

---

# Fusion-PSRO: Nash Policy Fusion for Policy Space Response Oracles

---

Jiesong Lian

Huazhong University of Science & Technology, Wuhan, China

## Abstract

A popular approach for solving zero-sum games is to maintain populations of policies to approximate the Nash Equilibrium (NE). Previous studies have shown that Policy Space Response Oracles (PSRO) algorithm is an effective multi-agent reinforcement learning framework for solving such games. However, repeatedly training new policies from scratch to approximate Best Response (BR) to opponents' mixed policies at each iteration is both inefficient and costly. While some PSRO variants initialize a new policy by inheriting from past BR policies, this approach limits the exploration of new policies, especially against challenging opponents. To address this issue, we propose Fusion-PSRO, which employs policy fusion to initialize policies for better approximation to BR. By selecting high-quality base policies from meta-NE, policy fusion fuses the base policies into a new policy through model averaging. This approach allows the initialized policies to incorporate multiple expert policies, making it easier to handle difficult opponents compared to inheriting from past BR policies or initializing from scratch. Moreover, our method only modifies the policy initialization phase, allowing its application to nearly all PSRO variants without additional training overhead. Our experiments on non-transitive matrix games, Leduc Poker, and the more complex Liars Dice demonstrate that Fusion-PSRO enhances the performance of nearly all PSRO variants, achieving lower exploitability.

## 1 Introduction

Zero-sum games, such as StarCraft [33, 24] and DOTA2 [37], involve strong non-transitivity, presenting unique challenges in game theory and artificial intelligence [7]. Solving these non-transitive games often involves training and expanding a set of policies to approximate a Nash Equilibrium (NE) capable of contending with any opponent. Approaches like Fictitious Play (FP) [3] and Double Oracle (DO) [18] can converge to an NE by learning a set of policies, even in cyclic games (e.g., *rock-paper-scissors*). For larger-scale problems with complex game landscapes, the Policy Space Response Oracles (PSRO) provides an effective open-ended learning paradigm [12]. PSRO iteratively approximates the Nash Equilibrium by learning the BR to the opponent's mixed policies at each iteration.

Previous research on PSRO has primarily concentrated on three key areas: enhancing diversity, improving training efficiency, and refining solution concepts. First, methods aimed at enhancing diversity, such as Diverse PSRO [2], BD&RD-PSRO [20], UDM-PSRO [15], and PSD-PSRO [36], focus on promoting a more diverse set of policies to cover a wider Policy Hull, thereby increasing robustness and generalization against varied opponents. For improving training efficiency, approaches like Pipeline-PSRO [17] parallelize the training of multiple Best Response (BR) policies to accelerate convergence and reduce computational time. Finally, refining solution concepts involves methods such as  $\alpha$ -Rank [22], which propose alternative evaluation metrics and optimization techniques to better approximate the Nash Equilibrium (NE). Despite their innovations, these approaches share




Figure 1: **Overview of the Fusion-PSRO Framework.** Fusion-PSRO extends PSRO by adding an initialization step. (1) **Compute**: Simulating game interactions to complete the missing entries in the payoff tensor  $M$ ; (2) **Solve**: Calculating the meta-NE  $\sigma$  using the meta-solver  $M$ , based on the updated payoff tensor; (3) **Initialize**: Generating an initial policy through policy fusion  $\mathcal{F}$  based on meta-NE  $\sigma$  for each player; (4) **Expand**: Training a new policy based on the initialized policy using the oracle  $\mathcal{O}$ , which is then added to each player’s policy space.

a common feature: they almost either initialize a new BR policy from scratch or select a historical policy to inherit for initialization, which can be inefficient or limiting on policy exploration.

Repeatedly training new BR policies from scratch is inefficient and costly [38, 17]. Even though inheriting past BR policies can save some training time, this approach often restricts exploration during the training stages because of the behavioral preferences or distributions of the policies, requiring abundant iterations to adjust to the original policy distribution. These original policy distributions are typically well-trained against historical opponent populations but may not effectively handle new opponent policies, especially against adversaries unseen before. This misgeneralization, where policies inherited from past BR fail to effectively handle the latest opponents’ policies, might hinder better BR approximation. This problem is more frequent in large-scale games where policies continuously evolve. Such misgeneralization limit the effectiveness of PSRO in adapting to new opponents, highlighting the need for policies that can better handle unexpected challenges [7].

Our first idea is based on the observation that historical policies may possess unique insights for handling previously unseen opponents. In cyclic games, it is not impossible to train a approximate BR to specific opponents. The challenge lies in exploring all best responses and combining them into balanced strategies to approach a Nash Equilibrium more. Many studies have demonstrated that policy ensembles in reinforcement learning can enhance generalization capabilities [23, 35, 29, 28], suggesting the potential effectiveness of integrating historical BR policies in PSRO. However, simply integrating historical policies in PSRO does not guarantee the inclusion of all BRs for various opponents. Therefore, we propose merging historical policies into a single policy to achieve an ensemble-like effect, which can be fine-tuned to handle new opponents. This process of fusing historical policies aligns with the initialization of the BR policy in PSRO, forming the second key idea of our approach.

In this paper, we propose the Fusion-PSRO framework, which aims to enhance the traditional PSRO paradigm by focusing more on the fusion of historical policies to achieve better BR approximation. Based on this, we introduce the Nash Policy Fusion method. This method selects high-quality base policies according to a meta Nash Equilibrium (meta-NE) and then merges these policies into a single policy using Nash-weighted averaging. When the policy weights are similar, this process provides a first-order approximation to a policy ensemble [19][25]. Based on this, we theoretically analyze the improvement of Nash-weighted average initialization in terms of utility and policy exploration. Finally, our experiments validate the effectiveness of Fusion-PSRO, demonstrating lower exploitability and significantly better performance in diversity-enhanced methods.

## 2 Related Work

**Ensemble Reinforcement Learning.** Policy ensembles in reinforcement learning (RL) leverage multiple policies to enhance performance, stability, and generalization across RL tasks. These methods address overfitting, exploration-exploitation dilemmas, and sample inefficiency by integrating diverse policies. Notable examples include Bootstrapped DQN, which improves exploration through multiple Q-networks [23], and Ensemble DDPG, enhancing robustness in deterministic policy gradients [35]. Advances such as determinantal point processes and stochastic ensemble value expansion aim to maximize policy diversity and optimize exploration [29, 28, 4]. Applications like Multi-DQN for stock market forecasting demonstrate the utility of policy ensembles [5].

**Model Fusion.** Applying ensembles directly to address evolving opponent policies could notably increase computational demands [30]. However, model fusion research, although not directly targeted at policy ensemble reinforcement learning, offers valuable insights that could inform these applications. Model fusion, particularly through weight averaging, serves as a first-order approximation of model ensembles without incurring additional computational costs, thereby providing a practical integration path [19]. Techniques such as “mode connectivity”, “alignment”, and “weight averaging” can optimize parameter spaces, facilitating robust policy integration [13][34]. Approaches like “model merge”, which combines various models into a single model, and methods such as Fisher merging, may be helpful for model generalization [16]. The Rewarded Soups (RS), which blends weights fine-tuned on diverse rewards, introduces an innovative technique for adapting policies to various opponents [25]. By incorporating these methods into PSRO paradigm, using population parameter averaging (PAPA) and stochastic weight averaging (SWA), policies may be diversified and periodically enhanced, thus reducing computational overhead and supporting iterative improvement [11, 21]. These model fusion approaches hold the potential to significantly enhance policies, offering more efficient and robust solutions for complex games.

**Diverse Methods in PSRO.** PSRO has embraced various methods to enhance policy space diversity, similar to techniques used in policy ensembles within reinforcement learning, which aim to maximize policy diversity and optimize exploration efficiency [29, 28, 4]. Diverse PSRO promotes policy diversity within the population to better explore the policy space[2]. BD&RD-PSRO combines behavioral and response diversity, aiming to reduce the exploitability of the meta-policy by ensuring that a diverse set of policies is maintained within the population[20]. However, these methods primarily focus on enlarging the gamescape, which might not directly translate to better approximations of a NE. PSD-PSRO further extends this approach by introducing a new diversity metric that focuses on enlarging the Policy Hull (PH), which more effectively reduces population exploitability and leads to a closer approximation of an NE [36]. These efforts underline the promise of integrating diverse policy ensembles within PSRO, enhancing adaptability and reducing predictability in responses.

