

Query Complexity of Approximate Equilibria in Anonymous Games

Paul W. Goldberg¹ and Stefano Turchetta²

¹ University of Oxford paul.goldberg@cs.ox.ac.uk

² Technische Universität München stefano.turchetta@gmail.com

Abstract. We study the computation of approximate equilibria of anonymous games, with algorithms that may proceed via a sequence of adaptive queries to the game’s payoff function, assumed to be unknown initially. The general topic we consider is *query complexity*, that is, how many queries are necessary or sufficient to compute an approximate Nash equilibrium. We present upper and lower bounds for general anonymous games with n players that share a constant number of strategies k . We also consider the following subclasses: symmetric games, self-anonymous games, and Lipschitz games.

The basic kind of query is one that identifies the payoff to a single specified player in response to a given pure-strategy profile. We compare this kind of query with ones that respond with a collection of all payoffs in response to an anonymized profile; we find that in some cases this “bundling” of information leads to loss of query efficiency.

We show that exact equilibria cannot be found via query-efficient algorithms. We also give an example of a 2-strategy, 3-player anonymous game that does not have any exact Nash equilibrium in rational numbers, answering a question posed in [Daskalakis and Papadimitriou, 2014, Chen et al., 2014]. Our main results are in the context of general two-strategy anonymous games. We provide a randomised query-efficient algorithm that queries only $\tilde{O}(n^{11/8}/\epsilon^2)$ payoffs to compute a $O\left(\epsilon + \frac{1}{\epsilon\sqrt{n}}\right)$ -NE. It is based on a new polynomial-time approximation scheme whose performance improves on a previous one on instances where ϵ is fixed and n is large. We also prove that $\Omega(n \log n)$ payoffs must be queried in order to find any ϵ -well-supported Nash equilibrium, even by randomised algorithms.

1 Preliminaries

This paper analyzes game-theoretical solution concepts, such as exact and approximate Nash equilibria, under the *payoff query complexity* perspective. We focus on the class of anonymous games, in which a large number of players n share a small number of pure-strategies k , and the payoff to a player depends on the number of players who use each strategy, but not their identities. Note that if k is a constant, then anonymous games have a polynomial-size representation. [Daskalakis and Papadimitriou, 2014] consider anonymous games and graphical games to be the two most important classes of concisely-represented multiplayer games. These games appear frequently in practice, e.g., voting systems, traffic routing, and auction settings. Although these games have polynomial-sized representations, an extensive-form representation may still be inconveniently large, making it desirable to work with algorithms that do not require all the data on a game to comprise the input.

In the past two years, there has been a series of results regarding the query complexity of computing solution concepts both in general games and also in some specific classes, such as graphical or congestion games. The payoff query model that was generally used in these

articles consists in letting every player select an action to play, which creates an action profile. As a result, every player learns her payoff for playing the chosen action against the generated profile. We find that this model (which we call the *profile query model*) is not well-suited for the representation of anonymous games. In particular, querying strategy profiles does not exploit the symmetries of the payoff function that make the representation compact. We provide a simple but costly lower bound for this and introduce two other types of queries that suit anonymous games better, which we call *single-player queries* and *all-players queries*. We present these in more detail below.

1.1 Definitions

Anonymous Games. An *anonymous game* is a tuple $(n, k, \{u_j^i\}_{i \in [n], j \in [k]})$ that consists of n players, k actions, or pure strategies, per player, and a utility function $u_j^i : \Pi_{n-1}^k \rightarrow [0, 1]$ for each player $i \in [n]$ and every strategy $j \in [k]$, whose domain is the set $\Pi_{n-1}^k := \{(x_1, \dots, x_k) \in \mathbb{N}_0^k : \sum_{j \in [k]} x_j = k\}$ of all possible ways to partition $n - 1$ players into the k strategies. The number of payoffs stored by any such game is $n|\Pi_{n-1}^k| = O(n^k)$, therefore, polynomial in n if k is a constant. We will always assume that the number of strategies k is a constant. Furthermore, as also noticeable by u_j^i 's codomain, we make the standard assumption of having all payoffs being normalised into the interval $[0, 1]$.

We can define the expected utility obtained by player $i \in [n]$ in the following manner. Let \mathcal{X}_i be a random unit vector of k dimensions, each representing an action. If i plays a pure strategy $j \in [k]$, then \mathcal{X}_i 's expected value $\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{X}_i] = e_j$, where e_j is the unit vector with 1 at its j -th component. On the other hand, if i randomises, then $\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{X}_i] = (p_1^i, \dots, p_k^i)$, where p_j^i is the probability that i plays strategy j . Player i has to face the sum of $n - 1$ such random vectors $\mathcal{X}_{-i} := \sum_{\ell \neq i} \mathcal{X}_\ell$, where we use the subscript $-i$ to denote all players other than i . Therefore, the expected utility obtained by player i for playing action j against \mathcal{X}_{-i} is

$$\mathbb{E}[u_j^i(\mathcal{X}_{-i})] := \sum_{x \in \Pi_{n-1}^k} u_j^i(x) \cdot \Pr[\mathcal{X}_{-i} = x].$$

Clearly, if player i is playing a mixed strategy (p_1^i, \dots, p_k^i) , her expected payoff simply consists of a weighted average, i.e., $\mathbb{E}[u^i(\mathcal{X})] := \sum_{j \in [k]} p_j^i \cdot \mathbb{E}[u_j^i(\mathcal{X}_{-i})]$, where $\mathcal{X} := \sum_{\ell \in [n]} \mathcal{X}_\ell$. The fact that expected utilities can be computed in polynomial-time may not be immediate. [Daskalakis and Papadimitriou \[2014\]](#) present a simple dynamic programming algorithm for this purpose. We remark that whenever we deal with two-strategy anonymous games, we use a 0-1 random indicator variable X_i to denote whether player i plays strategy 1, instead of a two-dimensional random vector \mathcal{X}_i .

Solution Concepts. With the above notation, we can say that (p_1^i, \dots, p_k^i) is a best-response if and only if $\mathbb{E}[u^i(\mathcal{X})] \geq \mathbb{E}[u_j^i(\mathcal{X}_{-i})]$ for all $j \in [k]$. A *Nash equilibrium* (NE) requires every player best-responding to each other; therefore, the above best-response condition must hold for every $i \in [n]$. This can be viewed also as no player having an incentive to deviate from her possibly mixed strategy. This fact leads to a first relaxation of NE, which is the notion of an

ϵ -approximate Nash equilibrium (ϵ -NE) where every player's incentive to deviate is at most $\epsilon > 0$. We say that $(\mathcal{X}_i)_{i \in [n]}$, which represents a mixed-strategy profile, constitutes an ϵ -NE if for all $i \in [n]$ and all $j \in [k]$,

$$\mathbb{E}[u^i(\mathcal{X})] + \epsilon \geq \mathbb{E}[u_j^i(\mathcal{X}_{-i})].$$

This definition, however, does not prohibit allocating a small amount of probability to arbitrarily bad strategies. An ϵ -approximate well-supported Nash equilibrium (ϵ -WSNE) addresses this issue by forcing every player to place a positive amount of probability solely to ϵ -approximate best-responses, i.e., $(\mathcal{X}_i)_{i \in [n]}$ induce an ϵ -WSNE if for all $i \in [n]$, all $j \in [k]$, and all $\ell \in \text{supp}(\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{X}_i])$,

$$\mathbb{E}[u_\ell^i(\mathcal{X}_{-i})] + \epsilon \geq \mathbb{E}[u_j^i(\mathcal{X}_{-i})].$$

It is worth noting that although an ϵ -WSNE is also an ϵ -NE, the converse need not be true.

In this paper we provide some query complexity lower bounds for computing an ϵ -approximate well-supported correlated equilibrium (ϵ -WSCE), which, differently from an ϵ -WSNE, is a probability distribution over action profiles. Due to a correlated equilibrium being defined over action profiles, it is more convenient to state its definition for a game represented in normal-form, i.e., with a utility function $v_j^i : [k]^{n-1} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ defined over action profiles. A probability distribution ψ over action profiles is a *correlated equilibrium* (CE) if for all $i \in [n]$ and all $j, \ell \in [k]$,

$$\sum_{a \in [k]^{n-1}: a_i = j} \psi(a) \cdot (v_\ell^i(a_{-i}) - v_j^i(a_{-i})) \leq 0.$$

Analogously to the concept of ϵ -WSNE, an ϵ -WSCE is a distribution ψ over action profiles such that for every player $i \in [n]$, all actions $j, \ell \in [k]$, and letting $p_j^i = \Pr_{a \sim \psi}[a_i = j]$,

$$\sum_{a \in [k]^{n-1}: a_i = j} \psi(a) \cdot (v_\ell^i(a_{-i}) - v_j^i(a_{-i})) \leq p_j^i \cdot \epsilon.$$

Sub-classes of Anonymous Games. We have seen that in anonymous games, every player's payoff function is symmetric w.r.t. permutations of the players. Brandt et al. [2009] proposed three further restrictions of the utility function that lead to the definition of the following three classes of games. First, an anonymous game is *symmetric* if for all $i, \ell \in [n]$, $j \in [k]$, and $x \in \Pi_{n-1}^k$, then $u_j^i(x) = u_j^\ell(x)$, i.e., all players have the same utility function. Second, an anonymous game is *self-anonymous* if for all $i \in [n]$, $j, \ell \in [k]$, and $x \in \Pi_{n-1}^k$, $u_j^i(x) = u_\ell^i(x + e_j - e_\ell)$, i.e., player i 's preferences depend on how all the n players are partitioned into the k strategies; therefore, i is not able to recognise herself among the others. Third, an anonymous game is *self-symmetric* if it is both symmetric and self-anonymous. We study these classes of games and prove that the additional symmetries may lead to better query complexity bounds.

Query-efficiency and Payoff Query Models. Our general interest is in polynomial-time algorithms that find solutions of anonymous games, while checking just a small fraction of the $O(n^k)$ payoffs of an n -player, k -strategy games. The basic kind of query is a *single-player query* which receives as input a player $i \in [n]$, a strategy $j \in [k]$, and a partition $x \in \Pi_{n-1}^k$

of $n - 1$ players into the k strategies, and it returns the corresponding payoff $u_j^i(x)$. A *profile query* (used in Fearnley et al. [2013]) consists of an action profile $(a_1, \dots, a_n) \in [k]^n$ where every player $i \in [n]$ receives her payoff according to that profile. Clearly, a profile query can be simulated using n single-player queries. The motivation for studying profile queries (from Fearnley et al. [2013]) is that in a software simulation of a game, there may in practice be a cost saving in collect all the payoffs that result from a single pure-strategy profile. An *all-players query* receives as input a common strategy $j \in [k]$, and a common partition $x \in \Pi_{n-1}^k$, and it outputs $u_j^i(x)$ to all $i \in [n]$. Since profile queries and all-players queries return n payoffs, we will consider them to have a cost of n single-player queries.

We investigate the complexity of finding equilibria in anonymous games according to these different payoff query models. We show that the profile query model can be inefficient in the context of anonymous games due to numerous queries being wasted to obtain unnecessary information. This motivates the all-players query model, in the context of anonymous games.

1.2 Related Work

Throughout the last decade, there has been interest in the complexity of finding an ϵ -approximate Nash equilibrium. A main reason is the intractability results for computing an exact Nash equilibrium. Indeed, it is **PPAD**-complete [Daskalakis et al., 2009a], even in the two-player case [Chen et al., 2009]. It is known that bimatrix games admit no FPTAS unless **PPAD** = **P** [Chen et al., 2009]. Moreover, there exists a quasi-polynomial algorithm for finding an ϵ -approximate Nash equilibrium [Lipton et al., 2003]. Hence, the main open-question is “Does there exist a PTAS for finding an ϵ -approximate Nash equilibrium for general games?”. The question is solved positively for some subclasses of games such as *two-player low-rank games* [Kannan and Thorsten, 2010] and *anonymous games* with a constant number of strategies [Daskalakis and Papadimitriou, 2014]. Concerning negative results, Hazan and Krauthgamer [2011] have shown that it is very unlikely that a PTAS for the Nash equilibrium that maximises the social welfare exists.

As stated in [Daskalakis and Papadimitriou, 2014], throughout the last few years, there have been several improvements in the running time of the algorithms that achieve the anonymous games’ PTAS. We outline the ideas behind these results. The first one, [Daskalakis and Papadimitriou, 2007], concerns two-strategy games and is based upon the quantisation of the strategy space into nearby multiples of ϵ . According to a probabilistic lemma, shown in the paper, n Bernoulli random indicator variables with probabilities p_1, \dots, p_n can be rounded to probabilities q_1, \dots, q_n being multiples of $1/\kappa$, for any κ , so that the total variation distance between the two associated PBDs is at most $O(1/\sqrt{\kappa})$. It is worth emphasising the fact that this number does not depend on n . We let a player have all these quantised strategies as her pure strategies. Searching over all the possible configurations leads to a running time of $O(n^{1/\epsilon^2})$, i.e., polynomial in n and exponential in $1/\epsilon$. The same authors successively extended the result to games with any constant number k of strategies by generalising the probabilistic lemma to multinomial distributions [Daskalakis and Papadimitriou, 2008].

Due to $1/\epsilon$ being the exponent of n , the result seems highly impractical. As a matter of fact, about a year later, Daskalakis [2008] has found a so-called efficient PTAS whose running time is $\text{poly}(n) \cdot (1/\epsilon)^{O(1/\epsilon^2)}$, which definitely improves upon the aforementioned one. The

idea of this algorithm is based on a better understanding of the structure of ϵ -equilibria in two-strategy anonymous games. He shows that there exists an ϵ -WSNE where either a small fraction of the players - at most $O(1/\epsilon^3)$ - randomises and the others play pure strategies, or whoever randomises plays the same mixed strategy. Given this fact, the algorithm aims to find an ϵ -equilibrium by solely searching over the restricted domain that satisfies the above properties.

All the previously mentioned algorithms share the property of being oblivious, i.e., they search over unordered sets of mixed strategies sampled by a predefined distribution. [Daskalakis and Papadimitriou \[2009\]](#) have proven a lower bound on the running time needed by any oblivious algorithm, which lets the latter algorithm be essentially optimal. In the same article, they show that the lower bound can be broken by utilising a non-oblivious algorithm, which has the currently best known running time for finding an ϵ -equilibrium in two-strategy anonymous games of $O(\text{poly}(n) \cdot (1/\epsilon)^{O(\log^2(1/\epsilon))})$. The idea is based upon the construction of an ϵ -cover of the set of PBDs with respect to the total variation distance. They show that such a cover exists, and that the running time needed to find an ϵ -equilibrium is no more than the time required to find an ϵ -cover. The algorithm works by searching over the first $O(\log 1/\epsilon)$ moments of the mixed strategy profile at Nash equilibrium. A complete proof of this result is in [Daskalakis and Papadimitriou \[2013\]](#).

Other relevant results regarding anonymous games are the following. An anonymous game, whose players' payoff functions are λ -Lipschitz continuous, is guaranteed to have an ϵ -approximate pure Nash equilibrium, with $\epsilon = O(\lambda k^2)$, if it has a constant number of strategies [[Daskalakis and Papadimitriou, 2007](#)]. [Daskalakis and Papadimitriou \[2014\]](#) make a more accurate analysis, which gives an approximation bound of $\epsilon = O(\lambda k)$. They, further, propose a polynomial-time algorithm for finding such an equilibrium that consists in solving $O(n^k)$ maximum flow problems. [Brandt et al. \[2009\]](#) study the complexity of finding pure Nash equilibria in four classes of anonymous games. They show that the problem is easy if the number of strategies is constant w.r.t. the number n of players, and hard as soon as there is a linear dependence on n . In this work we investigate the query complexity of approximate mixed equilibria in these four classes of games.

The analysis of the payoff query complexity of game-theoretical solution concepts is a recently active research topic in algorithmic game theory. In the last two years, several researchers have obtained upper and lower bounds of approximate equilibria in different game settings, which we briefly survey below. Our contribution regards the study of query-efficient algorithms and lower bounds in the class of anonymous games.

[Fearnley et al. \[2013\]](#) presented the first series of results. Finding a Nash equilibrium in a bimatrix game requires k^2 queries, even in zero-sum games. This can be seen by constructing a Hide-and-Seek game - a generalisation of Matching Pennies - where a player is paid for playing the same strategy as the opponent, and the other player is paid for playing something different. The unique Nash equilibrium consists in randomising uniformly among all k strategies for both players. Any algorithm must query the whole $k \times k$ matrix in order to find the unique Nash equilibrium. The lower bound can be broken if we focus on ϵ -approximate Nash equilibria. In fact, there exists a simple adaptation of [Daskalakis et al. \[2009b\]](#)'s algorithm, which finds a $\frac{1}{2}$ -NE using $2k - 1$ payoff queries. [Fearnley et al. \[2013\]](#), moreover, show that the algorithm is asymptotically optimal due to a lower bound of $k - 1$ queries. Interestingly, they show that

for a constant $\epsilon = O(1/\log k)$, the payoff query complexity of finding an ϵ -NE is $\Omega(k \log k)$. The article contains results also about graphical games and congestion games.

