

CO 456: Introduction to Game Theory

University of Waterloo
Martin Pei
Fall 2020

Marco Yang

Last updated: September 21, 2020

Contents

1	Course Administration	1
	Overview	1
	Instructor	1
	Assignments	1
	Exams	1
	Grading	1
2	Impartial Games	2
	Nim	2
	Impartial games	3
	Winning strategy	5
3	Equivalent Games (I)	6
	Game sums	6
	Game equivalences	7
	Losing games and empty Nim	8
4	Equivalent Games (II)	10
5	Nim and Nimbers (I)	12
	Nimbers	12
	Winning strategy for Nim	14
6	Nim and Nimbers (II)	16
7	Sprague–Grundy Theorem	18
	Poker nim	18
	Mex	19

Lecture 1: Course Administration

Overview

Planned topics:

1. Combinatorial games
2. Strategic games
3. Mechanism design
4. Cooperative games

Instructor

Martin Pei (mpei).

Assignments

Roughly 30-40 assignment problems, up to 4 per week. Due Fridays at 11:59 pm Eastern on Crowdmark. All equally weighted, marked out of 10.

Exams

Three term tests and a final exam.

- Term test 1: Wednesday, October 7, 12:01 am to 11:59 pm EDT
- Term test 2: Wednesday, November 11, 12:01 am to 11:59 pm EST
- Term test 3: Wednesday, December 2, 12:01 am to 11:59 pm EST
- Final exam: scheduled during final exam period (December 9-23)

Each term test is allotted 2.5 hours within the 24-hour window (student's choice). Final exam is allotted 3 hours within its 24-hour window (student's choice). Open book.

Grading

- 40% assignment problems (lowest 7 dropped)
- Best 3 of 4 assessments:
 - 20% term test 1
 - 20% term test 2
 - 20% term test 3
 - 20% final exam

Lecture 2: Impartial Games

Nim

We are given some piles of chips. Two players play alternately. On a player's turn, they pick a pile and remove at least 1 chip from it. The first player who cannot make a move loses.

Example

- 1, 1, 2.
 - Player I removes 2 chips from the last pile.
 - Player II removes a 1-chip pile.
 - Player I removes the last chip.
 - Player II has no move and loses.
 - Player I has a winning strategy.

This is a **winning game** or **winning position**.

- 5, 5.
 - Regardless of Player I's move, Player II can mirror it on the other pile.
 - Player II always has a move, so Player I loses.
 - Player I always loses (*i.e.* Player II has a winning strategy).

This is a **losing game** or **losing position**.

- 5, 7.
 - Player I first equalizes piles (here, removing 2 from the pile of 7).
 - Player II loses (by the previous case).

This is a winning game.

Lemma 2.1

In instances of Nim with two piles of n, m chips, it is a winning game if and only if $n \neq m$.

Impartial games

Nim is an impartial game.

Definition — impartial game

Conditions for an **impartial game**:

1. There are two players, Player I (who starts) and Player II.
2. There are several positions and a starting position.
3. A player performs one of a set of allowable moves, which depends only on the current position and not on the player (hence “impartial”). Each possible move generates an **option**.
4. The players move alternately.
5. There is complete information.
6. There are no chance moves.
7. The first player with no available move loses.
8. The rules guarantee that games end.


Example

Games which are not impartial:

- Tic-tac-toe (violates 7—may tie)
- Chess (violates 3—may only move your pieces)
- Poker (violates 5—cards hidden)
- Monopoly (violates 6—relies on dice rolls)

Example

Let $G = (1, 1, 2)$ be a Nim game. There are 4 possible moves, hence 4 possible options.



Each H_i is itself another Nim game.

Note: we can define an impartial game by its position and options recursively.

Definition — game simplicity

A game H that is reachable from game G by a sequence of allowable moves is **simpler** than G .

Example

Other impartial games:

- Subtraction game
 - One pile of chips.
 - Valid move: remove 1, 2, or 3 chips.
- Rook game
 - $m \times n$ chess board with a rook at (i, j) .
 - Valid move: move the rook any number of spaces up or left.
- Green hackenbush game
 - Graph connected to the floor at some vertices.
 - Valid move: remove an edge of the graph, then any components no longer connected to the floor.

Spoiler: all impartial games are essentially Nim games.

Winning strategy

Lemma 2.2

In any game G , either Player I or Player II has a winning strategy.

Proof.


By induction on simplicity of G .

