Imprecise Probabilities in Non-cooperative Games

Robert Nau
Fuqua School of Business
Duke University
Durham, NC 27708 USA
robert.nau@duke.edu

Abstract

Game-theoretic solution concepts such as Nash equilibrium are commonly used to model strategic behavior in terms of precise probability distributions over outcomes. However, there are many potential sources of imprecision in beliefs about the outcome of a game: incomplete knowledge of payoff functions, non-uniqueness of equilibria, heterogeneity of prior probabilities, unobservable background risk, and distortions of revealed beliefs due to risk aversion, among others. This paper presents a unified approach for dealing with these issues, in which the typical solution of a game is a convex set of probability distributions that, unlike Nash equilibria, may be correlated between players. In the most general case, where players are risk averse, the probabilities do not represent beliefs alone. Rather they must be interpreted as products of subjective probabilities and relative marginal utilities for money.

Keywords: coherence, previsions, lower and upper probabilities, correlated equilibrium, risk neutral probabilities, risk neutral equilibrium

1 Introduction

Game theory occupies the increasingly large middle ground of rational choice theory: the problem of "2, 3, 4… bodies" in which agents must reason about the strategic behavior of other rational agents as well as reflect on their own preferences and compete in markets. The modeling of interactive decisions of this kind requires some special tools and assumptions. First, the rules of the game are (in the most general case) parameterized in units of utility rather than money or goods in order to allow for differences in tastes and attitudes toward risk. Second, the utility functions of different players are assumed to be common knowledge, enabling them to model each other's decisions as well as their own, and to all know that they can all do this, and so on. Third, common knowledge of rationality and common knowledge of the rules of the game are assumed to lead to an equilibrium, usually a Nash equilibrium or one of its refinements or extensions, in which the decision of each player is individually rational given the decisions simultaneously made by the other players, and randomization (if any) is performed independently. And fourth, when there is uncertainty about any of the game parameters, the beliefs of the players are assumed to be consistent with a common prior distribution, which generates an infinite hierarchy of mutually consistent reciprocal beliefs. In applications these assumptions are usually applied at maximum strength in order to tightly (often uniquely) constrain the solution, yet all of them are open to question. This paper will pursue some of these questions and show how they lead to solutions that are characterized by exactly the same rationality conditions as individual decisions and competitive markets. Their common priors and equilibria are generally expressed in terms of imprecise probabilities that need not satisfy an independence condition and do not always represent the players' true subjective beliefs.

The approach to modeling games that will be used in this paper follows that of Nau and McCardle (1990) and Nau (1992), which is just a multi-player extension of de Finetti's operational approach to defining subjective probabilities, which in turn is a microcosm of a financial market. It lends itself naturally to modeling imprecise probabilities; in fact, its behavioral primitives are assertions of lower and upper bounds on probabilities and expectations

2 Imprecise subjective probabilities

Virtually all of the fundamental theorems of rational choice theory—subjective probability, expected utility, subjective expected utility, asset pricing, welfare economics, cardinal utilitarianism, *and* non-cooperative games—are duality theorems that can be proved by using a separating hyperplane argument. In the versions of these theorems that involve finite sets of states and/or consequences, it is a variant of Farkas' lemma, the basis of the duality theorem of linear programming:

LEMMA 1: For any matrix $\boldsymbol{G}$, either there exists a non-negative vector $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ such that $\boldsymbol{\alpha} \bullet \boldsymbol{G} < \boldsymbol{0}$ or else there exists a non-negative vector $\boldsymbol{\pi}$ such that $\boldsymbol{G}\,\boldsymbol{\pi} \geq \boldsymbol{0}$, $\boldsymbol{\pi} \neq \boldsymbol{0}$.

LEMMA 2: For any matrix $\boldsymbol{G}$, either there exists a non-negative vector $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ such that $\boldsymbol{\alpha} \bullet \boldsymbol{G} \leq \boldsymbol{0}$ and $[\boldsymbol{\alpha} \bullet \boldsymbol{G}]_k < 0$ or else there exists a non-negative vector $\boldsymbol{\pi}$, with $\pi_k > 0$, such that $\boldsymbol{G}\,\boldsymbol{\pi} \geq \boldsymbol{0}$.

De Finetti's (1974) "fundamental theorem of probability," as it applies to imprecise probabilities and expectations, can be proved as follows, using the language of financial markets. Consider an agent ("she") who is uncertain about which element of a finite set $\boldsymbol{S}$ of states of the world will occur. Let N denote the number of states and let $\boldsymbol{x}$ denote an *asset*, which is an N-vector of payoffs assigned to states. The agent's *lower prevision for* $\boldsymbol{x}$ is the price $\underline{P}(\boldsymbol{x})$ that she is publicly willing to pay per unit of $\boldsymbol{x}$ in arbitrary (but small) quantities chosen by someone else. This means that for any small positive number α chosen by an observer ("he"), the agent will accept a bet whose payoff vector for her is $\alpha(\boldsymbol{x} - \underline{P}(\boldsymbol{x}))$, with the opposite payoffs to the observer.[1] For example, if N=3, $\boldsymbol{x} = (3, 1, -2)$, and $\underline{P}(\boldsymbol{x}) = 1.4$, the agent will accept a bet whose payoff vector for her is $(1.6\alpha, -0.4\alpha, -3.4\alpha)$ for any small positive α chosen by the observer. A lower prevision for an asset may be considered as a *lower expectation*, i.e., a lower bound on its subjective expected value for the agent. In the special case where $\boldsymbol{x}$ is a binary vector that is the indicator of an event, its prevision is a *lower probability* for the event.

Lower previsions can also be assessed conditionally. If $\boldsymbol{x}$ is the payoff vector of an asset and $\boldsymbol{e}$ is the indicator vector of an event, the agent's *conditional lower prevision for* $\boldsymbol{x}$ *given* $\boldsymbol{e}$ is the price $\underline{P}(\boldsymbol{x}|\boldsymbol{e})$ that she is publicly willing to pay per unit of $\boldsymbol{x}$ in arbitrary (but small) multiples chosen by an observer, subject to the condition that the bet will be called off if $\boldsymbol{e}$ does not occur. This means that the agent will agree to accept a bet whose payoff vector for her is $\alpha(\boldsymbol{x} - \underline{P}(\boldsymbol{x}|\boldsymbol{e}))\boldsymbol{e}$, for any small positive α. To continue the previous example, if $\boldsymbol{e} = (1, 1, 0)$, i.e., the indicator for the event in which either state 1 or state 2 occurs, and $\underline{P}(\boldsymbol{x}|\boldsymbol{e}) = 2.1$, the agent will accept a bet whose payoff vector for her is $(0.9\alpha, -1.1\alpha, 0)$. In the special case where $\underline{P}(\boldsymbol{x}|\boldsymbol{e}) = 0$, the agent is willing to pay zero for $\boldsymbol{x}$ conditional on $\boldsymbol{e}$, i.e., she will accept a small bet whose payoff vector is proportional to $\boldsymbol{x}$ conditional on the occurrence of $\boldsymbol{e}$. This is equivalent to an unconditional bet with payoffs proportional to $\boldsymbol{xe}$.

