# Game Theory: Bayesian Nash Equilibrium

Adaptive and Cooperative Algorithms (ECE 457A)

ECE, MME, and MSCI Departments, University of Waterloo, ON, Canada

Course Instructor: Benyamin Ghojogh Fall 2023 Sequential-Move Games

# Sequential-Move Games & Common Knowledge

- In ordered (sequential-move) games, the players play the game in order.
- Recall that a ordered (sequential-move) game can be represented by an extensive form or a game tree.
- Common knowledge refers to the assumption that:
  - each player knows what the game tree looks like.
  - each player knows that other players know what the game tree looks like.
  - each player knows that other players know that other players know what the game tree looks like.
  - and so on.
- Of course, this assumption is useful when all players play the game rationally.
- This reminds us of the episode "The One Where Everybody Finds Out" in the "Friends" series where there is the following conversation: "they don't know that we know they know we know!".



## Certain, Symmetric, and Complete Games

- Recall that <u>nature</u> can be one of the players which makes random movements with known probabilities.
- Certain game: nature does not move after any player but it either does not participate in the game or starts the game.
- **Symmetric game**: no player has information different from other players when it moves or at the end nodes of the game tree.
- Complete game: nature does not move first or its initial move is observed by every player so that all players know what situation the game is in.

Bayesian Nash Equilibrium

# Bayesian Nash Equilibrium

- Bayesian Nash equilibrium, proposed in 1967 [1, 2], considers some probabilistic beliefs for every player.
- Therefore, it is useful if there is some **randomness** in the game, such as when **nature** plays a role in the game.
- Moreover, note that Bayesian Nash equilibrium is usually used for ordered (sequential-move) games.
- Every player assumes with some probabilistic beliefs that the other players will have some strategy in playing the game.
- Then, while the players play the game one by one during the game, the players update their beliefs using Bayes' rule.
- In the Bayesian Nash equilibrium, we propose an equilibrium and use it to calculate the beliefs; then, we check whether the strategies are the best response for the generated beliefs.
- By Bayes' rule, we see we are probably in which path of the tree.





- Consider an example game with the following <u>extensive form</u> where the <u>nature N</u>, then player *p*, and then player *q* play in order.
- The game has two players p and q and a nature. The actions of player p are p<sub>1</sub> and p<sub>2</sub> while the actions of player q are q<sub>1</sub> and q<sub>2</sub>. The actions of nature are A, B, and C with probabilities 0.7, 0.1, and 0.2, respectively.



- Step 1: we propose a strategy profile.
  - The player p observes the action of nature and then performs its action. The player q does not observe the action of nature but can guess it according to the action of the rational player p.
  - The prior beliefs of the player q is that nature moves A, B, or C with probabilities 0.7, 0.1, and 0.2, respectively.
  - The player q assumes based on the actions of player p (this assumption makes sense because of the payoffs of the player p at the end nodes of the tree):
    - \* If the player p chooses action  $p_1$ , nature must have chosen A or B probably.
    - So,  $\mathbb{P}(p_1|A) = \mathbb{P}(p_1|B) = (1)$  and  $\mathbb{P}(p_1|C) = (0)$  **\*** If the player p chooses action  $p_2$ , nature must have chosen C probably. So,  $\mathbb{P}(p_2|A) = \mathbb{P}(p_2|B) = (0)$  and  $\mathbb{P}(p_2|C) = (0)$ .
  - If player p chooses  $p_1$ , then player q chooses action  $q_1$ . If player p chooses  $p_2$ , then player q chooses action  $q_2$ . This strategy makes sense because of the payoffs of the player q at the end nodes of the tree.

- Step 2: we see what beliefs the strategy profile generates when players update their beliefs in response to each <u>others' moves</u>.
  - Updating the beliefs of player q about the nature if the player p chooses action p1:



Updating the beliefs of player q about the nature if the player p chooses action p<sub>2</sub>:

$$\mathbb{P}(A|p_2) = \frac{\mathbb{P}(k_0|A)\mathbb{P}(A)}{\mathbb{P}(p_2|A)\mathbb{P}(A) + \mathbb{P}(p_2|B)\mathbb{P}(B) + \mathbb{P}(p_2|C)\mathbb{P}(C)} = \frac{0 \times 0.7}{(0 \times 0.7) + (0 \times 0.1) + (1 \times 0.2)} = 0,$$

$$\mathbb{P}(B|p_2) = \frac{0 \times 0.7}{(0 \times 0.7) + (0 \times 0.1) + (1 \times 0.2)} = 0,$$

$$\mathbb{P}(C|p_2) = \frac{1 \times 0.2}{(0 \times 0.7) + (0 \times 0.1) + (1 \times 0.2)} = 1.$$

