arXiv:2503.24159v1 [math.OC] 31 Mar 2025

A system level approach to generalised feedback Nash equilibrium seeking in partially-observed games

Otacilio B. L. Neto, Michela Mulas, and Francesco Corona

Abstract—This work proposes an algorithm for seeking generalised feedback Nash equilibria (GFNE) in noncooperative dynamic games. The focus is on cyber-physical systems with dynamics which are linear, stochastic, potentially unstable, and partially observed. We employ System Level Synthesis (SLS) to reformulate the problem as the search for an equilibrium profile of closed-loop responses to noise, which can then be used to reconstruct a stabilising output-feedback policy. Under this setup, we leverage monotone operator theory to design a GFNE-seeking algorithm capable to enforce closed-loop stability, operational constraints, and communication constraints onto the control policies. This algorithm is amenable to numerical implementation and we provide conditions for its convergence. We demonstrate our approach in a simulated experiment on the noncooperative stabilisation of a decentralised power-grid.

Index Terms-Noncooperative games, generalised Feedback Nash equilibrium, Monotone operators, System level synthesis

I. INTRODUCTION

➤ YBER-PHYSICAL systems are often comprised of many interacting subsystems each operated by a self-interested decision-making agent. Each agent should control its subsystem according to a feedback policy which is optimal, given its local objective, while still satisfying global requirements, given the policies applied to the other subsystems. However, because of the noncooperative and multi-objective nature of the problem, a traditional approach to policy synthesis is impractical. Dynamic game theory provides an alternative framework by explicitly accounting for the behaviour of these rational agents when deciding on their policies [1]. Under this framework, the policy synthesis task translates to finding a profile of feedback policies (the strategies) which are feasible and agreeable to all agents (the *players*); that is, a strategic equilibrium. Gametheoretical approaches to online decision-making have found success in many applications including power systems [2]-[4], communication networks [5], and multi-agent robotics [6]-[8].

Due to their generality, a pertinent class of problems concern noncooperative dynamic games in which the underlying system is stochastic, potentially unstable, and partially observed. In such problems, players choose output-feedback policies to jointly stabilise the whole system while only (noisy) measurements of its internal state are available. Their choice can be further restricted by coupled constraints on their actions, on the resulting state-responses, and on the policies

themselves (e.g., encoding communication delays). A relevant solution concept is the generalised feedback Nash equilibrium (GFNE, [1], [9]): A set of policies which are, simultaneously, the best strategy for each player given the others' choices. Despite prevalent, Nash equilibria are notoriously hard to compute [10] and there are still no systematic solutions to the aforementioned class of dynamic games. The current practice for solving dynamic games includes dynamic programming [11]-[16], complementarity methods [17], [18], and ad-hoc heuristics [19], [20]. These methods are mostly limited to state-feedback problems and cannot address either closedloop stability, operational constraints, or design of the policy structure. Moreover, they focus on solving the game for the sake of analysing how the agents behave when applying equilibrium policies; often not discussing how players might learn such policies themselves. Equilibrium-seeking algorithms, when players actively search for an equilibrium, mimic the behaviour of real agents and thus provide routines for decentralised policy learning that can be implemented in practice.

Recently, monotone operator theory has gained attention as an unifying framework for designing equilibrium-seeking algorithms in many engineering applications [21]-[23]. Under a refined solution concept, the variational generalised Nash equilibrium (vGNE), noncooperative games can be reformulated as monotone inclusion problems and then approached by fixed-point methods which often translate to equilibriumseeking routines. This operator-theoretical approach not only allows the solution of noncooperative games with non-trivial information structures, a major challenge in the field [24], but also simplifies the convergence analysis of such routines. Regrettably, its application is mostly limited to static games due to technical challenges arising in GFNE-seeking problems: The space of output-feedback policies (i.e., mappings from measurement to action signals) is generally not endowed with an inner product, necessary for defining variational equilibria. In addition, the numerics common to most vGNE-seeking routines (e.g., computing pseudo-gradient and projections) are cumbersome when the strategy spaces are infinite-dimensional; thus limiting their scalability. However, if such issues can be overcome, monotone operator theory stands out as a promising platform for designing GFNE-seeking algorithms for dynamic games. This is the purpose of this study.

In this work, we propose a GFNE-seeking algorithm for partially-observed stochastic dynamic games. Our algorithm is centred on the equivalent representation of linear outputfeedback policies as their corresponding *closed-loop responses* (or system level responses) to disturbances. Under this setup, players design policies indirectly by instead choosing desired system level responses that serve as their parametrisations.

Otacilio B. L. Neto and Francesco Corona are with the Department of Chemical and Metallurgical Engineering, Aalto University, Finland (e-mails: {otacilio.neto, francesco.corona}@aalto.fi).

Michela Mulas is with the Department of Teleinformatics Engineering, Federal University of Ceará, Brazil (e-mail: michela.mulas@ufc.br).

This work has been submitted to the IEEE for possible publication. Copyright may be transferred without notice, after which this version may no longer be accessible.

2

Using the System Level Synthesis (SLS, [25]) methodology, we translate the original dynamic game into a static game whose strategy space consists of closed-loop responses that explicitly enforce stability (for the whole networked system), operational constraints (on the state and control signals), and communication constraints (for the output-feedback policies). This strategy space is convex and finite-dimensional, making the associated static game amenable to numerical solutions. We formulate a monotone inclusion problem to obtain a vGNE for this static game, which is then used to directly reconstruct a GFNE solution to the original problem; effectively enabling the design of a GFNE-seeking algorithm. In this direction, we design a routine in which: i) players improve their policies, in parallel, by updating their system level parametrisations, while ii) a coordinator ensures that constraints are satisfied. Using standard results from operator theory, we derive convergence certificates for this GFNE-seeking algorithm. The routine does not depend on the state and actions applied to the underlying system and thus can be executed simultaneously with its operation. In summary, our contributions are:

- A principled approach to solve noncooperative dynamic games using monotone operator theory. Specifically, we propose an equilibrium-seeking algorithm based on the equivalent representation of GFNE as their corresponding closed-loop responses to process and measurement noise;
- ii) The design of our proposed algorithm to address stability, operational, and communication constraints in partiallyobserved systems. We consider the (not restrictive) case of policies subjected to actuation and communication delays;
- iii) A formal analysis of the convergence properties of our proposed algorithm and a specific implementation of its numerics to improve its efficiency and scalability.

We demonstrate our GFNE-seeking algorithm in a simulated problem: The noncooperative control of a unstable power-grid. We execute the algorithm alongside an operation of the system and show that players approach a GFNE solution while still complying with operational and communication constraints.

This work builds on our preliminary work which addressed the design of best-response methods for GFNE-seeking in state-feedback problems [26]. In this paper, we extend those results by considering output-feedback policies and by using monotone operator theory as a platform for algorithmic design.

The paper is organised as follows: Section II overviews static games and their solutions through equilibrium-seeking algorithms. In Section III, we overview dynamic games, derive equivalent static games using System Level Synthesis, then propose an equilibrium-seeking algorithm for their solution. Finally, Section IV demonstrates our proposal in a simulated example and Section V provides some concluding remarks.

A. Notation

We use Latin and Greek letters to denote vectors (lowercase) and mappings (uppercase). Sets are in calligraphic font; exceptions are the usual \mathbb{R} and \mathbb{N} . In particular, sequences are denoted $x = (x_t)_{t \in \mathcal{I}}$ given a set $\mathcal{I} \subseteq \mathbb{N}$, or $x = (x_t)_{t=0}^T$ if $\mathcal{I} = \{0, \ldots, T\}$. We define the spaces of N_x -dimensional sequences $\ell_p^{N_x}(\mathcal{I}) = \{x : ||x||_{\ell_p} = (\sum_{t \in \mathcal{I}} ||x_t||^p)^{\frac{1}{p}} < \infty\}$, for $p \in (0, \infty)$, with $\ell_{\infty}^{N_x}$ the space of all bounded sequences. $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y})$ is the set of bounded linear operators $A : \mathcal{X} \to \mathcal{Y}$ and we sometimes write transformed signals as $Ax = (Ax_t)_{t \in \mathcal{I}}$. We use the standard definitions of Hardy spaces \mathcal{H}_{∞} and \mathcal{RH}_{∞} , with $\frac{1}{z}\mathcal{RH}_{\infty}$ denoting all real-rational strictly proper transfer functions. Some other standard signals and operators used in this paper are: The impulse signal $\delta = (\delta_t)_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$, the identity operator I and matrix I_N , and the normal cone N_S and projection proj_S operators for a closed convex set $S \subseteq \mathbb{R}^N$.

We distinguish set-valued mappings from ordinary functions using the notation $F: \mathcal{X} \rightrightarrows \mathcal{Y}$. For any tuple $s = (s^p)_{p \in \mathcal{P}} \in \mathcal{S}$ we often write $s = (s^p, s^{-p})$ to highlight the *p*-th element; this should not be interpreted as a reordering. Similarly, for any set $\mathcal{S} = \prod_{p \in \mathcal{P}} \mathcal{S}^p$, we define the product $\mathcal{S}^{-p} = \prod_{\tilde{p} \in \mathcal{P} \setminus \{p\}} \mathcal{S}^{\tilde{p}}$. A mapping $F: \mathbb{R}^N \rightrightarrows \mathbb{R}^M$ is M_F -strongly-monotone and L_F -Lipschitz continuous with $0 < M_F \le L_F < \infty$ if

$$\langle u - v, x - y \rangle \ge M_F \|x - y\|_2^2$$
 and $\|u - v\|_2 \le L_F \|x - y\|_2$,

for any $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^N$, $u \in F(x)$ and $v \in F(y)$. The mapping is a contraction if $L_F < 1$, nonexpansive if $L_F = 1$, monotone if the first inequality only holds for $M_F = 0$, and maximally monotone if no other monotone operator $\tilde{F} : \mathbb{R}^N \rightrightarrows \mathbb{R}^M$ properly contains it. Finally, $\mathbf{fix}(F) = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^N : x \in F(x)\}$ and $\mathbf{zer}(F) = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^N : 0 \in F(x)\}$ denote its set of fixedpoint and zeroes, respectively.

II. GENERALIZED NASH EQUILIBRIUM SEEKING

A (static) N_P -player game, denoted by a tuple

$$\mathcal{G} \coloneqq (\mathcal{P}, \{S^p\}_{p \in \mathcal{P}}, \{L^p\}_{p \in \mathcal{P}}), \tag{1}$$

defines the problem in which players $p \in \mathcal{P} = \{1, \ldots, N_P\}$ each decides on a strategy $s^p \in S^p(s^{-p}) \subseteq S^p$ to minimise an objective function $L^p : S^1 \times \cdots \times S^{N_P} \to \mathbb{R}$. The strategy sets $S^p \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{N_s^p}$ ($\forall p \in \mathcal{P}$) define the actions available to the players, with $S^p : S^{-p} \rightrightarrows S^p$ restricting this choice based on their rivals' strategies. As such, the problem is coupled through both objective functions and feasible action sets. Finally, the players are assumed to be non-cooperative and acting simultaneously.

