

Major-Minor Mean Field Game of Stopping: An Entropy Regularization Approach

Xiang Yu* Jiacheng Zhang[†] Keyu Zhang[‡] Zhou Zhou[§]

Abstract

This paper studies a discrete-time major-minor mean field game of stopping where the major player can choose either an optimal control or stopping time. We look for the relaxed equilibrium as a randomized stopping policy, which is formulated as a fixed point of a set-valued mapping, whose existence is challenging by direct arguments. To overcome the difficulties caused by the presence of a major player, we propose to study an auxiliary problem by considering entropy regularization in the major player's problem while formulating the minor players' optimal stopping problems as linear programming over occupation measures. We first show the existence of regularized equilibria as fixed points of some simplified set-valued operator using the Kakutani–Fan–Glicksberg fixed-point theorem. Next, we prove that the regularized equilibrium converges as the regularization parameter λ tends to 0, and the limit corresponds to a fixed point of the original operator, thereby confirming the existence of a relaxed equilibrium in the original mean field game problem.

Mathematics Subject Classification: 91A13, 91A55, 60G40

Keywords: Major-minor mean field game of stopping, Markov decision processes, relaxed equilibrium, entropy regularization, linear programming, fixed point

1 Introduction

After the seminal studies of Lasry and Lions [22] and Huang, Caines, and Malhamé [19], mean field game (MFG) problems have garnered significant development during the past decades thanks to the merit of tractability and the broad applications in different fields such as finance, economics and biology. For a preliminary introduction on this topic, we refer to Cardaliaguet [6]; and more recent advances can be found in Carmona and Delarue [7, 8].

*Department of Applied Mathematics, The Hong Kong Polytechnic University, Kowloon, Hong Kong. Email: xiang.yu@polyu.edu.hk

[†]Department of Statistic, The Chinese University of Hong Kong, New Territories, Hong Kong. Email: jiachengzhang@cuhk.edu.hk

[‡]Department of Mathematical Sciences, Tsinghua University, Beijing, China. Email: Zhangky21@mails.tsinghua.edu.cn

[§]School of Mathematics and Statistics, University of Sydney, Sydney, Australia. Email: zhou.zhou@sydney.edu.au

With the fast-growing theoretical advances in mean-field theories and stochastic control, various types of generalizations of MFG have been proposed and studied. Among them, one burgeoning direction is to study the MFG problem of optimal stopping, where all agents aim to choose the optimal stopping time under weak interactions with the population via the distribution of the stopped state processes or the stopping times. MFG of optimal stopping were initially studied by Nutz [24] and by Carmona, Delarue, and Lacker [10], employing a probabilistic approach in the general framework. In settings where the underlying process is described by a stochastic differential equation (SDE), MFG of optimal stopping has been examined by Bertucci [4] using a PDE approach, and by Bouveret, Dumitrescu, and Tankov [5], as well as Dumitrescu, Leutscher, and Tankov [14], using a linear programming approach.

Another important extension of MFG problems is to investigate the formulation with major and minor players, see some pioneer studies among [3, 12, 13, 18, 23], to name a few. This direction of extension addresses the limitation of the stringent assumption in classical MFG problems that, as the number of players grows large, the influence of any single player on the population becomes asymptotically negligible, which does not match with some practical applications when some decision maker's choices have prominent impacts on all other individual players even in the large population. However, as the minor player's objective function and state process depend on the state of the major player, the policy chosen by each minor player naturally need to be adapted to the filtration generated by the major player's state process as if there exists a common noise. Due to this reason, the presence of a major player spurs many theoretical challenges closely related to the well-known difficulties caused by the common noise.

A general methodology to study MFG with common noise (with regular controls) was proposed by Carmona, Delarue, and Lacker [9], in which the main difficulty roots in the infinite dimension of the space such that it is nearly impossible to apply some standard compactification arguments and the fixed point arguments based on topological methods. In the context of MFGs of optimal stopping, incorporating common noise brings more challenges. The models in [10, 24] allow for common noise and establish the existence of an equilibrium by exploiting the special structure of the game. However, these models have limitations and cannot be applied to certain types of games, such as those of the war of attrition type. To the best of our knowledge, the only work that considers a general framework for MFG of optimal stopping with common noise is [15], which, due to the aforementioned technical challenges, restricts their setup to a discrete-time setting and a finite state space on the strength of the linear programming approach.

The present paper aims to investigate a major-minor MFG, in which the major player faces either an optimal control or an optimal stopping problem, while each minor player in the large population aims to select an optimal stopping time. For technical convenience, we also focus on a discrete-time setting and assume that the state space of the major player is finite. The mean field feature is encoded by the fact that the transition kernels and reward functions of major and minor players depend on the law of the minor players. In the context of optimal stopping, this is specified by a flow of subprobability measures μ_t for $t = 0, 1, \dots, T$ and m_t for $t = 0, 1, \dots, T - 1$, where μ_t represents the distribution of minor players who have stopped at time t , and m_t represents the distribution of minor players still active in the game at time

t. Comparing with the classical MFG problems, each minor player’s transition kernel and reward function now depend on the major player’s state. As a direct consequence, the decision making of the minor players are influenced by a form of common noise stemming from the state of the major player, which renders the processes μ and m stochastic and adapted to the filtration generated by the major player. In contrast to [15], this form of common noise is not an exogenous source of randomness, but influenced by the major player’s choice of policy. The coupled structure in the equilibrium stopping policies of major and minor players introduces additional complexity and remains underexplored in the existing literature.

In this study, we prove the existence of a relaxed equilibrium (see Definition 2.3) for a major-minor MFG of stopping, allowing for randomized policies for both the major and minor players. Contrary to the compactification technique used in the literature of MFG problems (see e.g., [9, 10, 14, 21]), the non-uniqueness of the solutions to the major player’s problem leads to a set-valued mapping that is not convex-valued in general, which hinders the direct application of the Kakutani-Fan-Glicksberg theorem, see the discussion below Definition 2.3. In response to this challenge, instead of working with the original problem directly, we propose to consider the auxiliary formulation of the major player’s problem under entropy regularization, in which the entropy term of a randomized policy is added into the reward functional of the major player (see Definition 2.4). Drawing the merit from the entropy regularization formulation that the optimal solution for the major player is unique and admits an explicit form of Gibbs-measure, we are allowed to exercise a linear programming approach to tackle the minor players’ optimal stopping problem by considering a simplified auxiliary set-valued mapping. The existence of a regularized equilibrium (see Definition 2.4) is then established by applying the Kakutani–Fan–Glicksberg fixed-point theorem for the auxiliary mapping; see Theorem 4.6. Finally, we approximate the original problem by a sequence of its entropy-regularized counterparts with a vanishing regularization parameter $\lambda \rightarrow 0$, and show that the limit of the sequence of regularized equilibria is a fixed point of the original set-valued operator and therefore a relaxed equilibrium in the original MFG; see Theorem 5.3.

To summarize, the contributions of the present paper are three-fold: Firstly, our work, to the best of our knowledge, is the first attempt to study major-minor MFG in the context of optimal stopping, whereas existing literature mainly focuses on optimal control problems. Secondly, we extend the linear programming framework (see for instance [15, 16, 17]) to a more general setting by incorporating the major player’s influence on all minor players’ decision making and allowing for measure-dependent transition kernels. Thirdly, we develop a methodology to combine the entropy regularization and linear programming methods to the major-minor MFG and establish the existence of relaxed equilibria using the vanishing regularization. We highlight that the entropy regularization plays a key role to select a unique solution to the major player’s problem, which successfully eliminates the technical issues arising from the direct fixed point argument for the original problem. Note that, although the entropy regularization has been recently applied to facilitate the existence of fixed point in some time-inconsistent control problems (see, e.g., [2, 25]), our attempt to fuse this idea in the proof of existence of relaxed equilibrium for major-minor MFG of stopping is novel and may motivate some related future studies.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 introduces the problem formulation of the major-minor MFG of stopping and the definition of relaxed equilibria. In addition, the auxiliary problem under entropy regularization is also formulated therein together with the definition of regularized equilibria. Section 3 presents some technical assumptions together with two examples satisfying these assumptions. The existence of regularized equilibria for the auxiliary problem is proved in Section 4. The existence of relaxed equilibria for the original MFG problem is established in Section 5 via vanishing entropy regularization. Some auxiliary results are collected in Appendix A.

Notations Throughout this paper, we equip any finite set E , with the discrete metric d^0 . For a topological space (E, τ) , we denote by $\mathcal{B}(E)$ the Borel σ -algebra, by $\mathcal{M}^s(E)$ the set of Borel finite signed measures on E , by $\mathcal{M}(E)$ the set of Borel finite positive measures on E , by $\mathcal{P}^{\text{sub}}(E)$ the set of Borel subprobability measures on E and by $\mathcal{P}(E)$ the set of Borel probability measures on E . For any $\rho \in \mathcal{P}(E)$, we use $\text{supp}(\rho)$ to stand for the support of ρ . We denote by $M(E)$ the set of Borel measurable functions from E to \mathbb{R} , by $M_b(E)$ the subset of Borel measurable and bounded functions, by $C(E)$ the subset of continuous functions, and by $C_b(E)$ the subset of continuous and bounded functions. The set $M_b(E)$ is endowed with the supremum norm $\|\varphi\|_\infty = \sup_{x \in E} |\varphi(x)|$. We use $\mathcal{Y}^{\mathcal{X}}$ to denote the set of functions from \mathcal{X} to \mathcal{Y} and use δ_x to denote the Dirac measure at x . We use $P(de)$ to denote the probability measure on a topological space (E, τ) . When E is finite, we sometimes write it as $P(e')$, which should not cause any confusion.

2 Problem Formulation

Let $\mathbb{T} = \{0, 1, 2, \dots, T\}$ denote the set of time indices, with $\mathbb{T}^* = \{1, 2, \dots, T\}$. We consider a stochastic process (X^0, X) on a filtered probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{F}, \mathbb{P})$, where $X^0 = (X_t^0)_{t \in \mathbb{T}}$ represents the major player's state, taking values in S^0 , a finite set with a discrete metric d^0 , and $X = (X_t)_{t \in \mathbb{T}}$ stands for the state of the minor players, taking values in a nonempty compact metric space (S, d) .

Let A be a compact action space for the major player, with two primary cases of interest: (1) $A \subset \mathbb{R}^\ell$, for a fixed $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$ with $\text{Leb}(A) > 0$; and (2) $A = \{0, 1\}$ ¹, which covers to the scenario of an optimal stopping. All minor players in the large population need to solve optimal stopping problems. The precise formulations of the optimization problems for major and minor players will be given later.

In this paper, we allow the major player process X^0 to be non-Markovian. To address this, we lift the state space of the major player to the space of all its trajectories, a technique also employed in [15, 20]. The trajectory of X^0 up to time t is described by a finite-dimensional matrix-valued process U_t . Define $\mathcal{I} := \{1, \dots, |S^0|\}$, where $S^0 = \{z_j : j \in \mathcal{I}\}$ is the finite state space of X^0 , with distinct elements $z_j \neq z_{j'}$ for $j \neq j'$, $(j, j') \in \mathcal{I}^2$. The process U , taking values in $W := \{0, 1\}^{(T+1) \times |S^0|}$ (the space of $(T+1) \times |S^0|$ -dimensional binary matrices), is defined as follows:

$$U_t(\omega)(s+1, j) = 1_{s \leq t} 1_{X_s^0(\omega) = z_j}, \quad (s, j) \in \mathbb{T} \times \mathcal{I}, \quad t \in \mathbb{T}, \quad \omega \in \Omega, \quad (2.1)$$

¹The argument in this paper can be directly extended to the case where A is a finite set.

where $\mathbb{T} = \{0, \dots, T\}$. Alternatively, for $s \in \mathbb{T}$ and $z \in S^0$, let $M[s, z]$ denote the $(T + 1) \times |S^0|$ -dimensional matrix given by

$$M[s, z](r + 1, j) = 1_{s=r} 1_{z=z_j}, \quad (r, j) \in \mathbb{T} \times \mathcal{I}.$$

Then, for $t \in \mathbb{T}$, we have

$$U_t = \sum_{s=0}^t M[s, X_s^0]. \quad (2.2)$$

Define a function $\Psi_t : W \rightarrow S^0$ by

$$\Psi_t(u) := \sum_{j \in \mathcal{I}} z_j 1_{u(t+1, j)=1}, \quad u \in W.$$

It is easy to see that

$$X_s^0 = \Psi_s(U_t), \quad \forall s \leq t \text{ and } t \in \mathbb{T}, \quad (2.3)$$

hence the information about the entire trajectory of X^0 up to time t is encoded in U_t . Moreover, we can conclude that $\sigma(U_t) = \mathcal{F}_t^{X^0} = \mathcal{F}_t^U$.

