

Correlated Equilibria in Large Anonymous Bayesian Games

Frederic Koessler*

Marco Scarsini[†]Tristan Tomala[‡]

September 6, 2023

Abstract

We consider multi-population Bayesian games with a large number of players. Each player aims at minimizing a cost function that depends on this player's own action, the distribution of players' actions in all populations, and an unknown state parameter. We study the nonatomic limit versions of these games and introduce the concept of Bayes correlated Wardrop equilibrium, which extends the concept of Bayes correlated equilibrium to nonatomic games. We prove that Bayes correlated Wardrop equilibria are limits of action flows induced by Bayes correlated equilibria of the game with a large finite set of small players. For nonatomic games with complete information admitting a convex potential, we prove that the set of correlated and of coarse correlated Wardrop equilibria coincide with the set of probability distributions over Wardrop equilibria, and that all equilibrium outcomes have the same costs. We get the following consequences. First, all flow distributions of (coarse) correlated equilibria in convex potential games with finitely many players converge to Wardrop equilibria when the weight of each player tends to zero. Second, for any sequence of flows satisfying a no-regret property, its empirical distribution converges to the set of distributions over Wardrop equilibria and the average cost converges to the unique Wardrop cost.

KEYWORDS: Bayes correlated equilibrium, coarse correlated equilibrium, congestion games, no-regret, nonatomic games, potential games, selfish routing, Wardrop equilibrium.

*HEC Paris and GREGHEC-CNRS, 78351 Jouy-en-Josas, France. koessler@hec.fr

[†]Luiss University, 00197 Rome, Italy. marco.scarsini@luiss.it

[‡]HEC Paris and GREGHEC, 78351 Jouy-en-Josas, France. tomala@hec.fr

1 Introduction

In many interactive decision situations with a large number of participants, single agents are impacted only by their own choice, the distribution of actions in the population, and the state of the world. For instance, the time a morning commuter spends on the road to go from home to office depends on the chosen route, the number of commuters on the various roads, and the presence of accidents; the benefit of adopting a new technological standard or subscribing to a social network depends on the quality of the standard or network, and on the proportions of adopters or subscribers; carbon emissions due to traffic depend on the proportions of people traveling by plane, by car or by train. Such situations can be represented by anonymous games where the utility that a player enjoys, or the cost that a player incurs depends on this player's action and on the distribution of other players' actions. A widely studied class of games of this type is given by congestion games, where players use resources whose cost depends on the number of users. Prominent applications are routing games, where players travel through a network of roads with the objective of reaching destination as fast as possible. When the number of players is large and each individual has a small impact on the overall distribution, these games can be approximated by nonatomic games, which are often more tractable (see, e.g., Roughgarden, 2007).

In this paper, we consider a general model of Bayesian nonatomic games with multiple populations, where the action sets and cost functions are population specific. Each agent incurs a cost depending on the individual action, on the action distribution in each population, and on an a priori unknown state parameter. A prominent instance are Bayesian routing games and, in line with the literature on this topic, we take the convention that players minimize cost functions, which simply are negatives of utility functions. Yet, our class of games is much larger than routing games or congestion games and encompasses population games, as described in Sandholm (2010). These include some oligopoly games and random matching games. We extend this class of games to the Bayesian setting.

We study two main solution concepts, *correlated Wardrop equilibrium* (CWE) and *Bayes correlated Wardrop equilibrium* (BCWE), that allow players' actions to be correlated which one another and with the state of the world. They are the analogs of correlated equilibrium (Aumann, 1974) and Bayes correlated equilibrium (Bergemann and Morris, 2016). The concepts of correlated equilibrium and Bayes correlated equilibrium in Aumann (1974, 1987) and Bergemann and Morris (2016) are justified by considering all possible equilibrium outcomes for all possible information structures, in the context of games with finitely many players. This approach immediately faces the daunting task of describing all information structures for a continuum of players. To circumvent this problem, we adopt the point of view of action flows and Wardrop equilibria (called Nash equilibria of population games in Sandholm, 2010) where strategy profiles that map players to actions are not explicitly defined. Instead, we consider the distributions of action flows in each population that result from equilibrium behavior. Hence, our solution concepts are expressed in terms of probability

distributions over action flows in each population (conditional on the state), instead of probability distributions over action profiles. We also introduce the concept of *Bayes deterministic Wardrop equilibrium*, which corresponds to a BCWE with deterministic flows: it assigns a flow over actions to each state of the world. Under complete information, a Bayes deterministic Wardrop equilibrium is a Wardrop equilibrium.

Our results motivate the model of nonatomic games as a limit of games with large but finite sets of players with small weights. We show that every converging sequence of Bayes correlated equilibrium outcomes of finite n -player games, converges to a BCWE when n tends to infinity and the weight of every player tends to zero (Proposition 1). Conversely, we show that for every BCWE, there exists a sequence of (approximate) Bayes correlated equilibrium outcomes that converges to that BCWE (Proposition 3). Furthermore, we prove that Bayes deterministic Wardrop equilibria correspond to limits of Bayes correlated equilibrium outcomes with conditionally independent signals (Proposition 2).

In games with complete information that admit a convex potential (i.e., the cost functions are the partial derivatives of a convex function), we show that every coarse CWE (and therefore every CWE) is a mixture of Wardrop equilibria, and all Wardrop equilibria have the same cost profiles (Proposition 4). As a consequence, all (coarse) CWE have the same cost profiles as well. This result applies in particular to congestion games with increasing resource costs, which admit a convex potential. Combined with our convergence result, this result implies that all flow distributions of correlated equilibria in games with finitely many players, converge to mixtures of Wardrop equilibria (Corollary 2). These results do not hold without a convex potential (see Example 1 and Example 2) and do not extend to incomplete information (see Example 3). To the best of our knowledge, we provide the first non-trivial class of games with finite action sets where correlated equilibria coincide with convex combinations of Nash equilibrium outcomes. This property does not hold even for two-player zero-sum games (see Forges, 1990). Another consequence of Proposition 4 is that if a nonatomic game has a convex potential, then any accumulation point of a sequence of flows that has no external regret, is a mixture of Wardrop equilibria (Corollary 3).

Related literature

Congestion games with a finite number of players are introduced by Rosenthal (1973), their relations with potential games are studied by Monderer and Shapley (1996). Wardrop (1952) studies a strategic model of traffic where each agent has a negligible weight and introduces the principle now known as Wardrop equilibrium. Beckmann et al. (1956) characterize Wardrop equilibria as the solutions of a convex optimization program. The works of Sandholm (2001, 2010) give a general model of games with nonatomic players, beyond congestion games, and a general definition of potential games; see also Hofbauer and Sandholm (2009). Notions related to nonatomic versions of correlated and Bayes correlated equilibria have been studied under different names (see, e.g., Díaz

et al., 2009, Tavafoghi and Teneketzi, 2018, Zhu and Savla, 2021).

The relationships between Nash equilibria and Wardrop equilibria in congestion games are studied by Haurie and Marcotte (1985) in the atomic splittable case, where finitely many players can split their weights among several routes, and by Cominetti et al. (2023) in the atomic nonsplittable case. Sandholm (2001) studies the convergence of the potential of finite potential games to the potential of nonatomic potential games.

Properties of the set of correlated equilibria in both finite and infinite games are studied by Hart and Schmeidler (1989). Various extensions of correlated equilibria to incomplete information are analyzed by Myerson (1982), Forges (1993, 2006) and Bergemann and Morris (2016). Neyman (1997) proves that in games with a finite number of players, convex strategy sets, and a convex potential, every correlated equilibrium is a mixture of Nash equilibria (Neyman, 1997, actually considers players who maximize utilities in a game with a concave potential; for the equivalent game where players minimize costs, the potential is convex). This result is extended under the weaker condition of diagonal convexity by Ui (2008).

Ashlagi et al. (2008) introduce the mediation value—i.e., the ratio between the maximal welfare in a correlated equilibrium and the maximal welfare in a mixed-strategy equilibrium—and show that the mediation value can be arbitrarily high in congestion games with finitely many players. A result closely related to our Proposition 4 is in Díaz et al. (2009) who show that correlation does not decrease total cost compared to Nash equilibria in congestion games with parallel edges and nonatomic players (they use a definition of correlated equilibrium which is equivalent to a correlated Wardrop equilibrium with finite support). This result does not extend beyond congestion games, as shown by the El Farol example given in Díaz et al. (2009) and Mitsche et al. (2013), which we recall in Example 1.

In our paper, we abstract away from the description of the set of players as a measurable space. Instead, we focus on action flows, as is common in the literature on congestion games (Roughgarden, 2007), and as is done in the systematic study of population games (Sandholm, 2010). There exists a huge literature on games with measurable set of players, and Hart and Schmeidler (1989) have extended the definition of correlated equilibrium to measurable sets of players, using finitely additive measures. It is not difficult to check that any countably additive correlated equilibrium of Hart and Schmeidler (1989) induces a correlated Wardrop equilibrium; the proof is available upon request. The approach of describing general information structures for arbitrary measurable sets of players inevitably faces the technical hurdle of uncountable families of independent random variables. We have purposefully chosen to avoid those difficulties. For a recent contribution on related topics, see Hellwig (2022) and references therein.

Organization of the paper

Section 2 presents the multi-population model of Bayesian nonatomic games and defines the concept of Bayes correlated Wardrop equilibrium and related equilibrium notions. Section 3 shows our convergence results, which prove that the concept of Bayes correlated Wardrop equilibrium is a reasonable approximation of Bayes correlated equilibria in games with large finite sets of players. Section 4 deals with complete-information games that admit a convex potential. Appendix A contains a list of symbols used throughout the paper.

Notation

For any compact set \mathcal{X} , we let $\Delta(\mathcal{X})$ be the set of Borel probability distributions over \mathcal{X} . The symbol δ_x denotes the Dirac mass on x . Given probability distributions $\{\mu^n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$, μ in $\Delta(\mathcal{X})$, the notation $\mu^n \xrightarrow{w^*} \mu$ denotes weak* convergence of μ^n to μ i.e., $\int f d\mu^n \rightarrow \int f d\mu$ for every continuous function $f: \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. For a finite set \mathcal{J} we let $|\mathcal{J}|$ denote its cardinality and, for $\gamma > 0$, we use the notation

$$\Delta_\gamma(\mathcal{J}) := \left\{ \mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{J}} : \forall j \in \mathcal{J}, y_j \geq 0, \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}} y_j = \gamma \right\}. \quad (1.1)$$

Therefore, in this case, we identify $\Delta(\mathcal{J})$ with $\Delta_1(\mathcal{J})$.

