

# Prediction and Playing Games

Vineel Pratap  
vineel@eng.ucsd.edu

February 20, 2014

Chapter 7 : Prediction, Learning and Games - Cesa Binachi & Lugosi

# K-Person Normal Form Games

- ▶ Each player  $k$  ( $k = 1, \dots, K$ ) has  $N_k$  possible actions -  
 $i_k \in 1, \dots, N_k$
- ▶  $K$ -tuple of all the players' actions  
 $\mathbf{i} = (i_1, \dots, i_K) \in \bigotimes_{k=1}^K \{1, \dots, N_k\}$
- ▶ Loss suffered by player  $k$  is  $\ell^{(k)}$ , where  $\ell^{(k)} : \mathbf{i} \rightarrow [0, 1]$

## Mixed strategy

- ▶ Mixed strategy for player  $k$  is a probability distribution  $\mathbf{p}^k = (p_1^{(k)}, \dots, p_{N_k}^{(k)})$
- ▶ Action played by player  $k$ ,  $I^{(k)}$  is a random variable taking values in the set  $\{1, \dots, N_k\}$  according to the distribution  $\mathbf{p}^{(k)}$
- ▶  $K$ -tuple of actions played by all players,  $\mathbf{I} = (I^{(1)}, \dots, I^{(K)})$
- ▶ Mixed strategy profile,

$$\pi(\mathbf{i}) = \mathbb{P}[\mathbf{I} = \mathbf{i}] = p_{i_1}^{(1)} \times \dots \times p_{i_K}^{(K)}$$

for all  $\mathbf{i} = (i_1, \dots, i_K) \in \bigotimes_{k=1}^K \{1, \dots, N_k\}$

# Nash Equilibrium

- ▶ The expected loss of player is

$$\begin{aligned}\pi \ell^{(k)} &\equiv \mathbb{E} \ell^{(k)}(\mathbf{I}) \\ &= \sum_{i_1=1}^{N_1} \dots \sum_{i_K=1}^{N_K} p_{i_1}^{(1)} \times \dots \times p_{i_K}^{(K)} \ell^{(k)}(i_1, \dots, i_K)\end{aligned}$$

- ▶ A mixed strategy profile  $\pi = \mathbf{p}^{(1)} \times \dots \times \mathbf{p}^{(K)}$  is called a Nash Equilibrium if

$$\pi \ell^k \leq \pi'_k \ell^k$$

for all  $k = 1, \dots, K$  and mixed strategies  $\mathbf{q}^{(k)}$ ,

$$\pi'_k = \mathbf{p}^{(1)} \times \dots \times \mathbf{q}^{(k)} \times \dots \times \mathbf{p}^{(K)}$$

- ▶ **Nash Theorem** : Every finite game has a mixed strategy Nash equilibrium

## Two-Person Zero-Sum Games

- ▶ For each pair of actions  $\mathbf{i} = (i_1, i_2)$ , where  $i_1 \in \{1, \dots, N_1\}$  and  $i_2 \in \{1, \dots, N_2\}$ , the losses of the two players satisfy

$$\ell^{(1)}(\mathbf{i}) = -\ell^{(2)}(\mathbf{i})$$

- ▶ Simplifying notation - replace  $\ell^{(1)}$ ,  $N_1$ ,  $N_2$  by  $\ell$ ,  $N$ ,  $M$
- ▶ Mixed strategy profile  $\pi = \mathbf{p} \times \mathbf{q}$ , where  $\mathbf{p} = (p_1, \dots, p_N)$  and  $\mathbf{q} = (q_1, \dots, q_M)$ , is a Nash equilibrium if and only if for all  $\mathbf{p}' = (p'_1, \dots, p'_N)$  and  $\mathbf{q}' = (q'_1, \dots, q'_M)$ ,

$$\sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^M p_i q'_j \ell(i, j) \leq \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^M p_i q_j \ell(i, j) \leq \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^M p'_i q_j \ell(i, j)$$

