

An Optimal Distributed Algorithm with Operator Extrapolation for Stochastic Aggregative Games

Tongyu Wang^{a,e}, Peng Yi^{a,b,c}, Jie Chen^{a,b,d}

^aDepartment of Control Science and Engineering, Tongji University, Shanghai, 201804, China;

^bThe Shanghai Research Institute for Intelligent Autonomous Systems, Shanghai, 201804, China.

^cThe Institute of Advanced Study, Tongji University, Shanghai, 201804, China

^dFrontiers Science Center for Intelligent Autonomous Systems, Tongji University, Shanghai, China

^eShanghai Institute of Intelligent Science and Technology, Tongji University, Shanghai 200092, China

Abstract

This work studies Nash equilibrium seeking for a class of stochastic aggregative games, where each player has an expectation-valued objective function depending on its local strategy and the aggregate of all players' strategies. We propose a distributed algorithm with operator extrapolation, in which each player maintains an estimate of this aggregate by exchanging this information with its neighbors over a time-varying network, and updates its decision through the mirror descent method. An operator extrapolation at the search direction is applied such that the two step historical gradient samples are utilized to accelerate the convergence. Under the strongly monotone assumption on the pseudo-gradient mapping, we prove that the proposed algorithm can achieve the optimal convergence rate of $O(1/k)$ for Nash equilibrium seeking of stochastic games. Finally, the algorithm performance is demonstrated via numerical simulations.

Keywords: Aggregative games, Stochastic game, Distributed algorithm, Operator extrapolation, Optimal convergence rate

1. Introduction

In recent years, the non-cooperative games have been widely applied in decision-making for networked systems, where selfish networked players aim to optimize their own objective functions that have coupling with other players' decisions. Nash equilibrium (NE) is one of the most widely used solution concept to non-cooperative games, under which no participant can improve its utility by unilaterally deviating from the equilibrium strategy [1]. Specifically, the aggregative games is an important class of non-cooperative games, in which each player's cost function depends on its own strategy and the aggregation of all player strategies [2]. This aggregating feature emerges in numerous decision-making problems over networks systems, when the individual utility is affected by network-wide aggregate. Hence, aggregative games and its NE seeking algorithm get wide research, with application in charging coordination for plug-in electric vehicles [3, 4], multidimensional opinion dynamics [5, 6], communication channel congestion control [7], and energy management in power grids [8, 9], etc. It also worth

pointing out that stochastic game should be taken as a proper decision-making model when there are information uncertainties, dating back to [10], while the NE seeking for stochastic games with various sampling schemes are recently studied [11, 12]. Hence, when the game has both information uncertainties and aggregating-type objective functions, stochastic aggregative game and its NE seeking are studied [13, 14, 15].

Generally speaking, NE seeking methods include centralized, distributed, and semi-decentralized methods. In the centralized methods [16], each player needs to know the complete information to compute an NE in an introspective manner. In the semi-decentralized methods [17], there exists a central coordinator gathering and broadcasting signals to all players. While in distributed methods [18], each player has its private information and seeks the NE through local communications with other players. As such, designing distributed NE seeking algorithm has gained tremendous research interests due to the benefits owing to decentralization.

Existing works on distributed NE seeking largely resided in best-response (BR) schemes [19][12][6] and gradient-based approaches [20][21][22]. In BR schemes, players select a strategy that best responds to its rivals' current strategies. For example, [23] proposed an inexact generalization of this scheme in which an inexact best response strategy is computed via a stochastic approximation scheme. In gradient-based approaches, the algorithm is easily implementable with a low computation complexity per iteration. For instance, [24] designed an accelerated distributed gradient play for a strongly monotone game and proved its geometric convergence, while it needs to estimate all

*This research is supported by Shanghai Municipal Science and Technology Major Project No. 2021SHZDZX0100, Shanghai Municipal Commission of Science and Technology Project No. 19511132101, National Natural Science Foundation of China under Grant 62003239, Shanghai Sailing Program No. 20YF1453000, and the Fundamental Research Funds for the Central Universities, China.

Email addresses: wang_tongyu@tongji.edu.cn (Tongyu Wang), yipeng@tongji.edu.cn (Peng Yi), chenjie206@tongji.edu.cn (Jie Chen)

URL: <http://www.elsevier.com> (Jie Chen)

players' strategies. To reduce the communication costs, [25] proposed a consensus-based distributed gradient algorithm for aggregative games, in which players only need to estimate the aggregate in each iteration. Furthermore, [26] proposed a distributed gradient algorithm based on iterative Tikhonov regularization method to resolve the class of monotone aggregative games. [27] proposed a fully asynchronous distributed algorithm and rigorously show the convergence to a Nash equilibrium. Besides, [28, 9] proposed a continuous-time distributed algorithm for aggregative games.

Moreover, fast convergence rate is indispensable bonus for distributed Nash equilibrium seeking algorithm, since it implies less communication rounds. Particular, for stochastic games, distributed NE seeking with a fast convergence rate is highly desirable since its also implies low sampling cost of stochastic gradients. Motivated by this, [30] designed an extra-gradient method to improve the speed of NE seeking, while it needs two steps of operator evaluations and two step of projections at each iteration. To further reduce the computation burden, [31] proposed a simpler recursion with one step of operator evaluation and projection at each iteration, given by $x_{t+1} = \operatorname{argmin}_{x \in X} \gamma_t \langle F(x_t + \beta_t(x_t - x_{t-1})), x \rangle + V(x_t, x)$, called projected reflected gradient method. But the iterate $x_t + \beta_t(x_t - x_{t-1})$ may sit outside the feasible set X , so it needs to impose the strong monotone assumption on the pseudo-gradient over \mathbb{R}^n . Recently, [32] proposed an operator extrapolation (OE) method to solve the stochastic variational inequality problem, for which the optimal convergence rate can be achieved through one operator evaluation and a single projection per iteration.

Motivated by the demands for fast NE seeking algorithm of stochastic aggregative games and inspired by [32], we propose a distributed operator extrapolation (OE) algorithm via mirror descent and dynamical averaging tracking. At each stage, each player aligns its intermediate estimate by a consensus step with its neighbors' estimates of the aggregate, samples an unbiased estimate of its payoff gradients, takes a small step via the OE method, and then mirrors it back to the strategy set. The algorithm achieves the optimal convergence rate $O(1/k)$ for the class of stochastic strongly monotone aggregative games. The numerical experiments on a Nash-cournot competition problem demonstrate its advantages over some existing NE seeking methods. In addition, we compare our algorithm with some other distributed algorithms for aggregative games and summarize those works in Table 1. Specially, we compare the iteration complexity and communication rounds to achieve an ϵ -NE when the iterate x satisfies $\mathbb{E}[\|x - x^*\|^2] \leq \epsilon$. The proposed algorithm can achieve the optimal convergence rate with only one communication round per iteration in comparison with multiple communication rounds required by [6] and [29]. Though [27] can achieve convergence rate $1/k$ with fixed step-sizes for a deterministic game, our work can achieve the optimal convergence result with diminishing step for a stochastic game, which can model various information uncertainties.

The rest of paper is organized as follows. In section 2, we give the formulation of the stochastic aggregate games, and

state the assumptions. In section 3, we propose a distributed operator extrapolation algorithm and provide convergence results for the class of strongly monotone games. The proof of main results are given in Section 4. We show the empirical performance of our algorithm through the Nash-cournot model in section 5, and give concluding remarks in Section 6.

Notations: A vector x is a column vector while x^T denotes its transpose. $\langle x, y \rangle = x^T y$ denotes the inner product of vectors x, y . $\|x\|$ denotes the Euclidean vector norm, i.e., $\|x\| = \sqrt{x^T x}$. A nonnegative square matrix A is called doubly stochastic if $A\mathbf{1} = \mathbf{1}$ and $\mathbf{1}^T A = \mathbf{1}^T$, where $\mathbf{1}$ denotes the vector with each entry equal 1. $\mathbf{I}_N \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}$ denotes the identity matrix. Let $\mathcal{G} = \{\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{E}\}$ be a directed graph with $\mathcal{N} = \{1, \dots, N\}$ denoting the set of players and \mathcal{E} denoting the set of directed edges between players, where $(j, i) \in \mathcal{E}$ if player i can obtain information from player j . The graph \mathcal{G} is called strongly connected if for any $i, j \in \mathcal{N}$ there exists a directed path from i to j , i.e., there exists a sequence of edges $(i, i_1), (i_1, i_2), \dots, (i_{p-1}, j)$ in the digraph with distinct nodes $i_m \in \mathcal{N}$, $\forall m : 1 \leq m \leq p-1$.

2. Problem Formulation

In this section, we formulate the stochastic aggregative games over networks and introduce basic assumptions.

2.1. Problem Statement

We consider a set of N non-cooperative players indexed by $\mathcal{N} \triangleq \{1, \dots, N\}$. Each player $i \in \mathcal{N}$ choose its strategy x_i from a strategy set $X_i \in \mathbb{R}^m$. Denote by $\mathbf{x} \triangleq (x_1^T, \dots, x_N^T)^T \in \mathbb{R}^{mN}$ and $\mathbf{x}_{-i} \triangleq \{x_j\}_{j \neq i}$ the strategy profile and the rival strategies, respectively. In an aggregative game, each player i aim to minimize its cost function $f_i(x_i, \sigma(\mathbf{x}))$, where $\sigma(\mathbf{x}) \triangleq \sum_{j=1}^N x_j$ is an aggregate of all players' strategies. Furthermore, given $\sigma(\mathbf{x}_{-i}) \triangleq \sum_{j=1, j \neq i}^N x_j$, the objective of player i is to minimize its parameterized stochastic local cost:

$$\min_{x_i \in X_i} f_i(x_i, x_i + \sigma(\mathbf{x}_{-i})) \triangleq \mathbb{E}[\psi_i(x_i, x_i + \sigma(\mathbf{x}_{-i}); \xi_i(\omega))], \quad (1)$$

where $\xi_i : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d_i}$ is a random variable defined on the probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P}_i)$, $\psi_i : \mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R}^{d_i} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a scalar-valued function, and $\mathbb{E}[\cdot]$ denotes the expectation with respect to the probability measure \mathbb{P}_i .

