# Continual Re-Solving for HUNL Poker: Theoretical Backbone and Implementation Manual

#### Abstract

This document consolidates the theoretical backbone of a practical, continual re-solving system for heads-up no-limit Texas Hold'em (HUNL) under a sparse action menu and depth-limited search. The goal is twofold: (i) to serve as an instruction manual for implementing the method end-to-end, and (ii) to present the elementary proofs used to verify core invariants in the accompanying work  $HUNL\_AI$  (the implementation paper). All other foundational results are cited to the established literature on continual re-solving (DeepStack). Formal statements and proofs written out below are restricted to those provided in  $HUNL\_AI$ ; no new theory is introduced here. :contentReference[oaicite:0]index=0

#### 1 Problem Setting and High-Level Design

Game model. HUNL is a two-player zero-sum extensive-form game with imperfect information, chance nodes (dealing), and alternating moves. Play proceeds across streets (preflop, flop, turn, river), with public-card revelation between betting rounds.

Continual re-solving. At each decision, re-solve the current public subtree to obtain a local strategy, act from that strategy, and carry forward only (a) the acting player's range and (b) the opponent's counterfactual value (CFV) vector, updated after own/chance/opponent transitions. Depth is limited for tractability; beyond the limit, leaf utilities are provided by learned CFV functions. (Foundational soundness and re-solving protocol are due to DeepStack; see fixed reference at the end.)

**Sparse actions and depth limits.** A first layer of {Fold, Call/Check, Pot, All-in} with lean replies balances strength and tractability; depth limits at the end of street on preflop and flop invoke CFV networks; the turn proceeds to terminal with exact endgame. These choices match the implementation/invariant suite described in  $HUNL\_AI$ . :contentReference[oaicite:1]index=1

# 2 Notation and Objects

- K buckets (clusters) per street;  $r_1, r_2 \in \Delta^K$  denote bucketed ranges.
- P > 0 current pot; Pnorm :=  $P/(S_1^{(0)} + S_2^{(0)}) \in (0, 1]$ .
- $\varphi_{\text{board}} \in \{0,1\}^{52}$  one-hot encoding of public cards.
- CFV networks (flop/turn) output per-bucket pot-fraction CFVs for both players.

#### 3 CFV Networks and Outer Zero-Sum Layer

#### 3.1 Input/Output contract (instruction)

For each depth-limit query (end of preflop or flop), build

$$x = [Pnorm \mid \varphi_{board} \mid r_1 \mid r_2] \in \mathbb{R}^{1+52+2K}$$

and obtain unadjusted predictions  $(v_1, v_2) \in \mathbb{R}^K \times \mathbb{R}^K$  in fractions of pot. Multiply by P only if chip units are needed downstream. :contentReference[oaicite:2]index=2

#### 3.2 Per-sample outer zero-sum adjustment (statement and proof)

**Proposition 1** (Outer zero-sum identity). Let  $s_1 = \langle r_1, v_1 \rangle$ ,  $s_2 = \langle r_2, v_2 \rangle$ , and  $\delta := \frac{1}{2}(s_1 + s_2)$ . Define

$$f_1 := v_1 - \delta \mathbf{1}, \qquad f_2 := v_2 - \delta \mathbf{1}.$$

Then  $\langle r_1, f_1 \rangle + \langle r_2, f_2 \rangle = 0$  (up to numerical roundoff).

Proof.

$$\langle r_1, f_1 \rangle + \langle r_2, f_2 \rangle = \langle r_1, v_1 \rangle - \delta \langle r_1, \mathbf{1} \rangle + \langle r_2, v_2 \rangle - \delta \langle r_2, \mathbf{1} \rangle = (s_1 + s_2) - \delta (1 + 1).$$

Since  $\delta = \frac{1}{2}(s_1 + s_2)$ , the expression reduces to  $(s_1 + s_2) - (s_1 + s_2) = 0$ . :contentReference[oaicite:3]index=3

**Implementation note.** Apply the adjustment samplewise after the linear heads and before loss computation; report all validation metrics in pot units.

# 4 Follow/Terminate Gadget and Monotone Carry-Forward

Let S be a boundary state (end-of-street) with opponent range  $r_{\text{opp}} \in \Delta^K$  and constraint vector  $c^{(t)} \in \mathbb{R}^K$  (opponent CFFs) carried from the previous boundary.

# 4.1 Gadget (instruction)

For each bucket i, the opponent chooses Terminate (receive  $c_i^{(t)}$ ) or Follow (enter the re-solved subgame and receive  $\tilde{v}_i^{(t)}$ ). Define

$$v_{\text{opp},i} := \max\{c_i^{(t)}, \ \tilde{v}_i^{(t)}\}, \qquad v_{\text{hero},i} := -v_{\text{opp},i}.$$

This preserves zero-sum per bucket and range-weights to zero overall (consistency with the outer layer). :contentReference[oaicite:4]index=4

### 4.2 Monotone carry-forward (statement and proof)

**Proposition 2** (Protection & monotonicity). With the update  $c^{(t+1)} := \max\{c^{(t)}, \tilde{v}^{(t)}\}$  (componentwise), it holds that

- (i)  $v_{opp,i} \ge c_i^{(t)}$  for all i (Terminate is never worse than Follow).
- (ii)  $c_i^{(t+1)} \ge c_i^{(t)}$  for all i (non-decreasing lower bound across boundaries).

