w$ ith realm arket histories
A gain we use ${ }^{P}, G(`)<1$ to justify that in the sum $m$ ations over $s_{r}$ and $s_{r^{0}}^{0}$ the upper lim it can safely be replaced by L . T hus:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \lim _{L!} \frac{1}{L} X_{S_{r}=0}^{X^{L}} P \quad ; \quad\left({ }_{j}^{P} S_{j} ; A ; Z\right){ }_{i=1}^{h Y^{r}} P \quad ; \quad\left({ }_{j i i} s_{j} ; A ; Z\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

T he present calculation is sim ilar to that of the volatility $m$ atrix in the fake history online M G [1]OO-1] (the quantity ${ }^{2}={\overline{A^{2}}}^{2} \quad \overline{\mathrm{~A}}^{2}$ can be regarded as a conditional volatility, w here the condition is that in collecting our statistics w e are to restrict ourselves to those tim es where the observed history strings take the value ), so also here we have to w orry about pairw ise tim e coincidences. Each such coincidence e ectively rem oves one constraint of the type ; (:::;A ; ) , since the latter will be $m$ et autom atically. T he rem aining term $s$ w ill occur in extensive sum mations, so that we m ay replace each unpaired' occurrence of a factor ; (:::;A ; ) , except for those $w$ th the sam e argum ent as one of the $G$ aussian variables, by its tim e average. In practioe this im plies the replacem ent
and therefore

As in the calculation of the volatility in $\left.{ }_{[1-10}^{-1}\right]$, lacking as yet a m ethod to deal w ith all the com plicated term $s$ generated by the factor proportional to the leaming rate $\sim$, we have to restrict ourselves in practice to approxim ations. As in [ī0] $]$ we rst rem ove the m ost tridky term s by putting $\sim$ ! 0 . This gives

W e then assum e that the $\lim$ it $L$ ! 1 in the last line converts the associated sam ple average into a full average over the statistics of the $G$ aussian elds viven by $(\overline{6} \overline{2} \overline{1})$, ie.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \lim _{L!1}{\frac{1}{2} \mathrm{~L}_{\mathrm{s}=0}^{\mathrm{X}}}_{\mathrm{L}} \quad ; \quad(\mathrm{s} ; \mathrm{A} ; Z) \quad ; \quad(\mathrm{s}+\mathrm{k} ; \mathrm{A} ; Z) \mathrm{s} \quad \mathrm{~s}+\mathrm{k} \text { ! }
\end{aligned}
$$

Separating the correlation function into a persistent and a non-persistent term,$C(k)=$ $c+C(k)$, and retuming to the earlier notation $w$ ith tim e di erences inside the kemels $G$, results in the history-conditioned equivalent of the volatility approxim ation in $[\underline{1} 0010]:$

$$
\begin{align*}
& \frac{1^{h}}{2} 1+C+C\left(\underset{j<r}{X} S_{j} \quad{ }_{j<r^{0}}^{X} \quad S_{j}^{0}\right)^{i} \\
& =\frac{1+\mathrm{c}}{2(1+\mathrm{p})^{2}}+\frac{1}{2}^{\mathrm{Z}} \mathrm{dsds}^{0}(\mathbb{I}+\mathrm{p} \quad \mathrm{G})^{1} \mathrm{C}(\mathrm{~s} \quad \mathrm{~S})(\mathbb{I}+\mathrm{P} \quad \mathrm{G})^{1} \tag{130}
\end{align*}
$$

$w$ here $\mathbb{I}(x ; y)=(x \quad y)$. In order to get to the present stage we have averaged the dependent term $s$ inside $\overline{A^{2}}$ over the $G$ aussian $m$ easure $h:$ : :i jiA ; . C onsistency dem ands that in working out ${ }^{2}=\overline{\mathrm{A}}^{2} \quad \overline{\mathrm{~A}}^{2}$ we do the samew ith the term $\overline{\mathrm{A}}^{2}$, where $\overline{\mathrm{A}}$ is given by $(\underline{1} 2 \overline{2} \overline{4})$, so our approxim ation for the history-conditioned volatility becom es

