

Enforce and selective operators of combinatorial games

Tomoaki Abuku^{1†}, Shun-ichi Kimura^{2†}, Hironori Kiya^{3†},
Urban Larsson^{4†}, Indrajit Saha^{5*†}, Koki Suetsugu^{1†},
Takahiro Yamashita^{2†}

¹ National Institute of Informatics, Hitotsubashi, Chiyoda, 101-8430, Tokyo, Japan.

² Department of Mathematics, Hiroshima University, Kagamiyama, Higashi-Hiroshima City, 739-8526, Hiroshima, Japan.

³ Department of Informatics, Osaka Metropolitan University, Gakuencho, Nakaku, Sakai, 599-8531, Osaka, Japan.

⁴ Industrial Engineering and Operations Research, Indian Institute of Technology Bombay, Powai, Mumbai, 400076, Maharashtra, India.

⁵ Department of Informatics, Kyushu University, Motooka, Fukuoka, 819-0395, Fukuoka, Japan.

*Corresponding author(s). E-mail(s): indrajit@inf.kyushu-u.ac.jp;
Contributing authors: buku3416@gmail.com;
skimura@hiroshima-u.ac.jp; kiya@omu.ac.jp; larsson@iitb.ac.in;
suetsugu.koki@gmail.com; d236676@hiroshima-u.ac.jp;

†These authors contributed equally to this work.

Abstract

We consider an *enforce operator* on impartial rulesets similar to the Muller Twist and the comply/constrain operator of Smith and Stănică, 2002. Applied to the rulesets \mathbf{A} and \mathbf{B} , on each turn the opponent enforces one of the rulesets and the current player complies, by playing a move in that ruleset. If the outcome table of the enforce variation of \mathbf{A} and \mathbf{B} is the same as the outcome table of \mathbf{A} , then we say that \mathbf{A} dominates \mathbf{B} . We find necessary and sufficient conditions for this relation. Additionally, we define a *selective operator* and explore a distributive-lattice-like structure within applicable rulesets. Lastly, we define the nim-value of rulesets under the enforce operator and establish well-known properties for impartial games.

Keywords: Nim, Wythoff nim, Combinatorial game theory, Comply/Constrain operator, Enforce operator, Muller twist, Selective operator, Nim-value.

1 Introduction

The Muller Twist of a combinatorial game was popularized through the ruleset QUARTO.¹ The first occurrences in the literature are [HR01] and [SS02], and the term *comply/constrain* was coined. At each stage of play, before the current player makes a move, the opponent may constrain their set of options. The current player complies and plays according to the constrained ruleset. After each move, any previous constraint is forgotten. Various contributions study a variation of a Muller Twist as a *blocking maneuver*. In such rulesets, typically, a given parameter determines the maximum number of prohibited/constrained moves within given subsets of the options [HR01, HR1, HR, GS04, HL06, L09, L11, L15, CLN17].

Here we introduce a comply/constrain operator on pairs of rulesets that we dub the *enforce-operator*. Given a couple of rulesets with a common position set, at each stage of play, before the current player moves, exactly one of the rulesets is enforced by the opponent (meaning that all the other ones are prohibited).²

Example 1. The ruleset YAMA NIM is like TWO HEAP NIM, except that a player must remove at least two tokens from one heap and, in the same move, add one token to the other heap [KiY23, Y23]. For an example of our enforce-operator, if the pair of rulesets is NIM and YAMA NIM, and the position is $(1, 1)$, then the current player cannot move if the other player enforces YAMA NIM. That would be a successful previous player constraint. If the position is $(0, 2)$, the current player can win immediately unless YAMA NIM is enforced. By following the ruleset of YAMA NIM, the only option is $(1, 0)$, from which YAMA NIM should be enforced. Thus, in the combined game of NIM and YAMA NIM, $(0, 2)$ is a win for the current player.

We will show how YAMA NIM dominates NIM in the sense that the solution of YAMA NIM coincides with the solution of the enforce-ruleset of NIM and YAMA NIM.

To the best of our knowledge, we generalize this idea to a new concept of ruleset domination for classes of impartial combinatorial games. Our main result is a precise description of when a ruleset dominates another ruleset.

In addition, we establish that domination is not an order, but we establish properties close to those of an order. We define the notion of strong domination with respect to pairs of rulesets and show that strong domination implies domination. We prove that strong domination satisfies the desired transitive properties.

Further, we study another operator referred to as the *selective operator*; on each turn, the current player selects exactly one of a given set of rulesets and plays according

¹The game QUARTO, created by Blaise Muller and published by Gigamic, was one of the five Mensa Games of the Year in 1993 and has received other international awards.

²Usually there will be a pair of rulesets, but any finite (or infinite) number of rulesets could belong to the given set.

to its rules. The two operators can be combined as long as the rulesets share the same position set, i.e. ‘game board’. We demonstrate a distributive-lattice-like structure of the combined operators.

Moreover, we define nim-values under enforce-rulesets and argue that the famous Sprague-Grundy theory continues to hold. In particular, we prove that when there are several game components, some of them with enforce-rulesets, their disjunctive sum is a loss for the current player if and only if the nim-sum of their defined nim-values is 0.

1.1 Related literature

A blocking variation of NIM was introduced as a problem in [HR01]. This variation proceeds the same way as ordinary NIM [B02], but before each move, the opponent may block at most one option. In [HR], the authors solve this blocking variation of NIM on three heaps. The preprint [HR1] generalizes blocking NIM to any composition of impartial games and computes their nim-values under a blocking maneuver. They claim that the strategy for this composite blocking is similar to the non-blocking version. In [SS02] they study NIM-type games where the opponent blocks the removal of an odd or even number of pieces. Authors in [GS04] consider the same ruleset, but “the number taken must not be equivalent to some numbers modulo n ”. In [HL06], the authors introduce the Muller Twist in connection with WYTHOFF NIM; here bishop-type moves can be blocked. The authors prove that the solutions of such games are close to certain Beatty sequences. In [H08, SR18], Muller Twist explores with a specific (SUBTRACTION) ruleset of our operator. Both papers study the periodicity of the nim-values for a given SUBTRACTION set S . In [H08], consider the set of legal moves from a set of infinite arithmetic sequences, while in [SR18] generalizes [H08] by allowing finite arithmetic progression moves.

