

# BEST-RESPONSE DYNAMICS IN TWO-PERSON RANDOM GAMES WITH CORRELATED PAYOFFS

HLAFO ALFIE MIMUN<sup>†</sup>, MATTEO QUATTROPANI<sup>\*</sup>, AND MARCO SCARSINI<sup>†</sup>

**ABSTRACT.** We consider finite two-player normal form games with random payoffs. Player A's payoffs are i.i.d. from a uniform distribution. Given  $p \in [0, 1]$ , for any action profile, player B's payoff coincides with player A's payoff with probability  $p$  and is i.i.d. from the same uniform distribution with probability  $1 - p$ . This model interpolates the model of i.i.d. random payoff used in most of the literature and the model of random potential games. First we study the number of pure Nash equilibria in the above class of games. Then we show that, for any positive  $p$ , asymptotically in the number of available actions, best response dynamics reaches a pure Nash equilibrium with high probability.

*Keywords:* pure Nash equilibrium, random games, potential games, best response dynamics.

*Mathematics Subject Classification 2020:* 91A05, 91A26, 91A14.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

**1.1. The problem.** Consider the class of two-person normal-form finite games. Some properties hold for the entire class, for instance, the mixed extension of each game in the class admits a Nash equilibrium (Nash, 1950, 1951). Some properties hold generically, for instance, generically the number of Nash equilibria is finite and odd (Wilson, 1971, Harsanyi, 1973). Some properties do not hold generically and neither does their negation; for instance having a pure Nash equilibrium or not having a pure Nash equilibrium is not a generic property of finite games. Still, it may be relevant to know how likely it is for a finite game to admit a pure equilibrium. Along a similar line of investigation, how likely is a recursive procedure—such as best response dynamics—to reach a pure Nash equilibrium in finite time?

One way to formalize these questions is to assume that the game is drawn at random according to some probability measure. It is not clear what a natural probability measure is in this setting; a good part of the literature on the topic has focused on measures that make the payoffs i.i.d. with zero probability of ties. Few papers have relaxed this assumption. For instance, Rinott and Scarsini (2000) considered payoff vectors that are i.i.d. across different action profiles, but can have some positive or negative dependence within the same action profile. Amiet et al. (2021b) considered i.i.d. payoffs whose distribution may have atoms and, as a consequence, may produce ties. Durand and Gaujal (2016) studied the class of random potential games, i.e., a class of games that admit a potential having i.i.d. entries.

**1.2. Our contribution.** In this paper we want to study two-person games with random payoffs where the stochastic model for the payoffs parametrically interpolates the case of i.i.d. payoffs with no ties and the case of random potential games. In particular, we start with a model where all payoffs are i.i.d. according to a continuous distribution function (without loss of generality, uniform on  $[0, 1]$ ) and we consider an i.i.d. set of coin tosses, one for each action profile. If the toss gives head, then the original payoff of the second player is made equal to the payoff of the first player; if the toss gives tail, the payoff remains unchanged. The relevant parameter is the probability  $p$  of getting heads in the coin toss. If  $p = 0$ , we obtain the classical model of random games with continuous i.i.d. payoffs. If  $p = 1$ , we get the model of common-interest random games.

From the viewpoint of pure Nash equilibria (PNE) any potential game is strategically equivalent to a common-interest game. Therefore, the above class of games parametrically interpolates the case of i.i.d. payoffs with no ties and the case of random potential games. When  $p$  is small, the game is close to a game with i.i.d. payoffs; when  $p$  is large, the game is close to a potential game.

For this parametric class of games we first compute the expected number of PNE as a function of  $p$ , and then study its asymptotic behavior as the numbers of actions of the two players diverge, possibly at different speeds. It is well known (Powers, 1990) that, as the number of action increases, the asymptotic distribution of the number of PNE is a Poisson(1) distribution, for i.i.d. random payoffs. Our result shows an interesting phase transition around  $p = 0$ , in the sense that for every  $p > 0$  the expected number of PNE diverges.

We then consider best response dynamics (BRD) for the above class of games. Durand and Gaujal (2016) considered BRD for random potential games with an arbitrary number of players and the same number of actions for each player. In this class of games a PNE is reached by a BRD in finite time. Durand and Gaujal (2016) studied the asymptotic behavior of the expectation of this random time. In our paper we first consider potential games and we compute the distribution of the time that the BRD needs to reach a PNE. Moreover we compute exactly the first two moments of this random time, when the two players have the same action set.

Amiet et al. (2021a) showed that, for games with i.i.d. continuous payoffs, when players have the same action set, as the number of actions increases, the probability that a BRD reaches a PNE goes to zero. Here we prove that for every positive  $p$ , asymptotically in the number of actions, a BRD reaches a PNE in finite time with probability arbitrarily close to 1. Again this shows a phase transition in  $p = 0$  for the behavior of the BRD.

Finally, we generalize the result of Amiet et al. (2021a) to the case of possibly different action sets for the two players.

**1.3. Related literature.** Games with random payoffs have been studied for more than sixty years. We refer the reader to Amiet et al. (2021b), Heinrich et al. (2021) for an extensive survey of the literature on the topic. Here we mention just some recent papers and some articles that are more directly connected with the results of our paper. Powers (1990) proved that in random games with i.i.d. payoffs having a continuous distribution, as the number of actions of at least two players diverges, the asymptotic distribution of the number of PNE is Poisson(1). Stanford (1995) computed the exact nonasymptotic form of this distribution, from which the result in Powers (1990) can be obtained as a corollary. Rinott and Scarsini (2000) relaxed the hypothesis of i.i.d. payoffs, retaining independence of payoffs corresponding to different action profiles, but allowing dependence within the payoffs within the same profile. They proved an interesting phase transition in terms of the payoffs' correlation: asymptotically in either the number of players or the number of actions, for negative dependence the number of PNE goes to 0, for positive dependence it diverges, and for independence it is Poisson(1), as proved by Powers (1990).

Pei and Takahashi (2019) studied point-rationalizable strategies in two-person random games. Since the number of point-rationalizable strategies for each player is weakly larger than the number of PNE, they were interested in the typical magnitude of the difference between these two numbers. A game is dominance solvable if iterated elimination of strictly dominated strategies leads to a unique action profile, which must be a PNE. Alon et al. (2021) used recent combinatoric results to prove that the probability that a two-person random game is dominance solvable vanishes with the number of actions.

Several papers studied the behavior of various learning dynamics BRD in games with random payoffs. For instance, Galla and Farmer (2013) studied a type of reinforcement learning called experience-weighted attraction in two-person games and showed the existence of three different regimes in terms of convergence to equilibria. Sanders et al. (2018) extended their analysis to

games with an arbitrary finite number of players. Pangallo et al. (2019) compared through simulation the behavior of various adaptive learning procedures in games whose payoffs are drawn at random. Heinrich et al. (2021) compared the behavior of BRD in games with random payoffs, when the order of acting players is fixed vs when it is random and they showed that, asymptotically in either the number of players or the number of strategies, the fixed-order BRD converges with vanishing probability, whereas the random-order does converge to a PNE whenever it exists. Similar results were obtained by Wiese and Heinrich (2022).

Coucheney et al. (2014), Durand and Gaujal (2016), Durand et al. (2019) focused on random potential games and measured the speed of convergence of BRD to a PNE. Amiet et al. (2021a) dealt with two-person games where the players have the same action set and payoffs are i.i.d. with a continuous distribution. They compared the behavior of best response dynamics and better response dynamics. They proved that, asymptotically in the number of actions, the first reaches a PNE only with vanishing probability, whereas the second does reach it, whenever it exists. Amiet et al. (2021b) studied a class of games with  $n$  players and two actions for each player where the payoffs are i.i.d. but their distribution may have atoms. They proved that the relevant parameter for the analysis of this class of games is the probability of ties in the payoffs, called  $\alpha$ . They showed that, whenever this parameter is positive, the number of PNE diverges, as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  and proved a central limit theorem for this random variable. Moreover, using percolation techniques, they studied the asymptotic behavior of BRD, as a function of  $\alpha$ , and they showed a phase transition at  $\alpha = 1/2$ .

Potential functions in games were introduced by Rosenthal (1973) and their properties were extensively studied by Monderer and Shapley (1996). Among them, existence of PNE and convergence to one of these equilibria of the most common learning procedures, including BRD.

Goemans et al. (2005) introduced the concept of sink equilibrium. Sink equilibria are strongly connected stable sets of action profiles that are never abandoned once reached by a BRD. A sink equilibrium that is not a PNE is what in this paper is called a trap.

Fabrikant et al. (2013) studied the class of weakly acyclical games, i.e., the class of games for which from every strategy profile, there exists some better-response improvement path that leads from that strategy profile to a PNE. This class includes potential games and dominance solvable games as particular cases.

The goal of our paper is to consider probability measures on spaces of finite noncooperative games that go beyond the usual assumption of i.i.d. payoffs. In particular, we define a parametric family of probability measures that interpolates random games with i.i.d. payoffs and random potential games. The interpolation is achieved locally by acting on each action profile of the game and replacing—with some fixed probability and independently across profiles—the payoff of the second player with the payoff of the first player. A different interpolation could be achieved by considering a convex combination of a game with i.i.d. payoffs and a random potential game. This was done, e.g., in Rinott and Scarsini (2000), where the payoffs are Gaussian vectors obtained by summing to each entry of an i.i.d. Gaussian vector, a common (independent) Gaussian random variable (which plays the role of the *random potential*). This approach is somehow comparable with the idea of decomposing the space of finite games proposed by Candogan et al. (2011). This decomposition was then used by Candogan et al. (2013) to analyze BRD in games that are close to potential games.

**1.4. Organization of the paper.** Section 2 introduces some basic game theoretic concepts. Section 3 defines the parametric family of distributions on the space of games and deals with the number of PNE in games with random payoffs. Section 4 studies the behavior of BRD in games with random payoffs in the above parametric class, for different values of the parameter. Section 5 contains all the proofs. Section 6 lists the symbols used throughout the paper.