2 Bayesian nonatomic games

We study Bayesian nonatomic games where infinitely many players are partitioned into finitely many populations, and each population has a finite set of available actions. The analog of a strategy profile in this context is a distribution of actions in each population, which we call a *flow*. Players aim at minimizing cost functions that are population specific and depend on flows and on an unknown state parameter drawn from a finite set. This section formally presents our model and solution concepts.

Definition 1. A *Bayesian nonatomic game* $\Gamma = (\mathcal{K}, \gamma, \mathcal{A}, \Theta, p, \mathbf{c})$ is given by the following elements:

- (a) A finite set \mathcal{K} of *populations*, where each population $k \in \mathcal{K}$ has size $\gamma^k > 0$.
- (b) For each population $k \in \mathcal{K}$, a finite set of *actions* \mathcal{A}^k , with $\mathcal{A} = \times_{k \in \mathcal{K}} \mathcal{A}^k$. For each $k \in \mathcal{K}$, the set of *flows* is

$$\mathcal{Y}^k := \Delta_{\gamma^k}(\mathcal{A}^k), \quad (2.1)$$

and $\mathcal{Y} = \times_{k \in \mathcal{K}} \mathcal{Y}^k$ is the set of flow profiles.

- (c) A finite set of *states* Θ and a full-support *probability distribution* $p \in \Delta(\Theta)$ over states.

- (d) For each $(k, a) \in \mathcal{K} \times \mathcal{A}^k$, a continuous *cost function* $c_a^k : \mathcal{Y} \times \Theta \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ (given a flow profile \mathbf{y} , in state θ , the cost for an individual in population k who chooses action a is $c_a^k(\mathbf{y}, \theta)$).

A transition probability $\mu : \Theta \rightarrow \Delta(\mathcal{Y})$ that associates a distribution over flows to each state is called an *outcome* of the game.

Definition 2. A *Bayes correlated Wardrop equilibrium* (BCWE) of a Bayesian nonatomic game Γ is an outcome $\mu : \Theta \rightarrow \Delta(\mathcal{Y})$ such that for every $k \in \mathcal{K}$ and $a, b \in \mathcal{A}^k$:

$$\sum_{\theta \in \Theta} p(\theta) \int y_a^k c_a^k(\mathbf{y}, \theta) d\mu(\mathbf{y} | \theta) \leq \sum_{\theta \in \Theta} p(\theta) \int y_a^k c_b^k(\mathbf{y}, \theta) d\mu(\mathbf{y} | \theta). \quad (2.2)$$

The interpretation of the definition of BCWE is as follows. For each state $\theta \in \Theta$, a mediator who knows the state draws a flow \mathbf{y} at random according to the distribution $\mu(\cdot | \theta)$. Then, for each population $k \in \mathcal{K}$ and action $a \in \mathcal{A}^k$, the mediator recommends a random mass y_a^k of players in population k to play a . The outcome is a BCWE if no player has an incentive to deviate from the mediator's recommendation when all the other players follow the mediator's recommendation. Indeed, for each population k , if we divide Eq. (2.2) by the ex-ante expected mass $\sum_{\theta} p(\theta) \int y_a^k d\mu(\mathbf{y} | \theta)$ of players choosing a in population k , then we see that the left-hand-side is proportional to the expected cost of playing a , conditionally of being recommended a , and the right-hand-side is proportional to the expected cost of playing b , conditionally of being recommended a .

The definition of BCWE has some particular cases of interest. First, a *Bayes deterministic Wardrop equilibrium* (BDWE) is a mapping $\mathbf{y}(\cdot) : \Theta \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$ such that for every $k \in \mathcal{K}$ and $a, b \in \mathcal{A}^k$:

$$\sum_{\theta \in \Theta} p(\theta) y_a^k(\theta) c_a^k(\mathbf{y}(\theta), \theta) \leq \sum_{\theta \in \Theta} p(\theta) y_a^k(\theta) c_b^k(\mathbf{y}(\theta), \theta). \quad (2.3)$$

Hence, a BDWE is a BCWE such that in each state the distribution $\mu(\cdot | \theta)$ is a Dirac distribution $\delta_{\mathbf{y}(\theta)}$ on some flow $\mathbf{y}(\theta)$. The BDWE inequalities can be interpreted as obedience constraints when, in each state θ , the mass of players receiving recommendation a in population k is $y_a^k(\theta)$. In Proposition 2, we provide a formal link between BDWE and equilibria in games with large finite sets of players who get conditionally independent signals.

Second, under complete information (i.e., $\Theta = \{\theta\}$), the definition of BDWE reduces to the well known definition of *Wardrop equilibrium* (WE). A WE of the game with complete information at state θ , is a flow $\mathbf{y} = (\mathbf{y}^k)_{k \in \mathcal{K}}$ such that for all k , and all a, b in \mathcal{A}^k

$$y_a^k c_a^k(\mathbf{y}, \theta) \leq y_a^k c_b^k(\mathbf{y}, \theta). \quad (2.4)$$

In other words, in each population, only actions with the smallest cost receive a positive flow:

$$\forall k \in \mathcal{K}, \forall a \in \mathcal{A}^k, y_a^k > 0 \implies c_a^k(\mathbf{y}, \theta) = \min_b c_b^k(\mathbf{y}, \theta).$$

This is called a Nash equilibrium of population games in Sandholm (2010).

Existence of WE is easily proved by a standard Kakutani fixed point argument (see Sandholm, 2010, theorem 2.1.1, page 24). Observe that if, for every $\theta \in \Theta$, $\mathbf{y}(\theta)$ is a WE of the nonatomic game with complete information at θ , then $\mathbf{y}(\cdot)$ is a BDWE of Γ . Hence, for every Bayesian nonatomic game, BDWE and BCWE exist.

Congestion games are important instances of our general model. A *Bayesian congestion game* is defined by the following quantities:

- a finite set of *resources* \mathcal{E} ;
- for each population $k \in \mathcal{K}$, a set of actions $\mathcal{A}^k \subseteq 2^{\mathcal{E}}$;
- for each resource $e \in \mathcal{E}$, a cost function $c_e: \mathbb{R}_+ \times \Theta \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$, which is continuous in the first variable.

For each resource $e \in \mathcal{E}$, the *load* on resource e induced by the flow \mathbf{y} is

$$x_e := \sum_k \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}^k, a \ni e} y_a^k. \quad (2.5)$$

When the state is θ , the cost of using resource e is $c_e(x_e, \theta)$ and the cost of choosing action $a \in \mathcal{A}^k$ in population k is obtained additively:

$$c_a^k(\mathbf{y}, \theta) := \sum_{e \in a} c_e(x_e, \theta). \quad (2.6)$$

One of the main applications of congestion games is traffic routing, as is reflected in the terminology. In a network routing model, the resources are the edges of an underlying oriented multigraph; each population is represented by an origin-destination pair of vertices; and actions for population k are feasible paths from its origin to its destination. In this case, the cost functions c_e are nondecreasing. The class of congestion games is larger than the class of routing games. For instance it includes cost-sharing games, for which the cost functions c_e are nonincreasing.

Some authors (e.g., Dafermos, 1980, Sohet et al., 2021) consider congestion games with nonseparable costs where the cost of an action is an arbitrary continuous function of loads on resources. This generalization of congestion games is also a particular case of our model.

3 Convergence

The aim of this section is to explore the relation between Bayesian games with finitely many players and Bayesian nonatomic games. In particular, we will prove that the solution concepts introduced in Section 2 correspond to limits of equilibrium outcomes in Bayesian games with finitely many players, as the number of players tends to infinity and the players' weights tend to zero.

Given a Bayesian nonatomic game Γ , we consider an n -player Bayesian game Γ^n with $|\mathcal{K}|$ populations, where population k has n^k players and $n = \sum_k n^k$. The action set of each player in population k is \mathcal{A}^k . For each k , player $i = 1, \dots, n^k$ in population k has a weight w_i^k with $\sum_{i=1}^{n^k} w_i^k = \gamma^k$.

Every action profile $\mathbf{a} = (\mathbf{a}^k)_k \in \times_k (\mathcal{A}^k)^{n^k}$ induces a flow $\mathbf{y}(\mathbf{a}) = (\mathbf{y}^k(\mathbf{a}^k))_k = \left((y_a^k)_{a \in \mathcal{A}^k} \right)_{k \in \mathcal{K}}$ defined by

$$y_a^k = \sum_{i=1}^{n^k} w_i^k \mathbb{1}\{a_i^k = a\}, \quad (3.1)$$

for each $k \in \mathcal{K}$ and $a \in \mathcal{A}^k$. For each action profile \mathbf{a} and state θ , the cost of player i in population k who plays action a is given by $c_a^k(\mathbf{y}(\mathbf{a}), \theta)$.

We now recall the definition of Bayes correlated equilibrium for finite games (Bergemann and Morris, 2016) within the present context.

Definition 3. A *Bayes correlated equilibrium* (BCE) of the n -player game Γ^n is a mapping $\beta^n : \Theta \rightarrow \Delta(\times_k (\mathcal{A}^k)^{n^k})$ such that $\forall k, \forall i = 1, \dots, n^k, \forall a, b \in \mathcal{A}^k$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\theta, \mathbf{a}_{-i}} p(\theta) \beta^n(a, \mathbf{a}_{-i}^k, \mathbf{a}^{-k} \mid \theta) c_a^k(\mathbf{y}^k(a, \mathbf{a}_{-i}^k), \mathbf{y}^{-k}(\mathbf{a}^{-k}), \theta) \\ \leq \sum_{\theta, \mathbf{a}_{-i}} p(\theta) \beta^n(a, \mathbf{a}_{-i}^k, \mathbf{a}^{-k} \mid \theta) c_b^k(\mathbf{y}^k(b, \mathbf{a}_{-i}^k), \mathbf{y}^{-k}(\mathbf{a}^{-k}), \theta). \end{aligned} \quad (3.2)$$

When all the inequalities are satisfied up to $\varepsilon > 0$ the mapping β^n is called an ε -*Bayes correlated equilibrium*.

