

# No-Regret Learning

CMPUT 654: Modelling Human Strategic Behaviour

Hart & Mas-Colell (2000)  
Nekipelov, Syrgkanis, and Tardos (2015)

# Lecture Outline

1. Recap
2. Hart & Mas-Colell (2000)
3. Coarse Correlated Equilibrium
4. Nekipelov, Syrgkanis, and Tardos (2015)

# Hart & Mas-Colell (2000)

## Why:

- A no-regret algorithm (**regret matching**) that converges to **correlated equilibrium**
  - **Influential:** This paper is always cited in this area
1. Defines regret matching algorithm and argues for its plausibility
  2. Proves that it converges to correlated equilibrium

# Correlated Equilibrium

## Definition:

Given an  $n$ -agent game  $G=(N,A,u)$ , a **correlated equilibrium** is a tuple  $(\nu, \pi, \sigma)$ , where

- $\nu = (\nu_1, \dots, \nu_n)$  is a tuple of random variables with domains  $(D_1, \dots, D_n)$ ,
- $\pi$  is a joint distribution over  $\nu$ ,
- $\sigma = (\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n)$  is a vector of mappings  $\sigma_i : D_i \rightarrow A_i$ , and
- for every agent  $i$  and mapping  $\sigma'_i : D_i \rightarrow A_i$ ,

$$\sum_{d \in D_1 \times \dots \times D_n} \pi(d) u_i(\sigma_1(d_1), \dots, \sigma_n(d_n)) \geq \sum_{d \in D_1 \times \dots \times D_n} \pi(d) u_i(\sigma_1(d_1), \dots, \sigma'_i(d_i), \dots, \sigma_n(d_n))$$

# Correlated Equilibrium (simplified)

## **Definition:**

Given an  $n$ -agent game  $G=(N,A,u)$ , a **correlated equilibrium** is a distribution  $\sigma \in \Delta(A)$  such that for every  $i \in N$  and actions  $a'_i, a''_i \in A_i$ ,

$$\sum_{a \in A: a_i = a'_i} \sigma(a) [u_i(a''_i, a_{-i}) - u_i(a)] \leq 0$$

# Repeated Setting

- A game  $G=(N,A,u)$  is played repeatedly over  $t=1,2,\dots$
- At time  $t$ , agent  $i$  selects action  $a_t^i$
- Each agent  $i$  receives utility  $u_i(a_t)$

# Regret Matching

- For every pair of strategies  $j, k$ , let  $W_{i,t}(j, k)$  be the utility that  $i$  would have received at time  $t$  by playing  $k$  instead of  $j$ 
  - Unchanged from  $u_i(a^t)$  if  $i$  didn't play  $j$
- $D_{i,t}(j, k)$  is the average of  $W_{i,t}(j, k) - u_i(a^t)$  up until time  $t$
- At each time step, each agent chooses between actions with **positive**  $D(j, k)$ , where  $j$  is the **most-recent action**, and the most-recent action  $j$

# Convergence of Regret Matching

**Theorem:**

If all players play according to regret matching, then the empirical distributions of play converge to the set of correlated equilibria.



# Coarse Correlated Equilibrium

- Instead of getting to replace each action with an arbitrary action, compare to the case where we play a single action:

## **Definition:**

Given an  $n$ -agent game  $G=(N,A,u)$ , a **coarse correlated equilibrium** is a distribution  $\sigma \in \Delta(A)$  such that for every  $i \in N$  and action  $a'_i \in A_i$ ,

$$\sum_{a_{-i} \in A_{-i}} \sigma(a) u_i(a'_i, a_{-i}) - \sum_{a \in A} \sigma(a) u_i(a) \leq 0$$

# Convergence of Multiagent No-Regret Learning

**Proposition:**

If every agent plays a no-regret learning algorithm, then the empirical distribution of play will converge to a coarse correlated equilibrium.

# Nekipolov, Syrgkanis, and Tardos (2015)

## **Why:**

Application of a non-equilibrium behavioural rule to econometrics

1. Define rationalizable set NR
2. Prove properties of NR for sponsored search auctions
3. Apply to value estimation

# Setting: Sponsored Search

- There are  $k$  slots
- Each agent submits a bid  $b_i$
- Highest bid gets first slot, etc.
- Each agent pays bid of next-highest slot
- Payments are **per-click** rather than **per-impression**

# Problem: Estimating Types

- Each agent has a **value**  $v_i$  for a click
- We want to **estimate** what those values are, based on bids
- *Previously:* Assume **equilibrium**
- *Now:* Assume **no-regret learning**

# Rationalizable Set

**Definition:**

The **rationalizable set**  $NR$  is the set of pairs  $(v_i, \varepsilon_i)$  such that  $i$ 's sequence of bids has regret less than  $\varepsilon_i$  if  $i$ 's value is  $v_i$ .

# Data Analysis

## Claims:

1. Bids are highly **shaded** (only 60% of value)
2. Almost all accounts have a few keywords with very small error, and others with large error

# Epilogue

## Some questions:

1. Regret matching includes a notion of **inertia**. How closely related to I-SAW is it?
2. Why do we think that the **smallest** rationalizable error is the one to use for point estimates?