

Bayes Correlated Equilibrium

Daisuke Oyama

Game Theory I

October 9, 2023

Papers

- ▶ Bergemann, D. and S. Morris (2016). “Bayes Correlated Equilibrium and the Comparison of Information Structures in Games,” *Theoretical Economics* 11, 487-522.
- ▶ Bergemann, D. and S. Morris (2019). “Information Design: A Unified Perspective,” *Journal of Economic Literature* 57, 44-95.

(We often deviate from these papers in notation.)

Base Game

We fix the base game:

- ▶ $I = \{1, \dots, |I|\}$: Set of players
- ▶ A_i : Finite set of actions for i ($A = A_1 \times \dots \times A_{|I|}$)
- ▶ Θ : Finite set of states
- ▶ $\mu \in \Delta(\Theta)$: Probability distribution over Θ
Assume full support: $\mu(\theta) > 0$ for all $\theta \in \Theta$
- ▶ $u_i: A \times \Theta \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$: i 's payoff function

We identify the base game with $(u_i)_{i \in I}$.

Bayes Correlated Equilibrium (without Prior Information)

- ▶ $\nu \in \Delta(A \times \Theta)$: Outcome

Definition 1

$\nu \in \Delta(A \times \Theta)$ is a *Bayes correlated equilibrium* of $(u_i)_{i \in I}$ if it satisfies

1. *consistency*: $\sum_a \nu(a, \theta) = \mu(\theta)$ for all $\theta \in \Theta$; and
2. *obedience*: for all $i \in I$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{a_{-i}, \theta} \nu((a_i, a_{-i}), \theta) u_i((a_i, a_{-i}), \theta) \\ & \geq \sum_{a_{-i}, \theta} \nu((a_i, a_{-i}), \theta) u_i((a'_i, a_{-i}), \theta) \end{aligned}$$

for all $a_i, a'_i \in A_i$.

Information Structures

- ▶ T_i : Set of types of player i (finite or countably infinite)
($T = T_1 \times \cdots \times T_{|I|}$)

- ▶ $\pi \in \Delta(T \times \Theta)$: Common prior, consistent with μ :

$$\sum_t \pi(t, \theta) = \mu(\theta)$$

for all $\theta \in \Theta$.

- ▶ Together with the base game, an information structure $\mathcal{T} = ((T_i)_{i \in I}, \pi)$ defines an incomplete information game.

- ▶ A strategy profile $\sigma = (\sigma_i)_{i \in I}$ is a Bayes Nash equilibrium of \mathcal{T} if for all $i \in I$ and all $t_i \in T_i$,

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_i(t_i)(a_i) &> 0 \\ \Rightarrow \sum_{t_{-i}, \theta} \pi(t_{-i}, \theta | t_i) \sum_{a_{-i}} \left(\prod_{j \neq i} \sigma_j(t_j)(a_j) \right) u_i((a_i, a_{-i}), \theta) \\ &\geq \sum_{t_{-i}, \theta} \pi(t_{-i}, \theta | t_i) \sum_{a_{-i}} \left(\prod_{j \neq i} \sigma_j(t_j)(a_j) \right) u_i((a'_i, a_{-i}), \theta) \end{aligned}$$

for all $a_i, a'_i \in A_i$.

- ▶ $\pi(t_i) = \sum_{t_{-i}, \theta} \pi((t_i, t_{-i}), \theta)$
- ▶ $\pi(t_{-i}, \theta | t_i) = \frac{\pi((t_i, t_{-i}), \theta)}{\pi(t_i)}$

Partial Implementation

- ▶ An information structure \mathcal{T} and a strategy profile σ induce an outcome $\nu \in \Delta(A \times \Theta)$ if

$$\nu(a, \theta) = \sum_t \pi(t, \theta) \prod_i \sigma_i(t_i)(a_i)$$

for each $a \in A$ and $\theta \in \Theta$.

Definition 2

$\nu \in \Delta(A \times \Theta)$ is *partially implementable* if there exist an information structure \mathcal{T} and a Bayes Nash equilibrium σ of \mathcal{T} that induce ν .

Partial Implementation

Proposition 1

$\nu \in \Delta(A \times \Theta)$ is partially implementable if and only if it is a Bayes correlated equilibrium.

Proof

“Only if” part

- ▶ Suppose that an information structure $\mathcal{T} = ((T_i)_{i \in I}, \pi)$ and a Bayes Nash equilibrium σ of \mathcal{T} that induce ν .

- ▶ First, ν satisfies consistency: for all $\theta \in \Theta$,

$$\sum_a \nu(a, \theta) = \sum_a \sum_t \pi(t, \theta) \prod_i \sigma_i(t_i)(a_i) = \sum_t \pi(t, \theta) = \mu(\theta).$$

- ▶ Second, fix $i \in I$ and $a_i, a'_i \in A$.

