

Rationalizability, Iterated Dominance, and the Theorems of Radon and Carathéodory

Roy Long *

February 2022

Stanford Economic Review 2024

Abstract

The game theoretic concepts of rationalizability and iterated dominance are closely related and provide characterizations of each other. Indeed, the equivalence between them implies that in a two player finite game, the remaining set of actions available to players after iterated elimination of strictly dominated strategies coincides with the rationalizable actions. I prove a dimensionality result following from these ideas. I show that for two player games, the number of actions available to the opposing player provides a (tight) upper bound on how a player's pure strategies may be strictly dominated by mixed strategies. I provide two different frameworks and interpretations of dominance to prove this result, and in doing so relate it to Radon's Theorem and Carathéodory's Theorem from convex geometry. These approaches may be seen as following from point—line duality. A new proof of the classical equivalence between these solution concepts is also given.

*University of Chicago Economics

Originally written February 2022. This version January 2024

1 Introduction

Strategic dominance is a standard concept in game theory. It encapsulates the intuition that in a strategic environment, one should never take some action a if in all possible scenarios (formally, all profiles of the other players' actions), another action a' does strictly better.

In this section, we review the concepts of dominance and rationalizability, and summarize the content of the paper.

We consider finite, two player strategic games. For $i = 1, 2$, player i 's (pure) strategies is the set of actions A_i .

Definition: A pure strategy for player i , $a_i \in A_i$ is strictly dominated by another pure strategy a'_i if $u_i(a_i, a_{-i}) < u_i(a'_i, a_{-i})$ for any a_{-i} .

Dominance can be generalized to mixed strategies, where players randomize over actions. In this case, the expected payoff is compared.

Definition: A (pure) strategy $a_i \in A_i$ is strictly dominated by a mixed strategy s_i over the set $\{a_j\}$ if $u_i(a_i, a_{-i}) < U_i(s, a_{-i}) = \sum_j p_j u_i(a_j, a_{-i})$ for all a_{-i} where (p_j) is a probability distribution over $\{a_j\}$ specified by s .

If the game is finite, the iterated elimination of strictly dominated strategies may be performed. The simple algorithm is to repeatedly remove strategies (for either player) which are strictly dominated by some mixed strategy from the game, until no such strategies are left. It is easy to show that the set of remaining strategies are those that were not strictly dominated in the original game, and any strictly dominated strategy is removed by this process.

More recently, the solution concept of *rationalizability* was developed. For two player games the definition is as follows:

Definition: An action $a_i \in A_i$ is *not rationalizable* if for any belief $q = (q_1, \dots, q_m)$ player i has about player $(-i)$'s strategy s_{-i} , there exists some other action $a'_i \in A$ (which may depend on q) such that $U_i(a_i, s_{-i}) < U_i(a'_i, s_{-i})$

One can also give a recursive definition of k -level rationalizability ($k \in \mathbb{N}$), and repeatedly remove strategies that are not rationalizable until all remaining actions are rationalizable.

It is easy to show that any strictly dominated strategy is not rationalizable, as one intuitively expects. It turns out that the converse is true as well, which was first shown in 1984 independently by both Bernheim [1] and Pearce [2].

Theorem 1.1. (Pearce, Bernheim). *Given a finite, two player strategic game G , the set of (pure) strategies that remain after iterated elimination of strictly dominated strategies are precisely the strategies that are rationalizable in G .*

Proof. See Appendix. □

Bernheim's proof represents strategies as payoff vectors in \mathbb{R}^d and uses the separating hyperplane theorem. Pearce's proof uses the minimax theorem for zero sum games. See Fudenberg [3] or Yildiz [4] for a presentation of the former and Obara [5] for the latter.

The central result of this paper is **Theorem 2.1**. We prove a tight bound on the minimum number of strategies needed to form a mixed strategy that strictly dominates another strategy. There is a rich connection to convex geometry in our analysis, and there are several representations of dominance and rationalizability that lead to classical results in this area of mathematics.

The methods in section 2 also yield a new proof of **Theorem 1.1**, mirroring the separating hyperplane proof of the equivalence. We defer our proof to the appendix.

In section 2, we provide a proof of **Theorem 2.1** using Radon’s Theorem motivated by a natural view of the equivalence between rationalizability and dominance. We also show that the bound still holds when a player can have infinitely many actions.

In section 3, we represent dominance using vectors in \mathbb{R}^d . We give another proof of **Theorem 2.1**, and discuss the mathematical connections between the two proofs.

We may also see the two approaches as resulting from a kind of point—line duality. In section 3, we view strategies as payoff vectors (or points), while in section 2, strategies are represented by hyperplanes.

2 Connections to Convex Geometry

We study the following question: Given a two player finite strategic game G with action sets A, B , suppose some player’s (without loss of generality player 1) pure strategy $a_i \in A$ is strictly dominated by a mixed strategy on a set of actions $\{a_j\} = A' \subseteq A$. Can we bound the size of the support of this mixed strategy, $|A'|$?

An obvious bound is $|A'| \leq |A|$, and furthermore $|A'| \leq |A| - 1$, as if $a_i \in A'$ then a_i is still dominated by some mix on $A' \setminus \{a_i\}$.

Interestingly, it turns out that we actually can bound $|A'|$ by the number of actions available to player 2, i.e. $|B|$. This is not at all obvious.

More precisely, we have the following result:

Theorem 2.1. *Let G be a finite two player game, where player 1’s set of actions is A and player 2’s set of actions is B . If $a_i \in A$ is strictly dominated by a mix of strategies over $\{a_j\} \subseteq A$, then in fact a_i is strictly dominated by a mixed strategy $\{a'_j\}$ consisting of at most $\min(|A|, |B|)$ actions. An analogous bound holds for player 2.*

Remark 2.2. The bound for player 1 can be improved to $\min(|A| - 1, |B|)$ based on the simple observation above. In fact, we will show that this bound is tight.

Now the result for player 1 is trivial if $|A| \leq |B|$, but it is not immediately clear why such a result should be true otherwise. Why does the number of actions the opponent has affect (and moreover provides a bound on) how a player’s pure strategies are dominated by mixes of their own strategies?

For example, if player 2 has $|B| = 4$ available actions and player 1 has $|A| = 10$ available actions, then this tells us that if some action $a_i \in A$ of player 1 is strictly dominated, it's in fact dominated by some set of just 4 of player 1's available actions.

When $|B| = m = 1$, it is trivial, as player 2 only has one action that she must play. When $m = 2$, this tells us that if a pure strategy is strictly dominated, either it is dominated by another pure strategy or by a mix of two strategies.

Henceforth, we assume von Neumann Morgenstern preferences, i.e. preferences over strategies are compared based on their expected payoffs.

To motivate this theorem, we start by first examining the case for $m = 2$. Consider the simple 3×2 game, with the payoffs as listed, where rows are player 1's actions and columns are player 2's actions.