A strategy profile $s = (s^1, \ldots, s^{N_P}) \in \mathcal{S} = \mathcal{S}^1 \times \cdots \times \mathcal{S}^{N_P}$, characterises a solution to \mathcal{G} when it is agreeable to all players. If acting rationally, a reasonable assumption is that players might prefer to (myopically) choose a best-response to their rivals's strategies. Formally, the mapping $BR^p : \mathcal{S}^{-p} \rightrightarrows \mathcal{S}^p$,

$$BR^p(s^{-p}) \coloneqq \arg\min_{s^p} \{L^p(s^p, s^{-p}) : s^p \in S^p(s^{-p})\}$$
(2)

defines all such strategies for each player $p \in \mathcal{P}$. A profile is a best-response for all players, simultaneously, when it is a fixed-point of the joint-best-response mapping $BR : S \rightrightarrows S$ defined as $BR(s) \coloneqq BR^1(s^{-1}) \times \cdots \times BR^{N_P}(s^{-N_P})$. This motivates a formal solution concept for non-cooperative games known as the *generalized Nash equilibrium* (GNE, [9]).

Definition 1. A profile $s^* = (s^{1^*}, \ldots, s^{N_P^*}) \in S$ satisfying $s^* \in BR(s^*)$ is a generalized Nash equilibrium (GNE) of \mathcal{G} .

Under this definition, the game \mathcal{G} is solved when no player can improve its objective by unilaterally deviating from its current strategy. The set of fixed-points $\mathbf{fix}(BR)$ comprise all the solutions to \mathcal{G} . As such, the existence and uniqueness of a GNE depend explicitly on the properties of the objectives $\{L^p\}_{p\in\mathcal{P}}$ and constraints $\{S^p\}_{p\in\mathcal{P}}$ functions. Hereafter, we ensure that the problems being discussed are well-posed by making the following assumptions on their primitives:

Assumption 1. For each player $p \in \mathcal{P}$,

- a) the objective L^p is continuously differentiable in all its arguments and strictly convex in s^p for all $s^{-p} \in S^{-p}$.
- b) the strategy set S^p is nonempty, compact, and convex. The mapping $S^p : S^{-p} \rightrightarrows S^p$ takes the form

$$S^{p}(s^{-p}) \coloneqq \{s^{p} \in \mathcal{S}^{p} : (s^{p}, s^{-p}) \in \mathcal{S}^{global}\}, \qquad (3)$$

given a compact convex constraint set $S^{global} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{N_s}$. Moreover they satisfy $S_{\mathcal{G}} = (S^1 \times \cdots \times S^{N_P}) \cap S^{global} \neq \emptyset$.

Under Assumption 1, $BR : S_{\mathcal{G}} \to S_{\mathcal{G}}$ is a continuous function from a nonempty compact convex set onto itself: The existence of GNE (i.e., $\mathbf{fix}(BR) \neq \emptyset$) is ensured by the Brouwer's fixed-point theorem [27]. In practice, these conditions imply that players' best-responses are always unique and their actions are coupled only through a common constraint. Specifically, Eq. (3) can be interpreted as the competition for a limited shared resource (e.g., bandwidth in a network or goods in a supply-chain). Although restrictive, these assumptions still cover a broad class of problems of practical relevance.

We investigate GNE-seeking algorithms for solving \mathcal{G} . Namely, we are interested in fixed-point methods for players to learn a strategy profile $s^* \in \mathbf{fix}(BR)$. Assuming that \mathcal{G} can be repeated, with $s_k = (s_k^1, \ldots, s_k^{N_P})$ being the strategies played at the k-th episode, we seek an *update rule* $T : S_{\mathcal{G}} \to S_{\mathcal{G}}$ such that $s_{k+1} = T(s_k)$ converges to an equilibrium $s^* \in \mathbf{fix}(BR)$. Conforming with realistic scenarios, such a mapping must be

- *semi-decentralized*, in the sense that players compute their updates independently, with minimal coordination;
- based on private information, in the sense that players do not query their rivals' objectives and strategy sets.

A natural choice consists on the operator $T = (1-\eta)I + \eta BR$ for some $\eta \in (0, 1)$, since $s_{k+1} = (1-\eta)s_k + \eta BR(s_k)$ converges to a fixed-point $s^* \in fix(BR)$ (a GNE, by definition) when BR is either a nonexpansive or contractive operator [28]. This method, *Best-Response Dynamics* (BRD), satisfies the above requirements. However, the Lipschitz properties of BR are difficult to establish for most generalized Nash equilibrium problems and convergence might fail even in simple cases [26]. Alternatively, we consider a refinement of the GNE solution concept which is standard for games under Assumption 1: The variational generalized Nash equilibrium (vGNE, [9]).

Definition 2. A profile $s^{\star} = (s^{1^{\star}}, \dots, s^{N_P^{\star}}) \in \mathcal{S}$ satisfying

$$\langle F(s^*), s - s^* \rangle \ge 0, \quad \forall s \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{G}},$$
 (4)

given the pseudo-gradient $F(s) = (\nabla_{s^p} L^p(s^p, s^{-p}))_{p \in \mathcal{P}}$, is a variational generalized Nash equilibrium (vGNE) of game \mathcal{G} . Moreover, we let **VI**(BR) denote the set of all vGNE of \mathcal{G} .

The term vGNE is justified as $VI(BR) \subseteq fix(BR)$ [9]. Despite the implication that some of the equilibrium solutions can be lost, this solution concept leads to more stable and fair strategy profiles; it is indeed a refinement [29]. The following standing assumption is taking for this class of equilibria:

Assumption 2. The pseudo-gradient F is maximal monotone.

Under this assumption, obtaining a vGNE $s^* \in \mathbf{VI}(BR)$ is equivalent to the monotone inclusion problem

Find
$$s^* \in \mathbb{R}^{N_s}$$
 such that $0 \in F(s^*) + N_{\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{G}}}(s^*)$, (5)

which can be solved via operator-splitting methods [28], [30]. In this work, we tackle Problem (5) using *forward-backward splitting* (FB-Splitting), a well-established method for solving monotone inclusion problems. This method and its application to vGNE-seeking are overviewed in the following.

A. Forward-backward splitting for vGNE-seeking

Because F is maximal monotone and single-valued, some algebra allow us to obtain the equivalence

$$0 \in F(s^*) + N_{\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{G}}}(s^*) \iff s^* = (I + \eta N_{\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{G}}})^{-1}(I - \eta F)(s^*),$$

for any constant $\eta > 0$. In turn, this implies

$$\mathbf{VI}(BR) = \mathbf{zer}(F + N_{\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{G}}}) = \mathbf{fix}(T)$$
(6)

for the operator $T = (I + \eta N_{S_{\mathcal{G}}})^{-1} \circ (I - \eta F)$. This operator is a candidate update rule, since the iterations $s_{k+1} = T(s_k)$ converge to a (unique) solution $s^* \in \mathbf{VI}(BR)$ whenever T is a contraction. Due to its composition form, this iteration can be split into a forward and backward step, respectively

$$\underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} s_{+}^{1} \\ \vdots \\ s_{+}^{N_{P}} \end{bmatrix}}_{s_{+}} = \underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} s_{k}^{1} - \eta \nabla_{s^{1}} L^{1}(s_{k}^{1}, s_{k}^{-1}) \\ \vdots \\ s_{k}^{N_{P}} - \eta \nabla_{s^{N_{P}}} L^{p}(s_{k}^{N_{P}}, s_{k}^{-N_{P}}) \end{bmatrix}}_{(I - \eta F)(s_{k})}; \quad (7a)$$

$$s_{k+1} = \operatorname{proj}_{\mathcal{S}_{G}}(s_{+}), \quad (7b)$$

since $(I + \eta N_C)^{-1} = \text{proj}_C$ for any closed convex set C and $\eta > 0$ [28]. We thus propose the semi-decentralised routine for vGNE-Seeking via FB-Splitting outlined in Algorithm 1. At each k > 0, the routine consists of two main instructions:

- Simultaneously, players propose new strategies to improve their objectives while disregarding the constraints;
- 2. A coordinator collects these proposals then computes (and broadcasts) the closest permissible strategies.

Algorithm 1: vGNE-Seeking via FB-Splitting1 Initialize $s_0 = (s_0^1, \dots, s_0^{N_P});$ 2 for $k = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ do3for each player $p \in \mathcal{P}$ do4 $\lfloor s_+^p \coloneqq s_k^p - \eta \nabla_{s^p} L^p(s_k^p, s_k^{-p});$ 5for coordinator do6 $\lfloor s_{k+1} \coloneqq \operatorname{proj}_{S_{\mathcal{G}}}(s_+);$

In practice, this routine is interpreted as players moving towards best-response strategies while a coordinator ensures that no constraint is violated. In addition to this convenient interpretation, Algorithm 1 benefits a realistic vGNE-seeking by requiring only the profiles $(s_k)_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ to be public: The players do not access the objectives $\{L^p\}_{p\in\mathcal{P}}$ and constraint $\{S^p\}_{p\in\mathcal{P}}$ functions, except for their own. This information needs only to be available to the coordinator. Finally, we remark that the routine can still be specialised to have players estimate their rivals' strategies, $s_k^{-p} \in \mathcal{S}^{-p}$, and compute pseudo-gradients, $\nabla_{s^p} L^p(s_k^p, s_k^{-p})$, by sharing local information [21], [22].

As previously mentioned, $T(s_k) \to s^* \in \mathbf{VI}(BR)$ when T is a contraction. Because the operator $\operatorname{proj}_{S_{\mathcal{G}}} = (I + \eta N_{S_{\mathcal{G}}})^{-1}$ is nonexpansive (as $S_{\mathcal{G}}$ is nonempty, closed and convex), this translates into requiring that the forward operator $(I - \eta F)$ be contractive. The following result can thus be established:

Theorem 1. Let the pseudo-gradient F be L_F -Lipschitz and M_F -strongly-monotone. If $\eta \in (0, 2M_F/L_F^2)$, then Algorithm 1 converges linearly to the unique $s^* \in \mathbf{VI}(BR)$ with rate

$$\lim_{k \to \infty} \frac{\|s_{k+1} - s^{\star}\|_2}{\|s_k - s^{\star}\|_2} = \sqrt{1 - \eta(2M_F - \eta L_F^2)}$$
(8)

from any initial strategy profile $s_0 \in \mathbb{R}^{N_s}$.

Proof. Since $VI(BR) = zer(F + N_{S_{\mathcal{G}}})$, the proof is as in [28, Proposition 26.16] with $A = N_{S_{\mathcal{G}}}$ and B = F.

This result implies that the vGNE-seeking algorithm has linear convergence: Each strategy update decreases the distance to a vGNE solution by (at least) a constant factor. It also implies that convergence can be slow if $M_F/L_F^2 \ll 1$. In such cases, the game (or, more directly, the pseudo-gradient F) is said to be ill-conditioned¹. We also remark that choosing an appropriate learning rate $\eta > 0$ require full knowledge of the pseudogradient. In this work, it is assumed that the coordinator is responsible for computing and broadcasting this parameter to the players. Finally, note that Algorithm 1 can be modified to include some termination criterion (e.g., to be interrupted when the updates become numerically negligible), then resulting in an ϵ -vGNE, a profile for which no player can improve their objective by more than $\varepsilon > 0$ by deviating [1].