In [L09], the author considers TWO PILE NIM with a move-size dynamic constraint on the moves. The author proves that the winning strategy is \mathcal{P} -equivalent to WYTHOFF NIM with a blocking maneuver on the bishop-type moves. In [L15], the author considers several restrictions of the game m -WYTHOFF NIM, which is an extension of WYTHOFF NIM. The author considers a blocking maneuver on the rook-type options and finds that they are \mathcal{P} -equivalent to specific congruence restrictions on the rook-type options. In [L11], the author considers BLOCKING WYTHOFF NIM with a generic blocking maneuver; for a given parameter k , at each stage of play, at most $k - 1$ options may be blocked by the opponent. The author finds the winning strategies for $k = 2$ and $k = 3$. In [CLN17], the authors demonstrate that BLOCKING WYTHOFF NIM can be solved by a cellular automaton. The authors also present experimental results showing fascinating self-organized structures as the blocking parameter k increases. Another class of games in the context of Muller Twist is PUSH THE BUTTON [DU18], which have two rulesets, denoted as A and B . A game starts by moving according to the A ruleset, but at some point, a player may press the button, and all subsequent moves are played according to the B ruleset. Games with Muller Twists are similar, except that the button is pressed many times, switching back and forth between the rulesets. The authors study pairwise combinations of the classical rulesets NIM, WYTHOFF NIM, and EUCLID, and compute the winning positions for the combined rulesets.

1.2 Organization

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 defines our combinatorial games. Section 3 introduces selective and enforce operators, and solves the ruleset domination problem. Section 4 establishes a distributive-lattice-like structure for our operators. Section 5 discusses the nim-value for the enforce operator.

2 Impartial rulesets and games

Our terminology and notation is an adaptation of [S13] (see also [C76] and [BCG82]). Here we will make a clear distinction of ‘ruleset’ and ‘game’. Usually one is interested in a comparison of game positions (or game values) but here the main interest is a comparison of entire rulesets. This type of research will require a common ‘game board’.

Definition 2 (Impartial Ruleset). Let \mathcal{X} be a set of game positions and let $f : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \text{pow}(\mathcal{X})$ be an option map which sends $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}$ to its set of options $f(\mathbf{x}) \subset \mathcal{X}$. Then (\mathcal{X}, f) is an impartial ruleset.

Informally, we call the set \mathcal{X} of all (starting) positions, the ‘game board’.

Definition 3 (Terminal Position). If $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}$ satisfies $f(\mathbf{x}) = \emptyset$, then \mathbf{x} is a terminal position.

All our rulesets will be short and we define the same in the following.

Definition 4 (Short Ruleset). The ruleset $A = (\mathcal{X}, f)$ is short if for any $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}$, there exists a non-negative integer $T_A(\mathbf{x})$ such that every play sequence starting in \mathbf{x} , terminates in at most $T_A(\mathbf{x})$ moves.

Given a short ruleset (\mathcal{X}, f) , we play a 2-player game by assigning a starting position $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}$ and a starting player. The players choose an option alternately, and a player who must play from a terminal position loses (normal-play convention).

Unless otherwise stated, we consider the normal-play convention for determining the perfect play outcomes, i.e., the \mathcal{P} -positions and \mathcal{N} -positions. A \mathcal{P} -position is a position, for which the previous player wins (the current player loses) and otherwise the position is an \mathcal{N} -position.

Definition 5 (Outcome). Consider a ruleset $A = (\mathcal{X}, f)$. Then $\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{x}) = \mathcal{O}_A(\mathbf{x}) \in \{\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{N}\}$ is the perfect play outcome of the position $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}$, under ruleset A .

For example, if $\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{x}) = \mathcal{P}$, then \mathbf{x} is a \mathcal{P} -position. Let $\mathbb{Z}_{>0} = \{1, 2, \dots\}$ and $\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} = \mathbb{Z}_{>0} \cup \{0\}$ denote the positive and non-negative integers respectively. The next examples review four impartial rulesets on the common game board $\mathcal{X} = \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \times \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$.

Example 6 (TWO HEAP NIM). For all positions $(x, y) \in \mathcal{X}$ of NIM, the set of options is

$$f((x, y)) = \{(x - i, y) \mid 1 \leq i \leq x\} \\ \cup \{(x, y - i) \mid 1 \leq i \leq y\}.$$

NIM outcome $\mathcal{O}((x, y)) = \mathcal{P}$ if and only if $x = y$.

We introduce the ruleset CORNER THE BISHOP.

Example 7 (CORNER THE BISHOP). For all positions $(x, y) \in \mathcal{X}$ of CORNER THE BISHOP, the set of options is

$$f((x, y)) = \{(x - i, y - i) \mid 1 \leq i \leq \min(x, y)\}.$$

CORNER THE BISHOP outcome $\mathcal{O}((x, y)) = \mathcal{P}$ if and only if $x = 0$ or $y = 0$.

Example 8 (WYTHOFF NIM [W07]). Consider WYTHOFF NIM. Then, for all $(x, y) \in \mathcal{X}$, the set of options is

$$f((x, y)) = \{(x - i, y) \mid 1 \leq i \leq x\} \\ \cup \{(x, y - i) \mid 1 \leq i \leq y\} \\ \cup \{(x - i, y - i) \mid 1 \leq i \leq \min(x, y)\}.$$

WYTHOFF NIM outcome $\mathcal{O}((x, y)) = \mathcal{P}$ if and only if $x = \lfloor n\alpha \rfloor$ and $y = x + n$, for some $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$, where $\alpha = \frac{1+\sqrt{5}}{2}$, or vice versa.

Example 9 (YAMA NIM [KiY23, Y23]). For all positions $(x, y) \in \mathcal{X}$ of YAMA NIM, the set of options is

$$f((x, y)) = \{(x - i, y + 1) \mid 2 \leq i \leq x\} \\ \cup \{(x + 1, y - i) \mid 2 \leq i \leq y\}.$$

The YAMA NIM outcome $\mathcal{O}((x, y)) = \mathcal{P}$ if and only if $|x - y| \leq 1$.

We illustrate the options of NIM, CORNER THE BISHOP, WYTHOFF NIM and YAMA NIM in Figure 1. A black circle represents a typical starting position $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}$ and the white circles represent the options $f(\mathbf{x})$, of the respective rulesets. The outcomes of NIM, CORNER THE BISHOP, WYTHOFF NIM and YAMA NIM are illustrated in Figure 2.




Fig. 1: The pictures represent typical options of (a) NIM, (b) CORNER THE BISHOP, (c) WYTHOFF NIM and (d) YAMA NIM respectively (with starting position the filled circle).




