

# A Game Theoretic Analysis of the Three-Gambler Ruin Game

Ath. Kehagias, G. Gkyzis, A. Karakoulakis, A. Kyprianidis

June 13, 2024

## Abstract

We study the following game. Three players start with initial capitals of  $s_1, s_2, s_3$  dollars; in each round player  $P_m$  is selected with probability  $\frac{1}{3}$ ; then *he* selects player  $P_n$  and they play a game in which  $P_m$  wins from (resp. loses to)  $P_n$  one dollar with probability  $p_{mn}$  (resp.  $p_{nm} = 1 - p_{mn}$ ). When a player loses all his capital he drops out; the game continues until a single player wins by collecting everybody's money.

This is a “strategic” version of the classical Gambler's Ruin game. It seems reasonable that a player may improve his winning probability by judicious selection of which opponent to engage in each round. We formulate the situation as a *stochastic game* and prove that it has at least one Nash equilibrium in deterministic stationary strategies.

## 1 Introduction

In this paper we study a version of the three-gambler ruin problem in which, whenever a gambler is “activated”, he *chooses* his opponent. More specifically, we study our version is played by the following rules.

1. The game is played in discrete time steps (rounds).
2. Three players start at the 0-th round with initial capitals, of  $s_1, s_2$  and  $s_3$  dollars.
3. In each round, one player is chosen with probability  $\frac{1}{3}$  and then *he* chooses another player against whom he will play.
4. Suppose that the  $m$ -th player plays against the  $n$ -th one; with probability  $p_{mn}$  (resp.  $p_{nm} = 1 - p_{mn}$ ) he wins from (resp. loses to) the  $n$ -th player one dollar.
5. The game continues until a single player wins (i.e. accumulates the total  $s_1 + s_2 + s_3$  dollars); if this never happens, the game continues ad infinitum.

The above game is a “strategic” (in the *game-theoretic* sense) version of the “classical” Gambler's Ruin (GR). Intuitively, it appears reasonable that a player may improve his winning probability by judicious opponent selection in each round. As far as we know, this game theoretic approach to GR has not been explored previously.

The “classic” Gambler’s Ruin involves two gamblers, is one of the earliest-studied probability problems (for a historical review see [6, 27, 30]) and remains one of the most popular introductory examples in the theory of Markov Chains. For an overview of the basic results see [8].

An obvious generalization of GR is to have three or more gamblers. An early attempt in this direction is [21] but the first (as far as we know) major advance appeared in [26] and involved “*symmetric play*”, i.e., in each round all players have equal probability of winning. Symmetric play was further studied in [7, 24, 25] and numerous other publications [1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 12, 28, 29]. The case of “*asymmetric play*”, i.e., when players’ winning probabilities are not necessarily equal, has also been studied, first in [22, 23] and more recently in [13, 14, 15]. Finally versions played on graphs have also been studied, for example in [19].

In all of the above works, no player *strategy* is involved. In other words, the players cannot influence who participates in a given round of the game.<sup>1</sup> Hence the evolution of the game is governed by purely probabilistic laws.

As already mentioned, in this paper we take a different approach. In Section 2 we provide a rigorous formulation as a stochastic game. In Section 3 we provide an introductory analysis of the simple case in which each player starts with initial capital of one dollar. In Section 4 we study the general case (i.e., with arbitrary initial capitals) and prove that the game has at least one Nash equilibrium (NE) in deterministic stationary strategies. In Section 5 we discuss the computation of the NE and provide several numerical experiments. In Section 6 we summarize our results and propose some future research directions.

It is worth emphasizing that our results can be generalized for the case of more than three players; we limit ourselves to the three-player case mainly for simplicity of presentation.

## 2 The Game

We denote our game by  $\Gamma_3(\mathbf{p}, K)$ . It involves three players (gamblers)  $P_1, P_2, P_3$  and has parameters  $\mathbf{p} = (p_1, p_2, p_3)$  and  $K$ , which satisfy:

$$\forall n \in \{1, 2, 3\} : p_n \in (0, 1) \text{ and } K \in \{3, 4, , \dots\}.$$

$\Gamma_3(\mathbf{p}, K)$  is played as follows:

1. At times  $t \in \{0, 1, 2, \dots\}$  and for  $n \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ ,  $P_n$ ’s *capital* is  $s_n(t)$ .
2. At  $t = 0$ , the capitals satisfy  $\sum_{n=1}^3 s_n(0) = K$ .
3. At  $t \in \{1, 2, \dots\}$  a player  $P_n$  is selected equiprobably from the set  $\{n : s_n(t) > 0\}$ .
4.  $P_n$  selects another player  $P_m$  such that  $s_m(t) > 0$ .

---

<sup>1</sup>A notable exception appears in [24], where it is stated that “none of the preceding quantities [winning probability, expected game duration etc.] depend on the rule for choosing the players in each stage”. Here we have a case in which strategies are implicitly considered, but they turn out to be irrelevant. This is the case because the author studies *symmetric play*; as we will see, things are different for asymmetric play.

5. With probability  $p_{nm}$  (resp.  $p_{mn}$ )  $P_n$  receives one unit from (resp. pays one unit to)  $P_m$ , where

$$p_{12} = p_1, \quad p_{21} = 1 - p_1, \quad p_{23} = p_2, \quad p_{32} = 1 - p_2, \quad p_{31} = p_3, \quad p_{13} = 1 - p_3.$$

Hence the players' capitals change as follows:

- (a) if  $P_n$  wins then  $s_n(t) = s_n(t-1) + 1$  and  $s_m(t) = s_m(t-1) - 1$ ;
- (b) if  $P_n$  loses then  $s_n(t) = s_n(t-1) - 1$  and  $s_m(t) = s_m(t-1) + 1$ ;
- (c) for  $k \in \{1, 2, 3\} \setminus \{n, m\}$  we have  $s_k(t) = s_k(t-1)$ .

Obviously, at all  $t$  we have  $\sum_{n=1}^3 s_n(t) = K$ .

6. If at some time  $t'$  one player is left with zero capital, the game continues between the two remaining players.
7. The game continues until at some time  $t''$  there exists a single player  $P_m$  with  $s_m(t'') = \sum_{n=1}^3 s_n(0)$ , in which case this player is the winner. If we such a player does not exist for any turn, the game continues ad infinitum.

The *game state* at time  $t$  is  $\mathbf{s}(t) = (s_1(t) \ s_2(t) \ s_3(t))$ . The *state set* is

$$S = \left\{ (s_1, s_2, s_3) : \forall n : s_n \geq 0 \text{ and } \sum_{n=1}^3 s_n = K \right\}.$$

Note that each  $(s_1, s_2, s_3)$  can be rewritten as  $(s_1, s_2, K - s_1 - s_2)$ . For  $s_1 = i$ , we have  $K - i + 1$  possible states of the form  $(i, j, K - i - j)$  with  $j \in \{0, 1, \dots, K - i\}$ ; since  $i$  can take any value in  $\{0, 1, \dots, K\}$ , the total number of states is

$$N_K = |S| = \frac{(K+1)(K+2)}{2}.$$

We define the following state sets:

$$S_1 = \{(K, 0, 0)\}, \quad S_2 = \{(0, K, 0)\}, \quad S_3 = \{(0, 0, K)\}, \quad S_i = \{(s_1, s_2, s_3) : \forall n : s_n > 0\}.$$

We will call the states  $s \in S_\tau = S_1 \cup S_2 \cup S_3$  *terminal*, the states  $\mathbf{s} \in S_i$  *interior* and the states  $s \in S_b = S \setminus S_i$  *boundary*. It is easily checked that  $|S_i| = \frac{(K-1)(K-2)}{2}$  and  $|S_b| = 3K$ . It will be convenient to number the states so that: the first state is  $(K, 0, 0)$ , the second is  $(0, K, 0)$  and the third is  $(0, 0, K)$ ; the remaining states can be numbered arbitrarily.