**1.5. Notation.** Given an integer  $n$ , the symbol  $[n]$  indicates the set  $\{1, \dots, n\}$ . Given a finite set  $A$ , the symbol  $|A|$  denotes its cardinality. The symbol  $\sqcup$  denotes the union of disjoint sets. We use the notation  $x \wedge y := \min\{x, y\}$ . The symbol  $\xrightarrow{P}$  denotes convergence in probability.

Given two nonnegative sequences  $h_n, g_n$ , we use the following common asymptotic notations:

$$h_n = o(g_n) \quad \text{if} \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{h_n}{g_n} = 0, \quad (1.1)$$

$$h_n = \mathcal{O}(g_n) \quad \text{if} \quad \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{h_n}{g_n} < \infty, \quad (1.2)$$

$$h_n = \Omega(g_n) \quad \text{if} \quad \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{h_n}{g_n} > 0, \quad (1.3)$$

$$h_n = \omega(g_n) \quad \text{if} \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{h_n}{g_n} = \infty, \quad (1.4)$$

$$h_n = \Theta(g_n) \quad \text{if} \quad h_n = \mathcal{O}(g_n) \quad \text{and} \quad h_n = \Omega(g_n). \quad (1.5)$$

## 2. PRELIMINARIES

We consider two-person normal-form games where, for  $i \in \{A, B\}$ , player  $i$ 's action set is  $[K^i]$  and  $U^i: [K^A] \times [K^B] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is player  $i$ 's payoff function. The game is defined by the payoff bimatrix

$$U := (U^A, U^B), \quad (2.1)$$

where, for  $i \in \{A, B\}$ ,

$$U^i := (U^i(a, b))_{a \in [K^A], b \in [K^B]}. \quad (2.2)$$

A *pure Nash equilibrium* (PNE) of the game is a pair  $(a^*, b^*)$  of actions such that, for all  $a \in [K^A], b \in [K^B]$  we have

$$U^A(a^*, b^*) \geq U^A(a, b^*) \quad \text{and} \quad U^B(a^*, b^*) \geq U^B(a^*, b). \quad (2.3)$$

As is well known, PNE are not guaranteed to exist. A class of games that admits PNE is the class of *potential games*, i.e., games for which there exists a *potential function*  $\Psi: [K^A] \times [K^B] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  such that for all  $a, a' \in [K^A]$ , for all  $b, b' \in [K^B]$ , we have

$$U^A(a, b) - U^A(a', b) = \Psi(a, b) - \Psi(a', b), \quad (2.4a)$$

$$U^B(a, b) - U^B(a, b') = \Psi(a, b) - \Psi(a, b'). \quad (2.4b)$$

Games of *common interest*, i.e., games for which  $U^A = U^B$ , are a particular case of potential games. As far as PNE are concerned, every potential game is strategically equivalent to a common interest game, for instance to the game where  $U^A = U^B = \Psi$ . For the properties of potential games with an arbitrary number of players, we refer the reader to [Monderer and Shapley \(1996\)](#).

Given a finite game, it is interesting to see whether an equilibrium can be reached iteratively by allowing players to deviate whenever they have an incentive to do so. In particular, we will consider a procedure where, starting from a fixed action profile, players in alternation choose their best response to the other player's action. If the procedure gets stuck in an action profile, then it has reached a pure Nash equilibrium. In general, there is no guarantee that this occurs.

The *best response dynamics* (BRD) is a learning algorithm taking as input a two-player game  $(U^A, U^B)$  and a starting strategy profile  $(a_0, b_0)$ . For each  $t \geq 0$  we consider  $\text{BRD}(t)$  on  $[K^A] \times [K^B]$  such that

$$\text{BRD}(0) = (a_0, b_0) \quad (2.5)$$

and, if  $\text{BRD}(t) = (a', b')$ , then, for  $t$  even,

$$\text{BRD}(t+1) = (a'', b'), \quad (2.6)$$

where  $a' \neq a'' \in \arg \max_{a \in [K^A]} U^A(a, b')$ , if such an action  $a''$  exists, otherwise

$$\text{BRD}(t+1) = \text{BRD}(t); \quad (2.7)$$

for  $t$  odd,

$$\text{BRD}(t+1) = (a', b''), \quad (2.8)$$

where  $b' \neq b'' \in \arg \max_{b \in [K^B]} U^B(a', b)$ , if such an action  $b''$  exists, otherwise

$$\text{BRD}(t+1) = \text{BRD}(t). \quad (2.9)$$

It is easy to see that, if, for some  $\hat{t}$ ,

$$\text{BRD}(\hat{t}) = \text{BRD}(\hat{t}+1) = \text{BRD}(\hat{t}+2) = (a^*, b^*), \quad (2.10)$$

then  $\text{BRD}(t) = (a^*, b^*)$  for all  $t \geq \hat{t}$  and  $(a^*, b^*)$  is a PNE of the game.

The algorithm stops when it visits an action profile for the second time. If this profile is the same as the one visited at the previous time, then a PNE has been reached.

**Definition 2.1.** A *trap* is a finite set  $\mathcal{T}$  of action profiles such that

- (a)  $|\mathcal{T}| \geq 2$ ,
- (b) if  $\text{BRD}(t) \in \mathcal{T}$ , then  $\text{BRD}(t+1) \in \mathcal{T}$ ;
- (c) for every  $(a, b) \in \mathcal{T}$ , there exists  $t$  such that  $\text{BRD}(t+k|\mathcal{T}|) = (a, b)$ , for every  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ .

Notice that the definition of BRD implies that for every trap  $\mathcal{T}$  we have  $|\mathcal{T}| \geq 4$  and  $|\mathcal{T}|$  even. Moreover, for every game  $(U^A, U^B)$  and every initial profile  $(a, b)$ , the BRD eventually visits a PNE or a trap in finite time, say  $\tau$ .

Even if the game admits PNE, there is no guarantee that a BRD reaches one of them; it could cycle over a trap, i.e., it could start to periodically visit the same set of action profiles and never stabilize. On the other hand, if the game is a potential game, then a BRD always reaches a PNE.

The goal of this paper is to study the number of PNE and the behavior of BRD in a “typical” game. To make sense of the above sentence, we need to formalize the meaning of the term typical. The approach that we will take is stochastic. That is, we will assume the bimatrix  $U$  to be random and drawn from a distribution that will be specified later. Under this assumption, the set NE of PNE is a (possibly empty) random subset of  $[K^A] \times [K^B]$  and the number of PNE is an integer-valued random variable. Moreover, we will be able to speak about the probability that BRD converges (to a PNE).

### 3. NUMBER OF PURE NASH EQUILIBRIA IN RANDOM GAMES

As mentioned in the Introduction, several attempts have been made in the literature to put a probability measure on a space of games. Most of the existing papers assume all the entries of  $U$  to be i.i.d. with a continuous marginal distribution. There are some notable exceptions to the independence assumption. [Rinott and Scarsini \(2000\)](#) considered a setting where the action profiles have a continuous distribution and are i.i.d., but some dependence is allowed within each profile. [Durand and Gaujal \(2016\)](#) considered random potential games where the entries of the potential are i.i.d. with a continuous distribution.

Our stochastic model is quite general, since—in a sense that will be made precise—it interpolates the i.i.d. payoffs and the random potential.

Consider a continuous distribution function  $F$ . This is the marginal distribution of each one the entries of  $U$ . It is not difficult to see that, if every payoff is transformed using the same strictly increasing function, then the new game has the same PNE as the original one. This implies that any game with random equally and continuously distributed payoffs is strategically equivalent to



a game where the payoffs have a uniform distribution on  $[0, 1]$ . Therefore, for the sake of convenience, we will assume that  $F$  is uniform on  $[0, 1]$ .

Start with  $(U^A, U^B)$ , where all the entries are i.i.d. with distribution  $F$ . Then, for each action profile  $(a, b)$ , with probability  $p$  replace  $U^B(a, b)$  with  $U^A(a, b)$ . In other words, for every pair  $(a, b)$ ,

- with probability  $1 - p$ , the random payoffs  $U^A(a, b)$  and  $U^B(a, b)$  are independent,
- with probability  $p$ , we have  $U^A(a, b) = U^B(a, b)$ .

The larger  $p$ , the closer the game is to a potential game. The smaller  $p$ , the closer the game is to a random game with i.i.d. payoffs. The game whose payoff bimatrix is obtained as above will be denoted by  $U(p)$ .

The analysis of this class of games is quite complicated for fixed  $K^A, K^B$ . Therefore, as it is done in much of the literature, we will take an asymptotic approach, letting the number of actions grow. More formally, we will consider a sequence  $(U_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  of payoff bimatrices, where the numbers of actions in game  $U_n$  are  $K_n^A, K_n^B$ , and these two integer sequences are increasing in  $n$  and diverge to  $\infty$ . In particular, we allow the number of actions of the two players to diverge at different speeds.

We now compute the expected number of PNE in the above-defined class of random games.

**Proposition 3.1.** *If  $W$  is the number of PNE in the game  $U(p)$ , then*

$$\mathbb{E}[W] = p \frac{K^A K^B}{K^A + K^B - 1} + (1 - p). \quad (3.1)$$

The following corollary shows the asymptotic behavior of the ratio between the random number of PNE and the cardinality of the smaller action set. In what follows, all the asymptotic equalities hold for  $n \rightarrow \infty$ .

**Corollary 3.2.** *If  $K_n^B = \omega(K_n^A)$  and  $W_n$  is the number of PNE in the game  $U_n$ , then*

$$\frac{W_n}{K_n^A} \xrightarrow{P} p. \quad (3.2)$$

*If  $K_n^B = \alpha_n K_n^A$ , with  $\alpha_n \rightarrow \alpha$ , then*

$$\frac{W_n}{K_n^A} \xrightarrow{P} \frac{\alpha}{\alpha + 1} p. \quad (3.3)$$

*In particular, if  $K_n^A = K_n^B = K_n$ , then*

$$\frac{W_n}{K_n} \xrightarrow{P} \frac{p}{2}. \quad (3.4)$$

When  $p = 0$ , i.e., the payoffs are i.i.d., the number of PNE converges in distribution to a Poisson with parameter 1 (see Powers, 1990). When the payoffs within the same action profile are positively correlated, Rinott and Scarsini (2000) showed that the number of PNE diverges. A similar phenomenon happens here when  $p > 0$ .

