# Stochastic Generalized Dynamic Games with Coupled Chance Constraints

Seyed Shahram Yadollahi, Hamed Kebriaei, and Sadegh Soudjani

Abstract—Designing multi-agent systems with safety constraints and uncertain dynamics is a challenging problem. This paper studies a stochastic dynamic noncooperative game with coupling safety chance constraints. The uncertainty is assumed to satisfy a concentration of measure property. Firstly, due to the non-convexity of chance constraints, a convex under-approximation of chance constraints is given using constraints on the expectation. Then, the conditions for the existence of the stochastic generalized Nash equilibrium (SGNE) of the under-approximated game are investigated, and the relation between the  $\varepsilon$ -SGNE of the original game and the under-approximated one is derived. A sampling-based algorithm is proposed for the SGNE seeking of the underapproximated game that does not require knowing the distribution of the uncertainty nor the analytical computation of expectations. Finally, under some assumptions on the game's pseudo-gradient mapping, the almost sure convergence of the algorithm to SGNE is proven. A numerical study is carried out on demand-side management in microgrids with shared battery to demonstrate the applicability of the proposed scheme.

Index Terms—Stochastic generalized dynamic games, chance constraints, concentration of measure, Nash seeking algorithm, sampling-based algorithm

### I. INTRODUCTION

Stochastic dynamic games [1] have attracted significant attention over the last two decades [2]–[4]. Considering safety constraints in the design and analysis of systems has become a prominent feature, especially for multi-agent systems [5]. In game theory, encoding safety constraints become more challenging when we have coupling constraints among the agents in addition to the local constraints. Analysis of games with such constraints requires the concept of *generalized Nash equilibrium* (GNE) [6], and has applications in energy management [7] and autonomous vehicle control [8], among others. Although the GNE problem has been well studied in the literature in static and deterministic environments [6], [9], it becomes more realistic and also challenging when the dynamics and uncertainties are taken into account.

There are only a few studies that address dynamics or uncertainties in the GNE analysis [10]–[13]. The previous works in generalized games have one or more of the following

Sadegh Soudjani is with the Max Planck Institute for Software Systems, Kaiserslautern, 67663, Germany, (sadegh@mpi-sws.org).

limitations: (1) Lack of shared dynamics [10], [11], [14]–[18] or stochastic uncertainties [12], [13], [19], [20] in modeling; (2) Objectives being limited to quadratic functions [7], [8], [12], [13], [21] and affine [7], [8], [11]–[13], [15], [21] or separable constraints [10]; (3) Having high computational costs due to multiple optimization problems per iteration [8], [18], [22]; (4) Lack of convergence guarantees [8] or feasibility assurances [8], [23]; and (5) Limited to specific probability distributions for uncertainty [8], [22].

In this paper, the GNE is studied in the presence of shared stochastic dynamics and chance constraints, which form a stochastic generalized dynamic game (SGDG) problem. The shared dynamics are linear and time-variant influenced by players' decisions and stochastic disturbances. The disturbance's distribution is unknown but belongs to a class of distributions that satisfy a concentration of measure property. In the first step, the SGDG is reformulated to a stochastic generalized Nash equilibrium (SGNE) problem while the chance constraints are under-approximated by expected constraints. leveraging the concentration of measure properties of the random variables. This creates an "under-approximated game" that consists of an expected cost for each player and an expected coupling constraint among all the players. We show that the equilibrium obtained for the under-approximated game also serves as an  $\varepsilon$ -SGNE for the original SGDG. Next, the conditions for the existence of an SGNE for the underapproximated game are investigated. Finally, since the exact distribution of the disturbance is not known and also analytical computation of the expectations is generally challenging and computationally complex, we propose a sample-based, semidecentralized algorithm capable of computing an SGNE of the approximated game.

The main contributions of this paper are as follows:

- We provide the first results on SGDG that incorporates coupling chance constraints under uncertainties with general distribution exhibiting the concentration of measure property. Furthermore, in this paper, we present cost functions and coupling constraints in a more general form compared to previous studies [7], [10]. Unlike [8], [22], our approach does not require full knowledge of the distribution functions of the involved random variables and is not restricted to a specific class of distributions, such as Gaussian.
- We reformulate the original SGDG to an SGNE problem by under-approximating the non-convex coupling chance constraints using convex constraints on expectation. Additionally, we demonstrate that the SGNE of the under-

Seyed Shahram Yadollahi and Hamed Kebriaei are with the School of ECE, College of Engineering, University of Tehran, Tehran, Iran. H. Kebriaei is also with the School of Computer Science, Institute for Research in Fundamental Sciences (IPM). Emails: (shahram.yadollahi@ut.ac.ir, kebriaei@ut.ac.ir).

approximated game is an  $\varepsilon$ -SGNE of the original SGDG.

- We propose a semi-decentralized algorithm for seeking an SGNE of the under-approximated game, utilizing operator theory and stochastic approximation techniques.
- The existence of SGNE (i.e., ε–SGNE for the original game) is studied, and the almost sure convergence of the proposed algorithm to the SGNE is proved under the condition of monotonicity of the game's pseudo-gradient mapping.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section II provides a review of the related works. Section III gives the essential notations used in this paper and reviews some useful preliminaries. Section IV presents the system model and gives the problem statement. Section V discusses the under-approximation of the main game's feasible set and the construction of the under-approximated game. The existence of an SGNE in this game and its connection to the main game are also analyzed. Section VI proposes an algorithm for seeking SGNE. Finally, Section VII demonstrates the applicability and performance of our framework in demand-side management for microgrids utilizing a shared battery.

#### II. LITERATURE REVIEW

The initial foundations of dynamic game theory can be traced back to the seminal works [24] and [25], which laid the groundwork for subsequent advancements in the field. Over the years, a significant body of research has explored dynamic games without coupling constraints [1], [19], [20]. In recent years, games with coupling constraints have attracted significant attention. The study of generalized games has predominantly focused on deterministic static frameworks. Foundational works have established the theoretical basis for generalized Nash equilibria (GNE) in deterministic settings, highlighting existence and computation under various structural assumptions [6], [9].

Driven by the need to incorporate uncertainty in real-world systems, stochastic variants of generalized games have been studied [11], [14]. One of the earliest significant contributions to stochastic generalized games is the work [14], which characterizes SGNE using Karush-Kuhn-Tucker (KKT) conditions and stochastic variational inequalities. While this work lays a foundational framework for SGNE analysis, it does not provide computational algorithms for solving such games. The development of computational techniques for SGNE-seeking has since advanced significantly. Early works, such as [10], [11], [15], [23], [26], introduced semi-decentralized and distributed algorithms capable of converging to SGNE under scenarios where uncertainty affects only players' objective functions, modeled as expected values of stochastic convex functions. Nevertheless, these approaches assume affine or separable convex coupling constraints and do not address games where stochasticity influences constraints.Furthermore, convergence in [11], [15], [23], [26] was shown under strict/strong monotonicity or co-coercivity of the pseudo-gradient mapping, while [10] extended results to mere monotonicity.

Probabilistic guarantees are incorporated into decisionmaking processes to ensure that specified performance or safety requirements are met with a certain level of confidence. The works [16], [17] have studied traditional stochastic games with *local chance constraints*. The work [18] has addressed stochastic generalized games with *coupling chance constraints* by employing scenario-based methods. The proposed algorithm is based on alternating direction method of multipliers to approximate chance constraints but requires solving multiple optimization problems iteratively, limiting its computational efficiency and scalability.

Dynamic extensions of stochastic generalized games have been studied recently. The work [21] has studied SGDG with non-probabilistic affine coupling constraints, introducing a bifurcation in control variables: those affecting state dynamics and those influencing constraints. An SGNE-seeking algorithm is proposed under the assumption of uncertainty with Gaussian distribution, which requires solving multiple optimal control problems per iteration, emphasizing computational intensity but ensuring vehicle control under probabilistic constraints. The work [22], an algorithm is developed for computing local SGNE in SGDGs with Gaussian uncertainties. The proposed two-stage method approximates chance constraints linearly and utilizes Lagrange multipliers and penalty updates. Despite innovative approximations, the approach lacks convergence guarantees and the feasibility of constraints.

The work [8] has studied vehicle safety using SGDGs with quadratic objectives and affine coupling chance constraints. The considered model features linear shared dynamics with uncertainties confined to safety constraints. Addressing demand-side management in microgrids with shared battery is studied in [7] using SGDG with coupling chance constraints. The cost functions and the chance constraints are assumed to be quadratic and linear, respectively. Moreover, the supports and two first moments of random variables are assumed to be known. The main game is under-approximated with a deterministic game, and a deterministic algorithm is proposed to compute the GNE of the under-approximated game.

The closest work to ours is the framework proposed in [10]. We extend this framework by considering stochastic dynamics and shared coupling chance constraints.

### **III. NOTATIONS AND PRELIMINARIES**

Throughout this paper,  $\mathbb{N} = \{0, 1, 2, ...\}$  denotes the set of natural numbers,  $\mathbb{R}^m$  ( $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^m$ ) refers to the *m*-dimensional (nonnegative) Euclidean space, and  $\mathbb{R} = \mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty\}$ . The transpose of a vector  $x \in \mathbb{R}^m$  and a matrix  $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ is denoted by  $x^\top$  and  $A^\top$ , respectively. The inner product between vectors  $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^m$  is  $\langle x, y \rangle = x^\top y$ , and the associated norm is  $||x||_2 = \sqrt{x^\top x}$ . The induced 2-norm a matrix Ais denoted by ||A||. We define  $\mathbf{1}_m \in \mathbb{R}^m$  as the vector of ones,  $\mathbf{0}_m \in \mathbb{R}^m$  as the vector of zeros, and  $I_m \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$  as the identity matrix. The stacked column vector from vectors  $x_1, \ldots, x_N$  is denoted by  $\operatorname{col}(x_1, \ldots, x_N)$ . The Cartesian product of sets  $\mathcal{D}_i, i \in \{1, \ldots, N\}$ , is denoted by  $\prod_{i=1}^N \mathcal{D}_i$ . Given the function  $g : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}^m$ , we define  $\nabla_x g(x) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$ with  $[\nabla_x g(x)]_{i,j} := \frac{\partial g_j(x)}{\partial x_i}$ . Let w be a random variable. We denote its expectation and its variance by  $\mathbb{E}[w]$  and  $\operatorname{Var}[w]$ , respectively. We define the filtration  $\mathcal{F}^w = \{\mathcal{F}_{(k)}^w\}$ , that is a family of  $\sigma$ -algebras such that  $\mathcal{F}_{(0)}^w = \sigma(X_0), \mathcal{F}_{(k)}^w = \sigma(X_0, w_{(0)}, w_{(1)}, \dots, w_{(k-1)})$  for all  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ . In other words,  $\mathcal{F}_{(k)}^w$  contains the information about w up to time k.

Consider the *set-valued operator*  $\mathcal{A} : \mathbb{R}^m \rightrightarrows 2^{\mathbb{R}^m}$ . The *domain* of  $\mathcal{A}$  is defined as dom $\mathcal{A} = \{x \mid \mathcal{A}(x) \neq \emptyset\}$ , where  $\emptyset$  represents the *empty set*, and the *range* is range $\mathcal{A} = \{y \mid \exists x, y \in \mathcal{A}(x)\}$ . The *identity operator* is denoted by Id.

The graph of  $\mathcal{A}$  is defined as  $\operatorname{gra} \mathcal{A} = \{(x, u) \mid u \in \mathcal{A}(x)\}$ , and the *inverse* operator  $\mathcal{A}^{-1}$  is defined via its graph as  $\operatorname{gra} \mathcal{A}^{-1} = \{(u, x) \mid (x, u) \in \operatorname{gra} \mathcal{A}\}$ . The zero set of  $\mathcal{A}$  is  $\operatorname{zer} \mathcal{A} = \{x \mid 0 \in \mathcal{A}(x)\}$ .  $\mathcal{A}$  is called *monotone* if  $\forall (x, u), \forall (y, v) \in \operatorname{gra} \mathcal{A}$ , we have  $\langle x - y, u - v \rangle \geq 0$ . Furthermore,  $\mathcal{A}$  is *maximally monotone* if its graph  $\operatorname{gra} \mathcal{A}$  is not properly contained within the graph of any other monotone operator. The *resolvent* of  $\mathcal{A}$  is defined as  $R_{\mathcal{A}} = (\operatorname{Id} + \mathcal{A})^{-1}$ , which is single-valued with  $\operatorname{dom} R_{\mathcal{A}} = \mathbb{R}^m$  if  $\mathcal{A}$  is maximally monotone.

A proper lower semi-continuous convex function is a convex function  $f: \mathbb{R}^n \to (-\infty, +\infty]$  that is never  $-\infty$ , takes finite values somewhere in its domain, and satisfies the property that for any sequence  $x_k \to x$ ,  $\liminf_{k\to\infty} f(x_k) \ge f(x)$ . For a proper lower semi-continuous convex function f, the sub-differential operator  $\partial f$ :  $\operatorname{dom} f \to 2^{\mathbb{R}^m}$  is defined by  $x \mapsto \{g \in \mathbb{R}^m \mid f(y) \ge f(x) + \langle g, y - x \rangle, \forall y \in \operatorname{dom} f\}$ , and  $\partial f$  is maximally monotone. The proximal operator of f is  $\operatorname{prox}_f = R_{\partial f}: \mathbb{R}^m \to \operatorname{dom} f$ , defined as  $\operatorname{prox}_f(x) = \arg\min_{u \in \operatorname{dom} f} \{f(u) + \frac{1}{2} ||u - x||^2\}$ .