A Nash equilibrium (NE) of the aggregative game (1) is a tuple $\mathbf{x}^* = \{x_i^*\}_{i=1}^N$ such that for each $i \in \mathcal{N}$,

$$f_i(x_i^*, \sigma(\mathbf{x}^*)) \leq f_i(x_i, x_i + \sigma(\mathbf{x}_{-i}^*)), \quad \forall x_i \in X_i.$$

We consider the scenario that each player $i \in \mathcal{N}$ knows the structure of its private function f_i , but have no access to the aggregate $\sigma(\mathbf{x})$. Instead, each player may communicate with its neighbors over a time varying graph $\mathcal{G}_k = \{\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{E}_k\}$. Define $W_k = [\omega_{i,j,k}]_{i,j=1}^N$ as the adjacency matrix, where $\omega_{i,j,k} > 0$ if and only if $(j, i) \in \mathcal{E}_k$, and $\omega_{i,j,k} = 0$, otherwise. Denote by $N_{i,k} \triangleq \{j \in \mathcal{N} : (j, i) \in \mathcal{E}_k\}$ the neighboring set of player i at time k .

Literature	stochastic	Method	rate	Iteration	communication	sample
[6]	×	BR-based	-	-	ν rounds	-
[27]	×	gradient-based	$1/k$	-	1 round	-
[29]	✓	gradient-based	$1/k$	$\mathcal{O}(\ln(1/\epsilon))$	$k + 1$ rounds	N_k
This work	✓	gradient-based	$1/k$	Corollary 1	1 round	1

Table 1: A list of some recent research papers on distributed methods for resolving aggregative games.

In column 2 “stochastic”, ✓ means that the studied problem is stochastic, while × implies that the studied problem is deterministic; In columns 4 and 5, dash - implies that the literature has not studied this property; In column 6 “communication” stands for that the communication round required at each iteration; In column 7 “sample” stands for the number of sampled gradients per iteration.

2.2. Assumptions

We impose the following conditions on the time-varying communication graphs $\mathcal{G}_k = \{\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{E}_k\}$.

Assumption 1. (a) W_k is doubly stochastic for any $k \geq 0$;
(b) There exists a constant $0 < \eta < 1$ such that

$$\omega_{i,j,k} \geq \eta, \quad \forall j \in \mathcal{N}_{i,k}, \quad \forall i \in \mathcal{N}, \quad \forall k \geq 0;$$

(c) There exists a positive integer B such that the union graph $\{\mathcal{N}, \bigcup_{l=1}^B \mathcal{E}_{k+l}\}$ is strongly connected for all $k \geq 0$.

We define a transition matrix $\Phi(k, s) = W_k W_{k-1} \cdots W_s$ for any $k \geq s \geq 0$ with $\Phi(k, k+1) = \mathbf{I}_N$, and state a result that will be used in the sequel.

Lemma 1. [33, Proposition 1] Let Assumption 1 hold. Then there exist $\theta = (1 - \eta/(4N^2))^{-2} > 0$ and $\beta = (1 - \eta/(4N^2))^{1/B}$ such that for any $k \geq s \geq 0$,

$$|\Phi(k, s)_{ij} - 1/N| \leq \theta \beta^{k-s}, \quad \forall i, j \in \mathcal{N}. \quad (2)$$

We require the player-specific problem to be convex and continuously differentiable.

Assumption 2. For each player $i \in \mathcal{N}$, (a) the strategy set X_i is closed, convex and compact; (b) the cost function $f_i(x_i, \sigma(x))$ is convex in $x_i \in X_i$ for every fixed $x_{-i} \in X_{-i} \triangleq \prod_{j \neq i} X_j$; (c) $f_i(x_i, \sigma)$ is continuously differentiable in $(x_i, \sigma) \in X_i \times \mathbb{R}^m$.

For any $x \in X \triangleq \prod_{i=1}^N X_i$ and $z \in \mathbb{R}^m$, define

$$F_i(x_i, z) \triangleq (\nabla_{x_i} f_i(\cdot, \sigma) + \nabla_{\sigma} f_i(x_i, \cdot))|_{\sigma=z},$$

$$\phi_i(\mathbf{x}) \triangleq \nabla_{x_i} f_i(x_i, \sigma(\mathbf{x})) = F_i(x_i, \sigma(\mathbf{x})), \text{ and } \phi(\mathbf{x}) \triangleq (\phi_i(\mathbf{x}))_{i=1}^N. \quad (3)$$

From (3) and Assumption 2(c), it follows that the pseudogradient $\phi(x)$ is continuous. Since each player-specific problem is convex, by [34, Proposition 1.4.2], \mathbf{x}^* is a NE of (1) if and only if \mathbf{x}^* is a solution to a variational inequality problem $\text{VI}(X, \phi)$, i.e., finding $\mathbf{x}^* \in X$ such that

$$(\bar{\mathbf{x}} - \mathbf{x}^*)^\top \phi(\mathbf{x}^*) \geq 0, \quad \forall \bar{\mathbf{x}} \in X \triangleq \prod_{j=1}^N X_j. \quad (4)$$

Since ϕ is continuous, X is convex and compact, the existence of NE follows immediately by [34, Corollary 2.2.5].

For each $i \in \mathcal{N}$, define

$$M_i \triangleq \max_{x_i \in X_i} \|x_i\|, \quad M_H \triangleq \sum_{j=1}^N M_j, \quad (5)$$

$$\tilde{C} \triangleq \theta M_H + 2\theta \sum_{j=1}^N M_j / (1 - \beta). \quad (6)$$

We impose the following Lipschitz continuous conditions.

Assumption 3. (a) $\phi(\mathbf{x})$ is L -Lipschitz continuous in x , i.e.,

$$\|\phi(\mathbf{x}) - \phi(\mathbf{y})\| \leq L\|x - y\|, \quad \forall \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in X.$$

(b) For each $i \in \mathcal{N}$ and any $x_i \in X_i$, $F_i(x_i, z)$ is L_{f_i} -Lipschitz continuous in z over some compact set, particularly, for all $z_1, z_2 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ with $\|z_1\| \leq N\tilde{C} + M_H$ and $\|z_2\| \leq N\tilde{C} + M_H$:

$$\|F_i(x_i, z_1) - F_i(x_i, z_2)\| \leq L_{f_i} \|z_1 - z_2\|.$$

In addition, we require each $\psi_i(x_i, \sigma; \xi_i)$ to be differentiable, and assume there exists a stochastic oracle that returns unbiased gradient sample with bounded variance.

Assumption 4. For each player $i \in \mathcal{N}$ and any $\xi_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$,
(a) $\psi_i(x_i, \sigma; \xi_i)$ is differentiable in $x_i \in X_i$ and $\sigma \in \mathbb{R}^m$;
(b) for any $x_i \in X_i$ and $z \in \mathbb{R}^m$, $q_i(x_i, z; \xi_i) = (\nabla_{x_i} \psi_i(x_i, \sigma; \xi_i) + \nabla_{\sigma} \psi_i(x_i, \sigma; \xi_i))|_{\sigma=z}$ satisfies $\mathbb{E}[q_i(x_i, z; \xi_i)|x_i] = F_i(x_i, z)$ and $\mathbb{E}[\|q_i(x_i, z; \xi_i) - F_i(x_i, z)\|^2|x_i] \leq \nu_i^2$ for some constant $\nu_i > 0$.

3. Algorithm Design and Main Results

In this section, we design a distributed NE seeking algorithm and prove its optimal convergence to the Nash equilibrium in the mean-squared sense.

3.1. Distributed Mirror Descent Algorithm with Operator Extrapolation

We assume throughout that the paper that the regularization function h is 1-strongly convex, i.e.,

$$h(y) \geq h(x) + \langle \nabla h(x), y - x \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \|x - y\|^2, \quad \forall x, y \in \mathbb{R}^m.$$

We define the Bregman divergence associated with h as follows.

$$D(x, y) \triangleq h(y) - (h(x) + \langle \nabla h(x), y - x \rangle), \quad \forall x, y \in \mathbb{R}^m. \quad (7)$$

Recall that the operator extrapolation method for VI in [32] requires a simple recursion at each iteration given by

$$x_{t+1} = \operatorname{argmin}_{x \in X} \gamma_t \langle F(x_t) + \lambda_t (F(x_t) - F(x_{t-1})), x \rangle + D(x_t, x),$$

which only involves one operator evaluation $F(x_t)$ and one prox-mapping over the set X .

Suppose that each player i at stage $k = 1, 2, \dots$ selects a strategy $x_{i,k} \in X_i$ as an estimate of its equilibrium strategy, and holds an estimate $v_{i,k}$ for the average aggregate. At stage $k + 1$, player i observes its neighbors' past information $v_{j,k}$, $j \in \mathcal{N}_{i,k}$ and updates an intermediate estimate by the consensus step (8), then it computes its partial gradient based on the sample observation, and updates its strategy $x_{i,k+1}$ by a mirror descent scheme (9) with operator extrapolation [32] by setting $q_i(x_{i,0}, N\hat{v}_{i,1}; \xi_{i,0}) = q_i(x_{i,1}, N\hat{v}_{i,2}; \xi_{i,1})$ without loss of generality. Finally, player i updates the average aggregate with the renewed strategy $x_{i,k+1}$ by the dynamic average tracking scheme (10). The procedures are summarized in Algorithm 1.

Algorithm 1 Distributed Mirror Descent Method with Operator Extrapolation

Initialize: Set $k = 1$, $x_{i,1} \in X_i$ and $v_{i,1} = x_{i,1}$ for each $i \in \mathcal{N}$.

Iterate until convergence

Consensus. Each player computes an intermediate estimate by

$$\hat{v}_{i,k+1} = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_{i,k}} w_{ij,k} v_{j,k}. \quad (8)$$

Strategy Update. Each player $i \in \mathcal{N}$ updates its equilibrium strategy and its estimate of the average aggregate by

$$x_{i,k+1} = \operatorname{argmin}_{x_i \in X_i} \left(\alpha_k \langle (1 + \lambda_k) q_i(x_{i,k}, N\hat{v}_{i,k+1}; \xi_{i,k}) - \lambda_k q_i(x_{i,k-1}, N\hat{v}_{i,k}; \xi_{i,k-1}), x_i \rangle + D(x_{i,k}, x_i) \right), \quad (9)$$

$$v_{i,k+1} = \hat{v}_{i,k+1} + x_{i,k+1} - x_{i,k} \quad (10)$$

where $\alpha_k > 0$, $\lambda_k > 0$, and $\xi_{i,k}$ denotes a random realization of ξ_i at time k .