It remains to show that rational lower previsions satisfy the laws that ought to be satisfied by lower bounds on probabilities and expectations. Suppose that the agent assigns a conditional lower prevision $\underline{P}(\boldsymbol{x}_m|\boldsymbol{e}_m)$ to asset $\boldsymbol{x}_m$ given the occurrence of event $\boldsymbol{e}_m$, $m = 1,\ldots, M$, subject to the further requirement that bets on different events are additive, which is the way a bookmaker or financial market normally operates. For example, if the agent simultaneously assigns lower previsions $\underline{P}(\boldsymbol{x}_1|\boldsymbol{e}_1)$ and $\underline{P}(\boldsymbol{x}_2|\boldsymbol{e}_2)$ to asset $\boldsymbol{x}_1$ conditional on event $\boldsymbol{e}_1$ and asset $\boldsymbol{x}_2$ conditional on event $\boldsymbol{e}_2$, this means that for any positive real numbers α_1 and α_2 chosen by the observer, she will accept a bet whose payoff for her in state n is $\alpha_1(x_{1n} - \underline{P}(\boldsymbol{x}_1|\boldsymbol{e}_1))e_{1n} + \alpha_2(x_{2n} - \underline{P}(\boldsymbol{x}_2|\boldsymbol{e}_2))e_{2n}$, where x_{mn} and e_{mn} denote the values of $\boldsymbol{x}_m$ and $\boldsymbol{e}_m$ in state n for $m = 1, 2$.

The agent is rational *ex ante* if her previsions do not expose her to arbitrage, i.e., if the opponent is not able to make a riskless profit through a clever combination of bets. She is rational *ex post* in state k if they do not allow the opponent to earn a riskless profit if state k occurs. These rationality conditions are called "coherence" and "ex post coherence," respectively. More precisely:

DEFINITION: The conditional lower previsions $\{\underline{P}(\boldsymbol{x}_1|\boldsymbol{e}_1), \ldots, \underline{P}(\boldsymbol{x}_M|\boldsymbol{e}_M)\}$ are *coherent* if there do not exist non-negative numbers $\{\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_M\}$ such that $\sum_{m=1}^{M} \alpha_m (x_{mn} - \underline{P}(\boldsymbol{x}_m \,|\, \boldsymbol{e}_m))e_{mn} < 0 \;\forall\, n$, i.e., the payoff to the agent is strictly negative in all states. They are *ex post coherent in state k* if and only if there do not exist non-negative numbers $\{\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_M\}$ such that $\sum_{m=1}^{M} \alpha_m (x_{mn} - \underline{P}(\boldsymbol{x}_m \,|\, \boldsymbol{e}_m))e_{mn} \leq 0 \;\forall\, n$ with strict inequality when $n = k$, i.e., the agent's payoff is surely non-positive and strictly negative in state k.

Coherence entails ex post coherence in at least one state.

THEOREM 1 (de Finetti and others): The conditional lower previsions $\{\underline{P}(\boldsymbol{x}_1|\boldsymbol{e}_1), \ldots, \underline{P}(\boldsymbol{x}_M|\boldsymbol{e}_M)\}$ are coherent [ex post coherent in state k] if and only if there exists a non-empty convex set Π of probability distributions on states of the world [satisfying $\pi_k > 0$] such that, for all m and all $\boldsymbol{\pi} \in \Pi$, $P_{\boldsymbol{\pi}}(\boldsymbol{x}_m|\boldsymbol{e}_m) \geq \underline{P}(\boldsymbol{x}_m|\boldsymbol{e}_m)$ or else $P_{\boldsymbol{\pi}}(\boldsymbol{e}_m) = 0$.

Proof: Let $\boldsymbol{G}$ denote the matrix whose m^{th} row is the vector $(\boldsymbol{x}_m - \underline{P}\,(\boldsymbol{x}_m|\boldsymbol{e}_m))\boldsymbol{e}_m$ of payoffs to the agent for the

[1] Notational conventions: Lower-case boldface letters such as $\boldsymbol{x}$ and $\boldsymbol{e}$ are used interchangeably for payoff vectors of assets and indicator vectors of events as well as for their proper names (e.g., "event $\boldsymbol{e}$" is the event whose indicator vector is $\boldsymbol{e}$). In the expression $\alpha(\boldsymbol{x} - \underline{P}(\boldsymbol{x}))$, $\boldsymbol{x}$ is a vector and α and $\underline{P}(\boldsymbol{x})$ are scalars, and the multiplication and subtraction are performed pointwise, yielding a vector whose n^{th} element is $\alpha(\boldsymbol{x}_n - \underline{P}(\boldsymbol{x}))$. If $\boldsymbol{x}$ and $\boldsymbol{y}$ are vectors of the same length, then $\boldsymbol{xy}$ denotes their pointwise product (another vector of the same length), and $\boldsymbol{x} \bullet \boldsymbol{y}$ denotes their inner product (a scalar). If $\boldsymbol{G}$ is a matrix and $\boldsymbol{x}$ and $\boldsymbol{y}$ are vectors of appropriate length, then $\boldsymbol{x} \bullet \boldsymbol{G}$ and $\boldsymbol{G}\,\boldsymbol{y}$ denote matrix multiplication of $\boldsymbol{G}$ by $\boldsymbol{x}$ on the left or by $\boldsymbol{y}$ on the right, yielding vectors. If $\boldsymbol{\pi}$ is a probability distribution on states and $\boldsymbol{x}$ is a payoff vector and $\boldsymbol{e}$ is an indicator vector for an event, then $P_{\boldsymbol{\pi}}(\boldsymbol{x})$ is the corresponding expected value of $\boldsymbol{x}$ and $P_{\boldsymbol{\pi}}(\boldsymbol{e})$ is the probability of $\boldsymbol{e}$, i.,e. $P_{\boldsymbol{\pi}}(\boldsymbol{x}) = \boldsymbol{\pi} \bullet \boldsymbol{x}$ and $P_{\boldsymbol{\pi}}(\boldsymbol{e}) = \boldsymbol{\pi} \bullet \boldsymbol{e}$. $P_{\boldsymbol{\pi}}(\boldsymbol{x}|\boldsymbol{e})$ denotes the conditional expectation of $\boldsymbol{x}$ given the occurrence of $\boldsymbol{e}$ that is determined by $\boldsymbol{\pi}$, i.e, $P_{\boldsymbol{\pi}}(\boldsymbol{x}|\boldsymbol{e}) = P_{\boldsymbol{\pi}}(\boldsymbol{xe})/P_{\boldsymbol{\pi}}(\boldsymbol{e})$ provided that $P_{\boldsymbol{\pi}}(\boldsymbol{e}) > 0$.