## 3 Notations and Preliminary

**Extensive-Form Game.** We analyze extensive-form games with perfect recall [9]. In these games, players progress through a sequence of actions, each associated with a world state  $w \in \mathcal{W}$ . In an  $N$ -player game, the joint action space is  $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}_1 \times \dots \times \mathcal{A}_N$ . For player  $i \in \mathcal{N} = \{1, \dots, N\}$ , the set of legal actions at world state  $w$  is  $\mathcal{A}_i(w) \subseteq \mathcal{A}_i$ , and a joint action is  $a = (a_1, \dots, a_N) \in \mathcal{A}$ . After players choose a joint action, the transition function  $\mathcal{T}(w, a) \in \Delta^{\mathcal{W}}$  determines the probability distribution of the next world state  $w'$ . Upon transitioning from  $w$  to  $w'$  via joint action  $a$ , player  $i$  observes  $o_i = \mathcal{O}_i(w, a, w')$  and receives a reward  $\mathcal{R}_i(w)$ . The game ends after a finite number of actions when a terminal world state is reached.

**Metrics in Extensive-Form Game.** A history, denoted  $h = (w^0, a^0, w^1, a^1, \dots, w^t)$ , is a sequence of actions and world states starting from the initial state  $w^0$ . An information set for player  $i$ , denoted  $s_i$ , is a sequence of that player’s observations and actions up to that point:  $s_i(h) = (a_i^0, o_i^1, a_i^1, \dots, o_i^t)$ . A player’s strategy  $\pi_i$  maps from an information set to a probability distribution over actions. A strategy profile  $\pi$  is a tuple  $(\pi_1, \dots, \pi_N)$ . Strategies of all players except  $i$  are denoted  $\pi_{-i}$ . When a strategy  $\pi_i$  is learned through RL, it is referred to as a policy. The expected value (EV)  $v_i^\pi(h)$  for player  $i$  is the expected sum of future rewards in history  $h$  when all players follow strategy profile  $\pi$ . The EV for an information set  $s_i$  is  $v_i^\pi(s_i)$ , and for the entire game, it is  $v_i(\pi)$ . In a two-player zero-sum game,  $v_1(\pi) + v_2(\pi) = 0$  for all strategy profiles  $\pi$ . A Nash equilibrium (NE) is a strategy profile where no player can achieve a higher EV by deviating:  $\pi^*$  is a NE if  $v_i(\pi^*) = \max_{\pi_i} v_i(\pi_i, \pi_{-i}^*)$  for each player  $i$ . The *exploitability*  $e(\pi)$  of a strategy profile  $\pi$  is  $e(\pi) = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}} \max_{\pi_i'} v_i(\pi_i', \pi_{-i})$ . A BR strategy  $\mathbb{BR}_i(\pi_{-i})$  for player  $i$  maximizes exploitation of  $\pi_{-i}$ :  $\mathbb{BR}_i(\pi_{-i}) = \arg \max_{\pi_i} v_i(\pi_i, \pi_{-i})$ . An  $\epsilon$ -BR strategy  $\mathbb{BR}_i^\epsilon(\pi_{-i})$  for player  $i$  is at most  $\epsilon$  worse than the BR:  $v_i(\mathbb{BR}_i^\epsilon(\pi_{-i}), \pi_{-i}) \geq v_i(\mathbb{BR}_i(\pi_{-i}), \pi_{-i}) - \epsilon$ . An  $\epsilon$ -Nash equilibrium ( $\epsilon$ -NE) is a strategy profile  $\pi$  where  $\pi_i$  is an  $\epsilon$ -BR to  $\pi_{-i}$  for each player  $i$ .

**Normal-Form Game and Restricted Game.** A *normal-form game* is a single-step extensive-form game. An extensive-form game induces a normal-form game where the legal actions for player  $i$  are its deterministic strategies  $X_{s_i \in \mathcal{I}_i} \mathcal{A}_i(s_i)$ . These deterministic strategies are called pure strategies. A mixed strategy is a distribution over a player’s pure strategies. A *restricted game*, as employed in PSRO, refers to a variant of a *normal-form game* where players’ strategies are limited to specific populations  $\Pi_i^t$ . In each iteration, the game’s NE ( $\sigma$ ) is determined based on these restricted populations. Subsequently, each player’s population expands as they compute and incorporate the best response to this equilibrium.

## 4 Fusion-PSRO

In this section, we propose Fusion-PSRO, an enhanced framework of PSRO, designed for policy initialization. Additionally, we introduce a simple and effective method called Nash Policy Fusion. This method leverages meta-NE to select high-quality policies, which are then fused through weighted averaging to initialize the BR policy. Finally, we provide guidelines for integrating Fusion-PSRO with other PSRO variants.

### 4.1 A Policy Fusion Framework for PSRO

In addition to efforts in maximizing policy diversity and exploration efficiency through ensemble reinforcement learning [29, 28, 4], integrating diverse multi-policy models into a single policy via distillation has also been shown to effectively utilize historical global information [6]. These approaches are collectively referred to as policy fusion in our work. Policy fusion aims to enhance robustness and adaptability by integrating differentiated existing policies. Inspired by this, we propose a policy fusion framework for enhancing PSRO, named Fusion-PSRO, to leverage past policies more effectively when training new BR policies.

As illustrated in Figure 1, our approach enhances PSRO by introducing a policy fusion component during the initialization of new policies. Given that not all policies generated by PSRO are near-optimal, the meta-Nash Equilibrium (meta-NE) helps us select high-quality policies. Typically, policy initialization in PSRO involves either inheriting historical policies or starting from scratch [12], both methods proving inefficient and costly. While employing policy distillation or ensemble learning for policy fusion does enhance policy generalization and mitigates BR mismatch, it also leads to higher training costs. In contrast, weighted averaging serves as a cost-effective alternative. By directly averaging the weights of base policies, it provides a practical fusion method, making it the preferred approach in Fusion-PSRO. In fact, when the weights of multiple models are similar, weighted averaging may serve as the first-order approximation of policies ensemble [19].

The process of fusion-based initialization in PSRO can be summarized into two main actions: *selection* and *mergence*. The *selection* phase involves choosing base policies from population that are not only strong but also diverse, ensuring a representative set of policies. The *mergence* phase then fuses these selected policies in a way that optimizes computational resources, potentially even reducing costs. Finally, the resulting fused policy is then integrated into the training oracle of PSRO or other PSRO variants, allowing this framework to be applied across multiple PSRO adaptations for enhancing their



ability to utilize knowledge from existing policies and improve overall performance. To illustrate, using weighted averaging as an example, the generic expression can be defined as Eq. (1): In our framework,  $\pi_{\text{fusion}}$  represents the policy obtained after fusion, where  $\pi^{*(i)}$  denotes the  $i$ -th base policy. The parameters of these policies are denoted as  $\theta_{\pi_{\text{fusion}}}$  for the fused policy and  $\theta_{\pi^{*(i)}}$  for each base policy. The fusion method, symbolized by  $\mathcal{F}(\cdot)$ , employs weighted averaging (WA) as indicated by the following expression:

$$\theta_{\pi_{\text{fusion}}} = \mathcal{F}(\theta_{\pi^{*(1)}}, \theta_{\pi^{*(2)}}, \dots, \theta_{\pi^{*(k)}}) = \sum_{i=1}^k \lambda_{\pi^{*(i)}} \theta_{\pi^{*(i)}}, \quad (1)$$

where  $\lambda_{\pi^{*(i)}}$  represents the fusion weights assigned to each base model, ensuring that  $\sum_{i=1}^k \lambda_{\pi^{*(i)}} = 1$ . We define the policy fusion objective to ensure that the utility of the fused policy  $\pi_{\text{fusion}}$ , when contending against a specific opponent  $\pi_{-i}$ , is at least as high as that obtained by any historical policy. This is crucial to guarantee that the performance does not degrade post-fusion. The utility function  $U(\pi_{\text{fusion}}, \pi_{-i}; \theta)$  measures this effectiveness, where  $\theta$  represents the network parameters obtained from the base models through the fusion operation  $\mathcal{F}$ . Formally, the objective can be expressed as:

$$\begin{aligned} \theta_{\pi_{\text{fusion}}} &= \arg \max_{\theta} U(\pi_{\text{fusion}}, \pi_{-i}; \theta), \\ \text{subject to } U(\pi_{\text{fusion}}, \pi_{-i}; \theta_{\pi_{\text{fusion}}}) &\geq U(\pi_i^j, \pi_{-i}; \theta_i^j) \text{ for } \forall \pi_i^j \in \Pi_i, \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

where  $\Pi_i$  is the policy set of player  $i$ ,  $\pi_i^j$  represents the  $j$ -th historical policy of player  $i$  and  $\theta_i^j$  are its parameters. This ensures that the fused policy maximizes its utility while maintaining performance that is at least equivalent to any policy in the policy set, as described in Eq. (2).

