
INFINITE HORIZON MARKOV ECONOMIES

Denizalp Goktas*

Department of Computer Science
Brown University
Providence, RI
denizalp_goktas@brown.edu

Sadie Zhao*

SEAS
Harvard University
Cambridge, MA
sadie_zhao@g.harvard.edu

Yiling Chen

SEAS
Harvard University
Cambridge, MA
yiling@seas.harvard.edu

Amy Greenwald

Department of Computer Science
Brown University
Providence, RI
amy_greenwald@brown.edu

ABSTRACT

In this paper, we study a generalization of Markov games and pseudo-games that we call Markov pseudo-games, which like the former, captures time and uncertainty, and like the latter, allows for the players' actions to determine the set of actions available to the other players. In the same vein as [Arrow and Debreu](#), we intend for this model to be rich enough to encapsulate a broad mathematical framework for modeling economies. We then prove the existence of a game-theoretic equilibrium in our model, which in turn implies the existence of a general equilibrium in the corresponding economies. Finally, going beyond [Arrow and Debreu](#), we introduce a solution method for Markov pseudo-games, and prove its polynomial-time convergence.

We then provide an application of Markov pseudo-games to infinite-horizon Markov exchange economies, a stochastic economic model that extends [Radner](#)'s stochastic exchange economy and [Magill and Quinzii](#)'s infinite horizon incomplete markets model. We show that under suitable assumptions, the solutions of any infinite horizon Markov exchange economy (i.e., recursive Radner equilibria—RRE) can be formulated as the solution to a concave Markov pseudo-game, thus establishing the existence of RRE, and providing first-order methods for approximating RRE. Finally, we demonstrate the effectiveness of our approach in practice by building the corresponding generative adversarial policy neural network, and using it to compute RRE in a variety of infinite-horizon Markov exchange economies.

*Both authors contributed equally to the paper.

1 Introduction

In 1896, Léon Walras formulated a mathematical model of markets as a resource allocation system comprising supply and demand functions that map values for resources, called *prices*, to quantities of resources—*ceteris paribus*, i.e., all else being equal. Walras argued that any market would eventually settle into a steady state, which he called *competitive* (nowadays, also called *Walrasian*) *equilibrium*, as a collection of prices and associated supply and demand s.t. the demand is *feasible*, i.e., the demand for each resource is less than or equal to its supply, and *Walras' law* holds, i.e., the value of the supply is equal to the value of the demand. Unlike in Walras' model, real-world markets do not exist in isolation but are part of an *economy*. Indeed, the supply and demand of resources in one market depend not only on prices in that market, but also on the supply and demand of resources in other markets. If every market in an economy is simultaneously at a competitive equilibrium, Walras' law holds for the economy as a whole; this steady state, now a property of the economy, is called a *general equilibrium*.

Beyond Walras' early forays into competitive equilibrium analysis, foremost to the development of the theory of general equilibrium was the introduction of a broad mathematical framework for modeling economies, which is known today as the *Arrow-Debreu competitive economy* (Arrow and Debreu, 1954). In this same paper, Arrow and Debreu developed their seminal game-theoretic model, namely (quasi)concave pseudo-games, and proved the existence of generalized Nash equilibrium in this model. Since this game-theoretic model is sufficiently rich to capture Arrow-Debreu economies, they obtained as a corollary the existence of general equilibrium in these economies.

In their model, Arrow and Debreu posit a set of resources, modeled as commodities, each of which is assigned a price; a set of consumers, each choosing a quantity of each commodity to consume in exchange for their endowment; and a set of firms, each choosing a quantity of each commodity to produce, with prices determining (*aggregate*) *demand*, i.e., the sum of the consumptions across all consumers, and (*aggregate*) *supply*, i.e., the sum of endowments and productions across all consumers and firms, respectively. This model is *static*, as it comprises only a single period model, but it is nonetheless rich, as commodities can be state and time contingent, with each one representing a good or service which can be bought or sold in a single time period, but that encodes delivery opportunities at a finite number of distinct points in time. Following Arrow and Debreu's seminal existence result, the literature would slowly turn away from static economies, which do not *explicitly* involve time and uncertainty, such as Arrow-Debreu competitive economies.

Arrow and Debreu's model fails to provide a comprehensive account of the economic activity observed in the real world, especially that which is designed to account for *time* and *uncertainty*. Chief among these activities are *asset markets*, which allow consumers and firms to insure themselves against uncertainty about future states of the world. Indeed, while static economies with state- and time-contingent commodities can *implicitly* incorporate time and uncertainty, the assumption that a complete set of state- and time-contingent commodities are available at the time of trade is highly unrealistic. Arrow (1964) thus proposed to enhance the Arrow-Debreu competitive economy with *assets* (or *securities* or *stocks*),² i.e., contracts between two consumers which promise the delivery of commodities by its seller to its buyer at a future date. In particular, Arrow introduced an asset type nowadays known as the *numéraire Arrow security*, which transfers one unit of a designated commodity used as a unit of account—the *numéraire*—when a particular state of the world is observed, and nothing otherwise. As the numéraire is often interpreted as money, assets which deliver only some amount of the numéraire, are called *financial assets*.

²Some authors (e.g., Geanakoplos (1990)) distinguish between assets, stocks, and securities, instead defining securities (resp. stocks) as those assets which are defined exogenously (resp. endogenously), e.g., government bonds (resp. company stocks). As this distinction makes no mathematical difference to our results, and is only relevant to stylized models, we make no such distinction.

Formally, Arrow considered a *two-step stochastic exchange economy*. In the initial state, consumers can buy or sell *numéraire* Arrow securities in a *financial asset market*. Following these trades, the economy stochastically transitions to one of finitely many other states in which consumers receive returns on their initial investment and participate in a *spot market*, i.e., a market for the immediate delivery of commodities, modeled as a static exchange economy—which, for our purposes, is better called an *exchange market*.³ A general equilibrium of this economy is then simply prices for financial assets *and* commodities, which lead to a feasible allocation of all resources (i.e., financial assets and spot market commodities) that satisfies Walras' law.

Arrow (1964) demonstrated that the general equilibrium consumptions of an exchange economy with state- and time-contingent commodities can be implemented by the general equilibrium spot market consumptions of a two-step stochastic economy with a considerably smaller, yet *complete* set of *numéraire* Arrow securities, i.e., a set of securities available for purchase in the first period that allow consumers to transfer wealth to *all* possible states of the world that can be realized in the second period. In conjunction with the welfare theorems (Debreu, 1951; Arrow, 1951), this result implies that economies with *complete financial asset markets*, i.e., economies with such a complete set of securities, achieve a Pareto-optimal allocation of commodities by ensuring optimal risk-bearing via financial asset markets; and conversely, any Pareto-optimal allocation of commodities in economies with time and uncertainty can be realized as a competitive equilibrium of a complete financial asset market.

Arrow's contributions led to the development of a new class of general equilibrium models, namely *stochastic economies* (or *dynamic stochastic general equilibrium—DSGE—models*) (Geanakoplos, 1990).⁴ At a high-level, these models comprise a sequence of world states and spot markets, which are linked across time by asset markets, with each next state of the world (resp. spot market) determined by a stochastic process that is independent of market interactions (resp. dependent only on their asset purchase) in the current state. Mathematically, the key difference between a static and a stochastic economy is that consumers in a stochastic economy face a collection of budget constraints, one per time-step, rather than only one. Indeed, Arrow (1964)'s proof that general equilibrium consumptions in stochastic complete economies are equivalent to general equilibrium consumptions in static state- and time-contingent commodity economies relies on proving that the many budget constraints in a complete stochastic economy can be reduced to a single one.

Stochastic economies were introduced to model arbitrary finite time horizons (Radner, 1968) and a variety of risky asset classes (e.g., stocks (Diamond, 1967), risky assets (Lintner, 1975), derivatives (Black and Scholes, 1973), capital assets (Mossin, 1966), debts (Modigliani and Miller, 1958) etc.), eventually leading to the emergence of *stochastic economies with incomplete asset markets* (Magill and Shafer, 1991; Magill and Quinzii, 2002; Geanakoplos, 1990), or colloquially, *(incomplete) stochastic economies*.⁵ Unlike in Arrow's stochastic economy, the asset market is not complete in such economies, so consumers cannot necessarily insure themselves against all future world states.

³An (Arrow-Debreu) exchange economy is simply an (Arrow-Debreu) competitive economy without firms. Historically, for simplicity, it has become standard practice *not* to model firms, as most, if not all, results extend directly to settings with firms. In line with this practice, we do not model firms, but note that our results and methods also extend directly to settings that include firms.

⁴As these models incorporate both time and uncertainty, they are often referred to as dynamic stochastic general equilibrium models. Nonetheless, we opt for the stochastic economy nomenclature, because, as we demonstrate in this paper, these economies can be seen as instances of (generalized) stochastic games.

⁵While many authors have called these models incomplete economies (Geanakoplos, 1990; Magill and Quinzii, 2002; Magill and Shafer, 1991), these models capture both incomplete and complete asset markets. In contrast, we refer to stochastic economies with incomplete or complete asset markets as *stochastic economies*, adding the (in)complete epithet only when necessary to indicate that the asset market is (in)complete.

The archetypal stochastic economy is the *Radner stochastic exchange economy*, deriving its name from Radner's proof of existence of a general equilibrium in his model (Radner, 1972). Radner's economy is a finite-horizon stochastic economy comprising a sequence of spot markets, linked across time by asset markets. At each time period, a finite set of consumers observe a world state and trade in an asset market and a spot market, modeled as an exchange market. Each *asset market* comprises *assets*, modelled as time-contingent *generalized Arrow securities*, which specify quantities of the commodities the seller is obliged to transfer to its buyer, should the relevant state of the economy be realized at some specified future time.⁶ Consumers can buy and sell assets, thereby transferring their wealth across time, all the while insuring themselves against uncertainty about the future. The canonical solution concept for stochastic economies, *Radner equilibrium* (also called *sequential competitive equilibrium*⁷ (Mas-Colell et al., 1995), *rational expectations equilibrium* (Radner, 1979), and *general equilibrium with incomplete markets* (Geanakoplos, 1990)), is a collection of history-dependent prices for commodities and assets, as well as history-dependent consumptions of commodities and portfolios of assets, such that, for all histories, the aggregate demand for commodities and the *aggregate demand for assets* (i.e., the total number of assets bought) are feasible and satisfy Walras' law.

In spite of substantial interest in stochastic economies among microeconomists throughout the 1970s, the literature eventually trailed off, perhaps due to a seeming difficulty in proving existence of a general equilibrium in simple economies with incomplete asset markets that allow assets to be sold short (Geanakoplos, 1990), or to the lack of a second welfare theorem (Dreze, 1974; Hart, 1975). Financial and macroeconomists stepped up, however, with financial economists seeking to further develop the theoretical aspects of stochastic economies (see, for instance, Magill and Quinzii (2002)), and macroeconomists seeking practical methods by which to solve stochastic economies in order to determine the impact of various policy choices (via simulation; see, for instance, Sargent and Ljungqvist (2000)).

Infinite horizon stochastic economies are one of the new and interesting directions in this more recent work on stochastic economies. Infinite horizon models come with one significant difficulty that has no counterpart in a finite horizon model, namely the possibility for agents to run a *Ponzi scheme* via asset markets, in which they borrow but then indefinitely postpone repaying their debts by refinancing them continually, from one period to the next. From this perspective infinite horizon models represent very interesting objects of study, not only theoretically; it has also been argued that they are a better modeling paradigm for macroeconomists who employ simulations (Magill and Quinzii, 1994), because they facilitate the modeling of complex phenomena, such as asset bubbles (Huang and Werner, 2000), which can be impacted by economic policy decisions.

Magill and Quinzii (1994) introduced an extension of Radner's model to an infinite horizon setting, albeit with financial assets, and presented suitable assumptions under which a sequential competitive equilibrium is guaranteed to exist in this model. Progress on the computational aspects of stochastic economies has been slow, however, and mostly confined to finite horizon settings (see, Sargent and Ljungqvist (2000) and Volume 2 of Taylor and Woodford (1999) for a standard survey and Fernández-Villaverde (2023) for a more recent entry-level survey of computational methods used by macroeconomists). Indeed, demands for novel computational methods for solving macroeconomic models, and theoretical frameworks in which to understand their computational complexity, have been repeatedly shared by macroeconomists (Taylor and

⁶Here, Arrow securities are "generalized" in the sense that they can deliver different quantities of *many* commodities at different states of the world, rather than only one unit of a commodity at only one state of the world. Although Arrow (1964) considered only *numéraire* securities, his theory was subsequently generalized to generalized Arrow securities (Geanakoplos, 1990).

⁷This terminology does not contradict the economy being at a competitive equilibrium, but rather indicates that at all times, the spot and asset markets are at a competitive equilibrium, hence implying the overall economy is at a general equilibrium.

Woodford, 1999). This gap in the literature points to a novel research opportunity; however, it is challenging for non-macroeconomists to approach these problems with their computational tools.

Contributions In Section 3, we introduce Markov pseudo-games, and we establish the existence of (pure) *generalized Markov perfect equilibria (GMPE)* in concave Markov pseudo-games (Theorem 3.1). This result can be seen as a stochastic generalization of Arrow and Debreu (1954)’s existence result for (pure) generalized Nash equilibrium in concave pseudo-games (Facchinei and Kanzow, 2010). To the best of our knowledge, it also implies the existence of pure (or deterministic) Markov perfect equilibria in a large class of continuous-action Markov games for which existence was heretofore known only in mixed (or randomized) policies (Fink, 1964; Takahashi, 1964).

Although the computation of GMPE is PPAD-hard in general, because GMPE generalize Nash equilibrium, we reduce this computational problem to generative adversarial learning between a generator, who produces a candidate equilibrium policy profile, and an adversary, who produces a policy profile of best responses to the candidate equilibrium (Goktas et al., 2023a) (Observation 1). Assuming parameterized policies, and taking advantage of the recent progress on solving generative adversarial learning problems (e.g., (Lin et al., 2020; Daskalakis et al., 2020)), we show that a policy profile which is a stationary point of the exploitability (i.e., the players’ cumulative maximum regret) can be computed in polynomial time under mild assumptions (Theorem 3.2). This result implies that a policy profile that satisfies necessary first-order stationarity conditions for a GMPE in Markov pseudo-games with a bounded best-response mismatch coefficient (Lemma 4)—i.e., those Markov pseudo-games in which states explored by any GMPE are easily explored under the initial state distribution—can be computed in polynomial time, a result which is analogous known computational results for zero-sum Markov games (Daskalakis et al., 2020). As our theoretical computational guarantees apply to policies represented by neural networks, we obtain the first, to our knowledge, deep reinforcement learning algorithm with theoretical guarantees for general-sum games.

In Section 4, we introduce an extension of Magill and Quinzii (1994)’s infinite horizon exchange economy, which we call the *infinite horizon Markov exchange economy*. On the one hand, our model generalizes Magill and Quinzii’s to a setting with arbitrary, not just financial assets; on the other hand, we restrict the transition model to be Markov. The Markov restriction allows us to prove the existence of a *recursive Radner equilibrium (RRE)* (Mehra and Prescott, 1977) (Theorem 4.1). Our proof reformulates the set of RRE of any infinite horizon Markov exchange economy as the set of GMPE of an associated generalized Markov game (Theorem 4.1). To our knowledge, ours is the first result of its kind for such a general setting, as previous recursive competitive equilibrium existence proofs were restricted to economies with one consumer (also called the representative agent), one commodity, or one asset (Mehra and Prescott, 1977; Prescott and Mehra, 1980). The aforementioned results allow us to conclude that a stationary point of the exploitability of the Markov pseudo-game associated with any infinite horizon Markov exchange economy can be computed in polynomial time (Theorem 4.2).

Finally, in Section 5 we implement our policy gradient method in the form of a generative adversarial policy network (GAPNet), and use it to try to find RRE in three infinite horizon Markov exchange economies with three different types of utility functions. Experimentally, we find that our GAPNet produces approximate equilibrium policies that are closer to GMPE than those produced by a standard baseline for solving stochastic economies.

2 Preliminaries

Notation. We use caligraphic uppercase letters to denote sets (e.g., \mathcal{X}), bold uppercase letters to denote matrices (e.g., \mathbf{X}), bold lowercase letters to denote vectors (e.g., \mathbf{p}), lowercase letters to denote scalar quantities (e.g., x), and uppercase letters to denote random variables (e.g., X). We denote the i th row vector of a matrix (e.g., \mathbf{X}) by the corresponding bold lowercase letter with subscript i (e.g., \mathbf{x}_i). Similarly, we denote the j th entry of a vector (e.g., \mathbf{p} or \mathbf{x}_i) by the corresponding lowercase letter with subscript j (e.g., p_j or x_{ij}). We denote functions by a letter determined by the value of the function, e.g., f if the mapping is scalar valued, \mathbf{f} if the mapping is vector valued, and \mathcal{F} if the mapping is set valued.

We denote the set $\{1, \dots, n\}$ by $[n]$, the set $\{0, 1, \dots, n\}$ by $[n^*]$, the set of natural numbers by \mathbb{N} , and the set of real numbers by \mathbb{R} . We denote the positive and strictly positive elements of a set using a $+$ or $++$ subscript, respectively, e.g., \mathbb{R}_+ and \mathbb{R}_{++} .

For any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we denote the n -dimensional vector of zeros and ones by $\mathbf{0}_n$ and $\mathbf{1}_n$, respectively. We let $\Delta_n = \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}_+^n \mid \sum_{i=1}^n x_i = 1\}$ denote the unit simplex in \mathbb{R}^n , and $\Delta(A)$ denote the set of all probability distributions over a given set A . We also define the support of a probability density function $f \in \Delta(\mathcal{X})$ as $\text{supp}(f) \doteq \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X} : f(\mathbf{x}) > 0\}$. Finally, we denote the orthogonal projection operator onto a set C by Π_C , i.e., $\Pi_C(\mathbf{x}) \doteq \arg \min_{\mathbf{y} \in C} \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|^2$.

We define the subdifferential of any function $f : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ w.r.t. variable \mathbf{x} at a point $(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$ by $\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{x}}f(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}) \doteq \{\mathbf{h} \mid f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{b}) \geq f(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}) + \mathbf{h}^T(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{a})\}$, and we denote the derivative operator (resp. partial derivative operator w.r.t. \mathbf{x}) of any function $\mathbf{g} : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}$ by $\partial \mathbf{g}$ (resp. $\partial_{\mathbf{x}} \mathbf{g}$).

Terminology. Fix any norm $\|\cdot\|$. Given $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, the function $f : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is said to be ℓ_f -Lipschitz-continuous iff $\forall \mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2 \in \mathcal{A}, \|f(\mathbf{x}_1) - f(\mathbf{x}_2)\| \leq \ell_f \|\mathbf{x}_1 - \mathbf{x}_2\|$. If the gradient of f is $\ell_{\nabla f}$ -Lipschitz-continuous, f is called $\ell_{\nabla f}$ -Lipschitz-smooth.

We require notions of stochastic convexity related to stochastic dominance of probability measures (Atakan, 2003b). Given non-empty and convex parameter and outcome spaces \mathcal{W} and \mathcal{O} respectively, a conditional probability distribution $\mathbf{w} \mapsto p(\cdot \mid \mathbf{w}) \in \Delta(\mathcal{O})$ is said to be *stochastically convex* (resp. *stochastically concave*) in $\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{W}$ if for all continuous, bounded, and convex (resp. concave) functions $v : \mathcal{O} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $\lambda \in (0, 1)$, and $\mathbf{w}', \mathbf{w}^\dagger \in \mathcal{W}$ s.t. $\bar{\mathbf{w}} = \lambda \mathbf{w}' + (1 - \lambda) \mathbf{w}^\dagger$, it holds that $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{O} \sim p(\cdot \mid \bar{\mathbf{w}})} [v(\mathcal{O})] \leq$ (resp. \geq) $\lambda \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{O} \sim p(\cdot \mid \mathbf{w}')} [v(\mathcal{O})] + (1 - \lambda) \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{O} \sim p(\cdot \mid \mathbf{w}^\dagger)} [v(\mathcal{O})]$.

3 Markov Pseudo-Games

We begin by developing our formal game model. The games we study are stochastic, in the sense of Shapley (1953), Fink (1964), and Takahashi (1964). Further, they are pseudo-games, in the sense of Arrow and Debreu (1954). Arrow and Debreu introduced pseudo-games to establish the existence of competitive equilibrium in their seminal model of an exchange economy, where an auctioneer sets prices that determine the consumers' budget sets, and hence their feasible consumptions. It is this dependency among the players' feasible actions that characterizes pseudo-games. We model stochastic pseudo-games, and dub them *Markov pseudo-games*, as the games are Markov in that the stochastic transitions depend only on the most recent state and player actions.

3.1 Model

An (*infinite horizon discounted*) Markov pseudo-game $\mathcal{M} \doteq (n, m, \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{X}, \mathbf{r}, p, \gamma, \mu)$ is an n -player dynamic game played over an infinite discrete time horizon. The game starts at time $t = 0$ in some initial state $S^{(0)} \sim \mu \in \Delta(\mathcal{S})$ drawn randomly from a set of states $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^l$. At this and each subsequent time period $t = 1, 2, \dots$, the players encounter a state $\mathbf{s}^{(t)} \in \mathcal{S}$, in which each $i \in [n]$ simultaneously takes an action $\mathbf{a}_i^{(t)} \in \mathcal{X}_i(\mathbf{s}^{(t)}, \mathbf{a}_{-i}^{(t)})$ from a *set of feasible actions* $\mathcal{X}_i(\mathbf{s}^{(t)}, \mathbf{a}_{-i}^{(t)}) \subseteq \mathcal{A}_i \subseteq \mathbb{R}^m$, determined by a *feasible action correspondence* $\mathcal{X}_i : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}_{-i} \rightrightarrows \mathcal{A}_i$, which takes as input the current state $\mathbf{s}^{(t)}$ and the other players' actions $\mathbf{a}_{-i}^{(t)} \in \mathcal{A}_{-i}$, and outputs a subset of the i th player's action space \mathcal{A}_i . We define $\mathcal{X}(\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{a}) \doteq \times_{i \in [n]} \mathcal{X}_i(\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{a}_{-i})$.

Once the players have taken their actions $\mathbf{a}^{(t)} \doteq (\mathbf{a}_1^{(t)}, \dots, \mathbf{a}_n^{(t)})$, each player $i \in [n]$ receives a *reward* $r_i(\mathbf{s}^{(t)}, \mathbf{a}^{(t)})$ given by a *reward function* $\mathbf{r} : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$, after which the game either ends with probability $1 - \gamma$, where $\gamma \in (0, 1)$ is called the *discount factor*, or continues on to time period $t + 1$, transitioning to a new state $S^{(t+1)} \sim p(\cdot \mid \mathbf{s}^{(t)}, \mathbf{a}^{(t)})$, according to a *transition probability function* $p : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$, where $p(\mathbf{s}^{(t+1)} \mid \mathbf{s}^{(t)}, \mathbf{a}^{(t)}) \in [0, 1]$ denotes the probability of transitioning to state $\mathbf{s}^{(t+1)} \in \mathcal{S}$ from state $\mathbf{s}^{(t)} \in \mathcal{S}$ when action profile $\mathbf{a}^{(t)} \in \mathcal{A}$ is played.

Our focus is on continuous-state and continuous-action Markov pseudo-games, where the state and action spaces are non-empty and compact, and the reward functions are continuous and bounded in each of \mathbf{s} and \mathbf{a} , holding the other fixed.

A *history* $\mathbf{h} \in \mathcal{H}^\tau \doteq (\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A})^\tau \times \mathcal{S}$ of length $\tau \in \mathbb{N}$ is a sequence of states and action profiles $\mathbf{h} = ((\mathbf{s}^{(t)}, \mathbf{a}^{(t)})_{t=0}^{\tau-1}, \mathbf{s}^{(\tau)})$ s.t. a history of length 0 corresponds only to the initial state of the game. For any history $\mathbf{h} = ((\mathbf{s}^{(t)}, \mathbf{a}^{(t)})_{t=0}^{\tau-1}, \mathbf{s}^{(\tau)})$ of length $\tau \in \mathbb{N}$, we denote by $\mathbf{h}_{:\tau'}$, the first $\tau' \in [\tau^*]$ steps of \mathbf{h} , i.e., $\mathbf{h}_{:\tau'} = ((\mathbf{s}^{(t)}, \mathbf{a}^{(t)})_{t=0}^{\tau'-1}, \mathbf{s}^{(\tau')})$. Overloading notation, we define the *history space* $\mathcal{H} \doteq \bigcup_{\tau=0}^\infty \mathcal{H}^\tau$. For any player $i \in [n]$, a *policy* $\pi_i : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_i$ is a mapping from histories of any length to i 's space of (pure) actions. We define the space of all (deterministic) policies as $\mathcal{P}_i \doteq \{\pi_i : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_i\}$. A *Markov policy* (Maskin and Tirole, 2001) π_i is a policy s.t. $\pi_i(\mathbf{s}^{(\tau)}) = \pi_i(\mathbf{h}_{:\tau})$, for all histories $\mathbf{h} \in \mathcal{H}^\tau$ of length $\tau \in \mathbb{N}_+$, where $\mathbf{s}^{(\tau)}$ denotes the final state of history \mathbf{h} . As Markov policies are only state-contingent, we can compactly represent the space of all Markov policies for player $i \in [n]$ as $\mathcal{P}_i^{\text{markov}} \doteq \{\pi_i : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_i\}$.

Fixing player $i \in [n]$ and $\pi_{-i} \in \mathcal{P}_{-i}$, we define the *feasible policy correspondence* $\mathcal{F}_i(\pi_{-i}) \doteq \{\pi_i \in \mathcal{P}_i \mid \forall \mathbf{h} \in \mathcal{H}, \pi_i(\mathbf{h}) \in \mathcal{X}_i(\mathbf{s}^{(\tau)}, \pi_{-i}(\mathbf{h}))\}$, given history $\mathbf{h} \in \mathcal{H}^\tau$, and the *feasible subclass policy correspondence* $\mathcal{F}_i^{\text{sub}}(\pi_{-i}) \doteq \{\pi_i \in \mathcal{P}_i^{\text{sub}} \mid \forall \mathbf{s} \in \mathcal{S}, \pi_i(\mathbf{s}) \in \mathcal{X}_i(\mathbf{s}, \pi_{-i}(\mathbf{s}))\}$, for any $\mathcal{P}^{\text{sub}} \subseteq \mathcal{P}^{\text{markov}}$. Of particular interest is $\mathcal{F}_i^{\text{markov}}(\pi_{-i})$ itself, obtained when $\mathcal{P}^{\text{sub}} = \mathcal{P}^{\text{markov}}$.

