

Team Collaboration vs Competition: New Fictitious Play Dynamics for Multi-team Zero-Sum Games

Ahmed Said Donmez, Yuksel Arslantas and Muhammed O. Sayin*

Abstract

This paper presents a new variant of fictitious play (FP) called team-fictitious-play (Team-FP) that can reach equilibrium in multi-team competition, different from the other variants of FP. We specifically focus on zero-sum potential team games with network separable interactions (ZSPTGs), unifying potential games (if there is a single team) and zero-sum polymatrix games (if each team has a single member) due to their wide range of applications from robotics to financial markets beyond two-team games. Similar to the FP dynamics, in Team-FP, agents follow a simple behavioral rule where they respond (with some inertia and exploration in the update of actions) to the last actions of the neighboring team members and the beliefs formed about the other neighbors' strategies as if the opponents are playing according to some stationary strategy. We show the almost sure convergence of the empirical averages of teams' action profiles to near team-Nash equilibrium in ZSPTGs under standard assumptions on the step sizes used. We formulate a bound on the approximation error, decaying with the exploration in the agents' responses. We further examine the performance of the Team-FP dynamics numerically.

1 Introduction

Multi-team competition, blending collaboration and competition, is becoming increasingly common in diverse domains, from robotics and resource management to online gaming and financial markets [Kitano et al. \[1997\]](#), [Cardenas et al. \[2009\]](#), [do Nascimento Silva and Chaimowicz \[2017\]](#), [Vinyals et al. \[2019\]](#), [Jaderberg et al. \[2019\]](#). Correspondingly, two-team zero-sum games have recently received attention yet mainly for the efficient computation of equilibrium with sophisticated algorithms [Farina et al. \[2018\]](#), [Zhang et al. \[2021\]](#), [Carminati et al. \[2022\]](#), [Kalogiannis et al. \[2022\]](#). However, predicting emergent behaviors of agents following *rough* behavioral rules such as fictitious play (FP) is crucial for the justification of equilibrium analysis and designing simple

*A. S. Donmez, Y. Arslantas, and M. O. Sayin are with the Department of Electrical & Electronics Engineering at Bilkent University, Ankara, Türkiye 06800. (Emails: said.donmez@bilkent.edu.tr, yuksel.arslantas@bilkent.edu.tr, sayin@ee.bilkent.edu.tr)




Figure 1: An illustration of three-team games with network separable interactions as if the agents are playing two-team games at different layers with the same actions and their payoffs are the sum of the payoffs collected at these layers. An edge represent the dependence of the agent’s payoff on the neighbors’ actions.

yet robust agent-level strategies [Shoham et al., 2007, Fudenberg and Levine, 2009, Ozdaglar et al., 2022].

Contributions. We present a new variant of FP dynamics, called *Team-FP*, to tackle this challenge for networked interactions where the payoff functions depend only on the agents’ actions from certain neighborhoods. In the Team-FP dynamics, agents take the smoothed best response against the last actions of the neighboring team members and the beliefs formed about the other neighbors’ strategy with some inertia in the action update under the simplifying assumption that the opponents are playing according to some stationary strategy. Team-FP reduces to the widely-studied smoothed fictitious play (SFP) Fudenberg and Kreps [1993] (or log-linear learning Blume [1993]) dynamics if each team has a single agent (or there is a single team). We focus on *multi-team zero-sum potential team games* (ZSPTGs) with network separable interactions across teams, unifying zero-sum polymatrix games [Cai et al., 2016] (if each team has a single agent) and potential games [Monderer and Shapley, 1996] (if there is a single team), as illustrated in Fig. 1.

The non-stationarity induced by the adaptation of the opponent teams poses a critical challenge for agents to learn coordination in the best team-response. Based on the optimal coupling lemma (e.g. see [Levin and Peres, 2017, Chapter 4]) and stochastic differential inclusion approximation methods (e.g., see Benaïm et al. [2005], Perkins and Leslie [2013]), we show that the (weighted) empirical averages of each team’s action profile in the Team-FP dynamics converge

almost surely to near team-Nash equilibrium (i.e., the best team-response to the other teams’ action profiles’ empirical average) in ZSPTGs provided that the step sizes used satisfy standard assumptions. We formulate a bound on the approximation error, decaying with the exploration in the agents’ responses. Team-FP is also rational in the sense that teams can learn to play (near) optimally if the opponent teams play according to stationary strategy.

Related Works. In a broader sense, this paper is related to the works on learning in potential games, zero-sum polymatrix games, and (more closely) multi-team zero-sum games.

Potential games. FP and its variants are known to reach equilibrium in potential games with wide range of applications in distributed optimization [Monderer and Shapley, 1996, Hofbauer and Sandholm, 2002, Arslan et al., 2007, Xu et al., 2012, Zheng et al., 2014]. However, any equilibrium can lead to arbitrarily poor performance with respect to the potential function compared to the cases where all agents are controlled/coordinated to maximize it, as measured by the price-of-anarchy metric [Koutsoupias and Papadimitriou, 1999]. On the other hand, the log-linear learning dynamics can reach efficient equilibrium (e.g., see [Marden and Shamma, 2012, Tatarenko, 2017]). However, it is not clear whether such dynamics can track efficient equilibrium in dynamic environments. Notably, Tatarenko [2018] and Sayin and Unlu [2023] addressed, resp., efficient learning under non-stationarity induced by the decaying exploration in agents’ responses for the repeated play of potential games and non-stationarity induced by evolving stage games in stochastic team problems.

Zero-sum polymatrix games. FP and its variants are also known to reach equilibrium in two-agent zero-sum games Hofbauer and Sandholm [2002]. However, we can transform any general-sum game to a multi-agent zero-sum game by introducing a non-effective auxiliary agent (with a single action). There have been several attempts to address zero-sum games beyond two-agent cases [Bergman and Fokin, 1998, Cai and Daskalakis, 2011, Cai et al., 2016]. Particularly, Cai et al. [2016] introduced zero-sum polymatrix games where agents have network separable pairwise interactions with applications in security. Recently, learning in zero-sum polymatrix games received attention for stochastic games [Park et al., 2023, Kalogiannis and Panageas, 2023]. Park et al. [2023] have also addressed the convergence of FP in multi-agent zero-sum polymatrix games. Zero-sum polymatrix games is a special case of ZSPTGs. For example, in ZSPTGs, agents are not necessarily playing polymatrix games where only two agents interact. Instead, we let multiple agents to interact for each pair of teams, as illustrated in Fig. 1.

Two-team zero-sum games. Existing works on two-team zero-sum games and adversarial team games (e.g., see Celli and Gatti [2018], Farina et al. [2018], Probo [2018], Zhang et al. [2021, 2022], Carminati et al. [2022]) have recently primarily focused on the efficient computation of team-minimax equilibrium or establishing coordination within teams so that they would act similar to a single agent via explicit communication Celli and Gatti [2018], Zhang et al. [2021] or pre-communication (i.e., *ex ante*) Farina et al. [2018]. Notably, Farina et al. [2018] introduced Fictitious Team Play algorithm for extensive-form two-team zero-sum games with imperfect information.

Team-FP differs from this algorithm by letting agents *learn* to team up via behavioral rules (specifically log-linear learning dynamics) similar to the classical FP yet with shorter memory in belief formation and inertia in the action update.

Organization. The rest of the paper is organized as follows. We describe ZSPTGs and the (independent) Team-FP dynamics, resp., in §2 and in §3. We provide analytical and numerical results, resp., in §4 and §5. We conclude the paper with some remarks in §6. Appendices include some preliminary information and the proofs of technical results.

2 Zero-sum Potential Team Games

Consider a *multi-team game*, characterized by the tuple $\langle \mathcal{T}, (A^i, u^i)_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \rangle$, where \mathcal{T} and \mathcal{I} denote, resp., the teams and agents' index sets, and A^i and $u^i : A \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ (with $A := \prod_{j \in \mathcal{I}} A^j$) denote, resp., the agent i 's finite action set and payoff function. Let \mathcal{T}_m denote the index set of agents in team m . We say that a multi-team game is *zero-sum potential team game* (ZSPTG) if for each team m , there exists a potential function $\phi^m : A \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$u^i(\hat{a}^i, a^{-i}, \underline{a}^{-m}) - u^i(a) = \phi^m(\hat{a}^i, a^{-i}, \underline{a}^{-m}) - \phi^m(a), \quad (1)$$

for all $(\hat{a}^i, a) \in A^i \times A$ and $i \in \mathcal{T}_m$, where $a^{-i} := \{a^j\}_{j \in \mathcal{T}_m \setminus \{i\}}$ are the actions of other team members, $\underline{a}^{-m} := \{\underline{a}^\ell\}_{\ell \neq m}$ are the action profiles of other teams; and the potential functions sum to zero, i.e., $\sum_{m \in \mathcal{T}} \phi^m(a) = 0$ for all $a \in A$.

