

Machine Learning Methods for Large Population Games with Applications in Operations Research

Gökçe Dayanıklı*

Mathieu Laurière†

Abstract

In this tutorial, we provide an introduction to machine learning methods for finding Nash equilibria in games with large number of agents. These types of problems are important for the operations research community because of their applicability to real life situations such as control of epidemics, optimal decisions in financial markets, electricity grid management, or traffic control for self-driving cars. We start the tutorial by introducing stochastic optimal control problems for a single agent, in discrete time and in continuous time. Then, we present the framework of dynamic games with finite number of agents. To tackle games with a very large number of agents, we discuss the paradigm of mean field games, which provides an efficient way to compute approximate Nash equilibria. Based on this approach, we discuss machine learning algorithms for such problems. First in the context of discrete time games, we introduce fixed point based methods and related methods based on reinforcement learning. Second, we discuss machine learning methods that are specific to continuous time problems, by building on optimality conditions phrased in terms of stochastic or partial differential equations. Several examples and numerical illustrations of problems arising in operations research are provided along the way.

Keywords. game theory; multi-agent systems; mean field games; machine learning; artificial intelligence; deep learning; reinforcement learning

Contents

1	Introduction	2
2	Finite player games and mean field games	3
2.1	Background on single-agent control	4
2.2	Nash equilibria in finite player games	5
2.3	From large populations to mean field games	6

*Department of Statistics, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Champaign, IL 61820, USA
gokced@illinois.edu.

†Shanghai Frontiers Science Center of Artificial Intelligence and Deep Learning; NYU-ECNU Institute of Mathematical Sciences, NYU Shanghai, 567 West Yangsi Road, Shanghai, 200126, People's Republic of China,
mathieu.lauriere@nyu.edu.

3	Examples and extensions	9
3.1	Discrete time models	9
3.1.1	Crowd motion	10
3.1.2	Traffic routing	10
3.1.3	Cybersecurity	11
3.2	Continuous time models	12
3.2.1	Project value management	12
3.2.2	Electricity production	12
3.2.3	Trading with price impact	13
3.3	Extensions	14
4	Methods for discrete time models	14
4.1	Fixed point algorithms	15
4.2	Computing a best response by policy optimization	16
4.3	Computing a best response by dynamic programming	17
4.4	Numerical illustrations	19
4.4.1	Traffic routing with online mirror descent	19
4.4.2	Crowd motion with fictitious play and RL	20
5	Methods for continuous time models	23
5.1	Deep learning methods for solving FBSDEs	23
5.1.1	Algorithm 1: Iterative learning	24
5.1.2	Algorithm 2: Simultaneous learning	25
5.1.3	Numerical illustration: Epidemic model with FBSDE deep learning	27
5.2	Deep learning methods for solving PDEs	28
5.2.1	Deep Galerkin method for mean field FBPDEs	29
5.2.2	Numerical illustration: Portfolio liquidation with PDE deep learning	31
6	Conclusion and perspectives	31

1 Introduction

Motivations. Optimization is pervasive in operations research (OR), and cover some classical examples such as supply and demand management in fast moving consumer products sector, healthcare operations management, or shortest path design for package distribution; see e.g. Rardin and Rardin [110], Frazier [65], Gill et al. [69]. Optimal control theory provides a framework and a set of tools which extends standard optimization to dynamical problems. Stochastic optimal control further extends the theory of deterministic control to situations where disturbances may affect the dynamics. Applications range from adjusting the temperature of a room to controlling the trajectory of an aircraft, or deciding an optimal portfolio to maximize financial return. Stochastic optimal control theory has been developed extensively over the twentieth century and various numerical methods have been introduced, such as dynamic programming which was introduced by Bellman [15], which exploits the time structure in a crucial way. More recently, a class of discrete time optimal control problems called Markov decision processes (MDPs) have been the focus of reinforcement learning (RL) methods, borrowing ideas from dynamic programming or direct policy optimization; see e.g. Sutton and Barto [118], Bertsekas [19] for monographs on this topic. However, stochastic optimal control is limited to optimizing the performance of a single dynamical system but many real-world scenarios involve multiple strategic agents simultaneously controlling systems that interact through their dynamics or their objective functions. Examples can be found in traffic routing (drivers interact through the creation of traffic jams), finance (investors interact through a collective

impact on the price), electricity management (producers and consumers need to reach an equilibrium between offer and demand of electricity), or epidemic management (citizens interact through the spread of the infection), to cite just a few. When the agents are non-cooperative, each controller must try to anticipate other agents' decisions in order to optimize their own objective function. Game theory has been introduced to study such situations, first in the static setting by Nash [103], Von Neumann [120] and then in dynamic setting by Fudenberg and Tirole [66], Başar and Olsder [14]. Dynamic game theory is significantly more complex than optimal control theory but has a huge potential in the OR applications. One of the bottlenecks for real-world applications has thus far been the development of efficient numerical methods for large scale games, but new approaches have been introduced in the recent years. We refer e.g. to Hu and Laurière [78] for a survey of machine learning methods for stochastic optimal control and games mostly in continuous time, and to Laurière et al. [96] for a survey of learning methods for discrete time mean field games. Compared with these references, the present tutorial will cover discrete and continuous time models, with a focus on potential applications in OR.

Scope of the tutorial. The goal of this tutorial is to present recent methods for games with many players. In this direction, we will more specifically focus on two aspects of scalability: in terms of number of agents and in terms of model complexity. First, in order to model situations with a large number of interacting agents, we will introduce the framework of mean field games, see e.g. Huang et al. [81], Lasry and Lions [90, 91], which borrows ideas from statistical physics to provide a tractable approximation of games with very large populations. MFG theory has attracted a growing interest since its introduction, and various models have been introduced for applications that could be relevant in OR such as applications in epidemic control, see e.g. Laguzet and Turinici [88], Aurell et al. [10], Arefin et al. [8], Elie et al. [58], Aurell et al. [11], in energy demand and climate change policy decisions, see e.g. Aïd et al. [3], Djehiche et al. [56], Carmona et al. [44], Dayanıklı and Laurière [54], Alasseur et al. [5], Bagagiolo and Bauso [13], in traffic control, see e.g. Chevalier et al. [48], Huang et al. [79], Festa and Göttlich [62], in cybersecurity, see e.g. Kolokoltsov and Bensoussan [84], Miao and Li [99], Kolokoltsov and Malafeyev [85], in advertisement decisions, see e.g. Carmona and Dayanıklı [34], Salhab et al. [115], or in systemic risk in the financial markets, see e.g. Carmona et al. [41]. Second, to be able to solve complex models (e.g., problems in which the state dimension is high), we will move beyond the classical numerical approaches and will focus on machine learning based methods. Although more traditional methods benefit from the rich background of numerical analysis, machine learning methods (in particular deep learning and reinforcement learning methods) have met impressive empirical successes, which make them very appealing for applications in game theory and OR.

Structure of the tutorial. The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we introduce basic notations and definitions for optimal control and dynamic games in stochastic environments, both in discrete and continuous time. We also present the framework of mean field games, which provide a way to approximate games with very large number of players. To make these concepts more concrete and to show the flexibility of the frameworks, Section 3 presents several examples of models and discusses a few extensions which make the models more realistic. We then present classical families of machine learning methods for discrete time games in Section 4. Machine learning methods for continuous time games are presented in Section 5 by exploiting the connection with stochastic differential equations and partial differential equations. Finally, we conclude with a summary and some future directions in Section 6.

2 Finite player games and mean field games

In this section, we first briefly present the framework of optimal control for a single agent¹, in discrete time and continuous time. We then present the framework of dynamical games, again in discrete and

¹Throughout this tutorial, we use terms *agent* and *player* interchangeably.

continuous times. From there, we present the paradigm of mean field games.

2.1 Background on single-agent control

We will start by introducing the stochastic optimal control problems both in discrete and continuous times which are similar but differ in notation and terminology. In these problems, there is only one agent who aims to optimize their objectives by choosing some controls (i.e. actions).

Discrete time. Because of their wide applicability in the reinforcement learning, we will mainly focus on the *Markov Decision Processes* (MDPs) for the discrete time setup. An MDP is defined by a tuple (S, A, N_T, μ_0, P, r) where S is the state space, A is the action space, $N_T > 0$ is the total number of time steps, $\mu_0 \in \mathcal{P}(S)$ is an initial state distribution, $P_n(s, a) \in \mathcal{P}(S)$ is the probability distribution of the next state when using action a in state s at time n , and $r_n(s, a)$ is the immediate reward acquired when the agent used action a in state s at time n . To alleviate notation, we will write $\mathcal{T} = \{0, 1, \dots, N_T\}$ for the set of times. Sometimes the next state is also included in the reward function's inputs. The actions and states can be both continuous or finite. We mostly focus on the finite action and state space setup since in the presentation of the continuous time setup we will focus on the continuous action and state spaces. The aim of the agent is to find an optimal *policy*. The policy is a function $\pi : \mathcal{T} \times S \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(A)$ that gives the probability distribution on the actions that can be taken while being at a specific state s at a given time. If this distribution is a Dirac distribution, then the policy is called a pure policy. Then, the objective of the agent is to choose a policy π that maximizes the cumulative expected reward:

$$J(\pi) = \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{n=0}^{N_T} r_n(s_n, a_n) \right]$$

$$a_n \sim \pi_n(s_n), \quad s_{n+1} \sim P_n(s_n, a_n), \quad n \geq 0, \quad s_0 \sim \mu_0.$$

In general, the last reward does not depend on the action, but we keep the same notation for all time steps to alleviate the presentation. The problem is introduced in the finite time horizon setting for the sake of consistency with the following sections on optimal control and mean field games (which are most often studied in finite horizon). However, it can be also stated in the infinite time horizon setting, in which case one usually considers the discounted reward and looks for stationary policies because this is sufficient to achieve the optimal value. We refer e.g. to the book of Bertsekas and Shreve [20, Section 9.5] for the rigorous proof of existence of an optimal policy that is stationary, under suitable assumptions. The reader interested in RL is referred to the book of Sutton and Barto [118] for more background on MDPs from the machine learning perspective. One of the most common approaches to solve MDPs is to use dynamic programming, which relies on the introduction of a value function. We discuss in more details this notion in Section 4.3 below.

Continuous time. The agent chooses an A -valued² square-integrable control $\alpha := (\alpha_t)_{t \in [0, T]} \in \mathbb{A}$ to minimize their expected cost over a time horizon $[0, T]$ where $T > 0$. In some applications, T can also be taken as infinity, which is called infinite horizon stochastic optimal control problem. Controls can be of several form, such as open-loop, closed-loop, or Markovian. For the sake of brevity, we omit technical details here and refer interested reader to e.g. Borkar [22, Section 2.2] for more details. The agent's state $\mathbf{X} := (X_t)_t$ where $X_t \in \mathbb{R}^d$ will evolve according to a stochastic differential equation. The dimension of the state and control can be integers d and k , respectively; however, for the sake of simplification in notation, we will take $d = k = 1$. In this section, we will focus on continuous state; however, in general, state can also be finite (i.e. discrete). The stochastic optimal control problem can be written

²In order to show the existence and uniqueness results the control set $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^k$ is generally assumed to be closed, convex and bounded.

mathematically as follows: minimize over $\alpha = (\alpha_t)_t$ the total expected cost

$$\begin{aligned}
 J(\alpha) &= \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^T f(t, X_t, \alpha_t) dt + g(X_T) \right] \\
 dX_t &= b(t, X_t, \alpha_t) dt + \sigma(t, X_t) dW_t, \quad X_0 = \zeta \sim \mu_0,
 \end{aligned} \tag{2.1}$$

where $\mathbf{W} = (W_t)_t$ is one-dimensional Brownian motion to represent randomness. Here, $f : [0, T] \times \mathbb{R} \times A \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is called running cost, $g : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is called terminal cost, $b : [0, T] \times \mathbb{R} \times A \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is called drift, and $\sigma : [0, T] \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is called volatility. By following convention in the engineering community, we wrote the model as a minimization problem; however, it can also be written as a maximization problem. There are different ways to solve this problem by characterizing the solution with some differential equations. One approach is to use Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman (HJB) equation to characterize the value function, another one is to use a backward stochastic differential equation by using Pontryagin stochastic maximum principle (see e.g. Yong and Zhou [123]). We can introduce an application example as follows: Assume there is an employee who decides on how much effort at time t they are going to put in the project where the value of the project at time t can be thought as the state of the agent at that time. The value of the project will depend on how much effort the employee puts in and some constant exogenous randomness. Objectives of the employee can be to minimize their effort in the project while maximizing their time dependent and terminal utility from the project value. Then this problem can be mathematically modeled by choosing $b(t, X_t, \alpha_t) = \alpha_t$, $\sigma(t, X_t) = \sigma$, $f(t, X_t, \alpha_t) = \alpha_t^2 - U(X_t)$, and $g(X_T) = -U(X_T)$ where $U : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a utility function and $\sigma > 0$ is a constant. Realize that maximizing the utility corresponds to minimizing negative utility which in turn explains the minus signs in front of the utility functions.

Remark 2.1. *The volatility σ can be a function of the control too, i.e., of the form $\sigma(t, X_t, \alpha_t)$. However, this requires using the full Hamiltonian and is technically more challenging, both from the theoretical and the numerical viewpoints. Our presentation of the stochastic control problem is motivated by the mean field game framework we will discuss in the sequel. We choose to follow immediately the setting used in the vast majority of the MFG literature, which focuses on uncontrolled volatility (i.e., the volatility is not a function of control α_t).*

2.2 Nash equilibria in finite player games

Discrete time. A discrete time N -player game is defined by a tuple $(\underline{S}, \underline{A}, N_T, \underline{\mu}^0, \underline{P}, r) = ((S^1, \dots, S^N), (A^1, \dots, A^N), N_T, (\mu_0^1, \dots, \mu_0^N), (P^1, \dots, P^N), (r^1, \dots, r^N))$ where N is the number of players and the other symbols roughly have the same interpretation as before for each player, but now P^i and r^i are going to involve interactions between the players. S^i and A^i are the state and action spaces for player i , μ_0^i is the initial state distribution for player i , $P^i : \mathcal{T} \times \underline{S} \times A^i \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(S^i)$, $r^i : \mathcal{T} \times \underline{S} \times A^i \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, and $P_n^i(\underline{s}, a^i)$ and $r_n^i(\underline{s}, a^i)$ denote respectively the probability distribution of s_{n+1}^i and the reward for player i , when the states of all players are $\underline{s} = (s^1, \dots, s^N)$ and the action of player i is a^i at time n . A policy for player i is a function $\pi^i : \mathcal{T} \times \underline{S} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(A^i)$ that gives the probability distribution on the actions that can be taken while the players are at states \underline{s} at a given time. Then, given the policies $\underline{\pi}^{-i} = (\pi^1, \dots, \pi^{i-1}, \pi^{i+1}, \dots, \pi^N)$ used by other players, the objective of the agent i is to choose a policy π^i that maximizes the cumulative expected reward:

$$\begin{aligned}
 J^i(\pi^i; \underline{\pi}^{-i}) &= \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{n=0}^{N_T} r_n^i(\underline{s}_n, a_n^i) \right], \\
 a_n^j &\sim \pi_n^j(\underline{s}_n), \quad s_{n+1}^j \sim P_n^j(\underline{s}_n, a_n^j), \quad n \geq 0, s_0^j \sim \mu_0^j, \quad j \in [N].
 \end{aligned} \tag{2.2}$$

Here again, the problem could be studied in the infinite-horizon discounted setting. Since the policy of player i depends on the policy of the other players, the problem is, thus far, not fully well-defined. The

most common notion of solution is Nash equilibrium, in which each player has no incentive to deviate unilaterally. More precisely:

Definition 2.2. A Nash equilibrium is a policy profile $\hat{\pi} = (\hat{\pi}^1, \dots, \hat{\pi}^N)$ such that, for every $i \in [N]$, $\hat{\pi}^i$ is a maximizer of $J^i(\cdot; \hat{\pi}^{-i})$.