Define the gradient noise

$$\zeta_{i,k} \triangleq q_i(x_{i,k}, N\hat{v}_{i,k+1}; \xi_{i,k}) - F_i(x_{i,k}, N\hat{v}_{i,k+1}), \quad (11)$$

$\mathbf{x}_k = (x_{1,k}^T, \dots, x_{N,k}^T)^T$, and $\mathcal{F}_k \triangleq \{\mathbf{x}_1, \xi_{i,l}, i \in \mathcal{N}, l = 1, 2, \dots, k-1\}$. Then with Algorithm 1, $x_{i,k}$ and $\hat{v}_{i,k+1}$ are adapted to \mathcal{F}_k . Define $\zeta_k = (\zeta_{1,k}^T, \dots, \zeta_{N,k}^T)^T$. From Assumption 4, it follows that for each $i \in \mathcal{N}$:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\zeta_k | \mathcal{F}_k] &= 0, \quad \mathbb{E}[\|\zeta_{i,k}\|^2 | \mathcal{F}_k] \leq v_i^2, \quad \text{and} \\ \mathbb{E}[\|\zeta_k\|^2 | \mathcal{F}_k] &\leq \sum_{i=1}^N v_i^2 \triangleq v^2. \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

3.2. Main Results

Define

$$\widehat{D}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = \sum_{i=1}^N D(x_i, y_i) \text{ for any } \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in X, \quad (13)$$

With the definition of the Bregman's distance, we can replace the strong monotonicity assumption by the following assumption. This assumption taken from [32] includes $\langle \phi(\mathbf{x}), \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}^* \rangle \geq \mu \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}^*\|$, $\forall \mathbf{x} \in X$ as the special case when $h(x) = \|x\|^2/2$.

Assumption 5. *There exists a constant $\mu > 0$ such that*

$$\langle \phi(\mathbf{x}), \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}^* \rangle \geq 2\mu \widehat{D}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}^*), \quad \forall \mathbf{x} \in X.$$

With this condition, we now state a convergence property of Algorithm 1, for which the proof can be found in Section 4.2.

Proposition 1. *Consider Algorithm 1. Let Assumptions 1-5 hold. Assume, in addition, that there exists a positive sequence $\{\theta_k\}_{k \geq 1}$ satisfying*

$$\theta_{k+1} \alpha_{k+1} \lambda_{k+1} = \theta_k \alpha_k, \quad (14)$$

$$\theta_{k-1} \geq 16\alpha_k^2 \lambda_k^2 L^2 \theta_k, \quad (15)$$

$$\theta_k \leq \theta_{k-1} (2\mu \alpha_{k-1} + 1) \text{ and } 8L^2 \alpha_k^2 \leq 1. \quad (16)$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} & \theta_t (2\mu \alpha_t + 1/2) \mathbb{E}[\widehat{D}(\mathbf{x}_{t+1}, \mathbf{x}^*)] + \sum_{k=1}^{t-1} \frac{\theta_k}{4} \mathbb{E}[\widehat{D}(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{x}_{k+1})] \\ & \leq \theta_1 \mathbb{E}[\widehat{D}(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}^*)] + 8v^2 \sum_{k=1}^t \theta_k \alpha_k^2 \lambda_k^2 + 2\theta_t \alpha_t^2 v^2 \\ & + \theta_1 \alpha_1 \lambda_1 \mathbb{E}[\varepsilon_1] + 2 \sum_{k=1}^t \theta_k \alpha_k \mathbb{E}[\varepsilon_{k+1}], \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

where

$$\varepsilon_k \triangleq 2 \sum_{i=1}^N L_{f_i} M_i (\|N\hat{v}_{i,k+1} - \sigma(\mathbf{x}_k)\| + \|N\hat{v}_{i,k} - \sigma(\mathbf{x}_{k-1})\|). \quad (18)$$

Remark 1. *Consider the special case where the digraph \mathcal{G}_k is a complete graph for each time k with $W_k = \frac{\mathbf{1}_N \mathbf{1}_N^T}{N}$. Then (17) becomes*

$$\begin{aligned} & \theta_t (2\mu \alpha_t + 1/2) \mathbb{E}[\widehat{D}(\mathbf{x}_{t+1}, \mathbf{x}^*)] + \sum_{k=1}^{t-1} \frac{\theta_k}{4} \mathbb{E}[\widehat{D}(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{x}_{k+1})] \\ & \leq \theta_1 \mathbb{E}[\widehat{D}(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}^*)] + 8v^2 \sum_{k=1}^t \theta_k \alpha_k^2 \lambda_k^2 + 2\theta_t \alpha_t^2 v^2. \end{aligned}$$

This recovers the bound of [32, Theorem 3.3].

In the following, we establish a bound on the consensus error $\|\sigma(\mathbf{x}_k) - N\hat{v}_{i,k+1}\|$ of the aggregate, for which the proof can be found in Section 4.3.

Proposition 2. *Consider Algorithm 1. Let Assumptions 1, 2, and 3 hold. Then*

$$\begin{aligned} \|\sigma(\mathbf{x}_k) - N\hat{v}_{i,k+1}\| & \leq \theta M_H N \beta^k \\ & + \theta N \sum_{s=1}^k \beta^{k-s} \alpha_{s-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \left((1 + 2\lambda_{s-1}) C_i + \lambda_{s-1} \|\zeta_{i,s-2}\| \right. \\ & \quad \left. + (1 + \lambda_{s-1}) \|\zeta_{i,s-1}\| \right), \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

where the constants θ, β are defined in (2), and

$$C_i \triangleq N \check{C} L_{f_i} + \max_{\mathbf{x} \in X} \|\phi_i(\mathbf{x})\|. \quad (20)$$

By combining Proposition 1 and Proposition 2, we can show that the proposed method can achieve the optimal convergence rate for solving the stochastic smooth and strongly monotone aggregative games. The proof can be found in Section 4.4.

Theorem 1. *Consider Algorithm 1. Suppose Assumptions 1-5 hold. Set*

$$c_0 = \frac{4L}{\mu}, \quad \alpha_k = \frac{1}{\mu(k + c_0 - 1)},$$

$$\theta_k = (k + c_0 + 1)(k + c_0), \quad \lambda_k = \frac{\theta_{k-1}\alpha_{k-1}}{\theta_k\alpha_k}.$$

Then the following hold with $c_e \triangleq 4N\tilde{C} \sum_{i=1}^N L_{f_i} M_i$.

$$\mathbb{E}[\widehat{D}(\mathbf{x}_{t+1}, \mathbf{x}^*)] \leq \frac{2(c_0 + 2)(c_0 + 1)\widehat{D}(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}^*)}{(t + c_0 + 1)(t + c_0)}$$

$$+ \frac{8(v^2 + c_1)}{\mu^2(t + c_0 + 1)(t + c_0)} + \frac{2c_0(c_0 + 1)c_e}{\mu(c_0 - 1)(t + c_0 + 1)(t + c_0)} \quad (21)$$

$$+ \frac{8(c_2 + 4v^2)t}{\mu^2(t + c_0 + 1)(t + c_0)},$$

where

$$c_1 \triangleq 2\theta M_H N(1 + \beta)\mu\beta \left(\frac{c_0 - 1}{1 - \beta} + \frac{1}{(1 - \beta)^2} \right) \sum_{i=1}^N L_{f_i} M_i, \quad (22)$$

$$c_2 \triangleq \frac{8\theta N(3 - \beta) \sum_{i=1}^N (C_i + v_i)}{(1 - \beta)^2} \sum_{i=1}^N L_{f_i} M_i. \quad (23)$$

Corollary 1. *The number of iterations (the same as communication rounds) required by Algorithm 1 for obtaining an approximate Nash equilibrium $\bar{\mathbf{x}} \in X$ satisfying $\mathbb{E}[\widehat{D}(\bar{\mathbf{x}}, \mathbf{x}^*)] \leq \epsilon$ is bounded by*

$$\max \left(\frac{L\sqrt{\widehat{D}(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}^*)}}{\mu\sqrt{\epsilon}}, \frac{\sqrt{v^2 + c_1}}{\mu\sqrt{\epsilon}}, \frac{\sqrt{L}}{\mu\sqrt{\epsilon}}, \frac{c_2 + 4v^2}{\mu^2\epsilon} \right).$$

4. Proof of Main Results

4.1. Preliminary Results

We now state a property from [35, Proposition B.3], and a well-known technical results regarding the optimality condition of (9) (see [36, Lemma 3.1]).

Lemma 2. *Let h be a smooth and 1-strongly convex regularizer. Then*

$$D(x_i, y_i) \geq \frac{1}{2} \|x_i - y_i\|^2, \quad \forall x_i, y_i \in X_i, \quad (24)$$

and

$$\alpha_k \langle (1 + \lambda_k)q_i(x_{i,k}, N\hat{v}_{i,k+1}; \xi_{i,k}), x_{i,k+1} - x_i \rangle$$

$$- \alpha_k \langle \lambda_k q_i(x_{i,k-1}, N\hat{v}_{i,k}; \xi_{i,k-1}), x_{i,k+1} - x_i \rangle + D(x_{i,k}, x_{i,k+1})$$

$$\leq D(x_{i,k}, x_i) - D(x_{i,k+1}, x_i), \quad \forall x_i \in X_i. \quad (25)$$

Then from (13) and (24) it follows that

$$\widehat{D}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \geq \frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|^2, \quad \forall \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in X. \quad (26)$$

Furthermore, we define

$$\Delta D_{i,k}(x_i) \triangleq D(x_{i,k}, x_i) - D(x_{i,k+1}, x_i), \quad (27)$$

$$\Delta q_{i,k} \triangleq q_i(x_{i,k}, N\hat{v}_{i,k+1}; \xi_{i,k}) - q_i(x_{i,k-1}, N\hat{v}_{i,k}; \xi_{i,k-1}), \quad (28)$$

$$\Delta \widehat{D}_k(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{i=1}^N \Delta D_{i,k}(x_i) = \widehat{D}(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{x}) - \widehat{D}(\mathbf{x}_{k+1}, \mathbf{x}). \quad (29)$$

We are now ready to show the convergence properties of the proposed method.