The *game history* at time  $t$  is  $\mathbf{h}(t) = \mathbf{s}(0) \mathbf{s}(1) \dots \mathbf{s}(t)$ . The set of all *admissible* histories is denoted by  $H$ . A *terminal history* is an  $\mathbf{h}(t) = \mathbf{s}(0) \mathbf{s}(1) \dots \mathbf{s}(t)$  such that  $\mathbf{s}(t) \in S_\tau$ .

For  $n \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ ,  $P_n$ 's *payoff* is defined for every terminal history  $\mathbf{h} = \mathbf{s}(0) \mathbf{s}(1) \dots \mathbf{s}(t)$  by

$$Q_n(\mathbf{h}) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{iff } s_n(t) = K \\ 0 & \text{else;} \end{cases}$$

payoff of nonterminal histories is zero.

A strategy for  $P_n$  is a function  $\sigma_n : H \rightarrow \Delta_3 \cup \{(0, 0, 0)\}$ , where

$$\Delta_3 = \left\{ (x_{n1}, x_{n2}, x_{n3}) \text{ with } x_{nm} \geq 0 \text{ for } m \neq n, x_{nn} = 0, \sum_{m=1}^3 x_{nm} = 1 \right\}.$$

The interpretation is that

$$\sigma_n(\mathbf{h}) = (x_{n1}, x_{n2}, x_{n3}) \Leftrightarrow (\forall m, n : \Pr(P_n \text{ selects } P_m \text{ at } t | \mathbf{h}) = x_{nm}).$$

We will only consider *admissible* strategies<sup>2</sup>. A strategy profile is a triple  $\sigma = (\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \sigma_3)$ . A strategy  $\sigma_n$  is called *deterministic* iff

$$\forall \mathbf{h} = \mathbf{s}(0) \mathbf{s}(1) \dots \mathbf{s}(t) : \sigma_n(\mathbf{h}) = (x_1(\mathbf{h}), x_2(\mathbf{h}), x_3(\mathbf{h})) \text{ has a single nonzero element.}$$

A strategy  $\sigma_n$  is called *stationary* iff, for every  $\mathbf{h}$ ,  $\sigma_n(\mathbf{h})$  depends only on the last state, i.e., iff

$$\forall \mathbf{h} = \mathbf{s}_0 \mathbf{s}_1 \dots \mathbf{s}_t : \sigma_n(\mathbf{h}) = \sigma_n(\mathbf{s}_t);$$

We will use the following shorter notation the  $x_{mn}$ 's:

$$x_1 = x_{12} \text{ (and } 1 - x_1 = x_{13}), \quad x_2 = x_{23} \text{ (and } 1 - x_2 = x_{21}), \quad x_3 = x_{31} \text{ (and } 1 - x_3 = x_{32}),$$

and we will denote a stationary strategy profile by  $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, x_2, x_3)$ .

An initial state  $\mathbf{s}(0)$  and a strategy profile  $\sigma = (\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \sigma_3)$  define a probability measure on  $H$ . Hence the *expected payoff* to  $P_n$  is well defined by

$$Q_n(\mathbf{s}(0), \sigma) = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{s}(0), \sigma}(Q_n(\mathbf{h})).$$

It is easily seen that  $Q_n(\mathbf{s}(0), \sigma)$  is  $P_n$ 's probability of winning when the starting state is  $\mathbf{s}(0)$  and the players use the strategy profile  $\sigma$ .

### 3 The case $K = 3$

As a preliminary step in our analysis, let us consider the game when total capital is  $K = 3$  (this is obviously the first nontrivial case) and, for  $n \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ ,  $P_n$  uses the *stationary* strategy  $\mathbf{x}_n = (x_n(\mathbf{s}))_{\mathbf{s} \in S}$ . Suppressing the dependence on  $\mathbf{x} = (\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2, \mathbf{x}_3)$ , we denote  $P_n$ 's payoff, when the game starts at state  $\mathbf{s}$ , by

$$V_n(\mathbf{s}) = Q_n(\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{x}).$$

Let us compute  $\mathbf{V}_1(\mathbf{s}) = (V_1(\mathbf{s}))_{\mathbf{s} \in S}$ . First, we have

$$V_1(3, 0, 0) = 1, \quad V_1(0, 3, 0) = V_1(0, 0, 3) = V_1(0, 1, 2) = V_1(0, 2, 1) = 0.$$

---

<sup>2</sup>For example, we exclude strategies which assign positive probability to selecting a player with zero capital, to a player selecting himself etc.

Also, when two players are left in the game, the only admissible strategy for each one is to select the other. For instance, in the state  $(1, 2, 0)$ , we must have

$$x_1(1, 2, 0) = x_{12}(1, 2, 0) = 1, \quad x_2(1, 2, 0) = x_{23}(1, 2, 0) = 0.$$

We have the following transition probabilities:

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr((2, 1, 0) \rightarrow (3, 0, 0)) &= p_1, & \Pr((2, 1, 0) \rightarrow (1, 2, 0)) &= 1 - p_1, \\ \Pr((1, 2, 0) \rightarrow (2, 1, 0)) &= p_1, & \Pr((1, 2, 0) \rightarrow (0, 3, 0)) &= 1 - p_1. \end{aligned}$$

Consequently

$$\begin{aligned} V_1(2, 1, 0) &= p_1 V_1(3, 0, 0) + (1 - p_1) V_1(1, 2, 0), \\ V_1(1, 2, 0) &= p_1 V_1(2, 1, 0) + (1 - p_1) V_1(0, 3, 0), \end{aligned}$$

which becomes

$$\begin{aligned} V_1(2, 1, 0) &= p_1 + (1 - p_1) V_1(1, 2, 0), \\ V_1(1, 2, 0) &= p_1 V_1(2, 1, 0). \end{aligned}$$

Solving the above system we get

$$V_1(2, 1, 0) = \frac{p_1}{1 - p_1 + p_1^2}, \quad V_1(1, 2, 0) = \frac{p_1^2}{1 - p_1 + p_1^2}.$$

Similarly, we have

$$\begin{aligned} V_1(2, 0, 1) &= (1 - p_3) + p_3 V_1(1, 0, 2) \\ V_1(1, 0, 2) &= (1 - p_3) V_1(2, 0, 1) \end{aligned}$$

and we get

$$V_1(2, 0, 1) = \frac{1 - p_3}{1 - p_3 + p_3^2}, \quad V_1(1, 0, 2) = \frac{1 - 2p_3 + p_3^2}{1 - p_3 + p_3^2}.$$

Finally, simplifying  $x_n(1, 1, 1)$  to  $x_n$  (for  $n \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ ) we have

$$\begin{aligned} V_1(1, 1, 1) &= \\ & \frac{1}{3} (x_1 (p_1 V_1(2, 0, 1) + (1 - p_1) V_1(0, 2, 1)) + (1 - x_1) (p_3 V_1(0, 1, 2) + (1 - p_3) V_1(2, 1, 0))) \\ & + \frac{1}{3} (x_2 (p_2 V_1(1, 2, 0) + (1 - p_2) V_1(1, 0, 2)) + (1 - x_2) (p_1 V_1(2, 0, 1) + (1 - p_1) V_1(0, 2, 1))) \\ & + \frac{1}{3} (x_3 (p_3 V_1(0, 1, 2) + (1 - p_3) V_1(2, 1, 0)) + (1 - x_3) (p_2 V_1(1, 2, 0) + (1 - p_2) V_1(1, 0, 2))). \end{aligned}$$

For example,  $\frac{1}{3}x_1 p_1 V_1(2, 0, 1)$  is the probability of:

$$P_1 \text{ being selected, } P_1 \text{ selecting } P_2 \quad \text{and } P_1 \text{ beating } P_2.$$

Substituting the known right hand values, after a considerable amount of algebra we get

$$V_1(1, 1, 1) = \frac{(1 - p_3)(x_1 + 1 - x_2)p_1}{3(p_3^2 - p_3 + 1)} + \frac{p_1(x_3 + 1 - x_1)(1 - p_3)}{3(p_1^2 - p_1 + 1)} \\ + \frac{(1 - p_3)^2(x_2 + 1 - x_3)(1 - p_2)}{3(p_3^2 - p_3 + 1)} + \frac{p_1^2(x_2 + 1 - x_3)p_2}{3(p_1^2 - p_1 + 1)}.$$

This can also be written as

$$V_1(1, 1, 1) = \frac{p_1(1 - p_3)(p_1 + p_3 - 1)(p_1 - p_3)x_1 + \Pi_1(x_2, x_3)}{3(1 - p_3 + p_3^2)(1 - p_1 + p_1^2)} \quad (1)$$

where  $\Pi_1(x_2, x_3)$  is a first degree polynomial in  $x_2$  and  $x_3$ . Hence we have completed the computation of  $\mathbf{V}_1 = (V_1(\mathbf{s}))_{\mathbf{s} \in S}$ .