conditional bet determined by the assignment of prevision $\underline{P}\ (\boldsymbol{x}_m|\boldsymbol{e}_m)$ to asset $\boldsymbol{x}_m$ conditional on event $\boldsymbol{e}_m$. The conditional lower previsions $\{\underline{P}(\boldsymbol{x}_1|\boldsymbol{e}_1),\ldots, \underline{P}(\boldsymbol{x}_M|\boldsymbol{e}_M)\}$ are coherent if and only if there does not a exist non-negative vector $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ such that $\boldsymbol{\alpha} \bullet \boldsymbol{G} < \boldsymbol{0}$. By Lemma 1, this is true if and only there exists a non-negative vector $\boldsymbol{\pi}$ such that $\boldsymbol{G\pi} \geq \boldsymbol{0}$, $\boldsymbol{\pi} \neq \boldsymbol{0}$, which can be normalized so that its elements sum to 1, a probability distribution. The condition $\boldsymbol{G\pi} \geq \boldsymbol{0}$ means $P_{\boldsymbol{\pi}}((\boldsymbol{x}_m - \underline{P}(\boldsymbol{x}_m|\boldsymbol{e}_m))\boldsymbol{e}_m) \geq 0$, or equivalently $P_{\boldsymbol{\pi}}(\boldsymbol{x}_m\boldsymbol{e}_m) \geq \underline{P}(\boldsymbol{x}_m|\boldsymbol{e}_m))P_{\boldsymbol{\pi}}(\boldsymbol{e}_m)$, for all m. This is trivially true if $P_{\boldsymbol{\pi}}(\boldsymbol{e}_m) = 0$, because both sides are zero. If $P_{\boldsymbol{\pi}}(\boldsymbol{e}_m) > 0$, it rearranges to $P_{\boldsymbol{\pi}}(\boldsymbol{x}_m\boldsymbol{e}_m)/P_{\boldsymbol{\pi}}(\boldsymbol{e}_m) \geq \underline{P}(\boldsymbol{x}_m|\boldsymbol{e}_m)$, which by definition means $P_{\boldsymbol{\pi}}(\boldsymbol{x}_m|\boldsymbol{e}_m) \geq \underline{P}(\boldsymbol{x}_m|\boldsymbol{e}_m)$. The corresponding result for ex post coherence in state k follows by applying Lemma 2 in place of Lemma 1. ■

Coherent lower previsions therefore have the properties of lower probabilities and expectations determined by a convex set of probability distributions, which can be interpreted to represent the possibly-imprecise beliefs of the agent, if she has linear utility for money.

An under-appreciated property of de Finetti's operational definition of subjective probabilities and expectations is that it does not merely define them: it makes them common knowledge in the everyday specular sense of the term. The prices are visible to both actors in the scene, and the actors both know it, and both know that they both know it, and so on, and the meaning of the numbers is commonly understood by virtue of the opportunities that they create for reciprocal financial transactions. This is a property of posted prices in general. They do not only simplify the decision-making of consumers and investors: they are also credible and commonly known numerical measurements of the comparative beliefs and values of those who post them.

It might be argued that game-theoretic techniques should be used to address the question of why and how the agent should offer distinct lower and upper previsions (bid and ask prices) in her interaction with the observer, or whether she should offer to bet at all. There might be asymmetric information or incentives for secrecy or deception or speculation that would motivate the agent to set her bid prices for assets at levels other than her true lower bounds on their expected payoffs, whatever "true" might mean. This would merely beg the question of how the rules of the higher-order game would come to be commonly known in numerical terms. If an infinite regress is to be avoided, then at some level of description the amount of private information about her beliefs and values that an agent is willing to publicly reveal is a behavioral primitive. In the sequel, the game-theoretic argument will be turned on its head: the fundamental theorem of non-cooperative games is merely an extension of the fundamental theorem of probability to multiple actors in the same scene.

3 Previsions conditioned on one's own moves

In the assessment of previsions via offers to bet, there is no requirement that states of the world should be events that are beyond the agent's control. However, an observer might be reluctant to take the other side of any bet whose payoff depends on an event that they both know the agent *does* control, and by the same token, the agent might be reluctant to offer to bet on events that she knows to be controlled by others. An important special case is one in which the state space can be partitioned as $\boldsymbol{S} = \boldsymbol{S}_1 \times \boldsymbol{S}_2$, where $\boldsymbol{S}_1$ is a set of events that the agent controls (her own moves) while $\boldsymbol{S}_2$ is a set of events outside her control (moves of nature or other agents). If $\boldsymbol{e}$ is an event that is measurable with respect to $\boldsymbol{S}_1$ (the indicator for a move or subset of moves of the agent), and $\boldsymbol{x}$ is the payoff vector of an asset that is measurable with respect to $\boldsymbol{S}_2$ (a bet whose payoff depends only on moves of others), it might be reasonable for the agent to assert a lower prevision for $\boldsymbol{x}$ conditional on $\boldsymbol{e}$. If she asserts that $\underline{P}(\boldsymbol{x}|\boldsymbol{e}) = 0$, it means that she will accept a small bet whose payoff vector is proportional to $\boldsymbol{x}$ under the same conditions in which she would choose the move $\boldsymbol{e}$, or equivalently, she will accept a small bet whose payoff vector is proportional to $\boldsymbol{xe}$. Such a bet reveals some information about the agent's payoff function in the game she is playing against nature or her adversaries, without necessarily revealing the move she intends to make. Namely, her payoffs in the game are such that her best move is $\boldsymbol{e}$ only under conditions where her prevision for $\boldsymbol{x}$ is non-negative. This method for revealing limited information about one's payoff function yields enough detail about the rules of a non-cooperative game to determine its equilibria, as will be shown next.

4 Imprecise equilibria of games

Let $\mathcal{G}$ denote a non-cooperative game among I players, each having a finite set of strategies. Let $\boldsymbol{S} = \boldsymbol{S}_1 \times\ldots\times \boldsymbol{S}_I$ denote the set of outcomes, where $\boldsymbol{S}_i$ is the set of index numbers for strategies of player i. Let $\boldsymbol{s} = (s_1, \ldots, s_I)$ denote a particular outcome, in which s_i is the strategy chosen by player i. Let $\boldsymbol{x}_i$ denote the payoff function (an $|\boldsymbol{S}|$-dimensional vector) for player i, whose value in outcome $\boldsymbol{s}$ is $x_i(\boldsymbol{s})$. Assume that payoffs are measured in units of a common money and that the players are risk neutral. (The risk neutrality assumption will be relaxed later.) The "true" game $\mathcal{G}$ is therefore defined by the sets of strategies $\{\boldsymbol{S}_i\}$ and payoff vectors $\{\boldsymbol{x}_i\}$.

Let $\boldsymbol{e}_{ij}$ denote the event in which player i plays her j^{th} strategy, and for every $j \in \boldsymbol{S}_i$, let $\boldsymbol{x}_{ij}$ denote a vector of payoffs that is obtained from $\boldsymbol{x}_i$ as follows: $\boldsymbol{x}_{ij}(\boldsymbol{s}) = \boldsymbol{x}_i(s_1, \ldots, j, \ldots, s_N)$, where the j occurs in the i^{th} position. In other words, $\boldsymbol{x}_{ij}(\boldsymbol{s})$ is the profile of payoffs that player i receives by playing her j^{th} strategy while all other players play according to $\boldsymbol{s}$. Note that there is some duplication of information in the structure of $\boldsymbol{x}_{ij}(\boldsymbol{s})$: it contains multiple copies of the payoff profile that player i obtains by playing j, because the element of $\boldsymbol{x}_{ij}(\boldsymbol{s})$ in coordinate $(s_1, \ldots, s_i, \ldots, s_N)$ is the same for all values of s_i.

Suppose that the payoff functions $\{\boldsymbol{x}_i\}$ are not commonly known *a priori* and must therefore be revealed through some credible language of communication. The language that will be used here is the same one that was sketched in the previous section. To see how it works in the game, observe that in the event that player i chooses her j^{th} strategy, she must weakly prefer the profile of payoffs she gets by playing strategy j to the profile of payoffs she would have gotten by playing any other strategy k. In the terms introduced above, she evidently prefers $\boldsymbol{x}_{ij}$ over $\boldsymbol{x}_{ik}$ in the event that $\boldsymbol{e}_{ij}$ occurs, which means that she would trade $\boldsymbol{x}_{ik}$ for $\boldsymbol{x}_{ij}$ conditional on $\boldsymbol{e}_{ij}$. Such a trade is equivalent to an unconditional bet with a payoff vector of $(\boldsymbol{x}_{ij} - \boldsymbol{x}_{ik})\boldsymbol{e}_{ij}$. If the agent wants to let this information about her payoff function become common knowledge, she can publicly offer to accept a small bet whose payoff vector is proportional to $(\boldsymbol{x}_{ij} - \boldsymbol{x}_{ik})\boldsymbol{e}_{ij}$ at the discretion of an observer. Or, to turn the story around, if by magic her payoff function $\boldsymbol{x}_i$ is already common knowledge, then it is also common knowledge that she will accept such a bet.[2] Note that she is not betting directly on her own strategy. Rather, her own strategy is used as a conditioning event for bets on what other players will do. Bets that are conditioned on the player's own strategy, which may be uncertain to the observer and the other players, do not necessarily reveal her actual state of information or her intended move.

