

**FROM DISCRETE TO CONTINUOUS BEST-RESPONSE
DYNAMICS: DISCRETE FLUCTUATIONS DO NOT SCALE
WITH THE POPULATION SIZE**

AZADEH AGHAEYAN AND POURIA RAMAZI

ABSTRACT. In binary decision-makings, individuals often go for a common or rare action. In the framework of evolutionary game theory, the best-response update rule can be used to model this dichotomy. Those who prefer a common action are called *coordinators* and those who prefer a rare one are called *anticoordinators*. A finite mixed population of the two types may undergo perpetual fluctuations, the characterization of which appears to be challenging. It is particularly unknown, whether the fluctuations scale with the population size. To fill this gap, we approximate the discrete finite population dynamics of coordinators and anticoordinators with the associated mean dynamics in the form of semicontinuous differential inclusions. We show that the family of the state sequences of the discrete dynamics for increasing population sizes forms a generalized stochastic approximation process for the differential inclusion. On the other hand, we show that the differential inclusions always converge to an equilibrium. This implies that the reported perpetual fluctuations in the finite discrete dynamics of coordinators and anticoordinators do not scale as the population size do. The results encourage to first analyze the often simpler semicontinuous mean dynamics of the discrete population dynamics as the semicontinuous dynamics partly reveal the asymptotic behaviour of the discrete dynamics.

1. INTRODUCTION

Humans face a variety of repetitive decision-making problems, such as whether to follow the fashion trends, get a flu shot, or sign a petition [1, 2]. In such two-option decision-making problems, individuals are often either *coordinators*, those who adopt a decision whenever it has been already adopted by a particular population proportion of decision-makers, or *anticoordinators*, those who go for a decision whenever it has been rejected by a particular population proportion [3, 4].

In the framework of evolutionary game theory, the so-called *best-response* update rule captures the decision-making processes of coordinators and anticoordinators by assuming linear payoff functions. An increasing payoff function with respect to the commonality of the decisions makes the best-response update rule equivalent to the *linear threshold model*, where the individuals are coordinators with possibly unique thresholds [5]. A decreasing payoff function, on the other hand, models the anticoordinators.

The precise analysis of these decision-making processes requires accounting for the action of each single individual. As a result, a large body of research studied

Date: November 6, 2023. The Department of Mathematics and Statistics, Brock University, Canada. This work has been submitted to the IEEE for possible publication. Copyright may be transferred without notice.

the steady state behaviour of finite discrete populations of best-responders. The problem has been investigated in a variety of set-ups ranging from well-mixed [6, 7] to structured populations [8, 9]. As for structured population, in some research, semi-tensor products were utilized to convert the dynamics to linear dynamical systems [10–12].

It was shown that a finite population of heterogeneous coordinators, who differ in perceiving the commonality, equilibrates under asynchronous activation sequence [13]. The same result holds for a finite population of heterogeneous anticoncoordinators [14]. As for finite populations of coordinating and anticoncoordinating agents, it was shown that the dynamics may undergo perpetual fluctuations and the length of fluctuations was approximated [15]. The exact form and the conditions for the existence of the fluctuations appear to be an open complex problem.

Researchers get around the challenges arising from the analysis of finite population dynamics by exploiting the associated deterministic *mean dynamics* [16], where the population is assumed to be infinitely large. In this regard, most studies investigated the replicator dynamics which are the mean dynamics of the other popular update rule, *imitation* [17–20]. Fewer studies considered the best-response mean dynamics, which are differential inclusions [21–25]. Some studies also approximated the evolution of decisions in structured populations with ordinary differential equations [26–28].

Although analysis of the mean dynamics is generally more straightforward compared to that of finite populations, the potential discrepancy between these two may question the validity of such an approximation. Hence, much effort has been devoted to connecting the behaviour of finite populations with the associated mean dynamics as the population size grows [29–32]. The results on infinite horizon behavior connect the Birkhoff center of the mean dynamics with the support of the stationary measures of the Markov chain corresponding to the finite population’s dynamics [30, 33].

How can these results, which link the mean dynamics to finite population dynamics, be applied to the heterogeneous populations of coordinators and anticoncoordinators? To the best of our knowledge, no study investigated the asymptotic behaviour of infinite heterogeneous populations of exclusively coordinators, exclusively anticoncoordinators, or a mixture of both. Even if there were such results, could they shed light on the discrete population dynamics?

We provide the answer in this paper. First, through an intuitive example we show that the perpetual fluctuations do not scale as the population size grows. Second, we write the population dynamics as a Markov chain and obtain the associated semicontinuous population dynamics—an upper semicontinuous differential inclusion. Third, we show that the collection of population dynamics Markov chains define *generalized stochastic approximation processes* for the semicontinuous population dynamics [33]. This allows the use of the results in [33] to approximate the asymptotic behaviour of the discrete population dynamics by finding the Birkhoff center of the semicontinuous population dynamics, which we do in the last part of the paper.

Our contribution is fourfold: *i)* We show that in the semicontinuous population dynamics, the exclusively heterogeneous population of coordinators may admit two types of equilibrium points, clean-cut and ruffled coordinator-driven, where clean-cut equilibria are asymptotically stable and ruffled are unstable—**Lemma 2** and

Theorem 2. On the contrary, the exclusively heterogeneous population of anti-coordinators admit only one globally asymptotically stable equilibrium point that could be either clean-cut or ruffled anti-coordinator driven—**Corollary 1.** These results are in line with the existing results on the steady-state behaviour of finite heterogeneous populations of exclusively coordinators [13] and exclusively anticonordinators [14]. *ii)* We show that in the semicontinuous population dynamics, the mixed heterogeneous population of coordinators and anticonordinators may admit all three types of equilibria, clean-cut, ruffled anticonordinator-driven, and ruffled coordinator-driven, where clean-cut and ruffled anticonordinator-driven equilibria are asymptotically stable, the other type is unstable, and the dynamics always converge to one of the equilibria—**Lemma 2** and **Theorem 2.** *iii)* Consequently, we show that the reported perpetual fluctuations in the finite discrete dynamics of coordinators and anticonordinators [15] do not scale as the population size do—**Theorem 3** and **Corollary 4**, which are the main result of this paper. *iv)* Out of the analysis of the semicontinuous population dynamics, insightful hints on the asymptotic behaviour of the finite populations were obtained, such as having the same equilibria and similar long-term behaviour. Hence, in general for other population dynamics, it may prove useful to study the behaviour of the semicontinuous population dynamics, which is usually more straightforward, prior to the precise analysis of the finite population dynamics.

Notations. In this paper, the following notations are used. The set of real, non-negative real, integer, nonnegative integer, and positive integer numbers are respectively shown by \mathbb{R} , $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, \mathbb{Z} , $\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$, and \mathbb{N} . For each $i \in \mathbb{N}$, $[i]$ denotes $\{1, 2, \dots, i\}$. Boldface letters refer to a vector. The i^{th} element of the vector \mathbf{q} is indicated by q_i . The calligraphic font \mathcal{X} represents a set. A sequence of variables x_0, x_1, x_2, \dots is represented by $\langle x_k \rangle$. The floor function $\lfloor x \rfloor : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ returns the greatest integer less than or equal to x . The sign function is denoted by $\text{sgn}(\cdot)$ and equals 1 for a positive argument, -1 for a negative argument and 0 otherwise. The i^{th} standard basis vector is denoted by \mathbf{e}_i . The Euclidean norm of a vector \mathbf{x} is denoted by $|\mathbf{x}|$. By the notation $[a, b] - c$, we mean $[a - c, b - c]$. The set of all subsets of the set \mathcal{X} is shown by $2^{\mathcal{X}}$.

2. PROBLEM FORMULATION

We consider a well-mixed population of N agents, labeled by $1, 2, \dots, N$, choosing repeatedly between two strategies 1 and 2 over a discrete time sequence $t \in \frac{1}{N}\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ that is indexed by k where $k = \lfloor Nt \rfloor$. Each agent $i \in [N]$ has a *threshold* $\tau(i) \in (0, 1)$ and is either a *coordinator* or an *anticoordinator*. A coordinator (resp. an anticonordinator) tends to choose strategy 1 whenever the population proportion of strategy-1 players, denoted x^N , does not fall short of (resp. does not exceed) her threshold, i.e., $x^N - \tau(i) \geq 0$ (resp. ≤ 0) At each time index k exactly one agent chosen uniformly at random becomes active and receives the chance to switch to her tendentious strategy. At time index $k + 1$, the strategy of agent i active at time index k will be

$$(1) \quad s_i(k + 1) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } x^N(k) \geq \tau(i), \\ 2 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

if she is a coordinator and otherwise, if she is an anticonordinator,

$$(2) \quad s_i(k+1) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } x^{\mathbf{N}}(k) \leq \tau(i), \\ 2 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

where s_i is the strategy of agent i .

Coordinators (resp. anticonordinators) who have the same threshold build up a subpopulation, and there all altogether \mathbf{p}' (resp. \mathbf{p}) subpopulations of coordinators (resp. anticonordinators). Coordinating (resp. anticonordinating) subpopulations are labeled in the ascending (resp. descending) order of their thresholds by $1, \dots, \mathbf{p}'$ (resp. \mathbf{p}), that is, $\tau'_1 < \tau'_2 < \dots < \tau'_{\mathbf{p}'}$ (resp. $\tau_1 > \tau_2 > \dots > \tau_{\mathbf{p}}$), where τ'_p (resp. τ_p) is the threshold of the p^{th} coordinating (resp. anticonordinating) subpopulation. So the heterogeneity of the population is captured by the distribution of population proportions over the total $\mathbf{P} = \mathbf{p} + \mathbf{p}'$ subpopulations as $\boldsymbol{\rho} = (\rho_1, \dots, \rho_{\mathbf{p}}, \rho'_{\mathbf{p}'}, \dots, \rho'_1)$ where ρ'_j (resp. ρ_j) represents the proportion of the number of individuals in subpopulation j coordinators (resp. anticonordinators) to the whole population size \mathbf{N} . For convenience of vector indexing, for $j \geq \mathbf{p} + 1$, we define $\rho_j = \rho'_{\mathbf{p}+1-j}$. To avoid a subpopulation of size zero, we assume that $\min_j \{\rho_j\} \geq \frac{1}{\mathbf{N}}$.

Remark 1. *The update rules (1) and (2) are equivalent to the best-response update rule provided that the agents' payoffs are a linear function of the population proportion of strategy-1 players [34].*

At the population level, the collective behaviour of the agents in each subpopulation is of interest rather than that of each single agent *per se*. As a result, we define the *population state* as the distribution of 1-players over the \mathbf{P} subpopulations at each index k and denote it by

$$\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{N}} = (x_1^{\mathbf{N}}, \dots, x_{\mathbf{p}}^{\mathbf{N}}, x'_{\mathbf{p}'}^{\mathbf{N}}, \dots, x_1^{\mathbf{N}}),$$

where $x_p^{\mathbf{N}}$ (resp. $x'_{p'}$) represents the proportion of 1-players who belong to coordinating (resp. anticonordinating) subpopulation p . We again use the notation $x_p^{\mathbf{N}} = x'_{\mathbf{p}+1-p}$ for $p > \mathbf{p}$. By defining

$$\mathcal{X}_{ss} = \prod_{j=1}^{\mathbf{p}} [0, \rho_j] \times \prod_{j=1}^{\mathbf{p}' } [0, \rho'_{\mathbf{p}'-j+1}],$$

the resulting state space then equals $\mathcal{X}_{ss} \cap \frac{1}{\mathbf{N}}\mathbb{Z}^{\mathbf{P}}$. Define the function $u(p, \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{N}}) : [\mathbf{P}] \times \mathcal{X}_{ss} \rightarrow \{1, 2\}$ that returns 1 (resp. 2) if 1 (resp. 2) is the tendentious strategy of subpopulation p at population state $\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{N}}$:

$$u(p, \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{N}}) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } (x^{\mathbf{N}} \leq \tau_p \text{ and } p \leq \mathbf{p}) \text{ or } (x^{\mathbf{N}} \geq \tau'_{\mathbf{p}+1-p} \text{ and } p > \mathbf{p}), \\ 2 & \text{if } (x^{\mathbf{N}} > \tau_p \text{ and } p \leq \mathbf{p}) \text{ or } (x^{\mathbf{N}} < \tau'_{\mathbf{p}+1-p} \text{ and } p > \mathbf{p}). \end{cases}$$

The evolution of the state defines the *population dynamics* and is governed by update rules (1), (2), and the activation sequence of the agents. More specifically, the activation sequence is generated by the sequence of random variables $\langle \mathbf{A}_k \rangle$ where \mathbf{A}_k is the agent active at time index k and takes values in $[\mathbf{N}]$ with the distribution $\mathbb{P}[\mathbf{A}_k = i] = \frac{1}{\mathbf{N}}$. This defines the discrete population dynamics as follows:

Definition 1. *The discrete population dynamics are defined by the following discrete time stochastic equation for $k = 0, 1, \dots$*

$$(3) \quad \mathbf{x}^N(k+1) = \mathbf{x}^N(k) + \frac{1}{N} \text{sgn}(\mathbf{S}_k - u(\mathbf{P}_k, \mathbf{x}^N)) \mathbf{e}_{\mathbf{P}_k},$$

where \mathbf{P}_k and \mathbf{S}_k are random variables with distributions $\mathbb{P}[\mathbf{P}_k = p] = \rho_p$ and $\mathbb{P}[\mathbf{S}_k = 1] = x^N$.

In Definition 1, the random variable \mathbf{P}_k is the subpopulation of the agent active at time index k , and the random variable \mathbf{S}_k equals 1 (resp. 2) if the strategy of the active agent at index k equals 1 (resp. 2). Note the difference between strategies 1 and 2 and the numbers 1 and 2.

Example 1. *In the context of public health, when a newly developed vaccine is introduced, some individuals choose to get vaccinated (i.e., strategy 1) as long as the vaccination coverage is below a certain threshold [35]. For them, this signals that not enough individuals are vaccinated, and they want to be immunized. Conversely, some individuals go for vaccination when a specific proportion of the population has already been vaccinated [36] as then they perceive the vaccine as safe or a societal norm. The first group can be thought of as anticoncoordinators, while the latter are coordinators. The perception of what proportion of the population needs to be vaccinated to be considered rare or common varies among individuals, resulting in a heterogeneous population.*

What is the asymptotic behaviour of the population dynamics as the population size approach infinity? Does the population state reach an *equilibrium point* where no agent tends to switch her adopted strategy? Or does the population state enter a non-singleton *minimal positively invariant set*? A minimal positively invariant set is a non-empty subset of the state space such that once the population state enters the set, it remains there afterward under any activation sequence and visits all states contained in the set with a positive probability, resulting in perpetual fluctuations. We know that a finite exclusive population of coordinators and also a finite exclusive population of anticoncoordinators equilibrate in the long-run [13, 14]. However, a finite *mixed* population consisting of both coordinating and anticoncoordinating subpopulations may admit minimal positively invariant sets, [15] the characterization of which appears to be challenging and remain unsolved. Could the obtained results on the asymptotic behaviour of finite populations be revealed by investigating the associated mean dynamics?

