

Game Theory

Q1) Given Pay-off Matrix:-

	B1	B2
A1	-1, 1	0, 0
A2	3, -3	2, -2
A3	4, -4	-1, 1

Pay off Matrix.

Observations: zero-sum game.

For utilities given in
 → The above pay-off matrix, ~~neither~~ there is NO Dominant strategy equilibrium since, there ~~is~~ is no ~~dominant~~ ~~strongly~~ or even weakly or very weakly dominating strategy for either row player or column player.

→ Pure Mini-Max strategies:-

(*) Saddle point.

(A_2, B_2) is a pure-mini-max strategy since A_2 is the saddle point for the matrix that represents ~~the~~ row players utility alone.

	B1	B2	min of row
A1	-1	0	-1
A2	3	2	2
A3	4	-1	-1
max of col	4	2	

The row player is trying to maximize his gain while the column player is trying to minimize his loss.

Q5)

MSNE for the following game:-

		q B_1	$1-q$ B_2
p A_1		5, 3	3, 4
$1-p$ A_2		4, 5	4, 3

MSNE:-

COND 1):- $3p + 5(1-p) = 4p + 3(1-p)$

$$\Rightarrow -2p + 5 = p + 3$$

$$\boxed{p = \frac{2}{3}}$$

COND 2:-

$$5q + 3(1-q) = 4q + 4(1-q)$$

$$5q + 3 = 4$$

$$\boxed{q = \frac{1}{2}}$$

\therefore strategy for Row player: ΔS_{A0}

$$\Delta S_{\beta} = \left(\left(\frac{2}{3}, \frac{1}{3} \right), \left(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2} \right) \right)$$

Q2) Prove that every dominant strategy equilibrium of a two-player zero-sum game is a saddle point of the matrix.

Soln:-

let (s_i^*, s_j^*) be a dominant strategy equilibria.

$$\Rightarrow \therefore u_1(s_i^*, s_j) > u_1(s_i, s_j) \quad \forall i \in N \setminus i^*$$

$$\Rightarrow u_1(s_i^*, s_j) = \max_i (u_1(s_i, s_j)) \quad \forall j \in N$$

$$\Rightarrow u_1(s_i^*, s_j^*) = \max_i (u_1(s_i, s_j^*)) \rightarrow (1)$$

where (i) represents number of strategies for the row player.

Similarly,

$$u_2(s_j^*, s_j) \geq u_2(s_j, s_j) \quad \forall j \in N \setminus j^*$$

But we know,

$$u_1(s) + u_2(s) = 0.$$

$$\Rightarrow -u_2(s_j^*, s_j) < -u_2(s_j, s_j) \quad \forall j \in N \setminus j^*$$

$$\Rightarrow u_1(s_i, s_j^*) < u_1(s_i^*, s_j^*)$$

$$\Rightarrow u_1(s_i^*, s_j^*) = \min_j (u_1(s_i^*, s_j)) \rightarrow (2)$$

Since ~~eqa~~ there exists a dominant strategy equilibria

(1), (2) \Rightarrow that (s_i^*, s_j^*) are a saddle point.

it clear that

Q3) 9 P -

$$u_i(\sigma_i, \sigma_{-i}) = \sum_{s_{-i} \in S_{-i}} \sigma_i(s_i) u_i(s_i, s_{-i})$$

Solⁿ

we know that,

$$u_i(s_i, \sigma_{-i}) = \sum_{s_{-i} \in S_{-i}} \left(\prod_{j \neq i} \sigma_j(s_j) \right) u_i(s_i, s_{-i}) \quad \hookrightarrow \textcircled{1}$$

$$\Rightarrow u_i(\sigma_i, \sigma_{-i}) = \sum_{(s_1, s_2, \dots, s_N) \in S} \left(\prod_{j \in N} \sigma_j(s_j) \right) u_i(s_i, s_{-i})$$

$$= \sum_{s_1 \in S_1} \sum_{s_2 \in S_2} \dots \sum_{s_N \in S_N} \left(\prod_{j \in N} \sigma_j(s_j) \right) u_i(s_i, s_{-i})$$

$$= \sum_{s_i \in S_i} \sum_{s_{-i} \in S_{-i}} \left(\prod_{j \neq i} \sigma_j(s_j) \right) \sigma_i(s_i) u_i(s_i, s_{-i})$$

$$= \sum_{s_i \in S_i} \sigma_i(s_i) \left\{ \sum_{s_{-i} \in S_{-i}} \left(\prod_{j \neq i} \sigma_j(s_j) \right) u_i(s_i, s_{-i}) \right\}$$

From $\textcircled{1} \Rightarrow$

$$u_i(\sigma_i, \sigma_{-i}) = \sum_{s_i \in S_i} \sigma_i(s_i) u_i(s_i, \sigma_{-i}),$$

Q4) Robot Game:-

$N = \{1, 2\}$ (2 players)
(Robots)

Actions:- $\{GO, Diver\}$

Pay off - Matrix:-

	GO	DIVERT
GO	$-COC, -COC$	$0, -COC$
DIVERT	$-COC, 0$	$-COC, \underline{COC}$

Cost of Action

'GO' = 0.

Cost of Action

'DIVERT' = COC

Cost of ~~action~~

Collision = COC .

Also,

$$COC > COD$$

Check if (GO, GO) is PSNE:

$$U_1(GO, GO) = -COC$$

$$U_1(DIVERT, GO) = -COC$$

$$U_1(GO, GO) < U_1(DIVERT, GO) \Rightarrow \text{NOT PSNE.}$$

But $(GO, DIVERT)$:-

$$U_1(GO, DIVERT) > U_1(DIVERT, DIVERT) \quad \&$$

$$U_2(GO, DIVERT) > U_2(DIVERT, GO)$$

$\therefore (GO, DIVERT)$ is a PSNE.

For $(DIVERT, DIVERT)$:-

For $(DIVERT, DIVERT)$:-

$$U_2(DIVERT, DIVERT) < U_2(DIVERT, GO)$$

\therefore NOT PSNE.

Utilities are symmetric

Therefore PSNEs

for the Robots are

$(GO, DIVERT), (DIVERT, GO)$