

Potential Games

Muhamet Yildiz
14.126 Game Theory
MIT Economics Department

May 6, 2024

Potential Games

- In many applications, incentive to unilateral deviation may be as though they have a common payoff function
- ... as in common interest games
- ... although they have considerable amount of conflict
- Examples:
 - Prisoners' Dilemma
 - Cournot Oligopoly, Price competition
 - Most games in global games module
- Such games are called potential games
- ... and have many useful properties

- 1 Ordinal Potential Games
- 2 Potential Games
- 3 Congestion Games
- 4 Bayesian Potential Games

Ordinal Potential Games

- Fix a complete information game $G = (N, S, u)$ with finite N
- **Definition:** $P : S \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is an *ordinal potential function* for G if
$$u_i(s_i, s_{-i}) - u_i(s'_i, s_{-i}) > 0 \iff P(s_i, s_{-i}) - P(s'_i, s_{-i}) > 0 \quad (\forall i,$$
- G is an *ordinal potential game* if it admits an ordinal potential function.
- Condition for a potential when applicable:

$$\text{sign} \left(\frac{\partial u_i}{\partial s_i} \right) = \text{sign} \left(\frac{\partial P}{\partial s_i} \right).$$

- **Example:** Cournot Oligopoly with inverse-demand function Π and constant marginal cost:
- ... Payoff function:
$$u_i(q_1, \dots, q_n) = q_i (\Pi(Q) - c)$$
- ... Ordinal Potential function:

$$P(q_1, \dots, q_n) = q_1 \cdots q_n (\Pi(Q) - c)$$

Pure Strategy Nash Equilibria

Proposition

Assume P is an ordinal potential function for G . Then,

- 1 Pure NE of G coincide with pure NE of $(N, S, (P, \dots, P))$.
 - 2 Every $s \in \arg \max_{s \in S} P$ is a pure strategy Nash equilibrium of G .
 - 3 If S is compact and u is continuous, then G has a pure NE.
- An *improvement path* is a sequence s^0, s^1, \dots with i_0, i_1, \dots s.t.
 - $s_{-i_m}^m = s_{-i_m}^{m-1}$ and $u_{i_m}(s^m) > u_{i_m}(s^{m-1})$ for each m .

Proposition

Let P be an ordinal potential function for G . Then,

- 1 P increases along every improvement path;
- 2 $|s^0, \dots, s^m| \leq |S|$ when S is finite;
- 3 every maximal improvement path terminates at a pure NE.

Definitions

For $w = (w_1, \dots, w_n) \in \mathbb{R}_+^N$, $P : S \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a w -potential function for G if

$$u_i(s_i, s_{-i}) - u_i(s'_i, s_{-i}) = w_i (P(s_i, s_{-i}) - P(s'_i, s_{-i})) \quad (\forall i, s_i, s'_i, s_{-i}).$$

G is a w -potential game if it admits a w -potential function.

$P : S \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a (exact) potential function for G if

$$u_i(s_i, s_{-i}) - u_i(s'_i, s_{-i}) = P(s_i, s_{-i}) - P(s'_i, s_{-i}) \quad (\forall i, s_i, s'_i, s_{-i}).$$

G is a potential game if it admits an exact potential function.

- payoff function for a w -potential game: $u_i(s) = w_i P(s) + d_i(s_{-i})$
- Condition for a w -potential when applicable:

$$\frac{\partial u_i}{\partial s_j} = w_j \frac{\partial P}{\partial s_j} \quad (\forall i).$$

- Unique up to a constant!

- Investment Game:

	<i>a</i>	<i>b</i>
<i>a</i>	θ, θ	$\theta - 1, 0$
<i>b</i>	$0, \theta - 1$	$0, 0$

	<i>a</i>	<i>b</i>
<i>a</i>	θ	0
<i>b</i>	0	$1 - \theta$

(1)

- Prisoners' Dilemma:

	<i>C</i>	<i>D</i>
<i>C</i>	$5, 5$	$0, 6$
<i>D</i>	$6, 0$	$1, 1$

	<i>C</i>	<i>D</i>
<i>C</i>	0	1
<i>D</i>	1	2

(2)

- Modified Prisoners' Dilemma (Ordinal Potential):