- Step 3: we check whether given those beliefs together with the strategies of the other players, each player is choosing a best response for itself.
  - The above calculations show that if player p chooses action  $p_1$ , the player q believes that nature has chosen A or B with probabilities 0.875 and 0.125, respectively.
  - Figure p chooses action  $p_2$ , the player q believes that nature has definitely chosen C with probability 1.
  - As a result, according to the above analysis and the payoffs in the tree, player q chooses action  $q_1$  if player p chooses action  $p_1$ . Moreover, player q chooses action  $q_2$  if player p chooses action  $p_2$ .
  - Note that if nature has chosen B and player p has actually chosen action  $p_1$ , it would have more payoff for player q to choose action  $q_2$ ; however, as it is more probable that nature must have chosen A given the action  $p_1$  of the player p, it makes sense for the player q to choose action  $q_1$  after the action  $p_1$  of the player p.
  - In summary, the strategy of players in the Bayesian Nash equilibrium is as follows:
    - If player p chooses action p1 (so the nature must have chosen A with higher probability or B with lower probability), then player q chooses action q1.
       If player p chooses action p2 (so the nature must have chosen C with
      - probability 1), then player q chooses action  $q_2$ .

- Note that here, the proposed strategy was deterministic. We can also propose a stochastic strategy, also called mixed strategy (we will see it later).
- For example, we could have proposed the following strategy: the player p chooses action  $p_1$  with probability 0.5 in state A of nature, with probability 0.4 in state **B** of nature, and with probability 0.1 in state C of nature. In this case, the conditional probabilities would become:  $\mathbb{P}(p_1|A)\mathbb{P}(A)$  $\underbrace{\mathbb{P}(A|p_1)}_{\mathbb{P}(A|p_1)} = \frac{\mathbb{P}(p_1|A)\mathbb{P}(A)}{\mathbb{P}(p_1|A)\mathbb{P}(A) + \mathbb{P}(p_1|B)\mathbb{P}(B) + \mathbb{P}(p_1|C)\mathbb{P}(C)} = \underbrace{\sqrt{0.5 \times 0.7}}_{(0.5 \times 0.7) + (0.4 \times 0.1) + (0.1 \times 0.2)} = \underbrace{0.853}_{0.853},$ player gs  $\mathbb{P}(B|p_1) = \frac{0.4 \times 0.1}{(0.5 \times 0.7) + (0.4 \times 0.1) + (0.1 \times 0.2)} = 0.0975,$  $\mathbb{P}(C|p_1) = \frac{0.1 \times 0.2}{(0.5 \times 0.7) + (0.4 \times 0.1) + (0.1 \times 0.2)} = 0.0487.$
- Likewise, it is possible to have mixed strategies for the action p<sub>2</sub>.

- Consider an example game with the following <u>extensive form</u> where the <u>nature N</u>, then player p, then player q, and then player r play in order.
- The game has three players p, q, r, and a nature. The actions of player p are  $p_1$  and  $p_2$ , the actions of player q are  $q_1$  and  $q_2$ , and the actions of player r are  $r_1$  and  $r_2$ . The actions of nature are  $A_2$  and  $B_2$  with probabilities 0.5-and 0.5, respectively.



#### • Step 1: we propose a strategy profile.

- The player p observes the action of nature and then performs its action. The player q does not observe the action of nature but can guess it according to the action of the rational player p. The player r does not observe the action of nature but can guess it according to the action of the rational players p and q.
- The prior beliefs of the player q is that nature moves <u>A, B, or C</u> with probabilities 0.3, 0.3, and 0.3, respectively.
- The player q assumes based on the actions of player p (this assumption makes sense because of the payoffs of the player p at the end nodes of the tree):
  - \* If the player p chooses action  $p_1$ , nature must have chosen <u>B or C probably</u>. So,  $\mathbb{P}(p_1|\underline{A}) = 0$  and  $\mathbb{P}(p_1|B) = \mathbb{P}(p_1|C) = 1$ .
  - \* If the player p chooses action  $p_2$ , nature must have chosen A probably. So,  $\mathbb{P}(p_2|A) = 1$  and  $\mathbb{P}(p_2|B) = \mathbb{P}(p_2|C) = 0$ .

Step 1: we propose a strategy profile.

