A Glimpse of Game Theory
Games and Game Theory

• Much effort to develop computer programs for artificial games like chess or poker commonly played for entertainment.

• Larger issue: account for, model and predict how agents (human or artificial) interact with other agents.

• **Game theory** accounts for mixture of cooperative and competitive behavior.

• Applies to zero-sum and non-zero-sum games.
Basic Ideas of Game Theory

• **Game theory** studies how strategic interactions among rational players produce outcomes with respect to players’ preferences
  – Preferences represented as utilities (numbers)
  – Outcomes might not have been intended

• Provides a general theory of strategic behavior

• Generally depicted in mathematical form

• Plays important role in economics, decision theory and **multi-agent systems**
Zero Sum Games

• Zero-sum: participant's gain/loss exactly balanced by losses/gains of the other participants

• Total gains of participants minus total losses = 0
  
  Poker is zero sum game: money won = money lost

• Commercial trade not a zero sum game
  
  If country with an excess of bananas trades with another for their excess of apples, both may benefit

• Non-zero sum games more complex to analyze

• More non-zero sum games as world becomes more complex, specialized and interdependent
Rules, Strategies, Payoffs & Equilibrium

Situations are treated as “games”:

• Rules of game: who can do what, and when they can do it
• Player's strategy: plan for actions in each possible situation in the game
• Player's payoff: amount that player wins or loses in particular situation in a game
• Player has a dominant strategy if her best strategy doesn’t depend on what others do
Game Theory Roots

• Defined by John von Neumann & Oskar Morgenstern

• Provides powerful model & practical tools to model interactions among sets of autonomous agents

• Used to model strategic policies (e.g., arms race)
Nash Equilibrium

• Occurs when each player's strategy is optimal given strategies of other players
• It means that no player benefits by unilaterally changing strategy, while others stay fixed
• Every finite game has at least one Nash equilibrium in either pure or mixed strategies (proved by John Nash)
  – Nash won 1994 Nobel Prize in economics for this work
  – Read *A Beautiful Mind* by Sylvia Nasar (1998) and/or see the 2001 film
Prisoner's Dilemma

• Famous example from game theory
• Strategies must be undertaken without full knowledge of what other players will do
• Players adopt dominant strategies, but they don't necessarily lead to the best outcome
• **Rational behavior** leads to a situation where everyone is worse off!

Will the two prisoners cooperate to minimize total loss of liberty or will one of them, trusting the other to cooperate, betray him so as to go free?
Bonnie and Clyde

Bonnie and Clyde are arrested and charged with crimes. They’re questioned separately, unable to communicate. They know how it works:

– If both proclaim mutual innocence (cooperating), they will be found guilty anyway and get three year sentences for robbery
– If one confesses (defecting) and the other doesn’t (cooperating), the confessor is rewarded with a light, one-year sentence and the other gets a severe eight-year sentence
– If both confess (defecting), then the judge sentences both to a moderate four years in prison

What should Bonnie do? What should Clyde do?
The payoff matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BONNIE</th>
<th>CLYDE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Confess</strong></td>
<td>Confess</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 years each</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 year for Bonnie and 8 years for Clyde</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Not Confess</strong></td>
<td>8 years for Bonnie and 1 year for Clyde</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 years each</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Bonnie’s Decision Tree

There are two cases to consider

If Clyde Confesses

- Bonnie
  - Confess
    - 4 Years in Prison
      - Best Strategy
  - Not Confess
    - 8 Years in Prison

If Clyde Does Not Confess

- Bonnie
  - Confess
    - 1 Year in Prison
      - Best Strategy
  - Not Confess
    - 3 Years in Prison

Bonnie’s **Dominant strategy** is to confess (defect) because no matter what Clyde does she is better off confessing.
So what?

• Clyde’s reasoning is the same
  – They both get 4-year sentences
  – They could have both had 3-years

• But it seems we should always defect and never cooperate

• No wonder Economics has been called the dismal science
Some PD examples

- There are lots of examples of the Prisoner’s Dilemma situations in the real world
- It makes it difficult for “players” to avoid the bad outcome of both defecting
  - Cheating on a cartel
  - Trade wars between countries
  - Arms races
  - Advertising
  - Communal coffee pot
  - Class team project
Advertising

- Advertising is expensive
- All firms advertising tends to equalize the effects
- Everyone would gain if no one advertised
- But firms increase their advertising to gain advantage
- Which makes their competition do the same
- It’s an arms race
Games Without Dominant Strategies

- In many games, players have no **dominant strategy**
- Player's strategy depends on others’ strategies
- If player's best strategy depends on another’s strategy, she has no dominant strategy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Confess</th>
<th>Not Confess</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ma</strong></td>
<td>6 years for Ma</td>
<td>5 years for Ma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 year for Pa</td>
<td>3 years for Pa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pa</strong></td>
<td>8 years for Ma</td>
<td>4 years for Ma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 years for Pa</td>
<td>2 years for Pa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ma’s Decision Tree

If Pa Confesses

- Confess: 8 Years in Prison
- Not Confess: 5 Years in Prison

If Pa Doesn’t Confess

- Confess: 4 Years in Prison
- Not Confess: 6 Years in Prison

Ma has no explicit dominant strategy, but there is an implicit one since Pa does have a dominant strategy (What is it?)
Pa’s Decision Tree

