

Equilibrium Selection for Multi-agent Reinforcement Learning: A Unified Framework

Runyu (Cathy) Zhang^{*} Jeff Shamma[†] Na Li^{*}

June 14, 2024

Abstract

While there are numerous works in multi-agent reinforcement learning (MARL), most of them focus on designing algorithms and proving convergence to a Nash equilibrium (NE) or other equilibrium such as coarse correlated equilibrium. However, NEs can be non-unique and their performance varies drastically. Thus, it is important to design algorithms that converge to Nash equilibrium with better rewards or social welfare. In contrast, classical game theory literature has extensively studied equilibrium selection for multi-agent learning in normal-form games, demonstrating that decentralized learning algorithms can asymptotically converge to potential-maximizing or Pareto-optimal NEs. These insights motivate this paper to investigate equilibrium selection in the MARL setting. We focus on the stochastic game model, leveraging classical equilibrium selection results from normal-form games to propose a unified framework for equilibrium selection in stochastic games. The proposed framework is highly modular and can extend various learning rules and their corresponding equilibrium selection results from normal-form games to the stochastic game setting.

1 Introduction

Multi-agent systems have numerous real-world applications, including power and energy management [Lagorse et al., 2010, Roche et al., 2010], network routing [Claes et al., 2011, Tao et al., 2001], and robotic swarms [Liu and Wu, 2018, Iñigo-Blasco et al., 2012]. With the recent advancements in reinforcement learning (RL), there has been a growing effort in the design and analysis of multi-agent reinforcement learning (MARL) algorithms. Stochastic games (SGs) serve as a foundational multi-agent model which has been extensively studied in contemporary MARL research. The concept of stochastic games was introduced by Shapley [1953], and subsequent research has developed numerous NE-seeking algorithms, particularly within the RL framework (e.g., Littman [1994], Bowling and Veloso [2000], Shoham et al. [2003], Buşoniu et al. [2010], Lanctot et al. [2017], Zhang et al. [2019]). With advancements in RL theory, recent studies have also explored finite-time iterations and sample complexity for learning Nash equilibria (NE) and other equilibrium concepts such as correlated equilibria (CE) and coarse correlated equilibria (CCE). For example, Zhang et al. [2021], Leonardos et al. [2021], Zhang et al. [2022b] study convergence to Nash equilibrium for Markov potential games. Bai and Jin [2020], Daskalakis et al. [2021], Zhang et al. [2022a] focus on NE-seeking algorithm under the two-player zero-sum setting. Song et al. [2021], Jin et al. [2021] study efficient learning and convergence to CE and CCE for the general-sum game.

However, while this line of research provides valuable insights into MARL, most works on stochastic games focus on designing algorithms and proving convergence to an NE (or CE/CCE). A significant drawback is that NEs can be non-unique, with their performance varying drastically. Less progress has been made in selecting a high-performance NE. Although works such as [Zhang et al., 2023, Chen et al., 2022] attempt to capture performance guarantees in terms of the price of anarchy (PoA), which measures the performance ratio of the worst NE to the Pareto-optimal policy, they primarily

^{*}Harvard University. Email: {runyuzhang@fas.harvard.edu, nali@seas.harvard.edu}

[†]University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. Email: jshamma@illinois.edu

consider worst-case bounds and do not investigate the deliberate design of algorithms to ensure convergence to a high-quality NE.

In contrast, selecting high-quality Nash equilibria (NEs) has been extensively examined in the game theory literature under the normal-form game setting [Foster and Young, 1990, Young, 1993, Samuelson, 1997, Fudenberg and Levine, 2009, Frankel et al., 2003]. One idea of equilibrium selection is that although there are multiple NEs in a normal-form game, only a small subset of them are stable to small perturbations (e.g., mistakes made by players) under certain learning dynamics. These more stable NEs are known as stochastically stable equilibria (SSE), first introduced in Foster and Young [1990], Young [1993]. Building on this line of research, many papers have studied equilibrium selection for different learning dynamics. Specifically, under the potential game assumption, it has been shown that for log-linear learning [Blume, 1993] and its extensions [Marden and Shamma, 2012], only the global maximum of the potential function is stochastically stable. Pradelski and Young [2012] and Marden et al. [2012] further explore the deliberate design of learning dynamics for general-sum games to ensure that only social utility maximizing (Pareto-optimal) equilibria are stochastically stable. Other learning algorithms have also been analyzed, including fictitious play [Monderer and Shapley, 1996], joint strategy fictitious play [Marden et al., 2009a], adaptive play [Young, 1993], and interactive trial and error learning [Young, 2009], among others [Young, 2020, 2004, Marden et al., 2009b]. Notably, these approaches have been applied to practical multi-agent problems such as wind farm control [Marden et al., 2012], vehicle-target assignment problems [Arslan et al., 2007], and network routing [Marden et al., 2009b].

Our contributions. Motivated by the extensive research on equilibrium selection in normal-form games, a natural follow-up question is whether these concepts can be leveraged in MARL. In this paper, we introduce a unified and modular framework for equilibrium selection in MARL, specifically focusing on stochastic games. Our framework takes an actor-critic type structure, where the critic estimates the Q -functions of the SG, and the actor applies classical learning algorithms in normal-form games with respect to the Q -functions. The proposed framework is highly modular, allowing for the incorporation of various learning rules from normal-form games and the application of their equilibrium selection results to stochastic games. This modularity ensures flexible adaptation and application across different scenarios. Specifically, our results enable the design of multi-agent learning algorithms where only potential-maximizing or utility-maximizing policies are stochastically stable, thereby providing a systematic approach to developing algorithms that converge to high-performance equilibria. For example, an immediate corollary of our result is that log-linear learning can asymptotically converge to the potential-maximizing policies for Markov potential games (MPGs). This offers a different perspective compared to the works of Zhang et al. [2021] and Leonardos et al. [2021], which only focus on convergence to a Nash equilibrium for MPGs. Additionally, for general-sum SGs, by incorporating algorithms in the normal-form game setting into our framework, we design an algorithm that guarantees convergence to the utility-maximizing (Pareto optimal) policies.

2 Problem Settings and Preliminaries

2.1 The stochastic game model

We consider the following stochastic game (SG) model $\mathcal{M} := \{\mathcal{S}, \{\mathcal{A}\}_{i=1}^n, P, r, \rho, H\}$, where there are n agents, and H is the horizon of the Markov game. $s_h \in \mathcal{S}$ is the state at horizon h and $a_{i,h} \in \mathcal{A}_i$ is the local action of agent i . We denote the global action as the concatenation of local actions, i.e., $a_h = \{a_{1,h}, \dots, a_{n,h}\}$, and thus $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}_1 \times \dots \times \mathcal{A}_n$. P denotes the state transition probabilities, where next state $s_{i,h+1}$ is determined by the current state s_h and action a_h , i.e. $s_{h+1} \sim P_h(\cdot | s_h, a_h)$. At horizon h , the stage reward is $r_h : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \rightarrow [0, 1]$. ρ is the initial local state distribution. A stochastic policy $\pi = \{\pi_h : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \Delta(\mathcal{A})\}_{h=1}^H$ (where $\Delta(\mathcal{A})$ is the probability simplex over \mathcal{A}) specifies a strategy in which agents choose their actions based on the current state in a stochastic fashion. Throughout this paper, we use $[n]$ to denote the set $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$. We also use the notation $-i$ to denote the set of all agents except for agent i , i.e. $[n] \setminus i$. For two integers h, h' such that $h \leq h'$, the notation $h : h'$ is used to denote the set $\{h, h+1, \dots, h'\}$.

Given a policy π , we define the value function as well as Q function as:

$$V_{i,h}^\pi(s) := \mathbb{E}^\pi \left[\sum_{h'=h}^H r_{i,h'}(s_{h'}, a_{h'}) \mid s_h = s \right], \quad Q_{i,h}^\pi(s, a) := \mathbb{E}^\pi \left[\sum_{h'=h}^H r_{i,h'}(s_{h'}, a_{h'}) \mid s_h = s, a_h = a \right].$$

We would also like to note that the value of $V_{i,h}^\pi$ only depends on $\pi_{h:H}$ and that $Q_{i,h}^\pi$ depends on $\pi_{h+1:H}$. Thus, in circumstances where it needs more accurate specifications, we also write $V_{i,h}^\pi$ as $V_{i,h}^{\pi_{h:H}}$ and $Q_{i,h}^\pi$ as $Q_{i,h}^{\pi_{h+1:H}}$.

Given the definition of Q -functions, we are now ready to define the Markov perfect Nash equilibrium.

Definition 1 (Markov perfect (Pure Nash) equilibrium (MPE)). *A deterministic policy π^* is called a Markov perfect equilibrium (MPE) if and only if for all $i \in [n]$, $h \in [H]$, $s \in \mathcal{S}$, the following inequality holds*

$$Q_{i,h}^\pi(s, a^*) > Q_{i,h}^\pi(s, a_i, a_{-i}^*), \quad \forall a_i \neq a_i^*,$$

where a^* is the action such that $\pi^*(a^*|s) = 1$. We also denote the set of MPEs as Π_{MPE} .

Informal statement of the main result - equilibrium selection for SGs. Our primary focus, as stated in the introduction, is equilibrium selection for SGs. The key insight is to leverage equilibrium selection results from normal-form games (detailed in Section 2.2) to establish a framework for SGs. Our algorithm, introduced in Section 3, comprises two steps: estimating the Q -function (critic) and applying learning rules from normal-form games with respect to the Q -function (actor). This algorithm provides a unified framework, as substituting different learning rules from the normal-form game setting will yield corresponding results in the SG setting. For instance, Table 1 gives a high-level summary of three different algorithms and their respective outcomes. Detailed statements and interpretations of the results are provided in later sections. We now introduce the related notions in Table 1 in more detail.¹

Table 1: Equilibrium selection

Learning Rule	Result for normal-form game	Result for Stochastic Game
log-linear learning	Potential maximizing (Potential game)	Potential maximizing (MPG)
Pradelski and Young [2012]	Pareto optimal Pure NE	Pareto optimal MPE
Marden et al. [2012]	Pareto optimal	Pareto optimal

Definition 2 (Pareto optimal policy and Pareto optimal MPE). *A policy π^* is a Pareto optimal policy if it maximizes the social utility, i.e., $\sum_{i=1}^n V_{i,h}^{\pi^*}(s) \geq \sum_{i=1}^n V_{i,h}^\pi(s) \forall \pi, h \in [H], s \in \mathcal{S}$.*

Similarly, a policy π^ said to be a Pareto optimal MPE if $\sum_{i=1}^n V_{i,h}^{\pi^*}(s) \geq \sum_{i=1}^n V_{i,h}^\pi(s) \forall \pi \in \Pi_{\text{MPE}}$.*

Potential game (which we will define in the later section, Definition 9) is a well-studied subclass of the normal-form game in equilibrium selection. The definition of Markov potential game (MPG) is an extension of the potential game in the normal-form game setting.

Definition 3 (Markov potential game (MPG)). *A stochastic game is called a Markov potential game (MPG) if there exists functions $\{\phi_h\}_{h \in [H]}$, $\phi_h : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that the following function*

$$\Phi_h^\pi(s, a) := \mathbb{E}^\pi \left[\sum_{h'=h}^H \phi_{h'}(s_{h'}, a_{h'}) \mid s_h = s, a_h = a \right]$$

satisfy the equation $\Phi_h^\pi(s, a_i, a'_{-i}) - \Phi_h^\pi(s, a_i, a_{-i}) = Q_{i,h}^\pi(s, a_i, a'_{-i}) - Q_{i,h}^\pi(s, a_i, a_{-i})$ for any policy π and agent i as well as action a . The function Φ_h^π is called the total potential function and ϕ is the stage potential function.

¹The work in [Pradelski and Young, 2012, Marden et al., 2012] is for general-sum game under the interdependence assumption (Appendix A.1)

Definitions of MPG also exist in the literature for the setting of continuous state and action spaces Macua et al. [2018] as well as infinite-horizon discounted case SGs Zhang et al. [2021], Leonardos et al. [2021]. Due to the difference in the settings, the definition is also slightly different compared with these works. However, one aspect in common is that identical interest SG always serves as an important special case of MPG.

Given the definition of MPG, we can define the potential maximizing policy as follows.