Given a mapping $\beta^n : \Theta \rightarrow \Delta(\times_k (\mathcal{A}^k)^{n^k})$, the induced *outcome* is $\mu^n : \Theta \rightarrow \Delta(\mathcal{Y})$ defined as:

$$\mu^n(\mathbf{y} \mid \theta) = \sum_{\mathbf{a}: \mathbf{y}(\mathbf{a}) = \mathbf{y}} \beta^n(\mathbf{a} \mid \theta). \quad (3.3)$$

In words, there is mediator who knows the state, draws an action profile $\mathbf{a} = (a_i^k, \mathbf{a}_{-i}^k, \mathbf{a}^{-k})$, and privately recommends action $a_i^k \in \mathcal{A}^k$ to player i in population k . Eq. (3.2) is the BCE constraint stating that player i who is recommended $a_i^k = a$, prefers playing a over playing any other action $b \in \mathcal{A}^k$. Similarly to Eq. (2.2), by dividing both sides by the probability of recommending a , we see that Eq. (3.2) compares the expected costs of playing a or b , conditionally on being recommended to play a . Bergemann and Morris (2016) proved that the set of BCE outcomes is the set of all

Bayesian Nash equilibrium outcomes, for all possible information structures over the state set Θ , where an information structure is family of stochastic signals $(s_i)_i$, jointly correlated with the state and such that s_i is privately observed by player i .

The next proposition is related to the convergence result of Cominetti et al. (2023), which proves the convergence of Nash equilibria of congestion games with finitely many players to Wardrop equilibria of the corresponding nonatomic congestion games. The argument of the proof is that the obedience conditions of the BCE of the n -player game depend on the distribution of flows and carry over to the limit as the number of players grows.

Proposition 1. *Consider a sequence of weights $\{\mathbf{w}(n)\}$ such that $\max_{k,i} w_i^k(n) \rightarrow_n 0$, and let μ^n be a BCE outcome of the game Γ^n for each integer n . Then, any weak* accumulation point μ of the sequence $\{\mu^n\}$ is a BCWE of the Bayesian nonatomic game Γ .*

Proof. For given n , consider a BCE outcome of the game Γ^n . Let \mathbf{P}^n denote the probability measure induced by the prior p and the BCE β^n , and let \mathbf{E}^n be the corresponding expectation.

Eq. (3.2) can be rewritten as follows:

$$\mathbf{E}^n \left[\mathbf{1} \left\{ a_i^k = a \right\} c_a^k(\mathbf{y}(\mathbf{a}), \theta) \right] \leq \mathbf{E}^n \left[\mathbf{1} \left\{ a_i^k = a \right\} c_b^k \left(\mathbf{y}^k(\mathbf{a}^k) + w_i^k(n)(\delta_b^k - \delta_a^k), \mathbf{y}^{-k}(\mathbf{a}^{-k}), \theta \right) \right], \quad (3.4)$$

where δ_a^k is the flow on \mathcal{A}^k such that $y_a^k = 1$. Multiplying by $w_i^k(n)$ and summing over $i = 1, \dots, n^k$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E}^n \left[\sum_i w_i^k(n) \mathbf{1} \left\{ a_i^k = a \right\} c_a^k(\mathbf{y}(\mathbf{a}), \theta) \right] \\ \leq \mathbf{E}^n \left[\sum_i w_i^k(n) \mathbf{1} \left\{ a_i^k = a \right\} c_b^k \left(\mathbf{y}^k(\mathbf{a}^k) + w_i^k(n)(\delta_b^k - \delta_a^k), \mathbf{y}^{-k}(\mathbf{a}^{-k}), \theta \right) \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (3.5)$$

The l.h.s. of Eq. (3.5) is

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E}^n \left[\sum_i w_i^k(n) \mathbb{1}\{a_i^k = a\} c_a^k(\mathbf{y}(\mathbf{a}), \theta) \right] \\
&= \sum_{\theta, \mathbf{y}} \mathbb{P}^n(\theta, \mathbf{y}(\mathbf{a}) = \mathbf{y}) \mathbb{E}^n \left[\sum_i w_i^k(n) \mathbb{1}\{a_i^k = a\} c_a^k(\mathbf{y}(\mathbf{a}), \theta) \mid \mathbf{y}(\mathbf{a}) = \mathbf{y}, \theta \right] \\
&= \sum_{\theta, \mathbf{y}} \mathbb{P}^n(\theta, \mathbf{y}(\mathbf{a}) = \mathbf{y}) \mathbb{E}^n \left[\sum_i w_i^k(n) \mathbb{1}\{a_i^k = a\} \mid \mathbf{y}(\mathbf{a}) = \mathbf{y} \right] c_a^k(\mathbf{y}, \theta) \\
&= \sum_{\theta, \mathbf{y}} \mathbb{P}^n(\theta, \mathbf{y}(\mathbf{a}) = \mathbf{y}) y_a^k c_a^k(\mathbf{y}, \theta) \\
&= \sum_{\theta, \mathbf{y}} p(\theta) \mu^n(\mathbf{y} \mid \theta) y_a^k c_a^k(\mathbf{y}, \theta) \\
&= \sum_{\theta} p(\theta) \int y_a^k c_a^k(\mathbf{y}, \theta) d\mu^n(\mathbf{y} \mid \theta),
\end{aligned} \tag{3.6}$$

where $\mu^n(\cdot \mid \theta) \in \Delta(\mathcal{Y})$ is the (marginal) distribution of the flow $\mathbf{y}(\mathbf{a})$ induced by $\beta^n(\cdot \mid \theta)$. Consider a sequence $\{\beta^n\}$ of BCE of the n -player game such that for each θ , $\mu^n(\cdot \mid \theta)$ weak* converges to some $\mu(\cdot \mid \theta)$ in \mathcal{Y} (take a subsequence if needed) and suppose that $\max_{k,i} w_i^k(n) \rightarrow_n 0$. Then, the expression in (3.6) tends to $\sum_{\theta} p(\theta) \int y_a^k c_a^k(\mathbf{y}, \theta) d\mu(\mathbf{y} \mid \theta)$.

The r.h.s. of Eq. (3.5) is

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E}^n \left[\sum_i w_i^k(n) \mathbb{1}\{a_i^k = a\} c_b^k(\mathbf{y}(\mathbf{a}), \theta) \right] + \\
& \mathbb{E}^n \left[\sum_i w_i^k(n) \mathbb{1}\{a_i^k = a\} \left(c_b^k(\mathbf{y}^k(\mathbf{a}) + w_i^k(n)(\delta_b^k - \delta_a^k), \mathbf{y}^{-k}(\mathbf{a}), \theta) - c_b^k(\mathbf{y}(\mathbf{a}), \theta) \right) \right] \\
&= \sum_{\theta} p(\theta) \int y_a^k c_b^k(\mathbf{y}, \theta) d\mu^n(\mathbf{y} \mid \theta) + \text{error term}.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.7}$$

The first term in Eq. (3.7) tends to $\sum_{\theta} p(\theta) \int y_a^k c_b^k(\mathbf{y}, \theta) d\mu(\mathbf{y} \mid \theta)$. For the second term, note that the finite family of functions $\{\mathbf{y} \mapsto c_b^k(\mathbf{y}, \theta)\}_{k,\theta,b}$ is uniformly equicontinuous on the compact \mathcal{Y} ; that is, $\forall \varepsilon > 0, \exists \bar{w}, \text{ s.t. } \forall w \leq \bar{w}, \forall k, \theta, a, b, \forall \mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{Y}$, we have $|c_b^k(\mathbf{y}^k + w(\delta_b^k - \delta_a^k), \mathbf{y}^{-k}, \theta) - c_b^k(\mathbf{y}, \theta)| \leq \varepsilon$. Thus for all $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists \bar{n} such that $\forall n \geq \bar{n}, \forall k, i$, we have $w_i^k(n) \leq \bar{w}$; hence, $|\text{error term}| \leq \varepsilon$ for all $n \geq \bar{n}$. Therefore, the r.h.s. of Eq. (3.5) tends to $\sum_{\theta} p(\theta) \int y_a^k c_b^k(\mathbf{y}, \theta) d\mu(\mathbf{y} \mid \theta)$, which proves that μ is a BCWE. \square

The next proposition shows that a BDWE of a nonatomic game is related to a BCE with conditionally independent signals in n -player games. Conditionally independent signals are common in the literature on games with incomplete information such as global games or models of social

learning. A BCE β^n of the n -player game has the *conditional independence property* if for all \mathbf{a} and θ , $\beta^n(\mathbf{a} \mid \theta) = \prod_k \prod_{i=1}^{n^k} \beta_{i,k}^n(a_i \mid \theta)$ for some $\beta_{i,k}^n: \Theta \rightarrow \Delta(\mathcal{A}^k)$, $k \in \mathcal{K}$, $i = 1, \dots, n^k$. That is, recommended actions are independent, conditional on the state. A BCE with the conditional independence property is a Bayesian Nash equilibrium induced by conditionally independent signals. Compared with the proof of Proposition 1, the additional ingredient in the proof of Proposition 2 is that, from the weak law of large numbers, conditional independence implies that distributions of flows converge to their expectation. Thus, the limits of expected flows define a BDWE.

Proposition 2. *Consider a sequence of weights $\{w(n)\}$ such that $\max_{k,i} w_i^k(n) \rightarrow_n 0$, and let μ^n be a BCE outcome of the game Γ^n with the conditional independence property for each integer n . Then, any weak* accumulation point μ of the sequence $\{\mu^n\}$ is a BDWE of the Bayesian nonatomic game Γ .*

Proof. To prove this convergence result we use Proposition 1 and show that any weak* accumulation point μ of $(\mu^n(\cdot \mid \theta))_\theta$ is a mapping $\mathbf{y}: \Theta \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$. In other words, the distribution of flows $\mu(\cdot \mid \theta)$ in state θ is a Dirac mass on some flow $\mathbf{y}(\theta)$.