From (1) we can easily compute  $P_1$ 's *optimal* strategy. Since he wants to maximize his payoff by choice of  $x_1 = x_1(1, 1, 1)$ , he will use the following strategy:

$$\hat{x}_1 = \begin{cases} 1 \text{ iff: } & \text{either } (p_1 + p_3 - 1 > 0 \text{ and } p_1 - p_3 > 0) \text{ or } (p_1 + p_3 - 1 < 0 \text{ and } p_1 - p_3 < 0) \\ 0 \text{ iff: } & \text{either } (p_1 + p_3 - 1 > 0 \text{ and } p_1 - p_3 < 0) \text{ or } (p_1 + p_3 - 1 < 0 \text{ and } p_1 - p_3 > 0) \end{cases} \quad (2)$$

For  $n \in \{2, 3\}$ , a similar analysis yields  $P_n$ 's payoff  $\mathbf{V}_n$  (as a function of strategy profile  $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, x_2, x_3)$ ) and his optimal strategy  $\hat{x}_n$ . The expressions for  $\hat{x}_2(1, 1, 1)$  and  $\hat{x}_3(1, 1, 1)$  are analogous to (2). It is easily checked that  $(\hat{x}_1, \hat{x}_2, \hat{x}_3)$  is the unique Nash equilibrium of  $\Gamma_3(\mathbf{p}, 3)$ .

## 4 The General Case

Let us now study the general case, i.e., when  $K \in \{3, 4, \dots\}$ .

### 4.1 Payoff Equations

For a given stationary strategy profile  $\mathbf{x}$ , for any  $\mathbf{s} = (s_1, s_2, s_3) \in S$  and any  $n \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ , let  $V_n(s_1, s_2, s_3) = Q_n(s_1, s_2, s_3, \mathbf{x})$  and  $\mathbf{V}_n = (V_n(\mathbf{s}))_{\mathbf{s} \in S}$ . We will now write the *payoff system*, i.e., the system of equations satisfied by  $\mathbf{V}_n = (V_n(\mathbf{s}))_{\mathbf{s} \in S}$ .

To this end we start by recognizing that, for a given stationary strategy profile  $\mathbf{x}$ , the process  $(\mathbf{s}(t))_{t=0}^{\infty}$  is a Markov chain. Let us define for each  $\mathbf{s} = (s_1, s_2, s_3) \in S$  the *neighborhood*  $\mathbf{N}(s_1, s_2, s_3)$  of  $\mathbf{s}$  to be the set of states reachable in one time step from  $\mathbf{s}$ . For example, when  $\mathbf{s} \in S_i$ , we have

$$\mathbf{N}(s_1, s_2, s_3) = \{(s_1 + 1, s_2 - 1, s_3), (s_1 - 1, s_2 + 1, s_3), \dots, (s_1, s_2 - 1, s_3 + 1)\}.$$

For every  $\mathbf{s} \in S$  and  $\mathbf{s}' \in \mathbf{N}(\mathbf{s})$  we define the transition probabilities

$$\pi_{\mathbf{s}', \mathbf{s}} = \Pr(\mathbf{s}(t + 1) = \mathbf{s}' | \mathbf{s}(t) = \mathbf{s}).$$

Then  $\mathbf{V}_1$  satisfies the following equations.

1. For boundary states we have:

$$V_1(K, 0, 0) = 1; \quad (3)$$

for all  $s_2 \in (0, 1, \dots, K)$ :

$$V_1(0, s_2, K - s_2) = 0; \quad (4)$$

and for all  $s_1 \in (1, \dots, K - 1)$ :

$$V_1(s_1, K - s_1, 0) = \sum_{\mathbf{s}' \in \mathbf{N}(s_1, K - s_1, 0)} \pi_{(s_1, K - s_1, 0), \mathbf{s}'} V_1(\mathbf{s}'),$$

$$V_1(s_1, 0, K - s_1) = \sum_{\mathbf{s}' \in \mathbf{N}(s_1, 0, K - s_1)} \pi_{(s_1, 0, K - s_1), \mathbf{s}'} V_1(\mathbf{s}'),$$

which becomes

$$V_1(s_1, K - s_1, 0) = p_1 V_1(s_1 + 1, K - s_1 - 1, 0) + (1 - p_1) V_1(s_1 - 1, K - s_1 + 1, 0) \quad (5)$$

$$V_1(s_1, 0, K - s_1) = (1 - p_3) V_1(s_1 + 1, 0, K - s_1 - 1) + p_1 V_1(s_1 - 1, 0, K - s_1 + 1). \quad (6)$$

2. For all interior states  $(s_1, s_2, s_3) \in S_i$  we have

$$V_1(s_1, s_2, s_3) = \sum_{\mathbf{s}' \in \mathbf{N}(s_1, s_2, s_3)} \pi_{(s_1, s_2, s_3), \mathbf{s}'} V_1(\mathbf{s}')$$

which can be written as either

$$\begin{aligned} V_1(s_1, s_2, s_3) = & \left( \frac{x_1(s_1, s_2, s_3) + (1 - x_2(s_1, s_2, s_3))}{3} \right) p_1 V_1(s_1 + 1, s_2 - 1, s_3) \\ & + \left( \frac{x_1(s_1, s_2, s_3) + (1 - x_2(s_1, s_2, s_3))}{3} \right) (1 - p_1) V_1(s_1 - 1, s_2 + 1, s_3) \\ & + \left( \frac{x_2(s_1, s_2, s_3) + (1 - x_3(s_1, s_2, s_3))}{3} \right) p_2 V_1(s_1, s_2 + 1, s_3 - 1) \\ & + \left( \frac{x_2(s_1, s_2, s_3) + (1 - x_3(s_1, s_2, s_3))}{3} \right) (1 - p_2) V_1(s_1, s_2 - 1, s_3 + 1) \\ & + \left( \frac{x_3(s_1, s_2, s_3) + (1 - x_1(s_1, s_2, s_3))}{3} \right) p_3 V_1(s_1 - 1, s_2, s_3 + 1) \\ & + \left( \frac{x_3(s_1, s_2, s_3) + (1 - x_1(s_1, s_2, s_3))}{3} \right) (1 - p_3) V_1(s_1 + 1, s_2, s_3 - 1), \quad (7) \end{aligned}$$

or as

$$\begin{aligned}
V_1(s_1, s_2, s_3) &= \frac{x_1(s_1, s_2, s_3)}{3} (p_1 V_1(s_1 + 1, s_2 - 1, s_3) + (1 - p_1) V_1(s_1 - 1, s_2 + 1, s_3)) \\
&+ \frac{(1 - x_1(s_1, s_2, s_3))}{3} ((1 - p_3) V_1(s_1 + 1, s_2, s_3 - 1) + p_3 V_1(s_1 - 1, s_2, s_3 + 1)) \\
&+ \frac{x_2(s_1, s_2, s_3)}{3} (p_2 V_1(s_1, s_2 + 1, s_3 - 1) + (1 - p_2) V_1(s_1, s_2 - 1, s_3 + 1)) \\
&+ \frac{(1 - x_2(s_1, s_2, s_3))}{3} ((1 - p_1) V_1(s_1 - 1, s_2 + 1, s_3) + p_1 V_1(s_1 + 1, s_2 - 1, s_3)) \\
&+ \frac{x_3(s_1, s_2, s_3)}{3} (p_3 V_1(s_1 - 1, s_2, s_3 + 1) + (1 - p_3) V_1(s_1 + 1, s_2, s_3 - 1)) \\
&+ \frac{(1 - x_3(s_1, s_2, s_3))}{3} ((1 - p_2) V_1(s_1, s_2 - 1, s_3 + 1) + p_2 V_1(s_1, s_2 + 1, s_3 - 1)).
\end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