2.1 Transition Law

We next specify the transition law of the major and minor players in our setting. Assume that

$$\begin{aligned} X_{k+1}^0 &\sim \tilde{P}_{k+1}^0(U_k, \alpha_k, m_k, dx^0), \quad k \in \mathbb{T} \setminus \{T\}, \quad X_0^0 \sim \tilde{P}_0^0(dx^0), \\ X_{k+1} &\sim P_{k+1}(X_k, U_k, m_k, dx), \quad k \in \mathbb{T} \setminus \{T\}, \quad X_0 \sim P_0(dx), \end{aligned}$$

where for any $(u, a, m) \in W \times A \times \mathcal{P}^{\text{sub}}(S)$ (resp. $(x, u, m) \in S \times W \times \mathcal{P}^{\text{sub}}(S)$) and $k \in \mathbb{T} \setminus \{T\}$,

$$\tilde{P}_{k+1}^0(u, a, m, dx^0) \in \mathcal{P}(S^0) \quad (\text{resp. } P_{k+1}(x, u, m, dx') \in \mathcal{P}(S))$$

and $\tilde{P}_0^0 \in \mathcal{P}(S^0)$ (resp. $P_0 \in \mathcal{P}(S)$). Here, m_k is a $\sigma(U_k)$ -measurable random variable valued in $\mathcal{P}^{\text{sub}}(S)$, defined by $m_k = m_k(U_k)$ for deterministic functions $m_k : W \rightarrow \mathcal{P}^{\text{sub}}(S)$. We consider a relaxed feedback control $\alpha_k = \alpha_k(U_k)$ with the mapping $\alpha_k : W \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(A)$. We denote by \mathcal{A} the set of all relaxed feedback controls.

To overcome the issue of non-Markovian assumption, we work with U rather than X^0 . By (2.2), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} U_{k+1} &\sim F_{k+1}^0(U_k, \alpha_k, m_k, u') := \sum_{x^0 \in S} I_{U_k + M(t+1, x^0) = u'} \tilde{P}_{k+1}^0(U_k, \alpha_k, m_k, x^0), \quad k \in \mathbb{T} \setminus \{T\}, \\ U_0 &\sim P_0^0(u) := \tilde{P}_0^0(M(0, X_0^0) = u). \end{aligned}$$

It is evident that all properties of $\tilde{P}^0(u, a, m, u')$ with respect to the variables (a, m) are inherited from P^0 . Moreover, the transition law of U and X under a relaxed feedback control $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}$ is

$$\begin{aligned} U_{k+1} &\sim \pi_{k+1}^0(U_k, du'; \alpha_k(U_k), m_k(U_k)) := \int_A P_{k+1}^0(U_k, a, m_k(U_k), du') \alpha_k(U_k)(da), \\ X_{k+1} &\sim P_{k+1}(X_k, U_k, m_k(U_k), dx'). \end{aligned} \quad (2.4)$$

2.2 Major player's problem

The reward function of the major player associated with the relaxed feedback control $\alpha = (\alpha_k)_{\mathbb{T} \setminus \{T\}}$ over the finite horizon \mathbb{T} is given by:

$$J^0(\alpha; \mu, m) = \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \int_A f_t^0(\Psi_t(U_t), a, m_t) \alpha_t(U_t)(da) + g^0(\Psi_T(U_T), \mu_T) \right],$$

where the running reward functions f_t^0 are measurable real-valued functions on $S^0 \times A \times \mathcal{P}^{sub}(S)$, the terminal cost function g is a real-valued measurable function on $S^0 \times \mathcal{P}^{sub}(S)$ and $\mu := (\mu_k)_{k \in \mathbb{T}}$ is an \mathbb{F}^U -adapted process valued in $\mathcal{P}^{sub}(S)$.

Notably, this framework can accommodate the optimal stopping feature with additional assumptions. To wit, we introduce an enlarged state space $\bar{S}^0 = S^0 \cup \{\Delta\}$, where Δ represents the stopped state. We also consider the action space $A = \{0, 1\}$, where $a = 1$ indicates the immediate stopping and $a = 0$ indicates the continuation. In this setup, we assume that the functions \tilde{P}^0 , f^0 , and g^0 satisfy the following conditions:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{supp}(\tilde{P}_{t+1}^0(u, 0, m, dx)) &\in S^0, \quad \forall (t, u, m) \in \mathbb{T} \setminus \{T\} \times W \times \mathcal{P}^{sub}(S), \\ \tilde{P}_{t+1}^0(u, 1, m, dx) &= \delta_\Delta, \quad \forall (t, u, m) \in \mathbb{T} \setminus \{T\} \times W \times \mathcal{P}^{sub}(S), \\ \tilde{P}_{t+1}^0(u, a, m, dx) &= \delta_\Delta, \quad \forall (t, a, m) \in \mathbb{T} \setminus \{T\} \times A \times \mathcal{P}^{sub}(S) \text{ and } \Psi_t(u) = \Delta, \\ f_t^0(\Delta, 1, m) &\geq f_t^0(\Delta, 0, m), \quad \forall (t, m) \in \mathbb{T} \setminus \{T\} \times \mathcal{P}^{sub}(S), \\ g^0(x, \mu) &= 0, \quad \forall (x, \mu) \in \bar{S}^0 \times \mathcal{P}^{sub}(S)^2, \end{aligned}$$

where the first two conditions ensure that the major player exits the game (i.e., reaches state Δ) if and only if the action $a = 1$. The third condition specifies that once the major player exits the game, it is irreversible (i.e., $\Psi_t(u) = \Delta$ implies the process stays at Δ). The fourth condition incentivizes the major player such that, if she exits the game before the terminal period T , she will not change her action again. In this scenario, the stopping policy is given by $\tau^0 := \inf\{t \in \mathbb{T} : \alpha_t = 1\} \wedge T$ with the convention that $\inf \emptyset = \infty$.

2.3 Minor player's problem

Next, we formulate each minor player's optimal stopping problem using the linear programming approach introduced by [5]. First, we can conclude from (2.4) that (X, U) is a Markov chain with the transition kernels

$$\pi(x, u; \alpha, m; dx', du') := \left(\pi_t(x, u; \alpha_{t-1}(u), m_{t-1}(u); dx', du') \right)_{t \in \mathbb{T}^*}$$

specified by

$$\pi_t(x, u; \alpha_{t-1}(u), m_{t-1}(u); dx', du') = P_t(x, u, m_{t-1}(u), dx') \pi_t^0(u, du'; \alpha_{t-1}(u), m_{t-1}(u)).$$

²Here, for ease of presentation, we set $g = 0$. In fact, alternative assumptions can be made to account for cases where the major player receives nonzero payoffs when she decides to stop, as our proof does not depend on these specific assumptions.

With a slight abuse of notation, let $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{F}, \mathbb{P})$ be a complete filtered probability space such that (X, U) is an \mathbb{F} -Markov chain with transition kernels $\pi(x, u; dx', du'; \alpha, m)$. For any \mathbb{F} -stopping time τ taking values in \mathbb{T} , define the random subprobability measures $\tilde{m}_t : \Omega \rightarrow \mathcal{P}^{\text{sub}}(S)$ and $\tilde{\mu}_t : \Omega \rightarrow \mathcal{P}^{\text{sub}}(S)$ satisfying

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{m}_t(B) &:= \mathbb{P}[X_t \in B, t < \tau | \mathcal{F}_t^{X^0}], \quad \text{a.s.,} \quad B \in \mathcal{B}(S), \quad t \in \mathbb{T} \setminus \{T\}, \\ \tilde{\mu}_t(B) &:= \mathbb{P}[X_t \in B, \tau = t | \mathcal{F}_t^{X^0}], \quad \text{a.s.,} \quad B \in \mathcal{B}(S), \quad t \in \mathbb{T}.\end{aligned}$$

Here \tilde{m}_t represents the distribution at time t of the minor players still in the game. On the other hand, $\tilde{\mu}_t$ is the distribution at time t of the minor players who exit the game.

Moreover, using the fact that $\mathcal{F}_t^{X^0} = \sigma(U_t)$ is finitely generated by the sets $(\{U_t = u\})_u$, we can identify these random subprobabilities with the mappings $\tilde{m}_t : W \rightarrow \mathcal{P}^{\text{sub}}(S)$ and $\tilde{\mu}_t : W \rightarrow \mathcal{P}^{\text{sub}}(S)$ given by

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{m}_t(u)(B) &:= \mathbb{P}[X_t \in B, t < \tau | U_t = u], \quad B \in \mathcal{B}(S), \quad t \in \mathbb{T} \setminus \{T\}, \quad u \in W_t, \\ \tilde{m}_t(u)(B) &:= 0, \quad B \in \mathcal{B}(S), \quad t \in \mathbb{T} \setminus \{T\}, \quad u \notin W_t, \\ \tilde{\mu}_t(u)(B) &:= \mathbb{P}[X_t \in B, \tau = t | U_t = u], \quad B \in \mathcal{B}(S), \quad t \in \mathbb{T}, \quad u \in W_t, \\ \tilde{\mu}_t(u)(B) &:= 0, \quad B \in \mathcal{B}(S), \quad t \in \mathbb{T}, \quad u \notin W_t,\end{aligned}$$

where $W_t := \{u \in W : \mathbb{P}(U_t = u) > 0\}$.

2.3.1 Derivation of the constraint

As (X, U) is an \mathbb{F} -Markov chain with transition kernels $\pi(x, u; dx', du'; \alpha, m)$, for any $\varphi \in M_b(\mathbb{T} \times S \times W)$ we have

$$\mathbb{E}[\varphi(t+1, X_{t+1}, U_{t+1}) - \varphi(t, X_t, U_t) | \mathcal{F}_t] = \mathcal{L}(\varphi)(t, X_t, U_t; \alpha_t(U_t), m_t(U_t)), \quad \text{a.s.}$$

where for $(t, x, u) \in \mathbb{T} \setminus \{T\} \times S \times W$,

$$\mathcal{L}(\varphi)(t, x, u; \alpha_t(u), m_t(u)) := \int_{S \times W} [\varphi(t+1, x', u') - \varphi(t, x, u)] \pi_{t+1}(x, u; \alpha_t(u), m_t(u); dx', du').$$

Moreover, the process $\mathcal{M}(\varphi)$ defined by $\mathcal{M}_0(\varphi) = \varphi(0, X_0, U_0)$ and

$$\mathcal{M}_t(\varphi) = \varphi(t, X_t, U_t) - \sum_{s=0}^{t-1} \mathcal{L}(\varphi)(s, X_s, U_s; \alpha_s(U_s), m_s(U_s)), \quad t \in \mathbb{T}^*,$$

is an \mathbb{F} -martingale. In particular, for any \mathbb{F} -stopping time τ , we have $\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{M}_\tau(\varphi) | \mathcal{F}_0] = \varphi(0, X_0, U_0)$ a.s.

Taking the expectation leads to

$$\mathbb{E}[\varphi(\tau, X_\tau, U_\tau)] = \mathbb{E}[\varphi(0, X_0, U_0)] + \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{t=0}^{\tau-1} \mathcal{L}(\varphi)(t, X_t, U_t; \alpha_t(U_t), m_t(U_t)) \right].$$

We deduce that the occupation measures satisfy the following constraint

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{t=0}^T \sum_{u \in W_t} p_t(u; \alpha, m) \int_S \varphi(t, x, u) \tilde{\mu}_t(u)(dx) \\
&= \sum_{u \in W_0} p_0(u) \int_S \varphi(0, x, u) m_0^*(u)(dx) \\
&+ \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \sum_{u \in W_t} p_t(u; \alpha, m) \int_S \mathcal{L}(\varphi)(t, x, u; \alpha_t(u), m_t(u)) \tilde{m}_t(u)(dx),
\end{aligned}$$

for any bounded and measurable test function φ , where

$$\begin{aligned}
p_t(u; \alpha, m) &:= \mathbb{P}(U_t = u), \quad p_0(u) := \mathbb{P}(U_0 = u), \\
m_0^*(u)(B) &:= \mathbb{P}(X_0 \in B | U_0 = u) = P_0(B).
\end{aligned}$$

Here, $p_t(u; \alpha, m)$ is used to emphasize the dependence of $\mathbb{P}(U_t = u)$ on the first t elements of α and m . In the sequel, we will restrict the constraint to continuous test functions (which are bounded due to compactness), as they are more suitable for our topological arguments.