Given a policy profile $\pi \in \mathcal{P}$ and a history $\mathbf{h} \in \mathcal{H}^\tau$, we define the *discounted history distribution* assuming initial state distribution μ as $\nu_\mu^{\pi, \tau}(\mathbf{h}) = \mu(\mathbf{s}^{(0)}) \prod_{t=0}^{\tau-1} \gamma^t p(\mathbf{s}^{(t+1)} \mid \mathbf{s}^{(t)}, \mathbf{a}^{(t)}) \mathbb{1}_{\{\pi(\mathbf{h}_{:t})\}}(\mathbf{a}^{(t)})$. Overloading notation, we also define the set of all realizable trajectories $\mathcal{H}^{\pi, \tau}$ of length τ under policy π as $\mathcal{H}^{\pi, \tau} \doteq \text{supp}(\nu_\mu^{\pi, \tau})$, i.e., the set of all histories that occur with non-zero probability. We then denote by $\nu_\mu^\pi \doteq \nu_\mu^{\pi, \infty}$, and by $H = (S^{(0)}, (A^{(t)}, S^{(t+1)})_{t=0}^{\tau-1})$ any randomly sampled history from $\nu_\mu^{\pi, \tau}$. Finally, we define the *discounted state-visitation distribution*, again assuming initial state distribution μ , as $\delta_\mu^\pi(\mathbf{s}) = \sum_{\tau=0}^\infty \int_{\mathbf{h} \in \mathcal{H}^{\pi, \tau} : \mathbf{s}^{(\tau)} = \mathbf{s}} \nu_\mu^{\pi, \tau}(\mathbf{h})$.

For any policy profile $\pi \in \mathcal{P}$, the *state-value function* $v^\pi : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ and the *action-value function* $q^\pi : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ are defined, respectively, as

$$v^\pi(\mathbf{s}) \doteq \mathbb{E}_{S^{(t+1)} \sim p(\cdot | S^{(t)}, A^{(t)})} \left[\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} r(S^{(t)}, A^{(t)}) \mid S^{(0)} = \mathbf{s}, A^{(t)} = \pi(S^{(t)}) \right] \quad (1)$$

$$q^\pi(\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{a}) \doteq \mathbb{E}_{S^{(t+1)} \sim p(\cdot | S^{(t)}, A^{(t)})} \left[\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} r(S^{(t)}, A^{(t)}) \mid S^{(0)} = \mathbf{s}, A^{(0)} = \mathbf{a}, A^{(t+1)} = \pi(S^{(t+1)}) \right]. \quad (2)$$

Overloading notation, for any initial state distribution $v \in \Delta(\mathcal{S})$ and policy profile π , we denote by $v^\pi(v) \doteq \mathbb{E}_{S \sim v} [v^\pi(S)]$.

Finally, the (*expected cumulative*) *payoff* associated with policy profile $\pi \in \mathcal{P}$ is given by $u(\pi) \doteq v^\pi(\mu)$.

3.2 Solution Concepts and Existence

Having defined our game model, we now define two natural solution concepts, and establish their existence. Our first solution concept is based on the usual notion of Nash equilibrium (1950b), yet applied to Markov pseudo-games. Our second is based on the notion of subgame-perfect equilibrium in extensive-form games, a strengthening of Nash equilibrium with the additional requirement that an equilibrium be Nash not just at the start of the game, but at all states encountered during play. In the context of stochastic games, such equilibria are called “recursive,” or “Markov perfect.” Following Bellman (1966) and Arrow and Debreu (1954), we identify natural assumptions that guarantee the existence of equilibrium in pure Markov policies, meaning deterministic policies that depend only on the current state, not on the history. When applied to incomplete stochastic economies, this theorem implies existence of recursive Radner (or competitive) equilibrium, to our knowledge the first result of its kind.

An ε -*generalized Markov perfect equilibrium* (ε -GMPE) $\pi^* \in \mathcal{F}^{\text{markov}}(\pi^*)$ is a Markov policy profile s.t. for all states $\mathbf{s} \in \mathcal{S}$ and players $i \in [n]$, $v_i^{\pi^*}(\mathbf{s}) \geq \max_{\pi_i \in \mathcal{F}_i(\pi_{-i}^*)} v_i^{(\pi_i, \pi_{-i}^*)}(\mathbf{s}) - \varepsilon$. An ε -*generalized Nash equilibrium* (ε -GNE) $\pi^* \in \mathcal{F}(\pi^*)$ is a policy profile s.t. for all states $\mathbf{s} \in \mathcal{S}$ and players $i \in [n]$, $u_i(\pi^*) \geq \max_{\pi_i \in \mathcal{F}_i(\pi_{-i}^*)} u_i(\pi_i, \pi_{-i}^*) - \varepsilon$. We call a 0-GMPE (0-GNE) simply a GMPE (GNE). As GMPE is a stronger notion than GNE, every ε -GMPE is an ε -GNE.

Assumption 1 (Existence). *For all $i \in [n]$, assume 1. \mathcal{A}_i is convex; 2. $\mathcal{X}_i(\mathbf{s}, \cdot)$ is upper- and lower-hemicontinuous, for all $\mathbf{s} \in \mathcal{S}$; 3. $\mathcal{X}_i(\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{a}_{-i})$ is non-empty, convex, and compact, for all $\mathbf{s} \in \mathcal{S}$ and $\mathbf{a}_{-i} \in \mathcal{A}_{-i}$; and 4. for any policy $\pi \in \mathcal{P}$, $\mathbf{a}_i \mapsto q_i^\pi(\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{a}_i, \mathbf{a}_{-i})$ is continuous and concave over $\mathcal{X}_i(\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{a}_{-i})$, for all $\mathbf{s} \in \mathcal{S}$ and $\mathbf{a}_{-i} \in \mathcal{A}_{-i}$.*

Assumption 2 (Policy Class). *Given $\mathcal{P}^{\text{sub}} \subseteq \mathcal{P}^{\text{markov}}$, assume 1. \mathcal{P}^{sub} is non-empty, compact, and convex; and 2. (Closure under policy improvement) for each $\pi \in \mathcal{P}^{\text{sub}}$, there exists $\pi^+ \in \mathcal{P}^{\text{sub}}$ s.t. $q_i^{\pi^+}(\mathbf{s}, \pi_i^+(\mathbf{s}), \pi_{-i}(\mathbf{s})) = \max_{\pi_i' \in \mathcal{F}_i(\pi_{-i})} q_i^\pi(\mathbf{s}, \pi_i'(\mathbf{s}), \pi_{-i}(\mathbf{s}))$, for all $i \in [n]$ and $\mathbf{s} \in \mathcal{S}$.*

Assumption 2, introduced as Condition 1 in Bhandari and Russo (2019), ensures that the policy class under consideration (e.g., $\mathcal{P}^{\text{sub}} \subseteq \mathcal{P}^{\text{markov}}$) is expressive enough to include best responses.

Theorem 3.1. *Let \mathcal{M} be a Markov pseudo-game for which Assumption 1 holds, and let $\mathcal{P}^{\text{sub}} \subseteq \mathcal{P}^{\text{markov}}$ be a subspace of Markov policy profiles that satisfies Assumption 2. Then there exists a policy $\pi^* \in \mathcal{P}^{\text{sub}}$ such that π^* is an GMPE of \mathcal{M} .*

3.3 Equilibrium Computation

Our approach to computing a GMPE in a Markov pseudo-game \mathcal{M} is to minimize a *merit function* associated with \mathcal{M} , i.e., a function whose minima coincides with the pseudo-game's GMPE. Our choice of merit function, a common one in game theory, is *exploitability* $\varphi : \mathcal{P} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$, defined as $\varphi(\boldsymbol{\pi}) \doteq \sum_{i \in [n]} \left[\max_{\boldsymbol{\pi}'_i \in \mathcal{F}_i^{\text{markov}}(\boldsymbol{\pi}_{-i})} u_i(\boldsymbol{\pi}'_i, \boldsymbol{\pi}_{-i}) - u_i(\boldsymbol{\pi}) \right]$. In words, exploitability is the sum of the players' maximal unilateral payoff deviations.

Exploitability, however, is a merit function for GNE, *not* GMPE; *state exploitability*, $\phi(\boldsymbol{s}, \boldsymbol{\pi}) = \sum_{i \in [n]} \left[\max_{\boldsymbol{\pi}'_i \in \mathcal{F}_i^{\text{markov}}(\boldsymbol{\pi}_{-i})} v_i^{(\boldsymbol{\pi}'_i, \boldsymbol{\pi}_{-i})}(\boldsymbol{s}) - v_i^{\boldsymbol{\pi}}(\boldsymbol{s}) \right]$ at all states $\boldsymbol{s} \in \mathcal{S}$, is a merit function for GMPE. Nevertheless, as we show in the sequel, for a large class of Markov pseudo-games, namely those with a bounded best-response mismatch coefficient (see Section 3.3.3), the set of Markov policies that minimize exploitability equals the set of GMPE, making our approach a sensible one.

We are not out of the woods yet, however, as exploitability is non-convex in general, even in one-shot finite games (Nash, 1950a). Although Markov pseudo-games can afford a convex exploitability (see, for instance (Flam and Ruszczyński, 1994)), it is unlikely that all do, as GNE computation is PPAD-hard (Chen et al., 2009; Daskalakis et al., 2009). Accordingly, we instead set our sights on computing a *stationary point* of the exploitability, i.e., a policy profile $\boldsymbol{\pi}^* \in \mathcal{F}^{\text{markov}}(\boldsymbol{\pi}^*)$ s.t. for any other policy $\boldsymbol{\pi} \in \mathcal{F}^{\text{markov}}(\boldsymbol{\pi}^*)$, it holds that $\min_{\boldsymbol{h} \in \mathcal{D}\varphi(\boldsymbol{\pi}^*)} \langle \boldsymbol{h}, \boldsymbol{\pi}^* - \boldsymbol{\pi} \rangle \leq 0$.⁸ Such a point satisfies the necessary conditions of a GMPE.

In this paper, we study Markov pseudo-games with possibly continuous state and action spaces. As such, we can only hope to compute an *approximate* stationary point of the exploitability in finite time. Defining a notion of approximate stationarity for exploitability is, however, a challenge, because exploitability is non-differentiable in general (once again, even in one-shot finite games).

Given an approximation parameter $\varepsilon \geq 0$, a natural definition of an ε -stationary point might be a policy profile $\boldsymbol{\pi}^* \in \mathcal{F}^{\text{markov}}(\boldsymbol{\pi}^*)$ s.t. for any other policy $\boldsymbol{\pi} \in \mathcal{F}^{\text{markov}}(\boldsymbol{\pi}^*)$, it holds that $\min_{\boldsymbol{h} \in \mathcal{D}\varphi(\boldsymbol{\pi}^*)} \langle \boldsymbol{h}, \boldsymbol{\pi}^* - \boldsymbol{\pi} \rangle \leq \varepsilon$. Exploitability is not necessarily Lipschitz-smooth, however, so in general it may not be possible to compute an ε -stationary point in $\text{poly}(1/\varepsilon)$ evaluations of the (sub)gradient of the exploitability.⁹

To address, this challenge, a common approach in the optimization literature (see, for instance Appendix H, Definition 19 of Liu et al. (2021)) is to consider an alternative definition known as (ε, δ) -stationarity. Given approximation parameters $\varepsilon, \delta \geq 0$, an (ε, δ) -stationary point of the exploitability is a policy profile $\boldsymbol{\pi}^* \in \mathcal{F}^{\text{markov}}(\boldsymbol{\pi}^*)$ for which there exists a δ -close policy $\boldsymbol{\pi}^\dagger \in \mathcal{P}$ with $\|\boldsymbol{\pi}^\dagger - \boldsymbol{\pi}^*\| \leq \delta$ s.t. for any other policy $\boldsymbol{\pi} \in \mathcal{F}^{\text{markov}}(\boldsymbol{\pi}^\dagger)$, it holds that $\min_{\boldsymbol{h} \in \mathcal{D}\varphi(\boldsymbol{\pi}^\dagger)} \langle \boldsymbol{h}, \boldsymbol{\pi}^\dagger - \boldsymbol{\pi} \rangle \leq \varepsilon$. The exploitability minimization method we introduce can compute such an approximate stationary point in polynomial time. Furthermore, asymptotically, our method is guaranteed to converge to an exact stationary point of the exploitability.

⁸While we provide a definition of a(n approximate) stationary point for expositional purposes at present, an observant reader might have noticed the exploitability φ is a mapping from a function space to the positive reals, and its Fréchet (sub)derivative is ill-specified without a clear definition of the normed vector space of policies on which exploitability is defined. Further, even when clearly specified, such a (sub)derivative might not exist. The precise meaning of a derivative of the exploitability and its stationary points will be introduced more rigorously once we have suitably parameterized the policy spaces.

⁹To see this, consider the convex minimization problem $\min_{x \in \mathbb{R}} f(x) = |x|$. The minimum of this optimization occurs at $x = 0$, which is a stationary point since a (sub)derivative of f at $x = 0$ is 0. However, for $x < 0$, we have $\frac{\partial f(x)}{\partial x} = -1$, and for $x > 0$, we have $\frac{\partial f(x)}{\partial x} = 1$. Hence, any $x \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$ can at best be a 1-stationary point, i.e., $\left| \frac{\partial f(x)}{\partial x} \right| = 1$. Hence, for this optimization problem, it is not even possible to guarantee the existence of an ε -stationary point distinct from $x = 0$, assuming $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$, let alone the computation of an ε -stationary point x^* s.t. $\left| \frac{\partial f(x^*)}{\partial x} \right| \leq \varepsilon$.

More precisely, following [Goktas and Greenwald \(2022\)](#), who minimize exploitability to solve for variational equilibria in (one-shot) pseudo-games, we first formulate our problem as the quasi-optimization problem of minimizing exploitability,¹⁰ and then transform this problem into a coupled min-max optimization (i.e., a two-player zero-sum game) whose objective is cumulative regret, rather than the potentially ill-behaved exploitability. Under suitable parametrization, such problems are amenable to polynomial-time solutions via simultaneous gradient descent ascent ([Arrow et al., 1958](#)), assuming the objective is Lipschitz smooth in both players’ decision variables and gradient dominated in the inner player’s. We thus formulate the requisite assumptions to ensure these properties hold of cumulative regret in our game, which in turn allows us to show that two time scale simultaneous stochastic gradient descent ascent (TTSSGDA) converges to an $(\varepsilon, O(\varepsilon))$ -stationary point of the exploitability in $\text{poly}(1/\varepsilon)$ gradient steps.

3.3.1 Exploitability Minimization

Given a Markov pseudo-game \mathcal{M} and two policy profiles $\pi, \pi' \in \mathcal{P}$, we define the *state cumulative regret* at state $s \in \mathcal{S}$ as $\psi(s, \pi, \pi') = \sum_{i \in [n]} [v_i^{(\pi'_i, \pi_{-i})}(s) - v_i^\pi(s)]$; the *expected cumulative regret* for any initial state distribution $v \in \Delta(\mathcal{S})$ as $\psi(v, \pi, \pi') = \mathbb{E}_{s \sim v} [\psi(s, \pi, \pi')]$, and the *cumulative regret* as $\Psi(\pi, \pi') = \psi(\mu, \pi, \pi')$. Additionally, we define the *state exploitability* of a policy profile π at state $s \in \mathcal{S}$ as $\phi(s, \pi) = \sum_{i \in [n]} \max_{\pi'_i \in \mathcal{F}_i^{\text{markov}}(\pi_{-i})} v_i^{(\pi'_i, \pi_{-i})}(s) - v_i^\pi(s)$; the *expected exploitability* of a policy profile π for any initial state distribution $v \in \Delta(\mathcal{S})$ as $\phi(v, \pi) = \mathbb{E}_{s \sim v} [\phi(s, \pi)]$, and *exploitability* as $\varphi(\pi) = \sum_{i \in [n]} \max_{\pi'_i \in \mathcal{F}_i^{\text{markov}}(\pi_{-i})} u_i(\pi'_i, \pi_{-i})$.

In what follows, we restrict our attention to the subclass $\mathcal{P}^{\text{markov}} \subseteq \mathcal{P}$ of (pure) Markov policies. This restriction is without loss of generality, because finding an optimal policy that maximizes a state-value or payoff function, while the other players’ policies remain fixed, reduces to solving a Markov decision process (MDP), and an optimal (possibly history-dependent) policy in an MDP is guaranteed to exist in the space of (pure) Markov policies under very mild continuity and compactness assumptions ([Puterman, 2014](#)). Indeed, the next lemma justifies this restriction.

Lemma 1. *Given a Markov pseudo-game \mathcal{M} , a Markov policy profile $\pi^* \in \mathcal{F}^{\text{markov}}(\pi^*)$ is a GMPE if and only if $\phi(s, \pi^*) = 0$, for all states $s \in \mathcal{S}$. Similarly, a policy profile $\pi^* \in \mathcal{F}(\pi^*)$ is an GNE if and only if $\varphi(\pi^*) = 0$.*

This lemma tells us that we can reformulate the problem of computing a GMPE as the quasi-minimization problem of minimizing state exploitability, i.e., $\min_{\pi \in \mathcal{F}^{\text{markov}}(\pi)} \phi(s, \pi)$, at all states $s \in \mathcal{S}$ simultaneously. The same is true of computing a GNE and exploitability.

This straightforward reformulation of GMPE (resp. GNE) in terms of state exploitability (resp. exploitability) does not immediately lend itself to computation, as exploitability minimization is non-trivial, because exploitability is neither convex nor differentiable in general. Following [Goktas and Greenwald \(2022\)](#), we can reformulate these problems yet again, this time as coupled quasi-min-max optimization problems ([Wald, 1945](#)). We proceed to do so now; however, we restrict our attention to exploitability, and hence GNE, knowing that we will later show that minimizing exploitability suffices to minimize state exploitability, and thereby find GMPE.

Observation 1. *Given a Markov pseudo-game \mathcal{M} ,*

$$\min_{\pi \in \mathcal{F}(\pi)} \varphi(\pi) = \min_{\pi \in \mathcal{F}(\pi)} \max_{\pi' \in \mathcal{F}^{\text{markov}}(\pi)} \Psi(\pi, \pi') . \quad (3)$$

¹⁰Here, “quasi” refers to the fact that a solution to this problem is both a minimizer of exploitability and a fixed point of an operator, such as \mathcal{F} or $\mathcal{F}^{\text{markov}}$.

While the above observation makes progress towards our goal of reformulating exploitability minimization in a tractable manner, the problem remains challenging to solve for two reasons: first, a fixed point computation is required to solve the outer player's minimization problem; second, the inner player's policy space depends on the choice of outer policy. We overcome these difficulties by choosing suitable policy parameterizations.

3.3.2 Policy Parameterization

In a coupled min-max optimization problem, any solution to the inner player's maximization problem is implicitly parameterized by the outer player's decision. We restructure the jointly feasible Markov policy class to represent this dependence explicitly.

Define the class of *dependent policies* $\mathcal{R} \doteq \{\rho : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{A} \mid \forall (s, a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}, \rho(s, a) \in \mathcal{X}(s, a)\} = \times_{i \in [n]} \{\rho_i : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}_i \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_{-i} \mid \forall (s, a_{-i}) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}_{-i}, \rho_i(s, a_{-i}) \in \mathcal{X}_i(s, a_{-i})\}$. With this definition in hand we arrive at an *uncoupled* quasi-min-max optimization problem:

Lemma 2. *Given a Markov pseudo-game \mathcal{M} ,*

$$\min_{\pi \in \mathcal{F}(\pi)} \max_{\pi' \in \mathcal{F}^{\text{markov}}(\pi)} \Psi(\pi, \pi') = \min_{\pi \in \mathcal{F}(\pi)} \max_{\rho \in \mathcal{R}} \Psi(\pi, \rho(\cdot, \pi(\cdot))) . \quad (4)$$

It can be expensive to represent the aforementioned dependence in policies explicitly. This situation can be naturally rectified, however, by a suitable policy parameterization. A suitable policy parameterization can also allow us to represent the set of fixed points s.t. $\pi \in \mathcal{F}^{\text{markov}}(\pi)$ more efficiently in practice (Goktas et al., 2023a).

Define a *parameterization scheme* $(\pi, \rho, \mathbb{R}^\Omega, \mathbb{R}^\Sigma)$ as comprising a unconstrained parameter space \mathbb{R}^Ω and parametric policy profile function $\pi : \mathcal{S} \times \mathbb{R}^\Omega \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ for the outer player, and an unconstrained parameter space \mathbb{R}^Σ and parametric policy profile function $\rho : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathbb{R}^\Sigma \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ for the inner player. Given such a scheme, we restrict the players' policies to be parameterized: i.e., the outer player's space of policies $\mathcal{P}^{\mathbb{R}^\Omega} = \{\pi : \mathcal{S} \times \mathbb{R}^\Omega \rightarrow \mathcal{A} \mid \omega \in \mathbb{R}^\Omega\} \subseteq \mathcal{P}^{\text{markov}}$, while the inner player's space of policies $\mathcal{R}^{\mathbb{R}^\Sigma} = \{\rho : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathbb{R}^\Sigma \rightarrow \mathcal{A} \mid \sigma \in \mathbb{R}^\Sigma\}$. Using these parameterizations, we redefine $v^\omega \doteq v^{\pi(\cdot; \omega)}$, $q^\omega \doteq q^{\pi(\cdot; \omega)}$, $u(\omega) = u(\pi(\cdot; \omega))$, and $v_\mu^\omega = v_\mu^{\pi(\cdot; \omega)}$; and $v^\sigma(\omega) \doteq v^{\rho(\cdot, \pi(\cdot; \omega); \sigma)}$; $q^\sigma(\omega) \doteq q^{\rho(\cdot, \pi(\cdot; \omega); \sigma)}$; $u(\sigma(\omega)) = u(\rho(\cdot, \pi(\cdot; \omega); \sigma))$; $v_\mu^\sigma(\omega) = v_\mu^{\rho(\cdot, \pi(\cdot; \omega); \sigma)}$; and so on.

Assumption 3 (Parameterization for Min-Max Optimization). *Given a Markov pseudo-game \mathcal{M} and a parameterization scheme $(\pi, \rho, \mathbb{R}^\Omega, \mathbb{R}^\Sigma)$, assume 1. for all $\omega \in \mathbb{R}^\Omega$, $\pi(s; \omega) \in \mathcal{X}(s, \pi(s; \omega))$, for all $s \in \mathcal{S}$; and 2. for all $\sigma \in \mathbb{R}^\Sigma$, $\rho(s, a; \sigma) \in \mathcal{X}(s, a)$, for all $(s, a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$.*

Assuming a policy parameterization scheme that satisfies Assumption 3, we restate our goal, state exploitability minimization, one last time as the following min-max optimization problem:

$$\min_{\omega \in \mathbb{R}^\Omega} \max_{\sigma \in \mathbb{R}^\Sigma} \Psi(\omega, \sigma) \doteq \Psi(\pi(\cdot; \omega), \rho(\cdot, \pi(\cdot; \omega); \sigma)) . \quad (5)$$

Now, given unconstrained parameter space, we are able to simplify our definition of (ε, δ) -stationary point of the exploitability: a policy parameter $\omega^* \in \mathbb{R}^\Omega$ for which there exists a δ -close policy parameter $\omega^\dagger \in \mathbb{R}^\Omega$ with $\|\omega^* - \omega^\dagger\| \leq \delta$ s.t. $\min_{h \in \mathcal{D}_\varphi(\omega^\dagger)} \|h\| \leq \varepsilon$.

3.3.3 State Exploitability Minimization

Returning to our stated objective, namely *state* exploitability minimization, we turn our attention to obtaining a tractable characterization of this goal. Specifically, we argue that it suffices to minimize exploitability,

rather than state exploitability, as any policy profile that is a stationary point of exploitability is also a stationary point of state exploitability across all states simultaneously, under suitable assumptions.

Our first lemma states that a stationary point of the exploitability is almost surely also a stationary point of the state exploitability at all states. Moreover, if the initial state distribution has full support, then any (ε, δ) -stationary point of the exploitability can be converted into an $(\varepsilon/\alpha, \delta)$ -stationary point of the *state* exploitability, with probability at least $1 - \alpha$.

Lemma 3. *Given a Markov pseudo-game \mathcal{M} , for $\omega \in \mathbb{R}^\Omega$, suppose that $\phi(s, \cdot)$ is differentiable at ω for all $s \in \mathcal{S}$. If $\|\nabla_\omega \varphi(\omega)\| = 0$, then, for all states $s \in \mathcal{S}$, $\|\nabla_\omega \phi(s, \omega)\| = 0$ μ -almost surely, i.e., $\mu(\{s \in \mathcal{S} \mid \|\nabla_\omega \phi(s, \omega)\| = 0\}) = 1$. Moreover, for any $\varepsilon > 0$ and $\delta \in [0, 1]$, if $\text{supp}(\mu) = \mathcal{S}$ and $\|\nabla_\omega \varphi(\omega)\| \leq \varepsilon$, then with probability at least $1 - \delta$, $\|\nabla_\omega \phi(s, \omega)\| \leq \varepsilon/\delta$.*

In fact, we can strengthen this probabilistic equivalence to a deterministic one by restricting our attention to Markov pseudo-games with bounded best-response mismatch coefficients. Our best-response mismatch coefficient generalizes the minimax mismatch coefficient in two-player settings (Daskalakis et al., 2020) and the distribution mismatch coefficient in single-agent settings (Agarwal et al., 2020).

Given \mathcal{M} with initial state distribution μ and alternative state distribution $v \in \Delta(\mathcal{S})$, and letting $\Phi_i(\pi_{-i}) \doteq \arg \max_{\pi'_i \in \mathcal{F}_i^{\text{markov}}(\pi_{-i})} u_i(\pi'_i, \pi_{-i})$ denote the set of best response policies for player i when the other players play policy profile π_{-i} , we define the *best-response mismatch coefficient* for policy profile π as $C_{br}(\pi, \mu, v) \doteq \max_{i \in [n]} \max_{\pi'_i \in \Phi_i(\pi_{-i})} (1/1-\gamma)^2 \|\delta_v^{(\pi'_i, \pi_{-i})}/\mu\|_\infty \|\delta_\pi^\pi/\mu\|_\infty$.

Lemma 4. *Let \mathcal{M} be a Markov pseudo-game with initial state distribution μ . Given policy parameter $\omega \in \mathbb{R}^\Omega$ and arbitrary state distribution $v \in \Delta(\mathcal{S})$, suppose that both $\phi(\mu, \cdot)$ and $\phi(v, \cdot)$ are differentiable at ω , then we have: $\|\nabla \phi(v, \omega)\| \leq C_{br}(\pi(\cdot; \omega^*), \mu, v) \|\nabla \varphi(\omega)\|$.*

Once again, Lemma 3 states that any approximate stationary point of exploitability is also an approximate stationary point of state exploitability with high probability, while Lemma 4 upper bounds state exploitability in terms of exploitability, when the best-response mismatch coefficient is bounded. Together, these two lemmas imply that finding a policy profile this is a stationary point of exploitability is sufficient for find a policy profile this is a stationary point of state exploitability, and hence one that satisfies the necessary conditions of a GMPE.

3.3.4 Algorithmic Assumptions

We are nearly ready to describe our reinforcement learning algorithm for computing a stationary point of Equation (5), and thereby finding a policy profile that satisfies the necessary conditions of a GMPE. As Equation (5) is a two-player zero-sum game, our method is a variant of simultaneous gradient descent ascent (GDA) (Arrow et al., 1958), meaning it adjusts its parameters based on first-order information until it reaches a (first-order) stationary point. Polynomial-time convergence of GDA typically requires that the objective be Lipschitz smooth in both decision variables, and gradient dominated in the inner one, which in our application, translates to the cumulative regret $\Psi(\omega, \sigma)$ being Lipschitz smooth in (ω, σ) and gradient dominated in σ . These conditions are ensured, under the following assumptions on the Markov pseudo-game.

