Reactive strategies with longer memory

Nikoleta E. Glynatsi, Ethan Akin, Martin Nowak, Christian Hilbe

1 Formal Model

We consider infinitely repeated games among two players, player p and player q. Each round, they engage in the donation game with payoff matrix

$$\begin{pmatrix} b-c & -c \\ b & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{1}$$

Here b and c denote the benefit and the cost of cooperation, respectively. We assume $b>c>0$ throughout. Therefore, the payoff matrix (1) is a special case of the prisoner's dilemma with payoff matrix,

$$\begin{pmatrix} R & S \\ T & P \end{pmatrix}, \tag{2}$$

with $T > R > S > P$ and $2R > T + S$. Here, R is the reward payoff of mutual cooperation, T is the temptation to defect payoff, S is the sucker's payoff, and P is the punishment payoff for mutual defection.

We assume in the following, that the players' decisions only depend on the outcome of the previous n rounds. To this end, an *n-history for player p* is a string $h^p = (a^p_{-1}, \ldots, a^p_{-n}) \in \{C, D\}^n$. An entry a^p_{-k} corresponds to player p's action k rounds ago. Let H^p denote the space of all n-histories of player p. Analogously, let H^q as the set of n-histories h^q of player q. Sets H^p and H^q contain $|H^p| = |H^q| = 2^n$ elements each.

A pair $h=(h^p, h^q)$ is called an *n-history of the game*. We use $H = H^p \times H^q$ to denote the space of all such histories. This set contains $|H| = 2^{2n}$ elements.

Memory-n strategies. A *memory-n* strategy is a vector $\mathbf{m} = (m_h)_{h\in H} \in [0, 1]^{2n}$. Each entry m_h corresponds to the player's cooperation probability in the next round, depending on the outcome of the previous n rounds. If the two players use memory-n strategies $\mathbf{m}$ and $\mathbf{m}'$, one can represent the interaction as a Markov chain with a $2^{2n} \times 2^{2n}$ transition matrix M. Let $\mathbf{v} = (v_h)_{h\in H}$ be an invariant distribution of this Markov chain. Based on the invariant distribution $\mathbf{v}$, we can also compute the players' payoffs. To this end, let $\mathbf{S}^k = (S^k_h)_{h\in H}$ denote the vector that returns for each h the one-shot payoff that player p obtained k rounds ago,

$$S^k_h = \begin{cases} b-c & \text{if } a^p_{-k} = C \text{ and } a^q_{-k} = C \\ -c & \text{if } a^p_{-k} = C \text{ and } a^q_{-k} = D \\ b & \text{if } a^p_{-k} = D \text{ and } a^q_{-k} = C \\ 0 & \text{if } a^p_{-k} = D \text{ and } a^q_{-k} = D \end{cases} \tag{3}$$

Then we can define player p's repeated-game payoff $s_{\mathbf{m},\mathbf{m}'}$ as

$$s_{\mathbf{m},\mathbf{m}'} = \mathbf{v} \cdot \mathbf{S}^1 = \mathbf{v} \cdot \mathbf{S}^2 = \ldots = \mathbf{v} \cdot \mathbf{S}^n. \tag{4}$$

The equalities $\mathbf{v} \cdot \mathbf{S}^1 = \ldots = \mathbf{v} \cdot \mathbf{S}^n$ correspond to the intuition that it does not matter which of the past n rounds we use to define average payoffs. The payoff $s_{\mathbf{m}',\mathbf{m}}$ of player q can be defined analogously.

Let's provide definitions for some additional terms that will be used in this manuscript.

Nash Strategies. A strategy $\mathbf{m}$ for player p, is a *Nash strategy*, if player q never receives a payoff higher than that of the mutual cooperation payoff. Irrespective of q's strategy. Namely if,

$$s_{\mathbf{m}',\mathbf{m}} \leq (b-c) \ \forall \ m' \ \in [0,1]^{2n}. \tag{5}$$

Nice Strategies. A player's strategy is *nice*, if the player is never the first to defect.

Partner Strategies. For player p, a *partner strategy* is a nice strategy such that,

$$\begin{aligned} s_{\mathbf{m}',\mathbf{m}} < (b-c) \ &\Rightarrow \quad s_{\mathbf{m},\mathbf{m}'} < (b-c), \quad \textit{and} && (6)\\ s_{\mathbf{m}',\mathbf{m}} \geq (b-c) \ &\Rightarrow \quad s_{\mathbf{m}',\mathbf{m}} = s_{\mathbf{m},\mathbf{m}'} = (b-c) \quad \forall \ m' \ \in [0,1]^{2n}. && (7) \end{aligned}$$

%ToDo Do we need both?

In other words, partners strive to achieve the mutual cooperation payoff of $(b-c)$ with their co-player. However, if the co-player doesn't cooperate, they are prepared to penalize them with lower payoffs. Partner strategies, by definition, are best responses to themselves, making them Nash strategies [Hilbe et al., 2015]. All partner strategies are Nash strategies, but not all Nash strategies are partner strategies.

%ToDo Why are partner strategies interesting to study?

Previously, the work of [Akin, 2016] characterized all partner strategies in the case of memory-one strategies. For higher memory values ($n > 1$), a few works ([Hilbe et al., 2017]) have managed to characterize subsets of memory$-n$ partner strategies. This difficulty arises from the fact that as memory increases, obtaining analytical results becomes more challenging. In this work, we focus on reactive strategies instead of memory$-n$ strategies. Reactive strategies, a subset of memory$-n$ strategies, are formally introduced in Section 3. We characterize all reactive partner strategies for $n = 2$ and $n = 3$, and present a series of results starting from Section 3.1. In the following section, we will discuss a series of results for the case of memory$-n$.

2 An Extension of Akin's Lemma

Akin's Lemma. The work of [Akin, 2016] focuses on the case of memory-one strategies, thus for $n = 1$. A memory-one strategy of player p is represented by the vector $\mathbf{m} = (m_1, m_2, m_3, m_4)$, and and when played against a co-player with strategy $\mathbf{m}'$, the resulting stationary distribution is denoted as $\mathbf{v} = (v_1, v_2, v_3, v_4)$. Akin's lemma states the following,

Lemma 2.1 (Akin's Lemma)**.** Assume that player p uses the memory-one strategy $\mathbf{m} = (m_1, m_2, m_3, m_4)$, and q uses a strategy that leads to a sequence of distributions $\{\mathbf{v}^k, k = 1, 2, ...\}$ with $\mathbf{v}^k$ representing the distribution over the states in the k^{th} round of the game. Let $\mathbf{v}$ be the associated stationary distribution, then,

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{n}\sum_{k=1}^{n}\mathbf{v}^k\cdot(\mathbf{m}-(1,1,0,0))=0,\ \text{and therefore } \mathbf{v}\cdot(\mathbf{m}-(1,1,0,0))=0. \tag{8}$$

Akin's Lemma for $1\leq k\leq n$.

One special case of memory$-n$ strategies are the round$-k-$repeat strategies for some $1\leq k\leq n$. Player p uses a *round-k-repeat strategy* $\mathbf{m}^{k-\text{Rep}}$ if in any given round, the player chooses the same action as k rounds ago. That is, if the game's n-history is such that $a^p_{-k}=C$, then $m_h^{k-\text{Rep}}=1$; otherwise $m_h^{k-\text{Rep}}=0$.

With the same method as in [Akin, 2016], one can show *Akin's Lemma*: For each k with $1\leq k\leq n$, the invariant distribution $\mathbf{v}$ satisfies the following relationship,

$$\mathbf{v}\cdot(\mathbf{m}-\mathbf{m}^{k-\text{Rep}})=\sum_{h\in H}v_h(m_h-m_h^{k-\text{Rep}})=0. \tag{9}$$

The intuition for this result is that $\mathbf{v}\cdot\mathbf{m}$ and all $\mathbf{v}\cdot\mathbf{m}^{k-\text{Rep}}$ are just different (but equivalent) expressions for player p's average cooperation rate. For example, $\mathbf{v}\cdot\mathbf{m}$ corresponds to a setup in which one first draws a history h according to the invariant distribution $\mathbf{v}$; then one takes player p's probability m_h to cooperate in the next round; the expectation of this procedure is $\sum_{h\in H}v_h m_h$.

%ToDo Do we need a proof here? The intuition is summarising the proof.

%ToDo Do we use italics when referring to keywords of the manuscript?

