A C C Coolen

D epartm ent of M athem atics, K ing's C ollege London The Strand, London W C 2R 2LS, UK

A bstract. It is shown how the generating functionalm ethod of D e D om inicis can be used to solve the dynam ics of the original version of the m inority gam e (M G), in which agents observe real as opposed to fake m arket histories. Here one again nds exact closed equations for correlation and response functions, but now these are de ned in terms of two connected e ective non-M arkovian stochastic processes: a single e ective agent equation sim ilar to that of the Yake' history m odels, and a second e ective equation for the overallm arket bid itself (the latter is absent in Yake' history m odels). 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 Le, 87.23 G e, 05.70 Ln, 64.60 Ht E-m ail: tcoolen@mth.kcl.ac.uk

1. Introduction

M inority G am es (M G) [1] are simple and transparent models which were designed to increase our understanding of the complex collective processes which result from inductive decision making by interacting agents in simpli ed h arkets'. They are mathematical implementations of the so-called ElFarolbar problem [2]. M any versions of the M G have by now been studied in the literature, see e.g. the recent textbook [3] for an overview. They dier in the type of microscopic dynamics used (e.g. batch versus on-line, stochastic versus deterministic), in the demittion of the information provided to the agents (real-valued versus discrete, true versus fake market histories) and the agents' decision making strategies, and also in the specie c recipe used for converting the observed external information into a trading action (inner products versus look-up tables). M odels with Yake' market histories (proposed rst in [4]), where at each point in time all agents are given random rather than realmarket data upon which to base their decisions, have the advantage of being M arkovian and were therefore the rst to be studied and solved in the theoretical physics literature using techniques from equilibrium [5, 6, 7, 8] and non-equilibrium [9, 10, 11, 12] statistical mechanics.

A fler [4] had revealed the sim ilarity between the behaviour of the volatility in the standard MG models with real versus fake market histories, it was shown via num erical

simulations that this statement did not extend to many variations of the MG, such as games with dierent strategy valuation update rules [13] or with populations where agents do not allobærve history strings of the same length [14]. Furthermore, even in the standard MG one does not profound dierences in the history frequency distributions (although there these dierences do not impact on observables such as the volatility or the fraction of 'frozen' agents). A partly phenom enological attempt at analyzing quantitatively the elects of true history in the MG was presented in [15], and followed by a simulation study [16] of bid periodicities induced by having real histories. A fler these two papers virtually all theorists restricted them selves to the exclusive analysis of MG versions with fake histories, simply because there is no proper theory yet for MG versions with real histories, in spite of the fact that these are the more realistic types.

There would thus seem to be merit in a mathematical procedure which would allow for the derivation of exact dynamical solutions for MGs with real market histories. The objective of this paper is to develop and apply such a procedure. Models with real m arket histories are strongly non-M arkovian, so analytical approaches based on pseudoequilibrium approximations (which require the existence of a microscopic Lyapunov function) are ruled out. In contrast, the generating functional analysis (GFA) m ethod of [17], which has an excellent track record in solving the dynam ics of M arkovian M G s, will turn out to work also in the case of non-M arkovian m odels. There are two com plications in developing a GFA for MGs with real histories. Firstly, having real histories in plies that no batch' version of the dynamics can be de ned (since batch models by de nition involve averaging by hand over all possible histories). Thus one has to return to the original on-line de nitions. Secondly, the temporal regularization method [18] upon which one normally relies in carrying out a GFA of on-line MG 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 disrupts the tim ing of all retarded m icroscopic forces and thereby leads to extrem ely messy equationsz. Thus, one has to develop the GFA directly in terms of the un-regularized m icroscopic laws.

This paper is divided into two distinct parts, sim ilar to the more traditional GFA studies of MGs with fake market histories. The st part deals with the derivation of closed macroscopic laws from which to solve the canonical dynamic order parameters for the standard (on-line) MG with true market history. These will turn out to be formulated in terms of two e ective equations (rather than a single equation, as for models with fake histories): one for an elective agent, and one for an elective overall market bid. These equations are fully exact. The second part of the paper is devoted to constructing solutions for these elective processes. In particular, this paper focuses on the usual persistent observables of the MG and on the distribution of history frequencies, which are calculated in the form of an expansion of which the statement in numerical simulations.

z Note that in models with fake histories there are no retarded microscopic forces, so that there this particular problem could not occur.

2.De nitions

2.1. Generalized M inority Game with both valuation and overall bid perturbations

In the standard MG one imagines having N agents, labeled by i = 1; :::; N. At each iteration step '2 f0;1;2;:::g of the game, each agent i submits a bid' b_i (') 2 f 1;1g to the market. The (re-scaled) cumulative market bid at stage ' is de ned as

$$A(') = p \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} b_i(') + A_e(')$$
(1)

An external contribution $A_e(`)$ has been added, representing e.g. the actions of market regulators, which will enable us to identify speci c response functions later. Protis assumed to be made by those agents who ind them selves subsequently in the minority group, i.e. when A(`) > 0 by those agents i with $b_i(`) < 0$, and when A(`) < 0 by those with $b_i(`) > 0$. Each agent i determines his bid $b_i(`)$ at each step ` on the basis of publicly available information, which the agents believe to represent historic market data, here given by the vector (`;A;Z) 2 f 1;1^M.

The numbers fZ (';)g, with = 1;:::;M, are zero-average G aussian random variables, which represent a Yake' alternative to the true market data. M is the number of iteration steps in the past for which market information is made available. We de ne = $2^{\text{M}} = N$, and take to remain nite as N ! 1. The parameter 2 [0;1] allows us to interpolate between the cases of strictly true (= 0) and strictly fake (= 1) market histories. We distinguish between two classes of Yake history' variables:

consistent:
$$Z(';) = Z('); \quad hZ(')Z(^{Q})i = {}^{2} \cdots$$
 (3)

inconsistent : Z (';) all independent; hZ (';)Z
$$({}^{0}; {}^{0})i = {}^{2} \cdots {}^{0}$$
 (4)

W e note that (4) does not correspond to a pattern being shifted in time, contrary to what one expects of a string representing the time series of the overall bid, so that the agents in a realmarket could easily detect that they are being fooled. Hence (3) seems a more natural description of fake history. A lthough fake, it is at least consistently so.

Each agent has S trading strategies, which we label by a = 1; :::; S. Each strategy a of each trader i consists of a complete list R^{ia} of 2^M recommended trading decisions fR^{ia}g 2 f 1;1g, covering all 2^d possible values of the external information vector . We draw allentries fR^{ia}g random ly and independently before the start of the game, with equal probabilities for 1. Upon observing history string (';A;Z) at stage ', given a trader's active strategy at that stage is a_i ('), the agent will follow the instruction of his active strategy and take the decision b_i (') = R^{ia_i(')}_(';A;Z). To determ ine their active strategies a_i ('), all agents keep track of valuations p_{ia} ('), which measure 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 onwards. These valuations are updated continually, via

$$p_{ia}('+1) = p_{ia}(') \qquad \widetilde{p_{M}} A(') R^{ia}_{(';A;Z)}$$
(5)

The factor ~ represents a learning rate. If the active strategy a_i (') of trader i at stage ' is de ned as the one with the highest valuation p_a (') at that point, and upon writing F [';A;Z] = $\frac{p}{N}$; (';A;Z), our process becomes

$$p_{ia}('+1) = p_{ia}(') - \frac{\tilde{p}}{N} A(') R^{ia}F[';A;Z]$$
 (6)

A (') = A_e(') +
$$\frac{1}{N} = \sum_{i}^{X \times X} R^{ia_{i}(')} F$$
 [';A;Z] (7)

$$a_{i}(') = \arg \max_{a^{2} f_{1};...;S_{g}} f_{p_{ia}}(')g$$
 (8)

We note that $(N)^{1^{P}} = (N)^{1^{P}} F^{2}$ [';A;Z] = 1. The standard MG is recovered for ! 0 (i.e. true market data only), whereas the 'fake history' MG as in e.g. [4,9] is found for ! 1 (i.e. fake market data only, of the inconsistent type (4)).

Henceforth we will restrict ourselves to the simplest case S = 2, where each agent has only two strategies, so a 2 f1;2g, since the choice made for S has been shown to have only a quantitative e ect on the behaviour of the MG.Our equations can now be simplied in the standard way upon introducing the new variables

$$q_{i}(') = \frac{1}{2} [p_{i1}(') \quad p_{2}(')]$$
(9)

$$!^{i} = \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{R}^{i1} + \mathbb{R}^{i2}]; \qquad {}^{i} = \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{R}^{i1} - \mathbb{R}^{i2}]$$
(10)

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

$$R^{ia_{i}}(') = \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{R}^{i1} \qquad R^{i2} + \frac{1}{2} \operatorname{sgn} [q_{i}(')] \mathbb{R}^{i1} + R^{i2}]$$

= $!^{i} + \operatorname{sgn} [q_{i}(')]^{i}$ (11)

The above S = 2 formulation is easily generalized to include decision noise: one simply replaces $\operatorname{sgn}[q_i(`)] ! [q_i(`);z_i(`)]$, in which the $fz_j(`)g$ are independent and zero average random numbers, described by a symmetric and unit-variance distribution P(z). The function [g;z] is taken to be non-decreasing in q for any z, and parametrized by a control parameter T = 0 such that [g;z] 2 f = 1;1g, with $\lim_{T \neq 0} [g;z] = \operatorname{sgn}[g]$ and $\lim_{T \neq 1} dz P(z) [g;z] = 0$. Typical examples are additive and multiplicative noise de nitions, described by $[g;z] = \operatorname{sgn}[q + Tz]$ and $[g;z] = \operatorname{sgn}[q] \operatorname{sgn}[1 + Tz]$, respectively. The parameter T measures the degree of random ness in the agents' decision making, with T = 0 bringing us back to $a_i(`) = \arg \max_a fp_{ia}(`)g$, and with purely random strategy selection for T = 1.

Upon translating our microscopic laws (6,7) into the language of the valuation di erences (9) for S = 2, we nd that now our MG equations close in terms of our new dynamical variables $fq_i()g$, so that perturbations of valuations (again for the purpose of de ning response functions later) can be implemented simply by replacing $q_i(') ! q_i(') + i(')$, with i(') 2 R. Thus we arrive at the following closed equations, de ning our generalized S = 2 M G process:

$$q_{i}('+1) = q_{i}(') + i(') \frac{\tilde{p}}{N} = K \quad i \in [';A;Z]A(')$$
 (12)

$$A(\mathbf{'}) = A_{e}(\mathbf{'}) + \frac{1}{p} \frac{1}{N} X^{n} + \frac{1}{p} \frac{1}{N} X^{n} \left[q_{i}(\mathbf{'}); z_{i}(\mathbf{'})\right]^{i} F^{i} [\mathbf{'}; A; Z]$$
(13)

$$F [';A;Z] = \frac{P}{N}; (';A;Z)$$
(14)

$$(';A;Z) = \begin{cases} gn[(1)A(' 1) + Z(';1)] \\ gn[(1)A(' M) + Z(';M)] \end{cases}$$
(15)

The values of fA ('); Z (') g for ' 0 and of the q(0) play the role of initial conditions.

The key di erences at the mathematical level between MG models with fake history and those with true history as de ned above, are in the dependence of the microscopic laws on the past via the history string fA (' 1);:::;A (' M)g occurring in (';A;Z) 2 f 1;1 $^{\circ}$, in combination with the presence and role of the zero-average G aussian random variables fZ (';)g.

2.2. M athem atical consequences of having real history

In all generating functional analyses of MG s which have been published so far, the choice = 1 elim inated with 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 simply by integer numbers , labeling each of the $2^{M} = p = N$ possible become possible. The variables fZ (';)g now play the role of random disturbances of the true m arket history as perceived by the agents, and there is no reason why all possible histories should occur (let alone with equal frequencies) or why some entries fZ (';)g (e.g. those with sm all values of , which corrupt the most recent past in the history string) could not be more in portant than others. The problem has become equalitatively di erent. One can thus anticipate various mathem atical consequences for the generating functional analysis of introducing history into the MG. An early appreciation of these will help us to proceed with the calculation more e ciently.

Firstly, we will have to analyze the original on-line version of the MG; the batch version can no longer exist by de nition, since it involves averaging by hand over all possible histories' at each iteration step. However, the tem poral regularization m ethod of [18] which was employed successfully for the on-line MG with fake history [10], based on introducing Poissonnian distributed real-valued random durations for the individual iterations in (12,13), can in practice no longer be used in the non-Markovian case. The reason for this is the problem which prompted the authors of [10] to add the external perturbations $_{i}$ (') 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 individual iteration steps only in plies a harm less uncertainty in where we are on the time axis, in a system with retarded interactions one would generate very messy equations. We must therefore proceed with our process as it is, without temporal regularization (although we will be able to recover the previous theory in the limit ! 1, as it should). It will in fact turn out that the more direct application of the generating functional method presented in this paper brings the bene t of greater transparency. For instance, the continuity assumptions underlying our use of saddle-point arguments in path integrals become much more clear than they were in [10]. A salways we continue to concentrate on the evaluation and disorder averaging of the generating functional

$$Z[] = he^{i} >_{0} i^{(i)} [q_{i}(i);z_{i}(i)] i$$
(16)

The brackets in (16) denote averaging over the stochastic process (12,13), whose random ness is here caused by the decision noise fz(')g and the fake history variables fZ(';)g. A though (16) boks like the corresponding expressions for batch MGs, here we have to allow for '= O(N). Studying the un-regularized process also in plies that one has to be more careful with nite size corrections. This has consequences in working out the disorder average of the generating functional: in previous MG 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 terms in plies

that our equations simplify considerably if, instead of binary strategy entries, we choose the variables fR^{ia}g to be zero-average and unit-variance G aussian variables.

It will turn out that in our analysis of (16) an important role will be played by the following quantity:

$$\overline{W} [`; `^{0}; A; Z] = \frac{1}{N} X F [`; A; Z]F [`^{0}; A; Z]$$

$$= (`; A; Z); (`^{0}; A; Z)$$
(17)

This object is a function of the paths fAg and fZg, and indicates whether or not the histories as perceived by the agents at times ` and ⁰ 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 terms of the quantity (17), rather than substitute $({}^{i}_{A,iZ})$; $({}^{0}_{A,iZ})$ directly. This will prevent unnecessary future repetition, since it will allow for most of the theory to be applied also to MG models with inner product rather than bok-up table de nitons for the agents' history-to-action conversion [19].

