

# EVOLUTIONARY SELECTION AGAINST

## DOMINATED STRATEGIES

Josef Hofbauer\* and Jörgen W. Weibull\*\*

June 1995

N° 9506

\* Hofbauer thanks the Institute for Advanced Study - Collegium Budapest for its hospitality during this work.

\*\* Weibull's research was sponsored by the Industrial Institute for Economic and Social Research (IUI), Stockholm. He thanks the CEPREMAP, Paris, for its hospitality during part of this work.

# EVOLUTIONARY SELECTION AGAINST DOMINATED STRATEGIES

Josef Hofbauer\* and Jörgen W. Weibull\*\*

**ABSTRACT :** A class of evolutionary selection dynamics is defined, and the defining property, convex monotonicity, is shown to be sufficient and essentially necessary for the elimination of strictly dominated pure strategies. More precisely, in any convex-monotone dynamics all strictly dominated strategies are eliminated along all interior solutions. On the other hand, for all selection dynamics where the growth rates of pure strategies are determined by a *non-convex* function of their current payoffs we construct games with strictly dominated strategies that survive along a large set of interior solutions.

**Keywords :** evolutionary games, rationalizable strategies

**JEL classification :** C7, C72

-----

## SELECTION EVOLUTIVE ET ELIMINATION DES STRATEGIES DOMINEES

**RESUME :** On définit une classe de dynamiques par sélection évolutive. On montre que la propriété utilisée pour définir cette classe, la monotonie convexe, est suffisante, et essentiellement nécessaire, pour l'élimination des stratégies pures strictement dominées. Plus précisément, dans toute dynamique évolutive convexe monotone, toutes les stratégies strictement dominées sont éliminées le long de toute trajectoire intérieure. D'autre part, pour toute dynamique par sélection où les taux de croissance des stratégies pures sont déterminés par une fonction *non convexe* de leurs rapports courants, on construit des jeux comportant des stratégies strictement dominées qui ne sont pas éliminées pour un ensemble large de solutions intérieures.

**Mots Clés :** jeux évolutifs, stratégies rationalisables

**Classification JEL :** C7, C72

# Evolutionary Selection against Dominated Strategies

Josef Hofbauer\* and Jörgen W. Weibull†

June 7, 1995

## Abstract

A class of evolutionary selection dynamics is defined, and the defining property, convex monotonicity, is shown to be sufficient and essentially necessary for the elimination of strictly dominated pure strategies. More precisely, in any convex-monotone dynamics all strictly dominated strategies are eliminated along all interior solutions. On the other hand, for all selection dynamics where the growth rates of pure strategies are determined by a *non-convex* function of their current payoffs we construct games with strictly dominated strategies that survive along a large set of interior solutions. (Doc: dom.tex.)

## 1 Introduction

A basic rationality postulate in non-cooperative game theory is that players never use pure strategies that are strictly dominated. This postulate only requires that a player's (pure strategy) payoffs indeed represent her preferences over outcomes. In particular, no knowledge of other players' preferences or behavior is required. A more stringent rationality postulate is that players

---

\*Hofbauer thanks the Institute for Advanced Study - Collegium Budapest for its hospitality during this work.

†Weibull's research was sponsored by the Industrial Institute for Economic and Social Research (IUI), Stockholm. He thanks the CEPREMAP, Paris, for its hospitality during part of this work.

never use pure strategies that are iteratively strictly dominated. In addition, this postulate requires that all players know each others payoffs, that they know that they know each others payoffs, etc. up to a finite level  $k$  of mutual knowledge (where  $k$  is the number of rounds required to halt the procedure of iterated elimination of strictly dominated pure strategies).

A fundamental question in evolutionary game theory thus is whether evolutionary selection processes do eliminate all strictly dominated pure strategies or even all iteratively strictly dominated pure strategies. If all iteratively strictly dominated strategies do vanish, this provides an evolutionary justification for the presumption that strategically interacting agents behave *as if* it were mutual knowledge that they are rational in the sense of never using strictly dominated strategies.<sup>1</sup> Clearly, this justification is more compelling the wider is the class of evolutionary selection processes for which this result is valid.

So far, the result has been established for so-called aggregate monotonic selection dynamics in Samuelson and Zhang (1992).<sup>2</sup> This is a class of continuous-time dynamics that contains the biological replicator dynamics. Samuelson and Zhang also show that all aggregate monotonic selection dynamics are closely related to the replicator dynamics: the differential equations for any dynamics in this class differ from the replicator equations only by a positive factor, a factor which may be player specific and population state dependent.

Here we generalize Samuelson's and Zhang's result to a considerably wider class of evolutionary selection dynamics which we call *convex monotone*. We also show that this result is sharp within a wide class of selection dynamics where the growth rate of each pure strategy is determined by a function of its payoff. For all dynamics in this class which fail our condition there exist games in which strictly dominated strategies survive along (large sets of) solutions. The new class of dynamics is shown to contain a number of (not aggregate monotonic) selection dynamics that arise in models of social evolution by way of imitation.

---

<sup>1</sup>See Weibull (1994) for a discussion of the "as if" approach to game theoretic rationality.

<sup>2</sup>In contrast, the result is known not to be valid for the discrete-time version of the replicator dynamics, see Dekel and Scotchmer (1992).