To address multi-team zero-sum games, we focus on ZSPTGs with network separable interactions across teams, as illustrated in Fig. 1. In other words, we can separate the potential functions and correspondingly payoff functions as

$$\phi^m \equiv \sum_{\ell \neq m} \phi^{m\ell} \quad \text{and} \quad u^i \equiv \sum_{\ell \neq m} u^{i\ell} \quad \forall i \in \mathcal{T}_m, \quad (2)$$

for some $\phi^{m\ell} : \underline{A}^m \times \underline{A}^\ell \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $u^{i\ell} : \underline{A}^m \times \underline{A}^\ell \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, where $\underline{A}^m := \prod_{i \in \mathcal{T}_m} A^i$ for each $m \in \mathcal{T}$.

The following example generalizes the potential game formulation for distributed optimization (e.g., see Arslan et al. [2007], Xu et al. [2012], Zheng et al. [2014]) to two-team zero-sum potential games.

Example 1. Consider two teams of agents interacting over a network. We can represent their interactions via a graph $G = (V, E)$, where the set of vertices V corresponds to the agents and the set of (undirected) edges correspond to their interactions. Let agent i from team m receive a local payoff $r^i : A^i \times \prod_{j:(i,j) \in E} A^j \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ depending on the actions of the neighboring agents only. Agent i adds the neighboring team members' local payoffs whereas subtracts the other neighbors' local payoffs in his/her

Algorithm Family 1 Team-FP dynamics

initialize: $\{\pi_0^\ell\}_{\ell \neq m}$ and $\{a_{-1}^j\}_{j \in \mathcal{T}_m \setminus \{i\}}$ arbitrarily
for each stage $k = 0, 1, \dots$ **do**

 play

$$\begin{cases} a_k^i \sim \mu_k^i & \text{if chosen} \\ a_k^i = a_{k-1}^i & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

 where μ_k^i is given by (7)

 update $\pi_{k+1}^\ell = \pi_k^\ell + \alpha_k(a_k^\ell - \pi_k^\ell)$ for all $\ell \neq m$

end for

total payoff. In other words, the total payoff is given by

$$u^i \equiv \sum_{j:(i,j) \in E} \mathbb{I}_{\{j \in \mathcal{T}_m\}} r^j - \sum_{j:(i,j) \in E} \mathbb{I}_{\{j \notin \mathcal{T}_m\}} r^j. \quad (3)$$

This yields that the team m has the potential function

$$\phi^m \equiv \sum_{j \in \mathcal{T}_m} r^j - \sum_{j \notin \mathcal{T}_m} r^j, \quad (4)$$

and therefore, these potential functions sum to zero.

Given the strategy profile of teams $\{\pi^m \in \Delta(\underline{A}^m)\}_{m \in \mathcal{T}}$, we define the *team-Nash gap* for team m as

$$\text{NG}^m(\pi) := \max_{\tilde{\pi} \in \Delta(\underline{A}^m)} \phi^m(\tilde{\pi}, \pi^{-m}) - \phi^m(\pi), \quad (5)$$

and $\text{NG}(\pi) := \sum_{m \in \mathcal{T}} \text{NG}^m(\pi)$, where $\pi^{-m} := \{\pi^\ell\}_{\ell \neq m}$. Correspondingly, we say that the strategy profile of teams $\{\pi^m\}_{m \in \mathcal{T}}$ is ϵ -*team-Nash equilibrium* if $\text{NG}(\pi) \leq \epsilon$.

3 Team-Fictitious-Play Algorithms

We next present the Team-FP dynamics combining the log-linear learning and fictitious play dynamics for learning in multi-team games played repeatedly. Let $a_k^i \in A^i$ denote the agent i 's action at stage k . Correspondingly, $\underline{a}_k^m = (a_k^i)_{i \in \mathcal{T}_m}$ denote the team m 's action profile. Observing the joint actions of team m , agents $j \notin \mathcal{T}_m$ can form a belief about the team m 's joint strategy. Let $\pi_k^m \in \Delta(\underline{A}^m)$ denote the belief they formed. We can view actions as pure strategy. Then, agents $j \notin \mathcal{T}_m$ can update the belief according to

$$\pi_{k+1}^m = \pi_k^m + \alpha_k(\underline{a}_k^m - \pi_k^m) \quad \forall k = 0, 1, \dots \quad (6)$$

such that the belief π_{k+1}^m corresponds to the empirical average of the past action profiles $\{\underline{a}_0^m, \dots, \underline{a}_k^m\}$.

Agent i from team m either takes the latest action a_k^i ($a_k^i = a_{k-1}^i$), or takes the action a_{k-1}^i

Algorithm Family 2 Independent Team-FP dynamics

initialize: $\{\pi_0^\ell\}_{\ell \neq m}$ and $\{a_{-1}^j\}_{j \in \mathcal{T}_m \setminus \{i\}}$ arbitrarily
for each stage $k = 0, 1, \dots$ **do**
 play

$$\begin{cases} a_k^i \sim \mu_k^i & \text{w.p. } \delta \\ a_k^i = a_{k-1}^i & \text{w.p. } (1 - \delta) \end{cases}$$

 where μ_k^i is given by (7)
 update $\pi_{k+1}^\ell = \pi_k^\ell + \alpha_k(a_k^\ell - \pi_k^\ell)$ for all $\ell \neq m$
end for

according to the logit response $\mu_k^i \in \Delta(A^i)$, i.e., $a_k^i \sim \mu_k^i \in \Delta(A^i)$. The logit response μ_k^i is given by

$$\mu_k^i(a^i) = \frac{\exp(U_k^i(a^i)/\tau)}{\sum_{\tilde{a}^i \in A^i} \exp(U_k^i(\tilde{a}^i)/\tau)} \quad \forall a^i \in A^i, \quad (7)$$

for some temperature parameter $\tau > 0$, where $U_k^i(a^i) := \mathbb{E}_{\underline{a}^{-m} \sim \pi_k^{-m}} [u^i(a^i, a_{k-1}^{-i}, \underline{a}^{-m})]$ for all $a^i \in A^i$, $a_{k-1}^{-i} := \{a_{k-1}^j\}_{j \in \mathcal{T}_m \setminus \{i\}}$ and $\pi_k^{-m} := \{\pi_k^\ell\}_{\ell \neq m}$. Due to the definition of potential function $\phi^m(\cdot)$ for team m , as described in (1), the logit response μ_k^i is also given by

$$\mu_k^i = \operatorname{argmax}_{\mu \in \Delta(A^i)} \{\Phi_k^m(\mu) + \tau \mathcal{H}(\mu)\} \quad \forall i \in \mathcal{T}_m, \quad (8)$$

where $\Phi_k^m(\mu) := \mathbb{E}_{(a^i, \underline{a}^{-m}) \sim (\mu, \pi_k^{-m})} [\phi^i(a^i, a_{k-1}^{-i}, \underline{a}^{-m})]$ and $\mathcal{H}(\cdot)$ is the entropy regularization.

We introduce Team-FP and independent Team-FP dynamics depending on how agents update their actions. In the former, a single agent can get chosen randomly, as in the classical log-linear learning. In the latter, each agent can update his/her action with probability $\delta \in (0, 1)$ independent of others, as in the independent log-linear learning. The latter addresses the coordination burden in the update of actions within teams. Algorithms 1 and 2 provide descriptions of these dynamics for the typical agent i from team m .

Agents can have networked interactions such that their payoff functions depend only on the actions of certain agents, e.g., from one/two-hop neighborhoods. For such cases, agents can form beliefs about these neighbors' strategies only as if they play according to some stationary strategy. For example, assume that the payoff of agent $i \notin \mathcal{T}_m$ depends only on the actions of agent $j \in \mathcal{N} \cap \mathcal{T}_m$ for some neighborhood \mathcal{N} . Agent i can form a belief about these agents' strategies according to

$$\pi_{k+1}^{im} = \pi_k^{im} + \alpha_k(\underline{a}_k^{im} - \pi_k^{im}) \quad \forall k = 0, 1, \dots \quad (9)$$

where $\underline{a}_k^{im} = \{a_k^j\}_{j \in \mathcal{N} \cap \mathcal{T}_m}$. Then, π_k^{im} would correspond to the marginalization of π_k^m for the agents

$j \in \mathcal{N} \cap \mathcal{T}_m$. Therefore, local observations (within the neighborhood) would be sufficient to follow Algorithms 1 and 2. Furthermore, we focus on the homogeneous cases where agents $j \notin \mathcal{T}_m$ have a common belief about team m 's strategy, which is possible, e.g., when they have common initial belief and use the same step size.

4 Convergence Results

For the convergence analysis of Algorithms 1 and 2, we make the following assumption on the step sizes used.

Assumption 1. *The step size $\alpha_k \in [0, 1]$ satisfies the stochastic approximation conditions: $\alpha_k \rightarrow 0$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$, $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \alpha_k = \infty$, and $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \alpha_k^2 < \infty$. Additionally, we have $\alpha_k - \alpha_{k+1} \geq \alpha_k \alpha_{k+1}$.*

The last condition in Assumption 1 ensures that recent observations do not have much weight in the empirical averages computed. The classical example $\alpha_k = 1/(k+1)$ satisfies Assumption 1.

The following theorem shows the convergence of Algorithms 1 and 2 to near team-Nash equilibrium.