1 \ 2	L	R
U	(6,1)	(0,3)
M	(2,1)	(5,0)
D	(3,2)	(3,1)

Figure 1: payoff matrix

Then if player 1 has belief $(q, 1 - q)$ over $\{L, R\}$ about player 2's strategy, then player 1's expected payoffs by playing U, M, D are, respectively:

$$E_U = 6q$$

$$E_M = 2q + 5(1 - q) = 5 - 3q$$

$$E_D = 3$$

By plotting these as graphs on the domain $q \in [0, 1]$, we can see that for every $q \in [0, 1]$, the $E_D(q)$ is less than at least one of $E_U(q)$ and $E_M(q)$. rationalizability then tells us that D is strictly dominated by some mixed strategy of U and M .

Let $E_U = f_1, E_M = f_2, E_D = f_3$ for ease of notation. Since these functions are all linear and therefore convex, their maximum is also convex. So by taking the upper convex hull of the lines, ie. $f_{MAX} = \max_{1 \leq i \leq 3} \{f_i\}$, the graph of f_3 lies entirely below the upper convex hull f_{MAX} and is strictly dominated by it.

Now let's look at a different game, where player 2 again has two actions $B = \{b_1, b_2\}$, and suppose player 1 has five actions $\{a_1, \dots, a_5\}$ corresponding to the following expected payoffs for player 1, if she has belief $(q, 1 - q)$ over $\{b_1, b_2\}$:

$$\begin{aligned}
E_1(q) &= 1.2q + 0.4 \\
E_2(q) &= -1.3q + 1.3 \\
E_3(q) &= 0.5q + 0.8 \\
E_4(q) &= -0.8q + 1 \\
E_5(q) &= 0.8.
\end{aligned}$$

The graph below shows the expected payoffs of these strategies as a function of the belief $q \in [0, 1]$, where the black curve is E_2 , the green curve is E_4 , the horizontal purple curve is E_5 , the positive sloping purple curve is E_1 , and the blue curve is E_3 .




Figure 2: expected payoffs given beliefs

We can see that a_4 and a_5 are strictly dominated by a_1, a_2, a_3 as $E_4(q), E_5(q) < \max\{E_1(q), E_2(q), E_3(q)\}$ for all $0 \leq q \leq 1$. For example, a_4 is strictly dominated by a mix over a_1, a_2, a_3 with mixed strategy $q = (0.2, 0.3, 0.5)$, which results in an expected payoff of $0.2(1.2q+0.4)+0.3(-1.3q+1.3)+0.5(0.5q+0.8) = 0.1x+0.87 > 0.8 = E_5(q)$ for all $q \in [0,1]$, and a_5 is strictly dominated by a mix over a_1, a_2, a_3 with mixed strategy $q = (0.2, 0.7, 0.1)$ which results in an expected payoff of $0.2(1.2q + 0.4) + 0.7(-1.3q + 1.3) + 0.1(0.5q + 0.8) = 1.07 - 0.62q > -0.8q + 1$ for all $q \in [0, 1]$.

Notice that in both cases, we only need to choose two out of the three to guarantee a mixed strategy that strictly dominates them. For example, if we consider a mix over with a_1, a_2 with probability distribution $(0.3, 0.7)$, then the expected payoff is $0.3(1.2q + 0.4) + 0.7(-1.3q + 1.3) = 1.03 - 0.55q > -0.8q + 1 = E_4(q)$ for all $q \in [0, 1]$. Similarly, a_5 can be dominated by mixes over just $\{a_1, a_2\}$, as well as a mix of $\{a_2, a_3\}$. Graphically, we see that for a strictly dominated action, we can choose just two of the graphs of other

functions such that the maximum of them lies strictly above the dominated strategies' graph.

Unfortunately, there are some edge cases where strict dominance never happens and the graph of every f_i is part of the upper convex hull $\max f_i$ at some point.

Thus, the equivalence of rationalizability and elimination of dominated strategies gives us the following result:

Proposition 2.3. (*Theorem 2.1 for $d = 2$*) *Let $f_1, f_2, \dots, f_k : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be linear, i.e. $f_i(x) = a_i x + b_i$ for all i , and $g \in [0, 1]$. Suppose $g : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is also linear and satisfies: for all $x \in [0, 1]$, the $\max_i(f_i(x)) > g(x)$. Then there exists weights $0 \leq r_1, \dots, r_k \leq 1$ such that $r_1 + \dots + r_k = 1$ and $\sum r_i f_i(x) > g(x)$ for all $x \in [0, 1]$. In fact, it is possible to choose the r_i such that all but at most two of them are 0.*

In other words, if the graph of an action's expected payoff lies strictly below the upper convex hull (i.e. it's strictly dominated), it is in fact strictly dominated by a mix over a set of at most two actions.

Proof. The first part of the statement follows from the equivalence of rationalizability and iterated dominance, so we show the second part. First, note that we may assume that $g(x) = 0$ for $x \in [0, 1]$, as we consider $f'_i(x) = f_i(x) - g(x)$ for all i , which are still linear functions and the condition becomes $\max_i f'_i > 0$ with $g' = 0$.

First, remove all functions f_i where $f_i(x) \leq g(x)$ for all $x \in [0, 1]$, as they will never be part of the upper convex hull. Now, for the graphs of the remaining functions, either they intersect the graph of g or they don't. If they don't, then they lie entirely above g , i.e. $f_k(x) > g(x)$ for all $x \in [0, 1]$, and we can just let $r_k = 1$ and all other $r_i = 0$.

Otherwise, they have a unique intersection point. For simplicity, as we noted above, we may assume g is zero. Then, we can look at where each f_k intersects $[0, 1]$ on the x -axis. Let L be the leftmost x -intercept in $[0, 1]$ such that the corresponding f has positive slope, and R be the rightmost x -intercept in $[0, 1]$ such that the corresponding f has negative slope. Then, it's easy to see that $L < R$ because otherwise $\max f$ is not greater than zero at points between L and R , so it reduces to only having two functions f_1, f_2 , where $f_1 = a_1(x + b_1)$ and $f_2 = a_2(x + b_2)$ where $a_1 > 0, a_2 < 0$ and $0 \leq b_1 < b_2 \leq 1$.

Then, we have $r_1 f_1 + r_2 f_2 = r_1 a_1(x + b_1) + r_2 a_2(x + b_2)$, and by setting $r_1 a_1 = -r_2 a_2$, we just get a constant function which is greater than zero ($r_1 f_1 + r_2 f_2$ goes through the intersection point of f_1, f_2 which lies above the x -axis.) \square

Notice that in the last step of the previous proof, we didn't need to explicitly construct the function $r_1 f_1 + r_2 f_2$. In fact, the equivalence of rationalizability and iterated strict dominance tells us if the graph of $g(x)$ is strictly below the upper convex hull formed by some set of f_i , then g is strictly dominated by those f_i , so in particular, we're guaranteed that

such r_i exists for the corresponding f_i that make the weighted sum greater than g . The main result of the previous proof was that we only needed to choose two of the f_i and it would be sufficient that the $\max f_i$ over those two functions would be greater than zero at all points.