Assumption 4 (Lipschitz Smooth Payoffs). *Given a Markov pseudo-game \mathcal{M} and a parameterization scheme $(\pi, \rho, \mathbb{R}^\Omega, \mathbb{R}^\Sigma)$, assume 1. \mathbb{R}^Ω and \mathbb{R}^Σ are non-empty, compact, and convex, 2. $\omega \mapsto \pi(s; \omega)$ is twice continuously differentiable, for all $s \in \mathcal{S}$, and $\sigma \mapsto \rho(s, \mathbf{a}; \sigma)$ is twice continuously differentiable, for all $(s, \mathbf{a}) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$; 3. $\mathbf{a} \mapsto r(s, \mathbf{a})$ is twice continuously differentiable, for all $s \in \mathcal{S}$; 4. $\mathbf{a} \mapsto p(s' \mid s, \mathbf{a})$ is twice continuously differentiable, for all $s, s' \in \mathcal{S}$.*

Assumption 5 (Gradient Dominance Conditions). *Given a Markov pseudo-game \mathcal{M} together with a parameterization scheme $(\pi, \rho, \mathbb{R}^\Omega, \mathbb{R}^\Sigma)$, assume 1. (Closure under policy improvement) For each $\omega \in \mathbb{R}^\Omega$, there exists $\sigma \in \mathbb{R}^\Sigma$ s.t. $q_i^\omega(\mathbf{s}, \rho_i(\mathbf{s}, \pi(\mathbf{s}; \omega); \sigma), \pi_{-i}(\mathbf{s}; \omega)) = \max_{\pi'_i \in \mathcal{F}_i(\pi(\cdot; \omega))} q_i^\omega(\mathbf{s}, \pi'_i(\mathbf{s}), \pi_{-i}(\mathbf{s}; \omega))$ for all $i \in [n]$, $\mathbf{s} \in \mathcal{S}$. 2. (Concavity of action-value) $\sigma \mapsto q_i^{\omega'}(\mathbf{s}, \rho_i(\mathbf{s}, \pi_{-i}(\mathbf{s}; \omega); \sigma), \pi_{-i}(\mathbf{s}; \omega))$ is concave, for all $\mathbf{s} \in \mathcal{S}$ and $\omega, \omega' \in \mathbb{R}^\Omega$.*

3.3.5 Algorithm and Convergence

Finally, we present our algorithm for finding an approximate stationary point of exploitability, and thus state exploitability. The algorithm we use is two time-scale stochastic simultaneous gradient descent-ascent (TTSSGDA), first analyzed by [Lin et al. \(2020\)](#); [Daskalakis et al. \(2020\)](#), for which we prove best-iterate convergence to an $(\varepsilon, O(\varepsilon))$ -stationary point of exploitability after taking $\text{poly}(1/\varepsilon)$ gradient steps under Assumptions 4 and 5.

Algorithm 1 Two time-scale simultaneous SGDA (TTSSGDA)

Inputs: $\mathcal{M}, (\pi, \rho, \mathbb{R}^\Omega, \mathbb{R}^\Sigma), \eta_\omega, \eta_\sigma, \omega^{(0)}, \sigma^{(0)}, T$

Outputs: $(\omega^{(t)}, \sigma^{(t)})_{t=0}^T$

- 1: Build gradient estimator \widehat{G} associated with \mathcal{M}
 - 2: **for** $t = 0, \dots, T - 1$ **do**
 - 3: $\mathbf{h} \sim \nu^\omega, \mathbf{h}' \sim \times_{i \in [n]} \nu^{(\sigma_i(\omega_{-i}), \omega_{-i})}$
 - 4: $\omega^{(t+1)} \leftarrow \omega^{(t)} - \eta_\omega \widehat{G}_\omega(\omega^{(t)}, \sigma^{(t)}; \mathbf{h}, \mathbf{h}')$
 - 5: $\sigma^{(t+1)} \leftarrow \sigma^{(t)} + \eta_\sigma \widehat{G}_\sigma(\omega^{(t)}, \sigma^{(t)}; \mathbf{h}, \mathbf{h}')$
 - 6: **return** $(\omega^{(t)}, \sigma^{(t)})_{t=0}^T$
-

Recall that Assumption 4 guarantees Lipschitz smoothness w.r.t. to both ω and σ , while Assumption 5 guarantees gradient dominance w.r.t. σ . As the gradient of cumulative regret involves an expectation over histories, we assume that we can simulate trajectories of play $\mathbf{h} \sim \nu_\mu^\pi$ according to the history distribution ν_μ^π , for any policy profile π , and that doing so provides both value and gradient information for the rewards and transition probabilities along simulated trajectories. That is, we rely on a differentiable game simulator (see, for instance [Suh et al. \(2022\)](#)), meaning a stochastic first-order oracle that returns the gradients of

the rewards r and transition probabilities p , which we query to estimate deviation payoffs, and ultimately cumulative regrets.

Under this assumption, we estimate these values using realized trajectories from the history distribution $\mathbf{h} \sim \nu_\mu^\omega$ induced by the outer player's policy, and the deviation history distribution $\mathbf{h}^\sigma \sim \times_{i \in [n]} \nu_\mu^{(\sigma_i(\omega_{-i}), \omega_{-i})}$ induced by the inner player's policy. More specifically, for all policies $\pi \in \mathcal{P}^{\text{markov}}$ and histories $\mathbf{h} \in \mathcal{H}^T$, the *payoff estimator* for player $i \in [n]$ is given by $\widehat{u}_i(\pi; \mathbf{h}) \doteq \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \mu(\mathbf{s}^{(0)}) r_i(\mathbf{s}^{(t)}, \pi'(\mathbf{s}^{(t)})) \prod_{k=0}^{t-1} \gamma^k p(\mathbf{s}^{(k+1)} \mid \mathbf{s}^{(k)}, (\mathbf{s}^{(k)}))$. Furthermore, for all $\omega \in \mathbb{R}^\Omega$, $\sigma \in \mathbb{R}^\Sigma$, $\mathbf{h} \sim \nu_\mu^\omega$, and $\mathbf{h}^\sigma = (\mathbf{h}_1^\sigma, \dots, \mathbf{h}_n^\sigma) \sim \times_{i \in [n]} \nu_\mu^{(\sigma_i(\omega_{-i}), \omega_{-i})}$, the *cumulative regret estimator* is given by $\widehat{\Psi}(\omega, \sigma; \mathbf{h}, \mathbf{h}') \doteq \sum_{i \in [n]} \widehat{u}_i(\rho_i(\cdot, \pi_{-i}(\cdot; \omega); \sigma), \pi_{-i}(\cdot, \omega); \mathbf{h}_i^\sigma) - \widehat{u}_i(\pi(\cdot; \omega); \mathbf{h})$, while the *cumulative regret gradient estimator* is given by $\widehat{G}(\omega, \sigma; \mathbf{h}, \mathbf{h}') \doteq (\nabla_\omega \widehat{\Psi}(\omega, \sigma; \mathbf{h}, \mathbf{h}'), \nabla_\sigma \widehat{\Psi}(\omega, \sigma; \mathbf{h}, \mathbf{h}'))$.

Our main theorem requires one final definition, namely the *equilibrium distribution mismatch coefficient* $\|\partial \delta_{\mu^*} / \partial \mu\|_\infty$, defined as the Radon-Nikodym derivative of the state-visitation distribution of the GNE π^* w.r.t. the initial state distribution μ . This coefficient, which measures the inherent difficulty of visiting states under the equilibrium policy π^* —without knowing π^* —is closely related to other distribution mismatch coefficients used in the analysis of policy gradient methods ([Agarwal et al., 2020](#)).

We now state our main theorem, namely that, under the assumptions outlined above, Algorithm 1 computes values for the policy parameters that nearly satisfy the necessary conditions for an MGPNE in polynomially many gradient steps, or equivalently, calls to the differentiable simulator.

Theorem 3.2. *Given a Markov pseudo-game \mathcal{M} , and a parameterization scheme $(\pi, \rho, \mathbb{R}^\Omega, \mathbb{R}^\Sigma)$, suppose Assumption 1, 4, and 5 hold. For any $\delta > 0$, set $\varepsilon = \delta \|C_{br}(\cdot, \mu, \cdot)\|_\infty^{-1}$. If Algorithm 1 is run with inputs that satisfy, $\eta_\omega, \eta_\sigma \asymp \text{poly}(\varepsilon, \|\partial\delta_\mu^{\pi^*}/\partial\mu\|_\infty, \frac{1}{1-\gamma}, \ell_{\nabla\Psi}^{-1}, \ell_\Psi^{-1})$, then for some $T \in \text{poly}(\varepsilon^{-1}, (1-\gamma)^{-1}, \|\partial\delta_\mu^{\pi^*}/\partial\mu\|_\infty, \ell_{\nabla\Psi}, \ell_\Psi, \text{diam}(\mathbb{R}^\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^\Sigma), \eta_\omega^{-1})$, there exists $\omega_{\text{best}}^{(T)} = \omega^{(k)}$ with $k \leq T$ that is a $(\varepsilon, \varepsilon/2\ell_\Psi)$ -stationary point of the exploitability, i.e., there exists $\omega^* \in \mathbb{R}^\Omega$ s.t. $\|\omega_{\text{best}}^{(T)} - \omega^*\| \leq \varepsilon/2\ell_\Psi$ and $\min_{h \in \mathcal{D}\varphi(\omega^*)} \|h\| \leq \varepsilon$.*

Further, for any arbitrary state distribution $v \in \Delta(\mathcal{S})$, if $\phi(v, \cdot)$ is differentiable at ω^ , $\|\nabla_{\omega} \varphi(v, \omega^*)\| \leq \delta$, i.e., $\omega_{\text{best}}^{(T)}$ is a (ε, δ) -stationary point for the expected exploitability $\phi(v, \cdot)$.*

4 Incomplete Markov Economies

Having developed a mathematical formalism for Markov pseudo-games, along with a proof of existence of GMPE as well as an algorithm that computes them, we now move on to our main agenda, namely modeling incomplete stochastic economies in this formalism. We establish the first proof, to our knowledge, of the existence of recursive competitive equilibria in standard incomplete stochastic economies, and we provide a polynomial-time algorithm for approximating them.

4.1 Static Exchange Economies

A *static exchange economy* (or *market*¹¹) $(n, m, d, \mathcal{X}, \mathcal{E}, \mathcal{T}, \mathbf{r}, \mathbf{E}, \Theta)$, abbreviated by (\mathbf{E}, Θ) when clear from context, comprises a finite set of $n \in \mathbb{N}_+$ *consumers* and $m \in \mathbb{N}_+$ *commodities*. Each consumer $i \in [n]$ arrives at the market with an *endowment* of commodities represented as vector $e_i = (e_{i1}, \dots, e_{im}) \in \mathcal{E}_i$, where $\mathcal{E}_i \subset \mathbb{R}^m$ is called the *endowment space*.¹² Any consumer i can sell its endowment $e_i \in \mathcal{E}_i$ at *prices* $\mathbf{p} \in \Delta_m$, where $p_j \geq 0$ represents the value (resp. cost) of selling (resp. buying) a unit of commodity $j \in [m]$, to purchase a consumption $\mathbf{x}_i \in \mathcal{X}_i$ of commodities in its *consumption space* $\mathcal{X}_i \subseteq \mathbb{R}^m$.¹³ Every consumer is constrained to buy a consumption with a cost weakly less than the value of its endowment, i.e., consumer i 's *budget set*—the set of consumptions i can afford with its endowment $e_i \in \mathcal{E}_i$ at prices $\mathbf{p} \in \Delta_m$ —is determined by its *budget correspondence* $\mathcal{B}_i(e_i, \mathbf{p}) \doteq \{\mathbf{x}_i \in \mathcal{X}_i \mid \mathbf{x}_i \cdot \mathbf{p} \leq e_i \cdot \mathbf{p}\}$.

Each consumer's consumption preferences are determined by its type-dependent preference relation \succeq_{i, θ_i} on \mathcal{X}_i , represented by a type-dependent *utility function* $\mathbf{x}_i \mapsto r_i(\mathbf{x}_i; \theta_i)$, for *type* $\theta_i \in \mathcal{T}_i$ that characterizes consumer i 's preferences within the *type space* $\mathcal{T}_i \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ of possible preferences.¹⁴ The goal of each consumer

¹¹Although a static exchange “market” is an economy, we prefer the term “market” for the static components of an infinite horizon Markov exchange economy, a dynamic exchange economy in which each time-period comprises one static market among many.

¹²Commodities are assumed to include labor services. Further, for any consumer i and endowment $e_i \in \mathcal{E}_i$, $e_{ij} \geq 0$ denotes the quantity of commodity j in consumer i 's possession, while $e_{ij} < 0$ denotes consumer i 's debt, in terms of commodity j .

¹³We note that, for any labor service j , consumer i 's consumption x_{ij} is negative and restricted by its consumption space to be lower bounded by the negative of i 's endowment, i.e., $x_{ij} \in [-e_{ij}, 0]$. This modeling choice allows us to model a consumer's preferences over the labor services she can provide. More generally, the consumption space models the constraints imposed on consumption by the “physical properties” of the world. That is, it rules out impossible combinations of commodities, such as strictly positive quantities of a commodity that is not available in the region where a consumer resides, or a supply of labor that amounts to more than 24 labor hours in a given day.

¹⁴In the sequel, we will be assuming, for any consumer i with any type $\theta_i \in \mathcal{T}_i$, the type-dependent utility function $\mathbf{x}_i \mapsto r_i(\mathbf{x}_i; \theta_i)$ is continuous, which implies that it can represent any type-dependent preference relation \succeq_{i, θ_i} on \mathbb{R}^m that is complete, transitive, and continuous (Debreu et al., 1954).

i is thus to buy a consumption $\mathbf{x}_i \in \mathcal{B}_i(\mathbf{e}_i, \mathbf{p})$ that maximizes its utility function $\mathbf{x}_i \mapsto r_i(\mathbf{x}_i; \boldsymbol{\theta}_i)$ over its budget set $\mathcal{B}_i(\mathbf{e}_i, \mathbf{p})$.

We denote any *endowment profile* (resp. *type profile* and *consumption profile*) as $\mathbf{E} \doteq (e_1, \dots, e_n)^T \in \mathcal{E}$ (resp. $\boldsymbol{\Theta} \doteq (\boldsymbol{\theta}_1, \dots, \boldsymbol{\theta}_n)^T \in \mathcal{T}$ and $\mathbf{X} \doteq (\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n)^T \in \mathcal{X}$). The *aggregate demand* (resp. *aggregate supply*) of a *consumption profile* $\mathbf{X} \in \mathcal{X}$ (resp. *an endowment profile* $\mathbf{E} \in \mathcal{E}$) is defined as the sum of consumptions (resp. endowments) across all consumers, i.e., $\sum_{i \in [n]} \mathbf{x}_i$ (resp. $\sum_{i \in [n]} e_i$).

4.2 Infinite Horizon Markov Exchange Economies

An *infinite horizon Markov exchange economy* $\mathcal{I} \doteq (n, m, l, d, \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E}, \mathcal{T}, \mathbf{r}, \gamma, p, \mathcal{R}, \mu)$, comprises $n \in \mathbb{N}$ consumers who, over an infinite discrete time horizon $t = 0, 1, 2, \dots$, repeatedly encounter the opportunity to buy a consumption of $m \in \mathbb{N}$ commodities and a portfolio of $l \in \mathbb{N}$ assets, with their collective decisions leading them through a *state space* $\mathcal{S} \doteq \mathcal{O} \times (\mathcal{E} \times \mathcal{T})$. This state space comprises a *world state space* \mathcal{O} and a *spot market space* $\mathcal{E} \times \mathcal{T}$. The spot market space is a collection of *spot markets*, each one a static exchange market $(\mathbf{E}, \boldsymbol{\Theta}) \in \mathcal{E} \times \mathcal{T} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R}^d$.

Each *asset* $k \in [l]$ is a *generalized Arrow security*, i.e., a divisible contract that transfers to its owner a quantity of the j th commodity at any world state $o \in \mathcal{O}$ determined by a matrix of asset returns $\mathbf{R}_o \doteq (\mathbf{r}_{o1}, \dots, \mathbf{r}_{ol})^T \in \mathbb{R}^{l \times m}$ s.t. $r_{okj} \in \mathbb{R}$ denotes the quantity of commodity j transferred at world state o for one unit of asset k . The collection of asset returns across all world states is given by $\mathcal{R} \doteq \{\mathbf{R}_o\}_{o \in \mathcal{O}}$. At any time step $t = 0, 1, 2, \dots$, a consumer $i \in [n]$ can invest in an *asset portfolio* $\mathbf{y}_i \in \mathcal{Y}_i$ from a *space of asset portfolios (or investments)* $\mathcal{Y}_i \subset \mathbb{R}^l$ that define the *asset market*, where $y_{ik} \geq 0$ denotes the units of asset k bought (long) by consumer i , while $y_{ik} < 0$ denotes units that are sold (short). Assets are assumed to be *short-lived* (Magill and Quinzii, 1994), meaning that any asset purchased at time t pays its dividends in the subsequent time period $t + 1$, and then expires.¹⁵ Assets allow consumers to insure themselves against future realizations of the spot market (i.e., types and endowments), by allowing it to transfer wealth across world states.

The economy starts at time period $t = 0$ in an *initial state* $S^{(0)} \sim \mu$ determined by an initial state distribution $\mu \in \Delta(\mathcal{S})$. At each time step $t = 0, 1, 2, \dots$, the state of the economy is $\mathbf{s}^{(t)} \doteq (o^{(t)}, \mathbf{E}^{(t)}, \boldsymbol{\Theta}^{(t)}) \in \mathcal{S}$. Each consumer $i \in [n]$, observes the world state $o^{(t)} \in \mathcal{O}$, and participates in a spot market $(\mathbf{E}^{(t)}, \boldsymbol{\Theta}^{(t)})$, where it purchases a *consumption* $\mathbf{x}_i^{(t)} \in \mathcal{X}_i$ at *commodity prices* $\mathbf{p}^{(t)} \in \Delta_m$, and an *asset market* where it invests in an *asset portfolio* $\mathbf{y}_i^{(t)} \in \mathcal{Y}_i$ at *assets prices* $\mathbf{q}^{(t)} \in \mathbb{R}^l$. Every consumer is constrained to buy a consumption $\mathbf{x}_i^{(t)} \in \mathcal{X}_i$ and invest in an asset portfolio $\mathbf{y}_i^{(t)} \in \mathcal{Y}_i$ with a total cost weakly less than the value of its current endowment $\mathbf{e}_i^{(t)} \in \mathcal{E}_i$. Formally, the set of consumptions and investment portfolios that a consumer i can afford with its current endowment $\mathbf{e}_i^{(t)} \in \mathcal{E}_i$ at current commodity prices $\mathbf{p}^{(t)} \in \Delta_m$ and current asset prices $\mathbf{q}^{(t)} \in \mathbb{R}^l$, i.e., its *budget set* $\mathcal{B}_i(\mathbf{e}_i^{(t)}, \mathbf{p}^{(t)}, \mathbf{q}^{(t)})$, is determined by its *budget correspondence* $\mathcal{B}_i(\mathbf{e}_i, \mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q}) \doteq \{(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{y}_i) \in \mathcal{X}_i \times \mathcal{Y}_i \mid \mathbf{x}_i \cdot \mathbf{p} + \mathbf{y}_i \cdot \mathbf{q} \leq \mathbf{e}_i \cdot \mathbf{p}\}$.

After the consumers make their consumption and investment decisions, they each receive *reward* $r_i(\mathbf{x}_i^{(t)}; \boldsymbol{\theta}_i^{(t)})$ as a function of their consumption and type, and then the economy either collapses with probability $1 - \gamma$,

¹⁵While for ease of exposition we assume that assets are short-lived, our results generalize to infinitely-lived generalized Arrow securities (Huang and Werner, 2004) (i.e., securities that never expire, so yield returns and can be resold in every subsequent time period following their purchase) with appropriate modifications to the definitions of the budget constraints and Walras' law. In contrast, our results do *not* immediately generalize to *k-period-living generalized Arrow securities* (i.e., securities that yield returns and can be resold in the k subsequent time periods following their purchase, until their expiration), as such securities introduce non-stationarities into the economy. To accommodate such securities would require that we generalize our Markov game model and methods to accommodate policies that depend on histories of length k .

or survives with probability γ , where $\gamma \in (0, 1)$ is called the *discount rate*.¹⁶ If the economy survives to see another day, then a new state is realized, namely $(O', E', \Theta') \sim p(\cdot \mid \mathbf{s}^{(t)}, \mathbf{Y}^{(t)})$, according to a *transition probability function* $p : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ that depends on the consumers' investment portfolio profile $\mathbf{Y}^{(t)} \doteq (\mathbf{y}_1^{(t)}, \dots, \mathbf{y}_n^{(t)})^T \in \mathcal{Y}$, after which the economy transitions to a new state $S^{(t+1)} \doteq (O', E' + \mathbf{Y}^{(t)} \mathbf{R}_{O'}, \Theta')$, where the consumers' new endowments depends on their returns $\mathbf{Y}^{(t)} \mathbf{R}_{O'} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$ on their investments.

Remark 1. *If only one commodity is delivered in exchange for assets, i.e., for all world states $o \in \mathcal{O}$, $\text{Rank}(\mathbf{R}_o) \leq 1$, then the generalized Arrow securities are numéraire generalized Arrow securities, and the assets are called financial assets.*¹⁷ *An infinite horizon Markov exchange economy is world-state-contingent iff the cardinality of the world state space is weakly greater than that of the spot market space, i.e., $|\mathcal{O}| \geq |\mathcal{E} \times \mathcal{T}|$. Intuitively, when this condition holds, there exists a surjection from world states to spot market states, which implies that spot market states are implicit in world states, so that the spot market states can be dropped from the state space, i.e., $\mathcal{S} \doteq \mathcal{O}$. An infinite horizon Markov exchange economy has complete asset markets if it is world-state-contingent, and assets can deliver some commodity at all world states, i.e., for all world states $o \in \mathcal{O}$, $\text{Rank}(\mathbf{R}_o) \geq 1$. Otherwise, it has incomplete asset markets. Colloquially, we call an infinite horizon exchange economy with (in)complete asset markets an (in)complete exchange economy. Intuitively, in complete exchange economies, consumers can insure themselves against all future realizations of the spot market—uncertainty regarding their endowments and types—since a complete exchange economy is world-state contingent. Further, when there is only a single commodity, s.t. $m = 1$, and only one financial asset which is a risk-free bond s.t. $l = 1$, and the return matrix for all world states $o \in \mathcal{O}$ (now a scalar since there is only one commodity and one financial asset) is given by $r_o \doteq \alpha$, for some $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$, we obtain the standard incomplete market model (Blackwell, 1965; Lucas Jr and Prescott, 1971).*

A history $\mathbf{h} \in \mathcal{H}^\tau \doteq (\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y} \times \Delta_m \times \mathbb{R}^l)^\tau \times \mathcal{S}$ is a sequence $\mathbf{h} = ((\mathbf{s}^{(t)}, \mathbf{X}^{(t)}, \mathbf{Y}^{(t)}, \mathbf{p}^{(t)}, \mathbf{q}^{(t)})_{t=0}^{\tau-1}, \mathbf{s}^{(\tau)})$ of tuples comprising states, consumption profiles, investment profiles, commodity price, and asset prices s.t. a history of length 0 corresponds only to the initial state of the economy. For any history $\mathbf{h} \in \mathcal{H}^\tau$, we denote by $\mathbf{h}_{:p}$ the first $p \in [\tau^*]$ steps of \mathbf{h} , i.e., $\mathbf{h}_{:p} \doteq ((\mathbf{s}^{(t)}, \mathbf{X}^{(t)}, \mathbf{Y}^{(t)}, \mathbf{p}^{(t)}, \mathbf{q}^{(t)})_{t=0}^{p-1}, \mathbf{s}^{(p)})$. Overloading notation, we define the *history space* $\mathcal{H} \doteq \bigcup_{\tau=0}^{\infty} \mathcal{H}^\tau$, and then *consumption, investment, commodity price and asset price policies* as mappings $\mathbf{x}_i : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}_i$, $\mathbf{y}_i : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}_i$, $\mathbf{p} : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \Delta_m$, and $\mathbf{q} : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^l$ from histories to consumptions, investments, commodity prices, and asset prices, respectively, s.t. $(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{y}_i)(\mathbf{h})$ is the consumption-investment decision of consumer $i \in [n]$, and $(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q})(\mathbf{h})$ are commodity and asset prices, both at history $\mathbf{h} \in \mathcal{H}$. A *consumption policy profile* (resp. *investment policy profile*) $\mathbf{X}(\mathbf{h}) \doteq (\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n)(\mathbf{h})^T$ (resp. $\mathbf{Y}(\mathbf{h}) \doteq (\mathbf{y}_1, \dots, \mathbf{y}_n)(\mathbf{h})^T$) is a collection of consumption (resp. investment) policies for all consumers. A consumption policy $\mathbf{x}_i : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}_i$ is *Markov* if it depends only on the last state of the history, i.e., $\mathbf{x}_i(\mathbf{h}) = \mathbf{x}_i(\mathbf{s}^{(\tau)})$, for all histories $\mathbf{h} \in \mathcal{H}^\tau$ of all lengths $\tau \in \mathbb{N}$. An analogous definition extends to investment, commodity price, and asset price policies.

Given $\boldsymbol{\pi} \doteq (\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q})$ and a history $\mathbf{h} \in \mathcal{H}^\tau$, we define the *discounted history distribution* assuming initial state distribution μ as $\nu_\mu^{\boldsymbol{\pi}, \tau}(\mathbf{h}) = \mu(\mathbf{s}^{(0)}) \prod_{t=0}^{\tau-1} \gamma^t p(O^{(t+1)}, \mathbf{E}^{(t+1)} + \mathbf{Y}^{(t)} \mathbf{R}_{O^{(t+1)}}, \Theta^{(t+1)} \mid$

¹⁶While for ease of exposition we assume a single discount factor for all consumers, our results extend to a setting in which each consumer $i \in [n]$ has a potentially unique discount factor $\gamma_i \in (0, 1)$ by incorporating the discount rates into the consumers' payoffs in the Markov pseudo-game defined in Appendix B.2, rather than the history distribution.

¹⁷Recall that the numéraire is a fixed commodity that is used to standardize the value of other commodities, while a numéraire generalized Arrow security is a generalized Arrow security that delivers its returns in terms of the numéraire. If the assets deliver exactly one commodity, i.e., $\text{Rank}(\mathbf{R}_o) = 1$ at all world states o , we take that commodity to be the numéraire for the corresponding spot markets. On the other hand, if the assets deliver no commodity, i.e., $\text{Rank}(\mathbf{R}_o) = 0$ at world state o , then we can take any arbitrary commodity to be the numéraire, in which case, the assets vacuously “deliver” zero units of the numéraire, and no units of any other commodities either.

