

# Small Support Approximate Equilibria in Large Games

Yakov Babichenko<sup>‡</sup>

November 18, 2021

## Abstract

In this note we provide a new proof for the results of Lipton et al. [3] on the existence of an approximate Nash equilibrium with logarithmic support size. Besides its simplicity, the new proof leads to the following contributions:

1. For  $n$ -player games, we improve the bound on the size of the support of an approximate Nash equilibrium.
2. We generalize the result of Daskalakis and Papadimitriou [4] on small probability games from the two-player case to the general  $n$ -player case.
3. We provide a logarithmic bound on the size of the support of an approximate Nash equilibrium in the case of graphical games.

---

\*Center for the Mathematics of Information, Department of Computing and Mathematical Sciences, California Institute of Technology. e-mail:babich@caltech.edu.

<sup>†</sup>The author wishes to thank Constantinos Daskalakis and Siddarth Barman for useful discussions and comments. The author gratefully acknowledges support from a Walter S. Baer and Jeri Weiss fellowship.

# 1 Introduction

The problem of the existence of a small-support approximate equilibrium (i.e., every player randomizes among *small* set of his actions) has been studied in the literature for the past two decades. Althofer [1] considered two-player zero-sum games and showed existence of approximately optimal strategies with support of size  $O(\log m)$ , where  $m$  is the number of actions. Lipton, Markakis, and Mehta [3] later generalized this result to all two-player games; i.e., they showed existence of an approximate equilibrium with support of size  $O(\log m)$ . This result yields an exhaustive search algorithm for computing an approximate Nash equilibrium with a quasi-polynomial running time ( $m^{\log m}$ ). This is the best-known bound today for computing an approximate Nash equilibrium. Daskalakis and Papadimitriou [4] generalized the technique of Lipton et al. [3] to prove that in two-player games an approximate Nash equilibrium can be computed in polynomial time in games that possess a small-probabilities Nash equilibrium (see definition in Section 4).

The related problem of the existence of a pure Nash equilibrium (an equilibrium with the minimal support) in subclasses of games has been studied in the literature for much longer; see, e.g., Rosenthal [7] and Shmeidler [8]. A recent paper by Azrieli and Shmaya [2] analyzes the relation between the influence that a player has on the payoffs of other players and the existence of an approximate Nash equilibrium. They show that if the influence is small enough, then such a game has an approximate pure Nash equilibrium.

In this note we provide a new proof for the results of Lipton et al. [3] and Daskalakis and Papadimitriou [4] using similar techniques to those developed by Azrieli and Shmaya [2]. Besides its simplicity, the new proof leads to the following contributions:

1. For  $n$ -player games we improve the bound on the size of the support

of an approximate Nash equilibrium from  $O(n^2 \log m)$  (see Lipton et. al. [3]) to  $O(n \log m)$  (see Corollary 1).

2. We generalize the result of Daskalakis and Papadimitriou [4] from two-player games case to all  $n$ -player game cases (see Corollary 3).

3. We provide a logarithmic bound ( $O(\log n + \log m)$ ) on the size of the support of approximate Nash equilibrium in the case of graphical games. This bound is novel (see Theorem 1).

The note is organized as follows. In Section 2 we present the notations and preliminaries that will be useful in our new proof. In Section 3 we state and prove the a result on graphical games; this result generalizes Lipton et al. [3]. In Section 4 we state and prove the result that generalizes the result of Daskalakis and Papadimitriou. Section 5 is a discussion.

## 2 Preliminaries

We consider  $n$ -player games where every player  $i$  has a large number of actions. For simplicity, we will consider the case where all players have the same number of actions<sup>1</sup>  $m$ . We will use the following standard notations. We denote by  $A_i = \{1, 2, \dots, m\}$  the *actions set of player  $i$* , and by  $A = \times_i A_i$  the *actions profile set*. The simplex  $\Delta(A_i)$  is the set of *mixed strategies of player  $i$* . We will assume that the payoffs of all players are in  $[0, 1]$ , and  $u_i : A \rightarrow [0, 1]$  will denote the *payoff function of player  $i$* . The payoff function  $u_i$  can be multilinearly extended to  $u_i : \Delta(A) \rightarrow [0, 1]$ . The *payoff functions profile* is  $u = (u_i)_{i=1}^n$ , which is also called the *game*. A mixed action profile  $x = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)$  is an *Nash  $\varepsilon$ -equilibrium* if for every action  $a_i \in A_i$ , it

---

<sup>1</sup>Given a game where player  $i$  has  $m_i$  actions, we can consider an equivalent game where every player has  $m = \max_i m_i$  actions. This can be done by adding  $m - m^i$  strictly dominated actions to every player  $i$ .

holds that  $u_i(x) \geq u_i(a_i, x_{-i}) - \varepsilon$ .