Further work on bimatrix games has been carried on in [Fearnley and Savani, 2014]. They show that for any $\epsilon < 1/2$, finding an ϵ -approximate Nash equilibrium requires $\Omega(k^2)$ deterministic queries. Furthermore, they start evaluating the complexity of *randomised* queries. They show that $\Omega(k^2)$ randomised queries are necessary to find a $\frac{1}{6k}$ -Nash equilibrium. The general idea of both lower bounds consists in hiding a full column c having all ones. Any algorithm performing $o(k^2)$ queries cannot discover such a column c , and if c is not discovered, we cannot achieve the desired approximation guarantee. The deterministic lower bound constructs an adversary whereas the randomised one uses a probability distribution over games. The article introduces also randomised query-efficient algorithms for finding ϵ -NE and ϵ -WSNE.

Hart and Nisan [2013] and Goldberg and Roth [2014] analyse the query complexity of finding exact and approximate correlated equilibria in n -player two-strategy games. The former article shows the following two facts. First, exponentially many deterministic queries are required to find a $\frac{1}{2}$ -CE. Second, any randomised (or deterministic) algorithm that finds an exact CE needs $2^{\Omega(n)}$ expected cost, where the cost includes the number of queries plus the output support size. Note that lower bounds on correlated equilibria automatically apply also to Nash equilibria. The latter article discusses the randomised query complexity of ϵ -CE and of the more demanding ϵ -WSCE. They show that, for any $\epsilon < 1/2$, the query complexity of finding an ϵ -CE is $\Theta(\log n)$, where the upper bound is given by using a clever application of the Multiplicative Weights algorithm [Arora et al., 2012], and the lower bound is proven using a probability distribution over payoffs of two-strategy n -player games. Furthermore, in the same paper, they show a linear lower bound on the number of queries necessary to find an ϵ -WSCE. Additionally, they give query-efficient reductions from the problem of verifying an ϵ -WSNE to the problem of computing an ϵ -WSNE.

Another relevant result in the context of query complexity is from Babichenko [2014], who proves an exponential in n lower bound for finding an ϵ -WSNE in n -player k -strategy games, for constant $k = 10^4$ and $\epsilon = 10^{-8}$, via probabilistic query algorithms. The proof consists of three steps, where the first is a reduction that maps all ϵ -WSNE to the approximate fixed points of a Lipschitz continuous n -dimensional mapping, the second reduces the problem of finding an approximate fixed point to the problem of finding the end of simple path, and the last shows that, even if randomisation is allowed, finding the end of a simple is a hard problem. Moreover, using a construction similar to the one of Daskalakis et al. [2009a], he shows that exponentially many queries are required to find an ϵ -NE, for $\epsilon = 10^{-17}/n$, i.e., proportional to $1/n$.

Finally, we mention a recent result by Daskalakis et al. [2012], which concerns learning a Poisson Binomial Distribution up to ϵ -accuracy with only a constant number of samples. Their algorithm uses the probabilistic theorems that led to the above mentioned anonymous games' PTAS. This result differs from ours for the fact that they can directly query the distribution they want to learn. We, instead, make queries to the payoff function of the players and aim to learn an equilibrium with these data.

We remark that all the aforementioned query lower bounds are for general normal-form games, so they do not directly work for the class of anonymous games. For instance, it seems unlikely to require an exponential number of queries for a game that has a polynomial-size.

1.3 Overview of the Results

We begin with a lower bound (Example 2.1) in the profile model where most of the queries return unnecessary information and cost an amount equal to the full representation of the game. For this reason, we introduce and focus on the other two query models that better suit the compact representation of anonymous games. Single-player queries allow players to know any payoff they want, making the model very strong. All-players queries restrict this power by enforcing all players to know their payoff for playing the same strategy when facing the same situation. A lower bound in the single-player model carries over into the other models. On the other hand, a profile-query-algorithm can be efficiently simulated by the other models.

We prove that, unfortunately, even in two-strategy anonymous games, asking for an exact Nash equilibrium is a very demanding question as it requires querying the full compact representation. Further, we show that such a lower bound can be broken either by focusing on restricted classes of games or by asking for an approximate Nash equilibrium. As an example of the former case, we derive query-efficient divide-and-conquer algorithms for two-strategy symmetric games and k -strategy self-symmetric games, which always possess a pure Nash equilibrium.

Our main result is in the context of approximate Nash equilibria of two-strategy n -player anonymous games. We propose a polynomial-time randomised algorithm that finds a $O(\epsilon + \frac{1}{\epsilon\sqrt{n}})$ -NE with $\tilde{O}(n^{3/8}/\epsilon^2)$ all-players queries. The algorithm is adaptive, in the sense that it makes decisions according to previous answers, and guarantees any additive approximation larger than $\frac{1}{\sqrt[4]{n}}$ with high probability. Finding an approximate Nash equilibrium is, under a query complexity perspective, an easier task than finding an exact one, which requires querying all the $2n$ payoffs.

Along with the above algorithm, we derive a lower bound on the number of all-players queries needed to find an ϵ -WSNE in two-strategy anonymous games. We construct an adversarial distribution over games and prove that no algorithm can make less than a logarithmic number of queries on this distribution.

Furthermore, we show that in the class of k -strategy self-anonymous games, where k is a constant, if every player plays an action uniformly at random, then we obtain an additive approximation proportional to $\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}$. This means that no queries are needed in this context.

In addition to this, we propose query-efficient algorithms in the context of Lipschitz anonymous games, which are games where every player's utility function has the property of being Lipschitz continuous. These results are used by our algorithm for general anonymous games.

2 Simulations of Query Models

We begin with comparing the standard profile query model with the other two in the context of anonymous games. We remark that one profile or one all-players query costs n units whereas

a single-player query costs 1 unit, i.e., the number of returned payoffs. We use \mathcal{A}_p , \mathcal{A}_s , and \mathcal{A}_{all} to denote an algorithm in the profile, single-player, and all-players model, respectively.

2.1 Simulating Profile Queries

Suppose there exists an algorithm \mathcal{A}_p that finds, e.g., a Nash equilibrium of a k -strategy anonymous game with q profile queries. We claim that \mathcal{A}_p can be easily simulated by an algorithm \mathcal{A}_s that makes qn single-player queries, i.e., they both cost qn units. On the other hand, we may need to spend slightly more if we want to simulate \mathcal{A}_p with an algorithm \mathcal{A}_{all} in the all-players model. This is due to the fact that every player is forced to know the payoff for the same action $j \in [k]$ and same partition $x \in \Pi_{n-1}^k$. We claim that a profile query can be simulated by at most k all-players queries. Let $a = (a_1, \dots, a_n)$ be the input of profile query. In general, a may contain all k different actions. Let $N_j \in [n]$ be the group of players who asked for action j 's payoff in a . For all $j \in [k]$, we query the payoff for strategy j against the partition $(|N_1|, \dots, |N_j|-1, \dots, |N_k|) \in \Pi_{n-1}^k$. Thus, any profile query algorithm \mathcal{A}_p that uses q queries can be simulated by an all-players query algorithm \mathcal{A}_{all} with at most kq queries. The cost, therefore, increases only by a constant factor.

2.2 Simulating Single-player Queries

Due to a single-player query returning only one payoff, we determine the number of profile and all-players queries needed to simulate a sequence of n single-player queries. If we do not constrain these n single-player queries asking for different players' payoffs, then we may have that the sequence always asks for the payoff of the same player i against different partitions, so that n profile or all-players queries are needed. This would imply a cost of n^2 in the profile and all-players models as opposed to an initial cost of n . However, even if the sequence of single-player queries contains all different players' payoffs, a linear number of profile or all-players queries is still required. To see this, it is enough to construct a sequence where every player $i \in [n]$ asks for her payoff for playing some strategy $j \in [k]$, which may even be the same for all players, against a different partition $x \in \Pi_{n-1}^k$. Clearly, a linear number of profile or all-players queries is indeed enough to obtain any information gotten by a sequence of n single-player queries. It is sufficient to use a profile or all-players query for each single-player query in the sequence.

2.3 Simulating All-players Queries

We note that n single-player queries are sufficient to simulate any all-players query. It is more interesting to consider whether all-players queries can be efficiently simulated by profile queries. We argue that this is generally not the case. Clearly, n profile queries are able to obtain all the information returned by one all-players query since every profile query may focus on obtaining a specific player's payoff. Unfortunately, there exist examples where this upper bound is attained. In the following subsection, we present a lower bound that requires a quadratic cost for a distribution over two-strategy anonymous games.

However, there are cases in which an all-player query can be simulated by a constant number of profile queries. For instance, suppose we are dealing with a two-strategy anonymous

game, and let $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ be a constant. If we query the payoff for playing strategy $j \in [2]$ when αn players are playing strategy $\ell \in [2]$, then $1/\alpha$ profile queries are enough to get all the information. The easiest case is when $\alpha = 1/2$ since we could just let the first profile query consist of half of the players playing 1, and the other half playing 2, and the second query consists of all players playing the opposite action. In general, we apply the following sequence of profile queries.

$$\underbrace{(1, \dots, 1)}_{\alpha n}, \underbrace{(2, \dots, 2)}_{(1-\alpha)n}, \underbrace{(2, \dots, 2)}_{\alpha n}, \underbrace{(1, \dots, 1)}_{\alpha n}, \underbrace{(2, \dots, 2)}_{(1-2\alpha)n}, \dots, \underbrace{(2, \dots, 2)}_{(1-\alpha)n}, \underbrace{(1, \dots, 1)}_{\alpha n}.$$

In this way, every query lets αn players know their payoffs; therefore, $1/\alpha$ profile queries suffice to simulate an all-players query as specified above. If we view the number of players playing strategy one as points on a line, the above simulation fact suggests that if an all-players query-algorithm \mathcal{A}_{all} solely asks for points that are proportional to n , then it can be simulated by a profile query-algorithm \mathcal{A}_{p} whose cost is increased only by a constant factor.

2.4 A Quadratic Cost Lower Bound in the Profile Model

We show that finding an ϵ -WSCE, for any $\epsilon < 1/2$, in a two-strategy anonymous game may require a linear number of profile queries, i.e., a cost of n^2 units. Due to the fact that a two-strategy anonymous game incorporates $2n^2$ payoffs, such a lower bound prevents the existence of a profile-query efficient algorithm for well-supported approximate equilibria.

Example 2.1. Let \mathcal{D}_n be the following distribution over two-strategy n -player anonymous games where every player's payoff takes a value in $\{0, \frac{1}{2}, 1\}$. Let a player $h \in [n]$ be chosen uniformly at random. Let h 's and the other players' (\bar{h} denotes a typical player different from h) payoffs be defined as in [Figure 1](#).

<table style="border-collapse: collapse; margin: auto;"> <tr> <td style="padding: 5px;">x</td> <td style="padding: 5px;">0</td> <td style="padding: 5px;">...</td> <td style="padding: 5px;">$n-2$</td> <td style="padding: 5px;">$n-1$</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding: 5px;">$u_1^h(x)$</td> <td style="padding: 5px;">$\frac{1}{2}$</td> <td style="padding: 5px;">...</td> <td style="padding: 5px;">$\frac{1}{2}$</td> <td style="padding: 5px;">$\frac{1}{2}$</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding: 5px;">$u_2^h(x)$</td> <td style="padding: 5px;">0</td> <td style="padding: 5px;">...</td> <td style="padding: 5px;">0</td> <td style="padding: 5px;">1</td> </tr> </table> <p style="text-align: center;">(a) h's payoff</p>	x	0	...	$n-2$	$n-1$	$u_1^h(x)$	$\frac{1}{2}$...	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{1}{2}$	$u_2^h(x)$	0	...	0	1	<table style="border-collapse: collapse; margin: auto;"> <tr> <td style="padding: 5px;">x</td> <td style="padding: 5px;">0</td> <td style="padding: 5px;">...</td> <td style="padding: 5px;">$n-2$</td> <td style="padding: 5px;">$n-1$</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding: 5px;">$u_1^{\bar{h}}(x)$</td> <td style="padding: 5px;">$\frac{1}{2}$</td> <td style="padding: 5px;">...</td> <td style="padding: 5px;">$\frac{1}{2}$</td> <td style="padding: 5px;">$\frac{1}{2}$</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding: 5px;">$u_2^{\bar{h}}(x)$</td> <td style="padding: 5px;">0</td> <td style="padding: 5px;">...</td> <td style="padding: 5px;">0</td> <td style="padding: 5px;">0</td> </tr> </table> <p style="text-align: center;">(b) Other players' payoff</p>	x	0	...	$n-2$	$n-1$	$u_1^{\bar{h}}(x)$	$\frac{1}{2}$...	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{1}{2}$	$u_2^{\bar{h}}(x)$	0	...	0	0
x	0	...	$n-2$	$n-1$																											
$u_1^h(x)$	$\frac{1}{2}$...	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{1}{2}$																											
$u_2^h(x)$	0	...	0	1																											
x	0	...	$n-2$	$n-1$																											
$u_1^{\bar{h}}(x)$	$\frac{1}{2}$...	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{1}{2}$																											
$u_2^{\bar{h}}(x)$	0	...	0	0																											

Fig. 1. Definition of \mathcal{D}_n 's payoffs. x denotes the number of player who play strategy 1.

Remark 2.1. In the profile query model, any randomised algorithm needs to make $\Omega(n)$ queries, which cost $\Omega(n^2)$ units, to find an ϵ -WSCE of \mathcal{D}_n , for any $\epsilon \in [0, \frac{1}{2})$.

Proof. We use Yao's minimax principle due to dealing with a distribution over instances. We first argue that any game G drawn from \mathcal{D}_n has a unique pure-strategy ϵ -WSCE. Clearly,

there are $n - 1$ players that must all play pure strategy 1 in any ϵ -WSCE, for $\epsilon < \frac{1}{2}$. Once we fixed these $n - 1$ players, h chooses to play strategy 2. In the profile query model, every player specifies the strategy she plays and gets told her payoff according to the aggregated strategy profile. Any algorithm \mathcal{A} that outputs a strategy profile that is an ϵ -WSCE of \mathcal{D}_n with probability at least $\frac{1}{2}$ must guess the hidden player h right with probability at least $\frac{1}{2}$. The probability that \mathcal{A} guesses the identity of h by making no query at all is $\frac{1}{n}$ due to h being chosen uniformly at random. In order to guess who h is, \mathcal{A} queries profiles where $n - 1$ players play 1 and a selected player i plays 2. Suppose \mathcal{A} made k queries. The probability of \mathcal{A} guessing h 's identity is $\frac{1}{n-k}$. Any answer \mathcal{A} receives can only tell whether the specified player who plays strategy 2 is h or not, so information concerning previous trials do only reduce the search space by one element. In order to let the success probability be at least $\frac{1}{2}$, \mathcal{A} must make $n - 1$ queries, leading to a lower bound of $\Omega(n)$.

Remark 2.2. In the all-players query model, one query is enough to discover a pure Nash equilibrium of \mathcal{D}_n .

3 Exact Nash Equilibria

We begin with lower-bounding the number of single-player queries (the least constrained query model) needed to find an exact NE in an anonymous game. We show that, unfortunately, there exist games in which any algorithm must exhaustively query all the payoffs in order to determine what strategies form a NE. It appears that difficult games are the ones that possess a unique fully-mixed NE. We define a game G that has this feature below and prove the lower bound on it. We remark that a similar proof idea —having a unique fully-mixed equilibrium— could be used to obtain a lower bound in the general k -strategy case.

Example 3.1. Let G be the following two-strategy n -player anonymous game. Let n be even, and let $\delta = 1/n^2$ (δ needs to be sufficiently small that the payoffs lie in $[0, 1]$.) Half of the players have a utility function as shown in the left side of [Figure 2](#), and the remaining half as in its right side.

Theorem 3.1. *A deterministic single-player query-algorithm may need to query $\Omega(n^2)$ payoffs in order to find an exact Nash equilibrium of an n -player anonymous game, even for self-anonymous games.*

Proof. The game G_n shown in [Example 3.1](#) is self-anonymous: this constraint means that $u_2^i(j + 1) = u_1^i(j)$ for all players i , strategies $j < n - 1$.

We proceed by arguing that in G_n , at least $n/2$ players must use mixed strategies. The result follows, since an equilibrium must then support linear in n , and for a player who mixes, it becomes necessary to check, via queries, his payoffs for all these outcomes.

It will be seen that G_n has an equilibrium in which all players mix with equal probabilities $\frac{1}{2}$; we do not eliminate the possibility of other equilibria.

