

MPRA

Munich Personal RePEc Archive

Purification, Saturation and the Exact Law of Large Numbers

Wang, Jianwei and Zhang, Yongchao

University of Science and Technology of China, National University
of Singapore and Hausdorff Research Institute for Mathematics

April 2010

Online at <https://mpra.ub.uni-muenchen.de/22119/>
MPRA Paper No. 22119, posted 20 Apr 2010 20:40 UTC

Purification, Saturation and the Exact Law of Large Numbers*

Jianwei Wang[†] Yongchao Zhang[‡] §

First draft: September 2009

This version: April 2010

Abstract

Purification results are important in game theory and statistical decision theory. The purpose of this paper is to prove a general purification theorem that generalizes many earlier results. The key idea of our proof is to make use of the exact law of large numbers. As an application, we show that every mixed strategy in games with finite players, general action spaces and diffused, conditionally independent incomplete information has many strong purifications.

JEL classification: C60 · C70

Keywords: Exact law of large numbers · Fubini extension · Incomplete information · Purification · Saturated probability space

* The authors are very grateful to Yi-Chun Chen, Sengkee Chua, Haifeng Fu, M. Ali Khan, Xiao Luo and Yeneng Sun for helpful discussions. The first draft of this paper was prepared when Yongchao Zhang participated the Trimester Program on Mechanism Design held at the Hausdorff Research Institute for Mathematics (HIM), Bonn University, May-August 2009. Financial support from HIM is specially acknowledged.

[†]Department of Mathematics, University of Science and Technology of China, Hefei, Anhui Province, P.R. China, 230026. Email: wangjw@ustc.edu.cn.

[‡]Department of Mathematics, National University of Singapore, Block S17 (SOC1), 10 Lower Kent Ridge Road, Singapore, 119076. Email: yongchao@nus.edu.sg.

[§]Hausdorff Research Institute for Mathematics, Poppelsdorfer Allee 45, D-53115 Bonn, Germany.

1 Introduction

The idea of purification, i.e., elimination of randomness, is important in game theory and statistical decision theory. Theorem 4 of [Dvoretzky et al. \(1951a\)](#) (DWW Theorem henceforth), which is a generalization of the celebrated theorem of Lyapunov for vector measures, plays a central role. In particular, it says that corresponding to any mixed strategy with finite actions, there exists a pure strategy with identical integrals with respect to a finite set of atomless measures on a measurable space. Here the pure strategy is called a *purification* of the mixed strategy.

The applications of DWW Theorem to purification problems are also investigated in [Dvoretzky et al. \(1950, 1951b\)](#). In particular, the purification results for statistical decision procedures, and for mixed strategies in two person zero-sum games with finite actions are established. The relevance of DWW Theorem to purification results in finite-player games with finite actions and with diffused, incomplete information is suggested by [Radner and Rosenthal \(1982\)](#) and [Milgrom and Weber \(1985\)](#).¹ In these games, each equilibrium in mixed strategy has a payoff equivalent or distribution equivalent purification. A unified approach by applying DWW Theorem to purification problems in games with finite players is presented in [Khan et al. \(2006\)](#). More precisely, [Khan et al.](#) establish a stronger purification result that, in the above games with diffused and incomplete information, any mixed strategy (not necessarily an equilibrium) has a strong purification (see Definition 4 below). In addition, [Khan et al.](#) establish the existence of purification for any mixed-strategy Nash equilibrium in a large non-anonymous game as in [Schmeidler \(1973\)](#), and the existence of symmetrization for an equilibrium distribution in a large anonymous game as in [Mas-Colell \(1984\)](#) and [Khan and Sun \(1991\)](#).

DWW Theorem has been generalized in several ways. [Edwards \(1987\)](#) shows that DWW Theorem still holds for a countable infinite action space without any additional assumptions; see also [Khan and Rath \(2009\)](#) for an elementary proof. In the context of an uncountable action space, [Loeb and Sun \(2006\)](#) show a generalization of DWW Theorem by working with atomless Loeb measure spaces instead of atomless measure spaces.² Moreover, a more general version of DWW Theorem is presented in [Podczeck \(2009a\)](#) and [Loeb and Sun \(2009\)](#), where atomless Loeb measure spaces are replaced by *saturated probability spaces* (see Section 2.1 below).

The concept of saturated probability space is introduced by [Hoover and Keisler \(1984\)](#). Loosely speaking, a measure space is saturated if its σ -algebra restricted to any set with positive measure is never countably generated modulo all the null subsets (see Definition 2 below). In comparison, the σ -algebra on the usual Lebesgue unit interval is countably generated (modulo the null sets). Saturated probability spaces could serve as a substi-

¹See [Radner and Rosenthal \(1982, Footnote 3\)](#) and [Milgrom and Weber \(1985, Section 5\)](#).

²For the construction of Loeb measure spaces, see [Loeb and Wolff \(2000\)](#).

tute for Lebesgue spaces in situations where the latter fails to work. [Keisler and Sun \(2009\)](#) investigate several properties which are valid on any saturated probability space but invalid on any non-saturated probability space. As a result, such a property can be used to characterize the saturation property of probability spaces. These properties, for instance, include various regularity properties on distributions of correspondences defined on a probability space (such as convexity, closedness, compactness, preservation of upper semi-continuity), and the existence of pure strategy equilibria in games with many players. Recently, there has been a growing literature on applications of saturated probability space in economic theory, see [Khan et al. \(2005\)](#), [Loeb and Sun \(2009\)](#), [Noguchi \(2009\)](#), [Podczeck \(2009a,b\)](#), [Sun and Yannelis \(2009\)](#), etc.

In this paper, we present a general purification theorem on saturated probability spaces (see [Theorem 1](#) below), which provides a far reaching generalization of the earlier purification results. In particular, it generalizes the results of [Loeb and Sun \(2006, 2009\)](#) and [Podczeck \(2009a\)](#) in the following two ways. First, we work with a general Polish (complete separable metric) action space instead of a compact metric space. Second, we require the payoff functions to be jointly measurable, while in [Loeb and Sun \(2006, 2009\)](#) and [Podczeck \(2009a\)](#), the payoff functions should satisfy a more restrictive condition, the *Carathéodory* condition (see [Section 3](#) below).

Our proof is built heavily on the *exact law of large numbers* (ELLN for brevity) systematically studied in [Sun \(1998, 2006\)](#) (see also [Subsection 2.2](#) below). This ELLN approach is different from the techniques used in [Loeb and Sun \(2006, 2009\)](#) and [Podczeck \(2009a\)](#). In particular, [Loeb and Sun \(2006\)](#) make use of the nonstandard analysis. [Loeb and Sun \(2009\)](#) apply techniques of [Hoover and Keisler \(1984\)](#) that certain properties can be transferred from one saturated probability space to another. And in [Podczeck \(2009a\)](#), the main result is proved through establishing new results in functional analysis. It is worthwhile to note that in [Loeb and Sun \(2006, 2009\)](#), [Podczeck \(2009a\)](#), the proofs of their purification theorems depend on the setting that the action space is a compact metric space and the payoff functions satisfy the Carathéodory condition. Thus, their methods cannot be applied to the setting of our main result, [Theorem 1](#), directly.

One advantage of this ELLN approach is that one can simultaneously obtain MANY required purification mappings. Specifically, these purification mappings can be indexed by a full subset in an atomless probability space. In comparison, note that in the earlier purification results only the existence of SOME purification mapping has been established. The relevance of the ELLN to the *ex post* Nash equilibrium of a large game with idiosyncratic uncertainty is already considered in [Theorem 7](#) of [Khan and Sun \(2002, p. 1792\)](#). Further results on *ex post* Nash equilibrium in large games are established in [Khan et al. \(2005\)](#) and [Sun \(2007a\)](#).