For every  $(s_1, s_2, s_3) \in S_i$ , the values of the  $\pi_{(s_1, s_2, s_3), s'}$  probabilities can be read from (7); for  $(s_1, s_2, s_3) \in S_1$ , the values of the  $\pi_{(s_1, s_2, s_3), s'}$  probabilities can be read from (5)-(6).

The equations (3)-(8) are the *payoff system* for  $\mathbf{V}_1$ . We have similar payoff systems for  $\mathbf{V}_2$  and  $\mathbf{V}_3$ . In the rest of this section we will focus on  $\mathbf{V}_1$ . Let  $\Pi(\mathbf{x})$  be the transition probability matrix with  $\Pi_{\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{s}'}(\mathbf{x}) = \pi_{\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{s}'}(\mathbf{x})$  (for all  $\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{s}' \in S$ ). Then the *payoff system* can be written as

$$V_1(K, 0, 0) = 1 \text{ and } V_1(0, K, 0) = V_1(K, 0, 0) = 0 \text{ and } \mathbf{V}_1 = \Pi(\mathbf{x}) \mathbf{V}_1. \tag{9}$$

This is a linear system and can be solved by the standard methods. An alternative but equivalent form of (9) is the following. Recall that we have numbered the states  $\mathbf{s} \in S$  so that the first state is  $(K, 0, 0)$ , the second is  $(0, K, 0)$  and the third is  $(0, 0, K)$ . Now define the matrix  $\tilde{\Pi}_1(\mathbf{x})$  and the vector  $\mathbf{b}_1$  as follows:

$$\tilde{\Pi}_1(\mathbf{x}) = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ \pi_{4,1} & \pi_{4,2} & \dots & \pi_{4,N_K} \\ \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots \\ \pi_{N_K,1} & \pi_{N_K,2} & \dots & \pi_{N_K,N_K} \end{bmatrix}, \quad \mathbf{b}_1 = \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ \dots \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

Then (9) is equivalent to

$$\mathbf{V}_1 = \tilde{\Pi}_1(\mathbf{x}) \mathbf{V}_1 + \mathbf{b}_1. \tag{10}$$

If the payoff system (10) has exactly one solution  $\bar{\mathbf{V}}_1$ , then  $\bar{V}_1(s)$  is  $P_1$ 's payoff when the game starts with capitals  $s = (s_1, s_2, s_3)$ .

## 4.2 Markov Chains

As already mentioned, for every stationary strategy profile  $\mathbf{x}$ , the process  $(\mathbf{s}(t))_{t=0}^\infty$  is a Markov chain, with transition probability matrix  $\Pi(\mathbf{x})$ .



**Proposition 4.1** If for all  $m, n \in \{1, 2, 3\}$  we have  $p_{mn} \in (0, 1)$  then, for every  $\mathbf{x}$ , every interior state communicates with all terminal states.

**Proof.** Take any state  $\mathbf{s} = (s_1, s_2, s_3) \in S_i$  and suppose that the game is in  $\mathbf{s}$ ; let  $\delta = \min_{m,n} p_{mn}$ . Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr("P_1 \text{ is selected and he loses the turn}") &\geq \frac{1}{3} (x_{12}(\mathbf{s}) p_{21} + x_{13}(\mathbf{s}) p_{31}) \\ &\geq \frac{1}{3} (x_1(\mathbf{s}) p_{21} + (1 - x_1(\mathbf{s})) p_{31}) \geq \frac{\delta}{3}. \end{aligned}$$

In other words, there is a positive probability that the game moves to a state  $\mathbf{s}' = (s_1 - 1, s'_2, s'_3)$ . Hence there is a positive probability that eventually the game will reach a boundary state  $\mathbf{s}'' = (0, s'_2, s'_3)$ ; either  $\mathbf{s}''$  is a terminal state itself, or  $\mathbf{s}'' \in S \setminus (S_i \cup S_\tau)$  and communicates with both  $(0, K, 0)$  and  $(0, 0, K)$ . Hence  $\mathbf{s}$  communicates with both  $(0, K, 0)$  and  $(0, 0, K)$ . Repeating the argument for  $P_2$  we see that  $\mathbf{s}$  also communicates with  $(K, 0, 0)$ . ■

By Proposition 4.1 and standard Markov chain results [11, 16], every nonterminal state is transient and the game will reach *some* terminal state w.p. 1 and in finite expected time. Furthermore we have the following.

**Proposition 4.2** If for all  $m, n \in \{1, 2, 3\}$  we have  $p_{mn} \in (0, 1)$ , then, for every  $\mathbf{x}$ , the limit  $\bar{\Pi}(\mathbf{x}) = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \Pi^t(\mathbf{x})$  exists.

**Proof.** Recall that the three terminal states are numbered as first, second and third. Since they are absorbing and all other states are transient, the probability transition matrix has the form

$$\Pi(\mathbf{x}) = \begin{bmatrix} I & 0 \\ W & U \end{bmatrix}. \quad (11)$$

Then we have

$$\Pi^t(\mathbf{x}) = \begin{bmatrix} I & 0 \\ (\sum_{i=0}^{t-1} U^i) W & U^t \end{bmatrix}$$

By standard Markov chain results [11, 16]  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} U^t = 0$  and  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{i=0}^{t-1} U^i$  exists and equals  $(I - U)^{-1}$ . Hence

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \Pi^t(\mathbf{x}) = \begin{bmatrix} I & 0 \\ \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} (\sum_{i=0}^{t-1} U^i) W & U^t \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} I & 0 \\ (I - U)^{-1} W & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

This completes the proof. ■

**Proposition 4.3** If the limit  $\bar{\Pi}(\mathbf{x}) = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \Pi^t(\mathbf{x})$  exists then

$$\forall (s_1, s_2, s_3) \in S : \bar{\Pi}_{(s_1, s_2, s_3), (K, 0, 0)}(\mathbf{x}) = V_1(s_1, s_2, s_3).$$

**Proof.** Recall that

$$\forall (s_1, s_2, s_3) \in S : V_1(s_1, s_2, s_3) = \Pr("P_1 \text{ wins when the game has started in } (s_1, s_2, s_3)")$$

We have the following possibilities.