Lemma 3. *Let $\{\mathbf{x}_k\}$ be generated by Algorithm 1. Let Assumptions 2 and 3 hold. Suppose, in addition, that (14) and (15) hold for some positive sequence $\{\theta_k\}_{k \geq 1}$.*

Then

$$\sum_{k=1}^t \theta_k \left(\alpha_k \sum_{i=1}^N \langle q_i(x_{i,k+1}, N\hat{v}_{i,k+2}; \xi_{i,k+1}), x_{i,k+1} - x_i \rangle + \widehat{D}(\mathbf{x}_{k+1}, \mathbf{x}) + \frac{1}{4} \widehat{D}(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{x}_{k+1}) \right)$$

$$- 2\alpha_t^2 \theta_t L^2 \|\mathbf{x}_{t+1} - \mathbf{x}\|^2 - \alpha_t \theta_t \langle \zeta_{t+1} - \zeta_t, \mathbf{x}_{t+1} - \mathbf{x} \rangle \quad (30)$$

$$\leq \sum_{k=1}^t \theta_k \widehat{D}(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{x}) + \sum_{k=1}^t \theta_k \alpha_k \lambda_k \varepsilon_k$$

$$+ 2 \sum_{k=1}^t \theta_k \alpha_k^2 \lambda_k^2 \|\zeta_k - \zeta_{k-1}\|^2 + \alpha_t \theta_t \varepsilon_{t+1}.$$

Proof. With the definitions (27) and (28), (25) becomes

$$\Delta D_{i,k}(x_i) \geq \alpha_k \langle q_i(x_{i,k+1}, N\hat{v}_{i,k+2}; \xi_{i,k+1}), x_{i,k+1} - x_i \rangle$$

$$- \alpha_k \langle \Delta q_{i,k+1}, x_{i,k+1} - x_i \rangle \quad (31)$$

$$+ \alpha_k \lambda_k \langle \Delta q_{i,k}, x_{i,k} - x_i \rangle$$

$$+ \alpha_k \lambda_k \langle \Delta q_{i,k}, x_{i,k+1} - x_i \rangle + D(x_{i,k}, x_{i,k+1}).$$

By multiplying both sides of the above inequality by θ_k , and summing up from $i = 1$ to N , and $k = 1$ to t , we obtain that

$$\sum_{k=1}^t \theta_k \Delta \widehat{D}_k(\mathbf{x}) \geq \sum_{k=1}^t \theta_k \alpha_k \lambda_k \sum_{i=1}^N \langle \Delta q_{i,k}, x_{i,k} - x_i \rangle$$

$$+ \sum_{k=1}^t \theta_k \alpha_k \sum_{i=1}^N \langle q_i(x_{i,k+1}, N\hat{v}_{i,k+2}; \xi_{i,k+1}), x_{i,k+1} - x_i \rangle$$

$$- \sum_{k=1}^t \theta_k \alpha_k \sum_{i=1}^N \langle \Delta q_{i,k+1}, x_{i,k+1} - x_i \rangle \quad (32)$$

$$+ \sum_{k=1}^t \theta_k \sum_{i=1}^N D(x_{i,k}, x_{i,k+1}) + \sum_{k=1}^t \theta_k \alpha_k \lambda_k \sum_{i=1}^N \langle \Delta q_{i,k}, x_{i,k+1} - x_{i,k} \rangle.$$

Then by recalling that $\Delta q_{i,1} = 0$, using (13) and (14), we obtain

$$\sum_{k=1}^t \theta_k \Delta \widehat{D}_k(\mathbf{x}) \geq -\theta_t \alpha_t \sum_{i=1}^N \langle \Delta q_{i,t+1}, x_{i,t+1} - x_i \rangle$$

$$+ \underbrace{\sum_{k=1}^t \theta_k \widehat{D}(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{x}_{k+1}) + \sum_{k=1}^t \theta_k \alpha_k \lambda_k \sum_{i=1}^N \langle \Delta q_{i,k}, x_{i,k+1} - x_{i,k} \rangle}_{\triangleq Q_t} \quad (33)$$

$$+ \sum_{k=1}^t \theta_k \alpha_k \sum_{i=1}^N \langle q_i(x_{i,k+1}, N\hat{v}_{i,k+2}; \xi_{i,k+1}), x_{i,k+1} - x_{i,k} \rangle.$$

By the definitions of (11) and (28), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^N \langle \Delta q_{i,k}, x_{i,k+1} - x_{i,k} \rangle &= \sum_{i=1}^N \langle \zeta_{i,k} - \zeta_{i,k-1}, x_{i,k+1} - x_{i,k} \rangle \\ &+ \sum_{i=1}^N \langle F_i(x_{i,k}, N\hat{v}_{i,k+1}) - F_i(x_{i,k-1}, N\hat{v}_{i,k}), x_{i,k+1} - x_{i,k} \rangle \\ &= \langle \zeta_k - \zeta_{k-1}, \mathbf{x}_{k+1} - \mathbf{x}_k \rangle \\ &+ \sum_{i=1}^N \langle F_i(x_{i,k}, N\hat{v}_{i,k+1}) - F_i(x_{i,k-1}, N\hat{v}_{i,k}), x_{i,k+1} - x_{i,k} \rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (34)$$

By using (5) and Assumption 3, we derive

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{i=1}^N \langle F_i(x_{i,k}, N\hat{v}_{i,k+1}) - F_i(x_{i,k-1}, N\hat{v}_{i,k}), x_{i,k+1} - x_{i,k} \rangle \\ &\stackrel{(3)}{=} \sum_{i=1}^N \langle F_i(x_{i,k}, N\hat{v}_{i,k+1}) - F_i(x_{i,k}, \sigma(\mathbf{x}_k)), x_{i,k+1} - x_{i,k} \rangle \\ &+ \sum_{i=1}^N \langle F_i(x_{i,k-1}, \sigma(\mathbf{x}_{k-1})) - F_i(x_{i,k-1}, N\hat{v}_{i,k}), x_{i,k+1} - x_{i,k} \rangle \\ &+ \sum_{i=1}^N \langle \phi_i(\mathbf{x}_k) - \phi_i(\mathbf{x}_{k-1}), x_{i,k+1} - x_{i,k} \rangle \\ &\geq - \sum_{i=1}^N \|F_i(x_{i,k}, N\hat{v}_{i,k+1}) - F_i(x_{i,k}, \sigma(\mathbf{x}_k))\| \|x_{i,k+1} - x_{i,k}\| \\ &- \sum_{i=1}^N \|F_i(x_{i,k-1}, \sigma(\mathbf{x}_{k-1})) - F_i(x_{i,k-1}, N\hat{v}_{i,k})\| \|x_{i,k+1} - x_{i,k}\| \\ &+ \langle \phi(\mathbf{x}_k) - \phi(\mathbf{x}_{k-1}), \mathbf{x}_{k+1} - \mathbf{x}_k \rangle \\ &\geq -2 \sum_{i=1}^N L_{f_i} M_i (\|N\hat{v}_{i,k+1} - \sigma(\mathbf{x}_k)\| + \|N\hat{v}_{i,k} - \sigma(\mathbf{x}_{k-1})\|) \\ &- L \|\mathbf{x}_k - \mathbf{x}_{k-1}\| \|\mathbf{x}_{k+1} - \mathbf{x}_k\|. \end{aligned} \quad (35)$$

This together with (34), and the definitions of Q_t and ε_k in (33) and (18) implies that

$$\begin{aligned} Q_t &\geq \sum_{k=1}^t \theta_k \widehat{D}(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{x}_{k+1}) + \sum_{k=1}^t \theta_k \alpha_k \lambda_k \langle \zeta_k - \zeta_{k-1}, \mathbf{x}_{k+1} - \mathbf{x}_k \rangle \\ &- \sum_{k=1}^t \theta_k \alpha_k \lambda_k L \|\mathbf{x}_k - \mathbf{x}_{k-1}\| \|\mathbf{x}_{k+1} - \mathbf{x}_k\| - \sum_{k=1}^t \theta_k \alpha_k \lambda_k \varepsilon_k. \end{aligned} \quad (36)$$

Then by (26), the following holds with defining $\theta_0 \triangleq 0$.

$$Q_t \geq \frac{1}{4} \sum_{k=1}^t \theta_k \widehat{D}(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{x}_{k+1})$$

$$\begin{aligned} &+ \sum_{k=1}^t \left(\underbrace{\theta_k \alpha_k \lambda_k \langle \zeta_k - \zeta_{k-1}, \mathbf{x}_{k+1} - \mathbf{x}_k \rangle + \frac{\theta_k}{8} \|\mathbf{x}_{k+1} - \mathbf{x}_k\|^2}_{\triangleq \text{Term 1}} \right) \\ &+ \sum_{k=1}^t (-\theta_k \alpha_k \lambda_k L \|\mathbf{x}_k - \mathbf{x}_{k-1}\| \|\mathbf{x}_{k+1} - \mathbf{x}_k\|) \\ &+ \sum_{k=1}^t \left(\frac{\theta_k}{8} \|\mathbf{x}_{k+1} - \mathbf{x}_k\|^2 + \frac{\theta_{k-1}}{8} \|\mathbf{x}_{k-1} - \mathbf{x}_k\|^2 \right) \\ &+ \frac{\theta_t}{8} \|\mathbf{x}_{t+1} - \mathbf{x}_t\|^2 - \sum_{k=1}^t \theta_k \alpha_k \lambda_k \varepsilon_k. \end{aligned} \quad (37)$$

We let

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Term 2} &\triangleq -\theta_k \alpha_k \lambda_k L \|\mathbf{x}_k - \mathbf{x}_{k-1}\| \|\mathbf{x}_{k+1} - \mathbf{x}_k\| \\ &+ \frac{\theta_k}{8} \|\mathbf{x}_{k+1} - \mathbf{x}_k\|^2 + \frac{\theta_{k-1}}{8} \|\mathbf{x}_{k-1} - \mathbf{x}_k\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