If G has no allowable moves, then Player I loses, so Player II has a winning strategy. Assume G has allowable moves and the lemma holds for all games simpler than G . Among all options of G , if Player I has a winning strategy in one of them, Player I will move to that option and win. Otherwise, Player II has a winning strategy for all options, so Player II wins regardless of Player I's move. \square


That is, every impartial game G is either a winning game or a losing game.

Example

Winning game of Nim (at least one winning move):



Losing game of Nim (no winning moves):



Note: we assume players play perfectly. If there is a winning move, then they will take it.

Lecture 3: Equivalent Games (I)

Game sums

Definition — game sum

Let G and H be two games with respective options G_1, \dots, G_m and H_1, \dots, H_n . We define $G + H$ as the game with options

$$G_1 + H, \dots, G_m + H, G + H_1, \dots, G + H_n.$$

Example

We denote $*n$ to be a game of Nim with one pile of n chips. Then $*1 + *1 + *2$ is a Nim game with three piles of 1, 1, and 2 chips.

Example

Let $\#n$ be the subtraction game with n chips. Then $*5 + \#7$ is the game where a move is either to remove at least 1 chip from the pile of 5 (Nim) or to remove 1, 2, or 3 chips from the pile of 7 (subtraction game).

Lemma 3.1

Let \mathcal{G} be the set of all impartial games. Then for all $G, H, J \in \mathcal{G}$,

1. $G + H \in \mathcal{G}$ (closure)
2. $(G + H) + J = G + (H + J)$ (associativity)
3. There exists an identity $0 \in \mathcal{G}$ (the game with no options) where $G + 0 = 0 + G = G$.
4. $G + H = H + G$ (symmetry)

Note: \mathcal{G} is an abelian group, except for an inverse element.

Game equivalences

Definition — game equivalence

Two games G and H are **equivalent** if for any game J , $G + J$ and $H + J$ have the same outcome (*i.e.*, both are winning games or both are losing games). Notation: $G \equiv H$.

Example

$*3 \equiv *3$. Since $*3 + J$ is the same game as $*3 + J$, they have the same outcome.

$*3 \not\equiv *4$. $*3 + *3$ is a winning game but $*4 + *3$ is a losing game ([Lemma 2.1](#)).

Lemma 3.2

$*n \equiv *m$ if and only if $n = m$.

Lemma 3.3

The relation \equiv is an equivalence relation. That is, for all $G, H, K \in \mathcal{G}$,

1. $G \equiv G$ (reflexivity).
2. $G \equiv H$ if and only if $H \equiv G$ (symmetry).
3. If $G \equiv H$ and $H \equiv J$, then $G \equiv J$ (transitivity).

Exercise 3.4

Prove that if $G \equiv H$, then $G + J \equiv H + J$ for any game J .

Proof.

Consider any games J and K . Let $M = J + K$. Then $G + J + K = G + M$ and $H + J + K = H + M$. Since $G \equiv H$, $G + M$ and $H + M$ have the same outcome. But then $(G + J) + K$ and $(H + J) + K$ have the same outcome by [Lemma 3.1](#). K was arbitrary, so $G + J \equiv H + J$. \square

Losing games and empty Nim

Nim with one pile $*n$ is a losing game if and only if $n = 0$.

Theorem 3.5

G is a losing game if and only if $G \equiv *0$.

Corollary 3.6

If G is a losing game, then J and $J + G$ have the same outcome for any game J .

Proof.

Since G is a losing game, $G \equiv *0$ by Theorem 3.5. Then $J + G \equiv J + *0 \equiv J$ by Exercise 3.4 and Lemma 3.1, so J and $J + G$ have the same outcome. \square

Example

1. Recall $*5 + *5$ and $*7 + *7$ are losing games. Corollary 3.6 says $*5 + *5 + *7 + *7$ is also a losing game. (Player I moves in either $*5 + *5$ or $*7 + *7$. Player II plays a winning move in the same part by equalizing piles.)
2. $\underbrace{*1 + *1 + *2}_{\text{winning}} + \underbrace{*5 + *5}_{\text{losing}}$ is a winning game by Corollary 3.6. (Player I removes $*2$, leaving a similar game to the previous.)

Proof (Theorem 3.5).

(\Leftarrow) If $G \equiv *0$, then $G + *0$ has the same outcome as $*0 + *0$. But $*0 + *0$ is a losing game, so G is a losing game.