We are given the following reward functions:

$$f_t : S \times W \times \mathcal{P}^{\text{sub}}(S) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \quad t \in \mathbb{T} \setminus \{T\}, \quad g_t : S \times W \times \mathcal{P}^{\text{sub}}(S) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \quad t \in \mathbb{T}.$$

For notational convenience, define the sets $\mathcal{C}_\mu := \prod_{t \in \mathbb{T}} \mathcal{P}^{\text{sub}}(S)^W$ and $\mathcal{C}_m := \prod_{t \in \mathbb{T} \setminus \{T\}} \mathcal{P}^{\text{sub}}(S)^W$. Given $(\mu, m) \in \mathcal{C}_\mu \times \mathcal{C}_m$, the reward function for the minor player associated with some $\tau \in \mathcal{T}$ is

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{t=0}^{\tau-1} f_t(X_t, U_t, m_t(U_t)) + g_\tau(X_\tau, U_\tau, \mu_\tau(U_\tau)) \right],$$

where \mathcal{T} is the set of \mathbb{F} -stopping times valued in \mathbb{T} . Moreover, we can define the occupation measures $(\tilde{\mu}, \tilde{m})$ associated with τ and rewrite the reward function by

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{t=0}^{\tau-1} f_t(X_t, U_t, m_t(U_t)) + g_\tau(X_\tau, U_\tau, \mu_\tau(U_\tau)) \right] \\
&= \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \sum_{u \in W_t} p_t(u; \alpha, m) \int_S f_t(x, u, m_t(u)) \tilde{m}_t(u)(dx) \\
&+ \sum_{t=0}^T \sum_{u \in W_t} p_t(u; \alpha, m) \int_S g_t(x, u, \mu_t(u)) \tilde{\mu}_t(u)(dx).
\end{aligned}$$

We are then ready to present the optimization problem for the minor player under the linear programming formulation.

Definition 2.1. (Set of constraints) Fix a tuple $(\mu, m, \alpha) \in \mathcal{C}_\mu \times \mathcal{C}_m \times \mathcal{A}$, and let $\mathcal{R}[m; \alpha]$ be the set of pairs $(\tilde{\mu}, \tilde{m}) \in \mathcal{C}_\mu \times \mathcal{C}_m$ such that for all $\varphi \in C(\mathbb{T} \times S \times W)$ and $u \in W_t := \{u \in W : p_t(u; \alpha, m) := \mathbb{P}(U_t = u) > 0\}$, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{t=0}^T \sum_{u \in W_t} p_t(u; \alpha, m) \int_S \varphi(t, x, u) \tilde{\mu}_t(u)(dx) \\ &= \sum_{u \in W_0} p_0(u) \int_S \varphi(0, x, u) m_0^*(u)(dx) \\ &+ \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \sum_{u \in W_t} p_t(u; \alpha, m) \int_S \mathcal{L}(\varphi)(t, x, u; \alpha_t(u), m_t(u)) \tilde{m}_t(u)(dx). \end{aligned}$$

Definition 2.2. (LP optimization criteria) For $(\mu, m, \alpha) \in \mathcal{C}_\mu \times \mathcal{C}_m \times \mathcal{A}$, let $\Gamma[(\mu, m; \alpha)] : \mathcal{R}[m; \alpha] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be the reward functional associated to $(\tilde{\mu}, \tilde{m})$, defined by

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma[(\mu, m; \alpha)](\tilde{\mu}, \tilde{m}) &:= \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \sum_{u \in W_t} p_t(u; \alpha, m) \int_S f_t(x, u, m_t(u)) \tilde{m}_t(u)(dx) \\ &+ \sum_{t=0}^T \sum_{u \in W_t} p_t(u; \alpha, m) \int_S g_t(x, u, \mu_t(u)) \tilde{\mu}_t(u)(dx). \end{aligned}$$

2.4 Major-Minor mean field equilibrium

Our goal is to examine the existence of the relaxed equilibrium for the major-minor mean field game as randomized policy. Let us first introduce some related definitions.

Definition 2.3. (Relaxed equilibrium)

1. Given $(\mu, m) \in \mathcal{C}_\mu \times \mathcal{C}_m$, solve the relaxed control problem:

$$\sup_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}} J^0(\alpha; \mu, m) = \sup_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \int_A f_t^0(\Psi_t(U_t), a, m_t(U_t)) \alpha_t(U_t)(da) + g^0(\Psi_T(U_T), \mu_T(U_T)) \right]. \quad (2.5)$$

Define the set valued mapping $\mathbb{A} : \mathcal{C}_\mu \times \mathcal{C}_m \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ as

$$\mathbb{A}(\mu, m) := \arg \max_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}} J^0(\alpha; \mu, m). \quad (2.6)$$

2. Define the set valued mapping $\hat{\mathcal{R}} : \mathcal{C}_\mu \times \mathcal{C}_m \times \mathcal{A} \rightarrow 2^{\mathcal{C}_\mu \times \mathcal{C}_m}$ as

$$\hat{\mathcal{R}}(\mu, m, \alpha) = \mathcal{R}[m; \alpha] \quad (2.7)$$

Define $\hat{\Theta} : \mathcal{C}_\mu \times \mathcal{C}_m \times \mathcal{A} \rightarrow 2^{\mathcal{C}_\mu \times \mathcal{C}_m}$ as

$$\hat{\Theta}(\mu, m, \alpha) := \arg \max_{(\tilde{\mu}, \tilde{m}) \in \hat{\mathcal{R}}(\mu, m, \alpha)} \Gamma[(\mu, m; \alpha)](\tilde{\mu}, \tilde{m}). \quad (2.8)$$

3. Define the set valued mapping $\Theta^* : \mathcal{C}_\mu \times \mathcal{C}_m \rightarrow 2^{\mathcal{C}_\mu \times \mathcal{C}_m}$ as

$$\Theta^*(\mu, m) := \bigcup_{\alpha \in \mathbb{A}(\mu, m)} \hat{\Theta}(\mu, m, \alpha). \quad (2.9)$$

The set of relaxed equilibrium coincides with the set of fixed points of Θ^* .

Note that the set-valued mapping $\hat{\Theta}$ defined in (2.8) has convex values due to the linearity of the mapping Γ . However, the solution to (2.5) may not be unique under our assumptions, rendering the set-valued mapping Θ^* in (2.9) not necessarily convex-valued in general. To wit, let us present a simple example to illustrate this issue. Consider a model where the major player solves a deterministic problem:

$$\sup_{t \in \{0,1,2\}} G_t$$

where $G_0 = 0, G_1 = G_2 = 1$. For the major player, there are three possible paths to consider:

- (p0) The major player stops at the initial time $t = 0$.
- (p1) The major player chooses to continue at $t = 0$ and then stops at $t = 1$.
- (p2) The major player continues until the terminal time $t = 2$ and stops.

It is clear that an optimal relaxed strategy for the major player is given by $(a_0, a_1, a_2) = (0, \alpha, 1 - \alpha)$ with $\alpha \in [0, 1]$, where a_i represents the probability of the major player stopping at time i .

The minor player solves the following problem:

$$\sup_{t \in \{0,1,2\}} \mathbb{E}[H_t]$$

where $H_0 = \frac{1}{2}$,

$$H_1 = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if the major player stops at } t = 1, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

and $H_2 = \frac{1}{3}$.

Let $\mu = (\mu_0, \mu_1, \mu_2)$ denote the policy of the minor player, with μ_i representing the probability of the minor player stopping at time i . Additionally, μ is adapted to the realization of the major player's stopping in general. Obviously, the set-valued mapping Θ^* is independent of the input. We claim that this mapping is not convex.

- (i) For the major player's strategy $(a_0, a_1, a_2) = (0, 0, 1)$, it is easy to check a best response of minor player is

$$\mu^*(p0) = \mu^*(p1) = \mu^*(p2) = (1, 0, 0).$$

- (ii) For the major player's strategy $(a_0, a_1, a_2) = (0, 1, 0)$, it is easy to check a best response of minor player is

$$\mu^{**}(p0) = \mu^{**}(p2) = (0, \beta, 1 - \beta), \quad \forall \beta \in [0, 1], \quad \mu^{**}(p1) = (0, 1, 0).$$

Consider $\hat{\mu} := \frac{1}{2}\mu^* + \frac{1}{2}\mu^{**}$, which takes the following form:

$$\hat{\mu}(p0) = \left(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{\beta}{2}, \frac{1-\beta}{2}\right), \quad \hat{\mu}(p1) = \left(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, 0\right), \quad \hat{\mu}(p2) = \left(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{\beta}{2}, \frac{1-\beta}{2}\right).$$

We claim that if $\beta > 0$, then $\hat{\mu}$ is not in the set Θ^* . Indeed, if not, then $\hat{\mu}$ must be induced by some $(a_0, a_1, a_2) = (0, \alpha, 1 - \alpha)$ with $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ ³. However, in this case, path (p2) has positive probability, and $\hat{\mu}$ is never optimal because, along path (p2), $(\frac{1}{2}, 0, \frac{1}{2})$ clearly yields a greater reward. This leads to a contradiction.

Another key observation is that the fixed point of $\hat{\Theta}(\cdot, \cdot, \alpha)$ with $\alpha \in \mathbb{A}(\mu, m)$ fixed remains a fixed point of Θ^* . However, it is unclear how to select a suitable α that exhibits good continuity with respect to (μ, m) ⁴, in order to ensure the applicability of the fixed point theorem.

To illustrate this, let us consider an example of a deterministic control problem for the major player under the setting $T = 1$ with no terminal reward and a binary action space $A = \{0, 1\}$. The cost functional is expressed by

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\int_A f^0(a, m_0(U_0)) \alpha(da) \right],$$

where f^0 denotes the running reward function, $m_0(U_0)$ represents the initial mean field term, and α is a relaxed control. It is evident that the optimal relaxed control is not unique and is characterized by

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha^*(u)(a) &:= \delta_1(a) \mathbf{1}_{f^0(1, m_0(u)) > f^0(0, m_0(u))} + \delta_0(a) \mathbf{1}_{f^0(1, m_0(u)) < f^0(0, m_0(u))} \\ &+ (p\delta_1(a) + (1-p)\delta_0(a)) \mathbf{1}_{f^0(1, m_0(u)) = f^0(0, m_0(u))}, \end{aligned}$$

where $p \in [0, 1]$, and the optimal strategy may not be continuous with respect to m .

In response to the previous challenges using the direct argument, we propose an auxiliary problem by adding an entropy regularization in the reward functional of the major player's problem. We first establish the existence of a regularized equilibrium for a simplified fixed-point mapping. Then, by letting the regularization parameter λ tend to 0, we show that the limit is a relaxed equilibrium of the original MFG problem.

Definition 2.4. (Regularized equilibrium)

1. Given $(\mu, m) \in \mathcal{C}_\mu \times \mathcal{C}_m$, solve the regularized control problem:

$$\sup_{\alpha \in \mathcal{D}} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \left(\int_A f_t^0(\Psi_t(U_t), a, m_t(U_t)) \alpha_t(U_t)(da) + \lambda \mathcal{H}(\alpha_t(U_t)) \right) + g^0(\Psi_T(U_T), \mu_T(U_T)) \right], \quad (2.10)$$

³An easy contradiction argument implies that α cannot take the values 0 or 1.

⁴Here, continuity is understood in the weak sense: $\alpha(\mu^n, m^n)(u)$ converges weakly to $\alpha(\mu, m)(u)$ pointwise if $(\mu^n(u), m^n(u))$ converges weakly to $(\mu(u), m(u))$ pointwise.

where $\alpha \in \mathcal{D}$ indicates that for $t \in \mathbb{T} \setminus \{T\}$, we have $\alpha_t \in \mathcal{D}(A)$ such that $\alpha_t \in \mathcal{P}(A)^W$ with $\alpha_t(u)(B) = \int_B \alpha_t(u)(a) da$ for all Borel sets $B \subset A$ and U evolves as described in (2.4). Additionally, its Shannon differential entropy satisfies $\mathcal{H}(\alpha_t(u)) > -\infty$, where

$$\mathcal{H}(\alpha_t(u)) = - \int_A \ln(\alpha_t(u)(a)) \alpha_t(u)(a) da.$$

2. Define the set valued mapping $\mathcal{R}^* : \mathcal{C}_\mu \times \mathcal{C}_m \rightarrow 2^{\mathcal{C}_\mu \times \mathcal{C}_m}$ as

$$\mathcal{R}^*(\mu, m) = \mathcal{R}[m; \alpha^\lambda(\mu, m)], \quad (2.11)$$

where $\alpha^\lambda(\mu, m)$ is the unique solution of (2.10). Define $\Theta : \mathcal{C}_\mu \times \mathcal{C}_m \rightarrow 2^{\mathcal{C}_\mu \times \mathcal{C}_m}$ as

$$\Theta(\mu, m) := \arg \max_{(\tilde{\mu}, \tilde{m}) \in \mathcal{R}^*(\mu, m)} \Gamma[(\mu, m; \alpha^\lambda)](\tilde{\mu}, \tilde{m}). \quad (2.12)$$

3. The set of Regularized equilibrium coincides with the set of fixed points of Θ .

Remark 2.5. Both the relaxed and regularized equilibria are strong solutions in the sense of [9], i.e., in our case the mean-field terms are adapted to the major player's controlled state process.