Consider a sequence of BCE β^n with outcome μ^n that has the conditional independence property for each n and, up to extracting a subsequence, assume that $\mu^n(\cdot \mid \theta)$ converges to $\mu(\cdot \mid \theta)$ for each $\theta \in \Theta$. For each k and action $a \in \mathcal{A}^k$, let $Y_a^k(n) := \sum_{i=1}^{n^k} w_i^k(n) \mathbb{1}\{a_i^k = a\}$ denote the random flow of population k on action a . We have $\mathbb{E}^n[Y_a^k(n) \mid \theta] = \int y_a^k d\mu^n(y \mid \theta) \rightarrow \int y_a^k d\mu(y \mid \theta) =: y_a^k(\theta)$. To prove the result, it is enough to show that conditionally on θ , the variance of $Y_a^k(n)$ tends to 0.

$$\text{Var}_\theta^n[Y_a^k(n)] \leq \frac{\sum_i (w_i^k(n))^2}{4} \leq \frac{(\max_i w_i^k(n)) \sum_i w_i^k(n)}{4} = \frac{\max_i w_i^k(n) \gamma^k}{4} \rightarrow 0. \quad (3.8)$$

Thus, conditionally on θ , the random variable $Y_a^k(n)$ converges in distribution to $y_a^k(\theta)$, which means that $\mu^n(\cdot \mid \theta)$ weak* converges to $\delta_{\mathbf{y}(\theta)}$. \square

Proposition 2 implies the following corollary.

Corollary 1. *Let Γ be a game with complete information, i.e., let $|\Theta| = 1$. Consider a sequence of weights $\{w(n)\}$ such that $\max_{k,i} w_i^k(n) \rightarrow_n 0$, and let μ^n be a mixed Nash equilibrium outcome of the game Γ^n for each integer n . Then, any weak* accumulation point μ of the sequence $\{\mu^n\}$ is a WE of Γ .*

This corollary extends the convergence result of Cominetti et al. (2023) from congestion games to our general class of nonatomic games with continuous cost functions. The proof follows immediately from Proposition 2, by noticing that in a game with complete information, a BCE is simply a correlated equilibrium, and that the conditional independence property reduces its outcome to a Nash equilibrium in mixed strategies.

The next proposition complements Propositions 1 and 2 by showing converse results for approximate equilibria. That is, any BCWE is a limit of approximate BCE of games with n players. The

structure of the proof is as follows. First, we approximate a BCWE μ with a finite-support outcome whose probabilities are rational numbers having common denominator n . Then, we consider a mediator who draws a flow from μ and assigns actions to subsets of players drawn according to the above rational probabilities. If the approximation is fine enough, this yields an approximate BCE. The analog of this result is proved for BDWE by relying on the law of large numbers when the mediator sends i.i.d. recommendations to players. In the limit, the mass of players who are recommended a given action coincides with the flow on this action given by the BDWE.

- Proposition 3.** (a) *Let μ be a BCWE of the Bayesian nonatomic game Γ . Then there exist a sequence of weights $\{w(n)\}$ such that $\max_{k,i} w_i^k(n) \rightarrow_n 0$, a sequence $\varepsilon^n \searrow 0$, and a sequence of ε^n -BCE outcomes μ^n of Γ^n such that $\{\mu^n\}$ weak* converges to μ as n tends to ∞ .*
- (b) *Let μ be a BDWE of the Bayesian nonatomic game Γ . Then there exist a sequence of weights $\{w(n)\}$ such that $\max_{k,i} w_i^k(n) \rightarrow_n 0$, a sequence $\varepsilon^n \searrow 0$, and a sequence of ε^n -BCE outcomes μ^n of Γ^n with the conditional independence property such that $\{\mu^n\}$ weak* converges to μ as n tends to ∞ .*

To prove Proposition 3, we first provide two preliminary lemmas. Let $f: \mathcal{Y} \times \Theta \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a continuous function and consider the following minimization program over the set of BCWE:

$$\begin{aligned} & \min_{\mu \in \Delta(\mathcal{Y}^\Theta)} \sum_{\theta \in \Theta} p(\theta) \int f(\mathbf{y}, \theta) \, d\mu(\mathbf{y} \mid \theta) \\ & \text{s.t. } \sum_{\theta \in \Theta} p(\theta) \int y_a^k c_a^k(\mathbf{y}, \theta) \, d\mu(\mathbf{y} \mid \theta) \leq \sum_{\theta \in \Theta} p(\theta) \int y_a^k c_b^k(\mathbf{y}, \theta) \, d\mu(\mathbf{y} \mid \theta), \quad \forall k \in \mathcal{K}, \forall a, b \in \mathcal{A}^k. \end{aligned} \tag{P}$$

The next lemma proves the existence of a solution with finite support, whose cardinality is upper bounded. The proof follows from a use of Caratheodory's theorem which is common in the theory-of-moment problems (see, e.g., Lasserre, 2008). The argument is based on the observation that the objective function and the constraints depend only on the expected values of the following functions of flows:

$$\sum_{\theta \in \Theta} p(\theta) f(\mathbf{y}, \theta) \text{ and } \sum_{\theta \in \Theta} p(\theta) y_a c_b(\mathbf{y}, \theta), \text{ with } a, b \in \mathcal{A}.$$

Thus, program (P) can be expressed via the convex hull of the joint range of those functions. The dimension of this set gives the upper bound on the cardinality of the support.

Lemma 1. *Program (P) admits a solution μ with finite support, whose cardinality is at most $|\Theta|(|\cup_k (\mathcal{A}^k \times \mathcal{A}^k)| + 1)$.*

Proof. First, we show that a BCWE $\mu \in \Delta(\mathcal{Y}^\Theta)$ can equivalently be represented by some $\tilde{\mu} \in \Delta(\mathcal{Y}^\Theta)$. To achieve this, Kuhn's Theorem on the equivalence between mixed and behavior strategies is applied to the one-player game tree where θ is observed before choosing y . Notice that the set

\mathcal{Y} is infinite; to cover this setting, we invoke Mertens et al. (2015, theorem II.1.6, page 63). To be more explicit, if we define

$$\mathcal{Y}^\Theta := \{(\mathbf{y}(\theta))_{\theta \in \Theta} : \mathbf{y}(\theta) \in \mathcal{Y}\}, \quad (3.9)$$

the mediator draws a vector $\tilde{\mathbf{y}} \in \mathcal{Y}^\Theta$ according to the product distribution $\tilde{\mu}$ over \mathcal{Y}^Θ , defined as follows: for any family of Borel sets $B_\theta \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{Y})$, $\theta \in \Theta$,

$$\tilde{\mu}(\times_{\theta \in \Theta} B_\theta) := \prod_{\theta \in \Theta} \mu(B_\theta \mid \theta). \quad (3.10)$$

Program (P) can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} & \min_{\tilde{\mu} \in \Delta(\mathcal{Y}^\Theta)} \int \sum_{\theta} p(\theta) f(\mathbf{y}(\theta), \theta) \, d\tilde{\mu}(\tilde{\mathbf{y}}), \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \int \sum_{\theta} p(\theta) y_a^k(\theta) c_a^k(\mathbf{y}(\theta), \theta) \, d\tilde{\mu}(\tilde{\mathbf{y}}) \leq \int \sum_{\theta} p(\theta) y_a^k(\theta) c_b^k(\mathbf{y}(\theta), \theta) \, d\tilde{\mu}(\tilde{\mathbf{y}}), \quad \forall k \in \mathcal{K}, \forall a, b \in \mathcal{A}^k. \end{aligned}$$

For $k \in \mathcal{K}$, $a, b \in \mathcal{A}^k$, and $f: \mathcal{Y} \times \Theta \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, define

$$\tilde{z}_{a,b}^k(\tilde{\mathbf{y}}) := \sum_{\theta} p(\theta) y_a^k(\theta) c_b^k(\mathbf{y}(\theta), \theta), \quad (3.11)$$

$$\tilde{\mathbf{z}}(\tilde{\mathbf{y}}) := (\tilde{z}_{a,b}^k(\tilde{\mathbf{y}}))_{k \in \mathcal{K}, (a,b) \in \mathcal{A}^k \times \mathcal{A}^k} \in \mathbb{R}^{\cup_k (\mathcal{A}^k \times \mathcal{A}^k)}, \quad (3.12)$$

$$\bar{f}(\tilde{\mathbf{y}}) := \sum_{\theta} p(\theta) f(\mathbf{y}(\theta), \theta), \quad (3.13)$$

$$\mathcal{Z} := \left\{ (\mathbf{z}, c) \in \mathbb{R}^{\cup_k (\mathcal{A}^k \times \mathcal{A}^k)} \times \mathbb{R} : \exists \tilde{\mathbf{y}} \in \mathcal{Y}^\Theta \text{ s.t. } (\mathbf{z}, c) = (\tilde{\mathbf{z}}(\tilde{\mathbf{y}}), \bar{f}(\tilde{\mathbf{y}})) \right\}. \quad (3.14)$$

The objective function and the constraints are linear with respect to $(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}(\tilde{\mathbf{y}}), \bar{f}(\tilde{\mathbf{y}}))$, so Program (P) is equivalent to

$$\min \left\{ c \text{ s.t. } (\mathbf{z}, c) \in \text{co}(\mathcal{Z}) \text{ and } z_{a,a}^k \leq z_{a,b}^k, \forall k \in \mathcal{K}, \forall a, b \in \mathcal{A}^k \right\},$$

where $\text{co}(\mathcal{Z})$ is the convex hull of \mathcal{Z} . Because \mathcal{Z} is connected, by Caratheodory's theorem, any point in $\text{co}(\mathcal{Z})$ can be obtained as a convex combination of $|\cup_k (\mathcal{A}^k \times \mathcal{A}^k)| + 1$ points (Fenchel, 1929). The value of the objective function at any BCWE can be obtained with a BCWE that randomizes over a set of flows with cardinality at most $|\Theta|(|\cup_k (\mathcal{A}^k \times \mathcal{A}^k)| + 1)$, because any $\tilde{\mathbf{y}}$ induces at most $|\Theta|$ different flows. \square

Lemma 1 has the following implication.

