

INFORMATION SPILLOVER IN MULTIPLE ZERO-SUM GAMES

LUCAS PAHL

ABSTRACT. This paper considers an infinitely repeated three-player Bayesian game with lack of information on two sides, in which an informed player plays two zero-sum games simultaneously at each stage against two uninformed players. This is a generalization of the Aumann et al. [1] two-player zero-sum one-sided incomplete information model. Under a correlated prior, the informed player faces the problem of how to optimally disclose information among two uninformed players in order to maximize his long term average payoffs. Our objective is to understand the adverse effects of “information spillover” from one game to the other in the equilibrium payoff set of the informed player. We provide conditions under which the informed player can fully overcome such adverse effects and characterize equilibrium payoffs. In a second result, we show how the effects of information spillover on the equilibrium payoff set of the informed player might be severe.

1. INTRODUCTION

In their seminal work, Aumann et al. [1] analyzed an undiscounted infinitely repeated two-player zero-sum game with lack of information on one side: one player (the informed) knows the stage game being played whereas the other (the uninformed) does not know and cannot observe payoffs, only actions. They showed that this game has a value and constructed optimal strategies for the players. Matters are more complicated if the informed player were to play against *more than one* uninformed player, as it would be the case of a military power (e.g., USA) negotiating with two different countries (e.g., Russia and Iran).¹ By observing what the informed player plays against some other uninformed player, an uninformed player can make inferences about the game he plays against the informed player. As a consequence, it may not be optimal for the informed player to play his unilaterally optimal strategy against some of the uninformed players. Put differently, the *information spillover* among the games played between the informed player and the uninformed players adds layers of complexity to the analysis.

We consider a three-player undiscounted infinitely repeated game in which one of the players is informed of the two zero-sum stage games that he plays against each of the other two (uninformed) players. Each uninformed player only knows the prior probability distribution over the finite set of pairs of zero-sum finite-action stage games, and during the play of the game observes the profiles

Date: October, 2021. This paper subsumes a previous paper titled “Information Spillover in Bayesian Repeated Games”.

I am grateful to Paulo Barelli and Hari Govindan for their guidance and encouragement. I would like to thank Sven Rady, Rida Laraki, Tristan Tomala, Heng Liu and Mathijs Janssen for comments and suggestions.

¹The USA may want to conceal from Russia the exact size of its arsenal, and at the same time may want to reveal it to Iran to leverage its bargaining position. More examples in this line can be found in Aumann et al. [1].

of actions (but not the payoffs). The informed player collects the sum of payoffs from the two component games.

In the absence of information spillover, for instance when neither of the uninformed players can observe the actions played in the other zero-sum game, our three-player game has a single expected payoff, namely, the sum of values of each of the two-player component games. However, when all players are able to observe the actions played across each zero-sum game, the information spillover kicks in and it is in principle unclear whether the informed player can attain the sum of values in equilibrium. This sum of values can actually be shown to be an upper bound on the equilibrium payoffs of the informed player in our three-player game.

Our first main result provides a condition under which the informed player can attain this upper bound in equilibrium, even in the presence of information spillover. More precisely, we show the informed player can attain anything as an equilibrium payoff from his individually rational payoff to the above mentioned upper bound, thus characterizing the set of equilibrium payoffs in the three-player game. In particular, this result implies that the three-player model we analyse might have a continuum of equilibrium payoffs, even though it is a zero-sum model.

The method used to obtain this first result is also of interest to the model of two-player games studied by Aumann et al. [1]. Under a sufficient condition on the stage-payoffs, we show that different optimal strategies from those constructed by Aumann et al. exist. The strategy of the informed player, in particular, does not involve any signaling on path of play, even when the standard optimal strategy constructed by Aumann et al. necessarily does.

In a second a result we provide a necessary condition for equilibria paying the upper bound to the informed player. We explore two consequences of this result. First, we show that a natural class of equilibria which involve signaling on equilibrium path never pays the upper bound to the informed player. Second, we present an example showing that the effects of information spillover might be very severe, in the sense that the informed player is not able to attain the upper bound in equilibrium.

1.1. Related Literature. To the best of our knowledge, the model analyzed here is new. Although the model we analyse is zero-sum, the results and the techniques presented remain closer to the non-zero-sum literature, especially to Hart [7] and Sorin [12]. We highlight here a few additional papers on discounted and undiscounted Bayesian repeated games with perfect monitoring that have technical and thematic similarities to this project. A significant part of the literature on undiscounted Bayesian repeated games with perfect monitoring analyses models under the assumption of “known own payoffs” (see Forges [4]). This is a reasonable assumption in several applications and allows for equilibrium-payoff characterizations which are especially tractable (see Shalev [10]).

Under this assumption, Forges and Solomon [5] provide a simple characterization of Nash equilibrium payoffs in undiscounted Bayesian repeated games of two players.² This characterization is used to show that in a class of public good games, uniform equilibria might not exist. More closely related to our paper in terms of the information environment is Forges et al. [6]. In this paper, among other results, cooperative solutions of one-shot Bayesian games with two players and exactly one informed player are related to noncooperative solutions of two-player repeated Bayesian games with exactly one informed player. More specifically, under the assumption of existence of uniform punishment strategies for the uninformed player, the *joint-plan* equilibrium payoffs of the repeated game equal the set of cooperative solutions of the one-shot Bayesian game. This *folk theorem* is not however an equilibrium payoff characterization, since it is known from Hart [7] that joint plans cannot account for the whole of equilibrium payoffs in general.

One additional reference in the discounted dynamic games literature is Huangfu and Liu [8]. Although considering a significantly different model from ours, this paper motivated our work by considering information spillovers between different markets with asymmetric information. In that paper, a seller holds private information about the quality of goods he sells in two different markets and buyers learn about the seller’s private information from observing past trading outcomes not only in the market in which they directly participate, but also from observing the outcomes of the other market. The authors show, under certain assumptions on the correlation of qualities between goods in different markets, that information spillover can mitigate adverse selection.

1.2. Organization. The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. The model is presented in Section 2. Section 3 presents our first main result. Section 4 presents our second main result and Section 5 concludes. The proofs of technical results are left to the Appendix. Additional results can be found in a Supplemental Appendix.³

2. MODEL

2.1. Notation. Given a finite set K , $\Delta(K)$ is the set of probability distributions over K ; the interior of X will be denoted by $\text{int}(X)$, its boundary by $\partial(X)$, and its convex closure by $\text{co}(X)$. For $p \in \Delta(K_A \times K_B)$, p_A (resp. p_B) denotes its marginal on K_A (resp. K_B), and $\text{supp}(p)$ its support. We denote a product distribution on $K_A \times K_B$ by $p_A \otimes p_B$, and use $\Delta(K_A) \otimes \Delta(K_B)$ to denote the set of all such distributions.

A *3-player infinitely repeated zero-sum game with lack of information on two sides*, denoted $\mathcal{G}(p^0)$ is given by the following data:

- Three players, namely player 1 (the informed player), player 2 and player 3 (the uninformed players).

²An additional assumption needed for the characterization is the existence of “uniform punishment strategies” for the players in the Bayesian stage game, that is, strategies that allow a player to be punished by holding his payoffs at his ex-post individually rational level.

³<https://pahllucas.wixsite.com/lucaspahl>.

- Finite sets: $I_i, J_i, K_i, i = A, B$ with $I_A \times I_B$ (resp. J_A and J_B) being the set of actions of player 1 (resp. players 2 and 3), and $K_A \times K_B$ being the set of states.
- $p^0 \in \Delta(K_A \times K_B)$ is the prior.
- For each $k_A \in K_A$ and $k_B \in K_B$, A^{k_A} and B^{k_B} are $|I_A| \times |J_A|$ and $|I_B| \times |J_B|$ -payoff matrices, respectively.

The play of the infinitely repeated game is as follows:

- At stage 0, state $(k_A, k_B) \in K_A \times K_B$ is drawn according to distribution p^0 and only player 1 knows the draw.
- At each stage $t = 1, 2, \dots$, the players independently choose an action in their own set of actions: when player 1 chooses $(i_A^t, i_B^t) \in I_A \times I_B$ and players 2 and 3 choose $j_A^t \in J_A$ and $j_B^t \in J_B$, respectively, the stage payoff to player 1 is then $A_{i_A^t, j_A^t}^{k_A} + B_{i_B^t, j_B^t}^{k_B}$; to player 2, $-A_{i_A^t, j_A^t}^{k_A}$ and to player 3, $-B_{i_B^t, j_B^t}^{k_B}$. Monitoring is perfect, i.e., all players observe all past action profiles before starting stage $t + 1$.

Players are assumed to have perfect recall and the whole description of the game is common knowledge. A behavior strategy for player 1 is an element $\sigma = (\sigma^{(k_A, k_B)})_{(k_A, k_B) \in K_A \times K_B}$, where for each $(k_A, k_B) \in K_A \times K_B$, $\sigma^{(k_A, k_B)} = (\sigma_t^{(k_A, k_B)})_{t \geq 1}$ and $\sigma_t^{(k_A, k_B)}$ is a mapping from the Cartesian product $H_t := (I_A \times J_A \times I_B \times J_B)^{t-1}$ (with $H_0 := \{\emptyset\}$) to $\Delta(I_A \times I_B)$, giving the lottery on actions played by player 1 at a stage t , when the state is (k_A, k_B) . Because players 2 and 3 do not know the state, a behavior strategy for player 2 (resp. player 3) is an element $\tau_A = (\tau_{A,t})_{t \geq 1}$ (resp. $\tau_B = (\tau_{B,t})_{t \geq 1}$), where $\tau_{A,t}$ (resp. $\tau_{B,t}$) is a mapping from $H_t := (I_A \times J_A \times I_B \times J_B)^{t-1}$ to $\Delta(J_A)$ (resp. $\Delta(J_B)$), giving the lottery on actions to be played by player 2 (resp. player 3) on stage t . The set of behavior strategies of player 1 is denoted by Σ ; for player 2, it is denoted by \mathcal{T}_A and for player 3, it is denoted by \mathcal{T}_B .

We now define our equilibrium notion for the model. A behavior strategy profile (σ, τ_A, τ_B) induces, for every state (k_A, k_B) and stage $T > 0$, a probability distribution on H_{T+1} . Also, (σ, τ_A, τ_B) and p^0 induce a probability distribution over $K_A \times K_B \times H_{T+1}$. We can thus define the average expected payoffs (with κ being a random variable taking values on $K_A \times K_B$ distributed according to p^0 , κ_A the random variable obtained from projecting κ on K_A and κ_B the random variable obtained from projecting κ on K_B):

$$\alpha_T^{k_A, k_B} = \alpha_T^{k_A, k_B}(\sigma, \tau_A, \tau_B) := \mathbb{E}_{\sigma^{(k_A, k_B)}, \tau_A, \tau_B} \left[\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T (A_{i_A^t, j_A^t}^{k_A} + B_{i_B^t, j_B^t}^{k_B}) \right],$$

$$\beta_T^A(\sigma, \tau_A, \tau_B) := \mathbb{E}_{\sigma, \tau_A, \tau_B, p^0} \left[\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T (-A_{i_A^t, j_A^t}^{\kappa_A}) \right],$$

$$\beta_T^B(\sigma, \tau_A, \tau_B) := \mathbb{E}_{\sigma, \tau_A, \tau_B, p^0} \left[\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T (-B_{i_B^t, j_B^t}^{\kappa_B}) \right].$$

Equilibrium Concept. A profile (σ, τ_A, τ_B) is a *uniform equilibrium* of $\mathcal{G}(p^0)$ when:

- (1) For each $(k_A, k_B) \in \text{supp}(p^0)$,⁴ $(\alpha_T^{k_A, k_B}(\sigma, \tau_A, \tau_B))_{T \geq 1}$ converges as T goes to infinity to some $\alpha^{k_A, k_B}(\sigma, \tau_A, \tau_B)$, $(\beta_T^A(\sigma, \tau_A, \tau_B))_{T \geq 1}$ converges to some $\beta^A(\sigma, \tau_A, \tau_B)$ and $(\beta_T^B(\sigma, \tau_A, \tau_B))_{T \geq 1}$ converges to some $\beta^B(\sigma, \tau_A, \tau_B)$.
- (2) For each $\epsilon > 0$, there exists a positive integer T_0 such that for all $T \geq T_0$, (σ, τ_A, τ_B) is an ϵ -Nash equilibrium in the finitely repeated game with T stages, i.e.,
 - (a) For each $(k_A, k_B) \in \text{supp}(p^0)$ and $\sigma' \in \Sigma$, $\alpha_T^{k_A, k_B}(\sigma', \tau_A, \tau_B) \leq \alpha_T^{k_A, k_B}(\sigma, \tau_A, \tau_B) + \epsilon$;
 - (b) For each $\tau'_A \in \mathcal{T}_A$, $\beta_T^A(\sigma, \tau'_A, \tau_B) \leq \beta_T^A(\sigma, \tau_A, \tau_B) + \epsilon$;
 - (c) For each $\tau'_B \in \mathcal{T}_B$, $\beta_T^B(\sigma, \tau_A, \tau'_B) \leq \beta_T^B(\sigma, \tau_A, \tau_B) + \epsilon$.

Uniform equilibrium is a standard equilibrium concept for the analysis of undiscounted repeated games. It contains a strong requirement, namely (2), which posits that the profile (σ, τ_A, τ_B) must generate an ϵ -equilibrium in all “long” ($T \geq T_0$) but T -times (where $T < \infty$) repeated version of our model.⁵

If (σ, τ_A, τ_B) is an equilibrium in $\mathcal{G}(p^0)$, the associated vector

$$(\alpha(\sigma, \tau_A, \tau_B), \beta^A(\sigma, \tau_A, \tau_B), \beta^B(\sigma, \tau_A, \tau_B)),$$

where $\alpha(\sigma, \tau_A, \tau_B) := (\alpha^{k_A, k_B}(\sigma, \tau_A, \tau_B))_{(k_A, k_B) \in \text{supp}(p^0)}$, is the *vector of payoffs* of (σ, τ_A, τ_B) . Also $\alpha(\sigma, \tau_A, \tau_B) \cdot p^0$ (where \cdot is the standard scalar product in Euclidean space) is the *ex-ante equilibrium payoff* of the informed player.