Now, we generalize the preceding intuition to higher dimensions, i.e. when player 2 has more than two actions. In essence, what we did in the previous proof was this: after subtracting g from all the f_i , we were left with graphs of linear functions whose overall maximum is strictly greater than 0, i.e. their upper convex hull lies strictly above the x -axis. Then, we looked at all linear functions that intersected $[0, 1]$. We can assume this because if the linear function had an x -intercept outside of $[0, 1]$, then its restriction to $[0, 1]$ will clearly be positive. Thus, we only needed to consider the cases of positive and negative slope that intersected $[0, 1]$. Then, if a positive sloped line intersected $[0, 1]$ at x_0 , the $\max_i f_i(x) > 0$ for all $x > x_0$, and if a negative sloped line intersected $[0, 1]$ at x_0 , we know $\max_i f_i(x) > 0$ for all $x < x_0$.

Thus, the problem is reduced to: given a set of 1-dimensional rays or half lines that cover $[0, 1]$, we want to show that there exists a subset of at most two of them that also covers $[0, 1]$.




Figure 3: Covering of $[0, 1]$ by half-lines

In general, a belief player 1 can have about player 2 where player 2 can choose from m possible actions b_1, \dots, b_m is an m -tuple $(q_1, \dots, q_m) \in [0, 1]^m$ where $\sum_{i=1}^m q_i = 1$. Letting $q_m = 1 - q_1 - \dots - q_{m-1}$, the set of possible beliefs is represented by the $m - 1$ -dimensional simplex S^{m-1} (including its interior) of points $x = (x_1, \dots, x_{m-1}) \in [0, 1]^{m-1}$ where $\sum_{i=1}^{m-1} x_i \leq 1$. For example, when $m = 2$, this is just the line segment $[0, 1]$. When $m = 3$, this is the closed triangle region bounded by the x -axis, the y -axis, and the line $x + y = 1$. When $m = 4$, it is a tetrahedron with vertices at $(0, 0, 0)$, $(1, 0, 0)$, $(0, 1, 0)$, $(0, 0, 1)$, and so forth.

Let us examine this for the $d = 3$ case. We can plot the mixed strategies (beliefs) of player 2 in q_1 - q_2 space, which is S^2 , the right isosceles triangle in \mathbb{R}^2 bounded by $q_1, q_2 \geq 0, q_1 + q_2 \leq 1$. Then, the expected payoff for player 1 by choosing action a_i , with belief $q = (q_1, q_2, q_3 = 1 - q_1 - q_2)$, is a function $f_i : S^1 \subset [0, 1]^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defined by $f(q_1, q_2) = a_{i,1}q_1 + a_{i,2}q_2 + a_{i,3}(1 - q_1 - q_2)$. Thus, the graph of f_i is the restriction of a plane to S^1 .

Finally, we have the graph of g , which is also a plane. Again, we can consider $f' = f - g$,

and the resulting functions are still planes, so we have $\max\{f'(x)\} > 0$ for all $x \in S^1$. Now, each of the planes f'_i will intersect the plane $\mathbb{R}^2 \times \{0\}$ at some line l in the q_1 - q_2 plane. First, if any f'_i is parallel to \mathbb{R}^2 , then clearly it is constant and strictly greater than zero, and so that single function $f_i > g$ for all $x \in S^2$. This means that the pure strategy a_i strictly dominates g so we may ignore this case. The cross sections will be lines that intersect the closed simplex S^2 (i.e. the closed triangle with vertices $(0, 0)$, $(0, 1)$, $(1, 0)$) and we will have open half planes h_1, h_2, \dots, h_k that cover S^2 .

So in the general case, each action a_i has an expected utility $f_i : S^{m-1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ whose graph is a $m - 1$ dimensional hyperplane in \mathbb{R}^n , restricted to the domain S^{m-1} . After taking a transformation $f'_i = f_i - g$, the condition turns into $\max\{f'_i\} > 0$. Then, each hyperplane f'_i intersects $\mathbb{R}^{m-1} \times 0$, which cuts \mathbb{R}^{m-1} into two half spaces, where one of the (open) half spaces represents the set of points where $f'_i > 0$, and the other (closed) half space represents the set of points where $f'_i \leq 0$. Of course, we only care about the intersection of the half spaces with the domain $S^{m-1} \subset \mathbb{R}^{m-1}$.




Figure 4: A partial covering of S^2 with half planes

We are thus left with the following problem:

Proposition 2.4. (Theorem 2.1, geometric form) *Let $Q \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be a d -dimensional convex polytope (including its boundary and interior). Suppose a set of open half spaces h_1, h_2, \dots, h_n covers Q . Then, there exists a subset of at most $d + 1$ of these h_i that also cover Q .*

The key observation is that we want to remove redundant half spaces. If a half space covers a region that is also covered by another set of half planes, then we can remove the first half plane and the covered region will be the same. A half space being covered by another

half space corresponds to dominance by a pure strategy. Being covered by a set of half spaces corresponds to being dominated by a mixed strategy. We define a **minimal configuration** to be one where no half plane can be removed and the remaining half planes still cover the polytope, i.e. each half plane contains a point that is uniquely covered by it.

First, we gain some intuition for this result by showing it for $d = 3$, i.e. a covering of S^2 with half planes.

Proposition 2.5. (Theorem 2.1 for $d = 3$) *Let $Q \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ be a closed convex polygon including its interior. Suppose n open half planes covers Q . Then, there exists a subset of at most 3 half planes that cover Q .*

Proof. Suppose for contradiction that there exists a covering of the polygon Q with half planes $\{h_i\}$ such that any subset of $\{h_i\}$ that also covers Q contains at least four planes. Consider any minimal configuration $\{h'_j\} \subset \{h_i\}$ that covers Q . By assumption, $|\{h'_j\}| \geq 4$.

Since $\{h'_j\}$ is minimal, we cannot remove any $h \in \{h'_j\}$ to get a smaller subset of half planes that also covers Q . Thus, for every h'_j , there exists some point $p_j \in Q$ that is only covered by h'_j .

Thus, we have four points $p_1, p_2, p_3, p_4 \in Q$ such that p_j is uniquely covered by h'_j for all $1 \leq j \leq 4$.

There are a few possible configurations. We check the cases based on the convex hull H of p_1, p_2, p_3, p_4 .

Suppose H is a line segment, i.e. $p_1 p_2 p_3 p_4$ are collinear, in that order. Then, we've just reduced it to the $d = 2$ one dimensional case, as each plane bisects the line at some intersection point and covers everything to one side. So we see that there must be some plane that covers at least two points as there are more than two planes.

Now suppose H is a triangle, say $H = \triangle p_2 p_3 p_4$. Then p_1 lies in $\triangle p_2 p_3 p_4$. If p_1 lies strictly in the interior of $\triangle p_2 p_3 p_4$, then clearly any half planes that cover p_1 also intersect $\triangle p_2 p_3 p_4$, and we see that one of those vertices are necessarily covered as well. (If the plane doesn't cover any of the three vertices, then the entire triangle lies on the other side of the plane and is also not covered so p_1 is not covered, which can't happen.)

If p_2 lies on the boundary (one of the sides) of $\triangle p_2 p_3 p_4$, then we need to be a bit careful but the same result holds as in the previous subcase.