3 Technical Assumptions

To facilitate our fixed point arguments and the convergence analysis as the regularization parameter λ tends to zero, let us unpack the following standing assumptions imposed on the model.

Assumption 3.1. (i) For all $(k, u, a, m) \in \mathbb{T} \setminus \{T\} \times W \times A \times \mathcal{P}^{sub}(S)$,

$$P_{k+1}^0(u, a, m, du') = \overline{P}_{k+1}^0(u, a, \int_S b_{k+1}(x) m(dx), du')$$

where $\overline{P}_{k+1}^0 : W \times A \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathcal{P}^{sub}(W)$ for some $d \in \mathbb{N}$. We assume that for each fixed $k \in \mathbb{T} \setminus \{T\}$, \overline{P}_{k+1}^0 is continuous and the function $b_{k+1} : S \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ are continuous. Moreover, in the case where $\text{Leb}(A) > 0$, we assume that the mappings $a \mapsto \overline{P}_{k+1}^0(u, a, y, u')$ are Lipschitz continuous, uniformly with respect to the other arguments.

(ii) For all $(k, x, u, m) \in \mathbb{T} \setminus \{T\} \times S \times W \times \mathcal{P}^{sub}(S)$,

$$P_{k+1}(x, u, m, dx') = \overline{P}_{k+1}(x, u, \int_S c_{k+1}(x) m(dx), dx')$$

where $\overline{P}_{k+1} : S \times W \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathcal{P}^{sub}(S)$ for some $d \in \mathbb{N}$. We assume that for each fixed $k \in \mathbb{T} \setminus \{T\}$, \overline{P}_{k+1} is continuous and the function $c_{k+1} : S \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ are continuous.

Remark 3.1. By Lemma B.1, condition (i) in Assumption 3.1 implies that for any $(k, u, u') \in \mathbb{T} \setminus \{T\} \times W^2$ the mapping $\pi_{k+1}^0(u, u'; \alpha, m) : \mathcal{P}(A) \times \mathcal{P}^{\text{sub}}(S) \rightarrow [0, 1]$, that is

$$\pi_{k+1}^0(u, u'; \alpha, m) := \int_A P_{k+1}^0(u, a, m, u') \alpha(da),$$

is continuous.

Remark 3.2. By Assumption 3.1 and Remark 3.1, we conclude that $\pi_t(x, u; \alpha, m; dx', du') : S \times W \times \mathcal{P}(A) \times \mathcal{P}^{\text{sub}}(S) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(S \times W)$, where

$$\pi_t(x, u; \alpha, m; dx', du') := P_t(x, u, m, dx') \pi_t^0(u, du'; \alpha, m),$$

is continuous for each $t \in \mathbb{T}^*$.

Assumption 3.2. (i) For all $(t, x, a, m) \in \mathbb{T} \setminus \{T\} \times S^0 \times A \times \mathcal{P}^{\text{sub}}(S)$,

$$f_t^0(x, a, m) = \bar{f}_t^0(x, a, \int_S h_t(x) m(dx))$$

where $\bar{f}_t^0 : S^0 \times A \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ for some $d \in \mathbb{N}$. We assume that for each fixed $t \in \mathbb{T} \setminus \{T\}$, \bar{f}_t^0 is continuous and bounded and the function $h_t : S \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ are continuous. Moreover, in the case where $\text{Leb}(A) > 0$, we assume that the mappings $a \mapsto \bar{f}_t^0(x, a, y)$ are Lipschitz continuous, uniformly with respect to the other arguments.

(ii) For all $(x, \mu) \in S^0 \times \mathcal{P}^{\text{sub}}(S)$,

$$g^0(x, \mu) = \bar{g}^0(x, \int_S e(x) \mu(dx))$$

where $\bar{g}^0 : S^0 \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ for some $d \in \mathbb{N}$. We assume that \bar{g}^0 is continuous and bounded and that the function $e : S \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ are continuous.

Assumption 3.3. (i) For each $(t, x, u, m) \in \mathbb{T} \setminus \{T\} \times S \times W \times \mathcal{P}^{\text{sub}}(S)$,

$$f_t(x, u, m) = \bar{f}_t(x, u, \int_S \bar{h}_t(x) m(dx))$$

where $\bar{f}_t : S \times W \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ for some $d \in \mathbb{N}$. We assume that \bar{f}_t is continuous and bounded and that the function $\bar{h}_t : S \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ is continuous.

(ii) For each $(t, x, u, \mu) \in \mathbb{T} \times S \times W \times \mathcal{P}^{\text{sub}}(S)$,

$$g_t(x, u, \mu) = \bar{g}_t(x, u, \int_S \bar{e}(x) \mu(dx))$$

where $\bar{g}_t : S \times W \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ for some $d \in \mathbb{N}$. We assume that \bar{g}_t is continuous and bounded that the function $\bar{e} : S \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ is continuous.

For the case of $A \subset \mathbb{R}^\ell$ with $\text{Leb}(A) > 0$, we require the following assumption from [2] to properly control the entropy term.

Assumption 3.4. *When $\ell > 1$, there exists $\vartheta > 0$ and $\iota \in (0, \pi/2]$ such that for any $a \in A$, there is a cone with vertex a and angle ι (denoted by $\text{cone}(a, \iota)$) that satisfies $(\text{cone}(a, \iota) \cap B_\vartheta(a)) \subseteq A$. When $\ell = 1$, there exists $\vartheta > 0$ such that for any $a \in A$, either $[a - \vartheta, a]$ or $[a, a + \vartheta]$ is contained in A .*

We next present an application example that satisfies these assumptions to illustrate that the above model assumptions are not restrictive.

Example: Consider a bank run model involving a major player, the bank, and minor players, the depositors. Define the set $S^0 := \{0, 1, \dots, d\}$, where $i \in S^0$ represents levels of operational performance, with higher values indicating better performance, and 0 stands for the default state.

The representative depositor's balance X_t evolves by

$$X_{t+1} = (1 + r_t(X_t^0))X_t, \quad \forall t \in \mathbb{T} \setminus \{T\}, \quad X_0 = x \in \mathbb{R}^+,$$

where $r_t : S^0 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ are non-decreasing functions representing the interest rate. Consequently, the state space S for X is finite and therefore compact. The minor player will choose time τ to withdraw money. For simplicity, we assume that the transition kernel of X^0 satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{P}^0(x, a, m, x+1) &:= \frac{a + m(S)}{2}, \quad \forall (x, a, m) \in S^0 \setminus \{0, d\} \times [0, 1] \times \mathcal{P}^{sub}(S), \\ \tilde{P}^0(x, a, m, x-1) &:= 1 - \frac{a + m(S)}{2}, \quad \forall (x, a, m) \in S^0 \setminus \{0\} \times [0, 1] \times \mathcal{P}^{sub}(S), \\ \tilde{P}^0(d, a, m, d) &:= \frac{a + m(S)}{2}, \quad \forall (a, m) \in [0, 1] \times \mathcal{P}^{sub}(S), \\ \tilde{P}^0(0, a, m, 0) &:= 1, \quad \forall (a, m) \in [0, 1] \times \mathcal{P}^{sub}(S), \end{aligned}$$

where $a \in [0, 1]$ represents the bank's effort, and $m(S) = \int_S 1 m(ds)$ represents the fraction of depositors who have not withdrawn their funds at time t . This formulation indicates that a greater bank effort a or a higher fraction of non-withdrawing depositors $m(S)$ enhances the likelihood of improving the bank's performance.

The reward function of the bank is given by

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{t=1}^{T-1} f^0(t, X_t^0, m_t(S)(U_t)) + h^0(\alpha_t) + g^0(X_T, \mu_T(S)(U_T)) \right],$$

where U is the trajectory of X^0 given by (2.1), $\mu_T(S)(u) = \int_S 1 \mu_T(ds)(u) \in [0, 1]$ represents the proportion of depositors exit the game at time T . Assume that the functions f^0 , g^0 and h^0 satisfy the following properties:

- The function $f^0(t, x, y)$ is decreasing in t , and non-decreasing in both x and y , with the condition $f^0(t, 0, y) = 0$. The function $g^0(x, y)$ is non-decreasing in x and decreasing in y , and satisfies $g^0(0, y) = 0$. The function $h^0(a)$ is strictly decreasing in a , with the condition $h^0(0) = 0$.

- For any $(t, x) \in \mathbb{T} \setminus \{T\} \times S^0$, the function $f^0(t, x, y)$ is continuous in y . For any $x \in S^0$, the function $g^0(x, y)$ is continuous in y . The function $h^0(a)$ is Lipschitz continuous in a .

The reward function of the representative minor player is given by

$$\mathbb{E} [g(X_\tau, X_\tau^0)],$$

where $g : S \times S^0 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is given by

$$g(x, x^0) = \begin{cases} U(x), & \text{if } x^0 \neq 0, \\ U(\gamma x), & \text{if } x^0 = 0. \end{cases}$$

Here, $\gamma \in [0, 1)$ is a constant representing the recovery rate after the bank's default, and U is the utility function of the depositors. Given the above setup, it is clear that all previous assumptions are satisfied.

4 Existence of Regularized Equilibrium

Given $(\mu, m) \in \mathcal{C}_\mu \times \mathcal{C}_m$, we will solve the regularized control problem (2.10) using the dynamic programming principle (DPP). Define the value function by

$$V^\lambda(t, u) = \sup_{\tilde{\alpha} \in \mathcal{D}_t} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{s=t}^{T-1} \left(\int_A f_s^0(\Psi_s(U_s), a, m_s(U_s)) \tilde{\alpha}_s(U_s)(da) + \lambda \mathcal{H}(\tilde{\alpha}_s(U_s)) \right) + g^0(\Psi_T(U_T), \mu_T(U_T)) \middle| U_t = u \right],$$

where $\mathcal{D}_t = \prod_{s=t}^{T-1} \mathcal{D}(A)$ with $\mathcal{D}_0 = \mathcal{D}$. By DPP, we can derive that

$$V^\lambda(t, u) = \max_{\tilde{\alpha} \in \mathcal{D}(A)} \left\{ \int_A f_t^0(\Psi_t(u), a, m_t(u)) \tilde{\alpha}(u)(da) + \lambda \mathcal{H}(\tilde{\alpha}(u)) + \sum_{u' \in W} V^\lambda(t+1, u') \int_A P_{t+1}^0(u, a, m_t(u), u') \tilde{\alpha}(u)(da) \right\},$$

$$V^\lambda(T, u) = g^0(\Psi_T(u), \mu_T(u)),$$

which implies the optimal relaxed control is determined by

$$\alpha_t^\lambda(u)(a) = \frac{e^{\frac{1}{\lambda}(f_t^0(\Psi_t(u), a, m_t(u)) + \sum_{u' \in W} V^\lambda(t+1, u') P_{t+1}^0(u, a, m_t(u), u'))}}{\int_A e^{\frac{1}{\lambda}(f_t^0(\Psi_t(u), i, m_t(u)) + \sum_{u' \in W} V^\lambda(t+1, u') P_{t+1}^0(u, i, m_t(u), u'))} da}, \quad t \in \mathbb{T} \setminus \{T\}.$$

For the case that $A = \{0, 1\}$, we have

$$\alpha_t^\lambda(u)(1) = \frac{e^{\frac{1}{\lambda}(f_t^0(\Psi_t(u), 1, m_t(u)) + \sum_{u' \in W} V^\lambda(t+1, u') P_{t+1}^0(u, 1, m_t(u), u'))}}{\sum_{i=0}^1 e^{\frac{1}{\lambda}(f_t^0(\Psi_t(u), i, m_t(u)) + \sum_{u' \in W} V^\lambda(t+1, u') P_{t+1}^0(u, i, m_t(u), u'))}}, \quad t \in \mathbb{T} \setminus \{T\},$$

$$\alpha_t^\lambda(u)(0) = \frac{e^{\frac{1}{\lambda}(f_t^0(\Psi_t(u), 0, m_t(u)) + \sum_{u' \in W} V^\lambda(t+1, u') P_{t+1}^0(u, 0, m_t(u), u'))}}{\sum_{i=0}^1 e^{\frac{1}{\lambda}(f_t^0(\Psi_t(u), i, m_t(u)) + \sum_{u' \in W} V^\lambda(t+1, u') P_{t+1}^0(u, i, m_t(u), u'))}}, \quad t \in \mathbb{T} \setminus \{T\}.$$

Remark 4.1. By Assumptions 3.1 and 3.2, and using backward induction, we conclude that $\alpha_t^\lambda(u)$ is continuous in (μ, m) for every $u \in W$ and $t \in \mathbb{T} \setminus \{T\}$. In the sequel, when we need to emphasize the dependence α^λ on (μ, m) , we write α^λ as $\alpha^\lambda(\mu, m)$ or $(\alpha_k^\lambda(u; \mu, m))_{k,u}$.

