
Q-learners Can Provably Collude in the Iterated Prisoner’s Dilemma

Quentin Bertrand¹

¹Université de Montréal and Mila

Juan Duque¹

²University of Bologna

Emilio Calvano²

[†]Canada CIFAR AI Chair

Gauthier Gidel^{1†}

Abstract

The deployment of machine learning systems in the market economy has triggered academic and institutional fears over potential tacit collusion between fully automated agents. Multiple recent economics studies have empirically shown the emergence of collusive strategies from agents guided by machine learning algorithms. In this work, we prove that multi-agent Q -learners playing the iterated prisoner’s dilemma can learn to collude. The complexity of the cooperative multi-agent setting yields multiple fixed-point policies for Q -learning: the main technical contribution of this work is to characterize the convergence towards a specific cooperative policy. More precisely, in the iterated prisoner’s dilemma, we show that with optimistic Q -values, any self-play Q -learner can provably learn a cooperative policy called Pavlov, also referred to as `win-stay`, `lose-switch` policy, which strongly differs from the vanilla Pareto dominated `always defect` policy.

1 Introduction

In economy, *perfect competition* has been a common set of assumptions that ensure good properties of markets, such as reaching Pareto optimal equilibria, where supply matches demand (Debreu, 1959). One of the main assumptions in perfect competition is the existence of regulations that prevent anti-competitive activities (Radaelli, 2004; Conway et al., 2006), *e.g.*, the United States anti-trust laws that prevent companies from colluding and agreeing on artificially high prices (Posner, 2009).

Over the last decades, algorithmic pricing has increasingly taken over manual pricing (Schechner, 2017), especially in online good selling: one-third of Amazon sellers were relying on algorithmic pricing in 2015 (Chen et al., 2016). The rise of automated machine learning price setting has then triggered multiple academic (Ezrahi and Stucke, 2015; Mehra, 2015) and institutional (OECD, 2017; Bureau, 2018) concerns over the potential risk of tacit collusion: if multiple online sellers rely on machine learning to set prices,

Could sellers tacitly learn to collude by simultaneously setting high prices through algorithmic pricing?

Empirically, algorithmic pricing has been shown not to push down prices in online goods selling (Chen et al., 2016, Fig. 14-17). For simple models of the market economy, such as Bertrand competitions (Deneckere and Davidson, 1985), algorithmically set prices (Waltman and Kaymak, 2008) have been empirically shown to reach collusive strategies (Calvano et al., 2019, 2020; Hansen et al., 2021; Asker et al., 2022). Tacit collusion has been shown to appear in such settings, where prices were dynamically set using standard machine learning algorithms, such as Q -learning (Watkins and Dayan, 1992) or bandits (Auer et al., 2002).

Theoretically, the emergence of tacit collusion has been studied in (over)simplified settings. Indeed, even for simple cooperative/competitive games such as the prisoner’s dilemma (Flood, 1958; Kendall et al., 2007), the dynamic created by standard machine learning algorithms in this multi-agent setting is so complex that usually very simplified versions of the algorithm are considered. In particular, expected versions of ϵ -greedy Q -learning (Seijen et al., 2009; Sutton and Barto, 2018, 6.10), *without memory*, *i.e.*, without knowledge of the previous state are often considered (Banchio and Skrzypacz, 2022; Banchio and Mantegazza, 2022). Due to the oversimplification of previous analysis, doubts remain on the emergence causes of cooperation: it could be due to poorly designed algorithms or corner cases of the simplified analysis (Calvano et al., 2023).

Contributions. In this work, we study the dynamic of two agents playing the iterated prisoner’s dilemma and choosing their actions according to ϵ -greedy Q -learning policies. Importantly, as opposed to previous work (Banchio and Skrzypacz, 2022; Banchio and Mantegazza, 2022), we study the standard *stochastic* (i.e., not averaged) version of ϵ -greedy Q -learning (Algorithm 1), with memory. More precisely,

- In this multi-agent setting, we show that one-step memory Q -learning (Algorithm 1 in Section 2.3) exhibits new cooperative equilibria (Proposition 6 in Section 3.1), which do not exist without memory.
- We then show that, without exploration, i.e., ϵ -greedy Q -learning with $\epsilon = 0$, if the initialization of the agent is optimistic enough (Even-Dar and Mansour, 2001), then agents learn cooperative policy (Theorem 8 in Section 3.2), referred to as **win-stay, lose-shift** policy (Nowak and Sigmund, 1993).
- Next, we extend the convergence toward a cooperative policy to ϵ -greedy Q -learning with $\epsilon > 0$ (Theorem 9 in Section 3.3). This is the main technical difficulty, as one needs to prove the convergence of a stochastic process toward a specific equilibrium.
- Finally, we empirically show that the collusion proved for standard Q -learning algorithms is also observed for deep Q -learning algorithms (Section 5).

The manuscript is organized as follows: Section 2 provides recalls on the prisoner’s dilemma and multi-agent Q -learning. Section 3 contains our main results: the existence of new equilibria with memory (Proposition 4), and the convergence toward this collusive strategy (Theorems 8 and 9). Previous related works on the dynamics of multi-agent Q -learning are detailed in Section 4. Similar collusive behaviors are also observed for deep Q -learning algorithms in Section 5.

2 Setting and Background

First, Section 2.1 provides recalls on the iterated prisoner’s dilemma. In Section 2.2, we motivate and define the equilibrium notion of interest in the multi-agent reinforcement learning setting: *subgame perfect equilibrium* (Definition 2). In particular, it can be shown that perfect equilibria are *symmetric*, which motivates the self-play analysis. Finally, Section 2.3 provides recalls on reinforcement learning, and more specifically, multi-agent ϵ -greedy Q -learning.

2.1 Iterated Prisoner’s Dilemma

In this work, we consider a two-player iterated prisoner’s dilemma whose players have a *one-step* memory. At each time step, players choose between cooperate (C) or defect (D), i.e., each player i choose an action

Table 1: Prisoner’s Dilemma Rewards, $1 < g < 2$.

	Cooperate	Defect
Cooperate	$2g$	$2 + g$
Defect	$2 + g$	2

$a^i \in \mathcal{A} \triangleq \{C, D\}$, which yields a reward $r_i(a^1, a^2)$ for player i , $i \in \{1, 2\}$. Table 1 describes the rewards $r_1(a^1, a^2)$ and $r_2(a^1, a^2)$ respectively obtained by each player depending on their respective action a^1 and a^2 : as Banchio and Mantegazza (2022), we consider simplified rewards, which are parameterized by a single scalar g , $1 < g < 2$. Note that such a game is *symmetric*: $r_1(a^1, a^2) = r_2(a^2, a^1) = r_{a^1, a^2}$.

When the prisoner’s dilemma is not repeated, joint defection is the only Nash equilibrium: for a fixed decision of the other prisoner, defecting always reaches better rewards than cooperating. This yields the celebrated paradox: even though the rewards obtained in the ‘defect defect’ state are Pareto dominated by the ones obtained with the ‘cooperate cooperate’ state, the Pareto-suboptimal choice ‘defect defect’ remains the only Nash equilibrium. When the prisoner’s dilemma is infinitely repeated, new equilibria can emerge and the ‘cooperate cooperate’ situation can be reached (Osborne, 2004). Note that infinitely many time steps are essential for such equilibria to exist.

2.2 Notions of Equilibria

At a given step, the choice of each player to cooperate or defect is conditioned by the actions $\mathcal{S} \triangleq \{CC, DD, CD, DC\}$ played at the previous time step, where the first action stands for the action picked by the first player at the previous time-step. $\Delta_{\mathcal{A}}^{\mathcal{S}}$ denotes the space of policies $\pi : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \rightarrow [0, 1]$, such that for all $s \in \mathcal{S}$, $\sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \pi(a|s) = 1$. Given two policies (i.e., mixed strategies) $\pi_1, \pi_2 \in \Delta_{\mathcal{A}}^{\mathcal{S}}$, a discount factor $\gamma \in (0, 1)$, and distribution ρ over the initial state space \mathcal{S} , the cumulated reward observed by the agent $i \in \{1, 2\}$ is given by

$$J_i(\pi_1, \pi_2) \triangleq \mathbb{E}_{s_0 \sim \rho, a_t^i \sim \pi_i(\cdot|s_t)} \left[\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t r_{a_t^1, a_t^2} \right]. \quad (1)$$

Using the cumulative rewards of each player (Equation (1)), one can now define a Nash equilibrium for the iterated prisoner’s dilemma.

Definition 1 (Nash Equilibrium). *Given a distribution ρ over the initial state $s_0 \in \mathcal{S}$, a Nash equilibrium of a two-player game is a pair of non-exploitable policies, i.e., policies $\pi_1^*, \pi_2^* \in \Delta_{\mathcal{A}}^{\mathcal{S}}$ such that $\forall \pi_1, \pi_2 \in \Delta_{\mathcal{A}}^{\mathcal{S}}$, $J_1(\pi_1^*, \pi_2^*) \geq J_1(\pi_1, \pi_2^*)$ and $J_2(\pi_1^*, \pi_2^*) \geq J_2(\pi_1^*, \pi_2)$.*

Algorithm 1 Multi-agent Self-Play Q -learning

init : s_0, Q
param: α, γ, ϵ
for *iter* **do**
 Compute a_t^1 and a_t^2 via [Algorithm 2](#) using Q .
 Compute $r_1 = r_{a_t^1, a_t^2}$.
 // Update the Q -value entry in s_t, a_t^1
 $Q_{s_t, a_t^1} += \alpha \left(r_1 + \gamma \max_a Q_{(a_t^1, a_t^2), a} - Q_{s_t, a_t^1} \right)$
return Q

Interestingly, the symmetry of the game yields $J_1(\pi_1, \pi_2) = J_2(\pi_2, \pi_1)$. An equilibrium such that each player adopts the same strategy is called symmetric. While symmetric games with infinitely many strategies may not have symmetric Nash equilibria ([Fey, 2012](#); [Xeferis, 2015](#)), it has been proven that finite symmetric games ([Nash, 1951](#)), as well as a large class of iterated prisoner’s dilemmas ([Cheng, 2022](#)), always exhibits a symmetric equilibrium. Interestingly, for iterated games, one can define a stronger notion of equilibrium: *subgame perfect equilibrium* ([Osborne, 2004](#)).

Definition 2 (Subgame Perfect Equilibrium). *A subgame perfect equilibrium is a pair of strategy (π_1^*, π_2^*) that is a Nash equilibrium for any distribution ρ over the initial state $s_0 \in \mathcal{S}$.*

Clearly, a subgame perfect equilibrium is a Nash equilibrium. However, some Nash equilibria are not subgame perfect: a Nash policy may be purposely suboptimal in certain states to incentivize their opponents to avoid reaching that state. For instance, for γ large enough, the **Grim trigger** strategy (*i.e.*, cooperate as long as your opponent cooperates and unconditionally defect as soon as the opponent defects) is a Nash equilibrium of the iterated prisoner’s dilemma but not subgame perfect equilibrium ([Osborne, 2004](#), Chap. 14).

For ourselves, we consider three policies, **always defect**, **Pavlov** (defined in [Propositions 3](#) and [4](#)), and the ‘in-between’ strategy profile, that is *not* an equilibrium, and that we refer to as **lose-shift**. A summary of these policies can be found in [Table 2](#) in [Appendix B](#). Standard results ([Osborne, 2004](#), Chap. 14) state that **always defect** and **Pavlov** (for a discount factor γ large enough) are subgame perfect equilibria. Proofs are recalled in [Appendix A](#) for completeness.

Proposition 3 (Always defect). *For all $\gamma \in (0, 1)$, the **always defect** policy, *i.e.*, $\pi^{\text{Defect}}(D|s) = 1, \forall s \in \mathcal{S}$, is a subgame perfect equilibrium.*

Proposition 4 (Pavlov). *If $1 > \gamma \geq \frac{2-g}{2(g-1)}$, then the **Pavlov** policy, *i.e.*, $\pi^{\text{Pavlov}}(D|s) = 1, \forall s \in \{CD, DC\}$ and $\pi^{\text{Pavlov}}(C|s) = 1, \forall s \in \{DD, CC\}$, is a subgame perfect equilibrium.*

Algorithm 2 ϵ -greedy

input : Q, s
param: $0 \leq \epsilon \leq 1/2$
return $\arg \max_{a'} Q_{s, a'}$ with prob. $1 - \epsilon$ and $\arg \min_{a'} Q_{s, a'}$ with prob. ϵ

Note that the condition $1 > \gamma > \frac{2-g}{2(g-1)}$ implies $g > 4/3$. In plain words, Pavlov can be summarized as *cooperate as long as the players are synchronized by playing the same action*. [Propositions 3](#) and [4](#) illustrate the difficulty of multi-agent reinforcement learning for the prisoner’s dilemma: multiple equilibria exist, which correspond to very different policies: always defecting and a cooperative policy. Thus, one should not only care about convergence toward equilibrium, but one should also care about *which* equilibrium the agents converge to. The reached equilibrium will depend on the dynamics of the algorithm used to estimate the policies π_i^* . For ourselves, we considered standard Q -learning algorithms, and provide recalls on them in [Section 2.3](#).

