

# An Introduction to Game Theory Part II: Mixed and Correlated Strategies

Bernhard Nebel

## Randomizing Actions ...

- Since there does not seem to exist a rationale decision, it might be best to **randomize** strategies.
- Play **Head** with probability  $p$  and **Tail** with probability  $1-p$
- Switch to **expected utilities**

	Head	Tail
Head	1,-1	-1,1
Tail	-1,1	1,-1

## Some Notation

- Let  $G = (N, (A_i), (u_i))$  be a **strategic game**
- Then  $\Delta(A_i)$  shall be the set of probability distributions over  $A_i$  – the set of **mixed strategies**  $\alpha_i \in \Delta(A_i)$
- $\alpha_i(a_i)$  is the probability that  $a_i$  will be chosen in the mixed strategy  $\alpha_i$
- A profile  $\alpha = (\alpha_i)$  of mixed strategies induces a probability distribution on  $A$ :  $p(a) = \prod_i \alpha_i(a_i)$
- The expected utility is  $U_i(\alpha) = \sum_{a \in A} p(a) u_i(a)$

## Example of a Mixed Strategy

- Let
  - $\alpha_1(H) = 2/3, \alpha_1(T) = 1/3$
  - $\alpha_2(H) = 1/3, \alpha_2(T) = 2/3$
- Then
  - $p(H,H) = 2/9$
  - ...
  - $U_1(\alpha_1, \alpha_2) = ?$
  - $U_2(\alpha_1, \alpha_2) = ?$

	Head	Tail
Head	1,-1	-1,1
Tail	-1,1	1,-1

## Mixed Extensions

- The **mixed extension** of the strategic game  $(N, (A_i), (u_i))$  is the strategic game  $(N, \Delta(A_i), (U_i))$ .
- The **mixed strategy Nash equilibrium of a strategic game** is a Nash equilibrium of its mixed extension.
- Note that the **Nash equilibria in pure strategies** (as studied in the last part) are just a special case of mixed strategy equilibria.

## Nash's Theorem

**Theorem.** Every finite strategic game has a mixed strategy Nash equilibrium.

- Note that it is essential that the game is **finite**
- So, there **exists** always a solution
- What is the **computational complexity**?
- This is an open problem! **Not known** to be **NP-hard**, but there is **no known polynomial time algorithm**

## The Support

- We call all pure actions  $a_i$  that are chosen with non-zero probability by  $\alpha_i$  the **support** of the mixed strategy  $\alpha_i$

**Lemma.** Given a finite strategic game,  $\alpha^*$  is a *mixed strategy equilibrium* if and only if for every player  $i$  every pure strategy in the support of  $\alpha_i^*$  is a **best response** to  $\alpha_{-i}^*$

## Proving the Support Lemma

- Assume that  $\alpha^*$  is a **Nash equilibrium** with  $a_i$  being in its support but **not being a best response** to  $\alpha_{-i}^*$ .
- This means, by **reassigning the probability** of  $a_i$  to the other actions in the support, one can get a **higher payoff** for player  $i$ .
- This implies  $\alpha^*$  is **not a Nash equilibrium** ~ **contradiction**
- ← (Proving the contraposition): Assume that  $\alpha^*$  is **not a Nash equilibrium**.
- This means that there exists  $\alpha_i'$  that is a **better response** than  $\alpha_i^*$  to  $\alpha_{-i}^*$ .
- Then because of how  $U_i$  is computed, there must be an action  $a_i'$  in the support of  $\alpha_i'$  that is a better response (higher utility) to  $\alpha_{-i}^*$  than an action  $a_i^*$  in the support of  $\alpha_i^*$ .
- This implies that there are actions in the support of  $\alpha_i^*$  that are **not best responses** to  $\alpha_{-i}^*$ .