Our analysis of the equilibrium payoff set of the game $\mathcal{G}(p^0)$ in the next section will rely on certain properties of each of the two-player, infinitely repeated zero-sum games that the informed player plays against each uninformed player. For this reason we now recall some of the main results in Aumann et al. [1], which is the original reference for this two-player model. Let K be the finite set of states and $M = (M^k)_{k \in K}$ a collection of zero-sum payoff matrices where $M^k \in \mathbb{R}^{I \times J}$ for each $k \in K$. Denote by $G_M(p)$ the *infinitely repeated, two-player, zero-sum game with lack of information on one side* with prior $p \in \Delta(K)$ and undiscounted payoffs (see Sorin [13], Chapter 3, for a detailed description of this model or Aumann et al. [1]). Let $M(p) = \sum_{k \in K} p^k M^k$ and define $v_M(p) = \min_{t \in \Delta(J)} \max_{s \in \Delta(I)} s M(p) t = \max_{s \in \Delta(I)} \min_{t \in \Delta(J)} s M(p) t$, where s is a row vector

⁴Remark 3.5 in Section 3 shows that assuming the prior $p^0 \in \text{int}(\Delta(K_A \times K_B))$ (as customary in the literature) is not without loss of generality for the results in this paper. This is why we present the definition requiring convergence of $(\alpha_T^{k_A, k_B})_{T \geq 1}$, $(k_A, k_B) \in \text{supp}(p^0)$. The same reasoning applies to condition (2).

⁵One notable aspect of this equilibrium notion is that uniform equilibria in our model are approximate Nash equilibria in the discounted version of our model: if (σ, τ_A, τ_B) is a uniform equilibrium, then (σ, τ_A, τ_B) is a ϵ -Nash equilibrium of the discounted versions of our model for a sufficiently high discount factor. See Theorem 13.32 in Maschler et al. [9].

and t a column vector. The function $q \in \Delta(K) \mapsto v_M(q) \in \mathbb{R}$ is called the *non-revealing value function*. Let $\text{Cav}(v_M)$ be the (pointwise) smallest concave function g from $\Delta(K)$ to \mathbb{R} such that $g(q) \geq v_M(q)$ for all $q \in \Delta(K)$. Alternatively, one can define $\text{Cav}(v_M)(q) := \{\sum_{i=1}^k \alpha_i v_M(q_i) \mid \exists k \in \mathbb{N}, \forall i \in \{1, \dots, k\}, \alpha_i \geq 0, \sum_{i=1}^k \alpha_i q_i = q, \sum_{i=1}^k \alpha_i = 1\}$. Aumann et al. [1] proved that a (uniform) value of $G_M(p)$ exists and equals $\text{Cav}(v_M)(p)$. They also showed how to construct (uniformly) optimal strategies for both players.

Given the model $\mathcal{G}(p^0)$, the infinitely repeated, two-player, zero-sum game with lack of information on one side with prior p_A^0 defined by states K_A and payoff matrices $(A^{k_A})_{k_A \in K_A}$ with undiscounted payoffs will be denoted $G_A(p_A^0)$ – this game is played by players 1 (informed) and 2 (uninformed). Analogously, we define $G_B(p_B^0)$ as the two-player, infinitely repeated, zero-sum game with lack of information on one side played between players 1 and 3. The two-player, infinitely repeated zero-sum game with lack of information on one side and prior $p^0 \in \Delta(K_A \times K_B)$ with undiscounted payoffs, where stage payoff matrices are $(C^{k_A, k_B})_{k_A \in K_A, k_B \in K_B}$ given by $C_{i_A, i_B, j_A, j_B}^{k_A, k_B} := A_{i_A, j_A}^{k_A} + B_{i_B, j_B}^{k_B}$ will be denoted $G_{A+B}(p^0)$. This two-player game will be used as an auxiliary game to construct strategies in the three-player game $\mathcal{G}(p^0)$.

Example 2.1. We would like to illustrate the new strategic difficulties that arise in the model $\mathcal{G}(p^0)$ in comparison to the two-player zero-sum model of Aumann et al. [1]. Two sets $A = \{A^1, A^2\}$ and $B = \{B^1, B^2\}$ of payoff matrices are defined below together with $p^0 \in \Delta(K_A \times K_B)$, where $K_A = \{1, 2\}$ and $K_B = \{1, 2\}$.

$$p^0 = \begin{bmatrix} 1/2 & 0 \\ 0 & 1/2 \end{bmatrix}$$

$$A^1 = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \quad A^2 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$$

$$B^1 = \begin{bmatrix} 4 & 0 & 2 \\ 4 & 0 & -2 \end{bmatrix} \quad B^2 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 4 & -2 \\ 0 & 4 & 2 \end{bmatrix}$$

In the matrix p^0 , an entry p_{ij}^0 corresponds to the probability with which Nature chooses A^i and B^j . Since the prior assigns perfect correlation between states, there are only two states to consider effectively: states (1, 1) and (2, 2). Denote by q the variable representing the probability of state 1 (in both games) and $1 - q$ the probability of state 2 (in both games). Each row of A^i and $B^j, i, j \in \{1, 2\}$ corresponds to a stage-game action of the informed player: call the first row “U” and the second row “D”. By computation, we get:

$$v_A(q) = q(1 - q) \text{ for all } q \in [0, 1]$$

FIGURE 1. Graphs of $\text{Cav}(v_A)$ and v_A





FIGURE 2. Graphs of $\text{Cav}(v_B)$ and v_B



$$v_B(q) = \begin{cases} 4q & \text{if } q \in [0, 1/4) \\ -4q + 2 & \text{if } q \in [1/4, 1/2) \\ 4q - 2 & \text{if } q \in [1/2, 3/4) \\ -4q + 4 & \text{if } q \in [3/4, 1] \end{cases}$$

These imply that:

$$\text{Cav}(v_A)(q) = v_A(q) = q(1 - q) \text{ for all } q \in [0, 1]$$

$$\text{Cav}(v_B)(q) = \begin{cases} 4q & \text{if } q \in [0, 1/4) \\ 1 & \text{if } q \in [1/4, 3/4) \\ -4q + 4 & \text{if } q \in [3/4, 1] \end{cases}$$

The optimal strategy of the informed player in the two-player repeated zero-sum game $G_B(1/2)$ is defined as follows: in case the state drawn by Nature is 1, the informed player plays “U” with probability 1/4 and after that plays at each stage, independently, the optimal action of the one-shot zero-sum game whose matrix is $B(1/4)$; in case the state drawn by Nature is 2, the informed player plays “U” with probability 3/4 and, after that, plays the optimal action of the one-shot zero-sum

game whose matrix is $B(3/4)$. After observing the realized action of the informed player in the first stage, the uninformed player updates his beliefs about the states to *posteriors* about states 1 and 2: in our example, the uninformed player, after observing “ U ”, assigns probability $1/4$ to the state being 1. On the other hand, after observing “ D ”, the uninformed player assigns probability $3/4$ to the state being 1. The strategy just described for the informed player is an example of a *signaling strategy*: the informed player uses his actions to signal information about the underlying state. After the first stage, according to the construction described, no more information is signaled and the uninformed player plays the optimal action of the one-shot zero-sum game with matrix $B(1/4)$ or $B(3/4)$ forever, depending on whether U or D was realized, respectively. Playing the signaling strategy guarantees to the informed player an ex-ante payoff of $(1/2)v_B(1/4) + (1/2)v_B(3/4) = (1/2)\text{Cav}(v_B)(1/4) + (1/2)\text{Cav}(v_B)(3/4) = \text{Cav}(v_B)(1/2) = 1$. Now, in game $G_A(1/2)$ the non-revealing value function of the informed player is strictly concave, which implies that his optimal strategy in this game is non-revealing (at any prior): one optimal strategy for the informed player is to play at each stage the optimal action of the one-shot zero-sum game with matrix $A(1/2)$ independently forever. If the informed player uses the signaling strategy described in $G_B(1/2)$, because of perfect correlation between κ_A and κ_B , this strategy also induces the same updating on the part of the (uninformed) player 2, inducing, similarly, posteriors $1/4$ and $3/4$ in the two-player zero-sum repeated game $G_A(1/2)$. By using that strategy in game $G_B(1/2)$, the informed player in game $G_A(1/2)$ can now only guarantee $(1/2)\text{Cav}(v_A)(1/4) + (1/2)\text{Cav}(v_A)(3/4) = 3/16 < 1/4 = \text{Cav}(v_A)(1/2)$. The example shows that playing the optimal strategies constructed by Aumann and Maschler in each game $G_A(p_A^0)$ and $G_B(p_B^0)$ cannot guarantee the informed player an ex-ante expected payoff equal to the sum of values $\text{Cav}(v_A)(p_A^0) + \text{Cav}(v_B)(p_B^0)$.

3. FIRST MAIN RESULT: EQUILIBRIUM PAYOFF-SET CHARACTERIZATION

Our first main result (Theorem 3.2) provides a sufficient condition under which the equilibrium payoffs of the informed player in $\mathcal{G}(p^0)$ permits a simple characterization. In particular, this characterization implies that the game $\mathcal{G}(p^0)$ might have a continuum of equilibrium payoffs. We now introduce the necessary concepts and state our main result in full generality. The remainder of the section is dedicated to the proof and additional consequences of the result we would like to highlight.

Recall that the non-revealing value function $v_A(q)$ is defined by $\min_{\tau} \max_{\sigma} \sigma A(q) \tau'$, where σ is a row vector and τ' a column vector of the one-shot, two-player, zero-sum game with payoff matrix $A(q)$. For q in the affine hull H_A of the simplex $\Delta(K_A)$, one can consider the immediate extension of $v_A(q)$ to H_A given by the same min-max formula. Denote this extension by v_A^e . As we will need to make considerations about the derivative of v_A^e at points in $\Delta(K_A)$, we will define once and for all a parametrization for the affine space H_A . Let $T : \mathbb{R}^{|K_A|-1} \rightarrow H_A$ be defined as follows: Let $e_i^{K_A-1} = (0, \dots, 1, \dots, 0) \in \mathbb{R}^{K_A-1}$ with 1 in the i -th position. Analogously, let

$e_i^{K_A} = (0, \dots, 1, \dots, 0) \in \mathbb{R}^{|K_A|}$. Define $T : \mathbb{R}^{|K_A|-1} \rightarrow H_A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{|K_A|}$ as the affine transformation that maps $e_i^{K_A-1} \mapsto e_{i+1}^{K_A}$ and $0 \mapsto e_1^{K_A}$, for $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, |K_A| - 1\}$. Since T is affine, $Tx = Sx + e_1^{K_A}$, where S is an injective linear transformation; we will also denote by S the matrix representation of S according to the canonical basis. The function $(v_A^e \circ T) : \mathbb{R}^{|K_A|-1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a Lipschitz function and therefore is almost everywhere differentiable in $\mathbb{R}^{|K_A|-1}$. The *generalized gradient*⁶ of $(v_A^e \circ T)$ at x^0 is defined as $\partial(v_A^e \circ T)(x^0) = \text{co}\{\lim(\nabla(v_A^e \circ T))(x^0 + h_k) | h_k \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } k \rightarrow +\infty\}$, where $x^0 + h_k \in \mathbb{R}^{|K_A|-1}$ is a point of differentiability of $(v_A^e \circ T)$, for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$.⁷ For notational convenience, we write $\partial v_A(p_A^0) \equiv \partial(v_A^e \circ T)(x^0)$, where $T(x^0) = p_A^0$. Let now $P \subset \mathbb{R}^{|K_A|-1}$ be such that $T(P) = \Delta(K_A)$. Define the *restricted superdifferential* of $\text{Cav}(v_A \circ T|_P)$ at p - denoted $\partial^* \text{Cav}(v_A)(p)$ - as the set of vectors $v \in \mathbb{R}^{|K_A|-1}$ that satisfy $\text{Cav}(v_A)(p) + v \cdot h \geq \text{Cav}(v_A \circ T|_P)(x + h)$ for all h with $x + h \in P$ and $T(x) = p$. Below, $\phi_A S$ denotes the pre-multiplication of the row vector ϕ_A by the matrix S .

Definition 3.1. The two-player infinitely repeated zero-sum game with lack of information on one side $G_A(p_A^0)$ satisfies the property *NR* at p_A^0 if there exists $p_A \in \Delta(K_A)$ and $\phi_A \in \mathbb{R}^{|K_A|}$ such that:

- (1) $\text{Cav}(v_A)(p_A) = v_A(p_A) = \phi_A \cdot p_A$ and $\text{Cav}(v_A)(p_A^0) = \phi_A \cdot p_A^0$;
- (2) $\phi_A S \in \partial v_A(p_A)$;
- (3) $\phi_A S \in \partial^* \text{Cav}(v_A)(p_A)$.

Given $\mathcal{G}(p^0)$, the number $\text{Cav}(v_A)(p_A^0) + \text{Cav}(v_B)(p_B^0)$ is an upper bound on the ex-ante equilibrium payoffs of player 1, because each uninformed player can always play the optimal strategy of his repeated zero-sum game, holding the payoffs of the informed player at most at $\text{Cav}(v_A)(p_A) + \text{Cav}(v_B)(p_B)$. On the other hand, letting $h(p) := v_A(p_A) + v_B(p_B)$, a lower bound on the ex-ante equilibrium payoffs of the informed player is given by the concavification of h evaluated at p^0 .⁸

For $p^0 \in \Delta(K_A \times K_B)$, let

$$I(p^0) = [\text{Cav}(h)(p^0), \text{Cav}(v_A)(p_A^0) + \text{Cav}(v_B)(p_B^0)].$$

We call $\text{Cav}(h)(p^0)$ the *lower end* of $I(p^0)$ and $\text{Cav}(v_A)(p_A^0) + \text{Cav}(v_B)(p_B^0)$ the *upper end* of $I(p^0)$.

Theorem 3.2. Let $p^0 \in \Delta(K_A \times K_B)$ such that $\text{supp}(p_A^0) = K_A$ and $\text{supp}(p_B^0) = K_B$. Suppose each game $G_A(p_A^0)$ and $G_B(p_B^0)$ satisfies *NR* at p_A^0 and p_B^0 , respectively. Then it follows that $I(p^0)$ is the set of ex-ante equilibrium payoffs of the informed player in the game $\mathcal{G}(p^0)$.

The interval $I(p^0)$ might be degenerate as well as nondegenerate. Whenever $I(p^0)$ is nondegenerate, for any sufficiently small perturbation of the stage-game payoff matrices, the resulting model $\mathcal{G}(p^0)$ also has an associated interval $I(p^0)$ which is nondegenerate. A proof of

⁶See Clark [3].

