Math 340 Some games reduce to smaller games Richard Anstee 2020

Certain payoff matrices reduce nicely and then are easy to solve. Let

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{r}_1^T \\ \mathbf{r}_2^T \\ \vdots \\ \mathbf{r}_m^T \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{s}_1 & \mathbf{s}_2 & \cdots & \mathbf{s}_n \end{bmatrix}$$

Theorem 1 Let A be a payoff matrix with $\mathbf{r}_i \leq \mathbf{r}_j$. Then there is an optimal strategy \mathbf{x}^* with $x_i^* = 0$. Also if A is a payoff matrix with $\mathbf{s}_i \geq \mathbf{s}_j$. Then there is an optimal strategy \mathbf{y}^* with $y_i^* = 0$.

Proof: From any optimal strategy **x** for the row player, we can create a new optimal strategy \mathbf{x}^{**} with $\mathbf{x}^{**} = \mathbf{x}$ except that $x_i^{**} = 0$ and $x_j^{**} = x_i + x_j$.

As an example, consider the following payoff matrix:

Γ —	$\cdot 2$	3	0	-6	-3]
	0	-4	9	-2	$\begin{bmatrix} -3\\1\\5 \end{bmatrix}$
	6	-2	7	4	5
L		-3		3	

Now column 3 is larger than column 4 and so the column player won't choose column 3. The new payoff matrix with column 3 deleted is

Now column 1 is larger than column 3 and so the column player won't choose column 1. The new payoff matrix with column 1 deleted is

$$\begin{bmatrix} 3 & -6 & -3 \\ -4 & -2 & 1 \\ -2 & 4 & 5 \\ -3 & 3 & 2 \end{bmatrix}$$

Now row 2 and row 4 are both smaller than row 3 and so the row player won't choose row 2 or row 4. The new payoff matrix with rows 2 and 4 deleted is

$$\left[\begin{array}{rrrr} 3 & -6 & -3 \\ -2 & 4 & 5 \end{array}\right]$$

Now column 3 is larger than column 2 and so the column player won't choose column 3. The new payoff matrix with column 3 deleted is

$$\left[\begin{array}{rrr} 3 & -6 \\ -2 & 4 \end{array}\right]$$

We compute the optimal strategy for the row player is $(2/5, 3/5)^T$ with value 0 and the optimal strategy for the column player is $(2/3, 1/3)^T$. Back in the original 4×5 game, the optimal strategies for the row and column player respectively are $\mathbf{x}^* = (2/5, 0, 3/5, 0)^T$ and $\mathbf{y}^* = (0, 2/3, 0, 1/3, 0)^T$. This problem was more for amusement than anything but it repeatedly reminds us than an optimal player does not choose a bad strategy.