

ε -Nash Equilibria of a Multi-player Nonzero-sum Dynkin Game in Discrete Time

Said Hamadène*, Mohammed Hassani[†] and Marie-Amélie Morlais*

January 12, 2022

Abstract

We study the infinite horizon discrete time N -player nonzero-sum Dynkin game ($N \geq 2$) with stopping times as strategies (or pure strategies). We prove existence of an ε -Nash equilibrium point for the game by presenting a constructive algorithm. One of the main features is that the payoffs of the players depend on the set of players that stop at the termination stage which is the minimal stage in which at least one player stops. The existence result is extended to the case of a nonzero-sum game with finite horizon. Finally, the algorithm is illustrated by two explicit examples in the specific case of finite horizon.

AMS Classification subjects: 91A15 ; 91A10 ; 91A30 ; 60G40 91A60.

Keywords: Nonzero-sum Game ; Dynkin game ; Snell envelope ; Stopping time ; Nash equilibrium point ; Pure strategies.

1 Introduction

The following zero-sum game on stopping times was introduced by E.B. Dynkin [2]. Two players (or decision makers) π_i , $i = 1, 2$, observe a bivariate sequence of adapted random variables $\{(x_n, y_n), n \geq 0\}$. The first (resp. second) player chooses a stopping time which is denoted by τ_1 (resp. τ_2) such that for any $n \geq 0$, $\{\tau_1 = n\} \subset \{x_n \geq 0\}$ (resp. $\{\tau_2 = n\} \subset \{x_n < 0\}$). At $\tau_1 \wedge \tau_2$, if it is finite, π_2 pays π_1 an amount which equals to y_τ and the game terminates.

*Université du Maine, LMM, Avenue Olivier Messiaen, 72085 Le Mans, Cedex 9, France. e-mail: hamadene@univ-lemans.fr

[†]Université Cadi Ayyad, Faculté poly-disciplinaire de Safi, Département de Mathématiques et Informatique. B.P. 4162 Safi Maroc. e-mail : medhassani@ucam.ac.ma. This work has been carried out while the second author was visiting Université du Maine, Le Mans (Fr.).

If the game never terminates, π_2 does not pay anything. The objective of π_1 (resp. π_2) is to maximize (resp. minimize) the following expected payoff

$$\gamma(\tau_1, \tau_2) = \mathbf{E}[y_\tau].$$

Dynkin [2] proved that if $\sup_{n \geq 0} |y_n|$ is integrable, the game has a value, i.e.,

$$\sup_{\tau_1} \inf_{\tau_2} \gamma(\tau_1, \tau_2) = \inf_{\tau_2} \sup_{\tau_1} \gamma(\tau_1, \tau_2).$$

Moreover he characterized ε -optimal stopping times. Since this seminal work, the discrete time zeros-sum game has been widely discussed in several settings and works of which one can quote [6, 7, 11, 15, 19], etc.

Comparatively nonzero-sum Dynkin games have been less discussed even if there are also some works on this subject (see e.g. [5, 9, 17]). The problem we deal with in this paper is of nonzero-sum type in discrete time and which can be briefly described as follows:

Let us consider N players π_1, \dots, π_N ($N \geq 2$). Assume that for $i = 1, \dots, N$, π_i chooses the stopping time τ_i in order to stop or exit from the game which is then terminated at $R := \min\{\tau_j, j \in \{1, \dots, N\}\} = \tau_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \tau_N$. The corresponding payoff for π_i is given by

$$J_i(\tau_1, \dots, \tau_N)(\omega) := X_{R(\omega)}^{i,I}(\omega) \quad (1.1)$$

where:

- (i) $I(\omega) = \{j \in \{1, \dots, N\}, \tau_j(\omega) = R(\omega)\}$ is the coalition of players which makes the decision to stop the game at $R(\omega)$;
- (ii) $X^{i,I}$ is the payoff stochastic process for π_i and which depends on I .

The problem we are interested in is to find an ε -Nash equilibrium point (hereafter **NEP** for short) for the game, i.e., an N -tuple of stopping times $(\tau_1^*, \dots, \tau_N^*)$ such that for any $i = 1, \dots, N$,

$$\varepsilon + \mathbf{E}[J_i(\tau_1^*, \dots, \tau_N^*)] \geq \mathbf{E}[J_i(\tau_1^*, \dots, \tau_{i-1}^*, \tau, \tau_{i+1}^*, \dots, \tau_N^*)], \text{ for any stopping time } \tau.$$

Nonzero-sum discrete time Dynkin games are also considered in several papers including [4, 6, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 14, 16, 17, 18] (see also the references therein). However those works, either, they deal only with the case of two players and/or suppose some special structure of the payoffs, or, the strategies of the players are of randomized type.

The main objective of our work is to study the discrete time nonzero-sum Dynkin game when

- (i) there are more than two players and the strategies of players are pure or stopping times ;
- (ii) the reward of each player, which is a stochastic process, depends also on the set of players

which choose to terminate the game ;

(iii) the payoff processes are not supposed to satisfy a specific structure condition like being supermartingales or other structures (see [8, 9]).

In this paper, we show that the nonzero-sum discrete time game described above has an ε -Nash equilibrium point in pure strategies. It is a continuation of the work on the same subject by two of the authors [5] where they have shown that the game has an **0-NEP** if the payoff processes satisfy some specific property at infinity (see (2.3) below). This property is not supposed here and then we cannot expect an **0-NEP** for the game but only ε -Nash equilibria.

This paper is organized as follows: In Section 2, we set accurately the problem, recall the Snell envelope notion and provide a result (Theorem 1) which is in a way the streamline in the construction of the ε -**NEP** for the discrete time nonzero-sum Dynkin game. We also discuss the relevance of the main assumption on the payoff processes (referred later as Assumption (A)) through two examples. The approximating scheme and its main properties are introduced in Section 3. In Section 4, we show that the limit of the approximating scheme provides an ε -**NEP** for the game which is the main result of the paper. We also provide an extended result to the case of nonzero-sum games with finite horizon. Finally, Section 5 is devoted to the analysis of two examples of games with finite horizon: the first with deterministic rewards and the second one with stochastic rewards. For both examples, the constructive algorithm is carried out. We shall provide explicit ε -**NEP** and discuss some of their properties.

2 Setting of the problem and hypotheses

Throughout this paper, $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbf{P})$ is a fixed probability space on which is defined a filtration $\mathbf{F} := (\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \in \mathbf{N}}$. For any stopping time θ , let us denote by

- (i) \mathcal{T}_θ the set of \mathbf{F} -stopping times τ such that $\tau \geq \theta$ and $\mathcal{T}_\theta^N = \mathcal{T}_\theta \times \dots \times \mathcal{T}_\theta$;
- (ii) $\mathbf{E}_\theta[\cdot]$ the conditional expectation *w.r.t.* \mathcal{F}_θ , i.e., $\mathbf{E}_\theta[X] := \mathbf{E}[X|\mathcal{F}_\theta]$, for any integrable random variable X ;
- (iii) $\mathcal{J} := \{1, \dots, N\}$ and $\mathcal{P} := \{I \subseteq \mathcal{J} \text{ such that } I \neq \emptyset\}$.

Let $\bar{\mathbf{N}} := \mathbf{N} \cup \{\infty\}$ and w.l.o.g we assume that $\mathcal{F}_\infty := \mathcal{F} = \bigvee_{t \geq 0} \mathcal{F}_t$. For $i \in \mathcal{J}$ and $I \in \mathcal{P}$, let $(X_t^{i,I})_{t \in \bar{\mathbf{N}}}$ be an \mathbf{F} -adapted and real valued process such that

$$\mathbf{E}[\sup_{t \in \bar{\mathbf{N}}} |X_t^{i,I}|] < \infty.$$

We moreover assume that they satisfy the following hypotheses

Assumption 2.1 (A) : For any $i, j = 1, \dots, N$ and all $t \in \mathbf{N}$,

$$X_t^{i, \{i, j\}} \leq X_t^{i, \{j\}}, \quad \mathbf{P} - a.s. \quad \blacksquare$$

For T_1, \dots, T_N elements of \mathcal{T}_0 and $i \in \mathcal{J}$, we define $J_i(T_1, T_2, \dots, T_N)(\omega)$, the payoff associated with the player i , as follows:

$$J_i(T_1, T_2, \dots, T_N) := \sum_{I \in \mathcal{P}} X_R^{i, I} 1_{\cap_{j \in I} \{T_j = R\} \cap \cap_{j \in I^c} \{T_j > R\}}, \quad \mathbf{P} - a.s. \quad (2.1)$$

where

- (i) $R := \min\{T_j, j \in \mathcal{J}\} = T_1 \wedge \dots \wedge T_N$;
- (ii) by convention we assume that $\cap_{i \in \emptyset} A_i = \Omega$.

Let us emphasize that for fixed ω , if $I(\omega) := \{j \in \mathcal{J}, T_j(\omega) = R(\omega)\} = I_0$ then

$$J_i(T_1, T_2, \dots, T_N)(\omega) = X_R^{i, I_0}(\omega).$$

Note that if $R(\omega) = \infty$ then obviously $I(\omega) = \mathcal{J}$.

Remark 2.2 If $I_0 \neq \mathcal{J}$ then X_∞^{i, I_0} does not play any role, therefore w.l.o.g we can assume that $X_\infty^{i, I_0} = 0$.

We next precise the notion of ε -equilibrium we deal with.

Definition 2.3 Let $\varepsilon \geq 0$. An N -tuple of stopping times $(T_1^*, T_2^*, \dots, T_N^*) \in \mathcal{T}_0^N$ is called an ε -NEP point for the nonzero-sum Dynkin game if for all $i = 1, \dots, N$ we have

$$\mathbf{E}[J_i(T_1^*, \dots, T_{i-1}^*, T, T_{i+1}^*, \dots, T_N^*)] \leq \mathbf{E}[J_i(T_1^*, \dots, T_{i-1}^*, T_i^*, T_{i+1}^*, \dots, T_N^*)] + \varepsilon, \quad \forall T \in \mathcal{T}_0. \quad (2.2)$$

Remark 2.4 (i) If $\varepsilon = 0$, this definition means that $(T_i^*)_{i=1, N}$ is a standard NEP for the game. Otherwise, i.e., if $\varepsilon > 0$, it means that for any $i = 1, \dots, N$, $(T_i^*)_{i=1, N}$ verifies:

$$\left| \sup_{T \in \mathcal{T}_0} \mathbf{E}[J_i(T_1^*, \dots, T_{i-1}^*, T, T_{i+1}^*, \dots, T_N^*)] - \mathbf{E}[J_i((T_i^*)_{i=1, N})] \right| \leq \varepsilon.$$

(ii) In order to show that the game has an ε -NEP, we need Assumption (A) to be fulfilled. However we do not know how to get rid of it since, when it is not satisfied, the game may or may not have an ε -NEP. This can be seen through the two following examples.