	<i>C</i>	<i>D</i>
<i>C</i>	$5, 5$	$0, 6$
<i>D</i>	$6, 0$	$1, 2$

	<i>C</i>	<i>D</i>
<i>C</i>	0	1
<i>D</i>	1	2

(3)

- No Potential function for Modified Prisoners' Dilemma

Proposition

Assume: each S_i is an interval and u_i is twice continuously differentiable. Then, G is a potential game iff

$$\frac{\partial^2 u_i}{\partial s_i \partial s_j} = \frac{\partial^2 u_j}{\partial s_i \partial s_j} \quad (\forall i, j \in N).$$

A potential function (when exists):

$$P(s) = \sum_{i \in N} \int_0^1 \frac{\partial u_i}{\partial s_i}(x(t)) x_i'(t) dt$$

where $x : [0, 1] \rightarrow S$ is a (piecewise) continuously differentiable path with $x(0) = \hat{s}$ and $x(1) = s$ for some arbitrarily fixed $\hat{s} \in S$.

Examples of Nice Games:

- **Cournot Oligopoly:**

$$u_i(q_1, \dots, q_n) = q_i (\Pi(Q) - c)$$
$$\frac{\partial^2 u_i}{\partial q_i \partial q_j} = \Pi'(Q) + q_i \Pi''(Q).$$

- ... a potential game iff demand is linear!
- ... Potential function for linear demand ($\Pi(Q) = a - bQ$):

$$P(q_1, \dots, q_n) = a \sum_i q_i - b \sum_i q_i^2 - b \sum_{i < j} q_i q_j - \sum_i c_i(q_i).$$

- **Differentiated Price Competition:**

$$u_i(p_1, \dots, p_n) = (p_i - c_i) Q_i(p_1, \dots, p_n)$$
$$\frac{\partial^2 u_i}{\partial p_i \partial p_j} = \frac{\partial Q_i}{\partial p_j} + (p_i - c_i) \frac{\partial^2 Q_i}{\partial p_i \partial p_j}.$$

- ... a potential game iff demand functions are linear and symmetric!

A general test for a potential

- A finite path: $\gamma = (s^0, \dots, s^m)$ with $\iota = (i_0, \dots, i_m)$ such that $s_{-i_k}^k = s_{-i_k}^{k-1}$ for all $k > 0$.
- A finite path is *closed* if $s^0 = s^m$;
- it is *simple* if $s^k \neq s^l$ for all other distinct pairs (k, l) .
- For any finite path $\gamma = (s^0, \dots, s^m)$ define

$$I(\gamma) = \sum_{k=1}^m u_{i_k}(s^k) - u_{i_k}(s^{k-1}).$$

Proposition

The following are equivalent.

- G is a potential game.
- $I(\gamma) = 0$ for all finite closed paths.
- $I(\gamma) = 0$ for all finite, closed, simple paths of length 4.

Definition

A *congestion model* is a tuple $C = (N, M, S, c)$ where

- $N = \{1, \dots, n\}$ is the set of players
- $M = \{1, \dots, m\}$ is the set of facilities (or resources)
- $S = S_1 \times \dots \times S_n$ is the set of strategy profiles where $S_i = 2^M \setminus \{\emptyset\}$
- $c_j \in \mathbb{R}^N$; $c_j(k) =$ payoff from using facility j when k players use.

A *congestion game*: $G = (N, S, u)$ where

$$\begin{aligned} u_i(s) &= \sum_{j \in s_i} c_j(k_j(s)) \\ k_j(s) &= \#\{i' \in N \mid j \in s_{i'}\} \quad (\forall j \in M). \end{aligned}$$

Theorem

Every congestion game is a potential game with

$$P(s) = \sum_{j \in \cup_i s_i} \sum_{l=1}^{k_j(s)} c_j(l).$$

Coversely, every finite potential game G is isomorphic to a congestion game.

Example

- Binary action game: $A_i = \{0, 1\}$,
- payoff from $a_i = 1$: $v(\alpha)$; $\alpha = \#$ players who take action 1
- and the payoff from action 0 is zero.
- ... as a congestion game: $c_0(k) = 0$ and $c_1(k) = v(k)$.
- The potential function:

$$P(s) = \sum_{l=1}^{\alpha(s)} v(l),$$

where $\alpha(s) = \#$ of players who take action 1 under strategy profile s .