$\mathbf{s}^{(t)}, \mathbf{Y}^{(t)} \mathbb{1}_{\{\mathbf{Y}(\mathbf{h}_{:t})\}}(\mathbf{Y}^{(t)})$. Overloading notation, we define the set of all realizable trajectories $\mathcal{H}^{\pi, \tau}$ of length τ under policy profile π as $\mathcal{H}^{\pi, \tau} \doteq \text{supp}(\nu_{\mu}^{\pi, \tau})$, i.e., the set of all histories that occur with non-zero probability, and we let $H = ((S^{(t)}, A^{(t)})_{t=0}^{\tau-1}, S^{(\tau)})$ be any randomly sampled history from $\nu_{\mu}^{\pi, \tau}$. Finally, we abbreviate $\nu_{\mu}^{\pi} \doteq \nu_{\mu}^{\pi, \infty}$.

4.3 Solution Concepts and Existence

An *outcome* $(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q}) : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y} \times \Delta_m \times \mathbb{R}^l$ of an infinite horizon Markov exchange economy is a tuple¹⁸ consisting of a commodity prices policy, an asset prices policy, a consumption policy profile, and an investment policy profile. An outcome is *Markov* if all its constituent policies are Markov: i.e., if it depends only on the last state of the history, i.e., $(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q})(\mathbf{h}) = (\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q})(\mathbf{s}^{(\tau)})$, for all histories $\mathbf{h} \in \mathcal{H}^{\tau}$ of all lengths $\tau \in \mathbb{N}$.

We now introduce a number of properties of infinite horizon Markov exchange economies outcomes, which we use to define our solution concepts. While these properties are defined broadly for (in general, history-dependent) outcomes, they also apply in the special case of Markov outcomes.

Given a consumption and investment profile (\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}) , the *consumption state-value function* $v_i^{(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q})} : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is defined as: $v_i^{(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q})}(\mathbf{s}) \doteq \mathbb{E}_{H \sim \nu_{\mu}^{(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q})}} [\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t r_i(\mathbf{x}_i(H_{:t}); \Theta^{(t)}) \mid S^{(0)} = \mathbf{s}]$.

An outcome $(\mathbf{X}^*, \mathbf{Y}^*, \mathbf{p}^*, \mathbf{q}^*)$ is *optimal* for i if i 's *expected cumulative utility* $u_i(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q}) \doteq \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{s} \sim \mu} [v_i^{(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q})}(\mathbf{s})]$ is maximized over all affordable consumption and investment policies, i.e.,

$$(\mathbf{x}_i^*, \mathbf{y}_i^*) \in \arg \max_{\substack{(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{y}_i) : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}_i \times \mathcal{Y}_i, \forall t \in \mathbb{N}, \mathbf{h} \in \mathcal{H}^t \\ (\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{y}_i)(\mathbf{h}_{:t}) \in \mathcal{B}_i(\mathbf{e}_i^{(t)}, \mathbf{p}^*(\mathbf{h}_{:t}), \mathbf{q}^*(\mathbf{h}_{:t}))}} u_i(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{x}_{-i}^*, \mathbf{y}_i, \mathbf{y}_{-i}^*, \mathbf{p}^*, \mathbf{q}^*) . \quad (6)$$

A Markov outcome $(\mathbf{X}^*, \mathbf{Y}^*, \mathbf{p}^*, \mathbf{q}^*)$ is *Markov perfect* for i if i maximizes its consumption state-value function over all affordable consumption and investment policies, i.e.,

$$(\mathbf{x}_i^*, \mathbf{y}_i^*) \in \arg \max_{\substack{(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{y}_i) : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}_i \times \mathcal{Y}_i, \forall \mathbf{s} \in \mathcal{S}, \\ (\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{y}_i)(\mathbf{s}) \in \mathcal{B}_i(\mathbf{e}_i, \mathbf{p}^*(\mathbf{s}), \mathbf{q}^*(\mathbf{s}))}} \left\{ v_i^{(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{x}_{-i}^*, \mathbf{y}_i, \mathbf{y}_{-i}^*, \mathbf{p}^*, \mathbf{q}^*)}(\mathbf{s}) \right\} . \quad (7)$$

A consumption policy \mathbf{X} is said to be *feasible* iff for all time horizons $\tau \in \mathbb{N}$ and histories $\mathbf{h} \in \mathcal{H}^{\tau}$ of length τ , $\sum_{i \in [n]} \mathbf{x}_i(\mathbf{h}) - \sum_{i \in [n]} \mathbf{e}_i^{(\tau)} \leq \mathbf{0}_m$, where $\mathbf{e}_i^{(\tau)} \in \mathcal{E}_i$ is consumer i 's endowment at the end of history \mathbf{h} , i.e., at state $\mathbf{s}^{(\tau)}$. Similarly, an investment policy is *feasible* if $\sum_{i \in [n]} \mathbf{y}_i(\mathbf{h}) \leq \mathbf{0}_l$. If all the consumption and investment policies associated with an outcome are feasible, we will colloquially refer to the outcome as *feasible* as well.

An outcome $(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q})$ is said to satisfy *Walras' law* iff for all time horizons $\tau \in \mathbb{N}$ and histories $\mathbf{h} \in \mathcal{H}^{\tau}$ of length τ , $\mathbf{p}(\mathbf{h}) \cdot \left(\sum_{i \in [n]} \mathbf{x}_i(\mathbf{h}) - \sum_{i \in [n]} \mathbf{e}_i^{(\tau)} \right) + \mathbf{q}(\mathbf{h}) \cdot \left(\sum_{i \in [n]} \mathbf{y}_i(\mathbf{h}) \right) = 0$, where, as above, $\mathbf{e}_i^{(\tau)} \in \mathcal{E}_i$ is consumer i 's endowment at state $\mathbf{s}^{(\tau)}$.

The canonical solution concept for stochastic economies is the Radner equilibrium.

Definition 1 (Radner Equilibrium). A Radner (or sequential competitive) equilibrium (RE) (*Radner, 1972*) of an infinite horizon Markov exchange economy \mathcal{I} is an outcome $(\mathbf{X}^*, \mathbf{Y}^*, \mathbf{p}^*, \mathbf{q}^*)$ that is 1. optimal for all consumers, i.e., Equation (6) is satisfied, for all consumers $i \in [n]$; 2. feasible; and 3. satisfies Walras' law.

¹⁸Instead of expressing this tuple as $\mathcal{X}^{\mathcal{H}} \times \mathcal{Y}^{\mathcal{H}} \times \Delta_m^{\mathcal{H}} \times \mathbb{R}^{l\mathcal{H}}$, we sometimes write $(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q}) : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y} \times \Delta_m \times \mathbb{R}^l$.

As a Radner equilibrium is in general infinite dimensional, we are often interested in a recursive Radner equilibrium which is a *Markov* outcome, i.e., one that depends only on the last state of the history rather than the entire history, and as such better behaved.

Definition 2 (Recursive Radner Equilibrium). A recursive Radner (or Walrasian or competitive) equilibrium (RRE) (Mehra and Prescott, 1977; Prescott and Mehra, 1980) of an infinite horizon Markov exchange economy \mathcal{I} is a Markov outcome $(\mathbf{X}^*, \mathbf{Y}^*, \mathbf{p}^*, \mathbf{q}^*)$ that is 1. Markov perfect for all consumers, i.e., Equation (7) is satisfied, for all consumers $i \in [n]$; 2. feasible; and 3. satisfies Walras' law.

The following assumptions are standard in the equilibrium literature (see, for instance, Geanakoplos (1990)). We prove the existence of a recursive Radner equilibrium under these assumptions.

Assumption 6. Given an infinite horizon Markov exchange economy \mathcal{I} , assume for all $i \in [n]$,

1. $\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E}$, are non-empty, closed, convex, with \mathcal{E} additionally bounded;
2. $(\theta_i, \mathbf{x}_i) \mapsto r_i(\mathbf{x}_i; \theta_i)$ is continuous and concave, and $(\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{y}_i) \mapsto p(\mathbf{s}' \mid \mathbf{s}, \mathbf{y}_i, \mathbf{y}_{-i})$ is continuous and stochastically concave, for all $\mathbf{s}, \in \mathcal{S}$ and $\mathbf{y}_{-i} \in \mathcal{Y}_{-i}$;
3. for all $\mathbf{e}_i \in \mathcal{E}_i$, the correspondence

$$(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q}) \rightrightarrows \mathcal{B}_i(\mathbf{e}_i, \mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q}) \cap \{(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{y}_i) \mid \sum_{i \in [n]} \mathbf{x}_i \leq \sum_{i \in [n]} \mathbf{e}_i, \sum_{i \in [n]} \mathbf{y}_i \leq \mathbf{0}_m, (\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}\}$$

is continuous¹⁹;

4. $\mathcal{B}_i(\mathbf{e}_i, \mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q}) \cap \{(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{y}_i) \mid \sum_{i \in [n]} \mathbf{x}_i \leq \sum_{i \in [n]} \mathbf{e}_i, \sum_{i \in [n]} \mathbf{y}_i \leq \mathbf{0}_m, (\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}\}$ is non-empty, convex, and compact, for all $\mathbf{e}_i \in \mathcal{E}_i$, $\mathbf{p} \in \Delta_m$, and $\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{R}^l$ ²⁰;
5. (no saturation) there exists an $\mathbf{x}_i^+ \in \mathcal{X}_i$ s.t. $r_i(\mathbf{x}_i^+; \theta_i) > r_i(\mathbf{x}_i; \theta_i)$, for all $\mathbf{x}_i \in \mathcal{X}_i$ and $\theta_i \in \mathcal{T}_i$.

Next we associate an exchange economy Markov pseudo-game \mathcal{M} with a given infinite horizon Markov exchange economy \mathcal{I} .

Definition 3 (Exchange Economy Markov Pseudo-Game). Let \mathcal{I} be an infinite horizon Markov exchange economy. The corresponding exchange economy Markov pseudo-game $\mathcal{M} = (n + 1, m + l, \mathcal{S}, \times_{i \in [n]} (\mathcal{X}_i \times \mathcal{Y}_i) \times (\mathcal{P} \times \mathcal{Q}), \mathcal{B}', r', p', \gamma', \mu')$ is defined as

- The $n + 1$ players comprise n consumers, players $1, \dots, n$, and one auctioneer, player $n + 1$.
- The set of states $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{O} \times \mathcal{E} \times \mathcal{T}$. At each state $\mathbf{s} = (o, \mathbf{E}, \Theta) \in \mathcal{S}$,
 - each consumer $i \in [n]$ chooses an action $\mathbf{a}_i = (\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{y}_i) \in \mathcal{B}'_i(\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{a}_{-i}) \subseteq \mathcal{X}_i \times \mathcal{Y}_i$ from a set of feasible actions $\mathcal{B}'_i(\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{a}_{-i}) = \mathcal{B}_i(\mathbf{e}_i, \mathbf{a}_{n+1}) \cap \{(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{y}_i) \mid \sum_{i \in [n]} \mathbf{x}_i \leq \sum_{i \in [n]} \mathbf{e}_i, \sum_{i \in [n]} \mathbf{y}_i \leq \mathbf{0}_m, (\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}\}$ and receives reward $r'_i(\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{a}) \doteq r_i(\mathbf{x}_i; \theta_i)$; and
 - the auctioneer $n + 1$ chooses an action $\mathbf{a}_{n+1} = (\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q}) \in \mathcal{B}'_{n+1}(\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{a}_{-(n+1)}) \doteq \mathcal{P} \times \mathcal{Q}$ where $\mathcal{P} \doteq \Delta_m$ and $\mathcal{Q} \subseteq [0, \max_{\mathbf{E} \in \mathcal{E}} \sum_{i \in [n]} \sum_{j \in [m]} e_{ij}]^l$, and receives reward $r'_{n+1}(\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{a}) \doteq \mathbf{p} \cdot \left(\sum_{i \in [n]} \mathbf{x}_i - \sum_{i \in [n]} \mathbf{e}_i \right) + \mathbf{q} \cdot \left(\sum_{i \in [n]} \mathbf{y}_i \right)$.
- The transition probability function is defined as $p'(\mathbf{s}' \mid \mathbf{s}, \mathbf{a}) \doteq p(\mathbf{s}' \mid \mathbf{s}, \mathbf{Y})$.

¹⁹One way to ensure that this condition holds is to assume that for all $\mathbf{s} = (o, \mathbf{E}, \Theta) \in \mathcal{S}$, returns from assets are positive $\mathbf{R}_o \geq \mathbf{0}_{ml}$, and for all consumers $i \in [n]$, there exists $(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{y}_i) \in \mathcal{X}_i \times \mathcal{Y}_i$, s.t. $\mathbf{x}_i < \mathbf{e}_i$, $\mathbf{y}_i < \mathbf{0}$.

²⁰One way to ensure that this condition holds is to assume that for all $\mathbf{s} = (o, \mathbf{E}, \Theta) \in \mathcal{S}$, returns from assets are positive, i.e., $\mathbf{R}_o \geq \mathbf{0}_{ml}$, and \mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y} are bounded from below.

- The discount rate $\gamma' = \gamma$ and the initial state distribution $\mu' = \mu$.

Our existence proof reformulates the set of recursive Radner equilibria of any infinite horizon Markov exchange economy as the set of GMPE of the exchange economy Markov pseudo-game.

Theorem 4.1. *Consider an infinite horizon Markov exchange economy \mathcal{I} . Under Assumption 6, the set of recursive Radner equilibria of \mathcal{I} is equal to the set of GMPE of the associated exchange economy Markov pseudo-game \mathcal{M} .*

Corollary 1. *Under Assumption 6, the set of recursive Radner equilibria of an infinite horizon Markov exchange economy is non-empty.*

4.4 Equilibrium Computation

Since a recursive Radner equilibrium is infinite-dimensional when the state space is continuous, its computation is FNP-hard (Murty and Kadi, 1987). As such, it is generally believed that the best we can hope to find in polynomial time is an outcome that satisfies the necessary conditions of a stationary point of a recursive Radner equilibrium. Since the set of recursive Radner equilibria of any infinite horizon Markov exchange economy is equal to the set of GMPE of the associated exchange economy Markov pseudo-game (Theorem 4.1), running Algorithm 1 on this exchange economy Markov pseudo-game will allow us to compute a policy profile that satisfies the necessary conditions of a stationary point of an GMPE, and hence a recursive Radner equilibrium.

Combining Theorem 4.1 and Theorem 3.2, we thus obtain the following computational complexity guarantees for Algorithm 1, when run on the exchange economy Markov pseudo-game associated with an infinite horizon Markov exchange economy.²¹

Theorem 4.2. *Consider an infinite horizon Markov exchange economy \mathcal{I} and the associated exchange economy Markov pseudo-games \mathcal{M} . Let $(\pi, \rho, \mathbb{R}^\Omega, \mathbb{R}^\Sigma)$ be a parametrization scheme for \mathcal{M} and suppose Assumptions 4, 5, and 6 hold. Then, the convergence results in Theorem 3.2 hold for \mathcal{M} .*

5 Experiments

Given an infinite horizon Markov exchange economy \mathcal{I} , we associate with it an exchange economy Markov pseudo-game \mathcal{M} , and we then construct a deep learning network to solve \mathcal{M} . To do so, we assume a parametrization scheme $(\pi, \rho, \mathbb{R}^\Omega, \mathbb{R}^\Sigma)$, where the parametric policy profiles (π, ρ) are represented by neural networks with $(\mathbb{R}^\Omega, \mathbb{R}^\Sigma)$ as the corresponding network weights. Computing an RRE via Algorithm 1 can then be seen as the result of training a generative adversarial neural network (Goodfellow et al., 2014), where π (resp. ρ) is the output of the generator (resp. adversarial) network. We call such a neural representation a *generative adversarial policy network (GAPNet)*.

Following this approach, we built GAPNets to approximate the RRE in two types of infinite-horizon Markov exchange economies: one with a deterministic transition probability function and another with a stochastic transition probability function. Within each type, we experimented with three randomly sampled economies, each with 10 consumers, 10 commodities, 1 asset, 5 world states, and characterized

²¹While for generality and ease of exposition we state Assumptions 4 and 5 for the exchange economy Markov pseudo-game \mathcal{M} , we note that when the infinite horizon Markov exchange economy \mathcal{I} satisfies Assumption 6, to ensure that the associated exchange economy Markov pseudo-game \mathcal{M} satisfies Assumption 4 and 5, it suffices to assume that the parametric policy functions (π, ρ) are affine; the policy parameter spaces $(\mathbb{R}^\Omega, \mathbb{R}^\Sigma)$ are non-empty, compact, and convex; for all players $i \in [n]$ and types $\theta_i \in \mathcal{T}_i$, the utility function $\mathbf{x}_i \mapsto r_i(\mathbf{x}_i; \theta_i)$ is twice continuously differentiable; and for all $\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{s}' \in \mathcal{S}$, the transition function $\mathbf{Y} \mapsto p(\mathbf{s}' | \mathbf{s}, \mathbf{Y})$ is twice continuously differentiable.




Figure 1: Normalized Metrics for Economies with Stochastic Transition Probability Function

by a distinct class of reward functions, which impart different smoothness properties onto the state-value function: *linear*: $r_i(\mathbf{x}_i; \boldsymbol{\theta}_i) = \sum_{j \in [m]} \theta_{ij} x_{ij}$; *Cobb-Douglas*: $r_i(\mathbf{x}_i; \boldsymbol{\theta}_i) = \prod_{j \in [m]} x_{ij}^{\theta_{ij}}$; and *Leontief*: $r_i(\mathbf{x}_i; \boldsymbol{\theta}_i) = \min_{j \in [m]} \left\{ \frac{x_{ij}}{\theta_{ij}} \right\}$.²²

We compare our results with a classic neural projection method (also known as deep equilibrium nets (Azinovic et al., 2022)), which macroeconomists and others use to solve stochastic economies. In this latter method, one seeks a policy profile that minimizes the norm of the system of first-order necessary and sufficient conditions that characterize RRE (see for instance, (Fernández-Villaverde, 2023)).²³ We use the same network architecture for both methods, and select hyperparameters through grid search. In all experiments, we evaluate the performance of the computed policy profiles using three metrics: total first-order violations, average Bellman errors,²⁴ and exploitability.

Figure 2 (Appendix C) depicts our results for economies with deterministic transition functions. Perhaps unsurprisingly, while GAPNets demonstrates a clear advantage in minimizing exploitability in all three economies, the neural projection method (NPM) slightly outperforms GAPNets in minimizing total first order violations and average Bellman error, the metrics they are specifically designed to minimize. Furthermore, in all three economies, exploitability is near 0, highlighting GAPNet’s ability to approximate at least a Radner equilibrium. Figure 1 presents our results for economies with stochastic transition functions. These results indicate that stochasticity hinders NPM’s ability to minimize the three metrics, even the method is explicitly designed to minimize two of them. In contrast, GAPNet successfully minimizes all three metrics across all economies.

²²Full details of our experimental setup appear in Appendix C, including hyperparameter search values, final experimental configurations, and visualization code. See also our code repository: <https://anonymous.4open.science/r/Markov-Pseudo-Game-EC2025-DCB8>.

²³We describe the neural projection method in Appendix C.1.

²⁴The definitions of these two metrics can be found in Appendix C.1.

6 Conclusion

In this paper, we tackled the problem of computing general equilibrium in dynamic stochastic economies. We showed that the computation of a recursive Radner equilibrium in an infinite horizon Markov exchange economy can be reduced to the computation of a generalized Markov perfect equilibrium in an associated generalized Markov pseudo-game. This reduction allowed us to develop a polynomial-time algorithm to approximate recursive Radner equilibria. Perhaps more importantly, our work connects recent developments in deep reinforcement learning to macroeconomics, thereby uncovering myriad potential new research directions.

References

- Daron Acemoglu. *Introduction to modern economic growth*. Princeton university press, 2008. (Cited on page 29.)
- Yves Achdou, Jiequn Han, Jean-Michel Lasry, Pierre-Louis Lions, and Benjamin Moll. Income and wealth distribution in macroeconomics: A continuous-time approach. *The review of economic studies*, 89(1): 45–86, 2022. (Cited on page 29.)
- Alekh Agarwal, Sham M Kakade, Jason D Lee, and Gaurav Mahajan. Optimality and approximation with policy gradient methods in markov decision processes. In *Conference on Learning Theory*, pages 64–66. PMLR, 2020. (Cited on pages 12 and 13.)
- S Rao Aiyagari. Uninsured idiosyncratic risk and aggregate saving. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 109(3):659–684, 1994. (Cited on page 29.)
- Kenneth Arrow and Gerard Debreu. Existence of an equilibrium for a competitive economy. *Econometrica: Journal of the Econometric Society*, pages 265–290, 1954. (Cited on pages 1, 2, 5, 6, and 8.)
- Kenneth J Arrow. An extension of the basic theorems of classical welfare economics. In *Proceedings of the second Berkeley symposium on mathematical statistics and probability*, volume 2, pages 507–533. University of California Press, 1951. (Cited on page 3.)
- Kenneth J Arrow. Le role des valeurs boursieres pour la repartition la meilleure des risques, econometrie, 41-47, english translation as the role of securities in the optimal allocation of risk-bearing. *Review of Economic Studies*, 31:91–96, 1964. (Cited on pages 2, 3, and 4.)
- Kenneth Joseph Arrow, Leonid Hurwicz, and Hirofumi Uzawa. *Studies in linear and non-linear programming*. 1958. (Cited on pages 10 and 12.)
- Alp E Atakan. Stochastic convexity in dynamic programming. *Economic Theory*, 22:447–455, 2003a. (Cited on page 40.)
- Alp E. Atakan. Stochastic convexity in dynamic programming. *Economic Theory*, 22(2):447–455, 2003b. ISSN 09382259, 14320479. URL <http://www.jstor.org/stable/25055693>. (Cited on page 6.)
- Adrien Auclert, Bence Bardóczy, Matthew Rognlie, and Ludwig Straub. Using the sequence-space jacobian to solve and estimate heterogeneous-agent models. *Econometrica*, 89(5):2375–2408, 2021. (Cited on pages 28 and 30.)
- Marlon Azinovic, Luca Gaegauf, and Simon Scheidegger. Deep equilibrium nets. *International Economic Review*, 63(4):1471–1525, 2022. (Cited on pages 20 and 41.)
- Xiaohui Bei, Jugal Garg, and Martin Hoefer. Tatonnement for linear and gross substitutes markets. *CoRR abs/1507.04925*, 2015. (Cited on page 30.)

- Richard Bellman. Dynamic programming. *Science*, 153(3731):34–37, 1966. (Cited on page 8.)
- Truman Bewley. A difficulty with the optimum quantity of money. *Econometrica: Journal of the Econometric Society*, pages 1485–1504, 1983. (Cited on page 29.)
- Jalaj Bhandari and Daniel Russo. Global optimality guarantees for policy gradient methods. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1906.01786*, 2019. (Cited on pages 8 and 38.)
- Fischer Black and Myron Scholes. The pricing of options and corporate liabilities. *Journal of political economy*, 81(3):637–654, 1973. (Cited on page 3.)
- David Blackwell. Discounted dynamic programming. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, 36(1):226–235, 1965. (Cited on page 16.)
- Olivier Jean Blanchard and Charles M Kahn. The solution of linear difference models under rational expectations. *Econometrica: Journal of the Econometric Society*, pages 1305–1311, 1980. (Cited on page 31.)
- Mathieu Blondel, Quentin Berthet, Marco Cuturi, Roy Frostig, Stephan Hoyer, Felipe Llinares-López, Fabian Pedregosa, and Jean-Philippe Vert. Efficient and modular implicit differentiation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2105.15183*, 2021. (Cited on page 44.)
- James Bradbury, Roy Frostig, Peter Hawkins, Matthew James Johnson, Chris Leary, Dougal Maclaurin, George Necula, Adam Paszke, Jake VanderPlas, Skye Wanderman-Milne, and Qiao Zhang. JAX: composable transformations of Python+NumPy programs, 2018. URL <http://github.com/google/jax>. (Cited on page 44.)
- Simina Brânzei, Nikhil Devanur, and Yuval Rabani. Proportional dynamics in exchange economies. In *Proceedings of the 22nd ACM Conference on Economics and Computation*, pages 180–201, 2021. (Cited on page 30.)
- David Cass. *Competitive equilibrium with incomplete financial markets*. University of Pennsylvania, Center for Analytic Research in Economics and . . . , 1984. (Cited on page 28.)
- David Cass. *On the "number" of equilibrium allocations with incomplete financial markets*. University of Pennsylvania, Center for Analytic Research in Economics and . . . , 1985. (Cited on page 28.)
- Xi Chen and Xiaotie Deng. Settling the complexity of two-player nash equilibrium. In *2006 47th Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS'06)*, pages 261–272. IEEE, 2006. (Cited on page 30.)
- Xi Chen, Xiaotie Deng, and Shang-Hua Teng. Settling the complexity of computing two-player nash equilibria. *Journal of the ACM (JACM)*, 56(3):1–57, 2009. (Cited on page 9.)
- David Childers, Jesús Fernández-Villaverde, Jesse Perla, Christopher Rackauckas, and Peifan Wu. Differentiable state-space models and hamiltonian monte carlo estimation. Technical report, National Bureau of Economic Research, 2022. (Cited on page 31.)
- Lawrence J Christiano, Martin S Eichenbaum, and Mathias Trabandt. On dsge models. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 32(3):113–140, 2018. (Cited on page 29.)
- Richard Clarida, Jordi Gali, and Mark Gertler. Monetary policy rules and macroeconomic stability: evidence and some theory. *The Quarterly journal of economics*, 115(1):147–180, 2000. (Cited on page 29.)
- James Cloyne, Clodomiro Ferreira, and Paolo Surico. Monetary policy when households have debt: new evidence on the transmission mechanism. *The Review of Economic Studies*, 87(1):102–129, 2020. (Cited on page 29.)