III. GENERALIZED FEEDBACK NASH EQUILIBRIUM SEEKING VIA SYSTEM LEVEL SYNTHESIS

We consider N_P -player dynamic stochastic games,

$$\mathcal{G}_{\infty}^{\mathrm{LQ}} \coloneqq (\mathcal{P}, \Sigma, \{U^p\}_{p \in \mathcal{P}}, \{J^p\}_{p \in \mathcal{P}}), \tag{9}$$

defined by linear dynamics and measurement model

$$\Sigma : \begin{cases} x_{t+1} = Ax_t + B_w w_t + \sum_{p \in \mathcal{P}} B_u^p u_t^p, & x_0 = 0; \\ y_t = Cx_t + D_w w_t. \end{cases}$$
(10b)

The dynamics (Eq. 10a) describe how the state of the game, $x = (x_t)_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$, evolves in response to the exogenous inputs $w = (w_t)_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$ and the player's actions $u^p = (u_t^p)_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$, $p \in \mathcal{P}$. The measurement process (Eq. 10b) describes how a public observation of the game, $y = (y_t)_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$, is formed by (noisy) partial emissions of its state. We consider bounded signals, that is, $x \in \ell_{\infty}^{N_x}(\mathbb{N})$, $u^p \in \ell_{\infty}^{N_u^p}(\mathbb{N})$, $w \in \ell_{\infty}^{N_w}(\mathbb{N})$, and $y \in \ell_{\infty}^{N_y}(\mathbb{N})$.

¹This is from $\kappa_F = L_F/M_F$ being the condition number of F.

Finally, we assume w to be a white noise process satisfying $Ew_t = 0$ and $E(w_{t+\tau}w_t^{\mathsf{T}}) = \delta_{\tau}I_{Nw}$ for all $t, \tau \in \mathbb{N}$.

In this class of dynamic games, each player decides a plan of action $u^p \in U^p(u^{-p})$ to minimize an objective functional

$$J^{p}(u^{p}, u^{-p}) \coloneqq \mathbf{E}\left[\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \left\| \begin{bmatrix} W_{x}^{p} & W_{u}^{p} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} x_{t} \\ u_{t}^{p} \end{bmatrix} \right\|_{2}^{2} \right], \quad (11)$$

given weighting matrices $W_x^p \in \mathbb{R}^{N_z \times N_x}$ and $W_u^p \in \mathbb{R}^{N_z \times N_u}$ with dimension $N_z \ge N_x + N_u$. This functional can be interpreted as the expected energy $\mathbb{E} ||z||_{\ell_2}^2$ of a performance signal $z = (W_x^p x_t + W_u^p u_t^p)_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$. The mappings $U^p : \mathcal{U}^{-p} \rightrightarrows \mathcal{U}^p$ restrict each player's strategies based on their rivals' choices, with \mathcal{U}^p the set of all permissible strategies. As in the static case, players might prefer to act according to best-responses,

$$BR^p(u^{-p}) \coloneqq \operatorname{arg\,min}_{u^p} \left\{ J^p(u^p, u^{-p}) : u^p \in U^p(u^{-p}) \right\},$$

such that a (open-loop) GNE solution to $\mathcal{G}_{\infty}^{LQ}$ is understood as an action profile $u^{\star} = (u^{1^{\star}}, \dots, u^{N_{P}^{\star}}) \in \mathcal{U} = \mathcal{U}^{1} \times \dots \times \mathcal{U}^{N_{P}}$, for which no player unilaterally benefits by deviating. Formally, this corresponds to a fixed-point $u^{\star} \in \mathbf{fix}(BR)$. The following assumptions are thus taken for this class of games:

Assumption 3. For each player $p \in \mathcal{P}$,

- a) the weighting matrix W_u^p is full-column-rank and it satisfies $(W_u^p)^{\mathsf{T}}(W_x^p) = 0$ and $(W_x^p)^{\mathsf{T}}(W_u^p) = 0$;
- b) the noise-filtering matrices B_w and D_w are full-row-rank and they satisfy $(B_w)(D_w)^{\mathsf{T}} = 0$ and $(D_w)(B_w)^{\mathsf{T}} = 0$.

c) the mapping $U^p: \mathcal{U}^{-p} \rightrightarrows \mathcal{U}^p$ takes the form

 $U^p(u^{-p}) \coloneqq \{ u^p \in \mathcal{U}^p : (u^p, u^{-p}) \in \mathcal{U}^{global} \},\$

given the local \mathcal{U}^p and global \mathcal{U}^{global} constraint sets

$$\mathcal{U}^p = \{ u^p \in \ell_{\infty}^{N_u^p}(\mathbb{N}) : G_{u^p} u_t^p \preceq 1, \ t \in \mathbb{N} \}; \mathcal{U}^{global} = \{ u \in \ell_{\infty}^{N_u}(\mathbb{N}) : G_x x_t + G_u u_t \preceq 1, \ t \in \mathbb{N} \},$$

where we implicitly use the fact that $x = F_u u + F_w w$ for causal linear operators (F_u, F_w) induced by Eq. (10a). Moreover, $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{G}} = (\mathcal{U}^1 \times \cdots \times \mathcal{U}^{N_P}) \cap \mathcal{U}^{global} \neq \emptyset$.

These conditions are analogous to Assumption 1: They are to ensure that $\mathbf{fix}(BR) \neq \emptyset$. In this case, however, the joint policy $u = (u^1, \ldots, u^{N_P})$ must also be internally stabilising to avoid $x_t \to \infty$ (and thus, $J^p(u^p, u^{-p}) \not< \infty$ for some $p \in \mathcal{P}$). Hereafter, we characterise an equilibrium as admissible only if it stabilises the game. The following assumption ensures that (not necessarily $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{G}}$ -feasible) stabilising action profiles exist.

Assumption 4. The system (A, B_u, C) , given the input matrix $B_u = [B_u^1 \cdots B_u^{N_P}]$, is both controllable and observable.

In this work, however, we do not focus on open-loop equilibria $u^* \in \mathbf{fix}(BR)$: A plan of action having such information structure is undesirable, as the game becomes sensible to noise disturbances and decision errors [1]. Conversely, feedback policies $u^p = K^p(y)$, for some $K^p : \ell_{\infty}^{N_y} \to \ell_{\infty}^{N_u^p}$, can detect such errors and adapt the plan of action accordingly. We thus consider that players' actions are represented by linear policies

$$u^p \coloneqq K^p y, \quad K^p : y \mapsto \Phi^p_K * y,$$
 (12)

given causal operators $K^p \in \mathcal{C}^p \subseteq \mathcal{L}(\ell_{\infty}^{N_y}, \ell_{\infty}^{N_p^p})$ defined by their convolution kernels $\Phi_K^p = (\Phi_{K,n}^p)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$. The sets $\{\mathcal{C}^p\}_{p \in \mathcal{P}}$ restrict the players' choices to policies that satisfy some $\mathcal{G}_{\infty}^{LQ}$ related restrictions (e.g., actuation and communication delays). In this setup, each *p*-th player's best-responses correspond to the solutions to the synthesis problem

$$\underset{K^{p} \in \mathcal{C}^{p}}{\text{minimize}} \quad \mathbf{E} \left[\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \left\| \begin{bmatrix} W_{x}^{p} & W_{u}^{p} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} x_{t} \\ u_{t}^{p} \end{bmatrix} \right\|_{2}^{2} \right]$$
(13a)

subject to
$$x_{t+1} = Ax_t + B_w w_t + \sum_{\bar{p} \in \mathcal{P}} B_u^{\bar{p}} u_t^p$$
, (13b)

 $\forall \bar{p} \in \mathcal{P}$

$$u_{\bar{t}}^{\bar{p}} = (K^{\bar{p}}y)_{t},$$
(13d)

$$G_x x_t + G_u u_t \preceq 1, \quad G_{u^p} u_t^p \preceq 1, \tag{13e}$$

$$x_0 = 0.$$
 (13f)

We denote the solutions to Problem (13) as $BR_K^p(K^{-p})$, given the joint policy $K^{-p}: y \mapsto (K^{\bar{p}}y)_{\bar{p} \in \mathcal{P} \setminus \{p\}}$. As before, the map

$$BR_K(K) \coloneqq BR_K^1(K^{-1}) \times \cdots \times BR_K^{N_P}(K^{-N_P})$$

denote the set of jointly-best-response policies. This formulation induces a version of the game $\mathcal{G}_{\infty}^{LQ}$ in which a solution is now understood as a *policy profile* $K := (K^1, \ldots, K^{N_P}) \in \mathcal{C}$, $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{C}^1 \times \cdots \times \mathcal{C}^{N_P}$, which is agreeable to all players. The solution concept that naturally arises is that of a generalized *feedback* Nash equilibrium (GFNE).

Definition 3. A profile $K^* = (K^{1^*}, \ldots, K^{N_P^*}) \in C$ satisfying $K^* \in BR_K(K^*)$ is a generalized feedback Nash equilibrium (GFNE) of the dynamic game \mathcal{G}_{LQ}^{LQ} .

Although GFNEs and GNEs are similar concepts, designing GFNE-seeking routines is considerably more challenging: Being infinite-dimensional and stochastic, the results from Section II cannot be readily applied to Problem (13). Indeed, even the definition of a vGFNE is less clear, as the space of policies, $\mathcal{L}(\ell_{\infty}^{N_y}, \ell_{\infty}^{N_u})$, it not a Hilbert but a Banach space (and, consequently, is not equipped with an inner product) [27]. In the following, we propose to overcome these challenges by considering a specific, but equivalent, representation of the feedback policies. We show how this can be leveraged to approximate the best-response mappings BR_K^p ($\forall p \in \mathcal{P}$) using finite-dimensional robust optimization problems, thus enabling the design of a vGFNE-seeking algorithm for dynamic games.

A. System-level best-response mappings

System level synthesis (SLS, [25]) is a novel methodology for controller design centred on representing control policies in terms of the closed-loop responses that they achieve. Under this representation, the synthesis of stabilising feedback policies can be posed as numerically tractable convex optimisation problems, even when subjected to operational constraints (on state and action signals) and structural constraints (on the policy's parameters). In this section, we use this framework to translate the best-response mappings BR_K^p ($\forall p \in \mathcal{P}$) into equivalent system-level best-response mappings BR_{Φ}^p ($\forall p \in \mathcal{P}$) which are suitable for designing GFNE-seeking routines. We start by assuming a stabilising profile (K^1, \ldots, K^{N_P}) , ensured by Assumption 4. Each policy is associated with a transfer matrix $\hat{K}^p \in \mathcal{RH}_{\infty}$, $\hat{K}^p = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{z^n} \Phi_{K,n}^p$, which defines the output-feedback $\hat{u}^p = \hat{K}^p \hat{y}$ in frequency domain. Considering the \mathbb{Z} -transform of the state-space Eq. (10),

$$z\hat{x} = A\hat{x} + B_w\hat{w} + \sum_{p\in\mathcal{P}} B^p_u\hat{u}^p;$$
(14a)

$$\hat{y} = C\hat{x} + D_w\hat{w}; \tag{14b}$$

$$\hat{u}^p = \hat{K}^p \hat{y}, \qquad (\forall p \in \mathcal{P}), \tag{14c}$$

the signals $(\hat{x}, \hat{u}^1, \dots, \hat{u}^{N_P})$ can be posed in terms of \hat{w} as

$$\begin{bmatrix} \hat{x} \\ \hat{u}^{1} \\ \vdots \\ \hat{u}^{N_{P}} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \Phi_{xx} & \Phi_{xy} \\ \hat{\Phi}_{ux}^{1} & \hat{\Phi}_{uy}^{1} \\ \vdots & \vdots \\ \hat{\Phi}_{ux}^{N_{P}} & \hat{\Phi}_{uy}^{N_{P}} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \hat{\delta}_{x} \\ \hat{\delta}_{y} \end{bmatrix}, \quad (15)$$

where $\hat{\delta}_x = B_w \hat{w}$ and $\hat{\delta}_y = D_w \hat{w}$, and

$$\begin{split} \hat{\Phi}_{xx} &= \left((zI - A) - \sum_{p \in \mathcal{P}} B_u^p \hat{K}^p C \right)^{-1}; \\ \hat{\Phi}_{ux}^p &= \hat{K}^p C \hat{\Phi}_{xx}; \\ \hat{\Phi}_{xy} &= \sum_{p \in \mathcal{P}} \hat{\Phi}_{xx} B_u^p \hat{K}^p; \\ \hat{\Phi}_{uy}^p &= \hat{K}^p + \sum_{\tilde{p} \in \mathcal{P}} \hat{K}^p C \hat{\Phi}_{xx} B_u^{\tilde{p}} \hat{K}^{\tilde{p}}. \end{split}$$