- The player r assumes based on the action of player q after the action of player p (this assumption makes sense because of the payoffs of the players p and q at the end nodes of the tree):
  - **\*** If players p and q do actions  $p_1$  and  $q_1$ , respectively, nature must have chosen
  - ★ If players p and q do actions p<sub>1</sub> and q<sub>1</sub>, respectively, nature must have chosen B probably. So, P(q<sub>1</sub>|A, p<sub>1</sub>) = 0, P(q<sub>1</sub>|B, p<sub>1</sub>) = 1, and P(q<sub>1</sub>|C, p<sub>1</sub>) = 0.
    ★ If players p and q do actions p<sub>1</sub> and q<sub>2</sub>, respectively, nature must have chosen C probably. So, P(q<sub>2</sub>|A, p<sub>1</sub>) = 0, P(q<sub>2</sub>|B, p<sub>1</sub>) = 0, and P(q<sub>2</sub>|C, p<sub>1</sub>) = 1.
    ★ If players p and q do actions p<sub>2</sub> and q<sub>1</sub>, respectively, nature must have chosen A probably. So, P(q<sub>1</sub>|A, p<sub>2</sub>) = 1, P(q<sub>1</sub>|B, p<sub>2</sub>) = 0, and P(q<sub>1</sub>|C, p<sub>2</sub>) = 0.
    ★ If players p and q do actions p<sub>2</sub> and q<sub>2</sub>, respectively, nature must have chosen A probably. So, P(q<sub>2</sub>|A, p<sub>2</sub>) = 1, P(q<sub>1</sub>|B, p<sub>2</sub>) = 0, and P(q<sub>1</sub>|C, p<sub>2</sub>) = 0.
    ★ If players p and q do actions p<sub>2</sub> and q<sub>2</sub>, respectively, nature must have chosen A probably. So, P(q<sub>2</sub>|A, p<sub>2</sub>) = 1, P(q<sub>2</sub>|B, p<sub>2</sub>) = 0, and P(q<sub>2</sub>|C, p<sub>2</sub>) = 0.
- If player p chooses  $p_1$ , then player q chooses action  $q_1$ , then player r chooses action  $r_1$ . If player *p* chooses  $p_2$ , then player *q* chooses action  $q_1$ , then player *r* chooses action  $r_2$ . This strategy makes sense because of the payoffs of all players at the end nodes of the tree

- Step 2: we see what beliefs the strategy profile generates when players update their beliefs in response to each others' moves.
  - Updating the beliefs of player q about the nature if the player p chooses action p1:

$$\underbrace{\mathbb{P}(A|p_{1})}_{\mathbb{P}(A|p_{1})} = \underbrace{\frac{\mathbb{P}(p_{1}|A)\mathbb{P}(A)}{\mathbb{P}(p_{1}|A)\mathbb{P}(A) + \mathbb{P}(p_{1}|B)\mathbb{P}(B) + \mathbb{P}(p_{1}|C)\mathbb{P}(C)}_{0 \times 0.3} = \underbrace{0}_{0,0} = \underbrace{0}_{0,0} = \underbrace{\mathbb{P}(B|p_{1})}_{(0 \times 0.3) + (1 \times 0.3) + (1 \times 0.3)} = \underbrace{0}_{0,0} = \underbrace{\mathbb{P}(C|p_{1})}_{(0 \times 0.3) + (1 \times 0.3) + (1 \times 0.3)} = \underbrace{0}_{0,0} = \underbrace{0}_{0,0}$$

Updating the beliefs of player q about the nature if the player p chooses action p<sub>2</sub>:

$$\mathbb{P}(\underline{A}|p_{2}) = \frac{\mathbb{P}(p_{2}|A) \mathbb{P}(A)}{\mathbb{P}(p_{2}|A) \mathbb{P}(A) + \mathbb{P}(p_{2}|B) \mathbb{P}(B) + \mathbb{P}(p_{2}|C) \mathbb{P}(C)}$$
  
=  $\frac{1 \times 0.3}{(1 \times 0.3) + (0 \times 0.3) + (0 \times 0.3)} = \underbrace{1,}_{1,}$   
$$\underline{\mathbb{P}(B|p_{2})} = \mathbb{P}(\underline{C}|p_{2}) = \frac{0 \times 0.3}{(1 \times 0.3) + (0 \times 0.3) + (0 \times 0.3)} = \underbrace{0,}_{1,}$$