To establish the existence of a regularized equilibrium, we first demonstrate the continuity of the set \mathcal{R}^* , as defined in (2.11), in the context of set-valued mappings. Afterwards, we prove the existence of a fixed point for Θ using Kakutani-Fan-Glicksberg's fixed point theorem; see, for example, Corollary 17.55 in [1].

Topology. We say that $(m^n)_{n \geq 1}$ converges to m in \mathcal{C}_m if for all $t \in \mathbb{T} \setminus \{T\}$ and $u \in W$, $(m_t^n(u))_{n \geq 1}$ converges to $m_t(u)$ weakly. We say that $(\mu^n)_{n \geq 1}$ converges to μ in \mathcal{C}_μ if for all $t \in \mathbb{T}$ and $u \in W$, $(\mu_t^n(u))_{n \geq 1}$ converges to $\mu_t(u)$ weakly. We recall that for a compact metric space K , the set $\mathcal{P}^{\text{sub}}(K)$ is compact for the topology of weak convergence.

Lemma 4.2. *Under Assumption 3.1, the set $\mathcal{R}[m; \alpha]$ is compact.*

Proof. Relative compactness follows from the fact that $\mathcal{P}^{\text{sub}}(S)$ is compact and henceforth \mathcal{C}_μ and \mathcal{C}_m are also compact. Let us check that $\mathcal{R}[m; \alpha]$ is closed. Consider a sequence $(\tilde{\mu}^n, \tilde{m}^n)_{n \geq 1} \subset \mathcal{R}[m; \alpha]$ converging to some $(\tilde{\mu}, \tilde{m})$ and we claim that $(\tilde{\mu}, \tilde{m}) \in \mathcal{R}[m; \alpha]$. For all $\varphi \in C(\mathbb{T} \times S \times W)$ and $n \geq 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{t=0}^T \sum_{u \in W_t} p_t(u; \alpha, m) \int_S \varphi(t, x, u) \tilde{\mu}_t^n(u)(dx) \\ &= \sum_{u \in W_0} p_0(u) \int_S \varphi(0, x, u) m_0^*(u)(dx) \\ &+ \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \sum_{u \in W_t} p_t(u; \alpha, m) \int_S \mathcal{L}(\varphi)(t, x, u; \alpha_t(u), m_t(u)) \tilde{m}_t^n(u)(dx). \end{aligned}$$

Note that for each $t \in \mathbb{T}$ and $u \in W_t$ the function $x \mapsto \varphi(t, x, u)$ is continuous and bounded, it holds that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_S \varphi(t, x, u) \tilde{\mu}_t^n(u)(dx) = \int_S \varphi(t, x, u) \tilde{\mu}_t(u)(dx).$$

In view that for each $t \in \mathbb{T} \setminus \{T\}$ and $u \in W_t$ the function $x \mapsto \mathcal{L}(\varphi)(t, x, u; \alpha_t(u), m_t(u))$ is continuous (by Remark 3.2) and bounded, we have

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_S \mathcal{L}(\varphi)(t, x, u; \alpha_t(u), m_t(u)) \tilde{m}_t^n(u)(dx) = \int_S \mathcal{L}(\varphi)(t, x, u; \alpha_t(u), m_t(u)) \tilde{m}_t(u)(dx).$$

Therefore, the desired result holds that $(\tilde{\mu}, \tilde{m}) \in \mathcal{R}[m; \alpha]$. \square

Lemma 4.3. *Let Assumptions 3.1 and 3.3 hold. Then, the map*

$$(\mathcal{C}_\mu \times \mathcal{C}_m \times \mathcal{A}) \times (\mathcal{C}_\mu \times \mathcal{C}_m) \ni ((\bar{\mu}, \bar{m}, \alpha), (\mu, m)) \mapsto \Gamma[\bar{\mu}, \bar{m}; \alpha](\mu, m) \in \mathbb{R}$$

is continuous.

Proof. Let $(\bar{\mu}^n, \bar{m}^n, \alpha^n)_{n \geq 1} \subset \mathcal{C}_\mu \times \mathcal{C}_m \times \mathcal{A}$ and $(\mu^n, m^n)_{n \geq 1} \subset \mathcal{C}_\mu \times \mathcal{C}_m$ be two sequences converging to $(\bar{\mu}, \bar{m}, \alpha) \in \mathcal{C}_\mu \times \mathcal{C}_m \times \mathcal{A}$ and $(\mu, m) \in \mathcal{C}_\mu \times \mathcal{C}_m$ respectively. By Assumption 3.3 and applying Lemma B.1, we get for all $t \in \mathbb{T} \setminus \{T\}$ and $u \in W$,

$$\int_S f_t(x, u, \bar{m}_t^n(u)) m_t^n(u)(dx) \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_S f_t(x, u, \bar{m}_t(u)) m_t(u)(dx),$$

and for all $t \in \mathbb{T}$ and $u \in W$,

$$\int_S g_t(x, u, \bar{\mu}_t^n(u)) \mu_t^n(u)(dx) \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_S g_t(x, u, \bar{\mu}_t(u)) \mu_t(u)(dx).$$

Moreover, Remark 3.1 implies that

$$p_t(u; \alpha^n, \bar{m}^n) \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} p_t(u; \alpha, \bar{m}).$$

Therefore, it follows that $((\bar{\mu}, \bar{m}, \alpha), (\mu, m)) \mapsto \Gamma[\bar{\mu}, \bar{m}; \alpha](\mu, m)$ is continuous. \square

Lemma 4.4. *Under Assumptions 3.1-3.3, the set valued mapping \mathcal{R}^* defined in (2.11) is continuous.*

Proof. Step 1. We first prove the upper hemicontinuity. By the Closed Graph Theorem, it suffices to show that \mathcal{R}^* has closed graph. Consider a sequence $(\tilde{\mu}^n, \tilde{m}^n) \in \mathcal{R}^*(\bar{\mu}^n, \bar{m}^n) = \mathcal{R}[\bar{m}^n; \alpha^\lambda(\bar{\mu}^n, \bar{m}^n)]$ such that $(\tilde{\mu}^n, \tilde{m}^n)_{n \geq 1} \rightarrow (\tilde{\mu}, \tilde{m})$ and $(\bar{\mu}^n, \bar{m}^n) \rightarrow (\bar{\mu}, \bar{m})$. Let us show that $(\tilde{\mu}, \tilde{m}) \in \mathcal{R}^*(\bar{\mu}, \bar{m})$.

Here, we use U^n to denote the markov chain with transition kernel

$$\pi^{0,n} := (\pi_{k+1}^0(u, u'; \alpha_k^\lambda(u; \bar{\mu}^n, \bar{m}^n), \bar{m}_k^n(u)))_{u, u', k}$$

and use U to denote the markov chain with transition kernel

$$\pi^0 := (\pi_{k+1}^0(u, u'; \alpha_k^\lambda(u; \bar{\mu}, \bar{m}), \bar{m}_k(u)))_{u, u', k}.$$

Remark 3.1 and Remark 4.1 yield that $\pi^{0,n} \rightarrow \pi^0$ component by component, from where the law of U^n converges weakly to that of U . By the Skorokhod's representation theorem, there exist W -valued processes \tilde{U}^n and \tilde{U} , defined on some probability space (Ω, \mathcal{F}, P) , such that the law of \tilde{U}^n coincides with that of U^n , the law of \tilde{U} coincides with that of U , and $\tilde{U}_k^n \rightarrow \tilde{U}_k$ for all $k \in \mathbb{T}$ P -a.s. Because W is a finite set, for each $k \in \mathbb{T}$, we in fact have $\tilde{U}_k^n = \tilde{U}_k$ for n large enough. It follows that for n large enough,

$$p_t(u; \alpha^\lambda(\bar{\mu}^n, \bar{m}^n), \bar{m}^n) = \mathbb{P}(U_t^n = u) = P(\tilde{U}_t^n = u) = P(\tilde{U}_t = u) = \mathbb{P}(U_t = u) = p_t(u; \alpha^\lambda(\bar{\mu}, \bar{m}), \bar{m}).$$

Therefore, $W_t^n := \{u \in W : p_t(u; \alpha^\lambda(\bar{\mu}^n, \bar{m}^n), \bar{m}^n) > 0\}$ and $W_t := \{u \in W : p_t(u; \alpha^\lambda(\bar{\mu}, \bar{m}), \bar{m}) > 0\}$ are the same when n is sufficiently large. As $(\tilde{\mu}^n, \tilde{m}^n) \in \mathcal{R}^*(\bar{\mu}^n, \bar{m}^n)$, it follows that for n large

enough, for all $\varphi \in C(\mathbb{T} \times S \times W)$ and $u \in W_t$, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{t=0}^T \sum_{u \in W_t} p_t(u; \alpha^\lambda(\bar{\mu}, \bar{m}), \bar{m}) \int_S \varphi(t, x, u) \tilde{\mu}_t^n(u)(dx) \\ &= \sum_{u \in W_0} p_0(u) \int_S \varphi(0, x, u) m_0^*(u)(dx) \\ &+ \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \sum_{u \in W_t} p_t(u; \alpha^\lambda(\bar{\mu}, \bar{m}), \bar{m}) \int_S \mathcal{L}(\varphi)(t, x, u; \alpha_t^\lambda(u; \bar{\mu}^n, \bar{m}^n), \bar{m}_t^n(u)) \tilde{m}_t^n(u)(dx). \end{aligned}$$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_S \mathcal{L}(\varphi)(t, x, u; \alpha_t^\lambda(u; \bar{\mu}^n, \bar{m}^n), \bar{m}_t^n(u)) \tilde{m}_t^n(u)(dx) \\ &= \sum_{u'} \pi_t^0(u, u'; \alpha_t^\lambda(u; \bar{\mu}^n, \bar{m}^n), \bar{m}_t^n(u)) \int_S \left(\int_S \varphi(t+1, x', u') P_t(x, u, \bar{m}_t^n(u), dx') \right) \tilde{m}_t^n(u)(dx) \\ &- \int_S \varphi(t, x, u) \tilde{m}_t^n(u)(dx). \end{aligned}$$

Then, combining Lemma B.1, Assumption 3.1, Remark 3.1, and Remark 4.1, we have

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_S \mathcal{L}(\varphi)(t, x, u; \alpha_t^\lambda(u; \bar{\mu}^n, \bar{m}^n), \bar{m}_t^n(u)) \tilde{m}_t^n(u)(dx) = \int_S \mathcal{L}(\varphi)(t, x, u; \alpha_t^\lambda(u; \bar{\mu}, \bar{m}), \bar{m}_t(u)) \tilde{m}_t(u)(dx).$$

It readily follows that $(\tilde{\mu}, \tilde{m}) \in \mathcal{R}^*(\bar{\mu}, \bar{m})$.

Step 2. We now prove the lower hemicontinuity. Consider a sequence $(\bar{\mu}^n, \bar{m}^n)_{n \geq 1} \subset \mathcal{C}_\mu \times \mathcal{C}_m$ such that $(\bar{\mu}^n, \bar{m}^n) \rightharpoonup (\bar{\mu}, \bar{m})$ and let $(\mu, m) \in \mathcal{R}^*(\bar{\mu}, \bar{m}) = \mathcal{R}[\bar{m}; \alpha^\lambda(\bar{\mu}, \bar{m})]$. Our task is to show that, up to a subsequence, we can find $(\mu^n, m^n) \in \mathcal{R}^*(\bar{\mu}^n, \bar{m}^n) = \mathcal{R}[\bar{m}^n; \alpha^\lambda(\bar{\mu}^n, \bar{m}^n)]$ and $(\mu^n, m^n) \rightharpoonup (\mu, m)$.