The transfer matrices $(\hat{\Phi}_{xx}, \hat{\Phi}_{ux}^p, \hat{\Phi}_{xy}, \hat{\Phi}_{uy}^p)$ are system level responses or closed-loop maps: They describe how the game's state and the players' actions react to the noise. For ease of notation, we define $\hat{\Phi}_{ux} = (\hat{\Phi}_{ux}^p)_{p \in \mathcal{P}}$ and $\hat{\Phi}_{uy} = (\hat{\Phi}_{uy}^p)_{p \in \mathcal{P}}$. Under this representation, the following result holds:

Theorem 2 (System level parametrisation). Consider the dynamics Eq. (14) under output-feedback $\hat{u}^p = \hat{K}^p \hat{y}$ for all players $p \in \mathcal{P}$. The following statements are true:

a) The affine subspaces described by

$$\begin{bmatrix} zI - A & -B_u^1 \cdots - B_u^{N_P} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \hat{\Phi}_{xx} & \hat{\Phi}_{xy} \\ \hat{\Phi}_{ux} & \hat{\Phi}_{uy} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} I & 0 \end{bmatrix}; \quad (16a)$$

$$\begin{bmatrix} \hat{\Phi}_{xx} & \hat{\Phi}_{xy} \\ \hat{\Phi}_{ux} & \hat{\Phi}_{uy} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} zI - A \\ -C \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} I \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}; \quad (16b)$$

$$\hat{\Phi}_{xx}, \hat{\Phi}_{ux}, \hat{\Phi}_{xy} \in \frac{1}{z} \mathcal{RH}_{\infty}, \quad \hat{\Phi}_{uy} \in \mathcal{RH}_{\infty}, \quad (16c)$$

parametrize all the responses $(\hat{\delta}_x, \hat{\delta}_y) \mapsto (\hat{x}, \hat{u}^1, \dots, \hat{u}^{N_P})$ achievable by a stabilising policy $\hat{K} = (\hat{K}^1, \dots, \hat{K}^{N_P})$.

b) Any response $(\hat{\Phi}_{xx}, \hat{\Phi}_{ux}, \hat{\Phi}_{xy}, \hat{\Phi}_{uy})$ satisfying Eq. (16) is achieved by policies $\hat{K}^p = \hat{\Phi}^p_{uy} - \hat{\Phi}^p_{ux} \hat{\Phi}^{-1}_{xx} \hat{\Phi}_{xy} \ (p \in \mathcal{P})$ which can be implemented as in Figure 1, that is,

$$z\hat{\xi} = \tilde{\Phi}_{xx}\hat{\xi} + \tilde{\Phi}_{xy}\hat{y};$$
 (17a)

$$\hat{u}^p = \tilde{\Phi}^p_{ux}\hat{\xi} + \tilde{\Phi}^p_{uy}\hat{y},$$
 (17b)

with $\tilde{\Phi}_x = z(I - z\hat{\Phi}_{xx})$, $\tilde{\Phi}^p_{ux} = z\hat{\Phi}^p_{ux}$, $\tilde{\Phi}_{xy} = -z\hat{\Phi}_{xy}$ and $\tilde{\Phi}^p_{uy} = \hat{\Phi}^p_{uy}$. Moreover, the policy $\hat{K} = (\hat{K}^1, \dots, \hat{K}^{N_P})$ obtained by stacking each Eq. (17) is internally stabilising.

Proof. The proof is identical to that of [25, Theorem 5.1] by letting $B_2 = [B_u^1 \cdots B_u^{N_P}]$ and $C_2 = C$.



Fig. 1. Feedback structure for policies $\hat{K}^p = \hat{\Phi}^p_{uy} - \hat{\Phi}^p_{ux} \hat{\Phi}^{-1}_{xx} \hat{\Phi}_{xy} = \tilde{\Phi}^p_{uy} + \tilde{\Phi}^p_{ux} (zI - \tilde{\Phi}_{xx})^{-1} \tilde{\Phi}_{xy}, p \in \mathcal{P}$, according to Eq. (17).

In favour of a time-domain exposition, we will refer to the system level responses mostly through their kernels,

$$\Phi_{xx} = (\Phi_{xx,n})_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \in \ell_2(\mathbb{N}), \quad \Phi_{xy} = (\Phi_{xy,n})_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \in \ell_2(\mathbb{N}),$$

$$\Phi_{ux}^p = (\Phi_{ux,n}^p)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \in \ell_2(\mathbb{N}), \quad \Phi_{uy}^p = (\Phi_{uy,n}^p)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \in \ell_1(\mathbb{N}).$$

Due to strict causality, we have $\Phi_{xx,0} = \Phi_{xy,0}^p = \Phi_{ux,0}^p = 0$. From Eq. (17), a time-domain characterisation of each policy \hat{K}^p can be obtained in terms of these spectral components.

Corollary 2.1. The policy \hat{K}^p from Eq. (17) is defined by the kernel $\Phi_K^p = \Phi_{uy}^p - \Phi_{ux}^p * \Phi_{xx}^{-1} * \Phi_{xy}$ and is implemented as

$$\xi_{t+1} = -\sum_{n=0}^{t} \Phi_{xx,n+2}\xi_{t-n} - \sum_{n=0}^{t} \Phi_{xy,n+1}y_{t-n}; \quad (18a)$$

$$u_t^p = \sum_{n=0}^t \Phi_{ux,n+1}^p \xi_{t-n} + \sum_{n=0}^t \Phi_{uy,n}^p y_{t-n}.$$
 (18b)

using an auxiliary internal state $\xi = (\xi_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ with $\xi_0 = 0$.

The system level parametrisation enables a methodology for policy synthesis consisting of searching the space of stabilising policies directly through $(\Phi_{xx}, \Phi_{ux}^p, \Phi_{xy}, \Phi_{uy}^p)$, for each $p \in \mathcal{P}$. This parametrisation can be leveraged to reformulate the best-response mappings $\{BR_K^p\}_{p\in\mathcal{P}}$ as tractable numerical programs. In this direction, consider that players design their policies $K = (K^1, \ldots, K^{N_P})$ by choosing a desired system level response $(\Phi_{ux}^p, \Phi_{uy}^p)$ to the noise. From Theorem 2(a), a stabilising policy must have parameters satisfying the system

$$\int \Phi_{xx,n+1} = A \Phi_{xx,n} + \sum_{p \in \mathcal{P}} B^p_u \Phi^p_{ux,n}; \qquad (19a)$$

$$\Sigma_{\Phi}: \left\{ \Phi_{xy,n+1} = A \Phi_{xy,n} + \sum_{p \in \mathcal{P}} B^p_u \Phi^p_{uy,n}; \quad (19b) \right.$$

$$\begin{pmatrix} \Phi_{xx,1} = I_{N_x},
\end{cases}$$
(19c)

and its "dual"

Ì

$$\begin{pmatrix} \Phi_{xx,n+1}^{\mathsf{T}} = A^{\mathsf{T}} \Phi_{xx,n}^{\mathsf{T}} + C^{\mathsf{T}} \Phi_{xy,n}^{\mathsf{T}}; \\ \end{pmatrix} (20a)$$

$$\Sigma^{*}_{\Phi} : \begin{cases} \Phi^{p}_{ux,n+1} = A^{\dagger} \Phi^{p^{\prime}}_{ux,n} + C^{\dagger} \Phi^{p^{\prime}}_{uy,n}, & (\forall p \in \mathcal{P}); (20b) \\ \Phi_{xx,1} = I_{N_{\pi}}. & (20c) \end{cases}$$

The best-response mappings for $\mathcal{G}^{LQ}_{\infty}$ are then equivalent to the output-feedback system level synthesis problem

$$\underset{\Phi_{ux}^{p}, \Phi_{uy}^{p}}{\text{minimize}} \quad \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \left\| \begin{bmatrix} W_{x}^{p} & W_{u}^{p} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \Phi_{xx,n} & \Phi_{xy,n} \\ \Phi_{ux,n}^{p} & \Phi_{uy,n}^{p} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} B_{w} \\ D_{w} \end{bmatrix} \right\|_{F}^{2}$$

$$(21a)$$

subject to Σ_{Φ} from Eq. (19), Σ_{Φ}^* from Eq. (20), (21b)

$$\begin{bmatrix} \Phi_{xx} & \Phi_{xy} \\ \Phi_{xx}^p & \Phi_{yy}^p \end{bmatrix} \in \mathcal{C}_{\Phi}^p, \tag{21c}$$

$$\begin{bmatrix} G_x & G_u \\ & \tilde{G}_{u^p} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \Phi_{xx} & \Phi_{xy} \\ \Phi_{ux} & \Phi_{uy} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} B_w \\ D_w \end{bmatrix} * w_n \preceq 1,$$
(21d)

where we define $\tilde{G}_{u^p} = e_p^{\mathsf{T}} \otimes G_{u^p}$ to simplify its statement. The system-level constraint in Eq. (21c) is introduced to encode the policy constraint $K^p \in \mathcal{C}^p$ in terms of its parameters; that is, we design $\mathcal{C}_{\Phi}^p = \{\Phi^p : \hat{K} = \hat{\Phi}_{uy}^p - \hat{\Phi}_{ux}^p \hat{\Phi}_{xx}^{-1} \hat{\Phi}_{xy}, K \in \mathcal{C}^p\}$. An important class of constraints \mathcal{C}^p (and their corresponding realization through \mathcal{C}_{Φ}^p) will be discussed in a later subsection. We refer to [25], [31] for more details on how Problem (21) can be derived from the original policy synthesis Problem (13).

The solutions to Problem (21), as a function of other players' responses, are denoted as $BR^p_{\Phi}(\Phi^{-p}_{ux}, \Phi^{-p}_{uy})$. Again,

$$BR_{\Phi}(\Phi_{ux}, \Phi_{uy}) = BR_{\Phi}^{1}(\Phi_{ux}^{-1}, \Phi_{uy}^{-1}) \times \dots \times BR_{\Phi}^{N_{P}}(\Phi_{ux}^{-N_{P}}, \Phi_{uy}^{-N_{P}})$$

is the joint best-response to a system-level profile (Φ_{ux}, Φ_{uy}) . Due to the equivalence between BR_K and BR_{Φ} , it is clear that a stabilising policy profile is a GFNE (i.e., $K^* \in BR_K(K^*)$) if the corresponding system-level response is a fixed-point of BR_{Φ} (i.e., $(\Phi_{ux}^*, \Phi_{uy}^*) \in BR_{\Phi}(\Phi_{ux}^*, \Phi_{uy}^*)$). This implies a correspondence between $\mathcal{G}_{\infty}^{LQ}$ and an underlying system-level dynamic game in terms of the responses $(\Phi_{xx}, \Phi_{ux}, \Phi_{xy}, \Phi_{uy})$. In turn, this implies that the GFNE problem of finding a policy $K \in \mathcal{L}(\ell_{\infty}^{N_y}, \ell_{\infty}^{N_u})$ in a Banach space can be reformulated as finding a kernel $\Phi \in \ell_2(\mathbb{N})$ in a Hilbert space, thus enabling a vGNE-seeking approach such as described in Section II.