(\Rightarrow) Suppose G is a losing game. We show $G + J$ and $*0 + J \equiv J$ have the same outcome.

- ① Suppose J is a losing game. We show “if G and J are both losing games, then $G + J$ is a losing game” by induction on simplicity of $G + J$.

When $G + J$ has no options, G and J have no options, so G , J , and $G + J$ are all losing games. Assume $G + J$ has some options and the statement holds for simpler games. WLOG, Player I moves on G , resulting in $G' + J$. G is a losing game, so G' is a winning game. Player II makes a winning move from G' to G'' , resulting in $G'' + J$. Then G'' is a losing game, so by induction $G'' + J$ is a losing game. Player I loses, so $G + J$ is a losing game.

- ② Suppose J is a winning game, so J as a winning move to J' . Player I moves from $G + J$ to $G + J'$. G and J' are both losing games, so by ① $G + J'$ is a losing game. Player II loses, so Player I wins and $G + J$ is a winning game.

□

Lecture 4: Equivalent Games (II)

Lemma 4.1 — copycat principle

For any game G , $G + G \equiv *0$.

Proof.

By induction on the simplicity of G .

When G has no options, $G + G$ has no options, so $G + G \equiv *0$ by [Lemma 4.1](#).

Suppose G has options, and WLOG suppose Player I moves from $G + G$ to $G' + G$. Then Player II can move to $G' + G'$. By induction, $G' + G' \equiv *0$, so it is a losing game for Player I. Therefore, $G + G$ is a losing game, and $G + G \equiv *0$. \square

Aside: this means G is its own “inverse”.

Lemma 4.2

$G \equiv H$ if and only if $G + H \equiv *0$.

Proof.

(\implies) From $G \equiv H$, we add H to both sides to get $G + H \equiv H + H \equiv *0$ by the [copycat principle](#).

(\impliedby) From $G + H \equiv *0$, we add H to both sides to get $G + H + H \equiv *0 + H \equiv H$. But $G + H + H \equiv G + *0 \equiv G$ by the [copycat principle](#), so $G \equiv H$. \square

Example

$*1 + *2 + *3$ is a losing game, so $*1 + *2 + *3 \equiv *0$. By [Lemma 4.2](#), $*1 + *2 \equiv *3$. Or, $*1 + *3 \equiv *2$.

Another way to prove game equivalence is by showing that they have equivalent options.

Lemma 4.3

If the options of G are equivalent to the options of H , then $G \equiv H$. (More precisely: there is a bijection between options of G and H where paired options are equivalent.)

Example

We can show $*1 + *2 \equiv *3$ by [Lemma 4.3](#):

$$\begin{array}{rcl}
 *1 + *2 & & *3 \\
 \hline
 *2 & \equiv & *2 \\
 *1 & \equiv & *1 \\
 *1 + *1 & \equiv & *0
 \end{array}$$

Note: the converse of [Lemma 4.3](#) is false.

Proof (Lemma 4.3).

It suffices to show that $G + H \equiv *0$ (by [Lemma 4.2](#)), *i.e.*, $G + H$ is a losing game. This is true when G and H both have no options. Suppose that G and H have options and suppose WLOG Player I moves to $G' + H$. By assumption, there exists an option of H , say H' , where $H' \equiv G'$. So Player II can move to $G' + H'$. Since $G' \equiv H'$, $G' + H' \equiv *0$ by [Lemma 4.2](#). So $G' + H'$ is a losing game for Player I. Hence $G + H$ is a losing game. \square

Lecture 5: Nim and Nimbers (I)

Goal: show that every Nim game is equivalent to a Nim game with a single pile.

Nimbers

Definition — nimber

If G is a game such that $G \equiv *n$ for some n , then n is the **number** of G .

Example

Any losing game has number 0 ([Theorem 3.5](#)).

Exercise 5.1

Show that the notion of a number is well-defined. (That is, every impartial game has exactly one number.)

Proof (see P3(b)).

□

Theorem 5.2

If $n = 2^{a_1} + 2^{a_2} + \dots$ where $a_1 > a_2 > \dots$, then $*n \equiv *2^{a_1} + *2^{a_2} + \dots$.

(The link to powers of 2 is hard to explain; we'll revisit this later.)