- Bruno Codenotti, Benton McCune, and Kasturi Varadarajan. Market equilibrium via the excess demand function. In *Proceedings of the thirty-seventh annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing*, pages 74–83, 2005. (Cited on page 30.)
- Bruno Codenotti, Amin Saberi, Kasturi Varadarajan, and Yinyu Ye. Leontief economies encode nonzero sum two-player games. In *SODA*, volume 6, pages 659–667, 2006. (Cited on page 30.)
- John C Cox and Stephen A Ross. The valuation of options for alternative stochastic processes. *Journal of financial economics*, 3(1-2):145–166, 1976. (Cited on page 28.)
- John C Cox, Stephen A Ross, and Mark Rubinstein. Option pricing: A simplified approach. *Journal of financial Economics*, 7(3):229–263, 1979. (Cited on page 28.)
- John C Cox, Jonathan E Ingersoll Jr, and Stephen A Ross. An intertemporal general equilibrium model of asset prices. *Econometrica: Journal of the Econometric Society*, pages 363–384, 1985. (Cited on page 28.)
- Michael Curry, Alexander Trott, Soham Phade, Yu Bai, and Stephan Zheng. Learning solutions in large economic networks using deep multi-agent reinforcement learning. (Cited on page 31.)
- Constantinos Daskalakis, Paul W Goldberg, and Christos H Papadimitriou. The complexity of computing a nash equilibrium. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 39(1):195–259, 2009. (Cited on pages 9 and 30.)
- Constantinos Daskalakis, Dylan J Foster, and Noah Golowich. Independent policy gradient methods for competitive reinforcement learning. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 33:5527–5540, 2020. (Cited on pages 5, 12, 13, 37, and 38.)
- Damek Davis, Dmitriy Drusvyatskiy, Kellie J MacPhee, and Courtney Paquette. Subgradient methods for sharp weakly convex functions. *Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications*, 179:962–982, 2018. (Cited on page 37.)
- Gerard Debreu. The coefficient of resource utilization. *Econometrica*, 19(3):273–292, 1951. ISSN 00129682, 14680262. URL <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1906814>. (Cited on page 3.)
- Gerard Debreu et al. Representation of a preference ordering by a numerical function. *Decision processes*, 3: 159–165, 1954. (Cited on page 14.)
- Xiaotie Deng and Ye Du. The computation of approximate competitive equilibrium is ppad-hard. *Information Processing Letters*, 108(6):369–373, 2008. (Cited on page 30.)
- N. R. Devanur, C. H. Papadimitriou, A. Saberi, and V. V. Vazirani. Market equilibrium via a primal-dual-type algorithm. In *The 43rd Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, 2002. Proceedings.*, pages 389–395, 2002. doi: 10.1109/SFCS.2002.1181963. (Cited on page 30.)
- Peter Diamond. Income taxation with fixed hours of work. *Journal of Public Economics*, 13(1):101–110, 1980. (Cited on page 29.)
- Peter A. Diamond. The role of a stock market in a general equilibrium model with technological uncertainty. *The American Economic Review*, 57(4):759–776, 1967. ISSN 00028282. URL <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1815367>. (Cited on pages 3 and 29.)
- Steven Diamond and Stephen Boyd. CVXPY: A Python-embedded modeling language for convex optimization. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 17(83):1–5, 2016. (Cited on page 44.)
- Jacques H Dreze. Investment under private ownership: optimality, equilibrium and stability. In *Allocation under Uncertainty: Equilibrium and Optimality: Proceedings from a Workshop sponsored by the International Economic Association*, pages 129–166. Springer, 1974. (Cited on page 4.)
- Darrell Duffie. Stochastic equilibria with incomplete financial markets. *Journal of Economic Theory*, 41(2): 405–416, 1987. (Cited on page 28.)

- Darrell Duffie and Wayne Shafer. Equilibrium in incomplete markets: I: A basic model of generic existence. *Journal of Mathematical Economics*, 14(3):285–300, 1985. (Cited on page 28.)
- Darrell Duffie and Wayne Shafer. Equilibrium in incomplete markets: II: Generic existence in stochastic economies. *Journal of Mathematical Economics*, 15(3):199–216, 1986. (Cited on page 28.)
- James Durbin and Siem Jan Koopman. *Time series analysis by state space methods*, volume 38. OUP Oxford, 2012. (Cited on page 30.)
- Maria Eskelinen. Monetary policy, agent heterogeneity and inequality: Insights from a three-agent new keynesian model. 2021. (Cited on page 29.)
- Francisco Facchinei and Christian Kanzow. Generalized nash equilibrium problems. *Annals of Operations Research*, 175(1):177–211, 2010. (Cited on page 5.)
- Ky Fan. Fixed-point and minimax theorems in locally convex topological linear spaces. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 38(2):121–126, 1952. ISSN 0027-8424. (Cited on pages 31 and 32.)
- J. Fernández-Villaverde, J.F. Rubio-Ramírez, and F. Schorfheide. Chapter 9 - solution and estimation methods for dsge models. volume 2 of *Handbook of Macroeconomics*, pages 527–724. Elsevier, 2016. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/bs.hesmac.2016.03.006>. URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1574004816000070>. (Cited on pages 28 and 30.)
- Jesús Fernández-Villaverde. *Computational Methods for Macroeconomics*. University of Pennsylvania, 2023. URL <https://www.sas.upenn.edu/~jesusfv/teaching.html>. Lecture notes for one-year course on computational methods for economists. (Cited on pages 4 and 20.)
- Anthony V Fiacco and Jerzy Kyparisis. Convexity and concavity properties of the optimal value function in parametric nonlinear programming. *Journal of optimization theory and applications*, 48(1):95–126, 1986. (Cited on page 32.)
- Arlington M Fink. Equilibrium in a stochastic n -person game. *Journal of science of the hiroshima university, series ai (mathematics)*, 28(1):89–93, 1964. (Cited on pages 5 and 6.)
- Sjur Flam and Andrzej Ruszczyński. Noncooperative convex games: Computing equilibrium by partial regularization. Working papers, International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis, 1994. URL <https://EconPapers.repec.org/RePEc:wop:iasawp:wp94042>. (Cited on page 9.)
- Yuan Gao and Christian Kroer. First-order methods for large-scale market equilibrium computation. In Hugo Larochelle, Marc’Aurelio Ranzato, Raia Hadsell, Maria-Florina Balcan, and Hsuan-Tien Lin, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 33: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2020, NeurIPS 2020, December 6-12, 2020, virtual*, 2020. URL <https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper/2020/hash/f75526659f31040afeb61cb7133e4e6d-Abstract.html>. (Cited on page 30.)
- Rahul Garg and Sanjiv Kapoor. Auction algorithms for market equilibrium. In *Proceedings of the thirty-sixth annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing*, pages 511–518, 2004. (Cited on page 30.)
- John Geanakoplos. An introduction to general equilibrium with incomplete asset markets. *Journal of mathematical economics*, 19(1-2):1–38, 1990. (Cited on pages 2, 3, 4, 18, and 29.)
- John D Geanakoplos and Herakles M Polemarchakis. Walrasian indeterminacy and keynesian macroeconomics. *The Review of Economic Studies*, 53(5):755–779, 1986. (Cited on page 28.)
- Denizalp Goktas and Amy Greenwald. Exploitability minimization in games and beyond. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2022. (Cited on page 10.)

- Denizalp Goktas, David C Parkes, Ian Gemp, Luke Marris, Georgios Piliouras, Romuald Elie, Guy Lever, and Andrea Tacchetti. Generative adversarial equilibrium solvers. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.06607*, 2023a. (Cited on pages 5 and 11.)
- Denizalp Goktas, Jiayi Zhao, and Amy Greenwald. Tâtonnement in homothetic Fisher markets. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.04890*, 2023b. (Cited on page 30.)
- Ian Goodfellow, Jean Pouget-Abadie, Mehdi Mirza, Bing Xu, David Warde-Farley, Sherjil Ozair, Aaron Courville, and Yoshua Bengio. Generative adversarial nets. In Z. Ghahramani, M. Welling, C. Cortes, N. Lawrence, and K.Q. Weinberger, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 27. Curran Associates, Inc., 2014. URL <https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper/2014/file/5ca3e9b122f61f8f06494c97b1afccf3-Paper.pdf>. (Cited on page 19.)
- Bruce C Greenwald and Joseph E Stiglitz. Externalities in economies with imperfect information and incomplete markets. *The quarterly journal of economics*, 101(2):229–264, 1986. (Cited on page 29.)
- Jiequn Han, Yucheng Yang, et al. Deepham: A global solution method for heterogeneous agent models with aggregate shocks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2112.14377*, 2021. (Cited on pages 29 and 31.)
- Charles R. Harris, K. Jarrod Millman, Stéfan J van der Walt, Ralf Gommers, Pauli Virtanen, David Cournapeau, Eric Wieser, Julian Taylor, Sebastian Berg, Nathaniel J. Smith, Robert Kern, Matti Picus, Stephan Hoyer, Marten H. van Kerkwijk, Matthew Brett, Allan Haldane, Jaime Fernandez del Rio, Mark Wiebe, Pearu Peterson, Pierre Gérard-Marchant, Kevin Sheppard, Tyler Reddy, Warren Weckesser, Hameer Abbasi, Christoph Gohlke, and Travis E. Oliphant. Array programming with NumPy. *Nature*, 585: 357–362, 2020. doi: 10.1038/s41586-020-2649-2. (Cited on page 44.)
- Oliver D Hart. On the optimality of equilibrium when the market structure is incomplete. *Journal of economic theory*, 11(3):418–443, 1975. (Cited on page 4.)
- Tom Hennigan, Trevor Cai, Tamara Norman, Lena Martens, and Igor Babuschkin. Haiku: Sonnet for JAX, 2020. URL <http://github.com/deepmind/dm-haiku>. (Cited on page 44.)
- Kevin XD Huang and Jan Werner. Asset price bubbles in arrow-debreu and sequential equilibrium. *Economic Theory*, 15:253–278, 2000. (Cited on page 4.)
- Kevin XD Huang and Jan Werner. Implementing arrow-debreu equilibria by trading infinitely-lived securities. *Economic Theory*, 24:603–622, 2004. (Cited on page 15.)
- Gur Huberman. A simple approach to arbitrage pricing theory. *Journal of Economic Theory*, 28(1):183–191, 1982. (Cited on page 28.)
- Mark Huggett. The risk-free rate in heterogeneous-agent incomplete-insurance economies. *Journal of economic Dynamics and Control*, 17(5-6):953–969, 1993. (Cited on page 29.)
- J. D. Hunter. Matplotlib: A 2d graphics environment. *Computing in Science and Engineering*, 9(3):90–95, 2007. doi: 10.1109/MCSE.2007.55. (Cited on page 44.)
- Kamal Jain, Vijay V Vazirani, and Yinyu Ye. Market equilibria for homothetic, quasi-concave utilities and economies of scale in production. In *SODA*, volume 5, pages 63–71, 2005. (Cited on page 30.)
- Kenneth L Judd. Projection methods for solving aggregate growth models. *Journal of Economic Theory*, 58 (2):410–452, December 1992. ISSN 0022-0531. doi: 10.1016/0022-0531(92)90061-L. URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/002205319290061L>. (Cited on page 40.)
- Jinill Kim and Sunghyun Henry Kim. Spurious welfare reversals in international business cycle models. *Journal of International Economics*, 60(2):471–500, 2003. (Cited on page 30.)

- Robert G King, Charles I Plosser, and Sergio T Rebelo. Production, growth and business cycles: Technical appendix. *Computational Economics*, 20:87–116, 2002. (Cited on page 31.)
- Finn E Kydland and Edward C Prescott. Time to build and aggregate fluctuations. *Econometrica: Journal of the Econometric Society*, pages 1345–1370, 1982. (Cited on pages 28, 29, and 31.)
- Tianyi Lin, Chi Jin, and Michael Jordan. On gradient descent ascent for nonconvex-concave minimax problems. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 6083–6093. PMLR, 2020. (Cited on pages 5, 13, and 38.)
- John Lintner. The valuation of risk assets and the selection of risky investments in stock portfolios and capital budgets. In *Stochastic optimization models in finance*, pages 131–155. Elsevier, 1975. (Cited on page 3.)
- Mingrui Liu, Hassan Rafique, Qihang Lin, and Tianbao Yang. First-order Convergence Theory for Weakly-Convex-Weakly-Concave Min-max Problems, July 2021. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/1810.10207>. arXiv:1810.10207. (Cited on page 9.)
- John B Long Jr and Charles I Plosser. Real business cycles. *Journal of political Economy*, 91(1):39–69, 1983. (Cited on page 29.)
- Lee Hsien Loong and Richard Zeckhauser. Pecuniary externalities do matter when contingent claims markets are incomplete. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 97(1):171–179, 1982. (Cited on page 29.)
- Robert E Lucas Jr. Asset prices in an exchange economy. *Econometrica: journal of the Econometric Society*, pages 1429–1445, 1978. (Cited on page 29.)
- Robert E Lucas Jr and Edward C Prescott. Investment under uncertainty. *Econometrica: Journal of the Econometric Society*, pages 659–681, 1971. (Cited on pages 16 and 28.)
- Michael Magill and Martine Quinzii. Infinite horizon incomplete markets. *Econometrica: Journal of the Econometric Society*, pages 853–880, 1994. (Cited on pages 1, 4, 5, and 15.)
- Michael Magill and Martine Quinzii. *Theory of incomplete markets*, volume 1. Mit press, 2002. (Cited on pages 3, 4, and 28.)
- Michael Magill and Wayne Shafer. Incomplete markets. *Handbook of mathematical economics*, 4:1523–1614, 1991. (Cited on page 3.)
- Lilia Maliar, Serguei Maliar, John Taylor, and Inna Tsener. A tractable framework for analyzing a class of nonstationary markov models. Technical report, National Bureau of Economic Research, 2015. (Cited on page 30.)
- Lilia Maliar, Serguei Maliar, and Pablo Winant. Deep learning for solving dynamic economic models. *Journal of Monetary Economics*, 122:76–101, September 2021. ISSN 0304-3932. doi: 10.1016/j.jmoneco.2021.07.004. URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0304393221000799>. (Cited on page 41.)
- Andreu Mas-Colell, Michael D. Whinston, and Jerry R. Green. *Microeconomic Theory*. Number 9780195102680 in OUP Catalogue. Oxford University Press, 1995. ISBN ARRAY(0x4cf9c5c0). URL <https://ideas.repec.org/b/oxp/obooks/9780195102680.html>. (Cited on page 4.)
- Eric Maskin and Jean Tirole. Markov perfect equilibrium: I. observable actions. *Journal of Economic Theory*, 100(2):191–219, 2001. (Cited on page 7.)
- R Mehra and EC Prescott. Recursive competitive equilibria and capital asset pricing. *Essays in Financial Economics*, 1977. (Cited on pages 5 and 18.)
- Franco Modigliani and Merton H Miller. The cost of capital, corporation finance and the theory of investment. *The American economic review*, 48(3):261–297, 1958. (Cited on page 3.)

- Jan Mossin. Equilibrium in a capital asset market. *Econometrica: Journal of the econometric society*, pages 768–783, 1966. (Cited on page 3.)
- Katta G Murty and Santosh N Kabadi. Some np-complete problems in quadratic and nonlinear programming. *Mathematical Programming*, 39:117–129, 1987. (Cited on page 19.)
- John F. Nash. The bargaining problem. *Econometrica*, 18(2):155–162, 1950a. ISSN 00129682, 14680262. URL <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1907266>. (Cited on page 9.)
- John F. Nash. Equilibrium points in n -person games. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 36(1):48–49, 1950b. doi: 10.1073/pnas.36.1.48. URL <https://www.pnas.org/doi/abs/10.1073/pnas.36.1.48>. (Cited on page 8.)
- David MG Newbery and Joseph E Stiglitz. *The theory of commodity price stabilization. A study in the economics of risk*. 1982. (Cited on page 29.)
- Juan Carlos Parra-Alvarez. *Solution Methods and Inference in Continuous-time Dynamic Equilibrium Economies:(with Applications in Asset Pricing and Income Fluctuation Models): a PhD Thesis Submitted to School of Business and Social Sciences, Aarhus University, in Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements of the PhD Degree in Economics and Business*. Department of Economics and Business, Aarhus University, 2015. (Cited on page 31.)
- Edward C. Prescott and Rajnish Mehra. Recursive competitive equilibrium: The case of homogeneous households. *Econometrica*, 48(6):1365–1379, 1980. ISSN 00129682, 14680262. URL <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1912812>. (Cited on pages 5 and 18.)
- Martin L Puterman. *Markov decision processes: discrete stochastic dynamic programming*. John Wiley & Sons, 2014. (Cited on page 10.)
- Roy Radner. Competitive equilibrium under uncertainty. *Econometrica: Journal of the Econometric Society*, pages 31–58, 1968. (Cited on page 3.)
- Roy Radner. Existence of equilibrium of plans, prices, and price expectations in a sequence of markets. *Econometrica: Journal of the Econometric Society*, pages 289–303, 1972. (Cited on pages 1, 4, and 17.)
- Roy Radner. Rational expectations equilibrium: Generic existence and the information revealed by prices. *Econometrica: Journal of the Econometric Society*, pages 655–678, 1979. (Cited on page 4.)
- Stephen A Ross. Options and efficiency. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 90(1):75–89, 1976. (Cited on page 28.)
- Thomas J Sargent and Lars Ljungqvist. Recursive macroeconomic theory. *Massachusetts Institute of Technology*, 2000. (Cited on pages 4 and 30.)
- Maxime Sauzet. Projection Methods via Neural Networks for Continuous-Time Models, December 2021. URL <https://papers.ssrn.com/abstract=3981838>. (Cited on page 41.)
- M. J. P. Selby. *Economica*, 57(227):413–415, 1990. ISSN 00130427, 14680335. URL <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2554945>. (Cited on page 28.)
- Lloyd S Shapley. Stochastic games. *Proceedings of the national academy of sciences*, 39(10):1095–1100, 1953. (Cited on page 6.)
- David Silver, Guy Lever, Nicolas Heess, Thomas Degris, Daan Wierstra, and Martin Riedmiller. Deterministic policy gradient algorithms. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 387–395. Pmlr, 2014. (Cited on page 36.)
- Joseph E Stiglitz. Self-selection and pareto efficient taxation. *Journal of public economics*, 17(2):213–240, 1982. (Cited on page 29.)

- Nancy L Stokey. *Recursive methods in economic dynamics*. Harvard University Press, 1989. (Cited on page 30.)
- Hyung Ju Suh, Max Simchowitz, Kaiqing Zhang, and Russ Tedrake. Do differentiable simulators give better policy gradients? In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 20668–20696. PMLR, 2022. (Cited on page 13.)
- Masayuki Takahashi. Equilibrium points of stochastic non-cooperative n -person games. *Journal of Science of the Hiroshima University, Series AI (Mathematics)*, 28(1):95–99, 1964. (Cited on pages 5 and 6.)
- John B Taylor and Michael Woodford. *Handbook of macroeconomics*, volume 1. Elsevier, 1999. (Cited on page 4.)
- Guido Van Rossum and Fred L Drake Jr. *Python tutorial*. Centrum voor Wiskunde en Informatica Amsterdam, The Netherlands, 1995. (Cited on page 44.)
- Abraham Wald. Statistical decision functions which minimize the maximum risk. *Annals of Mathematics*, pages 265–280, 1945. (Cited on page 10.)
- Leon Walras. *Elements de l'economie politique pure, ou, Theorie de la richesse sociale*. F. Rouge, 1896. (Cited on page 2.)
- Jan Werner. Equilibrium in economies with incomplete financial markets. *Journal of Economic Theory*, 36(1):110–119, 1985. (Cited on page 28.)

A Related Work

Beyond the works mentioned earlier, our paper is close to two literature on stochastic economies, one in financial economics which theoretical and focuses on understanding mathematical properties of general equilibrium competitive equilibrium in incomplete markets (Duffie, 1987; Selby, 1990; Duffie and Shafer, 1985; 1986), and another one in macroeconomics which focuses on the computation of sequential or recursive competitive equilibrium in incomplete stochastic economies to simulate various macroeconomic issues; see, for instance, Kydland and Prescott (1982) and Lucas Jr and Prescott (1971).²⁵

Financial economics Regarding the literature in financial economics, we refer the reader to the survey work of Magill and Quinzii (2002), and mention here only a few of some the influential models for the development of stochastic economies. Following the initial interest of the early 1970, the literature on stochastic economies in financial economics mostly focused on stochastic economies with two time-periods up to the end of the 1980s. In the early 1980s, there was an explosion of option pricing studies and arbitrage pricing in the early 1980s (See, for example, Cox and Ross (1976); Ross (1976) Cox et al. (1979), Cox et al. (1985), and Huberman (1982).] By the mid-1980s, the theory of stochastic economies made great strides, with two influential papers, Cass (1984; 1985) showing that existence of a general equilibrium could be guaranteed if all the assets promise delivery in fiat money, and he showed that with such financial assets there could be a multiplicity of equilibrium. In contrast, our existence result does not assume the existence of fiat money. Almost simultaneously Werner (1985) also gave a proof of existence of equilibrium with financial assets, and Geanakoplos and Polemarchakis (1986) showed the same for economies with real assets that promise delivery in the same consumption good. Duffie (1987) then extended the existence results for purely financial assets to arbitrary finite horizon stochastic economies. As stochastic economies with incomplete asset markets have been shown to not satisfy a first welfare theorem of economics, following preliminary

²⁵Since the 90s, a sizable body of work in financial economics (see for instance (Fernández-Villaverde et al., 2016; Auclert et al., 2021)) has considered computational approaches to solving general equilibrium models of financial markets; however, much of this work can be seen as extension of the macroeconomics literature.

insight from [Diamond \(1967\)](#) the literature turned its attention to define notions of constrained efficiency. Successive refinements of the definition were given by [Diamond \(1980\)](#), [Loong and Zeckhauser \(1982\)](#), [Newbery and Stiglitz \(1982\)](#), [Stiglitz \(1982\)](#), and [Greenwald and Stiglitz \(1986\)](#) with a mostly accepted definition of constrained efficiency becoming clear by the late 1980, with [Geanakoplos \(1990\)](#) eventually proving that sequential competitive equilibrium is constrained inefficient.

Macroeconomics The literature on stochastic economies in macroeconomics is known under the name of *dynamic stochastic general equilibrium (DSGE) models*. Stochastic economies have received interest in macroeconomics after [Lucas Jr's \(1978\)](#) seminal work, in which he derived a recursive competitive equilibrium in closed form in a stochastic economy with one commodity and one consumer allowing him to analyze asset prices in his model. Unfortunately, beyond Lucas' simpler model, it became apparent that analyzing the solutions of stochastic economies required the use of computation. One of the earliest popular stochastic economy models in economics which was solved via computational methods is the *Real Business Cycle (RBC)* model ([Kydland and Prescott, 1982](#); [Long Jr and Plosser, 1983](#)). The RBC model is a parameterized stochastic economy whose parameters are calibrated to accurately model the US economy. RBC models are characterized by demand generated by a representative infinitely-lived agent, with supply generated exogenously by a standard (or Solow) growth model ([Acemoglu, 2008](#)), or by a representative firm. These models have fallen out of favor, because some of their assumptions were invalidated by data (see, for example, Section 2 of [Christiano et al. \(2018\)](#)). They were replaced by a class of DSGE models known as *Representative Agent New Keynesian (RANK)* models (see, for instance, [Clarida et al. \(2000\)](#)). As RBC and RANK models derive their modelling assumptions from two different schools of macroeconomic thought (i.e., the New Keynesian and New Classical schools, respectively), from a mathematical and computational perspective they can be seen as the same, as both are characterized by a representative consumer and an exogenous growth model, or a representative firm.

Following the financial crisis of 2008, these representative-agent models, too, fell out of favor, and the literature turned to modeling heterogeneity, because of its importance in understanding inequality, in particular across consumers. *Heterogeneous agent new Keynesian models (HANK)* are stochastic economies which are built on top *Bewley-Huggett-Aiyagari* models ([Bewley, 1983](#); [Huggett, 1993](#); [Aiyagari, 1994](#)), and are characterized by demand and supply generated by an infinite population of agents with differing characteristics. These models are mathematically and computationally much more different than the RBC and RANK models and have been shown to be possible to model as single population mean-field games ([Achdou et al., 2022](#)), i.e., games with an infinite population of players. More recently, a new class of stochastic economies called *Many Agent New Keynesian (MANK)* has emerged. This class of models bridges the gap between the infinite population regime of heterogeneous agent models and the single agent regime of representative agent models. These models are characterized by a demand and a supply generated by multiple consumers and firms, but are arguably more interpretable ([Eskelinen, 2021](#)) (see, for instance, [Cloyne et al. \(2020\)](#); [Eskelinen \(2021\)](#)) and have shown to approximate the solutions of heterogeneous agent models effectively when the number of agents in the economy is large enough ([Han et al., 2021](#)). That is MANK models are sufficiently expressive to capture a range of models, corresponding to RANK at one extreme, and to HANK at the other. Ignoring the stylized details of the aforementioned stochastic economies, all of them feature static markets, linked over time, often although not always, by incomplete financial asset markets, and differ in the number and heterogeneity of the agents, firms and goods in the economy, as well as the types of transitions they employ, whether it be transition functions which model *aggregate shocks* (i.e., transition functions which change the state of each consumer and firm in the economy in the same way) or *idiosyncratic shock* (i.e. transition function which model transition the state of each consumer in

the economy in distinct way). *The infinite horizon Markov exchange economy that we develop in this paper corresponds to a many agent stochastic economy model, and can be coupled with either the New Keynesian or New Classical paradigm to capture most of the models proposed in the literature.*

Computation of competitive equilibrium The study of the computational complexity of competitive equilibria was initiated by [Devanur et al. \(2002\)](#), who provided a polynomial-time method for computing competitive equilibrium in a special case of the Arrow-Debreu (exchange) market model, namely Fisher markets, when buyers utilities are linear. [Jain et al. \(2005\)](#) subsequently showed that a large class of Fisher markets with homogeneous utility functions could be solved in polynomial-time using interior point methods. [Gao and Kroer \(2020\)](#) studied an alternative family of first-order methods for solving Fisher markets, assuming linear, quasilinear, and Leontief utilities, as such methods can be more efficient when markets are large. More recently, [Goktas et al. \(2023b\)](#) showed that tâtonnement converges to competitive equilibrium in homothetic Fisher markets, assuming bounded elasticity of Hicksian demand.

Devising algorithms for the computation of competitive equilibrium in general Arrow-Debreu markets is still an active area of research. While the computation of competitive equilibrium is PPAD-hard in general ([Chen and Deng, 2006](#); [Daskalakis et al., 2009](#)), the computation of competitive equilibrium in Arrow-Debreu markets with Leontief buyers is equivalent to the computation of Nash equilibrium in bimatrix games ([Codenotti et al., 2006](#); [Deng and Du, 2008](#)), and hence PPAD-hard as well, there exist polynomial-time algorithms to compute competitive equilibrium in special cases of Arrow-Debreu markets, including markets whose excess demand satisfies the weak gross substitutes condition ([Codenotti et al., 2005](#); [Bei et al., 2015](#)) and Arrow-Debreu markets with buyers whose utilities are linear ([Garg and Kapoor, 2004](#); [Brânzei et al., 2021](#)) or satisfy constant elasticity of substitution, which gives rise to weak gross substitute demands ([Brânzei et al., 2021](#)).

Solution methods in macroeconomics. As stochastic economies can be analytically intractable to solve without restrictive assumptions, such as homogeneous consumers (e.g., representative agent new Keynesian models models, for a survey, see [Sargent and Ljungqvist \(2000\)](#)), researchers have attempted to solve them via dynamic programming. These methods often discretize the continuous state and action spaces, and then apply variants of value and policy iteration ([Stokey, 1989](#); [Sargent and Ljungqvist, 2000](#); [Auclert et al., 2021](#)). Unfortunately, this approach is unwieldy when applied to incomplete markets with multiple commodities and/or heterogeneous consumers ([Fernández-Villaverde et al., 2016](#)). As a result, many of these methods lack optimality guarantees, and thus might not produce correct solutions, which may lead to drastically different policy recommendations, as inaccurate solutions to stochastic economies have been known to cause spurious welfare reversal ([Kim and Kim, 2003](#)). Perhaps even more importantly, while static markets afford efficient, i.e., polynomial-time, algorithms for computing competitive equilibrium under suitable assumption (see, for instance [Jain et al. \(2005\)](#) or [Goktas et al. \(2023b\)](#) for a more recent survey), to the best of our knowledge, there is no known class of stochastic economies (excluding the special case of static economies) for which the computation of a sequential or recursive competitive equilibrium is polynomial-time. Yet the macroeconomics literature speaks to the need for efficient methods to solve these models, or at least better understand the trade-offs between the speed and accuracy of proposed solution techniques ([Fernández-Villaverde et al., 2016](#)).