Finally, suppose H contains all four points p_1, p_2, p_3, p_4 , so the points form a non-degenerate convex quadrilateral, without loss of generality $p_1 p_2 p_3 p_4$ in clockwise order. Then, note that

p_1p_3 intersects p_2p_4 at some point x inside H , and again we see that any point that covers x also covers at least two of the vertices of H , so this case is covered.

The result follows, i.e. any covering of S^2 with n half planes contains a subcover using at most three half planes. \square

For the general case in \mathbb{R}^d , we utilize **Radon's Theorem**, which states:

Theorem 2.6. (Radon) *Let P be a set of $n \geq d + 2$ distinct points in \mathbb{R}^d . Then, P can be partitioned into two nonempty subsets V_1 and V_2 such that the convex hulls of V_1 and V_2 intersect.*

Proof. See appendix. \square

For the general case in \mathbb{R}^d , let $Q \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be a convex polytope (i.e. including the boundary and interior). Suppose there are $n \geq d + 2$ half spaces $h_1 \dots h_n$ which cover Q , such that each half space contains a point $p_i \in Q$ that is only covered by h_i .

By Radon's Theorem (as $n \geq d + 2$), we can partition $P = \{p_1, \dots, p_n\}$ into two sets P_1 and P_2 such that their convex hulls $H(P_1), H(P_2)$ intersect. Consider a point $x \in H_1(P_1) \cap H_1(P_2)$ in this intersection, which lies in the original polytope Q by convexity: as $P_1, P_2 \subset P \subset Q$, we have $H(P_1), H(P_2) \subset H(P) \subset H(Q) = Q$.

However, x cannot be covered by any h_i with corresponding p_i in P_1 , as x is in H_2 , and so any such h_i would have to intersect H_2 and contain some other point in P_2 . Analogously x cannot be covered by any h_i with p_i in P_2 . So $x \in Q$ is not covered by $\bigcup h_i$, which is a contradiction. This uses the fact that for an open half space, if a set of points all lie on the other side, then their convex hull also lies entirely on the other side.

So letting $Q = S^{n-1}$, the $n - 1$ -dimensional simplex, we have proven **Theorem 2.1**. \blacksquare

An immediate result of **Theorem 2.1** is that it gives us a characterization of which actions can be removed by iterated strict dominance, i.e. which ones are rationalizable. Indeed, as we've shown, if f_i lies under the upper convex hull of f_1, \dots, f_m , then f_i is strictly dominated. In practice, we should be able to solve this with linear programming. If f_i is part of the upper convex hull at any point $q \in S^{m-1}$, then $f_i(q) \geq f_k(q)$ for all $1 \leq k \leq m$, so no mixed strategy beats f_i with belief q . Finally, we point out the case of weak dominance. When $m = 2$, it's easy to see that either the graph of the function lies strictly below the upper convex hull, coincides with the upper convex hull on some set that contains an interval, or intersects the upper convex hull exactly at a single point. The last case is when the action is weakly dominated. For $m = 3$, we see that weak dominance can result in a weak set (where the graph of the function coincides with the upper convex hull) of a point or a

line, and so forth.

We also note that **Theorem 2.1** still holds even if one player has infinitely many actions.

Corollary 2.7. *Let G be a two player game where player 2 has a finite number of actions $B = \{b_1, \dots, b_m\}$, and player 1 has infinitely many actions $A = \{a_i\}_{i \in I}$ for some index set I . Then, if some action a_i is strictly dominated by a mixed strategy over a set of actions $\{a_j\} = A' \subset A$, in fact a_i is strictly dominated by a mixed strategy over a finite set of at most m actions.*

Proof. We simply note that we are covering $Q = S^{n-1}$ with open half spaces h_{a_j} , and since Q is compact (closed and bounded), $\bigcup_{a_j \in A'} h_{a_j}$ forms an open cover of Q , so there exists a finite subcollection $a'_1, a'_2, \dots, a'_k \in A'$ such that $\bigcup_{a'_j \in A'} h_{a'_j}$ also covers Q . Then by the previous result, we again know that there exists a subset of at most m of these $h_{a'_j}$ that covers Q , and we are done. \square

3 A Linear Algebra Perspective

Now, let us turn to a completely different representation of dominance. This approach yields a more natural, geometric, interpretation of **Theorem 2.1**, which can be seen fundamentally as a dimensionality result.

Again suppose player 2 has m actions b_1, \dots, b_m . We view the payoffs for player 1 as a matrix $A = (a_{ij})$ (linear transformation), and each action a_i as a row vector $v_i = (a_{i,1}, \dots, a_{i,m})$.

Assuming von-Neumann Morgenstern Preferences, by taking a positive affine transformation, we may first transform the matrix to $A' = A + cJ$, where J is the $n \times m$ matrix with all 1's and c is a positive constant, so that all coordinates are strictly positive.

We view each payoff action as a vector in \mathbb{R}^m . Then, if we play a mixed strategy over some actions $\{a_j\}$ with probabilities $\{p_j\}$, then in vector form this represents $\sum p_j v_j$, where $\sum p_j = 1$.

In other words, if we take the convex hull of all the v_j , along with the origin, the possible mixed strategies over these vectors is represented by the outer boundary B of the convex hull H .

Similarly, we see that the convex polytope formed by taking the convex hull of the vec-

tors is exactly the region

$$\left\{ \sum_{i=1}^m \lambda_i v_i \mid 0 \leq \lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_m \leq 1 \text{ and } \sum_{i=1}^m \lambda_i \leq 1 \right\},$$

i.e. the region contained by the affine hull of the vectors v_1, \dots, v_m .

The natural connection here is that the characterization of probability distributions over m elements using the simplex and the linear algebra formulation of convex hull of points using linear combinations are very similar, which leads to a re-interpretation of the probabilities/weights as coefficients of vectors.

With this formulation in mind, we now prove several preliminary results about strict dominance.

Proposition 3.1. *A pure strategy a_i is strictly dominated by another pure strategy a_j if and only if the k th component of v_i is strictly less than the k th component of v_j for all $1 \leq k \leq m$.*

Proof. First, suppose that for some strategies a_i, a_j , that $a_{i,k} < a_{j,k}$ for all components $1 \leq k \leq m$. Clearly for any belief $q = (q_1, \dots, q_m) \in [0, 1]^m$, $\sum q_k = 1$ we have $\sum_{k=1}^m q_k (a_{i,k} - a_{j,k}) < 0$ because each term is less than or equal to zero and not all of them are zero, so $\sum_{k=1}^m q_k a_{i,k} < \sum_{k=1}^m q_k a_{j,k}$, i.e. $E(a_i) < E(a_j)$, and a_i is strictly dominated by a_j .

Now, suppose $v_i = (a_{i,1}, \dots, a_{i,m})$ is strictly dominated by $v_j = (a_{j,1}, \dots, a_{j,m})$. Then, for all possible beliefs $q = (q_1, \dots, q_m)$, we must have $\sum_{k=1}^m q_k a_{i,k} < \sum_{k=1}^m q_k a_{j,k}$, so $\sum_{k=1}^m q_k (a_{i,k} - a_{j,k}) < 0$. By letting $q = (1, 0, \dots, 0), (0, 1, 0, \dots, 0), \dots, (0, \dots, 0, 1)$, we see that $a_{i,k} < a_{j,k}$ for all $1 \leq k \leq m$. \square

It turns out that more generally, if we consider strict dominance by a mixed strategy, we can treat the mixed strategy as a pure strategy vector and compare them as if we were comparing two pure strategies' vectors. This leads us to the following proposition.