If Ma Confesses

Pa

Confess

Not Confess

1 Years in Prison

3 Years in Prison

Best Strategy

If Ma Does Not Confess

Pa

Confess

Not Confess

2 Years in Prison

0 Years in Prison

Best Strategy

Pa does have a dominant strategy: confess
Some games have no simple solution

In the following payoff matrix, neither player has a dominant strategy. There is no non-cooperative solution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td>1, -1</td>
<td>-1, 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td>-1, 1</td>
<td>1, -1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Player A

Player B
Repeated Games

• A repeated game is a game that the same players play more than once
• Repeated games differ from one-shot games since a player’s current actions can depend on the past behavior of other players
• Cooperation is encouraged
Iterated Prisoner’s Dilemma

• Game theory: rational players should always defect when engaged in a PD situation
• In real situations, people don’t always do this
• Why not? Possible explanations:
  – People aren’t rational
  – Morality
  – Social pressure
  – Fear of consequences
  – Evolution of species-favoring genes
• Which make sense? How can we formalize?
Iterated Prisoner’s Dilemma

• **Key idea:** We often play more than one “game” with a given player.

• Players have complete knowledge of past games, including their choices and other players’ choices.

• Your choice when playing against player can be based on whether she’s been cooperative in past.

• Simulation was first done by Robert Axelrod (Michigan) where programs played in a round-robin tournament (DC=5;CC=3;DD=1;CD=0).

• The simplest program won!
Some possible strategies

• Always defect
• Always cooperate
• Randomly choose
• Pavlovian (win-stay, lose-switch)
  Start always cooperate, switch to always defect when punished by other’s defection, switch back & forth on every punishment
• Tit-for-tat (TFT)
  Be nice, but punish defections: Start cooperating and, after that always do what other player did on previous round
• Joss
  Sneaky TFT that defects 10% of the time
• In an idealized (noise free) environment, TFT is both a very simple and very good strategy
Characteristics of Robust Strategies

Axelrod analyzed entries and identified characteristics

**Nice:** never defects first

**Provocable:** respond to defection by promptly defecting. Prompt response important; slow to anger a poor strategy; some programs tried even harder to take advantage

**Forgiving:** respond to single defections by defecting forever worked poorly. Better to respond to TIT with 0.9 TAT; might dampen echoes & prevent feuds

**Clear:** Clarity an important feature. With TFT you know what to expect and what will/won’t work. With too much randomness or bizarre strategies in program, competing programs cannot analyze and began to always defect.
Implications of Robust Strategies

• Succeed not by "beating" others, but by allowing both to do well. TFT never "wins" a single turn! It can't. It can never do better than tie (all C).

• You do well by motivating cooperative behavior from others ... the provocability part

• Envy is counterproductive. Doesn’t pay to get upset if someone does a few points better than you in a single encounter. To do well, others must also do well, e.g., business & its suppliers.
Implications of Robust Strategies

• Need not be smart to do well. TFT models cooperative relations with bacteria and hosts.
• Cosmic threats and promises aren’t necessary, though they may be helpful
• Central authority unnecessary, though it may be helpful
• Optimum strategy depends on environment. TFT isn’t necessarily best program in all cases. It may be too unforgiving of JOSS & too lenient with RANDOM
Emergence

• Process where larger entities, patterns, and regularities arise via interactions among smaller or simpler entities that themselves don’t exhibit such properties

• E.g.: Shape and behavior of a flock of birds or school of fish

• Might cooperation be an emergent property?
Required for emergent cooperation

• A non-zero sum situation

• Players equal in power; no discrimination or status differences

• Repeated encounters with other player you can recognize

  Garages depending on repeat business versus those on busy highways. Being unlikely to ever see someone again => a non-iterated dilemma.

• Low temptation payoff

  If defecting makes you a billionaire, you're likely to do it. "Every person has a price."
Ecological model

• Assume ecological system that can support N players
• Players gain or loose points on each round
• After each round, poorest players die and richest multiply
• Noise in environment can model likelihood that an agent makes errors in following a strategy misinterpret another’s choice
• A simple way of modeling this is described in The Computational Beauty of Nature
Evolutionary stable strategies

- Strategies do better or worse against other strategies
- Successful strategies should work well in a variety of environments
  - E.g.: ALL-C works well in an mono-culture of ALL-Cs but not in a mixed environment
- Successful strategies should be able to “fight off mutations”
  - E.g.: ALL-D mono-culture is very resistant to invasions by any cooperating strategies
  - E.g.: TFT can be “invaded” by ALL-C
Population simulation

(a) TFT wins

(b) A noise free version with TFT winning

(c) 0.5\% noise lets Pavlov win

Figure 17.3  Population simulations of the ecological version of the iterated Prisoner’s Dilemma: (a) an idealized version that illustrates the rise of TFT; (b) a noise-free simulation with TFT winning; (c) with 0.5 percent noise Pavlov wins
If you are interested...

• **Axelrod Python**
  – [https://github.com/Axelrod-Python](https://github.com/Axelrod-Python)
  – Explore strategies for the Prisoners dilemma game
  – Over 100 strategies from the literature and some original ones
  – Run round robin tournaments with a variety of options
  – Population dynamics

• Easy to install
  – pip3 install axelrod

• Also includes notebooks
20th anniversary IPD competition (2004)

- New Tack Wins Prisoner's Dilemma
- Coordinating Team Players within a Noisy Iterated Prisoner’s Dilemma Tournament
- U. Southhampton bot team won using covert channel to let Bots on the team recognize each other
- The 60 bots
  - Executed series of moves that signaled their ‘tribe’
  - Defect if other known to be outside tribe, coordinate if in tribe
  - Coordination was not just cooperation, but master/slave : defect/cooperate