By the argument in Appendix A, we can construct a filtered probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{F}, P)$ such that $(\tilde{X}^n, \tilde{U}^n)$ and (\tilde{X}, \tilde{U}) are \mathbb{F} -Markov chains taking values in $S \times W$, with transition kernels

$$\pi(x, u; \alpha^\lambda(\bar{\mu}^n, \bar{m}^n), \bar{m}^n; dx', du') \quad \text{and} \quad \pi(x, u; \alpha^\lambda(\bar{\mu}, \bar{m}), \bar{m}; dx', du'),$$

and the same initial distribution $m_0^*(u)(dx)p_0(u)$. Moreover,

$$(\tilde{X}_k^n, \tilde{U}_k^n) \rightarrow (\tilde{X}_k, \tilde{U}_k), \quad \forall k \in \mathbb{T}, P\text{-a.s.}$$

Following the argument in Theorem 2 and Appendix A of [15], we conclude that for $(\mu, m) \in \mathcal{R}[\bar{m}; \alpha^\lambda(\bar{\mu}, \bar{m})]$, it can be associated with randomized stopping times. Specifically, we can extend the filtered probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{F}, P)$ to $(\bar{\Omega}, \bar{\mathcal{F}}, \bar{\mathbb{F}}, \bar{P})$ such that

- $(\bar{\Omega}, \bar{\mathcal{F}}, \bar{\mathbb{F}})$ is a complete probability space endowed with a complete filtration $\bar{\mathbb{F}}$, which supports random variables $(\bar{\tau}, \bar{X}, \bar{U}, \bar{X}^1, \bar{U}^1, \dots)$.

- (\bar{X}, \bar{U}) and (\bar{X}^n, \bar{U}^n) are $\bar{\mathbb{P}}$ -Markov chains valued in $S \times W$, with transition kernels

$$\pi(x, u; \alpha^\lambda(\bar{\mu}, \bar{m}), \bar{m}; dx', du') \quad \text{and} \quad \pi(x, u; \alpha^\lambda(\bar{\mu}^n, \bar{m}^n), \bar{m}^n; dx', du'),$$

and the same initial distribution $m_0^*(u)(dx)p_0(u)$, satisfying $(\bar{X}_k^n, \bar{U}_k^n) \rightarrow (\bar{X}_k, \bar{U}_k), \forall k \in \mathbb{T}, \bar{\mathbb{P}}$ -a.s.

- $\bar{\tau}$ is an $\bar{\mathbb{F}}$ -stopping time valued in \mathbb{T} .
- The measures have the following representations:

$$\begin{aligned} m_t(u)(B) &= \bar{\mathbb{P}}[\bar{X}_t \in B, t < \bar{\tau} \mid \bar{U}_t = u], \quad B \in \mathcal{B}(S), \quad t \in \mathbb{T} \setminus \{T\}, \quad u \in \bar{W}_t, \\ \mu_t(u)(B) &= \bar{\mathbb{P}}[\bar{X}_t \in B, \bar{\tau} = t \mid \bar{U}_t = u], \quad B \in \mathcal{B}(S), \quad t \in \mathbb{T}, \quad u \in \bar{W}_t, \end{aligned}$$

with $\bar{W}_t := \{u \in W : \bar{\mathbb{P}}(\bar{U}_t = u) > 0\}$.

Consider the set $\bar{W}_t^n := \{u \in W : \bar{\mathbb{P}}(\bar{U}_t^n = u) > 0\}$. As $\bar{U}_k^n \rightarrow \bar{U}_k$ for each $k \in \mathbb{T}$ $\bar{\mathbb{P}}$ -a.s. and W is a finite set, we deduce that $\bar{U}_k^n = \bar{U}_k$ for sufficiently large n . Consequently, it follows that $\bar{W}_k^n = \bar{W}_k$ for sufficiently large n .

Now, for sufficiently large n , let us define

$$\begin{aligned} m_t^n(u)(B) &= \bar{\mathbb{P}}[\bar{X}_t^n \in B, t < \bar{\tau} \mid \bar{U}_t^n = u], \quad B \in \mathcal{B}(S), \quad t \in \mathbb{T} \setminus \{T\}, \quad u \in \bar{W}_t^n, \\ m_t^n(u) &= m_t(u), \quad t \in \mathbb{T} \setminus \{T\}, \quad u \notin \bar{W}_t^n, \\ \mu_t^n(u)(B) &:= \bar{\mathbb{P}}[\bar{X}_t^n \in B, \bar{\tau} = t \mid \bar{U}_t^n = u], \quad B \in \mathcal{B}(S), \quad t \in \mathbb{T}, \quad u \in \bar{W}_t^n, \\ \mu_t^n(u) &:= \mu_t(u), \quad t \in \mathbb{T}, \quad u \notin \bar{W}_t^n. \end{aligned}$$

Then, we have that $(\mu^n, m^n) \in \mathcal{R}^*(\bar{\mu}^n, \bar{m}^n) = \mathcal{R}[\bar{m}^n; \alpha^\lambda(\bar{\mu}^n, \bar{m}^n)]$ by a similar argument as in subsection 2.3.1.

We next proceed to show that $m^n \rightarrow m$, and the proof for $\mu^n \rightarrow \mu$ is similar. By the construction of m^n , we can restrict our attention to $u \in \bar{W}_t$. Then, for $t \in \mathbb{T} \setminus \{T\}$ and $u \in \bar{W}_t$, we consider a bounded and continuous function $\varphi : S \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that for n large enough, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_S \varphi(x) m_t^n(u)(dx) - \int_S \varphi(x) m_t(u)(dx) \right| &= \left| \mathbb{E}^{\bar{\mathbb{P}}}[\varphi(\bar{X}_t^n) I_{t < \bar{\tau}} \mid \bar{U}_t^n = u] - \mathbb{E}^{\bar{\mathbb{P}}}[\varphi(\bar{X}_t) I_{t < \bar{\tau}} \mid \bar{U}_t = u] \right| \\ &= \frac{\left| \mathbb{E}^{\bar{\mathbb{P}}}[\varphi(\bar{X}_t^n) I_{t < \bar{\tau}} I_{\bar{U}_t^n = u}] - \mathbb{E}^{\bar{\mathbb{P}}}[\varphi(\bar{X}_t) I_{t < \bar{\tau}} I_{\bar{U}_t = u}] \right|}{\bar{\mathbb{P}}(\bar{U}_t = u)} \\ &\leq C \mathbb{E}^{\bar{\mathbb{P}}}[\|\varphi(\bar{X}_t^n) - \varphi(\bar{X}_t)\|]. \end{aligned}$$

By the Dominated Convergence Theorem, we obtain the desired result. \square

By a direct modification of the proof of Lemma 4.4, we can get the next result.

Lemma 4.5. *Suppose that Assumptions 3.1 and 3.3 hold. Then, the set-valued mapping $\hat{\mathcal{R}}$ defined in (2.7) is continuous.*

Theorem 4.6. *Suppose that Assumptions 3.1-3.3 are satisfied, for every $\lambda > 0$, there exists a regularized equilibrium.*

Proof. We aim to apply Kakutani-Fan-Glicksberg's Theorem. First note that $\mathcal{C}_\mu \times \mathcal{C}_m$ is nonempty, compact, convex and is included in

$$\prod_{t \in \mathbb{T}} \mathcal{M}^s(S)^W \times \prod_{t \in \mathbb{T} \setminus \{T\}} \mathcal{M}^s(S)^W,$$

which is a locally convex Hausdorff space (endowed with the product topology and the set of finite signed measures endowed with the topology of weak convergence). Moreover, Θ defined in (2.12) has nonempty values since $\mathcal{R}^*[\mu, m]$ is compact by Lemma 4.2 and for each $(\bar{\mu}, \bar{m}, \alpha) \in \mathcal{C}_\mu \times \mathcal{C}_m \times \mathcal{A}$, the map $(\mu, m) \mapsto \Gamma[\bar{\mu}, \bar{m}, \alpha](\mu, m) \in \mathbb{R}$ is continuous on $\mathcal{C}_\mu \times \mathcal{C}_m$ by Lemma 4.3. This map is linear which gives that Θ has convex values. Again, by Lemma 4.3 and Remark 4.1, the map $(\mathcal{C}_\mu \times \mathcal{C}_m)^2 \ni ((\bar{\mu}, \bar{m}), (\mu, m)) \mapsto \Gamma[\bar{\mu}, \bar{m}; \alpha^\lambda(\bar{\mu}, \bar{m})](\mu, m) \in \mathbb{R}$ is continuous. This, together with Berge's Maximum Theorem (e.g., Theorem 17.31 in [1]), for which Lemma 4.4 is required, and the Closed Graph Theorem, implies that Θ has a closed graph. With the help of Kakutani-Fan-Glicksberg's fixed point theorem, we conclude that a regularized equilibrium exists. \square

5 Existence of Relaxed Equilibrium

Back to our original MFG problem, we need to address the existence of the relaxed equilibrium in Definition 2.3. As a direct modification of Lemma 1 in [2], we first have the next result.

Lemma 5.1. *Let Assumptions 3.1, 3.2, and 3.4 hold. Then, for sufficiently small $\lambda > 0$ and for any $t \in \mathbb{T} \setminus \{T\}$,*

$$\sup_{u \in W} |\mathcal{H}(\alpha_t^\lambda(u))| \leq \kappa_1 + \kappa_2 |\ln \lambda| + \ell \ln(1 + \sup_{u \in W} |V^\lambda(t+1, u)|),$$

where κ_1 and κ_2 are positive constants independent of λ .

Then, by the dynamic programming equation, we obtain

$$\sup_{u \in W} |V^\lambda(t, u)| \leq M + \kappa_1 \lambda + \kappa_2 \lambda |\ln \lambda| + \ell \lambda \ln(1 + \sup_{u \in W} |V^\lambda(t+1, u)|) + \sup_{u \in W} |V^\lambda(t+1, u)|,$$

where M is a positive function independent of λ . Thus, by induction, we arrive at the following result:

Lemma 5.2. *Let Assumptions 3.1, 3.2, and 3.4 hold. Given $\lambda_n \in (0, 1]$ with $\lambda_n \downarrow 0$, we have $\sup_{n,t,u} |V^{\lambda_n}(t, u)| < \infty$.*

We are now ready to present the main result.

Theorem 5.3. *Under Assumptions 3.1, 3.2, and 3.3, we have the following results:*

- *If $A \subset \mathbb{R}^\ell$ with $\text{Leb}(A) > 0$ and Assumption 3.4 holds, then a relaxed equilibrium exists.*
- *If $A = \{0, 1\}$, no further assumption is needed, and a relaxed equilibrium exists.*

Proof. Step 1: Major player's problem.

Case 1: $A \subset \mathbb{R}^\ell$ with $\text{Leb}(A) > 0$. Since $a \mapsto f_t^0(x, a, m)$ and $a \mapsto P_{t+1}^0(u, a, m, u')$ are continuous (by Assumptions 3.1 and 3.2), and A is compact, for any $(t, y, u, m) \in \mathbb{T} \setminus \{T\} \times \mathbb{R}^{|W|} \times W \times \mathcal{P}^{sub}(S)^W$, we have that

$$E_t(y, u, m) := \arg \max_{a \in A} \{f_t^0(\Psi_t(u), a, m(u)) + P_{t+1}^0(u, a, m(u), \cdot) \cdot y\}$$

is nonempty and compact, where $P_{t+1}^0(u, a, m(u), \cdot) := (P_{t+1}^0(u, a, m(u), u'))_{u' \in W}$. For any $(t, y, m) \in \mathbb{T} \setminus \{T\} \times \mathbb{R}^{|W|} \times \mathcal{P}^{sub}(S)^W$, consider the collection

$$\Gamma_t(y, m) := \{\alpha \in \mathcal{P}(A)^W : \text{supp}(\alpha(u)) \subset E_t(y, u, m), \quad \forall u \in W\}.$$

Take any sequence $\{\lambda_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ in $(0, 1]$ with $\lambda_n \downarrow 0$. By Theorem 4.6, for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists a regularized equilibrium $(\mu^n, m^n) \in \mathcal{C}_\mu \times \mathcal{C}_m$ with $\lambda = \lambda_n$. Since $\mathcal{C}_\mu \times \mathcal{C}_m$ is compact, the sequence (μ^n, m^n) has a subsequence (without relabeling) that converges to some $(\mu, m) \in \mathcal{C}_\mu \times \mathcal{C}_m$.

Furthermore, because the sequence $\{V^{\lambda_n}(t, u)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is bounded in \mathbb{R} (by Lemma 5.2), it has a subsequence (without relabeling) that converges to some $V(t, u) \in \mathbb{R}$ for any $(t, u) \in \mathbb{T} \times W$.