## Two-Person Zero-Sum Games

- ▶ Introduce notation  $\bar{\ell}(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q}) = \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^M p_i q_j \ell(i, j)$

$$\max_{\mathbf{q}'} \bar{\ell}(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q}') = \bar{\ell}(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q}) = \min_{\mathbf{p}'} \bar{\ell}(\mathbf{p}', \mathbf{q})$$

$$\max_{\mathbf{q}'} \bar{\ell}(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q}') \leq \max_{\mathbf{q}'} \min_{\mathbf{p}'} \bar{\ell}(\mathbf{p}', \mathbf{q}')$$

$$\min_{\mathbf{p}'} \max_{\mathbf{q}'} \bar{\ell}(\mathbf{p}', \mathbf{q}') \leq \max_{\mathbf{q}'} \min_{\mathbf{p}'} \bar{\ell}(\mathbf{p}', \mathbf{q}') \rightarrow (1)$$

- ▶ Also, for all  $\mathbf{p}$  and  $\mathbf{q}'$ ,  $\bar{\ell}(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q}') \geq \min_{\mathbf{p}'} \bar{\ell}(\mathbf{p}', \mathbf{q}')$

$$\max_{\mathbf{q}'} \bar{\ell}(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q}') \geq \max_{\mathbf{q}'} \min_{\mathbf{p}'} \bar{\ell}(\mathbf{p}', \mathbf{q}') \text{ for all } \mathbf{p}$$

$$\min_{\mathbf{p}'} \max_{\mathbf{q}'} \bar{\ell}(\mathbf{p}', \mathbf{q}') \geq \max_{\mathbf{q}'} \min_{\mathbf{p}'} \bar{\ell}(\mathbf{p}', \mathbf{q}') \rightarrow (2)$$

## von Neumann's minimax theorem

- ▶ From (1) & (2), the existence of Nash equilibrium  $\mathbf{p} \times \mathbf{q}$  implies that

$$\min_{\mathbf{p}'} \max_{\mathbf{q}'} \bar{\ell}(\mathbf{p}', \mathbf{q}') = \max_{\mathbf{q}'} \min_{\mathbf{p}'} \bar{\ell}(\mathbf{p}', \mathbf{q}')$$

- ▶ The common value is called the value of the game,  $V$
- ▶ Nash equilibrium,  $\mathbf{p} \times \mathbf{q} \Leftrightarrow \bar{\ell}(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q}) = V$

*"As far as I can see, there could be no theory of games ... without that theorem ... I thought there was nothing worth publishing until the Minimax Theorem was proved" - John von Neumann, 1928*

## Correlated Equilibrium

A probability distribution  $P$  over the set  $\bigotimes_{k=1}^K \{1, \dots, N_k\}$  of all possible  $K$ -tuples of actions is called a correlated equilibrium if for all  $k = 1, \dots, K$ ,

$$\mathbb{E} \ell^{(k)}(\mathbf{I}) \leq \mathbb{E} \ell^{(k)}(\mathbf{I}^-, \tilde{I}^{(k)}),$$

where the r.v.  $\mathbf{I} = (I^{(1)}, \dots, I^{(K)})$  is distributed according to  $P$  and  $(\mathbf{I}^-, \tilde{I}^{(k)}) = (I^{(1)}, \dots, I^{(k-1)}, \tilde{I}^{(k)}, I^{(k+1)}, \dots, I^{(K)})$ , where  $\tilde{I}^{(k)}$  is an arbitrary  $\{1, \dots, N_k\}$ -valued r.v. that is a function of  $I^{(k)}$



## Correlated Equilibrium

**Lemma:** A probability distribution  $P$  over the set of all  $K$ -tuples  $\mathbf{i} = (i_1, \dots, i_K)$  of actions is a correlated equilibrium if and only if, for every player  $k \in \{1, \dots, K\}$  and actions  $j, j' \in \{1, \dots, N_k\}$ , we have

$$\sum_{\mathbf{i}: i_k=j} P(\mathbf{i}) (\ell^{(k)}(\mathbf{i}) - \ell^{(k)}(\mathbf{i}^-, j')) \leq 0$$

where  $(\mathbf{i}^-, j') = (i_1, \dots, i_{k-1}, j', i_{k+1}, \dots, i_K)$ .