Theorem 1. [Main Result] *Given a ZSPTG characterized by $\langle \mathcal{T}, (A^i, u^i)_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \rangle$, let every agent follow either Algorithm 1 or 2. If Assumption 1 holds, then the Nash gap for $\pi_k := (\pi_k^m)_{m \in \mathcal{T}}$ satisfies*

$$\limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \text{NG}(\pi_k) \leq \tau \log |A| \tag{10}$$

for Algorithm 1, and

$$\limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \text{NG}(\pi_k) \leq \tau \log |A| + D \cdot K(\delta) \tag{11}$$

for Algorithm 2, where $D > 0$ is some constant and $K(\cdot)$, as described later in (30), vanishes as $\delta \rightarrow 0^+$.

The critical challenge in the convergence analysis is the non-stationarity induced by the adaptation of the opponent teams while the team members are learning to coordinate in the best team response. We address this issue by approximating the dynamics with a fictional scenario as if the agents do not update their beliefs formed about the opponent teams' play over finite-length epochs so that they could have learned to team up. We can couple the dynamics in the main and fictional scenarios to bound the approximation error since these two scenarios become more and more similar across epochs due to the averaging in the beliefs formed. Sayin and Unlu [2023] used a similar approach to address the non-stationarity of stage games in stochastic team problems. Distinctly, we then relax the problem by considering any approximation error within these bounds and apply stochastic differential inclusion approximation (e.g., see Benaïm et al. [2005], Perkins and Leslie [2013]) to turn the problem into continuous-time *better* response dynamics with arbitrary bounded errors in zero-sum polymatrix games.

The following corollary to the main result shows the rationality of the (independent) Team-FP dynamics.

Corollary 1. *Given a ZSPTG characterized by $\langle \mathcal{T}, (A^i, u^i)_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \rangle$, let agents from team m follow either Algorithm 1 or 2 while other teams play according to some stationary strategy π^{-m} . If Assumption 1 holds, then empirical average of the action profiles played by team m satisfies*

$$\limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \text{NG}^m(\pi_k^m, \pi^{-m}) \leq \tau \log |A| \quad (12)$$

for Algorithm 1, and

$$\limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \text{NG}^m(\pi_k^m, \pi^{-m}) \leq \tau \log |A| + D \cdot K(\delta) \quad (13)$$

for Algorithm 2.

4.1 Proof of Main Result

The following is an overview of the proof in two steps:

Step 1. We first divide the horizon into epochs. Then, within each epoch, we characterize the cumulative update on the beliefs of agents. Here, we introduce the joint action distributions, the difference of actual joint actions, and these distributions as a Martingale difference sequence. Then, by exploring a fictional scenario where beliefs do not change within an epoch, we characterize the difference between the joint action distributions and the stationary distribution of a Markov chain (MC) induced by the fictional scenario. This difference is the common error term for both algorithms. We prove that we could have bound this error with an arbitrarily small number if we had chosen a sufficiently large epoch length. Then, independent update of actions in Algorithm 2 causes an additional bounded error term as the difference between the stationary distribution of the MC induced and the smoothed best response of a team.

Step 2. By relaxing the problem and allowing the total error to take any value within the bounds, we use Theorem 2 and characterize the limit behavior of the discrete belief update by using a Lyapunov function. We conclude the proof by showing that the set where the Lyapunov function does not change anymore and has an empty interior is an ϵ -team-NE for Algorithms 1 and 2, with different bounds on ϵ .

Some preliminary information about stochastic approximation methods and optimal coupling lemma are provided in Appendix A.1. The proofs for technical lemmas and propositions are moved in Appendix A.3.

Step 1. Let π_k^m denote the belief of others on the joint actions of team m . Then, the update rule is given in (9). Observing the actions of agents from team m , agents from other teams can update

their belief according to

$$\pi_{k+1}^m = \pi_k^m + \alpha_k(\underline{a}_k^m - \pi_k^m) \quad \forall k = 0, 1, \dots \quad (14)$$

If we divide the horizon into T -length epochs, the belief update for the agents can be written as

$$\pi_{k_0+T}^m = \left(\prod_{k=k_0}^{k_0+T-1} (1 - \alpha_k) \right) \pi_{k_0}^m + \sum_{k=k_0}^{k_0+T-1} \alpha_k \underline{a}_k^m \left(\prod_{\ell=k+1}^{k_0+T-1} (1 - \alpha_\ell) \right). \quad (15)$$

Let n be the epoch index and $\pi_{(n)}^m := \pi_{nT}^m$ for all n denote the belief about team m in epoch n . Furthermore, for the sake of notational simplicity we define

$$\beta_k := \alpha_k \prod_{\ell=k+1}^{(k+1)T-1} (1 - \alpha_\ell) \quad (16a)$$

$$\beta_{(n)} := \sum_{k=nT}^{(n+1)T-1} \beta_k. \quad (16b)$$

We can rewrite (15) in epoch n as

$$\pi_{(n+1)}^m = (1 - \beta_{(n)})\pi_{(n)}^m + \beta_{(n)} \left(\sum_{k=nT}^{(n+1)T-1} \frac{\beta_k}{\beta_{(n)}} \underline{a}_k^m \right). \quad (17)$$

Let $\mathcal{F}_{(n)}$ be a filtration generated by σ -algebra $\sigma(A_0, \dots, A_{nT-1})$ where A_t denotes the joint actions taken by each team at stage t , i.e., $A_t = (a_t^1, \dots, a_t^M)$. It is important to note that $\pi_{(n)}^m$ is $\mathcal{F}_{(n)}$ -measurable function. Let's define the joint action distributions of team m at time k in epoch n as follows

$$\mu_{(n),k}^m := \mathbb{E}[\underline{a}_k^m | \mathcal{F}_{(n)}]. \quad (18)$$

Then, we can write (17) as in the form of stochastic approximation

$$\pi_{(n+1)}^m = (1 - \beta_{(n)})\pi_{(n)}^m + \beta_{(n)} \left(\sum_{k=nT}^{(n+1)T-1} \frac{\beta_k}{\beta_{(n)}} \mu_{(n),k}^m + \omega_{(n+1)}^m \right), \quad (19)$$

where $\omega_{(n+1)}^m$ is a Martingale difference sequence defined as

$$\omega_{(n+1)}^m := \sum_{k=nT}^{(n+1)T-1} \frac{\beta_k}{\beta_{(n)}} (\underline{a}_k^m - \mu_{(n),k}^m). \quad (20)$$

Now, let's consider a fictional scenario for the analysis in which the beliefs are only updated

at the ends of T -length epochs as in [Sayin and Unlu \[2023\]](#). In this fictional scenario, we consider that, $\hat{\pi}_t^m = \pi_{(n)}^m \forall nT \leq t \leq nT - 1, \forall m \in \mathcal{T}$. In this case, consider the MC generated by the log-linear learning for team m . Each joint action profile $\underline{a}_{(n),k}^m$ is a state and anytime an agent is randomly chosen and choose to change their action, a transition to another state happens, but the actual scenario is not an MC. On the other hand, fictional scenario generates a homogenous MC whose stationary distribution is crucial in the following analysis.

Define the stationary distribution of the MC of the joint actions of team m in the fictional scenario for Team-FP and Independent Team-FP as $\check{\mu}_{(n),\star}^m$ and $\hat{\mu}_{(n),\star}^m$, respectively. Note that, for Team-FP, the stationary distribution of the fictional scenario is the smoothed best response of the team m to the constant beliefs about other teams since log-linear learning converges under the assumption of stationary opponent [Blume \[1993\]](#), [Marden and Shamma \[2012\]](#). Hence, the stationary distribution of the fictional scenario for [Algorithm 1](#) can be written as

$$\check{\mu}_{(n),\star}^m = \operatorname{argmax}_{\mu \in \Delta(A)^m} (\phi^m(\mu, \pi_{(n)}^{-m}) + \tau \mathcal{H}(\mu)). \quad (21)$$

Then, we can write the belief update for team m [\(15\)](#) as

$$\pi_{(n+1)}^m = (1 - \beta_{(n)})\pi_{(n)}^m + \beta_{(n)} \left(\check{\mu}_{(n),\star}^m + \omega_{(n+1)}^m + \tilde{e}_{(n)}^m + \hat{e}_{(n)}^m \right), \quad (22)$$

where $\hat{e}_{(n)}^m$ is the error due to the difference between the stationary distribution of the fictional scenario and the state distribution of the actual scenario, and $\tilde{e}_{(n)}^m$ is the error due to the difference between the stationary distribution of the fictional scenario in Independent Team-FP and Team-FP. Note that $\tilde{e}_{(n)}^m = 0$ if [Algorithm 1](#) is followed.

$$\hat{e}_{(n)}^m := \sum_{k=nT}^{(n+1)T-1} \frac{\beta_k}{\beta_{(n)}} (\mu_{(n),k}^m - \hat{\mu}_{(n),\star}^m) \quad (23a)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{e}_{(n)}^m &:= \sum_{k=nT}^{(n+1)T-1} \frac{\beta_k}{\beta_{(n)}} (\hat{\mu}_{(n),\star}^m - \check{\mu}_{(n),\star}^m) \\ &= \hat{\mu}_{(n),\star}^m - \check{\mu}_{(n),\star}^m, \end{aligned} \quad (23b)$$

where the second equality in [\(23b\)](#) follows from [\(16b\)](#).