Instead of proving Corollary 3.2, we will actually prove the following stronger result, where we allow the parameter  $p$  to vary with  $n$ . The proof uses a second-moment argument.

**Proposition 3.3.** *If  $p_n = \omega(1/\sqrt{K_n})$ , then*

$$\frac{K_n^A + K_n^B}{p_n K_n^A K_n^B} W_n \xrightarrow{P} 1. \quad (3.5)$$

#### 4. BEST RESPONSE DYNAMICS

We now want to study the behavior of BRD in the class of random games introduced in [Section 3](#).

First notice that the continuity of  $F$  implies that the probability of ties in the payoffs is zero; as a consequence, once the game is realized, a BRD is almost surely deterministic. In this respect, the symbols P and E refer solely to the randomness of the payoffs, not to any randomness in the BRD.

Moreover, the symmetry of our model implies that, without loss of generality, we can assume the starting position of the BRD to be any fixed profile, for instance  $(1, 1)$ .

**4.1. Potential games.** We start studying the case of  $p = 1$ , i.e., the case of potential games. In the following proposition we obtain the distribution of the first time the BRD reaches a PNE. For the sake of brevity, we write  $\text{NE}_n$  for the (random) set of PNE in the game  $\mathcal{U}_n(p_n)$ .

Define

$$\tau_n^{\text{NE}} := \min\{t: \text{BRD}_n(t) \in \text{NE}_n\}, \quad (4.1)$$

$$q_{t,n} := \mathbb{P}\left(\tau_n^{\text{NE}} = t \mid \tau_n^{\text{NE}} \geq t\right) \quad \text{for all } t \in \{0, \dots, 2K_n - 2\}, \quad (4.2)$$

$$R_n(t) := \{(a, b): \text{either } \text{BRD}_n(s) = (a', b) \text{ or } \text{BRD}_n(s) = (a, b'), \\ \text{for some } a' \in [K_n^{\text{A}}], b' \in [K_n^{\text{B}}] \text{ and } s \leq t\}, \quad (4.3)$$

and

$$r_n(t) := \left\lfloor \frac{t+1}{2} \right\rfloor K_n^{\text{A}} + \left\lfloor \frac{t+1}{2} \right\rfloor K_n^{\text{B}} - \left\lfloor \frac{t+1}{2} \right\rfloor \left\lfloor \frac{t+1}{2} \right\rfloor, \quad \text{for } t \geq 1. \quad (4.4)$$

In words,  $\tau_n^{\text{NE}}$  is the first time the process  $\text{BRD}_n(t)$  visits a PNE;  $q_{t,n}$  is the probability that a PNE will be reached at time  $t$ , given that it has not been reached before; and  $R_n(t)$  is the set of all action profiles  $(a, b)$  belonging to either a row or a column that  $\text{BRD}_n$  has already visited by time  $t$ .

**Lemma 4.1.** *Let  $p_n = 1$ . Then, for all  $0 < t \leq \tau_n^{\text{NE}}$ ,*

$$|R_n(t)| = r_n(t). \quad (4.5)$$

Moreover,

$$q_{0,n} = \frac{1}{K_n^{\text{A}} + K_n^{\text{B}} - 1}, \quad (4.6)$$

$$q_{1,n} = \frac{K_n^{\text{A}} - 1}{K_n^{\text{A}} + K_n^{\text{B}} - 2}, \quad (4.7)$$

and, for  $t \geq 2$ ,

$$q_{t,n} = \frac{r_n(t-1)}{r_n(t)}. \quad (4.8)$$

**Theorem 4.2.** *With the definitions of [Lemma 4.1](#), we have*

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\tau_n^{\text{NE}} > t\right) = \prod_{j=0}^t (1 - q_{j,n}). \quad (4.9)$$

The following proposition provides the asymptotic expectation and variance of  $\tau_n^{\text{NE}}$  when the two players have the same action set.

**Proposition 4.3.** *If  $p_n = 1$  and  $K_n^A = K_n^B$ , for every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , then*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \left[ \tau_n^{\text{NE}} \right] = e - 1 \quad (4.10)$$

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \text{Var} \left[ \tau_n^{\text{NE}} \right] \approx 0.767. \quad (4.11)$$

We point out that our expression for  $\mathbb{E} \left[ \tau_n^{\text{NE}} \right]$  coincides with the one in [Durand and Gaujal \(2016, theorem 4\)](#), but the proof techniques exploited in [Theorem 4.2](#) are completely different from the ones used by [Durand and Gaujal \(2016\)](#); moreover, our analysis considers the whole distribution of  $\tau_n^{\text{NE}}$  and not just its expectation.

**4.2. The general case.** In a recent paper [Amiet et al. \(2021a\)](#) show that, when  $p = 0$  and  $K_n^A = K_n^B$ , with high probability the BRD does not converge to the set  $\text{NE}_n$ .

In this paper we complement such a negative result by showing that a tiny bit of correlation in the players payoffs, namely  $p_n > 0$ , is enough to dramatically change this phenomenon.

**Theorem 4.4.** *Fix a sequence  $p_n$ . If*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log(p_n)}{\log(K_n^A \wedge K_n^B)} = 0, \quad (4.12)$$

*then*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P} \left( \tau_n^{\text{NE}} < \infty \right) = 1. \quad (4.13)$$

In other words, [Theorem 4.4](#) shows that if  $p_n$  is not too close to zero, an equilibrium will be found in time that is of order  $p_n^{-\mathcal{O}(1)}$ .

In particular, if  $p_n = p > 0$ , for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , then a sufficiently large but constant time is enough to find an equilibrium with high probability. This is stated rigorously in the next corollary.

**Corollary 4.5.** *Let  $p_n = p \in (0, 1)$ , for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , and  $K_n^A \wedge K_n^B \rightarrow \infty$ . Then, for all  $\varepsilon > 0$ , there exists some  $T = T(\varepsilon)$  such that*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P} \left( \tau_n^{\text{NE}} < T \right) > 1 - \varepsilon. \quad (4.14)$$

*Remark 4.6.* Notice that, in this setting, the expectation of the random variable  $\tau_n^{\text{NE}}$  is always unbounded, even when  $p_n \rightarrow 1$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  arbitrarily fast. In fact, if  $p_n \neq 1$ , for every finite  $n$ , with positive probability  $\tau_n^{\text{NE}} = \infty$ , leading to an infinite expectation.

**4.3. The i.i.d. rectangular case.** [Amiet et al. \(2021a, theorem 2.3\)](#) proved that, when the payoffs are i.i.d. and  $K_n^A = K_n^B$ , the BRD ends in a trap with probability converging to 1, as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . As a counterpart of [Theorem 4.2](#), we want to extend their result to the general setting  $K_n^A \neq K_n^B$ .

**Proposition 4.7.** *If  $p = 0$ , then*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}(\tau_n^{\text{NE}} < \infty) = 0. \quad (4.15)$$

Even though the result in [Proposition 4.7](#) can be achieved by naturally adapting the proof of [Amiet et al. \(2021a, theorem 2.3\)](#) to the rectangular case, for completeness we present a detailed proof in [Section 5](#).

## 5. PROOFS

### Proofs of [Section 3](#).



*Proof of Proposition 3.1.* By linearity of expectation, we have

$$\mathbb{E}[W] = K^A K^B \mathbb{P}((1, 1) \in \text{NE}). \quad (5.1)$$

Conditioning on the event  $\{U^A(1, 1) = U^B(1, 1)\}$  and using the law of total probability, we get

$$\mathbb{P}((1, 1) \in \text{NE}) = p \frac{1}{K^A + K^B - 1} + (1 - p) \frac{1}{K^A K^B}. \quad (5.2)$$

To see that Eq. (5.2) holds, consider the following: when  $U^A(1, 1) = U^B(1, 1)$ , the profile  $(1, 1)$  is a PNE if and only if  $U^A(1, 1)$  is larger than or equal to all payoffs  $U^A(a, 1)$  and all payoffs  $U^B(1, b)$  for all  $a \in [K^A]$  and all  $b \in [K^B]$ . By symmetry, this happens with probability  $1/(K^A + K^B - 1)$ . On the other hand, when  $U^A(1, 1) \neq U^B(1, 1)$ , the profile  $(1, 1)$  is a PNE if and only if  $U^A(1, 1)$  is larger than or equal to all payoffs  $U^A(a, 1)$  for all  $a \in [K^A]$  and  $U^B(1, 1)$  is larger than or equal to all payoffs  $U^B(1, b)$  for all  $b \in [K^B]$ . By independence of the payoffs and by symmetry, this happens with probability  $1/K^A K^B$ . Plugging Eq. (5.2) into Eq. (5.1), we get the result.  $\square$

*Proof of Proposition 3.3.* Define, for every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,

$$K_n := \min(K_n^A, K_n^B) \quad (5.3)$$

and let  $W_n$  be the random number of PNE in the game  $U_n(p_n)$ , as in Corollary 3.2.

By Proposition 3.1 we get

$$\mathbb{E}[W_n] = p_n \frac{K_n^A K_n^B}{K_n^A + K_n^B - 1} + (1 - p_n) = (1 + o(1)) p_n \frac{K_n^A K_n^B}{K_n^A + K_n^B}, \quad (5.4)$$

where, in the asymptotic equality we used the fact that  $p_n \sqrt{K_n} \rightarrow \infty$ . This shows that  $\mathbb{E}[W_n] \rightarrow \infty$ .

