

## Economics 2030

Fall 2018

Martin J. Osborne

### Solutions to Problem Set 1

1. (a) Firm 1's payoff function is

$$\begin{cases} q_1(\alpha - c - q_1 - q_2 - \cdots - q_n) & \text{if } q_1 + q_2 + \cdots + q_n \leq \alpha \\ -cq_1 & \text{if } q_1 + q_2 + \cdots + q_n > \alpha. \end{cases}$$

This function is a quadratic in  $q_1$  where it is positive, and is zero when  $q_1 = 0$  and when  $q_1 = \alpha - c - q_2 - \cdots - q_n$ . Thus firm 1's best response function is

$$b_1(q_{-1}) = \begin{cases} (\alpha - c - q_2 - \cdots - q_n) / 2 & \text{if } q_2 + \cdots + q_n \leq \alpha - c \\ 0 & \text{if } q_2 + \cdots + q_n > \alpha - c \end{cases}$$

(where  $q_{-1}$  stands for the list of the outputs of all the firms except firm 1).

The best response functions of every other firm is the same.

- (b) The conditions for  $(q_1^*, \dots, q_n^*)$  to be a Nash equilibrium are

$$\begin{aligned} q_1^* &= b_1(q_{-1}^*) \\ q_2^* &= b_2(q_{-2}^*) \\ &\vdots \\ q_n^* &= b_n(q_{-n}^*) \end{aligned}$$

or, in an equilibrium in which all the firms' outputs are positive,

$$\begin{aligned} q_1^* &= \frac{1}{2}(\alpha - c - q_2^* - q_3^* - \cdots - q_n^*) \\ q_2^* &= \frac{1}{2}(\alpha - c - q_1^* - q_3^* - \cdots - q_n^*) \\ &\vdots \\ q_n^* &= \frac{1}{2}(\alpha - c - q_1^* - q_2^* - \cdots - q_{n-1}^*). \end{aligned}$$

(c) We can write the equations as

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \alpha - c - 2q_1^* - q_2^* - \cdots - q_{n-1}^* - q_n^* \\ 0 &= \alpha - c - q_1^* - 2q_2^* - \cdots - q_{n-1}^* - q_n^* \\ &\vdots \\ 0 &= \alpha - c - q_1^* - q_2^* - \cdots - q_{n-1}^* - 2q_n^*. \end{aligned}$$

If we subtract the second equation from the first we obtain  $0 = -q_1^* + q_2^*$ , or  $q_1^* = q_2^*$ . Similarly subtracting the third equation from the second we conclude that  $q_2^* = q_3^*$ , and continuing with all pairs of equations we deduce that  $q_1^* = q_2^* = \cdots = q_n^*$ . Let the common value of the firms' outputs be  $q^*$ . Then each equation is  $0 = \alpha - c - (n+1)q^*$ , so that  $q^* = (\alpha - c)/(n+1)$ .

In summary, the game has a unique Nash equilibrium, in which the output of every firm  $i$  is  $(\alpha - c)/(n+1)$ .

- (d) The price at this equilibrium is  $\alpha - n(\alpha - c)/(n+1)$ , or  $(\alpha + nc)/(n+1)$ . As  $n$  increases this price decreases, approaching  $c$  as  $n$  increases without bound:  $\alpha/(n+1)$  decreases to 0 and  $nc/(n+1)$  decreases to  $c$ .

2. The game is defined as follows.

**Players**  $\{1, \dots, n\}$ .

**Actions** The set of actions of each player  $i$  is  $[0, \infty)$  (the set of possible bids).

**Payoffs** The payoff of player  $i$  is  $v_i - b_i$  if her bid  $b_i$  is equal to the highest bid and no player with a lower index submits this bid, and 0 otherwise.

The set of Nash equilibria is the set of profiles  $b$  of bids with  $b_1 \in [v_2, v_1]$ ,  $b_j \leq b_1$  for all  $j \neq 1$ , and  $b_j = b_1$  for some  $j \neq 1$ .

That all these profiles are Nash equilibria is easy to verify. To see that there are no other equilibria, first we argue that there is no equilibrium in which player 1 does not obtain the object. Suppose that player  $i \neq 1$  submits the highest bid  $b_i$  and  $b_1 < b_i$ . If  $b_i > v_2$  then player  $i$ 's payoff is negative, so that he can increase his payoff by bidding 0. If  $b_i \leq v_2$  then player 1 can deviate to the bid  $b_i$  and win, increasing his payoff.

Now let the winning bid be  $b^*$ . We have  $b^* \geq v_2$ , otherwise player 2 can change his bid to some value in  $(v_2, b^*)$  and increase his payoff.

Also  $b^* \leq v_1$ , otherwise player 1 can reduce her bid and increase her payoff. Finally,  $b_j = b^*$  for some  $j \neq 1$  otherwise player 1 can increase her payoff by decreasing her bid.