Example 2. *Consider a population of N agents stratified into one anticoncoordinating subpopulation and five coordinating subpopulations. The thresholds and population proportions of the subpopulations are respectively as follows: $(\tau_1, \tau'_5, \tau'_4, \tau'_3, \tau'_2, \tau'_1) = (0.885, 0.89, 0.604, , 0.481, 0.44)$ $(\rho_1, \rho'_5, \rho'_4, \rho'_3, \rho'_2, \rho'_1) = (12/30, 3/30, 3/30, 3/30, 1/30, 8/30)$. For each value of $N = 30, 60, 120, \dots, 3840$, the population state was simulated 100 times with different random activation sequences and initial conditions. For each run, the upper and lower bounds of the population proportion of strategy 1 players were recorded. The maximum upper and minimum lower bounds for each population size N is depicted in Figure 1. For small populations, the population state undergoes perpetual fluctuations. However, as the population size escalates, the length of fluctuations reduces.*

Example 2 gives us an intuition that the length of fluctuations in mixed populations of coordinating and anticoncoordinating agents does not scale with the population




Figure 1. The long-term fluctuations of the population proportion of strategy-1 players for varying population sizes. The circles represent the upper bounds of the invariant sets and the crosses show the lower bounds of the invariant sets. As the population size increases the lower and upper bounds converge and eventually match.

size. Does this observation extend to every mixed population of coordinators and anticonordinators as the population size approaches infinity i.e., $N \rightarrow \infty$? (Fig 2). The available results in stochastic approximation theory provide the basis for investigating this question.

3. BACKGROUND

We present definitions related to stochastic processes and differential inclusion theory. These concepts lay the basis for introducing Theorem 1 which connects the asymptotic behaviour of the finite populations and their associated mean dynamics.

The following is mainly adopted from [37]. A *discrete time stochastic process* $\langle \mathbf{X}_k \rangle$ is a sequence of random variables indexed by $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$, where \mathbf{X}_k is the *state of the stochastic process*. A *Markov chain* is a discrete time stochastic process $\langle \mathbf{X}_k \rangle$ where \mathbf{X}_{k+1} is independent of the states $\mathbf{X}_{k-1}, \dots, \mathbf{X}_0$ given \mathbf{X}_k . A Markov chain is *finite*, if the space over which the states are defined is finite. The transition probabilities of a Markov chain is denoted by $P_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}}$ which represents the probability of reaching \mathbf{y} at index $k+1$ given that the state at index k is equal to \mathbf{x} , i.e., $P_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}} = \mathbb{P}[\mathbf{X}_{k+1} = \mathbf{y} | \mathbf{X}_k = \mathbf{x}]$. The transition matrix $P = [P_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}}]$ is defined accordingly. A Markov chain is *homogeneous* if its transition probabilities are time independent. The vector $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ is the *invariant probability measure* or *stationary distribution* for a Markov chain with transition matrix P if $\boldsymbol{\mu}P = \boldsymbol{\mu}$ and $\sum_i \mu_i = 1$, where $\mu_i \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$.

For a sequence $\langle \epsilon_k \rangle = \epsilon_0, \epsilon_1, \dots$, and function x , we denote the sequence $x(\epsilon_0), x(\epsilon_1), \dots$ by $\langle x^\epsilon \rangle$. The notation $\langle x^\epsilon \rangle_{\epsilon > 0}$ emphasizes that the sequence $\langle \epsilon_k \rangle$ is positive. By notation $\langle x_k^\epsilon \rangle_k$, we mean the sequence $x_0^\epsilon, x_1^\epsilon, \dots$ which is indexed by $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$.




Figure 2. How does the asymptotic behaviour of the finite population of interacting agents (3) evolve as the population size approaches infinity? An exclusive finite population of coordinators and an exclusive finite population of anticoordinators each equilibrates in the long-run, [13, 14]. The proportion of 1-players in a mixed finite population may undergo perpetual fluctuations [15].

The index is dropped when it can be inferred from the context. Let $\langle \mathbf{X}_k^\epsilon \rangle_k$ be a Markov chain parameterized by $\epsilon > 0$. Stochastic approximation theory links the asymptotic long-term behaviour of the Markov chain $\langle \mathbf{X}_k^\epsilon \rangle_k$ as ϵ approaches zero to a differential inclusion, defined in the following.

A *differential inclusion* is defined by

$$(4) \quad \dot{\mathbf{x}}(t) \in \mathcal{V}(\mathbf{x}(t)),$$

where $\mathcal{V} \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is a set-valued map specifying a set of evolution at each point $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $t \in \mathbb{R}$. A *Caratheodory solution* of (4) on $[0, t_1] \subset \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ is an absolutely continuous map $\mathbf{x}^o : [0, t_1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ such that for almost all $t \in [0, t_1]$, $\dot{\mathbf{x}}^o(t) \in \mathcal{V}(\mathbf{x}^o(t))$ [38]. From now on, by a *solution* of (4), we mean its Caratheodory solution. A point $\mathbf{x}^* \in \mathbb{R}^n$ that satisfies $\mathbf{0} \in \mathcal{V}(\mathbf{x}^*)$ is an *equilibrium* of (4) [38]. The *set-valued dynamical system* induced by the differential inclusion (4) is denoted by $\Phi(\mathbf{x}_0)$ and defined as the set of all solutions of (4) with initial condition \mathbf{x}_0 [33].

Example 3. Consider the scalar differential inclusion (4) with $x \in \mathbb{R}$ and

$$\mathcal{V}(x(t)) = \begin{cases} \{-1 - x(t)\} & \text{if } x(t) < 0, \\ [-1, 1] & \text{if } x(t) = 0, \\ \{1 - x(t)\} & \text{if } x(t) > 0. \end{cases}$$

For any positive initial condition $x(0)$, the solution of (4) equals $x(t) = 1 + e^{-t}(x(0) - 1)$, see Figure 3. For any negative initial condition $x(0)$, the solution of (4) equals $x(t) = -1 + e^{-t}(1 + x(0))$. For the initial condition $x(0) = 0$, however, the solution $x(t)$ is not unique and belongs to $\{0, e^{-t} - 1, 1 - e^{-t}\}$. The set valued dynamical system Φ for initial condition $x(0) = 0$ equals $\Phi(0) = \{0, e^{-t} - 1, 1 - e^{-t}\}$, and for other initial conditions will be a singleton. As for equilibrium points of (4), we need to find the points x^* at which $\mathcal{V}(x^*) = 0$, yielding $-1, 0$, and 1 .




Figure 3. Example 3. The upper panel represents the set-valued map $\mathcal{V}(x)$. The lower panel represents the solution set of $\dot{x}(t) \in \mathcal{V}(x)$ with 0 as the initial state. The solution set equals $\{0, e^{-t} - 1, 1 - e^{-t}\}$.

A set-valued map \mathcal{V} is called *upper semicontinuous* at \mathbf{x}_0 if for any open set $\mathcal{O} \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ with $\mathcal{V}(\mathbf{x}_0) \subset \mathcal{O}$, there exists a neighborhood $\mathcal{B}(\mathbf{x}_0)$ of \mathbf{x}_0 such that $\mathcal{V}(\mathcal{B}(\mathbf{x}_0)) \subset \mathcal{O}$ [39]. When an upper semicontinuous map is equipped with three additional properties of nonemptiness, convexity, and boundedness, the map is *good upper semicontinuous*. The set-valued map \mathcal{V} defined in Example 3 is good upper semicontinuous. However, the scalar set-valued map

$$\mathcal{V}(x(t)) = \begin{cases} \{-1 - x(t)\} & \text{if } x(t) < 0, \\ [0, 1] & \text{if } x(t) = 0, \\ \{1 - x(t)\} & \text{if } x(t) > 0, \end{cases}$$

is not upper semicontinuous, because it is not so at $x = 0$. Let $\text{cl}(\mathcal{X})$ be the closure of set \mathcal{X} .

Definition 2 ([33]). Let Φ be the dynamical system induced by (4). The recurrent points of Φ are defined as

$$\mathcal{R}_\Phi = \left\{ \mathbf{x}_0 \mid \mathbf{x}_0 \in \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x}_0) \right\},$$

where $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x}_0)$ is the **limit set** of point \mathbf{x}_0 defined by $\bigcup_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathbf{x}_0}} \bigcap_{t \geq 0} \text{cl}(\mathbf{y}[t, \infty])$ and $\mathcal{S}_{\mathbf{x}_0}$ is the set of solutions of differential inclusion (4) with the initial condition \mathbf{x}_0 . The **Birkhoff center** of Φ , $\text{BC}(\Phi)$, is defined as the closure of \mathcal{R}_Φ , i.e., $\text{BC}(\Phi) = \text{cl}(\mathcal{R}_\Phi)$.

Each \mathbf{y} in Definition 2 is a solution of the differential inclusion, and the term $\bigcap_{t \geq 0} \text{cl}(\mathbf{y}[t, \infty])$ is the limit set of \mathbf{y} . In words, \mathbf{x}_0 is a recurrent point of Φ if it is

included in the limit set of some solution that starts from \mathbf{x}_0 . Examples include equilibria and limit cycles. In Example 3, $\text{BC}(\Phi) = \{-1, 0, 1\}$.

How to approximate the realizations of a collection of Markov chains $\langle \mathbf{X}_k^\epsilon \rangle_k$ for a sequence of $\epsilon > 0$ with solutions of a differential inclusion $\dot{\mathbf{x}} \in \mathcal{V}(\mathbf{x})$? The following definition establishes the basis for doing so.

Definition 3. [33] Consider the good upper semicontinuous differential inclusion $\dot{\mathbf{x}} \in \mathcal{V}(\mathbf{x})$ over the convex and compact state space \mathcal{X}_0 . For a sequence of positive values of scalar ϵ approaching 0, let $\mathbf{U}^\epsilon = \langle \mathbf{U}_k^\epsilon \rangle_k$ be a sequence of \mathbb{R}^n -valued random variables and $\langle \mathcal{V}^\epsilon \rangle$ be a family of set-valued maps on \mathbb{R}^n . We say that $\langle \langle \mathbf{X}_k^\epsilon \rangle_k \rangle_{\epsilon > 0}$ is a family of generalized stochastic approximation processes (or a GSAP) for the differential inclusion $\dot{\mathbf{x}} \in \mathcal{V}(\mathbf{x})$ if the following conditions are satisfied:

- (1) $\mathbf{X}_k^\epsilon \in \mathcal{X}_0$ for all $k \geq 0$,
- (2) $\mathbf{X}_{k+1}^\epsilon - \mathbf{X}_k^\epsilon - \epsilon \mathbf{U}_{k+1}^\epsilon \in \epsilon \mathcal{V}^\epsilon(\mathbf{X}_k^\epsilon)$,
- (3) for any $\delta > 0$, there exists an $\epsilon_0 > 0$ such that for all $\epsilon \leq \epsilon_0$ and $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}_0$,

$$\mathcal{V}^\epsilon(\mathbf{x}) \subset \{ \mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid \exists \mathbf{y} : |\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}| < \delta, \inf_{\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{V}(\mathbf{y})} |\mathbf{z} - \mathbf{v}| < \delta \},$$

- (4) for all $T > 0$ and for all $\alpha > 0$,

$$\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \mathbb{P} \left[\max_{k \leq \frac{T}{\epsilon}} \left| \sum_{i=1}^k \epsilon \mathbf{U}_i^\epsilon \right| > \alpha \mid \mathbf{X}_0^\epsilon = \mathbf{x} \right] = 0$$

uniformly in $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}_0$.

The GSAPs can be regarded as perturbed solutions of the differential inclusions. The first condition ensures that the perturbed solutions are within the same set as the unperturbed solutions are. The second one is the definition of the GSAP as a recursive stochastic process. The third condition ensures that the collection $\langle \mathcal{V}^\epsilon \rangle$ approaches to the vicinity of \mathcal{V} as ϵ approaches zero. Well-behaved random variables such as sub-Gaussian random variables and some classes of random variables with finite higher moments satisfy the last condition.

Example 4. Consider the scalar differential inclusion (4) with $x \in [0, 1]$ and

$$(5) \quad \mathcal{V}(x) = \begin{cases} \{1 - x\} & \text{if } x < \tau. \\ [0, 1] - x & \text{if } x = \tau, \\ \{-x\} & \text{if } x > \tau. \end{cases}$$

For a sequence of positive scalars approaching zero $\langle \epsilon \rangle$, let $\langle \mathbf{U}_k^\epsilon \rangle_k$ be defined as a sequence of independent random variables such that each equals to 1 with probability 0.5 and -1 with probability 0.5. Define \mathcal{V}^ϵ as (5), but now τ is replaced with $\tau + \epsilon$. Following the second condition in Definition 3, $\langle \mathbf{X}_k^\epsilon \rangle_k$ is defined where $\mathbf{X}_0^\epsilon = x(0)$. Provided that $\epsilon < 0.5$, the first condition in Definition 3 is satisfied which can be shown by induction. As for the third condition, for each δ , ϵ_0 can be chosen any arbitrary value smaller than δ . The described U_k^ϵ satisfies the last condition in Definition 3 based on [33, Proposition 2.3]. Hence, the collection of $\langle \langle \mathbf{X}_k^\epsilon \rangle_k \rangle_\epsilon$ defines a GSAP for (4) where $\mathcal{V}(x)$ equals to (5).

In [33], Roth and Sandholm studied the limiting stationary distributions of these GSAPs and showed that if for each $\epsilon > 0$, $\langle \mathbf{X}_k^\epsilon \rangle_k$ is a Markov chain, their stationary measures as ϵ approaches zero will be concentrated on $\text{BC}(\Phi)$. It is said that $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ is a

weak limit point of $\langle \boldsymbol{\mu}^\epsilon \rangle_{\epsilon > 0}$ if there exists a vanishing sequence $\langle \alpha_k \rangle$ where $\alpha_k \geq 0$ such that for $\epsilon = \alpha_k$, $\langle \boldsymbol{\mu}^\epsilon \rangle$ converges to $\boldsymbol{\mu}$.