⁷Notice that to define the generalized gradient, one needs to take limits from all possible directions in $\mathbb{R}^{|K_A|-1}$. That is why one needs to extend the non-revealing value function “outside” of the simplex.

⁸Consider the two-player infinitely repeated zero-sum game $G_{A+B}(p^0)$. It is straightforward to check that the non-revealing value of $G_{A+B}(p^0)$ is $h(p^0)$. From Aumann et al. [1], the value of $G_{A+B}(p^0)$ is $\text{Cav}(h)(p^0)$, so the informed player can guarantee $\text{Cav}(h)(p^0)$.

this robustness property can be found in the Supplemental Appendix (Proposition 1.1). As an example, the interval $I(p^0)$ of the game $\mathcal{G}(p^0)$ of Example 2.1 is nondegenerate: we have $\text{Cav}(v_A)(p_A^0) + \text{Cav}(v_B)(p_B^0) = 1/4 + 1 > 1 + 3/16 = \text{Cav}(h)(p^0)$. There are cases where $I(p^0)$ is degenerate (for example, when $p^0 \in \Delta(K_A) \otimes \Delta(K_B)$). In these cases only one ex-ante equilibrium payoff exists (without any assumptions on the games $G_A(p_A^0)$ and $G_B(p_B^0)$).⁹

3.1. On the Proof of Theorem 3.2. The proof of Theorem 3.2 amounts to showing that when the NR property is satisfied for each of the two-player zero-sum repeated games $G_A(p_A^0)$ and $G_B(p_B^0)$, then an equilibrium of each of these games can be constructed on which no information is revealed on path of play, i.e., no signaling occurs. If such a non-revealing equilibrium of each of the zero-sum repeated games can be constructed, then we can immediately construct an equilibrium of the 3-player game $\mathcal{G}(p^0)$.

We define the set of *non-revealing equilibrium payoffs* (of the informed player), denoted $\mathcal{NR}(p^0)$, of game $\mathcal{G}(p^0)$. Let $\mathcal{NR}(p^0)$ be the set of vectors $(\phi_A, \phi_B) \in \mathbb{R}^{|K_A|} \times \mathbb{R}^{|K_B|}$ that satisfy:

(1) (Feasibility)

$$(\phi_A, \phi_B) \in F_A \times F_B,$$

where $F_A := \text{co}\{(A_{i_A, i_B}^{k_A})_{k_A \in K_A} | i_A \in I_A, j_A \in J_A\}$ and $F_B := \text{co}\{(B_{i_B, j_B}^{k_B})_{k_B \in K_B} | i_B \in I_B, j_B \in J_B\}$.

(2) (Individual rationality for player 1)

$$\phi \cdot q \geq h(q), \forall q \in \Delta(\text{supp}(p^0)), \phi = (\phi_A^{k_A} + \phi_B^{k_B})_{(k_A, k_B) \in \text{supp}(p^0)}.$$

(3) (Individual rationality for players 2 and 3)

$$\phi_A \cdot p_A^0 \leq \text{Cav}(v_A)(p_A^0), \phi_B \cdot p_B^0 \leq \text{Cav}(v_B)(p_B^0).$$

The three conditions above defining the set of non-revealing equilibrium payoffs parallel the conditions defined for two-player repeated games with a single informed player (see Hart [7]). We briefly recall the reason why $(\phi_A, \phi_B) \in \mathcal{NR}(p^0)$ implies we can construct equilibria in $\mathcal{G}(p^0)$ that reveal no information on path of play and have ϕ_A (resp. ϕ_B) as the vectors of payoffs of the informed player in $G_A(p_A^0)$ (resp. $G_B(p_B^0)$). Let $(\phi_A, \phi_B) \in \mathcal{NR}(p^0)$. Since $\phi_A \in F_A$,

$$\phi_A = \sum_{(i_A, j_A) \in I_A \times J_A} \lambda_{i_A, j_A} (A_{i_A, j_A}^{k_A})_{k_A \in K_A}, \quad \sum_{(i_A, j_A) \in I_A \times J_A} \lambda_{i_A, j_A} = 1, \lambda_{i_A, j_A} \geq 0.$$

Consider then a sequence of (pure) actions $((i_A^t, j_A^t))_{t \geq 1}$ and define a function $\chi^{(i_A, j_A)} : I_A \times J_A \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ where $\chi^{(i_A, j_A)}(i'_A, j'_A) = 1$, if $(i'_A, j'_A) = (i_A, j_A)$, and $\chi^{(i_A, j_A)}(i'_A, j'_A) = 0$, if $(i'_A, j'_A) \neq (i_A, j_A)$. Assume that the sequence $h_\infty^A = ((i_A^t, j_A^t))_{t \geq 1}$ satisfies for each $(i_A, j_A) \in I_A \times J_A$,

⁹Proposition 3.5 of the Supplemental Appendix shows an equilibrium of $\mathcal{G}(p^0)$ with an associated payoff equal to $\text{Cav}(h)(p^0)$ always exists.

$\lim_{T \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \chi^{(i_A, j_A)}(j_A^t, j_A^t) = \lambda_{i_A j_A}$.¹⁰ When players 1 and 2 play the sequence of actions h_∞^A in $G_A(p_A^0)$, the payoff achieved is $\phi_A^{k_A}$, for each state $k_A \in K_A$. Obviously, a similar reasoning applies to $\phi_B \in F_B$, and $\phi_B^{k_B}$ is the payoff achieved by a deterministic sequence of actions played at each stage. Conditions (2) and (3) now imply that this deterministic path of play can be supported as an equilibrium path of play: condition (2) guarantees that, in case player 1 deviates from the deterministic sequence, players 2 and 3 can punish him. So it guarantees that under no possible state (k_A, k_B) player 1 could obtain more than $\phi^{(k_A, k_B)}$ ¹¹; condition (3) guarantees, in turn, that any deviation of player 2 (resp. player 3) can be punished by player 1 with an optimal strategy of game $G_A(p_A^0)$ (resp. $G_B(p_B^0)$).

We now define the set $NR_A(p_A^0)$ of non-revealing equilibrium payoffs of the two-player repeated game $G_A(p_A^0)$. The set $NR_A(p_A^0)$ is the set of vectors $\alpha_A \in \mathbb{R}^{|K_A|}$ that satisfies (i) $\alpha_A \cdot q \geq v_A(q)$, for all $q \in \Delta(K_A)$; (ii) $\alpha_A \cdot p_A^0 = \text{Cav}(v_A)(p_A^0)$ and (iii) $\alpha_A \in F_A$. This is the set of equilibrium payoffs for which no signaling occurs on path. This set is essentially the specification for a two-player, zero-sum infinitely repeated game with lack of information on one side of the set of non-revealing equilibrium payoffs (called “ G ”) defined for nonzero-sum two-player repeated games with lack on information on one side in Hart [7] (see p. 124). Note that each k_A -th entry of a vector α_A in $NR_A(p_A^0)$ is the payoff for the informed player in $G_A(p_A^0)$ when the state is k_A . All vectors α_A in $NR_A(p_A^0)$ generate the same ex-ante payoff, i.e., the (uniform) value $\text{Cav}(v_A)(p_A^0) = \alpha_A \cdot p_A^0$, but there might be several vectors generating this payoff.

It is now easy to see that $NR_A(p_A^0) \times NR_B(p_B^0) \subset \mathcal{NR}(p^0)$. If one can show that $NR_A(p_A^0)$ and $NR_B(p_B^0)$ are both nonempty, then the existence of an equilibrium of $\mathcal{G}(p^0)$ paying the upper end of $I(p^0)$ is immediate. We prove then the following key lemma for the result:

Lemma 3.3. *Let $G_A(p_A^0)$ satisfy NR at p_A^0 . Then $NR_A(p_A^0) \neq \emptyset$.*

Proof. See Appendix A. □

Therefore, the existence of an equilibrium paying the upper end of $I(p^0)$ is an immediate consequence of Lemma 3.3. The lower end of $I(p^0)$ is always an equilibrium of $\mathcal{G}(p^0)$ – i.e., no additional assumption is required. A proof of this result can be found in the Supplemental Appendix (Proposition 3.5).¹² When the upper and lower ends of $I(p^0)$ are both an ex-ante equilibrium payoff for the informed player, then we can use a straightforward application of *jointly controlled lotteries*

¹⁰Lemma 2 in Sorin [12] shows such a sequence exists for any such $\lambda_{i,j}$.

¹¹Condition (2) implies that there is an optimal strategy of the uninformed player in the game $G_{A+B}(p^0)$ which guarantees the informed player will not obtain more than $\phi^{(k_A, k_B)}$ for each state (k_A, k_B) . In the Supplemental Appendix, Proposition 4.5, we show this strategy can indeed be played by players 2 and 3 in $\mathcal{G}(p^0)$.

¹²We do not include this proof here because it derives essentially from a long application of the work of Simon et al. [11] to our three-player environment.

developed in Aumann et al. [1] in order to obtain that the whole interval $I(p^0)$ can be attained as an ex-ante equilibrium payoff to the informed player.¹³

Remark 3.4. As both the definitions of the property NR at p_A^0 and the set $NR_A(p_A^0)$ concern the game $G_A(p_A^0)$, we compare their content in detail. The properties (1)-(3) in the Definition of NR at p_A^0 (Definition 3.1) are properties of v_A : (1) states that p_A is a point of identity between v_A , $\text{Cav}(v_A)$ and the affine function $q \in \Delta(K_A) \mapsto \phi_A \cdot q$; (1) also states that p_A^0 is a point of identity between the same affine function and $\text{Cav}(v_A)$; (2) states that $\phi_A S$ is a (generalized) gradient at p_A of v_A ; (3) states that ϕ_A is a “supergradient” of $\text{Cav}(v_A)$ at p_A . If a vector ϕ_A satisfies (3) and the first two equalities of (1), then this implies that ϕ_A satisfies (i) in the definition of $NR_A(p_A^0)$. If ϕ_A satisfies the last equality of (1), then it is immediate that it satisfies (ii) of $NR_A(p_A^0)$. Property (iii) in the definition of $NR_A(p_A^0)$ bears no immediate relation with the non-revealing value function v_A . But, as the proof of Lemma 3.3 shows, it is implied by a geometric property of v_A , namely, property (2). Therefore, information about $NR_A(p_A^0)$ can be inferred from properties of v_A only. The precise way to do this inference is presented in the proof of Lemma 3.3.

Remark 3.5. We remark that property (2) of $\mathcal{NR}(p^0)$ differs from the usual assumption present in the literature, namely, that $p^0 \in \text{int}(\Delta(K_A \times K_B))$. The reason why we do not adopt this assumption is as follows: as mentioned above, $NR_A(p_A^0) \times NR_B(p_B^0) \subset \mathcal{NR}(p^0)$ for any $p^0 \in \Delta(K_A \times K_B)$; if $p^0 \in \text{int}(\Delta(K_A \times K_B))$, then we have in addition that $NR_A(p_A^0) \times NR_B(p_B^0) = \mathcal{NR}(p^0)$: to see this, take $(\phi_A, \phi_B) \in \mathcal{NR}(p^0)$. To show (ϕ_A, ϕ_B) is in $NR_A(p_A^0) \times NR_B(p_B^0)$, we just have to check that property (i) defining the sets $NR_A(p_A^0)$ and $NR_B(p_B^0)$ is satisfied; the other conditions are immediate. Suppose by contradiction there exists $\bar{q}_A \in \Delta(K_A)$ such that $\phi_A \cdot \bar{q}_A < v_A(\bar{q}_A)$. Fix now $\bar{q}_B \in \Delta(K_B)$ such that $\phi_B \cdot \bar{q}_B \leq v_B(\bar{q}_B)$. It follows that for $\bar{q} = \bar{q}_A \otimes \bar{q}_B \in \Delta(K_A \times K_B)$, $\phi_A \cdot \bar{q}_A + \phi_B \cdot \bar{q}_B < v_A(\bar{q}_A) + v_B(\bar{q}_B) = h(\bar{q})$, which is a contradiction, since (ϕ_A, ϕ_B) satisfies Condition (2) of $\mathcal{NR}(p^0)$. Hence, when $p^0 \in \text{int}(\Delta(K_A \times K_B))$, $(\phi_A, \phi_B) \in \mathcal{NR}(p^0)$ implies that ϕ_A (respect. ϕ_B) is a vector of equilibrium payoffs in $G_A(p_A^0)$ (respect. $G_B(p_B^0)$) of the informed player $I(p^0)$.

One can see immediately that the argument above relies on the product structure of the set of states $\text{supp}(p^0) = K_A \times K_B$; if one assumes a prior p^0 for which $\text{supp}(p^0)$ is not a cartesian product, then the argument above cannot be repeated and is, in fact, not true.¹⁴ The example below shows that for $p^0 \notin \text{int}(\Delta(K_A \times K_B))$, $NR_A(p_A^0) \times NR_B(p_B^0) \subsetneq \mathcal{NR}(p^0)$.

¹³A jointly controlled lottery is a public randomization device that is endogenously generated by the players so that the players can coordinate. We can define a jointly controlled lottery that randomizes between equilibria paying the upper and lower ends of $I(p^0)$ with any given probability, in order to obtain any given number in $I(p^0)$ as an ex-ante equilibrium payoff of the informed player. See Aumann et al. [1] p. 272 for details. For completeness, the explicit construction of the equilibrium involving jointly controlled lotteries is included in the Supplemental Appendix (Proposition 5.1).

¹⁴This reasoning also justifies why the assumption that is adopted throughout is $p_A^0 \in \text{int}(\Delta(K_A))$ and $p_B^0 \in \text{int}(\Delta(K_B))$ and not $p^0 \in \text{int}(\Delta(K_A \times K_B))$: if, for instance, p_A^0 does not have full support, then one can eliminate from the set of states in K_A the ones that have 0 probability under p_A^0 and the resulting space of states is also a product subset of $K_A \times K_B$.