Zero-determinant strategies. Based on Akin's Lemma, we can derive a theory of zero-determinant strategies analogous to the case of memory-one strategies. In the following, we say a memory-n strategy $\mathbf{m}$ is a zero-determinant strategy if there are k_1, k_2, k_3 and α, β, γ such that $\mathbf{m}$ can be written as

$$\mathbf{m}=\alpha\mathbf{S}^{k_1}+\beta\tilde{\mathbf{S}}^{k_2}+\gamma\mathbf{1}+\mathbf{m}^{k-\text{Rep}}, \tag{10}$$

where $\mathbf{1}$ is the vector for which every entry is 1. By Akin's Lemma and the definition of payoffs,

$$0=\mathbf{v}\cdot(\mathbf{m}-\mathbf{m}^{k-\text{Rep}})=\mathbf{v}\cdot(\alpha\mathbf{S}^{k_1}+\beta\tilde{\mathbf{S}}^{k_2}+\gamma\mathbf{1})=\alpha s_{\mathbf{m},\mathbf{m}'}+\beta s_{\mathbf{m}',\mathbf{m}}+\gamma. \tag{11}$$

That is, payoffs satisfy a linear relationship.

One interesting special case arises if $k_1=k_2=k_3=:k$ and $\alpha=-\beta=1/(b+c)$ and $\gamma=0$. In that case, the formula (10) yields the strategy

$$m_h=\begin{cases}1 & \text{if } a^q_{-k}=C\\ 0 & \text{if } a^q_{-k}=D\end{cases} \tag{12}$$

That is, this strategy implements Tit-for-Tat (for $k=1$) or delayed versions thereof (for $k>1$). By Eq. (11), the enforced payoff relationship is $s_{\mathbf{m},\mathbf{m}'}=s_{\mathbf{m}',\mathbf{m}}$ (in particular, these strategies are *partners*).

Another interesting special case arises if $k_1 = k_2 = k_3 =: k$ and $\alpha = 0$, $\beta = -1/b$, $\gamma = 1 - c/b$. In that case Eq. (10) yields the strategy

$$m_h = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \ a^q_{-k} = C \\ 1 - c/b & \text{if } \ a^q_{-k} = D \end{cases} \tag{13}$$

That is, the generated strategy is GTFT (if $k = 1$), or delayed versions thereof (for $k > 1$). By Eq. (11), the enforced payoff relationship is $s_{\mathbf{m}',\mathbf{m}} = b - c$. In particular, these strategies are not *partner strategies*, but they satisfy the notion of being *Nash strategies*.

The two aforementioned results can be summarized as follows:

- Any Tit-for-Tat strategy for any n, including delayed versions for $k > 1$, is considered a partner strategy.
- Any GTFT strategy for any n, including delayed versions for $k > 1$, is considered a Nash strategy.

%ToDo Should these results be propositions?

3 Reactive Partner Strategies

A *reactive−n strategy* is denoted by a vector $\mathbf{p} = (p_h)_{h \in H^q} \in [0, 1]^{2n}$. Each entry p_h corresponds to the player's cooperation probability in the next round, based on the co-player's action(s) in the previous n rounds. Therefore, n-bit reactive strategies exclusively rely on the co-player's n-history, remaining unaffected by the focal player's own actions during the past n rounds. From this point onward, we distinguish between memory-n strategies and reactive-n strategies, using notations $\mathbf{m}$ and $\mathbf{p}$ respectively for each set of strategies.

To begin, let's introduce some additional notation. Suppose player p adopts are reactive$-n$ strategy $\mathbf{p}$, and suppose player q adopts an arbitrary memory-n strategy. Let $\mathbf{v} = (v_h)_{h \in H}$ be an invariant of the game between the two players. We define the following marginal distributions with respect to the possible n-histories of player q,

$$v^q_h = \sum_{h^p \in H^p} v_{(h^p, h^q)} \ \forall \ h^q \in H^q. \tag{14}$$

These entries describe how often we observe player q to choose actions h^q, in n consecutive rounds (irrespective of the actions of player p). Note that,

$$\sum_{h \in H^q} v^q_h = 1. \tag{15}$$

Similarly, the cooperation rate of player q can also be defined irrespective of the actions of player p. Let $H^q_{k=C}$ be the subset of H^q, for which,

$$H^q_{k=C} = \{h \in H^q : h_{-k} = C\}. \tag{16}$$

Let $\rho_{\mathbf{m}}$ be the cooperation rate of player q playing an arbitrary memory-n strategy $\mathbf{m}$ when playing against player p with a reactive strategy,

$$\rho_{\mathbf{m}} = \sum_{h \in H^q_{1=C}} v^q_h \; = \; \sum_{h \in H^q_{2=C}} v^q_h \; = \; \dots \; = \; \sum_{h \in H^q_{n=C}} v^q_h. \tag{17}$$

The equalities $\sum_{h \in H^q_{1=C}} v^q_h \; = \; \sum_{h \in H^q_{2=C}} v^q_h \; = \; \dots \; = \; \sum_{h \in H^q_{n=C}} v^q_h$ correspond to the intuition that it does not matter which of the past n rounds player q cooperated to define the cooperation rate.

We can also express player p's average cooperation rate $\rho_{\mathbf{p}}$ in terms of v^q_h by noting that,

$$\rho_{\mathbf{p}} \quad = \quad \sum_{h \in H^q} v^q_h \cdot p_h. \tag{18}$$

Because we consider simple donation games, we note that these two quantities, $\rho_{\mathbf{m}}$ *and* $\rho_{\mathbf{p}}$, are sufficient to define the payoffs of the two players,

$$\begin{aligned} s_{\mathbf{p},\mathbf{m}} &= b\,\rho_{\mathbf{m}} - c\,\rho_{\mathbf{p}} \\ s_{\mathbf{m},\mathbf{q}} &= b\,\rho_{\mathbf{p}} - c\,\rho_{\mathbf{m}}. \end{aligned} \tag{19}$$

3.1 Sufficiency of Self reactive strategies

To characterize all partner reactive-n strategies, one would usually need to check against all pure memory-n strategies McAvoy and Nowak [2019]. However, we demonstrate that when player p uses a reactive-n strategy, it is sufficient to check only against self-reactive-n strategies. This is a direct outcome of Lemma 3.1.

Self-reactive-n strategies are also a subset of memory-n strategies. They only consider the focal player's own n-history, and ignore the co-player's. Formally, a self-reactive-n strategy is a vector $\tilde{\mathbf{p}} = (\tilde{p}_h)_{h \in H^p} \in [0,1]^{2n}$. Each entry $\tilde{p}_h$ corresponds to the player's cooperation probability in the next, depending on the player's own action(s) in the previous n rounds.

Lemma 3.1. *Let* $\mathbf{p}$ *be an reactive*$-n$ *strategy for player* p*. Then, for any memory*$-n$ *strategy* $\mathbf{m}$ *used by player* q*, player* p*'s score is exactly the same as if* q *had played a specific self-reactive memory-*n *strategy* $\tilde{\mathbf{p}}$*.*

Proof. □

Note that Lemma 3.1 aligns with the previous result by Press and Dyson [2012]. They discussed the case where one player uses a memory-one strategy and the other player employs a longer memory strategy. They demonstrated that the payoff of the player with the longer memory is exactly the same as if the player had employed a specific shorter-memory strategy, disregarding any history beyond what is shared with the short-memory player. The result here follows a similar intuition: if there is a part of history that one player does not observe, then the co-player gains nothing by considering the history not shared with the short-memory player.

More specifically, the play of a self-reactive player solely relies on their own previous actions. Hence, describing the self-reactive player's play can be achieved through a Markov process with a $2^n \times 2^n$ transition matrix $\tilde{M}$ instead. The stationary distribution $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}$ of $\tilde{M}$ has the following property:

$$\tilde{u}_h = u^q_h \;\forall\; h \in H^q. \tag{20}$$

From hereupon we will use the notation $\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{p}$, and $\tilde{\mathbf{p}}$ to denote memory-n, reactive-n, and self-reactive-n strategies.

3.2 Reactive-Two Partner Strategies

In this section, we focus on the case of $n = 2$. Reactive-two strategies are denoted as a vector $\mathbf{p} = (p_{CC}, p_{CD}, p_{DC}, p_{DD})$ where p_{CC} is the probability of cooperating in this turn when the co-player cooperated in the last 2 turns, p_{CD} is the probability of cooperating given that the co-player cooperated in the second to last turn and defected in the last, and so forth. A nice reactive-two strategy is represented by the vector $\mathbf{p} = (1, p_{CD}, p_{DC}, p_{DD})$.

Theorem 3.2 ("Reactive-Two Partner Strategies")**.** A reactive-two strategy $\mathbf{p}$, is a partner strategy if and only if, it's nice ($p_{CC} = 1$) and the remaining entries satisfy the conditions:

$$p_{DD} < 1 - \frac{c}{b} \;\; and \;\; \frac{p_{CD} + p_{DC}}{2} < 1 - \frac{1}{2} \cdot \frac{c}{b}. \tag{21}$$

There are two independent proves of Theorem 3.2. The first prove is in line with the work of [Akin, 2016], and the second one relies on Lemma 3.1. Here, we discuss both.