## 4.2 Nash Policy Fusion

In Fusion-PSRO, a metric is required to represent the importance of policies within the population, which aids in selecting powerful base policies and determining their fusion weights. We choose meta-Nash Equilibrium (meta-NE) as this metric, which calculated from the payoffs generated by the current meta-game, indicates the relative importance of each policy under Nash equilibrium within the current population, offering significant representational value. Furthermore, since it is pre-generated, it does not incur additional resource costs. We prioritize fusing stronger strategies, specifically those with higher probabilities in the Nash Equilibrium. These policies are defined as  $\Pi_i^* = \arg \text{top}_k(\Pi_i, P(\sigma_i))$ , representing the selection of the top  $k$  policies from the player  $i$ 's policy set through the highest probabilities with meta-NE  $\sigma_i$  (excluding opponent policies  $\sigma_{-i}$ ). This selection criterion ensures we focus on the most effective policies, as higher probability indicates greater importance.

Instead of traditional ensemble learning and distillation, which are resource-intensive and costly to maintain, we employ weighted averaging (WA) for fusing base policies. WA directly averages the model parameters, making it a simple and computationally efficient approach. This method can yield solutions closer to the optimal policy in the policy space with low loss function values, as demonstrated by techniques like SWA in RL [21]. For the fusion weights in WA for Fusion-PSRO, we use the softmax function to ensure the weights sum to one and to promote diversity by narrowing the gap between the weights of base policies through exponential operations. Therefore, the fusion weights  $\lambda_{\Pi_i^*}$  can be constructed as shown in Eq.(3), enabling scalable trade-offs between high-quality policies.

$$\lambda_{\Pi_i^*} = \text{softmax}(\text{top-k}(P(\sigma_i))), \quad (3)$$

where  $i$  notes the  $i$ -th player,  $\Pi_i^*$  represents the current base policies subset  $[\pi_i^{*(1)}, \pi_i^{*(2)}, \dots, \pi_i^{*(k)}]$  of player  $i$ . Corresponding process is shown in Algorithm 1. It is important to clarify that  $k$  cannot be less than 2, as policy fusion requires at least two base policies. If  $k = 1$ , it is a special case of fusion initialization known as inherit initialization. Base policies are chosen exclusively from the same player's population  $i$ . And  $\Pi_i^*$  represents the high-quality policies with the highest probabilities in the current meta-NE ( $\sigma_i^t$ ) to be merged.

---

**Algorithm 1** Initialization via Nash Policy Fusion (WA)

---

- 1: **Input:** population  $\Pi_i^t$ , meta-NE  $\sigma_i^t$  for player  $i$ , new policy  $\pi_i^{t+1}$  for player  $i$ , top-k ratio  $\alpha$ , current iteration  $t$ , fusion start condition  $c$ .
  - 2: **if**  $t \geq c$  **then**
  - 3:     Calculate number of policy-fused  $k$ :  $k = \max(2, \alpha|\Pi_i^t|)$
  - 4:     Select high-quality policy set  $\Pi_i^*$  from  $\Pi_i^t$ :  $\Pi_i^* = \arg \text{top}_k(\Pi_i^t, P(\sigma_i^t))$
  - 5:     Calculate fusion proportion  $\lambda_{\Pi_i^*}$ :  $\lambda_{\Pi_i^*} = \text{softmax}(\text{top-k}(P(\sigma_i^t)))$
  - 6:     Initialize  $\pi_i^{t+1}$  with  $\theta_{\pi_i^{t+1}} = \lambda_{\Pi_i^*} \times \theta_{\Pi_i^*}$
  - 7: **else**
  - 8:     Initialize  $\pi_i^{t+1} \sim \sigma_i^t$
  - 9: **end if**
  - 10: **Output:** initialized  $\pi_i^{t+1}$  for player  $i$
- 

### 4.3 Nash Policy Fusion for PSROs

Following the fusion-based initialization, we initially adopt the standard PSRO training processes and objective functions. Integrating the aforementioned fusion-based approach, we introduce Nash Policy Fusion for PSRO, detailed in Algorithm 2. It should be emphasized that when  $t < 2$ , the prerequisites for Fusion are not satisfied (requiring at least two base policies), and thus the default initialization method of PSRO is applied. If the objective function utilizes regularization forms from other PSRO variants, or if the training process employs different PSRO variants, the framework is referred to as Fusion-PSROs. We have applied this fusion enhancement to nearly all variants, with experimental results presented in Section 5. To illustrate the plug-and-play attribute of our work, we integrated

---

**Algorithm 2** Fusion-PSRO

---

- 1: **Input:** initial policy sets for all players  $\Pi$
  - 2: Compute utilities  $U^\Pi$  for each joint  $\pi \in \Pi$
  - 3: Initialize meta-NE  $\sigma_i = \text{UNIFORM}(\Pi_i)$
  - 4: **for**  $e \in \{1, 2, \dots\}$  **do**
  - 5:     **for** player  $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$  **do**
  - 6:         Initialize  $\pi_i^{t+1}$  via **Algorithm 1** // Better Initialization
  - 7:         **for** many episodes **do**
  - 8:             Sample  $\pi_{-i} \sim \sigma_{-i}^t$
  - 9:             Train oracle  $\pi_i^{t+1}$  over  $\rho \sim (\pi_i^{t+1}, \pi_{-i})$
  - 10:         **end for**
  - 11:          $\Pi_i^{t+1} = \Pi_i^t \cup \{\pi_i^{t+1}\}$
  - 12:     **end for**
  - 13:     Compute missing entries in  $M^{t+1}$
  - 14:     Compute a meta-NE  $\sigma$  from  $M^{t+1}$
  - 15: **end for**
  - 16: **Output:** current meta-NE for each player
- 

fusion process into PSD-PSRO as an example, whose algorithm is provided in Appendix A. In addition, given that Fusion is treated as an initialization method in this study, we have conducted corresponding ablation experiments to compare Fusion with other initialization approaches (including normal initialization[26], inherited initialization[12], orthogonal initialization[27], Kaiming initialization[10]) when used into PSRO and its variants, which are documented in Appendix B.

### 4.4 How Nash Policy Fusion Works

To understand the mechanics of Nash Policy Fusion, we propose Assumption 1 adapted from the Nash-EMA developed in NLHF[19]. Let  $\{\pi_i^j\}_{j=1}^N$  be a set of trained policy models with corresponding network parameters  $\{\theta_{\pi_i^j}\}_{j=1}^N$  for player  $i$ . The goal is to fuse these models into a single policy model  $\pi_{\text{fusion}}$  with parameters  $\theta_{\pi_{\text{fusion}}}$ . Each policy model  $\pi_i^j$  has been well trained in the same environment but against different opponents.

**Assumption 1.** *The weighted average at the policy network parameter level provides a first-order approximation to the ensemble at the policy output level when the policy network parameters are similar. Using the first-order Taylor expansion, we have:*

$$\pi_{\text{fusion}} \approx \pi_{\text{ensemble}} + \sum_{j=1}^N \frac{\partial \pi_{\text{ensemble}}}{\partial \pi_i^j} (\pi_i^j - \pi_{\text{ensemble}}), \quad (4)$$

where  $\pi_{\text{ensemble}} = \sum_{j=1}^N w_j \pi_i^j$ , and the weights  $w_j$  satisfy  $\sum_{j=1}^N w_j = 1$ .