On the other hand, since A is compact, the set $\mathcal{P}(A)$ is compact under the weak topology of probability measures. Thus, for each $(t, u) \in \mathbb{T} \setminus \{T\} \times W$, the sequence $\{\alpha_t^{\lambda_n}(u)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ in $\mathcal{P}(A)$ has a subsequence (without relabeling) that converges weakly to some $\alpha_t(u) \in \mathcal{P}(A)$.

Now, we claim that $\alpha_t \in \Gamma_t(V(t+1, \cdot), m_t)$ for every $t \in \mathbb{T} \setminus \{T\}$, that is, we need to show that $\alpha_t(u) \in \mathcal{P}(A)$ is supported by the compact set $E_t(V(t+1, \cdot), u, m_t) \subset A$ for all $(t, u) \in \mathbb{T} \setminus \{T\} \times W$. Here, $V(t+1, \cdot) := (V(t+1, u'))_{u' \in W}$. Now let us fix a $t \in \mathbb{T} \setminus \{T\}$. Because this holds trivially when $E_t(V(t+1, \cdot), u, m_t) = A$, we assume $E_t(V(t+1, \cdot), u, m_t) \subsetneq A$ in the following. Our goal is to prove that for any $u \in W$, $\alpha_t(u)(B_r(a_0)) = 0$ for all $a_0 \in A$ and $r > 0$ such that

$$\overline{B_r(a_0)} \cap E_t(V(t+1, \cdot), u, m_t) = \emptyset \quad \text{and} \quad B_r(a_0) \subseteq A.$$

Note that this readily implies $\text{supp}(\alpha_t(u)) \subset E_t(V(t+1, \cdot), u, m_t)$ for all $u \in W$, as desired. To this end, take a continuous and bounded function $h : A \rightarrow [0, 1]$ such that

$$h(a) \equiv 1 \quad \text{for } u \in B_r(a_0) \quad \text{and} \quad h(a) \equiv 0 \quad \text{for } u \notin \overline{B_{r+d/2}(a_0)}, \quad (5.1)$$

where $d := \text{dist}(\overline{B_r(a_0)}, E_t(V(t+1, \cdot), u, m_t))$ is strictly positive because $\overline{B_r(a_0)}$ and $E_t(V(t+1, \cdot), u, m_t)$ are disjoint compact sets.

Consider $\beta_t(u) := \max_{a \in A} \{f_t^0(\Psi_t(u), a, m_t(u)) + P_{t+1}^0(u, a, m_t(u), \cdot) \cdot V(t+1, \cdot)\} < \infty$. Note that $d > 0$ implies

$$\varepsilon := \beta_t(u) - \sup\{f_t^0(\Psi_t(u), a, m_t(u)) + P_{t+1}^0(u, a, m_t(u), \cdot) \cdot V(t+1, \cdot) : a \in \overline{B_r(a_0)}\} > 0.$$

Also, by the continuity of $a \mapsto f_t^0(\Psi_t(u), a, m_t(u)) + P_{t+1}^0(u, a, m_t(u), \cdot) \cdot V(t+1, \cdot)$,

$$L := \text{Leb} \left(\left\{ a \in A : f_t^0(\Psi_t(u), a, m_t(u)) + P_{t+1}^0(u, a, m_t(u), \cdot) \cdot V(t+1, \cdot) \geq \beta_t(u) - \frac{\varepsilon}{4} \right\} \right) > 0.$$

As $V^{\lambda_n}(t+1, u) \rightarrow V(t+1, u)$, $f_t^0(\Psi_t(u), a, m_t^n(u)) \rightarrow f_t^0(\Psi_t(u), a, m_t(u))$ and $P_{t+1}^0(u, a, m_t^n(u), u') \rightarrow P_{t+1}^0(u, a, m_t(u), u')$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ large enough, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \beta_t(u) - \sup\{f_t^0(\Psi_t(u), a, m_t^n(u)) + P_{t+1}^0(u, a, m_t^n(u), \cdot) \cdot V^n(t+1, \cdot) : a \in \overline{B_r(a_0)}\} &> \frac{\varepsilon}{2}, \\ \text{Leb} \left(\left\{ a \in A : f_t^0(\Psi_t(u), a, m_t^n(u)) + P_{t+1}^0(u, a, m_t^n(u), \cdot) \cdot V^n(t+1, \cdot) \geq \beta_t(u) - \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \right\} \right) &\geq \frac{L}{2}, \end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality follows from the Berge Maximum Theorem. As a result, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} &\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_A h(a) \alpha_t^{\lambda_n}(u)(da) \\ &\leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\overline{B_{r+d/2}(a_0)}} h(a) \frac{e^{\frac{1}{\lambda_n}(f_t^0(\Psi_t(u), a, m_t^n(u)) + P_{t+1}^0(u, a, m_t^n(u), \cdot) \cdot V^n(t+1, \cdot))}}{\int_A e^{\frac{1}{\lambda_n}(f_t^0(\Psi_t(u), a, m_t^n(u)) + P_{t+1}^0(u, a, m_t^n(u), \cdot) \cdot V^n(t+1, \cdot))}}(da) \\ &= \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\overline{B_{r+d/2}(a_0)}} h(a) \frac{e^{\frac{1}{\lambda_n}(f_t^0(\Psi_t(u), a, m_t^n(u)) + P_{t+1}^0(u, a, m_t^n(u), \cdot) \cdot V^n(t+1, \cdot) - (\beta_t(u) - \varepsilon/2))}}{\int_A e^{\frac{1}{\lambda_n}(f_t^0(\Psi_t(u), a, m_t^n(u)) + P_{t+1}^0(u, a, m_t^n(u), \cdot) \cdot V^n(t+1, \cdot) - (\beta_t(u) - \varepsilon/2))}}(da) \\ &\leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\overline{B_{r+d/2}(a_0)}} h(a) \frac{e^{-\frac{\varepsilon}{2\lambda_n}}}{\int_{\{a \in A : f_t^0(\Psi_t(u), a, m_t^n(u)) + P_{t+1}^0(u, a, m_t^n(u), \cdot) \cdot V^n(t+1, \cdot) \geq \beta_t(u) - \frac{\varepsilon}{2}\}} 1(da) \\ &\leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{2e^{-\frac{\varepsilon}{2\lambda_n}}}{L} \text{Leb} \left(\overline{B_{r+d/2}(a_0)} \right) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

In view that h is continuous and bounded that satisfies (5.1), it holds that

$$\alpha_t(u) \left(\overline{B_r(a_0)} \right) \leq \int_A h(a) \alpha_t(u)(da) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_A h(a) \alpha_t^{\lambda_n}(u)(da) = 0$$

The claim $\alpha_t \in \Gamma_t(V(t+1, \cdot), m_t)$ for every $t \in \mathbb{T} \setminus \{T\}$ follows from the arbitrariness of t .

We next prove that for any $(t, u) \in \mathbb{T} \setminus \{T\} \times W$,

$$V(t, u) = \int_A f_t^0(\Psi_t(u), a, m_t(u)) \alpha_t(u)(da) + \sum_{u' \in W} V(t+1, u') \int_A P_{t+1}^0(u, a, m_t(u), u') \alpha_t(u)(da),$$

$$V(T, u) = g^0(\Psi_T(u), \mu_T(u)),$$

which, combined with the fact that $\alpha_t \in \Gamma_t(V(t+1, \cdot), m_t)$ for every $t \in \mathbb{T} \setminus \{T\}$, implies that V satisfies the following dynamic programming equation:

$$\begin{aligned} V(t, u) &= \sup_{\alpha \in \mathcal{P}(A)^W} \left\{ \int_A f_t^0(\Psi_t(u), a, m_t(u)) \alpha(u)(da) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \sum_{u' \in W} V(t+1, u') \int_A P_{t+1}^0(u, a, m_t(u), u') \alpha(u)(da) \right\}, \\ V(T, u) &= g^0(\Psi_T(u), \mu_T(u)). \end{aligned}$$

Recall that for every $t \in \mathbb{T} \setminus \{T\}$, V^{λ_n} satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} V^{\lambda_n}(t, u) &= \int_A f_t^0(\Psi_t(u), a, m_t^n(u)) \alpha_t^{\lambda_n}(u)(da) + \lambda_n \mathcal{H}(\alpha_t^{\lambda_n}(u)) \\ &\quad + \sum_{u' \in W} V^{\lambda_n}(t+1, u') \int_A P_{t+1}^0(u, a, m_t^n(u), u') \alpha_t^{\lambda_n}(u)(da). \end{aligned}$$

Taking the limit as $n \rightarrow \infty$, by Assumptions 3.1 and 3.2 and applying Lemma B.1 and Lemma 5.1, we arrive at the following result:

$$V(t, u) = \int_A f_t^0(\Psi_t(u), a, m_t(u)) \alpha_t(u)(da) + \sum_{u' \in W} V(t+1, u') \int_A P_{t+1}^0(u, a, m_t(u), u') \alpha_t(u)(da).$$

Furthermore, $V(T, u) = g^0(\Psi_T(u), \mu_T(u))$ follows directly from taking the limit.

Finally, by a standard verification argument, we can conclude that α solves the major player's problem (2.5) corresponding to (μ, m) , that is, $\alpha \in \mathbb{A}(\mu, m)$.

Case 2: $A = \{0, 1\}$. It is clear that for any $t \in \mathbb{T} \setminus \{T\}$,

$$|\mathcal{H}(\alpha_t^\lambda(u))| \leq 2 \max_{p \in [0,1]} |p \log(p)| = \frac{2}{e}. \quad (5.2)$$

In a similar fashion, we can obtain the uniform boundedness of the value function V^λ with $\lambda \in [0, 1]$. Note that $\alpha_t^\lambda(u) \in \mathcal{P}(\{0, 1\})$ for any $(t, u) \in \mathbb{T} \setminus \{T\} \times W$. Therefore, there exists a sequence $\{\lambda_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ in $(0, 1]$ with $\lambda_n \rightarrow 0$ such that $((\mu^n, m^n), V^{\lambda_n}, \alpha^{\lambda_n})$ converges to $((\mu, m), V, \alpha)$.

Define for any $(t, u) \in \mathbb{T} \setminus \{T\} \times W$ and $i = 0, 1$,

$$g(t, u, i) := f_t^0(\Psi_t(u), i, m_t(u)) + \sum_{u' \in W} V(t+1, u') P_{t+1}^0(u, i, m_t(u), u').$$

We claim that, for any $(t, u) \in \mathbb{T} \setminus \{T\} \times W$,

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_t(u)(1) &= 0, \alpha_t(u)(0) = 1, \text{ if } g(t, u, 0) > g(t, u, 1), \\ \alpha_t(u)(1) &= 1, \alpha_t(u)(0) = 0, \text{ if } g(t, u, 0) < g(t, u, 1). \end{aligned} \quad (5.3)$$

We prove the case when $g(t, u, 0) > g(t, u, 1)$. Let $\varepsilon := g(t, u, 0) - g(t, u, 1) > 0$. Recall that

$$\alpha_t^{\lambda_n}(u)(1) = \frac{e^{\frac{1}{\lambda_n} g^n(t, u, 1)}}{\sum_{i=0}^1 e^{\frac{1}{\lambda_n} g^n(t, u, i)}} = \frac{1}{1 + e^{\frac{1}{\lambda_n} (g^n(t, u, 0) - g^n(t, u, 1))}}, \quad t \in \mathbb{T} \setminus \{T\},$$

where

$$g^n(t, u, i) := f_t^0(\Psi_t(u), i, m_t^n(u)) + \sum_{u' \in W} V^{\lambda_n}(t+1, u') P_{t+1}^0(u, i, m_t^n(u), u').$$

Thanks to Assumptions 3.1 and 3.2, we obtain that $g^n(t, u, i) \rightarrow g(t, u, i)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Then, $g^n(t, u, 0) - g^n(t, u, 1) \geq \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$ when n is large enough. Hence,

$$\alpha_t(u)(1) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \alpha_t^{\lambda_n}(u)(1) \leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{1 + e^{\frac{\varepsilon}{2\lambda_n}}} = 0.$$

We next proceed to show that

$$\begin{aligned} V(t, u) &= \sum_{i=0}^1 f_t^0(\Psi_t(u), i, m_t(u)) \alpha_t(u)(i) + \sum_{u' \in W, i \in \{0,1\}} V(t+1, u') P_{t+1}^0(u, i, m_t(u), u') \alpha_t(u)(i), \\ V(T, u) &= g^0(\Psi_T(u), \mu_T(u)), \end{aligned}$$

which can be verified by taking the limit in the equations below, noting the uniform bound in (5.2):

$$\begin{aligned} V^{\lambda_n}(t, u) &= \sum_{i=0}^1 f_t^0(\Psi_t(u), i, m_t^n(u)) \alpha_t^{\lambda_n}(u)(i) + \lambda_n \mathcal{H}(\alpha_t^{\lambda_n}(u)) \\ &\quad + \sum_{u' \in W, i \in \{0,1\}} V^{\lambda_n}(t+1, u') P_{t+1}^0(u, i, m_t^n(u), u') \alpha_t^{\lambda_n}(u)(i), \\ V^{\lambda_n}(T, u) &= g^0(\Psi_T(u), \mu_T^n(u)). \end{aligned}$$

This, together with (5.3), implies that V satisfies the dynamic programming equation. Therefore, a standard verification argument yields that α solves the major player's problem associated with (μ, m) , i.e., $\alpha \in \mathbb{A}(\mu, m)$.