Proof One. Suppose player p adopts a reactive-two strategy $\mathbf{p} = (p_{CC}, p_{CD}, p_{DC}, p_{DD})$. Moreover, suppose player q adopts an arbitrary memory-2 strategy $\mathbf{m}$. Let $\mathbf{v} = (v_h)_{h \in H}$ be an invariant distribution of the game between the two players.

We define the following four marginal distributions with respect to the possible two-histories of player q,

$$\begin{aligned} v^q_{CC} &= \sum_{h^p \in H^p} v_{(h^p, CC)} \\ v^q_{CD} &= \sum_{h^p \in H^p} v_{(h^p, CD)} \\ v^q_{DC} &= \sum_{h^p \in H^p} v_{(h^p, DC)} \\ v^q_{DD} &= \sum_{h^p \in H^p} v_{(h^p, DD)}. \end{aligned} \tag{22}$$

These four entries describe how often we observe player q to choose actions CC, CD, DC, DD in two consecutive rounds (irrespective of the actions of player p). We can define player q's average cooperation rate $\rho_{\mathbf{m}}$ as

$$\rho_{\mathbf{m}} := v^q_{CC} + v^q_{CD} = v^q_{CC} + v^q_{DC}. \tag{23}$$

Here, the second equality holds because it does not matter whether we define player q's cooperation rate based on the first or the second round of each 2-history. In particular, we can use this equality to conclude

$$v^q_{CD} = v^q_{DC}. \tag{24}$$

Similarly, we can express player p's average cooperation rate $\rho_{\mathbf{p}}$ in terms of v^q_{CC}, v^q_{CD}, v^q_{DC}, v^q_{DD} by noting that

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_{\mathbf{p}} &= v^q_{CC}\, p_{CC} + v^q_{CD}\, p_{CD} + v^q_{DC}\, p_{DC} + v^q_{DD}\, p_{DD} \\ &= v^q_{CC}\, p_{CC} + v^q_{CD}\, (p_{CD}{+}p_{DC}) + v^q_{DD}\, p_{DD}. \end{aligned} \tag{25}$$

Here, the second equality is due to Eq. (24).

After these preparations, we can prove our theorem based on the same method as in Akin [2016].

Proof. Suppose player q has some strategy $\mathbf{m}$ and player p has a reactive-two strategy such that $s_{\mathbf{m},\mathbf{p}} \geq b{-}c$. It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\leq s_{\mathbf{m},\mathbf{p}} - (b{-}c) \\ &\overset{Eq.\ (19)}{=} b\rho_{\mathbf{p}} - c\rho_{\mathbf{m}} - (b{-}c) \\ &\overset{Eqs.\ (23),(25),(15)}{=} b\left(v^q_{CC}p_{CC}{+}v^q_{CD}(p_{CD}{+}p_{DC}){+}v^q_{DD}p_{DD}\right) - c\left(v^q_{CC}{+}v^q_{CD}\right) - (b{-}c)\left(v^q_{CC}{+}2v^q_{CD}{+}v^q_{DD}\right) \\ &= v^q_{CC}\, b\,(p_{CC} - 1) + v^q_{CD}\Big(b(p_{CD}{+}p_{DC}){+}c{-}2b\Big) + v^q_{DD}\Big(bp_{DD} - (b{-}c)\Big). \end{aligned} \tag{26}$$

By assumption (21),

$$p_{CC} = 1, \qquad b(p_{CD}{+}p_{DC}){+}c{-}2b < 0, \qquad bp_{DD} - (b{-}c) < 0. \tag{27}$$

Because any $v^q_{XY} \geq 0$, inequality (26) can only hold if $v^q_{CD} = v^q_{DD} = 0$, which implies $v^q_{DC} = 0$ because of Eq. (24). But then it follows that $v^q_{CC} = 1$. By Eqs. (23) and (25) it follows that $\rho_{\mathbf{m}} = \rho_{\mathbf{p}} = 1$, and hence $s_{\mathbf{m},\mathbf{p}} {=} s_{\mathbf{p},\mathbf{m}} {=} b{-}c$. $\square$

Proof Two. Suppose player p adopts a nice reactive-two strategy $\mathbf{p} = (1, p_{CD}, p_{DC}, p_{DD})$. For $\mathbf{p}$ to be a Nash strategy,

$$s_{\mathbf{m},\mathbf{p}} \leq (b - c), \tag{28}$$

must hold against all pure memory-2 strategies ($\mathbf{m} \in \{0,1\}^{4^2}$). Due to Lemma 3.1, it is sufficient to check only against pure self-reactive strategies, and in the case of $n = 2$ there can be only 16 such strategies. We refer to them as $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^i$ for $i \in 1, \ldots, 16$. The strategies are as follow,

- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^0 = (0, 0, 0, 0)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^1 = (0, 0, 0, 1)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^2 = (0, 0, 1, 0)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^3 = (0, 0, 1, 1)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^4 = (0, 1, 0, 0)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^5 = (0, 1, 0, 1)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^6 = (0, 1, 1, 0)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^7 = (0, 1, 1, 1)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^8 = (1, 0, 0, 0)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^9 = (1, 0, 0, 1)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{10} = (1, 0, 1, 0)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{11} = (1, 0, 1, 1)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{12} = (1, 1, 0, 0)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{13} = (1, 1, 0, 1)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{14} = (1, 1, 1, 0)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{15} = (1, 1, 1, 1)$

Proof. Suppose player p plays a nice reactive-two strategy $\mathbf{p} = (1, p_{CD}, p_{DC}, p_{DD})$, and suppose the co-player q plays a pure self-reactive-two strategy $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}$. The possible payoffs for $\tilde{\mathbf{q}} \in \{\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^0, \dots, \tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{16}\}$ are:

$$
\begin{array}{llllll}
s_{\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^i,\mathbf{p}} = & b \cdot p_{DD} & \textit{and} & s_{\mathbf{p},\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^i} = & -c \cdot p_{DD} & \textit{for} \quad i \in \{0, 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12, 14\} \\
s_{\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^i,\mathbf{p}} = & \frac{b\cdot(p_{CD}+p_{DC}+p_{DD})}{3} - \frac{1}{3}\cdot c & \textit{and} & s_{\mathbf{p},\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^i} = & \frac{1}{3}\cdot b - \frac{c\cdot(p_{CD}+p_{DC}+p_{DD})}{3} & \textit{for} \quad i \in \{1, 9\} \\
s_{\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^i,\mathbf{p}} = & \frac{b\cdot(p_{CD}+p_{DC}+p_{DD}+1)}{4} - \frac{1}{2}\cdot c & \textit{and} & s_{\mathbf{p},\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^i} = & \frac{1}{2}\cdot b - \frac{c\cdot(p_{CD}+p_{DC}+p_{DD}+1)}{4} & \textit{for} \quad i \in \{3\} \\
s_{\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^i,\mathbf{p}} = & \frac{b\cdot(p_{CD}+p_{DC})}{2} - \frac{1}{2}\cdot c & \textit{and} & s_{\mathbf{p},\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^i} = & \frac{1}{2}\cdot b - \frac{c\cdot(p_{CD}+p_{DC})}{2} & \textit{for} \quad i \in \{4, 5, 12, 13\} \\
s_{\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^i,\mathbf{p}} = & \frac{b\cdot(p_{CD}+p_{DC}+1)}{3} - \frac{2}{3}\cdot c & \textit{and} & s_{\mathbf{p},\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^i} = & \frac{2}{3}\cdot b - \frac{c\cdot(p_{CD}+p_{DC}+1)}{3} & \textit{for} \quad i \in \{6, 7\} \\
s_{\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^i,\mathbf{p}} = & b - c & \textit{and} & s_{\mathbf{p},\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^i} = & (b - c) & \textit{for} \quad i \in \{8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15\}
\end{array}
$$

Setting the payoff expressions of $s_{\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^i,\mathbf{p}}$ to smaller or equal to $(b - c)$ we get the following unique conditions,

$$p_{DD} \leq 1 - \frac{c}{b} \tag{29}$$

$$\frac{p_{CD} + p_{DC} + p_{DD}}{3} \leq 1 - \frac{2c}{3b} \tag{30}$$

$$\frac{p_{CD} + p_{DC}}{2} \leq 1 - \frac{c}{2b} \tag{31}$$

$$\tag{32}$$

Note that condition (31) is the sum of conditions (30) and (32). Thus, only conditions (30) and (32) are necessary.

By setting, $p_{DD} = 1 - \frac{c}{b}$ and $\frac{p_{CD}+p_{DC}}{2} = 1 - \frac{c}{2b}$ to any of the above expressions of $s_{\mathbf{p},\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^i}$ we can see that $s_{\mathbf{p},\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^i} < (b - c)$. Thus, for $\mathbf{p}$ to be a partner strategy, the inequalities must be strict.