Define the *indicator function* of a set  $\mathcal{U}$  as  $\iota_{\mathcal{U}}(x) = 0$  if  $x \in \mathcal{U}$  and  $\iota_{\mathcal{U}}(x) = \infty$  otherwise. For a closed convex set  $\mathcal{U}$ ,  $\iota_{\mathcal{U}}$  is a proper lower semi-continuous function.  $\partial \iota_{\mathcal{U}}$  is also the *normal cone operator* of  $\mathcal{U}$ , i.e.,  $\mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{U}}(x) = \{v \mid \langle v, y - x \rangle \leq 0, \forall y \in \mathcal{U}\}$  and dom $\mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{U}} = \mathcal{U}$ . Define *projection* x onto  $\mathcal{U}$  by  $\operatorname{proj}_{\mathcal{U}}(x) = \arg \min_{y \in \mathcal{U}} ||x - y||$ . In this case,  $R_{\mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{U}}}(x) = \operatorname{proj}_{\mathcal{U}}(x)$ . Let  $\mathcal{U}$  be a nonempty closed convex set and f be a proper lower semi-continuous function; then, for all x

$$\begin{split} z &= \operatorname{proj}_{\mathcal{U}}(x) \Leftrightarrow \langle z - x, y - z \rangle \geq 0, \quad \forall y \in \mathcal{U}, \\ z &= \operatorname{prox}_{\mathcal{U}}(x) \Leftrightarrow \langle z - x, y - z \rangle \geq f(z) - f(y), \, \forall y \in \mathcal{U}. \end{split}$$

A point  $x \in \mathbb{R}^m$  is a *fixed point* of a single-valued operator  $\mathcal{T} : \mathbb{R}^m \to \mathbb{R}^m$  if  $\mathcal{T}(x) = x$ , with the set of fixed points denoted by fix $\mathcal{T}$ . The composition of operators  $\mathcal{A}$  and  $\mathcal{B}$ , denoted  $\mathcal{A} \circ \mathcal{B}$ , is defined by  $\operatorname{gra}(\mathcal{A} \circ \mathcal{B}) = \{(x, z) \mid \exists y \in \operatorname{range}\mathcal{B}, (x, y) \in \operatorname{gra}\mathcal{B}, (y, z) \in \operatorname{gra}\mathcal{A}\}$ , and their sum  $\mathcal{A} + \mathcal{B}$  is given by  $\operatorname{gra}(\mathcal{A} + \mathcal{B}) = \{(x, y + z) \mid (x, y) \in \operatorname{gra}\mathcal{A}, (x, z) \in \operatorname{gra}\mathcal{B}\}$ . We refer the readers to [27] for more details on monotone operators.

#### IV. MODELING FRAMEWORK AND PROBLEM STATEMENT

This section introduces the concept of Stochastic Generalized Dynamic Games (SGDG) in discrete time with coupling chance constraints. Consider a set of players  $\mathcal{I} :=$  $\{1, 2, ..., N\}$  and a time horizon T. At each time instant  $t \in \{0, 1, ..., T-1\}$ , each player  $i \in \mathcal{I}$  selects a strategy  $u_t^i \in \mathcal{D}_t^i \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{n_i}$ , where  $\mathcal{D}_t^i$  is a nonempty, compact, and convex set. This strategy affects the global state of the system denoted by  $s_t \in \mathbb{R}^{n_s}$  through the following stochastic difference equation:

$$s_{t+1} = \boldsymbol{A}_t s_t + \sum_{j=1}^N \boldsymbol{B}_t^j u_t^j + w_t, \ \forall t \in \{0, 1, \dots, T-1\}, \ (1)$$

where  $A_t \in \mathbb{R}^{n_s \times n_s}$  and  $B_t^j \in \mathbb{R}^{n_s \times n_j}$  are time-dependent system matrices,  $w_t \in \mathbb{R}^{n_s}$  represents the disturbance at time  $t, w := \operatorname{col}(w_0, \ldots, w_{T-1})$ , and  $s_0$  is the initial state which is assumed to be known.

The collective strategy for each player i is defined as  $u^i = \operatorname{col}(u_0^i, \ldots, u_{T-1}^i) \in \mathcal{D}^i$ , where  $\mathcal{D}^i = \prod_{t=0}^{T-1} \mathcal{D}_t^i$ . The strategy profile for all players is denoted by  $u = \operatorname{col}(u^1, \ldots, u^N) \in \mathcal{D}$ , with  $\mathcal{D} = \prod_{j=1}^N \mathcal{D}^j$ . The strategy profile excluding player i is represented by  $u^{-i} = \operatorname{col}(u^1, \ldots, u^{i-1}, u^{i+1}, \ldots, u^N) \in \mathcal{D}^{-i}$ , where  $\mathcal{D}^{-i} = \prod_{j=1, j \neq i}^N \mathcal{D}^j$ . The state variable profile is given by  $s = \operatorname{col}(s_0, \ldots, s_T) \in \mathbb{R}^{(T+1)n_s}$ .

Each player  $i \in \mathcal{I}$  seeks to minimize its own cost function by selecting an appropriate strategy  $u^i$ . The cost function for player i is defined as

$$\mathbb{J}^i(s_0, u^i, u^{-i}) = \mathbb{E}_w\left[\hat{J}^i(s) + \tilde{J}^i(u^i, u^{-i})\right], \qquad (2)$$

where  $\hat{J}^i : \mathbb{R}^{(T+1)n_s} \to \mathbb{R}$  and  $\tilde{J}^i : \mathbb{R}^{T\sum_j n_j} \to \mathbb{R}$ .

In addition to minimizing its cost function, each player i is also subject to the following shared safety chance constraints

$$\mathbb{P}\left\{\xi^{j}(s,u) \leq 0\right\} \geq 1 - \gamma^{j}, \quad j \in \{1,\dots,m\}, \qquad (3)$$

where  $\xi^j(s, u) := \hat{\xi}^j(s) + \tilde{\xi}^j(u)$ , with  $\hat{\xi}^j : \mathbb{R}^{(T+1)n_s} \to \mathbb{R}$  and  $\tilde{\xi}^j : \mathbb{R}^T \sum_{j} n_j \to \mathbb{R}$ . Here,  $\hat{\xi}^j(s)$  is a measurable function for each *j*. Moreover,  $\gamma^j \in (0, 1)$  is a constant-violation tolerance for the *j*<sup>th</sup> coupling chance constraint.

Assumption 1: For all  $i \in \mathcal{I}$ , the cost function  $\mathbb{J}^i$  is welldefined. The function  $\hat{J}^i(s)$  is a differentiable convex function with respect to s, and  $\tilde{J}^i(u^i, u^{-i})$  is a differentiable convex function with respect to  $u^i$ .

Assumption 2: For all  $j \in \{1, 2, ..., m\}$ , the function  $\hat{\xi}^{j}(s)$  is a convex differentiable function with respect to s, and  $\tilde{\xi}^{j}(u^{i}, u^{-i})$  is a convex differentiable function with respect to  $u^{i}$ .

In this paper, open loop information structure is considered, i.e., players commit to a sequence of actions at the beginning of the game [28]. In an open loop structure, players base their strategies solely on the knowledge of time t and the initial state  $s_0$  [12]. Based on this, for any  $t \in \{0, 1, ..., T\}$ , the state space model from equation (1) can be explicitly written as

$$s_t = \mathbf{\Phi}(t,0)s_0 + \sum_{k=0}^{t-1} \mathbf{\Phi}(t,k+1) \left( \sum_{j=1}^N \mathbf{B}_k^j u_k^j + w_k \right), \quad (4)$$

where the transition matrix  $\Phi(t_1, t_2)$ , for  $t_1 \ge t_2$ , is given by

$$\mathbf{\Phi}(t_1, t_2) = \begin{cases} \mathbf{A}_{t_1 - 1} \dots \mathbf{A}_{t_2}, & t_1 > t_2 \ge 0, \\ \mathbf{I}, & t_1 = t_2 \ge 0. \end{cases}$$

Using equation (4), the state vector s can be compactly expressed as

$$s = \Theta s_0 + \sum_{j=1}^{N} \Gamma^j u^j + \Upsilon w, \qquad (5)$$

where  $\Theta \in \mathbb{R}^{(T+1)n_s \times n_s}$ ,  $\Gamma^j \in \mathbb{R}^{(T+1)n_s \times Tn_j}$ , and  $\Upsilon \in \mathbb{R}^{(T+1)n_s \times Tn_s}$ . The exact definitions of  $\Theta$ ,  $\Gamma^j$ , and  $\Upsilon$  are derived from equation (4) but omitted here for brevity. Equation (5) shows that the state profile is a linear combination of the initial state, each player's strategy profile, and w.

Substituting s from (5) into  $\hat{J}^{i}(s)$  in (2), the cost function of player i becomes

$$\mathbb{J}^{i}(s_{0}, u^{i}, u^{-i}) = \mathbb{E}_{w}\left[J^{i}\left(s_{0}, u^{i}, u^{-i}, w\right)\right] \\
= \mathbb{E}_{w}\left[\hat{J}^{i}\left(\Theta s_{0} + \sum_{j=1}^{N} \Gamma^{j} u^{j} + \Upsilon w\right) + \tilde{J}^{i}(u^{i}, u^{-i})\right]. \quad (6)$$

Similarly, by substituting *s* from (5) into  $\hat{\xi}^{j}(s)$  in (3), the chance constraints become

$$\mathbb{P}\left\{\bar{\xi}^{j}(s_{0}, u, w) \leq 0\right\} \geq 1 - \gamma^{j}, \quad j \in \{1, \dots, m\},$$
(7)

where  $\bar{\xi}^{j}(s_{0}, u, w) = \hat{\xi}^{j} \left( \Theta s_{0} + \sum_{j=1}^{N} \Gamma^{j} u^{j} + \Upsilon w \right) + \tilde{\xi}^{j}(u).$ *Remark 1:* Using Assumptions 1 and 2, the fact that s

is affine in  $u^i$ , and the expectation preserves convexity [29, subsection 3.2.1], we get that the functions  $J^i(s_0, u^i, u^{-i}, w)$ ,  $\mathbb{J}^i(s_0, u^i, u^{-i})$ , and  $\bar{\xi}^j(s_0, u^i, u^{-i}, w)$  are all convex in  $u^i$ .

Given that the objective function of each player depends in general on the strategies of other players, both directly and indirectly through system states, along with the presence of coupling constraints and uncertainties in system dynamics, objective functions, and constraints, the problem can be formulated as an SGDG as follows:

$$\mathcal{G}_{1} = \begin{cases} \text{Players: } \mathcal{I} = \{1, 2, \dots, N\} \\ \text{Strategies of Players: } u^{i}, \ i \in \mathcal{I} \\ \text{Cost Functions: (6), Local, } i \in \mathcal{I} \\ \text{Constraints: } \begin{cases} \text{Local: } u^{i} \in \mathcal{D}^{i} \\ \text{Coupling Chance Constraints: (7)} \end{cases} \end{cases}$$

The coupled feasible set of strategies in  $\mathcal{G}_1$  can be defined as

$$\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{G}_1}(s_0) = \mathcal{D} \cap \{ u \in \mathbb{R}^T \sum_{j=1}^N n_j \mid (7) \text{ holds} \}.$$

Similarly, the feasible set for player i is

$$\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{G}_{1}}^{i}(s_{0}, u^{-i}) = \{ u^{i} \in \mathcal{D}^{i} | \exists u^{-i}, (s_{0}, u^{i}, u^{-i}) \in \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{G}_{1}}(s_{0}) \}.$$

**Definition** 1: An  $\varepsilon$ -SGNE for  $\mathcal{G}_1$  is a strategy  $u_* \in \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{G}_1}$ such that for all  $i \in \mathcal{I}$ ,

$$\mathbb{J}^{i}(s_{0}, u_{\star}^{i}, u_{\star}^{-i}) \leq \inf \left\{ \mathbb{J}^{i}(s_{0}, y, u_{\star}^{-i}) \mid y \in \mathcal{U}^{i}_{\mathcal{G}_{1}}(s_{0}, u_{\star}^{-i}) \right\} + \varepsilon.$$
(8)

An  $\varepsilon$ -SGNE represents a strategy profile where no player can reduce their cost by more than  $\varepsilon$  through unilateral deviation. If (8) holds with  $\varepsilon = 0$ , then  $u_*$  is a SGNE for  $\mathcal{G}_1$ . In this paper, we aim to investigate  $\varepsilon$ -SGNE in  $\mathcal{G}_1$ .

#### V. CONVEX UNDER-APPROXIMATION OF THE SGDG

Since the chance constraints (7) are typically non-convex, each player faces a non-convex stochastic optimization problem, and determining Nash equilibria for general stochastic games is NP-hard [30]. Moreover, without further assumptions on the distribution of uncertainty, such as normality, finding a generalized Nash equilibrium for  $\mathcal{G}_1$  is intractable [31]. Therefore, we propose a convex under-approximation of (7) by raising the following assumption on the class of the distribution of uncertainty.

Assumption 3: Let the random variable w in (7) be defined on the probability space  $(\Xi_w, \mathcal{F}_w, \mathbb{P}_w)$ . The probability space satisfies the inequality

$$\mathbb{P}_w\left\{ |\phi(w) - \mathbb{E}_w[\phi(w)]| \le \theta \right\} \ge 1 - h(\theta), \quad \forall \theta \ge 0, \quad (9)$$

for any function  $\phi : \Xi_w \to \mathbb{R}$  in a class  $\mathcal{C}$ . Here,  $h : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \to [0,1]$  is a monotonically decreasing function, and for each  $j \in \{1, \ldots, m\}, \, \bar{\xi}^j(s_0, u, \cdot) \in \mathcal{C}$ .

In Assumption 3, the random variable w is assumed to have the concentration of measure (CoM) property. The class of functions C is usually considered to be the set of Lipschitz continuous functions. The CoM phenomenon states that in a probability space, if a set has a measure of at least one-half, most points are close to that set. Additionally, if a function on this space is sufficiently regular, the probability of it deviating significantly from its expectation or median is low [32].

**Remark** 2: Assumption 3 is especially relevant in highdimensional spaces, where probability tends to concentrate in small regions. Many distributions, such as Gaussian, sub-Gaussian, exponential, and log-concave, are known to exhibit CoM properties. Examples of different distributions with the CoM property and corresponding h functions can be found e.g., in [32]. For instance, the standard multi-variate Gaussian distribution satisfies (9) with  $h(t) = \min\{2e^{-2t^2/\pi^2}, 1\}$  [33], [34]. Observe that if we substitute  $h(\cdot)$  with another monotonically decreasing function  $\bar{h}(\cdot)$  such that  $\bar{h}(\cdot) \ge h(\cdot)$ , the inequality (9) remains valid when using  $\bar{h}(\cdot)$ .