3. The disorder averaged generating functional

3.1. Evaluation of the disorder average

Rather than stwriting the microscopic process in probabilistic form, as in [10], we will express the generating functional (16) 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 microscopic dynamical equations (12,13), i.e.

$$1 = \bigvee_{i}^{Y} \frac{Z}{2} = \frac{d\hat{q}_{i}(i)}{2} e^{i\hat{q}_{i}(i) [q_{i}(i+1) - q_{i}(i) - i(i) + \frac{\tilde{p}}{N}]^{P}} e^{iF} [iA_{i}Z]A(i)$$

$$1 = \bigvee_{i}^{Y} \frac{Z}{2} = \frac{d\hat{A}(i)}{2} e^{i\hat{A}(i) [A_{i}(i) - A_{e}(i) - \frac{1}{P}]^{P}} e^{iA} e^{iA_{e}(i) [A_{e}(i) - \frac{1}{P}]^{P}} e^{iA} e^{iA} e^{iA_{e}(i) [A_{e}(i) - \frac{1}{P}]^{P}} e^{iA} e^{iA$$

(since our microscopic laws are of an iterative and causal form, they have unique solutions). To compactify our equations we will use the short-hand $s_i(') = [q_i('); z_i(')]$. We can now write the disorder average \overline{Z} [] of (16) as follows:

$$\overline{Z[]} = \begin{bmatrix} Z & Z \\ 4 & Y \\ 4 & \frac{dA(')dA^{(')}}{2}e^{iA^{(')}A(')}A^{(')}A^{(')}A^{(')}A^{(')}A^{(')}A^{(')}A^{(')}A^{(')}A^{(')}B^{(')}A^{(')}B^{($$

The brackets h:: $i_{fz,Zg}$ denote averaging over the Gaussian decision noise and the pseudo-memory variables, and we have used the abbreviations (10). The short-hand $Du = (2)^{\frac{1}{2}}e^{\frac{1}{2}u^2}$ and the previously introduced quantity \overline{W} [:::] in (17) allow us to write the disorder average (over the independently distributed zero-average and unit-variance R^{ia}) in the last line of (18) as

$$\frac{P}{e^{N^{\frac{1}{P}}}} = Y Y Z \qquad D u e^{\frac{i\eta}{2N^{\frac{1}{P}}}} P, [\sim q_{1}(`)A (`) A^{(`)}[l+s_{1}(`)]]F [`;A;Z]}$$

$$\frac{V Y Z}{V Y Z} P, [\sim q_{1}(`)A (`) A^{(`)}[l+s_{1}(`)]]F [`;A;Z]}$$

$$= e^{\frac{1}{4N}} P, [\sim q_{2N^{\frac{1}{P}}}]P, [\sim q_{1}(`)A (`) A^{(`)}[l-s_{1}(`)]]F [`;A;Z]}$$

$$= e^{\frac{1}{4N}} P, [\sim q_{2N^{\frac{1}{P}}}]P, [\sim q_{1}(`)A (`) A^{(`)}[l-s_{1}(`)]]F [`;A;Z]}$$

$$= e^{\frac{1}{4N}} P, [\sim q_{2N^{\frac{1}{P}}}]P, [\sim q_{1}(`)A (`) A^{(`)}[l-s_{1}(`)]]F [`;A;Z]}$$

$$= e^{\frac{1}{4N}} P, [\sim q_{2N^{\frac{1}{P}}}]P, [\sim q_{1}(`)A (`) A^{(`)}[L-s_{1}(`)]]F [`;A;Z]}$$

$$= e^{\frac{1}{4N}} P, [\sim q_{2N^{\frac{1}{P}}}]P, [\sim q_{2N^{\frac{1}{P}}}]P, [\sim q_{1}(`)A (`) A^{(`)}[L-s_{1}(`)]]F [`;A;Z]}$$

$$= e^{\frac{1}{4N}} P, [\sim q_{2N^{\frac{1}{P}}}]P, [\sim q_{2N^{\frac{1}{P}$$

We next isolate the usual observables $L(; *^{0}) = N^{1^{P}} {}_{i} \hat{q}_{i} (*) \hat{q}_{i} (*^{0}), K(; *^{0}) = N^{1^{P}} {}_{i} s_{i} (*) \hat{q}_{i} (*^{0}), and C(*; *^{0}) = N^{1^{P}} {}_{i} s_{i} (*) s_{i} (*^{0}), by inserting appropriate integrals over -distributions. We also use the abbreviations DC = <math>\binom{Q}{N} \frac{1}{N} \frac{dC}{dC} (*; *^{0}) = \frac{1}{2}$ (sim ilarly for other two-time observables) and DA = $\binom{Q}{N} \frac{1}{N} \frac{dC}{dC} (*; *^{0}) = \frac{1}{2}$ (sim ilarly for A). Initial conditions for the $q_{i}(0)$ are assumed to be of the factorized form $p_{0}(q) = \binom{Q}{i} p_{0}(q_{i}(0))$. In anticipation of issues to arise in subsequent stages of our analysis, especially those related to the scaling with N of the number of individual iterations of the process, we will also de ne the largest iteration step in the generating

$$\begin{aligned} \text{functional as } \overset{\text{`m ax}}{}_{\text{m ax}} \cdot \text{A Il this allow s us to write Z [] in the form} \\ \overline{\text{Z []}} = & \text{D C D C D K D K D L D L e}^{\text{IN}} \overset{\text{P}}{}_{\text{,0}} \overset{\text{C}}{\mathbb{P}}^{(\text{'}; \text{'})} C (\text{'}; \text{'}) + K^{(\text{'}; \text{'})} K (\text{'}; \text{'}) + L^{(\text{'}; \text{'})} L (\text{'}; \text{'})} \\ & \overset{\text{C}}{\mathbb{P}}^{(\frac{Q}{m ax} \log N)} \overset{\text{Z}}{}_{\text{D A D A}} e^{i \overset{\text{P}}{\text{i}}} \overset{\text{A}^{(\text{'})}}{, A^{(\text{'})} A (\text{'})} A_{e} (\text{'})] \\ & \overset{\text{d}}{\mathbb{P}}^{\frac{1}{q}} \overset{\text{P}}{, 0} \overset{\text{W}}{}_{\text{W}} [\text{'}; \text{'}^{0}A; Z] f A^{(\text{'})} K (\text{'}; \text{'}) A (\text{'}) + A^{(\text{'})} K (\text{'}; \text{'}) A (\text{'}) g \\ & * \overset{\text{d}}{\mathbb{P}}^{\frac{1}{q}} \overset{\text{W}}{, 0} \overset{\text{W}}{}_{\text{W}} [\text{'}; \text{'}^{0}A; Z] f A^{(\text{'})} K (\text{'}; \text{'}) A (\text{'}) + A^{(\text{'})} (1 + C (\text{'}; \text{'}) A (\text{'}) g \\ & * \overset{\text{H}}{\mathbb{Z}} & \overset{\text{H}}{\mathbb{Y}} \\ & \overset{\text{H}}{\mathbb{Z}} \overset{\text{H}}{} \overset{\text{W}}{} (\overset{\text{H}}{(\text{'})} (1 + 1) & \overset{\text{H}}{\mathbb{Q}_{1}} (\text{'}) (1 + C (\text{'}; \text{'}) A (\text{'}) g \\ & \overset{\text{H}}{\mathbb{Y}} \\ & \overset{\text{H}}{\mathbb{Z}} \overset{\text{H}}{} \overset{\text{H}}{} \overset{\text{H}}{} \overset{\text{H}}{} (1 + 1) & \overset{\text{H}}{\mathbb{Q}_{1}} (\text{'}) (1 + C (\text{'}; \text{'}) A (\text{'}) g \\ & \overset{\text{H}}{\mathbb{Y}} \\ & \overset{\text{H}}{\mathbb{Z}} & \overset{\text{H}}{\mathbb{Y}} \\ & \overset{\text{H}}{\mathbb{Z}} \end{aligned} \\ & \overset{\text{H}}{\mathbb{Z}} \overset{\text{H}}{\mathbb{Z}} \end{aligned} \\ & \overset{\text{H}}{\mathbb{Z}} \end{aligned} \\ & \overset{\text{H$$

with

$$= i \sum_{v^{0} i_{max}} [\hat{C}(v; v^{0})C(v; v^{0}) + \hat{K}(v; v^{0})K(v; v^{0}) + \hat{L}(v; v^{0})L(v; v^{0})]$$
(21)

$$= \frac{1}{N} \log DADA e^{i \sum_{max}} A(v)A(v) A_{e}(v)]$$
(22)

$$= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i} \log^{*Z} A^{i} \sum_{v^{0}} A(v)A e^{i(v)}A_{i}ZM(v; v^{0})A_{i}A_{i}A)$$
(22)

$$= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i} \log^{*Z} A^{i} \sum_{v^{0}} A(v)A e^{i(v)}A e^{i(v)}A_{i}ZM(v; v^{0})A_{i}A_{i}A)$$
(22)

$$= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i} \log^{*Z} A^{i} \sum_{v^{0}} A(v)A e^{i(v)}A e^{i($$

and with

$$M ['; `^{0}; A; A^{\hat{}}] = \sim^{2} A (')L ('; `^{0})A (`^{0}) \sim A^{\hat{}} (')K ('; `^{0})A (`^{0}) + A^{\hat{}} (`^{0})K (`^{0}; `)A (')] + A^{\hat{}} (')[1 + C ('; `^{0})]A^{\hat{}} (`^{0})$$
(24)

The O ($^{2}_{max} \log N$) corrections in (20) are constants, which releast the scaling with N used in defining the conjugate order parameters.

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 [C;K;L], which is now de ned in terms of a stochastic process for the overall bid A (') rather than being an explicit function of the order parameters (which had been the situation in all fake history versions of the gam e), and in the remaining task to implement an appropriate scaling with N of the time scale 'm ax. W e can now also see the advantage in our earlier decision to de ne G aussian rather than binary bok-up table entries. W ith the N -scaling of 'm ax still pending, instead of (19), in the binary case we would have found

$$\begin{array}{ccc} P & P & & i \\ P & & \log \cos \frac{1}{2N}P & , \\ e^{i} & & \log \cos \frac{1}{2N}P & , \\ & & & & \\ \end{array} \begin{bmatrix} -\hat{q}_{i}(')A(') + \hat{A}(') [1 & s_{i}(')] \end{bmatrix} F & [';A;Z] \\ \end{array}$$
(25)

In this expression we see that, for $m_{max} = 0$ (N), the dimensional event choices of strategy look-up table entry distribution will give the same results only for those paths fA;Zg where the frequency of occurrence each of the 2^{M} possible histories is of order 0 (N⁻¹). In the latter case the function F [';A;Z] scales e ectively inside summations over 'as F [';A;Z] = 0 (N^{-1/2}), and we return to (19). Thus, for non-G aussian distributions of the fR^{-ia}g at this stage of the GFA one either has to carry on with them ore complicated expression (25), which cannot be expressed in terms of the order parameters fC;K;Lg, or one has to make further assumptions on the overall bid statistics, which (although turning out to be correct) require validation a posteriori.

3.2. Canonical time scaling

For the on-line MG with random external information (i.e. with = 1) it is known that the relevant time scale is $n_{max} = 0$ (N). Rather than imposing the time scale $n_{max} = 0$ (N) by hand, it is satisfactory to see that one can also extract this canonical time scaling from our present equations (20,21,22,23).

For nite m_{ax} we immediately nd $\lim_{N \le 1} = 0$ in (22), and our generating functional will be dom inated by the physical saddle-point of $\lim_{N \leq 1} [+]$, giving $\hat{C} = \hat{K} = \hat{L} = 0$. This leads to a trivial e extive single spin problem, which just describes a frozen state. This makes perfect sense in view of our de nitions (12,13): individual updates of the variables q_i are of order N $\frac{1}{2}$, so nothing can change on time-scales corresponding to only a nite number of iteration steps. Thus our present equations autom at ically lead us to the choice $m_{max} = 0$ (1= N), where $\lim_{N \le 1} N = 0$; the function will indeed scale di erently as soon as m_{ax} is allowed to diverge with N.W e thus de ne $m_{ax} = t_{max} = N$, where 0 $t_{max} < 1$ (of order N⁰) and with $\lim_{N \le 1} N = 0$. In order to obtain well-de ned lim its at the end in (21), we see that we have to re-scale our conjugate order parameters according to $(\hat{C};\hat{K};\hat{L}) \leq N^2(\hat{C};\hat{K};\hat{L})$. Furtherm ore, for the perturbation elds f_i ; f_i to retain statistical signi cance they also will have to be re-scaled in the familiar manner, according to $(i; i) ! N^{-1}(\tilde{i}; \tilde{i})$ (similar to [10]). The integrations over order parameters and conjugate order parameters in (20) will now become path integrals for N ! 1 x.

It will be convenient to introduce the following e ective measure:

ЪО

$$\begin{split} & \text{hg}[\text{fq};\hat{q};\text{zg}]\text{i}_{?} = \lim_{N \,!\, 1} \, \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i}^{N \,!} \frac{\prod_{i=1}^{N} \sum_{j=1}^{N} \frac{1}{N} \left[\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \frac{1}{N} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \frac{1}{N} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \frac{1}{N} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \frac{1}{N} \frac{1}{N} \left[\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \frac{1}{N} \frac{1}{N$$

x This is the point, therefore, where the inevitable continuity assumptions regarding our macroscopic dynamic observables enter. In the present derivation these take a more transparent form than in [10], where they were hidden inside the details of the tem poral regularization.

9

10

(27)

Upon substituting $n_{ax} = t_{max} = n_{max}$ into our equations (21,22,23), followed by appropriate re-scaling of the conjugate order parameters, these three functions acquire the following form (modulo irrelevant constants):

$$= i_{N}^{2} \int_{t_{max}=N}^{X} \hat{C} (\mathbf{'}; \mathbf{'}^{0}) C (\mathbf{'}; \mathbf{'}^{0}) + \hat{K} (\mathbf{'}; \mathbf{'}^{0}) K (\mathbf{'}; \mathbf{'}^{0}) + \hat{L} (\mathbf{'}; \mathbf{'}^{0}) L (\mathbf{'}; \mathbf{'}^{0})^{i} (28)$$

$$= \frac{1}{N} \log \left[D A D A W \left[A; A J Z \right] \right]_{f Z g}$$
(29)

$$=\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i}^{X} \log_{i=1}^{Z t_{m}} dq(\mathbf{'}) dq(\mathbf{'}) M_{i}[fq;q;zg]i_{z}$$
(30)

with

$$\mathbb{W} [A; \hat{A}]_{\mathbb{Z}}] = e^{i \sum_{i=1}^{p} t_{m ax^{=} N} \hat{A}(i) A(i) A_{e}(i)] \frac{1}{4} \sum_{i=1}^{p} t_{m ax^{=} N} \overline{W}[i; 0; A; \mathbb{Z} M[i; 0; A; A^{A}]}$$
(31)

It is clear that and now have proper N ! 1 lim its. The canonical choice of $_{\rm N}$ is subsequently determ ined by the mathematical condition that $\lim_{\rm N \ ! \ 1}$ [C;K;L] \in 0, but nite. It follows that (20) is again dom inated by its physical saddle-point, and we are nearly back in familiar territory.