Fig. 2: The pictures represent the \mathcal{P} -positions of (a) NIM, (b) CORNER THE BISHOP, (c) WYTHOFF NIM and (d) YAMA NIM respectively for an initial 11 by 11 game board.

3 New operators of combinatorial games

In this section, we introduce the *selective* and *enforce* operators. The selective operator is the natural ‘dual’ to our defined enforce operator (Definition 13). Together they satisfy some nice properties (see Section 4).

Definition 10 (Jointly Short). Let $A = (\mathcal{X}, f_A)$ and $B = (\mathcal{X}, f_B)$ be short rulesets on a set \mathcal{X} . Then A and B are jointly short if the ruleset (\mathcal{X}, f) given by, for all $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}$, $f(\mathbf{x}) = f_A(\mathbf{x}) \cup f_B(\mathbf{x})$, is short.

Informally we will say A -options or B -options for these respective sets $f_A(\mathbf{x})$ or $f_B(\mathbf{x})$.

In more generality, a set of short rulesets $\{A_i\}$ is *jointly short*, if the ruleset (\mathcal{X}, f) given by, for all $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}$, $f(\mathbf{x}) = \bigcup_i f_{A_i}(\mathbf{x})$, is short.

Definition 11 (Selective Operator). Let A and B be jointly short rulesets on a set \mathcal{X} . A selective operator on these rulesets is the ruleset $A \odot B$, where, on each turn, the current player selects one of the two rulesets A or B and plays according to its rules.

WYTHOFF NIM is a good example of a selective operator; combine TWO HEAP NIM with CORNER THE BISHOP. See Figure 1.

Example 12. Let ruleset A be TWO HEAP NIM and let ruleset B be YAMA NIM. Then, the options of $A \odot B$ are as in Figure 3. The white circles represent the moves of NIM, and the rectangles represent the moves of YAMA NIM. The current player can choose either of the rulesets, so all of them are the moves of $A \odot B$.




Fig. 3: An example of the selective operator.

For all $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}$, we may interpret $f(\mathbf{x}) = f_A(\mathbf{x}) \cup f_B(\mathbf{x})$ as the options of $A \odot B$. Note that the selective operator is defined only if the rulesets are jointly short.

Notice that for both $(A \odot B) \odot C$ and $A \odot (B \odot C)$, the current player selects one of A , B and C , so the associative law $(A \odot B) \odot C = A \odot (B \odot C)$ holds.

Note that if we relax the condition that A and B be jointly short, even if they were individually short, the ruleset $A \odot B$ might not be defined. For example, if $\mathcal{X} = \{(x, y) \mid x, y \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}\}$, with

$$f_A((x, y)) = \{(x', y') \mid x', y' \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}, x' < x\},$$

and

$$f_B((x, y)) = \{(x', y') \mid x', y' \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}, y' < y\},$$

then A and B are short, but $A \odot B$ are not jointly short.

Impartial game values are all incomparable, with respect to the standard partial order of games. Here we are concerned with entire rulesets, and their comparisons. We will discuss the problem of ruleset domination with respect to our enforce operator.

Definition 13 (Enforce Operator). Let A and B be jointly short rulesets on a set \mathcal{X} .

The enforce operator on these rulesets is the combined ruleset $A \odot B$, where on each turn, before a play, the opponent enforces one of these two rulesets, and the current player plays according to that ruleset. That is, for all $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}$, the opponent enforces either of the set of options $f_A(\mathbf{x})$ or $f_B(\mathbf{x})$.

Observe that the enforce operator belongs to the family of comply/constrain, so every enforce maneuver is forgotten after each move. Notice that for both $(A \odot B) \odot C$ and $A \odot (B \odot C)$, the opponent enforces one of A , B and C , so the associative law $(A \odot B) \odot C = A \odot (B \odot C)$ holds.

Definition 14 (Enforce Domination). Consider two rulesets A and B on a set \mathcal{X} . If, for any $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}$, $\mathcal{O}_{A \odot B}(\mathbf{x}) = \mathcal{O}_A(\mathbf{x})$, then ruleset A dominates ruleset B , denoted $A \vdash B$. If both $B \vdash A$ and $A \vdash B$, then the rulesets A and B are similar, denoted $A \simeq B$. If neither domination holds, then the rulesets A and B are confused, denoted $A \parallel B$.

Example 15 (Dominated Ruleset). Let ruleset A be TWO HEAP NIM and let ruleset B be CORNER THE BISHOP. Then, for all \mathbf{x} , $\mathcal{O}_{A \odot B}(\mathbf{x}) = \mathcal{O}_B(\mathbf{x})$, and hence CORNER THE BISHOP dominates TWO HEAP NIM. Namely, if the game starts at the edge of the game board, that is, if one of the coordinates is 0, then the previous player enforces CORNER THE BISHOP, and wins. Otherwise, the current player has a good option in both rulesets. Namely, they play to the edge of the game board.

Example 16 (Confused Rulesets). Let ruleset A be YAMA NIM and let ruleset B be CORNER THE BISHOP. The initial \mathcal{P} -positions of $A \odot B$ are depicted in Figure 4. Suppose the starting position is $\mathbf{x} = (10, 10)$. From Figure 2 (d) and Figure 4 we have $\mathcal{O}_A(\mathbf{x}) = \mathcal{P}$ and $\mathcal{O}_{A \odot B}(\mathbf{x}) = \mathcal{N}$, respectively. Hence $A \not\prec B$. Consider the starting position $\mathbf{x} = (1, 1)$. From From Figure 2 (b) and Figure 4 we have $\mathcal{O}_B(\mathbf{x}) = \mathcal{N}$ and $\mathcal{O}_{A \odot B}(\mathbf{x}) = \mathcal{P}$, respectively, and hence $B \not\prec A$. Therefore $A \parallel B$; the rulesets are confused.

		0										10
0	\mathcal{P}	\mathcal{P}	\mathcal{P}	\mathcal{P}	\mathcal{P}	\mathcal{P}	\mathcal{P}	\mathcal{P}	\mathcal{P}	\mathcal{P}	\mathcal{P}	\mathcal{P}
	\mathcal{P}	\mathcal{P}										
	\mathcal{P}											
	\mathcal{P}											
	\mathcal{P}											
	\mathcal{P}											
	\mathcal{P}											
	\mathcal{P}											
	\mathcal{P}											
10	\mathcal{P}											

Fig. 4: The initial \mathcal{P} -positions of $A \odot B$ as in Example 16.

3.1 A solution of the ruleset domination problem

Let us solve the problem of ruleset domination.