Assume that for any $n \geq 0$, $\mathcal{F}_n = \{\Omega, \emptyset\}$. Then \mathcal{T}_0 is reduced to constant stopping times. Next for $n \in \bar{\mathbf{N}}$, let us set:

$$X_n^{1, \{1\}} = 0, X_n^{1, \{2\}} = 0, X_n^{1, \{1, 2\}} = 1 \text{ and } X_n^{2, \{2\}} = 0, X_n^{2, \{1\}} = 0, X_n^{2, \{1, 2\}} = -1$$

and then the assumption (A) is not satisfied since

$$X_n^{1,\{1,2\}} = 1 > 0 = X_n^{1,\{2\}}, \forall n \in \bar{\mathbf{N}}.$$

On the other hand we have,

$$J_1(t_1, t_2) = -J_2(t_1, t_2) = 1_{(t_1=t_2)}.$$

Therefore one can easily check that for ε in $(0, 1)$ this nonzero-sum Dynkin game does not have an ε -NEP.

Let us now skip to the following second example. For $n \in \bar{\mathbf{N}}$, let us define

$$X_n^{1,\{1\}} = 0, X_n^{1,\{2\}} = 0, X_n^{1,\{1,2\}} = 1 \text{ and } X_n^{2,\{2\}} = 0, X_n^{2,\{1\}} = 0, X_n^{2,\{1,2\}} = 0$$

and then, once more, (A) is not satisfied since

$$X_n^{1,\{1,2\}} = 1 > 0 = X_n^{1,\{2\}}, \forall n \in \bar{\mathbf{N}}.$$

On the other hand

$$J_1(t_1, t_2) = 1_{(t_1=t_2)} \text{ and } J_2(t_1, t_2) = 0.$$

Then, for any $\varepsilon \geq 0$ and t arbitrarily fixed in \mathbf{N} , (t, t) is an ε -NEP, which means that (A) is not a necessary condition.

(iii) Under Assumption (A), if moreover the processes $X^{i,I}$ verify

$$\overline{\lim}_{t \in \mathbf{N}} X_t^{i,\{i\}} = \limsup_{t \in \mathbf{N}} X_t^{i,\{i\}} := \inf_{t \in \mathbf{N}} \sup_{t \leq n < \infty} X_n^{i,\{i\}} \leq X_\infty^{i,\mathcal{J}}, \mathbf{P} - a.s. \quad (2.3)$$

then it is proved in Hamadène-Hassani [5], that the game has an 0-NEP. ■

To tackle the game problem we consider, we mainly use the notion of Snell envelope of processes which we introduce briefly below. For more details on this subject one can refer e.g. to ([1], pp. 431 or [3], pp. 140). For sake of completeness we give the following result related to existence of an ε -optimal stopping time as we do not find a reference where it is given in the form we need it later.

Theorem 1 : Let $U = (U_t)_{t \in \bar{\mathbf{N}}}$ be an \mathbf{F} -adapted \mathbb{R} -valued process such that $\mathbf{E}[\sup_{t \in \bar{\mathbf{N}}} |U_t|] < \infty$. For any \mathbf{F} -stopping time θ let us define:

$$Z(\theta) = \operatorname{esssup}_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_\theta} \mathbf{E}[U_\tau | \mathcal{F}_\theta] \text{ (and then } Z(\infty) = U_\infty). \quad (2.4)$$

For $n \in \bar{\mathbf{N}}$, let us set $Z_n := Z(n)$. Then

(i) $Z(\theta) = Z_\theta, \forall \theta \in \mathcal{T}_0$;

(ii) $(Z_n)_{n \geq 0}$ is a \mathbf{F} -supermartingale and for any $\varepsilon > 0$, the stopping time

$$\tau^* = \min\{s \geq 0, \quad Z_s \leq U_s + \varepsilon\}$$

is ε -optimal, i.e.,

$$\forall \tau \in \mathcal{T}_0 \quad \mathbf{E}[U_\tau] \leq \mathbf{E}[U_{\tau^*}] + \varepsilon, \quad \mathbf{P} - a.s. \quad (2.5)$$

Finally, $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} Z_t = U_\infty$ on the set $(\tau^* = \infty)$.

Proof: First note that for any stopping time θ , the random variable $Z(\theta)$ is defined since $\mathbf{E}[\sup_{t \in \bar{\mathbf{N}}} |U_t|] < \infty$. Next the first property follows from the fact that, for all stopping times θ and λ

$$Z(\theta) = Z(\lambda) \text{ on the random set } \{\theta = \lambda\}$$

and $\bar{\mathbf{N}}$ is a discrete set. Let us focus on (ii). For any $t \in \mathbf{N}$ we have,

$$\mathbf{E}_t[Z_{t+1}] = \operatorname{esssup}_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_{t+1}} \mathbf{E}[U_\tau | \mathcal{F}_t] \leq Z_t,$$

which implies that $(Z_n)_{n \geq 0}$ is an \mathbf{F} -supermartingale. On the other hand we have

$$Z_t \geq U_t \vee E_t[Z_{t+1}].$$

For any $\tau \in \mathcal{T}_t$, it also holds

$$\mathbf{E}[U_\tau | \mathcal{F}_t] = U_t 1_{(\tau=t)} + \mathbf{E}[U_{\tau \vee (t+1)} | \mathcal{F}_t] 1_{(\tau \geq t+1)} \leq U_t 1_{(\tau=t)} + \mathbf{E}[Z_{t+1} | \mathcal{F}_t] 1_{(\tau \geq t+1)} \leq U_t \vee E_t[Z_{t+1}],$$

which implies that

$$\forall t \in \mathbf{N}, \quad Z_t = U_t \vee E_t[Z_{t+1}].$$

Therefore

$$\forall t \in \mathbf{N}, \quad (\mathbf{E}[Z_{(t+1) \wedge \tau^*} | \mathcal{F}_t] - Z_{t \wedge \tau^*}) = (\mathbf{E}[Z_{t+1} | \mathcal{F}_t] - Z_t) 1_{(\tau^* > t)} = 0$$

since $(\tau^* > t) \subset (Z_t > U_t)$. Then for all $t \in \mathbf{N}$,

$$\mathbf{E}[Z_{(t+1) \wedge \tau^*}] = \mathbf{E}[Z_{t \wedge \tau^*}] = \mathbf{E}[Z_0]. \quad (2.6)$$

Thus the supermartingale $(Z_{t \wedge \tau^*})_{t \in \mathbf{N}}$ is actually a martingale. Besides we have

$$\forall n \geq 0, |Z_n| \leq \mathbf{E}[\sup_{k \in \bar{\mathbf{N}}} |U_k| | \mathcal{F}_n], \quad (2.7)$$

henceforth:

(a) the supermartingale $(Z_t)_{t \in \mathbf{N}}$ is \mathbf{P} -a.s. convergent and uniformly integrable and it converges in $L^1(d\mathbf{P})$;

(b) the martingale $(Z_{t \wedge \tau^*})_{t \in \mathbf{N}}$ is uniformly integrable and then converges in $L^1(d\mathbf{P})$ to Z_{τ^*} ;

(c) the random variable Z_{τ^*} is integrable and by Fatou's Lemma we have $\mathbf{E}[Z_0] \geq \mathbf{E}[Z_{\tau^*}]$.

But for any $t \geq s$ and $\tau \in \mathcal{T}_t$ we have

$$\mathbf{E}[U_\tau | \mathcal{F}_t] \leq \mathbf{E}[\sup_{s \leq n \leq \infty} U_n | \mathcal{F}_t]$$

and then

$$Z_t \leq \mathbf{E}[\sup_{s \leq n} U_n | \mathcal{F}_t].$$

Therefore taking the limit in t and using a result by Neveu ([11], pp.29, Proposition II.2.11) we obtain

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} Z_t \leq \sup_{s \leq n \leq \infty} U_n$$

from which we get, by taking the infimum in s , the following inequality

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} Z_t \leq \overline{\lim}_{t \rightarrow \infty} U_t \vee U_\infty. \quad (2.8)$$

Next by taking the limit in t in (2.6) and taking into account (a), (b) and (c) above yields

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \leq \mathbf{E}[Z_0] - \mathbf{E}[Z_{\tau^*}] &= \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{E}[Z_{t \wedge \tau^*} - Z_{\tau^*}] \\ &= \mathbf{E}[(\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} Z_t - U_\infty)1_{\{\tau^* = \infty\}}]. \end{aligned} \quad (2.9)$$

But on $\{\tau^* = \infty\}$ we have

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} Z_t \geq \overline{\lim}_{t \rightarrow \infty} U_t + \varepsilon$$

and then by (2.8) we have

$$\overline{\lim}_{t \rightarrow \infty} U_t + \varepsilon \leq \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} Z_t \leq U_\infty.$$

Then (2.9) implies that

$$\mathbf{E}[Z_0] = \mathbf{E}[Z_{\tau^*}] \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{P} - a.s., \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} 1_{\{\tau^* = \infty\}} Z_t = U_\infty 1_{\{\tau^* = \infty\}}.$$

Thus

$$\sup_{\tau \geq 0} \mathbf{E}[U_\tau] = \mathbf{E}[Z_0] = \mathbf{E}[Z_{\tau^*}] \leq \mathbf{E}[U_{\tau^*}] + \varepsilon$$

and τ^* is ε -optimal. ■

Remark 2.5 (i) $(Z_n)_{n \in \bar{\mathbf{N}}}$ is actually the smallest \mathbf{F} -supermartingale which is greater than the payoff process U .

(ii) If the condition $\overline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} U_n \leq U_\infty$, is not satisfied then an 0-optimal stopping time may not exist. Indeed let us consider the process $(U_n)_{n \in \bar{\mathbf{N}}}$ such that $U_n = 1 - \frac{1}{n+1}$ for $n \in \mathbf{N}$ and $U_\infty = 0$. Therefore the Snell envelope $(Z_n)_{n \in \bar{\mathbf{N}}}$ of U is $Z_n = 1$ if $n \in \mathbf{N}$ and $Z_\infty = 0$. Now if τ is a stopping time then

$$\mathbf{E}[U_\tau] = \mathbf{E}[U_\tau 1_{(\tau < \infty)}] = \mathbf{P}[\tau < \infty] - \mathbf{E}\left[\frac{1}{\tau + 1}\right] < 1 = \sup_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_0} \mathbf{E}[U_\tau] = \mathbf{E}[Z_0].$$

Thus an 0-optimal stopping time does not exist for the optimal stopping problem with payoff U . However and for any $\varepsilon > 0$, if n_ε is such that $\frac{1}{n_\varepsilon + 1} < \varepsilon$ then n_ε is an ε -optimal stopping time.

