

## Solution for Problem 3 (Homework 2)

Andrey Kolobov

October 25, 2011

Suppose we knew that the game has a joint Nash equilibrium strategy  $\{\vec{p}, \vec{q}\}$  that assigns probabilities  $p_i > 0$  to a subset  $I_R$  of row player  $R$ 's pure strategies and  $q_i > 0$  to a subset  $I_C$  of column player  $C$ 's pure strategies. Such a strategy would need to satisfy the following conditions:

- No matter what pure strategy  $r \in I_R$   $R$  plays, the expected payoff to  $R$  given  $C$ 's mixed strategy  $q$  should be the same value; denote it as  $V_R$ . (If this value is not the same for all  $r \in I_R$ ,  $R$  has an incentive to deviate by choosing a pure strategy that brings the biggest payoff, i.e.  $\{\vec{p}, \vec{q}\}$  isn't a Nash equilibrium.)
- If  $R$  decides to play a pure strategy  $r \notin I_R$ , the expected payoff to  $R$  shouldn't be more than  $V_R$ . (Otherwise,  $\vec{p}$  should assign a non-zero probability to that pure strategy, i.e. the strategy should be in  $I_R$ .)
- Similarly, no matter what pure strategy  $c \in I_C$   $C$  plays, the expected payoff to  $C$  should be the same; denote this value as  $V_C$ .
- If  $C$  plays a pure strategy  $c \notin I_C$ ,  $C$ 's expected payoff should be no more than  $V_C$ .
- Under  $\{\vec{p}, \vec{q}\}$ , the probabilities of pure strategies in  $I_R$  and in  $I_C$  respectively must sum to one and be no less than zero.
- Under  $\{\vec{p}, \vec{q}\}$ , the probabilities of pure strategies not in  $I_R$  and not in  $I_C$  respectively must be zero.

These requirements translate into the following system of linear inequalities:

$$\sum_{j=1}^m q_j A_{i,j} = V_R \quad \text{for all } i, \text{ s.t. } s_i \in I_R \quad (1)$$

$$\sum_{j=1}^m q_j A_{i,j} \leq V_R \quad \text{for all } i, \text{ s.t. } s_i \notin I_R \quad (2)$$

$$\sum_{i=1}^n p_i A_{i,j} = V_C \quad \text{for all } j, \text{ s.t. } s_j \in I_C \quad (3)$$

$$\sum_{i=1}^n p_i A_{i,j} \leq V_C \quad \text{for all } j, \text{ s.t. } s_j \notin I_C \quad (4)$$

$$\sum_{i=1}^n p_i = 1 \quad (5)$$

$$p_i \geq 0 \quad \text{for all } i, \text{ s.t. } s_i \in I_R \quad (6)$$

$$p_i = 0 \quad \text{for all } i, \text{ s.t. } s_i \notin I_R \quad (7)$$

$$\sum_{j=1}^m q_j = 1 \quad (8)$$

$$q_j \geq 0 \quad \text{for all } j, \text{ s.t. } s_j \in I_C \quad (9)$$

$$q_j = 0 \quad \text{for all } j, \text{ s.t. } s_j \notin I_C \quad (10)$$

To find a Nash equilibrium for given  $I_R$  and  $I_C$ , we need to find *any*  $\{\vec{p}, \vec{q}\}$  satisfying the above system of inequalities. In other words, we need to solve the corresponding LP feasibility problem. LP feasibility problems are just a type of LP problems — in the latter one is interested in an optimal solution to a system of inequalities, while in the former one is interested in any solution to it. Therefore, if a solution exists it can be found with an LP solver in finite time.

Of course, we don't actually know  $I_R$  and  $I_C$  for which a Nash equilibrium exists. Therefore, we need to iterate over all possible pairs of action sets and for each to try to find a Nash equilibrium strategy as described above. Once such a strategy is found, the algorithm will halt. There are a total of  $2^{n+m}$  possible action set pairs, so the whole algorithm runs in a finite, although large, amount of time.