Theorem 1. [33, Theorem 3.5 and Corollary 3.9] For a vanishing sequence of $\epsilon > 0$, let $\langle \langle \mathbf{X}_k^\epsilon \rangle_k \rangle_{\epsilon > 0}$ be GSAPs for a good upper semicontinuous differential inclusion $\dot{\mathbf{x}} \in \mathcal{V}(\mathbf{x})$. Assume that for each ϵ , $\langle \mathbf{X}_k^\epsilon \rangle_k$ is a Markov chain and let $\boldsymbol{\mu}^\epsilon$ be an invariant probability measure of $\langle \mathbf{X}_k^\epsilon \rangle_k$. Let $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ be a weak limit point of $\langle \boldsymbol{\mu}^\epsilon \rangle_{\epsilon > 0}$. Then the support of $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ is contained in $\text{BC}(\Phi)$, where Φ is the dynamical system induced by $\dot{\mathbf{x}} \in \mathcal{V}(\mathbf{x})$.

4. THE LINK TO THE SEMICONTINUOUS DYNAMICS

Our aim is to determine the asymptotic behaviour of the population dynamics (3) as the population size N approaches infinity. Theorem 1 connects the asymptotic behaviour of the GSAPs to the steady-state behaviour of their associated differential inclusion. Hence, if one shows that firstly, dynamics (3) define a Markov chain and secondly, the collection of the Markov chains indexed by the population size is a GSAP for a good upper semicontinuous differential inclusion, then the results of Theorem 1 can be applied, meaning that the asymptotic behaviour of the population dynamics can be revealed by analyzing the differential inclusion.

In view of (3), the next state of the population dynamics only depends on the current population state and the adopted strategy of and the subpopulation associated with the current active agent. As a result, the sequence of $\langle \mathbf{x}^N(k) \rangle_k$ is a realization of the Markov chain defined in the following.

Definition 4. The **population dynamics Markov chain** is the Markov chain $\langle \mathbf{X}_k^{\frac{1}{N}} \rangle_k$ with the state space $\mathcal{X}_{ss} \cap \frac{1}{N}\mathbb{Z}^P$, initial state $\mathbf{X}_0^{\frac{1}{N}} = \mathbf{x}^N(0)$ and transition probabilities

$$(6) \quad P_{\mathbf{x}^N, \mathbf{y}^N}^N = \begin{cases} (\rho_p - x_p^N)(2 - u(p, \mathbf{x}^N)) & \text{if } \mathbf{y}^N = \frac{1}{N}\mathbf{e}_p + \mathbf{x}^N, \\ x_p^N(u(p, \mathbf{x}^N) - 1) & \text{if } \mathbf{y}^N = -\frac{1}{N}\mathbf{e}_p + \mathbf{x}^N, \\ x_p^N(2 - u(p, \mathbf{x}^N)) + & \text{if } \mathbf{y}^N = \mathbf{x}^N, \\ (\rho_p - x_p^N)(u(p, \mathbf{x}^N) - 1) & \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Proposition 1. The sequence $\langle \mathbf{x}^N(k) \rangle_k$ is a realization of $\langle \mathbf{X}_k^{\frac{1}{N}} \rangle_k$.

For the sake of readability, the proofs of the results are provided in the appendix.

Remark 2. We increase the population size N in a way that the population structure, i.e., the population proportions of the subpopulations, $\boldsymbol{\rho}$, remains unchanged. Hence, the sequence $\langle N \rangle$ according to which the population size approaches infinity should satisfy $N\boldsymbol{\rho} \in \mathbb{Z}^P$. We denote the set of such valid population sizes by \mathcal{N} .

Now, to apply Theorem 1, we need to show that the collection of $\langle \langle \mathbf{X}_k^{\frac{1}{N}} \rangle_k \rangle_{N \in \mathcal{N}}$ is a GSAP for a good upper semicontinuous differential inclusion and hence the support of the limit point of its invariant probability measures is determined by the steady-state behavior of that differential inclusion. We claim that $\langle \langle \mathbf{X}_k^{\frac{1}{N}} \rangle_k \rangle_{N \in \mathcal{N}}$ is a GSAP for the following differential inclusion:

Definition 5. The semicontinuous population dynamics is defined by $\dot{\mathbf{x}} \in \mathcal{V}(\mathbf{x})$, where $\mathcal{V} : \mathcal{X}_{ss} \rightarrow 2^{\mathcal{X}_{ss}}$, and for $p \leq \mathfrak{p}$

$$(7a) \quad \mathcal{V}_p(\mathbf{x}) = \begin{cases} \{\rho_p - x_p(t)\} & \text{if } x(t) < \tau_p, \\ [0, \rho_p] - x_p(t) & \text{if } x(t) = \tau_p, \\ \{-x_p(t)\} & \text{if } x(t) > \tau_p, \end{cases}$$

and for $p > \mathfrak{p}$

$$(7b) \quad \mathcal{V}_p(\mathbf{x}) = \begin{cases} \{-x_p(t)\} & \text{if } x(t) < \tau'_{\mathfrak{p}+1-p}, \\ [0, \rho_p] - x_p(t) & \text{if } x(t) = \tau'_{\mathfrak{p}+1-p}, \\ \{\rho_p - x_p(t)\} & \text{if } x(t) > \tau'_{\mathfrak{p}+1-p}, \end{cases}$$

where $x(t) = \sum_{p=1}^{\mathfrak{p}} x_p(t)$.

The above dynamics are indeed the *mean dynamics* of the discrete population dynamics (3) [16]. The mean dynamic considers the decision-making process as a continuous process with an infinitely large population and \dot{x}_p describes the rate of change in the population proportion of strategy-1 players of subpopulation p . This equals the expected inflow, that is the rate of change to strategy 1 minus the expected outflow, that is the rate of change to strategy 2:

$$(8) \quad \dot{x}_p \in F_{p,1}(\mathbf{x}) - F_{p,2}(\mathbf{x}),$$

where $F_{p,1}, F_{p,2} : \mathcal{X}_{ss} \rightarrow 2^{[0, \rho_p]}$. If the population proportion of strategy-1 players is higher (resp. lower) than the threshold of anticonordinating (resp. coordinating) subpopulation p , then the inflow will be zero and the outflow equals the current proportion of strategy-1 players of subpopulation p , i.e., $\dot{x}_p = -x_p$. On the contrary, if the population proportion of strategy-1 players is lower (resp. higher) than the threshold of anticonordinating (resp. coordinating) subpopulation p , then the outflow will be zero and the inflow equals the current proportion of strategy 2 players of subpopulation p , i.e., $\dot{x}_p = \rho_p - x_p$. When the population proportion of strategy-1 players equals the threshold of (anticonordinating or coordinating) subpopulation p , both strategies 1 and 2 are a legitimate choice should there be no tie-breaker, and some may choose strategy 1 while others may choose strategy 2. Therefore, the rate will be bounded by the above two cases, i.e., $-x_p$ and $\rho_p - x_p$, resulting in the interval $[-x_p, \rho_p - x_p]$. If there is a tie-breaker, such as the set-up in this paper, then one of the strategies is preferred, resulting in one of the above two cases, which results in a *selection* of the defined differential inclusion. A *selection* from $\mathcal{V}(\mathbf{x})$ is a singleton map $\nu(\mathbf{x}) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ which satisfies $\nu(\mathbf{x}) \in \mathcal{V}(\mathbf{x})$ for all \mathbf{x} in \mathbb{R}^n [39]. That is why the mean dynamics of the discrete population dynamics (3) is sometimes considered as a selection from (7) [33]. It can be easily checked that the differential inclusion (7) satisfies the conditions of good upper semicontinuity.

Remark 3. The equivalent equation to (8) in the context of best-response would be

$$\dot{\mathbf{x}} \in \mathbf{Br}(\mathbf{x}) - \mathbf{x}$$

where $\mathbf{Br} : \mathcal{X}_{ss} \rightarrow 2^{\mathcal{X}_{ss}}$ is the best-response correspondence where $\text{Br}_p(\mathbf{x})$ returns that population proportion of strategy-1 players of subpopulation p maximizing their utility defined in the game-theoretic context of the linear threshold models (see Remark 1). In the set-up of this paper, $\text{Br}_p(\mathbf{x}) = \rho_p(2 - u(p, \mathbf{x}))$.

Lemma 1. The collection of $\langle \langle \mathbf{X}_k^{\frac{1}{N}} \rangle_k \rangle_{N \in \mathcal{N}}$ is a GSAP for (7).

Based on Lemma 1, the population dynamics (3) define GSAPs for the differential inclusion (7). Hence, in view of Theorem 1 the support of the limit point of the stationary distributions of (6), as $N \rightarrow \infty$, is contained in the Birkhoff center of Φ induced by (7). In the next section, we determine the Birkhoff center of Φ .

Remark 4. *The set-up in (1), (2), and (3) is based on a particular tie-breaking rule [40] where the agents prefer strategy 1 when the population proportion of 1-players equals the agent's threshold, i.e., $x^N = \tau(i)$ for every agent i . However, for other tie-breaking rules, such as when strategy 2 or the current strategy of the agent is preferred, Lemma 1 remains valid. The reason is that a different tie-breaker will only change $u(\cdot, \cdot)$ and consequently the selection from (7) at $x = \tau(i)$. Therefore, investigating the asymptotic behaviour of (7) does reveal that of the discrete population dynamics (3) with such tie-breaking rules as population size approaches infinity.*

5. THE ANALYSIS OF THE SEMICONTINUOUS DYNAMICS

To analyze the semicontinuous dynamics, the equilibrium points of (7) should be characterized. The following subsection provides the intuition for how analyzing the evolution of $x(t)$ in Definition 5 as the population proportion of strategy-1 players helps that of semicontinuous population dynamics.

5.1. Intuition and example.

Example 5. *Consider a mixed population of one anticonordinating and two coordinating subpopulations. The thresholds and the population proportions of the subpopulations are respectively as follows: $(\tau_1, \tau_2, \tau_1') = (0.85, 0.75, 0.35)$ and $(\rho_1, \rho_2', \rho_1') = (0.6, 0.3, 0.1)$. The semicontinuous population dynamics are $\dot{\mathbf{x}} \in \mathcal{V}(\mathbf{x})$, where $\mathcal{V} = [\mathcal{V}_1, \mathcal{V}_2, \mathcal{V}_3]^\top$ and*

$$(9a) \quad \mathcal{V}_1(\mathbf{x}) = \begin{cases} \{0.6 - x_1(t)\} & \text{if } x(t) < 0.85, \\ [-x_1(t), 0.6 - x_1(t)] & \text{if } x(t) = 0.85, \\ \{-x_1(t)\} & \text{if } x(t) > 0.85, \end{cases}$$

$$(9b) \quad \mathcal{V}_2(\mathbf{x}) = \begin{cases} \{-x_2(t)\} & \text{if } x(t) < 0.75, \\ [-x_2(t), 0.3 - x_2(t)] & \text{if } x(t) = 0.75, \\ \{0.3 - x_2(t)\} & \text{if } x(t) > 0.75, \end{cases}$$

$$(9c) \quad \mathcal{V}_3(\mathbf{x}) = \begin{cases} \{-x_3(t)\} & \text{if } x(t) < 0.35, \\ [-x_3(t), 0.1 - x_3(t)] & \text{if } x(t) = 0.35, \\ \{0.1 - x_3(t)\} & \text{if } x(t) > 0.35. \end{cases}$$

To find the equilibrium points, we should find the state populations \mathbf{x}^ at which $\mathbf{0} \in \mathcal{V}(\mathbf{x}^*)$. The combinations of all possible cases for $\mathcal{V}_1, \mathcal{V}_2$, and \mathcal{V}_3 should be considered based on the value of x . So if we already knew the value of x at equilibrium, we would only need to investigate the in-force case in $\mathcal{V}_1, \mathcal{V}_2$, and \mathcal{V}_3 to find x_1, x_2, x_3 , and in turn \mathbf{x} at equilibrium. Hence, we obtain the dynamics $x(t)$ as follows. The thresholds divide the unit interval into four disjoint open intervals, i.e., $(0, 0.35)$, $(0.35, 0.75)$, $(0.75, 0.85)$, and $(0.85, 1)$. When $x \in (0, 0.35)$, $\mathcal{V}(\mathbf{x})$ is a singleton and $\dot{\mathbf{x}}$ will be equal to $(0.6 - x_1, -x_2, -x_3)$. The derivative of x , will then be $\dot{x} = 0.6 - x_1 - x_2 - x_3 = 0.6 - x$. If x equals the threshold of coordinating*

subpopulation 1, that is 0.35, then $\mathcal{V}_3(\mathbf{x})$ will be multi-valued and in turn $\dot{\mathbf{x}}$ will belong to $(\{0.6 - x_1\}, \{-x_2\}, \{-x_3, 0.1 - x_3\})$ resulting in $\dot{x} \in [0.6, 0.7] - x$. A similar procedure can be applied to the other intervals, resulting in $\dot{x}(t) \in \mathcal{X}(x)$, where

$$(10) \quad \mathcal{X}(x) = \begin{cases} \{0.6 - x(t)\} & \text{if } x(t) \in [0, 0.35), \\ [0.6, 0.7] - x(t) & \text{if } x(t) = 0.35, \\ \{0.7 - x(t)\} & \text{if } x(t) \in (0.35, 0.75), \\ [0.7, 1] - x(t) & \text{if } x(t) = 0.75, \\ \{1 - x(t)\} & \text{if } x(t) \in (0.75, 0.85), \\ [0.4, 1] - x(t) & \text{if } x(t) = 0.85, \\ \{0.4 - x(t)\} & \text{if } x(t) \in (0.85, 1]. \end{cases}$$

At equilibrium, we have $0 \in \mathcal{X}(x^*)$. So we can find the equilibrium by investigating all of the intervals in (10). The image of the first interval $[0, 0.35)$ under \mathcal{X} is $(0.25, 0.6]$, which does not include zero, and hence is equilibrium-free. The point 0.35 is also not the equilibrium, because $0 \notin \mathcal{X}(0.35)$. However, the image of the interval $(0.35, 0.75)$ under \mathcal{X} is $(-0.05, 0.35)$, which includes zero. Therefore, the abstract dynamics admit an equilibrium point in this interval, which turns out to be $x_1^* = 0.7$ as $0 \in \mathcal{X}(0.7)$. Following the same procedure, we find two additional equilibrium points $x_2^* = 0.75$ and $x_3^* = 0.85$ for the abstract dynamics.