Example 3.6. We follow the notation of Example 2.1. For $\varepsilon > 0$ and $q^0 \in (0, 1)$, consider the game $\mathcal{G}(p^0)$ given by the following data:

$$p^0 = \begin{bmatrix} q^0 & 0 \\ 0 & (1 - q^0) \end{bmatrix}$$

$$A^1 = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \quad A^2 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$$

$$B^1 = \begin{bmatrix} -\varepsilon & -\varepsilon \\ \varepsilon & \varepsilon \end{bmatrix} \quad B^2 = \begin{bmatrix} \varepsilon & \varepsilon \\ -\varepsilon & -\varepsilon \end{bmatrix}$$

The first thing to observe is that $NR_B(p_B^0) = \emptyset$: notice that $\phi_B \in NR_B(p_B^0)$ iff $\phi_B = (\varepsilon, \varepsilon)$; but $F_B = \text{co}\{(\varepsilon, -\varepsilon), (-\varepsilon, \varepsilon)\}$, which clearly does not contain $(\varepsilon, \varepsilon)$. In particular, we therefore have that $NR_A(p_A^0) \times NR_B(p_B^0) = \emptyset$. One can now show that $\mathcal{NR}(p^0) \neq \emptyset$. We sketch the proof for completeness: fix $q^0 = \frac{1}{5}$. The game $G_A(p_A^0)$ trivially satisfies NR at p_A^0 , because v_A is strictly concave and smooth in the interval $(0, 1)$. Therefore, there exists $\phi_A \in F_A$ such that $\phi_A \cdot p_A^0 = v_A(p_A^0)$ and $\phi_A \cdot q \geq v_A(q), \forall q \in \Delta(K_A)$. For example, one might take $\phi_A = (\frac{16}{25}, \frac{1}{25})$. In $G_B(p_B^0)$ consider now the vector $\phi_B = (-\varepsilon, \varepsilon)$, which is in F_B . Taking $\varepsilon > 0$ sufficiently small, the vector $\phi \in \mathbb{R}^{K_A \times K_B}$ whose entries are given by $\phi^{k_A, k_B} := \phi_A^{k_A} + \phi_B^{k_B}, \forall k_A \in K_A, k_B \in K_B$ is in $\mathcal{NR}(p^0)$.

3.2. An Interpretation for NR . Even though the property NR at p_A^0 is not straightforward to interpret, as it mainly describes certain geometric properties of the non-revealing value function, there is a class of infinitely repeated two-player zero-sum games with lack of information on one side that always satisfies it.

In this section, whenever a two-player, zero-sum infinitely repeated games $G_A(p_A^0)$ is considered, it is assumed, without loss of generality, that $p_A^0 \in \text{int}(\Delta(K_A))$.

Definition 3.7. A two-player, infinitely repeated zero-sum game with lack of information on one-side and undiscounted payoffs $G_A(p)$ is *locally non-revealing at p* ¹⁵ whenever there exist $(\alpha_i)_{i=1}^k \in \mathbb{R}^k$ and $(p_i)_{i=1}^k \in \prod_{i=1}^k \Delta(K_A)$ such that:

- (1) For each $i = 1, \dots, k$, $\alpha_i > 0$ and $\sum_{i=1}^k \alpha_i = 1$;
- (2) $\sum_{i=1}^k \alpha_i p_i = p$;
- (3) $\text{Cav}(v_A)(p) = \sum_{i=1}^k \alpha_i v_A(p_i)$;
- (4) For some $i_0 \in \{1, \dots, k\}$, $p_{i_0} \in \text{int}(\Delta(K_A))$.

¹⁵We provide a robustness result regarding payoff perturbations for property “locally non-revealing” in the Supplemental Appendix (Section 2). The result shows that the property is *not* non-generic.

The definition above implicitly describes an optimal strategy for the informed player in the game $G_A(p)$ for which there is signaling on path of play: the informed player “splits” the prior p into finitely many posteriors $(p_i)_{i=1}^k$ such that $\text{Cav}(v_A)(p) = \sum_{i=1}^k \alpha_i v_A(p_i)$. This is the typical optimal strategy constructed by Aumann et al.. The local non-revelation property tells us that whenever the informed player in $G_A(p_A^0)$ has an Aumann et al.’s strategy under which he does not exclude some state (i.e., when there is at least one induced posterior in the interior of the simplex of states), then there exists an equilibrium of the game $G_A(p_A^0)$ where the informed player does not signal on path of play.


Proposition 3.8. *Suppose $G_A(p_A^0)$ is locally non-revealing at p_A^0 . Then it follows that $G_A(p_A^0)$ satisfies NR at p_A^0 .*

Proposition 3.8 shows that the local non revelation property implies the NR property. Example 3.9 below shows that the NR property is strictly more general than the local non-revelation property. As an example, the games $G_A(p_A^0)$ and $G_B(p_B^0)$ defined in Example 2.1 are both locally non-revealing at their respective priors. Note that in that example, the game $G_B(p_B^0)$ is such that the optimal strategy of the informed player constructed by Aumann et al. involves signaling on path (this is the signaling strategy we briefly described in the example).

Example 3.9. Let $K_A = \{1, 2\}$ be the set of states. Let q denote the probability of state 1 and $p_A^0 = 1/2$ (prior of state 1). Consider the following game $G_A(p_A^0)$:

$$A^1 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{bmatrix}; A^2 = \begin{bmatrix} -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

FIGURE 3. Graphs of $\text{Cav}(v_A)$ and v_A



For a row vector $v \in \mathbb{R}^m$, denote by v' the transposed column vector. The figure depicts the graphs of $v_A(q) = -q(1 - q)$ and $\text{Cav}(v_A)(q) = 0, \forall q \in [0, 1]$. Consider the actions $\sigma_A = (1, 0)$ and $\tau_A = (0, 1)'$. Then $\alpha_A = (\sigma_A A^1 \tau_A, \sigma_A A^2 \tau_A) = (0, 0)$, so $\alpha^A \cdot q = \text{Cav}(v_A)(q) = 0, \forall q \in [0, 1]$. Therefore $\alpha_A \in NR_A(p_A^0)$. First note that the local non-revelation property at p_A^0 is not satisfied in $G_A(p_A^0)$. We show that the property NR at p_A^0 is satisfied in the example. The linear transformation S in this example is defined by $Sx = (x, -x)$. Notice that the only candidates for p and ϕ_A satisfying

the conditions of property NR at p_A^0 are $p = 0$ or $p = 1$ and α_A . Notice that at $p = 0$, just by looking at the graph depicted above, one can see that conditions (1) and (3) of property NR are satisfied for the vector α^A . Now, $\lim_{q \rightarrow 0^-} \nabla(v_A^e \circ T)(q) = 0$, since $v_A^e \circ T$ is constant and equal to 0 in $(-\infty, 0)$. Using the notation defined above, we have that $\alpha^A S = 0$, so that $\alpha^A S \in \partial v_A(p)$. Observe that because of the strict convexity of the non-revealing value function v_A , the optimal strategy of the informed player as constructed in Aumann et al. necessarily involves signaling on path, namely, inducing posteriors at the boundary of the 1-simplex of states. However, property NR at p_A^0 guarantees that an equilibrium exists for which no signaling occurs on path.

Example 3.10. The next example shows that NR at p_A^0 is not always satisfied. Let $G_A(p_A^0)$ be defined from the payoff matrices below and q denote the probability of state 1 with prior $p_A^0 = 1/2$.

$$A^1 = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ -1 & -1 \end{bmatrix} \quad A^2 = \begin{bmatrix} -1 & -1 \\ 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$$

FIGURE 4. Graphs of $\text{Cav}(v_A)$ (dotted) and v_A (continuous)




Figure 4 depicts the non-revealing value function and its concavification. The only two candidates for p_A and ϕ_A are $p_A = 0$ and $p_A = 1$ and $(1, 1)$. Notice that $v_A^e \circ T$ has a derivative at $p_A = 0$, which is equal to -2 , so $\partial v_A(p_A) = \{-2\}$, whereas $\phi_A S = (1, 1)S = 0$. Therefore, $\phi_A S \notin \partial v_A(p_A)$. The same reasoning applies to show that $\phi_A S \notin \partial v_A(p_A)$, when $p_A = 1$. Therefore, property (2) of Definition 3.1 is not satisfied.

Remark 3.11. It is possible to prove directly that if $G_A(p_A^0)$ is locally non-revealing at p_A^0 then $NR_A(p_A^0) \neq \emptyset$. The proof is illustrative of how the geometry of v_A determines the existence of equilibria in $G_A(p_A^0)$ that involve no signaling on path of play and therefore we include it here. The proof is divided in two cases: (a) $\text{Cav}(v_A)(p_A^0) > v_A(p_A^0)$ and (b) $\text{Cav}(v_A)(p_A^0) = v_A(p_A^0)$. We start

with (a). We first construct the candidate vector of payoffs $\phi_A \in \mathbb{R}^{|K_A|}$ for the informed player. Then we show that $\phi_A \in NR_A(p_A^0)$.

Let $\text{Cav}(v_A)(p_A^0) = \sum_{s \in S} \lambda_s v_A(p_s)$, $\lambda_s \geq 0$, $\sum_{s \in S} \lambda_s = 1$ and let p_{s_0} be the posterior which is interior to the simplex of states. Let $\mathcal{H} = \{(q, \alpha) \in \Delta(K_A) \times \mathbb{R} \mid \text{Cav}(v_A)(q) \geq \alpha\}$. Note that \mathcal{H} is a convex subset of $\mathbb{R}^{|K_A|} \times \mathbb{R}$. Now, note that $(p_A^0, \text{Cav}(v_A)(p_A^0)) = \sum_{s \in S} \lambda_s (p_s, v_A(p_s))$. Since, by (a), $\forall s \in S, p_s \neq p_0$, it follows that $(p_A^0, \text{Cav}(v_A)(p_A^0))$ is not an extremum point of \mathcal{H} (cf. [14], Section 18). Therefore, there exists a face F of \mathcal{H} , with dimension $d \geq 1$, such that F contains $(p_A^0, \text{Cav}(v_A)(p_A^0))$ and each point $(p_s, v_A(p_s))$. Take now a supporting hyperplane H to \mathcal{H} which contains F . The hyperplane H intersected with $\Delta(K_A) \times \mathbb{R}$ is the graph of an affine function $q \in \Delta(K_A) \mapsto \phi_A \cdot q \in \mathbb{R}$, where ϕ_A is a vector in $\mathbb{R}^{|K_A|}$.

We now claim that $\phi_A \in NR_A(p_A^0)$. As the graph of the affine function $q \in \Delta(K_A) \mapsto \phi_A \cdot q$ is $H \cap (\Delta(K_A) \times \mathbb{R})$, it follows that $\phi_A \cdot q = \text{Cav}(v_A)(q), \forall q \in [p_{s_0}, p_A^0]$, where $[p_{s_0}, p_A^0]$ denotes the segment between p_{s_0} and p_A^0 . In particular, $\text{Cav}(v_A)(p_A^0) = \phi_A \cdot p_A^0$ is satisfied, and so ϕ_A satisfies (ii). From the fact that H supports \mathcal{H} at F , it follows that $\phi_A \cdot q \geq v_A(q), \forall q \in \Delta(K_A)$. This proves ϕ_A satisfies (i). Thus it only remains to show $\phi_A \in F_A$. Let σ_A be the Aumann et al. optimal strategy of the informed player in $G_A(p_{s_0})$, which is state-independent since $\text{Cav}(v_A)(p_{s_0}) = v_A(p_{s_0})$. For the uninformed player, there exists a Blackwell strategy ¹⁶ τ_A and a constant $L > 0$ such that $\mathbb{E}_{\sigma_A, \tau_A, p_{s_0}}^{k_A} [\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T (A_{i_A^t, j_A^t}^{k_A})] \leq \phi_A^{k_A} + \frac{L}{\sqrt{T}}, \forall k_A \in K_A$ (see proof of Corollary 3.34 in Sorin [13]), where $\mathbb{E}_{\sigma_A, \tau_A, p_{s_0}}^{k_A}$ is the conditional expectation given $\kappa_A = k_A$. The profile (σ_A, τ_A) is therefore a uniform equilibrium of $G_A(p_{s_0})$, so it follows that the limit $\lim_{T \rightarrow +\infty} \mathbb{E}_{\sigma_A, \tau_A, p_{s_0}}^{k_A} [\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T (A_{i_A^t, j_A^t}^{k_A})]$ exists for each $k_A \in K_A$.

For each $k_A \in K_A$, let v^{k_A} be this limit. It follows from the inequality of the Blackwell strategy given above that $\forall k_A \in K_A, v^{k_A} \leq \phi_A^{k_A}$. Since for each $T \geq 1$,

$$\mathbb{E}_{\sigma_A, \tau_A, p_{s_0}} [\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T (A_{i_A^t, j_A^t}^{\kappa_A})] = \sum_{k_A \in K_A} p_{s_0}^{k_A} (\mathbb{E}_{\sigma_A, \tau_A, p_{s_0}}^{k_A} [\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T (A_{i_A^t, j_A^t}^{k_A})])$$

it follows that $\sum_{k_A \in K_A} p_{s_0}^{k_A} v^{k_A} = \text{Cav}(v_A)(p_{s_0})$, as any uniform equilibrium pays $\text{Cav}(v_A)(p_{s_0})$. Since $p_{s_0} \in \text{int}(\Delta(K_A))$, it must be that $v^{k_A} = \phi_A^{k_A}$, for all $k_A \in K_A$. Since F_A is compact and convex and neither σ_A nor τ_A condition on realized states, it follows that $(v^{k_A})_{k_A \in K_A} = v \in F_A$. This shows $\phi_A \in F_A$ and concludes that $\phi_A \in NR_A(p_A^0)$, as claimed. The proof of case (b) is immediate, since the Aumann et al. optimal strategy of the informed player in $G_A(p_A^0)$ is already state-independent. This concludes the proof of the claim.

We would like to make two remarks about the proof above. Notice that the first part of the proof does not rely on any assumption on $G_A(p_A^0)$ being locally non-revealing at p_A^0 , i.e., it does not rely on the assumption that an optimal strategy of the informed player exists inducing an

¹⁶Cf. the next subsection for a discussion and definition of Blackwell strategies.

interior posterior. The first paragraph just serves the purpose of pinning down the correct vector ϕ_A . Notice that the assumption of $p_{s_0} \in \text{int}(\Delta(K_A))$ is used in the proof above only when we show that $\phi_A = v$. Second, we did not show in the proof that the profile (σ_A, τ_A) is an equilibrium of $G_A(p_A^0)$; we used the fact that (σ_A, τ_A) is a uniform equilibrium of $G_A(p_{s_0})$, inducing the vector of payoffs for the informed player equal to ϕ_A , and obtained that $\phi_A \in NR_A(p_A^0)$.