According to [32, Proposition 4] and Assumption 3, the feasible domain of the chance constraints in (7) includes the following compact expected constraint:

$$\mathbb{E}_w\left[g(s_0, u, w)\right] \le 0,\tag{10}$$

where  $g(s_0, u, w) := \bar{\xi}(s_0, u, w) + h^{-1}(\gamma) + \beta$  with  $\bar{\xi}(s_0, u, w) := \operatorname{col}(\bar{\xi}^1, \dots, \bar{\xi}^m), \ \gamma := \operatorname{col}(\gamma^1, \dots, \gamma^m)$ , and  $h^{-1}(\gamma) := \operatorname{col}(h^{-1}(\gamma^1), \dots, h^{-1}(\gamma^m))$ . The vector  $\beta = \operatorname{col}(\beta^1, \dots, \beta^m)$ , for all  $\beta \ge 0$ , can be empirically adjusted to control the tightness level of the nder-approximation.

Now we define a new game  $\mathcal{G}_2$  by replacing the coupling constraint (7) with (10). Analogous to  $\mathcal{G}_1$ , the coupled feasible strategy set for  $\mathcal{G}_2$  is defined as

$$\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{G}_2}(s_0) = \mathcal{D} \cap \{ u \in \mathbb{R}^{T \sum_{j=1}^N n_j} \mid (10) \text{ holds} \}, \qquad (11)$$

and the feasible strategy set for player i in this game is

$$\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{G}_{2}}^{i}(s_{0}, u^{-i}) = \{ u^{i} \in \mathcal{D}^{i} \mid \exists u^{-i}, (s_{0}, u^{i}, u^{-i}) \in \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{G}_{2}}(s_{0}) \}.$$

The SGNE of  $\mathcal{G}_2$  is also defined according to Definition 1. In the following, we show that there exists an SGNE of  $\mathcal{G}_2$ , which is an  $\varepsilon$ -SGNE for  $\mathcal{G}_1$ .

#### A. Characterization of SGNE in $\mathcal{G}_2$

Let us consider the following assumptions.

Assumption 4: The set  $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{G}_2}$  satisfies the Slater's constraint qualification. For each  $s_0 \in \mathbb{R}^{n_s}$  and  $w \in$ 

 $\begin{array}{lll} \Xi_w, & g(s_0,\cdot,w) \quad \text{is} \quad \ell_g(s_0,w)\text{-Lipschitz} \quad \text{continuous.} \quad \text{Additionally,} \quad g(s_0,u,w) \quad \text{and} \quad \nabla_u g(s_0,u,w) \quad \text{are} \quad \text{bounded,} \\ \text{meaning that} \quad \sup_{u \in \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{G}_2}} \|g(s_0,u,w)\| &\leq & B_{1g}(s_0,w) \quad \text{and} \\ \sup_{u \in \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{G}_2}} \|\nabla_u g(s_0,u,w)\| &\leq & B_{2g}(s_0,w). \quad \text{For each} \quad i \in \mathcal{I}, \\ s_0 \in \mathbb{R}^{n_s}, \, u^{-i} \in \mathcal{D}^{-i}, \text{ and} \quad w \in \Xi_w, \, J^i(s_0,\cdot,u^{-i},w) \text{ in (6) is} \\ \ell_{J^i}(s_0,u^{-i},w)\text{-Lipschitz continuous.} \quad \text{The constants} \, \ell_g(s_0,w), \\ B_{1g}(s_0,w), \, B_{2g}(s_0,w) \quad \text{, and} \quad \ell_{J^i}(s_0,u^{-i},w), \text{ for all } i \in \mathcal{I}, \\ \text{are integrable with respect to } w. \end{array}$ 

Among all possible SGNE, we focus on an important subclass that possesses suitable properties (like greater social stability and economic fairness [6, Theorem 4.8]) and is more tractable [35]. This subclass corresponds to the solution set with respect to  $u_{\star}$  of the following stochastic variational inequality (SVI):

$$\langle \mathbb{F}_{\mathcal{G}_2}(s_0, u_\star), u - u_\star \rangle \ge 0, \ \forall u \in \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{G}_2}(s_0),$$
 (12)

where  $\mathbb{F}_{\mathcal{G}_2}$  is the pseudo-gradient mapping defined as

$$\mathbb{F}_{\mathcal{G}_{2}}(s_{0}, u) := \begin{bmatrix} \mathbb{E}_{w} \begin{bmatrix} \nabla_{u^{1}} J^{1}(s_{0}, u^{1}, u^{-1}, w) \\ \mathbb{E}_{w} \begin{bmatrix} \nabla_{u^{2}} J^{2}(s_{0}, u^{2}, u^{-2}, w) \end{bmatrix} \\ \vdots \\ \mathbb{E}_{w} \begin{bmatrix} \nabla_{u^{N}} J^{N}(s_{0}, u^{N}, u^{-N}, w) \end{bmatrix} \end{bmatrix}.$$
 (13)

**Remark** 3: Note that the interchangeability of the expected value and the gradient in  $\mathbb{F}_{\mathcal{G}_2}$  is guaranteed under Assumptions 1 and 4 [14, Lemma 3.4].

Under Assumptions 1–4, it follows from [36, Proposition 12.7] that any solution of  $SVI(\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{G}_2}, \mathbb{F}_{\mathcal{G}_2})$  in (12) is an SGNE for  $\mathcal{G}_2$  while vice versa does not hold in general.

**Proposition** 1: If Assumptions 1–4 hold, the solution set of  $SVI(\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{G}_2}, \mathbb{F}_{\mathcal{G}_2})$  is not empty.

*Proof:* The statement follows from [37, Corollary 2.2.5].

We call variational SGNE (v-SGNE) those SGNE that are also solutions of the associated SVI, namely the solution of SVI( $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{G}_2}, \mathbb{F}_{\mathcal{G}_2}$ ) in (12) with  $\mathbb{F}_{\mathcal{G}_2}$  in (13) and  $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{G}_2}$  in (11). Given that  $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{G}_2}$  meets the Slater constraint qualification as stated in Assumption 4, based on [37, Proposition 1.3.4],  $u_{\star}$  is a v-SGNE if there exists a  $\overline{\lambda} \in \mathbb{R}^m_{\geq 0}$  such that the following KKT inclusions hold for any  $i \in \overline{\mathcal{I}}$ :

$$\begin{cases} 0 \in \mathbb{E}_{w} \left[ \nabla_{u^{i}} J^{i}(s_{0}, u_{\star}^{i}, u_{\star}^{-i}, w) \right] + \mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{D}^{i}}(u_{\star}^{i}) \\ + \mathbb{E}_{w} \left[ \nabla_{u^{i}} g(s_{0}, u_{\star}^{i}, u_{\star}^{-i}, w) \right] \overline{\lambda}, \\ 0 \in -\mathbb{E}_{w} \left[ g(s_{0}, u_{\star}^{i}, u_{\star}^{-i}, w) \right] + \mathcal{N}_{\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{m}}(\overline{\lambda}). \end{cases}$$
(14)

The interchangeability of the expected value and gradient in (14) is guaranteed by Assumptions 2 and 4 [14, Lemma 3.4].

Next, we recast the KKT conditions in (14) as a compact operator inclusion:

$$0 \in \mathcal{T}(u,\overline{\lambda}) = \\ = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbb{F}_{\mathcal{G}_2}(s_0, u) + \mathbb{E}_w \left[ \nabla_u g(s_0, u, w) \right] \overline{\lambda} + \mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{D}}(u) \\ \mathcal{N}_{\mathbb{R}^m_{\geq 0}} \left( \overline{\lambda} \right) - \mathbb{E}_w \left[ g(s_0, u, w) \right] \end{bmatrix}, \quad (15)$$

where  $\mathcal{T} : \mathcal{U} \times \mathbb{R}^m_{\geq 0} \Rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{T \sum_{j=1}^N n_j} \times \mathbb{R}^m$  is a set-valued mapping. The v-SGNE of  $\mathcal{G}_2$  corresponds to the zeros of the operator  $\mathcal{T}$ , which can be expressed as the sum of two operators  $\mathcal{T} = \mathcal{A} + \mathcal{B}$ , where

$$\mathcal{A}: \begin{bmatrix} u\\ \overline{\lambda} \end{bmatrix} \mapsto \begin{bmatrix} \mathbb{F}_{\mathcal{G}_2}(s_0, u) \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} \mathbb{E}_w \left[ \nabla_u g(s_0, u, w) \right] \overline{\lambda} \\ -\mathbb{E}_w \left[ g(s_0, u, w) \right] \end{bmatrix}$$

$$\mathcal{B}: \begin{bmatrix} u \\ \overline{\lambda} \end{bmatrix} \mapsto \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{D}}(u) \\ \mathcal{N}_{\mathbb{R}^m_{\geq 0}}(\overline{\lambda}) \end{bmatrix}.$$
(16)

Thus,  $u_{\star}$  is a v-SGNE if and only if there exists a  $\overline{\lambda}_{\star} \in \mathbb{R}^{m}_{\geq 0}$  such that  $\operatorname{col}(u_{\star}, \overline{\lambda}_{\star}) \in \operatorname{zer}(\mathcal{A} + \mathcal{B})$ .

*Lemma 1:* Under Assumptions 1–4, we have  $\operatorname{zer}(\mathcal{A}+\mathcal{B}) \neq \emptyset$ .

*Proof:* Since Assumptions 1–4 hold, Proposition 1 ensures that the game  $\mathcal{G}_2$  has at least one v-SGNE  $u_*$ . Therefore, from [38, Theorem 3.1] we get that there exists a  $\overline{\lambda}_* \in \mathbb{R}^m_{\geq 0}$  such that the KKT conditions in (14) are satisfied. Hence,  $\operatorname{zer}(\mathcal{A} + \mathcal{B}) \neq \emptyset$ .

Assumption 5: The mapping  $\mathbb{F}$  is monotone and  $\ell_{\mathbb{F}}$ -Lipschitz continuous for some  $\ell_{\mathbb{F}} > 0$ .

*Lemma 2:* Let Assumptions 2-5 hold. Then, we have that (1)  $\mathcal{A}$  is monotone and  $\ell_{\mathcal{A}}$ -Lipschitz continuous, and (2)  $\mathcal{B}$  is maximally monotone.

Proof:

- (1) From (16), we have A = A<sub>1</sub> + A<sub>2</sub>, where A<sub>1</sub> maps col(u, λ̄) to col(𝔽<sub>G2</sub>(s<sub>0</sub>, u), 0) and A<sub>2</sub> maps col(u, λ̄) to col (𝔼<sub>w</sub> [∇<sub>u</sub>g(s<sub>0</sub>, u, w)] λ̄, -𝔼<sub>w</sub> [g(s<sub>0</sub>, u, w)]). By Assumption 5, A<sub>1</sub> is monotone, and based on Assumptions 2–3 and [39, Theorem 1], A<sub>2</sub> is monotone because K(u, λ̄) = 𝔼<sub>w</sub>[g(s<sub>0</sub>, u, w)]λ̄ is a proper saddle function on U<sub>G2</sub>×ℝ<sub>≥0</sub>. Therefore, since the sum of two monotone operators is monotone [27, Proposition 20.10], A is monotone. Moreover, Assumptions 5 and 4 ensure that A is Lipschitz continuous.
- (2) Since normal cones of closed convex sets are maximally monotone, and concatenation preserves maximality [27, Proposition 20.23], *B* is maximally monotone.

# B. SGNE of $\mathcal{G}_2$ as an $\varepsilon$ -SGNE of $\mathcal{G}_1$

At the beginning of this section, we showed that the nonconvex constraint (7) of  $\mathcal{G}_1$  can be under-approximated by (10) of  $\mathcal{G}_2$ . In this subsection, we focus on establishing a relation between the solution of the under-approximated game  $\mathcal{G}_2$  and that of the actual game  $\mathcal{G}_1$ . We demonstrate that the v-SGNE of  $\mathcal{G}_2$  is an  $\varepsilon$ -SGNE for  $\mathcal{G}_1$  while  $\varepsilon$  is bounded with a dualitylike gap induced by the under-approximation of the feasible set of  $\mathcal{G}_1$ .

**Theorem** 1: Let  $u_*$  be a v-SGNE of the game  $\mathcal{G}_2$ . Then, it is an  $\varepsilon$ -SGNE for the game  $\mathcal{G}_1$ .

*Proof:* Let  $\lambda = \operatorname{col}(\lambda^1, \ldots, \lambda^m) \in \mathbb{R}^m_{\geq 0}$ . For each  $i \in \mathcal{I}$  and  $u^i \in \mathcal{U}^i_{\mathcal{G}_1}$ , we have

$$\mathbb{J}^{i}(s_{0}, u^{i}, u_{\star}^{-i}) \geq \mathbb{J}^{i}(s_{0}, u^{i}, u_{\star}^{-i}) + \\
+ \sum_{j=1}^{m} \left\{ \lambda^{j} \left( \mathbb{E}_{w} \left[ g^{j}(s_{0}, u^{i}, u_{\star}^{-i}, w) \right] - \mathbb{E}_{w} \left[ g^{j}(s_{0}, u^{i}, u_{\star}^{-i}, w) \right] \right. \\
+ \underbrace{1 - \gamma^{j} - \mathbb{P} \left\{ \bar{\xi}^{j}(s_{0}, u^{i}, u_{\star}^{-i}, w) \leq 0 \right\}}_{\leq 0} \right\} \\
\geq \mathbb{J}^{i}(s_{0}, u^{i}, u_{\star}^{-i}) + \sum_{j=1}^{m} \lambda^{j} \left( \mathbb{E}_{w} \left[ g^{j}(s_{0}, u^{i}, u_{\star}^{-i}, w) \right] - M^{j} \right), \tag{17}$$

where, for  $j \in \{1, ..., m\}$ ,

$$M^{j} := \sup_{u^{i} \in \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{G}^{1}}} \|1 - \gamma^{j} - \mathbb{P}\left\{\bar{\xi}^{j}(s_{0}, u^{i}, u_{\star}^{-i}, w) \leq 0\right\} \\ - \mathbb{E}_{w}\left[g^{j}(s_{0}, u^{i}, u_{\star}^{-i}, w)\right] \|.$$
(18)

Multiplying both sides of (17) by a minus sign and subsequently adding  $\mathbb{J}^i(s_0, u^i_\star, u^{-i}_\star)$  to both sides yields

$$\mathbb{J}^{i}(s_{0}, u_{\star}^{i}, u_{\star}^{-i}) - \mathbb{J}^{i}\left(s_{0}, u^{i}, u_{\star}^{-i}\right) \leq \mathbb{J}^{i}(s_{0}, u_{\star}^{i}, u_{\star}^{-i}) - \left(\mathbb{J}^{i}(s_{0}, u^{i}, u_{\star}^{-i}) + \sum_{j=1}^{m} \lambda^{j} \mathbb{E}_{w}\left[g^{j}(s_{0}, u^{i}, u_{\star}^{-i}, w)\right]\right) \\
+ \sum_{j=1}^{N} \lambda^{j} M^{j} \leq \mathbb{J}^{i}(s_{0}, u_{\star}^{i}, u_{\star}^{-i}) + \sum_{j=1}^{N} \lambda^{j} M^{j} - \inf_{u^{i} \in \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{G}_{1}}} \left(\mathbb{J}^{i}(s_{0}, u^{i}, u_{\star}^{-i}) + \sum_{j=1}^{m} \lambda^{j} \mathbb{E}_{w}\left[g^{j}(s_{0}, u^{i}, u_{\star}^{-i}, w)\right]\right) \\
\leq \mathbb{J}^{i}(s_{0}, u_{\star}^{i}, u_{\star}^{-i}) - \sup_{\lambda \geq 0} \left[\inf_{u^{i} \in \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{G}_{1}}} \left(\mathbb{J}^{i}(s_{0}, u^{i}, u_{\star}^{-i}) + \sum_{j=1}^{m} \lambda^{j} \mathbb{E}_{w}\left[g^{j}(s_{0}, u^{i}, u_{\star}^{-i}, w)\right]\right) - \sum_{j=1}^{N} \lambda^{j} M^{j}\right].$$
(19)

Finally, setting the right-hand side of (19) to  $\varepsilon^i$  and letting  $\varepsilon = \max{\{\varepsilon^1, \ldots, \varepsilon^N\}}$ , we get that  $u_*$  is a  $\varepsilon$ -SGNE for  $\mathcal{G}_1$ .