1. If  $(s_1, s_2, s_3) = (K, 0, 0)$ , then  $\bar{\Pi}_{(s_1, s_2, s_3), (K, 0, 0)}(\mathbf{x}) = 1 = V_1(K, 0, 0)$ .
2. If  $(s_1, s_2, s_3) = (0, K, 0)$ , then  $\bar{\Pi}_{(0, K, 0), (K, 0, 0)}(\mathbf{x}) = 0 = V_1(0, K, 0)$ .
3. If  $(s_1, s_2, s_3) = (0, 0, K)$ , then  $\bar{\Pi}_{(0, 0, K), (K, 0, 0)}(\mathbf{x}) = 0 = V_1(0, 0, K)$ .
4. If  $(s_1, s_2, s_3) \in S \setminus S_\tau$ , then  $\bar{\Pi}_{(s_1, s_2, s_3), (K, 0, 0)}(\mathbf{x}) = ((\sum_{i=0}^{\infty} U^i) W)_{(s_1, s_2, s_3), (K, 0, 0)}$ . This is the probability that:  $(s_1(t), s_2(t), s_3(t))$  stays in  $S \setminus S_\tau$  for  $i$  steps (for some  $i \in (0, 1, \dots)$ ) and then moves into  $(K, 0, 0)$ . In every such case  $P_1$  wins.

This completes the proof. ■

Hence we can compute  $\mathbf{V}_1$  as the limit of  $\Pi^t(\mathbf{x})$ . From standard MC analysis [11, 16] we can get estimates of the  $\Pi^t$  rate of convergence, mean absorption time etc. Another way to compute  $\mathbf{V}_1$  is provided by the following.

**Proposition 4.4** Suppose that  $\mathbf{x}$  is such that  $\bar{\Pi}(\mathbf{x}) = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \Pi^t(\mathbf{x})$  exists. Choose an arbitrary  $N_K \times 1$  vector  $\mathbf{U}_1^{(0)}$  and

$$\text{For } t \in \{0, 1, 2, \dots\} \text{ let: } \mathbf{U}_1^{(t+1)} = \tilde{\Pi}_1(\mathbf{x}) \mathbf{U}_1^{(t)} + \mathbf{b}_1. \quad (12)$$

The iteration (12) converges and  $\bar{\mathbf{U}} = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{U}^{(t)}$  is a solution of the payoff system (10).

**Proof.** The key fact here is that, for any solution  $\mathbf{V}_1$  of the payoff system:

1. when  $\mathbf{s} \in S_\tau$ ,  $V_1(\mathbf{s})$  is fixed to be either 0 or 1;
2. when  $\mathbf{s} \in S_\tau^c$ ,  $V_1(\mathbf{s})$  is the weighted average of its neighbors:

$$V_1(\mathbf{s}) = \sum_{\mathbf{s}' \in N(\mathbf{s})} \pi_{\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{s}'} V_1(\mathbf{s}').$$

Consequently, every solution of the payoff system is a harmonic function. Hence the payoff system has a unique solution  $\mathbf{V}_1$  which can be obtained as the limit of (12). ■

### 4.3 Stationary Equilibria

We want to show that  $\Gamma_3(\mathbf{p}, K)$  possesses a Nash equilibrium (NE), i.e., a strategy profile  $\hat{\sigma}$  such that:

$$\forall n, \forall \sigma_n : Q_n(\mathbf{s}(0), \hat{\sigma}_n, \hat{\sigma}_{-n}) \geq Q_n(\mathbf{s}(0), \sigma_n, \hat{\sigma}_{-n}) \quad (13)$$

To this end we introduce an auxiliary *discounted* game, denoted by  $\tilde{\Gamma}_3(\mathbf{p}, K, \gamma)$ , where  $\gamma \in (0, 1)$ .  $\tilde{\Gamma}_3(\mathbf{p}, K, \gamma)$  is the same as  $\Gamma_3(\mathbf{p}, K)$  except for the following.

1. In  $\tilde{\Gamma}_3(\mathbf{p}, K, \gamma)$  the states  $(K, 0, 0)$ ,  $(0, K, 0)$ ,  $(0, 0, K)$  are *preterminal* and we introduce a new terminal state  $\bar{s}$ ; state transition probabilities remain the same except that every preterminal state  $s \in S_\tau$  transits to  $\bar{s}$  with probability one.

2. We define *turn payoff* functions  $q_n(s)$ :

$$\forall n : q_n(s) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{iff } s \in S_n, \\ 0 & \text{else.} \end{cases}$$

3. The total payoff function  $\tilde{Q}_n$  and the expected total payoff function  $\tilde{Q}_n$  are defined as follows:

$$\tilde{Q}_n(\mathbf{h}) = \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t q_n(s), \quad \tilde{Q}_n(s(0), \sigma) = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{s}(0), \sigma} \left( \tilde{Q}_n(\mathbf{h}) \right)$$

$\tilde{\Gamma}_3(\mathbf{p}, K, \gamma)$  is a *discounted* stochastic game and, according to the following well known theorem, possesses a stationary NE.

**Proposition 4.5 (Fink [10])** Every  $N$ -player discounted stochastic game has a stationary Nash equilibrium.

In the following proposition we strengthen Fink's theorem for the case of  $\tilde{\Gamma}_3(\mathbf{p}, K, \gamma)$ .

**Proposition 4.6** For every  $\mathbf{p}$ ,  $K$  and  $\gamma$ ,  $\tilde{\Gamma}_3(\mathbf{p}, K, \gamma)$  has a deterministic stationary Nash equilibrium. In other words, there exists a  $\hat{\mathbf{x}} = (\hat{\mathbf{x}}_1, \hat{\mathbf{x}}_2, \hat{\mathbf{x}}_3)$  such that

$$\forall n \in \{1, 2, 3\}, \forall \mathbf{s}_0 \in S, \forall \mathbf{x}^n : \tilde{Q}^n(\mathbf{s}_0, \hat{\mathbf{x}}_n, \hat{\mathbf{x}}_{-n}) \geq \tilde{Q}^n(\mathbf{s}_0, \mathbf{x}_n, \hat{\mathbf{x}}_{-n}). \quad (14)$$

**Proof.** According to [10], for a general  $N$ -player discounted stochastic game, the following equations must be satisfied for all  $n$  and  $\mathbf{s}$  at a Nash equilibrium<sup>3</sup>:

$$\mathcal{V}_n(\mathbf{s}) = \max_{\sigma_n(\mathbf{s})} \sum_{a_1} \dots \sum_{a_N} \sigma_{1,a_1}(\mathbf{s}) \dots \sigma_{N,a_N}(\mathbf{s}) \left[ q_n(\mathbf{s}) + \gamma \sum_{\mathbf{s}'} \mathcal{P}(\mathbf{s}'|\mathbf{s}, a_1, \dots, a_N) \mathcal{V}_n(\mathbf{s}') \right], \quad (15)$$

where:

1.  $\sigma_n$  is  $P_n$ 's strategy,  $\sigma_n(\mathbf{s})$  is his action probability vector at state  $\mathbf{s}$  and  $\sigma_{n,a_n}(\mathbf{s})$  is the probability that, given the current game state is  $\mathbf{s}$ ,  $P_n$  plays action  $a_n$ .
2.  $\mathcal{V}_n(\mathbf{s})$  is the expected payoff to  $P_n$  obtained at equilibrium, when the game has started at state  $\mathbf{s}$  and the strategy and the strategy profile  $\sigma = (\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_N)$  is used.
3.  $q_n(\mathbf{s})$  is  $P_n$ 's turn payoff at state  $\mathbf{s}$ .
4.  $\mathcal{P}(\mathbf{s}'|\mathbf{s}, a_1, \dots, a_N)$  is the probability that, given that the current state is  $\mathbf{s}$  and the player actions are  $a_1, \dots, a_N$ , the next state is  $\mathbf{s}'$ .

---

<sup>3</sup>We have modified Fink's notation, so as to conform to our own.

