Reasoning Model for No-Limit Hold'em Poker

Project Overview

- Develop a **reasoning model** optimized for poker.
- Goal: Maximize Expected Value (EV) through strategic and adaptive play.
- Applications in game theory, economic modeling, and negotiation.

1. Success Metrics

- Expected Value per Hand (EV)
- Win Rate vs. Opponents
- **✓** Unpredictability & Robustness
- **✓** Computational Efficiency

Constraints

- Computational Limits Real-time decision-making is required.
- Data Availability Must gather diverse hand histories.

2. Risks and Challenges

- **Data Quality** Hands may end without revealing all cards.
- ▲ Combinatorial Explosion Over 56 billion hand possibilities per player.

Prior Work

- PokerBench LLMs trained to play professional poker.
- PokerGPT Lightweight solver leveraging LLMs.
- Pluribus Near-GTO multiplayer strategies.

3. Technical Approach

- Fine-tuning LLM (DeepSeek R1) for action decisions.
- Self-Play with PyPokerEngine for iterative training.
- **© Goal:** Train model to process poker hand states & choose optimal actions.

4. Mathematical Formulation

Maximize Expected Value (EV)

 $\max \mathbb{E}[\text{Winnings per action}]$

Minimize Regret

$$\min \sum_{t=1}^{T} (\text{Best Possible Outcome} - \text{Chosen Action Outcome})$$

Constraints: Bankroll management, time limits, opponent inference.

5. Algorithm Choice & Justification

- Why a Reasoning Model?
- ✓ More efficient and adaptive than GTO solvers.
- ✓ Avoids excessive computation per hand.
- ✓ Can generalize across diverse poker hands & scenarios.

6. Implementation Strategy

Using PyTorch

- Fine-Tuning Model Train with pot odds, hand strength, & opponent tendencies.
- **2 PyPokerEngine Integration** Simulate hands and update parameters via reward signals.

7. Validation Methods

- Comparisons to GTO Strategies
- **Testing Against Bots & Humans**
- Measuring Win Rate & Decision Accuracy

8. Resource Requirements

- **SECOND SECOND S**
- **Historical Hand Histories** for training data.
- Time & Budget Need efficient real-time inference.

9. Initial Results

- X GPT-2: 0% Accuracy Could not output strategic actions.
- ✓ Larger Models (GPT-4, Reasoning Models) performed significantly better.

Performance Metrics

- Win Rates vs. Baselines
- Decision Accuracy (vs. GTO strategies)
- Consistency Across Game Scenarios

10. Current Limitations

- Insufficient Compute More powerful models needed.
- "Unconstrained LLM Output Must restrict responses to concise actions.

11. Next Steps

- @ Restrict LLM Output Limit to "check", "fold", "raise 20", etc.
- **© Explore More Powerful Models** DeepSeek-R1, GPT-4, or domain-specific models.
- **The Example 2 Enhance Data Pipeline** Annotate and systematically train with additional plays.
- **Optimize Efficiency** Reduce computational load in training & inference.
- Onvestigate Modern RL Techniques Explore PPO (Proximal Policy Optimization) & GRPO (General Reinforcement Policy Optimization) for training.
- © Conduct Literature Review Study reasoning models like TinyZero and DeepSeek for potential adaptation.
- **©** Run & Fine-Tune TinyZero Locally Load TinyZero and apply RL fine-tuning using our existing dataset.

12. Open Questions

- ? Beyond Fine-Tuning How can RL or hierarchical reasoning improve performance?
- ? Constrained Output Best method to limit model responses?
- ? Validating Partial Information How to infer hidden opponent cards?

13. Alternative Approaches

- Standalone Reasoning Models (non-LLM)
- Pure Reinforcement Learning
- Hybrid Approach Mix of GTO solvers & RL

14. Key Learnings

- Small LLMs are unreliable for structured decision-making.
- GTO models are too computationally expensive for real-time play.
- Reasoning-based models show promise for strategic adaptability.

Final Thoughts

By leveraging reasoning models, self-play, and structured training, we aim to create a powerful No-Limit Hold'em Al.

Project Playlist: Spotify Link