**Remark** 4: If  $M^j = 0$  in (18) for all  $j \in \{1, \ldots, m\}$ , then we can conclude that  $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{G}_1}^i(s_0, u_{\star}^{-i}) = \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{G}_2}^i(s_0, u_{\star}^{-i})$  for all  $i \in \mathcal{I}$ . Now, by setting  $\lambda = \lambda_{\star}$  (as corresponding dual variable of  $u_{\star}$ ) and applying (19), along with the complementary slackness condition from the KKT conditions of the SGNE in  $\mathcal{G}_2$ , we find that the right-hand side of (19) is zero. Thus,  $u^{\star}$  is the SGNE of  $\mathcal{G}_1$ .

### VI. SGNE SEEKING ALGORITHM FOR $\mathcal{G}_2$

In this section, we propose an algorithm to obtain the v-SGNE of  $\mathcal{G}_2$ , which corresponds to the zeros of the operator  $\mathcal{T} = \mathcal{A} + \mathcal{B}$  as shown in (15)–(16). Since computing the expected value mappings in  $\mathcal{A}$  needs the information on the distributions of the random variables which are unknown, we approximate  $\mathcal{A}$ , with

$$\hat{\mathcal{A}}: \begin{bmatrix} (u, \boldsymbol{w}) \\ \overline{\lambda} \end{bmatrix} \mapsto \begin{bmatrix} \hat{F}_{\mathcal{G}_2}(s_0, u, \boldsymbol{w}) \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} \hat{\boldsymbol{\Lambda}}(s_0, u, \boldsymbol{w})\overline{\lambda} \\ -\hat{G}(s_0, u, \boldsymbol{w}) \end{bmatrix}, \quad (20)$$

where  $F_{\mathcal{G}_2}$ ,  $\Lambda$ , and G are respectively approximations of  $\mathbb{F}_{\mathcal{G}_2}$ ,  $\Lambda$ , and  $\mathbb{E}_w[g]$ , using a collection of samples w of the random variable w. Here,

$$\mathbf{\Lambda}(s_0, u) = \operatorname{col}\left(\mathbf{\Lambda}^1(s_0, u^1, u^{-1}), \dots, \mathbf{\Lambda}^N(s_0, u^N, u^{-N})\right),\,$$

where  $\Lambda^{i}(s_{0}, u^{i}, u^{-i}) := \mathbb{E}_{w} [\nabla_{u^{i}} g(s_{0}, u^{i}, u^{-i}, w)]$ , for  $i \in \mathcal{I}$ . Note that to simplify the notation, we have omitted  $s_{0}$  from the arguments of the involved operators.

We propose Algorithm 1 to obtain a v-SGNE for the game  $\mathcal{G}_2$  in a semi-decentralized manner. In each iteration k, the process begins with the coordinator collecting the values  $u_{(k)}^i$  from each player  $i \in \mathcal{I}$ . Next, the coordinator uses a set of random samples  $\boldsymbol{w}_{(k)}^0 = \operatorname{col}(\boldsymbol{w}_{[1]}^0, \ldots, \boldsymbol{w}_{[M_{(k)}]}^0)$ , to approximate  $\mathbb{E}_w \left[ g(s_0, u_{(k)}, w) \right]$  as outlined in (21). The coordinator

then computes an intermediate variable  $\tilde{\lambda}_{(k)} \in \mathbb{R}^m$  through an averaging step with inertia, which enables convergence under the monotonicity assumption, as given in (22). Following this, the coordinator compute  $\overline{\lambda}_{(k+1)}$  via a projection step (23) and sends  $\overline{\lambda}_{(k)}$  to each player. Upon receiving this variable, each player *i* approximates  $\mathbb{F}_{\mathcal{G}_2}^i$  and  $\Lambda^i$  through a set of random samples  $\boldsymbol{w}_{(k)}^i = \operatorname{col}(\boldsymbol{w}_{[1]}^i, \dots, \boldsymbol{w}_{[M_{(k)}]}^i)$ , as specified in (24) and (25), respectively. Each player then computes  $\tilde{u}_{(k)}^i$ by averaging, as described in (26), and updates  $u^i$  using a projection step, as shown in (27). The updated values are then sent back to the coordinator. It is important to note that the samples in  $\boldsymbol{w}_{(k)}^i$  are drawn independently from  $\mathbb{P}_w$ . Moreover,  $\alpha_{(k)}$  is a proper positive step size.

Algorithm 1 Semi-decentralized sampling-based computation of the v-SGNE of  $\mathcal{G}_2$ .

- 1: Initialization:  $u_{(0)}^i \in \mathcal{D}^i, \overline{\lambda}_{(0)} \in \mathbb{R}^m_{\geq 0}.$
- 2: Iteration k:

(1) **Coordinator**: Receive  $u_{(k)}^i$  for all  $i \in \mathcal{I}$ , and update:

$$\hat{G}(s_0, u_{(k)}, \boldsymbol{w}^0_{(k)}) = \frac{1}{M_{(k)}} \sum_{l=1}^{M_{(k)}} g(s_0, u_{(k)}, \boldsymbol{w}^0_{[l]}), \qquad (21)$$

$$\tilde{\lambda}_{(k)} = (1 - \delta)\overline{\lambda}_{(k)} + \delta\tilde{\lambda}_{(k-1)}, \qquad (22)$$

$$\overline{\lambda}_{(k+1)} = \operatorname{proj}_{\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{m}} \left\{ \widetilde{\lambda}_{(k)} + \alpha_{(k)} \widehat{G}\left(s_{0}, u_{(k)}, \boldsymbol{w}_{(k)}^{0}\right) \right\}.$$
(23)

(2) **Player** *i*: Receive  $\overline{\lambda}_{(k)}$  and update:

$$\hat{F}_{\mathcal{G}_{2}}^{i}(s_{0}, u_{(k)}, \boldsymbol{w}_{(k)}^{i}) = \frac{1}{M_{(k)}} \sum_{l=1}^{M_{(k)}} \nabla_{u^{i}} J^{i}(s_{0}, u_{(k)}, \boldsymbol{w}_{[l]}^{i}),$$
(24)

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{\Lambda}}^{i}(s_{0}, u_{(k)}, \boldsymbol{w}_{(k)}^{i}) = \frac{1}{M_{(k)}} \sum_{l=1}^{M_{(k)}} \nabla_{u^{i}} g(u_{(k)}^{i}, u_{(k)}^{-i}, \boldsymbol{w}_{[l]}^{i}),$$
(25)

$$\tilde{u}_{(k)}^{i} = (1 - \delta)u_{(k)}^{i} + \delta \tilde{u}_{(k-1)}^{i},$$
(26)

$$u_{(k+1)}^{i} = \operatorname{proj}_{\mathcal{D}^{i}} \left[ \tilde{u}_{(k)}^{i} - \alpha_{(k)} \left( \hat{F}_{\mathcal{G}_{2}}^{i} \left( u_{(k)}^{i}, u_{(k)}^{-i}, \boldsymbol{w}_{(k)}^{i} \right) \right. \\ \left. + \hat{\Lambda}^{i} \left( s_{0}, u_{(k)}, \boldsymbol{w}_{(k)}^{i} \right) \overline{\lambda}_{(k)} \right) \right].$$
(27)

3: **Output:** Strategies  $u^i$  for each player

Common assumptions for using approximations (21), (24), and (25) include selecting an appropriate batch size sequence  $M_{(k)}$  [10], [40], [41].

Assumption 6: The batch sizes  $(M_{(k)})_{k\geq 1}$  satisfy

$$M_{(k)} \ge c(k+k_0)^{a+1},$$

for some constants c, a > 0, and  $k_0 > 1$ .

From Assumption 6, it follows that  $1/M_{(k)}$  is summable [42, Section 11.8], a standard assumption used in combination with variance reduction techniques to control stochastic errors [10], [40], [41].

#### A. Convergence analysis of Algorithm 1

In this subsection, we analyze the convergence of Algorithm 1. To this end, we derive an upper bound for the variance of the approximation error of  $\mathcal{A}$  in Proposition 2. Utilizing this proposition along with two supporting lemmas, we demonstrate that the proposed algorithm converges almost surely (a.s.) to the v-SGNE of  $\mathcal{G}_2$ .

Let us define  $z = \operatorname{col}(u, \overline{\lambda})$  and  $\tilde{z} = \operatorname{col}(\tilde{u}, \lambda)$ . Algorithm 1 can be written in compact form as

$$\tilde{z}_{(k)} = (1 - \delta) z_{(k)} + \delta \tilde{z}_{(k-1)}, 
z_{(k+1)} = (\mathrm{Id} + \alpha_{(k)} \mathcal{B})^{-1} \left( \tilde{z}_{(k)} - \alpha_{(k)} \hat{\mathcal{A}}(z_{(k)}) \right).$$
(28)

Since we are using an estimate of the operator  $\mathcal{A}(z_{(k)})$ , need to characterize the effect of the estimation error on the convergence of the algorithm. Hence, we define  $e_{(k)} =$  $\hat{\mathcal{A}}(z_{(k)}, \boldsymbol{w}) - \mathcal{A}(z_{(k)})$  as the estimation error on the extended operator. We can represent  $e_{(k)}$  in terms of the estimation error in the elements of  $\mathcal{A}(s_0, z_{(k)})$  which are

$$e_{1,(k)} = \hat{F}_{\mathcal{G}_{2}}\left(s_{0}, u_{(k)}, \boldsymbol{w}_{(k)}\right) - \mathbb{F}_{\mathcal{G}_{2}}\left(s_{0}, u_{(k)}\right), \\ e_{2,(k)} = \hat{\Lambda}\left(s_{0}, u_{(k)}, \boldsymbol{w}_{(k)}\right) - \boldsymbol{\Lambda}(s_{0}, u_{(k)}), \\ e_{3,(k)} = \hat{G}\left(s_{0}, u_{(k)}, \boldsymbol{w}_{(k)}\right) - \mathbb{E}_{w}\left[g\left(s_{0}, u_{(k)}, w\right)\right].$$
(29)

Substituting (29) into the definition of  $e_{(k)}$ , we get  $e_{(k)}$  =  $\operatorname{col}(e_{1,(k)} + e_{2,(k)}\overline{\lambda}_{(k)}, -e_{3,(k)}).$ 

**Remark** 5: Note that since  $\hat{F}$ ,  $\hat{\Lambda}$ , and  $\hat{G}$  are empirical mean over samples  $w_{(k)}$ , they are unbiased estimators of  $\mathbb{F}_{\mathcal{G}_2}$ ,  $\Lambda$ , and  $\mathbb{E}_{w}\left[g\left(s_{0}, u_{(k)}, w\right)\right]$ , respectively. Then, for all i = 1, 2, 3and  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ , we have, a.s.,  $\mathbb{E}\left[e_{i,(k)} \mid \mathcal{F}^w_{(k)}\right] = 0.$ 

In the stochastic framework, there are usually assumptions on variances of stochastic errors  $e_{1,(k)}$ ,  $e_{2,(k)}$ , and  $e_{3,(k)}$  [40], [43].

Assumption 7: There exist some  $\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \sigma_3$ 0. such that, for all i = 1, 2, 3 and  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $\sup_{u \in \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{G}_2}} \operatorname{Var} \left[ e_{i,(k)} \mid \mathcal{F}^w_{(k)} \right] \leq \sigma_i^2$ . *Proposition 2:* For all  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ , if Assumption 7 holds, we

have

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\left\|\boldsymbol{e}_{(k)}\right\|^{2} \mid \mathcal{F}_{(k)}^{w}\right] \leq \frac{C\left[\left(1+\left\|\overline{\lambda}_{(k)}\right\|\right)\sigma_{1}^{2}+\left(\left\|\overline{\lambda}_{(k)}\right\|^{2}+\left\|\overline{\lambda}_{(k)}\right\|\right)\sigma_{2}^{2}+\sigma_{3}^{2}\right]}{M_{(k)}},$$
(30)

for some C > 0.