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 2=\overline{A^{2}} \quad \frac{h^{-2} i}{(1+\mathrm{P})^{2}}
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{align*}
& =\frac{1}{2}^{\mathrm{Z}} \mathrm{dsds}^{0}(\mathbb{I}+\mathrm{p} \quad \mathrm{G})^{1}(\mathrm{~s}) \mathrm{C}^{\sim}(\mathrm{s} \quad \mathrm{~s})(\mathbb{I}+\mathrm{p} \quad \mathrm{G})^{1}\left(\mathrm{~s}^{0}\right) \tag{131}
\end{align*}
$$

O ur nal step again follow s' 1 decay vary fast, aw ay from the value $C^{\sim}(0)=1 \quad C$, so that in the expansion of ${ }^{\prime}(\overline{1} \overline{1} \overline{1} \overline{1})$ in powers of $G$ we retain only the zero-th term :

$$
\begin{equation*}
2=\frac{1}{2}(1 \quad c) \tag{132}
\end{equation*}
$$


w ith

$$
\begin{equation*}
\%(\mathrm{f} ;)=\lim _{\mathrm{p}!1} \frac{1}{\mathrm{p}}^{\mathrm{X}} \quad[\mathrm{f} \quad \mathrm{p} \quad] \quad[\quad-\quad] \tag{134}
\end{equation*}
$$ W e know the ${ }^{-}$to be Gaussian variables, w ith $h^{-} \quad i=0$ and $h^{-2} i=\frac{1}{2}(1+c)$ (se the above derivation of ${ }^{2}$ where this was shown and used). Hence, upon making our nal sim plifying assum ption that in the relevant orders of our calculation the correlations betw een the history frequencies and the Gaussian elds are irrelevant, we obtain

$$
\begin{equation*}
\%(f ;)=\%(f) \frac{e^{2}=(1+c)}{(1+c)} \tag{135}
\end{equation*}
$$

and hence (113 $\overline{1} \bar{j})$ sim pli es to

U sing the integral ${ }^{R} D \times \operatorname{Erf}^{2}(A x)=\frac{4}{\arctan [ }\left[\overline{1+4 A^{2}}\right] \quad 1$, in combination $w$ ith the identity ${ }^{R}{ }^{d f} \%(f) f=1$, our approxim ate expression for the param eter thus becom es

In the $\lim$ it of strictly fake history we recover from ( $\left.1 \mathbf{1} \frac{1}{3} \overline{1}\right)$, the value $\lim : 1=$ (4= ) arctan [1] $1=0$, as it should. For M G s w ith strictly true $m$ arket history, on the other hand, expression ( $1 \overline{1} \overline{3} \bar{\eta})$ simpli es to

$$
\begin{equation*}
\lim _{0}=\underline{4}_{0}^{z_{1}} \mathrm{df}_{0} \%(f) f \arctan 1+{\frac{2(1+\mathrm{c})}{(1+\mathrm{f})^{2}(1 \quad c)}}^{\# \frac{1}{2}} 1 \tag{138}
\end{equation*}
$$

In accordance w ith earlier observations in sim ulations $[1 \overline{1} \overline{1}]$ w e also see that, as the system approaches the phase transition when is low ered from within the ergodic regim e, the increase of the susceptibility autom atically reduces the width param eter, until it vanishes com pletely at the critical point.
7. C losed theory for persistent observables in the ergodic regim e

W e have now obtained a closed theory for the tim e-translation invariant states of our
 order param eters, combined w ith expressions ( 1010 for the width of the relative history frequency distribution \% ( $f$ ). This theory predicts correctly (i) that the phase transition point $c(T)$ of the M G w ith history is identical to that of the $m$ odelw ith fake $m$ em ory, (ii) that at the transition point the relative history frequency distribution reduces to $\%(f)=[f 1]$ ( f ith at that point also the order param eters allbecom ing independent of whether we have true or fake history), and (iii) the shape of the relative history frequency distribution. In the lim it ! 1 the theory also reproduces the correct order param eter values $==c=0$, for any value of . For $=0$ (strictly truem em ory) it predicts $\lim !1 \quad=\frac{1}{3}$ and hence lim ! $1 \quad 2 \quad 1: 37$.