In the sequel, to be able to pass to the limit when the number N of players goes to infinity, we will focus on the case where the players are indistinguishable and have symmetric interactions. In other words, we will assume $S^i = S, A^i = A, \mu_0^i = \mu_0, P^i = P$ and $r^i = r$ for all i , and furthermore, for every n and a^i , $P_n(\cdot, a^i)$ and $r_n(\cdot, a^i)$ are symmetric functions of the input $\underline{s} = (s^1, \dots, s^N)$, i.e., they are invariant under permutation of the N coordinates of \underline{s} . This structure is crucial to be able to pass to the mean field limit, as we will discuss in the next section.

Continuous time. In continuous time, each agent solves an optimal control problem analogous to (2.1) except that, in the game setting, the cost and the dynamics potentially depend on the other players states or actions. For simplicity of presentation, we will only consider interactions through states.

Let us consider $N > 1$ agents. Agent i chooses an A^i -valued square-integrable control $\alpha^i := (\alpha_t^i)_t \in \mathbb{A}^i$ to minimize their expected cost over a time horizon $[0, T]$ where $T > 0$. The agent's state $\mathbf{X}^i := (X_t^i)_t$ where $X_t^i \in \mathbb{R}^d$ will evolve according to a stochastic differential equation (SDE). As before, for the simplicity in presentation, we will take the state and action dimensions equal to 1 and we will focus on continuous state and control spaces. Similar to the continuous time stochastic control models, the state and the control spaces can be also finite. Given the controls of the other players $\underline{\alpha}^{-i} = (\alpha^1, \dots, \alpha^{i-1}, \alpha^{i+1}, \alpha^N)$, the goal for player i is to solve the stochastic optimal control problem: Minimize over α^i

$$J(\alpha^i; \underline{\alpha}^{-i}) = \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^T f^i(t, \underline{X}_t, \alpha_t^i) dt + g^i(\underline{X}_T) \right]$$

$$dX_t^i = b^i(t, \underline{X}_t, \alpha_t^i) dt + \sigma^i(t, \underline{X}_t) dW_t^i, \quad X_0^i = \zeta^i \sim \mu_0^i,$$

where $\mathbf{W}^i = (W_t^i)_t$ is one-dimensional Brownian motion to represent randomness specific to player i . The random variables ζ^j and the Brownian motions W^j are all independent. Here, the running cost $f^i : [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^N \times A \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, the terminal cost $g^i : \mathbb{R}^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, the drift $b^i : [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^N \times A \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, and the volatility $\sigma^i : [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ depend on the positions of all the players. They could also depend on the actions of all the players but we omit this to alleviate the notations.

In this context, a Nash equilibrium is defined as follows.

Definition 2.3. A Nash equilibrium is a control profile $\hat{\alpha} = (\hat{\alpha}^1, \dots, \hat{\alpha}^N)$ such that, for every $i \in [N]$, $\hat{\alpha}^i$ is a minimizer of $J^i(\cdot; \hat{\alpha}^{-i})$.

As already mentioned in the discrete time case, to pass to the mean field limit when N goes to infinity, we will focus on the case where the players are indistinguishable and have symmetric interactions. In the context of the above formulation in continuous time, we will assume $\mu_0^i = \mu_0, b^i = b, \sigma^i = \sigma, f^i = f$, and $g^i = g$ for all i , and furthermore, for every t and a^i , $f(t, \cdot, a^i), g(\cdot), b(t, \cdot, a^i)$ and $\sigma(\cdot)$ are symmetric functions of the input $\underline{x} = (x^1, \dots, x^N)$, i.e., they are invariant under permutation of the N coordinates of \underline{x} .

2.3 From large populations to mean field games

As the number of agents gets higher, we need to consider an exponentially increasing number of interactions which will create difficulty in tractability. In order to prevent this, mean field games (MFGs) have been recently proposed to approximate the games with large number of agents. In this section, we will introduce MFGs both in discrete and continuous time setups and later on, solving these models with machine learning will be the focus of this tutorial. In MFGs, all the agents are assumed to be

identical and interacting symmetrically through the population distribution (of state, action/control, or joint state-control) and the number of agents is assumed to go to infinity. Thanks to these assumptions, we can focus on a *representative* agent who is infinitesimal such that when she changes her control, the population distribution is not affected. This reduces the problem of N interacting agents to a problem of a representative agent and her interactions with the population distribution. At a high level, the connection between finite player games and mean field games are summarized in Figure 1. We discuss this diagram in more details at the end of this section.




Figure 1: Conceptual connections between N -player game and mean field game. Under suitable assumptions, letting N go to infinity (from left to right), the Nash equilibria in an N -player game converge to the mean field Nash equilibrium. Conversely (from right to left), using a mean field Nash equilibrium in a finite player game leads to an approximate Nash equilibrium whose quality improves with N .

Discrete time. In an MFG, we want to understand the evolution of the mean field (which in our case will be the state distribution) and the decisions made by one representative player. This is sufficient to understand the behavior of the whole population since all the players are assumed to be indistinguishable.

A discrete time MFG is defined by a tuple (S, A, N_T, μ^0, P, r) where the symbols have the same interpretation as before, but now P and r are going to involve interactions with the mean field. S and A are the state and action spaces for each player, μ_0 is the initial state distribution for each player, $P : \mathcal{T} \times S \times A \times \mathcal{P}(S) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(S)$, $r : \mathcal{T} \times S \times A \times \mathcal{P}(S) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, and $P_n(s, a, \mu)$ and $r_n(s, a, \mu)$ denote respectively representative player's next state probability distribution and reward, if at time n this player is at state s , uses action a and the rest of the population has state distribution μ . A policy for a player is a function $\pi : \mathcal{T} \times \underline{S} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(A)$ that gives the probability distribution on the actions that can be taken at a given time. In this formulation, the policy is a function of the representative player's own state and not a function of the mean field distribution. The reason for this comes from the fact that when the number of players goes to infinity, the mean field will be a deterministic function of time through the law of large numbers. Therefore, its effect can be taken into account directly through the time dependence of the policy.

It will be convenient to use the following notation: given a policy π , we denote by μ^π the mean field sequence induced when the whole population uses policy π , i.e.,

$$\mu_0^\pi = \mu^0, \quad \mu_{n+1}^\pi(s) = \sum_{s', a} \mu_n^\pi(s') \pi_n(a|s') P_n(s', a, \mu_n^\pi), n = 0, \dots, N_T - 1. \quad (2.3)$$

Here, we focus on interactions through the state distribution only, although more general interactions

(e.g. through the action distribution) could be considered. As a consequence, a player’s reward can be defined as a function of the mean field sequence instead of a function of the other player’s policies. This is a major simplification compared with finite-player games (see (2.2)). Another key simplification is that each player has no influence on the mean field at all, so unilateral deviations do not perturb the mean field. Optimality conditions are thus easier to phrase than in finite-player games, as we shall see in the sequel. Given a mean field $\mu = (\mu_n)_{n \in \mathcal{I}}$ describing the behavior of the rest of the population, the objective of a representative player is to choose a policy π that maximizes the cumulative expected reward:

$$J(\pi; \mu) = \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{n=0}^{N_T} r_n(s_n, a_n, \mu_n) \right], \quad (2.4)$$

$$a_n \sim \pi_n(s_n), s_{n+1} \sim P_n(s_n, a_n, \mu_n), n \geq 0, s_0 \sim \mu_0.$$

Based on this notion, we can define the concept of Nash equilibrium. The counterpart to Definition 2.2 is:

Definition 2.4. *A (discrete time mean field) Nash equilibrium is a policy $\hat{\pi}$ and a mean field $\hat{\mu}$ such that the following two conditions are satisfied:*

- $\hat{\pi}$ is a maximizer of $J(\cdot; \hat{\mu})$ as defined in (2.4),
- $\hat{\mu}$ is the mean field induced by policy $\hat{\pi}$, i.e., $\hat{\mu} = \mu^{\hat{\pi}}$ using the notation introduced in (2.3).

This definition can be interpreted as a fixed point problem. Let us denote by BR the function that gives the set of best responses given a mean field, and by MF the function that gives the mean field induced by a policy. Then a mean field Nash equilibrium $(\hat{\pi}, \hat{\mu})$ satisfies $\hat{\pi} \in BR \circ MF(\hat{\pi})$ and $\hat{\mu} \in MF \circ BR(\hat{\mu})$ where \circ denotes the composition of functions. So solving an MFG amounts to finding a fixed point of $BR \circ MF$ or $MF \circ BR$. It should be noted that, while uniqueness of the equilibrium mean field $\hat{\mu}$ can be guaranteed by monotonicity assumptions, it is in general more difficult to ensure uniqueness of the best response to $\hat{\mu}$. In the continuous space setting, uniqueness of the best response can be guaranteed under strict convexity assumptions. The existence of the discrete time mean field Nash equilibrium can be proved either: (a) by showing that the of the fixed point mappings ($BR \circ MF$ or $MF \circ BR$) is a strict contraction and using Banach fixed point theorem, or (b) by proving some compactness property and using Schauder or Kakutani fixed point theorem for instance, see e.g. Gomes et al. [70]. The first method also gives uniqueness by typically requires quite strong assumptions (e.g., Lipschitz continuity of the dynamics and cost with small enough Lipschitz constants).

It can be shown, under suitable conditions, that a mean field Nash equilibrium policy $\hat{\pi}$ is an approximate Nash equilibrium for the corresponding finite player game, and the quality of the approximation improves as the number of player increases (see at the end of the section for more details). Furthermore, it is in general computationally more efficient to solve an MFG than to tackle directly the corresponding game with a finite but large number of players, see Figure 3 below for an illustration in a routing game.

Continuous time. Similar to the previous sections, the *representative* agent chooses an A -valued³ square-integrable control $\alpha := (\alpha_t)_t \in \mathbb{A}$ to minimize their expected cost over a time horizon $[0, T]$ where $T > 0$ (as before T can be infinity). The representative agent’s state $\mathbf{X} := (X_t)_t$ where $X_t \in \mathbb{R}^d$ will evolve according to an SDE that depends on her own state, control, as well as the population distribution. For the simplicity in presentation, we will take the dimension of state and control equal to 1. As in the previous sections, we will present the model with continuous state space; however, in general, state can also be finite (i.e. discrete). For example, we can have an application related to mitigation of epidemics. In this case, the agents’ states will be their health status such as susceptible, infected, recovered, etc. The

³As mentioned previously in Section 2.1, in order to show the existence and uniqueness results the control set $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^k$ is generally assumed to be closed, convex and bounded.

objective of the representative agent using control $\alpha \in \mathbb{A}$ when interacting with other agents through the population state distribution, $\mu := (\mu_t)_t$ with $\mu_t \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R})$ is to minimize

$$J(\alpha; \mu) = \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^T f(t, X_t, \alpha_t, \mu_t) dt + g(X_T, \mu_T) \right] \quad (2.5)$$

$$dX_t = b(t, X_t, \alpha_t, \mu_t) dt + \sigma(t, X_t, \mu_t) dW_t, \quad X_0 = \zeta \sim \mu_0,$$

where $\mathbf{W} := (W_t)_t$ is the Brownian Motion representing the idiosyncratic (i.e. individual and independent) noise the agents face. The MFG models where there is a common randomness source all the agents are affected in the same way are called *MFGs with common noise* which are more technically involved since the players' states are not independent anymore and one needs to work with a conditional mean field. Following the terminology used in stochastic optimal control problems, we call function f, g, b, σ running cost, terminal cost, drift and volatility, respectively. In the model above, the representative agent interacts with the population through the population state distribution; however, in general the interactions can be through the population control distribution or joint control and state distribution which is called *extended* MFG models in the literature. The continuous time MFG models can be solved with the analytic approach or the probabilistic approach. In the former, the solution is characterized by forward-backward partial differential equations (FBPDE) where the backward component is the Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman (HJB) equation and the forward component is the Kolmogorov-Fokker-Planck (KFP) equation. In the latter, the solution is characterized by forward-backward stochastic differential equations (FBSDE). We refer to the monographs of Bensoussan et al. [16], Carmona et al. [42] for more background.

In this context, we can define the notion of Nash equilibrium as follows.

Definition 2.5. *A (continuous time mean field) Nash equilibrium is a control $\hat{\alpha}$ and a mean field $\hat{\mu}$ such that the following two conditions are satisfied:*

- $\hat{\alpha}$ is a minimizer of $J(\cdot; \hat{\mu})$ as defined in (2.5),
- $\hat{\mu}$ is the mean field induced by control $\hat{\alpha}$.

As in the discrete time case, the problem can be phrased as a fixed point problem. This fixed point formulation provides a basis for existence results using fixed point theorems (see e.g. Huang et al. [81], Carmona et al. [42]). Uniqueness of the equilibrium mean field can be proved under Lasry-Lions monotonicity condition, see e.g. Lasry and Lions [92], while uniqueness of the best response is generally ensured by strict convexity assumptions that result in having a unique optimizer for the Hamiltonian.

The two directions illustrated by Figure 1 have been proved rigorously in several settings, under suitable assumptions. For the justification that mean field Nash equilibrium provides a good approximate Nash equilibrium in finite player games, interested readers can refer for instance to Huang et al. [81], Bensoussan et al. [16] in the continuous setting, and to Saldi et al. [113, 114], Cui et al. [52] in the discrete setting. For the convergence of Nash equilibria in finite-player games towards mean field Nash equilibria, we refer e.g. to the works of Cecchin et al. [47], Cardaliaguet et al. [32], Lacker [87].

3 Examples and extensions

In this section, we provide several examples from the mean field games literature in both discrete time and continuous time. We conclude by mentioning several extensions of the framework.

3.1 Discrete time models

We first note that, in the same way that optimal control contains optimization problems as a special case, static (single-shot) games can naturally be embedded in the framework of finite horizon dynamic

games by considering games with a single state and a single time step. We refer to e.g. Muller et al. [102, 101], Wang and Wellman [121] for variants of the classical rock-paper-scissors game and prisoner’s dilemma game in the finite-horizon MFG framework, as well as learning algorithms for such games and refer to Carmona and Dayanikh [34] for a static mean field game application. In this section, we present a few models which are truly dynamic.

3.1.1 Crowd motion

We start with an example in discrete time and discrete spaces which has a straightforward physical interpretation: crowd motion. Pedestrians move around in a spatial domain and interact through the density of the crowd, which may for instance create discomfort or slower movements. The main ingredients can be summarized as follows:

- Agents: pedestrians.
- States: possible locations, for instance a grid world of the form $S = \{0, \dots, s_1\} \times \{0, \dots, s_2\}$.
- Actions: possible moves; for instance up, left, down, right or stay, which corresponds to $A = \{(1, 0), (0, -1), (-1, 0), (0, 1), (0, 0)\}$
- Transitions: $P_n(s, a, \mu) =$ the distribution of $s + a + \epsilon_n$, where ϵ_n is a random variable taking values in A which is interpreted as a random perturbation of the agent’s movements.
- Rewards: $r_n(s, a, \mu)$ can include spatial preferences (e.g., of the form $-|s - s_*|$ where s_* is a target state), cost of moving (e.g., $-|a|$), and mean-field interactions such as:
 - attraction towards the mean (e.g., $-|x - \bar{\mu}|$ where $\bar{\mu}$ is the mean of μ);
 - crowd aversion (e.g., $-\mu(x)$, which penalizes the fact of being in a crowded location) ;
 - congestion (e.g., $-\mu(x)|a|$, which penalizes the fact of moving through a crowded region).

Notice that the last two types of interactions can also be non-local, e.g., $-(\rho \star \mu)(x)$ or $-(\rho \star \mu)(x)|a|$ where ρ is a kernel and \star denotes the (discrete) convolution.

- Obstacles can be included in the model by adding a set of forbidden states and, when an agent is supposed to move to a forbidden state, she just stays at her current state.

Numerical illustrations are provided in Section 4.4.2 for a model of the above type, solved using fictitious play and reinforcement learning. Similar models have been considered for instance by Perrin et al. [109], Zaman et al. [124], Algumaei et al. [6].

3.1.2 Traffic routing

We then consider another application with a clear physical interpretation: traffic routing. Cars evolve on a network of roads and try to reach a destination, but each car faces traffic jams created by the population of cars. The main elements of the model are:

- Agents: cars (or drivers).
- States: one possible approach is to consider that the states are the locations along (a discretization of) the roads (edges of the network); however this could lead to a very large number of states; another approach is to consider that the state of a car is: the edge on the network and the waiting time before it can move to the next edge.
- Actions: in routing, the actions a car can take when it arrives at a cross-road is the next road (edge of the network); in a more sophisticated model, one could consider that the car can also choose its velocity (or acceleration) along the current road.

