Math 167: Game Theory
UCLA

Darsh Verma

Winter 2026

Hello and welcome! As the title suggests, these are my lecture notes on Game Theory. Our professor is **Sylvester Zhang**. The textbook that we are using is **Game Theory, Alive by Anna R. Karlin and Yuval Peres**.

The goal of these lecture notes is to write **understandable** math. Some dude said, "If you can't explain it to a six year old, then you don't understand it yourself". The hope is that anyone coming across these notes (like you!) will be able to at least take away the gist of these concepts. Email me at darsh [at] ucla [dot] edu if you find any errors!

Huge shoutout to https://zitong.me/notes/rings-notes.pdf who inspired me to attend class and lock in.

Contents

List of Definitions

List of Theorems

1 Lecture 1: Jan 5

1.1 Introduction

Today, the professor arrived 20 minutes late so we just did a brief intro on things we're gonna do in the class like combinatorial games, two-person zero sum games, general sum games, Nash equilibria, fixed-point theorem, and evolutionary models.

Apparently, the fixed point theorem is used to prove something related to the Nash equilibria. Interestingly enough, Zitong sent me this reel a few days ago where I first learned about the fixed point theorem.

We ended lecture by playing the classic 4×5 version of Chomp! It seems to me that the first player always has a winning strategy but I need to formalize why this is true.

2 Jan 7 : Lecture 2

2.1 Impartial Combinatorial games

- two-player games, alternate turns

- perfect information

- no randomess

- both players have the same set of moves

- player who takes the last move wins

- win or loss outcome

Example 2.1. There are n chips on a table. There are two players, Larry and Rick. A valid move is to take 1, 2, or 3 chips from the pile. Assume that Larry goes first and the player who takes the last chip wins.

We proceed with backward induction. Let's define the following states:

N : the next player to take a move wins.

P : the previous player that took a move won.

These are conventions because you can have multiple players instead of just two. We could have also just called them you and your opponent.

Backward induction just means that we start analyzing states by having 0 chips on the table. That falls under state P. This implies that if there are 1, 2, or 3 chips on the table, those fall under state N because the next player who moves can just take 1, 2, or 3 chips and win the game. Similarly, we can extend this logic that 4 chips falls under state P, and so on.

It turns out that the Larry has a 75% chance of winning, and Rick has a 25% chance of winning simply because of who went first.

Example 2.2 (Chomp)**.** Given a 2×3 chocolate bar, here are the possible states it can go to

We ended class with a quiz on induction.

3   Lecture 3 : Jan 9

I'm not sure what these initial definitions are but I'll understand later.

Definition. $P_0 = P_1 = \{\text{terminal position}\}$
$N_{n+1} = \{x \mid \text{there exists a move } x \to y, y \in P_n\}$
$P_{n+1} = \{x \mid \text{there exists a move } x \to y, y \in N_n\}$

Definition (Progressively Bounded). A game is called progressive bounded if for every position x, there exists an upper bound $B(x) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ on the number of moves until the game stops.

Now, we will talk about potential winning strategies for the Game Chomp.

Proposition 3.1 (Chomp Winners be like).

For any rectangular $n \times m$ Chomp game, the player that goes first wins!

Proof. If we have a square board, start off by removing everything from the square up and to the right of the poisoned square. Then, just mimic your opponent.

Now, we will prove the existence of a winning strategy for a rectangular board. Make a harmless move by removing the top right square. Now, that board is either a P state or an N state.
Assume we are in an N state. Whatever move Player 2 makes, Player 1 could have made that same move when they went first. So Player 1 wins.
On the other hand, being in a P state implies that Player 2 already lost. this is dumbass proof but wtv $\qquad \square$

Theorem 3.2.

Let x be a state of a progressively bounded impartial combinatorial game. Then, $x \in N \cup P$ and $N \cap P = \emptyset$.

Proof. This theorem is basically saying that every state is either state N or state P but never both. And from any state, there always exists a winning strategy. Since we are in a progressively bounded game, we have $B(x)$. We are gonna induct on $n = B(x)$.
The base case is trivial apparently.
Our inductive hypothesis: if $B(x) = n$, then $x \in P_n \cup N_n$, and $P_n \cap N_n = \emptyset$.
For our inductive step, we need to prove if $B(x) = n + 1$, then $x \in P_{n+1} \cup N_{n+1}$, and $P_{n+1} \cap N_{n+1} = \emptyset$.

Case 1: for any move $x \to y$, $y \in N_n \implies x \in P_{n+1}$
Case 2: there exists a move $x \to y$, $y \in P_n \implies x \in N_{n+1}$ $\square$

3.1   Nim

There are several piles of finitely many chips. A player can remove any number of chips from a single pile. Players alternate in turns. The player who takes the last chip wins.

To start off, let's think about a game with 2 piles with an arbitrary number of chips in them. If one pile has a chips, and the other has b chips this is equivalent to a Chomp game as follows:

We ended class by thinking about the strategy if we had 3 piles.