Figure 3. Left: the predicted persistent correlations c together w ith sim ulation data in the non-ergodic regim e, for the on-line M G w ith strictly true history (i.e. $=0$; the solid line gives the theoretical prediction, full circles the experim ental data) and for the on-line M G w ith strictly fake mem ory (i.e. $\quad=1$; the dashed line gives the theoreticalprediction, open circles the experim entaldata). In both cases decision noise w as absent. R ight: the corresponding predicted fraction of frozen agents, under the sam e experim ental conditions and $w$ th the sam e $m$ eaning of lines and $m$ arkers.


F igure 4. Them om ents $2={ }^{R}$ df \% (f) $f^{2}$ and $3^{R} d f \%$ (f) $f^{3}$ of the distribution of relative history frequencies for the M G w ith strictly true history and absent decision noise (i.e. $=\mathrm{T}=0$ ), as predicted by the theory (solid and dashed lines), com pared to the $m$ om ents asm easured in num ericalsim ulations ( $m$ arkers, $w$ ith circles indicating 2 and squares indicating 3 ). N ote that $0=1=1$ (by de nition).

Let us nally reduce our closed equations to a m ore com pact form, for the sim plest nontrivial case of the M G w ith strictly ture market history (i.e. $=0$ ) and w thout decision noise (i.e. $[1]=1$ ). H ere we have
$u=\frac{P-}{S_{0} \frac{R}{2}} \quad=\frac{1}{{ }_{R}} \quad=1 \quad \operatorname{Erf}[u]$

$$
\begin{align*}
& c=1 \quad \operatorname{Erf}[u]+\frac{1}{2 u^{2}} \operatorname{Erf}[u] \quad \frac{1}{u^{p}}=e^{u^{2}} \tag{140}
\end{align*}
$$

 right-hand side of ( $1 \overline{1} \overline{4} \bar{q})$, and upon elim inating the quantities and $S_{0}$, we nd ourselves $w$ th a closed set of equations for the trio fu; ; $g$ :

$$
\begin{align*}
& ={ }^{Z} \mathrm{Dz} \mathrm{~h}^{\mathrm{h}}+\frac{1}{6} \mathrm{P}-\left(\begin{array}{ll}
3 z & z^{3}
\end{array}\right) \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{Z}} \mathrm{p} \overline{+\frac{5}{6}{ }^{2}} \frac{1}{2}\left(+\frac{1}{2}{ }^{2}\right) \tag{145}
\end{align*}
$$

Solving these three coupled equations num erically, followed by com parison w ith sim ulation data, shows a surprising level of agreem ent, in spite of the expansions and assum ptions which have been used to derive ( $1 \overline{4} \overline{4}$ perform ance of the theory in describing the on-line M G w ith strictly true m arket history (i.e. $=0$ ), together $w$ ith sim ilar data for the on-line fake history M G (i.e. = 1), for com parisontyy, In all these sim ulations $N=8193$. C alculation of the rst two non-trivial $m$ om ents $k$ of the distribution of relative history frequencies, see e.g. gurei-4 (where in the sim ulations $N^{2}=2^{28}$ ), show $s$ that for sm all values of the $w$ idth of $\%$ ( $f$ ) (ie. 2 close to one, which is true close to and below the critical point) the predictions of the theory are excellent, but that the perform ance of equations ( 1 for larger values of 2 . This is obvious, since these equations result e ectively from an expansion forsm all values of 2 1. Taking this expansion to higher orders should lead to system atic im provem ent, but willbe non-trivial.
yy elow the criticalpoint, where $=1$ throughout, equation (13) predicts that $=0$. This im plies that $\%(f)=\left[\begin{array}{ll}f & 1] \text { for }<c(T) \text {, and that below the critical point the di erences between true }\end{array}\right.$ and fake history (if any) are con ned to dynam ical phenom ena or to states w ithout tim etranslation
 the persistent order param eters in M G swith and without history were identical in the low regin e.