Definition 17 (Property 1). The ordered pair of rulesets (A, B) satisfies Property 1 if, for any $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}$, if $\mathcal{O}_A(\mathbf{x}) = \mathcal{N}$ then there is an option $\mathbf{x}' \in f_B(\mathbf{x})$ such that $\mathcal{O}_A(\mathbf{x}') = \mathcal{P}$.

We write $P_1(A, B)$ if (A, B) satisfies Property 1. The intuition of this property, with respect to the enforcement operator, is as follows: since the opponent is the enforcer, they need never enforce ruleset B , if $P_1(A, B)$.

The ordered pair of rulesets (A, B) does not satisfy Property 1 if there exists an $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}$ such that $\mathcal{O}_A(\mathbf{x}) = \mathcal{N}$ and, for all $\mathbf{x}' \in f_B(\mathbf{x})$, $\mathcal{O}_A(\mathbf{x}') = \mathcal{N}$. We write $P_1(A, B)^c$ if (A, B) does not satisfy Property 1. To continue the intuition from the previous paragraph, in this case, the opponent could benefit by enforcing ruleset B .

Theorem 18 (Dominated Ruleset). *Assume that A and B are jointly short rulesets on a set \mathcal{X} . Then $A \vdash B$ if and only if $P_1(A, B)$ holds.*

Proof. First, assume that (A, B) satisfies Property 1. We need to demonstrate that $A \vdash B$. Assume that $\mathcal{O}_A(\mathbf{x}) = \mathcal{N}$. Then, under ruleset $A \odot B$, either way, the current player can move to a position \mathbf{x}' such that $\mathcal{O}_A(\mathbf{x}') = \mathcal{P}$. This is because if ruleset A is enforced, as $\mathcal{O}_A(\mathbf{x}) = \mathcal{N}$, there is a position $\mathbf{x}' \in f_A(\mathbf{x})$ such that $\mathcal{O}_A(\mathbf{x}') = \mathcal{P}$, and if ruleset B is enforced, Property 1 guarantees there is an $\mathbf{x}' \in f_B(\mathbf{x})$ such that $\mathcal{O}_A(\mathbf{x}') = \mathcal{P}$. Thus, by induction, $\mathcal{O}_{A \odot B}(\mathbf{x}) = \mathcal{N}$.

On the other hand, if $\mathcal{O}_A(\mathbf{x}) = \mathcal{P}$, it suffices for the previous player to enforce ruleset A .

Namely, for any $\mathbf{x}' \in f_A(\mathbf{x})$, $\mathcal{O}_A(\mathbf{x}') = \mathcal{N}$. Thus, by induction, $\mathcal{O}_{A \odot B}(\mathbf{x}) = \mathcal{P}$.

Hence, for all \mathbf{x} , $\mathcal{O}_A(\mathbf{x}) = \mathcal{O}_{A \odot B}(\mathbf{x})$.

Next, assume that $A \vdash B$, and (A, B) does not satisfy Property 1. By domination, and $P_1(A, B)^c$, there is a position $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}$, with $\mathcal{O}_A(\mathbf{x}) = \mathcal{O}_{A \odot B}(\mathbf{x}) = \mathcal{N}$, such that for any $\mathbf{x}' \in f_B(\mathbf{x})$, $\mathcal{O}_A(\mathbf{x}') = \mathcal{O}_{A \odot B}(\mathbf{x}') = \mathcal{N}$. Thus, from this \mathbf{x} , the opponent can enforce ruleset B , and then the current player has to move to some $\mathbf{x}' \in f_B(\mathbf{x})$, for which $\mathcal{O}_A(\mathbf{x}') = \mathcal{O}_{A \odot B}(\mathbf{x}') = \mathcal{N}$. Thus, the current player cannot play from the \mathcal{N} -position \mathbf{x} in $A \odot B$ to a \mathcal{P} -position \mathbf{x}' in $A \odot B$, a contradiction. \square

Remark 19. By virtue of Theorem 18, this is a “survival of the weakest”, since the dominated ruleset is the stronger ruleset, and it will not be enforced by the other player. The outcomes of a stronger ruleset are here irrelevant. Hence the weaker ruleset dominates the stronger ruleset.

Corollary 20. *Let A and B be jointly short rulesets on \mathcal{X} .*

- (1) *If $f_A(\mathbf{x}) \subseteq f_B(\mathbf{x})$, for all $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}$, then $A \vdash B$.*
- (2) *If, for any $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}$ with $\mathcal{O}_B(\mathbf{x}) = \mathcal{P}$, \mathbf{x} is also a \mathcal{P} -position for ruleset A , then $A \vdash B$.*
- (3) *$A \simeq B$ if and only if $\mathcal{O}_A(\mathbf{x}) = \mathcal{O}_B(\mathbf{x})$.*

Proof. (1) By Theorem 18, it suffices to find a B -option \mathbf{x}' such that $\mathcal{O}_A(\mathbf{x}') = \mathcal{P}$, whenever $\mathcal{O}_A(\mathbf{x}) = \mathcal{N}$. Indeed, the existence follows from $f_A(\mathbf{x}) \subseteq f_B(\mathbf{x})$.

(2) For any $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}$ with $\mathcal{O}_A(\mathbf{x}) = \mathcal{N}$, by our assumption, we have $\mathcal{O}_B(\mathbf{x}) = \mathcal{N}$; hence there is some option $\mathbf{x}' \in f_B(\mathbf{x})$ with $\mathcal{O}_B(\mathbf{x}') = \mathcal{P}$. This implies $\mathcal{O}_A(\mathbf{x}') = \mathcal{P}$; hence $P_1(A, B)$ holds.

(3) When $A \vdash B$ and $B \vdash A$, for any $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}$, we have $\mathcal{O}_A(\mathbf{x}) = \mathcal{O}_{A \odot B}(\mathbf{x}) = \mathcal{O}_B(\mathbf{x})$, and hence $\mathcal{O}_A(\mathbf{x}) = \mathcal{O}_B(\mathbf{x})$. Conversely if $\mathcal{O}_A(\mathbf{x}) = \mathcal{O}_B(\mathbf{x})$, then by (2), $A \vdash B$ and $B \vdash A$; hence $A \simeq B$. \square

Example 21. Let ruleset A be YAMA NIM and let ruleset B be TWO HEAP NIM. If $\mathcal{O}_A((x, y)) = \mathcal{N}$, we may assume $x - y \geq 2$, and one can move to $(x - (x - y), y) = (y, y) \in f_B((x, y))$ which is a \mathcal{P} -position of ruleset A . Hence, $P_1(A, B)$ holds, $A \vdash B$, and $\mathcal{O}_{A \odot B}((x, y)) = \mathcal{O}_A((x, y))$. YAMA NIM also dominates WYTHOFF NIM, by the same move.