Definition 4 (Potential-maximizing policy). *In this paper, the potential policy is only defined for MPGs (Definition 3). For a MPG with total potential function Φ_h^π , the potential-maximizing policy π^* is the policy such that $\Phi_h^{\pi^*}(s, a) \geq \Phi_h^\pi(s, a)$, $\forall s \in \mathcal{S}, a \in \mathcal{A}$ holds for all policy π .*

2.2 Equilibrium selection for normal-form games

The normal-form game is captured by the reward functions $\{r_i : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}\}_{i=1}^n$, where r_i is the reward of agent i and $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}_1 \times \dots \times \mathcal{A}_n$ is the action space. For equilibrium selection, people generally consider the setting where the group of agents follows certain *iterative* learning rules that describe how agents respond to the reward outcome from the previous action. To assist the learning, the iterative process sometimes includes some other auxiliary variables. Mathematically, a learning rule can be in general described by a Markov chain:

$$(a^{(t+1)}, \xi^{(t+1)}) \sim K^\epsilon(\cdot, \cdot | a^{(t)}, \xi^{(t)}),$$

where the transition kernel K^ϵ is defined on the action space \mathcal{A} and an auxiliary variable space \mathcal{E} , and $a^{(t)}, \xi^{(t)}$ stands for the action and auxiliary variables at iteration t , respectively. Here the parameter ϵ in the transition kernel represents the ‘rate of mistakes’, where we assume that agents does not respond fully rational and accurate towards their observation of the reward outcome. We will use the following example, log-linear learning, which is one of the most popular algorithms analyzed in equilibrium selection, to further illustrate the role of ϵ .

Example 1 (Log-linear learning [Blume, 1993, Marden and Shamma, 2012]). *For log-linear learning, there’s no hidden variable, i.e., $\mathcal{E} = \emptyset$, and the algorithm is defined by the following transition probability kernel K^ϵ*

$$K^\epsilon \left(a^{(t+1)} = (a_{-i}^{(t)}, a_i^{(t+1)}) | a^{(t)}; \{r_i\}_{i=1}^n \right) = \frac{1}{n} \frac{\epsilon^{-r_i(a^{(t+1)})}}{\sum_{a_i} \epsilon^{-r_i(a_i, a_{-i}^{(t)})}}. \quad (1)$$

In Example 1, as the rate of mistakes ϵ goes to zero, the learning rule will converge to the *best-response* strategy. Note that although the Markov chain induced by the best-response strategy is not ergodic and can have multiple stationary distributions (e.g. all strict NEs are stationary), by adding the rate of mistakes ϵ , the Markov chain is ergodic and has a unique stationary distribution. We also provide another example for better illustration of the hidden variable ξ .

Example 2 ([Marden et al., 2012]). *For the learning rule in [Marden et al., 2012], the hidden variable ξ takes the form $\xi = (\xi_1, \xi_2, \dots, \xi_n)$, where $\xi_i \in \{C, D\}$ represents the ‘mood’ of agent i , with C represents Content and D represents Discontent. Given $a_i^{(t)}, \xi_i^{(t)}$, the update for $a_i^{(t+1)}$ is given by:*

- If $\xi_i^{(t)} = D$, then $a_i^{(t+1)}$ is uniform randomly selected from \mathcal{A}_i .
- If $\xi_i^{(t)} = C$, then with probability $p = 1 - \epsilon^c$, $a_i^{(t+1)} = a_i^{(t)}$, with probability ϵ^c , $a_i^{(t+1)}$ is uniform randomly selected from $\mathcal{A}_i \setminus \{a_i^{(t)}\}$,

where the parameter c is a constant that $c \geq n$. Given $a^{(t+1)}$, the update for $\xi_i^{(t+1)}$ is given by

- If $\xi_i^{(t)} = C$ and $a^{(t+1)} = a^{(t)}$, then $\xi_i^{(t+1)} = C$.
- Otherwise, $\xi_i^{(t+1)} = C$ with probability $\epsilon^{1-r_i(a^{(t+1)})}$ (else, $\xi_i^{(t+1)} = D$).

In general, in this paper, we make the following ergodicity assumptions for K^ϵ ,

Assumption 1 (Ergodicity). *For any given $\epsilon > 0$, and any set of reward $\{r_i : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}\}_{i=1}^n$, the Markov chain induced by the transition kernel $K^\epsilon(a^{(t+1)}, \xi^{(t+1)} | a^{(t)}, \xi^{(t)}; \{r_i\}_{i=1}^n)$ is ergodic.*

Definition 5 (Stationary distribution π^ϵ). *Given Assumption 1, we know that the Markov chain K^ϵ induces a unique stationary distribution on $\mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{E}$, which we denote as $\pi^\epsilon(\cdot, \cdot)$. Without causing confusion, we also overload the notation $\pi^\epsilon(a)$ to denote the marginal stationary distribution on \mathcal{A} , i.e. $\pi^\epsilon(a) = \sum_{\xi \in \mathcal{E}} \pi^\epsilon(a, \xi)$.*

We are now ready to discuss equilibrium selection in detail. One idea of equilibrium selection is that although there are multiple NEs in a normal-form game, some equilibria are more stable than others when the learning process has mistakes. These more stable NEs are known as stochastically stable equilibria (SSE) Foster and Young [1990], Young [1993]. For instance, although all strict NEs are stationary under the best response, interestingly, as the rate of mistakes ϵ in the log-linear learning rule (1) goes to zero, π^ϵ will only have support on a limited subset of the NEs, which are the SSE.

Definition 6 (Stochastically stable equilibrium (SSE) [Foster and Young, 1990, Young, 1993]). *The stochastically stable equilibria of a learning rule K^ϵ are actions a^* such that $\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \pi^\epsilon(a^*) > 0$*

To calculate the SSE given a normal-form game $\{r_i\}_{i=1}^n$, we first define the resistance and stochastic potential of the normal-form game. We make the following assumption of the learning rule:

Assumption 2. *For any pair of $(a, \xi), (a', \xi')$, we have that there exists a constant $R((a, \xi) \rightarrow (a', \xi'))$ and $C_1, C_2 > 0$, such that*

$$C_1 \epsilon^{R((a, \xi) \rightarrow (a', \xi'))} < K^\epsilon(a', \xi' | a, \xi; \{r_i\}_{i=1}^n) < C_2 \epsilon^{R((a, \xi) \rightarrow (a', \xi'))}$$

Definition 7 (Resistance). *The constant $R((a, \xi) \rightarrow (a', \xi'))$ is called as the resistance of the transition $(a, \xi) \rightarrow (a', \xi')$ under transition kernel $K^\epsilon(\cdot | \cdot; \{r_i\}_{i=1}^n)$.*

Additionally, we can construct a graph given the resistance of transitions, where the weight of the directed edge $(a, \xi) \rightarrow (a', \xi')$ is given by $R((a, \xi) \rightarrow (a', \xi'))$. Given a set of edges T in the directed graph, the resistances of these edges are given by the sum of the resistance of edges, i.e.

$$R(T) := \sum_{a \rightarrow a' \in T} R(a \rightarrow a').$$

Note that when $\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} K^\epsilon(a, \xi' | a, \xi; \{r_i\}_{i=1}^n) > 0$, then the resistance $R((a, \xi) \rightarrow (a', \xi')) = 0$. If $K^\epsilon(a, \xi' | a, \xi; \{r_i\}_{i=1}^n) = 0$ for all ϵ , then the resistance $R((a, \xi) \rightarrow (a', \xi')) = +\infty$.

Given the definition of resistance, we are ready to define the stochastic potential. We first define the spanning tree rooted at vertex (a, ξ) as follows. A spanning tree, rooted at vertex (a, ξ) (or a (a, ξ) -tree) is a set of $|\mathcal{A}||\mathcal{E}| - 1$ directed edges such that from every vertex different from (a, ξ) , there is a unique directed path in the tree to (a, ξ) . We denote the set of (a, ξ) -trees as $\mathcal{T}(a, \xi)$.

Definition 8 (Stochastic potential). *The stochastic potential $\gamma(a, \xi)$ of an action a and a hidden variable ξ is defined as:*

$$\gamma(a, \xi) := \min_{T \in \mathcal{T}(a, \xi)} R(T)$$

We also use the notation $\gamma(a, \xi; \{r_i\}_{i=1}^n)$ to specify that the stochastic potential is with respect to the game $\{r_i\}_{i=1}^n$.

The following theorem points out that the SSEs minimize the stochastic potential

Theorem 1 ([Foster and Young, 1990, Young, 1993]). *An action $a^* \in \mathcal{A}$ is the SSE of a normal-form game $\{r_i\}_{i=1}^n$ and learning rule K^ϵ if and only if there exists a hidden variable $\xi^* \in \mathcal{E}$ such that a^*, ξ^* minimizes the stochastic potential, i.e., $\gamma(a^*, \xi^*) = \min_{a, \xi} \gamma(a, \xi)$. Further, for any pair of $(a, \xi), (a', \xi')$, there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that*

$$\frac{\pi^\epsilon(a, \xi)}{\pi^\epsilon(a', \xi')} < C \epsilon^{\gamma(a, \xi) - \gamma(a', \xi')}$$

Theorem 1 is very useful for capturing the SSE of different learning rules. For example, for potential games (defined below), classical results show that the stochastic potential γ is closely related to the potential function ϕ .

Definition 9 (Potential game). *A normal-form game $\{r_i\}_{i=1}^n$ is called a potential game if there exists a potential function $\phi : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that the following equation holds for any agent i .*

$$\phi(a_i, a_{-i}) - \phi(a_i, a'_{-i}) = r_i(a_i, a_{-i}) - r_i(a_i, a'_{-i}), \quad \forall a_i, a'_i \in \mathcal{A}_i, a_{-i} \in \mathcal{A}_{-i}.$$

Thus we can obtain the following corollary.

Corollary 1 ([Blume, 1993, Marden and Shamma, 2012]). *For potential games, under log-linear learning (Example 1), the SSEs are the potential maximizing actions a^* such that $a^* \in \arg \max_a \phi(a)$. Further, the stationary distribution π^ϵ satisfies*

$$\frac{\pi^\epsilon(a)}{\pi^\epsilon(a')} < C\epsilon^{\phi(a') - \phi(a)}.$$

Further, for the learning rule in Example 2, we can show that the SSE is pareto-optimal.

Corollary 2 (Marden et al. [2012]). *For general-sum normal-form games, under certain interdependence assumption (see Appendix A.1), the SSEs of the learning rule in Example 2 are Pareto-optimal (which are not necessarily NEs), i.e., a^* is a SSE if and only if*

$$a^* \in \arg \max_a \sum_{i=1}^n r_i(a)$$

Here we also provide another learning rule whose SSE is the Pareto-optimal NE. For the sake of compactness, we defer the detailed learning rule in Appendix A.2.

Example and Corollary 3 (Pradelski and Young [2012]). *If a general-sum game has at least one pure NE, then under the same interdependence assumption as in Corollary 5, the learning rule in [Pradelski and Young, 2012] guarantees that SSEs are the Nash equilibria that are Pareto-optimal, i.e., a^* is a SSE if and only if*

$$a^* \in \arg \max_{a \text{ is a pure NE}} \sum_{i=1}^n r_i(a)$$

3 Equilibrium selection for stochastic games: a unified framework

Given the promising results of equilibrium selection in normal-form games, a natural next step is to extend this approach to stochastic games. In this paper, we present a unified framework that leverages the learning rules K^ϵ from the normal-form game setting as foundational components for solving stochastic games. This framework's modularity is particularly appealing, allowing us to derive different outcomes by simply incorporating various learning rules.

The algorithm is outlined in Algorithm 1. The core idea is to apply the learning rule K^ϵ independently at each stage h and state s . Here, $a_h^t(s)$ and $\xi_h^t(s)$ denote the action and hidden variable at iteration t , stage h , and state s , respectively. The algorithm comprises two main steps: the actor (step 1) and the critic (step 2). The critic updates the variables $Q_{i,h}^t(s, a)$ using a Bellman-like iteration, while the actor applies the learning rule K^ϵ , substituting the reward $\{r_i\}_{i=1}^n$ in the normal-form game with the values $\{Q_{i,h}^t(s, \cdot)\}_{i=1}^n$ computed by the critic instead.

Definition 10 (Notation $\pi^{(t)}$ and π^ϵ). *We use the notation $\pi_h^{(t)}(\cdot, \cdot | s)$ to denote the joint probability distribution of $a_h^{(t)}(s), \xi_h^{(t)}(s)$. We also overload the notation $\pi_h^{(t)}$ to also denote the marginal distribution on $a_h^{(t)}(s)$, i.e. $\pi_h^{(t)}(a | s) = \sum_{\xi \in \mathcal{E}} \pi_h^{(t)}(a, \xi | s)$. If the limitation exists we also denote the stationary distribution as $\pi_h^\epsilon(a, \xi | s) := \lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \pi_h^{(t)}(a, \xi | s)$, $\pi_h^\epsilon(a | s) := \lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \pi_h^{(t)}(a | s)$.*

We are now ready to present our main theorem, which analyzes the stochastically stable policy of Algorithm 1 and extends the equilibrium selection theorem (Theorem 1) to the SG setting.