Consider an equilibrium and let p_i be the probability that player i plays 1, in that equilibrium.

x	0	1	2	...	$n-2$	$n-1$
$u_1^i(x)$	$\frac{1}{2} - (\frac{n}{2} - \frac{1}{2})\delta$	$u_1^i(0) - (\frac{n}{2} - \frac{3}{2})\delta$	$u_1^i(1) - (\frac{n}{2} - \frac{5}{2})\delta$...	$u_1^i(n-3) + (\frac{n}{2} - \frac{3}{2})\delta$	$u_1^i(n-2) + (\frac{n}{2} - \frac{1}{2})\delta$
$u_2^i(x)$	$\frac{1}{2}$	$u_1^i(0)$	$u_1^i(1)$...	$u_1^i(n-3)$	$u_1^i(n-2)$

(a) Payoff table for “majority-seeking” player i

x	0	1	2	...	$n-2$	$n-1$
$u_1^i(x)$	$\frac{1}{2} + (\frac{n}{2} - \frac{1}{2})\delta$	$u_1^i(0) + (\frac{n}{2} - \frac{3}{2})\delta$	$u_1^i(1) + (\frac{n}{2} - \frac{5}{2})\delta$...	$u_1^i(n-3) - (\frac{n}{2} - \frac{3}{2})\delta$	$u_1^i(n-2) - (\frac{n}{2} - \frac{1}{2})\delta$
$u_2^i(x)$	$\frac{1}{2}$	$u_1^i(0)$	$u_1^i(1)$...	$u_1^i(n-3)$	$u_1^i(n-2)$

(b) Payoff table for “minority-seeking” player i

Fig. 2. Majority-minority game G 's payoffs. There are $\frac{n}{2}$ majority-seeking players and $\frac{n}{2}$ minority-seeking players. x denotes the number of players other than i who play 1. Due to being a self-anonymous game, payoffs of the form $u_2^i(j)$ are equal to $u_1^i(j-1)$, moreover, payoffs $u_1^i(j)$ are being expressed in terms of how they differ from $u_1^i(j-1)$ (or equivalently $u_2^i(j)$).

Let $I_1^i(s)$ denote the expected payment to player i to play 1, minus the expected payment to i to player 2, in strategy profile s . If m other players play strategy 1, note that for a majority player i , $I_1^i(s) = (m - \frac{n}{2} - \frac{1}{2})\delta$. By linearity of expectations, if in a mixed strategy s , x is the expected number of other players who play 1, $I_1^i(s) = (x - \frac{n}{2} - \frac{1}{2})\delta$.

Consequently, for a majority player i' , the incentive for i' to play 1 is $[\sum_{i \neq i'} p_i - \frac{n-1}{2}]\delta$.

For a minority player i' , the incentive for i' to play 2 is the same, i.e. $[\sum_{i \neq i'} p_i - \frac{n-1}{2}]\delta$.

Suppose a majority player i' mixes with probability $p_{i'} \in (0, 1)$. Note that $\sum_{i \neq i'} p_i = \frac{n-1}{2}$. The expected number of users of strategy 1 differs from the expected number of users of strategy 2 by less than 1. This means that no majority player may use a pure strategy; if he did, he would have an incentive to use the opposite strategy. So all majority players must use mixed strategies.

Suppose a minority player i' plays a mixed strategy uses $p_{i'} \in (0, 1)$. Suppose in addition all majority players play pure strategies. In that case, as before, any majority player would want to switch. So in this case, all majority players must mix, as before.

Finally, suppose all players play pure strategies. If strategies 1 and 2 both have the same number of users, then all majority players will want to switch. If (say) strategy 1 is used by more than $n/2$ players, it will be being used by a minority player who will want to switch.

In conclusion, all majority players must use mixed strategies. \square

3.1 A game whose solution must have irrational numbers

[Daskalakis and Papadimitriou, 2014, Chen et al., 2014] note as an open problem, the question of whether there is a 2-strategy anonymous game whose Nash equilibria require players to mix with irrational probabilities. The following example show that such a game does indeed exist, even with just 3 players. In the context of this paper, it helps to justify our focus on approximate rather than exact Nash equilibria.

Example 3.2. Consider the following anonymous game represented in both normal-form in [Figure 3](#) and in the anonymous compact form in [Figure 4](#).

	Go	Stay	
Go	(1, 0, 1)	(1, $\frac{1}{2}$, 0)	
Stay	(0, 0, 0)	($\frac{1}{2}$, $\frac{1}{4}$, 0)	
	Go		

	Go	Stay
Go	(1, 0, 0)	(0, $\frac{1}{4}$, $\frac{1}{2}$)
Stay	($\frac{1}{2}$, 1, $\frac{1}{2}$)	(1, 0, 1)
	Go	Stay

Fig. 3. The three-player two-strategy anonymous game in normal form. A payoff tuple (a, b, c) represents the row, the column, and the matrix players' payoff, respectively.

	x	0	1	2
Go: $u_1^r(x)$	0	1	1	
Stay: $u_2^r(x)$	1	$\frac{1}{2}$	0	

	x	0	1	2
Go: $u_1^c(x)$	1	0	0	
Stay: $u_2^c(x)$	0	$\frac{1}{4}$	$\frac{1}{2}$	

	x	0	1	2
Go: $u_1^m(x)$	0	0	1	
Stay: $u_2^m(x)$	1	$\frac{1}{2}$	0	

(a) r 's payoff table (b) c 's payoff table (c) m 's payoff table

Fig. 4. The three-player two-strategy anonymous game represented in the anonymous compact form.

Theorem 3.2. *There exists a three-player two-strategy anonymous game that has a unique Nash equilibrium where all the players must randomise with irrational probabilities.*

Proof. We use the game in [Example 3.2](#).

We refer to the action ‘‘Go’’ as strategy 1 and to ‘‘Stay’’ as strategy 2. It is easy to verify that the game admits no pure Nash equilibrium. We show that this game has a unique Nash equilibrium where players r, c, m must place an irrational amount of probability p_r, p_c, p_m onto strategy 1. Suppose, for the moment, that the game admits only fully mixed equilibria. Then, these can be found by solving the following system of equations.

$$\begin{cases} \frac{1}{2} \cdot (p_c \cdot (1 - p_m) + p_m \cdot (1 - p_c)) + p_c \cdot p_m = (1 - p_m) \cdot (1 - p_c) \\ (1 - p_r) \cdot (1 - p_m) = \frac{1}{4} \cdot (p_r \cdot (1 - p_m) + p_m \cdot (1 - p_r)) + \frac{1}{2} \cdot p_r \cdot p_m \\ p_r \cdot p_c = (1 - p_r) \cdot (1 - p_c) + \frac{1}{2} \cdot (p_r \cdot (1 - p_c) + p_c \cdot (1 - p_r)), \end{cases}$$

which reduces to

$$\begin{cases} \frac{3}{2} \cdot (p_c + p_m) - p_c \cdot p_m = 1 \\ \frac{5}{4} \cdot (p_r + p_m) - p_r \cdot p_m = 1 \\ \frac{1}{2} \cdot (p_r + p_c) + p_r \cdot p_c = 1, \end{cases}$$

whose unique solution in the interval $[0, 1]$ is

$$p_r = \frac{1}{12}(\sqrt{241} - 7) \approx 0.71, \quad p_c = \frac{1}{16}(\sqrt{241} - 7) \approx 0.53,$$

$$p_m = \frac{1}{36}(23 - \sqrt{241}) \approx 0.21.$$

Now we show that everybody must indeed randomise in order to be in equilibrium. Suppose we fix player r to play 1. Given this, it is easy to see that both c and m must play 2, making r unhappy and willing to move to strategy 2. If we fix r to play 2, then m plays 2 and c plays 1. However, r would be better off deviating to strategy 1. Similar arguments can prove that we cannot fix c to any of the two strategies nor m to play 1. The most interesting case is when we fix m to play 2. Given this, we must set $p_r = \frac{4}{5}$ and $p_c = \frac{2}{3}$ in order for r and c to be in equilibrium between each other. Player m 's expected payoff for playing 1 is $\frac{2}{3} \cdot \frac{4}{5} = \frac{8}{15}$, which is larger than what she gets for playing 2, i.e., $(\frac{1}{3} \cdot \frac{1}{5}) + \frac{1}{2} \cdot (\frac{4}{15} + \frac{2}{15}) = \frac{4}{15}$. Hence, m cannot play pure 2, and the game has a unique fully-mixed Nash equilibrium where all players must randomise with irrational probabilities.

4 Symmetric Games

The previous lower bound implies that there is no query-efficient algorithm to find an exact NE in general anonymous games. Therefore, it is reasonable to ask whether we can find a NE in the class of symmetric games with fewer queries. We show that this is indeed the case in the context of two-strategy symmetric games and k -strategy self-symmetric games. To do so, we exploit the fact that these two classes of games always admit pure Nash equilibria (PNE). We remark that due to every player sharing the same utility function, all-players queries make no sense; therefore, we conduct our studies in the single-player model.

Proposition 4.1. *To find a Nash equilibrium of any 2-strategy n -player symmetric game, it is enough to make $O(\log n)$ single-player queries.*

Algorithm 1: SymmetricPNE

Data: The number n of players.

Result: The number m of players that should play strategy 1 in a PNE.

begin

 | **return** SymmetricPNESearch($0, n - 1$);

end

Proof. Consider the binary-search-like [Algorithm 1](#), which calls [Algorithm 2](#) as a subroutine. We know that a PNE must exist, and we show that the algorithm correctly finds a PNE. The function *Query* returns the payoff that corresponds to the specified input. Termination is clear due to the first if-statement. It is also clear that when the conditions are met for returning an output, we have found a PNE. We now show that if a PNE is in the search space of the k -th round and not yet found, then there is a PNE in the search space of round $k + 1$.

Algorithm 2: SymmetricPNESearch

Data: The search space extrema α and β .

Result: The number m of players that should play strategy 1 in a PNE.

```
begin
   $m := \lfloor \frac{\alpha + \beta}{2} \rfloor$ ;
  if  $m = \alpha \vee m = \beta$  then
    | return  $m$ ;
  end
   $u_1(m - 1) := \text{Query}(1, m - 1)$ ;
   $u_2(m - 1) := \text{Query}(2, m - 1)$ ;
   $u_1(m) := \text{Query}(1, m)$ ;
   $u_2(m) := \text{Query}(2, m)$ ;
  if  $u_1(m - 1) \geq u_2(m - 1)$  and  $u_1(m) \leq u_2(m)$  then
    | return  $m$ ;
  end
  if  $u_1(m - 1) < u_2(m - 1)$  then
    |  $\beta := m$ ;
  else
    |  $\alpha := m$ ;
  end
  return SymmetricPNESearch( $\alpha, \beta$ );
end
```

The base case is trivial since the search space is $\{0, \dots, n - 1\}$, and a PNE is guaranteed to exist. Hence, suppose that after k recursive calls a PNE is still in the search space but not found yet. We need to show that there is still a PNE in the search space of step $k + 1$. Let $\{\alpha_k, \dots, \beta_k\}$ be the search space at step k . Let $m_k := \lfloor \frac{\alpha_k + \beta_k}{2} \rfloor$ as in the algorithm. Since m_k does not lead to an equilibrium, the algorithm makes a case distinction. Note that, by construction, $u_1(\alpha_k) \geq u_2(\alpha_k)$ and $u_1(\beta_k - 1) < u_2(\beta_k - 1)$. In fact, in the case $u_1(m_k - 1) < u_2(m_k - 1)$, we have that the search space is $\{\alpha_k, \dots, m_k\}$. Due to the induction hypothesis, a PNE is located at an $x \in \{\alpha_k, \dots, \beta_k\}$. We, hence, only need to show that a PNE is located at an $x \leq m_k - 1$. A PNE must be there since otherwise it must always hold that $u_1(x) < u_2(x)$ for all $x \in \{\alpha_k, \dots, m_k\}$, contradicting the fact that, by construction, $u_1(\alpha_k) \geq u_2(\alpha_k)$. The other case is symmetric. If $u_1(m_k) \geq u_2(m_k)$, then the resulting search space is $\{m_k, \dots, \beta_k\}$. No PNE would require having $u_1(x) \geq u_2(x)$ for all $x \in \{m_k, \dots, \beta_k\}$. We know, however, that $u_1(\beta_k - 1) < u_2(\beta_k - 1)$, which is a contradiction.

We now analyse the algorithm in terms of the number of queries $Q(n)$ required to find a PNE. It is clear that we have the recurrence relation $Q(n) = Q(n/2) + 4$, which gives the solution of $\Theta(\log n)$. In fact, with a simple inductive argument, it is easy to check that $Q(n) = 4 \log_2 n + 1$. \square

The following lower bound is given on the restricted class of self-symmetric games and makes the above algorithm asymptotically optimal. Whenever we deal with self-symmetric games, we use $u : \Pi_n^k \rightarrow [0, 1]$ in the k -strategy case and $u : \{0, \dots, n\} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ in the two-strategy case to denote the utility function of any player i due to being independence from i .

Proposition 4.2. *Any comparison-based algorithm needs to make $\Omega(\log n)$ single-player queries to find a PNE in a two-strategy n -player self-symmetric game in the worst case.*

Proof. We use the comparison-tree model, which is more powerful than the single-player model. An algorithm \mathcal{A} can use a function $Compare(x, y)$, which returns the relation $R \in \{<, =, >\}$ occurring between $u(x)$ and $u(y)$. A lower bound on the number of comparisons implies the same lower bound on the number of queries. We show that is always possible to specify an adversary that results in the claimed requirement for the number of comparisons used to find a PNE.

It is clear that \mathcal{A} needs to compare only pairs of adjacent numbers. Hence, let $x \in \{0, \dots, n-1\}$ be chosen such that x and $x+1$ are compared in the first iteration. We construct the payoff function u as follows. If $x < n/2$, then $u(x) < u(x+1)$ and $u(y) < u(y+1)$ for all $y \in \{0, \dots, x-1\}$. If, instead, $x \geq n/2$, then $u(x) > u(x+1)$ and $u(y) > u(y+1)$ for all $y \in \{x+1, \dots, n-1\}$. Clearly, such a construction ensures a PNE being among at least $\frac{n+1}{2} - 1$ not compared elements in either case.

The same construction can be applied at any step k of the algorithm. Let $V_k := \{\alpha_k, \dots, \beta_k\}$ be the set of not compared elements at the beginning of step $k+1$ of \mathcal{A} , for some $\alpha_k, \beta_k \in \{0, \dots, n-1\}$ and $\alpha_k \leq \beta_k$. Let $x \in V_k$ be the chosen element at step $k+1$. We make the same case distinction as above, with n being now equal to $\frac{\alpha_k + \beta_k}{2}$. Hence, $|V_{k+1}| \geq \frac{|V_k|}{2} - 1$. So, we can always specify a PNE to be not found in the k -th iteration unless $|V_k|$ is constant. Initially, $|V_0| = n+1$. A simple inductive argument shows that, for any k , $|V_k| \geq \frac{n - (2^{k+1} - 3)}{2^k}$.

We now bound the number of comparisons k required by any comparison-based algorithm. This means finding k such that $|V_k| = c$ for some constant c . We can do so by applying the previous bound and solving the following equation.

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{n - (2^{k+1} - 3)}{2^k} = c &\iff n + 3 = 2^k \cdot (c + 2) \\ &\iff \frac{n + 3}{c + 2} = 2^k \\ &\iff k = \log_2(n + 3) - \log_2(c + 2) = \Omega(\log n). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we need at least $\Omega(\log n)$ comparisons to find a PNE in two-strategy self-symmetric games. \square

Remark 4.1. Any comparison-based algorithm that finds a social-welfare-maximising NE in a two-strategy self-symmetric game needs to make $\Omega(n)$ payoff queries in the worst case.

Proof. It is easy to see that finding the NE that maximises the social surplus is equivalent to finding the maximum of an array of $n+1$ elements. It is known that any algorithm possesses a worst-case instance in which it must make a linear number of comparisons. \square

It is easy to verify that every k -strategy self-symmetric game possesses a pure Nash equilibrium since it corresponds to a local maximum of the function u , and this is guaranteed to exist. Now we sketch that the payoff query complexity of finding a PNE in k -strategy self-symmetric games is $\Theta(n^{k-2})$.

Proposition 4.3. *Any comparison-based algorithm that find a PNE in an n -player k -strategy self-symmetric game, for constant $k > 2$, needs to make $\Omega(n^{k-2})$ single-player queries in the worst case.*

Proof (Proof sketch).




Fig. 5. The simplex when $k = 3$. The yellow area shows the embedded grid. The not relevant points for the local maxima computation are in red.

We can express the payoff function u as taking as input the partitions of players into the first $k - 1$ strategies because the last partition, relating to strategy k , has size $n - \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} x_j$. Hence, let $x = (x_1, \dots, x_{k-1})$ be a configuration of players into the first $k - 1$ strategies, where x_j indicates the number of players playing strategy j . We need to find a point x such that nobody has an incentive to deviate from it.