Example

$11 = 2^3 + 2^1 + 2^0$ and $13 = 2^3 + 2^2 + 2^0$. Using [Theorem 5.2](#), $*11 \equiv *2^3 + *2^1 + *2^0$ and $*13 \equiv *2^3 + *2^2 + *2^0$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
 *11 + *13 &\equiv (*2^3 + *2^1 + *2^0) + (*2^3 + *2^2 + *2^0) \\
 &\equiv (*2^3 + *2^3) + *2^2 + *2^1 + (*2^0 + *2^0) && \text{(associativity, commutativity)} \\
 &\equiv *0 + *2^2 + *2^1 + *0 && \text{(copycat principle)} \\
 &\equiv *2^2 + *2^1 \\
 &\equiv *(2^2 + 2^1) && \text{(Theorem 5.2)} \\
 &\equiv *6.
 \end{aligned}$$

So the number of $*11 + *13$ is 6.

In general, how can we find the number of $*b_1 + *b_2 + \cdots + *b_n$? We look at the binary expansions of each b_i . The copycat principle will cancel any pair of identical powers of 2. So, we should look for powers of 2 that appear in an odd number of expansions of b_i 's.

We can use binary numbers: 11 in binary is 1011, 13 in binary is 1101. Take the XOR of the binary representations:

$$\begin{array}{r}
 1011 \\
 \oplus 1101 \\
 \hline
 0110 = 6
 \end{array}$$

So $11 \oplus 13 = 6$.

Example

Consider $*25 + *21 + *11$. The number of this game is given by the binary XOR of the numbers:

$$\begin{array}{r}
 11001 \\
 10101 \\
 \oplus 01011 \\
 \hline
 00111
 \end{array}$$

So $*25 + *21 + *11 \equiv *7$ (the number is 7).

Corollary 5.3

$$*b_1 + *b_2 + \cdots + *b_n \equiv *(b_1 \oplus b_2 \oplus \cdots \oplus b_n).$$

This shows that every Nim game has a number.

Winning strategy for Nim

Example

$*11 + *13 \equiv *6$. This is a winning game. How can we find a winning move?

We want to move to a game that is equivalent to $*0$. We can add $*6$ to both sides: $*11 + *13 + *6 \equiv *6 + *6 \equiv *0$ (copycat principle). But this isn't a valid move.

Consider $*11 + (*13 + *6)$. We see $13 \oplus 6 = 11$. So this is equivalent to $*11 + *11$, a losing game.

The winning move: remove 2 chips from the pile of 13.

Example

$*25 + *21 + *11 \equiv *7$. Add $*7$ to both sides. Consider $*25 + (*21 + *7) + *11$. We see $21 \oplus 7 = 18$, so this is equivalent to $*25 + *18 + *11$.

The winning move: remove 3 chips from the pile of 21.

Why did we pair $*7$ with $*21$ instead of $*25$ or $*11$? Those would be invalid moves: $25 \oplus 7 = 30 > 25$ and $11 \oplus 7 = 12 > 11$.

Can we always pair the nimber with a pile such that the resulting equivalent game is simpler? Yes.

Lemma 5.4

If $*b_1 + \dots + *b_n \equiv *s$ where $s > 0$, then there exists some b_i where $b_i \oplus s < b_i$.

Proof idea: look for the largest power of 2 in s . Consider $*25 + *21 + *11 \equiv *7$.

1	1	0	0	1	25	25 \oplus 7: 4 is added
1	0	1	0	1	21	21 \oplus 7: 4 is subtracted
\oplus	1	1	0	1	11	11 \oplus 7: 4 is added
	0	1	1	1	7	
		\uparrow	\uparrow	\uparrow		
		4	2	1	\leftarrow	4 > 2 + 1 so \oplus reduces 21 and increases 25 or 11

Proof (Lemma 5.4).

Suppose $s = 2^{a_1} + 2^{a_2} + \dots$ where $a_1 > a_2 > \dots$. Then 2^{a_1} appears in the binary expansions of b_1, \dots, b_n an odd number of times (in particular, at least once). Let b_i be one of them. Suppose $*b_i + *s \equiv *t$ for some t . Since 2^{a_1} is in the binary expansions of b_i and s , 2^{a_1} is not in the binary expansion of t . For $2^{a_2}, 2^{a_3}, \dots$, at worst none of them are in the binary expansion of b_i , so all of them are in the binary expansion of t . So $t \leq b_i - 2^{a_1} + 2^{a_2} + 2^{a_3} + \dots < b_i$ since $2^{a_1} > 2^{a_2} + 2^{a_3} + \dots$. \square

Finding winning moves in a winning Nim game: Say a game has nimber s . Look at the largest power of 2 in the binary expansion of s . Pair it up with any pile $*b_i$ containing this power of 2. By [Lemma 5.4](#), $s \oplus b_i < b_i$. So a winning move is taking away $b_i - (s \oplus b_i)$ chips from the pile $*b_i$.

