

U. S. AIR FORCE  
PROJECT RAND  
RESEARCH MEMORANDUM

ON WEAK CONVERGENCE OF STRATEGIES IN CERTAIN  
GAMES OVER A FUNCTION SPACE

Wendell Fleming

RM-745

17 December 1951

Assigned to \_\_\_\_\_

This is a working paper. It may be expanded, modified, or withdrawn at any time. The views, conclusions, and recommendations expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the official views or policies of the United States Air Force.

---

*The* **RAND** *Corporation*  
1700 MAIN ST. • SANTA MONICA • CALIFORNIA

Copyright 1952  
The RAND Corporation

# Report Documentation Page

Form Approved  
OMB No. 0704-0188

Public reporting burden for the collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington VA 22202-4302. Respondents should be aware that notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person shall be subject to a penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information if it does not display a currently valid OMB control number.

1. REPORT DATE <b>17 DEC 1951</b>		2. REPORT TYPE		3. DATES COVERED <b>00-00-1951 to 00-00-1951</b>	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE <b>On Weak Convergence of Strategies in Certain Games over a Function Space</b>				5a. CONTRACT NUMBER	
				5b. GRANT NUMBER	
				5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	
6. AUTHOR(S)				5d. PROJECT NUMBER	
				5e. TASK NUMBER	
				5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER	
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) <b>Rand Corporation, Project Air Force, 1776 Main Street, PO Box 2138, Santa Monica, CA, 90407-2138</b>				8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER	
9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)				10. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S)	
				11. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S)	
12. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT <b>Approved for public release; distribution unlimited</b>					
13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES					
14. ABSTRACT					
15. SUBJECT TERMS					
16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF:			17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT	18. NUMBER OF PAGES	19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON
a. REPORT <b>unclassified</b>	b. ABSTRACT <b>unclassified</b>	c. THIS PAGE <b>unclassified</b>			



Summary: For a certain class of games over a function space, mixed strategies are weak limits of pure strategies. It follows that, except in special instances, no compact topology can be imposed on the pure strategy spaces for a game of this type in such a way that the payoff is continuous, even when the payoff has a continuous kernel and the pure strategy spaces are bounded.

ON WEAK CONVERGENCE OF STRATEGIES IN  
CERTAIN GAMES OVER A FUNCTION SPACE

Wendell Fleming

1. We consider here 2-person zero sum games which have as pure strategies bounded measurable functions  $x$  and  $y$  on the closed unit interval  $(0,1)$  and payoffs of the form

$$(a) \quad M(x,y) = \int_0^1 K[x(t),y(t)]v(t)dt,$$

where  $K$  is continuous and  $v$  is summable.

We write  $f:x_\theta$ ,  $0 \leq \theta \leq 1$ , to denote the strategy for the maximizing player which chooses the function  $x_\theta$  according to the uniform distribution on  $\theta$ . If  $x_\theta(t)$  is measurable in  $(t,\theta)$ , such an  $f$  is called a 1-parameter mixed strategy<sup>1</sup>. In the same way,  $g:y_\theta$  denotes a 1-parameter mixed strategy for the minimizing player. For such strategies  $f, g$  the expectation is given by

$$(b) \quad M(f,g) = \int_0^1 \int_0^1 \int_0^1 K[x_\theta(t),y_\phi(t)]v(t)dt \, d\theta d\phi.$$

<sup>1</sup> It should be noted that no generality would be gained here by admitting families of functions  $x_\theta$  distributed on  $(0,1)$  according to an arbitrary distribution  $F(\theta)$ . For, such a distribution reduces to a uniform distribution by the change of variables  $\theta = F^{-1}(\tau)$ ,  $\bar{x}_\tau = x_{F^{-1}(\tau)}$ , where  $F^{-1}(\tau) = \sup_s [\tau \geq F(s)]$ .

Theorem: Given a 1-parameter mixed strategy  $f: x_\theta$  for the maximizing player with  $0 \leq x_\theta(t) \leq 1$  for all  $t$  and  $\theta$ , there exists a sequence  $(X_n)$  of step functions with  $0 \leq X_n(t) \leq 1$  for all  $t$  and  $n = 1, 2, \dots$  such that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} M(X_n, y) = M(f, y)$$

for every bounded measurable function  $y$  and every payoff  $M$  of the form (a) with continuous kernel  $K$ . If all the  $x_\theta$  satisfy the side condition  $\int_0^1 x_\theta(t) dt = A$ , then the  $X_n$  may

be chosen so as to satisfy this same condition.

The corresponding statement is true for the minimizing player.

The theorem above states that the set of pure strategies is "weakly" dense in the set of 1-parameter mixed strategies. No uniformity of convergence is asserted; thus, the theorem does not imply the statement (which is, of course, false for many payoffs) that pure strategies are "almost as good" as mixed strategies, i.e., that  $\max_x \min_y = \max_f \min_y$ .

$$\max_x \min_y = \max_f \min_y$$

Our theorem is an easy consequence of a theorem on linear averages due to L. C. Young [3, p.225]. We leave the proof to § 2, and consider first an interesting corollary.