3.3. The saddle point equations

In order to elim inate the elds $f_i()$; i()g, and thereby sim plify our equations, we next extract the physical meaning of our order parameters from the generating functional by taking appropriate derivatives with respect to these elds. This gives

$$C(\mathbf{'}; \mathbf{'}) = \lim_{N \neq 1} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i}^{X} \overline{hs_{i}(\mathbf{'})s_{i}(\mathbf{'})i} = h[q(\mathbf{'});z(\mathbf{'})][q(\mathbf{'});z(\mathbf{'})]i_{2}$$
(32)

$$G('; '^{0}) = \lim_{N \neq 1} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i}^{X} \frac{(hs_{i}(')i)}{(l_{i}('))} = ih [q(');z(')]\hat{q}(')]$$
(33)

$$0 \qquad = \lim_{N \downarrow 1} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i}^{X} \frac{\frac{\theta^2}{1}}{\theta_{i}(\mathbf{\hat{v}})\theta_{i}(\mathbf{\hat{v}})} = h\hat{q}(\mathbf{\hat{v}})\hat{q}(\mathbf{\hat{v}})\hat{l}_{2} \qquad (34)$$

Thus at the physical saddle-point of (20) we have the usual relations $L('; {}^{0}) = 0$ and $K('; {}^{0}) = iG('; {}^{0})$, where G denotes the single-site response function. Upon varying $f\hat{C};\hat{K};\hat{L}g$ in (20) we reproduce self-consistently the by now standard equations

$$C('; '^{0}) = h[q(');z(')][q('^{0});z('^{0})]i_{2}$$
(35)

$$G('; '^{0}) = ih [q('); z(')]\hat{q}(^{0})i_{2}$$
(36)

$$L('; '^{0}) = h\hat{q}(')\hat{q}('^{0})i_{2} = 0$$
(37)

We turn to variation of the order parameters fC;K;Lg in + (as only depends on the conjugate order parameters). In working out derivatives of we observe that the conjugate bids e extively act as di erential operators, ie \hat{A} (s) ! $i \hat{Q} = \hat{Q} A_e$ (s). This

gives us our rem aining three saddle point equations:

$$\hat{C}(\mathbf{s};\mathbf{s}^{0}) = \lim_{N \downarrow 1} \frac{i}{4N_{N}^{2}} \frac{\frac{e^{2}}{e^{\mathbf{A}_{e}}(\mathbf{s})e^{\mathbf{A}_{e}}(\mathbf{s}^{0})} \int_{\mathbf{D}_{R}}^{\mathbf{D}_{R}} DADAW [\mathbf{A};\mathbf{A};\mathbf{Z}] \overline{W}[\mathbf{s};\mathbf{s}^{0};\mathbf{A};\mathbf{Z}]_{fZg}}{DADAW [\mathbf{A};\mathbf{A};\mathbf{Z}]_{fZg}}$$
(38)

$$\hat{K}(s;s^{0}) = \lim_{N \downarrow 1} \frac{\sim}{2N_{N}^{2}} \frac{\frac{\theta}{\theta A_{e}(s)}}{\sum_{R \downarrow 1} D A D A W [A;A J Z] W [s;s^{0};A;Z] A (s^{0})}{\sum_{R \downarrow 2} D A D A W [A;A J Z]}$$
(39)

$$\hat{L}(s;s^{0}) = \lim_{N \leq 1} \frac{i^{2}}{4N_{N}^{2}} \frac{\stackrel{D_{R}}{D A D A W A; A Z}}{\stackrel{D_{R}}{D} A D A W A; A Z} \frac{\stackrel{E}{W}(s;s^{0};A;Z|A(s)A(s^{0}))}{\stackrel{E}{D}_{R}}$$
(40)

At the physical saddle-point, we may use L = 0 and the symmetry of \overline{W} [:::] to simplify the function M ['; ''; A; A] which occurs in the measure (31) to

$$M ['; '^{0}; A; \hat{A}] = \hat{A} (') [1 + C ('; '^{0})] \hat{A} ('^{0}) \qquad 2i \hat{A} (') G ('; '^{0}) A ('^{0})$$
(41)

The generating elds $f_i(`)g$ are now no longer needed and can be removed. The perturbations \tilde{i} are still useful for calculating the response function G, but can be chosen site-independent, i.e. $\tilde{i}(`) = \tilde{i}(`)$. The measure (27) will then lose its site dependence. Also the functions f; ; g have at this stage become obsolete. We may de nea new time $t = \tilde{i}_N = O(N^0)$, which will be real-valued as N ! 1, and we may take the limit N ! 1 in the de nitions of our observables. The latter can subsequently be written in terms of the new real-valued time arguments, C ($i; i^0$) ! C ($t; t^0$) (and similar for the other kernels).

4. The resulting theory

4.1. Sim pli cation of saddle-point equations

W e m ay now summarize our saddle-point equations for fC;Gg in the usual compact way, in terms of an e ective single agent process:

C
$$(t;t^0) = \text{hsgn}[q(t)] \text{sgn}[q(t^0)] i_2$$
 G $(t;t^0) = \text{ihsgn}[q(t)] \dot{q}(t^0) i_2$ (42)

with a measure which is de ned in terms of path integrals, as in [10] (and with time integrals running from t = 0 to $t = t_{max}$):

To nd the kernels $\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{\hat{r}}; \mathbf{\hat{L}}; \mathbf{\hat{L}})$ we have to evaluate equations (38,39,40) further, remembering that the left-hand sides as yet still involve the integer time labels (s; s⁰), rather than the continuous times. Now the scaling chosen for _N with N which we adopt will be crucial. We observe that all complications are contained in the evaluation, for large N and for any given realization of the fake market information path fZ g, of objects of the following general form (with all operators evaluated at the saddle-point):

$$hQ [fAg]_{i_{fA}; r_g} = DAD\hat{A} W [A; \hat{A}; z] Q [fAg]$$
(45)

We can con m, by repeating the steps taken in evaluating the disorder-averaged generating functional \overline{Z} [] but now for calculating averages of arbitrary functions of the overall market bid path fAg, that the physical interpretation of the measure (45) is

$$\lim_{N \downarrow 1} \overline{hQ [fAg]i} = hQ [fAg]i_{fAjZg}$$
(46)

Thus (45) de nes the asymptotic disorder-averaged probability density for observing a path' fAg ofglobalbids, for a given realization of the fake history path fZg. To evaluate (45) we introduce two path-dependent matrices G [A;Z] and D [A;Z], with entries

$$G [A; Z]('; '^{0}) = \overline{W} ['; '^{0}; A; Z] G ('; '^{0})$$
(47)

$$D [A;Z]('; '^{0}) = \overline{W} ['; '^{0};A;Z][1 + C ('; '^{0})]$$
(48)

De nition (17) tells us that G [A;Z]('; ") = G ('; ") if the history' observed at stage ' is identical to that observed at stage ', and zero otherwise, and sim ilarly for the relation between D [A;Z]('; ") and 1 + C ('; "). We now use auxiliary integration variables f g to linearize the term in the exponent of (45) which is quadratic in A[^], and use causality of the response function G where appropriate:

$$\begin{split} hQ \ [fAg]i_{fA \ JZ \ g} &= \begin{array}{c} Z \ t_{m \ gx^{E} \ N}}{2} \\ & \begin{array}{c} \frac{dA \ (') dA^{'} (')}{2} e^{iA^{'} (') \ A \ (') \ A \ e^{(') + \frac{1}{2} \ e^{-P}} \ t_{0<, \ G \ A; \ Z \]('; \ 0^{0} \ A \ (^{0})]} \ Q \ [fAg]}{2} \\ & \begin{array}{c} \frac{R \ Q \ t_{m \ ax^{E} \ N}}{2} e^{iA^{'} (') \ A \ (') \ A \ e^{(') + \frac{1}{2} \ e^{-P}} \ t_{0<, \ G \ A; \ Z \]('; \ 0^{0} \ A \ (^{0})]} \ Q \ [fAg]}{2} \\ & \begin{array}{c} \frac{R \ Q \ t_{m \ ax^{E} \ N}}{2} e^{iA^{'} (') \ A \ (') \ A \ e^{(') + \frac{1}{2} \ e^{-P}} \ t_{0<, \ G \ A; \ Z \]('; \ 0^{0} \ A \ (^{0})]} \ Q \ [fAg]}{2} \\ & \begin{array}{c} \frac{R \ Q \ t_{m \ ax^{E} \ N}}{2} e^{iA \ (') \ Q \ [fAg]} \\ & \begin{array}{c} \frac{R \ Q \ t_{m \ ax^{E} \ N}}{2} e^{iA \ (') \ Q \ [fAg]} \\ & \begin{array}{c} \frac{R \ Q \ t_{m \ ax^{E} \ N}}{2} e^{iA \ (') \ Q \ [fAg]} \\ & \begin{array}{c} \frac{R \ Q \ t_{m \ ax^{E} \ N}}{2} e^{iA \ (') \ Q \ [fAg]} \\ & \begin{array}{c} \frac{R \ Q \ t_{m \ ax^{E} \ N}}{2} e^{iA \ (') \ Q \ [fAg]} \\ & \begin{array}{c} \frac{R \ Q \ t_{m \ ax^{E} \ N}}{2} e^{iA \ (') \ Q \ [fAg]} \\ & \begin{array}{c} \frac{R \ Q \ t_{m \ ax^{E} \ N}}{2} e^{iA \ (') \ Q \ [fAg]} \\ & \begin{array}{c} \frac{R \ Q \ t_{m \ ax^{E} \ N}}{2} e^{iA \ (') \ Q \ [fAg]} \\ & \begin{array}{c} \frac{R \ Q \ t_{m \ ax^{E} \ N}}{2} e^{iA \ (') \ Q \ [fAg]} \\ & \begin{array}{c} \frac{R \ Q \ t_{m \ ax^{E} \ N}}{2} e^{iA \ (') \ Q \ [fAg]} \\ & \begin{array}{c} \frac{R \ Q \ t_{m \ ax^{E} \ N}}{2} e^{iA \ (') \ Q \ [fAg]} \\ & \begin{array}{c} \frac{R \ Q \ t_{m \ ax^{E} \ N}}{2} e^{iA \ (') \ Q \ [fAg]} \\ & \begin{array}{c} \frac{R \ Q \ t_{m \ ax^{E} \ N}}{2} e^{iA \ (') \ Q \ [fAg]} \\ & \begin{array}{c} \frac{R \ Q \ t_{m \ ax^{E} \ N}}{2} e^{iA \ (') \ Q \ (fAg]} \\ & \begin{array}{c} \frac{R \ Q \ t_{m \ ax^{E} \ A}}{2} e^{iA \ (') \ Q \ (fAg]} \\ & \begin{array}{c} \frac{R \ Q \ t_{m \ ax^{E} \ A}}{2} e^{iA \ (') \ Q \ t_{m \ ax^{E} \ A}} \ & \begin{array}{c} \frac{R \ Q \ t_{m \ ax^{E} \ A}}{2} e^{iA \ (') \ A \ A \ A} \ & \begin{array}{c} \frac{R \ Q \ A}}{2} e^{iA \ A} \ & \begin{array}{c} \frac{R \ Q \ A}}{2} e^{iA \ A} \ & \begin{array}{c} \frac{R \ Q \ A}}{2} e^{iA \ A} \ & \begin{array}{c} \frac{R \ Q \ A}}{2} e^{iA \ A} \ & \begin{array}{c} \frac{R \ Q \ A}}{2} e^{iA \ A} \ & \begin{array}{c} \frac{R \ Q \ A}}{2} e^{iA \ A} \ & \begin{array}{c} \frac{R \ Q \ A}}{2} e^{iA \ A} \ & \begin{array}{c} \frac{R \ Q \ A}}{2} e^{iA \ A} \ & \ \\ \end{array}{}$$
{c} \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \

Here h:: $i_{f_{a};Z_{g}}$ refers to averaging over the zero-average G aussian elds w ith fA; Z gdependent covariance h $v_{i_{f_{a};Z_{g}}} = \frac{1}{2}D$ [A; Z]('; '). We conclude from our expression for hQ [fAg] $i_{fA;Z_{g}}$ that the conditional disorder-averaged probability density P [fAgjfZg] for nding a bid path fAg, given a realization fZ g of the pseudo-history, is given by

$$P [fAgjfZg] = {}^{*} {}^{t_{m}} {}^{*}_{W} {}^{=}_{N} {}^{2} {}^{*}_{A} (`) A_{e} (`) + \frac{1}{2} {}^{\times}_{\circ_{<}} G (`; `^{0}) \overline{W} [`; `^{0}; A; Z] A (`^{0}) {}^{,5} {}^{f}_{A; Zg} (49)$$

with hQ [fAg] $i_{fA,zg} = {}^{R_{Q}} (\ dA (\)P$ [fAg]fZg]Q [fAg]. Causality ensures that the density (49) is normalized, since both $\$ and G [A;Z]('; ') involve only entries of the paths fA;Zgwith times k < '.

Having established (49), our equations (38,39,40) can be simplified considerably. We immediately nd that $\hat{C} = 0$. To simplify comparison with the theory of [10] (corresponding to = 1), we will make a nalchange in notation and put

$$\hat{K}(\mathbf{'};\mathbf{'}^{0}) = R(\mathbf{'};\mathbf{'}) \qquad \hat{L}(\mathbf{'};\mathbf{'}^{0}) = \frac{1}{2} i (\mathbf{'};\mathbf{'})$$
(50)

This allows us, with p = N and in anticipation of our expected time scaling $_{N} = -2p$ (known from the analysis in [10] of the M arkovian limit = 1), to write the remaining equations (39,40) in the simple form

$$R('; '^{0}) = \lim_{N \leq 1} \frac{2}{(A_{e}('))} \left(\frac{2}{2p_{N}} \right)^{2} h_{W} ['^{0}; '; A; Z] A(') i_{fA; Z_{g}} (fZ_{g})$$
(51)

$$('; ^{0}) = \lim_{N ! 1} \left(\frac{2^{2}}{2p_{N}} \right)^{D} h_{W} ['; ^{0}; A ; Z] A (') A ('^{0}) i_{fA ; Z g}$$
(52)

We see that R de ness a response function associated with external bid perturbation, and hence obeys causality: R ('; '⁰) = 0 for '⁰ > '. This, in turn, enables us to simplify equations (42) for fC; G g and the measure h:::i₂ to a form identical to that found in [10] for the M arkovian ('fake history') on-line M G:

$$C (t;t^{0}) = h [q(t);z(t)] [q(t^{0});z(t^{0})]i_{2}$$
(53)

G (t;t⁰) =
$$\frac{1}{2} (t) = \frac{1}{2} (t) = \frac$$

$$hg[fq;zg]i_{?} = \frac{\int fdqg hg[fq;zg]M [fq;zg]i_{z}}{\int fdqg hM [fq;zg]i_{z}}$$
(55)

$$M [fq;zg] = p_0 (q(0)) fdqg e^{\frac{1}{2}} dtdt^0 (t;t^0)q(t)q(t^0)$$

$$R_{e^{i}dt q(t)} \left[\frac{d}{dt}q(t) - (t) + R_{dt^0 R (t;t^0)} [q(t^0);z(t^0)] \right]$$
(56)

4.2. Summary and interpretation

We recognize that (56) describes the usual e ective single-trader equation with a retarded self-interaction and zero-average Gaussian noise (t) with covariances h (t) (t) i = (t; t):

$$\frac{d}{dt}q(t) = (t) = ($$

We have used the fact, as in [10], that the discontinuity of the correlation function for equal times, i.e. C (t;t) = 1, will in the continuous time limit be irrelevant. This implies that we may carry out the averages over the decision noise and are left only with expressions involving [q] = dz P(z) [q;z], and that (with the exclusion of $t = t^0$, where one has C (t;t) = 1) the order parameter equations (53,54) simplify to

C (t; t⁰) = h [q(t)] [q(t⁰)]i₂ G (t; t⁰) =
$$-\frac{1}{2}$$
 h [q(t)]i₂ (58)

Our remaining problem is to solve the order parameters fR; g from (51,52). To do so we must select the canonical time scale $_{\rm N}$ such that the N ! 1 limit in (51,52)

is both non-trivial (i.e. N su ciently small) and well-de ned (i.e. N not too small). For the special value = 1 we know [10] that N = ~=2p. Although here we have followed a di erent route towards a continuous time description, we show in Appendix A that indeed N = ~=2p, by working out our present equations in detail for the fake history limit ! 1. Given this canonical time scaling and given the de nition \overline{W} ['; '0;A;Z] = (';A;Z); ('0;A;Z), we nd our equations (51,52) taking their nalforms:

$$R (t; t^{0}) = \lim_{N ! 0} \frac{DD}{A_{e}(t^{0})} A (') \xrightarrow{EE} (59)$$

$$(\mathsf{t}; \mathfrak{t}^{0}) = \sim \lim_{N \to 0} \frac{1}{N} \overset{\mathrm{LD}}{\operatorname{A}} (\mathsf{'}) \operatorname{A} (\mathfrak{'}^{0}) \qquad \underset{(\mathsf{'}; \mathfrak{A}; \mathbb{Z}); \quad (\mathsf{'}^{0}; \mathfrak{A}; \mathbb{Z}) \quad f \mathfrak{A}; \mathbb{Z} \mathfrak{g} := \mathfrak{t}_{\mathbb{N}}; \mathsf{'}^{0} = \mathfrak{t}^{0} = \mathfrak{h}}{\operatorname{K}}$$
(60)

with $= A_e(') = N^{-1} = 0$ ('). Here $h_{1:1} = A_{2}$ refers to an average over the stochastic process (49) for the overall bids fA g and over the pseudo-history fZ g. The bid evolution process can be written in more explicit form as

$$A(') = A_{e}(') + \frac{1}{2} \sim \sum_{0 < 1}^{X} G('; 0) \qquad (A_{i}, Z_{i}) = A('0) \qquad (61)$$

with the zero-average G aussian random elds f g, characterized by

h ·
$$_{0}i_{f} \xrightarrow{}_{\mathcal{A};Zg} = \frac{1}{2} [1 + C ('; ^{0})] _{(';\mathcal{A};Z); (^{0};\mathcal{A};Z)}$$
(62)

Equation (61) is to be interpreted as follows. For every realization fZg of the fake history 'path' one iterates (61) to ind successive bid values upon generating the zeroaverage Gaussian random variables \cdot with statistics (62) (which depend, in turn, on the recent bid realizations). The result is averaged over the fake history paths fZg.