We now show that  $W_n$  concentrates around its expectation. To this end, we use an upper bound on the second moment of  $W_n$ . Notice that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[W_n^2] &= \mathbb{E} \left[ \left( \sum_{(a,b) \in [K_n^A] \times [K_n^B]} \mathbb{1}_{(a,b) \in \text{NE}_n} \right)^2 \right] \\ &= \sum_{(a,b) \in [K_n^A] \times [K_n^B]} \sum_{(a',b') \in [K_n^A] \times [K_n^B]} \mathbb{P}((a,b), (a',b') \in \text{NE}_n). \end{aligned} \quad (5.5)$$

The continuity of  $F$  implies that, if either  $a = a'$  or  $b = b'$ , then

$$\mathbb{P}((a,b), (a',b') \in \text{NE}_n) = 0. \quad (5.6)$$

If  $a \neq a'$  and  $b \neq b'$ , then the event  $(a',b') \in \text{NE}_n$  depends on the event  $(a,b) \in \text{NE}_n$  only through the payoffs  $U^A(a',b)$  and  $U^B(a,b')$ . Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}((a,b), (a',b') \in \text{NE}_n) &= \mathbb{P}((a,b) \in \text{NE}_n) \mathbb{P}((a',b') \in \text{NE}_n \mid (a,b) \in \text{NE}_n) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}((a,b) \in \text{NE}_n) \mathbb{P} \left( U^A(a',b) = \max_{a'' \in K_n^A \setminus \{a\}} U^A(a'',b), \right. \\ &\quad \left. U^B(a',b') = \max_{b'' \in [K_n^B] \setminus \{b\}} U^B(a',b'') \right) \\ &= \mathbb{P}((a,b) \in \text{NE}_n) \left( p_n \frac{1}{K_n^A + K_n^B - 3} + (1 - p_n) \frac{1}{(K_n^A - 1)(K_n^B - 1)} \right) \\ &= (1 + o(1)) (\mathbb{P}((a,b) \in \text{NE}_n))^2, \end{aligned} \quad (5.7)$$

where the last equality stems from Eq. (5.2). This yields

$$\mathbb{E}[W_n^2] = (1 + o(1)) (\mathbb{E}[W_n])^2. \quad (5.8)$$

By Chebyshev's inequality, we have that, for every  $\varepsilon > 0$ ,

$$\mathbb{P}(|W_n - \mathbb{E}[W_n]| \geq \varepsilon \mathbb{E}[W_n]) \leq \frac{\mathbb{E}[W_n^2] - (\mathbb{E}[W_n])^2}{\varepsilon^2 (\mathbb{E}[W_n])^2} = o(1), \quad (5.9)$$

where the asymptotic upper bound follows from Eq. (5.8).  $\square$

**Proofs of Section 4.1.** Before delving into technicalities, we want to discuss the probabilistic idea underlying the forthcoming proofs. As stressed above, for a given realization of the payoffs, the BRD is a deterministic algorithm that decides its next step only on the basis of *local information*. In what follows we will exploit this fact by revealing the players' payoffs only when this information is needed to select the next position of the BRD. This whole process, in which the BRD moves on a sequentially sampled random game, can be thought of as a non-Markov stochastic process, and the time at which the BRD stops can be seen as a stopping time for such a stochastic process.

*Proof of Lemma 4.1.* First we prove Eq. (4.5) by induction. For  $t = 1$  we have  $|R_n(1)| = K_n^A + K_n^B - 1$ , which is trivially true. Assume now that Eq. (4.5) holds up to  $t - 1 < \tau_n^{\text{NE}}$ . Notice that  $\text{BRD}_n(t)$  cannot visit a row or column visited at time  $1, 2, \dots, t - 1 < \tau_n^{\text{NE}}$ . Since player A plays first, by the inductive hypothesis, we have, for  $0 < t \leq \tau_n^{\text{NE}}$ ,

$$|R_n(t)| = \begin{cases} r_n(t-1) + K_n^B - \left\lfloor \frac{t+1}{2} \right\rfloor, & \text{if } t \text{ is odd;} \\ r_n(t-1) + K_n^A - \left\lfloor \frac{t+1}{2} \right\rfloor, & \text{if } t \text{ is even.} \end{cases} \quad (5.10)$$

Since

$$r_n(t-1) = \left\lfloor \frac{t}{2} \right\rfloor K_n^A + \left\lfloor \frac{t}{2} \right\rfloor K_n^B - \left\lfloor \frac{t}{2} \right\rfloor \left\lfloor \frac{t}{2} \right\rfloor, \quad (5.11)$$

we can rewrite the right hand side of Eq. (5.10) as (4.4). Hence we deduce that Eq. (4.5) holds.

Compute now  $q_{t,n}$  for  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . Since  $p_n = 1$ , we have  $U_n^A = U_n^B$  almost surely. Therefore, to simplify the notation, we write

$$U_n(a, b) := U_n^A(a, b) = U_n^B(a, b). \quad (5.12)$$

We start with  $t = 0$ . We have

$$\begin{aligned} q_{0,n} &= \mathbb{P}(\tau_n^{\text{NE}} = 0 \mid \tau_n^{\text{NE}} \geq 0) \\ &= \frac{\mathbb{P}(\tau_n^{\text{NE}} = 0)}{\mathbb{P}(\tau_n^{\text{NE}} \geq 0)} \\ &= \mathbb{P}(\tau_n^{\text{NE}} = 0) \\ &= \mathbb{P}\left(U_n(1, 1) = \max\left\{\max_{\ell \in [K_n^A]} U_n(\ell, 1), \max_{\ell \in [K_n^B]} U_n(1, \ell)\right\}\right) \\ &= \frac{1}{K_n^A + K_n^B - 1}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.13)$$

Let now  $t = 1$ . We have

$$\mathbb{P}(\tau_n^{\text{NE}} \geq 1) = \mathbb{P}(\tau_n^{\text{NE}} \geq 0) - \mathbb{P}(\tau_n^{\text{NE}} = 0) = 1 - \frac{1}{K_n^A + K_n^B - 1} = \frac{K_n^A + K_n^B - 2}{K_n^A + K_n^B - 1}. \quad (5.14)$$

Moreover, if we define the event

$$D_a := \{\text{player A's best response to action 1 is } a\}, \quad (5.15)$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}(\tau_n^{\text{NE}} = 1) &= \sum_{a \in [K_n^{\text{A}}]} \mathbb{P}(\tau_n^{\text{NE}} = 1 \mid D_a) \mathbb{P}(D_a) \\
&= \sum_{a=2}^{[K_n^{\text{A}}]} \mathbb{P}(\text{Beta}(K_n^{\text{A}}, 1) \geq \text{Beta}(K_n^{\text{B}} - 1, 1)) \frac{1}{K_n^{\text{A}}} \\
&= \sum_{a=2}^{[K_n^{\text{A}}]} \frac{K_n^{\text{A}}}{K_n^{\text{A}} + K_n^{\text{B}} - 1} \cdot \frac{1}{K_n^{\text{A}}} \\
&= \frac{K_n^{\text{A}} - 1}{K_n^{\text{A}} + K_n^{\text{B}} - 1},
\end{aligned} \tag{5.16}$$

where, with an abuse of notation, we have identified a random variable with its distribution and the two Beta random variables are independent.

Therefore, combining Eqs. (5.14) and (5.16), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
q_{1,n} &= \mathbb{P}(\tau_n^{\text{NE}} = 1 \mid \tau_n^{\text{NE}} \geq 1) \\
&= \frac{\mathbb{P}(\tau_n^{\text{NE}} = 1)}{\mathbb{P}(\tau_n^{\text{NE}} \geq 1)} \\
&= \frac{K_n^{\text{A}} + K_n^{\text{B}} - 1}{K_n^{\text{A}} + K_n^{\text{B}} - 2} \cdot \frac{K_n^{\text{A}} - 1}{K_n^{\text{A}} + K_n^{\text{B}} - 1} \\
&= \frac{K_n^{\text{A}} - 1}{K_n^{\text{A}} + K_n^{\text{B}} - 2}.
\end{aligned} \tag{5.17}$$

Let now  $t \geq 2$ . Call  $\Pi_t$  the set of sequences  $\pi = (\pi_0, \pi_1, \dots, \pi_t)$  such that

- $\pi_i = (a_i, b_i) \in [K_n^{\text{A}}] \times [K_n^{\text{B}}]$  for  $i \geq 0$ ,
- $\pi_0 = (1, 1)$ ,
- if  $i$  is odd, then  $b_i = b_{i-1}$ , whereas, if  $i > 0$  is even, then  $a_i = a_{i-1}$ ,
- there is no pair of distinct odd indices  $i, j$  such that  $b_i = b_j$ ,
- there is no pair of distinct even indices  $i, j$  such that  $a_i = a_j$ .

Notice that the set  $\Pi_t$  coincides with all possible trajectories of length  $t$  of  $\text{BRD}_n$  satisfying the event  $\{\tau_n^{\text{NE}} \geq t\}$ . Define

$$G_t^\pi = \{\text{BRD}_n(s) = \pi_s \text{ for } 0 \leq s \leq t\}. \tag{5.18}$$

Notice that

$$q_{t,n} := \mathbb{P}(\tau_n^{\text{NE}} = t \mid \tau_n^{\text{NE}} \geq t) = \sum_{\pi \in \Pi_t} \mathbb{P}(\tau_n^{\text{NE}} = t \mid G_t^\pi, \tau_n^{\text{NE}} \geq t) \mathbb{P}(G_t^\pi \mid \tau_n^{\text{NE}} \geq t). \tag{5.19}$$

The conditional probability  $\mathbb{P}(\tau_n^{\text{NE}} = t \mid G_t^\pi, \tau_n^{\text{NE}} \geq t)$  equals the probability that the maximum of  $r_n(t-1)$  i.i.d. uniform random variables is bigger than the maximum of  $K_n^* - \lfloor \frac{t+1}{2} \rfloor$  uniform random variables, where

$$K_n^* = \begin{cases} K_n^{\text{A}} & \text{if } t \text{ is even,} \\ K_n^{\text{B}} & \text{if } t \text{ is odd.} \end{cases} \tag{5.20}$$