## 2 Games and Selection Dynamics

Consider any finite  $n$ -player game in normal form,  $G = (I, S, u)$ , where  $I = \{1, \dots, n\}$  is the set of players,  $S = \prod_{i \in I} S_i$  is the set of pure-strategy profiles, each player's pure-strategy set  $S_i$  being finite,  $S_i = \{1, \dots, m_i\}$ , and  $u : S \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$  is the combined payoff function. Let  $m$  denote the total number of pure strategies in the game,  $m = m_1 + \dots + m_n$ .

For each player  $i$ , let  $\Delta_i$  denote her set of mixed strategies,

$$\Delta_i = \left\{ x_i \in \mathbb{R}_+^{m_i} : \sum_{h \in S_i} x_{ih} = 1 \right\}. \quad (1)$$

We write  $e_i^h \in \Delta$  for the mixed strategy for player  $i$  that assigns unit probability to her pure strategy  $h \in S_i$ . Geometrically,  $e_i^h$  is the  $h$ 'th vertex of the unit simplex  $\Delta_i$ . A *face* of  $\Delta_i$  is the convex hull of a subset of its vertices; the face spanned by  $S'_i \subset S_i$  is denoted

$$\Delta_i(S'_i) = \text{co} \{ e_i^h : h \in S'_i \} = \{ x_i \in \Delta_i : e_i^k = 0 \ \forall k \notin S'_i \}. \quad (2)$$

Let  $\Theta$  denote the polyhedron in  $\mathbb{R}^m$  of mixed strategy profiles,  $\Theta = \Theta(S) = \prod_{i \in I} \Delta_i$ . The *face* of  $\Theta$  associated with any collection of pure strategy subsets  $S'_i \subset S_i$  is accordingly defined by  $\Theta(S') = \prod_{i \in I} \Delta_i(S'_i)$ . As usual, statistically independent individual randomizations extend the domain of the payoff function  $u$  from the vertices of  $\Theta$  to all of  $\Theta$ , and this renders  $u$  polynomial. In fact,  $u$  is an  $n$ -linear function defined on the whole Euclidean space  $\mathbb{R}^m$  where  $\Theta$  is embedded. We write  $u_i(y_i, x_{-i})$  for the payoff to player  $i$  when she plays  $y_i \in \Delta_i$  and the others play according to the strategy profile  $x \in \Theta$ .

A pure strategy  $h \in S_i$  is *strictly dominated* if there is some (pure or mixed) strategy  $y_i \in \Delta_i$  such that  $u_i(y_i, x_{-i}) > u_i(e_i^h, x_{-i})$  for all  $x \in \Theta$ . A pure strategy is *iteratively strictly dominated* if it is strictly dominated in the original game  $G$ , or in the reduced game  $G'$  obtained by elimination from  $G$  of all strictly dominated strategies in  $G$ , or in the further reduced game  $G''$  obtained by elimination from  $G'$  of all strictly dominated strategies in  $G'$ , etc. The set  $S$  of pure-strategy profiles being finite, this procedure stops after a finite number of iterations.

In evolutionary game theory one considers large populations of individuals who are randomly matched to play a given game. Here we imagine one

population for each player position in a finite  $n$ -player game, and selection processes are thought to operate over time on the composition of behaviors - pure strategies - in each player population in the form of a *regular selection dynamics* on the polyhedron  $\Theta$ . By this is meant a system of (autonomous, first-order) ordinary differential equations

$$\dot{x}_{ih} = x_{ih}g_{ih}(x) , \quad (3)$$

where the function  $g : X \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^m$  has open domain  $X \supset \Theta$ , is locally Lipschitz continuous, and satisfies the orthogonality condition (" $\cdot$ " denotes the inner product)

$$x_i \cdot g_i(x) = 0 \quad [\forall i \in I, x \in \Theta] . \quad (4)$$

This condition implies that the sum of population shares in each player population remains constantly equal to one. Any regular selection dynamics has a unique global solution  $x(\cdot) : \mathbf{R} \rightarrow X$  through any initial state  $x(0) \in \Theta$ , and leaves  $\Theta$ , as well as its interior  $\text{int}(\Theta)$  and each of its faces, invariant.

Following Samuelson and Zhang (1992) we call a regular selection dynamics (3) *monotone* if it meets the following axiom:<sup>3</sup>

$$(M) \quad u_i(e_i^h, x_{-i}) > u_i(e_i^k, x_{-i}) \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad g_{ih}(x) > g_{ik}(x).$$

They call a regular selection dynamics (3) *aggregate monotonic* if the growth-rate functions  $g_{ih}$  satisfy the more stringent axiom

$$(AM) \quad u_i(y_i, x_{-i}) > u_i(z_i, x_{-i}) \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad y_i \cdot g_i(x) > z_i \cdot g_i(x).$$

Moreover, they show that the growth-rate functions associated with any aggregate monotonic selection dynamics can be written in the form

$$g_{ih}(x) = \lambda_i(x) \left( u_i(e_i^h, x_{-i}) - u_i(x) \right) , \quad (5)$$

for some positive functions  $\lambda_i : X \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ . The *standard replicator dynamics* (Taylor, 1979) corresponds to the special case  $\lambda_i(x) \equiv 1$  for all players  $i$ . The *payoff adjusted replicator dynamics* (Maynard Smith, 1982, see also Hofbauer

---

<sup>3</sup>This property is called *relative monotonicity* in Nachbar (1990) and *order compatibility* in Friedman (1991).

and Sigmund, 1988), corresponds to the special case  $\lambda_i(x) \equiv 1/u_i(x)$  for all players  $i$  (presuming all payoffs are positive).