Lemma 2. *The set of BCWE with finite support is dense in the set of BCWE.*

Proof. Call \mathcal{C} the closure of the set of BCWE with finite support and assume, *ad absurdum*, the

existence of a BCWE μ outside \mathcal{C} . Because the set $\mathcal{C} \subseteq (\Delta(\mathcal{Y}))^\Theta$ is convex and closed, from the separation theorem, for each θ , there exists a continuous function $f(\cdot, \theta) : \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$\sum_{\theta} p(\theta) \int f(\mathbf{y}, \theta) d\mu(\mathbf{y} | \theta) < \inf_{\nu \in \mathcal{C}} \left\{ \sum_{\theta} p(\theta) \int f(\mathbf{y}, \theta) d\nu(\mathbf{y} | \theta) \right\}, \quad (3.15)$$

which contradicts Lemma 1. \square

Proof of Proposition 3. We prove the result for finite games with $|\mathcal{K}|n$ players with n players per population, where each player in population k has weight γ^k/n .

(a) From Lemma 2 it is enough to prove the result for a BCWE μ with finite support. Dividing by γ^k , the BCWE condition is equivalent to

$$\forall k \in \mathcal{K}, \forall a, b \in \mathcal{A}^k, \sum_{\theta, \mathbf{y}} p(\theta) \mu(\mathbf{y} | \theta) \frac{y_a^k}{\gamma^k} c_a^k(\mathbf{y}, \theta) \leq \sum_{\theta, \mathbf{y}} p(\theta) \mu(\mathbf{y} | \theta) \frac{y_b^k}{\gamma^k} c_b^k(\mathbf{y}, \theta). \quad (3.16)$$

Let $\mathcal{Y}^* := \cup_{\theta} \text{supp } \mu(\cdot | \theta)$. We approximate the numbers y_a^k/γ^k with sequences of rationals for $k \in \mathcal{K}$, $a \in \mathcal{A}^k$, and $\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{Y}^*$. For every integer n , there exist integers $(N_a^{k,n}(\mathbf{y}))_{k \in \mathcal{K}, a \in \mathcal{A}^k, \mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{Y}^*}$ such that, for all $\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{Y}^*$, $k \in \mathcal{K}$, and $a \in \mathcal{A}^k$,

$$\sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}^k} N_a^{k,n}(\mathbf{y}) = n \quad \text{and} \quad \left| \frac{N_a^{k,n}(\mathbf{y})}{n} - \frac{y_a^k}{\gamma^k} \right| \leq \eta_n, \quad (3.17)$$

with $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \eta_n = 0$. The flow profile

$$\left(\gamma^k \frac{N_a^{k,n}(\mathbf{y})}{n} \right)_{k \in \mathcal{K}, a \in \mathcal{A}^k} \quad (3.18)$$

is denoted by \mathbf{y}_n .

We construct $\beta^n : \Theta \rightarrow \Delta(\times_k (\mathcal{A}^k)^{n^k})$ as follows: Conditionally on state θ , the mediator draws $\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{Y}^*$ with probability $\mu(\mathbf{y} | \theta)$, then, for each population k , recommends action a to a subset of players of cardinality $N_a^{k,n}(\mathbf{y})$, chosen uniformly from population k . Conditionally on (θ, \mathbf{y}) , the probability that player i in population k is recommended a is $N_a^{k,n}(\mathbf{y})/n$. The total probability that player i in population k is recommended a is

$$\mathbf{P}^{k,n}(a) := \sum_{\theta, \mathbf{y}} p(\theta) \mu(\mathbf{y} | \theta) \frac{N_a^{k,n}(\mathbf{y})}{n}. \quad (3.19)$$

Notice that

$$\mathbf{P}^{k,n}(a) \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{\theta, \mathbf{y}} p(\theta) \mu(\mathbf{y} | \theta) \frac{y_a^k}{\gamma^k} =: \mathbf{P}^k(a). \quad (3.20)$$

If $\mathbf{P}^k(a) = 0$, then $\mathbf{P}^{k,n}(a)$ is arbitrarily small for large n . Hence, deviating after being recommended a cannot bring a profit that is larger than ε for such n . Conditionally on being recommended a , the expected cost that player i in population k incurs, when playing b , is

$$\frac{1}{\mathbf{P}^{k,n}(a)} \sum_{\theta, \mathbf{y}} p(\theta) \mu(\mathbf{y} | \theta) \frac{N_a^{k,n}(\mathbf{y})}{n} c_b^k \left(\mathbf{y}_n^{-k}, \mathbf{y}_n^k + \frac{\gamma^k}{n} (\delta_b^k - \delta_a^k), \theta \right). \quad (3.21)$$

The triangular inequality gives

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \frac{N_a^{k,n}(\mathbf{y})}{n} c_b^k \left(\mathbf{y}_n^{-k}, \mathbf{y}_n^k + \frac{\gamma^k}{n} (\delta_b^k - \delta_a^k), \theta \right) - \frac{y_a^k}{\gamma^k} c_b^k(\mathbf{y}) \right| \\ & \leq \frac{N_a^{k,n}(\mathbf{y})}{n} \left| c_b^k \left(\mathbf{y}_n^{-k}, \mathbf{y}_n^k + \frac{\gamma^k}{n} (\delta_b^k - \delta_a^k), \theta \right) - c_b^k(\mathbf{y}_n, \theta) \right| + \left| \frac{N_a^{k,n}(\mathbf{y})}{n} c_b^k(\mathbf{y}_n, \theta) - \frac{y_a^k}{\gamma^k} c_b^k(\mathbf{y}, \theta) \right|. \end{aligned} \quad (3.22)$$

Thus,

$$\left| \frac{N_a^{k,n}(\mathbf{y})}{n} c_b^k \left(\mathbf{y}_n^{-k}, \mathbf{y}_n^k + \frac{\gamma^k}{n} (\delta_b^k - \delta_a^k), \theta \right) - \frac{y_a^k}{\gamma^k} c_b^k(\mathbf{y}, \theta) \right| \leq \omega\left(\frac{\gamma}{n}\right) + \omega(\eta_n) =: \frac{\varepsilon_n}{2}, \quad (3.23)$$

where $\omega(\cdot)$ is a modulus of continuity ($\lim_{\eta \searrow 0} \omega(\eta) = 0$) common to all mappings $\mathbf{y} \mapsto c_a^k(\mathbf{y}, \theta)$, $\mathbf{y} \mapsto y_a^k c_b^k(\mathbf{y}, \theta)$, for $k \in \mathcal{K}$ and $(a, b) \in \mathcal{A}^k \times \mathcal{A}^k$. This modulus of continuity exists because all these mappings are uniformly continuous on the compact \mathcal{Y} . It follows from Eq. (3.16) that no unilateral deviation can lead to a profit larger than ε_n .

(b) Take a BDWE $\mathbf{y}(\cdot)$, fix a number of players n for each population k and construct β^n as follows. For each state θ and each population k , each player is recommended action a with probability $y_a^k(\theta)/\gamma^k$. Recommendations are i.i.d. across players in each population and independent across populations. Let $Z_a^k(n) = (\gamma^k/n) \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{1}\{a_i^k = a\}$ denote the weighted average number of players in population k who are recommended action a and let $\mathbf{Z}^k(n) := (Z_a^k(n))_{a \in \mathcal{A}^k}$. Under β^n , a player i in population k who plays b , conditionally on being recommended a , incurs the expected cost $C_{a,b}^k(\beta^n)$, where

$$\begin{aligned} C_{a,b}^k(\beta^n) &= \frac{1}{\mathbf{P}^k(a)} \sum_{\theta} p(\theta) \mathbb{E}^n \left[\mathbb{1}\{a_i^k = a\} c_b^k \left(\mathbf{Z}^{-k}(n), \mathbf{Z}^k(n) + (\gamma^k/n)(\delta_b^k - \delta_a^k), \theta \right) \right], \\ &= \frac{1}{\mathbf{P}^k(a)} \sum_{\theta} p(\theta) \frac{y_a^k(\theta)}{\gamma^k} \mathbb{E}^n \left[c_b^k \left(\mathbf{Z}^{-k}(n), \mathbf{Z}^k(n) + (\gamma^k/n)(\delta_b^k - \delta_a^k), \theta \right) \mid \theta, a_i^k = a \right], \end{aligned} \quad (3.24)$$

with

$$\mathbf{P}^k(a) := \sum_{\theta} p(\theta) \frac{y_a^k(\theta)}{\gamma^k}. \quad (3.25)$$

The product $\mathbf{P}^k(a) C_{a,b}^k(\beta^n)$ is the expectation $\mathbb{E}[\mathbb{1}\{a_i^k = a\}(\text{cost of playing } b)]$. By the law of large

numbers, this quantity converges to

$$\sum p(\theta) \frac{y_a^k(\theta)}{\gamma^k} c_b^k(\mathbf{y}^{-k}(\theta), y^k(\theta), \theta). \quad (3.26)$$

The set of triples (k, a, b) is finite; hence, for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists \bar{n} such that for all $n \geq \bar{n}$, for all $k \in \mathcal{K}$, and all $a, b \in \mathcal{A}^k$, we have

$$\left| \mathbb{P}^k(a) C_{a,b}^k(\beta^n) - \sum p(\theta) \frac{y_a^k(\theta)}{\gamma^k} c_b^k(\mathbf{y}^{-k}(\theta), y^k(\theta), \theta) \right| \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{2}. \quad (3.27)$$

Because $\mathbf{y}(\cdot)$ is a BDWE, from Eq. (3.16) we get that β^n is an ε -BCE. \square

4 Correlated equilibria and Wardrop equilibria in potential games

This section studies BCWE in the class of convex potential games with complete information. A Bayesian nonatomic game Γ with $|\Theta| = 1$ is simply called a nonatomic game and denoted by $\Gamma = (\mathcal{K}, \gamma, \mathcal{A}, \mathbf{c})$. In this section we restrict attention to this class of games with complete information and remove any reference to the state θ in the notations. Recall that a *Wardrop equilibrium* (WE) of the nonatomic game Γ is a flow $\mathbf{y} = (y^k)_{k \in \mathcal{K}}$ such that for all $k \in \mathcal{K}$ and all $a, b \in \mathcal{A}^k$, we have

$$y_a^k c_a^k(\mathbf{y}) \leq y_b^k c_b^k(\mathbf{y}). \quad (4.1)$$

Definition 4. A *correlated Wardrop equilibrium* (CWE) of the nonatomic game Γ is a distribution $\mu \in \Delta(\mathcal{Y})$ over flows such that for all $k \in \mathcal{K}$ and all $a, b \in \mathcal{A}^k$, we have

$$\int y_a^k c_a^k(\mathbf{y}) \, d\mu(\mathbf{y}) \leq \int y_b^k c_b^k(\mathbf{y}) \, d\mu(\mathbf{y}). \quad (4.2)$$

A *coarse correlated Wardrop equilibrium* (CCWE) of the nonatomic game Γ is a distribution $\mu \in \Delta(\mathcal{Y})$ over flows such that for all $k \in \mathcal{K}$, and all $b \in \mathcal{A}^k$, we have

$$\int \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}^k} y_a^k c_a^k(\mathbf{y}) \, d\mu(\mathbf{y}) \leq \int \gamma^k c_b^k(\mathbf{y}) \, d\mu(\mathbf{y}). \quad (4.3)$$

The symbols $\text{WE}(\Gamma)$, $\text{CWE}(\Gamma)$ and $\text{CCWE}(\Gamma)$ denote the sets of WE, CWE and CCWE of Γ , respectively.

