

**Economics 14.126**  
**Problem Set 2**  
*Due Wednesday Oct 29*

1. Verify the claim in the proof of part (i) of Lemma 3.1 in Fudenberg-Levine (JET 94.)
2. FT 5.10.
3. Consider the following version of a repeated prisoner's dilemma. In the stage game, players choose simultaneously between  $C$  and  $D$ ; the expected payoffs to an action profile are given by

	$C$	$D$
$C$	1,1	$-h, 1+d$ ,
$D$	$1+d, -h$	0,0

where  $d$  and  $h$  are positive, and  $d - h < 1$ .

There are two public outcomes,  $x', x''$ . The probability distribution over these outcomes is symmetric:  $\pi_{x'}(C, D) = \pi_{x'}(D, C)$ , and satisfies  $\pi_{x'}(C, C) < \pi_{x'}(C, D)$  and  $\pi_{x'}(C, D) > \pi_{x'}(D, D)$ .

- a) Verify that the expected payoff given above are consistent with a model where each player's realized payoff depends only on her own action and the public outcome.
- b) Show that the set  $\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 1} E(\delta)$  is bounded away from the efficient frontier, where  $E(\delta)$  is the set of payoff vectors of perfect public equilibria.
- c) For a given function  $\pi$ , let  $\gamma = \pi_{x'}(C, D) - \pi_{x'}(C, C)$  and let  $\beta = \pi_{x'}(C, D) - \pi_{x'}(D, D)$ . Consider a sequence of games indexed by  $n$  that all have the expected payoff function given above, where both  $\gamma_n$  and  $\beta_n$  converge to 0, and the ratio  $\frac{\gamma_n}{\gamma_n + \beta_n}$  converges to 0 as well. What is  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 1} E(\delta)$ ?

d) Discuss this example. How do your findings relate to the fact that no action profile is pairwise identifiable?

4. Consider a repeated game of adverse selection, of the type described in Section 8 of FLM [94], where the player's stage-game is a report of their type, but suppose that the distribution  $p$  over types is not a product measure. Suppose that each player  $i$  has only 2 possible types, and that  $p$  puts positive probability on each of the possible type profiles.

a) Does the game have a product structure?

b) Suppose there are only two players. Is truthful reporting pairwise identifiable for generic distributions?

c) Suppose there are 3 players. Find a profile that is not pairwise identifiable.

d) Still with three players, show that the truthful reporting profile is pairwise identifiable for generic probability distributions  $p$ .

5) (extra credit) This question asks you to extend the characterization of  $\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 1} E(\delta)$  to cases where the set  $Q = \bigcap_{\lambda} H(\lambda)$  is lower dimensional. To do this, think of iterating the definition of  $Q$ , where at the first round is the original definition, and at each subsequent round  $k$  the set of current-period payoffs  $g(\alpha)$  is constrained to lie in the set  $Q_{k-1}$  that was obtained in the previous round, and the continuation payoffs  $w$  are constrained to lie in the affine hull of  $Q_{k-1}$  (that is, each  $w$  must be a linear combination of payoff vectors in  $Q_{k-1}$ , but the weights need neither be non-negative nor to sum to 1.) Show that this iterative process is well defined, and that the limit set  $Q^*$  equals  $\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 1} E(\delta)$ .