

Module 3: "Dynamic games of complete information"

Lecture 22: "Infinitely Repeated Games: Trigger Strategy"

The Lecture Contains:

☰ Trigger Strategy

◀◀ Previous Next ▶▶

Module 3: "Dynamic games of complete information"

Lecture 22: "Infinitely Repeated Games: Trigger Strategy"

Consider the following game:

	L ₂	R ₂
L ₁	1, 1	5, 0
R ₁	0, 5	4, 4

Suppose this game is infinitely repeated. Further suppose that each person's discount factor is δ and each player's payoff in the repeated game is the present value of the players' payoffs from the stage games.

- it can be shown that co-operation i.e. (R_1, R_2) can occur in every stage even though the only NE in each individual stage of game is the non-cooperative outcome (L_1, L_2) .

◀ Previous Next ▶

Trigger Strategy

- Suppose player i begins the infinitely repeated game by cooperating in the first period (by playing R_i) and then cooperates in each subsequent stage only if both players have cooperated in every previous stage.
- Formally player i 's strategy is:
 - Play R_i in the first stage
 - In the t^{th} period, if the outcome of all " $t-1$ " preceding stages has been (R_1, R_2) , then play R_i , otherwise play L_i .

This is called the Trigger strategy

- Player i goes on cooperating until someone fails to cooperate. If cooperation is broken by one player, then that deviation from the cooperative action triggers off a switch to non-cooperation (L_1, L_2) for all the future periods
- If both players adopt this trigger strategy, then the outcome of this infinitely repeated game is co-operation always[i.e. (R_1, R_2) in each stage]

Module 3: "Dynamic games of complete information"

Lecture 22: "Infinitely Repeated Games: Trigger Strategy"

Proposition : If δ is close enough to 1, it is a NE of the infinitely repeated game for both the players to adopt the trigger strategy. (TS)

Proof : Consider any arbitrary period t there are 2 possible situations:

Situation 1:

In one previous period, outcome differs from (R_1, R_2)

Situation 2:

For all periods upto " $t-1$ " (R_1, R_2) is the outcome.

In order to show that (TS, TS) is a NE, one has to show that if player j has adopted TS ($j= 1, 2$), then player i ($i \neq j$) has no unilateral incentive to deviate from TS.

Situation 1 :

- In one period, outcome differs from (R_1, R_2) . Since player j has adopted TS, after that period, player j will play L_j for all future periods.
- The best response for player i then is to also choose L_i for all future periods.
- Hence once the deviation occurs and given that player 2 has chosen TS, it is also optimal for player 1 to choose TS.

Module 3: "Dynamic games of complete information"

Lecture 22: "Infinitely Repeated Games: Trigger Strategy"

Proposition [Contd...]**Situation 2:**

All the proceeding outcomes in period upto 't-1' (R_1, R_2)

If Player j is playing TS, then since there is no deviation from (R_1, R_2) in previous periods; player j will be playing R_j in the present period

Present Value of payoff of player i by playing TS

$$= 4 + 4\delta + 4\delta^2 + \dots$$

$$= \frac{4}{1 - \delta}$$

Suppose player i deviates from TS & plays L_i . Playing L_i will yield payoff of 5 in period t.

- triggers non co-operations by player j (since j plays TS) => player j hence forth will always play L_j
- Best response of i is then to play L_i also
- In all the periods after deviation, outcome is (L_1, L_2) and payoff is therefore 1 in all future periods.

Module 3: "Dynamic games of complete information"

Lecture 22: "Infinitely Repeated Games: Trigger Strategy"

PV of payoff of player i by deviation from TS

$$= 5 + \delta + \delta^2 + \dots = \frac{5 - 4\delta}{1 - \delta}$$

PV of pay off of player i by playing **TS** > PV of payoff of play i by deviating from TS

$$\Rightarrow 4/1 - \delta > \frac{5 - 4\delta}{1 - \delta} \Rightarrow \delta > \frac{1}{4}$$

Given $\delta > \frac{1}{4}$, **(TS, TS)** will be a NE \Rightarrow there will always be co-operation.

◀ Previous Next ▶