Remark that CWE is simply a BCWE under complete information. Also, a CWE that assigns probability one to a single flow induces no strategic uncertainty and corresponds to a WE. A CCWE is the adaptation of the concept of coarse correlated equilibrium (Moulin and Vial, 1978) to nonatomic games: the mediator recommends actions in such a way that obedience yields an ex-ante expected cost which is less or equal to the cost of playing b unconditionally on the recommendation.

It is immediate to see that

$$\Delta(\text{WE}(\Gamma)) \subseteq \text{CWE}(\Gamma) \subseteq \text{CCWE}(\Gamma). \quad (4.4)$$

However, in general, the inclusions can be strict. The next example, taken from Mitsche et al. (2013), shows that $\Delta(\text{WE}(\Gamma))$ can be a proper subset of $\text{CWE}(\Gamma)$.

Example 1 (El Farol tapas bar (Arthur, 1994)). In this nonatomic game, there is a single population and the action set \mathcal{A} is $\{a, b\}$, which represent staying home and going to the bar, respectively. The cost functions are:

$$c_a(\mathbf{y}) = 1, \quad c_b(\mathbf{y}) = \max\{2 - 4y_b, 4y_b - 2\}. \quad (4.5)$$

The idea is that it is nice to go to the bar when there is some crowd, but not when the crowd is either too large or too small. The game Γ admits three WE: $(1, 0)$, $(3/4, 1/4)$, and $(1/4, 3/4)$, and the total cost is equal to 1 for all of them.

Consider now the flows $\mathbf{z} = (1, 0)$ and $\mathbf{w} = (1/2, 1/2)$. The distribution μ such that

$$\mu(\mathbf{z}) = \frac{1}{3}, \quad \mu(\mathbf{w}) = \frac{2}{3}, \quad (4.6)$$

is a CWE, because it satisfies the equilibrium constraints

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{2}{3} &= \frac{1}{3}z_a c_a(\mathbf{z}) + \frac{2}{3}w_a c_a(\mathbf{w}) \leq \frac{1}{3}z_a c_b(\mathbf{z}) + \frac{2}{3}w_a c_b(\mathbf{w}) = \frac{2}{3}, \\ 0 &= \frac{1}{3}z_b c_b(\mathbf{z}) + \frac{2}{3}w_b c_b(\mathbf{w}) \leq \frac{1}{3}z_b c_a(\mathbf{z}) + \frac{2}{3}w_b c_a(\mathbf{w}) = \frac{1}{3}. \end{aligned}$$

This CWE is not a mixture of WE. Therefore, $\Delta(\text{WE}(\Gamma)) \subsetneq \text{CWE}(\Gamma)$. Moreover, the total cost of this CWE is $2/3$, which is lower than the total cost of each WE.

Now we introduce an important class of nonatomic games for which equality holds in (4.4).

Definition 5. A nonatomic game is a *potential game* if there exists an open neighborhood $\widehat{\mathcal{Y}}$ of \mathcal{Y} and a continuously differentiable function $\Phi: \widehat{\mathcal{Y}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that, for every $k \in \mathcal{K}$, $a \in \mathcal{A}$ and $\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{Y}$, we have

$$\frac{\partial \Phi(\mathbf{y})}{\partial y_a^k} = c_a^k(\mathbf{y}). \quad (4.7)$$

The function Φ is called the *potential* of Γ .

Any congestion game is a potential game. Consider a congestion game with resource set \mathcal{E} , action set \mathcal{A}^k for population k , and continuous nondecreasing cost function $c_e: \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ for

resource e . This game admits the potential function

$$\Phi(\mathbf{y}) = \sum_{e \in \mathcal{E}} \int_0^{x_e} c_e(u) \, du, \quad (4.8)$$

where $x_e = \sum_k \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}^k, a \ni e} y_a^k$ is the load on resource e induced by the flow \mathbf{y} . If cost functions are nondecreasing, this function is convex. All minimizers of this potential function with nondecreasing costs have the same cost profiles $(c_e(x_e))_{e \in \mathcal{E}}$. In other words, although WE of a congestion game with nondecreasing costs are not necessarily unique, they all have the same costs.

Note that the El Farol game (Example 1) has a potential given by

$$\Phi(1 - y_b, y_b) = \begin{cases} 1 + y_b - 2y_b^2 & \text{if } y_b \leq \frac{1}{2}, \\ 2 - 3y_b + 2y_b^2 & \text{if } y_b \geq \frac{1}{2}, \end{cases} \quad (4.9)$$

which is not convex.

The next proposition shows that, for nonatomic games with a convex potential, distributions over WE exhaust the set of CCWE (and therefore CWE), and equilibrium costs are unique.

Proposition 4. *If a nonatomic game Γ has a convex potential, then*

$$\text{CCWE}(\Gamma) = \text{CWE}(\Gamma) = \Delta(\text{WE}(\Gamma)). \quad (4.10)$$

In addition, all WE (and therefore all CCWE and CWE) have the same costs profiles: all actions with positive flow have the same cost in all equilibria.

We first recall the following lemma.

Lemma 3. *If a nonatomic game has a convex potential, then the set of WE is the set of minimizers of Φ .*

Proof. This result follows from Sandholm (2001, proposition 3.1), who proves that the set of WE is the set of Karush–Kuhn–Tucker (KKT) points of the minimization problem $\min\{\Phi(\mathbf{y}) : \mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{Y}\}$. The KKT points are the minimizers of Φ , because Φ is convex. \square

Proof of Proposition 4. From Lemma 3 we have

$$\Delta(\arg \min \Phi) = \arg \min_{\mu \in \Delta(\mathcal{Y})} \mathbb{E}_\mu[\Phi] \subseteq \text{CWE}(\Gamma). \quad (4.11)$$

Conversely, take a CCWE μ and suppose that there exists $\mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{Y}$ such that $\Phi(\mathbf{z}) < \int \Phi(\mathbf{y}) \, d\mu(\mathbf{y})$. Using the fact that $\Phi(\mathbf{z}) - \Phi(\mathbf{y}) \geq \nabla \Phi(\mathbf{y})(\mathbf{z} - \mathbf{y})$ and integrating, we obtain

$$\int \nabla \Phi(\mathbf{y})(\mathbf{z} - \mathbf{y}) \, d\mu(\mathbf{y}) \leq \Phi(\mathbf{z}) - \int \Phi(\mathbf{y}) \, d\mu(\mathbf{y}) < 0.$$

We have

$$\nabla\Phi(\mathbf{y})(\mathbf{z} - \mathbf{y}) = \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}} \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}^k} (z_a^k - y_a^k) c_a^k(\mathbf{y}),$$

so

$$\sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}} \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}^k} \int y_a^k c_a^k(\mathbf{y}) \, d\mu(\mathbf{y}) > \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}} \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}^k} z_a^k \int c_a^k(\mathbf{y}) \, d\mu(\mathbf{y}) \geq \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}} \gamma^k \min_{a \in \mathcal{A}^k} \int c_a^k(\mathbf{y}) \, d\mu(\mathbf{y}).$$

Thus, there exist $k \in \mathcal{K}$ such that

$$\sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}^k} \int y_a^k c_a^k(\mathbf{y}) \, d\mu(\mathbf{y}) > \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}^k} z_a^k \int c_a^k(\mathbf{y}) \, d\mu(\mathbf{y}) \geq \gamma^k \min_{a \in \mathcal{A}^k} \int c_a^k(\mathbf{y}) \, d\mu(\mathbf{y}),$$

and $b \in \mathcal{A}^k$ such that

$$\sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}^k} \int y_a^k c_a^k(\mathbf{y}) \, d\mu(\mathbf{y}) > \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}^k} z_a^k \int c_a^k(\mathbf{y}) \, d\mu(\mathbf{y}) \geq \gamma^k \int c_b^k(\mathbf{y}) \, d\mu(\mathbf{y}).$$

This contradicts (4.3), so μ cannot be a CCWE.