$$\begin{array}{ll} \textit{Proof.} \ \ (\text{i) Since} \ v_{\text{opp},i} = \max\{c_i^{(t)}, \tilde{v}_i^{(t)}\}, \ v_{\text{opp},i} \geq c_i^{(t)} \ \text{by definition.} \ \ (\text{ii) By the update,} \ c_i^{(t+1)} = \max\{c_i^{(t)}, \tilde{v}_i^{(t)}\} \geq c_i^{(t)}. \ \text{:contentReference[oaicite:5]index=5} \end{array}$$

**Implementation note.** Use self-play CFVs for  $c^{(t)}$  in practice for stability; the termination option guarantees safety while damping oscillations between boundaries. :contentReference[oaicite:6]index=6

#### 5 Bayes-Consistent Range Updates

Let  $i \in \{1, \dots, K\}$  index opponent buckets. After observing an opponent action a, update

$$p'(i) = \frac{p(i) \pi(a \mid i)}{\sum_{j=1}^{K} p(j) \pi(a \mid j)}.$$

**Proposition 3** (Normalization and invariances). For any prior  $p \in \Delta^K$  and likelihoods  $\pi(a \mid i) \geq 0$  with  $\sum_i p(i) \pi(a \mid i) > 0$ ,

- (i)  $\sum_{i} p'(i) = 1$  (posterior is a probability vector);
- (ii) If  $\pi(a \mid i)$  is constant in i, then p' = p (uninformative action leaves the prior unchanged);
- (iii) For a sequence of independent observations  $a_1, \ldots, a_T$ , the posterior equals the one-shot update with product likelihoods.

*Proof.* (i) Summing the numerator over i yields the denominator; division gives 1. (ii) If  $\pi(a \mid i) = \kappa$  for all i, then  $p'(i) = p(i)\kappa/(\kappa \sum_j p(j)) = p(i)$ . (iii) Follows by multiplication of likelihoods and a single normalization at the end. :contentReference[oaicite:7]index=7

**Instruction.** Maintain strictly positive mass by construction; a small uniform mixture is acceptable as a safety fallback when external priors are degenerate. :contentReference[oaicite:8]index=8

# 6 Clustering and Bucket Interface

**Feature sketch.** Practical clustering can be framed in a low-dimensional feature space capturing (i) showdown equity, (ii) equity potential, and (iii) a payoff proxy, normalized before Euclidean k-means. Bucket count is  $K = \min\{K_{\text{target}}, |H|\}$  for candidate hand set H. Drift-triggered reclustering avoids unnecessary recomputation. (Full engineering details are in the implementation paper; clustering is a design layer, not a theoretical guarantee, so no proof is replicated here.) :contentReference[oaicite:9]index=9

# 7 Depth-Limit Policy and Endgame

**Depth-limit placement.** End-of-street on preflop/flop (CFV networks) and solve-to-terminal from turn through river (exact endgame). This matches the documented interface between search and value functions and preserves the pot-fraction semantics. :contentReference[oaicite:10]index=10

# 8 Engine Invariants (Sanity Layer)

Mass and pot monotonicity. Range mass is conserved to numerical tolerance, and public pot changes are non-negative modulo explicit refunds, with street transitions restricted to "stay or advance by one". (These are enforced as testable invariants rather than game-theoretic lemmas; no further proofs needed here.) :contentReference[oaicite:11]index=11

### 9 Implementation Checklist (Instruction Manual)

- 1. State & legality. Implement a single public-state engine: actor order per street; sparse legal menu; street advance on equalization; all-in lock fast-forward. :contentReference[oaicite:12]index=12
- 2. **CFV I/O.** Input [Pnorm  $|\varphi_{\text{board}}| r_1 | r_2$ ]; output per-bucket pot-fraction CFVs; apply outer zero-sum adjustment before loss and logging. :contentReference[oaicite:13]index=13
- 3. **Re-solver.** CFR-style iterations with *Follow/Terminate* gadget at boundary; self-play constraints; carry-forward via componentwise max; statistical action pruning with reactivation (variance-aware). :contentReference[oaicite:14]index=14
- 4. **Preflop cache.** Content-addressed signature; require bit-identical reuse on hits. :contentReference[oaicite:15]index=15
- 5. Sanity harness. Enforce zero-sum residual  $\leq 10^{-6}$  (post-adjust), range-mass tolerance, and non-negative pot deltas on synthetic transitions. :contentReference[oaicite:16]index=16

### 10 References (Fixed)

- Implementation paper: HUNL\_AI (ResolveNet Poker: Neural CFV re-solving for HUNL; full engineering and verification suite). :contentReference[oaicite:17]index=17
- Foundational continual re-solving: Moravčík et al. (DeepStack: Expert-Level Artificial Intelligence in Heads-Up No-Limit Poker), *Science* 356(6337):508–513, 2017; see also arXiv:1701.01724 for the technical appendix (algorithms, action tables, zero-sum outer layer, depth-limit placement, and LBR settings).

# Appendix: Minimal Proof Sketches Included

Only proofs reproduced in  $HUNL\_AI$  are written out here: (A) outer zero-sum identity for the per-sample adjustment; (B) gadget protection and monotone carry-forward; (C) Bayes posterior normalization/invariance. All other theoretical foundations are cited to the fixed DeepStack reference above.