3.3. Consequences for Two-player Zero-sum Repeated Games with Incomplete Information. Lemma 3.3 tells us that given a two-player zero-sum game with lack of information one side that satisfies the property NR at the prior, there exists an equilibrium of the 2-player game for which no signaling occurs on path of play (i.e., the set of non-revealing equilibrium payoffs of this game is nonempty). Even for games for which Aumann et al. constructed strategies that necessarily involved signaling on path (see Example 3.9 or $G_B(p_B^0)$ in Example 2.1), the NR property implies the existence of an equilibrium for which no signaling occurs on path. We would like to illustrate this message with an example.

Consider the two-player, zero-sum infinitely repeated game with lack of information on one side $G_B(1/2)$ between players 1 and 3, defined by the data in Example 2.1. Following Aumann et al.'s technique for constructing optimal strategies, the strategy of the informed player would be the strategy highlighted in Example 2.1, that is, a *signaling strategy*: the informed player uses his actions to signal information about the underlying state for finitely many stages and after that plays the (mixed) optimal action of the one-shot, zero-sum game given by the posterior at each state independently. Playing this strategy in $G_B(p_B^0)$ guarantees to the informed player an ex-ante payoff of $(1/2)v_B(1/4) + (1/2)v_B(3/4) = (1/2)\text{Cav}(v_B)(1/4) + (1/2)\text{Cav}(v_B)(3/4) = \text{Cav}(v_B)(1/2) = 1$. Now, the optimal strategy for the uninformed player in $G_B(1/2)$ is a so-called *approachability strategy* or *Blackwell strategy*. For a general game $G_B(p_B^0)$, a Blackwell strategy can be defined as follows: given $\phi_B \in \mathbb{R}^{|K_B|}$ s.t. $\phi_B \cdot q \geq v_B(q)$, $q \in \Delta(K_B)$, $\text{Cav}(v_B)(p_B^0) = \phi_B \cdot p_B^0$, τ_B is a *Blackwell strategy* (for ϕ_B and p_B^0), if for each $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $T_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\forall T \geq T_0$, σ_B a strategy of the informed player and $k_B \in K_B$,

$$\mathbb{E}_{\sigma_B, \tau_B, p^0}^{k_B} \left[\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T (B_{i_B^t, j_B^t}^{\kappa_B}) \right] \leq \phi_B^{k_B} + \varepsilon,$$

where $\mathbb{E}_{\sigma_B, \tau_B, p^0}^{k_B}$ is the conditional expectation given $\kappa_B = k_B$. So τ_B precludes the informed player from achieving more than $\phi_B^{k_B} + \varepsilon$ in a sufficiently long (but finitely repeated) game, for any state $k_B \in K_B$. This implies that the ex-ante expected payoff to the informed player in a sufficiently long game is not larger than $\text{Cav}(v_B)(p_B^0) + \varepsilon$. For our example, take $\phi_B = (1, 1)$ and consider τ_B the Blackwell strategy for ϕ_B and p_B^0 as defined in the example. It follows the pair (σ_B, τ_B) is a (uniform) equilibrium with associated payoff $\text{Cav}(v_B)(p_B^0) = 1$.

We call the strategies just defined *standard optimal strategies*. In contrast to these standard optimal strategies, for which there is revelation of information on path of play, we now construct

equilibrium strategies for both players for which *no information is revealed on path*. The idea for the construction of these strategies is simple. Both players play a deterministic sequence of actions as long as the other plays it. This deterministic sequence is supported by punishment strategies, in the sense that if any player deviates from his sequence of actions, the other player starts to play the punishment strategy forever. Let us first define the deterministic path of play for this example: the deterministic sequence of actions is defined by $((i_B^t, j_B^t))_{t=1}^\infty = ((U, R), (U, M), (U, R), (U, M), \dots)$; so the uninformed player alternates between R (right column) and M (middle column), whereas the informed player plays U at every stage. For each state $k_B \in \{1, 2\}$, the payoff (to the informed player) obtained from this path of play is:

$$\lim_{T \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T B_{i_B^t, j_B^t}^{k_B} = 1.$$

This implies the ex-ante payoff to the informed player is also $1 = \text{Cav}(v_B)(1/2)$. In case any player deviates from his prescribed sequence of actions, the other player can observe the deviation and play from the next stage onwards his standard optimal strategy in $G_B(1/2)$, which guarantees that a deviation is not profitable. As mentioned, the strategies just defined are also a (uniform) equilibrium in $G_B(1/2)$, but reveal no information on path of play.

4. SECOND MAIN RESULT: NECESSARY CONDITION FOR THE UPPER END OF $I(p^0)$ TO BE ATTAINED IN EQUILIBRIUM

Theorem 4.1 is the main result of this section. Intuitively, it shows that equilibria which pay the upper end of $I(p^0)$ to the informed player imply a particular type of signaling procedure. Theorem 4.1 can therefore be viewed as a constraint to the signaling strategies an informed player might play in an equilibrium paying the upper end of $I(p^0)$. Presenting the formal statement of the Theorem requires some preliminary definitions.

The Basic Probability Space. For each $t \in \mathbb{N}$, let $H_t := (I_A \times I_B \times J_A \times J_B)^{t-1}$ and denote by \mathcal{H}_t the finite field it generates over $H_\infty = (I_A \times I_B \times J_A \times J_B)^\infty$; we therefore have a collection of fields $(\mathcal{H}_t)_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$. Let \mathcal{H}_∞ be the σ -field generated by $(\mathcal{H}_t)_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$. Note that $(\mathcal{H}_t)_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$ is an increasing sequence of finite subfields of \mathcal{H}_∞ . Let $\Omega = H_\infty \times K_A \times K_B$ and endow it with the σ -field $\mathcal{H}_\infty \otimes 2^{K_A \times K_B}$. We will also denote the field generated by H_t on Ω by \mathcal{H}_t .

Martingale of Posteriors. Let (σ, τ_A, τ_B) be a profile of strategies in $\mathcal{G}(p^0)$. Let $\mathbb{P}_{\sigma, \tau_A, \tau_B, p^0}$ be the probability induced by $(\sigma, \tau_A, \tau_B, p^0)$ on $(\Omega, \mathcal{H}_\infty \otimes 2^{K_A \times K_B})$. We define the *martingale of posteriors* obtained through Bayesian updating. For $t \in \mathbb{N}$, let $p_t^{k_A, k_B} := \mathbb{P}_{\sigma, \tau_A, \tau_B, p^0}(\kappa = (k_A, k_B) | \mathcal{H}_t)$ and $p_t := (p_t^{k_A, k_B})_{(k_A, k_B) \in K_A \times K_B}$. The sequence $(p_t)_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a $\Delta(K_A \times K_B)$ -valued martingale with respect to $(\mathcal{H}_t)_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$, satisfying: (i) $p_1 = p^0$; (ii) there exists p^∞ such that $p_t \rightarrow p^\infty$ a.s. as $t \rightarrow +\infty$. The a.s. limit p^∞ of the process $(p_t)_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$ is called the *asymptotic posterior*.

Theorem 4.1. *Let (σ, τ_A, τ_B) be an equilibrium of $\mathcal{G}(p^0)$ and let $(p_t)_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$ be the martingale of posteriors induced by the equilibrium. Assume (σ, τ_A, τ_B) pays ex-ante $\text{Cav}(v_A)(p_A^0) + \text{Cav}(v_B)(p_B^0)$ to the informed player. Then $(\text{Cav}(v_\ell)(p_{t\ell}))_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a martingale, for each $\ell \in \{A, B\}$.*

The next corollary of Theorem 4.1 is motivated by the following intuition. Take a game $\mathcal{G}(p^0)$ for which $p^0 \in \text{int}(\Delta(K_A \times K_B))$ and assume that $\mathcal{NR}(p^0) = \emptyset$. This last assumption implies that if the upper end of $I(p^0)$ can be attained in equilibrium in $\mathcal{G}(p^0)$, then the informed player *must* use a state-dependent strategy on path, i.e., he must use signaling. An idea of how such signaling procedure could occur is as follows: the informed player could signal so as to induce posteriors that are product distributions; this would imply that, once the posterior realizes, from then onwards no correlation exists between the zero-sum games at the posteriors and therefore the informed player could play each of the zero-sum games without concern for information spillover; is it possible that there are equilibria of $\mathcal{G}(p^0)$ for which the described signaling procedure exists and the upper end of $I(p^0)$ can be attained in equilibrium? Corollary 4.2 provides an answer to this question.

Corollary 4.2. *Let (σ, τ_A, τ_B) be an equilibrium of $\mathcal{G}(p^0)$. Suppose this equilibrium pays the upper end of $I(p^0)$ and its associated asymptotic posterior p^∞ is a product¹⁷ a.s.. Then $I(p^0)$ is degenerate.*

Proof. Since p^∞ is a product a.s., then $\text{Cav}(h)(p^\infty) = \text{Cav}(v_A)(p_A^\infty) + \text{Cav}(v_B)(p_B^\infty)$ a.s.. Taking expectations on both sides and using Jensen's inequality, it follows that $\text{Cav}(h)(p^0) \geq \mathbb{E}[\text{Cav}(v_A)(p_A^\infty)] + \mathbb{E}[\text{Cav}(v_B)(p_B^\infty)]$. By Theorem 4.1, $\mathbb{E}[\text{Cav}(v_A)(p_A^\infty)] = \text{Cav}(v_A)(p_A^0)$ and $\mathbb{E}[\text{Cav}(v_B)(p_B^\infty)] = \text{Cav}(v_B)(p_B^0)$. Therefore, $\text{Cav}(h)(p^0) \geq \text{Cav}(v_A)(p_A^0) + \text{Cav}(v_B)(p_B^0)$. Since, $\text{Cav}(h)(p^0) \leq \text{Cav}(v_A)(p_A^0) + \text{Cav}(v_B)(p_B^0)$, we have that $I(p^0)$ is degenerate. \square

Therefore, if $I(p^0)$ is non-degenerate, no equilibrium paying the upper end of $I(p^0)$ to the informed player induces a product asymptotic posterior. In other words, such an equilibrium must maintain the correlation (even at infinity) between the zero-sum games with positive probability.

4.1. On the Proof of Theorem 4.1. The proof of Theorem 4.1 requires some preliminary work. In particular, it requires an auxiliary Lemma (Lemma 4.3) which provides a necessary condition for equilibria of $\mathcal{G}(p^0)$.

Lemma 4.3. *Let (σ, τ_A, τ_B) be an equilibrium in $\mathcal{G}(p^0)$. Then there exists a sequence of random variables $(p_t, \beta_{A,t}, \beta_{B,t})_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$ on the space $(\Omega, \mathcal{H}_\infty \otimes 2^{K_A \times K_B}, \mathbb{P}_{\sigma, \tau_A, \tau_B, p^0})$ taking values in $\Delta(K_A \times K_B) \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}$ such that:*

- (1) $(p_t, \beta_{A,t}, \beta_{B,t})_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a martingale adapted to $(\mathcal{H}_t)_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$.
- (2) $\beta_{A,1} + \beta_{B,1}$ is the expected payoff of the equilibrium to player 1.
- (3) $\beta_{A,t} \leq \text{Cav}(v_A)(p_{tA})$ a.s., $\forall t \in \mathbb{N}$.

¹⁷By p^∞ being a product a.s. we mean that there exists $X : \Omega \rightarrow \Delta(K_A)$ and $Y : \Omega \rightarrow \Delta(K_B)$, both $\mathcal{H}_\infty \otimes 2^{K_A \times K_B}$ -measurable, such that $p^\infty = X \otimes Y$ a.s..

(4) $\beta_{B,t} \leq \text{Cav}(v_B)(p_{tB})$ a.s., $\forall t \in \mathbb{N}$.

Proof of Theorem 4.1. First, notice that for each $\ell \in \{A, B\}$ and $k, s \in \mathbb{N}$ with $k \leq s$ we have that $\text{Cav}(v_\ell)(p_{k\ell}) = \text{Cav}(v_\ell)(\mathbb{E}[p_{s\ell}|\mathcal{H}_k]) \geq \mathbb{E}[\text{Cav}(v_\ell)(p_{s\ell})|\mathcal{H}_k]$ a.s. – where the equality follows from the fact that $(p_s)_{s \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a martingale, and the inequality follows from Jensen’s inequality. Assume by contradiction that there exist $k, s \in \mathbb{N}$ with $k < s$, $\ell_0 \in \{A, B\}$ and an atom $h_k \in H_k$ such that $\text{Cav}(v_{\ell_0})(p_{k\ell_0})(h_k) > \mathbb{E}[\text{Cav}(v_{\ell_0})(p_{s\ell_0})|\mathcal{H}_k](h_k)$. It follows that $\text{Cav}(v_{\ell_0})(p_{\ell_0}^0) \geq \mathbb{E}[\text{Cav}(v_{\ell_0})(p_{k\ell_0})] > \mathbb{E}[\text{Cav}(v_{\ell_0})(p_{s\ell_0})] \geq \mathbb{E}[\beta_{\ell_0,s}] = \beta_{\ell_0,1}$, where the first inequality is given by Jensen’s inequality, the second by assumption, the third by (3) and (4) of Lemma 4.3 and the last equality by the martingale property. This then implies that $\text{Cav}(v_A)(p_A^0) + \text{Cav}(v_B)(p_B^0) > \beta_{A,1} + \beta_{B,1}$. Contradiction, since by (2) of Lemma 4.3 we have that $\beta_{A,1} + \beta_{B,1} = \text{Cav}(v_A)(p_A^0) + \text{Cav}(v_B)(p_B^0)$. \square

Example 4.4. In the next example, $I(p^0)$ is nondegenerate and the upper end of $I(p^0)$ is not an ex-ante equilibrium payoff. More precisely, only the lower end of $I(p^0)$ is an ex-ante equilibrium payoff for the informed player. Consider $\mathcal{G}(p^0)$ defined by the following data:

$$p^0 = \begin{bmatrix} 1/2 & 0 \\ 0 & 1/2 \end{bmatrix}$$

$$A^1 = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ -1 & -1 \end{bmatrix} \quad A^2 = \begin{bmatrix} -1 & -1 \\ 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$$

$$B^1 = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \quad B^2 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$$

Assume by way of contradiction that (σ, τ_A, τ_B) is an equilibrium that pays ex-ante $\text{Cav}(v_A)(p_A^0) + \text{Cav}(v_B)(p_B^0)$ for the informed player in $\mathcal{G}(p^0)$. Let $V_A : \Delta(K_A) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be given by $V_A(p) := \max_{\sigma, \tau} \{\sigma \bar{A}(p) \tau | \sigma \bar{A}(p) \tau \leq \text{Cav}(v_A)(p)\}$. For this example we have that $V_A(p) = v_A(p), \forall p \in \Delta(K_A)$, which can be checked by computation. Let $(\beta_{A,s})_{s \in \mathbb{N}}, (\beta_{B,s})_{s \in \mathbb{N}}$ be the martingales from Lemma 4.3. We need the following auxiliary claim, whose proof is left to Appendix B.