**Proposition 1.** *Based on Assumption 1, when the weights equal Nash probabilities, the Nash fusion policy is an approximate Nash policy in the restricted game. If we define the expected utility as  $U(\pi_i, \pi_{-i})$ , then*

$$U(\pi_{fusion}, \pi_{-i}) \gtrsim U(\pi_i^j, \pi_{-i}) \quad \forall \pi_i^j \in \Pi_i, \quad (5)$$

where  $\pi_i^j$  represents the  $j$ -th historical policy of player  $i$  and  $\Pi_i$  is the policy set of player  $i$  in the current restricted game.

*Proof:* See Appendix C.1. Proposition 1 demonstrates that Nash-weighted average enables scalable trade-offs between near-optimal historical policies from the perspective of the global utility function.

**Proposition 2.** *If Assumption 1 holds, Nash-weighted average initialization is superior to inherit initialization and scratch initialization. For their expected utilities, we have*

$$U(\pi_{fusion}, \pi_{-i}; \theta_{\pi_{fusion}}) \gtrsim U(\pi_{inherit}, \pi_{-i}; \theta_{\pi_{inherit}}) \gg U(\pi_{scratch}, \pi_{-i}; \theta_{\pi_{scratch}}), \quad (6)$$

where  $(\pi_{fusion}, \theta_{\pi_{fusion}})$ ,  $(\pi_{inherit}, \theta_{\pi_{inherit}})$  and  $(\pi_{scratch}, \theta_{\pi_{scratch}})$  are the policies and parameters initialized by the fusion, inherit, and scratch methods, respectively.

*Proof:* See Appendix C.2. Proposition 2 indicates that Nash-weighted average initialization is better than inherit and scratch initialization, providing a baseline guarantee for the fusion objective constraints in Eq. (2).

Additionally, we find that Nash-weighted initialization retains exploration terms by combining multiple policies, each contributing its own exploratory strategy, as shown in Proposition 3. This method is superior to the inherit initialization, as it prevents overfitting to current opponents' policies and enhances overall exploration capability.

**Proposition 3.** *The Nash-weighted initialization combines the exploration capabilities of multiple policies, with each policy contributing to the overall exploration:*

$$U(\pi_{fusion}, \pi_{-i}; \theta_{\pi_{fusion}}) \approx \sum_{j=1}^N w_j U(\pi_{fusion}, \pi_{-i}; \theta_{\pi_i^j}) + \underbrace{\frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^N w_j (\theta_{\pi_{fusion}} - \theta_{\pi_i^j})^T H_j (\theta_{\pi_{fusion}} - \theta_{\pi_i^j})}_{\text{Exploration term}}. \quad (7)$$

where  $\theta_{\pi_i^j}$  represents the parameters of the  $j$ -th policy in player  $i$ 's policy set.

*Proof:* See Appendix C.2.

## 5 Experiments

We aim to validate the effectiveness of our Fusion-PSRO framework in generating better BR approximations, thereby inducing a less exploitable population. We incorporate not only PSRO[12] but also multiple state-of-the-art PSRO variants into our framework, including Pipeline-PSRO[17], PSRO<sub>r,N</sub>[1], BD&RD-PSRO[14], Diverse-PSRO[20], and PSD-PSRO[36], collectively referred to as Fusion-PSROs, for comparative analysis against their original versions. The benchmarks include single-state games (non-transitive mixture game) and complex extensive games (Leduc Poker and Liars Dice). In all cases, Fusion-PSROs demonstrate the capability to achieve lower *exploitability* as shown in Figure 2 and Figure 3, which in a sense supports Proposition 1 of approximate Nash policies. Furthermore, in the non-transitive mixture game, trajectories generated by Fusion-PSROs are denser around the Gaussian center point, as shown in Figure 2b, indicating more comprehensive exploration, substantiating Proposition 3. Moreover, the ablation studies on different initializations in Liars Dice, as depicted in Figure 4 (detailed in Appendix B), reveal that new policies generated by Fusion-PSROs attain higher *rewards*, suggesting for better BR approximation, thereby validating Proposition 2. Benchmark and implementation details are documented in Appendix D.

**Non-Transitive Mixture Game** is characterized by seven Gaussian humps that are evenly spaced on a two-dimensional plane. Each policy in the game corresponds to a point on this plane, analogous to the weights (the probability of that point within each Gaussian distribution) that players allocate to the humps. To achieve the best policy, players should position themselves near the central area of the Gaussian humps and investigate all the distributions thoroughly. In Figure 2a, we depict the exploration trajectories during training for both the original versions (PSROs) of PSRO and its various




Figure 2: Training exploration trajectories on Non-Transitive Mixture Game. The final *exploitability*  $\times 100$  (Exp) for each method is indicated at the bottom.

variants, alongside their counterparts in Fusion-PSRO framework (Fusion-PSROs) shown in Figure 2b. While the trajectories of PSROs gradually expand outward from the center, those generated by Fusion-PSROs are denser around the Gaussian center, indicating the potential for achieving better BR policy. Upon analyzing this process, we observe that policy fusion alters the initialization positions, resulting in starting points of trajectories closer to the Gaussian center. As training proceeds, the trajectories systematically traverse almost every Gaussian center, clarifying the reasons behind the better BR approximation. Moreover, Fusion-PSROs exhibit lower *exploitability* (EXP), suggesting that policy fusion of historical policies enhances the robustness of the population. Contrary to conventional approaches, where PSRO and PSRO<sub>r,N</sub> are typically limited by the number of threads of only 1—compared to 4 in other PSRO variants—thus severely constraining their exploration capabilities, we opted for a different way. To mitigate this constraint, we tripled the training episodes for these two algorithms compared to others, aiming to balance the exploration limitations.




Figure 3: *Exploitability* of the meta-NE on Leduc poker and Liars Dice. The numbers of samples for training each BR in two games are set to  $2e4$ ,  $2e5$  respectively.

**Leduc Poker** is a simplified variant of poker [31], with a deck consisting of two suits, each containing three cards. Each player antes one chip, and a single private card is dealt to each player. Since Diverse-PSRO cannot scale to the RL setting and the code for BD&RD-PSRO in complex games is unavailable, we compare PSRO and PSD-PSRO with their policy fusion counterparts, Fusion-PSRO and Fusion-PSD-PSRO, to illustrate the impact of diversity on Fusion-PSRO framework (similarly in Liars Dice). As shown in Figure 3a, both Fusion-PSRO and Fusion-PSD-PSRO are more effective at reducing *exploitability* than their corresponding original version, which in a sense supports Proposition 1. Additionally, diversity-enhanced Fusion-PSD-PSRO outperforms Fusion-PSRO, highlighting the benefits of diversity in policy fusion, substantiating Proposition 3.

**Liars Dice** is a bluffing game where each player begins with a set of concealed dice and makes progressively higher bids regarding the count of a specific die face across all players [8]. The game alternates between making bids and challenging the veracity of the previous bid, leading to the loss of dice (or defeat in the game) for incorrect challenges or bids. As shown in Figure 3b, similar to Leduc Poker, by merging historical policies, both Fusion-PSRO and Fusion-PSD-PSRO achieve




Figure 4: Average *Reward* for each iteration (71-80) during the training of each approximate BR within PSD-PSRO.

lower *exploitability* [32] than their corresponding original versions, meanwhile Fusion-PSD-PSRO outperforms Fusion-PSRO. Additionally, since policy fusion in Fusion-PSRO can be considered a method of policy initialization, we conducted ablation experiments to compare other four different initialization methods including normal initialization (random values from a normal distribution) [26], orthogonal initialization (orthogonal weight matrices) [27], Kaiming initialization (weights scaled by the square root of the number of input units) [10] and inherited initialization (inheriting weights from previously trained models or policies, which is the default initialization method in OpenSpiel library’s PSRO) [12]. In the experiment, we initialized the initial populations using these four methods respectively and continued using them to generate approximate BRs (corresponding to Normal-BR, Orthogonal-BR, Kaiming-BR and Inherited-BR respectively) during new policy training within PSRO and PSD-PSRO. Simultaneously, we replaced them with Nash Policy Fusion to generate the second BR (Fusion-BR) for comparison. As an example, Figure 4 shows the average *reward* for each iteration (71-80) during the training of each approximate BR within PSD-PSRO (detailed in Appendix B). At the start of training each policy, Fusion-BR, by merging historical policies, and Inherited-BR, by inheriting historical policies, both achieve higher initial rewards, while the other three BRs need to be trained from scratch with lower rewards. Furthermore, Fusion-BR converges to a higher average reward in nearly half the episodes compared to other BRs, potentially reducing the computational resources required for Fusion-PSROs. In terms of final converged average reward, Fusion-BR outperforms all other BRs, thereby validating Proposition 2. The experimental results indicate that Fusion-PSROs can generate better approximate BR policies by using Nash Policy Fusion to initialize the policy closer to the BR, enabling faster and more accurate BR approximation during training and potentially reducing the computational cost of PSRO and its variants.