- Transitions: they can model the movement of the car along the current road and then the transition to the next road; alternatively, they can model the decay of the waiting time until reaching the crossroad and then the transition to the next road;
- Rewards: each wants to reach a target destination as soon as possible.
- If there are several origins and destinations, this can be represented using a multi-population MFG.

A model of this type has been considered for instance by Cabannes et al. [25]. A more precise description of the model is given in Section 4.4.1 and numerical illustrations are provided.

3.1.3 Cybersecurity

Next, we present a model of cybersecurity introduced by Kolokoltsov and Bensoussan [83]; see also the book of Carmona and Delarue [35, Section 7.2.3]. The players are computers which do not want to be infected, and there are finitely many states, corresponding to the level of infection and the level of protection. The original model is in continuous time but here we will present a discrete time version, to be consistent with our notations. More generally, continuous-time finite-state games can be approximated by discrete-time finite-state games by discretizing time and then replacing transition rate matrices by transition probabilities.

- Agents: computers.
- States: there are 4 possible states, $S = \{DI, DS, UI, US\}$, which corresponds to the level of defense (Defended or Undefended) and the level of infection (Infected or Susceptible).
- Actions: each computed can decide that they want to change their level of protection, which is represented by the choice of a level a in $A = \{0, 1\}$; $a = 0$ (resp. $a = 1$) means that they want to keep (resp. switch to the other extreme) their current level of protection.
- Transitions: at a high level, the probability of being infected increases with the proportion of infected computers, the intensity of attack (which is a fixed parameter in this model) and it is lower when the computer is defended than when it is not. If one starts from the original continuous time model introduced by Kolokoltsov and Bensoussan [83] with transition rate matrix denoted by Q , then the transition matrix P over a time step of size Δt is given by $P = \exp(\Delta t Q)$. The transition rate matrix in [35, Section 7.2.3] is:

$$Q = \begin{pmatrix} \dots & Q_{DS \rightarrow DI} & \rho a & 0 \\ q_{rec}^D & \dots & 0 & \rho a \\ \rho a & 0 & \dots & Q_{US \rightarrow UI} \\ 0 & \rho a & q_{rec}^U & \dots \end{pmatrix}$$

where $Q_{DS \rightarrow DI} = v_H q_{inf}^D + \beta_{DD} \mu(\{DI\}) + \beta_{UD} \mu(\{UI\})$, and $Q_{US \rightarrow UI} = v_H q_{inf}^U + \beta_{UU} \mu(\{UI\}) + \beta_{DU} \mu(\{DI\})$, and all the instances of \dots should be replaced by the negative of the sum of the entries of the row in which \dots appears on the diagonal. The matrix depends on the action a and the mean field μ . The parameters are as follows: $\rho > 0$ determines the rate at which a computer can switch its level of protection; q_{rec}^D or q_{rec}^U are the rates at which a computer can recover depending on whether it is defended or not; $v_H q_{inf}^D$ (resp. $v_H q_{inf}^U$) determines the rates at which a computer becomes infected by the attacker (v_h represents the strength of the attack) if it is defended (resp. undefended); $\beta_{UU} \mu(\{UI\})$ (resp. $\beta_{UD} \mu(\{UI\})$) represents the rate of infection by undefended infected computers if the computer is undefended (resp. defended); $\beta_{DU} \mu(\{DI\})$ (resp. $\beta_{DD} \mu(\{DI\})$) represent the rates of infection by defended infected computers if it is undefended (resp. defended).

- Rewards: the rewards discourage the computers from being infected but also makes them pay a cost to be defended; it takes the form: $r(x, a, \mu) = - [k_D \mathbf{1}_{\{DI, DS\}}(x) + k_I \mathbf{1}_{\{DI, UI\}}(x)]$.

Models of this type have been considered for instance by Laurière [94], Vasal [119].

3.2 Continuous time models

Some of the discrete time models can also be studied in continuous time. For example, crowd motion has been studied in the MFG literature by Lachapelle and Wolfram [86], Achdou and Laurière [2], Achdou and Lasry [1], while the cybersecurity model discussed above was introduced by Kolokoltsov and Bensoussan [83] in continuous time as already mentioned, and then revisited e.g. by Kolokoltsov and Malafeyev [85], Carmona and Delarue [35]. We refer to these works for more details on these models. Below, we present several other models.

3.2.1 Project value management

We extend the example given in the introduction of continuous time stochastic optimal control problems in Section 2.1. In the extended model, we have infinitely many non-cooperative agents (i.e., employees) and the representative agent's problem is given as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{(\alpha_t)_t} \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^T \left(\frac{1}{2} \alpha_t^2 - U(X_t) \right) dt - U(X_T) \right] \\ dX_t = (\alpha_t + \bar{X}_t) dt + \sigma dW_t, \quad X_0 = \zeta \sim \mu_0, \end{aligned}$$

where $U : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a concave utility function. Intuitively, the mathematical model implies that each player has some utility from their own project value (i.e., state) which is denoted by the \mathbb{R} -valued process $\mathbf{X} = (X_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$ and has some cost from putting too much effort (i.e., control) denoted by \mathbb{R} -valued process $\boldsymbol{\alpha} = (\alpha_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$. The initial project value of the representative agent follows an initial distribution μ_0 . We see that the dynamics of the value of the project is affected by the agent's own effort (α_t) and also the average value of the projects in the population which is denoted by $\bar{X}_t = \int_{\mathbb{R}} x \mu_t(dx)$ at a given time. In this model, the representative player is interacting with the population through the average state (i.e., average project value) in the population.

3.2.2 Electricity production

Motivated by the example given in Carmona, Dayanikli, and Laurière [44], we present a game problem for large number of non-cooperative the electricity producers who are using nonrenewable energy resources in the production and who are paying a carbon tax depending on their pollution levels. The mean field interactions will come through the price of the electricity. In this setup, the representative electricity producer's model is given as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{(\alpha_t)_t} \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^T (c_1(\alpha_t)^2 + pN_t + c_2(Q_t - D_t)^2 - c_3(\rho_1 + \rho_2(D_t - \bar{Q}_t))Q_t) dt + \tau P_T \right] \\ dN_t = \alpha_t dt, \quad N_0 \sim \mu_{n,0}, \quad dE_t = \delta \alpha_t dt + \sigma_1 dW_t^1, \quad E_0 \sim \mu_{e,0}, \\ dP_t = E_t dt, \quad P_0 \sim \mu_{p,0}, \quad dQ_t = \kappa \alpha_t dt + \sigma_2 dW_t^2, \quad Q_0 \sim \mu_{q,0}. \end{aligned}$$

In this model, the representative electricity producer controls the change in nonrenewable energy source usage at time t and it is denoted by $\alpha_t \in \mathbb{R}$. The representative producer has a 4-dimensional state: nonrenewable energy usage at time t ($N_t \in \mathbb{R}_+$), instantaneous carbon emission at time t ($E_t \in \mathbb{R}_+$), cumulative pollution at time t ($P_t \in \mathbb{R}_+$), and instantaneous electricity production at time t ($Q_t \in \mathbb{R}_+$).

In the dynamics, $\delta, \kappa, \sigma_1, \sigma_2$ are positive coefficients, where δ and κ denote the carbon emission level and production efficiency per unit nonrenewable energy usage, respectively. $(W_t^1)_{t \in [0, T]}$ and $(W_t^2)_{t \in [0, T]}$ two independent Brownian motions that represent idiosyncratic noises. In the objective, the first term represents the cost of ramping up or down the production too quickly in the facility, the second one is the price paid for instantaneous nonrenewable energy usage where p denotes the price per unit nonrenewable energy usage. The third term is the penalty for matching the exogenous average electricity demand which is denoted by $(D_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$, and the fourth term is the revenue gained from the selling the electricity. Here $\rho_1 + \rho_2(D_t - \bar{Q}_t)$ denotes the price per unit of electricity. We can see that the price is increasing if the average demand is more than the average supply ($\bar{Q}_t = \mathbb{E}[Q_t]$) and is decreasing vice versa. This term is introducing the mean field interactions. Finally, the fifth term represents the carbon tax the producer pays at the terminal time T .

3.2.3 Trading with price impact

Another application example of continuous time mean field games is modeling the traders. Here, for the sake of definiteness, we follow the model introduced by Cardaliaguet and Lehalle [31] and we assume that there is a single stock being traded. In this models the agents are traders, or more specifically brokers who are in charge of liquidating their portfolio in a given time interval. In this setup, the representative trader's model is given as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{(\alpha_t)_t} -\mathbb{E} \left[-\phi \int_0^T |Q_t|^2 dt + X_T + Q_T S_T - A|Q_T|^2 \right] \\ dS_t = \gamma \bar{\mu}_t dt + \sigma dW_t, \quad S_0 \sim \mu_{s,0} \\ dQ_t = \alpha_t dt, \quad Q_0 \sim \mu_{q,0} \\ dX_t = -\alpha_t (S_t + \kappa \alpha_t) dt, \quad X_0 \sim \mu_{x,0}. \end{aligned}$$

In this model, the representative trader controls their rate of buying and selling the stock at time t which is denoted by $\alpha_t \in \mathbb{R}$. The state of the representative trader has three components: the price of the underlying stock S_t , which is common to all the players, the individual portfolio Q_t (i.e., number of shares of the stock), the individual wealth X_t (for example in dollars). Therefore, the state space is \mathbb{R}^3 . Notice the portfolio and the wealth can potentially take negative values if the trader needs to buy shares and is allowed to borrow money. The representative trader's control directly affects their portfolio and wealth. The individual wealth process ($\mathbf{X} = (X_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$) is affected by a *temporary* price impact while the stock price process ($\mathbf{S} = (S_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$) is influenced by a *permanent* price impact. Their scales are respectively determined by positive coefficients κ and γ . The permanent price impact involves $\bar{\mu}_t$, which is the average trading rate (average action), i.e., $\bar{\mu}_t = \mathbb{E}[\alpha_t]$. We refer to Cardaliaguet and Lehalle [31] for more explanations. In the objective, the first term and the last term are the cost of holding a large portfolio (either at time T or any time before that). Here, A and ϕ are positive constants that weigh the importance of these penalizations and can be interpreted as parameterizing the risk preference of the trader. The second and the third terms represents the terminal payoff which depends on the wealth and the value of the portfolio at time T . Since the objective is *minimizing*, a negative sign is added before the expectation.

Since the model involves interactions through the distribution (in this mode through its mean) of actions, it is referred to as an *extended* MFG or an MFG of controls. We present numerical illustrations in Section 5.2.2.

The model is similar to the model considered by Cartea and Jaimungal [46], which can be solved using reinforcement learning and real data as e.g. by Leal et al. [97]. However, the main difference of the above model is the fact that the price impact is here endogeneous since it is the result of the actions of all players, which makes the model more realistic than when $\bar{\mu}_t$ is given as an exogeneous term. Other similar

models of optimal execution have been proposed by Carmona and Lacker [36] in the weak formulation, and revisited in the book of Carmona and Delarue [35, Sections 1.3.2 and 4.7.1] in the strong formulation.

3.3 Extensions

To simplify the presentation, we restrict our attention to *homogeneous* populations with *symmetric* interactions, and to the notion of *Nash equilibrium*. However real-world situations are often much more complex. Several extensions of this framework have been studied. For instance, multi-population MFGs consider MFGs in which there are several populations who interact, and each population is approximated by a mean field (see e.g. Huang et al. [81], Feleqi [61], Cirant [49], Bensoussan et al. [18] for an analytical approach and Carmona et al. [42, Section 7.1.1] for a probabilistic formulation). Graphon games go one step further towards heterogeneous interactions by considering that the continuum of agents have interactions that are weighted by a network structure (see e.g. Parise and Ozdaglar [106], Carmona et al. [43] in the static case and e.g. Caines and Huang [26, 27], Aurell et al. [12] in the dynamic case; see Cui and Koepl [51], Fabian et al. [60] for learning methods). Major-minor MFGs include one (or several) significant (i.e., major) agent(s) to the model, where she (they) can directly affect the mean field (see e.g. Huang [80], Nguyen and Huang [104], Nourian and Caines [105], Bensoussan et al. [17] in the LQ setting, Sen and Caines [116], Carmona and Zhu [45], Carmona and Wang [39] for the probabilistic analysis, Lasry and Lions [93], Cardaliaguet et al. [33] for the analytical viewpoint, Carmona and Dayanıklı [34], Dayanıklı and Laurière [54] for the incorporation of multiple major players, and Cui et al. [52] for a learning algorithm). If the major player has a stochastic evolution, this may lead to a form of common noise for the minor players, which makes such models challenging to analyze and to solve. Stackelberg MFGs considers that a principal influences the agents in the mean field population (see e.g. Bensoussan et al. [17], Elie et al. [57] for the theoretical background and Aurell et al. [10], Dayanıklı and Laurière [53] for machine learning methods). The main difference between major-minor MFG and Stackelberg MFG is the equilibrium notion between the major agent/principal and the mean field population. In major-minor MFG, the major player and the minor players that constitute the large population are in a Nash equilibrium. However, in Stackelberg MFG, the principal and the players in the mean field population are in a Stackelberg equilibrium. Because of this difference, one of these notions can be a better fit for the application of interest. For example, if we are interested in public policy making, a Stackelberg MFG can be a better fit to model the interactions of a government and the individuals in a large society. Furthermore, other notions of solutions have been investigated, such as social optimum, also called mean field control (MFC) or control of McKean-Vlasov dynamics (see e.g. Bensoussan et al. [16], Carmona et al. [40] for the definitions, and Carmona and Laurière [37, 38], Dayanıklı et al. [55] for deep learning methods), and correlated equilibrium (see Campi and Fischer [28], Bonesini et al. [21] for theoretical background and Muller et al. [102, 101] for learning algorithms). While Nash equilibrium assumes that the agents are in a non-cooperative setup, mean field control considers a purely cooperative setup and correlated equilibrium consider non-cooperative players who can share a common signal. These setups can be relevant depending on the application under consideration. For instance, MFC can be relevant in distributed robotics, since all the robots cooperate to achieve a common goal.

4 Methods for discrete time models

In this section, we describe several methods to solve discrete time games. To fix the ideas, we present the algorithms in the context of mean field games, although similar ideas could be used for finite-player games. We start with a general description of fixed point methods to compute Nash equilibria. We then discuss two classical families of algorithms to compute best responses: policy optimization and dynamic programming.

4.1 Fixed point algorithms

High-level description. Recall that the solution notion, namely Nash equilibrium, can be formulated as a fixed point problem. Therefore, the simplest idea is to iteratively apply the *best response operator* and the *mean field operator*. To be more specific, let us consider that, at the beginning of iteration $k \geq 0$, we have a candidate $\mu^k = (\mu_n^k)_{n=0, \dots, N_T}$ for the mean field sequence. We first compute a new policy, say π^{k+1} , which is a best response against μ^k . Then we compute the new mean field, μ^{k+1} as the sequence induced when the whole population uses policy π^{k+1} . There are several methods to perform these steps in practice, depending on the setting. Specific methods will be presented and discussed in detail below, with a special attention given to methods allowing to compute a best response. This is summarized in Algorithm 1.

Algorithm 1 Fixed point iterations

Input: initial mean field $\mu^0 = (\mu_n^0)_n$; number of iterations K

Output: equilibrium policy and mean field

- 1: Compute a best response π^0 against mean field μ^0
 - 2: **for** $k = 0, \dots, K - 1$ **do**
 - 3: **Mean field update:** Let μ^{k+1} be the mean field induced by policy π^k
 - 4: **Policy update:** Compute a best response π^{k+1} against mean field μ^{k+1}
 - 5: **return** π^K, μ^K
-

Convergence. A first remark is that, if the sequences of $(\mu^k)_{k \geq 0}$ and $(\pi^k)_{k \geq 0}$ converge, say respectively to μ and π , then (μ, π) form a Nash equilibrium. Indeed, in the limit, the mean field update does not modify μ , which means that μ is the mean field generated by policy π ; moreover, if the policy update does not modify π , it means that π is a best response against μ . We thus obtain a pair which satisfies the requirements of a Nash equilibrium, see Definitions 2.4 and 2.5. This property is true even if there are multiple Nash equilibria.