We describe only a few of the most influential computational approaches to solving stochastic economies in macroeconomics, and refer the reader to [Fernández-Villaverde et al. \(2016\)](#) for a detailed survey. [Durbin and Koopman 2012](#) developed an extended path algorithm. The idea was to solve, for a terminal date sufficiently far into the future, the path of endogenous variables using a shooting algorithm. Recently, [Maliar et al. \(2015\)](#)

extended this idea, developing the extended function path (EFP) algorithm, applicable to models that do not admit stationary Markov equilibria. [Kydland and Prescott \(1982\)](#) exploit the fact that their model admits a Pareto-optimal recursive equilibrium, and thus they solve the social planner's problem, instead of solving for an equilibrium. To do so, they rely on a linear quadratic approximation, and exploit the fast algorithms known to solve that class of optimization problems. [King et al. \(2002\)](#) (in the widely disseminated technical appendix, not published until 2002), building on [Blanchard and Kahn \(1980\)](#)'s approach, linearized the equilibrium conditions of their model (optimality conditions, market clearing conditions, etc.), and solved the resulting system of stochastic linear difference equations. More recently, a growing literature has been applying deep learning methods in attempt to stochastic economies (see, for instance, [Curry et al.](#); [Han et al. \(2021\)](#); [Childers et al. \(2022\)](#)). There also exists a large literature in macroeconomics on solution methods in continuous rather than discrete time, which is out of the scope of this paper. We refer the interested reader to [Parra-Alvarez \(2015\)](#).

B Omitted Results and Proofs

B.1 Omitted Results and Proofs from Section 3

Theorem 3.1. *Let \mathcal{M} be a Markov pseudo-game for which Assumption 1 holds, and let $\mathcal{P}^{\text{sub}} \subseteq \mathcal{P}^{\text{markov}}$ be a subspace of Markov policy profiles that satisfies Assumption 2. Then there exists a policy $\pi^* \in \mathcal{P}^{\text{sub}}$ such that π^* is an GMPE of \mathcal{M} .*

Proof. First, by Part 3 of Assumption 1, we know that for any $i \in [n]$, $\mathcal{F}_i^{\text{sub}}(\pi_{-i})$ is non-empty, convex, and compact, for all $\pi_{-i} \in \mathcal{P}_{-i}$. Moreover, 2 of Assumption 1, \mathcal{F}^{sub} is upper-hemicontinuous. Therefore, by the Fan's fixed-point theorem ([Fan, 1952](#)), the set $\mathcal{F}^{\text{sub}} \doteq \{\pi \in \mathcal{P}^{\text{sub}} \mid \pi \in \mathcal{F}^{\text{sub}}(\pi)\}$ is non-empty.

For any player $i \in [n]$ and state $s \in \mathcal{S}$, we define the *individual state best-response correspondence* $\Phi_i^s : \mathcal{P}^{\text{sub}} \rightrightarrows \mathcal{A}_i$ by

$$\Phi_i^s(\pi) \doteq \arg \max_{\mathbf{a}_i \in \mathcal{X}_i(\mathbf{s}, \pi_{-i}(\mathbf{s}))} r_i(\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{a}_i, \pi_{-i}(\mathbf{s})) + \mathbb{E}_{S' \sim p(\cdot \mid \mathbf{s}, \mathbf{a}_i, \pi_{-i}(\mathbf{s}))} [\gamma v_i^\pi(S')] \quad (8)$$

$$= \arg \max_{\mathbf{a}_i \in \mathcal{X}_i(\mathbf{s}, \pi_{-i}(\mathbf{s}))} q_i^\pi(\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{a}_i, \pi_{-i}(\mathbf{s})) \quad (9)$$

Then, for any player $i \in [n]$, we define the *restricted individual best-response correspondence* $\Phi_i : \mathcal{P}^{\text{sub}} \rightrightarrows \mathcal{P}_i^{\text{sub}}$ as the Cartesian product of individual state best-response correspondences across the states restricted to \mathcal{P}^{sub} :

$$\Phi_i(\pi) = \left(\prod_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \Phi_i^s(\pi) \right) \cap \mathcal{P}_i^{\text{sub}} \quad (10)$$

$$= \{\pi_i \in \mathcal{P}_i^{\text{sub}} \mid \pi_i(\mathbf{s}) \in \Phi_i^s(\pi), \forall \mathbf{s} \in \mathcal{S}\} \quad (11)$$

Finally, we can define the *multi-player best-response correspondence* $\Phi : \mathcal{P}^{\text{sub}} \rightrightarrows \mathcal{P}^{\text{sub}}$ as the Cartesian product of the individual correspondences, i.e., $\Phi(\pi) \doteq \prod_{i \in [n]} \Phi_i(\pi)$.

To show the existence of GMPE, we first want to show that there exists a fixed point $\pi^* \in \mathcal{P}^{\text{sub}}$ such that $\pi^* \in \Phi(\pi^*)$. To this end, we need to show that 1. for any $\pi \in \mathcal{P}^{\text{sub}}$, $\Phi(\pi)$ is non-empty, compact, and convex; 2. Φ is upper hemicontinuous.

Take any $\pi \in \mathcal{P}^{\text{sub}}$. Fix $i \in [n], s \in \mathcal{S}$, we know that $\mathbf{a}_i \mapsto q_i^\pi(s, \mathbf{a}_i, \pi_{-i}(s))$ is concave over $\mathcal{X}_i(s, \pi_{-i}(s))$, and $\mathcal{X}_i(s, \pi_{-i}(s))$ is non-empty, convex, and compact by Assumption 1, then by Proposition 4.1 of [Fiacco and Kyparisis \(1986\)](#), $\Phi_i^s(\pi)$ is non-empty, compact, and convex.

Now, notice $\times_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \Phi_i^s(\pi)$ is compact and convex as it is a Cartesian product of compact, convex sets. Thus, as \mathcal{P}^{sub} is also compact and convex by Assumption 2, we know that $\Phi_i(\pi) = \left(\times_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \Phi_i^s(\pi) \right) \cap \mathcal{P}_i^{\text{sub}}$ is compact and convex. By the assumption of *closure under policy improvement* under Assumption 2, we know that since $\pi \in \mathcal{P}^{\text{sub}}$, there exists $\pi^+ \in \mathcal{P}^{\text{sub}}$ such that

$$\pi_i^+ \in \arg \max_{\pi_i' \in \mathcal{F}_i^{\text{markov}}(\pi_{-i})} q_i^\pi(s, \pi_i'(s), \pi_{-i}(s))$$

for all $s \in \mathcal{S}$, and that means $\pi_i^+(s) \in \Phi_i^s(\pi)$ for all $s \in \mathcal{S}$. Thus, $\Phi_i(\pi)$ is also non-empty. Since Cartesian product preserves non-emptiness, compactness, and convexity, we can conclude that $\Phi(\pi) = \times_{i \in [n]} \Phi_i(\pi)$ is non-empty, compact, and convex.

Similarly, fix $i \in [n], s \in \mathcal{S}$, for any $\pi \in \mathcal{P}^{\text{sub}}$, since $\mathcal{X}_i(s, \cdot)$ is continuous (i.e. both upper and lower hemicontinuous), by the Maximum theorem, Φ_i^s is upper hemicontinuous. $\pi \mapsto \times_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \Phi_i^s(\pi)$ is upper hemicontinuous as it is a Cartesian product of upper hemicontinuous correspondence, and consequently, $\pi \mapsto \left(\times_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \Phi_i^s(\pi) \right) \cap \mathcal{P}_i^{\text{sub}}$ is also upper hemicontinuous. Therefore, Φ is also upper hemicontinuous.

Since $\Phi(\pi)$ is non-empty, compact, and convex for any $\pi \in \mathcal{P}^{\text{sub}}$ and Φ is upper hemicontinuous, by Fan's fixed-point theorem ([Fan, 1952](#)), Φ admits a fixed point.

Finally, say $\pi^* \in \mathcal{P}^{\text{sub}}$ is a fixed point of Φ , and we want to show that π^* is a generalized Markov perfect equilibrium (GMPE) of \mathcal{M} . Since $\pi^* \in \Phi(\pi^*) = \times_{i \in [n]} \Phi_i(\pi^*)$, we know that for all $i \in [n]$, $\pi_i^*(s) \in \Phi_i^s(\pi^*) = \arg \max_{\mathbf{a}_i \in \mathcal{X}_i(s, \pi_{-i}^*(s))} q_i^{\pi^*}(s, \mathbf{a}_i, \pi_{-i}^*(s))$. We now show that for any $i \in [n]$, for any $\pi_i \in \mathcal{F}_i(\pi_{-i}^*)$, $v_i^{\pi^*}(s) \geq v_i^{(\pi_i, \pi_{-i}^*)}(s)$ for all $s \in \mathcal{S}$. Take any policy $\pi_i \in \mathcal{F}_i(\pi_{-i}^*)$. Note that π_i may not be Markov, so we denote $\{\pi_i(\mathbf{h}_{:t})\}_{t \in \mathbb{N}} = \{\mathbf{a}_i^{(t)}\}_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$. Then, for all $\mathbf{s}^{(0)} \in \mathcal{S}$,

$$\begin{aligned} & v_i^{\pi^*}(\mathbf{s}^{(0)}) \\ &= q_i^{\pi^*}(\mathbf{s}^{(0)}, \pi_i^*(\mathbf{s}^{(0)}), \pi_{-i}^*(\mathbf{s}^{(0)})) \\ &= \max_{\mathbf{a}_i \in \mathcal{X}_i(\mathbf{s}^{(0)}, \pi_{-i}^*(\mathbf{s}^{(0)}))} q_i^{\pi^*}(\mathbf{s}^{(0)}, \mathbf{a}_i, \pi_{-i}^*(\mathbf{s}^{(0)})) \\ &= \max_{\mathbf{a}_i \in \mathcal{X}_i(\mathbf{s}^{(0)}, \pi_{-i}^*(\mathbf{s}^{(0)}))} r_i(\mathbf{s}^{(0)}, \mathbf{a}_i, \pi_{-i}^*(\mathbf{s}^{(0)})) + \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{s}^{(1)} \sim p(\cdot | \mathbf{s}^{(0)}, \mathbf{a}_i, \pi_{-i}^*(\mathbf{s}^{(0)}))} [\gamma v_i^{\pi^*}(\mathbf{s}^{(1)})] \\ &\geq r_i(\mathbf{s}^{(0)}, \mathbf{a}_i^{(0)}, \pi_{-i}^*(\mathbf{s}^{(0)})) + \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{s}^{(1)} \sim p(\cdot | \mathbf{s}^{(0)}, \mathbf{a}_i^{(0)}, \pi_{-i}^*(\mathbf{s}^{(0)}))} [\gamma v_i^{\pi^*}(\mathbf{s}^{(1)})] \end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

For any $\mathbf{s}^{(0)} \in \mathcal{S}$, define $v'_i(\mathbf{s}^{(0)}) \doteq r_i(\mathbf{s}^{(0)}, \mathbf{a}_i^{(0)}, \boldsymbol{\pi}_{-i}^*(\mathbf{s}^{(0)})) + \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{s}^{(1)} \sim p(\cdot | \mathbf{s}^{(0)}, \mathbf{a}_i^{(0)}, \boldsymbol{\pi}_{-i}^*(\mathbf{s}^{(0)}))} [\gamma v_i^{\boldsymbol{\pi}^*}(\mathbf{s}^{(1)})]$. Since $v_i^{\boldsymbol{\pi}^*}(\mathbf{s}) \geq v'_i(\mathbf{s})$ for all $i \in [n]$, $\mathbf{s} \in \mathcal{S}$, we have for any $\mathbf{s}^{(0)} \in \mathcal{S}$

$$\begin{aligned}
 & v_i^{\boldsymbol{\pi}^*}(\mathbf{s}^{(0)}) \\
 & \geq r_i(\mathbf{s}^{(0)}, \mathbf{a}_i^{(0)}, \boldsymbol{\pi}_{-i}^*(\mathbf{s}^{(0)})) + \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{s}^{(1)} \sim p(\cdot | \mathbf{s}^{(0)}, \mathbf{a}_i^{(0)}, \boldsymbol{\pi}_{-i}^*(\mathbf{s}^{(0)}))} [\gamma v_i^{\boldsymbol{\pi}^*}(\mathbf{s}^{(1)})] \\
 & \geq r_i(\mathbf{s}^{(0)}, \mathbf{a}_i^{(0)}, \boldsymbol{\pi}_{-i}^*(\mathbf{s}^{(0)})) + \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{s}^{(1)} \sim p(\cdot | \mathbf{s}^{(0)}, \mathbf{a}_i^{(0)}, \boldsymbol{\pi}_{-i}^*(\mathbf{s}^{(0)}))} [\gamma v'_i(\mathbf{s}^{(1)})] \\
 & \geq r_i(\mathbf{s}^{(0)}, \mathbf{a}_i^{(0)}, \boldsymbol{\pi}_{-i}^*(\mathbf{s}^{(0)})) \\
 & + \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{s}^{(1)} \sim p(\cdot | \mathbf{s}^{(0)}, \mathbf{a}_i^{(0)}, \boldsymbol{\pi}_{-i}^*(\mathbf{s}^{(0)}))} \left[\gamma \left(r_i(\mathbf{s}^{(1)}, \mathbf{a}_i^{(1)}, \boldsymbol{\pi}_{-i}^*(\mathbf{s}^{(1)})) \right. \right. \\
 & \left. \left. + \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{s}^{(2)} \sim p(\cdot | \mathbf{s}^{(1)}, \mathbf{a}_i^{(1)}, \boldsymbol{\pi}_{-i}^*(\mathbf{s}^{(1)})} [\gamma v_i^{\boldsymbol{\pi}^*}(\mathbf{s}^{(2)})] \right) \right] \\
 & \geq r_i(\mathbf{s}^{(0)}, \mathbf{a}_i^{(0)}, \boldsymbol{\pi}_{-i}^*(\mathbf{s}^{(0)})) \\
 & + \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{s}^{(1)} \sim p(\cdot | \mathbf{s}^{(0)}, \mathbf{a}_i^{(0)}, \boldsymbol{\pi}_{-i}^*(\mathbf{s}^{(0)}))} \left[\gamma \left(r_i(\mathbf{s}^{(1)}, \mathbf{a}_i^{(1)}, \boldsymbol{\pi}_{-i}^*(\mathbf{s}^{(1)})) \right. \right. \\
 & \left. \left. + \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{s}^{(2)} \sim p(\cdot | \mathbf{s}^{(1)}, \mathbf{a}_i^{(1)}, \boldsymbol{\pi}_{-i}^*(\mathbf{s}^{(1)})} [\gamma v'_i(\mathbf{s}^{(2)})] \right) \right] \\
 & \vdots \\
 & \geq v_i^{(\boldsymbol{\pi}_i, \boldsymbol{\pi}_{-i}^*)}(\mathbf{s})
 \end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

where in Equation (13), we recursively expand v'_i and eliminate $v^{\boldsymbol{\pi}^*}$ using Equation (12). We therefore conclude that for all states $\mathbf{s} \in \mathcal{S}$, and for all $i \in [n]$,

$$v_i^{\boldsymbol{\pi}^*}(\mathbf{s}) \geq \max_{\boldsymbol{\pi}_i \in \mathcal{F}_i(\boldsymbol{\pi}_{-i}^*)} v_i^{(\boldsymbol{\pi}_i, \boldsymbol{\pi}_{-i}^*)}(\mathbf{s}).$$

□

Lemma 1. *Given a Markov pseudo-game \mathcal{M} , a Markov policy profile $\boldsymbol{\pi}^* \in \mathcal{F}^{\text{markov}}(\boldsymbol{\pi}^*)$ is a GMPE if and only if $\phi(\mathbf{s}, \boldsymbol{\pi}^*) = 0$, for all states $\mathbf{s} \in \mathcal{S}$. Similarly, a policy profile $\boldsymbol{\pi}^* \in \mathcal{F}(\boldsymbol{\pi}^*)$ is an GNE if and only if $\varphi(\boldsymbol{\pi}^*) = 0$.*

Proof of Lemma 1. We first prove the result for state exploitability.

($\boldsymbol{\pi}^*$ is a GMPE $\implies \phi(\mathbf{s}, \boldsymbol{\pi}^*) = 0$ for all $\mathbf{s} \in \mathcal{S}$): Suppose that $\boldsymbol{\pi}^*$ is a GMPE, i.e., for all players $i \in [n]$, $v_i^{\boldsymbol{\pi}^*}(\mathbf{s}) \geq \max_{\boldsymbol{\pi}_i \in \mathcal{F}_i(\boldsymbol{\pi}_{-i}^*)} v_i^{(\boldsymbol{\pi}_i, \boldsymbol{\pi}_{-i}^*)}(\mathbf{s})$ for all state $\mathbf{s} \in \mathcal{S}$. Then, for all state $\mathbf{s} \in \mathcal{S}$, we have

$$\forall i \in [n], \max_{\boldsymbol{\pi}_i \in \mathcal{F}_i(\boldsymbol{\pi}_{-i}^*)} v_i^{(\boldsymbol{\pi}_i, \boldsymbol{\pi}_{-i}^*)}(\mathbf{s}) - v_i^{\boldsymbol{\pi}^*}(\mathbf{s}) = 0 \tag{14}$$

Summing up across all players $i \in [n]$, we get

$$\phi(\mathbf{s}, \boldsymbol{\pi}^*) = \sum_{i \in [n]} \max_{\boldsymbol{\pi}_i \in \mathcal{F}_i(\boldsymbol{\pi}_{-i}^*)} v_i^{(\boldsymbol{\pi}_i, \boldsymbol{\pi}_{-i}^*)}(\mathbf{s}) - v_i^{\boldsymbol{\pi}^*}(\mathbf{s}) = 0 \tag{15}$$

($\phi(\mathbf{s}, \boldsymbol{\pi}^*) = 0$ for all $\mathbf{s} \in \mathcal{S} \implies \boldsymbol{\pi}^*$ is a GMPE): Suppose we have $\boldsymbol{\pi}^* \in \mathcal{F}^{\text{markov}}(\boldsymbol{\pi}^*)$ and $\phi(\mathbf{s}, \boldsymbol{\pi}^*) = 0$ for all $\mathbf{s} \in \mathcal{S}$. That is, for any $\mathbf{s} \in \mathcal{S}$

$$\phi(\mathbf{s}, \boldsymbol{\pi}^*) = \sum_{i \in [n]} \max_{\boldsymbol{\pi}_i \in \mathcal{F}_i(\boldsymbol{\pi}_{-i}^*)} v_i^{(\boldsymbol{\pi}_i, \boldsymbol{\pi}_{-i}^*)}(\mathbf{s}) - v_i^{\boldsymbol{\pi}^*}(\mathbf{s}) = 0. \quad (16)$$

Since for any $i \in [n]$, $\boldsymbol{\pi}_i^* \in \mathcal{F}_i^{\text{markov}}(\boldsymbol{\pi}_{-i}^*)$, $\max_{\boldsymbol{\pi}_i \in \mathcal{F}_i^{\text{markov}}(\boldsymbol{\pi}_{-i}^*)} v_i^{(\boldsymbol{\pi}_i, \boldsymbol{\pi}_{-i}^*)}(\mathbf{s}) - v_i^{\boldsymbol{\pi}^*}(\mathbf{s}) \geq v_i^{\boldsymbol{\pi}_i^*}(\mathbf{s}) - v_i^{\boldsymbol{\pi}^*}(\mathbf{s}) = 0$. As a result, we must have for all player $i \in [n]$,

$$v_i^{\boldsymbol{\pi}^*}(\mathbf{s}) = \max_{\boldsymbol{\pi}_i \in \mathcal{F}_i(\boldsymbol{\pi}_{-i}^*)} v_i^{(\boldsymbol{\pi}_i, \boldsymbol{\pi}_{-i}^*)}(\mathbf{s}), \quad \forall \mathbf{s} \in \mathcal{S} \quad (17)$$

Thus, we can conclude that $\boldsymbol{\pi}^*$ is a GMPE.

Then, we can prove results for exploitability in an analogous way.

($\boldsymbol{\pi}^*$ is a GNE $\implies \varphi(\boldsymbol{\pi}^*) = 0$): Suppose that $\boldsymbol{\pi}^*$ is a GNE, i.e., for all players $i \in [n]$, $u_i(\boldsymbol{\pi}^*) \geq \max_{\boldsymbol{\pi}_i \in \mathcal{F}_i(\boldsymbol{\pi}_{-i}^*)} u_i(\boldsymbol{\pi}_i, \boldsymbol{\pi}_{-i}^*)$. Then, we have

$$\forall i \in [n], \quad \max_{\boldsymbol{\pi}_i \in \mathcal{F}_i(\boldsymbol{\pi}_{-i}^*)} u_i(\boldsymbol{\pi}_i, \boldsymbol{\pi}_{-i}^*) - u_i(\boldsymbol{\pi}^*) = 0 \quad (18)$$

Summing up across all players $i \in [n]$, we get

$$\varphi(\boldsymbol{\pi}^*) = \sum_{i \in [n]} \max_{\boldsymbol{\pi}_i \in \mathcal{F}_i(\boldsymbol{\pi}_{-i}^*)} u_i(\boldsymbol{\pi}_i, \boldsymbol{\pi}_{-i}^*) - u_i(\boldsymbol{\pi}^*) = 0 \quad (19)$$

($\varphi(\boldsymbol{\pi}^*) = 0 \implies \boldsymbol{\pi}^*$ is a GNE): Suppose we have $\boldsymbol{\pi}^* \in \mathcal{F}(\boldsymbol{\pi}^*)$ and $\varphi(\boldsymbol{\pi}^*) = 0$. That is,

$$\varphi(\boldsymbol{\pi}^*) = \sum_{i \in [n]} \max_{\boldsymbol{\pi}_i \in \mathcal{F}_i(\boldsymbol{\pi}_{-i}^*)} u_i(\boldsymbol{\pi}_i, \boldsymbol{\pi}_{-i}^*) - u_i(\boldsymbol{\pi}^*) = 0. \quad (20)$$

Since for any $i \in [n]$, $\boldsymbol{\pi}_i^* \in \mathcal{F}_i(\boldsymbol{\pi}_{-i}^*)$, $\max_{\boldsymbol{\pi}_i \in \mathcal{F}_i(\boldsymbol{\pi}_{-i}^*)} u_i(\boldsymbol{\pi}_i, \boldsymbol{\pi}_{-i}^*) - u_i(\boldsymbol{\pi}^*) \geq u_i(\boldsymbol{\pi}_i^*, \boldsymbol{\pi}_{-i}^*) - u_i(\boldsymbol{\pi}^*) = 0$. As a result, we must have for all player $i \in [n]$,

$$u_i(\boldsymbol{\pi}^*) = \max_{\boldsymbol{\pi}_i \in \mathcal{F}_i(\boldsymbol{\pi}_{-i}^*)} u_i(\boldsymbol{\pi}_i, \boldsymbol{\pi}_{-i}^*) \quad (21)$$

Thus, we can conclude that $\boldsymbol{\pi}^*$ is a GNE. \square

Observation 1. Given a Markov pseudo-game \mathcal{M} ,

$$\min_{\boldsymbol{\pi} \in \mathcal{F}(\boldsymbol{\pi})} \varphi(\boldsymbol{\pi}) = \min_{\boldsymbol{\pi} \in \mathcal{F}(\boldsymbol{\pi})} \max_{\boldsymbol{\pi}' \in \mathcal{F}^{\text{markov}}(\boldsymbol{\pi})} \Psi(\boldsymbol{\pi}, \boldsymbol{\pi}') . \quad (3)$$

Proof. The per-player maximum operator can be pulled out of the sum in the definition of state-exploitability, because the i th player's best-response policy is independent of the other players' best-response policies, given a fixed policy profile $\boldsymbol{\pi}$:

$$\forall \mathbf{s} \in \mathcal{S}, \quad \phi(\mathbf{s}, \boldsymbol{\pi}) = \sum_{i \in [n]} \max_{\boldsymbol{\pi}'_i \in \mathcal{F}_i^{\text{markov}}(\boldsymbol{\pi}_{-i})} v_i^{(\boldsymbol{\pi}'_i, \boldsymbol{\pi}_{-i})}(\mathbf{s}) - v_i^{\boldsymbol{\pi}}(\mathbf{s}) \quad (22)$$

$$= \max_{\boldsymbol{\pi}' \in \mathcal{F}^{\text{markov}}(\boldsymbol{\pi})} \sum_{i \in [n]} v_i^{(\boldsymbol{\pi}'_i, \boldsymbol{\pi}_{-i})}(\mathbf{s}) - v_i^{\boldsymbol{\pi}}(\mathbf{s}) \quad (23)$$

$$= \max_{\boldsymbol{\pi}' \in \mathcal{F}^{\text{markov}}(\boldsymbol{\pi})} \psi(\mathbf{s}, \boldsymbol{\pi}, \boldsymbol{\pi}') \quad (24)$$

The argument is analogous for exploitability:

$$\varphi(\boldsymbol{\pi}) = \sum_{i \in [n]} \max_{\boldsymbol{\pi}'_i \in \mathcal{F}_i^{\text{markov}}(\boldsymbol{\pi}_{-i})} u_i(\boldsymbol{\pi}'_i, \boldsymbol{\pi}_{-i}) - u_i(\boldsymbol{\pi}) \quad (25)$$

$$= \max_{\boldsymbol{\pi}' \in \mathcal{F}^{\text{markov}}(\boldsymbol{\pi})} \sum_{i \in [n]} u_i(\boldsymbol{\pi}'_i, \boldsymbol{\pi}_{-i}) - u_i(\boldsymbol{\pi}) \quad (26)$$

$$= \max_{\boldsymbol{\pi}' \in \mathcal{F}(\boldsymbol{\pi})} \Psi(\boldsymbol{\pi}, \boldsymbol{\pi}') \quad (27)$$

□

Lemma 3. *Given a Markov pseudo-game \mathcal{M} , for $\boldsymbol{\omega} \in \mathbb{R}^\Omega$, suppose that $\phi(\mathbf{s}, \cdot)$ is differentiable at $\boldsymbol{\omega}$ for all $\mathbf{s} \in \mathcal{S}$. If $\|\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\omega}} \varphi(\boldsymbol{\omega})\| = 0$, then, for all states $\mathbf{s} \in \mathcal{S}$, $\|\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\omega}} \phi(\mathbf{s}, \boldsymbol{\omega})\| = 0$ μ -almost surely, i.e., $\mu(\{\mathbf{s} \in \mathcal{S} \mid \|\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\omega}} \phi(\mathbf{s}, \boldsymbol{\omega})\| = 0\}) = 1$. Moreover, for any $\varepsilon > 0$ and $\delta \in [0, 1]$, if $\text{supp}(\mu) = \mathcal{S}$ and $\|\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\omega}} \varphi(\boldsymbol{\omega})\| \leq \varepsilon$, then with probability at least $1 - \delta$, $\|\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\omega}} \phi(\mathbf{s}, \boldsymbol{\omega})\| \leq \varepsilon/\delta$.*

Proof. First, using Jensen's inequality, by the convexity of the 2-norm $\|\cdot\|$, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{s} \sim \mu} [\|\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\omega}} \phi(\mathbf{s}, \boldsymbol{\omega})\|] &\leq \left\| \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{s} \sim \mu} [\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\omega}} \phi(\mathbf{s}, \boldsymbol{\omega})] \right\| \\ &= \left\| \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\omega}} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{s} \sim \mu} [\phi(\mathbf{s}, \boldsymbol{\omega})] \right\| \\ &= \|\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\omega}} \varphi(\boldsymbol{\omega})\|. \end{aligned}$$

The first claim follows directly from the fact that for all $\mathbf{s} \in \mathcal{S}$, $\|\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\omega}} \phi(\mathbf{s}, \boldsymbol{\omega})\| \geq 0$, and hence for the expectation $\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{s} \sim \mu} [\|\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\omega}} \phi(\mathbf{s}, \boldsymbol{\omega})\|]$ to be equal to 0, its value should be equal to zero on a set of measure 1.