## 8. D iscussion

We have developed a m athem atical procedure for the derivation of exact dynam ical solutions for $M$ inority $G$ am es $w$ th realm arket histories, using the generating functional analysis techniques of $\left[1 \overline{1} 11_{1}\right.$. So far these techniques had only been developed for (and applied successfiully to) the less realistic but $m$ athem atically sim pler M G versions $w$ ith fake $m$ arket histories, restricting theoretical progress to those particular gam e versions only. W e have shown how the technical di culties associated with the non -M arkovian character of the $m$ icroscopic law $s$ induced by having real histories can be dealt $w$ th, and found (in the in nite system size lim it) exact and closed macroscopic law from which to solve the canonical dynam ic order param eters for the standard (on-line) M G $w$ ith true $m$ arket history. H ere these law $s$ tum out to be form ulated in term $s$ of two e ective equations (rather than a single equation, as for m odels w th fake histories): one for an e ective agent, and one for an e ective overall $m$ arket bid. In the second part of this paper we have constructed solutions for these e ective equations, focusing $m$ ostly on the usualpersistent observables ofthe M G in tim e-translation invariant states (persistent correlations and the fraction of frozen agents) and on the calculation from
rst principles of the distribution of history frequencies. These ob jects are calculated in the form of an expansion in powers of the width of the history frequency distribution, of which the rst few term sare derived in explicit form. The nal theory was shown to give accurate predictions for the persistent observables and for the shape of the history frequency distribution. It gives precise predictions for the $w$ idth in the region where this width rem ains relatively sm all (which is inevitable in view of the expansion used).
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A ppendix A. R ecovering the fake history lim it
It helpful for our understanding of the N ! 1 lim it in $(\overline{5} \overline{9}, 1, \overline{0} \overline{0})$ to rst retum to the sim plest case where we know what the outcom e should be, being = 1, i.e. fake history
 so we en passant re-con $m$ the correctness of the assum ed scaling ${ }_{\mathrm{N}}=\sim=2 \mathrm{p}$.
 on the path $f A g$, and reduce to

The role of the $G$ aussian variables $f Z g$ has thereby been reduced to determ ining the statistics of the sym $m$ etric random $m$ atrix $B$ with entries $B \cdots=\bar{W}\left[{ }^{\prime} ;{ }^{0} ; Z\right]$ :
w th $\mathrm{p}=2^{\mathrm{M}}=\mathrm{N}$. The two relevant properties of these m atrices are relatively easily derived, and are found to be the follow ing. For any cyclic com bination of $r$-th $m$ om ents (w th $r>0$ ), where $s_{1}>s_{2}>:::>s_{r}$ and $r>1$ (no sum $m$ ations) one has

$$
\begin{equation*}
h \mathrm{~B}_{\mathrm{s}_{1} \mathrm{~s}_{2}} \mathrm{~B}_{\mathrm{s}_{2} ; s_{3}}::: \mathrm{B}_{\mathrm{s}_{r} ; s_{1}} i_{\mathrm{B}}=\mathrm{p}^{1} \mathrm{r} \tag{A.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

The second type of average one needs involves two tim e-ordered strings of $m$ atrix elem ents (of lengths $r$ and $r^{0}$, respectively) connected by two further $m$ atrix elem ents, where $\mathrm{s}_{0}>\mathrm{s}_{1}>:::>\mathrm{s}_{\mathrm{r}}$ and $\mathrm{s}_{0}^{0}>\mathrm{s}_{1}^{0}>:::>\mathrm{s}_{\mathrm{r}^{0}}^{0}$ :

The partial decoupling of the paths fA $g$ and $f Z g$ im plies that our expressions for the kemels $R$ and sim plify to

Since the bid evolution process ( $\overline{4} \overline{9}$ ) is now linear in fA $g$, and involves only fAgindependent zero-average G aussian elds , where $h, ~{ }^{\prime} i_{f} \beta g=\frac{1}{2} B, \ldots\left[1+C\left({ }^{\prime} ;{ }^{0}\right)\right]$, it is easily solved for any given realization of the random $m$ atrix $B$ :

$$
\begin{equation*}
A(\Upsilon)=A_{e}(\Upsilon)+,+{\underset{r>0}{x}\left(\frac{\sim}{2}\right)^{r}}_{k<\cdot}^{X}\left[(G B)^{r}\right]_{k}\left[A_{e}(k)+{ }_{k}\right] \tag{A.7}
\end{equation*}
$$

in which GB denotes the $m$ atrix with entries $(G B) \cdots=G\left({ }^{\prime}{ }^{0}\right) B \cdots(i . e$. involying com ponent $m$ ultiplication rather than $m$ atrix $m$ ultiplication). To $m$ ake a com parison
$w$ th the results of $[1]=1]$ ] we m ust rem ove the extemalbid perturbations $A_{e}(')$ after they have served to generate the response function $R$.