Lemma 1. *Given the stationary distribution of the MC in the fictional scenario, $\hat{\mu}_{(n),\star}^m$, the difference between the stationary distribution of the fictional scenario and the state distribution of the actual scenario can be bounded as*

$$\|\mu_{(n),k}^m - \hat{\mu}_{(n),\star}^m\|_1 \leq c \rho^{k-nT} + dT\alpha_{nT} \forall m \in \mathcal{T}, \quad (24)$$

where c, d , and ρ are some constants.

Then, Lemma 1 yields that, we can bound $\widehat{e}_{(n)}^m$.

$$\|\widehat{e}_{(n)}^m\|_1 \leq \sum_{k=nT}^{(n+1)T-1} \frac{\beta_k}{\beta_{(n)}} \|\mu_{(n),k}^m - \widehat{\mu}_{(n),*}^m\| \quad (25a)$$

$$\leq \sum_{k=nT}^{(n+1)T-1} \frac{\beta_k}{\beta_{(n)}} \left(c \rho^{k-nT} + d T \alpha_{nT} \right) \quad (25b)$$

$$= c \sum_{k=nT}^{(n+1)T-1} \frac{\beta_k}{\beta_{(n)}} \rho^{k-nT} + d \sum_{k=nT}^{(n+1)T-1} \frac{\beta_k}{\beta_{(n)}} \cdot T \alpha_{nT} \quad (25c)$$

where (25a) follows from triangle inequality, and (25b) follows from (24). Assuming the no recency bias condition on the step size parameter in Assumption 1, $\beta_{k+1}/\beta_k \leq 1$ holds. Then, because of the monotonically decreasing property of β_k ,

$$\sum_{k=nT}^{(n+1)T-1} \frac{\beta_k}{\beta_{(n)}} \rho^{k-nT} \leq \frac{\beta_{nT}}{\beta_{(n)}} \sum_{k=nT}^{(n+1)T-1} \rho^{k-nT} \quad (26a)$$

$$\leq \frac{\beta_{nT}}{\beta_{(n)}} \frac{1}{1-\rho}. \quad (26b)$$

Note that, $\frac{\beta_{nT}}{\beta_{(n)}} \rightarrow \frac{1}{T}$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Also, $T \alpha_{nT} \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Then, we can bound the error with the following inequality,

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|\widehat{e}_{(n)}^m\|_1 \leq \frac{1}{T} \frac{1}{1-\rho} \quad \forall m \in \mathcal{T}, \quad (27)$$

This implies that, we could bound the error due to the difference of fictional and actual scenario with an arbitrarily small number if we had selected a sufficiently large T .

We can also bound $\widehat{e}_{(n)}^m$ using Lemma 3 [Sayin and Unlu, 2023, Lemma 5], as when the beliefs are fixed, this error is the difference of stationary distributions between the classical log-linear learning and independent log-linear learning,

$$\|\widehat{e}_{(n)}^m\|_1 \leq 2(1 - \lambda(\delta))^{|T_m|} \frac{1 + \bar{\epsilon}(\delta)}{\bar{\epsilon}(\delta)} \quad \forall m \in \mathcal{T}, \quad (28)$$

where

$$\lambda(\delta) := \frac{|T_m| \delta(1-\delta)^{|T_m|-1}}{1 - (1-\delta)^{|T_m|}} \quad (29a)$$

$$\xi = \frac{1}{\max_{m \in \mathcal{T}} |T_m|} \frac{\exp(\min(\phi)/\tau)}{\max_{i \in \mathcal{I}} |A^i| \exp(\max(\phi)/\tau)} \quad (29b)$$

$$\bar{\epsilon}(\delta) := \left(\frac{\xi^2 \delta(1-\delta)^{|T_m|-1}}{|T_m| (1 - (1-\delta)^{|T_m|})} \right)^{|T_m|}, \quad (29c)$$

and define

$$K^m(\delta) := 2(1 - \lambda(\delta)^{|T_m|}) \frac{1 + \bar{\epsilon}(\delta)}{\bar{\epsilon}(\delta)} \quad \forall m \in \mathcal{T} \quad (30a)$$

$$K(\delta) := \max_{m \in \mathcal{T}} K^m(\delta). \quad (30b)$$

Note that, as $\delta \rightarrow 0^+$, $K^m(\delta), K(\delta) \rightarrow 0$.

Step 2. To use stochastic approximation with differential inclusion methods, let's define $f(\cdot): \Delta \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{\sum_{m \in \mathcal{T}} \|A^m\|}$ where $\Delta = \times_{m \in \mathcal{T}} \Delta(A^m)$ and

$$f(\pi_{(n)}) := \mu_{(n),*} - \pi_{(n)} + e_{(n)} \quad (31)$$

where $\mu_{(n),*} := (\mu_{(n),*}^m)_{m \in \mathcal{T}}$, $\pi_{(n)} := (\pi_{(n)}^m)_{m \in \mathcal{T}}$, $e_{(n)} := (\hat{e}_{(n)})_{m \in \mathcal{T}} + (\tilde{e}_{(n)})_{m \in \mathcal{T}}$. Then, we relax the problem and let $e^m \subset \Delta(A^m)$ be a set of vectors such that each vector in e^m satisfies the following condition

$$\|\bar{e}\|_1 \leq \frac{1}{T} \frac{1}{1-\rho} + K^m(\delta) \quad \forall \bar{e} \in e^m. \quad (32)$$

Given this, we can define the set-valued function $F(\cdot): \Delta \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{\sum_{m \in \mathcal{T}} \|A^m\|}$ as follows,

$$F(\pi) \in \mu_* - \pi + e \quad (33)$$

where μ_*^m is the smoothed best response to π^{-m} , and $\mu_* := (\mu_*^m)_{m \in \mathcal{T}}$, $\pi := (\pi^m)_{m \in \mathcal{T}}$, $e := (e^m)_{m \in \mathcal{T}}$, which are stacked vectors of beliefs, smoothed best responses and sets of error terms, respectively.

Proposition 1. *The set-valued function $F(\cdot)$, as described in (33), is a Marchaud map.*

Proposition 1 and Theorem 2 yields that (22) converges to the global attractor of the differential inclusion if it exists, i.e.,

$$\dot{\pi}^m \in \mu_*^m - \pi^m + e^m \quad \forall m \in \mathcal{T}. \quad (34)$$

Here, the error term due to the non-stationary behavior of beliefs and the error term caused by

independent log-linear learning are included in the stochastic approximation. We have formulated bounds on the error terms in the limit and relaxed the problem by allowing the error term to be anything within the bounds. Thus, we can characterize the limit behavior of (22) through (34) if there exists a Lyapunov function V .

Define the following functions,

$$L^m(\pi) := \max_{\mu} \{ \phi^m(\mu, \pi^{-m}) + \tau \mathcal{H}(\mu) \} - \phi^m(\pi) \quad (35a)$$

$$L(\pi) := \sum_{m \in \mathcal{T}} L^m(\pi) \quad (35b)$$

$$H := \sum_{m \in \mathcal{T}} \log(|\underline{A}^m|). \quad (35c)$$

Proposition 2. *Consider a differential inclusion described in (34). Then, the following continuous function $V : \Delta(A) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ is a Lyapunov function of (34) for the set $\Lambda = \{V(\pi) = 0\}$.*

$$V(\pi) = \left[L(\pi) - \frac{C}{T} - DK(\delta) - \tau H \right]_+ \quad (36)$$

where C and D are some positive constants, T is the epoch length, and $K(\delta)$ is the bound for the error resulting from following Algorithm 2.

Given the Proposition 2, Theorem 2 [Perkins and Leslie, 2013, Theorem 3.1], and [Benaïm et al., 2005, Proposition 3.27], as all the solutions to the differential inclusion (34) asymptotically converges to the set $\Lambda = \{\pi : V(\pi) = 0\}$, the discrete-time update (22) also converges to the same set Λ as a perturbed solution of the differential inclusion. Within the set Λ , $0 \leq L(\pi) \leq \frac{C}{T} + DK(\delta) + \tau H$. Therefore,

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} L(\pi_{(n)}) < \frac{C}{T} + DK(\delta) + \tau H. \quad (37)$$

Since $L^m(\pi_{(n)}) \geq 0$ for all $\pi_{(n)}^m \in m \in \mathcal{T}$, (35b) and (37) yields that,

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} L^m(\pi_{(n)}) < \frac{C}{T} + DK(\delta) + \tau H \quad \forall m \in \mathcal{T}. \quad (38)$$

By definition,

$$L^m(\pi_{(n)}) > \max_{\mu} \{ \phi^m(\mu, \pi_{(n)}^{-m}) \} - \phi^m(\pi_{(n)}), \quad (39)$$

and this leads to the following result.

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \max_{\mu} \{ \phi^m(\mu, \pi_{(n)}^{-m}) \} - \phi^m(\pi_{(n)}) < \frac{C}{T} + DK^m(\delta) + \tau H \quad \forall m \in \mathcal{T}. \quad (40)$$




Figure 2: The visualization illustrates an example of ZSPTG that has been randomly generated and used in simulation, in which \circ , \square , and \hexagon agents constitute each team.