Now, for the second part, by Markov's inequality, we have: $\mathbb{P} \left(\|\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\omega}} \phi(\mathbf{s}, \boldsymbol{\omega})\| \geq \varepsilon/\delta \right) \leq \frac{\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{s} \sim \mu} [\|\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\omega}} \phi(\mathbf{s}, \boldsymbol{\omega})\|]}{\varepsilon/\delta} \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{\varepsilon/\delta} = \delta$. □

Lemma 4. *Let \mathcal{M} be a Markov pseudo-game with initial state distribution μ . Given policy parameter $\boldsymbol{\omega} \in \mathbb{R}^\Omega$ and arbitrary state distribution $v \in \Delta(\mathcal{S})$, suppose that both $\phi(\mu, \cdot)$ and $\phi(v, \cdot)$ are differentiable at $\boldsymbol{\omega}$, then we have: $\|\nabla \phi(v, \boldsymbol{\omega})\| \leq C_{br}(\boldsymbol{\pi}(\cdot; \boldsymbol{\omega}^*), \mu, v) \|\nabla \varphi(\boldsymbol{\omega})\|$.*

Proof. In this proof, for any $i \in [n]$, we define $\sigma_i(\boldsymbol{\omega}) = \boldsymbol{\rho}_i(\cdot, \boldsymbol{\pi}(\cdot; \boldsymbol{\omega}); \boldsymbol{\sigma})$ as player i 's policy in the policy profile $\boldsymbol{\sigma}(\boldsymbol{\omega}) = \boldsymbol{\rho}(\cdot, \boldsymbol{\pi}(\cdot; \boldsymbol{\omega}); \boldsymbol{\sigma})$. Similarly, we define $\omega_i = \boldsymbol{\pi}_i(\cdot; \boldsymbol{\omega})$ as player i 's policy in the policy profile $\boldsymbol{\omega} = \boldsymbol{\pi}(\cdot; \boldsymbol{\omega})$.

Given a policy parametrization scheme $(\pi, \rho, \mathbb{R}^\Omega, \mathbb{R}^\Sigma)$, consider any two parameters $\omega \in \mathbb{R}^\Omega$, $\sigma \in \mathbb{R}^\Sigma$, and any two initial state distributions $\mu, \nu \in \Delta(\mathcal{S})$, we know that

$$\left\| \nabla_\omega \psi(\nu, \omega, \sigma) \right\| \quad (28)$$

$$= \left\| \nabla_\omega \sum_{i \in [n]} u_i(\sigma_i(\omega), \omega_{-i}) - u_i(\omega) \right\| \quad (29)$$

$$= \left\| \sum_{i \in [n]} \nabla_\omega (u_i(\sigma_i(\omega), \omega_{-i}) - u_i(\omega)) \right\| \quad (30)$$

$$= \left\| \sum_{i \in [n]} \nabla_\omega \left[\mathbb{E}_{\substack{s' \sim \delta_v^{(\sigma_i(\omega), \omega_{-i})} \\ s \sim \delta_\mu^\omega}} [r_i(s', \rho_i(s', \pi(s; \omega); \sigma), \pi_{-i}(s'; \omega)) - r_i(s, \pi(s; \omega))] \right] \right\| \quad (31)$$

$$= \left\| \sum_{i \in [n]} \mathbb{E}_{\substack{s' \sim \delta_v^{(\sigma_i(\omega), \omega_{-i})} \\ s \sim \delta_\mu^\omega}} \left[\nabla_{a_{-i}} q_i^{\sigma_i(\omega), \omega_{-i}}(s', \rho_i(s', \pi(s'; \omega); \sigma), \pi_{-i}(s'; \omega)) \nabla_\omega (\rho_i(s', \pi_{-i}(s'; \omega); \omega), \pi(s'; \omega)) - \nabla_a q_i^\omega(s, \pi(s; \omega)) \nabla_\omega \pi(s; \omega) \right] \right\| \quad (32)$$

$$\leq \max_{i \in [n]} \max_{s', s \in \mathcal{S}} \frac{\delta_v^{(\sigma_i(\omega), \omega_{-i})}(s') \delta_v^\omega(s)}{\delta_\mu^{(\sigma_i(\omega), \omega_{-i})}(s') \delta_\mu^\omega(s)} \left\| \mathbb{E}_{\substack{s' \sim \delta_\mu^{(\sigma_i(\omega), \omega_{-i})} \\ s \sim \delta_\mu^\omega}} \left[\nabla_{a_{-i}} q_i^{\sigma_i(\omega), \omega_{-i}}(s', \rho_i(s', \pi(s'; \omega); \sigma), \pi_{-i}(s'; \omega)) \nabla_\omega (\rho_i(s', \pi_{-i}(s'; \omega); \omega), \pi(s'; \omega)) - \nabla_a q_i^\omega(s, \pi(s; \omega)) \nabla_\omega \pi(s; \omega) \right] \right\| \quad (33)$$

$$\leq \max_{i \in [n]} \max_{s', s \in \mathcal{S}} \frac{\delta_v^{(\sigma_i(\omega), \omega_{-i})}(s') \delta_v^\omega(s)}{\delta_\mu^{(\sigma_i(\omega), \omega_{-i})}(s') \delta_\mu^\omega(s)} \left\| \nabla_\omega [v_i^{\sigma_i(\omega), \omega_{-i}}(\mu) - v_i^\omega(\mu)] \right\| \quad (34)$$

$$\leq \left(\frac{1}{1 - \gamma} \right)^2 \max_{i \in [n]} \max_{s', s \in \mathcal{S}} \frac{\delta_v^{(\sigma_i(\omega), \omega_{-i})}(s') \delta_v^\omega(s)}{\mu(s') \mu(s)} \left\| \nabla_\omega \psi(\mu, \omega, \sigma) \right\| \quad (35)$$

$$= \left(\frac{1}{1 - \gamma} \right)^2 \max_{i \in [n]} \left\| \frac{\delta_v^{(\sigma_i(\omega), \omega_{-i})}}{\mu} \right\|_\infty \left\| \frac{\delta_\mu^\omega}{\mu} \right\|_\infty \left\| \nabla_\omega \psi(\mu, \omega, \sigma) \right\| \quad (36)$$

where Equation (32) and Equation (34) are obtained by deterministic policy gradient theorem (Silver et al., 2014), and Equation (35) is due to the fact that $\delta_\mu^\omega(s) \geq (1 - \gamma)\mu(s)$ for any $\pi \in \mathcal{P}$, $s \in \mathcal{S}$.

Given condition (1) of Assumption 5, fix any $\omega \in \mathbb{R}^\Omega$, there exists $\sigma^* \in \mathbb{R}^\Sigma$ s.t. for all $i \in [n]$, $s \in \mathcal{S}$:

$$q_i^\omega(s, \rho_i(s, \pi(s; \omega); \sigma^*), \pi_{-i}(s; \omega)) = \max_{\pi'_i \in \mathcal{F}_i(\pi(\cdot; \omega))} q_i^\omega(s, \pi'_i(s), \pi_{-i}(s; \omega)) .$$

Thus, $\phi(s, \omega) = \psi(s, \omega, \sigma^*)$ for all $s \in \mathcal{S}$. Hence, plugging in the optimal best-response policy $\sigma = \sigma^*$, we obtain that

$$\left\| \nabla_\omega \phi(\nu, \omega) \right\| \leq \left(\frac{1}{1 - \gamma} \right)^2 \max_{i \in [n]} \left\| \frac{\delta_v^{(\sigma_i^*(\omega), \omega_{-i})}}{\mu} \right\|_\infty \left\| \frac{\delta_\mu^\omega}{\mu} \right\|_\infty \left\| \nabla_\omega \phi(\mu, \omega) \right\| \quad (37)$$

$$\leq \left(\frac{1}{1 - \gamma} \right)^2 \max_{i \in [n]} \max_{\pi'_i \in \Phi_i(\pi_{-i}(\cdot; \omega))} \left\| \frac{\delta_v^{(\pi'_i, \pi_{-i}(\cdot; \omega))}}{\mu} \right\|_\infty \left\| \frac{\delta_\mu^\omega}{\mu} \right\|_\infty \left\| \nabla_\omega \phi(\mu, \omega) \right\| \quad (38)$$

where eq. (38) is due to the fact that $\sigma_i^*(\omega) \in \Phi_i(\pi_{-i}(\cdot; \omega))$.

□

Lemma 2. *Given a Markov pseudo-game \mathcal{M} ,*

$$\min_{\pi \in \mathcal{F}(\pi)} \max_{\pi' \in \mathcal{F}^{\text{markov}}(\pi)} \Psi(\pi, \pi') = \min_{\pi \in \mathcal{F}(\pi)} \max_{\rho \in \mathcal{R}} \Psi(\pi, \rho(\cdot, \pi(\cdot))) . \quad (4)$$

Proof. Fix $\pi^* \in \mathcal{F}^{\text{markov}}(\pi^*)$. We want to show that

$$\max_{\pi' \in \mathcal{F}^{\text{markov}}(\pi^*)} \varphi(\pi^*, \pi') = \max_{\rho \in \mathcal{R}} \varphi(\pi^*, \rho(\cdot, \pi(\cdot))) .$$

Define $\mathcal{P}^{\mathcal{R}, \pi^*} \doteq \{\pi : s \mapsto \rho(s, \pi^*(s)) \mid \rho \in \mathcal{R}\} \subseteq \mathcal{P}^{\text{markov}}$.

First, for all $\pi' \in \mathcal{P}^{\mathcal{R}, \pi^*}$, $\pi'(s) = \rho(s, \pi^*(s)) \in \mathcal{X}(s, \pi^*(s))$, for all $s \in \mathcal{S}$, by the definition of \mathcal{R} . Thus, $\pi' \in \mathcal{F}^{\text{markov}}(\pi^*) = \{\pi \in \mathcal{P}^{\text{markov}} \mid \forall s \in \mathcal{S}, \pi(s) \in \mathcal{X}(s, \pi^*(s))\}$. Therefore, $\mathcal{P}^{\mathcal{R}, \pi^*} \subseteq \mathcal{F}^{\text{markov}}(\pi^*)$, which implies that $\max_{\pi' \in \mathcal{F}^{\text{markov}}(\pi^*)} \varphi(\pi^*, \pi') \geq \max_{\pi' \in \mathcal{P}^{\mathcal{R}, \pi^*}} \varphi(\pi^*, \pi') = \max_{\rho \in \mathcal{R}} \varphi(\pi^*, \rho(\cdot, \pi(\cdot)))$.

Moreover, for all $\pi' \in \mathcal{F}^{\text{markov}}(\pi^*)$, $\pi'(s) \in \mathcal{X}(s, \pi^*(s))$, for all $s \in \mathcal{S}$, by the definition of $\mathcal{F}^{\text{markov}}$. Define ρ' such that for all $s \in \mathcal{S}$, $\rho'(s, a) = \pi'(s)$ if $a = \pi^*(s)$, and $\rho'(s, a) = a'$ for some $a' \in \mathcal{X}(s, a)$ otherwise. Note that $\rho' \in \mathcal{R}$, since $\forall (s, a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$, $\rho'(s, a) \in \mathcal{X}(s, a)$. Thus, as $\pi'(s) = \rho'(s, \pi^*(s))$, for all $s \in \mathcal{S}$, it follows that $\pi' \in \mathcal{P}^{\mathcal{R}, \pi^*}$. Therefore, $\mathcal{F}^{\text{markov}}(\pi^*) \subseteq \mathcal{P}^{\mathcal{R}, \pi^*}$, which implies that $\max_{\pi' \in \mathcal{F}^{\text{markov}}(\pi^*)} \varphi(\pi^*, \pi') \leq \max_{\pi' \in \mathcal{P}^{\mathcal{R}, \pi^*}} \varphi(\pi^*, \pi') = \max_{\rho \in \mathcal{R}} \varphi(\pi^*, \rho(\cdot, \pi(\cdot)))$.

Finally, we conclude that $\max_{\pi' \in \mathcal{F}^{\text{markov}}(\pi^*)} \varphi(\pi^*, \pi') = \max_{\rho \in \mathcal{R}} \varphi(\pi^*, \rho(\cdot, \pi(\cdot)))$. \square

Theorem 3.2. *Given a Markov pseudo-game \mathcal{M} , and a parameterization scheme $(\pi, \rho, \mathbb{R}^\Omega, \mathbb{R}^\Sigma)$, suppose Assumption 1, 4, and 5 hold. For any $\delta > 0$, set $\varepsilon = \delta \|C_{br}(\cdot, \mu, \cdot)\|_\infty^{-1}$. If Algorithm 1 is run with inputs that satisfy, $\eta_\omega, \eta_\sigma \asymp \text{poly}(\varepsilon, \|\partial \delta_\mu^{\pi^*} / \partial \mu\|_\infty, \frac{1}{1-\gamma}, \ell_{\nabla \Psi}^{-1}, \ell_{\Psi}^{-1})$, then for some $T \in \text{poly}(\varepsilon^{-1}, (1-\gamma)^{-1}, \|\partial \delta_\mu^{\pi^*} / \partial \mu\|_\infty, \ell_{\nabla \Psi}, \ell_{\Psi}, \text{diam}(\mathbb{R}^\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^\Sigma), \eta_\omega^{-1})$, there exists $\omega_{\text{best}}^{(T)} = \omega^{(k)}$ with $k \leq T$ that is a $(\varepsilon, \varepsilon/2\ell_\Psi)$ -stationary point of the exploitability, i.e., there exists $\omega^* \in \mathbb{R}^\Omega$ s.t. $\|\omega_{\text{best}}^{(T)} - \omega^*\| \leq \varepsilon/2\ell_\Psi$ and $\min_{h \in \mathcal{D}\varphi(\omega^*)} \|h\| \leq \varepsilon$.*

Further, for any arbitrary state distribution $v \in \Delta(\mathcal{S})$, if $\phi(v, \cdot)$ is differentiable at ω^ , $\|\nabla_\omega \varphi(v, \omega^*)\| \leq \delta$, i.e., $\omega_{\text{best}}^{(T)}$ is a (ε, δ) -stationary point for the expected exploitability $\phi(v, \cdot)$.*

Proof. As is common in the optimization literature (see, for instance, Davis et al. (2018)), we consider the Moreau envelope of the exploitability, which we simply call the *Moreau exploitability*, i.e.,

$$\tilde{\varphi}(\omega) \doteq \min_{\omega' \in \mathbb{R}^\Omega} \left\{ \varphi(\omega') + \ell_{\nabla \psi} \|\omega - \omega'\|^2 \right\} .$$

Similarly, we also consider the *state Moreau exploitability*, i.e., the Moreau envelope of the state exploitability:

$$\tilde{\phi}(s, \omega) \doteq \min_{\omega' \in \mathbb{R}^\Omega} \left\{ \phi(s, \omega') + \ell_{\nabla \psi} \|\omega - \omega'\|^2 \right\} .$$

We recall that in these definitions, by our notational convention, $\ell_{\nabla \psi} \geq 0$, refers to the Lipschitz-smoothness constants of the state exploitability which in this case we take to be the largest across all states, i.e., for all $s \in \mathcal{S}$, $(\omega, \sigma) \mapsto \psi(s, \omega, \sigma)$ is $\ell_{\nabla \psi}$ -Lipschitz-smooth, respectively, and which we note is guaranteed to exist under Assumption 4. Further, we note that since $\Psi(\omega, \sigma) = \mathbb{E}_{s \sim \mu} [\psi(s, \omega, \sigma)]$ is a weighted average of ψ , $(\omega, \sigma) \mapsto \Psi(\omega, \sigma)$ is also $\ell_{\nabla \psi}$ -Lipschitz-smooth.

We invoke Theorem 2 of Daskalakis et al. (2020). Although their result is stated for gradient-dominated-gradient-dominated functions, their proof applies in the more general case of non-convex-gradient-dominated functions.

First, Assumption 4 guarantees that the cumulative regret Ψ is Lipschitz-smooth w.r.t. (ω, σ) . Moreover, under Assumption 4, which guarantees that $\sigma \mapsto q_i^{\omega'}(s, \rho_i(s, \pi_{-i}(s; \omega); \sigma), \pi_{-i}(s; \omega))$ is continuously differentiable for all $s \in \mathcal{S}$ and $\omega, \omega' \in \mathbb{R}^\Omega$, and Assumption 5, we have that Ψ is $\left(\left\|\frac{\partial \delta_{\mu}^{\pi^*}}{\partial \mu}\right\|_{\infty}/(1-\gamma)\right)$ -gradient-dominated in σ , for all $\omega \in \mathbb{R}^\Omega$, by Theorems 2 and 4 of Bhandari and Russo (2019). Finally, under Assumption 4, since the policy, the reward function, and the transition probability function are all Lipschitz-continuous, \hat{u} , $\hat{\Psi}$, and hence \hat{G} are also Lipschitz-continuous, since \mathcal{S} and \mathcal{A} are compact. Their variance must therefore be bounded, i.e., there exists $\varsigma_\omega, \varsigma_\sigma \in \mathbb{R}$ s.t. $\mathbb{E}_{h, h'}[\widehat{G}_\omega(\omega, \sigma; h, h') - \nabla_\omega \Psi(\omega, \sigma; h, h')] \leq \varsigma_\omega$ and $\mathbb{E}_{h, h'}[\widehat{G}_\sigma(\omega, \sigma; h, h') - \nabla_\sigma \Psi(\omega, \sigma; h, h')] \leq \varsigma_\sigma$.

Hence, under our assumptions, the assumptions of Theorem 2 of Daskalakis et al. are satisfied. Therefore, $1/T+1 \sum_{t=0}^T \|\nabla \tilde{\varphi}(\omega^{(t)})\| \leq \varepsilon$. Taking a minimum across all $t \in [T]$, we conclude $\left\|\nabla \tilde{\varphi}(\omega_{\text{best}}^{(T)})\right\| \leq \varepsilon$.

Then, by the Lemma 3.7 of (Lin et al., 2020), there exists some $\omega^* \in \mathbb{R}^\Omega$ such that $\|\omega_{\text{best}}^{(T)} - \omega^*\| \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{2\ell_\Psi}$ and $\omega^* \in \mathbb{R}_\varepsilon^\Omega \doteq \{\omega \in \mathbb{R}^\Omega \mid \exists \alpha \in \mathcal{D}\varphi(\omega), \|\alpha\| \leq \varepsilon\}$. That is, $\omega_{\text{best}}^{(T)}$ is a $(\varepsilon, \frac{\varepsilon}{2\ell_\Psi})$ -stationary point of φ .

Furthermore, if we assume that $\phi(\delta, \cdot)$ is differentiable at ω^* for any state distribution $\delta \in \Delta(\mathcal{S})$, φ is also differentiable at ω^* . Hence, by the proof of Lemma 4, we know that for any state distribution $v \in \Delta(\mathcal{S})$,

$$\|\nabla_\omega \phi(v, \omega)\| \leq \max_{\sigma^* \in \arg \max_{\sigma \in \mathbb{R}^\Sigma} \psi(v, \omega, \sigma)} \|\nabla_\omega \psi(v, \omega, \sigma^*)\| \quad (39)$$

$$\leq \max_{i \in [n]} \max_{\sigma^* \in \arg \max_{\sigma \in \mathbb{R}^\Sigma} \psi(v, \omega, \sigma)} \quad (40)$$

$$\left(\frac{1}{1-\gamma}\right)^2 \left\|\frac{\delta_v^{\sigma_i^*}(\omega, \omega_{-i})}{\mu}\right\|_{\infty} \left\|\frac{\delta_v^{\omega}}{\mu}\right\|_{\infty} \|\nabla_\omega \Psi(\omega, \sigma^*)\| \quad (41)$$

$$= C_{br}(\omega, \mu, v) \|\nabla_\omega \Psi(\omega, \sigma^*)\| \quad (42)$$

$$\frac{1}{C_{br}(\omega, \mu, v)} \|\nabla_\omega \phi(v, \omega)\| \leq \|\nabla_\omega \Psi(\omega, \sigma^*)\| \quad (43)$$

Therefore,

$$\omega^* \in \mathbb{R}_\varepsilon^\Omega \doteq \{\omega \in \mathbb{R}^\Omega \mid \exists \alpha \in \mathcal{D}\varphi(\omega), \|\alpha\| \leq \varepsilon\} \quad (44)$$

$$\supseteq \{\omega \in \mathbb{R}^\Omega \mid \exists \sigma^* \in \arg \max_{\omega \in \mathbb{R}^\Omega} \Psi(\omega, \sigma) \text{ s.t. } \|\nabla_\omega \Psi(\omega, \sigma^*)\| \leq \varepsilon\} \quad (45)$$

$$\supseteq \{\omega \in \mathbb{R}^\Omega \mid 1/C_{br}(\omega, \mu, v) \|\nabla_\omega \phi(v, \omega)\| \leq \varepsilon\} \quad (46)$$

$$= \{\omega \in \mathbb{R}^\Omega \mid \|\nabla_\omega \phi(v, \omega)\| \leq \delta\} \quad (47)$$

Therefore, we can conclude that there exists ω^* such that $\|\omega_{\text{best}}^{(T)} - \omega^*\| \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{2\ell_\Psi}$ and $\|\nabla_\omega \phi(v, \omega)\| \leq \delta$ for any v . Thus, $\omega_{\text{best}}^{(T)}$ is a (ε, δ) -stationary point of $\phi(v, \cdot)$ for any $v \in \Delta(\mathcal{S})$. \square

B.2 Omitted Results and Proofs from Section 4.3

Theorem 4.1. *Consider an infinite horizon Markov exchange economy \mathcal{I} . Under Assumption 6, the set of recursive Radner equilibria of \mathcal{I} is equal to the set of GMPE of the associated exchange economy Markov pseudo-game \mathcal{M} .*

Proof. Let $\pi^* = (\mathbf{X}^*, \mathbf{Y}^*, \mathbf{p}^*, \mathbf{q}^*) : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{P} \times \mathcal{Q}$ be an GMPE of the Radner Markov pseudo-game \mathcal{M} associated with \mathcal{I} . We want to show that it is also an RRE of \mathcal{I} .

First, we want to show that π^* is Markov perfect for all consumers. We can make some easy observations: the state value for the player $i \in [n]$ in the Radner Markov pseudo-game at state $\mathbf{s} \in \mathcal{S}$ induced by the policy π^*

$$v_i^{\pi^*}(\mathbf{s}) = \mathbb{E}_{H \sim \nu^{\pi^*}} \left[\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t r'_i(S^{(t)}, A^{(t)}) \mid S^{(0)} = \mathbf{s} \right] \quad (48)$$

$$= \mathbb{E}_{H \sim \nu^{\pi^*}} \left[\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t r_i(\mathbf{x}_i^*(S^{(t)}); \Theta_i^{(t)}) \mid S^{(0)} = \mathbf{s} \right] \quad (49)$$

is equal to the consumption state value induced by $(\mathbf{X}^*, \mathbf{Y}^*, \mathbf{p}^*, \mathbf{q}^*)$

$$v_i^{(\mathbf{X}^*, \mathbf{Y}^*, \mathbf{p}^*, \mathbf{q}^*)}(\mathbf{s}) \doteq \mathbb{E}_{H \sim \nu^{(\mathbf{X}^*, \mathbf{Y}^*, \mathbf{p}^*, \mathbf{q}^*)}} \left[\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t r_i(\mathbf{x}_i^*(H_{:t}); \Theta^{(t)}) \mid S^{(0)} = \mathbf{s} \right]. \quad (50)$$

as \mathbf{x}_i^* is Markov. Since π^* is a GMPE, we know that for any $i \in [n]$:

$$(\mathbf{x}_i^*, \mathbf{y}_i^*) \in \arg \max_{\substack{(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{y}_i): \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}_i \times \mathcal{Y}_i: \forall \mathbf{s} \in \mathcal{S}, \\ (\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{y}_i)(\mathbf{s}) \in \mathcal{B}_i(\mathbf{e}_i, \mathbf{p}^*(\mathbf{s}), \mathbf{q}^*(\mathbf{s}))}} \left\{ v_i^{(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{x}_{-i}^*, \mathbf{y}_i, \mathbf{y}_{-i}^*, \mathbf{p}^*, \mathbf{q}^*)}(\mathbf{s}) \right\}$$

for all $\mathbf{s} \in \mathcal{S}$, so $(\mathbf{X}^*, \mathbf{Y}^*, \mathbf{p}^*, \mathbf{q}^*)$ is Markov perfect.