Finally, as an application of [Theorem 1](#), following [Khan et al. \(2006\)](#), we study in [Section 4](#) the problem of purification for mixed strategies in game theoretic models as

in [Milgrom and Weber \(1985\)](#). We show that every mixed strategy has many strong purifications in such a finite-player game with a general Polish action space (not necessarily compact), and with a diffused, conditionally independent incomplete information structure, and even with discontinuous payoff functions.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. We present basic results about saturated probability spaces and the ELLN in [Section 2](#). The main result, [Theorem 1](#), is presented and discussed in [Section 3](#). [Section 4](#) deals with the problem of purification for mixed strategies in finite-player games with incomplete information as in [Milgrom and Weber \(1985\)](#). The proofs of the key results are relegated to [Appendix](#).

2 Saturation and the ELLN

In this section, we introduce basic results about saturated probability spaces in [Subsection 2.1](#), about the ELLN in [Subsection 2.2](#). [Subsection 2.3](#) deals with one relationship between the saturation property and the existence of rich Fubini extension based on a probability space.

For a Polish (complete separable metric) space X , denote its Borel σ -algebra by \mathcal{B}_X , and by $\mathcal{M}(X)$ the space of all Borel probability measures associated with the topology of weak convergence. Given any Borel probability measure $\gamma \in \mathcal{M}(X)$, its support is written as $\text{supp } \gamma$. It is well-known that, for any measure-valued mapping f from $(I, \mathcal{I}, \lambda)$ to $\mathcal{M}(X)$, the \mathcal{I} -measurability of f with respect to the weak topology is equivalent to the \mathcal{I} -measurability of the function $f(\cdot)(B)$ for all $B \in \mathcal{B}_X$. For any \mathcal{I} -measurable mapping $g : I \rightarrow X$, the induced distribution is defined as λg^{-1} by letting $\lambda g^{-1}(B) := \lambda[g^{-1}(B)]$ for all $B \in \mathcal{B}_X$.

Given two probability spaces based on I , say $(I, \mathcal{I}, \lambda)$ and $(I, \mathcal{I}', \lambda')$, we call the former is an *extension* of the latter if \mathcal{I}' is a sub σ -algebra of \mathcal{I} , and the restriction of λ to \mathcal{I}' coincides with λ' . Throughout this paper, we call a set is *countable* if it is finite or countably infinite. Let \mathbb{N} be the set of all the natural numbers.

2.1 Saturated Probability Space

We present the definition of saturated probability spaces introduced by [Hoover and Keisler \(1984\)](#).

Definition 1 *A probability space $(I, \mathcal{I}, \lambda)$ is said to be saturated if for any two Polish spaces X and Y , any Borel probability measure $\tau \in \mathcal{M}(X \times Y)$ with marginal probability measure τ_X on X , and any measurable mapping g from $(I, \mathcal{I}, \lambda)$ to X with distribution τ_X , there exists a measurable mapping $h : (I, \mathcal{I}, \lambda) \rightarrow Y$ such that the measurable mapping $(g, h) : (I, \mathcal{I}, \lambda) \rightarrow X \times Y$ has distribution τ .*

Given a probability space $(I, \mathcal{I}, \lambda)$, for any subset $S \in \mathcal{I}$ with $\lambda(S) > 0$, denote by $(S, \mathcal{I}^S, \lambda^S)$ the probability space restricted to S . Here $\mathcal{I}^S := \{S \cap S' : S' \in \mathcal{I}\}$ and λ^S is the probability measure re-scaled from the restriction of λ to \mathcal{I}^S . As shown in Hoover and Keisler (1984, Corollary 4.5), there is an equivalent definition for the saturated probability space.

Definition 2 We call a probability space $(I, \mathcal{I}, \lambda)$ saturated if it is nowhere countably generated, i.e., for any subset $S \in \mathcal{I}$ with $\lambda(S) > 0$, the restricted probability space $(S, \mathcal{I}^S, \lambda^S)$ is not countably generated (modulo all the null subsets).³

Here a probability space is said to be countably generated if its σ -algebra can be generated by a countable number of subsets (modulo all the null subsets). It is not countably generated if the σ -algebra \mathcal{I} can not be generated by any countable number of subsets (modulo all the null subsets).⁴

By Definition 2, a saturated probability space is an atomless probability space. Suppose $(I, \mathcal{I}, \lambda)$ is a saturated probability space, so is the restricted probability space $(S, \mathcal{I}^S, \lambda^S)$ for any subset $S \in \mathcal{I}$ with $\lambda(S) > 0$. For example, the Lebesgue unit interval, i.e., the interval $[0, 1]$ associated with the the σ -algebra of Lebesgue measurable sets and the Lebesgue measure, is a countably generated probability space; it is thus not a saturated probability space. In comparison, any atomless Loeb probability space is saturated.⁵ By Maharam’s theorem, a probability space is saturated if and only if its measure algebra is a countable convex combination of measure algebras of uncountable powers of the Borel σ -algebra on $[0, 1]$.⁶

2.2 The Exact Law of Large Numbers (ELLN)

For any two probability spaces $(I, \mathcal{I}, \lambda)$ and (Ω, \mathcal{F}, P) , we write $\mathcal{I} \otimes \mathcal{F}$ as the usual product σ -algebra (including all the null subsets) generated by $\{S \times T : S \in \mathcal{I}, T \in \mathcal{F}\}$, and write $\lambda \otimes P$ as the product probability measure on $\mathcal{I} \otimes \mathcal{F}$. Given any mapping F from $I \times \Omega$ to a Polish space X , for any $i \in I$ and $\omega \in \Omega$, let F_i denote the marginal mapping $F(i, \cdot)$ on Ω , and F_ω the marginal mapping $F(\cdot, \omega)$ on I . As in Sun (1998, 2006), a process F is said to be *essentially pairwise independent* if for λ -almost all $i \in I$, F_i and $F_{i'}$ are independent for λ -almost all $i' \in I$.

We shall construct an essentially pairwise independent process as follows. Let $[0, 1]$ be the unit interval endowed with the Borel σ -algebra $\mathcal{B}_{[0,1]}$ and the uniform distribution.

³This condition is originally called “ \aleph_1 -atomless” in Hoover and Keisler (1984), “rich” in an earlier version of Keisler and Sun (2009), then in Noguchi (2009), “super-atomless” in Podczeck (2009a,b), and “nowhere countably generatedness” in Loeb and Sun (2009).

⁴That is, the least cardinality of the collection of subsets that generates \mathcal{I} (modulo all the null subsets) is greater than the cardinality of all the natural numbers, \mathbb{N} .

⁵See Hoover and Keisler (1984).

⁶See Fajardo and Keisler (2002) for details. And see Maharam (1947) for the Maharam’s theorem.

For an atomless probability space $(I, \mathcal{I}, \lambda)$, let $\Omega = [0, 1]^I$ represent the space of all functions from I to the unit interval $[0, 1]$. By the Kolmogorov's extension theorem, we can consider the continuum product probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}', P')$, where \mathcal{F}' is the σ -algebra generated by cylinders of the form $\{\omega \in \Omega : \omega(i) \in B\}$ for all $B \in \mathcal{B}_{[0,1]}$, and P' is the continuum product probability measure on (Ω, \mathcal{F}') .

Next define π to be a process from $I \times \Omega$ to $[0, 1]$ by letting $\pi(i, \omega) := \omega(i)$ for all $(i, \omega) \in I \times \Omega$. Here the marginal function π_i is the i -th coordinate function on $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}', P')$. It is clear that π_i induces the uniform distribution on $[0, 1]$ for any $i \in [0, 1]$, and π_i, π_j are independent for $i \neq j$. Accordingly, the process π is an essentially pairwise independent process. However, it is well-known that this process π is not $\mathcal{I} \times \mathcal{F}'$ -measurable.⁷ Indeed, the essentially pairwise independence and the joint measurability of a process with respect to the usual product σ -algebra are never compatible with each other except for the trivial case that almost all random variables are essentially constants.⁸

To overcome the above non-compatibility problem of measurability and independence, we next follow Sun (2006) to work with the framework of *Fubini extension*. It is an enrichment of the usual product probability space on which the Fubini property is retained.

Definition 3 Take as given two probability spaces $(I, \mathcal{I}, \lambda)$ and (Ω, \mathcal{F}, P) .