Let us now sum marize the structure of the present theory describing the MG with true market history in the lim it N ! 1, by indicating the sim ilarities and the di erences with the previous theory describing the on-line MG without market history:

sim ilarities between the theory of real and fake history MGs:

The MG with real history is described again by the e ective single agent equation (57), from which the usual order dynam ical order parameters fC;Gg are to be solved self-consistently via (58).

The scaling with N of the characteristic times in the MG with history is identical to that of the MG without history, if we avoid highly biased global bid initializations (where the MG with history acts faster by a factor $\frac{P}{N}$).

di erences between the theory of real and fake history MGs:

Real and fake history MGs di er in the retarded self-interaction kernelR and the noise covariance kernel of the single agent equation. W ithout history, fR; gwere found as explicit functions of fC;Gg.W ith history they are to be solved from an e ective equation (61) for the evolving global bid. the e ective global bid process:

The e ective global bid process (61) is itself independent of the stochastic e ective single trader process (57). The two are linked only via the (time dependent) order parameters occurring in their de nitions.

At each stage in the process (61), the bid A (') is coupled directly only to bids in the past at times 0 with identical realization of the M -bit history string. In addition, only those elective global bid noise variables \cdot are correlated which correspond to times v with identical realizations of the M -bit history string.

The di erences between the two Yake history' de nitions (3,4) (i.e. consistent versus inconsistent) are seen to be limited to the details of the averaging process h::: i_{fZg} .

In Appendix A we show how one can recover from (57,61) the earlier theory of [10] in the fake history limit ! 1. This exercise serves two purposes. Firstly, it con mms that the canonical time scale of our process is indeed given by $_{\rm N} = -2p$ (modulo an irrelevant multiplicative constant). More importantly, being the simplest instance of our presently studied class of MG models, it provides useful intuition on how we might proceed to not solutions of our excitive processes (57,61) in the general case.

5. The role of history statistics

We continue with our analysis of the full MG with history, and next show that all the e ects induced by having real market history can be concentrated in the statistics of the M-bit memory strings of (15). More speci cally, the core objects in the theory will turn out to be the following functions, which measure the joint probability to nd identical histories in the elective global bid process (61) at k specied times f_1 ; ...; 'kg, relative to the probability p^k for this to happen in the case of random ly drawn fake histories and non-identical times:

We have abbreviated $P = P_{2f 1;1g^{M}}$, with $2^{M} = p = N$. For any value of k one recovers in the random history limit and for non-identical times lim $_{l 1 k}$ (:::) = 1. For k = 1 one has $_{1}(') = P_{ln}$ if $_{j (A;Z)}$ is $_{fA;Zg} = 1$, for any . In contrast, for arbitrary (i.e. when allowing for real histories) and k > 1 the functions (63) are nontrivial.

5.1. Reduction of the kernels fR; g

We will follow as much as possible the steps which we took in Appendix A in order to recover the = 1 equations (A.9,A.14). We re-write the global bid equation (61) as

$$X \stackrel{n}{\longrightarrow} \frac{1}{2} \sim G (\mathbf{'}; \stackrel{0}{\rightarrow}) \stackrel{O}{\longrightarrow} A (\mathbf{'}^{0}) = A_{e} (\mathbf{'}) +$$

and we form ally invert the operator on the left-hand side, using $_{N} = -2p$:

$$A(\mathbf{'}) = A_{e}(\mathbf{'}) + \mathbf{'} + \sum_{r>0}^{X} \left(\frac{2}{2}\right)^{r} \int_{\mathbf{'}_{1}:::\mathbf{'}_{r}}^{X} G(\mathbf{'};\mathbf{'}_{1})G(\mathbf{'}_{1};\mathbf{'}_{2}):::G(\mathbf{'}_{r-1};\mathbf{'}_{r})$$

$$h_{Y}^{r} \qquad i$$

$$(\mathbf{'}_{\mathcal{A}};Z); \quad (\mathbf{'}_{1};\mathcal{A};Z) \quad [A_{e}(\mathbf{'}_{r}) + \mathbf{'}_{r}] \qquad (64)$$

Expression (64) is itself not yet a solution of (61), since the bids fA (s)g also occur inside the history strings (v_0 ; A; Z) at the right-hand side. We now insert (64) rst into (59), and consider only in nitesimal external bid perturbations A_e, so that we need not worry about indirect e ects on A (') of these perturbations via the history strings (s; A; Z):

$$R (t; t^{0}) = (t \quad \overset{\circ}{0} + \lim_{N \mid 0} ((Y_{N})^{r})^{r} = (Y_{N})^{r} = (Y_{N})^{$$

Similarly we can insert (64) into (60), again with A_e ! 0, and nd

$$(t; t^{0}) = \sim \lim_{N \to 0} \frac{1}{N} \overset{<}{\overset{<}{_{rrr^{0} 0}}} X (_{N})^{r+r^{0}} \overset{X}{\overset{<}{_{1} ::::_{r}}} G (`_{0}; `_{1}) :::G (`_{r-1}; `_{r}) \\ \overset{X}{\overset{~}{_{0} ::::_{r}}} G (`_{0}; `_{1}^{0}) ::::G (`_{r-1}; `_{n}) p^{r+r^{0}} \overset{DD}{h} `_{r-r^{0}} \overset{O}{\overset{~}{_{1} :::_{r}}} f_{\overline{P}} ;_{Z} g \\ \overset{`_{1} ::::_{r}}{\overset{`_{1} ::::_{r}}{}} ih Y^{0} & i EE \stackrel{9}{=} \\ i= 1 \qquad (^{(_{0};A;Z)}; (`_{i}A;Z) ; (`_{i}A;Z) ; j= 1 \qquad (^{(_{0};A;Z)}; (`_{j}A;Z) ; f_{A};Z g; `_{0} = \frac{t}{N}; `_{0}^{0} = \frac{t^{0}}{N} \\ = \lim_{N \to 0} \overset{<}{\underset{r;r^{0} 0}{}} (_{N})^{r+r^{0}} \overset{X}{X} G (`_{0}; `_{1}) ::::G (`_{r-1}; `_{r}) \\ & X \qquad G (`_{0}; `_{1}) ::::G (`_{r-1}; `_{r}) [1 + C (`_{r}; `_{r}^{0})] \\ \overset{`_{0} ::::_{r}}{\overset{`_{1} :::_{r}}{}} r^{0} ::::_{r} `_{r}; `_{0}^{0}; ::::; `_{r}) (C_{r} = \frac{t}{N}; `_{0}^{0} = \frac{t^{0}}{N} (C_{r} = C_{r})]$$

The limits $_{\rm N}$! 0 in (65,66) are well-de ned, since each time sum mation combines with a factor $_{\rm N}$ to generate an integral, whereas pairwise identical times in (66) have a bare' factor $_{\rm N}$ but will also cause $_{\rm r+r^{0}+2}$ (:::) to gain a factor $p = \sim = 2_{\rm N}$ in compensation.

Since the single agent process (57) is linked to the global bid process (61) only via the kernels fR; g, we conclude from (65,66) (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 (63). More speci cally, there is no need for us to solve the global bid process (61) beyond knowing the history statistics which it generates.

5.2. Time-translation invariant stationary states

In fully ergodic and tim e-translation invariant states without anom abus response, we could in Yake history' MG versions indicate closed equations for persistent order parameters without having to solve for the kernels fC;Gg in full, and locate phase transitions exactly. This suggests that the same may be true for MGs with true history. Thus we make the standard tim e-translation invariance (TTI) ansatz for the kernels in (57) and for the correlation- and response functions:

C
$$(t;t^0) = C (t t)$$

R $(t;t^0) = R (t t)$
G $(t;t^0) = G (t t)$
C $(t;t^0) = (t t)$

with $= \frac{R_1}{0} dt R(t)$ nite. It turns out that several relations between persistent observables in TTI stationary states of the present non-Markovian MG process, if such states again exist, can be established on the basis of (57) alone. Upon following established notation conventions and abbreviating time averages as $\overline{f} = \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{n} \frac{R_n}{n} dt f(t)$, we may write the time average of (57) as

$$\overline{dq}=dt = \overline{q} + p - -$$
(67)

with $_{R} = \frac{R_{1}}{0} dt R$ (t). We may now de ne the familiar e ective agent trajectories corresponding to deleversus frozen agents as those with either dq=dt = 0 or dq=dt \neq 0, respectively. For frozen agents, consistency dem ands that sgn[] = sgn[dq=dt]. It then follows from (67) that the (at least for $_{R} > 0$ com plem entary and mutually exclusive) conditions for having a ' delever or a 'frozen' solution can be written as follows:

dkle:
$$\bar{j} + \bar{p} - \bar{j}_{R}$$
 [1]; $\bar{p} = \frac{-p - \bar{p}}{R}$ (68)

frozen:
$$j + p - j > R$$
 [1]; $- = [1] sgn - i$ (69)

W hich solution of (68) and (69) we will nd depends on the realization of the noise term $\bar{}$, which is a frozen G aussian variable with zero expectation value and with variance

$$S_0^2 = h^{-2}i_2 = \lim_{l \to 1} \frac{1}{2} \int_0^2 dt dt^0 \quad (t; t^0) = (1)$$
 (70)

W e m ay now proceed as in Appendix A towards the calculation of the persistent order parameters , and c, where denotes the fraction of frozen agents in the stationary state, where $= \frac{R_1}{0} dt G$ (t), and with

$$c = \lim_{t \ge 1} C(t) = \lim_{t \ge 1} \frac{1}{2} \int_{0}^{2} dt dt^{0} h[q(t)] [q(t^{0})]i_{2} = h^{-2}i_{2}$$
(71)

Upon introducing the short-hand $u = \prod_{R} [1] = S_0^{\Gamma} \overline{2}$, and upon using the conditions and relations (68,69), we not in the lim it \sim ! 0 of vanishing external elds:

$$= \frac{d}{S_0} \frac{d}{2} e^{\frac{1}{2} - 2 = S_0^2} \int_{r}^{h} p_{-r} \left[1\right]$$

= 1 Erf[u] (72)

$$c = \frac{Z}{S_{0}} \frac{d}{Z} e^{\frac{1}{2}-2} = S_{0}^{2} \int_{D}^{n} j P_{R} [I]^{2} [I]$$

$$+ \frac{P_{R}}{R} [I] \int_{D}^{1} \frac{1}{2} = P_{R}^{2}$$

$$= \frac{2[I]^{n}}{1} Erf[I] + \frac{1}{2u^{2}} Erf[I] \frac{1}{u^{2}} = e^{u^{2}}$$

$$= \frac{Z}{S_{0}} \frac{d}{Z} e^{\frac{1}{2}-2} = S_{0}^{2} \frac{d}{Q} = P_{R}^{2}$$

$$= Erf[I] = R$$
(74)

Hence, in order to nd the TTI stationary solution f; c; 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 (61). U sing (65,66), the latter can be written as

$$= \int_{R}^{2} dt R (t)$$

$$= 1 + \lim_{N \stackrel{!}{=} 0} \int_{r>0}^{n X} (N)^{r} G ('_{1} '_{2})G ('_{2} '_{3}) :::G ('_{r 1} '_{r})G ('_{r})$$

$$= \int_{r+1}^{2} (('_{1}; :::; '_{r}; 0))^{o} (75)$$

$$S_{0}^{2} = \lim_{L \downarrow 1} \frac{1}{L^{2}} X \lim_{\substack{N \downarrow 0 \\ 0; \gamma_{0}^{0} L}} \lim_{\substack{N \downarrow 0 \\ X} G \begin{pmatrix} \gamma_{0} & \gamma_{1} \end{pmatrix}^{r+r^{0}} X \\ G \begin{pmatrix} \gamma_{0} & \gamma_{1} \end{pmatrix}^{r+r^{0}} X \\ \frac{1}{1} \dots Y_{r} \end{pmatrix} G \begin{pmatrix} \gamma_{0} & \gamma_{1} \end{pmatrix}^{r+r^{0}} X = G \begin{pmatrix} \gamma_{0} & \gamma_{1} \end{pmatrix}^{r} (1 + C \begin{pmatrix} \gamma_{1} & \gamma_{2} \end{pmatrix})$$

5.3. TTI states with short history correlation times

Calculating the history statistics kernels (63) from the global bid process (61) is hard, but in those cases where the history correlation time L_h (measured in individual iterations ') in the process is much smaller than N, we can make progress in our analysis of TTI stationary states. We denot the asymptotic frequency (A;Z) at which history string occurs in a given realization fA;Z g of our process (61) as

$$(A;Z) = \lim_{L \le 1} \frac{1}{L} \sum_{i=1}^{X^{L}} ; \quad (i;A;Z)$$
(77)

Obviously ^P (A;Z) = 1. For = 1 (no history) we would have = p¹ for all . We may also de ne the distribution %(f) of these asymptotic history frequencies (A;Z), relative to the benchmark ho-memory' values p¹, and averaged over the global bid process (61) in the in nite system size (i.e. continuous time) limit:

$$%(f) = \lim_{p! \perp 1} \frac{1}{p} h [f p (A;Z)]_{i_{fA;Zg}}$$
 (78)

Our de nitions guarantee that ${}^{R_1}_0$ df f%(f) = 1 for any . For = 1 we simply recover %(f) = [f 1], i.e. all histories occur equally frequently. We have not yet shown that

18



F igure 1. Typical examples of history frequency distributions (78) as measured in simulations of the on-line M G without decision noise but with full history (i.e. = 0), after equilibration. Here N = 8193. Left: = 0:125 (in the non-ergodic regime of the M G, below $_{\rm c}$). R ight: = 2:0 (in the ergodic regime, above $_{\rm c}$).

the limit in (78) exists, i.e. that the history frequencies do indeed generally scale as $(A;Z) = 0 (N^{-1})$. Numerical simulations, however, con m quite convincingly that

 IfL_h is the history correlation time in the process (61), then nite samples of history occurrence frequencies can be expected to approach the asymptotic value (77) as

this ansatz is indeed correct (see e.g. Figure 1).

$$\frac{1}{2L} \sum_{\nu_{e}, L}^{\lambda^{*}L} ; \quad (\nu_{A;Z}) = (A;Z)^{h} + O((L_{h}=L)^{\frac{1}{2}})^{\frac{1}{2}}$$
(79)

This implies that in expressions such as (75), where G (') $G(^{\circ}) = O(j' ^{\circ}jN)$ and where only time strings $f'_1; \ldots; kg$ with mutual temporal separations of order O(N) will survive the limit N! 0, we may choose e.g. $L = {}^{P}\overline{L_h N}$ and e ectively replace

$$_{r+1}('_{1}; :::; '_{r}; 0) ! p^{r} [1 + O(\overline{L_{h}=N})]$$
(80)

This results in

$$= \lim_{p! \ 1} \frac{1}{p} \sum_{r \ 0}^{X} \left(\int_{r \ 0}^{r} p \left[1 + O\left(\frac{1}{L_{h}=L}\right)\right]^{r+1} \right)$$

$$= \lim_{p! \ 1} \frac{1}{p} \sum_{r \ 0}^{X} \frac{p \left[1 + O\left(\frac{1}{L_{h}=N}\right)\right]}{1 + p \left[1 + O\left(\frac{1}{L_{h}=N}\right)\right]} = \sum_{r \ 0}^{Z} df \ %(f) \frac{f}{1 + f}$$
(81)