Algorithm 1 Unified Learning Framework

Require: Initialization $Q_{i,h}^{(0)}(s,a) = r_{i,h}(s,a)$, $V_{i,H+1}^{(t)}(s) = 0$, for all $h \in [H], i \in [N], s \in \mathcal{S}, a \in \mathcal{A}, t \geq 0$. Randomly initialize $a_h^{(0)}(s) \in \mathcal{A}, \xi_h^{(0)}(s) \in \mathcal{E}$.

for $t = 0, 1, \dots$ **do**

for $h = H, H-1, \dots, 1$ **do**

 Step 1 (Actor): Let $a_h^{(t+1)}(s), \xi_h^{(t+1)}(s) \sim K^\epsilon(\cdot, \cdot | a_h^{(t)}(s), \xi_h^{(t)}(s); \{Q_{i,h}^{(t)}(s, \cdot)\}_{i=1}^n)$

 Step 2 (Critic): Calculate $V_{i,h}^{(t+1)}, Q_{i,h}^{(t+1)}$ for all $i \in [n], h \in [H]$ as follows:

$$V_{i,h}^{(t+1)}(s) = \frac{t}{t+1} V_{i,h}^{(t)}(s) + \frac{1}{t+1} Q_{i,h}^{(t)}(s, a_h^{(t)}(s)) \quad \left(\text{i.e. } V_{i,h}^{(t+1)}(s) = \frac{\sum_{\tau=1}^{t+1} Q_{i,h}^{(\tau)}(s, a_h^{(\tau)}(s))}{t+1} \right)$$

$$Q_{i,h}^{(t+1)}(s,a) = r_{i,h}(s,a) + \sum_{s'} P_h(s'|s,a) V_{i,h+1}^{(t+1)}(s')$$

end for

end for

Theorem 2. *Suppose that the learning rule K^ϵ considered in Algorithm 1 satisfies Assumption 1 and 2, then the stationary distribution π^ϵ (defined in Definition 10) exists. Further, $\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \pi^\epsilon = \pi^*$ exists, and that $\pi_h^*(\cdot|s)$ only has support on actions such that $\exists \xi \in \mathcal{E}$ such that (a, ξ) minimizes the potential $\gamma(a, \xi; \{Q_{i,h}^{\pi_{h+1:H}^*}(s, \cdot)\}_{i=1}^n)$ (Definition 8), i.e.*

$$\gamma(a, \xi; \{Q_{i,h}^{\pi_{h+1:H}^*}(s, \cdot)\}_{i=1}^n) = \min_{a', \xi'} \gamma(a', \xi'; \{Q_{i,h}^{\pi_{h+1:H}^*}(s, \cdot)\}_{i=1}^n).$$

Theorem 2 may initially appear abstract and challenging to interpret. To give a better illustration of the theorem, we present the following different corollaries that apply Theorem 2 to different learning rules (Example 1, 2 and 3). A detailed proof sketch and explanation of Theorem 2 and its implications are provided in the next section.

Corollary 4. *For a MPG (Definition 3), if the learning rule K^ϵ in Algorithm 1 is chosen as log-linear learning (Example 1), then π^* defined in Theorem 2 is a potential-maximizing policy (Definition 4).*

Corollary 5. *For a general sum SG, if the learning rule K^ϵ in Algorithm 1 is chosen as Example 2 and under certain interdependence assumption (see Assumption 3 in Appendix C), π^* defined in Theorem 2 is a Pareto optimal policy (Definition 2).*

Corollary 6. *For a general sum SG, if the learning rule K^ϵ in Algorithm 1 is chosen as Example 3, and if there exists at least one MPE, then under the interdependence assumption (see Assumption 3 in Appendix C), π^* defined in Theorem 2 is a Pareto optimal MPE (Definition 2).*

Remark 1. *Corollary 4,5,6 produce similar stochastically stable outcomes compared with their counterparts in the normal form setting, demonstrating the modularity and convenience of our framework. However, it also highlights a limitation: the strength of our results is contingent upon the strength of the corresponding normal-form game results. If the results for the normal-form game rely on certain assumptions (e.g., the potential game assumption or the interdependence assumptions), the corresponding results for the stochastic game will hold only under the same assumptions. Furthermore, since our algorithm applies learning rules at each stage h and state s , the assumptions must hold for each stage and state accordingly.*

Fully sample-based algorithm Note that Algorithm 1 is still restrictive because the update of the critic (step 2) still requires knowledge of the true transition probability $P_h(s'|s,a)$. However, we would like to point out that our algorithm framework as well as theoretical analysis can be extended to fully sample-based learning. For the sake of compactness, here we only provide the sample-based algorithm in Algorithm 2 but defer the theory and proof into Appendix F.

Algorithm 2 Sample-based Unified Learning Framework

Require: Initialization $Q_{i,h}^{(0)}(s,a) = r_{i,h}(s,a)$, $V_{i,H+1}^{(t)}(s) = 0$, for all $h \in [H], i \in [N], s \in \mathcal{S}, a \in \mathcal{A}, t \geq 0$. Randomly initialize $a_h^{(0)}(s) \in \mathcal{A}, \xi_h^{(0)}(s) \in \mathcal{E}$. Set the initial count $N_h(s,a) = 0$ for all $h \in [H], s \in \mathcal{S}, a \in \mathcal{A}$.

for $t = 0, 1, \dots$ **do**

for $h = H, H-1, \dots, 1$ **do**

 Step 1 (Actor): Let $a_h^{(t+1)}(s), \xi_h^{(t+1)}(s) \sim K^\epsilon(\cdot | a_h^{(t)}(s), \xi_h^{(t)}(s); \{Q_{i,h}^{(t)}(s, \cdot)\}_{i=1}^n)$

 Step 2 (Sample): Randomly sample $\bar{s}_1^{(t+1)} \in \mathcal{S}$, then sample the trajectory $\bar{s}_1^{(t+1)}, \bar{a}_1^{(t+1)}, \bar{s}_2^{(t+1)}, \dots, \bar{a}_{H-1}^{(t+1)}, \bar{s}_H^{(t+1)}$ using the policy $\bar{a}_h^{(t+1)} := a_h^{(t+1)}(\bar{s}_h^{(t+1)})$.

 Update $N_h(\bar{s}_h^{(t+1)}, \bar{a}_h^{(t+1)}) \leftarrow N_h(\bar{s}_h^{(t+1)}, \bar{a}_h^{(t+1)}) + 1$

 Step 3 (Critic): Calculate $V_{i,h}^{(t+1)}, Q_{i,h}^{(t+1)}$ for all $i \in [n], h \in [H]$ as follows:

$$V_{i,h}^{(t+1)}(s) = \frac{t}{t+1} V_{i,h}^{(t)}(s) + \frac{1}{t+1} Q_{i,h}^{(t)}(s, a_h^{(t)}(s)) \quad \left(\text{i.e. } V_{i,h}^{(t+1)}(s) = \frac{\sum_{\tau=1}^{t+1} Q_{i,h}^{(\tau)}(s, a_h^{(\tau)}(s))}{t+1} \right)$$

$$Q_{i,h}^{(t+1)}(s, a) = \begin{cases} \frac{N_h(s,a)-1}{N_h(s,a)} Q_{i,h}^{(t)}(s, a) + \frac{1}{N_h(s,a)} \left(r_{i,h}(s, a) + V_{i,h+1}^{(t+1)}(\bar{s}_{h+1}^{(t+1)}) \right), & \text{if } s, a = \bar{s}_h^{(t+1)}, \bar{a}_h^{(t+1)} \\ Q_{i,h}^{(t)}(s, a) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

end for

end for

4 Proof sketches for Theorem 2

Key technical challenge: iteration-varying $\{Q_{i,h}^{(t)}\}_{i=1}^n$. The major technical difficulty in extending the equilibrium selection result from the normal-form game setting to the stochastic game setting is that the learning rule is applied to $\{Q_{i,h}^{(t)}(s, \cdot)\}_{i=1}^n$ instead of $\{r_i\}_{i=1}^n$. Notice that $Q_{i,h}^{(t)}(s, \cdot)$ is a random variable that varies with each iteration t , and it is potentially correlated with outputs in the past iterations. Thus the dynamics is more complicated to analyze and we cannot directly apply existing results in the normal-form game setting to solve the problem. In this section, we use the special case of identical interest stochastic game with $H = 2$ and log-linear learning to illustrate the key proof ideas. The full proof and extension to more general settings can be found in the appendix.

To gain intuition: consider two-stage game $H = 2$ To gain an intuition on the convergence property for Algorithm 1, we first consider the stochastic game with only two stages, i.e., $H = 2$. For the sake of illustration, we choose the learning rule to be log-linear learning (Example 1) and the rewards to be identical rewards, i.e. $r_{i,h} = r_h$ for every agent i at every stage $h = 1, 2$. Thus, the Q -function estimations $Q_{i,h}^{(t)}$ are also the same and we denote it as $Q_h^{(t)}$. Also, note that log-linear learning doesn't require hidden variables ($\mathcal{E} = \emptyset$) thus the learning algorithm at stage h and state s is given by $a_h^{(t+1)}(s) \sim K^\epsilon(\cdot | a_h^{(t)}(s); Q_h^{(t)}(s, \cdot))$.

At the last stage $h = H = 2$ and at each state s , we have that $Q_H^{(t)}(s, \cdot) = r_H(s, \cdot)$, i.e. $Q_H^{(t)}$ does not vary with iteration t , thus the dynamic is the same as applying log-linear learning on a normal-form game, with the reward matrix given as $r_H(s, \cdot)$. Hence we can apply the results in the normal-form game setting and conclude that the stationary distribution $\pi^\epsilon_H(\cdot | s)$ exists for $a_H^{(t)}(s)$. Additionally, we can apply the concentration lemmas of the Markov chain at the second stage to conclude that

$$V_H^{(t+1)}(s) = \frac{\sum_{\tau=1}^{t+1} r_H(s, a_h^{(\tau)}(s))}{t+1} \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} V_H^{\pi^\epsilon_H}(s).$$

Thus this gives that for $h = H - 1 = 1$, we have

$$Q_{h=1}^{(t)}(s, a) = r_{h=1}(s, a) + \sum_{s'} P_{h=1}(s' | s, a) V_H^{(t)}(s') \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} r_{h=1}(s, a) + \sum_{s'} P_{h=1}(s' | s, a) V_H^{\pi^\epsilon_H}(s') = Q_{h=1}^{\pi^\epsilon_H}(s, a). \quad (2)$$

At stage $h = 1$, as the previous paragraph on the key technical challenge has pointed out, the problem becomes a bit more complicated because $Q_{h=1}^{(t)}(s, \cdot)$ is a random variable that is iteration-varying. Thus we cannot directly apply the result from the normal-form game setting. However, we can use the useful observation in equation (2) that $Q_{h=1}^{(t)}(s, a) \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} Q_{h=1}^{\pi^\epsilon H}(s, a)$, i.e. although $Q_h^{(t)}$ are random variables that vary w.r.t. t , as t goes to infinity it converges almost surely to a fixed value $Q_h^{\pi^\epsilon H}$. The following lemma serves as a fundamental lemma in the proof.

Lemma 1. *(Informal, formal statement see Lemma 6 in Appendix G) For random variables $Q_{h=1}^{(t)}(s, \cdot)$ that almost surely converges to $Q_{h=1}^{\pi^\epsilon H}(s, \cdot)$, we have that the stationary distribution and the concentration properties of the following random processes $\{a_{h=1}^{(t)}(s)\}, \{a'_{h=1}^{(t)}(s)\}$ in Eq (3) and (4) are the same.*

$$a_{h=1}^{(t+1)}(s) \sim K^\epsilon(\cdot | a_{h=1}^{(t)}(s); Q_{h=1}^{(t)}(s, \cdot)) \quad (3)$$

$$a'_{h=1}^{(t+1)}(s) \sim K^\epsilon(\cdot | a'_{h=1}^{(t)}(s); Q_{h=1}^{\pi^\epsilon H}(s, \cdot)) \quad (4)$$

The above lemma suggests that when considering the asymptotic behavior (e.g. stationary distribution), the original random process $K^\epsilon(\cdot | \cdot; Q_{h=1}^{(t)}(s, \cdot))$ is equivalent to considering the auxiliary process $K^\epsilon(\cdot | \cdot; Q_{h=1}^{\pi^\epsilon H}(s, \cdot))$. Note that for auxiliary process, $Q_{h=1}^{\pi^\epsilon H}(s, \cdot)$ is no longer iteration varying. Thus, we can apply classical results in equilibrium selection (in specific Corollary 1) and obtain the following lemma.