Next, we show that all WE have the same costs. We know from Lemma 3 that the WE minimize the potential, i.e., they are the solutions of the following convex optimization problem:

$$\min \left\{ \Phi(\mathbf{y}) : \forall k \in \mathcal{K}, \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}^k} y_a^k = \gamma^k, \forall k \in \mathcal{K}, \forall a \in \mathcal{A}^k, y_a^k \geq 0 \right\},$$

whose Lagrangian is

$$\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{y}, \boldsymbol{\lambda}) = \Phi(\mathbf{y}) - \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}} \lambda^k \left(\sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}^k} y_a^k \right) - \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}} \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}^k} \lambda_{a,k} y_a^k,$$

with $\boldsymbol{\lambda} = \left((\lambda^k)_{k \in \mathcal{K}}, (\lambda_{a,k})_{a \in \mathcal{A}^k, k \in \mathcal{K}} \right)$. From the KKT theorem, $\hat{\mathbf{y}}$ is a solution if and only if there exists $\hat{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}$ such that $(\hat{\mathbf{y}}, \hat{\boldsymbol{\lambda}})$ satisfies the KKT conditions: For all $k \in \mathcal{K}$ and $a \in \mathcal{A}^k$,

$$\frac{\partial \Phi}{\partial y_a^k}(\hat{\mathbf{y}}) = \hat{\lambda}^k + \hat{\lambda}_{a,k}; \quad \hat{\lambda}_{a,k} \cdot \hat{y}_a^k = 0; \quad \hat{\lambda}_{a,k} \geq 0; \quad \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}^k} \hat{y}_a^k = \gamma^k.$$

This condition is satisfied if and only if for all $(\mathbf{y}, \boldsymbol{\lambda})$,

$$\mathcal{L}(\hat{\mathbf{y}}, \boldsymbol{\lambda}) \leq \mathcal{L}(\hat{\mathbf{y}}, \hat{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}) \leq \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{y}, \hat{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}),$$

(see Rockafellar, 1970, theorem 28.3, page 281). From the exchange property, if $(\hat{\mathbf{y}}, \hat{\boldsymbol{\lambda}})$ and $(\bar{\mathbf{y}}, \bar{\boldsymbol{\lambda}})$ are such saddle points, then $(\hat{\mathbf{y}}, \bar{\boldsymbol{\lambda}})$ and $(\bar{\mathbf{y}}, \hat{\boldsymbol{\lambda}})$ are also saddle points.

Consider the relative interior of the set $\text{WE}(\Gamma)$. For each $k \in \mathcal{K}$, there exists a subset of actions $\mathcal{B}^k \subseteq \mathcal{A}^k$ such that $\times_{k \in \mathcal{K}} \mathcal{B}^k$ is the support of all flows in this relative interior. To see this, notice that for each pair of WE \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z} such that \mathbf{y} is in the relative interior and for each $t \in (0, 1]$, we have that $t\mathbf{y} + (1-t)\mathbf{z}$ is also in the relative interior. Therefore, for each a, k , whenever $y_a^k > 0$ for some WE, this must be true for all points in the relative interior of WE.

Consider now two points $\hat{\mathbf{y}}, \bar{\mathbf{y}}$ in the relative interior of $\text{WE}(\Gamma)$. For every $a \in \mathcal{B}^k$, we have $\hat{y}_a^k > 0, \bar{y}_a^k > 0$ and

$$\frac{\partial \Phi}{\partial y_a^k}(\hat{\mathbf{y}}) = \hat{\lambda}^k = \bar{\lambda}^k = \frac{\partial \Phi}{\partial y_a^k}(\bar{\mathbf{y}}).$$

Thus, for every $k \in \mathcal{K}$ and $a \in \mathcal{B}^k$, $c_a^k(\hat{\mathbf{y}}) = c_a^k(\bar{\mathbf{y}})$, and all points in the relative interior of $\text{WE}(\Gamma)$ have the same costs. By continuity, all points in $\text{WE}(\Gamma)$ have the same costs (notice that the support can only shrink when approaching the boundary). \square

Proposition 4 implies that mediation does not help as a tool for inducing other equilibrium outcomes than WE. Díaz et al. (2009, Theorem 1) showed that in a particular class of routing games, the smallest total cost achieved by a CWE cannot be smaller than the smallest total cost achieved by a WE. Proposition 4 significantly generalizes the result of Díaz et al. (2009) in two directions. First, Proposition 4 applies to all games with a convex potential. Second, it implies that mediation has no value regardless of the welfare objective, not only for minimizing the total cost.

The first part of the proof of Proposition 4, showing that any CCWE is a distribution over WE, follows similar steps as the proof of Neyman (1997, theorem 1). Neyman's result states that correlated equilibria are distributions of Nash equilibria in potential games with finitely many players, convex sets of actions, and a convex potential. There are several differences between Proposition 4 and Neyman (1997): finite vs. infinite set of players, convex vs. finite set of actions. Also, the games in Neyman (1997) are potential games in the sense of Monderer and Shapley (1996): differences of cost functions along unilateral deviations are equal to differences of the potential. Lastly, Neyman (1997) considers only correlated equilibria and not coarse correlated equilibria. Moulin et al. (2014) provide an example of a game satisfying the conditions of Neyman (1997) where there is a unique correlated equilibrium and a more efficient coarse correlated equilibrium. Hence, in the setup of Neyman (1997) with a convex potential, coarse correlated equilibria do not reduce to distributions over Nash equilibria.

Uniqueness of WE costs is a well known property of congestion games with nondecreasing costs. The usual proof uses the fact that costs of edges are functions of one-dimensional variables (the loads) and that the potential is given by the sum of the integrals of these function (see Roughgarden, 2007, theorem 18.8 and its proof). Proposition 4 generalizes it to all games with a convex potential. In our proof, we use the fact that WE are minimizers of the potential and that pairs of optimal solutions and Lagrange multipliers are saddle-points of the Lagrangian function.

We have previously observed that a network routing game with multiple populations has a convex potential when populations only differ by their feasible actions, i.e., by their origin-destination pairs and feasible routes (see e.g., Roughgarden, 2007, proposition 18.11). Hence, Proposition 4 applies to such games, and mediation has no value. However, if the cost functions differ across populations, then the multi-population routing game does not necessarily have a convex potential. The next example shows a two-population routing game with different cost functions, where there exists a CWE that Pareto dominates the unique WE.

Example 2. Consider the following two-population routing game. The set of actions is $\mathcal{A} = \{a, b\}$ for both populations. The costs functions in population 1 are given by $c_a^1(\mathbf{y}) = 1$ and $c_b^1(\mathbf{y}) = 2y_b^1$. The cost functions in population 2 are given by $c_a^2(\mathbf{y}) = 2$ and

$$c_b^2(\mathbf{y}) = \begin{cases} 2y_b^1 & \text{if } y_b^1 \leq 1/2 \\ 1 & \text{if } y_b^1 > 1/2. \end{cases} \quad (4.12)$$

Action b is strictly dominant for population 2, so the flow of population 2 on action b is 1 in every CWE. The unique WE is $y_b^1 = 1/2$ and $y_b^2 = 1$. Consider now the CWE in which the flow of population 1 on action b is equal to 1 with probability $1/2$ and is equal to 0 with probability $1/2$. The total cost of population 1 is unchanged, but the expected total cost of population 2 is strictly lower than in the WE:

$$\frac{1}{2}c_b^2(1) + \frac{1}{2}c_b^2(0) = 1/2 < c_b^2(1/2) = 1.$$

Combining Proposition 1 (applied to games with complete information) and Proposition 4, we get the following important corollary:

Corollary 2. *Let Γ be a nonatomic game with convex potential. Consider a sequence of weights $\{w(n)\}$ such that $\max_{k,i} w_i^k(n) \rightarrow_n 0$, and let μ^n be a correlated equilibrium outcome of Γ^n for each integer n . Then any weak* accumulation point μ of the sequence $\{\mu^n\}$ belongs to $\Delta(\text{WE}(\Gamma))$.*

This corollary shows that the value of mediation, that is, the additional welfare due to correlation, tends to zero when the weight of each player tends to zero, i.e., when the impact of each player's action on other players' costs becomes negligible. Ashlagi et al. (2008) showed that correlated equilibria may significantly decrease the total cost over Nash equilibria (the value of mediation is positive) in n -player routing games, even for a large number of players. However, in their examples, the weights of some players do not tend to zero. Also, our model takes as primitives continuous cost functions defined for all real valued flows. In the n -player games, costs are given by those continuous functions evaluated at the flows induced by the actions of the n players, for any n . By contrast, in the examples of Ashlagi et al. (2008), cost functions are tuned to the number of players.

Given that the concepts of BDWE and BCWE are extensions of—respectively—WE and CWE to Bayesian nonatomic games, it is natural to ask whether Proposition 4 extends to Bayesian

nonatomic games that admit a convex potential in each state. The next example shows that this is not the case in general. This is a single-population routing game with two actions, two states, and no cost externality. We find that there is a flow profile in the support of a BCWE which is not a BDWE flow profile. Hence, even if the game admits a convex potential in each state, distributions over BDWE do not exhaust the set of BCWE.

Example 3. Consider a Bayesian nonatomic game with a single population, where the action set \mathcal{A} is $\{a, b\}$, the state set Θ is $\{0, 1\}$, and the prior is uniform. The cost functions are given by $c_a(\mathbf{y}, \theta) = \theta$ and $c_b(\mathbf{y}, \theta) = 1/3$ for every θ and \mathbf{y} . It is easy to verify that for any $\alpha \in [0, \frac{1}{2}]$, there is a BCWE such in state $\theta = 0$ the flow is $\mathbf{y}(\theta) = (1, 0)$ with probability 1, and in state $\theta = 1$ the flow is $\mathbf{y}(\theta) = (1, 0)$ with probability α and $\mathbf{y}(\theta) = (0, 1)$ with probability $1 - \alpha$. However, there is no BDWE in which the flow is $\mathbf{y}(\theta) = (1, 0)$ in state $\theta = 1$.

5 No-regret and coarse correlated Wardrop equilibria

The notion of CCWE is also related to no-regret procedures. Define a no-regret sequence of flows as follows (see e.g., Blum et al., 2010).

Definition 6. A sequence of flows $\mathbf{y}(t)$, $t \in \mathbb{N}$, has no regret if for all $k \in \mathcal{K}$ we have

$$\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}^k} y_a^k(t) c_a^k(\mathbf{y}^k(t)) \leq \min_b \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \gamma^k c_b^k(\mathbf{y}(t)) + \varepsilon_T, \quad (5.1)$$

for every $T \in \mathbb{N}$, with $\lim_{T \rightarrow +\infty} \varepsilon_T = 0$.

The link with coarse correlated Wardrop equilibrium is evident by passing to the limit in Eq. (5.1). This gives:

Observation 1. *If a sequence of flows $\mathbf{y}(t)$ has no regret, then any weak* accumulation point μ of $\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \delta_{\mathbf{y}(t)}$ is a coarse correlated Wardrop equilibrium.*

Blum et al. (2010) consider nonatomic congestion games and show that if a sequence of flows has no external regret, then its average cost converges to the WE cost. Our approach allows us to generalize this result. We have the following generalization of Theorem 4.1 in Blum et al. (2010):

Corollary 3. *Consider a nonatomic game Γ with convex potential. If a sequence of flows $\mathbf{y}(t)$ has no regret, then any weak* accumulation point of the sequence $\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \delta_{\mathbf{y}(t)}$ belongs to $\Delta(\text{WE}(\Gamma))$.*

In particular, in a nonatomic game with convex potential, if a sequence of flows $\mathbf{y}(t)$ has no regret, then costs converge to the WE costs. Another direct consequence is that any accumulation point of the sequence $\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{y}(t)$ belongs to $\text{WE}(\Gamma)$.