Lecture 6: Nim and Nimbers (II)

Lemma 6.2

Let $0 \leq p, q < 2^a$ and suppose Theorem 5.2 holds for all values less than 2^a . Then $p \oplus q < 2^a$.

Proof (exercise: see P3(c))

□

Illustration of proof of Theorem 5.2: Consider $*7$. $7 = 4 + 2 + 1$. We want to prove $*7 \equiv *4 + *2 + *1$; by induction, $*2 + *1 \equiv *3$. We want to show $*7 \equiv *4 + *3$. By Lemma 4.3, we can show the two sides have equivalent options.

Options of $*7$: $*0, *1, \dots, *6$.

Options of $*4 + *3$: ① Move on $*4$. ② Move on $*3$.

- ① Options are $*0 + *3, *1 + *3, *2 + *3, *3 + *3$. Each part is < 4 , so by Lemma 6.2 each option is < 4 . (Calculating them, we have $*3, *2, *1, *0$, so they are also distinct.)
- ② Options are $*4 + *2, *4 + *1, 4 + *0$. Here, each first part is 4 and each second part is < 4 , so each power of 2 appears at most once among the two parts. We can apply induction here. (Calculating them, we have $*6, *5, *4$, which are exactly the remaining options of $*7$.)

Proof (Theorem 5.2).

By induction on n .

When $n = 1$, $n = 2^0$ and $*1 \equiv *2^0$.

Suppose $n = 2^{a_1} + 2^{a_2} + \dots$ where $a_1 > a_2 > \dots$. Let $q = n - 2^{a_1} = 2^{a_2} + 2^{a_3} + \dots$. If $q = 0$, then $n = 2^{a_1}$, so $*n \equiv *2^{a_1}$ (Lemma 3.1). Assume $q \geq 1$. Since $q < n$, by induction, $*q \equiv *2^{a_2} + *2^{a_3} + \dots$. It remains to show that $*n \equiv *2^{a_1} + *q$.

The options of $*n$ are $*0, *1, \dots, *(n-1)$. The options of $*2^{a_1} + *q$ can be partitioned into two types.

- ① Consider options of the form $*i + *q$ where $0 \leq i < 2^{a_1}$. Since $i, q < n$, by induction, the theorem holds for i and q . So $*i$ and $*q$ are equivalent to sums of Nim piles of their binary expansions. Using arguments from the last lecture (cancellation by copycat principle, as in Corollary 5.3), $*i + *q \equiv *r_i$ where $r_i = i \oplus q$. Since $i, q < 2^{a_1}$, we have $r_i < 2^{a_1}$ (Lemma 6.2). So $0 \leq r_0, r_1, \dots, r_{2^{a_1}-1} < 2^{a_1}$.

We now show these r_i 's are distinct. Suppose $r_i = r_j$ for some $i \neq j$. Then $*r_i \equiv *r_j$ (Lemma 3.2), so $*i + *q \equiv *j + *q$. Adding $*q$ on both sides, we get

$*i \equiv *j$ (copycat principle), so $i = j$. Contradiction.

Finally, there are 2^{a_1} of the r_i 's and there are 2^{a_1} possible values (0 to $2^{a_1} - 1$). By pigeonhole, for each $0 \leq j \leq 2^{a_1} - 1$, there is exactly one r_i with $r_i = j$. So the options of this type are equivalent to $\{*0, *1, \dots, *2^{a_1} - 1\}$.

- ② Consider options of the form $*2^{a_1} + *i$ where $0 \leq i < q$. Suppose $i = 2^{b_1} + 2^{b_2} + \dots$ where $b_1 > b_2 > \dots$. Then no b_i is equal to a_1 . So $2^{a_1} + 2^{b_1} + 2^{b_2} + \dots$ is a sum of distinct powers of 2. Then

$$\begin{aligned} *2^{a_1} + *i &\equiv *2^{a_1} + *2^{b_1} + *2^{b_2} + \dots && \text{(applying induction on } i\text{)} \\ &\equiv *(2^{a_1} + 2^{b_1} + 2^{b_2} + \dots) && \text{(applying induction on } 2^{a_1} + i\text{)} \\ &\equiv *(2^{a_1} + i). \end{aligned}$$

Since $0 \leq i < q$, the options of this type are equivalent to

$$\{*2^{a_1}, *(2^{a_1} + 1), \dots, *\underbrace{(2^{a_1} + q - 1)}_{n-1}\}.$$

Combining the two types of options, we see that the options of $*2^{a_1} + *q$ are equivalent to the options of $*n$. By [Lemma 4.2](#), $*2^{a_1} + *q \equiv *n$. \square

Lecture 7: Sprague–Grundy Theorem

So far: all Nim games are equivalent to a Nim game of a single pile.