A mixed strategy  $x_i = (x_i(1), x_i(2), \dots, x_i(m))$  of player  $i$  will be called *k-uniform* if  $x_i(j) = c_j/k$ , where  $c_j \in \mathbb{N}$  for every  $j = 1, 2, \dots, m$ . Note that the support of *k* uniform strategy is of size at most *k*. A mixed strategy profile  $x = (x_i)_{i=1}^n$  will be called *k-uniform* if every  $x_i$  is *k*-uniform.

We say that the payoff of player  $i$  depends on player  $j$  if there exists an action profile  $a_{-j}$  and a pair of actions  $a_j, a'_j$  of player  $j$  such that  $u_i(a_j, a_{-j}) \neq u_i(a'_j, a_{-j})$ . A game where the payoff of every player depends on at most  $d$  other players will be called a *graphical game of degree d*. Graphical games, introduced by Kearns et al. [5], express the situation where players are located on vertices of an underlying graph and their payoffs are influenced only by their neighbors' actions. Note that every  $n$ -player game is a graphical game of degree  $n - 1$ .

## 2.1 Lipschitz games

Player  $i$  has a  $\lambda$ -Lipschitz payoff function if  $|u_i(a_j, a_{-j}) - u_i(a'_j, a_{-j})| \leq \lambda$  for every  $i \neq j$  and every  $a_j, a'_j \in A_j$ . The Lipschitz property means that a change of strategy of a single player  $j \neq i$  has little effect on the payoff of player  $i$ . Note that player  $i$  can have a big effect on his own payoff. A game will be called  $\lambda$ -Lipschitz if the payoff functions of all players are  $\lambda$ -Lipschitz.

The following proposition is an important property of  $\lambda$ -Lipschitz games.

**Proposition 1.** If in an  $n$ -player game the payoff of player  $i$  depends on at most  $d$  players, and his payoff function is  $\lambda$ -Lipschitz, then for every pure action  $a_i \in A_i$  and for every mixed action profile of the opponents  $x_{-i}$ , it

holds that<sup>2</sup>

$$x_{-i}(B) \geq 1 - 2 \exp\left(-\frac{\delta^2}{d\lambda^2}\right)$$

where  $B \subset A_{-i}$  is defined by

$$B = \{a_{-i} : |u_i(a_i, a_{-i}) - u_i(a_i, x_{-i})| \leq \delta\}.$$

In simple words, Proposition 1 claims that if we randomize an action profile  $a_{-i}$  according to  $x_{-i}$ , then probably player  $i$  will have approximately the same outcome if he plays against  $a_{-i}$  or against  $x_{-i}$ .

Proposition 1 is based on the concentration of measure phenomena for Lipschitz functions (see Ledoux [6]) and it is derived explicitly in Azrieli and Shmaya [2].

## 2.2 From general games to Lipschitz games

We present a very natural procedure that constructs for every game a corresponding game with the Lipschitz property.

Fix  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ . Given a game  $u$  we construct a new game  $v = v(u, k)$  with  $kn$  players as follows. We “split” every player  $i$  into a population of  $k$  players  $i(1), i(2), \dots, i(k)$ . Each player  $i(j)$  plays the original game  $u$  against the aggregate behavior of the  $n - 1$  other populations of size  $k$ .