## 6 Conclusions and Limitations

In this paper, we introduced Fusion-PSRO framework, an innovative approach for initializing policies within the PSRO paradigm using policy fusion techniques. Our method leverages optimized base policies, integrating them via weight averaging to enhance the approximation of BR policies without additional training overhead. Extensive experiments in various game environments, including non-transitive matrix games, Leduc Poker and Liars Dice, demonstrate that Fusion-PSRO significantly improves the performance of PSRO and its variants, achieving lower exploitability and higher returns, especially as the number of policies increases.

Despite these promising results, our approach has some limitations. While Fusion-PSRO showed significant improvements in tested environments, its scalability to larger and more complex games requires further investigation. Additionally, the performance of Fusion-PSRO is sensitive to hyperparameter choices, such as the number of base policies to fuse, necessitating extensive hyperparameter tuning for optimal performance. Furthermore, our current method relies on weight averaging, which requires the policy weights to be very close to each other. There are other model fusion methods that could be explored and validated.

Future research could address these limitations by optimizing the selection and fusion process, applying Fusion-PSRO to more complex and larger-scale games, and integrating advanced policy fusion techniques to enhance performance and scalability. Additionally, exploring the theoretical foundations of policy fusion in reinforcement learning could provide deeper insights into its benefits and potential applications.

## References

- [1] David Balduzzi, Marta Garnelo, Yoram Bachrach, Wojciech Czarnecki, Julien Perolat, Max Jaderberg, and Thore Graepel. Open-ended learning in symmetric zero-sum games. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 434–443. PMLR, 2019.
- [2] David Balduzzi, Sébastien Racanière, James Martens, Jakob Foerster, Karl Tuyls, and Thore Graepel. Diverse population-based reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1901.08106*, 2019.
- [3] George W Brown. Iterative solution of games by fictitious play. *Act. Anal. Prod Allocation*, 13(1):374, 1951.
- [4] Jacob Buckman, Danijar Hafner, George Tucker, Eugene Brevdo, and Honglak Lee. Sample-efficient reinforcement learning with stochastic ensemble value expansion. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 31, 2018.
- [5] Salvatore Carta, Andrea Ferreira, Alessandro Simonetta Podda, Diego Reforgiato Recupero, and Andrea Sanna. Multi-dqn: An ensemble of deep q-learning agents for stock market forecasting. *Expert systems with applications*, 164:113820, 2021.
- [6] Yiqun Chen, Hangyu Mao, Tianle Zhang, Shiguang Wu, Bin Zhang, Jianye Hao, Dong Li, Bin Wang, and Hongxing Chang. Ptde: Personalized training with distilled execution for multi-agent reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.08872*, 2022.
- [7] Wojciech M. Czarnecki, Gauthier Gidel, Brendan D. Tracey, Karl Tuyls, Shayegan Omidshafiei, David Balduzzi, and Max Jaderberg. Real world games look like spinning tops. *ArXiv*, abs/2004.09468, 2020.
- [8] Christopher P Ferguson and Thomas S Ferguson. *Models for the Game of Liar’s Dice*. Springer, 1991.
- [9] Eric A Hansen, Daniel S Bernstein, and Shlomo Zilberstein. Dynamic programming for partially observable stochastic games. *Conference on Artificial Intelligence (AAAI)*, 2004.
- [10] Kaiming He, Xiangyu Zhang, Shaoqing Ren, and Jian Sun. Delving deep into rectifiers: Surpassing human-level performance on imagenet classification. In *Proceedings of the IEEE international conference on computer vision*, pages 1026–1034, 2015.
- [11] Alexia Jolicoeur-Martineau, Emy Gervais, Kilian Fatras, Yan Zhang, and Simon Lacoste-Julien. Population parameter averaging (papa). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.03094*, 2023.
- [12] Marc Lanctot, Vinicius Zambaldi, Audrunas Gruslys, Angeliki Lazaridou, Karl Tuyls, Julien Pérolat, David Silver, and Thore Graepel. A unified game-theoretic approach to multiagent reinforcement learning. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, Long Beach, CA, USA, 2017.
- [13] Weishi Li, Yong Peng, Miao Zhang, Liang Ding, Han Hu, and Li Shen. Deep model fusion: A survey. *ArXiv preprint ArXiv:2309.15698*, 2023.
- [14] Xiangyu Liu, Hangtian Jia, Ying Wen, Yaodong Yang, Yujing Hu, Yingfeng Chen, Changjie Fan, and Zhipeng Hu. Unifying behavioral and response diversity for open-ended learning in zero-sum games. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, Shanghai Jiao Tong University; Netease Fuxi AI Lab; University College London, 2021. NeurIPS.
- [15] Zongkai Liu, Chao Yu, Yaodong Yang, Zifan Wu, Yuan Li, et al. A unified diversity measure for multiagent reinforcement learning. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2022.
- [16] Michael S Matena and Colin A Raffel. Merging models with fisher-weighted averaging. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:17703–17716, 2022.
- [17] Stephen McAleer, John Lanier, Roy Fox, and Pierre Baldi. Pipeline psro: A scalable approach for finding approximate nash equilibria in large games. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, Vancouver, Canada, 2020.
- [18] H Brendan McMahan, Geoffrey J Gordon, and Avrim Blum. Planning in the presence of cost functions controlled by an adversary. In *Proceedings of the 20th International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML-03)*, pages 536–543, 2003.