In view of (9), the value x_1^* equals the summation of ρ_1 and ρ'_1 , i.e., the population proportions of those subpopulations whose preferred strategy at x_1^* is 1. Evaluating (9) at $x = x_1^*$, we see that $\mathbf{x}_1^* = (0.6, 0, 0.1)$ is an equilibrium point for the population dynamics.

The point x_2^* equals the threshold of the coordinating subpopulation 2 and the population state $\mathbf{x}_2^* = (0.6, 0.05, 0.1)$ is an equilibrium point for (9). At \mathbf{x}_2^* , except for coordinating subpopulation 2, members of the same subpopulations adopt the same strategy, i.e., $x_{2,1}^* = \rho_1$, $x_{2,3}^* = \rho'_1$.

Finally, the point $x_3^* = 0.85$ equals the anticonordinating subpopulation's threshold and $\mathbf{x}_3^* = (0.45, 0.3, 0.1)$ is also an equilibrium for the population dynamics. At \mathbf{x}_3^* , except for the anticonordinating subpopulation, members of the same subpopulations adopt the same strategy, i.e., $x_{3,2}^* = \rho'_2$, $x_{3,3}^* = \rho'_1$.

5.2. The abstract dynamics. Example 5 gives us an intuition that it is useful to focus on the evolution of the population proportion of 1-players, i.e., $x(t)$, which from now on we refer to as the *abstract state* as it is abstracting away the heterogeneity of the population. Define \mathbf{p}'_j (resp. \mathbf{p}_i) as the cumulative population proportion of coordinators (resp. anticonordinating), that is the population proportion of those having thresholds equal to or less (resp. greater) than τ'_j (resp. τ_i), i.e.,

$$\mathbf{p}'_j = \sum_{k=1}^j \rho'_k, \quad \mathbf{p}_i = \sum_{k=1}^i \rho_k,$$

where $j \in [\mathbf{p}']$, $i \in [\mathbf{p}]$, and we define $\mathbf{p}'_0 = \mathbf{p}_0 = \mathbf{p}_{-1} = \mathbf{p}'_{-1} = 0$, $\mathbf{p}'_{\mathbf{p}'+1} = \mathbf{p}'_{\mathbf{p}'}$, $\mathbf{p}_{\mathbf{p}+1} = \mathbf{p}_{\mathbf{p}}$, $\tau_{\mathbf{p}+1} = \tau'_0 = 0$, and $\tau_0 = \tau'_{\mathbf{p}'+1} = 1$.

Assumption 1. *The thresholds of the subpopulations are unique and satisfy the following:*

$$\forall k \in [\mathbf{p}] \cup \{0\} \forall l \in [\mathbf{p}'] \cup \{0\} (\mathbf{p}_k + \mathbf{p}'_l \notin \{\tau_1, \dots, \tau_{\mathbf{p}}, \tau'_1, \dots, \tau'_{\mathbf{p}'}\}).$$

In words, it is assumed that the summation of the cumulative population proportion of first k anticoordinating subpopulations and first l coordinating subpopulations does not match any of the thresholds for the P subpopulations. We refer the reader to Remark 5 for consequences of this assumption.

Proposition 2. *Consider the semicontinuous dynamics (7). Under Assumption 1, the evolution of the population proportion of 1-players, i.e., $x(t)$, is governed by*

$$(11) \quad \dot{x} \in \mathcal{X}(x),$$

$$\mathcal{X}(x) = \begin{cases} [\mathfrak{p}_{i-1} + \mathfrak{p}'_j, \mathfrak{p}_i + \mathfrak{p}'_j] - x & \text{if } \exists i(x = \tau_i), \\ [\mathfrak{p}_i + \mathfrak{p}'_{j-1}, \mathfrak{p}_i + \mathfrak{p}'_j] - x & \text{if } \exists j(x = \tau'_j), \\ \{\mathfrak{p}_i + \mathfrak{p}'_j - x(t)\} & \text{if } \exists i, j(x \in (\max\{\tau'_j, \tau_{i+1}\}, \min\{\tau'_{j+1}, \tau_i\})), \end{cases}$$

where for $x = \tau_i$, j equals $\max\{k | \tau'_k < \tau_i\}$ and for $x = \tau_j$, i equals $\max\{k | \tau'_j < \tau_k\}$.

We refer to (11) as the *abstract dynamics*.

5.3. Equilibrium points. Inspired by the definitions in [41] and based on Example 5, we claim that the equilibria of the population dynamics are either *clean-cut* or *ruffled* as defined in the following.

At a clean-cut population state, all members of every subpopulation adopt the same strategy in a way that all coordinating (resp. anticoordinating) subpopulations with thresholds equal to or less (resp. greater) than that of some benchmark coordinating (resp. anticoordinating) subpopulation $j \in [p']$ (resp. $i \in [p]$) play strategy 1 and the remaining subpopulations play strategy 2. This population state is shown as

$$\mathbf{c}^{ij} = (\rho_1, \dots, \rho_i, 0, \dots, 0, \rho'_j, \dots, \rho'_1).$$

The abstract state x at \mathbf{c}^{ij} is denoted by $c^{ij} = \mathfrak{p}_i + \mathfrak{p}'_j$. The state at which no coordinating (resp. anticoordinating) agents adopt strategy 1, is denoted by \mathbf{c}^{i0} (resp. \mathbf{c}^{0j}). In Example 5, \mathbf{x}_1^* (resp. x_1^*) is a clean-cut equilibrium point for (9) (resp. (10)) and equals \mathbf{c}^{11} (resp. c^{11}).

When the population proportion of strategy-1 players equals the threshold of some subpopulation, we have a ruffled population state. If the population proportion of strategy-1 players equals the threshold of some benchmark anticoordinating subpopulation i such that all coordinating (resp. anticoordinating) subpopulations with a threshold less (resp. greater) than that of subpopulation i play strategy 1, we have a *ruffled anticoordinator-driven* population state (as this equilibrium would not exist in the absence of anticoordinators):

$$\mathbf{a}^{ij} = (\rho_1, \dots, \rho_{i-1}, \tau_i - (\mathfrak{p}'_j + \mathfrak{p}_{i-1}), 0, \dots, 0, \rho'_j, \dots, \rho'_1),$$

where j equals $\max\{k | \tau'_k < \tau_i\}$. The abstract state at \mathbf{a}^{ij} is denoted by $a^{ij} = \tau_i$. In Example 5, \mathbf{x}_3^* (resp. x_3^*) is a ruffled anticoordinator-driven equilibrium point for (9) (resp. (10)) and equals \mathbf{a}^{12} (resp. a^{12}).

Finally, when the population proportion of strategy-1 players equals the threshold of some benchmark coordinating subpopulation j such that all coordinating (resp. anticoordinating) subpopulations with a threshold less (resp. greater) than that of subpopulation j play strategy 1, we have a *ruffled coordinator-driven* population state:

$$\mathbf{o}^{ij} = (\rho_1, \dots, \rho_i, 0, \dots, 0, \tau'_j - (\mathfrak{p}'_{j-1} + \mathfrak{p}_i), \rho'_{j-1}, \dots, \rho'_1),$$

where $i = \max\{k \in [\mathfrak{p}] | \tau'_j < \tau_k\}$. The abstract state at \mathbf{o}^{ij} is denoted by $o^{ij} = \tau'_j$. In Example 5, \mathbf{x}_2^* (resp. x_2^*) is a ruffled anticonordinator-driven equilibrium point for (9) (resp. (10)) and equals \mathbf{o}^{12} (resp. o^{12}).

From now on, for the sake of readability, we drop the word ‘‘ruffled’’ and simply say ‘‘(anti)coordinator-driven.’’ The following lemma proves that the equilibria of the semicontinuous population and abstract dynamics are one of these three population states.

Lemma 2. *The followings hold under Assumption 1:*

- (1) *The equilibrium points of the dynamics (7) and (11) are either clean-cut, anticonordinator-driven or coordinator-driven population states.*
- (2) *c^{ij} (resp. \mathbf{c}^{ij}) is an equilibrium of (11) (resp. (7)) iff*

$$(12) \quad \max\{\tau_{i+1}, \tau'_j\} < \mathfrak{p}'_j + \mathfrak{p}_i < \min\{\tau_i, \tau'_{j+1}\}.$$
- (3) *a^{ij} (resp. \mathbf{a}^{ij}) is an equilibrium (11) (resp. (7)) iff*

$$(13) \quad 0 < \tau_i - (\mathfrak{p}'_j + \mathfrak{p}_{i-1}) < \rho_i.$$
- (4) *o^{ij} (resp. \mathbf{o}^{ij}) is an equilibrium (11) (resp. (7)) iff*

$$(14) \quad \mathfrak{p}_i + \mathfrak{p}'_{j-1} < \tau'_j < \mathfrak{p}_i + \mathfrak{p}'_j.$$

According to Lemma 2, for every equilibrium of the semicontinuous population dynamics, e.g., \mathbf{c}^{ij} , there is exactly one *associated* equilibrium in the abstract dynamics, i.e., c^{ij} .

5.4. Global stability analysis. The abstract dynamics and in turn the semicontinuous population dynamics may admit several clean-cut, anticonordinator-driven, or coordinator-driven equilibrium points. Denote the set of clean-cut, anticonordinator-driven, and coordinator-driven equilibrium points of the semicontinuous population dynamics by \mathcal{Q}^c , \mathcal{Q}^a , and \mathcal{Q}^o , respectively. When there is no equilibrium point of either type, the corresponding set will be empty. Assume that there are together $\mathbb{Q} \in \mathbb{N}$ equilibrium points of clean-cut or anticonordinator-driven type. Arrange the clean-cut or anticonordinator-driven equilibrium points of the semicontinuous population dynamics (7) in the ascending order of their associated equilibrium points in the abstract dynamics. Hence, we have

$$q_1^* < q_2^* < \dots < q_{\mathbb{Q}}^*,$$

where q_k^* is the abstract state at $\mathbf{q}_k^* \in \mathcal{Q}^a \cup \mathcal{Q}^c$ for $k \in [\mathbb{Q}]$. A set $\mathcal{M} \subseteq \mathcal{X}_{ss}$ is *attractive* under differential inclusion (4) from a set $\mathcal{U} \subseteq \mathcal{X}_{ss}$ if for each solution $\mathbf{x}(t)$ with $\mathbf{x}(0) \in \mathcal{U}$ and each open ϵ -neighborhood of \mathcal{M} , there exists time $T > 0$ such that $\mathbf{x}(t)$ falls in ϵ -neighborhood of \mathcal{M} for all $t \geq T$ [42]. The union of all sets in \mathcal{X}_{ss} from which \mathcal{M} is attractive under differential inclusion \mathcal{V} is the *basin of attraction* of \mathcal{M} under \mathcal{V} [42]. The following theorem reveals the global behaviour of the semicontinuous population dynamics.

According to Lemma A 1, in the abstract dynamics, between every two anticonordinator-driven and/or clean-cut equilibria q_k^* and q_{k+1}^* , $k \in [\mathbb{Q} - 1]$, there exists exactly one coordinator-driven equilibrium, which we denote by $q_{k,k+1}^*$. The associated equilibrium in the semicontinuous dynamics is denoted by $\mathbf{q}_{k,k+1}^*$. Define $q_{0,1}^* = 0$ and $q_{\mathbb{Q},\mathbb{Q}+1}^* = 1$.

Theorem 2. *Consider the semicontinuous population dynamics (7) and its associated abstract dynamics (11). Under Assumption 1,*

- (1) Each $\mathbf{q}_{k-1,k}^*$, $k \in \{2, \dots, \mathbf{Q}\}$, is unstable, and each \mathbf{q}_k^* , $k \in [\mathbf{Q}]$, is asymptotically stable with the basin of attraction

$$\mathcal{A}(\mathbf{q}_k^*) = \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}_{ss} | x \in (q_{k-1,k}^*, q_{k,k+1}^*)\}.$$

- (2) The limit set of every point in $\{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}_{ss} | x = q_{k,k+1}^*\}$ for $k \in [\mathbf{Q} - 1]$ is either of \mathbf{q}_k^* , \mathbf{q}_{k+1}^* , or $\mathbf{q}_{k,k+1}^*$.

Indeed it can be shown that the clean-cut equilibrium points are exponentially asymptotically stable and the anticonordinator-driven equilibrium points are finite-time stable.

Corollary 1. *Under Assumption 1, for the semicontinuous population dynamics (7) and the associated abstract dynamics (11),*

- (1) *there exists at least one clean-cut or anticonordinator-driven equilibrium point;*
- (2) *if the dynamics admit only one equilibrium point, it is globally asymptotically stable.*

5.5. The Birkhoff center of the semicontinuous population dynamics. The following proposition determines the Birkhoff center of the dynamical system induced by (7).

Proposition 3. *If Assumption 1 holds, the Birkhoff center of the dynamical system induced by the semicontinuous population dynamics (7) is*

$$(15) \quad \text{BC}_M = \mathcal{Q}^c \cup \mathcal{Q}^a \cup \mathcal{Q}^o.$$

The following corollaries are direct results of Proposition 3 and determine the Birkhoff center of the dynamical system induced by the semicontinuous population dynamics capturing the behaviour of a population of exclusively coordinators and exclusively anticonordinators, respectively.

Corollary 2. *If Assumption 1 holds, the Birkhoff center of the semicontinuous population dynamics of a population of exclusively coordinators is*

$$(16) \quad \text{BC}_C = \mathcal{Q}^c \cup \mathcal{Q}^o.$$

As for the population of anticonordinators, the result would be $\text{BC}_A = \mathcal{Q}^a \cup \mathcal{Q}^c$. However, in this case, these sets can be simplified as it can be shown that there is only one equilibrium (Corollary 1) and it is either a clean-cut or ruffled anticonordinator-driven. We summarize this possibility into the following state:

$$\mathbf{q} = (\rho_1, \dots, \rho_{p-1}, \min\{\tau_p - \mathbf{p}_{p-1}, \rho_p\}, 0, \dots, 0).$$

In view of Lemma 2, the condition for the existence of this equilibrium would be $\mathbf{p}_{p-1} < \tau_p$ and $\tau_{p+1} < \mathbf{p}_p$.

Corollary 3. *If Assumption 1 holds, the Birkhoff center of the semicontinuous population dynamics describing the evolution of an exclusive population of \mathbf{p} types of anticonordinators is*

$$(17) \quad \text{BC}_A = \{\mathbf{q}\}.$$

So far, the steady-state behaviour of the semicontinuous population dynamics (7) was determined. The following section determines the asymptotic behaviour of the discrete population dynamics (3) as the population size approaches infinity.

