## Answers to Problem Set 4: Dynamic Game Theory
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## 1. Long Run versus Short Run


subgame perfect equilibrium as marked

|  | out | in |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| fight | $2^{*}, 0^{*}$ | $-1,-1$ |
| cooperate | $2^{*}, 0$ | $1^{*}, 1^{*}$ |

Out/fight is Nash, but isn't plausible because the incumbent wouldn't really fight.
Enter/cooperate is subgame perfect in the infinitely repeated game because it is subgame perfect in the stage game.

For the "out" equilibrium in the repeated game, note that after a failure to fight, the equilibrium is the subgame perfect "enter/cooperate" equilibrium. We must find the value of $\delta$ for which it is actually optimal for the incumbent to fight if there is entry. (Obviously if he does so, the entrants won't wish to enter.) That is
$(1-\delta)(-1)+\delta 2 \geq 1$
$3 \delta \geq 2$
$\delta \geq 2 / 3$
Unlike the non-perfect equilibrium of the stage game, this makes sense, since the incumbent is actually willing to fight, when the penalty is entry forever afterwards when he does not.

## 2. Bayes Law

Let E be the evidence and let H be the event that the husband did it.
$\operatorname{pr}(\mathrm{H})=.8 ; \operatorname{pr}(\mathrm{E} \mid \mathrm{H})=.8 ; \operatorname{pr}(\mathrm{E} \mid \sim \mathrm{H})=.15$
apply Bayes law

$$
\begin{aligned}
\operatorname{pr}(H \mid E) & =\frac{\operatorname{pr}(E \mid H) \operatorname{pr}(H)}{\operatorname{pr}(E)}=\frac{\operatorname{pr}(E \mid H) \operatorname{pr}(H)}{\operatorname{pr}(E \mid H) \operatorname{pr}(H)+\operatorname{pr}(E \mid \sim H) \operatorname{pr}(\sim H)} \\
& =\frac{.8 \times .8}{.8 \times .8+.15 \times .20}=.96
\end{aligned}
$$

so a $96 \%$ chance the husband did it. In the second case
$\operatorname{pr}(H \mid E)=\frac{.8 \times .8}{.8 \times .8+.05 \times .20}=.98$

## 3. Mixed Strategy Equilibrium

a) D and R are strictly dominant strategies, so this is the only Nash equilibrium.
b)

|  | L | R |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| U | $3^{*}, 2^{*}$ | 0,0 |
| D | 0,0 | $2^{*}, 3^{*}$ |

Two pure equilibria as marked. To the symmetric mixed equilibrium let $p$ be the probability L. Then for player 1 to be indifferent, player 2 must mix according to
$3 p=2(1-p)$ giving $p=2 / 5$ chance of Land a $3 / 5$ chance of R. For player 2 to be indifferent let $q$ be the chance of D ; we find that $q=2 / 5$ as well.
c)

|  | L | R |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| U | $4^{*}, 2$ | $3,5^{*}$ |
| D | $2,4^{*}$ | $4^{*}, 2$ |

2. No pure equilibrium. To find the mixed equilibrium, again, let $p$ be probability of L and $q$ be the probability of $D$. Then $4 p+3(1-p)=2 p+4(1-p)$ and $4 q+2(1-q)=2 q+5(1-q)$ so $p=1 / 3$ and $q=3 / 5$