(A) A probability space $(I \times \Omega, \mathcal{W}, Q)$ extending the usual product probability space $(I \times \Omega, \mathcal{I} \otimes \mathcal{F}, \lambda \otimes P)$ is said to be a Fubini extension if for any real-valued Q -integrable function F on $(I \times \Omega, \mathcal{W})$,

(1) F_i is P -integrable on (Ω, \mathcal{F}, P) for λ -almost all $i \in I$, and F_ω is λ -integrable on $(I, \mathcal{I}, \lambda)$ for P -almost all $\omega \in \Omega$;

(2) $\int_\Omega F_i dP$ and $\int_I F_\omega d\lambda$ are integrable on $(I, \mathcal{I}, \lambda)$ and (Ω, \mathcal{F}, P) respectively, in addition, $\int_{I \times \Omega} F dQ = \int_I \left(\int_\Omega F_i dP \right) d\lambda = \int_\Omega \left(\int_I F_\omega d\lambda \right) dP$.

(B) A Fubini extension $(I \times \Omega, \mathcal{W}, Q)$ is said to be rich if there is a \mathcal{W} -measurable process G from $I \times \Omega$ to the interval $[0, 1]$, such that G is essentially pairwise independent, and G_i induces the uniform distribution on $[0, 1]$ for λ -almost all $i \in I$. We say that such a rich Fubini extension is based on $(I, \mathcal{I}, \lambda)$, and the process G witnesses the richness of the Fubini extension.

In a Fubini extension $(I \times \Omega, \mathcal{W}, Q)$, note that the marginal probability measures of Q on (I, \mathcal{I}) and (Ω, \mathcal{F}) are λ and P respectively. To reflect this property, as in Sun (2006), we denote the Fubini extension $(I \times \Omega, \mathcal{W}, Q)$ by $(I \times \Omega, \mathcal{I} \boxtimes \mathcal{F}, \lambda \boxtimes P)$. Next we introduce the existence of rich Fubini extension based on a saturated probability space.

⁷See Doob (1953, p. 67) for the special case that $(I, \mathcal{I}, \lambda)$ is the Lebesgue unit interval.

⁸See Proposition 2.1 of Sun (2006).

Lemma 1 *Assume that $(I, \mathcal{I}, \lambda)$ is a saturated probability space, then there exists a probability space (Ω, \mathcal{F}, P) extending $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}', P')$, such that there exists a rich Fubini extension $(I \times \Omega, \mathcal{I} \boxtimes \mathcal{F}, \lambda \boxtimes P)$ on which the process of coordinate functions π is $\mathcal{I} \boxtimes \mathcal{F}$ -measurable and witnesses the richness of the Fubini extension.*

Remark 1 If both $(I, \mathcal{I}, \lambda)$ and (Ω, \mathcal{F}, P) are atomless Loeb probability spaces, their Loeb product probability space is a rich Fubini extension as shown in Theorem 6.2 of Sun (1998). Sun (2006, Proposition 5.6) provides another construction, where $I = [0, 1]$ and $(I, \mathcal{I}, \lambda)$ is a probability space obtained from a hyperfinite Loeb counting space via a bijection, and (Ω, \mathcal{F}, P) is an extension of the usual continuum product probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}', P')$. Based on the construction of Sun (2006), a new rich Fubini extension is presented in Sun and Zhang (2009) where $(I, \mathcal{I}, \lambda)$ is a saturated probability space and an extension of the Lebesgue unit interval. Podczeck (2009b) establishes a more general result that $(I, \mathcal{I}, \lambda)$ could be any saturated probability space.

Indeed, a rich Fubini extension satisfies the universality property in the sense that one can construct processes on it with essentially pairwise independent random variables that have any given variety of distributions on a general Polish space. The following result is Proposition 5.3 of Sun (2006).

Lemma 2 *Given a rich Fubini extension $(I \times \Omega, \mathcal{I} \boxtimes \mathcal{F}, \lambda \boxtimes P)$ and a Polish space X . Let f be a measurable mapping from $(I, \mathcal{I}, \lambda)$ to $\mathcal{M}(X)$, then there exists an $\mathcal{I} \boxtimes \mathcal{F}$ -measurable process $F : I \times \Omega \rightarrow X$ such that the process F is essentially pairwise independent and $f(i)$ is the induced distribution by F_i , for λ -almost all $i \in I$.*

The following result is a version of the ELLN in terms of sample means, see Corollary 2.10 of Sun (2006). Namely, in the framework of Fubini extension, if a process F is essentially pairwise independent, then for P -almost every sample function F_ω , its mean is equal to the mean of F .

Lemma 3 *Assume that $(I \times \Omega, \mathcal{I} \boxtimes \mathcal{F}, \lambda \boxtimes P)$ is a Fubini extension, and F is a real-valued, essentially pairwise independent, $\lambda \boxtimes P$ -integrable process on $I \times \Omega$. Then there exists a P -null subset $N \subseteq \Omega$, such that $\int_I F_\omega(i) d\lambda(i) = \int_I \int_\Omega F dP(\omega) d\lambda(i)$, $\forall \omega \in \Omega/N$.*

The framework of Fubini extension plays a fundamental role to study the ELLN. Indeed, this framework is “necessary and sufficient” for the ELLN. First, in such a framework, besides the ELLN in sample means as in Lemma 3, one can establish other forms of ELLN, for example the ELLN in terms of sample distributions or coalitional sample distributions, even the converse of the ELLN holds as well (see Sun (2006, Section 2.3)). Second, if a process is essentially pairwise independent and satisfies the property of coalitional aggregate certainty (i.e., for any $S \subset I$ with $\lambda(S) > 0$, almost every sample function restricted to S has the same distribution as the process restricted to $S \times \Omega$), then there exists a Fubini extension in which the process is measurable; see Sun (2007a).

2.3 Saturation and Rich Fubini Extension

Given a probability space $(I, \mathcal{I}, \lambda)$. Let \mathcal{C} be a countably generated sub- σ -algebra of \mathcal{I} . A measurable function f defined on the probability space $(I, \mathcal{I}, \lambda)$ is said to be *essentially \mathcal{C} -measurable* if there is a \mathcal{C} -measurable function g also defined on I such that $f(i) = g(i)$ for λ -almost all $i \in I$. The following result is Theorem 4.2 of Sun (2006).

Lemma 4 Let F be an essentially pairwise independent process from $(I \times \Omega, \mathcal{I} \boxtimes \mathcal{F}, \lambda \boxtimes P)$ to a Polish space X , and \mathcal{C} a countably generated sub- σ -algebra of \mathcal{I} . Then the set of all $\omega \in \Omega$ such that the function F_ω is essentially \mathcal{C} -measurable must have probability zero except for the trivial case that almost all the random variables F_i are constant.

The next result says that, the existence of a rich Fubini extension based on a probability space is a characterization of the saturation property as in Keisler and Sun (2009). It is straightforward from Lemmas 1 and 4; see Appendix below for the proof.

Corollary 1 *The probability space $(I, \mathcal{I}, \lambda)$ is saturated if and only if there is a rich Fubini extension based on it.*

3 The Purification Theorem

We first present the main result, Theorem 1, in Subsection 3.1, then we discuss it in Subsection 3.2.

In this section, we fix a saturated probability space $(I, \mathcal{I}, \lambda)$, and a rich Fubini extension $(I \times \Omega, \mathcal{I} \boxtimes \mathcal{F}, \lambda \boxtimes P)$ as in Lemma 1 above. Let X be a Polish space associated with \mathcal{B}_X and $\mathcal{M}(X)$ as in Section 2. For any \mathcal{I} -measurable mapping f from $(I, \mathcal{I}, \lambda)$ to $\mathcal{M}(X)$, let $f(i; B)$ be the value of the probability measure $f(i)$ for any Borel subset $B \subseteq X$. Denote by $f(i; dx)$ the integration operator with respect to this probability measure $f(i)$.