- [19] Rémi Munos, Michal Valko, Daniele Calandriello, Mohammad Gheshlaghi Azar, Mark Rowland, Zhaohan Daniel Guo, Yunhao Tang, Matthieu Geist, Thomas Mesnard, Andrea Michi, et al. Nash learning from human feedback. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.00886*, 2023.
- [20] Nicolas Perez Nieves, Yaodong Yang, Oliver Slumbers, David Henry Mguni, Ying Wen, and Jun Wang. Modelling behavioural diversity for learning in open-ended games. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2021.
- [21] Evgenii Nikishin, Pavel Izmailov, Ben Athiwaratkun, Dmitrii Podoprikin, Timur Garipov, Pavel Shvechikov, Dmitry Vetrov, and Andrew Gordon Wilson. Improving stability in deep reinforcement learning with weight averaging. In *Uncertainty in artificial intelligence workshop on uncertainty in Deep learning*, 2018.
- [22] Shayegan Omidshafiei, Christos Papadimitriou, Georgios Piliouras, Karl Tuyls, Mark Rowland, Jean-Baptiste Lespiau, Wojciech M Czarnecki, Marc Lanctot, Julien Perolat, and Remi Munos.  $\alpha$ -rank: Multi-agent evaluation by evolution. *Scientific Reports*, 9(1):1–29, 2019.
- [23] Ian Osband, Charles Blundell, Alexander Pritzel, and Benjamin Van Roy. Deep exploration via bootstrapped dqn. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 29, 2016.
- [24] Peng Peng, Ying Wen, Yaodong Yang, Quan Yuan, Zhenkun Tang, Haitao Long, and Jun Wang. Multiagent bidirectionally-coordinated nets: Emergence of human-level coordination in learning to play starcraft combat games. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1703.10069*, 2017.
- [25] Alexandre Rame, Guillaume Couairon, Corentin Dancette, Jean-Baptiste Gaya, Mustafa Shukor, Laure Soulier, and Matthieu Cord. Rewarded soups: towards pareto-optimal alignment by interpolating weights fine-tuned on diverse rewards. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36, 2024.
- [26] David E Rumelhart, Geoffrey E Hinton, and Ronald J Williams. Learning representations by back-propagating errors. *nature*, 323(6088):533–536, 1986.
- [27] Andrew M Saxe, James L McClelland, and Surya Ganguli. Exact solutions to the nonlinear dynamics of learning in deep linear neural networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1312.6120*, 2013.
- [28] Gaurav Sharma, Amit Singh, and Surbhi Jain. Deepevap: Deep reinforcement learning based ensemble approach for estimating reference evapotranspiration. *Applied Soft Computing*, 125:109113, 2022.
- [29] Hassam Sheikh, Kizza Frisbee, and Mariano Phielipp. Dns: Determinantal point process based neural network sampler for ensemble reinforcement learning. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 19731–19746. PMLR, 2022.
- [30] Yanjie Song, Ponnuthurai Nagaratnam Suganthan, Witold Pedrycz, Junwei Ou, Yongming He, Yingwu Chen, and Yutong Wu. Ensemble reinforcement learning: A survey. *Applied Soft Computing*, page 110975, 2023.
- [31] Finnegan Southey, Michael P Bowling, Bryce Larson, Carmelo Piccione, Neil Burch, Darse Billings, and Chris Rayner. Bayes’ bluff: Opponent modelling in poker. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1207.1411*, 2012.
- [32] Finbarr Timbers, Nolan Bard, Edward Lockhart, Marc Lanctot, Martin Schmid, Neil Burch, Julian Schrittwieser, Thomas Hubert, and Michael Bowling. Approximate exploitability: Learning a best response in large games. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2004.09677*, 2020.
- [33] Oriol Vinyals, Igor Babuschkin, Wojciech M Czarnecki, Michaël Mathieu, Andrew Dudzik, Junyoung Chung, David H Choi, Richard Powell, Timo Ewalds, Petko Georgiev, et al. Grandmaster level in starcraft ii using multi-agent reinforcement learning. *Nature*, 575(7782):350–354, 2019.
- [34] Mitchell Wortsman, Gabriel Ilharco, Samir Ya Gadre, Rebecca Roelofs, Raphael Gontijo-Lopes, Ari S Morcos, Hongseok Namkoong, Ali Farhadi, Yair Carmon, Simon Kornblith, et al. Model soups: averaging weights of multiple fine-tuned models improves accuracy without increasing inference time. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 23965–23998. PMLR, 2022.
- [35] Junta Wu and Huiyun Li. Deep ensemble reinforcement learning with multiple deep deterministic policy gradient algorithm. *Mathematical Problems in Engineering*, 2020:1–12, 2020.
- [36] Jian Yao, Weiming Liu, Haobo Fu, Yaodong Yang, Stephen McAleer, Qiang Fu, and Wei Yang. Policy space diversity for non-transitive games. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2023.

- [37] Deheng Ye, Guibin Chen, Wen Zhang, Sheng Chen, Bo Yuan, Bo Liu, Jia Chen, Zhao Liu, Fuhao Qiu, Hongsheng Yu, et al. Towards playing full moba games with deep reinforcement learning. In *34th Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS 2020)*, Vancouver, Canada, 2020.
- [38] Ming Zhou, Jingxiao Chen, Ying Wen, Weinan Zhang, Yaodong Yang, Yong Yu, and Jun Wang. Efficient policy space response oracles. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2202.00633*, 2022.



## A Algorithm for Fusion-PSD-PSRO

---


### Algorithm 3 Fusion-PSD-PSRO

---

- 1: **Input:** initial policy sets for all players  $\Pi$
  - 2: Compute utilities  $U^\Pi$  for each joint  $\pi \in \Pi$
  - 3: Initialize meta-NE  $\sigma_i = \text{UNIFORM}(\Pi_i)$
  - 4: **for**  $e \in \{1, 2, \dots\}$  **do**
  - 5:     **for** *player*  $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$  **do**
  - 6:         Initialize  $\pi_i^{t+1}$  via **Algorithm 1** and sample  $J$  policies  $\{\pi_i^j\}_{j=1}^J$  from Policy Hull  $\Pi_i^t$
  - 7:         **for** many episodes **do**
  - 8:             Sample  $\pi_{-i} \sim \sigma_{-i}^t$  and collect the trajectory  $\tau$  by playing  $\pi_i$  against  $\pi_{-i}$
  - 9:             Discount the terminal reward  $u(\pi_i, \pi_{-i})$  to each state as the extrinsic reward  $r_1$
  - 10:            Discount  $R^{kl}(\tau)$  to each state as the intrinsic reward  $r_2$
  - 11:            Store  $(s, a, s', r)$  to the buffer, where  $s'$  is the next state and  $r = r_1 + r_2$
  - 12:            Estimate the gradient with the samples in the buffer and train oracle  $\pi_i^{t+1}$  over  $\rho \sim (\pi_i^{t+1}, \pi_{-i})$
  - 13:         **end for**
  - 14:          $\Pi_i^{t+1} = \Pi_i^t \cup \{\pi_i^{t+1}\}$
  - 15:     **end for**
  - 16:     Compute missing entries in  $M^{t+1}$
  - 17:     Compute a meta-NE  $\sigma$  from  $M^{t+1}$
  - 18: **end for**
  - 19: **Output:** current meta-NE for each player.
- 

## B Average Reward during Training on Liars Dice

In ablation experiments, we initialized the initial populations using these four initialization methods respectively and continued using them to generate approximate BRs (corresponding to Normal-BR, Orthogonal-BR, Kaiming-BR and Inherited-BR respectively) during new policy training within PSRO and PSD-PSRO. Simultaneously, we replaced these initialization methods with the Nash Policy Fusion method to generate the second BR (Fusion-BR) for comparison. Figure 5 shows the average *reward* for each iteration (61-100) during the training of each approximate BR within PSRO and PSD-PSRO.






Figure 5: Average Reward for each iteration(61-100) during the training of each approximate BR within PSRO and PSD-PSRO.

## C Theoretical Analysis

Consider a set of well trained policy models  $\{\pi_i^j\}_{j=1}^N$  for player  $i$ , each with corresponding network parameters  $\{\theta_{\pi_i^j}\}_{j=1}^N$ . These models have been trained in the same environment but against different opponents. The objective is to fuse these models into a single policy model,  $\pi_{\text{fusion}}$ , with parameters  $\theta_{\pi_{\text{fusion}}}$ . Then we propose Assumption 1, adapted from the Nash-EMA developed in NLHF[19].

**Assumption 1.** *The weighted average at the policy network parameter level provides a first-order approximation to the ensemble at the policy output level when the policy network parameters are similar. Using the first-order Taylor expansion, we have:*

$$\pi_{\text{fusion}} \approx \pi_{\text{ensemble}} + \sum_{j=1}^N \frac{\partial \pi_{\text{ensemble}}}{\partial \pi_i^j} (\pi_i^j - \pi_{\text{ensemble}}), \quad (8)$$

where  $\pi_{\text{ensemble}} = \sum_{j=1}^N w_j \pi_i^j$ , and the weights  $w_j$  satisfy  $\sum_{j=1}^N w_j = 1$ .

**Lemma 1.** *If Assumption 1 holds, the fused policy and the ensemble policy at the policy output level are similar. That is,*

$$\pi_{\text{fusion}} \approx \sum_{j=1}^N w_j \pi_i^j = \pi_{\text{ensemble}}. \quad (9)$$

*Proof.* In most cases,  $\frac{\partial \pi_{\text{ensemble}}}{\partial \pi_i^j}$  is a constant because  $\pi_{\text{ensemble}}$  is a linear combination of  $\pi_i^j$ . Therefore, this term simplifies to:

$$\pi_{\text{fusion}} \approx \sum_{j=1}^N w_j \pi_i^j + \sum_{j=1}^N w_j \left( \pi_i^j - \sum_{k=1}^N w_k \pi_i^k \right). \quad (10)$$

Since

$$\sum_{j=1}^N w_j \left( \pi_i^j - \sum_{k=1}^N w_k \pi_i^k \right) = \sum_{j=1}^N w_j \pi_i^j - \sum_{j=1}^N w_j \sum_{k=1}^N w_k \pi_i^k,$$

and because  $\sum_{k=1}^N w_k = 1$ , it follows that:

$$\sum_{j=1}^N w_j \sum_{k=1}^N w_k \pi_i^k = \sum_{k=1}^N w_k \pi_i^k,$$

thus,

$$\sum_{j=1}^N w_j \left( \pi_i^j - \sum_{k=1}^N w_k \pi_i^k \right) = \sum_{j=1}^N w_j \pi_i^j - \sum_{k=1}^N w_k \pi_i^k = 0.$$

Above all, we have

$$\pi_{\text{fusion}} \approx \sum_{j=1}^N w_j \pi_i^j. \quad (11)$$

□

**Lemma 2.** *The expected utility of the ensemble policy can be expressed as the weighted sum of the expected utilities of the individual policies:*

$$U(\pi_{\text{ensemble}}, \pi_{-i}) = \sum_{j=1}^N w_j U(\pi_i^j, \pi_{-i}). \quad (12)$$

*Proof.* For a mixed strategy  $\pi_{\text{ensemble}} = \sum_{j=1}^N w_j \pi_i^j$  against an opponent's strategy  $\pi_{-i}$ , the expected utility is:

$$U(\pi_{\text{ensemble}}, \pi_{-i}) = \mathbb{E}_{\pi_{\text{ensemble}}, \pi_{-i}} [u(a, b)]. \quad (13)$$

where  $u(a, b)$  is the utility function depending on the action  $a$  taken by  $\pi_{\text{ensemble}}$ , and the action  $b$  taken by  $\pi_{-i}$ .

