# Sequence Form

Presenter: Brandon Dos Remedios

### Major Points

- 1) The problem sequence form solves
- 2) The 4 components of sequence form
- 3) What property does it introduce that helps computationally?
- 4) What are realization plans and how can we best implement them?
- 5) How can put this into something computable

### Consider a Small Game



#### **Properties:**

- Extensive Form
- Imperfect Information
- Perfect Recall

## The Problem

### Initial Approach: Induced Normal Form (INF)



### The Problem with INF



Number of pure strategies is the size of the cross product of actions at each node:

$$\implies O(e^n)$$

## Sequence Form

### An Initial Intuition

Instead of pure strategies consider the paths to leaf nodes in the tree



Number of paths to leaves is the number of leaves:

$$\implies O(n)$$

4 Components of Sequence Form



### Formal Definition: Sequences and Payoff

#### <u>Sequence</u>

- Defined for a player *i* for some node  $h \in H \cup Z$
- A **sequence** is an ordered set of player *i*'s actions that lie on the path to *h*
- Set of sequences for player i  $\Sigma_i$ , is the set of player *i* sequences that lead to a node for player *i*
- Sequence to root is Ø

#### <u>Payoff</u>

- Defined for a player *i* for some member  $\sigma$  of the set of all sequences  $\Sigma$ 

$$g_i(\sigma) = \begin{cases} u_i(z) & \text{if } \sigma \text{ legally reaches leaf node } z \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

### Our Small Game's Sequences



### Our Small Game's INF vs Sequence Form: Payoff Matrices



	Ø	C	D
Ø	(0, 0)	(0, 0)	(0, 0)
A	(0, 0)	(1, 2)	(3, 4)
В	(0, 0)	(5, 6)	(0, 0)
BE	(0, 0)	(0, 0)	(7, 8)
BF	(0, 0)	(0, 0)	(9, 10)

Sequence Form



### INF vs Sequence Form: Payoff Matrices



	Ø	C	D
Ø			
A		(1, 2)	(3, 4)
В		(5, 6)	
BE			(7, 8)
BF			(9, 10)

8 Non-zeroes Not Sparse 5 Non-zeroes **Sparse!** 

### Sparsity Advantage

- Large research base in taking advantage of sparseness for computation
- Sparse when non-zeros are O(n+m) instead of O(nm) which would be dense
- Key Idea: Ignore computations when things will obviously result in 0, reduces the amount we have to do

	C	D
AE	(1, 2)	(3, 4)
BE	(5, 6)	(7, 8)
AF	(1, 2)	(3, 4)
BF	(5, 6)	(9, 10)

1	Ø	C	D
Ø			
A		(1, 2)	(3, 4)
В		(5, 6)	
BE			(7, 8)
BF			(9, 10)

### A Really Quick Example



## **Realization Plans**

### Sequences Aren't Enough

- Sequences can't take the place of actions entirely
- Still need to assign what to do at every node (want a behavioral strategy)



### Behavioral Strategy to Realization Plan

- Behavioral strategy since perfect recall guarantees an equilibrium (Kuhn, 1953 + Nash, 1951)
- Assignment of some probability to every choice node h for player *i*, of taking some action at that node:

$$\beta_i(h, a_i)$$

- <u>Realization plan</u>:
  - Defined for a behavioral strategy  $B_i$

$$r_i: \Sigma_i \to [0, 1]$$
  $r_i(\sigma_i) = \prod_{(h, a_i) \in \sigma_i} \beta_i(h, a_i)$ 

### Linear Constraint Definition

 $\operatorname{seq}_i: I_i \to \Sigma_i$ 

- Maps information set to the sequence that leads to it

 $\operatorname{Ext}_i : \Sigma_i \to 2^{\Sigma_i}$ 

- Maps sequence to sequences that extend it

Define realization plan within linear constraints using these:

$$r_i(\emptyset) = 1, \ r_i(\sigma_i) \ge 0, \ \forall \sigma_i \in \Sigma_i$$
$$\sum_{\sigma'_i \in \operatorname{Ext}_i(I)} r_i(\sigma'_i) = r_i(\operatorname{seq}_i(I)), \ \forall I \in I_i$$



### Realization Plan Back to Behavioral Strategy

$$\beta_i(h, a_i) \equiv \frac{r_i(\operatorname{seq}_i(I)a_i)}{r_i(\operatorname{seq}_i(I))}$$

- This is equivalent to what we did earlier:

$$\prod_{(h,a_i)\in\sigma_i}\beta_i(h,a_i) = \frac{r_i(\operatorname{seq}_i(I)a_i)}{r_i(\operatorname{seq}_i(I))} \cdot \frac{r_i(\operatorname{seq}_i(I))}{r_i(\operatorname{seq}_i(I)a_{-i})} \cdot \ldots \cdot \frac{r_i(\operatorname{seq}_i(I)a_{-n})}{r_i(\varnothing)} = r_i(\operatorname{seq}_i(I)a_i)$$