2.3 Q -learning for Multi-agent Reinforcement Learning and Self Play

A popular approach to maximize the cumulative reward function [Equation \(1\)](#) is to find an *action-value function* or *Q -function*, that is a fixed-point of the Bellman operator ([Sutton and Barto, 2018](#), Eq. 3.17). Since the reward of the second player is stochastic in the multi-agent case, the fixed point equation writes $(s_t, a_t^1) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$ for all $(s_t, a_t^1) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$:

$$Q_{s_t, a_t^1}^* = \mathbb{E}_{a_t^2 \sim \pi(\cdot|s_t)} \left(r_{a_t^1, a_t^2} + \gamma \max_{a'} Q_{(a_t^1, a_t^2), a'}^* \right). \quad (2)$$

The policy π is said to be ϵ -greedy ($0 < \epsilon < 1/2$) if

$$\pi(a|s) = \begin{cases} 1 - \epsilon & \text{if } a = \arg \max_{a'} Q_{s, a'} \\ \epsilon & \text{else} \end{cases}, \text{ for } i \in \{1, 2\}.$$

Q -learning ([Algorithm 1](#)) consists of stochastic fixed-point iterations on the Bellman [Equation \(2\)](#), with a step-size $\alpha > 0$, $(a_t^1, a_t^2) \in \{C, D\}^2$

$$Q_{s_t, a_t^1}^{t+1} = Q_{s_t, a_t^1}^t + \alpha \left(r_{a_t^1, a_t^2} + \gamma \max_{a'} Q_{(a_t^1, a_t^2), a'}^t - Q_{s_t, a_t^1}^t \right). \quad (3)$$

In [Section 3](#) we study the dynamic of [Equation \(3\)](#) in the case of $\mathcal{A} = \{C, D\}$ and $\mathcal{S} = \{C, D\}^2$. Moreover, the second agent will be considered to be a copy of the first agent, *i.e.*, a_t^2 will be sampled according to the same policy as a_t^1 . Such a way to model the opponent is referred to as *self-play* and is the usual way

to deal with multiple agents in RL applications (Lowe et al., 2017; Silver et al., 2018; Baker et al., 2019; Tang, 2019).

3 Iterated Prisoner's Dilemma and Q-learning *with* Memory

In this section, we study the dynamics of multi-agent Q-learning with memory ($\mathcal{S} = (a^1, a^2)$). The complex structure of the multi-agent Q-learning yields multiple fixed points for Equation (2).

First, in Section 3.1, we show that, with memory, the cooperative Pavlov policy is a fixed-point of the Bellman Equation (2). Then, we show convergence of the dynamic resulting from Equation (3) toward the cooperative Pavlov policy. More precisely, we show that, with optimistic initialization, the ϵ -greedy policy with a small enough learning rate α starts from the **always defect** policy, and converges towards the Pavlov policy. For exposition purposes, we first treat the greedy case ($\epsilon = 0$ in Algorithm 2) in Section 3.2, and then the general case $0 < \epsilon < 1/2$ in Section 3.3.

3.1 New Equilibria with Memory

First, we show that the **always defect** and Pavlov policies are fixed-point policies of the multi-agent Bellman Equation (2).

Proposition 5 (Always Defect). *The following Q-function $Q^{*,\text{Defect}}$ is a fixed point of the multi-agent Bellman Equation (2) and yields an **always defect** policy, $\forall s \in \{C, D\}^2$,*

$$\begin{aligned} Q_{s,D}^{*,\text{Defect}} &= \mathbb{E}_{a^2 \sim \pi(\cdot|s)} r_{D,a^2} / (1 - \gamma) , \\ Q_{s,C}^{*,\text{Defect}} &= Q_{s,D}^{*,\text{Defect}} - \mathbb{E}_{a^2 \sim \pi(\cdot|s)} (r_{D,a^2} - r_{C,a^2}) . \end{aligned}$$

Proof of Proposition 5 can be found in Appendix B.1. More interestingly, the cooperative Pavlov policy is also a fixed-point of the multi-agent Bellman Equation (2).

Proposition 6 (Pavlov). *If $\gamma > (2 - g)/(2g - 2)$ and ϵ is small enough, then there exists a Q-function, $Q^{*,\text{Pavlov}}$, which is a fixed point of the multi-agent Bellman Equation (2) and yields the Pavlov policy, i.e.,*

$$\begin{aligned} \forall s \in \{CC, DD\} \quad Q_{s,C}^{*,\text{Pavlov}} &> Q_{s,D}^{*,\text{Pavlov}} \quad \text{and} \\ \forall s \in \{CD, DC\} \quad Q_{s,C}^{*,\text{Pavlov}} &< Q_{s,D}^{*,\text{Pavlov}} . \end{aligned}$$

Proof of Proposition 6, the exact Q-values and condition on ϵ can be found in Appendix B.2. The main takeaway from Proposition 6 is that, as opposed to the memoryless case (see related work in Section 4), there

exists a fixed point of the Bellman equation whose associated strategy is cooperative. In the next section (Section 3.2), we show that Algorithm 1 with no exploration ($\epsilon = 0$) and an optimistic enough initialization converges towards this cooperative Pavlov policy.

3.2 Fully Greedy Policy with No Exploration (Algorithm 2 with $\epsilon = 0$)

For exposition purposes, we first show the case $\epsilon = 0$, i.e., with no exploration. We assume that the initial policy is **always defect**, but we require 'optimistic enough' Q-values at initialization.

Assumption 7 (Q-values Initialization).

- i) $Q_{(D,D),D}^{*,\text{Defect}} \triangleq \frac{r_{DD}}{1-\gamma} < Q_{(D,D),C}^{t_0}$,
- ii) $Q_{(C,C),D}^{*,\text{Lose-shift}} \triangleq \frac{r_{DD} + \gamma r_{CC}}{1-\gamma^2} < Q_{(C,C),C}^{t_0}$,
- iii) $Q_{(C,C),C}^{t_0} < \frac{r_{CC}}{1-\gamma} \triangleq Q_{(C,C),C}^{*,\text{Pavlov}}$,
- iv) and for all $s \in \{C, D\}^2$, $Q_{s,D}^{t_0} > Q_{s,C}^{t_0}$.

Assumption 7 i) ensures that the policy can move from **always defect** to **lose-shift**. Assumption 7 ii) ensures that the policy moves from **lose-shift** to Pavlov. Finally, Assumption 7 iii) ensures that the policy stays in Pavlov.

Theorem 8. *Suppose that Assumption 7 holds and $s_0 = DD$, then Algorithm 1 with no exploration ($\epsilon = 0$) starts from the **always defect** policy, and converges towards the Pavlov policy in $O(1/\alpha)$ steps.*

Figure 1 illustrates Theorem 8 and shows the evolution of Equation (2) as a function of the number of iterations. At $t = 0$, $Q_{s,D} > Q_{s,C}$ for all states $s \in \{C, D\}$. The greedy action is playing defect, $Q_{(D,D),D} - Q_{DD,C}$ is increasing, and agents progressively learn the **lose-shift** policy. Once the **lose-shift** policy is learned, the greedy actions are cooperating when the state is DD, and defect when the state is CC. Hence, in this phase, Algorithm 1 successively updates $Q_{(C,C),D}$ and $Q_{(D,D),C}$, until $Q_{(C,C),D}$ goes below $Q_{(C,C),C}$. From this moment, agents start to play the Pavlov policy and do not change.

Proof. (Theorem 8) As illustrated in Figure 1, the trajectory can be decomposed in 3 phases: first, the policy goes from **always defect** to **lose-shift** policy (phase 1). Then, the policy goes from **lose-shift** to Pavlov (phase 2). Finally, the policy stays to the Pavlov policy.

• **Phase 1 – From always defect to lose-shift** ($t \leq t_1$). At t_0 we have, $s_0 = DD$, and for all $s \in \{C, D\}^2$, $Q_{s,D} > Q_{s,C}$, hence the greedy action is defect, and is always chosen since $\epsilon = 0$.




Figure 1: **From always defect to Pavlov policy, Algorithm 1 with no exploration (i.e., $\epsilon = 0$).** Evolution of the Q -learning policy as a function of the number of iterations in the iterated prisoner's dilemma. With a correct (optimistic) initialization, players go from an **always defect** policy to the **lose-shift** policy (at time t_1), and then go to the cooperative **Pavlov** policy (at time t_2).

Hence the Q -learning update Equation (3) writes

$$Q_{(D,D),D}^{t+1} = Q_{(D,D),D}^t + \alpha \left(r_{DD} + \gamma Q_{(D,D),D}^t - Q_{(D,D),D}^t \right) \quad (4)$$

Thus, while $Q_{(D,D),D} > Q_{(D,D),C}$, the only updated Q -value is $Q_{(D,D),D}$, and $Q_{(D,D),D}$ converges linearly towards $Q_{(D,D),D}^{*,\text{Defect}}$

$$Q_{(D,D),D}^{t+1} - Q_{(D,D),D}^{*,\text{Defect}} = (1 - \alpha(1 - \gamma))^t \left(Q_{(D,D),D}^t - Q_{(D,D),D}^{*,\text{Defect}} \right),$$

where $Q_{(D,D),D}^{*,\text{Defect}} \triangleq r_{D,D}/(1 - \gamma)$. Thus, if $Q_{(D,D),C}^{t_0} > Q_{(D,D),D}^{*,\text{Defect}} \triangleq r_{D,D}/(1 - \gamma)$, $Q_{(D,D),D}$ converges linearly towards $Q_{(D,D),D}^{*,\text{Defect}} < Q_{(D,D),C}^{t_0}$, then exists t_1 such that $Q_{(D,D),C}^{t_1} = Q_{(D,D),C}^{t_0} > Q_{(D,D),D}^{t_1}$. Once this time t_1 is reached, the policy switches from **always defect** to **lose-shift**, and the update in Equation (4) no longer guides the dynamics.

• **Phase 2 – From lose-shift to Pavlov** ($t_1 \leq t \leq t_2$). In this phase, players alternate to defect in the CC state and cooperate in the DD state. Hence the only entries successively updated are $Q_{(C,C),D}$ and $Q_{(D,D),C}$. For all $t \geq t_1$, Equation (3) becomes¹

$$Q_{(C,C),D}^{t+1} = (1 - \alpha)Q_{(C,C),D}^t + \alpha \left(r_{DD} + \gamma Q_{(D,D),C}^t \right), \quad (5)$$

$$Q_{(D,D),C}^{t+1} = (1 - \alpha)Q_{(D,D),C}^t + \alpha \left(r_{CC} + \gamma Q_{(C,C),D}^{t+1} \right). \quad (6)$$

Similarly to Phase 1, one can show that $Q_{(C,C),D}$ converges linearly towards $Q_{(C,C),D}^{*,\text{lose-shift}}$. Additionally, one can show that, while the dynamic follows

¹For clarity, one time step of Equations (5) and (6) corresponds to two ϵ -greedy updates.

Equations (5) and (6), and $Q_{(C,C),D}^t > Q_{(C,C),C}^t$, then $Q_{(D,D),C}^t > Q_{(D,D),D}^t$ (see Lemma 11). Hence there exists t_2 such that $Q_{(C,C),D}^{t_2} < Q_{(C,C),C}^{t_2}$ and $Q_{(D,D),C}^{t_2} > Q_{(D,D),D}^{t_2}$: the Pavlov policy is reached.

• **Phase 3 – Staying in Pavlov** ($t \geq t_2$).