3 The approximating scheme and its properties

Let us introduce sequences of stopping times which, as it will be shown later, converge to an ε -NEP of the game. Hereafter $\varepsilon > 0$ is fixed and we define by induction a sequence of \mathbf{F} -stopping times $(\tau_n)_{n \geq 1}$ in circular way since there is a move from one player to the next one until all the objects are defined for all players. Then, the procedure starts again with the first player. More precisely and for $n \geq 1$, let (i_n, q_n) be the unique pair of integers such that $n = Nq_n + i_n$ with $i_n \in \{1, 2, \dots, N\}$, and let us set:

- (i) $\tau_1 = \dots = \tau_N = \infty$, and
- (ii) for $n \geq N + 1$, we put

$$(a) \quad \theta_n = \min\{\tau_{n-1}, \tau_{n-2}, \dots, \tau_{n-N+1}\};$$

$$(b) \quad I_n := \{i_l \in \mathcal{J} : n - N + 1 \leq l \leq n - 1 \text{ and } \tau_l = \theta_n\};$$

$$(c) \quad \forall t \in \bar{\mathbf{N}}, U_t^n = X_t^{i_n, \{i_n\}} 1_{\{t < \theta_n\}} + Y^n 1_{\{t \geq \theta_n\}} \text{ with}$$

$$Y^n = (X_{\theta_n}^{i_n, I_n \cup \{i_n\}} \vee X_{\theta_n}^{i_n, I_n}) 1_{\{\theta_n < \infty\}} + X_\infty^{i_n, \mathcal{J}} 1_{\{\theta_n = \infty\}};$$

$$(d) \quad \forall t \in \bar{\mathbf{N}}, W_t^n = \text{esssup}_{\nu \in \mathcal{T}_t} \mathbf{E}[U_\nu^n | \mathcal{F}_t];$$

$$(e) \quad \mu_n = \min\{s \in \bar{\mathbf{N}}, W_s^n \leq U_s^n + \varepsilon\};$$

$$(f) \quad \tau_n = (\mu_n \wedge \tau_{n-N}) 1_{\{\mu_n \wedge \tau_{n-N} < \theta_n\}} + \tau_{n-N} 1_{\{\mu_n \wedge \tau_{n-N} \geq \theta_n\}}.$$

A few properties are collected below in the following remark.

Remark 3.1 For any $n \geq N + 1$,

(i) i_n does not belong to I_n and for every $I \in \mathcal{P}$ such that $i_n \notin I$ we have

$$\{I_n = I\} := \{\omega \in \Omega, I_n(\omega) = I\} = \bigcap_{j \in I} (\tau_{k_j} = \theta_n) \cap \bigcap_{j \in I^c \setminus \{i_n\}} (\tau_{k_j} > \theta_n) \in \mathcal{F}_{\theta_n},$$

where, for $j \neq i_n$, k_j is the unique integer such that $k_j \in \{n - N + 1, \dots, n - 1\}$ and $i_{k_j} = j$.

(ii) W^n is a supermartingale that satisfies for all $t \geq \theta_n$

$$W_t^n = U_t^n = Y^n.$$

Moreover the process $(W_{t \wedge \mu_n}^n)_{t \geq 0}$ is a \mathbf{F} -martingale.

(iii) The following inequalities are satisfied:

$$\mu_n \leq \theta_n, \tau_n \leq \tau_{n-N} \text{ and } \theta_n \leq \theta_{n-N}. \quad (3.1)$$

(iv) By Theorem 1-(ii), the stopping time μ_n is ε -optimal, i.e.,

$$\forall \tau \in \mathcal{T}_0, \mathbf{E}[U_\tau^n] \leq \mathbf{E}[U_{\mu_n}^n] + \varepsilon.$$

(v) Let n_0 be fixed. Since the induction is of circular type, then player i_{n_0} knows that the game will be terminated at θ_{n_0} and U^{n_0} is her payoff. She then chooses the time τ_{n_0} to stop the game accordingly. ■

First we are going to simplify the expression of τ_n .

Proposition 3.1 For any $n \geq 1$, $\mu_{n+N} \leq \tau_n$, \mathbf{P} -a.s..

Proof: Suppose on the contrary that there exists $m \geq 1$ such that $\mathbf{P}[\tau_m < \mu_{m+N}] > 0$. Let us set $n = \min\{m \geq 1 \text{ s.t. } P[\tau_m < \mu_{m+N}] > 0\}$. Since $\tau_1 = \dots = \tau_N = \infty$, then necessarily $n \geq N + 1$. On the set $\Theta := \{\tau_n < \mu_{n+N}\}$, such that $\mathbf{P}(\Theta) > 0$ by definition we have

$$\tau_n < \theta_{n+N} := \tau_{n+N-1} \wedge \tau_{n+N-2} \wedge \dots \wedge \tau_{n+1}, \quad (3.2)$$

since $\mu_{n+N} \leq \theta_{n+N}$ (see Remark 3.1-(ii)). Thus the minimality n implies that for all j such that $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, n - 1\}$, $\mu_{j+N} \leq \tau_j$ and then by definition of τ_{j+N}

$$\tau_{j+N} = \mu_{j+N} \mathbf{1}_{\{\mu_{j+N} < \theta_{j+N}\}} + \tau_j \mathbf{1}_{\{\mu_{j+N} = \theta_{j+N}\}}.$$

From (3.2) and the definition of θ_{n+N-1} we deduce that $\theta_{n+N-1} = \tau_n$ on Θ . It follows that

$$\tau_{n+N-1} = \mu_{n+N-1} \mathbf{1}_{\{\mu_{n+N-1} < \tau_n\}} + \tau_{n-1} \mathbf{1}_{\{\mu_{n+N-1} = \tau_n\}}. \quad (3.3)$$

Therefore, once more on Θ , we claim that

$$\tau_n < \tau_{n+N-1} = \tau_{n-1}. \quad (3.4)$$

The strict inequality in (3.4) stems from (3.2). Noting that $\mu_{n+N-1} \leq \theta_{n+N-1} = \tau_n$ and $\tau_n < \tau_{n+N-1}$ on Θ , we obtain $\mu_{n+N-1} < \tau_{n+N-1}$. Combined with (3.3), the equality in (3.4) holds true.

Let us now justify the following property on the set Θ

$$\forall j \in \{1, \dots, N-1\} \quad \tau_{n-j} = \tau_{n+N-j}. \quad (3.5)$$

Since the claim already holds for $j = 1$, we prove it for $j = 2$. By definition of Θ_{n+N-2} , one has

$$\theta_{n+N-2} = \tau_{n+N-3} \wedge \tau_{n+N-4} \wedge \dots \wedge \tau_{n+1} \wedge \tau_n \wedge \tau_{n-1} = \tau_n.$$

Indeed, using first (3.2), we obtain $\tau_n < \tau_{n+k}$, for any k in $1, \dots, N-1$ and using (3.4), we claim that $\tau_n < \tau_{n-1}$. Using once again the minimality of n and the definition of τ_{n+N-2} , we obtain

$$\tau_{n+N-2} = \mu_{n+N-2} \mathbf{1}_{\{\mu_{n+N-2} < \tau_n\}} + \tau_{n-2} \mathbf{1}_{\{\mu_{n+N-2} = \tau_n\}}.$$

Thanks to (3.2), $\tau_n < \tau_{n+N-2}$ and thus $\tau_n < \tau_{n+N-2} = \tau_{n-2}$. Assuming otherwise that $\tau_{n+N-2} = \mu_{n+N-2}$, it yields $\tau_{n+N-2} < \tau_n$ which is a contradiction on Θ and gives us the desired result for $j = 2$. Repeating the same arguments as many times as necessary, we obtain the claim stated in (3.5).

Therefore, due to property (3.5) and on the set Θ , it holds

$$\tau_n < \theta_{n+N} = \theta_n \text{ and } I_{n+N} = I_n.$$

Using both the minimality of n and the definition of τ_n we obtain

$$\tau_n = \mu_n \mathbf{1}_{\{\mu_n < \theta_n\}} + \tau_{n-N} \mathbf{1}_{\{\mu_n = \theta_n\}} = \mu_n,$$

since $\mu_n \leq \tau_{n-N}$ and $\tau_n < \theta_n$. Henceforth on Θ , we have $U^n = U^{n+N}$ since $\theta_{n+N} = \theta_n$, $i_{n+N} = i_n$ and $I_{n+N} = I_n$. By definition, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{1}_\Theta W_{\mu_n}^{n+N} = \mathbf{1}_\Theta W_{\tau_n}^{n+N} &= \mathbf{1}_\Theta \text{esssup}_{\nu \in \mathcal{T}_{\tau_n}} \mathbf{E}[U_\nu^{n+N} | \mathcal{F}_{\tau_n}] = \text{esssup}_{\nu \in \mathcal{T}_{\tau_n}} \mathbf{E}[\mathbf{1}_\Theta U_\nu^{n+N} | \mathcal{F}_{\tau_n}] \\ &= \text{esssup}_{\nu \in \mathcal{T}_{\tau_n}} \mathbf{E}[\mathbf{1}_\Theta U_\nu^n | \mathcal{F}_{\tau_n}] \\ &= \mathbf{1}_\Theta W_{\tau_n}^n = \mathbf{1}_\Theta W_{\mu_n}^n \leq \mathbf{1}_\Theta (U_{\mu_n}^n + \varepsilon) = \mathbf{1}_\Theta (U_{\mu_n}^{n+N} + \varepsilon) \end{aligned}$$

i.e., $\mathbf{1}_\Theta W_{\mu_n}^{n+N} \leq \mathbf{1}_\Theta (U_{\mu_n}^{n+N} + \varepsilon)$ and then $\mu_{n+N} \leq \mu_n$ on Θ . As on Θ we have $\mu_n = \tau_n < \mu_{n+N}$, this is contradictory with the previous inequality. Henceforth $\mathbf{P}[\Theta] = 0$ and for any $m \geq 1$ we have $\mu_{m+N} \leq \tau_m$, \mathbf{P} -a.s., which completes the proof. \blacksquare

As a by-product, we obtain the following simplified expression of τ_n .

Corollary 3.2 For any $n \geq N + 1$,

- (i) $\tau_n = \mu_n 1_{\{\mu_n < \theta_n\}} + \tau_{n-N} 1_{\{\mu_n = \theta_n\}}$;
- (ii) $\mu_n = \tau_n \wedge \theta_n = \tau_n \wedge \tau_{n-1} \wedge \cdots \wedge \tau_{n-N+1} \leq \mu_{n-N}$.

Proof: Using both Proposition 3.1 and the definition of τ_n , we obtain (i). As for (ii), for any $n \geq N + 1$, we have

$$\tau_n \wedge \theta_n = \tau_n 1_{\{\tau_n < \theta_n\}} + \theta_n 1_{\{\tau_n \geq \theta_n\}}.$$

But $\tau_n 1_{\{\tau_n < \theta_n\}} = \mu_n 1_{\{\mu_n < \theta_n\}}$ and on $[\tau_n \geq \theta_n]$ we have $\theta_n = \mu_n$. Therefore $\theta_n 1_{\{\tau_n \geq \theta_n\}} = \mu_n 1_{\{\tau_n \geq \theta_n\}} = \mu_n 1_{\{\tau_n \geq \mu_n\}}$. Gathering now those equalities yields $\mu_n = \tau_n \wedge \theta_n$. Finally the second equality is just the definition of θ_n . \blacksquare

We state below some properties of the sequences $(\tau_n)_n$, $(\theta_n)_n$, $(\mu_n)_n$, which we need later.