Lemma 2. *For a given state s and horizon h , define a^* such that $Q_h^{\pi^\epsilon}(s, a^*) \in \arg \max_a Q_h^{\pi^\epsilon}(s, a)$. There exists a uniform constant C (with respect to ϵ), such that for any ϵ ,*

$$\pi_{h=1}^\epsilon(a|s) < C e^{-\frac{1}{\epsilon}(Q_h^{\pi^\epsilon H}(s, a^*) - Q_h^{\pi^\epsilon H}(s, a))}, \quad \forall a \in \mathcal{A} \quad (5)$$

$$\pi_{h=2}^\epsilon(a|s) < C e^{-\frac{1}{\epsilon}(r_H(s, a^*) - r_H(s, a))}, \quad \forall a \in \mathcal{A} \quad (6)$$

From Lemma 2, let $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$, then from (6) we can get that for $h = H = 2$, $\pi_h^\epsilon \rightarrow \pi_h^*$, where π_h^* is the optimal policy that maximize the reward, i.e. $\pi_h^*(\cdot | s) \in \arg \max_{\pi_h(\cdot | s)} \sum_a \pi_h(a|s) r_h(s, a)$.

As for $h = 1$, note that from the previous argument, we have that as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$, $Q_h^{\pi^\epsilon H}(s, a) \rightarrow Q_h^{\pi^* H}(s, a)$, thus we can further conclude that $\pi_h^\epsilon \rightarrow \pi_h^*$ where $\pi_h^*(\cdot | s) \in \arg \max_{\pi_h(\cdot | s)} \sum_a \pi_h(a|s) Q_h^{\pi^* H}(s, a)$. Note that the above definitions for π_h^* satisfy the Bellman optimality condition, which allows us to draw the conclusion that π^* is the optimal policy that maximizes the accumulative reward. Thus we have proved the following Theorem 3.

Theorem 3. *Consider an identical interest, 2-stage game with the log-linear learning algorithm, then π^ϵ (Definition 10) exists. Further, as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$, $\pi^\epsilon \rightarrow \pi^*$, where π^* is the global optimal policy.*

Extension to $H > 2$, general-sum games and other learning rules. For the sake of compactness, we defer the extension to general settings to the appendix. The proof idea follows the above discussion, where the key insight is to use Lemma 1 to simplify the analysis.

5 Numerical Illustration

To have a better understanding of Theorem 2, we will start with the following illustrative example. The stochastic game that we consider is an identical interest, two-player, two-action game with two stages $h = 1, 2$. The game captures the process of two players collaboratively digging treasure at two different locations 0 and 1 (Figure 1 (left)). Each location has a shallow level and a deep level, and it requires the players to collaboratively dig at the same location to make progress. Location 0 has reward 1 at the shallow level and 0.5 at the deep level; location 1 has reward 0 at the shallow level and 2 at the deep level. The process can be summarized as a stochastic game (the diagram of the SG is deferred to Appendix H.1). For $h = 1$, there's only one state and thus the stage reward is given by a 2 by 2 reward matrix with nonzero reward of value 1 only when $a = (0, 0)$. The transition to the




Figure 1: (Left) Illustration of 2-stage the stochastic game. (Right) Numerical result of running Algorithm 1 with log-linear learning rule (with $\epsilon = 10^{-5}$). The plot demonstrates the evolution of $\pi^{(t)}(a|s)$ (estimated using empirical averaging), where s is the initial state and the yellow line plots the curve for $a = (1, 1)$ and the blue line $a = (0, 0)$. The shaded areas are the 60% confidence interval calculated by 100 runs.

second stage follows the following transition rule, if both players 1 and 2 choose to dig at location 0, i.e. $a_1 = a_2 = 0$, then the game will transit to state $s = A$, where they arrive at the deep level for location 0 and shallow level at location 1 (the reward table is given in Appendix H.1). Similarly, if $a_1 = a_2 = 1$ then the game will transit to $s = B$, where they arrive at the deep level for location 1. Otherwise, if the players fail to agree on a location, i.e., $a = (0, 1)$ or $(1, 0)$ they make no progress ($s = O$) and the reward will remain the same as stage $h = 1$ in this case.

In this game, there are two strict NEs, agreeing on location 0, i.e. both players choosing $a_{i,h} = 0$ for $h = 1, 2$, or agreeing on location 1, where $a_{i,h} = 1$. Note that the second NE is also the global optimal policy that gives a total reward 2 while the first only gives reward 1.5. Theorem 3 suggests that for log-linear learning, the stochastically stable policy is the global optimal policy, thus it should converge to the second instead of the first NE. Our numerical result (Figure 1 (right)) also corroborates the theoretical finding, where we find that the empirical frequency of selecting location 1 will converge to a value close to 1. In Appendix H.2 we also provide additional numerical illustrations for another general-sum example.²

6 Conclusions

In this paper, we have presented a unified and modular framework for equilibrium selection in the multi-agent reinforcement learning (MARL) setting. By leveraging classical equilibrium selection results from normal-form games, we extend these insights to the stochastic game context, providing an adaptable approach for achieving higher-quality equilibria. Our framework’s modularity allows for the seamless integration of various learning rules, demonstrating its flexibility and wide applicability.

Our work admittedly has its limitations. One major drawback is that our results focus primarily on asymptotic guarantees. Important aspects such as convergence rates and sample complexity remain unexplored in our current framework. Addressing these issues is crucial for understanding the practical applicability and efficiency of the proposed algorithms. Additionally, although we managed to obtain asymptotic results for fully sample-based learning, the sample efficiency is not ideal and thus there’s still a gap towards application to practical settings. We leave the investigation of these aspects as future work.

References

- Gürdal Arslan, Jason R Marden, and Jeff S Shamma. Autonomous vehicle-target assignment: A game-theoretical formulation. 2007.
- Yu Bai and Chi Jin. Provable self-play algorithms for competitive reinforcement learning. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 551–560. PMLR, 2020.

²Code implementation: <https://anonymous.4open.science/r/Equilibrium-Selection-for-MARL-AA43>.

- Lawrence E. Blume. The statistical mechanics of strategic interaction. *Games and economic behavior*, 5(3):387–424, 1993. ISBN: 0899-8256 Publisher: Elsevier.
- Michael Bowling and Manuela Veloso. An analysis of stochastic game theory for multiagent reinforcement learning. Technical report, Carnegie-Mellon Univ Pittsburgh Pa School of Computer Science, 2000.
- Lucian Buşoniu, Robert Babuška, and Bart De Schutter. Multi-agent reinforcement learning: An overview. *Innovations in multi-agent systems and applications-1*, pages 183–221, 2010.
- Dingyang Chen, Qi Zhang, and Thinh T Doan. Convergence and price of anarchy guarantees of the softmax policy gradient in markov potential games. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2206.07642*, 2022.
- Rutger Claes, Tom Holvoet, and Danny Weyns. A decentralized approach for anticipatory vehicle routing using delegate multiagent systems. *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems*, 12(2):364–373, 2011.
- Constantinos Daskalakis, Dylan J Foster, and Noah Golowich. Independent policy gradient methods for competitive reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2101.04233*, 2021.
- Dean Foster and Peyton Young. Stochastic evolutionary game dynamics. *Theoretical population biology*, 38(2):219–232, 1990.
- David M. Frankel, Stephen Morris, and Ady Pauzner. Equilibrium selection in global games with strategic complementarities. *Journal of Economic Theory*, 108(1):1–44, 2003. ISSN 0022-0531. doi: [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0022-0531\(02\)00018-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0022-0531(02)00018-2). URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0022053102000182>.
- M.I. Freidlin, J. Szücs, and A.D. Wentzell. *Random Perturbations of Dynamical Systems*. Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften. Springer, 2012. ISBN 9783642258473. URL <http://books.google.de/books?id=p8LFMILAiMEC>.
- Drew Fudenberg and David K Levine. Reputation and equilibrium selection in games with a patient player. In *A Long-Run Collaboration On Long-Run Games*, pages 123–142. World Scientific, 2009.
- John C Harsanyi. A new theory of equilibrium selection for games with complete information. *Games and Economic Behavior*, 8(1):91–122, 1995.
- Pablo Iñigo-Blasco, Fernando Diaz-del Rio, Ma Carmen Romero-Ternero, Daniel Cagigas-Muñiz, and Saturnino Vicente-Diaz. Robotics software frameworks for multi-agent robotic systems development. *Robotics and Autonomous Systems*, 60(6):803–821, 2012.
- Chi Jin, Qinghua Liu, Yuanhao Wang, and Tiancheng Yu. V-learning—a simple, efficient, decentralized algorithm for multiagent rl. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.14555*, 2021.
- Jeremy Lagorse, Damien Paire, and Abdellatif Miraoui. A multi-agent system for energy management of distributed power sources. *Renewable energy*, 35(1):174–182, 2010.
- Marc Lanctot, Vinicius Zambaldi, Audrunas Gruslys, Angeliki Lazaridou, Karl Tuyls, Julien Pérolat, David Silver, and Thore Graepel. A unified game-theoretic approach to multiagent reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1711.00832*, 2017.
- Stefanos Leonardos, Will Overman, Ioannis Panageas, and Georgios Piliouras. Global convergence of multi-agent policy gradient in markov potential games. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2106.01969*, 2021.
- Michael L Littman. Markov games as a framework for multi-agent reinforcement learning. In *Machine learning proceedings 1994*, pages 157–163. Elsevier, 1994.
- Jiming Liu and Jianbing Wu. *Multiagent robotic systems*. CRC press, 2018.

- Sergio Valcarcel Macua, Javier Zazo, and Santiago Zazo. Learning parametric closed-loop policies for markov potential games. *CoRR*, abs/1802.00899, 2018.
- Jason R. Marden and Jeff S. Shamma. Revisiting log-linear learning: Asynchrony, completeness and payoff-based implementation. *Games and Economic Behavior*, 75(2):788–808, 2012. ISBN: 0899-8256 Publisher: Elsevier.
- Jason R Marden, Gürdal Arslan, and Jeff S Shamma. Joint strategy fictitious play with inertia for potential games. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 54(2):208–220, 2009a.
- Jason R Marden, H Peyton Young, Gürdal Arslan, and Jeff S Shamma. Payoff-based dynamics for multiplayer weakly acyclic games. *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, 48(1):373–396, 2009b.
- Jason R. Marden, H. Peyton Young, and Lucy Y. Pao. Achieving pareto optimality through distributed learning. In *2012 IEEE 51st IEEE Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*, pages 7419–7424, Maui, HI, USA, December 2012. IEEE. ISBN 978-1-4673-2066-5 978-1-4673-2065-8 978-1-4673-2063-4 978-1-4673-2064-1. doi: 10.1109/CDC.2012.6426834. URL <http://ieeexplore.ieee.org/document/6426834/>.
- Dov Monderer and Lloyd S Shapley. Fictitious play property for games with identical interests. *Journal of economic theory*, 68(1):258–265, 1996.
- Daniel Paulin. Concentration inequalities for Markov chains by Marton couplings and spectral methods. *Electronic Journal of Probability*, 20(none):1 – 32, 2015. doi: 10.1214/EJP.v20-4039. URL <https://doi.org/10.1214/EJP.v20-4039>.
- Bary SR Pradelski and H Peyton Young. Learning efficient nash equilibria in distributed systems. *Games and Economic behavior*, 75(2):882–897, 2012.
- Robin Roche, Benjamin Blunier, Abdellatif Miraoui, Vincent Hilaire, and Abder Koukam. Multi-agent systems for grid energy management: A short review. In *IECON 2010-36th Annual Conference on IEEE Industrial Electronics Society*, pages 3341–3346. IEEE, 2010.
- Larry Samuelson. *Evolutionary games and equilibrium selection*, volume 1. MIT press, 1997.
- Lloyd S Shapley. Stochastic games. *Proceedings of the national academy of sciences*, 39(10):1095–1100, 1953.
- Yoav Shoham, Rob Powers, and Trond Grenager. Multi-agent reinforcement learning: a critical survey. Technical report, Technical report, Stanford University, 2003.
- Ziang Song, Song Mei, and Yu Bai. When can we learn general-sum markov games with a large number of players sample-efficiently?, 2021.
- Nigel Tao, Jonathan Baxter, and Lex Weaver. A multi-agent, policy-gradient approach to network routing. In *In: Proc. of the 18th Int. Conf. on Machine Learning*. Citeseer, 2001.
- H. Peyton Young. The Evolution of Conventions. *Econometrica*, 61(1):57, January 1993. ISSN 00129682. doi: 10.2307/2951778. URL <https://www.jstor.org/stable/2951778?origin=crossref>.
- H Peyton Young. *Strategic learning and its limits*. OUP Oxford, 2004.
- H Peyton Young. Learning by trial and error. *Games and economic behavior*, 65(2):626–643, 2009.
- H Peyton Young. Individual strategy and social structure: An evolutionary theory of institutions. 2020.
- Kaiqing Zhang, Zhuoran Yang, and Tamer Başar. Multi-agent reinforcement learning: A selective overview of theories and algorithms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1911.10635*, 2019.

