



2-3-BoS-Computation

2020年6月6日 星期六 下午2:39



2-3-BoS-
Comput...



Game Theory Online

strategies
zero-sum
probability

Computing Mixed Nash Equilibrium (I)

Game Theory Course:
Jackson, Leyton-Brown & Shoham

Game Theory Course: Jackson, Leyton-Brown & ShohamComputing Mixed Nash Equilibrium (I)

Computing Mixed Nash Equilibria

Battle of the Sexes

B

F

B

2, 1

0, 0

F

0, 0

1, 2

all of actions

- It's hard in general to compute Nash equilibria, but it's easy when you can guess the **support** *set of actions*
- For BoS, let's look for an equilibrium where **all actions** are part of the support

Game Theory Course: Jackson, Leyton-Brown & ShohamComputing Mixed Nash Equilibrium (I)

Computing Mixed Nash Equilibria

Battle of the Sexes

B

F

B

2, 1

0, 0

F

0, 0

1, 2

p $1-p$

- Let player 2 play B with p , F with $1 - p$.
- If player 1 best-responds with a mixed strategy, player 2 must make him indifferent between F and B (why?)
play. b. F sometimes \rightarrow B \rightarrow indifference.
EX. ② Better more u on B, less utility on F \rightarrow F utility = 0

Game Theory Course: Jackson, Leyton-Brown & ShohamComputing Mixed Nash Equilibrium (I)

Computing Mixed Nash Equilibria

Battle of the Sexes

B

F

B

2, 1

0, 0

F

0, 0

1, 2

p $1-p$ *randomize*

0 \rightarrow

$2p + 0(1 - p) = 0p + 1(1 - p)$
 $p = \frac{1}{3}$

- Let player 2 play B with p , F with $1 - p$.
- If player 1 best-responds with a mixed strategy, player 2 must make him indifferent between F and B (why?)
given 2 (p, 1-p)
u1(B) - player 1 response with B
u1(F) - player 1 response with F

Game Theory Course: Jackson, Leyton-Brown & ShohamComputing Mixed Nash Equilibrium (I)

Computing Mixed Nash Equilibria

Battle of the Sexes

B

F

B

2, 1

0, 0

F

0, 0

1, 2

- Likewise, **player 1** must **randomize** to make **player 2** indifferent.
 - Why is player 1 willing to randomize?

Game Theory Course: Jackson, Leyton-Brown & ShohamComputing Mixed Nash Equilibrium (I)

Computing Mixed Nash Equilibria

Battle of the Sexes

B

F

B

2, 1

0, 0

F

0, 0

1, 2

q $1-q$ *randomize*

- Likewise, player 1 must randomize to make player 2 indifferent.
 - Why is player 1 willing to randomize?
- Let player 1 play B with q , F with $1 - q$.
given (q, 1-q)
 $u_2(B) = u_2(F)$
 $q + 0(1 - q) = 0q + 2(1 - q)$
 $q = \frac{2}{3}$
- Thus the mixed strategies $(\frac{2}{3}, \frac{1}{3})$, $(\frac{1}{3}, \frac{2}{3})$ are a Nash equilibrium.
① ② this way \rightarrow make other NE.

Game Theory Course: Jackson, Leyton-Brown & ShohamComputing Mixed Nash Equilibrium (I)

Interpreting Mixed Strategy Equilibria

What does it mean to play a mixed strategy? Different interpretations:

- Randomize to **confuse** your opponent
 - consider the matching pennies example
- Randomize when **uncertain** about the other's action
 - consider battle of the sexes - diff. preference
- Mixed strategies are a concise description of what might happen in **repeated play**: count of pure strategies in the limit
proportion \rightarrow sampling population
- Mixed strategies describe **population dynamics**: 2 agents chosen from a population, all having deterministic strategies. MS gives the probability of getting each PS.

Game Theory Online

strategies
zero-sum
probability

Game Theory Course: Jackson, Leyton-Brown & Shoham

Computing Mixed Nash Equilibrium (I)

B

F

B

2, 1

0, 0

F

0, 0

1, 2

q $1-q$

① ② this way \rightarrow make other NE.
③ different \rightarrow MS.