Proposition 3.2 For any $m \geq N + 1$,

$$\mathbf{P}[\tau_m = \theta_m < \infty] = 0.$$

Proof: Let $m \geq N + 1$ and $\Omega'_m := \{\tau_m = \theta_m < \infty\}$. On the set Ω'_m , it holds that:

$$\forall j \in \{m - N + 1, \dots, m\}, \quad \theta_j \leq \tau_m \text{ and } \tau_j = \tau_{j-N}. \quad (3.6)$$

To begin with, we note that for $j = m$ and by definition of τ_m (see (i) in Corollary 3.2)

$$\tau_m = \tau_{m-N}.$$

This is due to the fact that, on Ω' , $\tau_m = \mu_m$ is contradictory with $\tau_m = \theta_m$. Property (3.6) is proved for $j = m$. Let proceed with a backward induction procedure by supposing

$$\exists l \in \{m - N + 1, \dots, m - 1\}, \forall j \in \{l + 1, \dots, m\}, \quad \theta_j \leq \tau_m \text{ and } \tau_j = \tau_{j-N}.$$

We have to prove both $\theta_l \leq \tau_m$ and $\tau_l = \tau_{l-N}$. We note that:

$$\begin{aligned} \theta_l &= \tau_{l-1} \wedge \cdots \wedge \tau_{m-N} \wedge \cdots \wedge \tau_{l-N+1} \\ &= \tau_{l-1} \wedge \cdots \wedge \tau_m \wedge \cdots \wedge \tau_{l+1}. \end{aligned}$$

The second equality follows from the induction hypothesis since $\tau_{m-N} = \tau_m$ and therefore, one obtains $\theta_l \leq \tau_m$. Next, if $\tau_l < \tau_{l-N}$ and by definition of τ_l we have $\tau_l < \theta_l \leq \tau_m = \theta_m$. Using once more the definition of θ_m , we have $\theta_m \leq \tau_l$ since $l \in \{m - N + 1, \dots, m - 1\}$, which is absurd. Therefore $\tau_l = \tau_{l-N}$ and the proof of the induction is stated.

Relying now on (3.6) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \theta_{m-N} &= \tau_{m-N-1} \wedge \cdots \wedge \tau_{m-N-N+1} \\ &= \tau_{m-1} \wedge \cdots \wedge \tau_{m-N+1} = \theta_m. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\tau_m = \tau_{m-M}$ then $\Omega'_m \subseteq \Omega'_{m-N} \subseteq \dots \subseteq \emptyset$, \mathbf{P} - a.s., which completes the proof. \blacksquare

Lemma 3.1 For any $m \geq N + 1$,

$$\left(\mu_m = \mu_{m+N} \right) \subset \left(\tau_m = \tau_{m+N} \right).$$

Proof: Let $m \geq N + 1$. On the set $\left(\mu_m = \mu_{m+N} \right)$ and assuming $\tau_m > \tau_{m+N}$ then

$$\mu_m = \mu_{m+N} = \tau_{m+N} < \theta_{m+N} \leq \theta_m.$$

But since $\mu_m = \tau_m \wedge \theta_m$, we have $\tau_{m+N} = \mu_m = \tau_m$ which is absurd and completes the proof.

■

4 Existence of an ε -Nash equilibrium point for the game

For any i in $\{1, \dots, N\}$, let us define

$$T_i^* = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \tau_{Nn+i} \text{ and } R_i^* = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \theta_{Nn+i} = \min\{T_j^* ; j \neq i\}. \quad (4.7)$$

Those limits exist since for any $n \geq N + 1$, we know that $\tau_n \leq \tau_{n-N}$ therefore the sequences of stopping times $(\tau_{Nn+i})_{n \geq 0}$ are non-increasing for any fixed i . On the other hand, as N is finite, we also have

$$\forall i \in \{1, \dots, N\}, R^* := T_1^* \wedge \dots \wedge T_N^* = R_i^* \wedge T_i^* = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu_{Nn+i} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu_n = \min\{\mu_n ; n \in \mathbf{N}\}.$$

Next for $i \in \{1, \dots, N\}$, let us define

$$I_i^*(\omega) := \{j \in \mathcal{J} \setminus \{i\} : T_j^*(\omega) = R_i^*(\omega)\}.$$

In what follows, we show that the N -tuple of stopping times $(T_i^*)_{i=1, \dots, N}$ is an ε -NEP point for the N -players nonzero-sum Dynkin game associated with $(J_i)_{i \in \mathcal{J}}$. The proof is obtained after several intermediary results which involve the stationary decreasing sequences of stopping times $(\tau_{Nn+i})_{n \geq 0}$ and their limits. For clarity, we list below the main steps:

(i) we first establish a link between the payoffs $J_i(T_1^*, \dots, T_{i-1}^*, \theta, T_{i+1}^*, \dots, T_N^*)$ and $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{E}[U_{\theta \wedge \theta_{Nn+i}}^{Nn+i}]$. The stationarity of the sequences plays an important role here.

(ii) By using the link between U^n and its Snell envelope process W^n , which is commonly used in optimal stopping problems, we are able to compare $J_i(T_1^*, \dots, T_{i-1}^*, \theta, T_{i+1}^*, \dots, T_N^*)$ and $J_i(T_1^*, \dots, T_N^*)$ for any given fixed stopping time θ .

(iii) Relying on Assumption (A), it allows us to cancel some extra terms and to check that $(T_i^*)_{i=1, \dots, N}$ is actually an ε -NEP for the game.

Lemma 4.1 *Let $(\beta_n)_{n \geq 1}$ be a decreasing sequence of stopping times that converges to β . Then for any $i \in \{1, \dots, N\}$ we have*

$$\begin{aligned} & \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{E}[U_{\beta_n \wedge \theta_{Nn+N+i}}^{Nn+N+i}] = \\ & \mathbf{E}[J_i(T_1^*, T_2^*, \dots, T_{i-1}^*, \beta, T_{i+1}^*, \dots, T_N^*)] + \\ & \mathbf{E}\left[\left(X_{R_i^*}^{i, I_i^*} - X_{R_i^*}^{i, I_i^* \cup \{i\}}\right)^+ \mathbf{1}_{\{R_i^* = \beta < \infty\}} + \left(X_{R_i^*}^{i, I_i^*} - X_{R_i^*}^{i, I_i^* \cup \{i\}}\right)^- \mathbf{1}_{\{R_i^* < \beta\}}\right]. \end{aligned} \quad (4.8)$$

Proof: For $q \in \mathbf{N}$, let us set $\Omega_q := \bigcap_{i \in \mathcal{J}} (\tau_{Nq+i} = T_i^*) \bigcap (\beta_q = \beta)$. Then, it is easily seen that $P(\Omega_q) \uparrow 1$ as $q \rightarrow \infty$. For any $\omega \in \Omega_q$, $\theta_{Nq+N+i}(\omega) = R_i^*(\omega)$, $I_i^*(\omega) = I_{Nq+N+i}(\omega)$ and $\beta_q(\omega) = \beta(\omega)$. Next let $i \in \mathcal{J}$ be fixed.

$$\begin{aligned} & \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{E}[U_{\beta_n \wedge \theta_{Nn+N+i}}^{Nn+N+i}] = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{E}[U_{\beta_n \wedge \theta_{Nn+N+i}}^{Nn+N+i} \{1_{\Omega_n} + 1_{\Omega_n^c}\}] = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{E}[U_{\beta_n \wedge \theta_{Nn+N+i}}^{Nn+N+i} 1_{\Omega_n}] \\ & = \mathbf{E}[X_{\beta}^{i, \{i\}} \mathbf{1}_{\{\beta < R_i^*\}} + (X_{R_i^*}^{i, I_i^* \cup \{i\}} \vee X_{R_i^*}^{i, I_i^*}) \mathbf{1}_{\{\beta \geq R_i^*, R_i^* < \infty\}} + X_{\infty}^{i, \mathcal{J}} \mathbf{1}_{\{\beta = R_i^* = \infty\}}]. \end{aligned}$$

For any $j \in \mathcal{J}^{-i}$, we set $\sigma_j = T_j^*$, $\sigma_i = \beta$ and $R = R_i^* \wedge \beta$. By definition of J_i , it holds that:

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{E}[J_i(T_1^*, \dots, T_{i-1}^*, \beta, T_{i+1}^*, \dots, T_N^*)] \\ & = \sum_{I \in \mathcal{P}} \mathbf{E}\left[\left\{X_{R_i^*}^{i, I} \mathbf{1}_{\cap_{j \in I} \{\sigma_j = R\}} \cap \cap_{j \in I^c} \{\sigma_j > R\}\right\} \mathbf{1}_{\{R < \infty\}}\right] + \mathbf{E}[X_{\infty}^{i, \mathcal{J}} \mathbf{1}_{\{R = \infty\}}] \\ & = \mathbf{E}[X_{\beta}^{i, \{i\}} \mathbf{1}_{\{\beta < R_i^*\}} + X_{\infty}^{i, \mathcal{J}} \mathbf{1}_{\{R = \infty\}}] \\ & \quad + \sum_{I \in \mathcal{P}, i \notin I} \mathbf{E}\left[\left\{X_{R_i^*}^{i, I} \mathbf{1}_{\cap_{j \in I} \{\sigma_j = R_i^*\}} \cap \cap_{j \in I^c \setminus \{i\}} \{\sigma_j > R_i^*\}\right\} \mathbf{1}_{\{R_i^* < \beta\}}\right] \\ & \quad + \sum_{I \in \mathcal{P}, i \notin I} \mathbf{E}\left[\left\{X_{R_i^*}^{i, I \cup \{i\}} \mathbf{1}_{\cap_{j \in I} \{\sigma_j = R_i^*\}} \cap \cap_{j \in I^c \setminus \{i\}} \{\sigma_j > R_i^*\}\right\} \mathbf{1}_{\{R_i^* = \beta < \infty\}}\right] \\ & = \mathbf{E}[X_{\beta}^{i, \{i\}} \mathbf{1}_{\{\beta < R_i^*\}} + X_{\infty}^{i, \mathcal{J}} \mathbf{1}_{\{R = \infty\}}] \\ & \quad + \sum_{I \in \mathcal{P}, i \notin I} \mathbf{E}\left[\left\{X_{R_i^*}^{i, I} \mathbf{1}_{\cap_{j \in I} \{\sigma_j = R_i^*\}} \cap \cap_{j \in I^c \setminus \{i\}} \{\sigma_j > R_i^*\}\right\} \mathbf{1}_{\{R_i^* \leq \beta\}} \mathbf{1}_{\{R_i^* < \infty\}}\right] \\ & \quad + \sum_{I \in \mathcal{P}, i \notin I} \mathbf{E}\left[\left\{\left(X_{R_i^*}^{i, I \cup \{i\}} - X_{R_i^*}^{i, I}\right) \mathbf{1}_{\cap_{j \in I} \{\sigma_j = R_i^*\}} \cap \cap_{j \in I^c \setminus \{i\}} \{\sigma_j > R_i^*\}\right\} \mathbf{1}_{\{R_i^* = \beta < \infty\}}\right]. \end{aligned}$$