3.2 No Transitivity

We find a contradiction in the transitivity of ruleset domination.

Proposition 22. *The binary ruleset relation of domination does not satisfy the transitive law.*

Proof. Let $\mathcal{X} = \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ and consider the following rulesets.

$$\text{Ruleset } A: f_A(x) = \begin{cases} \emptyset, & \text{if } x = 0, \\ \{x - 1\}, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

$$\text{Ruleset } B: f_B(x) = \{x - (2i + 1) \mid i \in \mathbb{Z}, 0 \leq i \leq \frac{x-1}{2}\}.$$

$$\text{Ruleset } C: f_C(x) = \{x - 2i \mid i \in \mathbb{Z}, 1 \leq i \leq \frac{x}{2}\}.$$

x	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	...
$\mathcal{O}_A(x)$	\mathcal{P}	\mathcal{N}	\mathcal{P}	\mathcal{N}	\mathcal{P}	\mathcal{N}	\mathcal{P}	\mathcal{N}	\mathcal{P}	\mathcal{N}	\mathcal{P}	...
$\mathcal{O}_C(x)$	\mathcal{P}	\mathcal{P}	\mathcal{N}	\mathcal{N}	\mathcal{N}	\mathcal{N}	\mathcal{N}	\mathcal{N}	\mathcal{N}	\mathcal{N}	\mathcal{N}	...
$\mathcal{O}_{A \odot C}(x)$	\mathcal{P}	\mathcal{P}	\mathcal{N}	\mathcal{P}	\mathcal{N}	\mathcal{P}	\mathcal{N}	\mathcal{P}	\mathcal{N}	\mathcal{P}	\mathcal{N}	...

Table 1: The rows illustrate the outcomes of the rulesets A , C , and enforce operator $A \odot C$, with A , B and C as in the proof of Proposition 22. Furthermore, we have $\mathcal{O}_A(x) = \mathcal{O}_B(x) = \mathcal{O}_{A \odot B}(x)$ and $\mathcal{O}_C(x) = \mathcal{O}_{B \odot C}(x)$.

From Table 1, we have $\mathcal{O}_A(x) = \mathcal{O}_B(x)$, hence $A \simeq B$. In particular $B \vdash A$.

Also, if $\mathcal{O}_C(x) = \mathcal{N}$, we may assume $x \geq 2$, and under ruleset B , a player can move to $(x - (2j + 1)) \in f_B(x)$, with $j = \lfloor \frac{x-1}{2} \rfloor$, which is a \mathcal{P} -position of ruleset C . Hence $C \vdash B$, and so $C \vdash B \vdash A$. However, $P_1(C, A)$ fails to hold. Namely, $\mathcal{O}_C(3) = \mathcal{N}$ but $f_A(3) = \{2\}$ and $\mathcal{O}_C(2) = \mathcal{N}$. Therefore, by Theorem 18, $C \not\vdash A$, and transitivity fails. \square

Similarly, one can see that in fact $A \parallel C$, which leads us to the next section.

3.3 Order Properties

Domination is not an order, but the following result suggests that there may be some order-like properties for domination.

Theorem 23. *Consider jointly short rulesets A , B and C such that $A \vdash B$, $B \vdash C$ and $C \vdash A$. Then the rulesets A , B and C are similar.*

Proof. Let $E = A \odot B \odot C$, which is short by assumption.

Let $N_A, N_B, N_C \subset \mathcal{X}$ be the sets of \mathcal{N} -positions for the ruleset A , B , and C respectively. Similarly, we let $P_A, P_B, P_C \subset \mathcal{X}$ be the set of \mathcal{P} -positions for A , B , and C .

Let us take $M = (N_A \cup N_B \cup N_C) \setminus (N_A \cap N_B \cap N_C)$.

Notice that if we can show that M is empty, then it implies $N_A = N_B = N_C$, and hence A , B , and C are similar. Let us assume that M is non-empty, and $\mathbf{x} \in M$ is an element with a minimal value of $T_E(\mathbf{x})$. By symmetry, we may assume that $\mathbf{x} \in N_A$. As $A \vdash B$, by Definition 17, there must be some option $\mathbf{y} \in f_B(\mathbf{x}) \cap P_A$.

As \mathbf{x} is a minimal in M , $\mathbf{y} \notin M$, and together with $\mathbf{y} \notin N_A$, we can conclude $\mathbf{y} \in P_B$. Now because \mathbf{x} has a B -option $\mathbf{y} \in P_B$, we know that $\mathbf{x} \in N_B$. Then by a similar argument, we have $\mathbf{x} \in N_C$, which contradicts our assumption $\mathbf{x} \in M$. Therefore M must be empty. \square

Theorem 23 suggests that domination is very close to an order relation.

Definition 24 (Strong Domination). Consider jointly short rulesets A and B . Then A strongly dominates B , if for any jointly short ruleset C , $A \odot B \odot C \simeq A \odot C$.

Proposition 25. Consider jointly short rulesets. Strong domination satisfies the following properties.

- (α) If ruleset A strongly dominates ruleset B , then $A \vdash B$.
- (β) If ruleset A strongly dominates ruleset B and ruleset B strongly dominates ruleset C , then ruleset A strongly dominates ruleset C .
- (γ) If ruleset A strongly dominates ruleset B and ruleset B strongly dominates ruleset C , then $A \vdash C$.
- (δ) When $f_A(\mathbf{x}) \subset f_B(\mathbf{x})$ for all $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}$, then ruleset A strongly dominates ruleset B .

Proof. We prove each property.

(α) Set $C = A$ in the Definition 24.

(β) For any ruleset D ,

$$\begin{aligned}
(A \odot C) \odot D &\simeq ((A \odot B) \odot C) \odot D && (A \text{ strongly dominates } B) \\
&\simeq A \odot ((B \odot C) \odot D) && (\text{associativity}) \\
&\simeq A \odot (B \odot D) && (B \text{ strongly dominates } C) \\
&\simeq (A \odot B) \odot D && (\text{associativity}) \\
&\simeq A \odot D && (A \text{ strongly dominates } B)
\end{aligned}$$

(γ) This is immediate from (α) and (β).