Given x , a player i could deviate from strategy $j \in [k - 1]$ to strategy $\ell \in [k - 1]$; thus, we need to compare $u(x)$ and $u(x - e_j + e_\ell)$, where e_j denotes the unit vector at component j . Another possibility is that a player i could deviate from strategy $j \in [k - 1]$ to strategy k , which requires us to check for a deviation towards $u(x - e_j)$. Finally, a player i might prefer playing strategy $\ell \in [k - 1]$ instead of k ; therefore, we also have to consider $u(x + e_\ell)$.

Let $\Gamma_\Delta(x)$ be the set of all the neighbour points of x as explained above, so that x induces a PNE if and only if $u(x) \geq u(y)$ for all $y \in \Gamma_\Delta(x)$. The last two mentioned possible deviations can be viewed as checking whether a point x in a $(k - 1)$ -dimensional grid is a local maximum with respect to its neighbourhood, defined as $\Gamma_G(x) := \{(y_1, \dots, y_{k-1}) : \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} |x_j - y_j| = 1\}$. It is clear that every point x being a local maximum w.r.t. $\Gamma_\Delta(x)$ is also a local maximum w.r.t. $\Gamma_G(x)$. [Althöfer and Klaus-Uwe, 1993] proved a lower bound of $n^{k-1}/(2n(k - 1) + 1)$, which is $\Omega(n^{k-2})$ if k is a constant, on the latter problem.

Unfortunately, we do not directly have a $(k - 1)$ -dimensional grid, but a simplex Δ . We claim that we can find a $(k - 1)$ -dimensional grid embedded in Δ whose side length is $\frac{n}{k-1}$,

which, for constant k , has still a linear size. This is indeed the case since all the grid vertices

$$\left\{ \left(0, \dots, 0 \right), \left(\frac{n}{k-1}, 0, \dots, 0 \right), \left(0, \frac{n}{k-1}, 0, \dots, 0 \right), \dots, \left(\frac{n}{k-1}, \dots, \frac{n}{k-1} \right) \right\}$$

satisfy the property of having their components summing up to at most n , which ensures a point belonging to Δ . [Figure 5](#) shows how the grid looks like when $k = 3$. The idea is to pick a $(k - 1)$ -dimensional grid instance of side length $\frac{n}{k-1}$ and construct a simplex Δ whose embedded $(k - 1)$ -dimensional grid G has the same values. If we ensure that no local maxima appears among the points in $\Delta \setminus G$, then any algorithm must return a point lying in G . For constant k , [Althöfer and Klaus-Uwe \[1993\]](#)'s lower bound prevents any algorithm being asymptotically better.

We now sketch a way to make sure that no local maximum lies outside G . For simplicity, assume, w.l.o.g., that the function u 's codomain is \mathbb{Z} . Let G be given, and let u be defined on G such that it attains [Althöfer and Klaus-Uwe \[1993\]](#)'s lower bound. Let $m := \min_{x \in G} u(x)$ be the minimum value returned by the function u . Let \mathcal{F} be the set of all faces of G . We design a payoff function u such that all points in $\Delta \setminus G$ adjacent to the points in $F \in \mathcal{F}$ have value $m - 1$, i.e., for all $F \in \mathcal{F}$, for all $y \in F$, we set $u(x) := m - 1$ for all $x \in \Delta \setminus G$ such that $x \in \Gamma_{\Delta}(y)$. Let all these points x such that $u(x) = u(m) - 1$ be identified by the set H . We set $u(y) := u(x) - 1$ for all $y \in \Delta \setminus G \setminus H$ such that $y \in \Gamma_{\Delta}(x)$ for $x \in H$. With the first definition we ensured that every point in the grid is at least as large as its outside neighbours. With the second one, we continued in a monotonically decreasing way, so that no new local maximum is introduced. This is done until we reach the vertices, which, apart from $(0, \dots, 0)$, are the minima of u . \square

Proposition 4.4. *A PNE in an n -player k -strategy self-symmetric game, for constant $k > 2$, can be found by querying at most $O(n^{k-2})$ payoffs.*

Proof (Proof sketch). Like in the previous proof, we assume the payoff function taking as input a $(k - 1)$ -dimensional vector x whose j -th component indicates how many players play strategy j . The number of players playing strategy k is equal to $n - \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} x_j$. In order to find a pure Nash equilibrium, we have to ensure the three aforementioned conditions, i.e., a point x such that $u(x) \geq u(y)$ for all $y \in \Gamma_{\Delta}(x)$, where $\Gamma_{\Delta}(x)$ is again used to denote the neighbourhood of x in Δ .

We apply a *divide-and-conquer* approach where, at every step t , we reduce the size of the search domain at step $t - 1$ at least by a constant factor. The key idea is to find a global maximum m of a $(k - 2)$ -dimensional simplex that cuts Δ into two parts Δ_1, Δ_2 , then check whether $u(m) \geq u(x)$ for all $x \in \Gamma_{\Delta}(m)$. If this is the case, then m is a local maximum, otherwise there exists at least an $x \in \Gamma_{\Delta}(x)$ such that $u(x) > u(m)$. Such an x must be in one of the two simplices Δ_1, Δ_2 such that $\Delta_1 \cup \Delta_2 = \Delta$.

Let $x \in \Delta_1$ w.l.o.g.. We claim that in order to find a local maximum of Δ it is enough to search in Δ_1 . To see this, we can view Δ_1 as a graph where for every $y \in \Delta_1$ there is an outgoing edge (y, z) if and only if $u(y) < u(z)$, for $z \in \Gamma_{\Delta}(y)$. If x has no outgoing edges, then it is a local maximum; otherwise, since $u(x) > u(m)$, x must have an edge towards the internal of Δ_1 . There must be an acyclic path going from x towards the internal of Δ_1 , which terminates in a local maximum, since otherwise we would have a cyclic preference relation.

The algorithm recursively finds the global maximum of a lower dimensional simplex that cuts Δ approximately into two halves. In order to get the claimed upper bound, we need that the global maximum search space goes down as a geometric series so that the asymptotic complexity is essentially given by the first global maximum computation. If Δ has k vertices, then every cutting simplex Δ^- possesses $k - 1$ vertices. Let Δ_j denote the simplex we have at the j -th step of the algorithm. At every step j , we find the median point m of the longest side of Δ_j , which connects two vertices v, w of Δ_j . Once we have done so, we define the cutting simplex Δ_j^- by picking m and all the vertices other than v, w . In Figure 6 we illustrate four possible iterations of the algorithm when $k = 4$, where we coloured the simplexes we queried at each step. This cutting strategy ensures that Δ_j^- 's volume drops down at least by a constant factor; thus, the number $Q(n)$ of queries we make is $O(n^{k-2})$.




Fig. 6. The simplex when $k = 4$. The coloured areas denote an hypothetical set of points we query at each step.

□

5 Lipschitz Games

A Lipschitz anonymous game is characterised by the property that every player's utility function is λ -Lipschitz continuous, for some constant λ .

Definition 5.1. *An anonymous game is λ -Lipschitz if there exists a real number $\lambda > 0$ such that $|u_j^i(x) - u_j^i(y)| \leq \lambda \|x - y\|_1$ for all $i \in [n], j \in [k]$, and $x, y \in \Pi_{n-1}^k$.*

Daskalakis and Papadimitriou [2014] prove that approximate pure Nash equilibria always exist in these types of games. The approximation guarantee is $O(\lambda k)$, where k denotes the number of actions per player.

Theorem 5.1. *For any $\delta \in \mathbb{N}$ and constant $k \geq 2$, we can find an ϵ -approximate Nash equilibrium, with $\epsilon = O(\lambda(k + \delta))$, in any k -strategy λ -Lipschitz anonymous game with at most $O(\sqrt{k} \cdot (\frac{n}{\delta})^{k-1})$ all-players payoff queries.*

Proof. We query all $x \in \Pi_{n-1}^k$ such that the first $k-1$ components are multiples of δ and $x_k \geq 0$. We, hence, let the last component be free and equal to $n-1 - \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} x_j$. It follows that $\sum_{j=1}^{k-1} x_j = n-1 - x_k$. In order for x_j to be a multiple of δ , there must exist an $\alpha_j \in \mathbb{N}_0$ such that $x_j = \alpha_j \delta$. Hence, we have

$$\sum_{j \in [k-1]} \alpha_j \delta = n-1 - x_k \iff \delta \sum_{j \in [k-1]} \alpha_j = n-1 - x_k.$$

All α_j 's being non-negative integers implies that also $\frac{n-1-x_k}{\delta}$ is a non-negative integer. This is indeed the case if and only if $n-1 - x_k$ is a multiple of δ , i.e., $n-1 - x_k = \beta \delta$ for some $\beta \in \mathbb{N}_0$.

$$\beta = \frac{n-1-x_k}{\delta}, \quad 0 \leq x_k \leq n-1 \iff 0 \leq \beta \leq \left\lfloor \frac{n-1}{\delta} \right\rfloor.$$

We need to count the number of ways to place β balls into $k-1$ bins for all $\beta = 0, \dots, \lfloor \frac{n-1}{\delta} \rfloor$. Thus, we have the following upper bound on the number of queried points in Π_{n-1}^k .

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\beta=0}^{\lfloor \frac{n-1}{\delta} \rfloor} \binom{\beta + (k-1) - 1}{(k-1) - 1} &= \sum_{\beta=0}^{\lfloor \frac{n-1}{\delta} \rfloor} \frac{(\beta + k - 2) \cdot \dots \cdot (\beta + 1)}{(k-2)!} \\ &\approx \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi(k-2)}((k-2)/e)^{k-2}} \sum_{\beta=0}^{\lfloor \frac{n-1}{\delta} \rfloor} \prod_{\gamma=1}^{k-2} (\beta + \gamma) \\ &\leq O\left(\frac{1}{k^{k-3/2}}\right) \sum_{\beta=0}^{\lfloor \frac{n-1}{\delta} \rfloor} (\beta + k - 2)^{k-2} \\ &\leq O\left(\frac{1}{k^{k-3/2}}\right) \left\lfloor \frac{n-1}{\delta} \right\rfloor \left(\left\lfloor \frac{n-1}{\delta} \right\rfloor + k - 2 \right)^{k-2} \\ &= O\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{k}} \left(\frac{n}{\delta}\right)^{k-1}\right). \end{aligned}$$

The L_1 distance between any two adjacent queried configuration vectors x and y is clearly equal to 2δ . This implies that for each $x \in \Pi_{n-1}^k$ there exists a queried configuration vector y such that $\|x - y\|_1 \leq \delta$. Therefore, if we derive a function f from the sampled points by interpolation, the approximation error is at most $\lambda\delta$. We know that there exists an ϵ -approximate pure Nash equilibrium with $\epsilon = O(\lambda k)$ if we have full knowledge of the payoff

function u . Let E denote the maximum approximation error between f and u , i.e., for all $x \in \Pi_{n-1}^k$, $i \in [n]$, $j \in [k]$, $|u_j^i(x) - f_j^i(x)| \leq E$. Let j be an ϵ -approximate best response w.r.t. f against configuration vector x . Then,

$$f_j^i(x) \geq f_\ell^i(x) - \epsilon, \quad \forall \ell \in [k].$$

We show that if j is an ϵ -approximate best response w.r.t. f against configuration vector x , then it is a $(2E + \epsilon)$ -approximate best response w.r.t. u . Let ℓ^* be an ϵ -approximate best response w.r.t. u against x . Then,

$$\begin{aligned} u_{\ell^*}^i(x) - u_j^i(x) - \epsilon &\leq u_{\ell^*}^i(x) - u_j^i(x) - \epsilon - (f_{\ell^*}^i(x) - f_j^i(x) - \epsilon) \\ &= u_{\ell^*}^i(x) - f_{\ell^*}^i(x) - (u_j^i(x) - f_j^i(x)) \\ &\leq |u_{\ell^*}^i(x) - f_{\ell^*}^i(x)| + |u_j^i(x) - f_j^i(x)| \\ &\leq 2E. \end{aligned}$$

In our case $E = \lambda\delta$; thus, if we combine [Daskalakis and Papadimitriou \[2014\]](#)'s result with ours, we obtain an ϵ -approximate pure Nash equilibrium, with $\epsilon = O(\lambda(\delta+k))$ using $k \cdot O(\frac{1}{\sqrt{k}}(\frac{n}{\delta})^{k-1})$ all-players payoff queries since we need to repeat the sampling for each strategy. We find such an ϵ -equilibrium with the flow-network approach mentioned in [\[Daskalakis and Papadimitriou, 2014\]](#), which clearly runs in time polynomial in n and $1/\delta$. \square

We obtain a more query-efficient algorithm in the case of two-strategy Lipschitz games where we utilise a binary-search approach. The algorithm works also in the setting in which queries return answers that are not precise but only ϵ -accurate. We will use this algorithm in a later section to prove our main result on general anonymous games.

Definition 5.2. *Let $\epsilon > 0$, and let $j \in [k]$, $x \in \Pi_{n-1}^k$ be the input of an all-players query. An ϵ -accurate all-players query returns a tuple of payoffs $(f_j^1(x), \dots, f_j^n(x))$ such that for all $i \in [n]$, $|u_j^i(x) - f_j^i(x)| \leq \epsilon$, i.e., they are within an additive ϵ of correct from the real tuple $(u_j^1(x), \dots, u_j^n(x))$.*

Theorem 5.2. *Let G be an n -player two-strategy λ -Lipschitz anonymous game. We can find a pure-strategy $O(\lambda + \epsilon)$ -WSNE with $O(\log n)$ ϵ -accurate all-players payoff queries.*

Remark 5.1. It follows that $O(n \log n)$ individual payoffs are queried, out of the $2n^2$ payoff values in the game.

Proof. We provide a straightforward existence proof, together with a query-efficient algorithm, of a pure-strategy $O(\lambda + \epsilon)$ -WSNE in the context of two-strategy games. We remark that existence is known already by [Daskalakis and Papadimitriou \[2014\]](#) in the context of k -strategy games. Their proof reduces the problem to finding a Brouwer fixed point. Due to dealing with two strategies only, we can use a bisection algorithm to find this fixed point, leading to the claimed $O(\log n)$ queries.

For all $i \in [n]$, $j \in [2]$, let f_j^i be the ϵ -accurate function derived by querying G . It is easy to see that f_j^i is $(\lambda + 2\epsilon)$ -Lipschitz continuous. Let $\phi : \{0, \dots, n-1\} \rightarrow \{0, \dots, n-1\}$ be a

function that, given a number $x \in \{0, \dots, n-1\}$ of players playing strategy 1, returns how many, among the first $n-1$ players, have strategy 1 as their best response against x . Note that we do not consider player n 's behaviour at the moment, and that a best response w.r.t. f_j^i is a 2ϵ -best response w.r.t. u_j^i , the real utility function.

Let $\hat{\phi} : [0, n-1] \rightarrow [0, n-1]$ be defined as follows. If $x \in \{0, \dots, n-1\}$, then $\hat{\phi}(x) := \phi(x)$; else, $x = \alpha \lfloor x \rfloor + (1-\alpha) \lceil x \rceil$ is the convex combination of two adjacent integers, so we define $\hat{\phi}(x) := \alpha \phi(\lfloor x \rfloor) + (1-\alpha) \phi(\lceil x \rceil)$, with $\alpha \in (0, 1)$. Due to $\hat{\phi}$ being continuous over the compact and convex $[0, n-1]$, according to Brouwer's fixed point theorem, there must exist a point x^* such that $\hat{\phi}(x^*) = x^*$. We show that we can find x^* with $O(\log n)$ queries to $\hat{\phi}$. First of all, we observe that any query to $\hat{\phi}$ can be simulated by 4 all-players queries. This is because, by definition of $\hat{\phi}$, in order to determine $\hat{\phi}(x)$, we need to know at most two values of ϕ : $\phi(\lfloor x \rfloor)$ and $\phi(\lceil x \rceil)$; furthermore, $\phi(y)$ can be obtained by querying $f_1^i(y)$ and $f_2^i(y)$ since we simply need to determine i 's best response at y for all $i \in [n-1]$. Let $g(x) := \hat{\phi}(x) - x$, for all $x \in [0, n-1]$. Looking for x^* is equivalent to looking for a root of g .

We use the bisection method to find such a root. The algorithm starts by evaluating the function at the interval's extrema, 0 and $n-1$. If we do not find a root in either of these two, it must be the case that $g(0) > 0$ and $g(n-1) < 0$. By the intermediate value theorem, g must have a root in $[0, n-1]$. Now we evaluate g at the middle point $\frac{n-1}{2}$. Suppose this is not a root, otherwise we are done. If $g(\frac{n-1}{2}) > 0$, there must exist a root in $[\frac{n-1}{2}, n-1]$. If $g(\frac{n-1}{2}) < 0$, on the other hand, there exists a root in $[0, \frac{n-1}{2}]$. The algorithm continues in this way by always halving the search space. Let N be the number of iterations made by the algorithm. Clearly, the output y is less than $\frac{n}{2^N}$ far from the fixed point x^* . Choosing $N = 2 \log n$, we have that $|y - x^*| < \frac{1}{n}$.