Let \mathcal{H} be the collection of real-valued functions ϕ on the product space $I \times X$ such that: (1) ϕ is $\mathcal{I} \otimes \mathcal{B}_X$ -measurable, and (2) ϕ is integrally bounded, i.e., there exists a nonnegative integrable function α^ϕ from $(I, \mathcal{I}, \lambda)$ to \mathbb{R} with $|\phi(i, x)| \leq \alpha^\phi(i)$ for all $(i, x) \in I \times X$.

3.1 The Main Result

We are ready to introduce our main result, which is a general purification theorem. See Appendix for the proof.

Theorem 1 *Let $(I \times \Omega, \mathcal{I} \boxtimes \mathcal{F}, \lambda \boxtimes P)$ be a rich Fubini extension based on a saturated probability space $(I, \mathcal{I}, \lambda)$. Assume X is a Polish space, and \mathcal{D} a countable subset of \mathcal{H} .*

Then for any \mathcal{I} -measurable mapping $f : I \rightarrow \mathcal{M}(X)$, there exists an $\mathcal{I} \boxtimes \mathcal{F}$ -measurable process $F : I \times \Omega \rightarrow X$ with the following properties.

(1) The process F is essentially pairwise independent and the induced distribution on X of F_i is $f(i)$ for λ -almost all i .

(2) For P -almost all $\omega \in \Omega$, the mapping $F_\omega : I \rightarrow X$ is a purification for f with respect to \mathcal{D} in the sense that for all $\phi \in \mathcal{D}$,

$$\int_I \int_X \phi(i, x) f(i; dx) d\lambda(i) = \int_I \phi[i, F_\omega(i)] d\lambda(i). \quad (1)$$

We can interpret Theorem 1 in a decision-making situation. Suppose Ann is the decision maker with the space of uncertainty, (I, \mathcal{I}) . She can choose an action from the space X and her payoff function is taken from \mathcal{D} . Assume further that before making an decision, she has no information about the uncertainty except the distribution λ , which is a probability measure on (I, \mathcal{I}) . Her objective is to maximize the expected payoff by choosing a *mixed strategy* $f : I \rightarrow \mathcal{M}(X)$. That is, her action is a probability measure on the action space X when facing the uncertainty i .

In Theorem 1, what is the role played by the probability space (Ω, \mathcal{F}, P) ? This space works as a random device for the decision maker. When facing the uncertainty i , Ann can choose actions with the assistance of this probability space. In particular, she takes the action $F_i(\omega)$ when ω is realized. In this way, she takes a *pure strategy* $F_\omega : (I, \mathcal{I}, \lambda) \rightarrow X$ when ω is realized. We call $F : (I \times \Omega, \mathcal{I} \boxtimes \mathcal{F}, \lambda \boxtimes P) \rightarrow X$ a *behaviorial strategy*.⁹ Assertion (1) in Theorem 1 says that for F_i defined on the probability space (Ω, \mathcal{F}, P) induces the same distribution as $f(i)$ for λ -almost all i . That is, with the assistance of the random device, the decision maker can implement her mixed strategy f by taking the behaviorial strategy F .

Next we say something about the property of essentially pairwise independence. Since $(I, \mathcal{I}, \lambda)$ is interpreted the space of uncertainty, the independence condition could model the situation that the decision maker takes actions independently when facing different uncertainty, provided that the information structure is sufficiently “rich”. In the theory of large games, $(I, \mathcal{I}, \lambda)$ is used to represent the space of names of the players. The independence property is natural since different players take actions independently.¹⁰

Under the assumption that the process F is essentially pairwise independent, by the ELLN, Assertion (2) in Theorem 1 implies that almost every F_ω is a required purification. More precisely, for almost any $\omega \in \Omega$, by taking the pure strategy F_ω , Ann can earn the amount of $\int_I \phi[i, F_\omega(i)] d\lambda(i)$, and this amount is exactly the same as what she can expect by taking the mixed strategy f , $\int_I \int_X \phi(i, x) f(i; dx) d\lambda(i)$. In other words, the risk about how much she can earn under different realizations of $\omega \in \Omega$ disappears.

⁹See Khan et al. (2006), for more discussion about mixed strategies and behaviorial strategies.

¹⁰See Khan and Sun (2002) for a survey.

The next result is a generalization of [Khan et al. \(2006, Corollary 1\)](#), which in turn is a generalization of the original DWW Theorem in [Dvoretzky et al. \(1951a\)](#). It follows from [Theorem 1](#) line by line as [Loeb and Sun \(2006, Corollary 2.4\)](#) follows from [Loeb and Sun \(2006, Theorem 2.2\)](#).

Corollary 2 *Let $(I \times \Omega, \mathcal{I} \boxtimes \mathcal{F}, \lambda \boxtimes P)$ be a rich Fubini extension based on a saturated probability space $(I, \mathcal{I}, \lambda)$. Let X be a Polish space. For each k in a countable set K , let μ_k be a finite signed measure on (I, \mathcal{I}) that is absolutely continuous with respect to λ . For each j in a countable set J , assume that $\phi_j \in \mathcal{H}$.*

Then for any \mathcal{I} -measurable mapping f from I to $\mathcal{M}(X)$, there exists an $\mathcal{I} \boxtimes \mathcal{F}$ -measurable process $F : I \times \Omega \rightarrow X$, such that F is essentially pairwise independent, the induced distribution of F_i is $f(i)$ for λ -almost all i ; and for P -almost all $\omega \in \Omega$ the sample mapping F_ω satisfies the following properties.

1. $\int_I \int_X \phi_j(i, a) f(i; dx) d\lambda(i) = \int_I \phi_j[i, F_\omega(i)] d\lambda(i), \forall j \in J;$
2. $\int_I f(i; B) d\mu_k(i) = \mu_k[F_\omega^{-1}(B)],$ for all $B \in \mathcal{B}_X$ and $k \in K;$
3. $F_\omega(i) \in \text{supp } f(i)$ for λ -almost all $i \in I$.

In [Corollary 2](#), let J be an empty set, the existence result of the above corollary is a variation of the DWW theorem on a saturated probability space $(I, \mathcal{I}, \lambda)$ and a general Polish space X . For another special case, taking J to be empty and the set K contains only one element with $\mu_1 = \lambda$, the existence result of [Corollary 2](#) is [Theorem 3.6 \(P6\)](#) of [Keisler and Sun \(2009\)](#).

3.2 Discussion

In this paper, besides establishing the existence result based on saturated probability spaces as in [Loeb and Sun \(2009\)](#), [Podczeck \(2009a\)](#), we can simultaneously obtain MANY required purifications. More precisely, these purifications can be indexed by a full subset in an atomless probability space (Ω, \mathcal{F}, P) .

Recall that the probability space (Ω, \mathcal{F}, P) can represent all the mappings from I to X (see [Subsection 2.2](#) above). Assume that the measure-valued mapping f in *nontrivial*, i.e., it is not the case that $f(i)$ is a Dirac measure on X for λ -almost all $i \in I$. Accordingly, for the relevant essentially pairwise independent process F , it is not the case that almost every F_i is essentially a constant. Then there are many different $\omega \in \Omega$ such that F_ω are different measurable mappings over $(I, \mathcal{I}, \lambda)$. Therefore, if f is nontrivial, we can simultaneously obtain many different purifications for f with respect to \mathcal{D} .

We next compare our general purification result, Theorem 1, with the earlier results in Loeb and Sun (2006, 2009) and Podczeck (2009a). First, as to the methodology, our result relies heavily on the ELLN. In comparison, the purification theorem of Loeb and Sun (2006) is based on atomless Loeb probability spaces, and the authors make use of techniques in nonstandard analysis. Loeb and Sun (2009) mainly apply techniques introduced by Hoover and Keisler (1984) that certain types of results over one saturated probability space can be transferred to another. Consequently, the existence result of purifications based on an atomless Loeb probability space, Loeb and Sun (2006, Theorem 2.2), can be transferred to the existence result based on a general saturated probability space. In Podczeck (2009a), new results on functional analysis are established to prove the general purification theorem.