In this part of the trajectory, both players cooperate in the state CC, and Equation (3) writes

$$Q_{(C,C),C}^{t+1} = Q_{(C,C),C}^t + \alpha \left(r_{CC} + \gamma Q_{(C,C),C}^t - Q_{(C,C),C}^t \right).$$

The only updated Q -entry is $Q_{(C,C),C}$, and $Q_{(C,C),C}$ converges linearly toward $Q_{(C,C),C}^{*,\text{Pavlov}}$

$$Q_{(C,C),C}^{t+1} - Q_{(C,C),C}^{*,\text{Pavlov}} = (1 - \alpha(1 - \gamma))^t \left(Q_{(C,C),C}^t - Q_{(C,C),C}^{*,\text{Pavlov}} \right),$$

with $Q_{(C,C),C}^{*,\text{Pavlov}} \triangleq r_{CC}/(1 - \gamma) > Q_{(C,C),D}^{t_2} = Q_{(C,C),D}^t$: there is no other change of policy. \square

In this Section 3.2, we showed that agents learned to cooperate with no exploration. In Section 3.3, we investigate cooperation in the general case ϵ . The proof idea is very similar but more technical.

3.3 ϵ -Greedy Q -Learning with Exploration (Algorithm 2 with $\epsilon > 0$)

In this section, we show that Algorithm 1 with sufficiently small step-size α or exploration parameter ϵ yields a cooperative policy with high probability.

Theorem 9. *Let $\delta > 0$ and $1/2 > \epsilon > 0$, ϵ sufficiently small such that Pavlov policy is a fixed-point of Equation (2) (as defined in Proposition 6). Suppose that Assumption 7 holds, and $s_0 = DD$. Then, for $\alpha \leq \frac{C \log(1/\epsilon)}{\log(1/\delta)}$, where C is a constant that depends on*




Figure 2: **From always defect to Pavlov policy, Algorithm 1 with exploration.** Evolution of the Q-learning policy as a function of the number of iterations in the iterated prisoner's dilemma. With a correct (optimistic) initialization, players go from an always defect policy to the lose-shift policy and then to the cooperative Pavlov policy.

γ , the rewards and the initializations of the Q-values, we have that with probability $1 - \delta$, Algorithm 1 does achieve a cooperative policy: *Pavlov* or *win-stay* policy in $O(1/\alpha)$ iterations, with probability $1 - \delta$.

Theorem 9 states that for an arbitrarily large probability, there exist small enough α and ϵ such that agent following Algorithm 1 converge from an always defect policy to a Pavlov policy. The full proof of Theorem 9 can be found in Appendix D. A proof sketch is provided below.

Proof sketch. We give the proof sketch for going from the always defect to lose-shift with high probability (Step 1). The proof for Theorem 9 is three-folded: first, we show that the non-greedy actions are chosen at most k time. This requires controlling the occurring probability (Lemma 10 i) of the event

$$\mathcal{E}_{k,T} \triangleq \{ \text{either } a_t^1 \text{ or } a_t^2 \text{ is a non-greedy action} \\ \text{for at most } k \text{ values of } t = 1, \dots, T \} .$$

Then, controlling the maximum deviation of the Q-entries of the greedy (Lemma 10 iv) and non-greedy actions (Lemma 10 iii), one can show that for a sufficiently small learning rate $\alpha > 0$, Q-learners go from always defect to lose-shift.

Lemma 10. *Let $0 < \epsilon < 1/2$, $0 < \gamma < 1$ and $0 \leq k \leq T$, $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Suppose that Assumption 7 holds, $s_0 = DD$, and both agents are guided by ϵ -greedy Q-learning (Algorithm 1), then*

i) *The probability of the event $\mathcal{E}_{k,T}$ is lower bounded*

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_{k,T}) \geq 1 - 2^T \epsilon^{T-k} .$$

ii) *On the event $\mathcal{E}_{k,T}$, for all $(s, a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$*

$$|Q_{s,a}^{t+1} - Q_{s,a}^t| \leq \frac{\Delta_r \alpha}{1 - \gamma} .$$

iii) *On the event $\mathcal{E}_{k,T}$, the deviation for the Q-values others than $Q_{(D,D),D}$ is at most*

$$|Q_{s,a}^t - Q_{s,a}^{t_0}| \leq \frac{2k\Delta_r\alpha}{1 - \gamma}, \quad \forall (s, a) \neq (DD, D) .$$

iv) *On the event $\mathcal{E}_{k,T}$, the deviation for the Q-value $Q_{(D,D),D}$ is upper-bounded*

$$Q_{(D,D),D}^{t+1} - Q_{(D,D),D}^{*,\text{Defect}} \leq \frac{2k\Delta_r\alpha}{1 - \gamma} \\ + (1 - \alpha(1 - \gamma))^{T-2k} \left(Q_{(D,D),D}^{t_0} - Q_{(D,D),D}^{*,\text{Defect}} \right) .$$

v) *On the event $\mathcal{E}_{k,T}$, for $k < \frac{(1-\gamma)\Delta Q}{2\alpha\Delta_r}$, with $\Delta Q \triangleq \min_{s \neq DD} Q_{s,D}^{t_0} - Q_{s,C}^{t_0}$*

$$Q_{s,D}^t > Q_{s,C}^t, \quad \forall t \leq T, s \neq DD .$$

vi) *On the event $\mathcal{E}_{k,T}$, if $T > 2k + \frac{\log\left(Q_{(D,D),C}^{t_0} - Q_{(D,D),D}^{*,\text{Defect}} - \frac{4k\Delta_r\alpha}{1-\gamma}\right) - \log\left(Q_{(D,D),D}^{t_0} - Q_{(D,D),D}^{*,\text{Defect}}\right)}{\log(1-\alpha+\gamma\alpha)}$,*

then

$$Q_{(D,D),D}^T < Q_{(D,D),C}^T .$$

Combining Lemmas 10 i) to 10 vi) yields that agents learn the lose-shift policy with high probability. Similar arguments hold for learning the Pavlov policy from the lose-shift policy. \square

Figure 2 shows the evolution of the Q-values as a function of the number of iterations for multiple values of ϵ . 100 of runs are averaged, and the standard deviation is displayed in the shaded area. For $\epsilon = 0.01$, we almost recover the no exploration case. As the exploration parameter ϵ grows, the less the condition for the Pavlov policy to be a fixed point of the multi-agent Bellman Equation (2) is respected (see Proposition 6).

4 Related Work

This question of tacit collusion/cooperation between agents has been studied almost independently in the economics and reinforcement learning literature. On the one hand, the economics community perceives collusion/cooperation as a negative feature since collusion between sellers is against the consumer’s interest and remains illegal, violating anti-trust laws. On the other hand, in reinforcement learning, collusion/cooperation is considered a desired property, which would yield symbiotic behaviors between decentralized agents.

Iterated Prisoner’s Dilemma and Q -learning without Memory. Without memory, *i.e.*, with $\mathcal{S} = \emptyset$, [Banchio and Mantegazza \(2022\)](#) study the averaged ([Seijen et al., 2009](#); [Sutton and Barto, 2018](#), 6.10), time-continuous dynamic of [Equation \(3\)](#) (no stochasticity and discreteness), with $p(a^1)$ the probability of picking the action $a^1 \in \{C, D\}$, $\forall a^1 \in \mathcal{A}$

$$\dot{Q}_{a^1} = p(a^1) (\mathbb{E}_{a^2 \sim \pi}(r_{a^1, a^2}) + \gamma \max_{a'} Q_{a'} - Q_{a^1}) . \quad (7)$$

The main takeaway from [Equation \(7\)](#) is that the dynamics of the Q -values are governed by two linear systems: one linear system when $Q_D > Q_C$ and one when $Q_D < Q_C$. When $Q_D = Q_C$ the vector field is discontinuous, but it can be defined as a set-valued function $F^{\text{Discontinuity}} \in \{\lambda F^D + (1 - \lambda)F^C; \lambda \in [0, 1]\}$, with F^C and F^D the vector fields in the region $Q_D < Q_C$ and $Q_D > Q_C$. [Banchio and Mantegazza \(2022, Fig. 5\)](#) shows the vector fields in each region for various values of the exploration parameter ϵ and the incentive to cooperate g . The main results from the memoryless case are the following:

- There is no equilibrium corresponding to a cooperative policy, *i.e.*, no fixed point of [Equation \(7\)](#) such that $Q_D^* < Q_C^*$.
- There is always an equilibrium corresponding to an **always defect** policy, *i.e.*, a fixed point of [Equation \(7\)](#) such that $Q_D^* > Q_C^*$
- Depending on the value of the exploration parameter ϵ and the incentive to cooperate g , an *additional equilibrium at the discontinuity of the vector field* can appear, *i.e.*, an equilibrium where $Q_D^* = Q_C^*$. This equilibrium is characterized by partial cooperation.

For ourselves, we built upon the ideas from [Banchio and Mantegazza \(2022\)](#) and showed that fully cooperative equilibria can be achieved by Q -learners *with memory*. In particular, we showed such a cooperative result for the practical, discrete and stochastic, Q -learning dynamics described in [Equation \(3\)](#) with an ϵ -greedy policy.

Multi-agent Reinforcement Learning. The problem of cooperation has also been approached in the *multi-agent reinforcement learning* community, which tackles the question of multiple agents’ decision-making in a *shared* environment. Depending on the environment and the rewards, agents can either prioritize their interests or promote cooperation. This yielded a vast literature of empirical algorithms aiming at learning cooperative strategies ([Whitehead, 1991](#)) in various settings ([Lowe et al., 2017](#); [Sunehag et al., 2017](#); [Guan et al., 2023](#)), depending if the agents can synchronize or not ([Nekoei et al., 2023](#); [Zhao et al., 2023](#)).

Multi-agent reinforcement learning has also been approached from the theoretical side: it has been analyzed in the case of zero-sum games ([Littman, 1994](#)), non-zero-sum with only a single Nash equilibrium ([Hu and Wellman, 1998](#)). The main difficulty of the multi-agent reinforcement learning theoretical analyses ([Zhang et al., 2021](#), §3) comes from (i) The notion of optimality/learning goal, *i.e.*, what are the desirable properties of the learned policy. (ii) The non-stationary environment, which yields rewards depending on the other player’s actions. (iii) The existence of multiple equilibria. While the question of convergence towards a *Nash* has previously been studied ([Hu and Wellman, 1998](#); [Wainwright, 2019](#)), characterizing towards *which equilibrium* algorithms converge is much harder, and is usually only studied numerically ([Kaisers, 2012](#)).

5 Experiments

Optimism in Practice. A practical way to initialize the Q -values is first to run [Algorithm 1](#) with the exploration parameter $\epsilon = 1/2$, which corresponds to the uniformly random policy, $p(C|s) = p(D|s) = 1/2, \forall s \in \mathcal{S}$. For $\epsilon = 1/2$, [Equation \(2\)](#) has a unique fixed-point policy, which yields an **always defect** strategy. The case $\epsilon = 1/2$ is equivalent to single agent Q learning because the action a^2 of the opponent is drawn from the uniform distribution $U(\{C, D\})$, which means that the first agent is learning in a stationary environment.

Influence of the step-size and the exploration. We consider the iterated prisoner’s dilemma with a fixed incentive to cooperate $g = 1.8$ and discount factor $\gamma = .6$. [Figure 3](#) shows the percentage of runs which achieve cooperation for multiple values of the exploration parameter ϵ and the step-size α . For each pair (ϵ, α) , [Algorithm 1](#) is run 100 times, for 2000 iterations, with an optimistic initialization. The percentage of runs that yields cooperation is displayed as a function of ϵ and α . As predicted by [Proposition 6](#), when ϵ is too large ($\epsilon = 0.2$), Pavlov policy is no longer




Figure 3: **Influence of α and ϵ on the cooperation.** For each pair (α, ϵ) , the probability of learning a cooperative strategy is estimated with 100 runs. As predicted by [Theorem 9](#), cooperation is achieved with a high probability for smaller values of the exploration parameter ϵ , and of the step-size α .

a stable point of [Equation \(2\)](#), and no cooperation is achieved. As predicted by [Theorem 9](#), smaller values of α and ϵ yield a larger probability of cooperation.

Extension to deep Q-learning. We train a DQN agent ([Mnih et al., 2015](#)) with a Q-function parametrized by a neural network with two linear layers and ReLU activations to play the iterated prisoner’s dilemma. First, the network is initialized by playing against a random agent for 500 iterations. As discussed in the previous paragraph, this corresponds to [Algorithm 2](#) with an exploration parameter of $\epsilon = 1/2$. Then the agent is playing against itself, with a decreasing exploration going from $\epsilon = 1/2$ to $\epsilon = 10^{-2}$. Details and hyperparameters can be found in [Appendix E](#).