The limit behavior can be characterized as an ϵ -team-NE, where, $\epsilon = DK(\delta) + \tau H$. The reason for that is, for any given lower bound on the limit set boundaries, $DK(\delta) + \tau H + \underline{\epsilon}$, we could have chosen a sufficiently large T at the beginning so that $\frac{C}{T} < \underline{\epsilon}$. Recall that, the term $K(\delta)$ only appears if Algorithm 2 is used instead of Algorithm 1. Therefore, we can conclude that for Algorithm 1, the ϵ -team-NE is reached asymptotically where $\epsilon = \tau H$, and for Algorithm 2, the limit set is an ϵ -near NE where, $\epsilon = DK(\delta) + \tau H$, and $DK(\delta) \rightarrow 0$ as $\delta \rightarrow 0$.

Note that (35b) and (39) yields the following inequality,

$$L(\pi_{(n)}) \geq \sum_{m \in \mathcal{T}} \max_{\mu} \{ \phi^m(\mu, \pi^{-m}) \} - \phi^m(\pi), \quad (41)$$

which is equal to $\text{NG}(\pi)_{(n)}$. Therefore, it can be concluded with a similar reasoning that,

$$\limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \text{NG}(\pi_k) \leq \tau \sum_{m \in \mathcal{T}} \log(|\underline{A}^m|) \quad (42)$$

for Algorithm 1, and

$$\limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \text{NG}(\pi_k) \leq DK(\delta) + \tau \sum_{m \in \mathcal{T}} \log(|\underline{A}^m|) \quad (43)$$

for Algorithm 2.

5 Simulation Results

In this section, we provide the simulation results for the evolution of NGs in Algorithms 1 and 2 with a specific focus on the impact of parameters τ and the independent update of actions. We

consider an example ZSPTG of three teams for both algorithms. Figure 2 is an illustration of the networked interactions in the example. We provide further details on the example in Appendix A.2.

For the simulation purposes, given the team size and number of teams, we randomly generate a graph with 0.3 probability of edge connection for any random edge. Then we define random valued functions for each edge. These edge functions are defined with a value from a uniform random distribution for each joint action of neighbors who are in the team and neighbors who are in the opponent’s team. Then, the edge functions are aggregated over edges to the nodes to generate the reward of each agent.

All the simulations are executed on a computer equipped with an Intel Xeon W7-3455 CPU and 128 GB RAM. For the Team-FP (Independent Team-FP), we have generated a three team game where each team has three agents with two possible actions, i.e., $|\mathcal{T}| = 3$, $|\mathcal{I}| = 9$, and $|A^i| = 2$ for all $i \in \mathcal{I}$. Hence, the size of the joint action space is 8 for each team.


We examine the evolution of NG in the Team-FP dynamics for different values of $\tau \in \{0.1, 0.15, 0.2\}$ over 15 independent trials for 10^5 iterations. We also compare the evolution of NG in the Team-FP and Independent Team-FP dynamics for $\tau = 0.1$, $\delta = 0.2$. The step size is also chosen to be $\alpha_k = 1/(k + 1)$ for both algorithms. All simulation results (see Figure 3) show convergence, and we observe lower final values of $\text{NG}(\pi)$ for smaller τ as we predicted. The Independent Team-FP requires more iterations to converge as updates are less frequent compared to Team-FP.

6 Conclusion


In this work we introduced a new variant of FP, called Team-FP, reaching equilibrium in multi-team competition. This variant was particularly tailored for zero-sum potential team games (ZSPTGs); bridging the gap between potential games for single teams and zero-sum polymatrix games for individual team members, and expanding the applicability of FP in addressing complex interactions among multiple teams. The proposed dynamics involved agents adhering to a straightforward behavioral rule, responding to the actions of neighboring team members while incorporating elements of inertia and exploration. We established the almost sure convergence of empirical averages of teams’ action profiles toward near team-Nash equilibrium, assuming standard conditions on the step sizes. Additionally, we formulated a bound on the approximation error, which diminishes with the exploration in agents’ responses.

Acknowledgment

This work was supported by the The Scientific and Technological Research Council of Türkiye (TUBITAK) BIDEB 2232-B International Fellowship for Early Stage Researchers under Grant Number 121C124.



(a) Evolution of Nash Gap for Team-FP



(b) Evolution of Nash Gap for Independent Team-FP

Figure 3: Convergence of the Nash gap over 10^5 iterations for a three team network, for Algorithm 1 in 3a and a comparison of Team-FP and Independent Team-FP in 3b. The solid curves represent the mean of NG over 15 different trials and the shaded areas are the one standard deviation above and below the mean of NG for each τ .

A Appendix

A.1 Preliminary Information

For completeness, we provide preliminary information about stochastic approximation framework with differential inclusion [Benaïm et al. \[2005\]](#), [Perkins and Leslie \[2013\]](#) and the ergodicity of MCs [Sayin and Unlu \[2023\]](#) used in the proof of the main result.

Definition 1 (Lyapunov function) *We say that a continuous function $V : \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a Lyapunov function for a subset Λ of \mathbb{R}^m provided that for any trajectory of the flow φ , e.g. $\varphi_t(x)$,*

- $V(y) < V(x)$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^m \setminus \Lambda$, $y \in \varphi_t(x)$, $t > 0$,
- $V(y) \leq V(x)$ for all $x \in \Lambda$, $y \in \varphi_t(x)$, $t \geq 0$,

Definition 2 (Marchaud map) [Perkins and Leslie \[2013\]](#) *A set-valued function $F(\cdot) : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ is a Marchaud map (or stochastic approximation map) if*

- (i) $F(\cdot)$ is upper semi-continuous, or equivalently, $\text{Graph}(F) = \{(x, y) : y \in F(x)\}$ is closed.
- (ii) For all $x \in X$, $F(x)$ is a non-empty, compact, and convex subset of \mathbb{R}^n .
- (iii) There exists a $c > 0$ such that $\sup_{y \in F(x)} \|y\| \leq c(1 + \|x\|)$ for all $x \in X$.

A.1.1 Stochastic Approximation Differential Inclusion

Theorem 2. [[Perkins and Leslie, 2013](#), Theorem 3.1] *Consider a sequence $\{y_k \in Y\}_{k \geq 0}$ evolving according to*

$$y_{k+1} - y_k - \alpha_k(e_k + \omega_k) \in \alpha_k F(y_k), \quad (44)$$

where

- The step sizes $\{\alpha_k \in [0, 1]\}_{k=0}^{\infty}$ decay at a suitable rate such that $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \alpha_k = \infty$ and $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \alpha_k^2 < \infty$.
- The set valued $F(y)$ is a Marchaud map.
- The error term $\|e_k\| \rightarrow 0$ almost surely.
- The noise sequence $\{\omega_k\}$ is \mathcal{F}_{k+1} -measurable with respect to the filtration \mathcal{F}_k generated by σ -algebra $\sigma(y_0, \omega_0, \dots, \omega_{k-1})$. Furthermore, $\{\omega_k\}$ is a Martingale difference sequence satisfying $\mathbb{E}[\omega_k | \mathcal{F}_k] = 0$ and $\mathbb{E}[\|\omega_k\|^2 | \mathcal{F}_k] < W$ for some constant W for all $k \geq 0$ almost surely.

Then, the linear interpolation of y_k is an asymptotic pseudo-trajectory to the differential inclusion

$$\dot{y} \in F(y). \quad (45)$$

Therefore, one can characterize the limit behavior of (44) through (45) if there exists a Lyapunov function V as given in Definition 1. Note that for $\Lambda \subset Y$ and $V : Y \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $V(\Lambda) \subset \mathbb{R}$ has empty interior. Therefore, every internally chain transitive set of differential inclusion (45) and the limit set of discrete update (44) are contained in Λ [Benaim et al., 2005, Proposition 3.27].

Lemma 2. [Sayin and Unlu, 2023, Lemma 2] Consider two discrete-time processes $\{\omega_t\}_{t \geq 0}$ and $\{\widehat{\omega}_t\}_{t \geq 0}$ over a finite state space Ω evolving according to transition kernels $\widehat{P}(\cdot|\widehat{\omega}_t) \in \Delta(\Omega)$ and $P_t(\cdot|\omega_t, \omega_{t-1}, \dots, \omega_0) \in \Delta(\Omega)$. Suppose that these processes satisfy the following conditions

- (i) For any pair $(\widehat{\omega}, \omega) \in \Omega \times \Omega$, where $\widehat{\omega} \neq \omega$, these processes follow some κ -length paths to a destination state ω' , such that $\widehat{\omega} = \widehat{h}^0, \dots, \widehat{h}^\kappa$ and $\omega = h^0, \dots, h^\kappa$, where they do not traverse the same state on these paths until reaching destination state. Moreover, there exist $\widehat{\varepsilon}, \varepsilon > 0$ such that for all t

$$\Pr \left(\bigwedge_{k=1}^{\kappa} \widehat{\omega}_{t+k} = \widehat{h}_k | \widehat{\omega}_t = \widehat{\omega} \right) \geq \widehat{\varepsilon} \quad \text{and} \quad \Pr \left(\bigwedge_{k=1}^{\kappa} \omega_{t+k} = h_k | \omega_t = \omega \right) \geq \varepsilon \quad (46)$$

- (ii) For any $t = 0, \dots, T-1$, there exists some constant $\lambda \in (0, 1]$ such that

$$\left\| P_t(\cdot|h_t, \dots, h_0) - \widehat{P}(\cdot|h_t) \right\|_{\text{TV}} \leq 1 - \lambda, \quad (47)$$

for all $\{h_\tau \in \Omega\}_{\tau=0}^t$.