So

$$\mathbb{P}(\tau_n^{\text{NE}} = t \mid G_t^\pi, \tau_n^{\text{NE}} \geq t) = \mathbb{P}\left(\text{Beta}(r_n(t-1), 1) > \text{Beta}\left(K_n^* - \left\lfloor \frac{t+1}{2} \right\rfloor, 1\right)\right)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \frac{r_n(t-1)}{r_n(t-1) + K_n^* - \lfloor \frac{t+1}{2} \rfloor} \\
&= \frac{r_n(t-1)}{r_n(t)},
\end{aligned}$$

where the last identity is due to Eq. (5.10). Using Eq. (5.19) we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}(\tau_n^{\text{NE}} = t \mid \tau_n^{\text{NE}} \geq t) &= \sum_{\pi \in \Pi_t} \mathbb{P}(\tau_n^{\text{NE}} = t \mid G_t^\pi, \tau_n^{\text{NE}} \geq t) \mathbb{P}(G_t^\pi \mid \tau_n^{\text{NE}} \geq t) \\
&= \frac{r_n(t-1)}{r_n(t)} \sum_{\pi \in \Pi_t} \mathbb{P}(G_t^\pi \mid \tau_n^{\text{NE}} \geq t).
\end{aligned} \tag{5.21}$$

Note that  $\{\tau_n^{\text{NE}} \geq t\} = \sqcup_{\pi \in \Pi_t} G_t^\pi$ . Hence

$$\sum_{\pi \in \Pi_t} \mathbb{P}(G_t^\pi \mid \tau_n^{\text{NE}} \geq t) = \mathbb{P}(\tau_n^{\text{NE}} \geq t \mid \tau_n^{\text{NE}} \geq t) = 1. \tag{5.22}$$

Therefore, Eq. (5.21) becomes

$$\mathbb{P}(\tau_n^{\text{NE}} = t \mid \tau_n^{\text{NE}} \geq t) = \frac{r_n(t-1)}{r_n(t)}. \quad \square$$

*Proof of Theorem 4.2.* Note that

$$\mathbb{P}(\tau_n^{\text{NE}} > t) = \mathbb{P}(\tau_n^{\text{NE}} > t \mid \tau_n^{\text{NE}} > t-1) \mathbb{P}(\tau_n^{\text{NE}} > t-1) = (1 - q_{t,n}) \mathbb{P}(\tau_n^{\text{NE}} > t-1). \tag{5.23}$$

Hence, by iteration, we get

$$\mathbb{P}(\tau_n^{\text{NE}} > t) = \prod_{j=1}^t (1 - q_{j,n}) \cdot \mathbb{P}(\tau_n^{\text{NE}} > 0) = \prod_{j=0}^t (1 - q_{j,n}). \quad \square$$

*Proof of Proposition 4.3.* To simplify the notation we define  $K_n = K_n^{\text{A}} = K_n^{\text{B}}$ . We first compute  $\mathbb{E}[\tau_n^{\text{NE}}]$ . By Theorem 4.2 we have

$$\mathbb{E}[\tau_n^{\text{NE}}] = \sum_{t=0}^{2K_n-2} \mathbb{P}(\tau_n^{\text{NE}} > t) = \sum_{t=0}^{2K_n-2} \prod_{j=0}^t (1 - q_{j,n}). \tag{5.24}$$

We split the first sum in Eq. (5.24) into two parts:  $t \in \{0, \dots, T_n - 1\}$  and  $t \in \{T_n, \dots, 2K_n - 2\}$ , where  $T_n = \lfloor \log^2 K_n \rfloor$ . We start by showing that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{t=T_n}^{2K_n-2} \prod_{j=0}^t (1 - q_{j,n}) = 0, \tag{5.25}$$

for which it suffices to show that for  $t \geq T_n$

$$\mathbb{P}(\tau_n^{\text{NE}} > t) = \prod_{j=0}^t (1 - q_{j,n}) = o(K_n^{-1}). \tag{5.26}$$

Notice that the sequence  $q_{t,n}$ , defined in Eq. (4.2), is increasing in  $t$ . Hence,

$$\mathbb{P}(\tau_n^{\text{NE}} > t) \leq (1 - q_{0,n})(1 - q_{1,n})^t \leq \frac{1}{2^t} = o(K_n^{-1}), \tag{5.27}$$

where in the last asymptotic equality we used  $q_{1,n} = \frac{1}{2}$  and  $T_n = \omega(\log(K_n))$ .

We are left to show that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{t=0}^{T_n} \prod_{j=0}^t (1 - q_{j,n}) = e - 1.$$

Notice that

$$1 - q_{0,n} = \frac{2K_n - 2}{2K_n - 1} = 1 - \mathcal{O}(K_n^{-1}) \quad \text{and} \quad 1 - q_{1,n} = \frac{1}{2}. \quad (5.28)$$

Moreover, since

$$r_n(t) - r_n(t-1) = K_n - \left\lfloor \frac{t}{2} \right\rfloor, \quad (5.29)$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned} 1 - q_{t,n} &= \frac{r_n(t) - r_n(t-1)}{r_n(t)} \\ &= \frac{K_n - \left\lfloor \frac{t}{2} \right\rfloor}{(t+1)K_n - \left\lfloor \frac{t+1}{2} \right\rfloor \left\lfloor \frac{t+1}{2} \right\rfloor} \\ &= \frac{1}{t+1} \cdot \frac{1 - \Theta(t/K_n)}{1 - \Theta(t/K_n)} \\ &= \frac{1}{t+1} \cdot \left( 1 + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{\log K_n}{K_n}\right) \right). \end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$\prod_{j=0}^t (1 - q_{j,n}) = 1 \cdot \frac{1}{2} \cdot \prod_{j=2}^t \frac{1}{j+1} \cdot (1 + o(1)) = \frac{1}{(t+1)!} (1 + o(1)) \quad (5.30)$$

that implies

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{t=0}^{T_n} \prod_{j=0}^t (1 - q_{j,n}) = \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{(t+1)!} = e - 1, \quad (5.31)$$

which, together with Eq. (5.25), proves Eq. (4.10).

We now prove Eq. (4.11). Call  $H_n$  the distribution function of  $\tau_n^{\text{NE}}$ . By Eq. (5.30), we have, for  $t \in \mathbb{N}$

$$H_n(t) = 1 - \mathbb{P}\left(\tau_n^{\text{NE}} > t\right) = (1 + o(1)) \cdot \left(1 - \frac{1}{(t+1)!}\right). \quad (5.32)$$

In what follows, we are going to use the following lemma, whose proof can be found, for instance, in Ogryczak and Ruszczyński (1999, corollary 3).

**Lemma 5.1.** *Let  $X$  be a random variable with finite expectation  $\mu$ , finite variance, and distribution function  $G$ . Define the function  $\Phi(x) := \int_0^x G(t) dt$ . Then*

$$\frac{1}{2} \text{Var}[X] = \int_0^{+\infty} (\Phi(t) - [t - \mu]_+) dt, \quad (5.33)$$

where  $[t - \mu]_+ = \max\{t - \mu, 0\}$ .

We now go back to the proof of Eq. (4.11). Since the random variable  $\tau_n^{\text{NE}}$  is bounded, we can apply Lemma 5.1 to get

$$\text{Var}\left[\tau_n^{\text{NE}}\right] = 2 \int_0^{\mu} \Phi_n(t) dt + 2 \int_{\mu}^{+\infty} [\Phi_n(t) - (t - \mu)] dt, \quad (5.34)$$

where, for all  $t \leq T_n$ ,

$$\Phi_n(t) = \int_0^t H_n(s) \, ds \sim \int_0^t \left(1 - \frac{1}{\lfloor s+1 \rfloor!}\right) \, ds, \quad (5.35)$$

and  $\mu := \mathbb{E}[\tau_n^{\text{NE}}] \sim e - 1$ .

By explicit numerical integration, we get

$$2 \int_0^\mu \Phi_n(t) \, dt \sim 2 \int_0^\mu dt \int_0^t \left(1 - \frac{1}{\lfloor s+1 \rfloor!}\right) \, ds \approx 0.258. \quad (5.36)$$

Moreover,

$$\Phi_n(t) - (t - \mu) = \int_0^t (H_n(s) - 1) \, ds + \int_0^{+\infty} (1 - H_n(s)) \, ds = \int_t^{+\infty} (1 - H_n(s)) \, ds \sim \int_t^{+\infty} \frac{1}{\lfloor s+1 \rfloor!} \, ds. \quad (5.37)$$

Hence, again by numerical integration,

$$2 \int_\mu^{+\infty} [\Phi_n(t) - (t - \mu)] \, dt \sim 2 \int_\mu^{+\infty} dt \int_t^{+\infty} \frac{1}{\lfloor s+1 \rfloor!} \, ds \approx 0.509. \quad (5.38)$$

This yields

$$\text{Var}[\tau_n^{\text{NE}}] \approx 0.767. \quad \square$$

**Proofs of Section 4.2.** We will actually prove the following stronger result, from which [Theorem 4.4](#) follows easily.

**Proposition 5.2.** *Fix a sequence  $p_n$ . Then, for every sequence  $T_n$  such that*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log(p_n)}{\log(T_n)} = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{T_n}{\sqrt{K_n^{\text{A}} \wedge K_n^{\text{B}}}} = 0, \quad (5.39)$$

*we have*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}(\tau_n^{\text{NE}} < T_n) = 1. \quad (5.40)$$

The proof of [Proposition 5.2](#) relies on the following lemma.