(δ) As $f_A(\mathbf{x}) \subset f_B(\mathbf{x})$ for any \mathbf{x} , the opponent has no merit for enforcing the ruleset B over A . \square

So, there might be a notion of domination among the ones that are defined, which has the property of transitivity, and also the existence of interesting rulesets.

4 A distributive-lattice-like structure

Let us establish some more properties of our operators.

Note that the selective operator is not a disjunctive sum operator. In a disjunctive sum of games, the current player chooses one of the components, but in $A \odot B$, the component is single and the player chooses one of the rulesets. In fact, this is the same as playing the combined rulesets A and B . However, by regarding it as an operator, we can find a distributive-lattice-like structure on rulesets. For distributive lattice, it is required that for any ruleset A, B on \mathcal{X} , if $A \simeq B$ then for any ruleset C on \mathcal{X} , $A \odot C \simeq B \odot C$. However, due to Proposition 22, we have a counterexample. Thus, we can only say that we have a *distributive-lattice-like* construction.

Let E be a ruleset on a set \mathcal{X} such that for any non-terminal $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}$, $f_E(\mathbf{x})$ includes the terminal position. Clearly, $\mathcal{O}_E(\mathbf{x}) = \mathcal{P}$ if and only if \mathbf{x} is a terminal position. Then, for any ruleset A on \mathcal{X} , $P_1(A, E)$ holds.

Therefore,

$$A \simeq A \odot E \simeq E \odot A$$

and E is an identity element of \odot . Furthermore, for any ruleset A ,

$$E \simeq A \odot E \simeq E \odot A$$

because the current player can win from any position except for the terminal position by selecting E . Thus, E is an absorbing element of \odot .

Let O be a ruleset on a set \mathcal{X} such that for any $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}$, $f_O(\mathbf{x})$ is the empty set. Clearly, $\mathcal{O}_O(\mathbf{x}) = \mathcal{P}$ for any \mathbf{x} . Then, for any ruleset A on \mathcal{X} , $P_1(O, A)$ holds. Therefore,

$$O \simeq A \odot O \simeq O \odot A$$

and O is an absorbing element of \odot . Furthermore, for any ruleset A ,

$$A \simeq A \odot O \simeq O \odot A$$

because the current player can only select A for the move.

Thus, O is an identity element of \odot .

Obviously, the operators \odot and \odot satisfy the commutative law and the associative law. Further, we also have the following theorem.

Theorem 26 (Absorption-Distributive). *Suppose A, B and C are the rulesets on a set \mathcal{X} . The two operators \odot and \odot satisfy the absorption law:*

$$\begin{aligned} (A \odot B) \odot A &\simeq A; \\ (A \odot B) \odot A &\simeq A; \end{aligned}$$

and the distributive law:

$$(A \odot B) \odot C \simeq (A \odot C) \odot (B \odot C);$$

$$(A \odot B) \odot C \simeq (A \odot C) \odot (B \odot C).$$

Proof. First, we show the absorption law. In $(A \odot B) \odot A$, the opponent has no benefit to choose $(A \odot B)$. Thus, $(A \odot B) \odot A \simeq A$.

In $(A \odot B) \odot A$, the current player has no benefit to choose $(A \odot B)$. Thus, $(A \odot B) \odot A \simeq A$.

Next, we demonstrate the distributive law.

Consider first the case that \mathbf{x} is an \mathcal{N} -position under $(A \odot B) \odot C$. This means that the current player has a winning move in one of A and B and in C . Without loss of generality, we may assume that the player has winning moves in A and in C . Then, playing from \mathbf{x} , under $(A \odot C) \odot (B \odot C)$, the current player can select $A \odot C$ and has a winning strategy whichever ruleset the opponent enforces. Next, consider the case that \mathbf{x} is a \mathcal{P} -position under $(A \odot B) \odot C$. Then the opponent can win by enforcing $(A \odot B)$ or C . Assume that the opponent can win by enforcing $(A \odot B)$. Then, playing in \mathbf{x} under $(A \odot C) \odot (B \odot C)$, whichever the current player chooses $(A \odot C)$ or $(B \odot C)$, the opponent can win by enforcing A or B . If the opponent can win by enforcing C , then in \mathbf{x} under $(A \odot C) \odot (B \odot C)$ the opponent can also win because whichever the current player chooses, the opponent can enforce C at last.

Secondly, if \mathbf{x} is an \mathcal{N} -position under $(A \odot B) \odot C$, the current player has a winning move in both of A and B or in C . Assume that the player has winning strategies in both A and B . Then, in \mathbf{x} under $(A \odot C) \odot (B \odot C)$, whichever the opponent enforces, the current player can choose a winning move in A or in B . If the current player has a winning move in C , then in \mathbf{x} under $(A \odot C) \odot (B \odot C)$, whichever the opponent enforces, the current player can choose a winning move in C .

If \mathbf{x} is a \mathcal{P} -position under $(A \odot B) \odot C$, then the opponent can win in $(A \odot B)$ and in C . Without loss of generality, we may assume that the opponent can win by enforcing A . Then, in \mathbf{x} under $(A \odot C) \odot (B \odot C)$, the opponent can win by enforcing $(A \odot C)$. Therefore, the pair of operators (\odot, \odot) satisfies the distributive law. \square

In future research, we aim to generalize both operators to partisan games and further investigate this distributive lattice in detail.

5 Nim-values under enforced rulesets

Let $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_k)$ be a NIM position with heap sizes x_1, x_2, \dots, x_k . The nim-sum of \mathbf{x} is given by $x_1 \oplus x_2 \oplus \dots \oplus x_k$, where the \oplus operator is: write the numbers x_1, x_2, \dots, x_k in binary and then add them without carrying. If the nim-sum is zero, we call \mathbf{x} a zero position.

Theorem 27 (Bouton [B02]). *Let \mathbf{x} be a NIM position.*

1. *If \mathbf{x} is a zero position, then every move from \mathbf{x} leads to a nonzero position.*
2. *If \mathbf{x} is a nonzero position, then there exists a move from \mathbf{x} to a zero position.*

Therefore, if \mathbf{x} is a zero position, the previous player can guarantee a win i.e., \mathbf{x} is a \mathcal{P} -position. If \mathbf{x} is a nonzero position, then the current player can guarantee a win i.e., \mathbf{x} is an \mathcal{N} -position.

Sprague and Grundy extended Bouton's theorem for general impartial games in normal play. The key is the minimal excludant (mex) function.