Comments on [Figure 4](#). A batch of actions is drawn at each iteration, and we compute the empirical probability of choosing the ‘cooperate’ action given a specific state $p(C|s)$, for all the previous possible states, $s \in \{CC, CD, DC, DD\}$. The procedure is repeated for multiple seeds and the mean across the seed is displayed as a thick line. [Figure 4](#) displays the probability of cooperation as a function of the number of iterations. Players start to cooperate in the CD states, then successively in the DD and CC states. Finally, around iteration 6000 players start to defect in the CD state and reach the Pavlov policy. As opposed to the vanilla Q-learning cases, in which the agents learn to cooperate is not the same, but the resulting policy is.

6 Conclusion and Limitation

In order to understand the empirical collusion phenomenon of machine learning algorithms observed in the economics community ([Calvano et al., 2019, 2020](#)), we theoretically studied multi-agent agent Q-learning




Figure 4: **Extension to deep Q-learning.** Evolution of the probability to cooperate conditioned on the state, *i.e.*, the previous actions, as a function of the number of iterations in the iterated prisoner’s dilemma. Multiple runs corresponding to multiple seeds are displayed, as well as their mean. Agents are trained against a random agent for the initialization and go from an **always defect** policy to the cooperative Pavlov policy.

in the minimalist setting of the prisoner’s dilemma. In this work, we first showed that the cooperative strategy Pavlov was a fixed point of the multi-agent [Equation \(2\)](#), for Q-learning *with* memory (as opposed to the memoryless case). We showed that multiple strategies were also fixed-point of this equation, but that two agents guided by the usual Q-learning algorithm ([Algorithm 1](#)) could learn the cooperative Pavlov policy, even when both agents start from an **always defect** policy. In addition, we provided explicit conditions for convergence towards such a cooperative strategy in the fully greedy case ($\epsilon = 0$, [Section 3.2](#)), and in the ϵ -greedy case ($\epsilon > 0$, [Section 3.3](#)).

One major limitation of our analysis is the self-play assumption, which is currently crucial in the proof of [Theorems 8 and 9](#): relaxing this assumption is left as future work. In addition, we plan to study other standard reinforcement learning algorithms, such as policy gradient. Finally, we also plan to study the extension of the emergence of this collusion phenomenon in other usual games such as Bertrand games and more complex multi-agent reinforcement learning games.

QB would like to thank Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd. for funding this research.

References

- J. Asker, C. Fershtman, and A. Pakes. Artificial intelligence, algorithm design, and pricing. In *AEA Papers and Proceedings*, volume 112, pages 452–56, 2022.
- P. Auer, N. Cesa-Bianchi, and P. Fischer. Finite-time analysis of the multiarmed bandit problem. *Machine learning*, 47:235–256, 2002.
- B. Baker, I. Kanitscheider, T. Markov, Y. Wu, G. Powell, B. McGrew, and I. Mordatch. Emergent tool use from multi-agent autocurricula. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1909.07528*, 2019.
- M. Banchio and G. Mantegazza. Adaptive algorithms and collusion via coupling. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2202*, 2022.
- M. Banchio and A. Skrzypacz. Artificial intelligence and auction design. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2202.05947*, 2022.
- Competition Bureau. Big data and innovation: Implications for competition policy in canada. <https://ised-isde.canada.ca/site/competition-bureau-canada/sites/default/files/attachments/2022/Big-Data-e.pdf>, 2018.
- E. Calvano, G. Calzolari, V. Denicolò, and S. Pastorello. Algorithmic pricing what implications for competition policy? *Review of industrial organization*, 55:155–171, 2019.
- E. Calvano, G. Calzolari, V. Denicolo, and S. Pastorello. Artificial intelligence, algorithmic pricing, and collusion. *American Economic Review*, 110(10):3267–3297, 2020.
- E. Calvano, G. Calzolari, V. Denicolò, and S. Pastorello. Algorithmic collusion: Genuine or spurious? *International Journal of Industrial Organization*, page 102973, 2023.
- L. Chen, A. Mislove, and C. Wilson. An empirical analysis of algorithmic pricing on amazon marketplace. In *Proceedings of the 25th international conference on World Wide Web*, pages 1339–1349, 2016.
- D. Cheng. Asymmetric equilibria in symmetric multiplayer prisoners dilemma supergames. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.13772*, 2022.
- P. Conway, D. De Rosa, G. Nicoletti, and F. Steiner. Regulation, competition and productivity convergence. 2006.
- G. Debreu. *Theory of value: An axiomatic analysis of economic equilibrium*, volume 17. Yale University Press, 1959.
- R. Deneckere and C. Davidson. Incentives to form coalitions with bertrand competition. *The RAND Journal of economics*, pages 473–486, 1985.
- E. Even-Dar and Y. Mansour. Convergence of optimistic and incremental Q-learning. *NeurIPS*, 14, 2001.
- A. Ezrachi and M. E. Stucke. The curious case of competition and quality. *Journal of Antitrust Enforcement*, 3(2):227–257, 2015.
- M. Fey. Symmetric games with only asymmetric equilibria. *Games and Economic Behavior*, 2012.
- M. M. Flood. Some experimental games. *Management Science*, 5(1):5–26, 1958.
- C. Guan, F. Chen, L. Yuan, Z. Zhang, and Y. Yu. Efficient communication via self-supervised information aggregation for online and offline multi-agent reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.09605*, 2023.
- K. T. Hansen, K. Misra, and M. Pai. Frontiers: Algorithmic collusion: Supra-competitive prices via independent algorithms. *Marketing Science*, 40(1):1–12, 2021.
- J. Hu and M. P. Wellman. Multiagent reinforcement learning: theoretical framework and an algorithm. In *ICML*, volume 98, pages 242–250, 1998.
- M. Kaisers. Learning against learning: Evolutionary dynamics of reinforcement learning algorithms in strategic interactions. 2012.
- G. Kendall, X. Yao, and S. Y. Chong. *The iterated prisoners’ dilemma: 20 years on*, volume 4. World Scientific, 2007.
- M. L. Littman. Markov games as a framework for multi-agent reinforcement learning. In *Machine learning proceedings 1994*, pages 157–163. Elsevier, 1994.
- R. Lowe, Y.I. Wu, A. Tamar, J. Harb, O. Pieter Abbeel, and I. Mordatch. Multi-agent actor-critic for mixed cooperative-competitive environments. *NeurIPS*, 2017.
- S. K. Mehra. Antitrust and the robo-seller: Competition in the time of algorithms. *Minn. L. Rev.*, 100:1323, 2015.
- V. Mnih, K. Kavukcuoglu, D. Silver, A. A. Rusu, J. Veness, M. G. Bellemare, A. Graves, M. Riedmiller, A. K. Fidjeland, G. Ostrovski, S. Petersen, C. Beattie, A. Sadik, I. Antonoglou, H. King, D. Kumaran, D. Wierstra, S. Legg, and D. Hassabis. Human-level control through deep reinforcement learning. *Nature*, 518(7540):529–533, 2015.
- J. Nash. Non-cooperative games. In *Essays on Game Theory*. Edward Elgar Publishing, 1951.

- H. Nekoei, A. Badrinaaraayanan, A. Sinha, M. Amini, J. Rajendran, A. Mahajan, and S. Chandar. Dealing with non-stationarity in decentralized cooperative multi-agent deep reinforcement learning via multi-timescale learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.02792*, 2023.
- M. Nowak and K. Sigmund. A strategy of win-stay, lose-shift that outperforms tit-for-tat in the prisoner's dilemma game. *Nature*, 364:56–58, 1993.
- OECD. Collusion: Competition policy in the digital age. <https://www.oecd.org/daf/competition/Algorithms-and-collusion-competition-policy-in-the-digital-age.pdf>, 2017.
- M. J. Osborne. *An introduction to game theory*, volume 3. Oxford university press New York, 2004.
- R. A. Posner. *Antitrust law*. University of Chicago press, 2009.
- C. M. Radaelli. The puzzle of regulatory competition. *Journal of Public Policy*, 24(1):1–23, 2004.
- S. Schechner. Why do gas station prices constantly change? blame the algorithm. *Wall Street Journal*, 8, 2017.
- H. Van Seijen, H. Van Hasselt, S. Whiteson, and M. Wiering. A theoretical and empirical analysis of expected sarsa. In *2009 IEEE Symposium on Adaptive Dynamic Programming and Reinforcement Learning*, pages 177–184. IEEE, 2009.
- D. Silver, T. Hubert, J. Schrittwieser, I. Antonoglou, M. Lai, A. Guez, M. Lanctot, L. Sifre, D. Kumaran, and T. Graepel. A general reinforcement learning algorithm that masters chess, shogi, and go through self-play. *Science*, 362(6419):1140–1144, 2018.
- P. Sunehag, G. Lever, A. Gruslys, W. M. Czarnecki, V. Zambaldi, M. Jaderberg, M. Lanctot, N. Sonnerat, J. Z. Leibo, K. Tuyls, and T. Graepel. Value-decomposition networks for cooperative multi-agent learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1706.05296*, 2017.
- R. S. Sutton and A. G. Barto. *Reinforcement learning: An introduction*. MIT press, 2018.
- Y. Tang. Towards learning multi-agent negotiations via self-play. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision Workshops*, 2019.
- M. J. Wainwright. Stochastic approximation with cone-contractive operators: Sharp ℓ_∞ -bounds for Q-learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1905.06265*, 2019.
- L. Waltman and U. Kaymak. Q-learning agents in a Cournot oligopoly model. *Journal of Economic Dynamics and Control*, 32(10):3275–3293, 2008.
- C. Watkins and P. Dayan. Q-learning. *Machine learning*, 8:279–292, 1992.
- S. D. Whitehead. A complexity analysis of cooperative mechanisms in reinforcement learning. In *AAAI*, pages 607–613, 1991.
- D. Xepferis. Symmetric zero-sum games with only asymmetric equilibria. *Games and Economic Behavior*, 2015.
- K. Zhang, Z. Yang, and T. Başar. Multi-agent reinforcement learning: A selective overview of theories and algorithms. *Handbook of reinforcement learning and control*, pages 321–384, 2021.
- X. Zhao, Y. Pan, C. Xiao, S. Chandar, and J. Rajendran. Conditionally optimistic exploration for cooperative deep multi-agent reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.09032*, 2023.

Checklist

1. For all models and algorithms presented, check if you include:
 - (a) A clear description of the mathematical setting, assumptions, algorithm, and/or model. [Yes]
 - (b) An analysis of the properties and complexity (time, space, sample size) of any algorithm. [Yes]
 - (c) (Optional) Anonymized source code, with specification of all dependencies, including external libraries. [No]
2. For any theoretical claim, check if you include:
 - (a) Statements of the full set of assumptions of all theoretical results. [Yes]
 - (b) Complete proofs of all theoretical results. [Yes]
 - (c) Clear explanations of any assumptions. [Yes]
3. For all figures and tables that present empirical results, check if you include:
 - (a) The code, data, and instructions needed to reproduce the main experimental results (either in the supplemental material or as a URL). [No]
 - (b) All the training details (e.g., data splits, hyperparameters, how they were chosen). [Yes]
 - (c) A clear definition of the specific measure or statistics and error bars (e.g., with respect to the random seed after running experiments multiple times). [Yes]
 - (d) A description of the computing infrastructure used. (e.g., type of GPUs, internal cluster, or cloud provider). [Yes]
4. If you are using existing assets (e.g., code, data, models) or curating/releasing new assets, check if you include:
 - (a) Citations of the creator If your work uses existing assets. [Not Applicable]
 - (b) The license information of the assets, if applicable. [Not Applicable]
 - (c) New assets either in the supplemental material or as a URL, if applicable. [Not Applicable]
 - (d) Information about consent from data providers/curators. [Not Applicable]
 - (e) Discussion of sensible content if applicable, e.g., personally identifiable information or offensive content. [Not Applicable]
5. If you used crowdsourcing or conducted research with human subjects, check if you include:
 - (a) The full text of instructions given to participants and screenshots. [Not Applicable]
 - (b) Descriptions of potential participant risks, with links to Institutional Review Board (IRB) approvals if applicable. [Not Applicable]
 - (c) The estimated hourly wage paid to participants and the total amount spent on participant compensation. [Not Applicable]

A Propositions 3 and 4

Proposition 3 (Always defect). *For all $\gamma \in (0, 1)$, the **always defect** policy, i.e., $\pi^{\text{Defect}}(\text{D}|s) = 1, \forall s \in \mathcal{S}$, is a subgame perfect equilibrium.*

Proof. Regardless of the state, given that the opponent is always defecting, the best response at each time step is to defect since $r_1(\text{C}, \text{D}) < r_1(\text{D}, \text{D})$. \square

Proposition 4 (Pavlov). *If $1 > \gamma \geq \frac{2-g}{2(g-1)}$, then the **Pavlov** policy, i.e., $\pi^{\text{Pavlov}}(\text{D}|s) = 1, \forall s \in \{\text{CD}, \text{DC}\}$ and $\pi^{\text{Pavlov}}(\text{C}|s) = 1, \forall s \in \{\text{DD}, \text{CC}\}$, is a subgame perfect equilibrium.*

Proof. Let us assume that our opponent plays according to **Pavlov** and show that the best response is to also adopt this strategy. By the one deviation principle (Osborne, 2004, Prop 438.1), one only needs to show that for the four possible starting states the best response against **Pavlov** is to follow **Pavlov**.