Formally, it will be convenient to present  $A_i$  as the set of vectors  $\{e_1, e_2, \dots, e_m\} \subset \mathbb{R}^m$ , where  $e_j$  is the  $j$ -th unit vector in  $\mathbb{R}^m$ . In such a representation the unit simplex  $\Delta^m := \{(x_j)_{j=1}^m : \sum_j x_j = 1, x_j \geq 0\}$  is the set of mixed strategies  $\Delta(A_i)$ . All players  $i(j)$  have the same actions set  $A_i$ . The

---

<sup>2</sup>By the notation  $x_{-i}(B)$ , we refer to  $x_{-i}$  as a probability measure on  $A_{-i}$ , and so  $x_{-i}(B)$  is the probability of the event  $B$ .

payoff of player  $i_0(j_0)$  is defined by

$$v_{i_0(j_0)}((a_{i(j)})_{1 \leq i \leq n, 1 \leq j \leq k}) = u_i \left( a_{i_0(j_0)}, \left( \frac{\sum_{j=1}^k a_{i(j)}}{k} \right)_{i \neq i_0} \right).$$

Note that  $\sum_{j=1}^k a_{i(j)}/k \in \Delta^m$ ; therefore, this vector represents the mixed strategy of population  $i$ .

**Remark 1.** The game  $v$  has the following two properties:

(P1)  $v$  is  $1/k$  Lipschitz, because a deviation of a single player  $i(j)$  changes the mixed strategy that is played by population  $i$  only by  $1/k$ .

(P2) Every pure Nash  $\varepsilon$ -equilibrium of the game  $v$  corresponds to a  $k$ -uniform mixed Nash  $\varepsilon$ -equilibrium of the game  $u$ . The corresponding mixed equilibrium will be the one where player  $i$  plays the aggregated strategy of population  $i$  in the game  $v$ .<sup>3</sup>

### 3 General Games and Graphical Games

**Theorem 1.** Every  $n$ -player graphical game of degree  $d$  with  $m$  actions for every player has a  $k$ -uniform Nash  $\varepsilon$ -equilibrium for  $k = \frac{8}{\varepsilon^2}d(\log n + \log m)$ .

Usually graphical game models consider games with a large number of players  $n$  of constant degree  $d$ . Theorem 1 proves the existence of a relatively simple approximate Nash equilibrium where every player uses a strategy with a support that is logarithmically small on  $n$  and  $m$ .

Lipton et al. [3] show that in every  $n$ -player game with  $m$  actions for every player there exists a  $k$ -uniform Nash  $\varepsilon$ -equilibrium for  $k = O(n^2 \log m)$ .

---

<sup>3</sup>Moreover, the opposite direction is also true. Every  $k$ -uniform  $\varepsilon$ -equilibrium of  $u$  corresponds to a pure Nash  $\varepsilon$ -equilibrium of  $v$ . The corresponding pure equilibrium will be the one where population  $i$  plays a pure profile with aggregated behavior  $x_i$ , where  $x_i$  is the  $k$ -uniform strategy of player  $i$  in the  $\varepsilon$ -equilibrium in the game  $u$ .

Theorem 1 applied to general games shows that in such games there exists a  $k$ -uniform Nash  $\varepsilon$ -equilibrium for  $k = O(n \log m)$ .

**Corollary 1.** Every  $n$ -player game of with  $m$  actions for every player has a  $k$ -uniform Nash  $\varepsilon$ -equilibrium for  $k = \frac{8}{\varepsilon^2}(n-1)(\log n + \log m)$ .

As a straightforward corollary of this result, we derive the following improvement to the oblivious algorithm for computing Nash approximate equilibrium in games with  $n$  players.

**Corollary 2.** Let  $k = \frac{8}{\varepsilon^2}(n-1)(\log n + \log m)$ . Then the oblivious algorithm<sup>4</sup> that exhaustively searches over the  $k$ -uniform strategies finds an  $\varepsilon$ -equilibrium in  $O(m^{n^2 \log m})$  steps.<sup>5</sup>

*Proof of Theorem 1.* Let  $k = \frac{8}{\varepsilon^2}d(\log n + \log m)$ . We construct the game  $v = v(u, k)$  as presented in Section 2.2. We prove that the game  $v$  possesses a pure Nash equilibrium, then, by Remark 1 (P2) this concludes the proof. Moreover, we will prove that every  $nk$ -player  $1/k$ -Lipschitz graphical game of degree  $dk$  has a pure Nash  $\varepsilon$ -equilibrium.