Let us now consider  $\tilde{\Gamma}_3(\mathbf{p}, K, \gamma)$ . Since no player has a choice of strategy on boundary states, we only need to consider interior states  $\mathbf{s} = (s_1, s_2, s_3) \in S_i$ . Letting  $n = 1$  and taking into account (8), (15) becomes

$$V_1(s_1, s_2, s_3) = \max_{x_1(s_1, s_2, s_3)} \gamma G(x_1(s_1, s_2, s_3))$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} G(x_1(s_1, s_2, s_3)) &= x_1(s_1, s_2, s_3) \frac{p_1 V_1(s_1 + 1, s_2 - 1, s_3) + (1 - p_1) V_1(s_1 - 1, s_2 + 1, s_3)}{3} \\ &\quad + (1 - x_1(s_1, s_2, s_3)) \frac{(1 - p_3) V_1(s_1 + 1, s_2, s_3 - 1) + p_3 V_1(s_1 - 1, s_2, s_3 + 1)}{3} \\ &\quad + \text{terms which do not involve } x_1(s_1, s_2, s_3) \end{aligned}$$

Clearly, the maximum is achieved at either  $x_1(s_1, s_2, s_3) = 1$  or  $x_1(s_1, s_2, s_3) = 0$ . This holds for every interior state, hence  $P_1$ 's strategy at equilibrium is deterministic (or can be substituted by an equivalent deterministic one).

The same analysis can be applied to  $P_2$  and  $P_3$  to complete the proof. ■

**Corollary 4.7** For every  $\mathbf{p}$  and  $K$ ,  $\Gamma_3(\mathbf{p}, K)$  has a deterministic stationary NE.

**Proof.** Let  $\hat{\mathbf{x}} = (\hat{x}_1, \hat{x}_2, \hat{x}_3)$  be a deterministic stationary NE of  $\tilde{\Gamma}_3(\mathbf{p}, K, \gamma)$ . Suppose that, for some  $\mathbf{s}_0$  and  $t$ , we have

$$\tilde{Q}(\mathbf{s}_0, \hat{\mathbf{x}}) = \left( \tilde{Q}_1(\mathbf{s}_0, \hat{\mathbf{x}}), \tilde{Q}_2(\mathbf{s}_0, \hat{\mathbf{x}}), \tilde{Q}_3(\mathbf{s}_0, \hat{\mathbf{x}}) \right) = (\gamma^t, 0, 0).$$

This means that, in  $\tilde{\Gamma}_3(\mathbf{p}, K, \gamma)$ ,  $P_1$  has won at time  $t$ . Applying the same  $\hat{\mathbf{x}}$  in  $\Gamma_3(\mathbf{p}, K, \gamma)$ , we have

$$Q(\mathbf{s}_0, \hat{\mathbf{x}}) = (Q_1(\mathbf{s}_0, \hat{\mathbf{x}}), Q_2(\mathbf{s}_0, \hat{\mathbf{x}}), Q_3(\mathbf{s}_0, \hat{\mathbf{x}})) = (1, 0, 0).$$

Clearly

$$\forall \mathbf{x}_1 : Q_1(\mathbf{s}_0, \hat{\mathbf{x}}_1, \hat{\mathbf{x}}_{-1}) \geq Q_1(\mathbf{s}_0, \mathbf{x}_1, \hat{\mathbf{x}}_{-1}).$$

Also, if there was some  $\mathbf{y}_n$  (with  $n \in \{2, 3\}$ ) such that

$$Q_1(\mathbf{s}_0, \hat{\mathbf{x}}_n, \hat{\mathbf{x}}_{-n}) < Q_1(\mathbf{s}_0, \mathbf{y}_n, \hat{\mathbf{x}}_{-n})$$

then  $P_n$  could win  $\Gamma_3(\mathbf{p}, K)$  (when starting at  $\mathbf{s}_0$ ) by using  $\mathbf{y}_n$  against  $\hat{\mathbf{x}}_{-n}$ . But then he could also win  $\tilde{\Gamma}_3(\mathbf{p}, K, \gamma)$  (when starting at  $\mathbf{s}_0$ ) by using the same  $\mathbf{y}_n$  against  $\hat{\mathbf{x}}_{-n}$ , so we would have

$$\tilde{Q}_1(\mathbf{s}_0, \hat{\mathbf{x}}_n, \hat{\mathbf{x}}_{-n}) < \tilde{Q}_1(\mathbf{s}_0, \mathbf{y}_n, \hat{\mathbf{x}}_{-n}).$$

But this is contrary to the hypothesis. The proof is similar for the case in which, for some  $\mathbf{s}_0$  and  $t$ ,

$$\tilde{Q}(\mathbf{s}_0, \hat{\mathbf{x}}) = \left( \tilde{Q}_1(\mathbf{s}_0, \hat{\mathbf{x}}), \tilde{Q}_2(\mathbf{s}_0, \hat{\mathbf{x}}), \tilde{Q}_3(\mathbf{s}_0, \hat{\mathbf{x}}) \right) = (0, 0, 0).$$

We conclude that:

$$\forall n \in \{1, 2, 3\}, \forall \mathbf{s}_0 \in S, \forall \mathbf{x}^n : \tilde{Q}_n(\mathbf{s}_0, \hat{\mathbf{x}}_n, \hat{\mathbf{x}}_{-n}) \geq \tilde{Q}_n(\mathbf{s}_0, \mathbf{x}_n, \hat{\mathbf{x}}_{-n})$$

and the proof is complete. ■

## 4.4 Nonstationary Equilibria

So far we have established that  $\Gamma_3(\mathbf{p}, K)$  has at least one stationary NE. It is conceivable that the existence of *nonstationary* NE can also be established by standard game theoretical arguments. We will only present some initial ideas on the subject, and relegate a full analysis to the future.

We limit our discussion to a variant of the discounted game, which we call  $\Gamma'_3(\mathbf{p}, K, \gamma)$ . This is the same as  $\tilde{\Gamma}_3(\mathbf{p}, K, \gamma)$ , except in that the losing players incur a cost of  $-1$ ; hence a player who loses all his capital at some time  $t'$ , receives payoff  $-\gamma^{t'}$ .

In  $\Gamma'_3(\mathbf{p}, K, \gamma)$  a player wants to win or, if this is not possible, to lose at the latest possible time. Under the circumstances, it is conceivable that, for example,  $P_1$  and  $P_2$  form an alliance against  $P_3$ , with the goal of bankrupting him first. For example,  $P_1$  and  $P_2$  might continuously play against  $P_3$ , forming in effect a “superplayer” with a higher probability of defeating  $P_3$ . However, what is required is a mechanism to enforce the alliance. This can be provided by using a “trigger” strategy:  $P_1$  selects  $P_3$  as long as  $P_2$  does the same; if at some round  $P_2$  selects  $P_1$ , then  $P_1$  selects  $P_2$  in all subsequent rounds. It appears likely that, under appropriate conditions on  $\gamma$ , this strategy will be a (nonstationary) NE. A “tit-for-tat” strategy might work in similar manner.

## 5 Computation of Stationary Equilibria

We now present a very preliminary examination of stationary NE computation (a more extensive account will be presented at a later time). We want to find a stationary strategy profile  $\hat{\mathbf{x}}$  such that:

$$\forall n, \mathbf{s}, \mathbf{x}_n : Q_n(\mathbf{s}, \hat{\mathbf{x}}_n, \hat{\mathbf{x}}_{-n}) \geq Q_n(\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{x}_n, \hat{\mathbf{x}}_{-n}) \quad (16)$$

or, equivalently,

$$\forall n, \mathbf{s}, \mathbf{x}_n : V_{n,\mathbf{s}}(\hat{\mathbf{x}}_n, \hat{\mathbf{x}}_{-n}) \geq V_{n,\mathbf{s}}(\mathbf{x}_n, \hat{\mathbf{x}}_{-n}). \quad (17)$$

Now, (17) can be rewritten as

$$\forall n, \mathbf{s} : V_{n,\mathbf{s}}(\hat{\mathbf{x}}_n, \hat{\mathbf{x}}_{-n}) = \max_{\mathbf{x}_n} V_{n,\mathbf{s}}(\mathbf{x}_n, \hat{\mathbf{x}}_{-n}) = \max_{\mathbf{x}_n} \left( \left[ \tilde{\Pi}(\mathbf{x}_n, \hat{\mathbf{x}}_{-n}) \mathbf{V}_n + \mathbf{u}_n \right]_s \right). \quad (18)$$