Step 2: Minor player's problem

We have shown in step 1 that $\alpha \in \mathbb{A}(\mu, m)$. Next, we will prove that $(\mu, m) \in \hat{\Theta}(\mu, m, \alpha)$, that is,

$$\max_{(\tilde{\mu}, \tilde{m}) \in \hat{\mathcal{R}}(\mu, m, \alpha)} \Gamma[(\mu, m; \alpha)](\tilde{\mu}, \tilde{m}) \leq \Gamma[(\mu, m; \alpha)](\mu, m),$$

which further implies that (μ, m) is a fixed point of the set-valued mapping Θ^* defined in (2.9), and hence is a relaxed equilibrium.

To verify the previous claim, we recall that

$$\max_{(\tilde{\mu}, \tilde{m}) \in \hat{\mathcal{R}}(\mu^n, m^n, \alpha^{\lambda_n})} \Gamma[(\mu^n, m^n; \alpha^{\lambda_n})](\tilde{\mu}, \tilde{m}) \leq \Gamma[(\mu^n, m^n; \alpha^{\lambda_n})](\mu^n, m^n).$$

For the RHS of above equation, by Lemma 4.3, we obtain

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \Gamma[(\mu^n, m^n; \alpha^{\lambda_n})](\mu^n, m^n) = \Gamma[(\mu, m; \alpha)](\mu, m).$$

For the LHS, by Lemma 4.2, Lemma 4.3, Lemma 4.5 and the Berge Maximum Theorem, we obtain that the function $\psi(\mu, m, \alpha)$

$$\psi(\mu, m, \alpha) := \max_{(\tilde{\mu}, \tilde{m}) \in \tilde{\mathcal{R}}(\mu, m, \alpha)} \Gamma[(\mu, m; \alpha)](\tilde{\mu}, \tilde{m})$$

is continuous. Therefore, it holds that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \max_{(\tilde{\mu}, \tilde{m}) \in \tilde{\mathcal{R}}(\mu^n, m^n, \alpha^{\lambda_n})} \Gamma[(\mu^n, m^n; \alpha^{\lambda_n})](\tilde{\mu}, \tilde{m}) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \psi(\mu^n, m^n, \alpha^{\lambda_n}) = \psi(\mu, m, \alpha),$$

which completes the proof. \square

A Probability Space Setup

In this section, we provide some detailed construction of the filtered probability space that has been used in the proof of Lemma 4.4. Let us consider a probability space $(\Theta, \mathcal{B}_\Theta, \mathbb{P}_\vartheta)$, where we assume that \mathbb{P}_ϑ is atomless. This assumption guarantees the existence of Borel measurable functions $h : \Theta \rightarrow [0, 1]$ such that h is uniformly distributed on $[0, 1]$ when viewed as a random variable on $(\Theta, \mathcal{B}_\Theta, \mathbb{P}_\vartheta)$. These uniform random variables, constructed via the functions h , will be employed repeatedly along with the following classical result from measure theory, which can be found in [11].

Lemma A.1. (*Blackwell-Dubins lemma*) *For any Polish space B , there exists a measurable function $\rho_B : \mathcal{P}(B) \times [0, 1] \mapsto B$, which we shall call the Blackwell-Dubins function of the space B , satisfying:*

- (i) *for each $\nu \in \mathcal{P}(B)$ and each uniform random variable $U \sim U(0, 1)$, the B -valued random variable $\rho_B(\nu, U)$ has distribution ν ;*
- (ii) *for almost every $u \in [0, 1]$, the function $\nu \mapsto \rho_B(\nu, u)$ is continuous for the weak topology of $\mathcal{P}(B)$.*

Consider the canonical probability space $(\Omega^c, \mathcal{F}^c, \mathbb{P}^c)$, defined as follows:

$$\Omega^c := \underbrace{\Theta \times \Theta \times \cdots \times \Theta}_{T+1}, \quad \mathcal{F}^c := \underbrace{\mathcal{B}_\Theta \times \mathcal{B}_\Theta \times \cdots \times \mathcal{B}_\Theta}_{T+1},$$

and equipped with the product probability measure

$$\mathbb{P}^c := \underbrace{\mathbb{P}_\vartheta \otimes \mathbb{P}_\vartheta \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathbb{P}_\vartheta}_{T+1}.$$

A generic element $\omega \in \Omega^c$ is represented as $\omega = (\theta_0, \theta_1, \dots, \theta_T)$, and the random variables ϑ_n are realized as coordinate mappings, defined for $n \in \mathbb{T}$ by $\vartheta_n(\omega) = \theta_n$. We introduce the filtration $\mathbb{F} = (\mathcal{F}_n)_{n \in \mathbb{T}}$, where $\mathcal{F}_n = \sigma\{\theta_0, \dots, \theta_n\}$, $n \in \mathbb{T}$. Consider the following system:

$$\begin{aligned} (X_0, U_0) &= (X_0^n, U_0^n) = \rho_B(m_0^*(u)(dx)p_0(u), h(\vartheta_0)), \quad n \in \mathbb{N}, \\ (X_{t+1}, U_{t+1}) &= \rho_B(\pi_{t+1}(X_t, U_t), h(\vartheta_{t+1})), \quad t \in \mathbb{T} \setminus \{T\}, \\ (X_{t+1}^n, U_{t+1}^n) &= \rho_B(\pi_{t+1}^n(X_t^n, U_t^n), h(\vartheta_{t+1})), \quad t \in \mathbb{T} \setminus \{T\}, \quad n \in \mathbb{N}, \end{aligned}$$

where $B = S \times W$ and

$$\pi_{t+1}^n(x, u) = \pi_{t+1}(x, u; \alpha_t^n(u), m_t^n(u); dx', du'), \pi_{t+1}(x, u) = \pi_{t+1}(x, u; \alpha_t(u), m_t(u); dx', du')$$

with $\alpha^n \rightarrow \alpha$ and $m^n \rightarrow m$.

Thus, (X, U) and (X^n, U^n) are \mathbb{F} -Markov processes with transition kernels π and π^n , respectively. We now show by induction that for any $k \in \mathbb{T}$, $(X_k^n, U_k^n) \rightarrow (X_k, U_k)$ \mathbb{P}^c -almost surely. The base case $k = 0$ is obvious. Assume that $(X_k^n, U_k^n) \rightarrow (X_k, U_k)$ \mathbb{P}^c -a.s. By Remark 3.2, Lemma A.1, and the induction hypothesis, we conclude that $(X_{k+1}^n, U_{k+1}^n) \rightarrow (X_{k+1}, U_{k+1})$ \mathbb{P}^c -a.s, which verifies the claim.

B A Technical Lemma

We document here a technical result established in [14], which is frequently used in our previous proofs of several main results.

Lemma B.1 (Lemma F.1 in [14]). *Let \mathcal{X} and \mathcal{Y} be complete, separable metric spaces, and let $\varphi : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be bounded and continuous. Then, the map*

$$\mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{X}) \ni (y, \nu) \mapsto \int_{\mathcal{X}} \varphi(x, y) \nu(dx)$$

is continuous.

Acknowledgement: X. Yu is supported by the Hong Kong Polytechnic University research Grant under No. P0045654 and by the Research Centre for Quantitative Finance at the Hong Kong Polytechnic University under grant No. P0042708.

References

- [1] C. D. ALIPRANTIS AND K. C. BORDER, *Infinite Dimensional Analysis: a Hitchhiker's Guide*, Springer, Berlin; London, 2006.
- [2] E. BAYRAKTAR, Y.-J. HUANG, Z. WANG, AND Z. ZHOU, *Relaxed Equilibria for Time-Inconsistent Markov Decision Processes*, Mathematics of Operations Research, forthcoming (2024).
- [3] A. BENSOUSSAN, M. H. M. CHAU, AND S. C. P. YAM, *Mean Field Games with a Dominating Player*, Applied Mathematics & Optimization, 74 (2016), pp. 91–128.
- [4] C. BERTUCCI, *Optimal stopping in mean field games, an obstacle problem approach*, Journal de Mathématiques Pures et Appliquées, 120 (2018), pp. 165–194.
- [5] G. BOUVERET, R. DUMITRESCU, AND P. TANKOV, *Mean-field games of optimal stopping: A relaxed solution approach*, SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization, 58 (2020), pp. 1795–1821.

- [6] P. CARDALIAGUET, *Notes on mean field games*, Notes from P.L. Lions lectures at Collège de France, (2013).
- [7] R. CARMONA AND F. DELARUE, *Probabilistic Theory of Mean Field Games with Applications I Mean Field FBSDEs, Control and Games*, Springer, 2018.
- [8] ———, *Probabilistic Theory of Mean Field Games with Applications II: Mean Field Games with Common Noise and Master Equations*, Springer, 2018.
- [9] R. CARMONA, F. DELARUE, AND D. LACKER, *Mean field games with common noise*, The Annals of Probability, 44 (2016), pp. 3740–3803.
- [10] ———, *Mean Field Games of Timing and Models for Bank Runs*, Applied Mathematics & Optimization, 76 (2017), pp. 217–260.
- [11] R. CARMONA, M. LAURIÈRE, AND Z. TAN, *Model-free mean-field reinforcement learning: Mean-field MDP and mean-field Q-learning*, The Annals of Applied Probability, 33 (2023), pp. 5334 – 5381.
- [12] R. CARMONA AND P. WANG, *An Alternative Approach to Mean Field Game with Major and Minor Players, and Applications to Herders Impacts*, Applied Mathematics & Optimization, 76 (2017), pp. 5–27.
- [13] R. CARMONA AND X. ZHU, *A probabilistic approach to mean field games with major and minor players*, The Annals of Applied Probability, 26 (2016), pp. 1535 – 1580.
- [14] R. DUMITRESCU, M. LEUTSCHER, AND P. TANKOV, *Control and optimal stopping Mean Field Games: a linear programming approach*, Electronic Journal of Probability, 26 (2021), pp. 1 – 49.
- [15] ———, *Energy transition under scenario uncertainty: a mean-field game of stopping with common noise*, Mathematics and Financial Economics, 18 (2023), pp. 233 – 274.
- [16] X. GUO, A. HU, AND J. ZHANG, *Optimization frameworks and sensitivity analysis of stackelberg mean-field games*, arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.04110, (2022).
- [17] X. GUO, A. HU, AND J. ZHANG, *Mf-omo: An optimization formulation of mean-field games*, SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization, 62 (2024), pp. 243–270.
- [18] M. HUANG, *Large-Population LQG Games Involving a Major Player: The Nash Certainty Equivalence Principle*, SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization, 48 (2010), pp. 3318–3353.
- [19] M. HUANG, R. P. MALHAME, AND P. E. CAINES, *Large population stochastic dynamic games: Closed-loop McKean-Vlasov systems and the Nash certainty equivalence principle*, Communications in Information and Systems, 6 (2006), pp. 221–251.
- [20] T. KURTZ, *Martingale Problems for Conditional Distributions of Markov Processes*, Electronic Journal of Probability, 3 (1998).
- [21] D. LACKER, *Mean field games via controlled martingale problems: Existence of Markovian equilibria*, Stochastic Processes and their Applications, 125 (2015), pp. 2856–2894.
- [22] J.-M. LASRY AND P.-L. LIONS, *Mean field games*, Japanese Journal of Mathematics, 2 (2007), pp. 229–260.
- [23] S. L. NGUYEN AND M. HUANG, *Linear-Quadratic-Gaussian Mixed Games with Continuum-Parametrized Minor Players*, SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization, 50 (2012), pp. 2907–2937.

- [24] M. NUTZ, *A mean field game of optimal stopping*, SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization, 56 (2018), pp. 1206–1221.
- [25] X. YU AND F. YUAN, *Time-inconsistent mean-field stopping problems: A regularized equilibrium approach*, Preprint, available at arXiv:2311.00381, (2023).