Algorithmic game theory

Martin Balko

8th lecture

November 30th 2023



Applications of regret minimization

Concluding the story of $\ensuremath{\mathsf{NE}}$

• We learned that Nash equilibria (NE) always exist.

• We learned that Nash equilibria (NE) always exist. However, there seem to be no polynomial algorithm for computing NE.

- We learned that Nash equilibria (NE) always exist. However, there seem to be no polynomial algorithm for computing NE.
- Therefore we came up with "relaxations" of NE.

- We learned that Nash equilibria (NE) always exist. However, there seem to be no polynomial algorithm for computing NE.
- Therefore we came up with "relaxations" of NE. Correlated equilibria (CE) look particularly interesting as we can compute them in polynomial time using linear programming.

- We learned that Nash equilibria (NE) always exist. However, there seem to be no polynomial algorithm for computing NE.
- Therefore we came up with "relaxations" of NE. Correlated equilibria (CE) look particularly interesting as we can compute them in polynomial time using linear programming.
- Using external regret minimization, we can apply no-regret dynamics to converge to coarse correlated equilibria (CCE).

- We learned that Nash equilibria (NE) always exist. However, there seem to be no polynomial algorithm for computing NE.
- Therefore we came up with "relaxations" of NE. Correlated equilibria (CE) look particularly interesting as we can compute them in polynomial time using linear programming.
- Using external regret minimization, we can apply no-regret dynamics to converge to coarse correlated equilibria (CCE).



- We learned that Nash equilibria (NE) always exist. However, there seem to be no polynomial algorithm for computing NE.
- Therefore we came up with "relaxations" of NE. Correlated equilibria (CE) look particularly interesting as we can compute them in polynomial time using linear programming.
- Using external regret minimization, we can apply no-regret dynamics to converge to coarse correlated equilibria (CCE).



• Today, we introduce a new notion of regret that will converge to CE.

Agent A with actions X = {1,..., N} selects a probability distribution p^t = (p₁^t,..., p_N^t) at every step t = 1,..., T.

- Agent A with actions X = {1,..., N} selects a probability distribution p^t = (p₁^t,..., p_N^t) at every step t = 1,..., T.
- After that, the adversary environment selects a loss vector $\ell^t = (\ell_1^t, \dots, \ell_N^t) \in [-1, 1]^N$ at every step $t = 1, \dots, T$.

- Agent A with actions X = {1,..., N} selects a probability distribution p^t = (p₁^t,..., p_N^t) at every step t = 1,..., T.
- After that, the adversary environment selects a loss vector $\ell^t = (\ell_1^t, \dots, \ell_N^t) \in [-1, 1]^N$ at every step $t = 1, \dots, T$.
- The agent A receives loss $\ell_A^t = \sum_{i=1}^N p_i^t \ell_i^t$ at step t.

- Agent A with actions X = {1,..., N} selects a probability distribution p^t = (p₁^t,..., p_N^t) at every step t = 1,..., T.
- After that, the adversary environment selects a loss vector $\ell^t = (\ell_1^t, \dots, \ell_N^t) \in [-1, 1]^N$ at every step $t = 1, \dots, T$.
- The agent A receives loss $\ell_A^t = \sum_{i=1}^N p_i^t \ell_i^t$ at step t. The cumulative loss of A is $L_A^T = \sum_{t=1}^T \ell_A^t$.

- Agent A with actions X = {1,..., N} selects a probability distribution p^t = (p₁^t,..., p_N^t) at every step t = 1,..., T.
- After that, the adversary environment selects a loss vector $\ell^t = (\ell_1^t, \dots, \ell_N^t) \in [-1, 1]^N$ at every step $t = 1, \dots, T$.
- The agent A receives loss $\ell_A^t = \sum_{i=1}^N p_i^t \ell_i^t$ at step t. The cumulative loss of A is $L_A^T = \sum_{t=1}^T \ell_A^t$. The cumulative loss of i is $L_i^T = \sum_{t=1}^T \ell_i^t$.

- Agent A with actions X = {1,..., N} selects a probability distribution p^t = (p₁^t,..., p_N^t) at every step t = 1,..., T.
- After that, the adversary environment selects a loss vector $\ell^t = (\ell_1^t, \dots, \ell_N^t) \in [-1, 1]^N$ at every step $t = 1, \dots, T$.
- The agent A receives loss $\ell_A^t = \sum_{i=1}^N p_i^t \ell_i^t$ at step t. The cumulative loss of A is $L_A^T = \sum_{t=1}^T \ell_A^t$. The cumulative loss of *i* is $L_i^T = \sum_{t=1}^T \ell_i^t$.
- Given a comparison class A_X of agents A_i that select a single action i in all steps, we let L^T_{min} = min_{i∈X} {L^T_{Ai}} be the minimum cumulative loss of an agent from A_X.

Weather	***	***	*	***	Loss
Algorithm	1			5	1
Umbrella	5	1	5	5	1
Sunscreen					3

- Agent A with actions X = {1,..., N} selects a probability distribution p^t = (p₁^t,..., p_N^t) at every step t = 1,..., T.
- After that, the adversary environment selects a loss vector $\ell^t = (\ell_1^t, \dots, \ell_N^t) \in [-1, 1]^N$ at every step $t = 1, \dots, T$.
- The agent A receives loss $\ell_A^t = \sum_{i=1}^N p_i^t \ell_i^t$ at step t. The cumulative loss of A is $L_A^T = \sum_{t=1}^T \ell_A^t$. The cumulative loss of *i* is $L_i^T = \sum_{t=1}^T \ell_i^t$.
- Given a comparison class A_X of agents A_i that select a single action i in all steps, we let L^T_{min} = min_{i∈X} {L^T_{Ai}} be the minimum cumulative loss of an agent from A_X.