Claim 4.5. *For each $s \in \mathbb{N}$, $\beta_{A,s} \leq V_A(p_{sA}) + Z_s$ a.s., where $(Z_s)_{s \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a (a.s.) nonnegative, bounded sequence that converges (a.s.) to 0.*

By the claim, we have $\beta_{A,s} \leq v_A(p_{sA}) + Z_s$ a.s.. The Martingale Convergence Theorem now implies that $\beta_{A,\infty} \rightarrow \beta_{A,\infty}, p_{sA} \rightarrow p_A^\infty$, as $s \rightarrow +\infty$. By the claim $Z_s \rightarrow 0$ a.s.. Therefore, we obtain $\mathbb{E}[\beta_{A,\infty}] \leq \mathbb{E}[v_A(p_A^\infty)]$. From (2) and (3) in Lemma 4.3, we have that $\mathbb{E}[\beta_{A,\infty}] = \text{Cav}(v_A)(p_A^0) \geq \mathbb{E}[v_A(p_A^\infty)]$. So it follows that $\mathbb{E}[\beta_{A,\infty}] = \mathbb{E}[v_A(p_A^\infty)]$, which implies that the distribution of p_A^∞ is concentrated at the boundary of $\Delta(K_A)$. Since v_B is strictly concave¹⁸ and $(v_B(p_{sB}))_{s \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a martingale (by Theorem 4.1), it follows that $p_{sB} = p_B^0$ a.s., $\forall s \in \mathbb{N}$. Hence, we have that for any history h_∞ outside a set of $\mathbb{P}_{\sigma, \tau_A, \tau_B, p}$ -measure zero, the matrix representation of $p^\infty(h_\infty)$ has either

¹⁸See Example 1 for the formula of v_B and depiction of its graph.

the first or the second row filled with zeros (recall that an entry p_{ij}^0 represents the probability of states i and j in game $G_A(p_A^0)$ and $G_B(p_B^0)$, respectively), i.e., $p^\infty(h_\infty)$ is either:

$$\begin{bmatrix} 1/2 & 1/2 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \text{ or } \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 1/2 & 1/2 \end{bmatrix}$$

Now the process of posteriors is a martingale, which implies that the expectation of p^∞ is p^0 . This implies that the following equation has a solution in $\lambda \in [0, 1]$:

$$\begin{bmatrix} 1/2 & 0 \\ 0 & 1/2 \end{bmatrix} = \lambda \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 1/2 & 1/2 \end{bmatrix} + (1 - \lambda) \begin{bmatrix} 1/2 & 1/2 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

But this equation has no solution for $\lambda \in [0, 1]$, which finally implies a contradiction. Hence, there is no equilibrium paying ex-ante to the informed player $\text{Cav}(v_A)(p_A^0) + \text{Cav}(v_B)(p_B^0)$. The arguments above give us more: recall that we had $\beta_{A,\infty} \leq V_A(p_A^\infty) = v_A(p_A^\infty)$ a.s. and since $\beta_{B,\infty} \leq \text{Cav}(v_B)(p_B^\infty) = v_B(p_B^\infty)$ a.s., these imply that $\beta_{A,\infty} + \beta_{B,\infty} \leq v_A(p_A^\infty) + v_B(p_B^\infty)$ a.s. and therefore $\mathbb{E}[\beta_{A,\infty} + \beta_{B,\infty}] \leq \mathbb{E}[v_A(p_A^\infty) + v_B(p_B^\infty)] \leq \mathbb{E}[\text{Cav}(h)(p^\infty)] \leq \text{Cav}(h)(p^0)$, where the second inequality follows by definition of $\text{Cav}(h)$ and the last inequality is given by Jensen's inequality. The number $\text{Cav}(h)(p^0)$ is the lowest possible ex-ante equilibrium payoff to the informed player. This implies that every uniform equilibrium of the example pays $\text{Cav}(h)(p^0)$ to the informed player.

Remark 4.6. We would like to highlight that although the stage-game payoff matrices of $G_A(p_A^0)$ in the example above are such that the column player has a redundant action (as both columns are identical), it does not follow from it that the game $\mathcal{G}(p^0)$ is equivalent to a two-player, zero-sum game between players 1 and 3, thus implying the *only* equilibrium payoff to player 1 in $\mathcal{G}(p^0)$ is unique and equals $\text{Cav}(h)(p^0)$. In order to show this point, we show that $\mathcal{G}(p^0)$ is actually equivalent to a two-player game which *is not zero-sum*.

It is obvious that the matrix A^1 (respect. A^2) can be substituted by the following equivalent matrix A_r^1 (respect. A_r^2), by simply eliminating the redundant column action of player 2. So,

$$p^0 = \begin{bmatrix} 1/2 & 0 \\ 0 & 1/2 \end{bmatrix}$$

$$A_r^1 = \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ -1 \end{bmatrix} \quad A_r^2 = \begin{bmatrix} -1 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}$$

$$B^1 = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \quad B^2 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$$

The model $\mathcal{G}(p^0)$ defined by the data above is evidently equivalent to the model $\mathcal{G}(p^0)$ defined by the data of the previous example, as only redundant actions have been eliminated. We now

define the two-player game between players 1 and 3 for which the ex-ante equilibrium payoff set of the informed player equals the ex-ante equilibrium payoff set of the informed player 1 in the game $\mathcal{G}(p^0)$. Precisely, we define a two-player, non-zero-sum infinitely repeated game with one-sided incomplete information and undiscounted payoffs $\mathbb{G}(q^0)$, where the set of states will be $K = \{1, 2\}$ with prior $q^0 = 1/2$ for state 1: the payoffs are given by the following bimatrix C^k ($k \in K$), where the informed player plays row and the uninformed player 3 plays column:

$$C^1 : \begin{array}{c} \\ (U, U) \\ (U, D) \\ (D, U) \\ (D, D) \end{array} \begin{array}{cc} L & R \\ \hline (2, -1) & (1, 0) \\ (1, 0) & (1, 0) \\ (0, -1) & (-1, 0) \\ (-1, 0) & (-1, 0) \end{array} \quad C^2 : \begin{array}{c} \\ (U, U) \\ (U, D) \\ (D, U) \\ (D, D) \end{array} \begin{array}{cc} L & R \\ \hline (-1, 0) & (-1, 0) \\ (-1, 0) & (0, -1) \\ (1, 0) & (1, 0) \\ (1, 0) & (2, -1) \end{array}$$

The rows and column labels in matrix C^k should be read as follows: L and R stand for the stage-game actions of the uninformed player (i.e., player 3). For the row player (i.e., player 1), (U, D) corresponds to choosing the top row in game in A^k and the bottom row in game B^k . Therefore the entry $C^k_{(U,D),L}$ is $(A^k_{U,L} + B^k_{D,L}, -B^k_{D,L})$. The other entries are analogously constructed. It is clear that the stage-game matrix C^k is not zero-sum, which then implies $\mathbb{G}(q^0)$ is not zero-sum. It is also clear that the set of ex-ante equilibrium payoffs in $\mathbb{G}(q^0)$ for the informed player is identical to that of $\mathcal{G}(p^0)$.

5. CONCLUSION

We studied a three-player generalization of the Aumann et al. model and analysed the effects of information spillover on the equilibrium payoff set of the informed player. Our first result provided a sufficient condition under which a continuum of equilibrium payoffs exist in the model and which implies, in particular, the existence of equilibria where the informed player circumvents the adverse effects of information spillover. These equilibria involve no signaling on equilibrium path. This sufficiency condition is implied by the more interpretable local non-revelation condition. Our second main result presented a necessary condition for equilibria to attain the upper end of $I(p^0)$, which provides a restriction on the signaling processes that can be generated by such an equilibrium. A corollary of this result is that equilibria which “uncorrelate” the two two-player zero-sum games $G_A(p_A^0)$ and $G_B(p_B^0)$ (whenever $I(p^0)$ is, of course, nondegenerate) do not achieve the upper end of $I(p^0)$.

Several questions remain unanswered with regards to the model $\mathcal{G}(p^0)$. What are the ex-ante equilibrium payoffs of the informed player that can be achieved through singalling on path of play? Is it possible, when $\mathcal{NR}(p^0) = \emptyset$ and $I(p^0)$ is nondegenerate, that the upper end of $I(p^0)$ is achieved as an equilibrium payoff of the informed player? As our last example (Example 4.4) showed, it might be the case that only the lower end of $I(p^0)$ is achievable as an equilibrium payoff. Is it possible that an example of $\mathcal{G}(p^0)$ exists for which the upper end of $I(p^0)$ is not achievable, but

something in the interior of $I(p^0)$ is an equilibrium payoff? These questions remain to be answered in future work.

REFERENCES

- [1] Aumann, R.J., Maschler, M., Stearns, R.E. (1995): *Repeated Games with Incomplete Information*. MIT Press.
- [2] Blackwell, D. (1956): "An analog of the minmax theorem for vector payoffs," *Pacific Journal of Mathematics* 6(1): 1-8.
- [3] Clark, F. H. (1975): "Generalized Gradients and Applications," *Transaction of the American Mathematical Society*, vol. 205, pp. 247-272.
- [4] Forges, F. (1992): "Repeated Games of Incomplete Information: non-zero-sum," *Handbook of Game Theory with Economic Applications*, 1 : 155-177.
- [5] Forges, F., Solomon, A. (2015): "Bayesian Repeated Games and Reputation," *Journal of Economic Theory*, 70-104.
- [6] Forges, F., Horst, U., Solomon, A. (2016): "Feasibility and individual Rationality in two-person Bayesian Games," *International Journal of Game Theory*, 45:11-36.
- [7] Hart, S. (1985): "Nonzero-sum Two-person Repeated Games with Incomplete Information," *Mathematics of Operations Research*, vol. 10, number 1, 117-153.
- [8] Huangfu, B., Liu, H. (2021): "Information Spillover in Multi-good adverse selection," *American Economics Journal: Microeconomics*, forthcoming.
- [9] Maschler, M., Solan, E., Zamir, S. (2013): *Game Theory*. Cambridge University Press.
- [10] Shalev, J. (1988): *Nonzero-sum two-person repeated games with incomplete information and observable payoffs*. Tel Aviv University. Faculty of Management.
- [11] Simon, R.S., Spiez, S., Toruńczyk, H. (1995) "The existence of equilibria in certain games, separation for families of convex functions and a theorem of Borsuk-Ulam type," *Israel Journal of Mathematics*, 92, 1-21.
- [12] Sorin, S. (1983): "Some results on the Existence of Nash Equilibria of Non-Zero Sum Games with Incomplete Information," *International Journal of Game Theory*, Vol. 12, Issue 4, p. 193-205.
- [13] Sorin, S. (2002): *A First Course on Zero-Sum Repeated Games*. Mathématiques et Applications 37. Springer.
- [14] Rockafellar, T. (1970): *Convex Analysis*. Princeton University Press.

6. APPENDIX A

Proof of Lemma 3.3.

Proof. For the proof of the Lemma we maintain the notation for the parametrization T , which is established before the statement of Theorem 3.2. Let ϕ_A and p_A be the vector and probability distribution over $\Delta(K_A)$ respectively, given by the property NR at p_A^0 . We will show that $\phi_A \in NR_A(p_A^0)$. We first show that ϕ_A satisfies (i) and (ii) of $NR_A(p_A^0)$. The vector ϕ_A satisfies (1) of Definition 3.1, which implies it satisfies (ii) of $NR_A(p_A^0)$ immediately. For (i), let $x \in \mathbb{R}^{|K_A|-1}$, $T(x) = p_A$ and $h \in \mathbb{R}^{|K_A|-1}$ such that $x + h \in P$. Because $\phi_A S$ satisfies (3) of Definition 3.1, we have that $\text{Cav}(v_A \circ T|_P)(x) + \phi_A S \cdot h \geq \text{Cav}(v_A \circ T|_P)(x + h)$. From (1) in Definition 3.1 and the definition of $\text{Cav}(v_A)$, $(v_A \circ T|_P)(x) + \phi_A S \cdot h \geq (v_A \circ T|_P)(x + h)$. Again, from (1), the left hand side of the last inequality can be written as $\phi_A \cdot T(x) + \phi_A S \cdot h = \phi_A \cdot S(x + h) + \phi_A \cdot e_1^{K_A} = \phi_A \cdot T(x + h)$. Therefore, we have that $\phi_A \cdot T(x + h) \geq (v_A \circ T|_P)(x + h)$, for any $h \in \mathbb{R}^{|K_A|-1}$ such that $x + h \in P$. Hence, $\phi_A \cdot q \geq v_A(q)$, $\forall q \in \Delta(K_A)$. This proves ϕ_A satisfies (i).

