

# Algorithmic game theory – Tutorial 1\*

October 7, 2021

## 1 Nash equilibria

A *normal-form game* is a triple  $(P, A, u)$ , where  $P$  is a finite set of  $n$  *players*,  $A = A_1 \times \dots \times A_n$  is a set of *action profiles*, where  $A_i$  is a set of *actions* available to player  $i$ , and  $u = (u_1, \dots, u_n)$  is an  $n$ -tuple, where each  $u_i: A \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is the *utility function* for player  $i$ .

The set of *pure strategies* of player  $i$  is the set  $A_i$  of available actions for  $i$ . The set  $S_i$  of *mixed strategies* of player  $i$  is the set of all probability distributions on  $A_i$ . The *expected payoff* for player  $i$  of the mixed-strategy profile  $s = (s_1, \dots, s_n)$  is

$$u_i(s) = \sum_{a=(a_1, \dots, a_n) \in A} u_i(a) \prod_{j=1}^n s_j(a_j).$$

We use the notation  $s_{-i} = (s_1, \dots, s_{i-1}, s_{i+1}, \dots, s_n)$  and, for a strategy  $s'_i \in S_i$  of player  $i$ , we use  $u_i(s'_i; s_{-i})$  to denote the number  $u_i(s_1, \dots, s_{i-1}, s'_i, s_{i+1}, \dots, s_n)$ .

The *best response* of player  $i$  to the strategy profile  $s_{-i}$  is a mixed strategy  $s_i^*$  such that  $u_i(s_i^*; s_{-i}) \geq u_i(s'_i; s_{-i})$  for each strategy  $s'_i \in S_i$  of  $i$ . A *Nash equilibrium* in  $G$  is a strategy profile  $(s_1, \dots, s_n)$  such that  $s_i$  is a best response of player  $i$  to  $s_{-i}$  for every  $i \in P$ .

**Exercise 1.** Verify that the expected payoff of a mixed strategy in a normal-form game  $G = (P, A, u)$  of  $n$  players is linear. That is, prove that  $u_i(s) = \sum_{a_i \in A_i} s_i(a_i) u_i(a_i; s_{-i})$  for every player  $i \in P$  and every mixed-strategy profile  $s = (s_1, \dots, s_n)$ .

**Exercise 2.** Compute mixed Nash equilibria in the following games:

- (a) Prisoner's dilemma,
- (b) Rock-Paper-Scissors.

and formally show that no other Nash equilibria exist in these games.

**Exercise 3** (Iterated dominance equilibrium). Let  $G = (P, A, u)$  be a normal-form game of  $n$  players. For player  $i$ , we say that a strategy  $s_i \in S_i$  is strictly dominated by a strategy  $s'_i \in S_i$  if, for every  $s_{-i} \in S_{-i}$ , we have  $u_i(s_i; s_{-i}) < u_i(s'_i; s_{-i})$ . Consider the following iterated process that will help us find Nash equilibria in some games.

Set  $A_i^0 = A_i$  and  $S_i^0 = S_i$  for every player  $i \in P$ . For  $t \geq 1$  and  $i \in P$ , let  $A_i^t$  be the set of pure strategies from  $A_i^{t-1}$  that are not strictly dominated by a strategy from  $S_i^{t-1}$  and let  $S_i^t$  be the set of mixed strategies with support contained in  $A_i^t$ . Let  $T$  be the first step, when the sets  $A_i^t$  and  $S_i^t$  are no longer shrinking for any  $i \in P$ . If each player  $i \in P$  is left with one strategy  $a_i \in A_i^T$ , we call  $a_1 \times \dots \times a_n$  an iterated dominance equilibrium of  $G$ .

- (a) Show that every iterated dominance equilibrium is a Nash equilibrium.
- (b) Find an example of a two-person game in normal form game with a Nash equilibrium that is not iterated dominance equilibrium.

**Exercise 4.** Use iterated elimination of strictly dominated strategies (introduced in Exercise 3) to find the unique Nash equilibrium in the following normal-form game of 2 players (see Table 1) by first reducing the game to a  $2 \times 2$  game.

---

\*Information about the course can be found at <http://kam.mff.cuni.cz/~balko/>

	$c_1$	$c_2$	$c_3$	$c_4$
$r_1$	(5, 2)	(22, 4)	(4, 9)	(7, 6)
$r_2$	(16, 4)	(18, 5)	(1, 10)	(10, 2)
$r_3$	(15, 12)	(16, 9)	(18, 10)	(11, 3)
$r_4$	(9, 15)	(23, 9)	(11, 5)	(5, 13)

Table 1: A game from Exercise 4.