A sufficient condition for the convergence of μ^k is that the composition $MF \circ BR$ of the two functions is a strict contraction. Intuitively, this holds provided each function is a strict contraction. In particular, the best response function needs to be Lipschitz in the mean field, with a small enough Lipschitz constant, which can be quite restrictive. One way to help this condition to be satisfied is to modify the reward by adding an extra entropic penalty, which regularizes the best response. Another option is to keep the original reward but to optimize only over a class of regularized policies such as policies that are soft-max of the Q-function. However, it should be noted that these two approaches modify the reward function and hence change the Nash equilibrium of the game, see e.g. Guo et al. [71], Cui and Koepl [50], Guo et al. [72], Anahtarci et al. [7].

As for the convergence of the policy, the main roadblock is that in many cases, there are multiple best responses to a given mean field. Here again, adding an entropic regularization in the reward or directly optimizing over smooth policies can help ensuring uniqueness of the best response at the expense of changing the Nash equilibrium.

Since computing a best response against a given mean field $\mu = (\mu_n)_{n=0, \dots, N_T}$ boils down to solving the MDP:

$$\max_{\pi} J(\pi; \mu).$$

Remark 4.1. We assume that the maximum (or, if the objective is minimization, the minimum) of the objective is attained. Otherwise, we can aim to find the supremum (or infimum) and approximately optimal policies.

This step can be tackled using any existing method for MDPs. Next, we describe two families of methods.

Variants. Several variants of the above fixed point iterations have been introduced. In the discrete time setting, the two main methods are Fictitious Play and Online Mirror Descent. They were first studied in the continuous time and space setting e.g. by Cardaliaguet and Hadikhanloo [30], Hadikhanloo [73].

- **Fictitious Play** consists in computing a BR not against the last mean field μ^k but against the average $\bar{\mu}^k$ of mean fields seen in past iterations, i.e., $\bar{\mu}_n^k(s) = \frac{1}{k} \sum_{j=1}^k \mu_n^j(s)$ for all s, n ; see Elie et al. [59], Perrin et al. [108] for proofs of convergence under monotonicity condition and numerical experiments.
- **Online Mirror Descent** consists in replacing the BR computation by a policy improvement based on first evaluating the current policy, computing the sum of all past value functions, and then letting the new policy be the softmax of this cumulative value function. To be specific, given the state-action value function Q obtained at a given iteration (by evaluating the previous policy), we compute the next policy by taking $\pi(a|x) = (\text{softmax}_\tau Q(x, \cdot))(a) = \exp(Q(x, a)/\tau) / \sum_{a' \in A} \exp(Q(x, a')/\tau)$, where $\tau > 0$ is the temperature parameter. We refer to Pérolat et al. [107] for more details and a proof of convergence under monotonicity assumption.

4.2 Computing a best response by policy optimization

A first and somewhat straightforward approach to compute an optimal policy is to view the MDP as an optimization problem over the space of policies. If the state space or the action space is large, then it is common to replace the policy π by a neural network π_θ with parameters $\theta \in \Theta$. Then, the problem becomes:

$$\max_{\theta \in \Theta} J(\pi_\theta; \mu). \quad (4.1)$$

To find an optimal parameter, we can then use gradient-based methods for instance. In general, there is no closed-form formula for $\nabla_\theta J(\pi_\theta; \mu)$, and we need to estimate this term. Since J is an expectation, we can use Monte Carlo samples and stochastic gradient descent (SGD) or extensions such as Adam optimizer. This is summarized in Algorithm 2. To alleviate the presentation, we introduce the following notation: a trajectory is denoted by $\tau = (s_n, a_n, r_n)_{n=0, \dots, N_T}$ with

$$s_0 \sim \mu_0, \quad a_n \sim \pi_{\theta, n}(s_n), \quad s_n \sim P_{n-1}(s_{n-1}, a_{n-1}, \mu_{n-1}), \quad r_n = r_n(s_n, a_n, \mu_n), \quad n = 1, \dots, N_T. \quad (4.2)$$

The total reward obtained for this trajectory is denoted by:

$$\hat{J}(\tau) = \sum_{n=0}^{N_T} r_n. \quad (4.3)$$

Note that τ implicitly depends on the policy that is used to generate the actions. Changing the policy implies changing the distribution of actions. To clarify the gradient's computation, one can introduce random variables ϵ_n and U_n for the randomness coming from the dynamics and the policy and write:

$$s_n = P_{n-1}(s_{n-1}, a_{n-1}, \mu_{n-1}, \epsilon_n), \quad a_n = \pi_{\theta, n}(s_n, U_n) \quad (4.4)$$

where now P and $\pi_{\theta, n}$ are deterministic functions. Now, we can compute the gradient of \hat{J} with respect to the policy's parameter θ for a given randomness realization $(\epsilon_n, U_n)_n$.

Algorithm 2 BR computation by policy optimization**Input:** mean field $\mu = (\mu_n)_n$; number of iterations K ; learning rates $(\beta^k)_{k=0,\dots,K-1}$ **Output:** (approximation of an) optimal neural network policy for (4.1)

- 1: Initialize θ^0
- 2: **for** $k = 0, \dots, K - 1$ **do**
- 3: Generate a trajectory: sample $(\epsilon_n)_n, (U_n)_n$ and use (4.4) to generate $\tau^k = (s_n, a_n, r_n)_{n=0,\dots,N_T}$ using (4.2) with policy π_{θ^k} and mean field μ
- 4: Compute the gradient $\nabla_{\theta} \hat{J}(\tau^k)$, where \hat{J} is defined in (4.3)
- 5: Update parameters: $\theta^{k+1} \leftarrow \theta^k + \beta^k \hat{J}(\tau)$
- 6: **return** θ^K

The above policy optimization method (implicitly) relies on the knowledge of the model in order to compute the gradient $\nabla_{\theta} \hat{J}(\tau)$ because to compute this quantity exactly, one needs the reward and transition functions. However, the method can be adapted to model-free setting using policy gradient type methods. This class of methods builds upon the policy gradient theorem. We refer to the book of Sutton and Barto [118, Chapter 13]. Although we focused here on the MFG setting, RL policy optimization methods can also be applied in finite player games, see e.g. Hambly et al. [74]. To ensure convergence of the algorithm, one needs to let the learning rates $(\beta^k)_k$ go to 0. However, they cannot vanish too quickly, otherwise the learning stops too early. From the theoretical perspective, rigorous proofs of convergence can be obtained through stochastic approximation, which formulates precise conditions on the learning rates. We refer to the original work of Robbins and Monro [111], and to the book of e.g. Borkar [23, Section 10.2] for an application of stochastic approximation arguments to the convergence of stochastic gradient schemes.

4.3 Computing a best response by dynamic programming

Another family of approaches consists in using the time structure of the MDP and using dynamic programming instead of viewing it as a pure optimization problem. To this end, we define the (state-only) value function as:

$$V_n^*(s; \mu) = \max_{\pi} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{n'=n}^{N_T} r_{n'}(s_{n'}, a_{n'}, \mu_{n'}) \mid s_n = s \right],$$

which is the maximum possible expected total reward when the state trajectory starts at time n from state s given the mean field μ . In particular, $\mathbb{E}_{s \sim \mu_0} [V_0^*(s; \mu)]$ is the best possible value achievable by an individual player given the mean field μ .

It can be shown that $V^* = (V_n^*)_n$ satisfies the Bellman equation, also called dynamic programming (DP) equation:

$$\begin{cases} V_{N_T}^*(s; \mu) = \max_{a \in A} r_{N_T}(s, a, \mu_{N_T}) \\ V_n^*(s; \mu) = \max_{a \in A} \{r_n(s, a, \mu_n) + \mathbb{E}_{s_{n'} \sim P_n(s, a, \mu_n)} [V_{n+1}^*(s_{n'}; \mu)]\}. \end{cases}$$

Any policy whose support is over the set of maximizers in the above equation for each s and n is a best response against the mean field μ . In fact, π is a best response against μ if and only if: for every $n = 0, \dots, N_T$, $s \in S$, $a \in A$,

$$\pi_n(a|s, \mu_n) > 0 \Rightarrow a \in \arg \max_{a \in A} \{r_n(s, a, \mu_n) + \mathbb{E}_{s_{n'} \sim P_n(s, a, \mu_n)} [V_{n+1}^*(s_{n'}; \mu)]\}.$$

In particular,

$$\mathbb{E}_{s_0 \sim \mu_0}[V_0^*(s_0; \mu)] = \max_{\pi} J(\pi; \mu).$$

In fact, it is often more convenient to work with the state-action value function, also called Q -function, which is defined as:

$$Q_n^*(s, a; \mu) = \max_{\pi} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{n'=n}^{N_T} r_{n'}(s_{n'}, a_{n'}, \mu_{n'}) \mid s_n = s, a_n = a \right].$$

It corresponds to the maximum possible expected total reward when the state trajectory starts at time n from state s and the first action is a given the mean field μ , after which the player picks actions according to an optimal policy. We have the relation:

$$V_n^*(s; \mu) = \max_{\nu \in \mathcal{P}(A)} \mathbb{E}_{a \sim \nu}[Q_n^*(s, a; \mu)],$$

and Q^* satisfies the Bellman equation (or DP equation):

$$\begin{cases} Q_{N_T}^*(s, a; \mu) = r_{N_T}(s, a, \mu_{N_T}) & (4.5) \\ Q_n^*(s, a; \mu) = r_n(s, a, \mu_n) + \mathbb{E}_{s_{n'} \sim P_n(s, a, \mu_n)} \left[\max_{a' \in A} Q_{n+1}^*(s_{n'}, a'; \mu) \right]. & (4.6) \end{cases}$$

The main advantage of working with the Q -function is that, once Q^* is computed, an optimal policy can easily be deduced: π is an optimal policy provided it is distributed over the set of maximizers of Q^* . Namely, for every $n = 0, \dots, N_T$, $s \in S$, $a \in A$,

$$\pi_n(a|s) > 0 \Rightarrow a \in \arg \max Q_n(s, \cdot; \mu).$$

In fact, if one computes Q^* by using the dynamic programming equation above, an optimal policy can be computed along the way. This is illustrated in Algorithm 3. Note that, in general, there are infinitely many best responses but perhaps only one of them gives the Nash equilibrium. Hence returning the Q -function instead of just one policy (chosen arbitrarily) can be useful.

Algorithm 3 BR computation by dynamic programming

Input: mean field $\mu = (\mu_n)_n$

Output: optimal Q -function and an optimal policy for (4.1)

- 1: Let $Q_{N_T}^*(s, a; \mu)$ for all s, a using (4.5)
 - 2: **for** $n = N_T - 1, \dots, 0$ **do**
 - 3: Compute $Q_n^*(s, a; \mu)$ for all s, a using (4.6)
 - 4: Let $\pi_n^*(\cdot|s)$ be an action distribution with support in $\arg \max Q_n(s, \cdot; \mu)$ for all s
 - 5: **return** Q^*, π^*
-

In Algorithm 3, each step is computed *exactly* in the sense that we assume we can compute perfectly the expectation and the maximal value appearing in (4.6). In practice, if the state and action spaces are large, we can replace Q^* and π^* by neural networks and train them using using samples and an SGD-based method.

The above approach can also be used as a foundation for model-free algorithms. Computing the optimal Q -function can be done using the celebrated Q -learning algorithm Watkins and Dayan [122] (with tabular representation) or one of the more recent developments based on deep neural networks such as DQN Mnih et al. [100]. It is also possible to learn both a Q -function approximation and policy approximation using methods such as actor-critic algorithms. We refer to e.g. Arulkumaran et al. [9], François-Lavet et al. [64] for surveys on the basics of deep RL and we omit more recent developments for the sake of brevity.

4.4 Numerical illustrations

We now present two concrete examples that are solved numerically using learning methods.

4.4.1 Traffic routing with online mirror descent

We present an illustration of the traffic routing model introduced by Cabannes et al. [25] and discussed in Section 3.1.2. We detail the model here. The network of roads is represented by an oriented graph. L denotes the set of edges or links. The model presented by Cabannes et al. [25] is in continuous time, but the implementation in OpenSpiel implementation uses a discrete time version of the model. Here, we directly focus on the discrete time version, in line with the notations introduced above. We fix a time horizon T and an integer N_T , and we define the time step size $\Delta t = T/N_T$.

- Agents: cars (or drivers).
- States: the state of an individual at time step n is $s_n = (\ell_n, w_n)$ corresponding to the current link and the waiting time. It takes values in $X = E \times \{0, \dots, N_T\}$.
- Actions: an individual can choose which edge to use next, among the set of successors of the current edge ℓ_n . So the global action space is $A = E$, but there is a constraint at time step n ensuring that the legal actions are only the successors of ℓ_n .
- Transitions: the initial state of a representative player is (ℓ_0, w_0) , and the dynamics are as follows: as long as $w_n > \Delta t$, the player cannot move to another link and the waiting time decreases, so:

$$\ell_{n+1} = \ell_n, \quad w_{n+1} = w_n - \Delta t,$$

and when $w_n \leq \Delta t$, the player can move to the next link and the waiting time is set to a new value, which depends on how congested the link is:

$$\ell_{n+1} \sim \pi_n(s_n), \quad w_{n+1} = c(\ell_n, \mu_n(\ell_n)),$$

where π denotes the policy, $\mu_n(\ell_n)$ is the total mass in link ℓ_n at time n , and $c : \mathcal{E} \times [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ is a congestion function; the value $c(\ell, m)$ determines the waiting time when arriving in a link ℓ with a proportion m of the total population. We refer to Cabannes et al. [25] for more discussions on realistic choices of congestion functions c based on empirical studies.

- Rewards: each player wants to arrive at the destination as soon as possible. Here, we assume that there is a common destination D for all the drivers.⁴ So the reward is simply the total time spent on the road before reaching the destination. Mathematically, we take $r((\ell, w), a, \mu) = -\mathbf{1}_{\ell \neq D}$, which makes the agent pay a cost of 1 as long as the state is not the destination state (notice that here we view links and not nodes as states). We could also multiply by Δt to take into account the time discretization but this will have no influence on the equilibrium policies.

We solve the MFG by using the OMD algorithm mentioned in Section 4.1. We employ the implementation available in the open-source library OpenSpiel; see Lanctot et al. [89].⁵ In particular, at each iteration, the value function and the mean field are computed using the transition matrices so there is no approximation.

⁴An extra component can be added to keep track of the destination if different groups of players have different destinations; see Cabannes et al. [25] for more details.

⁵More precisely, we used the codes available at the following address (as of May 2024), which allows to reproduce the experiments of Cabannes et al. [25]: https://github.com/google-deepmind/open_spiel/tree/master/open_spiel/data/paper_data/routing_game_experiments.




Figure 2: Evolution of the population distribution in the MFG of Braess network, at times $n = 0, 1, 8, 10, 16$ (from top left to bottom right). The size of the disc represents the proportion of the population on the corresponding link at that time.

As for the network, we consider here an MFG version of the celebrated Braess paradox Braess et al. [24]. The network and the evolution of the population using the equilibrium policy learnt by OMD are shown in Figure 2. In this example, there are 20 time steps, a single origin and a single destination. We refer to Cabannes et al. [25] for more details.

Next, we illustrate the advantage of solving an MFG instead of a finite player game, even when one is interested in a scenario with a finite population. For various values of N , we compare the computational time of two approaches: (1) solving the N -player Braess network game using counterfactual regret minimization with external sampling (ext CFR), and (2) solving the MFG using OMD. For each N , we run the computation 10 times and report the average. The results are reported in Figure 3. The computational time of CFR increases exponentially with N , while the cost of solving the MFG is independent of N .

4.4.2 Crowd motion with fictitious play and RL

In this section, we solve an MFG modeling crowd motion in a grid world by using fictitious play (FP) described in Section 4.1 and reinforcement learning. We consider the model discussed in Section 3.1.1 with a 2D grid world and 5 possible actions. The noise takes value $(0, 0)$ with probability $1 - p$ and takes value any of the 4 directions with probability $p/4$. The reward is simply: $-\mu(x)$, which reflects crowd aversion. The domain represents 4 rooms connected by doors. This model was introduced by Geist et al. [67], who studied the connection with RL. It has then been used as a benchmark problem in several other works, e.g. Algumaei et al. [6]. In the simulations, we consider a grid world of size 9×9 ; we took $p = 0.2$ for the noise probability and horizon $N_T = 15$.