Second, in the earlier purification results, i.e., Loeb and Sun (2006, Theorem 2.2) and (2009, Theorem 2.2), Podczeck (2009a, Theorem 2), the target space X is a compact metric space. While in our Theorem 1, we take X to be a more general Polish space.

Third, in the earlier results, instead of functions in \mathcal{H} , a more restrictive condition is imposed on the functions over the product $I \times X$. Let \mathcal{H}' denote the collection of functions considered in Loeb and Sun (2006, 2009) and Podczeck (2009a). Here \mathcal{H}' is the collection of all the functions ϕ on $I \times X$ with the following conditions. (1a) $\phi(\cdot, x)$ is \mathcal{I} -measurable on I for each $x \in X$, (1b) $\phi(i, \cdot)$ is continuous on X for each $i \in I$, and (2) ϕ is bounded by a non-negative λ -integrable function α^ϕ . Here the conditions (1a) and (1b) are the *Carathéodory condition*. It is known that any function satisfying the Carathéodory condition is also jointly measurable. As a result, \mathcal{H}' is a subset of \mathcal{H} (see Lemma 4.51 of Aliprantis and Border (1994)).

It is worthwhile to note that in Loeb and Sun (2006, 2009), Podczeck (2009a), the proofs of purification theorems therein depend on the setting that the target space is a compact metric space and the functions satisfy the Carathéodory condition. Thus, their methods cannot be applied to our setting in Theorem 1 directly.

Finally, together with Lemma 1, it follows from Theorem 1 that the saturation property of a probability space implies the existence of purification for any measure-valued mapping with a general Polish action space. We note that the converse also holds. Specifically, as illustrated by counterexamples in Loeb and Sun (2009, Remark 2.4) and Podczeck (2009a, Theorem 3(B)), if a probability space is not saturated, there exists a measure-valued mapping, a function $\phi \in \mathcal{H}$, such that the purification does not exist.¹¹

¹¹For the counterexample in the special setting that the probability space is a Lebesgue space, see Loeb and Sun (2006, Example 2.7). For a survey about similar counterexamples in the theory of large games, see Khan and Sun (2002, Section 5).

4 Finite Games with Incomplete Information

In this section, we apply our Theorem 1 to study the problem of purification for games with incomplete information as in [Milgrom and Weber \(1985\)](#). A game Γ with incomplete information consists of a finite set of m players and an information space available to them. Each player n can take actions from X_n , which is a Polish space for $1 \leq n \leq m$; and the Cartesian product $\prod_{n=1}^m X_n$ is written as X . For each player n , a measurable space (I_n, \mathcal{I}_n) represents the set of possible information for her. The information is incomplete in the sense that each player does not know the particulars of the other players' information. The payoff function of player n is $u_n : I_0 \times I_n \times X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, where $I_0 = \{i_{0k} : k \in \mathbb{N}\}$ is a countable set representing the common state space which affects payoffs of all the players. Thus, player n 's payoff function depends on the common states, her own information and the actions of all the players. Denote by \mathcal{I}_0 the power set of the countable set I_0 . Let $(I, \mathcal{I}) := (\prod_{j=0}^m I_j, \prod_{j=0}^m \mathcal{I}_j)$ be the product measure space and λ be a probability measurable on (I, \mathcal{I}) . The resulting probability space $(I, \mathcal{I}, \lambda)$ constitutes an information structure of the game. For each player n , assume further that the payoff function $u_n(i_0, i_n, x)$ is an $\mathcal{I}_n \otimes \mathcal{B}_X$ -measurable function for each $i_0 \in I_0$; in addition, for all $i \in I$, $|u_n(i_0, i_n, x)| \leq \alpha(i)$, where α is a nonnegative integrable function on $(I, \mathcal{I}, \lambda)$.

For $0 \leq j \leq m$, denote by λ_j the marginal probability measure of λ on (I_j, \mathcal{I}_j) . Suppose the support of λ_0 is the whole set I_0 . As a result, when the common state i_0 is i_{0k} , the conditional probability measure of λ on the space $(\prod_{j=1}^m I_j, \prod_{j=1}^m \mathcal{I}_j)$ exists and is denoted by $\lambda(\cdot ; i_{0k})$. Moreover, for each player n , let λ_{nk} be the marginal probability measure of $\lambda(\cdot ; i_{0k})$ on the measurable space (I_n, \mathcal{I}_n) . Following [Milgrom and Weber \(1985\)](#), the information structure $(I, \mathcal{I}, \lambda)$ is said to be *conditionally independent* if, $\lambda(\cdot ; i_{0k}) = \prod_{n=1}^m \lambda_{nk}$, $\forall k \in K$.

A *mixed strategy* for player n is a measurable mapping from her information space (I_n, \mathcal{I}_n) to $\mathcal{M}(X_n)$. A *pure strategy* is an \mathcal{I}_n -measurable mapping from I_n to X_n , and it can be regarded as a mixed strategy using Dirac measures. A *mixed (pure) strategy profile* $h = (h_1, \dots, h_m)$ is a tuple of mixed (pure) strategies, in which h_n specifies a mixed (pure) strategy for player n . Given any mixed strategy profile $f = (f_1, \dots, f_m)$, the corresponding expected payoff for player n is

$$U_n(f) := \int_I \int_X u_n(i_0, i_n, x) f_1(i_1; dx_1) \cdots f_n(i_n; dx_n) d\lambda(i), \quad (2)$$

where for each $i \in I$, the inner integral on X is the iterated integral on X_n, \dots, X_1 respectively. A mixed strategy profile $f = (f_n, f_{-n})$ is called a *Nash equilibrium* for the game Γ if for every player n , $U_n(f_n, f_{-n}) \geq U_n(f'_n, f_{-n})$ for any mixed strategy f'_n of player n .

The following definition is proposed in [Khan et al. \(2006\)](#).

Definition 4 A pure strategy profile $g = (g_1, \dots, g_m)$ is said to be a strong purification of a mixed strategy profile $f = (f_1, \dots, f_m) = (f_n, f_{-n})$ if the following four conditions are satisfied for each player n .

1. $U_n(f) = U_n(g)$.
2. For any given mixed strategy \tilde{f}_n of player n , $U_n(\tilde{f}_n, f_{-n}) = U_n(\tilde{f}_n, g_{-n})$.
3. For each $k \in K$, given $i_0 = i_{0k}$, g_n and f_n have the same conditional distribution on X_n , i.e., $\int_{I_n} f_n(i_n; \cdot) d\lambda_{nk}(i_n) = \lambda_{nk} g_n^{-1}(\cdot)$.
4. For λ_n -almost all $i_n \in I_n$, $g_n(i_n) \in \text{supp } f_n(i_n)$.

Item 1 means that the strong purification yields the same expected payoff as the mixed strategy for all players. Item 2 means that the expected payoff of Player n from any mixed strategy is always same irrespective of the opponents play being f_{-n} or g_{-n} . Thus, Items 1 and 2 guarantee that if the mixed strategy f is a Nash equilibrium, so is its strong purification, which is a pure strategy. See Section 3 of [Khan et al. \(2006\)](#) for more discussion.

We are now ready to present our main result for this section, which generalizes Theorem 3.2 of [Loeb and Sun \(2006\)](#). It is about the existence of strong purification for any mixed strategy profile in the game Γ . This result follows from Corollary 2 almost in the same way that Theorem 3.2 of [Loeb and Sun \(2006\)](#) follows from Corollary 2.4 of [\(2006\)](#). The proof is relegated to Appendix.

Theorem 2 Assume that (1) the information structure in the game Γ is conditionally independent, and (2) for each n , $(I_n, \mathcal{I}_n, \lambda_n)$ is a saturated probability space together with a rich Fubini extension $(I_n \times \Omega_n, \mathcal{I}_n \boxtimes \mathcal{F}_n, \lambda_n \boxtimes P_n)$. Then for any mixed strategy profile $f = (f_1, \dots, f_m)$ and for each player n , there exists an $\mathcal{I}_n \boxtimes \mathcal{F}_n$ -measurable process $F^n : I_n \times \Omega_n \rightarrow X_n$, which is essentially pairwise independent and F^n induces the distribution $f_n(i_n)$ on X_n for λ_n -almost all i_n , and $(F_{\omega_1}^1, \dots, F_{\omega_m}^m)$ is a strong purification of f for P_n -almost all $\omega_n \in \Omega_n$, for each n .

