

Problem Set 4

2012 ACM Class 5120309027 Huang Zen

Problem 1 (No collaborator.)

obviously $\sigma_i = \frac{1}{2}H + \frac{1}{2}T$ for each player i is a Nash. In which way, each player makes the other indifferent between choosing heads or tails, so neither player has an incentive to try another strategy.

Now given positive ϵ , let's consider a strategy namely σ' :

$$\sigma' = \begin{cases} (\frac{1}{2} + \frac{\epsilon}{20})H + (\frac{1}{2} - \frac{\epsilon}{20})T & i = 1, \dots, 5 \\ \frac{1}{2}H + \frac{1}{2}T & i = 6 \end{cases}$$

We found that

$$\begin{aligned} u_i(\sigma) &= 0 & (i = 1, \dots, 6) \\ |u_i(H, \sigma'_6)| &= |u_i(T, \sigma_6)| = 0 \leq \epsilon & (i = 1, \dots, 5) \\ |u_6((\sigma'_i), H)| &= |5((\frac{1}{2} - \frac{\epsilon}{20}) - (\frac{1}{2} + \frac{\epsilon}{20}))| = |-\frac{\epsilon}{2}| \leq \epsilon \\ |u_6((\sigma'_i), T)| &= |5((\frac{1}{2} + \frac{\epsilon}{20}) - (\frac{1}{2} - \frac{\epsilon}{20}))| = |\frac{\epsilon}{2}| \leq \epsilon \end{aligned}$$

However σ' is not a Nash since each player can always avoid receiving negative utility, so σ' yields a ϵ -Nash equilibrium.

Problem 2 (No collaborator.) W.L.G, take player 6 as the root and all other players be the children and terminated nodes.

suppose player 6 choose the strategy $\sigma = pH + qT$, $0 \leq p, q \leq 1, p + q = 1$. Player i chooses strategy (p_iH, q_iH) . If $p = q$, any strategy for player i is a best response. If $p > q$, best response for other players would be $(1H, 0T)$, If $p < q$, the best response would be $(0H, 1T)$.

So the table passed from the children is

$$T_i(p_iH + q_iT, pH + qT) = \begin{cases} 1 & p = q \text{ or } p > q, p_i = 1 \text{ or } p < q, q_i = 1 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

We have

$$u_6(p_i H + q_i H, p H + q H) = p \sum_{i=1}^5 q_i + q \sum_{i=1}^5 p_i = (1 - 2p)(2 \sum_{i=1}^5 p_i - 5)$$

For player 6, $p \neq q$ is obvious not a best response to his children's choices since all other players can choose one pure strategy and drop player 6's utility to negative. And when $p = q$, it's a best response only if $\sum_{i=1}^5 p_i = \frac{5}{2}$. So the table at the root is

$$T_6(pH + qT) = \begin{cases} 1 & p = q \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

while the witness list at the root is

$$\sum_{i=1}^5 p_i = \frac{5}{2}$$

This yields NEs with one player chooses equal probability H and T , others chooses equal sum of probability of H and T .

Problem 3 (No collaborator.)

Proof. In mixed strategy σ yielded from strategy set S , let p_i be the probability of σ_i ,

let $p = \sum_{i=1}^k \lambda_i p_i$ be the convex combination of p_i .

$$\forall i, \forall b \in S_i, \forall b' \in S_i \quad T = \{s \mid s \in S, s_i = b\}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}_{s \sim \sigma|_{s_i=b}} u_i(s) &= \sum_{s \in T} \frac{p(s)}{\sum_{s' \in S} p(s')} u_i(s) \\
&= \sum_{s \in T} \frac{\sum_{j=1}^k \lambda_j p_j(s)}{\sum_{s' \in S} p(s')} u_i(s) \\
&= \sum_{j=1}^k \lambda_j \frac{\sum_{s' \in S} p_j(s')}{\sum_{s' \in S} p(s')} \sum_{s \in T} \frac{p_j(s)}{\sum_{s' \in S} p_j(s')} u_i(s) \\
&= \sum_{j=1}^k \lambda_j \frac{\sum_{s' \in S} p_j(s')}{\sum_{s' \in S} p(s')} \mathbb{E}_{s \sim \sigma_j|_{s_i=b}} u_i(s) \\
&\geq \sum_{j=1}^k \lambda_j \frac{\sum_{s' \in S} p_j(s')}{\sum_{s' \in S} p(s')} \mathbb{E}_{s \sim \sigma_j|_{s_i=b}} u_i(b', s_{-i}) \\
&= \mathbb{E}_{s \sim \sigma|_{s_i=b}} u_i(b', s_{-i}) \quad (\text{by symmetry})
\end{aligned}$$

So

$$\mathbb{E}_{s \sim \sigma|_{s_i=b}} u_i(s) \geq \mathbb{E}_{s \sim \sigma|_{s_i=b}} u_i(b', s)$$

So for any finite game G , any finite convex combination of CEs is still a CE of G . \square

References

- [1] M. J. Osborne and A. Rubinstein. *A course in game theory*. MIT Press, 1994.
- [2] N. Nisan, T. Roughgarden, E. Tardos, and V. Vazirani (eds). *Algorithmic game theory*. Cambridge University Press, 2007. (Available at http://www.cambridge.org/journals/nisan/downloads/Nisan_Non-printable.pdf.)