We solve the problem using three different algorithms based on fictitious play. In each case, the mean field evolution is computed exactly using the transition matrix, but the methods differ by the way the best response (BR) and the average policy are computed:

- Exact Fictitious Play: standard fictitious play, with perfect computation of the BR (using backward induction);




Figure 3: Computational time of CFR for the N -player Braess game versus OMD for the MFG. The results are average over 10 runs.

- Tabular Q-learning Fictitious Play: computation of the BR using tabular Q learning and computation of the average policy by a tabular representation;
- Deep Fictitious Play: computation of the BR using deep RL (DQN) and computation of the average policy by deep learning (see Laurière et al. [95] for more details).

The simulations are done using the library OpenSpiel (see Lanctot et al. [89]), which contains the MFG crowd motion model as well as the above algorithms.⁶ Figure 4 shows the exploitabilities. For the methods based on RL, we ran the algorithms 10 times and computed the average (lines) as well as the standard deviation (shaded areas). For the tabular Q learning method, we used the default parameters in OpenSpiel. For the deep RL method, we ran it with two different choices of hyperparameters: in the first, we use 50 inner iterations of DQN, an architecture of [64, 64] neurons and a constant $\epsilon = 0.1$; in the second, we use 500 inner iterations, [128, 128, 128] neurons and an ϵ decaying from 0.1 to 0.001.⁷ We observe that standard fictitious play converges faster than the methods where the BR is approximated using RL. Among the two methods using RL, the one with tabular Q-learning converges faster than the one using deep RL. This is probably due to the fact the game is small enough that tabular methods can perform very well. For larger games, we expect deep RL methods to outperform tabular ones. Among the two sets of hyperparameters, we observe – as expected – that the second set of hyperparameters leads to a better performance. In any case, these results are provided only for the sake of illustration; to obtain better results, one should tune the hyperparameters of the tabular RL and the deep RL methods.

Figure 5 displays the evolution of the distribution when using the policy learnt by each of the algorithm (for the RL methods, we show one the result for the policy learnt in one of the 10 runs). We see that the agents spread through the four rooms in order to decrease the population density. The final distribution is more uniform with the exact and tabular RL methods and with the deep RL method (in the absence of hyperparameters tuning).

⁶See https://github.com/google-deeppmind/open_spiel/tree/master/open_spiel/python/mfg.

⁷The code is available upon request.




Figure 4: Exploitabilities for the 4-room crowd motion example with several variants of fictitious play, as described in the text.




Figure 5: Evolution of the distribution for the 4-room crowd motion example, solved with exact FP (row 1), FP with tabular Q learning (row 2), deep FP with hyperparameters 1 (row 3) and deep FP with hyperparameters 2 (row 4). Each column corresponds to a different timestep.

5 Methods for continuous time models

We now turn our attention to machine learning methods to solve continuous time models as presented in Section 2. A first possibility is to discretize the time, and then use one of the methods introduced for discrete time games (see Section 4). For instance, iterative methods combined with deep learning for finite player games have been proposed and analyzed by Hu [77], Han et al. [76]. For the sake of brevity, we omit these methods and we focus on approaches that are really specific to continuous time models.

An important advantage of using a continuous time formulation is the possibility to phrase optimality conditions through differential equations, and then solve numerically these equations. Below, we first discuss methods based on stochastic differential equations (SDEs) and then methods based on partial differential equations (PDEs). For simplicity of notation, we will take the volatility as a constant function, i.e., $\sigma(t, X_t, \mu_t) = \sigma$. The methods can be extended to more general forms of volatility.

5.1 Deep learning methods for solving FBSDEs

Under certain technical assumptions, see e.g. Carmona et al. [42, Chapter 3 and 4], a solution of an MFG (i.e., mean field Nash equilibrium) can be characterized with forward-backward differential equations (FBSDEs) that are of the form:

$$\begin{aligned} dX_t &= b(t, X_t, \hat{\alpha}_t, \mu_t)dt + \sigma dW_t, & X_0 &= \zeta \sim \mu_0 \\ dY_t &= -\partial_x H(t, X_t, \hat{\alpha}_t, \mu_t, Y_t)dt + Z_t dW_t, & Y_T &= \partial_x g(X_T, \mu_T), \end{aligned} \quad (5.1)$$

where $\mu_t = \mathcal{L}(X_t)$ and $\hat{\alpha}_t$ is the unique minimizer of the Hamiltonian, i.e.,

$$\hat{\alpha} = \arg \min_{\alpha_t} H(t, X_t, \alpha_t, \mu_t, Y_t),$$

where the Hamiltonian is defined as

$$H(t, X_t, \alpha_t, \mu_t, Y_t) = b(t, X_t, \alpha_t, \mu_t)Y_t + f(t, X_t, \alpha_t, \mu_t).$$

This shows that $\hat{\alpha}_t$ can be expressed as a function of the state of the representative agent X_t , the population distribution μ_t , and the *adjoint* process Y_t : $\hat{\alpha}_t = \hat{\alpha}(t, X_t, \mu_t, Y_t)$. In this formulation the adjoint process $\mathbf{Y} = (Y_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$ characterizes the derivative of the value function $u : (t, x) \mapsto (t, x)$ with respect to the state variable, where the value function is defined as:

$$u(t, x) = \min_{(\alpha_s)_{s \in [t, T]}} \mathbb{E} \left[\int_t^T f(s, X_s, \alpha_s, \mu_s) ds + g(X_T, \mu_T) \mid X_t = x \right].$$

As mentioned in the introduction of this section, for the sake of simplicity in the presentation of the problem, we assume that the volatility is constant, i.e., in the form of $\sigma(t, X_t, \mu_t) = \sigma$. The derivation of the above FBSDE (5.1) that characterizes the mean field Nash equilibrium follows from Pontryagin stochastic maximum principle. Their derivation and the analysis of the existence and uniqueness of their solutions are beyond the scope of this tutorial, which aims to focus on the machine learning methods to solve large population games. Interested readers can refer to Carmona et al. [42, Chapter 3]. Therefore, we will directly focus on solving the FBSDE system with machine learning techniques after introducing the FBSDE model for the simple example given in Section 3.2.1.

Remark 5.1 (Example). *We recall that in the example given in Section 3.2.1, the running cost is $f(t, X_t, \alpha_t, \mu_t) = \frac{1}{2}\alpha_t^2 - U(X_t)$ and the drift is $b(t, X_t, \alpha_t, \mu_t) = \alpha_t + \bar{X}_t$ where $\bar{X}_t = \int_{\mathbb{R}} x \mu_t(x)$. The mean field Nash equilibrium control is then given as the minimizer of the Hamiltonian: $\hat{\alpha}_t = -Y_t$, where $(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{Z})$ solves the following FBSDE:*

$$\begin{aligned} dX_t &= (-Y_t + \bar{X}_t)dt + \sigma dW_t, & X_0 &= \zeta \sim \mu_0 \\ dY_t &= \partial_x U(X_t)dt + Z_t dW_t, & Y_T &= -\partial_x U(X_T). \end{aligned}$$

The FBSDE (5.1) characterizing the mean field Nash equilibrium has two important challenges. First, there are forward and backward components which are coupled. The forward component moves forward in time starting from the initial time $t = 0$ and the backward component moves backward in time starting from the terminal time $t = T$. Second, these are McKean-Vlasov type equations which means that the distribution $\boldsymbol{\mu} = \mathcal{L}(X_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$ of the process \mathbf{X} is in the dynamics. If the model is linear-quadratic, the corresponding FBSDE can be solved by proposing an *ansatz* for Y_t , for example in the form of $Y_t = A_t X_t + B_t \bar{X}_t + C_t$ where A_t, B_t , and C_t are deterministic functions of time; see e.g. Malhamé and Graves [98]. However, obtaining explicit solutions of FBSDEs is in general a difficult task and instead numerical approaches can be used. In the following subsections we will show how the FBSDEs that characterize the solution of MFGs can be solved by using machine learning.

Remark 5.2. *In this section, we focus on the FBSDE system (5.1) that comes from Pontryagin stochastic maximum principle. However, we could have used also another probabilistic approach where the adjoint process characterizes the value function; see [42, Section 4.4]. This yields a different McKean-Vlasov FBSDE system. However, the numerical approaches introduced in this section can be adapted in a straightforward way to solve this FBSDE system.*

5.1.1 Algorithm 1: Iterative learning

The first approach we introduce to solve FBSDE (5.1) with machine learning methods is an *iterative* approach, which is based on a similar idea as the fixed point algorithms introduced in Section 4.1. In order to be able to implement the numerical approach, the first step is to discretize the time and to write the forward SDE in discrete time form. The second step is to fix a flow for backward process \mathbf{Y} and to simulate a population of size N in order to calculate the empirical distribution of the state X_t as an approximation for μ_t . The discretized forward equation can be written as follows:

$$X_{t_{n+1}}^i = X_{t_n}^i + \Delta t \times b(t_n, X_{t_n}^i, \hat{\alpha}_{t_n}^i, \mu_{t_n}^N) + \sigma \Delta W_{t_n}^i, \quad X_0^i \sim \mu_0 \quad (5.2)$$

for all $i \in [N]$ where $\hat{\alpha}_{t_n}^i = \hat{\alpha}(t_n, X_{t_n}^i, \mu_{t_n}^N, Y_{t_n}^i)$ and $\Delta W_{t_n}^i \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \Delta t)$ with $\Delta t = t_{n+1} - t_n$ where $t_n = n\Delta t$ represents the discretized time steps in $\mathcal{T} = \{0, t_1, t_2, \dots, T\}$. The mean field is approximated by the empirical distribution of states of the Monte Carlo simulated population, i.e., $\mu_{t_n}^N = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \delta_{X_{t_n}^i}$. We emphasize that since $\hat{\alpha}_{t_n}^i$ is a function of time t_n , state $X_{t_n}^i$, mean field $\mu_{t_n}^N$, and adjoint process $Y_{t_n}^i$, the function b can also be written as a function of $t_n, X_{t_n}^i, \mu_{t_n}^N, Y_{t_n}^i$. After the mean field is approximated, we need to *learn* the solution of the backward equation. In order to do this, we follow the strategy proposed by the deep BSDE method Han et al. [75] and we use a *shooting* method. In order to introduce this idea, we write the BSDE in (5.1) in integral form:

$$Y_t = \partial_x g(X_T) + \int_t^T \partial_x H(s, X_s, \hat{\alpha}_s, \mu_s) ds - \int_t^T Z_s dW_s,$$

where $\hat{\alpha}_s = \hat{\alpha}(s, X_s, \mu_s, Y_s)$. In this backward equation, process starts from the terminal condition $Y_T = \partial_x g(X_T, \mu_T)$ at the terminal time T and moves backward in time. Instead, we can start from an initial point Y_0 (which needs to be chosen, i.e., a control variable that we will optimize) and follow the same dynamics to arrive at a terminal point which we aim to match with the terminal condition. Therefore, we write the same differential equation forward in time by using the following integral form:

$$Y_t = Y_0 - \int_0^t \partial_x H(s, X_s, \hat{\alpha}_s, \mu_s) ds + \int_0^t Z_s dW_s.$$

Now, the objective is to *shoot* for the terminal condition by minimizing the distance between the simulated terminal Y_T and the terminal condition $\partial_x g(X_T, \mu_T)$ by choosing the initial point Y_0 and the

coefficient \mathbf{Z} in front of the randomness. Then, the problem becomes (after discretizing the time and approximating the mean field with the empirical distribution $\mu_{t_n}^N$):

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{Y_0, \mathbf{Z}} \mathbb{E}[(Y_T - \partial_x g(X_T, \mu_T^N))^2] \\ \text{s.t: } Y_{t_{n+1}} = Y_{t_n} - \Delta t \times \partial_x H(t_n, X_{t_n}, \hat{\alpha}_{t_n}, \mu_{t_n}^N) + Z_{t_n} \Delta W_{t_n}, \forall n \in \mathcal{T} \setminus \{T\}, \end{aligned} \quad (5.3)$$

given the Monte Carlo simulated trajectories $(X_{t_n}^i)_{t_n \in \mathcal{T}, i \in [N]}$ and $(\mu_{t_n}^N)_{t_n \in \mathcal{T}}$. For learning the solution of the problem (5.3), we will replace controls (Y_0, \mathbf{Z}) by parameterized functions $y_{0, \theta_1} : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $z_{\theta_2} : [0, T] \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. In order to approximate these functions we will use neural networks. Here, the initial point Y_0 is implemented as a function of initial state X_0 , since it represents the value at time $t = 0$, which is a function of the state at time 0. The process \mathbf{Z} is implemented as a function of time t and the state X_t , since it is a stochastic process. In order to update the neural network parameters to minimize the cost in (5.3), we can use SGD or mini batch gradient descent. More precisely, the objective is to minimize over the neural network parameters $\theta = (\theta_1, \theta_2)$ the (empirical) objective:

$$\mathbb{J}^N(\theta) = \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N (Y_T^{i, \theta} - \partial_x g(X_T^i, \mu_T^N))^2 \right], \quad (5.4)$$

given the previously Monte Carlo simulated trajectories $(X_{t_n}^i)_{t_n \in \mathcal{T}, i \in [N]}$ and $(\mu_{t_n}^N)_{t_n \in \mathcal{T}}$.

After learning $\mathbf{Y} = (Y_{t_n}^i)_{t_n \in \mathcal{T}, i \in [N]}$ with the shooting method, we can update $\mathbf{X} = (X_{t_n}^i)_{t_n \in \mathcal{T}, i \in [N]}$ by using (5.2) given \mathbf{Y} . We can continue the iterations until convergence. The details of the pseudo code can be found in Algorithms 4, 5, and 6.

The above algorithm iteratively compute an approximate best response and the induced approximate mean field. It can be expected to converge to yield an approximate Nash equilibrium under suitable contraction assumptions. It can be modified based on ideas similar to fictitious play or online mirror descent (see Section 4.1), although these are not always straightforward to implement with deep networks. Another approach, which directly aims for the FBSDE solution is discussed below.

Algorithm 4 Monte Carlo simulation of an interacting batch \mathbf{Y}

Input: Number of particles N ; state trajectories \mathbf{X} for N particles, mean field trajectory μ^N ; time horizon T ; time increment Δt ; initial distribution μ_0 ; control functions y_0, z

Output: Approximate sampled trajectories of (\mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{Z}) .

- 1: Let $n = 0$, $t_0 = 0$ and set $Y_0^i = y_0(X_0^i), \forall i \in [N]$
 - 2: **while** $n \times \Delta t = t_n < T$ **do**
 - 3: Set $Z_{t_n}^i = z(t_n, X_{t_n}^i), i \in [N]$
 - 4: Set $\hat{\alpha}_{t_n}^i = \hat{\alpha}(t_n, X_{t_n}^i, \mu_{t_n}^N, Y_{t_n}^i), i \in [N]$
 - 5: Sample $\Delta W_{t_n}^i \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \Delta t), i \in [N]$
 - 6: Let $Y_{t_{n+1}}^i = Y_{t_n}^i - \partial_x H(t_n, X_{t_n}^i, \hat{\alpha}_{t_n}^i, \mu_{t_n}^N) \Delta t + Z_{t_n}^i \Delta W_{t_n}^i, i \in [N]$
 - 7: Set $t_n = t_n + \Delta t$ and $n = n + 1$
 - 8: Set $N_T = n, t_{N_T} = T$
 - 9: **return** $(Y_{t_n}^i, Z_{t_n}^i)_{n=0, \dots, N_T, i \in [N]}$
-

5.1.2 Algorithm 2: Simultaneous learning

The second approach we introduce to solve FBSDE (5.1) with machine learning methods tries to overcome the possible inefficiency of the iterations by simulating the coupled processes \mathbf{X} and \mathbf{Y} simultaneously.

