

Question 1: Nash Equilibrium with Stochastic Choice

(i) We have to show that

$$\sigma_i \text{ admits an APU representation} \implies \sigma_i \text{ satisfies Ordinal IIA.}$$

First, note that for any finite set S_i , $\Delta_i(S_i)$ is a compact and convex subset of the Euclidean space.

Second, the objective function

$$F(p_i(s_{i,1}), \dots, p_i(s_{i,|S_i|})) = \sum_{s_i \in S_i} p_i(s_i) u_i(s_i) - c_i(p_i(s_i))$$

is continuous and strictly concave: the first term of the summand is linear while the second term is strictly concave since $c_i(p_i(s_i))$ is strictly convex.

Hence

$$\arg \max_{p_i} F(p_i(s_{i,1}), \dots, p_i(s_{i,|S_i|}))$$

is a singleton and is characterised by the first order condition (since c_i is continuously differentiable):

$$u_i(s_i) - c'_i(\sigma_i(s_i|S_i)) = 0 \quad \forall s_i \in S_i.$$

Then for any $s_i, s'_i \in S_i \cap S'_i$, we have

$$c'_i(\sigma_i(s_i|S_i)) - c'_i(\sigma_i(s_i|S'_i)) = c'_i(\sigma_i(s'_i|S_i)) - c'_i(\sigma_i(s'_i|S'_i)) = 0$$

which implies

$$c'_i(\sigma_i(s_i|S_i)) - c'_i(\sigma_i(s'_i|S_i)) = c'_i(\sigma_i(s_i|S'_i)) - c'_i(\sigma_i(s'_i|S'_i))$$

Composing by the exponential function, we have:

$$\frac{\exp(c'_i(\sigma_i(s_i|S_i)))}{\exp(c'_i(\sigma_i(s'_i|S_i)))} = \frac{\exp(c'_i(\sigma_i(s_i|S'_i)))}{\exp(c'_i(\sigma_i(s'_i|S'_i)))}$$

Then, defining $\phi := \exp \circ c'_i$ we have

$$\frac{\phi(\sigma_i(s_i|S_i))}{\phi(\sigma_i(s'_i|S_i))} = \frac{\phi(\sigma_i(s_i|S'_i))}{\phi(\sigma_i(s'_i|S'_i))}.$$

It just remains to show that ϕ satisfies the stated conditions.

- $\phi(0) = \lim_{x \rightarrow 0} \exp(c'_i(x)) = 0$ and it is clearly non-negative;
- ϕ is continuous since it is the composition of two continuous functions (c_i is continuously differentiable by assumption).
- Finally, since $c'(x)$ is strictly increasing since it is continuous and c is convex. Moreover, \exp is also strictly increasing.

Hence we proved that σ_i satisfies Ordinal IIA.

- (ii) Define the auxiliary game $\tilde{\Gamma} := \langle I, \Sigma, \tilde{u} \rangle$ where $\Sigma = \times_{i \in I} \Sigma_i$ and $\Sigma_i = \Delta(S_i)$. Moreover, Σ_i is a compact and convex subset of the Euclidean space $\mathbb{R}^{|S_i|}$ since S_i is assumed to be finite. The utility function \tilde{u}_i is defined as

$$\tilde{u}_i := \sum_{s_i \in S_i} \sum_{s_{-i} \in S_{-i}} \sigma_i(s_i) \sigma_{-i}(s_{-i}) u_i(s_i, s_{-i}) - \sum_{s_i \in S_i} c_i(\sigma_i(s_i)).$$

Clearly \tilde{u} is continuous in σ (it is linear) and concave in σ_i by the convexity of c_i . Thus u_i is quasi-concave in σ_i . The requirements of Theorem 3, page 21 of the Game theory lecture notes by Kartik, are satisfied. There exists a PSNE of $\tilde{\Gamma}$.

Let such a PSNE be $p^* = (p_i^*)_{i \in I}$ i.e. $\forall i \in I$

$$p_i^* \in \arg \max_{p_i \in \Sigma_i} u_i(p_i, p_{-i}^*) - \sum_{s_i \in S_i} c_i(\sigma_i^*(s_i)).$$

Hence p^* is an NE with APU of the APU game.

- (iii) What can we say about the set of Nash equilibrium with additive perturbed utility of when $u_i(1, 1)$ increases?

To answer this question, we apply Corollary 2 from lecture notes 14. on Monotone Comparative Statics in Games, which states the following:

Corollary 2: Let $\Gamma = \langle I, X, u^* \rangle$ and $\tilde{\Gamma} = \langle I, \tilde{X}, \tilde{u}^* \rangle$ be two normal-form games such that, for each $i \in I$,

- (a) X_i, \tilde{X}_i are compact, complete sublattices of an Euclidean space, such that $\tilde{X}_i \geq_{ss} X_i$,
- (b) u_i^*, \tilde{u}_i^* are continuous and quasisupermodular, and
- (c) \tilde{u}_i^* single-crossing dominates u_i^*

then

- the set of Nash equilibria of each game is a nonempty complete lattice,
- the largest (smallest) Nash equilibrium of $\tilde{\Gamma}$ is greater than the largest (smallest) Nash equilibrium of Γ .