Akin (1980) shows that all strictly dominated pure strategies vanish along any interior solution trajectory to the (single-population) replicator dynamics in any (finite) symmetric two-player game. Samuelson and Zhang (1992) establish that this conclusion is indeed valid for all iteratively strictly dominated pure strategies in any aggregate monotonic (two-population) selection dynamics in any (finite) two-player game. They also show that all pure strategies that are iteratively strictly dominated by other *pure* strategies vanish in any monotone selection dynamics in such games (see also Nachbar (1990)). Björnerstedt (1995) shows by way of a counter-example that this is not generally true for pure strategies that are strictly dominated only by mixed strategies.

### 3 Convex-Monotone Selection Dynamics

The following axiom is a weakening of aggregate monotonicity:

$$(CM) \quad u_i(y_i, x_{-i}) > u_i(e_i^h, x_{-i}) \quad \Rightarrow \quad y_i \cdot g_i(x) > g_{ih}(x).$$

This property, which we call *convex monotonicity*, is below shown to be sufficient for the elimination of iteratively strictly dominated pure strategies. But first we consider an important special case that motivates its name.

Consider the class of regular selection dynamics in which all growth-rate functions  $g_{ih}$  are of the form

$$g_{ih}(x) = \lambda_i(x) f[u_i(e_i^h, x_{-i})] + \mu_i(x) \quad (6)$$

for some functions  $f : \mathbf{R} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ ,  $\lambda_i : X \rightarrow \mathbf{R}_{++}$  and  $\mu_i : X \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ . More precisely, by a *payoff functional* (PF) selection dynamics we mean a function  $f^\# : \mathbf{R} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ , and for each game  $G = (I, S, u)$  a pair of functions  $\lambda_i : X \rightarrow \mathbf{R}_{++}$  and  $\mu_i : X \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ , such that (3,6) defines a regular selection dynamics for game  $G$  (note that the  $\mu_i$  are determined by (4)).

As a special case, call such a dynamics *linear* if  $f$  is linear with positive slope. Both the standard and the payoff adjusted replicator dynamics are linear in this sense. Set  $f(v) \equiv v$ ,  $\lambda_i(x) \equiv 1$  and  $\mu_i(x) \equiv -u_i(x)$  to obtain the standard replicator dynamics, and set  $f(v) \equiv v$ ,  $\lambda_i(x) \equiv 1/u_i(x)$  and  $\mu_i(x) \equiv$

$-1$  to obtain the payoff adjusted replicator dynamics (in the latter case presuming  $u_i(x) > 0$ ). Moreover, since all aggregate monotonic dynamics can be written in the form (5) these are linear PF dynamics ( $f(v) \equiv v$  and  $\mu_i(x) \equiv -\lambda_i(x)u_i(x)$ ).

More generally, we call a payoff functional dynamics *convex* if  $f$  in (6) is convex and strictly increasing. Heuristically, nonlinear convex PF dynamics have players react *over-proportionally* to higher payoffs.

Convex payoff functional selection dynamics may also be interpreted in terms of risk aversion with respect to "fitness." For suppose replication of pure strategies occurs as in equation (3) with growth rate functions as in (6). The numbers  $\varphi_{ih}(x) = f[u_i(e_i^h, x_{-i})]$  can then be interpreted as the *relative fitness* of pure strategy  $h$  in player population  $i$  when the overall population states is  $x$ : this is the relative rate at which pure strategy  $h$  is reproduced in population  $i$ . Let the functions  $\varphi_{ih}$  be given data. For a convex PF dynamics (3,6) we may recover the associated utility function by simply inverting the strictly increasing function  $f$ : At any given population state  $x$ ,  $u_i(e_i^h, x_{-i}) = f^{-1}[\varphi_{ih}(x)]$ . Hence, utility is a strictly increasing and *concave* function of fitness. In this sense, it is as if individuals were (weakly) risk averse with respect to fitness. For instance, if  $f$  is exponential (as in (7) below), then utility is logarithmic in relative fitness, and the Arrow-Pratt measure of absolute risk aversion, here with respect to relative fitness, meets the usual (DARA) condition of decreasing absolute risk aversion.

It was noted above that all aggregate monotonic selection dynamics meet axiom (CM). The following proposition establishes that not only all linear PF dynamics meet this axiom; in fact it holds for all convex PF dynamics and no other PF dynamics:

**Proposition:** A payoff functional selection dynamics satisfies axiom (CM) if and only if it is convex.

**Proof:** For the first claim, suppose  $g$  is of the form (6), where  $f$  is convex and strictly increasing. Suppose  $u_i(y_i, x_{-i}) > u_i(e_i^h, x_{-i})$ . Using Jensen's inequality:

$$y_i \cdot g_i(x) - e_i^h \cdot g_i(x) = \lambda_i(x) \left( \sum_{k \in S_i} y_{ik} f[u_i(e_i^k, x_{-i})] - f[u_i(e_i^h, x_{-i})] \right)$$



$$\begin{aligned}
&\geq \lambda_i(x) \left( f \left[ \sum_{k \in S_i} y_{ik} u_i(e_i^k, x_{-i}) \right] - f \left[ u_i(e_i^h, x_{-i}) \right] \right) = \\
&= \lambda_i(x) \left( f \left[ u_i(y_i, x_{-i}) \right] - f \left[ u_i(e_i^h, x_{-i}) \right] \right).
\end{aligned}$$

The last expression is positive since  $\lambda_i$  is positive and  $f$  strictly increasing, so (CM) is met.