Suppose that all the players offer to accept small conditional bets that are determined by their true payoff functions in the manner described above. Let $\boldsymbol{G}$ denote the matrix whose columns are indexed by outcomes of the game, whose rows are indexed by ijk, and whose ijk^{th} row is $(\boldsymbol{x}_{ij} - \boldsymbol{x}_{ik})\boldsymbol{e}_{ij}$, the payoff vector of the bet that is acceptable to player i in the event that she chooses strategy j in preference to strategy k. Then, under the assumption that such bets may be non-negatively linearly combined, an observer of the game may choose a non-negative vector of multipliers α to construct an acceptable bet that yields a total payoff vector of $\alpha \bullet \boldsymbol{G}$ to the players, with the opposite total payoffs to himself.

$\boldsymbol{G}$ will be henceforth called the "revealed rules of the game matrix" because, as will be shown, it contains all the commonly-knowable information about the rules that is actually used in determining the equilibria of non-cooperative games. However, $\boldsymbol{G}$ does not contain all the information about the true game $\mathcal{G}$ that is economically important to the players. In particular, it does not reveal the benefits that a given player might obtain from changes in the strategies of the other players, holding her own strategy fixed. The latter information is subtracted out when the calculation $(\boldsymbol{x}_{ij} - \boldsymbol{x}_{ik})\boldsymbol{e}_{ij}$ is performed. All that remains is information about how a given player would benefit by changing her own strategy, holding the strategies of the *other* players fixed. This is the essence of "non-cooperative" game-playing. The players do not consider the implications of their own play for the payoffs of other players, nor do they expect the other players to show that consideration to them.

Under the assumptions given above, we can define what it means for the game to be played rationally by applying the concept of ex post coherence jointly to all the players. Consider an observer who knows nothing about the game except the bets that the players have offered, which is the minimal information about the game's rules that is common knowledge. Suppose that he does not want to speculate on the game's outcome, but he would like to make a riskless profit if possible. From the observer's perspective, if several bets are placed on the same table at the same time, it doesn't matter if they are offered by one individual or by many who are all looking each other in the eye. If the observer manages to pick their pockets, the players have behaved irrationally as a group.

DEFINITION: The strategy $\boldsymbol{s}$ is *jointly coherent* if there does *not* exist a non-negative α such that $\alpha \bullet \boldsymbol{G} \leq \boldsymbol{0}$ and $[\alpha \bullet \boldsymbol{G}](\boldsymbol{s}) < 0$, i.e., if, under the revealed rules of the game, there is no system of system of bets under which the observer cannot lose and will win a positive amount from the players if they play $\boldsymbol{s}$.

Fortunately for the players, there is always at least one jointly coherent strategy: they are not doomed to exploitation if they honestly reveal some information about their payoff functions.[3] The interesting question is whether there are strategies that are *not* jointly coherent, and if so, how are they characterized.

In general, the players might choose either pure or randomized strategies, and randomized strategies might be either independent or correlated. Correlated randomization of strategies could be carried out with the help of a mediator but does not necessarily require it: flipping a coin or playing paper-scissors-rock are familiar

[2] Strictly speaking, the *choice* of strategy j in the presence of k can only be interpreted to mean a *preference* for j over k if the agent has complete preferences, requiring precise beliefs. Here, offers to bet are assumed to occur at a point in time when the agents may not yet have formed precise beliefs about what their opponents will do, but they expect that they will have done so by the time they are called upon to move. In the meantime they are making assertions about constraints that precise beliefs would have to satisfy in order for them to prefer one strategy over another, thereby partially revealing their payoff functions.

[3] A proof of this result is given in Nau and McCardle (1990). A proof of the dual condition, which (by Theorem 2) is the existence of a correlated equilibrium, is given by Hart and Schmeidler (1989). These proofs are more elementary than the proof of existence of a Nash equilibrium insofar as they do not invoke a fixed-point theorem. In Nau and McCardle's proof, the result follows from the existence of a stationary distribution of a Markov chain.

correlation devices that do not require a mediator, and a taking-turns convention in repeated play could be viewed as a correlation device from the perspective of an observer who doesn't who whose turn it is. Let $\boldsymbol{\pi}$ denote a (possibly-degenerate) probability distribution over the outcomes of the game, and suppose, hypothetically, that the players *do* employ a mediator who is instructed to randomly draw a joint strategy $\boldsymbol{s}$ according to the distribution $\boldsymbol{\pi}$ and then privately recommend to each player that she should play her own part of it. Thus, player i hears only her own recommended strategy, s_i, not those of the other players. Under these conditions, $\boldsymbol{\pi}$ is a common prior distribution over recommended joint strategies in the game, and each player can use Bayesian updating to compute a posterior distribution for the recommendations that were received by the other players, given her own recommendation. If each player's recommended strategy is optimal for her *a posteriori* when the others play their own recommended strategies, then $\boldsymbol{\pi}$ is a correlated equilibrium of the game (Aumann 1974, 1987). More precisely:

DEFINITION: $\boldsymbol{\pi}$ is a *correlated equilibrium* of $\mathcal{G}$ if and only if $\boldsymbol{G\pi} \geq \mathbf{0}$, which means that for every player i and every recommended strategy j and alternative strategy k of that player, either $P_{\boldsymbol{\pi}}(\boldsymbol{e}_{ij}) = 0$ (the probability of strategy j being recommended to player i is zero) or else $P_{\boldsymbol{\pi}}(\boldsymbol{x}_{ij}(\boldsymbol{s}) - \boldsymbol{x}_{ik}(\boldsymbol{s})|\boldsymbol{e}_{ij}) \geq 0$ (the conditional expected payoff of strategy j is greater than or equal to the conditional expected payoff of strategy k when j is recommended).

Because the set of all correlated equilibria of $\mathcal{G}$ is determined by a system of linear inequalities, it is a convex polytope—a tractable geometrical object—which will henceforth be denoted by $\Pi_{\mathcal{G}}$. A *Nash equilibrium* is a special case of a correlated equilibrium in which $\boldsymbol{\pi}$ is independent between players, allowing each player to perform her own randomization (if necessary) without a mediator. The set of Nash equilibria is not necessarily convex or connected or bounded by points with rational coordinates, and it can be rather difficult to compute, particularly in games with more than 2 players.

In these terms we can prove a "fundamental theory of non-cooperative games" which is the strategic generalization of the fundamental theorem of probability. Actually, the theorem and its proof are merely a restatement of the fundamental theorem of probability and *its* proof for the special case in which conditional previsions are jointly announced by two or more individuals and the assets and conditioning events to which they refer have a special structure that is determined by a non-cooperative game they are playing.

THEOREM 2 (Nau and McCardle 1990): In a game among risk neutral players, a strategy is jointly coherent if and only if there exists a correlated equilibrium in which it has positive probability.