- If we start in $s_0 \in \{\text{CD}, \text{DC}\}$, the opponent will defect and the best response is to defect since, if we cooperate, we end up in $s_1 = \text{CD}$ which leads to a worse payoff than going straight to DD by defecting, $r_{\text{CD}} + \gamma r_{\text{DD}} + \gamma^2 r_{\text{CC}} \leq r_{\text{DD}} + \gamma r_{\text{CC}} + \gamma^2 r_{\text{CC}}$, which is always the case since $r_{\text{CD}} < r_{\text{DD}} < r_{\text{CC}}$.
- If we start in $s_0 = \text{CC}$, we should show that it is better to cooperate than to defect. It is the case if, $r_{\text{CD}} + \gamma r_{\text{DD}} + \gamma^2 r_{\text{CC}} \leq r_{\text{CC}} + \gamma r_{\text{CC}} + \gamma^2 r_{\text{CC}}$, which is true if and only if $\gamma \geq \frac{r_{\text{DC}} - r_{\text{CC}}}{r_{\text{CC}} - r_{\text{DD}}} = \frac{2-g}{2(g-1)}$.
- Finally, if we start in $s_0 = \text{DD}$, it is better to cooperate than to defect as the opponent is cooperating. Hence, the best response to the **Pavlov** policy is to play according to **Pavlov**. \square

B Proofs of Q-values at Convergence

Table 2 summarizes the main policies considered: **always defect**, the **Pavlov** policy, and the in-between lose-switch policy.

Table 2: Summary of the main (deterministic) policies considered.

Policy	$\pi_{\text{D} \text{(D,D)}}$	$\pi_{\text{D} \text{(C,C)}}$	$\pi_{\text{D} \text{(C,D)}}$	$\pi_{\text{D} \text{(D,C)}}$
Always defect	1	1	1	1
Lose-switch	0	1	1	1
Pavlov	0	0	1	1

B.1 Always defect Policy

Proposition 5 (Always Defect). *The following Q-function $Q^{*,\text{Defect}}$ is a fixed point of the multi-agent Bellman Equation (2) and yields an **always defect** policy, $\forall s \in \{\text{C}, \text{D}\}^2$,*

$$\begin{aligned} Q_{s,\text{D}}^{*,\text{Defect}} &= \mathbb{E}_{a^2 \sim \pi(\cdot|s)} r_{\text{D},a^2} / (1 - \gamma) , \\ Q_{s,\text{C}}^{*,\text{Defect}} &= Q_{s,\text{D}}^{*,\text{Defect}} - \mathbb{E}_{a^2 \sim \pi(\cdot|s)} (r_{\text{D},a^2} - r_{\text{C},a^2}) . \end{aligned}$$

Proof. “Always defect” policy case: $\bar{a}^1(s) = \bar{a}^2(s) = \text{D}$ for all $s \in \{\text{C}, \text{D}\}^2$ In this case, the Q-value writes

$$Q_{s_t, a_t^1}^{*,\text{Defect}} = \gamma(1 - \epsilon) Q_{(a_t^1, \text{D}), \text{D}}^{*,\text{Defect}} + \gamma \epsilon Q_{(a_t^1, \text{C}), \text{D}}^{*,\text{Defect}} + \mathbb{E}_a r_{a_t^1, a} \quad (8)$$

$$Q_{s_t, \text{D}}^{*,\text{Defect}} - s\gamma(1 - \epsilon) Q_{(\text{DD}), \text{D}}^{*,\text{Defect}} - \gamma \epsilon Q_{(\text{DC}), \text{D}}^{*,\text{Defect}} = \mathbb{E}_a r_{\text{D}, a} \quad (9)$$

$$Q_{s_t, \text{C}}^{*,\text{Defect}} - \gamma(1 - \epsilon) Q_{(\text{C}, \text{D}), \text{D}}^{*,\text{Defect}} - \gamma \epsilon Q_{(\text{C}, \text{C}), \text{D}}^{*,\text{Defect}} = \mathbb{E}_a r_{\text{C}, a} . \quad (10)$$

Evaluating Equation (9) in $s_t = (D, C)$ and $s_t = (DD)$ yields

$$(1 - \gamma\epsilon)Q_{DC,D}^{*,\text{Defect}} - \gamma(1 - \epsilon)Q_{(D,D),D}^{*,\text{Defect}} = \mathbb{E}_a r_{D,a} \quad (11)$$

$$-\gamma\epsilon Q_{DC,D}^{*,\text{Defect}} + (1 - \gamma(1 - \epsilon))Q_{DD,D}^{*,\text{Defect}} = \mathbb{E}_a r_{D,a} . \quad (12)$$

One can see that

$$Q_{DC,D}^{*,\text{Defect}} = Q_{(D,D),D}^{*,\text{Defect}} = \mathbb{E}_a r_{D,a} / (1 - \gamma) , \quad (13)$$

is a solution to the linear system. Plugging Equation (13) into Equation (9) yields

$$Q_{CC,D}^{*,\text{Defect}} = Q_{CD,D}^{*,\text{Defect}} = \mathbb{E}_a r_{D,a} / (1 - \gamma) . \quad (14)$$

Plugging Equation (14) into Equation (10) yields

$$\forall s \in \{C, D\}^2, Q_{s,C}^{*,\text{Defect}} = \mathbb{E}_a r_{C,a} + \frac{\gamma}{1 - \gamma} \mathbb{E}_a r_{D,a} \quad (15)$$

$$= \frac{1}{1 - \gamma} \mathbb{E}_a r_{D,a} - (\mathbb{E}_a r_{D,a} - \mathbb{E}_a r_{C,a}) \quad (16)$$

$$= Q_{s,D}^{*,\text{Defect}} - (\mathbb{E}_a r_{D,a} - \mathbb{E}_a r_{C,a}) . \quad (17)$$

This means that these Q values imply a greedy **always defect** policy if and only if

$$\mathbb{E}_a r_{D,a} > \mathbb{E}_a r_{C,a} , \text{ i.e.,} \quad (18)$$

$$(1 - \epsilon)r_{DD} + \epsilon r_{DC} > (1 - \epsilon)r_{CD} + \epsilon r_{CC} , \quad (19)$$

which is always true since $r_{DD} > r_{CD}$ and $r_{DC} > r_{CC}$. □

B.2 Q -values at convergence for the Pavlov Policy

Proposition 6 (Pavlov). *If $\gamma > (2 - g)/(2g - 2)$ and ϵ is small enough, then there exists a Q -function, $Q^{*,\text{Pavlov}}$, which is a fixed point of the multi-agent Bellman Equation (2) and yields the Pavlov policy, i.e.,*

$$\forall s \in \{CC, DD\} \quad Q_{s,C}^{*,\text{Pavlov}} > Q_{s,D}^{*,\text{Pavlov}} \quad \text{and}$$

$$\forall s \in \{CD, DC\} \quad Q_{s,C}^{*,\text{Pavlov}} < Q_{s,D}^{*,\text{Pavlov}} .$$

Proof of Q -values at convergence for the Pavlov Policy.

$$Q_{s_t, a_t^1}^{*,\text{Pavlov}} = \gamma(1 - \epsilon)Q_{(a_t^1, \bar{a}^2(s_t)), \bar{a}^1(a_t^1, \bar{a}^2(s_t))}^{*,\text{Pavlov}} + \gamma\epsilon Q_{(a_t^1, \underline{a}^2(s_t)), \bar{a}^1(a_t^1, \underline{a}^2(s_t))}^{*,\text{Pavlov}} + \mathbb{E}_{a \sim \pi(\cdot | s_t)} r_{a_t^1, a} \quad (20)$$

$$Q_{CC, a_t^1}^{*,\text{Pavlov}} = \gamma(1 - \epsilon)Q_{(a_t^1, C), \bar{a}^1(a_t^1, C)}^{*,\text{Pavlov}} + \gamma\epsilon Q_{(a_t^1, D), \bar{a}^1(a_t^1, D)}^{*,\text{Pavlov}} + \mathbb{E}_{a \sim \pi(\cdot | CC)} r_{a_t^1, a} \quad (21)$$

$$Q_{DD, a_t^1}^{*,\text{Pavlov}} = \gamma(1 - \epsilon)Q_{(a_t^1, C), \bar{a}^1(a_t^1, C)}^{*,\text{Pavlov}} + \gamma\epsilon Q_{(a_t^1, D), \bar{a}^1(a_t^1, D)}^{*,\text{Pavlov}} + \mathbb{E}_{a \sim \pi(\cdot | DD)} r_{a_t^1, a} \quad (22)$$

$$Q_{CD, a_t^1}^{*,\text{Pavlov}} = \gamma(1 - \epsilon)Q_{(a_t^1, D), \bar{a}^1(a_t^1, D)}^{*,\text{Pavlov}} + \gamma\epsilon Q_{(a_t^1, C), \bar{a}^1(a_t^1, C)}^{*,\text{Pavlov}} + \mathbb{E}_{a \sim \pi(\cdot | CD)} r_{a_t^1, a} \quad (23)$$

$$Q_{DC, a_t^1}^{*,\text{Pavlov}} = \gamma(1 - \epsilon)Q_{(a_t^1, D), \bar{a}^1(a_t^1, D)}^{*,\text{Pavlov}} + \gamma\epsilon Q_{(a_t^1, C), \bar{a}^1(a_t^1, C)}^{*,\text{Pavlov}} + \mathbb{E}_{a \sim \pi(\cdot | DC)} r_{a_t^1, a} \quad (24)$$

Hence

$$Q_{(C,C),C}^{*,\text{Pavlov}} - \gamma(1-\epsilon)Q_{(C,C),C}^{*,\text{Pavlov}} - \gamma\epsilon Q_{(D,D),D}^{*,\text{Pavlov}} = \mathbb{E}_{a \sim \pi(\cdot|CC)} r_{C,a} \quad (25)$$

$$Q_{(C,C),D}^{*,\text{Pavlov}} - \gamma(1-\epsilon)Q_{(D,C),D}^{*,\text{Pavlov}} - \gamma\epsilon Q_{(D,D),C}^{*,\text{Pavlov}} = \mathbb{E}_{a \sim \pi(\cdot|CC)} r_{D,a} \quad (26)$$

$$Q_{(D,D),C}^{*,\text{Pavlov}} - \gamma(1-\epsilon)Q_{(C,C),C}^{*,\text{Pavlov}} - \gamma\epsilon Q_{(C,D),D}^{*,\text{Pavlov}} = \mathbb{E}_{a \sim \pi(\cdot|DD)} r_{C,a} \quad (27)$$

$$Q_{(D,D),D}^{*,\text{Pavlov}} - \gamma(1-\epsilon)Q_{(D,C),D}^{*,\text{Pavlov}} - \gamma\epsilon Q_{(D,D),C}^{*,\text{Pavlov}} = \mathbb{E}_{a \sim \pi(\cdot|DD)} r_{D,a} \quad (28)$$

$$Q_{(C,D),C}^{*,\text{Pavlov}} - \gamma(1-\epsilon)Q_{(C,D),D}^{*,\text{Pavlov}} - \gamma\epsilon Q_{(C,C),C}^{*,\text{Pavlov}} = \mathbb{E}_{a \sim \pi(\cdot|CD)} r_{C,a} \quad (29)$$

$$Q_{(C,D),D}^{*,\text{Pavlov}} - \gamma(1-\epsilon)Q_{(D,D),C}^{*,\text{Pavlov}} - \gamma\epsilon Q_{(D,C),D}^{*,\text{Pavlov}} = \mathbb{E}_{a \sim \pi(\cdot|CD)} r_{D,a} \quad (30)$$

$$Q_{(D,C),C}^{*,\text{Pavlov}} - \gamma(1-\epsilon)Q_{(C,D),D}^{*,\text{Pavlov}} - \gamma\epsilon Q_{(C,C),C}^{*,\text{Pavlov}} = \mathbb{E}_{a \sim \pi(\cdot|DC)} r_{C,a} \quad (31)$$

$$Q_{(D,C),D}^{*,\text{Pavlov}} - \gamma(1-\epsilon)Q_{(D,D),C}^{*,\text{Pavlov}} - \gamma\epsilon Q_{(D,C),D}^{*,\text{Pavlov}} = \mathbb{E}_{a \sim \pi(\cdot|DC)} r_{D,a} \quad (32)$$