W e can evaluate $(\bar{A}-\overline{\bar{A}})$ using only expression $(\bar{A}-\bar{i})$, the causally of the response function, and formula (

$$
\begin{align*}
& =\lim _{\mathrm{N}!0} \frac{1}{\mathrm{~N}} \quad{ }^{\mathrm{n}} \quad{ }_{\mathrm{N}} \mathrm{G}\left({ }^{\prime} ;{ }^{0}\right) \tag{A..}
\end{align*}
$$

 scaling of tim e ( $m$ odulo $O$ (1) factors) is indeed ${ }_{\mathrm{N}}=\sim=2 \mathrm{p} . \mathrm{W}$ e then nd exactly the expression in [1]

$$
\begin{equation*}
R\left(t ; t^{0}\right)=\quad\left(t \quad \&+{ }_{r>0}^{X}(\quad 1)^{r} G^{r}\left(t ; t^{0}\right)=[I I+G]^{1}\left(t ; t^{0}\right)\right. \tag{A.9}
\end{equation*}
$$

H ad we chosen an altemative scaling w ith N of ${ }_{\mathrm{N}}$, we would have found either the trivial result $R=0$, or an ill-de ned expression.

Next we tum to expression ( $\overline{6} \overline{\mathrm{q}}$ ) for the e ective agent's noise covariances, w ith $A_{e}=0$. The equivalence of the present expression and that in $[\underline{1} \overline{0} 0] \mathrm{w}$ ill be m ore transparent upon renam ing $\left({ }^{\prime} ;{ }^{10}\right)!\left(s_{0} ; s_{0}^{0}\right)$ and $D\left(k ; k^{0}\right)=1+C\left(k ; k^{0}\right)$ :

$$
\begin{align*}
& \left.\left(s_{0} ; S_{0}^{0}\right)=\lim _{\mathrm{N}!0} \frac{\sim}{N}_{\mathrm{N}}^{\mathrm{Z}} \mathrm{~dB} P \mathbb{B}\right] \mathrm{B}_{\mathrm{s}_{0} \mathrm{~s}_{0}^{0}} \mathrm{hA}\left(\mathrm{~s}_{0}\right) \mathrm{A}\left(\mathrm{~s}_{0}^{0}\right) i_{\mathrm{f}} \operatorname{\beta g} \\
& =\lim _{N}!0 \frac{\sim}{2_{N}}{ }_{r ; r^{0} 0}^{X}\left(\frac{\sim}{2}\right)^{r+r^{0}} \quad X \quad X \quad D\left(S_{r} ; S_{r^{0}}^{0}\right) \\
& G\left(S_{i} ; S_{1}\right)::: G\left(S_{r} \quad ; S_{r}\right) G\left(S_{0}^{0} ; S_{1}^{0}\right)::: G\left(S_{r^{0}}^{0} ; S_{r^{0}}^{0}\right) \\
& h\left(B_{s_{0} s_{1}}::: B_{s_{r}} 1_{s_{r}}\right) B_{s_{r} s_{r}^{0}}\left(B_{s_{0}^{0} s_{1}^{0}}::: B_{s_{r}^{0} 1} s_{r}^{0}\right) B_{s_{0} s_{0}^{0}} i_{B} \tag{A.10}
\end{align*}
$$

w th the proviso that when $r=0$ we must interpret the sum $s$ as ${ }^{P} s_{s_{1}:: s_{2}}$ ! 1 , $G\left(S_{0} ; S_{1}\right)::: G\left(S_{r} 1 ; S_{r}\right)!1$ and $B_{s_{0} s_{1}}::: B_{S_{r} 1 s_{r}}$ ! 1 (and sim ilarly when $r^{0}=0$ ). Since the kemel ( $s_{0} ; s_{0}^{0}$ ) is sym $m$ etric, wem ay w thout loss ofgenerally choose $s_{0}^{0}$ s. D ependent on the whether any orboth of the indioes ( $r ; r^{0}$ ) are zero, we have to evaluate the follow ing averages ( w th the short-hand ${ }^{-}{ }_{\mathrm{ij}}=1 \quad{ }_{\mathrm{ij}}$ ):
$r=q=0$ : here the average of the last line in ( $\bar{A}-\overline{1} \overline{1} \overline{\underline{G}})$ reduces to