In the last equality, we have added the term corresponding to the event $\{R_i^* = \beta\}$ in the second term and we have withdrawn it from the third one. Next and for any $I \in \mathcal{P}$ such that $i \notin I$,

$$\bigcap_{j \in I} \{\sigma_j = R_i^*\} \cap \bigcap_{j \in I^c \setminus \{i\}} \{\sigma_j > R_i^*\} = \{I_i^* = I\}.$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{E}[J_i(T_1^*, \dots, T_{i-1}^*, \beta, T_{i+1}^*, \dots, T_N^*)] \\ &= \mathbf{E}[X_\beta^{i, \{i\}} \mathbf{1}_{\{\beta < R_i^*\}} + X_\infty^{i, \mathcal{J}} \mathbf{1}_{\{R_i^* = \infty\}} + \\ & \quad X_{R_i^*}^{i, I_i^*} \mathbf{1}_{\{R_i^* \leq \beta\}} \mathbf{1}_{\{R_i^* < \infty\}} + (X_{R_i^*}^{i, I_i^* \cup \{i\}} - X_{R_i^*}^{i, I_i^*}) \mathbf{1}_{\{R_i^* = \beta < \infty\}}] \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{E}[U_{\beta_n \wedge \theta_{Nn+N+i}}^{Nn+N+i}] \\ & \quad - \mathbf{E}[(X_{R_i^*}^{i, I_i^*} - X_{R_i^*}^{i, I_i^* \cup \{i\}})^+ \mathbf{1}_{\{R_i^* = \beta < \infty\}} + (X_{R_i^*}^{i, I_i^*} - X_{R_i^*}^{i, I_i^* \cup \{i\}})^- \mathbf{1}_{\{R_i^* < \beta\}}]. \end{aligned}$$

The desired equality is thus stated. ■

Lemma 4.2 *For any $i \in \mathcal{J}$ and $\theta \in \mathcal{T}_0$, we have*

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{E}[J_i(T_1^*, T_2^*, \dots, T_{i-1}^*, \theta, T_{i+1}^*, \dots, T_N^*)] + \\ & \quad \mathbf{E}\left[\left(X_{R_i^*}^{i, I_i^*} - X_{R_i^*}^{i, I_i^* \cup \{i\}}\right)^+ \mathbf{1}_{\{R_i^* = \theta < \infty\}} + \left(X_{R_i^*}^{i, I_i^*} - X_{R_i^*}^{i, I_i^* \cup \{i\}}\right)^- \mathbf{1}_{\{R_i^* < \theta\}}\right] \\ & \leq \varepsilon + \mathbf{E}[J_i(T_1^*, T_2^*, \dots, T_{i-1}^*, T_i^*, T_{i+1}^*, \dots, T_N^*)] + \\ & \quad \mathbf{E}\left[\left(X_{R_i^*}^{i, I_i^*} - X_{R_i^*}^{i, I_i^* \cup \{i\}}\right)^+ \mathbf{1}_{\{R_i^* = T_i^* < \infty\}} + \left(X_{R_i^*}^{i, I_i^*} - X_{R_i^*}^{i, I_i^* \cup \{i\}}\right)^- \mathbf{1}_{\{R_i^* < T_i^*\}}\right]. \end{aligned} \tag{4.9}$$

Proof: Let $i \in \mathcal{J}$ and $\theta \in \mathcal{T}_0$. Since W^{Nn+N+i} is a supermartingale, $W^{Nn+N+i} \geq U^{Nn+N+i}$ and $(W_{k \wedge \mu_{Nn+N+i}}^{Nn+N+i})_{k \geq 0}$ is a martingale then

$$\begin{aligned} & \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{E}[U_{\theta \wedge \theta_{Nn+N+i}}^{Nn+N+i}] \leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{E}[W_{\theta \wedge \theta_{Nn+N+i}}^{Nn+N+i}] \leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{E}[W_0^{Nn+N+i}] \\ & = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{E}[W_{\mu_{Nn+N+i}}^{Nn+N+i}] \\ & \leq \varepsilon + \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{E}[U_{\mu_{Nn+N+i}}^{Nn+N+i}] = \varepsilon + \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{E}[U_{\tau_{Nn+N+i} \wedge \theta_{Nn+N+i}}^{Nn+N+i}]. \end{aligned}$$

Note that those limits exist due to the almost stationarity of all the decreasing sequences of stopping times which are involved. Finally by Lemma 4.1, we obtain the desired result since $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \tau_{Nn+N+i} = T_i^*$. \blacksquare

Lemma 4.3 *For any $i_1, i_2 \in \mathcal{J}$ such that $i_1 \neq i_2$*

$$P(T_{i_1}^* = T_{i_2}^* = R^* < \infty) = 0.$$

Proof: Let $\Omega_q := \bigcap_{i \in \mathcal{J}} (\tau_{Nq+i} = T_i^*)$ then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{P}(T_{i_1}^* = T_{i_2}^* = R^* < \infty) &= \mathbf{P}(T_{i_1}^* = T_{i_2}^* = R^* < \infty; \Omega_q) + \mathbf{P}(T_{i_1}^* = T_{i_2}^* = R^* < \infty; \Omega_q^c) \\ &\leq \mathbf{P}(\tau_{Nq+i_1} = \theta_{Nq+i_1} < \infty) + \mathbf{P}(\Omega_q^c) \\ &\leq \mathbf{P}(\Omega_q^c). \end{aligned}$$

The second inequality stems from Proposition 3.2. Taking now the limit in q the proof is complete since $\lim_{q \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{P}(\Omega_q^c) = 0$. \blacksquare

Lemma 4.4 *For any $i \in \mathcal{J}$*

$$\{R_i^* < T_i^*\} = \bigcup_{j \neq i} \{T_j^* = R^* < \infty\}.$$

and for all $j \neq i$ we have on $(T_j^* = R^* < \infty)$

$$I_i^* = \{j\}.$$

Therefore, under Assumption (A), we have

$$\mathbf{E}[(X_{R_i^*}^{i, I_i^*} - X_{R_i^*}^{i, I_i^* \cup \{i}\})^- \mathbf{1}_{\{R_i^* < T_i^*\}}] = 0. \quad (4.10)$$

Proof: First note that

$$\{R_i^* < T_i^*\} = \bigcup_{I \in \mathcal{P}, i \notin I} \left(\bigcap_{j \in I} \{T_j^* = R^* < \infty\} \cap \bigcap_{j \in I^c} \{R^* < T_j^*\} \right).$$

But by Lemma 4.3 for $I \in \mathcal{P}$ such that $i \notin I$ and $|I| > 1$ we have

$$\mathbf{P}\left(\bigcap_{j \in I} \{T_j^* = R^* < \infty\}\right) = 0,$$

as there cannot exist two different indices i_1 and i_2 such that $T_{i_1}^* = T_{i_2}^* = R^* < \infty$. Therefore

$$\{R_i^* < T_i^*\} = \bigcup_{j \neq i} \{T_j^* = R^* < \infty\}.$$

Next let $j \neq i$. On the set $\{T_j^* = R^* < \infty\}$, $j \in I_i^*$. Besides, if there exists $i_1 \in I_i^*$ satisfying $i_1 \neq j$ then one would have $T_j^* = T_{i_1}^* = R^* < \infty$. But this latter is of probability 0. Thus such an i_1 does not exist and $I_i^* = \{j\}$. Finally

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E}[(X_{R_i^*}^{i, I_i^*} - X_{R_i^*}^{i, I_i^* \cup \{i\}})^- 1_{\{R_i^* < T_i^*\}}] &= \sum_{j \neq i} \mathbf{E}[(X_{R_i^*}^{i, I_i^*} - X_{R_i^*}^{i, I_i^* \cup \{i\}})^- 1_{\{T_j^* = R^* < \infty\}}] \\ &= \sum_{j \neq i} \mathbf{E}[(X_{R_i^*}^{i, \{j\}} - X_{R_i^*}^{i, \{i, j\}})^- 1_{\{T_j^* = R^* < \infty\}}] = 0. \end{aligned}$$

The proof is now complete. ■

Remark 4.5 *As a by product of Lemma 4.3 we first obtain*

$$\forall i \in \mathcal{J}, \mathbf{P}(T_i^* = R_i^* < \infty) = 0.$$

Combining this with (4.10) in Lemma 4.4, we deduce that the two last terms in the right-hand side of inequality (4.9) in Lemma 4.2 are equal to zero. Note that Assumption (A) is crucial to justify (4.10).

As a by-product of Lemma 4.2, Lemma 4.4 and Remark 4.5, we obtain the main result of this paper.

Theorem 2 *The N -tuples $(T_i^*)_{i=1, \dots, N}$ is an ε -NEP for the nonzero-sum Dynkin game associated with the payoffs $(J_i)_{i=1, \dots, N}$ of (2.1). ■*

As a particular case, we end this section by considering a non-zero sum game with N players in discrete time but with finite time horizon T which could be random as well.

For clarity, we introduce some extra notations. We fix T in \mathbf{N}^* and, for each i in $\mathcal{J} := \{1, \dots, N\}$ and I in \mathcal{P} , we introduce a collection $(\tilde{X}_t^{i, I})_{t=0, \dots, T}$ of payoff processes associated with player i . We suppose that $(\tilde{X}_t^{i, I})_{t=0, \dots, T}$ satisfies

$$\forall t \in \{0, \dots, T\}, \forall (i, j) \in \{1, \dots, N\}, i \neq j, \quad \tilde{X}_t^{i, \{i, j\}} \leq \tilde{X}_t^{i, \{j\}}, \quad (4.11)$$

which is again and by abuse referred as Assumption (A). We also assume

$$\forall i \in \mathcal{J}, \forall I \in \mathcal{P}, \quad \tilde{X}_T^{i, I} = \tilde{X}_T^{i, \mathcal{J}}.$$

In such a finite horizon setting, this is a common assumption which means that, if the game ends at time T , the coalition necessarily consists of all players. Next and as in (2.1), the reward

functional \tilde{J}_i for Player i associated with a given N -tuple (T_1, \dots, T_N) of stopping times valued in $\{0, \dots, T\}$ is given by

$$\tilde{J}_i(T_1, \dots, T_N) := \sum_{I \in \mathcal{P}} \tilde{X}_R^{i,I} \mathbf{1}_{\cap_{j \in I} \{T_j = R\} \cap \cap_{j \in I^c} \{T_j > R\}}, \quad \mathbf{P} - a.s. \quad (4.12)$$

In what follows, we denote by \mathcal{T}_T^N (resp. \mathcal{T}_T) the set consisting of all N -tuples of stopping times valued in $\{0, \dots, T\}$ (resp. the set of all stopping times τ valued in $\{0, \dots, T\}$). The following conventions are assumed:

- (i) the stopping time R satisfies $R = \min\{T_1, \dots, T_N\}$ and R belongs to \mathcal{T}_T ;
- (ii) in analogy with the case with infinite horizon, we impose that if $R(\omega) = T$, then necessarily $I = \mathcal{J}$ (or equivalently, the coalition of players consists of all players if the game is stopped at terminal time T).