By using (15) and the Young's inequality $a^2 + b^2 \geq 2\|a\|\|b\|$, we derive $\text{Term 2} \geq 0$. Also, we obtain $\text{Term 1} \geq -2\theta_k \alpha_k^2 \lambda_k^2 \|\zeta_k - \zeta_{k-1}\|^2$. Then by substituting the bounds of Term 1 and Term 2 into (37), we have

$$\begin{aligned} Q_t &\geq \frac{1}{4} \sum_{k=1}^t \theta_k \widehat{D}(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{x}_{k+1}) - 2 \sum_{k=1}^t \theta_k \alpha_k^2 \lambda_k^2 \|\zeta_k - \zeta_{k-1}\|^2 \\ &+ \frac{\theta_t}{8} \|\mathbf{x}_{t+1} - \mathbf{x}_t\|^2 - \sum_{k=1}^t \theta_k \alpha_k \lambda_k \varepsilon_k. \end{aligned} \quad (38)$$

This together with (33) implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=1}^t \theta_k \Delta \widehat{D}_k(\mathbf{x}) &\geq \frac{1}{4} \sum_{k=1}^t \theta_k \widehat{D}(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{x}_{k+1}) - 2 \sum_{k=1}^t \theta_k \alpha_k^2 \lambda_k^2 \|\zeta_k - \zeta_{k-1}\|^2 \\ &+ \sum_{k=1}^t \theta_k \alpha_k \sum_{i=1}^N \langle q_i(x_{i,k+1}, N\hat{v}_{i,k+2}; \xi_{i,k+1}), x_{i,k+1} - x_{i,k} \rangle \\ &- \sum_{k=1}^t \theta_k \alpha_k \lambda_k \varepsilon_k + \frac{\theta_t}{8} \|\mathbf{x}_{t+1} - \mathbf{x}_t\|^2 - \theta_t \alpha_t \sum_{i=1}^N \langle \Delta q_{i,t+1}, x_{i,t+1} - x_{i,t} \rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (39)$$

Similarly to (34), we have that

$$\begin{aligned} &- \sum_{i=1}^N \langle \Delta q_{i,t+1}, x_{i,t+1} - x_{i,t} \rangle = -\langle \zeta_{t+1} - \zeta_t, \mathbf{x}_{t+1} - \mathbf{x}_t \rangle \\ &- \sum_{i=1}^N \langle F_i(x_{i,t+1}, N\hat{v}_{i,t+2}) - F_i(x_{i,t}, N\hat{v}_{i,t+1}), x_{i,t+1} - x_{i,t} \rangle \end{aligned} \quad (40)$$

Similarly to (35), by using Assumption 3, (3), and (5), we have that

$$\begin{aligned} &- \sum_{i=1}^N \langle F_i(x_{i,t+1}, N\hat{v}_{i,t+2}) - F_i(x_{i,t}, N\hat{v}_{i,t+1}), x_{i,t+1} - x_{i,t} \rangle \\ &\geq -\varepsilon_{t+1} - L \|\mathbf{x}_{t+1} - \mathbf{x}_t\| \|\mathbf{x}_{t+1} - \mathbf{x}_t\|. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{8} \|\mathbf{x}_{t+1} - \mathbf{x}_t\|^2 - \alpha_t \sum_{i=1}^N \langle \Delta q_{i,t+1}, x_{i,t+1} - x_i \rangle \\
& \geq \frac{1}{8} \|\mathbf{x}_{t+1} - \mathbf{x}_t\|^2 - \alpha_t \langle \zeta_{t+1} - \zeta_t, \mathbf{x}_{t+1} - \mathbf{x} \rangle \\
& \quad - \alpha_t \varepsilon_{t+1} - \alpha_t L \|\mathbf{x}_{t+1} - \mathbf{x}\| \|\mathbf{x}_{t+1} - \mathbf{x}\| \\
& \geq -\alpha_t \langle \zeta_{t+1} - \zeta_t, \mathbf{x}_{t+1} - \mathbf{x} \rangle - 2\alpha_t^2 L^2 \|\mathbf{x}_{t+1} - \mathbf{x}\|^2 - \alpha_t \varepsilon_{t+1},
\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows by the Young's inequality. This incorporating with (39) produces

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{k=1}^t \theta_k \Delta \widehat{D}_k(\mathbf{x}) & \geq \frac{1}{4} \sum_{k=1}^t \theta_k \widehat{D}(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{x}_{k+1}) - 2 \sum_{k=1}^t \theta_k \alpha_k^2 \lambda_k^2 \|\zeta_k - \zeta_{k-1}\|^2 \\
& + \sum_{k=1}^t \theta_k \alpha_k \sum_{i=1}^N \langle q_i(x_{i,k+1}, N\hat{v}_{i,k+2}; \xi_{i,k+1}), x_{i,k+1} - x_i \rangle \\
& - \sum_{k=1}^t \theta_k \alpha_k \lambda_k \varepsilon_k - \alpha_t \theta_t \langle \zeta_{k+1} - \zeta_k, \mathbf{x}_{t+1} - \mathbf{x} \rangle \\
& - 2\alpha_t^2 \theta_t L^2 \|\mathbf{x}_{t+1} - \mathbf{x}\|^2 - \alpha_t \theta_t \varepsilon_{t+1}.
\end{aligned}$$

By recalling the definition (29) and rearranging the terms, we prove the lemma. \square

4.2. Proof of Proposition 1

Since \mathbf{x}_k is adapted to \mathcal{F}_k , from (12) it follows that

$$\mathbb{E}[\langle \zeta_k, \mathbf{x}_k - \mathbf{x} \rangle] = \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[\langle \zeta_k, \mathbf{x}_k - \mathbf{x} \rangle | \mathcal{F}_k]] = \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[\langle \zeta_k | \mathcal{F}_k, \mathbf{x}_k - \mathbf{x} \rangle]] = 0$$

for any $k \geq 1$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[\langle \zeta_{t+1} - \zeta_t, \mathbf{x}_{t+1} - \mathbf{x} \rangle] & = \mathbb{E}[\langle -\zeta_t, \mathbf{x}_{t+1} - \mathbf{x} \rangle] \\
& = \mathbb{E}[\langle -\zeta_t, \mathbf{x}_{t+1} - \mathbf{x}_t \rangle].
\end{aligned} \tag{41}$$

By noting that $q_i(x_{i,k+1}, N\hat{v}_{i,k+2}; \xi_{i,k+1}) = F_i(x_{i,k+1}, N\hat{v}_{i,k+2}) + \zeta_{i,k+1}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[\langle q_i(x_{i,k+1}, N\hat{v}_{i,k+2}; \xi_{i,k+1}), x_{i,k+1} - x_i \rangle] \\
= \mathbb{E}[\langle F_i(x_{i,k+1}, N\hat{v}_{i,k+2}), x_{i,k+1} - x_i \rangle].
\end{aligned} \tag{42}$$

In addition, by (12) we have

$$\mathbb{E}[\|\zeta_k - \zeta_{k-1}\|^2] \leq 2\mathbb{E}[\|\zeta_k\|^2] + 2\mathbb{E}[\|\zeta_{k-1}\|^2] \leq 4v^2.$$

Then by taking unconditional expectations on both sides of (30), using (41) and (42), we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{k=1}^t \theta_k \left(\alpha_k \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{E}[\langle F_i(x_{i,k+1}, N\hat{v}_{i,k+2}), x_{i,k+1} - x_i \rangle] \right) \\
& + \sum_{k=1}^t \theta_k \left(\mathbb{E}[\widehat{D}(\mathbf{x}_{k+1}, \mathbf{x})] + \frac{1}{4} \mathbb{E}[\widehat{D}(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{x}_{k+1})] \right) \\
& - 2\alpha_t^2 \theta_t L^2 \mathbb{E}[\|\mathbf{x}_{t+1} - \mathbf{x}\|^2] + \alpha_t \theta_t \mathbb{E}[\langle \zeta_t, \mathbf{x}_{t+1} - \mathbf{x}_t \rangle] \\
& \leq \sum_{k=1}^t \theta_k \mathbb{E}[\widehat{D}(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{x})] + \sum_{k=1}^t \theta_k \alpha_k \lambda_k \mathbb{E}[\varepsilon_k] \\
& + 8v^2 \sum_{k=1}^t \theta_k \alpha_k^2 \lambda_k^2 + \alpha_t \theta_t \mathbb{E}[\varepsilon_{t+1}].
\end{aligned} \tag{43}$$

Note by Assumption 3(b), (3), and (5) that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \langle F_i(x_{i,k}, N\hat{v}_{i,k+1}), x_{i,k} - x_i \rangle \\
& = \langle F_i(x_{i,k}, \sigma(\mathbf{x}_k)), x_{i,k} - x_i \rangle \\
& + \langle F_i(x_{i,k}, N\hat{v}_{i,k+1}) - F_i(x_{i,k}, \sigma(\mathbf{x}_k)), x_{i,k} - x_i \rangle \\
& \geq \langle \phi_i(\mathbf{x}_k), x_{i,k} - x_i \rangle \\
& - \|F_i(x_{i,k}, \sigma(\mathbf{x}_k)) - F_i(x_{i,k}, N\hat{v}_{i,k+1})\| \|x_{i,k} - x_i\| \\
& \geq \langle \phi_i(\mathbf{x}_k), x_{i,k} - x_i \rangle - 2L_{f_i} M_i \|\sigma(\mathbf{x}_k) - N\hat{v}_{i,k+1}\|.
\end{aligned}$$

Then by recalling the definition of ε_k in (18), and using Assumption 5, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{i=1}^N \langle F_i(x_{i,k}, N\hat{v}_{i,k+1}), x_{i,k} - x_i^* \rangle & \geq \langle \phi(\mathbf{x}_k), \mathbf{x}_k - \mathbf{x}^* \rangle - 2\varepsilon_k \\
& \geq 2\mu \widehat{D}(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{x}^*) - \varepsilon_k.
\end{aligned} \tag{44}$$

Note by (26) and (12) that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{4} \mathbb{E}[\widehat{D}(\mathbf{x}_t, \mathbf{x}_{t+1})] + \alpha_t \mathbb{E}[\langle \zeta_t, \mathbf{x}_{t+1} - \mathbf{x}_t \rangle] \\
& \geq \frac{1}{8} \mathbb{E}[\|\mathbf{x}_t - \mathbf{x}_{t+1}\|^2] + \alpha_t \mathbb{E}[\langle \zeta_t, \mathbf{x}_{t+1} - \mathbf{x}_t \rangle] \\
& \geq \frac{1}{8} \mathbb{E}[\|\mathbf{x}_t - \mathbf{x}_{t+1}\|^2] - \alpha_t \sqrt{\mathbb{E}[\|\mathbf{x}_t - \mathbf{x}_{t+1}\|^2]} \sqrt{\mathbb{E}[\|\zeta_t\|^2]} \\
& \geq -2\alpha_t^2 \mathbb{E}[\|\zeta_t\|^2] \geq -2\alpha_t^2 v^2.
\end{aligned}$$

