HOMEWORK 3 SOLUTIONS

JOEL FRIEDMAN

Copyright: Copyright Joel Friedman 2014. Not to be copied, used, or revised without explicit written permission from the copyright owner.

Problem 1

(a) (There are a few ways of doing this): Since Alice takes the stochastic \mathbf{x} whose smallest component is as large as possible, any particular \mathbf{x} is at least as good (in terms of its smallest component) as the best \mathbf{x} . Said otherwise: the value of "Alice announces a mixed strategy is

 $\operatorname{AliceAnnouncesMixed}(A) = \max_{\mathbf{x} \text{ stoch}} \operatorname{MinEntry}(\mathbf{x}^{\mathrm{T}}A);$

hence this is at least as large as any particular value of

$$\operatorname{MinEntry}(\mathbf{x}^{\mathrm{T}}A)$$

for a particular stochastic vector, \mathbf{x} .

(b) Similarly any particular choice of stochastic ${\bf y}$ gives a ${\rm MaxEntry}(A{\bf y})$ larger than

BettyAnnouncesMixed
$$(A) = \min_{\mathbf{y} \text{ stoch}} \text{MaxEntry}(A\mathbf{y}).$$

(c) (Again, there are a number of possible solutions): In the game "Betty announces a mixed strategy," Alice can always ignore what Betty announces and play a mixed strategy \mathbf{x} , and then let Betty revise her strategy if she wants; this cannot be worse for Betty. But this game is just "Alice announces a mixed strategy."

Alternatively, one can see that

$$v_1 \leq (\mathbf{x}^{\mathrm{T}} A) \mathbf{y},$$

since **y** is stochastic and each entry of $\mathbf{x}^{\mathrm{T}}A$ is at least v_1 . Similarly

$$v_2 \ge \mathbf{x}^{\mathrm{T}}(A\mathbf{y}).$$

Hence

$$v_1 \leq \mathbf{x}^{\mathrm{T}} A \mathbf{y} \leq v_2.$$

(d) The value of "Alice announces a mixed strategy" cannot be greater than v_1 if $v_1 = v_2$, by part (a). Since Alice can achieve a value of v_1 , this is the maximum of "Alice announces a mixed strategy.

(e) We have

$$[2/3 \ 1/3] \left[\begin{array}{rrr} 1 & -1 \\ -2 & 2 \end{array} \right] = [0 \ 0],$$

Research supported in part by an NSERC grant.

and so $v_1 \ge 0$; we have

$$\left[\begin{array}{rrr} 1 & -1 \\ -2 & 2 \end{array}\right] \left[\begin{array}{r} 1/2 \\ 1/2 \end{array}\right] = \left[\begin{array}{r} 0 \\ 0 \end{array}\right],$$

and so $v_1 \leq 0$. By part (d), it follows that 0 is the value of this game.

(f) If $\mathbf{x}^T A$ has its minimum component, v, equal to the maximum component, w, of $A\mathbf{y}$, then by part (d) this common number v = w must be the value of the mixed strategy games (and \mathbf{x} and \mathbf{y} are optimum strategies). If not, then either \mathbf{x} or \mathbf{y} is not an optimal strategy, since we know that the two mixed strategy games have the same value.

Problem 2

We have the same initial dictionary:

If x_1 enters, then the most restrictive inequality is $w_3 \ge 0$ (since this imposes that $x_1 \le 4$, rather than the first two which impose, respectively, $x_1 \le 5$ and $x_1 \le 8$); hence x_1 enters forces w_3 to leave, and we get the second dictionary:

Now x_2 must enter (since w_3 has a negative coefficient in the ζ line); w_1 leaves since it is the most restrictive, and we get the third dictionary:

ζ	=	22	$+w_3$	$-6w_{1}$
x_2	=	2	$+w_{3}$	$-2w_1$
w_2	=	1	$-w_3$	$+3w_{1}$
x_1	=	3	$-w_3$	$+w_{1}$

So w_3 enters, and w_2 leaves, to yield the fourth dictionary

Since the coefficients of the non-basic variables in the ζ row are all negative or zero, we are done. We get $(x_1, x_2) = (2, 3)$ gives the largest possible value of $\zeta = 4x_1 + 5x_2$, namely 23.