Now we argue that we can deduce x^* 's exact value if we are given such a y . First, observe that by assumption

$$\alpha \lfloor x^* \rfloor + (1-\alpha) \lceil x^* \rceil = x^* = \hat{\phi}(x^*) = \alpha \phi(\lfloor x^* \rfloor) + (1-\alpha) \phi(\lceil x^* \rceil).$$

This equation is satisfied if and only if $\lfloor x^* \rfloor = \phi(\lfloor x^* \rfloor)$ and $\lceil x^* \rceil = \phi(\lceil x^* \rceil)$, i.e., either $x^* \in \mathbb{N}$, or both $\lfloor x^* \rfloor$ and $\lceil x^* \rceil$ are fixed points and, consequently, any convex combination of them is a fixed point, too. Due to this fact and that $|y - x^*| < \frac{1}{n}$, rounding y to the closest integer guarantees having found an integer fixed point x^* with $O(\log n)$ all-players queries.

Now we have that the first $n-1$ players are all best-responding (2ϵ -best-responding w.r.t. u_j^i) to x^* ; however, this is an illegal profile since some of these players are seeing player n playing 1, and the others are seeing her playing 2. We simply let player n best-respond to x^* . After this change, it is easily verified that a fraction of the other players experiences a regret that is at most $2\lambda + 4\epsilon$ since $|f_j^i(x-1) - f_j^i(x)| \leq \lambda + 2\epsilon$, for all $x \in [n-1]$, $i \in [n]$, $j \in [2]$. \square

6 Self-anonymous Games

We show that in self-anonymous games, if every player chooses her action totally at random, then this is a fairly good approximate NE, especially for large values of n . We start with the two-strategy case. Subsequently, we induct on the constant number k of strategies to prove that the asymptotic approximation guarantee is preserved in games with k actions per player.

Theorem 6.1. *In any two-strategy n -player self-anonymous game, the mixed-strategy profile $s = (\frac{1}{2}, \dots, \frac{1}{2})$ is an $O(1/\sqrt{n})$ -WSNE.*

Proof. We will show that for any player $i \in [n]$, we have

$$\mathbb{E}[u_1^i(X_{-i})] - \mathbb{E}[u_2^i(X_{-i})] \leq \frac{e}{\pi} \cdot \frac{1}{\sqrt{n-1}}, \text{ and} \quad (1)$$

$$\mathbb{E}[u_2^i(X_{-i})] - \mathbb{E}[u_1^i(X_{-i})] \leq \frac{e}{\pi} \cdot \frac{1}{\sqrt{n-1}}. \quad (2)$$

We start showing (1), i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{x=0}^{n-1} (u_1^i(x) - u_2^i(x)) \cdot \Pr[X_{-i} = x] \\ &= \sum_{x=0}^{n-2} (u_2^i(x+1) - u_2^i(x)) \cdot \Pr[X_{-i} = x] + (u_1^i(n-1) - u_2^i(n-1)) \cdot \Pr[X_{-i} = n-1] \\ &= \sum_{x=0}^{n-2} (u_2^i(x+1) - u_2^i(x)) \cdot \binom{n-1}{x} \cdot \frac{1}{2^{n-1}} + (u_1^i(n-1) - u_2^i(n-1)) \cdot \frac{1}{2^{n-1}} \\ &= \frac{1}{2^{n-1}} \left(\sum_{x=1}^{n-1} u_2^i(x) \cdot \left(\binom{n-1}{x-1} - \binom{n-1}{x} \right) + (u_1^i(n-1) - u_2^i(0)) \right), \end{aligned}$$

where in the second step we applied the self-anonymity property, in the third step we used the definition of the p.m.f. of the binomial distribution, and in the fourth one we simply rearranged terms. Since the utility function outputs values in $[0, 1]$, then $u_1^i(n-1) - u_2^i(0) \leq 1$. Moreover, for all $x = 1, \dots, \frac{n-1}{2}$, we have $\binom{n-1}{x-1} - \binom{n-1}{x} < 0$, and strictly positive for the remaining values. Thus, in the worst case we have

$$u_2^i(x) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } x \in \{1, \dots, \frac{n-1}{2}\} \\ 1 & \text{if } x \in \{\frac{n-1}{2} + 1, \dots, n-1\}, \end{cases}$$

reducing the above expression to be at most

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{2^{n-1}} \left(\sum_{x=\frac{n-1}{2}+1}^{n-1} \left(\binom{n-1}{x-1} - \binom{n-1}{x} \right) + 1 \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{2^{n-1}} \left(\sum_{x=\frac{n-1}{2}+1}^{n-1} \binom{n-1}{x-1} - \sum_{x=\frac{n-1}{2}+1}^{n-2} \binom{n-1}{x} \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{2^{n-1}} \left(\sum_{x=\frac{n-1}{2}}^{n-2} \binom{n-1}{x} - \sum_{x=\frac{n-1}{2}+1}^{n-2} \binom{n-1}{x} \right) = \frac{1}{2^{n-1}} \binom{n-1}{\frac{n-1}{2}} = \frac{1}{2^{n-1}} \cdot \frac{(n-1)!}{((\frac{n-1}{2})!)^2}. \end{aligned}$$

By Stirling's bounds, we know that $\sqrt{2\pi} \cdot n^{n+1/2} \cdot e^{-n} \leq n! \leq e \cdot n^{n+1/2} \cdot e^{-n}$. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2^{n-1}} \cdot \frac{(n-1)!}{\left(\left(\frac{n-1}{2}\right)!\right)^2} &\leq \frac{1}{2^{n-1}} \cdot \frac{e \cdot (n-1)^{n-1+\frac{1}{2}} \cdot e^{-(n-1)}}{\left(\sqrt{2\pi} \cdot \left(\frac{n-1}{2}\right)^{\frac{n-1+1}{2}} \cdot e^{-\left(\frac{n-1}{2}\right)}\right)^2} \\ &= \frac{1}{2^{n-1}} \cdot \frac{e \cdot (n-1)^{n-\frac{1}{2}} \cdot e^{-(n-1)}}{2\pi \cdot \left(\frac{n-1}{2}\right)^n \cdot e^{-(n-1)}} = \frac{e}{\pi} \cdot \frac{1}{\sqrt{n-1}}. \end{aligned}$$

We have, therefore, shown that (1) holds. In a similar way, we can show that (2) also holds.

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{x=0}^{n-1} (u_2^i(x) - u_1^i(x)) \cdot \Pr[X_{-i} = x] \\ &= \frac{1}{2^{n-1}} \left(\sum_{x=0}^{n-1} (u_2^i(x) - u_2^i(x+1)) \cdot \binom{n-1}{x} + (u_2^i(n-1) - u_1^i(n-1)) \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{2^{n-1}} \left(\sum_{x=1}^{n-1} u_2^i(x) \cdot \left(\binom{n-1}{x} - \binom{n-1}{x-1} \right) + u_2^i(0) - u_1^i(0) \right) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2^{n-1}} \left(\sum_{x=1}^{\frac{n-1}{2}} \binom{n-1}{x} - \binom{n-1}{x-1} + 1 \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{2^{n-1}} \left(\sum_{x=1}^{\frac{n-1}{2}} \binom{n-1}{x} - \sum_{x=1}^{\frac{n-1}{2}-1} \binom{n-1}{x} \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{2^{n-1}} \binom{n-1}{\frac{n-1}{2}} \leq \frac{e}{\pi} \cdot \frac{1}{\sqrt{n-1}}. \end{aligned}$$

□

Theorem 6.2. *For constant k , in any k -strategy n -player self-anonymous game letting every player randomise uniformly is a $O(1/\sqrt{n})$ -WSNE.*

Proof. We make an induction on the constant number k of strategies where the base case $k = 2$ follows by Theorem 6.1. Suppose that for constant $k - 1$ it holds that in any $(k - 1)$ -strategy n -player self-anonymous game, every player $i \in [n]$ mixing uniformly is a $O(1/\sqrt{n})$ -WSNE. We show that this holds also for constant k . Let G_k be a k -strategy self-anonymous game. Moreover, let $X_i^{(\ell)}$ be a random variable indicating whether player i plays strategy ℓ . As a result, $X_{-i}^{(k)} := \sum_{j \neq i} X_j^{(k)}$ denotes the number of players other than i playing strategy k in G_k . We observe that $\mathbb{E}[X_{-i}^{(k)}] = \frac{n-1}{k}$, so by Chernoff bounds, we have that

$$\Pr \left[X_{-i}^{(k)} \geq \frac{2}{k} (n-1) \right] \leq e^{-\frac{n-1}{3k^2}},$$

thus, exponentially small in n for constant k . Figure 7 illustrates the ignored area in the case $k = 3$. The difference in player i 's utility between strategies 1 and 2 is

$$\left| \sum_{x_k=0}^n \sum_{x_{k-1}=0}^{n-x_k} \cdots \sum_{x_2=0}^{n-\sum_{\ell=3}^k x_\ell} (u_1^i(x_2, \dots, x_k) - u_2^i(x_2, \dots, x_k)) \cdot \Pr[X_{-i}^{(2)} = x_2, \dots, X_{-i}^{(k)} = x_k] \right|,$$

where the utility function u_j^i takes as input the number x_m of players playing strategy m , for all $m = 2, \dots, k$. We omit x_1 since it is simply $n - \sum_{m=2}^k x_m$. If we condition on a fixed number of players playing some strategy, say k , we have

$$\left| \sum_{x_k=0}^n \Pr[X_{-i}^{(k)} = x_k] \sum_{x_{k-1}=0}^{n-x_k} \cdots \sum_{x_2=0}^{n-\sum_{\ell=3}^k x_\ell} (u_1^i(x_2, \dots, x_k) - u_2^i(x_2, \dots, x_k)) \cdot \Pr[X_{-i}^{(2)} = x_2, \dots, X_{-i}^{(k-1)} = x_{k-1} | X_{-i}^{(k)} = x_k] \right|.$$

We observe that, if we do not consider the sum over x_k , we are basically dealing with an $(n - x_k)$ -player $(k - 1)$ -strategy game G_{k-1} where all $(n - x_k)$ players are still randomising uniformly among the $k - 1$ strategies. This is true because we could think of fixing the identities of the x_k players playing strategy k to be $\{n - x_k + 1, \dots, n\}$, and G_{k-1} is anonymous, i.e., invariant under permutations of the players. By induction hypothesis, we can bound the difference in payoff in G_{k-1} by $O(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n-x_k}})$. We can, therefore, write

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \sum_{x_k=0}^{n-1} \Pr[X_{-i}^{(k)} = x_k] \cdot O\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n-x_k}}\right) \right| \\ & \leq \left| \sum_{x_k=0}^{\frac{2}{k}(n-1)} \Pr[X_{-i}^{(k)} = x_k] \cdot O\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n-2/k}}\right) + \sum_{x_k=\frac{2}{k}(n-1)+1}^{n-1} e^{-\frac{n-1}{3k^2}} \cdot 1 \right| \\ & \leq O\left(\sqrt{\frac{k}{kn-2}}\right) + \frac{k-2}{k} n \cdot e^{-\frac{n-1}{3k^2}} = O\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, as long as k is a constant, we have the above claimed upper bound. We remark that in the case in which k is not a constant, this proof does not work due to hiding a constant factor of $k!$ in the big-oh notation. The same argument can be used to bound any other pair of strategies $\{j, \ell\}$, with $j, \ell \in \{1, \dots, k\}$. \square

Corollary 6.1. *For any constant k , no payoff queries are needed to find a $O(1/\sqrt{n})$ -approximate equilibrium in k -strategy n -player self-anonymous games.*

7 Two-strategy Anonymous Games

We discuss our two main results about the query complexity of two-strategy anonymous games. We begin with a logarithmic lower bound on the number of all-players queries needed




Fig. 7. The simplex Π_{n-1}^3 . Every point is a way to partition $n - 1$ players into the 3 strategies. The red zone corresponds to the points we cut off due to exponentially low probability.

to find any ϵ -WSCE. Since we are lower-bounding the number of queries needed to find an approximate correlated equilibrium, we shall use $u^i : \{1, 2\}^n \rightarrow [0, 1]$ to denote the utility function as in normal-form games. Then, we propose an algorithm that finds an ϵ -NE with less than \sqrt{n}/ϵ^2 all-players queries. We outline the approach first in both cases.

7.1 Lower Bound

The main technique we use is the minimax principle [Yao, 1977]. It says that the number of steps required by a randomised algorithm to solve a worst-case instance is no less than the number needed by the best deterministic algorithm that solves a worst-case probability distribution over instances. Thus, it is enough to specify an adversarial distribution over instances and show that no deterministic algorithm can perform well on such a distribution.

The general approach to derive the logarithmic lower bound is the following. We specify a distribution over certain games that have unique pure Nash equilibria. The n players that participate in any of these games are partitioned into $\log(n)$ groups, which are numbered from 1 to $\log(n)$. Group i 's equilibrium strategy depends on what all the previous groups $\{1, \dots, i - 1\}$ play at equilibrium. Thus, finding out what the last group should play leads to a lower bound of $\log(n)$ all-players queries.

Definition 7.1. *Suppose we need to discover an unknown bit-string $A := (A_1, \dots, A_d)$. A longest-common-prefix query takes a bit-string $B := B_1 \dots B_d$ as input and outputs the length of the longest common prefix between A and B , i.e., $\text{lcp}(A, B) := \max_{j \in [d]} \{A_i = B_i \text{ for all } i = 0, \dots, j\}$.*

Lemma 7.1. *Let $A := A_1 \dots A_d$ be an unknown bit-string generated uniformly at random. Then, the expected number of queries needed by any lcp-query algorithm used to discover A is $\Omega(d)$.*

Proof. Let A be generated uniformly at random. We show by induction on q that the expected length of the longest common prefix between A and the q -th queried bit-string is at most q . This means that any deterministic algorithm \mathcal{A} that makes q queries outputs a bit-string B such that $\mathbb{E}[\text{lcp}(A, B)] \leq q + 1$. Suppose \mathcal{A} makes no queries and outputs B . Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\text{lcp}(A, B)] &= \Pr[A_1 = B_1] + \cdots + \Pr[A_1 = B_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge A_d = B_d] \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^d \frac{1}{2^i} = 1 - 2^{-d} < 1. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, the base case holds. Now, let $B^{(q)}$ denote the q -th queried input. Moreover, let $A_1 \dots A_{q-1} = B_1^{(q)} \dots B_{q-1}^{(q)}$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\text{lcp}(A, B^{(q)})] &= q - 1 + \Pr[A_q = B_q^{(q)}] + \cdots + \Pr[A_q = B_q^{(q)} \wedge \cdots \wedge A_d = B_d^{(q)}] \\ &= q - 1 + \sum_{i=1}^{d-q} \frac{1}{2^i} = q - 2^{-d+q} < q. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, \mathcal{A} needs to make at least $d - 1$ queries in order to output a bit-string B such that $\mathbb{E}[\text{lcp}(A, B)] = d$. \square

Lemma 7.2. *Let \mathcal{G}_n be the class of n -player two-strategy anonymous games such that $u^i(1, a_{-i}) = 1 - u^i(2, a_{-i})$ and $u^i(1, a_{-i}) \in \{0, 1\}$, for all $i \in [n], a_{-i} \in \{1, 2\}^{n-1}$. Then, there exists a distribution \mathcal{D}_n over \mathcal{G}_n such that every G drawn from \mathcal{D}_n has a unique (pure-strategy) ϵ -WSCE.*

Proof. Let $n = 2^k$, and let the first $n - 1$ players be partitioned into sets N_1, \dots, N_k such that $|N_j| = n/2^j$ for all $j \in [k]$. Let $I_j := \{0, \dots, 2^j - 1\}$. Moreover, let $1 \succ_i^x 2$ denote player i preferring strategy 1 to strategy 2 given that x other players are playing strategy 1. We use $1 \succ_P^I 2$ to mean that $1 \succ_i^x 2$ for all $i \in P$ and all $x \in I$. Furthermore, all players $i \in N_j$ share the same preferences.

We define \mathcal{D}_n in the following manner. For all $j \in [k]$, let N_j flip $|I_j|$ fair coins, one associated to each subset $S_{j,\ell} := \{\frac{\ell}{2^{j-1}}n, \dots, \frac{\ell+1}{2^{j-1}}n - 1\}$, with $\ell \in I_j$, to decide whether they prefer strategy 1 to 2 within $S_{j,\ell}$. This means that N_j 's preferences over a subset $S_{j,\ell}$ do not depend on what N_j prefer at some different $S_{j,m} \subset \{0, \dots, n - 1\}$. Player n , who belongs to no set N_j , flips a coin for every $\ell \in I_{k+1}$. In particular, with probability $1/2$, N_1 always prefer strategy 1 to 2, and with probability $1/2$, 2 to 1. Every game G drawn from \mathcal{D}_n has the feature of having a unique pure Nash equilibrium, which is also the unique correlated equilibrium. Moreover, N_j 's unique best response at equilibrium depends on what N_1, \dots, N_{j-1} play.

