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## Nim and Wythoff

- Nim: Select one of the $n$ stacks, take at least one token

- Wythoff: Take any number of tokens from one stack OR select the same number of tokens from both stacks



## Generalization of Wythoff to $n$ stacks

Wythoff: Take any number of tokens from one stack OR select the same number of tokens from both stacks

Generalization: Take any number of tokens from one stack OR

- take the same number of tokens from ALL stacks
- take the same number of tokens from any TWO stacks
- take the same number of tokens from any non-empty SUBSET of stacks


## Generalized Wythoff on $n$ stacks

Let $B \subseteq \mathcal{P}(\{1,2,3, \ldots, n\})$ with the following conditions:

1. $\varnothing \notin B$
2. $\{i\} \in B$ for $i=1, \ldots, n$.

A legal move in generalized Wythoff $\mathcal{G} \mathcal{W}_{n}(B)$ on $n$ stacks induced by $B$ consists of:

- Choose a set $A \in B$
- Remove the same number of tokens from each stack whose index is in $A$

The first player who cannot move loses.

## Examples

- Nim: Select one of the $n$ stacks, take at least one token

- Wythoff: Either take any number of tokens from one stack OR select the same number of tokens from both stacks



## Examples

- Nim: Select one of the $n$ stacks, take at least one token $B=\{\{1\},\{2\}, \ldots,\{n\}\}$

- Wythoff: Either take any number of tokens from one stack OR select the same number of tokens from both stacks



## Examples

- Nim: Select one of the $n$ stacks, take at least one token $B=\{\{1\},\{2\}, \ldots,\{n\}\}$

- Wythoff: Either take any number of tokens from one stack OR select the same number of tokens from both stacks

$B=\{\{1\},\{2\},\{1,2\}\}$


## Goal

- Generalized Wythoff is a two-player impartial game
- All positions (configurations of stack heights) are either winning or losing

Goal: Determine the set of losing positions
Smaller Goal: Say something about the structure of the losing positions

## Results for Wythoff

Let $\Phi=\frac{1+\sqrt{5}}{2}$. Then the set of losing positions is given by

$$
\mathcal{L}=\{(\lfloor n \cdot \Phi\rfloor,\lfloor n \cdot \Phi\rfloor+n) \mid n \geq 0\}
$$

They can be created recursively as follows:

- For $a_{n}$, find he smallest positive integer not yet used for $a_{i}$ and $b_{i}$, $i<n$.
- $b_{n}=a_{n}+n$. Repeat...

| $n$ | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $a_{n}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $b_{n}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
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## Results for Wythoff

Let $\Phi=\frac{1+\sqrt{5}}{2}$. Then the set of losing positions is given by

$$
\mathcal{L}=\{(\lfloor n \cdot \Phi\rfloor,\lfloor n \cdot \Phi\rfloor+n) \mid n \geq 0\}
$$

They can be created recursively as follows:

- For $a_{n}$, find he smallest positive integer not yet used for $a_{i}$ and $b_{i}$, $i<n$.
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## Results for Wythoff

Let $\Phi=\frac{1+\sqrt{5}}{2}$. Then the set of losing positions is given by

$$
\mathcal{L}=\{(\lfloor n \cdot \Phi\rfloor,\lfloor n \cdot \Phi\rfloor+n) \mid n \geq 0\}
$$

They can be created recursively as follows:

- For $a_{n}$, find he smallest positive integer not yet used for $a_{i}$ and $b_{i}$, $i<n$.
- $b_{n}=a_{n}+n$. Repeat...

| $n$ | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $a_{n}$ | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 6 | 8 |
| $b_{n}$ | 0 | 2 | 5 | 7 | 10 | 13 |

## Theorem

For the game of Wythoff, for any given position $(a, b)$, there is exactly one a losing position of the form $(a, y),(x, b),(z, z+|b-a|)$ for some $x \geq 0, y \geq 0$, and $z \geq 0$.

This structural result can be visualized as follows:
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## Theorem

For the game of Wythoff, for any given position $(a, b)$, there is exactly one a losing position of the form $(a, y),(x, b),(z, z+|b-a|)$ for some $x \geq 0, y \geq 0$, and $z \geq 0$.

This structural result can be visualized as follows: $(a, b)=(6,5)$


Losing positions: $(6,10),(3,5)$, and $(2,1)$.

$$
\vec{e}_{i}=i^{\text {th }} \text { unit vector; } \vec{e}_{A}=\sum_{i \in A} \vec{e}_{i}
$$

## Conjecture

In the game of generalized Wythoff $\mathcal{G} \mathcal{W}_{n}(B)$, for any position $\vec{p}=\left(p_{1}, p_{2}, \ldots, p_{n}\right)$ and any $A=\left\{i_{1}, i_{2}, \ldots, i_{k}\right\} \subseteq B$, there is a unique losing position of the form $\vec{p}+m \cdot \vec{e}_{A}$, where $m \geq-\min _{i \in A}\left\{p_{i}\right\}$.

## Theorem

The conjecture is true for $|A| \leq 2$, that is, if play is either on a single stack or any pair of two stacks.

## Example

$\mathcal{G} \mathcal{W}_{3}(\{\{1\},\{2\},\{3\},\{1,2\},\{1,3\},\{2,3\}\})$ - three stacks, with play on either a single or a pair of stacks. $\vec{p}=(11,17,20)$

| $A$ | $\tilde{p}$ |  |  |  |
| :---: | ---: | :--- | :--- | ---: |
| $\{1\}$ | $(26,17,20)$ | $=(11,17,20)$ | $+15 \cdot(1,0,0)$ |  |
| $\{2\}$ | $(11,31,20)$ | $=(11,17,20)$ | $+14 \cdot(0,1,0)$ |  |
| $\{3\}$ | $(11,17,36)$ | $=(11,17,20)$ | $+16 \cdot(0,0,1)$ |  |
| $\{1,2\}$ | $(19,25,20)$ | $=(11,17,20)$ | $+8 \cdot(1,1,0)$ |  |
| $\{1,3\}$ | $(1,17,10)$ | $=(11,17,20)$ | $-10 \cdot(1,0,1)$ |  |
| $\{2,3\}$ | $(11,35,38)$ | $=(11,17,20)+18 \cdot(0,1,1)$ |  |  |

## Example

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \left.B_{1}=\{\{1\},\{2\},\{3\},\{1,2\},\{1,3\},\{2,3\}\}\right) ; B_{2}=B_{1} \cup\{1,2,3\} \\
& \vec{p}=(11,17,20)
\end{aligned}
$$

| $A$ | $\tilde{p}_{1}$ | $\tilde{p}_{2}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\{1\}$ | $(26,17,20)$ | $(40,17,20)$ |
| $\{2\}$ | $(11,31,20)$ | $(11,1,20)$ |
| $\{3\}$ | $(11,17,36)$ | $(11,17,27)$ |
| $\{1,2\}$ | $(19,25,20)$ | $(7,13,20)$ |
| $\{1,3\}$ | $(1,17,10)$ | $(8,17,17)$ |
| $\{2,3\}$ | $(11,35,38)$ | $(11,12,15)$ |
| $\{1,2,3\}$ | - | $(15,21,24)$ |

## Proof Outline.

- For play on one stack, assuming no such position exists leads to contradiction (legal move from losing position to losing position) as there are only finitely many moves.
- For play on a pair of stacks, a somewhat different argument is needed that does not generalize to three or more stacks.


## Thank You!