For the second claim, consider any PF dynamics (3,6) that meets (CM). It follows from (CM) that  $f$  is necessarily strictly increasing. Suppose  $f$  is not convex. Then there are  $b, c \in \mathbf{R}$  such that  $f\left(\frac{b+c}{2}\right) > \frac{1}{2}[f(b) + f(c)]$ . By continuity of  $f$  there are  $a < \frac{b+c}{2}$  such that  $f(a) > \frac{1}{2}[f(b) + f(c)]$ . Let  $G$  be a game where player  $i$  has three pure strategies,  $h = 1, 2, 3$ , that earn payoffs  $a, b, c$ , respectively, against some strategy profile  $x \in \Theta$ . Let  $y_i \in \Delta_i$  be the mixed strategy that assigns probability  $\frac{1}{2}$  to pure strategies 2 and 3. Then

$$u_i(y_i, x_{-i}) = \frac{1}{2}(b + c) > a = u_i(e_i^1, x_{-i}).$$

However,

$$y_i \cdot g_i(x) = \lambda_i(x) \frac{f(b) + f(c)}{2} < \lambda_i(x) f(a) = e_i^1 \cdot g_i(x),$$

in violation of (CM). **End of proof.**

*Remark:* It is easily verified that axiom (CM) is satisfied by any selection dynamics (3) with growth rate functions in the more general functional form  $g_{ih}(x) = F_i \left[ u_i(e_i^h, x_{-i}), x \right]$  for  $F_i : \mathbf{R} \times X \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$  convex and strictly increasing in its first argument.

Björnerstedt and Weibull (1993) and Weibull (1995) consider a few classes of payoff functional selection dynamics derived from models of adaptation by way of imitation. They imagine that each individual in the interacting populations every now and then reviews her pure strategy choice in the light of noisy empirical information about current payoffs to alternative pure strategies.

First, suppose that the review rate is constantly equal to one for all individuals, but each individual imitates an individual in her own player population, randomly drawn with a higher probability for currently more successful

individuals. Then one obtains a payoff functional selection dynamics with  $f(v) \equiv s(v)$ , where  $s(v)$  is the probability "weight" factor given to an individual who earns payoff  $v$ .<sup>4</sup> A convex PF dynamics arises if  $s$  is strictly increasing and convex. For example, setting  $s(v) = \exp(\sigma v)$  for some  $\sigma > 0$  one obtains:<sup>5</sup>

$$\dot{x}_{ih} = x_{ih} \left( \frac{\exp[\sigma u_i(e_i^h, x_{-i})]}{\sum_{k \in S_i} x_{ik} \exp[\sigma u_i(e_i^k, x_{-i})]} - 1 \right) \quad (7)$$

For small  $\sigma$  this dynamics approaches the standard replicator dynamics slowed down by the factor  $\sigma$ .<sup>6</sup> For large  $\sigma$ , the dynamics approaches, at interior population states, the *best-reply dynamics* which assigns (equal) negative growth rates  $(-1)$  to all non-best replies.<sup>7</sup>

Secondly, suppose instead that the review rates are decreasing in the individual's current payoff, and assume now that each reviewing individual imitates "the first man in the street," i.e., an individual in her own player population who is randomly drawn according to a *uniform* probability distribution over this population. (This corresponds to  $s(v) \equiv 1$  above.) Then one obtains a payoff functional selection dynamics with  $f(v) \equiv -r(v)$ , where

---

<sup>4</sup>Let the review rate of all individuals be identically equal to one, and let the probability that a reviewing individual in population  $i$  will select pure strategy  $h$  be proportional to  $x_{ih} s[u_i(e_i^h, x_{-i})]$  for some strictly increasing and positive function  $s$ . In terms of expected values, this results in

$$g_{ih}(x) = \frac{s[u_i(e_i^h, x_{-i})]}{\sum_k x_{ik} s[u_i(e_i^k, x_{-i})]} - 1,$$

see eq. (7) in Björnerstedt and Weibull (1993), and eqs. (4.37) and (5.32) in Weibull (1995).

<sup>5</sup>See eq.(9) in Björnerstedt and Weibull (1993), eq. (4) in Weibull (1994), and Example 4.5 in Weibull (1995).

<sup>6</sup>The orbits approach those of the standard replicator dynamics as  $\sigma \rightarrow 0$ , but the speed of adjustment goes down toward zero. In the limit all population states are stationary.

<sup>7</sup>The limit of the right-hand side in (7) is a discontinuous vector field that does not admit solutions in general. On the other hand, limits of solutions of (7), as  $\sigma \rightarrow +\infty$ , are solutions of the multi-valued and upper hemi-continuous best reply dynamics  $\dot{x} = BR(x) - x$ , where  $BR(x)$  denotes the set of (mixed) best replies to  $x$ . This is a differential inclusion, and its solutions are in general not uniquely determined by the initial state. See Hofbauer (1994) for a rigorous treatment of this dynamics, and see Gaunersdorfer and Hofbauer (1994) for a comparison of its asymptotic behavior with that of the replicator and other selection dynamics. It is easily seen that this best-reply dynamics eliminates all (iteratively) strictly dominated strategies.