*Proof:* Based on definition of  $e_{(k)}$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \boldsymbol{e}_{(k)} \right\|^{2} &= \boldsymbol{e}_{(k)}^{\top} \boldsymbol{e}_{(k)} = \boldsymbol{e}_{1,(k)}^{\top} \boldsymbol{e}_{1,(k)} + \overline{\lambda}_{(k)}^{\top} \boldsymbol{e}_{2,(k)}^{\top} \boldsymbol{e}_{2,(k)} \overline{\lambda}_{(k)} \\ &+ 2\overline{\lambda}_{(k)}^{\top} \boldsymbol{e}_{2,(k)}^{\top} \boldsymbol{e}_{1,(k)} + \boldsymbol{e}_{3,(k)}^{\top} \boldsymbol{e}_{3,(k)} \leq \left\| \boldsymbol{e}_{1,(k)} \right\|^{2} + \\ \left\| \overline{\lambda}_{(k)} \right\|^{2} \left\| \boldsymbol{e}_{2,(k)} \right\|^{2} + 2 \left\| \overline{\lambda}_{(k)} \right\| \left\| \boldsymbol{e}_{2,(k)} \right\| \left\| \boldsymbol{e}_{1,(k)} \right\| + \left\| \boldsymbol{e}_{3,(k)} \right\|^{2} \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality is obtained by applying Cauchy-Schwarz inequality. Moreover, since  $2 \|e_{2,(k)}\| \|e_{1,(k)}\|$  $\left\|e_{1,(k)}\right\|^2+\left\|e_{2,(k)}\right\|^2$  , we have

$$\|\boldsymbol{e}_{(k)}\|^{2} \leq (1 + \|\overline{\lambda}_{(k)}\|) \|e_{1,(k)}\|^{2} +$$

$$\left( \left\| \overline{\lambda}_{(k)} \right\|^2 + \left\| \overline{\lambda}_{(k)} \right\| \right) \left\| e_{2,(k)} \right\|^2 + \left\| e_{3,(k)} \right\|^2.$$

By taking conditional expectations from both sides, we have

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\left\|\boldsymbol{e}_{(k)}\right\|^{2} \mid \mathcal{F}_{(k)}^{w}\right] \leq \left(1 + \left\|\overline{\lambda}_{(k)}\right\|\right) \mathbb{E}\left[\left\|\boldsymbol{e}_{1,(k)}\right\|^{2} \mid \mathcal{F}_{(k)}^{w}\right] \\ + \left(\left\|\overline{\lambda}_{(k)}\right\|^{2} + \left\|\overline{\lambda}_{(k)}\right\|\right) \mathbb{E}\left[\left\|\boldsymbol{e}_{2,(k)}\right\|^{2} \mid \mathcal{F}_{(k)}^{w}\right] \\ + \mathbb{E}\left[\left\|\boldsymbol{e}_{3,(k)}\right\|^{2} \mid \mathcal{F}_{(k)}^{w}\right].$$
(31)

Moreover, using an approach similar to it can be shown  $C\frac{\sigma_1^2}{M_{(k)}}, \mathbb{E}\left[\left\|e_{2,(k)}\right\|^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_{(k)}^w\right]$ [10, Proposition 1], that  $\mathbb{E}\left\|\left\|e_{1,(k)}\right\|^{2} \mid \mathcal{F}_{(k)}^{w}\right\|$  $\leq$  $\leq$  $C\frac{\sigma_2^2}{M_{(k)}}, \mathbb{E}\left[\left\|e_{3,(k)}\right\|^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_{(k)}^w\right] \leq C\frac{\sigma_3^2}{M_{(k)}}, \text{ for some } C > 0.$ Then, using this result and (31), we reach to (30). Finally, we indicate how to choose the parameters of the algorithm. This is fundamental for convergence analysis and, in practice, for the convergence speed.

Assumption 8: The averaging parameter  $\delta$  in (28) is such that  $\frac{1}{\phi} \leq \delta < 1$ , where  $\phi = \frac{1+\sqrt{5}}{2}$  is the golden ratio.

Assumption 9: The sequence  $(\alpha_{(k)})_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$  is a positive decreasing sequence such that  $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \alpha_{(k)} = \infty$ ,  $\lim_{k\to\infty} \frac{\alpha_{(k)}}{\alpha_{(k-1)}} \neq 0$ , and  $0 < \alpha_{(k)} \leq \frac{1}{4\delta(2\ell_{\mathcal{A}}+1)}$ , for all  $k = \{0, 1, 2, ...\}$ , where  $\ell_{\mathcal{A}}$  is the Lipschitz constant as in Lemma 2.

Let us define the residual function of  $z_{(k)}$  as

$$\operatorname{res}\left(z_{(k)}\right) = \left\| z_{(k)} - \left(\operatorname{Id} + \alpha_{(k)}\mathcal{B}\right)^{-1} \left(z_{(k)} - \alpha_{(k)}\mathcal{A}\left(z_{(k)}\right)\right) \right\|.$$

Lemma 3: Let Assumption 1–9 hold, and  $(z_{(k)}, \tilde{z}_{(k)})_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ be generated by Algorithm 1. Then, the following inequality holds:

$$\left\|\tilde{z}_{(k)} - z_{(k)}\right\|^{2} \ge \frac{1}{4} \operatorname{res}\left(z_{(k)}\right)^{2} - \frac{1}{2} \left\|\Delta z_{(k+1)}\right\|^{2} - \alpha_{(k)}^{2} \left\|e_{(k)}\right\|^{2},$$
(32)

where  $\Delta z_{(k+1)} = z_{(k+1)} - z_{(k)}$ . Proof: See Appendix II.

**Lemma** 4: Let Assumption 1–9 hold, and  $(z_{(k)}, \tilde{z}_{(k)})_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ be generated by Algorithm 1. Then, the following inequality holds:

$$\frac{2}{1-\delta} \left\| \Delta \tilde{z}_{(k+1)}^{\star} \right\|^{2} + \frac{\alpha_{(k)}}{\alpha_{(k-1)}} \frac{1}{\delta} \left\| \Delta z_{(k+1)} \right\|^{2} \\
\leq \frac{2}{1-\delta} \left\| \Delta \tilde{z}_{(k)}^{\star} \right\|^{2} - \frac{\alpha_{(k)}}{\alpha_{(k-1)}} \frac{2}{\delta} \left\| z_{(k)} - \tilde{z}_{(k)} \right\|^{2} \\
+ 2\alpha_{(k)} \ell_{\mathcal{A}} \left( \left\| \Delta z_{(k)} \right\|^{2} + \left\| \Delta z_{(k+1)} \right\|^{2} \right) \\
+ 2\alpha_{(k)} \left( \left\| \Delta e_{(k)} \right\|^{2} + \left\| \Delta z_{(k+1)} \right\|^{2} \right) - 4\alpha_{(k)} \left\langle e_{(k)}, \Delta z_{(k)}^{\star} \right\rangle, \tag{33}$$

where  $\Delta \tilde{z}_{(k)}^{\star} = \tilde{z}_{(k)} - z_{\star}$ ,  $\Delta z_{(k)}^{\star} = z_{(k)} - z_{\star}$ , and  $\Delta e_{(k)} =$  $e_{(k)} - e_{(k-1)}$ .

Proof: See Appendix III.

**Theorem 2:** Let Assumption 1–9 hold. Then, the sequence  $(u_{(k)})_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$  generated by Algorithm 1 converges a.s. to a v-SGNE of  $\mathcal{G}_2$ .

*Proof:* By applying the lower bound of  $\|\tilde{z}_{(k)} - z_{(k)}\|^2$ from (32) in (33), we obtain:

$$\frac{2}{1-\delta} \left\| \Delta \tilde{z}^{\star}_{(k+1)} \right\|^2$$

$$+ \left(\frac{\alpha_{(k)}}{\alpha_{(k-1)}}\frac{1}{2\delta} - 2\alpha_{(k)}\left(\ell_{\mathcal{A}} + 1\right)\right) \left\|\Delta z_{(k+1)}\right\|^{2} \\ \leq \frac{2}{1-\delta} \left\|\Delta \tilde{z}_{(k)}^{*}\right\|^{2} - \frac{\alpha_{(k)}}{\alpha_{(k-1)}}\frac{1}{4\delta} \operatorname{res}\left(z_{(k)}\right)^{2} \\ - \frac{\alpha_{(k)}}{\alpha_{(k-1)}}\frac{1}{\delta} \left\|\tilde{z}_{(k)} - z_{(k)}\right\|^{2} + \frac{\alpha_{(k)}}{\alpha_{(k-1)}}\frac{1}{\delta}\alpha_{(k)}^{2} \left\|e_{(k)}\right\|^{2} \\ + 2\ell_{\mathcal{A}}\alpha_{(k)} \left\|\Delta z_{(k)}\right\|^{2} + 2\alpha_{(k)} \left\|\Delta e_{(k)}\right\|^{2} \\ - 4\alpha_{(k)} \left\langle e_{(k)}, \Delta z_{(k)}^{*} \right\rangle.$$

Replacing  $\|\Delta e_{(k)}\|^2$  with its upper bound  $\|e_{(k)}\|^2 + \|e_{(k-1)}\|^2$ , taking the expectation from both sides, and then using Proposition 2 and Remark 5, we have

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\frac{2}{1-\delta} \left\|\Delta \tilde{z}_{(k+1)}^{\star}\right\|^{2} + \left(\frac{\alpha_{(k)}}{\alpha_{(k-1)}}\frac{1}{2\delta} - 2\alpha_{(k)}\left(\ell_{\mathcal{A}}+1\right)\right)^{2} \\ \left\|\Delta z_{(k+1)}\right\|^{2} \left|\mathcal{F}_{(k)}^{w}\right] + \frac{\alpha_{(k)}}{\alpha_{(k-1)}}\frac{1}{4\delta}\mathrm{res}\left(z_{(k)}\right)^{2} \\ + \frac{\alpha_{(k)}}{\alpha_{(k-1)}}\frac{1}{\delta}\left\|\tilde{z}_{(k)} - z_{(k)}\right\|^{2} \\ \leq \frac{2}{1-\delta}\left\|\Delta \tilde{z}_{(k)}^{\star}\right\|^{2} + 2\ell_{\mathcal{A}}\alpha_{(k)}\left\|\Delta z_{(k)}\right\|^{2} \\ + \left(\frac{\alpha_{(k)}^{2}}{\delta} + 4\alpha_{(k)}\right)\frac{C}{M_{(k)}}\left\{\left(1 + \left\|\overline{\lambda}_{(k)}\right\|\right)\sigma_{1}^{2} \\ + \left(\left\|\overline{\lambda}_{(k)}\right\|^{2} + \left\|\overline{\lambda}_{(k)}\right\|\right)\sigma_{2}^{2} + \sigma_{3}^{2}\right\} \\ + \frac{4\alpha_{(k)}C}{M_{(k-1)}}\left\{\left(1 + \left\|\overline{\lambda}_{(k-1)}\right\|\right)\sigma_{1}^{2} + \left(\left\|\overline{\lambda}_{(k-1)}\right\|^{2} + \left\|\overline{\lambda}_{(k-1)}\right\|\right)\sigma_{2}^{2} + \sigma_{3}^{2}\right\}.$$

Under Assumption 9 and Assumption 4, and by starting Algorithm 1 from feasible values, it is obvious that  $\overline{\lambda}$  is bounded during the algorithm. Thus, we have  $\|\overline{\lambda}_{(k)}\| \leq \overline{\lambda}_{\max} < \infty$ . Using this fact and Assumption 9, we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}\left[v_{(k+1)} \mid \mathcal{F}_{(k)}^{w}\right] + \theta_{(k)} \le v_{(k)} + \eta_{(k)},$$

where,

$$\begin{split} v_{(k)} &= \frac{2}{1-\delta} \left\| \Delta \tilde{z}_{(k)}^{\star} \right\|^2 + 2\ell_{\mathcal{A}} \alpha_{(k)} \left\| \Delta z_{(k)} \right\|^2, \\ \theta_{(k)} &= \frac{\alpha_{(k)}}{\alpha_{(k-1)}} \left[ \frac{1}{4\delta} \operatorname{res} \left( z_{(k)} \right)^2 + \frac{1}{\delta} \left\| \tilde{z}_{(k)} - z_{(k)} \right\|^2 \right], \\ \eta_{(k)} &= \left( \frac{\alpha_{(k)}^2}{\delta} + 4\alpha_{(k)} \right) \frac{C}{M_{(k)}} \left\{ \left( 1 + \overline{\lambda}_{\max} \right) \sigma_1^2 \right. \\ &+ \left( \overline{\lambda}_{\max}^2 + \overline{\lambda}_{\max} \right) \sigma_2^2 + \sigma_3^2 \right\} + \frac{4\alpha_{(k)}C}{M_{(k-1)}} \left\{ \left( 1 + \overline{\lambda}_{\max} \right) \sigma_1^2 \right. \\ &+ \left( \overline{\lambda}_{\max}^2 + \overline{\lambda}_{\max} \right) \sigma_2^2 + \sigma_3^2 \right\}. \end{split}$$

Now, by applying the Robbins-Siegmund lemma (see [44], also Lemma 5 in the appendix), we conclude that  $v_{(k)}$  converges and that  $\sum_k \theta_{(k)} < \infty$ . Given that  $\{\theta_{(k)}\}$  is nonnegative and summable, it follows that  $\lim_{k\to\infty} \theta_{(k)} = 0$ . Consequently, it implies  $\tilde{z}_{(k)} \to z_{(k)}$  and res  $(z_{(k)})^2 \to 0$ . Moreover, we can conclude that res  $(\tilde{z}_{(k)})^2 \to 0$ , and the sequence  $\{\tilde{z}_{(k)}\}$  is bounded.

#### **VII. SIMULATION RESULTS**

We analyze a grid-connected community microgrid with N = 20 identical residential households, each acting as an independent player. Each household can meet its energy needs through the power grid and a shared battery that is charged using renewable energy sources. In our model, we take into account uncertainty in renewable energy generation. The microgrid operates under a tariff structure, with the retailer providing tariff information to the households. In this setup, players interact exclusively with a central coordinator, and all decisions are made based on a day-ahead planning horizon. The state of charge (SoC) of the shared battery, SoC<sub>t</sub>, evolves according to the stochastic equation

$$\operatorname{SoC}_{t+1} = \operatorname{SoC}_t + \eta \Delta t \left[ r_t - \sum_{i=1}^N u_t^i \right], \quad t = 0, \dots, T-1,$$

where, at time t,  $u_t^i$  represents the discharging decision of the battery by the  $i^{\text{th}}$  household, and  $r_t$  denotes the power generated by renewable energy sources, which is a stochastic variable. The parameter  $\eta$  is the charging/discharging efficiency of the shared battery, and  $\Delta t$  is the sampling time. We assume that  $r^t$ , for  $t = 0, \ldots, T - 1$ , are independent normal random variables, and households and the coordinator just have access to samples of these random variables. We consider the following chance constraints:

$$\mathbb{P}\left\{\operatorname{SoC}^{\min} \leq \operatorname{SoC}_{t} \leq \operatorname{SoC}^{\max}\right\} \geq 1 - \hat{\gamma},\\ \mathbb{P}\left\{\left|\operatorname{SoC}_{T} - \operatorname{SoC}^{\operatorname{des}}\right| \leq c\right\} \geq 1 - \tilde{\gamma}.$$

where  $\operatorname{SoC}^{\min}$ ,  $\operatorname{SoC}^{\max}$ ,  $\hat{\gamma}$ , and  $\tilde{\gamma}$  are positive constants in [0,1] such that  $\operatorname{SoC}^{\min} \leq \operatorname{SoC}^{\max}$ ,  $\operatorname{SoC}^{\operatorname{des}} \in [\operatorname{SoC}^{\min}, \operatorname{SoC}^{\max}]$  is a positive constant, and  $c \in (0, \min \{\operatorname{SoC}^{\operatorname{des}} - \operatorname{SoC}^{\min}, \operatorname{SoC}^{\max} - \operatorname{SoC}^{\operatorname{des}}\})$ .