- ▶ By optimality, for all $t_i \in T_i$, if $\sigma_i(t_i)(a_i) > 0$, then

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{t_{-i}, \theta} \pi(t_{-i}, \theta | t_i) \sum_{a_{-i}} \left(\prod_{j \neq i} \sigma_j(t_j)(a_j) \right) u_i((a_i, a_{-i}), \theta) \\ & \geq \sum_{t_{-i}, \theta} \pi(t_{-i}, \theta | t_i) \sum_{a_{-i}} \left(\prod_{j \neq i} \sigma_j(t_j)(a_j) \right) u_i((a'_i, a_{-i}), \theta). \end{aligned}$$

- ▶ Multiply both sides by $\pi(t_i)\sigma_i(t_i)(a_i)$ and sum them over t_i : we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{a_{-i}, \theta} \sum_t \pi(t, \theta) \left(\prod_j \sigma_j(t_j)(a_j) \right) u_i((a_i, a_{-i}), \theta) \\ & \geq \sum_{a_{-i}, \theta} \sum_t \pi(t, \theta) \left(\prod_j \sigma_j(t_j)(a_j) \right) u_i((a'_i, a_{-i}), \theta), \end{aligned}$$

i.e.,

$$\sum_{a_{-i}, \theta} \nu(a, \theta) u_i((a_i, a_{-i}), \theta) \geq \sum_{a_{-i}, \theta} \nu(a, \theta) u_i((a'_i, a_{-i}), \theta).$$

This means that ν is a Bayes correlated equilibrium.

“If” part

- ▶ Suppose that ν is a Bayes correlated equilibrium.
- ▶ Let $\mathcal{T} = ((T_i)_{i \in I}, \pi)$ be the “direct mechanism”:
 - ▶ $T_i = \{a_i \in A_i \mid \sum_{a_{-i}, \theta} \nu((a_i, a_{-i}), \theta) > 0\}$ for each $i \in I$, and
 - ▶ $\pi = \nu$.
- ▶ Define σ by $\sigma_i(t_i)(a_i) = 1$ if $t_i = a_i$, and $\sigma_i(t_i)(a_i) = 0$ otherwise.
- ▶ Clearly, σ induces ν :

For all a, θ ,

$$\sum_t \pi(t, \theta) \prod_j \sigma_j(t_j)(a_j) = \pi(a, \theta) = \nu(a, \theta).$$

- ▶ It remains to show that σ is a Bayes Nash equilibrium of \mathcal{T} .

- For any i , $t_i = a_i$, and a'_i ,
the interim payoff (multiplied by $\pi(t_i)$) is

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{t_{-i}, \theta} \pi((t_i, t_{-i}), \theta) \sum_{a_{-i}} \left(\prod_{j \neq i} \sigma_j(t_j)(a_j) \right) u_i((a'_i, a_{-i}), \theta) \\ &= \sum_{a_{-i}, \theta} \pi((t_i, a_{-i}), \theta) u_i((a'_i, a_{-i}), \theta) \\ &= \sum_{a_{-i}, \theta} \nu((a_i, a_{-i}), \theta) u_i((a'_i, a_{-i}), \theta). \end{aligned}$$

- ▶ For all a_i, a'_i ,

since ν is a Bayes correlated equilibrium and hence

$$\sum_{a_{-i}, \theta} \nu((a_i, a_{-i}), \theta) u_i((a_i, a_{-i}), \theta) \geq \sum_{a_{-i}, \theta} \nu((a_i, a_{-i}), \theta) u_i((a'_i, a_{-i}), \theta),$$

if $\sigma_i(t_i)(a_i) > 0$ and hence $t_i = a_i$, then

$$\sum_{t_{-i}, \theta} \pi((t_i, t_{-i}), \theta) \sum_{a_{-i}} \left(\prod_{j \neq i} \sigma_j(t_j)(a_j) \right) u_i((a_i, a_{-i}), \theta) \geq \sum_{t_{-i}, \theta} \pi((t_i, t_{-i}), \theta) \sum_{a_{-i}} \left(\prod_{j \neq i} \sigma_j(t_j)(a_j) \right) u_i((a'_i, a_{-i}), \theta).$$

Best-Case Optimal Information Design

- ▶ An information designer chooses an information structure \mathcal{T} to maximize her objective $V: A \times \Theta \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, where she assumes that the best equilibrium (for the designer) is played in \mathcal{T} :

$$\sup_{\mathcal{T}} \max_{\sigma \in E(\mathcal{T})} \sum_{t, \theta} \pi(t, \theta) \sum_a (\prod_i \sigma_i(t_i)(a_i)) V(a, \theta),$$

where $E(\mathcal{T})$ is the set of Bayes Nash equilibria of \mathcal{T} .