Proposition 3.2. *Consider a mixed strategy over actions $\{a_j\}$ with probability distribution $\{\lambda_j\}$, which we represent as $u = \sum \lambda_j v_j$. Then, a pure strategy a_i is strictly dominated by the mixed strategy over $\{a_j\}$ if and only if the k th component of v_i is strictly less than the k th component of u , i.e. v_i is strictly dominated by the pure strategy vector representation of $\{a_j\}$ with lottery $\{\lambda_j\}$.*

Proof. Let $q \in [0, 1]^m$ be any belief player 1 can have about player 2's possible strategy. Then, the expected payoff with the pure strategy a_i is simply the dot product $E(a_i) = \langle v_i, q \rangle$, and the expected payoff by playing the mixed strategy is

$$E(\{a_j\}) = \sum \lambda_j \langle v_j, q \rangle = \sum \langle \lambda_j v_j, q \rangle = \left\langle \sum \lambda_j v_j, q \right\rangle = \langle u, q \rangle,$$

as with probability λ_j , player 1 plays action a_j , in which case the expected payoff is $\langle v_j, q \rangle$. Thus, we see that $E(a_i) < E(\{a_j\})$ if and only if $\langle v_i, q \rangle < \langle u, q \rangle$ for all possible beliefs q , which from the previous claim is equivalent to the components of v_i being strictly less than the components of u . \square

Now, we can start classifying which types of pure strategies are dominated by a mix over other strategies. Let's look at a set of pure strategies $\{a_j\}$ with corresponding vectors $\{v_j\}$. For example, consider the four vectors in \mathbb{R}^2 as below. Then, a good geometric intuition for whether a vector v is strictly dominated by some mix over $\{v_j\}$ is if the vector is contained in the convex hull formed.

For example, consider the following payoffs for player 1 in a game where player 2 has two actions and player 1 has three actions. $A = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 5 \\ 5 & 1 \\ 2 & 2 \end{pmatrix}$

We see that $a_3 = (2, 2)$ is strictly dominated by a mix of over a_1, a_2 with equal probability for both actions, i.e. the mixed vector is $v' = \frac{1}{2}(1, 5) + \frac{1}{2}(5, 1) = (3, 3)$ which strictly dominates $(2, 2)$.

If we graph them, we see that $(2, 2)$ lies between (inside) the vectors $(1, 5)$ and $(5, 1)$, i.e. the point $(2, 2)$ lies inside the convex hull or triangle with vertices $(0, 0), (1, 5), (5, 1)$. So a good intuitive guess is that points that lie within the convex hull formed by the vectors $(1, 5), (5, 1)$ will be dominated by some mix of the two.




Figure 5: vector representation of dominance

And indeed, this easily follows from the previous claims.

Proposition 3.3. *If a strategy vector v_i lies inside the convex hull (affine hull) of the vectors $H(\cup v_j)$ (but not on the outer faces/boundary), then the corresponding strategy a_i is strictly dominated by a mix over $\{a_j\}$.*

Proof. By the linear combination definition of convex hull, this means that we can write $v_i = \sum \lambda_j v_j$, where $0 \leq \lambda_j \leq 1$. Remove all vectors that have trivial contribution so we may assume that all $\lambda_j > 0$. Note that $\sum \lambda_j = s < 1$ as the the vector v_i does not lie on the outer boundary of the convex hull, so we may extend v_i to a vector $u = \lambda v_i$ with $\lambda > 1$ that intersects the outer boundary of the convex hull.

In particular, let $u = \sum \lambda'_j v_j = \sum \frac{\lambda_j}{s} v_j$ which represents a mixed strategy of $\{a_j\}$ with probability distribution $\{\lambda_j/s\}$ as $\sum \frac{\lambda_j}{s} = 1$. Note that $\lambda_j < \frac{\lambda_j}{s}$ for all terms in the sum. Then have

$$E(\{a_j\}) = \langle u, q \rangle = \left\langle \sum \frac{\lambda_j}{s} v_j, q \right\rangle > \langle \sum \lambda_j v_j, q \rangle = \langle v, q \rangle = E(a_i),$$

and a_i is dominated by this mix over $\{a_j\}$ as claimed. \square

Proposition 3.4. (*Characterization of strategies that are strictly dominated by a mix over a given set*)

Let $\{v_j\}$ be a set of pure strategy vectors corresponding to the actions $\{a_j\}$. Consider the boundary B , or the affine hull of the $\{v_j\}$ defined by

$$B = \left\{ \sum \lambda_j v_j : 0 \leq \lambda_j \leq 1, \sum \lambda_j = 1 \right\},$$

which represents the set of all possible mixed strategies over $\{a_j\}$. Then the set

$$X_B = \bigcup_{b \in B} \{v : v_{(k)} < b_{(k)} \forall 1 \leq k \leq m\}$$

defines the set of pure strategies that are strictly dominated by some mix of $\{a_j\}$. i.e. v is strictly dominated by a mix over $\{v_j\}$ if and only if $v \in X_B$.




Figure 6: covering of green convex hull by blue triangles

Before using this characterization to provide another proof of **Theorem 2.1**, let us return to the case of points that lie strictly within the convex hull of some set of actions'

vectors. We will use this to find an elegant and natural interpretation of **Theorem 2.1**. For now, we work with the closed convex hull (i.e. including the boundary B). The result is the same for open hull in the case of points that lie strictly within H .

Let's look at four points v_1, v_2, v_3, v_4 . as shown below.

Then, the region of vectors that are strictly dominated by a mix of $\{v_1, v_2, v_3, v_4\}$ is the region on the following page.

We can also look at the pairs of vectors, which bound triangular regions (above right).

These triangular regions represent the regions that are strictly dominated by two vectors. More specifically, the convex hulls are a subset of what points are strictly dominated by that set of vectors.

Now, the motivation for **Theorem 2.1** becomes clear: the polygon region formed by the convex hull of the vectors $\{v_1, v_2, v_3, v_4\}$ is equal to the union of the convex hulls of pairs of the vectors.




Figure 7: convex hull is covered by the union of triangles over all pairs of vectors

Formally, if $H(S)$ denotes the convex hull of a set of points S , then our preceding observation is:

$$\begin{aligned} H(O, v_1, v_2, v_3, v_4) &= H(O, v_1, v_2) \cup H(O, v_1, v_3) \cup H(O, v_1, v_4) \cup \dots \cup H(O, v_3, v_4) \\ &= \bigcup_{1 \leq i, j \leq 4} H(O, v_i, v_j) \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, if we have have n points in \mathbb{R}^3 , i.e. v_1, \dots, v_n in \mathbb{R}^3 , it's easy to see that taking the union over all triples of points, i.e. $H(O, v_1, \dots, v_n) = \bigcup_{i,j,k} H(O, v_i, v_j, v_k)$ yields the

entire convex hull. This is very intuitively clear. We are essentially considering all tetrahedrons with a fixed vertex O , and by shifting the vertices around, we use these tetrahedra to cover the entire interior of the polyhedra.

