

EconS 503 - Microeconomic Theory II  
Homework #2 - Due date: Friday, January 25th, in class.

1. **Strict Nash equilibrium.** Consider the following definition: A strategy profile  $s^* \equiv (s_1^*, \dots, s_N^*)$  is a *strict Nash equilibrium* (SNE) if it satisfies

$$u_i(s_i^*, s_{-i}^*) > u_i(s_i, s_{-i}^*) \text{ for every player } i, \text{ and every } s_i \in S_i.$$

You probably noticed that this definition is almost identical to the definition of Nash equilibrium (NE) strategy profiles, except for using a strict, rather than weak, inequality. In this exercise we connect both solution concepts, but first examine the relationship between a strict Nash equilibrium and IDSDS.

- (a) Show that if a strategy  $s_i^*$  is a SNE it must also survive IDSDS.
  - (b) Show the opposite relationship to that in part (a), that is, if strategy  $s_i^*$  survives IDSDS then  $s_i^*$  must be a SNE.
  - (c) Show that every player has a unique best response to his rivals' strategies.
  - (d) Show that if strategy profile  $s^*$  is SNE, it must also be a NE.
  - (e) Show that if strategy profile  $s^*$  is a NE, it doesn't need to be a SNE. An example suffices.
  - (f) Show that if strategy profile  $s^*$  is a SNE, the game has no mixed strategy NE.
2. **Contests with  $N$  players.** In this exercise we examine equilibrium investment in a contest, where  $N \geq 2$  players compete to earn a prize of common value  $V$ , and the probability of winning the prize is a function of a player's own investment relative to the aggregate investment of all the players. Hence, contests are often used to model promotions within a firm (where every worker invests time and effort into being selected for a promotion), political campaigns (where candidates invest money and resources to capture a larger share of votes), and R&D races (where firms invest resources into discovering a new product, such as a drug). We consider player  $i$ 's probability of winning the prize is given by

$$p_i = \frac{x_i^r}{\sum_{j=1}^N x_j^r},$$

where  $x_i$  denotes his investment and the parameter,  $r \geq 1$ , represents the effectiveness of his investment. For simplicity, we normalize the cost of every unit of investment to one dollar.

- (a) Setup and solve the utility maximization program for player  $i$ .
- (b) Verify that the equilibrium investment maximizes the expected utility of player  $i$ , that is, check second-order conditions.
- (c) *Comparative statics.* How does the equilibrium investment of player  $i$  change with  $V$ ,  $r$ , and  $N$ ?

- (d) Find the range of the effectiveness parameter  $r$  in which all the players participate.
- (e) Define Rent Dissipation as

$$D \equiv V - \sum_{i=1}^N x_i^*,$$

which can be understood as how many resources the society is left with all the players are completed with their investments. Find the Rent Dissipation  $D$  and show that it is positive for all the admissible values of  $r$ .

- (f) Is Rent Dissipation increasing or decreasing in the common value that players assign to the prize,  $V$ ; in the effectiveness parameter  $r$ ; and in the number of players  $N$ ?
- (g) What happens when all players coordinate their investment decisions?

### 3. Exercises from Tadelis:

- (a) Chapter 5: Exercises 5.11 and 5.16.