Let  $G$  be a game with payoff  $M(x, y)$ . Two mixed strategies  $f_1, f_2$  for the maximizing player are called equivalent (G) if  $M(f_1, y) = M(f_2, y)$  for all his opponent's pure strategies  $y$ .

For each  $A$ , let  $S_A$  denote the set of all measurable functions  $x$  which satisfy  $0 \leq x(t) \leq 1$  and  $\int_0^1 x(t) dt = A$ .

Seeking an analogy between games over the unit square with continuous payoffs and the games considered here, one might look for topologies in which the spaces  $S_A$  are compact and the payoffs  $M$  of type (a) are continuous. In most instances no such

topologies exist, as is shown by:

Corollary: Let  $G$  be a game which has payoff  $M$  of form (a) with continuous kernel  $K$  and  $S_A$  as the pure strategy space for the maximizing player. Then a necessary condition that a compact topology  $T$  on  $S_A$  exist with the property that  $M(x,y)$  is a continuous function of  $x$  on  $S_A$  for each pure strategy  $y$  for the minimizing player is that every 1-parameter mixed strategy  $f:x_\theta$ , with  $x_\theta$  in  $S_A$  for all  $\theta$ , be (G) equivalent to some pure strategy  $x_0$  in  $S_A$ .

In particular, if the maximizing player has an optimal 1-parameter mixed strategy but no optimal pure strategy, this optimal strategy is (G) equivalent to no pure strategy, and the necessary condition in the corollary does not hold.<sup>1</sup>

To prove the corollary, let  $\Sigma$  denote the space of pure strategies for the minimizing player. Suppose that a 1-parameter mixed strategy  $f:x_\theta$  with all  $x_\theta$  in  $S_A$  exists such that for no  $x$  in  $S_A$  does one have  $M(f,y) = M(x,y)$  for all  $y$  in  $\Sigma$ . By the Theorem, a sequence  $(X_n)$  in  $S_A$  exists with the property that  $M(f,y) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} M(X_n,y)$  for every bounded measurable function  $y$ .

Suppose that a topology  $T$  on  $S_A$  exists in which  $S_A$  is compact and  $M$  is continuous in  $x$  for each  $y$  in  $\Sigma$ . Since  $S_A$  is compact (T), a directed subsequence  $(X_{n_\alpha})$  of the sequence  $(X_n)$  converges (T) to some  $x_0$  in  $S_A$ .<sup>2</sup> By the (T) continuity of  $M$  in  $x$  for each  $y$  in  $\Sigma$ ,

$$M(f,y) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} M(X_n,y) = \lim_{\alpha} M(X_{n_\alpha},y) = M(x_0,y)$$

for all  $y$  in  $\Sigma$ , a contradiction.

<sup>1</sup> It is known that many games with payoffs of type (a) have optimal 1-parameter mixed strategies (cf. [1]).

<sup>2</sup> Since it is not assumed that  $T$  satisfies any countability axioms, it is necessary to use directed (i.e., non-countable) sequences here.

2. The theorem stated in §1 is proved in this section. The portions used here of Young's proof of the result [3,p.225] cited previously are stated as Lemmas 1 and 2.

Lemma 1: Let  $h(t)$  be continuous in an interval  $(a,b)$ , and let  $p_1, \dots, p_m$  be constants with  $p_i > 0$  for all  $i$  and  $\sum_{i=1}^m p_i = 1$ . For each  $n = 1, 2, \dots$ , subdivide  $(a,b)$  into  $n$  equal intervals  $\Delta_n^1, \dots, \Delta_n^n$  and further subdivide each  $\Delta_n^j$  into  $m$  intervals  $\Delta_n^{1j}, \dots, \Delta_n^{mj}$  in such a way that

$$\frac{|\Delta_n^{ij}|}{|\Delta_n^j|} = p_i \quad \text{for all } i = 1, 2, \dots, m. \quad \text{Then}$$

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{j=1}^n \int_{\Delta_n^{ij}} h(t) dt = p_i \int_a^b h(t) dt$$

for all  $i = 1, 2, \dots, m$ .

The proof of Lemma 1 is elementary, and hence is left to the reader.

Lemma 2: Let  $x_1, \dots, x_m$  and  $p_1, \dots, p_m$  be constants with  $p_i > 0$  for all  $i$  and  $\sum_{i=1}^m p_i = 1$ . Then given an interval

$(a,b)$ , a sequence  $(X_n)$  of step functions defined on  $(a,b)$  and assuming only the values  $x_1, \dots, x_m$  exists such that

$$\int_a^b X_n(t) dt = (b-a) \sum_{i=1}^m p_i x_i \quad \text{for each } n = 1, 2, \dots \text{ and}$$

---

<sup>1</sup>  $(\Delta)$  denotes the length of an interval  $\Delta$ .

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_a^b \phi(X_n(t), t) dt = \sum_{i=1}^m p_i \int_a^b \phi(x_i, t) dt$$

for every continuous function  $\phi(x, t)$ .