More generally, a non-degenerate set of $d + 1$ points in \mathbb{R}^d should determine a d -dimensional figure, and by varying across different points in the set, we should be able to cover all d -dimensional points in the convex hull, which is the following statement: Given n nonzero points v_1, \dots, v_n in \mathbb{R}^d , representing vectors extending from O , then we have:

$$H(O, v_1, \dots, v_n) = \bigcup_{S_d \in \binom{[n]}{d}} H(O, v_{k_1}, \dots, v_{k_d}), \text{ where } S_d \text{ varies over all subsets of } [n] = \{1, \dots, n\} \text{ with } d \text{ elements.}$$

It is now easy to show that the generalization of our intuitive observation follows from **Carathéodory's Theorem**.

Theorem 3.5. (Carathéodory) *If a point $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ lies in the convex hull of a set P , then x can be written as the convex combination of at most $d + 1$ points in P . i.e. there is a subset $P' \subset P$ consisting of $d + 1$ or fewer points such that $x \in H(P')$.*

Proof. See appendix. □

For our proof, we need a variant known as **Conical Carathéodory's Theorem**

Theorem 3.6. (Carathéodory's Theorem for Conical Hull) *Let $n \geq d + 1$ and v_1, \dots, v_n be n distinct nonzero vectors in \mathbb{R}^d . Consider the conical hull formed by this set. Then, if a nonzero point x is in the conical hull, x can be written as the conical combination of at most d of the v_i .*

Proof. See appendix. □

Corollary 3.7. *Furthermore, if x also lies in the convex hull $H(O, v_1, \dots, v_n)$, i.e. x is a convex combination of the v_i (and $O = 0$, so sum of coefficients of the v_i is less than or equal to one), then x can be written as the convex combination of at most d of the v_i , and O .*

Proof. See appendix. □

Finally, we can finish the second proof of **Theorem 2.1**. Let v_1, \dots, v_n be the vector payoffs for player 1. Let $H = H(O, v_1, \dots, v_n)$ be the convex hull of the set of vectors, and let B be the outer boundary of H .

From the characterization of these points, we know that a vector $v \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is strictly dominated by a mix over a subset of $\{v_j\} = v_1, \dots, v_n$ if and only if there exists some $b \in B$ such that

$v_{(k)} < b_{(k)}$ for all components $1 \leq k \leq m$. But $B \subset H$, and we know from the corollary following Carathéodory's Theorem that all points in H can be represented as the affine sum of at most d distinct vectors. Thus, if v_i is strictly dominated by some such b , we can write b as the affine linear combination of at most d of the $\{v_j\}$, which means that v_i is strictly dominated by a mix over those v_j , and in particular, is dominated by at most d of the other vectors as claimed. ■

We conclude by showing that the bound in **Theorem 2.1** is tight in the following sense:

Proposition 3.8. *For every pair $(n, m) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 2}^2$ there exists a game $G_{n,m}$ with $|A| = n$ and $|B| = m$, and a strategy $a_i \in A$ that is strictly dominated by a mixed strategy over a set $\{a_j\} = A'$ of size $|A'| = \min(|A| - 1, |B|)$, and a_i is not strictly dominated by a mixed strategy over any smaller set of actions. An analogous statement holds for player 2.*

Proof. We again represent pure strategies in their vector forms, with a pure strategy a_i is associated to a vector $v_i \in \mathbb{R}^m$, and a mixed strategy over $\{a_j\}$ associated to a convex combination $\sum_j \lambda_j v_j$.

First suppose $|A| - 1 < |B|$. Then, consider

$$\begin{aligned} v_1 &= (n, 0, 0, \dots, 0, 1, \dots, 1) \\ v_2 &= (0, n, 0, \dots, 0, 1, \dots, 1) \\ v_3 &= (0, 0, n, \dots, 0, 1, \dots, 1) \\ &\dots \\ v_{n-1} &= (0, 0, 0, \dots, n, 1, \dots, 1) \\ v_n &= (1, 1, 1, \dots, 1, 0, \dots, 0) \end{aligned}$$

where the k -th coordinate of v_k is n and the j -th coordinate is zero for $1 \leq j \leq n - 1$ and is one for $j \geq n$, for each $1 \leq k \leq n - 1$, and the first $n - 1$ coordinates of v_n are zero. Then, we see that v_n is strictly dominated by the mixed strategy

$$\frac{1}{n-1}v_1 + \frac{1}{n-1}v_2 + \dots + \frac{1}{n-1}v_{n-1} = \left(\frac{n}{n-1}, \frac{n}{n-1}, \dots, \frac{n}{n-1}, 1, \dots, 1\right) \gg (1, 1, 1, \dots, 1, 0, \dots, 0),$$

but v_n is clearly not strictly dominated by a mixed strategy over any smaller set as each v_k for $1 \leq k \leq n - 1$ is needed in the mixed strategy.

Now, suppose that $|B| \leq |A| - 1$. Then, consider

$$\begin{aligned} v_1 &= (2m, 0, 0, \dots, 0) \\ v_2 &= (0, 2m, 0, \dots, 0) \\ v_3 &= (0, 0, 2m, \dots, 0) \\ &\dots \\ v_m &= (0, 0, 0, \dots, 2m) \\ v_{m+1} &= (1, 1, 1, \dots, 1) \\ v_k &= (0, 0, 0, \dots, 0) \quad \forall m + 1 < k \leq n \end{aligned}$$

We see that v_{m+1} is strictly dominated by the mixed strategy

$$\frac{1}{m}v_1 + \frac{1}{m}v_2 + \cdots + \frac{1}{m}v_m = (2, 2, 2, \dots, 2) \gg (1, 1, 1, \dots, 1),$$

but v_m is clearly not strictly dominated by any mixed strategy over a set of $m - 1$ or fewer actions, as v_k for $k \geq m + 2$ are all zero vectors, and each v_k for $k \leq m$ is needed as v_k is the only vector that has a positive k -th coordinate. □

4 Appendix

The appendix provides proofs of Caratheodory's and Radon's Theorems, as well as a new proof of **Theorem 1.1** using the representation of dominance in section 2 and half-spaces.

We begin the proof of **Theorem 1.1** with the following covering lemma.

Lemma 4.1. (*Rotation covering*) *Suppose two half spaces $a \cdot x < 0$ (A) and $b \cdot x < 0$ (B) together cover a compact convex set S in \mathbb{R}^n . Then there exists $\lambda \in [0, 1]$ such that the half space C given by $(\lambda a + (1 - \lambda)b) \cdot x < 0$ also covers S .*

Proof. Suppose neither A nor B covers S by itself so $\lambda \in (0, 1)$. Also assume that a and b are not parallel (linearly dependent) as that case can be easily handled.

Thus the hyperplanes $a \cdot x = 0$ and $b \cdot x = 0$ intersect at an $n - 2$ dimensional subspace P . Note that P lies entirely outside of S .

