

Game Theory

Georg Moser

Institute of Computer Science @ UIBK

Winter 2009



Homework

Problem

Let $X \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ and X be finite with $x \in X$ a prize that amount to $\in x$. Consider the following definition of $f \succsim_T g$:

$$\min_{s \in T} \sum_{x \in X} x \cdot f(x|s) \geq \min_{s \in T} \sum_{x \in X} x \cdot g(x|s) .$$

- 1 Give an informal explanation of the relation $f \succsim_T g$
- 2 Does this definition of \succsim_T violate any of the axioms on decision theory?
- 3 Give an example of a preference (perhaps different from above) such that at least one axiom is violated

Problem

Consider the following four axioms on preferences of decision makers for lotteries f , g , and h and event S :

- (i) $f \succsim_S g$ or $g \succsim_S f$
- (ii) if $e \succ_S f$ and $g \succsim_S h$, $\alpha \in (0, 1]$ then $\alpha e + (1 - \alpha)g \succ_S \alpha f + (1 - \alpha)h$
- (iii) $f \succsim_S g$ and $g \succsim_S h$ implies $f \succsim_S h$
- (iv) if $f \succ_S h$ and $0 \leq \beta < \alpha \leq 1$, then $\alpha f + (1 - \alpha)h \succ_S \beta f + (1 - \beta)h$

Prove the following two properties.

- 1 The axiom (iii) follows from the first two
- 2 The axiom (iv) follows from the first two

Problem

consider the proof of the Expected Utility Maximisation Theorem; prove the following equality used:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t \in \Omega} \sum_{x \in X} f(x|t) (u(x, t) [p(t|S)a_1 + (1 - p(t|S))a_0] + (1 - u(x, t))a_0) = \\ \frac{1}{n} = \sum_{t \in \Omega} \sum_{x \in X} f(x|t) u(x, t) p(t|S) a_1 + \\ + \left(1 - \frac{1}{n} \left(\sum_{t \in \Omega} \sum_{x \in X} f(x|t) u(x, t) p(t|S) \right) \right) a_0 \end{aligned}$$

Problem

consider the proof of the Expected Utility Maximisation Theorem. Prove the reversed direction, i.e., given a utility function u , a conditional-probability function p fulfilling the assertions of the theorem, show that the thus defined relation \succsim_S fulfils all axioms

Problem

a decision-maker expresses the following preference order:

$$\begin{aligned} [\text{€}600] \succ [\text{€}400] \succ .9[\text{€}600] + .1[\text{€}0] \\ \succ .2[\text{€}600] + 0.8[\text{€}0] \\ \succ .25[\text{€}400] + .75[\text{€}0] \succ [\text{€}0] \end{aligned}$$

Prove or disprove: These preferences are consistent with a state-independent utility of money