Assertion (ii) is satisfied since, by definition of R and on the set $\{\omega, R(\omega) = T\}$ one has $T_i(\omega) = T$, for any i . Then

$$\tilde{J}_i(T_1, \dots, T_N) \mathbf{1}_{R=T} = \tilde{J}_i(T, \dots, T) \mathbf{1}_{R=T} = X_T^{i,\mathcal{J}} \mathbf{1}_{R=T}. \quad (4.13)$$

Setting $\bar{\mathbf{N}} := \mathbf{N} \cup \{+\infty\}$, we introduce a collection $(X_t^{i,I})_{t \in \bar{\mathbf{N}}}$ of payoff processes. More precisely,

$$\begin{aligned} \forall t \in \bar{\mathbf{N}}, \forall I \subset \mathcal{P}, \quad X_t^{i,I} &= \tilde{X}_t^{i,I}, \quad \text{if } 0 \leq t \leq T-1; \\ &= \tilde{X}_T^{i,\mathcal{J}}, \quad \text{if } t \geq T. \end{aligned} \quad (4.14)$$

We note that this nonzero-sum game associated with $(X_t^{i,I})_{t \in \bar{\mathbf{N}}}$ extends to the infinite horizon setting the one with finite horizon that we are studying. Thus, we naturally embed the finite horizon case into the infinite horizon one. We also comment the second equality in (4.14). Fixing $i \in \mathcal{J}$ and t in $\bar{\mathbf{N}}$ such that $t \geq T$, the process $X_t^{i,I}$ does not depend any more on the coalition I . Finally, we introduce the reward processes J_i associated with player i . For any (T_1, \dots, T_N) in \mathcal{T}^N ,

$$J_i(T_1, \dots, T_N) := \sum_{I \in \mathcal{P}} X_R^{i,I} \mathbf{1}_{\cap_{j \in I} \{T_j = R\} \cap \cap_{j \in I^c} \{T_j > R\}}, \quad \mathbf{P} - a.s., \quad (4.15)$$

with the stopping time R such that $R = \min\{T_1, \dots, T_N\}$. We claim that:

Corollary 4.6

The nonzero-sum game (with N players) with infinite time horizon and reward processes $(J_i)_{i \in \mathcal{J}}$ introduced in (4.15) satisfies:

- (i) *the collection $(X_t^{i,I})_{t \in \bar{\mathbf{N}}}$ introduced in (4.14) satisfies Assumption **(A)**;*

(ii) the same procedure as described in Section 3 provides:

- (a) N non-increasing sequences $(\tau_{Nq+i})_{q \in \mathbf{N}}$ initialized by $\tau_1 = \dots = \tau_N = \infty$;
- (b) setting $T_i^* = \lim_q \searrow \tau_{Nq+i}$, a N -tuple $(T_i^*)_{i \in \mathcal{J}}$ of stopping times which is an ε -**NEP** of the game (with reward processes J_i).

(iii) The following relationship holds:

$$\forall (T_1, \dots, T_N) \in \mathcal{T}^N, \quad \forall i \in \{1, \dots, N\}, \quad J^i(T_1, \dots, T_N) = \tilde{J}^i(T_1 \wedge T, \dots, T_N \wedge T). \quad (4.16)$$

Thus, if we set $\tilde{T}_i^* = T_i \wedge T$ for any i , (\tilde{T}_i^*) is in \mathcal{T}_T^N and it is an ε -**NEP** of the nonzero sum game with reward $(\tilde{J}_i)_{i \in \{1, \dots, N\}}$.

For completeness, we check below all the claims in Corollary 4.6. In view of (4.11), the first claim (i) is true and thus, the second claim (ii) results from Theorem 2. To prove the equality in (4.16), let fix a N -tuple (T_1, \dots, T_N) in \mathcal{T}^N . For this, we need to distinguish the following two cases:

- (a) If $R \wedge T = \min\{T_1 \wedge T, \dots, T_N \wedge T\} \leq T - 1$ then, combining the first equality in (4.14) and the definitions of \tilde{J}_i (resp. J_i) in (4.12) (resp. in (4.15)), it provides the desired equality.
- (b) If $R \wedge T = T$ (or equivalently $R \geq T$) then necessarily and for all i , $T_i \wedge T = T$ and thus, the desired equality results from (4.13).

Relying on Claim (ii)(b), on (4.13), (4.16) and on the definition in (2.2) of an ε -NEP then, $(\tilde{T}_i^*)_{i \in \{1, \dots, N\}}$ provides an ε -**NEP** of the game with reward processes $(\tilde{J}_i)_{i \in \{1, \dots, N\}}$ which ends the proof of Corollary 4.6. ■

5 Illustration of the constructive algorithm

In this section and through two explicit examples, we describe our constructive algorithm in discrete time and with finite time horizon T in \mathbf{N}^* and we illustrate some properties of the obtained ε -Nash equilibria. For sake of clarity, we denote by $(T_i^*)_{i=1}^N$ any given N -tuple produced by the algorithm. Relying on Theorem 2 which is our main result, such a N -tuple is an ε -**NEP** of the N -player game. In addition, the following property (referred as Claim (C) later) holds:

- (C) the ε -**NEP** $(T_i^*)_{i=1}^N$ may depend on the order of the player in the algorithm.

We stress the fact that, in the algorithm, the (so-called) "order" of each players is fixed at the beginning and each of the N players successively chooses their optimal stopping time. Thus, the

optimal decision of one player may change depending on its order in the construction. Indeed, the horizon time of its optimal stopping problem depends on the choice of the $N - 1$ other players.

5.1 First illustrating example

We study a deterministic case with $N = 3$ players and time horizon $T = 2$. For this, we define the deterministic reward processes $(X_t^{i,I})$ for all i in $\mathcal{J} = \{1, 2, 3\}$ and any coalition I in \mathcal{P} . In such a case, we have

$$\mathcal{P} = \{\{1\}, \{2\}, \{3\}, \{1, 2\}, \{1, 3\}, \{2, 3\}, \{1, 2, 3\}\}.$$

Since $T = 2$, we have to fix all rewards for all players at the three dates $n = 0, 1, 2$.

At time $n = 2$, we impose:

$$\forall i \in \mathcal{J}, \quad X_2^{i,\mathcal{J}} = 0.$$

At time $n = 0$,

$$\forall I \in \mathcal{P}, \quad X_0^{1,I} = X_0^{2,I} = X_0^{3,I} = \frac{1}{8}.$$

With those conventions, Assumption (A) is satisfied at time $n = 0$ and $n = 2$.

Next and for clarity, we collect below in a table all payoff functionals $(X_1^{i,I})$ at time $n = 1$.

$i \downarrow / I \rightarrow$	$\{1\}$	$\{2\}$	$\{3\}$	$\{1, 2\}$	$\{1, 3\}$	$\{2, 3\}$	$\{1, 2, 3\}$
1	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{1}{4}$	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{1}{4}$	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{1}{4}$	$\frac{1}{4}$
2	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{3}{2}$	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{1}{4}$	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{1}{4}$	$\frac{1}{2}$
3	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{1}{4}$	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{1}{4}$	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{1}{4}$	$\frac{1}{4}$

It remains to check Assumption (A) at time $n = 1$. First and for Player 1, the following conditions are satisfied:

$$\frac{1}{4} = X_1^{1,\{1,2\}} \leq X_1^{1,\{2\}} = \frac{1}{4}, \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{1}{2} = X_1^{1,\{1,3\}} \leq X_1^{1,\{3\}} = \frac{1}{2}.$$

The payoffs of player 1 and 3 being identical (see the first and third lines above) we obtain the same inequalities as above for player 3. Concerning the second player, one has

$$\frac{1}{4} = X_1^{2,\{1,2\}} \leq X_1^{2,\{1\}} = \frac{1}{2}, \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{1}{4} = X_1^{2,\{2,3\}} \leq X_1^{2,\{3\}} = \frac{1}{2}.$$

For clarity, we provide the main steps of our constructive algorithm which we shall use several times below. Recall that $\tau_1 = \tau_2 = \tau_3 = T$. Then, whatever $m \geq 4$ such that $m = 3q_m + i_m$,

with i_m in $\{1, 2, 3\}$, the stopping time τ_m associated with Player i_m satisfies:

$$\tau_m := \mu_m \mathbf{1}_{\mu_m < \theta_m} + \tau_{m-N} \mathbf{1}_{\mu_m \geq \theta_m}, \quad (5.17)$$

where both θ_m and μ_m are defined as follows:

- (i) $\theta_m := \tau_{m-1} \wedge \cdots \wedge \tau_{m-(N-1)}$ ($\theta_m = \tau_{m-1} \wedge \tau_{m-2}$ if $N = 3$).
- (ii) Introducing the process U^m as follows:

$$U_s^m = X_s^{i_m, \{i_m\}} \mathbf{1}_{s < \theta_m} + (X_{\theta_m}^{i_m, I_m} \vee X_{\theta_m}^{i_m, I_m \cup \{i_m\}}) \mathbf{1}_{\theta_m \leq s < T} + X_T^{i, \mathcal{J}} \mathbf{1}_{\theta_m = T}; \quad (5.18)$$

- (iii) the ε -optimal stopping time μ_n satisfies

$$\mu_m = \inf\{s \geq 0, \text{ s.t. } W_s^m \leq U_s^m + \varepsilon\}, \quad \text{where}$$

- (i) W^m stands for the Snell envelope process associated with U^m ;
- (ii) I_m stands for the coalition of players whose labels are in \mathcal{J}^{-i_m} and which make the decision to stop at time θ_m .

5.2 The algorithm applied to the example

To begin with, let provide below two Nash equilibria such that the coalition consists of strictly more than one player. We mention that those Nash equilibria cannot be reached by our explicit algorithm. More precisely, we provide below two **0-NEP**¹ associated with the game introduced above in Section 5.1.

- (a) The 3-tuple $(T_1, T_2, T_3) = (1, 2, 1)$ is a **0-NEP**: in this case, both the two players 1 and 3 stop the game at time $t = 1$ and thus the optimal coalition is $I^* = \{1, 3\}$.
- (b) The 3-tuple $(T_1, T_2, T_3) = (1, 1, 1)$ is another **0-NEP** with all players choosing to stop at time $t = 1$ and thus the associate coalition is $I^* = \mathcal{J}$.

Let prove that these two Nash equilibria cannot be reached as soon as we initialize the algorithm by setting $\tau_i = T = 2$ for $i = 1, 2, 3$ reminding here that τ_i is the stopping time associated with Player i .