These two hyperplanes divide \mathbb{R}^n into four quadrant regions based on the signs of $a \cdot x$ and $b \cdot x$. For the region where $a \cdot x < 0$ and $b \cdot x < 0$ clearly $(\lambda a + (1 - \lambda)b) \cdot x < 0$. So consider the other two regions. The parts of S in them are $S_A = (S \cap A) \setminus B$ and $S_B = (S \cap B) \setminus A$ which lie in two different quadrants. By assumption that neither A nor B alone cover S , both S_A, S_B are nonempty. Also S_A, S_B are compact and convex.

Consider the plane $C_\lambda: (\lambda a + (1 - \lambda)b) \cdot x = 0$ as λ increases from zero to one. Note that C_0 intersects S_A and C_1 intersects S_B . Suppose for contradiction that C_λ always intersects at least one of S_A and S_B . As S_A, S_B are both closed, this means for some λ^* the plane intersects both S_A and S_B , say at points p and q .

We claim that the line segment \overline{pq} intersects P . Note that $C_{\lambda^*} \subset P \cup Q_1 \cup Q_2$ where $Q_1 = \{x : a \cdot x \geq 0, b \cdot x < 0\}$ and $Q_2 = \{x : b \cdot x \geq 0, a \cdot x < 0\}$ where we used $\lambda \in (0, 1)$. Since $p \in Q_1, q \in Q_2$, as we move from p to q along the segment, the signs of $a \cdot x$ and $b \cdot x$ each change (from nonnegative to negative, or vice versa). But this can only happen at P , which means that \overline{pq} intersects P at some point z .

However as $p, q \in S$, by convexity, this means $z \in S$. This contradicts the fact that P does not intersect S . □

Theorem 4.2. (*Equivalence of rationalizability and dominance*) *Given a finite, two player strategic game G , the set of (pure) strategies that remain after iterated elimination of strictly dominated strategies are precisely the strategies that are rationalizable in G .*

Proof. It is easy to show that any strictly dominated strategy is not rationalizable, so we focus on the reverse implication. As before, let player 1 have strategies $\{a_1, \dots, a_m\}$ and we denote by $S^n = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid x_1 + \dots + x_n = 1, x_i \geq 0 \forall i\}$ the $n - 1$ dimensional simplex of probability vectors where n is the number of actions of player 2. Thus, a belief player 1 has about player 2 is some $q \in S^n$.

As in the framework of section 2, we can represent each pure strategy a_j as a linear function $f_j : S^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, whose image is a restricted hyperplane in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} . Suppose the pure strategy a_i represented by $f_i = g$ is not rationalizable. Again by taking $f'_j = f_j - g$ for all j we may assume that g is identically 0 on S^n . For a slight abuse of notation, in the following we write a_i to mean the payoff vector $(a_{i,1}, \dots, a_{i,n})$, so the expected payoff of playing the i -th action under belief q is $f_j(q) = a_i \cdot q$.

For a given f_j the set of beliefs q for which a_j yields strictly higher payoff than a_i are those that satisfy $f_j(q) = a_j \cdot q > 0$, ie. the intersection of an open half-space in \mathbb{R}^n with S^n . Let this half-space be H_j .

If a_i is a never best response, then the union of these H_j over all $j \neq i$ must cover S^n entirely. Similarly, for a mixed strategy $\sigma = r_1 a_1 + \dots + r_m a_m$, the beliefs for which σ yields higher payoff than a_i are those q satisfying $(r_1 a_1 + \dots + r_m a_m) \cdot q > 0$, which is also a half-space H_σ . Then, σ strictly dominates a_i iff the half-space H_σ covers S^n .

The proof of the theorem follows from **Lemma 4.2**, which allows us to repeatedly replace a pair of (pure or mixed) strategies with a single mixed strategy, such that the union of the remaining half-spaces still covers S^n . This reduces the number of strategies while maintaining the covering invariant. Eventually, the process terminates with a single half-space H^* that covers S^n by itself, which corresponds to a mixed strategy σ that dominates a_i .

Indeed, suppose we have $m - 1$ half spaces $p_j \cdot x < 0$ (H_j) for $j \in [m] \setminus \{i\}$ in \mathbb{R}^n each representing a pure strategy a_j , and their union covers the compact convex set of probability vectors S^n . We can now take two half spaces $p_1 \cdot x < 0$ and $p_2 \cdot x < 0$ and since $H_1 \cup H_2$ covers the convex compact set $S^n \setminus (H_3 \cup \dots \cup H_m)$, there exists some λ such that the half space $(\lambda p_1 + (1 - \lambda)p_2) \cdot x < 0$ covers $S^n \setminus (H_3 \cup \dots \cup H_m)$, and we can replace H_1, H_2 with this halfspace instead. Thus, we have reduced the total number of half spaces while still covering S^n . Iterating this process, we eventually have a single half space of the form $\lambda_1 a_1 + \dots + \lambda_m a_m < 0$ which covers S^n . Since we take convex combinations in each step, the weights are such that $\lambda_1 + \dots + \lambda_m = 1$ with all $\lambda_i \geq 0$, so this defines a mixed strategy σ which strictly dominates a_i . □

Theorem 4.3. (Radon) *Let P be a set of $n \geq d + 2$ distinct points in \mathbb{R}^d . Then, P can be partitioned into two nonempty subsets V_1 and V_2 such that the convex hulls of V_1 and V_2*

intersect.

Proof. Consider any set $X = \{x_1, \dots, x_{d+2}\} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ of $d + 2$ points.

Then there exists multipliers a_1, \dots, a_{d+2} , not all zero, such that:

$$\sum_{i=1}^{d+2} a_i x_i = 0, \quad \sum_{i=1}^{d+2} a_i = 0.$$

Take some particular nontrivial solution a_1, \dots, a_{d+2} . Let $Y \subseteq X$ be the set of points with positive multipliers and $Z = X \setminus Y$ be the set of points with negative or zero multiplier. Observe that Y and Z forms a partition of X into two subsets with intersecting convex hulls.

Indeed, $H(Y)$ and $H(Z)$ necessarily intersect because they each contain the point

$$p = \sum_{x_i \in Y} \frac{a_i}{A} x_i = \sum_{x_i \in Z} \frac{-a_i}{A} x_i,$$

where $A = \sum_{x_i \in Y} a_i = -\sum_{x_i \in Z} a_i$. So we have expressed p as convex combination of points in Y and also as a convex combination of points in Z , which means that p lies in the intersection of the convex hulls. □

Theorem 4.4. (Carathéodory) *If a point $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ lies in the convex hull of a set P , then x can be written as the convex combination of at most $d + 1$ points in P . i.e. there is a subset $P' \subset P$ consisting of $d + 1$ or fewer points such that $x \in H(P')$.*

Proof. Suppose x can be written as a convex combination of $k > d + 1$ of the points $x_i \in P$. Without loss of generality, they are x_1, \dots, x_k . Thus, we can write $x = \sum_{j=1}^k \lambda_j x_j$, where $0 < \lambda_j \leq 1$ and $\sum_{j=1}^k \lambda_j = 1$.