We define

$$\forall n, \mathbf{s} : F_{n,\mathbf{s}}(\mathbf{V}_1 | \mathbf{x}) = \max_{\mathbf{x}_n} \left( \left[ \tilde{\Pi}(\mathbf{x}) \mathbf{V}_n + \mathbf{u}_n \right]_s \right) \quad (19)$$

Then we can rewrite (18) as

$$\forall n : \mathbf{V}_n(\hat{\mathbf{x}}_n, \hat{\mathbf{x}}_{-n}) = \mathbf{F}_n(\mathbf{V}_n | \hat{\mathbf{x}}), \quad (20)$$

This system of nonlinear equations will, by the previous analysis, have at least one solution. We can either solve (20) directly or, alternatively, minimize

$$J(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{n=1}^3 \|\mathbf{V}_n(\hat{\mathbf{x}}_n, \hat{\mathbf{x}}_{-n}) - \mathbf{F}_n(\mathbf{V}_n | \hat{\mathbf{x}})\|^2. \quad (21)$$

One possibility is to solve (20) by exhaustive enumeration. For a given  $K$  we have  $g(K) = \frac{(K+1)(K+2)}{2} - 3K$  states in which there exist strategy choices and, if we limit ourselves to pure

strategies, for each such state we have  $2^3 = 8$  strategy outcome combinations. Hence there exist  $h(K) = 2^{3g(K)}$  possible overall strategy combinations. In the following table we list the values of  $g(K)$  and  $h(K)$  as functions of  $K$ .

$K$	3	4	5	6	7
$g(K)$	1	3	6	10	15
$h(K)$	$2^3 = 8$	$2^9 = 512$	$2^{18} = 262\,144$	$2^{30} = 1\,073\,741\,824$	$2^{45} = 35\,184\,372\,088\,832$

**Table 1**

It appears that finding a NE by exhaustive enumeration is feasible for , for  $K < 6$ ; for larger  $K$  values the computational burden is probably unmanageable.

An alternative approach is to use an iterative approach, inspired from *Value Iteration* which provably yields a solution for *two-player zero-sum* games [9]. Based on this, we can use the *MultiValue Iteration* (MVI) defined as follows.

$$\forall n, s : V_n^{(t+1)}(s) = F_{n,s}(\mathbf{V}_n^{(t)}(s|\mathbf{x}^{(t)})). \quad (22)$$

If (22) converges (which is not a priori guaranteed) it can be proved that the limit will be a solution of (20).

Finally, we can use various optimization algorithms to find a global minimum (which must be equal to zero) of the function

$$J(\hat{\mathbf{x}}) = \sum_{n=1}^3 \|\mathbf{V}_n(\hat{\mathbf{x}}_n, \hat{\mathbf{x}}_{-n}) - \mathbf{F}_n(\mathbf{V}_n|\hat{\mathbf{x}})\|^2. \quad (23)$$

We have applied several optimization algorithms, provided by the Matlab software system, to the minimization of (23). Most notably, we have used the following:

1. The Matlab function `fmincon` [17], which performs constrained gradient based optimization [20].
2. The Matlab function `particleswarm` [18], which implements *particle swarm optimization* [31].

We have performed several preliminary experiments and have found out that the best performance is obtained by the MVI algorithm; hence we only report results obtained by this particular algorithm. The main question is whether the algorithm converges. We have run 100 repetitions of the following experiment.

After randomly selecting a probabilities vector  $\mathbf{p} \in (0, 1)^3$  we run MVI for 150 runs for each  $K \in \{3, 4, \dots, 9\}$ , always initializing with  $\mathbf{x}^{(0)} = \mathbf{0}$ . If a solution  $\hat{\mathbf{x}}$  of the optimality equations (i.e., an equilibrium strategy profile) is achieved we count this as one successful run of the MVI algorithm. After the 150 runs are completed, we compute, for each  $K$ , the proportion of successful runs. The results are plotted in Figure 1.




Figure 1: Proportion of succesful MVI runs for 100 randomly selected  $\mathbf{p}$  vectors, as a function of  $K$ .




Figure 2: Proportion of succesful MVI runs for 100 randomly selected  $\mathbf{p}$  vectors, as a function of  $K$ .

It can be seen that MVI is “relatively” succesful. That is, the proportion of convergent runs is a decreasing function of  $K$  (i.e., it is harder to find a solution for larger  $K$  values) and we have a “reasonable” probability of success for  $K \leq 7$ ; furthermore, even for  $K \in \{8, 9\}$  we have a 50% or better probability of obtaining a solution. It must be emphasized that this is a lower bound on the performance of MVI. Running MVI repeatedly for a specific  $\mathbf{p}$ , with random initialization of  $\mathbf{x}^{(0)}$ , yields a higher success proportion, as our preliminary experiments (not reported here) indicate.

If we look at the MVI iteration (22) as a dynamical system, parametrized by  $\mathbf{p}$  and  $K$ , a natural question is this: given some  $K$ , for which subset  $\mathfrak{P}_K \subset [0, 1]^3$  does  $\mathbf{p} \in \mathfrak{P}_K$  ensure that (22) converges? Roughly speaking, the results of Figure 1 indicate that, for example, the volume of  $\mathfrak{P}_1$  is 1.00, that of  $\mathfrak{P}_2$  around 0.90 and so on. To further investigate this point, we repeat the above experiment for a restricted set of  $\mathbf{p}$  values. For example, when we fix  $p_1 = 1$  and choose  $p_2$  and  $p_3$  randomly, we obtain the results of Figure 2. Obviously for  $\mathbf{p} \in \{1\} \times [0, 1]^2$  the MVI algorithm has much higher probability of convergence.

We conclude this section by an initial numerical exploration of the following question:

*how much does a player benefit by playing optimally?*

To answer this, we perform several experiments of the following type.

1. We fix a particular  $\mathbf{p}$  vector and, for  $K = 9$ , use the MVI algorithm to obtain a NE  $(\hat{\mathbf{x}}_1, \hat{\mathbf{x}}_2, \hat{\mathbf{x}}_3)$  and the corresponding  $V_1(\hat{\mathbf{x}}_1, \hat{\mathbf{x}}_2, \hat{\mathbf{x}}_3)$ .
2. We assign to  $P_1$  a random strategy  $\bar{\mathbf{x}}_1$  and compute his payoff  $V_1(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_1, \hat{\mathbf{x}}_2, \hat{\mathbf{x}}_3)$ .
3. We compute the difference  $\overline{\delta V}_1 = V_1(\hat{\mathbf{x}}_1, \hat{\mathbf{x}}_2, \hat{\mathbf{x}}_3) - V_1(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_1, \hat{\mathbf{x}}_2, \hat{\mathbf{x}}_3)$ .
4. We repeat steps 2 and 3 by assigning the random strategy  $\bar{\mathbf{x}}_n$  to  $P_n$ , for  $n \in \{2, 3\}$ .

For  $n \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ ,  $\overline{\delta V}_n$  is a measure of how much  $P_n$  benefits by using the equilibrium strategy  $\widehat{\mathbf{x}}_n$  rather the random strategy  $\overline{\mathbf{x}}_n$ , given that the other two players use the equilibrium strategy. Because  $(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}_1, \widehat{\mathbf{x}}_2, \widehat{\mathbf{x}}_3)$  is a NE, we know that  $\overline{\delta V}_n$  will always be nonnegative; a large  $\overline{\delta V}_n$  indicates that  $P_n$  has a large incentive for using  $\widehat{\mathbf{x}}_n$ .