If there exists a Nash equilibrium in mixed strategy for the game Γ , it is guaranteed by Theorem 2 that there also exists a Nash equilibrium in pure strategy. In general, as discussed in Subsection 3.2 above, we can simultaneously obtain MANY pure strategy equilibria if the mixed strategy f is nontrivial. In particular, assume that the mixed strategy f is a Nash equilibrium for the game Γ , for each player n , and interpret $(\Omega_n, \mathcal{F}_n, P_n)$ as her random device. Theorem 2 states that for P_n -almost every realization of $\omega_n \in \Omega_n \forall n$, the realized pure strategy profile, $(F_{\omega_1}^1, \dots, F_{\omega_m}^m)$, is also a pure strategy Nash equilibrium for Γ .

Finally, we note that Theorem 2 generalizes the assumptions of compact metric action spaces and continuous payoff functions in Theorem 3.2 of [Loeb and Sun \(2006\)](#) to a general setting of Polish action spaces and measurable payoffs respectively. In such a general or less demanding setting of game theoretic models with incomplete information, it is stated in our theorem that each mixed strategy has many strong purifications. This reflects the idea of purification that “when information in games is sufficiently disparate among the players and when its distribution is sufficiently diffuse, the players might as well restrict their attention to pure strategies” (see p. 401 of [Radner and Rosenthal \(1982\)](#)).

5 Appendix: Proofs

Proof of Corollary 1. By Lemma 1, the saturation property implies the existence of a rich Fubini extension based on a probability space.

Next, we prove the converse. For the rich Fubini extension based on the probability space $(I, \mathcal{I}, \lambda)$, assume that the process π witnesses the richness. That is, π is an essentially pairwise independent process and the random variable π_i induces the uniform distribution on the interval $[0, 1]$. Note that this process π is nontrivial. By Lemma 4, the σ -algebra \mathcal{I} can not be countably generated. Otherwise almost all the sample functions are not \mathcal{I} -measurable, which contradicts Assertion (1) of Part A in Definition 3. Analogously, for any subset $S \in \mathcal{I}$ with $\lambda(S) > 0$, notice that the restriction of the process π to $S \times \Omega$ is also a nontrivial essentially pairwise independent process, then \mathcal{I}^S is not countably generated either. By Definition 2, the probability space $(I, \mathcal{I}, \lambda)$ is nowhere countably generated, hence it is saturated. \square

Proof of Theorem 1. Let us first fix one $\phi \in \mathcal{D}$. Given the saturated probability space $(I, \mathcal{I}, \lambda)$, together with the rich Fubini extension $(I \times \Omega, \mathcal{I} \boxtimes \mathcal{F}, P)$. Since the measure-valued mapping f is \mathcal{I} -measurable, by Lemma 2, there exists an $\mathcal{I} \boxtimes \mathcal{F}$ -measurable process $F : I \times \Omega \rightarrow X$, which is essentially pairwise independent and the random variable F_i induces distribution $f(i)$ for λ -almost all $i \in I$. Thus, we prove Assertion (1) in the theorem.

We next show Assertion (2). Notice that F_i induces the distribution $f(i)$ for λ -almost all i , it follows that,

$$\int_X \phi(i, x) f(i; dx) = \int_{\Omega} \phi[i, F(i, \omega)] dP(\omega); \quad (3)$$

then

$$\int_I \int_X \phi(i, x) f(i; dx) d\lambda(i) = \int_I \int_{\Omega} \phi[i, F(i, \omega)] dP(\omega) d\lambda(i). \quad (4)$$

Define $G^\phi(i, \omega) = \phi[i, F(i, \omega)]$. We next show in two steps that G^ϕ is a $\lambda \boxtimes P$ -integrable function. First, it is an $\mathcal{I} \boxtimes \mathcal{F}$ -measurable function on $I \times \Omega$. Towards this end, define H to be a process from $(I \times \Omega, \mathcal{I} \boxtimes \mathcal{F})$ to $(I \times X, \mathcal{I} \otimes \mathcal{B}_X)$ by letting $H(i, \omega) = [i, F(i, \omega)]$. The mapping H is measurable. Indeed, for any Borel subset $C \subseteq \mathbb{R}$, $\phi^{-1}(C) \in \mathcal{I} \otimes \mathcal{B}_X$ because ϕ is measurable, then $H^{-1}[\phi^{-1}(C)]$ is $\mathcal{I} \boxtimes \mathcal{F}$ -measurable. Note that $[G^\phi]^{-1}(C) = H^{-1}[\phi^{-1}(C)]$, we thus obtain the $\mathcal{I} \boxtimes \mathcal{F}$ -measurability of G^ϕ . Second, because $\phi(i, x)$ is bounded by $\alpha^\phi(i)$ for any $x \in X$, so is $G^\phi(i, \omega) = \phi[i, F(i, \omega)]$ for any $\omega \in \Omega$. Therefore, we obtain the $\lambda \boxtimes P$ -integrability of G^ϕ , because the λ -integrable function α^ϕ can also be viewed as a $\lambda \boxtimes P$ -integrable function on $I \times \Omega$.

Note that $(I \times \Omega, \mathcal{I} \boxtimes \mathcal{F}, \lambda \boxtimes P)$ is a Fubini extension of the product space between $(I, \mathcal{I}, \lambda)$ and (Ω, \mathcal{F}, P) , by Assertion (2), Part A of Definition 3,

$$\int_I \int_\Omega \phi[i, F(i, \omega)] dP(\omega) d\lambda(i) = \iint_{I \times \Omega} G^\phi d\lambda \boxtimes P. \quad (5)$$

Moreover, we claim that G^ϕ is an essentially pairwise independent process. Given any Borel subset C in \mathbb{R} , $\phi_i^{-1}(C) \in \mathcal{B}_X$ due to the measurability of $\phi(i, \cdot)$ for λ -almost all $i \in I$.¹² Then for such an i , $F_i^{-1}[\phi_i^{-1}(C)] \in \mathcal{F}$ since F_i is a \mathcal{F} -measurable mapping. It is clear that $[G_i^\phi]^{-1}(C) = F_i^{-1}[\phi_i^{-1}(C)]$, which implies that G_i^ϕ is \mathcal{F} -measurable for λ -almost all $i \in I$. Moreover, G_i^ϕ and $G_{i'}^\phi$ are pairwise independent if F_i and $F_{i'}$ are independent. Accordingly, the process G^ϕ is essentially pairwise independent because the process F satisfies this property.

Now we are ready to apply the ELLN for the essentially pairwise independent process G^ϕ . By Lemma 3, there exists a P -null subset $N^\phi \subseteq \Omega$, such that for any $\omega \in \Omega/N^\phi$,

$$\iint_{I \times \Omega} G^\phi d\lambda \boxtimes P = \int_I G_\omega^\phi(i) d\lambda(i) = \int_I \phi[i, F_\omega(i)] d\lambda(i) \quad (6)$$

Combining the above equations (4)-(6), for any $\omega \in \Omega/N^\phi$,

$$\int_I \int_X \phi(i, x) f(i; dx) d\lambda(i) = \int_I \phi[i, F_\omega(i)] d\lambda(i). \quad (7)$$

We next fix such a P -null subset for each $\phi \in \mathcal{D}$. Now we can turn to the countable subset \mathcal{D} of \mathcal{H} . Following the above procedure, we can construct a countable number of P -null subsets $N^\phi \subseteq \Omega, \forall \phi \in \mathcal{D}$, such that Equation (7) holds for each $\phi \in \mathcal{D}$. Let $N_1 = \bigcup_{\phi \in \mathcal{D}} N^\phi$, it is clear that $P(N_1) = 0$. Hence, by Equation (7), we obtain that for any $\phi \in \mathcal{D}$ and any $\omega \in \Omega/N_1$,

$$\int_I \int_X \phi(i, x) f(i; dx) d\lambda(i) = \int_I \phi[i, F_\omega(i)] d\lambda(i). \quad (8)$$

¹²This follows from the classic Fubini theorem.