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{h}:: \mathrm{i}_{\mathrm{B}}=\mathrm{hB} \mathrm{~s}_{\mathrm{s}_{0} s_{0}^{0}}^{2} \mathrm{i}=\mathrm{hB} \mathrm{~s}_{\mathrm{s}_{0}^{0}} \mathrm{i}=\mathrm{s}_{0} s_{0}^{0}+\frac{1-}{\mathrm{p}} \mathrm{~s}_{0} s_{0}^{0} \tag{A.11}
\end{equation*}
$$

$q=0 ; r>0$ : here the average in $(\bar{A} \cdot \overline{1} \overline{0})$ reduces to two term $s$ (representing the


$$
\begin{equation*}
h::: i_{B}=h\left(B_{s_{0} s_{1}}::: B_{s_{r} 1 s_{r}}\right) B_{s_{r} s_{0}^{0}} B_{s_{0} s_{0}^{0}} i=p^{r}{ }_{s_{0} s_{0}^{0}}+p^{r}{ }^{1-} s_{s_{0} s_{0}^{0}} \tag{A.12}
\end{equation*}
$$

where we used $B_{k k}=1$, for any $k$. The case $r=0, r^{0}>0$ is clearly equivalent.
r; $\mathrm{F}>0$ : now the relevant average reduces to that of $(\underline{\bar{A}}-\bar{A} \overline{4})$ ),

$$
\begin{align*}
& h:: \mathbb{Z}_{B}=h \mathbb{B}_{s_{0} s_{1}}::: B_{s_{r} \quad 1 s_{r}} \mathbb{B}_{s_{r} s_{r 0}^{0}} \mathbb{B}_{s_{0}^{0} s_{1}^{0}}::: B_{s_{r_{1}^{0}}^{0} s_{r}^{0}} \mathbb{B}_{s_{0} s_{0}^{0}} i \\
& \mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{r}} \mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{r}}{ }^{0} \tag{A.13}
\end{align*}
$$

Expression ( $(\bar{A}-1 \overline{1}=1)$ reduces to those derived for the cases where r or $r^{0}$ is zero (or both), so it is true for any $\left(r ; r^{0}\right) . W$ em ay thus insert ( $\left.\bar{A}-\overline{1}-\overline{1}\right)$ into ( $\left.\bar{A}-\overline{1} \overline{\bar{q}}\right)$, and obtain:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& =\mathrm{X}^{\mathrm{G}\left(\mathrm{~S} ; \mathrm{S}_{1}\right)::: \mathrm{G}\left(\mathrm{~S}_{\mathrm{r}_{\mathrm{r}}} ; \mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{r}}\right) \mathrm{G}\left(\mathrm{~S}_{0}^{0} ; \mathrm{S}_{1}^{0}\right)::: \mathrm{G}\left(\mathrm{~S}_{\mathrm{r}^{0}}^{0} 1 ; \mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{r}^{0}}^{0}\right)}
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& G\left(S ; S_{1}\right)::: G\left(S_{r_{1}} ; S_{r}\right) G\left(s_{0}^{0} ; S_{1}^{0}\right)::: G\left(S_{r^{0}}^{0} ; S_{r^{0}}^{0}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{align*}
& G\left(\$ ; S_{1}\right)::: G\left(S_{r} 1 ; S_{r}\right) G\left(s_{0}^{0} ; S_{1}^{0}\right)::: G\left(S_{r^{0}}^{0} ; S_{r^{0}}^{0}\right) \\
& {\left[1+C\left(s ; S_{r^{0}}^{0}\right)\right]} \tag{A.14}
\end{align*}
$$



A ppendix B.Expansion ofbid sign recurrence probabilities
 abbreviate

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{E}=\underset{\mathrm{Eff}}{\mathrm{~h}} \overline{2}^{q} \frac{(1) \overline{\mathrm{A}}}{2^{2}+(1} \mathrm{q}^{2}{ }^{\mathrm{i}} \tag{B.1}
\end{equation*}
$$