The mappings $\{BR_{\Phi}^p\}_{p\in\mathcal{P}}$ are still intractable as Problem (21) is also infinite-dimensional and stochastic. In this case, however, both issues can be tackled by a specific design of the system level constraints C_{Φ}^p and by a robust reformulation of the operational constraints from U^p ; as we present in the following. The best-responses BR_{Φ}^p ($\forall p \in \mathcal{P}$) thus become equivalent to solving finite-dimensional robust optimisation problems. Finally, Section III-B presents a vGFNE-seeking algorithm enabled by this system level parametrization.

Finite-dimensional responses through C_{Φ}^p : The problems in $\{BR_{\Phi}^p\}_{p\in\mathcal{P}}$ can be made finite-dimensional by restricting the choice of $K^p \in \mathcal{C}^p$ ($\forall p \in \mathcal{P}$) to the set of policies with finite-impulse response (FIR) kernels. Formally,

$$\mathcal{C}^p = \{ K^p \in \mathcal{L}(\ell_{\infty}^{N_y}, \ell_{\infty}^{N_u^p}) : \Phi_K^p \in \ell_1[0, N] \cap \mathcal{S}^p \}$$

for a horizon N > 1 and with the set $S^p \subseteq \ell_1[0, N]$ encoding the $\mathcal{G}^{LQ}_{\infty}$ -related restrictions imposed on the players' policies. From Theorem 2, this translates directly to

$$\mathcal{C}^{p}_{\Phi} = \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} \Phi_{xx} & \Phi_{xy} \\ \Phi^{p}_{ux} & \Phi^{p}_{uy} \end{bmatrix} = \Phi : \Phi_{n} \in \mathcal{S}^{p}_{\Phi,n}, \ n \in [0, N), \\ \Phi_{xx,0} = \Phi_{xy,0} = \Phi^{p}_{ux,0} = 0, \ \Phi_{N} = 0 \right\}, \quad (22)$$

which can then be included as the system level constraints in Eq. (21c). As C_{Φ}^p is finite-dimensional, so is the resulting optimization: The only nonzero decision variables are the spectral components $(\Phi_{xx,n}, \Phi_{ux,n}^p, \Phi_{xy,n})_{n=1}^{N-1}$ and $(\Phi_{uy,n}^p)_{n=0}^{N-1}$. The finite-impulse kernels also simplify the implementation of K^p by fixing the total number of summands in Corollary 2.1.

Remark 1. The terminal constraint $\Phi_N = 0$ from Eq. (22) cannot be satisfied when the system is only stabilisable and detectable. While this constraint can be relaxed (e.g., by instead requiring $\|\Phi_N\|_2 \leq \gamma$ for some $\gamma > 0$), the stability and sub-optimality properties of the resulting controller are well-understood only for the state-feedback case [25], [32].

The constraint sets $(S^p_{\Phi,n})_{n=0}^N$ are designed to impose structure onto the policies K^p through their system level parametrization (Corollary 2.1). In this work, we use sparsity constraints to encode actuation and communication delays:

$$S_{\Phi,n}^{p} = \left\{ \Phi_{n} \in \mathbb{R}^{(N_{x}+N_{u}^{p})\times(N_{x}+N_{y})} : \\ \operatorname{Sp}(\Phi_{n}) = \operatorname{Sp}\left(\begin{bmatrix} A^{\alpha_{n}} & A^{\alpha_{n}}C^{\mathsf{T}} \\ B_{u}^{\mathsf{T}}A^{\alpha_{n}} & B_{u}^{\mathsf{T}}A^{\alpha_{n+1}}C^{\mathsf{T}} \end{bmatrix} \right) \right\}, \quad (23)$$

for $n = 0, \ldots, N$, with $\alpha_n = \max(0, \lfloor (n - d_a)/d_c \rfloor)$ and $Sp(\cdot)$ denoting the support of a matrix. Under this setup, the policies K^p $(p \in \mathcal{P})$ satisfy that the *i*-th state component $[x]_i = ([x_t]_i)_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$ is only affected by the *i*-th action component $[B_u u^p]_i = ([B_u u^p_t]_i)_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$ after an actuation delay of $d_a \ge 0$ steps. Additionally, it specifies that measurements propagate in the communication network (which has the same topology as the physical system) with a *communication delay* of $d_c > 0$. These parameter are often determined by the hardware of the underlying control system and communication infrastructure. We refer to policies satisfying this information pattern as (d_a, d_c) -delayed feedback policies. This choice is not restrictive and the results in this paper generalize to a broader class informational constraints (such as those discussed in [31]). Finally, we note that the ability to impose sparsity to feedback policies, a central feature of the SLS framework, enables the solution of GFNE problems with asymmetric information patterns; a major challenge in the field [24], [33].

Robust operational constraints through U^p : The mapping BR^p_{Φ} is stochastic due to the constraints $u^p \in U^p(u^{-p})$ (Eq. 13e) becoming the random inequalities in Eq. (21d). The problem can be made deterministic by instead enforcing

$$\operatorname{prob}\left(\begin{bmatrix} G_x & G_u \\ & \widetilde{G}_{u^p} \end{bmatrix}_{i,:} \begin{bmatrix} \Phi_{xx} & \Phi_{xy} \\ \Phi_{ux} & \Phi_{uy} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} B_w \\ D_w \end{bmatrix} * w_n \le 1 \right) \ge \rho,$$
(24)

for every *i*-th row of the matrix $G^p = \operatorname{col}([G_x \ G_u], [0 \ G_{u^p}])$, given a probability $\rho \in (0.5, 1)$. Since w is a white-noise

process and $\Phi_w = (\Phi_{xx}B_w + \Phi_{xy}D_w, \Phi_{ux}B_w + \Phi_{uy}D_w)$ is FIR, some algebra allows expressing Eq. (24) as

$$\operatorname{prob}\left(G^{p}_{\Phi,i}\tilde{w}\leq 1\right)\geq\rho$$

given random vector \tilde{w} with $\mathrm{E}\tilde{w} = 0$ and $\mathrm{E}(\tilde{w}\tilde{w}^{\mathsf{T}}) = I_{NN_w}$, and the block-matrix $G_{\Phi,i}^p = \left[[G^p]_{i,:} \Phi_{w,0} \cdots [G^p]_{i,:} \Phi_{w,N} \right]$. The constraints Eq. (21d) can thus be realised using the cumulative distribution function of each $G_{\Phi,i}^p \tilde{w}$ $(i = 1, \dots, N_{G^p})$. A common assumption is to consider the random vector \tilde{w} to be Gaussian, i.e., $\tilde{w} \sim \mathrm{Normal}(0, I)$. Using standard results from optimization theory [34], Eq. (24) is then equivalent to the second-order conic (SOC) constraint

$$\|(G^{p}_{\Phi,i})^{\mathsf{I}}\|_{2} \le 1/Q(\rho) \tag{25}$$

with $Q: [0,1] \to \mathbb{R}$ being the quantile function of the standard Normal distribution (which is only positive for $\rho > 0.5$).

In summary, expanding Eq. (25), the operational (chance) constraint at the system level for each $i = 1, ..., N_{G^p}$ is

$$\left\| \left(\begin{bmatrix} G_x & G_u \\ & \tilde{G}_{u^p} \end{bmatrix}_{i,:} \begin{bmatrix} \Phi_{xx} & \Phi_{xy} \\ \Phi_{ux} & \Phi_{uy} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} B_w \\ D_w \end{bmatrix} \right)^{\mathsf{T}} \right\|_{\ell_2} \le \frac{1}{Q(\rho)}.$$
 (26)

Finally, we remark that these constraints cannot ensure that the synthesised policy satisfy the original U^p for all actual realisations of the noise w; even without the Gaussian assumption. However, at the risk of conservativeness, the best-response mapping BR^p_{Φ} can still be designed to ensure with arbitrarily high probability $\rho > 0.5$ that such constraints will be satisfied during operation would the noise be Gaussian.

B. vGFNE-seeking via SLP and FB-splitting

In this section, to simplify notation, we momentarily define $\Phi_x = [\Phi_{xx} \Phi_{xy}], \Phi_u^p = [\Phi_{ux}^p \Phi_{uy}^p]$, and $W_w = (B_w, D_w)$. The concept of a variational generalised feedback Nash equilibra (vGFNE) can be defined via the system level parametrisation of output-feedback policies: A profile $K^* = (K^{1^*}, \dots, K^{N_p^*})$ of policies parametrised as $\hat{K}^{p^*} = \hat{\Phi}_{uy}^{p^*} - \hat{\Phi}_{ux}^{p^*} (\hat{\Phi}_{xx}^*)^{-1} \hat{\Phi}_{xy}^*$ is a vGFNE when the profile $\Phi_u^* = (\Phi_u^{1^*}, \dots, \Phi_u^{N_p^*})$ is a vGNE of the (static) game defined by the system level objectives

$$J^p_{\Phi}(\Phi^p_u, \Phi^{-p}_u) = \sum_{n=0}^N \left\| \begin{bmatrix} W^p_x & W^p_u \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \Phi_{x,n} \\ \Phi^p_{u,n} \end{bmatrix} W_w \right\|_F^2$$

and the global feasible set

$$\begin{split} \mathcal{U}_{\Phi,\mathcal{G}} &= \{ \Phi_u \in \ell_2[0,N] :\\ \Sigma_{\Phi} \text{ from Eq. (19)}, \quad \Sigma_{\Phi}^* \text{ from Eq. (20)},\\ \operatorname{Sp}\left(\begin{bmatrix} \Phi_{x,n} \\ \Phi_{u,n} \end{bmatrix} \right) &= \operatorname{Sp}\left(\begin{bmatrix} A^{\alpha_n} & A^{\alpha_n}C^{\mathsf{T}} \\ B_u^{\mathsf{T}}A^{\alpha_n} & B_u^{\mathsf{T}}A^{\alpha_{n+1}}C^{\mathsf{T}} \end{bmatrix} \right) \, (\forall n),\\ & \left\| \left(\begin{bmatrix} \widetilde{G}_x & \widetilde{G}_u \end{bmatrix}_{i,:} \begin{bmatrix} \Phi_x \\ \Phi_u \end{bmatrix} W_w \right)^{\mathsf{T}} \right\|_{\ell_2} \leq \frac{1}{Q(\rho)} \, (\forall i),\\ & \begin{bmatrix} 1_{N_x \times N_x} & 1_{N_u \times N_x} \\ 1_{N_x \times N_y} & 0 \end{bmatrix} \odot \begin{bmatrix} \Phi_{x,0} \\ \Phi_{u,0} \end{bmatrix} = 0, \quad \begin{bmatrix} \Phi_{x,N} \\ \Phi_{u,N} \end{bmatrix} = 0 \Big\}, \end{split}$$

with $\widetilde{G}_x = (G_x, 0)$ and $\widetilde{G}_u = (G_u, \text{blkdiag}(G_{u^1}, \dots, G_{u^{N_P}}))$. Since the system level responses are FIR, we can represent $\Phi_x = (\Phi_{x,n})_{n=1}^N$ and $\Phi_u^p = (\Phi_{u,n}^p)_{n=0}^N$ as matrices obtained

Algorithm 2: vGFNE-Seeking via FB-Splitting

by stacking their spectral factors. The vGFNE-seeking problem can thus be formulated as the monotone inclusion problem

Find
$$\Phi_u^{\star} \in \mathbb{R}^{(N+1)N_u \times (N_x + N_y)}$$

such that $0 \in F_{\Phi}(\Phi_u^{\star}) + N_{\mathcal{U}_{\Phi,\mathcal{G}}}(\Phi_u^{\star})$, (27)

given the pseudo-gradient $F_{\Phi}(\Phi_u) = (\nabla_{\Phi_u^p} J_{\Phi}^p(\Phi_u^p, \Phi_u^{-p}))_{p \in \mathcal{P}}$. This is a special instance of Problem (5) and, as such, can be solved by the forward-backward operator splitting presented in Algorithm 1. For the class of dynamic games $\mathcal{G}_{\infty}^{LQ}$, it specialises to the vGFNE-seeking routine in Algorithm 2².