□

3.3 Reactive-Three Partner Strategies

In this section, we focus on the case of $n = 3$. Reactive-three strategies are denoted as a vector $\mathbf{p} = (p_{CCC}, p_{CCD}, p_{CDC}, p_{CDD}, p_{DCC}, p_{DCD}, p_{DDC}, p_{DDD})$ where p_{CCC} is the probability of cooperating in round t when the co-player cooperates in the last 3 rounds, p_{CCD} is the probability of cooperating given that the co-player cooperated in the third and second to last rounds and defected in the last, and so forth. A nice reactive-three strategy is represented by the vector $\mathbf{p} = (1, p_{CCD}, p_{CDC}, p_{CDD}, p_{DCC}, p_{DCD}, p_{DDC}, p_{DDD})$.

Theorem 3.3 ("Reactive-Three Partner Strategies")**.** A reactive-three strategy $\mathbf{p}$, is a partner strategy if and only if, it's nice ($p_{CCC} = 1$) and the remaining entries satisfy the conditions:

$$\frac{p_{CCD} + p_{CDC} + p_{DCC}}{3} < 1 - \frac{1}{3} \cdot \frac{c}{b} \qquad \frac{p_{CDD} + p_{DCD} + p_{DDC}}{3} < 1 - \frac{2}{3} \cdot \frac{c}{b} \qquad p_{DDD} < 1 - \frac{c}{b} \tag{33}$$

$$\frac{p_{CCD} + p_{CDD} + p_{DCC} + p_{DDC}}{4} < 1 - \frac{1}{2} \cdot \frac{c}{b} \qquad \frac{p_{CDC} + p_{DCD}}{2} < 1 - \frac{1}{2} \cdot \frac{c}{b} \tag{34}$$

Once again, there are two independent proves of Theorem 3.3, and present both.

Proof One. Suppose player p adopts a reactive-three strategy $\mathbf{p}$, and suppose player q adopts an arbitrary memory-three strategy $\mathbf{m}$. Let $\mathbf{v} = (v_h)_{h \in H}$ be an invariant distribution of the game between the two players.

We define the following eight marginal distributions with respect to the possible three-histories of player q,

$$\begin{aligned}
v^q_{CCC} &= \sum_{h^p \in H^p} v_{(h^p, CCC)} \\
v^q_{CCD} &= \sum_{h^p \in H^p} v_{(h^p, CCD)} \\
v^q_{CDC} &= \sum_{h^p \in H^p} v_{(h^p, CDC)} \\
v^q_{CDD} &= \sum_{h^p \in H^p} v_{(h^p, CDD)} \\
v^q_{DCC} &= \sum_{h^p \in H^p} v_{(h^p, DCC)} \\
v^q_{DCD} &= \sum_{h^p \in H^p} v_{(h^p, DCD)} \\
v^q_{DDC} &= \sum_{h^p \in H^p} v_{(h^p, DDC)} \\
v^q_{DDD} &= \sum_{h^p \in H^p} v_{(h^p, DDD)}.
\end{aligned} \tag{35}$$

These eight entries describe how often we observe player q to choose actions CCC, CCD, CDC, CDD, DCC, DCD, DDC, DDD in three consecutive rounds (irrespective of the actions of player p). We can define player q's average cooperation rate $\rho_{\mathbf{m}}$ as

$$\rho_{\mathbf{m}} := v^q_{CCC} + v^q_{CCD} + v^q_{DCC} + v^q_{DCD}. \tag{36}$$

In the case of $n = 3$ the following equalities hold,

$$v^q_{CCD} = v^q_{DCC} \tag{37}$$

$$v^q_{DDC} = v^q_{CDD} \tag{38}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
v^q_{CCD} + v^q_{DCD} &= v^q_{CDC} + v^q_{DDC} \Rightarrow \\
v^q_{CCD} &= v^q_{CDC} + v^q_{CDD} - v^q_{DCD}
\end{aligned} \tag{39}$$

The average cooperation rate of p's is given by

$$\begin{aligned}
\rho_{\mathbf{p}} \quad &= \quad v^q_{CCC}\, p_{CCC} + v^q_{CCD}\, p_{CCD} + v^q_{CDC}\, p_{CDC} + v^q_{CDD}\, p_{CDD} + v^q_{DCD}\, p_{DCD} + \\
&\qquad + v^q_{DDC}\, p_{DDC} + v^q_{DDD}\, p_{DDD} \\
&\overset{Eqs.\ (37),(38)}{=} v^q_{CCC}\, p_{CCC} + v^q_{CCD}\,(p_{CCD} + p_{DCC}) + v^q_{CDC}\, p_{CDC} + v^q_{CDD}\,(p_{CDD} + p_{DDC}) + \\
&\qquad v^q_{DCD}\, p_{DCD} + v^q_{DDD}\, p_{DDD}
\end{aligned} \tag{40}$$

Proof. Suppose player q has some strategy $\mathbf{m}$ and player p has a reactive-two strategy such that $s_{\mathbf{m},\mathbf{p}} \geq b-c$. It follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
0 \quad &\leq \quad s_{\mathbf{m},\mathbf{p}} - (b-c) \\
&\overset{Eq.\ (19)}{=} b\rho_{\mathbf{p}} - c\rho_{\mathbf{m}} - (b-c) \\
&\overset{Eqs.\ (40),(15)}{=} b\left(v^q_{CCC}p_{CCC} + v^q_{CCD}(p_{CCD}+p_{DCC}) + v^q_{CDC}p_{CDC} + v^q_{DDC}(p_{CDD}+p_{DDC}) + v^q_{DCD}p_{DCD} + v^q_{DDD}p_{DDD}\right) \\
&\qquad -c\left(v^q_{CCC}+2v^q_{CCD}+v^q_{DCD}\right) - (b-c)\left(v^q_{CCC}+2v^q_{CCD}+v^q_{CDC}+2v^q_{DDC}+v^q_{DCD}+v^q_{DDD}\right) \\
&= b\, v^q_{CCC}(p_{CCC}-1) + v^q_{CCD}(b\,(p_{CCD}+p_{DCC}-2)) + v^q_{CDC}(b\,(p_{CDC}-1)+c) + \\
&\qquad v^q_{CDD}(b\,(p_{CDD}+p_{DDC}-2)+2\,c) + v^q_{DCD}(b\,(p_{DCD}-1)) + v^q_{DDD}(b\,(p_{DDD}-1)+c) \\
&\overset{Eq.\ (39)}{=} b\, v^q_{CCC}(p_{CCC}-1) + v^q_{DDD}(b\,(p_{DDD}-1)+c) + v^q_{CDC}(b\,(p_{CCD}+p_{DCC}+p_{CDC}-3)+c) + \\
&\qquad v^q_{CDD}(b\,(p_{CDD}+p_{DDC}+p_{CCD}+p_{DCC}-4)+2\,c) + v^q_{DCD}(b\,(p_{DCD}-1) - b\,(p_{CCD}+p_{DCC})-2)
\end{aligned} \tag{41}$$

By assumption,

$$p_{CCC}=1, \quad b\,(p_{DDD}-1)+c<0, \quad b\,(p_{CCD}+p_{DCC}+p_{CDC}-3)+c$$

$$b\,(p_{CDD}+p_{DDC}+p_{CCD}+p_{DCC}-4)+2\,c<0 \Rightarrow -b\,(p_{CCD}+p_{DCC}-2) > b\,(p_{CDD}+p_{DDC}-2)+2\,c$$

$$b\,(p_{DCD}-1) - b\,(p_{CCD}+p_{DCC})-2<0 \Rightarrow b\,(p_{DCD}+p_{CDD}+p_{DDC}-3)+2\,c<0.$$

Because any $v^q_{XY} \geq 0$, inequality (41) can only hold if $v^q_{DDD}=v^q_{CDC}=v^q_{CDD}=v^q_{DCD}=0$, which implies $v^q_{DDC}=0$ because of Eq. (38) and $v^q_{CCD}=0$ because of Eq. (39). But then it follows that $v^q_{CCC}=1$. By Eqs. (36) and (40) it follows that $\rho_{\mathbf{m}}=\rho_{\mathbf{p}}=1$, and hence $s_{\mathbf{m},\mathbf{p}}=s_{\mathbf{p},\mathbf{m}}=b-c$. □

Proof Two. Consider all the pure self-reactive-three strategies, there are a total of 256 of them. These are given in the appendix. regardless, the payoff expressions for each of these strategies against a nice reactive-three strategies can be calculated explicitly. We will use these expressions to obtain the conditions for partner strategies similar to the previous subsection.