Since the overall average bid in the M G is equally likely to be positive than negative, and since ( $\left.\bar{B}_{-}^{-} \bar{j}_{1}^{\prime}\right)$ tells us that $\left.\operatorname{sgn} \mathbb{E} \quad\right]=\operatorname{sgn}[\bar{A} \quad]$, the $m$ om ents $h \mathbb{E}^{r}$ i for even values of $r$
will have to be zero. From this it follow s that
so

$$
\log \quad\left(g_{i} ; g_{2} ;:::\right)=\begin{align*}
& x  \tag{B.3}\\
& { }_{j 1} \log ^{h} 1+\underset{1 n g_{j}=2}{x} \\
& 2 n_{j}
\end{align*} \mathrm{hE}^{2 n_{i}^{i}}
$$

Equation $(\underline{B}-\overline{-3})$ tells us, rstly, that

$$
\begin{equation*}
(1 ; 1 ; 1 ;:::)=1 \tag{B.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

For arbitrary history coincidence num bers ( $g_{1} ; g_{2} ;:::$ ), not necessarily all equal to one, we $m$ ay expand $\left(\bar{B}_{-1}^{-}\right)$in the $m$ om ents $h{ }^{r}{ }^{r}$ :

$$
\begin{aligned}
& +O\left(h E^{6}\right)^{i} \\
& =\frac{1}{2}_{j{ }_{j 1}}^{x} g_{j}\left(g_{j} \quad 1\right) h E^{2} i+\frac{1}{12}^{h}\left(g_{j} \quad \text { 2) }(G \quad 3) h E^{4} i \quad 3 g_{j}\left(g_{j} \quad 1\right) h E^{2} i^{i^{i}}+O\left(h E^{6} i\right)\right.
\end{aligned}
$$

Finally, in leading order in E we m ay regard the variables $E$ as proportional to $\bar{A}$, and therefore as distributed in a Gaussian manner. This im plies (since hE $i=0$ ) that in leading order we have $h E^{4} i=3 h E{ }^{2} i$. H ence

$$
\begin{align*}
& \log \quad\left(g_{i} ; g_{2} ;:::\right)=\frac{1}{2} h E^{2}{ }_{i}{ }_{j}{ }_{1} g_{j}\left(g_{j}\right.
\end{align*}
$$

$$
\begin{align*}
& \text { 1) } 2 \mathrm{~g} \\
& +O\left(\mathrm{HE}^{6} \mathrm{i}\right) \tag{B.5}
\end{align*}
$$

A ppendix C.Combinatorics in history frequency $m$ om ents
 can be obtained by di erentiation of a simple generating function:

$$
\begin{align*}
& =R^{k} \lim _{x i y!1}\left(x \frac{d}{d x}\right)^{a}\left(y \frac{d}{d y}\right)^{b}(R \quad 2+x+y)^{k} \tag{C.1}
\end{align*}
$$

In particular:
$\mathrm{G}_{2 ; 0}^{\mathrm{k} ; \mathrm{R}}=\mathrm{kR}{ }^{1}+\mathrm{k}(\mathrm{k} \quad 1) \mathrm{R}^{2}$
$\mathrm{G}_{3 ; 0}^{\mathrm{k} ; \mathrm{R}}=\mathrm{kR}{ }^{1}+3 \mathrm{k}(\mathrm{k} \quad 1) \mathrm{R}^{2}+\mathrm{k}(\mathrm{k} \quad 1)(\mathrm{k} \quad 2) \mathrm{R}^{3}$
$\mathrm{G}_{4 ; 0}^{\mathrm{k} ; \mathrm{R}}=\mathrm{kR}{ }^{1}+7 \mathrm{k}(\mathrm{k} \quad 1) \mathrm{R}^{2}+6 \mathrm{k}(\mathrm{k} \quad 1)(\mathrm{k} \quad 2) \mathrm{R}^{3}+\mathrm{k}(\mathrm{k} \quad 1)(\mathrm{k} \quad 2)(\mathrm{k} \quad 3) \mathrm{R}^{4}(\mathrm{C} .4)$
$G_{2 ; 2}^{k ; R}=k\left(\begin{array}{lll}k & 1\end{array}\right) R^{2}+2 k\left(\begin{array}{lll}k & 1\end{array}\right)\left(\begin{array}{lll}k & 2\end{array}\right) R^{3}+k\left(\begin{array}{ll}k & 1\end{array}\right)\left(\begin{array}{ll}k & 2\end{array}\right)(\mathrm{k} \quad 3) R^{4}$