- Runyu Zhang, Zhaolin Ren, and Na Li. Gradient play in multi-agent markov stochastic games: Stationary points and convergence. *CoRR*, abs/2106.00198, 2021.
- Runyu Zhang, Qinghua Liu, Huan Wang, Caiming Xiong, Na Li, and Yu Bai. Policy optimization for markov games: Unified framework and faster convergence. In S. Koyejo, S. Mohamed, A. Agarwal, D. Belgrave, K. Cho, and A. Oh, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 35, pages 21886–21899. Curran Associates, Inc., 2022a. URL https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper_files/paper/2022/file/8951f484e8242b7f74817fdc390dd954-Paper-Conference.pdf.
- Runyu Zhang, Jincheng Mei, Bo Dai, Dale Schuurmans, and Na Li. On the global convergence rates of decentralized softmax gradient play in markov potential games. In S. Koyejo, S. Mohamed, A. Agarwal, D. Belgrave, K. Cho, and A. Oh, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 35, pages 1923–1935. Curran Associates, Inc., 2022b. URL https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper_files/paper/2022/file/0cd4c8c7ba098b199242c6634f43f653-Paper-Conference.pdf.
- Runyu Zhang, Yuyang Zhang, Rohit Konda, Bryce Ferguson, Jason Marden, and Na Li. Markov games with decoupled dynamics: Price of anarchy and sample complexity. In *2023 62nd IEEE Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*, pages 8100–8107, 2023. doi: 10.1109/CDC49753.2023.10383591.

A Additional Detail for the Learning Rules Example 2 and 3

A.1 The interdependence assumption in Corollary 2 and 3

Definition 11 (Interdependence [Marden et al., 2012]). *A normal-form game $\{r_i\}_{i=1}^n$ is interdependent if for every $a \in \mathcal{A}$ and every proper subset $J \subset [n]$, there exists an $i \notin J$ and a choice of actions $a'_J \in \prod_{j \in J} \mathcal{A}_j$ such that*

$$r_i(a'_J, a_{-J}) \neq r_i(a_J, a_{-J}).$$

Roughly speaking, the interdependence condition states that it is not possible to divide the agents into two distinct subsets that do not mutually interact with one another.

A.2 Detailed learning rule of Example 3

For the learning rule in Pradelski and Young [2012], the hidden variable ξ takes the form $\xi = (\xi_1, \xi_2, \dots, \xi_n)$, where $\xi_i = (m_i, \bar{a}_i, \bar{r}_i)$ is the hidden variable for agent i . $m_i \in \{C, C+, C-, D\}$ represents the ‘mood’ of agent i , with C represents Content, C+ Hopeful, C- Watchful and D Discontent; \bar{a}_i is the ‘benchmark action’; \bar{r}_i is the ‘benchmark payoff’.

The algorithm also requires two monotonically decreasing linear functions $F(x) = -\phi_1 x + \phi_2$, $G(x) = -\gamma_1 x + \gamma_2$, where $\phi_1, \phi_2, \gamma_1, \gamma_2 > 0$.

We now describe the learning rule. Given $\xi^{(t)}$, the update of $a^{(t+1)}, \xi^{(t+1)}$ is defined as followings:

- If $m_i^{(t)} = C$, with probability $1 - \epsilon$, $a_i^{(t+1)} = \bar{a}_i^{(t)}$. After taking the action, the agent receives payoff $r_i^{(t+1)} = r_i(a^{(t+1)})$, then the update of $\xi^{(t+1)}$ is given by
 - if $r_i^{(t+1)} > \bar{r}_i^{(t)}$, then with probability $\epsilon^{G(r_i^{(t+1)} - \bar{r}_i^{(t)})}$, $\xi_i^{(t+1)} = (C, a_i^{(t+1)}, r_i^{(t+1)})$; with probability $1 - \epsilon^{G(r_i^{(t+1)} - \bar{r}_i^{(t)})}$, $\xi_i^{(t+1)} = \xi_i^{(t)}$;
 - otherwise, $\xi_i^{(t+1)} = \xi_i^{(t)}$.

With probability ϵ , $a_i^{(t+1)}$ is selected uniform randomly from $\mathcal{A}_i \setminus \{\bar{a}_i^{(t)}\}$, and

- if $r_i^{(t+1)} > \bar{r}_i^{(t)}$, $\xi_i^{(t+1)} = (C+, \bar{a}_i^{(t)}, \bar{r}_i^{(t)})$.
- if $r_i^{(t+1)} < \bar{r}_i^{(t)}$, $\xi_i^{(t+1)} = (C-, \bar{a}_i^{(t)}, \bar{r}_i^{(t)})$
- if $r_i^{(t+1)} = \bar{r}_i^{(t)}$, $\xi_i^{(t+1)} = \xi_i^{(t)}$.
- If $m_i^{(t)} = C-$, then $a_i^{(t+1)} = \bar{a}_i^{(t)}$. After taking the action, the agent receives payoff $r_i^{(t+1)} = r_i(a^{(t+1)})$, then the update of $\xi^{(t+1)}$ is given by
 - if $r_i^{(t+1)} < \bar{r}_i^{(t)}$, $\xi_i^{(t+1)} = (D, \bar{a}_i^{(t)}, \bar{r}_i^{(t)})$.
 - if $r_i^{(t+1)} > \bar{r}_i^{(t)}$, $\xi_i^{(t+1)} = (C+, \bar{a}_i^{(t)}, \bar{r}_i^{(t)})$
 - if $r_i^{(t+1)} = \bar{r}_i^{(t)}$, $\xi_i^{(t+1)} = (C, \bar{a}_i^{(t)}, \bar{r}_i^{(t)})$.
- If $m_i^{(t)} = C+$, then $a_i^{(t+1)} = \bar{a}_i^{(t)}$. After taking the action, the agent receives payoff $r_i^{(t+1)} = r_i(a^{(t+1)})$, then the update of $\xi^{(t+1)}$ is given by
 - if $r_i^{(t+1)} < \bar{r}_i^{(t)}$, $\xi_i^{(t+1)} = (C-, \bar{a}_i^{(t)}, \bar{r}_i^{(t)})$.
 - if $r_i^{(t+1)} > \bar{r}_i^{(t)}$, $\xi_i^{(t+1)} = (C, \bar{a}_i^{(t)}, r_i^{(t+1)})$
 - if $r_i^{(t+1)} = \bar{r}_i^{(t)}$, $\xi_i^{(t+1)} = (C, \bar{a}_i^{(t)}, \bar{r}_i^{(t)})$.
- If $m_i^{(t)} = D$, then $a_i^{(t+1)}$ is selected uniform randomly from \mathcal{A}_i . After taking the action, the agent receives payoff $r_i^{(t+1)} = r_i(a^{(t+1)})$, then the update of $\xi^{(t+1)}$ is given by

- with probability $\epsilon^{F(r_i^{(t+1)})}$, $\xi_i^{(t+1)} = (C, a_i^{(t+1)}, r_i^{(t+1)})$.
- with probability $1 - \epsilon^{F(r_i^{(t+1)})}$, $\xi_i^{(t+1)} = \xi_i^{(t)}$.

Corollary 7 ([Pradelski and Young, 2012]). *For the learning rule described above, if the linear functions F, G satisfies $0 < F(x) < \frac{1}{2}n$, for $x \in [0, 1]$; $0 < G(x) < \frac{1}{2}$ for $x \in [-1, 1]$, then For a interdependent general-sum normal-form game that has at least one pure NE, the learning rule guarantees SSEs are the Nash equilibria that are Pareto-optimal, i.e., a^* is a SSE if and only if*

$$a^* \in \arg \max_{a \text{ is a pure NE}} \sum_{i=1}^n r_i(a)$$

B Proof of Theorem 2

Before stating the proof, we first introduce some important lemmas.

Lemma 3. (Proof see Appendix D) *For $h = 1, 2, \dots, H$, and every $s \in \mathcal{S}$, the stationary distribution π^ϵ exists, i.e. $a_h^{(t)}(s)$ converges to $\pi^\epsilon_h(\cdot|s)$ in distribution, and $V_h^{(t)}(s) \xrightarrow{a.s.} V_h^{\pi^\epsilon}(s)$, $Q_{i,h}^{(t)}(s, a) \xrightarrow{a.s.} Q_{i,h}^{\pi^\epsilon}(s, a)$. Further, the stationary distribution can be calculated by the following recursive definition:*

$\pi^\epsilon_H(\cdot, \cdot|s)$ is the stationary distribution under transition kernel $K^\epsilon(\cdot|\cdot; \{r_{i,H}(s, \cdot)\}_{i=1}^n)$

$\pi^\epsilon_h(\cdot, \cdot|s)$ is the stationary distribution under transition kernel $K^\epsilon(\cdot|\cdot; \{Q_{i,h}^{\pi^\epsilon_{h+1:H}}(s, \cdot)\}_{i=1}^n), h \leq H-1$

Lemma 4. (Proof see Appendix E) *There exists a uniform constant C (with respect to ϵ), such that for any ϵ ,*

$$\pi^\epsilon_h(a, \xi|s) < C\epsilon^{\gamma(a, \xi; \{Q_{i,h}^{\pi^\epsilon}(s, \cdot)\}_{i=1}^n) - \min_{a', \xi'} \gamma(a', \xi'; \{Q_{i,h}^{\pi^\epsilon}(s, \cdot)\}_{i=1}^n)}, \quad \forall a, \xi \in \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{B}$$

We are now ready to state the main proof of this section.

Proof of Theorem 2. From Lemma 3 we know that $\pi^{(t)}(\cdot|s)$ converges to $\pi^\epsilon(\cdot|s)$ in distribution. Further, from Lemma 4,

$$\pi^\epsilon_h(a, \xi|s) < C\epsilon^{\gamma(a, \xi; \{Q_{i,h}^{\pi^\epsilon}(s, \cdot)\}_{i=1}^n) - \min_{a', \xi'} \gamma(a', \xi'; \{Q_{i,h}^{\pi^\epsilon}(s, \cdot)\}_{i=1}^n)}, \quad \forall a, \xi \in \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{B}$$

We now prove the theorem using induction. For $h = H$, clearly this implies that $\pi^\epsilon_H(a, \xi|s) \rightarrow 0$ if $\gamma(a, \xi; \{r_{i,H}(s, \cdot)\}_{i=1}^n) > \min_{a', \xi'} \gamma(a', \xi'; \{r_{i,H}(s, \cdot)\}_{i=1}^n)$, i.e. $\pi_H^*(a|s) = 0$ if for all $\xi \in \mathcal{E}$, $\gamma(a, \xi; \{r_{i,H}(s, \cdot)\}_{i=1}^n) > \min_{a', \xi'} \gamma(a', \xi'; \{r_{i,H}(s, \cdot)\}_{i=1}^n)$, which proves the statement for $h = H$.

Assume that the statement holds for $h' = h + 1, \dots, H$, $\pi^{\epsilon_{h'}} \rightarrow \pi_{h'}^*$. We now show that the statement also holds for h . Note that for any pair of action and hidden variable a, ξ such that $\gamma(a, \xi; \{Q_{i,h}^{\pi_{h+1:H}}(s, \cdot)\}_{i=1}^n) > \min_{a', \xi'} \gamma(a', \xi'; \{Q_{i,h}^{\pi_{h+1:H}}(s, \cdot)\}_{i=1}^n)$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \pi^\epsilon_h(a, \xi|s) &< \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} C\epsilon^{\gamma(a, \xi; \{Q_{i,h}^{\pi_{h+1:H}}(s, \cdot)\}_{i=1}^n) - \min_{a', \xi'} \gamma(a', \xi'; \{Q_{i,h}^{\pi_{h+1:H}}(s, \cdot)\}_{i=1}^n)} \\ &= \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} C\epsilon^{\gamma(a, \xi; \{Q_{i,h}^{\pi_{h+1:H}}(s, \cdot)\}_{i=1}^n) - \min_{a', \xi'} \gamma(a', \xi'; \{Q_{i,h}^{\pi_{h+1:H}}(s, \cdot)\}_{i=1}^n) + o(1)} = 0 \end{aligned}$$

which completes the proof. \square

C Proof of Corollary 4, 5, 6

Proof of Corollary 4. Since at $h = H$, for any policy π , $Q_{i,H}^\pi = r_{i,H}$, thus from Theorem 2, we have that at stage $h = H$, $\pi_H^*(a|s) > 0$ if and only if

$$\gamma(a; \{r_{i,H}(s, \cdot)\}_{i=1}^n) = \min_{a'} \gamma(a'; \{r_{i,H}(s, \cdot)\}_{i=1}^n).$$

(Note that for log-linear learning, there's no hidden variable ξ .) Under the MPG assumption, we have that $\{r_{i,H}(s, \cdot)\}_{i=1}^n$ forms a potential game where the potential function is given as Φ_H . Thus, from Corollary 1 we know that such a satisfies

$$a \in \arg \max_a \Phi_H(s, a).$$

This implies that at $h = H$, π_H^* is a potential-maximizing policy.