Proof. The payoff expressions for a nice reactive-three strategy p against all pure self-reactive-three strategies are as follows,

$$
\begin{array}{lcll}
s_{\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^i,\mathbf{p}} = & b\, p_{DDD} & for\ \ i \in & [0,2,4,6,\ldots,250,252,254] \\
s_{\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^i,\mathbf{p}} = & \frac{b\cdot(p_{CDD}+p_{DCD}+p_{DDC}+p_{DDD})}{4} - \frac{1}{4}\cdot c & for\ \ i \in & \{1,9,33,41,65,73,97,105,129,137,161, \\
 & & & 169,193,201,225,233\} \\
s_{\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^i,\mathbf{p}} = & \frac{b\cdot(p_{CCD}+p_{CDD}+p_{DCC}+p_{DDC}+p_{DDD})}{5} - \frac{2}{5}\cdot c & for\ \ i \in & \{3,7,35,39,131,135,163,167\} \\
s_{\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^i,\mathbf{p}} = & \frac{b\cdot(p_{CDC}+p_{DCD})}{2} - \frac{1}{2}\cdot c & for\ \ i \in & \{4-7,12-15,20-23,28-31,68-71, \\
 & & & 76-79,84-87,92-95,132-135, \\
 & & & 140-143,148-151,156-159, \\
 & & & 196-199,204-207,212-215,220-223\} \\
s_{\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^i,\mathbf{p}} = & \frac{b\cdot(p_{CCD}+p_{CDD}+p_{DCC}+p_{DDC}+p_{DDD}+1)}{6} - \frac{1}{2}\cdot c & for\ \ i \in & \{11,15,43,47\} \\
s_{\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^i,\mathbf{p}} = & \frac{b\cdot(p_{CDD}+p_{DCD}+p_{DDC})}{3} - \frac{1}{3}\cdot c & for\ \ i \in & \{16,17,24,25,48,49,56,57,80,81,88, \\
 & & & 89,112,113,120,121,144,145,152,153, \\
 & & & 176,177,184,185,208,209,216,217, \\
 & & & 240,241,248,249\} \\
s_{\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^i,\mathbf{p}} = & \frac{b\cdot(p_{CCD}+p_{CDD}+p_{DCC}+p_{DDC})}{4} - \frac{1}{2}\cdot c & for\ \ i \in & \{18,19,22,23,50,51,54,55,146,147, \\
 & & & 150,151,178,179,182,183\} \\
s_{\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^i,\mathbf{p}} = & \frac{b\cdot(p_{CCD}+p_{CDD}+p_{DCC}+p_{DDC}+1)}{5} - \frac{3}{5}\cdot c & for\ \ i \in & \{26,27,30,31,58,59,62,63\} \\
s_{\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^i,\mathbf{p}} = & \frac{b\cdot(p_{CCD}+p_{CDC}+p_{CDD}+p_{DCC}+p_{DCD}+p_{DDC}+p_{DDD})}{7} - \frac{3}{7}\cdot c & for\ \ i \in & \{37,67,165,195\} \\
s_{\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^i,\mathbf{p}} = & \frac{b\cdot(p_{CCD}+p_{CDC}+p_{CDD}+p_{DCC}+p_{DCD}+p_{DDC}+p_{DDD}+1)}{8} - \frac{1}{2}\cdot c & for\ \ i \in & \{45,75\} \\
s_{\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^i,\mathbf{p}} = & \frac{b\cdot(p_{CCD}+p_{CDC}+p_{CDD}+p_{DCC}+p_{DCD}+p_{DDC})}{6} - \frac{1}{2}\cdot c & for\ \ i \in & \{52,53,82,83,180,181,210,211\} \\
s_{\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^i,\mathbf{p}} = & \frac{b\cdot(p_{CCD}+p_{CDC}+p_{CDD}+p_{DCC}+p_{DCD}+p_{DDC}+1)}{7} - \frac{4}{7}\cdot c & for\ \ i \in & \{60,61,90,91\} \\
s_{\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^i,\mathbf{p}} = & \frac{b\cdot(p_{CCD}+p_{CDC}+p_{DCC})}{3} - \frac{2}{3}\cdot c & for\ \ i \in & \{96-103,112-119,224-231,240-247\} \\
s_{\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^i,\mathbf{p}} = & \frac{b\cdot(p_{CCD}+p_{CDC}+p_{DCC}+1)}{4} - \frac{3}{4}\cdot c & for\ \ i \in & \{104-111,120-127\} \\
s_{\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^i,\mathbf{p}} = & (b-c) & for\ \ i \in & [128,255]
\end{array}
\tag{42}
$$

Setting these to smaller than the mutual cooperation payoff $(b-c)$ give the following ten conditions,

$$p_{DDD} \leq 1-\frac{c}{b}, \quad \frac{p_{CDC}+p_{DCD}}{2} \leq 1-\frac{1}{2}\cdot\frac{c}{b}, \quad \frac{p_{CDD}+p_{DCD}+p_{DDC}}{3} \leq 1-\frac{2}{3}\cdot\frac{c}{b},$$

$$\frac{p_{CCD}+p_{CDC}+p_{DCC}}{3} \leq 1-\frac{1}{3}\cdot\frac{c}{b}, \quad \frac{p_{CCD}+p_{CDD}+p_{DCC}+p_{DDC}}{4} \leq 1-\frac{1}{2}\cdot\frac{c}{b}$$

$$\frac{p_{CDD}+p_{DCD}+p_{DDC}+p_{DDD}}{4} \leq 1-\frac{3}{4}\cdot\frac{c}{b}, \quad \frac{p_{CCD}+p_{CDC}+p_{CDD}+p_{DCC}+p_{DCD}+p_{DDC}+p_8}{7} \leq 1-\frac{4}{7}\cdot\frac{c}{b},$$

$$\frac{p_{CCD}+p_{CDD}+p_{DCC}+p_{DDC}+p_8}{5} \leq 1-\frac{3}{5}\cdot\frac{c}{b}, \quad \frac{p_{CCD}+p_{CDC}+p_{CDD}+p_{DCC}+p_{DCD}+p_{DDC}}{6} \leq 1-\frac{1}{2}\cdot\frac{c}{b}$$

Note that only conditions are unique. The following can be derived from the sums of two or more of these conditions.

□

3.4 Reactive Counting Partner Strategies

A special case of reactive strategies is reactive-counting strategies. These are strategies that respond to the co-player's actions, but they do not distinguish between when cooperations/defections occurred; they solely consider the count of cooperations in the last n turns. A reactive-counting-n strategy is represented by a vector $\mathbf{r} = (r_i)_{i\in[0,n]}$, where the entry r_i indicates the probability of cooperating given that the co-player cooperated i times in the last n turns.

Reactive-Counting-Two Partner Strategies. These are denoted by the vector $\mathbf{r} = (r_2, r_1, r_0)$ where r_i is the probability of cooperating in after i cooperations in the last 2 turns. We can characterise reactive-counting-two partner strategies by setting $r_2 = 1$, and $p_{CD} = p_{DC} = r_1$ and $p_{DD} = r_0$ in conditions (21). This gives us the following result.

Lemma 3.4. A nice reactive-counting-two strategy $\mathbf{r} = (1, r_1, r_0)$ is a partner strategy if and only if,

$$r_1 < 1 - \frac{1}{2} \cdot \frac{c}{b} \quad \textit{and} \quad r_0 < 1 - \frac{c}{b}. \tag{43}$$

Reactive-Counting-Three Partner Strategies. These are denoted by the vector $\mathbf{r} = (r_3, r_2, r_1, r_0)$ where r_i is the probability of cooperating in after i cooperations in the last 3 turns. We can characterise reactive-counting-three partner strategies by setting $r_3 = 1$, and $p_{CCD} = p_{CDC} = r_2, p_{DCD} = p_{DDC} = r_1$ and $p_{DDD} = r_0$ in conditions (33). This gives us the following result.

Lemma 3.5. A nice reactive-counting-three strategy $\mathbf{r} = (1, r_2, r_1, r_0)$ is a partner strategy if and only if,

$$r_2 < 1 - \frac{1}{3} \cdot \frac{c}{b}, \quad r_1 < 1 - \frac{2}{3} \cdot \frac{c}{b} \quad \textit{and} \quad r_0 < 1 - \frac{c}{b}. \tag{44}$$

In the case of counting reactive strategies, we generalise to the case of n.

Given a reactive-counting-n strategy $\mathbf{r} = (r_n, r_{n-1}, \ldots, r_0)$, in the strategy's eyes the game can end up in n states. Each u_i state represents the state that the co-player cooperated i times in the last n turns with,

$$\sum_{i=0}^{n} u_i = 1 \Rightarrow \sum_{k=0}^{n} u_{n-k} = 1. \tag{45}$$

Thus the cooperation ratio of the strategy is,

$$\rho_{\mathbf{p}} = \sum_{k=0}^{n} r_{n-k} \cdot u_{n-k}. \tag{46}$$

the probability of cooperating given that the co-player cooperated i times. The co-player can use any self-reactive-n strategy, and thus the co-player differentiates between when the last cooperation/defection occurred. However, we can still express the co-player's cooperation rate as a function of u_i. More specifically, the co-player's cooperation rate is,

$$\rho_{\tilde{\mathbf{p}}} = \sum_{k=0}^{n} \frac{n-k}{n} \cdot u_{n-k}. \tag{47}$$

With this we have all the required tools to prove the following theorem.