Algorithm 5 Stochastic Gradient Descent for solving (5.3)

Input: Initial parameter θ_0 ; number of iterations K ; sequence $(\beta_k)_{k=0,\dots,K-1}$ of learning rates; number of particles N ; state trajectories \mathbf{X} for N particles, mean field trajectory $\boldsymbol{\mu}^N$; time horizon T ; time increment Δt ; initial distribution μ_0

Output: Approximation of θ^* minimizing \mathbb{J}^N defined by (5.4)

- 1: **for** $k = 0, 1, 2, \dots, K - 1$ **do**
- 2: Sample $S = (Y_{t_n}^i, Z_{t_n}^i)_{n=0,\dots,N_T, i \in [N]}$ using Algorithm 4 with control functions $(y_0, z) = (y_{0,\theta_{k,1}}, z_{\theta_{k,2}})$ and parameters: number of particles N ; state trajectories \mathbf{X} for N particles, mean field trajectory $\boldsymbol{\mu}^N$; time horizon T ; time increment Δt ; initial distribution μ_0
- 3: Compute the gradient $\nabla \mathbb{J}^N(\theta_k)$ of $\mathbb{J}^N(\theta_k)$
- 4: Set $\theta_{k+1} = \theta_k - \beta_k \nabla \mathbb{J}^N(\theta_k)$
- 5: **return** θ_K and trajectories $\mathbf{Y}^{\theta_K}, \mathbf{Z}^{\theta_K}$ for N particles.

In FBSDE (5.1) (and also in its discretized version), the backward and forward components are coupled; therefore, we cannot simulate them directly. In order to be able to do this, we need to rewrite the backward differential equation forward in time as introduced previously. The aim is to *shoot* for the terminal condition of the backward equation as introduced in the previous algorithm. However, instead of alternating between the forward and the backward dynamics, now we simulate the dynamics of \mathbf{X} and \mathbf{Y} at the same time.

To be specific, the problem becomes:

$$\begin{aligned} & \min_{Y_0, \mathbf{Z}} \mathbb{E}[(Y_T - \partial_x g(X_T, \mu_T^N))^2] \\ & \text{s.t: } X_{t_{n+1}} = X_{t_n} + \Delta t \times b(t_n, X_{t_n}, \hat{\alpha}_{t_n}, \mu_{t_n}^N) + \sigma \Delta W_{t_n}, \quad X_0 \sim \mu_0 \\ & \quad Y_{t_{n+1}} = Y_{t_n} - \Delta t \times \partial_x H(t_n, X_{t_n}, \hat{\alpha}_{t_n}, \mu_{t_n}^N) + Z_{t_n} \Delta W_{t_n}, \quad \forall t_n \in \mathcal{T} \setminus T, \end{aligned} \quad (5.5)$$

where $\hat{\alpha}_{t_n} = \hat{\alpha}(t_n, X_{t_n}, \mu_{t_n}^N, Y_{t_n})$ and $\Delta W_{t_n} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \Delta t)$ with $\Delta t = t_{n+1} - t_n$ where t_n represents the discretized time steps in $\mathcal{T} = \{0, t_1, t_2, \dots, T\}$. In order to approximate the mean field, we simulate by Monte Carlo a population of size N and use the empirical distribution of states $\mu_{t_n}^N = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \delta_{X_{t_n}^i}$ in the population. In this method, we can directly aim at minimizing the shooting error by replacing controls (Y_0, \mathbf{Z}) by parameterized functions $y_{0,\theta_1} : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $z_{\theta_2} : [0, T] \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, in which, as in Section 5.1.1, Y_0 is implemented as a function of X_0 and \mathbf{Z} is implemented as a function of t and X_t . In order to approximate these functions we will use neural networks similar to the previous algorithm. As we discussed in the previous algorithm, we can minimize the cost in (5.5) by using SGD by sampling one population of size N . Precisely, the aim is to minimize over the neural network parameters $\theta = (\theta_1, \theta_2)$ the following (empirical) objective:

$$\tilde{\mathbb{J}}^N(\theta) = \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N (Y_T^{i,\theta} - \partial_x g(X_T^{i,\theta}, \mu_T^{N,\theta}))^2 \right]. \quad (5.6)$$

The main difference of this algorithm from the previous one is that it simulates the trajectories of \mathbf{X} and \mathbf{Y} simultaneously. We can see that the objective to minimize in (5.6) is different than the objective in (5.4) since now \mathbf{X} and $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ are directly affected by the neural network parameters θ . The details of the algorithm can be found in Algorithms 7 and 8.

This type of algorithm has been used e.g. by Fouque and Zhang [63], Carmona and Laurière [38],

Algorithm 6 Iterative Learning for MFG

Input: Number of particles N ; time horizon $T = t_{N_T}$; time increment Δt ; initial distribution μ_0 ; number of iterations K

Output: Approximation of equilibrium mean field flow μ^*

- 1: Initialize $\mathbf{Y}^0 = (Y_{t_0}^{i,0}, \dots, Y_{t_{N_t}}^{i,0})_{i \in [N]}$ arbitrarily
 - 2: **for** $k = 1, \dots, K$ **do**
 - 3: Pick $X_0^{i,k} \sim \mu_0$ i.i.d, set $n = 0$
 - 4: **while** $n \times \Delta t = t_n < T$ **do**
 - 5: Let $\mu_{t_n}^{N,k} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \delta_{X_{t_n}^{i,k}}$
 - 6: Set $\hat{\alpha}_{t_n}^{i,k} = \hat{\alpha}(t_n, X_{t_n}^{i,k}, \mu_{t_n}^{N,k}, Y_{t_n}^{i,(k-1)})$, $i \in [N]$
 - 7: Sample $\Delta W_{t_n}^i \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \Delta t)$, $i \in [N]$
 - 8: Let $X_{t_{n+1}}^{i,k} = X_{t_n}^{i,k} + b(t_n, X_{t_n}^{i,k}, \hat{\alpha}_{t_n}^{i,k}, \mu_{t_n}^{N,k})\Delta t + \sigma \Delta W_{t_n}^i$, $i \in [N]$
 - 9: Set $t_n = t_n + \Delta t$ and $n = n + 1$
 - 10: Learn trajectory of \mathbf{Y}^k and get θ^k by using Algorithm 5 given \mathbf{X}^k , and $\mu^{N,k}$
 - 11: Set $\mu^{N,*} = \mu^{N,k}$
 - 12: **return** $\mu^{N,*}$ and θ^K
-

Germain et al. [68], Aurell et al. [10], Dayanikh and Laurière [53] to solve various kinds of forward-backward mean field SDE systems.

5.1.3 Numerical illustration: Epidemic model with FBSDE deep learning

Before concluding this section, we introduce an example of mitigating epidemics from Aurell, Carmona, Dayanikh, and Laurière [10] that solves FBSDEs by using deep learning. Different than the setup introduced here, this model is a *finite* state model. However, for showing the general applicability of the deep learning approach, we introduce the example and the results. The representative agent can be in 3 different states: Susceptible (S), Infected (I), and Recovered (R). The representative agent's state transitions from S to I depending on her own socialization level α_t , exogenous infection rate $\beta > 0$, and the average socialization level of the infected people $\int a \rho_t(da, I)$, where ρ is the joint control and state distribution. The last term introduces the mean field interactions into the model. Here, the socialization level α_t is the action chosen by the representative agent at time t . The interactions are thus through the distribution of actions. The representative agent's state transitions from I to R and R to S with constant rates γ and κ respectively. The jump rates can be seen in Figure 6. We consider that the objective of the representative agent is to minimize the following cost while choosing their socialization level $\alpha = (\alpha_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$:

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^T c_\lambda \frac{|\lambda_t^{(S)} - \alpha_t|^2}{2} \mathbb{1}_S(x) + \left(\frac{|\lambda_t^{(I)} - \alpha_t|^2}{2} + c_I \right) \mathbb{1}_I(x) + \frac{|\lambda_t^{(R)} - \alpha_t|^2}{2} \mathbb{1}_R(x) dt \right], \quad (5.7)$$

where c_λ and c_I are positive exogenous constants. In the cost (5.7), the terms $\lambda \in [0, 1]$ represent the social distancing policies (such as mask wearing, quarantining) set by the government exogenously and individuals do not want to deviate from these policies significantly. Moreover, infected people have a treatment cost denoted by c_I . We borrow the results from Aurell et al. [10] and show them in Figure 7. On the left plot and middle plot of Figure 7, we can see the social distancing policies set by the government

Algorithm 7 Simultaneous Monte Carlo simulation of an interacting batch \mathbf{X} and \mathbf{Y}

Input: number of particles N ; time horizon T ; time increment Δt ; initial distribution μ_0 ; control functions y_0, z

Output: Approximate sampled trajectories of $(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{Z})$.

- 1: Let $n = 0, t_0 = 0$; pick $X_0^i \sim \mu_0$ i.i.d. and set $Y_0^i = y_0(X_0^i), \forall i \in [N]$
 - 2: **while** $n \times \Delta t = t_n < T$ **do**
 - 3: Set $Z^i(t_n) = z(t_n, X_{t_n}^i), i \in [N]$
 - 4: Let $\mu_{t_n}^N = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \delta_{X_{t_n}^i}$
 - 5: Set $\hat{\alpha}_{t_n}^i = \hat{\alpha}(t_n, X_{t_n}^i, \mu_{t_n}^N, Y_{t_n}^i), i \in [N]$
 - 6: Sample $\Delta W_{t_n}^i \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \Delta t), i \in [N]$
 - 7: Let $X_{t_{n+1}}^i = X_{t_n}^i + b(t_n, X_{t_n}^i, \hat{\alpha}_{t_n}^i, \mu_{t_n}^N) \Delta t + \sigma \Delta W_{t_n}^i, i \in [N]$
 - 8: Let $Y_{t_{n+1}}^i = Y_{t_n}^i - \partial_x H(t_n, X_{t_n}^i, \hat{\alpha}_{t_n}^i, \mu_{t_n}^N) \Delta t + Z_{t_n}^i \Delta W_{t_n}^i, i \in [N]$
 - 9: Set $t_n = t_n + \Delta t$ and $n = n + 1$
 - 10: Set $N_T = n, t_{N_T} = T$
 - 11: **return** $(X_{t_n}^i, Y_{t_n}^i, Z_{t_n}^i)_{n=0, \dots, N_T, i \in [N]}$
-

with the dashed lines (orange for susceptible individuals and green for infected individuals) and the mean field Nash equilibrium socialization levels of the susceptible (maroon) and infected (dark green) individuals. On the 40th day, the government is setting more restrictive social distancing policies (which is implemented in the model by setting lower λ values). At the equilibrium, Infected individuals follow the policies closely, but susceptible individuals do not follow the policies set by the government closely instead they restrict their socialization level further to protect their health. In this figure the left plot corresponds to the *explicit* solution and the middle plot corresponds to the *deep learning* approach implemented with the algorithm of Section 5.1.2 above. We can see the deep learning method obtains a behavior which is very similar to the explicit solution.




Figure 6: SIR model with mean-field interactions.

5.2 Deep learning methods for solving PDEs

MFG equilibrium can be also characterized by using forward backward partial differential equations (FBPDEs). In this formulation, the backward equation is the Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman (HJB) equation and it characterizes the value function defined in Equation (5.1). The forward equation is the Kolmogorov-Fokker-Planck (KFP) equation and it characterizes the flow of the mean field. Then, the equilibrium control is given as the minimizer of the Hamiltonian, i.e., $\hat{\alpha}(t, x) = \arg \min_{\alpha} H(t, x, \alpha, m(t), \partial_x u(t, x))$,

Algorithm 8 Stochastic Gradient Descent for solving (5.5)

Input: Initial parameter θ_0 ; number of iterations K ; sequence $(\beta_k)_{k=0,\dots,K-1}$ of learning rates; number of particles N ; time horizon T ; time increment Δt ; initial distribution μ_0

Output: Approximation of θ^* minimizing $\tilde{\mathbb{J}}^N$ defined by (5.6)

- 1: **for** $k = 0, 1, 2, \dots, K - 1$ **do**
- 2: Sample $S = (X_{t_n}^i, Y_{t_n}^i, Z_{t_n}^i)_{n=0,\dots,N_T, i \in [N]}$ using Algorithm 7 with control functions $(y_0, \mathbf{z}) = (y_{0,\theta_{k,1}}, z_{\theta_{k,2}})$ and parameters: number of particles N ; time horizon T ; time increment Δt ; initial distribution μ_0
- 3: Compute the gradient $\nabla \tilde{\mathbb{J}}^N(\theta_k)$ of $\tilde{\mathbb{J}}^N(\theta_k)$
- 4: Set $\theta_{k+1} = \theta_k - \beta_k \nabla \tilde{\mathbb{J}}^N(\theta_k)$
- 5: **return** θ_K




Figure 7: Evolution of the controls: explicit solution (left), deep learning solution (middle), convergence of the loss value in the deep learning approach (right).

where Hamiltonian is defined as follows

$$H(t, x, \alpha, m, p) = b(t, x, \alpha, m)p + f(t, x, \alpha, m),$$

and (\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{u}) solves the following FBPDE:

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t m(t, x) &= \frac{1}{2} \sigma^2 \partial_{xx}^2 m(t, x) - \partial_x (b(t, x, \hat{\alpha}(t, x), m_t) m(t, x)), & m(0, x) &= m_0(x) \\ -\partial_t u(t, x) &= \frac{1}{2} \sigma^2 \partial_{xx}^2 u(t, x) + H(t, x, \hat{\alpha}(t, x), m_t, \partial_x u(t, x)), & u(T, x) &= g(x, m_T). \end{aligned} \quad (5.8)$$

Using the convention from the literature, we replaced the notation μ_t with m_t .

5.2.1 Deep Galerkin method for mean field FBPDEs

Similarly to the FBSDE approach discussed above, in the FBPDE approach, the backward and the forward equations are coupled and cannot be solved individually. In order to solve them, we use an extension to the Deep Galerkin method (DGM) introduced by Sirignano and Spiliopoulos [117]. DGM is a method that is introduced to solve general PDEs which shares similarities with physics informed neural networks Karniadakis et al. [82]. In this section we explain how it can be implemented to solve the FBPDEs that characterize a solution of the MFGs. Interested reader can refer to Al-Arabi et al. [4], Cao et al. [29], Ruthotto et al. [112], Carmona and Laurière [37] for further implementations of DGM to solve FBPDEs.

