On Invariant Games

Aviezri S. Fraenkel*
Department of Computer Science and Applied Mathematics
Weizmann Institute of Science
Rehovot 76100, Israel

October 26, 2009

Keywords: Combinatorial Game Theory, P-positions, Invariant Moves

We assume that the reader has some knowledge about combinatorial game theory. Basic definitions can be found in [1], [2].

A *take-away* game is played with finitely many tokens distributed into k piles. It is played by two players, who alternate in removing tokens according to the game's rules. Throughout we consider *normal* play, that is, the player first unable to move loses (because all the piles are empty); the opponent wins. Such a game has been called invariant in [4] if the same moves can be played from any game position, provided only that there are enough tokens in the piles. In the sequel any take-away game may be called simply *game*.

It is convenient to code positions and moves of games by k-tuples of nonnegative integers. For two k-tuples $x = (x_1, \dots, x_k)$ and $y = (y_1, \dots, y_k)$, we write $x \prec y$ if $x_i \le y_i$ for all $i = 1, \dots, k$.

Definition 1. A move $x = (x_1, \dots, x_k)$ in a game G is *invariant*, if it can be played from every position $p = (p_1, \dots, p_k)$ for which $x \prec p$. If x can be played from some position p with $x \prec p$ but there exists a position p_1 with $x \prec p_1$ from which it is not playable, the move is *variant*.

Definition 2. [4] A game G is *invariant* if all its moves are invariant. It is *variant* if it has some variant move.

Remark 1. A game can be described by a digraph $G = (V, E)$, where V is the set of game positions, and E its set of moves. The P-positions constitute the unique kernel K of G: It is an independent set (no edge between any pair of its vertices), and absorbing (every vertex $\notin K$ has an edge leading into K). It follows that the only variant moves x are those for which there exist vertices $p, q \in K$ such that x connects p and q. We denote the set of all P-positions of a game by $\mathcal{P}$, the set of all its N-positions by $\mathcal{N}$.

*`fraenkel@wisdom.weizmann.ac.il` `http://www.wisdom.weizmann.ac.il/~fraenkel`

It follows that a move is invariant if and only if it does not connect any P-position; in "electrical" language; if and only if it doesn't "short-circuit" any P-positions.

A general pair of *complementary Beatty sequences* has the form $(A_n, B_n) = (\lfloor n\alpha \rfloor, \lfloor n\beta \rfloor)_{n\geq 1}$, where α, β are positive irrationals satisfying $\alpha^{-1} + \beta^{-1} = 1$. Without loss of generality we may assume $\alpha < \beta$. Then actually $1 < \alpha < 2 < \beta$.

Let $\zeta > 0$ be irrational, $m > n > 0$ integers. Then

$$(m-n)\zeta - 1 < \lfloor m\zeta \rfloor - \lfloor n\zeta \rfloor < (m-n)\zeta + 1.$$

Thus,

$$\lfloor (m-n)\zeta \rfloor \leq \lfloor m\zeta \rfloor - \lfloor n\zeta \rfloor \leq \lfloor (m-n)\zeta \rfloor + 1. \tag{1}$$

Duchêne and Rigo [4] asked the following question, motivated by [3]: given any sequence $S : \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \to \mathbb{Z}^k_{\geq 0}$, is there an invariant game having S as its set of P-positions? They answered this in the negative: consider any sequence $S = (A_n, B_n)_{n\geq 0}$ beginning with $(0,0), (1,2), (3,5), (4,6)$, such that $\{A_n : n \geq 1\}$ and $\{B_n : n \geq 1\}$ split $\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$. Then from the N-position $(1,1)$ one must move to $(0,0)$. Hence $(1,1)$ is a move. But playing from $(4,6)$ to $(3,5)$ is not permitted, since the P-positions constitute an independent set. They put forward the following intriguing

Conjecture 1. *Given any pair of complementary Beatty sequences $S = (A_n, B_n)_{n\geq 1}$, there exists an invariant game having $S \cup \{(0,0)\}$ as its set of P-positions.*

The bulk of their paper consists of the definition and analysis of a game whose P-positions are complementary Beatty sequences, which they invented to support their conjecture, but the game is of independent interest.

