

Solving two-person zero-sum sequential games via  
efficient computation of Nash equilibria:  
proof-of-concept on Kuhn's 3-card Poker

DOHMATOB Elvis <sup>1,2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Parietal Team, INRIA

<sup>2</sup>Université Paris-Sud

Given a sequential two-person zero-sum game (e.g Texas Hold'em Poker), construct an optimal player.

# Two-person zero sum Sequential games

- There are 3 players: nature (player 0), Alice (player 1), and Bob (player 2).
- Players take turns in making moves
- Set of moves of any two distinct players don't overlap (i.e.  $A_p \cap A_q = \emptyset$  if  $p \neq q$ )

# Two-person zero sum Sequential games

- There are 3 players: nature (player 0), Alice (player 1), and Bob (player 2).
- Players take turns in making moves
- Set of moves of any two distinct players don't overlap (i.e.  $A_p \cap A_q = \emptyset$  if  $p \neq q$ )

# Two-person zero sum Sequential games

- There are 3 players: nature (player 0), Alice (player 1), and Bob (player 2).
- Players take turns in making moves
- Set of moves of any two distinct players don't overlap (i.e  $A_p \cap A_q = \emptyset$  if  $p \neq q$ )

# Minimax NE problem for general sequential game

$$\underset{x \in Q_1}{\text{maximize}} \underset{y \in \mathbb{R}_+^m, Fy=f}{\text{minimize}} y^T Ax, \quad (1)$$

where:

$$\left. \begin{aligned} Q_1 &:= \{x \in \mathbb{R}_+^n \mid Ex = e\} \text{ is Alice's complex, and} \\ Q_2 &:= \{y \in \mathbb{R}_+^m \mid Fy = f\} \text{ is Bob's complex.} \end{aligned} \right\} \quad (2)$$

# Minimax NE problem for general sequential game

$$\underset{x \in Q_1}{\text{maximize}} \underset{y \in \mathbb{R}_+^m, Fy=f}{\text{minimize}} y^T Ax, \quad (1)$$

where:

$$\left. \begin{aligned} Q_1 &:= \{x \in \mathbb{R}_+^n \mid Ex = e\} \text{ is Alice's complex, and} \\ Q_2 &:= \{y \in \mathbb{R}_+^m \mid Fy = f\} \text{ is Bob's complex.} \end{aligned} \right\} \quad (2)$$

# Two-person zero sum Sequential games

The game tree  $T$  (from Alice's perspective) is defined as follows.  $T$  has a set  $V(T)$  of nodes (aka vertices) and a set  $E(T)$  of edges.



# Non-Linear Ledoit-Wolf: Why? How?

- $(p/n \text{ large})$  or  $(\Sigma \text{ eigenvalues close to one another}) \Rightarrow$  linear shrinkage OK.  
 $(p/n \text{ small})$  or  $(\Sigma \text{ eigenvalues dispersed}) \Rightarrow$  non-linear shrinkage better.
- Marčenko-Pastur equation: relationship between  $\mathbf{S}$  and  $\Sigma$  eigenvalues under large-dimensional asymptotics.

# Non-Linear Ledoit-Wolf: deeper into the "how?"

- $H_n$  empirical d.f. of sample  $(\mathbf{S}_n)$  eigenvalues  $\tau_n$ .  
$$H_n(\tau) \equiv \frac{1}{p} \sum_{i=1}^p \mathbb{1}_{[\tau_i, +\infty[}(\tau)$$
- $F_n$  e.d.f. of population  $(\Sigma_n)$  eigenvalues  $\lambda_n$ .  
$$\mathbf{Y}_n = \mathbf{X}_n \Sigma_n^{1/2}, \mathbf{X}_n \sim \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \text{Id})$$
- $F_n$  (resp.  $H_n$ ) converges almost surely to  $F$  (resp.  $H$ ).
- Stieltjes transform of a non-decreasing function  $G$ :  
$$\forall z \in \mathbb{C}^+, m_G(z) \equiv \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \frac{1}{u-z} dG(u)$$
- Marčenko-Pastur equation:  
$$\forall z \in \mathbb{C}^+, m_F(z) = \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \frac{1}{\tau \left[ 1 - \frac{p}{n} - \frac{p}{n} z m_F(z) \right] - z} dH(\tau)$$

# Non-Linear Ledoit-Wolf: Implementation...

$$Q_{n,p} : [0, \infty]^p \rightarrow [0, \infty]^p$$
$$\mathbf{t} \equiv (t_1, \dots, t_p)^\top \mapsto Q_{n,p}(\mathbf{t}) \equiv (q_{n,p}^1(t), \dots, q_{n,p}^p(t))^\top$$

---

$$\hat{\tau}_n = \operatorname{argmin}_{\mathbf{t} \in [0, \infty]^p} \frac{1}{p} \sum_{i=1}^p [q_{n,p}^i(\mathbf{t}) - \lambda_{n,i}]^2$$

---

$$\widetilde{m}_{n,p}^{\hat{\tau}_n}(\lambda_i) \simeq \frac{n-p}{p\lambda_i} - \frac{n}{p} \frac{1}{\hat{\tau}_{n,i}\lambda_i}$$

---

$$\hat{d}_i^* = \frac{\lambda_i}{|1 - \frac{p}{n} - \frac{p}{n}|^2 \widetilde{m}_{n,p}^{\hat{\tau}_n}(\lambda_i)}; \text{ Covariance: } S_n^* \mathbf{U}_n \hat{\mathbf{D}}_n^* \mathbf{U}_n^\top, \text{ with } \mathbf{S}_n = \mathbf{U}_n \mathbf{D}_n \mathbf{U}_n^\top$$

# About the $Q_{n,p}$ function

$$Q_{n,p} : [0, \infty[^p \rightarrow [0, \infty[^p$$

$$\mathbf{t} \equiv (t_1, \dots, t_p)^T \mapsto Q_{n,p}(\mathbf{t}) \equiv (q_{n,p}^1(t), \dots, q_{n,p}^p(t))^T$$

---


$$\forall i = 1, \dots, p \quad q_{n,p}^i(t) \equiv p \int_{(i-1)/p}^{i/p} (F_{n,p}^t)^{-1}(u) du$$


---

$$(F_{n,p}^t)^{-1}(u) \equiv \sup\{x \in \mathbb{R} : F_{n,p}^t(x) \leq u\}$$


---

$$F_{n,p}^t(x) \equiv \max \left\{ 1 - \frac{n}{p}, \frac{1}{p} \sum_{i=1}^p \mathbb{1}_{\{t_i=0\}} \right\} \text{ if } x = 0,$$

$$F_{n,p}^t(x) \equiv \lim_{\eta \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{1}{\pi} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \text{Im} [m_{n,p}^t(\zeta + i\eta)] d\zeta \text{ otherwise}$$


---

$$m \equiv m_{n,p}^t(z) \text{ sol. in } \{m \in \mathbb{C} : -\frac{n-p}{nz} + \frac{p}{n}\} \text{ of}$$

$$m = \frac{1}{p} \sum_{i=1}^p \frac{1}{t_i(1 - \frac{p}{n} - \frac{p}{n}zm) - z}$$