What remains is the measurability of the sample functions F_ω for $\omega \notin N_1$. Since F is an $\mathcal{I} \boxtimes \mathcal{F}$ -measurable process, it is clear that F_ω is \mathcal{I} -measurable for P -almost all $\omega \in \Omega$. That is, there exists a P -null subset $N_2 \subseteq \Omega$ such that F_ω is \mathcal{I} -measurable for each $\omega \notin N_2$. Let $N = N_1 \cup N_2$, then $P(N) = 0$, and F_ω is \mathcal{I} -measurable and Equation (8) holds for any $\phi \in \mathcal{D}$ for any $\omega \in \Omega/N$. That is, the mapping F_ω , for any $\omega \in \Omega/N$, is a required purification of the measure-valued one f with respect to $\phi \in \mathcal{D}$. Thus we finish the proof of Assertion (2) of the theorem. \square

Proof of Theorem 2. The proof is a slight variation of the proof of [Loeb and Sun \(2006, Theorem 3.2\)](#).

In what follows, for any n , let $\Pi_{j \neq n}$ denote $\Pi_{1 \leq j \leq m, j \neq n}$, which represents the product over all the indices $1 \leq j \leq m$ except for $j = n$. For example, $X_{-n} = \Pi_{j \neq n} X_j$, $I_{-n} = \Pi_{j \neq n} I_j$. And for any $i = (i_0, i_1, \dots, i_m) \in I$, write i_{-n} to be $(i_1, \dots, i_m) = (i_n, i_{-n})$.

First fix player n . For each $k \in K$, let $\eta_k = \lambda_0(\{t_{0k}\})$. It is clear that for each $S_n \in \mathcal{I}_n$, $\lambda_n(S_n) = \sum_{k \in K} \eta_k \lambda_{nk}(S_n)$. Thus each λ_{nk} is absolutely continuous with respect to λ_n . Denote by β_{nk} the Radon-Nikodym derivative of λ_{nk} with respect to λ_n . According to the conditionally independence, we have $\lambda(\cdot; i_{0k}) = \Pi_{n=1}^m \lambda_{nk}$ for each k . For any mixed strategy profile $f = (f_1, \dots, f_m)$, player n 's expected payoff $U_n(f)$ defined in Equation (2) can be written as follows,

$$\sum_{k \in K} \eta_k \int_{i_{-0} \in \Pi_{j=1}^m I_j} \int_{x \in \Pi_{j=1}^m X_j} u_n(i_{0k}, i_n, x) \Pi_{j=1}^m f_j(i_j; dx_j) \Pi_{j=1}^m d\lambda_{jk}(i_j). \quad (9)$$

For the mixed strategy profile f , define

$$\psi_n^f(i_n, x_n) = \sum_{k \in K} \eta_k \beta_{nk}(i_n) \int_{I_{-n}} \int_{X_{-n}} u_n(i_{0k}, i_n, x_n, x_{-n}) \Pi_{j \neq n} f_j(i_j; dx_j) \Pi_{j \neq n} d\lambda_{jk}(i_j). \quad (10)$$

Then, by Equation (9) the expected payoff for player n is,

$$U_n(f) = \int_{I_n} \int_{X_n} \psi_n^f(i_n, x_n) f_n(i_n; dx_n) d\lambda_n(i_n). \quad (11)$$

For each $j = 1, \dots, m$, denote by $\gamma_{jk}^{f_j}$ the induced probability distribution on X_j of $\int_{I_j} f_j(i_j, \cdot) d\lambda_{jk}(i_j)$. Then, from Equation (10) we obtain that,

$$\psi_n^f(i_n, x_n) = \sum_{k \in K} \eta_k \beta_{nk}(i_n) \int_{X_{-n}} u_n(i_{0k}, i_n, x_n, x_{-n}) \Pi_{j \neq n} d\gamma_{jk}^{f_j}(x_j). \quad (12)$$

Equations (11) and (12) imply that, given $i_0 = i_{0k}$, player n 's expected payoff depends on the actions of the other players only through the induced conditional distributions of their strategies on their action spaces.

Recall that α is a λ -integrable function that dominates all the payoff functions. Let α_n be the function from I_n to \mathbb{R}_+ such that for each $i_n \in I_n$,

$$\alpha_n(i_n) = \sum_{k \in K} \eta_k \beta_{nk}(i_n) \int_{I_{-n}} \alpha(i_{0k}, i_n, i_{-n}) \Pi_{j \neq n} d\lambda_{jk}(i_j). \quad (13)$$

It is clear that α_n is λ_n -integrable and that $\int_I \alpha(i) d\lambda(i) = \int_{I_n} \alpha_n(i_n) d\lambda_n(i_n)$ by the classical Fubini theorem. Recall that for any $x \in X$ and $i \in I$, $|u_n(i_0, i_n, x)| \leq \alpha(i_0, i_n, i_{-n})$. Consequently, Equations (10) and (13) imply that for any $i_n \in I_n$, $s_n \in X_n$, $|\psi_n^f(i_n, x_n)| \leq \alpha_n(i_n)$. Therefore, the function ψ_n^f is an $\mathcal{I}_n \otimes \mathcal{B}_{X_n}$ -measurable function on $I_n \times X_n$.

Given the saturated probability space $(I_n, \mathcal{I}_n, \lambda_n)$, together with the rich Fubini extension $(I_n \times \Omega_n, \mathcal{I}_n \boxtimes \mathcal{F}_n, \lambda_n \boxtimes P_n)$. We now apply Corollary 2. The function ψ_n^f here corresponds to ψ_j thereof, and λ_{nk} for $k \in K$, X_n and f_n to η_k , X , and f therein respectively. By Corollary 2, there exists a process $F^n : I_n \times \Omega_n \rightarrow X_n$, which is essentially pairwise independent and $F_{i_n}^n$ induces the distribution $f_n(i_n)$ on X_n for λ_n -almost all $i_n \in I_n$; moreover, there exists a P_n -null subset $M_n \subseteq \Omega_n$ such that for each $\omega_n \notin M_n$, the sample mapping $F_{\omega_n}^n : I_n \rightarrow X_n$ is an \mathcal{I}_n -measurable mapping and satisfies the following properties.

- (i) $\int_{I_n} \int_{X_n} \psi_n^f(i_n, x_n) f_n(i_n; dx_n) d\lambda_n(i_n) = \int_{I_n} \psi_n^f[i_n, F_{\omega_n}^n(i_n)] d\lambda_n(i_n)$;
- (ii) for all Borel set B_n in X_n , $\int_{I_n} f_n(i_n; B_n) d\lambda_{nk}(i_n) = \lambda_{nk}[F_{\omega_n}^n]^{-1}(B_n) = \gamma_{nk}^{f_n}(B_n)$;
- (iii) $F_{\omega_n}^n(i_n) \in \text{supp } f_n(i_n)$ for λ_n -almost all $i_n \in I_n$.

Similarly, considering the saturated probability spaces $(I_j, \mathcal{I}_j, \lambda_j)$ together with the rich Fubini extension $(I_j \times \Omega_j, \mathcal{I} \boxtimes \mathcal{F}_j, Q_j)$, we can apply the above procedure for each player $j = 1, \dots, m$. In particular, we can construct F^j, M_j , such that $F_{\omega_j}^j$ satisfies the above (i)-(iii) for player $j, \forall \omega_j \notin M_j$. Let $\omega = (\omega_1, \dots, \omega_m)$ be the sample profile, and $F_\omega = (F_{\omega_1}^1, \dots, F_{\omega_m}^m) = (F_{\omega_n}^n, [F_\omega]_{-n})$.