Goal: extend this to all impartial games.

Poker nim

Being equivalent does not mean that two games play the same way.

Example

$*11 + *13 \equiv *6$. LHS: we want to move to $*11 + *11 \equiv *0$ by removing 2 chips from $*13$. RHS: remove all 6 chips.

There are other moves in the game, however. Say we move to $*11 + *8 \equiv *15$. LHS: we remove 5 chips from $*13$. RHS: add 9 chips.

Or, starting with $*11 + *11 \equiv *0$, any move on $*11 + *11$ will increase $*0$. Technically, adding chips is not allowed in Nim.

Definition — poker nim

A variation on Nim: **poker nim** consists of a regular Nim game plus a bag of B chips. We now allow regular Nim moves and adding $B' \leq B$ chips to one pile.

Example

In poker nim, $*3 + *4$ can move to $*53 + *4$ (assuming $B \geq 50$).

How does this change the game of Nim? It doesn't.

Say we face a losing game, so any regular Nim moves would lead to a loss. In poker nim, we now add some chips to one pile. The opposing play will simply remove the chips we placed, so nothing has changed. Adding chips is not beneficial to any player.

When we say that a game is equivalent to a Nim game with one pile, it is actually a *poker nim* game with one pile.

Mex

Suppose a game G has options equivalent to $*0, *1, *2, *5, *10, *25$. We claim that $G \equiv *3$.

The options of $*3$, which are $*0, *1, *2$, are all available to G . If we add chips to $*3$, then the opposing player can just remove them to get back to $*3$.

How did we get $*3$? It is the smallest non-negative integer that is not an option of G .

Definition — mex

Given a set of non-negative integers S , $\text{mex}(S)$ is the smallest non-negative integer not in S . (Mex stands for “minimum excluded integer”.)

Example

$$\text{mex}(\{0, 1, 2, 5, 15, 25\}) = 3.$$

The mex function is the critical link between any impartial games and Nim games.

Theorem 7.1

Let G be an impartial game and let S be the set of integers n such that there exists an option of G equivalent to $*n$. Then $G \equiv *(\text{mex}(S))$.

Example

$*1 + *1 + *2$ has options

- $*1 + *2 \equiv *3$,
- $*1 + *1 \equiv *0$, and
- $*1 + *1 + *1 \equiv *1$.

By Theorem 7.1, $*1 + *1 + *2 \equiv *(\text{mex}(\{0, 1, 3\})) \equiv *2$. (This is obvious by the copycat principle.)

Exercise 7.2

Prove that a game cannot be equivalent to one of its options.

Proof (Theorem 7.1).

Let $m = \text{mex}(S)$. It suffices to show that $G + *m \equiv *0$ (Lemma 4.2).

- ① Suppose we move to $G + *m'$ where $m' < m$. Since $m = \text{mex}(S)$, there exists an option G' of G such that $G' \equiv *m'$. Player II moves to $G' + *m'$, which is a losing game since $G' \equiv *m'$ (Lemma 4.2).
- ② Suppose we move to $G' + *m$ where G' is an option of G . Then $G' \equiv *k$ for some $k \in S$. So $G' + *m \equiv *k + *m \not\equiv *0$ since $k \neq \text{mex}(S)$. So $G' + *m$ is a winning game for Player II. Then $G + *m$ is a losing game for Player I, so $G + *m \equiv *0$.

□

Theorem 7.3 — Sprague–Grundy Theorem

Any impartial game G is equivalent to a poker nim game $*n$ for some n .

Slightly sketchy proof.

If G has no options, then $G \equiv *0$. Suppose G has options G_1, \dots, G_k . By induction, $G_i \equiv *n_i$ for some n_i . By Theorem 7.1, $G \equiv *(\text{mex}(\{n_1, \dots, n_k\}))$. □

So any impartial game has a number. How does this help?