(provided indeed $\lim_{N \le 1} L_h = 0$). The same simplication to an expression involving only the distribution % (f) can be achieved in (76), but there we have to be more careful in dealing with the occurrences of similar or identical times in the argument of (63). We rst rewrite (76) by transforming the iteration times according to

for all i2 f0; ...; rg :
$$\sum_{j=1}^{X^r} s_j$$

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

$$S_{0}^{2} = \lim_{N \stackrel{!}{=} 0} X_{r+r^{0} 0} (N_{N})^{r+r^{0}} X_{s_{0} ::::s_{r-1} > 0} G(s_{0}) ::::G(s_{r-1}) G(s_{0}^{0}) ::::G(s_{r-1}^{0}) G(s_{0}^{0}) :::::G(s_{r-1}^{0}) G(s_{0}^{0}) :::::G(s_{r-1}^{0}) G(s_{r-1}^{0}) G(s_{r$$

Each time summation is compensated either by a factor $_N$ (giving an integral), or limited in range by L and compensated by an associated factor L 1 , so that any 'pairing' where two (or more) times are close to each other (relative to the correlation time L_h) will not survive the combined limits $_N$! 0 and L ! 1 . Thus we may again put

$$_{r+r^{0}+2}$$
 (:::::) ! $p^{r+r^{0}+1}$ [1 + O ($\overline{L_{h}=N}$)] (82)

and nd, with C (1) = c:

$$S_{0}^{2} = (1 + c) \lim_{p! = 1} \frac{1}{p} X X (f^{+r^{0}} p [1 + 0(\frac{q}{L_{h}=N})]^{r+r^{0}+2}$$

$$= (1 + c) \lim_{p! = 1} \frac{1}{p} X \frac{p}{H} \frac{[1 + 0(\frac{q}{L_{h}=N})]^{i_{2}}}{1 + p [1 + 0(\frac{q}{L_{h}=N})]^{i_{2}}}$$

$$= (1 + c) \sum_{0}^{Z} df % (f) \frac{f^{2}}{(1 + f)^{2}}$$
(83)

Since only $_{\rm R}$ and S₀ are needed to solve our elective single agent process in TTI stationary states, we see that upon making the ansatz of short history correlation times L_h N the elects of history on the persistent order parameters in the MG are fully concentrated in the distribution %(f) of history frequencies, as defined by (78). Once %(f) has been extracted from the process (61), the TTI order parameters are given by the solution of the following set of equations:

$$u = \frac{\begin{bmatrix} 1 & j \\ - & - \\ S_0 & 2 \end{bmatrix}}{S_0 & 2} = \frac{1}{R} = 1 \quad \text{Erf}[u]$$
(84)

$$c = {}^{2} [1]^{n} 1 Erf[u] + \frac{1}{2u^{2}} Erf[u] - \frac{1}{u^{2}} e^{-u^{2}}$$
(85)

$$_{R} = \int_{0}^{Z_{1}} df \,\,^{8}(f) \,\,\frac{f}{1+f}$$
(86)

$$S_0^2 = (1 + c) \int_0^{2} df \, \%(f) \, \frac{f^2}{(1 + f)^2}$$
(87)

For p = 1 (the fake history limit) we have % (f) = [f 1], leading to $p = (1 + 1)^{-1}$ and $S_0 = p = \frac{1}{1 + c} = (1 + 1)^{-1}$, and the above equations are seen to reduce to the corresponding ones in [10], as they should.

6. Calculating the history statistics

Upon making the ansatz of short history correlation times in the MG, we have shown that noting closed equations for persistent TTI order parameters boils down to calculating the distribution %(f) of relative history frequencies, as de ned in (78)k. Our remaining programme of analysis is: (i) noting an expression for %(f), (ii) expressing this distribution in terms of the persistent order parameters fc; ; ; _R;S₀g, and (iii) con ming retrospectively the consistency of assuming short history correlation times.

6.1. The moments of%(f)

The distribution (78) is generated by the non-M arkovian process (61), which we cannot hope to solve directly. However, we can get away with a self-consistent calculation which does not require solving (61) in full. We focus on the moments $_{\rm k}$ of the distribution %, from which the latter can always be recovered (if the integrals below exist):

$$_{k} = \int_{z^{0}}^{z_{1}} df \,^{*}(f) f^{k}$$
(88)

$$\mathscr{E}(f) = \frac{d!}{2} e^{i! f} \frac{k}{k!} (i!)^{k}$$
(89)

Obviously $_0 = _1 = 1$, for any , which follows directly from de nition (78). In the absence of history (i.e. = 1) we have %(f) = [f 1], so that $_k = 1$ for all k 0. We will rely on the sum over moments in (89) converging on scales of k which are independent of N. This is equivalent to saying that the lim it (78) is well-de ned, so it does not restrict us further. By combining the de nitions (77,78,88) and (15), we can obtain a more explicit but still relatively simple expression for the moments $_k$:

$${}_{k} = \frac{1}{p} {}^{K} h [p \quad (A;Z)]^{k} ii_{fA;Zg}$$

$$= \lim_{L \mid 1} \frac{p^{k}}{L^{k}} {}^{X^{L} \quad DD \ M \quad n} \frac{1}{2} {}^{X \quad Y^{k}} \quad \stackrel{OEE}{}_{i \ ('j;A;Z)} {}^{fA;Zg}$$

$$= \lim_{L \mid 1} \frac{p^{k-1}}{L^{k}} {}^{X^{L} \quad DD \ M \quad n} Y^{k} \quad \stackrel{Y^{k} \quad OEE}{}_{i \ ('j;A;Z)} {}^{fA;Zg} {}^{fA;Zg}$$

$$= \lim_{L \mid 1} \frac{p^{k-1}}{L^{k}} {}^{X^{L} \quad DD \ M \quad n} Y^{k} \quad \stackrel{Y^{k} \quad OEE}{}_{i \ ('j;A;Z)} {}^{fA;Zg} {}^{fA;Zg} {}^{(90)}$$

The average $h::: i_{fA;Zq}$ in the last line of (90) equals the following joint probability:

$$h_{1}::i_{A;Zg} = P \operatorname{rob} \begin{array}{c} n \\ 1 ('_{1};A;Z) = \\ and \end{array} \begin{array}{c} ('_{1};A;Z) = \\ 2 ('_{2};A;Z) = \\ \vdots \end{array} \begin{array}{c} n \\ 2 ('_{1};A;Z) = \\ 1 ('_{2};A;Z) = \\ 2 ('_{2};A;Z) = \\ \vdots \end{array} \begin{array}{c} n \\ 2 ('_{k};A;Z) \end{array} \begin{array}{c} n \\ 2 ('_{k};A;Z) \end{array}$$

k A sim ilar conclusion was reached also in [15], but on the basis of several approximations. Furthermore, in contrast to the present GFA approach, in [15] there was no way to calculate % (f) from the theory.

Let us de ne the short-hand

Sam e(i) =
$${}^{n}_{i}('_{1};A;Z) = {}_{i}('_{2};A;Z) = :::= {}_{i}('_{k};A;Z)^{\circ}$$
 (92)

which states that the i-th component of the history string takes the same value at the k speci ed times $f_1; \ldots; kg$. G iven that our bid process obeys causality {, statement (91) can be written as

Since we need not consider values of k which scale with N or L, the contributions to (90) from those times $f'_1; \ldots; kg$ for which there are correlations between objects at a time r_r and those at another time r_r^0 will vanish in the limit L ! 1. Since we also know that we are in a TTI state, it follows that the conditional probabilities in (93) will not depend on the actual values $f'_1; \ldots; kg$. In the limit L ! 1 we may replace

Prob
$$[Sam e(r) jSam e(r + 1)^{:::} Sam e(M)] ! P_{kM}$$

where P_{kjn} denotes the probability to nd for random ly drawn and in nitely separated times $f'_1; \ldots; kg$ that $_i('_1;A;Z) = \ldots = _i('_k;A;Z)$, for an index i, given that the identity holds for the indices fi+ 1; \ldots; i+ m g (with P_{kjn} giving this probability in the absence of conditions). This allows us to write (90) as

$$_{k} = p^{k-1} P_{[kjM-1]} P_{[kjM-2]} ::: P_{[kj1]} P_{[kj0]}$$

$$(94)$$

As a simple test one may verify (94) for the trivial case = 1 (fake history only). Here conditioning on the past is irrelevant, so $P_{[kjn]} = P_{[kj0]} = 2^{1-k}$ for all m, which indeed gives us $_{k} = p^{k-1}2^{(1-k)M} = 1$ (as it should). In the continuous time limit N ! 1 (equivalently: for M ! 1, since $2^{M} = N$) we thus not the as yet exact formula

$$\lim_{M \downarrow 1} \log(k) = \lim_{M \downarrow 1} \log^{M_{X} 1} \log^{h} 2^{k-1} P_{[kjc]}$$
(95)

6.2. Reduction to history coincidence statistics

Next we have to nd an expression for the probabilities $P_{[kjr]}$. We know from (61,62) that the value of the overall bid at any time ' is only correlated with the bid value at time '⁰ if the two times ('; '⁰) have identical history strings, i.e. if (';A;Z) = ('⁰;A;Z).

22

[{] We here use the fact that a component $_{i}(`;A;Z)$ of the history string observed by the agents at time ` is by construction (see de nition (15)) referring to the overall bid at time ` i. It follows that the probability of nding a given value for $_{i}(`;A;Z)$ depends via causality only on the bids at the earlier times f` i 1;` i 2;:::g, hence on f $_{i+1}(`;A;Z)$; $_{i+2}(`;A;Z)$;:::g.

We know that individual histories show up during the process with probabilities of order N⁻¹. Since the likelihood of nding recurring histories during any number r = 0 M) of consecutive iterations of our process is thus vanishingly small (of order 0 (M =N)) such direct correlations are of no consequence in our calculation. The only relevant e ect of conditioning in the sense of the $P_{[kjr]}$ is via its biasing of histories in subsequent iterations. A likely the probability of history recurrence during a time window of size 0 (M) is vanishingly small, if two (short) instances of global bid trajectories are found to have identical realizations of some of the bits of their history strings, they will nevertheless be more likely than average to have an identical history realization in the resulting biases in the bids which are subsequently found at times with speci c histories, gives rise to the relative history frequency distributions % (f) as observed in e.g. Fig. 1.

The statem ent that the conditioning in P_{kjl} acts only via the joint likelihood of nding speci c histories f_1 ;:::; $_kg$ at the k speci ed (and widely separated) times f'_1 ;:::; $_kg$, translates into</sub>

$$P_{[kjr]} = P_{[kj_{1}]}; \dots; k^{[kj_{1}]}; \dots; k^{[kj_{1}]}; \dots; k^{[kj_{1}]}$$
(96)

Here P [kj 1;:::; k] denotes the likelihood to nd (1;A;Z) = :::= ('k;A;Z), if the history strings at those k times equal f 1;:::; kg, and P [1;:::; kjr] denotes the likelihood of nding those k speci c histories given that the bits of the k history strings have been identical over 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 with time '. Given this history string, A (') is a Gaussian variable (this follows from the e ective bid process (61)), with some average \overline{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 Gaussian variables, with variance ², we obtain:

$$P [kj_{1}; :::; k] = \begin{cases} Y^{k} h^{Z} & Z \\ D Z & dA P_{j}(A) [(1) A + Z] \\ y^{k} h^{Z} & Z \\ + & D Z & dA P_{j}(A) [(1) A + Z] \\ 2 & y^{j=1} & y^{k} h^{Z} & Z \\ 2 & y^{j=1} & y^{k} h^{Z} & Z \\ y^{k} & y^{k} h^{Z} + \frac{1}{2} Erf^{h} \frac{(1 - A)}{p 2} & y^{k} h^{Z} \\ y^{k} & y^{k} h^{Z} + \frac{1}{2} Erf^{h} \frac{(1 - A)}{p 2} & y^{k} h^{Z} \\ y^{k} & y^{k} h^{Z} + \frac{1}{2} Erf^{h} \frac{(1 - A)}{p 2} & y^{k} h^{Z} \\ y^{k} & y^{k} h^{Z} + \frac{1}{2} Erf^{h} \frac{(1 - A)}{p 2} & y^{k} h^{Z} \\ y^{k} & y^{k} h^{Z} + \frac{1}{2} Erf^{h} \frac{(1 - A)}{p 2} & y^{k} h^{Z} \\ y^{k} & y^{k} h^{Z} + \frac{1}{2} Erf^{h} \frac{(1 - A)}{p 2} & y^{k} h^{Z} \\ y^{k} & y^{k} h^{Z} + \frac{1}{2} Erf^{h} \frac{(1 - A)}{p 2} & y^{k} h^{Z} \\ y^{k} & y^{k} h^{Z} + \frac{1}{2} Erf^{h} \frac{(1 - A)}{p 2} & y^{k} h^{Z} \\ y^{k} & y^{k} h^{Z} + \frac{1}{2} Erf^{h} \frac{(1 - A)}{p 2} & y^{k} h^{Z} \\ y^{k} & y^{k} h^{Z} + \frac{1}{2} Erf^{h} \frac{(1 - A)}{p 2} & y^{k} h^{Z} \\ y^{k} & y^{k} h^{Z} + \frac{1}{2} Erf^{h} \frac{(1 - A)}{p 2} & y^{k} h^{Z} \\ y^{k} & y^{k} h^{Z} + \frac{1}{2} Erf^{h} \frac{(1 - A)}{p 2} & y^{k} h^{Z} \\ y^{k} & y^{k} h^{Z} + \frac{1}{2} Erf^{h} \frac{(1 - A)}{p 2} & y^{k} h^{Z} \\ y^{k} & y^{k} h^{Z} + \frac{1}{2} Erf^{h} \frac{(1 - A)}{p 2} & y^{k} h^{Z} \\ y^{k} & y^{k} h^{Z} + \frac{1}{2} Erf^{h} \frac{(1 - A)}{p 2} & y^{k} h^{Z} \\ y^{k} & y^{k} h^{Z} + \frac{1}{2} Erf^{h} \frac{(1 - A)}{p 2} & y^{k} h^{Z} \\ y^{k} & y^{k} h^{Z} + \frac{1}{2} Erf^{h} \frac{(1 - A)}{p 2} & y^{k} h^{Z} \\ y^{k} & y^{k} h^{Z} + \frac{1}{2} Erf^{h} \frac{(1 - A)}{p 2} & y^{k} h^{Z} \\ y^{k} & y^{k} h^{Z} + \frac{1}{2} Erf^{h} \frac{(1 - A)}{p 2} & y^{k} h^{Z} \\ y^{k} & y^{k} h^{Z} + \frac{1}{2} Erf^{h} \frac{(1 - A)}{p 2} & y^{k} h^{Z} \\ y^{k} & y^{k} h^{Z} + \frac{1}{2} Erf^{h} \frac{(1 - A)}{p 2} & y^{k} h^{Z} \\ y^{k} & y^{k} \end{pmatrix}$$

W e now write the sum over all combinations of histories in (96) in term s of a partitioning ⁺ Here 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) = $_{i+1}$ ('+ 1;A;Z). This is not true for inconsistent history noise. in groups, where two M -bit strings f_i; $_j$ g are in the same group if and only if they are identical. We write $(g_1; g_2; :::)$ for the subset of all combinations f₁; :::; $_k$ g with one group of size g_1 , a second group of size g_2 , and so on . C learly $g_1 + g_2 + :::= k$, for all possible subsets of our partitioning. This allows us to write

$$P_{[kjr]} = \bigcap_{\substack{k,g_1+g_2+...P}} kjg_1;g_2;...;P[g_1;g_2;...jr]$$
(98)

According to (97), the distribution $P[kjg_1;g_2;:::]$ is of the relatively simple form $P[kjg_1;g_2;:::] = 2^{1-k}$ (g_1;g_2;:::), with

$$(g_{1};g_{2};:::) = \frac{1}{2} \frac{Y}{j_{1}}^{(3)} \frac{x}{1} + Erf \frac{h}{p \frac{q}{2} \frac{q}{2} \frac{2}{2} + (1 \frac{q}{2})^{2}} \frac{i^{3}g_{j}}{5} \frac{g_{j}}{5} \frac{y}{1} + \frac{1}{2} \frac{Y}{j_{1}}^{(3)} \frac{x}{1} + Erf \frac{h}{p \frac{q}{2} \frac{q}{2} \frac{2}{2} + (1 \frac{q}{2})^{2}} \frac{i^{3}g_{j}}{5} \frac{g_{j}}{5} \frac{g_{j}}{5}$$