We next claim that F_ω is a strong purification of f , for any sample profile ω with $\omega_j \notin M_j$ for each j ; that is, it satisfies Items 1-4 in Definition 4. It is clear that the Items 3 and 4 are the above Assertions (ii) and (iii) respectively. We only need to prove Assertions 1 and 2 in the definition.

Towards this end, fix one such sample profile ω , i.e., $\omega_j \notin M_j$, for all j . For any mixed strategy \tilde{f}_n of player n , let $\tilde{f} = (\tilde{f}_n, f_{-n})$, and $\tilde{F}_\omega = (\tilde{f}_n, [F_\omega]_{-n})$. By Equation (11), the expected payoff of player n with \tilde{f}, F_ω and \tilde{F}_ω are respectively given by

$$U_n(\tilde{f}) = \int_{I_n} \int_{X_n} \psi_n^{\tilde{f}}(i_n, x_n) \tilde{f}_n(i_n; dx_n) d\lambda_n(i_n), \quad (14)$$

$$U_n([F_\omega]) = \int_{I_n} \psi_n^{F_\omega}[i_n, F_{\omega_n}^n(i_n)] d\lambda_n(i_n), \quad (15)$$

$$U_n(\tilde{F}_\omega) = \int_{I_n} \int_{X_n} \psi_n^{\tilde{F}_\omega}(i_n, x_n) \tilde{f}_n(i_n; dx_n) d\lambda_n(i_n). \quad (16)$$

Since Assertion (ii) above holds for all players, it is obvious that for $j \neq n$, $\gamma_{jk}^{f_j} = \gamma_{jk}^{F_\omega^j}$. By Equation (12), ψ_n^f only depends on the probability distributions $\gamma_{jk}^{f_j}, j \neq n$. Hence, we have $\psi_n^f = \psi_n^{F_\omega} = \psi_n^{\tilde{f}} = \psi_n^{\tilde{F}_\omega}$. By Assertion (i) above, it follows that,

$$\begin{aligned} U_n(f) &= \int_{I_n} \int_{X_n} \psi_n^f(i_n, x_n) f_n(i_n; dx_n) d\lambda_n(i_n) = \int_{I_n} \psi_n^f[i_n, F_{\omega_n}^n(i_n)] d\lambda_n(i_n) \\ &= \int_{I_n} \psi_n^{F_\omega}[i_n, F_{\omega_n}^i(i_n)] d\lambda_n(i_n) = U_n(F_\omega). \end{aligned}$$

We thus prove Item 1. Similarly, Item 2 also holds because,

$$\begin{aligned} U_n(\tilde{f}) &= \int_{I_n} \int_{X_n} \psi_n^{\tilde{f}}(i_n, a_n) \tilde{f}_n(i_n; da_n) d\lambda_n(i_n) \\ &= \int_{I_n} \int_{X_n} \psi_n^{\tilde{F}_\omega}(i_n, a_n) \tilde{f}_n(i_n; da_n) d\lambda_n(i_n) = U_n(\tilde{F}_\omega). \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

References

- C.D. Aliprantis and K.C. Border, *Infinite dimensional analysis: a hitchhiker's guide*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1994.
- J.L. Doob, *Stochastic Processes*, Wiley, New York, 1953.
- A. Dvoretzky, A. Wald and J. Wolfowitz, Elimination of randomization in certain problems of statistics and of the theory of games, *Proceedings of National Academy of Science, USA* **36** (1950), 256–260.
- A. Dvoretzky, A. Wald and J. Wolfowitz, Relations among certain ranges of vector measures, *Pacific Journal of Mathematics* **1** (1951a), 59–74.
- A. Dvoretzky, A. Wald and J. Wolfowitz, Elimination of randomization in certain statistical decision problems in certain statistical decision procedures and zero-sum two-person games, *Annals of Mathematical Statistics* **22** (1951b), 1–21.
- D.A. Edwards, On a theorem of Dvoretzky, Wald and Wolfowitz concerning Liapunov measures. *Glasgow Mathematical Journal* **29** (1987), 205–220.
- S. Fajardo and H.J. Keisler, *Model Theory of Stochastic Processes*, Lecture Notes in Logic, vol. 14, Assoc. Symbolic Logic, Urbana, IL, 2002.
- D.H. Fremlin, *Measure Theory, Volume 5: Set-theoretic Measure Theory (version 8.5.03/29.6.06)*, 2005. Available at <http://www.essex.ac.uk/maths/staff/fremlin/mt.htm>
- D.N. Hoover and H.J. Keisler, Adapted probability distributions, *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society* **286** (1984), 159–201.

- H.J. Keisler and Y.N. Sun, Why saturated probability spaces are necessary, *Advances in Mathematics* **221** (2009), 1584–1607.
- M.A. Khan and K.P. Rath, On games with incomplete information and the Dvoretzky-Wald-Wolfowitz theorem with countable partitions, *Journal of Mathematical Economics* **45** (2009), 830–837.
- M.A. Khan, K.P. Rath and Y.N. Sun, The Dvoretzky-Wald-Wolfowitz theorem and purification in atomless finite-action games, *International Journal of Game Theory* **34** (2006), 91–104.
- M.A. Khan, K.P. Rath, Y.N. Sun and H.M. Yu, On the theory of large games with a multiplicities of types of players: a reformulation, The Johns Hopkins University, mimeo., 2005.
- M.A. Khan, Y.N. Sun, On symmetric Cournot-Nash equilibrium distributions in a finite-action, atomless game, in *Equilibrium Theory in Infinite Dimensional Spaces* (M.A. Khan and N.C. Yannelis eds.), Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1991, pp. 325–332.
- M.A. Khan and Y.N. Sun, Non-cooperative games with many players, in *Handbook of Game Theory with Economic Applications, Volume III* (R.J. Aumann and S. Hart eds), Elsevier Science, Amsterdam, 2002, pp. 1761–1808.
- P.A. Loeb and Y.N. Sun, Purification of measure-valued maps, *Illinois Journal of Mathematics* **50** (2006), 747–762.
- P.A. Loeb and Y.N. Sun, Purification and saturation, *Proceedings of the American Mathematics Society* **137** (2009), 2719–2724.
- P.A. Loeb and M. Wolff, *Nonstandard Analysis for the Working Mathematician*, Kluwer Academic Publishers, Amsterdam, 2000.
- A. Mas-Colell, On a theorem of Schmeidler, *Journal of Mathematical Economics* **13** (1984), 200–206.
- P.R. Milgrom and R.J. Weber, Distributional strategies for games with incomplete information, *Mathematics of Operations Research* **10** (1985), 619–632.
- D. Maharam, On algebraic characterization of measure algebras, *Annals of Mathematics* **48** (1947), 154–167.
- M. Noguchi, Existence of Nash equilibria in large games, *Journal of Mathematical Economics* **45** (2009), 168–184.
- K. Podczeck, On purification of measure-valued maps, *Economic Theory* **38** (2009), 399–418.
- K. Podczeck, On existence of rich Fubini extensions, *Economic Theory*, published online, 2009.
- R. Radner and R.W. Rosenthal, Private information and pure-strategy equilibria, *Mathematics of Operations Research* **7** (1982), 401–409.
- D. Schmeidler, Equilibrium points of non-atomic games, *Journal of Statistical Physics* **7** (1973), 295–300.
- Y.N. Sun, A theory of hyperfinite processes: the complete removal of individual uncertainty via exact LLN, *Journal of Mathematical Economics* **29** (1998), 419–503.
- Y.N. Sun, The exact law of large numbers via Fubini extension and characterization of insurable risks, *Journal of Economic Theory* **126** (2006), 31–69.
- Y.N. Sun, On the Characterization of Individual Risks and Fubini Extension, National University of Singapore, mimeo., 2007a.

- Y.N. Sun, Large Bayesian games, National University of Singapore, mimeo., 2007b.
- Y.N. Sun, N.C. Yannelis, Saturation and the integration of Banach valued correspondences, *Journal of Mathematical Economics* **44** (2008), 861–865.
- Y.N. Sun and Y.C. Zhang, Individual risk and Lebesgue extension without aggregate uncertainty, *Journal of Economic Theory* **144** (2009), 432–443.