Proof: Subdivide  $(a, b)$  as in Lemma 1. Define  $X_n(t)$  to be  $x_i$  for those  $t$  which are in intervals  $\Delta_n^{ij}$ ,  $j = 1, 2, \dots, n$ . Apply Lemma 1 to the functions  $h_i(t) = \phi(x_i, t)$  and sum with respect to  $i$ .

To prove the main theorem, let  $\phi_1, \dots, \phi_n, \dots$  be a denumerable set of continuous functions on the unit square such that each continuous function on the unit square is a uniform limit of a sequence of these  $\phi_j$ .

Since  $x_\theta(t) = x(t, \theta)$  is measurable, and hence is an almost uniform limit of step functions,<sup>1</sup> for  $n = 1, 2, \dots$  a step function  $x_n(t, \theta)$  exists with  $0 \leq x_n(t, \theta) \leq 1$  and

$$\int_0^1 \int_0^1 x_n(t, \theta) dt d\theta = \int_0^1 \int_0^1 x(t, \theta) dt d\theta \quad \text{such that}$$

$$\left| \int_0^1 \int_0^1 [\phi_j[x(t, \theta), t] - \phi_j[x_n(t, \theta), t]] dt d\theta \right| < \frac{1}{n}$$

for  $j = 1, 2, \dots, n$ .

Since  $x_n(t, \theta)$  is a step function,  $\int_0^1 \int_0^1 \phi[x_n(t, \theta), t] dt d\theta$

may be written in the form

$$\sum_s \sum_i \int_{t_{s-1}}^{t_s} p_{is} \phi(x_{is}, t) dt,$$

where the  $(t_{s-1}, t_s)$  are non-overlapping intervals in each of

<sup>1</sup> Cf. McShane [2, p.160] for the definition of almost uniform convergence.

which  $x_n(t, \theta)$  is constant as a function of  $t$ . Applying Lemma 2 in each interval  $(t_{s-1}, t_s)$ , one gets a sequence  $(X_{nk}(t))$  of step functions with  $0 \leq X_{nk}(t) \leq 1$  such that

$$\int_{t_{s-1}}^{t_s} X_{nk}(t) dt = (t_s - t_{s-1}) \sum_i P_{is} x_{is} = \int_0^1 \int_{t_{s-1}}^{t_s} x_n(t, \theta) dt d\theta$$

for all  $k = 1, 2, \dots$  and

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_{t_{s-1}}^{t_s} \phi[X_{nk}(t), t] dt &= \sum_i P_{is} \int_{t_{s-1}}^{t_s} \phi[x_{is}, t] dt = \\ &= \int_0^1 \int_{t_{s-1}}^{t_s} \phi[x_n(t, \theta), t] dt d\theta \end{aligned}$$

for all continuous  $\phi(x, t)$ .

Summing with respect to  $s$ , one gets

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^1 \int_0^1 \phi[X_{nk}(t), t] dt = \int_0^1 \int_0^1 \phi[x_n(t, \theta), t] dt d\theta$$

$$\text{and } \int_0^1 X_{nk}(t) dt = \int_0^1 \int_0^1 x_n(t, \theta) dt d\theta \text{ for all } k = 1, 2, \dots$$

Hence, for each  $n$ , a step function  $X_n (= X_{nk_n})$ , for some  $k_n$  exists with  $0 \leq X_n(t) \leq 1$  and

$$\int_0^1 X_n(t) dt = \int_0^1 \int_0^1 x(t, \theta) dt d\theta \text{ such that}$$

$$\left| \int_0^1 \int_0^1 \phi_j[x(t, \theta), t] dt d\theta - \int_0^1 \phi_j[X_n(t), t] dt \right| < \frac{1}{n}$$

for  $j = 1, 2, \dots, n$ . Then

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^1 \phi_j[X_n(t), t] dt = \int_0^1 \int_0^1 \phi_j[x(t, \theta)] dt d\theta$$

for every  $j = 1, 2, \dots$ . Since the set of  $\phi_j$ 's is uniformly dense, it follows that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^1 \phi[X_n(t), t] dt = \int_0^1 \int_0^1 \phi[x(t, \theta), t] dt d\theta$$

for every continuous  $\phi(x, t)$ .

If  $y$ ,  $K$ , and  $v$  are all continuous functions,  $\phi(x, t) = K[x, y(t)]v(t)$  is continuous, and so

$$(c) \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^1 K[X_n(t), y(t)]v(t) dt = \int_0^1 \int_0^1 K[x(t, \theta), y(t)]v(t) dt.$$

It follows easily from the facts that every continuous kernel  $K$  is bounded and uniformly continuous for  $(x, y)$  in a bounded portion of the plane, and that every summable function on  $(0, 1)$  is an almost uniform limit of continuous functions that (c) still holds if we suppose merely that  $y$  is bounded and measurable and  $v$  is summable. This proves the theorem.

References

1. Danskin, J. M., Fleming, W., and Helmer, O., A simple class of games over function space, convex for the minimizing player, RM-740 .
2. McShane, E. J., Integration, Princeton Univer. Press, 1944.
3. Young, L. C., Generalized curves and the existence of an attained absolute minimum in the Calculus of Variations, Comptes Rendus Soc. Sc. Varsovie 30(1937) p. 212-234.

WF:mln