- A potential function for continuum of actions:

$$P(s) = \int_0^{\alpha(s)} v(x) dx.$$

- When v is increasing, P is maximized at (a, \dots, a) where $a_i = a$ is "risk-dominant", i.e., best response to the Laplacian belief!

Correlated Equilibrium

Theorem

Let $G = (N, S, u)$ be a game with potential P where

- each S_i is convex, and
- P is concave and continuously differentiable.

Then, a distribution μ on S is a correlated equilibrium iff

$$\mu(\arg \max P) = 1.$$

Corollary

If, in addition, S is compact and P is strictly concave, then there is a unique correlated equilibrium, which is a strict Nash equilibrium.

Bayesian Potential Games

- Consider a Bayesian game $\mathcal{B} = (N, \Theta, T, A, u, p)$ where $u_i : A \times \Theta \times T \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$
- $\mathcal{B} = (N, \Theta, T, A, u, p)$ is a *potential game* if there is $P : A \times \Theta \times T \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ s.t.

$$u_i(a_i, a_{-i}, \theta, t) - u_i(a'_i, a_{-i}, \theta, t) = P(a_i, a_{-i}, \theta, t) - P(a'_i, a_{-i}, \theta, t).$$

Proposition

Let $\mathcal{B} = (N, \Theta, T, A, u, p)$ be a Bayesian potential game with potential function $P : A \times \Theta \times T \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and a common prior p . Then, the ex-ante game $G(\mathcal{B})$ is a potential game with potential function $\mathcal{P} : A^T \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$,

$$\mathcal{P}(s) = E[P(s, \theta, t)].$$

If in addition $p(t_i) > 0$ for each $t_i \in T_i$, then each $s \in \arg \max \mathcal{P}(s)$ is a BNE.

Bayesian Potential Games—Counterexample

- Consider the state dependent common-interest game:

	a	b
a	1	0
b	0	1

θ_1

	a	b
a	0	1
b	1	0

θ_2

- Player i assigns probability 1 on θ_i .
- Ex-ante game is not an ordinal potential game!
- Suppose now Player 1 knows θ and Player 2 assigns equal probabilities on each θ .
- The interim game is not an ordinal potential game.

Global Supermodular Potential Games

- Bayesian game G^σ , indexed by the shock size σ :
 - $N = \{1, \dots, n\}$;
 - $\Theta \subseteq \mathbb{R}$;
 - A_i is a countable union of closed intervals within $[0, 1]$ where $0, 1 \in A_i$;
 - $u_i : A \times \Theta \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is continuous with bounded derivatives;
 - each player observes a signal

$$x_i = \theta + \sigma \varepsilon_i$$

where $(\theta, \varepsilon_1, \dots, \varepsilon_n)$ are stochastically independent with atomless densities, θ has full support, and $\varepsilon_1, \dots, \varepsilon_n$ are bounded.

- FMP Assumptions: Strategic complementarity, Dominance regions, state monotonicity
- Assume: G^σ is a Bayesian potential game with potential function $P : A \times \Theta \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$

Theorem

There exists a weakly increasing strategy profile s^ such that, for every $x = (x_1, x_1, \dots, x_1)$ at which s^* is continuous,*

- 1 *for every $\epsilon > 0$, there exists $\bar{\sigma} > 0$ such that*

$$S_i^\infty [x_i | G^\sigma] \subset (s^*(x_i) - \epsilon, s^*(x_i) + \epsilon) \quad (\forall \sigma < \bar{\sigma});$$

- 2 *$s^*(x)$ is a Nash equilibrium of the complete information game in which it is common knowledge that $\theta = x_1$;*
- 3 *at each θ where each $u_i(a_i, a_{-i}, \theta)$ is quasi-concave in a_i ,*

$$s^*(\theta, \dots, \theta) \in \arg \max_{a \in A} P(a, \theta).$$

MIT OpenCourseWare
<https://ocw.mit.edu/>

14.126 Game Theory
Spring 2024

For information about citing these materials or our Terms of Use, visit: <https://ocw.mit.edu/terms>.