This together with (43) and (44) implies that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{k=1}^t \theta_k (2\mu\alpha_k + 1) \mathbb{E}[\widehat{D}(\mathbf{x}_{k+1}, \mathbf{x}^*)] \\
& + \sum_{k=1}^{t-1} \frac{\theta_k}{4} \mathbb{E}[\widehat{D}(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{x}_{k+1})] - 2\alpha_t^2 \theta_t L^2 \mathbb{E}[\|\mathbf{x}_{t+1} - \mathbf{x}^*\|^2] \\
& \leq \sum_{k=1}^t \theta_k \mathbb{E}[\widehat{D}(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{x}^*)] + \sum_{k=1}^t \theta_k \alpha_k \lambda_k \mathbb{E}[\varepsilon_k] + 2\theta_t \alpha_t^2 v^2 \\
& + 8v^2 \sum_{k=1}^t \theta_k \alpha_k^2 \lambda_k^2 + \alpha_t \theta_t \mathbb{E}[\varepsilon_{t+1}] + \sum_{k=1}^t \theta_k \alpha_k \mathbb{E}[\varepsilon_{k+1}].
\end{aligned} \tag{45}$$

By recalling $\theta_k \leq \theta_{k-1}(2\mu\alpha_{k-1} + 1)$ from the condition (16), we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{k=1}^t \theta_k (2\mu\alpha_k + 1) \mathbb{E}[\widehat{D}(\mathbf{x}_{k+1}, \mathbf{x}^*)] - 2\alpha_t^2 \theta_t L^2 \mathbb{E}[\|\mathbf{x}_{t+1} - \mathbf{x}^*\|^2] \\
& \geq \theta_t \left((2\mu\alpha_t + 1/2) \mathbb{E}[\widehat{D}(\mathbf{x}_{t+1}, \mathbf{x}^*)] \right) + \sum_{k=1}^{t-1} \theta_{k+1} \mathbb{E}[\widehat{D}(\mathbf{x}_{k+1}, \mathbf{x}^*)] \\
& + \frac{\theta_t}{2} \left(\mathbb{E}[\widehat{D}(\mathbf{x}_{t+1}, \mathbf{x}^*)] - 4\alpha_t^2 L^2 \mathbb{E}[\|\mathbf{x}_{t+1} - \mathbf{x}^*\|^2] \right) \\
& \geq \theta_t (2\mu\alpha_t + 1/2) \mathbb{E}[\widehat{D}(\mathbf{x}_{t+1}, \mathbf{x}^*)] + \sum_{k=1}^{t-1} \theta_{k+1} \mathbb{E}[\widehat{D}(\mathbf{x}_{k+1}, \mathbf{x}^*)],
\end{aligned} \tag{46}$$

where the last inequality follows by (26) and $8L^2\alpha_k^2 \leq 1$ of (16). This together with (45) and (14) proves the result. \square

4.3. Proof of Proposition 2.

Since $v_{i,1} = x_{i,1}$ and $W(k)$ is doubly stochastic, similarly to [25, Lemma 2], we can show by induction that

$$\sum_{i=1}^N v_{i,k} = \sum_{i=1}^N x_{i,k} = \sigma(\mathbf{x}_k), \quad \forall k \geq 0. \quad (47)$$

Akin to [25, Eqn. (16)], we obtain the following bound.

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \frac{\sigma(\mathbf{x}_k)}{N} - \hat{v}_{i,k+1} \right\| &\leq \sum_{j=1}^n \left| \frac{1}{N} - [\Phi(k, 1)]_{ij} \right| \|v_{j,1}\| \\ &\quad + \sum_{s=1}^k \sum_{j=1}^n \left| \frac{1}{N} - [\Phi(k, s)]_{ij} \right| \|x_{j,s} - x_{j,s-1}\|. \end{aligned}$$

Then by using (2) and $v_{i,1} = x_{i,1}$, we obtain that

$$\left\| \frac{\sigma(\mathbf{x}_k)}{N} - \hat{v}_{i,k+1} \right\| \leq \theta \beta^k \sum_{j=1}^n \|x_{j,1}\| + \theta \sum_{s=1}^k \beta^{k-s} \sum_{j=1}^n \|x_{j,s} - x_{j,s-1}\|. \quad (48)$$

This combined with (5) proves

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \frac{\sigma(\mathbf{x}_k)}{N} - \hat{v}_{i,k+1} \right\| &\leq \theta \beta^k M_H + 2\theta \sum_{s=1}^k \beta^{k-s} \sum_{j=1}^n M_j \\ &\leq \theta M_H + 2\theta \sum_{j=1}^n M_j / (1 - \beta) \stackrel{(6)}{=} \tilde{C}. \end{aligned} \quad (49)$$

By (5) and (47), we have that $\|\sigma(\mathbf{x}_k)\| \leq M_H$ for any $k \geq 0$. Thus by (49), we obtain that for each $i \in \mathcal{N}$,

$$\|N\hat{v}_{i,k+1}\| \leq N\tilde{C} + M_H, \quad \forall k \geq 0.$$

Then by using Assumption 3(b) and (3), we obtain that for each $j \in \mathcal{N}$ and any $s \geq 0$:

$$\begin{aligned} \|F_j(x_{j,s}, N\hat{v}_{j,s})\| &\leq \|F_j(x_{j,s}, N\hat{v}_{j,s}) - F_j(x_{j,s}, \sigma(\mathbf{x}_s))\| \\ &\quad + \|F_j(x_{j,s}, \sigma(\mathbf{x}_s))\| \\ &\leq L_{f_j} \|N\hat{v}_{j,s} - \sigma(\mathbf{x}_s)\| + \|\phi_j(\mathbf{x}_s)\| \\ &\stackrel{(49)}{\leq} N\tilde{C}L_{f_j} + \max_{\mathbf{x} \in X} \|\phi_j(\mathbf{x})\| \stackrel{(20)}{=} C_j. \end{aligned} \quad (50)$$

By applying the optimality condition to (9), using the definitions (7) and (11), we have that

$$\begin{aligned} (x_i - x_{i,k+1})^T &\alpha_k ((1 + \lambda_k)(\zeta_{i,k} + F_i(x_{i,k}, N\hat{v}_{i,k+1})) \\ &\quad - \lambda_k(\zeta_{i,k-1} + F_i(x_{i,k-1}, N\hat{v}_{i,k}))) \\ &\quad + \nabla h(x_{i,k+1}) - \nabla h(x_{i,k}) \geq 0, \quad \forall x_i \in X_i. \end{aligned} \quad (51)$$

By setting $x_i = x_{i,k}$ in (51), rearranging the terms, and using the assumption that h is 1-strongly convex, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_k (x_{i,k} - x_{i,k+1})^T &((1 + \lambda_k)(\zeta_{i,k} + F_i(x_{i,k}, N\hat{v}_{i,k+1})) \\ &\quad - \lambda_k(\zeta_{i,k-1} + F_i(x_{i,k-1}, N\hat{v}_{i,k}))) \\ &\geq (x_{i,k} - x_{i,k+1})^T (\nabla h(x_{i,k}) - \nabla h(x_{i,k+1})) \geq \|x_{i,k} - x_{i,k+1}\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Then from (50) it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \|x_{i,k} - x_{i,k+1}\| &\leq \alpha_k ((1 + \lambda_k)(\|\zeta_{i,k}\| + \|F_i(x_{i,k}, N\hat{v}_{i,k+1})\|) \\ &\quad + \lambda_k(\|\zeta_{i,k-1}\| + \|F_i(x_{i,k-1}, N\hat{v}_{i,k})\|)) \\ &\leq \alpha_k ((1 + 2\lambda_k)C_i + (1 + \lambda_k)\|\zeta_{i,k}\| + \lambda_k\|\zeta_{i,k-1}\|). \end{aligned}$$

This together with (5) and (48) produces (19). \square

4.4. Proof of Theorem 1

By substituting (49) into the definition of ε_k in (18), we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon_k &= 2 \sum_{i=1}^N L_{f_i} M_i (\|N\hat{v}_{i,k+1} - \sigma(\mathbf{x}_k)\| + \|N\hat{v}_{i,k} - \sigma(\mathbf{x}_{k-1})\|) \\ &\leq 4N\tilde{C} \sum_{i=1}^N L_{f_i} M_i = c_e, \quad \forall k \geq 1. \end{aligned} \quad (52)$$

With the selection of parameters, similar to the proof of [32, Corollary 3.4], we can verify that (14), (15), and (16) hold. Furthermore, by $c_0 \geq 4$ and the simple calculations we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \theta_t(2\mu\alpha_t + 1/2) &> \theta_t/2 = (t + c_0 + 1)(t + c_0)/2, \\ \theta_t\alpha_t^2 &= \frac{(t + c_0 + 1)(t + c_0)}{\mu^2(t + c_0 - 1)^2} \leq \frac{2}{\mu^2}, \\ \theta_k\alpha_k &\leq \frac{2}{\mu^2\alpha_k}, \quad \theta_k\alpha_k\lambda_k = \theta_{k-1}\alpha_{k-1} \leq \frac{2}{\mu^2\alpha_{k-1}} \leq \frac{2}{\mu^2\alpha_k}, \\ \sum_{k=1}^t \theta_k\alpha_k^2\lambda_k^2 &= \sum_{k=1}^t \theta_k\alpha_k^2 \frac{\theta_{k-1}^2\alpha_{k-1}^2}{\theta_k^2\alpha_k^2} = \sum_{k=1}^t \frac{\theta_{k-1}^2\alpha_{k-1}^2}{\theta_k} \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^t \frac{(k + c_0)(k + c_0 - 1)^2}{\mu^2(k + c_0 - 2)^2(k + c_0 + 1)} \leq \frac{2t}{\mu^2}. \end{aligned}$$

