# SF2972 GAME THEORY

Jonas Sjöstrand, Mark Voorneveld and Jörgen Weibull Lecture 1: Jörgen Weibull

January 18, 2011

## 1 What is game theory?

A mathematically formalized theory of strategic interaction between

- countries at war and peace, in federations and international negotiations
- political candidates and parties competing for power
- firms in markets, owners and managers, employers and trade-unions
- members of communities with a common pool of resources
- family members and generations who care about each other's well-being
- animals within the same species, from different species, plants, cells
- agents in networks: computers, cell phones, vehicles in traffic systems

## 2 A brief history of game theory

- Emile Borel (1920s): Small zero-sum games
- John von Neumann (1928): the Maxmin Theorem
- von Neumann and Oskar Morgenstern (1944): *Games and Economic Behavior*
- John Nash (1950): Non-cooperative equilibrium ["A Beautiful Mind"]
- John Harsanyi (1960s): Incomplete information
- John Maynard Smith (1970s): Evolutionary stability

## **3** Two interpretations of game theory

John Nash's Ph D thesis, Department of Mathematics, Princeton, 1950.

### 3.1 The rationalistic interpretation

- 1. The players interact exactly once
- 2. The players are fully *rational*
- 3. Each player *knows the game* in question and *knows that all players are rational*

### 3.2 The mass-action interpretation

- 1. For each player role in the game: a large population of identical individuals
- 2. The game is recurrently played, each time by randomly drawn individuals, one from each player population
- 3. Individuals need not be rational, need not know the game, but individuals learn from own and others' experience (in the same player populatioon) to avoid poorly performing strategies

### 3.3 Nash equilibrium

**Definition**: A *Nash equilibrium* is a strategy profile such that if you expect the others to play according to it, then you cannot increase your own payoff by unilaterally changing your strategy.

**Q:** In the rationalistic and/or mass-action interpretation: will players necessarily play a Nash equilibrium?

## 3.4 Examples

A coordination game: 
$$\begin{array}{ccc} A & B \\ 2,2 & 0,0 \\ B & 0,0 & 1,1 \end{array}$$
  
The matching-pennies game: 
$$\begin{array}{ccc} H & T \\ 1,-1 & -1,1 \\ T & -1,1 & 1,-1 \end{array}$$

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} L & C & R \\ T & 7,0 & 2,5 & 0,7 \\ M & 5,2 & 3,3 & 5,2 \\ B & 0,7 & 2,5 & 7,0 \end{array}$$

## 4 Key concepts in game theory

- 1. strategy
- 2. normal (or strategic) form, extensive form
- 3. payoff function
- 4. Nash equilibrium
- 5. dominance
- 6. rationalizability

- 7. evolutionary stability
- 8. subgame-perfection
- 9. sequential equilibrium
- 10. perfect Bayesian equilibrium

## 5 This course

Purpose: to introduce key concepts, tools and results

Main themes: classical game theory and combinatorial game theory

Rough outline:

- 1. Introduction (today)
- 2. Normal-form (strategic-form) analysis (Jörgen)
- 3. Extensive-form analysis (Mark)
- 4. Combinatorial game theory (Jonas)

### 5.1 Readings

- 1. "A Course in Game Theory" by Martin Osborne and Ariel Rubinstein (available electronically on AR's home page)
- 2. "On Numbers and Games", by John Conway (two almost identical editions)
- "Winning Ways, Volumes 1-4" (available electronically at KTHB. Vol 1 fun to have).

### 5.2 Examination

Take-home exercises and a written exam

## **6** Simple applications of game theory

#### 6.1 Natural resources

- Two fishermen, fishing in the same area
- Each fisherman can either fish modestly, M, or aggressively, A. The profits are

$$egin{array}{cccc} M & A \ M & {f 3}, {f 3} & {f 1}, {f 4} \ A & {f 4}, {f 1} & {f 2}, {f 2} \end{array}$$

• Both prefer (M, M), and both dislike (A, A)

- If each of them strives to maximize his or her profit, and they are both rational: (A, A)
- Unregulated competition leads to over-exploitation
- Adam Smith's "invisible hand" fails
- This game is called a *Prisoners' Dilemma*, where *M* is to *cooperate*, *D* to *defect*

#### 6.2 Market competition

- *n* firms competing in a homogeneous product market
- All firms simultaneously select output levels  $q_1, q_2, ..., q_n$
- Let  $Q = q_1 + \dots q_n$
- $\bullet$  The market clears at a price p such that

$$D(p) = Q$$



- Suppose you are the manager of firm *i*, that all firms have the same production costs, and the managers of all firms are rational profitmaximers who know that the others are rational too.
- What level of output,  $q_i$ , would you choose?

• Solution in the case of duopoly, n = 2:



• Cournot 1839

#### 6.3 Partnerships

- Business partners, or pair of students writing an essay at KTH
- Each partner has to choose between W ("work") and S ("shirk")
  - If both choose W: expected gain to both
  - If one chooses W and the other S: *loss* to the first and *gain* to the second
  - If both choose S: expected heavy loss to both

$$egin{array}{ccc} W & S \ W & {f 3}, {f 3} & -1, {f 4} \ S & {f 4}, -1 & -2, -2 \end{array}$$

• This is **not** a Prisoners' Dilemma: S does *not dominate* D: it is (after all) better to "work" if the other "shirks"

- If you were one of the two individuals, what would expect from the other, what would you do?
- In a large population, with random matching, would (W, W) be a stable outcome? Would (S, S)?

## 7 Mathematics

### 7.1 Notation and tools

- 1. Useful sets:  $\mathbb N$  the positive integers,  $\mathbb R$  the reals,  $\mathbb R_+$  the non-negative reals
- 2. **Definition**: Upper-contour sets for a function  $f : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$

$$\{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : f(x) \ge \alpha\}$$

3. Definition: Convex sets  $X \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ 

$$x, y \in X \Rightarrow \lambda x + (1 - \lambda) y \in X \quad \forall \lambda \in [0, 1]$$

- 4. **Definition**: A function  $f : X \to \mathbb{R}$  with convex domain X, is *quasi-concave* if all its upper contour-sets are convex
- 5. Notation: Given a function  $f: X \to \mathbb{R}$ :

$$\arg\max_{x\in X} f(x) = \{x^* \in X : f(x^*) \ge f(x) \ \forall x \in X\}$$

6. Definition: A correspondence  $\varphi$  from a set X to a set Y, written

$$\varphi:X\rightrightarrows Y$$

is a function that assigns a *non-empty set*  $\varphi(x) \subset Y$  to each  $x \in X$ 

#### 7.2 Theorems

**Definition:** A set  $X \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  is *compact* if it is closed and bounded.

**Theorem 7.1 (Weierstrass' Maxium Theorem)** If  $X \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  is non-empty and compact, and  $f : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$  is continuous, then also  $\arg \max_{x \in X} f(x)$ is non-empty and compact.

**Definition**: For any set X and function  $f : X \to X$ ,  $x \in X$  is a *fixed point* if f(x) = x.

**Theorem 7.2 (Brouwer's Fixed-Point Theorem)** If  $X \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  is non-empty, compact and convex, and  $f : X \to X$  is continuous, then there exists at least one fixed point.