- Step 2: we see what beliefs the strategy profile generates when players update their beliefs in response to each others' moves.
  - According to the chain rule in probability, we have:

$$\mathbb{P}(A, p_1, q_1) = \mathbb{P}(q_1|A, p_1)\mathbb{P}(A, p_1) = \mathbb{P}(q_1|A, p_1)\mathbb{P}(p_1|A)\mathbb{P}(A).$$

Updating the beliefs of player r about the nature and player p if the player q chooses action q<sub>1</sub> (the case where player p has chosen action p<sub>1</sub>):

$$\begin{array}{c} \checkmark \quad \mathbb{P}(\underline{A, p_1}|q_1) = \left\{ \mathbb{P}(q_1|A, p_1)\mathbb{P}(p_1|A)\mathbb{P}(A) \right\} \times \\ & \left\{ \mathbb{P}(q_1|A, p_1)\mathbb{P}(p_1|A)\mathbb{P}(A) + \mathbb{P}(q_1|B, p_1)\mathbb{P}(p_1|B)\mathbb{P}(B) \right\} \\ & + \mathbb{P}(q_1|C, p_1)\mathbb{P}(p_1|C)\mathbb{P}(C) \right\}^{(1)} \\ & = \frac{0 \times 0 \times 0.3}{(0 \times 0 \times 0.3) + (1 \times 1 \times 0.3) + (0 \times 1 \times 0.3)} = 0, \\ \checkmark \quad \mathbb{P}(B, p_1|q_1) = \frac{1 \times 1 \times 0.3}{(0 \times 0 \times 0.3) + (1 \times 1 \times 0.3) + (0 \times 1 \times 0.3)} = 1, \\ \checkmark \quad \mathbb{P}(C, p_1|q_1) = \frac{0 \times 1 \times 0.3}{(0 \times 0 \times 0.3) + (1 \times 1 \times 0.3) + (0 \times 1 \times 0.3)} = 0, \end{array}$$

- Step 2: we see what beliefs the strategy profile generates when players update their beliefs in response to each others' moves.
  - Updating the beliefs of player r about the nature and player p if the player q chooses action q<sub>1</sub> (the case where player p has chosen action p<sub>2</sub>):

$$\begin{aligned}
& \underbrace{\mathbb{P}(A, p_2|q_1)}{\mathbb{P}(A, p_2)\mathbb{P}(p_2|A)\mathbb{P}(A)} \\
& \times \underbrace{\mathbb{P}(q_1|A, p_2)\mathbb{P}(p_2|A)\mathbb{P}(A) + \mathbb{P}(q_1|B, p_2)\mathbb{P}(p_2|B)\mathbb{P}(B)}_{\mathbb{P}(P_1|A, p_2)\mathbb{P}(p_2|C)\mathbb{P}(C)} \\
& + \mathbb{P}(q_1|C, p_2)\mathbb{P}(p_2|C)\mathbb{P}(C) \\
& = \frac{1 \times 1 \times 0.3}{(1 \times 1 \times 0.3) + (0 \times 0 \times 0.3) + (0 \times 0 \times 0.3)} = \underbrace{\mathbf{1}}_{\mathbb{P}(A)} \\
& \mathbb{P}(B, p_2|q_1) = \frac{0 \times 0 \times 0.3}{(1 \times 1 \times 0.3) + (0 \times 0 \times 0.3) + (0 \times 0 \times 0.3)} = \underbrace{\mathbf{0}}_{\mathbb{P}(C, p_2|q_1)} \\
& = \underbrace{0 \times 0 \times 0.3}{(1 \times 1 \times 0.3) + (0 \times 0 \times 0.3) + (0 \times 0 \times 0.3)} = \underbrace{\mathbf{0}}_{\mathbb{P}(A)} \end{aligned}$$

- Step 2: we see what beliefs the strategy profile generates when players update their beliefs in response to each others' moves.
  - Updating the beliefs of player r about the nature and player p if the player q chooses action q<sub>2</sub> (the case where player p has chosen action p<sub>1</sub>):

