PS/Ec 172, Set 2
Due Friday, April 21st at 11:59pm
Resubmission due Friday, May 11th at 11:59pm

Collaboration on homework is encouraged, but individually written solutions are required. Also, please name all collaborators and sources of information on each assignment; any such named source may be used.

(1) *Equilibria in strategic form games.* Find all the equilibria in the following games, which are described in the lecture notes.

  (a) *10 points.* Voter turnout when N^a and N^b are the same size.

  (b) *10 points.* Voter turnout when N^a is larger than N^b.

(2) *Cournot competition.* The Cournot competition game is described in the lecture notes.

  (a) *10 points*. An equilibrium is said to be *symmetric* if all players choose the same strategy. Find a symmetric pure Nash equilibrium of the Cournot competition game, as described in Exercise 3.9 of the lecture notes.

  (b) *10 points*. Imagine that an organized crime boss is brought in to enforce a cartel policy that maximizes the total utility of the companies. By how much does their total utility increase?

(3) *Elimination of weakly dominated strategies.* In this problem we will show that eliminating weakly dominated strategies can change the set of pure Nash equilibria. This is in contrast to what happens when eliminating strictly dominated strategies, which does not change the set of pure equilibria (see the lecture notes).

In the following game the additional strategy A was added to matching pennies.

	H	T	A
H	1,0	0,1	2,0
T	0,1	1,0	1,0
A	1/2,0	0,1	2,2

  (a) *10 points*. Show that this game has a pure Nash equilibrium.

  (b) *10 points*. What are the weakly dominated strategies?

  (c) *10 points*. Iteratively remove the weakly dominated strategies. What is the resulting game? What are its pure Nash equilibria?

(4) *Mixed Nash equilibria*. In the *auditing game* a taxpayer has to decide whether to cheat, and the IRS has to decide whether to audit. The benefit to the taxpayer from cheating is some $b > 0$. The cost of auditing is $c > 0$. The fine for cheaters is $f > 0$. Thus the game is described by

Omer Tamuz. Email: tamuz@caltech.edu.

	audit	not audit
cheat	$-f, f-c$	$b, 0$
not cheat	$0, -c$	$0, 0$

(a) *10 points*. For every possible value of b, c and f, find all the mixed Nash equilibria.

(b) *10 points*. In what direction does the equilibrium probability of an audit change as a function of b, c and f? How about the probability of cheating?

(c) *10 points*. In what direction do the players' equilibrium expected utilities change as a function of b, c and f?

(5) *Bonus question.* A prisoner escapes to the number line. He chooses some $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ to hide on the zeroth day. He also chooses some $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, and every day hides at a number that is k higher than in the previous day. Hence on day $t \in \{0,1,2,\dots\}$ he hides at $n + k \cdot t$.

Every day the detective can check one number and see if the prisoner is there. If he is there, she wins. Otherwise she can check again the next day.

Formally, the game played between the prisoner and the detective is the following. The prisoner's strategy space is $\{(n,k) : n,k \in \mathbb{Z}\}$, and the detective's strategy space is the set of sequences $(a_0, a_1, a_2, \dots)$ in $\mathbb{Z}$. The detective wins if $a_t = n + k \cdot t$ for some t. The prisoner wins otherwise.

(a) *1 point.* Prove that the detective has a winning strategy.