Insertion of the representation (98) for P $_{kjrl}$ into (95) allows us to write the moments of the relative history frequencies in the following form: ²
³

It will be helpful to assess which values of r in (100) can survive the limit M ! 1. W henever we have a value r such that M r! 1 as M ! 1, the condition that the k history bits were identical over the most recent r steps still leaves a large O (2^{M} r) num ber of compatible history strings to be found at the probing times f'₁;:::; 'kg, so the likelihood of noting histories coinciding in multiples (g;g₂;:::) scales as

$$P [g_1; g_2; ::: j_r] = \int_{j: j_r > 1}^{1} O (2^{(g_j 1)(r M)}); P [1; 1; ::: j_r] = 1 + O (2^{r M})$$

$$= \int_{r=0}^{K} \log^{1} 1 + O(2^{r M})^{1} = O(2^{R M})$$
(101)

Hence in (100) we need only those terms where M r is nite. These terms represent contributions where virtually all past components of the history strings at the times $f'_1; :::; kg$ were identical, which should indeed constrain the possible histories at the times $f'_1; :::; kg$ most, and indeed gives the largest history coincidence rates. We consequently switch our conditioning label from the number r of previously identical components to the number M r of unconstrained components, and write

For example: (k) denotes the subset of all combinations f $_1$;:::; $_k$ g where $_1 = ::: = _k$, (2;1;1;::) is the subset of all f $_1$;:::; $_k$ g where precisely two history strings are identical, and all others are distinct.

and nd (100) converting into the simpler form

$$\lim_{M \neq 1} \log(x_{k}) = \log_{r \leq 1} \log_{\substack{k \neq g_{1} + g_{2} + \dots \\ r \leq 1}} (g_{1}, g_{2}, \dots) Q_{n} [g_{1}, g_{2}, \dots) Q_{n} [g_{1}, g_{2}, \dots) Q_{n}]$$
(102)

We are left with the task to calculate the likelihood $Q[g_1;g_2;:::j_r]$ of nding at the k distinct times $f'_1;:::;'_kg$ of our process the histories $f_1;:::;_kg$ to be identical in prescribed multiples of $(g_1;g_2;:::)$, given that the bits of the k history vectors were identical during all but r of the most recent iterations.

At this stage we bene t from having to consider only values of r in (102) which are nite (compared to M, which is sent to in nity). For each value r of the number of 'free' components, there will be only 2^r possible history strings available to be allocated to the k times f'₁;::;; 'kg. In principle one would have to worry about the probabilities to be assigned to each of the 2^r options. However, we know for the full M -component history strings that their probabilities scale as $= f p^{-1} w \pm h f = 0$ (1), so the e ective probabilities of individual components of 2 f = 1;1g must scale as

$$_{i} = 0 (^{1=M}) = 0 (\frac{1}{2} f^{1=M}) = \frac{1}{2} [1 + 0 (M ^{1})]$$

From this we deduce that for nite r we may take all 2 allowed history strings to have equal probabilities. This turns the evaluation of $Q[g_1;g_2;:::j_r]$ into a solvable combinatorial problem. Each of k elements is given random ly one of 2^r colours (where each colour has probability 2^r), and $Q[g_1;g_2;:::j_r]$ represents the likelihood of nding identical colour sets of sizes $(g_1;g_2;:::)$. Let us abbreviate $R = 2^r$, and write the r-th term in (102) as $\log(H_r)$. Now, using $2^{r(g_1+...g_R)} = 2^{rk} = R^k$ we may simply write]

$$\lim_{M \ge 1} \log(k) = \sum_{r=1}^{X} \log H_r$$
(103)

$$H_{r} = \begin{matrix} X \\ (g_{1};g_{2};:::)Q & g_{1};g_{2};:::jr \\ (g_{1},g_{2};:::) \\ (g_{1},g_{2};:::) \\ x^{k} \stackrel{k}{}_{X} \stackrel{g_{1}}{}_{1} \stackrel{g_{2}}{}_{2} \stackrel{k}{}_{g_{1}} x^{:::} \stackrel{g_{R-1}}{}_{1} \\ & ::: \\ g_{1}=0 & g_{2}=0 & g_{3}=0 \\ I \\ R \stackrel{k}{}_{1} \stackrel{k}{}_{R} \stackrel{k}{}_{R} \stackrel{k}{}_{R} \stackrel{q}{}_{R} \stackrel{k}{}_{Q} \stackrel{k}{}_{Q} \stackrel{q}{}_{Q} \stackrel{i}{}_{I} \\ g_{1} & g_{2} \\ g_{3} \\ \end{matrix}$$
(104)

6.3. Expansion of sign-coincidence probabilities

Having simplied the conditional distribution $Q[g;g_2;:::jr]$ of history coincidences, we turn to $(g_1;g_2;:::)$ as given by (99). If we restrict ourselves to an expansion of (99) in powers of the (random) bid biases \overline{A} in which we retain only the leading terms, our

[]] One easily con m s that our expression for H_r is properly norm alized. Upon choosing $(g_1;g_2;:::) = 1$ one can perform the summations iteratively, starting from g_R and descending down to g_1 , which leads exactly to the factor R^k to combine with the R^{-k} present.

problem simpli es further to the point where we can obtain a fully explicit expression for the moments $_k$. In Appendix B we derive the following compact relations:

$$(\mathbf{g}_{1};\mathbf{g}_{2};:::) = \mathbf{e}^{\frac{1}{2}} \quad {}_{j \, 1} \, {}_{g_{j}}^{(g_{j} \, 1)} \, {}_{\frac{1}{4}}^{2} \, {}_{j \, g_{j}}^{(g_{j} \, 1)} \, {}_{(2g_{j} \, 3)+0}^{(3)} \tag{106}$$

$$= \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} Erf^{2} \frac{p}{2} \frac{q}{2^{2} + (1 - \frac{q}{2})^{2}}$$
(107)

The results (105,106) in ply that, rather than knowing the full probability distribution P $[g_1;g_2;:::j_r]$ in (100), we only need the (conditional) statistics of a modest number of relatively simple monom ials. Expanding the exponential in (106) up to the relevant orders, and using $P_j g_j = k$ (which is always true inside (104)) produces

$$(g_{1};g_{2};:::) = 1 + \frac{1}{2} \int_{j=1}^{h_{X}} g_{j}^{2} k^{i}$$

$$+ \frac{1}{4} \int_{2}^{2h} \frac{1}{2} \int_{ij=1}^{X} g_{j}^{2} g_{j}^{2} \int_{j=1}^{X} g_{j}^{3} (k - 5) \int_{j=1}^{X} g_{j}^{2} + \frac{1}{2} k^{2} \int_{k}^{i} k^{2} (108)$$

Since the combinatorial averaging process of (104) in this particular representation involves a measure which is invariant under permutations of the numbers $fg_1;g_2;::g_r$, the average of (108) is identical to that of the following simpler function (with $R = 2^r$):

$$e^{(g_1;g_2;:::)} = 1 + \frac{1}{2} (Rg_1^2 k)$$

$$+ \frac{1}{8} e^{2h}Rg_1^4 + R(R 1)q_1^2q_2^2 4Rq_1^3 2(k 5)Rg_2^2 + k^2 6k + 0(^3)$$
(109)

Instead of having to use full combinatorial measure (104), we can therefore extract all the relevant inform ation from the (joint) marginal distribution for the pair $(g_1;g_2)$ only. Inserting (109) into (104) gives us

$$H_{r} = 1 + \frac{1}{2} \stackrel{h}{R} G_{2;0}^{k;R} \stackrel{i}{k} + \frac{1}{8} \stackrel{2^{h}}{R} G_{4;0}^{k;R} + R (R 1) G_{2;2}^{k;R} \stackrel{i}{k} \\ 4R G_{3;0}^{k;R} 2 (k 5) R G_{2;0}^{k;R} + k^{2} 6k + O (^{3})$$
(110)

with

Those combinatorial factors $G_{a,b}^{k,R}$ which we need in order to evaluate (110) are calculated in Appendix C. They are found to be

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



Figure 2. Test of the predicted history frequency distributions (116) (left picture, based on expansion of the moments $_{k}$ up to rst order in the width, $_{k} = e^{\frac{1}{2} k (k \ 1)}$) and (118) (right picture, based on expansion up to second order, $_{k} = e^{\frac{1}{2} k (k \ 1)} \frac{1}{12} e^{2k (k \ 1) (2k \ 3)}$), together with the data of Fig. 1 as measured in simulations for = 2:0 and N = 8193. In both cases the second moment which parametrizes (116) and (118) was taken from the data: $_{2}$ 1:380.

$$G_{3;0}^{k;R} = \frac{k}{R} + \frac{3k(k-1)}{R^2} + \frac{k(k-1)(k-2)}{R^3}$$

$$G_{4;0}^{k;R} = \frac{k}{R} + \frac{7k(k-1)}{R^2} + \frac{6k(k-1)(k-2)}{R^3} + \frac{k(k-1)(k-2)(k-3)}{R^4}$$

$$G_{2;2}^{k;R} = \frac{k(k-1)}{R^2} + \frac{2k(k-1)(k-2)}{R^3} + \frac{k(k-1)(k-2)(k-3)}{R^4}$$

Insertion of these factors into (110), followed by restoration of the short-hand $R = 2^r$, gives us the fully explicit expression

$$H_{r} = 1 + \frac{1}{2} k (k - 1)2^{r} + \frac{1}{8} k (k - 1) (k - 2) (k - 3)4^{r} + 0 (^{3}) (112)$$

W e can now write explicit formulae for the moments of the relative history frequencies, and hence also for the distribution % (f) itself, in the form an expansion in a parameter

which controls the width of this distribution.

6.4. Resulting prediction for % (f)

The result (112), together with the earlier relation (103) and the geometric series leads us nally to the desired expression for the moments $_k$:

$$\lim_{M \downarrow 1} \log(k) = \frac{1}{2} k(k-1) \frac{1}{12} k(k-1) (2k-3) + O(3)$$
(113)

W e see that this general form ula obeys $_0 = _1 = 1$, as it should, and that

$$\lim_{M \downarrow 1} _{2} = e^{-\frac{1}{6}^{2} + O(^{3})}$$
(114)

Insertion into our earlier expression (89) for %(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 Gaussian integral allows

us to carry out the sum m ation over m om ents explicitly:

$$\begin{aligned} & \$(f) = \left[\begin{array}{c} \frac{d!}{2} e^{i! f} \left[\frac{x}{k} \right] \frac{(-i! f)}{k!} e^{\frac{1}{2} k(k-1)} \frac{1}{12} \left[\frac{2k(k-1)(2k-3) + 0(-3)}{k!} \right] \right] \\ & = \left[\begin{array}{c} \frac{z}{2} & \frac{d!}{2} e^{i! f} \left[\frac{x}{k} \right] \frac{(-i! f)}{k!} \right] \frac{1}{6} \frac{1}{6} \frac{d^3}{dz^3} + \cdots \right] e^{zk} \left[\frac{p}{k} \left[\frac{p}{k} \right] \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} \left[\frac{k}{2} \left[\frac{p}{2} \right] \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} \left[\frac{p}{2} \right] \frac{1}{2} \frac$$

W e m ay use (114) to express in term s of $_2$, turning our expansion of the m om ents $_k$ into an expansion in powers of log($_2$). D epending on whether we wish to take our expansion only to order 0 (log($_2$)), or also to 0 (log²($_2$)), we obtain

to 0 (log(₂)): %(f) =
$$\frac{e^{\frac{1}{2}z^2(f)}}{f 2 \log(2)}$$
 (116)

$$z(f) = \frac{\log(f) + \frac{1}{2}\log(2)}{\log(2)}$$
(117)

to O (log² (₂)): %(f) =
$$\frac{e^{\frac{1}{2}z^{2}(f)} h + \frac{1}{6} \log(2) (3z(f) z^{3}(f))}{f 2 \log(2) + \log^{2}(2)}$$
(118)

$$z(f) = \frac{\log(f) + \frac{1}{2} [\log(_{2}) + \frac{2}{3} \log^{2}(_{2})]}{\log(_{2}) + \log^{2}(_{2})}$$
(119)

The two statem ents (116) and (118) are indeed found to constitute increasingly accurate predictions for the actual distribution of the relative history frequencies, see e.g. Fig. 2. We have thus been able to explain the origin and the characteristics of the observed history frequency statistics. However, both form ulae are expansions for small . Should (118) be applied to values of which are not small, one has to be careful in dealing with large values of f, where %(f) could become negative (this would have been prevented by the higher orders in). The implication is that in the G aussian integral (115) one must in practice either introduce a cut-o $z = O(1^{-16})$, or exponentiate the factor $[1 + \frac{1}{6} \log(2)(3z(f) - z^2(f))]$.

6.5. The width of %(f)

W hat remains in order to round o our analysis of the distribution of relative history frequencies is to calculate the width parameter in (113) self-consistently from our equations. According to our theory, is given by (107), i.e. by

$$= \overset{X}{\operatorname{Erf}^{2}} \underbrace{\operatorname{Erf}^{2}}_{p \overline{2}^{\frac{q}{2} 2} + (1 \frac{3}{2})^{\frac{q}{2}}}^{h} (120)$$

The quantities \overline{A} and $^2 = \overline{A^2}$ \overline{A} describe the statistics of those bids which correspond to times with a prescribed history string . We know from (64) that these are G aussian variables, which implies that \overline{A} and 2 are all we need to know. Since we

restrict ourselves to non-anom alous T T I states, we can write both as long-tim e averages:

$$\overline{A} = \lim_{L \perp 1} L^{1} \sum_{i=1}^{X^{L}} (i)$$
(121)

$$\overline{A^{2}} = \lim_{L \downarrow 1} L^{1} L^{X^{L}}_{Y \downarrow 1} A^{2} (')$$
(122)

We can work out the average \overline{A} , using (64) and time-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 $'_j = s_j + s_{j+1} + \dots + s_r$). This results in

$$\overline{A} = \lim_{L \mid 1} \frac{1}{Lp} X^{L} X (_{N})^{r} G ((_{0} _{1}) :::G ((_{r 1} _{r})^{r}) _{0=1r 0} (_{1:::r})^{r} G ((_{0} _{1}) :::G ((_{r 1} _{r})^{r}) _{1::r}) = \frac{1}{p} X (_{N})^{r} X G ((_{0}) :::G ((_{r 1}))^{r} _{r 0} S_{0} :::S_{r 1} _{p} S_{0} :::S_{r 1} \\ \vdots \\ \lim_{L \mid 1} \frac{1}{L} X^{i < r} S_{i} h Y^{r} i \\ S_{r} = 0 i = 0 ; ((_{i} + :::+ S_{r})^{A}; Z) S_{r}$$
(123)

Given our ansatz of short history correlation times, in the sense of (79), and given = $P_{>0}$ G (') < 1 (so G (') must decay su ciently fast), we not this expression simplifying to

$$\overline{A} = \sum_{r=0}^{X} (p_{L})^{r} \lim_{L \neq 1} \frac{1}{L} \sum_{s=0}^{X^{L}} ; (s;A;Z) = \frac{1}{1+p}$$
(124)

In a similar manner we nd

$$\begin{split} \overline{A^{2}} &= \lim_{L \downarrow = 1} \frac{1}{L} \frac{X^{L}}{x^{0}}; \ {}^{(\circ_{0}A, z)}A(\circ_{0})A(\circ_{0}^{0}) \ {}^{\circ_{0}\circ_{0}} \\ &= \lim_{L \downarrow = 1} \frac{1}{L} \frac{X^{L}}{x^{0}} (\sum_{0 \to 0})^{r+r^{0}} (\sum_$$