Problem 3

(a) Our first dictionary is

ζ	=		v		
w_1	=		-v	$+11x_{1}$	$+8x_{2}$
w_2	=		-v	$+9x_{1}$	$+12x_{2}$
w_3	=	1		$-x_1$	$-x_2$

v enters, and either w_1 or w_2 leaves; let's choose w_1 (this is a degenerate pivot, where the ζ value does not increase and the basic feasible solution remains the same).

ζ	=		$-w_1$	$11x_1$	$+8x_{2}$
v	=		$-w_1$	$+11x_{1}$	$+8x_{2}$
w_2	=		w_1	$-2x_{1}$	$+4x_{2}$
w_3	=	1		$-x_1$	$-x_2$

Now we can take x_1 entering or x_2 . Say we choose x_1 enters, so w_2 leaves (in another degenerate pivot).

ζ	=	0	$+(9/2)w_1$	$-(11/2)w_2$	$+30x_{2}$
v	=	0	$+(9/2)w_1$	$-(11/2)w_2$	$+30x_{2}$
x_1	=	0	$+(1/2)w_1$	$-(1/2)w_2$	$+2x_{2}$
w_3	=	1	$-(1/2)w_1$	$+(1/2)w_2$	$-3x_{2}$

Now let's choose x_2 to enter (we could choose w_1 as well, which would ultimately add one more pivot) to obtain:

This shows that Alice's optimal mixed strategy is $(x_1, x_2) = (2/3, 1/3)$, giving a value of 10.

(b) Our starting dictionary is:

ζ	=		v		
w_1	=		-v	$-9x_{1}$	$-12x_2$
w_2	=		-v	$-11x_1$	$-8x_{2}$
w_3	=	1		$-x_1$	$-x_2$

So v enters and w_1 or w_2 leaves; say we take w_1 : we get degenerate pivot to the final dictionary:

ζ	=	0	$-1w_1$	$-9x_{1}$	$-12x_{2}$
v	=	0	$-1w_1$	$-9x_{1}$	$-12x_{2}$
w_2	=	0	$+1w_{1}$	$-2x_1$	$+4x_{2}$
w_3	=	1	$+0w_{1}$	$-1x_{1}$	$-1x_{2}$

(c) Since all entries of A_{+10} are positive, it is clear that v > 0, so $v \ge 0$ is no real restriction. Furthermore if we allow $x_1 + x_2 \le 1$, it will not change the optimum value of v, since any solution with $x_1 + x_2 < 1$ can have either x_1 or x_2 increased to get a larger value of v

(d) We know that Alice's optimal mixed strategy is given by the same LP in part (a) except with $x_1 + x_2 = 1$ and v arbitrary; by part (c) we know that these changes don't change the optimum mixed strategy.

JOEL FRIEDMAN

(e) A_{+10} is the game where Betty gives Alice \$10 and then they play the game A. Since this initial payment is independent of the rest of the game, the equilibria are the same and the value of A_{+10} is exactly 10 more than that of A. Similarly for A_{-10} .

(f) The discussion in part (c) does not apply, for v is certainly negative, and setting $x_1 + x_2 \leq 1$ allows $x_1 = x_2 = 0$ (intuitively allowing Alice not to play at all), which is better for v and Alice in a game with all negative entries. (There are other possible explanations for this question.)

(g) Betty's strategy is in the ζ row of the final dictionary. We will understand this later (Chapter 5) as due to the fact that the dictionary dual to Alice's final dictionary is a final dictionary for Betty.

For this small dictionary one may be able argue differently, without appealing to duality theory (Chapter 5). For example, if we want a linear combination of the columns that "balances" (Betty's equilibrium), this balancing can be done by finding the combination of w_1 and w_2 whose x_1, x_2 coefficients are equal, therefore recovering v with $10w_3$. In other words, the slack variables w_1 and w_2 each correspond to a column, and balancing them in terms of the slack w_3 corresponds to column balancing.

Perhaps you have another (and even simpler) explanation?

DEPARTMENT OF COMPUTER SCIENCE, UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA, VANCOUVER, BC V6T 1Z4, CANADA, AND DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA, VANCOUVER, BC V6T 1Z2, CANADA.

E-mail address: jf@cs.ubc.ca or jf@math.ubc.ca *URL*: http://www.math.ubc.ca/~jf

4