Proof: By Lemma 2, either there exists a non-negative vector $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ such that $\boldsymbol{\alpha} \bullet \boldsymbol{G} \leq \mathbf{0}$ and $[\boldsymbol{\alpha} \bullet \boldsymbol{G}](\boldsymbol{s}) < 0$ or else there exists a non-negative vector $\boldsymbol{\pi}$, with $\pi(\boldsymbol{s}) > 0$, such that $\boldsymbol{G\pi} \geq \mathbf{0}$. ■

Hence, the players are rational ex post if and only if they behave as if they had implemented a correlated equilibrium, i.e., if they play a strategy that could have occurred with positive probability in such an equilibrium.[4] But even more can be said: lower and upper bounds can be placed on the players' jointly-held previsions for outcomes of the game and any side bets that might be placed on it, namely the bounds that are determined by the convex polytope $\Pi_{\mathcal{G}}$ of correlated equilibria. On this basis it is appropriate to consider $\Pi_{\mathcal{G}}$ to be the rational "solution" of the game when it is played non-cooperatively in the absence of any constraints other than coherence, and in general it is a solution in terms of imprecise probabilities.[5]

A canonical example of a game in which a non-Nash correlated equilibrium is an attractive strategy is the coordination game known as "battle-of-the-sexes," one version of which has the following payoff matrix:

	Left	Right
Top	2, 1	0, 0
Bottom	0, 0	1, 2

The players would prefer to coordinate on either TL or BR as the solution, but Row has a slight preference for TL and Column has a slight preference for BR. The corresponding rules-of-the-game matrix, $\boldsymbol{G}$, is

	TL	TR	BL	BR
1TB	2	-1	0	0
1BT	0	0	-2	1
2LR	1	0	-2	0
2RL	0	-1	0	2

The row label 1TB means G_{1TB}, the payoff vector of the bet for player 1 choosing Top in preference to Bottom, etc. The correlated equilibrium polytope is a hexahedron with 5 vertices, of which 3 are Nash equilibria:

---

[4] In games of incomplete information, joint coherence leads to a correlated generalization of Bayesian equilibrium (Nau 1992).

[5] This approach can be generalized to the situation in which players do not exactly know their own payoffs. If each payoff in the game matrix is known by its recipient only to lie within some interval, then the ijk^{th} row of $\boldsymbol{G}$ becomes $(\boldsymbol{x}_{ij}^{max} - \boldsymbol{x}_{ik}^{min})\boldsymbol{e}_{ij}$, where $\boldsymbol{x}_{ij}^{max}$ and $\boldsymbol{x}_{ik}^{min}$ are pointwise maxima and minima of the possible payoffs of strategies j and k for player i. This means that in the event that player i chooses strategy j over strategy k, the minimal requirement that her conditional beliefs must satisfy is that her best possible lower prevision for the payoff of j should be at least as great as her worst possible lower prevision for the payoff of k. In general, this sort of payoff-imprecision weakens the constraints and therefore enlarges the set of correlated equilibria.

	TL	TR	BL	BR	Nash?
Vertex 1	1	0	0	0	Yes
Vertex 2	0	0	0	1	Yes
Vertex 3	2/9	4/9	1/9	2/9	Yes
Vertex 4	2/5	0	1/5	2/5	No
Vertex 5	1/4	1/2	0	1/4	No

Two views of the geometry of the correlated equilibrium polytope are shown below The simplex of all probability distributions on outcomes of the game is a tetrahedron, the set of distributions that are independent between players is a saddle, the correlated equilibrium polytope is a hexahedron, and their 3 points of intersection are the Nash equilibria. Nash equilibria always lie on the surface of the correlated equilibrium polytope, but in larger games they need not be vertices of it (Nau et al. 2004).





The mixed-strategy Nash equilibrium is on the inefficient frontier, as is often true of completely mixed strategies in games with multiple equilibria. An obvious and appealing solution of this game that is neither a Nash equilibrium nor an extremal correlated equilibrium is to flip a coin to choose between TL and BR, which is the midpoint of the edge connecting their two vertices.

The players can further restrict the set of rational solutions of the game through the acceptance of additional bets that reflect joint beliefs more precise than the whole set of correlated equilibria. For example, in the battle-of-sexes game, the row player could say "in the event that I play Top [Bottom], I will assign probability 1 (for betting purposes) to the event that my opponent will play Left [Right]," and the column player could similarly say that in the event that she plays Left [Right], she will assign probability 1 to the event that her opponent plays Top [Bottom]. This would indicate that, perhaps through cheap talk or some mechanism such as coin-flipping, the players have coordinated their moves, thereby reducing the set of joint probability distributions to the edge of the simplex that connects TL and BR.

5 Risk aversion & risk neutral probabilities

The results of the previous sections require the players to be risk neutral, i.e., to have state-independent linear utility for money. The more general case of risk averse players will be considered next, and it will be shown that risk aversion leads them to hedge their bets, making the revealed set of equilibria larger than it would have been otherwise. Furthermore, when players are risk averse, side bets may provide opportunities for Pareto-improving modifications of the rules of the game, which leads to some blurring of the distinction between strategic and competitive equilibria. In extreme cases, players may be able to hedge their positions so as to decouple their payoff functions and exit from the game altogether. To set the stage, some general remarks on the modeling of risk aversion are appropriate.

If an agent is risk averse rather than risk neutral, and if she has substantial prior stakes in events ("background risk"), then Theorem 1 still holds, but its parameters have a different interpretation. Suppose that the agent has subjective expected utility preferences and her risk attitude is represented by a strictly concave von Neumann-Morgenstern utility function $U(x)$, with its derivative denoted by $U'(x)$, and suppose that her background risk is represented by a payoff vector $\boldsymbol{z}$ whose elements differ across states by amounts that are large enough to cause substantial variations in the marginal utility of money. Then her acceptance of an additional small bet $\boldsymbol{x}$ will not be based on its expected value but rather on its expected marginal utility in the context of $\boldsymbol{z}$. If the agent's beliefs are represented by a precise probability distribution $\boldsymbol{p}$, then her status quo expected utility is $E_{\boldsymbol{p}}[U(\boldsymbol{z})]$. A bet $\boldsymbol{x}$ will be acceptable to her if it maintains or increases her expected utility, i.e., if $E_{\boldsymbol{p}}[U(\boldsymbol{z}+\boldsymbol{x})] - E_{\boldsymbol{p}}[U(\boldsymbol{z})] \geq 0$.

If the elements of $\boldsymbol{x}$ are small enough in magnitude so that only first-order effects are important, then $\boldsymbol{x}$ is acceptable if $E_{\boldsymbol{p}}[U'(\boldsymbol{z})\boldsymbol{x}] \geq 0$, or equivalently if $E_{\pi}[\boldsymbol{x}] \geq 0$, where $\boldsymbol{\pi}$ is a probability distribution obtained by multiplying the true probability distribution $\boldsymbol{p}$ pointwise by the marginal utility vector $U'(\boldsymbol{z})$ and then re-normalizing, i.e., $\pi(\boldsymbol{s}) \propto p(\boldsymbol{s})U'(z(\boldsymbol{s}))$. This is the *risk neutral probability distribution of the agent* at $\boldsymbol{z}$, because she evaluates small bets in a seemingly risk neutral way using $\boldsymbol{\pi}$ rather than her true subjective probability distribution $\boldsymbol{p}$. The risk neutral distribution of the agent is not uniquely determined by beliefs: it also depends on her background risk and her attitude toward it.[6]

In a financial market, the necessary and sufficient condition for asset prices to create no arbitrage opportunities is that there should exist a probability distribution under which every asset's expected payoff (discounted at the risk-free rate of interest if time is a factor), lies between its bid and ask prices. This result is known as the "fundamental theorem of asset pricing," and it is merely de Finetti's fundamental theorem of probability applied to asset prices offered by the whole market rather than by a single individual. The probability distribution that prices the assets is called the *risk neutral probability distribution of the market*, because it prices them in a seemingly risk neutral way, and it can be determined from prices of options or Arrow securities.[7] Because of friction and incompleteness, the market's risk neutral distribution is usually not unique. Rather, there is a convex set of risk neutral distributions determined by bid and ask prices for assets.