Definition 28 (Minimal Excludant). Let S denote a finite set of non-negative integers. Then the minimal excludant $\text{mex}(S)$ is the least non-negative integer not in S .

The Sprague-Grundy theory recursively assigns a non-negative integer $\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{x})$, known as the nim-value of \mathbf{x} , to each short normal play impartial game \mathbf{x} .

Definition 29 (Nim-value). For any game position \mathbf{x} , the nim-value function $\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{x})$ is

$$\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{x}) = \text{mex}(\{\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{x}') \mid \mathbf{x}' \in f(\mathbf{x})\}).$$

Theorem 30 (Sprague-Grundy [SP35, GR39]). For any game position \mathbf{x} , \mathbf{x} is a \mathcal{P} -position if and only if $\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{x}) = 0$. In general, \mathbf{x} is equivalent to a nim heap of size $\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{x})$.

Definition 31 (Disjunctive Sum). For any game positions \mathbf{x} and \mathbf{y} , the disjunctive sum $\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{y}$ is the game whose options are $\mathbf{x} + f(\mathbf{y}) = \{\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{y}' \mid \mathbf{y}' \in f(\mathbf{y})\}$ and $f(\mathbf{x}) + \mathbf{y} = \{\mathbf{x}' + \mathbf{y} \mid \mathbf{x}' \in f(\mathbf{x})\}$.

Theorem 32 (Sprague-Grundy [SP35, GR39]). For any game positions \mathbf{x} and \mathbf{y} ,

$$\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{y}) = \mathcal{G}(\mathbf{x}) \oplus \mathcal{G}(\mathbf{y}).$$

We can also consider the disjunctive sum of positions under rulesets combined by the enforce operator. We define recursively the enforce nim-value $\mathcal{G}^{\mathcal{E}}(\mathbf{x})$ of such positions as follows:

Definition 33 (Enforce Operator Nim-value). Let A and B be jointly short rulesets on \mathcal{X} , and consider the game $A \odot B$. Then, the enforce nim-value of $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}$ is $\mathcal{G}^{\mathcal{E}}(\mathbf{x}) = \mathcal{G}^{\mathcal{E}}_{A \odot B}(\mathbf{x})$ where

$$\mathcal{G}^{\mathcal{E}}(\mathbf{x}) = \text{mex}(\{\mathcal{G}^{\mathcal{E}}(\mathbf{x}') \mid \mathbf{x}' \in f_A(\mathbf{x})\} \cap \{\mathcal{G}^{\mathcal{E}}(\mathbf{x}') \mid \mathbf{x}' \in f_B(\mathbf{x})\}).^3$$

Let us justify the soundness of Definition 33 before we state the main result of this section. As A and B are jointly short, for any $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}$, there exists some number $T_{A \odot B}(\mathbf{x})$ such that every play sequence of $A \odot B$ starting from \mathbf{x} terminates at most $T_{A \odot B}(\mathbf{x})$ moves.⁴ To find $\mathcal{G}^{\mathcal{E}}(\mathbf{x}) = \mathcal{G}^{\mathcal{E}}_{A \odot B}(\mathbf{x})$, we proceed by induction on $T_{A \odot B}(\mathbf{x})$. If $T_{A \odot B}(\mathbf{x}) = 0$, then $\mathcal{G}^{\mathcal{E}}(\mathbf{x}) = 0$. Assume that for any \mathbf{y} with $T_{A \odot B}(\mathbf{y}) < T_{A \odot B}(\mathbf{x})$, we have already determined $\mathcal{G}^{\mathcal{E}}(\mathbf{y})$. Then for each $\mathbf{x}' \in f_A(\mathbf{x}) \cup f_B(\mathbf{x})$, we have $T_{A \odot B}(\mathbf{x}') < T_{A \odot B}(\mathbf{x})$, and we may assume that $\mathcal{G}^{\mathcal{E}}(\mathbf{x}')$ is already determined.

³This definition is similar to the way of [HR1], but in that manuscript they do not consider the concept of operator for rulesets.

⁴Here, we will use induction on the number of the length of play. Then, we use $T_{A \odot B}(\mathbf{x})$ (this T is defined in Definition 4) for the upper bound of the length of play on $A \odot B$, because we cannot define $T_{A \odot B}$.

Theorem 34. Let A and B be jointly short rulesets on \mathcal{X} .

- (1) If $f_A(\mathbf{x}) = \emptyset$ or $f_B(\mathbf{x}) = \emptyset$, then $\mathcal{G}^{\mathcal{E}}(\mathbf{x}) = 0$.
- (2) If $\mathcal{G}^{\mathcal{E}}(\mathbf{x}) = n$, then the previous player can enforce a ruleset such that, for any option \mathbf{x}' , $\mathcal{G}^{\mathcal{E}}(\mathbf{x}') \neq n$.
- (3) Consider integers $0 \leq m < n$. If $\mathcal{G}^{\mathcal{E}}(\mathbf{x}) = n$, then, whichever ruleset A or B the previous player enforces, there is an option \mathbf{x}' such that $\mathcal{G}^{\mathcal{E}}(\mathbf{x}') = m$.
- (4) $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}$ is a \mathcal{P} -position of $A \odot B$ if and only if $\mathcal{G}^{\mathcal{E}}(\mathbf{x}) = 0$.
- (5) Let R_1, \dots, R_k be impartial rulesets, some of them being impartial short rulesets, say R_1, \dots, R_j and some of them being jointly short enforce rulesets, say R_{j+1}, \dots, R_k . The corresponding game boards are $\mathcal{X}_1, \dots, \mathcal{X}_k$. The disjunctive sum $\mathbf{x}_1 + \dots + \mathbf{x}_k$ is a \mathcal{P} -position if and only if the nim-sum

$$\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{x}_1) \oplus \dots \oplus \mathcal{G}(\mathbf{x}_j) \oplus \mathcal{G}^{\mathcal{E}}(\mathbf{x}_{j+1}) \oplus \dots \oplus \mathcal{G}^{\mathcal{E}}(\mathbf{x}_k) = 0.$$

In other words, the enforced nim-values can be used in exactly the same way as the classical nim-values for determining the outcomes of disjunctive sums. In particular, when $A \odot B$ is an enforce operator of two jointly short rulesets A and B on a set \mathcal{X} , and $*n$ is a NIM heap of size n , then $\mathbf{x} + *n$ is a \mathcal{P} -position if and only if $\mathcal{G}^{\mathcal{E}}(\mathbf{x}) = n$.