For the implementation of this method, we will replace the state space with a compact subset \mathcal{R} of \mathbb{R} . We use neural networks to approximate the density function $m(t, x)$ and the value function $u(t, x)$ by

rewriting the FBPDE as an optimization problem in which we aim to minimize a loss function. This loss is constituted by the PDE *residuals* and penalty terms for the boundary conditions. It can be written as follows:

$$\mathbb{L}(\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{u}) = L^f(\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{u}) + L^b(\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{u}), \quad (5.9)$$

where the $L^f(m, u)$ denotes the costs related to the forward component (i.e., KFP) and $L^b(m, u)$ denotes the costs related to the backward component (i.e., HJB). These cost components are defined as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} L^f(\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{u}) &= c_f \|\partial_t m - \frac{1}{2} \sigma^2 \partial_{xx}^2 m + \partial_x(b(t, x, \hat{\alpha}, m(t))m)\|_{L^2([0, T] \times \mathcal{R})} + c_i \|m(0) - m_0\|_{L^2(\mathcal{R})}, \\ L^b(\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{u}) &= c_b \|\partial_t u + \frac{1}{2} \sigma^2 \partial_{xx}^2 u + H(t, x, \hat{\alpha}, m(t), \partial_x u)\|_{L^2([0, T] \times \mathcal{R})} + c_t \|u(T) - g(\cdot, m_T)\|_{L^2(\mathcal{R})}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\|\phi\|_{L^2(A)}$ defines the L_2 -norm of function ϕ defined on space A , and c_f, c_i, c_b, c_t are positive constants which are chosen to balance the importance of the corresponding terms in the total cost. If a density and value couple $(\hat{\mathbf{m}}, \hat{\mathbf{u}})$ solves the FBPDE (5.8), then we can see that the corresponding cost $\mathbb{L}(\hat{\mathbf{m}}, \hat{\mathbf{u}})$ should be zero. The deep learning approach aims to minimize this cost by replacing functions (\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{u}) by parameterized functions $m_{\theta_1} : [0, T] \times \mathcal{R} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ and $u_{\theta_2} : [0, T] \times \mathcal{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ where $\theta = (\theta_1, \theta_2)$ are the neural network parameters. As we introduced in Section 5.1, we can use SGD to minimize the cost (5.9) over the neural network parameters θ . Here, this means the following. To apply mini-batch gradient descent, at each iteration we sample $\mathbf{S} = (S, S_i, S_t)$ where S is a finite set of points in $[0, T] \times \mathcal{R}$, and S_i, S_t are two finite sets of points in \mathcal{R} . Then, the (empirical) cost function is computed as:

$$\mathbb{L}^{\mathbf{S}}(\theta) = L^{\mathbf{S},f}(\theta) + L^{\mathbf{S},b}(\theta), \quad (5.10)$$

where $L^{\mathbf{S},f} = c_f L^{\mathbf{S},f,\text{res}} + c_i L^{\mathbf{S},f,0}$ and $L^{\mathbf{S},b} = c_b L^{\mathbf{S},b,\text{res}} + c_t L^{\mathbf{S},b,T}$, with:

$$\begin{aligned} L^{\mathbf{S},f,\text{res}}(\theta) &= \frac{1}{|S|} \sum_{(t,x) \in S} \left| \partial_t m_{\theta_1}(t, x) - \frac{1}{2} \sigma^2 \partial_{xx}^2 m_{\theta_1}(t, x) + \partial_x(\hat{b}_{\theta}(t, x, m_{\theta_1}(t))m_{\theta_1}(t, x)) \right|^2, \\ L^{\mathbf{S},f,0}(\theta) &= \frac{1}{|S_i|} \sum_{x \in S_i} |m_{\theta_1}(0, x) - m_0(x)|^2, \\ L^{\mathbf{S},b,\text{res}}(\theta) &= \frac{1}{|S|} \sum_{(t,x) \in S} \left| \partial_t u_{\theta_2}(t, x) + \frac{1}{2} \sigma^2 \partial_{xx}^2 u_{\theta_2}(t, x) + \hat{H}_{\theta}(t, x, m_{\theta_1}(t), \partial_x u_{\theta_2}(t, x)) \right|^2, \\ L^{\mathbf{S},b,T} &= \frac{1}{|S_t|} \sum_{x \in S_t} |u_{\theta_2}(T, x) - g(x, m_{\theta_1}(T))|^2, \end{aligned}$$

where we used the shorthand notations $\hat{b}_{\theta}(t, x, m_{\theta_1}(t)) = b(t, x, \hat{\alpha}_{\theta}(t, x), m_{\theta_1}(t))m_{\theta_1}(t, x)$ and $\hat{H}_{\theta}(t, x, m_{\theta_1}(t), \partial_x u_{\theta_2}(t, x)) = H(t, x, \hat{\alpha}_{\theta}(t, x), m_{\theta_1}(t), \partial_x u_{\theta_2}(t, x))$ with the control function $\hat{\alpha}_{\theta}(t, x) = \hat{\alpha}(t, x, m_{\theta_1}(t), \partial_x u_{\theta_2}(t, x))$, which depends on both components of $\theta = (\theta_1, \theta_2)$. The details of the algorithm can be found in Algorithm 9.

Algorithm 9 Deep Galerkin Method for solving FBPDE system (5.8)

Input: Initial parameter θ_0 ; number of iterations K ; sequence $(\beta_k)_{k=0, \dots, K-1}$ of learning rates.

Output: Approximation of θ^* minimizing $\mathbb{L}^{\mathbf{S}}$ defined in (5.10)

- 1: **for** $k = 0, 1, 2, \dots, K - 1$ **do**
 - 2: Sample $\mathbf{S} = (S, S_i, S_t)$
 - 3: Compute the gradient $\nabla \mathbb{L}^{\mathbf{S}}(\theta_k)$ of $\mathbb{L}^{\mathbf{S}}(\theta_k)$
 - 4: Set $\theta_{k+1} = \theta_k - \beta_k \nabla \mathbb{L}^{\mathbf{S}}(\theta_k)$
 - 5: **return** θ_K
-

5.2.2 Numerical illustration: Portfolio liquidation with PDE deep learning

We consider the model proposed by Cardaliaguet and Lehalle [31] and discussed in Section 3.2.3. Following Cardaliaguet and Lehalle [31], the Nash equilibrium control is $\alpha_t^*(q) = \frac{\partial_q v(t, q)}{2\kappa}$, where (v, m) solve the following PDE system:

$$\begin{cases} -\gamma\bar{\mu}q = \partial_t v - \phi q^2 + \frac{|\partial_q v(t, q)|^2}{4\kappa} \\ \partial_t m + \partial_q \left(m \frac{\partial_q v(t, q)}{2\kappa} \right) = 0 \\ \bar{\mu}_t = \int \frac{\partial_q v(t, q)}{2\kappa} m(t, dq) \\ m(0, \cdot) = m_0, v(T, q) = -Aq^2. \end{cases}$$

As already mentioned before, the interactions are non-local and involve the mean of the controls and not just the mean of the states.

We solve this PDE system using the DGM. We use the architecture proposed in the DGM article with 3 layers and a width of 40. In the following results, we used the parameters: $T = 1$, $A = 1$, $\phi = 1$, $\kappa = 1$, $\gamma = 1$, and a Gaussian initial distribution. We consider two cases: mean 3 and variance 0.5, and mean -4 and variance 0.3. In both cases, the traders want to bring their inventory close to zero (but perhaps not exactly equal due to other terms in the cost and due to the price impact). In the first case, it means selling stocks, while in the second case, it means buying stocks. In the first case, Figures 8 and 9 show respectively the evolution of the distribution and of the control, and the comparison with the solution coming from a benchmark obtained using ODEs.⁸ In the second case, Figures 10 and 11 show respectively the distribution and the controls.




Figure 8: Case 1 of trading MFG example solved by DGM. Evolution of the distribution m : surface (left) and contour (right). The dashed red line corresponds to the mean obtained by the semi-explicit formula.

6 Conclusion and perspectives

In the sections above, we have presented the basic ideas behind learning methods for large-population games, with a particular focus on mean field games. We discussed both discrete time and continuous

⁸In this model, the equilibrium can be reduced to solving a system of ODEs; see Cardaliaguet and Lehalle [31].




Figure 9: Case 1 of trading MFG example solved by DGM. Optimal control α^* (dashed line) and learnt control (full line) at three different time steps.




Figure 10: Case 2 of trading MFG example solved by DGM. Evolution of the distribution m : surface (left) and contour (right). The dashed red line corresponds to the mean obtained by the semi-explicit formula.

time models.

From here, several directions remain to be investigated in future work. For example, in the direction of real-world applications, it would be interesting to solve games – and particularly MFGs – with very complex and large environments. It would also be important to study how realistic the MFG solution is by comparing it with observed data and other solution methods such as agent-based models. Typical examples in OR could be in traffic routing, epidemics, electricity consumption or portfolio management. Another aspect that would make MFG models more realistic is to blend cooperative and non-cooperative behaviors, since in reality people do not behave purely in one of the two extreme cases. In the direction of the theoretical foundations, it would be interesting to establish the convergence of the algorithms presented in the previous sections under more flexible assumptions than what is known thus far. Last but not least, although deep neural networks yield strong empirical successes, conditions under which they break the curse of dimensionality remain little understood in the context of large population games.

Acknowledgements

M.L. would like to thank Theophile Cabannes, Sertan Girgin, Julien Pérolat and Kai Shao for their help with OpenSpiel for the examples displayed in this paper. The authors would like to thank the anonymous reviewers for their valuable comments.




Figure 11: Case 2 of trading MFG example solved by DGM. Optimal control α^* (dashed line) and learnt control (full line) at three different time steps.

References

- [1] Yves Achdou and Jean-Michel Lasry. Mean field games for modeling crowd motion. *Contributions to partial differential equations and applications*, pages 17–42, 2019.
- [2] Yves Achdou and Mathieu Laurière. On the system of partial differential equations arising in mean field type control. *Discrete and Continuous Dynamical Systems*, 35(9):3879–3900, 2015.
- [3] René Aïd, Roxana Dumitrescu, and Peter Tankov. The entry and exit game in the electricity markets: A mean-field game approach. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2004.14057*, 2020.
- [4] Ali Al-Aradi, Adolfo Correia, Danilo Naiff, Gabriel Jardim, and Yuri Saporito. Solving non-linear and high-dimensional partial differential equations via deep learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1811.08782*, 2018.
- [5] Clémence Alasseur, Imen Ben Taher, and Anis Matoussi. An extended mean field game for storage in smart grids. *Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications*, 184:644–670, 2020.
- [6] Talal Algumaei, Ruben Solozabal, Reda Alami, Hakim Hacid, Merouane Debbah, and Martin Takáč. Regularization of the policy updates for stabilizing mean field games. In *Pacific-Asia Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*, pages 361–372. Springer, 2023.
- [7] Berkay Anahtarci, Can Deha Kariksiz, and Naci Saldi. Q-learning in regularized mean-field games. *Dynamic Games and Applications*, 13(1):89–117, 2023.
- [8] Md Rajib Arefin, KM Ariful Kabir, and Jun Tanimoto. A mean-field vaccination game scheme to analyze the effect of a single vaccination strategy on a two-strain epidemic spreading. *Journal of Statistical Mechanics: Theory and Experiment*, 2020(3):033501, 2020.
- [9] Kai Arulkumaran, Marc Peter Deisenroth, Miles Brundage, and Anil Anthony Bharath. Deep reinforcement learning: A brief survey. *IEEE Signal Processing Magazine*, 34(6):26–38, 2017.
- [10] Alexander Aurell, René Carmona, Gökçe Dayanıklı, and Mathieu Laurière. Optimal incentives to mitigate epidemics: A Stackelberg mean field game approach. *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, 60(2):S294–S322, 2022. doi: 10.1137/20M1377862. URL <https://doi.org/10.1137/20M1377862>.
- [11] Alexander Aurell, René Carmona, Gökçe Dayanıklı, and Mathieu Laurière. Finite state graphon games with applications to epidemics. *Dynamic Games and Applications*, 12(1):49–81, 2022.
- [12] Alexander Aurell, René Carmona, and Mathieu Laurière. Stochastic graphon games: Ii. the linear-quadratic case. *Applied Mathematics & Optimization*, 85(3):39, 2022.
- [13] Fabio Bagagiolo and Dario Bauso. Mean-field games and dynamic demand management in power grids. *Dynamic Games and Applications*, 4:155–176, 2014.
- [14] Tamer Başar and Geert Jan Olsder. *Dynamic noncooperative game theory*. SIAM, 1998.

- [15] Richard Bellman. Dynamic programming and stochastic control processes. *Information and control*, 1(3):228–239, 1958.
- [16] Alain Bensoussan, Jens Frehse, Phillip Yam, et al. *Mean field games and mean field type control theory*, volume 101. Springer, 2013.
- [17] Alain Bensoussan, MHM Chau, and SCP Yam. Mean field games with a dominating player. *Applied Mathematics & Optimization*, 74(1), 2016.
- [18] Alain Bensoussan, Tao Huang, and Mathieu Laurière. Mean field control and mean field game models with several populations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.00783*, 2018.
- [19] Dimitri Bertsekas. *Reinforcement learning and optimal control*, volume 1. Athena Scientific, 2019.
- [20] Dimitri Bertsekas and Steven E Shreve. *Stochastic optimal control: the discrete-time case*, volume 5. Athena Scientific, 1996.
- [21] Ofelia Bonesini, Luciano Campi, and Markus Fischer. Correlated equilibria for mean field games with progressive strategies. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 2024.
- [22] Vivek S Borkar. Controlled diffusion processes. *Probability Surveys*, 2:213–244, 2005.
- [23] Vivek S. Borkar. *Stochastic approximation*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge; Hindustan Book Agency, New Delhi, 2008. ISBN 978-0-521-51592-4. A dynamical systems viewpoint.
- [24] Dietrich Braess, Anna Nagurney, and Tina Wakolbinger. On a paradox of traffic planning. *Transportation science*, 39(4):446–450, 2005.
- [25] Theophile Cabannes, Mathieu Laurière, Julien Perolat, Raphael Marinier, Sertan Girgin, Sarah Perrin, Olivier Pietquin, Alexandre M Bayen, Eric Goubault, and Romuald Elie. Solving n-player dynamic routing games with congestion: A mean-field approach. In *Proceedings of the 21st International Conference on Autonomous Agents and Multiagent Systems*, pages 1557–1559, 2022.
- [26] Peter E Caines and Minyi Huang. Graphon mean field games and the GMFG equations: ε -Nash equilibria. In *2019 IEEE 58th conference on decision and control (CDC)*, pages 286–292. IEEE, 2019.
- [27] Peter E Caines and Minyi Huang. Graphon mean field games and their equations. *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, 59(6):4373–4399, 2021.
- [28] Luciano Campi and Markus Fischer. Correlated equilibria and mean field games: a simple model. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 47(3):2240–2259, 2022.
- [29] Haoyang Cao, Xin Guo, and Mathieu Laurière. Connecting GANs, MFGs, and OT. *Accepted to SIAM Applied Mathematics (arXiv preprint arXiv:2002.04112)*, 2020.
- [30] Pierre Cardaliaguet and Saeed Hadikhanloo. Learning in mean field games: the fictitious play. *ESAIM: Control, Optimisation and Calculus of Variations*, 23(2):569–591, 2017.
- [31] Pierre Cardaliaguet and Charles-Albert Lehalle. Mean field game of controls and an application to trade crowding. *Math. Financ. Econ.*, 12(3):335–363, 2018. ISSN 1862-9679. doi: 10.1007/s11579-017-0206-z. URL <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11579-017-0206-z>.
- [32] Pierre Cardaliaguet, François Delarue, Jean-Michel Lasry, and Pierre-Louis Lions. *The master equation and the convergence problem in mean field games:(ams-201)*. Princeton University Press, 2019.
- [33] Pierre Cardaliaguet, Marco Cirant, and Alessio Porretta. Remarks on nash equilibria in mean field game models with a major player. *Proc. Am. Math. Soc.*, 148(10):4241–4255, 2020.
- [34] René Carmona and Gökçe Dayanıklı. Mean field game model for an advertising competition in a duopoly. *International Game Theory Review*, 23(04):2150024, 2021.
- [35] René Carmona and François Delarue. *Probabilistic theory of mean field games with applications. I*, volume 83 of *Probability Theory and Stochastic Modelling*. Springer, Cham, 2018. ISBN 978-3-319-56437-1; 978-3-319-58920-6. Mean field FBSDEs, control, and games.