We also repeat the above suite of experiments comparing the equilibrium strategy  $\widehat{\mathbf{x}}_n$  to a uniform strategy  $\widetilde{\mathbf{x}}_n$ , by which, at every state  $\mathbf{s}$ ,  $P_n$  selects equiprobably one of the surviving players; now we compute the quantities  $\widetilde{\delta V}_n = V_1(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}_n, \widehat{\mathbf{x}}_{-n}) - V_1(\widetilde{\mathbf{x}}_n, \widehat{\mathbf{x}}_{-n})$ .

We perform the above experiments for several  $\mathbf{p}$  values and present our results in the following table.

$\mathbf{p}$	$\overline{\delta V}_1$	$\overline{\delta V}_2$	$\overline{\delta V}_3$	$\widetilde{\delta V}_1$	$\widetilde{\delta V}_2$	$\widetilde{\delta V}_3$
(0.10, 0.10, 0.10)	0.2357	0.2266	0.2072	0.1995	0.1995	0.1995
(0.90, 0.00, 0.50)	0.0619	0.0071	0.0726	0.0643	0.5321	0.0863
(0.80, 0.80, 0.50)	0.1455	0.0339	0.0318	0.1177	0.0462	0.0308
(0.3922, 0.8932, 0.6634)	0.0088	0.1421	0.0084	0.0091	0.1017	0.0069
(0.53, 0.20, 0.80)	0.0025	0.0033	$0.0948 \times 10^{-12}$	0.0032	0.0026	$0.0963 \times 10^{-12}$
(0.9000, 0.8747, 0.2252)	0.0616	0.0032	0.0006	0.0519	0.0023	0.0009

**Table 1**

Keeping in mind that the quantities  $\overline{\delta V}_n$  and  $\widetilde{\delta V}_n$  are differences between winning probabilities, the results of Table 1 indicate that in some cases a player has considerable incentive to use the equilibrium strategy; this is the case for the  $\mathbf{p}$ 's in rows one to four of the table. On the other hand, for the  $\mathbf{p}$ 's of rows five and six the player does not gain much by staying at equilibrium.

## 6 Conclusion

We have presented a strategic game version of the Three Gamblers' Ruin, formulated it as a stochastic game and proved that it always has at least one stationary deterministic NE. We have also briefly investigated the computational aspects of the game. We believe there is scope for much additional research on strategic variants of the Gambler's ruin; we conclude by listing several such variants which we consider worthy of further study in the future.

1. The game is played as before but ends when one player is eliminated. Payoff to each player is his capital at the end of the game.
2. The game is played as previously but the payoff is the *total discounted* capital  $\sum_t \gamma^t s_n(t)$ .
3. All of the above games can be generalized to games involving  $N$  gamblers.
4. The game is played on a graph with a gambler on each vertex; gamblers can only play against their neighbors.



## References

- [1] Amano, K. et al. “On a generalized ruin problem.” *International Workshop on Randomization and Approximation Techniques in Computer Science*. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2001.
- [2] Bruss, F. T., Louchard, G. and Turner, J. W. (2003). “On the  $N$ -tower problem and related problems”. *Adv. Appl. Prob.*, vol.35, pp. 278-294.
- [3] Chang, D. K. (1995). “A game with four players”. *Stat. & Prob. Letters*, vol. 23, pp. 111–15.
- [4] Cho, D.-H. (1996). “A game with  $N$  players”. *J. of the Korean Stat. Soc.*, vol. 25, pp. 185–93.
- [5] David, G. (2015) “Markov chain solution to the 3-tower problem”. In *Information and Communication Technology: Third IFIP TC 5/8 International Conference*.
- [6] Edwards, A. W. F. (1983), “Pascal’s problem: the gambler’s ruin”, *Int. Statistical Review*, vol. 51, pp. 73–79.
- [7] Engel, A. (1993). “The computer solves the three tower problem”. *Amer. Math. Monthly*, vol. 100, pp.62-67.
- [8] Feller, W. (1991), *An introduction to probability theory and its applications*, Vol. 1. John Wiley & Sons.
- [9] Filar J. and Vrieze K., (1997), *Competitive Markov Decision Processes: Theory, Algorithms, and Applications*. Springer.
- [10] Fink, A.M., (1964), “Equilibrium in a stochastic  $n$ -person game”. *J. of Sci. of the Hiroshima University, Series AI (Mathematics)*, vol. 28, pp.89-93.
- [11] Grinstead, C.M., and J.L. Snell, (1997), *Introduction to probability*. American Mathematical Soc.
- [12] Grigorescu , I. and Yao, Y.C., (2016), “Maximizing the variance of the time to ruin in a multiplayer game with selection”. *Adv. in Appl. Prob.*, vol. 48, pp.610-630.
- [13] Hashemiparast S.M. , Sabzevar M., (2011), “The asymmetric  $n$ -player gambler’s ruin problem with ties allowed and simulation”, *J. of the Korean Stat. Soc.*, vol. 40, pp. 267-276.
- [14] Hussain A., (2021), “A three-player gambler’s ruin problem: some extensions”. *Sci. Inq. and Rev.*, vol. 5, pp. 1-11.
- [15] Hussain A., (2023), “The ruin time for 3-player gambler’s problem: an approximate formula”, *Com. in Stat.–Simulation and Computation*, vol. 52, pp. 1651-1659.
- [16] Kemeny, J. G., and Snell, J.L., (1969), *Finite Markov chains*. Princeton, NJ: van Nostrand.
- [17] Matlab documentation for `fmincon`, <https://nl.mathworks.com/help/optim/ug/fmincon.html>.

- [18] Matlab documentation for the particle swarm optimization function `pso`, <https://nl.mathworks.com/help/gads/particleswarm.html>.
- [19] Néda Z., Újvári, L.D.S. and Istrate, G., (2017), “Gambler’s ruin problem on Erdős–Rényi graphs”, *Physica A*, vol. 468, pp. 147–157.
- [20] Nocedal, J., Öztoprak, F., and Waltz, R.A., (2014), “An interior point method for nonlinear programming with infeasibility detection capabilities”. *Optimization Methods & Software*, vol. 29, pp. 837–854.
- [21] Read R. C., (1966), “A type of gambler’s ruin problem”, *The Amer. Math. Monthly*, vol. 73, pp. 177-179.
- [22] Rocha A. and Stern F., (1999), “The gambler’s ruin problem with  $N$  players and asymmetric play”. *Stat. Probabil. Lett.*, vol. 44, pp. 87-95.
- [23] Rocha, A. L., and F. Stern. (2004). “The asymmetric  $n$ -player gambler’s ruin problem with equal initial fortunes”. *Adv. in Appl. Mathematics*, vol. 33, pp. 512–30.
- [24] Ross, S. M. (2009). “A simple solution to a multiple player gambler’s ruin problem”. *Amer. Math. Monthly*, vol. 116, pp. 77-81.
- [25] Swan, Y. C. and Bruss, F. T. (2006). “A matrix-analytic approach to the  $N$ -player ruin problem”. *J. Appl. Prob.* 43, 755-766
- [26] Sandell, D., (1988). “A game with three players”. *Stat. & Prob. Letters*, vol. 7, pp. 61–63.
- [27] Song, S. and Song, J. (2013) “A note on the history of the gambler’s ruin problem”. *Comm. Statist. Applic. Methods*, vol. 20, pp. 1–12.
- [28] Stirzaker, D. (1994), “Tower problems and martingales”. *Math. Scientist*, vol. 19, pp. 52-59.
- [29] Stirzaker, D. (2006), “Three-Handed Gambler’s Ruin”, *Adv. in Appl. Prob.*, vol. 38, pp. 284-286.
- [30] Takacs, L. (1969). “On the classical ruin problems”. *J. of the Amer. Stat. Assoc.*, vol. 64, pp. 889–906.
- [31] Wang, D., Tan D., and Liu, L., (2018), “Particle swarm optimization algorithm: an overview.” *Soft Computing*, vol. 22, pp. 387-408.