Theorem 3.6 ("Reactive-Counting Partner Strategies")**.** A reactive-counting$-n$ strategy $\mathbf{r} = (r_i)_{i\in[0,n]}$, is a partner strategy if and only if, the r_i entries satisfy the conditions:

$$r_n = 1, \text{ and } r_{n-k} < 1 - \frac{k}{n} \cdot \frac{c}{b}, \text{ for } k \in [1, n]. \tag{48}$$

Proof. Suppose player q has some strategy $\mathbf{m}$ and player p has a reactive-counting strategy such that $s_{\mathbf{m},\mathbf{p}} \geq b-c$. It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\leq s_{\mathbf{m},\mathbf{p}} - (b-c) \\ &\overset{Eq.\ (19)}{=} b\rho_{\mathbf{p}} - c\rho_{\mathbf{m}} - (b-c) \\ &\overset{Eqs.\ (45),(46),(47)}{=} b\sum_{k=0}^{n} r_{n-k} \cdot u_{n-k} - c\sum_{k=0}^{n} \frac{n-k}{n} \cdot u_{n-k} - (b-c)\sum_{k=0}^{n} u_{n-k} \\ & u_n\Big(b\,(r_n - 1)\Big) + \sum_{k=1}^{n} u_{n-k}\Big(b\sum_{k=1}^{n} r_{n-k} - c\sum_{k=0}^{n-1}\frac{n-k}{n} - (b-c)\sum_{k=0}^{n-1} 1\Big) \end{aligned} \tag{49}$$

For $(n-k) \in R$, if,

$$\Big(b\, r_{n-k} - c\,\frac{n-k}{n} - (b-c)\Big) < 0 \Rightarrow \tag{50}$$

$$b\,(r_{n-k} - 1) + (1 - \frac{n-k}{n})\,c < 0 \Rightarrow \tag{51}$$

$$r_{n-k} < 1 - \frac{n}{k} \cdot \frac{c}{b} \tag{52}$$

then $u_{n-k} for \in R{=}0$, which implies that $u_n = 1$. □

4 Prisoner's Dilemma

To characterise partner strategies for the general prisoner's dilemma, we can use the method based on Lemma 3.1. Here we discuss this result in the case of $n = 2$.

There are 16 pure-self reactive strategies in $n = 2$. To calculate the explicit payoff expressions for each pure strategy against a nice reactive-two strategy $\mathbf{p} = (1, p_{CD}, p_{DC}, p_{CD})$ we use the method discussed in Section 3.1. More specifically, for a self-reactive strategy $\mathbf{q}$, we calculate where the strategy is in the long term using the transition matrix,

$$\tilde{M} = \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{p}_1 & 1-\tilde{p}_1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \tilde{p}_2 & 1-\tilde{p}_2 \\ \tilde{p}_3 & 1-\tilde{p}_3 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \tilde{p}_4 & 1-\tilde{p}_4 \end{bmatrix} \tag{53}$$

Using the stationary vector $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}$ we can define the payoffs in the general prisoner's dilemma as follows:

$$\mathbf{s}_{\mathbf{q},\mathbf{p}} = a_R \cdot R + a_S \cdot S + a_T \cdot T + a_P \cdot P, \quad where$$

$$\begin{aligned}
a_R &= \tilde{v}_{CC}\, p_{CC}\, \tilde{q}_{CC} + \tilde{v}_{CD}\, p_{CD}\, \tilde{q}_{CD} + \tilde{v}_{DC}\, p_{DC}\, \tilde{q}_{DC} + \tilde{v}_{DD}\, p_{DD}\, \tilde{q}_{DD}, \\
a_S &= \tilde{v}_{CC}\, p_{CC}\, (1-\tilde{q}_{CC}) + \tilde{v}_{CD}\, p_{CD}\, (1-\tilde{q}_{CD}) + \tilde{v}_{DC}\, p_{DC}\, (1-\tilde{q}_{DC}) + \tilde{v}_{DD}\, p_{DD}\, (1-\tilde{q}_{DD}), \\
a_T &= \tilde{v}_{CC}\, (1-p_{CC})\, \tilde{q}_{CC} + \tilde{v}_{CD}\, (1-p_{CD})\, \tilde{q}_{CD} + \tilde{v}_{DC}\, (1-p_{DC})\, \tilde{q}_{DC} + \tilde{v}_{DD}\, (1-p_{DD})\, \tilde{q}_{DD}, \\
a_P &= \tilde{v}_{CC}\, (1-p_{CC})\, (1-\tilde{q}_{CC}) + \tilde{v}_{CD}\, (1-p_{CD})\, (1-\tilde{q}_{CD}) + \tilde{v}_{DC}\, (1-p_{DC})\, (1-\tilde{q}_{DC}) + \tilde{v}_{DD}\, (1-p_{DD})\, (1-\tilde{q}_{DD}).
\end{aligned}$$

This gives the following payoff expressions:

$$\begin{aligned}
s_{\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^i,\mathbf{p}} &= P(1-p_{DD}) + Tp_{DD} && for \quad i \in \{0,2,4,6,8,10,12,14\} \\
s_{\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^i,\mathbf{p}} &= \tfrac{-P(p_{CD}+p_{DC}-2)+Rp_{DD}-S(p_{DD}-1)+T(p_{CD}+p_{DC})}{3} && for \quad i \in \{1,9\} \\
s_{\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^i,\mathbf{p}} &= \tfrac{P(1-p_{CD})+R(p_{DC}+p_{DD})-S(p_{DC}+p_{DD}-2)+T(p_{CD}+1)}{4} && for \quad i \in \{3\} \\
s_{\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^i,\mathbf{p}} &= \tfrac{P(1-p_{DC})+Rp_{CD}-S(p_{CD}-1)+Tp_{DC}}{2} && for \quad i \in \{4,5,12,13\} \\
s_{\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^i,\mathbf{p}} &= \tfrac{R(p_{CD}+p_{DC})-S(p_{CD}+p_{DC}-2)+T}{3} && for \quad i \in \{6,7\} \\
s_{\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^i,\mathbf{p}} &= R && for \quad i \in \{8,9,10,11,12,13,14,15\}
\end{aligned}$$

Setting the above expressions to smaller than R gives the following conditions,

$$p_{DD} < \tfrac{P-R}{P-T}, \qquad p_{CD} + p_{DC} < \tfrac{2P+R(p_{DD}-3)-S(p_{DD}+1)}{P-T}, \qquad p_{CD} + p_{DC} < \tfrac{3R-2S-T}{R-S}$$
$$p_{DC} + p_{DD} < \tfrac{P(p_{CD}-1)+4R-2S-T(p_{CD}+1)}{R-S}, \qquad p_{CD}\,(R-S) + p_{DC}\,(T-P) < 2R-S-P$$

Consider the case where $T = 1$ and $S = 0$,

$$p_{DD} < \tfrac{P-R}{P-1}, \qquad p_{CD} + p_{DC} < \tfrac{2P+R(p_{DD}-3)}{P-1}, \qquad p_{CD} + p_{DC} < \tfrac{3R-1}{R}$$
$$p_{DC} + p_{DD} < \tfrac{P(p_{CD}-1)+4R-p_{CD}-1}{R}, \qquad p_{CD}\,R + p_{DC}\,(1-P) < 2R-P.$$

There are five conditions, however note that

$$p_{CD} < \frac{2R-P-p_{DC}\,(1-P)}{R} \tag{54}$$
$$p_{CD} < \frac{3R-1}{R} - p_{DC} \tag{55}$$

by setting (66) greater ti 65 we get,

$$(1 - P) < R$$

which is always true and thus we can only consider condition 66, as condition 65 will also be satisfied.

Similarly by setting (64) greater ti 61 we get,

$$\frac{2P + Rp_{DD} - 3R}{P - 1} < \frac{3R - 1}{R} \tag{56}$$

5 Figures



Figure 1: The abundance of partner strategies for $n = 1, 2, 3$ and $b = 1, c = 0.5$.

6 Pure Self-Reactive-Three Strategies

- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^0 = (0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^1 = (0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 1)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^2 = (0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 1, 0)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^3 = (0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 1, 1)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^4 = (0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 1, 0, 0)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^5 = (0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 1, 0, 1)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^6 = (0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 1, 1, 0)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^7 = (0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 1, 1, 1)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^8 = (0, 0, 0, 0, 1, 0, 0, 0)$



Figure 2: The abundance of partner counting strategies for $n = 1, 2, 3$ and $b = 1, c = 0.5$.