$r(v)$  is the relative review rate of an individual earning payoff  $v$ .<sup>8</sup> A *concave* PF dynamics arises if  $r$  is strictly decreasing and *convex*. For instance, if  $r(v) = \exp(-\sigma v)$  for some  $\sigma > 0$ , then

$$\dot{x}_{ih} = x_{ih} \left( 1 - \frac{\exp[-\sigma u_i(e_i^h, x_{-i})]}{\sum_{k \in S_i} x_{ik} \exp[-\sigma u_i(e_i^k, x_{-i})]} \right). \quad (8)$$

This dynamics constitutes a "concave dual" to the dynamics (7). For small  $\sigma$ , (8) performs approximately like (7); it approaches the standard replicator dynamics slowed down by the factor  $\sigma$ . For large  $\sigma$ , however, (8) approaches, at interior population states, the *worst-reply dynamics* which assigns (equal) positive growth rates (+1) to all non-worst replies.<sup>9</sup>

## 4 Elimination of Dominated Strategies

Suppose player  $i$  has a pure strategy  $h \in S_i$  that is strictly dominated by some mixed strategy  $y_i \in \Delta_i$ :  $u_i(y_i, x_{-i}) > u_i(e_i^h, x_{-i})$  for all  $x \in \Theta$ . Consider the function  $P : \text{int}(\Theta) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{++}$  defined by  $P(x) = x_{ih} \prod_{k \in S_i} x_{ik}^{-y_{ik}}$ . Evaluated along any interior solution trajectory  $x(\cdot) : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \Theta$  to a regular selection dynamics (3):

$$\dot{P}(x) = \sum_{k \in S_i} \frac{\partial P(x)}{\partial x_{ik}} \dot{x}_{ik} = P(x) (e_i^h - y_i) \cdot g_i(x). \quad (9)$$

In particular, under (CM) we have  $\dot{P}(x) < 0$  for all  $x \in \text{int}(\Theta)$ . Then  $P(x)$  decreases strictly along any interior solution. In fact, since  $\Theta$  is compact and  $g_i$  continuous, there is, by (CM), some  $\delta > 0$  such that  $(e_i^h - y_i) \cdot$

---

<sup>8</sup>Let  $r[u_i(e_i^h, x_{-i})] / \sum_k x_{ik} r[u_i(e_i^k, x_{-i})]$  be the review rate of a  $h$ -strategist in player population  $i$ , for  $r$  positive and decreasing, and let  $x_{ik}$  be the probability that a reviewing individual will select pure strategy  $k$ . In terms of expected values, this results in

$$g_{ih}(x) = 1 - r[u_i(e_i^h, x_{-i})] / \sum_k x_{ik} r[u_i(e_i^k, x_{-i})],$$

see eq. (4) in Björnerstedt and Weibull (1993, eq.4), and eqs. (4.28) and (5.24) in Weibull (1995).

<sup>9</sup>The worst-reply dynamics was introduced in (a 1993 version of) Björnerstedt (1995), see Section 7 below for a discussion.

$g_i(x) < -\delta$  for all  $x \in \Theta$ . Thus,  $\dot{P}(x) < -\delta P(x)$  and hence  $x_{ih}(t)$  decreases exponentially to zero from any interior initial state:

$$x_{ih}(t) = P(x(t)) \prod_{k \in S_i} x_{ik}(t)^{y_{ik}} \leq P(x(t)) < \theta \exp(-\delta t) \quad (10)$$

for some  $\theta > 0$ . Strictly dominated pure strategies are indeed eliminated in this class of dynamics!

A repetition of this argument leads to the conclusion that all iteratively strictly dominated pure strategies vanish along all interior solutions. Since axiom (CM) is much weaker than axiom (AM), this considerably generalizes the result in Samuelson and Zhang (1992, Theorem 2) that all iteratively strictly dominated pure strategies get wiped out in all aggregate monotonic selection dynamics.

**Theorem 1:** If a pure strategy  $h \in S_i$  is iteratively strictly dominated and  $x(0) \in \text{int}(\Theta)$ , then  $x_{ih}(t)_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \rightarrow 0$  under any regular selection dynamics (3) satisfying (CM).

**Proof:** Fix  $x(0) \in \text{int}(\Theta)$ . It has already been established that for each player position  $i \in I$  and strictly dominated pure strategy  $h \in S_i$  there exists some  $\delta_{ih}, \theta_{ih} > 0$  such that  $x_{ih}(t) < \theta_{ih} \exp(-\delta_{ih}t)$  for all  $t > 0$ . Let  $S' \subset S$  be the subset of pure strategy profiles that are *not* strictly dominated in the game. Let  $\delta = \min \{\delta_{ih} : i \in I, h \in S_i \setminus S'_i\}$  and  $\theta = \max \{\theta_{ih} : i \in I, h \in S_i \setminus S'_i\}$ . The sets  $I$  and  $S$  being finite,  $\delta, \theta > 0$ , and  $x_{ih}(t) < \theta \exp(-\delta t)$  for all  $i \in I$ ,  $h \notin S'_i$  and  $t > 0$ .

