

**Question:** Prove that the result of iterated elimination of strictly dominated strategies (that is, the set of strategies remaining after the elimination process has been completed) is independent of the order of elimination.

*Proof.* Let  $G = \langle N, \{S_i\}_{i \in N}, \{u_i\}_{i \in N} \rangle$  be a strategic form game where the notations have there usual meanings. Assume for contradiction that using iterated elimination of strictly dominated strategies completely we obtain two different reduced games  $\hat{G} = \langle N, \{\hat{S}_i\}_{i \in N}, \{u_i\}_{i \in N} \rangle$  and  $\hat{\hat{G}} = \langle N, \{\hat{\hat{S}}_i\}_{i \in N}, \{u_i\}_{i \in N} \rangle$  (this means there exists  $j \in N$  such that  $\hat{S}_j \neq \hat{\hat{S}}_j$ ). Let  $k \in N$  be an agent such that  $\hat{S}_k \setminus \hat{\hat{S}}_k \neq \emptyset$  and  $s_k \in \hat{S}_k \setminus \hat{\hat{S}}_k$  be the first strategy in the set  $\cup_{i \in N} \hat{S}_i \setminus \hat{\hat{S}}_i$  that was eliminated at some stage while obtaining  $\hat{\hat{G}}$ . Since  $s_k$  was eliminated while obtaining  $\hat{\hat{G}}$ , there must be a strategy  $t_k \in S_k$  such that  $t_k$  strictly dominated  $s_k$  at that stage. We distinguish two cases:

**Case 1:**  $t_k \in \hat{S}_k$ .

Since  $\hat{G}$  cannot be further reduced, there exists a strategy-profile  $r_{-k} \in \hat{S}_{-k}$  of the other players such that

$$u_k(s_k, r_{-k}) \geq u_k(t_k, r_{-k}).$$

Since  $s_k$  was eliminated by  $t_k$  at some stage of obtaining  $\hat{\hat{G}}$ , it must be the case that at least some component of  $r_{-k}$  were not present at that stage. Let  $r_l$  be a component of  $r_{-k}$  that was not present at that stage. This means  $r_l \notin \hat{\hat{S}}_l$  and it was eliminated before  $s_k$  was eliminated. But as  $r_l \in \hat{S}_l$ , this contradicts the fact that  $s_k$  is the first strategy in the set  $\cup_{i \in N} \hat{S}_i \setminus \hat{\hat{S}}_i$  that was eliminated at some stage while obtaining  $\hat{\hat{G}}$ .

**Case 2:**  $t_k \notin \hat{S}_k$ .

Complete the proof...