Then, consider $x_2 - x_1, \dots, x_k - x_1$, which is a linearly dependent set, so there exists μ_j for $2 \leq j \leq k$ not all zero such that $\sum_{j=2}^k \mu_j (x_j - x_1) = 0$ and not all are zero. Then, if we set $\mu_1 = -\sum_{j=2}^k \mu_j$, this means that $\sum_{j=1}^k \mu_j x_j = 0$ as well as $\sum_{j=1}^k \mu_j = 0$, and not all of the μ_j are equal to zero, so there exists some $\mu_j > 0$.

Now let $\alpha = \min_{1 \leq j \leq k} \left\{ \frac{\lambda_j}{\mu_j} : \mu_j > 0 \right\} = \frac{\lambda_i}{\mu_i}$. Note that $\alpha > 0$. Then, we have

$x = \sum_{j=1}^k \lambda_j x_j - \alpha \sum_{j=1}^k \mu_j x_j = \sum_{j=1}^k (\lambda_j - \alpha \mu_j) x_j$. Since $\alpha > 0$, then $\lambda_j - \alpha \mu_j \geq 0$ for all j . Also, $\sum_{j=1}^k (\lambda_j - \alpha \mu_j) = \sum_{j=1}^k \lambda_j - \alpha \sum_{j=1}^k \mu_j = 1 - \alpha \cdot 0 = 1$.

However, by definition, $\lambda_i - \alpha \mu_i = 0$. Thus, $x = \sum_{1 \leq j \leq k, j \neq i} (\lambda_j - \alpha \mu_j) x_j$, where every $\lambda_j - \alpha \mu_j$ is non-negative and their sum is one.

In other words, x is a convex combination of $k - 1$ points in P . Repeating this process, we can write x as a convex combination of at most $d + 1$ points in P , as desired. □

Theorem 4.5. (Carathéodory's Theorem for Conical Hull) *Let $n \geq d + 1$ and v_1, \dots, v_n be n distinct nonzero vectors in \mathbb{R}^d . Consider the conical hull formed by this set. Then, if a nonzero point x is in the conical hull, x can be written as the conical combination of at most d of the v_i .*

Proof. Suppose x is expressed as the conical combination of $k > d$ of the v_i , without loss of generality, v_1, \dots, v_k . Then, $x = \sum_{j=1}^k \lambda_j v_j$, where $\lambda_j > 0$ for all $1 \leq j \leq k$. Since $k > d$, then v_1, \dots, v_k is linearly dependent, so there exists μ_j , not all equal to zero, such that $\sum_{j=1}^k \mu_j v_j = 0$. By multiplying each μ_j by -1 if necessary, we can ensure that at least one of these μ_j must be positive. Without loss of generality, we may also assume that $\sum_{j=1}^k \mu_j \geq 0$ because if the sum were less than zero (then there would exist some negative μ_j), we could multiply each μ_j by -1 . Now, note that for any α , we have $\sum_{j=1}^k (\lambda_j - \alpha \mu_j) v_j = \sum_{j=1}^k \lambda_j v_j - \alpha \sum_{j=1}^k \mu_j v_j = x$. We want to choose some α such that $\lambda_i - \alpha \mu_i = 0$ for some i , and all $\lambda_j - \alpha \mu_j \geq 0$.

Indeed, if we let $\alpha = \min_{1 \leq j \leq k} \left\{ \frac{\lambda_j}{\mu_j} : \mu_j > 0 \right\} = \frac{\lambda_i}{\mu_i} > 0$, then we do have $\lambda_j - \alpha \mu_j \geq 0$ for all j . If $\mu_j \leq 0$, then since $\lambda_j > 0$, we have $\lambda_j - \alpha \mu_j \geq 0$. And if $\mu_j > 0$, we have $0 < \alpha = \frac{\lambda_i}{\mu_i} \leq \frac{\lambda_j}{\mu_j}$, and again $\lambda_j - \alpha \mu_j \geq 0$. Thus, $x = \sum_{j=1}^k (\lambda_j - \alpha \mu_j) v_j$ represents a conical combination using at most $k-1$ of the v_i , as all $\lambda_j - \alpha \mu_j \geq 0$, and $\lambda_i - \alpha \mu_i = 0$. We can repeat this process until we are left with at most d of the v_i , and so x is the conical combination of at most d of the v_i as desired. \square

Corollary 4.6. *Furthermore, if x also lies in the convex hull $H(O, v_1, \dots, v_n)$, i.e. x is a convex combination of the v_i (and $O = 0$, so sum of coefficients of the v_i is less than or equal to one), then x can be written as the convex combination of at most d of the v_i , and O .*

Proof. If x lies in the convex hull $H(O = v_0, v_1, \dots, v_k)$, that means that $x = \sum_{j=0}^k \lambda_j v_j$, where $\lambda_j > 0$ and $\sum_{j=0}^k \lambda_j = 1$. Since $O = 0$, this is the same as saying that $\sum_{j=1}^k \lambda_j \leq 1$. Again, if $k > d$, then we can write $\sum_{j=1}^k \mu_j v_j = 0$, where we can assume that $\sum_{j=1}^k \mu_j \geq 0$. But then in the preceding proof, we have that $\sum_{j=1}^k (\lambda_j - \alpha \mu_j) = \sum_{j=1}^k \lambda_j - \alpha \sum_{j=1}^k \mu_j \leq \sum_{j=1}^k \lambda_j \leq 1$, as $\alpha > 0$ and $\sum_{j=1}^k \mu_j \geq 0$. Again, recall that $\lambda_i - \alpha \mu_i = 0$, and each of the $\lambda_j - \alpha \mu_j \geq 0$.

Thus, x lies in the convex hull of $H(v_0, v_1, \dots, v_{i-1}, v_{i+1}, \dots, v_k)$. Like before, by repeating this process, we can show that x lies in the convex hull H^* of at most d of the nonzero v_i , along with v_0 , i.e. $x \in H(v_0, v_{j_1}, \dots, v_{j_d})$. \square

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Scott Gehlbach at the University of Chicago Political Science department (and Harris' Political Economy program) for teaching me game theory during my first year SSI Formal Theory class. Prof. Gehlbach introduced the concepts of iterated dominance and rationalizability to me, and this paper grew out of some observations I made from examples in his class. I would also like to thank various UChicago economics and computer science professors for kindly taking a look at the paper and giving feedback during Winter/Spring 2022. Roger Myerson also provided some important suggestions about improving the details of the paper, and the last proposition showing the bound is tight is partly motivated by his observation.

References

- [1] Bernheim, D. (1984) Rationalizable Strategic Behavior. *Econometrica* 52: 1007-1028.
- [2] Pearce, D. (1984) Rationalizable Strategic Behavior and the Problem of Perfection. *Econometrica* 52: 1029-1050.
- [3] Fudenberg, D. and Tirole, J. (1993) *Game Theory*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- [4] Yildiz, M. Rationalizability lecture notes. <https://dspace.mit.edu/handle/1721.1/99213>
- [5] Obara, I. Rationalizability and Iterated Elimination of Dominated Strategies
<http://www.econ.ucla.edu/iobara/Rationalizability201B.pdf>