For any  $\varepsilon > 0$  there is a finite time  $T$  after which  $x(t)$  stays within distance  $\varepsilon$  from the face  $\Theta(S')$ . In the reduced game  $G'$  defined by the pure-strategy subsets  $S'_i$ , let  $S''_i \subset S'_i$  be the subset of pure strategies (for each  $i \in I$ ) that are not strictly dominated in  $G'$ . For each  $i \in I$  and  $h \in S'_i \setminus S''_i$  let  $y_i^h \in \Delta_i$  strictly dominate  $h$  in  $G'$ . By continuity of  $g$ , compactness of  $\Theta(S') \subset \Theta$  and finiteness of  $S_i$  there exists some  $\varepsilon', \delta' > 0$  such that  $(y_i^h - e_i^h) g_i(x) > \delta'$  for all  $i \in I$ ,  $h \notin S''_i$  and  $x \in \Theta$  within distance  $\varepsilon'$  of  $\Theta(S')$ . After some finite time  $T'$ ,  $x(t)$  stays within this distance  $\varepsilon'$  from  $\Theta(S')$ , and by the above argument for exponential decay,  $x_{ih}(t) < \theta' \exp(-\delta't)$  for all  $i \in I$ ,  $h \in S'_i \setminus S''_i$  and all  $t > T'$ . Consequently, all pure strategies in the subset  $(S_i \setminus S'_i) \cup (S'_i \setminus S''_i)$  decay at least at the exponential rate  $\delta'' = \min \{\delta, \delta'\} > 0$ .

A finite repetition of this argument, by way of iterated elimination of strictly dominated pure strategies, leads to the conclusion that there exists some finite time  $T''$  and  $\delta'' > 0$  such that  $x_{ih}(t) < \theta'' \exp(-\delta''t)$  for all player positions  $i \in I$ , iteratively strictly dominated strategies  $h \in S_i$ , and times  $t > T''$ . End of proof.

## 5 Single-Population Dynamics

In this subsection we focus on the standard set up for evolutionary game theory: a single population of individuals randomly matched to play a symmetric and finite two-player game. For this purpose, let the common set of pure strategies available to each of the two players be denoted  $S = S_1 = \{1, \dots, m\}$ , write  $\Delta$  for the associated unit simplex of mixed strategies, and let  $\tilde{u}(x, y)$  be the payoff to mixed strategy  $x \in \Delta$  when used against mixed strategy  $y \in \Delta$ .

A *population state* is now a vector  $x \in \Delta$ , where  $x_h$ , for each pure strategy  $h \in S$ , is the population share of individuals using pure strategy  $h$ . Accordingly, a *regular selection dynamics* is a system of ordinary differential equations

$$\dot{x}_h = x_h \tilde{g}_h(x) \quad [\forall h \in S], \quad (11)$$

where  $\tilde{g} : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$  has open domain  $X \supset \Delta$ , is locally Lipschitz continuous, and satisfies the orthogonality condition  $x \cdot \tilde{g}(x) = 0$  for all  $x \in \Delta$ .

Axiom (CM) becomes

$$(CM') \quad \tilde{u}(y, x) > \tilde{u}(e^h, x) \Rightarrow y \cdot \tilde{g}(x) > \tilde{g}_h(x).$$

Payoff functional (PF) selection dynamics are defined as in the multi-population setting: these are single-population dynamics (11) with growth rate functions of the form

$$\tilde{g}_h(x) = \lambda(x) f[\tilde{u}(e^h, x)] + \mu(x), \quad (12)$$

for some functions  $\lambda$ ,  $\mu$  and  $f$ , where  $f$  is the same for all games but  $\lambda$  and  $\mu$  may depend on the game in question. Convex PF dynamics constitute the subclass where  $f$  is convex and strictly increasing. The single-population replicator dynamics is the special case  $\lambda(x) \equiv 1$ ,  $\mu(x) = -u(x, x)$  and  $f(v) \equiv v$ .

The same argument as that for Theorem 1 establishes

**Corollary:** If a pure strategy  $h \in S$  is iteratively strictly dominated in a symmetric two-player game, and  $x(0) \in \text{int}(\Delta)$ , then  $x_h(t)_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \rightarrow 0$  under any single-population dynamics (11) satisfying (CM'). A payoff functional dynamics (11) satisfies (CM') if and only if it is convex.

In contrast to the multi-population setting, all aggregate monotonic single-population dynamics have the *same* orbits as the single-population replicator dynamics. They only differ in the velocity with which the solutions move along the replicator orbits (reflected by the positive factor  $\lambda(x)$ ). In contrast, convex monotone single-population dynamics may have orbits which are quite distinct from those of the replicator dynamics. Examples for which this applies are given by the single-population dynamics version of (7) (see Figure 4.9 in Weibull (1995)).

## 6 Survival of Dominated Strategies

We now turn to converse results. For this purpose it is sufficient to consider single-population dynamics (see remark below). More specifically, we will show that Theorem 1 is sharp for single-population payoff functional selection dynamics. If  $f$  is not throughout convex, then there are symmetric two-player games with strictly dominated strategies surviving along interior solutions to the associated single-population dynamics. We establish this by a slight modification of a game given in Dekel and Scotchmer (1992).