The distinct feature in this vGNE-seeking routine is the policy update (Line 4): In practice, it corresponds to plugging the parameters ($\Phi_{xx|k}, \Phi_{ux|k}^p, \Phi_{xx|k}, \Phi_{uy|k}$) on the time-domain implementation from Corollary 2.1. Importantly, Algorithm 2 does not require knowledge of the state x or input u^p signals. A direct consequence is that the players can perform this policy learning routine while simultaneously operating the underlying system. Specifically, the players can operate according to the policies $K_k = (K_k^1, \ldots, K_k^{N_P})$ until the coordinator processes their update proposals $\Phi_{u|k+1} = (\Phi_{u|k+1}^1, \ldots, \Phi_{u|k+1}^{N_P})$ and returns the next set of responses $\Phi_{u|k+1} = (\Phi_{u|k+1}^1, \ldots, \Phi_{u|k+1}^{N_P})$, then used to update their policies. This facilitates vGFNE-seeking in games that cannot be interrupted for players to redesign their control policies (e.g., markets and smart grids).

We finish the section with discussions on the convergence and computational properties of Algorithm 2.

Convergence properties: From Theorem 1, this algorithm converges if the coordinator enforces a learning rate satisfying $\eta \in (0, 2M_{F_{\Phi}}/L_{F_{\Phi}}^2)$, with $M_{F_{\Phi}}$ and $L_{F_{\Phi}}$ being the strongmonotonicity and Lipschitz constants of F_{Φ} . Considering the quadratic objectives J_{Φ}^p $(p \in \mathcal{P})$ and linear dynamics Σ_{Φ} , each player's gradient can be shown to have the affine form

$$\nabla_{\Phi_u^p} J_{\Phi}^p(\Phi_u) = 2 \sum_{\tilde{p} \in \mathcal{P}} (H_{\Phi}^{pp^{\mathsf{T}}} H_{\Phi}^{p\tilde{p}}) \Phi_u^{\tilde{p}}(W_w W_w^{\mathsf{T}}) + h^p \quad (28)$$

given the block-triangular matrices $H^{p\tilde{p}}_{\Phi} = [H^{p\tilde{p}}_{\Phi,n,n'}]_{0 \le n,n' \le N}$,

$$H_{\Phi,n,n'}^{p\tilde{p}} = \begin{cases} W_{u}^{p} & \text{if } n = n' \text{ and } p = \tilde{p} \\ W_{x}^{p} A^{(n-1)-n'} B_{u}^{\tilde{p}} & \text{if } n > n' \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$
(29)

²The update-index $k \in \mathbb{N}$ should not be mistaken with time-indices $n \in \mathbb{N}$. In particular, $\Phi_{n|k}$ is the *n*-th factor of a kernel $\Phi \in \ell_2(\mathbb{N})$ after *k* updates. and appropriate constant matrix $h^p \in \mathbb{R}^{NN_u \times (N_x + N_y)}$. As such, also the pseudo-gradient $F_{\Phi}(\Phi_u)$ must be an affine operator. We can then establish the following result:

Theorem 3. The system-level pseudo-gradient F_{Φ} is $M_{F_{\Phi}}$ -strongly-monotone and $L_{F_{\Phi}}$ -Lipschitz with constants

$$M_{F_{\Phi}} = 2\sigma_{\min}(D_{\Phi}^{\dagger}H_{\Phi})\sigma_{\min}^2(W_w), \qquad (30a)$$

$$L_{F_{\Phi}} = 2\sigma_{\max}(D_{\Phi}^{\mathsf{I}}H_{\Phi})\sigma_{\max}^2(W_w). \tag{30b}$$

given $D_{\Phi} = \text{blkdiag}(H^{pp}_{\Phi})_{p \in \mathcal{P}}$ and $H_{\Phi} = [H^{p\bar{p}}_{\Phi}]_{p, \bar{p} \in \mathcal{P}}$.

From Theorems 1 and 3, the following holds:

Corollary 3.1. If $\eta \in (0, 2M_{F_{\Phi}}/L_{F_{\Phi}}^2)$, with $(M_{F_{\Phi}}, L_{F_{\Phi}})$ as in Eq. (30), then Algorithm 2 converges linearly to the unique $vGFNE \ \hat{K}^{\star} = (\hat{\Phi}_{uy}^{p^{\star}} - \hat{\Phi}_{ux}^{p^{\star}} \hat{\Phi}_{xx}^{\star^{-1}} \hat{\Phi}_{xy}^{\star})_{p \in \mathcal{P}}$, parametrised by the $vGNE \ \Phi_{u}^{\star} \in \mathbf{VI}(BR_{\Phi})$, with rate

$$\lim_{k \to \infty} \frac{\|\Phi_{u|k+1} - \Phi_{u}^{\star}\|_{\ell_{2}}}{\|\Phi_{u|k} - \Phi_{u}^{\star}\|_{\ell_{2}}} = \sqrt{1 - \eta(2M_{F_{\Phi}} - \eta L_{F_{\Phi}}^{2})} \quad (31)$$

from any initial $\Phi_{u|0} \in \mathbb{R}^{(N+1)N_u \times (N_x + N_y)}$.

Interestingly, this implies that the pseudo-gradient F_{Φ} is illconditioned if so is the noise-filtering matrix $W_w = (B_w, D_w)$ and that convergence rates are not affected by the noise if $W_w = I$. Moreover, it suggests that open-loop unstable games (when $\rho(A) \ge 1$) might require a careful tuning of W_x^p ($\forall p$) to avoid the terms $W_x^p A^n B_u^{\tilde{p}}$ (n = 1, ..., N-1) in Eq. (29) from exploding, then affecting the condition number of F_{Φ} .

Computation: Numerically, the pseudo-gradient operator F_{Φ} can be evaluated through automatic differentiation and the projection operator $\operatorname{proj}_{\mathcal{U}_{\Phi,\mathcal{G}}}$ by directly solving the associated optimization problem. However, the structure of this vGFNE problem allows for more efficient numerics. In the case of $F_{\Phi} = (\nabla_{\Phi_u^p} J_{\Phi}^p)_{p \in \mathcal{P}}$, each component can be computed as

$$\nabla_{\Phi_u^p} J^p(\cdot) = \left(2(W_u^{p^\mathsf{T}} W_u^p) \Phi_{u,n|k}^p(W_w W_w^\mathsf{T}) + 2(B_u^p)^\mathsf{T} \Delta_{x,n|k}^p(W_w W_w^\mathsf{T}) \right)_{n=0}^N, \quad (32)$$

with the sensitivities $\Delta_{x|k}^p = (\Delta_{u,n|k}^p)_{n=0}^N$ obtained by first forward-propagating the $\Phi_{x|k}$ responses,

$$\Phi_{x,1|k} = [I_{N_x} \quad 0] + \sum_{p \in \mathcal{P}} B_u^p \Phi_{u,0|k}^p;$$

$$\Phi_{x,n+1|k} = A \Phi_{x,n|k} + \sum_{p \in \mathcal{P}} B_u^p \Phi_{u,n|k}^p;$$

then by backward-propagating

$$\Delta_{x,N|k}^p = 0;$$

$$\Delta_{x,n-1|k}^p = A^{\mathsf{T}} \Delta_{x,n|k}^p + (W_x^{p\mathsf{T}} W_x^p) \Phi_{x,n|k}.$$

These operations are not demanding and thus players are not required large computational resources to participate in this vGFNE-seeking routine. Moreover, each gradient $\nabla_{\Phi_u^p} J_{\Phi}^p$ depends on other players' $\Phi_{u|k}^{-p}$ only through $\Phi_{x|k}$: When this response is already available (e.g., provided by the coordinator), then each *p*-th player is capable to compute its proposed update $\hat{\Phi}_{u|+}^p$ using only its own private information. In general, the projection map

$$\operatorname{proj}_{\mathcal{U}_{\Phi,\mathcal{G}}}(\Phi_{u|+}) = \operatorname{arg\,min}_{\Phi_u} \left\{ \|\Phi_u - \Phi_{u|+}\|_{\ell_2} : \Phi_u \in \mathcal{U}_{\Phi,\mathcal{G}} \right\}$$
(33)

is a sparse convex program that can be solved efficiently. However, in general, this problem still has $(N+1)N_u(N_x+N_y)$ decision variables and $NN_x(N_x+N_y)$ equality constraints; it scales poorly with the state-space dimensions (N_x, N_u, N_y) and FIR horizon N. Its computational burden can be alleviated by exploiting the structure of Problem (33) and solving it using a distributed approach: Consider the problem

$$\underset{\Psi,\Lambda}{\text{minimize }} J_{\Phi}^{(r)}(\Psi) + J_{\Phi}^{(c)}(\Lambda) \text{ subject to } \Psi = \Lambda \qquad (34)$$

defined by the extended-real-value functions

$$J_{\Phi}^{(r)}(\Psi) = \begin{cases} (1/2) \|\Psi - \Phi_{u,+}\|_{\ell_2}^2 & \text{if Eq. (20, 22) holds} \\ \infty & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$
$$J_{\Phi}^{(c)}(\Lambda) = \begin{cases} (1/2) \|\Lambda - \Phi_{u,+}\|_{\ell_2}^2 & \text{if Eq. (19, 22, 26) holds} \\ \infty & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

The Problem (34) can be solved by the Alternating Direction Method of Multipliers (ADMM, [30]), and either Ψ^* or Λ^* used as the projection $\Phi_{u|k+1}$. The subproblem associated with $J_{\Phi}^{(r)}$ considers only the dual dynamic constraints Σ_{Φ}^* (Eq. 20) and the structural constraints from Eq. (22). The subproblem associated with $J_{\Phi}^{(c)}$ considers the primal dynamic constraints Σ_{Φ} (Eq. 19), the structural constraints from Eq. (22), and the operational constraints from Eq. (26). For many cases (e.g., diagonal weighting matrices and bound constraints), these subproblems are, respectively, row-wise and column-wise separable and can be reduced into smaller problems to be solved in parallel. This can lead to a substantial performance improvement, making Algorithm 2 scalable to large-scale problems. We refer to [35] for more details on partially separable SLS problems and their solution via ADMM.

IV. ILLUSTRATIVE APPLICATION: STABILIZATION OF A PARTIALLY OBSERVED POWER-GRID

In the following, we study the efficacy and performance of the proposed vGFNE-Seeking via FB-Splitting (Algorithm 2) in a simulated application inspired by the decentralised control of power networks. The example is adapted from [35].

We consider a 3×3 grid network of interconnected subsystems (Figure 2). Each *p*-th node represents a power system operated by a self-interested agent aiming to stabilise its *phase angle deviation* θ^p and *frequency deviation* $\dot{\theta}^p$ against disturbances. For this purpose, each agent has actuators capable of applying a load directly to $\dot{\theta}^p$. However, for budgetary reasons, each subsystem is equipped only with a phase measurement unit producing noisy readings of θ . The measurements are publicly available through some communication network (which is assumed to have the same topology as in Figure 2).