3. (a) Any action profile  $(b_1, \dots, b_n)$  with the following properties is such an equilibrium:
- the winning bid is  $b_1$
  - the second-highest bid is at least  $v_2$  and is not submitted by player 2
  - the third-highest bid is less than  $v_2$  and at least  $v_j$ , where  $j$  is the player who submits the second-highest bid.

In such an action profile, player 1 wins and pays less than  $v_2$ . Denote by  $p^*$  the price player 1 pays. If the player who submits the second-highest bid changes her bid then either the outcome does not change or, if her bid exceeds  $b_1$ , she wins and pays the price  $p^*$ , which is at least her valuation (by the third condition). If any other player deviates either the outcome does not change or, if the deviant's bid exceeds  $b_1$ , the deviant wins and pays a price equal to the original second-highest bid, which is at least  $v_2$  and hence at least equal to the deviant's valuation.

(Note that you are asked only to find *one* equilibrium. An example of an action profile that satisfies the conditions is  $(b_1, \dots, b_n) = (v_1, v_n, v_3, v_2, v_n, \dots, v_n)$ .)

- (b) Consider an action profile in which the winner is player  $n$ . Player  $n$ 's bid  $b_n$  must be the highest, and the third-highest bid must be at most  $v_n$ , otherwise player  $n$ 's payoff is negative so that she can do better by bidding 0. But now consider a deviation by the player submitting the second-highest bid. If she bids more than  $b_n$  then she wins and the price she pays is at most  $v_n$ , so her payoff increases. Hence no such action profile is a Nash equilibrium.
4. The best response of player  $i$  to  $c_j$  is the value of  $c_i$  that maximizes  $v_i \sqrt{c_1 + c_2} - c_i$ . This function is strictly concave, so that if its maximizer is positive, this maximizer is the solution of the first-order condition

$$\frac{1}{2}v_i(c_1 + c_2)^{-1/2} - 1 = 0.$$

The solution is  $c_i = \frac{1}{4}(v_i)^2 - c_j$ , where  $j = 2$  if  $i = 1$ , and  $j = 1$  if  $i = 2$ . This solution is positive if  $c_j < \frac{1}{4}(v_i)^2$ . If  $c_j \geq \frac{1}{4}(v_i)^2$  then  $i$ 's payoff is decreasing in  $c_i$ , so that  $i$ 's best response is 0.

In summary, player  $i$ 's best response to  $c_j$  is

$$b_i(c_j) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } c_j \geq \frac{1}{4}(v_i)^2 \\ \frac{1}{4}(v_i)^2 - c_j & \text{if } c_j < \frac{1}{4}(v_i)^2 \end{cases}$$

We deduce (draw a diagram of the best response functions) that for any  $v_1 \neq v_2$  the game has a unique Nash equilibrium:

$$\begin{cases} (\frac{1}{4}(v_1)^2, 0) & \text{if } v_1 > v_2 \\ (0, \frac{1}{4}(v_2)^2) & \text{if } v_1 < v_2. \end{cases}$$

5. The game may be specified as follows.

**Players**  $N = \{1, \dots, n\}$ .

**Actions**  $A_i = [0, 1] \cup \{Out\}$  for all  $i \in N$ .

**Preferences**  $a \succ_i a'$  if  $i$  obtains more votes than any other player in  $a$  and ties with one or more players for the largest number of votes in  $a'$ , or if she ties with one or more players for the largest number of votes in  $a$  and  $a'_i = Out$ , or if  $a_i = Out$  and she loses in  $a'$ .

Let  $F$  be the distribution function of the citizens' favorite positions and let  $m = F^{-1}(\frac{1}{2})$  be its median (which is unique, since the density  $f$  is everywhere positive).

It is easy to check that for  $n = 2$  the game has a unique Nash equilibrium, in which both players choose  $m$ .

The argument that for  $n = 3$  the game has no Nash equilibrium is as follows.

- There is no equilibrium in which some player becomes a candidate and loses, since that player could instead stay out of the competition. Thus in any equilibrium all candidates must tie for first place.
- There is no equilibrium in which a single player becomes a candidate, since by choosing the same position any of the remaining players ties for first place.
- There is no equilibrium in which two players become candidates, since by the argument for  $n = 2$  in any such equilibrium they must both choose the median position  $m$ , in which case the third player can enter close to that position and win outright.

- There is no equilibrium in which all three players become candidates:
  - if all three choose the same position then any one of them can choose a position slightly different and win outright rather than tying for first place;
  - if two choose the same position while the other chooses a different position then the lone candidate can move closer to the other two and win outright.
  - if all three choose different positions then (given that they tie for first place) either of the extreme candidates can move closer to his neighbor and win outright.