Consider a mixed action profile  $x$  that is a (possibly mixed) Nash equilibrium of  $v$ . For every player  $i$  and every action  $b \in A_i$  of player  $i$ , we define the set of action profiles

$$E_{i,b} := A_i \times \{a_{-i} : |v_i(b, a_{-i}) - v_i(b, x_{-i})| \leq \varepsilon/2\} \subset A.$$

Every action  $a^* \in \cap_{i,b} E_{i,b} \cap \text{support}(x)$  is a pure Nash  $\varepsilon$ -equilibrium according to the following inequality:

$$v_i(d, a_{-i}^*) \leq v_i(d, x_{-i}) + \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \leq v_i(a_i^*, x_{-i}) + \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \leq v_i(a_i^*, a_{-i}^*) + \varepsilon,$$

---

<sup>4</sup>The term ‘‘oblivious algorithm’’ is from [4].

<sup>5</sup>Lipton et al. [3] prove a bound of  $O(m^{n^3 \log m})$  on the number of steps.

where the first inequality follows from  $a^* \in E_{i,d}$ , the second from  $a_i^* \in \text{support}(x^i)$ , and the third from  $a^* \in E_{i,a_i^*}$ . Therefore it is enough to prove that the above intersection is not empty.

By proposition 1 we have

$$x(E_{i,b}^c) \leq 2 \exp\left(-\frac{\varepsilon^2 k}{4d}\right). \quad (1)$$

Putting  $k = \frac{8}{\varepsilon^2} d(\log n + \log m)$  we get  $x(E_{i,b}^c) \leq 1/(2nkm)$ . There are  $nk$  players in  $v$ , and  $m$  actions for every player. Therefore there are  $nk m$  events  $E_{i,b}$ . Therefore,  $x(\cap E_{i,b}) \geq 1/2 > 0$ , which concludes the proof.  $\square$

## 4 Small Probability Games

Following the terminology of [4], a profile of mixed actions  $x$  will be called a *c-small probabilities profile* if  $x_i(j) \leq c/m$  for every player  $i$  and every  $j \in A^i$ . A game  $u$  will be called a *c-small probability game* if there exists a Nash equilibrium  $x$  that is a *c-small probability profile*.

Daskalakis and Papadimitriou [4] prove that in small probability two-player games the oblivious random algorithm that samples  $k$ -uniform strategies for  $k = \Theta(\log m)$  finds an approximate Nash equilibrium in  $O(c^2 m^{\log c})$  steps, i.e., in polynomial time in  $m$ . Here we generalize this result to general  $n$ -player games.

It will be convenient to think of the  $k$ -uniform strategies as a multiset that contains  $k$  *ordered* actions. In such a case the set of  $k$ -uniform strategy profiles is of size  $m^{kn}$ .

**Theorem 2.** Let  $u$  be an  $n$ -player  $c$ -small probability games with  $m$  actions for every player, and let  $k = \frac{8}{\varepsilon^2} (n-1)(\log n + \log m)$ . Then, among the  $m^{kn}$   $k$ -uniform strategy profiles in  $u$ , the number of strategy profiles that forms



an Nash  $\varepsilon$ -equilibrium is at least

$$\frac{m^{kn}}{2(nm)^{\frac{8}{\varepsilon^2}(n-1)n \ln c}}.$$

**Corollary 3.** Fix  $n$  and let  $k = \frac{8}{\varepsilon^2}(n-1)(\log n + \log m)$ . Then the oblivious algorithm that samples at random  $k$ -uniform strategies and checks whether it forms an  $\varepsilon$ -equilibrium finds such an  $\varepsilon$ -equilibrium in  $c$ -small probability games after  $(nm)^{\frac{8}{\varepsilon^2}(n-1)n \ln c}$  samples in expectation, i.e., after polynomial time in  $m$ .

*Proof of Theorem 2.* Fix  $k = \frac{8}{\varepsilon^2}(n-1)(\log n + \log m)$ , and let  $x$  be a  $c$ -small probability equilibrium of  $u$ . Consider the game  $v = v(u, k)$  that is defined in Section 2.2. Note that the action profile where every player  $i(j)$  plays the mixed action  $x_i$  is a Nash equilibrium of the game  $v$ . Denote this equilibrium by  $x^v$ .