Because the mixed strategy  $\pi_{\text{ensemble}}$  can be expressed as a linear combination of pure strategies:

$$\pi_{\text{ensemble}}(a) = \sum_{j=1}^N w_j \pi_i^j(a),$$

thus, the expected utility can be written as:

$$\begin{aligned} U(\pi_{\text{ensemble}}, \pi_{-i}) &= \sum_a \sum_b \pi_{\text{ensemble}}(a) \pi_{-i}(b) u(a, b) \\ &= \sum_a \sum_b \left( \sum_{j=1}^N w_j \pi_i^j(a) \right) \pi_{-i}(b) u(a, b). \end{aligned}$$

The expected utility of each pure strategy  $\pi_i^j$  against  $\pi_{-i}$  is:

$$U(\pi_i^j, \pi_{-i}) = \sum_a \sum_b \pi_i^j(a) \pi_{-i}(b) u(a, b).$$

Substituting back, we get:

$$U(\pi_{\text{ensemble}}, \pi_{-i}) = \sum_{j=1}^N w_j \sum_a \sum_b \pi_i^j(a) \pi_{-i}(b) u(a, b) = \sum_{j=1}^N w_j U(\pi_i^j, \pi_{-i}). \quad (14)$$

□

### C.1 Proof of Nash-weighted Average Initialization

**Proposition 1.** *Based on Assumption 1, when the weights equal Nash probabilities, the Nash fusion policy is an approximate Nash policy in the restricted game. If we define the expected utility as  $U(\pi_i, \pi_{-i})$ , then*

$$U(\pi_{\text{fusion}}, \pi_{-i}) \gtrsim U(\pi_i^j, \pi_{-i}) \quad \forall \pi_i^j \in \Pi_i, \quad (15)$$

where  $\pi_i^j$  represents the  $j$ -th historical policy of player  $i$  and  $\Pi_i$  is the policy set of player  $i$  in the current restricted game.

*Proof.* Based on Lemma 1 and 2, we have that combined utility function for Nash-weighted initialization is:

$$U(\pi_{\text{fusion}}, \pi_{-i}) \approx U \left( \sum_{j=1}^N w_j^j \pi_i^j, \pi_{-i} \right) = \sum_{j=1}^N w_j U(\pi_i^j, \pi_{-i}). \quad (16)$$

In a Nash equilibrium, the probabilities  $\{p_i\}_{i=1}^N$  associated with each policy are such that:  $\sum_{i=1}^N p_i = 1$  and no player can unilaterally improve their utility by changing their strategy. We set  $w_j = p_i$ , then:

$$\sum_{j=1}^N w_j U(\pi_i^j, \pi_{-i}) \geq U(\pi_i^j, \pi_{-i}) \text{ for } \forall \pi_i^j \in \Pi_i. \quad (17)$$

Above all, we get

$$U(\pi_{\text{fusion}}, \pi_{-i}) \gtrsim U(\pi_i^j, \pi_{-i}) \text{ for } \forall \pi_i^j \in \Pi_i. \quad (18)$$

□

It means that Nash-weighted average enable scalable trade-offs between near-optimal historical policies, describe as Eq.18.

## C.2 Superiority of Nash-weighted Initialization

**Proposition 2.** *If Assumption 1 holds, Nash-weighted average initialization is superior to inherit initialization and scratch initialization. For their expected utilities, we have*

$$U(\pi_{\text{fusion}}, \pi_{-i}; \theta_{\pi_{\text{fusion}}}) \gtrsim U(\pi_{\text{inherit}}, \pi_{-i}; \theta_{\pi_{\text{inherit}}}) \gg U(\pi_{\text{scratch}}, \pi_{-i}; \theta_{\pi_{\text{scratch}}}), \quad (19)$$

where  $(\pi_{\text{fusion}}, \theta_{\pi_{\text{fusion}}})$ ,  $(\pi_{\text{inherit}}, \theta_{\pi_{\text{inherit}}})$  and  $(\pi_{\text{scratch}}, \theta_{\pi_{\text{scratch}}})$  are the policies and parameters initialized by the fusion, inherit, and scratch methods, respectively.

*Proof.* For inherit initialization, the utility function is given by:

$$U(\pi_{\text{inherit}}, \pi_{-i}; \theta_{\pi_{\text{inherit}}}) = U(\pi_{\text{inherit}}, \pi_{-i}; \theta_{\pi_i^j}), \quad (20)$$

for some  $j$  in  $\{1, 2, \dots, N\}$ ,  $\pi_i^j$  represents the  $j$ -th historical policy of player  $i$ .

For Nash-weighted average initialization, the utility function is:

$$U(\pi_{\text{fusion}}, \pi_{-i}; \theta_{\pi_{\text{fusion}}}) = U(\pi_{\text{fusion}}, \pi_{-i}; \sum_{j=1}^N w_j \theta_{\pi_i^j}). \quad (21)$$

For scratch initialization, the utility function can be defined as:

$$U(\pi_{\text{scratch}}, \pi_{-i}; \theta_{\pi_{\text{scratch}}}), \quad (22)$$

where  $\theta_{\pi_{\text{scratch}}}$  can be initialized using various initialization approaches, including normal initialization [26], inherited [12], orthogonal initialization [27], and Kaiming initialization [10], among others.

- **Comparison:** Based on Lemma 1 and 2, the first term in the Nash-weighted utility function is a convex combination of near-optimal utilities, which is at least as good as any single near-optimal utility:

$$\sum_{i=1}^N w_i U(\pi_i, \pi_{-i}; \theta_{\pi_i}) \geq U(\pi_{\text{inherit}}, \pi_{-i}; \theta_{\pi_i^j}), \quad (23)$$

therefore:

$$U(\pi_{\text{fusion}}, \pi_{-i}; \theta_{\pi_{\text{fusion}}}) \gtrsim U(\pi_{\text{inherit}}, \pi_{-i}; \theta_{\pi_{\text{inherit}}}). \quad (24)$$

And it is significantly better than a scratch initialization:

$$\sum_{i=1}^N w_i U(\pi_{\text{fusion}}, \pi_{-i}; \theta_{\pi_i}) \gg U(\pi_{\text{scratch}}, \pi_{-i}; \theta_{\pi_{\text{scratch}}}), \quad (25)$$

therefore:

$$U(\pi_{\text{fusion}}, \pi_{-i}; \theta_{\pi_{\text{fusion}}}) \gg U(\pi_{\text{scratch}}, \pi_{-i}; \theta_{\pi_{\text{scratch}}}). \quad (26)$$

Above all, we have:

$$U(\pi_{\text{fusion}}, \pi_{-i}; \theta_{\pi_{\text{fusion}}}) \gtrsim U(\pi_{\text{inherit}}, \pi_{-i}; \theta_{\pi_{\text{inherit}}}) \gg U(\pi_{\text{scratch}}, \pi_{-i}; \theta_{\pi_{\text{scratch}}}). \quad (27)$$

□

**Proposition 3.** *The Nash-weighted initialization combines the exploration capabilities of multiple policies, with each policy contributing to the overall exploration:*

$$\begin{aligned} U(\pi_{\text{fusion}}, \pi_{-i}; \theta_{\pi_{\text{fusion}}}) &\approx \sum_{j=1}^N w_j U(\pi_{\text{fusion}}, \pi_{-i}; \theta_{\pi_i^j}) \\ &+ \underbrace{\frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^N w_j (\theta_{\pi_{\text{fusion}}} - \theta_{\pi_i^j})^T H_j (\theta_{\pi_{\text{fusion}}} - \theta_{\pi_i^j})}_{\text{Exploration term}}. \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

where  $\theta_{\pi_i^j}$  represents the parameters of the  $j$ -th policy in player  $i$ 's policy set.