The former fact is easily seen to be true by applying iterated elimination of dominated strategies. We illustrate how to do this in [Figure 8](#) where we use a black dotted line to mean that a player prefers playing action j to action ℓ . Dislike is shown by a grey dotted line. N_1 flips a coin, and it may happen that either strategy 1 or strategy 2 is the one they always prefer. N_2 flip two coins, each referring to half region, i.e., the first accounts for $\{0, \dots, \frac{n}{2} - 1\}$ and the second for $\{\frac{n}{2}, \dots, n - 1\}$. N_3 flips four coins, each accounting for a quarter of the region, and so on until N_k . Suppose these coin-flip outcomes for N_1, N_2, N_3 are as displayed in [Figure 8](#).

Once we know N_1 's best response, we can deduce what N_2 must play at equilibrium, i.e., strategy 2, since we know that at least $|N_1| = \frac{n}{2}$ players play strategy 1. Once, we fixed N_2 's strategy, we can deduce N_3 's one, i.e., strategy 2, since the number of other people playing strategy 1 is between $\frac{n}{2}$ and $\frac{3}{4}n - 1$. We repeat this procedure until player n best-responds to what all the previous players play.




Fig. 8. An example \mathcal{D}_n . A solid black line indicates that playing action j leads to a payoff of 1 as opposed to a grey dotted line that represents a payoff of 0.

This is easily seen to be the unique Nash equilibrium, which requires knowing what N_1, \dots, N_{j-1} must play in order to find out N_j 's best response. We show by induction on j that, in any ϵ -WSCE equilibrium, $\epsilon < 1$, no member of N_j would place probability $p > 0$ on her worst-response. Assume, w.l.o.g., that N_1 's best-response is strategy 1. Moreover, assume there exists a ϵ -WSCE ψ where some player $i \in N_1$ places some probability $p > 0$ on strategy 2. Then,

$$\sum_{a \in \{1,2\}^n: a_i=2} \psi(a) \cdot (u_1^i(a_{-i}) - u_2^i(a_{-i})) = p - 0 > p\epsilon,$$

which is a contradiction. Now suppose no player in N_1, \dots, N_{j-1} deviates from her best-response. Similarly to the base case, assume, for the sake of contradiction, that there exists an ϵ -WSCE ψ where some $i \in N_j$ places $p > 0$ on her worst-response, which is, w.l.o.g., strategy

2. Then, since all N_1, \dots, N_{j-1} are best-responding, we have

$$\sum_{a \in \{1,2\}^n: a_i=2} \psi(a) \cdot (u_1^i(a_{-i}) - u_2^i(a_{-i})) = p - 0 > p\epsilon,$$

which is, again, a contradiction. \square

We are now ready to prove the aforementioned logarithmic lower bound on the number of all-players queries. To do so, we use the above preliminary lemmas.

Theorem 7.1. *Let \mathcal{G}_n be defined as in Lemma 7.2. Then, for any $\epsilon \in [0, 1)$, any randomised all-players query algorithm must make $\Omega(\log n)$ queries to find an ϵ -WSCE of \mathcal{G}_n in the worst case.*

Proof. We use an adversarial distribution \mathcal{D}_n over \mathcal{G}_n and apply Yao's minimax principle Yao [1977] to lower-bound the expected cost that any deterministic algorithm must incur. We let \mathcal{D}_n be defined as in Lemma 7.2, so that it has a unique ϵ -WSCE, and show that learning this equilibrium is equivalent to learning an unknown $\log(n)$ -long bit-string as in Lemma 7.1.

If we associate a random indicator variable Y_j to N_j that is equal to one if and only if N_j are playing strategy 1 at equilibrium, then the number $y := \sum_{j=1}^k |N_j| \cdot Y_j$ corresponds to the number of players playing strategy 1 that player n sees at equilibrium. It is easily verified that, according to \mathcal{D}_n 's definition, $Y := Y_1 \dots Y_k$ is generated uniformly at random since every group of players flips a series of fair coins to determine their preferences. Clearly, any algorithm \mathcal{A} that outputs an ϵ -WSCE equilibrium of \mathcal{G}_n is able to tell what Y 's value is because it simply requires to look at what $\{1, \dots, n-1\}$ play in the pure equilibrium profile. Suppose an all-players query returns, for all $i \in [n]$, both payoffs for playing strategy 1 and 2 against $x \in \{0, \dots, n-1\}$ other players playing strategy one. We remark that this assumption can only strengthen the query model, which is fine for the purpose of a lower bound.

Due to every player in N_j sharing the same preferences, we can aggregate these so that we have an answer $A := A_1 \dots A_k$, where A_j is equal to one if and only if N_j 's best response to z is strategy 1. Let $Q := Q_1, \dots, Q_k$ be the binary representation of x . We argue that an all-player query is not able to give more information than the longest common prefix between Q and A . Suppose $A_1 \dots A_{\ell-1} A_{\ell+1} \dots A_k = Q_1 \dots Q_{\ell-1} Q_{\ell+1} \dots Q_k$, and $A_\ell \neq Q_\ell$ for some $\ell \in \{1, \dots, k-1\}$. According to \mathcal{D}_n 's definition, N_j flip a fair coin to determine their preferences for every consecutive subset of $\{0, \dots, n-1\}$ having size $\frac{n}{2^{j-1}}$. Assume, w.l.o.g., that $A_\ell = 1$ and $Q_\ell = 0$. Let $m \in \{\ell+1, \dots, k-1\}$. Then, N_m 's payoff at q and N_m 's payoff at any $q' \geq q + \frac{n}{2^\ell}$ correspond to two independent coin flip. Furthermore, any attempt to guess $Y_{\ell+1} \dots Y_k$ fails with probability $1 - 2^{\ell+1-k}$. Therefore, for any random $\log(n)$ -long bit-string A there exists a game G in the support of \mathcal{D}_n whose unique pure-strategy ϵ -WSCE is equal to A . Due to the lower bound given in Lemma 7.1, we have that the expected number of queries needed by any algorithm \mathcal{A} is $\Omega(\log n)$. \square

7.2 Upper Bound

Before going into technical lemmas, we provide an informal overview of the algorithmic approach. Suppose we are to solve an $(n+1)$ -player game G . The first idea is to *smooth* every

player's utility function, which generally is subject to no assumption, so that it becomes λ -Lipschitz continuous with Lipschitz constant λ . The Lipschitz continuity property ensures that the images of two adjacent inputs can differ at most by λ . We smooth a utility function by enforcing every player to place probability either ϵ or $1 - \epsilon$ onto strategy one. As a consequence, the expected payoff for player i is obtained by weighting her payoff values with a sum of two binomial distributions, which is a bell-shaped curve whose standard deviation is at least $\epsilon\sqrt{n}$.

We construct the smooth game \bar{G} in the following manner. Figure 9 illustrates the idea. The payoff received by player i when 0 other players are playing strategy one is weighted with respect to the binomial distribution where every coin toss has bias ϵ . In the case where 1 of the other players is playing strategy one, we weight the utility function with a distribution having $n - 1$ coin tosses with bias ϵ and 1 coin toss with bias $1 - \epsilon$. In general, the payoff obtained by player i when x other players play strategy one is given by weighting her utility function with a distribution that has $n - x$ coin tosses with bias ϵ and x tosses with bias $1 - \epsilon$.




Fig. 9. Definition of the utility functions of the smooth game \bar{G} .

Next, we show that the Lipschitz constant λ is proportional to $\frac{1}{\epsilon\sqrt{n}}$. Proving the same bound on the total variation distance of two adjacent distributions implies the statement. To do so, we exploit the fact that the distributions are unimodal and have an upper-bounded value at the mode. We make use of Stirling's approximation [Stirling, 1730] to upper-bound this value. Therefore, we may think of dealing with a λ -Lipschitz anonymous game \bar{G} .

The subsequent step consists of finding such a pure-strategy Nash equilibrium and mapping it back to G . Due to dealing with a two-strategy game, we use a simple bisection algorithm that finds the equilibrium with a logarithmic number of steps as shown by Theorem 5.2. Hence, if we were allowed querying \bar{G} directly, a logarithmic number of queries would suffice. Unfortunately, this is not the case; thus, we need to somehow simulate a query to \bar{G} with a possibly small number of queries to the original game G . The number of queries needed by

this simulation is a small polynomial in n , precisely $n^{3/8}$, which is the reason why we achieve the aforementioned overall query complexity.

To simulate a query to \bar{G} , we need to compute the expected utility with respect to a known probability distribution \mathcal{D} . We show that we can estimate expected utilities within ϵ -accuracy. The aforementioned bisection algorithm works for ϵ -accurate answers as well. The techniques and tools we use for this estimation are random sampling, Chernoff bounds [Chernoff, 1952] and Hoeffding's inequality [Hoeffding, 1963]. Let us call the known probability distribution \mathcal{D} . The first step is to use Chernoff bounds to cut off the tails of \mathcal{D} due to a low probability mass. It is enough to consider \mathcal{D} to be distributed over a support of size $\sqrt{n \log(n)}$ as opposed to n .

Subsequently, we approximate \mathcal{D} with a piecewise-constant distribution \mathcal{H} so that their variation distance is at most ϵ . First, we split the unimodal distribution \mathcal{D} into two pieces: an increasing and a decreasing one. Second, we divide every piece's support into equally-sized intervals. Every interval's constant value is set to be the average between its two end-points.

Estimating the expected payoff weighted with this histogram-like distribution is significantly easier. For this reason, we use \mathcal{H} instead of \mathcal{D} and then apply triangle inequality. For each constant-valued interval, we pick a sufficient amount of random samples so as to estimate the average value of the interval within ϵ -accuracy. Suppose the support has size s . An application of Hoeffding's inequality guarantees that $\sqrt{s \log(s)}$ many samples are enough to get an ϵ -accurate estimation with high probability. After a union bound over all the intervals, the result still holds with high probability, and the number of samples needed in total is of the order of $\frac{1}{\epsilon^2} \cdot n^{3/8} \cdot \text{poly} \log(n)$. Consequently, this is also the number of queries to G that we need to simulate a query to \bar{G} .

We are, henceforth, able to find an approximate pure Nash equilibrium of \bar{G} with less than \sqrt{n} all-players queries, for constant values of ϵ . This equilibrium is mapped back to G by letting the players who play strategy one in \bar{G} randomise $1 - \epsilon$ in G , and the ones who play strategy two in \bar{G} place probability ϵ on strategy one in G . The quality of the approximation is proportional to $\epsilon + \frac{1}{\epsilon\sqrt{n}}$.

We now move on to proving the above mentioned upper bound on the number of queries required to find an approximate Nash equilibrium. We commence with a few lemmas, which will be later used to prove the algorithm's performance.

Lemma 7.3. *Let $Y := \sum_{i=1}^n Y_i$ be the sum of n independent identically distributed 0-1 random variables such that $\mathbb{E}[Y_i] = p$, for all $i \in [n]$, $\epsilon \leq p \leq (1 - \epsilon)$, and $0 < \epsilon < 1/2$. Then, the value at Y 's mode is at most $\frac{e}{2\pi\epsilon\sqrt{n}}(1 + \frac{1}{\epsilon n})$, i.e., $O(\frac{1}{\epsilon\sqrt{n}})$.*

Proof. We show that the ratio between the value at mode and the expected value is at most $1 + \frac{1}{\epsilon n}$. Then, an application of Stirling's bounds on the value at the expected value will prove the lemma. Due to Y having a binomial distribution, its mode is $m = \lfloor (n+1)p \rfloor$. Hence, it is either equal to $\lfloor np \rfloor$ or $\lfloor np \rfloor + 1$. If it is the former case, we are fine because it coincides with the mean; thus, we assume that the latter holds. In the following we use $\{a\}$ to denote the

fractional part of a . We bound the ratio $\Pr[Y = \lfloor np \rfloor + 1]/\Pr[Y = \lfloor np \rfloor]$.

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\binom{n}{\lfloor np \rfloor + 1} \cdot p^{\lfloor np \rfloor + 1} \cdot (1-p)^{n - \lfloor np \rfloor - 1}}{\binom{n}{\lfloor np \rfloor} \cdot p^{\lfloor np \rfloor} \cdot (1-p)^{n - \lfloor np \rfloor}} &= \frac{p}{1-p} \cdot \frac{\lfloor np \rfloor! \cdot (n - \lfloor np \rfloor)!}{(\lfloor np \rfloor + 1)! \cdot (n - \lfloor np \rfloor - 1)!} \\
&= \frac{p}{1-p} \cdot \frac{n - \lfloor np \rfloor}{\lfloor np \rfloor + 1} \\
&= \frac{p}{1-p} \cdot \frac{n - np + \{np\}}{\lfloor np \rfloor + 1} \\
&= \frac{p}{1-p} \cdot \left(\frac{(1-p)n}{\lfloor np \rfloor + 1} + \frac{\{np\}}{\lfloor np \rfloor + 1} \right) \\
&\leq \frac{np}{np} + \frac{p \cdot \{np\}}{(1-p) \cdot np} \\
&< 1 + \frac{1}{\epsilon n}.
\end{aligned}$$

In the second to last step we used the fact that $\lfloor np \rfloor + 1 \geq np$. In the last one we used both $\{np\} < 1$ and $1 - p \geq \epsilon$. Now we bound the value at the expected value $x = \lfloor np \rfloor$ using Stirling's bounds.

$$\begin{aligned}
\Pr[Y = x] &= \binom{n}{x} \cdot p^x \cdot (1-p)^{n-x} \\
&\leq \frac{e \cdot n^{n+1/2} \cdot e^{-n} \cdot p^x \cdot (1-p)^{n-x}}{\sqrt{2\pi} \cdot x^{x+1/2} \cdot e^{-x} \cdot \sqrt{2\pi} \cdot (n-x)^{n-x+1/2} \cdot e^{-(n-x)}} \\
&= \frac{e}{2\pi} \cdot \frac{n^{n+1/2} \cdot p^x \cdot (1-p)^{n-x}}{(np)^{x+1/2} \cdot (n-np)^{n-x+1/2}} \\
&= \frac{e}{2\pi} \cdot \frac{n^{n+1/2} \cdot p^{np} \cdot (1-p)^{n-np}}{n^{np+1/2} \cdot n^{n-np+1/2} \cdot p^{np+1/2} \cdot (1-p)^{n-np+1/2}} \\
&= \frac{e}{2\pi} \cdot \frac{1}{\sqrt{p(1-p)} \cdot \sqrt{n}} \\
&\leq \frac{e}{2\pi} \cdot \frac{1}{\epsilon\sqrt{n}} = O\left(\frac{1}{\epsilon\sqrt{n}}\right).
\end{aligned}$$

If we combine $\Pr[Y = m]/\Pr[Y = x] < 1 + \frac{1}{\epsilon n}$ with $\Pr[Y = x] \leq \frac{e}{2\pi} \cdot \frac{1}{\epsilon\sqrt{n}}$, it follows that $\Pr[Y = m] \leq \frac{e}{2\pi\epsilon\sqrt{n}}(1 + \frac{1}{\epsilon n}) = O(\frac{1}{\epsilon\sqrt{n}})$, concluding the proof. \square

Lemma 7.4. *Let $Z := \sum_{i=1}^n Z_i$ be the sum of n independent 0-1 random variables such that $\mathbb{E}[Z_i] \in \{\epsilon, 1 - \epsilon\}$ for all $i \in [n]$ and fixed $0 < \epsilon < 1/2$. Then, the value at Z 's mode is at most $O(\frac{1}{\epsilon\sqrt{n}})$.*

Proof. By definition, Z is the sum of two random variables X, Y with binomial distributions $\text{Bin}(n_X, \epsilon)$ and $\text{Bin}(n_Y, 1 - \epsilon)$, respectively. We use n_X (resp. n_Y) to denote the number of coin

flips biased towards ϵ (resp. $1 - \epsilon$). Clearly, $n_X + n_Y = n$. Using the law of total probability, we express Z 's probability mass function as

$$\Pr[Z = \xi] = \sum_{x=0}^{n_X} \Pr[Z = \xi | X = x] \cdot \Pr[X = x] = \sum_{x=0}^{n_X} \Pr[X = x] \cdot \Pr[Y = \xi - x].$$

Due to $n_X + n_Y = n$, we have that $\max\{n_X, n_Y\} \geq n/2 = \Omega(n)$. Let n_X be the maximum, w.l.o.g.. Then, by [Lemma 7.3](#), $\Pr[X = x] \leq O(\frac{1}{\epsilon\sqrt{n_X}})$ for all $x = 0, \dots, n_X$. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr[Z = \xi] &\leq \sum_{x=0}^{n_X} O\left(\frac{1}{\epsilon\sqrt{n_X}}\right) \cdot \Pr[Y = \xi - x] \\ &= O\left(\frac{1}{\epsilon\sqrt{n_X}}\right) \cdot \sum_{x=0}^{n_X} \Pr[Y = \xi - x] \\ &\leq O\left(\frac{1}{\epsilon\sqrt{n_X}}\right) = O\left(\frac{1}{\epsilon\sqrt{n}}\right). \end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma 7.5 ([\[Daskalakis and Papadimitriou, 2014\]](#)). *Let $X, Y \in \{0, \dots, n\}$ be two random variables such that $\|X - Y\|_{TV} \leq \epsilon$. Let $f : \{0, \dots, n\} \rightarrow [0, 1]$. Then,*

$$\sum_{x=0}^n f(x) \cdot (\Pr[X = x] - \Pr[Y = x]) \leq 2\epsilon.$$

Proof.

