

CS344M

Autonomous Multiagent Systems

Patrick MacAlpine

Department of Computer Science
The University of Texas at Austin

Good Afternoon, Colleagues

Are there any questions?

Good Afternoon, Colleagues

Are there any questions?

- How can we apply game theory to RoboCup?
- Examples of game theory that aren't modeled as a matrix?
- What about irrational agents?
- Pure vs mixed strategy?

Logistics

- Progress reports due in 2 weeks

Logistics

- Progress reports due in 2 weeks

Game Theory Premises

- Simultaneous actions: (mutual exclusivity?)

Game Theory Premises

- Simultaneous actions: (mutual exclusivity?)
- No communication
- Outcome depends on **combination** of actions
- Utility (payoff) encapsulates **everything** about preferences over outcomes

Solution Concepts

- Dominant strategy
- Nash equilibrium
- Pareto optimality
- Maximum social welfare
- Maximin strategy

Prisoner's Dilemma

		Column	
		C(1)	D(2)
Row	C(1)	3, 3	0, 5
	D(2)	5, 0	1, 1

Chicken

		Column	
		C(1)	D(2)
Row	C(1)	3, 3	1, 5
	D(2)	5, 1	0, 0

Bach/Stravinsky

- My wife and I agree to meet at a concert

Bach/Stravinsky

- My wife and I agree to meet at a concert
- Unfortunately, there are 2: Bach and Stravinsky

Bach/Stravinsky

- My wife and I agree to meet at a concert
- Unfortunately, there are 2: Bach and Stravinsky
- No time to get in touch with each other

Bach/Stravinsky

- My wife and I agree to meet at a concert
- Unfortunately, there are 2: Bach and Stravinsky
- No time to get in touch with each other
- I prefer Stravinsky, she prefers Bach

Bach/Stravinsky

- My wife and I agree to meet at a concert
- Unfortunately, there are 2: Bach and Stravinsky
- No time to get in touch with each other
- I prefer Stravinsky, she prefers Bach
- But most of all, we want to be together

Bach/Stravinsky

- My wife and I agree to meet at a concert
- Unfortunately, there are 2: Bach and Stravinsky
- No time to get in touch with each other
- I prefer Stravinsky, she prefers Bach
- But most of all, we want to be together
 - If not, so distraught we don't care what we're listening to

Bach/Stravinsky

- My wife and I agree to meet at a concert
- Unfortunately, there are 2: Bach and Stravinsky
- No time to get in touch with each other
- I prefer Stravinsky, she prefers Bach
- But most of all, we want to be together
 - If not, so distraught we don't care what we're listening to
- Propose a payoff matrix

Bach/Stravinsky

			Wife	
		S		B
Me	S	2,1		0,0
	B	0,0		1,2

Nash Equilibrium

- Does every game have a pure strategy Nash equilibrium?

Matching Pennies

- We each put a penny down covered
- If they match, I win, if they don't, you win

Matching Pennies

- We each put a penny down covered
- If they match, I win, if they don't, you win

		Player 2	
		H	T
Player 1	H	1, -1	-1, 1
	T	-1, 1	1, -1

Matching Pennies

- We each put a penny down covered
- If they match, I win, if they don't, you win

		Player 2	
		H	T
Player 1	H	1, -1	-1, 1
	T	-1, 1	1, -1

Nash equilibrium?

Nash Equilibrium

- Every game has at least one Nash equilibrium

Nash Equilibrium

- Every game has at least one Nash equilibrium
 - Nobel prize **and** academy award!

Nash Equilibrium

- Every game has at least one Nash equilibrium
 - Nobel prize **and** academy award!
- Not known if complexity of finding one is NP-complete or in P

Some theory

- Prove that if each player plays a dominant strategy, the result is a Nash equilibrium

Some theory

- Prove that if each player plays a dominant strategy, the result is a Nash equilibrium
- Are all Nash equilibria the result of playing dominant strategies?

Some theory

- Prove that if each player plays a dominant strategy, the result is a Nash equilibrium
- Are all Nash equilibria the result of playing dominant strategies?
- Is the outcome of a Nash equilibrium necessarily Pareto optimal?