In equilibrium, the marginal prices that agents are willing to pay for financial assets must agree with market prices, which means that the risk neutral probability distributions of all the agents must agree with the risk neutral probability distribution of the market. More precisely, the set of risk neutral distributions that is determined by bid and ask prices in the market is the intersection of all the sets of risk neutral distributions that are determined by bid and ask prices of individual agents, which is non-empty if and only if there are no arbitrage opportunities. Thus, rational behavior in markets requires the agents to "agree" on risk neutral probabilities in the sense that their sets of personal risk neutral probabilities must overlap to some extent. In the special case where the agents have complete preferences and the market is also complete and frictionless, the risk neutral probabilities of the agents and the market are uniquely determined and must be identical.

[6] The role of risk neutral probabilities in modeling a single agent's aversion to risk—and also ambiguity—is discussed in more detail by Nau (2001, 2003, 2011).

[7] The literature on arbitrage pricing and risk neutral probabilities in finance traces back to the seminal work of Black and Scholes, Merton, Cox, Ross, Rubinstein, and many others in the 1970's, although the connection with de Finetti's use of the no-arbitrage principle in subjective probability, dating to the 1930's, was not noticed until later.

6 Risk neutral equilibria

When agents are risk averse with significant prior stakes in events, their lower and upper previsions determined by offers to accept small bets must be interpreted as lower and upper expectations with respect to convex sets of risk neutral probabilities, rather than true subjective probabilities, as discussed above. The same consideration applies to the analysis of games. A game's own payoffs are a source of background risk with respect to bets on its outcome, and if the players are sufficiently risk averse, this will give rise to distortions when the rules of the game are revealed through betting. The result will be that a rational solution of the game is characterized by a convex set of equilibria whose parameters are risk neutral probabilities.

Suppose that each player has strictly risk averse subjective-expected-utility preferences with respect to profiles of monetary payoffs in the game, and let U_i denote the strictly-concave von Neumann-Morgenstern utility function of player i. Then the payoff profiles $\{x_i(\boldsymbol{s})\}$ translate into utility profiles $\{U_i(x_i(\boldsymbol{s}))\}$. Let $\mathcal{G}^*$ denote the "true" game that is determined by the utility profiles. If U_i' denotes the first derivative of U_i, strict concavity requires that $U_i'(x) < U_i'(y)$ whenever $x > y$. Let $\boldsymbol{u}_i$ denote the utility payoff vector for player i, whose value in outcome $\boldsymbol{s}$ is $U_i(x_i(\boldsymbol{s}))$, and let $\boldsymbol{u}_i'$ denote the corresponding marginal utility vector whose value in outcome $\boldsymbol{s}$ is $U_i'(x_i(\boldsymbol{s}))$. Also, let $\boldsymbol{u}_{ij}$ denote the vector constructed from $\boldsymbol{u}_i$ in the same way that $\boldsymbol{x}_{ij}$ was constructed from $\boldsymbol{x}_i$, namely $u_{ij}(\boldsymbol{s}) = U_i(x_{ij}(\boldsymbol{s}))$. In other words, $u_{ij}(\boldsymbol{s})$ is the utility that player i would receive by playing her j^{th} strategy when all others play according to $\boldsymbol{s}$. Let $\boldsymbol{u}_{ij}'$ denote the corresponding profile of marginal utilities for money, i.e., $u_{ij}'(\boldsymbol{s}) = U_i'(x_{ij}(\boldsymbol{s}))$. As in the case of $\boldsymbol{x}_{ij}$, there is some duplication of information insofar as $u_{ij}(\boldsymbol{s})$ and $u_{ij}'(\boldsymbol{s})$ do not depend on the value of s_i.

By an argument analogous to the one used in the risk neutral case, player i will choose strategy j in preference to strategy k only if her beliefs are such that she would be willing to exchange the utility profile $\boldsymbol{u}_{ik}$, for the utility profile $\boldsymbol{u}_{ij}$, hence a small monetary bet yielding a profile of changes in *marginal* utility that is proportional to $\boldsymbol{u}_{ij} - \boldsymbol{u}_{ik}$ should be acceptable if the event $\boldsymbol{e}_{ij}$ is observed to occur. When strategy j is chosen, the agent's profile of marginal utilities for money is $\boldsymbol{u}_{ij}'$, and a monetary bet that yields a profile of marginal utilities proportional to $\boldsymbol{u}_{ij} - \boldsymbol{u}_{ik}$ can be obtained by dividing the utilities by the corresponding marginal utilities. Thus, agent i should be willing to accept a small bet whose monetary payoffs are proportional to $(\boldsymbol{u}_{ij} - \boldsymbol{u}_{ik})/\boldsymbol{u}_{ij}'$ conditional on the occurrence of $\boldsymbol{e}_{ij}$. Such a bet has an unconditional payoff vector of $((\boldsymbol{u}_{ij} - \boldsymbol{u}_{ik})/\boldsymbol{u}_{ij}')\boldsymbol{e}_{ij}$ in units of money.

Let $\boldsymbol{G}^*$ now denote the matrix whose rows are indexed by ijk and whose columns are indexed by $\boldsymbol{s}$ and whose ijk^{th} row is the vector $((\boldsymbol{u}_{ij} - \boldsymbol{u}_{ik})/\boldsymbol{u}_{ij}{}')\boldsymbol{e}_{ij}$. This is the revealed-rules matrix for the game $\mathcal{G}^*$, representing the information about the game that can be made common knowledge through unilateral offers to accept small bets when the players are risk averse. An observer may choose a small non-negative vector α of multipliers for these bets, and the players as a group will receive the vector of payoffs $\alpha \bullet \boldsymbol{G}^*$, with the opposite payoffs for the observer. The same rationality criterion that was applied in the risk neutral case also applies here in the risk averse case: an outcome $\boldsymbol{s}$ is jointly coherent if and only if there is no non-negative α such that $\alpha \bullet \boldsymbol{G}^* \leq \boldsymbol{0}$ and $[\alpha \bullet \boldsymbol{G}^*](\boldsymbol{s}) < 0$.[8] The definition of correlated equilibrium and the fundamental theorem of games can now be generalized accordingly. The proof is the same.

DEFINITION: $\boldsymbol{\pi}$ is a *risk neutral equilibrium* of $\mathcal{G}^*$ if and only if $\boldsymbol{G}^*\boldsymbol{\pi} \geq \boldsymbol{0}$, which means that for every player i and every strategy j and alternative strategy k of that player, either $P_{\boldsymbol{\pi}}(\boldsymbol{e}_{ij}) = 0$ or else $P_{\boldsymbol{\pi}}((\boldsymbol{u}_{ij} - \boldsymbol{u}_{ik})/\boldsymbol{u}_{ij}{}'|\boldsymbol{e}_{ij}) \geq 0$.