- ▶ By Proposition 1, this is equivalent to

$$\max_{\nu \in BCE} \sum_{a, \theta} \nu(a, \theta) V(a, \theta),$$

where BCE is the set of Bayes correlated equilibria.

... Finite linear program

- Linear program:

$$\max_{\nu} \sum_{a, \theta} V(a, \theta) \nu(a, \theta)$$

subject to

$$\sum_{a_{-i}, \theta} (u_i((a'_i, a_{-i}), \theta) - u_i((a_i, a_{-i}), \theta)) \nu((a_i, a_{-i}), \theta) \leq 0$$

(i, a_i, a'_i)

$$\sum_a \nu(a, \theta) = \mu(\theta),$$

(θ)

$$\nu(a, \theta) \geq 0.$$

(a, θ)

Investment Example: Single Player

- ▶ $I = \{1\}$
- ▶ $A_1 = \{NI, I\}$
- ▶ $\Theta = \{B, G\}$
- ▶ $\mu(B) = \mu(G) = \frac{1}{2}$
- ▶ Payoffs:

	B	G
NI	0	0
I	-1	x

$0 < x < 1$

- ▶ Designer's objective: maximize the probability of I :

$$V(a_1, \theta) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } a_1 = NI, \\ 1 & \text{if } a_1 = I. \end{cases}$$

▶ Zero information:

▶ NI : 0

▶ I : $\frac{1}{2} \times (-1) + \frac{1}{2} \times x < 0$

\Rightarrow Play NI

▶ Complete information:

▶ At $\theta = B$, play NI

▶ At $\theta = G$, play I

$\Rightarrow \text{Prob}(I) = \frac{1}{2}$

BCE

u_1	B	G
NI	0	0
I	-1	x

ν	B	G
NI	$\frac{1}{2}(1 - p_B)$	$\frac{1}{2}(1 - p_G)$
I	$\frac{1}{2}p_B$	$\frac{1}{2}p_G$

- ▶ Obedience for I :

$$\frac{1}{2}p_B \times (-1) + \frac{1}{2}p_G \times x \geq 0$$

- ▶ Obedience for NI :

$$0 \geq \frac{1}{2}(1 - p_B) \times (-1) + \frac{1}{2}(1 - p_G) \times x$$

- ▶ Since $x < 1$, the obedience condition for NI is not binding.

Optimal BCE

u_1	B	G
NI	0	0
I	-1	x

ν^*	B	G
NI	$\frac{1}{2}(1-x)$	0
I	$\frac{1}{2}x$	$\frac{1}{2}$

► $\text{Prob}(I) = \frac{1}{2}(1+x)$

Investment Example: Two Players

- ▶ $I = \{1, 2\}$
- ▶ $A_1 = A_2 = \{NI, I\}$
- ▶ $\Theta = \{B, G\}$, $\mu(B) = \mu(G) = \frac{1}{2}$
- ▶ Payoffs:

	<i>B</i>	<i>NI</i>	<i>I</i>
<i>NI</i>		0	0
<i>I</i>		-1	$-1 + \varepsilon$

	<i>G</i>	<i>NI</i>	<i>I</i>
<i>NI</i>		0	0
<i>I</i>		x	$x + \varepsilon$

$$0 < x < 1, -x < \varepsilon < \frac{1}{2}(1 - x)$$

- ▶ Designer's objective: maximize the number of players who invest.

- ▶ Zero information: (NI, NI)
- ▶ Complete information:
 - ▶ At $\theta = B$, (NI, NI)
 - ▶ At $\theta = G$, (I, I)

Optimal BCE

By symmetry, we focus on symmetric outcomes:

<i>B</i>	<i>NI</i>	<i>I</i>
<i>NI</i>	p_{0B}	p_{1B}
<i>I</i>	p_{1B}	p_{2B}

<i>G</i>	<i>NI</i>	<i>I</i>
<i>NI</i>	p_{0G}	p_{1G}
<i>I</i>	p_{1G}	p_{2G}

► Obedience for *I*:

$$p_{1B} \times (-1) + p_{2B} \times (-1 + \varepsilon) + p_{1G} \times x + p_{2G} \times (x + \varepsilon) \geq 0$$

► Obedience for *NI*:

$$0 \geq p_{0B} \times (-1) + p_{1B} \times (-1 + \varepsilon) + p_{0G} \times x + p_{1G} \times (x + \varepsilon)$$