This is a ROCK-SCISSORS-PAPER game, augmented by a fourth strategy, called DUMB, which is strictly dominated. The payoff matrix is given by

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} a & c & b & \gamma \\ b & a & c & \gamma \\ c & b & a & \gamma \\ a + \beta & a + \beta & a + \beta & 0 \end{bmatrix} \quad (13)$$

where  $c < a < b$ ,  $0 < \beta < b - a$ , and  $\gamma > 0$ . The pure strategies  $h \in H = \{1, 2, 3\}$  form a cycle of best replies. For a single-population selection dynamics (11) this implies that the (relative) boundary  $\Gamma_1$  of the face  $\Phi = \Delta(H)$  forms a *heteroclinic cycle*:  $\Gamma_1$  is an invariant set that consists of three

rest points  $e^h$ , for  $h \in H$ , which are saddle points in any monotone selection dynamics, and three connecting orbits. (Clearly  $\Gamma_1$  is unstable in the  $e^4$  direction since  $\beta > 0$ .) In particular, DUMB can invade a monomorphic population consisting of only  $h$ -strategists, for each of the pure strategies  $h = 1, 2, 3$ . Hence, on the boundary of  $\Delta$  there are three more rest points (corresponding to symmetric Nash equilibria of each of the associated  $2 \times 2$  'subgames') for any monotone selection dynamics (11):  $z^1 = (\frac{\gamma}{\beta+\gamma}, 0, 0, \frac{\beta}{\beta+\gamma})$ ,  $z^2 = (0, \frac{\gamma}{\beta+\gamma}, 0, \frac{\beta}{\beta+\gamma})$  and  $z^3 = (0, 0, \frac{\gamma}{\beta+\gamma}, \frac{\beta}{\beta+\gamma})$ .

Note that  $z^h \in \Delta$  attracts all orbits on the (relative) interior of the boundary face of  $\Delta$  where  $x_{h+1} = 0$ , for any monotone selection dynamics. Hence, there is another heteroclinic cycle  $\Gamma_2$  connecting these three rest points. The connecting orbits are now curves in these two-dimensional subfaces, invariant under the flow of (11), namely the unstable manifolds of the saddles  $z^h$ .

[Figure 1]

Let  $p = (\frac{1}{3}, \frac{1}{3}, \frac{1}{3}, 0)$  be the Nash equilibrium point of the RSP subgame. The strategy  $p$  is in Nash equilibrium with itself in the full game, iff  $\frac{a+b+c}{3} \geq a + \beta$ . Moreover,  $p$  strictly dominates pure strategy 4 (=DUMB) iff

$$\frac{a+b+c}{3} > a + \beta. \quad (14)$$

For the replicator dynamics, and, more generally all those meeting axiom (CM'), this implies that  $x_4(t) \rightarrow 0$  along all interior solutions.

The inequality (14) holds only if  $a < \frac{b+c}{2}$ . The latter inequality implies that the Nash equilibrium strategy  $p$  is globally stable in the replicator dynamics: Every solution that has all pure strategies  $h \in H$  initially present, will converge to  $p$ . For other (regular) monotone selection dynamics this need not be true. In particular, it may happen that  $p$  is not globally stable within the face  $\Phi$ , since the boundary cycle  $\Gamma_1$  may be attracting on that face. Then orbits close to  $\Gamma_1$  will spiral away from  $p$ . Near  $\Gamma_1$ ,  $x_4$  will increase most of the time and the orbits will converge to the heteroclinic cycle  $\Gamma_2$  formed by the  $z^h$ . The dominated pure strategy 4 will not be eliminated along such orbits.

Formally:




Figure 1



**Theorem 2:** Consider a regular single-population dynamics (11) where  $\tilde{g}$  is of the form (12). If  $f$  is not convex, then there exists a symmetric two-player game with payoff matrix as in (13) such that the dominated pure strategy 4 survives along an open set of interior solutions of (11).

**Proof:** As shown in the proof of the lemma: If  $f$  is not convex, there exist  $a, b, c \in \mathbf{R}$  such that  $2a < b + c$  and  $2f(a) > f(b) + f(c)$ . Consider now the RSPD game (13) with these  $a, b, c$ . As is easily seen, and was shown in Gaunersdorfer and Hofbauer (1994, section 4), the eigenvalues of the vector field (11) at a vertex  $e^h$  (for  $h \in H$ ) are given by  $\rho = \lambda(e^h) [f(b) - f(a)] > 0$  and  $-\tau = \lambda(e^h) [f(c) - f(a)] < 0$ . Now  $2f(a) > f(b) + f(c)$  implies  $\tau > \rho$ , i.e. the "incoming speed" is larger than the "outgoing speed," which means that  $\Gamma_1$  is attracting within the face  $\Phi$ , according to the stability criterion for heteroclinic cycles in Hofbauer (1981), Hofbauer and Sigmund (1988, sect. 22.1, in particular Exercise 6), and Gaunersdorfer (1992).

Now choose  $\beta > 0$  small enough to satisfy (14), and such that the  $z^h$ , the rest points of  $\Gamma_2$ , are close to the  $e^h$ , the rest points of  $\Gamma_1$ . Since the inequality guaranteeing stability for  $\Gamma_1$  within the face  $\Phi$  is strict it holds also for  $\Gamma_2$ : The "outgoing speed" is smaller than the "ingoing speed" at the rest points  $z^i$ . Since  $\Gamma_2$  (unlike  $\Gamma_1$ ) is asymptotically stable within the boundary of  $\Delta$  this establishes the (local) asymptotic stability of  $\Gamma_2$  (in the full space  $\Delta$ ), for small  $\beta > 0$ .<sup>10</sup> The dominated pure strategy 4 thus survives for an open set  $U \supset \Gamma_2$  of interior initial states. **End of proof.**

*Remark:* Theorem 2 also shows that two-population payoff functional dynamics (3,6), with a non-convex function  $f$ , do not eliminate all strictly dominated strategies in all games. Just consider (13) as the payoff matrix of a symmetric bi-matrix game. The restriction of the associated two-population dynamics to the invariant diagonal of the state space  $\Theta = \Delta^2$  coincides with the one-population dynamics studied above, and hence we obtain interior two-population solutions along which strategy DUMB survives.