$$\begin{split} \mathbb{P}(\underline{A, p_1 | q_2}) &= \left\{ \mathbb{P}(q_2 | A, p_1) \mathbb{P}(p_1 | A) \mathbb{P}(A) \right\} \times \\ &\left\{ \mathbb{P}(q_2 | A, p_1) \mathbb{P}(p_1 | A) \mathbb{P}(A) + \mathbb{P}(q_2 | B, p_1) \mathbb{P}(p_1 | B) \mathbb{P}(B) \\ &+ \mathbb{P}(q_2 | C, p_1) \mathbb{P}(p_1 | C) \mathbb{P}(C) \right\}^{-1} \\ &= \frac{0 \times 0 \times 0.3}{(0 \times 0 \times 0.3) + (0 \times 1 \times 0.3) + (1 \times 1 \times 0.3)} = 0, \\ \mathbb{P}(B, p_1 | q_2) &= \frac{0 \times 1 \times 0.3}{(0 \times 0 \times 0.3) + (0 \times 1 \times 0.3) + (1 \times 1 \times 0.3)} = 0, \\ \mathbb{P}(C, p_1 | q_2) &= \frac{1 \times 1 \times 0.3}{(0 \times 0 \times 0.3) + (0 \times 1 \times 0.3) + (1 \times 1 \times 0.3)} = 1. \end{split}$$

- Step 2: we see what beliefs the strategy profile generates when players update their beliefs in response to each others' moves.
  - Updating the beliefs of player r about the nature and player p if the player q chooses action q<sub>2</sub> (the case where player p has chosen action p<sub>2</sub>):

$$\begin{split} \mathbb{P}(\underline{A, p_2|q_2}) &= \left\{ \mathbb{P}(q_2|A, p_2) \mathbb{P}(p_2|A) \mathbb{P}(A) \right\} \times \\ \left\{ \mathbb{P}(q_2|A, p_2) \mathbb{P}(p_2|A) \mathbb{P}(A) + \mathbb{P}(q_2|B, p_2) \mathbb{P}(p_2|B) \mathbb{P}(B) \\ &+ \mathbb{P}(q_2|C, p_2) \mathbb{P}(p_2|C) \mathbb{P}(C) \right\}^{-1} \\ &= \frac{1 \times 1 \times 0.3}{(1 \times 1 \times 0.3) + (0 \times 0 \times 0.3) + (0 \times 0 \times 0.3)} = 1, \\ \mathbb{P}(B, p_1|q_2) &= \frac{0 \times 0 \times 0.3}{(1 \times 1 \times 0.3) + (0 \times 0 \times 0.3) + (0 \times 0 \times 0.3)} = 0, \\ \mathbb{P}(C, p_1|q_2) &= \frac{0 \times 0 \times 0.3}{(1 \times 1 \times 0.3) + (0 \times 0 \times 0.3) + (0 \times 0 \times 0.3)} = 0. \end{split}$$

• Step 3: we check whether given those beliefs together with the strategies of the other players, each player is choosing a best response for itself.

- The above calculations show that if player p chooses action p<sub>1</sub>, the player q believes that nature has chosen B or C with probabilities 0.5 and 0.5, respectively.
   If player p chooses action p<sub>2</sub>, the player q believes that nature has definitely chosen
  - A with probability 1.
- - player p has chosen action  $p_1$  and if nature has chosen B, player p has chosen action  $p_2$ .
  - If player q chooses action q<sub>2</sub>, the player r believes that if nature has chosen A, player p has chosen action  $p_2$  and if nature has chosen C, player p has chosen action  $p_1$ .
  - As a result, according to the above analysis and the payoffs in the tree, the strategy of players in the Bayesian Nash equilibrium is as follows:
    - **\*** If player p chooses action  $p_1$  (so the nature must have chosen B or C with equal probability), then player q chooses either action  $q_1$  or action  $q_2$ . Subcase (1): if player q chooses action  $q_1$ , player r chooses action  $r_1$ . Subcase (2): if player q chooses action  $q_2$ , player r chooses either action  $r_1$  or action r2.
    - **\*** If player p chooses action  $p_2$  (so the nature must have chosen A with probability 1), then player q chooses action  $q_1$ . Then, player r chooses action

**r**<sub>2</sub>.

## Acknowledgment

- Some slides of this slide deck are inspired by teachings of Prof. <u>Stanko Dimitrov</u> at the University of Waterloo, Department of Management Science and Engineering.
- Some slides of this slide deck are based on the following book: Eric Rasmusen, "Games and Information: An Introduction to Game Theory", 4th Edition, 2007, [3] https://www.rasmusen.org/GI/download.htm

### References

- J. C. <u>Harsanyi</u>, "Games with incomplete information played by Bayesian players," Management science, vol. 14, no. 3, pp. 159–182, 1967.
- [2] D. Fudenberg and J. Tirole, "Perfect Bayesian equilibrium and sequential equilibrium," journal of Economic Theory, vol. 53, no. 2, pp. 236–260, 1991.
- [3] E. Rasmusen, Games and information: An introduction to game theory. Wiley-Blackwell, 4 ed., 2007.