► Consistency:

$$p_{0B} + 2p_{1B} + p_{2B} = \frac{1}{2}$$

$$p_{0G} + 2p_{1G} + p_{2G} = \frac{1}{2}$$

- Under consistency, obedience for I implies obedience for NI :

$$\begin{aligned} & - [p_{0B} \times (-1) + p_{1B} \times (-1 + \varepsilon) + p_{0G} \times x + p_{1G} \times (x + \varepsilon)] \\ & - [p_{1B} \times (-1) + p_{2B} \times (-1 + \varepsilon) + p_{1G} \times x + p_{2G} \times (x + \varepsilon)] \\ & = \frac{1}{2}(1 - x) - \varepsilon(p_{1B} + p_{2B} + p_{1G} + p_{2G}) \\ & \geq \frac{1}{2}(1 - x) - \varepsilon > 0 \end{aligned}$$

Linear Program

- ▶ Maximize

$$2p_{1B} + 2p_{2B} + 2p_{1G} + 2p_{2G}$$

- ▶ subject to

$$p_{1B} + (1 - \varepsilon)p_{2B} - xp_{1G} - (x + \varepsilon)p_{2G} \leq 0 \quad (I)$$

$$p_{0B} + 2p_{1B} + p_{2B} = \frac{1}{2} \quad (B)$$

$$p_{0G} + 2p_{1G} + p_{2G} = \frac{1}{2} \quad (G)$$

$$p_{0B}, p_{1B}, p_{2B}, p_{0G}, p_{1G}, p_{2G} \geq 0$$

One may alternatively solve the dual problem:

► Minimize

$$\frac{1}{2}\lambda_B + \frac{1}{2}\lambda_G$$

► subject to

$$\lambda_B \geq 0 \quad (p_{0B})$$

$$\lambda_I + 2\lambda_B \geq 2 \quad (p_{1B})$$

$$(1 - \varepsilon)\lambda_I + \lambda_B \geq 2 \quad (p_{2B})$$

$$\lambda_G \geq 0 \quad (p_{0G})$$

$$-x\lambda_I + 2\lambda_G \geq 2 \quad (p_{1G})$$

$$-(x + \varepsilon)\lambda_I + \lambda_G \geq 2 \quad (p_{2G})$$

$$\lambda_I \geq 0$$

Case of Strategic Complementarity: $\varepsilon > 0$

- ▶ Let $p_{0G} = p_{1G} = 0$ and $p_{2G} = \frac{1}{2}$.
- ▶ Then let $p_{1B} = 0$, and solve $(1 - \varepsilon)p_{2B} - (x + \varepsilon)\frac{1}{2} = 0$ (I).

<i>B</i>	<i>NI</i>	<i>I</i>
<i>NI</i>	$\frac{1-x-2\varepsilon}{2(1-\varepsilon)}$	0
<i>I</i>	0	$\frac{x+\varepsilon}{2(1-\varepsilon)}$

<i>G</i>	<i>NI</i>	<i>I</i>
<i>NI</i>	0	0
<i>I</i>	0	$\frac{1}{2}$

- ▶ $V^* = 1 + \frac{x+\varepsilon}{1-\varepsilon} (> 1 + x)$

Case of Strategic Substitutability: $\varepsilon < 0$

Case (i) $\varepsilon \leq \frac{1}{2} - x$ (i.e., $|\varepsilon| \geq x - \frac{1}{2}$)

<i>B</i>	<i>NI</i>	<i>I</i>
<i>NI</i>	$\frac{1-2x-2\varepsilon}{2}$	$\frac{x+\varepsilon}{2}$
<i>I</i>	$\frac{x+\varepsilon}{2}$	0

<i>G</i>	<i>NI</i>	<i>I</i>
<i>NI</i>	0	0
<i>I</i>	0	$\frac{1}{2}$

► $V^* = 1 + x + \varepsilon (< 1 + x)$

Case (ii) $\varepsilon \geq \frac{1}{2} - x$ (i.e., $|\varepsilon| \leq x - \frac{1}{2}$)

	<i>B</i>	<i>NI</i>	<i>I</i>
<i>NI</i>		0	$\frac{1-x-2\varepsilon}{2(1-2\varepsilon)}$
<i>I</i>		$\frac{1-x-2\varepsilon}{2(1-2\varepsilon)}$	$\frac{-1+2x+2\varepsilon}{2(1-2\varepsilon)}$

	<i>G</i>	<i>NI</i>	<i>I</i>
<i>NI</i>		0	0
<i>I</i>		0	$\frac{1}{2}$

► $V^* = 1 + \frac{x}{1-2\varepsilon} (< 1 + x)$