The load balance equation for each household user is expressed as  $g_t^i = d_t^i - u_t^i$ , where  $g_t^i$  represents the power exchange of the *i*<sup>th</sup> household with the grid, and  $d_t^i$  denotes its power demand, which is known. Furthermore, the total power exchange is defined as  $g_t = \sum_{i=1}^N g_t^i$ . Each user also considers the local constraint  $0 \le u_t^i \le d_t^i$ . Let us consider all the households in the neighborhood are billed using common electricity tariffs, modeled with

$$\pi\left(g_{t}\right)=K_{t}^{\mathrm{ToU}}+\frac{k_{c}}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N}g_{t}^{i}$$

where  $\pi(g_t)$  is the common electricity tariff for households at time t and  $K_t^{\text{ToU}}$  is the conventional time-of-use pricing. The tariff may vary depending on the hour of the day, where  $k_c$ represents a positive parameter. We set  $K_t^{\text{ToU}}$  to take values according to Table I.

 TABLE I

 CONVENTIONAL TIME-OF-USE PRICING TARIFF.

| Time(t)                     | 0 - 4 | 5 - 14 | 15 - 16 | 17 - 21 | 22 - 24 |
|-----------------------------|-------|--------|---------|---------|---------|
| <b>Tariff</b> $(K_{ToU}^t)$ | 15.3  | 35.6   | 23.3    | 45.6    | 27.6    |



9




Fig. 1. A visual representation of the convergence of  $u_9^i, u_{17}^i, u_{21}^i$  during the execution of Algorithm 1.

The cost function of each household is defined as

$$\mathbb{J}^{i} = \mathbb{E}\left\{\underbrace{\sum_{t=0}^{\tau-1} \left[\pi\left(g_{t}\right)g_{t}^{i} + \sum_{j=1}^{N} \left(\alpha^{dch}\left(u_{t}^{j}\right)^{2} + \beta^{dch}u_{t}^{j}\right)\right\}\right]}_{Term \ I}$$

$$\underbrace{-\alpha^{\text{util}} \text{Ln}\left(1 + \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} g_{t}^{i}\right)}_{Term \ 2} + \underbrace{\frac{1}{2}\alpha^{\text{bat}} \left\|\text{SoC}_{T} - \text{SoC}^{\text{des}}\right\|^{2}}_{Term \ 3}\right\},$$

where  $\alpha^{\text{dch}}$ ,  $\beta^{\text{dch}}$ ,  $\alpha^{\text{util}}$ , and  $\alpha^{\text{bat}}$  are positive constants. The cost function consists of three terms: *Term 1* is related to the cost of electricity and battery degradation (cf. [7] and the references therein); *Term 2* is related to the user's utility function; and *Term 3* is related to the terminal state of the battery at the end of the day. The parameters of this model is set as follows: T = 24,  $\Delta t = 1$ ,  $\eta = 5 \times 10^{-5}$ ,  $\hat{\gamma} = 0.1$ ,  $\tilde{\gamma} = 0.1$ ,  $k_c = 1$ ,  $\alpha^{\text{dch}} = 80$ ,  $\beta^{\text{dch}} = 10$ ,  $\alpha^{\text{util}} = 50$ ,  $\alpha^{\text{bat}} = 1$ ,  $\text{SoC}^{\text{min}} = 0.1$ ,  $\text{SoC}^{\text{max}} = 0.9$ ,  $\text{SoC}^{\text{des}} = 0.5$ , c = 0.05. The batch size sequence is considered as  $M_{(k)} = [(k+2)^{1.1}]$ . The parameters of the algorithm are as  $\delta = 0.9$ ,  $\alpha_{(k)} = 1.4 \times 10^{-4} \frac{1}{k+2}$ .

Figure 1 illustrates the convergence of some components of the strategy of the  $i^{th}$  houshold during the algorithm's execution. Figure 2 shows that as the number of iterations of the proposed algorithm increases, both  $res(z_{(k)})$  and  $res(\tilde{z}_{(k)})$ converge to zero. This result aligns perfectly with the conclusions derived during the proof of Theorem 2. Figures 1-2 demonstrate that the proposed algorithm has a suitable convergence speed. Figures 3-4 demonstrate that the presence of a shared battery, charged via renewable energy sources, not only reduces the load imposed on the power network by supplying a portion of the consumers' demand, but also ensures-through managing the energy input to and output from the battery-that the battery retains an appropriate amount of energy at the end of the day for use on the following day. Note that in this example, we have considered the battery's initial and desired final SoC (at the end of the day) to be 0.5. According to Figure 4, the energy output from the battery is




Fig. 2. A visual representation of the convergence of res(z) and  $res(\tilde{z})$  during the execution of Algorithm 1.




Fig. 3. Aggregative demand and profile of power exchange of all the households with the grid.




Fig. 4. Profile of the mean of renewable energy and profile of power exchange of all the households with the battery.

adjusted in such a way that the battery's SoC at the end of the day falls within the desired range with a very high confidence.

#### VIII. CONCLUSION

In this paper, we analyzed stochastic generalized dynamic games that incorporate coupling chance constraints under uncertainties characterized by the concentration of measure property. To address the inherent complexity of coupling chance constraints, we under-approximated them using constraints on expectation. We established the existence of stochastic generalized Nash equilibria (SGNE) in the under-approximated game and demonstrated that any variational SGNE of the reformulated game serves as an  $\varepsilon$ -SGNE of the original game.

Furthermore, we developed an SGNE-seeking algorithm for the under-approximated game, leveraging the mere monotonicity and Lipschitz continuity of the pseudo-gradient operator. We provided almost-sure convergence guarantees for the proposed algorithm under these assumptions. Finally, through numerical simulations, we validated the applicability and efficacy of our approach in a demand-side management scenario within microgrids, demonstrating its capability to manage shared battery resources effectively under uncertainty.

#### **APPENDIX**

#### APPENDIX I: SOME USEFUL LEMMAS

The following lemma is useful in connection to convergence of a sequence of random variables.

Lemma 5 (Robbins-Siegmund Lemma, [44]): Let  $\mathcal{F}$  =  $\{\mathcal{F}_k\}$  be a filtration. Let  $\{v_k\}_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ ,  $\{\theta_k\}_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ ,  $\{\eta_k\}_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ , and  $\{\chi_k\}_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$  be non-negative sequences, such that  $\sum_k \eta_k < \infty$ ,  $\sum_{k} \chi_k < \infty$ , and let

$$\forall k \in \mathbb{N}, \quad \mathbb{E}\left[v_{k+1} \mid \mathcal{F}_k\right] + \theta_k \le (1 + \chi_k) v_k + \eta_k \quad a.s.$$

Then,  $\sum_k \theta_k < \infty$  and  $\{v_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$  converges a.s. to non-negative random variable.

*Lemma 6:* Let  $(z_{(k)}, \tilde{z}_{(k)})_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$  be a sequence generated by Algorithm 1, as defined in (28). Then, the following equations hold:

$$\begin{array}{ll} (1) & z_{(k)} - \tilde{z}_{(k-1)} = \frac{1}{\delta} \left( z_{(k)} - \tilde{z}_{(k)} \right) \\ (2) & \Delta z_{(k+1)}^{\star} = \frac{1}{1-\delta} \Delta \tilde{z}_{(k+1)}^{\star} - \frac{\delta}{1-\delta} \Delta \tilde{z}_{(k)}^{\star} \\ (3) & \frac{-\delta}{(1-\delta)^{2}} \left\| \Delta \tilde{z}_{(k+1)}^{\star} \right\|^{2} + \delta \left\| z_{(k+1)} - \tilde{z}_{(k)} \right\|^{2} + \\ & \frac{\delta}{(1-\delta)^{2}} \left\| \Delta \tilde{z}_{(k)}^{\star} \right\|^{2} = -2 \frac{\delta}{1-\delta} \langle z_{(k+1)} - \tilde{z}_{(k)}, \Delta \tilde{z}_{(k)}^{\star} \rangle \\ (4) & \left\langle z_{(k+1)} - \tilde{z}_{(k)}, \Delta z_{(k+1)}^{\star} \right\rangle = \frac{1}{2} \left\| z_{(k+1)} - \tilde{z}_{(k)} \right\|^{2} \\ & \frac{1}{2} \left\| \Delta z_{(k+1)}^{\star} \right\|^{2} - \frac{1}{2} \left\| \Delta \tilde{z}_{(k)}^{\star} \right\|^{2} \\ (5) & \left\langle \frac{1}{\delta} \left( z_{(k)} - \tilde{z}_{(k)} \right), \Delta z_{(k+1)} \right\rangle = -\frac{1}{2\delta} \left\| z_{(k)} - \tilde{z}_{(k)} \right\|^{2} - \\ & \frac{1}{2\delta} \left\| \Delta z_{(k+1)} \right\|^{2} + \frac{1}{2\delta} \left\| z_{(k+1)} - \tilde{z}_{(k)} \right\|^{2}. \end{array}$$

- (1) It can be easily shown by reordering the first equation of (28).
- (2) Substituting k with k + 1 in the first equation of (28) vields

$$\tilde{z}_{(k+1)} = (1-\delta) z_{(k+1)} + \delta \tilde{z}_{(k)}.$$
 (34)

Upon dividing both sides of (34) by  $1-\delta$  and rearranging the terms, we obtain

$$z_{(k+1)} = \frac{1}{1-\delta} \tilde{z}_{(k+1)} - \frac{\delta}{1-\delta} \tilde{z}_{(k)}$$

Next, by subtracting  $z_{\star}$  from both sides of the above equation and rewriting  $z_{\star}$  on the right-hand side as  $z_{\star} = \left(\frac{1}{1-\delta}z_{\star} - \frac{\delta}{1-\delta}z_{\star}\right)$ , and then reordering, we have  $\Delta z_{(k+1)}^{\star} = \frac{1}{1-\delta} \Delta \tilde{z}_{(k+1)}^{\star} - \frac{\delta}{1-\delta} \Delta \tilde{z}_{(k)}^{\star}.$ (3) Using (34), we have

$$3) Using (34), we have$$

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \Delta \tilde{z}_{(k+1)}^{\star} \right\|^{2} &= \left\| (1-\delta) \, z_{(k+1)} + \delta \tilde{z}_{(k)} - z_{\star} \right\|^{2} \\ &= \left\| (1-\delta) \, z_{(k+1)} + (\delta-1) \, \tilde{z}_{(k)} + \tilde{z}_{(k)} - z_{\star} \right\|^{2} \\ &= (1-\delta)^{2} \left\| z_{(k+1)} - \tilde{z}_{(k)} \right\|^{2} + \left\| \Delta \tilde{z}_{(k)}^{\star} \right\|^{2} \\ &+ 2 \, (1-\delta) \, \langle z_{(k+1)} - \tilde{z}_{(k)}, \Delta \tilde{z}_{(k)}^{\star} \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Then, by multiplying both sides of the above equation by  $\frac{-\delta}{(1-\delta)^2}$  and rearranging, we obtain (3).

(4) Using the cosine rule, 
$$\langle u, v \rangle = \frac{1}{2} (\|u\|^2 + \|v\|^2 - \|u - v\|^2)$$
, we find  
 $\left\langle z_{(k+1)} - \tilde{z}_{(k)}, \Delta z_{(k+1)}^{\star} \right\rangle = \frac{1}{2} (\|z_{(k+1)} - \tilde{z}_{(k)}\|^2 + \|\Delta z_{(k+1)}^{\star}\|^2 - \|\Delta \tilde{z}_{(k)}^{\star}\|^2).$ 

(5) The proof follows similarly to the previous one.