Then, let $\mu_t \in \Delta(\Omega)$ and $\widehat{\mu}_t \in \Delta(\Omega)$ denote the distributions of ω_t and $\widehat{\omega}_t$, respectively. Then, there exists a coupling over discrete-time processes $\{\omega_t\}$ and $\{\widehat{\omega}_t\}$ such that

$$\|\mu_t - \widehat{\mu}_t\|_1 \leq 2(1 - \varepsilon\widehat{\varepsilon})^{\frac{t}{\kappa}-1} + 2(1 - \lambda^\kappa) \frac{1 + \varepsilon\widehat{\varepsilon}}{\varepsilon\widehat{\varepsilon}} \quad \forall t = 0, \dots, T-1. \quad (48)$$

Lemma 3. [Sayin and Unlu, 2023, Lemma 5] Consider an n -agent identical-interest normal-form game characterized by the tuple $\mathcal{G} = \langle (A^i)_{i \in [n]}, r \rangle$, where A^i is the finite action set of agent i , $A := \prod_{i \in [n]} A^i$ is the joint action profile and $r : A \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is the common reward function. Let $\mu \in \Delta(A)$ and $\underline{\mu} \in \Delta(A)$ be the stationary distribution over the action profiles when agents adopted the classical log-linear learning and independent log-linear learning in the repeated play of \mathcal{G} , respectively. Then, one can characterize the closeness of these two stationary distributions as follows

$$\|\mu - \underline{\mu}\|_1 \leq \widetilde{K}(\delta) := 2(1 - \lambda(\delta)^n) \frac{1 + \bar{\varepsilon}(\delta)}{\bar{\varepsilon}(\delta)}, \quad (49)$$

where $\lambda(\delta) := \frac{n\delta(1-\delta)^{n-1}}{1-(1-\delta)^n} \in (0, 1]$ and $\bar{\epsilon}(\delta) := \left(\frac{\epsilon^2\delta(1-\delta)^{n-1}}{n(1-(1-\delta)^n)} \right)^n > 0$ for $\epsilon := \frac{1}{|A|} \exp(-2\bar{\Phi}/\tau) > 0$ and $\bar{\Phi}$ is the upper bound on potential function. As $\delta \rightarrow 0^+$, we have $\tilde{K}(\delta) \rightarrow 0$ since $\lambda(\delta) \rightarrow 1$ and $\bar{\epsilon}(\delta) \rightarrow (\epsilon/n)^{2n}$.

A.2 Multi-Team Network Example

Example 2. Let's construct a solid example of a ZSPTG for more than 2 teams. For notational simplicity, in this example, we make the following definitions. For any set $J \subset \mathcal{I}$, $A^J := \prod_{i \in J} A^i$ and $\alpha^J \in A^J$.

Consider a multi-team network game defined by the graph $G = (\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{E})$ and the tuple $\langle \mathcal{T}, (A^i, r^i)_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \rangle$. For notational simplicity, define 1-hop neighbors of agent i as, $\mathcal{N}(i) := \{j : (i, j) \in \mathcal{E}\}$, and define the set of agents in team of i as $[i]$. Assume that for each pair of connected agents where the agents are from different teams, $(i, j) \in \mathcal{E}$ and $[i] \neq [j]$, there is a function $u^{ij} := A^{\mathcal{N}(i) \cap ([i] \cup [j])} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, where $u^{ij} = 0$ if $(i, j) \notin \mathcal{E}$. Define a function, $u^i := A^{\mathcal{N}(i)} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that,

$$u^i := \sum_{j \in (\mathcal{N}(i) \cap (\mathcal{I} \setminus [i]))} u^{ij}(\alpha^{\mathcal{N}(i) \cap [i]}, \alpha^{\mathcal{N}(i) \cap [j]}). \quad (50)$$

Now let the reward functions r^i for each agent be defined as

$$r^i := \sum_{j \in (\mathcal{N}(i) \cap [i])} u^j - \sum_{\ell \in (\mathcal{N}(i) \cap \mathcal{I} \setminus [i])} \sum_{h \in (\mathcal{N}(\ell) \cap [i])} u^{\ell h}. \quad (51)$$

Note that the domain of the reward function r^i is actions of set of agents, which is a subset of 2-hop neighbors of agent i . In the upcoming analysis, we will demonstrate that this game unfolds as a ZSPTG.

Define the potential function $\phi^m : A \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ for team m as follows

$$\phi^m := \sum_{i \in \mathcal{T}_m} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}(i)} u^{ij} - u^{ji}. \quad (52)$$

Since each edge relation appears twice in the overall sum, and each term has a negative complement within the overall sum of potential functions, the equality $\sum_{m \in \mathcal{T}} \phi^m = 0$ holds. Hence, this is a zero-sum game. Furthermore, if agent $i \in \mathcal{T}_m$ changes their action from a^i to \bar{a}^i , denoting the joint action profiles, resp., with a and \bar{a} ; then the change in this single action only affects the values of the set of pairwise functions $\{u^{j\ell} : j \in (\mathcal{N}(i) \cap [i]) \text{ and } \ell \in (\mathcal{N}(j) \cap \mathcal{I} \setminus [i])\} \cup \{u^{j\ell} : j \in (\mathcal{N}(i) \cap \mathcal{I} \setminus [i]) \text{ and } \ell \in (\mathcal{N}(j) \cap [i])\}$ in which the action of agent i is in the domain. In other words, it is as if everyone can only affect the relation between neighbor team members' opponents, or neighbor opponents' opponents which act like the team members to

themselves. Then, the difference in the potential functions can be written as,

$$\begin{aligned}\phi^m(\bar{a}) - \phi^m(a) &= \sum_{j \in (\mathcal{N}(i) \cap [i])} \sum_{\ell \in (\mathcal{N}(j) \cap \mathcal{I} \setminus [i])} u^{ij} \\ &\quad - \sum_{\ell \in (\mathcal{N}(i) \cap \mathcal{I} \setminus [i])} \sum_{h \in (\mathcal{N}(\ell) \cap [i])} u^{\ell h} \\ &= r^i(\bar{a}) - r^i(a).\end{aligned}\tag{53}$$

Therefore, the game is a potential game. Note that the potential function is also separable. Define $\phi^{m\ell} : \underline{A}^m \times \underline{A}^\ell \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ as

$$\phi^{m\ell} := \sum_{i \in \mathcal{T}_m} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{T}_\ell} u^{ij} - u^{ji}.\tag{55}$$

Then, the following equality

$$\phi^m = \sum_{\ell \in \zeta^m} \phi^{m\ell}\tag{56}$$

can be verified. Hence, the separability condition is also satisfied, and the example game is a ZSPTG.

A.3 Proofs of Lemma 1 and Propositions 1 and 2

Proof of Lemma 1

The transition probabilities between states depend only on the beliefs on the other teams. Therefore, for the fictional scenario, during an epoch, this MC is homogenous. Let, $P_{(n),k}^m$ be the transition probabilities of the original non-homogeneous MC for the transition probabilities of the joint action profiles for team m , and let $\widehat{P}_{(n)}^m$ be the transition probabilities for the fictional scenario for the team m . For notational simplicity, we drop superscript m denoting the team, but $P_{(n),k}$ and $\widehat{P}_{(n)}$ denote the transition probabilities for the same team in original and fictional scenarios, respectively.

Step 1. In classical log-linear learning, at each step, only one agent can change their action and due to the soft-max nature of this action change, any action has positive probability which is bounded from below. This bound only depends on the minimum and maximum values of any agents' reward, which are defined by the game and bounded by definition, and the temperature parameter. If we divide that bound by the number of agents in the team ($|\mathcal{T}_m|$), we can obtain a lower bound on the probability of changing to any joint action which can be reached within a

single step. Let's call that bound ξ . Then, for any state ω or $\widehat{\omega}$, there is a $\xi > 0$ such that

$$P_{(n),k}(\omega|\omega_k) > \xi \iff P_{(n),k}(\omega|\omega_k) > 0 \quad (57)$$

$$\widehat{P}_{(n),k}(\widehat{\omega}|\widehat{\omega}_k) > \xi \iff \widehat{P}_{(n),k}(\widehat{\omega}|\widehat{\omega}_k) > 0. \quad (58)$$

The bound ξ can be chosen as

$$\xi = \frac{1}{\max_{m \in \mathcal{T}} |\mathcal{T}_m|} \frac{\exp(\min(\phi)/\tau)}{\max_{i \in \mathcal{I}} |A^i| \exp(\max(\phi)/\tau)}. \quad (59)$$

Then, we can find a path with positive probability for both of these scenarios, where their state does not match until they reach $\kappa = |\mathcal{T}_m|$. In other words, $\omega_{(n),nT+\kappa} = \widehat{\omega}_{(n),nT+\kappa}$ and $\omega_{(n),k} \neq \widehat{\omega}_{(n),k}$ for all $k = nT, \dots, nT + \kappa - 1$ with

$$\Pr \left(\bigwedge_{k=nT+1}^{nT+\kappa} \widehat{\omega}_{(n),k} \mid \widehat{\omega}_{(n),nT} \right) \geq \xi^\kappa \quad (60a)$$

$$\Pr \left(\bigwedge_{k=nT+1}^{nT+\kappa} \omega_{(n),k} \mid \omega_{(n),nT} \right) \geq \xi^\kappa. \quad (60b)$$

Hence, (60) satisfies the first condition for [Sayin and Unlu, 2023, Lemma 2].