This incorporating with (17) and (52) implies that

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{(t + c_0 + 1)(t + c_0)}{2} \mathbb{E}[\widehat{D}(\mathbf{x}_{t+1}, \mathbf{x}^*)] \\ &\leq \theta_1 \mathbb{E}[\widehat{D}(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}^*)] + \frac{(16t + 4)v^2}{\mu^2} \\ &\quad + \theta_1\alpha_1\lambda_1c_e + \frac{4}{\mu^2} \sum_{k=1}^t \frac{\mathbb{E}[\varepsilon_{k+1}]}{\alpha_k}. \end{aligned} \quad (53)$$

In the following, we establish an upper bound of $\sum_{k=1}^t \frac{\mathbb{E}[\varepsilon_{k+1}]}{\alpha_k}$. Note that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=1}^t k\beta^k &= \beta \left(\sum_{k=1}^t k\beta^{k-1} \right) = \beta \left(\sum_{k=1}^t \beta^k \right)' = \beta \left(\frac{\beta - \beta^{t+1}}{1 - \beta} \right)' \\ &= \frac{\beta(1 - \beta^{t+1} - (t+1)\beta^t(1 - \beta))}{(1 - \beta)^2} \leq \frac{\beta}{(1 - \beta)^2}. \end{aligned} \quad (54)$$

Hence for any $t \geq 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=1}^t \frac{\beta^k}{\alpha_k} &= \sum_{k=1}^t \mu(k + c_0 - 1)\beta^k = \mu(c_0 - 1) \sum_{k=1}^t \beta^k + \mu \sum_{k=1}^t k\beta^k \\ &\leq \frac{\mu\beta(c_0 - 1)}{1 - \beta} + \frac{\mu\beta}{(1 - \beta)^2}. \end{aligned} \quad (55)$$

Also, note by $c_0 \geq 4$ and (54) that

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{k=1}^t \frac{1}{\alpha_k} \sum_{s=1}^k \beta^{k-s} \alpha_{s-1} &= \sum_{k=1}^t \sum_{s=1}^k \beta^{k-s} \frac{\alpha_{s-1}}{\alpha_k} = \sum_{k=1}^t \sum_{s=1}^k \beta^{k-s} \frac{k+c_0-1}{s+c_0-2} \\
&= \sum_{k=1}^t \sum_{s=1}^k \beta^{k-s} \left(1 + \frac{k-s+1}{s+c_0-2}\right) \leq \sum_{k=1}^t \sum_{s=1}^k \beta^{k-s} (k-s+2) \\
&= 2 \sum_{k=1}^t \sum_{s=0}^{k-1} \beta^s + \sum_{k=1}^t \sum_{s=0}^{k-1} s\beta^s \\
&\leq \sum_{k=1}^t \left(\frac{2}{1-\beta} + \frac{\beta}{(1-\beta)^2} \right) = \frac{(2-\beta)t}{(1-\beta)^2}.
\end{aligned} \tag{56}$$

Similarly to (56), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{k=1}^t \frac{1}{\alpha_k} \sum_{s=1}^{k+1} \beta^{k+1-s} \alpha_{s-1} &= \sum_{k=1}^t \sum_{s=1}^{k+1} \beta^{k+1-s} \left(1 + \frac{k-s+1}{s+c_0-2}\right) \\
&\leq \sum_{k=1}^t \sum_{s=1}^{k+1} \beta^{k-s+1} ((k-s+1)+1) \\
&\leq \sum_{k=1}^t \left(\sum_{s=0}^k s\beta^s + \sum_{s=0}^k \beta^s \right) \\
&\leq \sum_{k=1}^t \left(\frac{1}{1-\beta} + \frac{\beta}{(1-\beta)^2} \right) = \frac{t}{(1-\beta)^2}.
\end{aligned} \tag{57}$$

Note by $c_0 \geq 4$ that for any ≥ 1 ,

$$\lambda_k = \frac{\theta_{k-1}\alpha_{k-1}}{\theta_k\alpha_k} = \frac{(k+c_0-1)^2}{(k+c_0+1)(k+c_0-2)} \leq 3/2.$$

By (12), we obtain that $\mathbb{E}[\|\zeta_{i,k}\|] \leq \sqrt{\mathbb{E}[\|\zeta_{i,k}\|^2]} \leq \nu_i, \forall k \geq 1$. This together with (19) produces

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[\|\sigma(\mathbf{x}_k) - N\hat{v}_{i,k+1}\|] &\leq \theta M_H N \beta^k \\
&+ \theta N \sum_{s=1}^k \beta^{k-s} \alpha_{s-1} \sum_{i=1}^N ((1+2\lambda_{s-1})C_i + (1+2\lambda_{s-1})\nu_i) \\
&\leq \theta M_H N \beta^k + 4\theta N \sum_{i=1}^N (C_i + \nu_i) \sum_{s=1}^k \beta^{k-s} \alpha_{s-1}.
\end{aligned}$$

Then by using (55) and (56), we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{k=1}^t \frac{1}{\alpha_k} \mathbb{E}[\|\sigma(\mathbf{x}_k) - N\hat{v}_{i,k+1}\|] \\
\leq \theta M_H N \mu \beta \left(\frac{c_0-1}{1-\beta} + \frac{1}{(1-\beta)^2} \right) + \frac{4\theta N \sum_{i=1}^N (C_i + \nu_i)(2-\beta)t}{(1-\beta)^2}.
\end{aligned} \tag{58}$$

Similarly, by using (55) and (57), we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{k=1}^t \frac{1}{\alpha_k} \mathbb{E}[\|\sigma(\mathbf{x}_{k+1}) - N\hat{v}_{i,k+2}\|] \\
\leq \theta M_H N \mu \beta^2 \left(\frac{c_0-1}{1-\beta} + \frac{1}{(1-\beta)^2} \right) + \frac{4\theta N \sum_{i=1}^N (C_i + \nu_i)t}{(1-\beta)^2}.
\end{aligned} \tag{59}$$

By recalling the definition of ε_k in (18), we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{k=1}^t \frac{\mathbb{E}[\|\varepsilon_{k+1}\|]}{\alpha_k} &= 2 \sum_{i=1}^N L_{f_i} M_i \sum_{k=1}^t \frac{\mathbb{E}[\|N\hat{v}_{i,k+1} - \sigma(\mathbf{x}_k)\|]}{\alpha_k} \\
&+ 2 \sum_{i=1}^N L_{f_i} M_i \sum_{k=1}^t \frac{\mathbb{E}[\|N\hat{v}_{i,k+2} - \sigma(\mathbf{x}_{k+1})\|]}{\alpha_k} \\
&\leq 2\theta M_H N \mu \beta (1+\beta) \left(\frac{c_0-1}{1-\beta} + \frac{1}{(1-\beta)^2} \right) \sum_{i=1}^N L_{f_i} M_i \\
&+ t \frac{8\theta N \sum_{i=1}^N (C_i + \nu_i)(3-\beta)}{(1-\beta)^2} \sum_{i=1}^N L_{f_i} M_i = c_1 + c_2 t,
\end{aligned}$$

where the last equality follows from the definitions of c_1 and c_2 in (22) and (23). This together with (53) and $\alpha_1\theta_1\lambda_1 = \alpha_0\theta_0 = \frac{c_0(c_0+1)}{\mu(c_0-1)}$ implies that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{(t+c_0+1)(t+c_0)}{2} \mathbb{E}[\widehat{D}(\mathbf{x}_{t+1}, \mathbf{x}^*)] \\
&\leq \theta_1 \mathbb{E}[\widehat{D}(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}^*)] + \frac{(16t+4)\nu^2}{\mu^2} \\
&+ \frac{c_0(c_0-1)C_e}{\mu(c_0-1)} + \frac{4(c_1+c_2t)}{\mu^2}.
\end{aligned} \tag{60}$$

Then the result follows immediately. \square

5. Numerical Simulations

In this section, we validate the algorithm performance through numerical simulation on the Nash-Cournot games (see e.g., [21, 14]). There is a collection of N factories denoted by $\mathcal{N} = \{1, \dots, N\}$ competing over l markets denoted by $\mathcal{L} \triangleq \{1, \dots, L\}$, where each factory i needs to decide its production $x_{i,l}$ at markets l . Then, the cost of production of factory i is defined as $c_i(x_i; \xi_i) = (c_i + \xi_i)^T x_i$, where $x_i \triangleq \text{col}(x_{i,j})_{j=1}^L$, $c_i > 0$ is parameter for factory i , and ξ_i is a random disturbance or noise with zero-mean and bounded variance. The income of factory i is $p_l(S_l; \zeta_l) x_i$, where $S_l = \sum_{i=1}^N x_{i,l}$ denote the aggregate products of all factories delivered to market l . By the law of supply and demand, the price function p_l can be represented by the reverse demand function and is defined as $p_l(S_l; \zeta_l) = d_l + \zeta_l - b_l S_l$, where $d_l > 0$, $b_l > 0$, and ζ_l is zero-mean random disturbance or noise. Then, the factory i 's cost is $\psi_i(x; \xi_i, \zeta_i) = c_i(x_i; \xi_i) - (d + \zeta - BS)^T x_i$, with $d = (d_1, \dots, d_L)^T$, $B = \text{diag}\{b_1, \dots, b_L\}$, $S = \text{col}\{S_1, \dots, S_L\}$ and $\zeta = \text{col}\{\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_L\}$. Finally, factory i 's local optimization problem is $\min_{x_i \in X_i} f_i(x) \triangleq \mathbb{E}[\psi_i(x; \xi_i, \zeta_i)]$, while satisfying a finite capacity constraint X_i .

It is straightforward to verify that the aforementioned Nash-cournot example satisfy the aggregative game formulation (1) with $\sigma(x) = \sum_{i=1}^N x_i$, and $f_i(x, \sigma) = c_i^T x_i - (d - B\sigma)^T x_i$. Then by (3), $F_i(x_i, z) = c_i - d + B(z + x_i)$ and $\phi_i(x) = c_i - d + B(\sum_{i=1}^N x_i + x_i)$. We can verify that Assumptions 2, 3 and 4 hold when the random variables $\xi_i, \zeta_l, i \in \mathcal{N}, l \in \mathcal{L}$ are zero mean with bounded variance. In addition, we set $h(x) = \frac{1}{2}\|x\|_2^2$, then the Bregman divergence becomes $D_h(x, y) = \|x - y\|_2^2$.