Acknowledgments

This work was partially supported by COST Action 16228 GAMENET. Frederic Koessler acknowledges the support of the ANR (StratCom ANR-19-CE26-0010-01). Marco Scarsini is a member of GNAMPA-INdAM. He acknowledges the support of the GNAMPA project CUP_E53C22001930001 “Limiting behavior of stochastic dynamics in the Schelling segregation model” and the Italian MIUR PRIN 2017 Project ALGADIMAR Algorithms, Games, and Digital Markets. Tristan Tomala gratefully acknowledges the support of the HEC foundation and ANR/Investissements d’Avenir under grant ANR-11-IDEX-0003/Labex Ecodec/ANR-11-LABX-0047.

References

- Arthur, W. B. (1994). Inductive reasoning and bounded rationality. *Amer. Econ. Rev.*, 84(2):406–411.
- Ashlagi, I., Monderer, D., and Tennenholtz, M. (2008). On the value of correlation. *J. Artificial Intelligence Res.*, 33:575–613.
- Aumann, R. J. (1974). Subjectivity and correlation in randomized strategies. *J. Math. Econom.*, 1(1):67–96.
- Aumann, R. J. (1987). Correlated equilibrium as an expression of Bayesian rationality. *Econometrica*, 55(1):1–18.
- Beckmann, M. J., McGuire, C., and Winsten, C. B. (1956). *Studies in the Economics of Transportation*. Yale University Press, New Haven, CT.
- Bergemann, D. and Morris, S. (2016). Bayes correlated equilibrium and the comparison of information structures in games. *Theor. Econ.*, 11(2):487–522.
- Blum, A., Even-Dar, E., and Ligett, K. (2010). Routing without regret: on convergence to Nash equilibria of regret-minimizing algorithms in routing games. *Theory Comput.*, 6:179–199.
- Cominetti, R., Scarsini, M., Schröder, M., and Stier-Moses, N. (2023). Approximation and convergence of large atomic congestion games. *Math. Oper. Res.*, 48(2):784–811.
- Dafermos, S. (1980). Traffic equilibrium and variational inequalities. *Transportation Sci.*, 14(1):42–54.
- Díaz, J., Mitsche, D., Rustagi, N., and Saia, J. (2009). On the power of mediators. In Leonardi, S., editor, *Internet and Network Economics*, pages 455–462. Springer Berlin Heidelberg.
- Fenchel, W. (1929). Über Krümmung und Windung geschlossener Raumkurven. *Math. Ann.*, 101(1):238–252.
- Forges, F. (1990). Correlated equilibrium in two-person zero-sum games. *Econometrica*, 58(2):515.
- Forges, F. (1993). Five legitimate definitions of correlated equilibrium in games with incomplete information. *Theory and Decision*, 35(3):277–310.

- Forges, F. (2006). Correlated equilibrium in games with incomplete information revisited. *Theory and Decision*, 61(4):329–344.
- Hart, S. and Schmeidler, D. (1989). Existence of correlated equilibria. *Math. Oper. Res.*, 14(1):18–25.
- Haurie, A. and Marcotte, P. (1985). On the relationship between Nash-Cournot and Wardrop equilibria. *Networks*, 15(3):295–308.
- Hellwig, M. F. (2022). Incomplete-information games in large populations with anonymity. *Theor. Econ.*, 17(1):461–506.
- Hofbauer, J. and Sandholm, W. H. (2009). Stable games and their dynamics. *J. Econom. Theory*, 144(4):1665–1693, 1693.e4.
- Lasserre, J. B. (2008). A semidefinite programming approach to the generalized problem of moments. *Math. Program.*, 112(1, Ser. B):65–92.
- Mertens, J.-F., Sorin, S., and Zamir, S. (2015). *Repeated Games*. Cambridge University Press, New York.
- Mitsche, D., Saad, G., and Saia, J. (2013). The power of mediation in an extended El Farol game. In *Algorithmic Game Theory*, volume 8146 of *Lecture Notes in Comput. Sci.*, pages 50–61. Springer, Heidelberg.
- Monderer, D. and Shapley, L. S. (1996). Potential games. *Games Econom. Behav.*, 14(1):124–143.
- Moulin, H., Ray, I., and Sen Gupta, S. (2014). Improving Nash by coarse correlation. *J. Econom. Theory*, 150:852–865.
- Moulin, H. and Vial, J.-P. (1978). Strategically zero-sum games: the class of games whose completely mixed equilibria cannot be improved upon. *Internat. J. Game Theory*, 7(3-4):201–221.
- Myerson, R. B. (1982). Optimal coordination mechanisms in generalized principal-agent problems. *J. Math. Econom.*, 10(1):67–81.
- Neyman, A. (1997). Correlated equilibrium and potential games. *Internat. J. Game Theory*, 26(2):223–227.
- Rockafellar, R. T. (1970). *Convex Analysis*. Princeton Mathematical Series, No. 28. Princeton University Press, Princeton, N.J.
- Rosenthal, R. W. (1973). A class of games possessing pure-strategy Nash equilibria. *Internat. J. Game Theory*, 2:65–67.
- Roughgarden, T. (2007). Routing games. In *Algorithmic Game Theory*, pages 461–486. Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge.
- Sandholm, W. H. (2001). Potential games with continuous player sets. *J. Econom. Theory*, 97(1):81–108.
- Sandholm, W. H. (2010). *Population Games and Evolutionary Dynamics*. Economic Learning and

Social Evolution. MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.

Sohet, B., Hayel, Y., Beaudé, O., and Jeandin, A. (2021). Coupled charging-and-driving incentives design for electric vehicles in urban networks. *IEEE Trans. Intell. Transportation Syst.*, 22(10):6342–6352.

Tavafoghi, H. and Teneketzis, D. (2018). Strategic information provision in routing games. mimeo.

Ui, T. (2008). Correlated equilibrium and concave games. *Internat. J. Game Theory*, 37(1):1–13.

Wardrop, J. G. (1952). Some theoretical aspects of road traffic research. In *Proceedings of the Institute of Civil Engineers, Part II*, volume 1, pages 325–378.

Zhu, Y. and Savla, K. (2021). Information design in non-atomic routing games with partial participation: Computation and properties. Technical report, arXiv:2005.03000.

A List of symbols

\mathcal{A}	set of action profiles, defined in Definition 1
\mathcal{A}^k	action set of population k , defined in Definition 1
a	action
a_i	action of player i
\mathbf{a}	action profile
b	action
\mathcal{B}^k	subset of \mathcal{A}^k
\mathcal{B}	Borel σ -field
c_a^k	cost of action a in population k , defined in Definition 1
c_e	cost of resource e in a congestion game
\mathbf{c}	$(c_a)_{a \in \mathcal{A}}$, defined in Definition 1
C_i	cost of player i in the game Γ^n
\mathbf{C}	$(C_i)_{i \in [n]}$
$C_{a,b}^k$	expected cost of a player in population k who plays b , conditionally on being recommended a
$\text{CCWE}(\Gamma)$	coarse correlated Wardrop equilibria of Γ
$\text{co}(\cdot)$	convex hull
$\text{CWE}(\Gamma)$	correlated Wardrop equilibria of Γ
e	resource in a congestion game
\mathcal{E}	resource set in a congestion game
\mathbf{E}^n	expectation corresponding to \mathbf{P}^n
k	population
\mathcal{K}	population set

\mathcal{L}	Lagrangian
$[n]$	player set of the game Γ^n
n^k	size of population k in the game Γ^n
$N_a^{k,n}$	number of players in population k that are recommended a
p	prior distribution on Θ , defined in Definition 1
\mathbf{P}^n	probability measure induced by the prior p and the BCE β^n
$\mathbf{P}^{k,n}(a)$	probability that player i in population k is recommended a , defined in (3.25)
w_i^k	weight of player i in population k
$\text{WE}(\Gamma)$	Wardrop equilibria of Γ
x_e	load on resource e , defined in (2.5)
y_a^k	flow on action a in population k
\mathbf{y}	flow vector
\mathbf{y}^*	equilibrium flow vector
$Y_a^k(n)$	random flow of population k on action a
\mathcal{Y}	$\times_k \mathcal{Y}^k$, set of feasible flows of the nonatomic game Γ
\mathcal{Y}^k	$\Delta_{\gamma^k}(\mathcal{A}^k)$, set of flows for population k
\mathcal{Y}^Θ	$\{(\mathbf{y}(\theta))_{\theta \in \Theta}, \text{ with } \mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{Y}\}$, defined in (3.9)
$Z_a^k(n)$	weighted average number of players in population k who are recommended action a
$\mathbf{Z}^k(n)$	$(Z_a^k(n))_{a \in \mathcal{A}^k}$
β^n	Bayes correlated equilibrium of the game Γ^n , defined in Definition 3
γ^k	size of population k , defined in Definition 1
γ	vector of population sizes, defined in Definition 1
Γ	nonatomic game
Γ^n	anonymous game with n players
δ_a	Dirac measure on a
$\Delta(\mathcal{A})$	simplex of probability measures on \mathcal{A}
$\Delta_\gamma(\mathcal{J})$	$\{\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{J}} : \forall j \in \mathcal{J}, y_j \geq 0, \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}} y_j = \gamma\}$, defined in (1.1)
θ	state
Θ	state space, defined in Definition 1
μ	outcome of the game, defined in Definition 1
μ^*	correlated equilibrium of the game Γ
μ^n	correlated equilibrium outcome of the game Γ^n , defined in (3.3)
π	mapping from Θ to $\Delta(\mathcal{T})$
Φ	potential, defined in (4.7)
$\omega(\cdot)$	modulus of continuity
$\xrightarrow{w^*}$	weak convergence

1

indicator function