**Lemma 5.3.** *Given a sequence  $\{X_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}_+}$  of i.i.d. random variables having a uniform distribution on  $[0, 1]$ , consider the event*

$$\mathcal{H} = \{X_1 < \max\{X_1, \dots, X_k\}\}. \quad (5.41)$$

*Then for all  $x \in [0, 1]$  we have*

$$\mathbb{P}(X_1 \leq x \mid \mathcal{H}) = x \cdot \frac{k - x^{k-1}}{k - 1} \geq x = \mathbb{P}(X_1 \leq x). \quad (5.42)$$

*Proof.* We have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(X_1 \leq x \mid \mathcal{H}) &= \frac{\mathbb{P}(X_1 \leq x, \mathcal{H})}{\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{H})} \\ &= \frac{\mathbb{P}(X_1 \leq x) - \mathbb{P}(X_1 \leq x, \mathcal{H}^c)}{\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{H})} \\ &= \frac{x - \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{H}^c)\mathbb{P}(X_1 \leq x \mid \mathcal{H}^c)}{1 - \frac{1}{k}} \\ &= \frac{x - \frac{1}{k}\mathbb{P}(X_1 \leq x \mid \mathcal{H}^c)}{1 - \frac{1}{k}}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.43)$$



Notice that, conditioning on the event  $\mathcal{H}^c$ ,  $X_1$  is distributed as  $\text{Beta}(k, 1)$ . Hence

$$P(X_1 \leq x \mid \mathcal{H}^c) = x^k. \quad (5.44)$$

Plugging the above identity in (5.43), we obtain the desired result.  $\square$

*Proof of Proposition 5.2.* Define the events

$$\mathcal{E}_n(t) := \{\text{BRD}_n(t) \in R_n(t-2)\}, \quad \text{for } t \geq 3, \quad (5.45)$$

$$\mathcal{Z}_n(t) := \{\text{BRD}_n(t) \neq \text{BRD}_n(t-1)\}, \quad \text{for } t \geq 1, \quad (5.46)$$

$$\mathcal{B}_n(t) := \begin{cases} \mathcal{Z}_n(t), & \text{for } t = 1, 2, \\ \mathcal{E}_n(t)^c \cap \mathcal{Z}_n(t), & \text{for } t \geq 3. \end{cases} \quad (5.47)$$

In words,  $\mathcal{E}_n(t)$  represents the event that at time  $t$  the process  $\text{BRD}_n(t)$  visits a previously visited row or column;  $\mathcal{Z}_n(t)$  represents the event that  $\text{BRD}_n(t-1)$  is not a PNE;  $\mathcal{B}_n(t)$  represents the event that neither  $\text{BRD}_n(t)$  is on a previously visited row or column, nor  $\text{BRD}_n(t-1)$  is a PNE. Therefore, the sequence  $\mathcal{E}_n(t)$  is increasing in  $t$ :

$$\mathcal{E}_n(t-1) \subset \mathcal{E}_n(t). \quad (5.48)$$

Then

$$P(\mathcal{E}_n(t)) = P(\mathcal{E}_n(t-1)) + P(\mathcal{E}_n(t) \cap \mathcal{E}_n(t-1)^c). \quad (5.49)$$

We have

$$\mathcal{E}_n(t) \cap \mathcal{E}_n(t-1)^c = \{\mathcal{E}_n(t) \cap \mathcal{E}_n(t-1)^c \cap \mathcal{Z}_n(t-1)^c\} \sqcup \{\mathcal{E}_n(t) \cap \mathcal{E}_n(t-1)^c \cap \mathcal{Z}_n(t-1)\}.$$

If  $\mathcal{Z}_n(t-1)^c$  holds, then  $\text{BRD}_n(t-1) \in R_n(t-3)$ . In other words,

$$\mathcal{E}_n(t-1)^c \cap \mathcal{Z}_n(t-1)^c = \emptyset. \quad (5.50)$$

In conclusion,

$$\begin{aligned} P(\mathcal{E}_n(t)) &= P(\mathcal{E}_n(t-1)) + P(\mathcal{E}_n(t) \mid \mathcal{B}_n(t-1))P(\mathcal{B}_n(t-1)) \\ &\leq P(\mathcal{E}_n(t-1)) + P(\mathcal{E}_n(t) \mid \mathcal{B}_n(t-1)). \end{aligned} \quad (5.51)$$

Moreover, we claim that, for  $t \geq 3$ , we have

$$P(\mathcal{E}_n(t) \mid \mathcal{B}_n(t-1)) \leq \begin{cases} \frac{\lfloor \frac{t}{2} \rfloor - 1}{K_n^B - 1} & \text{if } t \text{ is even,} \\ \frac{\lfloor \frac{t}{2} \rfloor - 1}{K_n^A - 1} & \text{if } t \text{ is odd.} \end{cases} \quad (5.52)$$

The conditional probability in the l.h.s. of Eq. (5.52) is the probability that, for  $t$  even, the maximum B payoff in the row (for  $t$  odd, the maximum A payoff in the column) where  $\text{BRD}_n(t)$  sits is achieved in one of the previously visited columns (rows). When  $p_n = 0$ , the inequality in Eq. (5.52) holds as an equality. This is due to the fact that all payoffs are i.i.d.. When  $p_n > 0$ , the payoffs in the row (column) of interest are not i.i.d.. Consider an A payoff in a previously visited row; with probability  $p_n$  it is uniformly distributed on  $[0, 1]$  and with probability  $1 - p_n$  it has a uniform law, conditional on not being the largest payoff in its row. A similar argument holds for B payoffs, replacing row with column. By Lemma 5.3, the distribution of a B payoff on a previously visited row (A payoff on a previously visited column) is stochastically dominated by a uniform distribution on  $[0, 1]$ . This proves the inequality in Eq. (5.52).

Iterating Eq. (5.51) we obtain

$$P(\mathcal{E}_n(t)) \leq \sum_{i=1}^t \frac{\lfloor \frac{i}{2} \rfloor - 1}{K_n^A \wedge K_n^B - 1} \leq \frac{t^2}{K_n^A \wedge K_n^B - 1}. \quad (5.53)$$

Call  $\tau_n^{\text{cycle}}$  the stopping time

$$\tau_n^{\text{cycle}} := \inf\{t \geq 4: \mathcal{E}_n(t) \cap \mathcal{Z}_n(t) \text{ holds}\}, \quad (5.54)$$

that is,  $\tau_n^{\text{cycle}}$  is the first time that the BRD re-visits an element of a trap. Hence, Eq. (5.53) says that for all  $p_n \in [0, 1]$ , if  $T_n = o(\sqrt{K_n^A \wedge K_n^B})$ , then, as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ ,

$$\mathbb{P}(\tau_n^{\text{cycle}} \leq T_n) \rightarrow 0. \quad (5.55)$$

Define

$$\tau_n := \tau_n^{\text{cycle}} \wedge \tau_n^{\text{NE}}. \quad (5.56)$$

If  $\text{BRD}_n(\tau_n) \neq (0, 0)$ , then  $\tau_n + 1$  is the (random) time at which the BRD stops, that is, the BRD is either in a trap (i.e.,  $\tau_n + 1 = \tau_n^{\text{cycle}} + 1$ ) or in a pure Nash equilibrium (i.e.,  $\tau_n + 1 = \tau_n^{\text{NE}} + 1$ ). Indeed, if the BRD reaches a PNE, then it stops at time  $\tau_n^{\text{NE}} + 1$ ; if it gets stuck in a trap, it stops when it revisits a previously visited profile, i.e., at time  $\tau_n^{\text{cycle}} + 1$ . We point out that, if  $\text{BRD}_n(\tau_n) = (0, 0)$  and  $\tau_n \geq 1$ , then at time  $\tau_n = \tau_n^{\text{cycle}}$  the BRD visits for the second time  $(0, 0)$  and hence the algorithm stops. If instead  $\tau_n = 0$ , then  $\text{BRD}_n(\tau_n) = (0, 0) \in \text{NE}$  and the BRD stops at time  $\tau_n + 1 = 1$ .

Notice that, for every sequence  $T_n = o(\sqrt{K_n^A \wedge K_n^B})$ , if we show that

$$\mathbb{P}(\tau_n \leq T_n) \rightarrow 1, \quad (5.57)$$

from Eqs. (5.55) and (5.56) it follows that

$$\mathbb{P}(\tau_n^{\text{NE}} \leq T_n) \rightarrow 1. \quad (5.58)$$

Fix a sequence  $T_n = o(\sqrt{K_n^A \wedge K_n^B})$  and define, for every integer  $s \in \{1, \dots, T_n - 1\}$ ,

$$S_n := \{(a, b) \in [K_n^A] \times [K_n^B]: U_n^A(a, b) = U_n^B(a, b)\}, \quad (5.59)$$

$$\mathcal{F}_n^{s, T_n} := \{\exists t \leq T_n - s \text{ s.t. } \text{BRD}_n(t + s') \in S_n, \forall s' \in \{0, \dots, s\}\}. \quad (5.60)$$

Roughly speaking,  $S_n$  is the set of action profiles that give the same payoff to the two players, while the event  $\mathcal{F}_n^{s, T_n}$  occurs if there exists an interval of  $s$  consecutive steps before  $T_n$  in which the BRD visits only elements in  $S_n$ . For every sequence  $(s_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  such that  $s_n \leq T_n$  for every  $n$ , we have

$$\mathbb{P}(\tau_n > T_n) = \mathbb{P}(\{\tau_n > T_n\} \cap \mathcal{F}_n^{s_n, T_n}) + \mathbb{P}(\{\tau_n > T_n\} \cap \{\mathcal{F}_n^{s_n, T_n}\}^c). \quad (5.61)$$

First we show that the first term on the r.h.s. of Eq. (5.61) goes to zero as  $s_n \rightarrow \infty$ . To this aim, it is enough to show that, under the event  $\mathcal{F}_n^{s_n, T_n}$ , there exists some  $t \leq T_n - s_n$  such that the best-responding player's payoff at time  $t + s_n$  is stochastically larger than a Beta( $u, 1$ ) random variable, with

$$u := r_n(s_n) - \frac{T_n^2}{4}. \quad (5.62)$$

Notice that, for  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  large enough,

$$u \geq \frac{s_n}{2}(K_n^A + K_n^B) - \frac{T_n^2}{2} \geq \frac{s_n}{3}(K_n^A + K_n^B), \quad (5.63)$$

where in the first inequality we used Eq. (4.4) and the fact that  $s_n \leq T_n$ ; the second inequality holds for all sufficiently large  $n$  by our choice of  $T_n$ . Indeed, after the interval of  $s_n$  consecutive steps in which the BRD visits only elements of  $S_n$ , the BRD visits an action profile  $(a, b)$  such that