We now prove by induction. Assume that $\pi_{h+1:H}^*$ is potential maximizing, we now prove that $\pi_{h:H}^*$ is also potential maximizing. From the Bellman optimality condition, it suffices to show that $\pi_h^*(a|s) > 0$ only if $a \in \arg \max_a \Phi_h^{\pi_{h+1:H}^*}(s, a)$. To show this, once again we apply Theorem 2 and conclude that $\pi_h^*(a|s) > 0$ only if

$$\gamma(a; \{Q_{i,h}^{\pi_{h+1:H}^*}(s, \cdot)\}_{i=1}^n) = \min_{a'} \gamma(a'; \{Q_{i,h}^{\pi_{h+1:H}^*}(s, \cdot)\}_{i=1}^n),$$

and Corollary 1 implies that this is equivalent to

$$a \in \arg \max_a \Phi_h^{\pi_{h+1:H}^*}(s, a),$$

and thus the proof is completed by induction \square

Before proving Corollary 5 and 7 we first state the interdependence assumption for these corollaries.

Assumption 3 (Interdependent Stochastic Game). *A stochastic game is called interdependent if for any policy π , stage $h \in [H]$ and state $s \in \mathcal{S}$, the Q -functions $\{Q_{i,h^\pi(s, \cdot)}\}_{i=1}^n$ forms an interdependent normal-form game (Definition 11).*

Proof of Corollary 5. The proof resembles the previous proof. From Theorem 2, we have that at stage $h = H$, $\pi_H^*(a|s) > 0$ if and only if there exists an action ξ' such that

$$\gamma(a, \xi; \{r_{i,H}(s, \cdot)\}_{i=1}^n) = \min_{a', \xi'} \gamma(a', \xi'; \{r_{i,H}(s, \cdot)\}_{i=1}^n).$$

Under Assumption 3, Corollary 2 further suggests that such a satisfies

$$a \in \arg \max_a \sum_{i=1}^n r_{i,H}(s, a)$$

This implies that at $h = H$, π_H^* is Pareto-optimal. We now prove by induction. Assume that $\pi_{h+1:H}^*$ is Pareto-optimal, we now prove that $\pi_{h:H}^*$ is also Pareto-optimal. From the Bellman optimality condition, it suffices to show that $\pi_h^*(a|s) > 0$ only if $a \in \arg \max_a \sum_{i=1}^n Q_{i,h}^{\pi_{h+1:H}^*}(s, a)$. To show this, once again we apply Theorem 2 and conclude that $\pi_h^*(a|s) > 0$ only if

$$\gamma(a, \xi; \{Q_{i,h}^{\pi_{h+1:H}^*}(s, \cdot)\}_{i=1}^n) = \min_{a', \xi'} \gamma(a', \xi'; \{Q_{i,h}^{\pi_{h+1:H}^*}(s, \cdot)\}_{i=1}^n).$$

and Corollary 1 implies that (Under Assumption 3) this is equivalent to

$$a \in \arg \max_a \sum_{i=1}^n Q_{i,h}^{\pi_{h+1:H}^*}(s, a),$$

and thus the proof is completed by induction. \square

Proof of Corollary 6. The proof follows almost the same as the proof of 5. From Theorem 2, we have that at stage $h = H$, $\pi_H^*(a|s) > 0$ if and only if there exists an action ξ' such that

$$\gamma(a, \xi; \{r_{i,H}(s, \cdot)\}_{i=1}^n) = \min_{a', \xi'} \gamma(a', \xi'; \{r_{i,H}(s, \cdot)\}_{i=1}^n).$$

Under Assumption 3, Corollary 2 further suggests that such a satisfies

$$a \in \underset{a \text{ is a pure NE of the normal-form game } \{r_{i,H}(s, \cdot)\}_{i=1}^n}{\arg \max} \sum_{i=1}^n r_{i,H}(s, a)$$

This implies that at stage $h = H$, π_H^* is a Pareto-optimal MPE.

We now prove by induction. Assume that $\pi_{h+1:H}^*$ is a Pareto-optimal MPE, we now prove that $\pi_{h:H}^*$ is also a Pareto-optimal MPE. It suffices to show that $\pi_h^*(a|s) > 0$ only if

$$a \in \underset{a \text{ is a pure NE of the normal form game } \{Q_{i,h}^\pi(s, \cdot)\}_{i=1}^n}{\arg \max} \sum_{i=1}^n Q_{i,h}^{\pi_{h+1:H}^*}(s, a) \quad (7)$$

To show this, once again we apply Theorem 2 and conclude that $\pi_h^*(a|s) > 0$ only if

$$\gamma(a, \xi; \{Q_{i,h}^{\pi_{h+1:H}^*}(s, \cdot)\}_{i=1}^n) = \min_{a', \xi'} \gamma(a', \xi'; \{Q_{i,h}^{\pi_{h+1:H}^*}(s, \cdot)\}_{i=1}^n).$$

and Corollary 1 implies that (Under Assumption 3) this is equivalent to Eq 7 and thus the proof is completed by induction. \square

D Proof of Lemma 3

Proof. We prove by induction. For $h = H$, the conclusion holds from classical concentration results for Ergodic Markov chains we get that the stationary distribution for $\pi_H^{(t)}(s), \xi_H^{(t)}(s)$ is $\pi_H^\epsilon(\cdot, \cdot|s)$ and that $V_{i,H}^{(t+1)}(s) = \frac{\sum_{\tau=1}^{t+1} r_{i,H}(s, \pi_H^{(\tau)}(s))}{t+1} \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} V_{i,H}^{\pi_H^\epsilon}(s, a)$.

Suppose that the conclusion holds for $h + 1$, we now prove for h . Since

$$Q_{i,h}^{(t+1)}(s, a) = r_{i,h}(s, a) + \sum_{s'} P_h(s'|s, a) V_{i,h+1}^{(t+1)}(s').$$

From from the induction hypothesis $V_{i,h+1}^{(t)} \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} V_{i,h+1}^{\pi_{i,h+1}^\epsilon}$ we have that

$$Q_{i,h}^{(t+1)}(s, a) \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} r_{i,h}(s, a) + \sum_{s'} P_h(s'|s, a) V_{i,h+1}^{\pi_{i,h+1}^\epsilon}(s') = Q_{i,h}^{\pi_{i,h}^\epsilon}.$$

Further, the learning dynamics satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} & \Pr \left(a_h^{(t+1)}(s), \xi_h^{(t+1)}(s), \{Q_{i,h}^{(t+1)}(s, \cdot)\}_{i=1}^n | a_h^{(1:t)}(s), \xi_h^{(1:t)}(s), \{Q_{i,h+1}^{(1:t+\tau)}(s, \cdot)\}_{i=1}^n \right) \\ &= K^\epsilon(a_h^{(t+1)}(s), \xi_h^{(t+1)}(s) | a_h^{(t)}(s), \xi_h^{(t)}(s); \{Q_{i,h}^{(t)}(s)\}_{i=1}^n). \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

Additionally, since $Q_h^{(t)} \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} Q_h^{\pi_h^\epsilon}$. Thus, we can apply Lemma 6 and get that $a_h^{(t)}(s), \xi_h^{(t)}(s)$ converges to $\pi_h^\epsilon(\cdot, \cdot|s)$ (defined as in the statement of Lemma 3) in distribution and that

$$\sum_{\tau=1}^t \frac{Q_{i,h}^{\pi_{i,h}^\epsilon}(s, a_h^{(\tau)}(s))}{t} \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} \sum_a \pi_h^\epsilon(a|s) Q_{i,h}^{\pi_{i,h}^\epsilon}(s, a) = V_{i,h}^{\pi_{i,h}^\epsilon}(s).$$

Additionally, since $Q_{i,h}^{(t)} \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} Q_{i,h}^{\pi_{i,h}^\epsilon}$, we also get

$$V_{i,h}^{(t)}(s) = \sum_{\tau=1}^t \frac{Q_{i,h}^{(\tau)}(s, a_h^{(\tau)}(s))}{t} \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} V_{i,h}^{\pi_{i,h}^\epsilon}(s),$$

which completes the proof. \square

E Proof of Lemma 4

Proof of Lemma 4. We define

$$\mu(a, \xi) = \sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}(a, \xi)} \prod_{a', \xi' \rightarrow a'', \xi'' \in T} K^\epsilon(a'', \xi'' | a', \xi'; \{Q_{i,h}^{\pi^\epsilon}(s, \cdot)\}_{i=1}^n).$$

It may be verified that the stationary distribution $\pi^\epsilon(\cdot, \cdot | s)$ satisfies [Freidlin et al., 2012]

$$\frac{\pi^\epsilon_h(a, \xi | s)}{\pi^\epsilon_h(a', \xi' | s)} = \frac{\mu(a, \xi)}{\mu(a', \xi')}, \quad \forall a, \xi, a', \xi'.$$

Further, from Assumption 2, $\mu(a)$ satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} \mu(a, \xi) &= \sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}(a, \xi)} \prod_{a', \xi' \rightarrow a'', \xi'' \in T} K^\epsilon(a'', \xi'' | a', \xi'; \{Q_{i,h}^{\pi^\epsilon}(s, \cdot)\}_{i=1}^n) \\ &\leq \sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}(a, \xi)} \prod_{a', \xi' \rightarrow a'', \xi'' \in T} C_2 \epsilon^{R(a', \xi' \rightarrow a'', \xi''); \{Q_{i,h}^{\pi^\epsilon}(s, \cdot)\}_{i=1}^n)} \\ &= C_2^{(|\mathcal{A}||\mathcal{B}|-1)} \sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}(a, \xi)} \epsilon^{R(T; \{Q_{i,h}^{\pi^\epsilon}(s, \cdot)\}_{i=1}^n)} \leq C_2^{(|\mathcal{A}||\mathcal{B}|-1)} |\mathcal{T}(a, \xi)| \epsilon^{\gamma^\epsilon(a, \xi; \{Q_{i,h}^{\pi^\epsilon}(s, \cdot)\}_{i=1}^n)}. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly

$$\begin{aligned} \mu(a, \xi) &\geq \sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}(a, \xi)} \prod_{a', \xi' \rightarrow a'', \xi'' \in T} C_1 \epsilon^{R(a', \xi' \rightarrow a'', \xi''); \{Q_{i,h}^{\pi^\epsilon}(s, \cdot)\}_{i=1}^n)} \\ &= C_1^{(|\mathcal{A}||\mathcal{B}|-1)} \sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}(a, \xi)} \epsilon^{R(T; \{Q_{i,h}^{\pi^\epsilon}(s, \cdot)\}_{i=1}^n)} \geq C_1^{(|\mathcal{A}||\mathcal{B}|-1)} \epsilon^{\gamma^\epsilon(a, \xi; \{Q_{i,h}^{\pi^\epsilon}(s, \cdot)\}_{i=1}^n)}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus we get

$$\frac{\pi^\epsilon_h(a, \xi | s)}{\pi^\epsilon_h(a^*, \xi^* | s)} = \frac{\mu(a, \xi)}{\mu(a^*, \xi^*)} \leq \left(\frac{C_2}{C_1} \right)^{(|\mathcal{A}|-1)} \max_{a, \xi} |\mathcal{T}(a, \xi)| \epsilon^{\gamma^\epsilon(a, \xi; \{Q_{i,h}^{\pi^\epsilon}(s, \cdot)\}_{i=1}^n) - \gamma^\epsilon(a^*, \xi^*; \{Q_{i,h}^{\pi^\epsilon}(s, \cdot)\}_{i=1}^n)}.$$

Then setting

$$a^*, \xi^* := \arg \min_{a', \xi'} \gamma^\epsilon(a', \xi'; \{Q_{i,h}^{\pi^\epsilon}(s, \cdot)\}_{i=1}^n)$$

completes the proof. \square

F Fully sampled-based algorithm

The result for this section relies on the following mild assumptions.

Assumption 4. *For the learning rule K^ϵ and any set of (possibly time-varying) reward functions $\{r_i^{(t)}\}_{i=1}^n$, we have that the (possibly non-homogeneous) Markov chain given by*

$$a^{(t+1)}, \xi^{(t+1)} \sim K^\epsilon(\cdot, \cdot | a^{(t)}, \xi^{(t)}; \{r_i^{(t)}\}_{i=1}^n)$$

satisfies that for any a ,

$$\Pr(a \text{ is visited infinitely many times}) = 1.$$

Note that this assumption is a slightly stronger assumption than ergodicity because we require the reward function for the transition kernel to be time-varying. However, it is not a strong assumption as one can easily check that the learning rules in Example 1, 3 and 2 all satisfy this assumption.