*Lemma* 7: Let  $(z_{(k)}, \tilde{z}_{(k)})_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$  be generated by Algorithm 1 defined as in (28). Then, the following equation holds:

$$-\left\langle z_{(k+1)} - \tilde{z}_{(k)} + \alpha_{(k)}\hat{\mathcal{A}}\left(z_{(k)}\right), \Delta z_{(k+1)}^{\star}\right\rangle + \frac{\alpha_{(k)}}{\alpha_{(k-1)}} \left\langle \frac{1}{\delta}(z_{(k)} - \tilde{z}_{(k)}) + \alpha_{(k-1)}\hat{\mathcal{A}}(z_{(k-1)}), \Delta z_{(k+1)}\right\rangle \\ = \frac{1}{2} \left( -\left\| z_{(k+1)} - \tilde{z}_{(k)} \right\|^{2} - \left\| \Delta z_{(k+1)}^{\star} \right\|^{2} + \left\| \Delta \tilde{z}_{(k)}^{\star} \right\|^{2} \right) \\ - \alpha_{(k)} \left\langle \mathcal{A}\left(z_{(k)}\right), \Delta z_{(k)}^{\star} \right\rangle - \alpha_{(k)} \left\langle \mathbf{e}_{(k)}, \Delta z_{(k+1)} \right\rangle \\ - \alpha_{(k)} \left\langle \mathbf{e}_{(k)}, \Delta z_{(k)}^{\star} \right\rangle - \alpha_{(k)} \left\langle \mathcal{A}\left(z_{(k)}\right), \Delta z_{(k+1)} \right\rangle \\ - \frac{1}{2\delta} \frac{\alpha_{(k)}}{\alpha_{(k-1)}} \left\| z_{(k)} - \tilde{z}_{(k)} \right\|^{2} - \frac{1}{2\delta} \frac{\alpha_{(k)}}{\alpha_{(k-1)}} \left\| \Delta z_{(k+1)} \right\|^{2} \\ + \frac{1}{2\delta} \frac{\alpha_{(k)}}{\alpha_{(k-1)}} \left\| z_{(k+1)} - \tilde{z}_{(k)} \right\|^{2} + \alpha_{(k)} \left\langle \mathbf{e}_{(k-1)}, \Delta z_{(k+1)} \right\rangle \\ + \alpha_{(k)} \left\langle \mathcal{A}\left(z_{(k-1)}\right), \Delta z_{(k+1)} \right\rangle. \tag{35} \\ Proof: \text{ Since } \hat{\mathcal{A}}\left(z_{(k)}\right) - \mathcal{A}\left(z_{(k)}\right) = \mathbf{e}_{(k)}, \text{ we have} \\ \left\langle \hat{\mathcal{A}}\left(z_{(k)}\right), \Delta z_{(k+1)}^{\star} \right\rangle = \left\langle \mathbf{e}_{(k)} + \mathcal{A}\left(z_{(k)}\right), \Delta z_{(k+1)}^{\star} \right\rangle \\ = \left\langle \mathbf{e}_{(k)} + \mathcal{A}\left(z_{(k)}\right), \Delta z_{(k)}^{\star} + \Delta z_{(k+1)} \right\rangle \\ = \left\langle \mathcal{A}\left(z_{(k)}\right), \Delta z_{(k)}^{\star} \right\rangle + \left\langle \mathbf{e}_{(k)}, \Delta z_{(k)}^{\star} \right\rangle$$

Moreover, we have

$$-\left\langle z_{(k+1)}-\tilde{z}_{(k)}+\alpha_{(k)}\hat{\mathcal{A}}\left(z_{(k)}\right),\Delta z_{(k+1)}^{\star}\right\rangle +$$

$$\frac{\alpha_{(k)}}{\alpha_{(k-1)}} \left\langle \frac{1}{\delta} (z_{(k)} - \tilde{z}_{(k)}) + \alpha_{(k-1)} \hat{\mathcal{A}}(z_{(k-1)}), \Delta z_{(k+1)} \right\rangle \\
= - \left\langle z_{(k+1)} - \tilde{z}_{(k)}, \Delta z_{(k+1)}^{\star} \right\rangle - \alpha_{(k)} \left\langle \hat{\mathcal{A}} \left( z_{(k)} \right), \Delta z_{(k+1)}^{\star} \right\rangle \\
+ \frac{1}{\delta} \frac{\alpha_{(k)}}{\alpha_{(k-1)}} \left\langle z_{(k)} - \tilde{z}_{(k)}, \Delta z_{(k+1)} \right\rangle \\
+ \alpha_{(k)} \left\langle \hat{\mathcal{A}} \left( z_{(k-1)} \right), \Delta z_{(k+1)} \right\rangle.$$

By applying Lemma 6(4), Equation (36), and Lemma 6(5) respectively to the first, second, and third terms on the right side of the above equation, we reach to (35).

*Lemma* 8: Let the sequence  $(z_{(k)}, \tilde{z}_{(k)})_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$  be generated by Algorithm 1 defined as in (28). Then, the following equation holds:

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \Delta z_{(k+1)}^{\star} \right\|^{2} &= \frac{1}{1-\delta} \left\| \Delta \tilde{z}_{(k+1)}^{\star} \right\|^{2} - \frac{\delta}{1-\delta} \left\| \Delta \tilde{z}_{(k)}^{\star} \right\|^{2} \\ &+ \delta \left\| z_{(k+1)} - \tilde{z}_{(k)} \right\|^{2}. \end{aligned}$$
(37)

*Proof:* Using Lemma 6(2), we have  $\left\|\Delta z_{(k+1)}^{\star}\right\|^2 = \frac{1}{(1-\delta)^2} \left\|\Delta \tilde{z}_{(k+1)}^{\star}\right\|^2 + \frac{\delta^2}{(1-\delta)^2} \left\|\Delta \tilde{z}_{(k)}^{\star}\right\|^2 - 2\frac{\delta}{(1-\delta)^2} \left\langle\Delta \tilde{z}_{(k+1)}^{\star}, \Delta \tilde{z}_{(k)}^{\star}\right\rangle$ . Now by applying (28) to the last term of this equation and performing some algebraic manipulation, we obtain

$$\begin{split} \left\| \Delta z_{(k+1)}^{\star} \right\|^2 &= \frac{1}{\left(1-\delta\right)^2} \left\| \Delta \tilde{z}_{(k+1)}^{\star} \right\|^2 + \frac{\delta^2}{\left(1-\delta\right)^2} \left\| \Delta \tilde{z}_{(k)}^{\star} \right\|^2 \\ &- 2 \frac{\delta}{1-\delta} \left\langle z_{(k+1)} - \tilde{z}_{(k)}, \Delta \tilde{z}_{(k)}^{\star} \right\rangle - 2 \frac{\delta}{\left(1-\delta\right)^2} \left\| \Delta \tilde{z}_{(k)}^{\star} \right\|^2. \end{split}$$

Finally, by applying Lemma 6(3) to the third term on the righthand side of the above equation, we arrive at (37).

#### APPENDIX II: PROOF OF LEMMA 3

In this section, we explain the proof of Lemma 3 in detail. *Proof:* Using the definition of the residual function and (28), along with some mathematical manipulations, we obtain

$$\operatorname{res} (z_{(k)})^{2} = \left\| -\Delta z_{(k+1)} + \left( \operatorname{Id} + \alpha_{(k)} \mathcal{B} \right)^{-1} \left( \tilde{z}_{(k)} - \alpha_{(k)} \hat{\mathcal{A}} \left( z_{(k)} \right) \right) \right\|^{2} \le 2 \left\| \Delta z_{(k+1)} \right\|^{2} + 2 \left\| \left( \operatorname{Id} + \alpha_{(k)} \mathcal{B} \right)^{-1} \left( \tilde{z}_{(k)} - \alpha_{(k)} \hat{\mathcal{A}} \left( z_{(k)} \right) \right) \right\|^{2} \le 2 \left\| \Delta z_{(k+1)} \right\|^{2} - \left( \operatorname{Id} + \alpha_{(k)} \mathcal{B} \right)^{-1} \left( \tilde{z}_{(k)} - \alpha_{(k)} \hat{\mathcal{A}} \left( z_{(k)} \right) \right) \right\|^{2}.$$
(38)

Similarly, since the projection operator,  $(\text{Id} + \alpha_{(k)}\mathcal{B})^{-1}$ , is firmly non-expansive [27, Proposition 4.16], we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \left( \mathrm{Id} + \alpha_{(k)} \mathcal{B} \right)^{-1} \left( \tilde{z}_{(k)} - \alpha_{(k)} \hat{\mathcal{A}} \left( z_{(k)} \right) \right) \\ &- \left( \mathrm{Id} + \alpha_{(k)} \mathcal{B} \right)^{-1} \left( z_{(k)} - \alpha_{(k)} \mathcal{A} \left( z_{(k)} \right) \right) \right\|^{2} \\ &\leq \left\| \tilde{z}_{(k)} - z_{(k)} + \alpha_{(k)} \left( \mathcal{A} \left( z_{(k)} \right) - \hat{\mathcal{A}} \left( z_{(k)} \right) \right) \right\|^{2} \\ &= \left\| \tilde{z}_{(k)} - z_{(k)} - \alpha_{(k)} e_{(k)} \right\|^{2} \\ &\leq 2 \left\| \tilde{z}_{(k)} - z_{(k)} \right\|^{2} + 2\alpha_{(k)}^{2} \left\| e_{(k)} \right\|^{2}. \end{aligned}$$
(39)

Now, by applying (39) to (38), and reordering the terms, it follows that

$$\left\|\tilde{z}_{(k)} - z_{(k)}\right\|^{2} \ge \frac{1}{4} \operatorname{res}\left(z_{(k)}\right)^{2} - \frac{1}{2} \left\|\Delta z_{(k+1)}\right\|^{2} - \alpha_{(k)}^{2} \left\|e_{(k)}\right\|^{2}.$$

# APPENDIX III: PROOF LEMMA 4

*Proof:* We define  $Q(u,\overline{\lambda}) = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \iota_{\mathcal{D}^i}(u^i) + \sum_{j=1}^{m} \iota_{\mathbb{R} \ge 0}(\overline{\lambda}^j)$ , where  $\overline{\lambda}^j$  denotes the *j*<sup>th</sup> entry of  $\overline{\lambda}$ . This definition implies that  $\mathcal{B} = \partial Q$ . By applying the relationship between proximal and resolvent operators given in [27, Proposition 16.44], we have  $(\mathrm{Id} + \alpha_{(k)}\mathcal{B})^{-1} = (\mathrm{Id} + \alpha_{(k)}\partial Q)^{-1} = \mathrm{prox}_{\alpha_{(k)}Q}$ .

Additionally, since the indicator function of a closed convex set is proper and lower semicontinuous function [27, Section 1.10], it follows from [27, Lemma 1.27] that, under Assumption 9,  $\alpha_{(k)}Q$  is also lower semicontinuous. As  $\alpha_{(k)}Q$  possesses this property, by applying [27, Proposition 12.26] to the second equation in (28), we have

$$-\left\langle z_{(k+1)} - \tilde{z}_{(k)} + \alpha_{(k)} \hat{\mathcal{A}} \left( z_{(k)} \right), \Delta z_{(k+1)}^{\star} \right\rangle$$
$$\geq \alpha_{(k)} \left( Q(z_{(k+1)}) - Q(z_{\star}) \right), \quad (40)$$

and

$$\left\langle z_{(k)} - \tilde{z}_{(k-1)} + \alpha_{(k-1)} \hat{\mathcal{A}} \left( z_{(k-1)} \right), \Delta z_{(k+1)} \right\rangle \\ \ge \alpha_{(k-1)} \left( Q(z_{(k)}) - Q(z_{(k+1)}) \right).$$
(41)

By applying Lemma 6(1) in Equation (41), we obtain

$$\left\langle \frac{1}{\delta} \left( z_{(k)} - \tilde{z}_{(k)} \right) + \alpha_{(k-1)} \hat{\mathcal{A}} \left( z_{(k-1)} \right), \Delta z_{(k+1)} \right\rangle$$
  
$$\geq \alpha_{(k-1)} \left( Q \left( z_{(k)} \right) - Q \left( z_{(k+1)} \right) \right). \quad (42)$$

Multiplying both sides of (42) by  $\frac{\alpha_{(k)}}{\alpha_{(k-1)}} \ge 0$  and subsequently adding the result to (40), yield

$$-\left\langle z_{(k+1)} - \tilde{z}_{(k)} + \alpha_{(k)} \hat{\mathcal{A}} \left( z_{(k)} \right), \Delta z_{(k+1)}^{\star} \right\rangle + \frac{\alpha_{(k)}}{\alpha_{(k-1)}} \left\langle \frac{1}{\delta} \left( z_{(k)} - \tilde{z}_{(k)} \right) + \alpha_{(k-1)} \hat{\mathcal{A}} \left( z_{(k-1)} \right), \Delta z_{(k+1)} \right\rangle \geq \alpha_{(k)} \left( Q(z_{(k)}) - Q(z_{\star}) \right).$$

$$(43)$$

By substituting the left-hand side of inequality (43) with an equivalent expression using Lemma 7 and subsequently multiplying both sides by two, we obtain

$$- \left\| z_{(k+1)} - \tilde{z}_{(k)} \right\|^{2} - \left\| \Delta z_{(k+1)}^{\star} \right\|^{2} + \left\| \Delta \tilde{z}_{(k)}^{\star} \right\|^{2} - \frac{\alpha_{(k)}}{\alpha_{(k-1)}} \frac{1}{\delta} \\ \left\{ \left\| z_{(k)} - \tilde{z}_{(k)} \right\|^{2} + \left\| \Delta z_{(k+1)} \right\|^{2} - \left\| z_{(k+1)} - \tilde{z}_{(k)} \right\|^{2} \right\} \\ - 2\alpha_{(k)} \left\{ \left\langle \mathcal{A} \left( z_{(k)} \right), \Delta z_{(k)}^{\star} \right\rangle + \left\langle \mathbf{e}_{(k)}, \Delta z_{(k)}^{\star} \right\rangle \\ + \left\langle \mathcal{A} \left( z_{(k)} \right) - \mathcal{A} \left( z_{(k-1)} \right), \Delta z_{(k+1)} \right\rangle + \left\langle \Delta \mathbf{e}_{(k)}, \Delta z_{(k+1)} \right\rangle \right\} \\ \geq 2\alpha_{(k)} \left( Q \left( z_{(k)} \right) - Q \left( z_{\star} \right) \right).$$
(44)

By substituting the term  $\left\|\Delta z_{(k+1)}^{\star}\right\|^2$  in (44) with its equivalent expression from Lemma 8, and then rearranging the result, we obtain

$$\frac{1}{1-\delta} \left\| \Delta \tilde{z}_{(k+1)}^{\star} \right\|^{2} + \frac{\alpha_{(k)}}{\alpha_{(k-1)}} \frac{1}{\delta} \left\| \Delta z_{(k+1)} \right\|^{2} \\
+ 2\alpha_{(k)} \left( Q\left( z_{(k)} \right) - Q\left( z_{\star} \right) \right) + 2\alpha_{(k)} \left\langle \mathcal{A}\left( z_{(k)} \right), \Delta z_{(k)}^{\star} \right\rangle \\
\leq \left( \frac{\delta}{1-\delta} \right) \left\| \Delta \tilde{z}_{(k)}^{\star} \right\|^{2} - \frac{\alpha_{(k)}}{\alpha_{(k-1)}} \frac{1}{\delta} \left\| z_{(k)} - \tilde{z}_{(k)} \right\|^{2} \\
+ \left( -1 - \delta + \frac{\alpha_{(k)}}{\alpha_{(k-1)}} \frac{1}{\delta} \right) \left\| z_{(k+1)} - \tilde{z}_{(k)} \right\|^{2} \\
- 2\alpha_{(k)} \left\langle \mathcal{A}\left( z_{(k)} \right) - \mathcal{A}\left( z_{(k-1)} \right), \Delta z_{(k+1)} \right\rangle \\
- 2\alpha_{(k)} \left\langle e_{(k)}, \Delta z_{(k)}^{\star} \right\rangle - 2\alpha_{(k)} \left\langle \Delta e_{(k)}, \Delta z_{(k+1)} \right\rangle. \quad (45)$$