Following the same analysis that was done in the proof of Theorem 1 we define the sets  $E_{i,b}$  and we know that  $x^v(\cap_{i,b} E_{i,b}) \geq 1/2$ . Two different pure action profiles in  $\cap_{i,b} E_{i,b} \cap \text{support}(x^v)$  correspond to two different  $k$ -uniform Nash  $\varepsilon$ -equilibria in  $u$ . Let us show that there are many different action profiles in  $\cap_{i,b} E_{i,b} \cap \text{support}(x^v)$ .

Note that  $x^v(a) \leq (c/m)^{nk}$  because  $x$  is a  $c$ -small probabilities profile. On the other hand,  $x^v(\cap_{i,b} E_{i,b}) \geq 1/2$ . Therefore, there must be at least  $m^{nk}/2c^{nk}$  different profiles in  $\cap_{i,b} E_{i,b} \cap \text{support}(x^v)$ , which yield that there are at least  $m^{nk}/2c^{nk}$  different  $k$ -uniform Nash  $\varepsilon$ -equilibria in  $u$ .

It only remains to evaluate the expression  $c^{nk}$ :

$$c^{nk} = (c^{\ln n + \ln m})^{\frac{8}{\varepsilon^2}(n-1)n} = (n^{\ln c} m^{\ln c})^{\frac{8}{\varepsilon^2}(n-1)n} = (nm)^{\frac{17}{\varepsilon^2}(n-1)n \ln c}.$$

□

## 5 Discussion

This note contains a new approach to the problem of an approximate small support Nash equilibrium. Instead of considering the game itself, we can consider a population game where every player is replaced by a population of players and analyze the existence of an approximate pure Nash equilibrium in the population game. I believe that this approach might be useful for analyzing other interesting questions. For example, the question of characterizing the class of two-player games where an approximate Nash equilibrium with constant support exists might have the following interpretation: which two-population games with constant population size has a pure Nash equilibrium? Clearly, characterization of the above class is an important question because for those games there exists a polynomial-time exhaustive search algorithm for computing an approximate Nash equilibrium.

This paper provides an upper bound of  $O(n \log m)$  on the size of the support of an approximate Nash equilibrium. It is known that the bound  $\log m$  is tight even in two-player games (see Althofer [1]); i.e., there exists a two-player game where no Nash approximate equilibrium with a support smaller than  $c \log m$  exists. The question whether the linear dependence on  $n$  is also tight remains an open question.

**Open problem:** Does there exist an  $n$ -player  $n$ -action game where in every Nash approximate equilibrium at least one of the players plays a mixed action with support of size  $f(n)$ ?

By Althofer [1] the answer to this question for  $f(n) = c \log n$  is positive. What about  $f(n) = cn^\alpha$  for  $\alpha < 1$ ? What about  $f(n) = cn$ ?

## References

- [1] Althofer, I. (1994) “On Sparse Approximations to Randomized Strategies and Convex Combinations,” *Linear Algebra and its Applications* 199, 339-355.
- [2] Azrieli, Y. and Shmaya, E. (2013) “Lipschitz Games,” *Mathematics of Operations Research*, forthcoming.
- [3] Lipton, R. J., Markakis, E., and Mehta, A. (2003) “Playing Large Games Using Simple Strategies,” *Proceedings of the 4th ACM Conference on Electronic Commerce* pp. 36–41.
- [4] Daskalakis, C. and Papadimitriou, C. H. (2009) “On Oblivious PTAS’s for Nash Equilibrium,” *Proceedings of the 41st Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*, pp. 75–84.
- [5] Kearns, M. J., Littman, M. L., and Singh, S. P. (2001) “Graphical Models for Game Theory,” *Proceedings of the 17th Conference on Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence*, pp. 253–260.
- [6] Ledoux, M. (2001) *The Concentration of Measure Phenomenon*, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI.
- [7] Rosenthal, R. W. (1973). “A Class of Games Possessing Pure-Strategy Nash Equilibria,” *International Journal of Game Theory* 2, 65–67.
- [8] Shmeidler, D. (1973). “Equilibrium Points of Nonatomic Games,” *Journal of Statistical Physics* 7, 295–300.