## Repeated Two-Player Zero-Sum Games

- ▶ At each time instant  $t = 1, 2, \dots$  player  $k$  ( $k = 1, \dots, K$ ) selects a mixed strategy  $\mathbf{p}_t^{(k)} = (p_{1,t}^{(k)}, \dots, p_{N_k,t}^{(k)})$  over the set  $1, \dots, N_k$  of his actions and draws an action  $I_t^{(k)}$  according to the distribution.
- ▶ Mixed strategy  $\mathbf{p}_t^{(k)}$  may depend on the sequence of random variables  $\mathbf{I}_1, \dots, \mathbf{I}_{t-1}$

## Repeated Two-Player Zero-Sum Games

- ▶ If all players play to keep their internal regret small, then the joint empirical frequencies of play converge to the set of correlated equilibria
- ▶ If every player uses a well-calibrated forecasting strategy to predict the  $K$ -tuple of actions  $\mathbf{I}_t$  and chooses an action that is the best reply to the forecasted distribution, the same convergence is also achieved.

## Regret based strategies

- ▶ At each round  $t$ , based on the past plays of both players, the row player chooses an action  $I_t \in \{1, \dots, N\}$  according to the mixed strategy  $\mathbf{p}_t$  and the column player chooses an action  $J_t \in \{1, \dots, M\}$  according to the mixed strategy  $\mathbf{q}_t$ .
- ▶ If the row player knew the column player's actions  $J_1, \dots, J_n$  in advance, he would choose  $I_t = \operatorname{argmin}_{i=1, \dots, N} \ell(i, J_t)$  invoking a total loss  $\sum_{t=1}^n \min_{i=1, \dots, N} \ell(i, J_t)$ .
- ▶ A meaningful objective is to minimize the difference between the row player's cumulative loss and the cumulative loss of the best constant strategy,

$$\text{minimize } \sum_{t=1}^n \ell(I_t, J_t) - \min_{i=1, \dots, N} \sum_{t=1}^n \ell(i, J_t)$$

## Hannan consistent strategy

- ▶ A strategy is Hannan consistent if the regret is  $o(1)$ , regardless of how the column player behaves.
- ▶ Assuming row player chooses his actions  $I_t$ , regardless of what the column player does,

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left( \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n \ell(I_t, J_t) - \min_{i=1, \dots, N} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n \ell(i, J_t) \right) \leq 0$$

*almost surely.*

- ▶ For example, this may be achieved by the exponentially weighted average mixed strategy

$$p_{i,t} = \frac{\exp \left( -\eta \sum_{s=1}^{t-1} \ell(i, J_s) \right)}{\sum_{k=1}^N \exp \left( -\eta \sum_{s=1}^{t-1} \ell(k, J_s) \right)} \quad i = \{1, \dots, N\}, \eta > 0$$

# Hannan consistent strategy

Notation :

$$\bar{\ell}(\mathbf{p}, j) = \sum_{i=1}^N p_i \ell(i, j) \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{\ell}(i, \mathbf{q}) = \sum_{j=1}^M q_j \ell(i, j)$$

**Theorem:** Assume that in a two-person zero-sum game the row player plays according to a Hannan-consistent strategy. Then

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n \ell(I_t, J_t) \leq V \quad \text{almost surely.}$$

Assuming Hannan consistency, it suffices to show that

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{i=1, \dots, N} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n \ell(i, J_t) &\leq V \\ \min_{i=1, \dots, N} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n \ell(i, J_t) &= \min_{\mathbf{p}} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n \bar{\ell}(\mathbf{p}, J_t) \end{aligned}$$

## Hannan consistent strategy

Then, letting  $\hat{q}_{j,n} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n \mathbb{I}_{J_t=j}$  be the empirical probability of the row player's action being  $j$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\mathbf{p}} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n \bar{\ell}(\mathbf{p}, J_t) &= \min_{\mathbf{p}} \sum_{j=1}^M \hat{q}_{j,n} \bar{\ell}(\mathbf{p}, j) \\ &= \min_{\mathbf{p}} \bar{\ell}(\mathbf{p}, \hat{\mathbf{q}}_n) \\ &\leq \max_{\mathbf{q}} \min_{\mathbf{p}} \bar{\ell}(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q}) = V. \end{aligned}$$

**Corollary** : Assume that in a two-person zero-sum game, both players play according to some Hannan consistent strategy. Then

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n \ell(I_t, J_t) = V \quad \text{almost surely.}$$