To this end, let construct recursively the sequence $(\tau_m)_{m \geq 4}$ and prove that the algorithm provides the **0-NEP** $(T_1^*, T_2^*, T_3^*) = (1, 2, 2)$. Thanks to (5.17), it holds

$$\tau_4 = \mu_4 \mathbf{1}_{\mu_4 < 2} + \tau_1 \mathbf{1}_{\mu_4 \geq 2},$$

¹By definition, any **0-NEP** is a fortiori a ε -**NEP**. The other way around is not true in general.

since, in that case: $\theta_4 = \tau_3 \wedge \tau_2 = 2$. By definition of the reward process U^4 in (5.18) which is associated with player 1 (since $i_4 = 1$), one obtains $U_0^4 = X_0^{1,\{1\}} = \frac{1}{8}$, whereas $U_1^4 = X_1^{1,\{1\}} = \frac{1}{2}$ and $U_2^4 = X_2^{1,\mathcal{J}} = 0$. The Snell envelope process $W^4 = SN(U^4)$ being a deterministic process (as it is for U^4), it satisfies:

$$W_0^4 = W_1^4 = \frac{1}{2} \text{ and } W_2^4 = 0.$$

Since $U_0^4 < W_0^4$ and $W_1^4 = U_1^4$, the optimal stopping time is $\mu_4 = 1 < 2$ and therefore $\tau_4 = \mu_4 = 1$ and $\theta_5 = \tau_4 \wedge \tau_3 = \tau_4 = 1$. Similarly and by definition, τ_5 satisfies

$$\tau_5 = \mu_5 \mathbf{1}_{\mu_5 < \theta_5} + \tau_2 \mathbf{1}_{\mu_5 \geq \theta_5} = \mu_5 \mathbf{1}_{\mu_5 < 1} + \tau_2 \mathbf{1}_{\mu_5 \geq 1}. \quad (5.19)$$

By definition of U^5 associated with Player 2 and defined in (5.18), it holds

$$U_0^5 = X_0^{2,\{2\}} = \frac{1}{8} \text{ and } U_1^5 = X_1^{2,\{1\}} \vee X_1^{2,\{1,2\}} = X_1^{2,\{1\}} = \frac{1}{2}.$$

Since $U_0^5 < U_1^5$, it is not optimal to stop before θ_5 which yields $\mu_5 = \theta_5 = 1$. Using (5.19), one obtains $\tau_5 = \tau_2 = 2$ and $\theta_6 = \tau_5 \wedge \tau_4 = \tau_4 = 1$.

Next and using both $U_0^6 = X_0^{3,\{3\}} = \frac{1}{8}$ and $U_1^6 = X_1^{3,\{1\}} \vee X_1^{3,\{1,3\}} = \frac{1}{2}$, the same argumentation as above gives $\mu_6 = \theta_6 = 1$ and thus $\tau_6 = \tau_3 = 2$. Finally and since $\theta_7 = \theta_4$ then $U^7 = U^4$. Player 1 faces the same optimal stopping problem as before and thus $\tau_7 = \tau_4 = 1$. To sum up, we have obtained $\tau_5 = \tau_2 = 2$, $\tau_6 = \tau_3 = 2$ and $\tau_7 = \tau_4 = 1$. Thus and for any n , $n \geq 2$ and any i in $\{1, 2, 3\}$, the three sequences $(\tau_{3n+i})_{n \geq 1}$ are now stationary. The 0-NEP $(1, 2, 2)$ is reached and the game is stopped at time 1 by Player 1 (the coalition is $I^* = \{1\}$).

We conclude by illustrating our main claim (C). For this, let suppose that the new "order" is $(2, 3, 1)$, meaning that (τ_{3n+1}) (resp. $(\tau_{3n+2})_n$ and $(\tau_{3n+3})_n$) stands for the sequence of stopping times associated with Player 2 (resp. with Player 3 and Player 1).

Once again, we initialize the algorithm by fixing $\tau_i = T = 2$ for $i = 1, 2, 3$ and we identify τ_4 , τ_5 and τ_6 recursively defined by (5.17). We first claim that $\tau_4 = \mu_4 = 1$. By definition of U^4 and since $\theta_4 = \tau_3 = 2$,

$$U_0^4 = X_0^{2,\{2\}} = \frac{1}{8}, \quad U_1^4 = X_1^{2,\{2\}} = \frac{3}{2} \text{ and } U_2^4 = X_2^{2,\mathcal{J}} = 0,$$

which implies $W_0^4 = W_1^4 = \frac{3}{2}$ and $W_2^4 = 0$, and thus $\mu_4 = 1 = \tau_4$. Since $\theta_5 = \tau_4 \wedge \tau_3 = \tau_4 = 1$, $U_0^5 = X_0^{3,\{3\}} = \frac{1}{8}$ and $U_1^5 = X_1^{3,\{2\}} \vee X_1^{3,\{3,2\}} = \frac{1}{4}$, the second player (Player 3) has no interest to stop before $\theta_5 = 1$ and thus $\mu_5 = \theta_5 = 1$ and $\tau_5 = \tau_2 = 2$. Since $\theta_6 = \tau_5 \wedge \tau_4 = \tau_4 = 1$, it yields $U_0^6 = X_0^{1,\{1\}} = \frac{1}{8}$ and $U_1^6 = X_1^{1,\{2\}} \vee X_1^{1,\{1,2\}} = X_1^{1,\{2\}} = \frac{1}{4}$. As above, $\mu_6 = \theta_6 = 1$ which yields $\tau_6 = \tau_3 = 2$ and $\theta_7 = \tau_6 \wedge \tau_5 = 2$.

Since $U^7 = U^4$, Player 2 faces the same optimal stopping problem (with horizon $\theta_7 = 2$) meaning

that $W^7 = W^4$. The same argumentation as for τ_4 gives $\tau_7 = \tau_4 = 1$. Thus, for any i in $1, 2, 3$, the three sequences $(\tau_{3q+i})_{q \geq 1}$ are stationary, which provides the **NEP** $(T_1^*, T_2^*, T_3^*) = (2, 1, 2)$ with coalition $I^* = \{2\}$ (consisting of Player 2).

5.3 Second example with random payoffs

We now consider an example of a nonzero-sum game in discrete time with $N = 2$ players which has random reward processes and finite horizon $T = 3$. We first introduce a Brownian motion $B = (B_n)_{n \in \mathbf{N}^*}$ and an independent sequence of i.i.d.² random variables $(N_n)_{n \geq 1}$ with common law the uniform law on $\{-1, 1\}$.

Let assume that the horizon time T is deterministic and equal to 3. We introduce below the (random) reward processes associated with each players. For the first player (referred later as Player 1), we set

$$\forall n \in \{1, 2, 3\}, \quad X_n^{1, \{1\}} = B_n; \quad X_n^{1, \{1, 2\}} = B_n + \frac{1}{2}, \quad \text{and} \quad X_n^{1, \{2\}} = B_n + 1,$$

whereas for the second player (referred as Player 2), we set

$$\forall n \in \{1, 2, 3\}, \quad X_n^{2, \{2\}} = B_n + N_n; \quad X_n^{2, \{1, 2\}} = B_n + N_n + \frac{1}{2}; \quad \text{and} \quad X_n^{2, \{1\}} = B_n + N_n + 1.$$

Since, for any n in $\{1, 2, 3\}$ both conditions $X_n^{1, \{1, 2\}} \leq X_n^{1, \{2\}}$ and $X_n^{2, \{1, 2\}} \leq X_n^{2, \{1\}}$ hold, Assumption **(A)** is satisfied.

On such a discrete time setting, we introduce the following filtration $(\mathcal{F}_n)_{n \geq 1}$

$$\forall n \in \{1, \dots, T\}, \quad \mathcal{F}_n = \sigma(B_i, N_i, i \in \{1, \dots, n\}).$$

From the definitions of $(B_n)_n$ and $(N_n)_n$ and using both the independence and/or martingale properties, we deduce:

$$\mathbf{E}(B_{n+1} | \mathcal{F}_n) = \mathbf{E}(B_{n+1} | B_n) = B_n \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{E}(N_{n+1} | \mathcal{F}_n) = \mathbf{E}(N_{n+1}) = 0. \quad (5.20)$$

To compute the Snell envelope $W := SN(U)$ of process U , we recall its (backward recursive) construction in discrete time

$$W_T = U_T \quad \text{and} \quad W_n = \max\{U_n; \mathbf{E}(W_{n+1} | \mathcal{F}_n)\}, \quad \text{for } n = T - 1, \dots, 1. \quad (5.21)$$

Let apply our algorithm by providing an explicit (random) ε -**NEP**, $0 \leq \varepsilon < \frac{1}{2}$. As in the previous paragraph, we construct both the two sequences (τ_m) and $(\mu_m)_{m \geq 3}$ with the first

²*i.i.d* is the standard abbreviation for independent and identically distributed.

one initialized as follows $\tau_1 = \tau_2 = 3$. Assuming here that Player 1 begins, it chooses first its ε -optimal stopping time $\mu^3 = \mu^3(\varepsilon, \omega)$ ⁽³⁾ defined as follows

$$\mu_3 = \text{Inf}\{n \in \{1, 2, 3\}, W_n^3 \leq U_n^3 + \varepsilon\}, \quad (5.22)$$

where, as in (5.18), $W^3 = SN(U^3)$ and U^3 satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} \forall n \in \{1, 2, 3\}, \quad U_n^3 &= \underbrace{X_n^{1,\{1\}} \mathbf{1}_{n < 3}}_{= B_n} + \underbrace{X_3^{1,\{1,2\}} \mathbf{1}_{n=3}}_{= B_3 + \frac{1}{2}}, \quad \text{since } \theta_3 = \tau_2 = 3. \end{aligned} \quad (5.23)$$

Using both (5.21) and the martingale property of (B_n) stated in (5.20), we obtain $\forall n \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ $W_n^3 = B_n + \frac{1}{2}$. Thus and since $\varepsilon < \frac{1}{2}$, the ε -optimal stopping time μ_3 defined in (5.22) satisfies $\mu_3 = \theta_3 = 3$. By definition of τ_3 in (5.17) and since $N = 2$, it holds

$$\tau_3 = \mu_3 \mathbf{1}_{\mu_3 < \theta_3} + \tau_1 \mathbf{1}_{\mu_3 = \theta_3} = \mu_3 \mathbf{1}_{\mu_3 < 3} + \tau_1 \mathbf{1}_{\mu_3 = 3} = \tau_1 = 3,$$

which implies $\theta_4 = \tau_3 = 3$. Next, μ_4 satisfies

$$\mu_4 = \text{Inf}\{1 \leq n \leq 3, W_n^4 \leq U_n^4 + \varepsilon\},$$

with the reward process U^4 such that

$$\begin{aligned} U_n^4 &= \underbrace{X_n^{2,\{2\}} \mathbf{1}_{n < 3}}_{= B_n + N_n} + \underbrace{X_n^{2,\{1,2\}} \mathbf{1}_{n=3}}_{= B_3 + N_3 + \frac{1}{2}}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.24)$$

Again using (5.17), τ_4 is such that: $\tau_4 = \mu_4 \mathbf{1}_{\mu_4 < \theta_4} + \tau_2 \mathbf{1}_{\mu_4 = \theta_4}$.

To identify the (random) ε -NEP, let compute the Snell envelope process $W^4 = SN(U^4)$ associated with U^4 expressed in (5.24).

