

# Mixed Extension of Zero-sum Games

Given a zero-sum game

$$G = \langle \{1, 2\}, (A_1, A_2), (u, -u) \rangle$$

where  $u_1 = u$  and  $u_2 = -u$ , consider its mixed extension, which we denote by  $G^\Delta$ . Since

$$U_2(\alpha) = \sum_a \alpha(a)u_2(a) = - \sum_a \alpha(a)u(a) = -U(\alpha)$$

the mixed extension is also zero-sum:  $G^\Delta = \langle \{1, 2\}, (\Delta(A_1), \Delta(A_2)), (U, -U) \rangle$ .

Now Proposition 33.1 asserts that every game  $G$  with finite strategy sets has a mixed Nash equilibrium, therefore if  $A_1, A_2$  are finite  $G^\Delta$  has an equilibrium. As we have just seen if  $G$  is zero-sum so is  $G^\Delta$ , so we can apply Proposition 22.2 (assuming finite  $A_i$ , which we do) which implies that:  $G^\Delta$  has a value  $v(G^\Delta)$ , all equilibria  $(\alpha_1^*, \alpha_2^*)$  are conservative and  $U(\alpha_1^*, \alpha_2^*) = v(G^\Delta)$ . Here of course  $\alpha_1^*$  is conservative if it solves  $\max_{\alpha_1} \min_{\alpha_2} U(\alpha_1, \alpha_2)$  and  $\alpha_2^*$  is conservative if it solves  $\min_{\alpha_2} \max_{\alpha_1} U(\alpha_1, \alpha_2)$ .

We have also seen that (repetita iuvant) considering pure strategies as degenerate mixed strategies the following holds:

**Proposition 1.**  *$a^*$  is an equilibrium of  $G$  if and only if it is an equilibrium of  $G^\Delta$ .*

*Proof.* If  $a^*$  is an equilibrium of  $G^\Delta$  there are no profitable deviations in the sets  $\Delta(A_i)$  so a fortiori there aren't in the smaller sets  $A_i$ . If on the other hand  $a^*$  is an equilibrium of  $G$ , that is for each  $i$  one has  $u_i(a_i, a_{-i}^*) \leq u_i(a_i^*, a_{-i}^*)$  for all  $a_i$ , then (equation 32.2)  $U_i(\alpha_i, a_{-i}^*) = \sum_{a_i} \alpha_i(a_i)u_i(a_i, a_{-i}^*) \leq u_i(a_i^*)$  so  $a^*$  is also an equilibrium of  $G^\Delta$ .  $\square$

The relation between values of  $G$  and  $G^\Delta$  is the following, where we let  $\underline{v}(G), \bar{v}(G)$  the lower and upper values of  $G$ .

**Proposition 2.**  $\underline{v}(G) \leq v(G^\Delta) \leq \bar{v}(G)$ .

*Proof.* Let  $(a_1^*, a_2^*)$  be conservative. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \underline{v}(G) &= \max_{a_1 \in A_1} \min_{a_2 \in A_2} u(a_1, a_2) = \min_{a_2 \in A_2} u(a_1^*, a_2) = \min_{a_2 \in A_2} U(a_1^*, a_2) \\ &= \min_{\alpha_2 \in \Delta(A_2)} U(a_1^*, \alpha_2) \leq \max_{\alpha_1 \in \Delta(A_1)} \min_{\alpha_2 \in \Delta(A_2)} U(\alpha_1, \alpha_2) = v(G^\Delta). \end{aligned}$$

The other half is analogous.  $\square$

For example for matching pennies as we have seen  $-1 = \underline{v}(G) < \bar{v}(G) = 1$  (and there is no equilibrium) while in the mixed extension it is  $v(G^\Delta) = 0$  which is what players get in equilibrium. Since  $G$  having a value means  $\underline{v}(G) = \bar{v}(G)$  we get the following

**Corollary.** *If  $G$  has a value  $v(G)$  then  $v(G) = v(G^\Delta)$ .*