Set $N = 20, l = 3$, and let the communication among the factories be described by an undirected time-varying graph. The graph at each iteration is randomly drawn from a set of four graphs, whose union graph is connected. Set the adjacency matrix $W = [w_{ij}]$, where $w_{ij} = \frac{1}{\max\{|N_i|, |N_j|\}}$ for any $i \neq j$ with $(i, j) \in \mathcal{E}$, $w_{ii} = 1 - \sum_{j \neq i} w_{ij}$, and $w_{ij} = 0$, otherwise. Let c_i is drawn from the uniform distribution $U[3, 4]$. The pricing parameters d_l, b_l of market $l \in \mathcal{L}$ are derived from uniform distributions $U[10, 10.5]$ and $U[0.5, 1]$, respectively. The capacity constraint for each $x_{i,l}$ is the same as $x_{i,l} \in [2, 10], \forall i \in \mathcal{N}, l \in \mathcal{L}$. After fixing the problem parameters c_i and d_l , let the random variables $\xi_i, i \in \mathcal{N}$ and $\zeta_l, l \in \mathcal{L}$ be randomly and uniformly from $U[-c_i/8, c_i/8]$ and $U[-d_l/8, d_l/8]$, respectively.

We implement Algorithm 1 and display the empirical results in Fig.1 by averaging of 20 sampling trajectories with the same initial points, with α_k and λ_k choosing as in Theorem 1. Besides, we compare our algorithm with the projected gradient method [25] and extra-gradient method [30] when applied to the stochastic aggregative game considered in this work, but the network aggregate value is still estimated with the dynamical average tracking. The projected gradient method (PGA) requires a simple projection given by

$$x_i^{k+1} := P_{X_i} \left[x_i^k - \alpha_k q_i(x_{i,k}, N\hat{v}_{i,k+1}; \xi_{i,k}) \right],$$

while the extra-gradient method (Extra-G) consists of two steps, requiring two steps of projection evaluation and gradient sample at each iteration.

$$\begin{aligned} \text{(extrapolation)} \quad x_i^{k+1/2} &= P_{X_i} \left[x_i^k - \alpha_k q_i(x_{i,k}, N\hat{v}_{i,k+1}; \xi_{i,k}) \right], \\ \text{(update)} \quad x_i^{k+1} &= P_{X_i} \left[x_i^k - \alpha_k q_i(x_i^{k+1/2}, N\hat{v}_{i,k+1}; \xi_{i,k}) \right]. \end{aligned}$$




Figure 1: Comparisons of Algorithm 1 with the projected gradient method (PGA) and the extra-gradient method (Extra-G). The trajectories are derived by averaging with 20 sample paths.

Fig.1 displays the convergence of the three algorithms, and it shows the superior convergence speed of Algorithm 1 compared to projected gradient method. Though the convergence speed of Algorithm 1 is almost the same as that of the extra-gradient method, the advantage of our method lies in that it only requires a single projection and one sampled gradient, greatly reducing the computing and sampling cost.

6. Conclusions

This paper proposes a distributed operator extrapolation method for stochastic aggregative game based on mirror descent, and shows that the proposed method can achieve the optimal convergence for the class of strongly monotone games. In addition, empirical results demonstrate that our method indeed brings speed-ups. It is of interest to explore the algorithm convergence for monotone games, and extend the operator extrapolation method to the other classes of network games in distributed and stochastic settings.

References

- [1] J. F. Nash, Jr., "Equilibrium points in n -person games," *Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.*, vol. 36, pp. 48–49, 1950.
- [2] M. K. Jensen, "Aggregative games and best-reply potentials," *Economic theory*, vol. 43, no. 1, pp. 45–66, 2010.
- [3] S. Grammatico, F. Parise, M. Colombino, and J. Lygeros, "Decentralized convergence to nash equilibria in constrained deterministic mean field control," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 61, no. 11, pp. 3315–3329, 2015.
- [4] S. Grammatico, "Dynamic control of agents playing aggregative games with coupling constraints," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 62, no. 9, pp. 4537–4548, 2017.
- [5] J. Ghaderi and R. Srikant, "Opinion dynamics in social networks with stubborn agents: Equilibrium and convergence rate," *Automatica*, vol. 50, no. 12, pp. 3209–3215, 2014. [Online]. Available: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0005109814004154>
- [6] F. Parise, S. Grammatico, B. Gentile, and J. Lygeros, "Distributed convergence to nash equilibria in network and average aggregative games," *Automatica*, vol. 117, p. 108959, 2020.
- [7] B. G. Bakshayesh and H. Kebriaei, "Decentralized equilibrium seeking of joint routing and destination planning of electric vehicles: A constrained aggregative game approach," *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems*, pp. 1–10, 2021.
- [8] G. Belgioioso, W. Ananduta, S. Grammatico, and C. Ocampo-Martinez, "Operationally-safe peer-to-peer energy trading in distribution grids: A game-theoretic market-clearing mechanism," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2107.13444*, 2021.
- [9] Z. Deng, "Distributed algorithm design for aggregative games of euler-lagrange systems and its application to smart grids," *IEEE Transactions on Cybernetics*, pp. 1–11, 2021.
- [10] L. S. Shapley, "Stochastic games," *Proceedings of the national academy of sciences*, vol. 39, no. 10, pp. 1095–1100, 1953.
- [11] J. Lei, U. V. Shanbhag, J.-S. Pang, and S. Sen, "On synchronous, asynchronous, and randomized best-response schemes for stochastic nash games," *Mathematics of Operations Research*, vol. 45, no. 1, pp. 157–190, 2020.
- [12] J. Lei and U. V. Shanbhag, "Linearly convergent variable sample-size schemes for stochastic Nash games: Best-response schemes and distributed gradient-response schemes," in *2018 58th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control*. IEEE, 2018, pp. 3547–3552.
- [13] E. Meigs, F. Parise, and A. Ozdaglar, "Learning in repeated stochastic network aggregative games," in *2019 IEEE 58th Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*. IEEE, 2019, pp. 6918–6923.
- [14] J. Lei, P. Yi, and L. Li, "Distributed no-regret learning for stochastic aggregative games over networks," in *2021 40th Chinese Control Conference (CCC)*. IEEE, 2021, pp. 7512–7519.
- [15] B. Franci and S. Grammatico, "Stochastic generalized nash equilibrium seeking under partial-decision information," *Automatica*, vol. 137, p. 110101, 2022.
- [16] P. Frihauf, M. Krstic, and T. Basar, "Nash equilibrium seeking in non-cooperative games," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 57, no. 5, pp. 1192–1207, 2012.
- [17] G. Belgioioso and S. Grammatico, "Semi-decentralized Nash equilibrium seeking in aggregative games with separable coupling constraints and non-differentiable cost functions," *IEEE control systems letters*, vol. 1, no. 2, pp. 400–405, 2017.

- [18] M. Ye and G. Hu, "Distributed Nash equilibrium seeking by a consensus based approach," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 62, no. 9, pp. 4811–4818, 2017.
- [19] U. V. Shanbhag, J.-S. Pang, and S. Sen, "Inexact best-response schemes for stochastic Nash games: Linear convergence and iteration complexity analysis," in *Decision and Control (CDC), 2016 IEEE 55th Conference on*. IEEE, 2016, pp. 3591–3596.
- [20] F. Salehisadaghiani and L. Pavel, "Distributed Nash equilibrium seeking in networked graphical games," *Automatica*, vol. 87, pp. 17–24, 2018.
- [21] P. Yi and L. Pavel, "An operator splitting approach for distributed generalized Nash equilibria computation," *Automatica*, vol. 102, pp. 111–121, 2019.
- [22] Z. Zhou, P. Mertikopoulos, A. L. Moustakas, N. Bambos, and P. Glynn, "Mirror descent learning in continuous games," in *2017 IEEE 56th Annual Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*, 2017, pp. 5776–5783.
- [23] J. Lei, U. V. Shanbhag, J.-S. Pang, and S. Sen, "On synchronous, asynchronous, and randomized best-response schemes for stochastic Nash games," *Mathematics of Operations Research*, vol. 45, no. 1, pp. 157–190, 2020.
- [24] T. Tatarenko, W. Shi, and A. Nedić, "Geometric convergence of gradient play algorithms for distributed Nash equilibrium seeking," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 66, no. 11, pp. 5342–5353, 2021.
- [25] J. Koshal, A. Nedić, and U. V. Shanbhag, "Distributed algorithms for aggregative games on graphs," *Operations Research*, vol. 64, no. 3, pp. 680–704, 2016.
- [26] J. Lei, U. V. Shanbhag, and J. Chen, "Distributed computation of Nash equilibria for monotone aggregative games via iterative regularization," in *2020 59th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*, 2020, pp. 2285–2290.
- [27] R. Zhu, J. Zhang, K. You, and T. Başar, "Asynchronous networked aggregative games," *Automatica*, vol. 136, Feb. 2022.
- [28] S. Liang, P. Yi, and Y. Hong, "Distributed nash equilibrium seeking for aggregative games with coupled constraints," *Automatica*, vol. 85, pp. 179–185, 2017.
- [29] J. Lei and U. V. Shanbhag, "Linearly convergent variable sample-size schemes for stochastic Nash games: Best-response schemes and distributed gradient-response schemes," in *2018 IEEE Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*, 2018, pp. 3547–3552.
- [30] C. D. Enrich, S. Jelassi, C. Domingo-Enrich, D. Scieur, A. Mensch, and J. Bruna, "Extragradient with player sampling for faster Nash equilibrium finding," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1905.12363*, 2019.
- [31] Y. Malitsky, "Projected reflected gradient methods for monotone variational inequalities," *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, vol. 25, no. 1, pp. 502–520, 2015.
- [32] G. Kotsalis, G. Lan, and T. Li, "Simple and optimal methods for stochastic variational inequalities, I: operator extrapolation," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2011.02987*, 2020.
- [33] A. Nedić and A. Ozdaglar, "Distributed subgradient methods for multi-agent optimization," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 54, no. 1, pp. 48–61, 2009.
- [34] F. Facchinei and J.-S. Pang, *Finite-dimensional variational inequalities and complementarity problems. Vol. I*, ser. Springer Series in Operations Research. New York: Springer-Verlag, 2003.
- [35] M. Bravo, D. Leslie, and P. Mertikopoulos, "Bandit learning in concave n-person games," *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 31, pp. 5661–5671, 2018.
- [36] G. Lan, *First-order and Stochastic Optimization Methods for Machine Learning*. Springer Nature, 2020.