Step 2. Consider the total variation distance between two transition probabilities. Transition probabilities between state $\omega = (a^i, a^{-i})$ and $\widetilde{\omega} = (\widetilde{a}^i, a^{-i})$ can be written as a function of the belief as follows

$$P_{\omega \rightarrow \widetilde{\omega}}(\pi_{(n),k}^{-m}) = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{T}_m|} \frac{\exp \left(\left(\phi^m \left(\widetilde{a}^i, a^{-i}, \pi_{(n),k}^{-m} \right) \right) / \tau \right)}{\sum_{\widetilde{a}^i} \exp \left(\phi^m \left(\widetilde{a}^i, a^{-i}, \pi_{(n),k}^{-m} \right) / \tau \right)}, \quad (61)$$

where $\pi_{(n),k}^{-m} := (\pi_{(n),k}^\ell)_{\ell \neq m}$. Remember that due to the separable structure of the network in ZSPTG we have

$$\phi^m(a^i, (a^{-i}), \pi_{(n),k}^{-m}) = \sum_{\ell \neq m} \mathbb{E}_{\underline{a}^\ell \sim \pi_{(n),k}^\ell} \phi^{m\ell}(a^i, a^{-i}, \underline{a}^\ell) \quad (62a)$$

$$= \sum_{\ell \neq m} (a^m)^T \Phi^{m\ell} \pi_{(n),k}^\ell, \quad (62b)$$

where $a^m = (a^{im})_{i \in \mathcal{T}_m}$ and $\Phi^{m\ell}$ is the matrix form of the potential function whose rows are the joint actions of team m and columns are the joint actions of team ℓ .

Note the due to the Lipschitz property of the soft-max function, there exists an $\mathcal{L}' < \infty$ such

that the total variation distance between two transition probabilities are bounded such that

$$\left\| P_{\omega \rightarrow \tilde{\omega}}(\pi_{(n),k}^{-m}) - P_{\omega \rightarrow \tilde{\omega}}(\hat{\pi}_{(n),k}^{-m}) \right\|_{\text{TV}} \leq \mathcal{L}' \left\| \sum_{\ell \neq m} (\Phi^{m\ell} \pi_{(n),k}^{\ell} - \Phi^{m\ell} \hat{\pi}_{(n),k}^{\ell}) \right\|_1 \quad (63a)$$

$$\leq \mathcal{L}' \sum_{\ell \neq m} \left\| (\Phi^{m\ell} (\pi_{(n),k}^{\ell} - \hat{\pi}_{(n),k}^{\ell})) \right\|_1 \quad (63b)$$

$$\leq \mathcal{L} \sum_{\ell \neq m} \left\| (\pi_{(n),k}^{\ell} - \hat{\pi}_{(n),k}^{\ell}) \right\|_1, \quad (63c)$$

where $\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}' \max_{m,\ell} (\|\Phi^{m\ell}\|_1)$. The distance between the belief of the original scenario and the fictional scenario can also be bounded thanks to the small step size. If we bound $\|a_k^{\ell} - \pi_k^{\ell}\|_1 < \|a_k^{\ell}\|_1 + \|\pi_k^{\ell}\|_1 = 2$. Then using triangle inequality

$$\left\| (\pi_{(n),k}^{\ell} - \hat{\pi}_{(n),k}^{\ell}) \right\|_1 = \left\| (\pi_{(n),k}^{\ell} - \pi_{(n),nT}^{\ell}) \right\|_1 \quad (64a)$$

$$\leq \sum_{t=nT}^{k+nT-1} 2\alpha_t \quad (64b)$$

$$\leq \sum_{t=nT}^{(n+1)T-1} 2\alpha_t \quad (64c)$$

$$\leq 2T\alpha_{nT}. \quad (64d)$$

Let's consider late epochs where $\alpha_{nT} < \frac{1}{2T\mathcal{L}|\mathcal{T}|}$, and set $2T\mathcal{L}|\mathcal{T}|\alpha_{nT} = 1 - \lambda_{nT}$ with $0 < \lambda_{nT} \leq 1$. Then,

$$\left\| P_{\omega \rightarrow \tilde{\omega}}(\pi_{(n),k}^{-m}) - P_{\omega \rightarrow \tilde{\omega}}(\hat{\pi}_{(n),k}^{-m}) \right\|_{\text{TV}} \leq 1 - \lambda_{nT}. \quad (65)$$

Hence, the second condition of [Sayin and Unlu, 2023, Lemma 2] is met, and we can invoke the corresponding Lemma such that given the distributions of the original and fictional scenarios, following inequality holds for all $k \geq nT$,

$$\left\| \mu_{(n),k} - \hat{\mu}_{(n),k} \right\|_1 \leq 2(1 - \varepsilon)^{\frac{k-nT}{\kappa} - 1} + 2(1 - \lambda_{nT}^{\kappa}) \frac{1 + \varepsilon}{\varepsilon}, \quad (66)$$

where $\varepsilon = \xi^{2\kappa}$. If we define constants, $c := 2(1 - \varepsilon)^{\frac{1}{\kappa} - 1}$, $\rho := (1 - \varepsilon)^{\frac{1}{\kappa}}$, $d := 4\frac{1 + \varepsilon}{\varepsilon}$, and assume that the fictional scenario initial distribution is the stationary distribution of the MC, $\hat{\mu}_{(n),\star}$, we can rewrite the inequality (66) as follows

$$\left\| \mu_{(n),k} - \hat{\mu}_{(n),\star} \right\|_1 \leq c \cdot \rho^{k-nT} + d \cdot T\alpha_{nT} \quad (67)$$

for all $k \geq nT$. \square

Proof of Proposition 1

The set Δ is compact set by definition as it is a Cartesian product of probability simplexes. Let's consider a convergent sequence $(\pi_n, \mu_n - \pi_n + e_n)_{n=1,2,\dots}$ in the set $\{(\pi_n, y) : y \in F(\pi)\}$, and let $(\pi^*, \mu^* - \pi^* + e^*)$ be the point that the sequence converges to. Given π_n , any μ_n is a fixed and unique value, and it is an element of the compact set that is generated by mapping probability simplex with the continuous soft-max function. Then, for any $\pi^* \in \Delta$, $\mu^* - \pi^*$ is a fixed value within another compact set. Furthermore, the error term must remain within the compact set $e^* \in e$. As a result, $(\pi^*, \mu^* - \pi^* + e^*)$ is also within the set $\{(\pi_n, y) : y \in F(\pi)\}$, and $F : \Delta \rightarrow A^{\sum_{m \in \mathcal{T}} \|\underline{A}^m\|}$ is a closed-set valued map. Therefore, the condition (i) is satisfied.

Given a $\pi \in \Delta$, $\mu_\star \in \Delta$ is a fixed value corresponding to the smoothed best responses to $\pi_{\{m \in \mathcal{T}\}}^{-m}$. Hence, $\mu_\star - \pi$ is a fixed value for a given π . Note that each $e^m \in e$ is a non-empty, bounded, closed and convex subset of $\mathbb{R}^{\sum_{m \in \mathcal{T}} \|\underline{A}^m\|}$. Therefore, for any given $\pi \in \Delta$, $F(\pi) = \mu_\star - \pi + e$ is a non-empty, compact, convex subset of $\mathbb{R}^{\sum_{m \in \mathcal{T}} \|\underline{A}^m\|}$. As a result, (ii) is also satisfied. The function F is bounded such that

$$\sup_{y \in F(x)} \|y\|_1 \leq \sup_{\pi \in \Delta} \|\pi\|_1 + \sup_{\mu \in \Delta} \|\mu\|_1 + \sup \|e\| \leq 2M + M \left(\frac{1}{T} \frac{1}{1 - \rho} + K^m(\delta) \right). \quad (68)$$

Hence, it satisfies the condition (iii). Since all three conditions are satisfied, F is a Marchaud Map according to the Definition 2. \square

Proof of Proposition 2

Observe that, by definition, all L^m are non-negative, therefore, L as well. Now, let's consider the time derivative of L by using envelope theorem

$$\frac{d}{dt} (L(\pi)) = \sum_{m \in \mathcal{T}} \left(\left(\sum_{\ell \in \zeta^m} (\mu_\star^m)^T \Phi^{m\ell} \dot{\pi}^\ell \right) \right). \quad (69)$$