Each *p*-th subsystem has the continuous-time dynamics

$$m^{p}\ddot{\theta}^{p} + d^{p}\dot{\theta}^{p} = -\sum_{\tilde{p}\in\mathcal{P}}\kappa^{p,\tilde{p}}(\theta^{p} - \theta^{\tilde{p}}) + u^{p} + \delta_{x}^{p}, \quad (35)$$

where u^p and δ^p_x represent the controllable load and the external disturbances, respectively. The fixed parameters are sampled



Fig. 2. Power-grid: Schematic of the interconnected network (left) and the interactions within each *p*-th subsystem (right).

from $m^p \sim \text{Uniform}(0.5, 1)$, $d^p \sim \text{Uniform}(1, 1.5)$, and $k^{p,\tilde{p}} = k^{\tilde{p},p} \sim \text{Uniform}(0.5, 1)$ with $k^{p,\tilde{p}} = 0$ if the link $j \to i$ is not present in the topology shown in Figure 2. The phase measurements of each *p*-th subsystem are represented by the signal $y^p = \theta^p + \delta^p_y$, with δ^p_y being the measurement noise. The disturbances δ^p_x and the measurement noise δ^p_y are modelled as additive white Gaussian noise (AWGN) with standard deviations of 1 and 0.1, respectively.

The agents seek to stabilise their associated subsystems while subject to operational and structural limitations: The bus between any two subsystems $p, \tilde{p} \in \mathcal{P}$ is required to satisfy

$$-5 \le \kappa^{p,\tilde{p}} \left(\theta^p(\tau) - \theta^{\tilde{p}}(\tau) \right) \le 5, \quad \forall \tau \in \mathbb{R},$$
(36)

to avoid overloading the corresponding channels. Moreover, the actuation and communication infrastructure is such that both the deployment of controls and the transmission of information occur with a time delay of 0.1 [units-of-time].

A. Game formulation and the vGFNE-seeking problem

This problem is formulated as a stochastic dynamic game

$$\mathcal{G}_{\infty}^{\mathrm{LQ}} \coloneqq (\mathcal{P}, \Sigma, \{U^p\}_{p \in \mathcal{P}}, \{J^p\}_{p \in \mathcal{P}})$$

with players $\mathcal{P} = \{1, \dots, 9\}$ and discrete-time dynamics

$$\Sigma: \begin{cases} x_{t+1} = Ax_t + B_w w_t + \sum_{p \in \mathcal{P}} B_u^p u_t^p, & x_0 = 0; \\ y_t = Cx_t + D_w w_t. \end{cases}$$

defined by the block matrix $A = [A_{ij}]_{1 \le i,j, \le N_P}$,

$$A_{ij} = \begin{cases} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0.1 \\ -\frac{0.1 \sum_{j} k^{ij}}{m^{i}} & 1 - \frac{0.1 d^{i}}{m^{i}} \end{bmatrix} & \text{ if } i == j \\ \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ \frac{0.1 k^{ij}}{m^{i}} & 0 \end{bmatrix} & & \text{ otherwise} \end{cases}$$

and $B_u^p = e_p \otimes \begin{bmatrix} 0 & \frac{0.1}{m^p} \end{bmatrix}^\mathsf{T} \ (\forall p \in \mathcal{P}), \ C = I_{N_P} \otimes \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$, and

$$(B_w, D_w) = \text{blkdiag} \left(I_{N_P} \otimes \begin{bmatrix} 0.01 & \\ & \frac{0.1}{m^p} \end{bmatrix}, 0.1 I_{N_y} \right).$$

This model is obtained by defining $x = (\theta^p, \dot{\theta}^p)_{p \in \mathcal{P}}$, then performing an Euler discretization to the state-space obtained from Eq. (35) using an interval of $\Delta \tau = 0.1$ units-of-time. The global measurement signal is defined as $y = (y^p)_{p \in \mathcal{P}}$. To ensure Assumption 3(b), we also include a small artificial disturbance to the phase angle deviation θ^p . In our experiment, $\rho(A) = 1$ and thus the system is not stable. It is, however, both controllable and observable. The task of stabilising each individual subsystem is encoded through the functional

$$J^p(u^p, u^{-p}) \coloneqq \mathbf{E} \left[\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \left\| \begin{bmatrix} W_x^p & W_u^p \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} x_t \\ u_t^p \end{bmatrix} \right\|_2^2 \right],$$

with $[W_x^p \ W_u^p] = \text{blkdiag}(e_p e_p^\mathsf{T} \otimes 0.01 I_{N_x}, I_{N_u^p})$. Finally, each *p*-th player's policy must be (d_a, d_c) -delayed with $d_a = d_c = 1$ and it must satisfy the operational constraints

$$U^p(u^{-p}) = \{ u^p \in \ell_{\infty}^{N_u}(\mathbb{N}) : G_x x_t \preceq 1, \ t \in \mathbb{N} \},$$
(37)

with matrix G_x encoding the capacity limits from Eq. (36).

We simulate an execution of the game $\mathcal{G}_{\infty}^{LQ}$ in which the players are seeking an equilibrium policy by adhering to the vGFNE-seeking routine in Algorithm 2. In this scenario, each player's policy is represented by a system level parametrisation (Section III-A) defined by FIR responses with N = 16 spectral components. The responses are constrained to have the sparsity patterns defined in Eq. (23) and to satisfy a robust realisation of the operational constraints with probability $\rho = 0.975$ (Eq. 26). The policies are updated every $\Delta k = 32$ time steps (that is, $k = \lfloor t/\Delta k \rfloor$) with rate $\eta = \frac{M_{F\Phi}}{L_{F\Phi}^2} = \frac{0.0002}{0.0004} = 0.5$, computed and provided by the central coordinator to ensure convergence. We set $\Phi_{u|0} = \text{proj}_{\mathcal{U}_{\Phi},\mathcal{G}}(0)$ as the initial profile.

B. Simulation results and discussion

Due to numerical limitations, we interrupt the updates at the k_f first satisfying $\|\Phi_{u|k_f+1} - \Phi_{u|k_f}\|_{\ell_2} / \|\Phi_{u|k_f}\|_{\ell_2} \le 10^{-15}$ when the policy updates become numerically negligible, and assume that $\Phi_{u|k_f} \approx \Phi_u^* \in \mathbf{VI}(BR_{\Phi})$. The convergence of the vGFNE-seeking algorithm to this fixed-point is shown in Figure 3. The predicted convergence based on the rate $L_{(I-\eta F_{\Phi})} = \sqrt{1 - \eta (2M_F - \eta L_F^2)} \approx 0.99995$ is also displayed. The results show that, when adhering to Algorithm 2, players converge to a vGFNE solution to $\mathcal{G}^{LQ}_{\infty}$ within $k_f = 10^4$ policy updates (or $t_f = 10^4 \times \Delta k$ time steps). Interestingly, despite slow, the actual convergence of our vGFNE-seeking routine is still faster than that predicted by Corollary 3.1 by a factor of almost 100. We remark that this does not disqualify the usefulness of this corollary, as its primary purpose is to certificate that $\mathcal{G}^{LQ}_{\infty}$ has an unique solution to which Algorithm 2 converges. In principle, once convergence is ensured, a potential acceleration can be achieved by incorporating inertia into Algorithm 2 [36]. In this experiment, the seemingly slow convergence of the vGFNE-seeking routine is still not a practical issue: If the power-grid is operated at a timescale of seconds, it would take $(t_f \times \Delta \tau) = 32000$ seconds, or 8 hours, for players to achieve an equilibrium strategy. This is a relatively short period of time considering that such infrastructure is expected to be operational for years. Finally, we again emphasize that Algorithm 2 allows the policy updates to occur alongside (and independently of) the actual operation of the system; the players can continuously improve their policies without interrupting or destabilising the grid.

In Figure 4, we show the first hour of operation of the powergrid while the policies are being updated (that is, for the first $t \leq 3600$ time steps or $k \leq |3600/\Delta k| = 112$ policy updates).



Fig. 3. Power-grid: Convergence of the vGFNE-seeking routine.



Fig. 4. Power-grid: Closed-loop (left panels) and open-loop (right panels) responses in terms of frequency loads u^p , phase angle measurements y_t^p , and pairwise buses $\kappa^{p,\tilde{p}}(\theta_t^p - \theta_t^{\tilde{p}})$, for all $p, \tilde{p} \in \mathcal{P}$. The signals from each subsystem are plotted superimposed. The shaded region indicates the unsafe operation region of the network channels.

We compare the closed-loop evolution with that obtained by an open-loop operation with $u_t^p = 0$ for all players $p \in \mathcal{P}$. The results show that the policies $K_k^p := \hat{\Phi}_{uy|k}^p - \hat{\Phi}_{ux|k}^p \hat{\Phi}_{xx|k}^{-1} \hat{\Phi}_{xy|k}^p$ $(\forall p \in \mathcal{P})$ stabilise the network against the external disturbances, as observed through the noisy measurements of $\{\theta^p\}_{p\in\mathcal{P}}$. Moreover, the closed-loop system is not destabilised by the implementation of a new control policy every $\Delta k = 32$ time steps. The policies are also shown to enforce the robust realisation of the operational constraints: The buses $\kappa^{p,\tilde{p}}(\theta_t^p - \theta_t^{\tilde{p}})$, between every $p, \tilde{p} \in \mathcal{P}$, are simultaneously within the safety limits for approximately 97% of this simulation period. Under open-loop operation, the safety limits are violated for the majority of the simulation period. This performance is obtained at the expense of relatively large frequency loads $\{u^p\}_{p\in\mathcal{P}}$. Given the tuning $\{W_x^p, W_u^p\}_{p\in\mathcal{P}}$, this is by design the optimal actions that the players must deploy while seeking an equilibrium policy.

Finally, the output-feedback policies K_k^p ($\forall p \in \mathcal{P}$) are also shown to implement a communication structure based on the topology in Figure 2. To demonstrate this property, we

simulate the closed-loop responses from the vGFNE policy, $K_{k_f} = (K_{k_f}^p)_{p \in \mathcal{P}}$, when the system is initially at rest (i.e., $x_0 = 0$) and is then subjected to an impulse affecting the phase angle deviation of the central subsystem (i.e., $B_w w_t = \delta_t e_9$). The results (Figure 5) show that the flow of information follows the network topology depicted in Figure 2: At t = 1, the impulse is perceived at the 5-th subsystem and the observation y_1^5 is propagated to its neighbors $p \in \{4, 6, 8\}$. The players $p \in \{5, 4, 6, 8\}$ react to this disturbance after an action delay of $d_a = 1$ time steps. At t = 3, its effect is perceived at the subsystems $p \in \{4, 6, 8\}$ and measurements $(y_1^p, y_2^p, y_3^p)_{p \in \{4, 6, 8\}}$ are transmitted to the two-hop neighbors $p \in \{1, 7, 9\}$. This information pattern proceeds until all the players $p \in \mathcal{P}$ have been affected and are engaged in attenuating the disturbance. The magnitude of the applied control actions is shown to be higher the closer the subsystems are to the central node p = 5. Additionally, the policies are observed to implement deadbeat control: The state is stirred to zero instantaneously after N = 16 control actions, corresponding to the FIR horizon. This behaviour (known as time-localization in the SLS literature [25]) explains the aforementioned aggressive control actions, as deadbeat controllers are notoriously aggressive for small N [37]. Interestingly, this property also implies that disturbances can be attenuated before they affect subsystems that are more than *N*-hops distant from the point where they enter the network.