---

<sup>10</sup>Compare with Theorem 22.1(b) in Hofbauer and Sigmund (1988).

## 7 Concluding Remarks

Theorem 1 identifies a class of evolutionary selection dynamics that select against all iteratively strictly dominated pure strategies in all (finite  $n$ -player) games. Our proof is an extension of Akin's (1980) proof that strictly dominated strategies are eliminated in the single-population replicator dynamics for symmetric two-player games.

Theorem 2 provides a complementary class of evolutionary selection dynamics under which strictly dominated strategies do survive for some games. Björnerstedt (1995), see also Björnerstedt et al. (1995), presents a different, but related, class of evolutionary selection dynamics with the same property. He imagines that individuals every now and then review their strategy choice by way of a (possibly noisy) payoff comparison with all other strategies. Such a reviewing individual changes strategy if and only if her current strategy is observed to yield the worst payoff of all pure strategies. In this case, she imitates a (uniformly) randomly drawn individual. Björnerstedt gives a nice geometric proof that the strictly dominated pure strategy in a version of the Dekel-Scotchmer (1992) game studied above survives the resulting "abandon the worst reply" dynamics for a large set of initial states. His argument is robust against small perturbations of the dynamics, so the result applies also to the monotone concave dynamics (8) for large  $\sigma$ . In contrast, our proof of Theorem 2 is based on the stability criterion in Hofbauer (1981) for heteroclinic cycles, and is not directly applicable to the worst-reply dynamics. On the other hand, the technique behind Theorem 2 is more powerful since it allows to obtain general and, in conjunction with Theorem 1 (and its corollary), sharp results.

In a parallel study, Hofbauer (1995) shows (among other things) that strictly dominated strategies can survive under another class of selection dynamics based on models of social evolution by way of imitation introduced in Weibull (1992,1995). In these imitation processes individuals every now and then make a binary and noisy comparison with the strategy used by another, randomly selected, individual. The reviewing individual switches to the sampled strategy iff its observed payoff is higher than her current observed payoff. The replicator dynamics, which corresponds to an affine cumulative probability distribution function for the observational errors (over the range of payoffs in the game), is essentially the only imitation dynamics in that class that eliminates strictly dominated strategies in all games.

In sum: all evolutionary dynamics in the class of convex monotone (CM) selection dynamics that we have introduced here lend support to the rationalistic principle of elimination of iteratively strictly dominated strategies, and it appears that this is the only class of evolutionary dynamics for which this is true.

## References

- [1] Akin E. (1980), "Domination or equilibrium", *Mathematical Biosciences* 50, 239-250.
- [2] Björnerstedt J. (1995), "Experimentation, imitation and evolutionary dynamics", mimeo., Department of Economics, Stockholm University
- [3] Björnerstedt J., Dufwenberg M., Norman P. and J. Weibull (1995), "Evolutionary selection dynamics and irrational survivors", working paper, Department of Economics, Stockholm University.
- [4] Björnerstedt J. and J. Weibull (1993), "Nash equilibrium and evolution by imitation", discussion paper no. 93-23 at DELTA (Paris), forthcoming in K. Arrow et al (eds.), *The Rational Foundations of Economic Behavior*, MacMillan.
- [5] Dekel E. and S. Scotchmer (1992), "On the evolution of optimizing behavior", *Journal of Economic Theory* 57, 392-406.
- [6] Friedman D. (1991), "Evolutionary games in economics", *Econometrica* 59, 637-666.
- [7] Gaunersdorfer A. (1992), "Time averages for heteroclinic attractors", *SIAM Journal of Applied Mathematics* 52, 1476-1489.
- [8] Gaunersdorfer A. and J. Hofbauer (1994), "Fictitious play, Shapley polygons, and the replicator equation", forthcoming, *Games and Economic Behavior*.
- [9] Hofbauer J. (1981), "A general cooperation theorem for hypercycles", *Monatshefte für Mathematik* (Vienna) 91, 233-240.

- [10] Hofbauer J. (1994), "Stability for the best response dynamics", preprint, Vienna University.
- [11] Hofbauer J. (1995), "Imitation dynamics for games", Preprint, Collegium Budapest.
- [12] Hofbauer J. and K. Sigmund (1988), *The Theory of Evolution and Dynamical Systems*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- [13] Maynard Smith J. (1982), *Evolution and the Theory of Games*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- [14] Nachbar J. (1990), "Evolutionary selection dynamics in games: convergence and limit results", *International Journal of Game Theory* 19, 59-89.
- [15] Samuelson L. and J. Zhang (1992), "Evolutionary stability in asymmetric games", *Journal of Economic Theory* 57, 363-391.
- [16] Taylor P. (1979), "Evolutionary stable strategies with two types of player", *Journal of Applied Probability* 16, 76-83.
- [17] Weibull J. (1992), "An introduction to evolutionary game theory", The Industrial Institute for Economic and Social Research (IUI) WP No. 347.
- [18] Weibull J. (1994), "The 'as if' approach to game theory: Three positive results and four obstacles", *European Economic Review* 38, 868-881.
- [19] Weibull J. (1995), *Evolutionary Game Theory*, forthcoming, MIT Press. Cambridge (USA).