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{x=0}^n f(x) \cdot (\Pr[X = x] - \Pr[Y = x]) &\leq \sum_{x=0}^n |f(x)| \cdot |\Pr[X = x] - \Pr[Y = x]| \\ &\leq 2 \cdot \|X - Y\|_{TV} = 2\epsilon, \end{aligned}$$

where we bounded $|f(x)| \leq 1$ due to taking values in $[0, 1]$. □

Lemma 7.6. *Let X be a unimodal distribution over $\{0, \dots, n\}$ whose value at the mode is upper-bounded by $O(\frac{1}{\epsilon\sqrt{n}})$, $\epsilon > 0$. Then, there exists a piecewise-constant distribution H over $\{0, \dots, n\}$ such that every constant interval, except for the boundaries, contains $\epsilon^2\sqrt{n}$ points and $\|X - H\|_{TV} \leq \epsilon$.*

Proof. Due to X being unimodal we can divide the distribution into two monotonic functions, an increasing and a decreasing one. With no loss of generality, we carry on our analysis solely on the latter because the argument is symmetric for an increasing distribution. Let the decreasing function f be defined over $\{m, \dots, n\}$ with m denoting the mode of X . Let $I = \{a, \dots, b\} \subset \{m, \dots, n\}$ be a discrete interval. Moreover, let $\mu := \frac{1}{|I|} \sum_{x=a}^b f(x)$ be the average value in I . Clearly, $f(x) \leq f(a)$ for all $x \in I$, and $f(b) \leq \mu$. Therefore, we have

$$\sum_{x=a}^b |f(x) - \mu| \leq |I| \cdot (f(a) - f(b)).$$

Now suppose $\{m, \dots, n\}$ is split into $r := \frac{n-m}{|I|}$ intervals

$$\{m = a_1, \dots, b_1\}, \dots, \{a_r, \dots, b_r = n\},$$

each of size $|I|$. The total error is

$$\sum_{i=1}^r \sum_{x=a_i}^{b_i} (f(x) - \mu_i) \leq \sum_{i=1}^r |I| \cdot (f(a_i) - f(b_i)).$$

Due to $f(b_i) \geq f(a_{i+1})$ and $f(b_r) = f(n) = 0$, we have that the total error is at most $|I| \cdot f(m)$.

If we consider the increasing part of the function, we similarly split $\{0, \dots, m-1\}$ into $s := \frac{m-1}{|I|}$ intervals of size $|I|$. By symmetry, we get a bound of $|I| \cdot f(m)$. Summing up both sides, we have that the L_1 distance between X and H is at most $2|I| \cdot f(m)$. Hence, the upper bound on the total variation distance is obtained by halving the expression. Using the fact that $f(m) \leq O(\frac{1}{\epsilon\sqrt{n}})$, we get that setting $|I| = \epsilon^2\sqrt{n}$ satisfies $\frac{|I|}{\epsilon\sqrt{n}} \leq \epsilon$. \square

Lemma 7.7 (Algorithm 6). *Let $\epsilon \geq \frac{1}{n^2}$. Let $X := \sum_{i=1}^n X_i$ be the sum of n independent 0-1 random indicator variables such that $\mathbb{E}[X_i] \in \{\epsilon, 1 - \epsilon\}$ for all $i \in [n]$. Moreover, let $f : \{0, \dots, n\} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ and $\mu := \sum_{x=0}^n f(x) \cdot \Pr[X = x]$ be unknown. Then, with probability $\geq 1 - \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\epsilon^2(n \log n)^{3/4}}}$, we can estimate μ with an empirical $\hat{\mu}$ such that $|\mu - \hat{\mu}| \leq \epsilon$ by sampling from f a set $S \subseteq \{0, \dots, n\}$ such that $|S| = O(\frac{1}{\epsilon^2}(n \log n)^{3/8} \sqrt{\log(2\sqrt{n \log n})})$.*

Proof. By Lemma 7.6, we know that we can approximate a unimodal distribution with a piecewise-constant one, so that the variation distance between the two stays bounded by ϵ . It is known that a Poisson Binomial distribution is unimodal, and a proof is, e.g., in [Gerber and Keilson, 1971]. We use the following two-sided Chernoff bounds to ignore the two tails of X .

$$\Pr[|X - \mathbb{E}[X]| \geq \delta] \leq \exp\left(-\frac{2\delta^2}{n}\right).$$

If we choose $\delta = \sqrt{n \log n}$, we have that the total probability mass at the tails is at most $\frac{1}{n^2}$, which is at most ϵ by assumption. Hence, we can assume that X is distributed along $D := \{\mathbb{E}[X] - \delta, \dots, \mathbb{E}[X] + \delta\}$ since cutting off the tails causes a loss of at most ϵ . Clearly, $|D| = 2\sqrt{n \log n}$.

Let H be the piecewise-constant approximation of X as in Lemma 7.5, which says that if we define $\bar{\mu} := \sum_{x=0}^n f(x) \cdot \Pr[H = x]$, then $|\mu - \bar{\mu}| \leq 2\epsilon$. We carry on our analysis on H rather than X , and then apply triangle inequality. Let $m := \frac{\sqrt{2}}{\epsilon^2} \sqrt{n \log n}$. Let $\bigcup_{i=1}^m I_i = D$, where every I_i is a constant-value discrete interval of size $\epsilon^2 \sqrt{|D|}$. We use η_i to denote the average value taken by f when weighted on I_i , i.e., $\eta_i := \frac{c_i}{|I_i|} \sum_{x \in I_i} f(x)$ where c_i denotes the constant value taken by H in I_i . Consequently, $\bar{\mu} = \frac{1}{m} \cdot \sum_{i=1}^m \eta_i$.

Now we determine the number of samples per interval required to estimate η_i within ϵ -accuracy. For this, let S_i be the set of sampled point within the interval I_i . Moreover, for all $\ell \in \{0, \dots, |I_i| - 1\}$, let

$$Y_\ell := \begin{cases} f(\ell + |I_i|) & \text{if } \ell + |I_i| \in S_i \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Let $Y := \sum_{\ell=0}^{|I_i|} Y_\ell$ be their sum. We estimate η_i with

$$\hat{\eta}_i := \frac{c_i}{|S_i|} \sum_{\ell=0}^{|I_i|-1} Y_\ell = c_i \cdot \frac{Y}{|S_i|}.$$

By definition, we know that

$$\eta_i = \frac{c_i}{|I_i|} \sum_{\ell=0}^{|I_i|-1} f(\ell + |I_i|) = c_i \cdot \frac{\mathbb{E}[Y]}{|S_i|}.$$

We bound the probability that $|\eta_i - \hat{\eta}_i| \geq \epsilon$ using Hoeffding's inequality.

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr[|\eta_i - \hat{\eta}_i| \geq \epsilon] &= \Pr\left[c_i \cdot \left| \frac{\mathbb{E}[Y] - Y}{|S_i|} \right| \geq \epsilon\right] \\ &\leq \Pr[|\mathbb{E}[Y] - Y| \geq \epsilon |S_i|] \\ &\leq 2 \exp\left(-\frac{2\epsilon^2 |S_i|^2}{|I_i|}\right) \\ &= 2 \exp\left(-\frac{2\epsilon^2 |S_i|^2}{\epsilon^2 \sqrt{|D|}}\right). \end{aligned}$$

In the second step we eliminated c_i due to being smaller than 1. Choosing $|S_i|^2 = \sqrt{|D|} \cdot \log |D| = \sqrt{2} \cdot \sqrt[4]{n \log n} \cdot \log(2\sqrt{n \log n})$, we have that $\Pr[|\eta_i - \hat{\eta}_i| \geq \epsilon] \leq \frac{2}{|D|^2}$.

Now, let $\hat{\mu} := \frac{1}{m} \cdot \sum_{i=1}^m \hat{c}_i$. Due to $|\eta_i - \hat{\eta}_i| \leq \epsilon$, with probability at least $1 - 2/|D|^2$, for all $i \in [m]$, we have that

$$|\bar{\mu} - \hat{\mu}| = \left| \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \eta_i - \hat{\eta}_i \right| \leq \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m |\eta_i - \hat{\eta}_i| \leq \frac{1}{m} \cdot m\epsilon = \epsilon.$$

In order to bound the failure probability, we use a union bound over all intervals, which leads to

$$\Pr[|\bar{\mu} - \hat{\mu}|] \leq \frac{2}{|D|^2} \cdot m = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}\epsilon^2 (n \log n)^{3/4}}.$$

Furthermore, by triangle inequality, we have that $|\mu - \hat{\mu}| \leq |\mu - \bar{\mu}| + |\bar{\mu} - \hat{\mu}| \leq 3\epsilon$, and the total number of samples is

$$\begin{aligned} m \cdot |S_i| &= \frac{\sqrt{2}}{\epsilon^2} \cdot \sqrt[4]{n \log n} \cdot \sqrt[4]{2} \cdot \sqrt[8]{n \log n} \cdot \sqrt{\log(2\sqrt{n \log n})} = \\ &= \frac{2^{3/4}}{\epsilon^2} \cdot (n \log n)^{3/8} \sqrt{\log(2\sqrt{n \log n})}. \end{aligned}$$

To get $|\mu - \hat{\mu}| \leq \epsilon$, we may simply choose an $\epsilon' = \frac{\epsilon}{3}$, which affects the number of samples only by a constant factor. \square

Lemma 7.8. Let $X^{(j,n)} := \sum_{i \in [n]} X_i$ denote the sum of n independent 0-1 random variables such that $\mathbb{E}[X_i] = 1 - \epsilon$ for all $i \in [j]$, and $\mathbb{E}[X_i] = \epsilon$ for all $i \in [n] \setminus [j]$. Then, for all $j \in [n]$, we have that

$$\left\| X^{(j-1,n)} - X^{(j,n)} \right\|_{TV} \leq O\left(\frac{1}{\epsilon\sqrt{n}}\right).$$

Proof. We use the following recursive formula for the probability mass function of a Poisson Binomial Distribution, as described in [Barlow and Heidtmann, 1984, Hong, 2013]. Due to this not depending on j , we use $X^{(*,n)}$ to denote a sum of n independent 0-1 random variables whose expectations can potentially be all different. Then,

$$\Pr\left[X^{(*,n)} = \xi\right] = (1 - p_n) \cdot \Pr\left[X^{(*,n-1)} = \xi\right] + p_n \cdot \Pr\left[X^{(*,n-1)} = \xi - 1\right]. \quad (3)$$

The plan is to bound the total variation distance between $X^{(j-1,n)}$ and $X^{(j,n)}$, i.e.,

$$\left\| X^{(j-1,n)} - X^{(j,n)} \right\|_{TV} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\xi=1}^n \left| \Pr\left[X^{(j-1,n)} = \xi\right] - \Pr\left[X^{(j,n)} = \xi\right] \right|.$$

Note that $X^{(j-1,n)}$ and $X^{(j,n)}$ differ only by how one coin flip is biased. Thus, we can use (3) to write

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr\left[X^{(j-1,n)} = \xi\right] &= (1 - \epsilon) \cdot \Pr\left[X^{(j-1,n-1)} = \xi\right] + \epsilon \cdot \Pr\left[X^{(j-1,n-1)} = \xi - 1\right], \text{ and} \\ \Pr\left[X^{(j,n)} = \xi\right] &= \epsilon \cdot \Pr\left[X^{(j-1,n-1)} = \xi\right] + (1 - \epsilon) \cdot \Pr\left[X^{(j-1,n-1)} = \xi - 1\right]. \end{aligned}$$

If we add these equivalences to the total variation distance expression, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\xi=1}^{n-1} \left| (1 - 2\epsilon) \cdot \Pr\left[X^{(j,n-1)} = \xi\right] - (1 - 2\epsilon) \cdot \Pr\left[X^{(j,n-1)} = \xi - 1\right] \right| &= \\ \frac{(1 - 2\epsilon)}{2} \sum_{\xi=1}^{n-1} \left| \Pr\left[X^{(j,n-1)} = \xi\right] - \Pr\left[X^{(j,n-1)} = \xi - 1\right] \right|. \end{aligned}$$

By definition, $X^{(j,n-1)}$ is such that $\mathbb{E}[X_i] \in \{\epsilon, 1 - \epsilon\}$, so by Lemma 7.4 we know that $\Pr[X^{(j-1,n-1)} = \xi] \leq O\left(\frac{1}{\epsilon\sqrt{n-1}}\right)$ for any $\xi \in \{0, \dots, n-1\}$. Let m be the mode of $X^{(j-1,n-1)}$, i.e., $m \in \{0, \dots, n-1\}$ such that $\Pr[X^{(j-1,n-1)} = m] \geq \Pr[X^{(j-1,n-1)} = \xi]$ for all $\xi \in \{0, \dots, n-1\}$. Due to $X^{(j-1,n-1)}$ being unimodal, we can split the sum $\sum_{\xi=0}^{n-1} |\Pr[X^{(j-1,n-1)} = \xi] - \Pr[X^{(j-1,n-1)} = \xi - 1]|$ into the two subsets $\{0, \dots, m\}$ and $\{m+1, \dots, n-1\}$ where the function is, respectively, increasing or decreasing and, hence, remove the absolute value

operator. Let us consider, w.l.o.g., the subset $\{0, \dots, m\}$; the other case is symmetric. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{\xi=1}^m \Pr \left[X^{(j-1, n-1)} = \xi \right] - \Pr \left[X^{(j-1, n-1)} = \xi - 1 \right] = \\ & \left(\Pr \left[X^{(j-1, n-1)} = 1 \right] - \Pr \left[X^{(j-1, n-1)} = 0 \right] \right) + \dots \\ & \dots + \left(\Pr \left[X^{(j-1, n-1)} = m \right] - \Pr \left[X^{(j-1, n-1)} = m - 1 \right] \right) = \\ & \Pr \left[X^{(j-1, n-1)} = m \right] - \Pr \left[X^{(j-1, n-1)} = 0 \right] \leq \Pr \left[X^{(j-1, n-1)} = m \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Summing up both the increasing and decreasing side bounds, we get that

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{\xi=0}^{n-1} \left| \Pr \left[X^{(j-1, n-1)} = \xi \right] - \Pr \left[X^{(j-1, n-1)} = \xi - 1 \right] \right| \leq \\ & 2 \cdot \Pr \left[X^{(j-1, n-1)} = m \right] = O \left(\frac{1}{\epsilon \sqrt{n-1}} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Substituting back to the variation distance expression and observing the obvious fact that $1 - 2\epsilon < 1$, we obtain

$$\left\| X^{(j-1, n)} - X^{(j, n)} \right\|_{\text{TV}} \leq O \left(\frac{1}{\epsilon \sqrt{n-1}} \right) = O \left(\frac{1}{\epsilon \sqrt{n}} \right),$$

which is what we wanted to prove. \square

We are now ready to state our query-efficient algorithm. The complete pseudo-code is in [Algorithm 3](#). We commence by defining what we mean by a smooth game.

Definition 7.2. Let $G = (n, 2, \{u_j^i\}_{i \in [n], j \in [2]})$ be a two-strategy anonymous game. Let $X_{-i}^{(x)} := \sum_{j \neq i} X_j$ denote the sum of $n-1$ random indicator variables where x of them have expectation equal to $1 - \epsilon$, and the remaining ones have expectation equal to ϵ . A smooth game $\bar{G} = (n, 2, \{\bar{u}_j^i\}_{i \in [n], j \in [2]})$ is defined in the following manner. The payoff $\bar{u}_j^i(x)$ obtained by every player $i \in [n]$ for playing strategy $j \in [2]$ against $x \in \{0, \dots, n-1\}$ is

$$\bar{u}_j^i(x) := \sum_{y=0}^{n-1} u_j^i(y) \cdot \Pr[X_{-i}^{(x)} = y] = \mathbb{E}[u_j^i(X_{-i}^{(x)})].$$

Theorem 7.2. Let $G = (n, 2, \{u_j^i\}_{i \in [n], j \in [2]})$ be a two-strategy anonymous game. With probability $\geq 1 - \frac{\sqrt{2}(\log n)^{1/4}}{\epsilon^2 n^{3/4}}$, [Algorithm 3](#) finds a $O(\frac{1}{\epsilon \sqrt{n}} + \epsilon)$ -NE of G in time $\text{poly}(n, 1/\epsilon)$ and makes at most $O(\frac{1}{\epsilon^2} n^{3/8} (\log n)^{11/8} \sqrt{\log(2\sqrt{n} \log n)})$ all-players payoff queries.