- $(a, b) \in S_n$ , that is, both players receive the same payoff;
- this common payoff is the largest of a set of random variables, among which at least  $u$  are i.i.d. Unif( $[0, 1]$ ) (see Figure Fig. 1 for more details);



maximum of  $K_n^A \vee K_n^B - 1$  i.i.d. random variables with a uniform distribution on  $[0, 1]$ . Therefore

$$\mathbb{P}(\{\tau_n > T_n\} \cap \mathcal{F}_n^{s_n, T_n}) \leq 1 - \frac{\lfloor \frac{s_n}{3} \rfloor (K_n^A + K_n^B)}{\lfloor \frac{s_n}{3} \rfloor (K_n^A + K_n^B) + (K_n^A \vee K_n^B - 1)} \leq \frac{3}{s_n + 3}, \quad (5.64)$$

which goes to zero as  $s_n \rightarrow \infty$ . Under the assumption in Eq. (5.39), it is possible to find two sequences  $(s_n)_n$  and  $(T_n)_n$  such that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} s_n = \infty, \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{s_n}{T_n} = 0, \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{T_n}{\sqrt{K_n^A \wedge K_n^B}} = 0, \quad (5.65)$$

and

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}(\{\tau_n > T_n\} \cap \{\mathcal{F}_n^{s_n, T_n}\}^c) \rightarrow 0. \quad (5.66)$$

Notice that under the event  $\{\tau_n > T_n\}$ , the probability of the event  $\{\mathcal{F}_n^{s_n, T_n}\}^c$  can be upper bounded by the probability that, splitting the interval  $\{0, \dots, T_n\}$  into subintervals of length  $s_n$ , none of them is such that the BRD visits only  $S_n$  in that subinterval. Therefore,

$$\mathbb{P}(\{\tau_n > T_n\} \cap \{\mathcal{F}_n^{s_n, T_n}\}^c) \leq \mathbb{P}\left(\text{Binomial}\left(\left\lfloor \frac{T_n}{s_n} \right\rfloor, p_n^{s_n}\right) = 0\right) = (1 - p_n^{s_n})^{\lfloor T_n/s_n \rfloor}. \quad (5.67)$$

If  $T_n = o(\sqrt{K_n^A \wedge K_n^B})$ , then the term on the r.h.s. of Eq. (5.67) goes to zero whenever

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{T_n}{s_n} p_n^{s_n} = \infty. \quad (5.68)$$

A necessary and sufficient condition for Eq. (5.68) is

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \log(T_n) - \log(s_n) - s_n \log(p_n^{-1}) = \infty, \quad (5.69)$$

or, equivalently,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \log(T_n) \left[ 1 - \frac{\log(s_n)}{\log(T_n)} - \frac{s_n \log(p_n^{-1})}{\log(T_n)} \right] = \infty. \quad (5.70)$$

Thanks to Eq. (5.39), we can choose, e.g.,

$$s_n = \log(T_n) \wedge \log\left(\frac{\log(T_n)}{\log(p_n^{-1})}\right) \rightarrow \infty. \quad (5.71)$$

Notice that if  $\log(T_n) < \log\left(\frac{\log(T_n)}{\log(p_n^{-1})}\right)$ , then  $s_n = \log(T_n)$  and

$$\log(p_n^{-1}) \leq \frac{\log(T_n)}{T_n} \rightarrow 0. \quad (5.72)$$

With the latter choice of  $s_n$  we get

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left[ 1 - \frac{\log(s_n)}{\log(T_n)} - \frac{s_n \log(p_n^{-1})}{\log(T_n)} \right] = 1, \quad (5.73)$$

which immediately implies the validity of Eq. (5.70).  $\square$

### Proofs of Section 4.3.

*Proof of Proposition 4.7.* For the sake of simplicity we assume that  $K_n^A \leq K_n^B$ , so that  $\tau_n^{\text{NE}} \leq 2K_n^A - 1$ . Call

$$\mathcal{C}_n(t) := \{\text{BRD}_n(t) \in \text{NE}_n\}. \quad (5.74)$$

Therefore, the statement in Eq. (4.15) is equivalent to

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \text{P}(\mathcal{C}_n(2K_n^A - 1)) = 0. \quad (5.75)$$

Notice that

$$\text{P}(\mathcal{C}_n(0)) = \frac{1}{K_n^A K_n^B} \quad \text{and} \quad \text{P}(\mathcal{C}_n(1)) = \text{P}(\mathcal{C}_n(0)) + \text{P}(\mathcal{C}_n(1) \mid \mathcal{C}_n(0)^c) \text{P}(\mathcal{C}_n(0)^c). \quad (5.76)$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{P}(\mathcal{C}_n(1) \mid \mathcal{C}_n(0)^c) &= \sum_{a=1}^{K_n^A} \text{P}(\mathcal{C}_n(1) \mid \mathcal{C}_n(0)^c \cap \text{BRD}_n(1) = (a, 1)) \text{P}(\text{BRD}_n(1) = (a, 1) \mid \mathcal{C}_n(0)^c) \\ &= \sum_{a=2}^{K_n^A} \text{P}(\mathcal{C}_n(1) \mid \mathcal{C}_n(0)^c \cap \text{BRD}_n(1) = (a, 1)) \text{P}(\text{BRD}_n(1) = (a, 1) \mid \mathcal{C}_n(0)^c) \\ &= \sum_{a=2}^{K_n^A} \frac{1}{K_n^B} \text{P}(\text{BRD}_n(1) = (a, 1) \mid \mathcal{C}_n(0)^c) \\ &= \frac{1}{K_n^B} (1 - \text{P}(\text{BRD}_n(1) = (1, 1) \mid \mathcal{C}_n(0)^c)) \\ &= \frac{1}{K_n^B} \left( 1 - \frac{\text{P}(\mathcal{C}_n(0)^c \mid \text{BRD}_n(1) = (1, 1)) \text{P}(\text{BRD}_n(1) = (1, 1))}{\text{P}(\mathcal{C}_n(0)^c)} \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{K_n^B} \left( 1 - \frac{\frac{K_n^B - 1}{K_n^B} \frac{1}{K_n^A}}{1 - \frac{1}{K_n^A K_n^B}} \right) = \frac{K_n^A - 1}{K_n^A K_n^B - 1}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.77)$$

This implies

$$\text{P}(\mathcal{C}_n(1)) = \frac{1}{K_n^A K_n^B} + \frac{K_n^A - 1}{K_n^A K_n^B - 1} \left( 1 - \frac{1}{K_n^A K_n^B} \right) = \frac{1}{K_n^B}. \quad (5.78)$$

Since  $\mathcal{C}_n(t) \cap \mathcal{C}_n^c(t-1) = \mathcal{C}_n(t) \cap \mathcal{B}_n(t-1)$ , we have, for  $t \geq 1$ ,

$$\text{P}(\mathcal{C}_n(t)) = \text{P}(\mathcal{C}_n(t-1)) + \text{P}(\mathcal{C}_n(t) \mid \mathcal{B}_n(t-1)) \text{P}(\mathcal{B}_n(t-1)), \quad (5.79)$$

where the event  $\mathcal{B}_n(t)$  is defined as in Eq. (5.45), setting  $R_n(0) = R_n(1) = \emptyset$ . Moreover,

$$\text{P}(\mathcal{C}_n(t) \mid \mathcal{B}_n(t-1)) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{K_n^A} \frac{K_n^B - \lfloor \frac{t}{2} \rfloor}{K_n^B - 1} & \text{for } t \text{ even,} \\ \frac{1}{K_n^B} \frac{K_n^A - \lfloor \frac{t}{2} \rfloor}{K_n^A - 1} & \text{for } t \text{ odd,} \end{cases} \quad (5.80)$$

$$\text{P}(\mathcal{B}_n(t)) = \begin{cases} \text{P}(\mathcal{B}_n(t-1)) \frac{K_n^A - 1}{K_n^A} \frac{K_n^B - \lfloor \frac{t}{2} \rfloor}{K_n^B - 1} & \text{for } t \text{ even,} \\ \text{P}(\mathcal{B}_n(t-1)) \frac{K_n^B - 1}{K_n^B} \frac{K_n^A - \lfloor \frac{t}{2} \rfloor}{K_n^A - 1} & \text{for } t \text{ odd.} \end{cases} \quad (5.81)$$

By iterating Eq. (5.81), for all  $t \leq 2K_n^A - 1$  odd, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
P(\mathcal{B}_n(t)) &= P(\mathcal{B}_n(t-2)) \frac{K_n^A - \lfloor \frac{t}{2} \rfloor}{K_n^A} \frac{K_n^B - \lfloor \frac{t}{2} \rfloor}{K_n^B} \\
&= \frac{K_n^B - 1}{K_n^B} \prod_{\substack{j=1 \\ j \text{ odd}}}^{\lfloor \frac{t}{2} \rfloor} \frac{K_n^B - j}{K_n^B} \frac{K_n^A - j}{K_n^A} \\
&\leq \prod_{\substack{j=1 \\ j \text{ odd}}}^{\lfloor \frac{t}{2} \rfloor} \left(1 - \frac{j}{K_n^A}\right) \\
&\leq \exp\left(-\sum_{\substack{j=1 \\ j \text{ odd}}}^{\lfloor \frac{t}{2} \rfloor} \frac{j}{K_n^A}\right) \\
&\leq \exp\left(-\frac{(t-1)^2}{4K_n^A}\right),
\end{aligned} \tag{5.82}$$

where we have used the inequality  $1 - x \leq e^{-x}$ .