Proof. We demonstrate that $\mathcal{G}^{\mathcal{E}}(\mathbf{x})$ as in Definition 33 satisfies all the properties (1)~(5).

(1) Suppose without loss of generality that $f_A(\mathbf{x}) = \emptyset$; then $\{\mathcal{G}^{\mathcal{E}}(\mathbf{x}') \mid \mathbf{x}' \in f_A(\mathbf{x})\} = \emptyset$, and the proof follows immediately from Definition 33.

(2) Assume that $\mathcal{G}^{\mathcal{E}}(\mathbf{x}) = n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$. Then, by Definition 33, either, for all $\mathbf{x}' \in f_A(\mathbf{x})$, $\mathcal{G}^{\mathcal{E}}(\mathbf{x}') \neq n$, or, for all $\mathbf{x}' \in f_B(\mathbf{x})$, $\mathcal{G}^{\mathcal{E}}(\mathbf{x}') \neq n$. In the first case enforce the ruleset A and otherwise B .

(3) Again we assume that $\mathcal{G}^{\mathcal{E}}(\mathbf{x}) = n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$. Take a non-negative integer $m (< n)$. Then by Definition 33, $m \in \{\mathcal{G}^{\mathcal{E}}(\mathbf{x}') \mid \mathbf{x}' \in f_A(\mathbf{x})\} \cap \{\mathcal{G}^{\mathcal{E}}(\mathbf{x}') \mid \mathbf{x}' \in f_B(\mathbf{x})\}$, which implies $\mathcal{G}^{\mathcal{E}}(\mathbf{x}') = m$ for some $\mathbf{x}' \in f_A(\mathbf{x})$ and $\mathcal{G}^{\mathcal{E}}(\mathbf{x}') = m$ for some $\mathbf{x}' \in f_B(\mathbf{x})$. Therefore, whichever ruleset the opponent enforces, the current player can find an option \mathbf{x}' such that $\mathcal{G}^{\mathcal{E}}(\mathbf{x}') = m$.

(4) Set $n = 0$ in (2) and set $m = 0$ in (3). Observe that in (2), the enforcing previous player has the usual advantage in a \mathcal{P} -position, while in (3) the non-enforcing current player has the standard \mathcal{N} -position advantage.

(5) Items (1)-(4) establish that the enforced nim-values $\mathcal{G}^{\mathcal{E}}$ satisfy all the standard properties of classical nim-values. Consequently, we can add them using the nim-sum in the same manner as classical nim-values to determine the outcomes of disjunctive sums. \square

Acknowledgments. This work is supported by JSPS, Grant-in-Aid for Early-Career Scientists, Grant Number 22K13953. This work is also supported by JSPS Kakenhi 20K03514, 23K03071, 20H01798. This work is also supported by JSPS KAKENHI JP21K21283. This work is also supported by JST, the establishment of university fellowships towards the creation of science technology innovation, Grant Number JPMJFS2129.

References

- [BCG82] E.R. Berlekamp, J.H. Conway, R.K. Guy, *Winning ways*, **1-2** Academic Press, London (1982). Second edition, **1-4**. A. K. Peters, Wellesley/MA (2001/03/03/04).
- [B02] C.L. Bouton, Nim, a game with a complete mathematical theory, *The Annals of Math. Princeton* (2) **3** (1902), 35–39.
- [C76] J.H. Conway, *On Numbers and Games*, Academic Press, London (1976). Second edition, A.K.Peters, Wellesley/MA (2001).
- [CLN17] M. Cook, U. Larsson, T. Neary, A cellular automaton for blocking queen games, *Nat. Comput.* (2017) 16: 397–410
- [DU18] Eric Duchene, Marc Heinrich, Urban Larsson, and Aline Parreau. The switch operators and push-the-button games: a sequential compound over rulesets. *Theoret. Comput. Sci.* 715 (2018): 71–85.
- [GS04] H. Gavel, P. Strimling, Nim with a modular Muller twist, *Integers* **4**, G4, 2004.
- [GR39] Patrick M Grundy. Mathematics and games. *Eureka* 2 (1939): 6–8.
- [HL06] P. Hegarty, U. Larsson, Permutations of the natural numbers with prescribed difference multisets, *Integers* **6**, Paper A3, 2006.
- [HR] A. Holshouser, H. Reiter, Three pile Nim with move blocking, https://math.charlotte.edu/sites/math.charlotte.edu/files/fields/preprint_archive/paper/2002_16_0.pdf.
- [HR01] A. Holshouser, H. Reiter, Problems and solutions: Problem 714 (Blocking Nim), *The College Mathematics Journal*, **32**, 382, 2001.
- [HR1] A. Holshouser and H. Reiter, Blocking combinatorial games, <http://math.uncc.edu/~hbreiter/BlockComb2.pdf>.
- [H08] D. G. Horrocks and M. A. Trenton. Subtraction with a Muller twist. *Integers* 8, no. 1 (2008): ig5-pdf.
- [KiY23] Shun-ichi Kimura and Takahiro Yamashita. On variations of Yama Nim and Triangular Nim. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2310.06610>.
- [L09] U. Larsson, 2-pile Nim with a restricted number of move-size imitations, *Integers* **9**, G4, 671–690, 2009.
- [L11] U. Larsson, Blocking Wythoff Nim, *Electron. J. Combin.*, **18**, P120, 2011.

- [L12] U. Larsson and Johan Wästlund. From heaps of matches to the limits of computability. *Electron. J. Combin.*, 20(P41), 2013.
- [L15] U. Larsson, Restrictions of m -Wythoff Nim and p -complementary Beatty sequences, (Ed. R.J. Nowakowski) *Games of no Chance 4*, MSRI Publications, (Cambridge University Press).
- [S13] Aaron N. Siegel, Combinatorial Game Theory, *Amer. Math. Soc.*(2013)
- [SS02] F. Smith, P. Stănică, Comply/constrain games or games with a Muller twist, *Integers*, **2**, G4, 2002.
- [SP35] Richard Sprague. Über mathematische kampfspiele. *Tohoku Mathematical Journal*, First Series 41 (1935): 438–444.
- [SR18] Archishman Sravankumar. Comply/Constrain Subtraction. preprint arXiv:1806.00474 (2018).
- [W07] W. A. Wythoff. A modification of the game of Nim. *Nieuw Arch. Wisk.* **7**, 199–202, 1907.
- [Y23] Takahiro Yamashita. Winning strategy and Grundy Numbers for some Nim game, (in Japanese) *Master Thesis*, Hiroshima University 2023.