Then, we use the differential inclusion formulation (34)

$$\frac{d}{dt} (L(\pi)) = \sum_{m \in \mathcal{T}} \left(-L^m(\pi) + \tau \mathcal{H}(\mu_\star^m) + \sum_{\ell \in \zeta^m} (\mu_\star^m)^T \Phi^{m\ell} e^\ell \right) \quad (70)$$

$$\leq -L(\pi) + \sum_{m \in \mathcal{T}} \left(\tau \mathcal{H}(\mu_\star^m) + \sum_{\ell \in \zeta^m} (\mu_\star^m)^T \Phi^{m\ell} e^\ell \right), \quad (71)$$

Since μ_\star^m is a probability distribution, we can find an upper bound Ξ on the inner summation in (70) as

$$\sum_{\ell \in \zeta^m} (\mu_\star^m)^T \Phi^{m\ell} e^\ell \leq \sum_{\ell \in \zeta^m} \|\Phi^{m\ell} e^\ell\|_1 \leq \zeta^m \|\Phi\|_1 \|e^\ell\|_1 \leq \zeta^m \|\Phi\|_1 \left(\frac{1}{T} \frac{1}{1 - \rho} + K^m(\delta) \right) = \Xi \quad (72)$$

The entropy function $\mathcal{H}(\mu_x^m)$ is bounded from above with $\log(|\underline{A}^m|)$, and as a result, (72) yields that, the inequality (70) can be written as

$$\frac{d}{dt}(L(\pi)) \leq -L(\pi) + \frac{C}{T} + DK(\delta) + \tau H. \quad (73)$$

Then, we choose our Lyapunov function V as

$$V(\pi) = \left[L(\pi) - \frac{C}{T} - DK(\delta) - \tau H \right]_+, \quad (74)$$

where C, D are constants, and $[f(x)]_+$ is defined as

$$[f(x)]_+ = \begin{cases} f(x) & , \text{ if } f(x) \geq 0 \\ 0 & , \text{ if } f(x) < 0 \end{cases} \quad (75)$$

Then, for any trajectory of the flow starting from π , i.e., $\varphi_t(\pi)$, (73) and (74) yields to the following results,

$$V(y) < V(\pi) \quad \text{if } V(\pi) > 0 \quad \forall y \in \varphi_t(\pi), \quad (76)$$

$$V(y) = V(\pi) = 0 \quad \text{if } V(\pi) = 0 \quad \forall y \in \varphi_t(\pi). \quad (77)$$

Therefore, $V(\pi)$ is a valid Lyapunov function. \square

References

- G. Arslan, M. F. Demirkol, and Y. Song. Equilibrium efficiency improvement in MIMO interference systems: A decentralized stream control approach. *IEEE Transactions on Wireless Communications*, 6(8):2984–2993, 2007.
- M. Benaïm, J. Hofbauer, and S. Sorin. Stochastic approximations and differential inclusions. *SIAM J. Control Optim*, 44(1):328–348, 2005.
- L. M. Bergman and I. N. Fokin. On separable non-cooperative zero-sum games. *Optimization*, 44(1):69–84, 1998.
- L. E. Blume. The statistical mechanics of strategic interaction. *Games Econom. Behav.*, 5(3):387–424, 1993.
- Y. Cai and C. Daskalakis. On minmax theorems for multiplayer games. In *Proceedings of the 22nd Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms*, pages 217–234. SIAM, 2011.
- Y. Cai, O. Candogan, C. Daskalakis, and C. Papadimitriou. Zero-sum polymatrix games: A generalization of minmax. *Math. Oper. Res*, 41(2):648–655, 2016.
- A. Cardenas, S. Amin, B. Sinopoli, A. Giani, A. Perrig, S. Sastry, et al. Challenges for securing cyber physical systems. In *Workshop on Future Directions in Cyber-physical Systems Security*, volume 5, page 7, 2009.
- L. Carminati, F. Cacciamani, M. Ciccone, and N. Gatti. A marriage between adversarial team games and 2-player games: Enabling abstractions, no-regret learning, and subgame solving. In *Int. Conf. Machine Learn. (ICML)*, pages 2638–2657. PMLR, 2022.
- A. Celli and N. Gatti. Computational results for extensive-form adversarial team games. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 32, 2018.
- V. do Nascimento Silva and L. Chaimowicz. MOBA: A new arena for game AI. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1705.10443*, 2017.
- G. Farina, A. Celli, N. Gatti, and T. Sandholm. Ex ante coordination and collusion in zero-sum multi-player extensive-form games. *Advances in Neural Inform. Process. (NeurIPS)*, 31, 2018.
- D. Fudenberg and D. M. Kreps. Learning mixed equilibria. *Games Econom. Behav.*, 5(3):320–367, 1993.
- D. Fudenberg and D. K. Levine. Learning and equilibrium. *Annual Rev. Econ.*, 1(1):385–420, 2009.
- J. Hofbauer and W. H. Sandholm. On the global convergence of stochastic fictitious play. *Econometrica*, 70(6):2265–2294, 2002.
- M. Jaderberg, W. M. Czarnecki, I. Dunning, L. Marris, G. Lever, A. G. Castaneda, C. Beattie, N. C. Rabinowitz, A. S. Morcos, A. Ruderman, et al. Human-level performance in 3d multiplayer games with population-based reinforcement learning. *Science*, 364(6443):859–865, 2019.
- F. Kalogiannis and I. Panageas. Zero-sum polymatrix Markov games: Equilibrium collapse and efficient computation of nash equilibria. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.14329*, 2023.

- F. Kalogiannis, I. Panageas, and E-V. Vlatakis-Gkaragkounis. Towards convergence to nash equilibria in two-team zero-sum games. In *Internat. Conf. Learning Representations (ICLR)*, 2022.
- H. Kitano, M. Asada, Y. Kuniyoshi, I. Noda, E. Osawa, and H. Matsubara. Robocup: A challenge problem for AI. *AI magazine*, 18(1):73–73, 1997.
- E. Koutsoupias and C. Papadimitriou. Worst-case equilibria. In *Annual Symposium on Theoretical Aspects of Computer Science*, pages 404–413. Springer, 1999.
- D. A. Levin and Y. Peres. *Markov Chains and Mixing Times*. American Mathematical Society, 2nd edition, 2017.
- J. R. Marden and J. S. Shamma. Revisiting log-linear learning: Asynchrony, completeness and payoff-based implementation. *Games Econom. Behav.*, 75(2):788–808, 2012.
- D. Monderer and L. S. Shapley. Potential games. *Games Econom. Behav.*, 14(1):124–143, 1996.
- A. Ozdaglar, M. O. Sayin, and K. Zhang. Independent learning in stochastic games. In *Proc. of the International Congress of Mathematicians*, volume 7, pages 5340–5373, 2022.
- C. Park, K. Zhang, and A. Ozdaglar. Multi-player zero-sum Markov games with networked separable interactions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.09470*, 2023.
- S. Perkins and D. S. Leslie. Asynchronous stochastic approximation with differential inclusions. *Stochastic Systems*, 2(2):409–446, 2013.
- G. Probo. Multi-team games in adversarial settings: Ex-ante coordination and independent team members algorithms. Master’s thesis, Politecnico di Milano, 2018.
- M. O. Sayin and O. Unlu. Logit-Q dynamics for efficient learning in stochastic teams. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.09806*, 2023.
- Y. Shoham, R. Powers, and T. Grenager. If multi-agent learning is the answer, what is the question? *Artificial Intelligence*, 171:365–377, 2007.
- T. Tatarenko. *Game-theoretic Learning and Distributed Optimization in Memoryless Multi-agent Systems*. Springer, 2017.
- T. Tatarenko. Independent log-linear learning in potential games with continuous actions. *IEEE Trans. on Control of Network Systems*, 5(3):913–923, 2018.
- O. Vinyals, I. Babuschkin, W. M. Czarnecki, M. Mathieu, A. Dudzik, J. Chung, D. H. Choi, R. Powell, T. Ewalds, P. Georgiev, et al. Grandmaster level in StarCraft II using multi-agent reinforcement learning. *Nature*, 575(7782):350–354, 2019.
- Y. Xu, J. Wang, Q. Wu, A. Anpalagan, and Y. D. Yao. Opportunistic spectrum access in cognitive radio networks: Global optimization using local interaction games. *IEEE Journal of Selected Topics in Signal Processing*, 6(2):180–194, 2012.
- B. Zhang, L. Carminati, F. Cacciamani, G. Farina, P. Olivieri, N. Gatti, and T. Sandholm. Subgame solving in adversarial team games. *Advances in Neural Inform. Process. (NeurIPS)*, 35:26686–26697, 2022.

- K. Zhang, Z. Yang, H. Liu, T. Zhang, and T. Başar. Finite-sample analysis of decentralized batch multiagent reinforcement learning with networked agents. *IEEE Trans. on Automatic Control*, 66(12):5925–5940, 2021.
- J. Zheng, Y. Cai, Y. Liu, Y. Xu, B. Duan, and X. Shen. Optimal power allocation and user scheduling in multicell networks: Base station cooperation using a game-theoretic approach. *IEEE Transactions on Wireless Communications*, 13(12):6928–6942, 2014.