

| Strategic decisions | Games |
| :--- | :--- |
| * Game theory tries to determine optimal strategy for each |  |
| player |  |
| * Strategy is a rule or plan of action for playing the game |  |
| players usually have a set of available strategies |  |
| * Optimal strategy for a player is one that yields the |  |
| maximum expected payoff |  |
| * We consider players who are rational |  |
| they think through their actions. |  |
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| Noncooperative vS. Cooperative games |
| :--- |
| * In a Cooperative game players negotiate binding contracts <br> that allow them to plan joint strategies <br> example: a joint venture by two firms (i.e., HSE and NES) |
| * In a Non-cooperative game negotiation of binding contracts |
| between players is not possible because agreements are |
| not possible or are not allowed |
| example: two competing firms, assuming each-other's <br> behavior, independently determine pricing and advertising <br> strategy to gain market share. |
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| Games |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| * A Game is any situation in which the participants (players) make strategic decisions |  |  |
| * For example |  |  |
| Firms competing with each other by setting prices, <br> - Individuals bidding against each other in an auction |  |  |
| * Strategic decisions result in payoffs to the players: outcomes that generate rewards or penalties . |  |  |
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| Strategic interaction |
| :--- |
| * In a game, your payoff depends on both <br> Your actions |
| Your opponents' actions |
| If you want to maximize your payoff, you should take your <br> opponent's actions into account when you make your own <br> decision |
| * Thus, it would be very useful for you to understand what is |
| the optimal response of your opponent . |
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| Information structure in games |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |
| * Games of complete information |  |  |
| Everyone knows the structure of the game (opponents, rules, set of actions, payoffs) |  |  |
| - Players may ignore some past actions by rivals |  |  |
| - Example: poker |  |  |
| * Games of perfect information |  |  |
| - Everyone knows the full history of actions by rivals |  |  |
| - Players may ignore the rules or the full set of possible payoffs |  |  |
| - Example: competing firms' objectives |  |  |
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|  | Games |
| :--- | :--- |
| Timing in games |  |
| \& Static games (one-shot games) <br> games where all players announce their strategies <br> simultaneously |  |
| * Repeated games |  |
| $\quad$ games where interaction is repeated more than once |  |
| * Dynamic games |  |
| games where players move sequentially $\ldots$ |  |
|  |  |


| Choosing strategies |
| :--- |
| * A strategy may dominate another strategy, independently <br> of what the opponent does <br> * Someone is giving you for free one of the following: <br> An admission at the university of your choice <br> 1 million dollars <br> 100 thousand dollars <br> * A dominated strategy is one that is sub-optimal to another <br> dominated strategies are irrelevant for the game <br> * A dominant strategy is one that is optimal <br> independently of what the opponent does <br> O2013-18 Kosmas Marinakis, HSE $\quad$ m2 - Lecture 12 |

Payoff matrix

| Games without a DE |
| :--- |
| * The optimal decision of a player without a dominant |
| strategy will depend on what the other player does |
| * Now each player is concerned about the decisions of other |
| players |
| * Altering the payoff matrix from the previous example, we |
| can see a situation where no dominant strategy exists . |
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| The Nash Equilibrium revisited |
| :--- |
| * In many games, there are no dominated strategies |
| * A more general equilibrium concept is the Nash |
| Equilibrium, which we used in oligopoly |
| NE: A combination of strategies from which no player has an |
| incentive to deviate unilaterally |
| * At the NE each player is doing its best, given the actions of |
| its opponents |
| * Cournot equilibrium is an instance of Nash Equilibrium |
| $\quad$ each firm sets output assuming the other firm's outputs are fixed |
| * Is the NE a stable equilibrium? |
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| Equilibrium concepts |
| :--- |
| * DE |
| "I am doing the best I can no matter what you do - you are |
| doing the best you can no matter what I do" |
| * NE |
| "I am doing the best I can given what you are doing - you are |
| doing the best you can given what I am doing" |
| * DE is a special case of NE. . |
| O2013-18 kosmas Marinakis, HSE |
| m2 - Lecture 12 |


| Static games |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| The Prisoners' Dilemma |  |  |
| * The most famous example in game theory is |  |  |
| Prisoners' Dilemma |  |  |
| - Bonnie and Clyde are accused of committing a crime |  |  |
| - They are both arrested and placed in separate cells |  |  |
| - Each has been asked to confess to the crime |  |  |
| - A confession will make the work of the prosecutor easier, so, she is offering them a deal to make them confess. |  |  |
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| Static games Prisoners' Dilemma |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Prisoners' Dilemma - offer |  |  |  |
|  | Clyde |  |  |
|  | Confess | Deny |  |
| - Confess | -5, -5 | -1, -10 |  |
| ¢ Deny | -10, -1 | -2, -2 |  |
| * The offer of the prosecutor to each prisoner is <br> - If you confess and your partner does not, you get 1 year and your partner 10 <br> - If you both confess, you get 5 years each <br> - If you both deny, you get 2 years each. |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
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| The "sidewalk" game |  |  |  | Static games |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | P2 |  |  |
|  |  | LHS | RHS |  |
|  | LHS | 1,1 | 0,0 |  |
|  | RHS | 0,0 | 1,1 |  |
| * There might be more than one NE <br> * Which one is the outcome of the game? <br> * Depends on <br> -Where the game begins from, or <br> - How initial perceptions are formed. |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
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| BMW vS: Benz: product choice problem |
| :--- |
| * BMW and Mercedes each wish to introduce a new type of |
| vehicle in the market |
| \& Either a Compact Utility Vehicle (CUV) or |
| \& A Compact Cabriolet (Cabrio) |
| * Firms will be better off if they introduce a different type of |
| vehicle |
| $\quad$ Because the demands in those markets are still small and |
| cannot accommodate two competing sellers |
| • Plus firms need to sell a high quantity to reach their MES |
| * Decisions are non - cooperative . |
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|  |  |  | Static games | BMW vs. Benz |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Product choice problem |  |  |  |  |
| Mercedes |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | CUV | Cabrio |  |
| 3 | CUV | -6, -6 | 12, 10 |  |
| 0 | Cabrio | 10, 12 | -5, -5 |  |
| If BMW hears that Mercedes is introducing a CUV, its best action is to produce a Cabrio <br> Bottom left corner is Nash equilibrium <br> What is other Nash Equilibrium? |  |  |  |  |
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## WARNING

This printout is provided as a courtesy, so that lecture time can be dedicated to note taking. These slides are not standalone material and should be used strictly as reference, side by side with notes taken in the lecture. Studying solely from the slides is not recommended and might in some cases mislead those who have not attended the relevant lecture. Less than $5 \%$ of tasks in tests and exams can be answered from the slides.