Next, we want to show that $(\mathbf{X}^*, \mathbf{Y}^*, \mathbf{p}^*, \mathbf{q}^*)$ satisfies the Walras's law. First, we show that for any $i \in [n]$, $\mathbf{s} \in \mathcal{S}$, $\mathbf{x}_i^*(\mathbf{s}) \cdot \mathbf{p}^*(\mathbf{s}) + \mathbf{y}_i^*(\mathbf{s}) \cdot \mathbf{q}^*(\mathbf{s}) - \mathbf{e}_i \cdot \mathbf{p}^*(\mathbf{s}) = 0$. By way of contradiction, assume that there exists some $i \in [n]$, $\mathbf{s} \in \mathcal{S}$ such that $\mathbf{x}_i^*(\mathbf{s}) \cdot \mathbf{p}^*(\mathbf{s}) + \mathbf{y}_i^*(\mathbf{s}) \cdot \mathbf{q}^*(\mathbf{s}) - \mathbf{e}_i \cdot \mathbf{p}^*(\mathbf{s}) \neq 0$. Note that $(\mathbf{x}_i^*(\mathbf{s}), \mathbf{y}_i^*(\mathbf{s})) \in \mathcal{B}'(\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{a}_{-i}) = \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{e}_i, \mathbf{p}^*(\mathbf{s}), \mathbf{q}^*(\mathbf{s})) = \{(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{y}_i) \in \mathcal{X}_i \times \mathcal{Y}_i \mid \mathbf{x}_i \cdot \mathbf{p}^*(\mathbf{s}) + \mathbf{y}_i \cdot \mathbf{q}^*(\mathbf{s}) \leq \mathbf{e}_i \cdot \mathbf{p}^*(\mathbf{s})\}$, so we must have $\mathbf{x}_i^*(\mathbf{s}) \cdot \mathbf{p}^*(\mathbf{s}) + \mathbf{y}_i^*(\mathbf{s}) \cdot \mathbf{q}^*(\mathbf{s}) - \mathbf{e}_i \cdot \mathbf{p}^*(\mathbf{s}) < 0$. By the (no saturation) condition of Assumption 6, there exists $\mathbf{x}_i^+ \in \mathcal{X}_i$ s.t. $r_i(\mathbf{x}_i^+; \theta_i) > r_i(\mathbf{x}_i^*(\mathbf{s}); \theta_i)$. Moreover, since $\mathbf{x}_i \mapsto r_i(\mathbf{x}_i; \theta_i)$ is concave, for any $0 < t < 1$, $r_i(t\mathbf{x}_i^+ + (1-t)\mathbf{x}_i^*(\mathbf{s}); \theta_i) > r_i(\mathbf{x}_i^*(\mathbf{s}); \theta_i)$. Since $\mathbf{x}_i^*(\mathbf{s}) \cdot \mathbf{p}^*(\mathbf{s}) + \mathbf{y}_i^*(\mathbf{s}) \cdot \mathbf{q}^*(\mathbf{s}) - \mathbf{e}_i \cdot \mathbf{p}^*(\mathbf{s}) < 0$, we can pick t small enough such that $\mathbf{x}'_i = t\mathbf{x}_i^+ + (1-t)\mathbf{x}_i^*(\mathbf{s})$ satisfies $\mathbf{x}'_i \cdot \mathbf{p}^*(\mathbf{s}) + \mathbf{y}_i^*(\mathbf{s}) \cdot \mathbf{q}^*(\mathbf{s}) - \mathbf{e}_i \cdot \mathbf{p}^*(\mathbf{s}) \leq 0$ but $\mathbf{x}'_i \in \mathcal{X}_i$ s.t. $r_i(\mathbf{x}'_i; \theta_i) > r_i(\mathbf{x}_i^*(\mathbf{s}); \theta_i)$. Thus,

$$q_i^{\pi^*}(\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{x}'_i, \mathbf{x}_{-i}^*(\mathbf{s}), \mathbf{Y}^*(\mathbf{s}), \mathbf{p}^*(\mathbf{s}), \mathbf{q}^*(\mathbf{s})) \quad (51)$$

$$= r'_i(\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{x}'_i, \mathbf{x}_{-i}^*(\mathbf{s}), \mathbf{Y}^*(\mathbf{s}), \mathbf{p}^*(\mathbf{s}), \mathbf{q}^*(\mathbf{s})) + \mathbb{E}_{S' \sim p(S' | \mathbf{s}, \mathbf{Y}^*(\mathbf{s}))} [\gamma v_i^{\pi^*}(S')] \quad (52)$$

$$= r_i(\mathbf{x}'_i; \theta_i) + \mathbb{E}_{S' \sim p(S' | \mathbf{s}, \mathbf{Y}^*(\mathbf{s}))} [\gamma v_i^{\pi^*}(S')] \quad (53)$$

$$> r_i(\mathbf{x}_i^*(\mathbf{s}); \theta_i) + \mathbb{E}_{S' \sim p(S' | \mathbf{s}, \mathbf{Y}^*(\mathbf{s}))} [\gamma v_i^{\pi^*}(S')] \quad (54)$$

$$= q_i^{\pi^*}(\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{X}^*(\mathbf{s}), \mathbf{Y}^*(\mathbf{s}), \mathbf{p}^*(\mathbf{s}), \mathbf{q}^*(\mathbf{s})) \quad (55)$$

This contradicts that fact that π^* is a GMPE since an optimal policy is supposed to be greedy optimal (i.e., maximize the action-value function of each player over its action space at all states) respect to optimal action value function. Thus, we know that for all $i \in [n]$, $\mathbf{s} \in \mathcal{S}$, $\mathbf{x}_i^*(\mathbf{s}) \cdot \mathbf{p}^*(\mathbf{s}) + \mathbf{y}_i^*(\mathbf{s}) \cdot \mathbf{q}^*(\mathbf{s}) - \mathbf{e}_i \cdot \mathbf{p}^*(\mathbf{s}) = 0$. Summing across the buyers, we get $\mathbf{p}^*(\mathbf{s}) \cdot \left(\sum_{i \in [n]} \mathbf{x}_i^*(\mathbf{s}) - \sum_{i \in [n]} \mathbf{e}_i \right) + \mathbf{q}^*(\mathbf{s}) \cdot \left(\sum_{i \in [n]} \mathbf{y}_i^*(\mathbf{s}) \right) = 0$ for any $\mathbf{s} \in \mathcal{S}$, which is the Walras' law.

Finally, we want to show that $(\mathbf{X}^*, \mathbf{Y}^*, \mathbf{p}^*, \mathbf{q}^*)$ is feasible. We first show that $\sum_{i \in [n]} \mathbf{x}_i^*(\mathbf{s}) - \sum_{i \in [n]} \mathbf{e}_i \leq \mathbf{0}_m$ for any $\mathbf{s} \in \mathcal{S}$. We proved that for any state $\mathbf{s} \in \mathcal{S}$, $r'_{n+1}(\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{X}^*(\mathbf{s}), \mathbf{Y}^*(\mathbf{s}), \mathbf{p}^*(\mathbf{s}), \mathbf{q}^*(\mathbf{s})) = \mathbf{p}^*(\mathbf{s}) \cdot \left(\sum_{i \in [n]} \mathbf{x}_i^*(\mathbf{s}) - \sum_{i \in [n]} \mathbf{e}_i \right) + \mathbf{q}^*(\mathbf{s}) \cdot \left(\sum_{i \in [n]} \mathbf{y}_i^*(\mathbf{s}) \right) = 0$, which implies $v_{n+1}^{\pi^*}(\mathbf{s}) = 0$. For any $j \in [m]$,

consider a $\mathbf{p} : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}$ defined by $\mathbf{p}(s) = \mathbf{j}_j$ for all $s \in \mathcal{S}$ and a $\mathbf{q} : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathcal{Q}$ defined by $\mathbf{q}(s) = \mathbf{0}_l$ for all $s \in \mathcal{S}$. Then, we know that

$$0 = v_{n+1}^{\pi^*} \quad (56)$$

$$= q_{n+1}^{\pi^*}(s, \mathbf{X}^*(s), \mathbf{Y}^*(s), \mathbf{p}^*(s), \mathbf{q}^*(s)) \quad (57)$$

$$\geq q_{n+1}^{\pi^*}(s, \mathbf{X}^*(s), \mathbf{Y}^*(s), \mathbf{p}(s), \mathbf{q}(s)) \quad (58)$$

$$= r'_{n+1}(s, \mathbf{X}^*(s), \mathbf{Y}^*(s), \mathbf{p}(s), \mathbf{q}(s)) + \mathbb{E}_{S' \sim p(S'|s, \mathbf{Y}^*(s))} [\gamma v_i^{\pi^*}(S')] \quad (59)$$

$$= \mathbf{j}_j \cdot \left(\sum_{i \in [n]} \mathbf{x}_i^*(s) - \sum_{i \in [n]} \mathbf{e}_i \right) \quad \forall j \in [m] \quad (60)$$

$$= \sum_{i \in [n]} x_{ij}^*(s) - \sum_{i \in [n]} e_{ij} \quad \forall j \in [m] \quad (61)$$

Thus, we know that $\sum_{i \in [n]} \mathbf{x}_i^*(s) - \sum_{i \in [n]} \mathbf{e}_i \leq \mathbf{0}_m$ for any $s \in \mathcal{S}$. Finally, we show that $\sum_{i \in [n]} \mathbf{y}_i^*(s) \leq \mathbf{0}_l$ for all $s \in \mathcal{S}$. By way of contradiction, suppose that for some asset $k \in [l]$, and some state $s \in \mathcal{S}$, $\sum_{i \in [n]} y_{ik}^*(s) > 0$. Then, the auctioneer can increase its cumulative payoff by increasing $q_k^*(s)$, which contradicts the definition of a GMPE.

Therefore, we can conclude that $\pi^* = (\mathbf{X}^*, \mathbf{Y}^*, \mathbf{p}^*, \mathbf{q}^*) : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{P} \times \mathcal{Q}$ is a RRE of \mathcal{I} .

Finally, notice that the transition functions set in our game are all stochastically concave and as such give rise action-value functions which are concave in the actions each of player (Atakan, 2003a), and it is easy to verify that the game also satisfies all conditions that guarantee the existence of a GMPE (see Section 4 of (Atakan, 2003a) for detailed proofs). Hence, by Theorem 3.1 which guarantees the existence of GMPE in generalized Markov games, we can conclude that there exists an RRE $(\mathbf{X}^*, \mathbf{Y}^*, \mathbf{p}^*, \mathbf{q}^*)$ in any Radner economy \mathcal{I} . \square

B.3 Omitted Results and Proofs from Section 4.4

Theorem 4.2. *Consider an infinite horizon Markov exchange economy \mathcal{I} and the associated exchange economy Markov pseudo-games \mathcal{M} . Let $(\pi, \rho, \mathbb{R}^\Omega, \mathbb{R}^\Sigma)$ be a parametrization scheme for \mathcal{M} and suppose Assumptions 4, 5, and 6 hold. Then, the convergence results in Theorem 3.2 hold for \mathcal{M} .*

Proof. In the proof of Theorem 4.1, we can observe that, for any infinite horizon Markov exchange economy \mathcal{I} and its associated generalized Markov exchange economy game \mathcal{M} , the exploitability of an outcome $(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q})$ in \mathcal{I} is equivalent to the exploitability of a policy $\pi = (\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q})$ in \mathcal{M} . Similarly, the state exploitability of an outcome $(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q})$ in \mathcal{I} is equivalent to the state exploitability of a policy $\pi = (\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q})$ in \mathcal{M} given any state $s \in \mathcal{S}$.

Therefore, this results follows readily from Theorem 3.2. \square

C Experiments

C.1 Neural Projection Method

The projection method (Judd, 1992), also known as the weighted residual methods, is a numerical technique often used to approximate solutions to complex economic models, particularly those involving dynamic programming and dynamic stochastic general equilibrium (DSGE) models. These models are common

in macroeconomics and often don't have analytical solutions due to their non-linear, dynamic, and high-dimensional nature. The projection method helps approximate these solutions by projecting the problem into a more manageable, lower-dimensional space.

The main idea of the projection method is to express equilibrium of the dynamic economic model as a solution to a functional equation $D(f) = \mathbf{0}$, where $f : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$ is a function that represent some unknown policy, $D : (\mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m) \rightarrow (\mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n)$, and $\mathbf{0}$ is the constant zero function. Some classic examples of the operator D includes Euler equations and Bellman equations. A canonical project method consists of four steps: 1) Define a set of basis functions $\{\psi_i : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m\}_{i \in [n]}$ and approximate each each function $f \in \mathcal{F}$ through a linear combination of basis functions: $\hat{f}(\cdot; \theta) = \sum_{i=1}^n \theta_i \psi_i(\cdot)$; 2) Define a residual equation as a functional equation evaluated at the approximation: $R(\cdot; \theta) \doteq D(\hat{f}(\cdot; \theta))$; 3) Choose some weight functions $\{w_i : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}\}_{i \in [p]}$ over the states and find θ that solves $F(\theta) \doteq \int_{\mathcal{S}} w_i(s) R(s; \theta) ds = 0$ for all $i \in [p]$. This gets the residual "close" to zero in the weighted integral sense; 4) Simulate the optimal decision rule based on the chosen parameter θ and basis functions.

Recently, the neural projection method was developed to extend the traditional projection method (Maliar et al., 2021; Azinovic et al., 2022; Sauzet, 2021). In the neural projection method, neural networks are used as the functional approximators for policy functions instead of traditional basis function approximations. In this section, we show how we can approximate generalized Markov Perfect Nash equilibrium of generalized Markov game, and consequently Recursive Radner Equilibrium of infinite-horizon Markov exchange economies, through the neural projection method.

Assumption 7. *Given a generalized Markov game \mathcal{M} , assume that 1. for any $i \in [n]$, $\mathbf{s} \in \mathcal{S}$, $\mathbf{a}_{-i} \in \mathcal{A}_{-i}$, $\mathcal{X}_i(\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{a}_{-i}) \doteq \{\mathbf{a}_i \in \mathcal{A}_i \mid h_{ic}(\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{a}_i, \mathbf{a}_{-i}) \geq 0 \text{ for all } c \in [d]\}$ for a collection of constraint functions $\{h_{ic} : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \mid c \in [d]\}$, where $\mathbf{a}_i \mapsto h_{ic}(\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{a}_i, \mathbf{a}_{-i})$ is concave for every $c \in [d]$.*

Theorem C.1. *Let \mathcal{M} be a generalized Markov game that satisfies Assumption 7. For any policy profile $\pi \in \mathcal{F}^{\text{markov}}$, π is a GMPE if and only if there exists Lagrange multiplier policy $\lambda : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+^{n \times d}$ such that (π, λ) solves the following functional equation: for all $i \in [n]$, $\mathbf{s} \in \mathcal{S}$,*

$$0 \in \partial_{\mathbf{a}_i} q_i^\pi(\mathbf{s}, \pi_i(\mathbf{s}), \pi_{-i}(\mathbf{s})) + \sum_{c \in [d]} \lambda_{i,c}(\mathbf{s}) \partial_{\mathbf{a}_i} h_{ic}(\mathbf{s}, \pi_i(\mathbf{s}), \pi_{-i}(\mathbf{s})) \quad (62)$$

$$\forall c \in [d], \quad 0 = \lambda_{i,c}(\mathbf{s}) h_{ic}(\mathbf{s}, \pi_i(\mathbf{s}), \pi_{-i}(\mathbf{s})) \quad (63)$$

$$\forall c \in [d], \quad 0 \leq h_{ic}(\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{a}_i^*, \pi_{-i}(\mathbf{s})) \quad (64)$$

$$(65)$$

and for all $i \in [n]$, $\mathbf{s} \in \mathcal{S}$,

$$v_i^\pi(\mathbf{s}) = q_i^\pi(\mathbf{s}, \pi_i(\mathbf{s}), \pi_{-i}(\mathbf{s})) \quad (66)$$

Proof. First, we know that a policy profile $\pi \in \mathcal{F}^{\text{markov}}$ is a GMPE if and only if it satisfies the following generalized Bellman Optimality equations, i.e., for all $i \in [n]$, $\mathbf{s} \in \mathcal{S}$,

$$v_i^\pi(\mathbf{s}) = \max_{\mathbf{a}_i \in \mathcal{X}_i(\mathbf{s}, \pi_{-i}(\mathbf{s}))} r_i(\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{a}_i, \pi_{-i}(\mathbf{s})) + \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{s}' \sim p(\cdot | \mathbf{s}, \mathbf{a}_i, \pi_{-i}(\mathbf{s}))} [\gamma v_i^\pi(\mathbf{s}')] \quad (67)$$

$$= \max_{\mathbf{a}_i \in \mathcal{X}_i(\mathbf{s}, \pi_{-i}(\mathbf{s}))} q_i^\pi(\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{a}_i, \pi_{-i}(\mathbf{s})) \quad (68)$$

Then since $\mathbf{a}_i \mapsto q_i^\pi(\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{a}_i, \pi_{-i}(\mathbf{s}))$ is concave over $\mathcal{X}_i(\mathbf{s}, \pi_{-i}(\mathbf{s}))$ by Assumption 1, the KKT conditions provides sufficient and necessary optimality conditions for the constrained maximization problem

$$\max_{\mathbf{a}_i \in \mathcal{X}_i(\mathbf{s}, \pi_{-i}(\mathbf{s}))} q_i^\pi(\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{a}_i, \pi_{-i}(\mathbf{s})) \quad (69)$$

That is, $\mathbf{a}_i^* \in \mathcal{X}_i(\mathbf{s}, \boldsymbol{\pi}_{-i}(\mathbf{s}))$ is a solution to eq. (69) if and only if there exists $\{\lambda_{ic}^* : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+\}_{c \in [d]}$ s.t.

$$0 \in \partial_{\mathbf{a}_i} q_i^\pi(\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{a}_i^*, \boldsymbol{\pi}_{-i}(\mathbf{s})) + \sum_{c \in [d]} \lambda_{ic}^*(\mathbf{s}) \partial_{\mathbf{a}_i} h_{ic}(\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{a}_i^*, \boldsymbol{\pi}_{-i}(\mathbf{s})) \quad (70)$$

$$\forall c \in [d], \quad 0 = \lambda_{ic}^*(\mathbf{s}) h_{ic}(\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{a}_i^*, \boldsymbol{\pi}_{-i}(\mathbf{s})) \quad (71)$$

$$\forall c \in [d], \quad 0 \leq h_{ic}(\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{a}_i^*, \boldsymbol{\pi}_{-i}(\mathbf{s})) \quad (72)$$

Therefore, we can conclude that $\boldsymbol{\pi} \in \mathcal{F}^{\text{markov}}$ is a GMPE if and only if there exists $\{\lambda_{ic} : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+\}_{i \in [n], c \in [d]}$ s.t. for all $i \in [n]$, $\mathbf{s} \in \mathcal{S}$,

$$0 \in \partial_{\mathbf{a}_i} q_i^\pi(\mathbf{s}, \boldsymbol{\pi}_i(\mathbf{s}), \boldsymbol{\pi}_{-i}(\mathbf{s})) + \sum_{c \in [d]} \lambda_{i,c}(\mathbf{s}) \partial_{\mathbf{a}_i} h_{ic}(\mathbf{s}, \boldsymbol{\pi}_i(\mathbf{s}), \boldsymbol{\pi}_{-i}(\mathbf{s})) \quad (73)$$

$$\forall c \in [d], \quad 0 = \lambda_{i,c}(\mathbf{s}) h_{ic}(\mathbf{s}, \boldsymbol{\pi}_i(\mathbf{s}), \boldsymbol{\pi}_{-i}(\mathbf{s})) \quad (74)$$

$$\forall c \in [d], \quad 0 \leq h_{ic}(\mathbf{s}, \boldsymbol{\pi}_i(\mathbf{s}), \boldsymbol{\pi}_{-i}(\mathbf{s})) \quad (75)$$

and for all $i \in [n]$, $\mathbf{s} \in \mathcal{S}$,

$$v_i^\pi(\mathbf{s}) = q_i^\pi(\mathbf{s}, \boldsymbol{\pi}_i(\mathbf{s}), \boldsymbol{\pi}_{-i}(\mathbf{s})) \quad (76)$$

□

Therefore, for a policy profile $\boldsymbol{\pi} \in \mathcal{F}^{\text{markov}}$ and a Lagrange multiplier policy $\boldsymbol{\lambda} : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+^{n \times d}$ such that $(\boldsymbol{\pi}, \boldsymbol{\lambda})$, consider the *total first order violation*

$$\Xi_{\text{first-order}}(\boldsymbol{\pi}, \boldsymbol{\lambda}) = \sum_{i \in [n]} \left\| \int_{\mathbf{s} \in \mathcal{S}} \partial_{\mathbf{a}_i} q_i^\pi(\mathbf{s}, \boldsymbol{\pi}_i(\mathbf{s}), \boldsymbol{\pi}_{-i}(\mathbf{s})) + \sum_{c \in [d]} \lambda_{i,c}(\mathbf{s}) \partial_{\mathbf{a}_i} h_{ic}(\mathbf{s}, \boldsymbol{\pi}_i(\mathbf{s}), \boldsymbol{\pi}_{-i}(\mathbf{s})) ds \right\|_2^2 \quad (77)$$

and the *average Bellman error*

$$\Xi_{\text{Bellman}}(\boldsymbol{\pi}, \boldsymbol{\lambda}) = \sum_{i \in [n]} \left\| \int_{\mathbf{s} \in \mathcal{S}} v_i^\pi(\mathbf{s}) - q_i^\pi(\mathbf{s}, \boldsymbol{\pi}_i(\mathbf{s}), \boldsymbol{\pi}_{-i}(\mathbf{s})) ds \right\|_2^2. \quad (78)$$

We can directly approximate the GMPE through minimizing the sum of these two errors.

Typically, approximating the GMPE using the neural projection method requires optimizing both the policy profile and the Lagrange multiplier policy. However, in exchange economy Markov pseudo-games, we derive a closed-form solution for the optimal Lagrange multiplier, allowing us to focus solely on optimizing the policy profile.

C.2 More Results

C.3 Implementation Details

Deterministic Case Training Details For deterministic transition probability case, for each reward function class we randomly sampled one economy with 10 consumers, 10 commodities, 1 asset, and 5 world state. The asset return matrix \mathbf{R} is sampled in a way such that $r_{okj} \sim U([0.5, 1.1])$ for all o, k , and j . Moreover, we set the length of the stochastic process to be 30. For the initial state, we sample each consumer's endowment $e_i \sim U([0.01, 0.1])^m$ and normalized so that the total endowment of each commodity add up to 1. We also sample each consumer's type $\boldsymbol{\theta}_i \sim U([1.0, 5.0])^m$, and set the world




Figure 2: Normalized Metrics for Economies with Deterministic Transition Probability Function

state to be 0. The transition probability function p is defined as $p(s' | s, Y) = 1$ for all $s(o, E, \Theta)$ where $s' = (o', E', \Theta')$ is defined as $o' = 0$, $E' = 0.01 \cdot \mathbf{1}_{n \times m}$, and $\Theta' = \Theta$.

Then, for both GAPNets method and neural projection method, we run 1000 episodes for each learning rate candidate in a grid search manner and measure the performance in terms of minimizing total first-order violation and average Bellman error. Finally, we pick the best hyperparameter for the final experiments.

In the final experiments, we run GAPNets for 2000 episodes using learning rates $\eta_\omega = 1 \times 10^{-5}$, $\eta_\sigma = 1 \times 10^{-5}$ for the linear economy, $\eta_\omega = 1 \times 10^{-5}$, $\eta_\sigma = 1 \times 10^{-5}$ for the Cobb-Douglas economy, and $\eta_\omega = 1 \times 10^{-5}$, $\eta_\sigma = 1 \times 10^{-5}$ for the Leontief economy. Similarly, we ran neural projection method for 2000 episodes using learning rates $\eta_\omega = 1 \times 10^{-4}$ for the linear economy, $\eta_\omega = 2.5 \times 10^{-5}$ for the Cobb-Douglas economy, and $\eta_\omega = 1 \times 10^{-4}$ for the Leontief economy. In this process, we compute the exploitability of computed policy profile through gradient ascent of the adversarial network. In specific, we ran 1000 episodes of gradient ascent with learning rate $\eta_\sigma = 5 \times 10^{-5}$ for the linear economy, $\eta_\sigma = 1 \times 10^{-4}$ for the Cobb-Douglas economy, and $\eta_\sigma = 1 \times 10^{-4}$ for the Leontief economy.

Next, for each economy, we randomly sample 50 policy profiles and record their total first-order violations, average Bellman errors, and exploitabilities. Finally, we normalize the results by the average of the sampled values.

Stochastic Case Training Details For stochastic transition probability case, for each reward function class we randomly sampled one economy with 10 consumers, 10 commodities, 1 asset, and 5 world state. The asset return matrix R is sampled in a way such that $r_{okj} \sim U([0.5, 1.1])$ for all o, k , and j . Moreover, we set the length of the stochastic process to be 30. For the initial state, we sample each consumer’s endowment $e_i \sim U([0.01, 0.1])^m$ and normalized so that the total endowment of each commodity add up to 1. We also sample each consumer’s type $\theta_i \sim U([1.0, 5.0])^m$, and set the world state to be 0. The transition

probability function will stochastically transition from state $s(o, \mathbf{E}, \Theta)$ to state $s' = (o', \mathbf{E}', \Theta')$ where $o' \sim U(\{0, 1, 2, 3, 4\})$, $\mathbf{E}' \sim 0.002 + U([0.01, 0.1])^{n \times m}$, and $\Theta' = \Theta$.

Then, for both GAPNets method and neural projection method, we run 1000 episodes for each learning rate candidate in a grid search manner and measure the performance in terms of minimizing total first-order violation and average Bellman error. Finally, we pick the best hyperparameter for the final experiments.

In the final experiments, we run GAPNets for 2000 episodes using learning rates $\eta_\omega = 1 \times 10^{-5}$, $\eta_\sigma = 1 \times 10^{-5}$ for the linear economy, $\eta_\omega = 2.5 \times 10^{-5}$, $\eta_\sigma = 2.5 \times 10^{-5}$ for the Cobb-Douglas economy, and $\eta_\omega = 5 \times 10^{-5}$, $\eta_\sigma = 5 \times 10^{-5}$ for the Leontief economy. Similarly, we ran neural projection method for 2000 episodes using learning rates $\eta_\omega = 5 \times 10^{-5}$ for the linear economy, $\eta_\omega = 2.5 \times 10^{-5}$ for the Cobb-Douglas economy, and $\eta_\omega = 5 \times 10^{-4}$ for the Leontief economy. In this process, we compute the exploitability of computed policy profile through gradient ascent of the adversarial network. In specific, we ran 1000 episodes of gradient ascent with learning rate $\eta_\sigma = 7.5 \times 10^{-4}$ for the linear economy, $\eta_\sigma = 1 \times 10^{-4}$ for the Cobb-Douglas economy, and $\eta_\sigma = 1 \times 10^{-4}$ for the Leontief economy. When estimating the neural loss function—cumulative regret for the GAPNets method and total first-order violations and average Bellman error for the neural projection method—we use 100 samples for GAPNets and 10 samples for the neural projection method. The primary reason for this difference is the high memory consumption of the neural projection method, which makes larger sample sizes infeasible.

Next, for each economy, we randomly sample 50 policy profiles and record their total first-order violations, average Bellman errors, and exploitabilities. Finally, we normalize the results by the average of the sampled values.

C.4 Other Details

Programming Languages, Packages, and Licensing We ran our experiments in Python 3.7 (Van Rossum and Drake Jr, 1995), using NumPy (Harris et al., 2020), CVXPY (Diamond and Boyd, 2016), Jax (Bradbury et al., 2018), OPTAX (Bradbury et al., 2018), Haiku (Hennigan et al., 2020), and JaxOPT (Blondel et al., 2021). All figures were graphed using Matplotlib (Hunter, 2007).

Python software and documentation are licensed under the PSF License Agreement. Numpy is distributed under a liberal BSD license. Pandas is distributed under a new BSD license. Matplotlib only uses BSD compatible code, and its license is based on the PSF license. CVXPY is licensed under an APACHE license.

Computational Resources The experiments were conducted using Google Colab, which provides cloud-based computational resources. Specifically, we utilized an NVIDIA T4 GPU with the following specifications: GPU: NVIDIA T4 (16GB GDDR6), CPU: Intel Xeon (2 vCPUs), RAM: 12GB, Storage: Colab-provided ephemeral storage.

Code Repository the full details of our experiments, including hyperparameter search, final experiment configurations, and visualization code, can be found in our code repository (<https://anonymous.4open.science/r/Markov-Pseudo-Game-EC2025-DCB8>).