One can observe that

$$Q_{(C,C),C}^{*,\text{Pavlov}} = Q_{(D,D),C}^{*,\text{Pavlov}} \quad (33)$$

$$Q_{(C,C),D}^{*,\text{Pavlov}} = Q_{(D,D),D}^{*,\text{Pavlov}} \quad (34)$$

$$Q_{(C,D),C}^{*,\text{Pavlov}} = Q_{(D,C),C}^{*,\text{Pavlov}} \quad (35)$$

$$Q_{(C,D),D}^{*,\text{Pavlov}} = Q_{(D,C),D}^{*,\text{Pavlov}} \quad (36)$$

And the system of equations rewrites

$$Q_{(C,C),C}^{*,\text{Pavlov}} - \gamma(1-\epsilon)Q_{(C,C),C}^{*,\text{Pavlov}} - \gamma\epsilon Q_{(C,D),D}^{*,\text{Pavlov}} = \mathbb{E}_{a \sim \pi(\cdot|CC)} r_{C,a} \quad (37)$$

$$Q_{(D,D),D}^{*,\text{Pavlov}} - \gamma(1-\epsilon)Q_{(C,D),D}^{*,\text{Pavlov}} - \gamma\epsilon Q_{(C,C),C}^{*,\text{Pavlov}} = \mathbb{E}_{a \sim \pi(\cdot|DD)} r_{D,a} \quad (38)$$

$$Q_{(C,D),C}^{*,\text{Pavlov}} - \gamma(1-\epsilon)Q_{(C,D),D}^{*,\text{Pavlov}} - \gamma\epsilon Q_{(C,C),C}^{*,\text{Pavlov}} = \mathbb{E}_{a \sim \pi(\cdot|CD)} r_{C,a} \quad (39)$$

$$Q_{(C,D),D}^{*,\text{Pavlov}} - \gamma(1-\epsilon)Q_{(C,C),C}^{*,\text{Pavlov}} - \gamma\epsilon Q_{(C,D),D}^{*,\text{Pavlov}} = \mathbb{E}_{a \sim \pi(\cdot|CD)} r_{D,a} \quad (40)$$

For $Q_{(C,C),C}^{*,\text{Pavlov}}$ and $Q_{(C,D),D}^{*,\text{Pavlov}}$ on needs to solve the following linear system:

$$\begin{pmatrix} 1 - \gamma(1 - \epsilon) & -\gamma\epsilon \\ -\gamma(1 - \epsilon) & 1 - \gamma\epsilon \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} Q_{(C,C),C}^{*,\text{Pavlov}} \\ Q_{(C,D),D}^{*,\text{Pavlov}} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbb{E}_{a \sim \pi(\cdot|CC)} r_{C,a} \\ \mathbb{E}_{a \sim \pi(\cdot|CD)} r_{D,a} \end{pmatrix} \quad (41)$$

which yields

$$Q_{(D,D),C}^{*,\text{Pavlov}} = Q_{(C,C),C}^{*,\text{Pavlov}} = \frac{(1 - \gamma\epsilon)\mathbb{E}_{a \sim \pi(\cdot|CC)} r_{C,a} + \gamma\epsilon\mathbb{E}_{a \sim \pi(\cdot|CD)} r_{D,a}}{1 - \gamma} \quad (42)$$

$$Q_{(D,C),D}^{*,\text{Pavlov}} = Q_{(C,D),D}^{*,\text{Pavlov}} = \frac{\gamma(1 - \epsilon)\mathbb{E}_{a \sim \pi(\cdot|CC)} r_{C,a} + (1 - \gamma(1 - \epsilon))\mathbb{E}_{a \sim \pi(\cdot|CD)} r_{D,a}}{1 - \gamma} \quad (43)$$

$$Q_{(C,D),D}^{*,\text{Pavlov}} - Q_{(C,D),C}^{*,\text{Pavlov}} = Q_{(D,C),D}^{*,\text{Pavlov}} - Q_{(D,C),C}^{*,\text{Pavlov}} \quad (44)$$

$$= \gamma(1 - \epsilon)Q_{(C,C),C}^{*,\text{Pavlov}} + \gamma\epsilon Q_{(C,D),D}^{*,\text{Pavlov}} + \mathbb{E}_{a \sim \pi(\cdot|CD)} r_{D,a} \quad (45)$$

$$- \gamma(1 - \epsilon)Q_{(C,D),D}^{*,\text{Pavlov}} - \gamma\epsilon Q_{(C,C),C}^{*,\text{Pavlov}} - \mathbb{E}_{a \sim \pi(\cdot|CD)} r_{C,a} \quad (46)$$

$$= \gamma(1 - 2\epsilon)Q_{(C,C),C}^{*,\text{Pavlov}} - \gamma(1 - 2\epsilon)Q_{(C,D),D}^{*,\text{Pavlov}} + \mathbb{E}_{a \sim \pi(\cdot|CD)} r_{D,a} - \mathbb{E}_{a \sim \pi(\cdot|CD)} r_{C,a} \quad (47)$$

$$= \gamma(1 - 2\epsilon)(Q_{(C,C),C}^{*,\text{Pavlov}} - Q_{(C,D),D}^{*,\text{Pavlov}}) + \mathbb{E}_{a \sim \pi(\cdot|CD)} r_{D,a} - \mathbb{E}_{a \sim \pi(\cdot|CD)} r_{C,a} \quad (48)$$

$$= \gamma(1 - 2\epsilon) \underbrace{(\mathbb{E}_{a \sim \pi(\cdot|CC)} r_{C,a} - \mathbb{E}_{a \sim \pi(\cdot|CD)} r_{D,a})}_{\text{depends on } \epsilon} + \underbrace{\mathbb{E}_{a \sim \pi(\cdot|CD)} r_{D,a} - \mathbb{E}_{a \sim \pi(\cdot|CD)} r_{C,a}}_{>0} \quad (49)$$

$$= \gamma(1 - 2\epsilon) \underbrace{((1 - \epsilon)(r_{CC} - r_{DD}) + \epsilon(r_{CD} - r_{DC}))}_{\text{depends on } \epsilon} + \underbrace{\mathbb{E}_{a \sim \pi(\cdot|CD)} r_{D,a} - \mathbb{E}_{a \sim \pi(\cdot|CD)} r_{C,a}}_{>0} \quad (50)$$

$$= \gamma(1 - 2\epsilon)(2(g - 1) - 2g\epsilon) + (2 - g) \quad (51)$$

Which is positive. In addition

$$Q_{(D,D),C}^{*,\text{Pavlov}} - Q_{(D,D),D}^{*,\text{Pavlov}} \quad (52)$$

$$= \gamma(1-2\epsilon) \underbrace{(\mathbb{E}_{a \sim \pi(\cdot|CC)} r_{C,a} - \mathbb{E}_{a \sim \pi(\cdot|CD)} r_{D,a})}_{\text{depends}} + \underbrace{\mathbb{E}_{a \sim \pi(\cdot|DD)} (r_{C,a} - r_{D,a})}_{<0} \quad (53)$$

$$= \gamma(1-2\epsilon) \underbrace{((1-\epsilon)(r_{CC} - r_{DD}) + \epsilon(r_{CD} - r_{DC}))}_{\text{depends on } \epsilon} + \underbrace{(1-\epsilon)(r_{CC} - r_{DC}) + \epsilon(r_{CD} - r_{DD})}_{<0} \quad (54)$$

$$= 2\gamma(1-2\epsilon) \underbrace{(((g-1) - g\epsilon))}_{\text{depends on } \epsilon} + g, \quad (55)$$

which is positive for ϵ small enough. □

C Proof the Fully Greedy Case (Theorem 8)

Following Equations (5) and (6), the dynamics of $Q_{(C,C),D}$ and $Q_{(D,D),C}$ is governed by the linear system

$$\begin{pmatrix} Q_{(C,C),D}^{t+1} \\ Q_{(D,D),C}^{t+1} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 1-\alpha & \alpha\gamma \\ \alpha\gamma(1-\alpha) & 1-\alpha + (\alpha\gamma)^2 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} Q_{(C,C),D}^t \\ Q_{(D,D),C}^t \end{pmatrix} + b, \quad (56)$$

for a given b . We know by Proposition 6 that the fixed point of this linear system is $(Q_{(C,C),D}^{*,\text{lose-shift}}, Q_{(D,D),C}^{*,\text{lose-shift}})$. Standard computations yield the eigenvalues of the matrix

$$\begin{pmatrix} 1-\alpha & \alpha\gamma \\ \alpha\gamma(1-\alpha) & 1-\alpha + (\alpha\gamma)^2 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (57)$$

are

$$\lambda_{\pm} = 1-\alpha + \alpha\gamma \left(\frac{\alpha\gamma}{2} \pm \sqrt{1-\alpha + \frac{(\alpha\gamma)^2}{4}} \right). \quad (58)$$

Thus for $0 < \alpha < 1$ and $0 < \gamma < 1$ we have $0 < \lambda_{\pm} < 1$ and thus $(Q_{(C,C),D}^t, Q_{(D,D),C}^t)$ converges linearly towards $(Q_{(C,C),D}^{*,\text{lose-shift}}, Q_{(D,D),C}^{*,\text{lose-shift}})$.

Then using Lemma 11, we have that $Q_{(C,C),D}^t$ will get below $Q_{(C,C),C}^{t_0}$ before $Q_{(D,D),C}^t$ getting below $Q_{(D,D),D}^{t_0}$.

Lemma 11. *In the phase from lose-shift to Pavlov, if $\frac{r_{DD} + \gamma r_{CC}}{1-\gamma^2} \triangleq Q_{(C,C),C}^{*,\text{lose-shift}} < Q_{(C,C),C}^{t_0} \leq \frac{r_{CC}}{1-\gamma}$, then while $Q_{(C,C),D}^t > Q_{(C,C),C}^{t_0}$, $Q_{(D,D),C}^t > Q_{(D,D),D}^{t_0}$.*

Proof. (Lemma 11) In phase 2, $Q_{(C,C),D}^{t+1} > Q_{(C,C),C}^{t_0}$ Using Equation (6)

$$Q_{(D,D),C}^{t+1} = (1-\alpha)Q_{(D,D),C}^t + \alpha \left(r_{CC} + \gamma \underbrace{Q_{(C,C),D}^{t+1}}_{> Q_{(C,C),C}^{t+1}} \right), \quad (59)$$

$$> \underbrace{Q_{(C,C),C}^{t_0}}_{> Q_{(D,D),D}^{t_0} = Q_{(D,D),D}^{t+1}}$$

hence

$$Q_{(D,D),C}^{t+1} > Q_{(D,D),D}^{t+1}. \quad (60)$$

□

D Proof of the ϵ -Greedy Case (Theorem 9)

Let us start with the proof of Lemma 10.