Definition 12 (Reachable state). *A state s is reachable at stage h if there exists a sequence of action $s_0, a_1, a_2, \dots, a_{h-1}$ such that there exists a positive probability that state s is being visited at stage h , i.e., $\Pr(s_h = s | s_0, a_1, a_2, \dots, a_{h-1}) > 0$*

Assumption 5. *All state $s \in \mathcal{S}$ are reachable at any stage $h \in [H]$.*

We would also like to note that Assumption 5 is also a mild assumption. Note that for SGs that doesn't satisfy this assumption, we can always restrict our discussion to the reachable states. We are now ready to state the main results for our fully sample-based algorithm (Algorithm 2). The results is almost identical to Theorem 2.

Theorem 4. *Suppose that the learning rule K^ϵ considered in Algorithm 2 satisfies Assumption 4 and 2 and that the SG satisfies Assumption 5, then for $h = 1, 2, \dots, H$, and every $s \in \mathcal{S}$, $a^{(t)}(s)$ converges to $\pi_h^\epsilon(\cdot | s)$ in distribution. Further, $\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \pi^\epsilon = \pi^*$ exists, and that $\pi_h^*(\cdot | s)$ only has support on the actions such that $\exists \xi \in \mathcal{B}$ such that (a, ξ) minimizes the potential $\gamma(a, \xi; \{Q_{i,h}^{\pi_h^{*+1:H}}(s, \cdot)\}_{i=1}^n)$, i.e.*

$$\gamma(a, \xi; \{Q_{i,h}^{\pi_h^{*+1:H}}(s, \cdot)\}_{i=1}^n) = \min_{a', \xi'} \gamma(a', \xi'; \{Q_{i,h}^{\pi_h^{*+1:H}}(s, \cdot)\}_{i=1}^n).$$

It suffices to prove that Lemma 3 still holds for the sample-based algorithm (Algorithm 2). Then the proof of Lemma 3 and Theorem 4 follows the same procedure as the proof of Theorem 2 (Appendix B). We now prove Lemma 3.

Proof of Lemma 3 for sample-based version (Algorithm 2). Similar to the proof in Appendix D for original version, we still prove by induction. Note that for $h = H$, the conclusion still holds from classical concentration results for Ergodic Markov chains we get that the stationary distribution for $\pi_H^{(t)}(s), \xi_H^{(t)}(s)$ is $\pi^\epsilon_H(\cdot, \cdot | s)$ and that $V_{i,H}^{(t+1)}(s) = \frac{\sum_{\tau=1}^{t+1} r_{i,H}(s, \pi_h^{(\tau)}(s))}{t+1} \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} V_{i,H}^{\pi^\epsilon_H}(s, a)$.

Suppose that the conclusion holds for $h+1$, we now prove for h . Notice that the Q update is the follows:

$$Q_{i,h}^{(t+1)}(s, a) = \begin{cases} \frac{N_h(s,a)-1}{N_h(s,a)} Q_{i,h}^{(t)}(s, a) + \frac{1}{N_h(s,a)} \left(r_{i,h}(s, a) + V_{i,h+1}^{(t+1)}(\bar{s}_{h+1}^{(t+1)}) \right), & \text{if } s, a = \bar{s}_h^{(t+1)}, \bar{a}_h^{(t+1)} \\ Q_{i,h}^{(t)}(s, a) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Thus it can be concluded that

$$\begin{aligned} Q_{i,h}^{(t+1)}(s, a) &= \frac{1}{N_h^t(s, a)} \sum_{i=1}^t \left(r_{i,h}(s, a) + V_{i,h+1}^{(\tau_i)}(\bar{s}_{h+1}^{(\tau_i)}) \right) \\ &= r_{i,h}(s, a) + \frac{1}{N_h^t(s, a)} \sum_{i=1}^t V_{i,h+1}^{(\tau_i)}(\bar{s}_{h+1}^{(\tau_i)}), \end{aligned}$$

where the notation $N_h^t(s, a)$ is the count $N_h(s, a)$ in Algorithm 2 at iteration step t . The notation τ_i 's are the iteration steps before iteration step t such that $s, a = \bar{s}_h^{(\tau_i)}, \bar{a}_h^{(\tau_i)}$.

Note that given Assumption 4 and 5, we have that $N_h^t(s, a) \rightarrow +\infty$ as $t \rightarrow +\infty$. Further, from induction assumption $V_{i,h+1}^{(t)} \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} V_{i,h+1}^{\pi^\epsilon}$. Thus from standard concentration results we know that

$$Q_{i,h}^{(t+1)}(s, a) \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} r_{i,h}(s, a) \sum_{s'} P(s' | s, a) V_{i,h+1}^{\pi^\epsilon}(s') = Q_{i,h}^{\pi^\epsilon}(s, a)$$

After proving $Q_{i,h}^{(t+1)}(s, a) \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} Q_{i,h}^{\pi^\epsilon}(s, a)$, the rest is the same as the proof in Appendix E, where we can apply Lemma 6 (set $X_t := (\pi_h^{(t)}(s), \xi_h^{(t)}(s)), Q_t := \{Q_{i,h}^{(t)}(s)\}_{i=1}^n$ in the statement of Lemma 6) and get that $\pi_h^{(t)}(s), \xi_h^{(t)}(s)$ converges to $\pi_h^\epsilon(\cdot, \cdot | s)$ in distribution and that

$$\sum_{\tau=1}^t \frac{Q_{i,h}^{\pi^\epsilon}(s, \pi_h^{(\tau)}(s))}{t} \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} \sum_a \pi_h^\epsilon(a | s) Q_{i,h}^{\pi^\epsilon}(s, a) = V_{i,h}^{\pi^\epsilon}(s).$$

Additionally, since $Q_{i,h}^{(t)} \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} Q_{i,h}^{\pi^\epsilon}$, we also get

$$V_{i,h}^{(t)}(s) = \sum_{\tau=1}^t \frac{Q_{i,h}^{(\tau)}(s, \pi_h^{(\tau)}(s))}{t} \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} V_{i,h}^{\pi^\epsilon}(s),$$

which completes the proof. \square

G Auxiliaries

Notations We first define the mixing time for the time-homogeneous Markov chain and the non-time-homogeneous Markov chain. We borrow the definition from [Paulin, 2015]

Definition 13 (Mixing time for time-homogeneous Markov chains). *Let X_1, X_2, X_3, \dots be a time-homogeneous Markov chain with transition kernel P and stationary distribution π . Then t_{mix} , the mixing time of the chain, is defined by*

$$d(t) := \sup_{\rho} \|P^t \rho - \pi\|_1, \quad (9)$$

$$t_{\text{mix}}(\epsilon) := \{t : d(t) \leq \epsilon\}.$$

Definition 14 (Mixing time for Markov chains without assuming time homogeneity). *Let $X_1, X_2, X_3, \dots, X_N$ be a Markov chain with transition probabilities P_1, P_2, P_3, \dots . Let $L(X_{i+t}|X_i = x)$ be the conditional distribution of X_{i+t} given $X_i = x$. Let us denote the minimal t such that $L(X_{i+t}|X_i = x)$ and $L(X_{i+t}|X_i = y)$ are less than ϵ away in ℓ_1 distance for every $1 \leq i \leq N - t$ by $\tau_{\text{mix}}(\epsilon)$, that is, for $0 < \epsilon < 1$, let*

$$\bar{d}(t) := \max_{1 \leq i \leq N-t} \sup_{x,y} \|L(x_{i+t}|X_i = x), L(x_{i+t}|X_i = y)\|_1 \quad (10)$$

$$\tau_{\text{mix}}(\epsilon) := \min\{t \in \mathbb{N} : \bar{d}(t) \leq \epsilon\}.$$

Lemma 5. *Suppose we have a random process $\{Q_t\}_{t=1}^{+\infty}$ such that*

$$Q_t \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} q^*,$$

where q^* is a constant vector (the random process doesn't necessarily need to be Markovian). And we have another random process $\{X_t\}_{t=1}^{+\infty}$, where X_t is a random variable on domain \mathcal{X} , which satisfies for any $\tau \geq 0$

$$\Pr(X_{t+1}|X_{1:t}, Q_{1:t+\tau}) = P_X(X_{t+1}|X_t, Q_t), \quad (11)$$

where the transition kernel $P_X(x'|x, Q)$ is continuous with respect to Q for every $x', x \in \mathcal{X}$.

Define π_X as the stationary distribution of the probability transition kernel $P_X(\cdot, q^*)$, i.e.

$$\pi_X(x') = \sum_x P_x(x'|x, q^*) \pi_X(x).$$

Then the following statements hold

- (1) $\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \Pr(X_t = x) = \pi_X(x)$.
- (2) For any bounded function g , $\frac{\sum_{\tau=1}^t g(X_\tau)}{t} \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} g^*$, where $g^* := \mathbb{E}_{X \sim \pi_X} g(X)$.

Proof. From the property of conditional probabilities and (11) we get

$$\Pr(X_{1:t+1}|Q_{1:t}) = \prod_{\tau=1}^t \Pr(X_{\tau+1}|X_{1:\tau}, Q_{1:t}) \Pr(X_1|Q_{1:t}) = \prod_{\tau=1}^t P_X(X_{\tau+1}|X_\tau, Q_\tau) \Pr(X_1)$$

This means that given the event $\{Q_t = q_t, Q_{t-1} = q_{t-1}, \dots, Q_1 = q_1\}$, then conditional on this event, $\{X_\tau\}_{\tau=1}^t$ forms a non-homogeneous Markov chain with transition probability defined as

$$P_\tau(x'|x) := P_X(x'|x, q_\tau).$$

Additionally, we also denote the transition kernel P^* as

$$P^*(x'|x) = P_X(x'|x, q^*)$$

and denote the ϵ -mixing time of P^* as $t_{\text{mix}}(\epsilon)$.

Since $Q_t \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} q^*$, and that $P_X(\cdot|\cdot, Q)$ is continuous with respect to Q , $P_t := P_X(x'|x, Q_t) \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} P^*$. Thus, for every $\epsilon > 0$, there exists a T such that,

$$\Pr \left(\left\| P_t - P^* \right\|_1 \leq \frac{\epsilon}{2t_{\text{mix}}\left(\frac{\epsilon}{2}\right)}, \forall t \geq T \right) \geq 1 - \epsilon$$

We denote this event as $A := \left\{ \left\| P_t - P^* \right\|_1 \leq \frac{\epsilon}{2t_{\text{mix}}\left(\frac{\epsilon}{2}\right)}, \forall t \geq T \right\}$.

We first prove statement (2). Since conditional on the event $B := \{Q_t = q_t, Q_{t-1} = q_{t-1}, \dots, Q_1 = q_1\}$, $\{X_\tau\}_{\tau=1}^t$ forms a non-homogeneous Markov chain with transition probabilities $P_\tau(x'|x) := P_X(x'|x, q_\tau)$. Applying Corollary 9 and Lemma 8, we get that for any $t \geq T_1 := T + t_{\text{mix}}\left(\frac{\epsilon}{2}\right)$,

$$\Pr \left(\left| \frac{\sum_{\tau=T_1}^t g(X_\tau)}{t - T_1 + 1} - \mathbb{E} \frac{\sum_{\tau=T_1}^t g(X_\tau)}{t - T_1 + 1} \right| \geq 2\epsilon \mid B \right) \leq 2e^{-\frac{72\epsilon^2 t}{49M\tau_{\text{mix}}\left(\frac{1}{4}\right)}}.$$

Further, applying Corollary 8 we get that if $B \subset A$, then for $t \geq T + \frac{\epsilon}{2t_{\text{mix}}\left(\frac{\epsilon}{2}\right)}$

$$\left| \mathbb{E} \frac{\sum_{\tau=T_1}^t g(X_\tau)}{t - T_1 + 1} - g^* \right| \geq \epsilon$$