It now remains to prove $\phi_A \in F_A$. For that we will use the following auxiliary claim: Let $h \in \mathbb{R}^{|K_A|-1}$ be such that $x+h \in \mathbb{R}^{|K_A|-1}$ is a point of differentiability of $v_A^e \circ T$. Then there exist mixed actions $\sigma_{x+h} \in \Delta(I_A), \tau_{x+h} \in \Delta(J_A)$ such that: (A) $\nabla(v_A^e \circ T)(x+h) = (\sigma_{x+h} A^{k_A} \tau'_{x+h})_{k_A \in K_A} S$; (B) $(\sigma_{x+h} A^{k_A} \tau'_{x+h})_{k_A \in K_A} \cdot T(x+h) = (v_A^e \circ T)(x+h)$, where τ'_{x+h} denotes the column vector given by the transpose of τ_{x+h} . We assume the claim for now and conclude the proof of the Lemma. Once this proof is settled, we provide a proof of the claim. Let $f = v_A^e \circ T$. From (2) in Definition 3.1, $\phi_A S \in \partial f(x)$. Since $\partial f(x)$ is convex, Carathéodory Theorem allows us to write $\phi_A S$ as a convex combination of $|K_A|$ points $\mathcal{N}(x) := \{d_1, \dots, d_{|K_A|}\} \subset \partial f(x)$, i.e., $\sum_{j=1}^{|K_A|} \lambda_j d_j = \phi_A S$. By the auxiliary claim and the definition of the generalized gradient, for each $j \in \{1, \dots, |K_A|\}$, there exists a sequence $\{h_t^j\}_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that $d_j^t := \nabla f(x+h_t^j) = (\sigma_{x+h_t^j} A^{k_A} \tau_{x+h_t^j})_{k_A \in K_A} S, (\sigma_{x+h_t^j} A^{k_A} \tau_{x+h_t^j})_{k_A \in K_A} \cdot T(x+h_t^j) = f(x+h_t^j)$ and $d_j^t \rightarrow d_j$, as $t \rightarrow +\infty$. Now, passing to a subsequence if necessary, we can assume that $\tau_{x+h_t^j} \rightarrow \tau_x^j \in \Delta(J_A)$ and $\sigma_{x+h_t^j} \rightarrow \sigma_x^j \in \Delta(I_A)$, as $t \rightarrow +\infty$. Hence, $(\sigma_x^j A^{k_A} \tau_x^j)_{k_A \in K_A} S = d_j$ and $(\sigma_x^j A^{k_A} \tau_x^j)_{k_A \in K_A} \cdot p_A = f(x) = v_A(p_A)$. This implies that $\phi_A S = \sum_j \lambda_j (\sigma_x^j A^{k_A} \tau_x^j)_{k_A \in K_A} S$ and $\sum_j \lambda_j (\sigma_x^j A^{k_A} \tau_x^j)_{k_A \in K_A} \cdot p_A = f(x) = v_A(p_A)$. Fix $q \in \Delta(K_A)$ and let $T(x+h) = q$. Then it follows that:

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_A \cdot q &= \phi_A \cdot T(x+h) = \phi_A \cdot T(x) + \phi_A S \cdot h = \sum_{j=1}^{|K_A|} \lambda_j (\sigma_x^j A^{k_A} \tau_x^j)_{k_A \in K_A} \cdot T(x) + \sum_{j=1}^{|K_A|} \lambda_j (\sigma_x^j A^{k_A} \tau_x^j)_{k_A \in K_A} S \cdot h = \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^{|K_A|} \lambda_j (\sigma_x^j A^{k_A} \tau_x^j)_{k_A \in K_A} \cdot q. \end{aligned}$$

Since $q \in \Delta(K_A)$ is arbitrary, it follows that

$$\phi_A = \sum_{j=1}^{|K_A|} \lambda_j (\sigma_x^j A^{k_A} \tau_x^j)_{k_A \in K_A},$$

which proves that $\phi_A \in F_A$. This settles the proof of the Lemma.

We now prove the auxiliary claim: For each $q \in H_A$, let $f_\tau^A(q) = \max_{\sigma} \sigma A(q) \tau'$ and $g_\tau = f_\tau^A \circ T$. For any τ , g_τ is obviously a convex function of q . By definition, denoting by τ_x an optimal strategy of the minimizer at the zero-sum game with matrix $A(T(x))$, we have that:

$$g_{\tau_{x+h}}(x+h+d) \geq v_A^e(T(x+h+d)) = v_A^e(T(x+h)) + \nabla f(x+h) \cdot d + o(\|d\|), \forall d \in \mathbb{R}^{|K_A|-1}.$$

Note $v_A^e(T(x+h)) = g_{\tau_{x+h}}(x+h)$. This gives $g_{\tau_{x+h}}(x+h+d) \geq g_{\tau_{x+h}}(x+h) + \nabla f(x+h) \cdot d + o(\|d\|), \forall d \in \mathbb{R}^{|K_A|-1}$. Since $g_{\tau_{x+h}}$ is a convex function, all its directional derivatives exist and we have that $g_{\tau_{x+h}}(x+h+d) \geq g_{\tau_{x+h}}(x+h) + \nabla f(x+h) \cdot d, \forall d \in \mathbb{R}^{|K_A|-1}$. This implies that $\nabla f(x+h)$ is a subgradient of the convex function $g_{\tau_{x+h}}$ at the point $x+h$. Note now that $g_{\tau_{x+h}}$ is piecewise

linear and its epigraph \mathcal{G}_{x+h} is therefore a polyhedral set. This implies every maximal proper face of \mathcal{G}_{x+h} is contained in a hyperplane H_i of $\mathbb{R}^{K_A-1} \times \mathbb{R}$ given by

$$H_i = \{(d, t) \in \mathbb{R}^{|K_A|-1} \times \mathbb{R} \mid ((s_i A^{k_A} \tau'_{x+h})_{k_A \in K_A} S, -1) \cdot (d, t) = -(s_i A^{k_A} \tau_{x+h})_{k_A \in K_A} \cdot e_1^{K_A}\},$$

where $s_i \in I_A$. Define $\bar{y} = (x+h, f(x+h))$. Notice that $(x+h, f(x+h)) = (x+h, g_{\tau_{x+h}}(x+h))$. Let $I_0 \subset I_A$ be the set of all pure actions corresponding to maximal proper faces of \mathcal{G}_{x+h} that contain \bar{y} . The graph of the affine function $r(d) = f(x+h) + \nabla f(x+h) \cdot d$ is a hyperplane of $\mathbb{R}^{|K_A|-1} \times \mathbb{R}$ that supports \mathcal{G}_{x+h} at $\bar{y} = (x+h, f(x+h))$. Now we claim that there exists $\sigma_{x+h} \in \Delta(I_0)$ such that $\nabla f(x+h) = \sum_{s \in I_0} \sigma_{x+h}(s) (s A^{k_A} \tau_{x+h}^T)_{k_A \in K_A} S = (\sigma_{x+h} A^{k_A} \tau_{x+h}^T)_{k_A \in K_A} S$: consider the $|K_A| \times |I_0|$ real-matrix D where each column corresponds to a vector $((s A^{k_A} \tau'_{x+h})_{k_A \in K_A} S, -1)$, where $s \in I_0$. Let w denote the column vector $(\nabla f(x+h), -1)'$ (note that the set $R = \{(d, t) : \mathbb{R}^{|K_A|-1} \times \mathbb{R} \mid (\nabla f(x+h), -1) \cdot (d, t) = -f(x+h)\}$ is the graph of r). It now follows from Farkas' Lemma¹⁹, that there exists a column vector with nonnegative entries $\lambda = (\lambda_s)_{s \in I_0}$ such that $D\lambda = w$. This linear system further implies that $\sum_{s \in I_0} \lambda_s = 1$. Therefore we have that there exists $\sigma_{x+h} \in \Delta(I_0)$ such that $\nabla f(x+h) = \sum_{s \in I_0} \sigma_{x+h}(s) (s A^{k_A} \tau'_{x+h})_{k_A \in K_A} S = (\sigma_{x+h} A^{k_A} \tau'_{x+h})_{k_A \in K_A} S$, which proves (A). In addition, because H_i supports \mathcal{G}_{x+h} at \bar{y} , it implies that $(\sigma_{x+h} A^{k_A} \tau'_{x+h})_{k_A \in K_A} \cdot T(x+h) = f(x+h)$, which proves (B). This concludes the proof of the claim. \square

Proof of Proposition 3.8.

Proof. The proof is divided in two-cases: (a) $\text{Cav}(v_A)(p_A^0) > v_A(p_A^0)$ and (b) $\text{Cav}(v_A)(p_A^0) = v_A(p_A^0)$. We start with (a). We first construct the candidate vector of payoffs $\phi_A \in \mathbb{R}^{|K_A|}$ and a probability distribution p_A and show the pair (ϕ_A, p_A) satisfies the definition of NR at p_A^0 .

Let $\text{Cav}(v_A)(p_A^0) = \sum_{s \in S} \lambda_s v_A(p_s)$, $\lambda_s \geq 0$, $\sum_{s \in S} \lambda_s = 1$ and let p_{s_0} be the posterior which is interior to the simplex of states. Let $\mathcal{H} = \{(q, \alpha) \in \Delta(K_A) \times \mathbb{R} \mid \text{Cav}(v_A)(q) \geq \alpha\}$. Note that \mathcal{H} is a convex subset of $\mathbb{R}^{|K_A|} \times \mathbb{R}$. Now, note that $(p_A^0, \text{Cav}(v_A)(p_A^0)) = \sum_{s \in S} \lambda_s (p_s, v_A(p_s))$. Since, by (a), $\forall s \in S, p_s \neq p_0$, it follows that $(p_A^0, \text{Cav}(v_A)(p_A^0))$ is not an extremum point of \mathcal{H} (cf. [14], Section 18). Therefore, there exists a face F of \mathcal{H} , with dimension $d \geq 1$, such that F contains $(p_A^0, \text{Cav}(v_A)(p_A^0))$ and each point $(p_s, v_A(p_s))$. Take now a supporting hyperplane H to \mathcal{H} which contains F . The hyperplane H intersected with $\Delta(K_A) \times \mathbb{R}$ is the graph of an affine function $q \in \Delta(K_A) \mapsto \phi_A \cdot q \in \mathbb{R}$, where ϕ_A is a vector in $\mathbb{R}^{|K_A|}$. The candidate pair satisfying NR at p_A^0 is (ϕ_A, p_{s_0}) . We now check that it satisfies the conditions of Definition 3.1. It is clear from the construction that $\phi_A \cdot q \geq \text{Cav}(v_A)(q)$, $\forall q \in \Delta(K_A)$. Using the definition of T , we can rewrite this inequality as $\text{Cav}(v_A \circ T|_P)(x) + \phi_A S \cdot h \geq \text{Cav}(v_A \circ T|_P)(x+h)$, $T(x) = p_{s_0}$, $\forall h \in \mathbb{R}^{|K_A|-1}$ such that $x+h \in P$. We obtain $\phi_A S \in \partial^* \text{Cav}(v_A)(p_{s_0})$. Since $\phi_A \cdot p_{s_0} = \text{Cav}(v_A)(p_{s_0}) = v_A(p_{s_0})$ and $\text{Cav}(v_A)(p_A^0) = \phi_A \cdot p_A^0$, (1) in Definition 3.1 is satisfied. It remains to prove that $\phi_A S \in \partial v_A(p_{s_0})$. In order to show this, we are going to apply some of the results in Clark [3]. The results we will

¹⁹See [14]

use from Clark are stated for convex functions, but we need to apply them for concave functions. In order to be explicit in the application, we have to do some small preliminary work.

Extend $\text{Cav}(v_A \circ T|_P)$ to $\mathbb{R}^{|K_A|-1}$ by letting it be $-\infty$ outside P and let h denote this extension; it follows that h is upper semicontinuous and concave. Notice that since p_{s_0} is in the interior of $\Delta(K_A)$, it follows that $\partial^* \text{Cav}(v_A)(p_{s_0})$ is actually the usual superdifferential $\partial h(x)$ of h at $x = T(p_{s_0})$ from convex analysis.²⁰ Given a continuous function $g : P \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{|K_A|-1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $\text{Vex}(g) : P \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ denotes the convexification of g .²¹ Notice now that $-h$ is the function equal to $\text{Vex}(-(v_A \circ T|_P))$ in P and $+\infty$ outside P , which implies it is convex and lower semicontinuous. Denoting by $\partial(-h)(x)$ the subdifferential (from standard convex analysis) of $-h$ at x , it follows that $-\phi_A S \in \partial(-h)(x)$. We now show that $\partial(-h)(x) \subseteq \partial(-(v_A^e \circ T))(x)$. This will follow from an application of Proposition 3.17 in Clark [3]. We first observe that the subdifferential $\partial(-h)(x)$ is equal to the generalized gradient $\partial(-h)(x)$, since $-h$ is convex (Proposition 1.2 in Clark [3]). Let E be the epigraph of $-h|_P = \text{Vex}(-(v_A \circ T|_P)) : P \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. The cone of normals $N_E(x, (-h)(x))$ is then the standard normal cone from convex analysis, namely, $\{\psi \in \mathbb{R}^{|K_A|-1} \times \mathbb{R} \mid \langle \psi, d - (x, (-h)(x)) \rangle \leq 0, \forall d \in E\}$ (see Proposition 3.3. in Clark [3]). Let now L be the epigraph of $f := -(v_A \circ T|_P) : P \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and let $N_L(x, f(x))$ be the cone of normals to L at $(x, f(x))$, as defined in Clark [3], Definition 3.1.²² We now show that $N_E(x, (-h)(x)) \subseteq N_L(x, f(x))$, which then implies the desired result, by Proposition 3.17 in Clark [3]. Let $\psi \in N_E(x, (-h)(x))$ and consider the supporting hyperplane at $(x, (-h)(x))$ to E with normal $\psi = z - r(z)$, where $r(z)$ is the nearest-point projection of z onto E and $r(z) = (x, (-h)(x))$. Notice in addition $r(z)$ is also the nearest point in L to z and $(x, (-h)(x)) = (x, f(x))$. Take now $y_k = r(z) + \lambda_k(z - r(z))$, where $(\lambda_k)_{k=1}^\infty$ and $\lambda_k \downarrow 0$ as $k \rightarrow +\infty$. Note that $r(z) = r(y_k), \forall k \in \mathbb{N}$. By Proposition 3.2 in [3], since $\lim_{k \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{\lambda_k}(y_k - r(y_k)) = \lim_{k \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{\lambda_k}(y_k - r(z)) = z - r(z)$, it follows that $z - r(z) = \psi \in N_L(x, f(x))$. It then follows from Proposition 3.17 in Clark [3] that $-\phi_A S \in \partial f(x)$. Since we have that $\partial(-f)(x) = -\partial f(x)$, it follows immediately that $\phi_A S \in \partial v_A(p_{s_0})$. This concludes the proof of case (a).