THEOREM 3: In a game among risk averse players, a strategy is jointly coherent if and only if there is a risk neutral equilibrium in which it has positive probability.

To provide a story to go with this solution concept, suppose that the players employ a mediator who will use a possibly-correlated randomization device to recommend strategies to them privately, but in this more general case they do not necessarily agree on the true prior probabilities of the outputs of the device. For example, the device may take some of its input data from financial markets or from political or sporting or weather events. Suppose that through side bets with each other or through participation in a public betting market for the input events, they have arrived at a common prior *risk neutral* probability distribution $\boldsymbol{\pi}$ for the outputs of the device. Finally, suppose they will not have the opportunity to directly observe any of the input or output data prior to making their moves *except* for the private recommendations they receive from the mediator, who *will* have observed the data. Under these conditions, for all i, j, and k, the constraint $P_{\boldsymbol{\pi}}((\boldsymbol{u}_{ij} - \boldsymbol{u}_{ik})/\boldsymbol{u}_{ij}{}'|\boldsymbol{e}_{ij}) \geq 0$ implies $\boldsymbol{p}_{ij} \bullet (\boldsymbol{u}_{ij} - \boldsymbol{u}_{ik}) \geq 0$, i.e., according to player i's own private beliefs, strategy j yields an expected utility greater than or equal to that of the alternative strategy k when j is recommended to her, so it is optimal for each player to follow the mediator if all others do, and this is common knowledge. Thus, a game among risk averse players is played coherently if and only if it is played "as if" with the help of a mediator who uses an incentive-compatible device with respect to whose outputs the players have a common prior risk neutral distribution, although their unobserved true distributions may differ.

A risk neutral equilibrium is a special case of a *subjective correlated equilibrium* (Aumann 1974, 1987), one that can be implemented with the use of a randomizing device about whose properties the players may hold differing beliefs. Such a device would be welcome in playing a zero-sum game—all players might believe their expected payoffs to be positive! Aumann (1987) remarks that such a result depends on "a conceptual inconsistency between the players." By permitting such inconsistencies, subjective correlated equilibrium places only weak restrictions on solutions of many games. A risk neutral equilibrium adds the nontrivial restriction that the players' risk neutral prior probabilities should be mutually consistent, as in an equilibrium of a financial market. When players are risk averse, their true probabilities may be unobservable, and inconsistencies among them are neither surprising nor problematic.

As in the risk neutral case, there is more to be said about the rational solution of the game than to identify the outcomes that are jointly coherent. It is also possible to place bounds on risk neutral probabilities of events or risk neutral expectations of financial assets that depend on the outcome of the game, namely whatever bounds are determined by the system of inequalities $\boldsymbol{G}^*\boldsymbol{\pi} \geq \boldsymbol{0}$ that defines the convex polytope of risk neutral equilibria. These bounds are bid-ask spreads for assets that the players are jointly offering to the observer through their bets that reveal information about the rules of the game.

A simple example of the concept of risk neutral equilibrium is provided by the zero-sum game of "matching pennies," whose payoff matrix is:

	Left	Right
Top	1, –1	–1, 1
Bottom	–1, 1	1, –1

When played by risk neutral players, the revealed-rules matrix $\boldsymbol{G}$, scaled to a maximum value of 1, is:

	TL	TR	BL	BR
1TB	1	-1	0	0
1BT	0	0	-1	1
2LR	1	0	-1	0
2RL	0	-1	0	1

[8] When the utility functions of the players are strictly concave rather than linear, the bet with payoff vector $((\boldsymbol{u}_{ij} - \boldsymbol{u}_{ik})/\boldsymbol{u}_{ij}{}')\boldsymbol{e}_{ij}$ is technically only "marginally" acceptable to player i, so a bet with an aggregate payoff vector of $\alpha \bullet \boldsymbol{G}^*$ may not be quite acceptable to the players for finite α. In such a case the observer may need to make a small side payment to the players to get them to agree to the deal, which makes the observer's position not entirely riskless. However, if $\alpha \bullet \boldsymbol{G}^* \leq \boldsymbol{0}$ and $[\alpha \bullet \boldsymbol{G}^*](\boldsymbol{s}) < 0$, then by choosing α sufficiently small, the magnitude of the required side payment can be made arbitrarily small in relative terms in comparison to the aggregate loss the players will suffer if they play $\boldsymbol{s}$, which will be considered here as sufficient grounds for not playing $\boldsymbol{s}$. This could be made precise by using the concept of ε-acceptable bets introduced in Nau (1995), but it will not be pursued here in the interest of brevity.

This game has a unique correlated/Nash equilibrium in which the players use independent 50-50 randomization, so the graph of the set of equilibria consists of the single point (¼, ¼, ¼, ¼) in the center of the saddle.

Now suppose that both players are risk averse and, in particular, assume that they both have exponential utility functions, $U(x) = 1 - \exp(-\rho x)$, where the risk aversion parameter is $\rho = \text{LN}(\sqrt{2})$. In units of utility, the payoff matrix of the matching-pennies game is then:

	Left	Right
Top	*a*, *b*	*b*, *a*
Bottom	*b*, *a*	*a*, *b*

where $a = 1 - \sqrt{½} \approx 0.293$ and $b = 1 - \sqrt{2} \approx -0.414$. The corresponding marginal utilities of money under the outcomes *a* and *b* are 0.245 and 0.49, respectively, which conveniently differ by a factor of exactly 2.

This game is constant-sum and strategically equivalent to the original one, having the same unique correlated/Nash equilibrium. However, the rules matrix of the corresponding revealed game, $\boldsymbol{G}^*$, is *not* equivalent because of the distortions of nonlinear utility for money. It looks like this when scaled to a maximum value of 1:

	TL	TR	BL	BR
1TB	1	−1/2	0	0
1BT	0	0	−1/2	1
2LR	−1/2	0	1	0
2RL	0	1	0	−1/2

The polytope of risk neutral equilibria determined by the inequalities $\boldsymbol{G}^*\boldsymbol{\pi} \geq \boldsymbol{0}$ is a tetrahedron with these vertices:

	TL	TR	BL	BR	EV>0?
Vertex 1	2/15	4/15	1/15	8/15	1BT
Vertex 2	8/15	1/15	4/15	2/15	1TB
Vertex 3	4/15	8/15	2/15	1/15	2RL
Vertex 4	1/15	2/15	8/15	4/15	2LR

None of them lies on the saddle of distributions that are independent between {T,L} and {B,R}, so none is a Nash equilibrium of a game with these strategy sets.[9] Each of these probability distributions satisfies 3 out of the 4 incentive constraints with equality, i.e., assigns an expected value of zero to 3 out of the 4 rows of $\boldsymbol{G}^*$. (The label of the row whose expected value is positive is shown in the rightmost column.). A graph of their configuration is shown below. The polytope of risk neutral equilibria is suspended in the middle of the probability simplex, and the saddle of independent distributions cuts through its interior, a situation that would be impossible for a set of correlated equilibria.



The uniform distribution that is the unique equilibrium of the game when the true utility functions of the players are common knowledge lies in the interior of the polytope of risk neutral equilibria. When players are risk averse, the small side bets they are willing to accept do not fully reveal the between-strategy differences in utility profiles that they face in the game, so the set of risk neutral equilibria is larger than the set of correlated equilibria. This is true in general, as summarized by:

THEOREM 4: The set of correlated equilibria of a game with monetary payoffs played by risk neutral players is a subset of the set of risk neutral equilibria of the same game played by risk averse players.