Fig. 5. Power-grid: Closed-loop impulse response in terms of measurements y^p and control inputs u^p , for each individual subsystem $p \in \mathcal{P}$.

V. CONCLUDING REMARKS

This work presented a GFNE-seeking algorithm for noncooperative games with dynamics that are linear, stochastic, potentially unstable, and partially-observed. We first considered the equivalent representation of each player's policies as their corresponding closed-loop responses to the noise (given others' policies), then we designed a routine in which: i) Players propose new policies whose closed-loop responses yield firstorder improvements on their individual objectives, ii) then a coordinator collects these proposals and compute the closest admissible closed-loop response. Under this system level parametrisation, the GFNE-seeking algorithm is applicable to problems in which the policies are required to be stabilising and to satisfy operational (on the state and input signals) and structural (on the policy itself) constraints. For the latter, it also enables the solution of partially-observed dynamic games with asymmetric information structures (e.g., when the underlying system has actuation and communication delays). Using results from operator theory, we derived conditions for the existence and uniqueness of a vGFNE solution and established convergence certificates for our algorithm. After its

main aspects are presented, the algorithm is demonstrated on the task of stabilising a partially observed and decentralised power-grid. The results demonstrate its efficacy: When adhering to this routine, players approach a GFNE solution while still complying with operational and communication constraints.

Appendix

PROOF OF THEOREM 3

Using the definition $F_{\Phi} = (\nabla_{\Phi_u^p} J_{\Phi}^p (\Phi_u^p, \Phi_u^{-p}))_{p \in \mathcal{P}}$ and Eq. (28), we have $F_{\Phi}(\Phi_u) = 2(D_{\Phi}^{\mathsf{T}} H_{\Phi}) \Phi_u(W_w W_w^{\mathsf{T}}) + h$ given block matrices $D_{\Phi} = \text{blkdiag}(H_{\Phi}^{pp})_{p \in \mathcal{P}}, H_{\Phi} = [H_{\Phi}^{p\tilde{p}}]_{p,\tilde{p} \in \mathcal{P}},$ and $h = (h)_{p \in \mathcal{P}}$. In vectorized form, this operator becomes $\operatorname{vec}(F_{\Phi}(\Phi_u)) = 2((W_w W_w^{\mathsf{T}}) \otimes (D_{\Phi}^{\mathsf{T}} H_{\Phi}))\operatorname{vec}(\Phi_u) + \operatorname{vec}(g).$ Since the strong-monotonicity constant of an affine operator F(x) = Ax + b is $(1/2)\lambda_{\min}(A + A^{\mathsf{T}})$ [30], we have that

$$M_{F_{\Phi}} = \lambda_{\min} \left((W_w W_w^{\mathsf{T}}) \otimes D_{\Phi}^{\mathsf{T}} H_{\Phi} + ((W_w W_w^{\mathsf{T}}) \otimes D_{\Phi}^{\mathsf{T}} H_{\Phi})^{\mathsf{T}} \right) \\ \leq 2\sigma_{\min} \left((W_w W_w^{\mathsf{T}}) \otimes (D_{\Phi}^{\mathsf{T}} H_{\Phi}) \right).$$

The tightest Lipschitz constant of F_{Φ} is obtained from the spectral norm $\|2(W_w W_w^{\mathsf{T}}) \otimes (D_{\Phi}^{\mathsf{T}} H_{\Phi})\|_2$ [30], or, equivalently,

$$L_{F_{\Phi}} = 2\sigma_{\max} \left((W_w W_w^{\mathsf{T}}) \otimes (D_{\Phi}^{\mathsf{T}} H_{\Phi}) \right).$$

Since $\sigma(A \otimes B) = \{s_i s_j : s_i \in \sigma(A), s_j \in \sigma(B)\}$ for any matrices A and B [38], Eq. 30 thus follows directly.

REFERENCES

- [1] T. Başar and G. J. Olsder, *Dynamic noncooperative game theory*. SIAM, 1998.
- [2] L. Chen, N. Li, S. H. Low, and J. C. Doyle, "Two market models for demand response in power networks," in 2010 First IEEE International Conference on Smart Grid Communications, pp. 397–402, 2010.
- [3] A.-H. Mohsenian-Rad, V. W. S. Wong, J. Jatskevich, R. Schober, and A. Leon-Garcia, "Autonomous demand-side management based on gametheoretic energy consumption scheduling for the future smart grid," *IEEE Transactions on Smart Grid*, vol. 1, no. 3, pp. 320–331, 2010.
- [4] W. Saad, Z. Han, H. V. Poor, and T. Basar, "Game-theoretic methods for the smart grid: An overview of microgrid systems, demand-side management, and smart grid communications," *IEEE Signal Processing Magazine*, vol. 29, no. 5, pp. 86–105, 2012.
- [5] L. Pavel, *Game Theory for Control of Optical Networks*. Birkhäuser, 2012.
- [6] J. F. Fisac, A. K. Akametalu, M. N. Zeilinger, S. Kaynama, J. Gillula, and C. J. Tomlin, "A general safety framework for learning-based control in uncertain robotic systems," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 64, no. 7, pp. 2737–2752, 2019.
- [7] R. Spica, E. Cristofalo, Z. Wang, E. Montijano, and M. Schwager, "A real-time game theoretic planner for autonomous two-player drone racing," *IEEE Transactions on Robotics*, vol. 36, no. 5, pp. 1389–1403, 2020.
- [8] M. Wang, Z. Wang, J. Talbot, J. C. Gerdes, and M. Schwager, "Gametheoretic planning for self-driving cars in multivehicle competitive scenarios," *IEEE Transactions on Robotics*, vol. 37, no. 4, pp. 1313–1325, 2021.
- [9] F. Facchinei and C. Kanzow, "Generalized Nash equilibrium problems," Annals of Operations Res., vol. 175, no. 1, pp. 177–211, 2010.
- [10] C. Daskalakis, P. W. Goldberg, and C. H. Papadimitriou, "The complexity of computing a Nash equilibrium," *Communications of the ACM*, vol. 52, no. 2, pp. 89–97, 2009.
- [11] J. Engwerda, W. Van Den Broek, and J. M. Schumacher, "Feedback Nash equilibria in uncertain infinite time horizon differential games," in *Proceedings of the 14th International Symposium of Mathematical Theory of Networks and Systems, MTNS 2000*, pp. 1–6, 2000.
- [12] D. Vrabie and F. Lewis, "Integral reinforcement learning for online computation of feedback Nash strategies of nonzero-sum differential games," in 49th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control, pp. 3066– 3071, IEEE, 2010.

- [13] G. Kossioris, M. Plexousakis, A. Xepapadeas, A. de Zeeuw, and K.-G. Mäler, "Feedback Nash equilibria for non-linear differential games in pollution control," *Journal of Economic Dynamics and Control*, vol. 32, no. 4, pp. 1312–1331, 2008.
- [14] R. Kamalapurkar, J. R. Klotz, and W. E. Dixon, "Concurrent learningbased approximate feedback-Nash equilibrium solution of *N*-player nonzero-sum differential games," *IEEE/CAA Journal of Automatica Sinica*, vol. 1, no. 3, pp. 239–247, 2014.
- [15] A. Tanwani and Q. Zhu, "Feedback Nash equilibrium for randomly switching differential–algebraic games," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 65, no. 8, pp. 3286–3301, 2019.
- [16] F. Laine, D. Fridovich-Keil, C.-Y. Chiu, and C. Tomlin, "The computation of approximate generalized feedback Nash equilibria," *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, vol. 33, no. 1, pp. 294–318, 2023.
- [17] P. V. Reddy and G. Zaccour, "Feedback Nash equilibria in linear-quadratic difference games with constraints," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 62, no. 2, pp. 590–604, 2017.
- [18] P. V. Reddy and G. Zaccour, "Open-loop and feedback Nash equilibria in constrained linear–quadratic dynamic games played over event trees," *Automatica*, vol. 107, pp. 162–174, 2019.
- [19] D. Fridovich-Keil, E. Ratner, L. Peters, A. D. Dragan, and C. J. Tomlin, "Efficient iterative linear-quadratic approximations for nonlinear multiplayer general-sum differential games," in 2020 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation, pp. 1475–1481, IEEE, 2020.
- [20] D. Fridovich-Keil, V. Rubies-Royo, and C. J. Tomlin, "An iterative quadratic method for general-sum differential games with feedback linearizable dynamics," in 2020 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation, pp. 2216–2222, IEEE, 2020.
- [21] P. Yi and L. Pavel, "An operator splitting approach for distributed generalized Nash equilibria computation," *Automatica*, vol. 102, pp. 111– 121, 2019.
- [22] G. Belgioioso, P. Yi, S. Grammatico, and L. Pavel, "Distributed generalized Nash equilibrium seeking: An operator-theoretic perspective," *IEEE Control Systems Magazine*, vol. 42, no. 4, pp. 87–102, 2022.
- [23] G. Belgioioso, D. Liao-McPherson, M. H. de Badyn, S. Bolognani, R. S. Smith, J. Lygeros, and F. Dörfler, "Online feedback equilibrium seeking," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 70, no. 1, pp. 203–218, 2025.
- [24] T. Başar, "Stochastic differential games and intricacy of information structures," in *Dynamic Games in Economics*, pp. 23–49, Springer, 2014.
- [25] J. Anderson, J. C. Doyle, S. H. Low, and N. Matni, "System level synthesis," *Annual Reviews in Control*, vol. 47, pp. 364–393, 2019.
- [26] O. B. L. Neto, M. Mulas, and F. Corona, "SLS-BRD: A systemlevel approach to seeking generalised feedback Nash equilibria," *arXiv*, vol. 2404.03809, 2024.
- [27] J. B. Conway, A course in functional analysis. Springer, 2 ed., 2007.
- [28] H. H. Bauschke and P. L. Combettes, Convex analysis and monotone operator theory in Hilbert spaces. Springer, 2 ed., 2017.
- [29] A. A. Kulkarni and U. V. Shanbhag, "On the variational equilibrium as a refinement of the generalized nash equilibrium," *Automatica*, vol. 48, no. 1, pp. 45–55, 2012.
- [30] E. K. Ryu and W. Yin, Large-scale convex optimization: algorithms & analyses via monotone operators. Cambridge University Press, 2022.
- [31] Y.-S. Wang, A System Level Approach to Optimal Controller Design for Large-Scale Distributed Systems. Dissertation (Ph.D.), California Institute of Technology, 2017.
- [32] S. Dean, H. Mania, N. Matni, B. Recht, and S. Tu, "On the sample complexity of the linear quadratic regulator," *Foundations of Computational Mathematics*, vol. 20, no. 4, pp. 633–679, 2020.
- [33] A. Nayyar and T. Başar, "Dynamic stochastic games with asymmetric information," in 51st IEEE Conference on Decision and Control, pp. 7145– 7150, IEEE, 2012.
- [34] S. P. Boyd and L. Vandenberghe, *Convex optimization*. Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- [35] Y.-S. Wang, N. Matni, and J. C. Doyle, "Separable and localized systemlevel synthesis for large-scale systems," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 63, no. 12, pp. 4234–4249, 2018.
- [36] F. Iutzeler and J. M. Hendrickx, "A generic online acceleration scheme for optimization algorithms via relaxation and inertia," *Optimization Methods and Software*, vol. 34, no. 2, pp. 383–405, 2017.
- [37] K. J. Åström and B. Wittenmark, *Computer-controlled systems: theory* and design. Prentice-Hall, 1997.
- [38] R. A. Horn and C. R. Johnson, *Topics in Matrix Analysis*. Cambridge University Press, 1991.