Some theory

- Prove that if each player plays a dominant strategy, the result is a Nash equilibrium
- Are all Nash equilibria the result of playing dominant strategies?
- Is the outcome of a Nash equilibrium necessarily Pareto optimal?
- Is a Pareto optimal outcome necessarily the result of Nash equilibrium strategies?

Some theory

- Prove that if each player plays a dominant strategy, the result is a Nash equilibrium
- Are all Nash equilibria the result of playing dominant strategies?
- Is the outcome of a Nash equilibrium necessarily Pareto optimal?
- Is a Pareto optimal outcome necessarily the result of Nash equilibrium strategies?
- Is the maximum social welfare outcome necessarily Pareto optimal?

Some theory

- Prove that if each player plays a dominant strategy, the result is a Nash equilibrium
- Are all Nash equilibria the result of playing dominant strategies?
- Is the outcome of a Nash equilibrium necessarily Pareto optimal?
- Is a Pareto optimal outcome necessarily the result of Nash equilibrium strategies?
- Is the maximum social welfare outcome necessarily Pareto optimal?
- If both players play maximin, is it necessarily a Nash equilibrium?

Mixed strategy equilibrium

		Player 2	
		Action 1	Action 2
Player 1	Action 1	4,8	2,0
	Action 2	6,2	0,8

Mixed strategy equilibrium

		Player 2	
		Action 1	Action 2
Player 1	Action 1	4,8	2,0
	Action 2	6,2	0,8

- What if player 2 picks action 1 $\frac{3}{4}$ of the time?

Mixed strategy equilibrium

		Player 2	
		Action 1	Action 2
Player 1	Action 1	4,8	2,0
	Action 2	6,2	0,8

- What if player 2 picks action 1 $\frac{3}{4}$ of the time? $1 = 3.5, 2 = 4.5$

Mixed strategy equilibrium

		Player 2	
		Action 1	Action 2
Player 1	Action 1	4,8	2,0
	Action 2	6,2	0,8

- What if player 2 picks action 1 $\frac{3}{4}$ of the time? $1 = 3.5, 2 = 4.5$
- What if player 2 picks action 1 $\frac{1}{4}$ of the time?

Mixed strategy equilibrium

		Player 2	
		Action 1	Action 2
Player 1	Action 1	4,8	2,0
	Action 2	6,2	0,8

- What if player 2 picks action 1 $\frac{3}{4}$ of the time? $1 = 3.5, 2 = 4.5$
- What if player 2 picks action 1 $\frac{1}{4}$ of the time? $1 = 2.5, 2 = 1.5$

Mixed strategy equilibrium

		Player 2	
		Action 1	Action 2
Player 1	Action 1	4,8	2,0
	Action 2	6,2	0,8

- What if player 2 picks action 1 $\frac{3}{4}$ of the time? $1 = 3.5, 2 = 4.5$
- What if player 2 picks action 1 $\frac{1}{4}$ of the time? $1 = 2.5, 2 = 1.5$

- Player 1 must be indifferent between actions 1 and 2

- Player 1 must be indifferent between actions 1 and 2
 $24q + 2 - 2q = 6q$

- Player 1 must be indifferent between actions 1 and 2 $4q + 2 - 2q = 6q$
- Player 2 must be indifferent between actions 1 and 2

- Player 1 must be indifferent between actions 1 and $24q+2-2q = 6q$
- Player 2 must be indifferent between actions 1 and $28p+2-2p = 8-8p$

- Player 1 must be indifferent between actions 1 and $24q+2-2q = 6q$
- Player 2 must be indifferent between actions 1 and $28p+2-2p = 8-8p$

Rock/Paper/Scissors

- Nash equilibrium?

Rock/Paper/Scissors

- Nash equilibrium?
- Why is anything else **not** an equilibrium?

Correlated Equilibria

Sometimes mixing isn't enough: Bach/Stravinsky

		Wife	
		S	B
Me	S	2, 1	0, 0
	B	0, 0	1, 2

Correlated Equilibria

Sometimes mixing isn't enough: Bach/Stravinsky

		Wife	
		S	B
Me	S	2, 1	0, 0
	B	0, 0	1, 2

Want only S,S or B,B - 50% each