

Iterative Elimination of
Dominated Strategies

Lecture 3.1

Definition (Strongly Dominated Strategy): Given $T = \langle N, (S_i)_{i \in N}, (u_i)_{i \in N} \rangle$
a strategy $s_i \in S_i$ for a player $i \in N$ is called a ~~strongly/weakly~~ dominated
strategy if there exists a mixed strategy $\sigma_i \in \Delta(S_i)$
s.t. $u_i(s_i, s_{-i}) \begin{matrix} \text{red} \text{ } \leq \\ \text{green} \text{ } \leq \end{matrix} u_i(\sigma_i, s_{-i}) \quad \forall s_{-i} \in S_{-i}$

Lemma: In any game $T = \langle N, (S_i)_{i \in N}, (u_i)_{i \in N} \rangle$ if a pure strategy $s_i \in S_i$ is strongly dominated, then, in every MSNE $(\sigma_i^*)_{i \in N}$ of T , we have $\sigma_i^*(s_i) = 0$.

Proof: by contradiction; Suppose there exists an MSNE $(\sigma_i^*)_{i \in N}$ of T such that $\sigma_i^*(s_i) \neq 0$ and s_i is strongly dominated by a mixed strategy $\sigma_i \in \Delta(S_i)$,
we have $\sigma_i \neq s_i$

Consider a mixed strategy $\pi \in \Delta(S_i)$ as follows

$$\pi(s'_i) = \sigma_i^*(s'_i) + \sigma_i^*(s_i) \cdot \sigma_i(s'_i) / (1 - \sigma_i(s_i)) \quad \forall s'_i \in S_i \setminus \{s_i\}$$

$$\pi(s_i) \geq 0 \quad \forall s'_i \in S_i, \quad \pi(s_i) = 0$$

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{s'_i \in S_i} \pi(s'_i) &= \sum_{\substack{s'_i \in S_i \\ s'_i \neq s_i}} \left(\sigma_i^*(s'_i) + \sigma_i^*(s_i) \frac{\sigma_i(s'_i)}{1 - \sigma_i(s_i)} \right) \\ &= \sum_{\substack{s'_i \in S_i \\ s'_i \neq s_i}} \sigma_i^*(s'_i) + \boxed{\frac{\sigma_i^*(s_i)}{1 - \sigma_i(s_i)} \sum_{\substack{s'_i \in S_i \\ s'_i \neq s_i}} \sigma_i(s'_i)} \\ &= \sum_{s'_i \in S_i} \sigma_i^*(s'_i) = 1 \end{aligned}$$

We have

$$u_i(\sigma_i, \underline{\sigma}_i^*) > u_i(\beta_i, \underline{\sigma}_i^*) \quad [\text{by our assumption}]$$

$$\begin{aligned} u_i(\pi, \underline{\sigma}_i^*) &= \sum_{\beta_i' \in S_i} u_i(\beta_i', \underline{\sigma}_i^*) \cdot \pi(\beta_i') \\ &= \sum_{\substack{\beta_i' \in S_i \\ \beta_i' \neq \beta_i}} \sigma_i^*(\beta_i') \cdot u_i(\beta_i', \underline{\sigma}_i^*) + \sum_{\substack{\beta_i' \in S_i \\ \beta_i' \neq \beta_i}} u_i(\beta_i', \underline{\sigma}_i^*) \cdot \boxed{\frac{\sigma_i^*(\beta_i) \sigma_i(\beta_i')}{1 - \sigma_i(\beta_i)}} \\ &= \text{---} + \frac{\sigma_i^*(\beta_i)}{1 - \sigma_i(\beta_i)} \cdot \boxed{\sum_{\substack{\beta_i' \in S_i \\ \beta_i' \neq \beta_i}} \sigma_i(\beta_i') u_i(\beta_i', \underline{\sigma}_i^*)} \\ &= \text{---} + \frac{\sigma_i^*(\beta_i)}{1 - \sigma_i(\beta_i)} \cdot \underbrace{\left[u_i(\sigma_i, \underline{\sigma}_i^*) - u_i(\beta_i, \underline{\sigma}_i^*) \right]} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= u_i(\sigma_i^*, \sigma_{-i}^*) - \sigma_i^*(\lambda_i) \cdot u_i(\lambda_i, \sigma_{-i}^*) + \frac{\sigma_i^*(\lambda_i)}{1 - \sigma_i(\lambda_i)} \left[u_i(\sigma_i, \sigma_{-i}^*) - u_i(\lambda_i, \sigma_{-i}^*) \right] \\
&= u_i(\sigma_i^*, \sigma_{-i}^*) + \frac{u_i(\lambda_i, \sigma_{-i}^*) \sigma_i^*(\lambda_i) - \sigma_i^*(\lambda_i) u_i(\lambda_i, \sigma_{-i}^*) + \sigma_i(\lambda_i) \cdot \sigma_i^*(\lambda_i')}{1 - \sigma_i(\lambda_i)} \\
&\quad u_i(\lambda_i, \sigma_{-i}^*) + \sigma_i^*(\lambda_i) \cdot u_i(\sigma_i, \sigma_{-i}^*) \\
&= u_i(\sigma_i^*, \sigma_{-i}^*) + \frac{\sigma_i(\lambda_i) \sigma_i^*(\lambda_i') u_i(\lambda_i, \sigma_{-i}^*) + \sigma_i^*(\lambda_i) u_i(\sigma_i, \sigma_{-i}^*)}{1 - \sigma_i(\lambda_i)} \\
&> u_i(\sigma_i^*, \sigma_{-i}^*)
\end{aligned}$$

This contradicts our assumption that $(\sigma_i^*)_{i \in N}$ is
an MSNE. \square