Proof. Let \bar{G} be defined as above, i.e., $\bar{u}_j^i(x)$ is equal to the expected utility of player i when x players are placing probability $1 - \epsilon$ to strategy 1, and all the others are playing 1 with probability ϵ . We start showing that \bar{G} is a λ -Lipschitz game, for $\lambda = O(\frac{1}{\epsilon \sqrt{n}})$. According to

Lemma 7.8, the total variation distance between two adjacent distributions $X_{-i}^{(x-1)}$ and $X_{-i}^{(x)}$ is at most $O(\frac{1}{\epsilon\sqrt{n}})$. As remarked in **Lemma 7.5**, an upper bound on the variation distance implies at most twice the same bound on the difference in utility, i.e.,

$$|\bar{u}_j^i(x-1) - \bar{u}_j^i(x)| = \left| \sum_{y=0}^{n-1} u_j^i(y) \cdot \left(\Pr[X_{-i}^{(x-1)}] - \Pr[X_{-i}^{(x)}] \right) \right| \leq O\left(\frac{1}{\epsilon\sqrt{n}}\right).$$

Therefore, \bar{u}_j^i is λ -Lipschitz continuous with $\lambda := O(\frac{1}{\epsilon\sqrt{n}})$. A λ -Lipschitz game is guaranteed to have a pure-strategy $O(\lambda + \epsilon)$ -WSNE, which can be found by $O(\log n)$ all-players ϵ -accurate queries as shown in **Theorem 5.2**. **Algorithm 3** follows the same bisection procedure as described in **Theorem 5.2** by using all-players queries to the smooth game \bar{G} .

However, we are not allowed to query \bar{G} directly. We must simulate an ϵ -accurate query to \bar{G} with q all-players queries to G . In **Lemma 7.7**, we show that, with probability $\geq 1 - \frac{\sqrt{2}}{\epsilon^2(n \log n)^{3/4}}$, **Algorithm 6** correctly simulates an ϵ -accurate all-players query with $q = O(\frac{1}{\epsilon^2}(n \log n)^{3/8} \sqrt{\log(2\sqrt{n \log n})})$ all-players queries to G . Hence, in total we make $O(\frac{1}{\epsilon^2} n^{3/8} (\log n)^{11/8} \sqrt{\log(2\sqrt{n \log n})})$ all-players payoff queries to G . With a union bound we can show that the failure probability is guaranteed to be at most $O(\frac{\sqrt{2}(\log n)^{1/4}}{\epsilon^2 n^{3/4}})$.

Once we find this pure-strategy $O(\epsilon + \frac{1}{\epsilon\sqrt{n}})$ -WSNE of \bar{G} , we use **Algorithm 7** to map the pure output profile to a mixed one where who plays 1 in \bar{G} places probability $1 - \epsilon$ on 1, and who plays 2 in \bar{G} places probability ϵ on 1. We show that the regret experienced by player i in G is no more than the one she experiences in \bar{G} . Suppose i plays pure strategy 1 in an ϵ -WSNE of \bar{G} . Then, she places $p_i = 1 - \epsilon$ on strategy 1 in G . Let μ_j^i denote the expected payoff obtained by player i when playing pure strategy j in \bar{G} . By definition, this is the same payoff i obtains in G for playing pure strategy j . The regret for not playing 2 in \bar{G} therefore is

$$\mu_2^i - \mu_1^i \leq c(\epsilon + \lambda), \text{ for some constant } c \geq 1. \quad (4)$$

We need to show that

$$\begin{aligned} (1 - \epsilon)\mu_1^i + \epsilon\mu_2^i &\geq \mu_1^i - c(\epsilon + \lambda), \text{ and} \\ (1 - \epsilon)\mu_1^i + \epsilon\mu_2^i &\geq \mu_2^i - c(\epsilon + \lambda). \end{aligned}$$

The first equation is easily verified due to $(\mu_1^i - \mu_2^i) \leq 1$. The second one can be rewritten as

$$(1 - \epsilon)(\mu_2^i - \mu_1^i) \leq c(\epsilon + \lambda),$$

which is true by $\epsilon \geq 0$ and (4). The case in which i plays pure strategy 2 in \bar{G} can be shown in a similar way.

Finally, we note that the algorithm is non-oblivious due to being adaptive and computationally efficient since its running time is equal to the number of queries times the time to compute the expected utility, which is polynomial as remarked, e.g., by [Daskalakis and Papadimitriou, 2014]. \square

Algorithm 3: ApproximateNE

Data: n, ϵ , oracle access to G .
Result: A mixed-strategy profile $s \in \{\epsilon, 1 - \epsilon\}^n$ that is a $O(\epsilon + \frac{1}{\epsilon\sqrt{n}})$ -NE of G .

```
begin
   $\hat{\phi}(0) := \text{BestResponseFunction}(n, \epsilon, 0)$ ;
   $\hat{\phi}(n - 1) := \text{BestResponseFunction}(n, \epsilon, n - 1)$ ;
  if  $\hat{\phi}(0) = 0$  then
    | return PureToMixedProfile( $\epsilon, (2, \dots, 2)$ );
  end
  if  $\hat{\phi}(n - 1) = n - 1$  then
    | return PureToMixedProfile( $\epsilon, (1, \dots, 1)$ );
  end
   $m := (n - 1)/2$ ;
  for  $k = 1$  to  $2 \log n$  do
    |  $\hat{\phi}(m) := \text{BestResponseFunction}(n, \epsilon, m)$ ;
    | if  $\hat{\phi}(m) = m$  then
    | | return PureToMixedProfile( $\epsilon, \text{BestResponseVector}(n, \epsilon, m)$ );
    | end
    | if  $\hat{\phi}(m) - m > 0$  then
    | |  $m = (m + n - 1)/2$ ;
    | else
    | |  $m = m/2$ ;
    | end
  end
  return PureToMixedProfile( $\epsilon, \text{BestResponseVector}(n, \epsilon, m)$ );
end
```

Algorithm 4: BestResponseFunction

Data: $n, \epsilon > 1/n^2, x \in [0, n - 1]$.
Result: $\hat{\phi}(x) \in [0, n - 1]$.

```
begin
   $a := \text{BestResponseVector}(n, \epsilon, \lfloor x \rfloor)$ ;
  Let  $y_1$  be the sum over all  $i \in [n - 1]$  of  $a_i = 1$ ;
  if  $x = \lfloor x \rfloor$  then
    | return  $y_1$ ;
  end
  Let  $x = \alpha \lfloor x \rfloor + (1 - \alpha) \lceil x \rceil$ ;
   $b := \text{BestResponseVector}(n, \epsilon, \lceil x \rceil)$ ;
  Let  $y_2$  be the sum over all  $i \in [n - 1]$  of  $b_i = 1$ ;
  return  $\alpha y_1 + (1 - \alpha) y_2$ ;
end
```

8 Conclusion and Further Work

We have shown that, unfortunately, there exist anonymous games that require every payoff-query algorithm to know all the payoffs to find an exact Nash equilibrium. However, if we restrict ourselves to consider the smaller class of symmetric games, we are able to find an equilibrium with an amount of queries that is significantly less than the whole representation

Algorithm 5: BestResponseVector

Data: $n, \epsilon > 1/n^2, x \in [0, n-1]$, oracle access to G
Result: A vector $a \in \{1, 2\}^n$ where every $i \in [n]$ best-responds to x .

```
begin
  if  $x \notin \mathbb{N}_0$  then
    |  $x = \text{RoundToClosestInteger}(x)$ ;
  end
   $u_1(x) := \text{SmoothGameQuery}(n, \epsilon, 1, x)$ ;
   $u_2(x) := \text{SmoothGameQuery}(n, \epsilon, 2, x)$ ;
  for  $i = 1$  to  $n$  do
    |  $a_i := \text{argmax}_{j \in [2]} \{u_1^i(x), u_2^i(x)\}$ ;
  end
  return  $a$ ;
end
```

Algorithm 6: SmoothGameQuery

Data: The number n of players, the approximation guarantee $\epsilon > 1/n^2$, the strategy $j \in [2]$, the number $x \in \{0, \dots, n-1\}$ of other players playing 1, oracle access to G .
Result: The payoffs $\bar{u}_j^i(x)$ for all $i \in [n]$.

```
begin
   $\mu := x \cdot (1 - \epsilon) + (n - 1 - x) \cdot \epsilon$ ;
   $D := \{\mu - \sqrt{n \log n}, \dots, \mu + \sqrt{n \log n}\}$ ;
   $m := \frac{\sqrt{2}}{\epsilon^2} \sqrt[4]{n \log n}$ ;
  Divide  $D$  into  $m$  adjacent intervals  $(I_1, \dots, I_m)$  such that  $|I_k| = \epsilon^2 \sqrt{|D|}$  for all  $k \in [m]$ ;
  for  $k = 1$  to  $m$  do
    | Sample  $|S_k| := \sqrt{\sqrt{|D|} \log |D|}$  points from  $I_k$  uniformly at random, and let  $S_k \subset I_k$  denote these;
    | for  $y \in S_k$  do
      | |  $u_j(y) := \text{All-playersQuery}(j, y)$ ;
    | end
  end
  Let  $X_{-i}^{(x)} := \sum_{\ell=1}^{n-1} Y_\ell$  such that  $\mathbb{E}[Y_\ell] = 1 - \epsilon$  if  $\ell \in [x]$ , or  $\mathbb{E}[Y_\ell] = \epsilon$  otherwise;
  return  $(\frac{1}{m} \sum_{k=1}^m \frac{1}{|S_k|} \sum_{y \in S_k} u_j^i(y) \cdot \Pr[X_{-i}^{(x)} = y])_{i \in [n]}$ ;
end
```

of the game. Additionally, we can break the lower bound if we are content with finding an approximate equilibrium. Indeed, we have proven that playing totally at random is a fairly good approximate equilibrium in self-anonymous games and proposed an efficient algorithm that finds an approximate Nash equilibrium in a two-strategy n -player game with less than \sqrt{n} queries. Moreover, we have lower-bounded the number of queries needed to find an approximate well-supported equilibrium, which must be at least $\log(n)$.

Thus, an immediate question is whether we can obtain sharper bounds on the query complexity of two-strategy anonymous games. There are various ways to strengthen the results. First, our lower bound holds for well-supported equilibria; therefore, it would be interesting to know whether a logarithmic number of queries is also a lower bound for the queries needed

Algorithm 7: PureToMixedProfile

Data: ϵ , a pure-strategy profile $a \in \{1, 2\}^n$.
Result: A mixed-strategy profile $s \in \{\epsilon, 1 - \epsilon\}^n$.

```
begin
  for  $i = 1$  to  $n$  do
    if  $a_i = 1$  then
      |  $s_i := 1 - \epsilon$ ;
    else
      |  $s_i := \epsilon$ ;
    end
  end
  return  $s$ ;
end
```

to find an ϵ -NE for $\epsilon < \frac{1}{2}$. We believe that this must indeed be the case. Second, we have utilised the all-players model. It is reasonable to ask whether a similar lower bound can be derived in the stronger single-player model. Third, our query-efficient algorithm fails to find an ϵ -WSNE due to enforcing everybody to randomise. Is there a query-efficient algorithm that finds an ϵ -WSNE? Fourth, we may think of generalising the algorithm for the k -strategy case by letting every player be enforced to place probability either $\frac{\epsilon}{k}$ or $1 - \frac{k-1}{k}\epsilon$ and obtain a similar smooth utility function. However, in this case we cannot use a bisection algorithm to find a fixed point of the smooth game. As a consequence, the query complexity might be strictly larger. The last main open question definitely is whether the problem of computing an ϵ -NE in a two-strategy anonymous game admits an FPTAS. Our algorithm, although running in time $\text{poly}(n, \frac{1}{\epsilon})$, is unfortunately not an approximation scheme due to not being able to work for very small values of ϵ , in particular when $\epsilon = o(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}})$.

Bibliography

- I. Althöfer and K. Klaus-Uwe. On the deterministic complexity of searching local maxima. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 43(2):111–113, 1993.
- S. Arora, E. Hazan, and S. Kale. The multiplicative weights update method: a meta-algorithm and applications. *Theory of Computing*, 8(1):121–164, 2012.
- Y. Babichenko. Query complexity of approximate Nash equilibria. In *Proceedings of the 46th Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*, STOC '14, pages 535–544, USA, 2014. ACM.
- R. E. Barlow and K. D. Heidtmann. Computing k-out-of-n system reliability. *IEEE Transactions on Reliability*, R-33(4):322–323, 1984.
- F. Brandt, F. Fischer, and M. Holzer. Symmetries and the complexity of pure nash equilibrium. *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, 75:163–177, 2009.
- X. Chen, X. Deng, and S. Teng. Settling the complexity of computing two-player Nash equilibria. *Journal of the ACM*, 56(3):1–57, 2009.
- X. Chen, D. Durfee, and A. Orfanou. On the Complexity of Nash Equilibria in Anonymous Games. *CoRR*, abs/1412.5681:1–29, 2014.
- H. Chernoff. A Measure of Asymptotic Efficiency for Tests of a Hypothesis Based on the sum of Observations. *Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, 23(4):493–507, 1952.
- C. Daskalakis. An efficient PTAS for two-strategy anonymous games. In C. H. Papadimitriou and S. Zhang, editors, *Internet and Network Economics*, volume 5385, pages 186–197. Springer, 2008.
- C. Daskalakis and C. H. Papadimitriou. Computing equilibria in anonymous games. In *In Proceedings of the 48th Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*, pages 83–93, 2007.
- C. Daskalakis and C. H. Papadimitriou. Discretized multinomial distributions and Nash equilibria in anonymous games. In *In Proceedings of the 49th Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*, pages 25–34, 2008.
- C. Daskalakis and C. H. Papadimitriou. On oblivious PTAS's for Nash equilibrium. In *Proceedings of the 41st Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*, STOC '09, pages 75–84, USA, 2009. ACM.
- C. Daskalakis and C. H. Papadimitriou. Sparse covers for sums of indicators. *CoRR*, abs/1306.1265, 2013.
- C. Daskalakis and C. H. Papadimitriou. Approximate Nash equilibria in anonymous games. *Journal of Economic Theory*, 2014.
- C. Daskalakis, P. W. Goldberg, and C. H. Papadimitriou. The complexity of computing a Nash equilibrium. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 39(1):195–259, 2009a.
- C. Daskalakis, A. Mehta, and C. H. Papadimitriou. A note on approximate Nash equilibria. In *Journal of Theoretical Computer Science*, volume 410, UK, 2009b. Elsevier Science Publishers Ltd.
- C. Daskalakis, I. Diakonikolas, and R. A. Servedio. Learning poisson binomial distributions. In *Proceedings of the 44th annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*, STOC '12, pages 709–728, USA, 2012. ACM.

- J. Fearnley and R. Savani. Finding approximate Nash equilibria of bimatrix games via payoff queries. In *Proceedings of the Fifteenth ACM Conference on Economics and Computation*, EC '14, pages 657–674, USA, 2014. ACM.
- J. Fearnley, M. Gairing, P. W. Goldberg, and R. Savani. Learning equilibria of games via payoff queries. In *Proceedings of the 14th ACM Conference on Electronic Commerce*, EC '13, pages 397–414, USA, 2013. ACM.
- H. Gerber and J. Keilson. Some results for discrete unimodality. *Journal American Statistical Association*, 66(334):386–389, 1971.
- P. W. Goldberg and A. Roth. Bounds for the query complexity of approximate equilibria. In *Proceedings of the Fifteenth ACM Conference on Economics and Computation*, EC '14, pages 639–656, USA, 2014. ACM.
- S. Hart and N. Nisan. The query complexity of correlated equilibria. *CoRR*, abs/1305.4874, 2013.
- E. Hazan and R. Krauthgamer. How hard is it to approximate the best Nash equilibrium? *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 40(1):79–91, 2011.
- W. Hoeffding. Probability Inequalities for Sums of Bounded Random Variables. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 58(301):13–30, 1963.
- Y. Hong. On computing the distribution function for the Poisson binomial distribution. *Computational Statistics & Data Analysis*, 59(1):41–51, 2013.
- R. Kannan and T. Thorsten. Games of fixed rank: hierarchy of bimatrix games. *Economic Theory*, 42(1):157–173, 2010.
- R. J. Lipton, E. Markakis, and A. Mehta. Playing large games using simple strategies. In *Proceedings of the 4th ACM Conference on Electronic Commerce*, EC '03, pages 36–41, USA, 2003. ACM.
- J. Stirling. *Methodus differentialis, sive tractatus de summation et interpolation serierum infinitarum*, 1730.
- A. C. Yao. Probabilistic computations: Toward a unified measure of complexity. In *Proceedings of the 18th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*, SFCS '77, pages 222–227, USA, 1977. IEEE Computer Society.