# Linear Programming and Duality

### Primal Linear Programming

- Constraints are linear and we can define an objective
- Variable: Realization plan
- Consider a 2-person game, the Primal LP of agent 1's best response given agent 2's realization plan is as follows:

$$\max \sum_{\substack{\sigma_1 \in \Sigma_1, \sigma_2 \in \Sigma_2}} g_1(\sigma_1, \sigma_2) r_2(\sigma_2) r_1(\sigma_2)$$
  
subj. to  $r_1(\emptyset) = 1, r_1(\sigma) \ge 0 \ \forall \sigma \in \Sigma_1$ 
$$\sum_{\sigma \in \text{Ext}_1(I)} r_1(\sigma) = r_1(\text{seq}_1(I)) \ \forall I \in I_1$$

### Primal Linear Programming

- Constraints are linear and we can define an objective
- Variable: Realization plan
- Consider a 2-person game, the Primal LP of agent 1's best response given agent 2's realization plan is as follows:

$$\begin{split} \max \sum_{\substack{\sigma_1 \in \Sigma_1, \sigma_2 \in \Sigma_2}} g_1(\sigma_1, \sigma_2) r_2(\sigma_2) r_1(\sigma_2) \\ \text{subj. to } r_1(\varnothing) = 1, \ r_1(\sigma) \geq 0 \ \forall \sigma \in \Sigma_1 \\ \sum_{\substack{\sigma \in \text{Ext}_1(I)}} r_1(\sigma) = r_1(\text{seq}_1(I)) \ \forall I \in I_1 \end{split}$$

### LP Duality

- Can get an equivalent problem to a Primal LP problem

$$\begin{array}{cccc} \max \ c^T x & \min \ y^T b \\ \text{subj. to } Ax = b & \longleftrightarrow & \text{subj. to } A^T y - z = c \\ x \geq 0 & z \geq 0 \end{array}$$
Primal LP Dual LP

### LP Dual Process

Step 1: Loosen Restrictions into Objective

Step 2: Optimize the bound

Step 3: Convert into equivalent Dual LP

$$c^{T}x \rightarrow c^{T}x + y^{T}(b - Ax)$$

$$\begin{cases} y^{T}b & \text{if } c - A^{T}y \leq 0\\ \infty & \text{if } c - A^{T}y > 0 \end{cases}$$

$$\min \ y^{T}b$$
subj. to 
$$A^{T}y - z = c$$

$$z \geq 0$$

m

### An Equivalent Dual LP (Computable in Zero-sum)

- Linear w.r.t the variables:

$$\begin{array}{ll} \min \ v_o \\ \text{subj. to} \ v_{I_1(\sigma_1)} - \sum_{I' \in I_1(\text{Ext}_1(\sigma_1))} v_{I'} \\ \geq \sum_{\sigma_2 \in \Sigma_2} g_1(\sigma_1, \sigma_2) r_2(\sigma_2) \ \forall \sigma_1 \in \Sigma_1 \end{array}$$

- For zero-sum/constant-sum can insert constraints on player 2's realization plan and optimize w.r.t those and the constraints on player 1's primal

$$r_2(\emptyset) = 1, r_2(\sigma_2) \ge 0 \ \forall \sigma_2 \in \Sigma_2$$
$$\sum_{\sigma'_2 \in \operatorname{Ext}_2(I)} r_2(\sigma'_2) = r_2(\operatorname{seq}_2(I)) \ \forall I \in I_2$$

### Computational Advantage/Limitations

- With this formulation we get a linear number of variables and constraints as well as a sparsity within the constraints
- Simplex method for solving LPs is potentially exponential w.r.t the variables and constraints, so we can't say anything super strong, but this is as least as good as before

### Major Takeaways

- Using INF leads to a solution space with a exponential number of dimensions w.r.t the size of the extensive form game
- Sequence form reduces the size of the solution space, by considering sequences instead of pure strategies
- This introduces sparsity within payoffs reducing computation work
- Realization plans allow sequences to be converted into usable behavioral strategies and can be specified by linear constraints
- LP can be used to best compute equilibria with this framework for certain games, specifically using tools such as the Dual LP to get a linear objective

### References

- (Shoham and Leyton-Brown, 2009, p.72, 134-142) Multiagent Systems: Algorithmic, Game-Theoretic, and Logical Foundations
- (von Stengel, 1994) *Efficient Computation of Behavior Strategies*
- (Ascher and Grief, p. 271-286) A First Course in Numerical Methods: Ch 9.3: Constrained Optimization
- (Ascher and Grief, Unpublished/Currently Being Written Sorry) Unpublished Second Edition, Ch: Sparse Direct Solvers