6. THE ASYMPTOTIC BEHAVIOUR OF THE DISCRETE POPULATION DYNAMICS

The following theorem asserts the main result of this paper.

Theorem 3. *Consider a heterogeneous population consisting of N interacting agents evolving according to the discrete population dynamics (3). Under Assumption 1, as population size N approaches infinity, the weak limit points of the invariant probability measures of the corresponding population dynamics Markov chain will be concentrated on*

- BC_M if the population is a mixture of coordinating and anticonducting subpopulations;
- BC_A if the population consists of anticonducting subpopulations;
- BC_C if the population consists of coordinating subpopulations.

In words, consider a population of coordinators and anticonductors who update their decisions asynchronously based on (1) and (2), respectively. As the population size approaches infinity, the population state almost surely only visits the equilibria in the Birkhoff center. Since the agents in the discrete dynamics do not make mistakes, once the population state reaches an equilibrium, it remains there afterward. Hence, according to the theorem, the cardinality of all minimal positively invariant sets, which are the limit sets of the dynamics, converge to zero. Consequently, the length of the possible fluctuations will converge to zero. This results in the following corollary.

Corollary 4. *Consider a heterogeneous population consisting of N interacting agents evolving according to the discrete population dynamics (3). Under Assumption 1, the ratio of the cardinality of every limit set to the population size N vanishes as $N \rightarrow \infty$.*

Remark 5. *Assumption 1 ensures that \mathcal{Q}^c , \mathcal{Q}^a , and \mathcal{Q}^o are distinct. Otherwise, the following possible cases may happen: (i) The threshold of benchmark anticonducting subpopulation i equals $\mathbf{p}'_j + \mathbf{p}_{i-1}$ (resp. $\mathbf{p}'_j + \mathbf{p}_i$). In this case, the equilibria \mathbf{a}^{ij} and $\mathbf{c}^{(i-1)j}$ (resp. \mathbf{c}^{ij}) match and remain stable. (ii) The threshold of benchmark coordinating subpopulation j equals $\mathbf{p}'_{j-1} + \mathbf{p}_i$ (resp. $\mathbf{p}'_j + \mathbf{p}_i$). In this case, the equilibria \mathbf{o}^{ij} and $\mathbf{c}^{i(j-1)}$ (resp. \mathbf{c}^{ij}) match, resulting in an unstable equilibrium. (iii) The threshold of benchmark coordinating subpopulation j equals that of benchmark anticonducting subpopulation i . In this case, the equilibrium τ_i for the abstract dynamics could be either stable or unstable depending on the value of $\max\{\mathbf{p}_{j-1} + \mathbf{p}_i, \mathbf{p}_j + \mathbf{p}_{i-1}\} - \tau_i$. If $\mathbf{p}_{j-1} + \mathbf{p}_i < \tau_i < \mathbf{p}_j + \mathbf{p}_{i-1}$, it is unstable and otherwise it is asymptotically stable. As for the semicontinuous population dynamics, a continuum of equilibria \mathbf{z}^{ij} emerges which is characterized by $\mathcal{Z} = \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}_{ss} | \forall l \notin \{i, P-j+1\}, z_l^{ij} = a_l^{ij}, z_i^{ij} + z_{P-j+1}^{ij} = \tau_i - (\mathbf{p}_{j-1} + \mathbf{p}_{i-1})\}$. The Birkhoff center will then also contain \mathcal{Z} . The population proportion of strategy-1 players is constant at \mathcal{Z} and consequently, the length of the possible fluctuations in the population proportion of strategy-1 players in the discrete population dynamics will converge to zero as $N \rightarrow \infty$.*

Revisiting Example 2. *Consider the associated semicontinuous population dynamics with the finite population dynamics introduced in Example 2. Based on Lemma 2, the mean dynamics admit only one equilibrium point at $x = \tau_1$ which is an anticonductor-driven equilibrium point. Therefore, according to Corollary 1*

this equilibrium point is globally asymptotically stable. Figure 4 depicts the evolution of population proportion of strategy-1 players merged with Figure 1. As seen, $x(t)$ approaches τ_1 . It can be inferred that the upper and lower bounds of the invariant sets are indeed converging to the threshold of anticoordinating subpopulation, i.e., $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} x^N(k) \rightarrow \tau_1$, which is in line with Theorem 3. The chattering observed in the solid black line is due to the numerical errors.

Example 6. Consider a population of size N consisting of four coordinating and three anticoordinating subpopulations. The population distribution over the subpopulations is $\boldsymbol{\rho} = (2/28, 3/28, 3/28, 6/28, 8/28, 3/28, 3/28)$. The thresholds of the anticoordinating subpopulations are $\tau_1 = 0.929$, $\tau_2 = 6/7$, $\tau_3 = 0.357$, and those of coordinators are $\tau'_1 = 0.05$, $\tau'_2 = 0.321$, $\tau'_3 = 0.5$, $\tau'_4 = 0.643$. When the population size N equals 28 or 56 (which is the next larger valid size; see Remark 2), the population proportion of 1-players either reaches $x^N = 11/28$ and remains there or fluctuates around $x^N = 6/7$. However, for larger populations, the fluctuation disappears.

Semicontinuous population dynamics. In view of Lemma 2, the semicontinuous population dynamics associated with the described discrete population dynamics admit three equilibrium points; one clean-cut equilibrium point \mathbf{c}^{22} at $(2/28, 3/28, 0, 0, 0, 3/28, 3/28)$ with the corresponding abstract state c^{22} equals $11/28$, one anticonordinator-driven equilibrium point \mathbf{a}^{24} at $(2/28, 2/28, 0, 6/28, 8/28, 3/28, 3/28)$ with the corresponding abstract state a^{24} equal to $6/7$, and one coordinator-driven equilibrium point \mathbf{o}^{23} at $(2/28, 3/28, 0, 0, 3/28, 3/28, 3/28)$ with the corresponding abstract state o^{23} equal to the threshold of coordinating subpopulation 3, 0.5. According to Theorem 2, except for a set of initial conditions of measure zero, the population state converges to either of \mathbf{c}^{22} or \mathbf{a}^{24} , depending on the initial condition—Figure 5. As for the discrete population dynamics, the observed fluctuations are around a^{24} which, based on simulation results, convert to an equilibrium. In addition, the equilibrium state at $x^N = 11/28$ preserves as the population size grows and is indeed equal to c^{22} .

7. CONCLUDING REMARKS

We analyzed the asymptotic behavior of a well-mixed finite heterogeneous population of agents playing binary games when the population size approaches infinity. We utilized the available results that link the stationary measures of the Markov chain corresponding to this discrete population dynamics and the steady-state behaviour of the associated semicontinuous mean dynamics. We then showed that the fluctuations in the finite mixed population of coordinators and anticonordinators do not scale with the population size (Figure 2). Namely, the fluctuations are a property of finite populations.

The convergence result of the semicontinuous population dynamics for exclusive populations of anticonordinators, i.e., Corollary 3, matches that of the discrete dynamics [14] where the population state was proven to always reach the clean-cut equilibrium \mathbf{q} or reach the set of two ruffled states (that are not possible here due to the continuity of the state space of the semicontinuous population dynamics). Similarly, the convergence result of the semicontinuous population dynamics for exclusive populations of coordinators, i.e., Corollary 2, matches that of the discrete dynamics [13] where the population state was proven to always equilibrate. Moreover, the equilibria of the discrete and semicontinuous dynamics match.




Figure 4. The associated abstract state with the discrete population dynamics described in Example 2 approaches τ_1 . The black solid line represents the evolution of the abstract state over time. The circles and crosses represent the upper and lower bounds of the invariant sets for different population sizes. In the discrete population set-up, as the population size increases, the upper and lower bounds of the population proportion of strategy 1 players in the invariant sets shrink to τ_1 .

In addition, the stability of clean-cut equilibrium points of semicontinuous population dynamics matches that of the discrete dynamics [43]. However, the stability of the ruffled types has not been investigated in the discrete population.

As for the fluctuations, in all of the examples, we observed that the interval defined by the lower and upper bounds of the ratio of strategy 1-players of the same population but over different initial conditions and activation sequences contains an anticonordinator-driven equilibrium point of the abstract dynamics. Moreover, as the population size grows, the interval shrinks to this equilibrium. It remains yet unknown whether this observation holds true always for every population and whether ruffled anticonordinator-driven equilibria are necessary for the existence of minimal positively invariant sets in the finite discrete populations.

According to our results, when analyzing discrete population dynamics, it is recommended to first analyze the associated mean (semi)continuous dynamics as they are often simpler and partly reveal the asymptotic behaviour of the discrete population dynamics.

REFERENCES

- [1] Z. Cao, H. Gao, X. Qu, M. Yang, and X. Yang, “Fashion, cooperation, and social interactions,” *PLoS One*, vol. 8, no. 1, p. e49441, 2013.
- [2] H. Blanton, A. E. Stuart, and R. J. Van den Eijnden, “An introduction to deviance-regulation theory: The effect of behavioral norms on message framing,” *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, vol. 27, no. 7, pp. 848–858, 2001.




Figure 5. Example 6. The solution of the semicontinuous population dynamics for two different initial conditions. The upper panel shows the evolution of the population state which converges to clean-cut equilibrium point $\mathbf{c}^{22} = (2, 3, 0, 0, 0, 3, 3)/28$ and the lower one depicts the evolution of the population state converging to the anticoordinator-driven equilibrium point $\mathbf{a}^{24} = (2, 2, 0, 6, 8, 3, 3)/28$, where the corresponding population proportion of 1-players equals $\tau_2 = 6/7$. The observed non-smoothness in the evolution of some subpopulations is due to the change in their preferred strategy. For example, in the upper panel, at time zero, the abstract state is below τ'_2 (resp. τ'_3) resulting in $\dot{x}'_2 < 0$ ($\dot{x}'_3 > 0$). As abstract state increases and exceeds τ'_2 (resp. τ'_3), the preferred strategy of coordinating (resp. anticoordinating) subpopulation 2 (resp. 3) changes to 1 (resp. 2) yielding $\dot{x}'_2 > 0$ (resp. $\dot{x}'_3 < 0$).

- [3] G. Como, S. Durand, and F. Fagnani, "Optimal targeting in super-modular games," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 67, no. 12, pp. 6366–6380, 2022.
- [4] L. Arditti, G. Como, F. Fagnani, and M. Vanelli, "Equilibria and learning dynamics in mixed network coordination/anti-coordination games," in *2021 60th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*, 2021, pp. 4982–4987.
- [5] M. Granovetter, "Threshold models of collective behavior," *American journal of sociology*, vol. 83, no. 6, pp. 1420–1443, 1978.
- [6] M. Vanelli, L. Arditti, G. Como, and F. Fagnani, "On games with coordinating and anti-coordinating agents," *IFAC-PapersOnLine*, vol. 53, no. 2, pp. 10 975–10 980, 2020.
- [7] Y. Zhu, C. Xia, and Z. Chen, "Nash equilibrium in iterated multiplayer games under asynchronous best-response dynamics," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 68, no. 9, pp. 5798–5805, 2023.
- [8] Y. Zhu, Z. Zhang, C. Xia, and Z. Chen, "Equilibrium analysis and incentive-based control of the anticoordinating networked game dynamics," *Automatica*, vol. 147, p. 110707, 2023.




Figure 2. [Revisit]-The connection between the asymptotic behaviour of finite populations of interacting agents evolving based on (3) and their associated semicontinuous population dynamics (7) based on Stochastic approximation theory.

- [9] S. Arefizadeh, S. Arefizadeh, S. R. Etesami, and S. Bolouki, “Robustness of dynamics in games: A contraction mapping decomposition approach,” *Automatica*, vol. 155, p. 111142, 2023.
- [10] P. Guo, Y. Wang, and H. Li, “Algebraic formulation and strategy optimization for a class of evolutionary networked games via semi-tensor product method,” *Automatica*, vol. 49, no. 11, pp. 3384–3389, 2013.
- [11] D. Cheng, “On finite potential games,” *Automatica*, vol. 50, no. 7, pp. 1793–1801, 2014.
- [12] J.-E. Feng, Y. Li, S. Fu, and H. Lyu, “New method for disturbance decoupling of boolean networks,” *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 67, no. 9, pp. 4794–4800, 2022.
- [13] P. Ramazi and M. Cao, “Convergence of linear threshold decision-making dynamics in finite heterogeneous populations,” *Automatica*, vol. 119, p. 109063, 2020.
- [14] —, “Asynchronous decision-making dynamics under best-response update rule in finite heterogeneous populations,” *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 63, no. 3, pp. 742–751, 2018.
- [15] P. Ramazi and M. H. Roohi, “Characterizing oscillations in heterogeneous populations of coordinators and anticoordinators,” *Automatica*, vol. 154, p. 111068, 2023.
- [16] W. H. Sandholm, *Population games and evolutionary dynamics*. MIT press, 2010.
- [17] G. Como, F. Fagnani, and L. Zino, “Imitation dynamics in population games on community networks,” *IEEE Transactions on Control of Network Systems*, vol. 8, no. 1, pp. 65–76, 2021.
- [18] D. Madeo and C. Mocenni, “Game interactions and dynamics on networked populations,” *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 60, no. 7, pp. 1801–1810, 2015.
- [19] M. A. Mabrok, “Passivity analysis of replicator dynamics and its variations,” *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 66, no. 8, pp. 3879–3884, 2021.