It is our purpose to prove the conjecture. We state this formally:

Theorem 1. *Given any pair of complementary Beatty sequences $S = (A_n, B_n)_{n\geq 1}$, there exists an invariant game having $S \cup \{(0,0)\}$ as its set of P-positions.*

Proof. Suppose that the assertion is false. By Remark 1, there exists a position $(a,b) \in \mathcal{N}$ such that for every move x from (a,b) into $\mathcal{P}$, x also connects two P-positions. Since $1 < \alpha < 2 < \beta$, the sequences A_n, B_n are increasing. Therefore any move from a *single* pile is invariant. Thus $a > 0$, $b > 0$, and every variant move must decrease both piles. Hence for all $(i,j) \in \mathbb{Z}^2_{\geq 1}$ with $i \leq a$, $j \leq b$ and every $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ such that $(a-i, b-j) = (A_n, B_n)$ or $(a-i, b-j) = (B_n, A_n)$, there exist $\ell > k \geq 0$ such that $(A_\ell - i, B_\ell - j) = (A_k, B_k)$, or $(A_\ell - i, B_\ell - j) = (B_k, A_k)$. In particular, either
(a1) $(A_\ell - a, B_\ell - b) = (A_k, B_k)$, $a \leq b$ or
(a2) $(A_\ell - a, B_\ell - b) = (B_k, A_k)$, $a \leq b$ or
(b1) $(A_\ell - a, B_\ell - b) = (A_k, B_k)$, $a > b$ or
(b2) $(A_\ell - a, B_\ell - b) = (B_k, A_k)$, $a > b$.

(a) Since the pair of Beatty sequences partitions $\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$, we have either $a = B_m$ or $a = A_m$ for some $m \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$. If $a = B_m$, then $b \geq B_m \geq A_m$, since $\beta > \alpha$. But

$b = A_m$ is impossible, since $(a, b) \in \mathcal{N}$. Thus $b > A_m$, so there is the invariant move $b \to A_m$, a contradiction. Therefore $a = A_m$. Also, $m \leq \ell$.

(a1) We have $A_\ell - A_m = A_k$. By (1), $A_{\ell-m} \leq A_k \leq A_{\ell-m} + 1$. Since $1 < \alpha < 2$, we might have $A_{\ell-m} + 1 = A_{\ell-m+1}$. Hence $m \in \{\ell - k, \ell - k + 1\}$. In particular,

$$A_{\ell-m+1} - A_{\ell-m} = 2 \implies k = \ell - m, \tag{2}$$

since $A_{\ell-m+1} - A_{\ell-m} = 2$ implies, by complementarity, $A_{\ell-m} + 1 = B_r$ for some $r \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$.

We also have $B_\ell - b = B_k$. Suppose first that $b = B_s$ for some $s \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$. Then $B_\ell - B_s = B_k$. By (1), $B_{\ell-s} \leq B_k \leq B_{\ell-s} + 1$. Since $\beta > 2$, $B_{\ell-s} + 1 = A_t$ for suitable $t \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$. It follows that $s = \ell - k$.

If $m = \ell - k$, then $s = m$, so $b = B_m$. But then $(a, b) = (A_m, B_m) \in \mathcal{P}$, a contradiction. Hence $m = \ell - k + 1 = s + 1$, $s = m - 1$, $a = A_m$, $b = B_{m-1}$. But then we can use the invariant move $A_m \to A_{m-1}$, a contradiction.

Therefore we must have $b = A_s$. Then $A_s = B_\ell - B_k$. By (1), $B_{\ell-k} \leq A_s \leq B_{\ell-k} + 1$. By disjointness of the Beatty sequences we then have $A_s = B_{\ell-k} + 1$. If $m = \ell - k$, then $b = A_s = B_m + 1$, so there is the invariant move $b \to B_m$. So assume

$$m = \ell - k + 1. \tag{3}$$

Then $b = B_{m-1} + 1$, so

$$(a, b) = (A_m, B_{m-1} + 1).$$

If $A_m - A_{m-1} = 1$, we can move to (A_{m-1}, B_{m-1}) with the invariant move $(1, 1)$. So let $A_m - A_{m-1} = 2$. We consider two cases:

(A) $(A_1, B_1) = (1, t)$ $t \geq 3$. Then the first two terms of the sequence $\{A_n\}$ are 1 and 2. Therefore $\alpha < 3/2$, so $\beta > 3$. Hence $B_{n+1} - B_n \geq 3$ for all $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$. This implies that $(1, 2)$ is an invariant move. So we can move $(A_m, B_{m-1} + 1) - (2, 1) = (A_{m-1}, B_{m-1})$, a contradiction.