Figure 3: The most abundant reactive-n strategies for $n = 1, 2, 3$ and $b = 1, c = 0.5, \beta = 1$.



Figure 4: The most abundant reactive-counting-n strategies for $n = 1, 2, 3$ and $b = 1, c = 0.5, \beta = 1$.

- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{9} = (0, 0, 0, 0, 1, 0, 0, 1)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{10} = (0, 0, 0, 0, 1, 0, 1, 0)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{11} = (0, 0, 0, 0, 1, 0, 1, 1)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{12} = (0, 0, 0, 0, 1, 1, 0, 0)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{13} = (0, 0, 0, 0, 1, 1, 0, 1)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{14} = (0, 0, 0, 0, 1, 1, 1, 0)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{15} = (0, 0, 0, 0, 1, 1, 1, 1)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{16} = (0, 0, 0, 1, 0, 0, 0, 0)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{17} = (0, 0, 0, 1, 0, 0, 0, 1)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{18} = (0, 0, 0, 1, 0, 0, 1, 0)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{19} = (0, 0, 0, 1, 0, 0, 1, 1)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{20} = (0, 0, 0, 1, 0, 1, 0, 0)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{21} = (0, 0, 0, 1, 0, 1, 0, 1)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{22} = (0, 0, 0, 1, 0, 1, 1, 0)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{23} = (0, 0, 0, 1, 0, 1, 1, 1)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{24} = (0, 0, 0, 1, 1, 0, 0, 0)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{25} = (0, 0, 0, 1, 1, 0, 0, 1)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{26} = (0, 0, 0, 1, 1, 0, 1, 0)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{27} = (0, 0, 0, 1, 1, 0, 1, 1)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{28} = (0, 0, 0, 1, 1, 1, 0, 0)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{29} = (0, 0, 0, 1, 1, 1, 0, 1)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{30} = (0, 0, 0, 1, 1, 1, 1, 0)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{31} = (0, 0, 0, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{32} = (0, 0, 1, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{33} = (0, 0, 1, 0, 0, 0, 0, 1)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{34} = (0, 0, 1, 0, 0, 0, 1, 0)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{35} = (0, 0, 1, 0, 0, 0, 1, 1)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{36} = (0, 0, 1, 0, 0, 1, 0, 0)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{37} = (0, 0, 1, 0, 0, 1, 0, 1)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{38} = (0, 0, 1, 0, 0, 1, 1, 0)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{39} = (0, 0, 1, 0, 0, 1, 1, 1)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{40} = (0, 0, 1, 0, 1, 0, 0, 0)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{41} = (0, 0, 1, 0, 1, 0, 0, 1)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{42} = (0, 0, 1, 0, 1, 0, 1, 0)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{43} = (0, 0, 1, 0, 1, 0, 1, 1)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{44} = (0, 0, 1, 0, 1, 1, 0, 0)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{45} = (0, 0, 1, 0, 1, 1, 0, 1)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{46} = (0, 0, 1, 0, 1, 1, 1, 0)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{47} = (0, 0, 1, 0, 1, 1, 1, 1)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{48} = (0, 0, 1, 1, 0, 0, 0, 0)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{49} = (0, 0, 1, 1, 0, 0, 0, 1)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{50} = (0, 0, 1, 1, 0, 0, 1, 0)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{51} = (0, 0, 1, 1, 0, 0, 1, 1)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{52} = (0, 0, 1, 1, 0, 1, 0, 0)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{53} = (0, 0, 1, 1, 0, 1, 0, 1)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{54} = (0, 0, 1, 1, 0, 1, 1, 0)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{55} = (0, 0, 1, 1, 0, 1, 1, 1)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{56} = (0, 0, 1, 1, 1, 0, 0, 0)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{57} = (0, 0, 1, 1, 1, 0, 0, 1)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{58} = (0, 0, 1, 1, 1, 0, 1, 0)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{59} = (0, 0, 1, 1, 1, 0, 1, 1)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{60} = (0, 0, 1, 1, 1, 1, 0, 0)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{61} = (0, 0, 1, 1, 1, 1, 0, 1)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{62} = (0, 0, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 0)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{63} = (0, 0, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{64} = (0, 1, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{65} = (0, 1, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 1)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{66} = (0, 1, 0, 0, 0, 0, 1, 0)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{67} = (0, 1, 0, 0, 0, 0, 1, 1)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{68} = (0, 1, 0, 0, 0, 1, 0, 0)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{69} = (0, 1, 0, 0, 0, 1, 0, 1)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{70} = (0, 1, 0, 0, 0, 1, 1, 0)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{71} = (0, 1, 0, 0, 0, 1, 1, 1)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{72} = (0, 1, 0, 0, 1, 0, 0, 0)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{73} = (0, 1, 0, 0, 1, 0, 0, 1)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{74} = (0, 1, 0, 0, 1, 0, 1, 0)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{75} = (0, 1, 0, 0, 1, 0, 1, 1)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{76} = (0, 1, 0, 0, 1, 1, 0, 0)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{77} = (0, 1, 0, 0, 1, 1, 0, 1)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{78} = (0, 1, 0, 0, 1, 1, 1, 0)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{79} = (0, 1, 0, 0, 1, 1, 1, 1)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{80} = (0, 1, 0, 1, 0, 0, 0, 0)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{81} = (0, 1, 0, 1, 0, 0, 0, 1)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{82} = (0, 1, 0, 1, 0, 0, 1, 0)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{83} = (0, 1, 0, 1, 0, 0, 1, 1)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{84} = (0, 1, 0, 1, 0, 1, 0, 0)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{85} = (0, 1, 0, 1, 0, 1, 0, 1)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{86} = (0, 1, 0, 1, 0, 1, 1, 0)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{87} = (0, 1, 0, 1, 0, 1, 1, 1)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{88} = (0, 1, 0, 1, 1, 0, 0, 0)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{89} = (0, 1, 0, 1, 1, 0, 0, 1)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{90} = (0, 1, 0, 1, 1, 0, 1, 0)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{91} = (0, 1, 0, 1, 1, 0, 1, 1)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{92} = (0, 1, 0, 1, 1, 1, 0, 0)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{93} = (0, 1, 0, 1, 1, 1, 0, 1)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{94} = (0, 1, 0, 1, 1, 1, 1, 0)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{95} = (0, 1, 0, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{96} = (0, 1, 1, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{97} = (0, 1, 1, 0, 0, 0, 0, 1)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{98} = (0, 1, 1, 0, 0, 0, 1, 0)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{99} = (0, 1, 1, 0, 0, 0, 1, 1)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{100} = (0, 1, 1, 0, 0, 1, 0, 0)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{101} = (0, 1, 1, 0, 0, 1, 0, 1)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{102} = (0, 1, 1, 0, 0, 1, 1, 0)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{103} = (0, 1, 1, 0, 0, 1, 1, 1)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{104} = (0, 1, 1, 0, 1, 0, 0, 0)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{105} = (0, 1, 1, 0, 1, 0, 0, 1)$

- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{106} = (0, 1, 1, 0, 1, 0, 1, 0)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{107} = (0, 1, 1, 0, 1, 0, 1, 1)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{108} = (0, 1, 1, 0, 1, 1, 0, 0)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{109} = (0, 1, 1, 0, 1, 1, 0, 1)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{110} = (0, 1, 1, 0, 1, 1, 1, 0)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{111} = (0, 1, 1, 0, 1, 1, 1, 1)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{112} = (0, 1, 1, 1, 0, 0, 0, 0)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{113} = (0, 1, 1, 1, 0, 0, 0, 1)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{114} = (0, 1, 1, 1, 0, 0, 1, 0)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{115} = (0, 1, 1, 1, 0, 0, 1, 1)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{116} = (0, 1, 1, 1, 0, 1, 0, 0)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{117} = (0, 1, 1, 1, 0, 1, 0, 1)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{118} = (0, 1, 1, 1, 0, 1, 1, 0)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{119} = (0, 1, 1, 1, 0, 1, 1, 1)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{120} = (0, 1, 1, 1, 1, 0, 0, 0)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{121} = (0, 1, 1, 1, 1, 0, 0, 1)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{122} = (0, 1, 1, 1, 1, 0, 1, 0)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{123} = (0, 1, 1, 1, 1, 0, 1, 1)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{124} = (0, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 0, 0)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{125} = (0, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 0, 1)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{126} = (0, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 0)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{127} = (0, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{128} = (1, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{129} = (1, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 1)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{130} = (1, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 1, 0)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{131} = (1, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 1, 1)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{132} = (1, 0, 0, 0, 0, 1, 0, 0)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{133} = (1, 0, 0, 0, 0, 1, 0, 1)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{134} = (1, 0, 0, 0, 0, 1, 1, 0)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{135} = (1, 0, 0, 0, 0, 1, 1, 1)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{136} = (1, 0, 0, 0, 1, 0, 0, 0)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{137} = (1, 0, 0, 0, 1, 0, 0, 1)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{138} = (1, 0, 0, 0, 1, 0, 1, 0)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{139} = (1, 0, 0, 0, 1, 0, 1, 1)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{140} = (1, 0, 0, 0, 1, 1, 0, 0)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{141} = (1, 0, 0, 0, 1, 1, 0, 1)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{142} = (1, 0, 0, 0, 1, 1, 1, 0)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{143} = (1, 0, 0, 0, 1, 1, 1, 1)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{144} = (1, 0, 0, 1, 0, 0, 0, 0)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{145} = (1, 0, 0, 1, 0, 0, 0, 1)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{146} = (1, 0, 0, 1, 0, 0, 1, 0)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{147} = (1, 0, 0, 1, 0, 0, 1, 1)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{148} = (1, 0, 0, 1, 0, 1, 0, 0)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{149} = (1, 0, 0, 1, 0, 1, 0, 1)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{150} = (1, 0, 0, 1, 0, 1, 1, 0)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{151} = (1, 0, 0, 1, 0, 1, 1, 1)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{152} = (1, 0, 0, 1, 1, 0, 0, 0)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{153} = (1, 0, 0, 1, 1, 0, 0, 1)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{154} = (1, 0, 0, 1, 1, 0, 1, 0)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{155} = (1, 0, 0, 1, 1, 0, 1, 1)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{156} = (1, 0, 0, 1, 1, 1, 0, 0)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{157} = (1, 0, 0, 1, 1, 1, 0, 1)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{158} = (1, 0, 0, 1, 1, 1, 1, 0)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{159} = (1, 0, 0, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{160} = (1, 0, 1, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{161} = (1, 0, 1, 0, 0, 0, 0, 1)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{162} = (1, 0, 1, 0, 0, 0, 1, 0)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{163} = (1, 0, 1, 0, 0, 0, 1, 1)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{164} = (1, 0, 1, 0, 0, 1, 0, 0)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{165} = (1, 0, 1, 0, 0, 1, 0, 1)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{166} = (1, 0, 1, 0, 0, 1, 1, 0)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{167} = (1, 0, 1, 0, 0, 1, 1, 1)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{168} = (1, 0, 1, 0, 1, 0, 0, 0)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{169} = (1, 0, 1, 0, 1, 0, 0, 1)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{170} = (1, 0, 1, 0, 1, 0, 1, 0)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{171} = (1, 0, 1, 0, 1, 0, 1, 1)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{172} = (1, 0, 1, 0, 1, 1, 0, 0)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{173} = (1, 0, 1, 0, 1, 1, 0, 1)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{174} = (1, 0, 1, 0, 1, 1, 1, 0)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{175} = (1, 0, 1, 0, 1, 1, 1, 1)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{176} = (1, 0, 1, 1, 0, 0, 0, 0)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{177} = (1, 0, 1, 1, 0, 0, 0, 1)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{178} = (1, 0, 1, 1, 0, 0, 1, 0)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{179} = (1, 0, 1, 1, 0, 0, 1, 1)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{180} = (1, 0, 1, 1, 0, 1, 0, 0)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{181} = (1, 0, 1, 1, 0, 1, 0, 1)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{182} = (1, 0, 1, 1, 0, 1, 1, 0)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{183} = (1, 0, 1, 1, 0, 1, 1, 1)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{184} = (1, 0, 1, 1, 1, 0, 0, 0)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{185} = (1, 0, 1, 1, 1, 0, 0, 1)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{186} = (1, 0, 1, 1, 1, 0, 1, 0)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{187} = (1, 0, 1, 1, 1, 0, 1, 1)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{188} = (1, 0, 1, 1, 1, 1, 0, 0)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{189} = (1, 0, 1, 1, 1, 1, 0, 1)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{190} = (1, 0, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 0)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{191} = (1, 0, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{192} = (1, 1, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{193} = (1, 1, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 1)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{194} = (1, 1, 0, 0, 0, 0, 1, 0)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{195} = (1, 1, 0, 0, 0, 0, 1, 1)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{196} = (1, 1, 0, 0, 0, 1, 0, 0)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{197} = (1, 1, 0, 0, 0, 1, 0, 1)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{198} = (1, 1, 0, 0, 0, 1, 1, 0)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{199} = (1, 1, 0, 0, 0, 1, 1, 1)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{200} = (1, 1, 0, 0, 1, 0, 0, 0)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{201} = (1, 1, 0, 0, 1, 0, 0, 1)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{202} = (1, 1, 0, 0, 1, 0, 1, 0)$

- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{203} = (1, 1, 0, 0, 1, 0, 1, 1)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{204} = (1, 1, 0, 0, 1, 1, 0, 0)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{205} = (1, 1, 0, 0, 1, 1, 0, 1)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{206} = (1, 1, 0, 0, 1, 1, 1, 0)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{207} = (1, 1, 0, 0, 1, 1, 1, 1)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{208} = (1, 1, 0, 1, 0, 0, 0, 0)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{209} = (1, 1, 0, 1, 0, 0, 0, 1)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{210} = (1, 1, 0, 1, 0, 0, 1, 0)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{211} = (1, 1, 0, 1, 0, 0, 1, 1)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{212} = (1, 1, 0, 1, 0, 1, 0, 0)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{213} = (1, 1, 0, 1, 0, 1, 0, 1)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{214} = (1, 1, 0, 1, 0, 1, 1, 0)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{215} = (1, 1, 0, 1, 0, 1, 1, 1)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{216} = (1, 1, 0, 1, 1, 0, 0, 0)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{217} = (1, 1, 0, 1, 1, 0, 0, 1)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{218} = (1, 1, 0, 1, 1, 0, 1, 0)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{219} = (1, 1, 0, 1, 1, 0, 1, 1)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{220} = (1, 1, 0, 1, 1, 1, 0, 0)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{221} = (1, 1, 0, 1, 1, 1, 0, 1)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{222} = (1, 1, 0, 1, 1, 1, 1, 0)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{223} = (1, 1, 0, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{224} = (1, 1, 1, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{225} = (1, 1, 1, 0, 0, 0, 0, 1)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{226} = (1, 1, 1, 0, 0, 0, 1, 0)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{227} = (1, 1, 1, 0, 0, 0, 1, 1)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{228} = (1, 1, 1, 0, 0, 1, 0, 0)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{229} = (1, 1, 1, 0, 0, 1, 0, 1)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{230} = (1, 1, 1, 0, 0, 1, 1, 0)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{231} = (1, 1, 1, 0, 0, 1, 1, 1)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{232} = (1, 1, 1, 0, 1, 0, 0, 0)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{233} = (1, 1, 1, 0, 1, 0, 0, 1)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{234} = (1, 1, 1, 0, 1, 0, 1, 0)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{235} = (1, 1, 1, 0, 1, 0, 1, 1)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{236} = (1, 1, 1, 0, 1, 1, 0, 0)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{237} = (1, 1, 1, 0, 1, 1, 0, 1)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{238} = (1, 1, 1, 0, 1, 1, 1, 0)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{239} = (1, 1, 1, 0, 1, 1, 1, 1)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{240} = (1, 1, 1, 1, 0, 0, 0, 0)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{241} = (1, 1, 1, 1, 0, 0, 0, 1)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{242} = (1, 1, 1, 1, 0, 0, 1, 0)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{243} = (1, 1, 1, 1, 0, 0, 1, 1)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{244} = (1, 1, 1, 1, 0, 1, 0, 0)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{245} = (1, 1, 1, 1, 0, 1, 0, 1)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{246} = (1, 1, 1, 1, 0, 1, 1, 0)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{247} = (1, 1, 1, 1, 0, 1, 1, 1)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{248} = (1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 0, 0, 0)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{249} = (1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 0, 0, 1)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{250} = (1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 0, 1, 0)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{251} = (1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 0, 1, 1)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{252} = (1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 0, 0)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{253} = (1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 0, 1)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{254} = (1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 0)$
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^{255} = (1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1)$

References

E. Akin. The iterated prisoner's dilemma: good strategies and their dynamics. *Ergodic Theory, Advances in Dynamical Systems*, pages 77–107, 2016.

C. Hilbe, A. Traulsen, and K. Sigmund. Partners or rivals? strategies for the iterated prisoner's dilemma. *Games and economic behavior*, 92:41–52, 2015.

C. Hilbe, L. A. Martinez-Vaquero, K. Chatterjee, and M. A. Nowak. Memory-n strategies of direct reciprocity. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 114(18):4715–4720, 2017.

A. McAvoy and M. A. Nowak. Reactive learning strategies for iterated games. *Proceedings of the Royal Society A*, 475(2223):20180819, 2019.

W. H. Press and F. J. Dyson. Iterated prisoner's dilemma contains strategies that dominate any evolutionary opponent. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 109(26):10409–10413, 2012.