Combining the above statement we get that for $t \geq T_1$

$$\begin{aligned} & \Pr \left(\left| \frac{\sum_{\tau=T_1}^t g(X_\tau)}{t - T_1 + 1} - g^* \right| \geq \epsilon \mid A, B \right) \\ & \leq \Pr \left(\left| \frac{\sum_{\tau=T_1}^t g(X_\tau)}{t - T_1 + 1} - \mathbb{E} \frac{\sum_{\tau=T_1}^t g(X_\tau)}{t - T_1 + 1} \right| \geq 2\epsilon \mid A, B \right) \leq 2e^{-\frac{72\epsilon^2(t-T_1+1)}{49M\tau_{\text{mix}}\left(\frac{1}{4}\right)}} \end{aligned}$$

and thus

$$\begin{aligned} & \Pr \left(\left| \frac{\sum_{\tau=T_1}^t g(X_\tau)}{t - T_1 + 1} - g^* \right| \geq \epsilon \mid A \right) \leq 2e^{-\frac{72\epsilon^2(t-T_1+1)}{49M\tau_{\text{mix}}\left(\frac{1}{4}\right)}} \\ \implies & \sum_{t \geq T_1} \Pr \left(\left| \frac{\sum_{\tau=T_1}^t g(X_\tau)}{t - T_1 + 1} - g^* \right| \geq \epsilon \mid A \right) < +\infty \\ \implies & \text{there exists } T_2 \text{ such that } \Pr \left(\left| \frac{\sum_{\tau=T_1}^t g(X_\tau)}{t - T_1 + 1} - g^* \right| \leq \epsilon, \forall t \geq T_1 + T_2 \mid A \right) \geq 1 - \epsilon \end{aligned}$$

Thus the following equality holds for any $\epsilon > 0$

$$\begin{aligned} & \Pr \left(\left| \frac{\sum_{\tau=T_1}^t g(X_\tau)}{t - T_1 + 1} - g^* \right| \leq \epsilon, \forall t \geq T_1 + T_2 \right) \\ & \geq \Pr(A) \Pr \left(\left| \frac{\sum_{\tau=T_1}^t g(X_\tau)}{t - T_1 + 1} - g^* \right| \leq \epsilon, \forall t \geq T_1 + T_2 \mid A \right) \geq (1 - \epsilon)^2. \end{aligned}$$

Note that this inequality is equivalent to

$$\frac{\sum_{\tau=T_1}^t g(X_\tau)}{t - T_1 + 1} \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} g^*,$$

which is also equivalent to

$$\frac{\sum_{\tau=1}^t g(X_\tau)}{t} \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} g^*,$$

which proves statement (2).

We now prove statement (1). By setting $g(x) = \mathbf{1}\{x = x_0\}$ which is easier to prove given the fact from Corollary 8 that under event A , for $t \geq T + \frac{\epsilon}{2t_{\text{mix}}(\frac{\epsilon}{2})}$

$$|\mathbb{E}g(X_t) - g^*| \leq \epsilon, \quad \mathbb{E}g(X_t) = \Pr(X_t = x_0), \quad g^* = \pi_X(x_0)$$

thus for $t \geq T + \frac{\epsilon}{2t_{\text{mix}}(\frac{\epsilon}{2})}$

$$|\Pr(X_t = x_0) - \pi_X(x_0)| \leq P(A)\epsilon + (1 - P(A))\epsilon = \epsilon + (1 - \epsilon)\epsilon \leq 2\epsilon$$

Let $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$, we have that $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \Pr(X_t = x_0) = \pi_X(x_0)$, which proves statement (1). \square

Lemma 6. For random variables $Q_h^{(t)}(s, \cdot)$ that almost surely converges to $Q_h^{\pi^{\epsilon_{h+1:H}}}(s, \cdot)$, we can define the following random processes

$$a_h^{(t+1)}(s), \xi_h^{(t+1)}(s) \sim K^\epsilon(\cdot | a_h^{(t)}(s), \xi_h^{(t)}(s); \{Q_{i,h}^{(t)}(s, \cdot)\}_{i=1}^n) \quad (12)$$

$$a_h^{\prime(t+1)}(s), \xi_h^{\prime(t+1)}(s) \sim K^\epsilon(\cdot | a_h^{\prime(t)}(s), \xi_h^{\prime(t)}(s); \{Q_{i,h}^{\pi^{\epsilon_{h+1:H}}}(s, \cdot)\}_{i=1}^n) \quad (13)$$

Define the stationary distribution of (12) and (13) as $\pi_h^\epsilon(a, \xi | s), \pi_h^{\epsilon'}(a, \xi | s)$, then we have that

1. $\pi_h^\epsilon(a, \xi | s) = \pi_h^{\epsilon'}(a, \xi | s)$
2. For any bounded function, e.g. $Q_{i,h}^{\pi^{\epsilon_{h+1:H}}}(s, \cdot)$, we have that

$$\frac{1}{t} \sum_{\tau=1}^t Q_{i,h}^{\pi^{\epsilon_{h+1:H}}}(s, a_h^{(\tau)}(s)) \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} \mathbb{E}_{a \sim \pi_h^{\epsilon'}} Q_{i,h}^{\pi^{\epsilon_{h+1:H}}}(s, a)$$

we have that the stationary distribution $\pi^\epsilon(a|s), \pi^{\epsilon'}(a|s)$ and the concentration properties of the following random processes $\{a_{h=1}^{(t)}(s)\}, \{\xi_{h=1}^{(t)}(s)\}$ in Eq (3) and (4) are the same.

Proof. The lemma is a direct corollary of Lemma 5. (By setting $X_t := (a_h^{(t)}(s), \xi_h^{(t)}(s)), Q_t := \{Q_{i,h}^{(t)}(s, \cdot)\}_{i=1}^n, q^* := \{Q_{i,h}^{\pi^{\epsilon_{h+1:H}}}(s, \cdot)\}_{i=1}^n, g := Q_{i,h}^{\pi^{\epsilon_{h+1:H}}}(s, \cdot)$ in the statement of Lemma 5) \square

Lemma 7. Suppose there's a probability transition kernel P^* that defines an Ergodic Markov chain with mixing time $t_{\text{mix}}(\epsilon) < \infty$, where $t_{\text{mix}}(\epsilon)$ is defined as in (9). We also denote the stationary distribution of P^* as π^* , i.e. $P^* \pi^* = \pi^*$. Suppose there's a sequence of probability transition kernel $\{P_t\}_{t=1}^{+\infty}$ satisfies $\|P_t - P^*\|_1 \leq \frac{\epsilon}{2t_{\text{mix}}(\frac{\epsilon}{2})}$, then for any $t \geq t_{\text{mix}}(\frac{\epsilon}{2})$ and any initial distribution ρ , we have that

$$\|P_t P_{t-1} \cdots P_1 \rho - \pi^*\|_1 \leq \epsilon.$$

Proof. Let $\pi_t := P_t P_{t-1} \cdots P_1 \rho$, then we get

$$\begin{aligned}
& \pi_{t+1} = P_t \pi_t = P^* \pi_t - (P^* - P_t) \pi_t \\
\implies \pi_{t+1} - \pi^* &= P^* (\pi_t - \pi^*) - (P^* - P_t) \pi_t \\
&= (P^*)^2 (\pi_{t-1} - \pi^*) - P^* (P^* - P_{t-1}) \pi_{t-1} - (P^* - P_t) \pi_t \\
&= (P^*)^{t_{\text{mix}}(\frac{\epsilon}{2})} (\pi_{t+1-t_{\text{mix}}(\frac{\epsilon}{2})} - \pi^*) + \sum_{\tau=t-t_{\text{mix}}(\frac{\epsilon}{2})}^t (P^*)^{t-\tau} (P^* - P_\tau) \pi_\tau \\
&= (P^*)^{t_{\text{mix}}(\frac{\epsilon}{2})} \pi_{t+1-t_{\text{mix}}(\frac{\epsilon}{2})} - \pi^* + \sum_{\tau=t-t_{\text{mix}}(\frac{\epsilon}{2})}^t (P^*)^{t-\tau} (P^* - P_\tau) \pi_\tau
\end{aligned}$$

Since P^* defines a Markov chain with mixing time t_{mix} , from the definition of mixing time we have

$$\|(P^*)^{t_{\text{mix}}(\frac{\epsilon}{2})} \pi_{t+1-t_{\text{mix}}(\frac{\epsilon}{2})} - \pi^*\|_1 \leq \frac{\epsilon}{2}.$$

Further,

$$\left\| \sum_{\tau=t-t_{\text{mix}}(\frac{\epsilon}{2})}^t (P^*)^{t-\tau} (P^* - P_\tau) \pi_\tau \right\|_1 \leq \sum_{\tau=t-t_{\text{mix}}(\frac{\epsilon}{2})}^t \|(P^* - P_\tau)\|_1 \leq \frac{\epsilon}{2t_{\text{mix}}(\frac{\epsilon}{2})} t_{\text{mix}}\left(\frac{\epsilon}{2}\right) = \frac{\epsilon}{2}$$

Combining the inequality we get

$$\|\pi_{t+1} - \pi^*\|_1 \leq \|(P^*)^{t_{\text{mix}}(\frac{\epsilon}{2})} \pi_{t+1-t_{\text{mix}}(\frac{\epsilon}{2})} - \pi^*\|_1 + \left\| \sum_{\tau=t-t_{\text{mix}}(\frac{\epsilon}{2})}^t (P^*)^{t-\tau} (P^* - P_\tau) \pi_\tau \right\|_1 \leq \frac{\epsilon}{2} + \frac{\epsilon}{2} = \epsilon,$$

which completes the proof. \square

Corollary 8. *For a bounded function g and a non-homogeneous Markov chain with transition kernel $\{P_t\}_{t=1}^\infty$ defined in Lemma 7 the random variable X_1, X_2, \dots generated from the Markov chain satisfies*

$$|\mathbb{E}g(X_t) - g^*| \leq M\epsilon, \quad \forall t \geq t_{\text{mix}}\left(\frac{\epsilon}{2}\right).$$

where M is defined as $M := \sup_{x,y \in \mathcal{X}} g(x) - g(y)$ and $g^* = \mathbb{E}_{x \sim \pi^*} g(x)$

Corollary 9. *The mixing time $\tau_{\text{mix}}(\epsilon)$ for the non-homogeneous Markov chain with transition kernel $\{P_t\}_{t=1}^\infty$ defined in Lemma 7 is finite for every $\epsilon > 0$. Specifically, we have*

$$\tau_{\text{mix}}(2\epsilon) \leq t_{\text{mix}}\left(\frac{\epsilon}{2}\right).$$


Lemma 8 (Corollary 2.11 in Paulin [2015]). *For any potentially non-homogeneous discrete time Markov chain with finite mixing time $\tau_{\text{mix}}(\epsilon) < \infty$, the random variable X_1, X_2, \dots generated from the Markov chain satisfies*

$$\Pr\left(\left|\frac{\sum_{\tau=1}^t g(X_\tau)}{t} - \mathbb{E}\frac{\sum_{\tau=1}^t g(X_\tau)}{t}\right| \geq \epsilon\right) \leq 2e^{-\frac{18\epsilon^2 t}{49M\tau_{\text{mix}}(\frac{1}{4})}},$$


where g is a bounded function and M is defined as $M := \sup_{x,y \in \mathcal{X}} g(x) - g(y)$.

H Additional Numerical Materials

H.1 Reward Diagram of the SG in Section 5



H.2 Another Numerical Example



We now provide another numerical example, which considers a two-player two-stage stag-hunt game, where the action 0 represents the ‘Stag’ action and action 1 represents the ‘Hare’ action. Stag is harder to hunt and thus needs both players to keep hunting persistently for two stages to success. However, it also has a higher reward 7.5, which is allocated evenly to both player and each get reward 3.75 at the second stage. Hare on the other hand is easier to hunt and can be caught by one player with one stage. However, the reward is also lower, of value 2. And if both players choose the Hare action, the reward is distributed equally to both of them (i.e. each gets reward of value 1). This process is fully captured by a stochastic game shown in the above diagram.

In this game, there are two strict NEs, the Stag NE, i.e. both choosing action ‘Stag’ for $h = 1, 2$; and the Hare NE, where both choose action ‘Hare’ for $h = 1, 2$. Note that in stag-hunt, the Hare NE is risk-dominant (c.f. [Harsanyi, 1995]) and the Stag NE is Pareto-dominant. Our theorem 2 suggests that running the algorithm framework (Algorithm 1) with log-linear learning will converge to the risk dominant NE and [Marden et al., 2012] converges to the Pareto optimal MPE. Our numerical result (Figure 2) also corroborates the theoretical finding, where we find that the empirical frequency of selecting action Hare will converge to a value close to 1 for log-linear learning, while running the algorithm framework with the learning rule in [Marden et al., 2012] the empirical frequency converges closer to the Stag action.




Figure 2: Numerical result of running Algorithm 1 with log-linear learning (Left) and the learning rule in [Marden et al., 2012] (Right) Illustration of 2-stage the stochastic game. (Right) The plot demonstrates the evolution of $\pi^{(t)}(a|s)$ (estimated using empirical averaging), where s is the initial state and the yellow line plots the curve for $a = (1, 1)$ and the blue line $a = (0, 0)$. The shaded areas are the 60% confidence interval, which are calculated by 100 runs.