D.1 Proof of Lemma 10: from always defect to lose-shift

Lemma 10. *Let $0 < \epsilon < 1/2$, $0 < \gamma < 1$ and $0 \leq k \leq T$, $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Suppose that Assumption 7 holds, $s_0 = DD$, and both agents are guided by ϵ -greedy Q-learning (Algorithm 1), then*

i) *The probability of the event $\mathcal{E}_{k,T}$ is lower bounded*

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_{k,T}) \geq 1 - 2^T \epsilon^{T-k} .$$

ii) *On the event $\mathcal{E}_{k,T}$, for all $(s, a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$*

$$|Q_{s,a}^{t+1} - Q_{s,a}^t| \leq \frac{\Delta_r \alpha}{1 - \gamma} .$$

iii) *On the event $\mathcal{E}_{k,T}$, the deviation for the Q-values others than $Q_{(D,D),D}$ is at most*

$$|Q_{s,a}^t - Q_{s,a}^{t_0}| \leq \frac{2k\Delta_r\alpha}{1 - \gamma}, \quad \forall (s, a) \neq (DD, D) .$$

iv) *On the event $\mathcal{E}_{k,T}$, the deviation for the Q-value $Q_{(D,D),D}$ is upper-bounded*

$$\begin{aligned} Q_{(D,D),D}^{t+1} - Q_{(D,D),D}^{*,\text{Defect}} &\leq \frac{2k\Delta_r\alpha}{1 - \gamma} \\ &+ (1 - \alpha(1 - \gamma))^{T-2k} \left(Q_{(D,D),D}^{t_0} - Q_{(D,D),D}^{*,\text{Defect}} \right) . \end{aligned}$$

v) *On the event $\mathcal{E}_{k,T}$, for $k < \frac{(1-\gamma)\Delta Q}{2\alpha\Delta_r}$, with $\Delta Q \triangleq \min_{s \neq DD} Q_{s,D}^{t_0} - Q_{s,C}^{t_0}$*

$$Q_{s,D}^t > Q_{s,C}^t, \quad \forall t \leq T, s \neq DD .$$

vi) *On the event $\mathcal{E}_{k,T}$, if $T > 2k + \frac{\log\left(Q_{(D,D),C}^{t_0} - Q_{(D,D),D}^{*,\text{Defect}} - \frac{4k\Delta_r\alpha}{1-\gamma}\right) - \log\left(Q_{(D,D),D}^{t_0} - Q_{(D,D),D}^{*,\text{Defect}}\right)}{\log(1-\alpha+\gamma\alpha)}$, then*

$$Q_{(D,D),D}^T < Q_{(D,D),C}^T .$$

D.1.1 Proof of Lemma 10 i)

Proof of Lemma 10 i). The proof of this result relies on the fact that

- The probability of the greedy action is $1 - \epsilon$.
- Each agent picks their action independently of the other.

Thus, either both agents take a greedy action with probability $(1-\epsilon)^2$, or at least one of them picks a non-greedy action with probability $2\epsilon - \epsilon^2$.

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_{k,T}) = \sum_{i=0}^k \mathbb{P}(\text{a nongreedy action has been picked exactly } i \text{ times in } T \text{ steps}) \quad (61)$$

$$= \sum_{i=0}^k \binom{T}{i} (1-\epsilon)^{2(T-i)} \overbrace{(2\epsilon - \epsilon^2)^i}^{\geq (2\epsilon)^i} \quad (62)$$

$$\geq \sum_{i=0}^k \binom{T}{i} (1-\epsilon)^{2(T-i)} (2\epsilon)^i \quad (63)$$

$$= 1 - \sum_{i=k+1}^T \binom{T}{i} (1-\epsilon)^{2(T-i)} \overbrace{(2\epsilon)^i}^{\leq (2\epsilon)^{k+1}} \quad (64)$$

$$\geq 1 - (2\epsilon)^{k+1} \overbrace{\sum_{i=k+1}^T \binom{T}{i} (1-\epsilon)^{2(T-i)}}^{\leq \sum_{i=0}^T \binom{T}{i} = 2^T} \quad (65)$$

$$\geq 1 - 2^T (2\epsilon)^{k+1} , \quad (66)$$

i.e.,

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_{k,T}) \geq 1 - 2^T (2\epsilon)^{k+1} . \quad (67)$$

□

We will then use this lemma in steps 1 and 2. The idea of the proof will be to leverage this lower bound to show that the ϵ -greedy dynamic behaves similarly to the fully greedy policy.

D.1.2 Proof of Lemma 10 ii)

Proof of Lemma 10 ii). For all state, action pair $(s, a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$, the Q -learning update rule writes

$$Q_{s,a}^{t+1} = Q_{s,a}^t + \alpha \left(r_t + \gamma \max_{a'} Q_{s,a'}^t - Q_{s,a}^t \right) . \quad (68)$$

In addition, since $Q = \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t r_t$, then the Q values cannot go above (resp. below) the maximal (resp. minimal) reward. In other words

$$\frac{r_{\min}}{1-\gamma} \leq Q_{s,a} \leq \frac{r_{\max}}{1-\gamma} \quad \text{which yields} \quad (69)$$

$$r_{\min} + \gamma \frac{r_{\min}}{1-\gamma} - \frac{r_{\max}}{1-\gamma} \leq r_t + \gamma \max_{a'} Q_{s,a'}^t - Q_{s,a}^t \leq r_{\max} + \gamma \frac{r_{\max}}{1-\gamma} - \frac{r_{\min}}{1-\gamma} \quad (70)$$

$$\frac{r_{\min} - r_{\max}}{1-\gamma} \leq r_t + \gamma \max_{a'} Q_{s,a'}^t - Q_{s,a}^t \leq \frac{r_{\max} - r_{\min}}{1-\gamma} . \quad (71)$$

Plugging Equation (71) in Equation (68) yields the desired result

$$|Q_{s,a}^{t+1} - Q_{s,a}^t| \leq \frac{\Delta_r \alpha}{1-\gamma} , \quad (72)$$

with $\Delta_r \triangleq r_{\max} - r_{\min}$ the difference between the maximal and the minimal reward. □

D.1.3 Proof of Lemma 10 iii)

Proof of Lemma 10 iii). Conditioning on $\mathcal{E}_{k,T}$, for all state-action pair $(s, a) \neq (\text{DD}, \text{D})$, $Q_{s,a}$ is updated at most $2k$ times. Since $Q_{s,a}$ is updated at most $2k$ times, Lemma 10 ii) repeatedly applied $2k$ times yields

$$|Q_{s,a}^t - Q_{s,a}^{t_0}| \leq \frac{2k \Delta_r \alpha}{1-\gamma} , \quad \forall (s, a) \neq (\text{DD}, \text{D}) . \quad (73)$$

□

D.1.4 Proof of Lemma 10 iv)

Proof of Lemma 10 iv). Let us consider the first step, from **always defect** to **lose-shift**. We start from the **always defect** region, *i.e.*, the greedy action is to defect regardless of the state. When the greedy action D is picked in the state DD, the entry $Q_{(D,D),D}$ is updated as follows. In other words, conditioning on $\mathcal{E}_{k,T}$

- The defect action D in the state DD is played at least $T - 2k$ times. When it is the case, $Q_{(D,D),D}$ is updated at least $T - 2k$ times according to

$$Q_{(D,D),D}^{t+1} = Q_{(D,D),D}^t + \alpha \left(r_{DD} + \gamma Q_{(D,D),D}^t - Q_{(D,D),D}^t \right) \quad (74)$$

$$Q_{(D,D),D}^{t+1} - Q_{(D,D),D}^{*,\text{Defect}} = (1 - \alpha + \alpha\gamma) \left(Q_{(D,D),D}^t - Q_{(D,D),D}^{*,\text{Defect}} \right), \quad (75)$$

with $Q_{(D,D),D}^{*,\text{Defect}} = \frac{r_{DD}}{1-\gamma}$.

- Otherwise $Q_{(D,D),D}$ update is bounded $2k$ times using Lemma 10 ii):

$$Q_{(D,D),D}^{t+1} - Q_{(D,D),D}^{*,\text{Defect}} \leq Q_{(D,D),D}^t - Q_{(D,D),D}^{*,\text{Defect}} + \frac{\Delta_r \alpha}{1-\gamma}. \quad (76)$$

Combining Equation (75) for at least $T - 2k$ steps, and Equation (76) for at most $2k$ steps yields

$$Q_{(D,D),D}^T - Q_{(D,D),D}^{*,\text{Defect}} \leq (1 - \alpha + \alpha\gamma)^{T-2k} \left(Q_{(D,D),D}^{t_0} - Q_{(D,D),D}^{*,\text{Defect}} \right) + \frac{2k\Delta_r\alpha}{1-\gamma}. \quad (77)$$

□

D.1.5 Proof of Lemma 10 v)

Proof. Let $s \in \mathcal{S} \setminus DD$, $t \leq T$, on the event $\mathcal{E}_{k,T}$

$$Q_{s,D}^t - Q_{s,C}^t = \underbrace{Q_{s,D}^t - Q_{s,D}^{t_0}}_{\geq -\frac{2k\Delta_r\alpha}{1-\gamma} \text{ (using Lemma 10 iii)}} + \underbrace{Q_{s,C}^{t_0} - Q_{s,C}^t}_{\geq -\frac{2k\Delta_r\alpha}{1-\gamma} \text{ (using Lemma 10 iii)}} + \underbrace{Q_{s,D}^{t_0} - Q_{s,C}^{t_0}}_{\geq \min_{s \neq DD} Q_{s,D}^{t_0} - Q_{s,C}^{t_0} \triangleq \Delta Q^{t_0}} \quad (78)$$

$$\geq -\frac{4k\Delta_r\alpha}{1-\gamma} + \Delta Q^{t_0}. \quad (79)$$

Hence if

$$k > \frac{(1-\gamma)\Delta Q^{t_0}}{4\Delta_r}, \quad (80)$$

then on the event $\mathcal{E}_{k,T}$ for all $s \in \mathcal{S} \setminus DD$,

$$Q_{s,D}^T - Q_{s,C}^T \geq 0. \quad (81)$$

Note that $\Delta Q^{t_0} \triangleq \min_{s \neq DD} Q_{s,D}^{t_0} - Q_{s,C}^{t_0} > 0$ since one starts from the **always defect** policy. □

D.1.6 Proof of Lemma 10 vi)

Proof. Using Lemma 10 iv), on the event $\mathcal{E}_{k,T}$, one has

$$Q_{(D,D),D}^T \leq (1 - \alpha + \alpha\gamma)^{T-2k} \left(Q_{(D,D),D}^{t_0} - Q_{(D,D),D}^{*,\text{Defect}} \right) + \frac{2k\Delta_r\alpha}{1-\gamma} + Q_{(D,D),D}^{*,\text{Defect}} \quad (82)$$

$$\leq -\frac{2k\alpha\Delta_r}{1-\gamma} + Q_{DD,C}^{t_0} \text{ if} \quad (83)$$

$$T > 2k + \frac{\log \left(Q_{(D,D),C}^{t_0} - Q_{(D,D),D}^{*,\text{Defect}} - \frac{4k\Delta_r\alpha}{1-\gamma} \right) - \log \left(Q_{(D,D),D}^{t_0} - Q_{(D,D),D}^{*,\text{Defect}} \right)}{\log(1 - \alpha + \gamma\alpha)}. \quad (84)$$

Remark 12. $\left(Q_{(D,D),C}^{t_0} - Q_{(D,D),D}^{*,\text{Defect}} - \frac{4k\Delta_r\alpha}{1-\gamma}\right)$ needs to be positive.

In addition, using [Lemma 10 iii](#)) on $\mathcal{E}_{k,T}$ yields

$$-\frac{2k\alpha\Delta_r}{1-\gamma} + Q_{DD,C}^{t_0} \leq Q_{DD,C}^T . \quad (85)$$

Combining [Equations \(83\)](#) and [\(85\)](#), yields that on $\mathcal{E}_{k,T}$, if

$$T > 2k + \frac{\log\left(Q_{(D,D),C}^0 - Q_{(D,D),D}^{*,\text{Defect}} - \frac{4k\Delta_r\alpha}{1-\gamma}\right) - \log\left(Q_{(D,D),D}^0 - Q_{(D,D),D}^{*,\text{Defect}}\right)}{\log(1-\alpha+\gamma\alpha)} , \quad (86)$$

then

$$Q_{(D,D),D}^T < Q_{(D,D),C}^T . \quad (87)$$

□

D.2 Proof of [Theorem 9](#)

Proof of [Theorem 9](#). To conclude, if we set $k = O(1/\alpha)$, such that $k < \frac{\Delta_Q(1-\gamma)}{2\alpha\Delta_r}$ and the total number of steps T such that $T > 2k + \frac{\log\left(Q_{(D,D),C}^{t_0} - Q_{(D,D),D}^{*,\text{Defect}} - \frac{4k\Delta_r\alpha}{1-\gamma}\right) - \log\left(Q_{(D,D),D}^0 - Q_{(D,D),D}^{*,\text{Defect}}\right)}{\log(1-\alpha+\gamma\alpha)}$, one that with the probability of at least $1 - 2^T \epsilon^{T-k}$, there exists $t_1 < T$ such that $Q_{(D,D),D}^{t_1} < Q_{(D,D),C}^{t_1}$.

