

Clustering coef: measure triadic closure

embeddedness \parallel $cc(A) = \frac{|\{(B,C) \in E : (A,B) \in E + (A,C) \in E\}|}{|\{(B,C) : (A,B) \in E + (A,C) \in E\}|}$

- Voc: Gatekeeper nodes, bridges (local...), neighborhood overlap
- Homophily: tend to be similar to our friends (mutable/inmutable)
- Selection / social influence (choose friends based on similarity \rightarrow become eventually more alike)
- Affiliation network: nodes common focal pts of activity \rightarrow interact
- Triadic [same friend] Focal [same interest/activity] Membership [friend/edge]

A: each player has a set of strategies, and is self-interested
 • payoff matrix (funcⁿ) - \rightarrow everything that can be gained (even altruism)
 • players know entire struct of game

a	1/-1	-10/0
c	0/-10	-4/-4

Prisoner's dilemma
DOMINANT STRATEGY
 LEADS TO \ominus SOCIAL WELFARE

Best response: strategy w/ highest payoff to other player's strategy.
 Unique \Rightarrow strict Best Resp.

- Strategy profile: collection of all combinations (SP1, SP2...)
- Dominant strategy: strategy that is BR for every strategy of other players.
- Nash Equilibrium: set of strategies such that each one is each player's BR to the other players.

1,1	0,2
0,2	1,1

Cycle of BRs \Rightarrow No NE
 • Deterministic

Pure Coordination Game: Actions of players are matched to get payoff
Unbalanced Coord. Game: \S pure

Pure strategy vs Mixed strategies (1 vs [0,1] prob)
 [BR if P2 plays ξ w/prob] \rightarrow Payoff is randomized: Expected payoff
 NE is solⁿ of eqn^s of exp. payoffs for each player (strategy profile is now set of prob.)

	1	(1-q)
s1	A, B	C, D
s2	E, F	G, H

- Pareto optimality: strategy profile such that there is no way to change the str. of one without lessening the payoff of the others
- Social optimality: Maximizes social welfare (sum of all payoffs)
- Backwards induction: \rightarrow conversion to normal form.
- Extensive form games: sequential equilibria: from back.ind. \Rightarrow SE \in [NE], NE \notin [SE] (NE comes from matrix)



- Braess' Paradox \rightarrow Unique NE (Dominant str. for all players is to take new route)
- Auctions:
 - multi-item: 1 seller + multiple items
 - procurement (reverse) auction: 1 buyer + multiple sellers
 - double-sided auction: multi-all \rightarrow matching

1st price shading
 payoff functions:
 $g(v) = v(v_k - s(v))$

difequ. true value \downarrow prob of winning \downarrow
 $\Rightarrow s(v) = \frac{v}{2}$
 • Winner's curse, (Loser's curse)

• ascending bid (English)
 • descending bid (Dutch)
 • sealed bid \rightarrow 1st price (PDS) \rightarrow 2nd price
 indep. private value
 Bidding true value is DS (Dominant str)
 \rightarrow max (social welfare)
 \rightarrow surplus is divided between buyer/seller
 \rightarrow similar to English Aucⁿ

- complement: item price & when combined - S substitute
- Navigation links, transition links
- WDC** bow-tie (in, SCC, OUT), tendrils, tubes, disconnected comp. 80
- infer retrieval (IR): query \rightarrow list relevant

Hubs & Authorities: Auth. update rule: $auth(p) = \sum_{\text{that point to } p} \text{hub scores of pages}$
Page Rank: Normalized: divide $\frac{sub(p)}{\sum auth(p)}$ (same hub)
 Basic rule: assign $1/n$ to all then $A \rightarrow B$ each gets $1/2$ of PR of A
 Scaled rule: \rightarrow each gets $\frac{(1-S)PR}{2}$

VCG: $P_{ij} = \frac{V_{B-i}^S}{\sum \text{prices}} - \frac{V_{B-j}^{S-1}}{\sum \text{prices}}$ (price j pays for i)
 eg. PA: 0 pays for her item in the case where A and C are not included.

GSP: bidder i gets i-th item for price 2nd highest bidder.
Matching Markets: one-sided - only buyers & sellers have pref. two-sided - both sides have preferences

Constrained set: \rightarrow matching theorem
Ranking / Valuation models ($P_1 > P_2 \dots$ vs $1, 0, 0 \dots$)
Preferred seller graph: after increasing prices to break constrained sets

Market clearing: same as requiring perfect matching in PSG
Gale-Shapley algo: FPDA / MPDA (FPDA \rightarrow optimizes social welfare for women, MPDA \rightarrow minimizes SW male-pref.)
 existence and all have same TP (all max(SW))
 $opt(w) = w$ in FPDA

Information effects: choice of others wield information
Direct Benefit effects: same technology

cluster density: set of nodes such that each node in the set has at least a fraction p (clus. dens.) of its network neighbours in the set
 $cd > \text{threshold} = \text{no. same-} \rightarrow \text{threshold } q = \frac{d}{2+3d}$ (pda $> (1-p)d/2$)
SIR: susceptible infectious removed **SIS**: susceptible inf. susc.

Ring network: random long-range links (spatial dep. prob links form)
King parent ancestry model: total pop N at some pt in time but is down to k lineages. to see if lineages collide, track one to some parent u , otherwise has to be tracked down to same parent in $(k-1)$ nodes [prob $1-3$, otherwise no collapsing. $1 - \frac{k(k-1)}{2}$]

Completeness: $A > B > C$ ($A > B$) **transitivity**: a void cyclicality
Plurality / Majority, **Borda** ($A > B > C$, $2, 1, 0$), **Approval** ($A > B > C$ x5: $A=5$, $A > B > C$ x3: $A=3, B=3$)

Single Transferable Vote: eliminate lowest candidate (plurality) at each round
Condorcet Principle: rule is condorcet-consistent if it selects condorcet winner (if \exists): winner in all pairwise maj. votes.
Condorcet paradox: cycles

Weak monotonicity: if A wins in a subset $ABSCD$, if people 'promote' A he should still win. (STV violates WM)

Indep. of Irrelevant Alternatives: if 2 candidates maintain their relative positions, the outcome should be the same

Unanimity (Weak Pareto): (A is better / $A > B$ always B cannot win)

Non-dictatorial, **Anonymity** (everyone is =), **Neutrality** (choices don't have weight)

Arrow's Theorem: No voting rule satisfies IIR, non-dict & unanimity
Median Voting: (single peaked: Δ) - no str. proof, condorcet consistent (in add) Pareto efficient (no other choice is better w/out)

Max's Theorem: plurality is the only one that satisfies anonymity, neutrality, $\text{\textcircled{A}}$ respons.