- [36] René Carmona and Daniel Lacker. A probabilistic weak formulation of mean field games and applications. *Ann. Appl. Probab.*, 25(3):1189–1231, 2015. ISSN 1050-5164. doi: 10.1214/14-AAP1020. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1214/14-AAP1020>.
- [37] René Carmona and Mathieu Laurière. Convergence analysis of machine learning algorithms for the numerical solution of mean field control and games I: The ergodic case. *SIAM Journal on Numerical Analysis*, 59(3):1455–1485, 2021.
- [38] René Carmona and Mathieu Laurière. Convergence analysis of machine learning algorithms for the numerical solution of mean field control and games: II—the finite horizon case. *The Annals of Applied Probability*, 32(6):4065–4105, 2022.
- [39] René Carmona and Peiqi Wang. An alternative approach to mean field game with major and minor players, and applications to herders impacts. *Appl. Math. Optim.*, 76:5–27, 2017.
- [40] René Carmona, François Delarue, and Aimé Lachapelle. Control of mckean–vlasov dynamics versus mean field games. *Mathematics and Financial Economics*, 7:131–166, 2013.
- [41] René Carmona, Jean-Pierre Fouque, and Li-Hsien Sun. Mean field games and systemic risk. *Communications in Mathematical Sciences*, 13(4):911–933, 2015.
- [42] René Carmona, François Delarue, et al. *Probabilistic theory of mean field games with applications I*. Springer, 2018.
- [43] René Carmona, Daniel B Cooney, Christy V Graves, and Mathieu Laurière. Stochastic graphon games: I. the static case. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 47(1):750–778, 2022.
- [44] René Carmona, Gökçe Dayanıklı, and Mathieu Laurière. Mean field models to regulate carbon emissions in electricity production. *Dynamic Games and Applications*, 12(3):897–928, 2022.
- [45] René A Carmona and Xiuneng Zhu. A probabilistic approach to mean field games with major and minor players. *Ann. Appl. Probab.*, 26(3):1535–1580, 2016.
- [46] Álvaro Cartea and Sebastian Jaimungal. Incorporating order-flow into optimal execution. *Math. Financ. Econ.*, 10(3):339–364, 2016. ISSN 1862-9679. doi: 10.1007/s11579-016-0162-z. URL <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11579-016-0162-z>.
- [47] Alekos Cecchin, Paolo Dai Pra, Markus Fischer, and Guglielmo Pelino. On the convergence problem in mean field games: a two state model without uniqueness. *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, 57(4):2443–2466, 2019.
- [48] Geoffroy Chevalier, Jerome Le Ny, and Roland Malhamé. A micro-macro traffic model based on mean-field games. In *2015 American Control Conference (ACC)*, pages 1983–1988. IEEE, 2015.
- [49] Marco Cirant. Multi-population mean field games systems with Neumann boundary conditions. *Journal de Mathématiques Pures et Appliquées*, 103(5):1294–1315, 2015.
- [50] Kai Cui and Heinz Koepl. Approximately solving mean field games via entropy-regularized deep reinforcement learning. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 1909–1917. PMLR, 2021.
- [51] Kai Cui and Heinz Koepl. Learning graphon mean field games and approximate nash equilibria. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2021.
- [52] Kai Cui, Gökçe Dayanıklı, Mathieu Laurière, Matthieu Geist, Olivier Pietquin, and Heinz Koepl. Learning discrete-time major-minor mean field games. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 38, pages 9616–9625, 2024.
- [53] Gokce Dayanıklı and Mathieu Laurière. A machine learning method for Stackelberg mean field games. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.10440*, 2023.
- [54] Gokce Dayanıklı and Mathieu Laurière. Multi-population mean field games with multiple major players: Application to carbon emission regulations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.16477 (accepted at 2024 American Control Conference (ACC))*, 2023.

- [55] Gokce Dayanikli, Mathieu laurière, and Jiacheng Zhang. Deep learning for population-dependent controls in mean field control problems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.04788*, 2023.
- [56] Boualem Djehiche, Julian Barreiro-Gomez, and Hamidou Tembine. Price dynamics for electricity in smart grid via mean-field-type games. *Dynamic Games and Applications*, 10:798–818, 2020.
- [57] Romuald Elie, Thibaut Mastrolia, and Dylan Possamaï. A tale of a principal and many, many agents. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 44(2), 2019.
- [58] Romuald Elie, Emma Hubert, and Gabriel Turinici. Contact rate epidemic control of covid-19: an equilibrium view. *Mathematical Modelling of Natural Phenomena*, 15:35, 2020.
- [59] Romuald Elie, Julien Perolat, Mathieu Laurière, Matthieu Geist, and Olivier Pietquin. On the convergence of model free learning in mean field games. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 34, pages 7143–7150, 2020.
- [60] Christian Fabian, Kai Cui, and Heinz Koepl. Learning sparse graphon mean field games. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 4486–4514. PMLR, 2023.
- [61] Ermal Feleqi. The derivation of ergodic mean field game equations for several populations of players. *Dynamic Games and Applications*, 3(4):523–536, 2013.
- [62] Adriano Festa and Simone Göttlich. A mean field game approach for multi-lane traffic management. *IFAC-PapersOnLine*, 51(32):793–798, 2018.
- [63] Jean-Pierre Fouque and Zhaoyu Zhang. Deep learning methods for mean field control problems with delay. *Frontiers in Applied Mathematics and Statistics*, 6:11, 2020.
- [64] Vincent François-Lavet, Peter Henderson, Riashat Islam, Marc G Bellemare, and Joelle Pineau. An introduction to deep reinforcement learning. *Foundations and Trends® in Machine Learning*, 11(3-4):219–354, 2018.
- [65] Peter I Frazier. Bayesian optimization. In *Recent advances in optimization and modeling of contemporary problems*, pages 255–278. Informs, 2018.
- [66] Drew Fudenberg and Jean Tirole. *Game theory*. MIT press, 1991.
- [67] Matthieu Geist, Julien Pérolat, Mathieu Laurière, Romuald Elie, Sarah Perrin, Oliver Bachem, Rémi Munos, and Olivier Pietquin. Concave utility reinforcement learning: The mean-field game viewpoint. In *Proceedings of the 21st International Conference on Autonomous Agents and Multi-agent Systems*, pages 489–497, 2022.
- [68] Maximilien Germain, Joseph Mikael, and Xavier Warin. Numerical resolution of mckean-vlasov fbsdes using neural networks. *Methodology and Computing in Applied Probability*, 24(4):2557–2586, 2022.
- [69] Philip E Gill, Walter Murray, and Margaret H Wright. *Practical optimization*. SIAM, 2019.
- [70] Diogo A Gomes, Joana Mohr, and Rafael Rigao Souza. Discrete time, finite state space mean field games. *Journal de mathématiques pures et appliquées*, 93(3):308–328, 2010.
- [71] Xin Guo, Anran Hu, Renyuan Xu, and Junzi Zhang. Learning mean-field games. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 32, 2019.
- [72] Xin Guo, Renyuan Xu, and Thaleia Zariphopoulou. Entropy regularization for mean field games with learning. *Mathematics of Operations research*, 47(4):3239–3260, 2022.
- [73] Saeed Hadikhanloo. Learning in anonymous nonatomic games with applications to first-order mean field games. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1704.00378*, 2017.
- [74] Ben Hambly, Renyuan Xu, and Huining Yang. Policy gradient methods find the nash equilibrium in n-player general-sum linear-quadratic games. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 24(139): 1–56, 2023.
- [75] Jiequn Han, Arnulf Jentzen, and Weinan E. Solving high-dimensional partial differential equations using deep learning. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 115(34):8505–8510, 2018.

- [76] Jiequn Han, Ruimeng Hu, and Jihao Long. Convergence of deep fictitious play for stochastic differential games. *Frontiers of Mathematical Finance*, 1(2), 2022.
- [77] Ruimeng Hu. Deep fictitious play for stochastic differential games. *Communications in mathematical sciences*, 19(2), 2021.
- [78] Ruimeng Hu and Mathieu Laurière. Recent developments in machine learning methods for stochastic control and games. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.10257*, 2023.
- [79] Kuang Huang, Xu Chen, Xuan Di, and Qiang Du. Dynamic driving and routing games for autonomous vehicles on networks: A mean field game approach. *Transportation Research Part C: Emerging Technologies*, 128:103189, 2021.
- [80] Minyi Huang. Large-population lqg games involving a major player: the nash certainty equivalence principle. *SIAM J. Control Optim.*, 48(5):3318–3353, 2010.
- [81] Minyi Huang, Roland P Malhamé, Peter E Caines, et al. Large population stochastic dynamic games: closed-loop McKean-Vlasov systems and the Nash certainty equivalence principle. *Communications in Information & Systems*, 6(3):221–252, 2006.
- [82] George Em Karniadakis, Ioannis G Kevrekidis, Lu Lu, Paris Perdikaris, Sifan Wang, and Liu Yang. Physics-informed machine learning. *Nature Reviews Physics*, 3(6):422–440, 2021.
- [83] Vassili N. Kolokoltsov and Alain Bensoussan. Mean-field-game model for botnet defense in cyber-security. *Appl. Math. Optim.*, 74(3):669–692, 2016. ISSN 0095-4616. doi: 10.1007/s00245-016-9389-6. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s00245-016-9389-6>.
- [84] Vassili N Kolokoltsov and Alain Bensoussan. Mean-field-game model for botnet defense in cyber-security. *Applied Mathematics & Optimization*, 74:669–692, 2016.
- [85] Vassili N Kolokoltsov and Oleg A Malafeyev. Corruption and botnet defense: a mean field game approach. *International Journal of Game Theory*, 47:977–999, 2018.
- [86] Aimé Lachapelle and Marie-Therese Wolfram. On a mean field game approach modeling congestion and aversion in pedestrian crowds. *Transportation research part B: methodological*, 45(10):1572–1589, 2011.
- [87] Daniel Lacker. On the convergence of closed-loop nash equilibria to the mean field game limit. *The Annals of Applied Probability*, 30(4):1693–1761, 2020.
- [88] Laetitia Laguzet and Gabriel Turinici. Individual vaccination as nash equilibrium in a sir model with application to the 2009–2010 influenza a (h1n1) epidemic in france. *Bulletin of mathematical biology*, 77:1955–1984, 2015.
- [89] Marc Lanctot, Edward Lockhart, Jean-Baptiste Lespiau, Vinicius Zambaldi, Satyaki Upadhyay, Julien Pérolat, Sriram Srinivasan, Finbarr Timbers, Karl Tuyls, Shayegan Omidshafiei, et al. Openpiel: A framework for reinforcement learning in games. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1908.09453*, 2019.
- [90] Jean-Michel Lasry and Pierre-Louis Lions. Jeux à champ moyen. I—le cas stationnaire. *Comptes Rendus Mathématique*, 343(9):619–625, 2006.
- [91] Jean-Michel Lasry and Pierre-Louis Lions. Jeux à champ moyen. II—horizon fini et contrôle optimal. *Comptes Rendus Mathématique*, 343(10):679–684, 2006.
- [92] Jean-Michel Lasry and Pierre-Louis Lions. Mean field games. *Japanese journal of mathematics*, 2(1):229–260, 2007.
- [93] Jean-Michel Lasry and Pierre-Louis Lions. Mean-field games with a major player. *Comptes Rendus Mathématique*, 356(8):886–890, 2018.
- [94] Mathieu Laurière. Numerical methods for mean field games and mean field type control. *Mean field games*, 78:221, 2021.

- [95] Mathieu Laurière, Sarah Perrin, Sertan Girgin, Paul Muller, Ayush Jain, Theophile Cabannes, Georgios Piliouras, Julien Pérolat, Romuald Elie, Olivier Pietquin, et al. Scalable deep reinforcement learning algorithms for mean field games. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 12078–12095. PMLR, 2022.
- [96] Mathieu Laurière, Sarah Perrin, Julien Pérolat, Sertan Girgin, Paul Muller, Romuald Elie, Matthieu Geist, and Olivier Pietquin. Learning mean field games: A survey. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.12944*, 2022.
- [97] Laura Leal, Mathieu Laurière, and Charles-Albert Lehalle. Learning a functional control for high-frequency finance. Preprint, [arXiv:2006.09611](https://arxiv.org/abs/2006.09611), 2020. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2006.09611>.
- [98] Roland P Malhamé and Christy Graves. Mean field games: A paradigm for individual-mass interactions. In *Proceedings of Symposia in Applied Mathematics*, volume 78, pages 3–32, 2020.
- [99] Li Miao and Shuai Li. Cyber security based on mean field game model of the defender: Attacker strategies. *International Journal of Distributed Sensor Networks*, 13(10):1550147717737908, 2017.
- [100] Volodymyr Mnih, Koray Kavukcuoglu, David Silver, Andrei A Rusu, Joel Veness, Marc G Bellemare, Alex Graves, Martin Riedmiller, Andreas K Fidjeland, Georg Ostrovski, et al. Human-level control through deep reinforcement learning. *Nature*, 518(7540):529–533, 2015.
- [101] Paul Muller, Romuald Elie, Mark Rowland, Mathieu Laurière, Julien Perolat, Sarah Perrin, Matthieu Geist, Georgios Piliouras, Olivier Pietquin, and Karl Tuyls. Learning correlated equilibria in mean-field games. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2208.10138*, 2022.
- [102] Paul Muller, Mark Rowland, Romuald Elie, Georgios Piliouras, Julien Perolat, Mathieu Laurière, Raphael Marinier, Olivier Pietquin, and Karl Tuyls. Learning equilibria in mean-field games: Introducing mean-field PSRO. In *Proceedings of the 21st International Conference on Autonomous Agents and Multiagent Systems*, pages 926–934, 2022.
- [103] John Nash. Non-cooperative games. *Annals of Mathematics*, pages 286–295, 1951.
- [104] Son Luu Nguyen and Minyi Huang. Linear-quadratic-gaussian mixed games with continuum-parametrized minor players. *SIAM J. Control Optim.*, 50(5):2907–2937, 2012.
- [105] Mojtaba Nourian and Peter E Caines. ϵ -Nash mean field game theory for nonlinear stochastic dynamical systems with major and minor agents. *SIAM J. Control Optim.*, 51(4):3302–3331, 2013.
- [106] Francesca Parise and Asuman Ozdaglar. Graphon games: A statistical framework for network games and interventions. *Econometrica*, 91(1):191–225, 2023.
- [107] Julien Pérolat, Sarah Perrin, Romuald Elie, Mathieu Laurière, Georgios Piliouras, Matthieu Geist, Karl Tuyls, and Olivier Pietquin. Scaling mean field games by online mirror descent. In *Proceedings of the 21st International Conference on Autonomous Agents and Multiagent Systems*, pages 1028–1037, 2022.
- [108] Sarah Perrin, Julien Pérolat, Mathieu Laurière, Matthieu Geist, Romuald Elie, and Olivier Pietquin. Fictitious play for mean field games: Continuous time analysis and applications. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 33:13199–13213, 2020.
- [109] Sarah Perrin, Mathieu Laurière, Julien Pérolat, Romuald Elie, Matthieu Geist, and Olivier Pietquin. Generalization in mean field games by learning master policies. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 36, pages 9413–9421, 2022.
- [110] Ronald L Rardin and Ronald L Rardin. *Optimization in operations research*, volume 166. Prentice Hall Upper Saddle River, NJ, 1998.
- [111] Herbert Robbins and Sutton Monro. A stochastic approximation method. *Ann. Math. Statistics*, 22:400–407, 1951. ISSN 0003-4851. doi: 10.1214/aoms/1177729586. URL <https://doi.org/10.1214/aoms/1177729586>.

- [112] Lars Ruthotto, Stanley J Osher, Wuchen Li, Levon Nurbekyan, and Samy Wu Fung. A machine learning framework for solving high-dimensional mean field game and mean field control problems. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 117(17):9183–9193, 2020.
- [113] Naci Saldi, Tamer Başar, and Maxim Raginsky. Approximate nash equilibria in partially observed stochastic games with mean-field interactions. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 44(3):1006–1033, 2019.
- [114] Naci Saldi, Tamer Başar, and Maxim Raginsky. Approximate markov-nash equilibria for discrete-time risk-sensitive mean-field games. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 45(4):1596–1620, 2020.
- [115] Rabih Salhab, Jérôme Le Ny, Roland P Malhamé, and Georges Zaccour. Dynamic marketing policies with rating-sensitive consumers: A mean-field games approach. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 299(3):1079–1093, 2022.
- [116] Nevroz Sen and Peter E Caines. Mean field game theory with a partially observed major agent. *SIAM J. Control Optim.*, 54(6):3174–3224, 2016.
- [117] Justin Sirignano and Konstantinos Spiliopoulos. Dgm: A deep learning algorithm for solving partial differential equations. *Journal of computational physics*, pages 1339–1364, 2018.
- [118] Richard S Sutton and Andrew G Barto. *Reinforcement learning: An introduction*. MIT press, 2018.
- [119] Deepanshu Vasal. Sequential decomposition of discrete-time mean-field games. *Dynamic Games and Applications*, pages 1–19, 2023.
- [120] John Von Neumann. On the theory of games of strategy. *Mathematische Annalen*, 100:295–320, 1928.
- [121] Yongzhao Wang and Michael P Wellman. Empirical game-theoretic analysis for mean field games. In *Proceedings of the 2023 International Conference on Autonomous Agents and Multiagent Systems*, pages 1025–1033, 2023.
- [122] Christopher JCH Watkins and Peter Dayan. Q-learning. *Machine learning*, 8:279–292, 1992.
- [123] Jiongmin Yong and Xun Yu Zhou. *Stochastic controls: Hamiltonian systems and HJB equations*, volume 43. Springer Science & Business Media, 2012.
- [124] Muhammad Aneeq Uz Zaman, Alec Koppel, Sujay Bhatt, and Tamer Başar. Oracle-free reinforcement learning in mean-field games along a single sample path. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 10178–10206. PMLR, 2023.