- [20] P. Ramazi and M. Cao, “Global convergence for replicator dynamics of repeated snowdrift games,” *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 66, no. 1, pp. 291–298, 2021.
- [21] J. Hofbauer, “Stability for the best response dynamics,” *Technical Report*, 1995, university of Vienna.
- [22] R. Golman and S. E. Page, “Basins of attraction and equilibrium selection under different learning rules,” *Journal of evolutionary economics*, vol. 20, no. 1, pp. 49–72, 2010.
- [23] B. Swenson, R. Murray, and S. Kar, “On best-response dynamics in potential games,” *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, vol. 56, no. 4, pp. 2734–2767, 2018.
- [24] U. Berger, “Two more classes of games with the continuous-time fictitious play property,” *Games and Economic Behavior*, vol. 60, no. 2, pp. 247–261, 2007.
- [25] G. Theodorakopoulos, J.-Y. Le Boudec, and J. S. Baras, “Selfish response to epidemic propagation,” *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 58, no. 2, pp. 363–376, 2012.
- [26] W. S. Rossi, G. Como, and F. Fagnani, “Threshold models of cascades in large-scale networks,” *IEEE Transactions on Network Science and Engineering*, vol. 6, no. 2, pp. 158–172, 2019.
- [27] C. Ravazzi, G. Como, M. Garetto, E. Leonardi, and A. Tarable, “Asynchronous semianonymous dynamics over large-scale networks,” *SIAM Journal on Applied Dynamical Systems*, vol. 22, no. 2, pp. 1300–1343, 2023.
- [28] S. Pei, R. Cressman, and B. Zhang, “Dynamic games on networks with heterogeneous players,” *Boyu, Dynamic Games on Networks with Heterogeneous Players*, 2022.
- [29] M. Benaïm, J. Hofbauer, and S. Sorin, “Stochastic approximations and differential inclusions,” *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, vol. 44, no. 1, pp. 328–348, 2005.
- [30] M. Benaïm, “Recursive algorithms, urn processes and chaining number of chain recurrent sets,” *Ergodic Theory and Dynamical Systems*, vol. 18, no. 1, pp. 53–87, 1998.
- [31] M. Benaïm and J. W. Weibull, “Deterministic approximation of stochastic evolution in games,” *Econometrica*, vol. 71, no. 3, pp. 873–903, 2003.
- [32] M. Benaïm and J. Weibull, “Mean-field approximation of stochastic population processes in games,” *hal-00435515*, 2009.
- [33] G. Roth and W. H. Sandholm, “Stochastic approximations with constant step size and differential inclusions,” *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, vol. 51, no. 1, pp. 525–555, 2013.
- [34] P. Ramazi, J. Riehl, and M. Cao, “Networks of conforming or nonconforming individuals tend to reach satisfactory decisions,” *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, vol. 113, no. 46, pp. 12985–12990, 2016.
- [35] Y. Ibuka, M. Li, J. Vietri, G. B. Chapman, and A. P. Galvani, “Free-riding behavior in vaccination decisions: an experimental study,” *PloS one*, vol. 9, no. 1, p. e87164, 2014.
- [36] J. Seanehia, C. Treibich, C. Holmberg, J. Müller-Nordhorn, V. Casin, J. Raude, and J. E. Mueller, “Quantifying population preferences around vaccination against severe but rare diseases: A conjoint analysis among french university students, 2016,” *Vaccine*, vol. 35, no. 20, pp. 2676–2684, 2017.
- [37] A. Klappenecker, “Markov chains,” *Texas AM University, Texas*, 2018.
- [38] J. Cortes, “Discontinuous dynamical systems,” *IEEE Control systems magazine*, vol. 28, no. 3, pp. 36–73, 2008.
- [39] G. V. Smirnov, *Introduction to the Theory of Differential Inclusions*. American Mathematical Soc., 2002, vol. 41.
- [40] N. Sakhaei, Z. Maleki, and P. Ramazi, “Equilibration analysis and control of coordinating decision-making populations,” 2022.
- [41] P. Ramazi and M. Cao, “Asynchronous decision-making dynamics under best-response update rule in finite heterogeneous populations,” *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 63, no. 3, pp. 742–751, 2017.
- [42] C. G. Mayhew and A. R. Teel, “On the topological structure of attraction basins for differential inclusions,” *Systems & Control Letters*, vol. 60, no. 12, pp. 1045–1050, 2011.
- [43] H. Le, M. Rajaei, and P. Ramazi, “Heterogeneous mixed populations of coordinating, anti-coordinating, and imitating individuals,” 2022.
- [44] S. Lalley, “Markov chains,” *The University of Chicago*, 2018. [Online]. Available: <http://galton.uchicago.edu/~lalley/Courses/383/index.html>

APPENDIX

7.1. Proof of Proposition 1.

Proof. To prove, it suffices to show that $\mathbb{P}[\mathbf{X}_{k+1} = \mathbf{x}^N(k+1) | \mathbf{X}_k = \mathbf{x}^N(k)] = P_{\mathbf{x}^N(k), \mathbf{x}^N(k+1)}^N$. That is to show that the probability the population dynamics (3) reach the state \mathbf{y}^N at index $k+1$ from the state \mathbf{x}^N at index k equals the transition probability $P_{\mathbf{x}^N, \mathbf{y}^N}^N$ in the Markov chain. This is straightforward, because at any state \mathbf{x}^N either the active agent switches to 1 or to 2 or sticks to her current strategy and no other case is possible. This summarizes the possible four cases in (6). In the first case, for example, the probability of an agent which belongs to the subpopulation p switches her strategy from 2 to 1 equals the probability of drawing such agent $\rho_p - x_p^N$ if strategy 1 is the tendentious strategy of subpopulation p 's agents, i.e., $u(p, \mathbf{x}^N) = 1$, and equals zero otherwise, i.e., $u(p, \mathbf{x}^N) = 0$. \square

7.2. Proof of Lemma 1. The proof of Lemma 1 is inspired by the steps taken in [33, Example 4.1].

Proof. By considering the sequence $\langle \frac{1}{N} \rangle_{N \in \mathcal{N}}$ as the vanishing sequence of $\epsilon > 0$, it suffices to show that there exist $\langle \mathbf{V}_k^{\frac{1}{N}} \rangle_k$ and $\langle \mathbf{U}_k^{\frac{1}{N}} \rangle_k$ such that the conditions in Definition 3 are met. As for the first condition of Definition 3, the state space over which (7) evolves, \mathcal{X}_{ss} , is bounded and closed, i.e., is compact. Every interval $[0, \rho_j]$, $j \in [P]$, is convex so their Cartesian product \mathcal{X}_{ss} is also convex. As the state space over which $\langle \mathbf{X}_k^{\frac{1}{N}} \rangle_k$ evolves is also a subset of \mathcal{X}_{ss} , the first condition of Definition 3 is satisfied. Let $\boldsymbol{\nu}^{\frac{1}{N}}(\mathbf{x}^N)$ denote the expected increment per time unit t of the Markov chain $\langle \mathbf{X}_k^{\frac{1}{N}} \rangle_k$ when the Markov state is at \mathbf{x}^N . Since $k = \lfloor Nt \rfloor$, there are N transition per unit time resulting in $\boldsymbol{\nu}^{\frac{1}{N}}(\mathbf{x}^N) = N\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{X}_{k+1}^{\frac{1}{N}} - \mathbf{X}_k^{\frac{1}{N}} | \mathbf{X}_k^{\frac{1}{N}} = \mathbf{x}^N]$. The p^{th} element of $\boldsymbol{\nu}^{\frac{1}{N}}$, $p \in [P]$, which is the expected increment in the subpopulation p , equals the summation of the multiplication of each possible change in the subpopulation p with its probability. In view of (6), there are two possible changes, i.e., $\frac{1}{N}$ step increment or $\frac{1}{N}$ step reduction, which results in $\nu_p^{\frac{1}{N}}(\mathbf{x}^N) = N(\frac{1}{N}(\rho_p - x_p^N)(2 - u(p, \mathbf{x}^N)) - \frac{1}{N}(x_p^N(u(p, \mathbf{x}^N) - 1)))$ and consequently, $\nu_p^{\frac{1}{N}}(\mathbf{x}^N) = \rho_p(2 - u(p, \mathbf{x}^N)) - x_p^N$. The second condition of Definition 3 is satisfied by $\mathbf{U}_{k+1}^{\frac{1}{N}} = N(\mathbf{X}_{k+1}^{\frac{1}{N}} - \mathbf{X}_k^{\frac{1}{N}} - \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{X}_{k+1}^{\frac{1}{N}} - \mathbf{X}_k^{\frac{1}{N}} | \mathbf{X}_k^{\frac{1}{N}} = \mathbf{x}^N])$ resulting in $\mathbf{X}_{k+1}^{\frac{1}{N}} - \mathbf{X}_k^{\frac{1}{N}} - \frac{1}{N}\mathbf{U}_{k+1}^{\frac{1}{N}} = \frac{1}{N}\boldsymbol{\nu}^{\frac{1}{N}}(\mathbf{x})$. Regarding the third condition, at each \mathbf{x} , $\boldsymbol{\nu}^{\frac{1}{N}}(\mathbf{x})$ should belong to the δ -distance of the image of (7) over a δ -neighborhood of \mathbf{x} . We know that the distance from a point to a set equals to the infimum distance of the point from the members of that set. Hence, if at each \mathbf{x} , $\boldsymbol{\nu}^{\frac{1}{N}}(\mathbf{x})$ lies within the δ -distance of the image of a selection from (7) over a δ -neighborhood of \mathbf{x} , so does it lie for the whole differential inclusion (7). As a result, we can focus on a selection from (7) rather than the whole differential inclusion (7). We, hence, consider a selection from (7) denoted by $\dot{\mathbf{x}} = \boldsymbol{\nu}(\mathbf{x})$ where $\boldsymbol{\nu}$ is a P -dimensional function and its p^{th} element ν_p equals $\rho_p - x_p$ if 1 is the tendentious strategy of subpopulation p and equals $-x_p$ if the tendentious strategy of subpopulation p is 2. This results in $\nu_p(\mathbf{x}) = \rho_p(2 - u(p, \mathbf{x})) - x_p$. The expected increment per unit of time, $\boldsymbol{\nu}^{\frac{1}{N}}$, is the same as the function $\boldsymbol{\nu}(\mathbf{x})$. As a result, the third condition is satisfied by selecting \mathbf{y} equal to \mathbf{x} . As for the last condition, in view of Example 4.1 in [33], it can be shown that $\langle \mathbf{U}_k^{\frac{1}{N}} \rangle_k$ is a martingale difference

sequence. On the other hand, for all k , $|\mathbf{U}_k^{\frac{1}{N}}| \leq \sqrt{\sum_{l=1}^{\mathbf{P}} (1 + \rho_l)^2}$ and hence $\mathbf{U}_k^{\frac{1}{N}}$ is uniformly bounded. Therefore, the conditions asserted in [33, Proposition 2.3] are satisfied and hence the satisfaction of the last condition is guaranteed. \square

7.3. Proof of Proposition 2.

Proof. It holds that $x = \sum_{k=1}^{\mathbf{P}} x_k$ and $0 \leq x \leq 1$. Considering Assumption 1, the thresholds of the subpopulations are distinct, building $\mathbf{P}+1$ disjoint open intervals in the unit interval, where their limit points are either 0, 1, or the thresholds. Denote by \mathcal{T} the union of the set $\{0, 1\}$ with the set of all subpopulations' thresholds. When $x \notin \mathcal{T}$, there exist $i \in \{0, 1, \dots, \mathbf{p} + 1\}$ and $j \in \{0, 1, \dots, \mathbf{p}' + 1\}$ where $x \in (\tau'_j, \tau_i)$ such that $\tau_{i+1} < x < \tau'_{j+1}$. In view of (7), in this case, $\mathbf{V}(\mathbf{x})$ is a singleton and for all $0 < l \leq i$ anticoordinating subpopulations, $\dot{x}_l = \rho_l - x_l$ and for the remaining anticoordinating subpopulations, i.e., $i < l \leq \mathbf{p}$, $\dot{x}_l = -x_l$. Similarly, for coordinating subpopulations, $\dot{x}_l = \rho_l - x_l$ for all $\mathbf{p} < l \leq \mathbf{P} - j + 1$ and $\dot{x}_l = -x_l$ for all $\mathbf{P} - j + 1 < l \leq \mathbf{P}$. By summing over the elements of $\dot{\mathbf{x}}$, we have $\dot{x} = \sum_{k=1}^{\mathbf{P}} \dot{x}_k = \mathbf{p}_i + \mathbf{p}'_j - x$. Therefore, for $x \in (\tau'_j, \tau_i)$, $\mathcal{X}(x) = \{\mathbf{p}_i + \mathbf{p}'_j - x\}$ which is the same as the last case of \mathcal{X} in (11). When $x \in \mathcal{T}$, three cases may happen: $x = \tau'_j$, $x = \tau_i$, or $x \in \{0, 1\}$. When $x = \tau_i$, based on (7), except for \mathcal{V}_i , the elements of $\mathbf{V}(\mathbf{x})$ are single-valued and contain either $\rho_l - x_l$ or $-x_l$. More specifically, for anticoordinating subpopulations, we have $\dot{x}_l = \rho_l - x_l$ for $l < i$ and $\dot{x}_l = -x_l$ for $i < l \leq \mathbf{p}$. As for coordinating subpopulations, assume that the set $\{k \in [\mathbf{p}'] | \tau'_k < \tau_i\}$ is not empty and let $j = \max\{k \in [\mathbf{p}'] | \tau'_k < \tau_i\}$. Then, for l satisfying $\mathbf{p} < l$ and $\mathbf{P} + 1 - l \leq j$, \dot{x}_l will be equal to $\rho_l - x_l$ and for l satisfying $j < \mathbf{P} + 1 - l \leq \mathbf{p}'$, \dot{x}_l will be equal to $-x_l$. If $\{k \in [\mathbf{p}'] | \tau'_k < \tau_i\}$ is empty, then \dot{x}_l for $l > \mathbf{p}$ will be equal to $-x_l$. Summing over the elements of $\dot{\mathbf{x}}$ except the i^{th} element, yields $\mathbf{p}_{i-1} + \mathbf{p}'_j - (x - x_i)$. As for $l = i$, we have $\dot{x}_i \in [-x_i, \rho_i - x_i]$ yielding $\dot{x} \in (\mathbf{p}_{i-1} + \mathbf{p}'_j - x, \mathbf{p}_i + \mathbf{p}'_j - x)$. Therefore, $\mathcal{X}(x) = [\mathbf{p}_{i-1} + \mathbf{p}'_j - x, \mathbf{p}_i + \mathbf{p}'_j - x]$, which is the same as the first case of \mathcal{X} in (11). If $x = \tau'_j$, a similar reasoning results in $\mathcal{X}(x) = [\mathbf{p}_i + \mathbf{p}'_{j-1} - x, \mathbf{p}_i + \mathbf{p}'_j - x]$, which is the same as the second case of \mathcal{X} in (11). Finally, when $x \in \{0, 1\}$, a similar reasoning yields $\dot{x} = \mathbf{p}_{\mathbf{p}} - x$ if $x = 0$ and $\dot{x} = \mathbf{p}'_{\mathbf{p}'} - x$ if $x = 1$. These two are equivalent to the first two cases of \mathcal{X} in (11) as $\tau_{\mathbf{p}+1} = \tau'_0 = 0$ and $\tau'_{\mathbf{p}'+1} = \tau_0 = 1$. \square