Now we prove case (b). Assume $\text{Cav}(v_A)(p_A^0) = v_A(p_A^0)$. From Aumann et al. [1], an optimal strategy σ_A of the informed player in $G_A(p_A^0)$ is to play the mixed action which is optimal in the (one-shot) zero-sum game with matrix $A(p_A^0)$, independently at each stage, whereas the strategy of the uninformed player 2 is an approachability strategy τ_A at p_A^0 . By definition of the approachability strategy, there exists a vector $\phi_A \in \mathbb{R}^{|K_A|}$ satisfying $\phi_A \cdot q \geq v_A(q), \forall q \in \Delta(K_A)$ such that player 2 approaches $\phi_A - \mathbb{R}_+^{|K_A|}$ and the profile (σ_A, τ_A) is a uniform equilibrium, with associated vector of payoffs equal to ϕ_A . We now observe that the pair (ϕ_A, p_A^0) satisfies the conditions of NR at p_A^0 . First, $\phi_A \cdot p_A^0 = \text{Cav}(v_A)(p_A^0) = v_A(p_A^0)$ (which is condition (1)) is clear. By the same reasoning as in the first paragraph of this proof $\phi_A \cdot q \geq v_A(q), \forall q \in \Delta(K_A)$ is then equivalent

²⁰See Rockafellar [14].

²¹ $\text{Vex}(g) := -\text{Cav}(-g)$.

²²We will actually use the equivalent formulation of the normal cone in Proposition 3.2 in Clark [3].

to $\phi_A S \in \partial^* \text{Cav}(v_A)(p_A^0)$, which is condition (3). The same reasoning as in the paragraph above (changing now $x = T(p_{s_0})$ to $x^0 = T(p_A^0)$) gives that $\phi_A \in \partial v_A(p_A^0)$, which is condition (2). This concludes the proof. \square

7. APPENDIX B

Proof of Lemma 4.3. Let (σ, τ_A, τ_B) be an equilibrium profile of \mathcal{G}^{p^0} . We start with the construction of the sequence of random variables $(p_t, \beta_{A,t}, \beta_{B,t})_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$. The sequence $(p_t)_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$ is the martingale of posteriors obtained from (σ, τ_A, τ_B) . It is therefore, immediately adapted to the sequence of increasing fields $(\mathcal{H}_t)_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$. Fix now a Banach limit L .²³ A triple of strategies (σ, τ_A, τ_B) is an L -equilibrium if:

- (1) $L((\alpha_T^{k_A, k_B}(\sigma, \tau_A, \tau_B))_{T \in \mathbb{N}}) \geq L((\alpha_T^{k'_A, k'_B}(\sigma', \tau_A, \tau_B))_{T \in \mathbb{N}}), \forall \sigma \in \Sigma, (k_A, k_B) \in K_A \times K_B$.
- (2) $L((\beta_T^A(\sigma, \tau_A, \tau_B))_{T \in \mathbb{N}}) \geq L((\beta_T^A(\sigma, \tau'_A, \tau_B))_{T \in \mathbb{N}}), \forall \tau'_A \in \mathcal{T}_A$.
- (3) $L((\beta_T^B(\sigma, \tau_A, \tau_B))_{T \in \mathbb{N}}) \geq L((\beta_T^B(\sigma, \tau_A, \tau'_B))_{T \in \mathbb{N}}), \forall \tau'_B \in \mathcal{T}_B$.

A uniform equilibrium of the game $\mathcal{G}(p^0)$ automatically satisfies (1), (2) and (3) above, so it is an L -equilibrium. For each $t \in \mathbb{N}$, let $\beta_{A,t} = L(\mathbb{E}[\alpha_T | \mathcal{H}_t])$, where $\alpha_T = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T A_{i_A^t, j_A^t}^{k_A}$ and

$\beta_{B,t} = L(\mathbb{E}[\beta_T | \mathcal{H}_t])$, where $\beta_T = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T B_{i_B^t, j_B^t}^{k_B}$. We now show (1) of Lemma 4.3: we have already argued that $(p_t)_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a martingale and it is immediate it is bounded. Since $L : \ell^\infty \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a continuous extension of $\lim : \ell_\infty \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, it is in particular Borel-measurable. Fix now $s < t$ and $h_s \in H_s$ with $\mathbb{P}(h_s) > 0$: $\mathbb{E}[\beta_{A,t} | \mathcal{H}_s](h_s) = \mathbb{E}[L(\mathbb{E}[\alpha_T | \mathcal{H}_t]) | \mathcal{H}_s](h_s) = \frac{1}{\mathbb{P}(h_s)} \mathbb{E}[L(\mathbb{E}[\alpha_T | \mathcal{H}_t]) \mathbb{1}_{h_s}]$. Letting now $X_T := L(\mathbb{E}[\alpha_T | \mathcal{H}_t]) \mathbb{1}_{h_s}$, we have that $X := (X_T)_{T \in \mathbb{N}} : \Omega \rightarrow \ell^\infty$ is a random variable that takes finitely many values in ℓ^∞ . Therefore, by Lemma 4.6 in Hart [7], L commutes with \mathbb{E} and we obtain: $\frac{1}{\mathbb{P}(h_s)} \mathbb{E}[L(X_T)] = \frac{1}{\mathbb{P}(h_s)} L(\mathbb{E}[X_T]) = \frac{1}{\mathbb{P}(h_s)} L(\mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[\alpha_T | \mathcal{H}_t] \mathbb{1}_{h_s}]) = L(\frac{1}{\mathbb{P}(h_s)} \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[\alpha_T | \mathcal{H}_t] \mathbb{1}_{h_s}])$, where the last equality follows from L being linear. Now, $L(\frac{1}{\mathbb{P}(h_s)} \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[\alpha_T | \mathcal{H}_t] \mathbb{1}_{h_s}]) = L(\mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[\alpha_T | \mathcal{H}_t] | \mathcal{H}_s](h_s))$, from the definition of the conditional expectation on a finite field. As h_s was arbitrarily chosen, we have $\mathbb{E}[\beta_{A,t} | \mathcal{H}_s] = L(\mathbb{E}[\alpha_T | \mathcal{H}_s]) = \beta_{A,s}$ a.s., proving $(\beta_{A,t})_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a martingale adapted to $(\mathcal{H}_t)_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$ (boundedness of this martingale is immediate from the fact that payoffs are bounded). The proof that $(\beta_{B,t})_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a bounded martingale adapted to $(\mathcal{H}_t)_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$ is the same. We now show condition (2) of Lemma 4.3. Notice that $\beta_{A,1} = L(\mathbb{E}[\alpha_T | \mathcal{H}_1]) = L(\mathbb{E}[\alpha_T]) = \lim_{T \rightarrow +\infty} \mathbb{E}[\alpha_T]$, where the last equality follows from the fact that payoffs of an equilibrium profile converge, by definition; the limit $\lim_{T \rightarrow +\infty} \mathbb{E}[\alpha_T]$ is precisely the expected payoff to player 1 in the game $G_A(p_A^0)$ from the equilibrium. By the same reasoning, $\beta_{B,1}$ is precisely the expected payoff of player 1 in game $G_B(p_B^0)$.

We now prove (3) from Lemma 4.3. Aiming for a contradiction, suppose there exists $h_t^0 \in H_t$ with $\mathbb{P}(h_t^0) > 0$, such that $\beta_{A,t}(h_t^0) > \text{Cav}(v_A)(p_{tA})(h_t^0)$. We will construct a profitable deviation for

²³For the definition of Banach limit, see Section 4.2 in Hart [7].

player 2. Let τ'_A be the following strategy. After h_t^0 has occurred, τ'_A will be equal to the strategy $\hat{\tau}_A(p_t)$, where $p_t := p_t(h_t^0)$ is the posterior given h_t^0 ; otherwise, τ'_A is equal to τ_A . We have,

$$\mathbb{E}[\alpha_T] - \mathbb{E}'[\alpha_T] = \mathbb{P}(h_t^0)(\mathbb{E}[\alpha_T|h_t^0] - \mathbb{E}'[\alpha_T|h_t^0]),$$

where \mathbb{E}' is the expectation taken with respect to the $p^0, \sigma, \tau'_A, \tau_B$. We claim that $L(\mathbb{E}'[\alpha_T|h_t^0]) \leq \text{Cav}(v_A)(p_{tA}(h_t^0)), \forall t \in \mathbb{N}$. We will assume the claim for now and conclude the proof of (3). We then prove the claim. Taking L on the right-hand-side of the highlighted equation and using linearity of L , one gets: $\beta_{A,t}(h_t^0) - L(\mathbb{E}'[\alpha_T|\mathcal{H}_t]) \geq \beta_{A,t}(h_t^0) - \text{Cav}(v_A)(p_{tA})(h_t^0) > 0$. This implies a contradiction: since taking L on the left hand side we obtain the difference between the expected payoffs from (σ, τ_A, τ_B) to player 1 and the expected payoffs from $(\sigma, \tau'_A, \tau_B)$ to player 1. As the expected payoffs to player 1 decreased strictly, player 2 is strictly better, which is a contradiction with the fact that (σ, τ_A, τ_B) is an equilibrium.

We now prove the claim: note that, $\mathbb{E}'[\alpha_T|h_t^0] = \frac{\mathbb{E}'[\alpha_T \cdot \mathbb{1}_{h_t^0}]}{\mathbb{P}'(h_t^0)} = \frac{1}{\mathbb{P}'(h_t^0)} \frac{1}{T} [\int_{h_t^0} \sum_{s=1}^{t-1} A_{i_A^s, j_A^s}^{\kappa_A} dP'] + \frac{1}{\mathbb{P}'(h_t^0)} \frac{T-t}{T} [\int_{h_t^0} \frac{1}{T-t} \sum_{s=t}^T A_{i_A^s, j_A^s}^{\kappa_A} dP']$. Let $C_T := \frac{(T-t)}{T}$ and $K_T := \frac{1}{\mathbb{P}'(h_t^0)} \frac{1}{T} [\int_{h_t^0} \sum_{s=1}^{t-1} A_{i_A^s, j_A^s}^{\kappa_A} dP']$. Then, $\mathbb{E}'[\alpha_T|h_t^0] = \frac{1}{\mathbb{P}'(h_t^0)} C_T [\int_{h_t^0} \frac{1}{T-t} \sum_{s=t}^T A_{i_A^s, j_A^s}^{\kappa_A} dP'] + K_T$. Now letting $P^\circ(\cdot) := P'(\cdot|h_t^0)$ and $\mathbb{E}^\circ[\cdot]$ the expectation operator with respect to $P^\circ(\cdot)$, we can re-write $\mathbb{E}'[\alpha_T|h_t^0]$ as $C_T \mathbb{E}^\circ[\frac{1}{T-t} \sum_{s=t}^T A_{i_A^s, j_A^s}^{\kappa_A}] + K_T$. Let now $\varepsilon > 0$. Note that because $\tau_A(h_t^0)$ is a Blackwell strategy, there exists $T_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ s.t. $\forall T \geq T_0$, $\mathbb{E}^\circ[\frac{1}{T-t} \sum_{s=t}^T A_{i_A^s, j_A^s}^{\kappa_A}] \leq \text{Cav}(v_A)(p_{tA}) + \varepsilon$. Therefore, $C_T \mathbb{E}^\circ[\frac{1}{T-t} \sum_{s=t}^T A_{i_A^s, j_A^s}^{\kappa_A}] + K_T \leq C_T \text{Cav}(v_A)(p_{tA}(h_t^0)) + \varepsilon C_T + K_T$. Since $K_T \rightarrow 0$ and $C_T \rightarrow 1$, as $T \rightarrow +\infty$, taking L on both sides of the inequality gives $L(\mathbb{E}'[\alpha_T|h_t^0]) \leq \text{Cav}(v_A)(p_{tA}(h_t^0)) + \varepsilon$. As $\varepsilon > 0$ is arbitrary, $L(\mathbb{E}'[\alpha_T|h_t^0]) \leq \text{Cav}(v_A)(p_{tA}(h_t^0))$, as required. This concludes the proof of the claim and the proof of (3). The proof of (4) is the exact same.

Proof of the Claim 4.5. Fix $t, s \in \mathbb{N}$ with $t \geq s$. Conditioning over \mathcal{H}_{t+1} and κ_A , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[A_{i_A^t, j_A^t}^{\kappa_A} | \mathcal{H}_s] &= \mathbb{E}[\sum_{k_A \in K_A} p_{t+1A}^{k_A} A_{i_A^t, j_A^t}^{k_A} | \mathcal{H}_s] = \sum_{k_A \in K_A} p_{sA}^{k_A} \mathbb{E}[A_{i_A^t, j_A^t}^{k_A} | \mathcal{H}_s] + \sum_{k \in K} \mathbb{E}[(p_{t+1A}^{k_A} - p_{sA}^{k_A}) A_{i_A^t, j_A^t}^{k_A} | \mathcal{H}_s] = \\ &= \mathbb{E}[A(p_{sA})_{i_A^t, j_A^t} | \mathcal{H}_s] + \sum_{k_A \in K_A} \mathbb{E}[(p_{t+1A}^{k_A} - p_{sA}^{k_A}) A_{i_A^t, j_A^t}^{k_A} | \mathcal{H}_s] \leq V_A(p_{sA}) + \sum_{k_A \in K_A} \mathbb{E}[(p_{t+1A}^{k_A} - p_{sA}^{k_A}) A_{i_A^t, j_A^t}^{k_A} | \mathcal{H}_s]. \end{aligned}$$

Summing over $t \in \mathbb{N}$ from $s \leq t \leq T$, and dividing by T , we have

$$\mathbb{E}[\alpha_T | \mathcal{H}_s] \leq \frac{s}{T} + V_A(p_{sA}) + \frac{1}{T} \sum_{s \leq t \leq T} \sum_{k_A \in K_A} \mathbb{E}[|p_{t+1A}^{k_A} - p_{sA}^{k_A}| | \mathcal{H}_s],$$

where we used the fact that stage payoffs at any state are bounded 1. Denote $Z_s := \frac{s}{T} + \frac{1}{T} \sum_{s \leq t \leq T} \mathbb{E}[\pi_s | \mathcal{H}_s]$, where $\pi_s := \sum_{k_A \in K_A} \sup_{t \geq s} |p_{t+1A}^{k_A} - p_{sA}^{k_A}|$. Taking Banach-limits (on T) on both sides, we have $\beta_{A,s} \leq V_A(p_{sA}) + \mathbb{E}[\pi_s | \mathcal{H}_s]$ a.s.. Since $p_s \rightarrow p^\infty$ a.s., as $s \rightarrow \infty$, it follows by Lemma 4.24 in [7], that $\mathbb{E}[\pi_s | \mathcal{H}_s] \rightarrow 0$ a.s.. \square

INSTITUTE FOR MICROECONOMICS, UNIVERSITY OF BONN, ADENAUERALLEE 24-42, 53113 BONN, GERMANY.
Email address: pahl.lucas@gmail.com