Again we use P , G (') < 1 to justify that in the sum mations over s_r and $s_{r^0}^0$ the upper lim it can safely be replaced by L. Thus:

The present calculation is similar to that of the volatility matrix in the fake history on line MG [10] (the quantity $2 = \overline{A^2} = \overline{A^2}$ and be regarded as a conditional volatility, where the condition is that in collecting our statistics we are to restrict ourselves to those times where the observed history strings take the value), so also here we have to worry about pairwise time coincidences. Each such coincidence electively removes one constraint of the type $(\dots, A;Z)$, since the latter will be met automatically. The remaining terms will occur in extensive summations, so that we may replace each 'unpaired' occurrence of a factor $(\dots, A;Z)$, except for those with the same argument as one of the G aussian variables , by its time average . In practice this in plies the replacement

$$\begin{split} h_{Y} & 1 & ih_{Y} & i \\ p & P & p \\ i = 1 \\ p & (p)^{r+r^{0} 2} \\ & (p)^{r+r^{0} 2} \\$$

and therefore

As in the calculation of the volatility in [10], lacking as yet a method to deal with all the complicated terms generated by the factor proportional to the learning rate \sim , we have to restrict ourselves in practice to approximations. As in [10] we is remove the most tricky terms by putting \sim ! 0. This gives

$$\overline{A^{2}} = \begin{array}{c} X \\ \overline{A^{2}} = \begin{array}{c} X \\ r_{r}r^{0} & 0 \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{c} (\ _{N} p \end{array})^{r+r^{0}} \begin{array}{c} X \\ s_{0} :::s_{r-1} \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{c} G \ (s_{0}) :::G \ (s_{r-1}) \\ s_{0}^{0} ::s_{r^{0}-1}^{0} \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{c} G \ (s_{0}^{0}) :::G \ (s_{r^{0}-1}) \end{array} \\ \\ X \\ k; \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{c} X \\ s_{r} \\ s_{r}$$

30

We then assume that the limit L ! 1 in the last line converts the associated sample average into a full average over the statistics of the Gaussian elds given by (62), i.e.

$$\lim_{L \downarrow = 1} \frac{1}{2} \frac{X^{L}}{L} = 0 \quad ; \quad (s;A;Z) \quad ; \quad (s+k;A;Z) \quad s \quad s+k \quad !$$

$$\lim_{L \downarrow = 1} \frac{1}{2} \frac{X^{L}}{L} = 0 \quad ; \quad (s;A;Z) \quad ; \quad (s+k;A;Z)^{L} \quad s \quad s+k \quad i \quad j_{A};Z = \frac{1}{2} [1 + C \quad (k)]$$

Separating the correlation function into a persistent and a non-persistent term, C (k) = c + C'(k), and returning to the earlier notation with time dimensions inside the kernels G, results in the history-conditioned equivalent of the volatility approximation in [10]:

$$\overline{A^{2}} = \frac{X}{(N^{p})^{r+r^{0}}} (S_{0}^{r}) :::G_{0}^{r+r^{0}} (S_{1}^{r})^{r+r^{0}} (S_{1}^{r})^{r+r^{0}$$

where $\mathbb{I}(x;y) = (x \quad y)$. In order to get to the present stage we have averaged the dependent term sinside $\overline{A^2}$ over the G aussian measure h:: $i_{\overline{A};Z}$. Consistency dem ands that in working out $2 = \overline{A^2} = \overline{A^2}$ we do the same with the term \overline{A}^2 , where \overline{A} is given by (124), so our approximation for the history-conditioned volatility becomes

$${}^{2} = \overline{A^{2}} \qquad \frac{h^{-2} i}{(1 + p)^{2}}$$

$$= \overline{A^{2}} \qquad \lim_{L \perp 1} \frac{1}{(L)^{2}} X^{L}, \qquad (YA;Z) = (YA;Z) = \frac{1 + C (YA;Z)}{2(1 + p)^{2}}$$

$$= \frac{1}{2} ds ds^{0} (II + p - G)^{-1} (s) C (s - S) (II + p - G)^{-1} (s^{0}) \qquad (131)$$

Our nal step again follows [10]. We assume that the non-persistent correlations C (t) decay vary fast, away from the value C (0) = 1 c, so that in the expansion of (131) in powers of G we retain only the zero-th term :

$$^{2} = \frac{1}{2} (1 \text{ c})$$
 (132)

W e m ay now return to expression (120) and insert our approxim ations (124) and (132):

$$= \lim_{p! \ 1} X = rf^{2} 4 \frac{(1 \ \overline{)}}{p \overline{2}(1 + p)} \frac{(1 \ \overline{)}}{2^{2} + \frac{1}{2}(1 \ \frac{3}{2}(1 - c))} \frac{5}{3}$$

$$= \frac{Z}{dfd} \% (f;) f E rf^{2} 4 \frac{(1 \ \overline{)}}{p \overline{2}(1 + f)} \frac{(1 \ \overline{)}}{2^{2} + \frac{1}{2}(1 \ \frac{3}{2}(1 - c))} (133)$$

with

$$%(\mathbf{f};) = \lim_{p! \ 1} \frac{1}{p} [\mathbf{f} \ p] [-]$$
 (134)

We know the to be Gaussian variables, with h = 0 and $h^{-2} i = \frac{1}{2}(1 + c)$ (see the above derivation of ² where this was shown and used). Hence, upon making our nal simplifying assumption that in the relevant orders of our calculation the correlations between the history frequencies and the Gaussian elds are irrelevant, we obtain

$$%(f;) = %(f) \frac{e^{2} = (1+c)}{(1+c)}$$
(135)

and hence (133) simpli es to

$$= \int_{0}^{Z_{1}} df \,^{8}(f) f \,^{2} D \, x \, E \, r f^{2} \,^{4} \frac{x (1 \,^{9}) \,^{p} \,^{1} + c}{2 (1 + f)^{\frac{q}{2} \,^{2} \,^{2} + \frac{1}{2}} (1 \,^{9}) (1 \, c)} \,^{3}(136)$$

Using the integral ${}^{R}D \ge rf^{2}(A \ge x) = \frac{4}{4} \arctan \left[\frac{p}{1+4A^{2}}\right] = 1$, in combination with the identity ${}^{R}df % (f)f = 1$, our approximate expression for the parameter thus becomes

$$= \frac{4}{0} \int_{0}^{Z_{1}} df \, \%(f) f \, \arctan \, 1 + \frac{(1 - \frac{3}{2}(1 + c))}{(1 + f)^{2} \left[\frac{2}{2} + \frac{1}{2}(1 - \frac{3}{2}(1 - c))\right]} \, 1 \quad (137)$$

In the limit of strictly fake history we recover from (137) the value lim $_{!1}$ = (4=) arctan[1] 1 = 0, as it should. For MGs with strictly true market history, on the other hand, expression (137) simpli es to

$$\lim_{\substack{P = 0 \\ P = 0}} = \frac{4}{0}^{Z_{1}} df \% (f) f \arctan 1 + \frac{2(1+c)}{(1+f)^{2}(1-c)} = 1$$
(138)

In accordance with earlier observations in sinulations [15] we also see that, as the system approaches the phase transition when is lowered from within the ergodic regime, the increase of the susceptibility automatically reduces the width parameter , until it vanishes completely at the critical point.

7. C losed theory for persistent observables in the ergodic regime

We have now obtained a closed theory for the time-translation invariant states of our MG, albeit in approximation. It consists of the equations (84,85,86,87) for the persistent order parameters, combined with expressions (116,118) for the shape and (114,137) for the width of the relative history frequency distribution %(f). This theory predicts correctly (i) that the phase transition point $_{\rm c}$ (T) of the MG with history is identical to that of the model with fake memory, (ii) that at the transition point the relative history frequency distribution point the relative history frequency distribution point the relative history frequency distribution point the relative history also reproduces the correct order parameter values = c = 0, for any value of . For = 0 (strictly true memory) it predicts $\lim_{t \to 1} t_t = \frac{1}{3}$ and hence $\lim_{t \to 1} t_t = 1$ 137.



F igure 3. Left: the predicted persistent correlations c together with simulation data in the non-ergodic regime, for the on-line MG with strictly true history (i.e. = 0; the solid line gives the theoretical prediction, full circles the experimental data) and for the on-line MG with strictly fake memory (i.e. = 1; the dashed line gives the theoretical prediction, open circles the experimental data). In both cases decision noise was absent. R ight: the corresponding predicted fraction of frozen agents, under the same experimental conditions and with the same meaning of lines and markers.



Figure 4. The moments $_{2} = {}^{R} df \%(f) f^{2}$ and $_{3} = {}^{R} df \%(f) f^{3}$ of the distribution of relative history frequencies for the MG with strictly true history and absent decision noise (i.e. = T = 0), as predicted by the theory (solid and dashed lines), compared to the moments as measured in num erical simulations (markers, with circles indicating $_{2}$ and squares indicating $_{3}$). Note that $_{0} = _{1} = 1$ (by de nition).

Let us nally reduce our closed equations to a more compact form, for the simplest nontrivial case of the MG with strictly true market history (i.e. = 0) and without decision noise (i.e. [1] = 1). Here we have

$$u = \frac{p_{-}}{S_0 \frac{p_{-}}{2}} = \frac{1}{R} = 1 \text{ Erf}[u]$$
(139)

$$c = 1 \quad \text{Erf}[u] + \frac{1}{2u^2} \text{Erf}[u] \quad \frac{1}{u^p} = e^{-u^2}$$
(140)

$${}_{R} = {}^{Z} {}^{h} {}_{Z} {}^{1} {}_{H} {}^{1} {}_{H} {}^{p} {}_{-} {}^{(3z)} {}^{z} {}^{3} {}^{j} {}^{h} {}^{p} {}^{r} {}^{+\frac{5}{6} {}^{2} {}_{+} {}^{1} {}_{2} {}^{(+\frac{1}{2} {}^{2})} {}^{+} {}^{i} {}^{1} {}^{1} {}^{(141)}$$

$$S_{0}^{2} = (1 + c) D_{z} 1 + \frac{1p}{6} (3z - 3z) e^{\frac{3}{2} - \frac{1}{2} (1 + \frac{1}{2})^{2} + \frac{1}{2} (1 + \frac{1}{2})^$$

Upon using (140) to write c as a function of u, i.e. c = c(u) with c(u) denoting the right-hand side of (140), and upon eliminating the quantities and S_0 , we indourselves with a closed set of equations for the trio fu; ; g:

$$u = -\frac{\text{Erf}[u]}{2 (1 + c)} \stackrel{8}{\stackrel{>}{\scriptstyle \sim}} D z \frac{1 + \frac{1}{6}p - (3z - z^{2})}{e^{-z} + \frac{5}{6}^{-2} + \frac{1}{2}(z + \frac{1}{2}^{-2}) + \frac{1}{2}}$$
(144)

$$= \frac{\operatorname{Erf}[u]}{:} \overset{8}{\sim} \overset{Z}{=} D z \frac{1 + \frac{1}{6} \overset{P}{=} (3z \quad z^{3})}{e^{z} \overset{P}{=} \frac{1}{(z^{2} + \frac{1}{2})^{2} + \frac{1}{2}(z^{2} + \frac{1}{2})^{2} + \frac{1}{$$

$$= \int_{8}^{2} \frac{h}{6} + \frac{1p}{6} - (3z - z^{3}) e^{z - \frac{1}{5} \frac{1}{6}(z - z^{2})}$$

$$= \int_{8}^{2} \frac{h}{6} + \frac{1}{6} + \frac{1}{6} \frac{1}{2} (146) + \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2$$

Solving these three coupled equations numerically, followed by comparison with simulation data, shows a surprising level of agreement, in spite of the expansions and assumptions which have been used to derive (144,145,146). Figure 3 shows the performance of the theory in describing the on-line M G with strictly true market history (i.e. = 0), together with similar data for the on-line fake history M G (i.e. = 1), for comparisonyy. In all these simulations N = 8193. Calculation of the rst two non-trivial moments $_{\rm k}$ of the distribution of relative history frequencies, see e.g. gure 4 (where in the simulations N 2 = 2²⁸), shows that for sm all values of the width of % (f) (i.e. $_2$ close to one, which is true close to and below the critical point) the predictions of the theory are excellent, but that the performance of equations result electively from an expansion for sm all values of $_2$ 1. Taking this expansion to higher orders should lead to system atic in provement, but will be non-trivial.

yyBelow the critical point, where = 1 throughout, equation (137) predicts that = 0. This implies that %(f) = [f 1] for < $_{\rm c}$ (T), and that below the critical point the di erences between true and fake history (if any) are con ned to dynam ical phenom ena or to states without time-translation invariance. This con rms earlier observations in numerical simulations [15], where it was found that the persistent order parameters in MGs with and without history were identical in the low regime.

34

8. D iscussion

We have developed a mathematical procedure for the derivation of exact dynamical solutions for M inority G ames with realmarket histories, using the generating functional analysis techniques of [17]. So far these techniques had only been developed for (and applied successfully to) the less realistic but mathematically simpler M G versions with fake market histories, restricting theoretical progress to those particular game versions only. We have shown how the technical diculties associated with the non-M arkovian character of the microscopic laws induced by having real histories can be dealt with, and found (in the in nite system size limit) exact and closed macroscopic laws from which to solve the canonical dynamic order parameters for the standard (on-line) M G with true market history. Here these laws turn out to be formulated in terms of two e ective equations (rather than a single equation, as for models with fake histories): one for an elective agent, and one for an elective overall market bid. In the second part of this paper we have constructed solutions for these elective equations, focusing mostly on the usual persistent observables of the M G in time-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 objects are calculated in the form of an expansion in powers of the width of the history frequency distribution, of which the rst few terms are derived in explicit form. The naltheory 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 width in the region where this width remains relatively small (which is inevitable in view of the expansion used).

References

- [1] Challet D and Zhang Y-C 1997 Physica A 246 407-418
- [2] Arthur W 1994 Am. Econ. Assoc. Papers and Proc. 84, 406-411
- [3] Challet D, Marsili M and Zhang Y C 2004 M inority Games { Interacting Agents in Financial Markets (Oxford: University Press)
- [4] Cavagna A 1999 Phys. Rev. E 59 3783-3786
- [5] Challet D, Marsili M and Zecchina R 2000 Phys. Rev. Lett. 84 1824-1827
- [6] Marsili M, Challet D and Zecchina R 2000 Physica A 280 522-553
- [7] Marsili M and Challet D 2001 Phys. Rev. E 64 056138
- [8] Marsili M, Mulet R, Ricci-Tersenghi F and Zecchina R 2001 Phys. Rev. Lett. 87 208701
- [9] HeimelJAF and Coolen ACC 2001 Phys. Rev. E 63 056121
- [10] Coolen A C C and HeimelJA F 2001 J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. 34 10783-10804
- [11] Coolen A C C, Heimel J A F and Sherrington D 2001 Phys. Rev. E 65 16126
- [12] Galla T, Coolen A C C and Sherrington D 2003 J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. 36 11159-11172
- [13] Johnson N F, HuiP M, Zeng D and TaiC W 1999 Physica A 269 493-502
- [14] Johnson N F, HuiP M, Zheng D and Hart M 1999 J. Phys. A 32 L427-L431
- [15] Challet D and M arsili M 2000 Phys. Rev. E 62 1862-1868
- [16] Lee C-Y 2001 Phys. Rev. E 64 015102 (R)
- [17] DeDominicis C 1978 Phys. Rev. B 18 4913-4919
- [18] Bedeaux D, Lakatos-Lindenberg K and Shuler K 1971 J.M ath. Phys. 12 2116-2123
- [19] Inoue JI and Coolen ACC in preparation

Appendix A.Recovering the fake history lim it

It helpful for our understanding of the N ! 1 limit in (59,60) to rst return to the sim plest case where we know what the outcome should be, being = 1, i.e. fake history strings of the inconsistent type (4). This is the model which was solved in [10]. In doing so we en passant re-con m the correctness of the assumed scaling $_{\rm N}$ = ~=2p.