7.4. Proof of Lemma 2.

Proof. The proofs are first done for the abstract dynamics. We first prove parts 2, 3, and 4. *Part 2)* (sufficiency) Should (12) hold, it would follow that $c^{ij} \in (\max\{\tau'_j, \tau_{i+1}\}, \min\{\tau'_{j+1}, \tau_i\})$ and based on (11), $0 \in \mathcal{X}(c^{ij})$, implying that c^{ij} is an equilibrium of (11). (Necessity) Should c^{ij} be an equilibrium of the abstract dynamics, then $0 \in \mathcal{X}(c^{ij})$. One of the three cases of \mathcal{X} in (11) must be active for $x = c^{ij}$. The first two cases of \mathcal{X} cannot be active because of Assumption 1. So the third one must hold, implying that $c^{ij} \in (\max\{\tau'_j, \tau_{i+1}\}, \min\{\tau'_{j+1}, \tau_i\})$, which is equivalent to (12). *Part 3)* and *Part 4)*. Following *Part 2)*, the sufficiency and necessity can be concluded. *Part 1)* In view of Assumption 1, equilibrium points of clean-cut, anticoordinator-driven, and coordinator-driven types do not match for (11). Hence, an abstract state can at most be only one of these three types. Now, we prove by contradiction that an equilibrium point of (11) should be either of these three types. Suppose x^* is an equilibrium point for (11) but is neither

clean-cut, anticonordinator-driven, nor coordinator-driven. At $x = x^*$ one of the cases of \mathcal{X} in (11) should be active. If the first case is active, we have $x^* = \tau_i$ and as it is an equilibrium point $0 \in \mathcal{X}(x^*)$. This results in $\mathbf{p}_{i-1} + \mathbf{p}'_j < \tau_i < \mathbf{p}_i + \mathbf{p}'_j$, which is equivalent to (13), but we assumed that x^* is not an anticonordinator-driven equilibrium point. This is a contradiction and as a result the first case cannot be active. Similarly, the second case of \mathcal{X} in (11) results in a contradiction. So the only remaining possibility is that $x^* \in (\max\{\tau'_j, \tau_{i+1}\}, \min\{\tau'_{j+1}, \tau_i\})$. At this interval \dot{x} equals $\mathbf{p}_i + \mathbf{p}'_j - x$. Hence, to have $0 \in \mathcal{X}(x^*)$, $\mathbf{p}_i + \mathbf{p}'_j - x^*$ should be zero resulting in $x^* = \mathbf{p}_i + \mathbf{p}'_j$. This means that x^* is a clean-cut equilibrium point, but we assumed that it is not the case. This is a contradiction and hence x^* should be either clean-cut, anticonordinator-driven, or coordinator-driven. Now, we prove the lemma for the equilibrium points of the semicontinuous population dynamics (7). *Part 2)* (Sufficiency) Should (12) hold, c^{ij} is an equilibrium point for the abstract dynamics, i.e., $0 \in \mathcal{X}(c^{ij})$ and considering the cases of \mathcal{X} in (11), $\mathcal{X}(c^{ij})$ is a singleton resulting $\dot{x}(c^{ij}) = 0$. By plugging c^{ij} into (7) where $x = c^{ij}$, we see that $\mathbf{0} \in \mathcal{V}(c^{ij})$ and hence c^{ij} is an equilibrium point for (7). (Necessity) Should \mathbf{c}^{ij} be an equilibrium point for (7), $\mathbf{0} \in \mathcal{V}(\mathbf{c}^{ij})$ and since at $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{c}^{ij}$, \mathcal{V} is a singleton, $\dot{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{c}^{ij}) = \mathbf{0}$ which results in $\dot{x} = 0$ and in turn, $x = c^{ij}$. We earlier showed that (12) is a necessary condition to have c^{ij} an equilibrium point for the abstract dynamics. This proves the necessity part. *Part 3)* (Sufficiency) Assume that (13) holds. By plugging \mathbf{a}^{ij} into (7), we see that $\mathbf{0} \in \mathcal{V}(\mathbf{a}^{ij})$ and hence \mathbf{a}^{ij} is an equilibrium point for (7). (Necessity) Should \mathbf{a}^{ij} be an equilibrium point for (7), $\mathbf{0} \in \mathcal{V}(\mathbf{a}^{ij})$ and consequently $0 \in \mathcal{V}_i(\mathbf{a}^{ij})$. This results in $0 \in [-a_i^{ij}, \rho_i - a_i^{ij}]$ and by plugging $a_i^{ij} = \tau_i - (\mathbf{p}_{i-1} + \mathbf{p}'_j)$ into $[-a_i^{ij}, \rho_i - a_i^{ij}]$, we have $0 \in [-\tau_i + \mathbf{p}_{i-1} + \mathbf{p}'_j, \rho_i - \tau_i + \mathbf{p}_{i-1} + \mathbf{p}'_j]$. This results in $\mathbf{p}_{i-1} + \mathbf{p}'_j < \tau_i < \mathbf{p}_i + \mathbf{p}'_j$ which is equivalent to (13). *Part 4)* The sufficiency and necessity can be shown similar to *Part 3*. *Part 1)* We prove by contradiction that an equilibrium point of (7) should be either of these three types. Suppose \mathbf{x}^* is an equilibrium point for (7) but is neither clean-cut, anticonordinator-driven, nor coordinator-driven. Now, based on the value of x^* , two cases may happen. *Case 1)* x^* equals a threshold. Suppose that x^* equals the threshold of one anticonordinating subpopulation, say i . From $\mathbf{0} \in \mathcal{V}(\mathbf{x}^*)$ we have $0 \in \mathcal{V}_l(\mathbf{x}^*)$ for $l \in [\mathbf{P}]$, where for $l \neq i$, $\mathcal{V}_l(\mathbf{x}^*)$ is a singleton and therefore to have $0 \in \mathcal{V}_l(\mathbf{x}^*)$, x_l^* must equal ρ_l for $l < i$ or $\mathbf{p} < l$ and $0 < \mathbf{P} + 1 - l \leq j$; and x_l^* must equal 0, otherwise, where $j = \max\{k \in [\mathbf{p}'] | \tau'_k < \tau_i\}$ and $j = 0$ if the set is empty. Therefore, $x^* - x_i^* = \mathbf{p}_{i-1} + \mathbf{p}'_j$. On the other hand, $x^* = \tau_i$ resulting in $x_i^* = \tau_i - \mathbf{p}'_j - \mathbf{p}_{i-1}$ which is in turn equal to a_i^{ij} . This results in that \mathbf{x}^* must be equivalent to \mathbf{a}^{ij} which is a contradiction. Similarly, the case where x^* equals the threshold of one coordinating subpopulation results in a contradiction. Therefore, x^* cannot be equal to a threshold. *Case 2)* x^* is not equal to any thresholds. In this case, $\mathcal{V}(\mathbf{x}^*)$ is a singleton and consequently, $\dot{\mathbf{x}} = \mathbf{0}$ which results in $\dot{x} = 0$. We already showed that the equilibrium points of (11) should be either clean-cut, anticonordinator-driven, or coordinator-driven which is a contradiction. Putting *Case 1* and *Case 2* together, the assumption that an equilibrium point of (7) is neither clean-cut, anticonordinator-driven, nor coordinator-driven reaches a contradiction. \square

7.5. Lemma A 1.

Lemma A1. Consider the abstract dynamics (11). Between every two consecutive anticondinator-driven and/or clean-cut equilibria, q_{k-1}^* and q_k^* , $k \in \{2, \dots, Q\}$, there exists one coordinator-driven equilibrium $q_{k-1,k}^*$ satisfying $q_{k-1}^* < q_{k-1,k}^* < q_k^*$.

Proof. We prove by contradiction. Consider two consecutive clean-cut or anticondinator-driven equilibrium points $q_{k-1}^* < q_k^*$. Assume on the contrary that there exist no coordinator-driven equilibrium points between q_{k-1}^* and q_k^* . In view of the possible cases of \mathcal{X} in (11), $\bar{f}(x) = \max\{y | y \in \mathcal{X}(x)\}$ will be negative for $x \in (q_{k-1}^*, d_{k-1}^+)$, where d_{k-1}^+ is lower bounded by $\min\{\bar{\tau}'_{q_{k-1}}, \bar{\tau}_{q_{k-1}}\}$, i.e., $d_{k-1}^+ \geq \min\{\bar{\tau}'_{q_{k-1}}, \bar{\tau}_{q_{k-1}}\}$, where $\bar{\tau}'_{q_{k-1}} = \tau'_{j+1}$, $\bar{\tau}_{q_{k-1}} = \tau_i$ when q_{k-1}^* is clean-cut, i.e., $q_{k-1}^* = c^{ij}$ and $\bar{\tau}'_{q_{k-1}} = \tau'_{j+1}$, $\bar{\tau}_{q_{k-1}} = \tau_{i-1}$ when q_{k-1}^* is anticondinator-driven, i.e., $q_{k-1}^* = a^{ij}$. Based on the value of $\min\{\bar{\tau}'_{q_{k-1}}, \bar{\tau}_{q_{k-1}}\}$, two cases may happen: *Case 1)* $\min\{\bar{\tau}'_{q_{k-1}}, \bar{\tau}_{q_{k-1}}\} = \bar{\tau}_{q_{k-1}}$ and consequently for a small enough $\varepsilon > 0$, $\bar{f}(\bar{\tau}_{q_{k-1}} - \varepsilon) < 0$. The sign of $\bar{f}(\bar{\tau}_{q_{k-1}} + \varepsilon)$ cannot be positive as $\bar{\tau}_{q_{k-1}}$ is the threshold of an anticondinating subpopulation and considering the cases of \mathcal{X} in (11), the value of \dot{x} at $x = \tau_i + \varepsilon$ is not greater than its value at $x = \tau_i - \varepsilon$ for any $i \in [p]$. Therefore, the sign of \bar{f} does not change around $x = \bar{\tau}_{q_{k-1}}$. Actually, no matter how many thresholds of anticondinating subpopulations (non benchmark subpopulations) are in the interval (q_{k-1}^*, q_k^*) , the sign of \bar{f} will not change in the neighborhood of them. So, in this case, $\bar{f}(\bar{\tau}_{q_{k-1}} + \varepsilon)$ remains negative. *Case 2)* $\min\{\bar{\tau}'_{q_{k-1}}, \bar{\tau}_{q_{k-1}}\} = \bar{\tau}'_{q_{k-1}}$ and consequently for a small enough $\varepsilon > 0$, $\bar{f}(\bar{\tau}'_{q_{k-1}} - \varepsilon) < 0$ and considering the second case of \mathcal{X} in (11), the sign of $\bar{f}(\cdot)$ changes in a neighborhood of a coordinating subpopulation's threshold only if $\bar{\tau}'_{q_{k-1}}$ satisfies (14), i.e., $\bar{\tau}'_{q_{k-1}}$ is a coordinator-driven equilibrium point. However, we assumed that it is not the case. Hence, the thresholds of coordinating subpopulations also do not impact the value of d_{k-1}^+ . Putting the results of *Case 1* and *Case 2* together, we conclude that $d_{k-1}^+ = q_k^*$, i.e., the sign of $\bar{f}(x)$ remains negative for $x \in (q_{k-1}^*, q_k^*)$. On the other hand, considering (12), (13), and the cases of \mathcal{X} in (11), it can be concluded that $\underline{f}(x) = \min\{y | y \in \mathcal{X}(x)\} > 0$ for $x \in (d_k^-, q_k^*)$, where d_k^- is upper bounded by $\max\{\bar{\tau}'_{q_k}, \bar{\tau}_{q_k}\}$, where $\bar{\tau}'_{q_k} = \tau'_n$, $\bar{\tau}_{q_k} = \tau_{m+1}$ when q_k^* is clean-cut, i.e., $q_k^* = c^{mn}$ and similarly $\bar{\tau}'_{q_k} = \tau'_n$, $\bar{\tau}_{q_k} = \tau_{m+1}$ when q_k^* is anticondinator-driven, i.e., $q_k^* = a^{mn}$. As x decreases, according to the cases of \mathcal{X} in (11), the change of the sign of $\underline{f}(x)$ from positive to negative can only happen if the flow passes through the coordinating subpopulation's threshold which equals a coordinator-driven equilibrium point, i.e., satisfies (14). However, we assumed it would not be the case. Hence, we conclude that the sign of $\underline{f}(x)$ is positive for $x \in (q_{k-1}^*, q_k^*)$. This is a contradiction as we already reached the conclusion that the sign of $\bar{f}(x)$ is negative for $x \in (q_{k-1}^*, q_k^*)$. Putting these arguments together, it is concluded that between two consecutive clean-cut or anticondinator-driven equilibrium points, q_{k-1}^*, q_k^* , there exists a coordinator-driven equilibrium point denoted by $q_{k-1,k}^*$. Following similar arguments, it is straightforward to show that the leftmost and rightmost equilibrium points are clean-cut or anticondinator-driven. Up to now, it has been shown that between two consecutive clean-cut or anticondinator-driven equilibrium points of the abstract dynamics, q_{k-1}^* and q_k^* , there exists a coordinator-driven equilibrium point, $q_{k-1,k}^*$ such that $q_{k-1}^* < q_{k-1,k}^* < q_k^*$. On the other hand, based Lemma 2, there is a one-to-one map between equilibrium points of the abstract dynamics and those of the semicontinuous population dynamics. Therefore, for each two ordered

clean-cut or anticoordinator-driven equilibrium points of the semicontinuous population dynamics \mathbf{q}_{k-1}^* and \mathbf{q}_k^* , there exists a coordinator-driven equilibrium point $\mathbf{q}_{k-1,k}^*$ such that $q_{k-1}^* < q_{k-1,k}^* < q_k^*$. \square

7.6. Proof of Theorem 2. As for *Part 1*, the instability of coordinator-driven equilibria is shown by providing an initial condition from which for a small ϵ , there exists no δ to satisfy the definition of stability. The stability of clean-cut and anticoordinator-driven equilibria is first shown for the abstract dynamics using Theorem 1 in [38]. Then, the definition of asymptotic stability is used to show that of clean-cut and anticoordinator-driven equilibria for the semicontinuous population dynamics. *Part 2* of the theorem is shown by using the definition of limit set.