Since A is a monotone operator, as shown in Lemma 2, and  $Q(z_{(k)}) \ge Q(z_{\star})$ , we have

$$\left\langle \mathcal{A}\left(z_{(k)}\right) - \mathcal{A}\left(z_{\star}\right), \Delta z_{(k)}^{\star} \right\rangle \geq 0 \iff \\ \left\langle \mathcal{A}\left(z_{(k)}\right), \Delta z_{(k)}^{\star} \right\rangle \geq \left\langle \mathcal{A}\left(z_{\star}\right), \Delta z_{(k)}^{\star} \right\rangle \iff \\ \left\langle \mathcal{A}\left(z_{(k)}\right), \Delta z_{(k)}^{\star} \right\rangle + \left(Q\left(z_{(k)}\right) - Q\left(z_{\star}\right)\right) \geq \\ \geq \left\langle \mathcal{A}\left(z_{\star}\right), \Delta z_{(k)}^{\star} \right\rangle + \left(Q\left(z_{(k)}\right) - Q\left(z_{\star}\right)\right) \geq 0.$$
(46)

Given Assumption 8 and Assumption 9, we have

$$\left(-1 - \delta + \frac{\alpha_{(k)}}{\alpha_{(k-1)}} \frac{1}{\delta}\right) \left\| z_{(k+1)} - \tilde{z}_{(k)} \right\|^2 \le 0.$$
(47)

Now, using (45), (46), and (47), we can find

$$\frac{1}{1-\delta} \left\| \Delta \tilde{z}_{(k+1)}^{\star} \right\|^{2} + \frac{\alpha_{(k)}}{\alpha_{(k-1)}} \frac{1}{\delta} \left\| \Delta z_{(k+1)} \right\|^{2} \\
\leq \frac{1}{1-\delta} \left\| \Delta \tilde{z}_{(k)}^{\star} \right\|^{2} - \frac{\alpha_{(k)}}{\alpha_{(k-1)}} \frac{1}{\delta} \left\| z_{(k)} - \tilde{z}_{(k)} \right\|^{2} \\
- 2\alpha_{(k)} \left\langle \mathcal{A} \left( z_{(k)} \right) - \mathcal{A} \left( z_{(k-1)} \right), \Delta z_{(k+1)} \right\rangle \\
- 2\alpha_{(k)} \left\langle e_{(k)}, \Delta z_{(k)}^{\star} \right\rangle - 2\alpha_{(k)} \left\langle \Delta e_{(k)}, \Delta z_{(k+1)} \right\rangle. \quad (48)$$

Moreover, by using Lipschitz continuity of A (it is shown in Lemma 2) and Cauchy-Schwartz and Young's inequality, we obtain that

$$-\left\langle \left(\mathcal{A}\left(z_{(k)}\right) - \mathcal{A}\left(z_{(k-1)}\right)\right), \Delta z_{(k+1)}\right\rangle \\\leq \left\|\mathcal{A}\left(z_{(k)}\right) - \mathcal{A}\left(z_{(k-1)}\right)\right\| \left\|\Delta z_{(k+1)}\right\| \\\leq \ell_{\mathcal{A}} \left\|\Delta z_{(k)}\right\| \left\|\Delta z_{(k+1)}\right\| \leq \frac{\ell_{\mathcal{A}}}{2} \left(\left\|\Delta z_{(k)}\right\|^{2} + \left\|\Delta z_{(k+1)}\right\|^{2}\right).$$

$$\tag{49}$$

Similarly, we have

$$-\left\langle \Delta e_{(k)}, \Delta z_{(k+1)} \right\rangle \le \left\| \Delta e_{(k)} \right\| \left\| \Delta z_{(k+1)} \right\| \le \frac{1}{2} \left( \left\| \Delta e_{(k)} \right\|^2 + \left\| \Delta z_{(k+1)} \right\|^2 \right).$$
(50)

By applying (49) and (50) in (48), it yields

$$\frac{1}{1-\delta} \left\| \Delta \tilde{z}_{(k+1)}^{\star} \right\|^{2} + \frac{\alpha_{(k)}}{\alpha_{(k-1)}} \frac{1}{\delta} \left\| \Delta z_{(k+1)} \right\|^{2}$$
$$\leq \frac{1}{1-\delta} \left\| \Delta \tilde{z}_{(k)}^{\star} \right\|^{2} - \frac{\alpha_{(k)}}{\alpha_{(k-1)}} \frac{1}{\delta} \left\| z_{(k)} - \tilde{z}_{(k)} \right\|^{2}$$

$$+ \alpha_{(k)} \ell_{\mathcal{A}} \left( \left\| \Delta z_{(k)} \right\|^{2} + \left\| \Delta z_{(k+1)} \right\|^{2} \right) \\ + \alpha_{(k)} \left( \left\| \Delta e_{(k)} \right\|^{2} + \left\| \Delta z_{(k+1)} \right\|^{2} \right) - 2\alpha_{(k)} \left\langle e_{(k)}, \Delta z_{(k)}^{\star} \right\rangle.$$

Now by multiplying both sides of the above equation by two and then subtracting the left-hand side of the result from  $\frac{\alpha_{(k)}}{\alpha_{(k-1)}} \frac{1}{\delta} \left\| \Delta z_{(k+1)} \right\|^2$ , it yields (33).

#### REFERENCES

- T. Başar and G. J. Olsder, *Dynamic noncooperative game theory*. SIAM, 1998.
- [2] T. Başar and G. Zaccour, Handbook of dynamic game theory. Springer, 2018.
- [3] J. Song, D. Wu, Y. Bian, and J. Dong, "A decision support system based on stochastic differential game model in pollution control chain," *IEEE Transactions on Systems, Man, and Cybernetics: Systems*, vol. 54, no. 3, pp. 1670–1682, 2024.
- [4] W. Schwarting, A. Pierson, S. Karaman, and D. Rus, "Stochastic dynamic games in belief space," *IEEE Transactions on Robotics*, vol. 37, no. 6, pp. 2157–2172, 2021.
- [5] D. Zhang, G. Feng, Y. Shi, and D. Srinivasan, "Physical safety and cyber security analysis of multi-agent systems: A survey of recent advances," *IEEE/CAA Journal of Automatica Sinica*, vol. 8, no. 2, pp. 319–333, 2021.
- [6] F. Facchinei and C. Kanzow, "Generalized Nash equilibrium problems," Annals of Operations Research, vol. 175, no. 1, pp. 177–211, 2010.
- [7] S. Yadollahi, H. Kebriaei, and S. Soudjani, "Generalized stochastic dynamic aggregative game for demand-side management in microgrids with shared battery," *IEEE Control Systems Letters*, 2023.
- [8] W. Xie, S. Lu, L. Dai, and Q. Wu, "Stochastic non-cooperative game for safety control of shared control vehicle in uncertain environments," *IET Control Theory & Applications*, vol. 17, no. 11, pp. 1495–1508, 2023.
- [9] G. Belgioioso, P. Yi, S. Grammatico, and L. Pavel, "Distributed generalized Nash equilibrium seeking: An operator-theoretic perspective," *IEEE Control Systems Magazine*, vol. 42, no. 4, pp. 87–102, 2022.
- [10] B. Franci and S. Grammatico, "Stochastic generalized Nash equilibriumseeking in merely monotone games," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 67, no. 8, pp. 3905–3919, 2021.
- [11] B. Franci and S. Grammatico, "A distributed forward-backward algorithm for stochastic generalized Nash equilibrium seeking," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 66, no. 11, pp. 5467–5473, 2021.
- [12] P. V. Reddy and G. Zaccour, "Open-loop Nash equilibria in a class of linear-quadratic difference games with constraints," *IEEE Transactions* on Automatic Control, vol. 60, no. 9, pp. 2559–2564, 2015.
- [13] P. V. Reddy and G. Zaccour, "Feedback Nash equilibria in linearquadratic difference games with constraints," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 62, no. 2, pp. 590–604, 2016.
- [14] U. Ravat and U. V. Shanbhag, "On the characterization of solution sets of smooth and nonsmooth convex stochastic Nash games," *SIAM Journal* on Optimization, vol. 21, no. 3, pp. 1168–1199, 2011.
- [15] B. Franci and S. Grammatico, "Stochastic generalized Nash equilibrium seeking under partial-decision information," *Automatica*, vol. 137, p. 110101, 2022.
- [16] V. V. Singh and A. Lisser, "A second-order cone programming formulation for two player zero-sum games with chance constraints," *European Journal of Operational Research*, vol. 275, no. 3, pp. 839–845, 2019.
- [17] S. Peng, N. Yadav, A. Lisser, and V. V. Singh, "Chance-constrained games with mixture distributions," *Mathematical Methods of Operations Research*, vol. 94, pp. 71–97, 2021.
- [18] J. Li, C.-Y. Chiu, L. Peters, F. Palafox, M. Karabag, J. Alonso-Mora, S. Sojoudi, C. Tomlin, and D. Fridovich-Keil, "Scenario-game admm: A parallelized scenario-based solver for stochastic noncooperative games," in 2023 62nd IEEE Conference on Decision and Control (CDC), pp. 8093–8099, 2023.
- [19] M. P. Abraham and A. A. Kulkarni, "New results on the existence of open loop Nash equilibria in discrete time dynamic games via generalized Nash games," *Mathematical Methods of Operations Research*, vol. 89, pp. 157–172, 2019.
- [20] G. Jank and H. Abou-Kandil, "Existence and uniqueness of openloop Nash equilibria in linear-quadratic discrete time games," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 48, no. 2, pp. 267–271, 2003.

- [21] P. V. Reddy and G. Zaccour, "Open-loop and feedback Nash equilibria in constrained linear–quadratic dynamic games played over event trees," *Automatica*, vol. 107, pp. 162–174, 2019.
- [22] H. Zhong, Y. Shimizu, and J. Chen, "Chance-constrained iterative linearquadratic stochastic games," *IEEE Robotics and Automation Letters*, vol. 8, no. 1, pp. 440–447, 2022.
- [23] C.-K. Yu, M. Van Der Schaar, and A. H. Sayed, "Distributed learning for stochastic generalized Nash equilibrium problems," *IEEE Transactions* on Signal Processing, vol. 65, no. 15, pp. 3893–3908, 2017.
- [24] R. Isaacs, Differential games: a mathematical theory with applications to warfare and pursuit, control and optimization. Wiley, 1965.
- [25] R. J. Aumann, "Acceptable points in general cooperative n-person games," *Contributions to the Theory of Games*, vol. 4, no. 40, pp. 287– 324, 1959.
- [26] S. Zou and J. Lygeros, "Semidecentralized zeroth-order algorithms for stochastic generalized Nash equilibrium seeking," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 68, no. 2, pp. 1237–1244, 2023.
- [27] H. H. Bauschke and P. L. Combettes, Convex analysis and monotone operator theory in Hilbert spaces. Springer, 2011.
- [28] D. Fudenberg and D. K. Levine, "Open-loop and closed-loop equilibria in dynamic games with many players," *Journal of Economic Theory*, vol. 44, no. 1, pp. 1–18, 1988.
- [29] S. Boyd and L. Vandenberghe, *Convex optimization*. Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- [30] V. Conitzer and T. Sandholm, "New complexity results about Nash equilibria," *Games and Economic Behavior*, vol. 63, no. 2, pp. 621– 641, 2008.
- [31] J. Li, C.-Y. Chiu, L. Peters, F. Palafox, M. Karabag, J. Alonso-Mora, S. Sojoudi, C. Tomlin, and D. Fridovich-Keil, "Scenario-game admm: A parallelized scenario-based solver for stochastic noncooperative games," in 2023 62nd IEEE Conference on Decision and Control (CDC), pp. 8093–8099, IEEE, 2023.
- [32] S. Soudjani and R. Majumdar, "Concentration of measure for chanceconstrained optimization," *IFAC-PapersOnLine*, vol. 51, no. 16, pp. 277– 282, 2018.
- [33] A. Barvinok, "Measure concentration in optimization," *Mathematical Programming*, vol. 79, pp. 33–53, 1997.
- [34] G. Pisier, The volume of convex bodies and Banach space geometry, vol. 94. Cambridge University Press, 1999.
- [35] G. Scutari, D. P. Palomar, F. Facchinei, and J.-S. Pang, "Convex optimization, game theory, and variational inequality theory," *IEEE Signal Processing Magazine*, vol. 27, no. 3, pp. 35–49, 2010.
- [36] D. P. Palomar and Y. C. Eldar, Convex optimization in signal processing and communications. Cambridge University Press, 2010.
- [37] F. Facchinei, "Finite-dimensional variational inequalities and complementarity problems," 2003.
- [38] A. Auslender and M. Teboulle, "Lagrangian duality and related multiplier methods for variational inequality problems," *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, vol. 10, no. 4, pp. 1097–1115, 2000.
- [39] R. T. Rockafellar, "Monotone operators associated with saddle-functions and minimax problems," in *Proceedings of Symposia in Pure Mathematics*, vol. 18, pp. 241–250, American Mathematical Society, 1970.
- [40] A. N. Iusem, A. Jofré, R. I. Oliveira, and P. Thompson, "Extragradient method with variance reduction for stochastic variational inequalities," *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, vol. 27, no. 2, pp. 686–724, 2017.
- [41] S. Ghadimi, G. Lan, and H. Zhang, "Mini-batch stochastic approximation methods for nonconvex stochastic composite optimization," *Mathematical Programming*, vol. 155, no. 1, pp. 267–305, 2016.
- [42] J. Stewart, Calculus: early transcendentals. Cengage Learning, 2012.
- [43] A. Kannan and U. V. Shanbhag, "Optimal stochastic extragradient schemes for pseudomonotone stochastic variational inequality problems and their variants," *Computational Optimization and Applications*, vol. 74, no. 3, pp. 779–820, 2019.
- [44] H. Robbins and D. Siegmund, "A convergence theorem for non negative almost supermartingales and some applications," in *Optimizing methods* in statistics, pp. 233–257, Elsevier, 1971.