For = 1 we see in (15) and (17) that both (:::) and \overline{W} [:::] lose their dependence on the path fAg, and reduce to

$$\begin{array}{c} 0 \\ \operatorname{sgn}\left[\mathbb{Z} \left(\mathbf{'};1\right)\right]^{1} \\ \left(\mathbf{'};\mathbb{Z}\right) = \begin{array}{c} B \\ B \\ Q \end{array} \qquad \vdots \qquad \begin{array}{c} C \\ A \end{array} \qquad \overline{\mathbb{W}}\left[\mathbf{'};\mathbf{'}^{0};\mathbb{Z}\right] = \\ \operatorname{sgn}\left[\mathbb{Z} \left(\mathbf{'};\mathbb{M}\right)\right] \end{array}$$
 (A.1)

The role of the Gaussian variables fZ g has thereby been reduced to determ ining the statistics of the symmetric random matrix B with entries $B_{110} = \overline{W}$ ['; '0; Z]:

$$P [B] = \begin{cases} * Y & h & \log_{2}(p) \\ B & \ddots & D \\ & \ddots & & D \\ & \ddots & & = 1 \end{cases} \qquad (A 2)$$

with $p = 2^{M} = N$. The two relevant properties of these matrices are relatively easily derived, and are found to be the following. For any cyclic combination of r-th moments (with r > 0), where $s_1 > s_2 > \ldots > s_r$ and r > 1 (no sum mations) one has

$$hB_{s_1s_2}B_{s_2;s_3}:::B_{s_r;s_1}i_B = p^{1-r}$$
(A.3)

The second type of average one needs involves two time-ordered strings of matrix elements (of lengths r and r^0 , respectively) connected by two further matrix elements, where $s_0 > s_1 > \ldots > s_r$ and $s_0^0 > s_1^0 > \ldots > s_{r^0}^0$:

$$h \mathbb{B}_{s_0 s_1} \mathbb{B}_{s_1 s_2} ::: \mathbb{B}_{s_r \ 1 s_r} \mathbb{B}_{s_r s_{r^0}^0} \mathbb{B}_{s_0^0 s_1^0} \mathbb{B}_{s_1^0 s_2^0} ::: \mathbb{B}_{s_{r^0} \ 1 s_{r^0}^0} \mathbb{B}_{s_0 s_0^0} \mathbf{i}$$

$$\stackrel{P_r \ P_{r^0}}{= p^{i=0} \quad j=0 \quad s_i s_j^0} r r^0 \mathbf{1}$$
(A.4)

The partial decoupling of the paths fAg and fZg in plies that our expressions for the kernels R and sim plify to

$$R (t;t^{0}) = \lim_{N ! 0} \frac{D}{A_{e}(t^{0})} B_{N} hA (') i_{fA ;Bg} B_{E} = t_{N}; = t_{N}, = t_{N}$$
(A 5)

$$(t;t^{0}) = \sim \lim_{N \neq 0} \frac{1}{N} B_{N} hA(N)A(N) i_{fA \not Bg} B_{h=t=N}; = t_{N}, N = t^{0}_{N}$$
(A.6)

Since the bid evolution process (49) is now linear in fAg, and involves only fAgindependent zero-average Gaussian elds , where $h \cdot {}_{0}i_{f \ Bg} = \frac{1}{2}B_{0}\left[1 + C(;)^{0}\right]$, it is easily solved for any given realization of the random matrix B:

$$A(') = A_{e}(') + \cdot + \sum_{r>0}^{X} (\frac{2}{2})^{r} \sum_{k(A.7)$$

in which GB denotes the matrix with entries $(GB)_{10} = G('; '^0)B_{10}$ (i.e. involving component multiplication rather than matrix multiplication). To make a comparison

with the results of [10] we must remove the external bid perturbations $A_{\rm e}$ (') after they have served to generate the response function R .

We can evaluate (A.5) using only expression (A.7), the causality of the response function, and formula (A.3). These give, with $= A_e(`) = N^{-1} (= 0 A(`):$

$$R('; '^{0}) = \lim_{A_{e} \ge 0} \lim_{N \ge 0} \frac{@}{@A_{e}('^{0})} \frac{1}{N}^{Z} dB P [B] B \cdots hA(')i_{f Bg}$$

$$= \lim_{N \ge 0} \frac{1}{N} \frac{X}{r_{0}} (\frac{\sim}{2})^{r} dB P [B] B \cdots [(GB)^{r}] \cdots$$

$$= \lim_{N \ge 0} \frac{1}{N} \frac{1}{N} \cdots N G('; '^{0})$$

$$+ \frac{X}{r > 1} (\sum_{S_{2} > S_{3} > \cdots > S_{r}} G('; S_{2})G(S_{2}; S_{3}) ::::G(S_{r}; '^{0}) (A.8)$$

We observe in (A.8), in view of \dots ! N (t) in the limit N ! 1, that the canonical scaling of time (modulo 0 (1) factors) is indeed N = ~=2p. We then not exactly the expression in [10] for the on-line 'fake history' MG:

$$R (t;t^{0}) = (t \quad \overset{0}{t}) + \overset{\Lambda}{\underset{r>0}{}} (1)^{r} G^{r} (t;t^{0}) = [II + G]^{1} (t;t^{0})$$
(A.9)

Had we chosen an alternative scaling with N of $_{\rm N}$, we would have found either the trivial result R = 0, or an ill-de ned expression.

Next we turn to expression (60) for the elective agent's noise covariances, with $A_e = 0$. The equivalence of the present expression and that in [10] will be more transparent upon renaming ('; '0) ! (s_0; s_0^0) and D (k; k^0) = 1 + C (k; k^0):

$$(\mathbf{s}_{0}; \mathbf{s}_{0}^{0}) = \lim_{N \to 0} \frac{\sim}{N} d\mathbf{B} P [\mathbf{B}] B_{\mathbf{s}_{0} \mathbf{s}_{0}^{0}} h\mathbf{A} (\mathbf{s}_{0}) \mathbf{A} (\mathbf{s}_{0}^{0}) \mathbf{i}_{f}_{\mathbf{B}g}$$

$$= \lim_{N \to 0} \frac{\sim}{2} \frac{X}{N} (\frac{\sim}{2})^{r+r^{0}} X X D (\mathbf{s}_{r}; \mathbf{s}_{r}^{0})$$

$$= \lim_{N \to 0} \frac{\sim}{2} (\mathbf{s}_{0}; \mathbf{s}_{1}) ::::G (\mathbf{s}_{r-1}; \mathbf{s}_{r}) G (\mathbf{s}_{0}^{0}; \mathbf{s}_{1}^{0}) ::::G (\mathbf{s}_{r^{0}-1}^{0}; \mathbf{s}_{r}^{0})$$

$$h(B_{s_0s_1}:::B_{s_{r-1}s_r})B_{s_{r}s_{r^0}}(B_{s_0^0s_1^0}:::B_{s_{r-1}^0s_r^0})B_{s_0s_0^0}i_B \qquad (A.10)$$

with the proviso that when r = 0 we must interpret the sum s as $s_{1} \dots s_{2} + 1$, G (s₀; s₁) :::G (s_{r 1}; s_r) ! 1 and B_{s0s1} :::B_{sr 1sr} ! 1 (and similarly when $r^{0} = 0$). Since the kernel (s₀; s₀⁰) is symmetric, we may without loss of generality choose s₀⁰ s₁. D ependent on the whether any or both of the indices (r; r⁰) are zero, we have to evaluate the following averages (with the short-hand $i_{j} = 1$ i_{j}):

r = f = 0: here the average of the last line in (A .10) reduces to

$$h:: \mathbf{i}_{B} = hB_{s_{0}s_{0}^{0}}^{2} \mathbf{i} = hB_{s_{0}s_{0}^{0}}^{2} \mathbf{i} = s_{0}s_{0}^{0} + \frac{1}{p} s_{0}s_{0}^{0}$$
(A.11)

r = 0; r > 0: here the average in (A 10) reduces to two terms (representing the cases $s_0 = s_0^0$ versus $s_0 < s_0^0$), which are both of the form (A 3),

$$h:::i_{B} = h(B_{s_{0}s_{1}}:::B_{s_{r-1}s_{r}})B_{s_{r}s_{0}^{0}}B_{s_{0}s_{0}^{0}}i = p^{-r} s_{0}s_{0}^{0} + p^{-r-1} s_{0}s_{0}^{0} \quad (A.12)$$

where we used $B_{kk} = 1$, for any k. The case $r = 0$, $r^{0} > 0$ is clearly equivalent.

r; 2 > 0: now the relevant average reduces to that of (A.4),

$$\begin{aligned} h:: i_{B} &= h \mathbb{B}_{s_{0}s_{1}} ::: B_{s_{r-1}s_{r}} \mathbb{B}_{s_{r}s_{r^{0}}^{0}} \mathbb{B}_{s_{0}^{0}s_{1}^{0}} ::: B_{s_{r^{0}-1}^{0}} \mathbb{B}_{s_{0}s_{0}^{0}} i \\ &= p^{r_{r} P_{r^{0}}}_{i=0} \sum_{j=0}^{r} s_{j}s_{j}^{0} r^{r^{0}-1} \end{aligned}$$
(A.13)

Expression (A.13) reduces to those derived for the cases where $r \circ r^0$ is zero (or both), so it is true for any $(r;r^0)$. We may thus insert (A.13) into (A.10), and obtain:

$$(s_{0}; s_{0}^{0}) = \lim_{N \stackrel{!}{=} 0} X (_{N})^{r+r^{0}} X X _{N} X _{N} D (s_{r}; s_{r^{0}}^{0}) \stackrel{Y^{r}}{=} Y^{r^{0}} h (p 1)_{s_{1}s_{1}^{0}} i$$

$$(s_{0}; s_{0}^{0}) = \lim_{N \stackrel{!}{=} 0} G (s_{0}; s_{1}) :::G (s_{r_{1}}; s_{r^{0}}) G (s_{0}^{0}; s_{1}^{0}) :::G (s_{r^{0}}, 1; s_{r^{0}}^{0})$$

$$= \lim_{N \stackrel{!}{=} 1} X (_{N})^{r+r^{0}} X _{X} X _{X} D (s_{r}; s_{r^{0}}^{0})$$

$$= \lim_{N \stackrel{!}{=} 0} Y^{r} Y^{r^{0}} h (_{N})^{r+r^{0}} D (s_{r}; s_{r^{0}}^{0})$$

$$= \int_{i=0}^{Y^{r}} Y^{r^{0}} h (_{N})^{r+r^{0}} X _{X} X _{X} D (s_{r}; s_{r^{0}}^{0})$$

$$= \int_{i=0}^{Y^{r}} (_{1})^{r+r^{0}} X _{r,r^{0}} S_{1} :::G (s_{r-1}; s_{r}) G (s_{0}^{0}; s_{1}^{0}) ::::G (s_{r^{0}}, 1; s_{r^{0}}^{0})$$

$$= X _{r,r^{r^{0}}} (_{1})^{r+r^{0}} S_{1} :::ds_{r} ds_{1}^{0} ::::ds_{r^{0}} Y^{r} Y^{r^{0}} h (1 + \frac{1}{2} \sim [s_{1} , s_{1}^{0}])$$

$$= G (s_{0}; s_{1}) ::::G (s_{r-1}; s_{r}) G (s_{0}^{0}; s_{1}^{0}) ::::G (s_{r^{0}}, 1; s_{r^{0}}^{0})$$

$$= (_{r,r^{r^{0}}} (_{0})^{r} (s_{1}; s_{1}) ::::G (s_{r-1}; s_{r}) G (s_{0}^{0}; s_{1}^{0}) ::::G (s_{r^{0}}, 1; s_{r^{0}}^{0})$$

$$= (_{r,r^{r^{0}}} (_{0})^{r} (s_{1}; s_{1}) ::::G (s_{r-1}; s_{r}) G (s_{0}^{0}; s_{1}^{0}) ::::G (s_{r^{0}}, 1; s_{r^{0}}^{0})$$

$$= (_{1} + C (s_{r}; s_{r^{0}}^{0})]$$

$$= (_{1} + C (s_{r}; s_{r^{0}}^{0})]$$

A loo (A.14) is identical to the corresponding expression in [10], as it should.

Appendix B. Expansion of bid sign recurrence probabilities

Here we derive the expansion (106) of the function $(q_1;q_2;:::)$ as defined in (99). We abbreviate

$$E = Erf \frac{h}{p \frac{q}{2} \frac{2}{2} + (1 \frac{q}{2})^{2}}$$
(B.1)

with $E^{r} = hE^{r}$ i. These short-hands allow us to compactify (99) to

Since the overall average bid in the MG is equally likely to be positive than negative, and since (B.1) tells us that sgn \mathbb{E}] = sgn $\overline{\mathbb{A}}$], the moments he^r i for even values of r

will have to be zero. From this it follows that

$$(g_{1};g_{2};:::) = \begin{array}{c} X & X \\ \begin{pmatrix} g_{1};g_{2};::: \end{pmatrix} = \begin{array}{c} X & X \\ & & & \\ & & \\ 2 \end{array} \\ & & & \\ & & \\ & & 2 \end{array} \begin{array}{c} g_{1} & g_{2} \\ & & & \\ & &$$

SO

$$\log (g_{1}; g_{2}; ...) = \begin{cases} x & h & x & g_{j} \\ \log 1 + & & 2n \\ j & 1 & 1 & n & g_{j}=2 \end{cases} hE^{2n}i^{i}$$
(B.3)

Equation (B.3) tells us, rstly, that

$$(1;1;1;:::) = 1$$
 (B.4)

For arbitrary history coincidence numbers $(g_1;g_2;:::)$, not necessarily all equal to one, we may expand (B 3) in the moments hE^ri:

$$\log (g_{1};g_{2};:::) = \sum_{j=1}^{X} \log^{n} 1 + \frac{1}{2}g_{j}(g_{j} = 1)hE^{2}i + \frac{1}{24}g_{j}(g_{j} = 1)(g_{j} = 2)(g_{j} = 3)hE^{4}i + O(hE^{6}i)^{i}$$
$$= \frac{1}{2}\sum_{j=1}^{X}g_{j}(g_{j} = 1)hE^{2}i + \frac{1}{12}h(g_{j} = 2)(g_{j} = 3)hE^{4}i = 3g_{j}(g_{j} = 1)hE^{2}i^{2}^{i} + O(hE^{6}i)$$

Finally, in leading order in E we may regard the variables E as proportional to \overline{A} , and therefore as distributed in a Gaussian manner. This implies (since hE i = 0) that in leading order we have hE⁴i = 3hE²i. Hence

$$\log (g_{1};g_{2};:::) = \frac{1}{2}hE^{2}i_{j1}^{X}g_{j}(g_{j} \ 1) \frac{1}{4}hE^{2}i_{j1}^{X}g_{j}(g_{j} \ 1)(2g \ 3) + O(hE^{6}i)$$
(B.5)

Appendix C.Combinatorics in history frequency moments

In this appendix we calculate the combinatorial factors $G_{a,b}^{k,R}$ as de ned in (111). They can be obtained by dimension of a simple generating function:

$$G_{a,b}^{k,R} = R \left[\begin{array}{cccc} & X^{k} & K_{X} & g_{1} & k & k & g_{1} \\ & & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & \\$$

In particular:

$$G_{2:0}^{k,R} = kR^{-1} + k(k-1)R^{-2}$$
 (C.2)

$$G_{3,0}^{k,R} = kR^{-1} + 3k(k-1)R^{-2} + k(k-1)(k-2)R^{-3}$$
 (C.3)

$$G_{4;0}^{k,R} = kR^{-1} + 7k(k-1)R^{-2} + 6k(k-1)(k-2)R^{-3} + k(k-1)(k-2)(k-3)R^{4}(C.4)$$

$$G_{2;2}^{k,R} = k(k-1)R^{-2} + 2k(k-1)(k-2)R^{-3} + k(k-1)(k-2)(k-3)R^{4}$$
(C.5)