## Using the Support Lemma

- The **Support Lemma** can be used to characterize all Nash equilibria types in 2-person 2x2 action games.
- There are 4 potential Nash equilibria in **pure strategies**
  - ❖ Easy to check
- There are another 4 potential Nash equilibria types with a **1-support** (pure) against **2-support** mixed strategies
  - ❖ Exists only if the payoff for the mixed strategy player is identical for both pure strategies and **one of the corresponding pure strategy profiles** is already a Nash equilibrium (follows from **Support Lemma**)
- There exists one other potential Nash equilibrium type with a **2-support** against a **2-support** mixed strategy
  - ❖ Here we can use the **Support Lemma** to compute the NE (if there exists one)

## A Mixed Nash Equilibrium for Matching Pennies

	Head	Tail
Head	1, -1	-1, 1
Tail	-1, 1	1, -1

- $U_1((1,0), (\alpha_2(H), \alpha_2(T))) = U_1((0,1), (\alpha_2(H), \alpha_2(T)))$
  - $U_1((1,0), (\alpha_2(H), \alpha_2(T))) = 1\alpha_2(H) + -1\alpha_2(T)$
  - $U_1((0,1), (\alpha_2(H), \alpha_2(T))) = -1\alpha_2(H) + 1\alpha_2(T)$
  - $\alpha_2(H) - \alpha_2(T) = -\alpha_2(H) + \alpha_2(T)$
  - $2\alpha_2(H) = 2\alpha_2(T)$
  - $\alpha_2(H) = \alpha_2(T)$
  - Because of  $\alpha_2(H) + \alpha_2(T) = 1$ :
    - $\alpha_2(H) = \alpha_2(T) = 1/2$
    - Similarly for player 1!
  - ❖  $U_1(\alpha^*) = 0$
- There is clearly no NE in **pure strategies**
- Lets try whether there is a 2/2 NE  $\alpha^*$  in **mixed strategies**
- Then the H action by player 1 should have the same utility as the T action when played against the mixed strategy  $\alpha_{-1}^*$

## Mixed NE for BoS

	Bach	Stravinsky
Bach	2, 1	0, 0
Stravinsky	0, 0	1, 2

- $U_1((1,0), (\alpha_2(B), \alpha_2(S))) = U_1((0,1), (\alpha_2(B), \alpha_2(S)))$
  - $U_1((1,0), (\alpha_2(B), \alpha_2(S))) = 2\alpha_2(B) + 0\alpha_2(S)$
  - $U_1((0,1), (\alpha_2(B), \alpha_2(S))) = 0\alpha_2(B) + 1\alpha_2(S)$
  - $2\alpha_2(B) = 1\alpha_2(S)$
  - Because of  $\alpha_2(B) + \alpha_2(S) = 1$ :
    - $\alpha_2(B) = 1/3$
    - $\alpha_2(S) = 2/3$
  - Similarly for player 1!
  - ❖  $U_1(\alpha^*) = 2/3$
- There are obviously 2 NEs in **pure strategies**
- Is there also a 2/2 **strictly mixed NE**?
- If so, again B and S played by player 1 should lead to the same payoff.

## Couldn't we Help the BoS Players?

- BoS have **two pure strategy** Nash equilibria
  - but **which** should they play?
- They can play a mixed strategy, but this is **worse** than any pure strategy
- The solution is to **talk about**, where to go
- Use an external random signal to decide where to go
- **Correlated Nash equilibria**
- In the BoS case, we get a payoff of 1.5

## Conclusion

- Although **Nash equilibria** do not always exist, one can give a guarantee, when we randomize finite games:
  - For every finite strategic game, there exists a Nash equilibrium in **mixed strategies**
- Actions in the support of mixed strategies in a NE are always best answers to the NE profile, and therefore have the same payoff ~ **Support Lemma**
- The Support Lemma can be used to determine mixed strategy NEs for **2-person** games with **2x2 action sets**
- In general, there is **no poly-time algorithm known** for computing a Nash equilibrium (and it is open whether this problem is NP-hard)
- In addition to pure and mixed NEs, there exists the notion of **correlated NE**, where you coordinate your action using an external randomized signal