Proof: If player i is risk neutral, she will accept a bet with payoff vector $(\boldsymbol{x}_{ij} - \boldsymbol{x}_{ik})\boldsymbol{e}_{ij}$, while if she is risk averse, she will accept a bet with payoff vector $((\boldsymbol{u}_{ij} - \boldsymbol{u}_{ik})/\boldsymbol{u}_{ij}')\boldsymbol{e}_{ij}$, where $u_{ij}(\boldsymbol{s}) = U_i(x_{ij}(\boldsymbol{s}))$, and $u_{ij}'(\boldsymbol{s}) = U_i'(x_{ij}(\boldsymbol{s}))$. The term $\boldsymbol{e}_{ij}$ will be ignored henceforth because it zeroes-out the same elements of both vectors. By the subgradient inequality, $U(z) < U(y) - U'(y)(y - z)$, because the value of a strictly concave function U at z must lie below the tangent to its graph at any other point y. Letting $y = x_{ij}(\boldsymbol{s})$ and $z = x_{ik}(\boldsymbol{s})$ yields $u_{ik}(\boldsymbol{s}) \leq u_{ij}(\boldsymbol{s}) - u_{ij}'(\boldsymbol{s})\,(x_{ij}(\boldsymbol{s}) - x_{ik}(\boldsymbol{s}))$, which rearranges to $(u_{ij}(\boldsymbol{s}) - u_{ik}(\boldsymbol{s}))/u_{ij}'(\boldsymbol{s}) \geq x_{ij}(\boldsymbol{s}) - x_{ik}(\boldsymbol{s})$, with strict inequality if $x_{ij}(\boldsymbol{s}) \neq x_{ik}(\boldsymbol{s})$. Hence, the bet that player i is willing to accept when she chooses strategy j in preference to k if she is risk neutral is weakly dominated by the bet she will accept in the same game if she is risk averse. This means $\boldsymbol{G^*} \geq \boldsymbol{G}$ pointwise, from which it follows that $\boldsymbol{G}\boldsymbol{\pi} \geq \boldsymbol{0}$ implies $\boldsymbol{G}^*\boldsymbol{\pi} \geq \boldsymbol{0}$, so if $\boldsymbol{\pi}$ is

[9] These distributions are the unique Nash equilibria of the game:

	L*	R*
T*	2, -1	-1, 1
B*	-2, 4	1, -4

under different mappings of {TL, TR, BL, BR} to {T*L*, T*R*, B*L*, B*R*}. They lie on the two other saddles that can be drawn within the original simplex: the one that omits the edges BL-BR and TL-TR and the one that omits the edges TL-BL and TR-BR a correlated equilibrium of the game played by risk neutral players, then it is a risk neutral equilibrium of the same game when it is played by risk averse players. ■

Hence, risk aversion introduces even more imprecision into the probabilistic solutions of non-cooperative games when their rules must be revealed through credible bets.

7 Rewriting the rules of the game

It was pointed out earlier, in the discussion of the battle-of-sexes game, that players could accept additional bets with an observer, beyond those that determine the rules of the game, in order to reveal more precise information about their joint beliefs. However, if they are risk neutral and have in fact implemented a Nash or correlated equilibrium, which induces a common prior distribution over outcomes of the game, they cannot both be made strictly better off through bets with each other. When players are risk averse, this is not necessarily true, and the matching-pennies game provides a good example. When played by risk averse players, it is a negative-sum game in units of utility, and for both players the unique Nash equilibrium (coin-flipping) has an expected utility that is below their status quo utility. Risk averse players would rather not play this game at all. Furthermore, player 1's marginal utility of money is greater in outcomes TR and BL (her losing outcomes) than in the other two, and vice versa for player 2. The Nash equilibrium is therefore not a *competitive* equilibrium of a financial market in which it is possible for the players to make additional bets that reveal their *solution* of the game in addition to the bets that reveal the *rules* of the game (the latter being the rows of G^*). In the context of the Nash equilibrium, it is desirable to both players to make a bet in which player 1 wins \$$x$ if TR or BL occurs and player 2 wins \$$x$ if TL or BR occurs, for any positive $x \leq 1$. Such a bet changes the rules of the game to a finite extent, but coin-flipping remains a Nash equilibrium. By choosing $x = 1$ they can even zero-out their payoffs, dissolving the game altogether. If they do not bet with each other in this fashion, but instead bet separately with an observer, there is an arbitrage opportunity for the observer that arises from the fact that, at the outset, the players' risk neutral probabilities do not agree if their true probability distributions are uniform.

8 Conclusions

The concept of coherent lower and upper previsions extends in a natural way to non-cooperative game theory, where it can be applied to the process of revealing the rules of the game as well as expressing the beliefs of the players. A rational solution of the game, from the perspective of an observer, is typically a convex set of correlated equilibria rather than a Nash equilibrium. The presence of aversion to risk changes the units of analysis from "true" subjective probabilities to "risk neutral" probabilities, as in asset pricing theory, and it typically renders the solutions even more imprecise. When risk averse players make bets with each other that reflect their beliefs about the solution of the game as well as the rules from which they started, they may be able to rewrite those rules in a mutually beneficial way, merging the concepts of strategic and competitive equilibrium

These results address some of the issues raised by Kadane and Larkey (1982) concerning the relation between game theory and subjective probability theory. The theory of game-playing presented here is a direct extension of subjective probability theory à la de Finetti, and it exploits the underappreciated common-knowledge property of de Finetti's use of bets to measure beliefs. Common knowledge of a game's rules constrains rational beliefs but in general it does not uniquely determine them, leaving room for subjective differences, particularly when players are risk averse and/or have incomplete knowledge of their own payoff functions.

References

[1] Aumann, R.J. (1974) Subjectivity and Correlation in Randomized Games. *Econometrica* **30**, 445-462

[2] Aumann, R.J. (1987) Correlated Equilibrium as an Expression of Bayesian Rationality. *Econometrica* **55**, 1-18

[3] de Finetti, B. (1974), *Theory of Probability, Vol. 1*. Wiley, New York.

[4] Hart, S. and D. Schmeidler (1989) Existence of Correlated Equilibria. *Mathematics of Operations Research* **14**, 18-25

[5] Kadane, J. and P. Larkey (1982) Subjective Probability and the Theory of Games, *Management Science* **28**, 113-120

[6] Nau, R.F. and K. F. McCardle (1990) Coherent Behavior in Non-cooperative Games. *J. Economic Theory* **50**, 424-444

[7] Nau, R.F. (1992) Joint Coherence in Games of Incomplete Information. *Management Science* **38**, 374-387

[8] Nau, R.F. (1995) Coherent Decision Analysis with Inseparable Probabilities and Utilities. *Journal of Risk and Uncertainty* **10**, 71-91

[9] Nau. R. F. (2001) De Finetti Was Right: Probability Does Not Exist. *Theory and Decision* **51**, 89-124

[10] Nau, R.F. (2003) A Generalization Of Pratt-Arrow Measure To Non-Expected-Utility Preferences And Inseparable Probability And Utility. *Management Science* **49**, 1089-1104

[11] Nau, R. F., S. Gomez Canovas and P. Hansen (2004) On the Geometry of Nash Equilibria and Correlated Equilibria. *International Journal of Game Theory* **32**, 443-453

[12] Nau, R.F. (2011) Risk, Ambiguity, and State-Preference Theory. *Economic Theory*, forthcoming