Since $\theta_4 = \tau_3 = 3$ and using (5.24), we claim

$$U_1^4 = X_1^{2,\{2\}} = B_1 + N_1, \quad U_2^4 = B_2 + N_2, \quad U_3^4 = B_3 + N_3 + \frac{1}{2}. \quad (5.25)$$

By definition of W^4 in (5.21), $W_3^4 = U_3^4 = B_3 + N_3 + \frac{1}{2}$. Using both (5.20) and (5.21),

$$W_2^4 = \max\{B_2 + N_2; \underbrace{\mathbf{E}(B_3 | \mathcal{F}_2)}_{= \mathbf{E}(B_3 | B_2) = B_2} + \underbrace{\mathbf{E}(N_3 | \mathcal{F}_2)}_{= \mathbf{E}(N_3)} + \frac{1}{2}\} = \max\{B_2 + N_2; B_2 + \frac{1}{2}\}.$$

This leads to

$$W_2^4 = (B_2 + 1) \mathbf{1}_{N_2=1} + (B_2 + \frac{1}{2}) \mathbf{1}_{N_2=-1}. \quad (5.26)$$

³From now, we omit both symbols ε and ω : contrary to the first example, all stopping times θ_m , μ_m and τ_m are a priori random and so it is for the NEP.

Finally $W_1^4 = \max\{B_1 + N_1; \mathbf{E}(W_2^4|\mathcal{F}_1)\}$, with

$$\mathbf{E}(W_2^4|\mathcal{F}_1) = (B_1 + 1)\mathbf{P}(N_2 = 1) + (B_1 + \frac{1}{2})\mathbf{P}(N_2 = -1) = B_1 + \frac{3}{4},$$

which yields

$$W_1^4 = (B_1 + 1)\mathbf{1}_{N_1=1} + (B_1 + \frac{3}{4})\mathbf{1}_{N_1=-1}. \quad (5.27)$$

It remains to distinguish the following three cases:

Case (i): $N_1 = 1$:

Relying on (5.27), one has $W_1^4 = (B_1 + 1)\mathbf{1}_{N_1=1} = U_1^4$, which gives $\mu_4 = 1$. Thus $\tau_4 = \mu_4 = 1$ and $\theta_5 = \tau_4 = 1$.

Since condition $\mu_5 < \theta_5 = 1$ cannot hold, and since $\tau_5 = \mu_5\mathbf{1}_{\mu_5 < \theta_5} + \tau_3\mathbf{1}_{\mu_5 \geq \theta_5}$ then, necessarily $\tau_5 = \tau_3 = 3$ and $\theta_6 = \tau_5 = 3$. It now suffices to prove that $\tau_6 = \tau_4 (= 1)$. Since $\theta_6 = \theta_4 = 3$, Player 2 again solves the same optimal stopping problem with reward process U^6 equal to U^4 . Thus $W^6 = W^4$ which leads to $\mu_6 = \mu_4 = 1$ and implies $\tau_6 = \mu_6 = \mu_4 = \tau_4$. The desired claim $\tau_6 = \tau_4$ is established. As a result, both sequences $(\tau_{2q+1})_{q \geq 1}$ and $(\tau_{2q+2})_{q \geq 1}$ are now stationary. On $\{N_1 = 1\}$, the ε -**NEP** $(T_1^*, T_2^*) = (3, 1)$ is reached.

Case (ii): $N_1 = -1$ and $N_2 = 1$:

In this case and in view of (5.26) and (5.27), we claim

$$W_1^4 = B_1 + \frac{3}{4} > B_1 - 1 + \varepsilon = U_1^4 + \varepsilon \quad \text{and} \quad W_2^4 = B_2 + 1 = U_2^4. \quad (5.28)$$

This gives $\mu_4 = 2$ and $\tau_4 = 2 = \theta_5$. Since $\theta_5 = \tau_4 = 2$, Player 1 faces an optimal stopping problem with ε -stopping time μ_5 and with reward process U^5 which satisfies:

$$U_n^5 = X_n^{1, \{1\}} \mathbf{1}_{n < \theta_5} + X_{\theta_5}^{1, \{2\}} \wedge X_{\theta_5}^{1, \{1, 2\}} \mathbf{1}_{n \geq \theta_5} = B_n \mathbf{1}_{n < 2} + (B_2 + 1) \mathbf{1}_{n \geq 2}.$$

From the martingale property of B_n and since $\varepsilon < \frac{1}{2}$, it implies $\mu_5 = \theta_5 = 2$ and $\tau_5 = \tau_3 = 3$. It remains to prove that $\tau_6 = \tau_4 = 2$ so that, as in case (i) above, both $(\tau_{2q+1})_{q \geq 1}$ and (τ_{2q+2}) are stationary. Since $\theta_6 = 3 = \theta_4$ then $U^6 = U^4$ with U^4 given in (5.25) which yields $W^4 = W^6$. Therefore, $\mu_6 = \mu_4 = 2$ and $\tau_6 = \mu_6 = 2 = \tau_4$, which is the desired claim.

On $\{N_1 = -1; N_2 = 1\}$, we obtain the ε -**NEP** $(T_1^*, T_2^*) = (3, 2)$.

Case (iii): $N_1 = -1$ and $N_2 = -1$:

On this last case and since $\varepsilon < \frac{1}{2}$, it holds

$$W_1^4 = B_1 + \frac{3}{4} > B_1 + N_1 + \varepsilon = U_1^4 + \varepsilon \quad \text{and} \quad W_2^4 = B_2 + \frac{1}{2} > B_2 + N_2 + \varepsilon = U_2^4 + \varepsilon,$$

which means that $\mu_4 = 3$ and $\tau_4 = 3$. We thus obtain $\theta_5 = \tau_4 = 3$. Since $\theta_3 = \theta_5 = 3$, then $U^5 = U^3$ and thus $W^5 = W^3$. Player 1 faces the same optimal stopping problem as before, which yields $\tau_5 = \tau_3 = 3$. Once again and for any $i = 1, 2$, $(\tau_{2q+i})_{q \geq 1}$ are stationary sequences and we obtain the ε -NEP $(T_1^*, T_2^*) = (3, 3)$.

We provide in a final remark two last comments concerning the constructive algorithm.

Remark

(1) Let fix ε such that $\varepsilon \geq \frac{1}{2}$ and let suppose that the constructive algorithm begins with Player 1. From the martingale property of B_n , we claim $W_n^3 = B_n + \frac{1}{2}$ for any $n \in \{1, 2, 3\}$. Therefore, $W_1^3 = B_1 + \frac{1}{2} \leq B_1 + \varepsilon = U_1^3 + \varepsilon$ and the ε -optimal stopping time is $\mu_3 = 1$. Using (5.17), we obtain $\tau_3 = \mu_3 = 1$, which implies $\theta_4 = \tau_3 = 1$. Since $\mu_4 < \theta_4$ cannot hold, we obtain $\tau_4 = \tau_2 = 3$ and $\theta_5 = \tau_4 = 3$. Noting that $\theta_5 = \theta_3$ as in Case (iii) above, we obtain $U^5 = U^3$ which implies that $W^5 = W^3$ and $\tau_5 = \mu_5 = \mu_3 = 1$. Thus, for any $i = 1, 2$, $(\tau_{2q+i})_{q \geq 1}$ are stationary and the ε -NEP $(T_1^*, T_2^*) = (1, 3)$ is reached.

(2) On the contrary and when $\varepsilon < \frac{1}{2}$, we check below that the choice of the first player in the constructive algorithm does not change the ε -NEP.

Suppose now that Player 2 chooses first, then $\theta_3 = \tau_2 = 3$ and its reward process U^3 is defined similarly as U^4 in (5.25). Therefore, Player 2 stops either at time $\mu_3 = 1, 2$ or 3 as in case (i)-(iii) above and this implies $\tau_3 = \mu_3$. Next, Player 1 faces an optimal stopping problem with horizon $\theta_4 = \tau_3$ and reward process U^4 defined as follows

$$U_n^4 = B_n \mathbf{1}_{n < \theta_4} + (B_n + \frac{1}{2}) \mathbf{1}_{n \geq \theta_4}.$$

Thus, whatever θ_4 and using once again the martingale property of B , Player 1 has never interest to stop before θ_4 which implies that $\mu_4 = \theta_4$ and $\tau_4 = \tau_2 = 3$. The obtained ε -NEP is the same as in case (i)-(iii) above, which proves the desired claim.

References

- [1] Dellacherie, C. and Meyer, P. A. (1980). Probabilités et Potentiel, Chapitres 1-8. *Hermann, Paris*.
- [2] Dynkin, E.B. (1969). The game variant of a problem on optimal stopping. *Soviet Math. Dokl.* 10, pp. 270-274.
- [3] El-Karoui, N. (1980). Les aspects probabilistes du contrôle stochastique. *Ecole d'été de Probabilités de Saint-Flour, Lect. Notes in Math. No 876, Springer Verlag*.

- [4] Ferenstein, E. Z. (2005). On Randomized Stopping Games. *Advances in Dynamic Games, Annals of the International Society of Dynamic Games, Volume 7, Part III*, pp. 223-233.
- [5] Hamadène, S. and Hassani, M. (2013). The Multi-player Nonzero-sum Dynkin Game in Discrete Time. To appear in *Mathematical Methods of Operation Research*.
- [6] Heller, Y. (2012). Sequential correlated equilibrium in stopping games. *Operations Research*, 60(1), 209-224.
- [7] Kiefer, Y.I. (1971). Optimal Stopped Games. *T. Prob. Appl.*, 16, pp. 185-189.
- [8] Mamer, J. W. (1987). Monotone stopping games. *J. Appl. Probab.* 24, pp. 386-401.
- [9] Morimoto, H. (1986). Nonzero-sum discrete parameter stochastic games with stopping times. *Probab. Theory Related Fields* 72, pp. 155-160.
- [10] Neumann, P., Ramsey, D. and Szaajowski, K. (2002). Randomized stopping times in Dynkin games. *Z. Angew. Math. Mech.* 82, pp. 811-819.
- [11] Neveu, J. (1975). Discrete-Parameter Martingales. *North-Holland, Amsterdam*.
- [12] Nowak, A. S. and Szaajowski, K. (1999). Nonzero-sum stochastic games. In *Stochastic and Differential Games*, (M. Bardi, T. E. S. Raghavan and T. Parthasarathy, eds.), pp. 297-342. Birkhauser, Boston.
- [13] Ohtsubo, Y. (1987). A nonzero-sum extension of Dynkin's stopping problem. *Math. Oper. Res.* 12, pp. 277-296.
- [14] Ohtsubo, Y. (1991). On a discrete-time nonzero-sum Dynkin problem with monotonicity. *Journ. Appl. Probab.* 28, pp. 466-472.
- [15] Rosenberg, D., Solan, E. and Vieille, N. (2001). Stopping games with randomized strategies. *Probab. Theory Related Fields* 119, pp. 433-451.
- [16] Shmaya, E., Solan, E. (2004). Two Player Non Zero-sum Stopping Games in Discrete Time. *The Annals of Probability*, vol. 32, No. 3B, pp. 2733-2764.
- [17] Shmaya, E., Solan, E. and Vieille, N. (2003). An application of Ramsey theorem to stopping games. *Games Econom. Behav.* 42, pp. 300-306.
- [18] Solan, E. and Vieille, N. (2001). Quitting games. *Math. Oper. Research* 26, pp. 265-285.
- [19] Yasuda, M. (1985). On a Randomized Strategy in Neveu's Stopping Problem. *Stochastic Processes Appl.*, 21, pp. 159-166.