(B) $(A_1, B_1) = (1, 2)$. Then the moves $(a, b) \to (1, 2)$ and $(a, b) \to (2, 1)$ are moves from $(a, b) \in \mathcal{N}$ to $(1, 2) \in \mathcal{P}$ and $(2, 1) \in \mathcal{P}$ respectively. Since we assume that the game is variant, these moves also lead from some P-position to another P-position.

(B1) Consider the move $(a, b) \to (1, 2)$. Then for our case (a1), $(A_\ell - (a - 1), B_\ell - (b - 2)) = (A_\ell - A_m + 1, B_\ell - B_{m-1} + 1) = (A_k, B_k)$. In particular, $B_k - 1 = B_\ell - B_{m-1}$. By (1), $B_{\ell-m+1} \leq B_k - 1 \leq B_{\ell-m+1} + 1$. Equivalently, by (3), $B_k \leq B_k - 1 \leq B_k + 1$, the left hand of which is a contradiction.

(B2) Consider the move $(a, b) \to (2, 1)$. Then $(A_\ell - (a - 2), B_\ell - (b - 1)) = (A_\ell - A_m + 2, B_\ell - B_{m-1}) = (A_k, B_k)$. In particular, $A_k - 2 = A_\ell - A_m$. By (1), $A_{\ell-m} \leq A_k - 2 \leq A_{\ell-m} + 1$. Equivalently, using (3), $A_{\ell-m} \leq A_{\ell-m+1} - 2 \leq A_{\ell-m} + 1$, so $2 \leq A_{\ell-m+1} - A_{\ell-m} \leq 3$. Since $1 < \alpha < 2$, actually $A_{\ell-m+1} - A_{\ell-m} = 2$. By (2) we then have $k = \ell - m$, contradicting (3).

(a2) We have $A_m = A_\ell - B_k$, $b = B_\ell - A_k$. Subtracting,

$$b - A_m = (B_\ell - A_\ell) + (B_k - A_k) \geq B_\ell - A_\ell.$$

Since $\beta > \alpha$, the sequence $\{B_n - A_n\}$ is a nondecreasing function of n. Since $m \leq \ell$ we have $B_\ell - A_\ell \geq B_m - A_m$. Thus $b \geq B_m$. But there cannot be equality, since $(a, b) \in \mathcal{N}$. Therefore $b > B_m$, so there is the invariant move $b \to B_m$.

(b) Analogously to case (a), we deduce that $b = A_m$ for suitable $m \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$.

(b1) We have $a = A_\ell - A_k$, $A_m = B_\ell - B_k$. Subtracting, $a - A_m = (B_k - A_k) - (B_\ell - A_\ell) \leq 0$ since $\ell > k$. Thus $a \leq A_m = b$, contradicting $a > b$.

(b2) We have $a = A_\ell - B_k$, $A_m = B_\ell - A_k$. Subtracting, $a - A_m = -(B_k - A_k) - (B_\ell - A_\ell) \leq 0$, contradicting $a > b = A_m$. ■

Possible Future Work. (i) Consider games whose P-positions are given by nonhomogeneous Beatty sequences: $\lfloor n\alpha + \gamma \rfloor$, $\lfloor n\beta + \delta \rfloor$; or $\lfloor n\alpha_i + \gamma_i \rfloor$, $i = 1, \ldots, k$. Are they also invariant?
(ii) Invariant games have the property that no move "short-circuits" any P-positions. It may be of interest to consider invariance in a stronger sense: moves that do not short-circuit any two same g-valued positions.

References

[1] M. Albert, R. J. Nowakowski and D. Wolfe [2007], *Lessons in Play: An Introduction to Combinatorial Game Theory*, A K Peters.

[2] E. R. Berlekamp, J. H. Conway and R. K. Guy [2001-2004], *Winning Ways for your Mathematical Plays*, Vol. 1-4, A K Peters, Wellesley, MA, 2nd edition: vol. 1 (2001), vols. 2, 3 (2003), vol. 4 (2004)

[3] E. Duchêne, A.S. Fraenkel, R.J. Nowakowski and M. Rigo [2009], Extensions and restrictions of Wythoff's game preserving its P-positions, *J. Combin. Theory – A*, in press.

[4] E. Duchêne and M. Rigo [2009], Invariant Games, to appear in *Theoretical Computer Science.*