Moreover, by Eq. (5.81),  $P(\mathcal{B}_n(t))$  is decreasing in  $t$  and, by Eq. (5.80),  $P(\mathcal{C}_n(t) \mid \mathcal{B}_n(t-1)) \leq 1/K_n^A$  for all  $t$ . Hence, iterating Eq. (5.79), we can write

$$\begin{aligned}
P(\mathcal{C}_n(t)) &= P(\mathcal{C}_n(t-2)) + P(\mathcal{C}_n(t-1) \mid \mathcal{B}_n(t-2))P(\mathcal{B}_n(t-2)) \\
&\quad + P(\mathcal{C}_n(t) \mid \mathcal{B}_n(t-1))P(\mathcal{B}_n(t-1)) \\
&\leq P(\mathcal{C}_n(t-2)) + \frac{2}{K_n^A} P(\mathcal{B}_n(t-2)).
\end{aligned} \tag{5.83}$$

By applying the estimate in Eq. (5.82) to  $P(\mathcal{B}_n(t-2))$ , we obtain, for  $t$  odd,

$$P(\mathcal{C}_n(t)) \leq P(\mathcal{C}_n(t-2)) + \frac{2}{K_n^A} \exp\left(-\frac{(t-3)^2}{4K_n^A}\right), \tag{5.84}$$

whose iteration leads to

$$P(\mathcal{C}_n(t)) \leq P(\mathcal{C}_n(1)) + \frac{2}{K_n^A} \sum_{\substack{j=1 \\ j \text{ odd}}}^{t-3} \exp\left(-\frac{j^2}{4K_n^A}\right) \leq \frac{1}{K_n^A} + \frac{2}{K_n^A} \sum_{\substack{j=1 \\ j \text{ odd}}}^{t-3} \exp\left(-\frac{j^2}{4K_n^A}\right), \tag{5.85}$$

where in the last inequality we have used Eq. (5.78) and the fact that  $K_n^A \leq K_n^B$ .

Taking  $t = 2K_n^A - 1$  and using the estimate  $\sum_{j=0}^H \exp\{-j^2/H\} = \mathcal{O}(\sqrt{H})$  for  $H \rightarrow \infty$ , we conclude that

$$P(\mathcal{C}_n(2K_n^A - 1)) \leq \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{K_n^A}}\right), \tag{5.86}$$

which implies Eq. (4.15). □

## 6. LIST OF SYMBOLS

$\mathcal{B}_n(t)$	$\{\text{BRD}(t) \notin R_n(t-1) \cup \text{NE}\}$ , defined in Eq. (5.47)
$\text{BRD}$	best response dynamics
$\mathcal{C}_n(t)$	$\{\text{BRD}_n(t) \in \text{NE}_n\}$ , defined in Eq. (5.74)
$D_a$	$\{\text{player A's best response to action 1 is } a\}$ , defined in Eq. (5.15)



$\mathcal{E}_n(t)$	$\{\text{BRD}(t) \in R_n(t-1)\}$ , defined in Eq. (5.45)
$F$	marginal distribution function of each payoff
$H_n$	distribution function of $\tau_n^{\text{NE}}$
$K_n^{\text{A}}$	number of player A's actions in the game $U_n$
$K_n^{\text{B}}$	number of player B's actions in the game $U_n$
$K_n$	$\min(K_n^{\text{A}}, K_n^{\text{B}})$ , defined in Eq. (5.3)
NE	set of pure Nash equilibria
$p_n$	probability that $U^{\text{A}}(a, b) = U^{\text{B}}(a, b)$ in the game $U_n$
$q_{t,n}$	$\text{P}(\tau_n^{\text{NE}} = t \mid \tau_n^{\text{NE}} \geq t)$ , defined in Eq. (4.2)
$r_n(t)$	$\left\lfloor \frac{t+1}{2} \right\rfloor K_n^{\text{A}} + \left\lfloor \frac{t+1}{2} \right\rfloor K_n^{\text{B}} - \left\lfloor \frac{t+1}{2} \right\rfloor \left\lfloor \frac{t+1}{2} \right\rfloor$ , defined in Eq. (4.4)
$S_n$	$\{(a, b) \in [K_n^{\text{A}}] \times [K_n^{\text{B}}] : U_n^{\text{A}}(a, b) = U_n^{\text{B}}(a, b)\}$ , defined in Eq. (5.59)
$R_n(t)$	defined in Eq. (4.3)
$t$	(discrete) time
$\mathcal{T}$	trap, defined in Definition 2.1
$U^{\text{A}}$	player A's payoff function
$U^{\text{B}}$	player B's payoff function
$W_n$	number of pure Nash equilibria in $U_n$
$\mathcal{Z}_n(t)$	$\{\text{BRD}_n(t) \neq \text{BRD}_n(t-1)\}$ , defined in Eq. (5.46)
$\Pi_t$	set of possible paths for BRD $_n$ up to time $t$
$\tau$	$\tau_n^{\text{cycle}} \wedge \tau_n^{\text{NE}}$ , defined in Eq. (5.56)
$\tau_n^{\text{NE}}$	first time the BRD visits a PNE, defined in Eq. (4.1)
$\tau_n^{\text{cycle}}$	first time the BRD re-visits an element of a trap, defined in Eq. (5.54)
$\Phi_n(t)$	$\int_0^t H_n(s) ds$ , defined in Eq. (5.35)
$\Psi$	potential function, defined in Eq. (2.4)

#### ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Hlafo Alfie Mimun and Marco Scarsini are members of GNAMPA-INdAM.

**Funding.** Hlafo Alfie Mimun and Marco Scarsini's research was supported by the Italian MIUR PRIN 2017 Project ALGADIMAR "Algorithms, Games, and Digital Markets." Matteo Quattropiani thanks the German Research Foundation (project number 444084038, priority program SPP2265) for financial support.

#### REFERENCES

- Alon, N., Rudov, K., and Yariv, L. (2021). Dominance solvability in random games. Technical report, arXiv 2105.10743.
- Amiet, B., Collevocchio, A., and Hamza, K. (2021a). When "better" is better than "best". *Oper. Res. Lett.*, 49(2):260–264.
- Amiet, B., Collevocchio, A., Scarsini, M., and Zhong, Z. (2021b). Pure Nash equilibria and best-response dynamics in random games. *Math. Oper. Res.*, 46(4):1552–1572.
- Candogan, O., Menache, I., Ozdaglar, A., and Parrilo, P. A. (2011). Flows and decompositions of games: harmonic and potential games. *Math. Oper. Res.*, 36(3):474–503.
- Candogan, O., Ozdaglar, A., and Parrilo, P. A. (2013). Dynamics in near-potential games. *Games Econom. Behav.*, 82:66–90.
- Coucheney, P., Durand, S., Gaujal, B., and Touati, C. (2014). General revision protocols in best response algorithms for potential games. In *Network Games, Control and Optimization (NetGCoop)*, Trento, Italy. IEEE Explore.
- Durand, S., Garin, F., and Gaujal, B. (2019). Distributed best response dynamics with high playing rates in potential games. *Performance Evaluation*, 129:40–59.
- Durand, S. and Gaujal, B. (2016). Complexity and optimality of the best response algorithm in random potential games. In *Algorithmic Game Theory*, volume 9928 of *Lecture Notes in Comput. Sci.*, pages 40–51. Springer, Berlin.

- Fabrikant, A., Jaggard, A. D., and Schapira, M. (2013). On the structure of weakly acyclic games. *Theory Comput. Syst.*, 53(1):107–122.
- Galla, T. and Farmer, J. D. (2013). Complex dynamics in learning complicated games. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA*, 110(4):1232–1236.
- Goemans, M., Mirrokni, V., and Vetta, A. (2005). Sink equilibria and convergence. In *46th Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS'05)*, pages 142–151.
- Harsanyi, J. C. (1973). Oddness of the number of equilibrium points: a new proof. *Internat. J. Game Theory*, 2:235–250.
- Heinrich, T., Jang, Y., Mungo, L., Pangallo, M., Scott, A., Tarbush, B., and Wiese, S. (2021). Best-response dynamics, playing sequences, and convergence to equilibrium in random games. Technical report, arXiv:2101.04222.
- Monderer, D. and Shapley, L. S. (1996). Potential games. *Games Econom. Behav.*, 14(1):124–143.
- Nash, J. (1951). Non-cooperative games. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 54:286–295.
- Nash, Jr., J. F. (1950). Equilibrium points in  $n$ -person games. *Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.*, 36:48–49.
- Ogryczak, W. and Ruszczyński, A. (1999). From stochastic dominance to mean-risk models: Semideviations as risk measures. *European J. Oper. Res.*, 116(1):33–50.
- Pangallo, M., Heinrich, T., and Farmer, J. D. (2019). Best reply structure and equilibrium convergence in generic games. *Science Advances*, 5(2):eaat1328.
- Pei, T. and Takahashi, S. (2019). Rationalizable strategies in random games. *Games Econom. Behav.*, 118:110–125.
- Powers, I. Y. (1990). Limiting distributions of the number of pure strategy Nash equilibria in  $N$ -person games. *Internat. J. Game Theory*, 19(3):277–286.
- Rinott, Y. and Scarsini, M. (2000). On the number of pure strategy Nash equilibria in random games. *Games Econom. Behav.*, 33(2):274–293.
- Rosenthal, R. W. (1973). A class of games possessing pure-strategy Nash equilibria. *Internat. J. Game Theory*, 2:65–67.
- Sanders, J. B. T., Farmer, J. D., and Galla, T. (2018). The prevalence of chaotic dynamics in games with many players. *Scientific Reports*, 8(1):4902.
- Stanford, W. (1995). A note on the probability of  $k$  pure Nash equilibria in matrix games. *Games Econom. Behav.*, 9(2):238–246.
- Wiese, S. C. and Heinrich, T. (2022). The frequency of convergent games under best-response dynamics. *Dyn. Games Appl.*, 12(2):689–700.
- Wilson, R. (1971). Computing equilibria of  $N$ -person games. *SIAM J. Appl. Math.*, 21:80–87.

DIPARTIMENTO DI ECONOMIA E FINANZA, LUISS UNIVERSITY, VIALE ROMANIA 32, 00197 ROMA, ITALY.  
*Email address:* {hmimun,marco.scarsini}@luiss.it

DIPARTIMENTO DI MATEMATICA “GUIDO CASTELNUOVO”, SAPIENZA UNIVERSITÀ DI ROMA, PIAZZALE ALDO MORO 5, 00185 ROMA, ITALY.  
*Email address:* matteo.quattropiani@uniroma1.it