*Proof.* Given the expected utility as  $U(\pi_i, \pi_{-i}; \theta_{\pi_i})$ , using the Taylor expansion and summing over all policies of player  $i$ , we get:

$$\begin{aligned}
U(\pi_{\text{fusion}}, \pi_{-i}; \theta_{\pi_{\text{fusion}}}) &\approx \sum_{j=1}^N w_j U(\pi_{\text{fusion}}, \pi_{-i}; \theta_{\pi_i^j}) \\
&+ \sum_{j=1}^N w_j \nabla U(\pi_{\text{fusion}}, \pi_{-i}; \theta_{\pi_i^j})^T (\theta_{\pi_{\text{fusion}}} - \theta_{\pi_i^j}) \\
&+ \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^N w_j (\theta_{\pi_{\text{fusion}}} - \theta_{\pi_i^j})^T H_j (\theta_{\pi_{\text{fusion}}} - \theta_{\pi_i^j}),
\end{aligned} \tag{29}$$

where  $H_j$  is the Hessian matrix of  $U(\pi_{\text{fusion}}, \pi_{-i}; \theta)$  at  $\theta_{\pi_i^j}$ .

To simplify the second term, we use the definition of  $\theta_{\pi_{\text{fusion}}}$ :

$$\theta_{\pi_{\text{fusion}}} - \theta_{\pi_i} = \sum_{k=1}^N w_k \theta_{\pi_i^k} - \theta_{\pi_i}. \tag{30}$$

Thus,

$$\sum_{j=1}^N w_j \nabla U(\pi_{\text{fusion}}, \pi_{-i}; \theta_{\pi_i^j})^T (\theta_{\pi_{\text{fusion}}} - \theta_{\pi_i^j}) = \sum_{j=1}^N w_j \nabla U(\pi_{\text{fusion}}, \pi_{-i}; \theta_{\pi_i^j})^T \left( \sum_{k=1}^N w_k \theta_{\pi_i^k} - \theta_{\pi_i^j} \right). \tag{31}$$

Since  $\sum_{k=1}^N w_k = 1$ , we simplify this term further:

$$\sum_{j=1}^N w_j \nabla U(\pi_{\text{fusion}}, \pi_{-i}; \theta_{\pi_i^j})^T \left( \sum_{k=1}^N w_k \theta_{\pi_i^k} - \sum_{k=1}^N w_k \theta_{\pi_i^j} \right). \tag{32}$$

Considering  $\theta_{\pi_i^j}$  as fixed parameters for each policy model, we rewrite the second term as:

$$\sum_{j=1}^N w_j \nabla U(\pi_{\text{fusion}}, \pi_{-i}; \theta_{\pi_i^j})^T \left( \sum_{k \neq j}^N w_k (\theta_{\pi_i^k} - \theta_{\pi_i^j}) \right). \tag{33}$$

Given the near-optimality and similarity of weights, this term becomes relatively small, leaving us with the primary term and the higher-order correction:

$$\begin{aligned}
U(\pi_{\text{fusion}}, \pi_{-i}; \theta_{\pi_{\text{fusion}}}) &\approx \sum_{j=1}^N w_j U(\pi_{\text{fusion}}, \pi_{-i}; \theta_{\pi_i^j}) \\
&+ \underbrace{\frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^N w_j (\theta_{\pi_{\text{fusion}}} - \theta_{\pi_i^j})^T H_j (\theta_{\pi_{\text{fusion}}} - \theta_{\pi_i^j})}_{\text{Exploration term}}.
\end{aligned} \tag{34}$$

□

## D Benchmark and Implementation Details

### D.1 Non-Transitive Mixture Game

This game is characterized by seven Gaussian humps that are evenly spaced on a two-dimensional plane. Each policy in the game corresponds to a point on this plane, analogous to the weights (the probability of that point within each Gaussian distribution) that players allocate to the humps. The

payoff containing both non-transitive and transitive components is  $\pi_i^T S \pi_{-i} + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=1}^7 (\pi_i^k - \pi_{-i}^k)$ , where

$$S = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & -1 & -1 & -1 \\ -1 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & -1 & -1 \\ -1 & -1 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & -1 \\ -1 & -1 & -1 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & -1 & -1 & -1 & 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & -1 & -1 & -1 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & -1 & -1 & -1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Contrary to conventional approaches, where PSRO and PSRO<sub>rN</sub> are typically limited by the number of threads of only 1—compared to 4 in other PSRO variants—thus severely constraining their exploration capabilities, we opted for a different way. To mitigate this constraint, we tripled the training episodes for these two algorithms compared to others, aiming to balance the exploration limitations.

## D.2 Leduc Poker

Since Diverse-PSRO cannot scale to the RL setting and the code for BD&RD-PSRO in complex games is unavailable, we compare PSRO and PSD-PSRO with their policy fusion counterparts, Fusion-PSRO and Fusion-PSD-PSRO. We implement the PSRO paradigm with Nash solver, using DQN as the oracle agent. Hyper-parameters are shown in Table 1.

Table 1: Hyperparameters for Leduc Poker.

Hyperparameters	Value
<i>Oracle</i>	
Oracle agent	DQN
Replay buffer size	$10^4$
Mini-batch size	512
Optimizer	Adam
Learning rate	$5 \times 10^{-3}$
Discount factor ( $\gamma$ )	1
Epsilon-greedy Exploration ( $\epsilon$ )	0.05
Target network update frequency	5
Policy network	MLP (state_dim-256-256-256-action_dim)
Activation function in MLP	ReLU
<i>PSRO</i>	
Episodes for each BR training	$2 \times 10^4$
meta-policy solver	Nash
<i>PSD-PSRO</i>	
Episodes for each BR training	$2 \times 10^4$
meta-policy solver	Nash
diversity weight ( $\lambda$ )	0.1
<i>Fusion-PSRO Framework</i>	
Fusion start condition ( $c$ )	2
Top-k selection factor ( $\alpha$ )	0.1
Maximum number of base policies ( $k =  \Pi_i^*  = \alpha  \Pi_i $ )	4
Minimum number of base policies ( $k =  \Pi_i^*  = \alpha  \Pi_i $ )	2

## D.3 Liars Dice

The Liars Dice game involves two players, each equipped with a single die. Incorrect challenges or bids result in immediate loss of the game, as they lead to the loss of dice. We implement the PSRO paradigm with Nash solver, using Rainbow-DQN as the oracle agent. Hyper-parameters are shown in Table 2.

Table 2: Hyperparameters for Liars Dice.

Hyperparameters	Value
<i>Oracle</i>	
Oracle agent	Rainbow-DQN
Replay buffer size	$10^5$
Mini-batch size	512
Optimizer	Adam
Learning rate	$5 \times 10^{-4}$
Learning rate decay	linear decay
Discount factor ( $\gamma$ )	0.99
Epsilon-greedy Exploration ( $\epsilon$ )	0.05
Target network update frequency	5
Network soft update ratio	0.005
Prioritized Experience Replay parameter	0.6
Important sampling parameter	0.4
Gradient clip	10
Policy network	MLP (state_dim-256-256-128-action_dim)
Activation function in MLP	ReLU
<i>PSRO</i>	
Episodes for each BR training	$2 \times 10^5$
meta-policy solver	Nash
<i>PSD-PSRO</i>	
Episodes for each BR training	$2 \times 10^5$
meta-policy solver	Nash
diversity weight ( $\lambda$ )	0.1
<i>Fusion-PSRO Framework</i>	
Fusion start condition ( $c$ )	2
Top-k selection factor ( $\alpha$ )	0.1
Maximum number of base policies( $M =  \Pi_i^*  = \alpha \Pi_i $ )	4
Minimum number of base policies( $M =  \Pi_i^*  = \alpha \Pi_i $ )	2