Proof. Part 1) Regarding the instability analysis of a coordinator-driven equilibrium point, say $\mathbf{q}_{k-1,k}^* = \mathbf{o}^{ij}$, consider the following initial condition $\mathbf{x}(0) = \mathbf{o}^{ij} + \delta^* \mathbf{e}_{\mathbf{P}-j+1}$ for an arbitrarily small $\delta^* \in (0, \min\{\tau'_{j+1}, \tau_i\} - \tau'_j)$. The corresponding abstract state $x(0)$ will then belong to $(\tau'_j, \min\{\tau'_{j+1}, \tau_i\})$. Pick ϵ to be equal to $0.5(\min\{\tau'_{j+1}, \tau_i, \mathbf{p}_i + \mathbf{p}'_j\} - \tau'_j)$. In view of (7), at such $x(0)$, $\mathcal{V}(\mathbf{x})$ is a singleton. Moreover, considering the structure of \mathbf{o}^{ij} , at $x(0)$ we have $\dot{x}_l = 0$ for $l \in \{1, \dots, \mathbf{P} - j, \mathbf{P} - j + 2, \dots, \mathbf{P}\}$. Indeed, the equation $\dot{x}_l = 0$ holds true as long as $x \in (\tau'_j, \min\{\tau'_{j+1}, \tau_i\})$. On the other hand, $x(0) > \tau'_j$ and in view of (14), we have $\dot{x}_{\mathbf{P}-j+1}(t) = \rho'_j - x_{\mathbf{P}-j+1}(t) > 0$, for all $t \leq t'$, where $t' = \inf\{t \geq 0 | x_{\mathbf{P}-j+1}(t) = \min\{\alpha_{i,j}, \rho'_j\}\}$, where $\alpha_{i,j} = \min\{\tau'_{j+1}, \tau_i\} - (\mathbf{p}_i + \mathbf{p}_{j-1})$. If $\min\{\alpha_{i,j}, \rho'_j\} = \alpha_{i,j}$, then $x(t') = \min\{\tau'_{j+1}, \tau_i\}$. Otherwise, $x(t') = \mathbf{p}_j + \mathbf{p}_i$. In either case, we observe that $|x(t') - \tau'_j|$ is greater than the selected value for ϵ , i.e., $0.5(\min\{\tau'_{j+1}, \tau_i, \mathbf{p}_i + \mathbf{p}'_j\} - \tau'_j)$, and the value of δ^* does not impact the value of $x(t')$. This indicates instability of \mathbf{o}^{ij} and in turn \mathbf{o}^{ij} . As for stability property of the other two types of equilibrium points, first we show for the abstract dynamics. Let $V_k(x) : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+ = \frac{1}{2}(x - q_k^*)^2$, where $q_k^* = \mathbf{p}_i + \mathbf{p}'_j$ if q_k^* is clean-cut, i.e., $q_k^* = c^{ij}$ and $q_k^* = \tau_i$ if it is anticoordinator-driven, i.e., $q_k^* = a^{ij}$. The set-valued derivative of $V_k(x)$ w.r.t (11) will be $\mathcal{D}(x) = \{(x - q_k^*)\nu | \nu \in \mathcal{X}(x)\}$ [38]. We also have $\bar{f}(x) = \max\{y | y \in \mathcal{X}(x)\} < 0$ for $x \in (q_k^*, q_{k,k+1}^*)$ and $\underline{f}(x) = \min\{y | y \in \mathcal{X}(x)\} > 0$ for $x \in (q_{k-1,k}^*, q_k^*)$ (refer to the proof of Lemma A 1). Hence, $\max \mathcal{D}(x) < 0$ for $x \in (q_{k-1,k}^*, q_{k,k+1}^*) / \{q_k^*\}$. According to [38, Theorem 1], q_k^* is a strongly asymptotically stable equilibrium point for (11). Also the basin of attraction of q_k^* , will be $(q_{k-1,k}^*, q_{k,k+1}^*)$. As for q_1^* (resp. $q_{\mathbf{Q}}^*$), we have $\bar{f}(0) > 0$ (resp. $\bar{f}(1) < 0$) and this case can be handled similarly which results in $\mathcal{A}(q_1^*) = [0, q_{1,2}^*)$ (resp. $\mathcal{A}(q_{\mathbf{Q}}^*) = (q_{\mathbf{Q}-1,\mathbf{Q}}^*, 1]$). Now, we show the asymptotic stability of \mathbf{q}_k^* when it is an anticoordinator-driven equilibrium point, i.e., $\mathbf{q}_k^* = \mathbf{a}^{ij}$. The case where \mathbf{q}_k^* is clean-cut can be handled similarly. We show that for every $\epsilon > 0$, there exists a $\delta > 0$ such that if $|\mathbf{x}(0) - \mathbf{a}^{ij}| < \delta$, then $|\mathbf{x}(t) - \mathbf{a}^{ij}| < \epsilon$ for all $t \geq 0$ and $|\mathbf{x}(t) - \mathbf{a}^{ij}| \rightarrow 0$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$. Consider a small enough $\epsilon > 0$, such that at an ϵ -neighborhood of \mathbf{a}^{ij} , for $l \in [\mathbf{P}] - \{i\}$, $\mathcal{V}_l(\mathbf{x})$ is a singleton and $\dot{x}_l = \rho_l - x_l$ for $l < i$ or for l satisfying both $\mathbf{p} < l$ and $0 < \mathbf{P} + 1 - l \leq j$. For the remaining l 's, $\dot{x}_l = -x_l$. From the stability of the abstract dynamics, the existence of $\delta_x > 0$ follows such that $|x(0) - a^{ij}| < \delta_x$ results in $|x(t) - a^{ij}| < \epsilon$ for $t \geq 0$. As a result, for $l \in [\mathbf{P}] - \{i\}$, the final value of x_l is a_l^{ij} and consequently x_l will approach a_l^{ij} exponentially, i.e., $|x_l(t) - a_l^{ij}| \leq (x_l(0) - a_l^{ij})e^{-t}$, for $t \geq 0$. On the other hand, we know that for any $y, z \in \mathbb{R}$, $|y + z| \leq |y| + |z|$. Hence, in view of $|x_i - a_i^{ij}|$

$= |(x - a^{ij}) - \sum_{l \neq i} (x_l - a_l^{ij})|$, we have $|x_i - a_i^{ij}| \leq |(x - a^{ij})| + |\sum_{l \neq i} (x_l - a_l^{ij})|$. Consequently, $|\mathbf{x}(t) - \mathbf{a}^{ij}|^2 < (|x(t) - a^{ij}| + |\sum_{l \neq i} (x_l - a_l^{ij})|)^2 + \sum_{l \neq i} |x_l - a_l^{ij}|^2$, for $t \geq 0$. On the other hand, starting from δ_x -neighborhood of a^{ij} , $|x(t) - a^{ij}|$ is bounded by $\mathbf{P} \max_l |x_l(0) - a_l^{ij}|$ resulting in $|\mathbf{x}(t) - \mathbf{a}^{ij}|^2 < (\mathbf{P} \max_l |x_l(0) - a_l^{ij}| + (\mathbf{P} - 1) \max_l |x_l(0) - a_l^{ij}| e^{-t})^2 + (\mathbf{P} - 1) \max_l |x_l(0) - a_l^{ij}|^2 e^{-2t}$ and $|\mathbf{x}(t) - \mathbf{a}^{ij}| < \max_l |x_l(0) - a_l^{ij}| \sqrt{(\mathbf{P} + (\mathbf{P} - 1)e^{-t})^2 + (\mathbf{P} - 1)e^{-2t}}$, for $t \geq 0$. Hence, \mathbf{a}^{ij} is stable because by choosing $\delta = \min\{\delta_x/\mathbf{P}, \varepsilon/\sqrt{(\mathbf{P} + (\mathbf{P} - 1))^2 + (\mathbf{P} - 1)}\}$, for all $t \geq 0$, we have $|x(t) - a^{ij}| < \varepsilon$ and consequently $|\mathbf{x}(t) - \mathbf{a}^{ij}| < \varepsilon$. As for asymptotic stability, we have $|\mathbf{x}(t) - \mathbf{a}^{ij}|^2 < (|x(t) - a^{ij}| + (\mathbf{P} - 1) \max_l |x_l(0) - a_l^{ij}| e^{-t})^2 + (\mathbf{P} - 1) \max_l |x_l(0) - a_l^{ij}|^2 e^{-2t}$, for $t \geq 0$. Since each term in the right hand side approaches zero, we have $\lim |\mathbf{x}(t) - \mathbf{a}^{ij}| \rightarrow 0$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$. Now, we obtain the basin of attraction of \mathbf{q}_k^* . (i) It is straightforward to show that if $x(0)$ falls in the basin of attraction q_k^* , the abstract dynamics will converge to an arbitrary small neighborhood of q_k^* in a finite time. Now, depending on the types of q_k^* , two cases may happen: *Case 1*) $q_k^* = c^{ij}$, i.e., q_k^* is clean-cut, then let $t = t_0$ be the time moment at which the abstract state x enters a small enough ε -neighborhood of q_k^* , such that for $l \leq i$ or $l \geq \max\{\mathbf{P} - j + 1, \mathbf{p} + 1\}$, we have $\dot{x}_l = \rho_l - x_l$ and for the remaining l 's, we have $\dot{x}_l = -x_l$. Then for $t > t_0$, the asymptotic value of x_l for $l \in [\mathbf{P}]$ is the same as that of at \mathbf{q}_k^* . Moreover, each x_l approaches c_l^{ij} exponentially. As a result, for $t > t_0$ we have $|\mathbf{x}(t) - \mathbf{q}_k^*| < C \exp(-t)$, for some constant C . *Case 2*) $q_k^* = a^{ij}$, i.e., q_k^* is anticonordinator-driven. Then, a time moment similar to t_0 defined in *Case 1* exists such that for $l \in [\mathbf{P}] - \{i\}$, $|x_l(t) - a_l^{ij}| < C \exp(-t)$, for some constant C and $t \geq t_0$. Therefore, it is straightforward to show that for any arbitrary small ε_1 , after some finite time $t_1 + t_0$, $|x_i(t) - q_{k_i}^*| < \varepsilon + (\mathbf{P} - 1)\varepsilon_1$ for $t > t_1 + t_0$ resulting in $|\mathbf{x}(t) - \mathbf{q}_k^*| < (\varepsilon + (\mathbf{P} - 1)\varepsilon_1)^2 + (\mathbf{P} - 1)\varepsilon_1^2$. Having this and (i) we conclude that in both cases 1 and 2, for any arbitrary ε -neighborhood of \mathbf{q}_k^* , time $T > 0$ can be found such that for all $t \geq T$, $|\mathbf{x}(t) - \mathbf{q}_k^*| < \varepsilon$. As a result, the basin of attraction of point \mathbf{q}_k^* equals $\{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}_{ss} | x \in (q_{k-1,k}^*, q_{k,k+1}^*)\}$. The basins of attraction of \mathbf{q}_1^* and $\mathbf{q}_\mathbf{Q}^*$ can be obtained similarly. *Part 2*) When $x(0) = q_{k-1,k}^*$, $q_{k-1,k}^* = o^{ij}$, two cases may happen. *Case 1*) The abstract state x remains at $q_{k-1,k}^*$. Then for $l \neq j$, $\mathcal{V}_l(\mathbf{x})$ is a singleton and \dot{x}_l is $\rho_l - x_l$ for $l \leq i$ or for $l > \mathbf{p}$ and $\mathbf{P} + 1 - j < l$; and \dot{x}_l is $-x_l$ for the remaining l 's. As a result, for $l \in [\mathbf{P}] - \{j\}$, the final value of x_l is o_l^{ij} and consequently x_l will approach o_l^{ij} exponentially. Then for any arbitrary small ε , in a finite time T we have $|x_l(t) - o_l^{ij}| < \varepsilon$ for $t \geq T$ and subsequently $|x_j(t) - o_j^{ij}| < |x(t) - o^{ij}| + \sum_{l \neq j} |(x_l(t) - o_l^{ij})| \leq (\mathbf{P} - 1)\varepsilon$ resulting in $|\mathbf{x}(t) - \mathbf{o}^{ij}| \leq \varepsilon \sqrt{\mathbf{P}(\mathbf{P} - 1)}$ for $t \geq T$. Hence, \mathbf{o}^{ij} is the limit point. *Case 2*) The abstract state x leaves $q_{k-1,k}^*$. Then, the provided reasoning for the case $x \neq q_{k-1,k}^*$ will be applicable resulting in \mathbf{q}_{k-1}^* or \mathbf{q}_k^* to be the limit point. Overall, the limit set of $\mathbf{q}_{k-1,k}^*$ is $\{\mathbf{q}_{k-1}^*, \mathbf{q}_{k-1,k}^*, \mathbf{q}_k^*\}$. \square

7.7. Proof of Proposition 3.

Proof. Based on Theorem 2, the set $\mathbf{Q}^c \cup \mathbf{Q}^a \cup \mathbf{Q}^o$ contains the limit sets of all \mathbf{x} in \mathcal{X}_{ss} . To find the corresponding Birkhoff center, we need to find the closure of the set of recurrent points. Based on Definition 2, the set of recurrent points is also equal $\mathbf{Q}^c \cup \mathbf{Q}^a \cup \mathbf{Q}^o$. As a results, the Birkhoff center of the population dynamics will be equal to $\mathbf{Q}^c \cup \mathbf{Q}^a \cup \mathbf{Q}^o$. \square

7.8. Proof of Theorem 3.

Proof. (i) Based on Proposition 1, the sequence $\langle \mathbf{x}^N(k) \rangle$ which evolves according to discrete population dynamics (3), is a realization of population dynamics Markov chain $\langle \mathbf{X}_k^{\frac{1}{N}} \rangle_k$ with transition probabilities formulated in (6). (ii) Based on Lemma 1, the collection of $\langle \langle \mathbf{X}_k^{\frac{1}{N}} \rangle_k \rangle_{N \in \mathcal{N}}$ is a GSAP for (7). (iii) The transition probabilities of the population dynamics Markov chain (6) are homogeneous and the state space over which the Markov chain is defined is finite. This results in the existence of invariant probability measures for Markov chain $\langle \mathbf{X}_k^{\frac{1}{N}} \rangle_k$ [44]. The existence of a weak limit point for a sequence of invariant probability measures $\langle \mu^{\frac{1}{N}} \rangle_{\frac{1}{N} \in \mathcal{N}}$ of the collection of Markov chains $\langle \langle \mathbf{X}_k^{\frac{1}{N}} \rangle_k \rangle_{N \in \mathcal{N}}$ is guaranteed by Bolzano-Weierstrass theorem. (iv) Proposition 3 specifies the Birkhoff centers of (7). Theorem 1 and (i)-(iv) together complete the proof. \square

THE DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS, BROCK UNIVERSITY, CANADA