In our case, the two games are given by $\Gamma = \langle I, X, u \rangle$ and $\tilde{\Gamma} = \langle I, X, \tilde{u} \rangle$, where $\tilde{\Gamma}$ is the game with the increased payoff for player i when $(1, 1)$ is played. X_i is the set of mixed strategies for player i . In our case, a mixed strategy is completely characterized by a number in $[0, 1]$, hence $\sigma_i \in X_i = [0, 1]$, the probability with which action 1 is played. Clearly, X_i compact. Moreover, it is also a complete sublattice of \mathbb{R} . Finally, $X_i \geq_{ss} X_i$ holds trivially. Thus, we have that the first set of conditions on the set of strategies are fulfilled.

Denote the strategies of i and j by $p = \sigma_i$ and $q = \sigma_j$. Then, we can write u_i^*, \tilde{u}_i^* as follows:

$$u_i^*(p, q) = pq u_i(1, 1) + (1 - p)q u_i(0, 1) + p(1 - q) u_i(1, 0) + (1 - p)(1 - q) u_i(0, 0) - (c_i(p) + c_i(1 - p)) \quad (1)$$

$$\tilde{u}_i^*(p, q) = pq \tilde{u}_i(1, 1) + (1 - p)q \tilde{u}_i(0, 1) + p(1 - q) \tilde{u}_i(1, 0) + (1 - p)(1 - q) \tilde{u}_i(0, 0) - (c_i(p) + c_i(1 - p)) \quad (2)$$

Thus, we also have that u_i^* and \tilde{u}_i^* are linear in σ^1 and thus continuous.

¹This follows from the fact that u_i^* and \tilde{u}_i^* are linear in p and q .

For quasimodularity, we use the equivalence $f \in C^2$ in $y \in Y$, then f is supermodular in y if and only if $\frac{\partial^2}{\partial y_i \partial y_j} f \geq 0, \forall i \neq j$ and the fact that supermodularity implies quasisupermodularity. In particular,

$$\frac{\partial^2 u_i^*(p, q)}{\partial y_i \partial y_j} = \underbrace{u_i(1, 1) - u_i(0, 1)}_{>0} + \underbrace{u_i(0, 0) - u_i(1, 0)}_{>0}$$

Note that the inequalities above come from the matching assumptions in the question. Thus, u_i^* is supermodular $\implies u_i^*$ is quasisupermodular. And following the same logic, \tilde{u}_i^* is quasisupermodular.

Lastly, we need to show that \tilde{u}_i^* single-crossing dominates u_i^* . Note that \tilde{u}_i differs from u_i in that $\tilde{u}_i(1, 1) > u_i(1, 1)$. Then using (1) and (2), we can rewrite $\tilde{u}_i^*(p, q) = u_i^*(p, q) - pq u_i(1, 1) + pq \tilde{u}_i(1, 1)$. Then for any given (p', q') s.t. $(p', q') \geq (p, q)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{u}_i^*(p', q') - \tilde{u}_i^*(p, q) &= u_i^*(p', q') - p' q' u_i(1, 1) + p' q' \tilde{u}_i(1, 1) - u_i^*(p, q) + pq u_i(1, 1) - pq \tilde{u}_i(1, 1) \\ &= u_i^*(p', q') - u_i^*(p, q) + \left(\underbrace{\tilde{u}_i(1, 1) - u_i(1, 1)}_{>0} \right) \underbrace{(p' q' - pq)}_{\geq 0} \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

Clearly, $\tilde{u}_i^*(p', q') - \tilde{u}_i^*(p, q) > (\geq) 0$ if $u_i^*(p', q') - u_i^*(p, q) > (\geq) 0$ and we have shown that \tilde{u}_i^* single-crossing dominates u_i^* . Therefore, we fulfill all the requirements of Corollary 2 and thus can apply it to obtain that the largest (smallest) Nash equilibrium of $\tilde{\Gamma}$ is greater than the largest (smallest) Nash equilibrium of Γ . Thus, we have that set of NE of the game $\tilde{\Gamma}$ weak set dominates the set of NE of the game Γ .

- (iv) First, note that since $c_i : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is continuous, $c_i([0, 1])$ is a compact subset of \mathbb{R} which implies that there is an $A, B \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $A \leq c_i(x) \leq B$ for any $x \in [0, 1]$ and any $i \in I$.