Weather	***	***	*	***	Loss
Algorithm	1			5	1
Umbrella	5	1	5	5	1
Sunscreen					3

• Our goal is to minimize the external regret $R_A^T = L_A^T - L_{min}^T$.

• Using swap regret instead of external regret, we get:

• Using swap regret instead of external regret, we get:

Algorithm 0.3: NO-SWAP-REGRET DYNAMICS(G, T, ε)

Input : A normal-form game G = (P, A, C) of *n* players, $T \in \mathbb{N}$, and $\varepsilon > 0$. Output : A prob. distribution p_i^t on A_i for each $i \in P$ and $t \in \{1, \ldots, T\}$. for every step $t = 1, \ldots, T$

 $\mathbf{do} \begin{cases} \text{Each player } i \in P \text{ independently chooses a mixed strategy } p_i^t \\ \text{using an algorithm with average swap regret at most } \varepsilon, \text{ with actions corresponding to pure strategies.} \\ \text{Each player } i \in P \text{ receives a loss vector } \ell_i^t = (\ell_i^t(a_i))_{a_i \in A_i}, \text{ where } \\ \ell_i^t(a_i) \leftarrow \mathbb{E}_{a_{-i}^t \sim p_{-i}^t}[C_i(a_i; a_{-i}^t)] \text{ for the product distribution } \\ p_{-i}^t = \prod_{j \neq i} p_j^t. \end{cases}$ Output $\{p^t: t \in \{1, \ldots, T\}\}.$

• Using swap regret instead of external regret, we get:

Algorithm 0.4: NO-SWAP-REGRET DYNAMICS(G, T, ε)

Input : A normal-form game G = (P, A, C) of *n* players, $T \in \mathbb{N}$, and $\varepsilon > 0$. *Output* : A prob. distribution p_i^t on A_i for each $i \in P$ and $t \in \{1, \ldots, T\}$. for every step $t = 1, \ldots, T$

- $\mathbf{do} \begin{cases} \text{Each player } i \in P \text{ independently chooses a mixed strategy } p_i^t \\ \text{using an algorithm with average swap regret at most } \varepsilon, \text{ with actions corresponding to pure strategies.} \\ \text{Each player } i \in P \text{ receives a loss vector } \ell_i^t = (\ell_i^t(a_i))_{a_i \in A_i}, \text{ where } \\ \ell_i^t(a_i) \leftarrow \mathbb{E}_{a_{-i}^t \sim p_{-i}^t}[C_i(a_i; a_{-i}^t)] \text{ for the product distribution } \\ p_{-i}^t = \prod_{j \neq i} p_j^t. \end{cases}$ Output $\{p^t : t \in \{1, ..., T\}\}.$
- No-swap-regret dynamics then converges to a correlated equilibrium.

• In normal-form games, players act simultaneously resulting in a static description of a game.

- In normal-form games, players act simultaneously resulting in a static description of a game.
- Today, we describe a different representation of games which provides a dynamic description where players act sequentially.

- In normal-form games, players act simultaneously resulting in a static description of a game.
- Today, we describe a different representation of games which provides a dynamic description where players act sequentially.
- Instead of tables, we describe games using trees.



Zdroj: https://cz.pinterest.com

- In normal-form games, players act simultaneously resulting in a static description of a game.
- Today, we describe a different representation of games which provides a dynamic description where players act sequentially.
- Instead of tables, we describe games using trees.



Zdroj: https://cz.pinterest.com

• For some of these games, we show how to compute NE.

Example: normal-form of chess

Example: normal-form of chess



Source: https://edition.cnn.com/

 Chess as a normal-form game: Each action of player *i* ∈ {black, white} is a list of all possible situations that can happen on the board together with the move player *i* would make in that situation. Then we can simulate the whole game of chess in one round.

Example: extensive form of chess

Example: extensive form of chess

• Root corresponds to the initial position of the chessboard. Each decision node represents a position on the chessboard and its outgoing edges correspond to possible moves in such a position.





Example

 An example of an imperfect-information game in extensive form (part (a)) and its normal-form (part (b)).



Example: Prisoner's dilemma

Example: Prisoner's dilemma

Prisoner's dilemma in extensive form (part (a)) and its normal-form (part (b)).



• We have two players with a six-shot revolver containing a single bullet. Each player has two moves: shoot or give up. If player gives up, he loses the game immediately. If he shoots, then he either dies or survives, in which case the other player is on turn.



Source: https://www.memedroid.com/

• We have two players with a six-shot revolver containing a single bullet. Each player has two moves: shoot or give up. If player gives up, he loses the game immediately. If he shoots, then he either dies or survives, in which case the other player is on turn.





• Consider that player 1 has payoffs (10, 2, 1) for (Win, Loss, Death) and that player 2 has payoffs (10, 0, 0).

• The Russian roulette in the extensive form using the random player.





Source: https://twitter.com/curiosite12



Source: https://twitter.com/curiosite12

Thank you for your attention.