We conclude the proof by noticing that if we want this event to happen with probability at least $1 - \delta$, we need to set ϵ such that

$$T \log(2) + k \log 2\epsilon \leq \log \delta. \quad (88)$$

Thus, we get $\log(\epsilon) \leq C\alpha \log(\delta)$ where C depends on the constants of T and k .

To summarize, we proved that with high probability, there exists a time step t_1 such that

$$Q_{(D,D),D}^{t_1} < Q_{(D,D),C}^{t_1} \quad (89)$$

$$Q_{(C,C),D}^{t_1} > Q_{(C,C),C}^{t_1} \quad (90)$$

$$Q_{(D,C),D}^{t_1} > Q_{(D,C),C}^{t_1} \quad (91)$$

$$Q_{(C,D),D}^{t_1} > Q_{(C,D),C}^{t_1} . \quad (92)$$

and for all $t < t_1$

$$Q_{(D,D),D}^t > Q_{(D,D),C}^t \quad (93)$$

$$Q_{(C,C),D}^t > Q_{(C,C),C}^t \quad (94)$$

$$Q_{(D,C),D}^t > Q_{(D,C),C}^t \quad (95)$$

$$Q_{(C,D),D}^t > Q_{(C,D),C}^t . \quad (96)$$

In plain words, the Q -values went from the **always defect** to the **lose-shift** region. □

D.3 From lose-shift to Pavlov

In this section, we show similar results to [Lemma 10](#). For simplicity, we considered that in [Equations \(5\)](#) and [\(6\)](#) one-time step was performing two ϵ -greedy updates.

1. We can lower-bound $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_{k,T})$
2. Under the event $\mathcal{E}_{k,T}$ we will observe at least $(1-4k)/2$ pair of updates following [Equations \(5\)](#) and [\(6\)](#) are performed and at most $4k$ greedy updates.

3. Thus the Q -values for the greedy actions $Q_{(C,C),D}$ and $Q_{(D,D),C}$ will converge linearly and can be bounded.
4. The Q -entries of the non-greedy actions can be bounded.

Similarly to [Lemma 10](#), one can control the Q -values in the greedy and non-greedy states.

Lemma 13. *Let us consider [Algorithm 1](#) with $\epsilon < 1/2$, $\gamma > 0$ and $\delta > 0$. If both agents act according to an ϵ -greed *lose-shift* policy then,*

- i) *On the event $\mathcal{E}_{k,T}$, for all $(s, a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$*

$$|Q_{s,a}^{t+1} - Q_{s,a}^t| \leq \frac{\Delta_r \alpha}{1 - \gamma} .$$

- ii) *On the event $\mathcal{E}_{k,T}$, for all $t \geq t_1$ the deviation for the Q -values others than $Q_{(D,D),C}$ and $Q_{(C,C),D}$ is at most*

$$|Q_{s,a}^t - Q_{s,a}^{t_1}| \leq \frac{2k\Delta_r\alpha}{1 - \gamma}, \quad \forall (s, a) \notin \{(DD, C), (CC, D)\} .$$

- iii) *On the event $\mathcal{E}_{k,T}$, the deviation for the Q -value $Q_{(C,C),D}$ is upper-bounded*

$$Q_{(C,C),D}^t - Q_{(C,C),D}^{*,lose-shift} \leq C_1 \lambda_1^{t-k} + C_2 \lambda_2^{t-k} + \frac{2k\Delta_r\alpha}{1 - \gamma} . \quad (97)$$

where C_1 and C_2 are defined in [Equation \(115\)](#).

- iv) *On the event $\mathcal{E}_{k,T}$, for $k < \frac{(1-\gamma)\Delta Q}{2\alpha\Delta_r}$, with $\Delta Q \triangleq \min_{s \notin \{DD, CC\}} Q_{s,D}^{t_0} - Q_{s,C}^{t_0}$*

$$Q_{s,D}^t > Q_{s,C}^t, \quad \forall t \leq T, s \neq \{DD, CC\} .$$

- v) *If $Q_{(C,C),D}^{t_0} - Q_{(C,C),C}^{t_0} \geq \frac{4k\Delta_r\alpha}{1-\gamma}$ then, for all $t_1 \leq t \leq t_2$*

$$Q_{(D,D),C}^t - Q_{(D,D),D}^t + Q_{(C,C),D}^t - Q_{(C,C),C}^t \geq \frac{k\Delta_r\alpha}{1 - \gamma} . \quad (98)$$

*In other words, this ensures that the agents either go to the Pavlov policy or oscillate between **always defect** and **lose-shift**, but do not directly go from **always defect** to **Pavlov**.*

The proof of [Lemmas 13 i\)](#) to [13 iv\)](#) are the same as for [Lemma 10](#).

Final proof of [Theorem 9](#). Once we reached the **lose-shift** policy, using [Lemmas 13 iii\)](#) and [13 iv\)](#), either

- $Q_{(C,C),D}^t < Q_{(C,C),C}^t$, and the policy changes for the **Pavlov**.
- Either non-greedy actions are taken, and we go to the **always always defect** policy, *i.e.*, we back to the previous situation, [Lemma 10](#), but at this time-step, $Q_{(C,C),D}^t$ might be closer to $Q_{(C,C),C}^t$. In this situation
 - Either greedy actions are taken and we achieve again the **lose-shift** region
 - Either non-greedy actions are taken, and $Q_{(C,C),D}^t$ might become smaller than $Q_{(C,C),C}^t$, which yield a **win-stay** policy.

□

Proof of [Lemma 13 v\)](#).

$$\begin{pmatrix} Q_{(C,C),D}^{t+1} - Q_{(C,C),D}^{*,lose-shift} \\ Q_{(D,D),C}^{t+1} - Q_{(D,D),C}^{*,lose-shift} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 - \alpha & \alpha\gamma \\ \alpha\gamma(1 - \alpha) & 1 - \alpha + (\alpha\gamma)^2 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} Q_{(C,C),D}^t - Q_{(C,C),D}^{*,lose-shift} \\ Q_{(D,D),C}^t - Q_{(D,D),C}^{*,lose-shift} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (99)$$

which yields

$$\begin{pmatrix} u^t \\ v^t \end{pmatrix} = M^t \begin{pmatrix} u^0 \\ v^0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (100)$$

with

$$M = \begin{pmatrix} a & -b \\ -ab & a + b^2 \end{pmatrix} \quad (101)$$

$$a = 1 - \alpha \quad (102)$$

$$b = \alpha\gamma \quad (103)$$

$$u^t = Q_{(C,C),D}^t - Q_{(C,C),D}^{*,\text{lose-shift}} \quad (104)$$

$$v^t = - \left(Q_{(D,D),C}^t - Q_{(D,D),C}^{*,\text{lose-shift}} \right) . \quad (105)$$

The matrix M can be diagonalized:

$$M = \underbrace{\begin{pmatrix} \frac{b^2 + \sqrt{4a^2 + b^4}}{2ab} & \frac{b^2 - \sqrt{4a^2 + b^4}}{2ab} \\ 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}}_{:=P:=(w_1|w_2)} \begin{pmatrix} \lambda_1 & 0 \\ 0 & \lambda_2 \end{pmatrix} \underbrace{\begin{pmatrix} \frac{ab}{\sqrt{4a^2 + b^4}} & \frac{1}{2} - \frac{\sqrt{4a^2 + b^4}}{2(4a+b)} \\ \frac{-ab}{\sqrt{4a^2 + b^4}} & \frac{1}{2} + \frac{\sqrt{4a^2 + b^4}}{2(4a+b)} \end{pmatrix}}_{P^{-1}}, \quad (106)$$

with $\lambda_1 = a + \frac{b^2 + \sqrt{b^4 + a^2}}{2}$, $\lambda_2 = a + \frac{b^2 - \sqrt{b^4 + a^2}}{2}$.

Let

$$\begin{pmatrix} \delta_1^0 \\ \delta_2^0 \end{pmatrix} := P^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} u^0 \\ v^0 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{u^0 ab}{\sqrt{4a^2 + b^4}} + v^0 \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{\sqrt{4a^2 + b^4}}{2(4a+b)} \right) \\ \frac{-u^0 ab}{\sqrt{4a^2 + b^4}} + v^0 \left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{\sqrt{4a^2 + b^4}}{2(4a+b)} \right) \end{pmatrix} \quad (107)$$

be the decomposition of $\begin{pmatrix} u^0 \\ v^0 \end{pmatrix}$ in the basis w_1, w_2 :

$$\begin{pmatrix} u^0 \\ v^0 \end{pmatrix} = \delta_1^0 w_1 + \delta_2^0 w_2 . \quad (108)$$

Combining [Equations \(100\)](#) and [\(108\)](#) yields

$$\begin{pmatrix} u^t \\ v^t \end{pmatrix} = \delta_1^0 \lambda_1^t w_1 + \delta_2^0 \lambda_2^t w_2 , \quad (109)$$

and

$$u^t - v^t = \underbrace{\delta_1^0}_{>0} \lambda_1^t \left\langle w_1, \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ -1 \end{pmatrix} \right\rangle + \underbrace{\delta_2^0}_{>0} \lambda_2^t \left\langle w_2, \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ -1 \end{pmatrix} \right\rangle \quad (110)$$

$$= \underbrace{\delta_1^0}_{>0} \lambda_1^t \underbrace{\left(\frac{b^2 + \sqrt{4a^2 + b^4}}{2ab} - 1 \right)}_{>0} - \underbrace{\delta_2^0}_{>0} \lambda_2^t \underbrace{\left(1 - \frac{b^2 - \sqrt{4a^2 + b^4}}{2ab} \right)}_{>0} . \quad (111)$$

Since $\lambda_1 > \lambda_2$, then if $u^{t_1} - v^{t_1} > 0$, then $u^t - v^t > u^{t_1} - v^{t_1} > 0$.

In other words, in order to show that $Q_{(C,C),D}^t - Q_{(C,C),D}^{*,\text{lose-shift}} + Q_{(D,D),C}^t - Q_{(D,D),C}^{*,\text{lose-shift}} := u^t - v^t \geq Cste$, then it is sufficient that $u^{t_1} - v^{t_1} \geq Cste$

Hence one only needs to show

$$Q_{(D,D),C}^{t_1} - Q_{(D,D),D}^{t_1} + Q_{(C,C),D}^{t_1} - Q_{(C,C),C}^{t_1} \geq \frac{k\Delta_r\alpha}{1-\gamma} \quad (112)$$

$$Q_{(C,C),D}^{t_1} - Q_{(C,C),C}^{t_1} \geq \frac{2k\Delta_r\alpha}{1-\gamma} \quad (113)$$

$$Q_{(C,C),D}^{t_0} - Q_{(C,C),C}^{t_0} \geq \frac{4k\Delta_r\alpha}{1-\gamma} , \quad (114)$$

□

Proof. Lemma 13 *iii*). Using Equation (108) one has

$$Q_{(C,C),D}^t - Q_{(C,C),D}^{*,\text{lose-shift}} \leq \underbrace{\delta_1^0 \frac{b^2 + \sqrt{4a^2 + b^4}}{2ab}}_{:=C_1} \lambda_1^{t-k} + \underbrace{\delta_2^0 \frac{b^2 - \sqrt{4a^2 + b^4}}{2ab}}_{:=C_2} \lambda_2^{t-k} + \frac{2k\Delta_r\alpha}{1-\gamma} . \tag{115}$$

□

E Hyperparameter for the deep Q-learning experiments

The hyperparameters used for the deep Q-learning experiments are summarized in Table 3. 5 runs are displayed in Figure 4, each run takes 3 hours to train on a single GPU on RTX8000.

Table 3: List of hyperparameters used in the deep Q-learning experiment (Figure 4).

Hyperparameter	Value
tau	0.01
seed	8
gamma	0.8
buffer_capacity	1000000
decay_eps	true
eps_decay_steps	600
eps_start	0.5
eps_end	0.01
loss_type	Huber Loss
optimizer_type	SGD
hidden_size	32
num_actions	2
num_iters	10000
batch_size	16384
do_self_play	true
pretrain_iters	600
pretrain_vs_random	true